



केनोपनिषद्

Translation of Sri Adi Shankaracharya's Vakya Bhasya,
Revised and Edited on May 8, 2018



Translation based on discourses by

Swami Bodhatmananda

Acharya, 16th and 17th Vedanta Course

Sandeepany Sadhanalaya, Chinmaya Mission

विषयानुक्रमणिका

Introduction – Vakya Bhashya.....1	द्वितीय खण्ड.....24
सम्बन्धभाष्य.....2	तृतीय खण्ड40
प्रथम खण्ड9	चतुर्थ खण्ड.....62

Introduction – Vakya Bhashya

- This Upanishad is from the Talavakara Brahmana of the Sama Veda.
- It is one of the Major Upanishads commented on by Bhagavan Shankaracharya
- Bhashyakarji wrote two commentaries on the same Upanishad, which is a unique feature of Kenopanishad.
 - The first one he wrote was “Pada Bhashya” which explains the Upanishad from the perspective of each word.
 - Unsatisfied, he wrote a second one, “Vakya Bhashya,” which looks to the sentence meaning for explanation of the Mantras.

सम्बन्धभाष्य

समाप्तं कर्म-आत्मभूत-प्राण-विषयं विज्ञानं कर्म च
अनेक-प्रकारं ययोः विकल्प-समुच्चय-अनुष्ठानात्
दक्षिण-उत्तराभ्यां सृतिभ्याम् आवृत्ति-अनावृत्ती
भवतः।

The topics of Prana-Upasana [i.e. Hiranyagarbha Upasana] (within the 'karma-kanda' section of this branch of Sama Veda) and karmas of many types have completed (in the 8 chapters leading up to "keneshitam," etc.); The performance of enjoined karma, or upasana, or both, leads to rebirth and no rebirth*, by the Southern and Northern paths, respectively. *(Here no rebirth means gradual liberation after having attained knowledge in Barhmaloka)

अतः ऊर्ध्वम् फल-निरपेक्ष-ज्ञान-कर्म-समुच्चय-
अनुष्ठानात् कृत-आत्म-संस्कारस्य उच्छिन्न-
आत्मज्ञानप्रतिबन्धकस्य द्वैत-विषय-दोष-दर्शिनः
निर्ज्ञात-अशेष-बाह्य-विषयत्वात् संसार-बीजम्-
अज्ञानम्-उच्चिच्छित्सतः प्रत्यग्-आत्म-विषयजिज्ञासोः
केनेषितम्-इति आत्म-स्वरूप-तत्त्व-विज्ञानाय अयम्
अध्याय आरभ्यते।

Furthermore, this chapter – "keneshitam," etc. – for knowing the essential nature of the Self, begins, for the one who has purified his mind by performing together the aforementioned karma and upasana without desiring results, who has destroyed the obstacles for self-knowledge, who sees defects in duality, who wants to destroy the root of samsara, which is ignorance, because he has completely understood the nature of external sense objects, and therefore he wants to know the innermost Self.

तेन च मृत्युपदम् अज्ञानम् उच्छेत्तव्यं तत्-तन्नः हि
संसारः यतः।

By this (upanishad), ignorance, which is of the nature of death, should be destroyed, because transmigration's existence verily depends on

	ignorance.
अनधिगतत्वात् आत्मनः युक्ता तदधिगमाय तद्विषया जिज्ञासा।	Because it is not known by other means, the natural desire for knowing the Self through the given subject ("keneshitam," etc) arises.
कर्मविषये च अनुक्तिः तद् विरोधित्वात्। (Sangrahavaakyam)	In the Karma section (preceding this upanishad), knowledge of Self is not explained, because Self-Knowledge and karma are opposed to each other.
अस्य विजिज्ञासितव्यस्य आत्मतत्त्वस्य कर्मविषये अवचनम्	The nature of Self was not explained in the karma portion, because it should be known as separate (from karma).
कस्मात् इति चेत् आत्मनः हि यथावत् विज्ञानं कर्मणा विरुध्यते।	If asked why – [because] true knowledge of the Self is opposed to the nature of karma.
निरतिशय-ब्रह्मस्वरूपः हि आत्मा विजिज्ञापयिषितः “तदेव ब्रह्म त्वं विद्धि नेदं यदिदमुपासते” – इत्यादिश्रुतेः	That Self, the knowledge of which is desired to be taught, is indeed of the nature of unsurpassed Brahman. As the shruti says “know that Brahman alone to be you, and not this which people worship as ‘this’.”
न हि स्वाराज्ये अभिषिक्तः ब्रह्मत्वं गमितः कञ्चन नमितुम् इच्छति अतः ब्रह्म अस्मि इति सम्बुद्धः न कर्म कारयितुं शक्यते	The one who has crowned himself in the kingdom of the Self, knowing the nature of Brahman, indeed has no desire to bow to anyone. Furthermore, he who knows “I am Brahman” cannot be made to do karma.
न हि आत्मानम् अवाप्तार्थं ब्रह्म मन्यमानः प्रवृत्तिं प्रयोजनवतीं पश्यति	The one who knows himself as Brahman doesn't see any action as purposeful (for gaining anything else since nothing else exists).

<p>न च निष्प्रयोजना प्रवृत्तिः, अतः विरुध्यते एव कर्मणा ज्ञानम्।</p>	<p>There cannot be any action without a purpose; thus, knowledge is opposed to karma.</p>
<p>अतः कर्म-विषये अनुक्तिः, विज्ञानविशेषविषया एव जिज्ञासा</p>	<p>[Knowledge] is not discussed in the karma section; therefore Knowledge can only be desired through a subject which exclusively discusses knowledge (i.e. Jnana Kanda).</p>
<p>कर्म अनारम्भ इति चेत् न, निष्कामस्य संस्कारार्थत्वात्</p>	<p>If one responds, "So then don't do any karma to begin with!" Such thinking is wrong, because desireless karma serves the purpose of purification (of mind).</p>
<p>यदि हि आत्मविज्ञानेन आत्म-अविद्या-विषयत्वात् परितित्याजयिषितं कर्म ततः "प्रक्षालनात् हि पङ्कस्य दूरात् अस्पर्शनं वरं" इति अनारम्भ एव कर्मणः श्रेयान्</p>	<p>PP – <i>If you say: because karma is an effect of ignorance of the self, through knowledge one should give up action, then, "rather than trying to wash mud, it is better not to touch it, remaining far;" according to this quotation (maxim of washing mud – prevention is better than curing), it is better not to start karma at all...</i></p>
<p>अल्पफलत्वात् आयासबहुलत्वात् तत्त्वज्ञानात् एव च श्रेयः प्राप्तेः इति चेत्</p>	<p>...because karma's results are finite, it is tiresome, and by self knowledge alone moksha is attained. --- If one argues in such a way –</p>
<p>सत्यम् एतत् अविद्या-विषयं कर्म अल्पफलत्व-आदि दोषवत् बंधरूपं च सकामस्य "कामान् यः कामयते" "इति नु कामयमानः" इत्यादि श्रुतिभ्यः न निष्कामस्य।</p>	<p>S – True. Karma – the effect of ignorance – does have the flaws of finite results etc. and bondage for the one who acts out of desire for results. "He who desires pleasures" (Mundaka Up. 3.2.2) "Such is the one who is desirous(Brahadaranyaka Up 4.4.6)." So say various Shruti texts (about one who acts out of</p>

	<p>desire) – but this doesn't apply to one who acts without desire.</p>
<p>तस्य तु संस्कारार्थानि एव कर्माणि भवन्ति तत् निर्वर्तक-आश्रय-प्राण-विज्ञान-सहितानि ।</p>	<p>For him (who acts without desire), execution of those (actions without desire) along with Prana Upasana (meditation on Hiranyagarbha – God who is the totality of manifest creation) only serve the purpose of purification.</p>
<p>“देवयाजी श्रेयान् आत्मयाजी वा” इति उपक्रम्य आत्मयाजी तु करोति “इदं मे अनेन अङ्गं संस्क्रियते” इति संस्कारार्थम् एव कर्माणि इति वाजसनेयके ।</p>	<p>If asking the question “Is devayaji or atmayaji (two types of rituals) better [to do]?” then in the Vaajasaneyaka branch of (Br. U.) it says to do atmayaji with the notion that “this will purify my anga” in this way actions are for purification. [A.G.ji says that anga is referring to antah karana, or simply, the mind]</p>
<p>“महायज्ञैः च यज्ञैः च ब्राह्मीयं क्रियते तनुः” “यज्ञः दानं तपः च एव पावनानि मनीषिणाम्” इत्यादि स्मृतेः च</p>	<p>“By mahayagnas and yagnas, this body is made eligible for knowledge of Brahman” (Manu Smriti 2.28) [A.G. here 'body' is referring again to the mind.] “Sacrifice, charity, and austerity are purifiers of the intellect.” (B.G. 18.5)</p>
<p>प्राणादि विज्ञानं च केवलं कर्म-समुच्चितं वा सकामस्य प्राणात्म-प्राप्ति-अर्थम् एव भवति</p>	<p>For one who acts out of desire, performance of praana upasana alone or along with karma will result only in praanaatmapraapti (attainment of hiranyagarbha state)</p>
<p>निष्कामस्य तु आत्मज्ञान प्रतिबन्ध-निर्माष्ट्र्यै भवति आदर्शनिर्माजनवत्</p>	<p>For one who acts without desire, [performance of praana upasana alone or along with karma] is for destruction of obstacles in self-knowledge, similar to cleaning a mirror.</p>
<p>उत्पन्न-आत्मविद्यस्य तु अनारम्भः निरर्थकत्वात्</p>	<p>For one in whom self-knowledge has arisen,</p>

<p>“कर्मणा बध्यते जन्तुः विद्यया च विमुच्यते। तस्मात्कर्म न कुर्वन्ति यतयः पारदर्शिनः।” इति</p>	<p>karma shouldn't be begun, because it is purposeless for him. “By karma a being is bound, by knowledge, he is freed. Therefore the wise who know the supreme, don't do karma.” ([maybe mahabharat, shasana parva?] 242.7)</p>
<p>“क्रियापथः च एव पुरस्तात् संन्यासः च तयोः संन्यासः एव अत्यरेचयत्” इति “त्यागेन एके” “नान्यः पन्था विद्यते” इत्यादि श्रुतिभ्यः च</p>	<p>“Of the two ancient paths, karma and renunciation, the path of renunciation alone excelled.” (No source available) “By renunciation alone” (Kaivalya 1.3) “[other than this] there is no other path” (Shvetashvatara 3.8), by these shruti quotations it is established.</p>
<p>न्यायात् च उपायभूतानि हि कर्माणि संस्कारद्वारेण ज्ञानस्य। ज्ञानेन तु अमृतत्वप्राप्तिः “अमृतत्वं हि विन्दते” “विद्यया विन्दते अमृतम्” इत्यादि श्रुति- स्मृतिभ्यः च</p>	<p>By logic also it is established. Through purification of mind, karmas are conducive to the attainment of knowledge. However, by knowledge alone immortality is gained. “Immortality is gained” (Kena 2.4) “By knowledge immortality is gained” (Kena 2.4) by these shrutis and similar smritis it is established.</p>
<p>न हि नद्याः पारगः नावं न मुञ्चति यथेष्टदेशगमनं प्रति स्वातन्त्र्ये सति।</p>	<p>One who crosses the river, having the freedom to attain his desired destination does not hesitate to give up the boat. [to clarify the double negative – The one who crosses the river must give up the boat in order to attain his destination]</p>
<p>न हि स्वभावसिद्धं वस्तु सिषाधयिषति साधनैः।</p>	<p>No one wants to use instruments to prove that which is self-evident.</p>

