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PREFACE

It is a joy for me to issue this edition of the Nāsadiya Sūkta, Rig Veda X. 129. In this Hymn of Creation we have the most sublime philosophical song in the history of the human race.

I am presenting here a fresh study of its contents. In my view its seven mantras present a consistent formulation of the metaphysical doctrine about cosmogony as known to the Vedic seers. Many other hymns of the Rigveda present an elaboration of the theories embodied in this Sūkta.

The hymn is planned in three portions as follows:

I. Mantras 1 and 2. These enumerate the various philosophical doctrines as they prevailed in the time of the Rigveda, viz.

1. Sad-AsadVāda,
2. Rajo-Vāda,
3. Vyoma-Vāda,
4. Parāvāra-Vāda,
5. Avarana-Vāda,
6. Ambho-Vāda,
7. Āmṛita-Āmṛtyu-Vāda,
8. Ahorātra-Vāda,
I have explained these in a succinct form.

II. Mantras 3, 4, 5. These form the kernel of the author’s views about creation. This portion bristles with a bunch of technical terms as Ābhu, Tucchhyya,
Mahimā is the same as Mahat or the first category to emanate from Tamas or Avyakta Prakṛiti.

III. Mantras 6 & 7. These are couched in a special style which is often found in the Rigveda, giving the doctrine not as a categorical statement but in the style of Saṅprāśa or Interrogation. The implication, however, is not negative but affirmative, e.g. करमे देवाय हृत्व विवेच न is not the query of perplexed ignorance, but an affirmation of the unknowable Hiranyagarbha, i.e. Anirukta Prajāpati whose symbol is 'Ku'. The same style is found in the two mantras, Mantra 6 in fact refers to the doctrine of the Devas (Deva-Vidya) as the basis of creation. The whole of the Rigveda ultimately lends itself into the hands of the Deva School of Philosophy (Deva-Vāda), which may be taken to be the ninth doctrine in addition to eight enumerated in the first two mantras.

Mantra 7 refers to the Adhyaksha of Visrṣiṭi whom the Rishis knew as Brahma. The statement whether the Creator himself knows the mystery of creation is rooted in the height of intuitional experience. This mantra succinctly and in a covert manner refers to Brahmavāda, Doctrine of Brahma as the highest basis of Vedic Philosophy from which other points of view originated.

Thus in the seven mantras of this Sūkta we find a complete statement of Vedic metaphysics which is the quint-essence of the Rigveda. I have published here a
running commentary of my own on the main ideas of the Sūkta, and then added comments of modern scholars like Keith, Macdonell, Wilson, and Coomaraswamy. I have also given the interpretation of ancient Indian writers, firstly from the Ṣatapatha Brāhmaṇa, secondly from Sāyaṇa's commentary on this Sūkta in the Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa, and finally his lucid commentary in the Rigveda Bhāṣya.

The Nāsadiya Sūkta is a blooming lotus comparable to a Padma-kosha. The seed of knowledge lies somewhere in its heart. It is saturated with the fragrance of thought that was in the intuition of the Rishis. One may repeat the hymn and breathe its aroma even now. The words are merely symbols which explode as thought advances to more subtle sheaths of Truth. 'This hymn is the finest effort of the imagination of the Vedic poet, and nothing else equals it'.

---

**CONTENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preface</th>
<th>i-iv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Text of the Nāsadiya Sūkta</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Griffith's Translation</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Our commentary</td>
<td>4-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantra 1</td>
<td>5-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantra 2</td>
<td>13-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantra 3</td>
<td>18-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantra 4</td>
<td>21-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantra 5</td>
<td>24-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantra 6-7</td>
<td>27-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Keith's Comments</td>
<td>28-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Macdonell's metrical translation</td>
<td>31-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Macdonell's Comments</td>
<td>33-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Wilson's translation</td>
<td>35-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Wilson's Comments</td>
<td>37-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Exegesis in the Ṣatapatha Brāhmaṇa</td>
<td>40-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Sāyaṇa's commentary of the Sūkta in the Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa</td>
<td>42-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Sāyaṇa's Commentary from the Rigveda</td>
<td>48-57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Our comments on the views of modern scholars</td>
<td>58-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Our comments on the older exegetical material</td>
<td>68-72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Banaras Hindu University

V. S. AGRAWALA

1-6-1963 [गणवंतः]
HYMN OF CREATION

NÄSADĪYA SŪKTA [RV. X. 129]

[ नासदीय सूक्त सूक्तेद १०.१२९ ]

नासदीय सूक्त

1-7 प्रजापति: परमेश्वर। आवर्तम निपुष्य।
नासदीयो सदासोधानी नासदीयो ना योमा परो यत्।
क्रिमावर्त: कु ह कस्य शर्मवर्त: क्रिमाशोडहनं गभोरस्। ॥
न सूत्यासोहद्वाहृतं न तहि न राज्या अह आसीयकेत:।
आनीवाचां स्वयं तदेवं तस्माध्य्यच परः कि चनस। ॥
तम आत्मोत्तमसा गृह्वम्प्रेता पकेत सति सर्वं सर्वमा इव।
तुष्टेनास्त्रेपिन्ति यदात्माच्छसतमनहनायायत्वकर्। ॥
कामस्तम्भन समवस्ताधि मनसे रेषः प्रथमं यदासीह।
स्तो बन्धुमस्ति निर्जिनद्वहुदि रत्नो न्योम्य: करो यमौ। ॥
तिरिष्ट्रीणो वितो रत्नेर्कामस्ति: स्तिवाः स्तिवाः ॥
तु रत्नो आसमहिमान आसस्तन्त्रा अस्वतावध्व:। पुरस्तात्। ॥
को अंद्रा चेद्र क इह न वोश्चकत्वानाता कुत इह विनिष्ठिः।
अर्जुदेवा अस्यविसत्वेनात्मा को वेद्र यत: भव भव। ॥
इह विष्टिर्यत भव भम्बू यदि वा द्वे यदि वा न।
भो अस्याय: परमे योमन्तस अह चेद्र यदि वा न चेद्र। ॥
5. Transversely was their severing line extended: what was above it then, and what below it? There were begetters, there were mighty forces, free action here and energy up yonder.

6. Who verily knows and who can here declare it, whence it was born and whence comes this creation?

The Gods are later than this world's production. Who knows then whence it first came into being?

7. He, the first origin of this creation, whether he formed it all or did not form it. Whose eye controls this world in highest heaven, he verily knows it, or perhaps he knows not.
COMMENTARY

RISHI OF THE SŪKTA—The Nāsadiya-sūkta is probably the most recondite statement of the metaphysical thought (Bhāva-vritam) of the Rishis employing a number of technical terms which later on were accepted as definitions in the codified systems of Indian philosophy. Its Rishi is Paramesṭhi Prajāpati who seems more to be the personification of an idea rather than a historical sage. Prajāpati in the transcendent form is conceived of as Svayambhū and as Paramesṭhi. Svayambhū or the Self-existent stands for the Absolute who is beyond all predication and above the two-fold categories as envisaged in the first two mantras, viz, beyond immortality and death, light and darkness, Prāṇa and Vāyu, Sat and Atar, Para and Apara, etc. Svayambhū as the Father-principle is the latent source of the manifested cosmos. As a pair to him is Prajāpati Paramesṭhi, representing the Mother principle of the manifested world, the plane of the basic duality, essential for the birth of the universe. Rightly therefore Paramesṭhi or the Universal is spoken of as the Seer responsible for the cosmogonic formulation in the hymn.

WORK OF PANDIT OJHA—This hymn contains reference to a number of doctrines which served as nucleus for the gathering thoughts of the Rishis when poetic statements of Śriśti-Vidyā were being attempted in a rich variety of bold linguistic forms. According to Pandit Madhusudan Ojha of Jaipur who was the one scholar to devote adequate attention to this hymn the first two mantras refer to ten different points of view, each of which occurs in different places in the Samhitās and the Brāhmaṇas. In his book ‘Dūkṣaḍaṇḍa-Rahasya’ he has carried out a discussion of these doctrines and I feel indebted to him for light on this sūkta. I have taken his comments and added much material of my own. The following is an exposition of the doctrines under reference.

Mantra I

1. SADASAD-VĀDA—According to this view the cosmos is Sat and its preceding cause Asat. In Rigveda 10.72 the period of cosmic time is said to be two-fold, viz. the life of Devas in a preceding age (Pūrṇa-yuga) and a subsequent age (Uttara-yuga) the former known as Asat and the latter as Sat. The two stand in a related priority and the Asat is said to be kin of Sat (Sato bandhun asati niravindan, RV.X.129.4). Elsewhere in the Rigveda both Asat and Sat are said to have existed in the highest Empyrean which was the abode of God and from which Aditi (Universal
Násadīya Sūkta

Nature) and her son Daksha (presiding genius of cosmic Yajña) were born—

असद्र सच परमेव्योमन् दक्षस्य जनस्तम्भितस्य।
चारस्मेव न्यथमाना ऋतस्य पूर्वेआयुं ऋषभमन्य्वेवः ॥

(RV. X. 5. 7)

The clearest interpretation is found in the Sātpatīha where Ast is explained as the Rishi-creation, which is further explained as Prāṇa-srishti i.e. the principle of consciousness which was the primeval essence in the beginning of the cosmos:

अहसम त्रिस्म आसीलम्। तदापुः किं तदास्तीस्तितव।
ऋषयो वाह ते अथे असिस्तीलम्। तदापुः के ते ऋषय इति।
प्राणा वा ऋषम्। ॥ (ŚB. 6.1.1.1.)

The gross material creation is said to be Sat and the preceding stage of Prāṇa or energy is termed Asat. It would be valid to speak of Brahman as Asat and Pradhāna or Prakṛti as Sat. The Seer negates here the predication of either Asat or Sat with reference to the preceding ontological entity which is Parātpara Svayambhū.

2. Rajo-Vāda—It is said here that Rajas, the primeval material cause of the universe, also did not have existence in the latent source. The doctrine of Rajas is very much amplified in the Rigveda. Once it is said that all the Devas or the Prāṇic energies in creation were at rest in the beginning, i.e. sleeping in

the depth of the primeval ocean of energy. When the urge for creation was felt and the simmering waters of the Deep Sea were churned by a tectonic world-creating movement, the Devas or the Giant-Powers of creativity sprang to their feet and began their cosmic dance. This filled the whole space with particles of agitated dust (Tīvra-reṇu, X. 72. 6) Their leader was Indra, the great dancer (Nṛita, VIII. 24. 12), Natarāja of later mythology who performs the cosmic tāṇḍava. Each universe is a particle of dust or a grain of sand filling the infinite ocean which is the source of creation.

We meet with another conception of Rajas in the Rigveda. It is said that Rajas is the power of black and white colour, the former is kṛishṇa rajas, i.e. latent power existing in the source and the latter is śukla rajas, the manifest power. The two are balancing each other, moving hand in hand, which we see in the form of Night and Day or as Darkness and Light revolving in a circle as the dynamic pulsating forces of creation—

अहस्त्व श्रुण्महर्षीन्म च विधिते रजस्व वेदाभीः।
वेदानारो जायमानो न राजावातिर्भयोभागिन्तमंसि ॥

(RV. VI. 9. 1)

The cosmic Fire or energy which has created the Sun and the Vaiśvānara in the individual centre depend for effective activity on the emergence of this two-fold Rajas as the basal dichotomy of the cosmos. They
are spoken of as the Pair of Twin Beauties, viz. the dark and white sisters in whose hands the mighty power of all the gods lies secure—

नाना चक्राते बम्या बण्णवर्ष्णाय तयोर्नन्ये चते क्रुष्यमन्यत्।
श्यामी च वदुर्वीच स्वसारी महादेवानामसुर्यमेकम्॥
(RV. III. 55. 111)

Vedic Rajas should be understood as typifying the principle of Motion (Gati) as against the principle of Rest (Sthiti). Rest is equivalent to Aja, the Unborn and Rajas the born principle or created cosmos. The former corresponds to Avyaya Purusha and the latter to Akshara Purusha, the former being the support of the latter—

वि यस्तस्तम्भ प्रत्येका राजायुक्तस्य रूपे क्रिमपि स्वदेशम्।
(RV. I. 164. 6).

