

h that the highest Self or Brahman is the first Cause, so the Sat in *Chā. VI. ii. 1* also refers to this highest as the first Cause.

श्रुतत्वाच्च ॥ १२ ॥

12. And because it is directly stated in the Scriptures. In the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* itself later on it is stated, 'From the Self sprang forth the Prāṇa, from the Self sprang the ether... All this springs from the Self' (VII. xxvi. where it is clearly stated that the Self is the cause of everything, thereby showing that the Sat referred to in *Chāndogya VI. ii. 1* is this highest Self or Brahman, and not the *adhāna*.

Topic 6 : Concerning 'The Self Consisting of Bliss'

आनन्दमयः, अभ्यासात् ॥ १३ ॥

13. The self consisting of bliss (is Brahman and not the individual soul) on account of the repetition (of bliss). In the last topic it has been shown that Brahman which is to be inquired into is different from the inert *Pradhāna* consisting of the three *Guṇas*, which is the object of enjoyment for the individual soul (*Jīva*). In the present topic it is shown that this Brahman is also different from the individual soul (*Jīva*), whether in its bound or its freed state, and is full of bliss.

In the beginning of the *Ānanda Vallī* of the *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* we find, 'From that Self sprang ether' etc. (II. 1), and later the text says, 'Different from this self which

consists of understanding (*Vijñānamaya*) is the inner Self that consists of bliss' (II. 5). A doubt arises as to whether 'the Self consisting of bliss' refers to the individual soul (*Jīva*) or the supreme Self (Brahman).

Objection : 'The Self consisting of bliss' is the individual soul because the text later says, 'The self embodied in that one i.e. the self consisting of understanding, is this Self consisting of bliss' etc. (II. 6), which declares its relation to a body, and this can indicate the individual soul and not Brahman, and as the individual soul is an intelligent being, creation preceded by thought is possible for it. So 'the Self consisting of bliss' is the individual soul (*Jīva*).

Answer : 'The Self consisting of bliss' here, refers to Brahman on account of the repetition of the word 'bliss'. The text begins with, 'Now this is an examination of bliss', and finally says, 'From where speech (the senses) together with the mind turns away unable to reach It. Knowing the bliss of that Brahman he fears nothing' (*Tai. II. 8*), and this indicates supreme Bliss, which cannot be surpassed by any other bliss like the earlier ones described in the section. Such infinite bliss can be true only of the supreme Self, which is opposed to all evil and is of an unmixed blissful nature and not of the individual self, which enjoys a particle of that bliss mixed with endless pain and grief. Therefore, 'the Self consisting of bliss' is the supreme Self.

विकारशब्दान्नेति चेन्न, प्राचुर्यात् ॥ १४ ॥

14. If it be said (Brahman is not referred to in the passage) on account of (the suffix 'mayat') denoting modification, (we reply) not so, because it (the suffix 'mayat') denotes abundance (of bliss).

Objection : The suffix 'mayat' is indicative of a modification, and so Ānandamaya cannot refer to Brahman, which is not an effect. Earlier in the section this suffix 'mayat' has been used to indicate an effect, as in 'the self consisting of food', 'the self consisting of Prāṇa' etc. and so here, in the expression 'the Self consisting of bliss', it also denotes a modification and so refers to the individual soul and not Brahman ; for the soul, which is of the nature of bliss, can, in the condition of bondage in Saṁsāra, be said to be a modification of bliss.

Answer : Though the suffix 'mayat' has been used earlier to indicate modification yet in the expression 'the Self consisting of bliss' it cannot refer to the individual soul, for even with regard to that all changes are denied in many texts like, 'It is neither born nor does it die' etc. (Ka. I. ii. 18). So the 'mayat' indicates abundance of bliss, in which sense also this suffix is often used. This abundance of bliss is possible in Brahman alone and not in the individual soul. Therefore 'the Self consisting of bliss' is Brahman and not the individual soul.

Again it is also not possible for the individual soul to become a modification in the sense a lump of clay becomes a pot, for it is against all scriptural teaching and logic. In the state of Saṁsāra its knowledge and bliss are only in contracted condition due to Karma.

तद्वेतुव्यपदेशाच्च ॥ १५ ॥

15. And because It is declared to be the cause of the bliss of the individual soul (even).

The supreme Self is said to be the cause of the bliss of others in the text, 'Who could move, who could live, if that

bliss did not exist in ether (Brahman)? For It alone causes bliss' (Tai. II. 7). That which causes bliss to others cannot but have bliss in abundance, and so 'the Self consisting of bliss' can refer only to Brahman and not to the individual soul. Further, that which imparts bliss to others, the individual souls, is different from them, and so can only be the supreme Self. That 'the Self consisting of bliss' is referred to by 'bliss' in the passage, will be stated in Sūtra 20.

मान्त्रवर्णिकमेव च गीयते ॥ १६ ॥

16. Moreover, that very (Brahman) which has been referred to in the Mantra portion is sung (in this passage as 'the Self consisting of bliss').

The second chapter of the *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* begins, 'He who knows Brahman attains the Highest... Brahman is Truth, Knowledge, and Infinity'. This very Brahman is finally declared in *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* (II. 5) as 'the Self consisting of bliss'. This Brahman, however, is different from the individual soul, inasmuch as It is declared to be the object to be attained by the soul—'The knower of Brahman attains the Highest'—and is therefore necessarily different from it. The same is made clear in all the subsequent passages, 'From that Self sprang ether' etc. Therefore 'the Self consisting of bliss' is different from the individual soul and refers to Brahman.

नेतरः, अनुपपत्तेः ॥ १७ ॥

17. (Brahman and) not the other (the individual soul), (is meant here) on account of the impossibility (of that assumption).

Objection : No doubt That which is to be attained is different from the Jīva that attains It, yet it must be said that the Brahman declared here is not altogether different from the soul (Jīva), for It is the essential nature of the worshipper (the soul), which is non-differentiated intelligence devoid of all attributes, and free from all ignorance. This non differentiated nature of the soul is declared by the text, 'Truth, Knowledge, Infinity is Brahman', and the text 'From where speech (the organs), together with the mind returns, unable to reach It' (II. 9) also refers to this soul as devoid of attributes in its essential nature. It is this to which the Mantra refers, therefore 'the Self consisting of bliss' is identical with this essential nature of the individual soul.

