

MFN
441

श्री

11 NB

17890

क ठो प नि प द्वा ण्य म्

श्रीरङ्गरामानुजमुनिविरचितम्

SRI RANGARĀMĀNUJA'S

KATHŌPANIṢAD-BHĀṢYA

EDITED

WITH INTRODUCTION TRANSLATION & NOTES

BY

Dr K C VARADACHĀRI M A PH D

Professor and Head of the Department of Philosophy

Sri Venkateswara College Tirupati

AND

D T TĀTĀCHĀRYA SIROMUNI M O L

Lecturer in Sanskrit Sri Venkateswara College Tirupati



BE S. J. P. D. T. E. - 111 111
(KARNATAKASITIA)

Published by

Sri P V R K PRASAD, I A S

Executive Officer

TIRUMALA TIRUPATI DEVASTHANAMS TIRUPATI

1979

1-1290

CONTENTS



1	Foreword	1
2	Introduction	v
3	Cross references	xvi
4	Kaṭhopanīṣad bhāṣya - Text	1
5	Tippaṇi	1
6	Various readings	xi
7	Corrigenda	xii
8	Index of quotations in the Bhāṣya	xiii
9	Kaṭhopanīṣad - bhāṣya - Translation	1

FOREWORD

The *Kathopanishad* is the third Upanishad to be published with English translation of the Viśiṣṭādvaita Bhāṣya in the Sri Venkateswara Oriental Series, the second to be published with the Bhāṣya of Raṅgarāmānuja and the first to be published with a few words of introduction from me.

The *Kaṭha* is perhaps the foremost in point of interest and popularity. It is a perfect specimen of the poetry of the ancient Hindus. The philosophy is not more clearly explained in any other Upanishad. To add to these the teaching is set in an attractive story. The story is found elsewhere in the ancient Literature and it is received and used here in more or less the same form to introduce the teaching and to indicate the fitness of a student to be initiated in the mystic philosophy. The story also brings out clearly the contrast between the characters of the practical father and the speculative son.

The Advaita commentaries on the Upanishads have been translated into English by several scholars before; but the Viśiṣṭādvaita commentaries have not been translated so far. The Institute has, therefore, undertaken to translate and publish them in its series and thus make the contents available to Indian Philosophers not conversant with Sanskrit. The Viśiṣṭādvaitic interpretation of the Upanishads has thus remained a sealed book and the merits of it have not attracted philosophers. It is hoped that the present series of translations published by the Institute will remove the disability.

The translators have been connected with the Institute till recently but now they have gone on to the staff of the sister institution, the Sri Venkateswara Arts College, which has been recently

II

started. It is hoped the change of location will not affect their work and they will continue the translation of other Bhāṣyas with the same zeal.

Owing to their being engaged in the work of the other institution, the Editors could not carry the Sanskrit text through the press and provide the book with the necessary indexes, readings, etc. This work has devolved upon Sri K. Sathakopachari, Nyaya-Mimamsa Siromani, Library Pandit in Sanskrit in the Institute.

The Institute will consider itself amply repaid if this series can infuse interest in Viśiṣṭādvaita Philosophy in the minds of scholars.

TIRUPATI, }
4—11—1948 }

P. V. RAMANUJASWAMI

Director.

KATHOPANISAD

INTRODUCTION

The *Kāthopaniṣad* is the third in the traditional order of the Upaniṣads and it is indeed a very important next step in the knowledge of Godhead or the Supreme Self of all. The *īśopaniṣad* mentioned briefly that the path of Karma, that is injuncted action (*dharma*), should be disinterestedly trodden faithfully and even mentioned that when followed with integral knowledge with fidelity (*vidyā*) it does help the 'crossing over' Death.¹ The *Kenopaniṣad* showed the transcendental nature and power of the ultimate Being and its supreme "desirableness" as manifested in the activities of the senses (or gods) and mind, but which these senses and mind could never know except vaguely (or subliminally). The *Kāthopaniṣad* embraces both these facts of immortality and ultimate beneficence (*amṛtava*² as *tadvanatva*). It elaborates the cryptic statement at the end of the *Kenopaniṣad* which describes the subsidiaries of the divine knowledge *tasyai tapo damaḥ karma ca pratiṣṭhā vedāḥ sarvāṅgāni satyam āyatanam*, iv. 8.

Dr. Ananda K. Coomaraswami considers *Katha* to be a gnostic document which has to be studied as part of the gnostic literature all over the world.³ According to Sri Krishna Prem⁴ "*Kāthopaniṣad* is a practical treatise written to help us achieve a very real end here and now" and the explanations he has given follow the occult literature all over the world. Thus we have every reason

1. The 'crossing over', is mentioned as something that has efficacy after death or dying (*vimukte pretyā*). It is so understood as counselling videha-mukti. It may mean 'occult passing on' according to Krishna Prem, but even Sankara does not accept this latter view.

2. *Śreyas* is the full nature of the Divine, and from this most possibly is developed the personality of Śrī who is stated to have her residence in the Divine Lord, therefore His name '*Śrī-niyāsa*'.

3. New Indian Antiquary I.

4. *Yoga of the Kāthopaniṣad*.

to take this Upaniṣad seriously as a 'Vidyā.' According to earlier seers and teachers a vidyā or a knowledge is a path to be trodden or followed in a particular manner and the fruits of such a path are indeed ultimate beatitude and realisation. Thus each Upaniṣad is a 'Vidyā,' a clear and definite instruction of a particular path, integral to the realisation of the Goal, which of course could be reached by other vidyās also. Thus the Upaniṣads in all are said to give thrity-two vidyās, of which the *Kaṭhapaniṣad* deals with the Nāciketa-vidyā or Trināciketa or Nāciketa-Agnividya.

The *Kaṭhapaniṣad* is a very important Upaniṣad in yet another sense. It contains a general survey of the Vedic ritual and philosophy and eschatology. It has had the good fortune of having been much studied and written about by scholars both occidental and oriental, and stands only next to *Īśā* and the *Gītā* from the point of view of popularity. Śrī Śaṅkara commented on this work as also Śrī Madhva, and Śrī Rāmānuja has commented in his *Śrī Bhāṣya*, on certain important points raised in this Upaniṣad, which have been taken into consideration by Bhagavān Bādarāyaṇa for purposes of synthesis in his *Vedānta Sūtras*. These points have been reproduced at the end of this work. Śrī Raṅgarāmānuja has commented on this work following closely the steps of Śrī Rāmānuja and his expounders like Śrī Sudarṣaṇa Sūri or Śruta-prakāśikācārya. Prof. Rawson, who is a careful scholar of this Upaniṣad, has stated in his work that he made no use of the *Bhāṣya* by Raṅgarāmānuja because of its *late* date and since Śrī Rāmānuja had discussed all that is necessary on intricate or important points. He however considers that Śrī Rāmānuja's explanations are more in accord with the spirit of the Upaniṣad than those of others.

The *Kaṭhapaniṣad* belongs to the Kāṭhaka School of the Kṛṣṇa Yajur Veda. We do not possess a Kāṭhaka-Brāhmaṇa. The Taittirīya Saṁhitā has both a Brāhmaṇa and an Upaniṣad. The Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa (III. 11.8 1-6) contains an outline of the Naciketa story with which the *Kaṭhapaniṣad* opens and is parallel to the latter which is made more elaborate. Indeed according to Raṅgarāmānuja this *anuvāka* of the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa is referred to by the *Kaṭhapaniṣad* in I. 17. Sri Krishna Prem considers that we can see 'the germ of this Upanisad' in Rg Veda X. 135.

No attempt has here been made to deal with the possible relations of this Upaniṣad to the *Bhagavad Gītā* which contains much that is parallel to, if not precisely identical with the instruction in almost the very language used here. Nor to Buddhism. We have to point out that whatever may be the appropriateness in such parallels we have always to remember that a Vidyā is an integral instruction and it may undergo transformation under new conditions due to subordination to other Vidyās.

But one thing is certain that, even as in the *Bhagavad Gītā*, the *Kāthopaniṣad* insists upon the necessity to perform ordained or injuncted karma (for that is *dharma*) the *svadharma* of each individual, and its performance is capable of leading to the highest abode of immortal existence, and not merely to the lower heaven. Such karma is incapable of binding the soul to *samsāra*. The truth is that disinterested action, or action divinised or offered to the Divine, action that reveals the glorious purpose of service to God, is capable of helping achievement of the immortal status for the soul. The question that arises thereafter is as to the nature of that soul after *mukti* or *mokṣa*, whether it continues to be separate or lost in the One Divine variously described as the Ocean or the Nirvāṇa state of Brahman? It is held by modern scholars that what Buddha meant by Nirvāṇa was a state of positive nature of the supremely Transcendent and not a negative state. It is clear that it is not annihilation as such or Pure Non-being. Any attainment of the Buddhistic metaphysical state of annihilation or loss of self or non-existence soul of as such has not formed part of the Upaniṣadic thought. It is particularly a feature of the rational method of Buddha, who in order to define the nature of the soul as held by the several thinkers, had to negate all that it is not. In this sense, Buddha went to the logical extreme of Yājñavalkya and insisted upon the apprehension of the futility of seeking to make permanent the impermanent congeries of affections, feelings, habits, desires and hopes. Truly we need the permanent, but the permanent is not all that it is described to be by materialistic metaphysics. Anyway it is not in line with the purpose of this Upaniṣad to investigate into the nature of the soul or self as such, but only as to what becomes of the soul or self on liberation, for it is clearly held that the soul does persist after death.

This Upaniṣad gives a definite answer to the question asked. It speaks in the first part of the Upaniṣad about the necessity to know the meaning of the Fire-altar as the Brāhmaṇas had taught it, (perhaps in the adhyātmic way too), and already the promise of the highest immortal state is envisaged in that section, though some commentators think otherwise.

But as the Upaniṣads are *Adhyātma-śāstras* or *vidyās* which instruct the occult truth and path towards the positive attainment of gnostic knowledge which could only be attained after a period of practice of self-control and service of the Divine (*yama* and *niyama* of the Yoga), the nature of the Supreme Self and that of the individual soul and its progressive attainment of the former are taught along with the steps of Yoga which lead to the ultimate realization. This Upaniṣad even like the *Īśā* inculcates the conjoint performance of *Avidyā* (construction of the Fire-altar and the rituals prescribed) and the *Vidyā*, which is the knowledge of the *Tattva* or Reality in respect of the three terms, God, soul and Nature. It is held by some thinkers that the final verses of the *Kāthopaniṣad* are not integral to the Upaniṣad as it concludes earlier. It may be that these final verses reveal the culmination of the Yoga of concentration at the time of departure, *antyakāla-smaraṇa*. The *antyakāla-smaraṇa* has been shown to be very helpful by the *Bhagavad Gītā* in respect of determining the nature of the world that a man would reach. Or more properly if *smaraṇa* pertains to concentration on any particular deity, it will be an invocation to that deity to lead him on to freedom or Bliss. This will reveal a psychological set-up in the consciousness, a psychological set which will reveal the type of personality that the soul has been building up, whether towards liberation or towards mundane enjoyment, '*preyas*' or '*śreyas*' as the *Kāthopaniṣad* beautifully puts it. It is an act of choice made under the great cloud of departure, the threat of death, and therefore revealing the inmost structure of the soul, its primary longing and conversion. That this choice-could be made earlier and practised with assiduity is not denied, but the crucial moment is indeed the moment of departure, death, threat of possible physical annihilation. And such moments are spiritual pointers to the status of the soul in its integral being. Man's primary instinct is confronted with other desires and the balance of death decides which side is heavier. Man is then alone weighed and measured.

STRUCTURE OF THE UPANIṢAD

It consists of two (parts) *adhyāyas*, each of which contains three sections (*vallis*). With the exception of the first two sentences in the first part, the whole Upaniṣad is in metrical form. Since the first *adhyāya* concludes with the following passage “*Nāciketam*” it is sometimes held that the Upaniṣad ends here and that the second *adhyāya* is a later addition. It is even claimed that the second *adhyāya* merely expands the teaching of the first *adhyāya*. The repetition of the last line (cd) in the first *adhyāya* confirms the above view that the natural conclusion should have been this alone. There is some difference between what is stated there and the conclusion in the second *adhyāya*. The real conclusion of the Upaniṣad seems to be the concluding verse of the second *adhyāya* (sixth *valli*): *mṛtyu proktam*.....

FIRST ADHYAYA

It appears however that importance is attached to the story of Naciketas in the first *adhyāya*,¹ whereas importance is attached to instruction regarding Reality (*tattva*), the means *hita* and the result (fruit, *phala*) as a whole in the second *adhyāya*. From this we find that this Upaniṣad contains, as is usual in all Upaniṣads,² the three instructions on *tattva*, *hita* and *puruṣārtha* without which no *vidyā* can be followed, not to speak of being understood.

I. Valli. The story of Naciketas after his having been offered to Death by his father Vājaśravas is contained in this section. After having gone to the abode of Death he had to wait for three days ere Death returned and in lieu of this waiting and fasting for three days as a guest, he was offered three boons. The story after describing the first two boons which pertain to the earth

1. It may be pointed out here that if in the Kenopaniṣad the story-myth is found in the third section, which illustrates the *tattva*, truth, enunciated in the earlier two sections, here the story-myth comes at the very beginning of the Upaniṣad and its inner meaning elaborated in the second *adhyāya*. The Kena insists upon knowing that all activity proceeds from and is sustained by the Brahman : here it is shewn that all action is to be totally consecrated to the Divine alone who is the inner ruler immortal, capable of being known within the heart along with the soul, that is also immortal, as its adorable Object.

2. cf. Introductions to Īśā and Kena Upaniṣads SVOS. vols. 5 and 7).

(*artha*) and heaven (*svarga*) introduces the philosophical third, Mokṣa or liberation from the round of existence in earth and heaven. Naciketas refused to entertain the third *puruṣārtha* namely desire (*kāma*), and withstood the temptations offered to him by Yama in this regard. This rejection of the *kāma-puruṣārtha* is shown to be of the *preyas* or mere pleasant which is other than and inferior to the *śreyas*, the good, which alone is to be sought, and this *śreyas* is liberation-getting. No true philosophical instruction can have effectiveness unless the *kāma-puruṣārtha* is totally rejected, as Yama himself points out in this story in the opening lines of the second *valli*.

It may however be asked as to what difference there is between the second and the third boons in as much as according to Raṅga-rāmānuja *svargya* refers to a *svarga* that is identical with “The eternal abode of Viṣṇu” and should be considered to be identical with the *Kenopaniṣad*’s final lines *ananta-svarga-loka-jyeye*. In the Tait. Brāhmaṇa-story of Nāciketas, the second boon refers to *dharma* that is the full effectiveness of sacrificial performance, (*tato vai tasyeṣṭāpūrte nakṣiyete*) for the sake of which Yama teaches Naciketas the Naciketa-Fire even as in the Upaniṣad here. The third boon in the Brāhmaṇa however refers to Immortality¹—freedom from re-death—*punar-mṛtyu*—a point also noticed in the second boon in the Upaniṣad I. 1.18cd. Yama in the Brāhmaṇa teaches that the Nāciketa-fire itself secures that end, thus confirming the view that the Upaniṣad has clubbed together the second and third boons there to form one here. Thus there has arisen a new question as to whether the soul exists at all in or after attaining the state of immortality, and as to how it then exists.

The third boon asked by Naciketas could not be answered without a clear understanding of what the question is about. The question about the existence of the soul after death does not refer to the existence or non-existence of the soul as such,² but to the

1. Sri Krishna Prem considers that it refers to the nature of the Freed or ‘passed over’ self, whether it could be referred to as Is or Is-not : the Upaniṣad definitely answers that such a one IS (*asti*), for it is here that there seems to be doubt.

2. There is no place here for the Buddhist view of general Śūnya, for it is clear that it really refers to the existence of a liberated soul as a separate entity or whether it non-exists having utterly merged in the One Being

nature of existence of the soul at liberation, that is, the nature of the liberated soul (*mukta*) and the nature of that which it attains, and the means to that final or peak-attainment (*param padam*). Therefore we can see that the Upaniṣad is a logical development of the Brāhmaṇa's third boon. Unless we take this question in this way, Yama's answer contained in the II. 12 cannot be held to be relevant.

II. *Vallī*. The first portion of this *Vallī* upto Mantra 11 is also an introduction to Yama's answer to the third question, as it describes the qualifications of a seeker after this.¹ It lays emphasis not only (i) on the detachment from *preyas*, worldly advancement and enjoyment, but also (ii) on the necessity of having a proper teacher to teach one that truth about 'śreyas,' the highest Good.

The tenth mantra of this *Vallī* contains the significant statement of Yama "that he performed or constructed the Nāciketa fire—altar and he attained the Eternal by means of transitory things." Śrī Saṅkara interprets the word 'eternal' as "comparatively enduring." The meaning given by Raṅgarāmānuja is in accordance with the Brāhmaṇa statement *tato vai so' pa punar mṛtyum ajayet*.

Yama's answer to Naciketa's question is very brief. It is contained in one single mantra (II. 12). Thereafter Yama tells Naciketas that he had already instructed him fully about that which he prayed for. But Naciketas asks Yama to tell him about the truth known as other than Dharma etc. Yama then begins to explain in detail the answer he gave cryptically in the twelfth mantra. Firstly he speaks about the Praṇava, then about the nature of the soul and lastly about the Supreme soul (II. 22). In verse 20 the Grace of the supreme Creator is stated to be necessary in adhyātma Yoga for beholding the hidden Being in the cave, the Supreme Lord who is *ānoraṇiyān mahato mahīyān*. *Dhātuh-prasāda* is to be interpreted as the grace of the Creator (who is also the supporter and protector) and not merely as the mental peace or luminosity which undoubtedly is a necessity in Yoga for any large or real comprehension of the Divine Nature. This

1. Sri Krishna Prem's references to the Myths of Temptation are interesting and reveal a significant secret of occultism.

idea is not merely implicitly but also explicitly stated in the 23rd verse. The text of Raṅgarāmānuja reads it ‘*dhātuh-prasādāt.*’ The verse 28 is interpreted by Raṅgarāmānuja as referring to the grace of God which is stated to result from loving devotion or one-pointed seeking in love. The concluding verses refer to the attainment of this knowledge and presence of the Divine within. It must be remembered that the theory of the Mīmāṃsakas about the existence of strict causality or determinism between ritual and fruits is repudiated or rather by-passed when the individual is asked to surrender himself for service to God through illumined love or one-pointed Yoga without seeking any fruits for his actions or *dhyānas*, since this non-seeking of anything for oneself is that which snaps the casual chain and is the meaning of true love or devotion or pure wisdom or illumined understanding and service. This *valli* concludes with the intimation of certain rules of conduct and instructs certain virtues that are to be cultivated for enabling one to receive the Supreme Grace.

III. Valli. The third *valli* deals with the *hita* or the means to the attainment of Supreme Grace, thus expanding the instruction given at the end of the *valli*. It lays stress on the necessity to control the sense-organs. It mentions further that control is to be exercised gradually in the following order: firstly on the sense-organs, secondly on the objects of enjoyment, thirdly on the mind, fourthly on the intellect, fifthly on the soul, sixthly on the body as a whole (the Unmanifest) and lastly reach through the above stages (of *dhāraṇa* cum-*pratyāhāra*) the Supreme Self, whose grace alone is capable of granting final Liberation. As many scholars hold, Yoga-śāstra might have got its fundamental clues from this section.

SECOND ADHYAYA

IV Valli. After pointing out the distinction between the seeker and the non-seeker or the indifferent seeker, this *valli* describes the nature of the Supreme Self as dwelling in all creatures, thus distinguishing Him from the embodied *jiva* who resides in a body (IV. 5-8). It may be noted that on account of the indwelling of the Infinite Person in the body of the embodied soul, the Infinite Person assumes the size of a thumb (*anguşṭha-mātra*) in the heart for the sake of meditation or conceivability.

V Vallī. This *vallī* develops the instruction regarding the indwelling-nature of Brahman with special reference to His being responsible for all the actions of the soul. (cf first *Kena* I.): What may be considered to be a direct answer to the third question of Naciketas in the I *vallī* “*Ye yam prete vicikitsā...*” (20) is here given by Yama who says “O Gautama, surely I shall teach you now the secret eternal Brahman and what the soul becomes after departure (release)” (V. 6—7) “Some souls enter wombs for getting bodies; others take up the form of the Unmoving in accordance with karma and in accordance with Knowledge,” with which we may profitably compare Srī Kṛṣṇa’s reply to Arjuna’s answer (*Bh. Gitā* VI. 40—47). The point at issue is, it may be noted, regarding the *seeker* mainly, and should not be held to be a reply regarding the ordinary man who has not entered on the spiritual path or Yogic evolution.

It may be seen here that Yama promises to teach first this secret eternal Brahman and then as to what becomes of the liberated soul after its departure from its body. Yama however answers the second part first in mantra 7, and the first is answered in the eighth mantra. This again shows that the third question after all refers not only to what becomes of the liberated soul after departure but also to the Nature of the Supreme Self, Brahman (who is held to be the Self of all souls including the departed and liberated ones). The *paramam sukham* in mantra 14 may have a possible reference to the Ānandavallī of the *Taittirīyopaniṣad* wherein this description of Brahman is developed at length. Thus if the Īśā-Rṣi described the realization of God as the indwelling Lord of all beings and things, as leading to non-revulsion, non-grief and non-fear, if the Kena-Rṣi taught the Supreme Cause as the “Desirable” (*Tad Vanam*), knowledge of Whom as such makes the realiser desirable, the Kāṭha Seer, Yama, promises a more integral realization of the “Desirable” as the *śreyas*, as the transcendent Bliss, *paramam sukham*.

VI Vallī. This *vallī* deals with the Yoga of attainment in 9th, 10th and 11th verses. In mantra 4, with regard to the difficulty in construction of the two lines Raṅgarāmānuja treats *asakad* as an active participle with *nañ* prefixed, which yields the meaning ‘unable.’ Like the *Kenopaniṣad*, this Upaniṣad in mantra 12

also takes special care to instruct that Brahman can be grasped neither by speech nor by mind fully; except through instruction received through a Guru it can never be grasped.

The Upaniṣad concludes with the additional knowledge that has to be learnt about the hundred psychonic paths (*nāḍis*) of the heart wherein the thumb-sized Lord dwells, one of which (later on known as *Suṣumnā*) leads upwards to immortality whilst others lead to lesser goals. It is this *Nāḍī* that has to be known as the path of exit at departure. It is considered by some modern writers that this knowledge may be a later addition. This not likely since the *Bṛihadārāṇyaka* seems to be aware of this fact. Further the path of exit is an integral piece of instruction to be given to a Yogin.

CROSS REFERENCES.¹

- I. Kaṭha 1. Same story: Tait. Brāh. III. 11.8
3a=Brh, 4.4.11a=Var. Īśā. 3a
7.: Vaṣiṣṭha Dharma Sūtra 11.13
8=Brh. 6.4.12
12=cf II. 1.1
17cd=Var. Śvet. 4.11.cd.
21bc=Maitrī. I. 2
- II. Kaṭha 4=Var. Maitrī. 7.9
5=Var. Muṇḍ. I. 2.8: Maitrī. 7.9
7=Bh. G. II 29
11=K.U. III, 2 & 1.12
12b=III. 1b; 4.6c; 4.7c
Muṇḍ. 2.1.8d; 3.1.7d
Maitrī, 2.6; 6.4; Bhāṣkalam 18
13d: Ch. Up. 8.1.1-5
15=Bh. G. VIII. 11
16=Var. Maitrī. 6.4
18, 19=Bh.G. II. 20, 19=Ch. VIII. 1.5.10.2 & 4
20=Śvet. 3, 20
22=Kaṭha. IV. 4. cd,
23=Muṇḍ. 3, 2.3
- III.² Kaṭha 1.d=Manu III. 18.5
3-5=Śvet. 2.9, charioteer is either Agni=(RV;
X. 51.6) or Breath (AA.II.3.8).
cf. RV. VI. 75.6; RV. X. 44.7
Maitrī. 2.3-4
2-6
4.4

1. From Hume's : *Ten Principal Upanisads*- Rawson : *The Kaṭha Upaniṣad* p. 45. Hill : *Bhagavad Gītā*; Hopkins : *Great Epic of India*: & Critical Ed. M. Bh. BORI.

2. Hopkins writes that the 3rd Vallī of *Kaṭha* is epitomised in *Sānti Parya*. Mh. Bh. XII. 247, 1 ff. (?)

M. Bh. III. 2.66 (?)

III, 211.23

V. 34.59

46.5

XI. 7.13

XII. 240. 11; XIV. 51.3

Manu. II.88

cf. Plato: Phaedrus.

4=Svet, I. 8, 9, 12: Maitrī. 6.10

9d=RV. I. 22. 20a=Maitri. 6.26

Rāmāyaṇa=VI. 41.25d (?)

10—12: *Var.* Mh. B. 12. 248. 3—5

10: Bh. G. III. 42

M. Bh. 12.297. 19. cd.

15=M. Bh. 12.240. 17—18

IV. Kaṭha

1a=Maitri.

3d=Kaṭh. V. 4d

3 & 5=Br̥h. 5.4—

4.:2. 22cd

5cd=4, 12cd. Br̥h. 4, IV, 15cd (?)

9ab=AV. X. 18. 16a-b 1 (A.K.C.)¹

9, a & d=AV. X. 18.16 : Br̥h. I. 5. 23ab

9c=AV. X. 7.38 : Br̥h. II. 5.15

9a : Br̥h. II. 5.15

10cd=*Var.* Br̥h. IV. 4. 19cd. : 10.11ab: Br̥h. IV
4.19ab

12=M. Bh. V. 45.24 (Cr. Ed.): Br̥h. IV. 4.15cd

13b=cf Maitri. VI. 2

13d=Br̥h. I. 5.23d

V. Kaṭha

1a=cf Śvet, 3.18

2=RV. 4.40.15 (RV. 4.40.10)

=Mahānā=10.6=M. Bh. XII. 240.32: Tait S.i.
8.15

6=Śvet. 3.7

7d=cf. Kauṣ. 1.2

9b=Br̥h. 2.5.19: Rg. V. VI. 41.18

1. A. K. C.: Ananda K. Coomaraswami. *Notes on Kaṭhopanisad*,
N. A. I. Vol. I.

- 9c=Munḍ. 2.1.4d
 12=*Var.* Śvet. 6.12
 13=Śvet 6.13
 15=Munḍ, 2.2.10; Śvet. 6.14
 cf Mai : 6.24; Bh. G. XV. 6,12

- VI. Kaṭha 1=Bh. G: XV. 1-3.=V.
 45.8 (Cr. Ed.)
 3=Tait. II. 8
 6=*Var.* Bh. G. XIII. 30=M. Bh. XII. 7.23
 9=*Var* Śvet. 4.20, Mahānārāyaṇa. I. 11
 M. Bh. V. 45.6 (Cr. Ed.)
 10=Mait. 6.30; pāda d=Bh. G, VIII, 21
 11=cf Munḍ. II. 2.3; 3.2.4b
 =Mānd. 6
 12=Ken. 3—ab; Munḍ. III. 1.8ab
 14=Brh. IV. 4.7
 15=Ch. 7.26.2; Munḍ. II. 2.8; III. 2.9
 16=Ch. VIII. 6.6=Praś. 3.6
 cf Munḍ. II. 2.6. Mai. VI. 30
 17=Śvet. III. 13ab
 =Śvet. V. 8; Mai. 6.38
 M. Bh.
 V. 45.24ab (Cri. Ed.)
 Anguṣṭa Mātra Puruṣa: M. Bh. 12.284: 175a. (?)
 Sāṅkhya & Kaṭha: iii. 10-13; VI. 7-11; Brh. I. 4.6
 Ch. vi. 3.4
 Praś. iv.
 Śvet. vi. 13.
-

HARIH OM

KATHOPANISAD

I. 1.

*Uṣan ha vai Vājaśravasaḥ sarvavedasam dadau
tasya ha Naciketā nāma putra āsa*

Once, the son of Vājaśravas, desiring (some fruit) gave away all his possessions. He had a son named Naciketas.

Commentary:

1. Let my *añjali* go to the Beauty of Añjanādri,¹ of the colour of common flax (*atasi*)-flower-bunch, with His chest adorned by Śrī.

2. Bowing to Vyāsa, Rāmānuja and other teachers, I shall write this comment, according to my intelligence, on the *Kaṭhopanīṣad*, for the delight of the learned.

uṣan: Desirous the word comes from the root *vaśa* meaning desire with the suffix *ṣatṛ*, which gets *sampraśāraṇa* (*Pāṇini* I. i. 45) as enjoined in the sūtra beginning with *grahijya* (*Pāṇini*. VI. i. 16).

ha vai: These two are particles, (used to) indicate things that have transpired. ‘The fruit’ is to be supplied.

vājaśravasaḥ: son of Vājaśravas. Vājaśravas is one who has attained fame through gifts of food (*vāja*).² His son is Vājaśravasaḥ. Or it may be a name, merely, Vajaśravas.

The meaning is that the sage indeed performing the sacrifice called Viśvajit (conqueror of the world)³ in which every possession

1. Beauty of Añjanādri is Śrī Veṅkateśvara.

2. cf. Sri Krishna Prem Yoga of the *Kaṭhopanīṣad* p. 14: meaning of Vājaśravasa.

3. The Viśvajit-sacrifice was performed by Mahābali when Vāmana came and asked for three paces of ground, symbolically the earth. Heaven and self, thus completing the sacrifice fully, Vāmana is stated to be the subject dealt with by this Upanīṣad. cf. *Viṣṇusahasranāma*: *viśvam* (1).

is to be offered as fees for performance (*dakṣiṇā*) (to Ṛtviks), gave away in that sacrifice all his possessions. By the word ‘*uśan*’ is indicated that the sacrifice, being one that is performed for getting some fruit, the fees, must necessarily be in every way correct (and proper).

āsa: babhūva: there was. Here (*bhū*) has not replaced the root ‘*as*’ as in ‘*svasthaye tārksyam*’ (for the well-being, Garuḍa), since *lit* (Perfect tense) is a *sārvadhātuka* (*Pāṇini* III 4.113) as enjoined in *Chandasy ubhayathā*.

I. 2.

*tam ha kumāram santam dakṣiṇāsu nīyamānāsu
śraddhāviveśa somanyata.*

While the fees were being distributed, Śraddha overtook him, who was still young. He reflected thus:

Commentary.

tam: Him, Naciketas

kumāram santam: who was still young¹

dakṣiṇāsu nīyamānāsu: at the time of distribution of fees, namely, cows to the *ṛtviks* (the officiating priests)

*śraddhā*²: devotional mentality due to his wishing well for his father (*pitur-hita-kāma-prayuktā*)

āviveśa: overtook.

Even though the thing which helps in procuring consent (to officiate as priests) is called fee(s) (*dakṣiṇā*), and the consent is (given) only once in a sacrifice, since (the word fees) gains its significance on account of that consent, therefore the word fees (*dakṣiṇā*) has to be only a singular number; wherefore (*ata eva*) it is stated by Jaimini (*Mīmāṃsā-sūtra* X. iii. 56) “O milch cows in the passage now is the fee of it” (*tasya dhenūr iti gavām*), that in the passage ‘the milch cow is its fee’ read in the context of the one-day sacrifice

1. cf. Krishna Prem “boy as he was.”

2 Krishna Prem translates it as Faith, but it is not “blind faith” accompanied by hidden doubt.” It is true faith or “fair faith,” which is a form of Knowledge.

called *bhū*, all the fees, the cows (112), the horse, & etc., belonging to the original sacrifice (*prākṛtasya*) are to be substituted by it (*dhenu*), this word fee here signifies some wealth (*bhṛti*). And it is used with reference to action as in “In this action this is the wage.” It is also used with reference to the agent (*kartṛ*) as in “In this action, this is the wage to this person (agent).” Since therefore the fees are many on account of the officiating priests being many, the plural ‘fees’ (*dakṣiṇāsu*) is proper. Therefore, it is said in the *adhikaraṇa* in Chapter X beginning with the *sūtra* “If the gift is to the brahman (priest) the fee (to the Ṛk priest) will be less by it, with the modification the fee will be the same”¹ that, if the passage occurring in the sacrifice called Ṛtapeya “The fee is the Soma-vessel made of Udumbara (fig-wood),” it must be given to the Brahman-priest, who is friendly and of the same gotra, is to be one single sentence (which it is not), then, the Brahman-priest’s share alone is to be substituted, since the word ‘*dakṣiṇā*’ could signify it with its primary significance without any resort to the secondary significance (*lakṣaṇā*) in respect of the portion.