The six-fold Rajas referred to here is the same as ‘Six Expansive Ones’ (ष्टुविरिन्दिवुद्ध, RV. X. 14. 16; वेदी: ष्टुविरिन्दिव, X.128.5). This is a reference to the six Space or to the Lokas, viz. Bhū, Bhuvah, Svāha, directions of Mahā, Janaḥ, Tapaḥ, with Satyam as the seventh corresponding to Aja, the unborn Prajāpati.

3. Vyoma-Vāda—This is a reference to the doctrine of Vyoma equivalent to Akāsa or Space as the ultimate substratum of all things which later on became a major plank in the philosophy of the Upanisads. All the creatures have their being in Akāsa. They emanate from Akāsa and find their ultimate rest in Akāsa. The RV. also makes frequent mention of Parama Vyoma as the source of all manifest Devas and Vāk. That highest Akāsa is immortal and the source of material space (Bhūtākāsa). The thousand-syllabled speech (Sahasrāksharā Vāk, RV. I. 164. 41) belongs to the level of Parama-Vyoma whereas the speech uttered as sound is mortal and belongs to the sphere of differentiated Akāsa. We all know that Sabda or speech is the attribute of Akāsa and both exist on two relative planes, viz. immortal and mortal, i.e. Divine and Material—Āmitā-Akāsa and Martya-Akāsa, Āmitā-Vāk and Martya Vāk, Parama-Vyoma and Vyoma.

4. Parāvara-Vāda—It has reference to the relative conception of Para and Apara, Absolute and Relative, Transcendent and Immanent, Higher and Lower, Urdhva and Adha, Eka and Bahudhā etc. This is a basic conception essential for manifestation. The doctrine is elaborated in Asyavāmiya Sūkta (RV. I. 164. 17-19). There are two categories Parārāda and Avarārāda, also Parastāt and Avastāt, Parāk and Arvāk. Indra symbolizes the former and Soma the latter; both are moving as an inseparable pair under a common mutual stress called Rajas or movement

इन्द्राय च चक्षु: सोम ताति धुरा न युक्त रजस्य वहनिः।
(RV. I. 164. 19).

5. Āvaraṇa-Vāda—In the second line of mantra 1 an important question is asked which has a
material bearing on the basic principles of creation. It is the question about the measure of the cosmos which determines the size or the container of the object to be made. What was the covering, where was it and what gave shelter? These have reference to the principle of Pramā referred to in Rigveda (Kāśit pramā pratimā, RV. X. 130.3). For any thing to be created two factors are essential to be determined, viz. size and model. The principle of size determines the centre (Nābhī), the diameter and the circumference (Maṇḍala). Whatever is created or made is subject to measurement. The cosmos is frequently spoken of as a measuring out, a planned activity on the part of its Creator. It is Vimāna, from the root Ma to measure. This is here referred to as Āvarāṇa and Sarman, the latter also meaning shelter or protection. Sarma is identified in the Brāhmaṇa literature as Charma (शर्म चर्म वा एकत्रियाः स्थानतमानाचूँ शर्म देवता, ŚB. III. 2.1.8), i.e. esoterically speaking Sarma is the same as Charma. On the plane of Matter we refer to it as Charma or skin which covers and shelters the organism and each of its constituent limbs and also every cell; the same is known, as Sarma on the plane of the working of Prāṇa or Devas. There would be no Yajña without this principle of Sarma or divine influence and energy becoming operative inside the measured field where that force or power asserts itself. It is stated in the Purāṇas that God Siva put on an elephant skin (Gaja-charma) in the beginning of his cosmic dance. Here the Elephant is the symbol of Ahaṅkāra, the Ego which emerges in the womb of the Universal as the centre of individual envelopment. The size of the Universe is a big question in modern science, and so the question of Virāt in its spatial and temporal extensions engaged the attention of ancient thinkers and they have striven to formulate their answers in words, but speech, howsoever articulate, falls short of precise definition when it has to grapple with the transcendent categories of Svayambhu Purusha and Virāj Purusha. The Mother-principle is truly the mould or shelter of all created forms and her womb (Yoni) is the measure of the manifested forms. The Earth is the symbol of the Mother and it is conceived of as the great receptacle or container (bhūmīr avapanain mahat, VS. 23.10). Anything and everything in material manifestation has its Mother. The earth before us of whatever size is the symbol of motherhood and each star including the sun has its mother so that ultimately the whole cosmos existed in the womb of its mother, symbolically thought of as Night (Jagato nivesāni, RV. I. 35.1), Darkness or the Great Goddess (Mahā Devī, Mahā Rātri, Mahā Māyā).

6. Ambho-Vāda:—This was also the basic creed of Vedic poets to think of the cosmic source or mother in terms of the unfathomed waters which are referred to variously as Ṛṣab, Śalīlam, Samudra, Soma,
rita, Arghava, etc. in the Rigveda. Those waters as the primeval ocean or the divine mother concealed in their womb millions and billions of fiery sparks which have now become visible to us as so many Suns. The process of creation on the plane of the Universal is continuous going on without stopping and should not be thought of as a historical event in time. Whatever happened in creation in the beginning is happening also today. The horoscope of the cosmos is unfolding incessantly and the powerful strides of Time are moving in endless circles. The infinite ocean as the source was wrapped in stillness but got agitated somewhere and by someone into culvusions which do not seem to stop anywhere. This has been graphically conceived as a mighty dance movement of the Gods or of the Yatis, i.e. a two-fold movement implying a pull towards the centre (Pravritti) and a corresponding movement turning away from the centre (Nivritti). Both are essential for the dance, viz. the stable axis and the moving felly. The Deva stands for Yajña, order, system or stability, whereas the Yati or Muni for the opposite principle of erratic motion. They coexist and are essential for creation

(MANTRA II—AMRITA-MRITYU-VADA)

beautiful Agni hidden in the waters under the care of the seven sisters (RV. III. 1. 3, अविनियमलं क्षणमप्स्तक्तवर्षाः /श्रवनस्पदिः स्वतंत्राम). The first to be born from the ocean of Rìta was Agni or Sûrya or Indra which is the symbol of the cosmic rhythm expressed as creation and dissolution.

Mantra II

7. Amrita-Mrityu-Våda:—Mantra 2 refers to the doctrine of immortality and death, the former is the Deva and the latter is Bhûta; the one is energy and the other matter, the one is divine and the other human, the one is beyond time and space and the other conditioned by time-space relata, the one stands for the principle of rest and the other for motion. In this way the two principles have diverse connotations and stand out as a coherent formula so intrinsically inseparable from each other that the Satpatha Brâhmaṇa speaks of Amrita existing within Mrityu and of Mrityu within Amrita (ŚB. X. 5.2.4). In creation both coexist. It is said that Aditi, the mother of Gods, gave birth to eight sons, seven of whom were the Aditya Immortals and the eighth was Sûrya. Aditi coaxed the first batch to create but with immortality alone as their possession they did not succeed. Then she turned to Mārtanda or Sûrya who combines in himself both Amrita and Mrityu, Life and Death, Energy and Matter and he was able to bring Life to the level of Matter. In the eyes of the Rishis Sûrya is the sign

Each Deva is the form of Agni and Agni is the son of Waters (Apāṁ napāt). The Gods discovered

(RV. X. 136.4).
of demarcation between immortality and death, that which is on this side of the Sun is in the grip of death or time and that which is beyond is in the lap of Amṛta—

Sa ṇa muṣṭỳāṅgaḥ karaṇaḥ caṇmādīśyaśc tvaṃ dṝṇātāmaṃ
brah ṣaṇam ātmaḥ cha bhūte sa punaḥ ṛṣyaprajñāt

(ŚB. 10.5.1.4)

8. AHORĀTRA-VĀDA—This was another name of the Kāla doctrine, i.e. Time as the supreme cause of the worlds manifested as a rhythm which is visible in the smaller and greater units of time. For example, Aḥorātra, the two-halves of the month, the seasons, the two semesters of the year, the Manavantara periods and the further astronomical measures of time—at every point there is a rhythm in which time presses on time as the supreme impeller and no other extraneous force or power is needed to explain the recurrent phenomenon of cosmic manifestation (कालं कालेन गौड़यम, मनु). The advocates of this doctrine had a long history and their tenets were of the widest acceptance by the teachers of both the Vedic and materialist schools.

The Atharva Veda gives a systematic account of the belief of the Kāla-Vāda metaphysics (AV. 19. 53. 14). All the created worlds are the chariot wheels of time. Time is a prolific horse who knows no decay and whose thousand eyes are turned to every space. He bears every one onward. Immortality is the axle of the chariot which moves on seven rolling wheels. He is the primal Deity, Deva whom all invoke. He is Kāla, Full Vase overflowing with life. He is the son of the Self-existent Father; there is no other power than he. Heaven and Earth were created by him and he stirred to motion what is and what will be. In Kāla all things have their being including Mind and Prāṇa. The highest Brahman is in Him; the Fiery principle wherever we see it is the product of Kāla, who is the father of Prajāpati and the lord of all. He made this universe and stirred it to motion and on him it rests. He is the support of the universal principle known as Paramesīthi, Kāla is self-made, whom we know as Kaśyapa Prajāpati, the on-looking creator. The sun ascends by Kāla, and in Kāla sinks again to rest. From Kāla sprang the twin principles of Ṛik and Yajus. In Kāla is the cosmic Yajña which is the eternal food for the gods. Both this world and the world that is lofty exist in Kāla. Kāla has conquered all the worlds and is supplicated by all as God Supreme.

The Night and Day unit (Aḥorātra) is but a sample, an exemplar of Mahā-Kāla which has taken form and all the mystery which exists in the source exists also in each fleeting moment of time. It is the great divine Horse of the Āsvamedha sacrifice. Time-Horse is being cut to pieces limb by limb but it does not decay or die. This intricate and lofty philosophical doctrine had many ramifications. For example, the conception
of Garutma Suparna, the, metres, the Chakra both as Kala-chakra and Brahma-chakra, Darsha-Paurnamasa sacrifices and Manvantaras were linked to the metaphysics of Kala. The adepts in this knowledge were known as Ahoratra-vids. In Puranic imagery Kala is symbolized as the Rishi Markandeya who has a life of a thousand year (Sahasravyu). At the end of the period of dissolution when Lord Vishnu starts afresh his chain of creativity, Markandeya is expelled out of the womb of Narayana and witnesses the miracle of the eternal life principle incarnating as a child and floating on a leaf on the surface of the Infinite Ocean.

