

A JOURNEY TOWARDS ESSENCE OF MANDUKYO UPONISHOD FOR A THEORY OF TIME¹

J. K. BARTHAKUR

Introduction

There is a dearth of material in modern India on research done on time. The studies made abroad have not evolved a cogent theory overcoming the impassess posed in the last century. In these studies, and in some literature of Indian origin, the Indian philosophical view on time has been projected as "circular". This "circularity" has the basis in the writings about recreation of the universe after every *Kolpo*^a. The matter of kolpo-wise creation, following destruction in *prôḷyô*^b, had been discussed and rejected by ādi Shōnkôchāryyô of the ninth century - Shonkaro in short - in his commentary on Māndūkyô ūpōnīshôd, or MU. In addition, he allows time to be taken as a concept; assumes time-constrictions during *sopno*^c, and *sushupti*^d; grants a multiplicity of conscious time; and disallows event-idea based conscious time to be anywhere near the terminal oneness. He arrives at oneness by discarding duality step by step; every step carrying him nearer to the goal. Shonkoro had met long ago the logical deadlock that stalls the contemporary philosophy in comprehending time. To recapitulate, the understanding of time, as perceived in its connection and association with events, escapes its commonplace meaning mainly in two paradoxes. The first is that a duration of time has to be open at least on one end because the events are separate from each other. Secondly, separate events cannot be observed or conceived without a measure of temporality, or *time is not definable*... India's *Shruti*^e has a good, ancient and misread doctrine of time that had taken care of suchlike paradoxes centuries ago.

Scope and objective

The scope of the essay will cover the text and the commentary of Shonkoro on MU. Its Part II flashes the basic text of MU.

Part III of the essay locates time in *Om*^f and derives time's definition via *odvoito*^g. The multiplicity of conscious time is a corollary. These aspects are the Indian philosophical heritage. The expressions² secured from this ancestry, are adequate to meet the requirements of the modern age.

Apologies are offered to Sanskrit scholars for writing Sanskrit in Roman script; and apologies are offered to the scholars not familiar with Sanskrit for the use of so many Sanskrit words in this essay. A pronunciation guide is provided for the latter in Endnote No. 1.

About the material that is being used in this essay

MU is included in the *Brāhmōṇ* or the philosophy part of *ōthōrvō Vedo* or AV. MU contains twelve *montrō*^hs; and it is the shortest and possibly the most abstract *uponishod*^f. MU deals with the sound of *Om*^j that occupies an important position in the Hindu philosophy³; and defines it. The concept of oneness or monism or *odvoito* emerges from it. The logical pattern of *Om* may be used as an anchor and a foundation for a theory of time.

The *odvoito* propounded by Shonkoro is called *Kéāvōlādvōitō* or "only *odvoitao*" and the same is different from the *odvoito* concept that emerged in the later ages like *Védāvédé* Bhāskārō, *Vishishtādvōitō* of Rāmanujō, *Dvōitādvōitō* of Nimbārō, *Shūddhādvōitō* of Vōllōbhō, and so on. These later versions of *odvoito* will not figure in this essay. Also, the alternatives to *odvoito* provided in *ōchintyōbhédābhédō* by Shri Chōityōnyō will not be discussed.

The differences with Shonkoro in interpreting MU : 2 and MU : 8 in the essay, are not discords.

The Shōnkōrōbhāshyō on *Gōūrōpādeeyōkārīkā* of *Māñḍūkyō* *uponishod* is shortened to MU : G : SB :. This will be the general pattern of references. Some abbreviations are defined in Footnote i.

Shonkoro had very clear ideas regarding time and he had extracted these

with a deep study of *shruti*. He had provided much material to resolve the contemporary problems of time. Shonkor's views in MU may be recounted, in advance, as below :

1. Time is a concept. Conscious time is associated with real or unreal events or ideas. Space is a physicality. Conscious time, space and real event or idea are jointly comprehensible. A blending of conscious time with unreal event or idea may distort space or make space appear as a concept.
2. There has to be a multiplicity of conscious time to be associated with the multiplicity of events and ideas.
3. There is no circularity in creation. Therefore, time also does not have to end.
4. *Odvoito* is the terminal result of a chain of arguments. So, the path to monism is a process of continually narrowing down of the prevailing multiplicity.

A few terms that were used by Shonkoro, are employed in this essay in their original form. A translation of the expressions does not do justice because they contain compressed forms of understanding. An attempt has been made to explain two of such terms before use; because without them the discussion can not begin.

***BROHMO*^k**

Brôhmô is the first or the nominative singular form of *Brôhmôn*. The concept of *Brohmo*, has been developed at some length in *uponishods*. With comments that indeed bear very fine arguments on a number of *uponishods*, Shankoro has laid the path to consider that *Brohmo* is the culmination of the logical development of an argument -- any argument. It is fair to say at the outset that this version of *Brohmo* is not acceptable to most of the Hindu theologicians. Regardless of such dissensions, one may sand-bag behind the verb root *brîh* and the adjunct *môn* : *brîh+môn* literally means that which generates or spreads by itself : A step beyond the terminal cloture of an argument. The concept of *Brohmo* is the containment of the totality of all sequences of reasoning in one source.

It is not easy to satisfy theologians with this type of arguments. Examples can be cited in SV⁴ in SV : 6 : 21 & 22 that reveal a cult-study of the concept of *Brohmo*; and to the worship in SV : 6 : 18 & 19. Shonkoro has used the word *pôrômâtmâ* to explain this idea of *Brhhmo* contained in SV:6:18. He had added *pôrômêshvôrô* before *pôrômâtmâ* while commenting on *Eeshôn* included in the first *montro* of EV⁵. EV is the first of the *uponishods* and it begins by saying that the universe, as *jôgôt* (*gôm+kkip*) in the form of a moving universe or as *sôm-sârô* (*sôm+sri+ghôn*) in the form of equilibrium and equinamity, is covered by *Eeshôn*. Shonkoro explains *Eeshôn* as *pôrômêshvôrô* and *pôrômâtmâ* after assigning the meaning of "ruling or governing" to *Eeshôn*. Thus, the requirements of theology seem to be adequately answered with the concept of *Pôrômêshvôrô* or *Pôrômâtmâ* or *Eeshôn*, which may yet cover the concepts concerning creation even if such concepts are transients.

Brohmo that is there where all logical processes terminate, is referred, understandably, sometimes as *Không Brôhmó* or "that *Brohmo*" : That *Brohmo* which is reached at the end of any argument. No more can be said about it because it exists without a definable character or quality. And "it is there" *tôt sôt - that or there exists*'. The other widely acceptable reference to *Brohmo* is made as *Nirgünô Brôhmô* or *Brohmo* without quality.

There were attempts at understanding *Brohmo* as an inductive process. An example is provided in Shonkoro's comments on BU : 2 : - 4 : 7 to 10. The basic point is to accept *Brohmo* as a premise because all derivatives from it fall in place without any conflict.

It is interesting that generations have distorted the concept, used the same word for so many different ways, attempted worship and placement of *Brohmo* in theogony; but all these are of no avail, *Brohmo* remains a concept, stays an intellectual pursuit, continues as an ultimate shield for logic.

OM

The linkage of *Brohmo* with the sound form of *Om* is a profound thought. *Om* is almost *Brohmo*.⁶ Shonkoro has provided an introduction to *Om* in the chapter called *ägômô prôkôrôn* of his commentary on MU. He quotes KU : 1 : 2 : 14 and 1 : 2 : 17, PR : 5 : 2, MO : 6 : 3, TU : 1 : 8 : 1 and CH 2 : 23 : 3.

He tells, but not very clearly, how *Om* came to be. CH : 3 comes the closest to explaining the origin of *Om*. It says that *Om* was realised by Prôjâpôtî in meditation. *Om* precedes Prôjâpôtî and Prôjâpôtî precedes Creation¹. Thus, *Om* is a pre-creation concept. It is a *Brohmo*-like concept. But there is not much convincing argument as to why *Om* is “the word” and not some other. CH 1 : 1 : 8 gives an interesting reason. *Om* is a universal expression of acquiescence and therefore, it is the highest possible intellectual attainment. It is true that *Om* provides, as proved by Shonkoro in various parts of *uponishod*, an excellent methodology to tackle the limiting thoughts. But it is not clear why the theologian assigns a magical property to *Om* and insists that it is the sound that reverberates as the totality of all the sounds of the universe. On the other hand, the *uponishod* by and large say that *Om* is a *Brohmo*-like concept. Shonkoro quotes as beolw :

“ <i>Om</i> is this”	KU : 1 : 2 : 14
“ <i>Om</i> is support”	KU : 1 : 2 : 17
“ <i>Om</i> is what is <i>Brohmo</i> ”	PR : 4 : 2
“ <i>Om</i> is the prayer word”	MO : 6 : 3
“ <i>Om</i> is <i>Brohmo</i> ”	TU : 1 : 8 : 1
“All is <i>Om</i> ”	CH : 2 : 23 : 3

Shonkoro provides varieties of arguments for acceptance of *Om* as a conceptual heavyweight. He summarises the scholarly discourse saying that the naming of a concept is a valid exercise in accordance with erudite tradition.^m He quotes CH in “the alternatives are only names and provide the luxury of words”ⁿ; “that (*Bromho*) spreads tied over everything with rope made of threads of names”^o; and “all these are only names as stated in *Shruti*”^p. There will be no harm if, for the purpose of this essay, *Om* is taken as a name of a *Brohmo*-like concept and *Pôrômô Brôhmô* is taken to be another name of *Brohmo*.