Now therefore it can be seen that even though the fee in reference to this (Viśvajit) sacrifice be one, there may be differences in the fees in reference to the *ṛtviks*, and as such, there is no impropriety in the (use of the) plural ‘fees.’

I. i. 3.

*pītodakā jagdha-tṛṇā dugdha-dohā nirindriyāḥ
anandā nāma te lokās tān sa gacchati tā dadat*

He who gives these (cows) by which the water has been drunk, the grass has been eaten, the milk has been given (and) which have become barren, goes to those words that are well-known as delightless.

Commentary.

The manner of this devotional mentality (on the part of Naciketas) is thus shown:

1. *Yadi brahmaṇaḥ tad ūnam tadvikāraḥ syāt.* Jaimini: *P. M. S.* X. iii. 72.

[*saḥ*] He (Naciketas) not having been paid any attention to by his father though addressed by him thus,

dvitīyam: for the second time, (and)

tṛtīyam api: for the third time also spoke to him “To whom will you give me?”

The father, pressed very much, became angry and told his son that he would give him away to Death.

I. i. 5.

*bahūnām emi prathamō bahūnām emi madhyamaḥ
kim svid yamasya kartavyam yaṁ mayādyā kariṣyati*

I go ahead of many, I go in the midst of many. What is that Death has to do, which he would have done by me?¹

Commentary.

Though thus spoken to (Naciketas) without fear or sorrow told his father thus: Of all those who go to the abode of Death I shall be either in the forefront or in the middle but never at the end. The intention is “I am not at all worried about going to the abode of Death.” (If it be asked) what is it that (you are worried) about? he replies:

kim svid: What purpose¹ has Death got which He is going to have done by me? Is there any advantage with one so tender as me to Death of fulfilled desires, where the gift of me to Him will be of some use, as (the gift of me) to Ṛtviks (will be). Therefore it is about this alone that I am worried. This is the intention.

I. i. 6.

*anupaśya yathā pūrve pratipaśya tathā pare
sasyam iva martyaḥ pacyate sasyam ivā jāyate punaḥ*

Reflect on how the ancestors (were); ponder how the other (present ones are). Man ripens like corn; he is again born like corn.

1. Krishna Prem: “What is the task that Yama, Lord of Death, will accomplish on me today?”

Commentary:

(Naciketas) looking at the father of remorseful heart who thought on hearing these words of such a son, who was free from any fear or anger, “I said, I give you to Death ‘out of anger’ but I do not wish to give away such a son to Death,” said:

pūrve: grandfather and others, as they were without any false speech; so also,

apare: the good men that are now even after them; in the same manner must you behave. This is the meaning.

sasyam iva: like corn

martyaḥ: the man becomes like corn worn out in a short while and, becoming worn out, dies, and like corn is he born again. In this mortal world which is transitory, what is the use of uttering falsehood. Keeping to truth send me to Death. This is the meaning.

I. i. 7.

*vaiśvānaraḥ praviśaty atithir brāhmaṇo gṛhān
tasyaitām śāntim kurvanti hara Vaivasvatodakam*

The fire, the brahman-guest, enters the house. To him (they) this appeasement make. O son of the Sun! take water (unto him, Naciketas).

Commentary:

That son (Naciketas), *having been thus sent away, stayed* at the gates of Death who was away, eating nothing for three nights. Then an old man at the gates (of Death’s abode) told Death (Yama), who returned after having been away, thus:

Verily the God of Fire himself in the form of Brāhmaṇ-guest enters the house. To that fire good men perform this appeasement of the form of water for feet-cleansing and offering of seat, so that they may not be burnt by their disrespect to him. Therefore, O Vaivasvata! bring to Naciketas water for feet-cleansing.

hara means *āhara:* bring. This is the meaning.

I. i. 8.

*āśāpratīkṣe saṁgatam sūnṛtāñ ca
 iṣṭāpūrte putrapaśūmṣ ca sarvān
 etad vṛnkte puruṣasyālpamedhaso
 yasyānaśnan vasati brāhmaṇo gṛhe*

Hope and expectations, contact (with good men), the true and kind words, sacrificial good deeds, beneficence, the sons and cattle of the unintelligent person at whose house a brāhmaṇ dwells starving, this (sin) destroys.¹

Commentary:

And they showed that failing to do it (honouring the guest) results in sinfulness (*pratyavāya*).

yasya alpamedhasaḥ puruṣasya gṛhe: In the house of which unintelligent person

anaśnan: starving

Brāhmaṇah: guest

vasati: dwells

tasya: of him

āśāpratīkṣe: desire and will; or else, *āśā* means desire for the unaccomplished, and *pratīkṣā*, desire to get things which are existing.

saṁgatam: contact with the good

sūnṛtām: speech that is true and pleasant

iṣṭāpūrte: *iṣṭa* means sacrifice and others and *pūrta* means construction of tanks etc.

putrān paśūmṣ ca: sons and cattle

etad: the sin of the form of starving

vṛnkte: deprives, destroys is the meaning: from *vṛji varjane:* to deprive. (VIII conjugation *śnam*) or else this is a form from the root *vṛja varjane* (II conjugation) which omits the conjugational sign *śaḥ*.)

1. This translation is in accordance with the commentary. But the text seems to be capable of another interpretation also—"Hope and expectations etc. etc., (all) this of the unintelligent person at whose house a brāhmaṇ remains starving, the (starving brāhmaṇ) destroys."

I. i. 9.

tisro rātrīr yadavātsīr gr̥he me
'naṣṇan brahman natithir namasyaḥ
namas te'stu brahman svasti me
'stu tasmāt prati trīn varān vṛṇīṣva

O Brahman! since you, the respectful guest, have stayed without food in my house for three nights, let my salutations be to you, O Brahman! Let there be well-being to me. In return, therefore, choose three boons.

Commentary:

Thus addressed by the elders, Death said to Naciketas:

me gr̥he: in my house, O Brahman fit to be revered, thou, the guest, have spent three nights without food. This is the meaning

namas te: the meaning is clear

tasmāt.....: therefore, for this reason

me: to me

svasti: well-being, so that I may be well

trīn varān: prati: three boons in return

vṛṇīṣva: choose.

Even though you are desireless, you should choose three boons corresponding to the three nights of fasting to favour me. This is the meaning.

I. i. 10.

śāntasamkalpaḥ sumanā yathā syād
vītamanyur Gautamo mābhi mṛtyo
tvatprasṛṣṭam mābhivadet pratītaḥ
etat trayāṇām prathamam varam vṛṇe

O Death! (please make) Gautama (my father) free from all anxieties, well-disposed, free-from anger towards me; (and) well pleased let him speak to me, sent back by you. This is the first of the three boons I elect.

Commentary:

Thus being requested, Naciketas said:

Mṛtyo: O Death!

śāntasaṁkalpaḥ: free from anxiety of the form “having reached Death, what will my son do?”

sumanāḥ: with his mind settled in peace

mābhi: towards me

Gautamaḥ: Gautama, my father

vītamanyuḥ: freed from anger (*roṣa*)

yathā syāt: (make him) so as to be thus.

And

tvat prasṛṣṭam: sent back (home) by you

mābhi: towards me.

pratītaḥ: pleased as before

vadet: would speak.

Or else

abhi vadet: will bestow (on me) blessings, since the *abhi-vadana* is used to signify the giving of blessings in Śmṛti-texts such as *abhivadati*, *nābhivādayate*.

etad....: the meaning is clear.

I. i. 11.

yathā purastād bhavitā pratitaḥ

Auddālakir Āruṇir mat prasṛṣṭaḥ

sukham rātrīḥ śayitā vītamanyus

tvām dadṛśivān ¹mṛtyumukhāt pramuktam

Son of Uddālaka of Aruṇa-family, influenced by me will be well-disposed (towards you) as before. On seeing you released from the mouth of Death, free from anger, he will happily sleep in the nights.

Commentary:

Asked thus Death replied: he will become as before well-disposed towards you. Auddālaki is to be taken as Uddālaka;

1. *darśivān:* Nir. Sa. Ed.

Āruṇi means son of Aruṇa. ' Or else he is a descendent of the two families, or else the son of Uddālaka and of the family of Aruṇa.²

mat prasṛṣṭaḥ: influenced by me or as favoured by me, the meaning is 'due to my blessing.'

sukham: Having become free from anger in respect of you, he will sleep happily in the future nights. *Lut* (1st Future) signifies that he will get (thereafter) good sleep.

dadṛṣivān: (*darṣivān*): Having seen (you) is the meaning. This is a form ending with the suffix *kvasu*. The suffix *kvasu* is preceded by it according to the Vārtika (*Pāṇini* VII. 2.69 *Vārtika*). This, where there is no reduplication, is a Vedic grammatical exception to the rule (*Pāṇini*. VI. 1.8).

matprasṛṣṭam: if the reading is in the accusative (i.e. *matprasṛṣṭam* in the place of *matprasṛṣṭaḥ*) then the construction is you who are sent back by me.'

I. i. 12.

*Svarge loke na bhayam kincanāsti
na tatra tvaṁ na jarayā bibheti
ubhe tīrtvā aśanāyāpipāse
śokātigo modate Svargaloke*

There is no fear whatever in the Svarga-world (heaven). You are not (present) there. One is not afraid of old age. Getting over the two, thirst and hunger, transcending sorrow, one delights in the Svarga-world.

Commentary:

Naciketas now asks for the second boon in two mantras (beginning with *Svarge loke*.....). Here the world *Svarga* means the realm of liberation. How it is so, will be explained later.

Mṛtyo: O Death. There you are not the Lord. One in old age does not fear (death). One does not fear old age. 'The man that exists there' is to be supplied there (in the verse).

2. *Dvyāmuṣyāyana* means the son of a lady who was given in marriage to an individual on the condition that her issue is to be deemed to be the son of the giver (of her). (Ānandagiri's Commentary).

ubhe:...aśanāyā: Hunger. Here also *Svarga* means the world of liberation.

I. i. 13.

*sa tvam Agnim Svargyam adhyeṣi Mṛtyo
prabrūhi tam śraddadhānāya mahyam
Svargalokā amṛtatvam bhajanta
etad dvitīyena vṛṇe vareṇa*

You of such nature, O Death, knowest the Agni leading to Svarga. Teach it to me who have much faith. Those who exist in Svarga-world attain immortality. This is the second boon I choose.

Commentary:

sa tvam: You whose omniscience is well-known in Purāṇa. You know the fire which is helpful in the attainment of Svarga.

jat (ya) is the suffix signifying *prayojana* (utility) according to the passage “*jat* comes as suffix after *Svarga* and others” (*Gaṇapātha Pāṇini* V. i. 111). It will be clear later on that the utility of Agni of the form of fire-altar in attaining *Svarga* is through meditation.

śraddadhānāya: to one who has ardent desire for liberation. What is that which you will get attaining the Svarga-world? The reply is:

Svargalokāh (amṛtatvam): those whose world is Svarga; this means those who have attained the supreme world, since the immortality which is called liberation (*mokṣa*) which is of the form of the manifestation (or revealment) of (ones) own nature comes only after the attainment of the Brahman in that particular place (here called Svarga) as in the passage “Having attained the Supreme Light one stands revealed with one’s own nature.”

*etad...*This is clear.

I. i. 14.

*pra te bravāmi tad u me nibodha
Svargyam agnim Naciketaḥ prajānan
anantalokāptim atho pratiṣṭhāmi
vidhi tvam enaṁ nihitaṁ guhāyām*

I shall explain to you fully: know that of me, O Naciketas! Knowing that fire which leads to Svarga (one gets) the attainment of the world of the infinite (Viṣṇu) and permanence. Know thou this (fire) placed in the cave.

Commentary:

Thus spoken to, Death speaks:

pra te bravīmi: I shall tell you who have requested. The use of the particle *pra* separated from the root is in accordance with *Pāṇini Sūtra*: ‘They can be used separately from roots’ (I. iv. 82).

me: From me: from my teaching do you know. This is the meaning. The goal of knowledge is now made known—*Svargyam agnim.*

anantalokāptim: the attainment of the world of the Infinite Viṣṇu, because of the subsequent passage (I. iii. 9) “That is Viṣṇu’s Supreme Abode.

atho: After the attainment of that

pratiṣṭhām: Non-return also. ‘One gets’ is to be supplied. Thinking that Naciketas may have a doubt as to how that knowledge could have such a power (Death) says:

viddhi: Know. This nature of knowledge that is the cause of liberation due to its being a subsidiary to the meditation on Brahman placed in the cave, others do not know. (Therefore) do you know it, is the idea.

Or else, the relation of cause and effect is determined when it is said “Knowing Agni do thou get attainment of the world of the Infinite and Permanence” since the root *vid* meaning ‘to know,’ could mean ‘to get.’ The suffix (*ṣatṛ*) in *prajānan* is in accordance with *Pāṇini* (III. 2.126) “The suffixes *ṣatṛ* and *śānac* come after the root whose meaning signifies or is the cause of another action.”

I. i. 15.

*lokādim agnim tam uvāca tasmai
yā iṣṭakā yāvatīr vā yathā vā
sa cāpi tat pratyavadad yathoktam
arthāsya Mrtyuḥ punarevāhatuṣṭah¹*

1. Prem: tushtim, satisfied.

To him, Death taught that fire, the means of (attaining) the world (Svarga). (He also taught him) which and how many are the bricks and how (they are to be arranged). He (Naciketas) too repeated it as it was taught. Then pleased with (his) ability Death spoke again.

Commentary:

Then the Veda speaks.

lokasya ādim: means to the world; the meaning is the same as *Svargya* (leading to Svarga).

tam Agnim uvāca: taught that fire. The meaning is that he taught him all this, the bricks, of what nature, of what number and the manner in which they have to be piled. The assimilation in *yāvatīr* (*yāvati as: yāvatyah* must be the proper form) is due to the exception in Vedic grammar.

sa cāpi: He too: and Naciketas too

tat: all that he heard exactly repeated, this is the meaning.

arthāsya: Death pleased on seeing the ability to grasp (the instruction given) of his disciple spoke again.

I. i. 16.

*tam abravīt prīyamāṇo mahātmā
varam tavehādya dadāmi bhūyaḥ
tavaiva nāmnā bhavitāyam agniḥ
sr̥ṅkām cemām anekarūpām gṛhāṇa*

The Mahātman (Death) being pleased told him. Now I give you here one more boon. This Fire verily shall be known by your name. Also take this resonant necklace of many hues.

Commentary:

High-minded Death well-pleased told Naciketas thus “I shall grant you a fourth boon.” What it is he explains:

tavaiva: This fire I have been teaching you will be known by the name of Nāciketa.

vicitrām sṛṅkām: many-coloured resonant necklace of precious stones. This do you accept is the meaning.¹

I. i. 17.

*triṇāciketas tribhir etya sandhim
trikarmakṛt tarati janma-mṛtyū
brahmajajñam devam īḍyam viditvā
nicāyyemām śāntim atyantam eti*

One learning the three *anuvākas* dealing with Nāciketa and performing three actions, attaining contact (with *brahmopāsana*) with the three, (by means of it) crosses over birth and death. Knowing and realising the soul born-of-Brahman and conscient as the worthy Lord, one attains thorough peace for ever.

Commentary;

Again He (Death) refers to Karma:

triṇāciketaḥ: One learning the three *anuvākas* (*Tait. Brāh.* III. xi. 7, 8 & 9) beginning with “*ayam vāva yaḥ pavate*” This verily which blows (is the Fire-Naciketas).

trikarmakṛt: One that does the actions of sacrificing and learning and giving, or else one who performs the *pāka-yajña* (seven domestic sacrifices), *havir-yajña* (corn-sacrifices) and *soma-yajña* (soma-sacrifices).

tribhir: with the fires thrice performed (constructed),

sandhim: contact with meditation on the Supreme Self

etya: attaining

janma-mṛtyū tarati: Crosses over birth and death. This is the meaning. Since this has to have the same sense as the passage *karoti tad yena punar na jāyate* occurring in the next mantra(d), and since this mantra has been interpreted in this manner by Vyasārya (author of *Sruta-Prakāśika*)² under the *Vedānta Sūtra*:

1. Krishna Prem gives a very interesting occult interpretation of this Garland of many forms in his work.

2. Commentary on the *Śrī Bhāṣya* of Śrī Rāmānuja.

I. iv. 6 “*trayāṇām eva caivam*—and of three only there is this mention and question.”

Thereafter he speaks of the meditation upon the Supreme Self which is the principal (*aṅgi*) mentioned in the first half of this verse *tribhir etya sandhim*.

This mantra has been explained in the *Bhāṣya* under the Sūtra (I. ii. 12) “Because of the specification” as follows:—*Brahmajajña* is soul, since he is born of Brahman and is conscient, knowing Him as the worthy Divine. The meaning is “Knowing the soul who meditates as that which has Brahman as its self.”

deva: What is meant by the *Bhāṣya* is this: “The significance of the word *deva* goes up to one who has the Supreme Self as one’s self, since the word *deva* signifies the Supreme Self and since identity cannot be between the soul and the Supreme.

nicāyā: Realizing one’s own self as one whose self is Brahman.

imam: this mentioned in the earlier part of this mantra as *trikarmakṛt tarati*.

śāntim: means the abolition of the miseries of the form of *samsāra* (the cycle of births and deaths).

I. i. 18.

triṇāciketas trayam etad veditvā
ya evam vidvānś cinute Nāciketam
sa mṛtyupāśān puratah pranodya
śokātigo modate Svargaloke

He who, having mastered the performance of the three sections dealing with the Nāciketa (fire) and knowing in this manner, performs the piling of the Nāciketa-altar after knowing the three,² that person, casting away the

1. Krishna Prem discusses the views of Śaṅkara and Madhva and inclines to the view that Madhva’s view is more revealing, as *Krama mukti* is true of the occult development.

2. Sri Śaṅkara considers this to be Father, Mother and Guru. Prem identifies them as Atma-Buddhi-Manas.

fetters of death even prior to transcending sorrow, enjoys in the celestial world.

Commentary:

triṇāciketa: has already been explained.

trayam etad: The nature of Brahman and the nature of the soul having the former as its self mentioned in the mantra *brahmajajñam devam īdyam:* (I. i. 17) and the nature of the fire (altar) mentioned in the passage “*Tribhīr etya saṁdhim*” (ibid).

viditvā: having known through the instruction of *gurus* or from sacrifices.

evam vidvān: The knower who with this knowledge of these three, constructs the Nāciketa-fire-altar.

saḥ: That person (casting away) the Death's fetters of the form of attachment and hatred etc.

purataḥ: even prior to leaving the body.

praṇodya: Casting away. The meaning is being free from the attachment and hatred even while living.

śokātigah: transcending sorrow; this has been already commented upon.

I. i. 18b.

This mantra is not in other texts, and is special to Ranga Rāmānuja's *Bhāṣya* on the *Upaniṣads*.

*yo vā, pyetām brahmajajñātmabhūtam
citim viditvā cinute Nāciketam
sa eva bhūtvā brahmajajñātmabhūtām
karoti tad yena punar na jāyate*

Whoever knowing this piling up which is the self-born of Brahman and sentient constructs Nāciketa (fire-altar), that very person becoming the born of Brahman and sentient, does that by which (he) is not born again.

yah.....: Whoever, knowing this piling up, knowing this to be of the form of his self, with Brahman as his Self.

If it be asked as to what authority there is for taking the word *svarga* frequently used in this context, to mean liberation (or the abode of the liberated), we state thus: There is no room for any doubt (in this matter since the Bhāṣyakāra (Rāmānuja) himself¹ has explicitly and impliedly explained with reference to the mantra containing the words *svargyam* and *agnim* (*Kaṭha*. I. i. 13) as follows: “It is the (abode of) liberation which is the highest end, that is meant by the word *svargya* here, because the text “Those that live in *svarga* attain immortality” (*Kaṭha*. I. i. 13) states that one who is there has neither birth nor death; because the reply is “One learning the three *anuvākas* dealing with Nāciketa and performing three actions, attaining contact with the three, by means of it crosses over death and birth” (*Kaṭha*. I. i. 17), and because it cannot be that Naciketas whose face is turned away from perishable ends can ask for the means for attaining a *svarga* that is transitory, as he scorns at the transitory ends when asking for the third boon; and because the liberation of the form of the unbounded bliss can be meant by the ‘*svarga*’ signifying the supreme Happiness.

(*Pūrvapakṣa*) *Objection*: If it be asked: The word ‘*svarga*’ is repeated four times in the two mantras concerning the second boon (*Kaṭha*. I. 1.12 and 13). If it means (the abode of) liberation, is it through primary significance or through secondary significance? The first (alternative) is not acceptable, because the *svarga* which is well-known in the Vedic and worldly usage means the opposite of liberation (*apavarga*) in such passages as “Through the two paths of *svarga* and *apavarga*...”; “One of the two, *svarga* and *apavarga*...” “Neither the *svarga* nor the non-birth”.....and “It may be *svarga*, since it is common to all (to be desired)” *P.M.S.* IV. 3.15), and because, according to the (Paurāṇic) passage¹ “the distance of fourteen lakhs (of miles) between the Sun and the Pole Star is spoken of by those who have studied the arrangement of the worlds as the *svarga*,” the word ‘*svarga*’ can signify that particular space that lies between the Sun and the Pole star and to that alone the Vedic and worldly usages have reference; and that is not the abode of liberation. Nor is the second alternative that is (that it means that) through secondary

1. *Śrī Bhāṣya*: I. iv. 6.

significance acceptable, because the primary significance has nothing to contradict it. If there can be anything to contradict it, what is it? (i) is it the mention of the absence of old age, death, the attainment of immortality etc., stated in the text of the question (*praśna-vākya*) or (ii) (is it) the crossing over old age etc., contained in the reply or (iii) (is it) that the transitory '*svarga*' that cannot be asked by Naciketas who is indifferent to all worldly desires?

Not the first (alternative), because the word '*svarga*' which precedes (the word *amṛta*) in the sentence which cannot be explained otherwise and signifies the principal (*viśeṣya*) of the sentence, cannot be interpreted according to the word '*amṛta*' (immortal) which is well-known in Vedic and worldly usages as signifying relative immortality and which stands at the concluding part of the passage; because in the Purāṇic contexts explaining the nature of the *svarga*, it is seen that those that dwell in the world of *svarga* are free from old age, death, hunger, thirst, sorrow etc.; because there is the *Smṛti* (passage) "Immortality is spoken of as existence till deluge (*pralaya*)"; because in this Upaniṣad itself the word 'immortal' is used in respect of Death in the passage "Having approached those that do not grow old and that are immortal" (*K.U.* I. i. 28); and because the statement (passage) that "they whose world is *svarga* attain immortality" can be explained as stated in (the passages) "Those in the world of Brahman at the time of final departure." (*Tait. Nār.*) and "Those that live in the world of *svarga* can attain immortality through meditation upon Brahman" (*Mund. U.* III. ii. 6).

Not the second (alternative), because the mantra *Triṇāciketa*'.....(*K. U.* I. i. 17) may be taken to mean that the fire (*Nāciketa*) that leads to *svarga* (Heaven) performed thrice is the means to the Brahman-Knowledge that helps the crossing over birth and death, and thus it need not be in contradiction with the primary meaning of the word '*svarga*.' For the same reason, the passage (*K. U.* I. i. 18d) which has the same meaning as the passage already stated, does not contradict the primary sense of the word *svarga*.

Nor the third alternative, according to which it is stated that it is impossible for Naciketas who is indifferent to any other goal, to ask for the transitory *svarga*. Yama (Death), the beneficent,

replying to the question regarding the fire that leads to *svarga*, introduced the topic on the nature of liberation, though not asked for (by Naciketas) in the passages “ The attainment of the world of the Infinite (*K.U. I. i. 14c*) and “ One, learning the three *anuvākas* dealing with Nāciketa and performing the three actions, attaining contact with the three, by means of it crosses over birth and death ” (*K.U. I. i. 17ab*), which created in Naciketas the desire to get freed (liberated). Thus he was made stronger by Yama’s reluctance to teach (as in the passage) *anyam varam Naciketo vṛṇīṣva* ‘ O Naciketas! ask for a different boon ” (*K.U. I. i. 21c*). How can his (Naciketas’s) scorn at the transitory ends made at that stage contradict his earlier prayer for *svarga*? Besides, it is seen in the passages *śvobhāvā martyasya yad Antakaitat sarvendriyāṇām jarayanti tejah— api sarvam jīvitam alpam eva tavaiva vāhās tava nṛtyagīte* (*K.U. I. i. 26*) “ O Death! (all those enjoyable things) of man will be non-existent to-morrow. These will wear out whatever power these sense-organs have. All the life is but brief. Let the conveyances, dance and music remain only for thee ” and others, that the human enjoyment alone is scorned at, and *svarga* is not spoken of derisively. If the word ‘ *svarga* ’ refers to liberation (abode of liberation) it cannot be the result of fire (of Naciketas), it being the result of knowledge alone. The word ‘ *svarga* ’ repeatedly used at the beginning, the middle and the end will get a strained meaning.

Or let there be contradiction in the reply. Still the word ‘ *svarga* ’ that is found in the question-passage that precedes (the reply), is strong enough according to the principle of *Upakramādhikaraṇa* (*PMS. III. 3.1-7*). Nor can it be said that “ for the sake of many ” the few found in the beginning are to be rejected according to the principle enunciated in the Sūtra “ Those of the larger number must have their common subsidiaries.” (*PMS. XII ii. 22*); because in the Sūtra (*PMS. XII. ii. 23*) it is said that “ that alone which is first ” is stronger than those at the end, though they are larger in number. Therefore there is no reason at all for over-riding the primary sense of the word *svarga*.

Siddhānta: The reply (to the above objection) is as follows: The word *svarga* signifies liberation (abode of liberation) only through its primary significance. The Mīmāṃsakas have stated in the *Svargakāmādhikaraṇa* (*PMS. VI. i. 1*) that the word *svarga*,

according to the principle *Nāgrhīta-viśeṣaṇanyāya* (that the cognition does not grasp the principal without grasping the attributes), signifies only delight (*prīti*) and not the substance that grants delight (*prīti-viśiṣṭa-dravya*).

Further they raise the issue that though it is true that the word *svarga* signifies delight according to the principle above-mentioned it is yet to be established that it signifies that delight which is enjoyable in another body at another place. It cannot be said that the supplementary passage “That in which there is no heat etc.,” leads to the conclusion that the word *svarga* used in the injuncting texts, signifies the particular kind of delight, because here there is no room for the principle “That which is doubtful is to be determined with the help of the rest of the passage” (*PMS*. I. iv. 29), since there is no doubt here as to the significance which has been already determined as having reference to delight in general (*prītimātra*) to which issue they (themselves) reply as follows:

“No doubt it is true the word *svarga* has its significance determined according to common usage itself. If, however, the word *svarga* is taken to mean the limited delight known to us, then the sacrifices such as *Jyotiṣṭoma* will have to be means to that (limited) delight. Consequently, the injunction regarding *Jyotiṣṭoma* and other sacrifices will become impotent on account of there being no intelligent person to perform these sacrifices which are full of hindrances and requiring much money, men and labour, when there are easier worldly means to achieve it, requiring comparatively little money, men and labour. When accordingly the significance of the word *svarga* is determined only as having reference to the unlimited delight which is mentioned in the supplementary passage the meaning is the same even in places where there is no such supplementary passage as in the case of the words “Wheat, pig, etc.” There is no need to accept any other significance regarding the worldly limited delight, since secondary significance alone is sufficient.

Nor can it be stated that the word *svarga* may have its significance only in respect of delight in general, while yet in the Veda it may mean the unlimited delight; because the part of the meaning (limitless) is not known otherwise, and therefore the power of

signifying has to include that part also necessarily, and this will lead to accepting the word as having two meanings viz. (i) one in the worldly usage and (ii) the other in the Vedic usage. When, however, the significance is in respect of the limitless delight known through the Vedic usage, then the worldly limited delight is indicated through secondary significance on account of its also having the common nature of being delight.

Since thus the Mīmāṃsakas have established that the word *svarga* means the unlimited delight alone, it is not reasonable to question the equation of *svarga* with liberation (abode of liberation). Just as the word 'Pārtha' is (not) frequently used in respect of other sons of Kuntī as in respect of Arjuna and yet signifies others also through its primary significance, so also, though the word *svarga* is not frequently used to denote anything other than the delight obtainable in the world lying between the Sun and the Pole Star, yet it does not lose its primary signifying power to signify that thing (*i.e.*, abode of liberation).

The words *barhis*, *ājya* and others, though they are not used by Āryas in respect of unpurified grass, ghee and others, yet they retain their primary significance in respect of them, because their non-usage by some (persons) cannot establish the absence of their signifying power. Therefore it is established in the *Barhirājyādhi-karaṇa* (PMS. I. 4.10) that the words *barhis* etc., have their signifying power in respect of the genus, *trṇatva*, grassness etc. This is stated in the *Vārtika*.¹ "In respect of a word which is seen at some places at least determined in its genus-sense, there is no reason to postulate¹ any other condition (*nimitta*), that word not losing that condition (*i.e.*, genus-sense)."

Therefore the word *svarga* is verily a common general term denoting liberation also.

Pūrvapakṣa (Objection): If it be asked: though the words *barhis*, *ājya* and others are not used by Āryas so as to indicate unpurified grass, ghee and others, still they may have their signifying power in respect of the unpurified things also, since there is such use by non-Āryas. But in the case of *svarga*, its signifying

1. Kumārila's *Tantra-Vārtika* (p. 343 Poona ed.).

power is to be accepted so as to exclude anything other than that delight that is obtainable in the world lying between the Sun and the Pole star, since the word is never used to signify anything other than that. Otherwise² the conclusion arrived at in the *Prodgātradhikaraṇa* (PMS. III. v. 23-26) is that the word Udgātr nominally means the particular ṛtvik who is the head of the four ṛtviks officiating as Sāman-singers, since it is never used in respect of any other of the group. But that particular ṛtvik being only one, the plural in the mantra “Let the Hotṛ’s cup come forward, also the Brahman’s cup, the Udgātr’s cup, the Yajamāna’s cup, and the sadasya’s cup” is inconsistent. Therefore we have to assume for it a secondary significance based upon the nominal significance, so as to make the word to mean the three in the group excluding Subrahmanya, or including Him, all the four of the group. Further in the *Ahīnādhikaraṇa*, (PMS. III. iii. 15-16) it is stated that the number twelve relating to *Upasāda*-sacrifices enjoined in the sentence “Twelve for the *Ahīna*” which occurs in the context of *Jyotiṣṭoma*, is however to be taken away to a particular group of sacrifices to be performed for many days (*ahargaṇa-viśeṣa*) because the word *ahīna* is to be etymologically explained as having been formed according to *Vārtika* under *Pāṇini* IV. 2.43, with *Kha*-suffix after the base *ahan* and is to be taken as meaning through nominal significance (*rūḍhi*) some particular group of sacrifices performed during a number of days, since it is not at all used in respect of *Sattra* sacrifices, and therefore it cannot refer to *Jyotiṣṭoma*, it not being an *ahīna* (group of sacrifices performed in a number of days).

Further¹ though the word ‘*dhāyyā*’ is formed according to *Pāṇini* (III. i. 129) and used to mean the ṛks called *samidhāni* (Rks used at the time of kindling the sacrificial fire), yet it does not mean the *Samidhāni* Rks in general, nor does it mean according to etymological explanation, namely, that which is used (*dhīyamāna*) in all the Rks that are used (in any rite), for it (the word) is not used in respect of the Rks that are utilized for praise with *sāman*

2. *Sat. Brāh.* IV. 2.1.29 & *Apaṣṭamba Śr.* S. XII. 23.13 cf. The text in the *Vārtika* of this śloka has the variant *gāmitā* instead of the word *kalpana*.