9. DEVA-VADA—In verse 6 there is a reference to the Gods (Devah) and a hypothesis is suggested that the cosmos was created by the activity of Devas, but as the divine powers themselves were subsequent to the birth of cosmos it is doubtful whether its mystery is known even to them. The doctrine of the Devas is the most widely accepted one in the Rigveda as the root cause of the cosmos. The Devas stand for the divine principle at all levels, viz. Mind, Life and Matter and there is no doubt that the Rishis had a deep belief in the potency of differentiated Pranic energies conceived of as the Devas who have produced these worlds and living beings and are sustaining them. One could say that of all the points of view enunciated in the Rigveda the one about the Devas is the most comprehensive in which all others become merged. Deva is literally the principle of light that shines in all times and places. The nature of that light is a vibration, a quivering, a process of contraction and expansion which bears the mystico-theological appellation of Prana. It is stated that in the beginning one transcendent Asura or mighty Pranic principle presided over all the Gods (महद्वेदांमुनुर्वभॆक).

He was called Asura because in him was concealed the Asu or Prana or the life germ which becomes manifested as so many Devas or divine powers that are in heaven and on earth. It is argued that the Devas also do not know the mystery of creation since the thousand headed Purusha whom they offered as an oblation in the cosmic sacrifice existed prior to their birth.

10. BRAHMA-VADA—The whole burden of this Suta is to trace the creation to its source in a transcendent being who is here called Adhyaksha existing in the highest Empyrean (Parame vyoman, RV. X.129.7). The word Brahman has not been used in this Suta, but there is hardly any doubt that the same is suggested by an overwhelming force of symbolical words. He is referred to as Ekam in mantra 2 and that one is suggestively called Paratpara, the Absolute beyond which nothing else existed (तत्स्मादान्व्यत्व पर फिचनास, RV. X.129.2). The appropriate symbol for the transcendent reality is given as Abhu, the all-encompassing
reality, which becomes modified in one of its portions as the cosmos. This later is called tuvehohhya, a minute unit in comparison to the Ābhu that surrounds it.

The Nāsadiya Sūkta is a model of brevity and compact thought presenting the highest metaphysical doctrine in only three and a half mantras. In mantra 2 the transcendent reality called Ekam is said to be of the nature of Prāṇa in that it was breathing but there was no material breath to sustain that life (Āntād avātam). How such a thing is possible no one knows nor can explain. The self-existent Creator lives in his own right and this power is referred to here as Svadāhā. Its precise genesis is an unknown mystery. Some call it the Lilā or Krīḍā of the Lord. The word Svadāhā points to the self of the Creator as a substance by which the creation is brought into being.

Mantra III

TWO-FOLD TAMAS PRINCIPLES:—In mantra 3 there is a reference to the two principles of Tamas, the one higher and the other lower, the latter being enveloped in the womb of the former. It is an Anugama reference depending on the exigencies of interpretation. The idea is that the two parents of the cosmos, viz. Svayambhū and Parameśthī both were concealed in their source; the first as an unmanifested and the second as formless manifestation. A reference to the second one is found in the mantra itself, viz. Saṭīlam, the Waters also called Āpāh, Samudram, or the mother principle in which creation (Idam sarvam) was concealed as something mysterious and unknown (Aprakātam). This was the mother principle or Para-mēsthī, the universal which is the latent source of the individual creation both on the level of the cosmos and in each living being. The mother with her womb creating the child is symbolised as Night (or Darkness) (Tamas.) The other higher and deeper tāmas is the transcendent principle called Svayambhū, the self-existent Brahma symbolised as an unknown and unknowable factor like the absolute arithmetical point. It is referred to as Anirukta, Amūrta and Ka Prafāpāti i.e. the father principle which creates his counterpart as his Mahīmā or Mahat.

ĀBHU AND TUCHCHHYA:—These two principles are referred to as Ābhu and Tuvehohhya. The Ābhu is the same as the thousand-headed Purusha (RV. X.90.1) and also the Purusha with heads, eyes, arms and feet on all sides.

Such a being can only be a Prāṇa Purusha in which all the undifferentiated faculties exists at all points as soon as the individuated Purusha begins to be formed each limb is located separately. This is the difference
between the Avyakta and Vyakta, and between what is known in Śaiva Iconography as the Liṅga Vigraha and Purusha Vigraha, the former is merely a symbol of all the possibilities of existence whereas in the latter they take a definite form and shape.

The next important word which refers to creation is tuekhēhhyā which signifies a dimensional form which is always termed as smaller or measured with respect to one which is beyond all measure. For example, the circumference evolved out of its centre is always to be deemed as inferior with respect to its source. The centre is Purusha and the circumference is its Mahimā (RV.X. 90.2), the former always taking precedence of the latter, the one being known as Üṛdhva and the other as Iha i.e. the non-directional particular point in a geometrical frame-work. It is the secret of Vedic doctrine that the absolute transcendent Brahman called Abhu or Ananta becomes modified by his own creative self and that becomes the Saṁsāra.

How this creational bifercation takes place is mentioned in the last part of mantra 3. It is the power of Tapas which transforms the point into its greatness. Tapas elsewhere is known as the primeval Heat (Agraṭa tapas), Devaushhyā, the divine heat or an incalculable explosion of energy called Abhīdha tapas (RV. X. 190.1). The source, nature and effect of this Tapas which could have existed and functioned as an infinite ocean of the waves of Prāṇa (Saman- chana-prasāraṇa) or Light and Heat (Jyoti and Ghramāsa) cannot be determined. What actually happens as a result of this activity is the creation of individual centres as whirl pools of energy which the Rishi here speaks of as Ekam. This one also was an unknown factor called Avyaya Purusha or Aja and Kimapisvīt (किमपिस्वित्) something which is beyond comprehension. (RV. I. 1.64.6).

Mantra IV

PRINCIPLE OF KĀMA:—Mantra 4 takes up the clue of the creative process after the one centre comes into being in the midst of the universal, it is known as the Mind, Manas or Consciousness with all its potentialities to begin to function as a centre. The basic quality of mind is Kāma. It was the first principle to come into existence as mentioned here by the words Agre and Prathamam. According to the Upanishads Manas is known variously as Prajñāna, Samjñāna, Vijnāna, Saṅkalpa, Maniśha, Smṛiti, Kratu, Asu, Kāma, Hṛidaya etc. and that Prajñāna is Brahma itself comprehending within its meaning and substance Brahma, Indra, Prajapati and all the Gods (Aitareya Up., III. 2).

The word Kāma, literally desire, refers also to the basic faculty by which the one principle becomes split up into two as the two halves of a single Egg, or the two parent called Dvāyā-Prithivī, the ‘father and
the mother principles, Agni and Soma, or the eternal man and the eternal woman. They are bound to each other by the most subtle principle of Love or Desire on the triple plane of Mind, Life and Matter. Kāma is the fecundating seed that germinates in the form of each living organism in the womb of the mother. It is a mysterious power which vitalises the whole consciousness. It is Nature’s own technique to perpetuate life on the plane of manifestation. The life span as expressed in each cell is designed to prepare each organism for the consummation of the secret of Love. Kāma in this sense is a divine act symbolised in Vedic term as the marriage of heaven and earth or the sacrament which throws open the flood gate for the descent of immortal Prāṇa in mortal matter. The union of Deva and Bhūta is accomplished through Kāma which becomes manifested as the principle of the Mind.

**Kinship of Sat-matter with Asat: Prāṇa:**

The second part of this mantra refers to the kinship between Sat and Asat. Sat here signifies the world of Matter and Asat the divine principle of Prāṇa or Life. The Śatapatha makes this definition clear that the principle of Prāṇa is termed in the esoteric languages of the Vedas as Asat (Prāṇa vā rishayah asat, ŚB. 6.1.1.1). It is stated elsewhere that in the cosmic activity of the divine powers it is the Asat which

creates Sat, viz. the principle of Prāṇa or life or consciousness which creates matter,

\[ \text{देवानां पूर्वों युगे उसनो सहजायत} \]

RV. X. 72.2.

Although mind and matter are diametrically opposed they are inseparable companions in each organic centre or the living body. It is to this dominant relationship that the mantra makes a specific reference. Both are sabandhu viz. kith and kin, which is the same as the doctrine of having a common womb (Sayoni). The living is the kin of the dead (matter) and the immortal has a common womb with the mortal,

\[ \text{जीवो सुतस्य चरति स्वभावितमस्वैं मतवेना सयोति} \]

RV. I. 164.30.

Living consciousness as manifested in matter is the supreme mystery which is a burden of these mantras. The poets direct the power of their inspired mind to the unravelling of this top mystery. A union of mind with matter is a fact of which each one is a witness to one’s ownself although no science or philosophy can explain how it has happened. The embryonic development of the mind and the body and all the psychical, vital and physical functionings and powers of thought, emotions, feelings etc. are a miracle of which the secrets are unknown.
Mantra V is couched partly in the language of wonderment, cogitating on the obscure nature of the mystery, and partly trying to approach the problem in the manner of science, tackling with such a reality as Reśas or the Seed and its assuming a majesty Mahima by systematic germination and growth. The reference to Raśmi, a ray of light is quite happy in the context of Vedic symbolism where the supreme divine reality is conceived of as Brahman or the Supernal Sun with a thousand rays of which a single ray is reflected in each living centre. If we look at the word of the mantra with deeper insight the question arises as to what is the ray, why it is said to be coming from the oblique side and who are the divinities that claim this spark to be their own. The answers to these three questions are significant in this context. The ray of light is Prāṇa, its source is the immortal divine consciousness or Viṁśāna which is the same as Sūrya, the symbol of Brahman. The deities which cluster round this Ray are those known as the Lightsipping Devas, Maṛśīpha Devas (VS. VII. 3). All the powers that are in heaven and on the earth, i.e. in the immortal divine source and in mortal matter are present in the single prāṇic radiant principle called Life. Although it is one and indivisible still it is differentiated within the living organism as so many different Devas or prāṇic centres each sipping its own light or radiant energy. There is not a single cell of matter where the radiant Deva principle called Prāṇa does not incarnate. This radiant spark of light is said to spread in an oblique direction (Tiraścīna), which implies that it creates its maṇḍala or mahima with itself as the source or centre (cf. VS. 32. 2, Ģṛdhva, Adhaḥ, and Tiryak). The four cardinal and the four intermediate directions form the sphere which the Prāṇa as Light-ray pervades (cf. sa sadhrīśhīkā sa vishūchir vasaṇāḥ, RV. I. 164. 31). Those who see it are left wondering—'whether it has come from below', 'whether it has come from above'. The words Adhaḥ and Upāri are relative and symbolical, the former refers to the manifested form in matter and the latter to the unmanifested source in the divine transcendent reality. The former is Eka-pāda, Adhaḥ, Iha; the latter is Tripād, Ģṛdhva, Upāri. Both remind us of a rich terminology familiar in many mantras and different formulations.

The Rishi then refers to two kinds of Devas, firstly those who are inherent in the seed or germinal state; wherever the seed is deposited the Devas or divine powers are incipient in it, forming its invisible or potential centre. The second class of Devas are called Mahimānaḥ, i.e., those manifesting as the greatness or majesty of the centre in the form of the circumference. Mahima is the same as Maṇḍala which refers to the totality of the manifested powers which had their latent existence in the invisible source. Thus all manifestation is an interplay of
these two aspects of the single creative act constituted as the seed and the organism. The one is hidden \( (paroksha) \), the other is visible \( (pratyaksha) \); the one is Prāṇa (Energy) the other is Bhūta (Matter). These may be imagined as the two wheels of the car of Indra, i.e. the central vital Prāṇa \( (Madhya Prāṇa, ŚB. VI. 1. 1.) \) who is present in each living organism.

