

soul and the supreme Self ; for it is seen that these two are referred to in that section. The supreme Self is indicated by the text, 'The wise who, by meditation on the Self, has realized the Ancient One who is difficult to be seen, who has entered into everything, who is seated in the heart, and who dwells in the abyss,—he indeed transcends joy and sorrow' (*Ka. I. ii. 12*). The individual soul is indicated in the text, 'He who knows Aditi also, who is one with the deities, who is born with the Prāṇa, who entering into the heart abides therein' etc. (*Ka. I. iv. 7*). 'Aditi' in this text means the individual soul which enjoys the fruit of its *karma*, which is associated with Prāṇa and is one with all the deities, that is, with the senses with which it enjoys the fruits, and is born in various forms. The fact that both are said to enjoy the fruits of actions, which cannot apply to the supreme Self, is according to the popular custom where characteristics of one in a group are indirectly applied to the whole group, as when we say 'the men with the umbrella', where only one has an umbrella and not the whole group. So here also, though it is one that is enjoying the fruits of actions, both are so spoken of. Or it may be because the supreme Self causes the individual soul to enjoy the fruits of its actions, both are agents in this enjoyment.

विशेषणाच्च ॥ १२ ॥

12. And from the (distinctive) qualities (of the two mentioned in subsequent texts).

In this section of the *Kātha Vallī* the individual soul and the supreme Self are depicted everywhere. In texts like 'It is never born, nor does it die' (*Ka. I. ii. 28*) the individual soul is depicted. In texts like 'It is smaller than the

small, greater than the great' (*Ka. I. ii. 20*) and 'The Self cannot be attained by the Veda' (*Ka. I. ii. 23*) the supreme Self is depicted.

Again, in this section of the *Kātha Vallī*, from the beginning to the end, the individual soul and the supreme Self are depicted as the worshipper and the object worshipped, the attainer and the thing attained respectively : 'The wise one who knows the Self as great and all-pervading never grieves' (*Ka. I. ii. 22*); 'He who has intellect as his charioteer, and who holds the reins of the mind, he reaches the end of the journey, and that is the highest world of Viṣṇu' (*Ka. I. iii. 9*). *vide* also (*Chā. III. xiii. 6*). So the eater is the supreme Self.

An objection, however, may be raised against this view as follows : This section begins with a question as to the true nature of the individual soul : 'There is a doubt when a man has departed from hence ; some say he is, while others say he is not' (*Ka. I. i. 20*). So it is but proper to take that this whole section is with respect to the individual soul. This view is not tenable ; for the question is not with respect to the existence or otherwise of the individual soul after death. For the second boon prayed for by Naciketas clearly shows that he had no doubt about its existence after death. Therefore, when Naciketas chooses for the third boon the solution of the doubt as to the existence or otherwise of the individual soul when it departs from hence, he questions this with respect to the individual soul which, being fit for liberation, departs from hence. So the words, 'departs from hence', do not refer merely to the separation from the body but to liberation, which is freedom from all bondage. Therefore the question refers to the knowledge of the true nature of the supreme Self, and thereby to the true nature

of liberation. 'When he has departed there is no more knowledge' (*Br.* II. iv. 12) deals with the same question. This doubt about the nature of liberation arises because different sages hold different views regarding it.

Those who are well versed in Vedānta know that Brahman is the sole cause of the universe, free from all imperfections, whose essential nature is infinite knowledge and bliss, who has innumerable auspicious qualities, and who is different from all other things. Of the Brahman the individual souls, whose nature is infinite knowledge and whose essential attribute is the intuition of Brahman, are modes and form of Its body. Their true nature, however, is covered by Nescience. Liberation consists in the destruction of this nescience and the intuition of Brahman by the individual soul, which thereby gains its true nature. Yama, who is satisfied as to the fitness of Naciketas for this knowledge of Brahman, teaches it to him and also the nature of liberation which consists in reaching the abode of the supreme Self or Brahman, from *Kātha* I. ii. 12 to I. iii. 9. Therefore the 'eater' is Brahman.

Topic 3 : The Person within the Eye is Brahman

अन्तर उपपत्तेः ॥ १३ ॥

13. (The person) inside (the eye is Brahman) on account of (the attributes mentioned therein) being appropriate (only to Brahman).

'This person that is seen inside the eye is the Self. This is immortal and fearless ; this is Brahman' (*Chā.* IV. xv. 1). The question is whether this person referred to here is the reflection of a person in the eye, or the individual soul, or the deity which presides over the function of the eye, or

Brahman. As the 'person' is referred to as something well known, by the words 'is seen', which shows that it is directly seen, it can be the reflection of a person, or the individual soul. Or it may also be the presiding deity of the eye, according to the text, 'The former (i.e. the person seen inside the sun) rests on the latter (i.e. the person inside the eye) through the rays' (*Br.* V. v. 2). This view the *Sūtra* refutes, and says that the person inside the eye is Brahman. For the text says that He is 'immortal' and 'fearless', which can be true only of Brahman. It further says, 'They call him Samyadvāma, for all blessings go towards him. He is also Vāmani, for he leads all blessings... He is also Bhāmani, for he shines in all worlds' (*Chā.* IV. xv. 2-4). These qualities also enumerated here can be true of Brahman only.

स्थानादिव्यपदेशाच्च ॥ १४ ॥

14. And because abode etc. (i.e. ruling the eye) are attributed to It (by other scriptural texts also).

He who abides in the eye and rules it is the supreme Self. 'He who inhabits the eye, ... and who controls the eye from within, He is your Self, the internal Ruler, the immortal' (*Br.* III. vii. 18). That supreme Self is recognized in the *Chāndogya* text also. That the reference is to something well known is true of the supreme Self also, and the words 'is seen' which hint at direct perception are equally true of the supreme Self as It is so perceived by Yogis in their meditation. Therefore the person in the eye in *Chā.* IV. xv. 1 is the supreme Self.

मुखविशिष्टाभिधानादेव च ॥ १५ ॥

15. And on account of the reference (by the text) only

(to Brahman) characterized by bliss (mentioned at the beginning of the Section).

The subject matter of the Section is only Brahman characterized by bliss. 'The vital energy is Brahman, bliss is Brahman, the ether is Brahman' (*Chā.* IV. x. 5); so taught the Fires to Upakosala Kāmalāyana about Brahman, and the same Brahman is further elucidated by his Teacher as the person in the eye, where the abode in the eye is prescribed for the purpose of meditation as also some qualities for the same purpose.

An objection is raised here that between the *Chāndogya* text IV. x. 5 and IV. xv. 1 the Fires taught Upakosala meditation on themselves, which yields certain results like long life. Therefore this instruction cannot be said to be a part of the teaching on Brahman. So, on account of the break in the continuity of the subject, the person in the eye cannot reasonably be connected with Brahman in the text at the beginning. This objection is not tenable as the word 'Brahman' occurs in both the *Chāndogya* texts, IV. x. 5 and IV. xv. 1. So the intervening topic, viz. the knowledge of the Fires, is subordinate to the same subject matter, viz. Brahman, particularly as the Fires also say, 'The Teacher shall tell you the way,' which shows that the instruction in the knowledge of Brahman is not complete without the instruction in the knowledge of the way. Moreover, Upakosala is a fit aspirant after knowledge, for he is disgusted with the world and desires freedom from all bondage. So the final words of the Fires, 'Upakosala, this, friend, is our knowledge and the knowledge of the Self; but the Teacher will declare to you the way' (*Chā.* IV. xiv. 1) shows clearly that the knowledge of the Fires is subordinate to the knowledge of the Self which leads to liberation. Therefore the other results

enumerated of this knowledge of the Fires are only by way of praise (*arthavāda*). Thus, the knowledge of the Fires being a member of the knowledge of Brahman, there is no reason why the Brahman referred to in the *Chā.* text IV. x. 5 cannot be connected with Brahman in IV. xv. 1, the object of which is only to mention an abode for meditation on Brahman and certain qualities of Brahman to be included in this meditation. Therefore the person in the eye in *Chā* IV. xv. 1 refers to Brahman mentioned earlier in IV. x. 5.