1. Ganganath Jha’s translation.

and praise without *sāman* (*stotra* and *śastra*) as it is not used in respect of *samidhāni* Rks in general. But it means some particular rks such as “Those with the terms ‘Pṛthu,’ ‘Pāja’ which are specially mentioned in Vedic passages” “The rks with Pṛthu and Pāja are the dhāyā ones.” This is found in the *Adhikaraṇa* having the sūtra (*PMS* V. iii. 3). All this will get contradicted if the word *svarga* could have its primary significance (in respect of liberation or abode of liberation) as stated by you (the siddhāntin). There would be no need to accept the words Udgātṛ etc., as having nominal significance in respect of a particular Rtvik and others.

Reply (Siddhānta):—

True. If the word ‘*svarga*’ was never used in respect of anything other than the ordinary *svarga* (that is the place between the Sun and the Pole star), then it would be necessary to accept a nominal significance for it, so restricted as not to apply to it (liberation). But it is used to denote that (liberation) also. For it is found to be used in the following passages in the spiritual scriptures (*adhyātma śāstreṣu* such as the *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka* I. 27.3. *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* and *Talavakāra*.

Upaniṣads:—

1. In that city there is a world-sheath of golden colour surrounded by light. Whoever knows that city of Brahman surrounded by nectar (bliss), to him the Supreme Self and Brahman grant long life, fame and progeny.

2. “By it the wise, the knowers of Brahman, go up hence to the heavenly world, released.”¹ (*Brh. U.*, 4.48).

3. “He verily who knows it, thus striking off evil becomes established in the most excellent, endless heavenly world.....”² (*Kena U.*, IV. 9.)

The nominal significance (of the word ‘*svarga*’ postulated by the Paurāṇikas must be disregarded even like that of the word ‘*avyakta*’ postulated by the Sāṃkhyas, since in the very context (of the *Katha Up.*) in the mantra (I. i. 18) the word ‘*svarga loka*’ which signifies the resultant of the combined *jñāna* and *karma*

1. Hume’s trans.

2. Hume’s trans.

is explained even by others as meaning the 'abode called *Vairāja*,' which is distinct from the world lying between the Sun and the Pole star.

Now, it may be said "The principle of signification (*i.e.*, being a world that is above the world of the Sun) being the same with regard to the place of *Vairāja*, it is not a secondary meaning. (It is a primary one)." (To this we reply), the world of Brahman (abode of liberation) too being the one that is above is not other than the primary sense. The usage such as "By the two paths of *svarga* and *apavarga* (liberation)," can be justified on the principle of *Brāhmaṇa-parivrājaka* (*i.e.*, the general term gets restricted on account of the particular mentioned along with it).¹

Or else let it be a secondary meaning since there is something to (contradict) its primary sense. What is it that contradicts it? Listen attentively. In the first of the question-mantras "*svarge loke na bhayam kiñcanāsti*: there is no fear whatsoever in the world of *svarga*," there is mentioned the complete riddance of sin by the words 'There is no fear whatsoever.' The absence of such fear of the form 'when through what sin would I fall' indicated by the passage "There is no comfort even to one who is in *svarga* it being transitory and having the fear of fall always," is meant here. Indeed it will happen to one that is altogether free from sin. By the passages "There you are not" (*K.U. I.i. 12b*) and "One does not fear old age" are indicated freedom from old age and freedom from death. By the passage "Having crossed over both hunger and thirst" (*K.U. I. i. 12c*) are mentioned absence of hunger and absence of thirst. And so freedom from sorrow is mentioned by the word "*śokātigah*" getting beyond sorrow (*K.U. I.i.12d*); by the words "One enjoys in the world of *Svarga*" (*K.U. I. i. 12*) are mentioned the nature of being one whose desires get always realized and whose volition is always true (*satya*). This is (also) mentioned in the scriptural passage "If he becomes desirous of the world of the fathers, verily through his volition there come his fathers (*samuttiṣṭhanti*) (He) attaining that world of fathers gets glorified" (*Ch. U. VIII. 2. 1*). Since therefore the manifestation of the eight Brahman-qualities (freedom from sin etc.)

1. It is very similar to the *Go-balivarda nyāya*.

taught in the scriptures is found here, it is not proper to hold (that the word *svarga* means) attainment of relative absence of death and birth available in the '*Svarga*'—world of the Purāṇas.

For the same reason, in the *Vidhyantādhikaraṇa* (of the seventh Chapter of Jaimini's *Pūrva Mīmāṃsā Sūtras*, it is stated that *vikṛtis* (sacrifices that take subsidiaries from prakṛti-sacrifices which have their own established subsidiaries), such as *saurya* (sacrifice enjoined in the passage: *sauryam caruṇi nirvapet brahmavaroasakāmah* (*PMS.* VII. iv. I), which have no subsidiaries enjoined in their contexts, which therefore, need subsidiaries take only those (subsidiaries) that are Vedic and belong to *Darśapūrṇamāsa*-sacrifices on account of there being the similarity of enjoinder by the three Vedas, the purpose of which is to enjoin actions to be done with the help of sacrificial fires (*vaitanika*). This is stated in the *Sāstra Dīpikā* (of Pārthasārathī Miśra) thus: "The group of Vedic subsidiaries presents itself through similarity of being Vedic (to the *vikṛtis*) but the group of non-Vedic (*laukiki*) subsidiaries being dissimilar cannot present itself."

It cannot be said: "Now for the recitation of formula (mantra) "*Eṣa te Vāyo iti brūyāt*: This is thine, O Vāyu!" which is enjoined by the passage "If one touches one sacrificial post, one should utter (the mantra) "This is thine O Vāyu!" the cause must be 'the touch of the post,' that is made according to Vedic injunction, on account of the similarity of being Vedic. Now one cannot accept this view as this will refute the *adhikaraṇa* of the ninth chapter beginning with the, *sūtra* " (It is) in connection with ordinary (touch) since it is connected with sin (*doṣa*)....."

(IX. 3. 9.)

IF

V.

(Reply). The recital enjoined as stated above in the passage "If one touches the sacrificial post he should say 'This is thine O, Vāyu!,' is preceded by the prohibition 'Verily the sacrificial post puts on itself what went wrong during the sacrifice. Therefore the sacrificial post puts on itself what went wrong during the sacrifice. Therefore the sacrificial post must not be touched.' Therefore the recitation enjoined must have reference to ordinary touch which is prohibited and requires expiation." Though thus there is no possibility of having anything to do with things that are

Vedic, it is only reasonable to accept reference to things that are Vedic where there is nothing going against it.

For this very reason, it is concluded in the *aśvapratigraheṣṭyadhikarāṇa* that the sacrifice (*iṣṭi*) enjoined in the passage (*Yajurveda Sam. Kṛṣṇa* II. iii. 12) “As many horses as he accepts (as gifts), so many (oblations cooked on four pans) (offerings) to Varuṇa should he offer”¹ is on account of only the gift of horse during the performance of Vedic sacrifices and not in respect of gift of horses to friends out of love etc., which is forbidden by the passage “One should not present animals with manes—*na kesariṇo dadāti*,” and so requires expiation. Similarly it has been said by others in the sūtra “The rules as to dying by day and so on in order not to return are given by Smṛtis for Yogins only. And those two viz., Yoga and Sāṃkhya are mere Smṛti, not of scripted character”² that there is no recognition in Vedānta of what is enjoined in the Smṛtis. Now therefore in the mantra beginning with “*Svarge loke*” it is only proper to take it to mean the eight qualities of Brahman, voidness of sin etc., which are established by the mystic literature (*adhyātma śāstra*). Further, (i) since in the second question the attainment of immortality is mentioned thus “*svargalokā amṛtatvam bhajante*” those living in the world of *svarga* attain immortality,” (ii) since the word *amṛtatva*—“immortality” is used in the Upaniṣadic (*adhyātma*) literature, in the sense of liberation ‘immortal’ in the passage (*K.U.* I. i. 28) “Having gone to those who never grow old and are immortal,” means only the freed (souls) and therefore could not mean ‘relatively immortal’ (beings) (iii) since later on in the passages “Therefore the Fire (altar) Nāciketa was piled by me. I have attained the eternal by means of the transitory things” (*K.U.* I. ii. 10); and “Let us be capable of meditating upon the fire that to which Nāciketa (altar) leads, which is the fearless shore for those who want to cross (the ocean of *saṃsāra*)” (*K.U.* I. iii. 2); and only the Brahman is said to be attained by means of the Nāciketa Fire-altar, the word ‘*svarga*’ cannot mean the ordinary *svarga*.’

1. *PMS.* III. iv. 28 and 29. This is the translation that one can make but according to *PMS* III. iv. 31 the word ‘*pratigṛhṇiyāt*’ in the passage means ‘would give’ rather than ‘accept.’ The oblations are to be offered by him who gives and not by him that receives or accepts. The above is the translation of *MM Ganganatha Jha*.

2. The *Vedānta Sūtra* IV. ii. 21 *San̄kara Bhāṣya*.

Moreover it is not consistent on the part of Naciketas who is described as one who has turned away from everything other than Brahman—‘ Naciketas would not choose anything but that ’ (K.U. I. i. 29)—to ask for this ‘ *svarga* ’ that is transitory. Further it is firmly established by the Mīmāṃsakas in the *Sūtra* “ *Mukhyaṃ va pūrvacodana lokavat*; on the other hand, the first, by reason of the first command as in ordinary life ” (PMS. XII. ii. 25) that what is mentioned first is strong only where there is mutual contradiction between things that are equal in number, since the enjoinder (*prayogavacana* or *prayoga-vidhi*) does not permit non-performance of greater number of subsidiaries when it is possible to abandon only a smaller number of subsidiaries. Where therefore things that are mentioned at the end are of greater number the principle that is taught in the *Sūtra* “ *Bhūyasaṃ syāt svadharmatvam* ” alone is to be accepted. And it is said in the *Vedānta Sūtra* (I. i. 34) regarding the characteristics of the Soul, (*jīva-liṅga*), mentioned in the text, that it is to be renounced on account of there being many more qualities pertaining to the Supreme Self which are mentioned in the text (of the *Pratardana Vidyā*) at the end. “ He verily makes one do the right act ”; “ This is the Over-Lord of the world ”; “ This is the protector of the world ”; “ The bliss, the Unaging, the Immortal.” Enough now of this lengthy exposition.

I. i. 20.

yeyam prete vicikitsā manuṣye
’stītyeke nāyam astīti caike
etad vidyām anuṣiṣṭas tvayāham
varāṇām eṣa varas tṛtīyah

The doubt which exists in respect of the mansome hold he is and others he is not—I wish to know this taught by you. This is the third of the boons.

Commentary:

Let me take up the subject. Naciketas says “ *Yeyam prete...* ” What follows is stated by Bhagavān Rāmānuja touching this mantra in the *adhikaraṇa* beginning with “ The eater because of the mention of the mobile and the immobile ” (*Śrī Bhāṣya* I.

ii. 9). He writes¹ “It is evident that his question is prompted by the desire to acquire knowledge of the true nature of the highest Self—which knowledge has the form of meditation on the highest Self,—and by means thereof knowledge of the true nature of final Release which consists in obtaining the highest Brahman. The passage, therefore, is not merely concerned with the problem as to the separation of the soul from the body, but rather with the problem of the Self freeing itself from all bondage whatever, the same problem, in fact, with which another scriptural passage also is concerned, viz., “when he has departed there is no more knowledge” (*Brh. Up.* II. 4. 12).² The full purport of Naciketas’s question, therefore, is as follows: When a man qualified for Release has died and thus freed himself from all bondage, there arises a doubt as to his existence or non-existence—a doubt due to the disagreement of philosophers as to the true nature of Release; in order to clear up this doubt I wish to learn from thee the true nature “of the state of Release.” Philosophers, indeed, hold many widely differing opinions as to what constitutes Release. Some hold that the Self is constituted by consciousness only, and that Release consists in the total destruction of this essential nature of the Self. Others, while holding the same opinion as to the nature of the Self, define Release as the passing away of Nescience (*avidyā*). Others hold that the Self is in itself non-sentient, like a stone, but possesses, in the state of bondage, certain distinctive qualities, such as knowledge and so on. Release then consists in the total removal of all these qualities, the Self remaining in a state of pure isolation (*kaivalya*). Others, again, who acknowledge a highest Self free from all imperfection, maintain that through connexion with limiting adjuncts that Self enters on the condition of an individual soul; Release then means the pure existence of the highest self, consequent on the passing away of the limiting adjunct. Those, however, who understand the Vedānta, teach as follows: There is a highest Brahman which is the sole cause of the entire universe, which is antagonistic to all evil, whose essential

1. The entire passage is quoted from *Śrī Bhāṣya* I.ii. 12. It is here extracted from Thibaut’s translation of the *Srī Bhāṣya* (pp. 270.271).

2. Thibaut has wrongly translated the *Brh. Up.* quotation, for it should be translated viśiṣṭādvaitically as “There is no more confusion of the individual soul with its body.”

nature is infinite knowledge and blessedness, which comprises within itself numberless auspicious qualities of supreme excellence, which is different in nature from all other beings, and which constitutes the inner Self of all. Of this Brahman, the individual souls—whose nature is unlimited knowledge, and whose only attribute is the intuition of the supreme Self—are modes in so far, namely as they constitute its body. The true nature of these souls is, however, obscured by Nescience, *i.e.*, the influence of the beginningless chain of works; and by Release then we have to understand that intuition of the highest Self, which is the natural state of the individual souls, and which follows on the destruction of Nescience. When Naciketas desires Yama graciously to teach him the true nature of Release and the means to attain it, Yama at first tests him by dwelling on the difficulty of comprehending Release, and by tempting him with various worldly enjoyments.”

It is also stated under the *Sūtra* “And of three only there is this mention and question” (*S. B. I. iv. 6*) thus: “As his third boon he, in the form of a question referring to final release, actually enquires about three things, *viz.*, the nature of the end to be reached, *i.e.*, Release; the nature of him who wishes to reach that end; and the nature of the means to reach it, *i.e.*, of meditation assisted by certain works¹.”

And also in the *Śrutaprakāśika*, it is stated thus: “The question of the nature of liberation is expressly stated as contained in the question-passage “*Yeyam ..*” (*K.U. I. i. 20*).

The question relating to meditation and others is implicit in it from the manner of the answer given. If liberation is the attainment of a qualITLESS state, the means to it would be the cognition of the sentence-meaning (*vākyārtha*). If the attainable is that possessing two characteristics (*ubhayaliṅga*) the means would be the meditation of it as such. Therefore knowledge of the nature of liberation requires the knowledge of what is related to it.”

Therefore the mantra “*Yeyam prete.....*” has reference only to the question pertaining to the nature of the freed but not merely

1. p. 361 Thibaut.

to the nature of the individual soul, who is the agent and enjoyer required for the performance of actions, which have results enjoyable in the other world, and (who is) distinct from its body. Otherwise it must be noted that the test of allurings, offers of provisions, manifold enjoyments and the showing that the object of his (Naciketas's) quest is extremely difficult to attain, will be foiled. Verily, what Naciketas means here is as follows: Having heard from good souls that the individual soul on departing from its last body, becomes as one manifest with eight qualities of freedom from sin, & etc., "I questioned (Yama) about the Fire leading to liberation by the two questions beginning with 'There is no fear at all in the world of *Svarga*.' But now owing to contradictory statements of the disputants there arises the doubt in respect of it. Some maintain there is that soul of the form of one that is free from sin which is described in the mantra "*Svarge loke.....*" But there are others who assert "He is not." Taught by you I would know this." This is the interpretation with which the passage in the reply "having heard of this nature of this Self and well studied it the knower enjoys abandoning his body which is the result of his actions, attaining this subtlest (*aṇumātra*), and attaining his own nature with the eight characteristics of freedom from sin and etc." (*K.U.* I. ii. 13), is in full accord. The meaning therefore is the same as is given below.

But some say that it is seen "In the *Vedānta Sūtra* (III. ii. 4): It (the nature of the individual soul) is hidden on account of the Will of the Supreme. Bondage and its reverse are truly due to It," that the concealment subordinately mentioned in the past participle (*tirohitam*—hidden) in the *Sūtra* is seen to be subsequently referred to in the next *Sūtra* (III. ii. 5) "Or it is through conjunction with its body," by the pronoun in the masculine gender. In the *Vāmana's Sūtra* (*Kāvyaḷaṅkāra* V. i. 11) "Reference by a pronoun to what is hidden in *samāsa* (compound) (is permissible)." the reference to that which is subordinately mentioned in words formed with *Kṛt* and *Taddhita* and other *vṛttis* is accepted. Therefore let there be reference by the word 'I am this' in the passage "*Nāyam asti...*" (*K.U.* I. i. 20) to *prāyaṇa*, liberation, subordinately indicated in the past participle '*preta*' in the mantra *Yeyam prete...*" etc. It cannot be said that the raising of such a doubt as to whether there is liberation or not in respect of one who is

liberated is self-contradictory, even as the doubt as to whether there is or is not eating in the man who has eaten, because we can accept that there is liberation in general but we can reasonably raise a doubt in respect of the particular nature of liberation; and so the word 'this' can refer to that particular nature. Now if it be asked where is the word '*prāyana*' seen as signifying liberation, as it signifies only departure from one's body. In the *Śruta-prakāśika*, the word *prāyana* is interpreted as signifying departure from the final (or last karmic) body, accepting the word as signifying departure from its body (in general). (We reply) Be it so. However let the doubt be only in respect of the departure from one's final body, since the word 'this' could refer to it. If further it be said that it having been well determined already there can be no doubt about it. (We reply) True. But it would be reasonable to raise the doubt as to whether departure from its final body happens just before the manifestation of the nature of Brahman (in him) (or after).

I. i. 21.

*devair atrāpi vicikitsitam purā
nāhi suvijñeyam aṇureṣa dharmah
anyam varam Naciketo vṛñīṣva
mā moparotsir ati mā srjainam*

In respect of this, even by Gods doubts were entertained before. Verily this is not easily comprehensible. This truth (dharma) is subtle. O Naciketas, ask for a different boon. Press me not. Please press me not. Leave me please.

Commentary:

Having been thus asked (to explain) the nature of the freed (*mukta*), Death (*Mṛtyu*), deeming that one is not capable of reaching it since the thing to be taught was very difficult (to understand) but is likely to fall down in the middle (of the stream), speaks thus "*Devair atrāpi...*"

devair api: Even by those Gods who know much.
atra asmin: in respect of the soul that is freed,

vicikitsitam: doubts were entertained.

nahi: the truth about the soul is not easily comprehensible.

aṇureṣa dharmah: (because it is) a very subtle truth (*dharmā*).
Dharma (truth) in general itself is difficult to comprehend. This is particularly very much so. This is the intention.

anyam varam: different boon. The meaning is clear.

mā moparotsiḥ: *mā mā* means prohibition. Duplication signifies *vīpsā*, emphasis. Do not press further.

Enam ati sṛja: This, leave me.

I. i. 22.

devair atrāpi vicikitsitam kila
tvañ ca mṛtyo yan na suvijñeyam āttha |
vaktā cāsyā tvāḍṛganyo na labhyo
nānyo varas tulya etasya kaścīt. || 22 ||

Did not even the Gods entertain doubts about this, as Thou sayest? O Death, that which thou sayest is not easily comprehensible, none else like Thee to teach could be got. No other boon whatever is equal to this.

Commentary.

Spoken to thus Naciketas says:

devair atrāpi: the meaning is clear.

tvañ ca: even you O Death who have spoken of the nature of the soul as not easily comprehensible.

tvāḍṛk: Like you, such as you. The rest is clear.

I. i. 23.

śatāyuṣaḥ putrapautrān vṛṇīṣva
bahūn paśūn hastihiranyam aśvān |
bhūmer mahadāyatanam vṛṇīṣva
svayañ ca jīva śarado yāvad icchasi || 23 ||

Choose sons and grandsons that live a hundred years;
a great number of cattle, elephants, gold, and horses.
Choose big empire on the earth. You yourself live as
many years as you wish.

Commentary.

Thus spoken to by Naciketas, Death (*Mṛtyu*), having made it certain that he (Naciketas) will not be leaving it in the middle on account of the subject being difficult and thinking that in spite of his having (the power or) ability to understand, the truth of the freed soul such as this is not fit to be imparted to one whose mind is bent on worldly pleasures, spoke seductively so that the desire to be liberated (on the part of Naciketas) may get confirmed and steady.

śatāyusaḥ: the meaning is clear

bhūmeh: of the earth

āyatanam: wide area or kingdom

vṛṇīṣva: choose.

or *bhūmeh*: on the earth

mahad āyatanam: abode with beautiful halls and stairs

vṛṇīṣva: choose.

svayam ca...: for yourself: as many years as you wish to live is the meaning.

I. i. 24.

etattulyam yadi manyase varam

vṛṇīṣva vittaṁ cirajīvikāṇ ca |

mahābhūmau Naciketas tvam edhi

kāmānāṁ tvā kāmabhājaṁ karomi || 24 ||

If you think of any boon on a par with this, choose wealth and long life. O Naciketas! Be you on the wide earth. I shall make you the object of desire of all desirable ones.

Commentary.

etat tulyam: If you think even of any other boon similar to the one mentioned, ask for that also. Enormous gold, precious stones and the like and long life; this is the meaning.

edhī: Become; 'a king' has to be supplied. (This is the form of) Second Person singular of the Imperative (*lot*) of the root *as:* to be.

kāmānām: Objects that are desired, that is, divine maids etc.

*kāmabhājam*¹: *kāma* means desire; *kāmabhāk* means one who comes into contact with desire as its object. The meaning is "I shall make you one who will be the object of desire on the part of those such as divine maids who are themselves objects of desire."

I. i. 25.

ye ye kāmā durlabhā martyaloke
sarvān kāmān̄schandataḥ prārthayasva |
imā rāmāḥ sarathāḥ satūryā
na hīdṛṣā lambhaniyā manuṣyaiḥ |
ābhir matprattābhiḥ paricārayasva
Naciketo maraṇam mānu prākṣiḥ || 25 ||

Whatever desirable things there are rare in the mortal world, ask for all those desirable things freely; these damsels with chariots and with musical instruments. Verily, things like these could hardly be attained by men. With these given by me get yourself served. O Naciketas! do not put any question regarding after-death.

Commentary.

chandataḥ: As you please is the meaning.

imā rāmāḥ: Damsels with chariots and musical instruments given by me are difficult to get by men. This is the mean

ābhiḥ: with these servant-women gifted by me get served, done, such as shampooing the feet, etc.

maraṇam anu: After-death. In other words, the nature of the freed soul. It may be seen that there is no harm if the word 'death' though signifying departure from one's body in general, signifies the particular one (departure) according to the context.

I. i. 26.

*śvo'bhāvā martyasya yad Amtakaitat
sarvendriyāṇām jarayanti tejaḥ |
api sarvam jīvitam alpam eva
tavaiva vāhās tava nṛtyagīte || 26 ||*

O Death! (all those enjoyable things) of man will be non-existent tomorrow. These will wear out whatever power the sense-organs have. All life is but brief. Let the conveyances, dance and music be only for Thee.

Commentary.

Though thus allured Naciketas with unswerving heart speaks:

śvo' bhāvāḥ: O Death! these enjoyable things of man expatiated of thee are such that they will become non-existent tomorrow. They will not last for two days. This is the meaning. Whatever power all the sense organs have, they will destroy. The enjoyment of celestial maids etc., will bring about weakness of all the senses. This is what is meant here.

api sarvam: even the life of Brahman is very brief, not to speak of the (tenure of) life of those like ourselves. The intention is that even the longest life is not fit to be courted.

vāhāḥ: chariots etc.

Let be; this is to be supplied.

I. i. 27.

*na vittena tarpaṇīyo manuṣyo
lapsyāmahe vittam adrākṣma cet tvā |
jīviṣyāmo yāvad iṣiṣyasi tvam
varas tu me varaṇīyah sa eva || 27 ||*

Man is not to be satisfied with wealth. We shall have wealth if we saw Thee. We shall live so long as Thou art lord. But the boon to be chosen by me is that alone.

Commentary.

na vittena: Truly no satisfaction is seen in any on account of wealth amassed since there is the axiom "Never has desire been quenched through enjoying the desired objects." This is meant. Besides,

lapsyāmahe vittam: If we have seen you we shall get wealth. What is meant is if there is seeing of you what difficulty is there in getting wealth? Then, if it be said that long life may be sought, he (Naciketas) replies.

jīviṣyāmo... During which time you sit (preside) as the Lord on the seat of Yama. (The Parasmaipada) *īṣyasi* is according to Vedic exception (*vyatyaya*), All that period our life will last. Verily there is nobody who transgressing your command will bring about termination of our life. What is meant is that life will be the same whether a boon is got or not (to this effect). Therefore the boon mentioned already in the mantra 'yeyam prete...' is the only one to be sought.

I. i. 28.

*ajīryatām amṛtānām upetya
jīryan martyaḥ kva tadāsthaḥ pra jānan |
abhidhyāyan varṇaratipramodān
anatidīrghe jīvite ko rameta || 28 ||*

Having become aware (of the nature) of those that never age and are immortal, how can a man that ages have consciously any desire for that (which is transient enjoyment)? Who realising the splendour and ecstasies (of the immortal) will have delight in life that is non too long?

Commentary.

ajīryatām: knowing the nature of the freed who have old age nor death.

prajānan: discriminating.

jīryan martyah: afflicted with old age and death; this being.

tadāsthah: Desirous of the objects such as divine damsels, which get afflicted with old age and death and others.

kvā: How can be? is the meaning.

abhidhyāyan varṇa.....: The splendours of the form of those of the solar orb.

ratipramodān: Different sorts of ecstasies caused by the enjoyment of Brahman; all these

abhidhyāyan: intelligently understanding.

anatidīrghe: atyalpe: too brief.

aihike jīvite: with (or in) this worldly life (which is too brief) who can be pleased? is the meaning.

I. i. 29.

*yasminnidam vicikitsanti Mṛtyo
yat sāmparāye mahati brūhi nas tat |
yo'yam varo gūḍham anupraviṣṭo
nānyam tasmān Naciketā vṛṇīte || 29 ||*

O Death! Tell me that regarding which (they) have doubts thus and which exists in the great After-death. Naciketas will not elect anything other than the boon which concerns the most esoteric.

Commentary.

yasmin: About which: concerning which the great and other-worldly nature of the freed souls, (they) have doubts that alone teach me.

yo'yam: Other than the boon which relates to the esoteric truth of the truth, Naciketas did not elect (to have) (*na vṛṇīte*) This is the word of the scripture (as it is neither the word of Yama nor of Naciketas).

*This concludes the First Valli of the First Adhyāya
of the Kathopaniṣad.*

II VALLI.

I. ii. 1.

*anyacchreyo'nyad utaiva preyas
 te ubhe nānārthe puruṣam sinītaḥ |
 tayoh śreya ādadānasya sādhu bhavati
 hīyate'rthād ya u preyo vṛṇīte.¹ || 1 ||*

(What is) good is different and verily (what is) pleasant is different; these two with different ends bind man. He who takes up the good among them does the right. But he who elects the pleasant verily falls away from the supreme end.

Commentary.

Having thus tested the disciple (Naciketas) and ascertained his firmness in the desire for liberation, Yama, deeming him fit for instruction, praises the desire for liberation:

anyat śreyah: The way of liberation that is praiseworthy is different, the way of enjoyment that is pleasant is quite different.

te: The Good and the Pleasant.

nānārthe: having ends distinct from each other.

puruṣam: the man.

sinītaḥ: bind. Make the man subject (*vaśyatām*) to themselves.

tayoh: Among these two.

śreyaḥ: the good, liberation.

ādadānasya: to him who strives after.

sādhu bhavati: well-being happens.

ya u preyo vṛṇīte: But he who chooses the pleasant.

u: eva: alone, indicates emphasis (*avadhāraṇa*)

arthāt hīyate: falls down from the supreme end (*puruṣa*)

1. Sri Krishna Prem translates 'Śreyas' as 'better.'

I. ii. 2.

*śreyaś ca preyaś ca manuṣyam etah
tau samparītya vivinakti dhīraḥ |
śreya hi dhiro 'bhi preyaśo vṛṇīte
preyaśo mando yogakṣemād vṛṇīte || 2 ||*

The good and the pleasant approach man. These the courageous (brave)¹ one contemplating discriminates. Verily the brave prefers the good to the pleasant. The dull-witted chooses the pleasant for the sake of worldly welfare.

Commentary.

śreyaś ca preyaś ca: the good and the pleasant.

manuṣyam etah: approach the man.

tau: these two things, the good and the pleasant.

samparītya: discriminating, critically considering.

vivinakti: divides (separates), as the swan (separates) milk and water.

dhīraḥ: Brave,—one that is pleased with his intellect, one who is intelligent.

preyaśaḥ abhi: preferable to the pleasant.

śreyaḥ hi: the good alone.

vṛṇīte: chooses.

mandah: one of dull-wit.

yogakṣemāt: for the sake of worldly welfare ²(literally: earning welfare). *Yoga* means the increase of the body and *kṣema*, its protection).

preyaḥ: the pleasant.

vṛṇīte: chooses.

1. It can also be the "wiseman" as the commentary indicates that aspect also.

2. cf. Ananda K. Coomaraswami: *Notes on Kathopaniṣad*, New Indian Antiquary Vol. I. p. 85 holds *yoga* and *kṣema* are "two very different habits." 'It is between *Yoga* and *Kṣema* that the sluggard makes his choice,' cf. T. S. V. 2. 12: *yoge 'nyāsām Prajānām manaḥ*—Therefore it means *Yogāc ca Kṣemāc ca*. But see Gita's usage "Yogakṣema."

I. ii. 3.

*sa tvam priyān priyarūpāmśca kāmān
 abhidhyāyan Naciketo 'tyasrākṣiḥ |
 naitām sṛṅkām vittamayīm avāpto
 yasyām majjantī bahavo manuṣyāḥ || 3 ||*

You O Naciketas! who are such a one deeply considering, left the delightful enjoyments of delightful forms. You did not accept this path of riches in which many men are lost.

Commentary.

sa tvam: You of such nature.

priyān: pleasant in themselves and (delightful) in respect of their form.

kāmān: the desirable, women and others is the meaning.

abhidhyāyan: understanding as having the faults of being followed by pain and mixed with pain.

atyasrākṣiḥ: left, is the meaning.

etam: this.

vittamayīm: of riches.

sṛṅkām: low path trodden by foolish men.

na avāptaḥ: have not taken up.

yasyām etc.: in which many men are lost; the meaning is clear.

I. ii. 4.

*dūram ete viparīte viṣūcī
 avidyā yā ca vidyeti jñātā |
 vidyābhīpsinam Naciketasam manye
 na tvā kāmā bahavo lolupanta. || 4 ||*

These two are far apart and mutually contradictory: that which is known as ignorance and that which is knowledge. I think (you), O Naciketas, as one that seeks knowledge. Many enjoyments did not allure you.

Commentary.

Avidyā: That which is known as non-knowledge having the form of actions leading to enjoyment.

yā ca vidyētī jñātā: and that which is known as knowledge having the form of the awareness of truth.

ete: Two.

dūram: altogether.

viṣūcī: (are) having opposite directions. *viparīte*: contradictory to each other.

vidyābhīpsinam: Him that seeks knowledge. In case the reading is *vidyābhīpsitam* (the meaning is) one by whom knowledge is desired. The Past participle becomes the second member of the compound word, since it is included in *Ahitāgni gaṇa* (*Pāṇini*, II, ii. 37), or else it is a case of Vedic exception (*vyatyaya*).

kāmāḥ: enjoyments.

bahavaḥ: though many.

tvā: you.

na lolupanta: Did not detract from the path of the Good (*śreyāḥ*). You are not subject to temptation: this is the meaning. *lolupanta*: is an Imperfect from the root *lup* with the suffix *yañ* according to *Pāṇini* (III. i. 23). But the omission of *ya* is a case of Vedic exception. Or else this is the Vedic form of *Ātmanepadi* derived from the root with the suffix *yañ* omitted; also the absence of *aṭ* (is to be explained in the same way).

