

2 manifold, for to Him are yoked ten organs, nay hundreds  
of them. He is the organs; He is ten, and thousands- many  
4 and infinite. That Brahman is without prior or posterior,  
without interior or exterior. This self, the perceiver of  
6 everything, is Brahman. This is the teaching.

इदं वै तन्मध्वित्यादि पूर्ववत्। रूपं रूपं प्रतिरूपो बभूव — रूपं रूपं प्रति प्रतिरूपः  
8 रूपान्तरं बभूवेत्यर्थः; प्रतिरूपोऽनुरूपो वा यादृक्संस्थानौ मातापितरौ तत्संस्थानः  
तदनुरूप एव पुत्रो जायते; न हि चतुष्पदो द्विपाज्जायते, द्विपदो वा चतुष्पात्; स एव हि  
10 परमेश्वरो नामरूपे व्याकुर्वाणः रूपं रूपं प्रतिरूपो बभूव। किमर्थं पुनः प्रतिरूपमागमनं  
तस्येत्युच्यते — तत् अस्य आत्मनः रूपं प्रतिचक्षणाय प्रतिख्यापनाय; यदि हि नामरूपे  
12 न व्याक्रियेते, तदा अस्य आत्मनो निरुपाधिकं रूपं प्रज्ञानघनाख्यं न प्रतिख्यायेत; यदा  
पुनः कार्यकरणात्मना नामरूपे व्याकृते भवतः, तदा अस्य रूपं प्रतिख्यायेत। इन्द्रः  
14 परमेश्वरः मायाभिः प्रज्ञाभिः नामरूपभूतकृतमिथ्याभिमानैर्वा न तु परमार्थतः, पुरुरूपः  
बहुरूपः, ईयते गम्यते — एकरूप एव प्रज्ञानघनः सन् अविद्याप्रज्ञाभिः। कस्मात्पुनः  
16 कारणात्? युक्ताः रथ इव वाजिनः, स्वविषयप्रकाशनाय, हि यस्मात्, अस्य हरयः  
हरणात् इन्द्रियाणि, शता शतानि, दश च, प्राणिभेदबाहुल्यात् शतानि दश च भवन्ति;  
18 तस्मात् इन्द्रियविषयबाहुल्यात् तत्प्रकाशनायैव च युक्तानि तानि न आत्मप्रकाशनाय  
; 'पराञ्चि खानि व्यतृणत्स्वयम्भूः' (क. उ. २।१।१) इति हि काठके। तस्मात् तैरेव  
20 विषयस्वरूपैरीयते, न प्रज्ञानघनैकरसेन स्वरूपेण।

22 *This is that meditation, etc.- is to be explained as before. (He) transformed*  
24 *Himself in accordance with each form, or (to put it differently) assumed the likeness*  
of each form. A son has the same form as, or resembles, his parents. A quadruped  
is not born of bipeds, nor vice versa. The same Lord, in the process of manifesting  
26 name and form. 'transformed Himself in accordance with each form.' Why did He  
come in so many forms? *That form of His was for the sake of making Him known.*

2 Were name and form not manifested, the transcendent nature of this Self as Pure  
 4 Intelligence would not be known. When, however, name and form are manifested  
 6 as the body and organs, it is possible to know Its nature. *The Lord on account of*  
 8 *Maya* or diverse knowledge, or (to give an alternative meaning) the false  
 10 identifications created by name, form and the elements, not in truth, *is perceived*  
 12 *as manifold*, because of these notions superimposed by ignorance, although He is  
 14 ever the same Pure Intelligence. Why? *For to Him -are yoked*, like horses to a  
 chariot, *ten organs-called 'Hari'* because they draw *-nay hundreds of them*, for the  
 purpose of revealing their objects; 'hundreds,' because there are a great many  
 beings. Since there are a large number of sense-objects (the Supreme Self appears  
 as manifold). It is to reveal them, and not the Self, that the organs are yoked. As  
 the Katha Upaniṣad says, 'The self-born Lord injured the organs by making them  
 outgoing in their tendencies' (IV. 1) \_ Therefore the Self is known not in Its true  
 nature as homogeneous Pure Intelligence, but merely as the sense-objects.

एवं तर्हि अन्यः परमेश्वरः अन्ये हरय इत्येवं प्राप्ते

16 *Question:* Then this Lord is one entity, and the organs another?

उच्यते — अयं वै हरयोऽयं वै दश च सहस्राणि बहूनि चानन्तानि च ; प्राणिभेदस्य  
 18 आनन्त्यात्। किं बहुना ? तदेतद्ब्रह्म य आत्मा, अपूर्वम् नास्य कारणं पूर्वं विद्यत इत्यपूर्वम्  
 , नास्यापरं कार्यं विद्यत इत्यनपरम्, नास्य जात्यन्तरमन्तराले विद्यत इत्यनन्तरम्, तथा  
 20 बहिरस्य न विद्यत इत्यबाह्यम्; किं पुनस्तत् निरन्तरं ब्रह्म? अयमात्मा; कोऽसौ? यः  
 प्रत्यगात्मा द्रष्टा, श्रोता मन्ता बोद्धा, विज्ञाता सर्वानुभूः — सर्वात्मना सर्वमनुभवतीति  
 22 सर्वानुभूः — इत्येतदनुशासनम् सर्ववेदान्तोपदेशः; एष सर्ववेदान्तानामुपसंहृतोऽर्थः;  
 एतदमृतमभयम्; परिसमाप्तश्च शास्त्रार्थः ॥

24 *Reply:* No; *He is the organs; he is ten and thousands-many and infinite*-because  
 26 there are an infinite number of beings. In short, *that Brahman* which is the self is  
 28 *without prior*, i.e. cause, or *posterior*, i.e. effect, *without interior or exterior*, i.e.  
 30 having no other species within It or without It. What is this homogeneous  
 Brahman? *This self*. What is that? The inner self that sees, hears, thinks,  
 understands, knows; *the perceiver of everything*, because as the self of all it  
 32 perceives everything. *This is the teaching* of all Vedanta texts-the gist of them. It  
 leads to immortality and fearlessness. The import of the scriptures has been fully  
 dealt with.

॥ इति द्वितीयाध्यायस्य पञ्चमं ब्राह्मणम् ॥

- 2 'जनको ह वैदेहः' इत्यादि याज्ञवल्कीयं काण्डमारभ्यते; उपपत्तिप्रधानत्वात् अतिक्रान्तेन  
मधुकाण्डेन समानार्थत्वेऽपि सति न पुनरुक्तता; मधुकाण्डं हि आगमप्रधानम्;  
4 आगमोपपत्ती हि आत्मैकत्वप्रकाशनाय प्रवृत्ते शक्नुतः करतलगतबिल्वमिव दर्शयितुम्;  
'श्रोतव्यो मन्तव्यः' (बृ. उ. २।४।५) इति ह्युक्तम्; तस्मादागमार्थस्यैव परीक्षापूर्वकं  
6 निर्धारणाय याज्ञवल्कीयं काण्डमुपपत्तिप्रधानमारभ्यते।

8 With 'Janaka, Emperor of Videha,' etc., the portion relating to Yājñavalkya  
begins. Though it treats of the same subject as the preceding one, viz. the  
Madhukāṇḍa, yet it is not a mere repetition, being mainly argumentative, whereas  
10 the preceding portion was mainly of the nature of scriptural testimony. When both  
scriptural evidence and argument start to demonstrate the unity of the Self, they  
12 can show it as clearly as a bael fruit on the palm of one's hand, for it has been  
said, '(The Self) should be heard of, reflected on,' etc. (II. iv. 5; IV. v. 6).  
14 Therefore it is to test the meaning of the Śrutis in the light of arguments that this  
portion relating to Yājñavalkya, which is mainly argumentative, is commenced.

- 16 आख्यायिका तु विज्ञानस्तुत्यर्था उपायविधिपरा वा; प्रसिद्धो ह्युपायो विद्वद्भिः शास्त्रेषु च  
18 दृष्टः — दानम्; दानेन ह्युपनमन्ते प्राणिनः; प्रभूतं हिरण्यं गोसहस्रदानं च इहोपलभ्यते;  
तस्मात् अन्यपरेणापि शास्त्रेण विद्याप्राप्त्युपायदानप्रदर्शनार्था आख्यायिका आख्या।  
20 अपि च तद्विद्यसंयोगः तैश्च सह वादकरणं विद्याप्राप्त्युपायो न्यायविद्यायां दृष्टः; तच्च  
अस्मिन्नध्याये प्राबल्येन प्रदर्श्यते; प्रत्यक्षा च विद्वत्संयोगे प्रज्ञावृद्धिः। तस्मात्  
22 विद्याप्राप्त्युपायप्रदर्शनार्थैव आख्यायिका ॥

24 The story may be taken either as a eulogy on knowledge or as prescribing  
the way to acquire it; for it is a well-known fact, which scholars also notice in the  
26 scriptures, that the making of presents is one such way. Through presents people  
are won over; and here we see that plenty of gold and a thousand cows are  
28 presented. Therefore, though this section has another main purpose, the story is  
introduced to show that the making of presents is a way to the acquisition of  
30 knowledge. Another customary way of acquiring it, as observed in the system of

logic, is the association with adepts in that line, and discussion with them; that too is amply shown in this chapter. And it is a common experience that association with scholars adds to our knowledge. Therefore we must conclude that the story is meant to point out the way to acquire knowledge.

ॐ। जनको ह वैदेहो बहुदक्षिणेन यज्ञेनेजे; तत्र ह कुरुपञ्चालानां ब्राह्मणा  
अभिसमेता बभूवुस्तस्य ह जनकस्य वैदेहस्य विजिज्ञासा बभूव, कः स्विदेषां  
ब्राह्मणानामनूचानतम इति; स ह गवां सहस्रमवरुरोध; दश दश पादा  
एकैकस्याः शृङ्गयोराबद्धा बभूवुः ॥ ३-१-१ ॥

Om. Janaka, Emperor of Videha, performed a sacrifice in which gifts were freely distributed. Vedic scholars from Kuru and Pañcāla were assembled there. Emperor Janaka of Videha had a desire to know, 'Which is the most erudite of these Vedic scholars?' He had a thousand cows confined in a pen, and on the horns of each cow were fixed ten Pādas<sup>11</sup> (of gold).