<p>स्वभावसिद्धः च आत्मा तथा न आपिपयिषितः आत्मत्वे सति नित्याप्तत्वात्</p>	<p>The nature of the self is also self-evident; therefore the desire to attain the self is not tenable, because, as it is of the nature of "I," it is ever-attained.</p>
<p>न अपि विचिकारयिषितः आत्मत्वे सति नित्यत्वात् अविकारित्वात् अविषयत्वात् अमूर्तत्वात् च</p>	<p>And the desire to modify the self is also untenable, because, being the Self, it is eternal, it can't be modified or objectified, and it is formless.</p>
<p>श्रुतेः च "न वर्धते कर्मणा" इत्यादि। स्मृतेः च "अविकार्योऽयम् उच्यते" इति न च सञ्चिकीर्षितः "शुद्धम् अपापविद्धम्" इत्यादि श्रुतिभ्यः अनन्यत्वात् च अन्येन अन्यत् संस्क्रियते</p>	<p>By shruti also it is established, "By karma it doesn't grow [modify]" (Brahadaranyaka 4.4.23) etc. By smriti, also: "It is said this can't be modified" (B.G. 2.25). And the desire to purify the self is also untenable: "[The Self] is pure and untouched by sin," (Ishavasya 8) and etc. is given by shruti. Also it can't be purified because there is nothing other than it; only by something else can something be purified.</p>
<p>न च आत्मनः अन्यभूता क्रिया अस्ति न च स्वेन एव आत्मना स्वम् आत्मानं सञ्चिकीर्षेत्</p>	<p>And there is no action outside of Atma either, [because Atma is one without a second] the desire for Atma to purify itself by itself is untenable.</p>
<p>न च वस्तु अन्तराधानं नित्य-प्राप्तिः वा वस्तु अन्तरस्य नित्या</p>	<p>And one object cannot be supported by a different object eternally, and likewise one object can't own another (distinct and different) object eternally.</p>
<p>नित्यत्वं च इष्टं मोक्षस्य</p>	<p>The eternality of liberation is what is desirable about it.</p>
<p>अतः उत्पन्नविद्यस्य कर्म आरम्भः अनुपपन्नः अतः</p>	<p>Therefore for the one in whom Self Knowledge</p>

व्यावृत्त-बाह्यबुद्धेः आत्मविज्ञानाय केनेषितम् इत्यदि

आरम्भः

has risen, there cannot be any action. And therefore, for the one who has controlled his extroverted mind, for the purpose of [his] Self-Knowledge, the Kenopanishad mantras starting from "Keneshitam" etc. are begun.

प्रथम खण्ड

ॐ केनेषितं पतति प्रेषितं मनः । केन प्राणः प्रथमः प्रौति युक्तः । केनेषितां वाचमिमां वदन्ति चक्षुः श्रोत्रं क उ देवो युनक्ति ॥ १ ॥

प्रवृत्ति-लिङ्गात् विशेषार्थः प्रश्नः उपपन्नः रथादीनां हि चेतनावद्-अधिष्ठितानां प्रवृत्तिः दृष्टा न अनधिष्ठितानाम्	The question about a specific force prompting the activity is appropriate. For example, it is seen in insentient chariots, that movement is dependent on sentient beings, and never in the absence of sentient beings.
मनआदीनां च अचेतनानां प्रवृत्तिः दृश्यते	And the activity of insentient objects like mind, etc. is observed.
तत् हि लिङ्गं चेतनावतः अधिष्ठातुः अस्तित्वे	This is the indicator of the existence of the sentient controller [which is asked about in the mantra]
करणानि हि मन आदीनि नियमेन प्रवर्तन्ते	The activity of instruments like the mind, etc. is thus regulated (by a sentient being). It is not so in the absence of a sentient controller.
तत् न असति चेतनावति अधिष्ठातरि उपपद्यते तत् विशेषस्य च अनधिगमात् चेतनावत्-सामान्ये च अधिगते विशेषार्थः प्रश्नः उपपद्यते	Because the student (through the above reasoning) got general knowledge that there must be <i>some</i> sentient controller, but doesn't have specific knowledge as to what exactly that controller is, this question is appropriate.
केन इषितं केन इष्टं कस्य इच्छा-मात्रेण मनः पतति गच्छति स्वविषये नियमेन व्याप्रियते इत्यर्थः	<i>Keneshitam</i> , by which desire, or by whose will, does the mind <i>patai</i> go to its object in such regulated manner?
मनुते अनेन इति विज्ञान-निमित्तम् अन्तःकरणं मनः प्रेषितम् इव इति उपमार्थः	<i>Manah</i> , that by which one thinks, the reason knowledge takes place, the inner instrument, <i>preshitam</i> , sent; this meaning is only figurative.
न तु इषित-प्रेषितशब्दयोः अर्थौ इह सम्भवतः	Here, the literal meanings of <i>ishita</i> and <i>preshita</i> are not appropriate
न हि शिष्यान् इव मनआदीनि विषयेभ्यः प्रेषयति आत्मा	Because the mind, etc. are not 'sent' towards objects, as it were, by the Atma, the way a guru sends his students.
विविक्त-नित्य-चित्स्वरूपतया तु निमित्तमात्रं प्रवृत्तौ	Atma is the 'prompter' only as unattached,

नित्यचिकित्सा अधिष्ठातृवत्

eternal, consciousness (which prompts without doing anything, or having any particular will or desire, but rather by its presence alone), like a chakora bird. [When a king eats, to make sure it isn't poisoned, he would put a chakora bird in front of the food; if poison was there the bird's eyes would change color. In this way, just by proximity, and not by any particular will, the chakora bird is a 'prompter.']

प्राणः इति नासिकाभवः प्रकरणात्

Prana the air which stays in the nose; this definition is in the context of this topic.

प्रथमत्वं प्रचलन-क्रियायाः प्राण-निमित्तत्वात् स्वतः
विषय-अवभासमात्रं करणानां प्रवृत्तिः

Prana is mentioned first because it is the cause of movement and action, while sense organs are only for illumining objects.

तस्मात् प्राथम्यं प्राणस्य

Therefore prana is mentioned first

प्रैति गच्छति युक्तः प्रयुक्तः इति एतत्

Praitī, goes, *yuktah*, enjoined [as in, "enjoined by what, do the pranas function?"].

वाचः वदनं किं निमित्तं प्राणिनां चक्षुः श्रोत्रयोः च
कः देवः प्रयोक्ता

Vacah, speech - what makes beings speak; which *deva*, god, makes the eyes and ears to function?

करणानाम् अधिष्ठाता चेतनावान् यः सः किं
विशेषणः इति अर्थः

What is the description of the one who is the prompter of the sense organs?

श्रोत्रस्य श्रोत्रं मनसो मनो यद्वाचो ह वाचं स उ प्राणस्य प्राणश्चक्षुषश्चक्षुरतिमुच्य धीराः
प्रेत्यास्माल्लोकादमृता भवन्ति ॥ २ ॥

श्रोत्रस्य श्रोत्रम् इत्यादि प्रतिवचनं निर्विशेषस्य
निमित्तत्वार्थम्

"Ear of the ear" etc. is the answer given to explain the instigative nature of the non-dual Atma.

विक्रियादि विशेषरहितस्य आत्मनः मनआदि-प्रवृत्तौ
निमित्तत्वम् इति एतत् श्रोत्रस्य श्रोत्रम् इत्यादि

The Atma is what prompts the activities of the mind, etc. while itself being without modifications or particularity; this is to be

प्रतिवचनस्य अर्थः अनुगमात्	understood from the answer given as “Ear of the ear, etc.”
तत् अनुगतानि हि अत्र अस्मिन् अर्थे अक्षराणि	These words of this mantra are to be understood thus.
कथम्? शृणोति अनेन इति श्रोत्रं तस्य शब्द- अवभासकत्वं श्रोत्रत्वं । शब्द-उपलब्ध-रूपतया अवभासकत्वं न स्वतः श्रोत्रस्य अचिद्रूपत्वात् आत्मनः च चिद्रूपत्वात्	How? That by which one hears is the ear. That which illuminates sound is the ability to hear. The ear cannot be said to illumine sound on its own as the one hearing sound, because it is insentient. However, the Atma can be considered as the unaided illuminator of sound, because it is of the nature of consciousness).
यत् श्रोत्रस्य उपलब्धत्वेन अवभासकत्वं तत् आत्म- निमित्तत्वात् श्रोत्रस्य श्रोत्रम् इति उच्यते	That ability to illumine sound of the ear is caused, guided, controlled by Atma (without the Atma doing anything or willing anything, just by its presence). This is meant by “ear of the ear, etc.”
यथा क्षत्रस्य क्षत्रं यथा वा उदकस्य औष्ण्यम् अग्निनिमित्तम् इति दग्धुः अपि उदकस्य दग्धाग्निः उच्यते	Just as a person in the warrior caste is a warrior, or just as the heat of water is really caused by fire; even water which burns is actually called fire which is burning.
उदकम् अपि हि अग्नि-संयोगाद् अग्निः उच्यते तद्वत् अनित्यं यत् संयोगात् उपलब्धत्वं तत् करणं श्रोत्रादि	Even water, which has come in contact with fire, is described as fire; in the same way, impermanent [and insentient/inert] receptors, having come into contact [with Atma, the source of sentiency], are called sense organs [thought to be sentient themselves].
उदकस्य इव दग्धत्वम् अनित्यं हि तत्र तत्	The apparent burning quality of water is only temporary, as is the sentient quality of sense organs.
यत्र तु नित्यम् उपलब्धत्वम् अग्नौ इव औष्ण्यं सः नित्य-उपलब्धि-स्वरूपत्वात् दग्धा इव उपलब्धा उच्यते	Like fire, in which the heat is permanently present, is called the one that burns, similarly, the one in which the ability of perception (sentiency) is permanently present, is called the perceiver/knower.

<p>श्रोत्रादिषु श्रोतृत्वादि उपलब्धिः अनित्या नित्या च आत्मनि अतः श्रोत्रस्य श्रोत्रम् इत्यादि अक्षराणाम् अर्थ अनुगमात् उपपद्यते निर्विशेषस्य उपलब्धि-स्वरूपस्य आत्मनः मनआदि-प्रवृत्ति-निमित्तत्वम् इति</p>	<p>In the ears, etc, the ability to hear, etc, [i.e. perceive/know] is impermanent, while it is permanent in Atma. Therefore, the meaning to be understood of the words “Ear of the ear, etc.” is that the Atma, which is of the permanent nature of knowledge and without particular qualities, is the cause for the activity of the mind and senses etc.</p>
<p>मनआदिषु एवं यथा उक्तम्</p>	<p>The mind, speech, and pranas, should be understood in the same way.</p>
<p>वाचः ह वाचं प्राणस्य प्राणः इति विभक्तिद्वयं सर्वत्र एव द्रष्टव्यं</p>	<p>The speech <i>of</i> the speech (subject-case), and the prana <i>of</i> the prana(object-case), such noun-cases are to be seen everywhere in this mantra</p>
<p>कथम् ? पृष्टत्वात् स्वरूप-निर्देशः प्रथमया एव निर्देशः तस्य च ज्ञेयत्वात् कर्मत्वम् इति द्वितीया अतः वाचः ह वाचं प्राणस्य प्राणः इत्यस्मात् सर्वत्र एव विभक्तिद्वयम्</p>	<p>How? Because the question was asked to point out the nature of the Atma. Indication is given in the subject-case. However Atma is the object to be known here, for which the object-case is appropriate. Therefore in speech of the speech, prana of the prana, etc. in all cases both noun case-endings are justifiable.</p>
<p>यत् एतत् श्रोत्रादि उपलब्धि-निमित्तं श्रोत्रस्य श्रोत्रम् इत्यादि लक्षणं नित्य-उपलब्धि-स्वरूपं निर्विशेषम् आत्मतत्त्वं तत्-बुद्धा अतिमुच्य अनवबोध-निमित्त-अध्यारोपितात् बुद्धि-आदि लक्षणात् संसारात् मोक्षणं कृत्वा धीराः धीमन्तः प्रेत्य अस्मात् लोकात् शरीरात् प्रेत्य वियुज्य अन्यस्मिन् अप्रतिसन्धीयमाने निर्निमित्तत्वात् अमृताः भवन्ति</p>	<p>That which is the cause of the perception by ears etc., which is indicated as “ear of the ear, etc.” which is of the nature of knowledge (Consciousness), without any particularity, which is the essential Self, having known which, having crossed the ignorance-causing superimposition which is the samsara characterized by the intellect, becoming free, wise people go beyond this world and body, and, not having any reason to join with another body, they become immortal.</p>
<p>सति हि अज्ञाने कर्माणि शरीर-अन्तरं प्रतिसन्दधते आत्मा अवबोधे तु सर्वकर्म-आरम्भ-निमित्त-अज्ञान-विपरीत-विद्या-अग्नि-विप्लुष्टत्वात् कर्मणाम् अनारम्भे</p>	<p>Only in ignorance, karma causes one to be joined with another body. But upon knowing the Self, the fire of knowledge, which is opposed to ignorance, burns the ignorance with is the cause for starting all karma, and when there is</p>

अमृताः एव भवन्ति	no action or need for action, [those wise people] verily become immortal.
शरीरादि सन्तान-अविच्छेद-प्रतिसन्धानादि-अपेक्ष्य-अध्यारोपित-मृत्यु-वियोगात्-पूर्वम् अपि अमृताः सन्तः नित्य-आत्म-स्वरूपवत्त्वात् अमृताः भवन्ति इति उपचर्यते	Even though they are already immortal, because the Self is eternal, it is still appropriate to say that they <i>become</i> immortal, in the sense that before, they remained in the self-superimposed notion “may this body, etc. not be cut off,” by which ignorance they were joined with death.