अथ एव च स ब्रह्म ॥ १६ ॥

#### 16. Therefore verily is that (ether) Brahman.

An objection is raised here : In the text, 'Bliss is Brahman, the ether is Brahman', how can one be sure that it refers to Brahman, on the basis of which you can say that the person in the eye is Brahman? It looks more like a *Pratīka Upāsana*, or meditation on a symbol as Brahman, as for example, in 'Name is Brahman, Mind is Brahman' etc. This objection the *Sūtra* refutes by saying that the *Chā.* text further says, 'What is bliss is ether, and what is ether is bliss.' Though worldly pleasure is ephemeral and the element ether is insentient, yet these two words *Ka* and *Kha* determine each other and give one idea, viz. infinite bliss, which is true only of Brahman. Therefore the supreme Self alone is taught in that text, and consequently the 'person in the eye' also is Brahman.

श्रुतोपनिषत्कृत्यभिधानाच्च ॥ १७ ॥

#### 17. Also on account of the statement of the way (after death) of those who have known the Truth of the

**Upaniṣads (i.e. knowers of Brahman) (with reference to the knower of the person in the eye).**

In the *Chā.* text IV. xv. 5 it is said that the knower of the person in the eye goes by the *Devayāna*. 'Now (if one who knows thus dies) . . . he goes by light, from light to day' etc. It is well known from other scriptural texts, like *Praśna* I. 10, that only the knowers of Brahman go by this path after death. Therefore the person in the eye here must be Brahman only.

अनवस्थितेरसम्भवाच्च नेतरः ॥ १८ ॥

**18. (The person in the eye is the supreme Self) and not any other (i.e. reflection in the eye etc.) as these do not exist always; and on account of the impossibility (of the qualities of the person in the eye being attributed to any of these).**

As the reflection in the eye, etc. do not exist always, or as a rule in the eye, and also because qualities like immortality, etc. cannot be appropriately attributed to them, none of these besides Brahman can be this person in the eye. The reflection in the eye is there so long as the eye is near to the person reflected. The individual soul which directs all the senses can have its seat only in the heart from where all the organs can be directed. The presiding deity, as the text says, 'rests with the rays on the person inside the eye' (*Br.* V. v. 2), and so need not necessarily reside in the eye. Moreover, qualities like immortality etc. cannot be predicated of them. So the person in the eye is Brahman only.

**Topic 4 : The Ruler within is Brahman**

In the last topic it was taken for granted that the

'internal Ruler' in *Br.* III. vii. 18 is Brahman and on that basis it was established that the person in the eye in *Chā.* IV. xv. 1 is Brahman. Now this section proves that the internal Ruler is Brahman.

अन्तर्यामी, अधिदेवाधिलोकादिषु तद्धर्मव्यपदेशात् ॥ १९ ॥

**19. The Ruler within of the gods, the worlds and so on (is Brahman) on account of the qualities of that (Brahman) being mentioned.**

Both the Kāṇva and Mādhyandina recensions of the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* read as follows : 'He who inhabits the earth but is within it, whom the earth does not know, whose body is the earth and who controls the earth from within, he is your self, the internal Ruler, the immortal' (III. vii. 3). The text further says of the existence of this Ruler within water, fire, the sky, air, heaven, the sun, quarters, the moon and the stars, ether, darkness, light, all beings, all the senses, the mind, the intellect etc. concluding each section by saying : 'He is your self, the internal Ruler, the immortal.' The Mādhyandina text mentions, in addition, all the worlds, the Vedas and the sacrifices ; and instead of the reading 'he who dwells in knowledge' they have, 'he who dwells in the self.' As the Mādhyandinas have these three extra sections, the word 'world' in the *Sūtra* is meant to include both the recensions. The internal Ruler spoken of here is Brahman and not the individual soul, for the characteristics of Brahman are mentioned. Being one, and ruler of everything,—all the worlds, beings, gods etc.—is a characteristic of Brahman. In answer to Uddālaka's question, 'Now describe the internal Ruler' (*Br.* III. vii. 2) Yājñavalkya delineates the internal Ruler beginning with the

text, 'He who inhabits the earth but is within it' etc. This quality of entering everything, the worlds, beings, gods, the Vedas, the sacrifices etc. controlling them from within, having everything for Its body, and being Self of everything can be true only of Brahman who is all-knowing and whose all desires are fulfilled, and not of any other. Scriptural texts like : 'He wished, may I be many, may I grow forth. Having sent forth, he entered into it. Having entered into it he became *sat* and *tyat*' (*Tai.* II. 6) established that the qualities of ruling everything and being the Self of everything belong to Brahman alone. *Subāla Upaniṣad* which begins with, 'There was nothing at the beginning' and ends by saying, 'the inner Self of everything, free from all imperfections is the one god, Nārāyaṇa', shows that Brahman rules all, is the Self of all, and has for Its body everything. Moreover, the quality of immortality is true only of Brahman. Nor does Its 'seeing' etc. depend on the senses as in the case of the individual soul but results from Its very nature, Its omniscience etc. 'He sees without eyes, hears without ears' etc. (*Śve.* III. 19) 'Whom the earth does not know,' 'whom the self does not know' show that He rules from within without their knowing It, and as is confirmed by 'unseen but seeing' etc. (*Br.* III. vii. 23). And the following text, 'There is no seer but He' denies any seer of the internal Ruler referred to in the text. The expression, 'He is your self' also distinguishes the individual soul from the internal Ruler who is its Self.

Therefore the internal Ruler is the supreme Self.

न च स्मार्तम्, अतद्धर्माभिलापात्, शरीरश्च ॥ २० ॥

20. And neither is (the Ruler within) that which is talked of in (Sāṃkhya) *Smṛti* (i.e. the Pradhāna), because

attributes contrary to its nature are mentioned (here); nor is it the individual soul (for the same reason).

That which is talked of in the *Smṛti*, i.e. the Pradhāna, or the individual soul is not the Ruler within, for qualities contrary to their nature, i.e. qualities impossible to be attributed to them, are mentioned in the texts under discussion. Qualities like being the seer of everything, ruler of everything, being the Self of everything, and immortality, by their very nature, can never be true of the Pradhāna or the individual soul.

उभयेऽपि हि भेदेनैनमधीयते ॥ २१ ॥

21. For both (the recensions) read this (i.e. the individual soul) as different (from the internal Ruler).

Again both the Mādhyandina and Kāṇva recensions which read, 'He who dwells in the self' and 'He who dwells in knowledge' respectively, show that the individual self on account of its being ruled by supreme Self is different from It. Therefore it is established that the inner Ruler who is different from the individual soul and free from all imperfections is the supreme Self, Nārāyaṇa.

Topic 5 : That which cannot be seen is Brahman

अदृश्यत्वादिगुणको धर्मोक्तेः ॥ २२ ॥

22. The possessor of qualities like invisibility etc. (is Brahman) on account of (Its) characteristics being mentioned.

In the *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* we have the following texts : 'The higher knowledge is that by which the Imperishable is known' (I. i. 5); 'That which cannot be seen or seized, which is without origin or qualities, eternal, all-pervading,

omnipresent, extremely subtle, Imperishable ; that which the wise behold as the source of all beings' (I. i. 6); 'Higher than the high, Imperishable' (II. i. 2). The question is whether in these texts the Imperishable which cannot be seen and the one which is higher than the high Imperishable refer to Pradhāna and the individual soul respectively of the Sāṃkhyas or whether both refer to Brahman.

