

EIGHT UPANISADS

VOLUME ONE

(*Īśā, Kena, Katha and Taittirīya*)

With the Commentary of
ŚĀṄKARĀCĀRYA

Translated by

SWAMI GAMBHIRANANDA



ADVAITA ASHRAMA
5 DEHI ENTALLY ROAD
CALCUTTA 14

Published by

Swami Budhananda
President, Advaita Ashrama
Mayavati, Almora, Himalayas

Set and Printed in India
By A. S. Kamath
at Sharada Press, Mangalore

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

The present attempt aims at making the thoughts of the great saint and philosopher Śrī Śāṅkarācārya available to those readers who are either unfamiliar with Sanskrit or, though fairly acquainted with it, prefer the medium of another language for a better understanding. It is very difficult to present such an abstruse philosophy through translation, when the language into which it is rendered differs so widely in form and in spirit from the original. We have still tried to be as literal and as true to the spirit and sequence of the sentences, as the English language would permit, without compromising comprehension.

In the translation of the commentary we have presented in italics the words quoted from the text by Śāṅkarācārya. These are followed by commas and the English equivalents, the explanatory words and passing remarks being separated from the synonyms by semi-colons or dashes. The words of the text along with their synonyms, are separated by semi-colons from other words. A full-stop marks the end of a group of connected words in the text. Readers unfamiliar with Sanskrit may skip over these italicised words; and still they will get fairly self-contained sentences to convey the ideas of the commentary in full.

The present volume contains only four of the principal Upaniṣads. And we hope to publish in the near future another volume containing four others, viz. Aitareya, Muṇḍaka, Māṇḍūkya, and Praśṇa.!

We have been laid under a deep debt of gratitude by Swami Omkarananda, who kindly edited the Īśā Upaniṣad. Our thanks are also due to many others who helped us in various ways in executing this work.

In transliteration we have followed the international system with which the readers of the masterly translation of the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad by Swami Madhavananda are familiar.

September 1957

GAMBHIRANANDA

CONTENTS

Īsā Upaniṣad	1
Kena Upaniṣad	31
Kaṭha Upaniṣad	91
Taittirīya Upaniṣad	221
Index to Texts	399

KEY TO TRANSLITERATION AND PRONUNCIATION

<i>sounds like</i>	<i>sounds like</i>
अ a o in son	ड d d
आ ā in master	ढ dh dh in <i>godhood</i>
इ i i in <i>if</i>	ण ñ n in <i>under</i>
ई ē ee in <i>feel</i>	त t French t
उ u u in <i>full</i>	थ th th in <i>thumb</i>
ऊ ū oo in <i>boot</i>	द d th in <i>then</i>
ऋ r somewhat between r and ri	ध dh theh in <i>breathe here</i>
ए e a in <i>evade</i>	न n n
ऐ ai y in <i>my</i>	प p p
ओ o oh	फ ph ph in <i>loop-hole</i>
औ au ow in <i>row</i>	ब b b
क k k	भ bh bh in <i>abhor</i>
ख kh ckh in <i>blockhead</i>	म m m
ग g g (hard)	य y
घ gh gh in <i>log-hut</i>	र r r
ङ ṅ ṅ	ल l l
च c ch (not k)	व v in <i>avert</i>
छ ch chh in <i>catch him</i>	श ś sh
ज j j	ष ṣ sh in <i>show</i>
झ jh dgeh in <i>hedggehog</i>	स s s
ञ ñ n (somewhat)	ह h h
ट t t	ऋ ṅ ng
ठ th th in <i>ant-hill</i>	: h half h

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

A.G.	..	Ānanda Giri
Ai.	..	Aitareya Upaniṣad
Ai. Ā.	..	Aitareya Āraṇyaka
Āp.	..	Āpastamba Dharma-Sūtras
Bṛ.	.	Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad
Ch	..	Chāndogya Upaniṣad
G.	..	Bhagavad Gītā
Īś.	..	Īśā Upaniṣad
Jā.	..	Jābāla Upaniṣad
Ka.	..	Kaṭha Upaniṣad
Kau.	..	Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad
Ke.	..	Kena Upaniṣad
M.	..	Manu Saṁhitā
Mā.	..	Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad
Mbh.	..	Mahābhārata
Mu.	..	Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad
Muk.	..	Muktika Upaniṣad
Pr.	..	Praśṇa Upaniṣad
Śv.	..	Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad
Tai.	..	Taittirīya Upaniṣad
Tai. Ā.	..	Taittirīya Āraṇyaka
Tai. B.	..	Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa
Tai. S.	..	Taittirīya Saṁhitā

ĪSA UPANIṢAD

ॐ पूर्णमदः पूर्णमिदं पूर्णात् पूर्णमुदच्यते
पूर्णस्य पूर्णमादाय पूर्णमेवावशिष्यते ॥

ॐ शान्तिः शान्तिः शान्तिः ॥

Om. That (supreme Brahman) is infinite, and this (conditioned Brahman) is infinite. The infinite (conditioned Brahman) proceeds from the infinite (supreme Brahman). (Then through knowledge), taking the infinite of the infinite (conditioned Brahman), it remains as the infinite (unconditioned Brahman) alone.

Om! Peacc! Peace! Peace!

ĪŚĀ UPANIṢAD

Introduction: The (Vedic) *mantras* (verses) beginning with *Īśāvāsyam* have not been utilised in *karma* (rituals etc.), for they serve to reveal the true nature of the Self, which is not an appendage to *karma*. The real nature of the Self consists in Its purity, sinlessness, oneness, eternity, incorporeity, omnipresence, etc., which will be indicated later on (Īś. 8). As that (nature) would conflict with *karma*, it is but natural that the verses are not applied to *karma*; for neither is the Self in Its real nature, as defined, a thing to be created, transformed, achieved, or purified, nor is It of the nature of an agent or enjoyer, whereby It could become a factor in *karma*. Moreover, all the Upaniṣads exhaust themselves simply by determining the true nature of the Self, and the Gītā and the scriptures dealing with *mokṣa* (the emancipation of the soul) have only this end in view. Accordingly all *karmas* have been enjoined by assuming such qualities for the Self as multiplicity, agentship, enjoyership, etc., and impurity, sinfulness, etc., which common sense takes for granted. For people who are versed in the science dealing with competence (of people treading this path) say that a man is qualified for *karma* when he hankers after the results of *karma*, be they of this world in the form of spiritual eminence etc., or of the hereafter in the form of heaven etc., and thinks of himself thus: "I am a twice-born man and am free from such defects as being one-eyed or hump-backed which stand in the way of one's competence for *karma*." Therefore these verses remove inherent ignorance through the revelation of the true nature of the Self, and thereby produce the knowledge of the oneness etc. of

the Self, which is the means for the uprooting of sorrow, delusion, etc., incidental to mundane existence. We shall briefly explain these (Vedic) verses for which have thus been determined the competent students, the subject matter, the relation between the Vedic text and the subject matter and the purpose.¹

ॐ ईशा वास्यमिदं सर्वं यत्किञ्च जगत्यां जगत् ।
तेन त्यक्तेन भुञ्जीथा मा गृधः कस्यस्विद्धनम् ॥ १ ॥

1. *Om.* All this—whatsoever moves on the earth—should be covered by the Lord. Protect (your Self) through that detachment. Do not covet anybody's wealth. (Or—Do not covet, for whose is wealth?)

One who lords it over is *Īt*;² *Īśā*, by *Īt*, by the Lord. He who is the supreme Ruler and supreme Self of all is the Lord. For as the indwelling soul of all, He is the Self of all beings and as such rules all. (So) *Īśā* (means) by that Lord, in His true form as the Self; *vāśyam*, should be covered. What (is to be covered)? *Idam sarvam yat kim ca*, all this whatsoever; *jagat*, moves; *jagatyām*, on the earth. All this is to be covered by one's own Self, the Lord, through His supreme reality (present in the realisation): "As the indwelling Self (of all), I am all this": all that is unreal, whether moving or

¹ One who wants emancipation is the competent student; the identity of the individual self and the absolute Self is the subject matter; the relation of the Vedic text and the subject matter consists in the former being the revealer of the latter; and the purpose is the removal of ignorance and the attainment of supreme Bliss.

² *Īt* is derived from the root *īś*, meaning "to rule" or "to have power".

not moving, is to be covered by its own supreme Self. As the adventitious bad odour of sandal, *agaru*, etc., resulting from moisture etc., because of their contact with water etc., is covered up by their natural smells through the process of rubbing those woods themselves, just so, (whatsoever moves on the earth will be abandoned through the contemplation of the Self which is the supreme Truth). "Whatever moves" means the apparent duality, the effect of ignorance, which is characterised by such ideas as doership, enjoyment, etc., and which is superimposed on one's own Self; and the phrase "on the earth" having been used illustratively (for all the worlds), it follows that all the bundle of modifications known as name, form, and action will be abandoned through the contemplation of the Self which is the supreme Truth. He, who is thus engaged in the thought of the Self as God, has competence only for renouncing the three kinds of desire for son etc.,¹ and not for *karma*. *Tena tyaktena*, through that detachment. *Tyaktena* means through detachment, (and not "by any abandoned thing"); for a son or a servant, when abandoned or dead, does not protect one, since he has no connection with oneself. So the meaning of the Vedic word (*tyaktena*) is "through renunciation". *Bhuñjīthāh*, protect. You who have renounced desires, *mā gṛdhaḥ*, do not covet, do not cherish any desire for wealth. Do not long for *kasya svid*, anybody's—either your own or somebody else's; *dhanam*, wealth—this is the meaning. The word *svid* is a meaningless particle. Or the meaning is this: Do not covet. Why? *Kasya svid dhanam*, whose is wealth?—this (question) is used in the sense of a denial, because nobody has any wealth which can be coveted. The idea is this: All this has

¹ For son, wealth, and worlds (vide Br. IV. iv. 22).

been renounced through this thought of the "Lord", "All this is but the Self", so that all this belongs to the Self, and the Self is all. Therefore do not have any hankering for things that are unreal.

So far as the knower of the supreme Self is concerned, the purport of the Vedic text (i.e. of the first verse) is this, that the Self is to be saved through firm devotedness to the knowledge of the Self after the renunciation of the threefold desire for sons etc. As for the other person who is unable to cognise the Self because of his mental preoccupation with the non-Self, the Vedic text (i.e. the second verse) imparts this instruction:

कुर्वन्नेवेह कर्माणि जिजीविषेच्छतः समाः ।

एवं त्वयि नान्यथेतोऽस्ति न कर्म लिप्यते नरे ॥ २ ॥

2. By doing *karma*, indeed, should one wish to live here for a hundred years. For a man, such as you (who wants to live thus), there is no way other than this, whereby *karma* may not cling to you.

Kurvan eva iha, verily by doing here—only by accomplishing; *karmāṇi*, *karmas*—Agnihotra (sacrifice) etc.; *jijīviṣet*, one should wish to live; *śatam samāh*, a hundred years. That much has been ascertained to be the longest span of human life. So through a restatement of that well-known fact, it is being enjoined that if one would desire to live a hundred years, one should do so by performing *karma* only. *Evam tvayi*, for you, such as you—as you have this kind of hankering for life; *nare*, for a man—for one identifying oneself only with one's human personality;

itah, other than this—than the present mode of life, viz of performing rituals like *Agnihotra* etc.; *na asti*, there is not, any other mode by which method, *karma na lipyate*, bad *karma* may not cling, i.e. one may not get attached to *karma*. Therefore, one should desire to live by doing only such *karmas* as *Agnihotra* etc., which are enjoined by scriptures.

Objection: But how is it known that the previous verse teaches the pursuit of knowledge for the man of renunciation, and the second one (teaches the path of) *karma* for one who is unable to renounce?

The *answer* is: Do you not remember what was pointed out (in the *introduction*) that the antithesis between knowledge and *karma* is irremovable like a mountain? Here also it has been said: “He who would desire to live should do so by performing work”; as also “All this should be covered by the Lord; protect (the Self) through that detachment; do not covet anybody’s wealth.” Moreover, the Vedic conclusion is this: “One should not hanker after life or death, and should repair to the forest.” Renunciation has been ordained by saying, “He shall not return from there” (*Sannyāsa*). And the difference between the results of these two (paths) will be spoken of (in verses 7 and 18) *seriatim*. Following on the creation of the cosmos, these two paths did emerge out: the path of *karma* being the earlier one; and the other being renunciation, consisting in the giving up of the three kinds of desire (for son etc.), in accordance with the latter path of detachment. Of these, the path of renunciation is the more excellent. And in the *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka* it is said, “Renunciation did, indeed, excel”. “These then are the two paths on which the Vedas are established: the one consists of duty characterised by

attachment, and the other is clearly marked out by detachment" (Mbh. Śāntiparva, 241.6)—this and similar ideas have been declared, after much deliberation, as his firm conviction to his son (Śuka) by Vyāsa, the teacher of the Vedas. The distinction between the two we shall show hereafter.

Now begins the verse for decrying the man who is devoid of knowledge:

असुर्या नाम ते लोका अन्धेन तमसाऽऽवृताः ।
तास्ते प्रेत्याभिगच्छन्ति ये के चात्महनो जनाः ॥ ३ ॥

3. Those worlds of devils are covered by blinding darkness. Those people that kill the Self go to them after giving up this body.

Asuryāḥ, of devils; as compared with the attainment of the non-dual state of the supreme Self, even gods are *asuras*, devils; and the worlds belonging to them are *asuryāḥ*. The word *nāma* is a meaningless indeclinable. *Te*, those; *lokāḥ* (lit. worlds)—(derived) from the root *luk*—means the births in which the results of *karma* are perceived or enjoyed; *āvṛtāḥ*, are covered; *andhena*, by blinding—characterised by blinding—characterised by the inability to see; *tamasā*, by darkness—in the form of ignorance. *Tān*, to them—that extend up to the motionless (trees etc.); *pretya*, after departing, giving up this body; *gacchanti*, go—in accordance with their *karma* and meditation (on gods etc.); *ātmahanāḥ*, those that kill the Self. Who are they? *Janāḥ*, (the common people) those that are ignorant. How do they kill the eternal Self? Because the Self, which exists, is concealed through the fault of ignorance. The experience of the Self

as free from decrepitude and death (present in the realisation, "I am free from decrepitude and death"), that comes as a result of the existence of the Self, remains concealed, as is the consciousness of a person who is killed. So the ordinary and ignorant persons are called the killers of the Self. Because of this fault of slaying the Self, they are subject to birth and death.

What is the nature of the Self by slaying which the ignorant people transmigrate, and contrariwise, the men of knowledge, the non-killers of the Self, become freed? This is being answered now:

अनेजदेकं मनसो जवीयो नैनद्देवा आध्नुवन्पूर्वमर्षत् ।
तद्भावतोऽन्यानत्येति तिष्ठत्तस्मिन्नपो मातरिश्वा दधाति ॥४॥

4. It is unmoving, one, and faster than the mind. The senses could not overtake It, since It ran ahead. Remaining stationary, It outruns all other runners. It being there, Mātariśvā allots (or supports) all activities.

Anejat, unmoving. The root *ejr* implies shaking. Shaking is motion, deviation from one's own condition. It is devoid of this, i.e. It is ever of the same form. And It is *ekam*, one, in all beings. It is *javiyah*, faster, *manasah*, than the mind, characterised by volition etc.

Objection: How can there be such contradictory statements that It is constant and motionless, and yet faster than the mind?

Answer: There is no inconsistency, for this is possible from the standpoint of the conditioned and the unconditioned. As such, It is spoken of as "unmoving, one", in

respect of Its own unconditioned aspect. And by reason of Its following the limiting adjunct, the mind, the internal organ characterised by volition and doubt, (It appears to be subject to modifications). The mind though encased in the body in this world, is able to reach such distances as the world of Brahmā in a single moment, at one volition; and hence the mind is well known as the fastest thing in the world. When that (speedy) mind travels fast to the world of Brahmā etc., the reflection of the conscious Self is perceived to have reached there, as it were, even earlier; and hence It is said to be (*manaso javīyaḥ*) faster than the mind. *Devāḥ*, the gods—the senses, the organs of knowledge such as eyes etc., are the *devas* because of illuminating (*dyotana*) their objects, *na āpnuvan*, could not overtake; *enat*, It, the reality of the Self that is under discussion. The mind is faster than these (senses). Because of the interposition of the activity of the mind, (between the Self and the senses), even a semblance of the Self does not become an object of perception to the senses; since, being all-pervasive like space, It *pūrvam arṣat*, ran ahead—reached the goal even before the swift mind. Though the all-pervasive entity of the Self, in Its real unconditioned state, is devoid of all worldly attributes and is subject to no mutation, yet (by reason of following the limiting adjunct, the mind), it appears, in the eyes of the non-discriminating people, to experience all empirical modifications brought about by the limiting adjuncts, and It also appears to be diverse in relation to the individual bodies. Hence the verse said so. *Tat*, That; *atyeti*, outruns—as it were; *dhāvataḥ anyān*, all other fast moving ones (runners), viz the mind, speech, the senses, etc., which are distinct from the Self. The sense “as it were” is suggested by the verse itself by the use of (the expression)

tiṣṭhat, remaining stationary, which implies, "Itself remaining unchanged". *Tasmin*, It being there—while the entity of the Self endures, which by Its nature is everlasting consciousness; *mātariśvā*, Air—so called because it moves (*śvayati*) in space (*mātarī*)—which sustains all life, which is of the nature of activity, on which depend all bodies and senses, in which all inhere, which is called Sūtra¹ (thread), and which holds together the whole world. That *Mātariśvā*, *dadhāti*, allots; *apah*, the activities²—consisting in the efforts of creatures, as well as flaming, burning, shining, raining, etc. in the case of fire, sun, cloud, etc. Or *dadhāti* many mean supports, in accordance with such Vedic texts as "From His fear the wind blows" (Tai. II. viii. 1). The meaning is that all these modifications of causes and effects occur so long as the eternally conscious reality of the Self, the source of everything, endures.

Since the Vedic *mantras* are untiring in their emphasis, the idea imparted by the previous verse is being stated again:

तदेजति तन्नैजति तद्दूरे तद्वन्तिके ।

तदन्तरस्य सर्वस्य तदु सर्वस्यास्य बाह्यतः ॥ ५ ॥

5. That moves, That does not move; That is far off, That is very near; That is inside all, and That is outside all.

¹ Hiraṇyagarbha, who is possessed of the twofold power of action and knowledge, is called Sūtra when conceived of as the principle of action.

² Since all Vedic sacrifices are performed with liquids like *soma*, ghee, milk, etc., and life, too, is dependent on liquids, *āpaḥ* (water) is figuratively used for action—the cause for the effect, i.e. activities of life.

Tat, That, the entity of the Self that is under consideration. That *ejati*, moves; and That again, by Itself, *na ejati*, does not move. The meaning is that, though in Itself It is motionless, It seems to move. Moreover, *tat dūre*. That is far off—That seems to be far away, since It is unattainable by the ignorant even in hundreds of millions of years; *tadvantike* is split into *tat u antike*. That is very near indeed—to the men of knowledge—It being their Self, that is not only far off, but is near too; *tat antar*, That is inside; *asya sarvasya*, of all—in accordance with the Vedic text: “The Self that is within all” (Br. III. iv. 1)—of all this world, consisting of name, form, and activity; *tat*, That; *u*, also; *sarvasya asya bāhyataḥ*, is outside all, because It is all-pervasive like space; and It is inside because It is extremely subtle. Besides, It is without interstices, (It is continuous), in accordance with the Vedic text: “Pure intelligence alone” (Br. IV. v. 13).

यस्तु सर्वाणि भूतान्यात्मन्येवानुपश्यति ।

सर्वभूतेषु चात्मानं ततो न विजुगुप्सते ॥ ६ ॥

6. He who sees all beings in the very Self, and the Self in all beings, feels no hatred by virtue of that (realisation).

Yaḥ, he who—the mendicant who wants to be freed; *anupaśyati*, sees; *sarvaṇi bhūtāni*, all beings—beginning from the Unmanifested and ending with the immobile; (as existing) *ātmani eva*, in the very Self—i.e. he does not see them as different from the Self, *sarvabhūteṣu ca*, and in all those beings; sees *ātmanam*, the Self—sees the Self of those beings as his own Self thus: “Just as I, the soul of the body which is an aggregate of causes and effects, am the witness

of all perceptions, and as such I am the source of its consciousness, and am pure and unconditioned, similarly in that very aspect of mine am I the soul of all, beginning from the Unmanifested and ending with the immobile"; he (who realises the unconditioned Self in all beings thus), *tataḥ*, by virtue of that vision; *na vijugupsate*, feels no hatred, does not hate. This is only a restatement of a known fact. For this is a matter of experience that all revulsion comes to one who sees something as bad and different from oneself, but for one who sees only the absolutely pure Self as a continuous entity, there is no object that can be the cause of revulsion. Therefore he does not hate.

Another verse also expresses the same purport:

यस्मिन्सर्वाणि भूतान्यात्मैवाभूद्विजानतः ।

तत्र को मोहः कः शोक एकत्वमनुपश्यतः ॥ ७ ॥

7. When to the man of realisation all beings become the very Self, then what delusion and what sorrow can there be for that seer of oneness? (Or—In the Self, of the man of realisation, in which all beings become the Self, what delusion and what sorrow can remain for that seer of oneness?)

Yasmin vijānataḥ, when to the man who has realised, (Or—in the aforesaid Self of the man of realisation in which); *sarvāṇi bhūtāni*, all those beings; *atma eva abhūt*, have become the Self alone—as a result of the realisation of the supreme Self; *tatra*, at that time (or to that Self); *kaḥ mohah*, *kaḥ śokah*, what delusion and what sorrow can there be? Sorrow and delusion, happen to the ignorant

man who does not perceive the seed of desire and actions, but not *anupaśyataḥ ekatvam*, to the man who realises the oneness, of the Self which is pure like space. The impossibility of grief and delusion, the effects of ignorance, having been indicated through the question, “what delusion and what sorrow can there be?”, the total eradication of worldly existence, with its cause, has been shown *ipso facto*.

This verse indicates what the Self, that was spoken of in the previous verses, really is in Its own nature:

स पर्यगाच्छुक्रमकायमव्रण-

मस्ताविरः शुद्धमपापविद्धम् ।

कविर्मनीषी परिभः स्वयम्भू-

यथातथ्यतोऽर्थान् व्यदधाच्छाश्वतीभ्यः समाभ्यः ॥८॥

8. He is all-pervasive, pure, bodiless, without wound, without sinews, taintless, untouched by sin, omniscient, ruler of mind, transcendent, and self-existent; he has duly allotted the (respective) duties to the eternal years (i.e. to the eternal creators called by that name).

Saḥ, He the aforesaid Self; *paryaḡāt*, is all-pervasive, like space—(the word) being derived from *pari*, on all sides, and *aḡāt*, went. He is *śukram*, pure, bright, resplendent, *akāyam*, bodiless, i.e. without the subtle body; *avraṇam*, without wound, scatheless; *asnāvīram*, without sinews—one in whom there is no sinew. By the two expressions, “without wound” and “without sinews”, the gross body is negated. *Śuddham*, taintless, devoid of the dirt of ignorance; thereby is negated the causal body. *Apāpavidham*,

untouched by sin in the form of merit and demerit etc.¹ The expressions beginning with *śukram* are to be converted into masculine because the introduction is made with *saḥ paryagāt* and the conclusion with *kaviḥ maṇiṣī* in the masculine form. *Kaviḥ* (omniscient) means the seer of the *krānta*, past,² i.e. seer of all, as the Vedic text says, "There is no other seer but this" (Br. III. viii. 11). *Maṇiṣī* means the ruler of the mind, i.e. omniscient God. *Paribhūḥ* is one who exists above all (transcendent). *Svayambhūḥ* means he who exists by himself. He, the all, becomes by Himself all, viz all that is transcended as well as all that is transcendental; and hence He is self-existent. He, the ever-free (all-powerful) Lord, because of His omniscience, *yāthātathyataḥ*, duly, as it should be, in consonance with actual result and endeavour; *arthān*, the duties; *vyadadhāt*, has allotted, i.e. distributed in the proper way (according to individual competence); *śāśvatībhyaḥ samābhyah*, to the eternal years, to the Prajāpatis (creators) called the years.

Here the first purport of the Vedas is devotedness to knowledge after renouncing all desires; and this idea has been expressed by the first verse thus: "All this should be covered by the Lord. . . . Do not covet anybody's wealth." And the second purport of the Vedas is that, in case this devotedness to knowledge is impossible for the man of ignorance, there should be continuance in the path of duty, which fact is stated in the second verse thus: "By doing *karmas*, indeed, should one wish to live." This division of paths of life, as shown in these verses, has also been indi-

¹ The idea is that the Self transcends morality, though a man of knowledge never acts immorally, his past training being a sufficient guarantee against this.

² By implication, past, present, and future.

cated in the Brhadāranyaka Upaniṣad. Thus from the text, "He desired, 'Let me have a wife'," etc. (Br. I. iv. 17), it can be clearly understood that works are meant for a man who is ignorant and hankers after results. And from the sentence, "The mind is his soul, and speech his wife," etc. (ibid. I. iv. 17), it can be clearly understood that ignorance and desires are the characteristics of a man devoted to work. So the result of this work is the creation of seven kinds of fruits¹ and continuance in a state of identification with them under the idea that they are the Self. And by the text, "What shall we achieve through children, we to whom the Self which we have attained is the goal?" etc. (Br. IV. iv. 22), it has been shown that for those who have realised the Self by renouncing the threefold desire for wife etc. (i.e. for son, wealth, and heavens), there can only be continuance in the Self Itself, as opposed to the continuance in the path of *karma*. After the condemnation of the ignorant man by the verse, "Those worlds of the devils" etc. (Īś. 3), the true nature of the Self has been revealed by the verses ending with, "He is all-pervasive," etc. (Īś. 8), to those men of renunciation who are steadfast in knowledge, so as to show that they alone are qualified for this and not those who have desires. So also in the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (VI. 21) this has been separately spoken of thus: "To those (men of complete renunciation) who had gone beyond all (the four) stages of life,² he spoke this holiest of things which is fully

¹ Br. I. v. 1-3. (1) The common human food; (2-3) *huta* and *prahuta* or *Darsā* and *Pūrṇamāsa*, which are foods for gods; (4-6) mind, speech, and vital force, which are foods for the soul; (7) milk, which is food for animals.

² The student, the householder, the man who has repaired to the forest, and the formal anchorite, as distinguished from the man who renounces either after or for the sake of God-realisation.

adored by the seers as a class." But the present verse is meant for those men of activity who have desires and want to live by doing *karma*.

Objection: How is it, again, known that it is not meant for all?

The *answer* is: None but a fool will wish to combine with any work, or with any other knowledge (i.e. meditation), that knowledge of the oneness of the Self that has been imparted to the passionless man after the eradication of the distinction of all ends and means, by the text, "When to the man of realisation all beings become the very Self, then what delusion and what sorrow can there be for such a seer of oneness?" (Īś. 7). But the condemnation of the ignorant etc. is done here with a view to achieving a combination (of *vidyā*, i.e. worship or meditation, and *karma*). And as to that, not the knowledge of the supreme Self, but the thing—viz the divine possession (i.e. the meditation on the gods)—that can possibly be combined with the other factor (viz *karma*), has been spoken of here as the associate of *karma*, since for this *vidyā* (meditation or worship) a result, different from the knowledge of Brahman has been declared thus: "Through *vidyā* is attained the world of the gods" (Br. I. v. 16). The denunciation of the separate pursuit of either of these two—*vidyā* and *karma*—is not merely for the sake of denunciation, but for the sake of bringing them together, for a distinct result is declared for each by the Vedic texts: "They ascend to this through *vidyā*"; "The world of gods (is attained) through *vidyā*" (Br. I. v. 16); "The people following the Southern Path do not reach there"; "The world of the Manes through rites" (Br. I. v. 16); and this is so because nothing enjoined by the scriptures can be unworthy of performance.

अन्धं तमः प्रविशन्ति येऽविद्यामपासते ।

ततो भूय इव ते तमो य उ विद्यायाः रताः ॥ ९ ॥

9. Those who worship *avidyā* (rites) enter into blinding darkness; but into greater darkness than that enter they who are engaged in *vidyā* (meditation).

Of these two, they *praviśanti*, enter; into *andham tamaḥ*, blinding darkness, characterised by absence of perception. Who? *Ye avidyām*, those who (worship) *avidyā*. *Avidyā* is different from *vidyā*, i.e. it is *karma*, since *karma* is opposed to *vidyā*; (they) *upāsate*, worship; that *avidyā* in the form of Agnihotra etc., alone. The import is that they perform this whole-heartedly. *Tataḥ*, than that darkness, characterised as blindness; *bhūyaḥ iva tamaḥ*, into greater darkness; *te*, they; enter. Who? *Ye*, they, who giving up rites; *vidyāyām u rataḥ*, are engaged only in *vidyā*, are always bent on the meditation on (and worship of) gods.

With regard to that matter, again, the separate secondary results of meditation and rites are advanced as reasons for the combination of the two, as otherwise, if one of these two closely associated factors bore fruit, while the other did not, they would be related as the part and the whole, (which is absurd).¹

अन्यदेवाहुर्विद्ययाऽन्यदाहुर्विद्यया ।

इति शुश्रुम धीराणां ये नस्तद्विचक्षिरे ॥ १० ॥

10. "They say that by *vidyā* a really differ-

¹ *Vidyā* and *karma* are very often enjoined to be performed separately by men of different tendencies; and separate results are enjoined for them. This would not have been so, if either formed part of the other.

ent result (is achieved), and they say that by *avidyā* a different result (is achieved)", thus have we heard the (teaching of) those wise men who explained that to us.

Anyat eva, a really different (thing); is produced as a result; *Vidyayā*, by *vidyā* (worship or meditation)—(this) *āhuḥ*, they say, because of the Vedic texts: "The world of gods is (won) through meditation" (Br. I. v. 16); "They ascend there through meditation". *Āhuḥ*, they say; *anyat avidyayā* by *avidyā*, *karma* (rites), a different (result) is produced, because of the Vedic text: "The world of the Manes (is won) through *karma*" (Br. I. v. 16). *Iti*, thus; *śūsṛtuma*, we have heard; *dhīrāṅām*, (the teaching) of the wise men, those teachers, who *vicacakṣire*, explained to us; *tat*, that—*karma* and meditation. The purport is that this is their knowledge traditionally received.

विद्यां चाविद्यां च यस्तद्वेदोभयं सह ।

अविद्यया मृत्युं तीर्त्वा विद्ययाऽमृतमश्नुते ॥ ११ ॥

11. He who knows these two, *vidyā* and *avidyā*, together, attains immortality through *vidyā*, by crossing over death through *avidyā*.

Since this is so, therefore *vidyā* and *avidyā*, i.e. meditation on deities and rites; *yaḥ tad veda ubhayam saha*, he who knows these together, knows them as things to be performed by the same person; for that man alone, who thus combines (the two), there occurs the successive acquisition of the two goals in the same individual. This is being said:

Avidyayā, through *avidyā*, through rites such as Agni-hotra; *mṛtyum*, death—rites and meditation induced by

one's nature;¹ *tīrtvā*, crossing over—over both these which are called death; *vidyayā*, through *vidyā*, the meditation on the deities; (one) *aśnute*, attains; *amṛtam*, immortality, identification with the deities; that very fact of becoming one with the gods being called immortality.

Now, with a view to combining the worship of the Manifested and the Unmanifested, each is being denounced separately:

अन्धं तमः प्रविशन्ति येऽसम्भूतिमुपासते ।

ततो भूय इव ते तमो य उ सम्भूत्याः रताः ॥ १२ ॥

12. Those who worship the Unmanifested (Prakṛti) enter into blinding darkness; but those who are devoted to the Manifested (Hiraṇyagarbha) enter into greater darkness.

Ye, those who; (worship) *asambhūtim*: *Sambhūti* means the fact of being born, as also the effect that has this (quality of being born); other than that is *asambhūti*, called Prakṛti (primal material cause), *avidyā* (ignorance), and *avyākṛta* (the Unmanifested). Those who *upāsate*, worship; this *asambhūti*—known as the unmanifest Prakṛti, cause, and *avidyā*, which is the seed of desire and work, and is blinding by nature; *te*, they; *praviśanti*, enter into; *andham tamaḥ*, blinding darkness, which is of a similar nature. *Tataḥ* than that; *bhūyaḥ*, greater; *iva*, as it were; *tamaḥ*, darkness; *praviśanti*, enter; *ye*, those who; *sambhūtyām ratāḥ*, are devoted to *sambhūti*—to the manifested Brahman called Hiraṇyagarbha.

¹ "The impression (created on the mind) by merit, demerit, etc., acquired in a previous birth, as manifested at the time of death, is called nature."—Śaṅkara's commentary on the Gītā, XVII. 2.

Now in this verse are being stated the results of the two constituent worships, which (results) necessitate the combination of those worships:

अन्यदेवाहुः सम्भवादन्यदाहुरसम्भवात् ।

इति शुश्रुम धीराणां ये नस्तद्विचचक्षिरे ॥ १३ ॥

13. “They spoke of a different result from the worship of the Manifested, and they spoke of a different result from the worship of the Unmanifested”—thus we have heard (the teaching of) those wise men who explained that to us.

Anyat eva, a different result indeed; *āhuḥ*, they spoke of; *sambhavāt*, from *sambhūti*, the Manifested; the idea is that they spoke of the result, comprising supernormal faculties such as becoming subtle etc., accruing from the worship of the manifested Brahman (Hiraṇyagarbha). Similarly too, they *anyat āhuḥ*, spoke of a different result; *asambhavāt*, from *asambhūti*, *avyākṛta*—from the worship of the Unmanifested—that which has been referred to in the text, “They enter into blinding darkness” (Īś. 12) and is called absorption into Prakṛti (Primordial Nature) by the *paurāṇikas*. *Iti*, thus; *śuśrūma dhīrāṇām*, we have heard the speech of the wise; who *vicacakṣire*, explained that to us, i.e. explained the result of the worship of the Manifested and the Unmanifested.¹

¹ “Māyā, depending on Consciousness and acting as a limiting adjunct of the supreme Lord, is well known in the other Vedic text: ‘Know Māyā as Prakṛti (material cause) and the great Lord as the possessor of Māyā’ (Śv. IV. 10)—that Māyā and not Brahman is spoken of here by the word Unmanifested, for it is not possible for the unchanging Brahman to be directly the material cause.”—A.G.

Since this is so, and since both are meant for the same human goal, it is proper to combine the worship of the Manifested and the Unmanifested. This is being said by the verse:

सम्भूतिं च विनाशं च यस्तद्वेदोभयं सह ।
विनाशेन मृत्युं तीर्त्वा सम्भूत्याऽमृतमश्नुते ॥ १४ ॥

14. He who knows these two—the Unmanifested and Destruction (Hiraṇyagarbha)—together, attains immortality through the Unmanifested by crossing death through Destruction.

He who knows these two—the Unmanifested and Destruction—together; *vināśena*, through Destruction; though *vināśa* (destruction) is an attribute of the evolutes of its substantive, it is spoken of as identical with the substantive itself (i.e. manifested Brahman or Hiraṇyagarbha), of which, too, it (*vināśa* or destruction) is a characteristic; by that, by the worship of that (*vināśa*); *mṛtyum tīrtvā*, crossing over death—the bundle of faults such as absence of super-normal faculty, and demerit, desire, etc.; for through the worship of Hiraṇyagarbha is obtained such results as powers of becoming subtle; *mṛtyum tīrtvā*, crossing over death, consisting in the non-possession of supernormal faculties; *asambhūtyā*, through the worship of the Unmanifested; *amṛtam aśnute*, (he) attains immortality—characterised as absorption in Prakṛti. It is to be noted that in *sambhūtim ca vināśam ca* there is a presentation by omission of the letter *a* (before *sambhūti*) which should be *asambhūti* in conformity with the mention of the fruit, viz absorption in Prakṛti (i.e. *asambhūti*).

It is indicated by the scriptures that absorption into Prakṛti is the highest result attainable through human and divine wealth.¹ Up to this is the course of worldly existence. Beyond this is the identification with the Self in all, as indicated earlier in the verse: "When to the man of realisation all beings become the very Self" (Īś. 7), which is the result of devotion to knowledge after renouncing all desires. Thus has been revealed the twofold purport of the Vedas consisting in desire for and desisting from activity. As to this, the (Śatapatha) Brāhmaṇa, ending with the Pravargya ritual, is devoted to the revelation as a whole of the Vedic purport indicated through injunction and prohibition of activity. And the Bṛhadāraṇyaka thereafter is devoted to the revelation of the Vedic purport characterised by desisting from activity. In this connection, the verse, "He who knows these two—*vidyā* and *avidyā*—together, attains immortality through *vidyā*, by crossing over death through *avidyā*" (Īś. 11), has been cited for the person who wants to live by doing rites—beginning from conception and ending in death—in conjunction with meditation on the lower Brahman. Now, then, the question, "By what route will he achieve immortality?" is being answered. "Now, That which is the Truth (Brahman), is the Sun—who is the Person in the solar orb, as also the Person in the right eye" (Br. V. v. 2)—he who has meditated on both these (Persons) as the Truth (Brahman) and performed the rites as mentioned (in the scriptures), prays at the time of death, to the Self, for the door leading to the Self, in the verse: "The face of Truth is concealed with a golden vessel" etc.

¹ "Cattle, land, gold, etc., are human wealth; meditation on gods is divine wealth."—A.G.

हिरण्मयेन पात्रेण सत्यस्यापिहितं मुखम् ।

तत्त्वं पूषन्नपावृण सत्यधर्माय दृष्टये ॥ १५ ॥

15. The face of the Truth (Brahman in the solar orb) is concealed with a golden vessel. Do thou, O Sun, open it so as to be seen by me who am by nature truthful (or am the performer of rightful duties).

Hiraṇmaya means golden, appearing as though made of gold, i.e. resplendent; by that; *pātreṇa*, by the vessel, which is like a lid that hides from view; *apīhitam*, is concealed, covered; *mukham*, the face, the door, *satyasya*, of Truth, of that very Brahman who is in the solar orb. *Tat tvam pūṣan*, that thou, O Sun; *apāvṛṇu*, do open, i.e. remove. I who have got the quality of Truth, by meditating on you as Truth, am *satyadharmā*; so *satyadharmāya* means, for my sake who am of that kind (truthful); or it means, for the sake of one (i.e. me) who performs the rightful duties. *Dṛṣṭaye*, so as to be seen; so that you yourself, who are the Truth, may be realised.

पूषन्नेकर्षे यम सूर्यं प्राजापत्य

व्यूह रश्मीन् समूह तेजः ।

यत्ते रूपं कल्याणतमं तत्ते पश्यामि

योऽसावसौ पुरुषः सोऽहमस्मि ॥ १६ ॥

16. O, thou, who art the nourisher, the solitary traveller, the controller, the acquirer, the son of Prajāpati, do remove thy rays, do gather up thy dazzle. I shall behold that form of thine

which is the most benign. I am that very Person that is yonder (in the sun).

Pūṣan, O Sun! The sun is the *pūṣā*, nourisher, because he nourishes the world. Similarly he travels alone (*ekarṣat*); hence he is *ekarṣi*. *Ekarṣe*, O solitary traveller. So also he is *yama*, controller, because of controlling (*saṁyamanāt*) all; O controller. Likewise he is *sūrya*, acquirer, because of securing to himself (*svīkaraṇāt*) all rays, vital forces, and liquids; O acquirer. The son of Prajāpati is *prājāpatya*; O son of Prajāpati. *Vyūha*, remove; thy own *rasmīn*, rays; *samūha*, gather up, withdraw; thy *tejaḥ*, heat, the oppressing dazzle. *Yat te*, that which is thy; *rūpam kalyāṇatamam*, most benign, most graceful, form; *tat*, that; *paśyāmi*, I shall see; by *te*, thy—thy grace, who art the Self. Moreover, I do not entreat thee like a servant; *yaḥ asau*, the Person who is there, in the solar orb—whose limbs are the *vyāhritis*,¹ and who is called a Person (Puruṣa) because he has the figure of a person; or because by him, in the form of the vital forces and intelligence, the whole world is filled; or because he resides in the city (of the heart)—*saḥ aham asmi*, that Person am I.

वायुरनिलममृतमथेदं भस्मान्तं शरीरम् ।

ॐ ऋतो स्मर कृतं स्मर ऋतो स्मर कृतं स्मर ॥ १७ ॥

17. Let (my) vital force now attain the (all-pervading) immortal Air; (and) now let this body be reduced to ashes. *Om*, O my mind,²

¹ *Bhūh* (earth) is his head; *Bhuvah* (sky) his hands; *svah* (heaven) his legs (Br. V.v. 3-4, Tai. I. v-vi, f.n., p. 254).

² "*Om*, O my mind" means—O Fire (i.e. Brahman) who is indented with the mind and whose symbol is *Om*.

remember—remember all that has been done. Remember—remember all that has been done.

Atha, now; as I am dying, let my *vāyuh*, vital force: give up its physical limitation and attain its divine nature which is the all-pervading, *amṛtam anilam*, immortal Air, i.e. *sūtrātmā* (Hiraṇyagarbha). The word “attain” has to be supplied to complete the sentence. The idea, “And let this subtle body, purified by rites and meditation, ascend”, is also understood, by virtue of the solicitation for the path (to ascend by). *Atha*, now; *idam śarīram*, this body; being offered as an oblation to fire; *bhasmāntam*, may be reduced to ashes. Since Brahman has *Om* as Its symbol, therefore, consonantly with the meditation followed (by the dying man), Brahman, which is called Fire and is Truth by nature, is presented here as identical with *Om*. *Krato*, O mind, whose characteristic is volition; *smara*, (you) remember; the time has arrived when all that has to be remembered by me should be remembered; therefore (you) remember all that has been thought of so long. And O Fire, *smara*, remember; *kṛtam smara*, whatever work has been done from my childhood, that too, thou remember. *Krato smara*, *kṛtam smara*—this repetition implies solicitude.

He prays for the path again through another verse:

अग्ने नय सुपथा राये अस्मान्
विश्वानि देव वयुनानि विद्वान् ।

ययोध्यस्मज्जुहुराणमेनो

भूयिष्ठां ते नमउक्तिं विधेम ॥ १८ ॥

18. O Fire! O god! Knowing, as thou do, all our deeds, lead us by the good path for the

enjoyment of the fruits of our deeds; remove from us all crooked sins. We offer thee many words of salutation.

Agne, O Fire; deva, O god; vidvān, knowing; viśvāni vāyunāni, all deeds or meditations; naya, lead; asmān, us—who are endowed with the aforesaid fruits of virtue; supathā, by the good path. The attribute “good path” is used for eschewing the Southern Path (Pitṛ-yāna). I am disgusted with the Southern Path which is characterised by going and coming; hence I entreat thee again and again, “Lead by the good path which is free from going and coming.” Rāye means, for the sake of wealth, i.e. for the enjoyment of the fruits of deeds. Moreover, yuyodhi, remove, destroy; asmat means asmattaḥ, from us; juhurāṇam, crooked, deceitful; enas, sin. The idea is this: Becoming purified thereby, we shall achieve our desired object. But (as) at present we cannot render any service to thee, (so) te, to thee; bhūyiṣthām, many; namaḥ uktim, words of salutation; vidhema, we offer—i.e. we serve thee with salutations.

(*A doubt*): Some people are filled with doubt at hearing the texts: “Crossing over death, through *avidyā*, attains immortality through *vidyā*” (Īś. 11), and “Crossing over death, through Destruction, attains immortality through the Unmanifested” (Īś. 14). Hence, to remove that doubt, we shall discuss (the topic) in brief. Now, then, the reason why the doubt arises is being stated: “By the word *vidyā*, why should not the knowledge of the supreme Self itself be understood; and so also (why should not) immortality (be taken in the primary sense)?”

Answer: Is it not a fact that by reason of the opposition between the knowledge of the supreme Self and

karma, mentioned earlier, there is no possibility of combination?

Objection: True. But the opposition is not comprehended, because opposition or agreement rests on the authority of scriptures. Just as the performance of *karma* and the pursuit of knowledge rest on the authority of the scriptures, so also do their opposition and agreement. Just as the prohibition, "Do not kill any living thing", learnt from scripture, is overridden by the injunction, "One should kill an animal in a sacrifice", so also it is possible in the case of *karma* and knowledge that *karma* and knowledge are to be combined.

Answer: No (they cannot be combined), because of the Vedic text: "What are known as *vidyā* (knowledge) and *avidyā* (*karma*) are entirely different, and they follow different courses" (Ka. I. ii. 4).

Objection: Suppose we say that there is no antagonism because of the text: "He who knows *vidyā* and *avidyā* together" (Īś. 11).

Answer: No, because of the opposition involved in (their) causes, natures, and results.

Objection: Since (on the one hand) it is impossible to accept either alternative when there is both opposition and non-opposition between *karma* and knowledge, and since (on the other hand) their combination is enjoined (here), may we not argue that there is (really) no contradiction (between them)?

Answer: No, since their co-existence is absurd.

Objection: Suppose we say that knowledge and *karma* may cohere in the same person successively.

Answer: No.¹ For when knowledge arises, *karma* vanishes, since in the person in whom knowledge exists, *karma* cannot remain. For it is a fact that when the knowledge, “Fire is hot and effulgent”, has arisen in a person, then in that very person there cannot arise the ignorance or doubt or error (of the form), “Fire is cold or non-illuminating”. The impossibility of sorrow and delusion (for a man of knowledge) is declared by the Vedic text: “When to the man of realisation all beings become the very Self, then what delusion and what sorrow can there be for that seer of oneness?” (Īś. 7). And we have already said that since ignorance is impossible (for such a man), *karma*, which originates from ignorance, is also impossible.

As for the text, “He attains immortality”, (Īś. 14) the immortality is a relative thing. If the knowledge of the supreme Self is understood by the word *vidyā*, the prayer for the path etc. in the text, “The face of the Truth (Brahman) is covered” etc. (Īś. 15) becomes irreconcilable.² Accordingly, the combination (of *karma*) is with meditation and not with the knowledge of the supreme Self. Thus we conclude by remarking that the meaning of the verse is just as we have interpreted.

ॐ पूर्णमदः पूर्णमिदं पूर्णात्पूर्णमुदच्यते ।
पूर्णस्य पूर्णमादाय पूर्णमेवावशिष्यते ॥

ॐ शान्तिः शान्तिः शान्तिः ॥

¹ If the succession consists in ignorance being earlier and knowledge later, then it is certainly admitted. But if ignorance is later (than knowledge), then it is impossible”—A G.

² For there can be no going or coming for a knower of Brahman who becomes all by becoming Brahman Itself

KENA UPANISAD

ॐ आध्यायन्तु ममाङ्गानि वाक्प्राणश्चक्षुः श्रोत्रमथो
बलमिन्द्रियाणि च सर्वाणि सर्वं ब्रह्मोपनिषदं माऽहं ब्रह्म
निराकुर्यां मा मा ब्रह्म निराकारोदनिराकरणमस्त्वनिराकरणं
मेऽस्तु तदात्मनि निरते य उपनिषत्सु धर्मास्ते मयि सन्तु
ते मयि सन्तु ।

ॐ शान्तिः शान्तिः शान्तिः ॥

May my limbs, speech, vital force, eyes, ears, as also strength and all the organs, become well developed. Everything is the Brahman revealed in the Upaniṣads. May I not deny Brahman; may not Brahman deny me. Let there be no spurning (of me by Brahman), let there be no rejection (of Brahman) by me. May all the virtues that are (spoken of) in the Upaniṣads repose in me who am engaged in the pursuit of the Self; may they repose in me.

Om Peace! Peace! Peace!

KENA UPANIṢAD

PART I

Introduction: Since the Upaniṣad commencing with *Keneṣitam* and revealing the supreme Brahman has to be spoken of, the ninth chapter¹ begins. Earlier than this, rites have been exhaustively dealt with, and the (different) meditations on the vital force as the basis of rites, as also the meditations on the (various) *Sāmas*,² forming parts of rites, have been spoken of. After that is stated the meditation on the *Gāyatra Sāma*, (thought of as the vital force), which ends with a succession of teachers and pupils and which relates to effects of action. If all these rites and meditations, as enjoined, are properly observed, they become the cause for the purification of the mind of one who is free from desires and longs for emancipation. But in the case of one who cherishes desires and has no enlightenment (i.e. meditation on or knowledge of gods), the rites by themselves, as enjoined in the Vedas and the Smṛtis, become the cause for the attainment of the Southern Path and for return to this world. But through activity prompted by natural impulses that are repugnant to the scriptures, there will be degradation into lower beings ranging from beasts to the motionless ones (trees etc.), in accordance with the Vedic text: “(If one does not perform rites or meditation), then one does

¹ The Kena Upaniṣad forms part of the Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa of the Talavakāra branch of the Sāma-Veda.

² A *Sāma* song is divided into parts—five or seven. This *Sāma* as also each of its parts has to be thought of variously. For such meditation see Ch. I and II.

not proceed by either of these Paths (Northern or Southern). They become these little creatures (mosquitoes etc.) that are constantly subject to birth and death following the (divine) order 'Be born and die.' This is the third state" (Ch. V. x. 8); and in accordance with the words of the other Vedic text: "Three kinds of beings¹ followed a course that deviates (from these Northern and Southern Paths)"² (Ai. Ā. II. i. 1.4). The longing for the knowledge of the indwelling Self arises only in that desireless man of pure mind who has renounced all transitory, external means and ends by virtue of the emergence of a special kind of tendency (in his mind) created by works done in this life or in previous ones. This fact is being shown in the form of questions and answers by the Vedic text beginning with *Keneṣitam*. In the Katha Upaniṣad, too, it is said, "The self-existent Lord destroyed the outgoing senses; therefore one sees the outer things and not the Self within. A rare discriminating man, who desired immortality, turned his eyes away and then saw the indwelling Self" (Ka. II. i. 1) etc. And in the (Muṇḍaka) Upaniṣad of the Atharva-Veda it is said, "Having examined the worlds attainable by work thus: 'The unproduced (everlasting emancipation) is not to be produced by work', the Brāhmaṇa should resort to renunciation. In order to know that fully, he must approach, with sacrificial faggots in hand, a teacher who is versed in the Vedas and is established in Brahman" (Mu. I. ii. 12). In this way alone, does a man of detachment acquire the competence to hear, meditate on, and realise the knowledge of the indwelling Self, and not otherwise. Besides, as a result of this realisation of the indwelling Self as Brahman, there comes the total cessa-

¹ Born from the womb, egg, or earth.

² And thereby they tread a path of sorrow.

tion of ignorance which is the seed of bondage and the cause of the emergence of desire and activity, in accordance with the verse: "What sorrow and what delusion can there be for that seer of oneness?" (Īś. 7); and also in accordance with the Vedic texts: "The knower of the Self transcends sorrow" (Ch. VII. 1.3); "When the One that is both cause and effect is seen, the knots of the heart of the (seer) are cut, all (his) doubts are resolved, and all *karma* is consumed" (Mu. II. ii. 8). etc.

Objection: May it not be argued that this result can be attained even from knowledge¹ coupled with rites and duties?

Answer: No, because in the Vājasaneyaka (Bṛhadāraṇyaka) Upaniṣad that (combination of rites and meditation) has been spoken of as the cause of a different result. Starting with the text, "Let me have a wife" (Bṛ. I. iv. 17), the Vājasaneyaka shows in the text, "This world of man is to be won through the son alone, and by no other rite; the world of the Manes through rites; and the world of the gods through meditation" (Bṛ. I. v. 16), how rites and duties lead to the attainment of the three worlds that are different from the Self. And there (in that Upaniṣad itself), again, the reason for embracing renunciation is adduced thus: "What shall we achieve through children, we to whom the Self we have attained is the goal?" (Bṛ. IV. iv. 22). The explanation of that reason is this: What shall we do with progeny, rites, and meditation combined with rites, which are the means for the attainment of worlds other than that

¹ The word *jñāna* occurs in two senses: (i) Vedāntic knowledge and (ii) knowledge about gods or meditation on them. *Jñāna* in the second sense can be combined with rites and duties, but not Vedāntic *jñāna*.

of the Self, and are the causes for the attainment of the three worlds of men, Manes, and gods? Nor are the three worlds—transitory and attainable by means as they are—desirable to us, to whom is desirable the world that is natural, “birthless, undecaying, immortal, fearless” (Br. IV. iv. 25), that “neither increases nor decreases through work” (Br. IV. iv. 23), and is eternal. And being eternal, it is not to be secured by any means other than the cessation of ignorance. Hence the only duty is to renounce all desires after the realisation of the unity of the indwelling Self and Brahman. Besides, the knowledge of the identity of the indwelling Self and Brahman militates against its co-existence with work. For the realisation of the identity of the Self and Brahman, which eradicates all dual ideas, cannot reasonably co-exist with work which presupposes the ideas of the difference of agent and results; for the object (of knowledge) being the deciding factor, the realisation of Brahman is not determined by human effort.¹

Therefore this desire to know the indwelling Self, in the case of a man who has renounced all seen and unseen results attainable by external means, is being shown by the Vedic text beginning with *Keneṣitam*. But the object (of the inquiry)—being subtle, the presentation in the form of questions and answers of the student and teacher leads to easy comprehension; and it is also shown that the object is not realisable through mere dialectics. Moreover, in accordance with the Vedic text, “This knowledge is not attainable

¹ “An object of injunction is that which has to be achieved by effort consequent on the injunction. Knowledge is not of that kind”—A.G. The object is the determining factor as regards the content of any valid knowledge. Neither injunction nor any accessory has any effect here.

through dialectics" (Ka. I. ii. 9), and the obligation about taking a teacher implied in the Vedic and Smṛti texts, "One who has a teacher knows" (Ch. VI. xiv. 2), "Such knowledge alone as is acquired from a teacher becomes the best"¹ (Ch. IV. ix. 3). "Learn that through obeisance" (G. IV. 34), it can be imagined that someone, having found no refuge in anything other than the indwelling Self, and having a longing for the fearless, eternal, auspicious, and unshakable (Brahman), approached a teacher who is established in Brahman, and asked:

ॐ केनेषितं पतति प्रेषितं मनः

केन प्राणः प्रथमः प्रैति युक्तः ।

केनेषितां वाचमिमां वदन्ति

चक्षुः श्रोत्रं क उ देवो युनक्ति ॥ १ ॥

I. Willed by whom does the directed mind go towards its object? Being directed by whom does the vital force, that precedes all, proceed (towards its duty)? By whom is this speech willed that people utter? Who is the effulgent being who directs the eyes and the ears?

Kena, by what agent; being *iṣitam*, willed, directed; *manaḥ*, the mind; *patati*, goes, goes towards its own object—this is the construction. Since the root *iṣ* cannot be taken here to imply either repetition or going,² it must be under-

¹ "Leads to the acquisition of the best result."—A.G.

² "Since the intention here is not to make the mind an object of the concept of either repeated occurrence or going, and since the desire is for knowing some special director of the mind."—A.G.

stood that the present form of the root is in its sense of desiring. The form in which the suffix *it* is used in the word *iṣitam* is a Vedic licence.¹ *Preṣitam* is a form of the same root, with *pra* prefixed to it, in the sense of directing. If the word *preṣitam* alone were used (without *iṣitam*) there would arise such an inquiry about the particular kind of director and the direction as: "By what particular director? And how is the direction?" But the attribute *iṣitam* being there, both the questions are set at rest, because thereby is ascertained a special meaning, viz. "directed (*preṣitam*) through whose mere will?"²

Objection: If this be the meaning intended, the purpose is served by the expression *willed by* alone, and the expression *directed* need not be used. Moreover, since it is reasonable that an additional word should imply an additional meaning, it is proper to understand some special sense such as: "By what is it directed—by will, act, or speech?"

Answer: This cannot be so because of the trend of the question. For the reasonable conclusion derived from the trend (of the question) is that the inquiry is made by a man who has become disgusted with the ephemeral works and their results, such as the assemblage of the body, senses, etc., and seeks to know something other than these, which is unchangeable and eternal. If it were not so, the question would be surely meaningless, since the directorship of the group of body etc. (over the mind) through will, word, and act is a familiar fact.

Objection: Even so, the sense of the word *directed* is not certainly brought out.

¹ The correct form should have been "*eṣitam*."—A.G.

² "By mere presence that involves no effort."—A.G.

Answer: No, since the word *directed* can reasonably convey a special sense, viz that it is the question of a man in doubt. Both the adjectives *iṣitam* (willed) and *preṣitam* (directed), in the sentence *willed by whom the directed mind goes*, are justifiable as implying: "Does the directorship belong to the aggregate of body and senses, which is a well-known fact; or does the directorship through mere will, over the mind etc., belong to some independent entity is different from the aggregate?"

Objection: Is it not a well-known fact that the mind is free and goes independently to its own object? How can the question arise with regard to that matter?

The *answer* is this: If the mind were independent in engaging or disengaging itself, then nobody would have contemplated any evil. And yet the mind, though conscious of consequences, wills evil; and, though dissuaded, it does engage in deeds of intensely sorrowful result. Hence the question, *keneṣitam patati* etc., is appropriate.

Kena, by whom; *prāṇaḥ*, the vital force; being *yuktaḥ*, engaged, directed; *praiti*, goes, towards its own activity? *Prathamaḥ*, first, should be an adjective of the vital force, for the activities of all the organs are preceded by it. *Imām vācam*, this speech, consisting of words; as ordinary people *vadanti*, utter; *kena iṣitam*, by whom is it willed (during that utterance)? Similarly, *kaḥ u devaḥ*, which effulgent being; *yamakṛti*, engages, directs towards their respective objects; *cakṣuḥ śrotam*, the eyes and the ears?

To the worthy disciple who had asked thus, the teacher said, "Hear what you have asked for in the question, 'Who is that effulgent being who is the director of the mind and other organs towards their own objects, and how does he direct?'"

श्रोत्रस्य श्रोत्रं मनसो मनो यद्

वाचो ह वाचं स उ प्राणस्य प्राणः ।

चक्षुषश्चक्षुरतिमुच्य धीराः

प्रेत्यास्माल्लोकादमृता भवन्ति ॥ २ ॥

2. Since He is the Ear of the ear, the Mind of the mind, the Speech of speech, the Life of life, and the Eye of the eye, therefore the intelligent men, after giving up (self-identification with the senses) and renouncing this world, become immortal.

Śrotasya śrotam, the Ear of the ear. The *śrotam* is that by which one hears, the instrument for the hearing of sound, the organ of hearing which reveals the words. He about whom you put the question, "Who is the effulgent being who directs the eyes and the ears?" --is the Ear of the ear.

Objection: Is it not incongruous to answer, "He is the Ear of the ear", when the reply should have been "So-and-so, with such and such attributes, directs the ears etc.?"

Answer: This is no fault, because His distinction can not be ascertained otherwise. If the director of the ears etc. can be known as possessed of His own activity, independently of the activities of the ears etc. just as it is in the case of the wielder of sickle etc., then this answer will be incongruous. But as a matter of fact, no director of ears etc., possessed of his own activity, is apprehended here like a mower possessed of a sickle etc. But He can be known, (as existing unmingled with the ear etc.), from the logical neces-

sity that such activities as deliberation, volition, determination, of those very composite things, viz the ear etc., must be meant for some one's benefit. Just as in the case of a house, so also (in this case) there does exist some one, standing outside the conglomeration of ears etc., by whose necessity is impelled the group of ears etc. Thus from the fact that composite things exist for the need of some one else, a director of the ears etc. can be known (i.e. inferred).¹ Hence the reply, "He is the Ear of the ear", is quite appropriate.

Objection: What, again, can there be the significance here of the expression, "The Ear of the ear" etc.? For just as a light has no need for another light, so in this context the ear can have no need for another ear.

Answer: There is no such fault. The significance here is this: The ear, to wit, is seen to be able to reveal its own object. This ability of the ear to reveal its own object is possible only when the eternal non-composite, all-pervading light of the Self is there, but not otherwise. Hence the expression, "Ear of the ear" etc., is justifiable. To the same effect there are other Vedic texts: "It is through the light of the Self that he sits" (Br. IV. iii. 6), "Through His light all this shines" (Ka. II. ii. 15; Śv. VI. 14; Mu. II. ii. 10), "kindled by which light the sun shines" (Tai. B. III. xii. 9.7), etc. And in the Gītā, "(Know that light to be mine), which is in the sun and which illumines the whole universe"

¹ "Ears etc., are subsidiary to some one different from themselves, for they are composite things, like a house etc.—by this inference the master of the ears etc. can be known. If he, too, should be a part of the combination, then he will be insentient like the house etc. Then we shall have to imagine another master for him, and so also a third for this. Thus to avoid an infinite regress, a Consciousness that is not a part of the combination is apprehended" —A.G.

(XV. 12), and “(As the one sun illumines the whole universe), so does He who resides in the body, O descendant of Bharata, illumine the whole body” (XIII. 33). So also in the Kāṭha Upaniṣad, “the permanent among all that is impermanent, the conscious among all that is conscious” (II. ii. 13). It is a commonly accepted belief that the ears etc. constitute the Self of all, and that these are conscious. This is being refuted here. There does exist something which is known to the intellect of the men of realisation, which dwells in the inmost recesses of all, which is changeless, undecaying, immortal, fearless, and unborn, and which is the Ear etc. of even the ear etc., i.e. the source of their capacity to act. Thus the answer and significance can be justified.

Similarly, *manasaḥ*, of the mind, of the internal organ; (He is) the *manaḥ*, Mind; because the internal organ is not able to perform its own functions— thinking, determination, etc.—unless the radiance of the light of consciousness is there. Therefore He is the Mind of the mind, too. Here the mind and the intellect are jointly mentioned by the word *manaḥ* (mind). *Yad vāco ha vācam*: the word *yat*, used in the sense of because, is connected with all such words as *śrotra* (ear) in this way: because He is the Ear of the ear, because He is the Mind of the mind, and so on. The objective case in *vāco ha vācam* is to be changed into the nominative in consonance with the expression *prāṇasya prāṇaḥ* (the Life of life).

Objection: In conformity with *vāco ha vācam*, why should not the conversion be into the objective case thus: *prāṇasya prāṇam*?

Answer: No, for it is reasonable to conform to the majority. So in consonance with the two words, (*saḥ* and

prāṇah), in *śaḥ u prāṇasya prāṇaḥ* (where they are in the nominative case), the implication of the word *vācam* is *vāk*, for thus is the reasonable conformity with the majority maintained. Moreover, a thing asked about should properly be denoted in the first (nominative) case. He, of whom you ask, and who is the Life of *prāṇa*—of that particular function called life; by Him, indeed, is ensured the capacity of the vital force to discharge its functions of sustaining life, and this is because there can be no sustaining of life by anything that is not presided over by the Self, in accordance with the Vedic texts: “Who, indeed, will inhale, and who will exhale if this Bliss (Brahman) be not there in the supreme Space (within the heart)?” (Tai. II. vii. 1), “Who pushes the *prāṇa* upward and impels the *apāna* inwards” (Ka. II. ii. 3), etc. Here, too, it will be said, “That which man does not smell with *prāṇa* (the organ of smell), but that by which *prāṇa* is impelled, know that to be Brahman” (Ke. I.9).

Objection: Is it not proper to understand *prāṇa* as the sense of smelling (and not life)¹ in a context which deals with the senses ears etc.?

Answer: This is true. But the text considers that by the mention of *prāṇa* (meaning the vital force), the sense of smell is referred to *ipso facto*. The meaning intended in the context is this: That for whose purpose occurs the activity of all the motor and sensory organs is Brahman.

So also He is the *cakṣuṣaḥ cakṣuḥ*, the Eye of the eye; the capacity to perceive colour that the eye, the organ of sight, possesses is merely by virtue of its being presided over by the consciousness of the Self. Hence He is the Eye of

¹ The word *prāṇa* is used in different senses in different contexts. It may mean vital force, exhaling, sense of smell, etc.

the eye. Since a questioner's desire is to know the thing he asks for, the expression, "having known" has to be supplied thus: "Having known Brahman, as the Ear etc. of the ear etc., as indicated before." This (addition) is also necessary, because the result is stated thus, "They become immortal" (Ke. 11.5), and because immortality is attained through realisation. From the fact that a man becomes free after getting realisation, it follows (that he becomes immortal) by giving up, (through the strength of knowledge), the group of organs beginning with the ear; that is to say, since by identifying the Self with the ear etc. a man becomes conditioned by these and takes birth, dies, and transmigrates, therefore having realised, as one's Self, the Brahman that is defined as the "Ear of the ear" etc., and *atimucya*, giving up self-identification with the ear etc. — (he becomes immortal). Those who give up self-identification with the ear etc. are the *dhīvāḥ*, intelligent, because the self-identification with the ear etc. cannot be given up unless one is endowed with uncommon intellect. *Pretya*, desisting; *asmāt lokāt*, from this world of empirical dealings involving ideas of "I and mine" with regard to sons, friends, wives, and relatives; i.e. having renounced all desires; (they) *bhavanti*, become; *amṛtāḥ*, immortal, immune from death. This is in accordance with the Vedic texts: "Not by work, not by progeny, not by wealth, but by renunciation some (rare ones) attained immortality" (Kaivalya Upaniṣad 1.2). "The self-existent Lord destroyed the outgoing senses hence one perceives the external things and not the Self within. A rare, discriminating man, longing for immortality, turned his eyes away and then saw the indwelling Self" (Ka. II. i. 1), "When all desires that cling to one's heart, fall off . . . then one attains Brahman here" (Ka. II. iii. 14), etc. Or renun-

ciation of desires being implied in the expression *atimucya* (giving up) itself, *pretya* means separating from this body, dying.

न तत्र चक्षुर्गच्छति न वाग्गच्छति नो मनः ।

न विद्मो न विजानीमो यथैतदनुशिष्यात् ॥ ३ ॥

3. The eye does not go there, nor speech, nor mind. We do not know (Brahman to be such and such): hence we are not aware of any process of instructing about It.

Since Brahman, as the Ear etc. of the ear etc., is the Self of those organs, therefore, *tatra*, there, to that Brahman; *caṅṣuḥ*, the eye; *na gacchati*, does not go; for it is not possible to go to oneself. Similarly *na vāk gacchati*, speech does not go. When a word, as expressed by the organ of speech, reveals its own idea, speech is said to go to its object. But Brahman is the Self of that word, as also of the organ that utters it; therefore speech does not go. Just as fire, which burns and illumines, does not burn or illumine itself, similarly is this so. *No manaḥ*, nor the mind. Though the mind thinks and determines other things, it does not think or determine itself; for of it, too, Brahman is the Self. A thing is cognised only by the mind and the senses. As Brahman is not an object of perception to these, therefore, *na vidmaḥ*, we do not know. "That Brahman is of this kind". Hence *na vijānmaḥ*, we are not aware of; *yathā*, the process by which; *etat*, this Brahman, *anuśiṣyāt*, should be taught, instructed to a disciple—this is the significance. For a thing that is perceived by the senses can be taught to another through categories denoting class, quality, and action.

Brahman is not possessed of these categories, viz class etc.; hence it is very difficult to convince the disciples about It through instruction. In this way the Upaniṣad shows the necessity of putting forth great effort in the matter of imparting instruction and comprehending its meaning.

The contingency of the total denial of any process of instruction having arisen from the text, "We do not know Brahman, and hence we are not aware of any process of instructing about It", and exception to this is being stated in the next verse. True it is that one cannot impart knowledge about the Highest with the help of such means of valid knowledge as the evidence of the senses; but the knowledge can be produced with the help of traditional authority. Therefore traditional authority¹ is being quoted for the sake of imparting instruction about It:

अन्यदेव तद्विदितादथो अविदितादधि ।

इति शुश्रुम पूर्वेषां ये नस्तद्व्याचक्षिरे ॥ ४ ॥

4. "That (Brahman) is surely different from the known; and again, It is above the unknown" -- such was (the utterance) we heard of the ancient (teachers) who explained It to us.

Anyat eva, different indeed; is *tat*, that, which is the topic under discussion and which has been spoken of as the Ear etc., of the ear etc., and as beyond their reach. It is, indeed, different from the known. The known is that which

¹ The word used by Śaṅkara is *āgama* which literally means traditional knowledge which has come down through the line of teachers and pupils. By quoting traditional teaching one does not expose oneself to the charge of speaking about something that defies speech.

is very much within the grasp of the act of knowing, that which is the object of the verb, "to know". Inasmuch as everything is known somewhere by somebody, all that is manifested is certainly known. The idea is that, It (Brahman) is different from that. Lest, in that case, It should be unknown, the text says, *atho*, again; *aviditāt*, from the unknown, from what is opposed to the known, from that which consists of the unmanifested ignorance, which is the seed of the manifested. The word *adhi*, used in the sense of "above", means "different" by a figure of speech; for it is well known that anything that exists above another is different from that other. Whatever is known is limited, mortal, and full of misery; and hence it is to be rejected. So when it is said that Brahman is different from the known it amounts to asserting that It is not to be rejected. Similarly, when it is affirmed that It is different from the unknown, it amounts to saying that It is not a thing to be obtained. It is for the sake of getting an effect that somebody acquires something different from himself to serve as a cause. For this reason, too, nothing different from the Self need be acquired to serve any purpose distinct from the knower (Self). Thus the statement, that Brahman is different from the known and the unknown, having amounted to Brahman being denied as an object to be acquired or rejected, the desire of the disciple to know Brahman (objectively) comes to an end, for Brahman is non-different from the Self. (Or, according to a different reading --the desire of the disciple to know a Brahman, different from the Self, comes to an end).¹ For nothing other than one's own Self can possibly be different from the known and the unknown. Thus it

¹ The expression concerned is *svātmano'nanyatvāt brahmanaviṣayā jñānāsā*, or *svātmano'nyabrahmanaviṣayā jñānāsā*.

follows that the meaning of the sentence is that the Self is Brahman. And this also follows from such Vedic texts as; "This Self is Brahman" (Mā. 2; Bṛ. II. v. 19, IV. iv. 5), "that Self which is untouched by sin" (Ch. VIII. vii. 1), "the Brahman that is immediate and direct—the Self that is within all" (Bṛ. III. iv. 1), etc. In this way, the text, "Thus we heard" etc., states how through a succession of preceptors and disciples was derived the purport of the sentence which establishes as Brahman that Self of all which is devoid of distinguishing features, and is the light of pure consciousness. Moreover, Brahman can be known only through such a traditional instruction of preceptors and not through argumentation, nor by study (or exposition), intelligence, great learning, austerity, sacrifices, etc.—*itī*, such (was what); *śuśrūma*, we heard; *pūrveṣāṃ*, of the ancient teachers, i.e. the utterance of those ancient teachers; *ye*, who; *uāh*, to us; *tat*, that Brahman; *vyācakakṣire*, explained, spoke clearly.

The idea that the Self is Brahman having been established through the sentence, "That is surely different from the known, and, again, that is above the unknown", the hearer has this doubt: "How can the Self be Brahman? For the Self is familiarly known to be that which is entitled to undertake rites and meditation and which, being subject to birth and death, seeks to attain either the gods headed by Brahmā (Creator) or heaven through the performance of rites or meditation. Therefore some adorable being other than that (Self), e.g. Viṣṇu, Īśvara (Śiva), Indra, or Prāṇa (vital force or Hiranyagarbha) may well be Brahman, but not so the Self; for this is opposed to common sense. Just as other logicians say that the Self is different from the Lord, so also the ritualists worship other gods saying,

'Sacrifice to that one', 'Sacrifice to that one'. Therefore it is reasonable that, that should be Brahman which is known and adorable; and the worshipper should be one who is different from this." Having noticed this doubt either from the looks or the words of the disciple, the teacher said, "Don't be in doubt"

यद्वाचाऽनभ्युदितं येन वागभ्युद्यते ।

तदेव ब्रह्म त्वं विद्धि नेदं यदिदमुपासते ॥ ५ ॥

5. That which is not uttered by speech that by which speech is revealed, know that alone to be Brahman, and not what people worship as an object.

Yat, that which, whose essence consists of Consciousness alone. *Vāk* (speech) is the organ which, clinging to the eight localities¹ and being presided over by (the god of) Fire, expresses the letters. The letters, too, as limited in their number and as subject to a certain sequence, in conformity with the meaning intended to be conveyed, are also called *vāk*.² Thus also the sound expressible by them, which is the *pada* (*sphoṭa*),³ is called *vāk*. This is in accordance

¹ Chest, throat, head, root of the tongue, teeth, nose, lips, and palate

² The word *gat* (cow), for instance, consists of the letter *g* and *au* which are fixed as regards their sequence so as to be able to express the meaning cow. This is the view of the Mīmāṃsaka school.

³ This is the view of the Sphoṭavādi grammarians. "*Sphoṭa* is derived from the root *sphaṭ* in the sense of *that which is manifested* by letters, i.e. that which imparts definite knowledge of word (*pada*), sentence, etc. Their idea is that this (*pada*-) *sphoṭa* has to be admitted since a unified idea (conveyed by the word) cannot be contingent on a multiplicity of letters."—A.G.

with the Vedic text: "The letter *a*, indeed, is all speech.¹ And that speech, being manifested as the *sparsā* letters, the *antaḥstha* letters (semi-vowels), and *uṣma* letters (aspirates),² becomes many and multifarious" (Ai. Ā. II. iii. 7.13). *Vācā*, by *vāk*, by speech, which has these modifications, viz regulated (metrical, *Rk*) non-regulated (prose, *Yajuh*), musical (*Sāma*), true, and false—by that *vāk* which becomes defined as words and to which the organ of speech is subordinate.³ (*Yat*, that which) is *anabhyuditam*, not expressed, not uttered; *ycna*, that by which, by Brahman, by the light of Consciousness; *vāk*, speech, together with its organs; *abhyudiyate*, is uttered, is expressed, that is to say, is engaged. That which has been spoken of here as "the Speech of speech" (Kc. 1. 2), and as "When It speaks, It is called the organ of speech" (Bṛ. I. iv. 7) and "He who controls the organ of speech from within" (Bṛ. III. vii. 17), etc., in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, and about whom the question has been raised thus, "The (power of) speech; that is found in men, is established in sounds. Does any Brāhmaṇa know it?" and the answer has been given by saying, "That by which one speaks in dream is speech"—that eternal power of speech that a speaker has is *vāk* which is in essence the light of Consciousness. And this follows from the Vedic text, "For the speaker's power of speech can never be lost" (Bṛ. IV. iii. 26). *Tat eva*, that indeed, that Self in its true nature; *tvam*, you; *viddhi*, know; as *brahma*,

¹ "That Power of Consciousness is *vāk* which is indicated by *Om*, in which *a* predominates, (*Om* being a combination of *a*, *u*, *m*), and this *Om* is called *sphaṭā*."—A.G.

² *Sparsā*—25 consonants from *k* to *m*; *antaḥstha*—*y*, *r*, *l*, *v*; *uṣma*—*ś*, *ṣ*, *ṣ*, *h*.