न तत्र चक्षुर्गच्छति न वाग्गच्छति नो मनो न विज्ञो न विजानीमो यथैतदनुशिष्यादन्यदेव तद्विदितादथो अविदितादधि। इति शुश्रुम पूर्वेषां ये नस्तद्व्याचक्षिरे ॥ ३ ॥

न तत्र चक्षुः गच्छति इति उक्ते अपि पर्यनुयोगे हेतुः अप्रतिपत्तेः श्रोत्रस्य श्रोत्रम् इति-एवम्-आदिना उक्ते अपि आत्म-तत्त्वे अप्रतिपन्नत्वात् सूक्ष्मत्व हेतोः वस्तुनः पुनः पुनः पर्यनुयुक्षाकारणम् आह -- न तत्र चक्षुः गच्छति इति	Although the essential nature of the self was explained by the Acharya in “Ear of the ear, etc.” because it was not understood by the disciple, he asked again and this mantra has been expressed. [Another reason] is that the Self is difficult to grasp and is very subtle, therefore, the student has the desire for repeated elaboration and hence this mantra.
तत्र श्रोत्रादि आत्मभूते चक्षुरादीनि वाक्-चक्षुषोः सर्वेन्द्रिय-उपलक्षणार्थत्वात् न विज्ञानम् उत्पादयन्ति	There (mantra 2) the essential nature of the ear etc. (ear of the ear) is the Self, so eyes, etc. (mantra 3, speech and eyes indicate all sense organs) cannot comprehend the Self.
सुखादिवत् तर्हि गृह्येत अन्तःकरणेन अतः आह -	<i>PP – but then, like happiness, etc. can it be understood by the mind?</i>
नो मनः। न सुखादिवत् मनसः विषयः तत् इन्द्रिय-अविषयत्वात्	S – The mantra says, neither does the Mind go there. Unlike happiness, etc., Atma is not within the scope of the mind, it is not in the scope of any of the senses.
न विद्मः न विजानीमः अन्तःकरणेन यथा एतद्ब्रह्म मनआदिकरण-जातम् अनुशिष्याद् अनुशासनं	We (the teachers) don’t know it, and we don’t know how, by the inner instrument this Brahman can be understood or taught (to the students); that

<p>कुर्यात् प्रवृत्ति-निमित्तं भवेत् तथा अविषयत्वात् न विद्मः न विजानीमः</p>	<p>Brahman is the reason that the mind, etc. instruments are able to function [so how can they, as the effect, know Brahman, the cause?] – in that sense [in the sense of an object of the mind] we don't understand brahman or know how to teach it.</p>
<p>अथवा श्रोत्रादीनां श्रोत्रादि-लक्षणं ब्रह्म-विशेषेण दर्शयेत् युक्ते आचार्यः आह न शक्यते दर्शयितुं</p>	<p>Or perhaps the student requests the teacher to show him in particular that Brahman which is the ear of the ear etc. (e.g. "can you show me where exactly is it?") to which the teacher responds that it can't be shown.</p>
<p>कस्मात्? न तत्र चक्षुः गच्छति इत्यादि पूर्ववत् सर्वम्</p>	<p>Why? Because "the eyes do not go there, etc." was all explained before.</p>
<p>अत्र तु विशेषः यथा एतत् अनुशिष्यात् इति</p>	<p>This is the meaning of "yathā etat anuṣiñyāt"</p>
<p>यथा एतत् अनुशिष्यात् प्रतिपादयेत् अन्यः अपि शिष्यान् इतः अन्येन विधिना इति अभिप्रायः</p>	<p>The teacher's opinion is, "Any other way that some other teacher might teach this, I don't know."</p>
<p>सर्वथा अपि ब्रह्म बोधयेत् युक्ते आचार्यः आह अन्यत् एव तत् विदितात् अथः अविदितात् अधि इति आगतं विदित-अविदिताभ्याम् अन्यत्वम्</p>	<p>But when the student feels "In any which way you please make me understand <i>Brahman</i>." Then the teacher said "It is different from the known and beyond the unknown" this differentiation from both known and unknown is the teaching that is passed down in tradition.</p>
<p>यो हि ज्ञाता सः एव सः सर्वात्मकत्वात्</p>	<p>The one who knows That, is himself That, as That is the Self of all.</p>
<p>अतः सर्वात्मनः ज्ञातुः ज्ञात्रन्तर-अभावात् विदितात् अन्यत्वम्</p>	<p>Therefore there is no <i>separate</i> knower than That as it is the Self of All, It alone is the Knower, and so it is different than the known.</p>
<p>"सः वेत्ति वेद्यं न च तस्य अस्ति वेत्ता" इति च मन्त्रवर्णात्</p>	<p>"He knows all that is to be known and for Him there is no other knower." (Shvetashvatara Upanishad 3.19)</p>
<p>"विज्ञातारम् अरे केन विजानीयात्" इति च वाजसनेयके</p>	<p>"By whom can the supreme knower be known?" (Brhadaranyaka Upanishad 2.4.14)</p>

अपि च व्यक्तम् एव विदितं तस्मात् अन्यत् इति अभिप्रायः	The message is that the scope of the “known” extends only to the manifest (that which has name and form), [Brahman is] different from that.
यत् विदितं व्यक्तं तत् अन्यविषयत्वात् अल्पं सविरोधं ततः अनित्यम् अतः एव अनेकत्वात् अशुद्धम् अतः एव तत् विलक्षणं ब्रह्म इति सिद्धम्	That which is known, i.e. manifest, is the object of knowledge of something other than itself. Because of this, it is limited, it is subject to destruction, and therefore it is impermanent. Following this, [what is manifest/known] is manifold, therefore it is impure [here, ‘impure’ is used in the sense that it is among many other thing and therefore unable to retain itself unmixed with anything else]. Therefore it is different than Brahman, thus it is established.
तर्हि अविदितं...?	<i>PP: Therefore it is not knowable...?</i>
न, विज्ञान-अनपेक्षत्वात्	S: No, because this type of knowledge is not required for Brahman.
यत् हि अविदितं तत् विज्ञान-अपेक्षम्	Only that which is unknown requires knowledge.
अविदित-विज्ञानाय हि लोक-प्रवृत्तिः	Only for unknown things do people in the world put forth effort to know.
इदं तु विज्ञान-अनपेक्षम्	This (Brahman) does not require knowledge of It.
कस्मात्?	Why?
विज्ञान-स्वरूपत्वात्	Because it is itself of the nature of Knowledge.
न हि यस्य यत्स्वरूपं तत् तेन अन्यतः अपेक्ष्यते	That which is the nature of a thing is not needed from something else.
न च स्वतः एव अपेक्षा अनपेक्षम् एव सिद्धत्वात्	And something doesn’t need anything from itself for being what it already is. Thus proved: knowledge of Brahman is not needed.
प्रदीपः स्वरूप-अभिव्यक्तौ न प्रकाश-अन्तरम् अन्यतः अपेक्षते स्वतः वा	A lamp does not need another source of light from itself or any other source to illumine it as its nature is illumination.
यत् हि अनपेक्षं तत् स्वतः एव सिद्धम्	That which does not need a thing to establish itself

	is established by itself.
प्रकाशात्मकत्वात् प्रदीपस्य अपेक्षितः अपि अनर्थकः स्यात् प्रकाशे विशेष-अभावात्	Because it is of the nature of illumination the necessity of another light is meaningless, because there's no particular differences between the lights (light is light)
न हि प्रदीपस्य स्वरूप-अभिव्यक्तौ प्रदीप-प्रकाशः अर्थवान्	The use of another lamp to illumine a lamp doesn't make any sense.
न च एवम् आत्मनः अन्यत्र विज्ञानम् अस्ति येन स्वरूप-विज्ञाने अपि अपेक्ष्यते	And in the same way, there is no knowledge other than [jnanaswaroopa] Atma, therefore to know Atma [objective] knowledge is not needed.
विरोधः इति चेत् न अन्यत्वात्	<i>But there's a contradiction! How can it be not known but also not require knowledge? Because Atma is different from both - known and unknown.</i>
स्वरूपविज्ञाने विज्ञान-स्वरूपत्वात् विज्ञान-अन्तरं न अपेक्षते इति एतत् असत् । दृश्यते हि विपरीत-ज्ञानम् आत्मनि सम्यक् ज्ञानं च न जानामि आत्मानम् इति	<i>PP: You said that there is no need for a separate knower of the Self because the nature of the Self is knowledge – this is not right, because both erroneous and correct knowledge happen in the Self – for example “I don't know the Self” etc.</i>
श्रुतेः च “तत्त्वमसि” “आत्मानम् एव अवेत्” “एवं वै तम् आत्मानं विदित्वा” इति च सर्वत्र श्रुतिषु आत्मविज्ञाने विज्ञानान्तर-अपेक्षत्वं दृश्यते तस्मात् प्रत्यक्ष-श्रुति-विरोधः इति चेत्	<i>“You are That” (Chandogya 6.8.7) or “Verily knew the Self,” (Brihadaranyaka 1.4.10) or “Having certainly known the Self” (Brihadaranyaka 3.5.1) etc. Everywhere in Shruti it is seen that for knowing Atma, the Self, a separate knower is required. That's why what you said earlier about not needing a knower of the self is opposed to Shruti, and therefore wrong...If it is argued thus...</i>
न	S: ...No.
कस्मात्?	<i>PP: Why?</i>
अन्यः हि सः आत्मा बुद्धि-आदि-कार्य-करण-सन्धात-अभिमान-सन्तान-अविच्छेद-लक्षणः अविवेक-आत्मकः बुद्धि-अवभास-प्रधानः चक्षुः-	S: The Atma is different than the individual whose identification with the body-mind complex has not been destroyed, who is indiscriminate (i.e. thinking improperly), whose inner essence is the Self of the