I. ii. 5.

avidyāyām antare vartamānāḥ
svayam dhīrāḥ paṇḍitaṁ manyamānāḥ |
dandramyamānāḥ pariyaṁti mūḍhā
andhenaiva nīyamānā yathāndhāḥ || 5 ||

Being amidst ignorance, considering themselves as intelligent and learned, fools wander afflicted (with pains, such as old age, illness etc.) even as the blind led by the blind.

Commentary.

Of the two paths referred to (in the previous mantra) “*Avidyā yā ca vidyeti....*” he (Death) denounces the path of desireful actions: .

avidyāyām: Non-knowledge of the form of desireful actions.

antare: in the midst of

vartamānāḥ: existing as in the dense darkness.

svayam (eva): by themselves.

dhīrāḥ paṇḍitammanyamānāḥ: considering themselves as intelligent and proficient (learned) in the scriptures.

dandramyamānāḥ: suffering from pains caused by old age diseases and others.

mūḍhāḥ: fools.

pariyanti: wander. The rest is clear. But some give the meaning taking the reading “*dandravyamānāḥ*” (instead of “*dandramyamānāḥ*”) as “those whose minds are melted by the fire of lust for objects.”

I. ii. 6.

na sāmparāyaḥ pratibhāti bālam

pramādyantam vittamohena mūḍham |

ayaṁ loko nāsti para iti mānī

punaḥ punar vaśam āpadyate me || 6 ||

The seeking for the other world never happens to the immature, the inattentive and the deluded by desire for wealth. One who thinks that this world is and no other, again and again comes under my subjection.

Commentary.

sāmparāyaḥ: Seeking the means to the other world.

bālam: to one who is incapable of discrimination.

pramādyantam: with inattentive mind

vittamohena mūḍham: one whose mental activities are subject to desire for objects.

na pratibhāti: does not occur.

ayam eva loko 'sti: there is this world alone; no other world exists. One who thinks thus becomes subject to extreme torture done by me. This is the meaning. That there is neither this world nor the other world is the meaning given under the *Vedānta Sūtra* III. I. 13. "In respect of others, there are ascent and descent after experiencing at the command of Death (*samyamanam*) because it is seen (in the scripture) that they go there " by Vyāsārya¹ who adopts the reading "*ayam loko nāsti para uta māṇi.*" In that case 'to him' (*tasya*) is to be supplied. So also the particle 'and' (*ca*).

māṇi: means the arrogant (*durmāṇi*). The explanation for the statement that this world does not exist for him, is to be gleaned from the fact of his excommunication from society by the orthodox (*śiṣṭa*). The word *durmāṇi* goes with the passage *punāḥ punar vaśam āpadyate me*—again and again comes under my subjection.²

I. ii. 7.

*śravaṇāyāpi bahubhir yo na labhyaḥ
 śṛṇvanto'pi bahavo yan na vidyuḥ |
 āścaryo vaktā kuśalo'sya labdhā-
 ścaryo jñātā kuśalānuśiṣṭaḥ. || 7 ||*

Who is not attainable by men even for hearing, whom many though hearing about cannot know, of whom rare is an able expounder and rare is one that attains Him, and rare is one that knows Him, guided by well-trained (men).

1. This reading is not found in the text of *Śrutaprakāśikā*. Referring to the passage quoted in the Sri B. "*ayam loko nāsti para iti māṇi,*" the author of the Sruta P. gives the intended meaning in these words "*atra amutra ca sukham nāsti ityarthah.*"

2. Raṅgarāmānuja thinks that to have this meaning the text must read *ayam loko nāsti para uta māṇi*. So he says that the author of the *Srutaprakāśikā* followed this reading. It must be noted here that in all the editions of the *Śrībhāṣya* and the *Sr. P.* the reading of the mantra text is *ayam loko nāsti na para iti māṇi*. The negative particle *na* before *para* is undoubtedly a scribal error.

Commentary.

yaḥ: the well-known supreme Self

bahubhiḥ: by many men

śravanāyāpi: for even being heard

na labhyaḥ: could not be attained; this is the meaning. The intention is that even the gain in hearing of about Him is itself the fruit of great and good deeds.

śṛṇvanto'pi: Though hearing etc. The intention is, surely it is not easy for all those that hear to attain clear knowledge of Him.

āścāryo vaktā: an able expounder and an able attainer of Him are rare. This is the meaning.

āścāryo jñātā: A knower (of Him) also taught by a proficient teacher (Guru) is rare since it is stated (in the *Gītā* VII. 3) “ Among thousands of men a certain one strives after realization: among those that have made attempts and realized, a certain one knows Me as I am.” This is the intention.

I. ii. 8.

na nareṇāvareṇa prokta eṣa

suvijñeyo bahudhā cintyamānaḥ |

ananyaprokte gatiḥ atra nāsty-

añīyān hyatarkyam aṇupramāṇāt. || 8. ||

This (supreme self) is not knowable easily when taught by a man of inferior order (since it is) considered in different ways¹ (by disputants). There is no access to it when it is not taught by another, since it is more subtle than anything of the subtle measure and is beyond reason.

Commentary.

avareṇa: by any of not superior order; by an ordinary person, by one the result of whose study of Vedānta is only scholarship.

nareṇa: by one who deems his body to be himself.

1. *Sribhāṣya* I. ii. 9.

eṣaḥ: the (Supreme) ātman (self)
suvijñeyo na: is not easily knowable
 What is the reason?

bahudhā cintyamānaḥ: considered in different ways; *vādibhiḥ*:
 by disputants, is to be supplied.

ananyaprokte: *ananyena*: by one who is not other than
 (who is one with) the soul that is taught, that is, whose sole subject
 of knowledge is the Supreme alone (*ekāntin*)—who has the perception
 of his soul as Brahman.

prokte: when the soul is taught.

gatiḥ: what understanding there will be that understanding
 will not be there when it is taught by a person of inferior under-
 standing. This is the meaning. Or else,

atra: here in the cycle of *samsāra*

gatiḥ: wheeling about *nāsti*: there is not; this is the meaning.
 Or else.

ananyaprokte: when it is not taught by another but known
 by oneself. *atra gatiḥ nāsti*: there is no understanding.

When the reading is *anyaprokte*: taught by another, the
 meaning is that when it is taught by an inferior person there is
 no understanding of the (nature of the) Self. If it be said that
 by whomsoever it is taught it is possible (to know) for one well-
 versed in reasoning (*ūhāpohaśālīnaḥ*), the answer is, *anīyan* etc.,
 because the soul is more subtle than the subtle, therefore its nature
 is beyond reasoning.

I. ii. 9.

naiṣā tarkeṇa matir āpaneyā
proktānyenaiva sujñānāyā preṣṭha |
yām tvam āpah satyadhṣtir batāsi
tvādrṇ no bhūyān Naciketaḥ praṣṭā || 9 ||

This knowledge cannot be obtained through reason-
 ing. Only when it is taught by another, O my dearest!
 it is capable of being well known. The same knowledge
 you have attained to! You are one of firm resolution.
 O Naciketas! I pray that enquiries of us may be like
 you.

Commentary.

The same is said again.

eṣā matiḥ: This knowledge relating to the Self

tarkaṇa prāpaṇīyā na: Is not attainable through reasoning. Therefore it is not possible to know it by himself, even by one who is well-versed in reasoning: this is the meaning.

preṣṭha: Dearest. Only the knowledge imparted by a Guru different from one's own self brings about that knowledge that leads to liberation., What is that knowledge? This is said in the words *yām tvam āpaḥ*. What knowledge you have got; that is you have decided as one that is to be acquired. This is the meaning.

satyadhṛtiḥ asi: You are one whose resolution is firm

bata: indicates sympathy.

tvāḍṛk: Let there be disciples like you.

I. ii. 10.

jānāmyaham śevadhir ity anityam

na hy adhruvaiḥ prāpyate hi dhruvam tat |

tato mayā Nāciketaś cito'gnir

anityair dravyaiḥ prāptavān asmi nityam. || 10 ||

I know wealth is transitory. Verily that eternal is not attained through things that are transitory. The fire (altar) Nāciketa was constructed by me with transitory things. I have therefore attained the eternal.

Commentary.

And again (Death) pleased says:

śevadhiḥ: treasure. The lordship such as that of Kuber and others, *i.e.*, which are similar to (what I have shown), which are results of actions, are transitory. This I know.

dhruvam tat: the truth of the Self that is eternal.

adhruvaiḥ: By actions that are means of (getting) transends, or that are performed with transitory things. This meaning.

tataḥ: therefore

mayā: by me who know this

Nāciketah agniḥ: The fire-altar Nāciketah

anityaih dravyaih: with transitory things

citaḥ: was constructed with a view to acquire knowledge leading to the attainment of Brahman.

Therefore

nityam: the knowledge which leads to the imperishable goal

prāptavān asmi: I have attained; this is the meaning.

For this reason there is no contradiction with the fact that the attainment of Brahman is brought about by knowledge (*jñāna*) alone.

I. ii. 11.

kāmasyāptim jagataḥ pratiṣṭhām

krātor ānantyam abhayasya pāram |

stomam mahad urugāyam pratiṣṭhām

drṣtvā dhṛtyā dhīro Naciketo'tyasrākṣiḥ. || 11 ||

Having perceived the attainment of desires by the world which is the result of action and the far shore of fearlessness, endless, full of great qualities, famous and eternal, O Naciketas! you, the intelligent, rejected the desirables with firmness.

Commentary.

Death describes Naciketas' fitness for hearing (for being taught), which was mentioned in the previous mantra I. ii. 9d).

kratoḥ: of karma, action (sacrifice)

pratiṣṭhām: the result

jagataḥ kāmasyāptim: the attainment by the world of its desires of the form of objects such as women, existing in all the worlds upto the abode of the fourfaced Brahman

drṣtvā: having perceived (this)

Now he speaks of the nature of Liberation (*mokṣa*).

ānāntyam—avināśitvam: non-destructibility

abhayasya pāram: atyantānirbhayatvam: absolute freedom from fear¹

stomam mahat: The group of great qualities such as freedom from sin, unfailing desires & etc.,

urugāyam²—urukīrtim: Fame and stability

Perceiving all these also as belonging to liberation, you have rejected the worldly desirables due to your keen discrimination. This is the meaning. Or else all these (adjectives) may be construed as belonging to the Supreme Self. Seeing the attainment of all desires in the nature of the Supreme Self itself which is of the form of liberation (*mokṣa*) and that It is the support of all the worlds and that It is itself of the form of infinite results of sacrifice (you have rejected the worldly desirables).

I. ii. 12.

ṭam durdarśam gūḍham anupraviṣṭam
guhāhitam gahvareṣṭham purāṇam |
adhyātmayogādhigamena devam
matvā dhīro harṣaśokau jahāti || 12 ||

The brave (soul) knowing, through the realisation attained by meditation upon the Self, the God difficult of being perceived, hidden, entering (and) residing in the cave (heart), indwelling, (and) beginningless, abandons both pleasure and sorrow.

Commentary.

(Death) answers the third question with the following two mantras:—

1. *Ananda K. Coomaraswami*: *ibid.* abhayam pāram abhayam titīṣatām pāram in III,—that is svargaloke (yatra) na bhayam kincanāsti I. 12. cf. AV. X, 8, 44; T.V: II 9—*Prs. Up.* 1. 10.

2. Cf. *Ananda K. Coomaraswami*: *stoma mahadyurugāyam*—"The exceedingly praised far-going (stride or step) of Viṣṇu."

durdarṣam: incapable of being perceived as stated in “Who is not attainable by men even for hearing....(i. ii. 7a.)”

gūḍham: hidden by non-knowledge which is of the form of action that obscures.

anupraviṣṭam: that has entered into all beings

guhāhitam: residing in the cave of the heart

purāṇam: beginningless (ancient)

adhyātmayogādhigamena: by means of *adhyātmayoga*, that is, concentration of the mind, having withdrawn it from objects, on one's self which is to be described (hereafter) in passages “An intelligent person should put his speech into his mind” (I. iii. 13) and “When these five sense-organs along with the mind are still” (I. iii. 10.) By means of that means, by means of the knowledge of the individual self.

devam: the Supreme Self. *matvā*: knowing; this is the attention. What is meant is that the knowledge of the individual soul is the means to the knowledge of the Supreme Self.

harṣaśokau: both pleasure and grief incident upon the attainment and non-attainment of the desires of objects of sense.¹

I. ii. 13.

*etacchrutvā samparigrhya martyaḥ
pravṛhya dharmyam anum etam āpya |
sa modate modanīyam hi labdhvā
vivṛtam sadma Naciketasam manye. || 13 ||*

Having thus heard this, the man, pondering over, abandoning the body and others resulting from action, and attaining the subtle self, enjoys achieving the enjoyable.²
I think the abode has been open to Naciketas.

1. cf. Iṣā Up. comm. by Veṅkaṭanātha.

2. Ananda K. Coomaraswami: *ibid.* “I consider Naciketas an opened house” Prof. Rawson “An open house I think is Naciketas.” Prem: “For Naciketas, I think, the Dwelling is open.”

Commentary.

etat: the truth of the Self

śrāutvā: having heard

samparigrhya: having pondered over. This is the meaning.

dharmyam: the result of action, body etc.,

pravṛhya: having separated; abandoning is the meaning

etam: this, one that is one's self

aṇum: subtle, beyond the reach of the eyes etc., on account of subtlity; the Supreme Self mentioned as "subtler and beyond reasoning" (I. ii. 8d).

āpya: having attained in a particular place

sah: he, the knower

modanīyam: enjoyable, viz., one's own nature with the eight qualities such as freedom from sin etc.

labdhvā: having got

modate: enjoys; becomes delighted, is the meaning.

Here (in this context) is to be remembered the meaning of the scriptural passage "The individual soul, departing from this (its) body and attaining the Supreme Light gets its own nature manifested. (Ch. U. VIII. 3. 4) There he moves about eating and playing and enjoying." (Ch. U. VIII. 12.3.).

Having thus replied to the question, Death praises Naciketas as one fit for liberation:

vivṛtam sadma: I think the abode of the form of Brahman is open, fit for entry of Naciketas,¹ is the meaning, since there is the scriptural passage: "This soul of his enters the Brahman abode." (Mu. U. III. 2.4.)

If it be asked: In order to be in accord with (the passage) "Knowing and realising the soul born of Brahman" (I. i. 17c.), let the individual soul with the supreme Self as its Self be meant in the passage "*adhyātmayogādhigamena matvā*—realisation attained by meditation upon his Self" (I. ii. 12), and consequently, let the previous portion "Him that is unperceivable" (ibid) also refer to the individual soul. And further let the previous context

1. See foot note 2 at page 50.

“Who is not attainable by men even for hearing, whom many though hearing could not know...” (I. ii. 7) also refer to the nature of the purified individual soul. Thus it will follow that this will be in accordance with the Gītā passage:

“Some one sees this which is wonderful:
Some other speaks of this which is wonderful:
Yet some other hears of this which is wonderful:
And even after hearing nobody knows this.” (B. G. II. 29)

which applies to the purified soul alone.

(We reply) Not so. Though in the mantra *Brahmajajña*.. (I. i. 17c.) on account of this characteristic (*liṅgam*) of the individual soul of the form of having birth from Brahman which is mentioned at the beginning, we take the word ‘*deva*’ mentioned at the end as meaning one whose self is the Lord (God), there is no reason for taking the word ‘*deva*’ in the mantra “*Tam durdarśam* (I.ii.12) as meaning one whose soul is God, since there is no mention of such a characteristic of the individual soul here. Holding this very view, Srī Rāmānuja has stated under the Sūtra “*Guhām praviṣṭhau*—the two that have entered the Cave” (I. ii. 11). “The entry into the ‘Cave’ (of the heart) by the Supreme Self is seen (mentioned in the Scripture) “*tam durdarśam*.....” (K.U. I. ii. 12). In the same manner this mantra has been explained as referring to the Supreme Self by Vyāsārya. But the Supreme Self is indicated by the word *gahvareṣṭham* as one whose body is the nature of the purified soul difficult to be known here mentioned as *gahvara*. But the difference is as follows: In the mantra “*Brahma jajñam*..” (I. i. 17c.) the nature of the purified individual soul with the Supreme Self as its soul is meant, whereas in the mantra “*Tam durdarśam*....” (I. ii. 12) the nature of the Supreme Self with the individual as its body is referred to. Thus there is no lack of identity in meaning.

I. ii. 14.

Now (Naciketas) asks, in order to get clear knowledge, for instruction regarding the Nature of that (Self) which has to be attained, mentioned as that which is distinct from the result of sacrificial works (*dharma*) in the passages: *adhyātmayogādhi-gamena devam matvā dhīro harṣaśokau jahāti*: (I. ii. 12cd.); *etacch*

rutvā samparigrhya martyaḥ pravṛhya dharmyam anum etam āpya sa modate modanīyam hi labdhvā... (I. ii. 13abc); *na hy adhruvaiḥ prāpyate hi dhruvam tat* (I. ii. 10b.); and the nature of the means (to the attainment of that) indicated in the same places by the word ‘*matvā*’ (pondering over) as distinct from *dharma* (sacrificial works) and the attainer indicated as ‘courageous’ (*dhīraḥ*) in the passage ‘*dhīro harṣaśokau jahāti*’ (I. ii. 12d.) (thus):—

*anyatra dharmād anyatrādharmād anyatrāsmāt kṛtākṛtāt |
anyatra bhūtācca bhavyācca yat tat paśyasi tad vada. || 14 ||*

Tell me that which verily thou seest that which is other than the right (*dharma*) other than the non-right (*adharma*) other than this which is done and is not done and other than the past as well as the future.

Commentary.

anyatra dharmād etc.

If it be asked: When it is said in the *Srī Bhāṣya* (I. iv. 6) that “(Naciketas) asked again (of Yama) for getting clear knowledge of the nature of the Godhead to be attained and mentioned as the object of meditation in (the passage) “*devam matvā*” (I. ii. 12) and of the individual soul the attainer, mentioned as one who is to be known in (the passage) ‘*adhyātmayogādhigamena...*’ (I. ii. 12), and of the meditation on Brahman mentioned in “*matvā dhīro harṣaśokāu jahāti*” (I. ii. 12), how could it be said in contradiction to it that, attainer is indicated by the word ‘*dhīraḥ*,’ we reply, not say this. That which is mentioned as that which is to be known (meditated upon) in the passage ‘*matvā*’ (I. ii. 12c) and which is signified by the word *ātman* (self), is only that of the purified nature taught in the *Prajāpati-Vidyā*¹ which is the object of meditation and which is to be attained. Therefore it (passage) also is one which instructs that which is to be attained. Since it is in reality non-different from the attainer, the *Bhāṣya* words (aforesaid) “*prāptuḥ pratyagātmanaśca*” are not in contradiction. Therefore the subsequent *Bhāṣya* passage to begin with....who is the attainer in the mantra “*na jāyate mriyate vā*

1. *Prajāpati Vidyā* is in the last part of *Chāndogya Up.* VIII. describing the instruction of *Prajāpati* to *Indra* and *Virocana*.

vipaścīt: “the intelligent is neither born nor dies” (I. ii. 18) too is not in contradiction (with this). Verily it cannot be that the nature of the purified (soul) mentioned as the intelligent (*vipaścīt*) which is taught in the mantra “The knower is neither born nor dies” (K.U. I. ii. 18), is of the form of the attainer, since that which is taught in the passages “The learned call as the enjoyer the soul together with its body, senses, and mind” “But the man who has intelligence, for charioteer and mind as bridle attains the final end of the path that Supreme abode of Viṣṇu” (I. ii. 4 and 9) is one who is of the nature of the attainer. And so it is explained in the *Sri Bhāṣya* under the *Sūtra* “Because again of the qualification” (I. ii. 12).

For the same reason in the Guha (Cave) passage (I. iii. 1) which refers to the identity of the place of residence of both attainable and attainer, it is seen that reference is made (to the individual soul) as *chāyā* which means the non-intelligent, but not as *vipaścīt* (intelligent). The meaning therefore is the same as said above. This mantra has been explained by Vyāsārya under the *Sūtra* (I. iv. 6) “Of the three.”

dharmah: *upāyah*: the means

dharmād anyatra: different from the well-known means is the meaning

adharmah: other than dharma, means that which is to be attained.

adharmād anyatra: the result which is different from the well-known results.

asmāt: by this term is intended the practiser who is kept in mind. The same (person) is the attainer. He indeed is different from the well-known practiser-attainer (*viz.*, he who performs yagñā and attains *svarga* etc.) since he is detached from any other ends when practising (yoga), and since at the attainment of the Ultimate End he is of the nature that manifests eight qualities (such as freedom from sin etc.);

kṛtākṛtāt: done and not done; qualifies means (*dharma*) and others. The meaning is “which is different from means and others which are done and not done and which is different from *dharma* and others, past and future.”

Having thus commented upon (this passage) in one way ” (Vyāsārya) gives another explanation beginning with “ Or else in consideration of the fact that in that case one ‘ different from ’ (in the 3rd line) becomes superfluous in as much as the three ‘ different froms ’ viz., (1) different from means done and not-done, and past and future; (2) different from results of the same kind and (3) different from this practiser of the same qualification, are sufficient and of the fact that since the means is conditioned by the three times it cannot be qualified as one distinct from all that is conditioned by the three times. Now it will be stated: Or else “ that which is different from dharma and adharma ” is the question regarding the meditation (*upāsana*), since the meditation is different from the means of the form of merit and demerit (*puṇyapāpa*). By the passage “ That which is different from that which is done and not-done ” and from the past and future, what is enquired is the attainable (end), that is not conditioned by time (*kālaparicchinnā*). The question of the attainer also is implicit in it, since the conscious attainer also is eternal and included in the attainable. It will be said (in the *Śrī Bhāṣya*) that the nature of the attainer is also included in it. What is meant is that the words ‘ which ’ and ‘ that ’ refer to the triad (the means, attainer and attainable).

If it be said that even according to this view the acceptance of the statement as referring to the two propositions is strained, because it appears that as the double usage of the word ‘ *anyatra* ’ appearing at the beginning is co-ordinate (*sāmānādhikaranyā*), even so the subsequent double usage of the same is co-ordinate. If there the particle ‘ and ’ (*ca*) was used twice and which is different from *dharma* and *adharma* and which is different from the three times (past, present and future),’ then, the natural co-ordination of the word ‘ different from ’ used four times subsequently could be ignored. Since therefore there is no reason for rejecting the co-ordination that appears to be in accordance with the method of expression (of this twice-used word *anyatra* at the beginning *prakrama rīti anusāri*), let the portion ‘ different from *dharma* and different from *adharma* ’ be one referring to Brahman, the attainable. If it be asked (by any objector of the objector) since the question of the particular means of attainment is to be included here, on account of there being a reply in respect of the means of attainment in the mantra “ This self is attainable neither by

thinking nor by meditation nor by good deal of hearing (I. ii. 23), the co-ordination of the word '*anyatra*' used four times (*śabda-yugadvayasya*) must be rejected, in spite of the absence of the particle 'and' (*ca*); (we reply) No. Because in the reply to only teaching in respect of a particular quality of the attainable, that is, the attainability only through such knowledge as has become of the form of 'Love' (*prīti-rupāpanna*), is seen in the passage "This self is not to be attained through thinking..." (I. ii. 23), and a reply referring chiefly to the means is not seen. (Otherwise) since such a reply as "Nor one whose mind is not quiet could attain this through knowledge" (I. ii. 24). "But who is without knowledge, absent-minded and always impure does not attain that abode" (I. iii. 7) is seen, why should not the question '*anyatra dharma anyatra*', refer to the opposite of the commonly known means.

If it be said that the saying that the means to the attainable is only the knowledge that has become of the nature of love, results in saying that the means must become of the nature of love, (we reply) so let it be. But this would not lead to the acceptance that the question and the answer have reference chiefly to the means.

Nor can one accept either the question 'Which is Devadatta's house?', or the answer to it "That is Devadatta's house which has a garden full of many Campaka trees, and with conch, discus and lotus inscribed on the sides of the doorway," as chiefly referring to the garden or the sides of the doorway.

Now therefore that part of the passage "*anyatra dharmād anyatrādharmād*" must be (taken as) one referring only to Brahman, different from the result of *dharma* and *adharma*, with a view to make the four-times-used word '*anyatra*,' co-ordinate.

Siddhānta: We reply: It is not seen that the statement "Do inform me of him whom you see to be other than Devadatta" said after the statement that this (man) is not born of Devadatta but of Yajñadatta, is a question that refers through secondary significance to one other than Devadatta's son just as it is a question

1. Lit, 'Step': Ananda K. Coomaraswami says that "A correlation of the three forms" with the "Three strides" of Viṣṇu is maintained throughout our text and must always be borne in mind."

referring to Yajñadatta who is other than Devadatta. Even so (it is) proper to say that the question *dharmād anyatra* etc., which follows the instruction that (it is) not the result of action, refers to the means of the form of knowledge, that is different from *dharma* but not that the question refers through secondary significance of *dharma*, to Brahman which is different from the result of *dharma*. So also it is determined by co-ordination in the passage ‘*adharmād anyatra*’ that it refers to the means only. But in respect of the following twice-used word ‘*anyatra*’ which signifies that which is different from that which is conditioned by the three-fold time it is reasonable to accept that it refers to the attainable alone, rejecting co-ordination because it is impossible that it refers to a means that is not conditioned by the threefold time. When it is said that ‘Who (is) the black-tall red-short’ there is co-ordination between black and tall because of lack of contradiction. Likewise there is co-ordination between red and short because of lack of mutual contradiction. But co-ordination is not seen between all the four (i.e., black, tall, red, short), in spite of the absence of the particle ‘and’ (*ca*). But the words form questions relating to two persons (one who is black and tall and the other who is red and short). Similarly here too since the particle ‘and’ (*ca*) is not used twice, no co-ordination is to be accepted. Or let there be co-ordination as you say. Even then, since according to the second interpretation of the question and reply the means also, like the attainer, is included in the question pertaining to the attainable, the question and reply pertaining to the means and attainer referred to in the Sūtra (I. iv. 6) “the reply and questions are in reference to three things alone” are appropriate and thus there is nothing wrong. Also therefore it is apparent that what is explained in the reply is only the attainable which is mentioned as ‘*padam*’ in the passage “That abode I shall teach you briefly” (I. ii. 15d).

This long discourse is enough. Let us now proceed with the commentary.

I. ii. 15.

Thus asked (by Naciketas), Death with a view to teach it in detail beginning with “Neither is (one) born nor dies” now to intensify the attention of the hearer introduces the brief exposition revealing the greatness of the Attainable thus:

*sarve vedā yat padam āmananti
tapāmsi sarvāṇi ca yad vadanti |
yadicchanto brahmacaryam caranti
tat te padam saṁgrahaṇa bravīmi || Omityetat || 15 ||*

Which abode all the Vedas speak of, which abode all the Āraṇyakas and Upaniṣads mention, desiring which (they) observe *brahmacarya* (celibacy), that abode I shall briefly teach you. This is *OM*.

Commentary.

sarve vedhāḥ...: The word '*pada*' (abode) signifies the nature of the attainable as according to etymological derivation '*padyate*' means 'is attained' (*gamyate*). "Which nature all the Vedas directly or indirectly (*paramparayā*) deal with, this is the meaning.

By this the following doubts or hypotheses are replied: Let this upaniṣad like the Prajāpati—Vidyā (Ch. U. VIII.) refer to the nature of the purified individual soul because (i) it is accepted by all that "*Na jāyate mriyate vā vipaścit*" and "*Hantā cenmanyate hantum*" both the mantras (I. ii. 18 and 19) refer to the nature of the purified individual soul, (ii) because the (two) mantras (I. ii. 20) "*aṅoranīyān mahato mahīyān...*" well apply to the individual soul described in it as so subtle as to be capable of entering into all (things) and as omnipresent, by the Smṛti passages "Know that Unperishing by which all this is pervaded" (Gītā II. 17) and "Actionless, unnameable, merely pervading, Unequaled" (?), (iii) because in accordance with the Gītā passage "It is unknowable because subtle it is far and near" (XIII. 15), the passage here "Sitting wanders afar and lying goes all round" (K.U. I.ii. 21), is also compatible with it, (iv) because the mantra (I. ii. 25) "To whom the Brahman and Kṣatriya both become food..." is capable of referring to it in consonance with the (Upabrahmaṇa) explanatory passage "The devourer and begetter" (Gītā XIII. 16), (v) because the mantra (I. iii. 9) "He attains the end of the way that Supreme Abode of Viṣṇu" also can have reference to the nature of the purified soul as stated in the Smṛti passages "The second is the transcendent abode of Him whose name is Viṣṇu, meditated upon by Yogins"; "You alone are the Lord, the cause of creation, destruction and existence, and which is the most Supreme Abode

(and) nothing else (vi) because according to the Smṛti (Gītā VIII 21) Unmanifest Imperishable they say that it is the ultimate end ' the mantra That is the Ultimate Means, that is the Ultimate End (K U I iii 11), also can refer to the purified soul, (vii) because according to the Smṛti (Gītā XIII 27) The Supreme Lord residing equally in all beings ' the Mantra ' He Hidden in all beings (I iii 12) can refer reasonably to the nature of the purified soul (viii) because according to the Gītā (XIII 27), the mantra ' The Lord of the past and future (K U II i 5) signifies a meaning that can go with the nature of the purified soul (viii b) because the individual soul alone is indicated as the subject matter in the context in the mantra (II i 1) The senses are extraverted ' through despising outward things (ix) because even the negative statement ' There is nothing distinct here ' can be reconciled with the same nature of the individual soul where there is a chance of making distinction, (x) because also the mantra Just as the one wind the one has pervaded the world (II ii 10) which recalls the Smṛti text The differences of the wind which blows uniformly caused by (its passing through) the different holes of the flute is named *śadja* etc , the same is the case with the difference of the Supreme Self (when it enters the things ' ¹ can refer possibly to the nature of the purified soul,, (xi) because there is nothing incongruous in the mantra ' Who makes manifold the One seed (K U V 12) having reference to the purified soul since in the *Gītā Bhaṣya* under the passage It has its feet and hands every where ' (Gītā XIII 13) it has been explained (by Śrī Rāmānuja) that the purified soul that has attained Supreme Equality with Brahman (*parama samya*) is the agent of the actions done by hands and feet etc , every where, (xii) because the mantra ' There the Sun does not shine (K U II ii 15) is compatible with the nature of the purified soul on the strength of passages of the Gītā The Sun does not illuminate (XV 6), and ' That light of lights is mentioned as being beyond darkness (XIII 17), (xiii) because the mantra at the end (K U II iii 17) One should discriminate Him from one's own body naturally can refer to the purified soul,

1 Viṣṇu Purāṇa Venurandhiādhibhedena bhedaḥ śadjādi Samyūtaḥ abhedavyāpino vāyostathā *sau paramatmaṇaḥ*

Variant reading in *Śāstra Dīpikā* (Nirnaya Sagar ed p 125 tasya mahāt manah *Anandāśrama* ed gives the reading *Paramesvarah*

and (xiv) because while the whole of this Upanisad could like the Prajāpati-passages (*Ch. U. VIII.*) be taken as referring to the purified soul alone, it is quite unnecessary to take the trouble of explaining it as referring to two attainables, namely, the individual soul and the Supreme Self (these above doubts are replied). It may be seen that the statement “That abode I shall teach you briefly” is to the effect that what is dealt with in all the Vedas is going to be taught, and the nature of the purified soul cannot be that which is dealt with in the portions of the Vedas that deal with the nature of the Supreme Self, though the nature of the Supreme Self which is the Inner Ruler (*antaryāmin*) of the purified soul can be dealt with in the portions that deal with the nature of purified soul.

tapāmsi: This is explained by Vyāsārya as meaning later portions of the Veda which are chiefly concerned with penances.

yad icchantah: desiring which

brahmacaryam: continence of the form of stay at the Teacher's residence, abstinence from sexual life, etc.

caranti: observe.

sangraheṇa: briefly.