जनको नाम ह किल सम्राट् राजा बभूव विदेहानाम्; तत्र भवो वैदेहः; स च  
बहुदक्षिणेन यज्ञेन — शाखान्तरप्रसिद्धो वा बहुदक्षिणो नाम यज्ञः, अश्वमेधो वा  
दक्षिणाबाहुल्यात् बहुदक्षिण इहोच्यते — तेनेजे अयजत्। तत्र तस्मिन्यज्ञे निमन्त्रिता  
दर्शनकामा वा कुरूणां देशानां पञ्चालानां च ब्राह्मणाः — तेषु हि विदुषां बाहुल्यं प्रसिद्धम्  
— अभिसमेताः अभिसङ्गता बभूवुः। तत्र महान्तं विद्वत्समुदायं दृष्ट्वा तस्य ह किल  
जनकस्य वैदेहस्य यजमानस्य, को नु खल्वत्र ब्रह्मिष्ठ इति विशेषेण ज्ञातुमिच्छा  
विजिज्ञासा, बभूव; कथम्? कः स्वित् को नु खलु एषां ब्राह्मणानाम् अनूचानतमः — सर्व

<sup>11</sup> A Pāda is about one-third of an ounce.

इमेऽनूचानाः, कः स्विदेषामतिशयेनानूचान इति। स ह अनूचानतमविषयोत्पन्नजिज्ञासः  
 2 सन् तद्विज्ञानोपायार्थं गवां सहस्रं प्रथमवयसाम् अवरुरोध गोष्ठेऽवरोधं कारयामास;  
 किंविशिष्टास्ता गावोऽवरुद्धा इत्युच्यते — पलचतुर्थभागः पादः सुवर्णस्य, दश दश  
 4 पादा एकैकस्या गोः शृङ्गयोः आबद्धा बभूवुः, पञ्च पञ्च पादा एकैकस्मिन् शृङ्गे ॥

There was a ruler of Videha named Janaka, who was an Emperor. He  
 6 performed a sacrifice in which gifts were freely distributed. Or the sacrifice itself may  
 have had that name (Bahu-dakṣiṇa), referred to elsewhere in the Vedas. Or the  
 8 horse sacrifice may here be so called because of the abundance of gifts in it. Vedic  
 scholars from Kuru and Pañcāla—which are famous for their large number of  
 10 scholars—were assembled in that sacrifice, either on invitation or as spectators.  
 Seeing that large assembly of scholars, Emperor Janaka of Videha, the sacrificer,  
 12 had a desire to know which was the greatest Vedic scholar among them. He thought  
 like this: ‘Which is the most erudite of these Vedic scholars? They are all versed in  
 14 the Vedas, but which is the greatest of them?’ Being desirous of knowing this, he,  
 as a means to finding it out, had a thousand young cows confined in a pen. The cows  
 16 are being described. On the horns of each cow were fixed ten Pādas—a Pāda being a  
 quarter of a Pala-of gold, five on each horn.

18

तान्होवाच, ब्राह्मणा भगवन्तो यो वो ब्रह्मिष्ठः स एता गा उदजतामिति। ते ह  
 20 ब्राह्मणा न दधृषुरथ ह याज्ञवल्क्यः स्वमेव ब्रह्मचारिणमुवाचैताः सोम्योदज  
 सामश्रवा इति; ता होदाचकार; ते ह ब्राह्मणाश्चुकुधुः, कथं नो ब्रह्मिष्ठो  
 22 ब्रुवीतेत्यथ ह जनकस्य वैदेहस्य होताश्वलो बभूव; स हैनं पप्रच्छ, त्वं नु खलु  
 नो याज्ञवल्क्य ब्रह्मिष्ठोऽसी इति; स होवाच, नमो वयं ब्रह्मिष्ठाय कुर्मो  
 24 गोकामा एव वयं स्म इति; तं ह तत एव प्रष्टुं दध्रे होताश्वलः ॥ ३-१-२ ॥

He said to them, ‘Revered Brāhmaṇas, let him who is the  
 26 best Vedic scholar among you drive these cows (home).’  
 None of the Brāhmaṇas dared. Then Yājñavalkya said to a  
 28 pupil of his, ‘Dear Sāmaśravas, please drive these cows  
 (home).’ He drove them. The Brāhmaṇas were enraged.

2 'How does he dare to call himself the best Vedic scholar  
 among us?' There was a Hotṛ<sup>12</sup> of Emperor Janaka of  
 Videha named Aśvala. He now asked Yājñavalkya,  
 4 'Yājñavalkya, are you indeed the best Vedic scholar among  
 us?' Yājñavalkya replied, 'I bow to the best Vedic scholar,  
 6 I just want the cows.' Thereupon the Hotṛ Aśvala  
 determined to interrogate him.

8  
 गा एवमवरुध्य ब्राह्मणांस्तान्होवाच, हे ब्राह्मणा भगवन्तः इत्यामन्त्र्य — यः वः युष्माकं  
 10 ब्रह्मिष्ठः — सर्वे यूयं ब्रह्माणः, अतिशयेन युष्माकं ब्रह्मा यः — सः एता गा उदजताम्  
 उत्कालयतु स्वगृहं प्रति। ते ह ब्राह्मणा न दधृषुः — ते ह किल एवमुक्ता ब्राह्मणाः  
 12 ब्रह्मिष्ठतामात्मनः प्रतिज्ञातुं न दधृषुः न प्रगल्भाः संवृत्ताः। अप्रगल्भभूतेषु ब्राह्मणेषु अथ  
 ह याज्ञवल्क्यः स्वम् आत्मीयमेव ब्रह्मचारिणम् अन्तेवासिनम् उवाच — एताः गाः हे  
 14 सोम्य उदज उद्गमय अस्मद्गृहान्प्रति, हे सामश्रवः — सामविधिं हि शृणोति, अतः  
 अर्थाच्चतुर्वेदो याज्ञवल्क्यः। ताः गाः ह उदाचकार उत्कालितवानाचार्यगृहं प्रति।  
 16 याज्ञवल्क्येन ब्रह्मिष्ठपणस्वीकरणेन आत्मनो ब्रह्मिष्ठता प्रतिज्ञातेति ते ह चुक्रुधुः  
 क्रुद्धवन्तो ब्राह्मणाः। तेषां क्रोधाभिप्रायमाचष्टे — कथं नः अस्माकम् एकैकप्रधानानां  
 18 ब्रह्मिष्ठोऽस्मीति ब्रुवीतेति। अथ ह एवं क्रुद्धेषु ब्राह्मणेषु जनकस्य यजमानस्य होता  
 ऋत्विक् अश्वलो नाम बभूव आसीत्। स एनं याज्ञवल्क्यम् — ब्रह्मिष्ठाभिमानि  
 20 राजाश्रयत्वाच्च धृष्टः — याज्ञवल्क्यं पप्रच्छ पृष्टवान् ; कथम्? त्वं नु खलु नो याज्ञवल्क्य  
 ब्रह्मिष्ठोऽसी३ इति — पुतिः भर्त्सनार्था। स होवाच याज्ञवल्क्यः — नमस्कुर्मो वयं  
 22 ब्रह्मिष्ठाय, इदानीं गोकामाः स्मो वयमिति। तं ब्रह्मिष्ठप्रतिज्ञं सन्तं तत एव  
 ब्रह्मिष्ठपणस्वीकरणात् प्रष्टुं दध्रे धृतवान्मनो होता अश्वलः ॥

<sup>12</sup> A priest who has the duty of invoking the gods in a sacrifice, reciting from the Rg-Veda.

2 Having the cows thus confined, *he said* addressing those Brāhmaṇas, ‘Revered  
 4 Brāhmaṇas, you are all Vedic scholars; *let him who is specially so among you drive*  
 6 *these cows home.*’ None of the Brāhmaṇas thus addressed *dared* to announce his  
 8 surpassing Vedic scholarship. When they were thus silenced, Yājñavalkya *said to a*  
 10 *pupil of his,* ‘Dear Sāmaśravas, *please drive these cows home.*’ ‘Sāmaśravas means  
 12 one who learns how to chant the Sāman. Hence by implication Yājñavalkya is  
 14 made out to be versed in all the four Vedas<sup>13</sup>. He drove the cows towards his  
 16 teacher’s home. Yājñavalkya, by accepting the prize meant for the best Vedic  
 18 scholar, indirectly declared himself as such; so *the Brāhmaṇas were enraged*. The  
 20 reason for their anger is being stated: *How does he dare to call himself the best Vedic*  
*scholar among us* who are each a great scholar? Among the Brāhmaṇas thus  
 enraged, *there was a Hotṛ of Janaka, the sacrificer, named Aśvala*. He prided himself  
 upon being the greatest Vedic scholar, and was insolent owing to royal patronage.  
 So he challenged Yājñavalkya as follows: ‘Yājñavalkya, *are you indeed the best Vedic*  
*scholar among us?*’ The prolonged accent (in the verb) signifies censure.  
 Yājñavalkya replied: ‘*I bow to the best Vedic scholar, now I just want the cows’*  
*Thereupon,* i.e. when he accepted the prize meant for the best Vedic scholar and  
 thereby declared himself to be one, the *Hotṛ Aśvala determined to interrogate him.*

20

22 याज्ञवल्क्येति होवाच, यदिदं सर्वं मृत्युनाप्तं, सर्वं मृत्युनाभिपन्नं, केन यजमानो  
 मृत्योराप्तिमतिमुच्यत इति; होत्रत्विजाग्निना वाचा; वाग्वै यज्ञस्य होता, तद्येयं  
 वाक्सोऽयमग्निः, स होता, स मुक्तिः, सातिमुक्तिः ॥ ३-१-३ ॥

24

26 ‘Yājñavalkya,’ said he, ‘since all this is overtaken by death,  
 28 and swayed by it, by what means does the sacrificer go  
 beyond the clutches of death?’ ‘Through the organ of  
 30 speech-through fire, which is the (real) priest called Hotṛ.  
 The sacrificer’s organ of speech is the Hotṛ. This organ of  
 speech is fire; this fire is the Hotṛ; this (fire) is liberation;  
 this (liberation) is emancipation.

<sup>13</sup> The grounds are as follows: He is principally a teacher of the Yajur-veda; the pupil in question learns from him how to chant the Sāman, which is the Ṛc set to music, so he must also know these two Vedas; and the Atharva-Veda is subsidiary to the other three.