<p>आदि-करणः नित्य-चित्-स्वरूप-आत्मा अन्तःसारः यत्र अनित्यं विज्ञानम् अवभासते</p>	<p>nature of knowledge, but that individual is only a reflection of the Self (consciousness), reflected in the inner instrument, senses etc... that being (the reflection, chidabhasa) is the locus of particular, impermanent knowledge.</p>
<p>बौद्ध-प्रत्ययानाम् आविर्भाव-तिरोभाव-धर्मकत्वात् तत्-धर्मतया एव विलक्षणम् अपि च अवभासते</p>	<p>Thoughts in the intellect have the nature of rising and falling (coming and goin). Because of this characteristic [the chidabhasa (as the locus of <i>impermanent</i> knowledge)] is different than Atma.</p>
<p>अन्तःकरणस्य मनसः अपि मनः अन्तर्गतत्वात् सर्वान्तर-श्रुतेः</p>	<p>The [Atma is the] mind of the mind, because it is innermost – as shruti proclaims it is the “Self of all.”</p>
<p>अन्तर्गतेन नित्यविज्ञानस्वरूपेण आकाशवत् अप्रचलित-आत्मना अन्तर्गर्भभूतेन बाह्यः बुद्धि- आत्मा तत्-विलक्षणः अर्चिर्भिः इव अग्निः प्रत्ययैः आविर्भावतिरोभावधर्मकैः विज्ञानाभासरूपैः अनित्यविज्ञानः आत्मा सुखी- दुःखी-इति अभ्युपगतः लौकिकैः</p>	<p>The unmoving Atma is innermost, and of the nature of eternal knowledge; it pervades all like space, and is like the inner womb of all; external to that Atma is the intellect, the locus of [particular] knowledge – that intellect is different than Atma. Atma and this intellect are like the fire and its moving sparks in the following way: by the thoughts that have the nature of rising and falling, which reflect the Consciousness, which are of the nature of impermanent knowledge, people in the world [falsely] imagine these to be the qualities of Atma, the Self, e.g. that the Self is happy or sad.</p>
<p>अतः अन्यः नित्य-विज्ञान-स्वरूपात् आत्मनः तत्र हि विज्ञान-अपेक्षा विपरीत-ज्ञानत्वं च उपपद्यते न पुनः नित्यविज्ञाने</p>	<p>Therefore, that (intellect reflecting consciousness) is different than the Self of the nature of eternal knowledge – there alone (in that intellect) is the necessity for particular knowledge and the possibility for erroneous knowledge; not in Atma which is eternal knowledge.</p>
<p>तत्त्वमसि इति बोध-उपदेशः न उपपद्यते इति चेत् आत्मानम् एव अवेत् इत्येवमादीनि च नित्य- बोध-आत्मकत्वात् न हि आदित्यः अन्येन प्रकाश्यते अतः तदर्थ-बोध-उपदेशः अनर्थकः</p>	<p><i>PP: But then the teaching statement “That Thou Art” is untenable, as is “The self was known (to be Brahman)” because Atma is supposedly of the nature of eternal knowledge. As you say, the sun is never illumined by any other source of light, therefore these statements which ‘reveal’ the Atma</i></p>

इति चेत्	<i>are pointless according to you...if argued thus...</i>
न लोक-अध्यारोप-अपोह-अर्थत्वात्	No, because these statements are to negate the superimposition of people.
सर्वात्मनि हि नित्य-विज्ञाने बुद्ध्यादि-अनित्यधर्माः लोकैः अध्यारोपिताः आत्म-अविवेकतः तत्- अपोह-अर्थः बोध-उपदेशः बोधात्मनः	People, out of their improper understanding of the Self, superimpose the impermanent natures of the intellect, etc. on that Self of All which is of the nature of eternal knowledge. Thus these teachings of Knowledge are for properly knowing the Self.
तत्र च बोध-अबोधौ समञ्जसौ अन्य-निमित्तत्वात् उदकः इव औष्ण्यम् अग्नि-निमित्तम् रत्रि-अहनी इव आदित्य-निमित्ते	Even though one's true nature is Knowledge, ignorance or knowledge of this are both possible because their cause is different (than one's own nature). The apparent heat in water is caused by fire; the apparent day and night are caused by the sun.
लोके नित्यौ औष्ण्यप्रकाशौ अग्नि-आदित्ययोः अन्यत्र भाव-अभावयोः निमित्तत्वात् अनित्यौ इव उपचर्येते	Actually heat and light are permanent qualities of fire and the sun, respectively. But elsewhere, the presence and absence of heat and light cause people in the world to think those qualities are temporary.
धक्ष्यति अग्निः प्रकाशयिष्यति सविता इति तद्वत्	Fire will burn and the sun will illumine
एवं च सुख-दुःख-बन्ध-मोक्ष-आदि अध्यारोपः लोकस्य तत् अपेक्ष्य तत् त्वम् असि आत्मानम् एव अवेत् इति आत्म-अवबोध-उपदेशेन श्रुतयः केवलम् अध्यारोप-अपोह-अर्थः	In the same way joy, sorrow, bondage, and liberation, etc. are superimpositions of [ignorant] people, and because of that such teachings of knowledge are required, like "That Thou Art (tat tvam asi)" "Know Atma alone." Through these teachings for understanding the self, found in Shruiti, are only to remove the superimposition of people.
यथा सविता असौ प्रकाशयति आत्मानम् इति तद्वत् बोध-अबोध-कर्तृत्वं च नित्य-बोधात्मनि तस्मात् अन्यत् अविदितात्। अधिशब्दः च अन्य-अर्थे	The way people say "the sun illumines itself," (indicating doership on behalf of the sun, where really there is none), similarly people designate the cause of knowledge and ignorance as Atma, the Self. Therefore Atma is different than the unknown. The word "adhi" (given in the mantra after "aviditāt") means "other."

<p>यत् वा यत् हि यस्य अधि तत्-ततः अन्यत् सामर्थ्यात्</p>	<p>Or, that which is above something else, is different than it. (The generally accepted meaning of adhi is “above” here Bhagvan is showing that that meaning also implies “otherness”). For example, the king is above his servants, etc. (and therefore different).</p>
<p>यथा अधि भृति-आदीनां राजा अव्यक्तम् एव अविदितं ततः अन्यत् इत्यर्थः</p>	<p>Only the unmanifest can be said to be “unknown” and therefore the thrust of this line of the shruti is that Atma is different than the unmanifest. (In other words, “different than the known” indicates that Atma is different from all gross and subtle matter, which can be known as an object, and “different than the unknown” indicates that Atma is different than even the unmanifest, causal universe).</p>
<p>विदितम् अविदितं च व्यक्त-अव्यक्ते कार्य-कारणत्वेन विकल्पिते ताभ्याम् अन्यद् ब्रह्म विज्ञान-स्वरूपं सर्व-विशेष-प्रत्यस्तमितम् इति अयं समुदाय-अर्थः</p>	<p>In the mantra, the words “known” and “unknown” refer to manifest and unmanifest, and are respectively understood effect and the cause. Brahman is indicated as different than both of them; that Brahman which is of the nature of Knowledge, where all differences end. This is the meaning of the sentences in the mantra.</p>
<p>अतः एव आत्मत्वात् न हेयः उपादेयः वा</p>	<p>Therefore because Brahman is the Self, it is cannot be given up or acquired.</p>
<p>अन्यद् हि अन्येन हेयं उपादेयं वा</p>	<p>Only other [objects] can be given up and acquired (the Self being the subject, it can't be an object of acquisition or rejection).</p>
<p>न तेन एव तत् अस्य कस्यचित् हेयम् उपादेयं वा भवति। आत्मा च ब्रह्म सर्वान्तरात्मत्वात् अविषयम् अतः अन्यस्य अपि न हेयम् उपाद्ये वा</p>	<p>Something cannot be given up or acquired by itself. Atma, which is Brahman, the innermost self of all, is not in the scope of sense organs, therefore by anything else (the Atma) cannot be given up or acquired.</p>
<p>अन्य-अभावात् च</p>	<p>Because there is nothing else other than Atma (to acquire it or to give it up). Atma alone is.</p>
<p>इति श्रुतम् पूर्वेषाम् इति आगम-उपदेशः</p>	<p>“This we heard from those before us” etc. indicates the lineage of teaching.</p>
<p>व्याचक्षिरे इति अस्वातन्त्र्यं तर्क-प्रतिषेध-अर्थम्</p>	<p>“They explained it to us” etc. indicates that what they explained (came from lineage, and therefore)</p>

<p>ये नः तद् ब्रह्म उक्तवन्तः ते नित्यम् एव आगमं ब्रह्म प्रतिपादकं व्याख्यातवन्तः न पुनः स्वबुद्धिप्रभवेण तर्केण उक्तवन्तः इति आगम-पारम्पर्य-अविच्छेदं दर्शयति विद्या-स्तुतये; तर्कः तु अनवस्थितः भ्रान्तः अपि भवति इति</p>	<p>precludes the possibility of independent reasoning of the teachers.</p> <p>To us (the students), those (the teachers) that taught that Brahman, they only explained Brahman according to the lineage of vedic instruction. And they didn't ever take anything from their own intellect or reasoning – they showed us exactly what is given in the lineage of instruction, unchanged, this all is indicated in the mantra to show the greatness of this knowledge; individual reasoning here has no place (in this teaching and lineage of teaching) as it is a product of delusion.</p>
---	--

यद्वाचानभ्युदितं येन वागभ्युद्यते ।
तदेव ब्रह्म त्वं विद्धि नेदं यदिदमुपासते ॥ ४ ॥

<p>यत् वाचा इति मन्त्रा अनुवादः दृढ-प्रतीतेः</p>	<p>This mantra, “By the speech” etc., is a restatement of the teaching for the purpose of making it clearer.</p>
<p>अन्यत् एव तत् विदितात् इति यः अयम् आगम-अर्थः ब्राह्मण-उक्तः अस्य एव द्रष्टिन्ने मन्त्रा यत् वाचा इत्यादयः पठ्यन्ते</p>	<p>It has come for clarifying the teaching in the mantra, “[Atma is] different from the known”(Kena 1.3) etc. which is the central message of this Upanishad (that comes in the Brahmana section of the Sama Veda)</p>
<p>यत् ब्रह्म वाचा शब्देन अनभ्युदितम् अनभ्युक्तम् अप्रकाशितम् इति एतत् येन वाक् अभ्युद्यते इति वाक् प्रकाश-हेतुत्व-उक्तिः</p>	<p>That Brahman which can't be understood, spoken of, or illumined (known) by speech, i.e. words, by that Brahman alone is speech understood, thus Brahman is said to be the reason for illuminating speech.</p>
<p>येन प्रकाशयते इति वाचः अभिधानस्य अभिधेय-प्रकाशकत्वस्य हेतुत्वम् उच्यते ब्रह्मणः</p>	<p>By that Brahman, speech illuminates – in other words the power of speech to illumine (understand) objects through words is actually the power of Brahman.</p>
<p>उक्तं च केन इषितां वाचम् इमां वदन्ति यत् वाचः</p>	<p>The question “By whose will does the speech get</p>

ह वाचम् इति, तदेव ब्रह्म त्वं विद्धि इति
अविषयत्वेन ब्रह्मणः आत्मनि अवस्थापनार्थ
आम्नायः

प्रथम खण्ड

spoken?” (Kena 1.1) was answered as “The speech of the speech.” (Kena 1.2) “Know that alone to be Brahman” (Kena 1.4) is indicated to establish Brahman in the intellect, as that which cannot be the object of perception.

[Guruji, Swamiji Tejomayanandaji offered one more interpretation of “tadeva brahma tvam viddhi” by saying “tadeva Brahman tvam” that Brahman alone is you, which is to be known by you, “viddhi.”]

यत् वाचा अनभ्युदितं वाक्-प्रकाश-निमित्तं च
इति ब्रह्मणः अविषयत्वेन वस्तु-अन्तर-जिघृक्षां
निवर्त्य स्वात्मनि एव अवस्थापयति आम्नायः तत्
एव ब्रह्म त्वं विद्धि इति यत्नतः उपरमयति | न
इदम् इति उपास्य-प्रतिषेधात् च

Brahman is described here as that which can't be understood by the speech, and that which is the cause of the illumination of speech; by this it is established that Brahman can't be an object of knowledge – to remove the natural desire to know everything as an object. Doing this, the Upanishad calms down the tendency to put effort and instead establish (know) it as one's own self, by saying “Know that (which is not an object) as Brahman.” And the sentence “it is not this which you worship here” precludes the possibility of Brahman of being the object of worship.