³ "The power of speech that human beings have, is established in sounds and letters, for it is expressed by these."

Brahman—(so called) because of its extensity (or unsurpassability)—that which is all-surpassing and is called Bhūmā, great (Ch. VII. xxiii. 1). The significance of the word *eva* is this: Know the Self alone to be the unconditioned Brahman after eradicating all such things as speech because of which adjuncts there occur such empirical expressions, with regard to the transcendental, unconditioned, unsurpassing, and equipoised Brahman, as “It is the Speech of speech”, “the Eye of the eye”, “the Ear of the ear”, “the Mind of mind”, the agent, the enjoyer, the controller, the knower, governor. “Consciousness, Bliss, Brahman” (Br. III. ix. 28.7), etc. *Na idam*, this is not; *brahma*, Brahman; *yat*, which; people *upāsate*, meditate on; as *idam*, this, (as a limited object) possessed of distinctions created by limiting adjuncts—as a non-Self e.g. God etc. Although in the sentence, “know that alone to be Brahman” it has already been stated that the non-Self is not Brahman, still with a view to enunciating an explicit rule (that leaves no scope for option) the idea is repeated in the sentence, “This is not Brahman”; or this may be with a view to excluding the identification of Brahman with what is not Brahman.¹

यन्मनसा न मनूते येनाहुर्मनो मतम् ।

तदेव ब्रह्म त्वं विद्धि नेदं यदिदमुपासते ॥ ६ ॥

6. That which man does not comprehend with the mind, that by which, they say, the

¹ In Mīmāṃsā philosophy *Nyāna-vidhi* pins one down to one thing only when alternatives are possible. Here the possibilities are, thinking of both Brahman and non-Brahman as Brahman. And the rule fixes us to the pursuit of Brahman only. *Parisaṅkhyā-vidhi* merely excludes something—here the thought of non-Brahman as Brahman. So the text may be interpreted from either point of view.

mind is encompassed, know that to be Brahman and not what people worship as an object.

Manas means the internal organ, mind and intellect being taken as one entity. The word *manas*, derived from the root *man* in the sense of that by which one thinks, is common to all organs, since it embraces all objects. In accordance with the Vedic text, "Desire, deliberation, doubt, faith, want of faith, steadiness, unsteadiness, shame, intelligence, and fear—all these are but the mind" (Br. I. v. 3), mind is that which has desire etc. as its functions. *Yat*, that which—the light of Consciousness which illumines the mind; one *na manute*, does not think or determine, by that mind, because It rules the mind by virtue of being the enlightener of the mind. Since the Self, indeed, constitutes the essence of everything, therefore the mind cannot act with regard to its own Self. The mind can think only when it is illumined by the light of Consciousness within. That Brahman, *yena*, by which—they, the knowers of Brahman, *ābhuḥ*, say—*manas*, the mind, together with its modes; *matam*, is thought of, encompassed. Therefore *viddhi*, know, *tat eva*, that very one, the Self of the mind, the internal illuminator; as Brahman. *Na idam*, etc. is to be understood as before.

यच्चक्षुषा न पश्यति येन चक्षुषि पश्यति ।

तदेव ब्रह्म त्वं विद्धि नेदं यदिदमपासते ॥ ७ ॥

7. That which man does not see with the eyes, that by which man perceives the activities of the eye, know that alone to be Brahman and not what people worship as an object.

Yat, that which; *caḅṣuṣā*, with the eye, as associated with the functions of the internal organ; *na paśyati*, (man) does not see, does not make an object of perception; *yena*, that by which; man *paśyati*, sees, perceives, encompasses, through the light of Consciousness; *caḅṣūmṣi*, the activities of the eye—diversified in accordance with the modes of the internal organ. *Tat eva*, etc., as before.

यच्छ्रोत्रेण न शृणोति येन श्रोत्रमिदं श्रुतम् ।
तदेव ब्रह्म त्वं विद्धि नेदं यदिदमुपासते ॥ ८ ॥

8. That which man does not hear with the ear, that by which man knows this ear, know that to be Brahman and not this that people worship as an object.

Yat śrotreṇa na śṛṇoti, that which man does not hear with the ear, that is presided over by the deity of the quarters, that is produced from *ākāśa*, and that is connected with the activity of the mind; *yena*, that by which, by the light of Consciousness; *idam śrotam śrutam*, this well-known ear is encompassed; *Tat eva*, etc., as before.

यत्प्राणेन न प्राणिति येन प्राणः प्रणीयते ।

तदेव ब्रह्म त्वं विद्धि नेदं यदिदमुपासते ॥ ९ ॥

इति केनोपनिषदि प्रथमः खण्डः ॥

9. That which man does not smell with the organ of smell, that by which the organ of smell is impelled, know that to be Brahman and not what people worship as an object.

Prāṇena, by the organ of smell, produced from earth, existing in the nostrils, and associated with the activities of the internal organ and the vital force; *yāt*, that which; man *na prāṇīti* does not smell, does not comprehend like smell; *yena*, that by which light of the Self; *prāṇaḥ*, the organ of smell--being illumined as an object; *praṇīyate*, is impelled--towards its own object. All the rest, *tat eva* etc., is just like what has gone before.

PART II

यदि मन्यसे सुवेदेति दहरमेवापि

ननं त्वं वेत्थ ब्रह्मणो रूपम् ।

यदस्य त्वं यदस्य देवेष्वथ न

मीमांस्यमेव ते मन्ये विदितम् ॥ १ ॥

1. (Teacher): If you think, "I have known Brahman well enough", then you have known only the very little expression that It has in the human body and the little expression that It has among the gods. Therefore Brahman is still to be deliberated on by you. (Disciple): "I think (Brahman) is known."

Fearing that the disciple, to whom has been brought home the conviction, "You are the Self, which is opposed to the acceptable and the unacceptable, and which is Brahman", may jump to the conclusion, "I know myself well enough that I, indeed, am Brahman", the teacher, with a view to dispelling that notion of the disciple, says, "If you think" etc.

Objection: Is not such a firm conviction as, "I know well enough", desirable?

Answer: True, a firm conviction is desirable but not such a one as, "I know It well enough." That knowable thing alone that falls within the range of cognition can be known thoroughly, just as an inflammable substance becomes consumable to a fire that burns it, but not so the essence itself of the fire. The well-ascertained purport of

all the Upaniṣads is that the personal Self of each Knower is Brahman. Here, too, the same fact has been established in the form of an answer to questions, in the text beginning with, "That which is the Ear of the ear" etc. (I. 2); and the same has been specifically affirmed in the text, "That which is not uttered by speech" (I. 5). Besides, the positive conclusion of the (traditional) line of knowers of Brahman has been adduced in the text: "That is surely different from the known; and again, It is above the unknown" (I. 4). And the topic will be concluded thus: "It is unknown to those who know well, and known to those who do not know" (II. 3). Hence it is proper to dispel the disciple's notion: "I know well enough." For the knower cannot be known by the knower, just as fire cannot be consumed by the consuming fire; and there is no other knower different from Brahman to whom Brahman can become a separate knowable. A separate knower is denied by the Vedic text: "There is no other knower but this" (Br. III. viii. 11). Therefore the conviction, "I know Brahman well enough", is certainly false. Hence the teacher has justifiably said, "If you think" etc.

Yadi, if perchance; *manyase*, you think; *Su veda iti*, "I know Brahman well enough." Although the entity may be inscrutable, yet some one who is possessed of real wisdom and who is free from defects, may at some time comprehend It, whereas some one else may not; hence the teacher says with hesitation, "If you think" etc. And it has been noticed that when it was declared, "The person that is perceived in the eye—this is the Self", so said he (Prajāpati). 'This is immortal, fearless—this is Brahman' " (Ch. VIII. vii. 4). Virocana, though he was a son of Prajāpati, and a scholar, and a king of the demons, still, owing to his natural

defects, understood, contrary to what was taught, an opposite object, viz the body, to be the Self. Similarly, Indra, the king of the gods, who could not comprehend when instructed once, twice, and thrice, did, at the fourth stage, when his natural defects had been removed, realise the same Brahman that was spoken of at the very initial stage (Ch. VIII. vii-xii). In ordinary life also it is seen that, of the disciples hearing from the same teacher, some one understands accurately, some one inaccurately, some one contrarily, and some one nothing at all. What more need one speak with regard to (the knowledge of) the real nature of the Self which is beyond the senses? In this matter, indeed, all dialecticians, whether they believe in (the) existence or non-existence (of the Self), have got their misconceptions. Therefore though the statement, "Brahman has been realised", has been made with firm conviction, still the teacher's apprehensive remark, "If you think" etc., is quite appropriate in view of the unwarranted comprehensions. *Tvam, you; vetha, know; nūnam, certainly; daharam¹ rūpam eva api, the very little form (i.e. expression); brahmanam, of Brahman.*

Objection: Are there many forms of Brahman, great and small, because of which it is said, "very little form" etc.?

Answer: Quite so. Many, indeed, are the aspects of Brahman created by conditions of name and form, but not naturally. From its own standpoint, forms, together with words, are denied thus: "That which is without sound, touch, form, and destruction; likewise tasteless, everlasting, and odourless" (Ka. I. iii. 15; Nr. 9; Muk. II. 72).

¹ A different reading is *dabham*, having the same sense.

Objection: Is it not a fact that the very attribute by which a thing is determined is its own nature? Therefore that very distinctive feature by which Brahman is defined must be Its nature. Hence it is argued that since consciousness cannot be an attribute of any one of (the elements) earth etc., nor can it be of all of them in their transformation (as body), and as it is not an attribute of either of (the senses such as) the ear etc., or of the internal organ (mind), therefore it is a feature of Brahman; and thus is Brahman defined by consciousness. Thus it has been said, "Knowledge, Bliss, Brahman" (Br. III. ix. 28.7) "Pure intelligence only" (Br. II. iv. 12), "Brahman is Truth, Knowledge, Infinite" (Tai. II. i. 1), "Brahman is consciousness" (Ai. V. 3) —thus, too, is the feature of Brahman determined in the Vedic texts.

Answer: Truly this is so. But even so, that aspect is indicated, not from the intrinsic point of view, but merely with reference to the limiting adjuncts —mind, body, and senses; and this is because of Its correspondence with those things, in accordance as the body etc. undergo expansion, contraction, disruption, etc., or are destroyed. But in reality, the conclusion will be: "unknown to those who know well, and known to those who do not know" (Ke. II. 3).

The expression, *yat asya*, should be construed with the expression, *brahmaṇaḥ rūpam* (the aspect of Brahman), that preceded it. (meaning thereby: that form of Brahman which). Not only do you know little of the expression of that Brahman that is conditioned by the human personality, but the expression of Brahman as conditioned by divine adjuncts, which you *deveṣu vettha*, know among the gods, that too, as known to you, is very little indeed. This is how I think. Whether the expression be in the human

personality or whether it be among the gods, it does not become freed from insignificance, since it is conditioned by adjuncts. The purport is that the Brahman, that is free from all distinctions, that is one without a second, and that known as Bhūmā (great) and eternal, cannot be known as a fully comprehended object. Since this is so, *atha nu*, therefore; *manye*, I think; *te*, for you; even now, Brahman is *mīmāṃsyaṃ eva*, certainly to be deliberated on. The disciple having been told so by the teacher, sat in solitude with his mind concentrated, discussed the traditional teaching, as imparted by the teacher, together with its purport, ascertained it by a process of reasoning, made it a matter of personal experience, approached the teacher, and said, “*Manye*, (now) I think; (Brahman) is *viditam*, known.”

(Teacher): “How (is Brahman known to you)?”
(Disciple): “Listen!” —

नाह मन्ये मुवेदेति नो न वेदेति वेद च ।
यो नस्तद्वेद तद्वेद नो न वेदेति वेद च ॥ २ ॥

2. “I do not think, ‘I know (Brahman) well enough’: (i.e. I consider) ‘Not that I do not know: I know and I do not know as well.’ He among us who understands that utterance, ‘Not that I do not know: I know and I do not know as well’, knows that (Brahman).”

Na aham n. mye suveda iti, I do not think, “I know Brahman well enough.” Being told (by the teacher), “Then Brahman is not certainly known by you”, (the disciple) replies, “*No na veda iti, veda ca*, not that I do not know Brahman: and I know, too.” From the use of the word *ca*

(and), in the expression *veda ca*, we are to understand, “*Na veda ca*, and I do not know, as well.”

(Teacher): Is it not contradictory (to say), “I do not think, ‘I know (Brahman) well enough,’ ” and “Not that I do not know: I know and I do not know as well”? If you do not consider, “I know well enough”, then how can you consider, “I know too”? Again if you consider, “I do know”, then why do you not consider, “I know well enough”? Leaving out of consideration doubt and false knowledge, it is a contradiction to say that the very same thing which is known by a man is not known well enough by him. Nor can a restrictive rule be laid down to the effect that Brahman is to be known as an object of doubt or false knowledge. For doubt and false knowledge are, indeed, everywhere known to be the causes of harm.

Though the disciple was thus given a shaking by the teacher, he remained unmoved. Moreover, revealing his own firm conviction in the knowledge of Brahman, he boldly declared with the strength derived from the traditional knowledge as imparted by the teacher in the sentence, “It is different from the known and is also above the unknown”, as also from the strength derived from reasoning and (personal) realisation. How (did he declare)? That is being said: “*Yah*, anyone who; *naḥ*, among us, among my co-disciples; *veda*, knows in reality; *tat*, that, that sentence uttered by me; he *veda*, knows; *tat*, Brahman.” (Teacher): “What again is your assertion?” To this he answers: “*No na veda iti veda ca*, not that I do not know: I know and I do not know as well.” With a view to showing his concurrence with the idea of the teacher and counteracting the comprehension of people of dull intellect, the disciple repeated with conviction in another language, viz “Not that I do not

know: I know and I do not know as well", the very same thing which was presented in the sentence, "It is different from the known and it is above the unknown"; and in doing so, he associated with this his own inference and realisation. Thus the exclamation, "He among us who understands that utterance knows that Brahman", becomes justifiable.

Stepping aside from the dialogue between the teacher and the taught, the Upaniṣad, speaking for itself, presents in these words, *yasyāmatam* etc., the whole of the conclusion arrived at through the dialogue:

यस्यामतं तस्य मतं मतं यस्य न वेद सः ।

अविज्ञातं विजानतां विज्ञातमविजानताम् ॥ ३ ॥

3. It is known to him to whom It is unknown; he does not know to whom It is known. It is unknown to those who know well, and known to those who do not know.

To that knower of Brahman, *yasya*, to whom; *amatam*, unknown; whose view, conviction, is that Brahman is not known; *tasya*, to him; *matam*, is known, Brahman is fully known—that is the meaning. Again, *yasya*, he to whom; *matam*, known; he who has the conviction, "Brahman is known to me"; *sah*, he; *na veda*, does not know; to be sure. The two views of the man of knowledge and the man of ignorance, which are thus presented, are being distinctly affirmed (in the second line), *avijñātam vijñātām* etc. *Avijñātam*, not known; Brahman is in fact unknown to *vijñātām*, to the people who know that is to say, to those who have fully realised. Brahman, is *vijñātam*, known;

avijānatam, to those who do not know, to those who have not got full realisation—that is to say, to those who identify the Self merely with the senses, the mind, and the intellect, but not to those whose intelligence is extremely primitive, (these latter being left out of consideration), for the latter do not have the consciousness, “Brahman is known by us”. The error involved in the idea, “Brahman is known to us”, is possible for those, however, who, by reason of non-discrimination between Brahman and the limiting adjuncts and because of their familiarity with the limiting adjuncts such as the intellect, consider the senses, the mind, and the intellect as the Self. Hence the incomplete knowledge is presented as a view to be refuted in the text, “known to those who do not know”. Or the latter half (of the verse, viz) *avijñātam* etc., is adduced as a reason (for the first half).¹

It has been ascertained that Brahman is unknown to those who know. If Brahman be wholly unknown, then there remains no distinction between the ordinary people and the knowers of Brahman. Besides, the statement, “unknown to those who know”, is self-contradictory. How then can Brahman be known adequately? To explain this the Upaniṣad says:

प्रतिबोधविदितं मतममृतत्वं हि विन्दते ।

आत्मना विन्दते वीर्यं विद्यया विन्दतेऽमृतम् ॥ ४ ॥

¹ “Just as in common experience it is well known that to the people, aware of the nature of the mother of pearl, the silver superimposed on it remains unknown (on that mother of pearl) but to the ignorant alone the superimposed silver is known (as silver), similarly, knowableness being a thing superimposed on Brahman, the men of realisation do not consider that Brahman as known.”—A.G.

4. It (i.e. Brahman) is really known when It is known with (i.e. as the Self of) each state of consciousness, because thereby one gets immortality. (Since) through one's own Self is acquired strength, (therefore) through knowledge is attained immortality.

Pratibodha-viditam, known with reference to each state of intelligence. By the word *bodha* are meant the cognitions acquired through the intellect. The Self, that encompasses all ideas as Its objects, is known in relation to all these ideas. Being the witness of all cognitions, and by nature nothing but the power of consciousness, the Self is indicated by the cognitions themselves, in the midst of cognitions, as non-different from them. There is no other door to Its awareness. Therefore when Brahman is known as the innermost Self (i.e. witness) of cognitions, then is It *matam*, known, that is to say, then there is Its complete realisation. Only by accepting Brahman as the witness of all cognitions can it be established that It is by nature a witness that is not subject to growth and decay, and is eternal, pure in essence, the Self, unconditioned, and one in all beings,¹ just as it is in the case of *ākāśa* (space) because of the non-difference of its characteristics despite its existence in pots, caves, etc. The purport of that very traditional text, "It is different from the known, and again It is above the unknown" (Ke. I. 4) which is thus clarified, is concluded here.

¹ "Since the reality of my consciousness, by virtue of which I am the witness, exists equally in all, I am not a mere witness in a single body. And since difference, origination, etc. do not inhere in the witness, therefore the non-duality, eternity, etc. of the witness are also established."—A.G.

For (in support of this) there is the other Vedic text: "The Witness of vision, the Hearer of hearing, the Thinker of thought, the Knower of knowledge" (Bṛ. III. IV. 2).

On the other hand, the explanation may run like this: "The Self being the agent of the act of knowing, one infers It to be the agent of the action from the fact of the cognitive act itself, just as one knows that to be the wind which moves a tree"; if this be the explanation, then the Self is a substance possessed of the power of knowing, but It is not the knowledge itself; and as for knowledge, it originates and dies; when knowledge originates, the Self becomes modified by it; and when knowledge dies, the Self becomes nothing but an unmodified substance with Its intelligence destroyed. In such a case, one cannot avoid the objection that the Self (thereby) becomes changeable, composed of parts, non-eternal, impure, etc.

As for the (following) view of the school of Kaṇāda, "Knowledge, arising from the contact of the soul and the mind, inheres in the soul; hence is the soul endowed with knowership. But it is not changeable; it is merely a substance just like a pot in which colour inheres" --since according to this view, too, Brahman is a mere substance without consciousness, it contradicts such Vedic texts as, "Knowledge, Bliss, Brahman" (Bṛ. III. ix. 28.7), "Brahman is Consciousness" (Ai. V. 3). And as the soul is partless and hence has no locality in it, and as the mind is ever in contact with it, the consequent illogicality of admitting any law regarding the origination of memory becomes insurmountable. Besides, one has to imagine that the Self can have the attribute of coming in contact with others, which idea is repugnant to the Vedas and the Smṛtis; for such are the Vedic and Smṛti texts: "Unattached, for It is never at-

tached" (Br. III. ix. 26), "It is unconnected, and is the supporter of all" (G. XIII. 14). Moreover, since logic demands that a thing that has attributes, and is not of a different category, can come into contact with another having attributes, therefore it is illogical to hold that the Self which is attributeless, undifferentiated, and distinct from everything else, can come into contact with anything whatsoever that does not belong to the same category. Hence if the Self is the witness of all cognitions, then and not otherwise is established the idea that the Self, which is an effulgence that is in reality eternal and undecaying knowledge, is Brahman. Therefore the expression *pratibodha-viditam* has the meaning as explained by us.

As for the explanation, "The expression, *pratibodha-viditam* means that the Self is known to oneself", it is possible in a context where the Self appears as a conditioned thing through identification with the limiting adjunct, intellect, so as to have such apparent activities as knowing the Self by the self (referred to in the texts): "Sees the Self in his own self" (Br. IV. iv. 23), "O Puruṣottama, (lit. Supreme Puruṣa, i.e. Being) you yourself know your Self through the self" (G. X. 15). But in a context where the unconditioned Self is one, there can neither be knowing by oneself nor by another. Besides, It being by nature Consciousness Itself, there can be no dependence on another consciousness, just as a light does not depend on another light.

If the fact of being known to oneself is held in accordance with the Buddhist theory, then knowledge becomes momentary and is left without a Self (Reality); and this will contradict such Vedic texts as: "For the knower's function of knowing can never be lost, because it is immortal" (Br. IV. iii. 30), "Eternal, multiformed, all-pervading" (Mu. I. i.

6), "That great birthless Self is undecaying, immortal, undying, fearless" (Bṛ. IV. iv. 25).

Others, again, imagine that by the word *pratibodha* is meant uncaused knowledge, as in the case of a sleeping man, while according to still others it is the knowledge that flashes but once.¹ (To this we say): Whether it be caused or uncaused, and whether it flashes once or twice, it is *pratibodha* to be sure.

Hi, because; *vindate*, (one) attains; *amṛtatvam*, immortality, existence in one's own Self, emancipation -by virtue of the aforesaid *pratibodha*, i.e. from the knowledge of the Self as appearing with reference to (i.e. as the witness of) each state of consciousness, therefore the Self is truly known when It is known along with each state of consciousness. Besides, consciousness, as having the indwelling Self as its content, is alone held to be the cause of immortality. Immortality does not surely consist in the Self becoming a non-Self. Immortality being the very nature of the Self, it is certainly without any cause. And thus mortality consists in the Self being perceived as the non-Self through ignorance.

How, again, is immortality attained through the aforesaid knowledge of the Self? This is being answered. *Ātmanā* through one's own Self; *vindate*, (one) attains; *vīryam*, strength, capacity. The strength got from wealth, friend, incantation, medicine, austerity, or Yoga cannot conquer death, for it is produced by impermanent things. But the strength, consequent on the knowledge of the Self, is

¹ "Once the unchanging Self is realised, there can no more be any knowership and therefore no possibility of further knowledge. Hence the knowledge that flashes but once and becomes the cause of immediate emancipation is called *pratibodha*."—A.G.

acquired through the Self alone and not through anything else. Thus, since the strength resulting from the knowledge of the Self is independent of any means of acquisition, that strength alone is able to conquer death. Since the strength produced by the knowledge of the Self is thus attained through the Self, therefore, *vidyayā*, through knowledge about the Self; (one) *vindate*, attains; *amṛtam*, immortality. In the Upaniṣad of the Atharva-Veda it is said, "This Self is not to be attained by one who has no strength, (resulting from steadfastness in the Self)" (Mu. III. ii. 4). Therefore the statement of the reason, "because thereby one attains immortality"; is quite appropriate.

Pitiable, indeed, it is to suffer through ignorance, birth, old age, death, disease, etc., among multitudes of beings such as gods, men, animals, ghosts, etc., in whom there is an abundance of misery natural to transmigratory existence. Therefore,

इह चेदवेदीदथ सत्यमस्ति

न चेदिहावेदीन्महती विनष्टिः ।

भूतेषु भूतेषु विचित्य धीराः

प्रेत्यास्माल्लोकादमृता भवन्ति ॥ ५ ॥

इति केनोपनिषदि द्वितीयः खण्डः ॥

5. If one has realised here, then there is truth; if he has not realised here, then there is great destruction. The wise once, having realised (Brahman) in all beings, and having turned away from this world, become immortal.

Cet, if—a man having scriptural sanction and ability; *avedit*, has known—the Self as defined and in the manner already explained; *iha*, here, indeed; *atha* then; *asti satyam*, there is truth, there subsist in this human birth the values consisting in long life, wealth, and holiness,¹ or supreme reality. *Iha*, here, even while living, *cet*, if; a competent man *na avidit*, has not realised; then there is *mahatī*, great, interminable; *vināṣṭiḥ* destruction, transmigratory existence consisting in non-cessation of a continuous succession of birth, old age, death, etc. Therefore the *dhirāḥ*, wise, Brāhmaṇas (the knowers of Brahman), who are thus familiar with merits and demerits; *vicitya*, having known, realised, the one reality of the Self; *bhūteṣu bhūteṣu*, in all beings moving and unmoving; *pretya*, turning away from, desisting from this world of ignorance—the world consisting of “I and mine”—i.e. having attained the non-dual state consisting in becoming identified with the Self of all; *amṛtāḥ bhavanti*, become immortal, become Brahman indeed—this is the idea; as it has been said in the Vedic text: “He who knows that supreme Brahman becomes Brahman indeed” (Mu. III. ii. 9).

¹ “This is said by way of eulogy. (The idea is that) even worldly reality (or value), comprising long life (*avināśa*), wealth (*arthavattā*), holiness (*sadbhāva*), and fame, comes to the knower of Brahman (as a by-product). In reality, the result consisting in being established in Brahman follows as a necessary consequence.”—A.G.

PART III

ब्रह्म ह देवेभ्यो विजिग्ये तस्य ह ब्रह्मणो विजये देवा
अमहीयन्त ॥ १ ॥

1. It was Brahman, indeed, that achieved victory for the sake of the gods. In that victory, that was in fact Brahman's, the gods became elated.

After hearing the text, "unknown to those who know well, and known to those who do not know" etc. (Ke. II. 3), some people of dull intellect may have this kind of delusion: "It is seen that whatever exists is known through the valid means of cognition; and whatever does not exist remains unknown, is like the horns of a hare, and is absolutely non-existent. Similarly, this Brahman, being unknown, is certainly non-existent"; lest there be this delusion, this story is begun. For the subsequent passages are seen to be leading to this conclusion: "Since that very Brahman is the ruler in every way, the supreme Deity of even the deities, the supreme Lord over the lordly beings, inscrutable, the cause of victory of the gods, and the cause of the defeat of the devils, therefore, how can It be non-existent?" Or the story is meant to eulogise the knowledge of Brahman. How? By saying that it was surely by virtue of the knowledge of Brahman, that Fire and other gods attained supremacy over the gods, and Indra got greater pre-eminence still. Or (through the story) it is shown that Brahman is inscrutable, inasmuch as Fire and others, powerful though they are, knew Brahman with sheer difficulty, and so also did Indra,

even though he is the ruler of the gods. Or the whole thing is meant to enjoin an injunction regarding the secret teachings (about meditations) that will follow¹ (Ke. IV. 4-7). Or the story is meant to show that apart from the knowledge of Brahman all notions of agentship etc. that creatures possess, as for instance the conceit of the gods with regard to victory etc., are false.

Brahman, the supreme Brahman already spoken of; *ha*, verily; *devebhyaḥ*, for the sake of the gods; *vijigye*, achieved victory. In a fight between the gods and the devils, Brahman, after conquering the devils, the enemies of the world and transgressors of divine rules, gave to the gods the victory and its results for ensuring the stability of the world. *Tasya ha Brahmanāḥ vijaye*, in that victory which was, indeed, Brahman's; *devāḥ* the gods, Fire etc.; *amaḥīyanta*, became elated.

त ऐक्षन्तास्माकमेवायं विजयोऽस्माकमेवायं महिमेति ।
तद्वैषां विजज्ञौ तेभ्यो ह प्रादुर्बभूव तन्न व्यजानत किमिदं
यक्षमिति ॥ २ ॥

2. They thought, "Ours, indeed, is this victory; ours, indeed, is this glory." Brahman knew this pretension of theirs. To them He did

¹ "The realisation of the Self as Brahman, which is meant for the most advanced ones and which is not an object of knowledge, has been spoken of earlier. Later will be stated the meditation on the qualified Brahman which is for the less advanced people. The following passages present that meditation, for the injunction for it is clearly to be seen (in IV. 6-7). So the real significance lies in this. As for the other interpretations (advanced by Śaṅkara), they are merely by way of showing possibilities."—A.G.

appear. They could not make out about that thing,¹ as to what this Yakṣa (venerable Being) might be.

Then not knowing that this victory and this glory belonged to God who sits in the hearts as the indwelling Self—omniscient, dispenser of the fruits of all works of all creatures, omnipotent, and desirous of encompassing the stability of the world—*te*, they, those gods; *aikṣanta*, thought; “*Ayam Vijayaḥ*, this victory, achieved by those who identify themselves with such limited beings as Fire etc.; is *asmākam eva*, ours indeed. *Asmākam eva*, ours indeed, and not of God who is our indwelling Self; is *ayam mahimā*, this glory evidenced by such states as of Fire, Air, Indra, etc., which are experienced by us as the result of victory. This has not been achieved by God who is our indwelling Self.” Brahman *ha*, surely; *vijajñau*, knew; *tat*, that, that deliberation of those whose thoughts were being directed by a false self-conceit; for Brahman is omniscient by virtue of being the director of the senses of all creatures. Noticing this false pride of the gods, and thinking, “In order that the gods may not be thus defeated like the devils, as a consequence of their vain-glory, I shall, out of grace for them, favour the gods by removing their presumptuousness”; *tebhyaḥ*, to the gods, for their sake; *ha*, indeed; through an unprecedentedly wonderful and astonishing form created by Brahman’s own power of *Māyā*;² *prādurbabhūva*, appeared as an

¹ Could not solve this riddle about the Brahman, appearing in the form of Yakṣa.

² “The *yoga*, or the combination, of attributes—*Sattva*, *Rajas*, and *Tamas* is *Māyā*. Through the power of that.”—A.G.

object of perception to the senses of the gods. The gods *na vyajānata*, did not comprehend; *tat*, that, the Brahman, as appearing; *kim iti*, as to what; *idam yakṣam*, this venerable great Being, might be.

तेऽग्निमब्रुवञ्जातवेद एतद्विजानीहि किमिदं यक्षमिति
तथेति ॥ ३ ॥

3. They said to Fire, "O Jātavedā, find out thoroughly about this thing as to what this Yakṣa is." He said, "So be it."

Te, they—those gods who failed to know It, and were desirous of knowing It, but had fear in their hearts; *agnim*, to Fire, (lit.) who goes ahead (of all); and who is *jātavedā*, almost omniscient;¹ *abruvam*, said: O Jātavedā, you being powerful among us *vijānīhi*, thoroughly find out about; *etat*, this Yakṣa that is in our view; *kim etat yakṣam iti*, as to what this Yakṣa (venerable Being) is.

तदभ्यद्रवत्तमभ्यवदत्कोऽसीत्यग्निर्वा अहमस्मीत्यब्रवी-
ञ्जातवेदा वा अहमस्मीति ॥ ४ ॥

4. To It he went. To him It said, "Who are you?" He said, "I am known as Fire, or I am Jātavedā."

Saying, "*Tathā*, so be it", *iti*, this much; Fire *tat*, towards that Yakṣa; *adrāvāt*, approached; Fire moved towards It. *Tam*, to him, to Fire, who had approached

¹ Agni precedes all other deities (*agre gacchati*) in receiving oblations at sacrifices; and Jātavedā is one who knows (*veṅta*) all that is created (*Jāta*).

and was desirous of asking, but had become silent because of absence of arrogance in Its presence, the Yakṣa, *abhyavadat*, said; “*Kaḥ asi iti*, who are you?” Thus being asked by Brahman, Fire said, “*Agniḥ vai*, I am Fire (*agni*) by name, and am also familiarly known as *Jāta-vedā*”, showing thereby his self-importance consisting in his being well known through the two names.

तस्मिन्स्त्वयि किं वीर्यमित्यपीदं सर्वं दहेयं यदिदं
पृथिव्यामिति ॥ ५ ॥

5. (It said), “What power is there in you, such as you are?” (Fire said), “I can burn up all this that is on the earth.”

To him, who had spoken thus, Brahman said, “*Tasmin tvayi*, in you who are such, who possess such famous names and attributes. *kim vīryam* what power, what ability, is there?” He replied, *daheyam*, I can burn up, reduce to ashes. *idam saivam*, all this creation that moves and does not move: *prithivyām*, on this earth. The word *prithivyām* is used illustratively (to indicate everything), for even things that are in the region above the earth are surely consumed by fire.

तस्मै तृणं निदधावेतद्देहि । तदुपप्रेयाय सर्वजवेन तन्न
शशाक दग्धु स तत एव निववृते नैतदशकं विज्ञातुं यदे-
तद्यक्षमिति ॥ ६ ॥

6. (Yakṣa) placed a straw for him saying, “Burn this.” (Fire) approached the straw with the power born of full enthusiasm. He could

not consume it. He returned from the Yakṣa (to tell the gods), "I could not ascertain It fully as to what this Yakṣa is."

Tasmai, for him, who had such presumption : Brahman *trṇam nidadhau*, placed a straw, in front of Fire. Being told by Brahman, "*Etat*, this, mere straw; *daha*, burn, in my front. If you are not able to burn it, give up your vanity as a consumer everywhere." (Fire) *tat upapreyāya*, went near that straw: *sarvajavena*, with the speed born of the fullest enthusiasm. Going there, *tat*, that thing; *na śasāka dagdhum*, he could not burn. That Fire being unable to burn the straw and becoming ashamed and foiled in his promise, *tataḥ eva*, from that Yakṣa; silently *nivavṛte*, withdrew, and went back towards the gods (to tell them), "*Na āsakam*, I did not succeed; *viññātum*, in knowing fully, *etat*, this Yakṣa: *yat etat Yakṣam*, as to what this Yakṣa is."

अथ वायुमबुवन्वायवेतद्विजानीहि किमेतद्यधमिति तथेति

॥ ७ ॥

7. Then (the gods) said to Air, "O Air, find out thoroughly about this thing as to what this Yakṣa is." (Air said), "So be it."

तदभ्यद्रवत्तमभ्यवदत्कोऽसीति वायुर्वा अहमस्मीत्यब्रवीन्मातरिश्वा वा अहमस्मीति ॥ ८ ॥

8. To It he went. To him It said, "Who are you?" He said, "I am known as Air, or I am Mātariśvā."

तस्मिन्स्त्वयि किं वीर्यमित्यपीदं सर्वमाददीय यदिदं
पृथिव्यामिति ॥ ९ ॥

9. (It said), "What power is there in you, such as you are?" (Air said), "I can blow away all this that is on the earth."

तस्मै तृणं निदधावेतदादत्स्वेति तदुपप्रेयाय सर्वजवेन
तन्न शशाकादातु म तत एव निववृते नैतदशकं विज्ञातुं
यदेतद्यक्षमिति ॥ १० ॥

10. (Yakṣa) placed a straw for him saying, "Take it up." Air approached the straw with all the strength born of enthusiasm. He could not take it up. He returned from that Yakṣa (to tell the gods), "I could not ascertain It fully as to what this Yakṣa is."

Aṛha, after that, they said to Air, "O Air, find out" etc. bears the same meaning as before. Vāyu (air) is so called because it blows, goes, or carries smell. Mātariśvā means that which travels (*śvayati*) in space (*mātari*). *Idam sarvam api*, all this. *ādadiya*, I can take up, blow away. *Yad idam prithivyām* etc., is just as explained earlier.

अथेन्द्रमब्रुवन्मघवन्नेतद्विजानीहि किमेतद्यक्षमिति तथेति
तदभ्यद्रवत्तस्मात्तिरोदधे ॥ ११ ॥

11. Then (the gods) said to Indra, "O Maghavā, find out thoroughly about this thing,

as to what this Yakṣa is." (He said), "So be it." He (Indra) approached It (Yakṣa). From him (Yakṣa) vanished away.

Atha indram abruvan, maghavan etat vijānīhi etc., is to be explained as before. Indra who is a great Lord, and is called Maghavā, because of strength: *tat abhyadravat*, approached that Yakṣa. *Tasmāt*, from him, from Indra who had approached Itself (Yakṣa); that Brahman, *ttrodadhe*, vanished from sight. Brahman did not so much as grant him an interview, so that Indra's pride at being Indra might be totally eradicated.

स तस्मिन्नेवाकाशे सित्रयमाजगाम बहुशोभमानाम्मा
हैमवतीं ताःहोवाच किमेतद्यक्षमिति ॥ १२ ॥

इति केनोपनिषिदि तृतीयः खण्डः ॥

12. In that very space he approached the superbly charming woman viz Umā Haimavatī.¹ To Her (he said), "What is this Yakṣa?"

The space, or the part of the space, where that Yakṣa vanished after revealing Itself, and the space where Indra also was at the time of the disappearance of Brahman, *tasmin eva ākāśe*, in that very space; *saḥ*, he, Indra, stayed on, deliberating in his mind, "What is this Yakṣa?" He did not return like Fire etc. Understanding his devotion to Yakṣa, Knowledge (of Brahman) made Her appearance as a woman, in the form Umā. *Saḥ*, he, Indra; *ājagāma*, approached; *bahuśobhamānām*, superbly

¹ The superbly fascinating (*haimavatī*) knowledge of Brahman (*Umā*), or the daughter of Himalayas, whose name was Umā.

charming; *tām*, Her, Umā; Knowledge being the most fascinating of all fascinating things, the attribute 'superbly charming' is appropriate for it—he approached *haimavatīm*, one who was as though attired in dress of gold, i.e. exquisitely beautiful. Or Umā Herself is Haimavatī, the daughter of Himavat (Himalayas). Thinking that, since She is ever in association with the omniscient God, She must be able to know, Indra approached Her; (and) *tām*, to Her, to Umā; *uvāca*, said, "Tell me, *kim etat yakṣam iti*, what is this Yakṣa—that showed Itself and vanished?"

PART IV

सा ब्रह्मेति होवाच ब्रह्मणो वा एतद्विजये महीयध्वमिति
ततो हैव विदाञ्चकार ब्रह्मेति ॥ १ ॥

1. "It was Brahman," said She. "In Brahman's victory, indeed, you became elated thus." From that (utterance) alone, to be sure, did Indra learn that It was Brahman.

Sā, She; *uvāca ha*, said, "*Brahma iti*, It was Brahman; *Brahmaṇaḥ vai vijaye*, in the victory of God, indeed. The devils were conquered only by God, and you were mere instruments there. In the victory that was really His, you *mahīyadhvam*, became elated, you attained glory." The word *etat*, in this way, is used adverbially (to modify the verb). "But yours is this vaingloriousness: '*Asmākam eva ayam vijayaḥ, asmākam eva ayam mahimā*—ours is this victory, ours is this glory,' (Ke. III. 2). *Tataḥ ha eva*, from that, from Umā's words alone, to be sure; Indra, *vidāncakāra*, learned; *Brahma iti*, that It was Brahman. The emphatic limitation implied in *tataḥ ha eva*, from that alone to be sure, implies that (he came to learn) not independently.

तस्माद्वा एते देवा अतितरामिवान्यान्देवान्यदग्निर्वायु-
रिन्द्रस्ते ह्येनन्नेदिष्ठं पस्पशुस्ते ह्येनत्प्रथमो विदाञ्चकार
ब्रह्मेति ॥ २ ॥

2. Therefore, indeed, these gods, viz Fire, Air, and Indra, did excel other gods, for they

touched It most proximately, and they knew It first as Brahman.

Since these gods—Fire, Air, and Indra—approached Brahman through conversation, visualisation, etc., *tasmāt*, therefore, *ete devāḥ*, these gods; *atitarām iva*, surpassed greatly, through their own excellence, i.e. good luck comprising power, quality, etc; *anyān devān*, the other gods. The word *iva* is meaningless or is used for the sake of emphasis. *Yat agniḥ vāyuh indraḥ*, (the gods) viz Fire, Air, and Indra. *Hi*, since; *te* they, those gods; *nediṣṭham pa-sparśuḥ*, most proximately, intimately, touched; *enat*, this Brahman; through the process of conversation etc., as described earlier. *Hi*, because, because of the further reason that; *te*, they; being *prathamāḥ* (should be *prathamāḥ*) first, being prominent; *enat*, this Brahman; *vidāncakāra*, (should be *vidāncakruḥ*), knew, knew It to be Brahman.

तस्माद्वा इन्द्रोऽतितरामिवान्यान्देवान्स ह्येनन्नेदिष्टं
पस्पर्शं स ह्येनत्प्रथमो विदाञ्चकार ब्रह्मेति ॥ ३ ॥

3. Therefore did Indra excel the other deities. For he touched It most proximately, inasmuch as he knew It first as Brahman.

Since even Fire and Air knew from the words of Indra alone, and since Indra heard first from Umā's words that It was Brahman, *tasmāt vai indraḥ atitarām iva*, therefore Indra did excel (the other deities). *Hi saḥ enat nediṣṭham pasparśa*, inasmuch as he touched It most proximately, because *saḥ hi enat prathamāḥ vidāncakāra Brahma iti*—this sentence has been already explained.

तस्यैष आदेशो यदेतद्विद्युतो व्यद्युतदा३ इतीन् न्यमी-
मिषदा३ इत्यधिदैवतम् ॥ ४ ॥

4. This is Its instruction (about meditation) through analogy. It is like that which is (known as) the flash of lightning, and It is also as though the eye winked. These are (illustrations) in a divine context.¹

Tasya of the Brahman under discussion, *eṣaḥ ādeśaḥ*, this is the instruction through analogy. That analogy through which the instruction about the incomparable Brahman is imparted is called *ādeśaḥ*. What is that? *Yat etat*, that fact, which is well known among people as the flash of lightning. Since *vidyutaḥ vyadyutat*, cannot mean that Brahman (*vyadyutat*) flashed (by borrowing Its light (*vidyutaḥ*) from lightning,² therefore the meaning has to be assumed to be “the flash of lightning”. *Ā*, like, is used in the sense of comparison. The meaning is: “It is like the flash of lightning”; and (this meaning is acceptable) since it is seen in a different Vedic text, “comparable to a single flash of lightning” (Br. II. iii. 6); for Brahman disappeared after revealing Itself but once to the gods like lightning.

¹ Analogies with regard to Brahman as It exists in Its divine, but conditioned, form in the solar orb. Cf. Gītā VIII.4 Brahman in Its form as Hiraṇyagarbha resides in the solar orb and presides over all the deities that are but Its different manifestations.

² “The meaning, ‘It flashed from lightning’, is inadmissible, for Brahman being self-effulgent, Its effulgence cannot be dependent on others. The meaning, ‘It performed the flashing of lightning,’ is unacceptable, since the flash that belongs to something cannot be produced by another.”—A.G.

Or the word *tejah* (brilliance) has to be supplied after the word *vidyutah* (of lightning). *Vyadyutat* (in this case) means flashed; (and) *ā* means as it were. The purport is: It was, as though, the brilliance of lightning flashed but once. The word *iti* is meant to call back to memory the word *ādeśa*; (so the meaning is): This is the *ādeśa*, the analogy. The word *it* is used for joining together. (So the sense is): Here is another analogy for It. What is that one? *Nyamīṣat*, winked, as the eye did the act of winking. The causative form (in *nyamīṣat*) is used in the same sense as the root itself. The *ā* is used here, too, in the sense of comparison. The meaning is: And it was like the opening and shutting of the eye with regard to its object. *Iti adhidāivatam*, this is by way of showing analogies of Brahman in a divine context.

अथाध्यात्मं यदेतद्गच्छतीव च मनोज्ञेन चैतदुपस्मर-
त्यभीक्षणं सङ्कल्पः ॥५॥

5. Then is the instruction through analogy in the context of the (individual) self: This known fact, that the mind seems to go to It (Brahman), and the fact that It (Brahman) is repeatedly remembered through the mind; as also the thought (that the mind has with regard to Brahman).

Atha, after this; is being told the analogical instruction *adhyātmam*, in the context of the soul, with regard to the indwelling Self. *Yat etat*, that which is a known fact, viz that *etat*, to this Brahman; *gacchati iva ca manah*, as though the mind goes, as though the mind enters into Brahman, encompasses It as an object. And the fact that *anena*, by

that mind; the spiritual aspirant; *abhīkṣam*, repeatedly, *upasmarati*, remembers intimately; *etat*, this Brahman; and the *saiikalpaḥ*, thought of the mind with regard to Brahman. Since Brahman has got the mind as Its limiting adjunct, It seems to be revealed by such states of the mind as thought, memory, etc., by which It seems to be objectified. Therefore, this is an instruction about Brahman, through analogy, in the context of the soul. In the divine context, Brahman has the attribute of revealing Itself quickly like lightning and winking;¹ and in the context of the soul, It has the attribute of manifesting Itself simultaneously with the states of the mind.² This is the instruction about Brahman through analogy. The need for this teaching about Brahman through analogy is that It becomes easily comprehensible to people of dull intellect when instruction is thus imparted. For the unconditioned Brahman, as such, cannot be comprehended by people of dull intellect.

तद्ध तद्वनं नाम तद्वनमित्युपासितव्यं स य एतदेवं वेदाभि
हैने२ सर्वाणि भूतानि संवाञ्छन्ति ॥६॥

¹ "The winking of the eye is rapid—this is well known; similar is Brahman's power of acting quickly. Its attribute in the divine context is the power to act quickly with regard to creation etc., since there is an absence of obstruction and effort. ... The light of lightning covers the whole world at once, similarly Brahman is unsurpassingly bright by nature, It accomplishes creation etc. of everything quickly, and It is possessed of supreme glory."—A.G.

² "One should meditate thus: 'Towards this Brahman, that is of the nature of light, my mind proceeds and there it rests.' The instruction in this form is the instruction in the context of the individual soul. The indwelling Brahman becomes revealed to one who meditates thus: 'The thoughts in my mind constantly revolve round Brahman.'"—A.G.

6. The Brahman is well known as the one adorable to all creatures: (hence) It is to be meditated on with the help of the name *tadvana*. All creatures surely pray to anyone who meditates on It in this way.

Tat, that Brahman; is *ha*, certainly; *tadvanam nāma*: *tadvanam* is derived from the words *tasya*, his, and *vanam*, adorable; It is adorable to all creatures, since It is their indwelling Self. Therefore Brahman is *tadvanam nāma*, well known as the one to be adored by all beings. Since it is *tadvana*, therefore *tadvanam iti*, through this name, *tadvana*, which is indicative of Its quality; It is *upāsītavyam*, to be meditated on. The text states the results of meditation through this name; *sah yah*, anyone that; *veda* meditates on; *etat*, the aforesaid Brahman; *evam*, thus, as possessed of the qualities mentioned above; *sarvāṇi bhūtāni*, all beings; *ha*, certainly; *enam*, to him, this meditator; *abhi-sarivāñchanti*, pray, as (they do) to Brahman.

उपनिषदं भो ब्रूहीत्युक्ता त उपनिषद्ब्राह्मी वाव त
उपनिषदमब्रूमेति ॥ ७ ॥

7. (Disciple): “Sir, speak of the secret knowledge.” (Teacher): “I have told you of the secret knowledge; I have imparted to you that very secret knowledge of Brahman.”

After being instructed thus, the disciple said to the teacher, “*Bhoḥ*, sir; *brūhi*, speak of; *upaniṣadam*, the secret thing, that is to be thought about.” *iti*. To the student who had spoken thus, the teacher said, *te*, to you; *upaniṣat*, the

secret knowledge; *uktā*, has been spoken of. "What is that, again?"—to such a question he answers, "*Te*, to you; *upa-niṣadam vāva abrūma iti*, I have spoken the very secret; *brāhmīn*, relating to Brahman, to the supreme Self—since the knowledge already imparted relates to the supreme Self." For the sake of (distinguishing) what follows, the teacher delimits (his teaching) thus: "The Upaniṣad that I have told you consists of nothing but what has already been presented as the Upaniṣad of the supreme Self."

Objection: What motive could have prompted the disciple, who had heard the Upaniṣad about the supreme Self to put this question: "Sir, speak of the Upaniṣad"? If, now, the question related to what had been already heard, then it is useless, inasmuch as it involved a repetition like the grinding over again of what had already been ground. If, again, the earlier Upaniṣad was incomplete, then it was not proper to conclude it by mentioning its result thus: "Having turned away from this world, the intelligent ones become immortal" (Ke. II. 5). Hence the question is improper even if it relates to some unexplained portion of the Upaniṣad already presented, inasmuch as no remainder was left over. What then is the intention of the question?

Answer: We say that this is the intention (of the disciple): "Does the secret teaching already imparted need any accessory, or does it not need any? If it does, tell me of the secret teaching with regard to that needed accessory. Or if it does not, then like Pippalāda make the clenching assertion: 'There is nothing beyond this' (Pr. VI. 7)." Thus this clencher of the teacher, "I have told you the Upaniṣad" is justified.

Objection: May it not be urged that this is not a concluding remark, inasmuch as the teacher has something more to add in the statement: "Concentration, cessation from sense-objects, rites, etc. are its legs" etc. (Ke. IV. 8).

Answer: It is true that a fresh matter is introduced by the teacher; but this is not done either by way of bringing in something as an attributive constituent (*śeṣa*) of the Upaniṣad or as an accessory (*sahakārī*) to it,¹ but rather as a means for the acquisition of the knowledge of Brahman, because *tapas* (concentration) etc., occurring as they do in the same passage along with the Vedas and their supplementaries, are given an equal status with the latter, and because neither the Vedas nor the science of pronunciation and euphony (*śikṣā*) etc., which are their supplementaries, can directly by either attributive constituents of the knowledge of Brahman or its helpful accessories.

Objection: Should not even things that occur in the same passage be put to separate uses according to their appropriateness? Just as the *mantras*, occurring at the end of a sacrifice, in the form of a hymn meant for the invocation of (many) deities, are applied with respect to the (individual) deities concerned, similarly it can be imagined that concentration, self-control, rites, truth, etc., will either be attributive constituents of the knowledge of Brahman or be helpful accessories (in accordance with their respective

¹ "By the word *śeṣa* is implied an attributive part contributing to the production of the effect (of the main rite). By the word *sahakārī* is implied something that need not necessarily be a constituent, but can be combined (with the principal rite)."—A.G. Both have a bearing on the result.

appropriateness).¹ As for the Vedas and their subsidiaries, they are means for either knowledge or rites by virtue of their respective meanings (ideas). In this way this division becomes appropriate when significance of words, relation (of things denoted), and reason are taken into consideration. Suppose we advance such an argument?

Answer: No, because this is illogical. This division does not certainly accord with facts, because it is not reasonable that the knowledge of Brahman, which repels all ideas of distinction of deeds, doers, and results, should have dependence on any attributive constituent, or any relation with any helpful accessory, and because the knowledge of Brahman and its result, freedom, are concerned only with the Self which is unassociated with any object. "He who wants emancipation should for ever give up all works together with their instruments, because it is known only by the man of renunciation. The state of the supreme Reality that is the same as the indwelling Self is attained by the man of renunciation." Therefore knowledge cannot reasonably have work either as an accessory or as a complement. Therefore the division (of concentration etc.) on the analogy of the invocation through hymn, occurring at the

¹ "At the end of all sacrifices, the deities are invoked with the hymn beginning with:

अग्निरिदं हविरजुषतावीवृधत महो ज्वायोऽकृत ।

अग्नीषोमाविदं हविरजुषेतामवीवृधेतां मही ज्यायोऽक्रताम् ॥

Now, although in this hymn many deities are mentioned, still, since it is proper to invoke at the end the deity to whom any particular sacrifice is made, the hymn itself has to be applied in accord with that propriety. Similarly concentration etc., will themselves be used as attributive constituents of knowledge."—A.G.

end of a sacrifice, is quite inappropriate. Hence it is proper to say that the question and the answer are meant for fixing a limit thus: "The secret teaching that has been imparted extends thus far only; it is adequate for the attainment of knowledge without depending on anything else."

तस्यै तपो दमः कर्मेति प्रतिष्ठा वेदाः सर्वाङ्गानि सत्य-
मायतनम् ॥८॥

8. Concentration, cessation from sense-objects, rites, etc., are its legs; the Vedas are all its limbs: truth is its abode.

Concentration etc. are the means for the acquisition; *tasyai*, (should be *tasyāḥ*) of that secret teaching (Upaniṣad), regarding Brahman which I thus spoke before you. *Tapah*, the concentration of the body, the senses, and the mind; *damah*, cessation (from sense-objects); *karma*, rites, Agnihotra etc. (are the means); for it is found that the knowledge of Brahman arises in a man who has attained the requisite holiness through the purification of the heart. For it is a matter of experience that, even though Brahman is spoken of, there is either non-comprehension or mis-comprehension in the case of one who has not been purged of his sin, as for instance, in the case of Indra and Virocana (Ch. VIII. vii-xii). Therefore knowledge, as imparted by the Vedas, dawns on one whose mind has been purified by concentration etc., either in this life or in many past ones, as is mentioned by the Vedic verse: "These things get revealed when spoken to that high-souled man who has supreme devotion towards the Effulgent One, and the same devotion to his teacher as to the Effulgent One" (Sv. VI.

23). And this is borne out by the Smṛti, "Knowledge dawns on a man on the eradication of sinful acts" (Mbh. Śā. 204.8). The word *iti* is used to draw attention to a synecdoche; that is to say, by the word *iti* are suggested other factors, beginning with these, which are helpful to the rise of knowledge, such as "Humility, unpretentiousness," etc. (G. xiii. 7). (Concentration etc. are the) *pratiṣṭhā*, two legs, stands as it were, of that Upaniṣad; for when these exist, knowledge of Brahman stands firm and becomes active, just as a man does with his legs. *Vedāḥ*, the four Vedas; and *sarvāṅgāni*, all the six subsidiaries beginning with the science of pronunciation and euphony (*śikṣā*) (are also the legs). The Vedas are the legs because they reveal the rites and knowledge; and all the *angāni*, subsidiaries, are so because they are meant for the protection of the Vedas. Or since the word *pratiṣṭhā* has been imagined to imply the two legs (of the knowledge), the Vedas are its *sarvāṅgāni*, all the limbs beginning with the head. In this case, the subsidiaries, such as the science of pronunciation and euphony, are to be understood to have been mentioned by the word Vedas; because when the principal factor is mentioned, the subsidiaries are mentioned *ipso facto*, they being dependent on the principal. *Satyam āyatanam*, *satya* is the *āyatana*, the dwelling place where the secret teaching resides. *Satya* means freedom from deceit and crookedness in speech, mind, and body; for knowledge abides in those who are free from deceit and who are holy, and not in those who are devilish by nature and are deceitful, as the Vedic text says, "those in whom there are no insincerity, falsehood, and deceit" (Pr. I. 16). Therefore *Satya* (truth) is imagined as the abode. Although by implication, truth has already been mentioned as legs, along with concentration etc., still

its allusion again as the abode is for indicating that as a means (for the acquisition of knowledge) it excels others, as the Smṛti says. "A thousand horse sacrifices and truth are weighed in a balance: and one truth outweighs a thousand horse sacrifices" (Viṣṇu Smṛti, 8).

यो वा एतामेवं वेदापहृत्य पाप्मानमनन्ते स्वर्गे लोके
ज्येष्ठे प्रतिष्ठति प्रतिष्ठति ॥ ९ ॥

इति केनोपनिषदि चतुर्थः खण्डः ॥

9. Anyone who knows this thus, he, having dispelled sin, remains firmly seated in the boundless, blissful, and highest Brahman. He remains firmly seated (there).

Yah vai, anyone who; *veda evam*, realises thus—as spoken; *etām*, this thing, this blessed knowledge of Brahman which has been already spoken of in the text beginning with "Willed by whom" (Ke. I. 1), which has been eulogised in the text beginning with, "It was Brahman indeed" (Ke. III. 1), and which is "the foundation of all knowledge" (Mu. I. i. 1). Notwithstanding the presentation of the fruit of the knowledge of Brahman in "because thereby one gets immortality" (Ke. II. 4), it is mentioned at the end by way of a formal conclusion. (Such a knower) *apahatya pāpmānam*, dispelling sin, shaking off the seed of mundane existence constituted by ignorance, desire, and work; *pratiṣṭhati*, remains firmly seated *anante*, in boundless, *svarge loke*: *Svarga loka* means in Brahman who is all Bliss. Being qualified by the word *ananta*, boundless, the word *svarga* does not mean heaven. Lest the word boundless

(*ananta*) be taken in any secondary sense, the text says *jyeye*, in the higher, that which is greater than all, in one's own Self which is boundless in the primary sense. The purport is that he does not again return to this world.

ॐ आध्यायन्तु ममाङ्गानि वाक्प्राणश्चक्षुः श्रोत्रमथो
बलमिन्द्रियाणि च सर्वाणि । सर्वं ब्रह्मौपनिषदं माऽहं ब्रह्म
निराकुर्यां मा मा ब्रह्म निराकरोदनिराकरणमस्त्वनिराकरणं
मेऽस्तु । तदात्मनि निरते य उपनिषत्सु धर्मास्ते मयि
सन्तु ते मयि सन्तु ॥

ॐ शान्तिः शान्तिः शान्तिः ॥

KATHA UPANIŞAD

ॐ सह नावतु । सह नौ भुगवतु । सह वीर्यं करवावहे ।
तेजस्वि नावधीतमस्तु । मा विद्विषावहे ॥

ॐ शान्तिः शान्तिः शान्तिः ॥

May He protect us both (the teacher and the taught) together (by revealing & knowledge). May He protect us both (by vouchsafing the results of knowledge). May we attain vigour together. Let what we study be invigorating. May we not cavil at each other.

Om Peace! Peace! Peace!

KATHA UPANIṢAD

PART I

CANTO I

Introduction: Salutation to Bhagavān¹ Yama (Death), son of the Sun and the impartor of the knowledge of Brahman, and salutation to Naciketā.

Now then, a brief exposition of the contents of the Katha Upaniṣad is begun for the sake of making their import easily comprehensible. The word *upaniṣad* is derived by adding *upa* (near) and *ni* (with certainty) as prefixes and *kṛip* as a suffix to the root *śad*, meaning to split up (destroy), go (reach, attain), or loosen. And by the word *upaniṣad* is denoted the knowledge of the knowable entity, presented in the book that is going to be explained. By virtue of what relation with (any particular) significance (of the word *upaniṣad*), again, is knowledge denoted by the word *upaniṣad*? This is being stated. Knowledge is called *upaniṣad* by virtue of its association with this significance; It (viz knowledge) splits up, injures, or destroys the seeds of worldly existence such as ignorance etc., in the case of those seekers of emancipation who, after becoming detached from the desire for the seen and unseen² objects, approach (*upa śad*) the knowledge that is called *upaniṣad* and that bears the characteristics to be presented hereafter, and who

¹ One who has knowledge of creation and dissolution, of birth and death of creatures, and of ignorance and knowledge.

² *Āruśravika* (unseen objects) “revealed in the scriptures (Vedas), such as enjoyment in heaven etc.”—A.G.

then deliberate on it with steadiness and certainty (*ni*).¹ Thus it will be said later on, “knowing that, one becomes freed from the jaws of Death” (Ka. I. iii. 15). Or the knowledge of Brahman is called *upanīṣad* because of its conformity to the idea of leading to Brahman, inasmuch as it makes the seekers after emancipation, who are possessed of the qualities already mentioned, attain the supreme Brahman. Thus it will be said later on, “Having become free from virtue and vice, desire and ignorance, (he) attained Brahman (Ka. II. iii. 18). And even the knowledge about Fire, who preceded all the worlds, who was born of Brahman and is possessed of enlightenment, and whose knowledge is prayed for (by Naciketā) through the second boon (Ka. I. i. 13), is also called *upanīṣad* by virtue of its bearing the meaning (to loosen) of the root (*sad*), inasmuch as by leading to the result, achievement of heaven, it weakens or loosens such multitude of miseries as living in the womb, birth, old age, etc., continually recurring in lives hereafter. Thus it will be spoken, “The dwellers of heaven get immortality,” etc. (*ibid*).

Objection: Is it not a fact that by the word *upanīṣad*, the readers refer to the book in such sentences as: “We read the *upanīṣad*,” and “We teach the *upanīṣad*”?

Answer: Though, from this point of view, the meanings of the root *sad*—such as loosening the causes of the world, viz ignorance etc.—are inapplicable with regard to a mere book, and applicable to knowledge, still this is no

¹ Approaching means “receiving through the instruction of the teacher,” and “deliberate” means “eliminate the idea of impossibility etc. with regard to such things as the unity of the individual Self and the transcendental Self.”—A.G.

fault, since the book, too, being meant for that purpose, can justifiably be denoted by that word, as for instance (in the sentence) "Clarified butter is indeed life". Thus with regard to knowledge, the word *upaniṣad* is used in its primary sense, while with regard to the book it is used in a secondary sense.

Thus from the very derivation of the word *upaniṣad*, it is suggested that one who is possessed of special attributes is qualified for knowledge. And the subject matter of the knowledge is also shown to be a unique thing, viz the supreme Brahman that is the indwelling Self. And the purpose of this *upaniṣad* is the absolute cessation of the transmigratory state, which consists in the attainment of Brahman.¹ And the connection (between knowledge and its purpose) has been mentioned *ipso facto* through the enunciation of such a purpose.² Thus these cantos themselves are (meant) for special persons (competent for their study), and have a special subject matter, a special purpose, and a special connection, inasmuch as they reveal, like an apple (lit. emblemic myrobalan) placed in the hand, the knowledge that is (meant) for a man of special competence and has a special subject matter, a special purpose, and a special connection as already explained. Hence we shall explain these cantos

¹ Total cessation of the world (i.e. rotation of birth and death) follows the eradication of ignorance. And since the non-existence of a superimposed thing is identical with the thing on which the superimposition occurs, the cessation of the world is the same as the attainment of Brahman. Or *Brahmaprāptilakṣaṇa* in the commentary may mean that the cessation (of the world) is indicative of the realisation of the supreme Bliss that is Brahman.

² "Knowledge is needed for the removal of ignorance which cannot be eradicated through work. So the goal of knowledge is connected with itself as an end is with means."—A.G.

to the best of our understanding. The story there is by way of eulogising the knowledge.

ॐ उशन् ह वै वाजश्रवसः सर्ववेदसं ददौ ।

तस्य ह नचिकेता नाम पुत्र आस ॥ १ ॥

1. Once upon a time, the son of Vājaśravā, being desirous of fruit, gave away everything. He had, as the story goes, a son named Naciketā.

Uśan, being desirous of; *ha* and *vai* (equivalent to—once upon a time) are two indeclinable particles, recalling to mind what happened before. Vājaśravā is he whose śravah, fame, is consequent on the giving of vāja, food. Or it is a proper name. His son, Vājaśravasa, being desirous of the fruit of the sacrifice, performed the *Viśvajit* sacrifice in which all is given away. In that sacrifice, he *dadau*, gave away; *sarvavedasam*, all (his) wealth. *Tasya*, of him, of that performer of sacrifice; *āsa*, there was; *ha*, as the story goes; *naciketā nāma putrah*, a son named Naciketā.

तं ह कुमारं सन्तं दक्षिणासु नीयमानासु श्रद्धाविवेश
सोऽस्मन्यत ॥ २ ॥

2. As the presents were being carried (to the Brāhmaṇas) faith took possession of him who was still a boy. He thought:

Tam, into him, into Naciketā; *kumāraṁ santam*, while still in the prime of life, still not adolescent, still a mere boy; *śraddhā*, faith (in the verity of the scriptures), induced by a desire to do good to his father; *āviveśa*, entered. At what time? This is being stated: *dakṣiṇāsu nīyamānāsu*, when

gifts were being carried, when cows meant for presents were being led separately, to the priests and the assembled Brāhmaṇas; *saḥ*, he, that Naciketā who had an influx of faith; *amanyata*, thought.

How he thought is being stated in *pītodakā* etc.

पीतोदका जग्धतृणा दुग्धदोहा निरिन्द्रियाः ।

अनन्दा नाम ते लोकास्तान् स गच्छति ता ददत् ॥ ३ ॥

3. He goes to those worlds that are known as joyless, who gives away the cows that have drunk water and eaten grass (for good), whose milk has been milked (for the last time), and which have lost their organs.

The cows meant for presents to the Brāhmaṇas are being described: Those by which *udakam*, water, has been *pītam*, drunk, are *pītodakāḥ*;¹ those by which *ṛṇam*, grass, has been *jagdhām*, eaten, are *jagdhā-ṛṇāḥ*; those whose *dugdhaḥ*, milk, has been *dohaḥ*, milked, are *dugdhā-dohāḥ*; *nirindriyāḥ*, those that are devoid of the power of their organs, incapable of bearing calves; that is to say, the cows that are decrepit and barren. *Dadat*, giving; *tāḥ* those, the cows that are of this kind; to the priests as rewards for their service; *gacchati*, (he, the performer of sacrifice) goes; *tān*, to those (worlds); *anandāḥ nāma te lokāḥ*, which worlds are known as devoid of happiness, joyless.

¹ Water has been drunk earlier only; but later on, even the power to drink water is absent."—A.G. Similarly there is no power to eat grass or give milk.—Ed.

स होवाच पितरं तत कस्मै मां दास्यसीति ।
द्वितीयं तृतीयं तः होवाच मृत्यवे त्वा ददामीति ॥ ४ ॥

4. He said to his father, "Father, to whom will you offer me?" He spoke to him a second time and a third time. To him (the father) said, "To Death I offer you."

"The evil result thus accruing to my father as a consequence of the imperfection of the sacrifice should be ward-off by me, who am a good son, by perfecting the sacrifice even through an offering of myself", thinking thus, *saḥ*, he—approached his father; and *uvāca ha*, said; *pitaram*, to the father—"Tata, (is the same as *tāta*), O father; *kasmai*, to whom, to which of the priests; *mām dāsyasi*, will you offer me, that is to say, offer me as a present?" *iti*. Though ignored by his father who was addressed thus, *dviṭīyam tṛtīyam uvāca*, he spoke even a second time and a third time, thus: "To whom will you offer me?" "To whom will you offer me?" Incensed at the thought, "This one is not behaving like a boy", the father *uvāca ha*, said, *tam*, to him, to his son—"Mṛtyave, to Death, to the son of the Sun; *dadāmi*, I give away; *tvā*, you, being the same as *tvām*", *iti*, (this much).

That son, having been spoken to thus, sorrowfully cogitated in a solitary place. How? That is being said:

बहूनामेमि प्रथमो बहूनामेमि मध्यमः ।
किं स्वद्यमस्य कर्तव्यं यन्मयाऽद्य करिष्यति ॥ ५ ॥

5. Among many I rank as belonging to the highest; among many I rank as belonging to the

middling. What purpose can there be of Death that my father will get achieved today through me?

Bahūnām, among many—of many sons or disciples; *emi*, I go (rank); *prathamah*, as first, that is to say, through the foremost conduct of a disciple etc. And *bahūnām*, among many—many middling ones; *madhyamaḥ emi*, I move (count) as a middling one, I behave through the middling conduct. But never do I behave as the worst.¹ Though I am a son possessed of such quality, still to me my father has said, “To Death I shall offer you,” *Kim svit*, what; *kartavyam*, purpose; *yamasya*, of Death—can there be; which purpose he (my father) *adya*, today; *kariṣyati*, will achieve; *mayā*, through me, by sending me?

“My father must have certainly spoken so out of anger without any consideration of purpose. Still the words of that father must not be falsified”, thinking thus, he said sorrowfully to his father, remorseful as the latter was because of the thought, “What a thing I have uttered!”

अनुपश्य यथा पूर्वे प्रतिपश्य तथाऽपरे ।

सस्यमिव मर्त्यः पच्यते सस्यमिवाजायते पुनः ॥ ६ ॥

6. Consider successively how your forefathers behaved, and consider how others behave (now). Man decays and dies like corn, and emerges again like corn.

¹ “The foremost conduct consists in engaging in the service of the teacher by ascertaining his wishes at the proper time. The engagement through an order is middling conduct. And disobedience to such orders is the worst.”—A.G.

Anupāśya: *anu*, successively, *paśya*, consider, have a look at; *yathā*, how; your, *pūrve*, forebears, dead father, grandfather, etc. behaved. And seeing them, it behoves you to tread in their footsteps. *Tathā*, similarly too; as *apare*, others—other holy men, behave; them also; you *pratipāśya*, consider. Not that in them there ever was, or is, any falsification. Opposed to that is the behaviour of bad people, which consists of paltering with truth. Besides, not by prevarication can anyone become free from death and decrepitude. For *martyaḥ*, man; *sasyam iva*, like corn; *pacyate*, decays and dies; and after dying, *punaḥ*, again; *sasyam iva ājāyate*, reappears (is born) like corn. Thus what does one gain in this impermanent human world by breaking one's own words? Protect your own truth and send me to Death. This is the idea.

Having been addressed thus, the father sent (him) for the sake of his own veracity. And he, having gone to Death's abode, lived for three nights (i.e. days), Death being out. When Death returned from his sojourn, his councillors or wives said to him by way of advice:

वैश्वानरः प्रविशत्यतिथिर्ब्राह्मणो गृहान् ।

तस्यैतां शान्तिं कुर्वन्ति हर वैवस्वतोदकम् ॥ ७ ॥

7. A Brāhmaṇa guest enters the houses like fire. For him they accomplish this kind of propitiation. O Death, carry water (for him).

Brāhmaṇaḥ, a Brāhmaṇa; as *atiithiḥ*, guest; *praviśati*, enters, like *vaiśvānaraḥ*, fire itself; as though burning *gṛhān*, the houses. Since *tasya*, for his sake—for the guest; the good people *kurvanti*, accomplish; *etām*, this kind of;

śāntim, propitiation—consisting in offering water for washing feet, a seat, etc., just as people do for allaying the conflagration of fire—and since evil consequences are declared in case of not doing so (Mu. I. ii. 3), therefore *vaivasvata*, O Death; *hara*, carry, *udakam*, water—for Naciketā for washing his feet.

आशाप्रतीक्षे संगतः सूनृतां

चेष्टापूते पुत्रपशूश्च सर्वान् ।

एतद्वृद्धक्ते पुरुषस्याल्पमेधसो

यस्यानश्नन्वसति ब्राह्मणो गृहे ॥ ८ ॥

8. If in anyone's house a Brāhmaṇa guest abides without food, that Brāhmaṇa destroys hope and expectation, the results of holy association and sweet discourse, sacrifices and charities, sons and cattle—all these—of that man of little intelligence.

Āśāpratīkṣe: *āśā* is the hope for a desirable thing which is attainable though unknown; *pratīkṣā* is expectation for something that is attainable and known; these two, hope and expectation, are *āśāpratīkṣe*; *saṅgatam* is the fruit derived from the association with the holy people.¹ *Sūnṛtām ca*: *sūnṛtā* is sweet discourse—the fruit of that also. *Iṣṭā-pūrte*: *iṣṭa* is the fruit of sacrifice and *pūrta* is that

¹ We read this portion of the commentary as “*saṅgatam. sat-sahyogajam*”. But some read it as “*saṅgatam, tatsahyogajam*”, which means “the fruit resulting from association with that, viz the objects of hope and expectation”.

of (charitable) work. *Putra-pasūn ca*, sons and cattle. *Sarvān etat* should be *sarvam etat*, all this, as described; (he) *vr̥ṅkte*, excludes (from) i.e. destroys; *puruṣasya alpa-medhasaḥ* from (i.e. of) a man of little intelligence; *yasya*, in whose; *gṛhe*, house; *brāhmaṇah*, a Brāhmaṇa; *anaśnan*, fasting; *vasati*, abides. Therefore a guest should not be neglected under any condition. This is the idea.

Having been warned thus, Death approached Naciketā with adoration and said:

तिस्रो रात्रीर्यदवात्सीर्गृहे मे

अनश्नन् ब्रह्मन्नतिथिर्नमस्यः ।

नमस्तेऽस्तु ब्रह्मन् स्वस्ति मेऽस्तु

तस्मात्प्रति त्रीन्वराण्वृणीष्व ॥ ९ ॥

9. O Brāhmaṇa, since you have lived in my house for three nights without food, a guest and an adorable person as you are, let my salutations be to you, and let good accrue to me (by averting the fault arising) from that (lapse). Ask for three boons—one in respect of each (night).

Brahman, O Brāhmaṇa; *vat*, since; *avātsīḥ*, you have lived; *gṛhe me*, in my house; *tisraḥ rātrīḥ* for three nights; *anaśnan*, without eating, *atithiḥ*, a guest; and *namasyaḥ*, worthy of being saluted (venerable)—as you are; therefore *namaḥ te astu*, let salutations be to you; *Brahman*, O Brāhmaṇa; let there be *svasti*, good fortune; *me*, for me; through the aversion of the evil accruing *tasmāt*, therefore, from the lapse caused by your abiding in my house without food. Although all good will befall me through your favour, still

for your propitiation all the more, *vr̥ṇīṣva* ask for; *trīn varān*, three boons—any particular three things you like; *prati*, one in respect of—each night you have spent without food.

As for Naciketā he said:

शान्तसंकल्पः सुमना यथा स्या-
द्वीतमन्युर्गौतमो मासिभ मृत्यो ।
त्वत्प्रसृष्ट मासिभवदेत्प्रतीत

एतत् त्रयाणां प्रथमं वरं वृणे ॥ १० ॥

10. O Death, of the three boons I ask this one as the first, viz that (my father) Gautama may become freed from anxiety, calm of mind, freed from anger towards me, and he may recognise me and talk to me when freed by you.

If you want to grant boons, then, *mṛtyo*, O Death; (I pray so) *yathā*, as; my father *gautamaḥ*, Gautama; *syāt*, may become; *śānta-saikalpaḥ*—he whose mind is freed, with regard to me, from the anxiety, “How may my son behave after reaching Death,” that man is *śāntasaikalpaḥ*; *sumanāḥ*, calm of mind; and also *vitamanyuh*, free from anger; *mā abhi*, towards me; moreover, he *abhivadet*, may talk to; *mā*, me; *tvatprasṛṣtam*, freed by you—sent towards home; *pratītaḥ*, getting his memory revived—i.e. recognising (me) thus, “That very son of mine is come”¹;—*trayā-*

¹ “Favour me in such a way, that my father may not avoid me under the idea, ‘This one has returned after becoming a ghost; he is not to be looked at.’”—A.G.

nām, of the three boons; *vr̥ṇe*, I ask for; *prathamam*, as the first boon; *etaṭ*, this one—that has this purpose, viz the satisfaction of my father.

Death said:

यथा पुरस्ताद् भविता प्रतीत

औद्दालकिरारुणिर्मत्प्रसृष्टः ।

सुखञ् रात्रीः शयिता वीतमन्यु-

स्त्वां ददृशिवान्मृत्युमुखात् प्रमुक्तम् ॥११॥

11. Having recognised (you), Uddālaki Āruṇi will be (possessed of affection) just as he had before. Seeing you freed from the jaws of Death, he will get over his anger and will, with my permission, sleep happily for many a night.