The view held by the opponent is : In the text discussed in the last topic, qualities like 'seeing', 'hearing' which are contrary to the nature of the insentient Pradhāna were present, and so the Ruler within was interpreted to be the supreme Self. In the *Muṇḍaka* texts cited we do not find any such qualities stated which would exclude the Pradhāna, and in *Mu.* II. i. 2 the reference is clearly to the individual which is higher than the Pradhāna. So the texts refer to the individual soul and the Pradhāna, and not to the supreme Soul.

The *Sūtra* refutes this view and says that it is the supreme Self that is referred to by both the texts, for qualities like, 'He is all-knowing, all-pervading' etc. (*Mu.* I. i. 9) are predicated of It, and these qualities are not applicable to the Pradhāna or the individual soul.

*Mu.* I. i. 5-6 declare that there is an Imperishable something possessing the qualities of invisibility etc. from which all this is born, 'the source of all beings'. Further in *Mu.* I. i. 9 the Śruti says that this Imperishable which is the source of all beings is 'all-knowing, all-perceiving'. For all these reasons it is clear that the supreme Self is referred to in these texts, and not the other two.

विशेषणभेदव्यपदेशाभ्यां च नेतरौ ॥ २३ ॥

23. The other two (viz the individual soul and the

Pradhāna) are not (referred to in the passage), because the characteristics of Brahman and the difference (of the Being which is the source of all beings from these two) are mentioned.

The Pradhāna is not referred to in the text, because the Śruti wants to prove in this section the proposition that 'by the knowledge of One everything is known.' This is not true in the case of Pradhāna, for the individual souls are not its products and so the knowledge of the Pradhāna will not give a knowledge of the individual soul. This 'One' is also distinguished from the individual soul by the text, 'Higher than the high Imperishable', where It is stated to be higher than the soul which is higher than the insentient Pradhāna, thus distinguishing It from the individual soul also.

रूपोपन्यासाच्च ॥ २४ ॥

24. And because (its) form is mentioned (the passage under discussion refers to Brahman).

'Fire is its head, its eyes the sun and the moon, the quarters its ears' etc. (*Mu.* II. i. 4) Thus it is said to have the three worlds for Its body. Hence that which is the source of all beings is none other than the supreme Self.

Topic 6 : Vaiśvānara is Brahman

In the last topic it was shown that the Akṣara in *Mu.* II. i. 2 is Brahman as it has the three worlds for its body. vide *Mu.* II. i. 4. In order to remove the doubt that other things besides Brahman may have the three worlds for Its body this section is begun.

वैश्वानरः साधारणशब्दविशेषात् ॥ २५ ॥

**25. Vaiśvānara (is Brahman) because of the qualifying adjuncts to the common word (Vaiśvānara).**

In the *Chāndogya* we find that five Ṛṣis came together and discussed, 'What is our Self, and what is Brahman?' (*Chā. V. xi. 1*). Being unable to come to any conclusion they approached Uddālaka Āruṇi who, they thought, knew about 'the Self called Vaiśvānara'. Uddālaka also was not quite conversant about this Vaiśvānara Self and so they all went to King Aśvapati Kaikeya who knew about this 'Vaiśvānara Self'. They approached him and said, 'You know at present that Vaiśvānara Self, tell us that' (*Chā. V. xi. 6*). Further on it is said, 'But he who worships this Vaiśvānara Self extending from heaven to the earth as identical with his own self, eats food in all worlds, in all beings, in all selves' (*Chā. V. xviii. 1*). Now what is this Vaiśvānara Self? Vaiśvānara generally means the gastric fire, ordinary fire, and the presiding deity of fire, Agni. Sometimes in the Scriptures it refers to the supreme Brahman also. 'Thus he rises as the Vaiśvānara' etc. (*Pra. I. 7*). In what sense is it used in the *Chāndogya* text? Normally one of these ordinary meanings of the word should be taken. But the *Sūtra* refutes this view and says that here Vaiśvānara is used to denote Brahman on account of the qualifying adjuncts to the word Vaiśvānara which can be true of Brahman alone.

The Ṛṣis were desirous of knowing that Brahman which is the Self of all the individual souls—'What is our Self, and what is Brahman?' With this object in view they went to the king and so the Vaiśvānara Self about which they questioned can only be the supreme Brahman. Moreover, the

words used in the earlier texts of the *Chāndogya* are 'Self' and 'Brahman' and in the later texts, 'Self' and 'Vaiśvānara', which also shows that Vaiśvānara denotes Brahman only. The result attained by the worship of the Vaiśvānara Self can be true only if the supreme Brahman is meant. The text says, 'He eats food in all worlds, in all beings, in all selves.' Here the eating of food, does not mean material food, but intuition of the ever-blissful Brahman which exists in all these worlds, beings, etc. 'Food means that which is eaten, i.e. experienced. *vide Tai. II. 7*. Again in *Chā. V. xxiv. 3* we find, 'As the soft fibres of the Iṣikā reed, when thrown into fire, are burnt, thus all his sins are burnt,' which shows that the result of the worship of the Vaiśvānara is freedom from all sins. Moreover, the Vaiśvānara is said to have the three worlds for its body. Due to all these qualities, viz being the Self of all, being the object of meditation for the realization of Brahman, the object of worship which results in the freedom from all sins, and having the three worlds for Its body, the Vaiśvānara Self denotes Brahman alone.

स्मर्यमाणमनुमानं स्यादिति ॥ २६ ॥

**26. (That form of the Lord described in other texts and) remembered (in the descriptions given in the Chandog text) is thus an indicatory mark (showing that the supreme Self is referred to in Chandog text also.)**

The *Chā. text. V. xviii. 2* describes the Vaiśvānara Self thus, 'Of the Vaiśvānara Self the heaven is the head, the sun the eye' etc. wherein one recognizes the Brahman described in other Śruti and Smṛti texts in similar terms. *vide Mu. II. i. 4*. Such a form as is described can belong to the



supreme Brahman only and so the Vaiśvānara Self is Brahman and not anything else.

शब्दादिभ्योऽन्तःप्रतिष्ठानाच्च नेतिचेत्, न,  
तथादृष्ट्युपदेशात्, असंभवात्, पुरुषमपि चैनमधीयते ॥ २७ ॥

27. If it be said that (Vaiśvānara) is not (Brahman) because of the word (Vaiśvānara which has a definite meaning, viz the gastric fire) and other reasons, and on account of its abiding inside (which is true of gastric fire), (we say) not so, because there is the instruction to conceive (Brahman) as such (as the gastric fire), because it is impossible (for the gastric fire to have the form described) and also because (Vājasaneyins) describe him (Vaiśvānara) as a person (which the gastric fire is not).

*Objection* : Vaiśvānara cannot be definitely said to be Brahman because in Scriptural texts we find that it is used to denote fire as for example in, 'This one is in the fire (Agni) Vaiśvānara.' Again as the Vaiśvānara is said to abide within, it may also refer to the gastric fire which abides inside a person, 'He who knows this Agni Vaiśvānara... abiding within man' etc. (Śa. X. vi. 1-11). In the text, 'the heart is the Gārhapatya fire' etc. (Chā. V. xviii. 2), Vaiśvānara abiding in the heart etc. is represented as the three fires. Further the text says, 'The first food which a man takes is an object of libation. And he who offers that first oblation should offer it to Prāṇa saying Svāhā' (Chā. V. x. 1), where Vaiśvānara is the abode of the offering to Prāṇa. For all these reasons given above Vaiśvānara means fire and not Brahman.