The same imagery is extended in the fourth part of the mantra under the symbolical term Svadhā and Prayati. Prayati is Prāṇa, the regulating centre which is the same as the seed, or in other terms Sthitī or Pratishṭā. We are reminded here of the explanation given to the letter \( Ya \) of Hṛdaya, i.e. Yamayati, that which governs and controls the manifest form, itself acting as the centre. The other principle is called Svadhā which is responsible for creating the Pitṛis. The Pitṛis are the Father-Mother principles operative behind each manifest form. Svadhā corresponds to Mahimā and Prayati to Retodhā, the two pairs typifying an appropriate terminology of the divine formless reality and the material forms or corporeal modality on the plane of matter. As explained earlier the one is Sat and the other Asat and both exist as an essential pair. The doctrine of the two co-existing is formulated as Para and Avara, Prayati or the source being Parastāt and Svadhā or the manifest form being Avastāt.

**Mantras VI & VII**

The last two mantras are couched in the language typical to Vedic scepticism throwing open the floodgates of doubt and bold enquiry knowing no bound:

Who verily knows and who can declare it?

Whence it was born and whence comes this creation?

The Gods are later than the world production.

Who knows then whence it first came into being?

He, the first origin of this creation, whether he formed it all or did not form it,

Whose eye controls this world in highest heaven,

He verily knows it, or perhaps he knows not.

Such a confession of ignorance should have been rooted in deep knowledge. In the worlds of Maurice Maeterlinck: ‘Is it possible to find in our human annals, words more majestic, more full of solemn anguish, more august in tone, more devout, more terrible? Where could we find at the very foundation of life a completer and more irreducible confession of ignorance? Where, from the depths of our agonistic, which thousands of years have augmented, can we point to a wider horizon? At the very outset it passes all that has been said, and goes farther than we shall ever dare to go, lest we fall into despair, for it does not fear to ask itself whether the Supreme Being knows what He has done—knows whether He is or is not the Creator, and questions whether He has become conscious of Himself.’

No doubt the Nāsadiya Sūkta touches the highest point in the philosophy of India. It is the most im-
important contribution of the Rigveda to Indian metaphysics, as observed by Keith writing about this hymn of creation:

The poem commences with an assertion: in the beginning there was neither being nor not-being: there was no atmosphere nor sky; the question is asked what covering there was, and was there a fathomless abyss of waters. There was neither death nor immortality, nor night nor day. There was nothing else in the world save the one which breathed, but without wind, of its own power. There was, however, darkness, and a moving ocean without light: through the might of fervour, Tapas, was born a living force enveloped in a shell. Then there developed desire, Kāma, the first seed of mind: the sages found the root of not-being, searching for it in the heart. Thus far the first four verses: the fifth is a puzzle: it may be referred to the sages who drove a division through the universe and distinguished the upper and the lower, the world of nature above, the principle of nature below: but this version is wholly problematical. The next two verses end with a deep expression of doubt: the gods are later than the creation and cannot know of its origin: whether the creation was made by itself or not, the overseer of it in the highest space of heaven he knows of it, or perhaps he knows not.

The hymn is clearly difficult to understand: the part of the seers, which appears merely as a statement of what their reflections have arrived at, is even understood by Bloomfield to be a cosmical action, indicating that they took part in the creation of the universe. This seems, however, unnatural and strained, but not more so than the interpretation of verse 5 adopted by Deussen, which would make it into an assertion that the sages were able to discriminate between the thing in itself and the phenomenal world, between naturans and naturate. What is clear is that there is conceived as first existing one thing, which is described as breathing without wind, an effort to express a primitive nature different in essence from anything known to the priest, conceived perhaps metaphorically only as a dark ocean or chaos. In this through Tapas, which here must rather be cosmic than refer to the activity of seers or other human powers, by inward fervour, springs up the being enveloped in a shell, which in the later conception is the golden world egg. The next step in development is the appearance of desire, unless that it is to be taken as born of mind, when it is described as the first seed of mind. If so, the mind must be deemed to be an attribute of the one which develops in the shell, whence springs desire: in the alternative the phrase may be taken as the source which produces mind, and desire, unconscious will, may be held to produce conscious will or mind. The latter view.
however, is unnatural in point of language and has the additional disadvantage that in the Taittirīya Āraṇyaka we already find that mind is given as prior to desire in a passage which is based on the hymn. Nor can we hold—and this is much more important—that Kāma was conceived as unconscious will: it is rather the natural expression for conscious desire, which would rise from the existence of mind as a substratum. The later philosophy makes the knowledge of desires depend on the existence of mind, and this idea may be foreshadowed here, where mind is made a cosmic prāṇa of desire. Beyond this the poet does not go; he ends with the suggestion of a supreme deity as distinct from the gods who are created, and ends with a doubt whether such a deity has power of knowledge, that is, whether it has consciousness at all. We cannot, therefore, really say whether or not the first cause of the world is deemed a conscious entity at all: the assertion that it was not the first cause of the world is not not-being, which is in words a little inconsistent with the assertion that the sages found the root of being in not-being, searching in the heart, is in effect an assertion that it was a peculiar sort of being, different from ordinary being. The reference to the heart, however, as the place of search reminds us that the heart even in the Rigveda seems the abode of mind, and suggests that in the ultimate issue the final entity might be deemed to be possessed of mind, for consciousness, without an object, is the nature in the Veda of the Brahman and even of Puruṣa in the Saṁkhya. This hymn is the finest effort of the imagination of the Vedic poet, and nothing else equals it.” (The Religion & Philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads, pp. 435-437).

MACDONELL'S TRANSLATION

1. Non-being then existed not, nor being:
   There was no air, nor heavens which is beyond it.
   What motion was there? Where? By whom directed?
   Was water there, and fathomless abysses?

2. Death then existed not, nor life immortal;
   Of neither night nor day was any semblance.
   The One breathed calm and windless by self-impulse:
   There was not any other thing beyond it.

3. Darkness at first was covered up by darkness;
   This universe was indistinct and fluid.
   The empty space that by the void was hidden,
   That One was by the force of heat engendered.
4. Desire then at the first arose within it,
Desire, which was the earliest seed of spirit.
The bond of being in non-being sages
Discovered searching in their hearts with wisdom.

5. Their ray extended light across the darkness:
But was the One above or was it under?
Creative force was there, and fertile power:
Below was energy, above was impulse.

6. Who knows it truly? who can here declare it?
Whence was it born? whence issued this creation?
And did the gods appear with its production?
But then who knows from whence it has arisen?

7. This world-creation, whence it has arisen,
Or whether it has been produced or has not,
He who surveys it in the highest heaven,
He only knows, or ev’n he does not know it.

[A. A. Macdonell]
Sanskrit Literature (1900) pp. 136-37.

MACDONELL’S COMMENTS

Macdonell calls it the Hymn Of Creation and says that in this cosmogonic poem the origin of world is explained as the evolution of the existence (Sat) from the non-existent (Asat). Water thus came into being first; from it was evolved intelligence by heat. It is the starting-point of natural philosophy which developed into the Sāṅkhya system.

He writes: Apart from its high literary merit, this poem is most noteworthy for the daring speculations which find utterance in so remote an age. But even here may be traced some of the main defects of Indian Philosophy—lack of clearness and consistency, with a tendency to make reasoning depend on mere words. Being the only piece of sustained speculation in the Rigveda, it is the starting-point of the natural philosophy which assumed shape in the evolutionary Sāṅkhya system. It will, moreover, always retain a general interest as the earliest specimen of Aryan philosophic thought. With the theory of the Song of Creation, that after the non-existent had developed into the existent, water came first, and then intelligence was evolved from it by heat, the cosmogonic accounts of the Brāhmaṇas substantially agree. Here, too, the non-existent becomes the existent, of which the first form is the waters.
On these floats Hiranyagarbha, the cosmic golden egg, whence is produced the spirit that desires and creates the universe. Always requiring the agency of the creator Prajāpati at an earlier or a later stage, the Brāhmaṇas in some of their accounts place him first, in others waters. This fundamental contradiction, due to mixing up the theory of creation with that of evolution, is removed in the Sāṅkhya system by causing Purusha, or soul, to play the part of a passive spectator, while Prakṛti, or primordial matter, undergoes successive stages of development. The cosmogonic hymns of the Rigveda are not only thus the precursors of Indian philosophy, but also of the Purāṇas, one of the main objects of which is to describe the origin of the world. (Sanskrit Literature, pp. 137—38).

According to him in the first verse the subject of āsūt is ‘this universe’ which in the beginning was neither non-existent nor existent. Tadānim signifies before the creation. The word ambhas refers to the existence of the water, the ocean in the beginning.

In verse 5 the word Rasmi is important. According to Macdonell the meaning of this word here is uncertain, but it may be an explanation of bandhu in 4c: the cord with which the sages (referred to by eshām) in thought measured out the distance between the existent and the non-existent, or between what was above and below; cp. 8. 25, 18, pari yo raśminā dīvo antān mame prithivyāḥ. Who with a cord has measured out the ends of heaven and earth; cp. also the expression Sūtraṁ vitatam (in A. V. X. 8. 37), the extended string with reference to the earth. Retodhās and Mahīmāṇaḥ are constrained as male and female cosmogonic principles, to which correspond respectively Prayatis and Svadhā. In T. S. 4. 3. 11. 1. mention is made of Trayo Mahīmāṇaḥ connected with fertility. (Vedico Reader, p. 210). But in his later metrical translation printed in Hymns From the Rigveda, he changed the meaning to ‘ray’, which we have also explained.

H.H. Wilson translated this Hymn as follows:—

The deity is Paramātmā, the author of the creation, preservation and dissolution of the various entities (bhavas), these being the subjects treated of in the hymn; the Rishi is Paramātmā, under his appellation Paramēśṭhin.

1. The non-existent was not, the existent was not; then the world was not, nor the firmament, nor that which is above (the firmament). How could there be any investing envelope, and where? Of what (could there be) felicity? How (could there be) the deep unfathomable water?

2. Death was not nor at that period immortality, there was no indication of day or night;
THAT ONE unbreathe upon breathed of his own strength, other than THAT there was nothing else whatever.

3. There was darkness covered by darkness in the beginning, all this (world) was undistinguishable water; that empty united (world) which was covered by a mere nothing was produced through the power of austerity.

4. In the beginning there was desire, which was the first seed of mind; sages having meditated in their hearts have discovered by their wisdom the connection of the existent with the non-existent.

5. Their ray was stretched out, whether across, or below, or above; (some were shedders of seed, (others) were mighty; food was inferior, the eater was superior.

6. Who really knows? Who in this world may declare it? Whence was this creation, whence was it engendered? The gods (were) subsequent to the (world’s) creation; so who knows whence it arose?

7. He from whom this creation arose, he may uphold it, or he may not (no one else can);

he who is its superintendent in the highest heaven, he assuredly knows, or if he knows not (no one else does).


WILSON’S COMMENTS

1. THE NON-EXISTENT, ETC.—To render this phraseology intelligible we must restrict the meanings of sat and asat (“ens” and “non-ens”) to visible and invisible existence, or in Hindu cosmology to matter and spirit (prakriti and purusha), which in the Vaidika system would not, as in the Sāṅkhya, have a distinct existence, but would be blended and lost in the one invisible, immaterial, incomprehensible First Cause, or Brahma, in the intervals of creation. The language used in describing this is usually somewhat vague, but the notion is evidently that the First Cause was in the beginning undeveloped in its effects, and existed before either inactive matter or active spirit, considered as distinct; it is not intended to be said that no cause or origin, no author of the universe, existed before creation, but that nothing else existed, neither matter nor spirit, and consequently that He created both; see the Vishnu Purāṇa, p. 12, where a similar passage is cited from the Veda, and this passage also is quoted by the
commentator (Ibid., note 16): though it is not perhaps quite accurately explained.