Yathā, as—the kind of affectionate feeling that your father had towards you; *purastāt*, before; your father *auddālakih*, Uddālaki; *pratītaḥ*, having recognised (you); *bhavitā*, will become—possessed of affection, in that very same way. Uddālaka and Uddālaki refer to the same (person). And he is *Āruṇih*, the son of Aruṇa; or he bears two family names.¹ *Matprasṛṣṭaḥ*, being permitted by me; (your father) *śayitā*, will sleep; during *rātrīḥ*, nights—other

¹ The suffix in *auddālaki* may not add any meaning to the original word *uddālaka* or it may signify the son of Uddālaka. In the latter case, he becomes a scion of the Uddālakas as also of the Aruṇas. This was possible when a brotherless girl was given in marriage with the stipulation that her son would be counted as belonging to either family, so that the offering of rice balls etc. to the departed of both the lines might be guaranteed.

(future) nights, too; *sukham*, happily—with a composed mind; and he will become *vitamanyuh*, free from anger—as well; *tvām dadṛśivān*, having seen you—his son; *mṛtyu-mukhāt pramuktam*, as having been freed from the jaws—from the grasp—of Death.

Naciketā said:

स्वर्गे लोके न भयं किंचनास्ति
न तत्र त्वं न जरया बिभेति ।
उभे तीर्त्वाऽशनायापिपासे

शोकातिगो मोदते स्वर्गलोके ॥ १२ ॥

12. In heaven there is no fear—you are not there, (and) nobody is struck with fear because of old age. Having transcended both hunger and thirst and crossed over sorrow, one rejoices in the heavenly world.

Svarg loka, in the heavenly world; *bhayam kimcana na asti*, there is no fear whatsoever—fear arising from disease etc.; and *tvam*, you, O Death; *na tatra*, are not there—you do not exert your might there all of a sudden; so unlike what happens in this world, there *jarayā*, because of old age; *na bibheti*, nobody shudders—at you. Moreover *ubhe aśanāyā-pipāse tīrvā*, having transcended both hunger and thirst; and *śokātigah*, having crossed over sorrow—being free from mental unhappiness; (one) *modate*, rejoices; *svargaloke*, in the heavenly world.

स त्वमग्निः स्वर्गमध्येषि मृत्यो
प्रब्रूहि त्वं श्रद्धधानाय मह्यम् ।

स्वर्गलोका अमृतत्वं भजन्त

एतद् द्वितीयेन वृणे वरेण ॥ १३ ॥

13. O Death, such as you are, you know that Fire which leads to heaven. Of that you tell me who am full of faith. The dwellers of heaven get immortality. This I ask for through the second boon.

Mṛtyo, O Death; since *saḥ tvam*, you, such as you are; *adhyeṣi*, remember, i.e. know; *svargyam agnim*, the Fire that is the means for the attainment of heaven—heaven that is possessed of the qualities aforesaid; (therefore) *tvam*, you; *prabrūhi*, speak; *mahyam śraddadhānāya*, to me who am full of faith, and who pray for heaven—(tell me of that Fire) by worshipping which; *svarga-lokāḥ*, the dwellers of heaven, those who have got heaven as their place of attainment, the sacrificers; *bhajante*, get; *amṛtatvam*, immortality, divinity. That fact which is *etat*, this knowledge of Fire; *vṛṇe*, I seek for; *dvitīyena vareṇa*, through the second boon.

This is the promise of Death:

प्र ते ब्रवीमि तदु मे निबोध

स्वर्ग्यमग्निं नचिकेतः प्रजानन् ।

अनन्तलोकादितिमथो प्रतिष्ठा

विद्धि त्वमेतं निहितं गुहायाम् ॥ १४ ॥

14. O Naciketā, being well aware of the Fire that is conducive to heaven, I shall tell you of it.

That very thing you understand, with attention, from my words. That Fire which is the means for the attainment of heaven and which is the support of the world, know it to be established in the intellect (of the enlightened ones).

Naciketas, O Naciketā; *te*, to you; *pra-bravāmi*, I shall say—what was prayed for by you. *Me*, from me, from my words; *nibodha*, understand with attention; *tat u*, that very thing, viz *svargyam agnim*, the Fire that is conducive to heaven—that is the means for the attainment of heaven; I shall tell you, *prajānan*, being well aware of (it)—this is the idea. The expressions, “I shall tell you” and “understand with attention” are meant for fixing the attention of the disciple (on the subject). Now he praises the Fire: That (Fire) which is *anantalokāptim*, the attainment of infinite world—that is, the means for the attainment of the result, viz heaven; *atho*, and also; *pratiṣṭhām*, the support—of the universe in the form of Virāt¹ (Cosmic Person)—*etam*, this, this Fire which is being spoken of by me; *viddhi*, you know; (as) *nihitam guhāyām*, located in the hidden place—i.e. placed in the intellect of men of knowledge.

These are words of the Upaniṣad itself:

लोकादिमग्नि तमुवाच तस्मै
या इष्टका यावतीर्वा यथा वा ।

¹ In the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad we read: “He (Virāt—the Cosmic Person, embodied in the gross universe) differentiated himself in three ways,” (I. ii. 3)—from which Vedic text it follows that it is the cosmic Virāt who exists as fire, air, and the sun. Fire as constituting that aspect of Virāt, is the support of the universe.”—A.G.

स चापि तत्प्रत्यवदद्यथोक्त-

मथास्य मृत्युः पुनरेवाह तुष्टः ॥ १५ ॥

15. Death told him of the Fire that is the source of the world, the class and number of bricks, as also the manner of arranging for the fire. And he (Naciketā), too, repeated verbatim, with understanding, all these as they were spoken. Then Death, being satisfied with this, said again:

Tasmai, to him, to Naciketā; Death *uvāca*, spoke of; *tam lokādim agnim*, that Fire—that is being dealt with, and that was prayed for by Naciketā—the Fire which (as Virāt) preceded the world—since it was the first embodied being. Moreover, *yāḥ iṣṭakāḥ*, the class of bricks, that are to be collected (for the sacrificial altar); *yāvatiḥ vā*, how many (the bricks are to be) in number; *yathā vā*, or how—how the fire is to be arranged;¹—all this he said, this is the significance. *Saḥ ca api*, and he, Naciketā, too; *pratyavadat*, repeated verbatim, with understanding; *tat*, all that; *yathoktam*, just as Death had spoken. *Atha*, then; *tuṣṭaḥ*, being satisfied, by his repetition; *mṛtyuḥ*, Death, *punaḥ eva āha*, said over again—desiring to offer another boon beside the three.

तमन्नवीत् प्रीयमाणो महात्मा

वरं तवेहाद्य ददामि भयः ।

तवैव नाम्ना भविताऽयमग्निः

सृङ्कां चामामनेकरूपां गृहाण ॥ १६ ॥

¹ How the sacrificial wood is to be piled up, how the fire is to be procured, and how it is to be lit up.

16. Feeling delighted, that high-souled one said to him, “Out of favour towards you, I now grant again another boon. This fire will be known by your name indeed. And accept this multiformed necklace as well.

How did he say? *Prīyamāṇaḥ*, being delighted—feeling highly pleased at the fitness of the disciple, *mahātmā*, the high-souled one, one who was not narrow-minded; *tam*, to him to Naciketā; *abravīt*, said: “*Iha*, here, out of delight; *tava*, for you; a fourth boon;¹ *adya*, now; *dadāmi*, I offer; *bhūyaḥ*, again. *Ayam agnīḥ*, this fire—the fire that is being spoken of by me; *bhavitā* will become—famous; *tava eva nāmnā*, by your name indeed. *Ca*, moreover; *gṛhāṇa*, accept; *imām*, this; *sṛṅkām*, necklace; (which is) *anekarūpām*, multiformed and variegated—resounding, set with jewels, and of various hues. Or *sṛṅkām* (may mean) the course—that consists of rites and is not ignoble; you accept. The idea is this: You accept an additional knowledge about (variegated) *karma*—(multiformed) because it leads to various results.”

He (Yama) praises the *karma* itself again:

त्रिणाचिकेतस्त्रिभिरेत्य सन्धि

त्रिकर्मकृत्तरति जन्ममृत्यू ।

ब्रह्मजज्ञं देवमीड्यं विदित्वा

निचाय्येमाः शान्तिमत्यन्तमेति ॥ १७ ॥

¹ The other three being, his father's composure, knowledge about Fire, and knowledge of the Self.

17. “One who getting connection with the three, piles up the Nāciketa fire thrice, and undertake three kinds of work, crosses over death. Getting knowledge of that omniscient One who is born of Brahmā, and realising Him, he attains this peace fully.

Sandhim ētya, getting connection; *tribhiḥ*, with the three—with mother, father, and teacher, i.e. getting his instruction from mother etc., properly—for that is known as a source of valid knowledge from another Vedic text: “As one who has a mother, father, and teacher should say” etc. (Bṛ. IV. i. 2). Or (*tribhiḥ* may mean) through the Vedas, the Smṛtis, and the good people; or through direct perception, inference, and the scriptures; for it is a matter of experience that clarity¹ follows from them. *Triṇāciketaḥ*, one who has piled up the Nāciketa fire thrice; or one who is possessed of its knowledge, studies it, and performs it; and *trikarmakṛt*, one who undertakes three kinds of *karma*—sacrifice, study (of the Vedas), and charity; *tarati*, crosses over; *janmamṛtyū*, birth and death. Moreover, *viditvā*, knowing—from scriptures; *brahmajajñam*: one that is born from Brahmā, i.e. Hiraṇyagarbha is *brahmaja* (*Virāt*), and one who is *brahmaja* and *jñā*, illumined, is *brahmajajña*—for He (i.e. *Virāt*) is omniscient; (knowing) that *devam*, deity, who is so called because of his effulgence (which is the derivative meaning), i.e. One who is possessed of such attributes as knowledge; and who is *īḍyam*, praiseworthy (adorable); (and) *nīcāyya*, looking (meditating) on (that *Virāt*)—as one’s

¹ “Comprehension of duties etc.”—A.G.

own Self¹; (one) *eti*, gets; *imām*, this (palpable), that is patent to one's understanding; *śāntim*, peace, cessation (from objects); *atyantam*, thoroughly. The idea is that through a combination of meditation and rites he attains the state of *Virāt*.²

Now he concludes the results of the knowledge about the Fire, and of its piling up, as also the topic under discussion:

त्रिणाचिकेतस्त्रयमेतद्विदित्वा

य एवं विद्वान्श्चिनुते नाचिकेतम् ।

स मृत्युपाशान् पुरतः प्रणोद्य

शोकातिगो मोदते स्वर्गलोके ॥ १८ ॥

18. "One who performs the Nāciketa sacrifice thrice after having known these three (factors), and he who having known thus, accomplishes the Nāciketa sacrifice, casts off the snares of Death even earlier and crossing over sorrow rejoices in heaven.

¹ "The number of bricks (in this sacrifice) is 720; the days and nights in a year (identified with *Virāt* Prajāpati) have also the same number. Because of this similarity of number the Fire (Year-Prajāpati) constituted by those days and nights, am I'—meditating on the Fire (*Virāt*) in this way as identified with oneself."—A G.

² Bālagopāendra's interpretation: "Just as one who undertakes three kinds of work after getting connected with the three crosses over death, so does he who performs the Nāciketa sacrifice three times. Moreover, getting knowledge of that omniscient One who is born of Brahman and realising that One (as his Self), he attains this peace fully."

Viditvā, after knowing; *etat trayam*, these three—described earlier, “the kind and number of bricks, as also the manner of arranging the fire” (Ka. I.i.15); he who becomes *triṅnāciketah*, a performer of the Nāciketa sacrifice thrice; and *yaḥ*, who; *evam vidvān*, having known the Fire (Virāt) thus—as identified with oneself; *cinute*, accomplishes; *nāciketam*, the Nāciketa fire, performs the sacrifice called Nāciketa;¹ *saḥ*, he; *praṇodya*, casting off; *mṛtyupāśān*, the snares of Death—consisting in vice, ignorance, desire, hatred, etc.; *purataḥ*, even earlier—i.e. before death; *śokātigaḥ*, crossing over sorrow—i.e. mental discomfort; *modate*, rejoices, *svargaloke*, in heaven, in the world of Virāt, by becoming identified with Him.

एष तेऽग्निर्नचिकेतः स्वर्ग्यो

यमवृणीथा द्वितीयेन वरेण ।

एतमग्निं तवैव प्रवक्ष्यन्ति जनास-

स्तृतीयं वरं नचिकेतो वृणीष्व ॥ १९ ॥

19. “O Naciketā, this is for you the boon about the Fire that leads to heaven, for which you prayed through the second boon. People will speak of this Fire as yours indeed. O Naciketā, ask for the third boon.”

Naciketah, O Naciketā; *te*, to you; *eṣaḥ*, this is; *svargyaḥ agniḥ*, the Fire—the boon about the Fire—that leads to heaven; *yam*, which—which Fire as a boon;

¹ “Undertakes meditation on the Nāciketa Fire (i.e. Virāt)” according to Bālagopāleन्द्रा, the word *Kratu* in the commentary being taken in the sense of “meditation”.

avr̥ṇīthāh, you prayed for; *dvitīyena vareṇa*, through the second boon. That boon about the Fire is granted to you. This is only a conclusion of what was said earlier. Moreover, *janāsaḥ* (is the same as *janāh*), people; *pravakṣyanti*, will speak of; *etam agnim*, this Fire; *tava eva*, as yours—by your name—indeed. This is the fourth boon that I have given out of my satisfaction. *Naciketah*, O Naciketā; *vṛṇīṣva*, ask for; *tṛtīyam varam*, the third boon. The idea is this: “unless that is given, I shall remain indebted.”

This much only, as indicated by the two boons, and not the true knowledge of the reality, called the Self, is attainable through the earlier *mantras* and *brāhmaṇas* (of the Vedas) which are concerned with injunction and prohibition. Hence for the elimination of the natural ignorance, which is the seed of mundane existence, which consists in superimposing activity, agentship, and enjoyment on the Self, and which has for its contents those objects of prohibition and injunction (the subject matter of the scriptures), it is necessary to speak of the knowledge of the unity of the Self and Brahman; which knowledge is opposed to this ignorance, is devoid of any tinge of superimposition (on the Self) of activity, agentship, and enjoyment, and has for its object absolute emancipation. Therefore the subsequent text is begun. Through the story is being elaborated the fact as to how in the absence of the knowledge of the Self, which is the subject matter of the third boon, there cannot be any contentment even after getting the second boon. Since one who has desisted from the impermanent ends and means that are comprised in the abovementioned rites becomes qualified for the knowledge of the Self, (therefore) with a

view to decrying those ends and means, Naciketā is being tempted through the presentation of sons etc. Having been told, "O Naciketā, you ask for the third boon", Naciketā said:

येयं प्रते विचिकित्सा मनुष्ये-

ऽस्तीत्येके नायमस्तीति चैके ।

एतद्विद्यामनुशिष्टस्त्वयाऽहं

वराणामेष वरस्तृतीयः ॥ २० ॥

20. This doubt that arises, consequent on the death of a man—some saying, "It exists", and others saying, "It does not exist"—I would know this, under your instruction. Of all the boons, this one is the third boon.

Yā iyam vicikitsā, this doubt, that arises; *prete manuṣye*, when a man dies; *eke*, some (say); *asti iti*, (It), the Self, which is distinct from the body, senses, mind, and intellect, and which gets connected with a fresh body (in the next life), exists; *ca eke*, and others (say); *ayam*, this one, a Self of this kind; *na asti*, does not exist. Hence It is a thing whose knowledge can be acquired by us neither through direct perception nor through inference. And yet the supreme human goal is dependent on a clear knowledge of It. Therefore, *tvayā anuśiṣṭaḥ*, being instructed by you; *aḥam*, I; *etat vidyām*, would know this. *Varāṇām*, of all the boons; *eṣaḥ*, this one; *varaḥ*, boon; is *tṛtīyaḥ*, the third—the remaining one.

With a view to testing whether this one (i.e. Naciketā) is absolutely fit or not for the knowledge of the Self, which (knowledge) is the means for the highest summation, Death says:

देवैरत्रापि विचिकित्सतं पुरा

न हि सुविज्ञेयमणुरेष धर्मः ।

अन्यं वरं नचिकेतो वृणीष्व

मा मोपरोत्सीरति मा सृजैनम् ॥ २१ ॥

21. With regard to this, even the gods entertained doubts in days of yore; for being subtle, this substance (the Self) is not easily comprehended. O Naciketā, ask for some other boon; do not press me; give up this (boon) that is demanded of me.

Purā, in days of yore; *atra*, with regard to this thing; *vicikitsitam*, doubt was entertained; *devaiḥ api*, even by gods; *hi*, since; *eṣaḥ*, *dharmah*, this principle—called the Self; *na suvijñeyam*, is not easily comprehensible—to common people, even though heard by them; It being *aṇuḥ*, subtle. Hence *naciketas*, O Naciketā; *vṛṇīṣva*, you ask for; *anyam varam*, some other boon—whose result is not subject to doubt. *Mā uparotsiḥ*, do not press; *mā*, me—as a creditor does a debtor—*mā*, being the same as *mām* (me); *atisṛja*, give up; *enam*, this boon; that is directed towards *mā*, me (that is to say, demanded of me).

Being spoken to thus, Naciketā said:

देवैरत्रापि विचिकित्सितं किल

त्वं च मृत्यो यन्न सुज्ञेयमात्थ ।

वक्ता चास्य त्वादृगन्यो न लभ्यो

नान्यो वरस्तुल्य एतस्य कश्चित् ॥ २२ ॥

22. Even the gods entertained doubt with regard to this thing; and O Death, since you too say that It is not well comprehended and since any other instructor like you, of this thing, is not to be had, (therefore) there is no other boon comparable to this one.

“*Atta*, with regard to this thing; doubt was entertained even by the gods”—this is heard by us from yourself. *Ca*, and; *mṛtyo*, O Death; *yat*, since; *tvam*, you; *ātttha*, say; that the reality of the Self, *na sijñeyam*, is not well comprehended; therefore this thing is unknowable even to the learned; *vaktā ca asya*, and an instructor of this principle; *anyaḥ*, anyone else—who is a learned man *tvādrk*, like you; *na labhyaḥ*, is not to be had—even by searching. But this boon is the means for the attainment of the highest goal. Hence *na anyaḥ varaḥ*, there is no other boon; *kaḥ cit*, whatsoever; which is *etasya tulyaḥ*, comparable to this one—since all the other bear impermanent fruits; this is the purport.

Although told this, still Death says by way of tempting :

शतायुषः पुत्रपौत्रान्वृणीष्व

बहून्पशन् हस्तिहिरण्यमश्वान् ।

भूमेर्महदायतनं वृणीष्व
स्वयं च जीव शरदो यावदिच्छसि ॥ २३ ॥

23. Ask for sons and grandsons that will be centenarians. Ask for many animals, elephants and gold, and horses, and a vast expanse of the earth. And you yourself live for as many years as you like.

Vṛṇīṣva, you ask for; *putra-pautiān*, sons and grandsons; who are *śatāyusaḥ*, gifted with a hundred years of life. Moreover, *bahūn*, many; *paśūn*, animals, such as cows etc.; *hasti-hiraṇyam*, elephants and gold; and *aśvān*, horses. Besides *vṛṇīṣva*, ask for; *mahat āyatanam*, a vast expanse, habitat, region, a kingdom; *bhūmeḥ*, of the earth. Furthermore, all this is useless if you yourself are short-lived. Therefore he says, *ca*, and; *svayam*, you yourself; *jīva*, live, hold to your body with all the senses unimpaired; for as many *śaradaḥ*, years; *yāvat icchasi*, as you wish—to live.

एतत्तुल्यं यदि मन्यसे वरं
वृणीष्व वित्त चिरजीविकां च ।
महाभूमौ नचिकेतस्त्वमेधि

कामानां त्वा कामभाजं करोमि ॥ २४ ॥

24. If you think some other boon to be equal to this, ask for that. Ask for wealth and long life. You become (a ruler) over a vast region. I make you fit for the enjoyment of (all) delectable things.

Yadi, if; *manyase*, you think; some other *varam*, boon; *etat-tulyam*, as equal to this; even that boon, *vīraṣva*, you ask for. Moreover, (you ask for) *vittam*, wealth—plenty of gold, jewels, etc; *ca cirajīvikām*, and long life—i.e. you ask for a long life together with wealth. In brief, *tvam*, you—Naciketā; *edhi*, become (a king); *mahābhūmau*, in a vast region. Besides, *karomi*, I make; *tvā*, you; *kāmahājānu*, partaker in the enjoyment—fit for enjoyment; *kāmānām*, of enjoyable things—divine as well as human; for I am a deity whose will never fails.

ये ये कामा दुर्लभा मर्त्यलोके

सर्वान् कामाश्छन्दतः प्रार्थयस्व ।

इमा रामाः सरथाः सतूर्या

न हीदृशा लम्भनीया मनुष्यैः ।

आभिर्मत्प्रत्ताभिः परिचारयस्व

नचिकेतो मरणं माऽनुप्राक्षीः ॥ २५ ॥

25. Whatever things there be that are desirable but difficult to get—pray for all those cherished things according to your choice. Here are these women with chariots and musical instruments—such are not surely to be had by mortals. With these, who are offered by me, you get yourself served. O Naciketā, do not inquire about death.

Ye ye, all things; that are *kāmāḥ*, desirable; and *durlabhāḥ*, difficult to get; *martyaloke*, in the human

world; *sarvān kāmān*, all those desirable things; *prār-thayasva*, ask for; *chandataḥ*, according to your choice. Moreover, *imāḥ*, here are; the celestial nymphs—the *rāmāḥ* (lit. women) who are so called because they delight (*ramayanti*) men; (and who are there) *sarathāḥ*, with chariots, and *satūryāḥ*, with musical instruments. *Īdrśāḥ*, such (women); *na hi lambhanīyāḥ*, are not surely to be had—without the favour of persons like us; *manuṣ-yaiḥ*, by mortals. *Ābhiḥ*, by these—by these female attendants; *matprattābhiḥ*, who are offered by me; *pari-cārayasva*, get (yourself) served—i.e. get your own service performed, such as washing of feet etc. O Naciketā, *maraṇam*, of death—as to the problem of death, as to whether anything exists after the fall of the body or not, which question is (useless) like the examination of the teeth of a crow; *mā anuprākṣīḥ*, do not inquire—it does not befit you to ask thus.

Although tempted thus, Naciketā, who was not to be perturbed like a vast lake, said:

श्वोभावा मर्त्यस्य यदन्तर्कैतत्
सर्वेन्द्रियाणां जरयन्ति तेजः ।

अपि सर्वं जीवितमल्पमेव

तवैव बाहास्तव नृत्यगीते ॥ २६ ॥

26. O Death, ephemeral are these, and they waste away the vigour of all the senses that a man has. All life, without exception, is short indeed. Let the vehicles be yours alone; let the dances and songs be yours.

Antaka, O Death; the enjoyable things enumerated by you are *śvobhāvāḥ*, ephemeral—whose existence (*bhāva*) is subject to the doubt as to whether they will exist or not tomorrow (*śvaḥ*); moreover, all those enjoyable things such as nymphs etc. *jarayanti*, waste away; *tejaḥ*, the vigour; *yat*, that (that there is) *sarva-indriyāṅām*, of all the senses; *martyasya*, of a human being; so these enjoyable things are an evil since they wear away virtue, strength, intelligence, energy, fame, etc. As for long life which you wish to offer, about that too listen; *Sarvaṁ api jīvitam*, all life—even that of Brahmā; is *alpam eva*, short indeed; what need be said of the longevity of those like us? Therefore *vāhāḥ*, the vehicles etc; and so also *nṛtyagīte*, the dances and songs; *tava eva*, yours alone—let them remain yours.

न वित्तेन तर्पणीयो मनुष्यो

लप्स्यामहे वित्तमद्राक्षम चेत्वा ।

जीविष्यामो यावदीशिष्यसि त्वं

वरस्तु मे वरणीयः स एव ॥ २७ ॥

27. Man is not to be satisfied with wealth. Now that we have met you, we shall get wealth. We shall live as long as you will rule it. But the boon that is worth praying for by me is that alone.

Besides, *manuṣyah*, man; *na tarpaṇīyah*, is not to be satisfied; *vittena*, with wealth—in abundance; for the acquisition of wealth is not seen in this world to satisfy anyone. Should there arise in us any hanker-

ing for wealth, *lapsyāmahe*, we shall acquire, i.e. we shall get; *vittam*, wealth; *cet adrākṣma*, now that we have seen; *tvā*, you—*tvā* being the same as *tvām*, you. Thus, too, we shall get longevity. *Jīviṣyāmaḥ*, we shall live; *yāvat*, as long as; *tvam*, you; *īśiṣyasi* (should rather be *īśiṣyase*), will rule—lord it over in the position of Death. How can a man, after having met you, become poor or short-lived? *Varaḥ tu me varaṇīyaḥ saḥ eva*, but the boon that is worth praying for by me is that alone—that which is the knowledge of the Self.

अजीर्यताममृतानामपेत्य

जीर्यन्मर्त्यः क्वधःस्थः प्रजानन् ।

अभिध्यायन् वर्णरतिप्रमोदा-

नतिदीर्घे जीविते को रमेत ॥ २८ ॥

28. Having reached the proximity of the undecaying immortals, what decaying mortal who dwells on this lower region, the earth, but knows of higher goals, will take delight in a long life while conscious of the worthlessness of music, disport, and the joy thereof?

Besides, *upetya*, having approached the proximity; *ajīryatām*, of the undecaying, of those who do not undergo the loss of age; *amṛtānām*, of the immortals; (and) *prajānan*, knowing, perceiving—that some other better benefit can be derived from them; but himself being *jīryan martyaḥ*, subject to decrepitude and death; (and himself) *kvadhahṣthaḥ*, living on the earth—the word being derived thus: *ku* is the earth and it is *adhaḥ*, below,

in relation to the sky and other regions; one who lives (*tiṣṭhati*) there is *kvadhāṣṭhaḥ*. (Being so) how can he ask for such evanescent things as sons, wealth, gold etc. which are fit to be prayed for by the non-discriminating people? Or there may be a different reading—*kva tadāsthaḥ*—in which case the words are to be construed thus: *tadāsthaḥ* is one who has *āsthā*, absorption in, resorts to with absorption (*teṣu*) in those, sons etc.; *kva* (means) when. (So the phrase means)—when will one, who wishes to achieve a human goal higher than that, difficult though it is to secure, become *tadāsthaḥ*, occupied with them? The idea is that nobody who knows their worthlessness will hanker after them. For every person verily wants to go higher and higher up. Therefore I am not to be seduced by the lure of sons, wealth etc. Moreover *kaḥ*, who, what sensible man; *abhidhyāyan*, while deliberating on —ascertaining the real nature of; *varṇaratipramodān*, music, disport, and delight—derivable from celestial nymphs etc.; as transitory; *rameta*, will delight; *atidīrghe jīvite*, in a long life?

यस्मिन्नदं विचिकित्सन्ति मृत्यो

यत्साम्पराये महति ब्रूहि नस्तत् ।

योऽयं वरो गूढमनुप्रविष्टो

नान्यं तस्मान्नाचिकेता वृणीते ॥ २९ ॥

इति काठकोपनिषदि प्रथमाध्याये प्रथमा वल्ली ॥

29. O Death, tell us of that thing about which people entertain doubt in the context of the next world and whose knowledge leads to a

great result. Apart from this boon, which relates to the inscrutable thing, Naciketā does not pray for any other.

Hence give up alluring me with transitory things and *brūhi naḥ* tell us; *tat*, that, which is prayed for by me; *yasmin*, about which—which Self; people *idam vicikitsanti*, entertain this doubt—as to whether it exists or not; *sāmparāye*, in the context of the next world—when a man dies; *yat*, which—which conclusive knowledge of the Self; *mahati*, is calculated to lead to a great result. To be brief, *ayam varaḥ*, this boon—that relates to the Self under discussion; *yaḥ*, which (boon); *gūḍham anupraviṣṭaḥ*, has entered into an inaccessible recess—has become very inscrutable: apart from that boon *anyam*, any other—any boon with regard to the non-Self that can be sought after by senseless people; *naciketā na vṛñite*, Naciketā does not pray for—even in thought. This (last sentence) is a statement by the Upaniṣad itself (and is not an utterance of Naciketā).

PART I

CANTO II

Having tested the disciple and found his fitness for knowledge, he (Yama) said:

अन्यच्छ्रेयोऽन्यदुतैव प्रेय-

स्ते उभे नानार्थे पुरुषः सिनीतः ।

तयोः श्रेय आददानस्य साधु

भवति हीयतेऽर्थाच्च उ प्रेयो वृणीते ॥ १ ॥

1. The preferable is different indeed; and so, indeed, is the pleasurable different. These two, serving divergent purposes, (as they do), bind men. Good befalls him who accepts the preferable among these two. He who selects the pleasurable falls from the true end.

Śreyah, the preferable, the supreme goal (freedom); *anyat eva* (is) certainly different. *Tathā* similarly; *uta*. too; *preyah*, the more pleasant; *anyat eva*, (is) different indeed. *Te ubhe*, both of them—the pleasurable and the preferable; *nānā arthe*, serving divergent purposes—as they do; *sinītaḥ*, bind; *puruṣam*, man—one who, as subject to caste, stage of life, etc., is competent for either. All men are impelled by these two under an idea of personal duty; for according as one hankers after prosperity or immortality, one engages in the pleasurable or the preferable. Therefore, all men are said to be bound by these two through their sense of duty with regard to

what leads to the pleasurable or the preferable. These two, though related severally to the (two) human goals¹, are opposed to each other, inasmuch as they are of the nature of knowledge and ignorance. Thus since these cannot be performed together by the same person, without discarding either of the two, therefore *tayoḥ*, of the two; *ādadānasya*, to one who accepts; only *śreyah*, the preferable, by discarding the pleasurable, (the latter) being of the nature of ignorance; *sādhū bhavati*, well-being, good comes—as a result. But he, who is a short-sighted, ignorant man, *hīyate*, gets alienated; *arthāt*, from this objective, from the human goal; i.e. he falls from the eternal supreme purpose. Who is that man? *Yaḥ u*, the one that; *preyaḥ vr̥ṇīte*, selects, i.e. takes hold of, the pleasurable.

If both can be done by a man at will, why do people cling mostly to the pleasurable only? This is being answered:

श्रेयश्च प्रेयश्च मनुष्यमेत-

स्तौ सम्परीत्य विविनक्ति धीरः ।

श्रेयो हि धीरोऽभि प्रेयसो वृणीते

प्रेयो मन्दो योगक्षेमाद्वृणीते ॥ २ ॥

2. The preferable and the pleasurable approach mankind. The man of intelligence, having considered them, separates the two. The intelligent one selects the electable in preference to the delectable; the non-intelligent one

¹ (i) Prosperity here and hereafter, and (ii) salvation.

selects the delectable for the sake of growth and protection (of the body etc.).

True it is that they are subject to (human) option; still, since they are not easily distinguishable by men of poor intellect either with regard to their means or with regard to their fruits, therefore *śreyas ca preyas ca*, the preferable and the pleasurable; *manuṣyam etaḥ*, approach men; as though they are intermixed. Therefore just as a swan separates milk from water, similarly *dhīraḥ*, a man of intelligence; *samparītya*, having surveyed fully, having considered mentally their importance and unimportance; *vivinakti*, separates; *tau* those two, viz the preferable and the pleasurable. And having distinguished, *śreyaḥ hi*, the electable indeed; *abhivṛṇīte*, (he) selects, because of its higher value, *preyasah*, in comparison with the delectable. Who is he (that prefers)? *Dhīraḥ*, the intelligent man. As for the *mandāḥ* the man of poor intelligence; he, because of a lack of discrimination; *yogakṣemāt*, for the sake of *yoga* and *kṣema*, i.e. for the growth and protection of the body etc.; *vṛṇīte*, selects; *preyaḥ*, the delectable, constituted by cattle, sons, etc.

स त्वं प्रियान्त्रियरूपांश्च कामा-

नभिध्यायन्नचिकेतोऽत्यस्त्राक्षीः ।

नैतां सुद्धां वित्तमयीमवाप्तो

यस्यां मज्जन्ति बहवो मनुष्याः ॥ ३ ॥

3. O Naciketā! you, such as you are, have discarded, after consideration, all the desirable

things that are themselves delightful or are the producers of delight. You have not accepted this path of wealth in which many a man comes to grief.

Saḥ tvam, you, such as you are—though tempted by me again and again; *abhidyāyan*, having considered—the defects such as impermanence and substantiality of; *kāmān*, desirable things; viz *prīyān*, dear ones, such as children etc.; *ca*, and; *prīyarupān*, producers of delight, such as nymphs etc.:¹ *naciketaḥ*, O Naciketā; *atyasrākṣīḥ*, you have discarded. What an intelligence you have! *Na avāptaḥ*, you have not accepted; *etām*, this; ugly *śrīkām*, course; *vittamayīm*, abounding in wealth; which is resorted to by ignorant people; *yasyām*, in which course; *bahavaḥ*, many; *manuṣyāḥ*, men; *majjanti*, sink, come to grief.

It has been said, “Good befalls him who accepts the preferable among these two. He who selects the pleasurable falls from the true end” (Ka. I.ii. 1). Why is that so?—Because:

दूरमेते विपरीते विषूची

अविद्या या च विद्येति ज्ञाता ।

विद्याभीप्सनं नचिकेतसं मन्ये

न त्वा कामा बहवोऽलोलुपन्त ॥ ४ ॥

4. That which is known as knowledge and that which is known as ignorance are widely

¹ Children are one's own Self, as it were, whereas nymphs are a degree removed from one.

contradictory, and they follow divergent courses. I consider Naciketā to be an aspirant for knowledge, (because) the enjoyable things, multifarious though they be, did not tempt you.

Ete, these two; are *dūram*, widely, by a great distance; *viparīte*, contradictory, mutually exclusive, like light and darkness, they being of the nature of discrimination and non-discrimination; *viṣūcī*, have divergent courses, i.e. they produce different results, being the cause of worldly existence and emancipation. This is the idea. Which are they? The answer is: *Yā ca* that which *jñātā*, is fully ascertained, known by the learned; *avidyā iti*, as ignorance—which has for its object the pleasurable; *yā ca*, and that which; (is known) *vidyā iti*, as knowledge—which has for its object the preferable. Of these two, *manye*, I consider; you *naciketāsam*, Naciketā; *vidyā-bhīpsinam*, as desirous of knowledge. Why? Because *kāmāḥ*, the enjoyable things, such as nymphs etc.—which distract the intellect of the unenlightened; although they are *bahavaḥ*, many; they *na alolupanta*, did not tempt; *tvā*, you—*tvā* being the same as *tvām*; did not deflect you from the path of the preferable by arousing a desire for enjoying them. Therefore I consider you to be craving for enlightenment, to be fit for the preferable—this is the idea.

अविद्यायामन्तरे वर्तमानाः

स्वयं धीराः पण्डितमन्यमानाः ।

दन्द्रम्यमाणाः परिरयन्ति मूढा

अन्धेनैव नीयमाना यथान्धाः ॥ ५ ॥

5. Living in the midst of ignorance and considering themselves intelligent and enlightened, the senseless people go round and round, following crooked courses, just like the blind led by the blind.

But those who are fit for worldly existence, they, *vartamānāḥ*, living; *avidyāyām antare*, in the midst of ignorance—as though in the midst of thick darkness, being entangled in hundreds of fetters, forged by craving for sons, cattle, etc; *manyamānāḥ*, considering—(thinking of themselves), *svayam* “we ourselves are; *dhīrāḥ*, intelligent; and *pañḍitāḥ*, versed in the scriptures”; those *mūḍhāḥ*, senseless, non-discriminating people; *pariyanti*, go round and round; *dandramyamānāḥ*, by following¹ very much the various crooked courses, being afflicted by old age, death, disease, etc.; just as many *andhāḥ*, blind people; *nīyamānāḥ*, being led; *andhena eva*, by the blind indeed, on an uneven road, come to great calamity.

Because of this alone, because of ignorance, the means for the attainment of the other world does not become revealed (to them):

न साम्परायः प्रतिभाति बालं

प्रमाद्यन्तं वित्तमोहेन मूढम् ।

अयं लोको नास्ति पर इति मानी

पुनः पुनर्वशमापद्यते मे ॥ ६ ॥

6. The means for the attainment of the

¹ Our reading is *gacchantāḥ*. A different reading is *icchantāḥ*, wishing for.

other world does not become revealed to the non-discriminating man who blunders, being fooled by the lure of wealth. One that constantly thinks that there is only this world, and none hereafter, comes under my sway again and again.

Samparāyaḥ is the other world, attainable after the falling of the body (*sampara*): *sāmparāyaḥ* is any particular scriptural means leading to the attainment of that other world. And this (means) *na pratibhāti*, does not become revealed to, i.e. does not become serviceable to *bālam*, a boy, a non-discriminating man; (who is) *pramādyantam*, blundering—whose mind clings to such needs as children, cattle etc.; and so also who is *mūḍham*, confounded, being covered by darkness (of ignorance): *vittamohena*, because of the non-discrimination caused by wealth. “*Ayam lokah*, there is only this world—that which is visible and abounds with women, food, drink, etc.; *na paraḥ asti*, there is no other world, that is invisible”—*iti mānī*, constantly thinking thus; (he) getting born, *punaḥ punaḥ*, again and again; *āpadyate*, becomes subject to the *vaśam*, control; *me*, of me, who am Death; that is, he remains involved in a succession of grief in the form of birth, death, etc. Such is the world in general.

But among thousands, it is only one like you who hankers after the preferable, and who becomes a knower of the Self; because:

श्रवणायापि बहुभिर्यो न लभ्यः

शृण्वन्तोऽपि बहवो यं न विद्युः ।

आश्चर्यो वक्ता कुशलोऽस्य लब्धाऽऽ-

श्चर्यो ज्ञाता कुशलानुशिष्टः ॥ ७ ॥

7. Of that (Self), which is not available for the mere hearing to many, (and) which many do not understand even while hearing, the expounder is wonderful and the receiver is wonderful, wonderful is he who knows, under the instruction of an adept.

Yah, that which—the Self that; *na labhyaḥ*, is not attainable; *bahubhiḥ*, by many; *śravaṇāya api*, even for the sake of hearing; *yam*, which—which Self; *bahavaḥ*, many (others); *śṛṅvantaḥ api*, even while hearing; *na vidyuḥ*, do not know; the unfortunate whose minds have not been purified may not know. Moreover, *asya vaktā*, Its expounder; (is) *āścaryaḥ*, wonderful—comparable to a wonder—a rare one, indeed, among many. Similarly, even after hearing of the Self, *kuśalaḥ*, one who is proficient—a rare one among many; becomes the *labdhā*, attainer. For *āścaryaḥ jñātā*, a wonderful man—a rare soul—becomes a knower; *kuśalānūśiṣṭaḥ*, being instructed by a proficient teacher.

Why (so)? Because:

न नरेणावरेण प्रोक्त एष

सुविज्ञेयो बहुधा चिन्त्यमानः ।

अनन्यप्रोक्ते गतिरत्र नास्ति

अणीयान् ह्यतर्क्यमणुप्रमाणात् ॥ ८ ॥

8. The Self is not certainly adequately known when spoken of by an inferior person; for It is thought of variously. When taught by one who has become identified with It, there is no further cogitation with regard to It. For It is beyond argumentation, being subtler even than the atomic quantity.

Eṣaḥ, this—the Self about whom you ask me; (when *proktaḥ*, spoken of; *avareṇa nareṇa*, by an inferior man, i.e. by a man of worldly understanding; *na hi suvijñeyaḥ*, is not certainly liable to be adequately understood; for It is *bahudhā*, variously—such as “It exists”, “It does not exist”, “It is the doer”, “It is not the doer”; *cintyamānaḥ*, deliberated on—by disputants. How, again, is It well understood? This is being said: The Self *ananyaprokte*, when spoken of by a non-different man, by the teacher who does not see duality, who has become identified with the Brahman that is to be revealed (by him¹); *atra*, here, with regard to the Self; *na asti*, there does not remain; *gatiḥ*, cogitation, of various kinds as to whether It exists or not; for from the Self is ruled out all thoughts involving doubt.

Or—*ananyaprokte*, when the (supreme) Self, that is non-different from, and is, one’s very Self is adequately taught;² *na asti gatiḥ*, there is no other comprehension;³

¹ Or—“revealed in the Upaniṣads”—*Bālagopāendra*.

² Or—“taught as non-different from, and as, one’s very Self”—*Bālagopāendra*.

³ Apart from the realisation: “I am Brahman.”

atra, in this Self; as there is nothing else¹ to be known. For the realisation of the unity of the Self is the culmination of all knowledge. Therefore, as there is no knowledge, there remains nothing to be known here.

Or—when the non-different Self is spoken of, *na asti atra gatiḥ*, there remains no transmigration;² for emancipation, which is the result of that realisation, follows immediately.

Or—when the Self is spoken of by a teacher who has become identified with the Brahman that he speaks of, there is *na agatiḥ*, no non-comprehension non-realisation. To this hearer, the realisation, “I am that (Self)”, does come, just as it did in the case of the teacher. This is the idea.

Thus is the Self well understood when It is taught to be non-different (from the taught) by a teacher who is well versed in the scriptures.³ Else the Self becomes *añyān*, more subtle; even *aṇupramāṇāt*, than an atomic thing. (For It is) *atarkyam* (should be *atarkyah*) cannot be argued out—cannot be known through mere reasoning called up through one’s own (independent) intellect.⁴ For if the Self be regarded as an object of argumentation and postulated to be atomic in quantity, someone else may hold It to be subtler than that, while still another may

¹ Apart from the unity of the Self and Brahman.

² Bālagopāendra interprets *samsāra-gati* as the appearance of duality as a reality. This appearance ceases after Self-knowledge.

³ “When It is taught by a teacher, well versed in the scriptures and established in a state of non-difference”—Bālagopāendra.

⁴ As distinguished from the intellect purified by the teachings of an adept.

hold It to be the subtlest. Thus there is no finality about sophistry.

नैषा तर्केण मतिरापनेया

प्रोक्तान्येनैव सुज्ञानाय प्रेष्ठ ।

यां त्वमापः सत्यधृतिर्बतासि

त्वादृङ्क्षो भूयान्नचिकेतः प्रष्टा ॥ ९ ॥

9. The wisdom that you have, O dearest one, which leads to sound knowledge when imparted only by someone else (other than the logician), is not to be attained through argumentation. You are, O compassionate one, endowed with true resolution. May our questioner be like you, O Naciketā.

Therefore *eṣā*, this—this wisdom about the Self, as presented by the Vedas, that arises when the Self is taught by one who has become identified with It; *tarkenā*, through argumentation—called up merely by one's own intellect; *na āpaneyā*, is not to be attained. Or (reading the word as *apaneyā*, the expression means)—is not to be eradicated, not to be destroyed. For logician, who is not versed in the Vedas, talks of all sorts of things that can be called up by his own intellect. Therefore, *preṣṭha*, O dearest one; this wisdom that originates from the Vedas, *sujñānāya bhavati*, leads to sound knowledge; when *prokte*, imparted; *anyena eva*, by a different person indeed—by a teacher who is versed in the Vedas and is different from the logician. What, again is that belief that is beyond argumentation? This is being said: *yām*, that which—

the wisdom that; *tvam āpaḥ*, you have attained; through the granting of the boon by me. *Asi*, you are; *satyadhṛtiḥ*, of true resolution—your resolves refer to real things. Death utters the word *bata* (a particle expressing compassion) out of compassion for Naciketā, thereby eulogising the knowledge that is going to be imparted. Any other *praṣṭā*, questioner—whether a son or a disciple; (that there may be *naḥ*, to us; *bhūyāt*, may he be; *tvādrk*, like you. Of what sort? The kind of questioner that you are; *naciketah*, O Naciketā.

Being pleased, he said again:

जानाम्यहं शेवधिरित्यनित्यं

न ह्यध्रुवैः प्राप्यते हि ध्रुवं तत् ।

ततो मया नाचिकेतश्चित्तोऽग्नि-

रनित्यैर्द्रव्यैः प्राप्तवानस्मि नित्यम् ॥ १० ॥

10. (Since) I know that this treasure is impermanent—for that permanent entity cannot be attained through impermanent things—therefore (knowingly) did I pile up the Nāciketa fire with impermanent things, and have (thereby) attained (relative) permanence.

Aham jānāmi, I know; *iti*, (this fact) that; *śevadhīḥ*, the treasure—comprising the fruits of action, which are prayed for like a treasure; that treasure is *anityam* (rather *anityaḥ*), impermanent. *Hi* for *anityaiḥ*, through impermanent things, *tat*, that; *dhravam*, permanent entity—which is the treasure called the supreme Self; *na prāpyate*, cannot be attained. But that treasure alone, which con-

sists of impermanent pleasure, is to be attained through impermanent things. *Hi* since, this is so; *tataḥ*, therefore; *mayā*, by me—knowing, as I did that the permanent cannot be attained through the evanescent; *nāciketāḥ agniḥ*, the fire called Nāciketa; *citaḥ* was piled up, i.e. the sacrifice that is meant for the acquisition of heavenly bliss was accomplished; *anityaiḥ dravyaiḥ*, with impermanent things—by animals etc. Having acquired the requisite merit thereby, *prāptavān asmi*, I have achieved; *nityam*, the permanent—the relatively permanent abode of Death which is called heaven.

कामस्याप्तिं जगतः प्रतिष्ठां

ऋतोरानन्त्यमभयस्य पारम् ।

स्तोममहदुहगायं प्रतिष्ठां दृष्ट्वा

धृत्या धीरो नचिकेतोऽत्यस्त्राक्षीः ॥ ११ ॥

11. O Naciketā, you, on becoming enlightened, have rejected (them all) by examining patiently the highest reach of desire, the support of the universe, the infinite¹ results of meditation, the other shore of fearlessness, the extensive course of (Hiraṇyagarbha) that is praiseworthy and great, as also (your own) state.

But you, *dr̥ṣṭvā*, having seen, examined; (Hiraṇyagarbha as) *kāmasya āptim*, the end of desire—that here indeed all desires end² (vide Mu. III. ii. 2); having seen

¹ All these are to be understood in a relative sense.

² Here, i.e. in the state of Hiraṇyagarbha. Desire cannot lead men beyond Hiraṇyagarbha.

Hiraṇyagarbha as) *jagataḥ pratiṣṭhām*, the support—because of His all-pervasiveness—of the world comprising all that is personal, elemental, heavenly, etc.; (having seen) the *ānanyam*, infinitude; *kratoḥ*, of meditation¹—the (relatively) infinite result (of meditation on Hiraṇyagarbha), which is the state of Hiraṇyagarbha; (having seen) *pāram*, the other shore, the utmost limit; *abhayasya*, of fearlessness; (having seen) the *urugāyam*, extensive course of (Hiraṇyagarbha):² which is *stoma-mahat*: that which is *stoma*, praiseworthy, and *mahat*, great—abounding in many attributes such as divine faculties of becoming subtle etc.—is *stoma-mahat*, because it is possessed of super-excellence; (and having seen) *pratiṣṭhām*, existence—your own state, unsurpassable though it is; *naciketah*, O Naciketā; having seen all these *dhṛtyā*, with patience; and having become, *dhīrah*, intelligent; *atyasrākṣīḥ*, you have renounced—have given up all these worldly enjoyments (up to the state of Hiraṇyagarbha), being desirous only of the Supreme One. O! what an unsurpassable quality you are endowed with!

तं दुर्दर्शं गूढमनुप्रविष्टं

गुहाहितं गह्वरेष्ठं पुराणम् ।

अध्यात्मयोगाधिगमेन देवं

मत्वा धीरो हर्षशोकौ जहाति ॥ १२ ॥

12. The intelligent man gives up happiness and sorrow by developing concentration of mind

¹ This is according to Bālagopāendra. Some translate it as “of sacrifice”.

² Since thereby is attained the state of Hiraṇyagarbha which lasts for a long time till final dissolution.

on the Self and thereby meditating on the old Deity who is inscrutable, lodged inaccessibly, located in the intellect, and seated in the midst of misery.

Tam, Him—the Self that you want to know; which is *durdarśam*, hard to see, because of Its extreme subtleness; *gūḍham anupraviṣṭam*, lodged inaccessibly, i.e. hidden by knowledge that changes in accordance with worldly objects; *guhāhitam*, located in the intellect—because It is perceived there; *gahvareṣṭham*, existing in the midst of misery—in the body and senses which are the source of many miseries. Since It is thus lodged inaccessibly and located in the intellect, therefore It is seated in the midst of misery. Hence It is hard to see; *matvā*, meditating on; that *purāṇam*, old (everlasting); *devam*, Deity—the Self; *adhyātmayogādhiḡmena*—concentration of the mind on the Self after withdrawing it from the outer objects is *adhyātmayoga*—through the attainment of that; *dhīraḡ*, the intelligent man; *jahāti*, gives up; *harṣasōkau*, happiness and sorrow—since there is no excellence or deterioration for the Self.

एतच्छ्रुत्वा सम्परिगृह्य मर्त्यः

प्रवृह्य धर्म्यमणुमेतमाप्य ।

स मोदते मोदनीयꣳ हि लब्ध्वा

विवृतꣳ सद्य नचिकेतसं मन्ये ॥ १३ ॥

13. After hearing this, grasping it fully, separating this righteous thing (from the body etc.), and attaining this subtle thing, that mortal rejoices, for he has obtained that which is the

cause of delight. I consider that the mansion (of Brahman) is wide open to Naciketā.

Moreover, *śrutvā*, after hearing—through the favour of the teacher; *etat*, that reality of the Self that I shall speak of; *sampariṅhya*, after grasping (It) fully—as one's own Self; *pravṛhya*, after separating (from body etc); this *dharma*, righteous¹ (thing, the Self); and *āpya*, after attaining; *etam aṇum*, this subtle thing—the Self; *saḥ martyaḥ*, that mortal—(who has become) the enlightened man; *modate*, rejoices; *labdhvā*, having obtained; *modaniyam*, that which causes delight. Therefore *manye*, I consider; that the *sadma*, mansion—the abode of Brahman, which is of this kind; *vivṛtam*, is wide open to—has approached towards;² *naciketasaṃ*, (you) Naciketā. The idea is: “I consider you fit for emancipation.”

(Naciketā said), “If I am fit and you, too, sir, are pleased with me, then

अन्यत्र धर्मादन्यत्राधर्मा-

दन्यत्रास्मात्कृताकृतात् ।

अन्यत्र भूताच्च भव्याच्चय

यत्तत्पश्यसि तद्वद ॥ १४ ॥

14. “Tell (me) of that thing which you see as different from virtue, different from vice,

¹ Lit. that which is conducive to virtue, the knowledge of Reality being the highest virtue.

² Brahman and the mansion are identical, and the approach of this mansion towards Naciketā consists in the propitiousness of Brahman.

different from this cause and effect, and different from the past and the future.”

Anyatra dharmāt, different from virtue—i.e. from the performance of scriptural duties, their results, and their accessories; so also *anyatra adharmāt*, different from vice; so also *anyatra asmāt kṛtākṛtāt*, different from this *kṛta*, the effect, and *akṛta*, the cause; moreover, *anyatra bhūtāt ca bhavyāt ca*, different from what was, or will be—as also what is—i.e. what is not limited by the three times (past, present, and future); *yat*, what—the thing of this kind that is beyond the reach of all empirical experience, which; *paśyasi*, you see, you know; *tat*, that thing; *vada*, you tell—me.

With a view to speaking of the thing asked for, as also some other attributes, Death said to him who had inquired thus:

सर्वे वेदा यत्पदमामनन्ति

तपांसि सर्वाणि च यद्वदन्ति ।

यदिच्छन्तो ब्रह्मचर्यं चरन्ति

तत्ते पदं संग्रहेण ब्रवीम्योमित्येतत् ॥ १५ ॥

15. I tell you briefly of that goal which all the Vedas with one voice propound, which all the austerities speak of, and wishing for which people practise Brahmacharya: it is this, viz *Om*.

Yat padam, that attainable thing—the goal, which; *sarve Vedāḥ*, all the Vedas—without divergence; *āmananti*, propound; *ca*, and; *yat*, that which; *sarvāṇi tapāṁsi*, all the austerities; *vadanti*, speak of—are meant for the attainment

of; *yat icchantah*, wishing for which; *caranti*, (they) practise; *brahmacaryam*, Brahmacharya that consists either in residence (for study) in the house of the teacher or in some other kind (i.e. lifelong celibacy) meant for the attainment of Brahman; *bravāmi*, I tell; *te*, you; *saṅgrahaṇa*, in brief: *tat*, that thing—the goal; *om iti etat*, is this, viz *Om*. The goal that you desire to know is this that is indicated by the word *Om* and that has *Om* as its symbol.¹

(Since *Om* is the name and symbol of Brahman), therefore:

एतद्ध्येवाक्षरं ब्रह्म एतद्ध्येवाक्षरं परम् ।

एतद्ध्येवाक्षरं ज्ञात्वा यो यदिच्छति तस्य तत् ॥ १६ ॥

16. This letter (*Om*), indeed, is the (inferior) Brahman (Hiranyagarbha); and this letter is, indeed, the supreme Brahman. Anybody, who, (while) meditating on this letter, wants any of the two, to him comes that.

Etat eva akṣaram brahma, this letter (*Om*), indeed, is (the inferior) Brahman (Hiranyagarbha). And *etat eva*

¹ It is well known that the thing that is revealed (i.e. flashes in the mind) on the utterance of a word is signified by that word. Thus the knowledge, untouched by outer objects, that reveals itself to the man of concentrated mind on the utterance of the word *Om*, is also dependent on and signified by *Om*. One should meditate thus: "I am Brahman, as signified by *Om* and as conditioned by *Māyā* in which the *satva* quality preponderates." If, however, one is not able to do so, one should superimpose the idea of Brahman on the symbol *Om*. The best minds can think of Brahman without *Om*. The middle ones can meditate on Brahman with the help of *Om*. And the inferior ones can worship Brahman on the symbol *Om*.

akṣaram param, this letter (*Om*) is the supreme Brahman. For of them both this letter (*Om*) is the symbol. *Jñātvā*, (while) worshipping; *etat eva akṣaram*, this very letter *Om* as Brahman; anything that—whether the supreme or the inferior Brahman; *yaḥ*, anybody; *icchati*, wishes for; *tat tasya*, that becomes his: if it is the supreme Brahman (that he desires), It becomes knowable; if it is the inferior Brahman, It becomes attainable.

एतदालम्बनं श्रेष्ठमेतदालम्बनं परम् ।

एतदालम्बनं ज्ञात्वा ब्रह्मलोके महीयते ॥ १७ ॥

17. This medium is the best; this medium is the supreme (and the inferior) Brahman. Meditating on this medium, one becomes adorable in the world of Brahman.

Since this is so, therefore, among all the mediums, (e.g. *Gāyatrī*), for the attainment of Brahman, *etat ālambanam*, this medium, is *śreṣṭham*, the highest—the most praiseworthy; *etat ālambanam*, this medium (is); *param*, supreme Brahman—as well as the inferior Brahman, since it relates to both the inferior Brahman and the supreme Brahman. *Jñātvā*, meditating on; *etat ālambanam*, this medium; *brahmaloke mahīyate*, one is worshipped in the world of Brahman. The idea is this: Getting identified with the supreme Brahman or the inferior Brahman, (as a result of meditation), he becomes adorable-like Brahman.

For those aspirants of medium and inferior quality, *Om* has been indicated both as a medium (for meditation on), and symbol (for worship), of the Self which is devoid of all attributes and which was inquired about in, “Tell me

of that thing which you see as different from virtue" etc. (Ka. I.ii.14;) and It has also been presented similarly, for similar aspirants, who wish to know the inferior Brahman.

Now this (verse) is being said with a view to ascertaining directly the nature of that Self which has the *Om* as Its medium:

न जायते म्रियते वा विपश्चि-

न्नायं कुतश्चिन्न बभूव कश्चित् ।

अजो नित्यः शाश्वतोऽयं पुराणो

न हन्यते हन्यमाने शरीरे ॥ १८ ॥

18. The intelligent Self is neither born nor does It die. It did not originate from anything, nor did anything originate from It. It is birthless, eternal, undecaying, and ancient. It is not injured even when the body is killed.

Vipaścīt, the intelligent one (Self)—intelligent because Its nature of consciousness is never lost; *na jāyate*, is not born—It is not produced; *na vā mriyate*, nor does It die. An impermanent thing, that has origination, is subject to many modifications. With a view to denying all the modifications in the Self, the first and last of these modifications, in the form of birth and death, are being first denied here in the text: "He is neither born nor dies." Moreover, *ayam*, this one—the Self; *na kutaścīt*, did not come from anything—did not originate from any other cause; and from the Self Itself *na kaścīt babhūva*, nothing originated—as something different from It. Therefore *ayam*, this Self;

(is) *ajah*, birthless; *nityah*, eternal; *śāśvataḥ*, undecaying. That which is impermanent is subject to decay; but this one is everlasting; therefore, again, It is *purāṇah*, ancient—new indeed even from of old. A thing is said to be new now which emerges into being through the development of its parts, as for instance, a pot etc. The Self, however, is opposed to them; It is ancient, i.e. devoid of growth. Since this is so, therefore, *na hanyate*, It is not killed—not injured; *śarīre hanyamāne*, when the body is killed—with weapons etc., though It exists there, just like space.

हन्ता चेन्मन्यते हन्तुः हतश्चेन्मन्यते हतम् ।

उभौ तौ न विजानीतो नायः हन्ति न हन्यते ॥ १९ ॥

19. If the killer thinks (of It) in terms of killing and if the killed thinks (of It) as killed, both of them do not know. It does not kill, nor is it killed.

Even though the Self is of this kind, still *cet*, if; someone who looks upon the mere body as the Self, *manyate*, thinks—of It; *hantum*, for the sake of killing—(if he) thinks, “I shall kill It”; and the other who is *hataḥ*, killed; *cet*, if; he too, should *manyate*, think; the Self to be *hatam*, killed—(if he) thinks, “I am killed”; *ubhau tau*, both of them, equally; *na vijānītaḥ*, do not know—their own Self; because *ayam*, this one; *na hanti*, does not kill—the Self being unchangeable; similarly *na hanyate*, It is not killed—because of the very fact of unchangeability, as in the case of space. Therefore the worldly existence, consisting of virtue and vice, relates merely to the ignorant man, it does not belong to the knower of Brahman, because for him virtue and vice

are inappropriate both according to the Vedic authority and logic.

How does one know the Self? This is being said:

अणोरणीयान्महतो महीया-

नात्माऽस्य जन्तोर्निहितो गुहायाम् ।

तमऋतुः पश्यति वीतशोको

धातुप्रसादान्महिमानमात्मनः ॥ २० ॥

20. The Self that is subtler than the subtle and greater than the great is lodged in the heart of (every) creature. A desireless man sees that glory of the Self through the serenity of the organs, and (thereby he becomes) free from sorrow.

(The Self is) *añīyān*, subtler; *aṇoh*, than the subtle—such as a (tiny) *śyāmāka* grain; *mahīyān*, greater; *mahatah*, than the great—things that have a great dimension such as the earth. Whatever great or atomic thing there be in the world, can possibly be so by being possessed of its reality through that eternal Self. When deprived of that Self, it is reduced to unreality. Therefore that very Self is subtler than the subtle and greater than the great, for It is conditioned by all names, forms, and activities which are Its limiting adjuncts. And that *ātmā*, Self; *nihitah*, is lodged—exists as the Self; *guhāyām*, in the heart; *asya jantoh*, of this creature—(in the heart) of all beings beginning from Brahṃā and ending with a clump of grass. *Tam*, that Self—the means for whose realisation are hearing, thinking, and

meditation;¹ (he sees, who is) *akratuḥ*, a desireless man, i.e. one who has desisted from all outer objects, seen or unseen; and when this (detachment) takes place, *dhātavaḥ*, the organs, such as mind etc. become composed, the *dhātus* being so called because of their holding (*dhāraṇa*) the body. (So) *dhātuprasādāt*, through the serenity of these organs; (he) *paśyati*, sees; *tam mahimānam*, that glory; *ātmanaḥ*, of the Self—that is not subject to growth and decay in accordance with the results of work—he sees, i.e. he directly realises the Self as “I am the Self”, and thereby he becomes *vitaśokaḥ*, free from sorrow.

Otherwise, the Self is difficult to be known by ordinary people who are possessed of desire, because:

आसीनो दूरं व्रजति शयानो याति सर्वतः ।
कस्तं मदामदं देवं मदन्यो ज्ञातुमर्हति ॥ २१ ॥

21. While sitting, It travels far away; while sleeping, It goes everywhere. Who but I can know that Deity who is both joyful and joyless?

(The Self) while *āsinaḥ*, sitting—remaining stationary, motionless, *dūram vrajati*, goes far; *śayānaḥ*, while sleeping; *yāti*, goes; *sarvataḥ*, everywhere. Similarly, that Deity, the Self, is *madāmada*, possessed of *mada*, and devoid of *mada*—joyful and joyless—possessed of contradictory qualities. Hence it being difficult to know It, *kaḥ*, who; *madanyaḥ*, apart from me; *jñātum arhati*, can know; *tam madāmadam*

¹ This is according to Bālagopāendra. The phrase *darśana-śravaṇa-manana-vijñāna-līngam* may also mean, “the Self whose existence is inferable from the acts of seeing, hearing, thinking, and knowing.”

devam, that joyful and joyless Deity? Since the Self, as conditioned by various limiting adjuncts, is possessed of opposite qualities and appears variously like a prism (*viśvarūpa*) or a philosopher's stone (*cintāmaṇi*),¹ therefore it is only by a wise man of fine intellect, like us, that this Self can be known. Hence the difficulty of Its realisation is being pointed out in the sentence: *kaḥ tam madanyaḥ jñātum arhati*, who apart from me can know It? Sleep is the cessation of the activities of the senses. The delimitation of consciousness,² caused by the senses, ceases for a sleeping man. When the Self is in such a state (of sleep), Its consciousness being of a general character, It *yāti sarvataḥ*, seems to go, (to be present), everywhere. When It is in a state of particularised consciousness, It, though really stationary by Its own nature, *dūram vrajati*, seems to travel far, in accordance with the movement of mind etc., because It is conditioned by those mind etc. In reality, It continues here (in this body) only.

The text further shows how from the knowledge of the Self comes the elimination of grief as well:

अशरीरः शरीरेष्वनवस्थेष्ववस्थितम् ।
महान्तं विभुमात्मानं मत्वा धीरो न शोचति ॥ २२ ॥

22. Having meditated on the Self, as bodiless in the midst of bodies, as permanent in the

¹ A *viśvarūpa* gem appears possessed of diverse colours, and a *cintāmaṇi* assumes various aspects in accordance with the thought of its possessor.

² Then consciousness has such limited expression as, "I am a man", "I see a blue thing", and so on.—A.G.

midst of the impermanent, and as great and pervasive, the wise man does not grieve.

The Self in Its own nature, is like space; (having meditated on) that Self (as) *aśarīram*, unembodied—as that bodiless Self; *śarīreṣu*, in the midst of bodies—of gods, Manes, human beings, etc.; (as) *avasthitam*, permanent, i.e. unchanging; *anavastheṣu*, in those that have no fixity—amidst the impermanent; and (having meditated) on the *mahāntam*, great (Self)—(and), lest the greatness be taken relatively, the text says *vibhum*, the pervasive; *ātmānam*, Self. The word Self (*ātman*) primarily means the indwelling Self. *Matvā*, having meditated—as “I am this”—on this Self that is of this kind; *dhīraḥ*, the wise man; *na śocati*, does not grieve. For grief cannot reasonably belong to a man of this kind who has known the Self.

The text says that though this Self is difficult to know, It can be known well through proper means:

नायमात्मा प्रवचनेन लभ्यो

न मेधया न बहुना श्रुतेन ।

यमेवैष वृणुते तेन लभ्य-

स्तस्यैष आत्मा विवृणुते तनूः स्वाम् ॥ २३ ॥

23. This Self cannot be known through much study, nor through the intellect, nor through much hearing. It can be known through the Self alone that the aspirant prays to; this Self of that seeker reveals Its true nature.

Ayam ātmā this Self; *na labhyaḥ* is not to be attained, is not to be known; *pravacanena* through the acquisition of many Vedas; and *na medhayā* not through the intellect—through the power of grasping the meaning of texts; *na bahunā śrutena* not through much hearing—alone. How is It then to be known? This is being said: *Yam eva* that (Self) indeed which is his (i.e. aspirant's) own Self which; *eṣaḥ* this one—the aspirant; *vṛṇute* prays to; *tena* by that —by that very Self which is the seeker (himself); the Self Itself is *labhyaḥ* can be known, i.e. It becomes known to be such and such. The meaning is that to a desireless man who seeks for the Self alone, the Self becomes known of Its own accord.¹ How is It known? This is being said: *eṣaḥ*, this Self, *tasya*, of that seeker of the Self;² *vivṛṇute*, reveals; *svām*, Its own—Its real; *tanūm*, body, i.e. Its own nature. There is this further fact;

नाविरतो दुश्चरितान्नाशान्तो नासमाहितः ।

नाशान्तमानसो वाऽपि प्रज्ञानेनैनमाप्नुयात् ॥ २४ ॥

24. One who has not desisted from bad conduct, whose senses are not under control, whose mind is not concentrated, whose mind is not free from anxiety (about the result of concentration), cannot attain this Self through knowledge.

Na avirataḥ, not one who has not desisted; *duṣcaritāt*, from bad conduct—from sinful works either prohibited,

¹ Through Its grace. For other interpretations of this verse, see Mu. III. iii. 3.

² Some take *tasya* to mean “to that seeker”.

or not sanctioned by the Vedas and the Smṛtis; *na aśāntaḥ*, nor one whose senses are not controlled—one who has not turned away from the lure of the senses; *na asamāhitaḥ*, nor one whose mind is not concentrated—one whose mind is scattered; *na*, nor one whose mind may be concentrated, but still who is *aśāntamānasaḥ*, whose mind is not at rest, because of hankering for the result of concentration; *āpnu-
yāt*, can attain; *enam*, this Self, that is being considered; *prajñānena*, through knowledge—of Brahman. But the man who has desisted from bad conduct, as also from the lure of the senses, whose mind has become concentrated, and who is also free from anxiety about the results of concentration, and has a teacher, attains the aforesaid Self through knowledge. This is the idea.

यस्य ब्रह्म च क्षत्रं च उभे भवत ओदनः ।

मृत्युर्यस्योपसेचनं क इत्था वेद यत्र सः ॥ २५ ॥

इति काठकोपनिषदि प्रथमाध्याये द्वितीया बल्ली ॥

25. How can one know thus as to where It (the Self) is, for which both the Brāhmaṇa and the Kṣatriya become food, and for which death takes the place of a curry?

But how can one, who is not of this kind, know the Self—the Self *yasya*, for which; *ubhe*, both; *brahma ca kṣatram ca*, the Brāhmaṇa and the Kṣatriya—though they are the upholders of all righteousness and the protectors of all; *bhavataḥ*, become; *odanaḥ*, food; *yasya*, for which Self; *mṛtyuḥ*, death—though it is the destroyer of all; (becomes) *upasecanam*, supplement to the food (like curry)—being

unfit even to be a food; *kaḥ*, who—being a man with a worldly intellect, and devoid of the disciplines described above; *veda* knows; *itihā*, in this way—like the man endowed with the above mentioned disciplines; *yatra*, as to where;¹ *saḥ*, It—the Self (exists)?

¹ The Self, the cater—destroyer of the universe—exists in Its own glory. Who knows It as such?

PART I

CANTO III

The connection that this canto, beginning with *ṛtam pibantau*, has (with the earlier ones) is this: Knowledge and ignorance have been presented as possessed of diverse, opposite results; but they have not been ascertained properly (as regards their natures and means) together with their results. For the determination of this is called up the analogy of the chariot, inasmuch as this leads to easy comprehension. Thus also are presented two selves, for distinguishing between the attained and the attainer, and the goal and the goer.

ऋतं पिबन्तौ सुकृतस्य लोके

गुहां प्रविष्टौ परमे परार्धे (ध्ये) ।

छायातपौ ब्रह्मविदो वदन्ति

पञ्चाग्नयो ये च त्रिणाचिकेताः ॥ १ ॥

1. The knowers of Brahman, the worshippers of the five fires,¹ and those who perform the Nāciketa sacrifice thrice, compare to shade and light, the two enjoyers of the inevitable results of work, who have entered within the body, into the cavity (of the heart) which is the supreme abode of the Most High (Brahman).

Pibantau, two drinkers of; *ṛtam*, truth, i.e. the results of work (which is called truth) because of its inevitability.

¹ Gārhapatya, Ahavaniya, Dakṣiṇāgni, Sabhya, and Āvasathya. Or heaven, cloud, earth, man, and woman—Bṛ. VI. ix-xiii.

Of these two, one drinks—enjoys—the fruit of work, and not the other. Still both are called enjoyers, because of association with the enjoyer, on the analogy of the expression “the possessors of the umbrella”.¹ *Sukṛtasya*, of what is done by oneself. This (word) is to be construed with *ṛtam* mentioned earlier—(meaning thereby the drinker of) the result of the work done by oneself. *Praviṣṭau*, (these) two have entered; *loke*, within this body; *guhām*, (is the same as *guhāyām*) into the cavity, into the intellect. *Parame*, (means) in the supreme; it (i.e. the space within the heart) is supreme in comparison with the outer space circumscribed by the human body; *parārdhe*, into that which is the abode (*ardha*) of Brahman (*para*)—there, indeed, is the supreme Brahman perceived. So the meaning is that they two have entered into the supreme abode of Brahman, which is the space within the heart. *Brahmavidah*, the knowers of Brahman, *vadanti*, speak of—these two, again, as different like *chāyātapau*, shade and light—because of (their) worldliness and freedom from worldliness. Not only those who have given up rites speak (thus), but also *pañcāgnayah*, those who worship the five fires—i.e. the householders; *ca*, and also; those who are *triṇāciketāḥ*, the people by whom has been piled up thrice the fire called Nāciketa.

यः सेतुरीजानानामक्षरं ब्रह्म यत् परम् ।

अभयं त्रितीर्षतां पारं नाचिकेतः शकेमहि ॥ २ ॥

2. We have known that Nāciketa Fire, which is the bridge for the sacrificers, as also that which

¹ When a king with his retinue moves out in a procession with umbrellas, people say, “*Chātrinaḥ yānti*—people with umbrellas are going” though most of the people in the procession do not possess umbrellas.

is the undecaying supreme Brahman beyond fear for those who want to cross over (the world).

Śakemahi, we were able to know as well as to pile up, *Nāciketam*, the Nāciketa Fire (which is *Virāt*); *yaḥ*, who; is like a *setuḥ*, bridge—since it is calculated to lead beyond sorrow; *ijānānām*, for the sacrificers—the performers of rites. Moreover, that which is *abhayam*, the fearless; *akṣaram brahma*, the undecaying Brahman—which is the supreme resort and is called the Self; *pāram titīrṣatām*, for those who want to go to the shore—to the shore of the (sea of this) world—that also we succeeded to know. The meaning of the sentence is that both the immanent and transcendental Brahman, which are the refuge of the knowers of rites and Brahman respectively, are worthy of realisation. For these two, in fact, have been introduced in the verse, “*ṛtam pibantau*” etc.

For the sake of that one among these (two Selves), which has through limiting adjuncts become the transmigrating soul and is fit for knowledge and ignorance whereby to attain either emancipation or the worldly state, a chariot is being imagined as a means to its reaching either.

आत्मानं रथिनं विद्धि शरीरं रथमेव तु ।

बुद्धि तु सारथिं विद्धि मनः प्रग्रहमेव च ॥ ३ ॥

3. Know the (individual) Self as the master of the chariot, and the body as the chariot. Know the intellect as the charioteer, and the mind as verily the bridle.

Of these, *viddhi*, know; *ātmanam*, the Self—the enjoyer of the fruits of *karma*, which is the soul in the worldly state;

as *rathinam*, the rider, the master of the chariot; *tu*, and; (know) *śarīram*, the body; as the *ratham*, the chariot—since the body is pulled by the senses which occupy the place of the horses tied to the chariot; *tu*, and; *viddhi*, know; *buddhim*, the intellect—characterised by determination; as *sārathim*, charioteer—since the body has the guiding intellect as its chief, just as the chariot has the guiding charioteer as its chief, all physical work being generally directed by the intellect. (Know) *manah*, the mind—characterised by volition, doubt, etc.; as *pragraham*, bridle—for just as the horses act, when held in by the reins, similarly the senses such as ear, etc. act when held in by the mind.

इन्द्रियाणि हयानाहुर्विषयास्तेषु गोचरान् ।

आत्मेन्द्रियमनोयुक्तं भोक्तेत्याहुर्मनीषिणः ॥ ४ ॥

4. They call the senses the horses; the senses having been imagined as horses, (know) the objects as the ways. The discriminating people call that Self the enjoyer when It is associated with the body, senses, and mind.

Āhuḥ, they—those versed in calling up the imagery of the chariot—call; *indriyāṇi*, the senses—eye etc.; *hayān*, horses—because of the similarity of drawing the chariot and the body. *Teṣu*, those very senses, having been imagined as horses; know, *viśayān*, the objects—such as colour etc.; as *gocarān*, the roads. *Manīṣiṇaḥ*, the discriminating people; *āhuḥ*, call; *ātmendriyamanoyuktam*, the Self as associated with the body, senses, and mind; as *bhoktā*, the enjoyer, the transmigrating soul. For the absolute Self can have no enjoyership; Its enjoyership is in fact created by

the limiting adjuncts such as the intellect etc. Thus also there is another Vedic text which shows the non-enjoyership of the absolute (Self): "It thinks, as it were, and shakes, as it were" etc. (Bṛ. IV. iii. 7). Only if this is so, does it become appropriate to attain the state of Viṣṇu (Ka. I. iii. 9) as one's own, through the analogy of the chariot which is going to be elaborated; but not otherwise, because one cannot transcend one's (true) nature.

This being so,

यस्त्वविज्ञानवान्भवत्ययुक्तेन मनसा सदा ।

तस्येन्द्रियाण्यवश्यानि दुष्टाश्वा इव सारथेः ॥ ५ ॥

5. But the senses of that intellect, which, being ever associated with an uncontrolled mind, becomes devoid of discrimination, are unruly like the vicious horses of the charioteer.

Yah tu, he however who—the charioteer called the intellect; *bhavati*, becomes; *avijñānavān*, unskilful—lacking in discrimination as regards engagement and disengagement, just as the other (real charioteer) is in conducting the chariot; being *sadā*, ever; associated *ayuktena manasā*, with an uncontrolled mind; *tasya*, his—of that incompetent intellect, i.e. of the driver; *indriyāṇi*, the senses—which are analogous to the horses; are *avaśyāni*, unruly uncontrollable; *duṣṭāśvāḥ iva*, like the vicious horses; *sāratheḥ*, of the charioteer—of the other (real) driver.