2 याज्ञवल्क्येति होवाच। तत्र मधुकाण्डे पाङ्केन कर्मणा दर्शनसमुच्चितेन यजमानस्य  
 मृत्योरत्ययो व्याख्यातः उद्गीथप्रकरणे सङ्क्षेपतः; तस्यैव परीक्षाविषयोऽयमिति  
 4 तद्गतदर्शनविशेषार्थोऽयं विस्तर आरभ्यते। यदिदं साधनजातम् अस्य कर्मणः  
 ऋत्विगभ्यादि मृत्युना कर्मलक्षणेन स्वाभाविकासङ्गसहितेन आप्तं व्याप्तम्, न केवलं  
 6 व्याप्तम् अभिपन्नं च मृत्युना वशीकृतं च — केन दर्शनलक्षणेन साधनेन यजमानः  
 मृत्योराप्तमिति मृत्युगोचरत्वमतिक्रम्य मुच्यते स्वतन्त्रः मृत्योरवशो भवतीत्यर्थः।

8

*'Yājñavalkya,' said he. In the section on the Udgītha (I. iii.) comprised in the*  
 10 *Madhukāṇḍa it has been briefly explained how a sacrificer can escape death*  
 12 *through the rite with five factors coupled with the meditation about it. The present*  
 14 *section being an examination of that, a rather detailed treatment is being given*  
 here in order to introduce some particulars about that meditation. *'Since all this,*  
 16 *the accessories of this rite, such as the priests and the fire, is overtaken by death,*  
 i.e. by ritualistic work attended with our natural attachment-not only overtaken,  
 but also *swayed by death, by what means, or meditation, does the sacrificer go beyond*  
 18 *the clutches of death, become independent of it?'*

18

ननु उद्गीथ एवाभिहितम् येनातिमुच्यते मुख्यप्राणात्मदर्शनेनेति —

20

*Objection:* Has it not already been said in the section on the Udgītha that he  
 22 transcends death by identifying himself with the vital force in the mouth?

24 बाढमुक्तम्; योऽनुक्तो विशेषस्तत्र, तदर्थोऽयमारम्भ इत्यदोषः।

26 *Reply:* Yes, but the particulars that have been omitted there will be given  
 here. So there is nothing wrong in it.

28

होत्रा ऋत्विजा अग्निना वाचा इत्याह याज्ञवल्क्यः। एतस्यार्थं व्याचष्टे — कः  
 30 पुनर्होता येन मृत्युमतिक्रामतीति उच्यते — वाग्वै यज्ञस्य यजमानस्य, 'यज्ञो वै  
 यजमानः' (शत. ब्राह्म. १४।२।२।२४) इति श्रुतेः, यज्ञस्य यजमानस्य या वाक्

सैव होता अधियज्ञे; कथम्? तत् तत्र येयं वाक् यज्ञस्य यजमानस्य, सोऽयं  
 2 प्रसिद्धोऽग्निः अधिदैवतम्; तदेतच्चन्नप्रकरणे व्याख्यातम्; स चाग्निः होता, 'अग्निर्वै  
 होता' (शत. ब्रा. ४।२।६) इति श्रुतेः। यदेतत् यज्ञस्य साधनद्वयम् – होता च ऋत्विक्  
 4 अधियज्ञम्, अध्यात्मं च वाक्, एतदुभयं साधनद्वयं परिच्छिन्नं मृत्युना आप्तं  
 स्वाभाविकाज्ञानासङ्गप्रयुक्तेन कर्मणा मृत्युना प्रतिक्षणमन्यथात्वमापद्यमानं  
 6 वशीकृतम्; तत् अनेनाधिदैवतरूपेणाग्निना दृश्यमानं यजमानस्य यज्ञस्य  
 मृत्योरतिमुक्तये भवति;

8

Yājñavalkya said, 'Through the organ of speech-through fire, which is the (real)  
 10 priest called Hotṛ.' The explanation follows. Who is that Hotṛ through whom the  
 sacrificer transcends death? 'The sacrificer's organ of speech is the Hotṛ.' 'Sacrifice'  
 12 here means the sacrificer. Witness the Śruti, 'The sacrifice is the sacrificer' (Ś.  
 XIV. II. ii. 24). The sacrificer's organ of speech is the Hotṛ with reference to  
 14 sacrifices. How? *This organ of speech of the sacrificer is the well-known fire, with*  
 reference to the gods. This has already been explained under the topic of the three  
 16 kinds of food (I. v. 11). And that *fire is the Hotṛ*, for the Śruti says, 'Fire is the  
 Hotṛ' (Ś. VI. iv. ii. 6). These two auxiliaries of a sacrifice, viz. the priest called  
 18 Hotṛ with reference to sacrifices, and the organ of speech with reference to the  
 body, being limited, are 'overtaken by death,' i.e. are continually changed by  
 20 ritualistic work directed by our natural attachment due to ignorance, and are  
 therefore 'swayed by death.' If the sacrificer looks upon them as fire, their divine  
 22 form, it conduces to his<sup>14</sup> liberation from death.

24 तदेतदाह – स मुक्तिः स होता अग्निः मुक्तिः अग्निस्वरूपदर्शनमेव मुक्तिः; यदैव  
 साधनद्वयमग्निरूपेण पश्यति, तदानीमेव हि स्वाभाविकादासङ्गान्मृत्योर्विमुच्यते  
 26 आध्यात्मिकात्परिच्छिन्नरूपात् आधिभौतिकाच्च; तस्मात् स होता अग्निरूपेण दृष्टः  
 मुक्तिः मुक्तिसाधनं यजमानस्य। सा अतिमुक्तिः – यैव च मुक्तिः सा अतिमुक्तिः  
 28 अतिमुक्तिसाधनमित्यर्थः। साधनद्वयस्य परिच्छिन्नस्य या अधिदैवतरूपेण

<sup>14</sup> As also the Hotṛ's.

अपरिच्छिन्नेन अग्निरूपेण दृष्टिः, सा मुक्तिः; या असौ मुक्तिः अधिदैवतदृष्टिः सैव  
 2 — अध्यात्माधिभूतपरिच्छेदविषयाङ्गास्पदं मृत्युमतिक्रम्य अधिदेवतात्वस्य  
 अग्निभावस्य प्राप्त्यर्था फलभूता सा अतिमुक्तिरित्युच्यते; तस्या अतिमुक्तेर्मुक्तिरेव  
 4 साधनमिति कृत्वा सा अतिमुक्तिरित्याह। यजमानस्य हि अतिमुक्तिः  
 वागादीनामग्न्यादिभावः इत्युद्गीथप्रकरणे व्याख्यातम्; तत्र सामान्येन  
 6 मुख्यप्राणदर्शनमात्रं मुक्तिसाधनमुक्तम्, न तद्विशेषः; वागादीनामग्न्यादिदर्शनमिह  
 विशेषो वर्ण्यते; मृत्युप्राप्त्यतिमुक्तिस्तु सैव फलभूता, या उद्गीथब्राह्मणेन व्याख्याता  
 8 'मृत्युमतिक्रान्तो दीप्यते' (बृ.उ.१।३।१२), (बृ.उ.१।३।१३), (बृ.उ.१।३।१४), (बृ.  
 उ.१।३।१५), (बृ.उ.१।३।१६), इत्याद्या ॥

10

So the text says: *This is liberation*, i.e. the Hotṛ who is fire is liberation. In  
 12 other words, looking upon the Hotṛ as fire is that. As soon as the sacrificer looks  
 upon the two accessories as fire, he is freed from death consisting in his limited  
 14 natural attachment relating to the body and the elements. Therefore that Hotṛ,  
 when looked upon as fire, is 'liberation,' i.e. the means of liberation, for the  
 16 sacrificer. *This is emancipation*: That which is liberation is emancipation. i.e. a  
 means to it. To look upon those two limited accessories as fire, which is their  
 18 unlimited divine form, is liberation. This liberation which consists in looking upon  
 (the Hotṛ and the organ of speech) in their divine aspect is also spoken of as the  
 20 resulting emancipation-becoming one with fire, their divine form-which takes one  
 beyond the death that consists in attachment to limitations relating to the body  
 22 and the elements. It is called emancipation, because that liberation itself is a means  
 to it. It has already been explained in the section on the Udgītha that the  
 24 identification of the organ of speech etc. with fire and so on is itself the  
 emancipation of the sacrificer. There it has been said in a general way that identity  
 26 with the vital force in the mouth is the means of liberation, but the particulars  
 have not been given. Here some details, viz. the viewing of the organ of speech  
 28 etc. as fire and so on, are given. The emancipation from death here dealt with is  
 the same as that which has been described as a result in the section on the Udgītha  
 30 in the words, '(That fire) having transcended death shines,' etc. (I. iii. 12).

अथ हैनमुषस्तश्चाक्रायणः पप्रच्छ। पुण्यपापप्रयुक्तैर्ग्रहातिग्रहैर्गृहीतः पुनः पुनः  
 2 ग्रहातिग्रहान् त्यजन् उपाददत् संसरतीत्युक्तम्; पुण्यस्य च पर उत्कर्षो व्याख्यातः  
 व्याकृतविषयः समष्टिव्यष्टिरूपः द्वैतैकत्वात्मप्राप्तिः। यस्तु ग्रहातिग्रहैर्ग्रस्तः संसरति,  
 4 सः अस्ति वा, न अस्ति; अस्तित्वे च किंलक्षणः – इति आत्मन एव  
 विवेकाधिगमाय उषस्तप्रश्न आरभ्यते। तस्य च निरुपाधिस्वरूपस्य  
 6 क्रियाकारकविनिर्मुक्तस्वभावस्य अधिगमात् यथोक्ताद्वन्द्वनात् विमुच्यते सप्रयोजकात्  
 आख्यायिकसम्बन्धस्तु प्रसिद्धः ॥

8  
 It has been stated that a man under the control of the organs and objects  
 10 (Grahas and Atigrahas), which are themselves directed by his merits and demerits,  
 repeatedly takes up and discards the organs and objects, and transmigrates. And  
 12 the perfection of merits has been explained as being concerned with the manifested  
 universe, collective and individual being the identification with Hiranyagarbha in  
 14 both those aspects. Now the question arises as to whether the entity that  
 transmigrates under the control of the organs and objects exists or does not exist:  
 16 and if it exists, what it is like. So it is to teach about the Self as a distinct entity  
 that the question of Uṣasta is introduced. If one knows That as unconditioned,  
 18 naturally free from action and its factors, one is freed from the above-mentioned  
 bondage together with its stimulating causes. The purpose of the story is already  
 20 known.