Answer : What is referred to in the Mantra cannot be the individual soul either in its bound or its freed state, for this is impossible, inasmuch as the soul cannot possess unconditioned omniscience as is mentioned in texts like, 'It thought, "may I grow forth"' etc. Unconditioned omniscience means the power to realize all one's purposes. Though a realized soul may be omniscient, yet it cannot be unconditioned omniscience, for in the state of Saṁsāra it is limited in power. *Sūtra* IV. iv. 17 denies the power of creation to the freed souls. Again, if the soul in its freed state be pure, non-differentiated intelligence, it cannot see different things, and so cannot possess unconditioned omniscience. Hence the impossibility referred to in the *Sūtra*. It has already been proved that there can be no non-differentiated or attributeless thing. If the text, 'From where speech (the organs) together with the mind turns away, unable to reach It' (*Tai.* II. 8), means that mind and speech (the organs) return from Brahman, it cannot thereby prove that Brahman is non-differ-

entiated or attributeless. Rather it would mean that speech and mind are no means to prove Brahman, and that would make It a mere nothing. But in the Scriptures beginning with, 'He who knows Brahman attains the Highest', it is mentioned that Brahman is omniscient, the creator of the world, the abode of bliss and knowledge, infinite bliss, etc. and so after having said all this, it is idle to say that there are no means of knowing Brahman because speech and mind are no means to it. In the text, 'From where speech together with the mind turns away' etc. the words 'From where' refer to the bliss of Brahman referred to in the text, 'He who knows the bliss of Brahman' (*Tai.* II. 9). Again the words 'Bliss of Brahman' show clearly that the bliss belongs to Brahman. After having thus qualified Brahman as possessing bliss etc. if it is sought to prove that Brahman is attributeless, being beyond speech and mind, it would be meaningless prattle. So we have to understand that the bliss of Brahman being infinite and measureless, it cannot be fathomed by speech and mind. That is what the text 'From where' etc. tries to teach. A person who knows this infinite measureless bliss of Brahman becomes fearless. Moreover, that the omniscient Being declared in this Mantra is different from the individual soul is made clear by texts declaring that It created the world through Its mere volition, that it is the inner Self of everything, and so on.

भेदव्यपदेशाच्च ॥ १८ ॥

18. And on account of the declaration of difference (between 'the Self consisting of bliss' and the individual soul), (the latter cannot be the one referred to in the passage).

Beginning with the words, 'From that Self sprang ether' etc. (*Tai.* II. 1), which give the nature of Brahman referred to in the Mantra, the text declares Its nature as different from that of the Jīva in 'Different from this self consisting of understanding (the soul) is the inner Self consisting of bliss'. Therefore 'the Self consisting of bliss' is not the soul but Brahman, which is different from it.

कामाच्च नानुमानापेक्षा ॥ १९ ॥

19. And on account of (Its) desire (being the sole cause of creation), there is no need of that which is inferred (i.e. the Pradhāna).

The text, 'It desired, "may I be many, may I be born"', 'It sent forth all this—whatever there is', (*Tai.* II. 6) shows that everything was carried by this 'Self consisting of bliss' without the aid of non-sentient matter or Pradhāna (which is inferred). But the individual soul, which is subject to Nescience, cannot create anything without the aid of a material thing. Hence 'the Self consisting of bliss' is other than the individual soul.

अस्मिन्नस्य च तद्योगं शास्ति ॥ २० ॥

20. And the Scriptures declare the union of this (the individual soul) with that (bliss) in that (Self consisting of bliss).

'It (the Self consisting of bliss) is indeed the essence (of existence); only by attaining this essence does the soul become blissful' (*Tai.* II. 7), where it is clearly stated that the individual soul becomes blissful after attaining 'the Self consisting of bliss'. Therefore this 'Self consisting of bliss'

which is attained by the soul is different from it and is the supreme Self or Brahman.

Hence it is established that the supreme Self or Brahman, which is different from the Pradhāna as declared in the last topic, is also different from the individual soul.

Topic 7 : The Person in the sun and the eye is Brahman

In the last topic it was objected that 'the Self consisting of bliss' was the individual soul, for the text declared its relation to a body. This argument was refuted, and it was established that 'the Self consisting of bliss' was the supreme Self, on account of its unmixed blissful nature, which can be true only of the supreme Self and not of the individual self. A further objection is raised against this conclusion as follows : We have in *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, 'He who is in this body and he who is in the sun, are the same.' Now the person in the sun is its presiding deity and since the individual soul animates that, 'the Self consisting of bliss' cannot be the supreme Self. This argument is refuted by saying that even the person in the sun is the supreme Self and not the individual soul.

अन्तस्तद्धर्मोपदेशात् ॥ २१ ॥

21. (The one) within (the sun and the eye is Brahman), because the characteristics of That are mentioned (therein).

'Now that golden (radiant) person who is seen within the sun, with a golden beard and golden hair... is named Ut, for he has risen (*Udita*) above all evils... *Ṛk* and *Sāman* are his joints... He is the lord of all worlds beyond the sun and of all objects desired by the gods' (*Chā.* I. vi.

6-8). 'Now the person who is in the eye is R̥k ; he is Sāman, Uktha, Yajus, Brahman. The form of that person in the eye is the same as that of the other (the person in the sun), the joints of the one are the joints of the other, the name of the one is also the name of the other... He is the lord of the world beneath the body and of all objects desired by men' (Chā. I. vii. 5-8). The question is whether the person in the sun is the individual soul, the presiding deity in the sun, or the supreme Self other than this soul.

Prima facie view : The person in the sun and the eye is the individual soul, the presiding deity in the sun, on account of his relation to a body, which relation exists only for souls to enable them to enjoy the merits and demerits of their previous actions. Such a connection with a body is not possible in the case of Brahman, who is not subject to any Karma. That is why the state of Liberation (*mokṣa*), in which one is not affected by good and evil, is said to be a state of disembodiedness. Moreover, though for ordinary souls whose merit is very little, it may not be possible to create the world, yet for a soul that has gained extraordinary merit and therefore has very great knowledge and power, it may be possible to create this world. Hence the texts which refer to the cause of the world and to the inner ruler refer to such a soul, as for example, the person in the sun, who has become all-knowing and all-powerful owing to acquired great merit. Therefore, there is no supreme Self other than such an individual soul, and texts like, 'It is neither gross nor subtle', etc. describe the real nature of the individual soul, while those texts that declare Liberation are meant to teach the true nature of the soul and the way to realize that nature.

Answer : The person in the sun and the eye is other than the individual soul, viz. the supreme Self, for the text

declares the qualities of that supreme Self as follows : 'He has risen above all evil', i.e. is free from all evil. This can be true only of the supreme Self and not the soul. Such other qualities as the mastery over all worlds and all objects of desire, the power to realize all one's desires, being the inner ruler of all, etc. which presuppose freedom from all evil, can belong to the supreme Self alone. 'It is the Self, free from all evil, free from old age, death and grief, from hunger and thirst, whose desires and whose resolves come true' etc. (Chā. VIII. i. 5). Again, qualities like being the creator of the universe and possessing infinite bliss, which are unattainable by Karma (action) cannot be the natural qualities of the soul, but can apply only to the supreme Self.