यस्तु विज्ञानवान्भवति युक्तेन मनसा सदा ।

तस्येन्द्रियाणि वश्यानि सदश्वा इव सारथेः ॥ ६ ॥

6. But of that (intellect) which—being ever associated with a restrained mind—is endowed with discrimination, the senses are controllable like the good horses of the charioteer.

Yaḥ tu, but that (intellect), again,—which is a charioteer opposed to the previous one; which *bhavati*, becomes; *vijñānavān*, skilful and possessed of discrimination; *yuktena manasā sadā*, being ever associated with a controlled mind—being endowed with a concentrated mind; *tasya*, of that (intellect); *indriyāni*, the senses—that are analogous to the horses; are *vaśyāni*, controllable—can be urged on or stopped; *sadaśvāḥ iva* like the good horses; *sāratheḥ*, of the charioteer—of the other (real) driver.

This is the result that is being foretold for the rider who has the aforesaid intellect as his charioteer:

यस्त्वविज्ञानवान्भवत्यमनस्कः सदाऽशुचिः ।

न स तत्पदमाप्नोति संसारं चाधिगच्छति ॥ ७ ॥

7. But he, (that master of the chariot), does not attain that goal (through that intellect), who, being associated with a non-discriminating intellect and an uncontrollable mind, is ever impure; and he attains worldly existence.¹

Yaḥ tu, but he (the soul, the master of the chariot) who *avijñānavān bhavati*, is associated with a non-discriminating intellect; *amanaskaḥ*, whose mind is not under control; who is, because of that very reason, *aśuciḥ*, unclean; *sadā*, for

¹ Some translators take *yaḥ*, meaning the intellect, as the nominative of the first part, and *śaḥ*, meaning the soul, as that of the second part.

ever; *saḥ*, that rider of the chariot; *na āpnoti*, does not achieve; *tat padam*, that goal—the aforesaid undecaying. One which is the supreme goal—with the help of that charioteer (viz intellect). Not only does he not attain emancipation, but also *adhigacchati*, he reaches; *samsāram*, worldly existence—involving birth and death.

यस्तु विज्ञानवान्भवति समनस्कः सदा शुचिः ।

स तु तत्पदमाप्नोति यस्माद्भूयो न जायते ॥ ८ ॥

8. That (master of the chariot), however, who is associated with a discriminating intellect, and being endowed with a controlled mind, is ever pure, attains that goal (getting detached) from which he is not born again.

The other one, *yaḥ tu*, who, however; is *viññānavān*, associated with a discriminating charioteer—i.e. the rider of the chariot who has knowledge; *samanaskah*, who is possessed of a controlled mind; and who is for that very reason, *sadā śuchih*, ever pure; *saḥ tu*, he however; *tat padam āpnoti*, attains that state; *yasmāt*, from which—becoming non-alienable from which acquired goal; *bhūyaḥ*, again; he *na jāyate*, is not born—in the world.

What is that goal? The text says, It is this:

विज्ञानसारथिर्यस्तु मनः प्रग्रहवान्नरः ।

सोऽध्वनः पारमाप्नोति तद्विष्णोः परमं पदम् ॥ ९ ॥

9. The man, however, who has, as his charioteer, a discriminating intellect, and who has under control the reins of the mind, attains the

end of the road; and that is the highest place of Viṣṇu.

Yaḥ naraḥ tu, the man however, who, as described earlier; *vijñānasārathiḥ*, has a discriminating intellect as his charioteer; *manaḥpragrahavān*, who has the mind as his reins—whose mind is controlled, who having a concentrated mind has become holy; *saḥ (naraḥ)*, that man—that man of knowledge; *āpnoti*, reaches; *adhvanaḥ pāram*, the end of the road—i.e. the very supreme goal to be reached beyond the course of the world. He becomes free from all the worldly bondages. *Tat*, that; is *param padam*, the highest place, i.e. the very nature; *viṣṇoḥ*, of Viṣṇu—of the all-pervading Brahman, of the supreme Self who is called Vāsudeva¹—which this man of knowledge attains.

Now this portion begins in order to show how the goal (i.e. Brahman), that is to be reached, is to be realised as the indwelling Self through an ascending gradation, from grossness to subtleness, commencing from the gross senses:

इन्द्रियेभ्यः परा ह्यर्था अर्थेभ्यश्च परं मनः ।

मनसस्तु परा बुद्धिर्बुद्धेरात्मा महान्परः ॥ १० ॥

10. The sense-objects are higher than the senses, and the mind is higher than the sense-objects; but the intellect is higher than the mind, and the Great Soul is higher than the intellect.

Now, then, the senses are gross. The *arthāḥ*, sense-objects, by which those senses were created for their (i.e. of

¹ He who provides dwelling place (*vāsa*) for all in Himself is *vāsu*. *Deva* is effulgent, i.e. self-luminous. He is both *vāsu* and *deva*.

the sense-objects) own revelation, are certainly *parāḥ*, higher—subtler, more pervasive, and are their inner selves; *indriyebhyaḥ*, than those senses—which are their own effects (the sense-organs having been created from sense-objects for perceiving them). *Arthebhyaḥ ca*, as compared with even those sense-objects, *manaḥ*, the mind; is *param*, higher—more subtle, pervasive, and is their inner self. By the word *manaḥ*, is indicated the elements in their rudimentary subtle form (*tanmātras*) which are the material cause of the mind, for they are the originators of volition and conjecture. *Manasaḥ api*, as compared with even the mind; *buddhiḥ*, the intellect; is *parā*, higher—subtler, more pervasive, and is their inner self. By the word *buddhiḥ* is denoted the rudimentary elements (*tanmātras*) which are the source of determination etc. *Buddheḥ*, as compared with the intellect; *mahān ātmā*, the Great Soul (is higher); it is *ātmā*, the soul, because it is the innermost principle of all the intelligence of all beings, and it is *mahān*, great, because it is the most pervasive of all. The principle called Hiraṇyagarbha, which was born before all, from the Unmanifested (*Māyā*), and which consists of both intelligence and activity, is called the Great Soul that is *paraḥ*, higher, than the intellect.

महतः परमव्यक्तमव्यक्तात्पुरुषः परः ।

पुरुषान्न परं किञ्चित्सा काष्ठा सा परा गतिः ॥ ११ ॥

11. The Unmanifested is higher than Mahat; Puruṣa is higher than the Unmanifested. There is nothing higher than Puruṣa. He is the culmination, He is the highest goal.

Mahataḥ, as compared (even) with Mahat (the Great Soul); *param*, higher—subtler, inner self, and the most

pervasive; is *avyaktam*, the Unmanifested—that which is the seed of the whole universe, the essence of unmanifested name and form, the state of combination of all powers of causes and effects,¹ called by such names as *avyakta* (Unmanifested), *avyākṛta* (Unevolved), *ākāśa* (Space), etc., resting on the supreme Self through and through like the power of a banyan tree in a tiny banyan seed.² *Avyaktāt*, as compared with that *avyakta*;³ (Puruṣa is) *paraḥ*, higher—subtler and greater, being the cause of all the causes and the inmost self of all—and therefore too, He is called *puruṣaḥ* (lit. person), because (derivatively) He fills up everything. Ruling out the possibility of anything being higher than Him, the text says, *puruṣāt na param kim cit*, there is nothing higher than Puruṣa. Since there is no other substance beyond Puruṣa who is a mass of pure consciousness, the Puruṣa is *kāṣṭhā*, the acme, the culmination—of subtleness, greatness, and inwardness as Self. Here, indeed, end all subtleness etc., commencing from the senses. Hence this is *parā gatiḥ*, the supreme goal—of all travellers, all individual souls that transmigrate; because the Smṛti says, “Going where they do not return” (G. VIII. 21; XV. 6).

Objection: Is it not a fact that if there is going, there

¹ During cosmic dissolution

² “As the seed, with the potentiality of the tree, is but a single entity, without a second, similarly Brahman, too, as possessed of the power of Māyā is not a dual entity”—A G.

³ That has no individuality when ascertained from the point of view of existence etc. It is the cause of the whole manifested world. Since it is dependent on the supreme Self, the latter is indirectly called the cause. But in reality the Self is not the cause, because It is not subject to mutation.

shall be coming as well? How is it then said, “from which he is not born again” (Ka. I. iii. 8)?

Answer: That is no fault. Since He is the indwelling Self of all, the fact of realising Him is figuratively spoken of as attaining Him. And that He is the indwelling Self is shown through His being higher than the senses, the mind, and the intellect. He who is a traveller goes, indeed, to something that is unattained, non-immanent, and non-Self; but not contrariwise. Thus there is the Vedic text: “Those who want to get beyond the ways (of the world) do not walk on roads” etc. (Itihāsa Upaniṣad, 18). Thus also is being shown that He is the indwelling Self of all:

एष सर्वेषु भूतेषु गूढोऽऽत्मा न प्रकाशते ।

दृश्यते त्वग्रथया बुद्ध्या सूक्ष्मया सूक्ष्मदर्शिभिः ॥ १२ ॥

12. He is hidden in all beings; and hence He does not appear as the Self (of all). But by the seers of subtle things, He is seen through a pointed and fine intellect.

Eṣaḥ, this one—this Puruṣa; *sarveṣu bhūteṣu*, in all creatures—from Brahmā to a clump of grass; *gūḍhaḥ*, is hidden;—though He has such activities as hearing, seeing, etc., yet He is covered by *avidyā*, i.e. *Māyā*.¹ Thus, since He is the *ātmā*, the Self (of all); *na prakāśate*, (He) does not appear as the Self of anyone.² Alas, how unfathomable, inscrutable, and variegated is this *Māyā*, that every creature,

¹ The very word *avidyā* (ignorance) suggests that it is removable by *vidyā* (knowledge); and *Māyā* (cosmic illusion) suggests that it is unreal.

² The Self, as such, cannot be the content of any conventional idea.

though in reality identical with the supreme Entity, and is instructed as such, does not grasp the fact, "I am the supreme Self", while even without being told, he accepts as his Self the non-selves, viz the aggregate of body and senses, under the idea, "I am the son of such a one", though these (latter) are objects of perception (and are hence not his selves) like pots etc.! Verily, it is through the Māyā of the supreme Being, that every man moves, again and again (through birth and death). There is this Smṛti on this point: "I am not revealed to all, being veiled by my Yoga-Māyā" (i.e. the illusion born of the congress of the *guṇas*) etc. (G. VII. 25).

Objection: Is it not contradictory to say, "Having realised It, the intelligent man does not grieve" (Ka. II.i. 4) and "He does not appear"?

Answer. This is not so. Since He is not known to a man whose intellect has not been purified, it is said, "He does not appear". *Tu* (but); *dṛśyate*, (He) is seen; through the purified (intellect)—*agryayā*, through the pointed (intellect); that (intellect) which is like a point (*agra*) is *agryā*; through that, i.e. being associated with concentration; *sūkṣmayā*, through the subtle (intellect) that is engaged in ascertaining subtle things.¹ By whom? *Sūkṣma-darśibhiḥ*, by the seers of subtle things. These seers are those who have become skilled in penetrating into the subtlest thing through their perception of an ascending order of

¹ "When the mind becomes concentrated through the perfection of meditation and thus becomes helpful, then from the *mahāvākya* (great saying—Thou art That), associated with that mind, there arises such a conviction as 'I am Brahman'. On that intellectual pattern is revealed the reality of Brahman; and this is conventionally referred to as the self-revealed immediate perception of Brahman."—A.G.

subtleness by following the process as indicated in the text, “The sense-objects are higher than the senses”, etc. (Ka. I.iii. 10). By them, i.e. by the learned people.

The means for His attainment is being stated:

यच्छेद्वाङ्मनसी प्राज्ञस्तद्यच्छेज्ज्ञान आत्मनि ।

ज्ञानमात्मनि महति नियच्छेत्तद्यच्छेच्छान्त आत्मनि ॥ १३ ॥

13. The discriminating man should merge the (organ of) speech into the mind; he should merge that (mind) into the intelligent self; he should merge the intelligent self into the Great Soul, he should merge the Great Soul into the peaceful Self.

Prājñah, the discriminating man; *yacchet*, should merge. What (should he merge)? *Vāk*, i.e. *vācam*, the organ of speech, (i.e. all the organs), *vāk* being used suggestively for all organs. Where? *Manasī*, into the mind; the use of the word with a long *ī* is a Vedic licence. *Tat*, that mind, again, *yacchet*, he should merge; *jñāne ātmani*, into the intellect—bright by nature—which is their self; as the intellect pervades the organs, beginning with the mind, it is their self, their innermost principle. *Jñānam*, the intellect; *niyacchet*, he should dissolve; *mahati ātmani*, in the Great Soul—the First Born (Hiraṇyagarbha). The idea is that he should make the intelligence as clear in its nature as is the First Born. And that Great Soul again, *yacchet*, he should sink; *sānte*, into the peaceful—whose nature does not admit of any distinction, which is unchangeable; (into that peaceful) *ātmani*, Self—into the real Self which is within all and is the witness of all the modifications of the intellect.

Just as the water in a mirage, the snake on a rope, and dirt in the sky are eliminated through the perception of the real nature of the mirage, rope, and the sky, similarly by dissolving in Puruṣa—the Self—through the knowledge of the true nature of one's own Self, all that is projected by unreal ignorance, that is characterised by action, instrument, and result, and that is but constituted by the three—name, form, and action—one becomes established in the Self and peaceful in mind, and he has his goal achieved. Since this is so, therefore, for the sake of realizing this—

उत्तिष्ठत जाग्रत

प्राप्य वरान्निबोधत ।

क्षुरस्य धारा निशिता दुरत्यया

दुर्गं पथस्तत्कवयो वदन्ति ॥ १४ ॥

14. Arise, awake, and learn by approaching the excellent ones. The wise ones describe that path to be as impassable as a razor's edge, which when sharpened, is difficult to tread on.

You creatures, who are sleeping in ignorance that has no beginning, *uttiṣṭhata*, arise, turn towards the knowledge of the Self; *jāgrata*, awake—put an end to the sleep of ignorance which is terrible by nature and is the seed of all evil. How (to put an end to it)? *Prāpya*, approaching; *varān*, the adorable ones, the excellent teachers—who know that (Self); *nibodhata*, learn—understand the all-pervading Self, taught by them, as "I am that". The Upaniṣad says out of compassion, like a mother, that this should not be neglected, for the thing to be known is comprehensible by a very fine intellect. With what can that fine intellect be

compared? This is being said: *Dhārā*, the edge; *kṣurasya*, of a razor; *nīṣītā*, being sharpened; becomes, *duratyayā*, such as can be passed over with great difficulty, impassable. As that razor is difficult to walk on with the feet, similarly, *kavayaḥ*, the intelligent people; *vadanti*, describe; *pathaḥ* (should rather be *panthānam*), the path; (as) *durgam*, impassable, i.e. hard to attain. The idea is that since the object to be known is very subtle, they speak of the path of knowledge leading to it as impassable.

How very subtle is the thing to be known? That is being said. Now, then, this earth is gross developed as it is by (the principles of) sound, touch, colour, taste, and smell; and it is an object of perception to all the senses. So also is the body. Here a gradation of subtleness, pervasiveness, purity, permanence, etc., is noticed in water etc., through the elimination of the attributes of smell etc., one by one, till one reaches, *ākāśa*¹ (space). Therefore what need is there to speak of the unsurpassable subtleness etc. of that in which there do not exist those attributes beginning with smell and ending with sound that are the causes of grossness. That is what the Upaniṣad shows:

अशब्दमस्पर्शमरूपमव्ययं

तथाऽऽरसं नित्यमगन्धवच्च यत् ।

अनाद्यनन्तं महतः परं भ्रवं

निचाय्य तन्मृत्युमुखात् प्रमुच्यते ॥ १५ ॥

¹ Earth is possessed of five qualities—smell, taste, colour, touch, and sound; water consists of the four qualities beginning from taste; fire of the next three; air of the next two; and space of the last one. It is difficult to translate the word *ākāśa*. *Vedānta-sāra* defines it as the element that provides space and has sound as its quality.

15. One becomes freed from the jaws of death by knowing that which is soundless, touchless, colourless, undiminishing, and also tasteless, eternal, odourless, without beginning, and without end, distinct from Mahat, and ever constant.

Yat, that which—is described as; *aśabdām*, soundless, *asparśām*, touchless; *arūpām*, colourless; *avyayām*, undiminishing; *tathā* and also; *arasam*, tasteless; *nityam*, eternal—that is the undecaying Brahman. That which is possessed of sound etc. diminishes. But this one, being soundless etc., is *avyayam*—It does not diminish, does not decay; and because of this, It is eternal. Whatever decays is non-eternal; but this one does not decay, therefore it is permanent. For this further reason, too, It is eternal: that which has no *ādi* (beginning), cause, is *anādi*, beginningless. That which has a cause is impermanent, because it is an effect and it merges into its cause, as for instance earth etc. But this one being the cause of all, is not the effect, and hence It is eternal; It has no cause into which It can merge. Similarly, *anantam*, infinite—that which has no end. As the plantain etc. are seen to be impermanent after yielding their products in the form of fruits etc., not even that way has Brahman any finitude; hence too, It is eternal. *Mahatah*, from the principle Mahat, called *buddhi*, intelligence; It is *param*, distinct, by nature—for It is the witness of all, being eternal Consciousness; and It is Brahman, being the Self of all beings. For it has been already said, “He is hidden in all beings” (Ka. I.iii.12). And *dhruvam*, is that which is changelessly constant, whose eternity is not

relative unlike that of the earth etc. *Nicāyya*, realising; *tat* that Self—the Self that is the Brahman of this kind; *pramucyate*, one gets freed from—detached from; *mṛtyumukhāt*, from the jaws, grasp of Death—which consists of ignorance, desire, and action.

For the sake of eulogising the knowledge under discussion the Upaniṣad says:

नाचिकेतमुपाख्यानं मृत्युप्रोक्तं सनातनम् ।

उक्त्वा श्रुत्वा च मेधावी ब्रह्मलोके महीयते ॥ १६ ॥

16. Relating and hearing this eternal anecdote—as received by Naciketā and as told by Death—the intelligent man becomes glorified in the region that is Brahman.

Uktvā relating—to Brāhmaṇas; *ca* and; *śrutvā* hearing—from teachers; this *sanātanam upākhyaṇam* eternal anecdote—eternal because it is Vedic; (that was) *nāciketam* received by Naciketā; (and) *mṛtyuproktam*, told by Death; *medhāvī*, the intelligent man *mahīyate*, becomes glorified; i.e. he becomes adorable by becoming identified with Brahman; *brahmaloke*, in the region of Brahman that is identical with Brahman Itself.

य इमं परमं गुह्यं श्रावयेद् ब्रह्मसंसदि ।

प्रयतः श्राद्धकाले वा तदानन्त्याय कल्पते ।

तदानन्त्याय कल्पत इति ॥ १७ ॥

इति काठकोपनिषदि प्रथमाध्याये तृतीया वल्ली ॥

17. Should anyone, after purification, get this highest secret recited before an assembly of Brāhmaṇas, or at the time of the ceremonies for the dead (then) that (ceremony) becomes conducive to eternal result.

Should *yaḥ*, anyone; *prayataḥ*, after becoming purified; *idaṃ śrāvayet*, cause this text to be recited—*verbatim*, as also with explanation; (that is) *paramam guhyam*, the greatest secret; *brahmasamsadi*, in an assemblage of Brāhmaṇas; *śrāddhakāle vā*, or at the time of the ceremonies for the dead, to the Brāhmaṇs seated for the feast; (then) *tat*, that—funeral ceremony, of that man; *kalpate*, becomes conducive; *ānantyāya*, to eternal result. The repetition is for concluding the Part.

PART II

CANTO I

It has been stated, "He is hidden in all beings, and hence He does not appear as the Self (of all). But He is seen through a pointed and fine intellect" (Ka. I. iii. 12). What again is the obstacle to this pointed intellect because of which there is an absence of that intellect and the Self is not seen? This canto is begun to show the cause of that non-perception.¹ For only when the cause that bars the good is known, can effort be made to remove it and not otherwise:

पराञ्च खानि व्यतृणत् स्वयम्भू-
स्तस्मात्पराङ्पश्यति नान्तरात्मन् ।
कश्चिद्धीरः प्रत्यगात्मानमैक्ष-
दावृत्तचक्षुरमृतत्वमिच्छन् ॥ १ ॥

1. The self-existent Lord destroyed the outgoing senses. Therefore one sees the outer things and not the inner Self. A rare discriminating man, desiring immortality, turns his eyes away and then sees the indwelling Self.

Parāñci, outgoing; by the word *khāni* (*kha* meaning an orifice, cavity) are referred to the senses such as ear etc., which are suggestively indicated by it. They surely proceed outward for revealing their objects, sound etc. He *vyatṛṇat*, afflicted, i.e. killed these; since they are of such a nature.

¹ This is according to the reading *tadadarśana*. The other reading is *taddarśana*, which gives the opposite meaning.

Who is He (that did so)? *Svayambhūh*, the Great Lord—who (*bhū*) exists ever, and (*svayam*, by Himself) on His own right, and not subject to anything else; (since He injured them), *tasmāt*, therefore; the perceiver (individual) *paśyati*, sees, perceives; *parāk*, the outer—sounds etc., which are the non-Self and exist as external things; *na antarātmān*, i.e. *na antarātmānam*, but (sees) not the inner Self. Though such is the nature of man, yet like reversing the current of a river *kaḥ cit dhīraḥ*, some (rare) discriminating man (sees); *pratyagātmānam*, the indwelling Self. That which is *pratyak* in the interior, and at the same time *ātmā*, the Self is the *pratyagātmā*. In common usage the word *ātmā* conventionally means only the individual soul, and not anything else. From the point of etymology, too, the word *ātmā* has that very sense. For in the Smṛti the derivation of the word is given thus: “Since It pervades, absorbs, and enjoys (all) objects in the world, and since from It the world derives its continuous existence, therefore, is It called the *ātmā*” (Līṅga Purāṇa, I.lxx.96). That indwelling Self—one’s own reality—one *aikṣat*, saw, i.e. sees, for in the Vedas there is no regularity about the tenses. How one sees is being stated: (Becoming) *āvṛttacakṣuḥ*, having one’s eyes covered—having one’s eye, i.e. the group of organs beginning with the ear, turned away from all sense-objects. Such a one, who is purified thus, sees the indwelling Self. For it is not possible for the same person to be engaged in the thought of sense-objects and to have the vision of the Self as well. Why, again, should the discriminating man check his natural propensity thus through great effort and then realise the Self? This is the answer: *Icchan*, desiring—for oneself. *amṛtatvam*, immortality—one’s own unchanging nature.

पराचः कामाननुयन्ति बाला-
स्ते मृत्योर्यन्ति विततस्य पाशम् ।
अथ धीरा अमृतत्वं विदित्वा
ध्रुवमध्रुवेष्विह न प्रार्थयन्ते ॥ २ ॥

2. The unintelligent people follow the external desires. They get entangled in the snares of the wide-spread death. Therefore the discriminating people, having known what true immortality is in the midst of impermanent things, do not pray for anything here.

Now then, the natural tendency to perceive outwardly the things that are not the Self is the cause of the obstruction of the vision of the Self; and it is ignorance, since it is opposed to that (vision). And there is that thirst for the enjoyment of those very outer things, whether seen or unseen, which are presented by ignorance. Those whose vision of the Self is obstructed by those two—ignorance and thirst—those *bālāḥ*, men of little intelligence; *anuyanti*, follow; only *parācaḥ kāmān*, the external desirable things. *Te*, they; because of that reason; *yanti*, get entangled in; *pāśam*, the snares—those by which one is bound, consisting in the association with or dissociation from the body, senses, etc.; *vitatasya*, of that which is vast, spread everywhere; *mṛtyoḥ*, of death—of the group of ignorance, desire, and action. The meaning is that they are constantly subject to birth, death, old age, disease, and other multifarious evils. Since this is so, *atha*, hence; *dhīraḥ*, the discriminating people; *viditvā*, having known; *amṛtatvam*, immortality

—which consists in continuing in the true state of the indwelling Self; as the *dhruvam*, sure thing; for the immortality of the gods and others is unstable, whereas this immortality consisting in continuing in the true state of the indwelling Self is stable, as is supported by the text, “It neither increases nor decreases through work” (Br.IV.iv.23). Having known the constant and unshakable immortality which is of this kind, having ascertained it from *adhruveṣu*, amidst all impermanent things; the knowers of Brahman *na pārthayaute*, do not pray for—anything; *iha*, in this world, that is full of evil; because all this is opposed to the vision of the innermost Self. The idea is that they inevitably rise above the desires for progeny, wealth, and worlds (of enjoyment).

How is that known, by realising which the men of enlightenment do not pray for anything else? This is being said:

येन रूपं रसं गन्धं शब्दान् स्पर्शाश्च मैथुनान् ।

एतेनैव विजानाति किमत्र परिशिष्यते । एतद्वै तत् ॥ ३ ॥

3. What remains here (unknowable to this Self) through which very Self people perceive colour, taste, smell, sound, touch, and sexual pleasures? This is that (Self asked for by Naciketā).

Yena, that by which—by the Self which is consciousness by nature; all people *vijānāti*, know clearly; *rūpam*, colour; *rasam*, taste; *gandham*, smell; *śabdām*, sound; *śparsan*, touch; *ca*, and; *maithunān*, pleasurable sensations from sex.

Objection: May it not be argued that the idea, "I know through the Self which is distinct from the body etc.," is not familiar to anyone? Rather all people experience thus: "I as the combination of the body etc. know."

Answer: But this is not so. Since the aggregate of body etc., is substantially indistinguishable from (knowable objects like) sound, etc., and hence it, too, is equally a knowable, it cannot reasonably be the knower. If the aggregate of body etc., though constituted by colour etc., can perceive colour etc., then the external colour etc., may as well know each other as also their own individual feature. But this does not tally with facts. Therefore, just as that through which iron burns (anything) is (inferred to be) fire, similarly people perceive colour and other attributes, in the form of the body etc., *etena eva*, through this only—through the Self which is consciousness by nature and which is distinct from the body etc. *Kim*, what, *atra*, in this world; *pariśiṣyate*, remains, which is unknowable to the Self? Nothing remains; but everything can certainly be known through the Self. The Self to which nothing can remain unknown is omniscient. *Etat vai tat*, this (Self) indeed is that. What is that? That which was asked for by Naciketā, about which the gods had also doubts, which is different from virtue etc., which is the highest state of Viṣṇu, and beyond which there is nothing. That very thing, which is described thus, is comprehended here. This is the idea.

Thinking that the Self, being subtle, is difficult to know, the text states the same idea over and over again:

स्वप्नान्तं जागरितान्तं चोभौ येनानुपश्यति ।

महान्तं विभूमात्मानं मत्वा धीरो न शोचति ॥ ४ ॥

4. Having realised that great and all-pervading Self, through which a man perceives the objects in both the sleep and the waking states, a wise man does not grieve.

Yena, that—the Self—through which; a man, *anupās-yati*, perceives; *svapnāntam*, the content of sleep, the sleep objects; similarly *jāgaritāntam*, the content of the waking state, the waking objects; *ubhau*, both—the sleep and waking objects. All this is to be explained as before.¹ *Matvā*, realising; that *mahāntam vibhum ātmānam*, great and all-pervading Self; having directly known It as identified with oneself thus, “I am the supreme Self”; *dhīraḥ*, the wise man; *na śocati*, does not grieve.

य इमं मध्वदं वेद आत्मानं जीवमन्तिकात् ।

ईशानं भूतभव्यस्य न ततो विजुगुप्सते । एतद्वै तत् ॥ ५ ॥

5. Anyone who knows proximately² this Self—the enjoyer of the fruits of works, the supporter of life etc.—as the lord of the past and the future, does not want to save (the Self) just because of that (knowledge). This is that.

Moreover, *yaḥ*, anyone who; *veda*, knows; *antikāt*, proximately, *imaṃ*, this; *ātmānam*, Self;—*jīvanam*, the sustainer of the whole lot of vital force etc.; *madvadam*, the enjoyer of the fruits of works—as *īśānam*, the ruler; *bhūtabhavyasya*, of past and future—of all the three times; *tataḥ*,

¹ The objection that can be raised, with regard to the Self's being the real knower is to be met as in II.1.3.

² As non-different from oneself.

after that—after that knowledge; *na vijugupsate*, does not want to save (himself)—because he has attained fearless-ness. One wants to save the Self so long as one is in the midst of fear and considers the Self to be impermanent. But when one knows the eternal, non-dual Self, then who would wish to save what or from whom? *Etat vai tat*, is to be explained as before.

Now it is being shown that the indwelling Self, that has been identified with God, is the Self of all.

यः पूर्व तपसो जातमद्भ्यः पूर्वमजायत ।

गृहां प्रविश्य तिष्ठन्तं यो भूतेर्भिव्यपश्यत । एतद्वै तत् ॥६॥

6. He sees this very aforesaid Brahman who sees the First Born (Hiranyagarbha)¹—born before the five elements from Consciousness (Brahman)—as existing in the cavity of the heart in the midst of body and senses, after having entered there.

Yah, anyone—who being desirous of freedom, (*vya-pasyata*, sees) the *pūrvam jātam*, the First Born—Hiranyagarbha; *yah*, who; *ajāyata*, was born; *pūrvam*, earlier. Earlier than what? That is being said: *Adbhyaḥ*, than water; the idea is that He was earlier than the five elements inclusive of water, and not merely earlier than water. *Tapasaḥ*, (born) from Brahman, characterised by consciousness etc. Anyone who (sees) that First Born, who after having created the *bodies* of gods etc., (and) *praviśya guhām*, having entered into the cavity of the heart, of everybody; *tiṣṭhantam*, remains in existence; *bhūtebhiḥ*, in association with the

¹ As an ornament, made of gold, continues to be gold, so is Hiranyagarbha nothing but Brahman.

elements—in the midst of body and senses, perceiving sound etc.; *yaḥ, vyapaśyata*, i.e. *paśyati*, anyone who sees thus, he sees; *etat vai tat*, this very thing that is under discussion.

या प्राणेन संभवत्यदितिदेवतामयी ।

गुहां प्रविश्य तिष्ठन्तीं या भूतेर्भिव्यजायत । एतद्वै तत् ॥७॥

7. He (sees) that very Brahman (who sees) that Aditi, comprising all the deities, who takes birth as Hiraṇyagarbha, who is manifested in association with the elements, and who is seated in the cavity of the heart, after entering there.

Furthermore, *yā aditiḥ*, that *Aditi*—so called because of enjoying (*adana*) all such things as sound; who is *devatā-mayī*, comprises all the deities; (and) who *sambhavati*, takes birth; *prāṇena* as Hiraṇyagarbha – from the supreme Brahman. The portion “He who sees that Aditi as existing in the cavity of the heart after having entered there”—is to be explained as before. That very Aditi is being distinguished—*yā* which; *bhūtebhiḥ* as associated with the elements; *vyajāyata* took birth i.e. was created.

अरण्योर्निहितो जातवेदा गर्भं इव सुभृतो गर्भिणीभिः ।
दिवे दिवे ईड्यो जागृवद्ब्रह्मविष्मद्भ्रमं नुष्येभिरग्निः ।

एतद्वै तत् ॥८॥

8. The sacrificial Fire lodged in two fire producing pieces of wood, (as also the Fire lodged in the hearts of Yogis) that is well protected, just as

much as the foetus is by pregnant women, and the Fire that is adorable every day by vigilant men with oblation (and contemplation)—that Fire too is but this Brahman.

Besides, that *jātāvedāḥ*, Fire; which is *nihītaḥ*, lodged; as the deity of the sacrifice, *araṇyoh*, in the upper and lower pieces of wood—(by rubbing which fire is produced); which, as the cater of all oblations, is (lodged) in the individual person (as Virāt, in the heart); and which is *subhṛtaḥ*, well protected—by the men of contemplation; *garbhaḥ iva*, just as the foetus—is well protected; *garbhīṅbhiḥ*, by pregnant women—through food, drink etc., that are not condemned. The meaning is that, just as in the world, the foetus is well protected, similarly it (i.e. the Fire) is protected by the priests and the meditators. Moreover, that *agnih*, Fire; which is *īdyah*, laudable and adorable—by sacrificers and meditators in the sacrifices and the hearts; *dive dive*, every day; *jāgrvadbhiḥ*, by the sleepless, i.e. vigilant; *manuṣyebhiḥ*, i.e. *manuṣyaḥ*, by men; *haviṣmadbhiḥ*, who are possessed of oblations, e.g. ghee, as also possessed of meditation and contemplation; *tat*, that Fire; *etat vai*, is this only—the Brahman that is being discussed.

यतश्चोदेति सूर्योऽस्तं यत्र च गच्छति ।

तं देवाः सर्वे अर्पितास्तदु नात्येति कश्चन । एतद्वै तत् ॥ ९ ॥

9. On that, from which the sun rises and in which it sets, are fixed all deities. None ever transcends that. This is that.

Moreover, *yataḥ ca*. that from which—from which *Prāṇa* (i.e. *Hiraṇyagarbha*); *udeti*, rises; *sūryaḥ*, the sun;

yatra, where, in which Prāṇa itself; *astam gacchati*, sets—day after day; *tam*, on that—on the Prāṇa which is the Self; *sarve devāḥ*, all the gods—Fire etc., in the divine context, and speech etc., in the personal context; *arpitāḥ*, are fixed—like spokes on the nave of a chariot wheel—during the period of existence (of the universe). He (that Prāṇa), too, is Brahman. This is that all-pervading Brahman. *Tat u*, that indeed; *na kaḥ cana*, nobody—whosever; *atyeti*, transcends—ceasing to be identified with It becomes something other than that. This is that.

The following verse is there to counteract the doubt that may arise in anybody's mind that the entity which exists in all beings from Brahmā down to the immovable and appears as non-Brahman, owing to those particular limiting adjuncts, is an individual soul different from the supreme Brahman, and is subject to birth and death:

यदेवेह यतदमुत्र यदमुत्र तदन्विह ।

मृत्योः स मृत्युमाप्नोति य इह नानेव पश्यति ॥ १० ॥

10. What, indeed, is here is there; what is there is here likewise. He who sees as though there is difference here, goes from death to death.

Yat eva iha, what, indeed, is here—that entity which, being associated with limiting adjuncts, viz the body and senses (i.e. as existing here in the individual), appears to the ignorant to be possessed of worldly attributes; *tat*, that—that very entity, established in Its own reality, is; *amutra*, there—(existing in Its causal condition as) Brahman which is by nature a mass of consciousness and is devoid of all worldly attributes. And *yat amutra*, that which is there (in the causal condition), established in Itself; *tat*, that very

thing; *īha anu*, (is) here likewise—appearing diversely in conformity with the limiting adjuncts such as name and form, body and senses; It is nothing else. This being so, *yaḥ*, anyone who—being deluded by ignorance, consisting in seeing differences that are natural to limiting adjuncts; *paśyati*, sees, perceives; *īha*, here—in this Brahman, which is not a plurality; *nānā iva*, as though there is difference; feels such differences as, “I am different from the supreme Self, and the supreme Brahman is different from me”; *saḥ*, he; *āpnoti*, gets; *mṛtyoḥ mṛtyum*, death after death, he becomes subject to repeated birth and death. Therefore one should not perceive like that; one should perceive thus: “I am, indeed, Brahman which is homogeneous consciousness and which pervades everything through and through like space.” This is the meaning of the sentence.

मनसैवेदमाप्तव्यं नेह नानाऽस्ति किञ्चन ।

मृत्योः स मृत्युं गच्छति य इह नानेव पश्यति ॥ ११ ॥

11. This is to be attained through the mind. • There is no diversity whatsoever. He who sees as though there is difference here, goes from death to death.

Before attaining the knowledge of unity, *īdam* this—Brahman which is homogeneous; *āptavyam*, is to be attained, as identical with the Self, there being nothing else existing; *manasā*, through the mind—which is purified by the teacher and the scriptures. And since ignorance, that prevents diversity, ceases on this attainment; *īha*, here—in the Brahman; *nānā*, diversity; *kim cana*, even so little; *na asti*, does not exist. On the other hand, *yaḥ*, he who—does not give up his vision of ignorance that is comparable to

darkness; (and) *nūnā iva paśyati*, sees as though there is diversity; *saḥ*, he; *mṛtyoḥ mṛtyuṃ gacchati*, does (indeed) go from death to death, even by superimposing the slightest difference. This is the idea.

The Upaniṣad again speaks of that Brahman which is being discussed:

अङ्गुष्ठमात्रः पुरुषो मध्य आत्मनि तिष्ठति ।

ईशानं भूतभव्यस्य न ततो विजुगुप्सते । एतद्वै तत् ॥ १२ ॥

12. The Being (Puruṣa), of size of the a thumb, resides in the body. Knowing Him as the ruler of the past and the future, one does not want, by virtue of that knowledge, to save the Self. This is that.

Anguṣṭhamātraḥ, of the size of a thumb, the lotus of the heart is of the size of a thumb; (and) as conditioned by the internal organ existing in the space within the lotus of the heart, (the Self) has the size of a thumb, just like space existing in a section of a bamboo that is of the size of a thumb. *Puruṣaḥ*, means He by whom everything is filled. Knowing Him, who *tiṣṭhati*, stays; *madhye ātmani* in the body; as the *īśānam*¹ *bhūtabhavyasya*, the ruler of the past and the present. (The portion) *na tataḥ* etc., is to be explained as before (Ka. II.i.5).

अङ्गुष्ठमात्रः पुरुषो ज्योतिरिवाधूमकः ।

ईशानो भूतभव्यस्य स एवाद्य स उ श्वः । एतद्वै तत् ॥ १३ ॥

13. The Puruṣa, who is of the size of a thumb, is like a light without smoke. He is the ruler of

¹ The alternative reading is *īśāno bhūtabhavyasya*

the past and the future. He exists today, and He will exist tomorrow. This is that.

Moreover, the *anguṣṭhamātraḥ puruṣaḥ*, the Puruṣa (the all-pervasive entity) of the size of a thumb, is *jyotiḥ iva adhūmakāḥ*, like a smokeless light. *Adhūmakāḥ* should rather be *adhūmakam*, since it qualifies *jyotiḥ* (which is neuter). He, who is perceived as such by the Yogis in their hearts, is the *īśānaḥ bhūtabhavyasya*, lord of the past and the future. *Saḥ*, He, the eternal and unchanging; exists *adya*, now, in all beings; *u* and; *saḥ*, He, will exist; *śvaḥ*, even tomorrow. The idea is that none equals Him now, nor will any be born in future (to do so). Though one of the alternatives, viz “Some say that He does not exist (after death)” (Ka. I.i.20), cannot logically arise, yet hereby it is refuted by the Upaniṣad itself in its own words, and so also is dismissed the theory of momentary existence.

The Upaniṣad again presents a refutation of the perception of difference with regard to Brahman:

यथोदकं दुर्गे वृष्टं पर्वतेषु विधावति ।

एवं धर्मान् पृथक् पश्यंस्तानिवानुविधावति ॥ १४ ॥

14. As water rained on an inaccessible height gets dispersed on (lower) hilly regions, similarly, one who perceives the selves differently, runs after them only.

Yathā, as; *udakam*, water; *vṛṣṭam*, poured; *durge*, on an inaccessible place, on a height; *vidhāvati*, flows---being dispersed becomes dissipated; *parvateṣu*, over hills, over hilly lower regions; *evam*, similarly; *paśyan*, seeing; *dharmān*, the selves; *pr̥thak*, differently—in everybody;

anuvichāvati, one runs after; *tān eva*, them only—those souls that conform to the different bodies. The meaning is that he assumes different bodies again and again.

Now is being stated as to how the nature of the Self is attained by one who is a man of realisation, for whom has been destroyed the perception of difference that is created by limiting adjuncts, who sees the non-dual Self which is a homogeneous mass of pure consciousness, and who is possessed of knowledge and is engaged in meditation.

यथोदकं शुद्धे शुद्धमासिक्तं तादृगेव भवति ।

एवं मुनेर्विजानत आत्मा भवति गौतम ॥ १५ ॥

इति काठकोपनिषदि द्वितीयाध्याये प्रथमा वल्ली ॥

15. O Gautama, as pure water poured on pure water becomes verily the same, so also does become the Self of the man of knowledge who is given to deliberation (on the Self).

Yathā, as; *śuddham udakam*, pure water; *āsiktam*, being poured; *śuddhe*, on pure (water); *bhavati*, becomes; *tādṛk eva*, of that kind only, of the same quality and not anything else; *ātmā*, the Self, too; *bhavati*, becomes; *evam*, so; *vijānatah*, of one who knows—realises unity; *muneh*, of one who deliberates; O Gautama. Therefore, giving up the perception of duality that bad logicians have and the erroneous notions that the non-believers entertain, the people whose pride has been quelled should eagerly seek after the realisation of the unity of the Self, that is inculcated by the Vedas that are more beneficent than thousands of fathers and mothers. This is the idea.

PART II

CANTO II

As Brahman is difficult to know, this is a fresh commencement for ascertaining in another way the reality that It is:

पुरमेकादशद्वारमजस्यावक्रचेतसः ।

अनुष्ठाय न शोचति विमुक्तश्च विमुच्यते । एतद्वै तत् ॥१॥

1. Of the unborn One, whose consciousness is unflickering, there is a city with eleven gates. Meditating (on Him), one does not grieve and, becoming freed, one becomes emancipated. This is that.

Puram, a city, i.e. comparable to a city; the body is the city, since in it we find an assemblage of such appendages of a city as gatekeepers, their commanders, etc.; and a city, together with its paraphernalia, is seen to be meant for an independent owner (viz king) who is not a constituent part of it;¹ similarly, since this body, consisting of an assemblage of various paraphernalia, has resemblance with a city, it must exist for an owner who takes the position of a king, but does not form a part of it. This city then, that is called a body, *ekādaśadyāram*, is possessed of eleven doors—seven in the head, three, inclusive of the navel, in the lower parts, and one on the (top of the) head; because of these, it is a city possessed of eleven doors. Of Whom?

¹ He does not grow or contract even though the city may do so, and His existence can be known independently of the city.

Ajasya, of the birthless One—of the Self which is free from all modifications, such as birth etc., which occupies the place of the king, and which is dissimilar to the properties of the city; *avakracetasah*, of the One whose knowledge is not crooked—whose *cetaḥ*, consciousness is *avakra*, straight, constant and unchanging like the light of the sun—i.e. of Brahman which is comparable to the king. *Anuṣṭhāya*, meditating, on Him to whom this city belongs, on the supreme Lord who is the owner of the city; for His *anu-ṣṭhāna* (lit. performance) consists in contemplation with a view to complete knowledge.¹ One who, after becoming entirely free from all desires, contemplates on Him as residing equally in all beings, *na śocati*, does not grieve. How can there be any vision of fear, since there is no occasion for sorrow after the attainment of fearlessness resulting from His realisation? Even here, (while still living), he becomes *vimuktaḥ*, free—free from the bondage of desire and duty, created by ignorance; *vimuktaḥ ca*, and having become free (while still living); *vimucyate*, he becomes emancipated, i.e. he does not take up a body again.

But He (the Self) does not reside in the city of one body only. What then? He exists in all the cities? How?

हृत्सः शुचिषद्वसुरन्तरिक्षस-

द्धोता वेदिषदतिथिर्दुरोणसत् ।

नृषद्वरसदृतसद्वचोमस-

दब्जा गोजा ऋतजा अद्रिजा ऋतं बृहत् ॥ २ ॥

¹ Unobstructed, direct vision. Bālagopāendra interprets *samyag-vijñānapūrvakan* as (meditation) that has complete realisation as its objective.

2. As the moving (sun) He dwells in heaven, (as air) He pervades all and dwells in inter-space; as fire He resides on the earth; as Soma He stays in a jar; He lives among men; He lives among gods; He dwells in space; He is born in water; He takes birth from the earth; He is born in sacrifice; He emerges from the mountains; He is unchanging; and He is great.

(As) *hamsah*, a mover—derived from the root *han*, meaning to go; He is *śuciṣat*—derived from *śuci*, pure, and *sad*, to live—a dweller, as the sun, in heaven which is pure. As *vasuḥ*—derived from the causative form of the root *vas*, meaning to provide dwelling for—as all-pervasive air; He is *antarikṣasad*, a dweller in the intermediate space. As *hotā* (meaning) fire—because of the Vedic text, “Fire, indeed, is *hotā*” (Cityupaniṣad, III.1., VII.1); (He is) *vediṣat* derived from the root *sad*—a resider on the *vedi*, i.e. earth—because of the *mantra* which begins with, “This *vedi* (sacrificial altar) is the highest state of the earth” (R. II.iii.20). *Arīṭihī* (*san*), as the Soma juice, (He is) *duroṇasat*, a dweller in a jar (*duroṇa*); or as a Brāhmaṇa guest, He dwells in houses (*duroṇa*). (He is) *nṛṣat*, a dweller among men; *varasat*, a dweller among the adorable ones—the gods; *ṛtasat*, a dweller in *ṛta*, i.e. truth or sacrifice; *vyomasat*, a dweller in *ākāśa* (space); *abjāḥ*—derived from *ap* (water) and *jā* (to be born)—born in water, as conch, mother of pearl, *makara* (a sea animal), etc.; *gojāḥ*, born on earth (*go*), as paddy, barley, etc.; *ṛtajāḥ*, born in the sacrifice, (*ṛta*), as its appendages; *adrijāḥ*, born from mountains (*adri*), as rivers etc.; although He is the Self of all, He is verily *ṛtam*, unchanging

in nature; (and) *brhat*, great—being the cause of all. Even if it be a fact that the sun is spoken of in this verse (and not the Self), still, as the sun is regarded in reality as the Self, there is no contradiction with the *brāhmaṇa* which explains that way.¹ The meaning of this verse is that the world has but one Self which is all-pervasive, and that there is no plurality of selves.

A (logical) basis is being provided for comprehending the nature of the Self:

ऊर्ध्वं प्राणमुन्नयत्यपानं प्रत्यगस्यति ।
मध्ये वामनमासीनं विश्वे देवा उपासते ॥ ३ ॥

3. All deities worship that adorable one, the seated in the middle, who pushes the *prāṇa* upward and impels the *apāna* inward.

The word *yah*, he who, is to be supplied. He who *unnayati*, leads higher up; *ūrdhvam*, upward—from the heart; *prāṇam*, the air functioning as exhalation; similarly, *pratyakasyati*, thrusts inward, downward; *apānam*, the air functioning as inhalation; that *vāmanam*, the adorable One; *madhye āsīnam*, sitting in the middle—sitting in the space inside the lotus of the heart, shining in the intellect as revealed knowledge; *viśve*, all; *devāḥ*, deities—the organs such as the eye etc.; *upāsate*, worship—by carrying to Him presents in the form of perception of colour etc., just as the subjects do to

¹ “In the *brāhmaṇa* portion of the Veda this verse is explained thus: ‘That sun is the *haṁsaḥ śuciṣat*.’ But there is a *mantra* which says, ‘The sun is the Self of all that moves and does not move’, (R. I. cxv. i; Ai. II.ii.3) from which it is known that the sun symbolises the all-pervasive Consciousness.”—A.G.

a king. The idea is that they never cease from activity meant for Him. The purport of the sentence is that He for whom, and under whose direction, exist all the activities of the organs and the vital force, is proved to be different from them.

अस्य विश्वंसमानस्य शरीरस्थस्य देहिनः ।

देहाद्विमुच्यमानस्य किमत्र परिशिष्यते । एतद्ध तत् ॥ ४ ॥

4. When this dweller in the body becomes detached, when He is freed from this body, what else remains in this body? This is that.

Moreover, *asya dehinaḥ śarīrasthasya*, of this embodied one (the Self) that is in the body; *viśvānsamānasya*, as It gets loosened, detached. The meaning of the word *viśvānsana* (loosening) is being given: *dehād vimucyamānasya*, as It gets freed from the body, *kim atra pariśiṣyate*, what else remains here--in this group of vital force etc. ?¹ Nothing remains here in this body. That Self is proved to be different (from the body etc.), on whose departure all this aggregate of body and senses becomes instantaneously powerless, defunct, and destroyed, just as it happens in the case of the citizens when the lord of the city retreats.

The opinion may be held that this body gets destroyed on the departure of the *prāṇa*, *apāna*, etc., but not owing to the exit of the Self that is distinct from them; for a man lives only by *prāṇa* and the rest. But this is not so.

¹ This is according to the reading, *prāṇādikalāpe*. If the reading is *prāṇādikalāpaḥ*, the meaning will be "nothing of the group of *prāṇa* etc. remains".

न प्राणेन नापानेन मर्त्यो जीवति कश्चन ।
इतरेण तु जीवन्ति यस्मिन्नेतावुपाश्रितौ ॥ ५ ॥

5. No mortal lives by *prāṇa* or *apāna*; but all live by something else on which these two depend.

Na prāṇena na apānena, neither through the function of exhaling nor through that of inhaling —nor by the eye and the rest; *kaḥ cana martyaḥ*, any human being; *jīvati*, lives —nobody lives. Inasmuch as these are meant for somebody else and act jointly, they cannot be the source of life. Composite things like houses etc., are not seen to exist in this world, unless this existence is brought about by someone for his own benefit, who is not part of the assemblage. This should be so in the case of *prāṇa* etc. too, since they also form a combination. Therefore all these *jīvanti*, live, maintain life, having been combined by someone else who is dissimilar to the *prāṇa* etc., that constitute the group. • *Yasmīn*, that on which —that Self, true and supreme, and distinct from the combination, on which; *etau* these two — *prāṇa* and *apāna*, in combination with eye etc.; *upāśritau*, are dependent;¹ and for the benefit of which uncombined Self, *prāṇa*, *apāna*, etc. exist as a combination, performing their own functions; that Self is established to be distinct from them. This is the purport.

हन्त त इदं प्रवक्ष्यामि गुह्यं ब्रह्म सनातनम् ।
यथा च मरणं प्राप्य आत्मा भवति गौतम ॥ ६ ॥

¹ Or—*Yasmīn* (*sati*) whose existence—the existence of which Self, supreme and distinct from the combination—being taken for granted; *etau upāśritau*, these two get supported.

6. Well, O Gautama, I shall tell you of this secret, eternal Brahman; and also how the Self fares after death.

Hanta, well, now again; *te*, to you; *pravakṣyāmi*, I shall tell; *idam*, this; *guhyaṃ*, secret; *sanātānam brahma*, everlasting Brahman; through knowledge of which comes about a cessation of all worldly existence, and through ignorance of which, *maraṇam prāpya*, attaining death; *yathā*, how; *ātmā*, the soul; *bhavati*, becomes—how It transmigrates; that you hear, O Gautama.

योनिमन्ये प्रपद्यन्ते शरीरत्वाय देहिनः ।

स्थाणुमन्येऽनुसंयन्ति यथाकर्म यथाश्रुतम् ॥ ७ ॥

7. Some souls enter the womb for acquiring bodies and others follow the motionless, in accordance with their work and in conformity with their knowledge.

Anye dehinaḥ, some souls—some ignorant fools; *śarīra-tvāya*, for assuming bodies; *yonim prapadyante*, enter into the womb. *Anye*, others—the extremely inferior ones; after death, *anusaiṅyanti*, follow; *sthāṇum*, the state of motionless things like trees etc.; *yathākarma*, in accordance as each one's work is—i.e. under the impulsion of the (fruits of) works they have accomplished in this life; similarly, too, *yathāśrutam*, in conformity with the nature of knowledge acquired. The idea is that they take bodies accordingly; for another Vedic text says; “Creatures are born in accordance with their knowledge.”

The Upaniṣad speaks of the secret Brahman about which it was promised, “I shall tell”:

य एष सुप्तेषु जागर्ति कामं कामं पुरुषो निर्मिमाणः ।
तदेव शुक्रं तद्ब्रह्म तदेवामृतमुच्यते ।

तस्मिँल्लोकाः श्रिताः सर्वे तदु नात्येति कश्चन । एतद्वै तत् ॥८॥

8. Puruṣa, who keeps awake and goes on creating desirable things even when the senses fall asleep, is pure; and He is Brahman, and He is called the Immortal. All the worlds are fixed on Him; none can transcend Him. This is that.

Yah, eṣaḥ, He who; jāganti, keeps awake and does not sleep; supteṣu, when prāṇa etc., are asleep. How? Nirmi-māṇaḥ, creating—through ignorance; kāmaṁ kāmaṁ, each of those desirable things—such desirable things as woman etc. Puruṣaḥ, the Puruṣa (all-pervading Brahman)—who keeps awake, by accomplishing these; tat eva, that (Puruṣa) indeed; is śukram, white, pure; tat brahma, that is Brahman—there is no other secret Brahman; tat eva, that indeed; amṛtam ucyate, is called the indestructible—in all scriptures. Moreover, sarve lokāḥ, all the worlds—such as the earth etc.; tasmin, on It—on Brahman; śritāḥ, are supported—for It is the source of all the worlds. The text beginning with tat u nātyeti kaścana is to be explained as before (Ka. II.i.9).

Since the knowledge of the unity of the Self, though validated by proof and reiterated more than once does not find a lodging in the hearts of those Brāhmaṇas of insincere intellect whose minds are swayed by the intellect of numerous logicians, therefore the Upaniṣad, being eager to inculcate it, says again and again :

अग्निर्यथैको भुवनं प्रविष्टो
रूपं रूपं प्रतिरूपो बभूव ।

एकस्तथा सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा
रूपं रूपं प्रतिरूपो बहिश्च ॥ ९ ॥

9. Just as fire, though one, having entered the world, assumes separate forms in respect of different shapes, similarly, the Self inside all beings, though one, assumes a form in respect of each shape; and (yet) It is outside.

Yathā, as; *agnih*, fire; though bright by nature and only *ekah*, one; *praviṣṭah*, having entered; *bhuvanam*—derived from the root *bhū* (to be), in the sense of a place where creatures come into being, the word means -this world; *rūpam rūpam prati*, in conformity with each form, i.e. in respect of the difference of combustible substances, such as wood etc.; *babhūva*, became; *pratirūpaḥ*, multiformed, assuming the respective shapes of those different fuels; *tathā*, similarly; *sarvabhūtāntarātāmā*, the Self that is inside all beings—by virtue of Its subtleness, like fire in fuels etc.; though only *ekah*, one; has become *pratirūpaḥ*, formed in accordance with the individual shapes—in respect of all bodies, owing to Its entry there; *bahīḥ ca*, and (yet) It is outside—in Its own unmodified form, just like space.

Similarly there is another illustration:

वायुर्यथैको भुवनं प्रविष्टो
रूपं रूपं प्रतिरूपो बभव ।

एकस्तथा सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा

रूपं रूपं प्रतिरूपो बहिश्च ॥ १० ॥

10. As air, though one, having entered into this world, assumes separate forms in respect of different shapes, similarly, the Self inside all beings, though one, assumes a form in respect of each shape. And yet It is outside.

Yathā, as; *vāyuh*, air—in the form of vital force; having entered into the bodies; *rūpam rūpam pratirūpaḥ babhūva*, etc., is to be explained as before.

Since the contingency arises that if the one entity is the Self of all, then the sorrowfulness of the world will belong to the supreme Brahman Itself, (therefore) this is being said:

सूर्यो यथा सर्वलोकस्य चक्षु-

नं लिप्यते चाक्षुषैर्बाह्यदोषैः ।

एकस्तथा सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा

न लिप्यते लोकदुःखेन बाह्यः ॥ ११ ॥

11. Just as the sun, which is the eye of the whole world, is not tainted by the ocular and external defects, similarly, the Self, that is but one in all beings, is not tainted by the sorrows of the world, It being transcendental.

Yathā, as; *sūryaḥ*, the sun; even though by virtue of helping the eyes through its light, and illuminating such

impure things as urine, ordure, etc., becomes *sarvalokasya cakṣuḥ*, the eye of all the people—who see those things: still *na lipyate*, it is not tainted; *cākṣuṣaiḥ bāhyadoṣaiḥ*, by the ocular and external blemishes—by ocular faults, physical lapses amounting to sin, which are caused by the sight of impurity etc., and by external faults consisting in the contact with impurity etc.; *tathā* similarly; (He who) though *ekah*, one; is *sarvabhūtantarātma*, the Self inside all; *na lipyate lokaduḥkhena*, is not tainted by the sorrows of the world; (since He is) *bāhyaḥ*, transcendental. It is through ignorance, superimposed on the Self, that people suffer the sorrows arising from desire and work. But that ignorance does not really inhere in one's Self just as the snake, the silver, the water, and the dirt, superimposed on a rope, a mother of pearl, a desert, and the sky (respectively), do not in reality exist as the distortions of the rope etc. But they appear as the defects of those things (rope etc.) because of the superimposition of false notions on the substances (rope etc.) that provide the bases for them.¹ They (the substances) are not tainted by those faults, for they are outside the notions thus falsely superimposed. Similarly, people, after having superimposed on the Self the false notions of action, agent, and fruit, like the snake (on a rope), experience the misery of birth, death, etc., consequent on that superimposition; but the Self, though It is the Self of all, is not tainted by the sorrows of the world arising from false superimposition. Why? (Because It is) outside. For just like the rope etc., It is extraneous to the superimposition of false notion.

¹ Or—"because of the superimposition of such false notions in the persons who come in contact with them."

एको वशी सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा

एकं रूपं बहुधा यः करोति ।

तमात्मस्थं येऽनुपश्यन्ति धीरा-

स्तेषां सुखं शाश्वतं नेतरेषाम् ॥ १२ ॥

12. Eternal peace is for those—and not for others—who are discriminating and who realise in their hearts Him who—being one, the controller, and the inner Self of all—makes a single form multifarious.

Moreover, He indeed is the supreme Lord, all-pervasive, independent, and *ekaḥ*, one; there is none equal to or greater than Him. (He is) *vaśī*, controller—for the whole universe is under His control. Why? Because (He is) *sarvabhūtarātāmā*, the Self in all beings. Since He, *yaḥ*, who, because of His inscrutable power; *karoti*, makes—by His mere existence; (His) *ekam rūpam*, one form—His own Self that is homogeneous and consists of unalloyed consciousness; *bahudhā*, diverse—through the differences in the impure conditions of name and form; *tam ātmastham*, Him as residing in the space of the heart within the body, i.e. as manifested as knowledge in the intellect, like a face appearing to exist in a mirror, it being impossible for the body to be the receptacle of the Self that is formless like space; *ye dhīrāḥ*, those discriminating people who—those who have ceased from external activities; *anupaśyanti*, realise directly—as a result of the pursuance of the instruction of the teacher—realise that God who is the Self; *teṣām*, for them, who have become identified with the supreme Lord; is *śāśvataṃ sukham*, eternal happiness—consisting in the bliss-

fulness of the Self; *na itareṣām*, not for others for those non-discriminating people whose intellects are attached to external things, for though the happiness is their very Self, (they do not get it), because of the obstruction of ignorance.

नित्योऽनित्यानां चेतनश्चेतनाना-

मेको बहूनां यो विदधाति कामान् ।

तमात्मस्थं येऽनुपश्यन्ति धीरा-

स्तेषां शान्तिः शाश्वती नेतरेषाम् ॥ १३ ॥

13. Eternal peace is for those—and not for others—who are discriminating and who realise in their hearts Him who—being the eternal among the ephemeral, the consciousness among the conscious—alone dispenses the desired objects to many.

Furthermore, *nityaḥ*, indestructible, *anityānām*, among the destructible; *cetanaḥ*, consciousness; *cetanānām*, among the conscious—among the manifestors of consciousness such as the living creatures beginning with Brahmā. As it is owing to fire that water etc., that are not fire, come to be possessed of the power to burn, similarly, the power to manifest consciousness that is seen in others is owing to the consciousness of the Self. Besides, He (is) the omniscient Lord of all—*yaḥ*, who; *ekaḥ*, alone; *vidadhāti*, arranges diversely, i.e. dispenses without effort; *kāmān*, desirable things, the fruits of work according to merit, as also out of His own grace; *bahūnām*, of many, of the desirous, worldly people. Those discriminating people who realise Him in their hearts—for them *śāntiḥ*, cessation; is *sāsvatī*, eternal—

for them accrues peace that is their very Self; and *na itare-
sām*, not for others who are of a different sort.

तदेतदिति मन्यन्तेऽनिर्देश्यं परमं सुखम् ।

कथं नु तद्विजानीयां किमु भाति विभाति वा ॥ १४ ॥

14. How shall I know that supreme, unspeakable Bliss which they realise directly as “This”? Is It self-effulgent—does It shine distinctly, or does It not?

(*Yat*) *tat*, that—that knowledge of the Self, that is *sukham*, bliss; *anirdeśyam*, indescribable; and *paramam*, superexcellent; (*yat tat*), that which, though beyond the range of speech and mind of ordinary people, still, the Brāhmaṇas, who are free from desires, *manyante*, consider; *etat iti*, as “this”, as something directly known; *katham nu*, how indeed; *vijānīyām*, I shall know; *tat*, that—happiness; how can I make It an object of my consciousness as “This”, as do the *sannyāsins* who are free from desires? *Kim u tat bhāti*, does It shine?—That which is self-effulgent, does It *vibhāti*, appear, is It seen, distinctly as an object of our intellect? *Vā*, or, is It not? (Or¹—since It is effulgent, is It perceived clearly as an object of our intellect, or is It not?)

The answer to this (aforesaid question) is that It is both self-effulgent and shines distinctly (or multifariously). How?

न तत्र सूर्यो भाति न चन्द्रतारकं
नेमा विद्युतो भान्ति कुतोऽयमग्निः ।

¹ The word *yat* being interpreted as meaning since.

तमेव भान्तमनुभाति सर्वं

तस्य भासा सर्वमिदं विभाति ॥ १५ ॥

इति काठकोपनिषदि द्वितीयाध्याये द्वितीया वल्ली ॥

15. There the sun does not shine, neither do the moon and the stars; nor do these flashes of lightning shine. How can this fire? He shining, all these shine; through his lustre all these are variously illumined.

Tatra, there—in Brahman which is one's Self; *sūryah*, the sun; *na bhāti*, does not shine, i.e. it does not illuminate that Brahman, though it illumines all. Similarly, *na candra-tārakam*, *na imāḥ vidyutaḥ bhānti*, neither the moon and stars nor these flashes of lightning shine; *kutaḥ ayam agniḥ*, how can this fire—that is seen by us—(shine)? To cut short, all, inclusive of these, that shines, *anubhāti*, shine according as, *tam eva bhāntam*, He, the supreme Lord, shines. Just as (hot) water, fire-brand, etc., owing to their contact with fire, burn according as the fire does, but not independently, similarly, it is verily *tasya bhāsā*, by His effulgence, that *sarvam idam*, all this—the sun etc.; *vibhāti*, shines variously. This being so it is that Brahman Itself that is effulgent and shines variously. Through the various kinds of effulgence in the effects, it is known that the characteristic of luminosity is intrinsic to that Brahman. For that luminosity which does not exist naturally cannot impart it to others; for a pot etc. are not seen to illuminate others, whereas luminous things like the sun etc., are seen to do so.

PART II

CANTO III

As in the world, the root of a (silk-cotton) tree can be traced by coming to know its cotton,¹ similarly the sixth canto is commenced in order to ascertain the real nature of Brahman through the determination of the tree of the universe of which Brahman is the root:

ऊर्ध्वमूलोऽवाकशाख एषोऽश्वत्थः सनातनः ।

तदेव शुक्रं तद्ब्रह्म तदेवामृतमुच्यते ।

तस्मिँल्लोकाः श्रिताः सर्वे तदु नात्येति कश्चन । एतद्वै तत् ॥ १ ॥

1. This is the beginningless peepul tree that has its roots above and branches down. That (which is its root) is pure, that is Brahman and that is called immortal. On that are fixed all the worlds; none transcends that. This verily is that.

Ūrdhvamūlah, that which has its roots above—the root that is the state of supreme Viṣṇu. This tree of the world, comprising everything from the Unmanifested to the immovables, has its root above. It is called *vrkṣa* (tree) because (of the root meaning) of being felled. It consists of many evils, such as birth, old age, death, sorrow, etc.; it changes itself every moment, inasmuch as no sooner is it seen than its nature is destroyed like magic, water in a mirage, a city in the sky, etc., and it ceases to exist ultimately like a tree; it is without any heart-wood like the stem of

¹ By seeing the cotton of the silk-cotton tree etc, one can infer that it comes from a tree which is rooted somewhere.

a plantain tree; it is subject to hundreds of doubts in the minds of sceptics; its reality is determined in its true colour by the seekers of truth;¹ its essence lies in its root, the supreme Brahman, ascertained in Vedānta; it grows from out of the seed of ignorance,² desire, action, and the Un-manifested; it has for its sprout Hiraṇyagarbha, the inferior Brahman, comprising the two powers of knowledge and action; it has for its trunk the diverse subtle bodies of all creatures; its vigour of growth results from the sprinkling of the water of desire; it has for its tender sprouts the objects of the senses of knowledge; its leaves are the Vedas, the Smṛtis, logic, learning, and instruction; its lovely flowers are the many deeds such as sacrifice, charity, austerity, etc.; its various tastes are the experience of happiness and sorrow; its infinite fruits are the means of subsistence of beings; it has its secondary roots well developed, entwined, and firmly fixed through the sprinkling of the water of desire (for those fruits);³ it has for its nests the seven worlds beginning from the one called Satya, built by the birds which are the living beings from Brahmā downwards; it has its uproar, rendered tumultuous through the various sounds arising from dancing, singing, instrumental music, disport (play, jest, etc.), clapping on the arms, laughing, pulling, crying, exclaiming "Alas, alas!" "Leave me, leave me!" induced by mirth and grief arising from the enjoyment and pain of living beings; and it is felled by the weapons of

¹ Or, according to another reading, "Its nature cannot be fixed as such and such by the seekers of truth.

² Superimposition.

³ Desires for works develop from desires for results; they get entwined and mixed up with various dispositions—*sāttvika*, *rājasika*, and *tāmasika* (calm, active, and lazy).

detachment consisting of the realisation of the identity of Brahman and the Self as inculcated by Vedānta. This tree of the world is an *aśvattha*¹—its nature is ever unsteady, like the peepul tree, shaken as it is by the wind of desire and deeds; it is *avākśākaḥ*—downwards are its branches, consisting of heaven, hell, and states of beasts and ghosts; (it is) *vanātamaḥ*, existing from time immemorial, having no beginning. *Tat eva*, that very thing—which is the root of the tree of the world—is; *śukram*, white, pure, resplendent—being in reality the light of the Self which is Consciousness; *tat brahma*, that is Brahman, being the greatest of all; *tat eva*, that indeed; *ucyate*, is called; *amṛtam*, indestructible by nature, being true. All else is false, being “mutable, existing as mere name dependent on speech” (Ch. VI. i. 4), and hence it is mortal. *Tasmin*, on Him, on Brahman that is absolutely true; *sarve*, all; *lokāḥ*, the worlds—which are comparable to a city in the sky, or water in a mirage, and which vanish on the realisation of the supreme Truth; *śṛitāḥ*, are fixed—during creation, existence, and dissolution, *Kaḥ cana na*, nothing whatsoever—no modification; *atyeti*, transcends; *tat u*, that—that Brahman; just as the products like pot etc., do not transcend (their material) earth etc. This verily is that.

It may be said that the very root of the world, Brahman, by realising which it is stated that people become immortal, does not exist, and that this (universe) has emerged out of nothing. But this is wrong:

यदिदं किं च जगत् सर्वं प्राण एजति निःसृतम् ।

महद्भयं वज्रमुद्यतं य एतद्विदुरमृतास्ते भवन्ति ॥२॥

¹ Lit. *a* not; *sthāta* existing; *śva*, tomorrow; impermanent.

2. All this universe, that there is, emerges and moves because there is the supreme Brahman that is a great terror like an uplifted thunderbolt. Those who know this become immortal.

Prāṇe (sati) the supreme Brahman¹ (being there), *yat idam kim ca jagat sarvam*, all this universe that there is; *niḥśṛtam (sat)* having emerged—acts regularly. That Brahman which is thus the cause of the origination etc., of the world is *mahat bhayam*, greatly terrifying - *bhayam* being derived in the sense of that from which one gets fear; *vajram udyatam*, like an upraised thunderbolt. The idea imparted is that just as servants, finding their master in front with an uplifted thunderbolt, methodically follow his command, similarly this universe consisting of the sun, the moon, the planets, the constellations, and the stars, continues methodically without a moment's respite because it has a God. *Ye*, those who; *viduḥ etat*, know this—the Brahman as the witness of all the activities of their minds; *te*, they; *bhavanti*, become; *amṛtāḥ*, possessed of deathlessness.

The text says how out of fear of Him the world behaves:

भयादस्याग्निस्तपति भयात्तपति सूर्यः ।

भयादिन्द्रश्च वायुश्च मृत्युर्धावति पञ्चमः ॥ ३ ॥

3. From fear of Him Fire burns, from fear shines the Sun; from fear run Indra and Air, and Death, the fifth.²

¹ "Brahman, being the source of activity of even the vital force (*prāṇa*), is figuratively referred to by the word *prāṇa*."—A.G.

² Fire etc. stand for their respective deities.

Aśya bhayāt, from fear of Him—of the supreme Lord; *agnih tapati*, Fire burns; *bhayāt*, from fear; *tapati*, shines; *sūryaḥ*, the Sun; *bhayāt indraḥ*, from fear, Indra; *ca*, and; *vāyuḥ*, Air; *mṛtyuḥ ca*, and Death; *pañcanaḥ*, the fifth; *dhāvati*, runs. For unless there was a ruler, like one with an uplifted thunderbolt in hand, over these protectors of the world who themselves are powerful, there would not have been any regulated activity as that of servants trembling out of fear for their master.

इह चेदशकद्धोद्भु प्राक्शरीरस्य विस्रसः ।

ततः सर्गेषु लोकेषु शरीरत्वाय कल्पते ॥ ४ ॥

4. If one succeeds in realising here before the falling of the body, (one becomes freed); (else) because of that (failure) one becomes fit for embodiment in the worlds of creatures.

Cet, if; (one) being competent; *aśakat*, i.e. *śaknoti*, succeeds; *boddhum*, in knowing—knows that Brahman which is the cause of this fear; even *tha*, here—while still living; *prāk śarīrasya visrasaḥ*, before the disintegration, falling off, of the body; then one becomes free from the bondage of the world. If one does not succeed in knowing, then *tataḥ*, because of that non-realisation, *sargeṣu lokeṣu*, in the worlds of creatable things—on earth etc., the word *sarga* being derived from the root *srj* in the sense of the places where creatable beings are created; *kalpate*, one becomes fit; *śarīratvāya*, for embodiment; the idea is that one assumes a body (in those worlds).

Hence effort is to be made for the realisation of the Self before the falling off of the body, for here alone is it

possible for the vision of the Self to be as clear as that of a face in a mirror, whereas this is not possible in other worlds apart from that of Brahmā, which however, is difficult to attain. How? *This is being answered:

यथाऽऽदर्शो तथाऽऽत्मनि यथा स्वप्ने तथा पितृलोके ।

यथाऽऽप्सु परीव ददृशे तथा गन्धर्वलोके

छायातपयोरिव ब्रह्मलोके ॥ ५ ॥

5. As (one sees) in a mirror, so in one's intellect; as in a dream, so in the world of the manes; as it is seen in water, so in the world of the Gandharvas. As it is in the case of shade and light, so in the world of Brahmā.

Yathā, as—as one sees oneself very distinctly reflected; *ādarśe*, in a mirror; *tathā*, similarly; here, *ātmani*, in one's own intellect—the idea is that, when the intellect has become spotless like a mirror, there springs a distinct vision of the Self. *Yathā svapne*, as in a dream—the vision arising from the impressions of the waking state is indistinct; *tathā*, similarly; indistinct is the vision of the Self *pitrloke*, in the world of the manes—because of being enangled in the enjoyment of the results of work. *Yathā apsu*, as in water; one's form *pari iva dadrśe*—is equivalent to *paridrśyate iva*—appears to be without clear demarcation of the parts (hazy); *tathā*, similarly; indistinct is the vision of the Self *gandharvaloke*, in the world of Gandharvas. It is known from the authority of the scriptures that similar is the case in other worlds as well. Only in one, viz *brahmaloke*, in the world of Brahmā, is the vision very distinct; *chāyā-ātapayoḥ iva*, as (it is) in the case of shade and light. But that world

is difficult to attain, being the result of many special kinds of work and knowledge (i.e. of rites and meditation). Therefore effort should be made for the realisation of the Self here itself. This is the idea.

How is He to be known and what is the need of His knowledge? This is being answered:

इन्द्रियाणां पृथग्भावमुदयास्तमयौ च यत् ।

पृथगुत्पद्यमानानां मत्वा धीरो न शोचति ॥ ६ ॥

6. Having known the dissimilarity of the senses that originate separately, as also their rising and setting, the intelligent man does not grieve.

Indriyāṇām, of the senses—such as ear etc.; *pr̥thak utpadyamānānām*, that are separately produced—from their sources, *ākāśa* etc., for the purpose of perceiving their own respective objects; *matvā* knowing—through discrimination; their *pr̥thagbhāvam*, difference—their nature of being essentially dissimilar to the nature of the Self that is extremely pure, absolute, and consciousness alone; similarly (knowing their) *udayāstamayau*, (rising and setting) creation and dissolution—in relation to the waking and sleeping states—as belonging to them and not to the Self; *dhīrah*, the intelligent man; *na śocati*, does not grieve; for, the constantly uniform nature of the Self being unchangeable, the Self cannot be the cause of sorrow. Similar is another Vedic text: “The knower of the Self crosses over sorrow” (Ch. VII.i.3).

The Self, in relation to which the dissimilarity of the senses has been pointed out, is not to be realised outside, for It is the inmost Self of all. How can that be? This is being said:

इन्द्रियेभ्यः परं मनो मनसः सत्त्वमुत्तमम् ।
सत्त्वादधि महानात्मा महतोऽव्यक्तमुत्तमम् ॥ ७ ॥

7. The mind is superior to the senses; the intellect is superior to the mind; Mahat (the Great Soul) is superior to the intellect; the Unmanifested is superior to Mahat.

The sense-objects, belonging to the same class as they do with the senses, are understood to be enumerated by the mention of the senses. The rest is as before (Ka. I.iii.10). By the word *sattva*, the intellect is referred to here.

अव्यक्तात्तु परः पुरुषो व्यापकोऽलिङ्ग एव च ।
यं ज्ञात्वा मुच्यते जन्तुरमृतत्वं च गच्छति ॥ ८ ॥

8. But superior to the Unmanifested is the supreme Puruṣa who is pervasive and is, indeed, without worldly attributes, knowing whom a man becomes freed and attains immortality.