22 अथ हैनमुषस्तश्चाक्रायणः पप्रच्छ; याज्ञवल्क्येति होवाच,  
 यत्साक्षादपरोक्षाद्ब्रह्म, य आत्मा सर्वान्तरस्तं मे व्याचक्ष्वेत्येष त आत्मा  
 24 सर्वान्तरः; कतमो याज्ञवल्क्य सर्वान्तरो यः प्राणेन प्राणिति स त आत्मा  
 सर्वान्तरो योऽपानेनापानीति स त आत्मा सर्वान्तरो यो व्यानेन व्यानीति स त

आत्मा सर्वान्तरो य उदानेनोदानिति स त आत्मा सर्वान्तरः, एष त आत्मा

सर्वान्तरः ॥३-४-१॥

Then Uṣasta, the son of Cakra, asked him. 'Yājñavalkya,' said he, 'explain to me the Brahman that is immediate and direct the self that is within all.' 'This is your self that is within all.' 'Which is within all, Yājñavalkya?' 'That which breathes through the Prāṇa is your self that is within all. That which moves downwards through the Apāna is your self that is within all. That which pervades through the Vyāna is your self that is within all. That which goes out through the Udāna is your self that is within all. This is your self that is within all.'

अथ ह एनं प्रकृतं याज्ञवल्क्यम्, उषस्तो नामतः, चक्रस्यापत्यं चाक्रायणः, पप्रच्छ। यत्  
ब्रह्म साक्षात् अव्यवहितं केनचित् द्रष्टुः अपरोक्षात् — अगौणम् — न श्रोत्रब्रह्मादिवत्  
— किं तत्? य आत्मा — आत्मशब्देन प्रत्यगात्मोच्यते, तत्र आत्मशब्दस्य  
प्रसिद्धत्वात्; सर्वस्याभ्यन्तरः सर्वान्तरः; यद्यःशब्दाभ्यां प्रसिद्ध आत्मा ब्रह्मेति — तम्  
आत्मानम्, मे मह्यम्, व्याचक्ष्वेति — विस्पष्टं शृङ्गे गृहीत्वा यथा गां दर्शयति तथा  
आचक्ष्व, सोऽयमित्येवं कथयस्वेत्यर्थः।

*Then Uṣasta, the son of Cakra, asked him, 'Yājñavalkya,' who has already been introduced. The Brahman that is immediate, not obstructed from the seer or subject by anything, and direct, not used in a figurative sense, like the ear and so forth, which are considered to be Brahman. What is that? The self that is within all. The word 'self' refers to the inner (individual) self, that being the accepted meaning of the term. The words 'Yat' and 'Yah'<sup>15</sup> indicate that the self familiar to all is identical with Brahman. Explain that self to me, speak about it clearly, as one shows a cow by taking hold of its horns, as much as to say, 'This is it.'*

<sup>15</sup> Neuter and masculine forms of the Sanskrit word meaning 'that'.

एवमुक्तः प्रत्याह याज्ञवल्क्यः – एषः ते तव आत्मा सर्वान्तरः सर्वस्याभ्यन्तरः;  
 2 सर्वविशेषणोपलक्षणार्थं सर्वान्तरग्रहणम्; यत् साक्षात् अव्यवहितम् अपरोक्षात्  
 अगौणम् ब्रह्म बृहत्तमम् आत्मा सर्वस्य सर्वस्याभ्यन्तरः, एतैर्गुणैः समस्तैर्युक्तः  
 4 एषः, कोऽसौ तवात्मा? योऽयं कार्यकरणसङ्घातः तव सः येनात्मना आत्मवान् स  
 एष तव आत्मा – तव कार्यकरणसङ्घातस्येत्यर्थः। तत्र पिण्डः, तस्याभ्यन्तरे  
 6 लिङ्गात्मा करणसङ्घातः, तृतीयो यश्च सन्दिह्यमानः – तेषु कतमो मम आत्मा  
 सर्वान्तरः त्वया विवक्षित इत्युक्ते इतर आह – यः प्राणेन मुखनासिकासञ्चारिणा  
 8 प्राणिति प्राणचेष्टां करोति, येन प्राणः प्रणीयत इत्यर्थः – सः ते तव  
 कार्यकरणसङ्घातस्य आत्मा विज्ञानमयः; समानमन्यत; योऽपानेनापानीति यो व्यानेन  
 10 व्यानीतीति – छान्दसं दैर्घ्यम्। सर्वाः कार्यकरणसङ्घातगताः प्राणनादिचेष्टा  
 दारुयन्त्रस्येव येन क्रियन्ते – न हि चेतनावदनधिष्ठितस्य दारुयन्त्रस्येव  
 12 प्राणनादिचेष्टा विद्यन्ते; तस्मात् विज्ञानमयेनाधिष्ठितं विलक्षणेन दारुयन्त्रवत्  
 प्राणनादिचेष्टां प्रतिपद्यते – तस्मात् सोऽस्ति कार्यकरणसङ्घातविलक्षणः, यश्चेष्टयति ॥

14 Thus addressed, Yājñavalkya replied, 'This is your self that is within all.' The  
 16 qualification 'that is within all' is suggestive of all qualifications whatsoever. That  
 which is 'immediate' or unobstructed, and 'direct' or used in its primary sense,  
 18 and which is 'Brahman or the vastest, the self of all and within all--all these  
 specifications refer to the self. 'What is that?', 'This self of yours? that by which  
 20 your body and organs are ensouled is your self, i.e. the self of the body and  
 organs.' 'There is first the body; within it is the subtle body consisting of the  
 22 organs; and the third is that whose existence is being doubted. Which of these do  
 you mean as my self that is within all?' Thus spoken to, Yājñavalkya said, 'That  
 24 which breathes (lit. does the function of the Prāṇa) through the Prāṇa, which  
 operates in the mouth and nose, in other words, "which makes the Prāṇa breathe"  
 26 (Ke. I. 9), is your self i.e. the individual self of the body and organs.' The rest is  
 similar in meaning. That which moves downwards through the Apāna, which pervades  
 28 through the Vyāna the long i in the two verbs is a Vedic licence by which the body

and organs are made to breathe and do other functions, like a wooden puppet.  
2 Unless they are operated by an intelligent principle, they cannot do any function  
such as breathing, as is the case with the wooden puppet. Therefore it is on account  
4 of being operated by the individual self, which is distinct from them, that they  
breathe and do other functions, as does the puppet. Hence that principle distinct  
6 from the body and organs exists which makes them function.

8 स होवाचोषस्तश्चाक्रायणो यथा विब्रूयादसौ गौरसावश्च इत्येवमेवैतद्व्यपदिष्टं  
भवति; यदेव साक्षादपरोक्षाद्ब्रह्म, य आत्मा सर्वान्तरस्तं मे व्याचक्ष्वेत्येष त  
10 आत्मा सर्वान्तरः; कतमो याज्ञवल्क्य सर्वान्तरः? न दृष्टेर्द्रष्टारं पश्येर्न श्रुतेः  
श्रोतारं शृणुयात् न मतेर्मन्तारं मन्वीथा न विज्ञातेर्विज्ञातारं विजानीयाः। एष  
12 त आत्मा सर्वान्तरोऽतोऽन्यदार्तं ततो होषस्तश्चाक्रायण उपरराम ॥ ३-४-२ ॥

14 Uṣasta, the son of Cakra, said, 'You have indicated it as  
one may say that a cow is such and such, or a horse is such  
and such. Explain to me the Brahman that is immediate and  
16 direct the self that is within all.' 'This is your self that is  
within all.' 'Which is within all, Yājñavalkya?' 'You cannot  
18 see that which is the witness of vision; you cannot hear that  
which is the hearer of hearing; you cannot think that which  
20 is the thinker of thought; you cannot know that which is  
the knower of knowledge. This is your self that is within  
22 all; everything else but this is perishable.' Thereupon  
Uṣasta, the son of Cakra, kept silent.

24 स होवाचोषस्तश्चाक्रायणः; यथा कश्चित् अन्यथा प्रतिज्ञाय पूर्वम्, पुनर्विप्रतिपन्नो  
26 ब्रूयादन्यथा — असौ गौः असावश्चः यश्चलति धावतीति वा, पूर्वं प्रत्यक्षं दर्शयामीति  
प्रतिज्ञाय, पश्चात् चलनादिलिङ्गैर्व्यपदिशति — एवमेव एतद्ब्रह्म प्राणनादिलिङ्गैर्व्यपदिष्टं  
28 भवति त्वया; किं बहुना? त्यक्त्वा गोतृष्णानिमित्तं व्याजम्, यदेव साक्षादपरोक्षाद्ब्रह्म य

आत्मा सर्वान्तरः, तं मे व्याचक्ष्वेति। इतर आह — यथा मया प्रथमं प्रतिज्ञातः तव

2 आत्मा — एवलक्षण इति — तां प्रतिज्ञामनुवर्त एव; तत् तथैव, यथोक्तं मया।

Uṣasta, the son of Cakra, said: As somebody first proposes one thing and then,  
4 being in doubt, may say something else—for instance, having proposed to point out  
a cow or a horse, he merely describes them through certain characteristics of theirs,  
6 such as walking and says, 'A cow is that which walks,' or 'A horse is that which  
runs'so you too have indicated Brahman through certain characteristics such as  
8 breathing. To be brief, give up your trick prompted by your hankering after the  
cows, and explain to me the Brahman that is immediate and direct the self that is within  
10 all. Yājñavalkya replied: I adhere to the proposition that I first made, that your  
self is such and such; it is exactly as I have described it.

12

यत्पुनरुक्तम्, तमात्मानं घटादिवत् विषयीकुर्विति — तत् अशक्यत्वान्न क्रियते।

14 कस्मात्पुनः तदशक्यमित्याह — वस्तुस्वाभाव्यात्; किं पुनः तत् वस्तुस्वाभाव्यम्?