ANY INVESTING ENVELOP—The Scholiast refers to the Purāṇas for an explanation, and accordingly see Vishṇu Purāṇa, p. 16, and note 25. Each element as created or developed is invested by its rudiment.

OF WHAT COULD THERE BE FELICITY—I.e., of whom or of what living being could enjoyment, or fruition, whether of pain or pleasure, be predicated, there being no life?

HOW COULD.....WATER—Sāyaṇa explains away another text, idam agre salilam āsit “this in the beginning was water,” by saying that that referred to another period.

2. BREATHED OF HIS OWN STRENGTH—Sāyaṇa takes Svaḍhā as meaning Māyā or Prakṛiti (Illusion or Nature), the source of the world of phenomena. He understands Saha “breathed along with Māyā.”

3. THROUGH THE POWER OF AUSTERITY—Tapas is said to mean not penance, but the contemplation of the things which were to be created.

4. THERE WAS DESIRE—i.e., in the mind of the Supreme Being.

5. THEIR RAY WAS STRETCHED OUT—This according to Sāyaṇa, refers to the suddenness of creation, which was developed in the twinkling of an eye, like the flash of the sun’s rays. It was so quick,

he continues, that it was doubtful whether the things in the central space (understood by the world “across”) were created first, or those above or those below; in other words, creation took place simultaneously in all three portions of the universe. Sāyaṇa tries to reconcile this with the received notion of creation in a series, (viz., that from Ātmā came the ākāśa, and from the ākāśa the wind, from the wind fire, etc.) by saying that this was the order in which things were created, but the development of the world was like a flash of lightning, so that the series could not be distinguished.

WHETHER ACROSS, OR BELOW, OR ABOVE—The word tirāsāhīnah, “across,” perhaps refers to the tiryakṣrotas, “that in which the stream of life is horizontal,” i.e., the animal world. The epithets in the second line of the verse are unusual and obscure; according to Sāyaṇa, the meaning is that among the created objects some were living creatures, others were great, as the sky, etc., the former being the enjoyers (bhoktārah), the latter the things to be enjoyed (bhogyāh), so the creation was distinguished as the food and the feeder. The verse occurs in Yajush, XXXIII. 74, where Mahidhara gives it several different interpretations, none more intelligible than those of Sāyaṇa.

6. WHENCE WAS.....ENGENDERED—I.e., from what material cause, and from what creative cause, did it arise?
3. This Mind, when created, wished to become manifest,—more defined, more substantial; it sought after a self (body). It practised austerity; it acquired consistency. It then beheld thirty-six thousand Arka-fires of its own self, composed of mind, built up of mind; mentally alone they were established (on sacrificial hearths) and mentally built up; mentally the cups (of Soma) were drawn thereat; mentally they chanted, and mentally they recited on (near) them,—whatever rite is performed at the sacrifice, whatever sacrificial rite there is, that was performed mentally only, as a mental performance, on those (fires or fire-altars) composed of mind, and built up of mind. And whatever it is that (living) beings here conceive in their mind that was done regarding those mental (Agnis):—they establish them (on the hearths) and build them up (as fire altars); they draw the cups for them; they chant on (near) them and recite hymns on them,—of that extent was the development of Mind, of that extent its creation,—so great is Mind: thirty-six thousand Arka-fires; and each of these as great as that former (fire-altar) was. [Eggeling]
Sāyāna’s Commentary on the Nāsadiya Sūkta in the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa [2.8.9.3-6] differs from the above.

TAITTIRĪYA BRĀHMAṆA—SĀYĀṆA’S / COMMENTARY

नस्सासीत्रो—

यदा पूर्वशिष्टः प्रलीपीतसुद्धिश्च नीरतता तदानी सदस्ती द्वे च च प्राचाय नासमूतामः। नामवर्षसिद्धवेच दैत प्रतिम्बायामां जगासंघवेचनोच्यते। नरविहारादिस्मां शुत्मसातित्युच्यते। तदुभयं नाससीत्रयः। किंतु काविद्वकावश्चाससीत्रयः। सा च विस्थापवाभावाः सती, जगासंघवेचनस्मात्वावायाःसती।

नो सद्नासीत्रति यहांश्चेण्वैवं तदृश प्राचायाये—नाससीत्रयो रजासंघवेचन सस्त्रज्ञसङ्गवाश्चुर्द्धिश्चुर्द्धिश्च तत्फः नाससीत्रयः।

नो व्योमः आकाशवचिना व्योमश्रावः सुप्रक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्यक्ष्य}
पुरुषे समुपमा चिन्तुविनाविविधं स्वन्यायवादः बन्थतो।
यथा वा जागरोष्यस्यवसमक्षसंयमनभवे विबधे समुपमा तुषणा सुखादुःखपर्यं मनोरायहरुपं स्वव्याहर बन्थते, एवमथ सर्वेश्वय कामो देवतिर्यग्नायदुसर्वव्यवाहाः बन्थते। कामो विद्यासो वेदात्तवारं गता हृदे हृदयकमो मनीष स्वबुद्धया प्रतीष्य विचारारसस्तविधः तत्रति कामं सत उपस्तयसामनयेषु जगतो वण्यं बलवनंतु निरक्षितत्रितत्वं। कामस्य स्वव्याहास्तेऽरुः वाजसंस्थितम् समारमिः —“अथो चतुरः काममेव पूर्ण-पुष्पः” इति। व्याससोपि समारिः —“कामव्यवाहासेवं नादृव-दृवं दृवं वननम्” इति।

आयुदितिमोहोपि तथा हस्ते। दशों हि पुरुषः प्रथमं विद्यानासंविधता तदव चतुर्थं प्रयत्नम्। सुचरुक्षुः वा चरते।
तस्माचं तिस्मलुतुस्वाभिजित्वाक्षरं एव सर्वभवासस्तेऽतिरिति विद्याम् निवरम्।

चथ वर्षमामी —

तिरक्षों —

रसम्: पूर्णया्रिसमानं: कग्रवस्त्रं प्रकाश्चैतन्यवादः:। एवं मूर्ममधिकत्तुपापां जगद्यतुनां मधथे तिरक्षोंस्यतेर्वतेषुमानो वितो व्यास: स चतुर्थयुप: परस्मािसमि पन्नार्थावर्मायोभागोक्षित:।
निमोपामभेदस्वित्त:। चिन्त्यावली चिन्तितपक्षपक्षपुज्यन्तिः।
पुस्तलिविषदिष्ठिनायाः। चतुर्मध:—सोस्य यक्ष: कग्रव-चैतन्यवादः:। सर्ववां बलवां मध्ये पर्यावक्षमायो श्रीमतनुस्थितियं भ्रमी व्यासावमभासते। अथ: पर्यावक्षमानस्त्रायस्यवास्तवं।

परिपुराणस्याभ्यासः चतुर्थयुप:। यथा घट—
निमित्त च वक्रत्वम्। वक्रतुमयः। कूड़ौक्तकरिति
चेटुत्त्त्वेते—किं देवा एवदुःखुः, उतसः। कश्चिद्यन्तुः। न
tात्रेद्वयं वक्रुत्त्वम् शक्तात् हस्य जगते विवर्जन्याय विविष्यतः
रेव विष्यते। स विद्युमध्यावसाय। स विद्युमध्यानवसाय।
विद्युमध्यावसायविवर्जन्याय परस्मेष्ठरी शक्तिस्तावत्त्वम्
कारणम्। प्रयति: सा। शक्तिः। प्रयति: यशमप्रमाणमिनि
सोदवं शक्तिप्रयत्नं
धार: परस्मेष्ठविन्दुः। स च परस्मेष्ठविन्दुः।
तवेनी। शक्तिप्रमाणविचे। जगरकंयुतमूल्यै। प्रत्यैः
िवर्जन्याय

यथा सप्तमाह—

यथा—

यथा स्याचनामात्रम्। भूतभूतस्तत्त्वम्। भूतभूतस्तत्त्वम्।
केचिनायानेव वा स्वसाधारणस्या
ध्यानाध्यायस्यात्मकः। तथाहि। प्रमाणाः
मूलकारायमिति क्याद्गीतमाद्यो मन्यते।
स्वतन्त्रमेत्येन प्रधानान्
जगमान्तिति कल्पितमस्य:।
शाश्वादिः। जपादुक्तिरिति माध्यमिका:।
जगत: कार्यमेव नासीति स्वभावम् एव। स्वतंत्रत्वं इति। लोकाशंसकातः।
ते सवेंद्रपि
अन्ततां एव। को०न्दः
वेदं जगकारस्य: को नाम पुष्पं साज्जावङ
नारङ्ग:। अन्याय: च क इह प्रयोगस्यमन्दृक्ष्या को
नाम जगात्कारायमी०
किद् वक्रत्वात्:—यथा विषिद्या चूः: कुत्ताजा कामदुपानः
कार्यमेव व्यया: पुराति कुतो निमित्तातुपनेति तविदुपानां
वेदेनुक्तमुन्दुः। नदेवीसौनिकः। कामदुपानःकार्यमेव
व्यया: पुराति कुतो निमित्तातुपनेति तविदुपानां
वेदेनुक्तमुन्दुः। नदेवीसौनिकः। कामदुपानःकार्यमेव
व्यया: पुराति कुतो निमित्तातुपनेति तविदुपानां
वेदेनुक्तमुन्दुः। नदेवीसौनिकः। कामदुपानःकार्यमेव
व्यया: पुराति कुतो निमित्तातुपनेति तविदुपानां
वेदेनुक्तमुन्दुः। नदेवीसौनिकः। कामदुपानःकार्यमेव
व्यया: पुराति कुतो निमित्तातुपनेति तविदुपानां
RIGVEDA—SĀYĀNA’S COMMENTARY

‘तपस्तत्सत्सर्वधिनायाजयते’कम्, इवादिनास्मे चुड़िः प्रतिपाद- विषयते। अभुना ततः भागवथा निरस्तसमतप्रपञ्चा या श्रवणतः सत्या निन्िहयते। तदानी श्रवणशास्त्रामविश्वब्यम तदस्य ज्ञातो मूलकारणम् ततु—अस्वात्त्वशिविशिस्तरूपाय्य नासस्तीत्। न हि तदाना कारणद्वस्य सतो जगत विविधत: सम्भवति। तथा नो सत्त् नैव निरालमक्स्य सच्चेते निवृत्त्यमासिणि। यथापि सदस्याविकल्प प्रतिष्ठा विलक्षणं मभवति तथापि भावाभावयोः सहाय- स्थानामिपि सम्भवति। कृतस्तोः: तदायमिपि सुभाषिनिलक्षण- निवृत्त्यमेवासासस्तीतचिन्यस्य। नतू नो सदिपि पारमार्थिकतस्वस्य निशेषः। तदासिनोऽसमानिलक्षणस्यः। अयोध्येत्। न। चानीदातामिनि तस्य सत्यसमेते वशये, परियोजनायथा एवास्त सत्यनिविषयत्व इति। एसमि तदानीनिपि विशेषणार्थकं व्यवहारात्मकायस्य तत्स्य: पारमार्थिकयुष्मवायुः। अय व्यवहारसङ्कल्प प्रृथिव्यावहीनं भाशां विशेषविवाहातु कर्म नो सदिपि निशेषः। तदास्त्त्र—‘नासस्तीत्र’ इति चाबि। ‘लोक रजातकुस्थयते’ (सिद्धा ४१११) इति यक्षः। अत्र च सामायायाशर्मष्टि- वचनाय। योगायो व्यक्तिमालवादस्यस्य: पातालद्वयः पृथिव्यान्त्वा नासससदिपि। तथा योग अन्तर्निविषय तदपि नो नैवासस्तीति। परस्यायान- चालान्यसोस्तादत्तिनिविषयः। परं: योगम् परस्ताुपरिधानो बहुक्षण्युक्तिस्सत्यस्मान्त्वद्वयति तदपि नासस्तीतिदिब्रवयः। अनेन चतुर्दश्युगपि श्रवणक्षण निविषयः। यथाधिक मभवति। अथ तवा वर्तमाने पुराणे प्रसिद्धिन्यानि विषयाविशेषता तेषामःस्थान-
नसादिय सूक्ता — श्रीमुत्तक विवेक इति न किंवरीय इति। नन्दीधरश्य
ब्रह्मणो माया सदृ संवयसंवभवत् संवयाभिमतं स्वतंत्रा तद्वरा
स्वर्जस्तस्तोगुणात्मिकस्मृतिके तवथा भवति नारायणौ तद्वरा
प्रकृतिरावयायां तस्या स्वतंत्रं निवर्ते। वायुपथःकम्बोधित्वम्
स्मृतिके तस्या स्वतंत्रं निवर्ते। च वायुपथःकम्बोधित्वम्
स्मृतिके तस्या स्वतंत्रं निवर्ते।