It may be noted that since this mantra which is chiefly a statement in respect of the teaching of the attainable, means by implication a praise of *Praṇava* (*Om*), there is no incongruity when the Bhāṣya says ‘after praising *Praṇava*,’ and (when) the *Srutaprakāśikā* says “after praising as that which indicates the Brahman spoken of in the first three lines (of the mantra) beginning with ‘All the Vedas’ is the meaning.

What is that (word) which indicates that briefly? The reply is *Om ityetat*: *Om* that is. According to (the *Gītā*) “The mention of Brahman is traditionally spoken of as of three forms. *Om Tat Sat*.” *Praṇava* is the word that indicates Brahman. It may be noted that since the parts of *Praṇava akāra* and *makāra* indicate the Supreme Self and individual soul respectively, there is instruction also with regard to the means and the attainer.

I 11 16

Now he (Yama) praises *Pranava* with the following two mantras —

*etaddhyevākṣaram Brahma etadhyevakṣaram param |
etadevakṣaram jñātva yo yadicchati tasya tat || 16 ||*

This very syllable indeed is Brahman, This very syllable is indeed supreme whoever, knowing this syllable indeed, whatever wants gets it

Commentary

This very syllable is Brahman on account of its being the means of attainment of Brahman, since in accordance with the text One should meditate on the Transcendent Person with this very same syllable *Om* (Pr U V 5), this is the object of meditation which leads to realisation of Brahman

etadevākṣaram param The best among those (words) fit to be muttered and fit to be meditated upon

etadevakṣaram jñātva He who practises this syllable through this practice whatever he desires (of the form) ‘ Let this fruit be attained by me ’ he realises This is the meaning

I 11 17

*etadalambanam sreṣṭham etadālambanam param |
etadālambanam jñātva brahmaloke mahīyate || 17 ||*

This is the best support, this is the highest support, knowing this support, one is glorified in the Brahman world

Commentary

This support means, of the form of OM is the best, better than meditation etc, is to be supplied

For this reason *Etadalambanam param* Meditation and others having this as their object are the best This is the meaning The meaning of the second half is clear

I. ii. 18.

na jāyate mriyate vā vipaścin-
 mānam kutaścinna babhūva kaścit |
 aśi mṛtaḥ śāśvato'yam purāṇo
 na hanyate hanyamāne śarīre || 18 ||

The knower is neither born nor dies; he comes
 from out of nothing nor was he ever born. This birthless,
 soulless, everlasting ancient is not destroyed when the
 body is destroyed.

Commentary.

The teacher with He (Death) teaches the nature of the individual
 soul with these mantras. In connection with this the following
 that were said by Vyāsārjya; These two mantras deal with one
 subject matter. Since the second (mantra) is only an explanation
 of the first, "not destroyed when the body is destroyed," the following
 mantra (verse 19) also refers only to individual soul, because
 as compared of the Supreme Self the world has no idea of his being
 the killer or the killed. Surely the Supreme Self transcends per-
 sonalities. How could there be any idea or being killed etc., in respect
 of Him? The idea of egoism such as the killer and killed as
 expressed in statements "I kill this," "This seeks to kill me"
 in individual souls, is only with reference to the individual soul.

If it be asked: the negation relating to killing is quite reasonable
 as respect of the supreme Self as there is the negation in "It does
 not get old through its body getting old," (We reply) True. The
 negation of change which was suggested by *daharākāśa* (subtle
 ether dwelling in the body) is reasonable. But here the common
 false notion is referred to and rejected. Surely there is no false
 notion even the part of any one of his being killed or the killer in
 respect of the Supreme Self. Therefore there is no place for either
 affirmation or negation (of killer or killed). Also the mantra "Neither
 is born nor dies" has the same meaning as that. Therefore
 both the mantras refer to the individual soul. Now to the literal
 meaning.

vyākhyāta: Being fit to be omniscient. This (being) who is
 free from birth and death. This is the meaning.

Nāyam kutaścīt having no cause (*utpada*ka)

na babhūva kaścīt even in old times having no birth in the forms of man etc ,

He gives the reason for the statement ' Neither is born nor dies ''

ajāḥ having no birth He then gives the reason for his, non death

nitya having no end He next gives the reason for his coming out of Nothing as *śāśvata* eternal Then he gives the reason for his never having been born as *Purana* ancient If it be asked How could it (the individual soul) be deathless, since its death should necessarily follow on the destruction of its body, due to its dwelling in the body He (Death) replies

na hanyate is not destroyed when his body is destroyed The meaning is clear

I 11 19

The same is explained further

hanta cenmanyate hantum hataścenmanyate hatam |
ubhau tau na vijanito nayam hanti na hanyate || 19 ||

If the killer thinks that he shall kill him, and if the killed thinks that he is killed, both these do not know (the nature of the soul) (He) does not kill nor (is the other) killed

Commentary

hantā cet The meaning is if one taking the body for the soul thinks I shall kill this

hataścenmanyate hatam the meaning is if one whose body and limbs are cut off, deeming his body as soul, thinks within himself I am mortally injured'

ubhau tau na vijanitāḥ Both of them do not know, 'The nature of the soul is to be supplied

nāyam hanti: He does not kill. 'The soul' is to be supplied.

na hanyate: Is not killed. 'The nature of the soul' is to be supplied.

It could not be said "How could there be any suggestion and negation of killing etc., in respect of the purified soul taught in the Vedānta, since it may be seen that he himself is the possessor of the body (*kṣetra*), and they (suggestion and negation) could be on account of this very fact (of embodiedness)."

A discussion is carried on in the *Vedānta Sūtras* (II. iii. 18.) touching these two mantras. The objector's view is that "inspite of the scriptural text "The wind, and other (*antarikṣa*)- these are immortal" (*Bṛh U.* II. 3.3), which teaches the (immortality of) wind and atmosphere, their origination is accepted because there is the scriptural passage, "The ether comes from out of the soul (and) the wind from out of the ether" (*Tait. Up.* II. 1). indicating the origination of them and their origination is accepted, and because it must be accepted that all things are modifications of Brahman so as to explain (the passage) "from the knowledge of the One the knowledge of all occurs" (taught in the scripture). So also, in spite of there being texts describing individual souls as eternal, as there are texts "He created the individual souls on earth with water" (*Tai. U.* II) "The Lord of creatures (*Prajāpati*) created the creatures," which teach that individual souls are created, one has to accept creation even in respect of the individual souls, with a view to explain "the arising of knowledge of all from the knowledge of One."

Against this (objection) it has been established in the *Vedānta Sūtra* (II. iii. 10) "The soul is not created because of the Scripture (statement), and because of its endlessness, on account of scripture (statement)," that the soul does not originate, since the texts "The knower is neither born nor dies" (*K. U.* I. ii. 18). "The knower and the ignorant are birthless." (*Śvet. Up.* I. ii.) negate origination. And therefore from the scriptures themselves its eternity is known. Nor should one doubt that therefore there will result contradiction to the passage (already quoted) from the texts which teach origination and make the assertion that 'all is known when that One is known,' because though its nature is eternal yet it undergoes changes of state of the form of contraction and expansion of

knowledge And thus the text teaching its origination and the statement regarding all knowledge can well be in accord with each other and because the text negating its origination can be reconciled (with it) as referring to its not having origination of the form of its very nature (substance) undergoing any change

The difference is this much There is undoubtedly change of the form of getting into different states in respect of all the three (categories), conscient inconscient and the Ruler—but then the inconscients have origination of the form of substantial modification, while there is no such origination for the conscients Their origination, however, is of the form of changes such as expansion and contraction in their characteristic of consciousness For the Ruler, however, though there is change of state as the Ruler of such (modified) conscients and inconscients, the above mentioned two fold changes (that happen in respect of inconscients and conscients) do not happen Therefore the Supreme Self is described as the Eternal in a different sense (than what applies to the individual soul) as mentioned in the passage 'Eternal of the eternal' (K U II 11 13) The meaning of the Śūtra has been explained "

If it be as asked whether the origination of the individual soul negated by the text 'He is neither born nor dies' is taught in the *Pāñcaratra* (passage) 'From Vāsudeva the individual soul called Samkarṣana is born,' (we reply) it cannot be in respect of the jīva (individual soul)

Similarly origination of the mind, which is an organ, from the individual soul, that is the agent, which is taught in the passage "From Samkarṣana is born the mind called Pradyumna ' cannot happen, because the origination of an organ from the individual soul is contrary to the text which teaches that the mind originates from Brahman "From this is born breath, mind and all organs (Mun U 11 3) This is the objector's view which is brought forward by the two *Vedānta Sūtras* 'Because of the impossibility of origination' and "Nor the organ from the Agent (II 11 39 and 40), and the Siddhānta view is given by the two *Sūtras* "Or (it) being knowledge and destroyer (*viśṭānam ca tat ādī ca*) it cannot be refuted" (II 11 41) and 'Also because of refutation (of jīva origination)" (II 11 42) 'Or' means the setting aside of the

Pūrvapakṣa view. *Vijñānādi* means in the *Śūtra* 'that which is knowledge and the Eater (destroyer).'

If it be asked since the word 'ādi' *ca* being a form according to *Lingānuṣāna sūtra* "*kyanto ghuḥ*,"¹ is always masculine, how could this explanation be given? We reply this is not a *ghu*, but a form derived from the root 'ada: to eat, with suffix meaning the necessary (*āvaśayaka*). Accordingly it can be seen that there is described (Brahman's) causality and its nature as destroyer of the world.

ādivijñānam: eater-intelligence means the Supreme Self.

The word 'jīva' mentioned in the passage "The individual soul called *Samkarṣaṇa* is born" means the Supreme Soul who presides over it. When this is so there can be no refutation of the authority of the *Sāstra* (*pāñcarātra*).

The notion of birth as applied to God (Supreme Self) means the wearing of a body out of His own free will. Since in the same *Pāñcarātra* the origination of the *jīva* is refuted (as in the passage) "He verily is beginningless and endless," there can be no statement contradictory to it. The passage "The individual soul called *Samkarṣaṇa* is born" mentions only the wearing a body by *Samkarṣaṇa* its presiding deity, out of His Free will. Consequently there is no lack of authoritativeness to *Pāñcarātra*. This is the meaning of the two *Śūtras*.

If it be asked, like the *Sāmkhya* and *Pāsupata* and other *adhikaraṇas* should not this *adhikaraṇa* also be taken as refuting the authority of the *Pāñcarātra*, we reply that it is not compatible with facts. It is incredible that *Bādarāyaṇa* who has written the *Mahābhārata* for expounding the *Vedas* and who has established in it at many places the authority of the *Pāñcarātra*, should refute the authority of the *Pāñcarātra* in the *Brahma Śūtras*. (The statements in the *Mahābhārata* are) (i) "This has been extracted like ghee from curd from the extensive Epic *Mahābhārata* of a hundred thousand (verses) using His mind as a churning-rod." (ii) "Just

1. *Kyanto ghuḥ* the forms derived from *Ghu: da* or *dha* (to give or to bear or to nourish) adding with suffix *ki* (*Pāṇini S. III. iii. 92*) are masculine

as butter (is) extracted from curd Brāhmana from bipeds, the Āraṇyaka from the Vedas, and chyle from plants (this Sāstra had been extracted) ' (ii) This is the great Upaniṣad equal to the four Vedas with views similar to Sāmkhya and Yoga, and is called Pāñcarātra,' (iv) "This is beneficial, this is Brahman, this is good without a superior' (v) Associated with Ṛg, Yajus and Saman as well as Atharvāṅgīrasa, this very teaching will become the authority indeed' This alone is the instruction (vi) By Brāhmanas, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas and Sūdras, wearing signs is (*Madhava*) to be adored, worshipped and served who is sung by Samkarṣaṇa in accordance with *Śattvata* injunction (Pāñcatātra) (vii) From this, *Śiṣyamābhava* Manu is going to promulgate the Dharmas

If it be asked (i) since similarly in the passages such as ' This is the complete truth of the learned Sāmkhyas which has been taught by chief ascetics such as Kapila and other accomplished souls, where O best of men there appear no false ideas, where there are very many excellences with absolute absence of faults, the absence of all faults such as wrong notion is mentioned in the Mahābhārata with regard to the School of Kapila and (ii) since it is declared that Nārāyaṇa is the ultimate Object of Sāmkhya Yoga Pāśupata and others in passages such as O Best among Kings, in all these sciences the Ultimate Object is the Lord Nārāyaṇa according to Scripture and Reasoning, and (iii) since it is stated in (the passage) The intelligent authors of the Śāstras speak of Him alone" that the authors of these schools (śāstras) also deal with Nārāyaṇa and (iv) since it is stated in (the passage)

The Sāmkhya Yoga, Pāñcarātra the Vedas Pāśupata, these authorities on the Self should not be destroyed (with the help of reasons) that all these are authorities on the self, and (v) since according to the example of Pāñcarātra, other schools also are said to be authorities as (in the passage) all are authorities as this excellent śāstra is, in that *pada* (V S II 11) the authority of such scriptures (*agama*) such as Sāmkhya, and Pāśupata is not refuted, (we reply) the absence of illusion and deception and others and the having of Nārāyaṇa as the Ultimate Object on the part of the authors of (these) śāstras are common Against those who however owing to insufficient study not knowing the heart of the propounders of these śāstras, and taking as true only

their surface-features, come forward (with objections), the author of the Sūtras granting that the schools of Sāmkhya and others refer only to those surface-features made the refutation. But the Pāñcarātra school even superficially appears to teach the Supreme Truth, the means and the goal, and since there appears nothing in contradiction with Vedas such as difference between material and efficient causes, it is *wholly authoritative*, and there is no room for doubting the contrary, in respect of any portion of it. This can be seen." This is what Vyāsārya has said (in the *Śrutaprakāśika*). Let us now proceed.

I. ii. 20.

Thus having clearly expounded the nature of the individual by the preceding two mantras, (now Death) teaches the nature of the Supreme Self who is the self of that (individual soul) (thus):

*aṇor aṇīyān¹ mahato mahīyān
 ātmasya jantor nihito guhāyām |
 tam akratuḥ paśayti vitaṣoko
 Dhātu prasādān mahīmānam ātmanaḥ. || 20 ||*

Subtler than the subtle, vaster than the vast, the Soul of this creature is put in the Cave (of the heart); Him the greatness of the individual soul the actionless sees, bereft of sorrow, through the grace of the Sustainer.

Commentary.

aṇoraṇīyān: More subtle than the conscient (soul) which is subtle when compared to all the unconscient things Subtler than that. That is, He is capable of entering into it.

mahato mahīyan: Greater than the ether etc., that is. there is nothing not pervaded by it.

asya jantoḥ: Of the individual soul spoken of by the earlier two mantras (defining jīva) as 'Neither born nor dies.'

ātmā: One that enters and controls-this is the meaning.

1. cf. ch. U. VI. 6, 6; VI 12.2; Muṇḍ, V. II. 2.2.

It is clear therefore that he who is dealt with in this mantia 'Subtler than the subtle' is different from the nature of the individual soul, mentioned in the two previous mantras. It should not be presumed that *asya jantohi* 'of this creature' need not be construed with 'self,' since it qualifies '*guhā* meaning the cave of the heart, which requires a possessor (*sambandha* (i) *sapekṣa* because there is no harm in construing the words *asya jantohi*' along with something other than the word *atmā* though it is construed with that also, according to the maxim of 'crow's eye (*kakakṣi-nṛāya*)' for in the passage 'Cutting the branch at the bottom, he makes the *upaveśa* (a small stick used in the sacrifice) (P M S IV 11 8) The word *mūlataḥ* at the bottom is taken as going with 'makes an *upavesā*' while it is taken also as going with 'cutting, cutting the branch at the bottom, one makes *upavesa* from the bottom.' Besides even though the passage means that It (Brahman) resides in the heart cave of the *jīva* (individual soul), there results the difference. Indeed there is no use in teaching that the *jīva* (the individual soul) is himself residing in his heart cave.

If it be asked that the self mentioned above as one that is placed in the *jīva*'s cave may be the *jīva* himself, because *asya jantohi* is to be accepted only as referring to its body which is made known by perception and other (sources of knowledge), due to the fact that individual soul who has been described as 'Neither born nor dies' cannot be spoken of as a creature (*jantu*) which means the created. It cannot be held that the subsequent contexts 'Who other than myself is fit to know that God who is free from both pleasure and sorrow (I 11 21b) and 'How He is, this who can know' (I 11 25b), which describe the difficulty of knowing, cannot be compatible with the individual soul who always is known as 'I' and as one who possesses agency and enjoyerness etc. because, though he is known by all the world as one who possesses agency etc., he could be such as to be difficult to be known as one who is of the nature of Brahman that is to be attained by the Freed, (we reply) No. Because the word *jantu* being a synonym for sentient (*cetana*) according to the Lexicon (of Amara Simha)—"*prāṇi tu cetano janmi jantu janya śarīraṇaḥ*" can signify the individual soul, and the pronominal '*asya*' can be taken to refer to the individual soul, spoken of in the previous

context and so should not be taken to mean the body known through perception and other (sources of knowledge). And since as stated in the (passages) “ This Self is in my inner heart, smaller than corn, barley or mustard or millet or their kernal, this self (is) in my inner heart greater than the earth, greater than the sky, greater than Heaven, greater than these worlds ” (*Ch. U. III.14.3*) the extreme subtilty and vastness, are qualities of the Supreme Self, there can be no doubt that what is described in this mantra “ Subtler than the subtle...” is the *Supreme Self*.

If it be asked since in the *Śrī Bhāṣya* under the Sūtra “ Not the individual soul because of incompatibility ” (I. i. 17), the state of being intelligent mentioned in the mantra “ With Brahman the intelligent ” (*Tait. U*) is said to be the unique characteristic of Brahman, the mantra the “ intelligent is neither born nor dies ” may be construed as referring to the Supreme Self. Whilst it is so, there is no resort to the difficulty in explaining the question and answer “ Different from dharma ” (I. ii. 14) as referring to two attainables, and the mantra “ neither born nor dies ” as referring to the nature of the attainable individual soul and the present context “ subtler than the subtle ” as dealing with the Supreme Self; we reply No. Because it is necessary to reject the primary meaning (*mukhyārtha*) of the word. ‘ Intelligent,’ as otherwise the negatation of ‘ killing ’ etc., would be irrelevant. Therefore the mantras the “ intelligent neither is born nor dies...” and “ If the killer thinks to kill...” on the one hand and the mantra in this context namely ‘ subtler than the subtle...’ on the other hand, cannot refer to the same topic.

The rest will be clarified later on.

tam: such a Supreme Self.

akratuḥ: Actionless, remaining without performing any Kāmya action, action done for getting any result.

Dhātōḥ: of the Supreme Self who supports.

prasādāt: due to the Grace.

ātmanah mahīmānam: One that brings about greatness to the soul; that is the self who is the cause of manifesting the qualities

such as omniscience etc , of the individual soul—that is the Supreme Self

yadā paśyati When one sees

vitaṣoka bereft of sorrow Then one becomes bereft of sorrow

In the *Dyubhivādyadhikāṇa* (*Śrī Bhaṣya* I iii 1) introducing the portion of the mantra 'When one sees the Lord distinct and pleased' (*Śvet U iv 7*) the *Bhaṣyakāra* (Śrī Rāmanuja) makes the following comment 'When this (self) sees the Lord of all, as distinct from himself and pleased and also (sees) the Lord's greatness of the form of control over all existence, then he becomes bereft of sorrow' Following that the meaning here may also be "He who sees also the Supreme Self's greatness of the form of control over all existence, becomes bereft of sorrow"

Or else the construction may be (he) becomes bereft of sorrow due to the Grace of the Supporter, since it may be seen there is the Smṛti—passage of 'Acyuta (He who falls not nor permits others falling) is pleased with him, when He is pleased there is banishment of sorrow"

When the reading (of the Upaniṣad text) is as follows *akṛatum paśyati dhātuḥ prasādāt mahimānam īśam akratum* means void of superiority and inferiority due to action

dhātuḥ of the Lord

I ii 21

Death shows that the truth of the Supreme Self on account of Its being fully transcendent is difficult of being grasped by one who is lacking the Grace of the Lord which is described (in the previous mantra) as the Grace of the Supporter

*asino duram vrayati śayāno yāti sarvataḥ |
kṣaṇam madamadam devam madanyo jñātum arhati || 21 ||*

Sitting he goes afar, lying down he moves every where Who except me can know Him the God free from pleasure and unpleasure

Commentary.

āsīno dūram...: Sitting... What is meant here is that ¹ such as sitting and going afar which ordinarily appear to be contradictory elsewhere, can be present in Him through the ¹ souls whose Self He is.¹

kas tam: Who Him who remains between (i.e., free from) the pairs of opposite qualities such as pleasure and pain, who can know except a person like me who is favoured by the Grace of the Supreme Self. This is the meaning.

I. ii. 22.

aśarīram śarīreṣvanavastheṣvavasthitam |
mahāntam vibhum ātmānam matvā dhīro na śocati || 22 ||

Contemplating upon the Self, bodiless but always established in transitory bodies, possessing vast powers, the brave (intelligent) one does not grieve.

Commentary.

aśarīram: Without a body brought about by actions.
anavastheṣu: in the transitory.

avasthitam: being eternally established.

mahāntam vibhum: possessing vast powers, Meditation on the Self (as described above) the intelligent (man) does not

I. ii. 23.

Death shows the means of attaining that (Supreme)

nāyamātmā pravacanena labhyo
namedhayā na bahunā śrutena |
yam evaiṣa vṛṇute tena labhyas
tasyaiṣa ātmā vivṛṇute tanūm svām. || 23 ||

1. cf. Iṣa. U. 4 and 5.

This Self is attainable neither by thinking nor by meditation nor by good deal of hearing Whom He chooses by that very person is He attainable To him this Self reveals His form ¹

Commentary

pravacanena Since here it is only reasonable to render the word *pravacana* as *manana*, thinking, and since there is no likelihood of *pravacana* which means teaching being considered as the cause (of attainment) and since this is explained by Vyāsarya (author of the *Srutaprakāśikā*) in this manner alone, *pravacana* means thinking

eṣaḥ The Supreme Self

yam which practiser

vṛnute chooses

tena labhyaḥ By the person sought by Him, is attainable The state of being sought after by Him (the Lord), can only be in respect of a person who is His Beloved To be His Beloved can happen only to one who loves Him (alone) Therefore the Love of God on the part of the practiser creates love of him on the part of God and thus it becomes the cause of the attainment of Him This is the meaning

tasya eṣaḥ To him, to that practiser, the Supreme Self

*tanūm*² *svarūpam*, His nature (form)

vivṛnute reveals The meaning is (He) gives Himself The same is the meaning when the reading is *vṛnute*

I ii 24

Now Death teaches certain functions (dharma) as subsidiaries to meditation that leads to the attainment of the Supreme Self

1 *Ch U VI 12 2 Mund U II 2 2*

2 *Tanūm Svām* *Svarūpam* cf *RV V 72 4* Some writers like Ānand K Coomaraswami and Dr S K Maitra write It hardly appears that any doctrine of Grace is necessarily involved But it appears to the writer here that it is inescapable

*nāvirato duṣcaritān nāśanto nāsamāhitaḥ |
nāśāntamānaso vāpi prajñānenainam āpnuyāt. || 24 ||*

No one who has not abstained from bad deeds, attains This through knowledge, nor he who is not free (from desire, anger and others) nor one who is not self recollected, nor one who has not controlled his mind.

Commentary.

duṣcaritāt avirataḥ: One who has not withdrawn from seducing other's wives and stealing other's properties.

aśāntaḥ: one whose passions of desire and anger have not subsided,

asamāhitaḥ: one whose mind is not attentive due to distractions by manifold activities.

aśāntamānasaḥ: one whose mind is not restrained

enam: The Supreme Self.

prajñānena: through knowledge.

nāpnuyāt: will not attain. This is the meaning.

It is quite proper to enjoin abstention from evil deeds, and others as the subsidiaries of the meditation, though all these are *puruṣārtha* (i.e., there are already injunctions prescribing abstention from all these things, the transgression of which will result in sinfulness); just as there is prohibition (negative injunction) "One should not speak falsehood" which, though a *puruṣārtha*, is again prescribed in the context of the Darśapūrṇamāsa—sacrifices as a subsidiary to them.

Now therefore if one, transgressing this negative injunction, which is a *puruṣārtha* (that which when transgressed result in sinfulness to that person), wants to perform correctly the meditation on the Supreme Self, then to that one, the meditation will not bear fruit, since this subsidiary is not acted upon. This is the meaning.

I II 25

yasya brahma ca kṣatram ca ubhe bhavata odanaḥ |
mṛtyur yasyopasecanam ka itthā veda yatra saḥ || 25 ||

To Whom the brahmana and kṣatriya both become food, to Whom Death is curry spice this, (Person) who knows as to how He is?

Commentary

brahma ca kṣatramca mean the whole world of the form of movables and immovables through secondary significance, the primary meaning being the two castes brāhmana and kṣatriya

vasya odano bhavati means by whom it is destroyable

yasya mṛtyur upasecanam for whom Death is helper in eating of others while he (Death) himself is eaten

saḥ He, the Supreme Self, that destroys all the movables and the immovables,

kaḥ yatra in which manner He is, that is how He is, that manner who knows

ittham (so as to be able to express it) it is this This is the meaning

If it be asked what is there to necessitate taking the words *brahma* and '*kṣatra*' to mean the entire world consisting of the moving and unmoving we shall explain —

When it is said that brāhmana and kṣatriya are food, it is necessary that the word '*odana*' (food) should through its secondary significance mean enjoyableness or destructibility, since the castes, brāhmana and kṣatriya cannot be literally food to any body. There is not indeed any individual self or Supreme Self who is the eater of only the brāhmanas and kṣatriyas or destroyer of them alone

If it be objected that this can be an injunction prescribing the destruction of brāhmanas and kṣatriyas for the sake of meditation, though He is the destroyer of all, just as in the passage 'He is Lord of all these worlds which are beyond Heaven' *Antarāditya vidya* (Ch Up II) only overlordship in respect of some particular world is being taught for the sake of meditation

though the Supreme Self is the Lord of all the worlds. Not so, because, like that, this is not a context of meditation. Therefore it is proper that the mention of the brāhmaṇa and kṣatriya should refer by secondary meaning to the moving and the unmoving. This is said by the author of the *Vedānta Sūtras* "The eater, because of the mention of moving and unmoving" (I. ii. 9).

If it be asked, even so, how is it that the word 'Food' is taken to signify secondarily destructibility, (since) even the attribution of secondary significance to a word must be based upon a particular quality and not on a general one? Indeed in the sentence "This pupil is fire" by the word 'fire' the substance-ness is not denoted unlike the golden colour and other qualities (which are recalled to mind). For this reason in the Adhvaryu's command (*praisa*) (*P.M.S.* III. 6) "Let the Hotṛ's cup come forward, also the Brahman's cup, the Udgātṛ's cup, the Yajamāna's cup," where the word '*udgātriṇām*,' because of the plural, is to be taken as referring to many, it is so accepted (in the Pūrva Mīmāṃsā) through the secondary significance as referring only to the group (of four) of Udgātṛ priests, and not as referring to the common characteristic of ṛtviks who are sixteen. Similarly, here also, though¹ *Brahma* and *Kṣatra* cannot be what are primarily signified by 'food,' yet it is only reasonable to take them through secondary significance as things edible or enjoyable and not as destructible, which is a remote meaning, and which will make the sentence refer to the Supreme Self, the destroyer of the mobile and immobile creatures.

We reply,² even if the quality of destructibility is a general one (*sādharaṇākāraḥ*), even then, it is only reasonable to accept it as being referred to through secondary significance, since it accords with the remainder of the passage "For whom Death is curry-spice."

If it be asked, since the word 'food' precedes 'curry-spice,' according to the primary significance of that word (*odana*), the particular³ characteristic of being enjoyable alone must be accepted

1. All editions other than the Poona ed. omit the two lines at this point, without which the whole thing reads as a puzzle.

2. *yadyapi* is only found in the Poona ed. other editions have omitted it.

3. It should be *asādhāraṇa* in the text but in all the editions it is found as *sādhāraṇa* which is obviously a mistake. cf. earlier sentence.

as indicated by it through secondary significance and the latter term 'curry spice' may be taken as meaning 'that which does not obstruct' Therefore 'He who enjoys brāhmaṇas and kṣatriyas and to whom Death is no obstructor (in this enjoyment) is that which is dealt with in this mantra, And the enjoyer can only be the individual soul therefore let it be the subject matter of this mantra

The reply is (If so) there will result the total rejection of the relation that is indicated between Death who is spoken of metaphorically as 'curry spice' and brāhmaṇa and kṣatriya, who are metaphorically spoken of as 'food,' as between curd and rice If it be said that (it means) to Whom brāhmaṇas and kṣatriyas are enjoyable and to Whom Death is no obstructor then indeed no relationship between Death on the one hand and the brāhmaṇas and kṣatriyas on the other hand, could be discerned Therefore though the word 'curry spice' is relatively a subsequent term in relation to the word 'food' (in this passage) it must be taken to mean only the particular thing which helps eating other things whilst it is also eaten up (along with them) rejecting the general meaning (of being not an obstructor) Consequently, according to the word 'curry spice,' occurring later in the same sentence the word 'food' also should signify in a secondary sense destructibility alone It is decided in the *Atiradhikarana* (I 11 2) that it is only correct to accept a sense that is indicated by another word occurring in the same sentence in preference to what is particularly indicated by the consideration of the word in question alone, because there is economy of intellectual activity (*buddhilaḥṭṭam*) and because it harmonizes the other parts of the passage (in question) Enough of this discussion that sprouts like tender leaves on a branch (*alam pallaviteṇa*)

*This concludes the Second Valli
of the First Adhyāya
of the Kathopanishad*

THIRD VALLI.

I. iii. 1.¹

ṛtam pibantau sukṛtasya loke
guhām praviṣṭau parame parārdhye |
chāyātapau ²brahmavido vadanti
pañcāgnayo ye ca triṇāciketāḥ || 1 ||

Knowers of Brahman who have five-fires, and who have studied the three anuvākas (beginning with *ayam vā va yaḥ pavate*) speak of shade and sunshine, which drink Ṛta and which have entered the cave in the most supreme excellent place in the world of good deeds.

Commentary:

If the Brahman is difficult of knowing as was stated in the last mantra (I. ii. 25. d.) "Who knows this as it is?" one cannot understand where and how He is and so we cannot meditate on Him. To Naciketas who thought thus, (Death) shows by two mantras that since the meditator and the meditated upon have entered the same cave (of the heart) and so the Supreme Self can be easily meditated upon, we can therefore meditate on Him.

ṛtam pibantau: *ṛta:* the inevitable result of action which is spoken of as truth (*satya*), *pibantau:* enjoying

sukṛtasya loke: existing in this very world which is attainable through good deeds

parame: in the most supreme ether

parārdha: means the ultimate number; fit for it is *parārdh-yam*. That means the excellent, existing in such a heart-ether (*hṛdayākāśa*)

chāyātapau: indicate through secondary significance the ignorant and the intelligent. The idea in mentioning the individual soul as ignorant is this. There may be a doubt that if the meditator

1. cf. RV. X. 177. 1-2;

2. cf. K. U. VI. 5.

and the meditated upon dwell in the same cave and they are (as indeed they are) attainer and attainable, the attainable cannot be said to be existing in the body which is metaphorically spoken of as a chariot helping attainment of That (attainable Brahman), as the thing that is approached with the help of the chariot cannot indeed be in the chariot itself. This doubt need not be. Though the attainable Supreme Self is there (within the body chariot) since on account of the individual soul being enshrouded in the ignorance of the form of action, due to the will of the Supreme Self, as stated in the *Vedānta Sūtra* (III 11 4) 'Hidden on account of the Will of the Transcendent,' the attainment of the form of the experience of Him is lacking. Therefore there is no incongruity in saying that the individual soul and the Supreme Self, attainer and the attainable dwell in the same cave, which is within the body, denoted by the metaphor 'chariot.'

pañcāgnayah Those whose mind is purified through service (worship) of the five fires

trināciketāh This has been already explained

brahmavidō vadanti Such knowers of Brahman speak of is the meaning. Since merely those who have worshipped (served) the five fires and mastered the three Naciketa *anuvākas*, have no ability to describe such a transcendent Self, these (*pañcāgni* and *trinaciketa*) are qualifications going with the knowers of Brahman.