यन्मनसा न मनुते येनाहुर्मनो मतम् ।
तदेव ब्रह्म त्वं विद्धि नेदं यदिदमुपासते ॥ ५ ॥
यच्चक्षुषा न पश्यति येन चक्षूंषि पश्यति ।
तदेव ब्रह्म त्वं विद्धि नेदं यदिदमुपासते ॥ ६ ॥
यच्छ्रोत्रेण न शृणोति येन श्रोत्रमिदं श्रुतम् ।
तदेव ब्रह्म त्वं विद्धि नेदं यदिदमुपासते ॥ ७ ॥
यत्प्राणेन न प्राणिति येन प्राणः प्रणीयते ।
तदेव ब्रह्म त्वं विद्धि नेदं यदिदमुपासते ॥ ८ ॥

यत् मनसा इत्यादि समानम्	“By the mind” etc. mantras are the same as mantra 1.4
मनः मतम् इति येन ब्रह्मणा मनः अपि विषयी-कृतं नित्य-विज्ञान-स्वरूपेण इति एतत्	“The mind is known.” (1.5) Because of Brahman, which is itself of the nature of eternal knowledge, the mind also becomes an object of knowledge.
सर्वकरणानाम्-अविषयं तानि च सव्यापाराणि सविषयाणि नित्य-विज्ञान-स्वरूप-अवभासतया येन अवभास्यन्ते इति श्लोक-अर्थः	That Brahman is not an object of knowledge by any of the sense organs; all of their activities and scopes of knowledge are illumined by that Brahman which is eternal knowledge (the sense organs are able to illumine objects only because of Brahman); this is the meaning of these verses.
“क्षेत्रं क्षेत्री तथा कृत्स्नं प्रकाशयति” इति स्मृतेः	“In this way the knower of the field illumines the entire field” (BG 13.34) Thus corroborates the Smriti.
“तस्य भासा” इति च अथर्वणे	“By His light (all this is illumined)” (Mundaka 2.2.10) also in Atharvana Veda.
येन प्राण इति क्रिया-शक्तिः अपि आत्म-विज्ञान-निमित्ता इति एतत्	“By that the Prana (functions)” (Kena 1.8) etc. The central message of these mantras is that even the power to act of these organs is due to the Atma which is ever of the nature of Knowledge.

द्वितीय खण्ड

<p>यदि मन्यसे सुवेद इति शिष्य-बुद्धि-विचालना गृहीत-स्थिरतायै</p>	<p>The sentences of the second Khanda, “If you think you know it well,” etc. are for the purpose of solidifying the grasp of knowledge in student’s mind, by shaking the knowledge. [This is according to the maxim of fixing a pole in the earth – to test how well one knows something, that knowledge should be shaken and driven deeper until it is certain that it can’t be shaken anymore]</p>
<p>विदित-अविदिताभ्यां निवर्त्य बुद्धिं शिष्यस्य स्वात्मनि अवस्थाप्य तत् एव ब्रह्म त्वं विद्धि इति स्वाराज्ये अभिषिच्य उपास्य-प्रतिषेधेन अथ अस्य बुद्धिं विचालयति</p>	<p>Having negated the known and the unknown, and told the student “know that alone (which is different than known and unknown) to be Brahman,” and having placed the student on the throne of the highest knowledge and negated that which is worshipped or the object of upasana, the Guru then proceeds to shake the student’s mind such that his knowledge becomes firm.</p>
<p>यदि मन्यसे सु वेदेति दभ्रमेवापि नूनं त्वं वेत्थ ब्रह्मणो रूपं यदस्य त्वं यदस्य देवेष्वथ नु मीमांस्यमेव ते मन्ये विदितम् ॥ १ ॥</p>	
<p>यदि मन्यसे सुवेद अहं ब्रह्म इति त्वं ततः अल्पम् एव ब्रह्मणः रूपं वेत्थ त्वम् इति नूनं निश्चितं मन्यते इति आचार्यः</p>	<p>“If you think you know it well that ‘I am Brahman’ then you definitely know very little of Brahman” this is the understanding of the Teacher.</p>
<p>सा पुनः विचालना किमर्था इति उच्यते पूर्व-गृहीत-वस्तुनि बुद्धेः स्थिरतायै</p>	<p>And why is the Teacher shaking the student’s thought process? It is said – he’s doing it in order to make firm the knowledge of Brahman that has been grasped earlier in the student’s mind.</p>
<p>देवेषु अपि सुवेद अहम् इति मन्यते यः सः अपि अस्य ब्रह्मणः रूपं दहरम् एव वेत्ति नूनम्</p>	<p>Even amongst devatas he who thinks “I know it well” he also only knows very little of Brahman.</p>
<p>कस्मात्? अविषयत्वात् कस्यचित् ब्रह्मणः</p>	<p>Why is that? Because Brahman cannot be an object of knowledge for anybody [Brahman is itself the Subject, the Self of all]</p>

<p>अथवा अल्पम् एव अस्य आध्यात्मिकं मनुष्येषु देवेषु च आधिदैविकम् अस्य ब्रह्मणः यत् रूपं तत् इति सम्बन्धः</p>	<p>Or the meaning of this could be that the Brahman which is understood by men and devatas (who believe “I know it very well”) is itself lacking.</p>
<p>अथ नु इति हेतुः मीमांसायाः</p>	<p>“And therefore” (Kena 2.1) is for giving the reason.</p>
<p>यस्मात् दहरम् एव सुविदितं ब्रह्मणः रूपम् अन्यत् एव तत् विदितात् इति उक्तत्वात्</p>	<p>To say that Brahman is very well known is surely erroneous, because it was said that Brahman is different than the known.</p>
<p>सुवेद इति च मन्यसे अतः अल्पम् एव वेत्थ त्वं ब्रह्मणः रूपं यस्मात् अथ नु तस्मात् मीमांस्यम् एव अद्य अपि ते तव ब्रह्म विचार्यम् एव यावत् विदित-अविदित-प्रतिषेध-आगम-अर्थ-अनुभव इति अर्थः</p>	<p>“And,” (the Teacher says,) “You think I know it very well, therefore you know only very little of Brahman. Thus, ‘your’ Brahman requires a little analysis” (in other words the teacher is telling the student he/she needs to contemplate more on the nature of Brahman). The meaning is that the teaching will be understood when both the known and unknown are negated.</p>
<p>मन्ये विदितम् इति शिष्यस्य मीमांसा-अनन्तर-उक्तिः प्रत्यय-त्रय-सङ्गतेः</p>	<p>The student’s words “I think it is known” came after contemplating sufficiently, because he had the triple-confirmation (the words of scripture, the words of the teacher, and his own experience.)</p>
<p>सम्यक् वस्तु निश्चयाय विचालितः शिष्यः आचार्येण मीमांस्यम् एव ते इति च उक्ते एकान्ते स्माहितः भूत्वा विचार्य यथा उक्तं सुपरिनिश्चितः सत् आह आगम-आचार्य-आत्म-अनुभव-प्रत्यय-त्रयस्य एकविषयत्वेन सङ्गति-अर्थम्</p>	<p>The student who had been shaken up by the teacher when he was told “For you, Brahman requires a lot of analysis,” went into solitude and, becoming calm, he contemplated on what was taught, for establishing the knowledge of Brahman. Becoming established in that knowledge, he replied “I think it is known” following the confirmation of the words of scripture, his teacher, and his own experience.</p>
<p>एवं हि सुपरिनिष्ठिता विद्या सफला स्यात् न अनिश्चिता इति न्यायः प्रदर्शितः भवति मन्ये विदितम् इति परिनिष्ठित-निश्चित-विज्ञान-प्रतिज्ञा-हेतु-उक्तेः</p>	<p>In this way, the logic (of fixing a pole in the earth mentioned earlier) is shown – knowledge which is well established alone is fruitful, but not shaky knowledge. Because of the statement</p>

द्वितीय खण्ड

of the student, "I think it is known," the argument that knowledge must be firm and unshakeable is conveyed.

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

परिनिष्ठितं सफलं विज्ञानं प्रतिजानीत आचार्य-आत्म-निश्चययोः तुल्यतायै यस्मात् हेतुम् आह न अह मन्ये सुवेद इति	The student then, to express that his and the teacher's understanding is the same, said "I don't think I know it very well, etc." [Only in Vakya Bhashya is the mantra given as "Na aha manye..." everywhere else it is given as "Na aham manye..."]
अह इति अवधारणार्थः निपातः न एव मन्ये इति एतत्	The interjection "aha" is for emphasis.
यावत् अपरिनिष्ठितं विज्ञानं तावत् सुवेद सुष्ठु वेद अहं ब्रह्म इति विपरीतः मम निश्चय आसीत्	Its connotation is as follows: I don't have the erroneous notion that "I know it very well, i.e. my understanding of Brahman is very good."
सः उपजगाम भवद्भिः विचालितस्य यथा- उक्त-अर्थ-मीमांसा-फल-भूतात् स्वात्म- ब्रह्मत्व-निश्चय-रूपात् सम्यक्-प्रत्ययत् विरुद्धत्वात्	I found the idea that "I know Brahman very well" to be contradictory to the teaching the way it was given, as a result of the fruit of contemplating on it; this was because of the shaking you gave me (in the previous mantra).
अतः न् अह मन्ये सुवेद इति	Therefore I don't think that 'I know it very well.'
यस्मात् च एतत् न एव न वेद न उ न वेद इति मन्ये इति अनुवर्तते अविदित-ब्रह्म-प्रतिषेधात्	Furthermore, this isn't so that I don't know Brahman, because Brahman was said to be different from the unknown (also).
कथं तर्हि मन्यसे इति-उक्ते आह -- वेद च च शब्दात् वेद च न वेद च इति अभिप्रायः	Then what is it that you know? If asked thus, it is said <i>veda ca</i> , "I know it and." By the word "and" it is meant that I know it and I don't know it also.
विदित-अविदिताभ्याम् अन्यत्वात् ब्रह्मणः तस्मात् मया विदितं ब्रह्म इति मन्ये इति वाक्य-अर्थः	Brahman is different than the known and the unknown, that's why [the student says] "I think Brahman is known by me;" this is the sentence meaning.
अथवा वेद च इति नित्य-विज्ञान-ब्रह्म- स्वरूपतया न उ न वेद वेद एव च अहं	Or the meaning of <i>veda ca</i> ("I know it, and") is that as my true nature is Brahman, eternal Knowledge, it can't be that I don't know, on the contrary, I definitely know,

स्वरूप-विक्रिय-अभावात्, विशेष-विज्ञानं च पराध्यस्तं न स्वतः इति परमार्थतः न च वेद इति	as my true nature can't have any modification. (This is the other possible meaning of <i>veda</i> . The other meaning of <i>ca</i> follows--) On the other hand, particular knowledge of Brahman is only superimposed by others but not by the Self, so from an absolute standpoint, it is not known.
यः नः तत् वेद तत् वेद इति पक्षान्तर- निरासार्थम् आम्राय उक्तार्थ-अनुवादात्	The (next line) "He among us who knows that (what I said), he knows that (Brahman)," is to preclude other opinions, because what was taught is repeated here.
यः नः अस्माकं मध्ये सः एव तत् ब्रह्म वेद न अन्यः	He, in our midst, (who knows it as different from known and unknown) alone knows Brahman, and not anyone else.
उपास्य-ब्रह्मवित्त्वात् अतः अन्यस्य यथा अहं वेद इति	(Why not anyone else?) Because, he who knows Brahman different than how I know it, only knows Brahman as an object of meditation.
वेद च इति पक्षान्तरे ब्रह्मवित्त्वं निरस्यते	The words " <i>veda ca</i> " are to exclude the idea that those with different opinions really know Brahman.
कुतः अयम् अर्थः अवसीयते इति उच्यते	How is this meaning concluded here? If asked...
उक्त-अनुवादात् उक्तं हि अनुवदति नः न वेद इति वेद च इति	Because " <i>na u na veda iti veda ca</i> " is repeated [to affirm that anyone else who really knows Brahman must know it exactly in this way].

यस्यामतं तस्य मतं मतं यस्य न वेद सः ।

अविज्ञातं विजानतां विज्ञातमविजानताम् ॥ ३ ॥

यस्य अमतम् इति श्रौतम् आख्यायिका-अर्थ-
उपसंहार-अर्थम्

Yasya amatam, etc. mantra is for concluding this story.