श्रीमुत्तक विवेक इति न किंवरीय इति। नन्दीधरश्य
ब्रह्मणो माया सदृ संवयसंवभवत् संवयाभिमतं स्वतंत्रा तद्वरा
स्वर्जस्तस्तोगुणात्मिकस्मृतिके तवथा भवति नारायणौ तद्वरा
प्रकृतिरावयायां तस्या स्वतंत्रं निवर्ते। वायुपथःकम्बोधित्वम्
स्मृतिके तस्या स्वतंत्रं निवर्ते। च वायुपथःकम्बोधित्वम्
स्मृतिके तस्या स्वतंत्रं निवर्ते।

श्रीमुत्तक विवेक इति न किंवरीय इति। नन्दीधरश्य
ब्रह्मणो माया सदृ संवयसंवभवत् संवयाभिमतं स्वतंत्रा तद्वरा
स्वर्जस्तस्तोगुणात्मिकस्मृतिके तवथा भवति नारायणौ तद्वरा
प्रकृतिरावयायां तस्या स्वतंत्रं निवर्ते। वायुपथःकम्बोधित्वम्
स्मृतिके तस्या स्वतंत्रं निवर्ते। च वायुपथःकम्बोधित्वम्
स्मृतिके तस्या स्वतंत्रं निवर्ते।

श्रीमुत्तक विवेक इति न किंवरीय इति। नन्दीधरश्य
ब्रह्मणो माया सदृ संवयसंवभवत् संवयाभिमतं स्वतंत्रा तद्वरा
स्वर्जस्तस्तोगुणात्मिकस्मृतिके तवथा भवति नारायणौ तद्वरा
प्रकृतिरावयायां तस्या स्वतंत्रं निवर्ते। वायुपथःकम्बोधित्वम्
स्मृतिके तस्या स्वतंत्रं निवर्ते। च वायुपथःकम्बोधित्वम्
स्मृतिके तस्या स्वतंत्रं निवर्ते।
नासिद्या सुक्ता

ननुनकारेण यद्य पूर्विमें जगवसीतू तथ्य तर्हि तथ्य जन्म।
र्यामानस्य जनकियां जनकेलेन कारकावान कारकू च कारकावान्तरविशेष इति कारकेः सतो नित्यपुरावृविस्तयत सत्यायामान। भूवैशिष्ट्यस्मिन्दशिष्यस्य जनकियां: प्रागापि तत्वित इत्युत्ते। कथ्य तथ्य जन्म। अत आह—'तमसा
गृह्यमें' इति। अग्रे घुटे: प्राकृ प्रलयलिङ्ग न्युत्तेम्यिन्क सर्वे
जातू तस्मा गृह्यमें। यथा नैवेद्यान: सर्वेदात्मात्मान्तरितितत
तद्वित्त। आत्मस्य वासस्त्वास्तमाँसापरसंबं भववुपास्तमां स्तम
इत्युत्ते। तेन तमसा निर्गुरू संवर्त कारणमूतेन तेनात्तस्मायांतिति
निवृति, आच्छादितास्त्राश्च नाम-रूपांम्य यदार्थविभेदं तदाच
तथ्य जनेवुत्ते। एतेन कारणव्याल्पादेव कार्यमुन्तुपि
इत्यहानिन्तोस्कार्यवांद्रो ये मन्यते ते प्रत्याख्यात।।
तत्र तथा कारणे तस्मि तवज्जयात्मक कार्ये बिचोते चेतू कथ्य नासीरूक्र
इत्यादिनिषेष्य:। तवा—'तम चासूति' इति। तत्र भाववुपास्तमां स्तम
सुकारण। तद्वित्तात तवत्समाप्न। यत: सर्वे जगतु प्राकृत: भासीद्वो निवृत्तत: इत्यहान:। ननवाक्रांतवादार्थं तद्या प्राकृत: भासीद्वो निवृत्तत: इत्यहान दुर्यमान। कथ्य तथो: कम्बन्नेज्ञातास्तमां। तवा—
'सच्चरितमिति'। भक्ष्येर्ममु अभाज्यामानम्। अयध्य:। यदाचि
जगत्तमस्मा भक्ष्येर्ममु वै चिकितो विचये तथापि भ्वहार-
धारायमावति तस्याः दशायाः नाम-रूपाः विपस्र्ते न भायत: इति
तवात्त्वायनकाम:। अत एव नदर्य स्मरेिति—'असािवशं तस्मृतू
महाभागालक्षम:। अत्कथानांमिपूर्व: भ्रवमिवधिषत: सर्वेः'। (तत्र
१.५२)।। इति। क्रुेदा य न प्रभायते तवा—'सलिलम' इति। 'बला
गली' भौवान्देव इसर्वू।। इसे दस्तमांव तस्मि जातू चलिते
कारणे संगतमिवभाग्यम् अ: चासूति।। अस्तेचित्ति तिप्ने
'बतुलत: धनुदिक्ष' स्ताकारे 'हलुध्यांधिय:।' इति विलोपे 'तिघनस्ते:।
( पाण: सू: २.३९३ )।। इति पुणुदसारास्तादावाम्।। यद्वा सलिल-
मिति लुक्ष्यपम:। रोलिमिति।। कथा क्षुरेणाविभागापर नीरूः
दुर्भागान्त तथा तमसाविभागात्म सर्वस्त: सत्यविभागामिथ्य:।
नः विविधविविचित्रपुष्पमुस्ः प्रभ्वक्य सक्मतितुच्छेन तमसा
क्षुरेण नीरस्याविभिमन:। तथा तमस्य प्रक्ष्यवृक्षविषयोत्त:।
तद्यु दुर्भाग्य: जगत:। सामस्यस्यपिनो नस्तस्तस्वर्भव: इत्यत आह—
'तुच्छेन' इति।। आसमनवाल्तति वाचाः तुच्छ्ये।। चान्द्रो
यकारोपण:।। तुच्छेन तुच्छकल्पन: सदस्सिद्धक्र्ष्यो भाव-
रुपावान्त: अभिभिन्त: आविष्टम: चाससि।। दहात: कम्ब्र्यि निश्च:।
दहातेर्द्वि—'गवीतन्तर:' इति गते: प्रकृतिस्वरत:म्।। एकृ
एकीमूर्त्य कारणे तमसाविभागात: आशािमपि तत्कार:जािरतां तस्य:।
सहायत्यपर्वा:ऽोचन:स्त: ्महिना माहास्येन अजायत: उप्रभ:।
तस्य:। सहायत्यपर्वा:ऽोचन:स्त: ्चासांद्राश्चात:—'य: सवेह:।
सर्वविभागायस्मां त:।' (सुंद: २० १.७।८)।। इति।
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ननकर्तह्या यद्विवास्य पर्योक्तां जगत:। नृत्तस्तची कारां
तदेव किनिवन्यनन्यित आह—'कामस्वर्श' इति।। अग्रे यदि
विकाराभायस्त पुस्त:। प्रागवशायां परमेभारस्य मनसि काम:। समतरित
सम्माजयात:। सितीजा जातेिर्य:।। ईश्वर्यस्य सिसुज्ञा बा
किलेकेकय आह—'मनस' इति।। मनस:। अत: करणस्य संवर्णि
वासनार्थेत: यायायां विशिष्टे: सवेधां समवेदत:।। सामान्या
पेनक्षेत्यां:। सर्वबायल्यन:।। करणोपु भवेत्तिमितिः।। एते
ननस्यनी गुणाधारां परास्यायात्म:।। तादो तैती भावि:। प्रभुस्क
भीमस्त: प्रथम:। बङ्गते दलिते: मृये:।। इति पुयायाकर्म: कम्बेि: यत
यत: कारणे लुक्ष्यसमें चासूिर: अभिभ:।। युद्माविज्ञायाया
परियं सर्व:।। फलप्रभ्व: सर्वविभाग: कम्बीम्र्य: परमेभारस्य मनसि सितीजा
अदायतेिर्य:।
तार्क तत्त्वानुसार श्रीमत्यं पर्यालोचन तत: सर्व जगत सृष्टि। तथा चास्मात्मये—‘सोऽक्षामय भवुतां प्रजायेष्ठित स तपोस्मयम्
स तपस्यक्षे सब्यसृष्टिः यस्य दिन भीष्’ ( कृत्स 180.8 ) इति
श्रुतिः। आत्मोभवावमिते तथे बिश्वद्वमत्युवमाराशीसवेन प्रमाणन्यति—‘सत’ इति। सत: सर्वेन इवानीमुक्तमानान तथैव सब्य सत्ता
जगत: भन्त सब्यवर्ग तत्सृष्टिं कस्यावर्गं प्राप्तसृष्टिं कस्यसृष्टिं
कर्म: कामद्वैव भवितानांगतत् सन्तानमानि। निर्माणत: हरे इदं
सिध्दम यमी निर्माणम् हरे इदं। सिध्दान्तस्य सन्तानम् हरे।
सन्तानन् हरे। निर्माणस्य दृष्ट:। निर्माणस्य सप्तिक्षेत्रस्य\nनिर्माणस्य दृष्टो वर्गांः। निर्माणस्य सप्तिक्षेत्राः निर्माणस्य दृष्ट:।
विविधान्तिनियतयः।

ऋषभेढ 10-11-126-4
एव श्रुतानन्धनसः सब्यद्वमापत्ये निर्दोषत:। श्रुतानन्धनसः तत्त्वानुसार द्वमापत्ये निर्दोषत:।
यथा च चास्मात्मये—‘सोऽक्षामय भवुतां प्रजायेष्ठित स तपोस्मयम्
स तपस्यक्षे सब्यसृष्टिः। तोऽक्षामय सर्वानुसार भवुतां प्रजायेष्ठित निर्माणम्।
कस्यावर्गं कस्यावर्गं प्राप्तसृष्टिं कस्यावर्गं प्राप्तसृष्टिं
कर्म: कामद्वैव भवितानांगतत् सन्तानमानि। निर्माणत: हरे इदं
सिध्दम यमी निर्माणम् हरे इदं। सिध्दान्तस्य सन्तानम् हरे।
सन्तानन् हरे। निर्माणस्य दृष्ट:। निर्माणस्य सप्तिक्षेत्रस्य\nनिर्माणस्य दृष्टो वर्गांः। निर्माणस्य सप्तिक्षेत्राः निर्माणस्य दृष्ट:।
विविधान्तिनियतयः।