This the *Sūtra* refutes firstly because the Scripture here teaches the worship of Brahman having the gastric fire for

its body. So the word 'fire' denotes not only the gastric fire but also Brahman in so far as qualified by the gastric fire. Secondly, the gastric fire cannot have the three worlds for its body as described in the text, as it is impossible. Lastly, the Vājasaneyins describe the Vaiśvānara as a person. 'This Agni (fire) Vaiśvānara is a person' (Śa. X. vi. i.2) and this Person (Puruṣa) is the supreme Brahman, for unconditioned personality belongs to Brahman alone. 'All this is the Person (Puruṣa)' (Śve. I. iii. 15); 'there is nothing higher than the Person' (Ka. III. 2). Gastric fire cannot be a person.

अत एव न देवता भूतञ्च ॥ २८ ॥

28. For the same reason (Vaiśvānara) is not the deity (fire) or the element (fire).

For the same reason, viz having the three worlds for its body and an unconditioned personality, neither the deity fire, nor the element fire, is referred to in the text under discussion, as these qualities are impossible in their case.

साक्षादप्यविरोधं जैमिनिः ॥ २९ ॥

29. Even (if the word Agni is taken) as directly (meaning Brahman) there is no contradiction : (so says) Jaimini.

Till now Agni co-ordinated with Vaiśvānara was said to represent Brahman in so far as It has the gastric fire for Its body. Therefore, it was held that the text enjoins meditation on Brahman. Jaimini, however, thinks that these two terms can be taken to refer to Brahman directly without any contradiction. Even as the word 'Vaiśvānara' can directly



refer to Brahman as possessing the quality of ruling all men in the world, so also the word 'fire' can directly refer to Brahman as meaning the foremost of all beings.

अभिव्यक्तेरित्याश्मरथ्यः ॥ ३० ॥

30. On account of manifestation—(so says) Āśmarathya.

'But he who worships this Vaiśvānara Self extending from heaven to the earth' etc. (*Chā. V. xviii. 1*). In this text the all-pervading Brahman is described as being limited by heaven, etc. Āśmarathya thinks that as the Lord manifests Himself like that to His devotees He is described thus.

अनुस्मृतेर्बादरिः ॥ ३१ ॥

31. For the sake of constant remembrance—(so says) Bādari.

Why should the Lord be regarded as a person having limbs like the head etc.? *vide Chā. V. xviii. 2*. Bādari thinks that the Lord is so imagined in human form for the sake of *Upāsana* (meditation). 'He who *in this way* meditates' (*Chā. V. xviii. 1*) enjoins devout meditation for the purpose of realizing Brahman. 'In this way' in the text means, 'as having a human form'. The eating of food means intuitional knowledge of Brahman who abides everywhere and is of the nature of supreme bliss. Enjoyment of worldly objects is not meant here, for that would obstruct final release.

A further doubt arises : The text says that the altar is its chest and the Kuśa grass on the altar its hairs etc. which shows that the gastric fire is meant.

सम्पत्तेरिति जैमिनिः, तथा हि दर्शयति ॥ ३२ ॥

32. Because of imaginary identification (with Agnihotra, so says) Jaimini; for so (the Śruti) declares.

'The chest the altar, the hairs the (Kuśa) grass on the altar, the heart the Gārhapatya fire' etc. (*Chā. V. xviii. 2*). This altar etc. is said to be the chest etc. of the Vaiśvānara in order to identify the offering to Prāṇa which is performed by the Upāsakas (worshippers) with the Agnihotra sacrifice: so says Jaimini. The text, 'But he who offers this Agnihotra with the full knowledge of its purport, he offers it in all worlds, in all beings, in all selves. As the fibres of the Isikā reed, when thrown into the fire, are burnt, thus all his sins are burnt' (*Chā. V. xxiv. 1-3*), also declares the same identification of the offering to Prāṇa with the Agnihotra.

आमनन्ति चैनमस्मिन् ॥ ३३ ॥

33. Moreover, they (the Vājasaneyins) teach him (viz the Vaiśvānara) as within that (viz the body of the Upāsaka).

In the text, 'Of this Vaiśvānara Self' etc. (*Chā. V. xviii. 2*), the supreme Self Vaiśvānara having the three worlds for Its body is taught as present in the body of the worshipper for the sake of worship by the Prāṇa-Agnihotra. That is, at the time of performing the Prāṇa-Agnihotra sacrifice, the various limbs from head to foot of the worshipper should be identified with heaven etc. which are the head etc. of the supreme Self.

The final conclusion, therefore, is that the Vaiśvānara Self is no other than the supreme Brahman.

## CHAPTER I

### SECTION III

*Topic 1 : The resting place of heaven, earth, etc.  
is Brahman*

द्युभ्वाद्यायतनं स्व-शब्दात् ॥ १ ॥

1. The resting place of heaven, earth, etc. (is Brahman) on account of the word 'Self' (or on account of the actual words of the Śruti) (designating this resting place).

'In Him heaven, the earth, and the sky are woven, as also the mind with all the senses. Know that Self alone and leave off other talk! He is the bridge of Immortality' (*Mu. II. ii. 5*).

Who is this abode in whom heaven, the earth, etc. are woven? Is it Brahman or the individual self? The opponent holds that it is the individual self because the being is described as the abode of the mind and the senses. Again in the next verse it is said, 'Where all the arteries meet like spokes fastened to the nave of a wheel,—there within the heart He moves, becoming manifold' (*Mu. II. ii. 6*). In this text that being is said to be the basis of the arteries, and the words 'becoming manifold' describes the being to be born in many ways as god, man, etc. All these are characteristics of the individual self and so the text refers to it and we have to interpret *Mu. II. ii. 5* consistent with this. It may be said that in *B.S. I. ii. 21* (topic 6) it has been shown that the *Mu. I. i. 6* refers to Brahman and so here

1.3.2. ]

Śrī-Bhāṣya

149

also it ought to refer to Brahman as It is the subject-matter of the discussion in the *Muṇḍaka* texts. This argument is untenable as the characteristics of the individual self are clearly mentioned, as against which other arguments cannot prevail.

This view the *Sūtra* refutes because of the words, 'He is the bridge of Immortality' which is true of Brahman alone. Nothing else can be the bridge or means to immortality for He alone is described as the means to immortality in all Upaniṣadic texts. 'Knowing Him alone one passes beyond death. There is no other way out from this circle of births and deaths' (*Śve. III. 8*). Again the word 'Self' unqualified by any term always represents Brahman and in *Mu. II. ii. 7* we have terms like 'all-knowing', 'all-cognizing', etc. which are qualities of Brahman only. Brahman may also be described as the abode of arteries. *vide Mahānārāyaṇa Upaniṣad XIII. viii. 12*. He can also be said to be born in many ways; 'Not born, He is born in many ways; the wise know the place of His birth' (*Puruṣa Sūkta 21*), where the text says that the supreme Self without giving up His nature takes the shape, make, qualities and works of different classes of beings like gods, men, etc. in order to become their abode. He being the abode of everything ultimately, He is also the abode of the mind, the senses, etc.

मुक्तोपसृज्यव्यपदेशाच्च ॥ २ ॥

2. Also because of the statement (in the Scripture) that that is to be attained by the liberated.

A further reason is given to show that Brahman is referred to in the passage under discussion. This abode of heaven, the earth, etc. is the goal of the liberated. 'When

the seer realizes the self-effulgent Being...then the wise one, shaking off merit and demerit, becomes stainless and attains supreme unity' (*Mu.* III. i. 3). 'As the flowing rivers disappear in the ocean losing name and form, thus a wise man freed from name and form, goes to the supreme Person who is greater than the great' (*Mu.* III. ii. 8). Therefore It can be Brahman alone.

नानुमानम्, अतच्छब्दात्, प्राणभृच्च ॥ ३ ॥

3. (The abode of heaven etc.) is not what is inferred (i.e. Pradhāna) owing to want of any term indicating it, (nor) also the individual self.

Pradhāna is not the subject-matter of this section in the *Mundaka* as there are no terms indicating it. Nor is it the individual self for the same reason.