Part II

AN EXAMINATION OF THE MĀNDŪKYÔ *Uponishod*

MU : 1 : *Om* this letter is everything. This letter is the explanation of all that is past, future and present; therefore, all these are

Om. If anything in time is left out of these three divisions of time, then that remainder of time is also *Om*.

Shonkoro has expanded this direct understanding of the *montrô*. According to his commentary, what is to be established in argument, or *ôbhîdhéyo*, is finally the same as what is established in argument, or *ôbhîdhân*; and therefore, together, both *ôbhîdhéyo*, and *ôbhîdhân*, are only *Om*. Since *Pôrômô Brôhmô* is also *Om*. This expansion is in order if the limiting termination of the questions that arise and the envisioned unlimited contents from where to draw a strain of inductions, are, as in a theory of time, the objectives. Thus, MU : 1 is an important *montrô* for a theory of time. *Om* is the origin of time. Beyond *Om* is *Brohmo*; where neither time nor any other identity can survive. *Om* falls short of the concept of *Brohmo*. *Om* is to be worshipped. This is confirmed by other texts.

CH:1:4:1 Pray to the expression (*udgeetho*⁹) *Om* : *Om* expresses : *Om* explains expression.

This is not *Brohmo* that has been explained as the terminal of deductive argument and at the start of the inductive reasoning. *Om* stems from the concept of *Brohmo*; an inductive step below *Brohmo*; it is pure, it is not a derivative of anything; it is worshipped; it is used. For “time”, CH : 1 : 4 ; 1 may support that “*Om* exposes time” and “*Om* explains time” and MU : 2 says that “*Om* contains time” in its purest form : Past, future, present and what is not past, future and present. This is a confirmation of AV : 19 : 53 : 3^r. Listen to Shonkoro in the first *môntrô* of ET :

Commentary of Shonkoro on ;

ET 1:1:1 äq meaning “spread” or ôd meaning “eat” or ôt meaning “constant movement” provides the root meaning to *atmâ*. What is called the universe and under stood by the differences supplied by name, shape and property, was *atma* who was

Question : Was not *atma* also time.
 Answer : No.
 Question : Why then use “was”?
 Answer : Time is different It is there with *atma* like

“foam” in water; “foam” and water may be same in substance but their difference ought to be understood.....

Naturally, the emergence of the concept of *atma* can not precede the concept of time. *Om* contains time. This unformed time remains unassociated with anything; and does not require time to be divided into past, present or future or any other possible segmentation. *Om* presents a limiting state for the study of time. It is worthwhile to accompany Shonkoro in MU.

For a theory of time, the secular circularity of indirection will be like this : *Om* is a pre-creation concept. *Om* is that part of *Brohmo* which is a pure sound or a pure abstraction and can be worshipped : Downwards, *atma* is a post-creation concept. *Atma* is that part of *Om* that has crossed over to a post-creation station; *atma* allows an understanding of *Om* through itself. Upwards, *Om* may be used as a methodology to approach the concept of *Brohmo*. *Brohmo*, *Om* and *atma* may not be in existence in the same conceptual level together; and it may not be possible to comprehend all three of them collectively. It may not also be correct to expect that there may be a common product-region of all the three. But the fact remains that these post-creation and pre-creation “speculations” emerge out of human logic which is a post-creation phenomenon. “Logic” is expected to be continuous in all directions; the singularities appearing only due to lack of or incomplete information. Thus, it is “logical” to assume that there can be a pre-creation-logical-reason or PCLR that may contain “impressions” of the trio of *Brohmo*, *Om* and *atma*; however restricted those “impressions” may be, PCLR allows the “impressions” to acquire inter-relation within PCLR. PCLR is the home of applied human intelligence. PCLR allows freedom to geometry to tackle mundanely the awesome; in this case, try to fasten in mind the amazing trio of Hindu philosophy. Further discussions may be presumed to be taking place either within PCLR or within “space”, the latter being a physicality.

A few terms may be adopted for the shake of brevity of discussing MU:2 and MU : 3.

Proponcho^t : This term basically means “doubt” or “confusion”. Very often the term carries wider and more complicated meanings

like “alternative interpretation” or “misrepresentation”. It is better to retain the term in English whenever it appears in the Sanskrit text since a detail explanation for its every use is not required for the purpose of this essay; and, on the other hand, without a detailed explanation, the attempted translations may mislead.

- Vôhishprôjnô: One who has acquired knowledge by oneself (without formal training). A vôhishprôjnô’s knowledge relates to the stage of being fully awake and to observable matter or idea.
- Vôishvânôrô: The term literally means “relating to the man form of universe” and really used for that specific meaning. The term helps to use parables for the universe.
- Ôgnihôtrô : It may mean the undying sacrificial fire. Also, it may mean one who attends to such sacrificial fire; all well as the pursuit of attainable knowledge or material wealth.

The *montras* may now be introduced as below :

- MU : 2 : All these are *Brohmo*. This *atma* is also *Brohmo*. This *atma* has four divisions.
- MU : 3 : The first division is of the *Vôishvânôrô* and *Vôhishprôjnô* of the fully awakened stage that has seven limbs and nineteen mouths.

Shonkoro explains that the seven parts of the body of *Vôishvânôrô atma* are outer-space which is the head, sun -- the eye, wind - the ... In the imagery of *ôgnihôtrô*, the sacrificial fire or the attainable knowledge is in the mouths. The nineteen mouths are ... Shonkoro raises the doubt himself as to why the third *montra* brings in the concepts of body and mouths instead of explaining the four parts of *Brohmo* that had been spoken of in MU : 2. He supplies the answer saying that there can be no harm in explaining the scope of discussion like this because the ultimate aim is to comprehend the totality of the plural existences as condensed into a conclusive oneness or singularity or monoism.

Shonkoro comments that it is the inner self or *atma* with which the four aspects of *proponcho*, and that which overlords them, are to be related. In that case, the overcoming and consequently discarding the *proponchos* establish the

oneness or *odvoito*. What is stated in other texts as “all that exist” and so on, so says Shonkoro, need not necessarily, or any longer, mean a plurality : The basic aim of *uponishod* is to establish a universal rule, which is, for Shonkoro, *odvoito*; and where this *odvoito* rests, becomes the source of all reasonings. Shonkoro cites Mōdhübrahmōñō part of BU. He begins in BU : 2 : 5 : 1 saying that all are extracts (honey) of one and one is the extract of all, to say that the concepts that come into the existence instantly^u, the concepts that do not become non-existent^v, the concepts that base on observation^w and the concepts that base on physicality^x, are the extracts^y of existence^z; and the existence is the extract of suchlike concepts. Shonkoro states that inertia and movement are really the aspects of “one”, the end of inertia is movement and the end of movement is inertia; what moves and what is inert is the same. Shonkoro attacks the issue from two directions : If one starts with the mutiplicity of concepts alone, then one ends with the combination of concepts and a physicality : If one starts with the multiplicity of physicalities alone, then one ends with a combination of physicalities and a concept. Possibly, the ideas of Shonkoro are more easily comprehended by some as below :

Proposition : COMBINATION OF CONCEPT WITH PHYSICALITY LEADS TO ONENESS OR ODVOITO.

If c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n are mutually exclusive concepts and p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n are mutually exclusive physicalities, where N and n are numbers and $N > n$, such that there is no subset of $(c_1p, c_2p, \dots, c_np)$ and of $(cp_1, cp_2, \dots, cp_n)$ where p is not compatible to combine with c 's or c is not compatible to join with p 's or by deduction since no condition is put to the process of combinations p 's not combining with c 's and c 's not combining with p 's are non-existent, or “zero's” for ordinary comperhension.

