

SAT—CHIT —ANANDA
IN
GREEK AND INDIAN THOUGHT

By

Judy D. Saltzman
Philosophy Department
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo

Transaction No. 98

THE INDIAN INSTITUTE OF WORLD CULTURE
Post Box No. 402
BASAVANAGUDI BANGALORE
560 004

THE INDIAN INSTITUTE OF WORLD CULTURE
Post Box No. 402, BASAVANAGUDI, BANGALORE - 560004

Transaction No. 98

SAT—CHIT —ANANDA
IN
GREEK AND INDIAN THOUGHT

By

Judy D. Saltzman
Philosophy Department
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo

All Rights Reserved

1998

FOREWORD

Dr. Judy D. Saltzman is a faculty member of the Department of Philosophy in California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, U.S.A. In February 1998 she delivered the first Jayalakshmi Ramachandran Memorial Endowment Lecture under the auspices of the Institute. She subsequently developed the script of her lecture into a comprehensive paper on "Sat-Chit-Ananda in Greek and Indian Thought". Having regard to the enduring value of this scholarly document, the Institute has deemed it fit to bring it out as a Transaction to facilitate its reaching a wider circle of interested readers.

Bangalore
August 6, 1998

Publishers

SAT-CHIT-ANANDA IN GREEK AND INDIAN THOUGHT

Judy D.Saltzman

Philosophy Department
California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo

To discuss the idea of the Sacred Triad, *SAT* (Existence or Being), *CHIT* (Intelligence or Mind) and *ANANDA* (Bliss or Supreme Peace), the topic needs to be limited. Although there may be other schools of Indian philosophy and areas of Greek thought worthy of comparison, the most striking parallels, if not exact correlations and possible lines of influence, can be found in the *Advaita Vedanta* and in the works of Plato and his Neo-Platonist followers: Plotinus, Proclus and Porphyry. For these reasons, this essay will be confined to a discussion of these philosophers and schools. It must also be noted that a comparison of such profound and rich ideas goes beyond mere conceptualization. In Platonic and *Vedantic* thought, there are instructions for the active application of philosophy to life. In the Republic and in other works of Plato, the Philosopher King returns after his/her enlightenment in the realm of the *Eidhv* or Forms (Real Ideas) in *order to* help others and to preserve the community. Such a return of the Wise One, the *Rsi*, is also articulated by *Sankaracharya* in his Crest Jewel of Wisdom:

The great and peaceful ones live regenerating the world like the coming of spring; having crossed the ocean of embodied existence themselves, they freely aid all others who seek to cross it. The very essence and inherent will of Mahatmas is to remove the suffering of others, just as the ambrosia -rayed moon of itself cools the earth heated by the intense rays of the sun¹.

Plato's Divine Dialectic in Book VII of the Republic leads us toward the same path of realization and return which *Sankara* exemplifies by the *Rsi*. The ignorant denizens of the Cave live their lives in chains, forcing themselves to stare at a wall in which only images of what is behind them are projected onto it by a fire. These poor souls are truly in a state of *Tamas* (inertia) and *Avidya* (ignorance). According to Plato, they are in a state of *Eikasiva* (*Eikasia* or Imagining), and see only the *Eikone* (images) they think are real. If a benevolent being (Philosopher King) comes along to act as a Guide (*Frovnhsis* or *Phronesis*), one of them could be released from his chains and begin the ascent upward. The former prisoner may then see that he was wrong about the images on the wall. They are not real. This is at least a true perception (*Avaya*). This act may put him into a state of *Rajas*. He may passionately desire knowledge, but not know what it is, because he is still in the Cave, the realm of *Maya*. It is only when he begins the ascent upward toward the light which may be at first blinding that he or she begins to see that there really is Truth (*Satya*) and that real thinking or *Diavnoia* (*Dianoia*), symbolized by mathematics, can lead one to real soul remembrance (*Turiya-Sattva*) and to Pure Vision (*Adhyatmavidya*). This last Plato called *Noesis*. It involves a direct cognizance of the Forms: ideas such as Goodness or *Avgaqovn* (*Agathon*), Justice or *Divkaiosune* (*Dikaiosyne*), Beauty or *Kalovn* (*Kalon*), Excellence or *Arethv* (*Arete*), and others. Upon reaching this state, the Philosopher King is worthy of a kind of release, which the Hindus would call *Moksa*. Plato describes it in the Phaedo:

But those who are judged to have lived a life of surpassing holiness— these are released and set free from confinement in these regions of the earth, and passing upward to their pure abode make their dwelling upon the earth's surface...²

Here “the earth's surface” represents the world of reality, just as the dwellings below or

the Cave, represents falsehood. This is the world which negates the one of *Maya*, constantly changing appearances. However, a Philosopher King or a true *Rsi* would not allow him/herself to live in a state of bliss for all eternity. For Plato, *Sofovn* (*Sophon*), meaning wisdom, was real bliss, and when a person attains wisdom, the Wise Being will return to help those not so wise. Thus it is in this Allegory that no mind ever fully knows the *Agathon*. No one ever achieves *Moksa* or permanently desires it, if he or she goes that far into the world of *Novhsis* (*Noesis*).³ (See diagram on next page). The Wise Being would not be satisfied to enjoy bliss (*Ananda*), but would find the highest joy in returning to help the community, in spite of the consequences. Indeed, those whose ignorance in action has led them to believe that images are real and truth is falsehood, will scarcely welcome one whose knowledge undermines everything upon which they base their life and identities.

* *Platonic Dialectic with Sanskrit Renderings*

SAT-CHIT-ANANDA	
TO <i>EPEKEINA</i> — <i>AGATHON-KAION-SOPHON</i>	
MOKSA	
<i>(Release)</i>	
Turiya Sattva (Soul Remembering)	Adhyatmavidya (Knowledge of the Soul) Noesis (Pure Vision)
Sattva (Being)	Satya (Truth)
Vairagya (Dispassion)	Dianoia (Real thinking)
WORLD OF NITYA SAT (ETERNITY)	
WORLD OF MAYA (BECOMING)	
Upper Cave	
Rajas (Desire)	Avaya (Perception)
The Cave	Avaya (Ignorance)
State of Consciousness	State of Knowing

This was the situation of Socrates, of Jesus, of *Sankara*, of Zoroastor, of Gautama Buddha and of many great teachers in history. Indeed, they were all trying to impart to brother and sister human beings truth about our inner natures—that we are all divine. We have within us what could be viewed as a Sacred Triad. The Hindus call it *SAT-CHIT-ANANDA*. The Neo-Platonists would designate it as *Avgaqovn-Kalovn-SoFovn*—*EPEKEINA* (“the Beyond Within” of Goodness, Beauty and Truth). Of course a closer translation of the Sanskrit to the Greek would be *TO EN-Nous-Ekstasis* (Being-Mind- Ecstasy). Nevertheless, the *Avgaqovn-Kalovn-Sofovn* is an interesting approximation of it, because for the Greek Platonists *Agathon* not only embodied Goodness, but was the Absolute Truth of Being. In other words, a being with no *Agathon* left in him/her could never remain in incarnation. The idea of *Kalon* or beauty is knowable only through the highest intuitions of geometry, a divine

science, and hence exemplifies intelligence. *Sophon* is Wisdom, but to be wise is the ultimate bliss for Plato.

However, it must be understood that neither Plato nor his Platonist followers ever really approach the exact meaning of the Sanskrit *SAT-CHIT-ANANDA*. Pure *SAT*, according to *Sankara*, is *Nirguna Brahman*, beyond all manifestation. It is pure Truth and the Real. It is rather like the solitary One (TO EN or TO HEN) of Plotinus. Very little can be said about it, because it is totally unmanifested. The Kabalists call it the *Ain Soph*. However, in *Sankara's* system, there is *SAT* of a lower order. There is *SAT* in all that exists. Without *SAT* nothing could exist. This latter concept of *SAT* could also be called *Saguna Brahman*.