दृष्ट्यादिद्रष्टृत्वम्; दृष्टेर्द्रष्टा ह्यात्मा; दृष्टिरिति द्विविधा भवति — लौकिकी पारमार्थिकी

16 चेति; तत्र लौकिकी चक्षुःसंयुक्तान्तःकरणवृत्तिः; सा क्रियत इति जायते विनश्यति

च; या तु आत्मनो दृष्टिः अश्रुयुष्णप्रकाशादिवत्, सा च द्रष्टुः स्वरूपत्वात्, न

18 जायते न विनश्यति च; सा क्रियमाणया उपाधिभूतया संसृष्टेवेति, व्यपदिश्यते —

द्रष्टेति, भेदवच्च — द्रष्टा दृष्टिरिति च; यासौ लौकिकी दृष्टिः चक्षुर्द्वारा रूपोपरक्ता

20 जायमानैव नित्यया आत्मदृष्ट्या संसृष्टेव, तत्प्रतिच्छाया — तथा व्याप्तैव जायते,

तथा विनश्यति च; तेन उपचर्यते द्रष्टा सदा पश्यन्नपि — पश्यति न पश्यति

22 चेति; न तु पुनः द्रष्टुर्दृष्टेः कदाचिदप्यन्यथात्वम्; तथा च वक्ष्यति षष्ठे — 'ध्यायतीव

लेलायतीव' (बृ.उ.४।३।७), 'न हि द्रष्टुर्दृष्टेर्विपरिलोपो विद्यते' (बृ.उ.४।३।२३)

24 इति च।

26 You asked me to present the self as one would a jar etc. I do not do so, because it is impossible. Why is it impossible? Owing to the very nature of the

2 thing. What is that? Its being the witness of vision etc., for the self is the witness  
 4 of vision. Vision is of two kinds, ordinary and real. Ordinary vision is a function  
 6 of the mind as connected with the eye; it is an act, and as such it has a beginning  
 8 and an end. But the vision that belongs to the self is like the heat and light of  
 10 fire; being the very essence of the witness, it has neither beginning nor end.  
 12 Because it appears to be connected with the ordinary vision, which is produced  
 14 and is but a limiting adjunct of it, it is spoken of as the witness, and also as  
 16 differentiated into witness and vision. The ordinary vision, however, is colored by  
 the objects seen through the eye, and of course has a beginning; it appears to be  
 connected with the eternal vision of the self, and is but its reflection; it originates  
 and ends, pervaded by the other. It is therefore that the eternal vision of the self  
 is metaphorically spoken of as the witness, and although eternally seeing, is spoken  
 of as sometimes seeing and sometimes not seeing. But as a matter of fact the  
 vision of the seer never changes. So it will be said in the fourth chapter, 'It thinks,  
 as it were, and shakes, as it were' (IV. iii. 7), and 'The vision of the witness can  
 never be lost' (IV. iii. 23).

18 तमिममर्थमाह — लौकिक्या दृष्टेः कर्मभूतायाः, द्रष्टारं स्वकीयया नित्यया दृष्ट्या  
 व्याप्तारम्, न पश्येः; यासौ लौकिकी दृष्टिः कर्मभूता, सा रूपोपरक्ता रूपाभिव्यञ्जिका  
 20 न आत्मानं स्वात्मनो व्याप्तारं प्रत्यञ्चं व्याप्नोति; तस्मात् तं प्रत्यगात्मानं दृष्टेर्द्रष्टारं  
 न पश्येः। तथा श्रुतेः श्रोतारं न शृणुयाः। तथा मतेः मनोवृत्तेः केवलाया व्याप्तारं  
 22 न मन्वीथाः। तथा विज्ञातेः केवलाया बुद्धिवृत्तेः व्याप्तारं न विजानीयाः। एष  
 वस्तुनः स्वभावः; अतः नैव दर्शयितुं शक्यते गवादिवत्॥

24 This is the meaning of the following passage: *You cannot see that which is the*  
 26 *witness of vision, i.e. which pervades by its eternal vision the act of our ordinary*  
 28 *vision. This latter, which is an act, is affected by the objects seen, and reveals*  
 30 *only colour (form), but not the inner self that pervades it. Therefore you cannot*  
 32 *see that inner self which is the witness of vision. Similarly you cannot hear that*  
 34 *which is the hearer of hearing; you cannot think that which pervades thought, the mere*  
*function of the mind; you cannot know that which pervades knowledge, the mere*  
*function of the intellect. This is the very nature of the thing; therefore it cannot*  
*be shown like a cow etc.*

2 'न दृष्टेर्द्रष्टारम्' इत्यत्र अक्षराणि अन्यथा व्याचक्षते केचित् – न दृष्टेर्द्रष्टारम् दृष्टेः  
 4 कर्तारम् दृष्टिभेदमकृत्वा दृष्टिमात्रस्य कर्तारम्, न पश्येरिति; दृष्टेरिति कर्मणि षष्ठी;  
 6 सा दृष्टिः क्रियमाणा घटवत् कर्म भवति; द्रष्टारमिति तृजन्तेन द्रष्टुर्दृष्टिकर्तृत्वमाचष्टे;  
 8 तेन असौ दृष्टेर्द्रष्टा दृष्टेः कर्तेति व्याख्यातृणामभिप्रायः। तत्र दृष्टेरिति षष्ठ्यन्तेन  
 10 दृष्टिग्रहणं निरर्थकमिति दोषं न पश्यन्ति; पश्यतां वा पुनरुक्तम् असारः प्रमादपाठ  
 इति वा न आदरः; कथं पुनराधिक्यम्? तृजन्तेनैव दृष्टिकर्तृत्वस्य सिद्धत्वात् दृष्टेरिति  
 निरर्थकम्; तदा 'द्रष्टारं न पश्येः' इत्येतावदेव वक्तव्यम्; यस्माद्धातोः परः तृच्  
 श्रूयते, तद्धात्वर्थकर्तरि हि तृच् स्मर्यते; 'गन्तारं भेत्तारं वा नयति' इत्येतावानेव  
 हि शब्दः प्रयुज्यते; न तु 'गतेर्गन्तारं भिदेर्भेत्तारम्' इति असति अर्थविशेषे  
 प्रयोक्तव्यः; न च अर्थवादत्वेन हातव्यं सत्यां गतौ; न च प्रमादपाठः,  
 सर्वेषामविगानात्; तस्मात् व्याख्यातृणामेव बुद्धिदौर्बल्यम्, नाध्येतृप्रमादः।

12 Some<sup>16</sup> explain the passage, 'You cannot see the witness of vision,' etc.  
 14 differently. According to them 'the witness of vision' means 'that which sees,' the  
 16 agent or cause of vision in general, without any distinction of kind. In other words,  
 18 they regard the genitive case in the term 'of vision' as having an  
 objective/accusative force. That vision is caused and is an effect, like a jar. The  
 20 suffix in the word 'Draṣṭṛ' (witness) indicates agency. Therefore, these  
 22 commentators opine, the expression 'the witness of vision' means 'the agent of  
 24 vision.' But they fail to see that the words 'of vision' then become redundant; or  
 26 even if they see it, they take it as a repetition, or as a faulty reading not worth  
 anything, and pay no attention to it. How are the words redundant? They are  
 28 redundant, because the word 'Draṣṭṛ' itself would be enough to indicate the agency  
 of vision; then one should only say, 'You cannot see the witness.' For the text  
 uses the suffix 'त्रच्' with the verb, and in grammar this always indicates agency  
 of the act denoted by the verb. We only say, 'One is conducting the traveler or  
 the cutter'; we should not, in the absence of any special meaning, say, 'the traveler  
 of travelling, or 'the cutter of cutting.' Nor should the extra words be dismissed  
 as a mere elucidation, if there is any alternative explanation; and it is not a faulty

<sup>16</sup> The reference is to Bhartṛprapañca.

2 reading, since all<sup>17</sup> unanimously accept it. Therefore it is a defect of the  
commentators' understanding and not a mistake on the part of the students.

4 यथा तु अस्माभिव्यारख्यातम् – लौकिकदृष्टेर्विविच्य नित्यदृष्टिविशिष्ट आत्मा  
प्रदर्शयितव्यः – तथा कर्तृकर्मविशेषणत्वेन दृष्टिशब्दस्य द्विः प्रयोग उपपद्यते  
6 आत्मस्वरूपनिर्धारणाय; 'न हि द्रष्टृदृष्टेः' इति च प्रदेशान्तरवाक्येन  
एकवाक्यतोपपन्ना भवति; तथा च 'चक्षुषि पश्यति' (के.उ.१।७) 'श्रोत्रमिदं श्रुतम्'  
8 (के.उ.१।८) इति श्रुत्यन्तरेण एकवाक्यता उपपन्ना। न्यायाच्च – एवमेव हि  
आत्मनो नित्यत्वमुपपद्यते विक्रियाभावे; विक्रियावच्च नित्यमिति च विप्रतिषिद्धम्।  
10 'ध्यायतीव लेलायतीव' (बृ.उ.४।३।७) 'न हि द्रष्टृदृष्टेर्विपरिलोपो विद्यते'  
(बृ.उ.४।३।२३) 'एष नित्यो महिमा ब्राह्मणस्य' (बृ.उ.४।४।२३) इति च  
12 श्रुत्यक्षराणि अन्यथा न गच्छन्ति।

14 But the way we have explained it, viz. that the self endowed with eternal  
vision, as opposed to the ordinary vision, should be pointed out, accounts for the  
16 two words 'witness' and 'vision' (in the expression 'the witness of vision') as  
describing the subject and the object, with a view to defining the nature of the  
18 self. It will also agree with the passage, 'The vision of the witness (can never be  
lost)' etc. (IV. iii. 23), occurring elsewhere, as also with the clauses, '(Through  
20 which) the eyes see' (Ke. I. 7), '(By which) this ear is heard' (Ke. I. 8), occurring  
in another text. It is also consonant with reason. In other words, the self can be  
22 eternal if only it is immutable; it is a contradiction in terms to say that a thing is  
changeful and yet eternal. Moreover, the Śruti texts, 'It thinks, as it were, and  
24 shakes, as it were' (IV. iii. 22), 'The vision of the witness can never be lost,' and  
'This is the eternal glory of a knower of Brahman' (IV. iv. 23), would otherwise  
26 be inconsistent.

28 ननु द्रष्टा श्रोता मन्ता विज्ञाता इत्येवमादीन्यक्षराणि आत्मनोऽविक्रियत्वे न  
गच्छन्तीति –

<sup>17</sup> Students of both Kāṇva and Mādhyandina recensions.

2 *Objection:* But such terms as ‘witness,’ ‘hearer,’ ‘thinker’ and ‘knower’  
would also be inconsistent if the self is immutable.