शिष्य-आचार्य-उक्ति-प्रत्युक्ति-लक्षणया
अनुभव-युक्ति-प्रधानया आख्यायिकया यः
अर्थः सिद्धः सः श्रौतेन वचनेन आगम-

That which is indicated by the conversation between teacher and student, which relied on understanding and logic, which has come down through Guru Parampara, has been succinctly concluded here by this shruti

प्रधानेन निगमन-स्थानीयेन संक्षेपतः उच्यते	quotation.
यत् उक्तम् विदितात् अन्यत् वागादीनाम् अगोचरत्वात् मीमांसितं च अनुभव- उपपत्तिभ्याम् ब्रह्म तत् तथा एव ज्ञातव्यम्	Brahman, which was described as, “different from the known” because it is not knowable through speech, etc. (instruments of knowledge), was analyzed through logic and personal understanding; it should be known in that way alone.
कस्मात्? यस्य अमतं यस्य विविदिषा प्रयुक्त- प्रवृत्तस्य साधकस्य अमतम् अविज्ञातम् अविदितं ब्रह्म इति आत्म-तत्त्व-निश्चय-फल- अवसान-अवबोधतया विविदिषा निवृत्ता इति अभिप्रायः तस्य मतं ज्ञातं तेन विदितं ब्रह्म	How? <i>Yasya amatam</i> - For the seeker, who, out of a desire to know started seeking, to whom Brahman is unknown, by becoming established in the understanding of the true nature of his Self (Brahman alone), his desire to know Brahman (as an object) dissolved – <i>tasya matam</i> for him it is known; by him alone Brahman is known.
येन अविषयत्वेन आत्मत्वेन प्रतिबुद्धम् इत्यर्थः	The one who knows Brahman as his own Self, and not as an object, by him alone Brahman is known.
सः सम्यक्-दर्शी यस्य विज्ञान-अनन्तरम् एव ब्रह्म-आत्म-भावस्य अवसितत्वात् सर्वतः कार्य-अभावः विपर्ययेण मिथ्या-ज्ञानः भवति	The true knower of Brahman is the one for whom, after getting knowledge, there is no doership, because he knows himself to be Brahman completely and everywhere. Any other understanding is false knowledge.
कथम्?	In what way?
मतं विदितं ज्ञातं मया ब्रह्म इति यस्य विज्ञानं सः मिथ्या-दर्शी विपरीत-विज्ञानः विदितात् अन्यत्वात् ब्रह्मणः न वेद सः न विजानाति	<i>Matam yasya</i> - ‘Brahman is known by me,’ the one who feels this way is not a real knower, because Brahman is other than the known. <i>Na veda saH</i> – he doesn’t know it.
ततः च सिद्धम् अवैदिकस्य विज्ञानस्य मिथ्यात्वम् अब्रह्म-विषयतया निन्दितत्वात् तथा कपिल-कणभुगादि समयस्य अपि विदित-ब्रह्म-विषयत्वात् अनवस्थित-तर्क- जन्यत्वात् विविदिषा अनिवृत्तेः च मिथ्यात्वम् इति	Following that, it is established that knowledge (of Brahman) which is found outside of the Vedas is false, because they are undermined on the basis that Brahman is not an object of knowledge. Furthermore, the philosophy of Kapila and Kanad (original proponents of the philosophy of logic), which is born out of logic, is unfounded because it also objectifies Brahman and doesn’t satisfy the desire to know Brahman (which is only satisfied by knowing Brahman as one’s own Self),

	therefore such knowledge is false.
स्मृतेः च “या वेद-बाह्याः स्मृतयः याः च काः च कुदृष्टयः सर्वाः ताः निष्फलाः प्रोक्ताः तमोनिष्ठाः हि ताः स्मृताः” इति विपरीत- मिथ्या-ज्ञानयोः अनिष्टत्वात् इति	From Manu Smriti (12.95), “The thinking which is not in line with Vedic thinking, or illogical, is known to be fruitless and based in ignorance.” Thus erroneous and false knowledges are undesirable.
अविज्ञातं विजानतां विज्ञातम् अविजानताम् इति पूर्व-हेतु-उक्तिः अनुवादस्य आनर्थक्यात्	“Brahman is ‘unknown’ for those who [really] know Brahman, and Brahman is ‘known’ for those who [really] don’t know Brahman.” This (second line of the mantra) is the reasoning given for the previous line, because exactly repeating the first line would add no meaning.
अनुवादमात्रे अनर्थकं वचनम् इति पूर्व- उक्तयोः यस्य अमतम् इत्यादिना ज्ञान- अज्ञानयोः हेतु-अर्थत्वेन इदम् उच्यते	Words which are merely repetition add no meaning, so for the two statements in the first line (“for him to whom It is unknown, he knows,” and “for him to whom It is known, he doesn’t know,”) this line is given as reasoning for knowledge and ignorance, respectively.
अविज्ञातम् अविदितम् आत्मत्वेन अविषयतया ब्रह्म विजानतां यस्मात् तस्मात् तदेव ज्ञानम्	Brahman is not known, because one who really knows Brahman (<i>jnani</i>) knows It as his own Self (the subject) and therefore Brahman can’t be an object (of the senses). This alone is Knowledge of Brahman.
यत् तेषां विज्ञातं विदितं व्यक्तम् एव बुद्धि- आदि-विषयं ब्रह्म अविजानतां विदित- अविदित-व्याप्तम् आत्मभूतं नित्य-विज्ञान- स्वरूपम् आत्मस्थम् अविक्रियम् अमृतम् अजरम् अभयम् अनन्यत्वात् अविषयम् इति एवम् अविजानतां बुद्धि-आदि-विषय- आत्मतया एव नित्यं विज्ञातं ब्रह्म	And the one who doesn’t really know Brahman (<i>ajnani</i>), considers Brahman as manifest, some object of knowledge. While in reality, for a true Knower, Brahman is the Self which is different than the known and unknown, it is of the nature of Eternal Consciousness, it resides in the Self, it is without modification, immortal, without decay, fearless, non-different (nondual), and unable to objectified by the senses. (For the one who doesn’t know, <i>ajnani</i>), Brahman is considered always as an object of the intellect, (certain boudha-philosophies consider the mind or intellect to be the self).
तस्मात् विदित-अविदित-व्यक्त-अव्यक्त-धर्म- अध्यारोपेण कार्य-कारण-भावेन सविकल्पम्	Of those (<i>ajnani</i> -s), because of superimposition of the qualities of known and unknown, i.e. manifest and

अयथार्थ-विषयत्वात्, शुक्तिकादौ रजतादि
अध्यारोपण-ज्ञानवत् मिथ्याज्ञानं तेषाम्

द्वितीय खण्ड

unmanifest, (Brahman) is considered as being part of cause and effect relation, and *savikalpa* (qualified), which is not really how Brahman is known, like in mother-of-pearl the superimposed knowledge of silver, (of those *ajnani-s*) knowledge of Brahman is false.

प्रतिबोधविदितं मतममृतत्वं हि विन्दते ।

आत्मना विन्दते वीर्यं विद्यया विन्दतेऽमृतम् ॥ ४ ॥

<p>प्रतिबोध-विदितं मतम् इति वीप्सा प्रत्ययानाम् आत्म-अवबोध-द्वारत्वात्</p>	<p>“In every thought it is known” this repetition of words indicates that thoughts are the way to know the Self. [pratibodha which means in each thought, is understood according to grammar as “bodham bodham prati” this repetition of the word “bodham”(thought) implies “in each thought.”]</p>
<p>बोधं प्रति बोधं प्रति इति वीप्सा सर्वप्रत्यय- व्याप्ति-अर्था</p>	<p>“In each-each thought” this repetition shows that with every thought there is invariable concomitance (of the Self).</p>
<p>बौद्धा हि सर्वे प्रत्ययाः तप्त-लोह-वत् नित्य- विज्ञान-स्वरूप-आत्म-व्याप्तत्वात् विज्ञान- स्वरूप-अवभासा तद्-अन्य-अवभासः च आत्मा तद्-विलक्षणः अग्निवत् उपलभ्यते इति तेन ते द्वारी भवन्ति आत्म-उपलब्धौ</p>	<p>All thoughts which come from the intellect are like heated iron – because they are pervaded by the Self which is eternal consciousness, they also are of the nature of reflected consciousness; and the Self which is reflected in those thoughts is different from them, the way fire is different than the iron that it pervades; but those thoughts in which the self is reflected are the way to grasp the Self – (thoughts are the way to understand the consciousness, because consciousness is what illumines thoughts).</p>
<p>तस्मात् प्रति-बोध-अवभास-प्रत्यक्- आत्मतया यत् विदितं तत् ब्रह्म तदेव मतं ज्ञातं तदेव सम्यक्-ज्ञानवत् प्रत्यक्-आत्म- विज्ञानम् न विषय-विज्ञानम्</p>	<p>Therefore, that inner Self which is known through the reflected consciousness in each thought alone is Brahman. That is known, that alone – with proper knowledge – is knowledge of the inner Self (Knowledge of Consciousness as the Subject). And Brahman or Consciousness known as an object is not proper knowledge.</p>
<p>आत्मत्वेन प्रत्यक्-आत्मानम् ऐक्षत् इति च काठके</p>	<p>“As the Self the inner Self was seen.” (Kathopanishad 2.1.3).</p>
<p>अमृतत्वं हि विन्दते इति हेतु-वचनं विपर्यये मृत्युप्रप्तेः</p>	<p>“(By knowledge of Self) immortality is gained,” (Kena 2.4) This sentence is showing that proper knowledge of self is the cause for immortality – because if the</p>

	knowledge is other than that, only death is attained.
विषय-आत्म-विज्ञाने हि मृत्युः प्रारभते	In the case of objective knowledge of self (if someone thinks that the Self is an object of knowledge) then death begins (i.e. wrong knowledge of self is the cause of birth and death).
इति आत्म-विज्ञानम् अमृतत्व-निमित्तम् इति युक्तं हेतु-वचनम् अमृतत्वं हि विन्दते इति	Therefore it is established that proper knowledge of self is the cause for immortality, and that the phrase "Immortality is gained" from this mantra indicates (Self-knowledge as) the cause.
आत्मज्ञानेन किम् अमृतत्वम् उत्पाद्यते	<i>PP: So is it that immortality is produced from Self Knowledge?</i> [i.e. Is it the case that without knowledge I'm not immortal, and by gaining knowledge I will 'get' immortality?]
न	S: No
कथं तर्हि?	<i>PP: Then how?</i>
आत्मना विन्दते स्वेन एव नित्य-आत्म-स्वभावेन अमृतत्वं विन्दते, न आलम्बन-पूर्वकम्	S: Immortality is gained from the Self – i.e. because of one's own true nature of the Eternal Self immortality is gained. Immortality doesn't depend on anything else.
	<i>[PP: Then why is the word "gained" used?]</i>
विन्दते इति आत्म-विज्ञान-अपेक्षम्	"Gained" here means that immortality expects Self-Knowledge. [My true Self is immortal, with or without knowledge. Due to erroneous understanding, I think of myself as mortal and finite. Self knowledge alone will remove this erroneous understanding. Thus it said "By Self Knowledge, immortality is gained." Immortality is not something new that is gained, but rather by Self knowledge one simply becomes aware of his true nature]
यदि हि विद्या उत्पाद्यम् अमृतत्वं स्यात् अनित्यं भवेत् कर्म-कार्यवत्	If immortality is <i>produced</i> by knowledge, then it would be impermanent, like any other effect of karma.