Moreover, the connection with a special body of the person in the sun as described is not due to any great merit acquired by that individual soul ; for the text, 'He has risen above all evil', quoted above, reminds us of another scriptural text, 'It has neither merit nor demerit, is free from all evil ; this Brahman is beyond all evil.' So this person is beyond all good and evil actions, and as such this body of his cannot be the result of any great merit acquired by him. Nor is it a fact that connection with a body necessarily makes one subject to Karma. The supreme Self, whose desires come true, can take a body at pleasure. The form of the person in the sun is one which the supreme Self takes of Its own accord, without being subject to Karma. It is immaterial (*aprākṛta*) and not a product of the Prakṛti and its three Guṇas. The Scripture also describes Its form as 'resplendent like the sun, beyond all darkness'. Just as the supreme Self possesses an infinite number of excellent qualities, so also It has a beautiful

divine form befitting Its nature, and to gratify Its devotees. It takes various forms according to their desires. Therefore, the person in the sun and the eye is the supreme Self, which is different from the soul that animates the sun etc.

भेदव्यपदेशाच्चान्यः ॥ २२ ॥

22. Also on account of a distinction being made, (the supreme Self) is different (from the individual soul animating the sun).

The passage, 'He who dwells in the sun and is within the sun, whom the sun does not know, whose body the sun is and who rules the sun from within, is thy Self, the ruler within, the immortal' etc. (*Bṛ. III. vii. 9*), shows that the supreme Self is within the sun and yet different from the individual soul animating the sun. This confirms the view expressed in the last *Sūtra*. This and the following texts in that section of the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* declare It as having all souls for Its body and being the inner ruler of all. Therefore the supreme Self is different from all individual souls, such as the *Hiraṇyagarbha* etc.

Topic 8 : The word *Ākāśa* (ether) refers to Brahman

The text, 'That from which these beings are born... That is Brahman' etc. (*Tai. III. 1*), teaches that Brahman is the cause of the world. What is the nature of this first Cause, the Brahman? 'Existence (*Sat*) alone, my dear, was this at the beginning... It thought... It brought forth fire' (*Chā. VI. ii. 1, 3*); 'Verily in the beginning all this was the Self... He thought', etc. (*Ai. Brā. II. iv. 1, 1-2*); 'From that Self was created ether', etc. (*Tai. II. 1*)

—texts like these, after describing Its nature by words that have a general import and not any special meaning have shown through words which connote such special characteristics as 'thinking', 'infinite bliss' and 'special form', that Brahman is different from the *Pradhāna* and the individual soul. In the rest of this Section (*Pāda*) it is established that even words that have a special meaning—such as *Ākāśa*—when they occur in texts relating to creation, refer to Brahman and not the thing they usually denote.

आकाशस्तल्लिङ्गात् ॥ २३ ॥

23. (The word) *Ākāśa* (ether) (is Brahman), on account of Its characteristic marks (being mentioned).

'“What is the goal of this world?” “*Ākāśa*”, he replied. “For all beings take their rise from *Ākāśa* only and dissolve in it. *Ākāśa* is greater than these. It is their ultimate resort”’ etc. (*Chā. I. ix. 1-2*). Here a doubt arises as to whether the word '*Ākāśa*' (ether) refers to the well-known elemental ether or to Brahman.

Prima facie view : Here the word '*Ākāśa*' (ether) refers to the elemental ether, for everywhere we have to find out the connotation of words from their etymology. Therefore, the word *Ākāśa* (ether) here denotes the elemental ether, and the Brahman referred to in the Scriptures is nothing but that. For after knowing Brahman as 'That from which these beings are born' etc. (*Tai. III. 1*), one is curious to know what is that from which these beings are born, and this is conveyed by the text, 'For all these beings take their rise from *Ākāśa* only' (*Chā. I. ix. 1*), which tells us that *Ākāśa* (ether) is the first Cause. Therefore, the words '*Sat*' (existence) in *Chāndogya VI. ii. 1* and '*Self*' in *Aitareya*

Brāhmaṇa I. i. 1. 1-2 also refer to this Ākāśa (ether). It may be objected that in the text, 'From that Self was created Ākāśa (ether)' (*Tai.* II. 1), Ākāśa itself is shown to be something created. But the objection does not hold, for the word 'Self' denotes that subtle state of Ākāśa (ether) from which the gross element Ākāśa is manifested. Therefore the elemental ether alone is referred to in this *Chāndogya* text, and it is declared to be the origin of the entire world. Hence texts that attribute 'thinking' etc. to the first Cause, have to be interpreted in a secondary sense.

Answer : The word Ākāśa (ether) denotes Brahman and not the elemental ether, because the text mentions qualities, such as being the origin of *all these beings*, being greater than everything else, and being the ultimate resort of all beings including sentient souls. Now the elemental ether cannot be the cause of sentient souls or the final goal or resort to be attained by all souls, nor can an insentient thing possess all excellent qualities so as to make it greater than everything else. But with respect to the supreme Self, and these qualities are befitting.

Again, the *Chāndogya* text quoted at the beginning mentions Ākāśa (ether) as something well-known ; and this knowledge is obtained from texts like, 'Existence alone, my dear, was there at the beginning, one only without a second' etc. (*Chā.* VI. ii. 1), which establish Brahman as the first Cause. Therefore in *Chāndogya* I. ix. 1-2 the word Ākāśa (ether) denotes Brahman, something already well-known. Though the word Ākāśa in common parlance denotes the well-known element Ākāśa (ether), yet as that cannot be the origin or cause of sentient beings, we cannot rely on this single argument and interpret all texts that declare an independent entity possessing excellent qualities

like omniscience etc. by this etymological meaning of the word Ākāśa. Therefore, the word 'Ākāśa' (ether) in this text denotes Brahman and not the individual soul.

Topic 9 : The word Prāṇa refers to Brahman

In the previous topic, the causality of Ākāśa was refuted. In this, the causality of Prāṇa (the vital force) is being denied.