4

न, यथाप्राप्तलौकिकवाक्यानुवादित्वात् तेषाम्; न आत्मतत्त्वनिर्धारणार्थानि तानि; ‘न  
6 दृष्टेर्दृष्टारम्’ इत्येवमादीनाम् अन्यार्थासम्भवात् यथोक्तार्थपरत्वमवगम्यते। तस्मात्  
अनवबोधादेव हि विशेषणं परित्यक्तं दृष्टेरिति। एषः ते तव आत्मा  
8 सर्वैरुक्तैर्विशेषणैर्विशिष्टः; अतः एतस्मादात्मनः अन्यदार्तम् – कार्यं वा शरीरम्,  
करणात्मकं वा लिङ्गम्; एतदेव एकम् अनार्तम् अविनाशि कूटस्थम्। ततो ह  
10 उषस्तश्चाक्रायण उपरराम ॥

12 *Reply:* Not so, for they only repeat conventional expressions as people think  
them. They do not seek to define the truth of the self. Since the expressions ‘the  
14 witness of vision’ etc. cannot otherwise be explained, we conclude that they mean  
what we have indicated. Therefore the opponents’ rejection of the qualifying term  
16 ‘of vision’ is due only to ignorance. *This is your self* specified by all those above-  
mentioned epithets. *Everything else but this self*, whether it is the gross body or the  
18 subtle body consisting of the organs, *is perishable*. This only is imperishable,  
changeless. *Thereupon Uṣasta, the son of Cakra, kept silent.*

20

22

इति तृतीयाध्यायस्य चतुर्थं ब्राह्मणम् ॥

24

2 बन्धनं सप्रयोजकमुक्तम्। यश्च बद्धः, तस्यापि अस्तित्वमधिगतम्, व्यतिरिक्तत्वं च।  
तस्य इदानीं बन्धमोक्षसाधनं ससन्न्यासमात्मज्ञानं वक्तव्यमिति कहोलप्रश्न आरभ्यते

4 —

6 Bondage with its stimulating causes has been spoken of. The existence of  
that which is bound, as also its distinctness from the body etc., has also been  
8 known. Now the knowledge of the Self together with renunciation, which is the  
means of liberating it from that bondage, have to be described. Hence the question  
10 of Kahola is introduced.

12 अथ हैनं कहोलः कौषीतकेयः पप्रच्छ; याज्ञवल्क्येति होवाच, यदेव  
साक्षादपरोक्षाद्ब्रह्म य आत्मा सर्वान्तरस्तं मे व्याचक्ष्वेत्येष त आत्मा  
14 सर्वान्तरः। कतमो याज्ञवल्क्य सर्वान्तरो योऽशनायापिपासे शोकं मोहं जरां  
मृत्युमत्येति। एतं वै तमात्मानं विदित्वा ब्राह्मणाः पुत्रैषणायाश्च वित्तैषणायाश्च  
16 लोकैषणायाश्च व्युत्थायाथ भिक्षाचर्यं चरन्ति; या ह्येव पुत्रैषणा सा वित्तैषणा,  
या वित्तैषणा सा लोकैषणोभे ह्येते एषणे एव भवतः। तस्माद्ब्राह्मणः पाण्डित्यं  
18 निर्विद्य बाल्येन तिष्ठासेत्। बाल्यं च पाण्डित्यं च निर्विद्याथ मुनिरमौनं च  
मौनं च निर्विद्याथ ब्राह्मणः; स ब्राह्मणः केन स्याद्येन स्यात्तेनेदृश  
20 एवातोऽन्यदार्तं ततो ह कहोलः कौषीतकेय उपरराम ॥ ३-५-१ ॥

22 Then Kahola, the son of Kuṣītaka, asked him.  
'Yājñavalkya,' said he, 'explain to me the Brahman that is  
24 immediate and direct the self that is within all.' 'This is  
your self that is within all.' 'Which is within all,  
26 Yājñavalkya?' 'That which transcends hunger and thirst,  
grief, delusion, decay and death. Knowing this very Self

2 the Brāhmaṇas renounce the desire for sons, for wealth and  
4 for the worlds, and lead a mendicant's life. That which is  
6 the desire for sons is the desire for wealth, and that which  
8 is the desire for wealth is the desire for the worlds, for both  
10 these are but desires. Therefore the knower of Brahman,  
12 having known all about scholarship, should try to live upon  
14 that strength which comes of knowledge; having known all  
about this strength as well as scholarship, he becomes  
meditative; having known all about both meditateness and  
its opposite, he becomes a knower of Brahman. How does  
that knower of Brahman behave? Howsoever he may  
behave, he is just such. Except this everything is  
perishable.' Thereupon Kahola, the son of Kuṣītaka, kept  
silent.

16 अथ ह एनं कहोलो नामतः, कुषीतकस्यापत्यं कौषीतकेयः, पप्रच्छ; याज्ञवल्क्येति  
होवाचेति, पूर्ववत् — यदेव साक्षादपरोक्षाद्ब्रह्म य आत्मा सर्वान्तरः तं मे व्याचक्ष्वेति —  
18 यं विदित्वा बन्धनात्प्रमुच्यते। याज्ञवल्क्य आह — एष ते तव आत्मा ॥

20 *Then Kahola, the son of Kuṣītaka, asked him, 'Yājñavalkya', said he to be*  
22 *explained as before 'explain to me the Brahman that is immediate and direct-the self*  
24 *that is within all,' knowing which one is freed from bondage. Yājñavalkya said,*  
*'This is your self.'*

किम् उषस्तकहोलाभ्याम् एक आत्मा पृष्टः, किं वा भिन्नावात्मानौ तुल्यलक्षणाविति।  
26 भिन्नाविति युक्तम्, प्रश्नयोरपुनरुक्तत्वोपपत्तेः; यदि हि एक आत्मा  
उषस्तकहोलप्रश्नयोर्विवक्षितः, तत्र एकेनैव प्रश्नेन अधिगतत्वात् तद्विषयो द्वितीयः  
28 प्रश्नोऽनर्थकः स्यात्; न च अर्थवादरूपत्वं वाक्यस्य; तस्मात् भिन्नावेतावात्मानौ  
क्षेत्रज्ञपरमात्माख्याविति केचिद्वाचक्षते।

30 *Question: Do Uṣasta and Kahola ask about one and the same self, or do they*  
32 *ask of different selves having similar characteristics?*

Some<sup>18</sup> say: It ought to be different selves, for then only can the two questions be other than a repetition. Had Uṣasta and Kahola asked about the same self, then one question having dealt with that, the second would have been redundant; and the passage in question is not a mere elucidation. Therefore the two selves must be different, viz. the individual self and the Supreme Self.

तन्न, 'ते' इति प्रतिज्ञानात्; 'एष त आत्मा' इति हि प्रतिवचने प्रतिज्ञातम्; न च एकस्य कार्यकरणसङ्घातस्य द्वावात्मानौ उपपद्येते; एको हि कार्यकरणसङ्घातः एकेन आत्मना आत्मवान्; न च उषस्तस्यान्यः कहोलस्यान्यः जातितो भिन्न आत्मा भवति, द्वयोः अगौणत्वात्मत्वसर्वान्तरत्वानुपपत्तेः; यदि एकमगौणं ब्रह्म द्वयोः इतरेण अवश्यं गौणेन भवितव्यम्; तथा आत्मत्वं सर्वान्तरत्वं च – विरुद्धत्वात्पदार्थानाम्; यदि एकं सर्वान्तरं ब्रह्म आत्मा मुख्यः, इतरेण असर्वान्तरेण अनात्मना अमुख्येन अवश्यं भवितव्यम्; तस्मात् एकस्यैव द्विः श्रवणं विशेषविवक्षया। यत्तु पूर्वोक्तेन समानं द्वितीये प्रश्नान्तर उक्तम्, तावन्मात्रं पूर्वस्यैवानुवादः – तस्यैव अनुक्तः कश्चिद्विशेषः वक्तव्य इति ।

*Reply:* No, because of the use of the word 'your.' It has been said in the reply, 'This is your self' (III. iv. 1-2; this text), and the same aggregate of body and organs cannot have two selves, for each aggregate possesses a single self. Nor can Uṣasta and Kahola mean selves essentially different from each other, since both cannot be primary, and self and within all. If one of the two be Brahman in a primary sense, the other must be secondary; similarly with selfhood and being within all, for these three terms are contradictory. If one of the two Brahman be the self, primary, and within all, then the other must be non-self, secondary, and not within all. Therefore one and the same self has been mentioned twice with a view to telling something special about it. That part only of the second question which is common to the first is a repetition of the latter, and the second question is introduced in order to furnish some detail not mentioned before.

<sup>18</sup> The reference is to Bhartṛprapañca.

कः पुनरसौ विशेष इत्युच्यते – पूर्वस्मिन्प्रश्ने – अस्ति व्यतिरिक्त आत्मा यस्यायं  
2 सप्रयोजको बन्ध उक्त इति द्वितीये तु – तस्यैव आत्मनः  
अशनायादिसंसारधर्मातीतत्वं विशेष उच्यते – यद्विशेषपरिज्ञानात् सन्न्याससहितात्  
4 पूर्वोक्ताद्वन्धनात् विमुच्यते। तस्मात् प्रश्नप्रतिवचनयोः ‘एष त आत्मा’  
इत्येवमन्तयोः तुल्यार्थतैव।

6

*Objection:* What is this detail?

8

*Reply:* It is this. In the first question it has been stated that there is a self  
distinct from the body, whose bondage together with its stimulating causes has  
10 been spoken of: but in the second something more is added, viz. that this self is  
beyond relative attributes such as hunger a detail, by knowing which, together with  
12 renunciation, one is freed from the bondage above spoken of. Therefore we  
conclude that in both cases the question and answer, ending with the words, ‘This  
14 is your self that is within all,’ have an identical meaning.

16

ननु कथम् एकस्यैव आत्मनः अशनायाद्यतीतत्वं तद्वत्त्वं चेति  
विरुद्धधर्मसमवायित्वमिति – न, परिहृतत्वात्;

18

नामरूपविकारकार्यकरणलक्षणसङ्घातोपाधिभेदसम्पर्कजनितभ्रान्तिमात्रं हि  
संसारित्वमित्यसकृदवोचाम, विरुद्धश्रुतिव्याख्यानप्रसङ्गेन च; यथा

20

रज्जुशुक्तिकागगनादयः सर्परजतमलिना भवन्ति पराध्यारोपितधर्मविशिष्टाः, स्वतः  
केवला एव रज्जुशुक्तिकागगनादयः – न च एवं विरुद्धधर्मसमवायित्वे पदार्थानां

22

कश्चन विरोधः

24

*Objection:* How can the same self possess contradictory attributes, such as  
being beyond hunger etc. and having them?