Avyaktāt tu paraḥ puruṣaḥ, Puruṣa is superior to the Unmanifested; and He is *vyāpakaḥ*, pervasive—for He is the source of all pervasive things such as space etc.; *aliṅgaḥ*—*liṅga* derivatively means that sign through which anything is comprehended, i.e. intellect etc.—He who has not that *liṅga*, intellect etc., is indeed *aliṅga*; that is, He who is devoid of all worldly attributes; *eva*, indeed. *Yam jñātvā*, having known whom—from the teacher and the scriptures; *jantuḥ*, a man; *mucyate*, becomes freed—even while living—from the bondages of the heart, such as ignorance etc.; and when the body falls, he *gacchati amṛtatvam ca*, attains

immortality as well. This part is to be construed with the earlier thus: He, the *alingaḥ* (incomprehensible) *paraḥ* (supreme) Puruṣa, by knowing whom a man becomes free and attains immortality, is superior to the Unmanifested.

How can there, then, be any possibility of the vision of the incomprehensible? This is being said:

न संदृशे तिष्ठति रूपमस्य

न चक्षुषा पश्यति कश्चनैनम् ।

हृदा मनीषा मनसाऽभिकल्पतो

य एतद्विदुरमृतास्ते भवन्ति ॥ ९ ॥

9. His form does not exist within the range of vision; nobody sees Him with the eye. When this Self is revealed through deliberation, It is realised by the intellect, the ruler of the mind,¹ that resides in the heart. Those who know this become immortal.

Asya rūpam, His form—the form of this inmost Self; *na tiṣṭhati*, does not exist; *sanidr̥ṣe*, as an object of vision. Therefore *na kaḥ cana*, nobody; *paśyati*, sees, perceives; *enam*, this Self—that is being considered; *cakṣuṣā*, through the eyes—i.e. through any of the senses, for the word *cakṣuḥ* (eye) is used here suggestively for all the senses. How, then, He is to be seen is being said: *hṛdā*, by that

¹ The intellect is the ruler dissuading the mind from its occupation with objects. The identity of the self and Brahman taught in the Upaniṣads, is confirmed by *manana*, deliberation. Then in the pure intellect, unoccupied with objects, arises the conviction, “I am Brahman” from the Upaniṣadic text, “That thou art.” Brahman becomes fully revealed to that convinced intellect.

which is in the heart; *manīṣā*, by the intellect—*manīṣ* being that which, as the controller, rules (*īṣte*) the mind (*manas*) characterised by thought. *Abhikṛptaḥ*, when (It is) con-
firmed, i.e. revealed; by that (intellect) which is in the heart and is free from occupation with objects; *manasā*, through the adequate vision consisting in deliberation; then “the Self can be realised”—this should be supplied to complete the sentence. *Ye*, those who; *viduḥ*, know; *etat*, this, this fact that the Self is Brahman; *te*, they; *amṛtāḥ bhavanti*, become immortal.

How can the ruler in the heart be attained? For that purpose yoga is being inculcated:

यदा पञ्चावतिष्ठन्ते ज्ञानानि मनसा सह ।

बुद्धिश्च न विचेष्टते तामाहुः परमां गतिम् ॥ १० ॥

10. When the five senses of knowledge come to rest together with the mind, and the intellect, too, does not function, that state they call the highest.

Yadā, at the time when; *pañca jñānāni*, the five senses of knowledge—such as ear etc., which are called *jñāna* (knowledge) being meant for it; *saha manasā*, together with the mind, which the senses follow—together with the internal organ (mind) which is (now) weaned away from (its functions of) thinking etc.; *avatiṣṭhante*, are at rest—in the Self alone, after desisting from their objects; *ca buddhiḥ*, and the intellect—characterised by determination; *na viceṣṭate*,¹ does not engage in its own activities; *tām*, that (state); *āhuḥ*, they call; *paramām gatim*, the highest state.

¹ An alternative reading is “*viceṣṭati*”.

तां योगमिति मन्यन्ते स्थिरामिन्द्रियधारणाम् ।
 अप्रमत्तस्तदा भवति योगो हि प्रभावाध्ययौ ॥ ११ ॥

11. They consider that keeping of the senses steady as yoga. One becomes vigilant at that time, for yoga is subject to growth and decay.

Manyante, they consider; *tām*, that state—which is such; viz *sthirām indriyadhāraṇām*, the steady control of the senses, i.e. keeping the inner and outer organs steady; *yogam iti*, as yoga (joining)—though in reality it is disjunction, for this state of the yogi consists in the cessation of the contact with all evils, and in this state, indeed, is the Self established in Its own nature, free from the superimposition of ignorance. *Bhavati*, one becomes; *apramattaḥ*, unerring—ever careful about the concentration of mind; *tadā*, at that time—at the very time that one commences yoga, which meaning follows from the implication of the context; for when the intellect etc., cease to function, there can be no possibility of carelessness; therefore the carefulness is enjoined even before the cessation of the activities of the intellect etc. Or since unimpeded vigilance is possible only when the senses are kept steady, it is stated, “One becomes unerring at that time.” Why? *Yogaḥ hi prabhavāpyayau*, for yoga is subject to growth and decay—this is the meaning. Therefore vigilance is needed for avoiding decay.¹ This is the idea.

If Brahman be an object of the activities of the intellect etc., then It should be specifically apprehended as “This is

¹ The sentence “Therefore” etc., follows up the first interpretation, where the Upaniṣad gives an injunction about the need of vigilance, the word, “becomes”, being transformed into “should become”. The second interpretation—starting with “Or since”—is a statement of fact.

such and such"; and since It cannot be perceived on the cessation of the intellect etc., there being then no instrument for cognition, Brahman should surely have no existence (then). It is a wellknown fact in the world that a thing exists so long as it is within the range of an instrument of cognition, and the contrary one is non-existent. Hence yoga is useless; or Brahman is to be perceived as non-existing inasmuch as It cannot be cognised. This contingency having arisen, this is the reply:

नैव वाचा न मनसा प्राप्तुं शक्यो न चक्षुषा ।

अस्तीति ब्रुवतोऽन्यत्र कथं तदुपलभ्यते ॥ १२ ॥

12. It cannot be attained through speech, nor through mind, nor through eye. How can It be known to anyone apart from him who speaks of It as existing?

It is true that *na eva vācā*, neither through speech; *na manasā*, nor through mind; *na cakṣuṣā*, nor through eye; nor through the other senses; *prāptum śakyaḥ*, It is to be attained; i.e. It cannot be attained; still though It is devoid of all attributes, It does exist, since It is known as the root of the universe; for the denial of effects presupposes some existence as their ultimate limit. Similarly, this effect (in the form of the universe) when traced back in ascending order of subtleness, makes one apprised of the idea of existence as its ultimate resort. Even when the intellect is being attenuated through the sublation of objects, the intellect dissolves only as pregnant with a concept of existence. And reason, indeed, is the proof for us in ascertaining the real nature of the existent and the non-existent. If the world had no root, this creation would be filled with non-existence and

would be perceived as non-existent. But in fact, this is not so; it is perceived as "existing", just as a pot etc., produced from earth etc., are perceived as permeated with earth. Therefore the Self, the root of the universe, is to be realised as existing. Why? *Asti iti bruvatah*, apart from the faithful one who, following the scriptures, speaks of existence; *anyatra*, anywhere else—in the one who holds the theory of non-existence, in the one who thinks perversely in this way, "The root of the world, the Self, does not exist; this effect is causeless, and it gets dissolved into non-existence as its end"; *katham*, how; can *tat*, that Brahman; *upalabhyate*, be known? The idea is that It is not perceived in any way.

अस्तीत्येवोपलब्धयस्तत्त्वभावेन चोभयोः ।

अस्तीत्येवोपलब्धस्य तत्त्वभावः प्रसीदति ॥ १३ ॥

13. The Self is (first) to be realised as existing, and (then) as It really is. Of these two (aspects), the real nature of the Self that has been known as merely existing, becomes favourably disposed (for self-revelation).

Therefore, eschewing the devilish company of those who advance the theory of non-existence, *asti iti eva upalabdhavyah*, the Self should be realised as existing (i.e. immanent in all)—as productive of effects in which existence inheres, and as having the intellect etc., as Its limiting adjuncts. But when the Self is devoid of all that and is not subject to changes—and effects do not exist apart from their cause, because of the Vedic text, "All modification is mere name, being supported by speech—earth alone is real" (Ch. VI.i.4)—then of that unconditioned, attributeless Self

that is free from becoming an object of such concepts as existence and non-existence; *tattvabhāvaḥ*, the true (transcendental) nature—(*bhavati*) is revealed. (*Tattvabhāvena*), in that (truly revealed) form, too—“is the Self to be realised”, this much is to be supplied. The sixth (genitive) case in *ubhayoḥ* is used to imply selection. *Ubhayoḥ*, of the two (aspects), again—of the conditioned and the unconditioned, of the aspects of immanence and transcendence; the *tattvabhāvaḥ*, the real (transcendental) aspect; *asti iti eva upalabdhasya*, of that very Self which was earlier realised as existing¹ (as immanent), i.e., which was known through the idea of existence called up by the limiting adjuncts that are themselves the effects of an existing entity; that real aspect of that very Self *prasīdati*, becomes favourably disposed for revealing Itself—i.e. to the man who had realised It earlier as existence; the real aspect being that from which all limiting adjuncts have vanished, which is different from the known and the unknown, is non-dual by nature, and is ascertained by such Vedic texts as, “not this, not this” (Bṛ. II.iii.6, III.ix.26), “not gross, not subtle, not short” (Bṛ. III.viii.8), “in the changeless, bodiless, inexpressible, un-supporting” (Tai. II.vii.1).

यदा सर्वे प्रमुच्यन्ते कामा येऽस्य हृदि श्रिताः ।

अथ मर्त्योऽमृतो भवत्यत्र ब्रह्म समश्नुते ॥ १४ ॥

14. When all desires clinging to one's heart fall off, then a mortal becomes immortal, (and) one attains Brahman here.

¹ The Self which was inferred as existing from the fact of Its being the cause of all the effects that are perceived as existing.

Of the man who has realised the supreme Reality, *yadā*, when; *sarve kāmāḥ*, all desires; *pramucyante*, fall off, are broken to pieces; owing to the absence of anything else to be desired; *ye*, the desires which; *hr̥di śritāḥ*, clung to the heart; *asya*, of that man of knowledge, before his enlightenment—the intellect, and not the Self, being the seat of the desires, which fact is also supported by another Vedic text—“desire, thought, (doubt, etc., all these are but the mind)” (Br. I. v. 3); *atha*, then; he who was before enlightenment *martyaḥ*, mortal, *amṛtaḥ bhavati*, becomes immortal, after enlightenment—by virtue of the elimination of death constituted by ignorance, desire, and deeds; death, which causes departure, having been destroyed, there remains no possibility of departure, and hence *atra*, here itself; owing to the cessation of all bondage, like the blowing out of a lamp, *samaśnute brahma*, (he) attains Brahman, i.e. (he) becomes Brahman Itself.

When again, the desires will be totally uprooted? This is being said;

यदा सर्वे प्रभिद्यन्ते हृदयस्येह ग्रन्थयः ।

अथ मर्त्योऽमृतो भवत्येतावद्धचनुशासनम् ॥ १५ ॥

15. When all the knots of the heart are destroyed, even while a man is alive, then a mortal becomes immortal. This much alone is the instruction (of all the Upaniṣads).

Yadā, when; *sarve granthayaḥ*, all the knots—i.e. all concepts arising from ignorance, that bind one fast like knots; *hr̥dayasya*, of the intellect; *prabhidante*, get shattered, are destroyed; *iha*, here—even while a man is living.

The concepts arising from ignorance are, "I am 'this body'", "This wealth is mine", "I am happy and unhappy", etc. When the bondages of ignorance are destroyed by the rise of the opposite knowledge of the identity of the Self and Brahman, in the form, "I am Brahman indeed and am not a transmigrating soul", then the desires originating from the knots become totally eradicated. *Atha martyaḥ amṛtaḥ bhavati*, then a mortal becomes immortal. *Etāvut hi*, this much only is—there should not be any anticipation that there is more: *anuśāsanam*, the instruction; the expression, "of all the Upaniṣads", should be supplied to complete the sentence.

By asserting, "He attains Brahman here" (Ka. II. iii.14), it has been declared that there is no going for an enlightened man for whom all the knots of ignorance become destroyed on the realisation of the identity of the Self with the all-pervading and absolutely attributeless Brahman, and who becomes Brahman even while living, which fact is also supported by another Vedic text: "Of him the organs do not depart. Being but Brahman he is merged in Brahman" (Br. IV. iv. 6). But for those who are not much advanced in the knowledge of Brahman, who are engaged in other kinds of knowledge (i.e. in worship and meditation), and who are fit for the world of Brahmā, as also for those others who are the opposite of these and are fit for worldly existence, this particular kind of path is stated with a view to eulogising the superior result of the knowledge of Brahman that is being treated here. Moreover, the knowledge of Fire had been questioned about and was imparted. The process of the attainment of the fruit of that knowledge has also to be described. Hence this verse is begun. As to that,

शतं चैका च हृदयस्य नाड्य-

स्तासां मूर्धानमभिनिःसृतैका ।

तयोर्ध्वमायन्नमृतत्वमेति

विष्वङ्ङन्या उत्क्रमणे भवन्ति ॥ १६ ॥

16. The nerves of the heart are a hundred and one in number. Of them the one passes through the head. Going up through that nerve one gets immortality. The others that have different directions, become the causes of death.

The nerves that issue out of the heart of a man are *śatam*, a hundred in number; *ca ekā*, and one—called *suṣumṇā*. *Tāsām*, of these; *ekā*, the one—the *suṣumṇā*; *abhiñihṛtā*, goes out, by piercing through *mūrdhānam*, the head. At the time of death one should bring one's mind under control through that (*suṣumṇā*) nerve, and get it concentrated in the heart. *Tayā*, through that nerve; *ūrdhvam āyan*, going up—along the Path of Sun (*uttara-mārga*); one *eti*, attains; *amṛtatvam*, immortality—which is relative because of the Smṛti, "The place (i.e. Brahmaloaka) that lasts till the absorption of all the elements (i.e. cosmic dissolution) is called immortality" (Viṣṇu Purāṇa, II. viii. 97). Or—after having enjoyed incomparable pleasures, abounding in the world of Brahmā, he attains immortality, in the primary sense of the word, along with Hiraṇyagarbha (Brahmā), in due course of time. *Viṣvak anyāḥ*, the other nerves that branch out (otherwise), in different directions, become the causes *utkramaṇe*, for death, i.e. for the attainment of the worldly state alone.

Now concluding the purport of all the cantos the Upaniṣad says:

अङ्गुष्ठमात्रः पुरुषोऽन्तरात्मा

सदा जनानां हृदये संनिविष्टः ।

तं स्वाच्छरीरात्प्रवृहेन्मुञ्जादिवेषीकां धैर्येण ।

तं विद्याच्छुक्रममृतं तं विद्याच्छुक्रममृतमिति ॥ १७ ॥

17. Puruṣa, the indwelling Self, of the size of a thumb, is ever seated in the hearts of men. One should unerringly separate Him from one's body like a stalk from the Muñja grass. Him one should know as pure and immortal. Him one should know as pure and immortal.

Anguṣṭhamātrah puruṣaḥ antarātmā sadā janānām hr̥daye, in the heart as related to men; *sanniviṣṭaḥ*—all this is as has been already explained (Ka. II.i. 12-13). *Tam*, Him; *pravṛhet*, one should raise, should pull out, should separate; *svāt śarīrāt*, from one's own body. Like what? That is being said: *Dhairyeṇa*, unerringly; *iṣīkām iva muñjāt*, like a stalk from the Muñja grass, that is inside it. *Vidyāt*, one should know; *tam*, that thing—the absolute Consciousness as drawn out from the body—to be *śukram amṛtam* as pure and immortal—to be the Brahman previously described. The repetition (of “Him one”, etc.), as also the word *iti*, is to show that the Upaniṣad is concluded.

Now this conclusion of the purport of the story is being stated with a view to eulogising the knowledge:

मृत्युप्रोक्तां नचिकेतोऽथ लब्ध्वा
 विद्यामेतां योगविधिं च कृत्स्नम् ।
 ब्रह्मप्राप्तो विरजोऽभूद्विमृत्यु-
 रन्योऽप्येवं यो विदध्यात्ममेव ॥ १८ ॥

18. Naciketā, having become first free from virtue and vice, as also desire and ignorance, acquired this knowledge imparted by Death, as also the process of yoga in its totality, and he attained Brahman. Anyone else, too, who becomes a knower thus (like Naciketā) of the indwelling Self, attains Brahman.

Naciketā, *labdhvā*, having attained—from Death, through the granting of boons; *nirtyuproktām etam vidyām*, this knowledge of Brahman imparted by Death—as stated above; *yogavidhim ca kṛtsnam*, and the process of yoga in its entirety, i.e. together with all its accessories and results. What happened to him after that? *Brahmaprāptāḥ abhūt*, (he) attained Brahman, i.e. became free. How? By having already become *virajah*, free from virtue and vice, (and) *vimṛtyuh*, free from desire and ignorance, through the acquisition of knowledge. Not only Naciketā, but *anyaḥ api*, anyone else, too—becomes like Naciketā a knower of Brahman by attaining the Self, existing in the context of the body, as the innermost reality in Its absoluteness, and not in any other form—other than the indwelling Self. He who knows *adhyātmam eva*, the Self, that exists in the context of the body—in the manner as described; who is an *evam-vit*, a knower of this kind, “he, too, having become *virajah* (free

from virtue and vice), becomes *vimṛtyuh* (free from desire and ignorance)—by knowing Brahman”—this (sentence) is to be added to complete the idea.

This valedictory prayer is uttered with a view to removing all faults incurred by the disciple and the teacher through lapses resulting from inadvertence during the course of acquiring or imparting the knowledge:

सह नावतु । सह नौ भुनक्तु । सह वीर्यं करवावहै ।
तेजस्विनावधीतमस्तु मा विद्विषावहै ॥ १९ ॥

ॐ शान्तिः शान्तिः शान्तिः ॥

इति काठकोपनिषदि द्वितीयाध्याये तृतीया वल्ली ॥

19. May He protect us both (by revealing knowledge). May He protect us both (by vouchsafing the results of knowledge). May we attain vigour together. Let what we study be invigorating. May we not cavil at each other. Peace! Peace! Peace!

Avatu, may He protect; *saha nau*, both of us together—by revealing the real nature of knowledge. Who? That supreme God Himself who is revealed in the Upaniṣads. Besides *bhunaktu*, may He protect, *saha nau*, both of us together—by revealing the result of that knowledge. *Karāvāvahai*, may we both accomplish; *saha*, together—jointly indeed; *vīryam*, the power—originating from knowledge. Moreover, let *adhītam*, the lesson; *tejasvinau* (is to be construed as *tejasvinoh*), of us two who are of sharp intellect (befitting for us)—let what has been studied by us be well

studied. Or the meaning is: Let *nau adhītam*, what has been studied by us two—be, very *tejasvi*, potent, invigorating. *Mā vidviṣāvahai*, may we not two cavil at each other—i.e. may we not entertain that antagonism subsisting between a disciple and his teacher owing to defects in study and teaching that originate from unwitting lapses. *Śāntiḥ*, śāntiḥ, śāntiḥ, peace, peace, peace—this repetition three times is to avert all evils.¹ *Om*.

¹ On the three planes—physical, natural, and supernatural

TAITTIRĪYA UPANISAD

ॐ शं नो मित्रः शं वरुणः । शं नो भवत्वयमा । शं न
इन्द्रो बृहस्पतिः । शं नो विष्णुरुक्रमः । नमो ब्रह्मणे ।
नमस्ते वायो । त्वमेव प्रत्यक्षं ब्रह्मासि । त्वामेव प्रत्यक्षं
ब्रह्म वदिष्यामि । ऋतं वदिष्यामि । सत्यं वदिष्यामि ।
तन्मामवतु । तद्वक्तारमवतु । अवतु माम् । अवतु वक्तारम् ।

ॐ शान्तिः शान्तिः शान्तिः ॥

ॐ सह नावतु । सह नौ भुनक्तु । सह वीर्यं
करवावहे । तेजस्विनावधीतमस्तु मा विद्विषावहे ।

ॐ शान्तिः शान्तिः शान्तिः ॥

(For translation etc see I.i. and II i)

TAITIRĪYA UPANIṢAD

PART I

ON THE SCIENCE OF PRONUNCIATION ETC.

CHAPTER I

Salutation to that (Brahman) which is of the nature of consciousness, from which this whole universe was born, into which it gets dissolved, and by which this is sustained.

I bow down ever before those adorable Teachers by whom was explained this Upaniṣad in the past, by taking into consideration the words, the sentences, and the means of valid knowledge.

With the grace of my Teacher, and for the benefit of those who prefer a clear exposition, I compose this explanation of this Upaniṣad that is the essence of (that section of the Vedas, called) the Taittirīya.

Introduction: In the preceding text¹ have been studied the obligatory duties that are meant for diminishing the accumulated sins, and the optional rites that are resorted to by people craving for results. Now is commenced the knowledge of Brahman with a view to eschewing the causes that lead to the performance of *karma*.² Desire must be the source of *karma*, since it stimulates action; for no impulsion to activity is possible in the case of those whose desires have been fulfilled, they being then established in their own Self as a result of the absence of desire. And fulfilment of

¹ The Taittirīya Āraṇyaka of which this Upaniṣad forms a part

² Rites, duties, etc., enjoined by scriptures.

desires follows from the desire for the Self¹ inasmuch as the Self, indeed, is Brahman, and for the knower of Brahman will be declared the attainment of the Highest (Tai. II. i. I). Therefore the continuance in one's own Self, on the eradication of ignorance, is tantamount to the attainment of the Highest, which fact is supported by such Vedic texts as: "One gets fearlessly established in (Brahman)" (II. vii), "He attains this Self made of Bliss" (II. viii. 5).

Objection: May it not be said that emancipation consists in remaining established in one's own Self without any positive effort—a state that ensues as a consequence of the non-commencement of optional and prohibited activities, the exhaustion through enjoyment of *karmas* that are commenced, and the absence of sin owing to the performance of obligatory *karmas*. Or, otherwise, emancipation results from the activities themselves, since *karmas* are the source of that unsurpassable happiness which is called heaven.

Answer: This cannot be so, because *karma* is multifarious; and, as such, there is the possibility that the actions, done in many previous births and bearing fruits (in this life) or remaining in abeyance, may have opposite results. Accordingly, since those of the actions that have not begun to bear fruit (in this life) cannot possibly become exhausted through enjoyment in (this) one single birth, it is reasonable that a fresh body may be created as a result of the residual fruits of action; and the existence of residual fruits of work is also proved by hundreds of Vedic and Smṛti texts such as: "Those who act here virtuously (take

¹ Really speaking, desire relates to the non-Self, and this ceases on the realisation of the Self. Therefore "the desire for the Self" is to be understood as implying an unfettered devotion to the Self with the idea that It alone is the Reality, and nothing else exists.

birth in a good womb)" (Ch. V. x.7); "Owing to the residual (results, the soul gets its future birth)" (Āp. II.2.2.3; Go. Sm. 11).

Objection: The obligatory duties are calculated to consume all the good and bad fruits of actions that are still inoperative.

Answer: No; for it is stated that the non-performance (of obligatory duties) entails *pratyavāya*. And the word *pratyavāya* means evil consequences. Since it is admitted that the obligatory duties are meant for warding off the evil consequence in the form of a future sorrow, they cannot be meant for consuming the actions that have not begun to bear fruit. Granted, however, that the obligatory duties are capable of dissipating the actions that are yet inoperative, it is only the impure ones that they can sweep away and not the pure ones; for there is no contradiction (between the pure actions and obligatory duties) inasmuch as the actions that have desirable results are pure by nature, and, as such, they cannot be logically opposed to obligatory duties, the pure and the impure alone being reasonably opposed to each other.

Moreover, since desires, that are the springs of action, cannot cease unless there is enlightenment, there is no possibility of the eradication of actions as a whole. And it has been said that since desire has for its objects things other than the Self, it belongs to one who has not realised the Self; that there can be no desire in one's own Self, It being ever realised;¹ and that the Self is the supreme Brahman. Besides, the non-performance of the obligatory duties is a

¹ "To those who see everything as the Self, there can be really no object (of desire) and hence there is no possibility of desire".—A.G.

negation, from which an evil consequence cannot reasonably follow;¹ hence the non-observance of the obligatory-duties is a pointer to the fruition of the evil consequences flowing from the sins accumulated in the past. Accordingly, the use of the suffix *śatī* (-ing) is not unreasonable in the text: "Not performing the obligatory duty (and performing the prohibited ones and getting attached to sense-objects, a man courts his downfall)"² (M. XI. 44). Else there will emerge a positive entity from a non-entity, which fact will nullify all means of valid knowledge. Therefore, it is not proved that such a man (as a result of *karma*) remains poised in his Self without any positive (spiritual) effort.

As for the statement "emancipation is attainable through activity inasmuch as the unsurpassable happiness, called heaven, is a result of works", that too is wrong. For emancipation is a permanent entity, and nothing that is everlasting can ever have a beginning. Whatever is produced in this world is impermanent. Therefore, emancipation is not a creation of work.

Objection: Karma in association with meditation (and worship) has the capacity of producing a permanent thing.

¹ "A future sorrow is called a *pratyavāya*, which being a positive entity, cannot have a non-entity as its cause. For according to the Vedic text, 'Sin arises from sin' (Bṛ IV. iv. 5) sorrow is caused by the performance of prohibited actions."—A.G.

² The use of the *śatī* (-ing) along with a negative (in 'not performing') cannot be construed to mean that non-performance is the cause of downfall; for the sentence bears a more reasonable interpretation. For good people point to evil consequences thus: "Had there been a proper performance of obligatory and occasional duties, there would have been an attenuation of accumulated sins. But this man did not perform the enjoined duties; hence there must be *pratyavāya* (i.e. non-elimination of future sorrow)." Non-performance is thus only a pointer and not a cause.

Answer: No, because that involves a contradiction. It is self-contradictory to say that a thing that is eternal is still created.

Objection: Since the very thing which is destroyed cannot be produced again, therefore liberation, though permanent, can be brought into existence just like non-existence in the form of destruction (which is brought about by action).¹

Answer: No, for freedom is a positive entity.² (Moreover) since non-existences, (as such), cannot be distinguished, it is a mere fancy to aver that non-existence in the form of destruction has a beginning.³ Non-existence is in fact that which is opposed to existence. On the analogy that existence, though one, is differentiated by a pot or a cloth, as the existence of a pot or the existence of cloth, the non-existence of existence, too, though undifferentiated, is imagined to be differentiated owing to the (fancied) association (with it) of action, quality, etc. Not that a non-existence can co-exist with a quality in the sense that a lotus

¹ According to the Nyāya philosophy, non-existences are of four kinds: (i) absolute non-existence (*atyantābhāva*), (ii) mutual non-existence (*anyonyābhāva*), (iii) non-existence in the form of destruction (*pradhvani-sābhāva*), and (iv) previous non-existence (*prāgabhāva*). As regards the third kind of non-existence, it occurs where a thing, e.g. a pot, is broken. Since that very pot cannot be created over again, the destruction, once encompassed, continues for eternity. Or, in other words, the destruction is created, but it is eternal. Similarly, a created salvation can be eternal.

² And not a non-existence, which destruction is.

³ It is wrong to deny a beginning for other forms of non-existence while allowing it for destruction only. Nyāya believes that emancipation means destruction of sorrow and nothing positive.

does (with its colour etc.). Should it be possessed of an adjective, it will become nothing but existence.¹

Objection: Since the agent of meditation and action is eternal. The salvation emerging as a result of a flow of meditation and action² is eternal.

Answer: No. For the agentship that flows like the current of the Gaṅgā is an evil in itself, and salvation will be subject to cessation on the cessation of agentship.³ Therefore, emancipation consists in continuance in one's own Self on the cessation of the material cause, viz ignorance, desire, and activity. The Self, as such, is Brahman; and from the knowledge of Brahman follows liberation consisting in the eradication of ignorance. Hence is commenced this Upaniṣad which is calculated to lead to the acquisition of the knowledge of Brahman. Knowledge (itself) is referred to by the word Upaniṣad, for, in the case of those who are devoted to it, it either loosens or ends such things as being born in a womb and old age, or because it takes one near Brahman, or because the highest good is

¹ An adjective co-exists with a noun. Now non-existence cannot co-exist with its counterpart—a positive attribute—though the latter is prefixed to it as an adjective (as in *ghatābhāva*—pot's non-existence); for if co-existence were possible, then on the assumption that *pradhvañsābhāva* is eternal, its adjectival counterpart, viz pot, would also, become eternal. Moreover, if it co-exists with the pot, then it cannot be non-existence, for existence and non-existence are mutually exclusive. Therefore, the supposition that different classes of non-existences can be distinguished is only an error arising from similar concepts pertaining to their positive counterparts.

² Since the means flow as a constant current, the end, too, will go on flowing concurrently and eternally.

³ If agentship flows on unceasingly, there will be no emancipation; and if the flow stops, emancipation too will stop.

proximately embedded in it. And the book, too, is called the Upaniṣad because it is meant for that purpose.

शं नो मित्रः शं वरुणः । शं नो भवत्वर्थ्यमा । शं न इन्द्रो
बृहस्पतिः । शं नो विष्णुरुक्रमः । नमो ब्रह्मणे । नमस्ते
वायो । त्वमेव प्रत्यक्षं ब्रह्मासि । त्वामेव प्रत्यक्षं ब्रह्म
वदिष्यामि । ऋतं वदिष्यामि । सत्यं वदिष्यामि ।
तन्मामवतु । तद्वक्तारमवतु । अवतु माम् । अवतु वक्तारम् ।
ॐ शान्तिः शान्तिः शान्तिः ॥ १ ॥ इति प्रथमोऽनुवाकः ॥

1. May Mitra be blissful to us. May Varuṇa be blissful to us. May Aryaman be blissful to us. May Indra and Brhaspati be blissful to us. May Viṣṇu, of long strides, be blissful to us. Salutation to Brahman. Salutation to you, O Vāyu. You, indeed, are the immediate Brahman. You alone I shall call the direct Brahman. I shall call you righteous. I shall call you truth. May He protect me. May He protect the teacher. May He protect me. May He protect the teacher. *Om*, peace, peace, peace!

May Mitra—the deity who identifies himself with and is the self of the function of exhaling and of day; become *śam*, blissful; *naḥ*, to us. Similarly, too, Varuṇa is the deity who identifies himself with and is the self of the function of inhaling and of night. Aryaman identifies himself with the eye and the sun, Indra with strength, and Brhaspati with speech and intellect. Viṣṇu is *urukramah*, possessed of

great strides—and identifies himself with the feet. These are the deities in the context of the body. The expression, *śam naḥ bhavatu*, may he be blissful to us, is to be connected with all. Since the comprehension, retention, and communication of knowledge of Brahman can proceed without hindrance when the gods are benevolent, their benignity is being prayed for by saying, *śam naḥ bhavatu* etc. By one, craving for the knowledge of Brahman, salutation and eulogy are offered to Vāyu (Air), so that the hindrances to the knowledge of Brahman may be averted; for the fruits of all actions are in his keeping. Vāyu is Brahman; *brahmanā*, to that Brahman; *namah* (humble) salutation; the expression, “I offer”, has to be added to complete the sentence. *Namah*, salutation; *te*, to you, *vāyo*, O Vāyu, i.e. I salute you. Thus Vāyu (Air, Life) himself is referred to both mediately and immediately. Besides, (O Air), since *tvam eva asi*, you yourself are; *pratyakṣam brahma*, the direct and immediate Brahman—being proximate and without any intervention, as contrasted with outer organs like the eye etc; therefore, *vadiśyāmi*, I shall call; *tvām eva*, you alone; as *pratyakṣam brahma*, the direct and immediate Brahman.¹ *Ṛtam*, righteousness, is an idea, fully-ascertained by the intellect in accordance with the scrip-

¹ Brahman is referred to indirectly by such words as, “that”, and directly by the word Vāyu; for Vāyu, in the form of the vital force (*prāṇa*) is directly perceived, though as Sūtra (Hiraṇyagarbha linking up all) he is known indirectly. The life force is more directly cognised than the sense-organs like the eye etc., which have to be inferred from the facts of their perceiving colour etc. The vital force is directly cognised by the Witness (Self); and as compared with the sense-organs, it is nearer to the Self. Besides, the word Brahman, derivatively means that which nourishes; the vital force nourishes the body. Therefore it is Brahman with regard to the body.

tures and in conformity with practice; that, too, being subject to you, *vadiṣyāmi*, I shall speak, of you alone as, that (*ṛta*). *Satyam*, truth, is that which is reduced to practice by speech and bodily action; since that truth, too, is practised under you, *vadiṣyāmi*, I shall call—you that truth. May *tat*, that, the all-pervasive Brahman, called Vāyu, being thus prayed to by me who hanker after knowledge, *avatu mām*, protect me—by endowing me with knowledge. May *tat*, that—very Brahman; *avatu*, protect; *vaktāram*, the expounder—by endowing him with the power of exposition. The repetition of the expressions, *avatu mām*, *avatu vaktāram*, is for showing solicitude (for the knowledge). The three repetitions in *Om śāntiḥ, śāntiḥ, śāntiḥ*, (*Om*, peace, peace, peace) are for destroying the three kinds of obstacles to the acquisition of knowledge, viz the physical, the natural, and the supernatural.

CHAPTER II

ॐ शीक्षां व्याख्यास्यामः । वर्णः स्वरः । मात्रा
बलम् । साम सन्तानः । इत्युक्तः शीक्षाध्यायः ॥ १ ॥
इति द्वितीयोऽनुवाकः ॥

We shall speak of the science of pronunciation. (The things to be learnt are) the alphabet, accent, measure, emphasis, uniformity, juxtaposition. Thus has been spoken the chapter on pronunciation.

The chapter "On the Science of Pronunciation" is begun, so that there may not be any slackness in the effort

involved in the recital of the text; for the comprehension of meaning plays a prominent part in the Upaniṣad.¹ Śīkṣā (derivatively) signifying that through which something is learnt, is the science of pronunciation of letters etc. Or from the (derivative) implication of those things that are learnt, śīkṣā means the letters etc. Śīkṣā is the same as śīkṣā, the lengthening (of *i*) being a Vedic licence. That śīkṣām, science of pronunciation; vyākhyāsyāmaḥ, we shall explain—(derivatively meaning) we shall speak (*khyā-syāmaḥ*) clearly (*vi*) and fully (*ā*). This form of the verb, signifying, as it does, the revelation of the activity (of the organ of speech), is derived from the root *caḥṣii* which optionally changes into *khyā*, and is preceded by *vi* and *ā*. Now the *varuḥ*, alphabet, consists of *a* etc. The *svaraḥ*, accent, is *udātta* (elevated) etc. (*svaritaḥ*, pitched; and *anudātta*, unaccented). The *mātrāḥ*, measures (the times required to pronounce), are short etc. *Balam*, emphasis, is a kind of effort (in pronunciation). *Sāmaḥ* is uniformity—a medium mode of pronunciation of letters. *Santānaḥ* is the same as *saihitā* i.e. juxtaposition (conjoining of the letters etc.). This is, indeed, what is to be taught. The chapter in which śīkṣā occurs is the śīkṣādhyāyaḥ. *Iti*, thus, *uktaḥ*, is spoken. The conclusion with the word, *uktaḥ*, is for the sake of making the way clear for what follows.

CHAPTER III

सह नौ यशः । सह नौ ब्रह्मवर्चसम् ।

अथातः सहिताया उपनिषिदं व्याख्यास्यामः ।

¹ Comprehension of meaning is dependent on proper pronunciation; and slackness in effort refers to errors in pronunciation.

पञ्चस्वधिकरणेषु । अधिलोकमधिज्यौतिषमधिविद्यमधिप्रज-
मध्यात्मम् । ता महासंहिता इत्याचक्षते । अथाधिलोकम् ।
पृथिवी पूर्वरूपम् । द्यौरुत्तररूपम् । आकाशः सन्धिः ॥ १ ॥

1. May we both attain fame together. May spiritual pre-eminence be vouchsafed to both of us together.

Now, therefore, we shall state the meditation on juxtaposition through five categories—relating to the worlds, to the shining things, to knowledge, to progeny, and to the body. These, they call the great juxtapositions. Now then, as regards the meditation on the worlds. The earth is the first letter. Heaven is the last letter. The sky is the meeting-place.

Now is being stated the esoteric meditation on the *sauhītā* (conjoining of letters). There, again, may the *yaśah*, fame—that is prayed for as a reward for the full knowledge of the esoteric meditation on the *sauhītā* etc.; come *saha*, simultaneously; *nau*, to us both—to the teacher and the taught. And the *brahma-varcasam*, spiritual pre-eminence, splendour, that results from it, may that, too, occur *saha*, simultaneously; *nau*, to us both. This is an expression of a prayer on the part of the pupil. For in the case of a pupil a prayer is appropriate, since his aspiration still remains unrealised. But this is not a prayer of the teacher, as he has gained the desired consummation. For a teacher is called so when his aspiration is fulfilled.

Atha, after this, after the codification of the science of study; since the intellect that is too much occupied with (verbal) texts cannot easily be led to the domain of comprehension of meaning, *atah*, therefore; *vyākhyāsyāmah*, we shall state; *upaniṣadam saṁhitāyāḥ*, the Upaniṣad, i.e. meditation, with regard to the *saṁhitā* (conjoining of letters)—a subject that is closely related to the (verbal) text itself; *pañcasu adhikaraṇeṣu*, under five headings—through five means or subjects of knowledge. Which are they? They are being enumerated; *adhilokam*, the meditation that refers to the worlds; similarly, *adhijyautiṣam*, meditation concerning lights; *adhividyam*, meditation concerning knowledge; *adhiprajam*, meditation concerning progeny; *adhyātmanam*, meditation concerning the body.¹ The people versed in the Vedas, *ācakṣate*, speak of; *tāḥ*, these ones—these meditations concerning five subjects—as *mahāsaṁhitāḥ*, great juxtapositions—they being great, since they relate to great things like the world, and being *saṁhitās* (juxtapositions) as well. *Atha*, now then; from among all these, as they are presented seriatim, *adhilokam*, the meditation with reference to the worlds, is being stated. The word *atah* is used everywhere to show the order (of meditation). *Pr̥thivī*, the earth, is; *pūrvarūpam*, the earlier form, the earlier letter; this amounts to saying that one should think of the first letter, occurring in a juxtaposition, as the earth. Similarly, too, the *uttararūpam*, the last letter; is *dyauh*, heaven. *Ākāśah*, sky (or space) is *sandhiḥ*, the

¹ As one thinks of an image as Viṣṇu, so one can think of the different factors in a juxtaposition as the deities that reside over them, the meditation being on the deities and not on the things that are enumerated under the five categories.

middle one, between the first and the last letters, since in it the first and last forms get united.

वायुः सन्धानम् । इत्यधिलोकम् । अथाधिज्योतिषम् ।
अग्निः पूर्वरूपम् । आदित्य उत्तररूपम् । आपः सन्धिः ।
वैद्युतः सन्धानम् । इत्यधिज्यौतिषम् । अथाधिविद्यम् ।
आचार्यः पूर्वरूपम् ॥ ३ ॥

अन्तेवास्युत्तररूपम् । विद्या सन्धिः । प्रवचनं सन्धानम् ।
इत्यधिविद्यम् । अथाधिप्रजम् । माता पूर्वरूपम् । पितोत्तर-
रूपम् । प्रजा सन्धिः । प्रजननं सन्धानम् । इत्यधि-
प्रजम् ॥ ३ ॥

अथाध्यात्मम् । अधरा हनुः पूर्वरूपम् । उत्तरा हनुरुत्तर-
रूपम् । वाक्सन्धिः । जिह्वा सन्धानम् । इत्यध्यात्मम् ।
इतीमा महासंहिताः । य एवमेता महासंहिता व्याख्याता
वेद । संधीयते प्रजया पशुभिः । ब्रह्मवर्चसेनाब्राह्मेण सुवर्गेण
लोकेन ॥ ४ ॥ इति तृतीयोऽनुवाकः ॥

2-4. Vāyu is the link. This is the meditation with regard to the worlds. Then follows the meditation with regard to the shining things. Fire is the first letter. The sun is the last letter. Water is the rallying point. Lightning is the link. This is the meditation with regard to the shining things. Then follows the meditation with regard to knowledge.

The teacher is the first letter. The student is the last letter. Knowledge is the meeting-place. Instruction is the link. This is the meditation with regard to knowledge. Then follows the meditation with regard to progeny. The mother is the first letter. The father is the last letter. The progeny is the focal point. Generation is the link. This is the meditation with regard to progeny. Then follows the meditation with regard to the (individual) body. The lower jaw is the first letter. The upper jaw is the last letter. Speech is the meeting-place. The tongue is the link. This is the meditation with regard to the (individual) body. These are the great juxtapositions. Anyone who meditates on these great juxtapositions, as they are explained, becomes conjoined with progeny, animals, the splendour of holiness, edible food, and the heavenly world.

Vāyuh, air, is; *sandhānam*, link (a catalytic agent)—derived in the sense of that by which things are conjoined.¹ *Iti*, thus far—is stated; *adhilokam*, the meditation with reference to the worlds. *Atha adhiyyautiṣam* etc., are to be

¹To illustrate: In the text *īse tvā*, the *e* that follows the *ś* is the symbol of the earth; the *ṛ* that follows is identical with heaven; the intermediate space between these two letters is *ākāśa* (the tryst); the other *ṛ* that emerges by duplication in that space as a result of the process of conjoining the two parts, the actual pronunciation being *īset-ṛvā*, is identified with Vāyu (the joining agent). This is how one should meditate." — Śaṅkarānanda.

similarly explained. The two words, *iti* and *imāh*, thus and these, allude to what was mentioned earlier. *Yah*, anyone who; *evam*, thus; *veda*, meditates; on *etāh mahāsanhitāh*, these great juxtapositions; *vyākhyātāh*, as explained. The meaning of the word *veda* should be *upāsānā*, meditation or adoration, because the topic is of perfect knowledge,¹ and because there is the text: "Thus O Prācīnayogya, you meditate" (Tai. I.vi.2). And meditation consists in a current of uniform concepts, not interspersed with dissimilar ones, which proceeds according to the scriptures and relates to an object enjoined in the scriptures. Besides, the word *upāsānā* is well known in the world in such sentences as, "He *upāsate*, waits on (i.e. adores), the Guru"; "He *upāsate*, waits on (i.e. adores), the king"; for a man who constantly serves the Guru and others is said to be rendering *upāsānā* (adoration) to them; and he acquires the fruit of his adoration. Similarly, in the present context, too, he who meditates thus *sandhīyate*, is conjoined with the things beginning from progeny and ending with heaven; that is, he acquires the fruits such as progeny and others.

CHAPTER IV

यश्छन्दसामृषभो विश्वरूपः । छन्दोभ्योऽध्यमृतात्संबभूव ।
स मेन्द्रो मेधया स्पृणोतु । अमृतस्य देव धारणो भूयासम् ।
शरीरं मे विचर्षणम् । जिह्वा मे मधुमत्तमा । कर्णाभ्यां भूरि

¹ If this meditation is resorted to by one who desires fruits, he gets these only. But this again leads a desireless man to knowledge of Brahman, and the second objective is aimed at by this Upaniṣad.

विश्रुवम् । ब्रह्मणः कोशोऽसि मेधया पिहितः १ श्रुतं मे
गोपाय । आवहन्ती वितन्वाना ॥ १ ॥

कुर्वाणाऽचीरमात्मनः । वासाऽसि मम गावश्च । अन्नपाने
च सर्वदा । ततो मे श्रियमावह । लोमशां पशुभिः सह
स्वाहा । आमायन्तु ब्रह्मचारिणः स्वाहा । विमाऽऽयन्तु
ब्रह्मचारिणः स्वाहा । दमायन्तु ब्रह्मचारिणः स्वाहा ।
शमायन्तु ब्रह्मचारिणः स्वाहा ॥ २ ॥

1-2. The *Om* that is the most exalted in the Vedas, that pervades all words, and that emerged from the immortal Vedas as their quintessence, may he (*Om* that is Indra), the supreme Lord, gratify me with intelligence. O Lord, may I be the receptacle of immortality. May my body be fit; may my tongue be surpassingly sweet; may I hear much through the ears. You are the sheath of Brahman; you are covered by (worldly) wisdom. Protect what I have heard. Then vouchsafe to me who am her (i.e. Prosperity's) own, that Prosperity which brings, increases, and accomplishes quickly for me clothes, cattle, food, and drink for ever, and which is associated with furry and other animals. *Svāhā*. May the Brahmācārins (i.e. students) come to me from all sides. *Svāhā*. May the Brahmācārins come to me in various ways. *Svāhā*. May the Brahmācārins come to me in the proper

way. *Svāhā*. May the Brahmachārins have physical self-control. *Svāhā*. May the Brahmachārins have mental self-control. *Svāhā*.

In the text, beginning with *yaḥ chandasām*, are being mentioned, for him who wants intelligence and wealth, a prayer and a sacrifice which are the means for their acquisition; and this conclusion is borne out by the indications implied in, "May that Indra strengthen me with wisdom", and "Then bring for me wealth". *Yaḥ*, he who; *chandasām*, among the Vedas; is *ṛṣabhah*, a bull—like a bull, because of pre-eminence; *viśvarūpaḥ*, omni-form—because of permeating all speech, in accordance with another Vedic text: "To illustrate: as by fibres (all the leaves are permeated, so by *Om* is permeated all speech)" (Ch. II. xxiii.3). Hence is *Om* the bull. *Om* is the object to be worshipped here; and hence its eulogy, through such words as "bull", is appropriate. *Chandobhyaḥ*, from the Vedas; *amṛtāt*, from immortality—the Vedas are indeed, immortal—from that immortality; *adhisambabhūva*, was born super-excellently. The idea is that, *Om* appeared as the quintessence when Prajāpati performed austerity (i.e. deliberated intently) with a view to extracting the finest pith from the worlds, the gods, and the Vedas. It was only a revelation (to him), for in the case of *Om*, which is everlasting, no real origination can properly be imagined. *Saḥ*, he—the *Om*, which is of this kind and which is *indraḥ*, the ordainer of all desires, the supreme Lord; *sṛjotu*, may (He) gratify or strengthen—for the strength of wisdom is the object prayed for; *mā*, me; *medhayā*, with wisdom. *Deva*, O God; *bhūyāsam*, may (I) become; *dhāraṇaḥ*, the wearer; *amṛtasya*, of immortality—of the knowledge of Brahman which is the

cause of immortality, this being the context of that knowledge.¹ Moreover, may, *me*, my; *śarīram*, body; become-*vicarṣaṇam*, skilful, i.e. fit. The verb *bhūyāsam* (in the first person) should (here) be changed into *bhūyāt* in the third person. (May) *me*, my; *jihvā*, tongue; (become) *madhumattamā*, exceedingly sweet, i.e. abundantly possessed of sweet speech. *Karṇābhyām*, through the ears; *Viśruvam*, may I hear, that is, may I become a hearer of; —*viśruvam* being the same as *vyāśruvam*; *bhūri*, much. The meaning of the passage is that the group of my body and senses should become fit for the knowledge of the Self.

For the same purpose, intelligence, too, is being prayed for, *Brahmaṇah*, of Brahman; *asi*, you are; the *kośah*, sheath—like the scabbard of a sword, because you are the seat of realisation; for you are the symbol of Brahman, on you is Brahman realised. (You are) *pihitaḥ*, covered; *medhayā*, by worldly intelligence—your reality is not known to people of ordinary intellect. (You) *gopāya*, protect; *me*, my; *srutam*, heard things—the knowledge, etc., of the Self, that I have acquired through hearing. The idea is: Vouchsafe it that there may not be any forgetfulness etc., of what I have acquired through it. These *mantras* are meant to be used for self-repetition by one who wants intelligence. Now are being stated the *mantras* to be used for offering oblations by one who wants prosperity.

Since prosperity to an unwise man is a cause of evil, therefore, *tataḥ*, after that, after the vouchsafing of intelli-

¹ Unless a man has intelligence, he cannot acquire knowledge of Brahman. Hence even a prayer for intelligence is meant for that knowledge. And since a poor man cannot purify his heart by scriptural rites, he must perform a sacrifice that is calculated to make him wealthy. Thus such a sacrifice, too, is an indirect aid to knowledge.

gence; *āvaha*, bring; *śriyam*, the (Goddess of) Prosperity; which is *āvahanī*, a bringer; *vitānvānā*, an increaser—for the root *tan* implies that kind of action; (*sarvadā*, ever); *kurvāṇā*, an accomplisher, *acīram*, soon—*acīram* being the same as *acīram*, the lengthening (of *i*) being a Vedic licence; or the reading may be, *cīram kurvāṇā*, an accomplisher for ever; *ātmanaḥ mama*, for myself who belong to Prosperity herself. (Bringer, etc.) of what? That is being said: *vāsānsi*, clothes; *ca*, and; *gāvah*, that is to say *gāḥ*, cattle; *ca annapāne*, and food and drink. (Bring) the Prosperity that, *sarvadā*, for ever, accomplishes all these. How is that Prosperity qualified? *Lomaśām*, furry—(Prosperity that is) endowed with goats, sheep etc.; *saha*, together with—(Prosperity that is) endowed with—other *paśubhiḥ*, animals. From the context, as determined by “*āvaha*, bring”, it follows that *Om* itself is to be connected (with *āvaha* as its nominative). The utterance of *svāhā* is for indicating the end of the *mantra* meant for offering an oblation. The construction of *ā* is with the remote word *yantu* thus: *āyantu* • *mām* (*brahmacāriṇaḥ*), may the Brahmacārins come to me (from all sides). Similarly, may *brahmacāriṇaḥ*, the Brahmacārins; *vi mā āyantu*, come to me variously; *pra mā āyantu*, come to me in a proper way;¹ *damāyantu*, be controlled in body; *śamāyantu*, be controlled in mind; etc.

यशो जनेऽसानि स्वाहा । श्रेयान् वस्यसोऽसानि स्वाहा ।
तं त्वा भग प्रविशानि स्वाहा । स मा भग प्रविश स्वाहा ।
तस्मिन् सहस्रशाखे निभगाहं त्वयि मृजे स्वाहा । यथाऽऽपः
प्रवता यन्ति यथा मासा अहर्जरम् । एवं मां ब्रह्मचारिणः ।

¹ *Vimāyantu* and *pramāyantu* are also interpreted thus: “May they be sincere towards me, may they be recipients of valid knowledge.”

धातरायन्तु सर्वतः स्वाहा । प्रतिवेशोऽसि प्र मा भहि प्र मा
पद्यस्व ॥ ३ ॥ इति चतुर्थोऽनुवाकः ॥

3. May I become famous among people. *Svāhā*. May I become praiseworthy among the wealthy. *Svāhā*. O adorable One, may I enter into you, such as you are. *Svāhā*. O venerable One, you, such as you are, enter into me. *Svāhā*. O adorable One, who are greatly diversified, may I purify my sins in you. *Svāhā*. As water flows down a slope, as months roll into a year, similarly O Lord, may the students come to me from all quarters. *Svāhā*. You are like a resting house, so you become revealed to me, you reach me through and through.

Aśāni, may I become; *yaśaḥ*, i.e. *yaśasvī*, famous; *jane*, among a multitude. *Vasyasaḥ*, is the same as *vasīyasaḥ*, and means, from the supremely affluent or from him that excels all the wealthy; *śreyān*, more praiseworthy; *aśāni*, I become—this is the construction. Moreover, *taṁ tvā*, into you, such as you are—as the sheath of Brahman; *bhaga*, O venerable One; *praviśāmi*, may I enter, and after entering, may I become identified, become your very Self; this is the idea. *Saḥ*, that, you, too; *bhaga*, O adorable One; *praviśa*, enter; *mā*, into me; let there be nothing but identity among us. *Tasmin*, in you, such as you are; *sahasraśākhē*, who are greatly diversified, *aham*, I; *mṛje*, purify my sinful acts. *Yathā*, as; *āpaḥ*, water; *yanti*, goes (flows); *pravatā*, down a sloping place; and *yathā*, as; *māsāḥ*, months; (roll

into) *aharjaram*, year—the year is *aharjara* since it, by undergoing change day by day, wears out people, or since the days get worn out, i.e. included in it. As the months go to it, *evam*, similarly, *dhātaḥ*, O Ordainer, of everything; let *brahmacāriṇaḥ*, the Brahmacārins; *mām āyantu*, come to me; *sarvataḥ*, from all quarters. *Prativedaḥ* means a resting-place, a house at hand. Thus to those who are devoted to you, *prativedaḥ asi*, you are like a rest-house, a place where all sorrows resulting from sin can be removed. Therefore, towards *mā*, me; *prabhāhi*, you reveal—yourself, and *pradyasva*, reach me through and through—make me full of you and identified with you as a metal is when soaked in mercury. The prayer for prosperity is dealt with in this context of knowledge for the sake of wealth; for wealth is needed for rites, and rites are calculated to diminish accumulated sins, on the exhaustion of which knowledge becomes revealed. Supporting this view there is this Smṛti: “Just as one sees oneself on the clean surface of a mirror, so knowledge arises for man on the exhaustion of sin” (Mbh. Śā.204.8; Garuḍa.I.237.6).

CHAPTER V

भूर्भुवः सुवरिति वा एतास्तिस्रो व्याहृतयः । तासामु ह
 स्मैतां चतुर्थीम् । माहाचमस्यः प्रवेदयते । मह इति ।
 तद्ब्रह्म । स आत्मा । अङ्गान्यन्या देवताः । भूरिति वा
 अयं लोकः । भव इत्यन्तरिक्षम् । सुवरित्यसौ लोकः ॥ १ ॥
 मह इत्यादित्यः । आदित्येन वाव सर्वे लोका महीयन्ते ।
 भूरिति वा अग्निः । भुव इति वायुः । सुवरित्यादित्यः ।

मह इति चन्द्रमाः । चन्द्रमसा वाव सर्वाणि ज्योतींषि
महीयन्ते । भूरिति वा ऋचः । भुव इति सामानि ।
सुवरिति यजूंषि ॥ २ ॥

1-2. *Bhūh*, *Bhuvah*, *Suvah*—these three, indeed, are the *Vyāhrtis*. Of them *Māhācamasya* knew a fourth one—*Maha* by name. It is Brahman; it is the Self. The other gods are the limbs. *Bhūh*, indeed, is this world. *Bhuvah* is the intermediate space. *Suvah* is the other world. *Maha* is the sun; through the sun, indeed, do all the worlds flourish. *Bhūh*, indeed, is the fire. *Bhuvah* is the air. *Suvah* is the sun. *Maha* is the moon; through the moon, indeed, all the luminaries flourish. *Bhūh*, indeed, is the *R̥g-Veda*. *Bhuvah* is the *Sāma-Veda*. *Suvah* is the *Yajur-Veda*.

The meditation with regard to conjoining has been stated. After that have been dealt with, in an orderly way, the *mantras* for one who desires intelligence and prosperity. They, too, are indirectly helpful to knowledge. Then is being commenced the internal meditation on Brahman as identified with the *Vyāhrtis*,¹ which has for its result the attainment of independent sovereignty (Tai. I.vi.2). The

¹ *Bhūh*, *bhuvah*, *suvah*, etc., which stand for the respective worlds, are technically called the *Vyāhrtis*. "These *Vyāhrtis* had been accepted with faith (by the student). If Brahman is now taught by ignoring them, it will not be comprehended by the student's intellect. Hence Brahman embodied in the *Vyāhrtis* as *Hiraṇyagarbha*, is being presented for his inward meditation."—A. G.

recital of the text *bhūḥ bhuvah suvah iti*, is for drawing attention to what was stated (earlier). The statement *etāḥ tisrah*, these three, is for calling up to memory the ones that have been enumerated; and *vai* (indeed) is used for refreshing the memory with regard to the things called up. Thus we are reminded of these three well-known *Vyāhrtis*. *Tāsām*, of these; this is the fourth *Vyāhrti* called *Maha*. *Māhācamasyah*, the son of Mahācamasa, *pravedayate*, knows—i.e. knew, or visualised, because (the particles) *u*, *ha*, and *sma*, refer to what is past; *tām etām caturthīm*, this fourth one. The mention of Māhācamasya is by way of alluding to the seer (*Ṛṣi*). And from the fact of his mention in the instruction here, it is to be understood that the remembrance of the seer, too, forms a part of the meditation. The *Vyāhrti* that was seen (discovered) by Māhācamasya, *Mahah iti*, as *Maha*; *tat*, that, is *brahma*, Brahman; for Brahman is great (*mahat*), and the *Vyāhrti*, too, is *Maha*. What is that again? It is the Self—the word *ātmā* (Self) being derived from the root *āp* in the sense of encompassing; for the other *Vyāhrtis*, comprising the worlds, gods, the Vedas, and the vital forces, are encompassed by the Self in the form of the *Vyāhrti*, *Maha*, that is identical with the sun, the moon, the Atharva-Veda, and food. Therefore *anyāḥ devāḥ*, the other gods, are the *aṅgāni*, limbs. The mention of the gods is suggestive of the worlds and other factors as well. Since the others, viz the gods, the worlds, etc., are the limbs of the Self in the form of the *Vyāhrti*, called *Maha*, therefore, the text says that the worlds etc., are made great by the sun etc., just as the limbs are made great, through the self (i.e. the trunk of the body). To become great (*mahanam*) is to grow, to develop; so *mahīyante* means (they) grow. *Ayam lokah* (this world), *agnih* (fire), *ṛgvedaḥ* (the Ṛg-Veda),

prāṇaḥ (exhalation)—these are the first *Vyāhṛti*, *Bhūh*. Similarly, each of the succeeding ones becomes fourfold.¹

मह इति ब्रह्म । ब्रह्मणा वाव सर्वे वेदा महीयन्ते ।
भूरिति वै प्राणः । भुव इत्यपानः । सुवरिति व्यानः ।
मह इत्यन्नम् । अन्नेन वाव सर्वे प्राणा महीयन्ते । ता वा
एताश्चतस्रश्चतुर्था । चतस्रश्चतस्रो व्याहृतयः । ता यो
वेद । स वेद ब्रह्म । सर्वेऽस्मै देवा बलिमावहन्ति ॥ ३ ॥
इति पञ्चमोऽनुवाकः ॥

3. *Maha* is Brahman (i.e. *Om*), for by Brahman (*Om*), indeed, are all the Vedas nourished. *Bhūh*, indeed, is *prāṇa*; *Bhuvah* is *apāna*; *Suvah* is *vyāna*; *Maha* is food; for by food, indeed, are all the vital forces nourished. These, then, that are four, are (each) fourfold. The *Vyāhṛtis* are divided into four groups of four (each). He who knows these knows Brahman. All the gods carry presents to him.

Maha is Brahman. Brahman means *Om*, for this being a context of words, any other meaning is inadmissible. The

¹The *Vyāhṛti*, called *Maha*, is the trunk or self of the body of Brahman in its aspect of Hiraṇyagarbha, for the trunk is the main thing on which are fixed and by which are sustained the subsidiary limbs. The first *Vyāhṛti* (*bhūh*) forms the legs; the second (*bhuvah*) constitutes the hands; the third (*suvah*) is the head of the Cosmic Person. The main injunction here is about the meditation on Brahman as embodied in the *Vyāhṛtis*. Then follow four other subsidiary meditations on the individual *Vyāhṛtis*, each of which is to be looked upon as identical with four things.

remaining portion is already explained. *Tāh vai etāh*, these above-mentioned ones—*Bhūh*, *Bhuvah*, *Suvah*, *Mahah*; these *catasrah*, four—each individually is *caturdhā*, of four kinds, the suffix *dhā*, implying mode. The meaning is that they, forming groups of four (things), become fourfold (individually).¹ And the instruction, over again, regarding those very things that were thought of before, is for the sake of making a strict rule about the sequence of their meditation. *Yah veda*, anyone who knows; *tāh*, those—the *Vyāhrtis* as mentioned; *sah veda*, he knows. Knows what? *Brahma*, Brahman.

Objection: Is it not a fact that when Brahman has been already known in (the text), “It is Brahman, it is the Self”, there should not be the statement again, “he knows Brahman”, as though It is still unknown?

Answer: No, there is no fault; since the intention is to state some speciality about Brahman. It is true that Brahman was known as identified with the fourth *Vyāhrti* (*Mahah*), but the special fact of Its being realised within the heart was not known, nor were known the attributes beginning with “who is realised through mind (i.e. knowledge)” etc., and ending with “enriched with peace” (I.vi. 1-2) that are being presented through a relationship of substance and qualities. Therefore, with a view to speaking of these, the scripture assumes as though Brahman is unknown, and says, “he knows Brahman”. Thus there is no defect. The idea is this: He, indeed, knows Brahman who knows It as qualified by the attributes to be mentioned hereafter.

¹As the moon is made of sixteen digits, so also the Cosmic Person can be imagined to be constituted by sixteen limbs. Hence by thinking on each of the four *Vyāhrtis* as consisting of four parts, one really meditates on the Cosmic Person in His totality.

Hence the present chapter is connected with the succeeding one through a single idea; for in both the chapters there is but a single meditation. And this is borne out by an indication (*liṅga*), too. For (the continuity of thought and imagery involved in) the statement, "He resides in fire in the form of the *Vyāhṛti Bhūh*" etc., (occurring in the sixth chapter) points to the unity of the meditation. Moreover, this (unity) follows from the absence of any (independent) verb of injunction, for (in the sixth chapter) there is no such imperative word as *veda* (should meditate), *upāsītavyaḥ* (is to be meditated on).¹ And again since the statement *tāḥ yaḥ veda* (he who meditates on them) (I. v. 3) implies something that has still to be stated, there is nothing to lead to a splitting up of the meditation (into two). And by asserting that there is an intention of stating some speciality, it has already been shown (by us) how this chapter has an ideological connection with what follows.

Asmāi, to this one—who has known thus: *sarve devāḥ*, all the deities—that form the limbs; *āvahanti*, carry, bring; *balim*, offering—i.e. when "he himself attains independent sovereignty" (I. vi. 2).

CHAPTER VI

It has been said that the other deities, viz those of *Bhūh*, *Bhuvah*, and *Svah*, are the limbs of Brahman as identified with the *Vyāhṛti* called *Mahaḥ*. Just as a *Sāla-grāma* (a stone symbol of Viṣṇu) is in the case of Viṣṇu, so

¹ "We do not find two independent verbs of injunction, from which to get the idea of two independent meditations. Besides, the division of the two chapters can be justified by holding the one as dealing with a primary injunction and the other with a subsidiary injunction. Accordingly, there is no justification for splitting up the meditation."—A. G.

the cavity of the heart is being presented as the place for the direct realisation of and the meditation on Brahman of which those *Vyāhrtis* are the limbs. For when Brahman is meditated on there, It is directly realised as possessed of such attributes as being "realised through knowledge" etc., like a myrobalan fruit in the hand. Moreover, the way to the realisation (of Brahman) as the Self of all has to be stated. Hence begins this chapter:

स य एषोऽन्तर्हृदय आकाशः । तस्मिन्नयं पुरुषो
मनोमयः । अमृतो हिरण्मयः । अन्तरेण तालुके । य एष
स्तन इवावलम्बते । सेन्द्रयोनिः । यत्रासौ केशान्तो विवर्तते ।
व्यपोह्य शीर्षकपाले । भूरित्यग्नौ प्रतितिष्ठति । भुव
इति वायौ ॥ १ ॥

सुवरित्यादित्ये । मह इति ब्रह्मणि । आप्नोति स्वारा-
ज्यम् । आप्नोति मनसस्पतिम् । वाक्पतिश्चक्षुष्पतिः ।
श्रोत्रपतिर्विज्ञानपतिः । एतत्ततो भवति । आकाशशरीरं
ब्रह्म । सत्यात्म प्राणारामं मन आनन्दम् । शान्ति-
समृद्धममृतम् । इति प्राचीनयोग्योपास्व ॥ २ ॥

इति षष्ठोऽनुवाकः ॥

1-2. In the space that there is in the heart, is this Person who is realisable through knowledge, and who is immortal and effulgent. This thing that hangs down between the palates like a teat, through it runs the path of Brahman; and reach-

ing where the hairs part, it passes out by separating the skulls. (Passing out through that path, a man) becomes established in Fire as the *Vyāhṛti Bhūh*; he becomes established in Air as the *Vyāhṛti Bhuvah*; in the Sun as the *Vyāhṛti Svah*; in Brahman as the *Vyāhṛti Mahah*. He himself gets independent sovereignty; he attains the lord of the mind; he becomes the ruler of speech, the ruler of eyes, the ruler of ears, the ruler of knowledge. Over and above all these he becomes Brahman which is embodied in *ākāśa*, which is identified with the gross and the subtle and has truth as Its real nature, which revels in life, under whose possession the mind is a source of bliss, which is enriched with peace and is immortal. Thus, O Prācīnayogya, you worship.

The word *sah* (he) is to be construed with *ayam puruṣah* (this Person), skipping over the intermediate words. *Yah eṣah*, this (space) that is *antaḥ hṛdaye*, inside the heart. The heart is a lump of flesh in the shape of a lotus, which is the seat of the vital force, which opens out through many nerves, which has its stalk upwards and face downwards, and which is perceived as a familiar thing when an animal is dissected. Within that is the *ākāśah*, space—that is quite familiar like the space within a water-pot; *tasmin*, within that; exists *ayam puruṣah*, this Person -who was mentioned earlier. *Puruṣa* is (derivatively) so called because of sleeping (*śayana*) within *puri*, the city (of the heart); or He by whom the worlds, such as the earth, are filled up (*pūrṇa*) is

the Puruṣa. (He is) *manomayaḥ*: *manaḥ* means knowledge, being derived from the root *man* implying, to know; *manomaya* means consisting of that knowledge, because of being realised through it.¹ Or *manaḥ* may mean the internal organ (mind), being derived from the root *man* in the sense of that through which one thinks; and one who presides over the mind, is identified with it, or is indicated by it, is *manomaya*. (He is) *amṛtaḥ*, deathless, *hiraṇmayāḥ*, effulgent. A path is being indicated which leads to the realisation of that Indra (i.e. Brahman) in His aforesaid nature who has these attributes, and who is realised within the cavity of the heart, and who is the Self of the man of knowledge. The nerve, called *sūṣumṇā*, goes upward from the heart and is well known in the scriptures on Yoga. And that nerve runs, *antareṇa*, in the well-known middle part; *tāluke*(should be *tālukayoḥ*), of the two palates. And *yaheṣaḥ*, that one—the piece of flesh which; *stanaḥ iva avalambate*, hangs down like a teat— between the palates; (the *sūṣumṇā* runs) through that even—this is the idea. And *yatra*, where; *keśāntaḥ*, the ends or roots, of the hairs; *vivartate*, divide—i.e. the top of the head; reaching that place, (the path) emerges out of it, *vyapohya*, splitting; *śīrṣakapāle*, the skull-bones on the head; that which (thus) issues forth, *sā indrayoniḥ*, that is the path of Indra, Brahman—the path for the realisation of His true nature. The man of knowledge, who thus realises the Self as identified with the mind, passes through the head, and *pratiṭiṣṭhati*, gets established; *agnau*, in Fire—(the deity) who presides over this world, who is identified with the *Vyāhṛti Bhūḥ*, and who is a limb of the great Brahman (as identified with *Mahaḥ*). The idea

¹ Since Brahman pervades the mind. It is realised in the mind which becomes transformed as knowledge (of Brahman).

is that the enlightened man pervades this world through his identity with Fire. Similarly, *Bhuvah iti*, as the second *Vyāhṛti Bhuvah*, that is identified with Air; *vāyau*, in Air; “he gets established”—this is understood, He becomes established, *āditye*, in the Sun, *Svaha iti*, as the third *Vyāhṛti Svah*, which is identified with the Sun. He becomes established *brahmaṇi*, in Brahman; *Mahaḥ iti*, as the fourth *Vyāhṛti Mahaḥ*, which is identified with Brahman and of which the others are parts. Remaining in them as identified with them and becoming Brahman, *āpnoti*, he attains; *svārājyam*, the state of a sovereign—he himself becomes a king who rules over all others, just as Brahman does over the gods that form Its limbs. And the deities that become his limbs carry offerings to the enlightened man just as they do to Brahman. *Āpnoti manasaspatim*, he attains the lord of the mind; since Brahman is all pervasive, It is the lord of all the minds; for It thinks through all the minds; a man who meditates thus attains It. Moreover, *bhavati*, he becomes; *vākpatiḥ*, the ruler of all the organs of speech. Similarly, also *cakṣuspatiḥ*, the ruler of all the eyes; *śrotra-patiḥ*, the ruler of all the ears; and *viññānapatiḥ*, the ruler of all kinds of knowledge. The idea is that he, being all-pervasive, becomes possessed of the respective senses through identification with the sense of all beings. Besides, *tataḥ*, over and above all that; *etat bhavati*, he becomes this. What is that? The answer is being given; (He becomes) *ākāśasarīram*—that which has *ākāśa* (space) as its body or whose body is as subtle as *ākāśa*. Who is that? *Brahma*, the Brahman, that is being discussed. It is *satyātma*: that which has *satya*, the gross and the subtle as also truth as Its *ātmā*, real characteristic, is this *satyātma*. (That Brahman is) *prāṇārāman*: that which has its *āramaṇa*, disport, in the

prāṇas, vital forces, is *prāṇārāma*; or that in which life finds its *ārāma*, delight, is *prāṇārāma*. (It is) *mana-ānandam*: that whose mind (*manaḥ*) has become bliss (*ānanda*), a producer of happiness is *mana-ānanda*. (It is) *śānti-samṛddham*: *śāntiḥ* is peace; the very entity that is peace, being also prosperous (*samṛddha*) is *śānti-samṛddha*; or that which is seen to be enriched (*samṛddha*) with peace is *śānti-samṛddha*. (It is) *amṛtam* immortal by nature. These additional attributes are to be understood as belonging to the earlier context beginning with *manomayaḥ* etc. Thus *prācīnayogyā*, O Prācīnayogyā; *upāsya* meditate on the aforesaid Brahman as possessed of the qualities of being realisable through knowledge etc. This is a presentation of the teacher's utterance by way of demonstrating his love (for meditation). The meaning of the word *upāsānā* (meditation) has already been explained.

CHAPTER VII

Of that very Brahman (i.e. Hiraṇyagarbha) that has been presented for meditation as identified with the *Kyāh-ṛtis*, another meditation, as identified with the groups of five things beginning with the earth, is being stated. Because of the similarity of the number five, they are equated with the metre called *Pañkti*.¹ Thereby everything becomes identified with *Pañkti*. And a sacrifice, too, is identified with *Pañkti*, because the (metre) *Pañkti* has five

¹ *Sampat* is a kind of meditation in which a lower thing is thought of as some other higher thing because of some point of similarity. Here the point of similarity is the number five. The different five factors, constituting the lower human personality, are here identified with the factors making up the higher cosmic Virāḥ.

feet (with five letters in each), and a Vedic text s̥ays. "The sacrifice is equated with *Paikṭi*"¹ (Bṛ. I.iv.17). As a result, all things beginning from the worlds and ending with the *ātmā* (*Virāt*) that are thought of as reduced to *Paikṭi*, are thereby virtually imagined to be a sacrifice. Through the sacrifice, thus imagined, one becomes Prajāpati, who is identified with all that is equated with *Paikṭi*. As to that, it is being shown how all this universe consists of *Paikṭi* (five factors):

पृथिव्यन्तरिक्षं द्यौर्दिशोऽवान्तरदिशाः ।² अग्निर्वायुरा-
दित्यश्चन्द्रमा नक्षत्राणि । आप ओषधयो वनस्पतय आकाश
आत्मा । इत्यधिभूतम् । अथाध्यात्मम् । प्राणो व्यानोऽ-
पान उदानः समानः । चक्षुः श्रोत्रं मनो वाक् त्वक् ।
चर्म मांसं स्नावास्थि मज्जा । एतदधिविधाय ऋषिर-
वोचत् । पाङ्क्तं वा इदं सर्वम् । पाङ्क्तेनैव पाङ्क्तं
स्पृणोतीति ॥ १ ॥ इति सप्तमोऽनुवाकः ॥

1. The earth, sky, heaven, the primary quarters, and the intermediate quarters; fire, air, the sun, the moon, and the stars; water, herbs, trees, sky, and *Virāt*—these relate to natural factors. Then follow the individual ones: *Prāṇa*, *Vyāna*, *Apāna*, *Udāna*, and *Samāna*;³ the eye, the ear, the

¹ Since a sacrifice is performed with five factors—the sacrificer and his wife, the priest, divine wealth, and human wealth. Thus everything can be equated not only with the metre *Paikṭi*, but also with sacrifice.

² Some texts read it as 'vāntaradīśah.

³ These different forms of the vital force perform these functions respectively: exhaling, pervading, inhaling, leaving the body, and digesting.

mind, speech, and the sense of touch; skin, flesh, muscles, bones, and marrow. Having imagined these thus, the seer said, "All this is constituted by five factors; one fills up the (outer) fivefold ones by the (individual) fivefold ones.

The earth, sky, heaven, the (primary) quarters, and the intermediate quarters—these constitute the groups of five in the context of the worlds. Fire, Air, Sun, Moon, Stars—these constitute the group of five deities (lit. shining ones). Water, herbs, trees, space, and *ātmā*, constitute the collection of five natural things. The word *ātmā* implies the cosmic gross body (Virāt) because this is a context of natural factors. *Iti adhibhūtam*, this with regard to natural things—this expression is used to imply the two groups of five worlds and the five deities as well, because the collections of the five worlds and the five deities, too, have been mentioned earlier. *Atha*, after that; *adhyātman*, with regard to the human person—the three groups of five each, in the context of the individual, are being stated: Those beginning with *prāṇa* (function of exhaling) constitute the group of five vital forces. Those starting with *cakṣu* (eye) make up the group of five sense organs. Those commencing with *carma* (skin) form the group of five material constituents of the body. This much, indeed, is all that pertains to the human person. And the external also is fivefold. Therefore, *etat adhidhāya*, having imagined these thus; *ṛṣiḥ*, the Vedas, or some seer endowed with this vision; *avocat*, said. What? That is being said: *pāñktam vai idam sarvam*, all this is constituted by five factors; *pāñktena eva*, through the fivefold ones—the ones relating to the human person; *spṛṇoti*, one strengthens, fills up; *pāñktam*, the

(external) fivefold ones; that is to say, they are realised as identical. The meaning is that, he who realises all this (existence) as fivefold becomes identified with Prajāpati Himself.¹

CHAPTER VIII

The meditation on Brahman as identified with the *Vyāhrtis* was stated (Tai. I.v.vi). Then followed a meditation on the same Brahman, conceived of as a fivefold entity (Tai. I.vii). Now is being enjoined a meditation on *Om* which is involved as a factor in all meditations. For though *Om* is a mere word, it becomes a means for the attainment of the supreme Brahman or of Hiraṇyagarbha in accordance as it is meditated on with the idea of the supreme Brahman or of Hiraṇyagarbha. For just as an image is a symbol of Viṣṇu, so is *Om* a symbol for both, (Brahman and Hiraṇyagarbha), in accordance with the Vedic text: "One becomes united with either of the two with the help of this sanctuary (i.e. symbol)" (Pr. V.2).