Regarding the Plotinian One (TO EN) or Eka in Sanskrit, Professor I.C. Sharma in *Neo-Platonism and Indian Thought*, thinks that "Although the expressions are different, the truth expressed by Plotinus and by the Bhagavad-Gita are the same."⁴ Sharma says the One is the same as *Paramapurusa*. However, the One is an abstraction far beyond anything manifested that the soul, which we can conceive of as being, has greater unity. Plotinus says,

*The soul, while distinct from The One, has greater unity because it has a higher degree of being. It is not The One. It is one, but its unity is contingent. Between The Soul and its unity there is the same difference as between body and body's unity. Looser aggregates, such as the choir, are furthest from unity; the more compact are the nearer; The Soul is nearer still, yet—as all the others—is only a participant in unity.*⁵

Although this may parallel an aspect of the Bhagavad-Gita, it falls short of the Absolute unity of *Atman* and *Brahman* in *Sankara's* writings. This unity is also expressed as *Ekam-eva-advitiam* (one only without a second).

Furthermore, Neo-Platonism also has a basic triad of TO EN (The One), and Nous, Mind and yuchv (Psyche), the Soul. According to Professor Hacker, in article "Cit and Nous" in the above work, claims that Trinitarian or Triune thinking is quite universal. Although one does not find the idea of three persons as one in Indian thought, as in the Christian Trinity for example, the idea of Ousiva, Zwhij, Nous (Ousia, Zoe, Nousor Being, Life, Spirit) of Proclus an interpenetrable unity as is *SAT-CHIT-ANANDA*. In fact, to be on to level of the *Atman* is to be on plane of *SAT-CHIT-ANANDA*. The self (Higher Manas), as real person is united with the Soul (Buddhi) which is realized Supreme Spirit (*Atman*). As Hacker understands,

*The self or atman is....a triune entity, in the monistic system mostly understood to be the Absolute. Its constituents or aspects of characteristics, each of which is the whole, are Existence, Spirit, Bliss (sat-chit-ananda). I venture to submit that the similarity between this triad and the Christian Trinity on the one hand as well as Proclus' "Being-Life-Spirit" triad on the other hand is no mere chance but is grounded in reality, the more so since this triad of Proclus does not so much imply subordination as interpenetration. The greatest divergence which separates the three triads is, I think, not the fact that they do not totally coincide at the conceptual level but that the idea of three Persons with an identical substance is unknown to the Indian and rejected by the Hellenistic Philosophers.*⁶

Of course, what is being rejected here is the orthodox Christian idea of three concretized personalities or Persons in One. What is quite acceptable and universal are three abstract ideas which, although in reality one, can be better understood as three. It is the same with the Hindu cycle of Brahma (Creator), Vishnu (Preserver) and Siva (Destroyer). These

three are one Great cycle.

In his *Studies in the Secret Doctrine*,⁷ Sri B.P.Wadia Mentions the idea of these trinities through all life and thought. The Secret Doctrine itself begins with the Trinity of the three Fundamental Propositions: Beness (SAT), the Law of Cycles, and the manifestation into consciousness. The Absolute Motion of Boundless Space of the First Fundamental (Beness) are Unknowable. The Great breath is knowable but only by realized souls or mahatmas. These could also be referred to, as in the *Bhagavad-Gita* as Krishna (Great Breath), *Daivaprakriti* or *FOHAT* (Divine Light) , and *Mulaprakriti* (Lower Manifesting Nature). This is why the *Gita* emphasizes the power of Krishna's two natures, one as Aja (Unborn) and the other as Manifestation. These three illuminate the idea that each human being is a ray or breath of the Absolute. These all work as one, as the sources of imagination and spiritual growth in the human being. Moreover, in *The Secret Doctrine*. These Three are explained in ancient Hindu thought as four or Tetraktis:

Hiranyagarbha, Hari and Sankara, —the three Hypostases of the manifesting “Spirit of the Supreme Spirit” (by which title Prithivi—the Earth— greets Vishnu in his first Avatar)—are the purely metaphysical abstract qualities of formation, preservation, and destruction, and are the three divine Avasthas (li. hypostases) of that which “does not perish with created things” (or Achyuta, a name of Vishnu).⁸