That this mantra refers to the two, the individual soul and transcendent Self, is said in the *Vedānta Sūtra* "Those two that have entered the cave are souls (I 11 11). If it be asked ¹(i) since there cannot happen the state of being an enjoyer of action mentioned in this mantra that is drinking Rta, by the Supreme Self who is free from (any) enjoyment of results of actions, (ii) since existence in a world attainable through good deeds and delimitation by a cave, are impossible for the transcendent Brahman which is omnipresent, (iii) since the descriptions (in this mantra) as shade and sunshine (*chayā* and *ātapa*) that is non luminous

1 A. K. Coomaraswami holds that these two refers to Mitra and Varuna. Mitra is the day Varuna the night. (P. B. XXV 19 10) *apara* and *Para Brahman* the immanent and Transcendent selves. God and Godhead.

and luminous, are not consistent if referred to the individual soul and the Supreme Self; (iv) since if the reference is to the intellect (*buddhi*) and *jīva* (*the individual soul*), all these (different views) will harmonize, and (v) since indeed the use of the word *pibantau* with reference to the organs of enjoyment of fruits of actions can be explained by taking it as an agent through secondary significance, it is only proper to hold that this mantra refers to *buddhi* (intellect) and the *jīva* (individual soul):—

We reply:— There is no room for the doubt raised by you since in the *sūtra* (I. ii. 11) “ Both entered the cave,” the same question has been raised and answered in the following manner: “ When there is (dual) number mentioned and one of them determined and the second requires determination. it is only reasonable to decide it as belonging to the same genus (*jāti*) (as the former), since there is parsimony of thought, when the genus already known is adopted and the particular alone is to be determined. If, on the other hand, it is said to be a thing of a different genus there is heaviness (*gauravam*) of thought, due to requiring two ideas, one of the genus and the other of the particular. Even in common usage in the statements such as “ The second to cow is to be sought,” is it seen to be similar. Consequently the second to the individual soul who is definitely known through its characteristic of drinking *Ṛta*, is to be determined to be the Supreme Self alone who belongs to the same genus as the individual soul, being conscient.

Since (i) the Supreme Self being the causal agent can be spoken of as one of the two who drink, since (ii) the inner organ (*buddhi*) is neither an independent agent nor a causal one, and so the word ‘*pibantau*’ (the two who drink) can in no way include it; since (iii) it is possible that the omnipresent Brahman does exist even in the world that is attained through good deeds, since (iv) the entering into the Cave also happened to (the Brahman) who in this very context is mentioned as having entered into the Cave “ *Guhāhitam gaḥvareṣṭham* ” *K. U.* (I. ii. 12b), and since (v) the word “ *chāyātapa* ” can indicate the a-little-knower and the All-knower, this mantra refers only to the individual soul and the Supreme Self.

Further the doubt that “because according to *Paiṅgirahasya Brāhmaṇa* the passage” “Of these two the one eats the sweet Pippa (*Mund. U. III. i.*) refers to the *sattva*, the mantra *Dvā’ suparnā*: the two birds (*Mund. U. III. 1*) refers to the intellect and soul (and) because in the *adhikaraṇa* containing the *Sūtra* (*V. S. III. iii. 34*) “This much for the sake of meditation.” this mantra is said to bear the same meaning as the mantra “The two birds,” this mantra has also to refer to the intellect and soul, is cleared by the author of the *Vedānta Sūtras* himself by the *Sūtra* (*I. ii. 1*) “The two that have entered the Cave are souls.” Besides the entering into the Cave on the part of the individual souls, is stated to be due to the instrumentality or conditioning by intellect. Its co-mention as entering the Cave with the intellect which itself has entered into the Cave is not valid. Though in respect of gold that has become heavier due to its being taken along with its base (*apasthambhaka*), the statement “gold is heavier” is reasonable yet such statements as “The gold and the base are heavier,” are not made. For this reason according to the opponent’s view the explanation given to this mantra in consonance with the *Sūtra* (*Guhām praviṣṭhau*) (*I. 2. 11*) is not reasonable. For, though according to the scriptural passage “With the form of *Jiva* (soul) entering into” (*Ch. U. VI. 3.2*), the Supreme Self enters with the form of the soul (*jīva*), yet, it does not enter (in His own nature), as Supreme Self. The mention of the Supreme Self and individual soul as the two that have entered the Cave cannot be correct. Indeed though one can say that Brahman is a *samsārin* (*i.e.*, one who is caught up in the chain of births and deaths), meaning by that that the Brahman is caught up in *samsāra* in his form as *jīva*, still one cannot say that the *two*, individual soul and Brahman, undergo *samsāra*. With regard to the two views accepted in accordance with the scriptural statements (i) “(It) makes through its manifestation (*ābhāsa*) the particular soul and the God” and itself becomes *Māyā* and *avidyā*, (*Nṛsimha pūrvatapanīya Up. 9*) and (ii) “Conditioned by the effect is this *jīva*, conditioned by the cause is God,” that either *avidyā* or the inner organ (*antaḥkaraṇa*) is adjunct (*upādhi*) of the *jīva*, it is not correct (to hold) that *avidyā* and the *antaḥkaraṇa* (inner organ) are the reflection containing reflexive adjuncts (*pratibimba-upādhitva*). Because it is not correct to hold that the individual soul is either the reflexion in *avidyā* or in the inner organ, since the consciousness (*caitanya*) which is

non-perceptual (*acākṣuṣa*) cannot be reflected. And reflection means that which is grasped by one through the rays of light in the eyes deflected on account of obstruction by a transparent substance. Therefore only two views remain; that the *jīva* (individual soul) is that which is delimited by *avidyā* or by *antaḥkarāṇa*.¹

Neither the scripture which describes the unconditioned Supreme Self as entering the Cave nor the *Antaryāmi Brāhmaṇa* is in accord with regard to these (two views) since (the soul) in the heart cave is (indeed) delimited by *avidyā* or *antaḥkarāṇa* (inner organ). Enough of this discussion. To proceed with the Commentary.

I. iii. 2.

*yaḥ setur ijānānām akṣaram brahma yat param |
abhayam titirṣatām pāram Nāciketam śakemahi || 2 ||*

Which is the bridge of sacrificers, which changeless is the supreme Brahman, the fearless shore for those who intend crossing (the samsāric ocean) which is to be attained by Nāciketas (fire), that let us be able to meditate upon.

Commentary:

yaḥ setuḥ:² which is our bridge, that is the supporter that is the granter of fruits of sacrifice (*karma*).

ijānānām: Of those that have performed sacrifices; (this is) a form with the suffix *kānac* (*Pāṇini* III. 2. 106).

akṣaram Brahma yat param: changeless supreme Brahman.

1. A. K. Coomaraswāmi writes: *Sukṛtasya loke* means 'righteous world,.....The Empyrean Brahma-world is more truly 'non-made' (*akṛta* uncreated) than well made (*Sukṛta*), unless we understand by 'well made' 'Self made' (*Svakṛta*) in accordance with *Tai. Up.* II. 7. He contends that Sankara's interpretation and incidentally Rangaramanuja's as *Karma phala* are impossible in this context with the *paramaparārdha*....." The Parama Vyomans: cf. RV. X. 129, 7 cf. RV. VII. 164, 10 and Praśna Up. 1.11.

2. cf. Ch. U. VII. 4, 4 Ya ātmā sa setuḥ; Br. U. IV, 4, 22; Mun. U. II, 2, 5; RV. X. 6 ; 16.

abhayam titīṣṭatām pāram: to those who intend to cross the samsāric ocean the shore, firm and fearless.

Nāciketam śakemahi: The meaning is that we are able to meditate upon that which is attainable through Nāciketa-fire. *śakemahi:* this is a case of first conjugation, *śap*, according to Vedic exceptional rules (*vyatyaya*).

This part of the Mantra has been explained by the Śrī Bhāṣya-kāra (Śrī Rāmānuja) in this very manner.

Therefore one need not be afraid that it is difficult to meditate upon.

I. iii. 3.

The following (mantra) beginning with “Know the Soul as the occupant of the chariot” teaches the nature of the attainer, with a view to instruct the requirements for the attainment of the supreme abode of Viṣṇu, which is the farther end (*terminus*) of the road of samsāra.

*ātmānam rathinam viddhi śarīram ratham eva tu |
buddhim tu sārathim viddhi manas pragraham eva ca || 3 ||*

Know the self as the occupant of the chariot, the body as the chariot itself, know the intellect (*buddhi*) to be the charioteer and the mind (*manas*) as the reins.

Commentary:

ātmānam rathinam: Him who presides over the body know as the occupant of the chariot.

śarīram.....: Know this body itself is the chariot.

buddhim: Since the activities of the body are dependent upon or due to determination called *buddhi* (intellect), the nature of being a charioteer (is attributed) to it. This is the idea.

pragrahaḥ: rein (or bridle, *raśanā*).

I. iii. 4.

indriyāṇi hayānāhur viṣayāṁst ṣu gocarān |
ātmendriyamanoyuktam bhoktety āhur manīṣiṇaḥ || 4 ||

(The intelligent) speak of the senses as the horses, their objects as their fields: (and they) speak of the soul along with its body, senses and the mind, as the enjoyer (*bhoktā*).

Commentary:

indriyāṇi hayān āhuḥ: the intelligent speak of the senses as the horses;¹ the meaning is clear.

viṣayān teṣu gocarān: *teṣu*: in respect of the senses which are expressed by the metaphor of horses. *gocarān*: as the paths (roads): know the sense-objects of the sound etc., to be these. This is the meaning.

Now (Death) shows as a quite well-known fact that in the absence of its body, senses, mind and intellect which are metaphorically referred to as chariot, charioteer, horses and reins, there is no agency on the part of the inactive self who is metaphorically spoken of as the rider in the chariot in respect of actions, both mundane and scriptural, of the form of movement.

ātmendriya.....: The word (*ātman*) refers to the body. The word *manas* refers through secondary significance also to the intellect, which is its effect, since in the previous mantra *buddhi* also is mentioned as the charioteer.

bhoktā: One who is the agent as well as enjoyer (of experiences). The idea is that the pure self has neither agency nor enjoyment.

I. iii. 5 and 6.

Now He (Death) speaks of the purpose of the metaphor of chariot etc., in respect of the body etc., in the following two mantras.

1. *Bh. Gita*. III. 6.

*yas tv avijñānvān bhavaty ayuktena manasā sadā |
tasyendriyāṇy avaśyāni duṣṭāśvā iva sāratheḥ || 5 ||*

*yas tu vijñānavān bhavati yuktena manasā sadā |
tasyendriyāṇi vaśyāni sadaśvā iva sāratheḥ || 6 ||*

For him, who always remains ignorant with his mind unconcentrated, his senses become uncontrollable just as wild¹ horses for the charioteer; but for him who becomes intelligent always with his mind concentrated, his senses become controllable, just as trained horses for the charioteer, (are controllable).

Commentary:

In this world indeed to one who has got a good charioteer and reins, the horses become obedient. In the same manner only when the intellect and mind, metaphorically spoken of as charioteer and bridle are good (trained and disciplined), the senses, metaphorically spoken of as horses, become obedient and not otherwise.

I. iii. 7 and 8.

With the following two mantras (Death) reveals the effects of subjugating or non-subjugating the senses mentioned as horses.

*yas tv avijñāvān bhavaty
amanaskaḥ sadāśuciḥ |
na sa tat padam āpnoti
samsāram cādhigacchati || 7 ||*

*yas tu vijñānavān bhavati
samanaskaḥ sadā śuciḥ |
sa tu tat padam āpnoti
yasmād bhūyo na jāyate || 8 ||*

He who remains ignorant, always absent-minded and impure, he does not attain that abode but gets more

1. Vicious: Krishna Prem.

entangled in *samsāra*. But he who becomes intelligent and vigilant (in mind) and pure attains that abode, as he is not born again.

Commentary:

amanaskaḥ: he whose mind is unsubjugated etc.

aśuciḥ: impure for the same reason because of his constant inclination towards thinking evil. This is the meaning.

samsāram ca adhigacchati: the meaning is that not only is there the failure to attain the desired abode but on the contrary it leads to the same dense jungle of *samsāra*.

I. iii. 9.

He (Death) concludes answering the question (*viz.*, Which is that abode?)

*vijnānasārathir yas tu
manahpragrahavān narah |
so'dhvanaḥ pāram āpnoti
tad viṣṇoḥ paramam padam || 9 ||*

But that man who has his intellect as charioteer and mind as bridle, he attains the supreme abode of Viṣṇu, which is the goal of the path.

Commentary:

vijñāna.....: The meaning is that he who has a trained intellect and mind attains the nature of the Supreme Self which is the end of the path of *samsāra*.

Now those among body and others, metaphorically spoken of as chariot and others for the sake of controlling, as to which are relatively more important than others in respect of controlling, are being mentioned in the following two mantras.

I. iii. 10 and 11.

indriyebhyaḥ parā hy arthā
arthebhyaḥ ca param manaḥ |
manasas tu parā buddhir
buddher ātmā mahān paraḥ || 10 ||

mahataḥ param avyaktam
avyaktāt puruṣaḥ paraḥ |
puraṣān na param kincit
sā kāṣṭhā sā parā gatiḥ || 11 ||

The objects are more important than the organs, and more important indeed than the objects is the mind (*manas*), and more important than the mind is the *buddhi* (intellect), and more important than the *buddhi* is the Great soul.

More important than the Great (soul) is the unmanifest (body), more important than the unmanifest is the *puruṣa* (person). More important than the *puruṣa* there is nothing. It is the ultimate (means for the means). It is the final goal.

Commentary:

The meaning of these two mantras has been stated by Bhagavān Rāmānuja in his *Bhāṣya* under the *Anumānīkādhikaraṇa* (I. iv. 1). The text of the *Śrī Bhāṣya* is as follows:—

“It thereupon proceeds to declare which of the different things¹ enumerated and compared to a chariot, and so on, occupy a superior position to the others in so far, namely, as they are that which require to be controlled - more important than the senses are the objects,’ and so on. More important² than the

1. Thibaut’s translation of the passage is given here. Thibaut has stated here ‘beings,’ it should be ‘things.’

2. Wherever, in Thibaut’s translation, ‘Higher’ occurs ‘More important’ has been substituted as Rangarāmānuja renders *param* as more important.

senses compared to the horses, are the objects compared to roads because even a man who generally controls his senses finds it difficult to master them in presence of their objects more important than the objects is the mind compared to the reins because when the mind inclines towards the objects even the non proximity to the latter does not make much difference more important than the mind (*manas*) is the intellect (*buddhi*) compared to the charioteer because in the absence of decision (which is the characteristic quality of *buddhi*) the mind also has little power more important than the intellect again is the (individual) self, for that self is the agent whom the intellect serves And as all this is subject to the wishes of the self, the text characterises it as the Great (self) Superior to the self again is the body, compared to the chariot for all activity whereby the individual self strives to bring about what is of advantage to itself depends on the body And more important finally than the body is the highest Person, the inner Ruler and Self of all the term and goal of the journey of the individual soul for the activities of all the beings enumerated depend on the wishes of that highest Self As the universal inner Ruler of that self brings about the meditation of the Devotee also for the Sutra (II iii 41) expressly declares that the activity of the individual soul depends on the Supreme Person He ¹alone is the Ultimate means for accomplishing the meditation upon that which is to be made amenable (*śāśikārya*) and that which is to be attained ultimately, hence the text says More important than the Person there is nothing It is the Ultimate means It is the final goal ²

Analogously scripture in the *Antaryami Brāhmaṇa* at first declares that the highest Self within witnesses and rules everything and thereupon negatives the existence of and further ruling principle There is no other seer but He ³&c Similarly in the *Bhagavad Gītā* The abode, the agent, the various senses, the different and manifold functions, and fifth the Divinity (*i.e.*, the highest Person) (XVIII 14)³ The Divinity meant here is the Highest

1 This sentence has been modified in this translation as Thibaut's is incorrect

2 Our translation of the Katha text is substituted in the place of Thibaut's

3 Bh G translation is ours And the sentence is modified by us

Person (*puruṣa*) alone because of the Gīta statement 'I dwell within the heart of all from me happen memory perception, apoha (absence of consciousness) ' (XV 15)¹, and making Him amenable means complete surrender to Him, as stated in

The Lord dwells in the heart of all creatures as if mounted on a machine (body) causing them to turn round and round by His Māyā Surrender unto Him alone with all your being Arjuna '' (Bh G XVIII 61 2)

I iii 12

*eṣa sarveṣu bhuteṣu gudho tmā na prakāśate |
dṛṣyate tv agrya ā budhyā sukṣmayā sukṣmadarśibhiḥ || 12 ||*

This person residing in all beings as their Self does not shine being hidden (by His Māyā) but He) is perceived by those subtle seeing seers with their intellects one pointed and subtle

Commentary

gudhah hidden, because of being hidden by the māyā of triple qualities

na prakāśate does not shine (as he is) to those who have not controlled both their inner and outer sense organs

agryayā being one pointed, that is having no outer or inner activities

sukṣmadarśibhiḥ by those experienced in perceiving intuitively

dṛṣyate is seen, this is the meaning

I iii 13

*yacched van manasi prājñas tad yacchejjñāna atmani |
jñanam ātmani mahati niyacchet tad yacchec chānta atmani || 13 ||*

1 Bh G translation is ours And the sentence is modified by us

2 Bh G trans is modified to suit Sri Rāmānuja's meaning

The intelligent (man) must integrate his speech with mind integrate the mind with the intellect in the soul, integrate the intellect with the soul that is great (and) integrate the soul with the quiet self

Commentary

Now the (Death) shows the manner of making one's inner and outer organs actionless and manner of knowing the nature of the individual soul mentioned in the mantra (K U I ii 12) through attaining the Yoga of one's inner self

yacched In respect of this mantra Śrī Rāmānuja has stated as follows The following describes the manner of controlling the senses, metaphorically described as horses and others *yacched vāñmanasi* (One) must integrate one's speech with one's mind, that is place one's organs of speech etc and the organs of sense in the mind The objective case after the noun *vak* is omitted according to the (*Pāṇinian*) rule *supam suluk* (VII 1 39) The locative case in *manasi* is lengthened according to Vedic exception *tad yacched jñāna atmani tat* that mind one should integrate with the intellect *Jñāna* here indicates intellect mentioned before *jñāne ātmani* these are two locatives which are not coordinate (*vyadhikarana*) The meaning is with the intellect that is in the soul *Jñanam atmani mahati niyacchet* (one) should integrate (one's) intellect with the soul that is great and agent *Tad yacchet śanta ātmani* That agent one should integrate with the Supreme Self the indwelling Ruler of all The nenter *tat* is according to Vedic exception That abode belonging to Viṣṇu is to be attained by such an occupant of the chariot (the body) This is the meaning

This (above passage in the *Śrī Bhāṣya*) has been explained by the author of the *Śrutaprakāśika* (as follows) 'Integration of speech with mind means making (speech) indifferent towards activities that are contrary to the mind Integration of mind with intellect means making mind act in accord with the decisions of the intellect Intellect is of the form of decision that the objects are renounceable (*heya*) The integration of that intellect with the soul means impelling the intellect towards the soul with a view to perceive it as something that has to be sought after

Quiescent means the state of being always opposed to the six waves of desire. Integration of the soul that is great (*mahat*) with the quiescent self means the consciousness of its being subservient to that (Supreme) Self.

Since the word *atman* is masculine, the word *tat* must be used as such but it is used (as the *Bhāṣya* says) in the neuter according to Vedic exception.

If it be asked that the statement in the *Bhāṣya*—that the two locatives *jñāne ātmani* are not co ordinate (and that) the meaning is that (one) should integrate (the mind) with the intellect which is in the soul—is not correct, since the qualification which is in the soul serves no purpose there being no knowledge which is not in the soul. It cannot be stated that in case this much is said that one should integrate that with the intellect (that is, if in the mantra the word *ātmani* is omitted) there is a possibility of mistaking this *jñāna* for the nature of the soul (*ātma svarūpa* or *dharma bhūta jñāna*) therefore it is said (in the mantra) *jñāna ātmani* intellect which is in the soul, because it (delusion) will get stronger by taking them i.e. *jñāne* and *ātmani* as co ordinate words. Verily the word *ātmani* cannot exclude the acceptance mistakenly of *jñāna* to be the soul. Nor can it be said that the meaning of the *Bhāṣya* ‘which is in the soul’ is that which is in the soul in the relation of cognition and cognized (*viśaya viśayi bhava sambandha*) that is *jñāna ātmani* means *jñāne* that has the soul as its object since thus it serves the purpose of distinguishing this from the substantive consciousness there is no fault of purposelessness because then the mantra passage *jñānam ātmani mahatī nīyacchet* becomes superfluous, this meaning being already implicit. We reply This is what Rāmanuja means. In the statement *tad yacched jñāne ātmani* the locative *ātmani* has the meaning of the cognized (*viśaya*). And that knowledge of the soul i.e., with a soul as its object is of the form ‘the soul is that which is to be sought after. All others are to be renounced. And this means that this knowledge is of the form of decision that the objects are to be renounced. This is clear from the *Śrutapīkaśika*. The integration of the soul which is great, of such knowledge that is of the form of decision to seek after the soul and renounce all else that are other than that, means to direct the consciousness

to turn towards the purpose of seeing the soul alone, which is the object to be sought after. This is also clear from the *Śrutaparakāśikā*. Since thus both the passages have their respective purposes there is no room for doubting that they are superfluous as maintained by you (the objector)

I iii 14

*uttiṣṭhata jāgrata prāpya varān nibodhata |
kṣurasya dhārā niṣita duratyaya
durgam pathas tat kavayo vadanti || 14 ||*

Rise up! Be awake! Approach superiors (and) learn!
The knife edge is sharp and difficult to walk on. The
learned speak of this path as difficult to attain

Commentary

Having thus instructed the manner of attracting (Him), He (Death) now calls the attention of the well equipped persons (*adhikarī puruṣaḥ*) —

uttiṣṭata Rise Up become inclined towards the knowledge of the Self

jāgrata Be awake bring about destruction of the sleep of ignorance

varān prāpya approaching great teachers

nibodhata learn the truth of the Self Or else

varān prāpya obtaining boons from the Godhead who has been well meditated upon, or from those that know the boons, such as those mentioned in the passage 'You will correctly understand the real nature of God

nibodhata learn the nature of the Self that is to be known. The intention is that one should not be indifferent (to the knowledge of the Self)

kavayaḥ knowers

the truth of the Self

gam pathah as the difficult path

lanti speak of For what reason? for the reason the
f the Self is

uasya dharā edge of a particular weapon

utā sharp

ratyaya difficult to walk upon

hat is meant here is that just as he who walks on a knife
as to lose his life if there is least inattention (on his part),
o at the time of knowing the nature of the Self if there is
itted the blunder of inattention there happens loss of one s

I III 15

aśabdam asparśam arūpam avyavam

tathārasan nityam agandhavad ca yat |

anadyanantam mahataḥ param dhruvam

nicāyā tan mṛtyumukhāt pramucyate || 15 ||

Having perceived that (Self) which is eternally sound
less, touchless, colourless, imperishable and tasteless,
odourless, and beginningless and endless, and higher
than the great (soul) fixed, one gets released from the
mouth of death

Commentary

Now He (Death) concludes here (with this mantra) The
d eternally goes with every one of the adjectives viz ,
ndless etc For the same reason of being soundless etc It
nperishable like time (*kālavat*) It means having no diminution
parts

mahataḥ the soul With the word *mahataḥ* reference is
de to the individual mentioned in the previous mantra (KU
iii 13) *ātman mahatā niyacchet*

dhruvam Fixed (immutable)

nīcayya Having perceived i.e. having contacted (God) through the meditation of the form similar to perception

mṛtyumukhāt from the mouth of Death means from the terrible *samsāra*

I iii 16

*Nācīketam upākhyānam Mṛtyupīkṛtam sanātanam |
uktva śrūtvā ca medhavi brahmaloke mahīyate || 16 ||*

Having spoken or heard this eternal story (*vidyā*) of Naciketas told by Death the intelligent is glorified in the world of Brahman

Commentary

To conclude *Nacīketam* This *vidyā* (*upākhyānam*) received by Naciketas

Mṛtyupīkṛtam taught by Death that is Death is only the teacher and not the author (of this *vidyā*) Therefore

sanātanam eternal The meaning is being of non human origin, it is eternal because of uninterrupted transmission (of this instruction)

I iii 17

*ya idam paramam guhyam śravayed brahmasamsadī |
prayataḥ śrāddhakale va tad ānantyāya kalpate tad
ānantyāya kalpate || 17 ||*

If one who purified makes this extreme esoteric heard in an assembly of Brāhmanas or at the time of Śraddha (then) that is capable of granting infinite fruits

Commentary

brahmasamsadī in the assembly of Brāhmanas

*This concludes the Third Valli of the First Adhyaya
of the Kathopanishad*

SECOND SECTION

FOURTH VALLI

II 1 1

*añci kham vyatṛnat svayambhus
 tasmāt parañ paśyanti nantarātman |
 ścid dhiṃ pratyagatmānam aikṣad
 avṛttacakṣur amṛtatvam icchan || 1 ||*

ie Self born (independent lord) condemned the
 (to) extraversion therefore they see (outward
) and not the inner self some intelligent man
 is eyes turned inward seeking immortality sees the
 I self

Commentary

a) seeing those that are indifferent to the nature of the
 te of the inspiring instruction Rise up and be awake
 i expresses (his) grief (thus)

senses

īci means *paran añcanti* which are extraverted that
 which reveal outer objects but not the self

i he gives the reason (for their extravertness)

ambhūḥ Self born independent Lord

nat tortured (condemned) from root *ṛ* to torture

Or else the meaning is (the Lord) has created the sense
 which reveal objects since roots have more than one meaning

nat therefore

añ is the same as *paracā* (objective plural) The meaning
 see or grasp the outward objects and not the inner self
 ‘*Parañ*’ becoming extraverted (they) see the objects alone ”
 meaning

the reading is *paraṃ paśyati* the singular refers to the
 (in general)

Death says that though the nature (*svabhāva*) of the world is like this there is some extraordinary person who inclines towards the inner self like one who is swimming upstream in a river

kaścit dhīrah etc The meaning is someone sees the self that is inward (*pratyañcam ātmānam*) The *Parasmaipada* is Vedic usage The same is the reason for the use of the Imperfect tense instead of the Present tense

cakṣus eye refers to or stands for all the sense organs This (*avṛttacakṣus* etc) means one seeking after liberation with all his sense organs withdrawn from their respective objects

II 1 2

parācaḥ kamān anuyanti bālāḥ
te mṛtyor janti vitatasya pāśam |
atha dhīrā amṛtatvam viditva
dhīruvām adhruveṣv iha na prarthayante || 2 ||

The immature follow the outward objects of desire They get into the noose of the omnipotent Death But the intelligent knowing the immortality, the everlasting, seek not (for anything) among the transitory (objects) here

Commentary

bālāḥ those of small intelligence

parācaḥ kamān outward objects of desire alone

anuyanti know¹

te mṛtyor They get bound in the wide samsara or else the meaning is that they fall into the noose of mine (Death) whose authority is unquestioned everywhere

atha the word *atha* ' (then) means taking up a different aspect of the present topic

¹ *anuyanti* is rendered as *avagacchanti* by RR But in no edition do we have the reading *anugacchanti* follow which is better than the commentator's reading

dhīrāṇi the intelligent

dhruvam anyatatvam viditva knowing the everlasting immortality in the inner self alone

iha here in this world of *samsara*

adhruveṣu among the transitory (objects)

na prañthayante hanker after nothing What is meant is one who has known the truth of the inner (pratyak) self has to abandon everything else It must be noted here that since the I-ness (*ahamtvā*) of all the individuals has reference to the Supreme Self and consequently the Supreme Self is denoted primarily by I (*aham*) He (the Supreme Self) has the (quality of) Selfness (*pratyaktva*)

II 1 3

*yena rūpam rasam gandham vabdan sparśamś ca maithunān |
etenaiṣa vijānāti kim atra pariśiṣyate' etad vai tat || 3 ||*

With regard to this by which alone one perceives colours tastes, smells sounds and touch on account of contact between two what remains there? This verily is That

Commentary

maithunān the particular pleasures brought about by union

yena etenaiṣa vijānāti the meaning is by which this means alone one knows completely (i.e., without remainder) The idea is that the sense organs which reveal colour and others are able to do their functions only when permitted by Him as in (the passage) 'Him the light of lights, the Gods adore (Br Up IV iv 16)

kim atra pariśiṣyate The idea is what is there that is not revealed by Him

etad vai tat This is That The supreme abode which was already mentioned as that which is the attainable is This alone, that is, the nature of the Supreme Self which is described in this mantra

II. i. 4.

*svapnāntam jāgaritāntam ca ubhau yenānupaśyati |
mahāntam vibhum ātmānam matvā dhīro na śocati || 4 ||*

By which (one) perceives both the worlds of dream and waking consciousness, meditating on the Self, (Him), great and infinite, the intelligent (one) does not grieve.

Commentary:

svapnāntam: (the state of dream): the meaning is by which the Supreme Self having the form of the senses, mind and others, men (*lokāḥ*) perceive all the dream and waking worlds. Him has to be supplied before ‘*mahāntam*’—the great. This has been already explained (under *K.U.* I. ii. 22.)

II. i. 5.

*ya idam madhvadam veda ātmānam jīvamantikāt |
īśānam bhūtabhavyasya na tato vijugupsate etad vai tat || 5 ||*

Him who knows this (individual soul) the eater of honey (results of actions) and the lord of the past and future near (it), one should not despise.¹ This is that.

Commentary:

idam: this, the neuter usage is Vedic exception. (It has to be taken as *imam:* this²

madhvadam: the eater of the results of actions mentioned in the passage *ṛtam pibantau* (*K.U.* I. iii. 1.a)

jīvam ātmānam: the individual soul as *jīva*

antikāt īśānam bhūtabhavyasya: and the Lord of all conscient and inconscient at all the three times, that resides near him (the *jīva*) as said in the passage “*guhām praviṣṭau*” (I. iii. 1. b)

1. cf. *Īśāvāsyopaniṣad* 6 d. which is repeated here. Veṅkatanātha has rendered it thus: *tato na vijugupsate: brahmātmakatvenānudṛṣṭeṣu sarveṣu svātmavibhūtinyāyāt kutaścid api na vijugupsate kvacid api nindām na karotīty arthaḥ.*

2. Reading given in *Katha*, text: Aurobindo (trans) is *imam*.

yo veda: who knows

na tato vijugupsate: him even though a doer of bad actions one should not despise. The word *jugupsā* is stated to mean despise under the *Sūtra* (*Pāṇini* III. i. 50) “which enjoins the employment of the suffix ‘*san*’ after the three roots *gup*, *tij* and *kit*.” The Ablative case *tataḥ* is in accordance with the *Vārtika* under II. iii. 88.

etad vai tat: the meaning is as explained before.

II. i. 6.

yaḥ pūrvam tapaso jātam adbhyaḥ pūrvam ajāyata |
guhām praviṣya tiṣṭhantam yo bhūtebhir vyapaśyata
etad vai tat || 6 ||

Who was born first from waters, that Brahman first born out of will (*tapas*) residing after entering into cave (of the heart) with the elements, Him who sees. This is indeed That.

Commentary:

yaḥ: who

adbhyaḥ: from waters; as stated in Manu “First He created waters alone. In them he cast his seed. That became the golden egg brilliant like the Sun. Brahmā the grandfather of all the worlds himself, was born from It.” This *adbhyaḥ* is in the Ablative case (*apādāna:* *Pāṇini* I. iv. 24.)

pūrvam: before individual creation (or particular creation, *vyaṣṭi*)

yaḥ ajāyata: who was born

tam: Him

tapasaḥ pūrvam jātam: first born out of sheer will alone as stated in the scriptural text (*Tait. Nārā.* 19.) “That divinity greater than all the worlds, Rudra, the chaser out of the diseases of *saṁsāra*, the unlimited omniscient (*maharṣi*) saw Brahmā, the

first among the Gods, while being born before the creation of anything else.”

guhām praviṣya tiṣṭhantam: having entered the cave of the heart and established (himself) there

bhūtebhiḥ: with the elements, that is, having body, sense-organs and inner organs etc.—such a Brahman, the fourfaced

vyapaśyata: He saw with the benediction “This must be the creator of the world.”

etad vai tat: This indeed is That: (this) has already been explained.