भेदव्यपदेशात् ॥ ४ ॥

4. On account of difference being mentioned (between the individual self and the abode of heaven etc.).

'The individual self abiding on the same tree, viz the body, being bewildered by Prakṛti (Nature) is immersed in grief; but when it sees the other one, the Lord, contented, and His glory, then his grief passes away' (*Mu.* III. i. 2). In texts like this, the abode of heaven etc. is described as different from the individual self. Being bewildered by Prakṛti, the object of enjoyment, the individual self grieves. But when it sees the greatness of the one different from it, viz the Lord, who is the beloved, and His glory which consists in ruling everything, then it becomes free from grief.

प्रकरणात् ॥ ५ ॥

### 5. On account of the subject-matter.

As the supreme Self is the subject-matter of the section, the abode of heaven etc. cannot be anything else but Brahman. That the supreme Self is the subject-matter of the *Mundaka* texts under discussions has already been shown in *B.S.* I. ii. 21. The same subject-matter is continued in the subsequent texts of the *Mundaka* and there is no break in the continuity of the subject-matter. To show that, this topic is begun. The topic about Vaiśvānara was introduced in between as it also refers to Brahman since Vaiśvānara has the three worlds for Its body.

स्थित्यदनाभ्याम् च ॥ ६ ॥

6. Also on account of (the mention of two conditions) remaining unattached and eating (which are the characteristics of the supreme Self and the individual self respectively).

'Two birds, inseparable friends, cling to the same tree. One of them eats the sweet fruit, the other looks on without eating' (*Mu.* III. i. 1). Here one is described as enjoying the fruits of its actions and the other as residing in the body in Its own splendour without enjoying the fruits of Its actions. The latter, the omniscient, the bridge of Immortality, the Self of all, can alone be the abode of heaven etc. and not the individual self which is subject to Karma and grieves.

Topic 2 : The Bhūman is Brahman

In the fast topic the abode of heaven etc. was interpreted as referring to Brahman because of the continuity of the

topic whose subject-matter was Brahman. So the opponent following the same argument now says that the Bhūman in *Chā.* VII. xxiii. and VIII. xxiv, is the individual self and not Brahman, inasmuch as the individual self is taught in *Chā.* I. i-xv. To remove this doubt this topic is begun.

भूमा सम्प्रसादादध्युपदेशात् ॥ ७ ॥

**7. The Bhūman (is Brahman) because the instruction about It is in addition to that about the individual self.**

In the seventh chapter of the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* Nārada approaches Sanatkumāra and says, 'I have heard from persons like your revered self that a knower of the Ātman goes beyond grief. I am in a state of grief. May your revered self take me across it' (*Chā.* VII. i. 3). Sanatkumāra teaches Nārada several truths. He begins with Name and goes higher and higher till he reaches Prāṇa. After Sanatkumāra finishes teaching each truth from Name upwards, Nārada every time asks him, 'Is there anything higher than this?'—to which Sanatkumāra answers, 'Yes, there is', and takes up the next higher truth. But after being taught about Prāṇa, Nārada does not ask whether there is anything higher than Prāṇa, nor is anything taught by Sanatkumāra, which shows that the instruction about the individual self ends with Prāṇa which is therefore the individual self. As no further truth is taught, we have to conclude that there is no break in the subject-matter and that what is taught in the subsequent Sections of the *Chāndogya* till the mention of Bhūman in Section xv, refers only to the individual self. That Prāṇa here means the individual self is known from the fact that unlike mere breath it is referred to as an intelligent principle in *Chā.* VII. xv. 2-3 where it is described

as capable of saying harsh things to others and therefore deserving of condemnation for such conduct. The final conclusion of the teaching therefore is that the true nature of the individual self bereft of all ignorance is abundant bliss on account of which the knower of the individual self goes beyond grief. Therefore Bhūman refers to the individual self and not Brahman.

This view the *Sūtra* refutes. The knower of Prāṇa, the individual self, is called in the texts an Ativādin or one who makes a statement surpassing previous statements, as the object of his worship is superior to other such objects mentioned earlier in the texts. *vide Chā.* VII. xv. 15. In the next Section, however, the texts says, 'But he really is an Ativādin who is such through the realization of the Truth.' Thereby this latter Ativādin is distinguished from the earlier one and is said to be really an Ativādin evidently as the Truth which is his object of worship is superior and different from the individual self which was the object of worship of the earlier one. Now it is well known that the Truth is Brahman. 'Truth, Knowledge and Infinity is Brahman' (*Tai.* II. 1). Nārada then says in *Chā.* VII. xvi. 1 that he desires to understand the Truth and become an Ativādin of the latter class. Thus Brahman which is called here the Truth is introduced as a fresh topic. After saying, 'But one must desire to understand the Truth', the texts says that Brahman should be known as bliss. 'But one must desire to understand bliss' (*Chā.* VII. xxii. 22). Subsequently it is said, 'The infinite alone is bliss. But one must desire to understand the infinite.' (*Chā.* VII. xxiii. 1), whereby the Truth is said to be infinite bliss. As the text applies Bhūman to this Truth which is different from the Prāṇa or individual self, as already explained above,

the Bhūman is nothing but Brahman. Moreover, as the Truth is said to be infinite bliss, we recognize in these texts the Brahman described as bliss in *Tai.* II. 7. Therefore, as there is a break from the topic dealing with the individual self, the word Bhūman, occurring in the later Sections, viz *Chā.* VII. xxiii. and xxiv. 1, dealing with Brahman, cannot refer to the individual self but to Brahman alone.

धर्मोपपत्तेश्च ॥ ८ ॥

8. And because the qualities (mentioned in the texts) are appropriate (only in the case of Brahman).

The qualities referred to are : Immortality, resting on its own greatness, being the Self of all and being the cause of everything. These qualities attributed to Bhūman hold good only in the case of Brahman and not in the case of the individual self. Therefore the Bhūman is Brahman.

Topic 3 : Akṣara is Brahman

In the last topic it was shown that on account of the Bhūman resting in its own glory it is Brahman. It may be said that beings other than Brahman are also seen to rest in their own glory. To remove such a doubt this topic is begun.

अक्षरमम्बरान्तधृतेः ॥ ९ ॥

9. The Akṣara (the Imperishable) (is Brahman) because it supports that which is beyond Ākāśa.

In the dialouge between Gārgī and Yājñavalkya in *Bṛ.* we have 'O Gārgī, the Brāhmaṇas describe It as the Imper-

ishable (Akṣara). It is neither coarse nor fine, neither short nor long' etc (*Bṛ.* III. viii. 8). Here the question is whether Akṣara means the Pradhāna, or the individual self, or Brahman, as the characteristics more or less of all the three are seen. The opponent holds that it is either the Pradhāna or the individual self and not Brahman. It is the Pradhāna, because Scriptures also refer to Pradhāna as Akṣara. 'He transcends even the unmanifest causal state of the world' (*Mu.* II. i. 2). Moreover, the text says, 'This very Imperishable, O Gārgī, pervades the ether (Ākāśa)' (*Bṛ.* III. viii. 11). This is true of the Pradhāna which is the cause of Ākāśa. The qualities neither coarse nor fine etc. are also characteristics of the Pradhāna. Therefore Akṣara is the Pradhāna.

It may be said that it cannot be the Pradhāna but the individual self for the text says, 'It is neither redness nor darkness,' which shows that it is not the Pradhāna consisting of the three guṇas. Therefore it is the individual self which is bereft of Rajas and Tamas and it is also designated as the Akṣara in texts like, 'All beings are perishable and the unchanging self is called the Imperishable' (*Gītā*, XV. 16). Again in texts like, 'The unmanifest is merged in the Akṣara' the individual self is said to be the support of Prakṛti. Therefore it can be said that the Akṣara pervades the Ākāśa, a product of Prakṛti.