These manifest in the human being as *Atma*, *Buddhi* and *Manas* in the spiritual human being. These are the Sun, Ray and Reflection which result in Memory, Desire and Body, which result in the “T”. Of course, behind them all there is the Absolute Life which is unknowable. These also correspond to the *Jagrat*, *Svapna* and *Sushupti* states of consciousness, behind which is *Turiya* (Boundless Omniscience).⁹ Although there is no exact parallel in Neo-Platonism, it can be said that Being (*Ousiva*), Cosmic Mind (*Nous*) and the Soul (*yuch*), although subordinate have behind them the One Reality (*TO EN*) which is behind and identical with it. The One (*TO EN*) is also absent form this Triad, but the hypostases *Nous* has the One standing behind it.¹⁰ Such trinities have always been present, even in Greek mythology in concretized forms, as Plotinus pointed out, as *Ouranous*, *Chronos* and *Zeus* in Hesiod's *Theogony*. Behind these there is always the great primordial waters of Chaos, called *Rah* in Egyptian mythology. These creative potencies, known as *Uranus*, *Saturn* and *Jupiter* in Roman mythology, represent the First Impulse of creation, then the cycles of time and finally the dominance of human consciousness. This trinitarian cyclic idea of *karma*- creativity, preservative knowledge and illuminative wisdom is quite universal. They can be found even in the ancient Babylonian texts, such as the *Enuma Elis*'as the Great Goddess *Tia'mat* (Chaos), Her consort god *Anu* (Cycles of Being) and the god *Marduk*(Manifesting Consciousness).¹¹ This cycle is most evident in the popular *Hindu-Brahma- Visnu* and *Siva* cycle of existence, which represents three unified forces of nature. None can exist without the others.

The *SAT-CHIT-ANANDA* in *Vedanta* is a more philosophical idea. Furthermore, in *Advaita Vedanta* it is an absolutely unitary idea. There is no separation of the Self in Bliss from *SAT*, the One Being. Any sense of separation is only *Maya* (illusion). On the level of the *Anandamaykosa* of the five sheaths, the sage knows himself/herself to be Brahman which is *SAT*. This absolute sense of unity with all beings leads to the sublime sense of ethics espoused by *Sankara* and his followers. The *Vedanta* ethics which resembles Platonic moral theory in many respects, also presents a trinity of recommended action, based on sympathy with all beings as part of the great Self. These are *Dana* (Self-Giving), *Dana* (Charity), and

Dana (duty of self-restraint and compassion enjoined by the gods).¹² The practice of these three great virtues comes from the ability to distinguish the Eternal from the may a of the non-eternal and the temporal. In *Advaita Vedanta*, all that is not Eternal is simply our mistake, our illusion (*Maya*).

These three ideals of *Vedanta* ethics (*Dama*, *Dana* and *Daya*) are rather like what Plato called *Sofrosunhv* (*Sophrosyne*) in his great dialogue *Charmides*. Indeed, for Plato and *Sankara* the ideals of restraint, self-giving and charity are at the very pinnacle of morality and service to the community. However, for the *Advaita Vedanta* devotee, the aspirant to knowledge must have a sympathy for other beings as if they were his very Self, because they really are. Otherwise, there is no right or wrong way to treat others. In the Platonic context, *Sophrosyne* is not so translatable as other terms such as *arete* (excellence or virtue) or *Dikaiousune* (justice or righteousness). However, the word is usually translated as temperance or prudence. *Sophrosyne* is the very opposite of *hubris* or self-pride.

In the dialogue *Charmides*, Socrates talks with the elderly man Critias. Socrates asked the old man why, among all the youths going in and out of the Temple, he is so impressed with the young man Charmides. What does he have which makes him special? Is he more intelligent, better looking, or a better athlete than the other boys? No, but he has a quality which they call *Sophrosyne*. Socrates admits that he does not know what this is, but it seems to make one happy. It seems to involve the essence of the search for the true person within.