The product terms are understood in a general form of multiplication such that the product term $c\hat{p}$'s may not even be compatible with one another. The same may be the case with $cp\hat{i}$'s. When they are not compatible to combine then n number of ci , cip 's or n number of $cp\hat{i}$'s are zeros. This cannot happen unless m , number of cip 's or c_j 's are zeros, where $1/2\mu_1 \leq \mu$, or n_1 number of $cp\hat{i}$'s or cp_i 's are zeros, where $1/2\pi n_1 \leq \pi$. Or at least m_1 or n_1 number of combinations that do not combine any further are zeros.

In this understanding, if twos of c_{ip} 's are compatible to combine, they combine to form $c_{ic}p$, which is less than any of c_{ip} or c_{jp} and leave out notionally resultant vacant positions. Similarly, if twos of cp_i 's are compatible to combine, they combine to form cp_{ip} , which is less than any of cp_i or cp_j , to occupy positions either of cp_i or of cp_j and leaves out notionally resultant vacant positions. This is because c 's not included in c_{ip} and p 's not included in cp_i are not comprehensible, or their values are zeros; as are the zero-values of any other of their combinations that do not combine any further. The process of further combinations like ... $pc_{ic}c_{jk}$... and ... $cp_{ip}p_k$... create more vacant positions and ultimately only one combination remains with nothing more to combine with.

The complement of zeros that are generated at different levels of combination, may not appear to be zeros at the previous level; because, as for example, it was possible for (m_i, μ) and (n_i, n) to contain zero-values but such zero-values could not be assigned to them automatically, or with a presumption, without introducing a flaw in the logic of constructing m_i and n_i . These zeros, that had remained unseen at the lower stage, rendered the next higher combinations as zero. And when the final pairs of combinations are arrived at, then they either combine or one of them carry a zero-value.

This is one of the ways of initial introduction of *odvoito* by Shonkoro in MU. Seen from many angles, or probably from any angle, MU is a summary of number of other presentations of the same idea of *odvoito* as explained in other texts of *uponishod*. The journey has just begun and yet it is yielding so rich dividend : It has to be continued.

Another term is required to be adopted for the next *môntrô* of MU.

sopno : The term literally means "dream". According to Shonkoro, when the visible or understandable cause-effect ends and awareness arises regarding an inner cause-effect which is like understandable cause-effect but not exactly the same, then that awareness is called the *sopno*. *Sopno* can also be due to "effect" or due to "cause" alone.

The second term that will be necessary to adopt is *tôijôsô*. But the term is explained by the *montrô* itself and Shonkoro explains this very important term

further in his commentary. Therefore, the *monstro* will be introduced first *tôijôsô* will be explained later.

MU : 4 : The second division is of that *tôijôsô* whose place is in *sopno*, who is wise at that stage as in the ordinary level of staying awake, who has seven parts of the body and nineteen mouths and who enjoys expression of wisdom without material aim.

Shonkoro states that the conscious mind bears tradition^{aa} which contains imprints of experiences and learning as in a printed cloth. The effects of such a tradition bound mind surface along with what is desired and derived without learning or experience. It then suggests that the instinct based, pre-printed and traditional mind is the cause of the conscious existence. Shonkoro refers to BU : 4 : 3 : 9 to say that, basically, there are two types of mind : The mind of “this world” and the mind of the “next world”. The dream or *sopno* is a junction^{bb} of this two types of mind and provides the support^{cc} for ideas to cross over from one level of existence of mind to another. Shonkoro explains that there is an inner expression of mind^{dd} which gets distributed in seeing, hearing, speaking, etc. while one is awake. This inner expression remains present in an undistributed form when one is in the stage of *sopno*. Shonkoro minces no word while stating that *sopno* is not an extra-experience : It is a memory of what had happened before.^{ee}

Shonkoro also refers to PU : 4 : 2 and PU : 4 : 4 to explain that the inner faculties get concentrated during *sopno*. Therefore, it is possible to be as wise during *sopno* as while awake and some remain so. When such a wisdom remains without a material aim, then only the feeling of its expression stays. This is *tôijôsô* of the second stage which is under consideration.

Shonkoro clarifies that the main aim of the *monstro* is to emphasise the distinction between *vôishvânôrô* of the previous *monstro* and *tôijôsô* of this. *Vôishvânôrô* is connected with external objects and ideas; therefore, the concept “is linked with the awakened state and tied to the obvious”^{ff}. The mind is in a deeper region than what is seen, heard or felt with senses. It is possible for some who are wise^{gg}, to keep their mental status at the same level while awake and while in a state of *sopno*. Such wise persons can also be without a material aim and be concerned only with the expression of wisdom that is revealed during

sopno. Such a concept of wise and the wisdom is called *tôijôsô*. The association of *tôijôsô* is with refined^{hh} knowledge.

Simplification : If 'e' represents external objects, events and ideas, 'a' *vôishvânôrô*, 'ε' *sopno* cause-effect and 't' *tôijôsô* then (e, a) and (ε, t) exist; (ε, a) does not exist.

Closely associated with *sopno* is the concept of *sushupti* which can be stated as below :

sushupti : The state of *sushupti* is slumber (i) when there is no desire and (ii) which is not a state of *sopno*.

The other term that will be required for adoption is *prôjñô*. The term is defined by MU : 5 and the commentary of Shonkoro thereon. Therefore, this term will also be used first and explained later.

MU : 5 The third division is of that *prôjñô* whose place is in *sushüpti*, who enjoys a concentrated form of superior wisdom at the stage of exceptional happiness that has the opening only to consciousness *chétómükhô*.

Shonkoro defines *prôjñô* as the knowledge which is complete and true for the past and true for the future. "By definition established" by the previous two stages "it is called *prôjñô*". "Otherwise, becoming a *prôjñô* is an exceptional stage, it has to be called *prôjñô* because other two stages" (which had been called *vôhishprôjñô* and *ôntôh prôjñô*, and) "concern specific knowledge as against the sensual and intellectual realisation of the third stage". Incidentally, "the ascetics reach this stage of *prôjñô* through control of body by *yôgô*, control of mind through transcendental meditaion and enhancement of knowledge through the study of *shruti*. The "happiness" contained in the *montrô* is also of exceptional calibre. Shonkoro refers to BU : 4 : 3 : 32 for its understanding. The usual and ordinary "observation" and the "knowing" come in smaller doses of satisfaction; but when these extend upto the limiting stages of sensual and intellectual understanding, then supreme happinessⁱⁱ results. It is this supreme happiness of "application of mind" that has found place in MU:5. The concept introduced in this *montrô* is continued onto the next *môntrô*.

MU : 6 This (*prôjñô*) is the Lord *Eeshvôrô*, this is the omniscient this is the omni-science of the knowledge yet to be born; and being omnific cause of creation and secession, is also the ultimate cause of all.

Shonkoro explains that the *Eeshvôrô*, used in this *montro* is not the God of theology. Being a derivation of *Eeshôn*, the word means, for this *môntrô*, “one who rules”. Thus, to call *prôjñô* the *Eeshvôrô* does not add a concept which is additional to what has been described as *pôrômô Brôhmô* in other parts of *shruti*. Shonkoro’s analysis is as follows : Since *prôjñô* is on the divide of consciousness and lack of it. it has to be omniscient : Therefore, it is omniscience of any knowledge that will ever be born : Therefore, the cause of what is created or seceded is also *prôjñô*.^{jj}

Shonkoro elaborates the concept to say that difference, identity and singularity of *atma* prevails in the outward manifestation of *prôjñô*, inward mainfesation of *prôjñô* and the potent manifestation of *prôjñô*. Similies are drawn to a big fish that swims between two banks no matter how different the banks are; and a big bird that flies smoothly no matter how turbulant the different parts of the wind-cover may be. Shonkoro explains that *vôishvônôrô* is vision or that which is lighted^{kk}; *tôijôsô* is inside mind; and *prôjñô* is in intellect. After a profound scholarly journey, Shonkoro explains that the *sôdbrôhmô* is but *sôt+brohmo* : Or, the existence+of+*Brohmo* can be said to be that which causes creation^{ll} and also that which is not related with creation^{mm}. “In both ways *Brohmo* satisfies the definition of existence and lack of existence realating to consciousness.”

Is this then “zero”? No. Without the opposite a doubt cannot exist. Opposite of *sôdbrôhmô* is the doubt for it. Therefore, it is not zero or emptiness. Is that then “meaningless”? No. It is at the end of a self-journey of intellect. If the journey was not meaningless, then *Sôdbrôhmô* is also not meaningless.