अतः न विद्या-उत्पाद्यम्	Therefore it isn't <i>produced</i> by knowledge.
यदि च आत्मना एव अमृतत्वं विन्दते किं पुनः विद्यया क्रियते इति उच्यते	So then if immortality is had by one's own self, then what is done by knowledge? [Then what role does Knowledge play in attaining immortality?]
अनात्म-विज्ञानं निवर्तयन्ती सा तत् निवृत्त्या स्वाभाविकस्य अमृतत्वस्य निमित्तम् इति कल्प्यते	Knowledge is the remover of wrong notion of one's self, having removed it, knowledge is [said to be] the reason for the immortality that is already one's true nature.
यतः आह वीर्यं विद्यया विन्दते	Since is said that "by knowledge, strength is gained," (Kena 2.4)
वीर्यं सामर्थ्यम् अनात्म-अध्यारोप-माया-स्वान्त-ध्वान्त-अनभिभाव्य-लक्षणं बलं विद्यया विन्दते	Strength means power, specifically the power to remove the superimposition of the not-self on the Self by Maya (the primordial ignorance); that superimposition is in the form of delusion of the mind; the strength to remove that delusion in the mind is the strength gained through Knowledge.
तत् च किं विशिष्टम्	What type of strength is that?
अमृतम् अविनाशि	It is immortality, in other words, deathlessness.
अविद्याजं हि वीर्यं विनाशि	The "strength" born of ignorance is impermanent, it has an end.
विद्यया अविद्यायाः बाध्यत्वात्	Because ignorance is negated by knowledge
न तु विद्यायाः बाधकः अस्ति इति विद्याजम् अमृतं वीर्यम्	But there is nothing which can negate knowledge, thus the strength born of knowledge is immortality alone.
अतः विद्या अमृतत्वे निमित्तमात्रं भवति	This is why the only 'cause' of immortality (in terms of understanding it as my true nature) is Knowledge.
न अयम् आत्मा बलहीनेन लभ्यः इति च आथर्वणे	"This Atma cannot be gained without strength." (Mundaka 3.2.4) thus it is said in the Atharvana Veda.
लोके अपि विद्याजम् एव बलम् अभिभवति न शरीरादि सामर्थ्यम् यथा हस्ति-आदेः	In the world also, strength born of knowledge overpowers other types of strength – the strength of physical body, etc. can't overpower knowledge-born

strength, like elephants, etc.

अथवा प्रतिबोध-विदितं मतम् इति सत् एव
अशेष-विपरीत-निरस्त-संस्कारेण स्वप्न-
प्रतिबोधवत् यत् विदितं तत् एव मतं ज्ञातं
भवति इति

Or the word "*pratibodha*" sentence "in every thought it is known" can be understood in this way – like the person who has woken from a dream, for whom all erroneous knowledge (gained in the dream) is known and negated, for him alone knowledge takes place (the waker only, as opposed to the dreamer).

अथवा गुरु-उपदेशः प्रतिबोधः तेन वा विदितं
मतम् इति

Or "*pratibodha*" can mean the teaching of the Guru, by which Brahman is known.

उभयत्र प्रतिबोध-शब्द-प्रयोगः अस्ति सुप्त-
प्रतिबुद्धः गुरुणा प्रतिबोधितः इति; पूर्वं तु
यथार्थम्

In both of these alternate cases the word *pratibodha* is used, however, the meaning originally given (at the beginning of this bhashya – as 'in each thought' should be understood.

इह चेदवेदीदथ सत्यमस्ति न चेदिहावेदीन्महती विनष्टिः ।

भूतेषु भूतेषु विचित्य धीराः प्रेत्यास्माल्लोकादमृता भवन्ति ॥ ५ ॥

<p>इह चेत् अवेदीत् इति अवश्य-कर्तव्यता उक्तिः विपर्यये विनाश-श्रुतेः</p>	<p>“If here he knows, etc.” this mantra is to emphasize that knowing Atma is what must be done, and to not know Atma is a great calamity.</p>
<p>इह मनुष्य-जन्मनि सति अवश्यम् आत्मा वेदितव्यः इति एतत् विधीयते</p>	<p>It is enjoined that <i>iha</i>, here, in this human birth, Atma should be known.</p>
<p>कथम् इह चेत् अवेदीत् विदितवान् अथ सत्यं परमार्थ-तत्त्वम् अस्ति अवाप्तं तस्य जन्मः सफलम् इति अभिप्रायः</p>	<p><i>Cet</i>, If here itself <i>avedit</i>, it is known, what happens? <i>Atha satyam asti</i>, then the ultimate reality is attained, in other words his (the one who knows Brahman) life is fulfilled.</p>
<p>न चेत् इह अवेदीत् न विदितवान् वृथा एव जन्म</p>	<p><i>Na cet iha avedit</i>, If it is not known here in this life, then this life is meaningless,</p>
<p>अपि च महती विनष्टिः महान् विनाशः जन्म-मरण-प्रबन्ध-अविच्छेद-प्रप्ति-लक्षणः स्यात् यतः तस्मात् अवश्यं तत् विच्छेदाय ज्ञेयः आत्मा</p>	<p>and it is a mahati vinashti, massive calamity – (the one doesn't know) will attain an unbroken cycle of the bondage of birth and death, because of this it is a must to know Atma in order to break that cycle.</p>
<p>ज्ञानेन तु किं स्यात् इति उच्यते भूतेषु भूतेषु चर-अचरेषु सर्वेषु इति अर्थः</p>	<p>Then (in this mantra) it is told what will be gained through knowledge – <i>bhuteshu bhuteshu</i>, amongst all moving and unmoving beings,</p>
<p>वचित्य पृथक् निष्कृष्य एकम् आत्म-तत्त्वं संसार-धर्मैः अस्पृष्टम् आत्म-भावेन उपलभ्य इति अर्थः अनेक-अर्थत्वात् धातूनां न पुनः चित्वा इति सम्भवति विरोधात् धीराः धीमन्तः विवेकिनः विनिवृत्त-बाह्य-विषय- अभिलाषाः प्रेत्य मृत्वा अस्मात् लोकात् शरीरादि अनात्म-लक्षणात् व्यावृत्त ममत्व अहंकाराः सन्तः इत्यर्थः अमृताः अमरण- धर्माणः नित्य-विज्ञान-अमृतत्व-स्वभावाः</p>	<p><i>vicitya dhirah</i>, the discriminative people whose external desires have been extinguished, they separate out and distinguish the one reality which is the Self, which is untouched by any of the qualities of samsaara, as one's own self they understand that ultimate reality. Verbal roots have many meanings, [in <i>vicitya</i>, the root means to choose or separate out, and this could be taken in a physical sense, like literally separating two objects; here that cannot be the case as the separation is in understanding that the Self is different than the world of names and forms], the meaning, “having separated out [physically],” is not possible here as it is contradictory.</p>

एव भवन्ति

द्वितीय खण्ड

[For continuity: ...the discriminative person, having separated Atma--] pretya having died asmaat lokaat from all which is not the self, from the body etc. they negate myness and i-ness, and amritaah bhavanti, they become immortals, i.e. [they know that they are of] the nature of eternal, undying consciousness.

द्वितीय खण्ड

This page is intentionally left blank

तृतीय खण्ड

Sambandha Bhashya: Proving the Existence of Ishvara as the omniscient giver of Karma Phala. This section is taken from the lectures of Swami Bodhatmanandaji.

“ब्रह्म ह देवेभ्यः” इति ब्रह्मणः दुर्विज्ञेयता उक्तिः यत्न-आधिक्यार्था	“Brahma ha devebhyah...” (the upcoming third chapter of Kenopanishad) explains that brahman is very difficult to know, for which a seeker must put forth serious effort.
समाप्ता ब्रह्मविद्या यद्-अधीनः पुरुषार्थः	The teaching of Self-knowledge is complete, upon which the purpose of life (liberation) depends.
अतः ऊर्ध्वम् अर्थवादेन ब्रह्मणः दुर्विज्ञेयता उच्यते	Hereafter, the difficulty of knowing Brahman is explained through allegory.
तद् विज्ञाने कथं नु नाम यत्नम् अधिकं कुर्यात् इति।	[The moral of the allegory being] one should put forth effort by any means necessary to know brahman.
शमादि-अर्थः वा आम्लायः अभिमान-शातनात्।	Or, this part of the Veda (this allegory of the third chapter of Kenopanishad) is about shama, etc. which are gained after destroying one’s ego.
शमादि वा ब्रह्म-विद्या साधनं विधित्सितं तत् अर्थः अयम् अर्थवाद आम्लायः।	One could say that this story is for glorifying the virtues, shama etc., which are enjoined in the Vedas as means for gaining knowledge of Brahman.
न हि शमादि-साधन-रहितस्य अभिमान-राग-द्वेषादि-युक्तस्य ब्रह्मविज्ञाने सामर्थ्यम् अस्ति	One who hasn’t developed the virtues Shama, etc, and who is full of ego, attachment and aversion, is indeed unfit for knowing Brahman.
व्यावृत्त-बाह्य-मिथ्या-प्रत्यय-ग्राह्यत्वात् ब्रह्मणः।	Only by turning inward away from extroverted, false, thoughts, can Brahman be known.
यस्मात् च अग्नि-आदीनां जय-अभिमानं शातयति ततः च ब्रह्मविज्ञानं दर्शयति अभिमान-उपशमे।	The ego of victory of agni, etc. is destroyed, and only after that can Brahman be known.
तस्मात् शमादि-साधन-विधान-अर्थः अयम् अर्थवादः इति अवसीयते।	Therefore, this story is expounded for glorifying the virtues of shama etc. and thereby enjoining them for

सगुण-उपासनार्थः वा अपोदितत्वात्।	Or, (the purpose of this allegory) is to explain meditation on saguna brahman, because it was negated earlier. [this is explained as follows -]
नेदं यदिदमुपासते इति उपास्यत्वं ब्रह्मणः अपोदितम् । अपोदितत्वात् अनुपास्यत्वे प्राप्ते तस्य एव ब्रह्मणः सगुणत्वेन अधिदैवम् अध्यात्मं च उपासनं विधातव्यम् इति एवम् अर्थः वा।	“Not this which is worshipped as ‘this’,” by this statement [in matras 1.4 - 1.8], the notion of meditation on Brahman as an object [i.e. saguna upasana] is negated. Because it was negated, Brahman can’t be attained through upasana. However, upasana on that same Brahman, conceptualized with attributes, such as totality (adhidaiva - the universe as a whole, īshvara, or sometimes nature), or a mind (adhyaātman – the individual, the Self expressing in one subtle body), is enjoined. This can also be the purpose of the allegory.
इति अधिदैवतं तद्वनम् इति उपासितव्यम् इति हि वक्ष्यति।	This totality, “should be meditated on as “tadvanam” (the one that deserves to be worshipped as the most adorable self in all beings)” will be explained (in Kenopanishad 4.6).
ब्रह्म इति परः लिङ्गात्	The word “Brahman” (in this section of Kenopanishad) indicates īshvara.
न हि अन्यत्र परात् ईश्वरात् नित्य-सर्वज्ञात् परिभूय-अग्नि-आदीन् तृणं वज्रीकर्तुं सामर्थ्यम् अस्ति तत् न शशाक दग्धुम् इत्यादि लिङ्गात् ब्रह्म-शब्द-वाच्यः ईश्वरः इति अवसीयते	Indeed, no one other than the all-knowing īshvara could have the power to defeat the Fire god etc; only īshvara could make a blade of grass into a powerful force which agni etc. could not burn. By such indicators it is established that [in this particular section] the word brahman indicates īshvara.
न हि अन्यथा अग्निः तृणम् दग्धुं न उत्सहते वायुः वा आदातुम्	Nothing else (other than īshvara) could cause agni and vāyu to be incapable of burning or moving a blade of grass.
ईश्वर-इच्छया तृणम् अपि वज्री-भवति इति उपपद्यते	By the will of īshvara even a blade of grass can become an immovable object.
तत् सिद्धिः जगतः नियत-प्रवृत्तेः	The world’s perfectly regulated functioning establishes that that (īshvara) exists. [****This is the pratiñā statement