For this reason, he adopted the Delphic Motto *GNWQISUAVETON* (*Gnothi Suaeton* or “Know Thyself”), as well as the idea of self-restraint and moderation (“Nothing to Excess”). The rest of the dialogue is along discussion on what *Sophrosyne* might be. Critias offer various definitions which are inadequate, incomplete and are dismissed by Socrates. At the end of the dialogue, what *Sophrosyne* is never resolved, although, after reading it, I felt that I had some sense of what it is. At least, with Plato’s instruction, one can detect it’s “sweet voice” in some, and be aware of its glaring lack in others. Rather like the man of *Li* in Confucius’ writings, the person of *Sophrosyne* is a being who always knows what to do in every situation. He has what the French call *Savoir Faire*. He is a person of law, but is not overly reserved or tense about it. Some of the definitions which are offered are as follows: (1) Doing all things orderly and quietly. This is dismissed, because, occasionally one must be quick and bold. (2) Modesty. Never false modesty, because one must know his/her abilities. (3) Goodness and nobility. The man or woman of *sophrosyne* does only good. However, it is difficult to know what is good and noble in all situations. (4) Minding one’s own business. However, craftsmen, physicians and statesmen must mind the business of others. (5) Self-knowledge is the essence of *sophrosyne*, but achieving it is even more difficult than defining it. (6) The man or woman of *Sophrosyne* is happy. In other words, they are content with the lot they have been dealt in life. They are content. However, at times they must give up personal happiness for duty.

When the dialogue is finished, we are not sure what all this means. It seems that the person of *sophrosyne* must have ail of these qualities. However, Socrates is able to take exception to each of them. Any one of them would be singularly a virtue, in Plato’s view. Yet individually they are not enough to add up to *Sophrosyne*. *Sophrosyne* seems to be one of these inarticulateable virtues of the soul, which is rare but real. We get the impression that the person of *Sophrosyne* has certainly realized something godlike in himself which he is willing to impart to others:

Indeed, as we were supposing at first, the wise man were able to distinguish what he knew and did not know, and that he knew the one and did

not know the other, and to recognize a similar faculty of discernment in others, there would certainly be a great advantage in being wise, for then we should never make a mistake, but should pass through life the unerring guides of ourselves and of those who are under us. We should not attempt to do what we did not know, but we should find out those who know, and hand the business over to them and trust in them. Nor should we allow those who are under us to do anything which they were not likely to do well, and they would be likely to do well just that of which they had knowledge.

And house or state which was ordered or administered under the guidance of wisdom and everything else of which wisdom was the lord, would be sure to be well ordered, for with truth guiding and error eliminated, in all their doings men must do nobly and well, and doing well means happiness.¹³

The Platonic path of *Sophrosyne* and the ethics of *Vedanta* certainly connects to the idea of the virtuous householder or housewife. In the Platonic view, the practitioner of *Sophrosyne* spontaneously knows what to do. In *Vedanta* one is released from *is* and *ought*, because total concern for the well being of others puts them in a situation where this distinction has vanished. Only by practicing this ethic can the *Ananyabhakti*, (aspirant to devotion) achieve *Nishkamakarma* (annihilation of *Kama*).

However, one can find Platonic ideas, not only in *Vedanta*, but in the most ancient of Hindu texts, the Manusmriti. The ideas of self-restraint and contentment as ultimate virtues, are evident in the Laws of Manu:

In order to be happy, a man must maintain perfect contentment and become self-controlled. For contentment is the very root of happiness, and the opposite of contentment is the root of all unhappiness.¹⁴

These ancient words are very like those of Plato when he speaks of the man of *Sophrosyne*. Contentment with the karma which comes to him is essential for any householder. Any man or woman who wishes to build a functional and happy home together must find contentment with what karma has offered them, and build a spiritual life from there. These ideas were certainly discussed again in B.P. Wadia's The Building of the Home.¹⁵ What is true of the householder is also true of the housewife, for they work in unity. Manu further says,

She should always be cheerful and clever at household affairs; she should keep her utensils well polished and have not too free a hand in spending.¹⁶

Indeed, what these grand ideals in the Manusmriti and in the Charmides result in is the practice of Dharma (Duty) on the spiritual path. This path may be opened only by those who attempt total self-restraint of the lower self. As Manu explains *Dharma*::

The ten points of duty are patience, forgiveness, self-control, not stealing, purification, and mastery of the sensory powers, wisdom, learning, truth, and lack of anger. Those priests who study the ten points of duty carefully and, after they have learnt it, follow it, progress to the highest level of existence.¹⁷