अत एव प्राणः ॥ २४ ॥

24. For the same reason (the word) 'Prāṇa' also refers to Brahman.

'"Which is that deity ?" "Prāṇa", he said. For all these beings merge in Prāṇa alone, and from Prāṇa they rise"' (*Chā.* I. ii. 4-5). The question is whether Prāṇa refers to the vital force or Brahman. The *prima facie* view is that it refers to the vital force, for the existence, activity, etc. of the entire sentient world depend on this vital force, and so it can be called the cause of the world. This view is refuted by this *Sūtra*, which holds that the word 'Prāṇa' refers to Brahman, and not to the vital force, for the text declares that the whole world merges in Prāṇa *alone* also rises from it. This is a characteristic of Brahman, and is referred to as something well known, as in the case of Ākāśa in the last topic. Moreover, one does not find the activity of the vital force in insentient things like stocks and stones, nor even in intelligence, and so it is not proper to say that 'all these beings merge in Prāṇa'. Therefore Brahman, as the bestower of life to all beings, is referred to in this text as Prāṇa. So the word 'Prāṇa' refers to some entity other than the

vital force, which is the cause of this world, which is free from evil, whose resolves come true, which is all-knowing, and so on, i.e. Brahman.

Topic 10 : The word 'light' is to be understood as Brahman

ज्योतिश्चरणाभिधानात् ॥ २५ ॥

25. (The word) light (means Brahman), on account of the mention of feet or quarters (in a complementary passage).

'Now the light which shines above this heaven, beyond all—higher than everything—in the highest world, beyond which there are no other worlds, that is the same light which is within man' (*Chā.* III. xiii. 7). Here the question is whether the word 'light' refers to the well known light of the sun, which is here described as the cause of the world, or to the supreme Self different from the sentient and insentient world, of infinite splendour, etc. The *prima facie* view is that it refers to the light of the sun, for though the word 'light' is referred to as something well known, yet there are no characteristics, as in the two previous topics, that can denote only the supreme Self ; and so there is nothing in the text to show that the supreme Self is referred to here. Moreover, this light is identified with the light in the person, or intestinal heat. So the word 'light' refers to the light of the sun. As against this view, the present *Sūtra* establishes that the word 'light' refers to Brahman.

In a previous text it has been said : 'This much, is Its glory ; greater than this is the Puruṣa. One foot (quarter) of It is all beings, while Its (remaining) three feet are immortal in heaven' (*Chā.* III. xii. 6), where all beings are

said to constitute a foot of this Person, and this is none other than Brahman, for That alone is well known as having four feet. See the description of the supreme Person given in the Puruṣa Sūkta (*R. V. X. 90*). The 'light' in *Chāndogya* III. xiii. 7, quoted at the beginning, is identified with this Person, since like the latter, the 'light' is also connected with heaven, and the pronoun 'that' signifies something already stated. Therefore the word 'light' refers to Brahman. Its identification with intestinal heat is for meditation alone to attain certain results. The Lord also says in the *Gītā*, 'I abide in the body of living beings as the fire (*Vaiśvānara*)', etc. (*XV. 14*) ; where He identifies Himself with intestinal heat.

छन्दोऽभिधानान्नेतिचेत् ,

न, तथा चेतोऽर्पणनिगदात् , तथाहि दर्शनम् ॥ २६ ॥

26. If it be said (that Brahman is) not (referred to), on account of a metre (the Gāyatrī) being mentioned, (we reply) no, because in that way (i.e. by means of the metre), the application of the mind (on Brahman) has been taught ; for so it is seen (in other texts).

An objection may be raised that in *Chāndogya* III. xii. 6, Brahman is not referred to, but the metre Gāyatrī, for an earlier text says, 'The Gāyatrī is everything whatever exists in the universe' (*ibid.* III. xii. 1). So the feet referred to in *ibid.* III. xii. 6, cited in the last *Sūtra*, mean this metre and not Brahman. In reply it is said : Not so ; for the word Gāyatrī here does not merely refer to the metre but also inculcates meditation on Brahman as the Gāyatrī for the attainment of certain results. Otherwise, a mere metre cannot be the cause of everything. Moreover, there

is a similarity between the two ; for in *ibid.* III. xii. 6 Brahman is said to have four feet, and the metre Gāyatrī too sometimes has four feet (though usually it has only three). Elsewhere also we find that words denoting metres are used in other senses through some similarity. *Vide ibid.* IV. iii. 8 where the metre Virāj having ten syllables denotes ten deities.

भूतादिपादव्यपदेशोपपत्तेश्चैवम् ॥ २७ ॥

27. This also makes possible the representation of beings etc. as the feet (of the Gāyatrī).

Beings, earth, body and heart can be the feet of Brahman only and not of the metre Gāyatrī, a mere collection of syllables. So the 'Gāyatrī' Brahman alone is referred to.

उपदेशभेदान्नेतिचेत्, न, उभयस्मिन्नप्यविरोधात् ॥ २८ ॥

28. If it be said (that Brahman referred to in the Gāyatrī passage cannot be recognized in the passage dealing with 'light'), on account of difference in specification, (we reply) no, for there is no contradiction in either (description to such recognition).

In the Gāyatrī passage heaven is specified as the abode of Brahman, while in *Chāndogya* III. xiii. 7 the 'light' is said to shine above heaven. How, then, can it be said that the same Brahman is referred to in both the passages ? The *Sūtra* says that there is no contradiction here, just as there is none when we say, with reference to a bird perching on the top of a tree, that it is perching on the tree, or that it is above the tree. Therefore the word 'light' refers to Brahman. It is appropriately called 'light' for Brahman is also

described as having extraordinary splendour. 'I know that Person of sun-like splendour', etc. (*Śve.* III. 8).

Topic 11 : Indra's Instruction to Prataardana

प्राणस्तथानुगमात् ॥ २६ ॥

29. Prāṇa is Brahman, it being so understood (from the purport of the texts).

In the last topic the casuality attributed to the sun and other luminary objects indicated by the word 'light' has been refuted. This topic decides that Indra, the leader of the gods, is also not the first Cause.

In the *Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad* we find the following conversation between Indra and Prataardana. The latter says to Indra, "You choose for me the boon that you deem most beneficial to man." Indra said, "Know me only ; that is what I consider most beneficial to man.... I am Prāṇa, the intelligent self (Prajñātman), meditate on me as life, as immortality... And that Prāṇa is indeed the intelligent self, blessed, undecaying, immortal" (*Kau.* III. 1-8). The question is whether the individual self is referred to here, or the supreme Self. The *prima facie* view is that the individual self is referred to, for Indra is the well known god, an individual self, and Prāṇa, which is equated with him, must represent that. Therefore Indra, the individual soul, is held out here as the object of meditation for man to attain the supreme good or immortality, and man's supreme good is attained by meditation on the first Cause, according to the texts, 'The first Cause is to be meditated upon' (*Atharva Śiras*), and 'For him there is delay only so long as he is not freed from the body ; then he becomes perfect.' (*Chā.*

I. xiv. 3). This the *Sūtra* refutes by saying that it is the supreme Self that is referred to in these passages as the object of meditation, inasmuch as Its special qualities such as being 'blessed', 'undecaying', and 'immortal' are mentioned.