ओमिति ब्रह्म । ओमितीदं सर्वम् । ओमित्येतदनु-
कृतिर्हं स्म वा अप्यो श्रावयेत्याश्रावयन्ति । ओमिति सामानि
गायन्ति । ओंशोमिति शस्त्राणि शंसन्ति । ओमित्यध्वर्युः
प्रतिगरं प्रतिगृणाति । ओमिति ब्रह्मा प्रसौति । ओमित्यग्नि-
होत्रमनुजानाति । ओमिति ब्राह्मणः प्रवक्ष्यन्नाह ब्रह्मोपाप्न-
वानीति । ब्रह्मैवोपाप्नोति ॥ १ ॥ इत्यष्टमोऽनुवाकः ॥

¹ Constituted by the five elements.

1. *Om* is Brahman. *Om* is all this. *Om* is well known as a word of imitation (i.e. concurrence). Moreover, they make them recite (to the gods) with the words, “*Om*, recite (to the gods)”. They commence singing *Sāmas* with *Om*. Uttering the words “*Om śom*” they recite the *śastras*. The (priest) Adhvaryu utters the encouraging words with *Om*. The (priest) Brahmā approves with the word *Om*. One permits the performance of the Agnihotra sacrifice with the word *Om*. A Brāhmaṇa, when about to recite the *Vedas* utters *Om* under the idea, “I shall attain Brahman”. He does verily attain Brahman.

Om iti: the word *iti* (this) is used for distinguishing the word *Om* as such (and not its meaning). One should contemplate in one’s mind, i.e. meditate, that *Om*, as a word, is Brahman. For *om iti idam sarvam*, all this, that consists of sound, is *Om*—since everything is permeated by *Om*, in accordance with another Vedic text: “As by the fibres (the leaves are pervaded, so by *Om* is pervaded all speech)” (Ch. II. xxiii. 3). And since all that is nameable is dependent on the names, it is said that all this is *Om*. The remaining passage is for the praise of *Om*, for it is to be meditated on. *Om iti etat*, this word that is *Om*, is *anukṛtiḥ*, a word of concurrence (lit. imitation). When somebody says, “I do”, or “I shall go”, another approves the act or speech by uttering the word *Om*. Therefore *Om* is imitation (approval). *Ha*, *sma*, and *vai*, indicate something well known, for *Om* is well known as a word of imitation (concurrence). *Adi*, more-

over, *āśrāvayanti*, (they) make them recite, with the words of direction, “*O śrāvaya iti, Om*, make (the gods) hear”¹. Similarly, the singers of *Sāmas*, *gāyanti*, sing, (start singing); *om iti*, uttering the word *Om*. The reciters of the *śastras*, too, *śāmsanti*, intonate; *śastrāṇi*, the *śastras*;² *om śom iti*, by uttering the words “*Om śom*”.³ Similarly, the priest, Adhvaryu, *pratigṛṇāti* utters; *pratigaram*, the encouraging words; *om iti*, with the word *Om*.⁴ *Brahmā*, the priest called *Brahmā* (who is versed in all the Vedas and supervises the rite), *prasauti*, approves—through direction, makes them recite. When told, “I shall pour oblation”, *om iti agni-hotram anujānāti*, he gives permission for the *Agnihotra* sacrifice by uttering the word *Om*. *Brāhmaṇah*, the *Brāhmaṇa*; *pravakṣyan*, when about to recite the Vedas, when intent on studying; *āha*, utters; *om iti*, the word *Om*—indeed; that is, he takes refuge in *Om* for the sake of study; under the idea, *upāpnavāni iti*, may I get—I shall acquire; *brahma*, the Vedas; *upāpnoti eva brahma*, he does master the Vedas. Or *brahma* means the supreme Self. (In this case the meaning is this): *Pravakṣyan*, wishing to make the Self attained; under the idea *upāpnavāni iti*, “May I attain,

¹ The priests offering oblations, get the direction from their leader thus: “*Om*, make the gods hear the formulas for oblations”, and then they chant the *mantras*.

² The *Ṛk mantras* set to tune are the *Sāmas*; those that are not so set are the *śastras*.

³ *Śam*, meaning bliss, changes to *śom*, in *om śom*, uttered as an acceptance of the directions of the leading priest.

⁴ Adhvaryu is the priest in charge of the *Yajur-mantras*. The priest in charge of the *Ṛg-mantras* seeks his permission with the words “*Om*, may we pray”. And he replies, “*Om*, this will be pleasing to us.” Śāṅkarānanda, however, gives an alternative meaning thus: *Pratigara* is a rite; *prati pratigaram*, with regard to this rite; *gṛṇāti*, he utters (*Om*).

the supreme Self"; *om iti āha*, one utters the word *Om*—indeed; and he *brahma upānoti eva*, does indeed attain Brahman—through that *Om*. The purport of the passage is that, since the activities that are undertaken with the utterance of *Om* become fruitful, *Om* should be meditated on as Brahman.

CHAPTER IX

From the statement that knowledge alone leads to the attainment of independent sovereignty (Tai. I.vi), it may follow that the duties enjoined by Vedas and Smṛtis are useless. In order to avoid such a contingency, the duties are being presented here, so that they may be shown as contributory to the attainment of human goals.

ऋतं च स्वाध्यायप्रवचने च । सत्यं च स्वाध्यायप्रवचने
 च । तपश्च स्वाध्यायप्रवचने च । दमश्च स्वाध्यायप्रवचने
 च । शमश्च स्वाध्यायप्रवचने च । अग्नयश्च स्वाध्याय-
 प्रवचने च । अग्निहोत्रं च स्वाध्यायप्रवचने च । अतिथयश्च
 स्वाध्यायप्रवचने च । मानुषं च स्वाध्यायप्रवचने च । प्रजा
 च स्वाध्यायप्रवचने च । प्रजनश्च स्वाध्यायप्रवचने च ।
 प्रजातिश्च स्वाध्यायप्रवचने च । सत्यमिति सत्यवचा
 राधीतरः । तप इति तपोनित्यः पौरुशिष्टिः । स्वाध्याय-
 प्रवचने एवेति नाको मौद्गल्यः । तद्धि तपस्तद्धि तपः ॥ १ ॥
 इति नवमोऽनुवाकः ॥

1. Righteousness and learning and teaching
 (are to be practised). Truth and learning and

teaching (are to be practised). Austerity and learning and teaching (are to be resorted to). Control of the outer senses and learning and teaching (are to be practised). Control of the inner organs and learning and teaching (are to be resorted to). The fires (are to be lighted up), and learning and teaching (are to be followed). The Agnihotra (is to be performed), and learning and teaching (are to be carried on). Guests (are to be entertained), and learning and teaching (are to be practised). Social good conduct (is to be adhered to), and learning and teaching (are to be followed). Children (are to be begotten), and learning and teaching (are to be carried on). Procreation and learning and teaching (are to be carried on). A grandson (is to be raised), and learning and teaching (are to be practised). Truth (is the thing)—this is what Satyāvacā, of the line of Rathītara, thinks. Austerity (is the thing)—this is what Taponitya, son of Puruśiṣṭi, thinks. Learning and teaching alone (are the things)—this is what Nāka, son of Mudgala, thinks. For that indeed is the austerity; for that indeed is the austerity.

The word *ṛta* has been explained.¹ *Svādhyāyaḥ* is study (of the scriptures). *Pravacana* is teaching (of the scriptures), or self-recital of the Vedas (called *brahmayajña*). These, viz

¹ Tai. I. 1: The definite ideas regarding duty imbibed from scripture s

ṛta etc., are to be practised—this much is understood at the end of the sentence. And *satyam* means truthfulness in speech or what has been explained earlier;¹ *tapah* is austerity etc; *damaḥ* is the control of the outer organs; *śamaḥ* is the control of the inner organs (mind). *Agnayah*, the fires—are to be piled up. And *agnihotram*, the Agnihotra sacrifice—is to be performed. And *atithayah*, the guests—are to be adored. *Mānuṣam* means social good conduct; that too should be practised as the occasion demands. And *prajā*, progeny—is to be begotten. *Prajanuḥ ca*, and procreation in due course. *Prajātiḥ* is the raising of a grandson; in other words, the son is to be married. Learning and teaching are mentioned in all the contexts in order to imply that these two are to be carefully practised even by one who is engaged in all these duties. The comprehension of meaning is dependent on study; and the supreme goal (emancipation) is dependent on the understanding of the meaning. And teaching is for the preservation of that memory and for the increase of virtue. Therefore one has to entertain a love for learning and teaching. *Satyam iti*, truth alone—is to be practised. *Satyavacāḥ* is one whose speech consists of truth; or *Satyavacāḥ* is his name. *Rāthītaraḥ*, the teacher Rāthītara, born in the line of Rathītara, thinks. *Tapah iti*, austerities alone—are to be undertaken. *Taponityaḥ*, one who is ever (*nitya*) steeped in austerity (*tapah*), or whose name is Taponitya. The teacher *pauruśiṣṭiḥ*, who is the son of Puruśiṣṭi, thinks. *Svādhyāya-pravacane eva*, learning and teaching alone—are to be practised; *iti* this is what; the teacher thinks, who was *Nākaḥ*, Nāka by name, and *Mudgalyaḥ*, a son of Mudgala. *Hi*, since; *tat*, that—learning and teaching, verily constitute *tapah*, austerity;

¹ Tai. I. 1: Righteousness reduced to practice.

therefore they are to be followed—this is the idea. Although truth, austerity, learning, and teaching were mentioned earlier, they are dealt with over again in order to show solicitude for them.

CHAPTER X

The *mantra* commencing with *aham vīkṣasya rerivā* is introduced here for the sake of self-recital (*japa*), and from the context it follows that the self-recital is for the sake of development of knowledge; for the present topic is concerned with knowledge, and no other purpose appears to be implied; moreover, it is considered that knowledge arises in one whose mind is purified by self-recital.

अहं वृक्षस्य रेरिवा । कीर्तिः पृष्ठं गिरेरिव । ऊर्ध्व-
पवित्रो वाजिनीव स्वमृतमस्मि । द्रविणः सर्वचसम् ।
सुमेधा अमृतोक्षितः । इति त्रिशङ्कोर्वेदानुवचनम् ॥ १ ॥
इति दशमोऽनुवाकः ॥

1. I am the invigorator of the tree (of the world). My fame is high like the ridge of a mountain. My source is the pure (Brahman). I am like that pure reality (of the Self) that is in the sun. I am the effulgent wealth. I am possessed of a fine intellect, and am immortal and undecaying. Thus was the statement of Trīśaṅku after the attainment of realisation.

Aham, I—as the self that rules from within—am; *rerivā*, the invigorator; *vīkṣasya*, of the tree—the tree of

saṁsāra (the world), that is subject to uprooting. My *kīrtiḥ*, fame—is high; *iva*, like; *pr̥ṣṭham*, the ridge; *gireḥ*, of a mountain. *Ūrdhvapavitraḥ*, I who am the all-pervasive Self, and whose *ūrdhvam*, cause, is *pavitram*, purifying, revealable through knowledge—the pure, supreme Brahman—that I am *ūrdhvapavitra*. *Vājini iva* is the same as *vājavati iva*; *vājam* is food, and (*vājini* means) in one that is possessed of food—that is to say, in the sun. Just as it is a fact, well known from hundreds of Vedic and Smṛti texts, that the *amṛtam*, nectar, the reality of the Self, that is lodged in the sun, is pure; similarly, *asmi*, am I; the *svamṛtam*, beautiful, holy, reality of the Self. *Savaracasam* means effulgent; and *draviṇam* is wealth; (and) “I am that (wealth) that is the reality of the self”—the expression “I am” is to be supplied at the end. Or the knowledge of Brahman is effulgent, inasmuch as it reveals the reality of the Self; and it is called wealth, being comparable to wealth because of its producing the bliss of emancipation. On this interpretation, “(this wealth) has been attained by me” (and not “I am”) has to be supplied at the end. I, whose wisdom (*medhas*) is beautiful (*su*), characterised by omniscience, that I am *sumedhāḥ*; this fine wisdom being due to my being endued with the skill of preserving, creating, and destroying the world. And therefore, I am *amṛtaḥ*, possessed of the attribute of immortality, (and) *akṣitaḥ*, inexhaustible, undecaying. Or the (latter) word may be *ukṣitaḥ* soaked in, i. e. soaked in *amṛta*, nectar; for there is a *Brāhmaṇa* text, too: “I am soaked in nectar.” *Iti*, thus; was the *vedānuvacanam*: *vacanam* is the statement *tnu*, after—the attainment of, *vedaḥ* i. e. *vedanam*, the realisation of the unity of the Self—*trisaṅkoḥ* of Trisāṅku—a seer who had known Brahman and become

Brahman. This statement (of his) was for the sake of expressing the fact that he had reached the goal of all desires, just like Vāmadeva (Ai. II. 5). The idea is that the traditional text in the form of the *mantra*, as visualised by Trīśaṅku through the eyes of a seer, reveals the knowledge of the Self. And it can be understood that the self-repetition of this *mantra* is calculated, to lead to knowledge. From the introduction of duty in the chapter commencing with, "Righteousness and" (I. ix), and the conclusion later on with the text, "Thus was the statement after the attainment of realisation", it becomes evident that the visions of the seers, with regard to the Self etc., become revealed to one who engages in the obligatory duties enjoined in the Vedas and Smṛtis, who is devoid of selfish motives, and who hankers after the realisation of the supreme Brahman.

CHAPTER XI

The instruction about duties, in the text commencing with "Having taught the Vedas", is meant to indicate that, before the realisation of Brahman, the duties inculcated in the Vedas and Smṛtis are to be performed regularly; for the Vedic reference to post-instruction (i. e. instruction after the study of the Vedas, implied in *anusāsti*) is meant for creating proper tendencies in a man; for in accordance with the Smṛti, "He eradicates sin through austerities, and attains immortality through knowledge" (M. XII. 104), the knowledge of the Self dawns easily on one who has the proper mental disposition and whose mind is purified. And this Upaniṣad will say, "Crave to know Brahman

through concentration" (III. ii. 5). Therefore, the duties are to be undertaken so that knowledge may emerge. From the mention of injunction implied in the expression, "imparts this post-instruction", it follows that guilt will be the consequence of the transgression of the command. Moreover, there is the fact of the earlier treatment of the rites etc. Rites etc., have been dealt with before the introduction of the absolute knowledge of Brahman. And this Upaniṣad will show the absence of rites etc., after the rise of knowledge, in such passages as, "(Whenever the aspirant) gets fearlessly established (in Brahman)" (II. vii. 1), "(The enlightened man) has nothing to be afraid of" (II. ix. 1). "(Him, indeed, this remorse does not afflict): why did I not perform good deeds?" (II. ix. 1). Hence it is known that duties are calculated to lead to the dawn of knowledge through the eradication of sins accumulated in the past. And this is borne out by the Vedic text: "Crossing over death through rites etc., one attains immortality through meditation" (Īś. II). The earlier inculcation of *ṛta* (righteousness) etc., (Tai. I. ix) was for the sake of avoiding the idea of their uselessness. And the present instruction is for making an obligatory rule about their performance, they being ordained for leading to the rise of knowledge.

वेदमनूच्यायार्थोऽस्तेवासिनमनुशास्ति । सत्यं वद । धर्मं
चर । स्वाध्यायान्मा प्रमदः । आचार्याय प्रियं धनमाहृत्य
प्रजातन्तु मा व्यवच्छेत्सीः । सत्यान्न प्रमदितव्यम् । धर्मान्न
प्रमदितव्यम् । कुशलान्न प्रमदितव्यम् । भूत्येन प्रमदितव्यम् ।
स्वाध्यायप्रवचनाभ्यां न प्रमदितव्यम् ॥ १ ॥

1. Having taught the Vedas, the preceptor imparts this post-instruction to the students: “Speak the truth. Practise righteousness. Make no mistake about study. Having offered the desirable wealth to the teacher, do not cut off the line of progeny. There should be no inadvertence about truth. There should be no deviation from righteous activity. There should be no error about protection of yourself. Do not neglect propitious activities. Do not be careless about learning and teaching.

Anūcya, having instructed; *vedam*, the Vedas; *ācāryaḥ*, the teacher; *anusāsti*, imparts a post-instruction; i.e. *anu*, after the mastery of the verbal text; *śāsti*, makes him, i.e. the *antevāsinam*, the disciple, understand its meaning. Hence it is implied that a student, who has studied the Vedas, should not leave his preceptor’s house without inquiring into the scriptural duties. And this is supported by the Smṛti: “One should begin the duties after understanding them” (Āp. II. xxi. 5). How does he instruct? The answer is: *Satyam vada*, speak the truth; *satyam* is that which accords with what is grasped through valid means of knowledge and is fit to be uttered; that thing *vada*, (you) speak. Similarly, *dharmam cara*, practise righteousness. Inasmuch as truth etc., are specifically mentioned, the word *dharma* (righteousness) is a generic term for all that is to be practised. *Svādhyāyāt*, from study; *mā pramadah* make no deviation. *Acāryāya*, for the preceptor; *āhrīya*, having brought, having offered; *priyam dhanam*, the

desirable wealth, in exchange for the knowledge; and having taken a worthy partner with his permission, *mā vyavacchetsīh*, do not break; *prajātantum*, the line of progeny—the family line should not be broken. The idea is that, even though a son is not begotten, effort should be made for his birth through such rites as the Putreṣṭi, which conclusion follows from the mention of the son, procreation, and getting a grandson (in Tai. I. ix); for, otherwise, the single word procreation would have been mentioned (there). *Satyāt na pramaditavyam*, there should be no negligence about truth. Inadvertence about truth is tantamount to falsehood. So from the force of the word *pramāda*, inadvertence, it follows that a falsehood should not be uttered even through forgetfulness; this is the idea. Else there would have been a mere prohibition of untruthfulness. *Dharmāt na pramaditavyam*: since the word *dharma* relates to practices to be undertaken, the *pramāda*, inadvertence, consists in not undertaking the practices; that should not be the case. That is to say, righteous actions must be undertaken. Similarly, *kuśalāt*, from an action meant for one's own protection, *na pramaditavyam*. *Bhūtiḥ* means *vibhūtiḥ*, welfare; *bhūtyai*, from that welfare, from an activity meant for welfare, from propitious work; *na pramaditavyam*. *Svādhyāya-pravacanābhyām na pramaditavyam*. *Svādhyāya* is learning, and *pravacana* is teaching; there should be no carelessness about them. The idea is that they should be regularly practised.

देवपितृकार्याभ्यां न प्रमदितव्यम् । मातृदेवो भव ।
पितृदेवो भव । आचार्यदेवो भव । अतिथिदेवो भव ।

यान्यनवद्यानि कर्माणि तानि सेवितव्यानि । नो इतराणि ।
यान्यस्माकं सुचरितानि । तानि त्वयोपास्यानि ॥ २ ॥

नो इतराणि । ये के चारुमच्छेयांसो ब्राह्मणाः । तेषां
त्वयाऽऽसनेन प्रश्वसितव्यम् । श्रद्धया देयम् । अश्रद्धयाऽ-
देयम् । श्रिया देयम् । ह्रिया देयम् । भिया देयम्
सविदा देयम् । अथ यदि ते कर्मविचिकित्सा वा
वृत्तविचिकित्सा वा स्यात् ॥ ३ ॥

ये तत्र ब्राह्मणाः संमर्शिनः । युक्ता आयुक्ताः । अलूक्षा
धर्मकामाः स्युः । यथा ते तत्र वर्तेरन् । तथा तत्र वर्तेथाः ।
अथाभ्याख्यातेषु । ये तत्र ब्राह्मणाः संमर्शिनः । युक्ता
आयुक्ताः । अलूक्षा धर्मकामाः स्युः । यथा ते तेषु वर्तेरन् ।
तथा तेषु वर्तेथाः । एष आदेशः । एष उपदेशः । एषा
वेदोपनिषत् । एतदनुशासनम् । एवमुपासितव्यम् । एवमु-
चैतदुपास्यम् ॥ ४ ॥ इत्येकादशोऽनुवाकः ॥

2-4. There should be no error in the duties towards the gods and manes. Let your mother be a goddess unto you. Let your father be a god unto you. Let your teacher be a god unto you. The works that are not blameworthy are to be resorted to, but not the others. These actions of ours that are commendable are to be followed by you, but not the others. You should, by offering

seats, remove the fatigue of those Brāhmaṇas who are more praiseworthy among us. The offering should be with honour; the offering should not be with dishonour. The offering should be in plenty. The offering should be with modesty. The offering should be with awe. The offering should be with sympathy. Then, should you have any doubt with regard to duties or customs, you should behave in those matters just as the Brāhmaṇas do, who may happen to be there and who are able deliberators, who are adepts in those duties and customs, who are not directed by others, who are not cruel, and who are desirous of merit. Then, as for the accused people, you should behave with regard to them just as the Brāhmaṇas do, who may happen to be there and who are able deliberators, who are adepts in those duties and customs, who are not directed by others, who are not cruel, who are desirous of merit. This is the injunction. This is the instruction. This is the secret of the Vedas. This is divine behest. This is how the meditation is to be done. This is how this must be meditated on.

So also *devapitr-kāryābhyām*, from duties towards the gods and manes; *na pramaditavyam*, there should be no deviation; the duties towards the gods and manes must be

performed. *Mātr-devaḥ* is one to whom the mother is a deity; as such, you *bhava*, do become, *mātr-devaḥ*. Similarly, you become *pitṛdevaḥ*, *ācārya-devaḥ*, *atithidevaḥ*: the idea is that these (father, teacher, guest) are to be worshipped as gods. Moreover, *yāni karmāṇi*, those activities; that are *anavadyāni*, not blameworthy, that constitute the conduct of the good people; *tāni sevityāni*, those are to be resorted to - by you; *no itarāṇi*, not the others — the others that are censurable are to be shunned, though they may be followed by the good people. *Yāni*, those that are; *asmākam*, our — of us teachers; *sucaritāni*, good conduct - not opposed to scriptures; *tāni*, those — alone, *upāsyāni tvayā*, are to be performed by you, for the sake of unseen results; that is to say, they are to be undertaken regularly; *no itarāṇi*, not the others, that are opposed to these, though they be done by the teacher. *Ye ke ca asmat-śreyāṇisaḥ*, those who are superior to, or more praiseworthy than, us—whoever they may be—by virtue of their distinction in teachership etc.; and are *brāhmaṇāḥ*, Brāhmaṇas — and not Kṣatriyas and others; *teṣām*, of them; *praśvasitavyam tvayā*, the fatigue must be removed by you; *āsanena*, by the offering of a seat etc.; *praśvāsanam* is the same as *prasvāśaḥ* the removal of fatigue. Besides (the sentence may be construed thus): *Teṣām āsane*, in their assemblage, when they are assembled for a meeting; *na praśvasitavyam tvayā*, (so much as) deep breathing should not be done by you — you should only try to grasp the meaning of what they say.

Moreover, whatever is to be given, *deyam*, should be given; *śraddhayā*, with reverence; it *adeyam*, should not be given; *aśraddhayā*, disrespectfully. It *deyam*, should be offered; *śriyā*, according to (one's) prosperity. And *deyam*,

should be given ; *hriyā*, with modesty. And *deyam*, should be given; *bhiyā*, with fear; and *sañvidā*, with *sañvid*, which means friendly action, etc. *Atha*, then—while you are conducting yourself thus; *yadi*, if—at any time; *syāt*, should there be; *te*, (in) your (mind); *karma-vicikitsā vā vṛtta-vicikitsā vā*: *vicikitsā*, doubt, with regard to the *karmas*, rites and duties, inculcated by the Vedas and Smṛtis, or with regard to *vṛtta*, conduct, consisting in customary behaviour; should there be doubt, then you *vartethāḥ*, should behave; *tathā*, in that manner; *yathā*, as, in the manner in which; *tatra*, with regard to that work or conduct; *te*, they—those Brāhmaṇas *varteran*, may behave; *ye brāhmaṇāḥ*, the Brāhmaṇas, who; *syuḥ*, may happen; *tatra*, at that time or place, to be *yuktāḥ*, adepts; *tatra*, in those works, etc.,—the word *tatra* being related with the remote word *yuktāḥ*—(the Brāhmaṇas who are) *sañmarśinaḥ*, able deliberators; *yuktāḥ*, adepts in duties or customs; *āyuktāḥ*, not directed by others; *ālūkṣāḥ*—is the same as *arūkṣāḥ*, not cruel (or not crooked) in disposition; *dharmakāmāḥ*, desirous of merit, i. e. not moved by passion. *Atha*, then; *abhyākhyāteṣu*: *abhyākhyātāḥ* are those who are charged by somebody with some doubtful guilt, with regard to them also; you should apply all the text, *ye tatra*, etc., in the way as shown before. *Eṣaḥ*, this is; *ādeśaḥ*, (the scriptural) injunction; *eṣaḥ* this is; *upadeśaḥ*, instruction - to sons and others by fathers and others; *eṣā*, this is *veda-upaniṣat*, the secret of the Vedas, i. e. the meaning of the Vedas. *Etat*, this is—verily; *anuśāsanam*, the behest of God—for the word *ādeśa* has already been explained as (scriptural) injunction. Or *anuśāsanam* means the direction of all those who are accepted as authoritative. Since this is so, therefore, *etat*,

this; *upāsitavyam*, should be meditated on; *evam*, thus. *Evam u ca etat upāsyam*, and thus must this be meditated on--and this meditation is not to be neglected. The repetition is to show solicitude.

KARMA, KNOWLEDGE, AND LIBERATION

Here, for the sake of distinguishing between knowledge and *karma* (i. e. scriptural rites and duties) we enter into a consideration of the question as to whether the supreme goal (emancipation) results from *karmas* alone, or from *karmas* aided by knowledge, or from *karmas* and knowledge in combination, or from knowledge aided by *karmas*, or from knowledge alone.

First opponent: As to that, the supreme goal must be the result of *karmas* alone, since a man who is versed in the full import of the Vedas is competent for *karmas*, in accordance with the Smṛti, "The Vedas, together with their secret, are to be mastered by the twice-born." And the mastery must be along with the purport of the Upaniṣads, which consists in the knowledge of the Self etc. Besides, the competence for duties is declared everywhere in such terms as: "The man of knowledge performs a sacrifice"; "The knowing man gets the sacrifice performed." And there is the further text, "After knowing follows the practice."¹ For some people consider that the Vedas, as a whole, are meant for *karma*; now, if the supreme goal be unattainable through *karma*, the Vedas will become useless.

Answer: No, for freedom is a permanent entity. That

¹ Seems to be an echo of G. XVI. 24.

freedom is eternal is an admitted fact. It is a matter of common experience that anything that is produced by action is impermanent. Should liberation be a result of action, it will be transitory; and this is undesirable, since it contradicts the logically justifiable Vedic text, "As the result of action becomes exhausted in this world (so also) the other world acquired through virtue, gets exhausted" (Ch. VIII. i. 6).

Objection: Since the obligatory *karmas* are undertaken,¹ and since the works that are prompted by motives and those that are prohibited are not resorted to, and since the works that have begun to bear fruit in this life get consumed through enjoyment and suffering, emancipation follows independently of knowledge.

Answer: That, too, is inadmissible. For this was refuted by us by saying that, since there is the possibility of residual results of work, there lies the contingency of the production of a fresh body by them, and by saying that since the residual results of work are not opposed to the performance of obligatory duties, their elimination (by the latter) is illogical (see *Introduction*). As for the assertion that a man, possessed of the full import of the Vedas, is competent for *karma* (and that, therefore, the supreme goal must be the result of *karma*), that, too, is wrong; for there is such a thing as meditation which is different from what is acquired by merely hearing the Vedas (at the house of the teacher). For one becomes competent to undertake *karmas* from a mere knowledge got through hearing, and he need not have to wait for meditation; whereas meditation is enjoined apart from

¹ Thereby warding off all latent suffering.

such Vedic study (at the teacher's house).¹ And this meditation has emancipation as its result and is well known as different (from mere study). Moreover, after having said, "(The Self) is to be heard (of)", other efforts are enjoined by saying, "It is to be thought of and meditated on" (Br. II. iv. 5); and deliberation and meditation are well known (in life) to be different from the knowledge acquired through hearing.²

Second opponent: In that case emancipation will result from *karma* aided by knowledge. *Karma*, as associated with knowledge, has the power of producing a different result. Just as poison, curd, etc., which by themselves are calculated to effect death or fever, can produce different results when mixed with sacred formulæ, sugar, etc., similarly, emancipation is generated by *karma* when associated with knowledge.

Answer: No, for the defect was pointed out (by us) by stating that whatever is produced is impermanent.

Objection: On the authority of scriptural text — e. g., "He does not return" (Ch. VIII. xv. 1) — emancipation is eternal, though it is produced.

¹ There is the general injunction about the study of the Vedas, to be sure. But the study may be merely of the verbal text or of its meaning as well. Besides, one need not know the meaning of all the texts to be qualified for rites and duties, since he can proceed to them after understanding those texts only that bear on them; the portion dealing with meditation may well be left over, since that portion is not necessary for these rites and duties.

² *Śravaṇa* (lit. hearing) means intelligent understanding of the import; *manana* (lit. thinking) means bringing conviction to oneself by deliberating on it and counteracting opposite ideas; and *nididhyāsana* (lit. concentrated meditation) means making it part of one's being by constant meditation.

Answer: No, for a scriptural text is only informative. A scriptural passage supplies information of a thing existing as such; it cannot create a thing that does not exist. Anything that is eternal cannot have a beginning despite a hundred texts (to the contrary); nor can anything be indestructible if it has a beginning.

Third opponent answered: Hereby is refuted the view that knowledge and *karma* in their combination can produce emancipation.

Objection: Knowledge and *karma* remove the causes that hinder emancipation.¹

Answer: No, for *karma* is known to have a different effect; for *karma* is known to result in creation, improvement (purification), transformation, or acquisition. And liberation is opposed to such consummations as creation etc.

Objection: Liberation is achievable in accordance with Vedic texts that speak of courses (that are followed by departing souls). That liberation can be acquired is proved by such texts as: "They proceed by the path of the sun" (Mu. I. ii. 11), "Going up through that (nerve)" (Ka. II. iii. 16).

Answer: No, because it (i. e. liberation, being identical with Brahman) is all-pervasive and non-different from the goers. Brahman is omnipresent, because It is the (material)

¹ "The hindrances are ignorance, vice, etc. Knowledge and *karma* remove them; but they do not produce emancipation itself. Thus the continuance in one's natural state (of freedom) can be eternal, since non-existence in the form of destruction (here—destruction of vice etc) is known to be everlasting."—A. G. (see p. 235, footnote 1).

cause of *ākāśā* (space) etc.,¹ and all conscious souls are non-different from Brahman. And hence liberation is not (an) achievable (result). A traveller has to reach a place which is different from himself. Not that the very place that is non-different from oneself can be reached by oneself. And this follows from the well-known fact of identity (of the individual and Brahman) gathered from hundreds of Vedic and Smṛti texts such as: "Having created it (the world), He entered into it" (Tai. II. vi. 1), "Know the individual soul also to be myself" (G. XIII. 2).

Objection: This (conclusion) runs counter to the Vedic texts about courses (that the departing souls follow), and the glory (that they attain), etc. Moreover, if emancipation be unobtainable, not only will the texts talking about courses be contradicted, it will also contradict such Vedic texts as: "He assumes a single form (he assumes two forms, etc.)" (Ch. VII. xxvi. 2). "Should he desire to be united with the manes, (the manes get united with him by his mere wish)" (Ch. VIII. ii. 1), "(Remaining established in his own nature, he moves on, enjoying happiness) in the company of women or with vehicles" (Ch. VIII. xii. 3).

Answer: No, for they (i. e. those texts) relate to the conditioned Brahman. Women and others can exist only in the conditioned Brahman but not in the unconditioned, according to such Vedic texts as: "One only without a second" (Ch. VI. ii. 1), "Where one does not see anything different" (Ch. VII. xxiv. 1). "What will one see there and with what?" (Br. II. iv. 14; IV. v. 15). Besides, the combination of knowledge and *karma* is not possible,

¹ Which are the material causes of everything.

because of their mutual contradiction. For knowledge—which relates to an entity in which all distinction of accessories, such as the agent, get merged—is antithetical to *karma* that has to be accomplished with accessories that are opposed to it (knowledge). For the same thing cannot be visualised as being in reality both possessed of such distinctions as agentship etc., and as devoid of them. Either of the two must of necessity be false. And when one or the other has to be false, it is reasonable that falsehood should pertain to that duality which is the object of natural ignorance, in accordance with hundreds of Vedic texts such as: “Because when there is duality, as it were, (then one smells something, one sees something, etc.)” (Br. II. iv. 14); “He goes from death to death (who sees differences, as it were, in It)” (Ka. II. i. 10; Br. IV. iv. 19), “And that, in which one perceives a second, is limited” (Ch. VII. xxiv. 1); “While he who worships another god (thinking), He is one and I am another (does not know)” (Br. I. iv. 10); For whenever this one (i. e. the aspirant) makes the slightest difference in It, (he is smitten with fear)” (Tai. II. vii. 1). And truth belongs to unity, according to such Vedic texts as: “It should be realised in one form only” (Br. IV. iv. 20), “One without a second” (Ch. VI. ii. 1), “All this is but Brahman” (Mu. II. ii. 11). “All this is but the Self” (Ch. VII. xxv. 2). Nor is *karma* possible without perceiving the difference implied by such (grammatical) cases as the dative etc. Besides, the denunciation of the perception of difference in the sphere of knowledge is to be met with at a thousand places in the Vedas. Hence there is an opposition between knowledge and *karma*, and hence also is their combination impossible. This being so, the statement that liberation

is brought about by a combination of knowledge and *karma* is not justifiable.

Objection: (On such an assumption) there is a contradiction of the Vedas, for *karmas* are enjoined (by them). If like the knowledge of the rope etc., meant for eradicating the false knowledge of the snake etc., the knowledge of the unity of the Self is inculcated for eradicating the distinction of such accessories as the agent etc., then a contradiction becomes inevitable, since the Vedic injunctions about *karma* are left without any scope. But as a matter of fact, *karmas* are enjoined, and that contradiction is inadmissible, since Vedic texts are all means of valid knowledge.

Answer: No, for the aim of the Vedas is to impart instruction in respect of human goals. That being so, the Vedic texts that are devoted to the communication of knowledge engage themselves in the revelation of knowledge under the belief that since a man has to be liberated from the world, ignorance, which is the cause of the world, must be eradicated through knowledge. Hence there is no contradiction.

Objection: Even so, the scriptures establishing the existence of the accessories, viz agent etc., are certainly contradicted.

Answer: No; the scriptures, on the assumption of the hypothetical existence of the accessories, enjoin rites and duties for the wearing away of the accumulated sins of those who aspire for liberation, and also as a means for the achievement of fruits by those who hanker after results. (But) they do not concern themselves with establishing the reality of those accessories. To explain: The rise of

knowledge cannot be imagined for one who has hindrances constituted by accumulated sins. On the wearing away of those sins, knowledge will emerge; from that will follow the cessation of ignorance, and from that the absolute cessation of the world. Moreover, a man who perceives something as non-Self has craving for that non-Self. And a man, impelled by desire, engages himself in works. From that follows the worldly state, consisting in embodiment etc., for the sake of enjoying the fruits of that desire. Contrariwise, for a man who, in the absence of the perception of the non-Self, sees the unity of the Self, there arises no desire, since objects (of desire) do not exist. Besides, since desire cannot rise with regard to oneself, owing to non-difference, there ensues liberation consisting in existence in one's own Self. From this also follows, that knowledge and *karma* are contradictory. And just because of this conflict, knowledge does not depend on *karma* so far as emancipation is concerned. And we have said that in the matter of the attainment of one's Self, the obligatory *karma* becomes the cause for the dawn of knowledge by way of removing the hindrance constituted by accumulated sins. And we pointed out that this is the reason why *karmas* have been introduced in the present context. Thus the Vedic texts enjoining *karmas* are not at variance (with the Upaniṣads). Hence it is established that the highest goal is achievable through knowledge alone.

Objection: In that case there is no possibility of any other stage of life (*āśrama*). Inasmuch as the rise of knowledge is contingent on *karma* and *karma* is enjoined in connection with the life of the householders, there can be only one stage of life. And from this point of view,

the Vedic texts, such as "One should perform the Agnihotra sacrifice throughout one's life", become more apposite.

Answer: No, for *karmas* are multifarious. Not that Agnihotra etc. are the only practices to be undertaken. There exist also such practices as celibacy, austerity, truthfulness, control of external and internal organs, and non-injury, which are familiarly associated with the other stages of life, besides such practices as concentration, meditation, etc.—all of which are best calculated to serve as means for the origination of knowledge, since they are unadulterated (with sinful acts). And this Upaniṣad will declare, "Crave to know Brahman through concentration" (III. ii. 5). And since, even before entering the householder's life, knowledge can emerge from the practices undertaken in earlier lives, and since one embraces the householder's life for performance of *karmas*, its acceptance becomes certainly meaningless when one has already acquired the knowledge that is (held to be) the result of *karmas* (to be performed in domestic life). Moreover, since sons etc., are meant for the (attainment of) worlds, how can there be any lingering inclination for *karma* in one who has (already) desisted from all desires for these worlds— to wit, this world, the world of the manes, and the world of the gods, which are attainable through such means as sons (and *karma* and meditation) (Br. I. v. 16) — who has attained the world of the Self that exists eternally, and who has nothing to achieve through *karma*? Even for one who has accepted the life of a householder, there will simply be cessation from *karma* after the rise of knowledge and after the renunciation of everything on the maturity of knowledge when one feels no need for any *karma*, in

accordance with the Vedic indication implied in such texts as, "My dear (Maitreyī), I am going to renounce this life for monasticism" (Br. IV. v. 2).

Objection: This is unsound, since the Vedas are at so much pains to prescribe *karma*. The Vedas display much solicitude for such *karmas* as Agnihotra; and *karmas* involve great effort, since Agnihotra etc., have to be performed with a variety of accessories. And since the practices pertaining to the other stages of life, such as austerity, celibacy, etc., are equally present in the householder's life, and since the other practices involve little trouble, it follows that a householder's duty should not be considered as an alternative, on the same footing with the duties of other stages of life.

Answer: No, for (the dispassionate man) there is the favourableness ensured by practices in his previous lives. As for the statement that "the Vedas are much at pains to enjoin *karma*" etc., that is nothing damaging; for the *karmas* such as Agnihotra, as also the practices of celibacy etc., undertaken in the past lives, become helpful to the rise of knowledge, because of which fact, some are seen to be non-attached to the world from their very birth, while others are seen to be engaged in *karma*, attached to the world, and averse to enlightenment. Accordingly, in the case of those who have become detached, owing to the tendencies created in the past lives, it is desirable to resort to the other stage of life. And since there is a profuseness of *karmas* leading to a plethora of results comprising progeny, heaven, glory of holiness, etc., and since people have an abundance of desire for those results, it is reasonable that the Vedas should evince a great solicitude for *karmas* meant for them: for it is a matter

of experience that peoples' desires expressed in such forms as "Let this be mine", "May that one be mine", are multifarious. Moreover, since *karmas* are a means (to enlightenment, the Vedas make greater effort with regard to them). We said that *karmas* are helpful to the rise of enlightenment; and one should pay more attention to the means rather than to the end.

Objection: Since enlightenment is caused by *karma*, there is no need for any other effort. If it is a fact that enlightenment emerges on the wearing away of the past accumulated sins through *karmas* alone, then apart from the *karmas*, it is needless to make any effort for the hearing (i. e. understanding) etc. of the Upaniṣads.

Answer: No, for there is no restrictive rule about that. There is surely no such rule that knowledge arises from the mere elimination of the obstructions alone, and not from the grace of God or the practice of austerity, meditation, etc.; for (as a matter of fact) non-injury, celibacy, etc., are aids to enlightenment; and hearing, thinking, and meditating are the direct causes of it. Hereby is established the need of other stages of life, and it is also proved that people in all stages of life can aspire for knowledge, and that the supreme goal is attainable through knowledge alone.

CHAPTER XII

An invocation is being read for warding off the obstructions to the knowledge already dealt with:

शं नो मित्रः शं वरुणः । शं नो भवत्वयमा । शं न इन्द्रो
बृहस्पतिः । शं नो विष्णुरुहक्रमः । नमो ब्रह्मणे । नमस्ते

वायो । त्वमेव प्रत्यक्षं ब्रह्मासि । त्वामेव प्रत्यक्षं ब्रह्मावा-
दिषम् । ऋतमवादिषम् । सत्यमवादिषम् । तन्मामावीत् ।
तद्वक्तारमावीत् । आवीन्माम् । आवीद् वक्तारम् । ॐ
शान्तिः शान्तिः शान्तिः ॥ १ ॥ इति द्वादशोऽनुवाकः ॥

इति शीक्षावल्ली समाप्ता ॥

This has been explained before¹ (pp. 229-31).

¹ The verbs in the second half are, however, put in the past tense. The translation of this half is: "I spoke of you as the immediate Brahman. I spoke of you as *r̥ta*. I spoke of you as *satya*. He protected me. He protected the teacher. He protected me, protected the teacher."

PART II

ON THE BLISS THAT IS BRAHMAN

CHAPTER I

The invocation beginning with *śam no mitraḥ* was recited (at the end of the last Part) in order to avert the impediments to the acquisition of the knowledge set forth earlier. Now is being recited the invocation, *śam no mitraḥ* etc.,¹ as also *saha nāvavatu* etc., for averting the obstacles to the acquisition of the knowledge of Brahman that is going to be stated:

(For “*Śam no*” etc. see I. i.).

ॐ सह नाववतु । सह नौ भुनक्तु । सह वीर्यं कर-
वावहै । तेजस्वि नावधीतमस्तु मा विद्विषावहै ॥ ॐ
शान्तिः शान्तिः शान्तिः ॥

May He protect us both together. May He nourish us both together. May we both acquire strength together. Let our study be brilliant. May we not cavil at each other. Om! Peace! Peace! Peace!

Śam no etc., is easy to understand just as before. *Saha nāvavatu*: *Avatu*, may He protect, *nau*, us both—the teacher and the taught; *saha*, together: *Bhunaktu*, may He nourish; *nau saha*. *Karavāvahai*, may we both accomplish; *vīryam*, strength—arising from knowledge; *saha*. Let the *adhītam*, study; *nau*, of us both—who are both

¹ Some books omit these references here to “*Śam no*” etc. in the commentary, as also the invocation itself.

bright; *tejasvi astu*, be brilliant;—let what we read be well read, i. e. let it be conducive to the comprehension of meaning. There is occasion for ill-feeling on the part of the student in the matter of learning, as also on the part of the teacher, consequent on unwitting lapses; hence the prayer, “May we not cavil” etc., is made in order to forestall this. *Mā vidviṣāvahai*, may we not entertain ill-feeling against each other. The three repetitions in the form *śāntiḥ, śāntiḥ, śāntiḥ*—peace, peace, peace—have been explained already (as meant for averting bodily, natural, and supernatural hindrances). Moreover, this invocation is for warding off the impediments to the knowledge that is going to be imparted. An unobstructed acquisition of the knowledge of the Self is being prayed for, since the supreme goal is dependent on that enlightenment.

The meditations relating to conjoining that are not opposed to rites and duties have been stated (Tai. I. iii). After that, with the help of the *Vyāhṛtis*, has been described the meditation on the conditioned Self within the heart (I. v-vi), which (meditation) culminates in the attainment of one’s independent sovereignty by oneself (I. vi. 2). But thereby one does not achieve the total eradication of the seed of worldly existence. Hence is begun, the text, *brahmadevīdūpnoti param* etc., for the sake of realising the Self as freed from all distinctions that are created by limiting adjuncts, so that (as a result of the realisation), ignorance which is the seed of all miseries, may cease. And the need of this knowledge of Brahman is the cessation of ignorance, as also the total eradication of worldly existence which results from that. And the Upaniṣad will declare, “The enlightened man has nothing to be afraid of” (Tai. II. ix. 1), and that it is inconceivable to be

established in a state of fearlessness so long as the causes of worldly existence persist (II. vii), and that things done and not done, virtue and vice, do not fill him with remorse (II. ix). Therefore it is understood that the absolute cessation of the worldly existence follows from this knowledge which has for its content Brahman that is the Self of all. And in order to apprise us of its own relation and utility at the very beginning, the Upaniṣad itself declares its utility in the sentence; *brahmaivid āpnoti param* -the knower of Brahman reaches the highest. For one engages in hearing, mastering, cherishing, and practising a science only when its utility and relation are well known. The result of knowledge certainly succeeds hearing etc., in accordance with such other Vedic texts as "It is to be heard of, reflected on, and meditated upon" (Br. II. iv. 5, IV. v. 6).

ॐ ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परम् । तदेषाऽभ्युक्ता ॥

सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म । यो वेद निहितं गुहायां परमे-
व्योमन् । सोऽश्नुते सर्वान् कामान् सह । ब्रह्मणा
विपश्चितेति ॥

तस्माद्वा एतस्मादात्मन आकाशः संभूतः । आकाशा-
द्वायुः । वायोरग्निः । अग्नेरापः । अद्भ्यः पृथिवी ।
पृथिव्या ओषधयः । ओषधीभ्योऽन्नम् । अन्नात्पुरुषः ।
स वा एष पुरुषोऽन्नरसमयः । तस्येदमेव शिरः । अयं दक्षिणः
पक्षः । अयमुत्तरः पक्षः । अयमात्मा । इदं पुच्छं प्रतिष्ठा ।
तदप्येष श्लोको भवति ॥ १ ॥ इति प्रथमोऽनुवाकः ॥

1. The knower of Brahman attains the highest. Here is a verse uttering that very fact: “Brahman is truth, knowledge, and infinite. He who knows that Brahman as existing in the intellect, lodged in the supreme space in the heart, enjoys, as identified with the all-knowing Brahman, all desirable things simultaneously.

From that Brahman, which is the Self, was produced space. From space emerged air. From air was born fire. From fire was created water. From water sprang up earth. From earth were born the herbs. From the herbs was produced food. From food was born man. That man, such as he is, is a product of the essence of food: Of him this, indeed, is the head; this is the southern side; this is the northern side; this is the Self; this is the stabilising tail.

Here is a verse pertaining to that very fact:

Brahmavit, the knower of Brahman; Brahman is that whose characteristics will be stated and who is called Brahman because of (the etymological sense of) *brhat-tamatva*, being the greatest. He who *vetti*, knows, that Brahman is *brahmavit*. He *āpnoti*, attains; *param*, the absolutely highest. That very Brahman (that occurs as the object of the verb, *vid*, to know) must be the highest (goal as well), since the attainment of something does not logically follow from the knowledge of something else and since another Vedic text, viz “He who knows

that supreme Brahman becomes Brahman indeed" etc., (Mu. III. ii. 9), clearly shows the attainment of Brahman by the knower of Brahman.

Objection: The Upaniṣad will say that Brahman permeates everything and is the Self of all; hence It is not attainable. Moreover, one thing is seen to be attained by another — one limited thing by another limited thing. And Brahman is unlimited and identical with all; hence Its attainment—as of something that is limited and is different from one's Self—is incongruous.

Answer: This is no fault.

Objection: How?

Answer: Because the attainment or non-attainment of Brahman is contingent on Its realisation or non-realisation. The individual soul, though intrinsically none other than Brahman, still identifies itself with, and becomes attached to, the sheaths made of food etc., which are external, limited, and composed of the subtle elements; and as (in the story) a man, whose mind is engrossed in the counting of others, misses counting himself, though that personality is the nearest to him and supplies the missing number,¹ just so, the individual soul, under a spell of ignorance, that is characterised by the non-perception of one's own true nature as Brahman,

¹ Ten men, after crossing a river, were faced with the question, "Have we lost one of us in the stream?" So they went on counting themselves. But each one missed taking himself into account and concluded that they were only nine, one having actually been drowned. They then began wailing, when a passer-by found out their foolishness, counted them one by one, and then turning to the last counter said, "You are the tenth." That reassured them.

accepts the non-Selves, such as the body composed of food, as the Self, and as a consequence, begins to think, "I am none other than those non-Selves composed of food etc." In this very way, Brahman, that is the Self, can become the non-Self through ignorance. Just as through ignorance, there is a non-discovery (in the story) of the individual himself who makes up the requisite number, and just as there is the discovery of the selfsame person through knowledge when he is reminded of that personage by someone, similarly in the case of one, to whom Brahman remains unattained owing to his ignorance, there may be a discovery of that very Brahman by realising that omnipresent Brahman to be none other than one's own Self—a realisation that comes through enlightenment consequent on the instruction of the scriptures.

The sentence, "The knower of Brahman attains the highest", is a statement in brief of the purport of the whole Part (II). The ideas involved in quoting a *Rg-mantra* with the words, "*Tad eṣā abhyuktā*—here is a verse uttering that very fact", are (as follows). (First) It is sought to determine the true nature of Brahman through a definition that is capable of indicating the intrinsic nature (in all its nakedness) of that very Brahman which was briefly referred to as a knowable entity in the pithy sentence, "The knower of Brahman attains the highest", but of which any distinct feature remained undetermined; (secondly) the knowledge of that Brahman having been spoken of (earlier) in an indefinite way, it is now sought to make that very Brahman realisable as non-different from one's own indwelling Self; (and lastly) the idea is to demonstrate that the attainment of supreme Brahman by a knower of Brahman—which (attainment) is spoken of

as the result of the realisation of Brahman²—is really nothing but identity with the Self of all, which is Brahman. Itself transcending all worldly attributes. *Tut*, with regard to that—with regard to what has been said by the *brāhmaṇa* portion (of the Upaniṣad), *eṣā*, this Ṛk (mantra); is *abhyuktā*, uttered:

The sentence *satyam jñānam anantam brahma—Brahman* is truth, knowledge, infinite—is meant as a definition of Brahman. For the three words beginning with *satya* are meant to distinguish Brahman which is the substantive. And from the fact that Brahman is the thing intended to be known, it follows that Brahman is the substantive. Since Brahman is sought to be presented as the chief object of knowledge—the knowable must be the substantive. And just because (Brahman and *satya* etc.) are related as the substantive and its attributives, the words beginning with *satya* have the same case-ending, and they stand in apposition. Brahman, being qualified by the three adjectives, *satya* etc., is marked out from other nouns. Thus, indeed, does a thing become known when it is differentiated from others; as for instance, in common parlance, a particular lotus is known when it is described as blue, big, and sweet-smelling.

Objection: A noun can be distinguished only when there is the possibility of its ruling out some other adjective (that does not belong to it), as for instance a (white) lotus can be distinguished by ruling out either red or blue. An adjective is meaningful when there are many nouns which belong to the same class and which are capable of having many adjectives; but it can have no meaning with regard to a single noun, where there is no possibility of any alternative adjective. There is a

single Brahman, just as there is a single sun; there do not exist other Brahmans from which It can be distinguished, unlike a blue lotus that can be (marked out from a red one).

Answer: No, there is nothing wrong, since the adjectives are used by way of definition (also).

Objection: How?

Answer: Since the adjectives (here) bear a pre-dominatingly defining sense and not a qualifying sense.

Objection: What again is the difference between the two relations—(1) that existing between the definition and the thing defined; and (2) that between the quality and the thing qualified?

The *answer* is: An adjective distinguishes a noun from things of its own class, whereas a definition marks it out from everything else, as for instance, (the definition of) *ākāśa* is that which provides space. And we said that the sentence (under discussion) stands for a definition.

The words, *satya* etc., are unrelated among themselves, since they subserve something else; they are meant to be applied to the substantive. Accordingly, each of the attributive words is thus related with the word Brahman, independently of the others: *satyam brahma, jñānam brahma, anantam brahma*. As for *satya*, a thing is said to be *satya*, true, when it does not change the nature that is ascertained to be its own; and a thing is said to be unreal when it changes the nature that is ascertained to be its own. Hence a mutable thing is unreal, for in the text, "A mutable thing (like a vessel of earth) exists only in name depending on speech; the earth alone is true" (Ch. VI. i. 4), it has been emphasised that, that alone is true that exists (Ch. VI. ii. 1). So the phrase *satyam brahma*

(Brahman is truth) distinguishes Brahman from unreal things.

From this it may follow that (the unchanging) Brahman is the (material) cause (of all subsequent changes); and since a material cause is a substance, it can be an accessory as well, thereby becoming insentient like earth. Hence it is said that Brahman is *jñānam*. *Jñāna* means knowledge, consciousness. The word *jñāna* conveys the abstract notion of the verb (*jñā*, to know); and being an attribute of Brahman along with truth and infinitude, it does not indicate the agent of knowing. If Brahman be the agent of knowing, truth and infinitude cannot justly be attributed to It. For as the agent of knowing, It becomes changeful; and, as such, how can It be true and infinite? That, indeed, is infinite which is not separated from anything. If it be the agent of knowing, It becomes delimited by the knowable and the knowledge, and hence there cannot be infinitude, in accordance with another Vedic text: "That is the Infinite in which one does not know anything else. And that in which one knows anything else is limited" (Ch. VII. xxiv.1).

Objection: From the denial of particulars in the (above) statement, "One does not know anything else", it follows that one *knows* the Self.

Answer: No, for the sentence is intended to enunciate a definition of the Infinite. The sentence, "in which one does not see anything else", etc., is devoted wholly to the presentation of the distinguishing characteristics of Brahman. Recognising the well-known principle that one sees something that is different from oneself, the nature of the Infinite is expressed in that text by declaring that the Infinite is that in which that kind of action does not

exist. Thus, since the expression, "anything else", is used (in the above sentence) for obviating the recognised fact of duality, the sentence is not intended to prove the existence of action (the act of knowing) in one's Self. And since there is no split in one's Self, cognition is impossible (in It). Moreover, if the Self be a knowable, there will remain no one else (as a knower) to know It, since the Self is already postulated as the knowable.

Objection: The same self can exist both as the knower and the known.

Answer: No, this cannot be simultaneously, since the Self is without parts. A featureless (indivisible) thing cannot simultaneously be both the knower and the known. Moreover, if the Self can be cognised in the sense that a pot is, (scriptural) instruction about Its knowledge becomes useless. For if an object is already familiar, just as a pot for instance is, the (Vedic) instruction about knowing it can have no meaning. Hence if the Self be a knower, It cannot reasonably be infinite. Besides, if It has such distinctive attributes as becoming the agent of knowing, It cannot logically be pure existence. And pure existence is truth, according to another Vedic text, "It is truth" (Ch. VI. vii. 7). Therefore the word *jñāna* (knowledge), having been used adjectivally along with truth and infinitude, is derived in the cognate sense of the verb, and it is used to form the phrase, *jñānam brahma* (Brahman is knowledge), in order to rule out (from Brahman) all instrumentality as that of an agent, as also for denying non-consciousness as that of earth etc.

From the phrase, *jñānam brahma*, it may follow that Brahman is limited, for human knowledge is seen to be

finite. Hence, in order to obviate this, the text says, *anantam*, infinite.

Objection: Since the words, *satya* (truth) etc., are meant only for negating such qualities as untruth, and since the substantive Brahman is not a well-known entity like a lotus, the sentence beginning with *satya* has nothing but a non-entity as its content, just as it is the case with the sentence, "Having bathed in the water of the mirage, and having put a crown of skyflowers on his head, there goes the son of a barren woman, armed with a bow made of a hare's horn."

Answer: No, for the sentence is meant as a definition. And we said that even though *satya* etc. are attributive words, their chief aim is to define. Since a sentence, stating the differentia of a non-existing substantive, is useless, and since the present sentence is meant to define, it does not, in our opinion, relate to a non-entity. Should even *satya* etc., have an adjectival sense, they do not certainly give up their meanings.¹ If the words *satya* etc., be meaningless, they cannot logically distinguish their substantive. But if they are meaningful, as having the senses of truth etc., they can justifiably differentiate their substantive Brahman from other substantives that are possessed of opposite qualities. And the word Brahman,

¹ "Etymologically, the word *satya* indicates an existing entity that is not sublated; the word *jñāna* means the self-revealing cognition of things; and the word *ananta* is used with regard to something pervasive, as in (the expression) 'the sky is infinite' etc. Hence they negate opposite ideas by the very fact of their imparting their own meanings to the substantives. Therefore they cannot be reduced to mere negation."—
A G.

too, has its own individual meaning.¹ Among these words, the word, *ananta*, becomes an adjective by way of negating finitude; whereas the words, *satya* and *jñāna*, become adjectives even while imparting their own (positive) senses to the substantive.

Since in the text, "From that Brahman which is the Self, (was produced this space)" (Tai. II. i), the word Self (*ātmā*) is used with regard to Brahman Itself, it follows that Brahman is the Self of the cognising individual; and this is supported by the text, "He attains this self made of bliss" (Tai. II. vii. 5), where Brahman is shown to be the Self. Moreover, it is Brahman which has entered (into men); for by the text, "having created that, (He) entered into that very thing" (Tai. II. vi. 1), it is shown that very Brahman has entered into the body as the individual soul. Hence the cogniser, in his essential nature, is Brahman.

Objection: If thus Brahman be the Self, It becomes the agent of cognition, since it is a well-known fact that the Self is a knower. And from the text, "He desired" (Tai. II. vi. 1), it is well established that the one who desires is also an agent of cognition. Thus, Brahman being the cogniser, it is improper to hold that Brahman is consciousness. Besides, that (latter conclusion) leads to its impermanence. For even if it be conceded that *jñāna* (cognition) is nothing but consciousness, and thus Brahman has only the cognate sense (knowledge) of the verb ("to know", and not the verbal sense of knowing), It (Brahman) will still be open to the charge of

¹ Derived from the root *br̥h* having the sense of growth, vastness, Brahman is that which is not limited by time, space or causation. Thus the word has its own positive import and cannot refer to a void.

impermanence and dependence. For the meanings of verbs are dependent on the cases (of the nouns). And knowledge is a sense conveyed by a root (dependent on a noun). Accordingly, Brahman becomes impermanent as well as dependent.

Answer: No, since without implying that knowledge is separable from Brahman, it is referred to as an activity by way of courtesy. (To explain): Knowledge, which is the true nature of the Self, is inseparable from the Self, and so it is everlasting. Still the intellect, which is the limiting adjunct of the Self, becomes transformed in the shape of the objects while issuing out through the eyes etc., (for cognising thing). These configurations of the intellect in the shape of sound etc., remain objectively illumined by the Consciousness that is the Self, even when they are in a state of incubation; and when they emerge as cognitions, they are still enlightened by that Consciousness.¹ Hence these semblances of Consciousness—a Consciousness that is really the Self—that are referable by the word knowledge and bear the root meaning (of the verb “to know”), are imagined by the non-discriminating people to be attributes of the Soul Itself and to be subject to mutation. But the Consciousness of Brahman is inherent in Brahman and is inalienable from It, just as the light of the sun is from the sun or the heat of fire is from fire. Consciousness is not dependent on any other cause for its (revelation), for it is by nature eternal (light). And since all that exists is inalienable from Brahman in time or space, Brahman being the cause of time, space, etc., and since Brahman is surpassingly subtle, there is

¹ In the incipient stage, they have the fitness to be illumined; and after emergence, they remain soaked in consciousness.

nothing else whether subtle or screened or remote or past, present or future which can be unknowable to it. Therefore, Brahman is omniscient. Besides, this follows from the text of the *mantra*: "Though He is without hands and feet, still He runs and grasps; though He is without eyes, still He sees; though He is without ears, still He hears. He knows the knowable, and of Him there is no knower. Him they called the first, great Person" (Śv. III. 19). There are also such Vedic texts as: "For the knower's function of knowing can never be lost, because It is immortal; but (It does not know, as) there is not that second thing, (separated from It, which It can know)" (Br. IV. iii. 30). Just because Brahman's nature of being the knower is inseparable and because there is no dependence on other accessories like the sense-organs, Brahman, though intrinsically identical with knowledge, is well known to be eternal. Thus, since this knowledge is not a form of action, it does not also bear the root meaning of the verb. Hence, too, Brahman is not the agent of cognition. And because of this, again, It cannot even be denoted by the word *jñāna* (knowledge). Still Brahman is indicated, but not denoted, by the word knowledge which really stands for a verisimilitude of Consciousness as referring to an attribute of the intellect; for Brahman is free from such things as class etc., which make the use of the word (knowledge) possible. Similarly, Brahman is not denoted even by the word *satya* (truth), since Brahman is by nature devoid of all distinctions. In this way, the word *satya*, which means external reality in general, can indirectly refer to Brahman (in such expressions) as "Brahman is truth", but it cannot denote It. Thus the words truth etc., occurring in mutual proximity,

and restricting and being restricted in turns by each other, distinguish Brahman from other objects denoted by the words, truth etc., and thus become fit for defining It as well. So, in accordance with the Vedic texts, "Failing to reach which (Brahman), words, along with the mind turn back" (Tai. II. iv. 1), and "(Whenever an aspirant gets fearlessly established in this changeless, bodiless,) inexpressible, and unsupported Brahman" (Tai. II. vii. 1), it is proved that Brahman is indescribable, and that unlike the construction of the expression, "a blue lotus", Brahman is not to be construed as the import of any sentence.¹

Yajñ veda, anyone who knows—that Brahman, described before; as *nihitam*, (hidden) existing; *guhāyām*, in the intellect; *guhā*, being derived from the root *guha* in the sense of hiding, means the intellect; because in that intellect are hidden the categories—knowledge, knowable, and knower; or because in that intellect are hidden the two human objectives—enjoyment and liberation. *Parame vyoman*, in the supreme space (that permeates its own effect, the intellect), *vyoman* being the same as *vyomni*—in the space, which is called the Unmanifested (i.e. Māyā), that, indeed, being the supreme space in accordance with the Vedic text, "By this Immutable (Brahman), O Gārgi, is the (Unmanifested) space (*ākāśa*, i.e., Māyā) pervaded" (Bṛ. III. viii. 11), where *ākāśa* occurs in the proximity of *akṣara* (Immutable.)² Or from the apposition (of *guhā*

¹ Brahman cannot be comprehended through the common relationship of words and things denoted by them. Nor can It be denoted through the relationship of substance and quality.

² "The Unmanifested called *vyoma* (space, *ākāśa*) is inherent in the intellect (*guhā*), which is the effect of the former. In that Unmanifested is placed Brahman. The element called *ākāśa* is not accepted

and *vyoma*) in the expression, *guhāyāni vyomni*, the Unmanifested space (Māyā) itself is the *guhā* (cavity); for in that, too, are hidden all things during the three periods (creation, existence, and dissolution), it being their cause as well as more subtle. In that (Māyā) is hidden Brahman. It is, however, reasonable to accept the space circumscribed by the cavity of the heart as the supreme space, for the text wants to present space here as something entering into realisation or meditation as a part of it.¹ The space within the heart is well known as the supreme space from the other Vedic texts; “The space that is outside the individual (Ch. III. xii. 7) . . . is the same as the space within the individual (Ch. III. xii. 8) (and that again) is the same as the space within the lotus of the heart” (Ch. III. xii. 9). (Thus the meaning of the sentence is): Within the cavity of the intellect that is within the (supreme) space defined by the heart, is *nihitam*, lodged, placed, Brahman; in other words, Brahman is perceived clearly through the function of that intellect; for apart from this perception, Brahman can have no connection, (in the sense of being lodged in), with any particular time or space, Brahman being all-pervasive and beyond all distinctions.

here as the meaning of *vyoma*, since the element *ākāśa* cannot be called *parama* (supreme), it being an effect of Unmanifested *ākāśa*. Besides in the Brhadāraṇyaka, the Unmanifested *ākāśa* and not the Element *ākāśa*, occurs in the proximity of Immutable Brahman (*akṣara*)” — A.G.

¹ Brahman is placed, i.e. manifest as the witness, in the cavity of the intellect that is lodged in the space circumscribed by the heart, and It is directly perceived there as such. If, however, Brahman is placed in the Cosmic Unmanifested, i.e., in the principle called Māyā, It will become an object of indirect perception. And an indirect realisation cannot negate the direct superimposition that a man suffers from.

Saḥ, he—one who has known Brahman thus; what does he do? *Aśnute*, enjoys; *sarvān*, all without any exception; *kāmān*, desires, i.e. all enjoyable things. Does he enjoy the sons, heavens, etc. in sequence as we do? The text says: No; he enjoys all the desirable things, that get focussed in a single moment, *saha*, simultaneously—through a single perception which is eternal like the light of the sun, which is non-different from Brahman Itself, and which we called “truth, knowledge, infinite”. That very fact is described here as *brahmaṇā saha*, in identification with Brahman. The man of knowledge, having become Brahman, enjoys as Brahman, all the desirable things simultaneously; and he does not enjoy in sequence the desirable things that are dependent on such causes as merit and demerit, and such sense-organs as the eyes, as does an ordinary man, identified with the worldly Self which is conditioned by limiting adjuncts, and which is a reflection (of the supreme Self) like that of the sun or water. How does he then enjoy? As identified with the eternal Brahman which is omniscient, all-pervasive, and the Self of all, he enjoys simultaneously, in the manner described above, all the desirable things that are not dependent on all such causes as merit etc., and are independent of the organs like the eyes etc. This is the idea. *Vaiśācityam* means, as (identified with) the intelligent, i.e. all-knowing (Brahman), for that, indeed, is true intelligence which is omniscience. The idea is that, he enjoys in his identity with the all-knowing Brahman. The word *iti* is used to indicate the end of the *mantra*.

The entire purport of the chapter is summed up succinctly in the sentence, “The knower of Brahman attains

the highest", occurring in the *brāhmaṇa* portion. And that pithy statement (aphorism) is briefly explained by the *mantra* (the *Rg* verse). Since the meaning of that very statement has to be elaborately ascertained again, the succeeding text, *tasmād vā etasmāt* etc., is introduced as a sort of a gloss to it. As to that, it has been said at the beginning of the *mantra* that Brahman is truth, knowledge, and infinite. The text proceeds to show how It can be truth, knowledge, and infinite. As to that, there are three kinds of infinitude—from the standpoint of space, time, and objects. To illustrate: The sky is unlimited from the point of view of space, for it is not limited in space. But the sky is not infinite as regards time or as regards (other) substances. Why? Since it is a product. Brahman is not thus limited in time like the sky, since It is not a product. A created thing is circumscribed by time, but Brahman is not created. Hence It is infinite from the point of view of time as well. Similarly, too, from the point of view of substances. How, again, is established Its infinitude from the point of view of substances? Since It is identical with all substances. A thing that is different acts as a limitation to another. For when the intellect gets occupied with something, it becomes detached from something else. That, because of which an idea becomes circumscribed, acts as a limit to that idea. To illustrate: The idea of cowhood is repelled by the idea of horsehood; hence horsehood debars cowhood, and the idea (of cowhood) becomes delimited indeed. That limitation is seen in the case of distinct substances. Brahman is not differentiated in this way. Hence It has infinitude even from the standpoint of substances. How, again, is Brahman non-different from everything? The answer is: Because It is the

cause of everything. Brahman is verily the cause of all things—time, space, etc.

Objection: From the standpoint of substances, Brahman is limited by Its own effects.

Answer. No, since the things that are, effects are unreal. For apart from the cause, there is really no such thing as effect by which the idea of the cause can become delimited. This fact is borne out by another Vedic text which says that "All modifications exist in name only, being supported by mere words; the earth (inhering in the modifications of earth) alone is true" (Ch. VI. 1. 4.); similarly, existence (i.e. Brahman that permeates everything) alone is true (Ch. VI. ii. 1). Brahman, then, is spatially infinite, being the cause of space etc. For space is known to be spatially infinite; and Brahman is the cause of that space. Hence it is proved that the Self is spatially infinite; for no all-pervading thing is seen in this world to originate from anything that is not so. Hence the spatial infinitude of Brahman is absolute. Similarly, temporally, too, Brahman's infinitude is absolute, since Brahman is not a product. And because there is nothing different from Brahman, It is infinite substantially as well. Hence Its reality is absolute.

By the word *tasmāt*, from that, is called to mind the Brahman that was briefly stated in the sentence started with; and by the word *etasmāt*, from this, is called to memory the Brahman just as It was defined immediately afterwards in the *mantra*. *Ātmanah*, from the Self—from the Brahman that was enunciated in the beginning in the words of the *brāhmaṇa* portion, and that was defined immediately afterwards as truth, knowledge, infinite (in the *mantra*)—from that Brahman that is called the Self;

for It is the Self of all, according to another Vedic text, "It is truth, It is the Self" (Ch VI. viii-xvi). Hence Brahman is the Self. From that Brahman, that is identical with the Self, *ākāśaḥ*, space; *sambhūtaḥ*, was created. *Ākāśa* means that which is possessed of the attribute of sound and provides space for all things that have forms. *Ākāśāt*, from that space; *vāyuḥ*, air—which has two attributes, being possessed of its own quality, touch, and the quality, sound, of its cause (*ākāśa*). The verb, "was created", is understood. *Vāyoḥ*, from that air, was created *agnih*, fire—which has three attributes, being possessed of its own quality, colour, and the two earlier ones (of its cause, air). *Agneḥ*, from fire, was produced, *āpaḥ*, water—with four attributes, being endowed with its own quality, taste, and the three earlier ones (of fire). *Adbhyaḥ*, from water, was produced *pṛthivī*, earth—with five attributes, consisting of its own quality, smell, and the four earlier qualities (of its cause, water). *Pṛthivyāḥ*, from the earth; *ośadhayaḥ*, the herbs. *Ośadhībhyaḥ*, from the herbs; *annam*, food. *Annāt*, from food, transformed into human seed, (was created), *puruṣaḥ*, human being, possessed of the limbs—head, hands, etc. *Saḥ vai eṣaḥ puruṣaḥ*, that human being, such as he is; *anarasamayāḥ*, consists of the essence of food, is a transformation of the food substance. Since the semen, the seed, emerging as it does as the energy from all the limbs, is assumed to be of the human shape, therefore the one that is born from it should also have the human shape; for in all classes of beings, the offsprings are seen to be formed after the fathers.

Objection: Since all beings, without exception, are modifications of the essence of food and since all are

equally descendants of Brahman, why is man alone specified?

Answer: Because of his pre-eminence.

Objection: In what, again, does the pre-eminence consist?

Answer: In his competence for *karma* and knowledge. For man alone is qualified for rites and duties as also for knowledge, by virtue of his ability, craving (for results), and non-indifference (to results). That a person, desirous (of results) and possessed of learning and capacity is qualified for work and knowledge, is proved by the evidence of another Vedic text which says: "In man alone is the Self most manifest, for he is the best endowed with intelligence. He speaks what he knows, he sees what he knows; he knows what will happen tomorrow; he knows the higher and lower worlds; he aspires to achieve immortality through mortal things. He is thus endowed (with discrimination), while other beings have consciousness of hunger and thirst only" (Ai. Ā. II. iii. 2. 5).

The intention here is to make that very human being enter into the inmost Brahman through knowledge. But his intellect, that remains engaged in the particulars that simulate the outer objects, thinking them to be the Self, though they are non-Selves, cannot without the support of some distinct object, be suddenly made contentless and engaged in the thoughts of the inmost, indwelling Self. Therefore, on the analogy of the moon on the bough,¹

¹ Though the moon is far away, it is at times spoken of as "the moon on the bough", because she appears to be near it. The point is that, the idea of something, which escapes ordinary comprehension, is sought to be communicated with the help of something more tangible though, in reality, the two are entirely disparate.

the text takes the help of a fiction that has an affinity with the identification of the Self and the physical body; and leading thereby the intellect inward, the text says, *tasya idam eva śiraḥ: tasya*, of that human being who is a modification of the essence of food, *idam eva śiraḥ*, this is verily the head—that is well known. The text, “This is verily the head”, is stated lest somebody should think that the head is to be imagined here just as it is in the case of the vital body etc., where things that are not heads are imagined to be so. Similar is the construction in the case of the side etc. *Ayam*, this—the right hand of a man facing east—is the *dakṣiṇaḥ pakṣaḥ*, the southern side. *Ayam*, this—the left hand—is the *uttaraḥ pakṣaḥ*, the northern side. *Ayam*, this—the middle portion (trunk) of the body—is the *ātmā*, self, soul of the limbs, in accordance with the Vedic text, “The middle of these limbs is verily their soul” (Ai. III. v. 4). *Idam*, this—the portion of the body below the navel, is the *pucchaṃ pratiṣṭhā*, the tail that stabilises. *Pratiṣṭhā* derivatively means that by which one remains in position. The *puccha* (here) is that which is comparable to a tail, on the analogy of hanging behind, as does the tail of a cow. On this pattern is established the symbolism in the case of the succeeding vital body etc., just as an image takes its shape from molten copper poured into a crucible. *Tat api*, as to that also, illustrative of that very idea contained in the *brāhmaṇa* portion; *eyaḥ bhavati ślokaḥ*, here occurs a verse—which presents the self made of food.

CHAPTER II

अन्नाद् वै प्रजायन्ते । याः काश्च पृथिवीश्च श्रिताः ।
 अथो अन्नेनैव जीवन्ति । अथैनदपि यन्त्यन्ततः ।
 अन्नं हि भूतानां ज्येष्ठम् । तस्मात् सर्वाँषधमुच्यते ।
 सर्वं वै तेऽन्नमाप्नुवन्ति । येऽन्नं ब्रह्मोपासते ।
 अन्नं हि भूतानां ज्येष्ठम् । तस्मात् सर्वाँषधमुच्यते ।
 अन्नाद् भूतानि जायन्ते । जातान्यन्नेन वर्धन्ते ।
 अद्यतेऽस्ति च भूतानि । तस्मादन्नं तदुच्यत इति ।

तस्माद्वा एतस्मादन्नरसमयात् । अन्योऽन्तर आत्मा
 प्राणमयः । तेनैष पूर्णः । स वा एष पुरुषविध एव । तस्य
 पुरुषविधताम् । अन्वयं पुरुषविधः । तस्य प्राण एव शिरः ।
 व्यानो दक्षिणः पक्षः । अपान उत्तरः पक्षः । आकाश
 आत्मा । पृथिवी पुच्छं प्रतिष्ठा । तदप्येष श्लोको भवति
 ॥ १ ॥ इति द्वितीयोऽनुवाकः ॥

1. All beings that rest on the earth are born verily from food. Besides, they live on food, and at the end, they get merged in food. Food was verily born before all creatures; therefore it is called the medicine for all. Those who worship food as Brahman acquire all the food. Food was verily born before all creatures; therefore it is called the medicine for all. Creature-

are born of food; being born, they grow by food. Since it is eaten and it eats the creatures, it is called food.