IV. 7.

*yā prāṇena sambhavaty Aditir devatāmayaḥ |
guhām praviṣya tiṣṭhantī yā bhūtebhir vyajāyata etad vai tat || 7 ||*

Which *Aditi* (eater) remains with breath possessing many sense-organs (*devatāmayaḥ*) remaining in the cave after entering into it: (and) which (*Aditi*) is born with elements. This indeed is that.

Commentary:

This mantra has been commented upon by Śrī Rāmānuja under the *Vedānta Sūtra* (I. ii. 11.) “The two have entered the Cave.” To quote the *Bhāṣya*: “*Aditi* means *jīva* (the etymology being) he who eats (*atti*) the fruits of actions. *Prāṇena sambhavati:* remains with the breath; *devatāmayaḥ:* having enjoyments dependent upon the sense-organs *Guhām praviṣya tiṣṭhantī:* residing in the hole in the lotus of the heart; *bhūtebhir vyajāyata:* having contact with elements earth etc., is born with the manifold form of gods and others.”

etad vai tat: This indeed is that, that is, *tat:* That. This means that this is one which has That as its self. It may be noted that since in this very context in the passage (KU. I. i. 17.) “the word *devam* was explained as meaning that which has the Supreme Self as its self, since in the Gīta passage elucidating this scriptural passage (XIII. 2.) *kṣetrajña* etc.: know me also as the knower

of the body ” the word *mām* has been explained by Śrī Rāmānuja himself to mean *madātmakam*: that which has me as its self, and since just as the word indicating the inseparable quality is capable of denoting the substance, even so the word indicating a substance having inseparable attributes also is well known as capable of denoting (signifying) its quality, therefore the explanation of the word ‘ *tat* ’ (that) as meaning that which has that as its self is appropriate.

II. i. 8.

araṇyor nihito jātavedā garbha iva subhṛto garbhīṇībhiḥ¹ |
dive dive īḍyo jāgrvadbhir haviṣmadbhir manuṣyebhir agniḥ
etad vai tat || 8 ||

Fire, called Jātavedas, is placed in the two *araṇis* adorable day by day by devoted men with oblations, kept carefully like fetus in the womb by pregnant women. This indeed is That.

Commentary:

araṇyoḥ: Fire that is in the two *araṇis*

garbha iva....: Like the fetus carefully kept (protected) by pregnant woman, with food and drink. This goes with the preceding *niḥita*; is placed.

dive dive: day by day

jāgrvadbhiḥ: by the wakeful that is not inattentive

haviṣmadbhiḥ: such as offer oblations like ghee etc.

īḍyaḥ: fit to be praised by such Ṛtviks

agniḥ: Fire, one who takes (praisers) to the forefront. This is to be construed as going with (placed in the *araṇis*).

etad vai: This nature of Agni indeed

tat: is that which has Brahman mentioned before as its Self.

1. cf. RV. III. 29.2 a; SV. I. 7.9; KBU. II. 4.8.

II. i. 9.

*yataṣ codeti sūryo'staṁ yatra ca gacchati |
taṁ devāḥ sarve arpitās tad u nātyeti kaścana etad vai tat || 9 ||*

From which rises the Sun and where he sets; in Him all the gods are set. That nobody can transgress. This indeed is That.

Commentary:

yataḥ.....: From which Brahman the Sun rises and in which he merges

taṁ devāḥ.....: The meaning is that all the gods are established in that Self.

tad u nātyeti kaścana: tat: That Brahman, the Self of all, nobody transgresses, since it is like (one's own) shadow that cannot be jumped over. This is the idea.

U; *eva:* emphasises the point.

etad vai tat: this has been already explained.

II. i. 10.

*yad eveha tad amutra yad amutra tad anv iha |
mr̥tyoḥ sa mr̥tyum āpnoti ya iha nāneva paśyati || 10 ||*

This same indeed which is here is yonder. The same that is yonder is here. From death to death goes he who sees here as if there is any difference.

Commentary:

If it be doubted that since it is not possible for the Supreme Self to be the Self of all for the self is that which is experienced as possessing 'I-ness' that is 'I,' and that self is experienced as absent from other places (in such statements as "I am here alone,") how can such a self be the self of all things at all places and at all times? The reply is as follows:

yad eva: which truth of the Supreme Self

iha: here in this world is experienced as 'I' and therefore is the Self

tad eva: that very same

amutra: is the self of all those that exist in the other worlds. Consequently there is no difference in self. This is the meaning. To elucidate further: the question here can be considered in two ways: (i) whether the experience that I am here alone which has been stated as opposed to the Supreme Self being the self of all things at all places and times, is that of those who know the truth of the Supreme Self or (ii) that of those who do not (know): Not the first (view), since there cannot be such an experience on their part as 'I am here alone.' On the other hand, their experience is of that Being as in all things as stated in the passage "I was the Manu and the Sun." Nor the second view, for the experience of the non-knowers of the truth being limited to them, the individual souls alone, their experiences having reference to their being absent at other places cannot contradict the Supreme Self being the self of all things, He being not grasped by them.

mṛtyoḥ : iha: In this Supreme Self

nāneva: as if there is difference

yaḥ paśyati: who sees

sah: He

mṛtyum āpnoti: goes from *saṁsāra* to *saṁsāra*. This is the meaning.

II. i. 11.

manasaivedam āptavyaṁ neha nānāsti kimcana |
mṛtyoḥ sa mṛtyum gacchati ya iha nāneva paśyati || 11 ||

This is to be attained by the mind alone. There is no difference whatever here. From death to death he goes who sees here as if there is difference.

Commentary:

If it be asked how is this truth of the Supreme Self that is the self of all, attainable by us, He (Death) replies:

idam: The nature of the Self

manasaiva: graspable by the purified mind alone. This is the meaning. The same thing already mentioned he repeats for the sake of emphasis. *ya iha* etc.: the meaning is clear.

II. i. 12.

aṅguṣṭhamātraḥ puruṣo madhya ātmani tiṣṭhati |
īśāno bhūtabhavyasya na tato vijugupsate etad vai tat || 12 ||

The Person of the size of the thumb, the Lord of the past and the future, resides in the middle of the body. He therefore does not despise. This indeed is That.

Commentary:

īśāno bhūtabhavyasya: the Lord of all the conscient and the inconscient existing at the three times

madhya ātmani: in the middle portion of the meditator's body

aṅguṣṭhamātraḥ tiṣṭhati: resides having the size of the thumb.

na tato vijugupsate; tataḥ: Therefore, for the same reason that He is the Lord of the past and the future, due to extreme kindness benevolence (*vātsalya*) *na vijugupsate:* He takes all the defects that pertain to the body as enjoyable things.

Objection (1) If it be asked whether (it is not) the individual soul alone that is described in this mantra because he is described as having the size of the thumb in the Śruti texts such as “lord of the Breath, wanders about (bound) by his actions;” “having the size of the thumb and with brilliant form similar to the Sun” (*Svet, Up. V. 7, 8*) and Smṛti texts (such as) “Death pulled out forcibly the man of the size of the thumb” (*MhB. Vana 284. 16*); it cannot be said that the Lordship over all the past and the future cannot go with him (the individual soul), since in accordance with the characteristic first mentioned the said overlordship mentioned at the end can be explained (to be) relatively (so); we reply Not (so) Because in the *Adhikaraṇa* beginning with the Sūtra (Vedānta) “*Śabdād eva pramitaḥ*—On account of the word (*īśāna*)

itself, the measured ” (I. 3. 24), raising the same objection (*pūrvapakṣa*) it has been established that since the measure ‘thumb’ due to delimitation by the heart can happen to the Supreme Self also, and since such a measure, is mentioned also in connection with the Supreme Self in the Taittirīya passage “The person is of the size of the thumb and resting on the thumb (heart) (of that size)” (*Tait. Nārāyaṇīya* 53) and in the *Svetāśvataropaniṣad* “The person of the size of the thumb, the inner self, is always residing in the hearts of the people” (III. 13), and since the unlimited lordship over the past and the future is the unique characteristic of Brahman alone, this mantra refers only to the Supreme Self.

Objection (2) But what some here say is “The measure of the thumb is the characteristic of the individual soul alone; however, the first half of this mantra simply restates the (nature of the) individual soul, and the third quarter informs that he is himself the Supreme Self.” This is not correct, since in that case the next Sūtra (I. iii. 25) “In relation (to the human heart since he resides) in the heart, this is so since human beings are qualified (for the meditation)” the purpose of which is to show that the measure of the thumb can apply to the Supreme, will become incongruous.

Objection (3) If it be asked “One may doubt that in this mantra there is no mention of *jīva* being the Brahman, since there is no reason to postulate the measure of the thumb to the individual soul who is known as having the measure of “the point of the awl (*ārāgra*), to clear which doubt this Sūtra has come into existence to prove its thumb-size,” we reply that this explanation is a strained one.

Objection (4) If it be asked “Since on account of the lexicographical passage ” “*Iṣvaraḥ śarva Iṣānaḥ . . .*” the word *Iṣāna* is established as signifying a particular god, and since the author of the *Śrutaprakāśikā*, who has commented upon the *Śrī Bhāṣya* passage under the same sūtra *Śabdād eva pramitaḥ* ” “On account of the word *iṣāno bhūtabhavyasya*: verily the Lordship over all the past and the future cannot belong to the individual who is subject to *karma*” as follows “Since by the word *śabda*, the word (in the *Sūtra* I. iii. 24) *Iṣāna* itself is referred to, the conclusion arrived at here is not due to any characteristic (*liṅga*), but due to the word

applying to the Lord Himself. This is the significance of the particle ‘*eva*’ (itself),” accepts the word *Īśāna* as Śruti (one of the six *pramāṇas* of Jaimini such as *śruti*, *liṅga* etc.,) the same sūtra (*i.e.*, word *Īśāna*) excludes Nārāyaṇa and the individual soul, and so this mantra has reference to Rudra alone. (We reply) Not so. When a word that has both *Yoga* and *Rūdhi* (etymologico-nominal) significance, has a word which qualifies that which is indicated by the Yoga-significance of the former (*yoga-rūdhi*-word), the nominal significance is not entertained, as seen in the examples such as the passage

padmāni yasyāgrasaroruhāṇi
prabhodayaty ūrdhvamukhair mayūkhaiḥ |

[The Lotuses growing in the lakes on the top of which (Himalayas) (the Sun) makes blossom forth with his rays that shoot upwards] (*Kumārasambhava*). Here in this passage it is seen that on account of the use of the word ‘*agra*’ (top) which qualifies the *saras* (lake) indicated by the first member of the compound *saroruha*, the nominal significance of the word *saroruha* is rejected. Otherwise the word *padmāni* need not be used. Therefore the word *Īśāna* is not a Śruti (of Jaimini). Only on account of lack of naturalness (in the interpretation) the author of the *Śrutaparakāśikā* himself has resorted to an alternative way of explanation beginning with “Or else,” in accordance with the natural trend of the *Śrī Bhāṣya*. This discussion is enough. To proceed.

etad vai tat: This indeed is That; this has been already explained.

II. i. 13.

aṅguṣṭhamātraḥ puruṣo jyotirivādhūmakāḥ |
īśāno bhūtabhavyasya sa evādyā sa u śvaḥ | etad vai tat || 13 ||

The person of the size of the thumb like the light without smoke, the lord of the past and the future, He (is) alone today and He himself tomorrow. This indeed is that.

Commentary:

jyotiḥ.....: Light. The meaning is He is shining like fire with dry fuel.

sa eva: He himself. the group of things of today and the group of things of tomorrow, the group of things that exist in the three times, all these have Him as Self. This is the meaning.

etad vai tat: This indeed is That, (the meaning) as before.

II. i. 14.

yathodakam durge vṛṣṭam parvateṣu vidhāvati |
evam dharmān pṛthak paśyaṁs tān evānuvidhāvati || 14 ||

As the water rained on the top of the mountain flows on all sides of the hills, even so one who sees dharmas differently runs after them alone.

Commentary:

Just as the rain water showered on the top of the mountain flows on the adjacent hillocks falling down in cascades, being scattered, so also, one who perceives the states of being (*dharmān*) of the inner ruler of gods and of men, which belong to the Supreme Self, as those that pertain to different substrata, falls into the abyss of *saṁsāra* after the manner of the fall of mountain-streams. This is the meaning.

II. i. 15.

yathodakam śuddhe śuddham āsiktam tādṛg eva bhavati |
evam muner vijānata ātmā bhavati Gautama || 15 ||

Just as pure water poured into pure water remains the same, even so becomes the soul of the intelligent meditators, O Gautama!

Commentary:

He (Death) speaks of the result of knowing all as having One Self.

yathodakam....: Just as pure water mixed with pure water remains like that alone, that is in no way different, even so

vijānataḥ muneḥ: Of the intelligent one that practises meditation

ātmā: the soul becoming pure on account of the knowledge of the Supreme Self

bhavati: becomes similar to the Pure Supreme Self. This is the meaning.

Gautama! O Gautama! He (Death) addresses him (Naciketas) as O Gautama, out of gladness, indicating the greatness of the Attainable.

*This concludes the First Valli of the Second Adhyāya
of the Kaṭhopaṇiṣad.*

FIFTH VALLI.

II. ii. 1.

puram ekādaśadvāram ajasyāvakracetasah |
anuṣṭhāya na śocati vimuktaś ca vimucyate || etad vai tat || 1 ||

There is the City with eleven gates of the undevius-minded, unborn: One discriminating this does not grieve. (He) being free gets freed. This indeed is That.

Commentary:

puram: There is the city called the body with eleven gates for going out, which are of the form of eleven organs.

ajasya: of the soul that suffers no change of the kinds of birth etc.

avakracetasah: having his mind uncrooked, that is, straight-minded, that is, capable of discrimination.

Just as the city is distinct from its owner, so also the body becomes distinctly known from its self. The idea is that for the undiscriminating person the body itself is the soul. (That is he suffers from *dehātmabhrama*)

anuṣṭhāya: knowing distinctly

na śocati: does not grieve. The meaning is he is free from grief, desire etc., which are related to the body

vimuktas ca vimucyate: Being free one gets freed. Getting free from sorrows, desires, hatreds etc., which are of the body and others (*ādhyātmikādi*), while living according to the maxim enunciated in the *Vedānta Sūtra*. “Then exhausting the others (merit and demerit) through experience one attains union” (IV. i.) at the end or lapse of *prārabdha karma*¹ attaining the river *Virajā*, through the path of the *Arcis* etc., one becomes freed from all contact with matter (*prakṛti*). This is the meaning.

1. karma that has begun to bear fruit is *prārabda karma*.

etat vai tat: This indeed is That. The nature of the freed described in the mantra is one that has the Supreme Self as its Self. This is the meaning.

Once again He (Death) emphasizes the Selfness of Brahman of all.

II. ii. 2.

*¹hamṣaḥ śuciṣad vasur antarikṣasad dhetā
vedīṣad atithīr duroṇasat |
nṛṣad varasad ṛtasad vyomasad
abjā gojā ṛtajā adrijā ṛtam br̥hat || 2 ||*

The Sun, the brilliant, the wind in the atmosphere, the fire on the altar, the guest in the house, the dweller in man, and dweller in those above them, resident in the world of truth, dweller in the celestial sky, there water-born, earth-born, sacrifice-born, mountain-born, —these are the great Truth.

Commentary:

hamṣaḥ: The Sun

śuciṣat: *śuchau:* in the Summer, *sīdati:* There is, In other words, the brilliant.

Vasuḥ: The wind: *vasayati:* makes one live

antarikṣasat: *antarikṣe sīdati:* That which is in the atmosphere

hotā vedīṣat: The Hotṛ-priest or the Fire who is in the altar.

1. This is a most used Mantra belonging as it does to all Vedas and śākhās: Cross references to this Mantra are given according to the VEDIC CONCORDANCE: Bloomfield. RV. IV. 10.5; Vaj. Sam. X. 24; XII. 14; Tait. Sam. I. 8. 15.2; IV. 2. 1. 5; Mait. S. II. 6. 12; II. 71. 14; III. 2. 1; III. 16. 1; IV. 4. 6; IV. 57.3; Kath. S. 15. 8; 16.8. Ait. B. 4. 12.5; Sat. B. 5. 4. 3. 22; 6. 7. 3. 11; Tait. Ar. 10. 10. 2: 10. 50. 1; Mah. Nār. Up. 9. 3. 17. 8. etc.

This Mantra is known by the following names *Durohanā ṛk*, *Haṁsavatī*, and *Angirasapavitra*.

atithir duroṇasat: the guest that has come to the house,

nṛṣat: One that resides in men as their self

varasat: One that resides similarly in those above men,
that is the Gods,

ṛtasat: One that resides in the World of Truth (*Satyaloka*
of *Brahman*).

vyomasat: *Vyoma* means the celestial sky. The individual
soul that is there also

abjāḥ: water-born

gojāḥ: earth-born

ṛtajāḥ: sacrifice-born, *i.e.*, the Svarga and other worlds
brought into being by actions. Or else, born of the air which
is mentioned here as *ṛta* on account of its long-lastingness.

adrijāḥ: mountain-born

All these are *ṛtam Br̥hat*, that is, are of the nature of the
Brahman which is unlimited Truth. This is the meaning.

II. ii. 3.

ūrdhvam prāṇam unnayaty apānam pratyagasyati |
madhye vāmanam āsīnam viṣve devā upāsate || 3 ||

(*Brahman*) uplifts the *prāṇa* and presses down the
apāna. The *Viṣvedevas* meditate upon (that) Dwarf
sitting in the middle.

Commentary:

The Supreme Self resting in the heart of all lifts the *prāṇa*-
breath upwards and throws the *apāna*-breath downwards.

madhye āsīnam: sitting in the middle of the heart-lotus

vāmanam: The adorable and worshippingable. Or else the
meaning is one who has the small size on account of limitation
by the heart-lotus.

tam: Him

Viṣve devāḥ: All those of the harmonious nature (*sattva-guṇa*)

upāsate: Meditate upon. This is the meaning.

II. ii. 4.

*asya viśramṣamānasya śarīrasthasya dehinaḥ |
dehād vimucyamānasya kim atra pariśiṣyate, etad vai tat || 4 ||*

For this embodied (meditator) whether he is in a good body or enfeebled body or is departing from it, what remains here? This indeed is That.

Commentary:

(Death) says that for the meditator who thus meditates upon the Supreme Self there is only that much delay as the fall of the body as stated in the Scriptural text “For him there is only so much delay as the departure from the body” (*Ch. U.*) VI. 14.2), and that there is nothing more to be done.

asya dehinaḥ: For the meditator

śarīrasthasya: whether he is established in the body that is strong, that is, strong-bodied, whether he is in this state

viśramṣamānasya: or else when he is enfeebled (in body) or *dehād vimucyamānasya:* or whether he is departing from the body

kim atra pariśiṣyate: What is there that remains? The idea is he has done his duty (*kṛtakṛtya*), there is nothing more to be done (by him).

etad vai tat: This indeed is That; (this has been) explained previously. (that is, the individual soul described here has the Supreme Self as its self).

II. ii. 5.

*na prāṇena nāpānena martyo jīvati kaścana |
itareṇa tu jīvanti yasminn etāv upāśritau || 5 ||*

No man whosoever lives by *prāṇa* or by *apāna*:
but all live by something other on which these two depend.

Commentary:

(Death) here speaks of His greatness in being the cause of
the breathing of all creatures;

na prāṇena....

Who is that another by whom they live? The reply is

yasmin etau upāśritau: On whom these two depend, that
on which the very functionings (*jīvanam*) of *prāṇa* and *apāna* depend
on that very same depend the lives of all else. This is the idea.
The rest of the mantra is clear.

II. ii. 6.

(Death) says I shall again teach you the Brahman, the most
secret and eternal.

*hanta ta idam pravakṣyāmi guhyam brahma sanātanam |
yathā ca maraṇam prāpya ātmā bhavati Gautama || 6 ||*

O Gautama! surely I shall teach you now the secret
eternal Brahman and what the soul becomes after
departure.

Commentary:

hanta: exclamation indicating wonder.

O Gautama ātmā etc.: The soul after departure, that is
after liberation

yathā bhavati: of what nature it becomes

tathā: of that nature

punar api: Once again, to you seeking liberation uninfluenced by desires and others (and therefore) fit for the instruction, I shall teach, this is the meaning.

II. ii. 7.

(Death) explains now as to what is meant by ‘hanta te’ in the previous mantra which has reference to a particular fit person:

yonim anye prapadyante śarīratvāya dehinaḥ |
sthāṇum anye ’nusamṃyanti yathākarma yathāśrutam || 7 ||

Some souls enter wombs for getting bodies, (and) others take up the form of the unmoving, in accordance with karma and in accordance with knowledge.

Commentary:

anye: those unlike you who are indifferent towards learning, the truth about the Supreme Self.

śarīratvāya: in order to take up bodies

yonim: womb of brāhmaṇas etc.

prapadyante: enter

anye: others

sthāṇum: the state of being unmoving (trees etc.)

anusamṃyanti: attain:

yathākarma yathāśrutam: in accordance with the actions and sacrifices and meditations performed by each, since there are the passages “Those of good conduct” (*Ch. Up.* V. 10.7) “Him follow knowledge and action” (*Brh. Up.* IV. iv. 2). This is the idea.

II. ii. 8.

He (Death) now takes up the question on hand after calling the attention of the disciple (Naciketas) by creating interest (in it):

ya eṣa supteṣu jāgarti
kāmaṁ kāmaṁ puruṣo nirmimāṇaḥ |
tad eva śukraṁ tad brahma
tad evāmṛtam ucyate |
tasmin lokāḥ śritāḥ sarve
tadu nātyeti kaścana || etad vai tat || 8 ||

That person who is awake whilst others are asleep creating through his willing and willing, that very same (being) effulgent is that Brahman. That same alone is spoken of as immortal. Therein rest all the worlds. That indeed none oversteps. This indeed is That.

Commentary:

supteṣu: Whilst the individual souls are asleep

kāmaṁ kāmaṁ: This is a form with the suffix *ṇamul*. It means willing and willing (again and again or successively, but this word does not mean desired objects such as sons etc.) mentioned in the *sarvān kāmān* (K.U. II.23. etc.) This meaning is clearly (seen) in the *Srī Bhāṣya* and the *Śrutaprakāśika* under the *adhikaraṇa* “*Sandhye* (III. iii. 1)

tad eva: That very same which is the person creating according to His personal desire willing and willing.

śukram: effulgent, revealing (objects)

tad eva: That itself, that is, not dependent upon anything else

tad eva amṛtam: that itself is the Immortal

He is spoken of as Immortal. The rest (of the mantra) is clear. It may be noted that though those that are eternally free (*nityamuktāḥ*) are also immortal, yet because they are not independently so (that is, their immortality is dependent upon the Divine Grace as it is), the emphasis *tad eva amṛtam* that alone is immortal is not incorrect. This enables the rejection of the view that the freed souls and the Divine Lord are identical, because of the exclusion of any other immortal, since the word *amṛtam* here means only the Unconditioned Immortal Person.

II 11 9

(Death) once again teaches that the One Self is the 'I' of all beings with a view to emphasise that fact since it is difficult to comprehend

*Agni yathaiko bhuvanam praviṣṭo
rupam rupam pratirupo babhūva |
ekas tatha sarvabhutantarātmā
rupam rupam pratirupo bahis ca || 9 ||*

Just as the one fire having entered the world has become such whose form is present in every form even so the one inner self of all beings has its presence in every form and outside

Commentary

Agni Just as the one element fire on account of its presence in everything due to triplication, having entered the world with its cosmos

rūpam rupam in every form, that is, in all material things Duplication means *vipśa* (pervasion in all that belong to that class or genu)

pratirupaḥ one with its form engraved in each It may be noted that since on account of the element fire being mixed with all the material forms it is one with its form present everywhere, he is *pratirupa* (in every form)

Similarly being One alone the Supreme Self is such that His form as *antavāmin* is present in every form

bahis ca He pervades them outside too This is the meaning

II 11 10

Death gives another instance

*Vāyuḥ yathaiko bhuvanam praviṣṭo
rupam rupam pratirupo babhūva |
ekas tatha sarvabhutantarātmā
rūpam rūpam pratirūpo bahis ca || 10 ||*

Just as the one air having entered the world has become such whose form is present in every form even so, the one inner self of all beings has its presence in every form and outside

Commentary

The meaning is same as that of the previous mantra

II 11

He (Death) then teaches by means of an example that though there is no difference between the Supreme Self and the individual soul as soul still the defects (of the individual souls) do not touch Him

*Suryo yathā sarvalokasya cakṣur
na lipyate cakṣuṣair bahvadoṣair |
ekas tatha sarvabhūtantaratma
na lipyate lokaduhkhena bahyah || 11 ||*

Just as the sun is the eye of all the world but is not smeared by the eye defects which are outside, even so the one Inner Self of all beings is not smeared by the griefs of the world He being outside them

Commentary

Sūryo yatha Just as the Sun though within the eye as its divinity, according to the Scriptural passages 'This (Sun) with his rays is established in this (eye)' The Sun becoming the eye entered the eye ball is not touched by the impurities that have come out (of it) even so the Supreme Self though residing in all souls, is not touched by the defects that are in them since He is beyond everything other than Himself on account of His unconditioned unique Nature of being free from all sin etc

II 11 12

*eko vaṣi sarvabhūtāntarātma
 ekam byam¹ bahudhā yaḥ karoti |
 tam ātmastham ye nupasyanti dhīrās
 teṣam sukham śāśvatam netareṣāṃ || 12 ||*

That One controller the Inner Self of all beings,
 who makes one seed manifold Him residing in the soul,
 those intelligent ones who see, to them there is eternal
 bliss (felicity) to none others

Commentary

ekaḥ One who has neither an equal nor superior

vaṣi vaṣaḥ will He who has it is *Vaṣin* or else it means
 one who has the universe at His command as stated in the passage
 The world remains at His will Or else it means that He is
 at the command of His devotees as stated in the (*Ramayana*
Bālakāṇḍa) passage ' We the two servants, O best of Seers are
 here

ekam byam The (one) seed of the form of the ultimate
 Unmanifest (*tamas*) which is undistinguished being one with Him
 as stated in the passage ' The Darkness becomes one with the
 Divine (*Pr Up IV 1*)

bahudhā yaḥ karoti He who makes it into the forms of
 the manifold matter such as Mahat and other (categories)

tam Him

ātmastham the inner ruler as stated in the passage Who
 residing in the Self (*Sud Up*)

ye paśyanti Who see

To them there is liberation This is the meaning

Some editions the text have *rupam* instead of *byam*

II n 13

*nityo ¹nityanam cetanaś cetanānam
 cko bahūnām yo vidadhati kaman |
 tam ātmastham ye nupaśyanti dhīras
 teṣām śamtiḥ śāśvati netareṣām || 13 ||*

Eternal of the eternal conscient of the conscients,
 one of the many who accomplishes the desires, Him
 dwelling in the soul which intelligent ones see, to them
 there is everlasting peace to none others

Commentary

(The Supreme Self) being eternal conscient and one alone,
 grants with facility the desired objects to the many, eternal
 conscients

The rest is clear

II n 14

Spoken to thus (by Death), the disciple (Naciketas) asks

*tad etad iti manyante nirdeśyam paramam sukham |
 katham nu tad vijaniyām kim u bhāti vibhati vā || 14 ||*

(The knowers) think the supreme bliss as fit to be
 pointed out as 'this is that' How can I know that?
 Does it shine? Does it shine luminously too?

Commentary

paramam sukham tat That transcendent Brahman, the
 Supreme Self of the nature of Supreme Bliss

etad iti perceptible like myrobalan fruit on the palm of
 the hand

manyante those with accomplished Yoga, like you, think
 That is persons like you, are able to perceive

1 Here also most texts of other schools have it as *Nityo nityanam* the
 Eternal in the many transcendent (cf Anandasrama ed)

katham How can I who am incapable of perceiving know the Brahman void of colour etc

Does it shine having rays of light? even then does it shine indistinctly due to mixture of some other light (such as that of the Sun or of other luminaries)?

II 11 15

*na tatra Suro bhānti na Candīatarakam
nema vidyuto bhanti kuto yam agniḥ |
tam eva bhāntam anubhāti sarvam
tasya bhāsā sarvam idam vibhāti || 15 ||*

There the Sun shines not nor the moon and stars nor do these lightnings shine How (then) can the fire? Him shining only, all else shine after, with His light all these shine

Commentary

(Yama) replies that for the sake of having an object for the yogins there is a form of the Supreme Lord beneficent on His divine auspicious as known from the scriptural authorities such as Having the colour of the Sun He is beyond darkness To Him whose form is ever the same and the Supreme Self with that body shines distinctly with His luminosity transcending all

This mantra has been explained under the *Vedānta Sūtra* (I 11 41) Because of seeing light with the following commentary There is seen the light of Him that is measured with the size of thumb the light which eclipses all other lights and is the cause of all other lights and helps (them to shine) And this Commentary (*Bhāṣya*) has been elucidated by Vyāsaśrīya (author of the *Śrutaprakāśika*) (thus) The first half of the mantra is stated thus That hides (eclipses) the other lights The meaning of the first quarter of the second half (of the mantra) is stated (that) it is that which is the cause of the other lights *anubhāntam* shining after by this is indicated the cause effect relation (between Him and other lights) The idea is that the unfailing antecedent consequent relation is indeed the cause effect relation The meaning of the fourth quarter (of the mantra) is stated to be helps others

to shine. This (meaning) is supported by the passage 'Having whose light the Sun shines' (II ?)¹ In the same work (*Śruti prakāśika*) there is seen another interpretation which is as follows. The first half means that if and when His effulgent Light is perceived all other luminaries get eclipsed. The third quarter means that He is the efficient cause that when the luminaries come into existence He helps the material causal substances of those luminaries. The fourth quarter means that He helps the luminaries even after they have come into existence by giving them through His contact (indwellingness) the power to perform their functions. As the rays of the moon (*candra*) help the rays of the eye.

Others say that the third quarter means that the illusory world has no separate appearance (*bhānam*) from that of the Brahman which is (its) substrate. But this is not correct, because though the active suffix (*ṣatī*) meaning agent in the word (*bhantam*) can somehow be explained in spite of there being no difference (between action and agent) as in the statement 'The knowledge of the disciple shines, yet the word *anubhāti* (shines after) is wrong for when Yajñadatta stands having no action of going apart from the action of Devadatta we have not seen any one making the statement that Yajñadatta follows Devadatta who goes.

If it be said that we have seen the statement that the iron burns after the fire (there). No. The statement is not accepted as a correct one if it is intended to convey that idea by one who already knows that the iron has no separate agency of the action 'burning'.

If it be said that the meaning accepted by you that 'if and when His Light is perceived the luminaries get eclipsed' is not appropriate, since the liberated ones who have got the perception of His Light yet perceive other luminaries, and therefore in their cases there is no eclipsing which means the non perception due

1 The word others here refers to the Mayīvādins.

2 The Telugu and Tamil Grantha printed texts are very corrupt here. The Poonj ed. gives the following text which is followed here.