These *prima facie* views are refuted by this *Sūtra*. The Ākāśa which is said to be the support of everything of the past, present and future is the unmanifest Pradhāna and not mere ether. The question is asked, 'In what is this Ākāśa woven like warp and woof?' and the answer given is 'In that Akṣara'. So the Akṣara cannot be the Pradhāna for Pradhāna cannot be its own support. Though the individual

self also can be said to be the support of the Pradhāna yet it is not referred to here for the following reason :

सा च प्रशासनात् ॥ १० ॥

**10. Because of the command this supporting (springs).**

This supporting of the cause of ether etc. results from the command which is inviolable. 'Under the mighty rule of this very Imperishable, O Gārgī, the sun and the moon are held in their own courses' (*Br.* III. viii. 9). This kind of command, which cannot be transgressed, cannot be true of the individual self. Therefore the Akṣara is not the individual self but Brahman.

अन्यभावव्यावृत्तेश्च ॥ ११ ॥

**11. And because of the negation of a different nature (from that of Brahman) (in the Akṣara).**

Another nature like that of the Pradhāna or the individual self is negated in Akṣara. The text, 'Verily this Imperishable, O Gārgī, is never seen, but is the seer' etc. (*Br.* III. viii. 11) excludes both these. The insentient Pradhāna is excluded because the text says that the Akṣara is an intelligent principle inasmuch as it is a seer, hearer etc. The individual self is excluded as the Akṣara is all-seeing but never seen etc. Therefore this exclusion in Akṣara, of what has a nature other than that of Brahman, confirms the view that It is Brahman

*Topic 4 : The supreme Person to be meditated upon is the supreme Brahman*

In the last topic it was shown that Brahman is not an

object of sight : 'Verily this Imperishable, O Gārgī, is never seen, but is the seer' etc. (*Br.* III. viii. 11). Therefore the Person who is described as the object of the act of seeing in *Pra.* V. 5 cannot be the supreme Brahman. To remove such a doubt this topic is begun.

ईक्षतिकर्म व्यपदेशात् सः ॥ १२ ॥

**12. Because of his being mentioned as an object of (the act of) seeing, he (the supreme Brahman, is that object).**

'He again who meditates upon the supreme Person with the syllable Om consisting of three Mātrās, he comes to the light and to the sun. He is freed from all sins, even as a snake is freed from its slough. He is taken up to the world of Brahmā (Brahmaloka) by the Sāman hymns ; He *sees* the Person dwelling in the heart who is supreme, higher than the individual souls' (*Pra.* V. 5). The question here is whether the object of *meditation* and *seeing* is Hiranyagarbha (Brahmā), the presiding deity of Brahmaloka, or the supreme Brahman. The opponent holds it is Hiranyagarbha. In the preceding verse it has been stated that he who meditates upon one Mātrā, returns to the world of men where he enjoys ; that he who meditates on two Mātrās attains the world of the moon in the heavens. After that the text says, 'He, again, who meditates on the supreme Person with the syllable Om consisting of three Mātrās' etc. The Brahmaloka mentioned in the text can be only the world of Hiranyagarbha as that is situated above the world of heavens. So the Person seen as a result of this meditation on the three Mātrās and who is said to be in the Brahma-loka can be only Hiranyagarbha (Brahmā), its presiding deity.

This view the *Sūtra* refutes and says that the supreme Person is the supreme Brahman. For in the text we find that one bereft of all sins sees the supreme Person. The place reached by such a person cannot be merely the world of Hiranyagarbha, and so the object of *seeing* cannot be this Hiranyagarbha. With respect to this Person the text says later, 'By the Sāmāns is attained that which is known only to the wise. What is peaceful, immortal, free from all fear and supreme, the sage also attains by means of this Om' later, 'By the Sāmāns is attained that which is known only to the wise', one recognizes the world of Viṣṇu, the supreme Brahman, mentioned in the text, 'The wise behold always that supreme abode of Viṣṇu' (*Su.* 6). The qualities mentioned in the text, viz peaceful, immortal etc. are apt only in the case of the supreme Brahman and not in the case of Hiranyagarbha. Moreover, in *Pra.* V. 5 we have, 'He sees the supreme Person', in which one recognizes the supreme Person mentioned in, 'So the wise man, freed from name and form, goes to the supreme Person' (*Mu.* III. ii. 8). That this *Muṇḍaka* text refers to the supreme Brahman has been shown while discussing *B.S.* I. ii. 22. So the object of seeing is the supreme Brahman and none else, as its qualities are mentioned.

#### Topic 5 : The small Ākāśa is Brahman

In the last topic it was shown that the Person in the heart (*Pra.* V. 5) is Brahman. But as this Person in the heart is designated by the word Ākāśa (*Chā.* VIII. i. 1) which commonly denotes the material ether, a doubt may arise about the Person in the heart being the supreme Brahman. To remove this doubt this topic is begun.

दहर उत्तरेभ्यः ॥ १३ ॥

**13. The small (Ākāśa) (is Brahman) because of the subsequent texts (which mention the qualities of Brahman).**

Now there is in this city of Brahman (the body) a small lotus-like palace (the heart), and in it is a small Ākāśa. What exists within that small Ākāśa is to be sought, that is to be understood' (*Chā.* VIII. i. 1). Now the question is : What is this small Ākāśa ? Is it the material ether which is the ordinary meaning of the word Ākāśa, or is it the individual soul or Brahman ? The opponent holds that as the ordinary meaning of the word Ākāśa is material ether, and as it is also designated as small, it can only be either the ether or the individual soul and not Brahman. The *Sūtra* refutes this view and says that the small Ākāśa is Brahman, as the texts later on say that it is the support of the whole world (*Chā.* VIII. i. 3) and free from all sins, old age, death etc. and that its desires are all fulfilled and resolves turn out true (*Chā.* VIII. i. 5).

A further objection is raised that as the text says that what is within this small Ākāśa is to be sought, the small Ākāśa is only the abode of something else which is the object that is desired, and that the small Ākāśa is not itself this object. This objection cannot stand for the following reasons : The small Ākāśa is said to be the real city of Brahman, the Self in *Chā.* VIII. i. 5, and the rest, the desires contained in it, are its qualities. So *Chā.* VIII. i. 1 should be understood as saying that the small Ākāśa together with the desires contained in it, i.e. the qualities that abide in it, should be sought. This is made all the more clear by *Chā.* VIII. i. 6 where it is said, 'But those who depart from here, having understood the Self and these true



desires (i.e. the qualities mentioned in *Chā.* VIII. i. 5), for them there is freedom to act as they wish in all the worlds' and not those who depart without the knowledge of these two, viz *Ākāśa* and its qualities.

गतिशब्दाभ्यां, तथा हि दृष्टं, लिङ्गं च ॥ १४ ॥

14. (The small *Ākāśa* is Brahman) on account of the going (into Brahman) and of the word (Brahmaloka); (the individual soul's going into Brahman) is likewise seen (from other Śruti texts); and (there is) an indicative sign.

'Thus do all creatures day after day go into *this* Brahmaloka' etc. (*Chā.* VIII. iii. 2). The word *this* in the text connects the place where these creatures go into day by day with the subject-matter of the chapter, viz the small *Ākāśa*. Again the word *this* is co-ordinated with Brahmaloka, thereby showing that the small *Ākāśa* is the supreme Brahman. In other Śruti texts also we find that this going of the individual souls daily into Brahman in the state of deep sleep is mentioned. 'All these creatures having become united with the Real (*Sat*) do not know that they are united with the Real' (*Chā.* VI. ix. 2). The word Brahmaloka is also used to designate the supreme Brahman in other texts also. 'This is the world that is Brahman' (*Bṛ.* IV. iii. 32). Moreover, it is not necessary to get the support of other texts to show that the creatures go daily into Brahman. The text itself says that as at the time of Pralaya (dissolution) so also in deep sleep state the individual souls get merged in the small *Ākāśa* and are free from all sufferings. This is a sufficient indicative sign to show that the small *Ākāśa* is the supreme Brahman. Again the word 'Brahmaloka' which refers to the small *Ākāśa* establishes that the latter is the

supreme Brahman if we interpret 'Brahmaloka' as the world which is Brahman itself and not as the world of *Brahmā*. There is therefore no need of support from other scriptural texts.