The adoption of another term *türeeyô* is unavoidable. The term is introduced in MU : 7, a translated version of which states as below :

MU : 7 : *Türeeyô* is not *ôntôhprôjñô* not *vôhishprôjñô*, not the both of them, not the potency of *prôjñô*. not *prôjñô*, not the

opposite of *prôjnô*. It is invisible, unusable, unacceptable, undefinable, unthinkable, not manipulatory, essence of the evidence of oneness, end of the *proponcho*, unmoveable, unalienable and oneness of odvoito. This is the fourth division, this is the *atma*, this is that which ought to be learnt.

Shonkoro reases a doubt. Why should this *montro* be sung at all? Is it not enough that in the earlier *montros* and in other parts of the *shruti* the nature of *âtma* has been described? Why all these 'no's and 'yes'es are devised now? Shonkoro also provides an answer saying that if a snake is wrongly taken to be a rope, then the rope is to be understood. If there is a pot in the total darkness and the state of darkness is not terminable, then a knowledge regrading the pot is to be acquired by means other than the termination of darkness. Shonkoro establishes in very fine arguments that the refutalⁿⁿ also can lead to a proof. What is "done" is the result of "doing". Who or what "does" is the cause or reason of "doing". The part of the "reason" passes on to "done" when "done" is understood. There remains a part of "reason" which is yet to be understood^{oo}. For this Shonkoro refers to BU : 4 : 3 : 23 to compare its statement that an observer can not conceive the opposite of observation. Similarly, the cause of "doing" as separated from "done", and the "reason" which is refined to the state of "yet to be understood", can not be conceived to have an opposite or alternative. This finality of "reason" can not contain vagueness^{pp} which leads to *maya*^{qq} or illusion that influences *prôjnô* which influences knowledge itself. Thus, Shonkoro makes a case for MU : 7.

The concept of *türeeyô* is a preparation to come to the concept of *Om*. In this attempt, Shonkoro takes man possibly to one of the highest pinnacles of human capability of reasoning. Out of the pen of Shonkoro, the language and the literature flow out as the finest of the music; and the reasonings roll out as a form of art. This is a piece of superb writing of arguments ever written or read, and for many, nothing more lofty than Shonkoro's exposition of *türeeyô* has been accomplished; or can be accomplished. One is astounded to think about the uses to which this level of thinking can be put in mathematics and physics.

However, for a theory of time, securement of a mere introduction to *türeeyô* is enough; because the problem of time beyond creation, and its associative conscious time, is mainly locational. The aim is to seek out where the mathematical argument for conscious time is. Thus, the companionship with the lofty *türeeyô* will be discontinued rather reluctantly.

The discussion done this far allows introduction of all the remaining *montros* of MU together; because it is the methodology of treatment of the limiting ideas which is important for a study of time. The concept of *atma* is already presented as the consciousness which has a time counterpart. This is also a composite concept which is divisible in four successive parts in such a way that the first part *vôishvânôrô* links with the concepts of creation of matter, energy and ideas, and ordinary existence of these, whereas the last and the fourth part *türeeyô* is almost as abstract as the next higher concept of *Om*.

Om has no "counterpart" of time but "contains" time - past, future and present and parts of time that are not past, future and present. For a theory of time, the limiting thought of *Om* may be sufficient and this is what the remaining *montros* of MU analyse. For the same reasons, two terms, that will be used as they are to avoid confusion, will now be assigned rather limited meaning. The first is *pädô* which may carry multiple meanings; but for the purpose of the remaining five *montros* of MU, it will mean the four stages of *vôishvânôrô tôijôsô prôjñô* and *türeeyô* which have already been introduced and explained to some extent. The next word is *mâtrâ*. This word will communicate only the letter-divisions or the sound ingredients of *Om*. The game plan is to associate four *pädôs* with the four *mâtrâ* of *Om*. MU:8 breaks in the concept of "finality of reason". It requires but a short reflection to accept that this "finality of reason" is the same as the concept of *atma* and not "the termination of the logical process".

MU : 8 : The finality of reason or *atma* is best defined by letter and that letter is *Om* which is best established by *mâtrâ*. *Pädô* is *mâtrâ* and *mâtrâ* is *pädô* rendered ô, ü, mô.

MU : 9 : The *vôishvânôrô*, who is in the awakened stage, is the first *mâtrâ* ô, because of His spread over all physicality,

observation, the concepts related with observation and the initial position of these (*while evolving an understanding of ātmā and Om*). Whosoever knows this, wins all that are desired and becomes the first amongst the doers (*doing and winning become the same*).

- MU : 10 : The *tôijôsô* who is in the *sopno* stage, is the second *mātrā* *ii*, because of His superiority (compared to *vôishvânôrô*) and the middle position (between *vôishvânôrô*, and *prôjñô*). Whosoever knows this, improves the results of their knowledge, becomes capable of treating (*opposites and extremities*) equally and none of them remain without the comprehension of *Brohmo*.
- MU : 11 : The *prôjñô*, who is in the *sushupti* stage, is the third *mātrā* *mô*, because of His role of assessment (of *vôishvânôrô* and *tôijôsô* at the points of their entrance into and the exit from the stage of *sûshüpti*) and ending by integration (of *vôishvânôrô* and *tôijôsô* at the stage of *sûshüpti*) Whosoever knows this (*about this onenes of assessment with the ending by unifying*), also assesses all and ends all by unification.
- MU : 12 : The consonent ending of *m*, which is an *ô* without a *mātrā*, which can not be used independently, which ends all *proponcho* (*like the consonent ending removes all doubts regarding the consonent*), which is benovolent (*like consonent ending is benevolent to the sound of the consonent*), which is singlar and "one" without duality (*like the consonent ending has the unrepeated finality*), is the *türeeyô ātmā*. Whosoever knows this, can enter his own *atma* (*for understanding the türeeyô ātmā*).

The portions in italics that are placed between brackets, have been picked up from or have been understood as such in the commentaries of Shonkoro on the above *montros*. This is done for a better comprehension of the *montros*, and such a more careful grasp of the presentation has become necessary, because a stage and surprising situation is met : Shonkoro has raised no objection to saying that the *pädô* of *atma* is same as the *mātrā* of *Om*!

PART III A REVIEW

It is Shonkoro who distinguishes *Brohmo* from *Om* and *Om* from *atma*. He has referred to KU : 1 : 4 that states clearly as below :

“Know that *Brohmo* is that which is not revealed by words but that which exposes words; whom you can worship is not *Brohmo*.”

Against this, the clear verdict of Shonkoro, as has been dictated in his own commentary on CH : 1 : 4 : 1 and quoted earlier, is conclusively that *Om* is to be worshipped. CH :L 1 : 1 : 1 states that *Om* is an expression of *udgeetho* which is to be worshipped. CH : 1 : 3 : 7 states that *udgeetho* stands for Säm, Yôjür and Rik Vedo and the term means extraction of essence from these. CH : 1 : 1 : 5 and CH : 1 ; 1 : 6 say that the combination of Rik and Yôjür Vedo is *udggetho* which is *Om*. *Om* certainly stands out as a heavyweight of Indian philosophy placed above *atma* or any other such concepts. In its *türeeyô* form, *atma* may come very close to *Om*; but its *vôishvânôrô* stage is far removed from the concept of *Om*. Shonkoro separates *Om* from *Brohmo*. Similarly, *atma* and *Om* are not the same concepts for Shonkoro and have been shown to be so in the earlier discussions. How *pädô* is *mâtrâ* and *mâtrâ* is *pädô*? It is not like Shonkoro to miss such an obvious point.

Time is not included in *atma* : It is an associate of *atma*. But it is included in *Om*. This understanding is sepcific : It is the first thing that MU speaks about in its very first *môntrô*. *Om* contains “everything” of consciousness : Consciousness of the past, of the present and what it will be in future. *Om* has to be a current concept if new consciousness is to be included in it as the same is created¹⁷. That *Om* is to be worshipped is also because it is a current concept: Worship includes endearment and endearment is “what it is” for “what is was” as well as “what it will be”. Therefore, how *Om* is related with *Brohmo* is also a current topic. Therefore, all the concepts involved, like those of *Brohmo*, *Om*, *atma* and so on, are the current issues in PCLR : Nothing can be assigned the position of a “had been”. How can *pädô* of *atma* be the *mâtrâ* of *Om* ?