26

*Reply:* The objection is not valid, having already been refuted (II.i.20 of this  
text). We have repeatedly said that the relative existence of the self is but a  
delusion caused by its association with limiting adjuncts, such as the body and  
28 organs, which are but the modifications of name and form. We have also made

2 this clear while explaining the apparently contradictory passages of the Śrutis  
(II.v.15 of this text). For instance, a rope, a mother-of-pearl, or the sky, becomes  
4 a snake, silver or blue respectively, owing to attributes imputed by people, but in  
themselves they are just a rope, a mother-of-pearl, or the sky. Thus there is no  
contradiction if things possess contradictory attributes.

6

नामरूपोपाध्यस्तित्वे 'एकमेवाद्वितीयम्' (छा.उ.६।२।१) 'नेह नानास्ति किञ्चन'  
8 (बृ.उ.४।४।१९) इति श्रुतयो विरुद्ध्येरन्निति चेत् –

10 *Objection:* Will not such Upaniṣadic texts as, 'One only without a second'  
(Ch. VI. ii. 1), and 'There is no difference whatsoever in It' (IV. iv. 19; Ka. IV.  
12 11), be contradicted if you admit the existence of the limiting adjuncts, name and  
form?

14

न, सलिलफेनदृष्टान्तेन परिहृतत्वात् मृदादिदृष्टान्तैश्च; यदा तु परमार्थदृष्ट्या  
16 परमात्मतत्त्वात् श्रुत्यनुसारिभिः अन्यत्वेन निरूप्यमाणे नामरूपे मृदादिविकारवत्  
वस्त्वन्तरे तत्त्वतो न स्तः – सलिलफेनघटादिविकारवदेव, तदा तत् अपेक्ष्य  
18 'एकमेवाद्वितीयम्' (छा.उ. ६।२।१) 'नेह नानास्ति किञ्चन' (बृ.उ. ४।४।१९)  
इत्यादिपरमार्थदर्शनगोचरत्वं प्रतिपद्यते; यदा तु स्वाभाविक्याऽविद्यया ब्रह्मस्वरूपं  
20 रज्जुशुक्तिकागगनस्वरूपवदेव स्वेन रूपेण वर्तमानं केनचिदस्पृष्टस्वभावमपि सत्  
नामरूपकृतकार्यकरणोपाधिभ्यो विवेकेन नावधार्यते, नामरूपोपाधिदृष्टिरेव च भवति  
22 स्वाभाविकी, तदा सर्वोऽयं वस्त्वन्तरास्तित्वव्यवहारः। अस्ति चायं भेदकृतो  
मिथ्याव्यवहारः, येषां ब्रह्मतत्त्वादन्यत्वेन वस्तु विद्यते, येषां च नास्ति;  
24 परमार्थवादिभिस्तु श्रुत्यनुसारेण निरूप्यमाणे वस्तुनि – किं तत्त्वतोऽस्ति वस्तु किं  
वा नास्तीति, ब्रह्मैकमेवाद्वितीयं सर्वसंव्यवहारशून्यमिति निर्धार्यते; तेन न  
26 कश्चिद्विरोधः। न हि परमार्थावधारणनिष्ठायां वस्त्वन्तरास्तित्वं प्रतिपद्यामहे –

‘एकमेवाद्वितीयम्’ (छा. उ. ६।२।१) ‘अनन्तरमबाह्यम्’ (बृ.उ. २।५।१९), (बृ.उ. ३।८।८) इति श्रुतेः; न च नामरूपव्यवहारकाले तु अविवेकिनां क्रियाकारकफलादिसंव्यवहारो नास्तीति प्रतिषिध्यते। तस्मात् ज्ञानाज्ञाने अपेक्ष्य सर्वः संव्यवहारः शास्त्रीयो लौकिकश्च; अतो न काचन विरोधशङ्का। सर्ववादिनामप्यपरिहार्यः परमार्थसंव्यवहारकृतो व्यवहारः ॥

6  
8  
10  
12  
14  
16  
18  
20  
22  
24  
26  
28  
30  
32  
34

*Reply:* No; this has already been refuted by the illustrations of the foam of water and (the modifications of) clay etc. But when name and form are tested from the standpoint of the highest truth in the light of the above Śruti texts, as to whether they are different from the Supreme Self or not, they cease to be separate entities, like the foam of water, or like the modifications (of clay) such as a jar. It is then that such passages as, ‘One only without a second,’ and ‘There is no difference whatsoever in It,’ have scope from the standpoint of the Supreme Self as referring to the highest realisation. But when on account of our primordial ignorance, the reality of Brahman, although remaining as it is, naturally untouched by anything-like the reality of the rope, the mother-of-pearl and the sky is not discriminated from the limiting adjuncts such as the body and organs, which are created by name and form, and our natural vision of those adjuncts remains, then this phenomenal existence consisting of things different from Brahman has full play. This unreal, phenomenal existence created by differentiation is indeed a fact for those who do not believe in things as different from Brahman as well as for those who do believe. But the believers of the highest truth, while discussing in accordance with the Śrutis, the actual existence or non-existence of things apart from Brahman, conclude that Brahman alone is the one without a second, beyond all finite relations. So there is no contradiction between the two views. We do not maintain the existence of things different from Brahman in the state when the highest truth has been definitely known, as the Śrutis say, ‘One only without a second,’ and ‘Without interior or exterior’ (II. v. 19; III. viii. 8). Nor do we deny the validity, for the ignorant, of actions with their factors and results while the relative world of name and form exists. Therefore scriptural or conventional outlook depends entirely on knowledge or ignorance. Hence there is no apprehension of a contradiction between them. In fact, all schools must admit the existence or non-existence of the phenomenal world according as it is viewed from the relative or the absolute standpoint.

तत्र परमार्थात्मस्वरूपमपेक्ष्य प्रश्नः पुनः — कतमो याज्ञवल्क्य सर्वान्तर इति। प्रत्याह  
 2 इतरः — योऽशनायापिपासे, अशितुमिच्छा अशनाया, पातुमिच्छा पिपासा; ते  
 अशनायापिपासे योऽत्येतीति वक्ष्यमाणेन सम्बन्धः। अविवेकिभिः तलमलवदिव गगनं  
 4 गम्यमानमेव तलमले अत्येति — परमार्थतः — ताभ्यामसंसृष्टस्वभावत्वात् — तथा  
 मूढैः अशनायापिपासादिमद्ब्रह्म गम्यमानमपि — क्षुधितोऽहं पिपासितोऽहमिति, ते  
 6 अत्येत्येव — परमार्थतः — ताभ्यामसंसृष्टस्वभावत्वात्; 'न लिप्यते लोकदुःखेन बाह्यः'  
 (क. उ. २।२।११) इति श्रुतेः — अविद्वल्लोकाध्यारोपितदुःखेनेत्यर्थः। प्राणैकधर्मत्वात्  
 8 समासकरणमशनायापिपासयोः।

10 Regarding the nature of the self as it is in reality, once more the question is  
 asked: 'Which is within all, Yājñavalkya?' The other replied, 'That which transcends  
 12 hunger and thirst'. The word 'which' in the text should be construed with  
 'transcends' coming shortly after. As the sky, fancied by the ignorant as being  
 14 concave and blue, is really without these qualities, being naturally untouched by  
 them, similarly Brahman, although fancied as being subject to hunger, thirst, etc.,  
 16 by the ignorant, who think that they are hungry or thirsty, really transcends these  
 qualities, being naturally untouched by them, for the Śruti says, 'It is not affected  
 18 by human misery, being beyond it'(Ka. V. 11) i.e. by misery attributed by ignorant  
 people. Hunger and thirst have been compounded in the text, as both are vital  
 20 functions.

22 शोकं मोहम् — शोक इति कामः; इष्टं वस्तु उद्दिश्य चिन्तयतो यत् अरमणम्,  
 तत् तृष्णाभिभूतस्य कामबीजम्; तेन हि कामो दीप्यते; मोहस्तु  
 24 विपरीतप्रत्ययप्रभवोऽविवेकः भ्रमः; स च अविद्या सर्वस्यानर्थस्य प्रसवबीजम्;  
 भिन्नकार्यत्वात्तयोः शोकमोहयोः असमासकरणम्। तौ मनोऽधिकरणौ; तथा  
 26 शरीराधिकरणौ जरां मृत्युं च अत्येति; जरेति कार्यकरणसङ्घातविपरिणामः  
 वलीपलितादिलिङ्गः; मृत्युरिति तद्विच्छेदः विपरिणामावसानः; तौ जरामृत्यू

शरीराधिकरणौ अत्येति। ये ते अशनायादयः प्राणमनःशरीराधिकरणाः प्राणिषु  
 2 अनवरतं वर्तमानाः अहोरात्रादिवत् समुद्रोर्मिवच्च प्राणिषु संसार इत्युच्यन्ते; योऽसौ  
 दृष्टेर्दृष्टेत्यादिलक्षणः साक्षादव्यवहितः अपरोक्षादगौणः सर्वान्तर आत्मा  
 4 ब्रह्मादिस्तम्बपर्यन्तानां भूतानाम् अशनायापिपासादिभिः संसारधर्मैः सदा न स्पृश्यते  
 – आकाश इव घनादिमलैः –

6  
 8 *Grief* is desire. The discomfort that one feels as one reflects on some  
 covetable thing is the seed of desire for one afflicted with a hankering, because it  
 10 kindles desire; while *delusion* is a mistake, a confusion, arising from a false notion;  
 it is ignorance, the fruitful source of all troubles. The two words are not  
 12 compounded, as grief and delusion produce different results. They have their seat  
 in the mind. (The self also transcends) *decay and death*, which centre in the body.  
 14 ‘Decay’ is that modification of the body and organs which is marked by wrinkles,  
 grey hair, etc. ‘Death’ is the fall of the body, the last modification to overtake it.  
 These, the hunger and the rest, which centre in the vital force, mind and body,  
 16 and are present in beings in an unbroken succession like days and nights, etc.,  
 and like the waves of an ocean, are called the relative or transmigratory existence  
 18 with regard to them. But that which is described as the witness of vision and so  
 forth, which is immediate or unobstructed and direct or used in a primary sense,  
 20 which is within all, and is the self of all beings from Hiraṇyagarbha down to a  
 clump of grass, is ever untouched by such relative attributes as hunger and thirst,  
 22 as the sky is untouched by impurities like the clouds etc.