The cultivation of such virtues are found in the spiritual instructions of Hinduism, Buddhism, Christianity, Islam and other spiritual paths. Plato, in trying to go beyond all religions and rituals to pure Being (*Agathon* or *SAT*), shows Socrates instructing the students

in the great dialogues the importance of the purification by philosophy. This purification amounts to the self-restraint of the soul, and the burying of the lower personal desires, or what the Hindus would call *Tapas*. In the dialogue *Phaedrus*, it is clear that only when the soul moves toward the highest abstraction, will it ever have knowledge and self-control. Writing of a place “beyond the heavens,” Plato says,

It is there that True Being dwells without color or shape that cannot be touched; reason alone, the soul's pilot can behold it, and all true knowledge is knowing thereof. Now even as the mind of a god is nourished by reason and knowledge, so also is it with every soul that has a care to receive her proper food; wherefore when at last she has beheld being, she is well content, and contemplating truth she is nourished and prospers, until the heaven's revolution brings her back full circle. And while she is Bourne round she discerns justice, its very self, and likewise temperance, and knowledge, not the knowledge that is neighbor to becoming and varies with the various objects to which we commonly ascribe being, but the veritable knowledge of being that veritably is. And when she has contemplated likewise and feasted upon all else that has true being, she descends again within the heavens and comes back home. And having come, the charioteer sets his steeds at their manger, and puts ambrosia before them and draught of nectar to drink withal.¹⁸

For Plato then real knowledge is that reflexive activity of the soul by which the knower knows him/herself to be dwelling with the Divine. As in the Upanishads, Plato calls forth the Chariot of the Soul image of light and dark horses. Having knowledge of True Being and the Forms absolutely depends on control of the dark horses, of psychic tendencies. Although expressed differently in Platonic terms than by *Sankara* and other Hindu sages, knowing the Divine amounts to climbing out of the Cave to realize the Divine in oneself. The great Muslim Sufi writer Sheik *Ibn al'Arabi* echoes the same sentiments when he quotes the Qur'an: “Whosoever knoweth himself, knoweth his Lord”¹⁹ *Ibn al'Arabi* was also a Neo-Platonist who was aware of the depths of the soul's struggle out of the Cave into the light was in total agreement with the *Phaedo*. Shortly before he drank the hemlock, Socrates, speaking more like a seer than an ordinary man, spoke of the purified life of philosophy and its rewards:

....And of these souls who have purified themselves by philosophy live thereafter altogether without bodies, and reach habitations even more beautiful, which is not easy to portray— nor is there time to do so now. But the reasons which we already described provide ground enough, as you can see, Simmias, for leaving nothing undone to attain during life some measure of goodness and wisdom, for the prize is glorious and the hope is great.²⁰

Such a state as Socrates alludes to but is unable to really describe is attainable only by complete purity of action. The realization in action of the Forms of *Agathon* (Goodness or Being), *Kalon* (Beauty) and *Sophon* (Wisdom), is attainable by one who is courageous enough to hurl oneself into the abyss of the philosophic life. The mystery of consciousness and meaning of existence will not be revealed by rituals, psychoanalysis or simple morality formulae. We must give ourselves totally, if we are to be true discoverers of the Triple Self which is One. B.P. Wadia articulates it perfectly in *Studies in the Secret Doctrine*:

*Because consciousness is triple the path to perfection is threefold: of Karma which deals with the Kriya-action aspect; of Gnyan which deals with the thought aspect; of Bhakti which deals with will aspect. By Karma we create; by knowledge we preserve, by devotion we regenerate. Karma begets Tamas— inertia, which knowledge sustains as Rajas—mobility, and which devotion transforms into Sattva—harmony. Sattva is Existence—Sat, which Knowledge recognizes through Ideation— Chit, and which devotion realizes in immortal Bliss— Ananda.*²¹

B.P. Wadia reminds us that we are in a constant cycles of *Kriya* (creative action), *Gnyan* (Love-Wisdom) and *Ichcha* (Regenerative Will). Behind this cycle, there is always the universal Self which reflects Absolute in each individual being. It is only by getting rid of the dominance of the lower, selfish personality that one can attain spiritual self-lessness. Plato's philosophic life or "life of the gods" is no different from the attainment taught in the Secret Doctrine, which Mr. Wadia quotes:

*By paralyzing the lower personality and arriving thereby at the full knowledge of the non-separateness of his higher Self from the One Absolute Self, man can, even during his terrestrial life become as "One of Us."*²²

As Plato intimates in the Charimides, it is only by illumined knowledge and self sacrifice that a being can attain *sophrosyne*. Only by offering the entire being to that Absolute One which is behind and within all of us, which Plato called *Agathon*, can a human realize SAT CHIT-ANANDA.