It appears that the chance of misreading MU : 2 is quite a possibility. A second look will be in order. MU : 2 says that “all these are *Brohmo*”, which

means that *Om* is *Brohmo* because *Om* is everything by virtue of the first *monstro*. This assertion is followed by “this *atma* is *Brohmo*”. The initial misreading can be due to overlooking that *Brohmo* is *không brôhmô* that which (enlarges) (is understood to have enlarged) by itself. In the previous sentence, the choice of the word “brôhmô” is deliberate to emphasise the point that the word may not always mean a respectable and distant “supreme” in the limits of human imagination, but may also indicate merely a characteristic of “selfgrowth”. Now, *atma* does take in a continuous input of consciousness created by the unremitting addition to human knowledge^{SS} and similarly, the scope of *Om* is also ceaselessly expanded with what is added to *atma* and augmentation of consequent perceptions that are required to be stored in *Om* by such rule, or with such guidance, that may have originated from *Brohmo*. Whatever may be the nature of that rule of guidance, it is perfectly in order to say that “*Om* is brôhmô” and “*atma* is brôhmô”, and that is what MU : 2 says. “That this *atma* has four *pädôs só* (silence) *yômätmä chotüshpäi*”. Can *pädôs* expand ?

The second misreading may be to ignore the significance of the order of repetitions of the words *ātma* and *brôhmô* which should read as, with “#” working as a meaning-separator, “+” indicating *sôndhi* combination and “&” indicating *sômäsô* combinations as below :

“all (emphatised) + that &^{II} (who is) + *brôhmô* #
 + this + *atma* (who is expandable) &^{III} (who is part of or understood with) *brôhmô*, #

That + this + *atma* (is with) &^{VV} four + *pädôs*”.

Without such meaning separations, one may conclude that *Om* and *atma* are the same because the *monstro* prescribed that *Om* is *Brohmo* and *atma* is *Brohmo*, whatever meaning that *Brohmo* may carry for itself.

The silence of Shonkoro in MU : 2 is intriguing. One explanation for this may be the traditional relationship that exists between the Guru and a disciple. If Guru *Gôüreepäädô*, the propagator of highly abstract *Ôjätôvädô* took a considered view against the conviction of his disciple Shonkoro, then the only recourse left to Shonkoro was to remain silent over the issue. No other

explanation regarding the hush is available; and the one offered in this paragraph is entirely speculative. It supports, however, the appearance of Shonkoro's views elsewhere.

The MU : 3, MU : 4 and MU : 5 name *ṛiṣhvānôrô* as the first *pādô* *tôijôsô* as the second *pādô* and *türeeyô* as the third *pādô*. MU : 6 confirms that *präjnô* of the *tôijôsô* stage relates to ordinary existence. MU : 7 names *türeeyô* to be the fourth *pādô* and Shonkoro establishes that *türeeyô* is not a stage of ordinary existence.

MU : 8 should be read, therefore, more carefully to cover the possibility that it was misread. Thus restructured, it deviates from the common translations and says as below :

The *pādôs* of *atma*'s "shelter of letters" are the *māträs* of *Om*'s "shelter of *māträs*"; and the *māträs* are the *pādôs* rendered *ô*, *ü* and *mô*.

Here, one real and one unreal situations are presented. Although *atma* may seek a shelter of *Om* to accommodate at least its *türeeyô* stage, there is no reason why *Om* will require a shelter of *māträ* excepting for the involved reason of its definition or a theoretical or arbitrary division. These arbitrary divisions, called *māträ* in general, are sought out and arranged in sequence. Then, the *pādôs* associate themselves with the names of the divisions.

A geometrical generalisation

Geometrically, a *pādô* projects upon a predestined part of *Om*. Naturally, *pādô* cannot cover the destined part of *Om* completely. As for example, no *pādô* contains conscious or any other form of time. On the other hand, *Om* contains all the forms of time. Therefore, all the divisions of *Om* will contain slots that remain uncovered by the projections of *pādôs* on them. As for example, *Om*'s Division *ô* will have a vacant place for Conscious Time; *Om*'s Division *ü* will keep a vacant place for *sopno* Time; *Om*'s Division *mô* will have a vacant place for *sushupti* Time; and *Om* Division "consonent ending" will have room for a Definitive Time. Apart from time, there may be other concepts that are not contained in *atma*⁸. All these will have to be accommodated in *Om*; because "Om

is all". There ought to be large areas, or groups of ideas, that remain uncovered by the projections of *pädôs* on the *Mâtrâ Divisions carved out of Om*. And there is no claim that *Om* is completely divisible by the *mâtrâs*. In this also *Om* differs from *ätmä*. The division of *atma* into *pädô* is comprehensive by virtue of MU : 2. The same is not the case with *Om*. It is not very difficult to see why it is so. The example of *türeeyô* stage of *atma* provides an obvious case. The stages of *vôishvânôrô*, *tôijôsô* and *türeeyô* are envelopes. The stage of *türeeyô* is based upon the form of *sushupti*. The base of *sushupti* is to be

- (a) not awakened
- (b) not *sopno* and
- (c) should not have any desire.

There may be another base, let us call it *prôshupti*, which is

- (a) and (b) same as for *sushupti*
- (c) not *sushupti*, and
- (d) same as (c) for *sushupti*.

Naturally, *prôshupti* can not be an *atma* related base and therefore, its resident, call it *trâñ*, can not be also *atma* related, by virtue of the "four *pädô*" division given for *atma* in MU : 2. On the other hand, the division given in Mu : 2 should be taken to be orthodox and literal, and *proshüpti* and *trâñ* may be taken to be the limiting concepts common to the concepts of *atma* and *Om*, say, the mystery of the prayer phenomena because of which *atma* prays for *trâñ*.

There may be yet another base, let us call it *pôrishüpti* (1), which is

- (a), (b) and (c) same as the *prôshüpti*
- (d) not *prôshüpti* and
- (e) same as (c) for *sushupti*.

By the definition already accepted, *pôrishüpti* (1) has to be part of *Om* alone and its resident, say, *pôritrâñ* (1) has also to be an *Om* related concept. There may be more bases called *pôrishüpti* (2), *pôrishüpti* (3) The *pôritrâñ* class of residents of the *pôrishüpti* class of bases are now entirely *Om* based and there had to be room for them in the

Divisions of *Om* other than the four already allotted to the four *pādōs* of *atma*. Thus *Om* may contain more than four *mātrās*. A suggestion may be to extend the ‘‘consonent ending’’, which is a vowel sound not ordinarily depicted in other languages⁹, and divide them into *mātrās* of same duration required to reach the consonent-ending from *ō* while producing the sound of ‘‘*Om*’’.

It must be said, with apology, that no disrespect is intended to the theologists while expanding the domain of *sushupti* or *tūreeyō* and no material gain, like helping to create yet another sectarian creed, lies at the bottom of it all. The above thoughts are supported by *shruti* and summarised in Geeta.¹⁰ The intention is only to show that the projections on *Om* of any part or whole of *atma*, can not cover the entire extent of *Om*. And there is no reason why any part of *Om* should be synonymous with any part of *atma* excepting for the limiting form of the parts of *atma* that are conceived with the intention of indentifying in *Om* a location where such parts of *atma* may find a logical asaylum. The instance of prayer can be such a possible commonality between *atma* and *Om*.

Introduction of the limitation of irreverasibility of ‘‘Rules that flow from *Brohmo*.

Proposition : OUT OF BROHMO FLOW RULES

An inflictment of a geometry of projections to picture the elemental relationship between *Om* and *atma*, builds the first step towards visualising how the limiting concepts find their way to foster an actual perception and consciousness on one hand, and to the limitless oneness on the other. *Om* is almost *Brohmo*. In *Brohmo* ends all logic. Therefore, every individual concept has to generalise, narrow down its differences and create common grounds with allied disciplines as it proceeds in its journey towards a logical end of its existence. Many of the concepts may not survive a very long journey, and before long, twos of them may but merge, for the twos may prove, on scrutiny, to be the separate versions of the same idea when the frills and the affectations are removed. That end of two ideas into an one, creates an intermediate oneness and the final oneness of the *odvoito* of theology is the stage when the final twos

have become one. This is the end of *proponcho* of theology. In this scheme, although *atma* may throw projections on *Om*, *Om* has no means to project anything on *Brohmo* except oneness, which cannot have any known or envisioned dimension. Therefore any flow can be only from *Brohmo* to *Om*, and the flow is not envisioned. Therefore, the flow can rather be called "rule", because this earthly term possibly describes adequately, and well, a "flow" that is ordinarily anticipated, inevitable, irreversible, definite and not envisioned.

Time, space and Shonkoro

In the chapter called "truthlessness" in MU, Shonkoro points towards the truthlessness in conceptualising that a mountain may be contained inside the body of a man,¹¹ or that the space may be constricted. Interestingly, and very conveniently for a theory of time, Shonkoro accepts the constriction of time^{ww} not only in *sopno* but also accedes to the idea that time constricts in thoughts under ordinary circumstances. The state of physicality encountered while time has constricted, is but a state of truth-lessness; like the "chariot (seen in *sopno*) is not there".¹² Shonkoro generalises and states that time and space may constrict in *sopno*, and that *sopno* differs from other times, but the truthlessness of physicality seen in *sopno* may also prevail in other times. The physicality seen in other times^{xx} is also truthless because mere "seeing"^{yy} and the truthlessness^{zz} are the same.¹³ It seems that Shonkoro had made a statement on the Special Theory of Relativity! But, possibly, he was apparently a step ahead of Einstein, because he says that the space can not constrict but it may be "seen" to have constricted or that space may appear constricted under the subjectivity of observer to "seeing", while it is not so in reality - or it is truthless that space constricts.