धृतेश्च महिम्नोऽस्यास्मिन्नुपलब्धेः ॥ १५ ॥

15. Moreover, on account of the supporting (of the world by the small *Ākāśa*, it is Brahman) for this greatness is seen in that (i.e. Brahman) (only).

'That Self is a bank, a limiting support, so that the worlds may not get confounded' (*Chā.* VIII. iv. 1)—in this text we find, in the small *Ākāśa*, that greatness of the supreme Brahman by way of holding the worlds asunder. Therefore it is the supreme Brahman. That this greatness belongs to Brahman alone is seen from other Śruti texts. 'Under the mighty rule of that Imperishable, O Gārgī, the sun and the moon are held in their positions' (*Bṛ.* III. viii. 9); 'It is the demarcating bank for keeping these worlds distinct from one another' (*Bṛ.* IV. iv. 22).

प्रसिद्धेश्च ॥ १६ ॥

16. Also because of the well-known meaning (of *Ākāśa* as Brahman, the small *Ākāśa* is Brahman).

In scriptural texts the word '*Ākāśa*' is used to denote Brahman also. 'Who indeed, would breathe, who would remain alive, if this Bliss was not in the ether (*Ākāśa*)?' (*Tai.* II. 7). 'All these beings take their rise from *Ākāśa* (ether) alone' (*Chā.* I. ix. 1). As the qualities like being free from sin etc. are predicated of this (small) *Ākāśa*, its meaning as Brahman is stronger than the other meaning which signifies merely the material ether.

इतर परामर्शत् स इति चेत् , न, असम्भवात् ॥ १७ ॥

17. Because of the reference to the other (i.e. the individual soul in a complementary passage) if it be said that it (is meant by the small Ākāśa) (we say) no, on account of the impossibility (of such an assumption).

The other i.e. the individual soul. 'Now that being, the individual soul in deep sleep, which having risen above this earthly body' (*Chā.* VIII. iii. 4)—in this passage the individual soul is referred to and so the opponent holds that the small Ākāśa is this individual soul. This, however, cannot be, for the qualities mentioned in *Chā.* VIII. i. 5 are impossible in its case.

उत्तराच्चेत् , आविर्भूतस्वरूपस्तु ॥ १८ ॥

18. If (it be said) that from subsequent texts (which refer to the individual soul, the small Ākāśa means it) (we say) but (that reference to it is in so far as its) real nature is made manifest.

An objection is raised that in *Chā.* VIII. vii. 1 the individual soul is described as free from sin etc. and therefore it is quite possible to interpret small Ākāśa as referring to it. Moreover, as the three states, waking, sleeping, and deep sleep are predicated of it, the reference is only to the individual soul and not Brahman, as these three states do not apply in the case of Brahman. So the individual soul is the topic of the teaching and hence small Ākāśa means the individual soul and not the supreme Brahman.

The second half of this *Sūtra* refutes this and says that the reference to the individual soul as free from sin etc. is in so far as it has realized its real nature. In the state of

bondage (*Samsāra*) its real nature is hidden from it, due to Karma, and it suffers pain and pleasure. But when it frees itself from Karma and rises above the body, i.e. gets disembodied and approaches the supreme light i.e. Brahman, its real nature which is freedom from sin etc. is manifested. But the earlier sections deal with the small Ākāśa whose nature is never hidden and is always free from sin etc. Moreover, the texts ascribe other qualities to the small Ākāśa which are not true of the individual soul even in the state of release—qualities like being a bank or support of the worlds. The small Ākāśa, therefore, is none other than the supreme Brahman.

अन्यार्थश्च परामर्शः ॥ १९ ॥

19. And the reference (to the individual soul) is for a different purpose.

'Now that being, having risen out of this body and reaching the highest light, appears in its own true form' (*Chā.* VIII. iii. 4). Here the individual soul is brought in to show that by meditation on the small Ākāśa it attains its true nature, and not to show that it is the same Ākāśa.

अल्पश्रुतेरिति चेत् , तदुक्तम् ॥ २० ॥

20. If it be said that because the Śruti declares the limitedness (of this Ākāśa, it cannot be the supreme Brahman); (we say) that has already been explained.

The text declares that the Ākāśa within the heart is small; and so it can be only the limited individual soul that is referred to and not the supreme Brahman. This objection has already been answered in *B.S.* I. ii. 7 where it has been

shown that for the sake of meditation Brahman may be viewed as of small size.

Therefore it is clear from the foregoing *Sūtras* that the small Ākāśa is the supreme Brahman which is ever perfect and has an infinite number of exalted qualities. On the other hand the being taught by Prajāpati as being under bondage, and attaining its true nature later when it approaches the highest light, is the individual soul and not the small Ākāśa.

अनुकृतेस्तस्य च ॥ २१ ॥

21. And on account of the attaining of the likeness of that.

As the individual soul is said to attain the likeness of the supreme light, the small Ākāśa, by meditating on it, the individual soul cannot be this small Ākāśa.

The attainment of the likeness of the supreme Brahman by the individual soul in a state of freedom consists in its being free from sin etc. So the one which attains this likeness, (viz the individual soul) and the one whose likeness is attained (the small Ākāśa, the supreme Brahman) are different. This attainment of likeness by the individual soul is also taught in other scriptural texts. 'When the seer sees the self-effulgent Being—ruler, maker, and source of the creator (Brahmā)—then that wise one, shaking off merits and demerits, attains supreme likeness, being free from all passions' (*Mu.* III. i. 3).

अपि स्मर्यते ॥ २२ ॥

22. The Smṛti also states this (attainment of likeness by the individual soul).

Smṛti (*Gītā*) also says that the individual soul, by meditation on it, attains its likeness in attributes. *Vide Gītā*, XIV. 2.

Topic 6 : The Person of the size of a thumb is Brahman

In *Sūtra* 20 it was shown that the smallness of Brahman referred to in *Daharavidyā* is for the sake of meditation. But we find that in scriptural texts the individual self alone is referred to as of limited size. So why should it not be the individual self? To remove this doubt this topic is begun. An alternative connection is this : In the previous topic the smallness of Brahman was established for the sake of meditation. To establish again its size as the size of a thumb this topic is begun.

शब्दादेव प्रमितः ॥ २३ ॥

23. From the very word ('Lord' mentioned in the text) (the being) measured (by the size of a thumb is Brahman).

'The being of the size of a thumb resides in the middle of the self, as the Lord of the past and future'; (knowing vide II. iv. 13 and II. vi. 17 also. Who is this being of the size of a thumb? Is it Brahman or the individual self? The opponent holds that it is the latter, for it is referred to as of the size of a thumb in *Śve.* V. 8 where it is clear that the reference is to the individual self as it is said to have desires and egoism. Again, nowhere else is Brahman said to be of the size of a thumb even for the sake of *Upāsana* (devout meditation). The individual soul can also be said

to be the 'Lord' as the text says, for it is the ruler of the body, the sense-organs etc.

This the *Sūtra* refutes and says that the 'being of the size of a thumb' is the supreme Brahman, for it is apparent from the words, 'The Lord of the past and future.' This rulership over everything of the past and future cannot belong to the individual self which is subject to Karma.

हृद्यपेक्षया तु मनुष्याधिकारत्वात् ॥ २४ ॥

24. But with reference to (the space in) the heart (is this declaration of size), as man alone is qualified (for meditation on Brahman).