न, वक्तुरात्मोपदेशादिति चेत्, अध्यात्म-

सम्बन्धभूमा ह्यस्मिन् ॥ ३० ॥

30. If it be said that (Brahman is) not (referred to in these passages), on account of the speaker's instruction about himself; (we reply, not so), because there is abundance of reference to the inner or supreme Self in this chapter).

An objection is raised that the word 'Prāṇa' cannot refer to Brahman, as stated in the last *Sūtra*, for the speaker Indra clearly refers to himself by this word, saying, 'I am Prāṇa' etc. The beginning of this chapter also clearly refers to an individual being, the god Indra, the slayer of the son of Tvaṣṭṛ and so words like 'blessed', 'undecaying', etc. found in the concluding portion of the chapter must be so interpreted as to harmonise with the beginning. So the word 'Prāṇa' here refers to the individual soul that is Indra, the well known god. This the *Sūtra* refutes by saying that in these passages there are profuse references to attributes that are special to the inner Self. First, Indra, who is Prāṇa, is prescribed as the object of meditation for attaining the highest good of man, i.e. Liberation, and this object can only be the supreme Self. Again, the text says, 'He makes him whom He wishes to raise from these worlds do good deeds; and He again makes him whom He wishes to degrade from these worlds do bad deeds' (*Kau.* III. 8), and this being the prompter of good and bad actions in man is a quality of

the supreme Self alone. The same holds true of the quality of being the abode of everything, sentient and insentient, and the epithets 'blessed', 'undecaying' and 'immortal' mentioned in the text: 'For as in a car the rim of a wheel is placed on the spokes, and the spokes on the nave, so are these objects placed in the subjects, and the subjects in the Prāṇa and the Prāṇa is indeed the self that is Prajñā (intelligence), blessed, undecaying, immortal', etc. (*Kau.* III. 8). The words, 'He is the guardian of the world, the king of the world and the Lord of the universe', can be true only of the supreme Self. Therefore, the supreme Self is referred to in these texts by the word Indra that is Prāṇa.

शास्त्रदृष्ट्या तूपदेशो वामदेववत् ॥ ३१ ॥

31. But (Indra's) instruction (to Pratardana is justified) by his realization of the Truth inculcated by the scriptures (viz 'I am Brahman'), as was the case with (the sage) Vāmadeva.

Though Indra is an individual being yet his instruction about himself as the object of meditation is based on realization of the scriptural Truth that he is Brahman. Witness the texts: 'In it all that exists has its self. It is the true. It is the Self, and thou art That.' (*Chā.* VI. viii. 7); 'He who dwelling in the self is different from the self' etc. (*Bṛ.* III. vii. 22). From texts like these Indra had realized that the supreme Self has the individual souls for its body, and hence words like 'I' and 'thou', which connote the individual self, ultimately refer to the supreme Self only; for terms applicable to the body extend also to the principle embodied. So in the passage under discussion, where Indra refers to himself, he actually refers to the supreme Self, which is his

own Self and which has his soul for Its body. The sage Vāmadeva, realizing himself as the body of the supreme Self, referred to It as 'I' where he said, 'I was Manu, and the sun', etc.

जीवमुख्यप्राणलिङ्गान्नेति चेत्, न, उपासात्रैविभ्यात्,
आश्रितत्वात्, इह तद्योगात् ॥ ३२ ॥

32. If it be said that (Brahman) is not referred to, on account of the characteristics of the individual soul and chief vital force (being mentioned), (we say) no—because of the threefoldness of meditation, and because (such threefold meditation is found in other places), and is appropriate here (also).

It may be said that in *Kauṣītaki* III. 8, we find at the beginning that the characteristics of the individual soul, the god Indra and the chief vital force are mentioned. The sentences, 'I slew the three-headed son of Tvaṣṭṛ', and 'I delivered the Arunmukhas, the devotees, to the wolves,' etc. refer to Indra. Again the sentences, 'As long as Prāṇa lives in the body, so long there is life, and Prāṇa alone is the conscious self, and taking hold of this body, it raises it up', refer to the vital force. The second half of the *Sūtra* refutes this objection and says that the supreme Self is designated by these terms in order to inculcate a threefold meditation, viz meditation of It *per se* as the cause of the universe; on Brahman having for Its body the totality of individual souls, and on Brahman having for its body the aggregate of objects and means of enjoyment. This threefold meditation we find in other texts. For example, the passage, 'Truth, Knowledge, Infinity is Brahman', and 'Bliss is Brahman', inculcate Brahman in Its true nature. In the passage, 'After creating

it, He entered into it. Having entered into it, He created the Sat and Tyat, (defined and undefined)' (*Tai.* II. 6); Brahman is defined as having for Its body sentient individual souls and insentient nature. In this chapter also this threefold meditation is prescribed. Wherever qualities of the supreme Self are attributed to or equated with any individual being or thing, the purpose is to refer to the supreme Self as the inner Self of all persons and things. Hence the being Indra who is Prāṇa refers to the supreme Self that is other than the individual souls.

A Brief Summary of the First Pāda

It has been shown in Section (Pāda) I, that a person who has studied the *Pūrva Mīmāṃsā* and has thus scrutinized and examined the true nature of work and has come to know that the results of work are ephemeral and therefore cannot help him to attain the highest aim of man viz Liberation (*mokṣa*), while he finds in another part of the Vedas, viz the Vedānta part of them, that the knowledge of Brahman leads to this Liberation, and who being convinced that words are capable of conveying knowledge about things existing and need not necessarily have any relation to things to be done, and so thinks the Vedāntic texts are authoritative so far as they convey knowledge of Brahman, which is the highest aim of man, should inquire into Brahman by a study of the *Uttara Mīmāṃsā* or *Śārīraka Mīmāṃsā*.

Scriptural texts declare a threefold classification; matter, individual souls and Brahman—matter being the object of enjoyment, souls, the enjoyers and Brahman, the ruling principle. Matter and souls which other texts declare to be connected with Brahman as Its body are controlled by It. It is therefore

the Self of everything—the inner Ruler. ‘He who inhabits the earth but is within it’ etc. (*Bṛ.* III. vii. 3-23). Other texts again teach that Brahman which has matter and souls for Its body exists as this world both in the causal and effected states, and hence speak of this world in both these aspects as that which is the real (*Sat*). ‘*Sat* alone was this in the beginning, One only without a second’ etc. (*Chā.* VI. ii. 8); ‘He wished, “May I be many”’ etc. (*Tai.* II. 6), and so on. These texts also uphold the threefold entities essentially distinct in nature from one another—a view which is supported by texts like, ‘Let me enter these three divine beings with this living self and then evolve names and forms’, where the three divine beings or primordial elements stand for the whole material world and the living self refers to the individual soul. Brahman is in Its causal or effected condition, according as It has for Its body matter and souls either in their subtle or gross state. The effect being thus non-different from the cause, it is known through the knowledge of the cause, and the initial promissory statement of the scriptures that by the knowledge of one thing everything is known holds good. As Brahman which has for Its body matter and souls in their gross and subtle states constitutes the effect and the cause, we can well say that It is the material (*upādāna*) cause of this world.