Multiplicity of conscious time

For a theory of time, it establishes that the time is a concept. It also says that the space is a physicality. Any presumption regarding the reality of the constriction of space as conceived in *sopno* or its variations, is "truthless" or a depiction of unreality. A portrayal of "truthless" unreality of a physicality is possible only if the associated time, or to be more specific, the consort of

conscious time generated along with the unreality of treating physicality as a concept or an abstraction or an impression, becomes “different” from each other. In other words, when the physicality has only one real form and the other forms of it are “truthless”, then the time has to adopt many forms to be associated with one “truthful” form of the real physicality and more than one “untruthful” styles of the unreal physicality. These multiple forms of time are the constructed “time-frames” of applied time or conscious time. The conscious time have a multiplicity to portray the “truthful” physicality in one factual countenance and to imitate the “untruthful” physicality of *sopno* in transient, but seemingly real visage while the *sopno* or *sushupti* lasts. The theory of time establishes that there is a multiplicity of conscious time for everything connected with event and its observation, *sopno* or no *sopno*; and every sequence of conscious time will constitute a ‘time-frame’. But Shonkoro remains, as is always the case, unbeaten. When *sopno* ends, then he brings in the concept of *maya*¹⁴, then comes *mônónigróhō*¹⁵. However, all these lead to a multiplicity of situations the time has to tackle; and since these stay within the limits of human perception, they are associated with the conscious time. Shonkoro’s *maya* is well known to the students of Indian and contemporary philosophy as is also that the truthlessness of *sopno* and of *maya* leave the oneness or *odvoito* as the residual truth.

“*Odvoito operator*”

The theory of time uses an “*odvoito operator*”^{aaa} to resolve the *proponcho* that a duration of time always must have at least one open end. One may start with the Shonkoro’s technique of “refutation”.¹⁶ He uses the term *pôrômärthō*^{bbb}. To use “refutations”, *pôrômärthō* is not secession, not creation, not bound, not resultant, not desired, not free. Thus defined, *pôrômärthō* is the total convergence to the single concept of *odvoito*. Shonkoro refuses to accept that *odvoito* is the absence of *dvoitō* or duality. He establishes that *odvoito* arises as the residual and the final truth when the truthlessness is removed. Shonkoro quotes Modbhägôvôdgetä (GTA:12:18 and GTA:13:27) to say that *odvoito* is a bliss, because it is same, when understood.^{ccc}

Shonkoro establishes the characteristics of *odvoito* from the reverse direction of deductive argumentation. In the chapter of *ôdvôütôprôkôrôñi*, he

calls them “poor”¹⁷ who pray¹⁸ and hope to become a part of *Brohmo* on the ground of the “constructed memory”¹⁹ that “before birth I was a part of *Brohmo*, so after death I shall become a part of *Brohmo* again through prayer”. The hope is not based on systematic logic. He quotes KU:1:4 that clearly states that whom you worship can not be the *Brohmo*²⁰; because *Brohmo* is not a worshipable identity. A simile is drawn from the invariability of the statement that “*Brohmo* causes the words to form; the words can not form the *Brohmo*”²¹. So, worship can not affect *Brohmo*. The starting point of the refutation is that the belief of the “poor” that “I am produced; so I am produced from *Brohmo*”²². Such a belief originates from “lack of study”²³; because the *shruti*s say variously that *Brohmo* has “no physicality, no shape, no body”²⁴; therefore, how can one²⁵ come out of it²⁶?

There was no reason or occasion for Shonkoro to bring in a geometrical clarity of the post-creation status of *Om* and *Brohmo*. It may go like this : A “poor” is one who is created. So, at best the “poor” may expect a to and fro movement from and to the Creator. The “creation” part has been more liberally described in *shruti* notwithstanding the fact that Shonkoro rejects “creation” itself and provides, as will be discussed a little later, alternative explanation as to why *shruti* speaks about creation. However, for the present purpose, an assemblance²⁷ of matter and ideas²⁸ to create the “poor”, precedes the act of the Creator²⁹ to create³⁰ a “poor”³¹, and the dissipation of the matter and ideas when the “poor” of the “miser”^{ddd} is no more.

The significance of the exercise is that the “miser” merges in the odvoito process long before other more substantial *Om* based ideas “merge” to complete the odvoito process to reach *Brohmo*. Shonkoro elaborates the process further.

Shonkoro cites the example of the composition of an earthen pot being earth prior to saying that the composition of life is *atma*.³² When life comes to end, it merges with *atma*.³³ If that be so, and there is just one *atma*, then, will not there be much confusion and sometimes disassociation^{eee} of effect from the cause of it? Shonkoro tackles this possibility variously.³⁴ Firstly he deals with the *sāṅkhyô* path that says that the *atma* remains with the same feeling^{fff} everywhere. He uses four words : *sômvâyô* to depict the relationship quality has with that which possesses or is assigned with the quality; *prôdhânô* to depict

that part of *atma* which is holding the discourse; *bôndhō* to depict the state of earthboundness or the absence of deliverance; and *môkshō* describes the deliverance “of the soul”, the endness, the unfetterment. He says that feeling has *sômôvâyō* with the intellectualism (of the *Prôdhânō* - *this is added by this author*). So, feeling provides no evidence that there is a difference between feeling and *atma*. The cause created by *Prôdhânō* has nothing to do with *atma*. Therefore, the effects of *bôndhō* or *môkshō* have to assemble on *prôdhânō* and not on *atma*. But this contradicts the *sānkhyō* philosophic base that *bôndhō* or *môkshō* can not be assigned with any entity other than the *atma* itself. Therefore, the argument does not contradict the fact that the exteriority of *prôdhânō* is not really a duality. About the *vôishéshikō* path that holds that desire, quality, dynamism, general and special connotation remain in *sômôvâyō*, Shonkoro takes the view that *atma* can not be identical with desire because the desire can not reach the identity³⁵ of *atma*. The desire can begin or end; its *sômôvâyō* with *atma* will create the fundamental question regarding the external presence of *atma*.^{EEE} Shonkoro demolishes the myth of the cyclical or *kolpo* bound Creation by saying that there is no necessity of such a legend because without such an illusion the purposes of the *shrutis* are served. A dissention, or creation or an end to creation cannot be the aim of *shruti*.³⁶

If a *maya* difference is taken to be a real disagreement in comprehension^{hhh} then, like fire may beget the terminal coolness, what is unperishableⁱⁱⁱ, unborn^{jjj}, the only one^{kkk} and by nature is existent^{lll}, will become perishable^{mmm} ³⁷. This can not be, or desired to be, the aim of even *maya* oriented perception. Therefore, disagreementⁿⁿⁿ to *odvoito* can only be on account of *maya*. It can not be the result of real comprehension. Therefore, an opposition to *odvoito* by Buddhism or by the lesser known differing Hindu School of *Kôpilô* or of *Kônâdô*, can not base on truthful containment of the meaning^{ppp}. When a conception is made for the perpetual existence, then the opposite of it also can not originate. Therefore, any differing view that causes the “death” of the original premise, cannot be accepted. The rule of the nature is that what is “deathless” can not be made to die; and what is perishable can not perpetuate.³⁸ The opposition to *odvoito* causes the natural perpetuity to come to an end. Then, how can what is opposite to *odvoito* (*Kôpilô*, *Kônâdô*, Buddha, *ôrhôt*, etc.) be sustained ? These are also transient phenomena and have to pass away by themselves.³⁹

There is another question⁴⁰ : Does not *shruti* itself talk about creation? The question arises, because, if everything ends in *odvoito* then a myth of creation is unnecessary; but *shruti*, comprising of *Vedos*, *Védāngôs* and *Védāntôs*, all being infallible, does speak about creation. If *odvoito* opposes *shruti*, then it is *odvoito* that fails, not *shruti*. Shonkoro answers saying “Yes”. But adds that the reason for the *shruti* saying something about the creation is not for the reason as it appears at the surface. The strength of what *Shonkoro* says lies in the fact that creation is contained in *Vedo* while *Védāngô* and *Védāntô*, have brought in the concept of *Brohmo* and finally *odvoito*. Every word of *Vedo* is synthetic; which permits multiple meanings of a text. On the other hand, *Védāngô* and *Védāntô*, are written in Sanskrit refined by a stricter grammar and carry more or less fixed meaning of what is written; and these support *odvoito*.