As the Lord abides in the heart of men who meditate on Him, and the heart is of the size of a thumb, He is said to be of the size of a thumb. As man alone is capable of meditation on Brahman, scriptural teachings are meant for him. Therefore it is with reference to him that the thumb is used as the standard of measurement.

*Topic 7 : The right of the gods to Brahma-vidyā*

In the previous topic it was said that men alone are capable of meditation on Brahman. So a doubt might arise that the gods are not entitled to such meditations. To remove such a doubt this topic is begun. In *Sūtras* 25-37 there is therefore a digression from the main topic of the Section.

तदुपर्यपि बादरायणः सम्भवात् ॥ २५ ॥

25. Bādarāyaṇa thinks (that) beings above men (i.e. the gods) also (are capable of meditation on the supreme

Brahman), because (it is) possible (for them also).

The gods also are entitled to meditation on Brahman according to Bādarāyaṇa, for they are also corporeal beings like men and so capable of such meditations and it is possible for them also to have a desire for final illumination. That they are corporeal beings we know from the hymns addressed to them as having a body. We also find in the Upanisads gods like Indra and others going to teachers for the attainment of the knowledge of the Brahman. So, as the gods are corporeal beings they are also entitled to meditation on Brahman.

विरोधः कर्मणीति चेत्, न, अनेकप्रतिपत्तेर्दर्शनात् ॥ २६ ॥

26. If it be said (that the corporeality of gods would involve) a contradiction to sacrifices; (we say) no, because we find (in the scriptures) (that gods) assume many forms (at one and the same time).

An objection is raised that if the gods are corporeal beings then it would not be possible for one and the same god to be present when invoked at sacrifices performed simultaneously at different places. This the latter part of the *Sūtra* refutes, for it is seen from scriptural texts that gods are capable of assuming several forms simultaneously.

शब्द इति चेत्, न, अतः प्रभवात् प्रत्यक्षानुमानाभ्याम् ॥ २७ ॥

27. If it be said (that the corporeality of the gods would involve a contradiction) with regard to (Vedic) words, (we say) no, since beings originate from them (as is known) from perception (Śruti) and inference (Smṛti).

All the words in the Vedas are eternal. Every word has as its counterpart a form, an object which it denotes. The

word, the object, and the relation between the word and the object are eternal verities. This is accepted by all orthodox Hindu philosophers. Now we have in the Vedas words like 'Indra,' 'Varuṇa' etc. and so the relation between these words and the gods they refer to should be eternal; but if the gods are corporeal beings they cannot be eternal. So the word 'Indra' etc. will be meaningless before the creation of Indra and after his demise, and consequently the eternity of the Vedas and their authoritativeness on that ground would be a myth.

The *Sūtra* refutes this objection thus. The Creator creates god Indra uttering the Vedic word 'Indra'. The words 'Indra' etc. do not mean particular individuals but a type. So each Vedic word has a counterpart, an object which is a type, class or species, that have the same form and as such is eternal and does not depend on the birth and death of individuals belonging to that type, as e.g. the word 'cow'. So when one Indra dies the Creator remembers the particular form of Indra and creates another Indra of the same form etc. even as a potter creates a new pot when an earlier one is destroyed. Hence there is no contradiction with Vedic words if the gods are corporeal beings. How is this known? Both from Śruti and Smṛti or direct perception and inference. In the Vedas it is said that the Creator uttered different words before creating different types of beings. 'He said Bhūh and then created the earth' (*Tai. Brā.* II. ii. 4). 'The several names, actions and conditions of all things He shaped in the beginning from the words of the Vedas' (*Manu* I. 21).

अत एव च नित्यत्वम् ॥ २८ ॥

28. From this very reason also (results) the eternity (of the Vedas).

The Creator recollects the meaning of the words in the Vedas and then creates the world of beings. He remembers the shape of different things in the world by uttering the Vedic words and creates those things. Though many of the Mantras in the Vedas are attributed to certain Ṛṣis yet they are not the authors but only discoverers or revealers. At the time of creation after a partial dissolution, Brahmā remembers with the help of the words of the Vedas the former Ṛṣis, Viśvāmitra and others, and He creates these Ṛṣis again having the same name and ability, who could therefore recite the same Mantras assigned to them, correctly and without any difficulty, thus revealing the very Mantras. So the eternity of the Vedas is established though these Ṛṣis are their revealers.

समाननामरूपत्वाच्चावृत्तावप्यविरोधो दर्शनात् स्मृतेश्च ॥ २९ ॥

29. And because of the sameness of names and forms (in every fresh cycle) there is no contradiction (to the eternity of these Vedic words) even in the revolving of world cycles, as is seen from the Śruti and the Smṛti.

An objection is raised. Since at the end of a cycle when there is complete dissolution including the Creator Brahmā and the Vedas, and creation begins afresh at the beginning of the next cycle, there is a break in the continuity of existence. So how could the eternity of the Vedas be established? This *Sūtra* refutes it. At the beginning of a new cycle the world will have the same name and form as it had in the previous cycles and so there is no contradiction to the eternity of the Vedas. The Śruti and the Smṛti declare the creation of a world of the same name and form. 'He who first creates Brahmā and delivers the Vedas to him' (*Śve.* VI. 18). 'As

in the rotation of the seasons, the very same signs of the different seasons are seen repeated, so also at the beginning of a cycle the various things are created as in the previous cycle' (Vi. I. v. 65).

*Topic 8 : The rights of the gods to practise certain Upāsanās*

मध्वादिष्वसम्भवादनधिकारं जैमिनिः ॥ ३० ॥

30. Jaimini (is of the opinion) that the gods (Vasu and others) are not entitled for Madhu-vidyā etc. on account of the impossibility.

It has been shown that the gods are qualified for the meditation on Brahman. Now the question is raised whether they are qualified for certain other upāsanās. In many of the meditations (upāsanās) one has to meditate on the self of some god or other. For example, in Madhu-vidyā one has to meditate on the sun-god. Such a meditation would be impossible for the sun-god. So the gods cannot practise these meditations for the same person cannot be both the object of meditation and the meditator. Moreover, the result of such meditations is the attainment of the position of such gods which they are already and there is no question of their attaining it. So Jaimini thinks the gods are not qualified for Madhu-vidyā etc.

ज्योतिषि भावाच्च ॥ ३१ ॥

31. And on account of (the meditation of the gods) being on the Light (of lights i.e. Brahman).

'The gods meditate on that Light of lights as life and

immortality' (Br. IV. iv. 16). Though this meditation is common to both men and the gods, yet the special mention of the gods shows that they have a right only for this meditation and not for other meditations like Madhu-vidyā etc.

भावं तु बादरायणः, अस्ति हि ॥ ३२ ॥

32. But Bādarāyaṇa (maintains) the existence (of these qualifications) for it is possible.

Bādarāyaṇa maintains that the gods have necessary qualifications for Madhu-vidyā etc. for it is possible for them to meditate upon Brahman in their own form and attain also its results, viz the position of Vasu (the sun-god) etc. in the next cycle also.

*Topic 9 : The right of the Sūdras for Brahmavidyā discussed*

शुगस्य तदनादरणश्रवणात्, तदाद्रवणात् सूच्यते हि ॥ ३३ ॥

33. Grief arose in him (Jānaśruti) on hearing the contemptuous words (of the Ṛṣi in the form of the flamingo); owing to his approaching him (Raikva with) that (grief) (Raikva called him a Sūdra); because it (the grief) is referred to (by Raikva).

In the last topic it has been shown that the gods are entitled to Brahma-vidyā. This topic discusses whether the Sūdras are entitled to it. Since like the gods, the Sūdras also are possessed of a body, capacity and desire for final liberation, it naturally follows that they too are entitled to Brahmavidyā. Maybe they are debarred from the Vedic