Texts which teach that Brahman is without qualities teach that It is free from all evil qualities. Similarly texts like, ‘True, infinite, knowledge is Brahman’, which declare that knowledge as Its essential nature declare that the essential nature of Brahman which is all-knowing can be defined as knowledge, while texts like, ‘He who all-knowing’ etc. show that It is essentially a knowing subject. Again texts like ‘He desired, “May I be many”’ (*Tai.* II. 6), teach that

Brahman exists as this manifold world, thereby denying the reality of all things different from It, which is the true import of texts like, ‘From death to death he goes who sees any plurality here’ (*Bṛ.* IV. iv. 19). Thus we find that texts which declare matter, souls and Brahman to be essentially different in nature, which declare Brahman to be the cause and the world the effect, and finally the cause and effect to be non-different, do not in the least contradict the texts which declare matter and soul in causal condition existing in a subtle state, not having assumed as yet names and forms, while in the gross or effected state they are designated by such names and forms. Thus some texts declare that matter, souls and Brahman are three different entities, while others teach that matter and souls in all their states form the body of God who is their Self, while still other texts teach that It in Its causal and effected states comprises within It these three entities. ‘All this is Brahman’.

Bondage is real and is the result of ignorance which is of the nature of Karma without a beginning. This bondage can be destroyed only through knowledge, i.e. through the knowledge that Brahman is the inner Ruler different from souls and matter. Such knowledge alone leads to final release or *mokṣa*. This knowledge is attained through the Grace of the Lord pleased by the due performance of the daily duties prescribed for different castes and stages of life, duties performed not with the idea of attaining any results but with the idea of propitiating the Lord. Works done with a desire of results lead to impermanent results while those performed with the idea of pleasing the Lord result in the knowledge of the nature of devout meditation which in turn leads to the intuition of Brahman as the inner Self different from souls and matter. This leads to *mokṣa*.

It has also been shown that the *Taittirīya* text 'That from which these beings are born', etc. (III. 1) defines Brahman and that this Brahman can be known only through the Scriptures and not through any other means of knowledge. 'I ask you of that Being who is to be known only from the Upaniṣads (*aupaniṣdam*), (*Bṛ.* III. ix. 26), where the word *only* shows that it can be known only through the Upaniṣads which alone are authority with respect to It. As all these texts refer to Brahman and have Brahman as their main purport which is the highest aim of man, these texts though not related to actions are authoritative and purposeful. That this Brahman, which is the first Cause is an intelligent principle, different from the insentient *Pradhāna* inasmuch as thinking is attributed to It, has been proved. It has also been proved that this first Cause is different from the individual soul be it either in the state of bondage or release, as It is said to be all-knowing, infinite bliss, the inner Ruler of all beings, sentient and insentient, etc. That this Brahman has a form which is immaterial (*aprākṛta*) and which form is not a result of Karma. That terms like *Ākāśa* (ether) *Prāṇa* (breath) though ordinarily refer to the well known material things yet in the texts where they occur they refer to Brahman because Its characteristics are mentioned. Similarly the word 'light' has been shown as referring to Brahman on account of its connection with heaven. That due to the characteristics of Brahman, viz the attainment of Liberation through Its knowledge, the word 'Indra' refers to Brahman as it is in keeping with scriptural teaching.

The result therefore arrived at was that the Scriptural texts have for their purport only Brahman which possesses an infinite number of good qualities and that It cannot be known through other sources.

CHAPTER I

SECTION II

In the first Section it has been shown that a person who has read the Vedic texts and studied the ritualistic portion of the Vedas (*Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā*) realize that the fruit of ritualistic action is ephemeral ; while from other Vedānta texts he finds that the fruit of the knowledge of Brahman is eternal and infinite. Therefore a desire for release through the knowledge of Brahman arises in him. Knowing further that words have the power of conveying knowledge about existing things and need not be connected with things to be done, and being convinced that Vedānta texts describing the nature of Brahman are authoritative means of conveying the knowledge of Brahman, which is the highest aim of man, he begins the study of the *Śārīraka Mīmāṃsā* (*Vedānta-Sūtras*).

It has also been shown that with respect to the supreme Brahman, which is the first Cause as defined by the *Taittirīya* text, 'That from which these beings are born' etc. (III. 1), Scriptures alone are the means of knowledge as It is not an object of any other means of knowledge. This point is further proved by the following facts : That all Vedānta texts refer to this Brahman alone which, though not related to actions, is yet the highest goal of man ; That this Brahman which is the first Cause is different from the insentient *Pradhāna* inasmuch as 'thinking' is attributed to the first Cause (*vide Chā. VI. ii. 2-3*); That It is also different from the sentient individual soul, be it in the state to release or bondage, as It is said to be infinite bliss, all-pervading and the inner Self of all beings, sentient and insentient ; That

this Brahman has a divine form which is not material (*aprākṛta*) and not a result of *karma*; That this first Cause though referred to by such terms as *Ākāśa* and *Prāṇa* (*vide Chā. I. ix. 1-2, and I. ii. 4-5*) which are well known material things, is yet the same supreme Being, Brahman; so also is the same Being referred to by the word 'light' in *Chā. III. xiii. 7*, on account of its connection with heaven and its supreme splendour; that due to the characterization of Brahman, viz. the attainment of Liberation through Its knowledge, the words *Indra* and *Prāṇa* (*vide Kau. III. i. 8*) refer to Brahman as it is in keeping with scriptural teaching. The result therefore arrived at was that the supreme Person, Brahman, which, on account of Its infinite number of excellent qualities, is so very different from all other things, is beyond all means of knowledge except the Scriptures whose texts have for their purport only Brahman.

Though the Vedānta texts have Brahman alone for their purport, yet certain texts seem to establish some particular beings comprised within *Pradhāna* or the individual souls. In this and the next two Sections such texts are taken for discussion, the doubt is answered, and the qualities mentioned in such texts are shown to establish certain excellent qualities of Brahman. In this Section texts which contain obscure references to the individual soul are discussed. In the third Section texts which contain clear references to the individual soul are taken up, while in the last Section the texts selected for discussion are those which seem to refer to the individual soul but in fact refer to Brahman.