MU:G:SB: *ôdvôitôprôkôrônô*, : 23 to 48 discard creation. Neither the begotten^{qqq} nor the prayer^{rrr} are creations. When the truth is a product of search, the terminal truth is just truth. It can have no other identity or function or purpose. To reach that truth, the path taken encounters part-truths, apparent-truths and transient-truths. *Shruti* is true to the truth, valid for all its pre-forms and legitimate for all of its applied forms. In this sense, *shruti* says about creation which is the apparent-truth for a logical construction. The root verbs of the commonly used words of creation and construction are the same. It is the logical construction that *shruti* speaks about^{sss}. The thought of creation is truthlessness. The logical framework that arrives at creation is also not invalid. The result of the process does not sustain scrutiny and one has to proceed further along the same creation path to a pre-creation state; and, like all other logical paths, the creation-path, inclusive of the pre-creation probe, also ends in *Brohmo*. The logic of the creation path is not invalid. So, *shruti* speaks about it. And Shonkoro speaks about it from an awe inspiring intellectual height in a precise, economic and appropriate language drawing substance from the depth of Indian *shruti*. One is left breathless and compelled to read again and again.

It is not possible for a time theorist, and it is not required of him, to carry the entire, burden Shonkoro had shouldered. If the creation was not there, then there was no “birth” of time either. The time is there. If creation is a

concept *ad infinitum* then time is also a concept *ad infinitum*. But the transient truths are many. So, the forms of conscious time that are associated with the events and the ideas that are identified with such transient truths, are also many. The safest course of action is to envelop all pre-creation identities inside a set named “Neti” from No! ‘___’ because shruti describes *Brohmo* with “no”’s or with “not this”, “not this”, “not that”, and so on. There can be a prudent flow out of this set to another conceivable set, named *sôt* for “existent”, a term used by Shonkoro - may be for a different purpose. It is, then a compromise. *sôt* contains what is created, in the sense the “created” is commonly understood, and allows a “chaos to order” situation to work to let events happen and ideas emerge. This appearance of events and ideas generates the “time-frames” of conscious time.

BU:4:3:9 concedes that there are two parts of mind : One part is of “this world”; and the other part is of the “other world”. Shonkoro considers in the first sentence of the commentary on BU:4:3:9, whether it is possible to have a third or fourth division of mind. He discards the idea as an impossible proposition for the human mind to comprehend more than two divisions of mind.

If Shonkoro could not do any better than this, then a time theorist should not try an arrangement which may be more complicated than “*Sôt*” and “*Néti*”. And it is not necessary to do so.

And it is *odvoito* itself that solves the impasse of disjointment of the instants of conscious time; because it is time that has to be associated with the truth of convergence of events and ideas *ad infinitum*. Even though the events and ideas are not residents of PCLR, the creation, or the idea thereof, emerges out of PCLR however brief that residence of creation, or of the idea of creation, in PCLR may be. “Brief” itself is a “time-term”. This “brief” combines the events and ideas with PCLR if the mystery of creation is approached from the reverse direction by what is created. In other words, “brief” is by nature combinatory and must generate a continuum of more “brief”’s. If an instant of conscious time contains more than one “brief”, then, the “brief”’s will remain one after the other within the instant without any gap. But this can not happen with the extension of the ordinary logical process. Therefore, the concept of an “odvoito operator” has to be built mathematically to let the miracle happen. This is what has been used in the theory of time.

ENDNOTES

1. FOR THE PURPOSE OF THIS ARTICLE

- ï may be pronounced like i as in disk
- ü may be pronounced like u as in put
- ô may be pronounced like o as in yoke
- é may be pronounced like e as in get
- ä may be pronounced like u as in but
- ó may be pronounced like oa as in coat
- ñ may be pronounced like of Hindi script
- ee may be pronounced like ea as in treat

2. Barhakur, J.K.: A Theory of Time; *Indian Philosophical Quarterly*; Vol. XXII; No.4; October, 1995; University of Poona; Pune; India.

The problem of assumed discontinuity and non-definability of time are tackled with expression like

$$V(t_1, t_2) = A\{O(e_{11}, a_1), O(e_{12}, a_2)\}$$

so that $V(t_1, t_0) = O(e_{11}, a_1)$

and $V(t_0, t_2) = O(e_{12}, a_2)$

Where O is an operator that can empathise real or unreal time with observation or awareness; V is an operator that can function upon real or unreal time; 't' is the meta-concept of time; 'e' is event or idea; 'a' is observation or awareness; e₁₂ happens after e₁₁ and they are not simultaneous; a₂ comes after a₁ and they are not simultaneous; A is an $\hat{\delta}dv\hat{o}it\hat{o}^2$ operator that can make two O's become one within a duration (t₁, t₂) to cause the *vy\hat{o}v\hat{o}h\hat{a}rik\hat{a} or conscious time V(t₁, t₂) understood for the duration(t₁, t₂).*

It has been shown that this type of expression can be used not only for a theory of time, but also for a multitude of other purposes. The associative to this expression is the form of a condition like $A\{O(e_{11}, a_1) (D) O(e_{12}, a_2)\} =$ (nothing), where (D) is called the $\hat{\delta}dv\hat{o}it\hat{o}$ difference, which renders the duration (t₁, t₂) an "instant" that is required to observe the event or become aware of the idea for which V(t₁, t₂) is true.

For more details, please look up the reference given above.

Some of the assumptions made in this theory of time are connected with *shruti* in this essay, to prove that they are not arbitrary or speculative.

3. It is possibly the sound of *Om* that finds a mention in the Gospel of John of New Testament that reads, as per a leading translation, as given below :

- “1. In [the] beginning the Word was, and the Word was with God, and the Word was a god.
2. This one was in [the] beginning with God.
3. All things came into existence through him, and apart from him not even one thing came into existence.
4. What has come into existence by means of him was life, and the life was the light of men.
5. And the light is shining in the darkness, but the darkness has not overpowered it.
6.”

4. Included in *Kṛishṇōyōjūrvédō*
5. The fortieth chapter of the *shūklōyōjūhsōnghitā*. Also called *Vājōsōnéeyesōnghitā*
6. *ōpōrō Brōhmō* in PR:5:2.
7. *ōkār, ūkār, mōkār*.
8. There is a claim in *Mārķéndōyō Mōhāpūrāṇō*'s MP:13:66 and 67 that *Yōgōnidrā* occupies a place in the *prōṇōbō* or in *ō, ū* and *mō* of *Om*, and also in the *ōrdhōmātrā* or in the “consonent ending”. According to MP:13:68 to 71, *Yōgōnidrā* starts an alternative centre of creation. This contention of having an alternative centre of creation, is supported by the intrinsic meaning of AV:10:125:7 & 8.
9. This sound is perhaps attempted to be mimicked by the Tibetan and Mongolian Lamas who follow the *Mōhāyānō* Sect of Buddhism.
10. *Pādō* (silence) *syō vishvō bhūtānī trīpādōsyāmritōng divī* RV:10:90:3
 all created is but one fourth of the supreme....
vishtōbhyāhōm idōng kritsnōmēkōngshēnō sthītōng jōgōt ... GEETA : 10 : 42.
(This universe) I (exhibit) is only a fraction of the whole that there is....