As compared with this self made of the essence of food, as said before, there is another inner self which is made of air. By that is this one filled. This self is also of the human form. Its human form takes after the human form of that (earlier one). Of this, *prāna* is the head, *vyāna* is the southern side, *apāna* is the northern side, space is the self, the earth is the tail that stabilises. Pertaining to that is this (following) verse:

Annāt, from food—transformed into chyle; *prajāḥ*, the living beings—moving or stationary; *prajāyante*, take birth; (the living beings), *vāḥ kāḥ ca*, whichever (they be)—without distinction; who, *pṛthivīm śritāḥ*, rest on, have taken as their resort, the earth—all of them are verily born from food. The word *vai* is used for calling up to memory (something mentioned earlier). *Atho*, moreover, when born. *annena eva*, by food, indeed; they *jīvanti*, live—preserve their lives, i.e. grow. *Atha*, besides; *antataḥ*, at the end, at the conclusion of the growth that is indicative of life; *api-yanti*, (they) move towards, the prefix *api* being used in the sense of towards; *enat*, it, i.e. food; the idea is that they get absorbed advancing in the direction of food, (and culminating in food). Why? *Hi*, since; *annam*, food; is *jyeṣṭham*, the first born; *bhūtānām*, of all beings. Since food is the source of all the other creatures beginning

with the physical, all living beings originate from food, live on food, and merge into food. Since this is so, *tasmāt*, therefore; food is *ucyate*, called; *sarvauṣadham*, a medicine for all, a curative that alleviates the bodily discomfort of all. The goal achieved by the knower of food as Brahman is being stated: *Te*, they; *āpnuvanti*, acquire; *sarvam vai annam*, all the food. Who? *Ye*, those who; *upāsate*, meditate on; *annam brahma*, food as Brahman—as shown earlier. How? Thus: “I am born of food, am identical with food, and merge in food. Therefore food is Brahman.” How, again, does the meditation on food, as identical with oneself, result in the acquisition of all the food? The answer is: *Hi annam jyeṣṭham bhūtānām*, since food is the first born of all beings; since it is the eldest, being born before all the creatures, *tasmāt sarvauṣadham ucyate* (see ante). Therefore it is logical that one who worships all food as identical with oneself should acquire all food. The repetition in “*annāt bhūtāni jāyante*, from food originate all creatures; *jātāni annena vardhante*, when born they grow through food” is for the sake of summing up. The etymology of the word *anna* is now being shown. Since food is *adyate*, eaten, by creatures; and itself *atti*, eats, *bhūtāni*, the creatures; *tasmāt*, therefore —by virtue of being eaten by creatures and of eating the creatures; *tat annam ucyate*, it is called food. The word *iti* is to indicate the end of the first sheath.

Brahman is the inmost of all the selves beginning from the physical sheath and ending with the blissful one. The scripture starts with the text *tasmāt vā etasmāt annarasa-mayāt* etc., with a view to revealing, through knowledge, that Brahman as the indwelling Self by following a

process of eliminating the five sheaths, just as rice is extracted from the grain called *kodrava* that has many husks. *Tasmāt vai etasmāt*, as compared with the body made of the essence of food, as described above; there is *anyah*, a different; *ātmā*, self; *antaraḥ*, which is inside, (which is) imagined through ignorance to be a self, just as the physical body is; (which latter self is) *prāṇamayah*: *prāṇa* is air (vital force), and *prāṇamaya* means constituted by air, possessed predominantly of air. *Tena*, by that airy (vital) self; *pūrṇaḥ*, is filled; *eṣaḥ* this one—the self constituted by the essence of food, just as bellows are filled with air. *Saḥ vai eṣaḥ prāṇamayah ātmā*, this vital self that has been spoken of; is *puruṣavidhāḥ eva*, also of a human form possessing a head, sides, etc. Is it so naturally? The text says, no. The self constituted by the essence of food is well known to have a human shape: *am*, in accordance with; *puruṣavidhātām tasya*, the human shape of that self, constituted by the essence of food, *ayam*, this, the self constituted by air; is *puruṣavidhāḥ*, humanly shaped like an image cast in a crucible, but not naturally. Similarly, the succeeding selves become human in shape in accordance with the human shapes of the preceding ones; and the earlier ones are filled up by the succeeding ones. How, again, is constituted its human form? The answer is *tasya*, of him, of the self constituted by the vital force that is a transformation of air; *prāṇaḥ eva*, the special function of exhaling through mouth and nostrils; is imagined, through the authority of the text, as *śiraḥ*, head. The imagination of the sides etc., at every turn, is just because of scriptural authority. *Vyānaḥ*, the function called *vyāna* (pervading the whole body); is *dakṣiṇaḥ pakṣaḥ*, the right side. *Apānaḥ*, *apāna* (the

function of inhaling); is *uttaraḥ pakṣaḥ*, the northern side. *Ākāśaḥ*, space, i.e. the function (of air) existing in space as *samāna*; is *ātmā*, the self – being comparable to the Self. (*Ākāśa* means *samāna*), for it is the context of the functions of the vital force, and it is the self, being in the middle as compared with the other functions that are in the periphery. The one that exists in the middle is recognised as the self in the Vedas, in accordance with the text. The middle (i.e. the trunk) of these limbs is the “self” (Ai. III v 4). *Prthivī pucchaṃ pratiṣṭhā: pṛthivī* means the deity of the earth; and this deity supports the physical vital force, since this deity is the cause of its stability according to another Vedic text, “That deity, taking help of the *apāna* in a man” (Pr. III. viii). Else the body would ascend upwards because of the action of the vital function called *udāna*, or there would be falling down because of its weight. Therefore the deity of the earth is the stabilising tail of the vital self. *Tat*, pertaining to that very idea with regard to the vital self; here is *eṣaḥ*, *ślokaḥ*, this verse.

CHAPTER III

प्राणं देवा अनु प्राणन्ति । मनुष्याः पशवश्च ये ।
 प्राणो हि भूतानामायुः । तस्मात् सर्वायुषमुच्यते ।
 सर्वमेव त आयुर्यन्ति । ये प्राणं ब्रह्मोपासते ।
 प्राणो हि भूतानामायुः । तस्मात् सर्वायुषमुच्यत इति ।
 तस्यैष एव शरीर आत्मा । यः पूर्वस्य । तस्माद्वा
 एतस्मात् प्राणमयात् । अन्योन्तर आत्मा मनोमयः । तेनैष

पूर्णः । स वा एष पुरुषविध एव । तस्य पुरुषविधताम् ।
 अन्वयं पुरुषविधः । तस्य यजुरेव शिरः । ऋदक्षिणः
 पक्षः । सामोत्तरः पक्षः । आदेश आत्मा । अथर्वाङ्गिरसः
 पुच्छं प्रतिष्ठा । तदप्येष श्लोको भवति ॥ १ ॥

इति तृतीयोऽनुवाकः ॥

1. The senses act by following the vital force in the mouth; all human beings and animals that are there act similarly; since on the vital force depends the life of all creatures, therefore it is called the life of all. Those who worship the vital force as Brahman, attain the full span of life; since on the vital force depends the life of all, it is called the life of all.

Of the preceding (physical) one, this one, indeed, is the embodied self. As compared with this vital body, there is another internal self constituted by mind. By that one is this one filled up. That self constituted by mind is also of a human shape. The human shape of the mental body takes after the human shape of the vital body. Of the mental body, the *Yajur-mantras* are the head. The *Rg-mantras* are the right side, the *Sāma-mantras* are the left side; the *brāhmaṇa* portion is the self (trunk), the *mantras* seen by Atharvāṅgiras are the stabilising tail. Pertaining to this here is a verse:

Devāḥ, the gods Fire etc.; *prāṇanti*, perform the act of breathing become active through the functioning of the vital force; *anu prāṇam*, after the self that is constituted by air; that is to say, the gods perform the vital functions by becoming identified with that which possesses the power of sustaining life. Or because this is the context of the physical body, *devāḥ* means the sense-organs; (they) *prāṇam anu prāṇanti*, become active by following the function of breathing, that subsists in the mouth. Similarly, *ye manuṣyāḥ paśavaḥ ca*, those that are human beings and animals, they become active through the function of breathing. Hence, also, it is not simply by possessing the limited self in the form of the body, built up by food, that creatures become dowered with selves. What then? Human beings and others are endowed with selves by virtue of possessing a vital body within each physical body, which former is common to, and pervades, each physical body as a whole. Similarly, all creatures are possessed of selves by virtue of being provided with the bodies beginning with the mental and ending with the blissful which successively pervade the preceding ones and which are made up of the elements, beginning with *ākāśa*, that are the creations of ignorance. So also are they blessed with a self by the Self that is common to all, self-existent, the source of ether etc., everlasting, unchanging, all-pervading, defined as “truth, knowledge, and infinite”, and beyond the five sheaths. And by implication it is also said that this is the real Self of all. It has been said that the senses act by following the activity of the vital force. How is that so? This is being answered: *Hi*, since; *prāṇiḥ*, the vital force; is *āyuh*, life; *bhūtānām*, of creatures—which accords

with another Vedic text, "Life lasts so long as the vital force resides in this body" (Kau. III.2); therefore it (the vital force) is *sarvāyusaḥ*: *sarvāyuh* means the life of all; and that which is *sarvāyuh*, *ucyate*, is called *sarvāyusaḥ*, the life of all. Since death is a known consequence of the departure of the vital force, the latter is universally recognised as the life of all. Hence those who, after detaching themselves from this external, personal, physical body, meditate on the inner, common vital force as Brahman with the idea, "I am the vital force, that is the self and the determinant of the span of life, being the source of life", get the full span of life in this world, i.e. they do not meet with any accidental death before the ordained span of life. The word *sarvāyuh* should, however, properly mean (full span of life, i.e.) one hundred years in accordance with the well-recognised fact in the Vedic text, "He attained the full span of life" (Ch. II. xi-xx, IV. xi-xiii). What is the reason (of attaining the full life)? *Prāṇaḥ hi bhūtānām āyuh tasmāt sarvāyusaḥ ucyate* (see ante). The repetition of the expression *prāṇaḥ hi* etc., is to indicate the logic of the attainment of the fruit of meditation, to wit: Anyone who worships Brahman as possessed of certain qualities, himself shares in them.

Tasya pūrvasya, of the physical body described above; *eṣaḥ eva*, this verily is; the *sārīraḥ ātmā*, the self existing in the body made of food. Which is it? *Yah eṣaḥ* that which is this one—constituted by the vital force. The rest beginning with *tasmāt vai etasmāt* is to be construed as before. *Anyah antarah ātmā*, there is another inner self; *manomayaḥ* constituted by mind. *Manah* means the internal organ comprising volition etc. That which consists

of mind is *manomaya*, just as in the case of *amanaya*. It is the inner self of the vital body. *Tasya*, of that mental body; *yajuh eva śiraḥ*, the *Yajur-mantras* are the head. *Yajuh* means a kind of *mantra* in which the number of letters and feet, and length (of lines) are not restricted; the word *yajuh* denotes (prose) sentences of that class. It is the head because of its pre-eminence, and the pre-eminence is owing to its subserving a sacrifice directly, for an oblation is offered with a *Yajur-mantra* uttered along with a *svāhā* etc. Or the imagination of the head etc., everywhere is only on the authority of the text. (*Yajuh* is a constituent of the mental sheath) since *yajuh* is that state of the mind which is related to organs (of utterance), effort (involved in utterance), sound (produced thereby), intonation, letters, words, and sentences; which consists of a volition with regard to these factors; which is pre-occupied with their thoughts; which has the organs of hearing etc., for its communication; and which has the characteristics of the *Yajur-mantras*. Thus also are (to be understood) the *R̥g mantras*, and thus the *Sāma-mantras*. Thus, when the *mantras* are considered as mental states, their mental repetition (*japa*) becomes possible, since that implies that those states alone are continued in the mind. Else, mental repetition of a *mantra* would not be possible, since the *mantra* would then be outside the mind just as much as pot etc., are¹ But, as a matter of fact, the repetition of *mantras* has to be undertaken (since it) is enjoined variously in connection with rites.

¹ The words in the *mantra* would be outside the mind, and mind would have no independence with regard to them.

Objection: The (mental) repetition of a *mantra* can be accomplished by the repetition of the memory of letters (constituting it).

Answer: No, since (on that assumption) there is no possibility of repetition in the primary sense. The repetition of *R̥g-mantra* is enjoined in the text., "The first *R̥g-mantra* is to be repeated thrice and the last *R̥g-mantra* is to be repeated thrice."

That being so, if the *R̥g-mantras* themselves be not made the objects of repetition, and if the repetition of their memory be undertaken, the repetition of the *R̥g-mantra*, in the primary sense, that is enjoined in "the first *R̥g-mantra* is to be repeated thrice", will be discarded. Hence the *mantras* called *Yajuh̥* are (in the last analysis) nothing but the Consciousness of the Self that is identical with the beginningless and endless Self—lodged in and conditioned by the mental functions that act as Its limiting adjuncts. Thus is the eternality of the Vedas justifiable. • Else, if they are objects like colour etc., they will be impermanent. Nor is that right. And the Vedic text, "Where all the Vedas get united is the Self in the mind"¹ (Cityupaniṣad, XI. 1, Tai. Ā. III. ii. 1), which declares the identity of the *R̥g-mantras* etc., with the eternal Self, can be reconciled only if the *mantras* are eternal. And there is also the *mantra* text, "The *R̥g-mantras* exist in that undecaying and supreme space (Brahman) where all the gods reside" (Śv. IV. 8). *Ādesāḥ* here means the *brāhmaṇa* portion of the Vedas, since (in consonance with the etymological meaning of *ādesā*, command) the *brāhmaṇa*

¹ Where the Self exists as the witness of all mental functions.

portion inculcates all that has to be enjoined. *Atharvān-girasaḥ*, the *mantra* and the *brūhmaṇa* portions seen by Atharvāṅgiras; are *pucchan pratiṣṭhā*, the stabilising tail, since they are chiefly concerned with rites performed for acquiring peace, prosperity, etc., which bring about stability. Pertaining to this is a verse, just as before, which reveals the self that is constituted by the mind:

CHAPTER IV

यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते । अप्राप्य मनसा सह ।
 आनन्दं ब्रह्मणो विद्वान् । न बिभेति कदाचनेति ।
 तस्यैष एव शरीर आत्मा । यः पूर्वस्य । तस्माद्वा
 एतस्मान्मनोमयात् । अन्योऽन्तर आत्मा विज्ञानमयः । तेनैष
 पूर्णः । स वा एष पुरुषविध एव । तस्य पुरुषविधताम् ।
 अन्वयं पुरुषविधः । तस्य श्रद्धैव शिरः । ऋतं दक्षिणः
 पक्षः । सत्यमुत्तरः पक्षः । योग आत्मा । महः पुच्छ
 प्रतिष्ठा । तदप्येष श्लोको भवति ॥ १ ॥

इति चतुर्थोऽनुवाकः ॥

1. One is not subjected to fear at any time if one knows the Bliss that is Brahman, failing to reach which (Brahman, as conditioned by the mind), words, along with the mind, turn back.¹

¹ Mind and speech cannot act with regard to that mental self which is constituted by themselves, since nothing can act on itself.

Of that preceding (vital) one, this (mental) one is verily the embodied self. As compared with this mental body, there is another internal self constituted by valid knowledge. By that one is this one filled up. This one, as aforesaid, has verily a human shape. It is humanly shaped in accordance with the human shape of the earlier one. Of him faith is verily the head; righteousness is the right side; truth is the left side; concentration is the self (trunk); (the principle, called) Mahat, is the stabilising tail. Pertaining to this, here is a verse:

Yataḥ vācaḥ nivantante etc., (For commentary see Tai. II. ix). *Tasya pūrvasya*, of that preceding one—of the one constituted by vital force; *eṣaḥ eva ātmā*, this one is verily the self; *śārīraḥ*, existing in the body. Which? *yaḥ eṣaḥ manomayaḥ*, that which is constituted by mind. “*Tasmād vai etasmāt*, as compared with this one” etc., is to be explained as before. *Anyah antaraḥ ātmā*, there is another self that is internal—the intelligence-self being within the mental-self. It has been mentioned that the mental self consists of the Vedas. The wisdom about the contents of the Vedas, amounting to certitude, is *vijñāna*; and that (*vijñāna*), again, in the form of determination, is a characteristic of the internal organ. *Vijñānamaya* is the self consisting of such *vijñāna*, and it is constituted by well-ascertained knowledge that is authoritative by nature. For sacrifice etc., are undertaken where there exists knowledge arising from a valid source. And the (next) verse will declare that it is the source of sacrifices. In one, who is

possessed of well-ascertained knowledge, there arises first. *śraddhā*, faith, with regard to the things to be performed. Since that faith precedes all duties, it is the *śiraḥ*, head, i.e. comparable to a head. *Rta* and *satya*, righteousness and truth, are as they have been explained before (I.i). *Yogaḥ* is conjunction, concentration. It is the *ātmanā*, self, being comparable to the Self. Faith etc., like the limbs of a body, become fit for the acquisition of valid knowledge in a man who is possessed of a self by virtue of his concentration. Therefore, *yogaḥ*, concentration, is the self (i.e. trunk) of the body constituted by knowledge. *Mahaḥ puchham pratiṣṭhā*: *Mahaḥ* means the principle called Mahat—the first born, in accordance with another Vedic text, “(He who knows) this Mahat (great), adorable, first-born being (as the Satya-Brahman).” (Br. V. iv. 1). It is *puchham pratiṣṭhā*, the supporting tail, since it is the cause (of the intelligent self). The cause is, in fact, the support of the effects, as for instance, the earth is of trees and creepers. The principle, called Mahat, is the cause of all intellectual cognitions. Thereby it becomes the support of the cognitive self consisting of intelligence. Pertaining to that there occurs this verse, just as before. Just as there are verses expressive of the physical self etc., that are mentioned in the *brāhmaṇa* portion, so also is there a verse with regard to the cognitive one.

CHAPTER V

विज्ञानं यज्ञं तनुते । कर्मणि तनुतेऽपि च ।
 विज्ञानं देवाः सर्वे । ब्रह्म ज्येष्ठमुपासते ।

¹ The Cosmic Person comprising all gross and subtle things.

विज्ञानं ब्रह्म चेद्वेद । तस्माच्चेन्न प्रमाद्यति ।
 शरीरे पाप्मनो हित्वा । सर्वान्कामान्समश्नुत इति ।
 तस्यैष एव शारीर आत्मा । यः पूर्वस्य । तस्माद्वा
 एतस्माद्विज्ञानमयात् । अन्योऽन्तर आत्माऽऽनन्दमयः । तेनैष
 पूर्णः । स वा एष पुरुषविध एव । तस्य पुरुषविधताम् ।
 अन्वयं पुरुषविधः । तस्य प्रियमेव शिरः । मोदो दक्षिणः
 पक्षः । प्रमोद उत्तरः पक्षः । आनन्द आत्मा । ब्रह्म
 पुच्छं प्रतिष्ठा । तदध्येष श्लोको भवति ॥ १ ॥
 इति पञ्चमोऽनुवाकः ॥

I. Knowledge actualises a sacrifice, and it executes the duties as well. All the gods meditate on the first-born Brahman, conditioned by knowledge. If one knows the knowledge-Brahman, and if one does not err about it, one abandons all sins in the body and fully enjoys all enjoyable things.

Of that preceding (mental) one this (cognitive) one is verily the embodied self. As compared with this cognitive body, there is another internal self constituted by bliss. By that one is this one filled up. This one, as aforesaid, has verily a human shape. It is humanly shaped in accordance with the human shape of the earlier one. Of him joy is verily the head, enjoyment is the

right side, hilarity is the left side; Bliss is the self (trunk). Brahman is the tail that stabilises. Apropos of this here is a verse:

Vijñānam yajñam tanute, knowledge actualises a sacrifice; for a man of knowledge executes it with faith etc. Hence knowledge is presented as the doer in (the expression) “Knowledge actualises the sacrifice”. *Apī ca*, and also; it *karmāṇi tanute*, executes the duties. Since everything is accomplished by knowledge, it is reasonable to say that the cognitive self is Brahman. Moreover, *sarve devāḥ*, all the gods, Indra and others; *upāsate*, meditate on; *vijñānam brahman*, Brahman as conditioned by cognition; (which is) the *jyeṣṭham*, the first-born—since it was born before all or because all actions presuppose it. That is to say, they meditate on that knowledge-Brahman, identifying themselves with it. Hence, through the worship of the *Mahat* Brahman, they become possessed of knowledge and glory. *Cet*, if; *veda*, one knows; that *vijñānam brahma*, Brahman as conditioned by cognition; and not only does one know, but also, *cet*, if, *na pramādyati tasmāt*, does not err about that Brahman does not deviate from that Brahman. Since one is prone to thinking the external non-Selves as the Self, there arises the possibility of swerving from the thought of the knowledge-Brahman as identified with one’s Self; in order to bar out that possibility, the text says, “if one does not err about that Brahman”, that is to say, if one has eschewed all ideas of identity of the physical selves etc., with his own Self and goes on thinking of the knowledge-Brahman as his Self. What will happen thereby? The answer is: *śarīre pāpmanahḥ hitvā*, abandoning all sins

in the body. All sins are verily caused by the identification of oneself with the body. And on the analogy of the removal of the shade, on the removal of the umbrella, their eradication is possible when their cause is removed as a result of the identification of oneself with the knowledge-Brahman. So the meaning is this: *litvā śarīre*, having abandoned in the body itself, all the physical *pāpmanah*, sins, that are caused by the identification of oneself with the body; and becoming identified with the knowledge-Brahman (i.e. Hiraṇyagarbha); one *samaśnute*, fully enjoys, through the cognitive self; *sarvān kāmān*, all desirable things, that are there in the knowledge-Brahman.

Tasya pūrvasya, of the preceding one, of the mental self; *eyaḥ eva ātmā*, this is verily the self, that is lodged in the mental *śarīra*, body, and is hence the *śārīrah*, embodied. Which? *Yah eyaḥ*, that which is this; *vijñānamayaḥ*, the cognitive one.

Tasmāt vai etc., is as already explained. From the context and from the use of the suffix, *mayat* (made of), it is to be understood that a conditioned self is implied by the word *ānandamayaḥ* (made of bliss). For the conditioned selves—made of food etc.—which are material, are dealt with here. And the self made of bliss also is included in that context. Besides, the suffix *mayat* is used here in the sense of transmutation (and not abundance), as in the case of *ānandamaya*. Hence the *ānandamaya* is to be understood as a conditioned self. This also follows from the fact of *saṅkramaṇa* (attaining). The text will say, "He attains the self made of bliss" (II. viii. 5). And things that are non-Selves and effects are seen to be attained by others. Moreover, the self made of bliss is mentioned in the text as the object of the act of attaining, just as it

is in the text, *annamayam ātmānam upasaniḥkrāmati*, he attains the self made of food (II. viii. 5). Nor is the (unconditioned) Self attainable, since such an attainment is repugnant to the trend of the passage and it is logically impossible. For the (unconditioned) Self cannot be attained by the Self, inasmuch as there is no split within the Self, and Brahman (the goal) is the Self of the attainer. Moreover, (on the supposition that the unconditioned Self is spoken of), the fancying of head etc., becomes illogical. For the imagination of limbs, head etc., is not possible in one (i.e. in the Self) which has the characteristics mentioned earlier, which is the cause of space etc., and which is not included in the category of effects. And this is borne out by such Vedic texts, denying distinctive attributes in the Self, as the following: “(Whenever an aspirant gets fearlessly established) in this changeless, bodiless, inexpressible, and unsupported (Brahman)” (Tai. II. vii. 1), “It is neither gross nor minute” (Bṛ. III. viii. 8), “The Self is that which has been described as ‘not this’, ‘not this’” (Bṛ. III. ix. 26). This also follows from the illogicality (otherwise) of quoting the (succeeding) *mantra*; for the quotation of the *mantra*, “If anyone knows Brahman as non-existing, he himself becomes non-existent” (Tai II.vi.1), cannot be justified on the supposition that Brahman is directly perceived to be the self possessed of such limbs as joy for Its head, and so on, since on that supposition there cannot exist any such doubt as “Brahman does not exist”. Besides, it is unjustifiable to refer separately to Brahman as the stabilising tail in “Brahman is the stabilising tail”. So the *ānandamaya* (made of bliss or blissful) *ātmā* (self) belongs to the category of the conditioned ones; it is not the supreme Self. *Ānanda* (bliss) is an

effect of meditation and rites, and *ānandamaya* is constituted by this bliss. And this self is more internal than the cognitive self, since it has been shown by the Upaniṣad to be indwelling the cognitive self which is the cause of sacrifices etc.. Inasmuch as the fruit of meditation and rites is meant for the enjoyer,¹ it must be the inmost of all; and the blissful self is the inmost as compared with the others. Further, this follows from the fact that meditation and rites are meant for the acquisition of joy etc., for meditation and rites are undertaken for joy etc. Thus since joy etc., which are the fruits (or rites and meditation), are nearer to the Self, it is logical that they should be within the cognitive self; for the blissful self, revived by the impression of joy etc., is perceived in dream as sustained by the cognitive self.²

Tasya, of him, of the self made of bliss; the *priyam*, joy arising from seeing such beloved objects as a son; is the *śiraḥ*, head comparable to a head, because of its pre-eminence. *Modaḥ*, enjoyment the joy that follows the acquisition of an object of desire. When that enjoyment reaches its acme it is *pramodaḥ*, exhilaration. *Ānandaḥ*, Bliss pleasure in general, which is the soul (trunk) of the different limbs, (i.e. expressions) of happiness in the form of joy etc., for this *ānanda*, (i.e. common Bliss), permeates them all. *Ānanda* (Bliss) is supreme Brahman; for it is Brahman which manifests Itself in various mental modifications, evoked by past good deeds, with regard to such limiting adjuncts as a son, a friend, etc., in the presence of which the mind, freed from *tanuḥ* (gloom, darkness,

¹ Since enjoyment follows action.

² "The self, possessed of joy etc., is not the primary self, since it is perceived by the witnessing Self in dream" ---A.G.

etc.), becomes placid. And this is known in the world as objective happiness. This happiness is momentary, since the result of past deeds that brings about those particular modifications of the mind is unstable. That being so, as much as that mind becomes purified through austerities that dispel *tamas* (indolence), and also through meditation, continence, and faith, so much do particular joys attain excellence and gain in volume in that calm and free mind. And this Upaniṣad will say, "That is verily the source of joy; for one becomes happy by coming in contact with that source of joy. This one, indeed, enlivens people" (Tai. II vii. 1). There is also this other Vedic text to the point, "On a particle of this very Bliss other beings live" (Br. IV. iii. 32). Thus, too, it will be said that bliss increases a hundredfold in every successive stage, in proportion to the perfection of detachment from desires (Tai. II. viii).¹ Thus, speaking from the standpoint of the knowledge of the supreme Brahman, Brahman is certainly the highest as compared with the blissful self that evolves gradually. The Brahman under discussion - which is defined as "truth, knowledge, infinite" (Tai. II. 1), for whose realisation have been introduced the five sheaths, commencing with the one made of food, which is the inmost of them all, and by which they become endowed with their selves (entity) - that *brahma*, Brahman, is *puccham pratiṣṭhā*, the tail that stabilises. That non-dual Brahman, again, which is the farthest limit of all negation

¹ If the increase of bliss were dependent on things alone, the Upaniṣad would not speak of bliss with reference to a man of detachment as it does in fact in Tai. II viii. In reality, bliss becomes higher in proportion as the heart becomes purer, calm, and more freed from objects, whereby it becomes able to reflect the Bliss that is Brahman.

of duality, superimposed by ignorance, is the support of the blissful self, for this self culminates in unity. (It follows, therefore, that) there does exist that One, the non-dual Brahman, as the farthest limit of the negation of duality, called up by ignorance, and this Brahman supports (the duality) like a tail Illustrative of this fact, too, here is a verse:

CHAPTER VI

असन्नेव स भवति । असद्ब्रह्मेति वेद चेत् ।
 अस्ति ब्रह्मेति चेद्वेद ॥ सन्तमेनं ततो विदुरिति ।
 तस्यैष एव शारीर आत्मा । यः पूर्वस्य । अथातोऽनु-
 प्रश्नाः । उताविद्वानमु लोकं प्रेत्य कश्चन गच्छति ३ ।
 आहो विद्वानमु लोकं प्रेत्य कश्चित्समश्नुता ३ उ ।

सोऽकामयत । बहु स्यां प्रजायेयेति । स तपोऽतप्यत ।
 स तपस्तप्त्वा । इदं सर्वमसृजत । यदिद किंच । तत्सृष्ट्वा ।
 तदेवानुप्राविशत् । तदनुप्रविश्य । सच्च त्यच्चाभवत् ।
 निरुक्तं चानिरुक्तं च । निलयनं चानिलयनं च । विज्ञानं
 चाविज्ञानं च । सत्यं चानृतं च सत्यमभवत् । यदिदं किंच ।
 तत्सत्यमित्याचक्षते तदप्येष श्लोको भवति ॥ १ ॥

इति षष्ठोऽनुवाकः ।

1. If anyone knows Brahman as non-existing, he himself becomes non-existent. If anyone knows that Brahman does exist, then they con-

sider him as existing by virtue of that (knowledge).

Of that preceding (blissful) one, this one is the embodied self. Hence hereafter follow these questions: After departing (from here) does any ignorant man go to the other world (or does he not)? Alternatively, does any man of knowledge, after departing (from here) reach the other world (or does he not)?

He (the Self) wished, "Let me be many, let me be born. He undertook a deliberation. Having deliberated, he created all this that exists. That (Brahman), having created (that), entered into that very thing. And having entered there, It became the formed and the formless, the defined and the undefined, the sustaining and the non-sustaining, the sentient and the insentient, the true and the untrue. Truth became all this that there is. They call that Brahman Truth. Pertaining to this, there occurs this verse:

Salī, he; *bhavati*, becomes; *asan eva*, non-existing indeed—like something non-existent; just as a non-entity has no relation with any human objective, similarly, he remains dissociated from any human objective (viz liberation). Who is that? He who, *cet*, perchance; *veda*, knows; *brahma*, Brahman; *asat iti*, as non-existing. As opposed to that, *cet veda*, should he know, that thing; *brahma iti*, as Brahman; which is *asti*, does exist—as the basis of all

diversification, the seed of all activity, though in Itself It is devoid of all distinctions, (then the knowers of Brahman consider him as existing). Why, again, should there be any apprehension of Its non-existence? We say that (this is so, because) Brahman is beyond all empirical relationships. The intellect that is prone to think of existence with regard to everything, possessed of human value and having speech alone as its substance, may assume non-existence with regard to anything that is opposed to this and is transcendental. For instance, it is well known that a pot, comprehended as a thing that man can deal with, is true, while anything of an opposite nature is false. Thus, by a parity of reasoning, there may arise here an apprehension of the non-existence of Brahman. Therefore it is said, "if anyone knows that Brahman does exist". What again, will happen to one who knows Brahman as existing? That is being answered: *Tatuh*, because of that realisation of existence; the knowers of Brahman *viduh*, know; *enam*, this one—who has this realisation; as *santam*, existing—as identified with the Self that is absolutely real, for he has become one with the Brahman that exists. The idea is that he becomes worthy to be known by others, just as Brahman is. Or (the alternative meaning is) if a man thinks, "Brahman is non-existence", then that man, by his want of faith, apprehends the entire righteous path, consisting of the scheme of castes, stages of life, etc., as false (non-existing), inasmuch as that path is not calculated to lead him to Brahman. Hence this atheist is called *asat*, unrighteous—in this world. As opposed to such a man, if anyone knows that "Brahman does exist", then, he, because of his faith, accepts truly the righteous path, comprising the scheme of castes, stages of life, etc., and

leading to the realisation of Brahman. Since this is so, *tatah*, therefore; the good people know this one as *santam*, treading the righteous path. The purport of the sentence is this: Because of this fact, Brahman is to be accepted as existing.

Tasya pūrvasya, of the preceding one of the cognitive one; *eṣaḥ eva*, this one, indeed is; *śārīraḥ ātmā*, the self existing in the body. Which is that? *Yaḥ eṣaḥ*, that which is this one the self made of bliss. As to this self there is no apprehension of non-existence. But Brahman's non-existence may be suspected, since It is devoid of all distinctions, and since It is common to all.¹ Since this is so, *ataḥ*, therefore: *atha*, afterwards; there are these *anupraśnāḥ*: *praśnāḥ* means questions, by the disciple who is the hearer, and *anu*, means after; the questions after what the teacher has spoken are the *anupraśnāḥ*. Brahman, being the cause of space etc., is equally common to the man of knowledge and the ignorant man. Therefore, it may be suspected that the ignorant man, too, reaches Brahman. *Uta* has the meaning of *api*, used in introducing a question. *Canā* is used in the sense of *api* (implying even). *Pretya*, departing, from here; does *kaḥ canā avidvān*, even one who is ignorant? *gacchati*, reach; *anum lokam*, that world – the Self? The question, "Or does he not go?" is implied because of the use of the plural number in *anupraśnāḥ*, questions put after the teacher's instruction. The remaining two questions are with regard

¹ Since Brahman pervades everything, its utility should be perceptible at every turn. But actually this is not so. Hence its existence can be questioned. But *ānandamaya's* (blissful self's) existence is not doubted in this sense. Hence *ānandamaya* is not the subject-matter of the verse quoted above.

to the enlightened man. If the ignorant man fails to reach Brahman, though It is the common source of all, then the attainment of Brahman by an enlightened man may as well be doubted. Hence with regard to him is the question: *Āho vidvān* etc. Does *kah cit*, someone; who is a *vidvān*, enlightened man knower of Brahman; *pietya*, departing, from here; *anum lokam samaśnute*, reach the other world? In the expression *samaśnute u*, the *e* (in *te*) is replaced by *av*, of which the *v* having been dropped out, the *a* becomes lengthened, and the expression becomes *samaśnutā u*. And the letter *u*, occurring later, should be transferred from the bottom and the letter *ta* should be detached from *uta*, occurring earlier, (to form a new word *uta*). Placing this (new) *uta* before the word *āho*, the question is being put: *Uta āho vidvān* etc., or does the enlightened man attain the other world? The other question is: "Or does the enlightened man not attain it, just as the ignorant man does not?" Alternatively, there are only two questions relating to the enlightened and unenlightened men. The plural occurs with reference to other questions that may crop up by implication. From hearing, "If one knows Brahman, as non-existing", and "If one knows that Brahman does exist", the doubt arises as to whether It exists or does not exist. From that, by implication, crops up this first question after the teacher's instruction: "Does Brahman exist or does It not?" The second one is: "Since Brahman is impartial, does the unenlightened man reach It or does he not?" Even if Brahman is equal to all, Its non-attainment, in the case of the enlightened man, can be suspected as much as in the case of the unenlightened one; and hence the third question following on the teacher's instruction, is, "Does

the man of knowledge attain or does he not?" The succeeding text is introduced for answering these questions.

Apropos of this, existence is being first spoken of. It remains to be explained as to what kind of truth is meant in the assertion that was made thus: "Brahman is truth, knowledge, infinite". Hence it is being said: Brahman's truth is affirmed by speaking of Its existence; for it is asserted that the existing is the true (an echo of Ch. VI. ii. 1). Therefore, the very affirmation of existence amounts to an avowal of reality. How is it known that this text bears such an import? From the trend of the words of this text. For the succeeding sentences, such as "They call that Brahman truth" (Tai. II. vi. 1), "(Who, indeed, will inhale and who exhale) if this Bliss (Brahman) be not there in the supreme space (within the heart)?"

Objection: While on this topic, the suspicion arises that Brahman is non-existent. Why? Because whatever exists is perceived as possessed of distinctive attributes, as for instance a pot etc. Whatever is non-existent is not perceived, as for instance the horn of a hare etc. Brahman is not perceived in that way. So Brahman does not exist, since It is not perceived as possessed of distinguishing attributes.

Answer: This is not tenable, since Brahman is the cause of space etc. It is not a fact that Brahman does not exist. Why? Since all the products of Brahman, such as space etc., are perceived. It is a matter of common experience in this world that any thing from which something is produced does exist, as for instance, earth, seed, etc., which are the causes of a pot, a sprout, etc. So Brahman does exist, since It is the cause of space etc. Nor is any effect perceived in this world as having been produced from non-

entity. If such effects as name and form had originated from nonentity, they should not have been perceived since they have no reality. But, as a matter of fact, they are perceived. Hence Brahman exists. Should any effect originate from nonentity, it should remain soaked in unreality even while being perceived. But facts point otherwise. Therefore Brahman exists. Pertaining to this another Vedic text—"How can a thing, that exists, come out of a thing that does not?" (Ch.VI.ii.2) —points out the logical impossibility of the creation of something out of nothing. Therefore, it stands to reason that Brahman is a reality.

Objection: As to that, should Brahman be the cause like earth, seed, etc.. It will be insentient.

Answer: No, since It is capable of desiring. It is not certainly a matter of experience that one who can desire can be insentient. And we have said that Brahman is, indeed omniscient; and so it is but reasonable that It should be capable of desiring.

Objection: Since Brahman has desires, It has wants like ourselves.

Answer: Not so, for It is independent. Such defects as desire cannot impel Brahman to action, just as they do others, by subjecting them to their influence. What then are these (desires of Brahman)? They are by nature truth and knowledge, and they are pure by virtue of their identity with Brahman.¹ Brahman is not impelled to action by them.

¹ "Brahman, as reflected on Māyā, is the material cause of the world, and It is possessed of desires that are the modifications of Māyā. But these modifications are not distinguishable from truth and knowledge, since they are permeated by Consciousness that is not subject to ignorance etc.; and they are pure, since they are untouched by unrighteousness etc. by virtue of their non-distinction from Brahman."

But Brahman ordains them in accordance with the results of actions of the creatures. Therefore, Brahman has independence with regard to desires. So Brahman has no want. And this follows also from the fact of Brahman's non-dependence on any other means. To explain, Brahman has no dependence on accessories etc., as others have whose desires are not identified with themselves but are dependent on such causes as righteousness, and require the extraneous body and senses as their instruments. How do they exist then (in Brahman)? They are non-different from Itself.¹ That fact is stated in *saḥ akāmayata: saḥ, the Self* from which space originated; *akāmayata*, desired. How? *Bahu yān: syām, I shall become, bahu, many.*

Objection: How can the One become many, unless It enters into something else?

The answer is in *prajayeya, "I shall be born"*. The multiplication here does not refer to becoming something extraneous as one does by begetting a son. How then? Through the manifestation of name and form that are latent in Itself. When name and form, existing latently in the Self, get manifested, they evolve into all the states by retaining their intrinsic nature as the self and remaining indistinguishable from Brahman in time and space. Then that evolution of name and form is (what is called) the appearance of Brahman as many. In no other way can one justify either the evolution of Brahman as a plurality, or Its finitude. Its finitude and plurality are just as in the

¹ "Since Māyā, as possessed of the impressions of desires, has identity with Brahman (through superimposition), the desires, that are the modifications of this Māyā, have also identity with Brahman. Therefore, there is no need for a physical body, etc." (for making possible the existence of desires in Brahman, as it is in our case)—A.G.

case of (the delimitation and diversification of) space, where these are the creations of extraneous factors. Hence the Self becomes multiple through these alone. For no such subtle, disconnected and remote thing exists as a non-Self, in the past, present, or future, which is different from the Self and separated from It by time or space. Therefore, it is because of the Self (i.e. Brahman) that name and form have their being under all circumstances, but Brahman does not consist of them. They are said to be essentially Brahman, since they cease to exist when Brahman is eliminated. And as conditioned by these two limiting adjuncts, Brahman enters as a factor into all empirical dealings involving such words as knowledge, knower, and knowable, as also their implications etc.

Having such a desire, *saḥ*, He -that Self; *tapah atapyata*: by *tapah* is meant knowledge since another Vedic text says, "He whose *tapah* consists of knowledge" (Mu. I.i.9), and since the other kind of *tapah* (austerity) is out of place in one in whom all desires remain fulfilled. That kind of *tapah*, knowledge, he *atapyata*, practised. The idea is that the Self reflected on the plan etc., of the creation of the world. *Saḥ tapah taptvā*, He, having reflected thus: *asṛjata*, created; in consonance with such contributory factors as the results of actions of creatures; *idam sarvam*, all this; *yat idam kim ca*, whatever there is, without any exception -this universe, together with space, time, name, and form as He perceived it, and as it is perceived by all beings under all circumstances. Brahman, *sṛjtvā*, having created; *tat*, that, this world. What did He do? The answer is: *tat eva*, into that very world -which had been created; *anuprāviśat*, He entered.

With regard to this, it is a matter for consideration as

to how He entered. Did the Creator enter in the very form of the Creator or in some other form? Which is the reasonable position?

Pseudo-Vedāntist: From the use of the suffix *krvā* (-ing), it follows that the Creator Himself entered.¹

Objection: Is that not illogical, since on the supposition that Brahman is a (material) cause in the same sense as clay is, the effects are non-different from Brahman? For it is the cause that becomes transformed into the effect. Hence it is illogical that, after the production of the effect, the cause should enter over again into the effect as a separate entity, as though it had not done so already.² Apart from being shaped into a pot, the clay has no other entry into the pot, to be sure.

Pseudo-Vedāntist: Just as earth, in the form of dust, enters into a pot (made of earth), similarly, the Self can enter into name and form under some other guise. And this also follows from another Vedic text, "Entering in the form of this individual soul" (Ch. VI. iii. 2).

Objection: This is not proper, since Brahman is one. In the case of earth, however, it is possible to enter into a pot in the form of dust, since lumps of earth are many and have parts, and since powder of earth has places still not penetrated by it. In the case of the Self, however, there cannot possibly be any entry, since It is one at the

¹ Grammar indicates that the finite verb and the verb ending with *krvā* (-ing), in the same sentence, refer to the same nominative.

² The action denoted by the verb having the suffix *krvā* precedes the action of the finite verb. This is not possible here, since the production of the effect and the entry of the cause into it are simultaneous.

same time that It has no dimension and has nowhere to enter into.

Pseudo-Vedāntist: What kind of entry will it be then? The fact of entry has to be upheld anyhow in view of the Upaniṣadic statement: "He entered into that very thing." That being so, Brahman may as well have dimensions, and having dimensions, it is but proper that Brahman's entry into name and form should be like that of a hand into the mouth.

Objection: No, since there is no empty space. For Brahman, which has become transformed into effects, has no other space, apart from that occupied by the effects, consisting of name and form, which is devoid of It and into which It can enter as an individual soul. Should It (i.e. Brahman as the individual soul) enter into the cause (viz Brahman as such),¹ It will cease to be an individual soul, just as a pot ceases to be a pot on entering into (i.e. on being reduced to) earth. Hence the text, "He entered into that very thing", cannot justifiably imply entry into the cause.

Pseudo-Vedāntist: Let (the entry be into) another effect. The text, "He entered into that very thing," means that one effect, viz the individual soul, entered into another effect, viz name and form.

Objection: No, since this involves a contradiction; for a pot does not become merged into another pot. Besides, this runs counter to the Vedic texts that speak of their distinction; so that the Vedic texts that reaffirm the difference of the individual soul from the effect, name and form,

¹ Brahman is the common cause of everything including the individual souls. Now, the individual soul may enter into Brahman which, though transformed as name and form, is still its cause.

will be contradicted. Furthermore, if the soul merges into name and form, liberation will be impossible. It does not stand to reason that one merges into what one tries to get freed from. The freedom of a thief, when captured, does not lie in his entering into the fetters.

Pseudo-Vedāntist. Suppose Brahman is transformed into two parts, external and internal. To explain, that very Brahman, which is the cause, has become diversified as the receptacle in the shape of body etc., and as the thing contained in the shape of the embodied soul.

Objection: No, for entry is possible only for what is outside. Not that a thing that is (naturally) comprised within another is said to have entered there. The entry should be of something that is outside, for the word entry (*praveśa*) is seen to carry that sense, as for instance in the sentence, "He entered into the house after erecting it."

Pseudo-Vedāntist. The entry may be like that of reflections, as of the sun etc., in water.

Objection: No, since Brahman is not limited, and since It has no configuration. A thing that is limited and has features can be reflected on something else which is by nature transparent, as for instance, the sun etc., can be reflected on water; but of the Self there can be no reflection, since It has no form. Moreover, the entry of the Self in the form of a reflection is not possible, since the Self is all-pervasive, being the cause of space etc., and since there is no other substance which can hold the Self's reflection by being placed somewhere unconnected with the Self. This being so, there is no entry whatsoever. Nor do we find any other interpretation possible for the text "He entered into that very thing." And a Vedic text is meant to enlighten us about supersensuous realities. But from this sentence, not even diligent people can

derive any enlightenment. Well, then, this sentence, "Having created it, He entered into that very thing," has to be discarded, since it conveys no meaning.

Vedāntist's answer: No, (it need not be discarded). As the sentence bears a different meaning, why should there be this discussion that is out of context? You should remember the other meaning which is implied in this sentence and which is the subject under discussion here, as stated in the text: "The knower of Brahman attains the highest. . . Brahman is truth, knowledge, and infinite. He who knows (that Brahman) as existing in the intellect (lodged in the supreme space in the heart)" (Tai. II. i. 1.) The knowledge sought to be imparted is of that Brahman, and that is also the topic under discussion. And the effects, beginning with space and ending with the body made of food, have been introduced with a view to inducing knowledge about the nature of that Brahman, and the topic started with is also the knowledge of Brahman. Of these, the self made of the vital force indwells and is different from the self made of food; within that is the self made of mind and the self made of intellect. Thus (by stages) the self has been made to enter into the cavity of the intellect. And there, again, has been presented a distinct self that is made of bliss. After this, through the comprehension of the blissful self which acts as a pointer (to the Bliss Brahman), one has to realise, within this very cavity of the heart, that Self as the culmination of the growth of bliss, which is Brahman (conceived of) as the stabilising tail (of the blissful self), which is the support of all modifications and which is devoid of all modifications. It is with this idea that the entry of the Self is assumed. Inasmuch as Brahman has no distinctive attribute, It cannot be realised anywhere else. It is a matter of experience that

knowledge of a thing is dependent on its association with distinct entities. Just as the knowledge of Rāhu arises from its association with the distinct entities, the sun and the moon,¹ similarly, the association of the Self with the cavity of the internal organ causes the knowledge of Brahman, for the internal organ has proximity (to the Self) and the power of illumination. Just as pot etc., are perceived when in contact with light, so also the Self is perceived when in contact with the light of intellectual conviction.² Hence it suits the context to say that the Self is lodged in the cavity of the intellect which is the cause of Its experience. In the present passage, however, which is a sort of elaboration of that theme, the same idea is repeated in the form, "Having created it, He entered into that very thing." *Tat*, that very Brahman Itself—which is the cause of space; and which *śrīṣṭvā*, after creating, the effect; has entered into the creation, as it were; is perceived, within the cavity of intellect, as possessed of such distinctions as being a seer, a hearer, a thinker, a knower, etc. That, indeed, is Its entry. Hence Brahman, as the cause of this phenomenon, must exist. Accordingly, just because It exists, It should be apprehended as such.

What did It do after entering creation? It *abhavat*, became; *sat ca*, the formed (gross); *tyat ca*, and the formless

¹ Rāhu is a mythological being that has no limb except a head. During eclipses it swallows the sun or the moon, and then alone we are conscious of its existence

² A thing becomes illumined with the light of knowledge, only when the internal organ is in contact with it, but not otherwise. A reflecting medium must be transparent enough to catch an image properly. The intellect alone can reflect the Self best. Again, light removes darkness, though both are insentient, similarly, intellectual conviction removes ignorance, though both are insentient. The intellect cannot reveal Brahman objectively.

(subtle). The formed and the formless, existing in the Self in their state of unmanifested name and form, are manifested by the indwelling Self: and even when manifested and known as the formed and the formless, they still continue to be inseparable from the Self in time and space. Having this fact in view, it is said that the Self became these two. Moreover, the (Self became) *nirukta* *ca anirukta* *ca*, the definable and the undefinable. *Nirukta* is that which is definable as "this is that", by distinguishing it from things of its own class as also from things of other classes, and by associating it with a certain time and space. *Anirukta* is its opposite. *Nirukta* and *anirukta*, too, are but attributes of the formed and the formless. Just as the formed and the formless are the visible and invisible, so also are the *nilayanam ca anilayanam ca*, the sustaining and the non-sustaining. *Nilayana* means a nest, a sustaining thing; and this is an attribute of the formed. *Anilayana*, a non-sustaining thing—is opposed to that (*nilayana*) and is an attribute of the formless. Though invisible, undefinable, and non-sustaining are the attributes of the formless, they relate only to the manifested, for they are referred to in the Vedas as occurring after creation. By *tyat*, the formless, are meant the vital force etc.; and they, again, are inexpressible as well as non-sustaining. So all these adjectives belonging to the formless, relate to the manifested (created). *Vijñānam* is sentient, and *avijñānam* is devoid of sentience, insentient stone etc. It follows from the context that *satyam* is veracity as found in empirical dealings, and not absolute truth. For the absolute truth is only one, which is Brahman. But here the relative truth, as found in the empirical world, is referred to; as for instance, water is said to be true in comparison with the water in a mirage which is false. *Anṛtam*, untruth, is the opposite of that.

What is it that *abhavat*, became, all this? That which is *satyam*, the absolute truth. What is that, again? It is Brahman; for it is Brahman that has been introduced as the topic of discussion by the sentence, "Brahman is truth, knowledge, infinite." The knowers of Brahman *ācaksate* call it *satyam*, truth, because it is the one Brahman, called *satya*, truth; that *abhavat*, became; *yat kim ca idam*, all this that there is—all modifications, without any exception, starting with the visible and the invisible, all of which are the features of the formed and the formless—there being no existence of any of these modifications of name and form apart from that Brahman.

The question that was mooted after the teacher's instruction concerned existence and non-existence. As an answer to this, it has been said that the Self desired, "I shall become many." He created, in accordance with His wish, such products as space etc., which are characterised as the visible and invisible etc., and then He entered into them to appear as many through His acts of seeing, hearing, thinking, and knowing. Hence it is implied thereby that the Self must be accepted as existing, since It is the cause of space etc., exists in this creation, is lodged in the supreme space within the cavity of the heart, and is perceived through Its diverse reflections on the mental concepts.¹

Tat, pertaining to this concerning this idea expressed in the *brāhmaṇa* portion; *eṣaḥ ślokaḥ bhavati*, occurs this verse. Just as in the preceding five chapters occurred verses expressive of the selves, counting from the one

¹ The mental concepts are "I am a doer", "I am an enjoyer", etc.; and these, again, being the different appearances of the light of the Self, reveal the Self in Its conditioned form, and not in Its unconditioned essence.

constituted by food, so, too, is there this verse which indicates through Its effects the existence of the Self that indwells everything.

CHAPTER VII

असद्वा इदमग्र आसीत् । ततो वै सदजायत ।
 तदात्मानः स्वयमकुरोत् । तस्मात्तत्सुकृतमुच्यत इति ।
 यद्वै तत् सुकृतम् । रसो वै सः । रसः ह्येवायं
 लब्ध्वाऽऽनन्दी भवति । को ह्येवान्यात्कः प्राणयात् । यदेष
 आकाश आनन्दो न स्यात् । एष ह्येवाऽऽनन्दयाति । यदा
 ह्येवैष एतस्मिन्नदृश्येऽनात्म्येऽनिरुक्तेऽनिलयनेऽभयं प्रतिष्ठां
 विन्दते । अथ सोऽभयं गतो भवति । यदा ह्येवैष एतस्मि-
 न्नदरमन्तरं कुरुते । अथ तस्य भयं भवति । तत्त्वेव भयं
 विदुषोऽमन्वानस्य । तदप्येष श्लोको भवति ॥ १ ॥
 इति सप्तमोऽनुवाकः ।

1. In the beginning all this was but the un-
 manifested (Brahman). From that emerged the
 manifested. That Brahman created Itself by It-
 self. Therefore It is called the self-creator.

That which is known as the self-creator is
 verily the source of joy; for one becomes happy
 by coming in contact with that source of joy.
 Who, indeed, will inhale, and who will exhale,
 if this Bliss be not there in the supreme space

(within the heart). This one, indeed, enlivens (people). For, whenever an aspirant gets fearlessly established in this unperceivable, bodiless inexpressible, and unsupporting Brahman, he reaches the state of fearlessness. For, whenever the aspirant creates the slightest difference in It, he is smitten with fear. Nevertheless, that very Brahman is a terror to the (so-called) learned man who lacks the unitive outlook.

Illustrative of this is this verse here:

Asat vai idam agre āsīt, in the beginning all this was but the unmanifested (Brahman). By the word *asat* is meant the unconditioned Brahman as contrasted with the state in which distinctions of name and form become manifested. Not that absolute non-existence (the root meaning of the word, *asat*) is meant, for the existent cannot come out of the non-existent. *Idam*, this, standing for the manifested world possessed of the distinctions of name and form; *agre*, in the beginning—before creation; *āsīt asat*, was but Brahman that could be called *asat*. *Tataḥ*, from that—from that unconditioned; *vai*, indeed; *sat* that which is distinguished by manifested name and form; *ajāyata* was born. Is the effect entirely separated from that (cause), just as a son is from the father? The answer is being given negatively: *Tat*, that which is called the unconditioned (Brahman); *svayam*, Itself; *akuruta*, created; *ātmānam*, Itself. Since this is so, *tasmāt*, therefore; *tat*, that Brahman Itself; *ucyate*, is called; *sukṛtam*, selfcreator.¹

¹ *Sukṛtam* (standing for *svakṛta*) should mean self-created. But Śaṅkara takes it as a Vedic licence for self-creator"—A.G.

By virtue of being the cause of everything, Brahman is well recognised in this world as the self-creator. Or, since Brahman Itself created everything by virtue of Its being everything, therefore that very Brahman, which is the cause from the standpoint of virtue as well, is called *sukṛta* (merit).¹ At all events, whether the meaning of *sukṛta* be "merit" or it be the other one (self-creator) a cause which is related to the fruit etc. is familiarly known in the world as *sukṛta*. That universal recognition is possible only if there is an eternal consciousness acting as the cause. Hence, from the universal fact of the admission of *sukṛta*, it follows that Brahman exists.

It exists because of this further reason. Of which reason? Since It is the source of joy. How is Brahman well known as the source of joy? The answer is: *Yat vai tat sukṛtam*, that which is known as the self-creator; *rasaḥ vai saḥ*, is verily the *rasaḥ* (a source of joy). *Rasaḥ* stands for anything that is a means for satisfaction, i.e. a source of joy, such as sweet and sour things which are well known to be so in the world. *Hi*, since, *rasam labdhvā*, begetting a thing of joy; *ayam bhavati*, one becomes, *ānandī*, happy. A nonentity is not seen in this world to be a cause of happiness. Inasmuch as those Brāhmaṇas (who have realised Brahman) are seen to be as happy as one is from obtaining an external source of joy—though, in fact, they do not take help of any external means of happiness, make no effort, and cherish no desire—it follows, as a matter of course, that Brahman is the source of their joy. Hence there does exist that Brahman which is full of joy² and is the spring of their happiness.

¹ *Sukṛta* (lit. well done) means merit, which is one of the causes of creation.

² Taking the expression, *rasavat*, to mean "like a juice, i.e. a sweet thing" (instead of "full of joy"), the concluding portion may be

Brahman exists because of this additional reason. Of which? Since such actions as exhaling are seen. This body, too, of a living being, exhales through that function of the vital force called *prāṇa* and inhales through that other called *apāna*. Thus are the body and senses, in their association, seen to perform their vital and organic functions. This achievement of unity for serving a common purpose is not possible unless there is an intelligence which is not a part of this conglomeration. For such is not the case anywhere else.¹ That fact is being stated: *yat, if; eṣaḥ ānandaḥ, this Bliss; na syāt, should not be there; ākāṣe, in the (supreme) space—that is lodged in the cavity of the heart; then in this world, kaḥ hi eva, who, indeed; anyāt, should inhale—should perform the function of apāna; or kaḥ prāṇyāt, who should exhale—should perform the function of prāṇa? Therefore that Brahman exists. People's happiness is caused by that very entity for whose purpose there are such activities of the body and senses, as exhaling etc., How? Eṣaḥ hi eva, this one—this supreme Self—indeed; ānandayāti (is the same as ānandayati), enlivens—people, in accordance with their merit. The idea is this: That very Self, which is Bliss by nature, is thought of as limited and diversified by people because of their ignorance.*

That Brahman exists as the cause of fear and fearlessness of the men of ignorance and knowledge (respectively). For fearlessness comes as a result of taking refuge in something that exists, whereas fear cannot cease by resorting to something translated thus: "Brahman, which is the spring of their happiness just as a sweet thing is."

¹ Building materials themselves, for instance, do not erect a structure. A house stands there because somebody built it and yet did not form a part of it.

thing that does not exist. How does Brahman become the cause of fearlessness? The answer is: *Hī*, since; *yadā eva*, at the very time that *esaḥ*, this one—an aspirant; *etasmin*, in this one—in Brahman. (Brahman) of what kind? *Adṛśye*: *dṛśya* is anything that is meant to be seen, that is to say, any modification; for a modification is meant to be perceived; what is not a *dṛśya* is *adrśya*, i.e. changeless. In this *adrśye*, changeless, that which is not an object of cognition. *Anātmye*, in the unembodied. Since It is imperceptible, It is incorporeal. Since It is incorporeal, It is *aniruktam*, inexpressible. Anything possessed of attributes can alone be expressed in words, and anything possessed of attributes is mutable, whereas Brahman is changeless, It being the source of all modifications. Hence, It is inexpressible. That being so, It is *anilayanam*: *nīlayana* is a nest, refuge; *anilayana* is the opposite of that; It is not the sustainer. The meaning of the sentence is: (When) in that entity which is this changeless, unembodied, inexpressible, unsustaining Brahman, (the aspirant) *vindate*, gets; *pratiṣṭhām*, stability, Self-absorption; *abhayam*, in a fearless way. The word, *abhayam* (fearlessly), is used adverbially (to modify the verb *vindate*, gets); or it has to be changed in gender to *abhayām* (fearless) to qualify the noun (*pratiṣṭhām*, stability). (When the aspirant gets this fearless stability in Brahman) *atha*, then; since he does not see then diversity that is the creation of ignorance and is the cause of fear, therefore, *saḥ*, he; *abhayam gataḥ bhavati*, becomes established in fearlessness. When he becomes established in his true nature, then he does not see anything else, does not hear anything else, does not know anything else. Someone gets afraid of someone else, but it is not logical that the Self should be afraid of the Self. Hence the Self is the source of

fearlessness for the Self. There are Brāhmaṇas to be found who are free of fear from all quarters. This would be unjustifiable if Brahman, the protector from fear were not there, at the same time that the causes of fear persisted. Therefore, from the fact of noticing their fearlessness, it follows that Brahman exists as the source of that intrepidity. When does that aspirant reach fearlessness? When he does not perceive anything else and does not create any *antaram*, difference, in the Self, then he attains fearlessness. This is the idea.

On the contrary, *hi*, since; *yadā*, when, in the state of ignorance; *eṣaḥ*, this one, the ignorant man; sees in this Self something, presented by nescience, like the vision of a second moon seen by a man suffering from the eye-disease called *timira*: and *etasmin*, in this, in Brahman; *kurute*, he creates; *ut aram*, even a slight; *antaram*, hole, difference—since the perception of difference is the cause of fear,¹ it means that even if he sees the slightest difference—*atha*, then, because of that seeing of difference; *tasya*, for that soul that perceives difference; *bhayaṃ bhavati*, fear crops up. So the Self alone is the cause of fear for the ignorant man himself. The Upa- niṣad states that very fact here: *Tu*, nevertheless; *tat eva*, that very Brahman; is *bhayaṃ*, a terror; *viduṣaḥ*, to the man of (apparent) learning, who perceives difference: that very Brahman, when perceived through a sense of duality and called God, becomes a terror for the (apparently) learned man who knows thus, “God is different from me, and I am a worldly creature different from God,” and who creates the slightest difference—(a terror) *amanvānasya*, for that un- thinking (learned) man, who does not view from the standpoint of unity. Accordingly, the man who does not realise

¹ Another reading is *bhedadarśanam eva hi antarakarṇam*—“the seeing of difference itself is the creator of difference”.

the entity of the Self as one and undifferentiated is really unenlightened, though he may be learned. Anyone who considers oneself destructible becomes struck with fear at the very sight of a destructive agency. A destroyer (in the ultimate analysis) can be so, only if it is itself indestructible.¹ Now, if there be no cause of destruction, there should be no such fear in the destructible as issues from a perception of a destroyer. The whole world, however, is seen to be stricken with fear. Therefore, from the perceived fact of fear in the world, it follows that there does exist a terrifying thing which is an indestructible agency of destruction, because of which the world shudders.

Expressive of this idea, too, there is this verse:

CHAPTER VIII

भीषाऽस्माद्वातः पवते । भीषोदेति सूर्यः ।
 भीषाऽस्मादग्निश्चेन्द्रश्च । मृत्युर्धावति पञ्चम इति ।
 सैषाऽऽनन्दस्य मीमांसा भवति । युवा स्यात्साधु-
 युवाऽध्यायकः । आशिष्ठो दृढिष्ठो बलिष्ठः । तस्येयं पृथिवी
 सर्वा वित्तस्य पूर्णा स्यात् । स एको मानुष आनन्दः । ते
 ये शतं मानुषा आनन्दाः ॥ १ ॥ स एको मनुष्यगन्धर्वाणा-
 मानन्दाः । श्रोत्रियस्य चाकामहतस्य । ते ये शतं मनुष्य-
 गन्धर्वाणामानन्दाः । स एको देवगन्धर्वाणामानन्दः ।

¹ The ultimate cause of fear must itself be indestructible, since a contrary supposition will lead to an infinite regress. And such an eternal agent is Brahman.

श्रोत्रियस्य चाकामहतस्य । ते ये शतं देवगन्धर्वाणामानन्दाः ।
 स एकः पितॄणां चिरलोकलोकानामानन्दः । श्रोत्रियस्य
 चाकामहतस्य । ते ये शतं पितॄणां चिरलोकलोकानामा-
 नन्दाः । स एक आजानजानां देवानामानन्दः ॥ २ ॥
 श्रोत्रियस्य चाकामहतस्य । ते ये शतमाजानजानां देवाना-
 मानन्दाः । स एकः कर्मदेवानां देवानामानन्दः । ये कर्मणा
 देवानपियन्ति । श्रोत्रियस्य चाकामहतस्य । ते ये शतं
 कर्मदेवानां देवानामानन्दाः । स एको देवानामानन्दः ।
 श्रोत्रियस्य चाकामहतस्य । ते ये शतं देवानामानन्दाः ।
 स एक इन्द्रस्याऽऽनन्दः ॥ ३ ॥ श्रोत्रियस्य चाकामहतस्य ।
 ते ये शतमिन्द्रस्याऽऽनन्दाः । स एको बृहस्पतेरानन्दः ।
 श्रोत्रियस्य चाकामहतस्य । ते ये शतं बृहस्पतेरानन्दाः ।
 स एकः प्रजापतेरानन्दः । श्रोत्रियस्य चाकामहतस्य । ते ये
 शतं प्रजापतेरानन्दाः । स एको ब्रह्मण आनन्दः । श्रोत्रि-
 यस्य चाकामहतस्य ॥ ४ ॥

1-4. Out of His fear the Wind blows. Out of fear the Sun rises. Out of His fear runs Fire, as also Indra, and Death, the fifth.

This, then, is an evaluation of that Bliss: Suppose there is a young man—in the prime of life, good, learned, most expeditious, most strongly built, and most energetic. Suppose there

lies this earth for him filled with wealth. This will be one unit of human joy.¹ If this human joy be multiplied a hundred times, it is one joy of the man-Gandharvas, and so also of a follower of the Vedas unaffected by desires. If this joy of the man-Gandharvas be multiplied a hundred times, it is one joy of the divine-Gandharvas, and so also of a follower of the Vedas unaffected by desire. If the joy of the divine-Gandharvas be increased a hundredfold, it is one joy of the manes whose world is everlasting, and so of a follower of the Vedas untouched by desire. If the joy of the manes that dwell in the everlasting world be increased a hundredfold, it is one joy of those that are born as gods in heaven, and so of a follower of the Vedas untouched by desire. If the joy of those that are born as gods in heaven be multiplied a hundredfold, it is one joy of the gods called the Karma-Devas, who reach the gods through Vedic rites, and so of a follower of the Vedas unaffected by desire. If the joy of the gods, called the Karma-Devas, be multiplied a hundredfold, it is one joy of the gods, and so of a follower of the Vedas untarnished by desire. If the joy of the gods be increased a hundred times, it is one joy of Indra, and so of a

¹ A unit of measurement for the estimation of Bliss.

follower of the Vedas untouched by desire. If the joy of Indra be multiplied a hundredfold, it is one joy of Bṛhaspati and so of a follower of the Vedas unaffected by desire. If the joy of Bṛhaspati be increased a hundred times, it is one joy of Virāt, and so of a follower of the Vedas untarnished by desire. If the joy of Virāt be multiplied a hundred times, it is one joy of Hiraṇyagarbha, and so is it of the follower of the Vedas unsullied by desire.

Bhīṣā, through fear; *asmāt*, of Him; *vātaḥ pavate*, (the god of) Wind blows. *Bhīṣā*, through fear; *udeti*, rises; *sūryaḥ*, the Sun. *Bhīṣā asmāt*, through fear of Him; *dhāvati*, runs; *agnih, ca Indraḥ ca*, Fire as also Indra; (and) *mṛtyuḥ pañca-mah*, Death, the fifth. Since Wind etc., greatly adorable and lordly though themselves they are, engage regularly in such highly strenuous works as blowing, it is reasonable to conclude that this is possible on the supposition of a ruler because of whom they have their disciplined activity. Since they engage in their duties out of fear of this Brahman, just as servants do out of fear of a king, therefore, Brahman does exist as their ruler as a terrifying entity.

And that Brahman, the source of fear, is Bliss. *Eṣā bhavati*, this is; a *mīmāṃsā*, evaluation; *ānandasya*, of the Bliss, that is the aforesaid Brahman. What is there to be assessed about the Bliss? The answer is: The Bliss can be studied thus from this point of view; whether It arises from the contact of subject and object, as is the case with worldly bliss, or whether It is natural. As to that, the worldly bliss attains excellence owing to a concurrence of external and internal means. The bliss, thus attained, is being instanced

here as an approach to the Bliss that is Brahman; for through this familiar bliss can be approached the Bliss that is comprehended by an intellect, free from objective thought. Even worldly bliss is a particle of the Bliss that is Brahman, which becomes transmuted into impermanent worldly bliss, consequent on knowledge becoming covered up by ignorance, and ignorance becoming successively thicker according as the individuals, starting with Hiraṇyagarbha, think diversely of this Bliss under the impulsion of the result of their past actions and in conformity with their past contemplations. Again, according as ignorance and desire become attenuated, that very Bliss appears to the vision of one, who is learned, versed in the Vedas, and free from passion, as rising higher and higher a hundredfold each time, in the planes starting with that of the man-Gandharvas, till the bliss of Hiraṇyagarbha is reached. But when the division of subject and object is eliminated by enlightenment, there is only the all-pervading and intrinsic Bliss that is one without a second. In order to impart this idea, the text says: *yuvā syāt* etc.

Yuvā, a youth—one in the prime of life. *Sādhu yuvā* is an adjective of youth, and means one who is both young and good. A youth may be bad, and a good man may not be young. Hence the specification, "Suppose there is a young man who is a good youth." *Adhvāyakaḥ*, is one who has studied the Vedas. *Āśiṣṭhaḥ*, the best ruler or the quickest in action. *Drdhiṣṭhaḥ*, most hardy (i.e. having all the senses intact). *Baliṣṭhaḥ*, strongest. (Suppose the youth is) blessed with such physical accessories. (And let there be) *tasya*, for him, *iyam sarvā pṛthivī*, this whole earth; *pūrṇā* filled, enriched; *vittasya*, (should rather be *vittena*), with wealth—with seen objects that are meant for enjoyment, and unseen objects that follow from *karma*. The idea is that he is a king ruling

over the earth. *Saḥ*, the joy that he has; is *ekaḥ mānuṣaḥ ānandaḥ* a single human bliss—a unit of the highest human bliss. *Te ye śatam mānuṣāḥ ānandāḥ*, that human bliss multiplied a hundredfold; is *saḥ ekaḥ manuṣya-gandharvāṇām ānandaḥ*, a unit of the bliss of the man-Gandharvas. The happiness of man-Gandharvas becomes a hundred times better than that of man. Man-Gandharvas are those human beings who become Gandharvas through some special *karmas* and meditations. As they are possessed of the power of disappearance etc., being endowed with subtle bodies and senses, so obstacles in their way are few, and they have the power to resist obstacles and have a wealth of accessories. Therefore, a man-Gandharva will have mental tranquillity inasmuch as he remains unopposed and can repel opposition. From the progress of that tranquillity follows a progressive expression of Bliss. Thus it stands to reason that in proportion to the betterment of tranquillity on the succeeding planes as compared with that on the preceding ones, the excellence of bliss also progresses a hundredfold. The man free from desire has not been taken into consideration at the initial stage with a view to showing that the bliss of one, who observes Vedic duties and is untouched by desire for the enjoyment of human objects, is a hundred times higher than the human bliss and is comparable to that of a man-Gandharva. Devotion to Vedic duties and sinlessness (Br. IV. iii. 33) are implied by the two terms “learned” and “young and good”. These two qualities are, indeed, common to all the planes. But desirelessness has been treated distinctively in order to demonstrate the superiority and inferiority of bliss independently of the superiority and inferiority of objects. Thus since happiness is seen to improve a hundredfold proportionately with the advance of desirelessness, it is treated here

with a view to enjoining dispassionateness as a means for the attainment of supreme Bliss. The rest has been already explained.

Deva-Gandharvāḥ, divine-Gandharvas, are so from their birth. The term *cirālokalokānām*, of those whose world lasts for ever, is an adjective of *pitṛṇām*, of the manes, the manes being so qualified since their world lasts (relatively) for ever. *Ājāna* is the world of the gods; those who are born there—born in the regions of gods as a result of special rites prescribed by the *Smṛtis*—are the *Ājānaja* gods. The *karmadevāḥ* are those who reach the gods by mere Vedic *karma*, such as Agnihotra etc. The *devāḥ*, gods, are those who are thirty-three in number¹ and receive oblations. Indra is their lord. His preceptor is Bṛhaspati. Prajāpati is Virāṭ who has the three worlds (earth, heaven, and intermediate space) as his body.² Brahmā pervades the whole universe as the cosmic and individual persons. This Brahmā is Hiranyagarbha in whom all these varieties of bliss become unified, and in whom reside virtue as the cause of that bliss, consciousness of that bliss, and dispassionateness of the highest order. This bliss of His is directly perceived everywhere by one who is versed in the Vedas, free from sin, and unsullied by desire. Hence it is inferred that these three qualities are the means (for the attainment of Bliss). Of these, Vedic learning and sinlessness are invariable (in all the planes), whereas desirelessness improves; and hence the last is known to be its best means. The Bliss of Brahman that is perceivable on the perfection of desirelessness and is also open to the direct vision of one who follows the Vedas, that supreme Bliss, a particle or a bit of which forms the bliss of this Brahmā, in accordance with the

¹ Eight Vasus, eleven Rudras, twelve Ādityas, Indra, and Prajāpati.

² Commentary on Br. III. iii. 2.

Vedic text, "On a particle of this very Bliss other beings live" (Br. IV. iii. 32), is that very Bliss from which all this bliss has separated like spray from the sea and into which it gets united again. It is the natural supreme Bliss, and in It there is no bifurcation of the joy and the enjoyer, since It is non-dual.

The result of this evaluation is being concluded here:

स यश्चायं पुरुषे । यश्चासावादित्ये । स एकः ।
 स य एवंवित् । अस्माल्लोकात्प्रेत्य । एतमन्नमयमात्मान-
 मुपसंक्रामति । एतं प्राणमयमात्मानमुपसंक्रामति । एतं
 मनोमयमात्मानमुपसंक्रामति । एतं विज्ञानमयमात्मानमुप-
 संक्रामति । एतमानन्दमयमात्मानमुपसंक्रामति । तदप्येष
 श्लोको भवति ॥ ५ ॥ इत्यष्टमोऽनुवाकः ॥

5. He that is here in the human person, and He that is there in the sun, are one. He who knows thus attains, after desisting from this world, this self made of food, attains this self made of vital force, attains this self made of mind, attains this self made of intelligence, attains this self made of bliss.

Expressive of this there occurs this verse:

He who, after projecting all the creation—beginning with space and ending with the body made of the essence of food—entered into it and is lodged in the supreme space within the cavity of the heart, is here indicated by the words *saḥ yaḥ*, He who. Who is He? *Ayam puruṣe yaḥ ca asau āditye*, He is in the human person, and He is the

same as resides in the sun. The supreme Bliss, that has been indicated as directly perceptible to the follower of the Vedas, and on a particle of which subsist all the beings, worthy of joy—counting from Brahmā—that supreme Bliss is being described as “He is the same as resides in the sun”. He is one in the same sense that the space in a pot, standing separately, is one with space (as such).

Objection: In the matter of describing that Bliss, the corporeal soul should not be referred to in general terms by saying, “He that is in the human person”, rather it is proper to indicate that soul by saying, “And He that is in the right eye” (Br.II.iii.5, IV.ii.2, V.v.2.), that being better known.

Answer: No, for the discussion is here about the supreme Self.¹ The supreme Self certainly forms the subject matter here in the texts, “In the changeless, bodiless” (Tai.II.viii), “Out of His fear the Wind blows” (II.viii.1), “This, then, is an evaluation of that Bliss” (*ibid*). It is not reasonable to refer suddenly to something out of context. And the subject sought to be taught is the knowledge of the supreme Self.² Therefore the supreme Self is referred to in the expression, *sah ekah*, He is one.

Objection: Is not the topic started with an estima-

¹ The other text, quoted above, refers to a meditation based on the identity of the individual soul and Hiraṇyagarbha, and not the identity, as such, of the individual self and the supreme Self.

² “The same unsurpassing Bliss of the conscious Reality that is reflected on a superior medium, viz the sun, is also reflected on an inferior medium, viz a human being possessing head, hands, etc. Thus, from the standpoint of supreme Bliss, the two distinct entities are on a par, and intrinsically they are the same. This is what is taught.”

tion of Bliss? The result of that estimation, too, has to be concluded by saying: "The Bliss that is non-different and intrinsic, and not a product of the contact between the subject and the object, is the supreme Self."

Answer: It is not quite in line with that to indicate (that Self) by way of eliminating the distinctions, pertaining to different loci, that we come across here in the sentence, "He that is in the human person and that is in the sun is the same"?

Objection: Even so, is it not useless to single out the sun?

Answer: No, it is not useless, because it is meant for obviating (notions of) superiority and inferiority. In the sun is found the highest perfection of duality, consisting of the formed and the formless. If, from the standpoint of the supreme Bliss, that perfection can be placed on the same footing with the human personality, after eliminating the peculiarities of the latter, there will remain no superiority or inferiority for one who attains that goal; and hence it becomes reasonable to say that "he attains a state of fearlessness" (Tai.II.vii).