24 तम् एतं वै आत्मानं स्वं तत्त्वम्, विदित्वा ज्ञात्वा – अयमहमस्मि परं ब्रह्म सदा  
 सर्वसंसारविनिर्मुक्तं नित्यतृप्तमिति, ब्राह्मणाः – ब्राह्मणानामेवाधिकारो व्युत्थाने,  
 26 अतो ब्राह्मणग्रहणम् – व्युत्थाय वैपरीत्येनोत्थानं कृत्वा; कुत इत्याह – पुत्रैषणायाः  
 पुत्रार्थैषणा पुत्रैषणा – पुत्रेणेमं लोकं जयेयमिति लोकजयसाधनं पुत्रं प्रति इच्छा  
 28 एषणा दारसङ्ग्रहः; दारसङ्ग्रहमकृत्वेत्यर्थः; वित्तैषणायाश्च – कर्मसाधनस्य  
 गवादेरुपादानम् – अनेन कर्म कृत्वा पितृलोकं जेष्यामीति, विद्यासंयुक्तेन वा

2 देवलोकम्, केवलया वा हिरण्यगर्भविद्यया दैवेन वित्तेन देवलोकम्। दैवाद्विक्तात्  
 2 व्युत्थानमेव नास्तीति केचित्, यस्मात् तद्वलेन हि किल व्युत्थानमिति – तदसत्,  
 4 ‘एतावान्वै कामः’ (बृ. उ. १।४।१७) इति पठितत्वात् एषणामध्ये दैवस्य वित्तस्य;  
 4 हिरण्यगर्भादिदेवताविषयैव विद्या वित्तमित्युच्यते, देवलोकहेतुत्वात्; नहि  
 6 निरुपाधिकप्रज्ञानघनविषया ब्रह्मविद्या देवलोकप्राप्तिहेतुः, ‘तस्मात्तत्सर्वमभवत्’ (बृ.  
 6 उ. १।४।१०) ‘आत्मा ह्येषां स भवति’ (बृ. उ. १।४।१) इति श्रुतेः; तद्वलेन हि  
 8 व्युत्थानम्, ‘एतं वै तमात्मानं विदित्वा’ (बृ. उ. ३।५।१) इति विशेषवचनात्।  
 8 तस्मात् त्रिभ्योऽप्येतेभ्यः अनात्मलोकप्राप्तिसाधनेभ्यः एषणाविषयेभ्यो व्युत्थाय –  
 10 एषणा कामः, ‘एतावान्वै कामः’ (बृ. उ. १।४।१७) इति श्रुतेः – एतस्मिन्  
 10 त्रिविधे अनात्मलोकप्राप्तिसाधने तृष्णामकृत्वेत्यर्थः।

12 *Knowing this very Self*, their own reality, as ‘I am this, the Supreme Brahman,  
 14 eternally devoid of relative attributes, and ever satisfied,’ *the Brāhmaṇas*-they are  
 14 mentioned because they alone are qualified for renunciation *renounce*, lit. rise up  
 16 in an opposite direction to what? *the desire for sons*, as means to winning this world,  
 16 thinking, ‘We will win this world through sons’- in other words, marriage; hence  
 18 the meaning is, they do not marry. (The desire) *for wealth*: procuring cattle etc.,  
 18 which are the means of rites, in order that one may perform rites through them  
 20 and win the world of the Manes, or that one may win the world of the gods either  
 20 by combining rites with meditation, which is divine wealth, or solely through  
 22 meditation on Hiraṇyagarbha. Some say that one cannot renounce divine wealth,  
 22 since it is through this that renunciation is possible. But this view is wrong, for  
 24 divine wealth also falls within the category of desires, as we know from the Śruti  
 24 passage, ‘This much indeed is desire’ (I. iv. 17). It is the meditation on the gods  
 26 such as Hiraṇyagarbha which is spoken of as wealth, because it leads to the world  
 26 of the gods. The knowledge of Brahman, which concerns the unconditioned Pure  
 28 Intelligence, cannot certainly be the means of attaining the world of the gods.  
 28 Witness the Śruti texts. ‘Therefore It became all’ (I. iv. 10), and ‘For he becomes  
 30 their self’ (Ibid.). It is through the knowledge of Brahman that renunciation takes  
 30 place, for there is the specific statement, ‘Knowing this very Self.’ Therefore they  
 32 renounce all these three objects of desire which lead to worlds that are not the  
 32 Self. ‘Eṣaṇā’ means desire, for the Śruti says, ‘This much indeed is desire.’ That

is to say, they cease to hanker after all this threefold means of attaining worlds  
2 that are not the Self.

सर्वा हि साधनेच्छा फलेच्छैव, अतो व्याचष्टे श्रुतिः – एकैव एषणेति; कथम्? या  
4 ह्येव पुत्रैषणा सा वित्तैषणा, दृष्टफलसाधनत्वतुल्यत्वात्; या वित्तैषणा सा लोकैषणा;  
फलार्थैव सा; सर्वः फलार्थप्रयुक्त एव हि सर्व साधनमुपादत्ते; अत एकैव एषणा  
6 या लोकैषणा सा साधनमन्तरेण सम्पादयितुं न शक्यत इति, साध्यसाधनभेदेन  
उभे हि यस्मात् एते एषणे एव भवतः। तस्मात् ब्रह्मविदो नास्ति कर्म कर्मसाधनं  
8 वा – अतो येऽतिक्रान्ता ब्राह्मणाः, सर्वं कर्म कर्मसाधनं च सर्वं  
देवपितृमानुषनिमित्तं यज्ञोपवीतादि – तेन हि दैवं पित्र्यं मानुषं च कर्म क्रियते,  
10 ‘निवीतं मनुष्याणाम्’ (तै. सं. २।५।११। १) इत्यादिश्रुतेः। तस्मात् पूर्वं ब्राह्मणाः  
ब्रह्मविदः व्युत्थाय कर्मभ्यः कर्मसाधनेभ्यश्च यज्ञोपवीतादिभ्यः, परमहंसपारिव्राज्यं  
12 प्रतिपद्य, भिक्षाचर्यं चरन्ति – भिक्षार्थं चरणं भिक्षाचर्यम्, चरन्ति – त्यक्त्वा स्मार्तं  
लिङ्गं केवलमाश्रममात्रशरणानां जीवनसाधनं पारिव्राज्यव्यञ्जकम्; विद्वान्  
14 लिङ्गवर्जितः – ‘तस्मादलिङ्गो धर्मज्ञोऽव्यक्तलिङ्गोऽव्यक्ताचारः’ (अश्व. ४६।५१) (व.  
१०।१२) इत्यादिस्मृतिभ्यः, ‘अथ परिव्राड्विवर्णवासा मुण्डोऽपरिग्रहः’ (जा. उ. ५)  
16 इत्यादिश्रुतेः, ‘सशिखान्केशान्निकृत्य विसृज्य यज्ञोपवीतम्’ (क. रु. १) इति च॥

18 Every desire for means is a desire for results; therefore the text says that  
desire is one. How? *That which is the desire for sons is he desire for wealth*, for both  
20 are equally means to tangible results. *And that which is the desire for wealth is the*  
22 *desire for the worlds*, for it is directed towards results. People adopt different means,  
actuated by the desire for results. Hence desire is one, because the desire for the  
24 worlds cannot be attained without the requisite means, *for both these are but desires*,  
one being but a means to the other. Therefore the knower of Brahman has nothing  
to do with rites or their accessories. ‘Brāhmaṇas’ in the text means those of past  
26 times. The rites and their accessories here spoken of refer to the holy thread etc.,  
which are means to the performance of rites pertaining to the gods, the manes and

man, for through them these rites are performed. Compare the Śruti, 'The holy thread that hangs straight down from the neck is for rites pertaining to men' (Tai. S. II. v. ii. 1). Therefore the ancient Brāhmaṇas-knowers of Brahman renouncing rites and their accessories, such as the holy thread, embrace the life of a monk (of the highest class) known as the Paramahansa, and lead a mendicant's life, live upon begging giving up the insignia of a monk's life prescribed by the Smṛtis, which are the means of livelihood for those who have merely taken recourse to that life. Witness the Smṛtis: 'The knower of Brahman wears no signs,' 'Therefore the knower of religion, who wears no signs, (should practise its principles)' (cf. Mbh. XIV. xlv. 51), and 'His signs are not manifest, nor his behaviour' (cf. Va. X.). And the Śruti: 'Then he becomes a monk, wears the ochre robe, shaves his head, and does not accept (superfluous) gifts,' etc. (Jā. 5); also, 'Having cut off his hair together with the tuft and giving up the holy thread,' etc. (Kś. I., II. 3).

ननु 'व्युत्थायाथ भिक्षाचर्यं चरन्ति' इति वर्तमानापदेशात् अर्थवादोऽयम्; न विधायकः प्रत्ययः कश्चिच्छ्रूयते लिङ्लोङ्गव्यानामन्यतमोऽपि; तस्मात् अर्थवादमात्रेण श्रुतिस्मृतिविहितानां यज्ञोपवीतादीनां साधनानां न शक्यते परित्यागः कारयितुम्; 'यज्ञोपवीत्येवाधीयीत याजयेद्यजेत वा' (तै. आ. २।१।१)। पारिव्राज्ये तावदध्ययनं विहितम् — 'वेदसन्न्यसनाच्छ्रद्धस्तस्माद्वेदं न सन्न्यसेत्' इति ; 'स्वाध्याय एवोत्सृज्यमानो वाचम्' (आ. ध. २।२।१०) इति च आपस्तम्बः; 'ब्रह्मोज्झं वेदनिन्दा च कौटसाक्ष्यं सुहृद्वधः। गर्हितान्नाद्ययोर्जग्धिः सुरापानसमानि षट्' (मनु. १।१।५६) — इति वेदपरित्यागे दोषश्रवणात्। 'उपासने गुरूणां वृद्धानामतिथीनां होमे जप्यकर्मणि भोजन आचमने स्वाध्याये च यज्ञोपवीती स्यात्' (आ. ध. १।१।५।१) इति पारिव्राजकधर्मेषु च गुरूपासनस्वाध्यायभोजनाचमनादीनां कर्मणां श्रुतिस्मृतिषु कर्तव्यतया चोदितत्वात् गुर्वाद्युपासनाङ्गत्वेन यज्ञोपवीतस्य विहितत्वात् तत्परित्यागो नैवावगन्तुं शक्यते। यद्यपि एषणाभ्यो व्युत्थानं विधीयत एव, तथापि पुत्राद्येषणाभ्यस्तिसृभ्य एव व्युत्थानम्, न तु सर्वस्मात्कर्मणः कर्मसाधनाच्च