Na hi Devadattagamane kriyāvyatiriktagamanakriyāśūnye tiṣṭhātī Yajñadatte gacchantam.

to commingling of identical natures, (we reply) this question has reference only to bond souls (*baddhas*)

If it be said that it cannot be the case, since there is no perception (*sakṣātkara*) of Him by bond souls, (we reply) No Aṣṣuna and others had the vision of Him and they were bond souls Or else (it means) when the Brahman is considered other luminaries such as the Sun do not shine just as in comparison with Kālidasa lesser ones are bad poets or no poets at all The meaning of the first half (of the mantra) (thus) is That Brahman therefore has the Form of the Supreme Light The statement That hides the other lights also means the same

This same idea is re enforced by the second half (of the mantra) which shows that the coming into existence and the capacity to perform their functions by the other luminaries require the help of the Supreme Self Thus it can be seen that there is no inconsistency here

Or else the first half has the same meaning as is apparent (that is they do not shine literally speaking)

If it be asked when the very effulgent Sun and others are experienced through perception, how can it be stated contrary to perception that they do not shine? The reply is given in the second half (of the mantra) *Tam eva bhantam* This seen effulgent Form of the Sun is not his own but it is the Light given to Him by the Supreme Self, and belongs to that Supreme Self alone This is stated in the *Gita* (XV 12) by Bhagavan Himself That light which is in the Sun and reveals the whole world and that light that is in the Moon and fire, that light do thou know as Mine This has been explained by Śrī Rāmānuja in His *Gītā Bhaṣya*

Which light there is of the Sun and others revealing the whole world that Light is Mine, and given to them by Me pleased with the worship done (individually) by one and all of them (to me)

The idea therefore is that it is quite correct to say in respect of them (the luminaries) that they do not shine, their effulgent forms being like glow worms in the darkness

SIXTH VALLI

II iii 1

*ūrdhvamūlo vaksakha eṣo'dvatthahī sanātanaḥ
 tad eva śukram tad brahma tad evamṛtam ucyate |
 tasmīn lokahī śritāḥ sarve tadū natyett kaścana
 etad vai tat || 1 ||*

This eternal pippal tree has its roots above and branches downward. The same is effulgent, that is Brahman. That same is said to be immortal. On Him all the worlds depend. That indeed none oversteps. This indeed is that.

Commentary

The (first) part of the mantra has been commented upon by Śrī Rāmānuja when explaining the *Gīta* passage (XV 1). The *Bhāṣya* passage is as follows: 'The pippal tree called *Samsara* which the scriptures describe as having its roots above and branches below and eternal. The scriptural passages are 'This eternal pippal tree has its roots above and branches below (*K U II iii 1*) and 'He who knows exactly the tree with its roots above and branches below (*Tait Ār I II 5*). The state of being with its roots above is on account of beginning with the fourfaced Brahman who is above the seven worlds being the first Cause, and its having branches below is on account of ending with earth dwelling men, cattle, beasts, worms, insects, birds and trees. Now he shows that Brahman is different from that. This mantra has already been explained (*K U II ii 8*).

II iii 2

*yad idam kiñca jagat sarvām
 prana ejati nihsṛtam |
 mahad bhayam vajram uḍyatam
 ya etad vidur amṛtas te bhavanti || 2 ||*

All this world whatsoever existing in the breath and emanating from it trembles with extreme fear as if from the uplifted thunder bolt. Those know this become immortal.

Commentary

Yad idam udyatam This part of the mantra has been commented upon by Śrī Rāmānuja under the *Vedānta Sūtra Kampanat* (I iii 40). Introducing this mantra he has said: There is mention in the Śruti of trembling due to great fear of Him of the entire world that is of all creatures residing in the person of the size of the thumb who is here mentioned as Breath (*Prāṇa*) having emanated from Him. The meaning is that the entire world trembles with great fear as if there is the uplifted Vajra with the feeling as to what would happen if His command is disobeyed. *Mahad bhayam, vajram, udyatam* these Nominatives have the sense of Ablatives since the meaning is the same as *bhayād asyagnis tapati* (K U II iii 3).

This *Bhāṣya* is elucidated in the *Śrutapraśaṅka* thus: The word existing is supplied on account of the Locative case *prāṇe*, in order to reply to the question: Where from it (*jagat*) has emanated? The author of the *Bhāṣya* (Śrī Rāmānuja) mentions that He Himself because of the context, He Himself is the source.¹ *Ejanam* is explained as *kampana*, i.e. trembling for the root is *ejj kampane* to tremble. Trembling here means the performance of one's own actions for fear of evil effects. On account of fear caused by the Supreme Person as if by the uplifted Vajra-weapon, the whole world trembles. This is the meaning. Here in this mantra, it may be noted that the four words *Mahad, Bhayam, Vajram, Udyatam* in the Nominative case have the sense of Ablatives. The first two words in the Nominative case having Ablative sense indicate fear; the latter two words indicate the Brahman, called Breath, the cause of fear.

But some explain this mantra also as follows — *Bhayam* means etymologically that of which one is afraid. That is that which causes fear. Like the uplifted highly fearful Vajra the Supreme Self herein called Breath makes everything tremble. The verb *ejati* has here the causal sense.

Yas tad The meaning is clear, It may be noted according to the maxim enunciated in the adhikarana with the *Sūtra*. For

1 The lacuna in the quotations is Raṅgarāmanuja's

the same reason Breath—*ata eva prana* (I 1 24) the word *prana* refers to Supreme Brahman alone. On this point there is no controversy (between the several schools)

II iii 3

*bhavad asyagnis tapati bhayat tapati Suryah |
bhavad Indraś ca Vāyuś ca Mṛtyuḥ dhavati pañcamah || 3 ||*

For fear of Him fire burns for fear of Him the Sun heats for fear of Him Indra, Vayu and Death the fifth run

Commentary

dhavati the root *dhavu* to go when referring to Indra and other (gods) indicates their respective functions. The rest of the mantra is clear

II iii 4

*iha ced aśakad boddhum prak śarīrasya vīśasah |
tatah sargeṣu lokeṣu śarīratvaya kalpate || 4 ||*

If one before the body gets loosened here is not able to know (Him) then he becomes liable to take body in the created worlds

Commentary

śarīrasya vīśasah prak before the falling apart of the body *vīśasah vīśramsant iha loke* in this world

boddhum to know Brahman

aśakat cet aśaknuvams cet if unable the change of conjugation is a case of Vedic exception

tatah for that reason

sargeṣu lokeṣu in the created worlds

śarīratvāya kalpate become subject to dissolution of the form of birth, old age, and death etc this is the meaning

The idea there is that one should attempt to know the Self before the fall of one's body (i.e. one's death)

II III 5

That the Self is difficult to know (Death) says

yatha darṣe tathātmam
yatha svapne tathā pitṛloke |
yathapsu pariva dadṛṣe tatha gandharvaloke
chayatapaḥ or iva brahmaloke || 5 ||

As on the newmoon day so in the body (*ātman*)
 as in the dream so in the world of the fathers as in the
 waters as if appearing on all sides so in the world of the
 Gandharvas as between the shade and sunshine so in the
 world of Brahman

Commentary

yathā darṣe the meaning is just as on the new moon day
 there being no moon shine the appearance (*pratibhāsa*) (of things)
 is not clear, so in this world with regard to the Self Or else
 the meaning is *yathādarṣe* just as the thing seen in the mirror
 is not seen as (it is) when seen directly, free from any modifications
 such as facing in the opposite direction, so is the cognition of
 the Self here (in this world)

Now he (Death) says that the same is the case in the other
 world *yathā svapne* just as the experiences in dream are unlike
 the experiences in the waking state, incapable of being reviewed
 so as to be free from all doubt in respect of them even so, is it
 (the experience of the Self) in the world of the fathers This is
 the meaning

yathāpsu just as the thing under water is not clearly
 perceptible as the things (outside water) even so

paridadṛśaiva looks as if perceived The meaning is that it
 is not seen all round That is even in the world of Gandharvas
 the appearance is superficial

chāyatapa Just as in the admixture of shade and sun shine the appearance is not such as would be in the unmixed sunshine so also in the world of Brahman (the fourfaced), the appearance is not perfect. The idea is that therefore the truth of That (Supreme) Self is difficult to know. Or else the idea is that though in the world of Brahman there is perfect discrimination between the self and the non self, just as between shade and sunshine still the Truth of the Supreme Self is not attainable for those that live here.

II iii 6

*indriyānam prthagbhavam udayastamayau ca yat |
prthagutpadyamanānam matva dhūo na śocati || 6 ||*

The intelligent man knowing that distinctness, origination dissolution are of the sense organs which are separate and come into existence does not grieve.

Commentary

indriyānām of the sense organs which are separate and come into existence. The sense organs stand for the body and others also.

udayāstamayau ca yat *yat* is an indeclinable meaning *yān* which origination and destruction are there, and which distinctness of the form of mutual difference, all these the intelligent person knowing these as belonging to the sense organs does not grieve. This means that one who knowing that mutual difference origination and dissolution do not happen to the soul which is of the form of consciousness (does not grieve).

Now Death describes with the following two mantras the very surrender of the soul already mentioned, since even with regard to knowing the truth of the individual soul as distinct from its body the only means is the surrender to the Divine Lord ¹

1 cf Prof. Maithra's denial of *prapatti* Vedanta Kesari 1943

II iii 7 and 8

*indriyebhyaḥ param mano manasaḥ sattvam uttamam |
 satvadadhi mahan atma mahato vyaktam uttamam || 7 ||
 avyaktat tu paraḥ puruṣo vāpako linga eva ca |
 yaṁ jñatva mucyate jantun amṛtatvañ ca gacchatī || 8 ||*

Superior to the sense organs is the mind superior to the mind is the intelligence superior to the intelligence even is the great soul superior to that great is the unmanifest

Superior to the unmanifest is the person the pervader and verily unferrable which knowing the creature gets liberated and attains immortality

Commentary

indriyebhyaḥ stands here for objects also since this has to be in accordance with a previous mantra (K U I iii 10) Verily the objects are greater than the sense organs and greater than the objects is the mind The word *sattva* (in the text) means intellect since it was stated before that greater than the mind is intellect (ibid)

alingaḥ Unknowable Superiority is intended in respect of making Him to condescend (to listen to our prayers) To make Him condescend means to surrender (to Him) alone

The rest is clear

II iii 9

*na samdr̥ṣe tiṣṭhatī rūpam asya
 na cakṣuṣa paśyati kaścanamam |
 hīdā manīṣa manasābhiklpto
 ya etad vidur amṛtās te bhavanti || 9 ||*

His form is not for perception, no one else sees him with his eyes He is attained by mind through devotion steadfastness Those who know Him they become immortal

Commentary:

asya rūpam: His form. or else it means His body. The meaning is that being omnipervading He does not stand as an object of perception. Or else there is (for Him) no perceptible colour such as blue etc. For this very reason (it is next said)

na cakṣuṣā paśyati: with the eye no one sees Him. The meaning is clear.

hṛdā manīṣā. . . .: This part (of the mantra) has been explained by Vyāsārya under the *Sarvatra prasiddhi adhikaraṇa* (of the *Śrī Bhāṣya*) (I. ii. 1.) as follows: By the word *hṛdā* is signified devotion; by *Manīṣā:* steadfastness. In the Mahābhārata (?) taking the first half as it is here, the following is read as the second half:

*bhaktyā ca dhṛtyā ca samāhitātmā
jñānasvarūpam paripaśyatiha.*

“Through devotion and steadfastness one with one’s mind concentrated, here perceives that of the form of knowledge.”

abhikṛptaḥ: graspable, attainable. The following is in the *Vedārthasaṅgraha* “The meaning (of the above quoted *Bhāṣya* passage) is that, one with one’s mind concentrated through steadfastness sees the Supreme Person with devotion.” ‘Sees’ means attains, since it has to be in accord with the *Gītā* passage “Through one pointed devotion is capable. . . .” (XI. 54).

ya enam viduh: the meaning is clear.

II. iii. 10.

*yadā pañcāvatiṣṭhante jñānāni manasā saha |
buddhiḥ ca na viceṣṭati tām āluḥ paramāṁ gatim || 10 ||*

When the five sense organs with mind are static and the intellect does not move, that (state) they say is the Supreme movement.

Commentary:

jñānāni: organs, according to derivation from *jñā* to know, with the suffix *lyut (ana):* meaning instrument. This has been

so explained by Vyāsāya (*Śrutaprakāśika*) in the *Sapta gaty adhikarana* (II 1v) The mind itself with the function of determination is indicated by the word *buddhi* So is it in the *Śrī Bhāṣya* The mind itself is mentioned by the words *buddhi ahankāra* and *citta* due to its different functions such as determination, egoity and reflection It is clear there itself that the 'paramagatim' mentioned here means movement towards liberation abandoning movements within the body

II iii 11

*tām yogam iti manyante sthūrām indriyadharanam |
apramattas tadā bhavati yogo hi prabhavā pyayau || 11 ||*

The state of steady concentration of the sense organs they deem as Yoga Then one should be vigilant since Yoga is the means to life ends (namely) attainment, and removal (of evil)

Commentary

tām That (state) mentioned in the previous mantra

indriyadharanām the supreme movement of the nature of concentration of outer and inner organs

yogam iti manyante (They) deem as Yoga Vyāsāya says that the meaning of *paramagati* is Yoga

apramattas tadā bhavati Then that is when the organs are motionless, there happens the state of vigilance of the mind

Of what use is this vigilance of the mind? (To this enquiry) he (Death) replies *Yogo hi prabhavaprayau* Yoga is indeed origination and cessation The idea is that since Yoga is in constant peril vigilance is necessary

Or else the idea is that one should be vigilant in respect of Yoga since it is the means of all life ends of the form of attainment of desired things and removal of all undesirable things

II iii 12

*naiva vaca na manasā praptum śakyo na cakṣuṣa |
astiti bruvato nyatra katham tad upalabhyate || 12 ||*

That is capable of attainment neither by speech nor by mind nor by the eye How can that be realized except from one who teaches that it is?

Commentary

naiva vaca the meaning is clear The following discussion is found in the *Pranapada* of the *Vedānta Sūtras* (II iv 8) *Sapta gateḥ viśeṣatvac ca* the organs are only seven since only seven are mentioned in the scriptures as going to the other world There are seven worlds in which the seven organs lying in the cave (placed in their respective places) move (*Mund U* II 1 8) and since only seven organs are enumerated when referring to the Yoga state in the Mantra (*K U* II iii 10) When the five sense organs with mind are static and the intellect Against this *prima facie* view the *siddhanta* is as follows But while living there are hands and others therefore not so (*V S* II iv 6) when there is the body, since hands and others are also useful in respect of taking up (things) and other activities hands and others also are organs Therefore it is not so Because of the śruti and smṛti texts There are ten organs in a person and the *ātman* is the eleventh' (*Bṛh U* III ix 4) where the word *ātman* means the mind The organs are ten and one the eleventh here is the mind (*Gītā* XIII 5) Statements of lesser number have reference to particular uses and statements of larger number are due to differences in mental functions This state (stated in the first half of the mantra) is explained

astiti except from the statement that It is this is the meaning The idea is that it is attainable only from the Upaniṣad

II iii 13

*astity evopalabhavyas tattvabhavena cobhayoh |
astityevopalabdhasya tattvabhavaḥ prasidati || 13 ||*

It is known through the statement that 'it is' as well as through the mind when one has known through these two that 'it is' the mind becomes clear (lucid calm)

Commentary

tattvabhāvena the etymology is *tattve bhavayati* helps knowing the truth *tattvabhavah* inner organ By this also the Supreme Self is to be known as It is What is meant is, after knowing Him as 'It is' by the Vedānta passages It is to be contemplated and meditated upon as It is with the mind also

ubhayaḥ of the two means that is, by the two means of knowing the statement above and by the mind

astiti eva upalabdhaḥ Of one who has known that It is the use of the past participle in the word *upalabdha* is similar to that in *bhukta* in the statement *bhuktā brāhmanah* brahmanas have eaten (that is its meaning is active and not passive)

tattvabhāvah prasīdati the mind becomes clear that is free from old faults

II III 14

*yada sarve pramucyante kāma ye sya hi dī śrītaḥ |
atha martyo mṛto bhavaty atra brahma samaśnute || 14 ||*

When all the desires that are in the heart of this (soul) are removed then the mortal becomes immortal and enjoys Brahman here alone

Commentary

kamaḥ desires for bad objects that are in the heart

yadā pramucyante when they get removed then

atha immediately,

martyaḥ this meditator (*upāsakaḥ*)

o *bhavati* attains immortality The meaning is that comes one whose past and future sins get removed and such him respectively

brahma samaśnute this means here itself, at the time when he enjoys Brahman

Following is the *Śrī Bhaṣya* under the *Sūtra* ' And the (the departure) upto the beginning of the movement, and immortality (is that which happens) before the burning up of the body (IV 11 7) The meaning is *anupoṣya* means not the contact with the body of sense organs and others Immortality is of the form or freedom from and destruction of future and past sins, that same is mentioned in the scriptural beginning with *Yada sarve pramucyante* (K U 14)

In respect of the (statement) *atra brahma samaśnute* here he enjoys the Brahman, the idea is that this has reference to experience of Brahman which happens at the time of meditation

Repeating that which was already said for the purpose of emphasis He (Death) concludes that what is to be taught is only this much —

II 11 15

*yadā sarve prabhidhyante hṛdayasyeha granthayah |
tatha martyo mṛto bhavaty etāvad anusasanam || 15 ||*

When all the knots of the heart are here broken, then man becomes immortal This much is the teaching

Commentary

granthayah likes and dislikes and others which are not easily untieable like knots

yada prabhidhyante that is when they are removed

etāvad anusāsanam that which is to be taught so as to be practised by the meditator is this much alone What is to be

stated namely which is the going out (of the body) through the *nāḍī* in the crown of head and passing through (the path of the) *arūḍis* and others is not of the meditator but of the word of God pleased with his meditation. This is the idea.

Now Death speaks of the final Liberation which is the second already referred to in (K U II 11) *Vimuktas ca* .

II III 16

*śatam caika ca hṛdayasya nāḍyas
tāsām mūrdhānam abhinīṣṭaika |
tasyorudhvam āyann amṛtatvam eti
viṣvann yā utkramane bhavanti || 16 ||*

Hundred and one are the *nāḍīs* of the heart. Of these one is stretched to the crown (of the head) through that one (*nāḍī*) one going upward gets immortality. The others (*nāḍīs*) are such as help going towards all sides.

Commentary

śatam ca there are hundred and one important *nāḍīs* of the heart among them the one Brahmanāḍī called *Suṣumnā* goes up towards the crown of the head. Through that *nāḍī*

urdhvam gacchan going to the world of Brahman

amṛtatvam eti means attains liberation of the form of the manifestation of his own nature following the attainment of Brahman together with the particular place

anyaḥ the other *nāḍīs*

viṣvan utkramane bhavanti are useful for going out towards the path of the diversified *samsara*. But Vyāsārya (in the *Śrūta-prakāśikā*) interprets this as follows. 'Other *nāḍīs* are scattered all round (the body). These are useful for those who seek not liberation to get out (of the body) (at the time of death) (IV 11 7). This passage is considered by Bhagavān Bādarāyana in the *Utkrāntipāda* (IV 11) To explain (the *prima facie* view

is this) ‘ The restriction that the going out happens to the knower through the head *nāḍi* other than the hundred and to a non knower through the others is not proper, since the *nāḍis* are very many and are too subtle to be distinctly seen, and so one cannot select. It is quite proper to hold that the statement *tayor dhvam āyannamītatvam eti viṣvann ya utkramane bhavanti*—through that one (*nāḍi*) one going upward gets immortality. The other (*nāḍis*) are such as help going towards all sides. (K U II iii 16cd) merely refers to the chance going out. Against the *prima facie* view the reply is given in the following Sūtra (IV ii 16). The place of the individual soul that is the heart becomes illuminated just in front of it, having the passage revealed by it, favoured by the Grace of the *Hāṁda* (the Supreme Dweller in the Heart) on account of the capacity of the Knowledge (on the part of the soul), and of the continuation of remembrance of the path which is a subsidiary of it through the one other than the Hundred. And the meaning of this (sūtra) is as follows

tadokaḥ the place of the individual soul that is, the heart

agṛa jvalanam in front of which there is illumination

tatprakāśitadvarah one becomes such that to whom the passage (of exit) is revealed by it since there is the scriptural passage “The top of the heart is illuminated by that illumination the soul goes out either through the eye or the crown of the head or other parts of the body (Bṛh U IV iv 3)

This much is common to both the knower and the non knower. But the knower gets up only through the head *nāḍi*, different from the hundred (other *nāḍis*). It is not that that *nāḍi* is not distinguishable by the knower, since the knower is favoured by the Supreme Person resident in his heart, being pleased with his knowledge (*upasana*) which is extremely blissful to him and which is an adoration of the Supreme Self, and on account of the continuous recollection of the Path highly pleasant to him, as the subsidiary to the Knowledge. Therefore he knows that *nāḍi* and so his going out through it is quite appropriate

Now to proceed —

II III 17

*angusṭhamātrah puruṣo nataratma
 sada janānām hṛdaye sanniviṣṭah }
 tam svāc charitāt pravṛthen
 muñjād iṣikām dhairyena |
 tam vidyācchukram amṛtam
 tam vidyācchukram amṛtam iti || 17 ||*

The person of the size of the thumb, the inner Self is always established in the heart of men Him, one should pull out with courage from one's own body as the stalk from the munja grass Him one should know as the brilliant immortal Him one should know as the brilliant immortal

Commentary

angusṭhamātrah the meaning is clear

tam svāc charitāt just as in the statement Devadatta is distinct from his own body the pronominal word *sva* (his own) refers to a thing belonging to Devadatta indicated by the co mentioned word (Devadatta) Even like that the word *svāc* (in the present mantra *tam svāc charitāt*) refers to that which belongs to the inner Self mentioned previously Consequently the meaning is as follows Him, the inner Self of all men, one should pull out (that is, know distinctly) from the individual soul mentioned here as men, as that which is His body That is after the manner mentioned in the scriptural text When one sees the Lord as different from oneself, and pleased (*Sv Up IV 7*) one should know (Him) as distinct on account of His being the supporter, controller and master (*seṣṭ*)

muñjat from the muñja grass

iṣikām iva like the stalk in its midst

dhairyena (with courage) with skill in knowledge This (word) goes with what preceded (*i e*, *pravṛthen* should pull out)

tam vidyāt (This has been) already explained Repetition indicates the conclusion of the teaching

II. iii. 18.

Now concludes the subject-matter of the Story (of Naciketas):

*Mṛtyuproktāṁ Naciketo'tha labdhvā
vidyām etāṁ yogavidhiṁ ca kṛtsnam |
brahmaprāpto virajo'bhūd vimṛtyur
anyo'pyevam yo vid adhyātmam eva || 18 ||*

Then Naciketas having attained this knowledge taught by Death together with the method of Yoga completely attained brahman became free from *rajas* (desire) and from death. Any other who knows (this) esoteric doctrine will become also such an one.

Commentary:

mṛtyu...: Naciketas having attained the knowledge of the Self taught by Death and also the method of Yoga mentioned in the passage “*yadā pañca...*” (K. U. II. iii. 10) after the manner mentioned in the scriptural passage, “Attaining the transcendent Light one becomes manifest by His own nature” (Ch. Up. VIII. 3.4), attaining Brahman became one in whom His eight qualities got manifested.

yo vid...: The knowledge relating to the Self whoever else knows, he also becomes like Naciketas. This is the meaning.

*Om sa ha nāvavatu sa ha nau bhunaktu.
saha vīryaṁ karavāvahai.
tejasvi nāv adhītam astu mā vidviṣāvahai.
Om śāntiḥ śāntiḥ śāntiḥ.*

May He protect us. May He protect us together. Let us bring about the power together. Let our learning be luminous. Let us not hate (one another). Om Śāntiḥ, Śāntiḥ, Śāntiḥ.

Commentary:

Now the *śanti* (peace chaut) is recited in order to abolish on the part of the taught and the teacher.

sa ha nau avatu sa ha The Supreme Self revealed by Knowledge *ha* indicates (His) well knownness

nau Us, the disciple and the teacher

avatu May protect revealing His form

saha nau bhunaktu May (He) protect us together through increasing knowledge Or else May He protect us so that we may be together without parting

saha viryam karavavahai May we bring about the power of knowledge by imparting it in accordance with rules The idea is knowledge becomes ineffective when the rules are not observed

tejasvi nau This means may what we have now learnt be very luminous (effective)

ma vidvishavahai May there be no hatred which means let there be no hatred between us due to learning and teaching in any unsanctioned way as stated in the *Smṛti* text 'One who teaches not in accordance with rules (*dharma*) and one who questions in contravention of rules, one of them dies or develops animosity

Śāntiḥ The triple repetition is for the purpose of doing away with all sins of commission and omission in thought, word and deed

*Thus concludes the Sixth Valli
in the Second Chapter of the
Kāthopaniṣad*

COMMENTATOR'S CONCLUSION.

That this Upaniṣad has reference only to God is determined by Bhagavān Bādarāyaṇa in three Adhikaraṇas of the *Samanvayādhyāya*.

ADHIKARAṆA I.

In the passage “*yasya brahma ca kṣatram ca..*”(K. U. I. ii. 25) “To whom the Brāhmaṇa and Kṣatriya both become food; to whom Death is curry spice; this who knows how He is?” the person indicated by the pronoun in the possessive ‘*yasya*’ is an eater or enjoyer, since Brāhmaṇa and Kṣatriya are spoken of on account of their being spoken of metaphorically as ‘rice,’ are to be taken as eatables or enjoyables. Now who is that eater (*bhoktā*)? The *prima facie* view is that He is the individual soul alone, since the Supreme Self cannot be the eater. Against this the Siddhānta view is expressed in the four *Sūtras*: (I) *Attā carā-caragrahaṇāt*: (II) *Prakaraṇāc ca*: (III) *Guhām praviṣṭāvātmānau hi taddarśaṇāt*: (IV) *Viśeṣaṇāc ca*: (*Vedānta Sūtras*: I. ii. 9, 10, 11, 12.)

The meanings of these are as follows.

I. The eater indicated in respect of rice mentioned in the passage “the two are rice” is the Supreme Self alone since in the mantra (K. U. I. ii. 25) it is said that He is the killer (destroyer) of all the mobile and immobile which are indicated by the words Brahma and Kṣatra which through secondary significance signify all the mobile and the immobile, and now that the word ‘*odana*,’ rice secondarily signifies the destroyable, has been shown when commenting upon this mantra, and may be seen there itself.

II. And also because (this mantra) is in the context of Brahman which begins with ‘The Great Omnipresent Soul..’ (K. U. I. ii. 29).

III. If it be said that since in the succeeding mantra “Drink-
ing ṛta. (I. iii. I) only the two that are capable of enjoying fruits of actions are mentioned and the Supreme Self cannot have any-

thing to do with that (enjoyment of the fruit of actions) either as Agent like the individual soul nor as instrument like the *antaḥ karana* (inner organ) the eater is not in the context dealing with the Supreme Self the reply is *guham praviṣṭau* (I II 12) the two that have entered the cave are only the two the individual soul and the Supreme Self because the two alone are mentioned as having entered the cave In the passage The brave (soul) knowing through the realisation attained by meditation upon this self that God difficult of perception hidden entering residing in the Cave, indwelling beginningless abandons both pleasure and sorrow, entering of the Supreme Self into the Cave is mentioned And also the entering into the heart cave by the individual soul is mentioned in the passage *Ya pranena sambhavati* That Aditi (eater) which remains with breath possessing many sense organs remaining in the cave after entering into it is born with elements (*K U II 17*) Since thus both of them are seen to have entered into the Cave and these two can be referred to as the two drinking ita (I III) according to the maxim of *Chatra* (one who has the umbrella)¹ no break in the context pertaining to the Supreme Self can be doubted on account of the mantra *ṛtam pibantau* (I III 1)

IV (*Viśeṣanac ca*) Since in the context in the passage '*Brahmajajñam* Knowing the soul born of Brahman and conscient as the worthy Lord one attains through peace of ever (*K U I 1 17cd*) the individual soul and the Supreme Self are specified as the meditator and the meditable the purpose of the mantra *ṛtam pibantau* (I III 1) is only to describe them in order to facilitate meditation as those resting in one and the same place So the mantra is that which only deals with individual soul and the Supreme Self It is concluded therefore that the Mantra *Brahma ca kṣatram ca* (*K U II 25*) has reference only to the Supreme Self

1 In the statement *chatrino gacchanti* made in respect of a group of persons going together a few of whom are carrying umbrellas the word *chatrinah* refers to the entire group including those that have not got them cf *Purvaṃnamasa Sūtras* I 14

ADHIKARAṆA II.

(Vedānta Sūtras I. iii. 6.)

Again in the mantra "*Aṅguṣṭhamātra*....the person of the size of the thumb, the Lord of the past and the future, resides in the middle of the body" (K. U. II. i. 12), the *prima facie* view is that he who is mentioned as of being the size of the thumb is the individual soul alone, since the measure of the thumb is well-known only in respect of the individual soul in the following *śruti* and *smṛti* passages:

"The master of breath (*prāṇa*) wanders about with his actions" (*Śvet. U. V. 7*): "One of the size of the thumb and having a form like that of the Sun" (*Śvet. U. V. 8*); and "Death pulled out with force the person of the size of the thumb" (*Mh. B. Vanaparva*). This is replied to by the Siddhānta given in the four following Sūtras.

- | | |
|---|-------------------|
| I. <i>Śabdād eva pramitaḥ</i> | V. S. I. iii. 24; |
| II. <i>Hṛdyapekṣayā tu manuṣayādkikāratvāt:</i> | „ I. iii. 25; |
| III. <i>Kampanāt:</i> | „ I. iii. 39; |
| IV. <i>Jyotirdarśanāt:</i> | „ I. iii. 40; |

The meaning of these is as follows:

I. One that is measured by the size of the thumb is the Supreme Self on account of the term itself, that is the term *Isāna*, which indicates lordship in the passage "*Isāno bhūtabhavyasya*—Lord of the Past and the Future." (K. U. II. i. 13).

II. If it be asked how then the delimitation to the size of the thumb can go with the Supreme Self (*Bādarāyaṇa*) replies that since the Supreme Self is in the heart which is of this size, on that account, the Supreme Self can be of that size. It cannot be doubted that the Supreme Self residing in the hearts of the horse and the ass and other (animals) which have no thumbs, and consequently that the Supreme Self cannot be measured by their thumbs, how the Supreme Self within them can have that size for, the scripture that enjoin meditation are only in respect of the human being because of their fitness for meditating; and the have thun

1729V
142

KATHOPANISAD

There is thus nothing to prevent postulation of this size on account of the delimitation of the Supreme Self residing in the heart due to its size which is of the size of the thumb

III *Kampanāt* (I iii 39) Since the scripture *Yad idam kīlca jagat sarvaṃ pīṇa ejati* All this world whatever existing in the breath and emanating from it trembles, extreme fear as if from the uplifted Vajra (K U II iii 2) mentions this one having the size of the thumb as being the cause of the fear which makes all creatures to tremble and this quality is known from scripture Afraid of Him the wind blows (*Tait Upaniṣad*) and others, as belonging to the Supreme Self the person of the size of the thumb is the Supreme Self

IV *Jyotirdaśanat* (I iii 43) Since in respect of him of the size of the thumb there is mentioned in the passage *Na tatra Sūryo bhāti* There the Sun shines not nor the Moon and stars nor do these lightnings shine how (then) can the fire? a light eclipsing all luminaries and the possession of such a light has been stated by the *Atharvāna Upaniṣad* as belonging to Brahman this one of the size of the thumb is the Supreme Self This is the meaning

THE ACADEMY OF SANSKRIT RESEARCH
ADHIKARANA
(KARNATA)

Since in the passages *Indriyebhyaḥ* Superior to the senses (I iii 10) the Sāṅkhyan method (of enumeration of categories) is recollected and since a Person other than the twenty five is negatived here (in this mantra I iii 10) by the word *Avyakta* is indicated only the primeval Matter accepted by the Sāṅkhyas which has not got the Brahman as its soul This *prima facie* view is expressed by the first part of the sūtra (V S I iv 1)

§ *anumanikam apyakeṣam iti cet*—If it be said that in some (recensions) also the primeval Matter is (also stated as the original cause) —and the reply is given by the later part of the same Sūtra ‘*Śarīra*’ and the following seven Sūtras They mean as follows

person
chariot
cf. Pu

I Since the word ‘*avyakta*’ can indicate the body which metaphorically spoken of as the chariot in the passage *śarīram*