The question as to whether Brahman exists or not, raised after the teacher's instruction, has been dealt with. One of these post-questions has been dismissed by saying that from the reasonings that justify the phenomena of creation, acquisition of joy, functioning of life, reaching a state of fearlessness, and experience of fear, it follows that Brahman does exist as the cause of those space etc. There are two other post-questions relating to the attainment or non-attainment of Brahman by the enlightened man and the unenlightened man. Of these, the last post-question is, "Does the enlightened man attain or does he

not?" In order to settle this, it is being said (as below). The middle post-question is settled by the answer to the last one; and hence no (separate) effort is made for solving it.

Saḥ yah, anyone that; is *evam̐vit*, a knower of this kind; who, having discarded all ideas of superiority and inferiority, knows Brahman, described earlier, in this manner, "I am the non-dual truth, knowledge, infinity"; for the word *evam̐*, thus, is used for alluding to some topic already mooted. What does he become? The totality of things seen and unseen is indicated by the term "this world"; he, *pretya*, (lit. after departing), desisting, becoming indifferent; *asmāt lokāt*, from this world—as described; *upasaṁkrāmati*, attains; *etam annamayam ātmānam*, this body built up by food, as described already. The idea is that he does not perceive the totality of objects as different from his body built up by food; he sees all the gross elements as identical with his body built up by food.¹ Then he attains *etam prāṇamayam ātmānam*, this body constituted by the vital force, that is itself undivided and is inside the (cosmic) body built up by all the food. Then he attains this body made of mind, this body made of intelligence,² this body made of bliss. Then he reaches the state of fearlessness in the changeless, bodiless, inexpressible, and unsupported (Tai.II.vii).

With regard to that, this has got to be considered:

¹ He attains identity with Virāt, the gross Cosmic Person, whose body is constituted by the three worlds—earth, heaven, and intermediate space.

² Hiranyagarbha, conceived of as possessing the powers of action, will, and knowledge, has a subtle body constituted by the totality of vital, mental, and intellectual energy.

What is he who knows thus, and how does he attain? Is the attainer different from or the same as the supreme Self? What follows from that? Should the attainer be different, the conclusion will run counter to such Vedic texts as "Having created that, He entered into that very thing" (Tai. II.vi), "(One who worships another god thinking), 'He is one, and I am another', he does not know" (Br. I.iv.10), "One without a second" (Ch. VI.ii.1), "Thou art that" (Ch. VI. viii-xvi). On the contrary, if the Self Itself attains the blissful self, we shall be faced with the unsoundness of the same entity being both subject and object; moreover, the supreme Self will either be reduced to a transmigratory soul or a nonentity.

Objection: The discussion is useless if the fault that arises on either assumption is unavoidable. On the other hand, if either of the assumptions is free from defect, or if a third flawless assumption is so, then that alone is the meaning of the scripture, so that the discussion is uncalled for.

Answer: No, for the discussion is meant for its ascertainment. True it is that the accruing defect cannot be avoided by accepting either of the two positions, and that the discussion becomes useless if a third flawless position is ascertained; but that third alternative has not been determined. Hence this consideration is fruitful as it is calculated to lead to that ascertainment.

Objection: True it is that an investigation is fruitful so far as it culminates in the fixing of the meaning of a scripture. But in your case, you will simply cogitate without ever hitting upon any meaning.

Answer: Is it your view that there can occur any Vedic sentence whose meaning need not be determined?

Objection: No.

Counter objection: How then (is the discussion useless)?

Objection: Because there are many opponents. You are a monist, since you follow the Vedic ideas, while the dualists are many who are outside the Vedic pale and who are opposed to you. Therefore I apprehend that you will not be able to determine.

Answer: This itself is a blessing for me that you brand me as sworn to monism and faced by many who are wedded to plurality. Therefore I shall conquer all; and so I begin the discussion.

The attainer must be the supreme Self alone, inasmuch as merger into that state is the idea implied. What is sought to be imparted here in the text, "The knower of Brahman attains the highest" (Tai.II.i), is becoming the supreme Self through Its knowledge. One thing cannot surely become something else.

Objection: Is it not also unsound to say that the individual soul becomes the supreme Self?

Answer: No, for the idea conveyed is that of removal of the identity (with the body etc.) created by ignorance. The attainment of one's own Self through the knowledge of Brahman, that is taught, is meant to imply the elimination of the distinct selves—such as the food-self, the products of nescience—which are really non-Selves, superimposed as Selves.

Objection: How is such a meaning understood?

Answer: Because knowledge alone is prescribed. The effect of knowledge is seen to be the eradication of ignorance; and here that knowledge alone is prescribed as the means for the attainment of the Self.

Objection: May not that be like the communicating of information about a path? So the mere prescription of knowledge as a means does not amount to showing that the supreme Self is the Self of the attainer.

Counter Objection: Why?

Opponent: For it is seen that, in the matter of reaching a different place, the information about the way is communicated. Not that the village itself can be the goer.¹

Answer: Not so, for the analogy is inept.² In the illustration cited, the information imparted is not of the village, but it is of the path, leading to one's arrival there. But in this case, no information about any other means apart from the knowledge of Brahman is imparted.

Objection: The knowledge of Brahman, as depending on such means as rites etc., enjoined earlier, is taught as a means for the attainment of the highest.

Answer: No, for this was refuted earlier by saying "Since liberation is eternal" etc.³ And the text, "Having created that, He entered into that very thing" (Tai.II.vi), shows that the Self, immanent in creation, is identical with the Supreme. And this follows from the logic of attaining the state of fearlessness. For if the man of enlighten-

¹ The traveller is not the village, though the knowledge of the path to the village is valuable to him. Similarly, the individual is not Brahman, though the instruction about knowledge of Brahman is valuable; for by practising it he can reach Brahman.

² One does not say, "You are the village", when talking about the path leading to it, whereas the identity of the two is taught here explicitly.

³ Brahman is identical with liberation, and as such, It is not to be attained. But we can know Brahman in the sense that our ignorance about It can be removed.

ment sees nothing as different from his own Self, then the statement, "He gets established in that state of fearlessness", becomes appropriate, since (for him) nothing exists as a separate entity which can cause fear. Moreover, if duality is a creation of nescience, then only is it reasonable to show its dissipation through knowledge; for (the proof of) the non-existence of a second moon consists in its not being seen by one whose eyes are not affected by the disease called *timira*.

Objection: But non-perception of duality is not thus a matter of experience.

Answer: No, for duality is not perceived by those who are deeply absorbed in the Self during sleep (or *samādhi*).

Objection: The non-perception of duality in deep sleep is comparable to the non-perception by one who is preoccupied with something else.

Answer: Not so, for then (i.e. in sleep and *samādhi*) there is non-perception of everything (so that there can be no preoccupation with anything).

Objection: Duality has existence because of its perception in the dream and waking states.

Answer: No, for the dream and waking states are creations of ignorance. The perception of duality that occurs in the dream and waking states is the result of ignorance, because it ceases on the cessation of ignorance.

Objection: The non-perception (of duality) in sleep is also a result of ignorance.

Answer: No, for it is natural. The natural state of a substance is immutable, for it exists in its own right. Mutability is not its real nature, since that depends on other factors. The real condition of a substance cannot

be dependent on external agencies. Any peculiarity that arises in an existing substance is a result of external agencies, and a peculiarity implies a change. The perceptions occurring in the dream and waking states are but modal expressions, for the true state of a thing is that which exists in its own right, and the unreal state is that which depends on others, inasmuch as it ceases with the cessation of others. Hence, unlike what happens in the dream and waking states, no modality occurs in deep sleep, for the non-perception in the latter state is natural.

For those, however, for whom God is different from the Self, and creation, too, is distinct, there is no elimination of fear; for fear is caused by something external; and neither can an existent be annihilated, nor can a non-existent emerge into being.

Objection: Something external becomes the source of fear when it is supplemented by others.¹

Answer: That, too, stands on an equal footing. For that permanent or impermanent agency,² which helps demerit etc., and whose help that something else takes to become the cause of fear for others, cannot have self-effacement by the very fact of what that agency is assumed to be;³ or should that have self extinction, the real and

¹ God, in association with merits and demerits of creatures, causes fear. But the liberated man has no fear of God since he is free from merit etc.

² *Adṛṣṭa*, unseen result, whose help God takes.

³ This above view cannot be advanced either by the Sāṃkhya or the Naiyāyika; for the former do not believe that an existing demerit can be wholly annihilated; and the latter do not say that so long as demerit persists, its effect will be totally absent. *Adṛṣṭa* also creates the same difficulty.

the unreal will become mutually convertible, so that nobody will have any faith in anything. From the standpoint of non-duality, however, that objection has no bearing, since the world is a superimposition through ignorance. For a second moon, seen by a man afflicted by the eye-disease, called *timira*, does not attain any reality, nor is it annihilated.

Objection: Knowledge and ignorance are qualities of the Self.¹

Answer: Not so, for they are perceived. Discrimination (i.e. knowledge) and non-discrimination (i.e. ignorance) are directly perceived, like colour etc., as attributes of the mind. Not that colour, perceived as an object, can be an attribute of the perceiver. And ignorance is ascertained by such forms of its perception as, "I am ignorant", "My knowledge is indistinct". Similarly, the difference of knowledge (from the Self) is perceived, and the enlightened people communicate the knowledge of the Self to others; and so, too, others grasp it. Accordingly, knowledge and ignorance are to be ranked with name and form; they are not attributes of the Self,² in accordance with another Vedic text, "(That which is called Space) brings about the manifestation of name and form. That in which these two

¹ If knowledge removes ignorance, then both of them must be qualities of the soul, and the soul must be subject to mutation by their emergence or disappearance.

² "The beginningless and inscrutable nescience, dependent on pure Consciousness for its existence, gets transformed as the internal organ. That organ, again, gets modified in the form of real knowledge and error in accordance with the preponderance of its *sāttvika* or *tāmasika* qualities. The substance called Consciousness, when reflected on such an organ, is either called enlightened or deluded. In reality Consciousness is neither enlightened nor unenlightened."—A.G.

exist is Brahman" (Ch. VIII.xiv.1). And those name and form are imagined to exist in Brahman like night and day in the sun, though in reality they are not there.

Objection: If (the Self and Brahman are) non-different then there arises the absurdity of the same entity becoming the subject and object in the text, "He attains that blissful Self" (Tai.II.viii 5).

Answer: Not so, for the attainment consists in mere enlightenment. The reaching taught here is not like that by a leech. How then? The text treating of attainment means merely realisation.¹

Objection: Attainment in the literal sense is meant here by the expression *upasaṅkrāmati*.

Answer: Not so, for this is not seen in the case of the body made of food; for in the case of one reaching the (cosmic) food-body (i.e. Virāṭ), one is not seen to reach out from this external world like a leech or in any other manner.

Objection: (Attainment is possible in the sense that) the mental body or the intellectual body, when it has gone out (in dream etc.), can return to acquire its own natural state again.

Answer: No, for there can be no action in one's own Self. (Moreover), the topic raised (by you) was that somebody, different from the food-body reaches the food-body; to say now that either the mental body

¹ "The blissful self is not the supreme Self, nor is there any *saṅkramaṇa* in the sense of entry. But what is meant here is the transcendence or negation of the blissful self, accepted falsely as the Self, through the realisation of Brahman, not as an object, but as identical with the Self."—A.G.

or the intellectual body reaches its own state involves a contradiction. Similarly, the returning to its own state by the blissful self is not the meaning of *sañkramaṇa*.¹

Therefore *sañkramaṇa* does not mean acquisition, nor does it mean the reaching of one of the five sheaths beginning with the food-body, by one among themselves. As a last resort, *sañkramaṇa* can reasonably consist only in realisation by some entity, other than the selves beginning with the food-self and ending with the blissful self. If *sañkramaṇa* means realisation alone, then through that *sañkramaṇa* i.e. through the rise of knowledge about the difference of the Self (from the non-Self) is removed the error of thinking of the non-Selves like the food-body as the Self, which error arises from the association of the Self with the cavity of the heart; for the Self, while residing within the blissful self, really permeates everything, since It entered into creation after projecting all things counted from space to food. The word *sañkramaṇa* is used figuratively with regard to this eradication of error created by ignorance, for in no other way can the attainment of the all-pervading Self be justified. Moreover, there is no other thing (that can reach the Self). Besides, the attainment cannot be of oneself; for a leech does not reach itself. Hence it is with a view to realising the Self, which has been defined above in the text, "Brahman is truth, knowledge, infinity" (Tai.II.i.1), that becoming many, entering into creation, acquisition of bliss,

¹ The opponent might say that the *sañkramaṇa*, in the case of the blissful self, means the attainment of its natural composure after a sorrowful experience. But this also is open to the objection that this runs counter to the opponent's line of argument, and the existence in one's own nature is not an acquisition in the real sense.

fearlessness, attainment, etc. have been attributed to Brahman, conceived of as the basis of all empirical dealings; but with regard to the really transcendental Brahman, beyond all conditions, there can be no such ascription.

Tat api, with regard to this also—with regard to the fact that by reaching, i.e. realising, the unconditioned Self by stages in this way, one ceases to have any fear from anywhere, and one gets established in the state that is fearlessness—*esaḥ ślokaḥ bhavati*, there occurs this verse. This verse stands for expressing briefly the meaning of the whole topic, the gist of this Part called the *Ānandavallī*, the Part *On Bliss*.

CHAPTER IX

यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते । अप्राप्य मनसा सह ।
 आनन्दं ब्रह्मणो विद्वान् । न बिभेति कुतश्चनेति ।
 एतः ह वाव न तपति । किमहः साधु नाकरवम् ।
 किमहं पापमकरवमिति । स य एवं विद्वानेते आत्मानः
 स्पृणुते । उभे ह्येवैष एते आत्मानः स्पृणुते । य एवं
 वेद । इत्युपनिषत् ॥ १ ॥ इति नवमोऽनुवाकः ॥

इति ब्रह्मानन्दवल्ली समाप्ता ॥

1. The enlightened man is not afraid of anything after realising that Bliss of Brahman, failing to reach which, words turn back along with the mind.

Him, indeed, this remorse does not afflict: “Why did I not perform good deeds, and why did I perform bad deeds? He who is thus enlightened strengthens the Self with which these two are identical; for it is he, indeed, who knows thus, that can strengthen the Self which these two really are. This is the secret teaching.

Yataḥ, that from which – from the Self, which is unconditioned, has the aforesaid definition, and is non-dual and Bliss; *vācaḥ*, words that stand for conditioned objects. Though words are applied by their users even with regard to the unconditioned and non-dual Brahman, expecting to express It because of Its similarity with other substances still those words *aprāpya*, without reaching, without expressing (that Brahman); *nivartante*, turn back, become despoiled of their power. The word *manāḥ* stands for a notion, a cognition. And as a word proceeds to anything, supersensuous though it be, conceptual knowledge also strives to encompass that thing as well as its significance; and where there is knowledge, there words too go. Hence words and ideas, speech and mind, move together everywhere. Therefore, that Brahman which is beyond all concepts and all words, and which has such attributes as invisibility, from which words, though used by their utterers in all possible ways for expressing Brahman, return *manasā saha*, together with the mind – with conceptual knowledge that is able to encompass everything else; the *vidvāṅ*, one who has known, through the aforesaid process; that *brahmaṅ ānandam*, Bliss of Brahman – the supreme Bliss of Brahman that is the Self of the follower

of the Vedas, who is sinless, unaffected by desire, and wholly free from all craving—the Bliss that is free from the relation of subject and object, is natural, eternal, and indivisible; (the man of knowledge) having known that Bliss, *na bibheti kutaścana*, is not afraid of anything, for there remains no cause of fear. There does not certainly exit anything, distinct from the man of knowledge, of which he can be afraid; for it has been said that, when anyone creates the slightest difference in this Brahman, through ignorance, then one is subject to fear (Tai.II.vii). But since for the enlightened man, the effects of ignorance have been removed like the second moon seen by a man with diseased eyes, it is proper that he has no fear of anything. This verse was quoted in the context of the mental self as well, because the mind is an aid to the knowledge of Brahman. But there the idea of Brahman was superimposed on the mental self, and then by saying by way of eulogy of that imaginary Brahman that “one is not subject to fear *at any time*” (II.iv), fear alone was denied; but by saying, “he is not afraid of anything”, in the (present) context of the non-dual (Brahman), the cause itself of fear is negated.

Objection: But causes of fear, viz omission of good deeds and commission of bad deeds, do persist (even in his case).

Answer: Not so.

Objection: How?

The *answer* is: (Such omission and commission) *na tapati*, do not worry or afflict; *etam*, such a man, who is a knower as aforesaid. *Ha* and *vāva*, are particles implying emphasis.

Objection: How, again, omission of virtue and commission of sin do not afflict (him)?

The *answer* is: When death approaches, the remorse comes in the form—"Kim, why; *na akaravam*, I did not perform; *sādhū*, good deeds?" Similarly, the repentance in the form—"Kim, why; *akaravam*, I did; *pāpam*, prohibited things?"—comes to him who is thrown into hell. These two—omission of the good and commission of the bad—do not torment this one, as they do the ignorant man.

Objection: Why, again, do they not afflict the enlightened man?

The *answer* is: *Saḥ yaḥ evam vidvān*, he who knows (Brahman) thus; *sprūte* delights or strengthens; *ete ātmānam*, these two—virtue and vice, the causes of grief—which are (really) the Self. The idea is that he considers both as identified with the supreme Self. *Hi* since, he who having divested both virtue and vice of their individual distinctions, has known *ete ātmānam eva*, these two as verily the Self; he *ātmānam sprūte*, strengthens the Self. Who? *Yaḥ evam veda*, he that knows Brahman thus—as non-dual and Bliss as described earlier. Virtue and vice, seen by him as identified with the Self, become powerless and harmless, and they do not bring about rebirth. *Iti upaniṣat*, this is the secret instruction—thus has been stated in this Part the knowledge of Brahman called Upaniṣad. The idea is that the most secret of all knowledge has been revealed; for in it is ingrained the highest consummation.

सह नावतु । सह नौ भुनक्तु । सह वीर्यं करवावहै ।
तेजस्वि नावधीतमस्तु मा विद्विषावहै ।

ॐ शान्तिः शान्तिः शान्तिः ॥

PART III

ON BHARGU'S ENLIGHTENMENT

CHAPTER I

ॐ सह नावतु । सह नौ भुनक्तु । सह वीर्यं
करवावहे । तेजस्वि नावधीतमस्तु मा विद्विषावहे ।

ॐ शान्तिः शान्तिः शान्तिः ॥

Since Brahman, that is truth, knowledge, and infinity, brought about this creation—starting with space and ending with the body made of food—then It entered into it, and seems to be possessed of distinctions because of this fact of entry, therefore one should realise thus: “I am that Brahman which is the Bliss that is distinct from all creation and is possessed of such characteristics as invisibility.” For the (subject of) entry (of Brahman) is meant to imply this. In the case of one who knows thus, good and bad deeds do not bring about a rebirth. This was the idea intended to be conveyed in the Part *On Bliss (Ānanda-vallī)*. The knowledge of Brahman, too, has been concluded. After this is to be taught concentration which is helpful to the knowledge of Brahman as also such meditations with regard to food etc., as have not been dealt with so far. Therefore this Part beigns. The story is meant to heighten the value of the knowledge by showing that it was imparted to a son by a father.¹

भृगुर्वै वारुणिः । बरुणं पितरमुपससार । अधीहि
भगवो ब्रह्मेति । तस्मा एतत्प्रोवाच । अन्नं प्राणं चक्षुः

¹ As a valuable heritage out of affection.

श्रोत्रं मनो वाचमिति । त२ होवाच । यतो वा इमानि भूतानि जायन्ते । येन जातानि जीवन्ति । यत्प्रयन्त्यभिसंविशन्ति । तद्विजिज्ञासस्व । तद् ब्रह्मेति । स तपोऽतप्यत । स तपस्तप्त्वा ॥ १ ॥ इति प्रथमोऽनुवाकः ॥

1. Bhṛgu, the well-known son of Varuṇa, approached his father Varuṇa with the (formal) request, "O, revered sir, teach me Brahman". To him he (Varuṇa) said this: "Food, vital force, eye, ear, mind, speech – (these are the aids to knowledge of Brahman)." To him he (Varuṇa) said: "Crave to know that from which all these beings take birth, that by which they live after being born, that towards which they move and into which they merge. That is Brahman." He practised concentration. He, having practised concentration,

The particle *vai*, alluding to a recognised fact, calls up to memory one who is well-known by the name Bhṛgu. *Vāruṇih* is the son of Varuṇa. Varuṇa's son, becoming anxious to know Brahman, *upasāsāva*, approached; his *pitarām varuṇam*, father Varuṇa; with, *iti*, this, sacred formula (*mantra*): "*Adhīhi bhagavaḥ brahma*, teach (me) Brahman, O revered sir." And *tasmāi*, to him, who had approached in due form; the father, too, *provāca*, spoke; *etat*, this—this sentence: "*Annami*" etc. He spoke of *annam*, food, i.e. the body; of *prāṇam*, the vital force, which is within that body and which is the eater; and

(he spoke) of the aids to knowledge, viz of *cakṣuḥ*, *śrotram*, *manaḥ*, *vācam*, eye, ear, mind, speech—he spoke of these as the doors to the realisation of Brahman.¹ And having spoken of food etc., as doors, he *uvāca*, told *tam*, him, Bhṛṅgu: the definition of Brahman. What is that (definition)? *Yataḥ vai*, that from which, indeed; *imāni bhūtāni*, all these beings—starting with Brahmā and ending with a clump of grass; *jāyante*, take birth; *jātāni*, being born; *yena jīvanti*, that by which they live—grow; *yat*, that Brahman towards which *prayanti*, they proceed, into which they *abhisamivisanti*, enter, with which they become fully identified, at the time of their dissolution—that with which the beings do not lose their identity during the times of creation, existence, and dissolution. This, then, is the definition of Brahman. *Vijjñāsasva*, crave to know well; *tat*, that; *brahma*, Brahman. Realise, through the help of food etc., that Brahman which is defined thus—this is the idea. Another Vedic text, too, shows that these are doors to the realisation of Brahman: “Those who have known the Vital Force of the vital force, the Eye of the eye, the Ear of the ear, and the Mind of the mind, have realised the ancient, primordial Brahman” (Br.IV.iv.18). Having heard from his father the doors to the realisation of Brahman, as also the definition of Brahman, *saḥ*, he—Bhṛṅgu; *atapyata*, practised; *tapah*, (lit. austerity), concentration—as a means to the realisation of Brahman.

Objection: How could Bhṛṅgu, again, accept *tapah*

¹ “These are doors in the sense that they are helpful in distinguishing the object aimed at. For it is from the fact of the impossibility of the activities of the body etc. continuing in any other way (than through the consciousness of the Self) that consciousness is distinguished from them as a separate entity.”—A.G.

(concentration) as a means, since it was not taught to be so?

Answer: (He accepted this) because of the incompleteness of the instruction. Varuṇa said that food etc., are the doors to the realisation of Brahman, and that Its definition is, "That from which all these beings take birth" etc. That, indeed, is incomplete; for Brahman was not directly pointed out there. For were it not really an incomplete statement, Brahman, in Its true nature, should have been indicated by saying, "This Brahman is of this kind", to the son who was desirous of knowing. Not that he indicated thus. How did he do then? He said in an incomplete manner. So it is to be understood, that for the knowledge of Brahman, the father certainly had some other discipline in view. As for singling out *tapah* (concentration), this is because it is the best discipline, for it is well known in the world that of all the means that are causally related with definite ends, concentration is the best.¹ So Bhṛgu accepted *tapah* as a means to the knowledge of Brahman though it was not taught by his father. This *tapah* consists in the concentration of the outer and inner organs, for that forms the door to the knowledge of Brahman in accordance with the Smṛti, "The concentration of the mind and the senses is the highest *tapah*. Since it is higher than all the virtues, it is called the highest virtue" (Mbh.Śā.250.4).

¹ From the father's description of Brahman, Bhṛgu could not arrive at any non-composite, unitary conception of Brahman which ruled out all duality and which could not be analysed back into its component parts; for the description itself was soaked in plurality. Bhṛgu aimed at an irresolvable concept, and hence he went on revolving in his mind what he had heard. That was his *tapah*.

And *saḥ*, he; *tapuḥ taptvā*, having practised concentration,

CHAPTER II

अन्नं ब्रह्मेति व्यजानात् । अन्नाद्भवे खल्विमानि
भूतानि जायन्ते । अन्नेन जातानि जीवन्ति । अन्नं प्रयन्त्यभि-
संविशन्तीति । तद्विज्ञाय । पुनरेव वरुणं पितरमुपससार ।
अधीहि भगवो ब्रह्मेति । तः होवाच । तपसा ब्रह्म
विजिज्ञासस्व । तपो ब्रह्मेति । स तपोऽतप्यत । स तप-
स्तप्त्वा ॥ १ ॥ इति द्वितीयोऽनुवाकः ॥

1. he realised food (i.e. Virāt, the gross Cosmic person) as Brahman. For it is verily from food that all these beings take birth, on food they subsist after being born, and they move towards and merge into food. Having realised that, he again approached his father Varuṇa with the (formal) request, "O, revered sir, teach me Brahman. To him he (Varuṇa) said: "Crave to know Brahman through concentration; concentration is Brahman. He practised concentration. He, having practised concentration,

Vyajānāt, he knew: *annam brahma iti*, food as Brahman; for food is endowed with the aforesaid characteristics. How? *Hi*, for; *annāt*, from food; *khalu eva*, indeed; *imāni*

bhūtāni jāyante, these beings are born; *jātāni jīvanti*, having been born, they live; *annena*, by food; and *prayanti abhisamivṛṣanti*, they move towards and enter into; *annam*, food. Hence it is reasonable that food is Brahman. This is the idea. He having practised concentration in this way; and *tat vijñāya*, having known that food, as Brahman, from its characteristics as well as reasoning; *varuṇam pitarām upasavāra*, approached his father Varuṇa; *punaḥ eva*, over again; with, *iti*, this, formal request, “*Adhīhi bhagavaḥ brahma*, O revered sir, teach me Brahman.”

Objection: What was, again, the occasion for his doubt?

The *answer* is: Because food is seen to have an origin. Concentration is repeatedly inculcated in order to emphasise the fact of its being the best discipline. The idea is this: “Concentration alone is your discipline till the description of Brahman can be pushed no further and till your desire to know becomes quietened. Through concentration alone, you crave to know Brahman.” The rest is easy.

CHAPTER III

प्राणो ब्रह्मेति व्यजानात् । प्राणाद्ब्रह्मेव खल्विमानि
भूतानि जायन्ते । प्राणेन जातानि जीवन्ति । प्राणं
प्रयन्त्यभिसंविशन्तीति । तद्विज्ञाय । पुनरेव वरुणं पितर-
मुपससार । अधीहि भगवो ब्रह्मेति । तद् होवाच । तपसा
ब्रह्म विजिज्ञासस्व । तपो ब्रह्मेति । स तपोऽतप्यत । स
तपस्तप्त्वा ॥ १ ॥ इति तृतीयोऽनुवाकः ॥

1. he knew the vital force as Brahman;¹ for from the vital force, indeed, spring all these beings: having come into being, they live through the vital force; they move towards and enter into the vital force. Having known thus, he again approached his father Varuṇa with the (formal) request, "O, revered sir, teach me Brahman". To him he (Varuṇa) said, "Crave to know Brahman through concentration; concentration is Brahman. He practised concentration. Having practised concentration,

CHAPTER IV

मनो ब्रह्मेति व्यजानात् । मनसो ह्येव खल्विमानि
भूतानि जायन्ते । मनसा जातानि जीवन्ति । मनः
प्रयन्त्यभिसंविशन्तीति । तद्विज्ञाय । पुनरेव वरुणं पितर-
मुपससार । अधीहि भगवो ब्रह्मेति । तद् होवाच । तपसा
ब्रह्म विजिज्ञासस्व । तपो ब्रह्मेति । स तपोऽतप्यत । स
तपस्तप्त्वा ॥ १ ॥ इति चतुर्थोऽनुवाकः ॥

1. he knew mind as Brahman; for from mind, indeed, spring all these beings; having been born,

¹ As Virūṭ (the food-Brahman) has an origin, Virūṭ could not fully answer the description. So Bhṛgu pushed on his inquiry to arrive at Hiraṇyagarbha, conceived of as possessing vital energy. Then he reached the same Hiraṇyagarbha, as possessed of mental energy, and lastly as possessed of the energy of knowledge (See footnotes, p. 357).

they are sustained by mind; and they move towards and merge into mind. Having known that, he approached his father Varuṇa again and made the (formal) request, "O revered sir, teach me Brahman. To him he (Varuṇa) said: "Crave to know Brahman through concentration; concentration is Brahman. He practised concentration. He having practised concentration,

CHAPTER V

विज्ञानं ब्रह्मेति व्यजानात् । विज्ञानाद्धेव खल्विमानि
भूतानि जायन्ते । विज्ञानेन जातानि जीवन्ति । विज्ञानं
प्रयन्त्यभिसंविशन्तीति । तद्विज्ञाय । पुनरेव वरुणं पितर-
मुपससार । अधीहि भगवो ब्रह्मेति । तꣳ होवाच । तपसा
ब्रह्म विजिज्ञासस्व । तपो ब्रह्मेति । स तपोऽतप्यत । स
तपस्तप्त्वा ॥ १ ॥ इति पञ्चमोऽनुवाकः ॥

He knew knowledge as Brahman; for from knowledge, indeed, spring all these beings; having been born, they are sustained by knowledge; they move towards and merge in knowledge. Having known that, he approached his father Varuṇa again, with the (formal) request, "O revered sir, teach me Brahman . To him he (Varuṇa) said: "Crave to know Brahman through concentration; concentration is Brahman." He

practised concentration. He having practised concentration,

CHAPTER VI

आनन्दो ब्रह्मेति व्यजानात् । आनन्दाद्ब्रह्मेव खल्विमानि भूतानि जायन्ते । आनन्देन जातानि जीवन्ति । आनन्दं प्रयन्त्यभिसंविशन्तीति । सैषा भार्गवी वारुणी विद्या । परमे व्योमन्प्रतिष्ठिता । स य एवं वेद प्रतितिष्ठति । अन्नवानन्नादो भवति । महान्भवति प्रजया पशुभिर्ब्रह्मवर्चसेन । महान् कीर्त्या ॥ १ ॥ इति षष्ठोऽनुवाकः ॥

1. he knew Bliss as Brahman; for from Bliss, indeed, all these beings originate; having been born, they are sustained by Bliss; they move towards and merge in Bliss. This knowledge, realised by Bhṛgu and imparted by Varuṇa (starts from the food-cell and) terminates in the supreme (Bliss), established in the cavity of the heart. He who knows thus becomes firmly established; he becomes the possessor of food and the eater of food; and he becomes great in progeny, cattle and the lustre of holiness, and great in glory.

Thus becoming pure through concentration and failing to find the characteristics of Brahman, in their fullness, in the selves composed of the vital force etc., Bhṛgu pene-

trated inside by degrees, and with the help of concentration alone realised the innermost Bliss that is Brahman. Therefore the idea conveyed by this topic is that anyone who is desirous of knowing Brahman should undertake the concentration of internal and external organs, which is the most excellent practice of *tapah* (austerity).

Now standing aside from the story, the Upaniṣad states the purport of the story in its own words: *ṣā eṣā*, this, then, is; the *vidyā*, knowledge; (which was) *bhārgavī*, realised by Bhṛgu; (and) *Vāruṇī*, imparted by Varuṇa; (which) commencing from the self, constituted by food, *pratiṣṭhitā*, culminates; in the supreme, non-dual Bliss that is lodged *parame vyoman*, in the cavity that is the supreme space within the heart. Anybody else, who realises the Bliss that is Brahman by entering through this very process and through concentration alone as his aid—that man, too, in consequence of his knowledge becoming firmly rooted, gets similarly fixed in the Bliss that is the supreme Brahman; that is to say, he becomes Brahman Itself.

• Moreover, a visible result is being vouchsafed for him: *Annavān* has to be taken in the sense of one who is possessed of plenty of food, since knowledge would get no credit if the term meant simply possession of food as such, for that is a patent fact in the case of everybody. Similarly, *annādaḥ*, (derived in the sense of an eater of food), means that he is blest with good digestion. *Mahān bhavati*, he becomes great. In what does the greatness consist? The answer is: *prajayā*, in sons etc.; *paśubhiḥ*, in cows, horses, etc.; *brahmavarcasena*, in the lustre resulting from the control of external and internal organs, knowledge, etc. He becomes *mahān*, great; *kīrtiyā*, through fame, from a virtuous life.

CHAPTER VII

अन्नं न निन्द्यात् । तद्ब्रतम् । प्राणो वा अन्नम् । शरीर-
मन्नादम् । प्राणे शरीरं प्रतिष्ठितम् । शरीरे प्राणः
प्रतिष्ठितः । तदेतदन्नमन्ने प्रतिष्ठितम् । स य एतदन्नमन्ने
प्रतिष्ठितं वेद प्रतितिष्ठति । अन्नवानन्नादो भवति ।
महान्भवति प्रजया पशुभिर्ब्रह्मवर्चसेन । महान् कीर्त्या ॥ १ ॥
इति सप्तमोऽनुवाकः ॥

1. His vow is that, he should not deprecate food. The vital force is verily the food, and the body is the eater; for the vital force is lodged in the body. (Again, the body is the food and the vital force is the eater, for) the body is fixed on the vital force. Thus (the body and vital force are both foods; and) one food is lodged in another. He who knows thus that one food is lodged in another, gets firmly established. He becomes a possessor and an eater of food. He becomes great in progeny, cattle, and the lustre of holiness and great in glory.

Moreover, since Brahman is realised through the portal of food, *na nindyāt*, one should not deprecate; *annam*, food; just as one would not cavil at his teacher. (This is) *tad-vratam*, a vow that is enjoined for him who knows Brahman thus. The inculcation of the vow is meant for the praise of food; and food is worthy of praise, since it is an aid to the realisation of Brahman. *Prāṇah vai*

annam, the vital force is verily a food, for the vital force is encased in the body. Anything that is encompassed by another becomes the food of the latter; and *śarīre prāṇaḥ pratiṣṭhitaḥ*, the vital force is lodged in the body; therefore the vital force is the food, and *śarīram annādānam*, the body is the eater. Similarly, the body, too, is a food and the vital force is an eater. Why? Since *prāṇe śarīram pratiṣṭhitam*, the body is fixed on the vital force, since the continuation of the body is dependent on the latter. Therefore both of these two—the body and the vital force—are (mutually) food and eater. In the aspect of their being lodged in each other, they are food; and in the aspect of being the support of each other they are eaters. Hence both the vital force and the body are food and eater. *Saḥ yaḥ*, he who; *veda*, knows; *etat annam anne pratiṣṭhitam*, this food as established on food; *pratiṣṭhīthati*, becomes firmly established—in the very form of food and eater. Moreover, he *bhavati*, becomes; *annavān*, a possessor of (plenty of) food; *annādāḥ*, an eater (i.e. a digester) of food. All these are to be explained as before.

CHAPTER VIII

अन्नं न परिचक्षीत । तद्ब्रूतम् । आपो वा अन्नम् ।
 ज्योतिरन्नादम् । अप्सु ज्योतिः प्रतिष्ठितम् । ज्योतिष्यापः
 प्रतिष्ठिताः । तदेतदन्नमन्ने प्रतिष्ठितम् । स य एतदन्नमन्ने
 प्रतिष्ठितं वेद प्रतितिष्ठति । अन्नवानन्नादो भवति ।
 महान्भवति प्रजया पशुभिर्ब्रह्मवर्चसेन । महान्कीर्त्या ॥ १ ॥
 इत्यष्टमोऽनुवाकः ॥

1. His vow is that he should not discard food. Water, indeed, is food; fire is the eater; for water is established on fire. (Fire is food and water is the eater, for) fire resides in water. Thus one food is lodged in another food. He who knows thus that one food is lodged in another, gets firmly established. He becomes a possessor and an eater of food. He becomes great in progeny, cattle, and the lustre of holiness, and great in glory.

Annam na paricakṣīta, he should not discard food. This is a vow for him, which is meant as a praise (for food) just as before. Thus the food, that is not ignored through ideas of good or bad, becomes eulogised and heightened in esteem. The idea, as explained before, should be similarly understood to be implied in the subsequent texts: *āpaḥ vai annam*, water, indeed, is food, etc.:

CHAPTER IX

अन्नं बहु कुर्वीत । तद्व्रतम् । पृथिवी वा अन्नम् ।
 आकाशोऽन्नादः । पृथिव्यामाकाशः प्रतिष्ठितः । आकाशे
 पृथिवी प्रतिष्ठिता । तदेतदन्नमन्ने प्रतिष्ठितम् । स य
 एतदन्नमन्ने प्रतिष्ठितं वेद प्रतिष्ठति । अन्नवानन्नादो
 भवति । महान्भवति प्रजया पशुभिर्ब्रह्मवर्चसेन । महान्
 कीर्त्या ॥ १ ॥ इति नवमोऽनुवाकः ॥

1. His vow is that he should make food plentiful. Earth is food; space is the eater; for earth is placed in space. (Space is food; and earth is eater, for) space is placed on earth. Thus one food is lodged in another food. He who knows thus that one food is lodged in another, gets firmly established. He becomes a possessor and an eater of food. He becomes great in progeny, cattle, and the lustre of holiness and great in glory.

The vow to make food plentiful is meant for one who worships fire and water as possessed of the attributes of food and eater in the way that was mentioned by the text, "water is established on fire" etc. (in the preceding chapter).

CHAPTER X

न कंचन वसतौ प्रत्याचक्षीत । तद्व्रतम् । तस्माद्यथा
कया च विधया बह्वन्नं प्राप्नुयात् । अराध्यस्मा अन्नमित्या-
चक्षते । एतद्वै मुखतोऽन्नं राद्धम् । मुखतोऽस्मा अन्नं
राध्यते । एतद्वै मध्यतोऽन्नं राद्धम् । मध्यतोऽस्मा अन्नं
राध्यते । एतद्वा अन्ततोऽन्नं राद्धम् । अन्ततोऽस्मा अन्नं
राध्यते ॥ १ ॥ य एवं वेद । क्षेम इति वाचि । योगक्षेम
इति प्राणापानयोः । कर्मेति हस्तयोः । गतिरिति पादयोः ।
विमुक्तिरिति पायौ । इति मानुषीः समाज्ञाः । अथ देवीः ।
तृप्तिरिति वृष्टौ । बलमिति विद्युति ॥ २ ॥

1-2. His vow is that he should not refuse anyone come for shelter. Therefore one should collect plenty of food by whatsoever means he may. (And one should collect food for the further reason that) they say, "Food is ready for him". Because he offers cooked food in his early age with honour, food falls to his share in the early age with honour. Because he offers food in his middle age with medium courtesy, food falls to his share in his middle age with medium honour. Because he offers food in this old age with scant esteem, food falls to his share in old age with scant consideration. To him who knows thus (comes the result as described).

(Brahman is to be meditated on) as preservation in speech; as acquisition and preservation in exhaling and inhaling; as action in the hands; as movement in the feet; as discharge in the anus. These are meditations on the human plane.

Then follow the divine ones. (Brahman is to be meditated on) as contentment in rain; as energy in lightning.

So also there is a vow for one who meditates on earth and space (as mutually food and cater): *na pratyācakṣīta*, he should not refuse; *kam cana*, anybody, whomsoever; *vasatau*, in the matter of dwelling. The meaning is that

he should not turn back anybody who may come for shelter. Since, if shelter is given, food, too, must be supplied, therefore *yayā kayā ca vidhayā*, by any means whatsoever; *piāpnuyāt bahu annam*, he should get, i.e. collect, plenty of food. Since the enlightened people (i.e. meditators) possessed of food, *ācakṣate*, “*Annam arādhi asmai*, food has been cooked for this man,” and they do not refuse him by saying “There is no food”, therefore also, one should acquire plenty of food. This is how this portion should be construed with the earlier. Moreover, the greatness of the gift of food is being stated: Food greets one back in that very manner and at that very period (of life) in which it is offered. How? That is being explained: *Etat vai*, the fact that, *annam*, food; *rāddham*, cooked; *mukhataḥ*, in early age, or with the best attitude, with veneration; “he offers to the guest seeking food”, this much is to be added to complete the sentence. What result will he get? The answer is: *Asmai*, for this one—for the giver of food; *annam rādhyate*, food is cooked; *mukhataḥ*, in the early age, or in the best manner. The idea is that food falls to his share just as it was offered. Similarly, *madhyataḥ* means during the middle part of life, and with middling courtesy. Thus, too, *antataḥ* means in the old age, and with scant courtesy, i.e. with discourtesy. In that manner *annam rādhyate asmai*, food is cooked for him, food accrues to him. *Yaḥ evam veda*, he who knows thus—knows the greatness of food as stated to him befalls the afore-said result of that gift.

Now is being stated a process of meditation on Brahman: *Kṣemah* means the preservation of what has been acquired. Brahman is to be meditated on as existing *vāci*, in speech, in the form of preservation. *Yogaḥ* means the

acquisition of what is not in possession. Though these acquisition and preservation occur so long as exhaling and inhaling function vigorously, still they are not brought about by the mere fact of living. What are they, then, due to? They are caused by Brahman. Therefore Brahman is to be meditated on as existing *prāṇāpānayoḥ*, in exhalation and inhalation, in the form of acquisition and preservation. Similarly, with regard to the other succeeding cases, Brahman is to be meditated on as identified with each one. Since work is done by Brahman, Brahman is to be meditated on as existing *hastayoḥ*, in the hands; *karma iti*, in the form of work; *gatiḥ iti*, as movement; *pādayoḥ*, in the feet; *vimuktiḥ iti*, as discharge; *pāyau*, in the anus. *Iti*, these are; *samāñāḥ*, cognitions, perceptions i.e. meditations; which are *mānuṣīḥ* (should be rather *mānuṣyaḥ*), pertaining to men, belonging to the physical body. *Atha*, after this; *daivīḥ*, (should be rather *daivyaḥ*), divine, the meditations pertaining to the gods—are being related. *Tṛptiḥ iti vṛṣṭau*, as satisfaction in rain. Since rain causes contentment by producing food etc., Brahman is to be meditated on as existing in rain in the form of contentment. Similarly, in the case of other things, Brahman is to be meditated on as existing in those forms. So also It is to be meditated on as energy in lighting.

यश इति पशुषु । ज्योतिरिति नक्षत्रेषु । प्रजाति-
रमृतमानन्द इत्युपस्थे । सर्वमित्याकाशे । तत्प्रतिष्ठेत्यपा-
सीत । प्रतिष्ठावान् भवति । तन्मह इत्युपासीत ।
महान्भवति । तन्मन इत्युपासीत । मानवान्भवति ॥ ३ ॥
तन्नम इत्युपासीत । नम्यन्तेऽस्मै कामाः । तद्ब्रह्मेत्युपा-

सीत । ब्रह्मवान्भवति । तद्ब्रह्मणः परिमर इत्युपासीत ।
 पर्येणं म्रियन्ते द्विपन्तः सपत्नाः । परि येऽप्रिया भ्रातृव्याः ।
 स यश्चायं पुरुषे । यश्चासावादित्ये । स एकः ॥ ४ ॥

3-4. Brahman is to be worshipped as fame in beasts; as light in the stars; as procreation, immortality, and joy in the generative organ; as everything in space. One should meditate on that Brahman as the support; thereby one becomes supported. One should meditate on that Brahman as great; thereby one becomes great. One should meditate on It as thinking; thereby one becomes able to think. One should meditate on It as bowing down; thereby the enjoyable things bow down to one. One should meditate on It as the most exalted; thereby one becomes exalted. One should meditate on It as Brahman's medium of destruction; thereby the adversaries that envy such a one die, and so do the enemies whom this one dislikes.

This being that is in the human personality, and the being that is there in the sun are one.

(Brahman is to be worshipped) as *yaśaḥ*, fame; *paśuṣu*, among animals;¹ as *jyotiḥ*, light, *nakṣatresu*, among stars. *Prajātiḥ*, procreation; *amṛtam*, immortality, getting of immortality—this being brought about by the son's repay-

¹ i. e. as existing in cattle-wealth, since wealth makes a man famous.

gods, viz. Lightning, Rain, Moon, Sun, and Fire. Therefore air is their *parimāṇaḥ*, destruction—in accordance with another Vedic text, ("Air [Virāt] is, indeed, the devourer", Ch. IV. iii. 1). Again, this very air is non-different from space; hence space is *brahmaṇaḥ parimāṇaḥ*, Brahman's medium of destruction. *Upāsīta*, one should meditate on *tat*, that space, which is non-different from air,¹ as Brahman's medium of destruction. (As a result) *sapat-nāḥ*, adversaries; who are *dviṣataḥ*, envious; *enam*, towards this man; *pari miyante*, part with their lives. There may be adversaries, who are not envious; hence the singling out in this form, "the envious adversaries". Those adversaries that are envious towards this man die. Moreover, *ye bhrātṛvyāḥ*, those adversaries (of this man); who are *apriyāḥ*, disliked (by him), though they may not be spiteful—they, too, die.

Beginning with the text, "the vital force is, indeed, the food, and the body is eater", and ending with space, the entire creation has been shown as food and eater.

Objection: It might have been said so; what of that?
Answer: Thereby is proved this: Worldly existence, comprising enjoyment and enjoyership, pertain only to created things, but not to the Self; yet it is superimposed on the Self through ignorance.

Objection: The Self, too, is a product of the supreme Self, and hence the Self's worldly existence is quite in order.

Answer: No, for the Upaniṣad refers to the entry of the Transcendental (Brahman). In the text, "Having created that, He entered into that very thing" (Tai.II.vi. 1),

¹ Since air comes out of space.

the entry into creation is predicated of the transcendental supreme Self which is the cause of space etc. Hence the Self which has entered into creation as the individual soul is none other than the supermundane, supreme Self. Moreover, this follows from the propriety of the same entity being the subject of the two verbs in the expression, "having created, he entered". If the two verbs implying creation and entry have the same subject, then only is the suffix *ktivā* (-ing) justifiable.

Objection: But the one which enters undergoes a change.

Answer: No, since entry has been explained away by giving it a different meaning (II.vi.).

Objection: May not the entry be through a change of attributes, since such a categorical text as "entering in the form of this individual soul, (let me evolve name and form)" (Ch. VI.iii.2) speaks of entry under a different mode.

Answer: No, since reinstatement into the earlier mode is spoken of in "Thou art That" (Ch.VI.viii-xvi).

Objection: It is a meditation, involving the superimposition of the greater on the less, which is calculated to remove a change that has come over one (of the two).

Answer: No, for the two are placed on the same pedestal in the text, "That is truth, That is the Self; and thou art That." (*ibid*).

Objection: The worldly state of the individual soul is a perceived reality.

Answer: No, for the perceiver cannot be perceived (Br.II.iv.14).

Objection: The (individual) Self, as endowed with worldly attributes is perceived.

Answer: Not so; (for if they are real attributes of the Self, then), since the attributes of a thing are non-separable from the substratum, they cannot reasonably become objects of perception, just as heat and light (of fire) cannot be subjected to burning or illumination (by fire).

Objection: The soul is inferred to be possessed of sorrow etc., since fear etc. are seen (in it).

Answer: No; for fear etc. and sorrow cannot be the qualities of the perceiver (soul), since they are perceived (by it).

Objection: This runs counter to the (Sāṁkhya) scripture promulgated by Kapila, and to the science of logic built up by Kaṇāda and others.

Answer: Not so; for if they have no Vedic basis or if they are opposed to the Vedas, it is reasonable to call them erroneous. And from the Vedas, as well as, from reasoning, the Self is proved to be transcendental. Besides, this follows from the unity of the Self.

Objection: How is that unity?

Answer: That is being stated (in *saḥ, yaḥ ca ayam* etc.). The whole of the text, *saḥ yaḥ ca ayam* etc., is to be construed as already explained (Tai.II.viii.5).

स य एवंवित् । अस्माल्लोकात्प्रेत्य । एतमन्नमय-
मात्मानमुपसंक्रम्य । एतं प्राणमयमात्मानुपसंक्रम्य । एतं
मनोमयमात्मानमुपसंक्रम्य । एतं विज्ञानमयमात्मानमुप-
संक्रम्य । एतमानन्दमयमात्मानमुपसंक्रम्य । इमाल्लोका-
न्कामाप्ती कामरूप्यनुसंचरन् । एतत् साम गायन्नास्ते ।

हा३वु हा३वु हा३वु ॥५॥ अहमन्नमहमन्नमहमन्नम् ।
 अहमन्नादो३ऽहमन्नादो३ऽहमन्नादः । अहंश्लोककृदहं-
 श्लोककृदहं श्लोककृत् । अहमस्मि प्रथमजा ऋता३स्य । पूर्वं
 देवेभ्योऽमृतस्य ना३भायि । यो मा ददाति स इदेव मा३ऽऽवा ।
 अहमन्नमन्नमदन्तमा३द्भि । अहं विश्वं भुवनमभ्यभवा३म् ।
 सुवर्नं ज्योतीः । य एव वेद । इत्युपनिषत् ॥ ६ ॥

इति दशमोऽनुवाकः ॥

इति भुगुवल्ली समाप्ता ॥

5-6. He who knows thus, attains, after desisting from this world, this self made of food. After attaining this self made of food, then attaining this self made of vital force, then attaining this self made of intelligence, then attaining this self made of bliss, and roaming over these worlds with command over food at will and command over all forms at will, he continues singing this *sāma* song: "Halloo! Halloo! Halloo! I am the food, I am the food, I am the food; I am the eater, I am the eater, I am the eater; I am the unifier, I am the unifier, I am the unifier; I am (Hiraṇyagarbha) the first born of this world consisting of the formed and the formless, I (as Virāt) am earlier than the gods. I am the navel

of immortality. He who offers me thus (as food), protects me just as I am. I, food as I am, eat him up who eats food without offering. I defeat (i.e. engulf) the entire universe. Our effulgence is like that of the sun. This is the Upaniṣad.

Starting from the self, constituted by food, and *ānandamayam ātmānam upasañkramya*, reaching the self, constituted by joy; *āste*, he sits (continues) *gāyan*, singing on, *etat sāma*, this *sāma* (song).

The meaning of the *Rg-mantra*—"Satyam jñānam etc.—Brahman is truth, knowledge," etc. (II.i.)—has been explained elaborately in the Part *On Bliss*, which is an exposition of it. But the meaning of the statement of its result contained in the text, "He enjoys, as identified with the all-knowing Brahman, all desirable things simultaneously" (II.i.), has not been elaborated. Now the following text begins, since it remains to be shown what these results are, what the objects of all those desires are, and how he enjoys them simultaneously in his identity with Brahman. As to that, in the story of the father and the son (in Part III), that is supplementary to the knowledge imparted earlier (in Part II), concentration has been spoken of as a means for the knowledge of Brahman. Besides, it has been shown how the creation, beginning from space and ending with food, can be divided into the eater and the eaten; and the meditations on Brahman have been referred to. Furthermore, all the enjoyments that there are and pertain to diverse products like space etc., have been shown to be the results of multifarious means that are systematically related to their results. On the attainment of unity, however, there cannot logically remain any desire or desirer, since all



diversity becomes merged in the Self. So how can one enjoy all desires simultaneously in the state of identity with Brahman? In answer to this question it is being said that this is possible because of his becoming the Self of all. To the question, "How is there an attainment of identity with the Self of all?"—the answer is: Having discarded excellence and non-excellence as a result of the knowledge of the identity of the Self existing in the individual and the sun, having attained in succession the selves—starting with the one made of food and ending with the one constituted by bliss—that are fancied through ignorance, and having realised, as a result, Brahman which is truth, knowledge, and infinity, which is unchangeable etc. by nature, which is natural Bliss, and which is birthless, immortal, fearless, and non-dual; and then (that man of knowledge) *anusaiṅcaran*, wandering; on *imān lokān*, these worlds—the earth etc.; this is how the expression *imān lokān* is to be construed with the remote word *anusaiṅcaran*. Wandering how? (Becoming) *kāmānū*—one who gets *anna*, food, according to *kāma*, wish, is *kāmānū*, (having command over food at will); similarly, one who gets *rūpaś*, forms, according to his wish is *kāmarūpī*: wandering on all these worlds, in his identity with all, i.e. perceiving all these worlds as the Self. What does he do? *Etat sāma gāyan āste*: *āste*, he continues; *gāyan*, singing, uttering; *etat sāma*, this *sāma* (song). Brahman Itself is the *sāma*, because It is *sama*, equal, non-different from everything. (So the idea is): He continues declaring the unity of the Self as also announcing, for the good of others, the result of that knowledge consisting in absolute contentment.

How does he sing? (He sings): *Hā-ā-ā vu, hā-ā-ā-vu, hā-ā-ā-vu*: the expression is used in the sense of halloo to indicate supreme surprise. What, again, is that surprise? The answer is: Although I am really the untainted, non-dual Self, still I am *annam*, the food, as also *annādaḥ*, the eater. Moreover, *aham ślokakṛt*: *śloka* means union—union of the food and the eater; the conscious being encompassing that union is the *ślokakṛt*. Or the expression may mean this: I bring about the assemblage of food itself, which is naturally meant for somebody other than itself, viz the eater, and which becomes diversified owing to this very fact. The three repetitions are meant for expressing astonishment. *Aham asmi*, I am, *prathamajāḥ* (is the same as *prathamajāḥ*), the first born (Hiraṇyagarbha); *ṛtasya*, of this world, consisting of the formed and the formless; and (I am Virāt which is) *pūrvam*, earlier; *devebhyaḥ*, than the gods. (I am) *nābhīḥ* the navel, middle part; *amṛtasya*, of immortality, i.e. the immortality of living beings is in my keeping. *Yaḥ*, anyone who, *dadāti mā*, offers me, to those who beg food—talks of me as the food; *saḥ*, he; *iti*, in this way; *āvāḥ*, i.e. *avati*, protects (me); *evam*, intact and just as I am. On the contrary, *aham*, I; who am but *annam*, the food, for the present; *admi*, eat up; *adantam annam*, that eater of food—any other man, who eats food without offering me in the form of food to his solicitors at the proper time.

At this point someone may say: "If this be so, I am afraid of liberation, consisting in becoming the Self of all. Let my worldly existence itself continue; for even though liberated, I shall still be food to be eaten by somebody." (The answer) is: Do not entertain such a fear, for the enjoyment of all the desirable things falls within the range of

relative existence. But this man of knowledge has become Brahman by transcending, through illumination, all that is described as the eater and the eaten which fall within the domain of empirical experience and which are the creations of ignorance. For him there exists nothing separately of which he can be afraid. Hence there is nothing to be afraid of in liberation.

Objection: If this be so, then what is meant by saying, "I am the eaten and the eater"?

Answer: This phenomenal existence, constituted by the eater and the eaten, that endures as a product, is nothing but a phenomenon; it is not a real substance. But though it is so, still, having in view the fact that it exists because of Brahman and that it is reduced to a non-entity apart from Brahman, this phenomenon is referred to in the text, "I am food" etc., for the sake of recommending the state of identity with Brahman which follows from the knowledge of Brahman. Therefore, when ignorance is eradicated, there cannot exist for the man, identified with Brahman, any remnant of such taints as fear which are the creations of ignorance. Accordingly, *ahamī*, I; *abhyabhavām*, overwhelm, engulf in my true nature as God; *viśvam*, the whole, *bhuvanām*, universe—derivatively meaning that which is enjoyed by all beings counting from Brahmā, or that on which all creatures are born. *Suvaḥ na jyotiḥ*: *Suvaḥ* is the sun; *na* expresses similitude. The meaning is: Our *jyotiḥ*, effulgence, is ever-shining *suvaḥ na*, like the sun. *Iti upaniṣad*, this is the knowledge of the supreme Self, inculcated in the two Parts (II and III). To him come the aforesaid fruits who masters the above-mentioned Upaniṣad by attaining the stature of Bhṛgu

after the acquisition of control over the inner and outer organs, dispassionateness, imperturbability, and concentration.

ॐ सह नावतु । सह नौ भुनक्तु । सह वीर्यं करवावहे । तेजस्वि नात्रधीतमस्तु मा विद्विषावहे ।

ॐ शान्ति शान्ति शान्ति ॥

INDEX TO TEXT

अग्निः पूर्वरूपम्	..	Tai.	I. iii.	2
अग्नियर्थको भुवनं	..	Ka.	II. ii.	9
अग्ने नय सुपथा	..	Īś.		18
अङ्गुष्ठमात्रः पुरुषो ज्योतिः	..	Ka.	II. i.	13
अङ्गुष्ठमात्रः पुरुषोऽन्तरात्मा	..	Ka.	II. iii.	17
अङ्गुष्ठमात्रः पुरुषो मध्ये	..	Ka.	I. i.	12
अजीयंताममृतानाम्	..	Ka.	I. i.	28
अणोरणीयान्गहतो	..	Ka.	I. ii.	20
अथ वायुमद्भुवन्	..	Ke.	III.	7
अथान. संहिताया उपनिषदं	..	Tai.	I. iii.	1
अथाधिज्योतिषम्	..	Tai.	I. iii.	2
अथाधिप्रजम्	..	Tai.	I. iii.	3
अथाधिविद्यम्	..	Tai.	I. iii.	2
अथाध्यात्मम्	..	Tai.	I. iii. 5, I. vii.	1
अथाध्यात्मं यदंतद	..	Ke.	IV.	5
अथन्द्रमद्भुवन्	..	Ke.	III.	11
अधरा हतुः पूर्वरूपम्	..	Tai.	I. ii.	4
अनुपश्य यथा पूर्वं	..	Ka.	I. i.	6
अनेजदेकं मनसो जवीयो	..	Īś.		4
अन्धं तमः प्रविशन्ति	..	Īś.	9, 12	
अन्नं न परिचक्षीत	..	Tai.	III. viii.	1
अन्नं न निन्द्यात्	..	Tai.	III. vii.	1
अन्नं बहु कुर्वीत	..	Tai.	III. ix.	1
अन्नं ब्रह्मेति व्यजानात्	..	Tai.	III. ii.	1
अन्नं हि भूतानां ज्येष्ठम्	..	Tai.	II. ii.	1



अन्नाद्वै प्रजाः प्रजायन्ते
 अन्नाद्भूतानि जायन्ते
 अन्यच्छ्रेयोऽन्यदुतैव
 अन्यत्र धर्मादन्यत्र
 अन्यदेव तद्विदिताद्
 अन्यदेवाहुर्विद्यया
 अन्यदेवाहुः सम्भवात्
 अरण्योर्निहितो जातवेदा
 अविद्यायामन्तरे वर्तमानाः
 अव्यक्तात्तु परः पुरुषः
 अशरीरं शरीरेषु
 अशब्दमस्पर्शमरूपम्
 असद्वा इदमग्र आसीत्
 असन्नेव स भवति
 अमुर्या नाम ते लोका
 अस्तीत्येवोपलब्धव्यः
 अस्य विलसमानस्य
 अहमन्महमन्नम्
 अहमस्मि प्रथमजा
 अहं वृक्षस्य रेरिवा
 आकाशशरीरं ब्रह्म
 आचार्यः पूर्वरूपम्
 आत्मानं रथिनं
 आनन्दो ब्रह्मेति व्यजानात्
 आनन्दाद्ब्रह्मेव खल्विमानि
 आप्नोति स्वाराज्यम्
 आ मा यन्तु ब्रह्मचारिणः

.. .. Tai. II. ii. 1
 Tai. II. ii. 1
 Ka. ii. 1
 Ka. I. ii. 14
 Ke. I. 4
 Īś. 10
 Īś. 13
 Ka. II. i. 8
 Ka. I. ii. 5
 Ka. II. iii. 8
 Ka. I. ii. 22
 Ka. I. iii. 15
 Tai. II. vii. 1
 Tai. II. vi. 1
 Īś. 3
 Ka. II. iii. 13
 Ka. II. ii. 4
 Tai. III. x. 6
 Tai. III. x. 6
 Tai. I. x. 1
 Tai. I. vi. 2
 Tai. I. iii. 2
 Ka. I. iii. 3
 Tai. III. vi. 1
 Tai. III. vi. 1
 Tai. I. vi. 2
 Tai. I. iv. 2

आवहन्ति वितन्वाना	..	Tai.	I. iv.	1
आशाप्रतीक्षे संगतं	.	Ka.	I. i.	8
आसीनो दूरं व्रजति	..	Ka.	I. ii.	21
इन्द्रियाणां पृथग्भावं	.	Ka.	II. iii.	6
इन्द्रियाणि हयानाहुः	..	Ka.	I. iii.	4
इन्द्रियेभ्यः परं मनः	.	Ka.	II. iii.	7
इन्द्रियेभ्यः परा ह्यर्था	..	Ka.	I. iii.	10
इह चेदशकद्वोद्धुं	..	Ka.	II. iii.	4
इह चेदवेदीदय	..	Kc.	II.	5
ईशा वास्यमिदं सर्वं	..	Īś.		1
उत्तिष्ठत जाग्रत प्राप्य	..	Ka.	I. iii.	14
उपनिषद भो ब्रूहीति	..	Ke.	IV.	7
उशन् ह वै वाजश्रवमः	..	Ka.	I. i.	1
ऊर्ध्वंमूलोऽवाक्शाख.	..	Ka.	II. iii.	1
ऊर्ध्वं प्राणमुन्नयत्यपानं	..	Ka.	II. ii.	3
ऋतं च स्वाध्यायप्रवचने च	.	Tai.	I. ix.	1
ऋतं पिबन्तौ सुकृतस्य	..	Ka.	I. iii.	1
एको वशी सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा	..	Ka.	II. ii.	12
एतच्छ्रुत्वा सम्पग्निगृह्य	.	Ka.	I. ii.	13
एतत्तुल्यं यदि मन्यसे	..	Ka.	I. i.	24
एतदालम्बनं श्रेष्ठं	..	Ka.	I. ii.	17
एतद्धथेवाक्षर ब्रह्म	..	Ka.	I. ii.	16
एतमानन्दमयमात्मानम्	.	Tai. II. viii. 5, III.	x.	5
एतं ह वाव न तपति	..	Tai.	II. ix.	1
एष आदेश एष उपदेशः	..	Tai.	I. xi.	4
एष ते अग्निर्नचिकेतः	..	Ka.	I. i.	19
एष सर्वेषु भूतेषु	..	Ka.	I. iii.	12

ओमिति ब्रह्म	Tai. I. viii.	1
कामस्याप्तिं जगतः प्रतिष्ठां	Ka. I. ii.	11
कुर्वन्नेवेह कर्माणि	Īś.	2
केनेषितं पतति प्रेषितं	Ke. I.	1
को ह्येवान्यात् कः प्राण्यात्	Tai. II. vii.	1
क्षेम इति वाचि	Tai. III. x.	2
जानाम्यहं शेवधिरित्यनित्यम्	Ka. I. ii.	10
त ऐक्षन्तास्माकमेवायं	Kc. III.	2
तत्सृष्ट्वा तदेवानुप्राविशत्	Tai. II. vi.	1
तदनुप्रविश्य सच्च त्यच्चाभवत्	Tai. II. vi.	1
तदभ्यद्रवत्तमभ्यवदत्	Kc. III. 4,	8
तदेजति तन्नैजति	Īś.	5
तदेतदिति मन्यन्ते	Ka. II. ii.	14
तद्ध तद्वनं नाम	Ke. IV.	6
तन्नम इत्युपासीत	Tai. III. x.	4
तपसा ब्रह्म विजिज्ञासस्व	Tai. III. ii.	5
तमब्रवीत् प्रीयमाणो	Ka. I. i.	16
तं दुर्दर्शं गूढम्	Ka. I. ii.	12
तं ह कुमारं सन्तं	Ka. I. i.	2
तस्माद्वा इन्द्रोऽतितराम्	Ke. III.	3
तस्माद्वा एतस्मादन्नरसमयात्	Tai. II. u.	1
तस्माद्वा एतस्मादात्मन	Tai. II. i.	1
तस्माद्वा एते देवा	Ke. IV.	2
तस्मिंस्त्वयि किं वीर्यम्	Ke. III. 5,	9
तस्मै तृणं निदधौ	Ke. III. 6,	10
तस्यै तपो दमः कर्मेति	Ke. IV.	8
तस्येष आदेशो यदेतत्	Ke. IV.	4

तस्यैष एव शारीर आत्मा	Tai.	II. iii.	1
तां योगमिति मन्यन्ते	Ka.	II. iii.	11
निस्त्रो रात्रीर्यदवात्सी-	Ka.	I. i.	19
तेज्जिनमब्रुवन् जातवेद	Ke.	III.	3
त्रिणाचिकेतस्त्रयमेतद्	Ka.	I. i.	18
त्रिणाचिकेतस्त्रिभिरत्य	Ka.	I. i.	17
दूरमेते विपरीते विपूची	Ka.	I. ii.	4
देवगितृकार्याभ्यां	Tai.	I. xi.	2
देवैरत्रापि विचिकित्सितं	Ka.	I. i.	21, 22
न कंचन वसतो प्रत्याचक्षीत	Tai.	III. x.	1
न जायते अत्रयते वा	Ka.	I. ii.	18
न तत्र चक्षुर्गच्छति	Ke.	I.	3
न तत्र सूर्या भ्राति	Ka.	II. ii.	15
न नरेणावरेण प्राक्त	Ka.	I. ii.	8
न प्राणेन नापानेन मर्त्यो	Ka.	II. ii.	5
न विन्नेन तपणीयो मनुष्यः	Ka.	I. i.	27
न संदृशे तिष्ठति रूपम्	Ka.	II. iii	9
नाचिकेतमुपाख्यानम्	Ka.	I. iii.	16
नायमात्मा प्रवचनेन लभ्यो	Ka.	I. ii.	23
नाविरतो दुश्चरितात्	Ka.	I. ii.	24
न साम्परायः प्रतिभाति	Ka.	I. ii.	6
नाहं मन्ये सुवेदेति	Ke.	II.	2
नित्योज्जित्यानां चेतन-	Ka.	II. ii.	13
नैव वाचा न मनसा	Ka.	II. iii.	12
नैषा तर्केण मतिरापनेया	Ka.	I. ii.	9
नो इतराणि	Tai.	I. xi.	3
पराचः कामाननयन्ति	Ka.	II. i.	2

परां च खानि व्यतृणत्	Ka. II. i. 1
पाङ्क्तं वा इदं सर्वम्	Tai. I. vii. 1
पीतोदका जग्धतृणा	Ka. I. i. 3
पुरमेकादशद्वारम्	Ka. II. ii. 1
पूपत्रेकर्षे यम सूर्यं	Īś. 16
पृथिवी पूर्वरूपम्	Tai. I. iii. 1
पृथिव्यन्तरिक्षं द्यौर्दिशः	Tai. I. vii. 1
प्रतिबोधविदितं मतम्	Ke. II. 4
प्र ते ब्रवीमि तदु मे	Ka. I. i. 14
प्राणं देवा अनुप्राणन्ति	Tai. II. iii. 1
प्राणो व्यानोऽपान	Tai. I. vii. 1
प्राणो ब्रह्मेति व्यजानात्	Tai. III. iii. 1
बहूनामेमि प्रथमो	Ka. I. i. 5
ब्रह्म ह देवेभ्यो विजिग्ये	Ke. III. 1
ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति पगम्	Tai. II. i. 1
भयादस्याग्निस्तपति	Ka. II. iii. 3
भीषाञ्जमाद्वातः पवते	Tai. II. viii. 1*
भूरित्यग्नौ प्रतितिष्ठति	Tai. I. vi. 1
भूर्भुवः सुवरिति	Tai. I. v. 1
भृगुर्वै वारुणिः	Tai. III. i. 1
मनसं वेदमाप्तव्यं	Ka. II. i. 11
मनो ब्रह्मेति व्यजानात्	Tai. III. iv. 1
मह इति, तद् ब्रह्म	Tai. I. v. 1
मह इति ब्रह्म	Tai. I. v. 3
मह इत्यादित्यः	Tai. I. v. 2
महतः परमव्यक्तम्	Ka. I. iii. 11
माता पूर्वरूपम्	Tai. I. iii. 4

मृत्युप्रोक्तां नचिकेतो	Ka. II. iii. 18
य इमं परमं गुह्यं	Ka. I. ii. 17
य इमं मध्वदं वेद	Ka. II. i. 5
य एष सुप्तेषु जागति	Ka. II. ii. 8
यच्चक्षुषा न पश्यति	Kc. I. 7
यच्छेद् बाङ्मनसी प्राज्ञः	.	.	Ka. I. iii. 13
यच्छ्रोत्रेण न श्रुणोति	Kc. I. 8
यतश्चोदेति सूर्यः	Ka. II. i. 9
यतो वा इमानि भूतानि	Tai. III. i. 1
यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते	..	Tai. II. iv. I, II. ix. 1	
यत् प्राणेन न प्राणिति	Ke. I. 9
यथाऽऽदर्शे तथाऽऽत्मनि	Ka. II. iii. 5
यथा पुरस्ताद् भविता	Ka. I. i. 11
यथोदकं दुर्गे वृष्टं	Ka. II. i. 14
यथोदकं शुद्धे शुद्धम्	Ka. II. i. 15
यदा पञ्चावतिष्ठन्ते	Ka II iii 10
यदा सर्वे प्रभिद्यन्ते	Ka II. iii. 15
यदा सर्वे प्रमूच्यन्ते	Ka. II. iii. 14
यदा ह्येवंप एतस्मिन्	Tai. II. vii. 1
यदिदं किं च जगत् सर्वं	Ka. II. iii. 2
यदि मन्यसे सुवेदेति	Kc. II. 1
यदेवेह तदमुत्र	Ka. II. i. 10
यद्वाचाज्जभ्युदितं येन	Kc. I. 5
यद्वं तत् सुकृतं	Tai. II. vii. 1
यन्मनसा न मनूते	Ke. I. 6
यः पूर्वं तपसो जातम्	Ka. II. i. 6
यश इति पशुषु	Tai. III. x. 3

यशो जनेऽशानि	Tai. I. iv.	3
यश्छन्दसामृषभो	Tai. I. iv.	1
यस्तु विज्ञानवान् भवति	Ka. I. iii. 6,	8
यस्तु सर्वाणि भूतान्यात्म-	Īś.	6
यस्त्वविज्ञानवान् भवति	Ka. I. iii. 5,	7
यस्मिन् सर्वाणि भूतान्यात्मैवा-	Īś.	7
यस्मिन्निदं विचिकित्सन्ति	Ka. I. i. 29	
यस्य ब्रह्म च क्षत्रं च	Ka. I. ii. 25	
यस्यामतं तस्य मतं	Ke. II.	3
य. सेतुरीजानानाम्	Ka. I. iii. 2	
या प्राणेन सम्भवत्यदिदि.	Ka. II. i. 7	
ये के चास्मच्छ्रयासो	Tai. I. ix. 3	
ये तत्र ब्राह्मणाः संमर्शिनः	Tai. I. xi. 4	
येन रूपं रसं गन्धं	Ka. II. i. 3	
येयं प्रेते विचिकित्सा	Ka. I. i. 20	
ये ये कामा दुर्लभा	Ka. I. i. 25	
योनिमन्ये प्रपद्यन्ते	Ka. II. ii. 7*	
यो वा एतामेवं वेदा-	Ke. IV. 9	
रसो वै सः	Tai. II. vii. 1	
लोकादिमग्नि तमुवाच	Ka. I. i. 15	
वायुर्यथैको भुवनं	Ka. II. ii. 10	
वायुरनिलममृतमथेदं	Īś.	17
विज्ञानं ब्रह्मेति	Tai. III. v. 1	
विज्ञान यज्ञं तनुते	Tai. II. v. 1	
विज्ञानसारथिर्यंस्तु	Ka. I. iii. 9	
विद्यां चाविद्यां च	Īś.	11
वेदमनूच्याचार्योऽन्तेवासिनम्	Tai. I. xi. 1	

वैश्वानरः प्रविशत्यतिथिः	..	Ka. I. i. 7
शतं चैका च हृदयस्य	..	Ka. II. iii. 16
शतायुषः पुत्रपौत्रान्	..	Ka. I. i. 23
शं नो मित्रः शं वरुणः	..	Tai. I. i. I, I. xii. 1
शान्तसंकल्पः सुमना	..	Ka. I. i. 10
शीक्षां व्याख्यास्यामः	..	Tai. I. ii. 1
श्रवणायापि बहूभिर्यो	..	Ka. I. ii. 7
श्रेयश्च प्रेयश्च मनुष्यम्	..	Ka. I. ii. 2
श्रोत्रस्य श्रोत्रं मनसो	..	Kc. I. 2
श्रोत्रियस्य चाकामहृतस्य	..	Tai. II. viii. 1
श्वोभावा मर्त्यस्य	..	Ka. I. i. 26
स एको मनुष्यगन्धर्वाणाम्	..	Tai. II. viii. 2
स तस्मिन्नेवाकाशे	..	Kc. III. 12
मर्त्यं जानमनन्तं ब्रह्म	..	Tai. II. i. 1
सत्यं वद धर्मं चर	..	Tai. I. xi. 1
सु त्वमग्निं स्वर्ग्यमध्येषि	..	Ka. I. i. 13
स त्वं प्रियान् प्रियरूपाश्च	..	Ka. I. ii. 3
स पर्यगाच्छुक्रमकायम्	..	Īś. 8
संभूतिं च विनाश च	..	Īś. 14
स य एवंवित्	..	Tai. III. x. 15
स य एषोऽस्तर्हृदय	..	Tai. I. vi. 1
स यश्चायं पुरुषे	..	Tai. II. viii. 5
सर्वे वेदा यत्पदम्	..	Ka. I. ii. 15
सह नावक्तु मह नो भुनक्तु	Ka. II. iii. 19, Tai. II. i. 1	
सह नो यशः	..	Tai. I. iii. 1
स होवाच पितरं तत	..	Ka. I. i. 4
सा ब्रह्मेति होवाच	..	Kc. IV. 1

सुवरित्यादित्ये	..	Tai. I. vi.	2
सूर्यो यथा सर्वलोकस्य	..	Ka. II. ii.	11
सैषाऽऽनन्दस्य मीमांसा	..	Tai. II. viii.	1
सोऽकामयत	..	Tai. II. vi.	1
स्वप्नान्तं जागरितान्तं	..	Ka. II. i.	4
स्वर्गं लोके न भयं	..	Ka. I. i.	12
हंसः शुचिषट्सुरन्तग्धिसद्	..	Ka. II. ii.	2
हन्त त इदं प्रवक्ष्यामि	..	Ka. II. ii.	6
हन्ता चेन्मन्यते हन्तुं	..	Ka. I. ii.	19
हिरण्मयेन पात्रेण	..	Īś.	15