ऋषभेढ 10-11-126-5
एव भोक्त्र-भोग्यरूपम् सन्निहित:। सन्निहित: मनविद्यां तत्त्वानुसार चास्मात्मये—‘पटवाद्वा
द्वमापत्ये निर्माणम्। यथा चास्मात्मये—पटवाद्वा द्वमापत्ये निर्माणम्।
कस्यावर्गं कस्यावर्गं प्राप्तसृष्टिं कस्यावर्गं प्राप्तसृष्टिं
कर्म: कामद्वैव भवितानांगतत् सन्तानमानि। निर्माणत: हरे इदं
सिध्दम यमी निर्माणम् हरे इदं। सिध्दान्तस्य सन्तानम् हरे।
सन्तानन् हरे। निर्माणस्य दृष्ट:। निर्माणस्य सप्तिक्षेत्रस्य\nनिर्माणस्य दृष्टो वर्गांः। निर्माणस्य सप्तिक्षेत्राः निर्माणस्य दृष्ट:।
विविधान्तिनियतयः।
नासदिया सूक्ता

विस्तरण वक्तूं शक्तुस्वादिव्यरथः। ननु देवा अजाननः।
सर्वार्थस्ते वस्तुविषयं वक्तूं च शक्तुस्वान्वीतत्त्वम् वा—\(अस्वर्गिनः\)।
देवा च अस्सय जगतो विसर्जनेन विषयंद्रिपुरुसार्वनन्दं वीरविधे
वज्रसिंहं सर्वेण सहिष्ठितेः वाचर्कः अर्जुनेनाम: हताः। भृतस्वप्नः
पश्चातिज्ञता इत्यरथः। तथाविवारस्ते कथं स्थोलपते: पूर्वकलीनोः
सुधि जानियुः। अजानन्तो वा कथं प्रभृत्यः। उन्हें दुविकाराचार्य
निमायति। अथ एवं सत्य देवा अर्ये न जानिति किल।
वद्वस्तीतिर्लं को नाम मनुष्यादि: वेद तजावक्षारण जानिति यतः
कारणात् हस्तं जगतु अऽवाचुः स्वाजायत्॥
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उक्तप्रकारण यथेवं जगात्सर्वं दुविकाराचार्य एवं सुङ्गं ज्ञानं
दुर्गमपीवाद—इत्यमिति। यत: उपाधानुष्ठात परम्परामन: इत्यं
विदुः: विबिधा गरिनितसमुदायद्विपुरुषं विलिङ्का सुधि: आकृति
आजङ्गासोरस्पि किल यदि च दुःस्तार्यत्वं यदि व न धार्यत्वं।
एवं च को नाम अन्यो घृः शक्तुः यत: धार्यदेवधर्म एव
धार्यदेवान्य इत्यरथः। एतेन कार्येष्व सार्वनिुप्रतिपादनेऽनेन
श्रद्धा उपाधानकारणमुक्तमेव भवति। तथा च पारमाथ सृष्टि—
'प्रकृतिं विश्वविद्यमानसुपथम' ( वेद २० । १५.३२ ) इति।
यदाः। अणेनार्थेन च पृथक्कं सुरुङ्कार्यविधेन द्वियतिः। कौ
बेदेयस्तुनक्तैते। इती विबिधा सुधि: यत आकृति च आमन्दाद
जानितें च वेद। न कोर्यः। नास्येव जगते जनम न
कव्याचिन्द्रेऽन्तं जगद्धतिः बहुः अन्याः भव्यतिः। यतः।
'जनिकृत: प्रकृति: ' ( पाद २० । १७.३० ) इत्य्याकारासांस्त्रां
पक्ष्यम्यास्तिसिद्ध। सस्मात् परमालम उपाधानोऽत्राचुः तं
परमालम को वेद। न कोर्यः। प्रकृतिः परमाले्ष्यो वा
जानितें च हि बहुः अन्याः। तथा स एवपाधानोऽत्र परमाला
स्वयमेव निमित्तमूतोऽसि सनू यदि च दृषे विद्वेषे इर्तं जगात
सस्मात् यदि च न सस्मात्। अस्तिव विसद्धिचवनसमन्तस्मायः
सांस्कृतं चेतास्मात्सु हृदिताः यथा। स एव विवेचे। तौ को वेदाः।
अजानन्तोऽसि बहुः जहातु प्रभावान्तोऽसि बहुः जगातु
स्वयमजायं तेषां विपरीतं विनिर्देहो विद्वेष् तो धितमजायं तेषां।
स एव उपाधानोऽसि यथ्यएषा न कोर्यः। यथा विवेचे। तौ
जानितं तद्वाचार्यानामस्वं तत्त्वविधानें कौ कौ इत्यरथः।
यथेवं जगात्स्वविद्यमानसुपथम न तां ता प्रमाणपद्धतिमाह्यायस्त
इत्याः: अथाः तस्मात् इत्यरथः प्रमाणायति 'यो अर्थात्। अथा
भृत्मोत्तमतास्मात् जगात्: यो अध्ययः। इतिहास इतिहास
सर्वमा स्वरूपं विद्वेष्यते। 'कव्यर्तः' इत्यादित्वमाते। 'कव्यर्तः'
इतिया च विद्वेष्यते। उदूः
सम्भव्याः। 'न हंसिन्क्ता: ' इति निलोपार्थिवय:। व्योमका
विवेष्यणं दृश्ये। निरिलायणस्वरूपस्त मथ्यः। यदाः। अव-
तिर्थिनेयः। व्योमका विवेष्यणं वेदे व्यासे। द्वाकालसुभिर-
परिचित्त्याः इत्यरथः। जयः। अर्थितावर्तः। व्योमका
विवेष्यणं श्वारामिव विशिष्टायानमति। इति क्योऽव्यासमन्त्वतिष्टिः।
यथात्क्षितं हि समत्वात् सन्तवदस्य: सन्यासि—'स सम्भव: कृष्णम्प्रतिष्टिः
इतिहास महिमः' ( बात २० । ७.३१.१ ) इति। इति 'यो वा
परमेश्वरः तो व्रहः। चक्षुः श्रीवर्ती चन्द्राभासांस्कृतः। सोरस्पि
नाम वेदे जानित। यदि व न वेद न जानित। को नाम अन्यो
जानिताय। सर्वं इतिहास एव तां सुख्य जानिताय नान्य इत्यरथः॥
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ANOTATIONS ON THE COMMENTS OF MODERN SCHOLARS

KEITH: pp. 28-31. Keith interprets this Sūkta with reference to the Golden Egg (Hiranyagarbha) in which the principle of Tapas becomes manifest as the primeval Purusha equal to Mind with the principle of Desire, Kāma. This is a sound interpretation and consistent with what the Indian tradition also holds. Keith also recognized in this hymn a reference to the Supreme Deity as the first cause of the World beyond the two-fold categories or Duality of Sat and Asat etc. One important fact in the comments of Keith is the distinction recognized between Hridaya and Manas i.e. Heart and Mind. Heart is the real divine centre unmanifest and invisible, which is the seat of Manas or Mind.

MACDONELL: pp. 31-35. Macdonell accepts in this hymn the evolution of Sat from Asat. He accepts Water as the substratum from which was evolved Manas or Buddhi (Intelligence) by the power of Tapas. Although he complains, not quite correctly, about the lack of clearness and consistency he is convinced of the fact that this is a piece of sustained speculation and the starting point of the evolutionary Sāṅkhya system. His deep insight also saw in this hymn substantial agreement with the cosmogony of the Brāhmaṇaṇas which is the same as the Hiranyagarbha-vidyā, the Cosmic Golden Egg in which the Universal Soul is produced. He recognizes the cosmogonic hymns of the Rigveda as the precursors not only of Indian Philosophy but also of the Purāṇas which originally concentrated on the theme of the origin of the world (Sarga-Pratisarga).

Macdonell’s meaning of Raśmi as the cord joining the Sat with the Asat also is noteworthy, as found in the phrase Sūtram vitam, the extended string of creation. He also recognizes the distinction between Prayati and Svadhā as the contrasted male and female cosmogonic principles.

WILSON: pp. 35-39. An excellent interpretation of Sat and Asat by Wilson is Matter and Spirit. The first Cause is Brahma in which the inactive matter and active spirit both existed undeveloped in their effect. The philosophy of Brahma as the transcendent cause being described in this Mantra is the view of Wilson.

COOMARASWAMY—Dr. Ananda Coomaraswamy in his book ‘A New Approach to the Vedas’ made a new translation of Nāṣadiya Sūkta couched in an apt and precise terminology as follows:—

Rigveda, X, 129

“Non-existence (asat) then was not, nor Existence (sat); neither Firmament (rajas), nor Empyrean (vyoman) there beyond:”
What covered over all (avārīvār) and where, or what was ahy resting-place (sārman)? What were the Waters (ambhāh), Fathomless Abyss (gahanaṁ gambram)? I.

Then was neither death (mrityu) nor life (amrita), nor any fetch (praketa) of night or day:

That One breathed (ānīt) breathless (avāta) by intrinsic-power (svadhā), none other was, nor aught there-beyond. II.

In the beginning (agre), Dark-Inert (tamas) was hid (gūla) by Dark-Inert (tamas). This all was fluid (sala), indeterminate (aprapaketa):

Void (tuechya) by void (ābhu) was overlaid (apihita): That One was born (aṇat) by the all-might (mahī) of intension (tapas). III.

In the beginning, Will (kāma) arose (suṣuvartat) therein, the primal seed (retas) of Intellect (manas) that was the first:

Searching the heart (hrō) thoroughly by thought (manīśā) wise-singers (kavayā) found there the kin (bandhu) of existent (sat) in the non-existent (asat). IV.

What trace was stretched across, below, and what above?

Seed (retas) was, Allmight (mahimānak) was; Intrinsic-power (svadhā) below, Purpose (prayati) above. V.

Who knows it aright? Who can here set it forth? Whence was it born (aṇatā), whence poured forth (visṛṣṭiḥ).

These Angles (devāh) are from its pouring-forth (visarjana), whence then it came-to-be (ābabhūva), who knows?

Whence outpoured (visṛṣṭiḥ) this came to be (ābabhūva), or whether one appointed (ādade) it or not.

He who is Over-Eye (ādhyākṣa) thereof in uttermost Empyrean (vyoman), he knows indeed, or knoweth not. VII.

From his commentary which is reproduced here we learn the following facts.

(1) He Believes that the trinity of terms Tamas, Rajas and Sattva is found in this Sūkta.

(2) Manas was the fecundating power or Buddhi, creative intellect of Brahman.

(3) He also takes note of the principle of Prāṇa (वानीप, that refers to the duality of Prāṇa and Apāṇa.

(4) His explanation of Svadhā as the intrinsic power generated from the first cause or primeval source is also worth noting. The primeval source is explained as the Waters, Nirguṇa Brahman, or Unconscious Godhead.