¹ *Samkaracharya*, quoted in Hermes. Vol. I #2, (Santa Barbara: Concord Grove Press), 1975. The translations by Charles Johnston offers a slightly different meaning, but still implies this teaching of the master is to be offered to others:

To those who are wandering in the desert of the world, athirst, on the path of circling birth and death, weary, oppressed and worn by sorrow as by the sun's fierce rays, may this teaching reveal the secondless ETERNAL, bringing joy, like an ocean of nectar near at hand; for this teaching of Shankara brings victory and leads to Nirvana." *Vivekachudamanh: The Crest Jewel of Wisdom*. Attributed to *Shankara Acharya*, Tr. by Charles Johnston, (London: John M. Watkins, 1964), p. 84.

² Plato, Phaeda The Collected Dialogues of Plato. (New York: Pantheon Books, 1966), Tr by Hugh Tredenick, Edit, by Edith Hamilton and Dorion Cairns, p. 94.

³ This diagram is adapted from a similar one by Raghavan Iyer in Parapolitics: Toward the City of Man. (Santa Barbara: Concord Grove Press, 1986), p. 45.

⁴ I.C. Sharma, "The Plotinian One and the Concept of Parampurusa in the Bhagavad-Gita." Neoplatonism in Indian Thought. (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1982), p. 98, Ed. by R. Baine Harris.

⁵ I.C. Sharma, *Ibid.* p. 98.

⁶Paul Hacker, *Cit and Nous*, *Ibid.* pp. 173-74, The Greek word *zwhv* in this text is spelled *zoev*..

- ⁷ B.P. Wadia, Studies in "The Secret Doctrine". (Bombay: Theosophy Company (India) private, Ltd.), p. 96.
- ⁸ H.P Blavatsky, The Secret Doctrine Vol. I. (Los Angeles: The Theosophy Company, 1964), p.18.,
- ⁸B. P Wadia, Op. Cit., p. 98.
- ⁹ Paul Hacker, Op.Cit, p. 170.
- ¹¹ "Akkadian Epics and Myths: The Creation Epic" (Enuma Elis').Tr. by E.A. Speiser, The Ancient near East. Vol. 1. An Anthology of Texts and Pictures, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958), p. 31.
- ¹² John Grimes, A Concise Dictionary of Indian Philosophy: Sanskrit—English. (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1988, pp. 110-111.
- ¹³ Plato, Charmides. Tr. by R. Hackforth, Op.Cit., p. 118.
- ¹⁴ The Laws of Manu. (London: the Penguin Classics, 19910, Tr. Wendy Doniger and Brian K. Smith, Chap.4, #12 p. 75.
- ¹⁵ B.P. Wadia, The Building of the Home. (Bangalore: W.Q. Judge Press, 1960).
- ¹⁶The Laws of Manu. Op.Cit. Chap. 5, p.115. #150.This is from a very controversial passage among feminists and liberal thinkers, because it refers to a woman never being allowed independence.
- ¹⁷ Ibid, Chap. 6, #92-93, p. 126.
- ¹⁸ Plato, Phaedrus. Op.Cit. Hamilton and Cairns Edition, Tr. by R. Hackforth, p. 494.
- ¹⁹ Muhyiddin Ibn al' Arabi, The Seals of Wisdom. (Santa Barbara: Concord Grove Press, 1983), p. 23,Quotation from The Holy Qur'an. Surah 27:92
- ²⁰ Plato, Phaedo. Hamilton and Cairns Edition, Op.Cit., p. 94.
- ²¹ B.P. Wadia, Studies in the Secret Doctrine. Op.Cit., p. 97.
- ²² Ibid., p. 98.