Topic 1 : The Being consisting of mind is Brahman

सर्वत्र प्रसिद्धोपदेशात् ॥१॥

1. (That which consists of the mind [*Manomaya*] is

Brahman) because (the text) states (qualities) well known (to denote Brahman only) throughout (the Scriptures).

In the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* we have : 'Man is a creature of thought. Even as is his thought is this world, so will be his hereafter. Therefore he should think (meditate thus): He who consists of the mind, whose body is *Prāṇa*, whose form is light' etc. (*III. xiv. 1-2*). Here the object of the meditation prescribed by the words, 'He should think (meditate)' is 'He who consists of the mind,' etc. A doubt arises whether the 'being consisting of the mind' etc. prescribed as the object of meditation is the individual soul or Brahman. The opponent holds that it is the individual soul, for the mind and *Prāṇa* are instruments of the individual soul, and as such, the qualities of 'consisting of the mind', etc. are apt in it and not in Brahman which is described as 'without *Prāṇa* and without mind' (*Mu. II. i. 2*). Nor is it possible to assume that Brahman which is mentioned in the previous text, 'All this is verily Brahman' (*Chā. III. xiv. 1*), is prescribed here as the object of meditation; for we get in this text itself the object of meditation prescribed, viz 'He who consists of the mind' etc. Hence there is no doubt about the object of meditation, and consequently there is no justification for us to infer it from a previous text. The word 'Brahman' which occurs in the concluding text, 'This my inner Self is Brahman' (*Chā. III. xiv. 4*), is used with respect to the individual soul to glorify it. So it is the individual soul that is referred to in the text under discussion as the object of meditation.

The *Sūtra* refutes this view and says that Brahman is the object of the meditation prescribed, for qualities like 'consisting of the mind' etc. which denote only the Brahman in Vedānta texts are found in this text. Vide also : 'He who

consists of the mind, the ruler of the subtle body (*prāṇa-śarīra*)' etc. (*Mu.* II. ii. 7); 'There is the ether within the heart and in it there is the Person consisting of the mind, immortal, golden' (*Tai.* I. vi. 1); 'It is not perceived by the eyes, nor by the speech...but by the pure mind', etc. (*Mu.* III. i. 8); 'It is the Prāṇa of the Prāṇa' (*Ke.* I. 2); 'Prāṇa alone is the conscious Self, and having laid hold of the body it makes it rise up' (*Kau.* III. 3); 'For all these beings merge into Prāṇa alone, and from Prāṇa they arise' (*Chā.* I. xi. 5). 'Consisting of the mind' means 'capable of being perceived by the pure mind' and 'having Prāṇa for the body' means 'the support or ruler of Prāṇa'. Thus the word 'Brahman' in the concluding portion of the text under discussion, 'This my inner Self is Brahman' is used in its primary sense and refers to Brahman. The text, 'without Prāṇa and without mind' means that Brahman does not depend on mind for thought, nor does Its life depend on Prāṇa.

Another interpretation of the *Sūtra* followed by many commentators, including the Vṛttikāra, is as follows : The text, 'All this indeed is Brahman...one ought to meditate on It calmly' etc. prescribes that, being calm, one should meditate on Brahman as the Self of all. The text, 'Therefore he should think' is an additional statement with respect to this instruction, stating certain qualities of Brahman for meditation, such as 'consisting of the mind', etc. The meaning, therefore, is that one should meditate on Brahman which has attributes like 'consisting of the mind', etc. as the Self of all. A doubt arises whether the individual soul or the supreme Self is denoted by the word 'Brahman'. The opponent holds that it is the individual soul, for that alone admits of being co-ordinated with the word 'all'. The word

'all' denotes the entire world from Brahmā down to a blade of grass. The state of Brahmā is an appendage of the individual soul, due to nescience and the soul's *karma*; and this is not possible in the case of Brahman which is all-wise, omnipotent, free from sin, and in which not even a trace of nescience can be found. It cannot be this 'all' which is full of evil. The word 'Brahman' is also used sometimes to denote the individual soul and in the state of release it is also said to be infinite. 'It is fit for infinity' (*Śve.* V. 9). As the nescience of the individual soul is due to *karma*, the individual soul can very well be said to be the cause etc. of the world. The text means : 'The individual soul, which by nature is infinite and therefore of the nature of Brahman, attains, due to nescience, the state of a god, or a man, or an animal, or a plant.'

This view the *Sūtra* refutes because the text, 'All this is Brahman. Let one meditate on this world as originating, ending, and existing in Brahman' refers to Brahman as something well known. All this is Brahman, because the entire world originates, ends, and exists in It (*tajjalān*); and so, that which is well-known in Vedānta texts as the first Cause is also stated here. This well-known Being is Brahman alone. *vide Tai.* III. vi. 1 and *Śve.* VI. 9. As the world has its Self in Brahman because it originates, ends, and exists in It, this world can be identified with Brahman. Brahman is the Self of the world both in Its causal and effected states, for in the former state It has for Its body all sentient and insentient beings in their subtle state, and in the latter in their gross condition. This kind of identity with the world is not incompatible with Brahman's possessing excellent qualities ; for imperfections of the world, which forms Its body, cannot affect Brahman. What has been

tated by the opponent, that the individual soul also can be said to be identical with the world, is not correct ; for there can be no such identity as individual souls are different in different bodies. Again, the released soul, though it is not limited, yet has not the power of creation etc. *vide Brahma-Sūtras* IV. iv. 17. Therefore in this text under discussion the supreme Self is denoted by the word 'Brahman'.

विवक्षितगुणोपपत्तेश्च ॥ २ ॥

2. Moreover the qualities desired to be expressed are befitting (only in the case of Brahman and so the passage refers to Brahman).

'He who consists of the mind, whose body is Prāṇa, whose form is light, whose resolve is true, whose nature is like that of ether, from whom all works, all desires, all sweet odours and tastes proceed—He who embraces all this, who never speaks, and is never surprised' etc. (*Chā.* III. xiv. 2). The qualities mentioned in this text are possible only in Brahman.

अनुपपत्तेस्तु, न शारीरः ॥ ३ ॥

3. On the other hand (they) are not appropriate (in the case of the individual soul) and so the individual soul is not (referred to in the text).

All the qualities mentioned in *Chā.* III. xiv. 2 cannot belong to the individual soul whether in the bound or released state, for it is very insignificant, subject to great suffering and to *karma*, and is ignorant. So it is not the individual soul but the supreme Brahman that is referred to in this text.

कर्मकर्तृव्यपदेशाच्च ॥ ४ ॥

4. And on account of the mention of the attainer and the object attained (the reference is to Brahman and to the individual soul).