(5) The principle of Veil (Avaraṇa) is very clearly grasped, namely that the world of Matter is a Veil for the ultimate Reality.
(6) A brilliant exposition relates to the spirit of the last two mantras in which he does not find an expression of Scepticism but by implication understands a sound ontological statement about the existence of the ultimate Reality. He is right in saying that the language of Mantras 6 and 7 could not have been used by anyone who did not believe in the highest Brahman as the final essence of all cosmos existing in the highest Empyrean (Parama vyoman). Thus Dr. Coomaraswamy subjected the Sūkta to a more detailed and specific analysis as follows:—

That is what is called a “late” hymn: from our present point of view it suffices that it antedates the earliest Upaniṣads by some centuries. A likeness to Upaniṣadic texts generally, and to our Brhadāraṇyaka Up., I, 1, 2, I and Maitri Up., V, 2, in particular will be noticed at a glance. This similarity is partly one of verbal identity (agre, sat, asat, tamas, salila, tapas, kāma, retas, manas, hrd, tad-eka, ānit = prāṇīti, vāta = vāyu, avāta = nirvāta, viṣṇīti, visarjana etc.), partly of verbal sense (ambha, salila = āpah, tapasah-mahi = tejas, svadhā = māyā, śaktī, svabhāva), and partly of total statement. Bandhu (= sajāta) “kin” as of blood relationship, is an exceedingly well-found expression for the “opposite relation” of Existence to the Non-existent, God to Godhead, Essence to Nature; as also in Brhadāraṇyaka Up., I, 1, 2. As for rajas, granted that no more is here directly implied than “firmament” or “space” and that the Śāmkhya as a formulated system

is of later publication, it still remains significant that in our hymn (not to speak of other Vedic sources) we have a trinity of terms (tamas, rajas, and tapasah-mahi = tejas = satvā) employed in their correct factorial (gaṇa) senses to denote the principles of passivity, movement, and essentiality, “later” represented by the three gaṇas more explicitly, and by the corresponding Trinity of Viṣṇu, Brahmā, and Śiva. By the “primal seed of Intellect” I understand rather “intellectual virility”, “creative intellect,” than the source of Intellect: cf. Rg Veda I, 71. 2, Brhadāraṇyaka Up., I, 5, 7 and similar passages, where Intellect (manas) is the fecundating power that begets upon Utterance or Wisdom (Vāo). Amṛta, in the second stanza, is not “immortality,” but simply life, continued existence, as in Rg Veda, VII, 57, 6, and equivalent to dirghamāyuḥ in X, 85, 19; the sense is “neither birth nor death as yet were”.

That “He breathes without air” (avāta, cf. later nirvāna, “despiration”) is a profound and significant expression, implying all the correlative of motion without local movement, and the like, which may be properly enunciated of the First Principle, for (only) where there is a duality, as it were” (Brhadāraṇyaka Up., IV, 5, 15) could it be otherwise. The thought is taken up and further developed in several passages of the Upanishads, particularly the Brhadāraṇyaka Up., as quoted above, p. 46, Kena Up.; 1, 8, “Know that as Brahman which breathes (prāṇīti) without breath
embodiment,” prathamam jāya-mānam-asthanvantam... bibharti, is itself (bodiless”), or more literally, “boneless” anasthā, that is to say “structureless”. ‘That is not yet “Selfed” (ātmavī)—“before creatures were, God was not God, albeit he was Godhead,” Eckhart, I, 410. Tamas (as in Maitri Up., V. 2.), apraketa salila, gahanāṁ gakhīram, etc., are all terms naturally designating the undifferentiated, unintelligible Godhead, “which is as though it were not,” Eckhart, I, 381: asat, non-existent, guṅha, hidden, there where “darkness reigns in the unknown-known unity,” Eckhart, I, 368, Cf. p. 6 and Note 21.

“What covered o’er?” That is, what and where was the world? āvarī var being from var, intensive reduplicated form of vr, “to cover,” “veil.” The world is thought of as veiling the ultimate reality, cf. Rg Veda V, 19, 1, “state after state is generated, veil (vavri) from veil appears,” hence also the prayer, Maitri Up., VI, 35, with respect to the Sun, “That face do thou unveil (apāvṛnu)” or “That door do thou open.”

Our hymn is by no means necessarily an expression of scepticism: it is rather wonder than a wondering that is suggested. “Who knows” is no more “sceptical” than Kabir’s tāsuk soi santa jānai “who are the Comprehenders thereof” or Blake’s “Did he who made the lamb make thee? “He knows or knows not,” if understood to mean “he knows and
knows not" would be sound theology. In the last stanza, alternative theories of "emanation" and of "creation by design" are propounded. In any case, the very form of the various statements and questions proves that sound ontological speculation was by no means a new thing, for it is inconceivable that such questions had been correctly formulated just a week or year before this particular hymn was published.

Not only are the terms and implications of our hymn all formally correct (pramiti) they tally also in form and content with those of the Upaniṣads. Yet we are asked to believe that Vedic thought was "primitive"—that the wise-singers of the Vedic hymns were able to express themselves in terms that have been universally employed elsewhere and otherwhen with a deep and known significance, and all without knowing what it was they said. It is as though it were argued that the law of gravity had been hit upon by lucky chance, long before anyone had consciously observed that heavy objects have a tendency to fall. Surely our faith in uniformity forbids us to imagine, what is outside the range of our experience, viz., that any sound formula, any clear statement of principles, could have been propounded by anyone who did not understand his own words. It would be far easier to suppose that such a statement had been propounded in the past by those who knew what they were saying, and that it had since come to be repeated mechanically without understanding: but on the one hand, that would be to push the beginnings of wisdom too far back for the comfort of those who fondly believe that wisdom came into the world only in their own day, and on the other would need proof by some internal evidence of the presumed misunderstanding. I prefer to believe that wherever and whenever a preposition has been correctly and intelligibly stated (but that covers both verbal and visual symbolisms, both "scripture" and "art") the proposition was also understood. Problems of ontology are not so simple that they can be solved by "luck" or "inspiration": on the contrary there is no sort of work more arduous than "audition," and here a man has need of all the power of the pure intellect. [A New Approach to the Vedas (1933), pp. 56-59].
COMMENTS ON OLDER EXEGETICAL MATERIAL

1. Śatapatha

The comment is short, extending to three Kapālikas only but the most important that we have on this Sūkta. Its unique exposition of the principle of Mind is as follows:—

1. Mind in the beginning before creation was undefined (Aniruktā) and unformed (Amūrta).

2. Such Mind was the same as the Prajāpati himself described as Aniruktā and Amūrta in the Brāhmaṇas.

This mind of Prajāpati desired to have a body (atmānaṃ anvaichekhat), that is to become an Ātman have a body or to (Ātman = body, cf. AV., 10.2.32). This was accomplished by the power of Tapas or Primeval Heat (Devauṣhṇya). That single Fire was the Sun or the Universal Mind which became parcelled out into thirty-six thousand smaller fires each named an Arka. The number thirty-six thousand is arrived at by computing three hundred and sixty days of the year for a period of one hundred years which is equal to a man’s life. Each day or Ahorātra period represents the burning of one Arka-Fire, and each one of them is a spark from the Universal Fire that is Sūrya. Both the

Cosmic Sun and its ray in the individual centre represent the Principle of consciousness, Intelligence or Mind (Etvāvat vai manaso vibhātiḥ). According to the doctrine of Purusho vai Yajñaḥ, it is stated that the Fires, the Soma Cups, the Altars, the Chants, and all the Rites are nothing but the symbols of Mind. The Mind is as great as Creation or Life. Again the Mind is as great as the Primeval Agni or Yajña Vedi that was the Sun.

That first cause was the same as Manas. This is a cardinal exposition of the Ānasādiya Sūkta in which the Principle of Manas or Buddhī is given the highest place, viz. the transcendent Principle (Aniruktā and Amūrta) and also the immanent categories which evolve as the body (Śarīra) and the Cosmos (Vīraḥ or Aṇḍa) or the Pañchā-bhūtas. The author of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa in his pregnant remarks identifies both the transcendent Brāhmaṇ beyond co-related categories and the manifested Cosmos with Mind (Manas Tattva or Auyaya Purusha) in its twofold aspects.

(2) Śāyana in his Commentary on the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa:

The Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa includes all the seven mantras of the Ānasādiya Sūkta (II.1.9.3-6). Śāyana’s comments there are different from what he has given on the Rigveda.

In explaining mantra 1 he takes Sat as Nāmarūpa, the world of names and forms and Aṣat as anything
absolutely non-existing like the horn on a man's head. The states beyond these two categories is called Avyakta. *Rajas* is said to imply the three *Gyūṣa Sattva*, *Rajas* and *Tamas*. *Vyoma* is the synonym of *Ākāsa*, taken to be the symbol of all the five material elements and the gross objects produced by them. The Brahmāṇḍa or the cosmic egg with all its sheaths like *Mahat-sattva*, *Manas* and *Pañcha-Bhūtās* did not exist. When the egg did not exist there were no sheaths to conceal it. In the case of intermediatory *Pralaya* the Waters exist, but in the case of *Mahā-Pralaya* great dissolution deep sea water did not exist.

In mantra 2 he states that there were no creatures (*Prāyanin*) and hence no life or death. The signs of Day and Night, viz. Sārya and Chandra also did not exist. Only the Great Brahman existed by his intrinsic power which was *Māyā*, the first cause of all creation (*Sārva jagat kāraṇarūpa*). There was no movement or activity as symbolised by Vāyu or Vāk. Thus there was nothing higher than the one Brahman.

In the third mantra *Tamas* is translated as *Avidyā Māyā* or basic ignorance which is the cause of the world. Māyā envelopes Brahman as *Tamas* and conceals the objects. The first *Tamas* refers to a certain aspect or potency existing in Brahman by which the second *Tamas* of *Avidyā* or *Jagat* could be created. This supports the view of Sāṅkhya which believes in Sat- kārya-vāda. Sāyaṇā explains Ābhu as *Jagat* which he says was covered in its first cause by a finitizing principle called *Tucheheha*. Basic ignorance (*Mūlā-jñāna* is called *Tucheheha* which conceals the manifest world at the time of dissolution. Sāyaṇā understand the world of *Tamas* as produced by the pre-existing *Avyakta*, *Tamas* or *Mūlā-jñāna* by the power of *Mahat* which is his translation of the word *Mahi* in mantra 3.

In mantra 4 he takes *Manas* as mind of *Parama Brahma* and *Retas* as primeval creation which is the same as *Kāma*. *Manas* is the first principle of Brahman's creation (*Brahmanah Sīrṣikshā-rūpam*). *Sat* is taken as the material world (*Bhūta-Bhautika-rūpa Jagat*) and *Asat* as the pre-existing *Avyakta*, *Kāma* as the link between the two (*Bandhāna-hetu*).

In mantra 5 the word *Raśmi* is taken to be the individual consciousness derived from a universal source (*Svayam-prakāśaḥchaitanyā*). *Tiraschchena* also is taken to be the pervasive quality of consciousness in Matter or Chaitanya Brahma manifesting itself through the objects, just as a thread is bound over and above a ball, similarly *Parama Brahma* encompasses from all sides the individual consciousness. To speak of Him as above and below is not possible. *Reto-dhā* is translated as essence, the Chaitanya principle inside the material form. The *Mahimānāḥ* represent the material objects produced by the power of the Chaitanya essence. *Svadhā* is translated as *Māyā* or *Avidyā*, the lower intrinsic power of Brahman and
Prayati as Brahman or Paramātmā who is the substratum (Ādāra). The two correspond to Prakriti Purusha.

In verse 6 Śāyaṇa explains the expression ‘Who knows,’ ‘Who has said’, as referring to the doctrines of Kaṇḍāda, Gautama and Kapila and the Mādhyaṃic philosophers but this entails an anacronism.

Mantra 7 is explained in terms of the material cause (Upādāna-kāraṇa) of the universe which is not known even to Brahman who is the Lord of the worlds.

(3) Śāyaṇa’s Commentary in the Rigveda.

This is much more elaborate than what he has interpreted in the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa. Although in substance there is not much difference, there is however a tendeney throughout to interpret the truth in conformity with the Vedānta doctrine of Śri Śaṅkarāchārya. In style also he has become polemical reflecting the spirit of his contemporaneous philosophical texts.
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