11. nô hyântôh sôn vritê déhântôrnâreeshû pôrvôtôhöstyâdeenân ... MU : G : SB :
Vôipôthyôprôkôrôñ : 1 : Commentary.
12. ôbhâvôshvôivô rôthâdeenân ... MU:G:SB: Vôipôthyôprôkôrôñ : 3 : Commentary.
13. drishyôtvômâsôtyôtvôm châvîskîshôtômûbhôyôtrô MU : G : SB : 4 :
Commentary.
14. MU : G : SB : 24, 28, 29; commentary to 25, 27; and use of the essence of it
in a number of other môntrô and commentary that follows.
15. MU : G : SB : 40, 41, 42.
16. prôtîshedh.
17. Kripônô deenôôlpôkôh ... MU : G : SB : ôdvôitôprôkôrôñô : 1 : Commentary
18. üpôsônâshrîtô ... MU : G : SB : ôdvôitôprôkôrôñô : 1
19. Smritôh ... MU : G : SB : ôdvôitôprôkôrôñô : 1
20. Tôdévô Brôhmô tvông vîddhî nédông yôdidômüpâsôté ... MU : G : SB :
ôdvôitôprôkôrôñô : 1 : Commentary
21. Yôdvâchânôbhÿûditông yénô vâgôbhÿûdyôté.
22. Jâtôhông jâté Brôhmôñî ... MU : G : SB : ôdvôitôprôkôrôñô : 2 : prelude
23. ôvidÿî ... MU : G : SB : ôdvôitôprôkôrôñô : 1 : Commentary
24. Nîrôyôvô ... MU : G : SB : ôdvôitôprôkôrôñô : 1 : Commentary
25. Sâvôyôvô ... MU : G : SB : ôdvôitôprôkôrôñô : 1 : Commentary
26. ... MU : G : SB : ôdvôitôprôkôrôñ : 2 : Commentary : second part
27. Rôhôtî - in AV : 13 : 1 : 4
28. Rûrhô - in AV : 13 : 1 : 4
29. The Creator is generally called the God, and He bears different names for
different communities and different religions. In Hindu Philosophy, there may
be more than one centre of Creation. Rôhîtô of the thirteenth chapter of ôthôrvô
Védô is a Creator. Rôhîtô creates not only the final beings, but also the matter
to create matter; matter-to-create-matter-to-create-... . No other religion says
much about matter-to-create-matter-to-... . Like Rôhîtô, Dévee of the tenth chapter
of Rîgvédô is also a Creator. On the other hand, in Budhism, there is no Creator
God; and the term God does not appear in that religion.
30. Rûrûrhô - in AV : 13 : 1 : 4.
31. Prôrûrhô - in AV : 13 : 1 : 9.

32. MU : G : SB : ôdvôitôprôkôrnô : 3
33. MU : G : SB : ôdvôitôprôkôrnô : 4
34. MU : G : SB : ôdvôitôprôkôrnô : 5
35. ôyütôsiddhô - the identity of time, place and characteristics, and the incapacity to add or subtract and being added or being subtracted from a status.
36. Kôlôhôtôptôttiprôlôyânang prôtipôttêrônishtôtvât. Last part of the commentary on MU : G : SB : ôdvôitôprôkôrnô : 15
37. Commentary on MU : G : SB : ôdvôitôprôkôrnô : 19
38. Commentary on MU : G : SB : ôdvôitôprôkôrnô : 21
39. Commentary on MU : G : SB : ôdvôitôprôkôrnô : 22
40. Commentary on MU : G : SB : ôdvôitôprôkôrnô : 22

ADDITIONAL NOTES

- a. Kolpo is pronounced Kôlpô. It is a large division of time. It is notionally of one thousand Môhâyüg or about 4.3×10^9 years according to popular belief.
- b. It means the end of creation on termination of a Kôlpô. According to Märkôndéyô Môhâpurânô (MP : 13 : 59-60), both creation at the beginning of a *kôlpô* and its annihilation in *prôlôyô* are due to *mâyä* of *Yôgônîdrä*; and thus supports the contention that the concept of Kôlpô-wise creation or destruction, is “unnecessary”.
- c. Sopno is pronounced sôpnô. The term is explained later.
- d. Sushupti is pronounced sushüpti. The term is explained later.
- e. Shruti is based on Vêdô. It is pronounced Shrütî.
- f. The term is explained a little later under its specific sub-head.
- g. Odvoito is pronounced as ôdvôitô. It will be explained in Part II of the essay while discussing MU : 2 and MU : 8; and expanded fuather in a later part of the essay.
- h. Pronounced môntrô.
- i. Pronounced üpônishôd.

The *uponishods* are one hundred and twelve in number : The following have been used in the essay : Brîhôt ôrônyôk or BU, Chhândô or CH, Eeshô or EE, Eeshâvâsyô or EV, Eteriyô or ET, Kenô or KU, Kôthô or KO, Prôshnô or PR, Mûndôkô or MO, Svétâsvôtôrô or Sv, and Tôiteriô or TU.

- j. Also pronounced ôⁿ where ⁿ is nasal or as óm.
- k. Pronounced Brôhmô.
- l. ôthôrvô Védô says in AV : 19 : 53 : 10 "... Kâlô pôrjâ ôsrîjôt kâlôgré prôjâpôtîm..." or partly "... time constructed prôjâpôtî, the concept of creation ..."; or time was there when prôjâpôtî, arrived ... This time is not the conscious time of our understanding. Védô is talking about a meta-concept called "time".
- m. On kârôvikârôshôbdâbhîdheyôshvô sôrvôh ... Om (ness) expressed traditionalised all.
- n. vâchârômbhônôm vikârô nâmôdhéyôm.
- o. tôdôsyédôm vâchâ tôntyâ nîmôbhîrdâmôbhîh sôvôsîtôm
- p. sôrvôheedôm nâmônî îtyâdîshrûtîbhyôh.
- q. Pronounced îdeegthô and used as "one who is prayed to".
- r. AV : 19 : 53 : 3 says that a "fullness of time" remains "much above" (pôrômé byómôn) the conscious time (prôtyôpông Kâlô). "Much above" is, by implication, located very close to Brohmo. This is confirmed by AV:19:53:9 and later by AV : 19 : 54 : 5 in "... Brôhmônâ kâlô so îyôte pôrômé nû dévôh ...".
- s. Pronounced ätmâ.
- t. Pronounced prôpônchô. The word will be put to casual use.
- u. *téjômôyôh - chinmâtrôprôkâshômôyôh.*
- v. *ômrîtômôyôh - ômôrôñdhôrmâ.*
- w. *âdhyâtmô - pûriûshôh.*
- x. *shôreerôh téjômôyôh ômrîtômôyôh*
- y. *môdhû.*
- z. sôrvôbhûtôh.
- aa. sônskârô.
- bb. *sôndhyô.*
- cc. *ôvôstômbhô.*

- dd. *svôyôm jyôti.*
- ee. *Nô chô sôpnô nãmâpûrvôdôrshônôm pûrvôdrishtôsmritihî sôpnô præyênô.*
Not also sôpnô not+seen+before memory+of+that+remembered sôpnô begets.
- ff. *sthülô prôjnâ.*
- gg. *ônîh prôjnô.*
- hh. *sûkshmô.*
- ii. *pôrômânôdô.*
- jj. The word *projno* means “very wise” or “very knowledgeable” in many parts of India.
- kk. *indhô.*
- ll. *Beejâtmâ.*
- mm. *Nirbeejô Bhôhmô.*
- nn. *prôtiśhûédhô.*
- oo. *ôprôtiśbôdhôrupô*
- pp. *nidrâ*
- qq. Pronounced *mâyâ.*
- rr. Later, MU : 6 speaks about the “Knowledge not yet born”.
- ss. MU : 6.
- tt. *Vôhübreehî* : The complex may mean *atma*.
- uu. *Môdhyôpôdôlôpee.*
- vv. *Tôtpûrûshô* : For time theory, if *atma* expands in content, then each *pädô* expands in content. (Place compare MU : 6.) So, the corresponding availability of accommodation in *mâtrâ* in *Om*, must be greater than *now* to be able to take care of the expansions.
- ww. *kâlôsyô ôdeerghôtâ.*
- xx. *jâgrôdrishyô.*
- yy. *drishôtvô.*
- zz. *ôsôtyôtvô.*
- aaa. Please see Endnote 2.
- bbb. The term is utilised in the theory of time with an altered meaning.

- ccc. Shonkoro quotes Geetä (GTA : 12 : 18 and GTA : 13 : 27) to say that *odvoito* is a bliss, because it is same, when understood, whether the one who has understood is a “dog, *Chandal* (caste that cremates human body) or learned.” Thus, an attempt to understand *odvoito* and using its limited geometrical form, is also a “path to bliss”, or at least, a “path to understand”. Shonkoro does not reject a statistician workman from following the “path”, with a box of geometrical tools in his hand, to repair the concept of time.
- ddd. The alternative and the more popular meaning of the Sanksrit word used for the “poor”, is “miser” - a person who does not exercise his mind liberally.
- eee. *sāngkôryô.*
- fff. *sukhee dükhee.*
- ggg. Or, even if desire is a pre-creation concept, it merges with *one* meta-concept of desire which stays as a part of atma. In doing so, the desire allows its process of becoming one meta-concept be charted mathematically.
- hhh. *tôtvôtôh.*
- iii. *ômrîtô*
- jjj. *ôjô.*
- kkk. *ôdvôyô.*
- lll. *sôt.*
- mmm. *sônômôrtyôtäng brôjêt.*
- nnn. *bhédô.*
- ooo. Jainism.
- ppp. *pôrômärthînô.*
- qqq. *jeevô.*
- rrr. *üpäsônä.*
- sss. One may again recall MU : 6. When the “knowledge not yet born” comes up, and is added to consciousness, then the same may be viewed “from below”, or from the level in which the created abides, as “creation” the *shrüti* speaks about. - Author.