In the same chapter of the *Chāndogya* there occurs the passage : 'When *I* shall have departed from hence, *I* shall attain Him (III. xiv. 4)', where 'Him' refers to 'who consists of the mind', the object of meditation, the thing to be attained, and the *I* refers to the individual soul, the attainer. Therefore the reference in the text is to Brahman, who is different from the individual soul.

शब्दविशेषात् ॥ ५ ॥

5. Because of the difference (indicated by the case endings) of the words.

In the text, 'This my Self within the heart' etc. (*Chā.* III. xiv. 4) the individual soul is denoted by the genitive case, while the object of meditation, 'who consists of the mind', is in the nominative case. So it is clear that the object of meditation is different from the individual soul. *vide Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* X. vi. 3.2, where they are still more clearly differentiated : 'As is a grain of rice, or a grain of barley...so is that golden Being in the self', where the individual soul and 'the self consisting of the mind' are clearly described as two different entities, for 'the self consisting of the mind', which is in the nominative case, is described as being in the individual self, the word denoting it being in the locative case. Therefore the reference in the text is to Brahman, and not to the individual soul.

स्मृतेश्च ॥ ६ ॥

6. From the Smṛti also (we learn that the individual soul is different from the one referred to in this text under discussion).

The Smṛti referred to is : 'I am centred in the hearts of all' etc. (*Gītā*, XV. 15); 'He who, free from delusion, thus knows me' (*Gītā*, XV. 19); 'The Lord, O Arjuna, is seated in the hearts of all beings.... Take refuge in Him' etc. (*Gītā*, XVIII. 61). Here the texts clearly describe the individual soul as the worshipper and the supreme Self as the object of worship.

अर्भकौकस्तत्तद् व्यपदेशाच्च नेति चेत्, न,

निचाय्यत्वादेवं व्योमवच्च ॥ ७ ॥

7. If it be said that (the passage does) not (refer to Brahman) because of the smallness of the abode (referred to, viz the heart) and also on account of its being designated as such (i.e. as minute), (we say) not so, (because Brahman has been so characterized) for the sake of contemplation and because (in the same passage) It is said to be like ether.

The text, 'He is my self within the heart', declares him to be small in size, as he dwells within the small space of the heart. The minuteness is declared also in the text, 'Smaller than a grain of rice' etc. (*Chā.* III. xiv. 3) vide also (*Mu.* I. i. 6 and *Sve.* V. 8). So that being cannot be the supreme Self; it can be only the individual soul. The *Sūtra* refutes this and says that Brahman is characterized as such for the sake of contemplation, and that minuteness is not Its true nature. For further on the same text says that It

is infinite like ether, 'greater than the earth, greater than the sky' etc. (*Chā.* III. xiv. 3). Its omnipresence is not marred by regarding It as limited by the space in the heart, or as minute in size. The case is analogous to that of the ether in the eye of the needle, which is spoken of as limited and small, whereas in fact it is all-pervading. Therefore the limitation of the abode and minuteness in size are meant only for the sake of meditation.

सम्भोगप्राप्तिरिति चेत्, न, वैशेष्यात् ॥ ८ ॥

8. If it is said that (if Brahman dwells within all bodies, It would also, like the individual soul) experience (pleasure and pain), (we say) not so, because of the difference in the nature (of the two).

The mere fact that Brahman dwells within bodies, like the individual souls, does not subject It to pleasure and pain, for what results in pleasure and pain is not mere connection with a body but being subject to the influence on good and evil deeds. That does not exist in the case of Brahman which is free from all sin. The scriptures also say, 'One of them eats the sweet fruit, while the other looks on without eating' (*Mu.* III. i. 1).

Topic 2 : The Eater is Brahman

If the supreme Self is not an enjoyer, then wherever there is reference to enjoyment we have to take that the individual soul is meant. This topic explains that it need not necessarily refer to the individual soul, and that in every case we have to decide from the context as to who is referred to.

अत्ता चराचरग्रहणात् ॥ ६ ॥

9. The eater (is Brahman), because both the movable and the immovable (i.e. the entire universe) is taken (as his food).

'Who thus knows where He is, to whom the Brāhmaṇas and Kṣatriyas are (as it were) but food and Death itself a condiment?' (Ka. I. ii. 25). The question is : Who is this 'He' the eater, that is suggested by the words 'food' and 'condiment'? Is it the individual soul or the supreme Self?

The opponent says it is the individual soul; for enjoyment, which is the result of *karma*, is possible only in the case of the individual soul, and not in the case of the supreme Self which is not subject to *karma*. The *Sūtra* refutes this view and says that it is the supreme Self. For here eating means reabsorbing of the whole universe, and not enjoying as a result of *karma*; and this is possible for Brahman alone. Here Brāhmaṇas and Kṣatriyas are mentioned as mere examples, meaning the entire universe, as they are the foremost of created beings. As death itself is taken as a condiment, it shows that all things consumed by death, i.e. the entire universe, is referred to as His food. This kind of eating is only the reabsorption of the entire universe, and therefore the eater is only Brahman and not the individual soul.

प्रकरणाच्च ॥ १० ॥

10. And because (Brahman) is the subject of the discussion.

The subject of discussion in the section in which *Kātha* I. ii. 25 occurs is Brahman. 'The wise one who knows the

Self...as great and all-pervading does not grieve' (Ka. I. ii. 22); 'That Self cannot be gained by the Veda, nor by the intellect, nor by deep scriptural learning. He whom the Self chooses, by him the Self can be attained. To him the Self reveals Itself' (Ka. I. ii. 23). This Self is recognized in the subsequent text, 'Who thus knows where He is' (Ka. I. ii. 25),—of which it has been said that it is hard to know It without Its grace.

An objection is raised here that the Person to whom the Brāhmaṇas and Kṣatriyas are (as it were) food is not the supreme Self, free from all imperfections. For, later we have in *Kātha Upaniṣad* the text, 'Having entered the cavity of the heart, the two enjoy in the body the rewards of their good works' etc. (I. iii. 1). Now this text clearly refers to the individual soul enjoying the fruits of its action in association with another, which can be either the *Prāṇa* or *Buddhi* (the intellect). This kind of enjoyment of the fruits of action is not possible for Brahman. But the *Prāṇa* and *Buddhi* are instruments of the soul and so can somehow be associated with it in this enjoyment, but not Brahman. So it is only the individual soul that is referred to in these texts; and as the 'eater' also occurs in the same section, it is the individual soul, and not Brahman.

To this the next *Sūtra* says as follows :

गुहां प्रविष्टावात्मानौ हि ; तद्दर्शनात् ॥ ११ ॥

11. The two that have entered into the cavity (of the heart) are indeed the two Selves (the individual and the Supreme), because it is so seen.

The two that are referred to in *Kātha* I. iii. 1 are not the individual soul and *Prāṇa* or *Buddhi*, but the individual