	<p>“tat-siddhi” (“īshvara exists”) and hetu statement “niyata-pravṛtteḥ” (“this can be deduced based on the perfectly ordered functioning of the world”).]</p>
<p>श्रुति-स्मृति-प्रसिद्धिभिः नित्य-सर्व-विज्ञाने ईश्वरे सर्वात्मनि सर्वशक्तौ सिद्धे अपि शास्त्रार्थ-निश्चयार्थम् उच्यते</p>	<p>Even though īshvara is well-established in śruti, smṛti, and well known in the world as eternal, all-knowing, the self of all, and all-powerful, here the topic of īshvara is taken up for discussion for the purpose of coming to a firm conclusion logically (which is already established in scriptures).</p>
<p>तस्य ईश्वरस्य सद्भाव-सिद्धिः कुतः भवति इति उच्यते</p>	<p>Thus it is said how the existence of that īshvara can be proven. (A.G. – That īshvara who is the forever-well-established creator and controller of the world)</p> <p>~</p> <p>End introduction. Begin first argument:</p>
<p>यदिदं जगत् देव-गन्धर्व-यक्ष-रक्षः-पितृ-पिशाचादि लक्षणं द्यु-वियत्-पृथिवि-आदित्य-चन्द्र-ग्रह-नक्षत्र-विचित्रं विविध-प्राणि-उपभोगयोग्य-स्थान-साधन-सम्बन्धि तत् अत्यन्त-कुशल-शिल्पिभिः अपि दुर्निर्माणं देश-काल-निमित्त-अनुरूप-नियत-प्रवृत्ति-निवृत्ति-क्रमं एतत् भोक्तृ-कर्म-विभागज्ञ-प्रयत्न-पूर्वकं भवितुम् अर्हति कार्यत्वे सति यथा उक्त-लक्षणत्वात्</p>	<p>This jagat, {appearing with the varieties of space, interspace, sun moon, planets, constellations, of such different variety that provide place and means conducive to the experiences of jīvas including devatā-s, celestial musicians, celestial beings, demons, ancestors, ghosts} is out of the scope of creation for even the most proficient architect. This world must be a creation of some sentient being who knows all the individual karmas of every experiencer, as their reception of their karma-phala is perfectly regulated by time, space, causality, to properly sequence the beginning and completion of karmas. Because it (this jagat) is an effect, it must have a creator (as described earlier).</p>
<p>गृह-प्रासाद-रथ-शयन-आसनादिवत्</p>	<p>Like a home, palace, chariot, bed, and seat, etc. These are all finite effects, and as such, must have a creator.</p>
<p>विपक्षे आत्मादिवत्</p>	<p>Unlike Ātman, which is not an observable effect, therefore cannot be said to have a creator.</p>
<p>कर्मणः एव इति चेत्</p>	<p>PP: What if one says that by karma alone this jagat has come about?</p>

<p>न, परतन्त्रस्य निमित्तमात्रत्वात्</p>	<p>S: No. Karma is dependent (on the one doing karma, or the one delivering the karma phala), therefore it is only a catalyst, not the main cause.</p>
<p>यदिदम् उपभोग-वैचित्र्यं प्राणिनां तत्-साधन-वैचित्र्यं च देश-काल-निमित्त-अनुरूप-नियत-प्रवृत्ति-निवृत्ति-क्रमं च तत् न नित्य-सर्वज्ञ-कर्तृकम्।</p>	<p>PP: This jagat, which is comprised of the various experiences of beings and their numerous instruments of experience, along with time, space, causality, and the well-governed beginning and ending of karma, is NOT the product of an eternal all-knowing creator.</p>
<p>किं तर्हि</p>	<p>S: Then what created it?</p>
<p>कर्मणः एव तस्य अचिन्त्यप्रभावत्वात् सर्वैः च फल-हेतुत्व-अभ्युपगमात्</p>	<p>PP: It is the product of karma alone, due to karma's inexplicable ability to give results; additionally, everyone understands and accepts that karma is the cause of our experiences. [This world of experience is composed entirely of the karma phala-s of jīva-s, hence the argument that the world is caused by karma, and not a creator.]</p>
<p>सति कर्मणः फलहेतुत्वे किम् ईश्वर-अधिक-कल्पनया इति। न नित्यस्य ईश्वरस्य नित्य-सर्वज्ञ-शक्तेः फलहेतुत्वं च इति चेत्</p>	<p>PP: If it is already established that karma is the cause of all karma-phala which comprises the entire jagat, why do we have to unnecessarily imagine some īshvara as the creator of jagat? This "īshvara" who is supposedly eternal and endowed with omniscience is not the cause of results of karma...</p> <p>If one argues in such a way...</p>
<p>न कर्मणः एव उपभोग-वैचित्र्यादि उपपद्यते</p>	<p>S: Karma alone cannot deliver the varied results of actions.</p>
<p>कस्मात् ? कर्तृतन्त्रत्वात् कर्मणः</p>	<p>PP: Why? Because karma is dependent on the one who is performing the action (the doer of an action is called "kartā".</p>
<p>चित्तिमत्प्रयत्न-निर्वृत्तं हि कर्म तत्प्रयत्न उपरमाद् उपरतं सद्देशान्तरे कालान्तरे वा नियत-निमित्त-विशेष-अपेक्षं कर्तुः फलं जनयिष्यति इति न युक्तम्-अनपेक्ष्यान्यदात्मनः प्रयोक्तृ</p>	<p>Karma is indeed produced by the efforts of a conscious being. When the efforts of a conscious being stop, the action (karma) concludes, and after that, in some other place and some other time, depending on some other conscious entity, the doer of the action will get the result. It can't be said that a kartā would get the results of his karma without some other conscious being to deliver</p>

	<p>those results.</p> <p>The point of this sentence is to prove the existence of ishvara by saying that karma, because it is insentient, depends on a sentient kartā to do the karma, and in the same way – because it is insentient, karma must also depend on some other sentient being (namely, ishvara), to deliver the result of the action.</p>
<p>कर्ता एव फल-काले प्रयोक्ता इति चेत् मया निर्वर्तितः असि त्वां प्रयोक्ष्ये फलाय यद् आत्म-अनुरूपं फलम् इति</p>	<p>If one says that the doer of the action alone is the conscious entity responsible for the delivery of the result to come at the time of that karma's fruition, (then he would at that time say to his karma) "(Oh Karma) you have been performed by me, now I will prompt you for that result which I want."</p>
<p>न, देश-काल-निमित्त-विशेष- अनभिज्ञत्वात्</p>	<p>Of course, this is absurd, because (a finite individual, jiva) cannot be the knower of all the factors that define a specific result for a given action, such as when and where and by what immediate cause the result of some past action is to be received.</p>
<p>यदि हि कर्ता देश-विशेष-अभिज्ञः सन् स्वातन्त्र्येण कर्म नियुञ्ज्यात्ततः अनिष्टफलस्य अप्रयोक्ता स्यात्</p>	<p>If the doer of the action DOES know the specifics of how his specific karma phala should come, like where exactly he would receive the result, etc., then, ordering karmas by his own will, he would never prompt unwanted results to come to him. [and yet, we the doers of actions, constantly experience sorrowful karma phala, which proves that it is not the kartā who is responsible for the delivery of his karma phala]</p>
<p>न च निर्निमित्तं तत् अनिच्छया आत्मसमवेतं तत् चर्मवद् विकरोति कर्म</p>	<p>The bottom line is – karma by itself cannot transform into karma phala without some other cause. Just as skin cannot change on its own (like developing wrinkles, or becoming dry, or sunburnt etc.) without some other cause, such as time, the lack of moisture in the air, or the sun. [In this example, it is implied that karma cannot give its phala by itself, but it depends on a conscious entity (namely ishvara) to deliver the karma phala.]</p>
<p>न च आत्मकृतम् अकर्तृसमवेतम्</p>	<p>And, anybody not associated with a karma which was</p>

<p>अयस्कान्तमणिवद् आकृष्ट भवति प्रधानकर्तृसमवेतत्वात् कर्मणः</p>	<p>performed by some other kartā, cannot, like a magnet, pull the result, because a karma is always associated with the performer of that action.</p>
<p>भूताश्रयम् इति चेत् न साधनत्वात्</p>	<p>If it said that karma is dependent on the body, this is wrong, as the body is only an instrument (of sentient doer).</p>
<p>कर्तृक्रियायाः साधनभूतानि भूतानि क्रियाकाले अनुभूतव्यापाराणि समाप्तौ च हलादिवत् कर्त्रा परित्यक्तानि न फलं कालान्तरे कर्तुम् उत्सहन्ते न हि हलं क्षेत्राद् व्रीहीन् गृहं प्रवेशयति</p>	<p>In the actions of a doer, the body, which is instrumental to the action, only engages in the experience at the time of the action; once the deed is completed, the body is disregarded as irrelevant to the action by the doer, like a plough. And after time has passed, the body is incapable of bringing the result of the action, the way a plough can't bring the harvest from the field into the home.</p>
<p>भूतकर्मणोः च अचेतनत्वात् स्वतः प्रवृत्ति अनुपपत्ति</p>	<p>Because bodies and actions are themselves insentient, they are incapable acting on their own. [Again, the very important point is reiterated – karma is a movement of matter. Matter cannot move without the presence of consciousness. This very supposition is questioned in the next sentence.]</p>
<p>वायुवत् इति चेत् न असिद्धत्वात्</p>	<p>If one asks, what about in the case of wind (an insentient thing apparently blowing by itself)? This can't be argued, as it is unsubstantiated. [Here the opponent brings up a counter-example, saying that it is not always the case that insentient matter DEPENDS on consciousness for its movement, citing the example of wind. Imagine the wind, perhaps blowing leaves around in a circle. Or imagine a river, slowly eroding a mountain, or carrying minerals downstream. Here we see a clear example of the movement of matter, and it seems that no consciousness is involved! So the opponent believes such examples debunk the vedāntin's supposition that the movement of matter requires consciousness.]</p>

न हि वायोः अचित्मितः स्वतः प्रवृत्तिः
सिद्धा, रथादिषु अदर्शनात्

तृतीय खण्ड

Wind's self-prompted action, being insentient, is unsubstantiated (unproven), and such action is not seen in any other insentient objects such as a chariot.

[The movement of wind, or any other movement of insentient matter, we cannot cite as an example since we are yet to establish whether the insentient wind blows by itself or prompted by Consciousness principle as mentioned in Kathopanishad 2.3.3.

One cannot say for sure if that movement originates from a sentient being by using means of knowledge other than scriptures because the origin of such movement can never be fully determined. For example, if we trace the movement of wind, it comes from differences in atmospheric pressure. Differences in atmospheric pressure come from how the earth is formed, its position relative to its sun, etc. These all can be traced back to the original cause which we empirically don't know and can't determine, without the help of scriptures. So although on the surface, it seems like wind is moving on its own, the origin of that movement is actually not known for a common man. Bhagavan Shankaracharya is NOT trying to claim that the movement of wind IS the work of a conscious entity. Instead he is logically arguing that this example cannot be cited as an objection because the origin of the movement is not known. For the purposes of this scriptural debate, it is only appropriate to consider examples of movement where the origin IS known. And in 100% of cases where the origin of some particular movement of matter is known, that origin is a sentient entity. Like in the case of the movement of chariots: the origin of that movement is always a sentient entity moving it, such as a horse, or a human being, etc.]

[So far, we are trying to logically determine who or what is responsible for the delivery of karma phala.

- 1) We have ruled out karma itself, because it is insentient, and all movement of matter depends on sentient beings.

तृतीय खण्ड

	<p>So which sentient being is responsible for the delivery of karma phala?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">2) We have also ruled out the kartā because a kartā experiences unwanted results, which he would not bring upon himself willingly.3) We have ruled out some other kartā because no individual can know all the infinite specific factors that go into receiving a particular phala, and also that no kartā has the power to magically pull results, especially considering that the results one experiences is inextricably tied to one's own karmas, and not anyone else's.4) We have ruled out bodies, or any other insentient matter, because of its inability to act independently of consciousness]
शास्त्रात् कर्मणः एव इति चेत् शास्त्रं हि क्रियातः फलसिद्धिम् आह न ईश्वरादेः स्वर्ग-कामः यजेत इत्यादि	PP: But by śāstra we know from karma alone (comes the result of action). śāstra itself has said that from karma one receives the result, and not from īshvara, etc. as indicated by such quotations: "One desirous of higher worlds should perform this yāga". The implication is that it is the karma which will give the result, not īshvara.
न च प्रमाण-अधिगतत्वात् आनर्थक्यं युक्तम्	<p>It is inappropriate to deny meaning to something which is supported by a pramāṇa.</p> <p>In this case the opponent is accusing the vedāntin of contradicting vedas, which he claims only cite karma as the entity responsible for giving someone a result.</p>
न च ईश्वर-अस्तित्वे प्रमाणान्तरम् अस्ति इति चेत्	<p>īshvara's existence is not supported by any other pramāṇa either.</p> <p>[this objection is addressed over the next several sentences]</p>
न, दृष्ट-न्याय हान अनुपपत्तेः	S: No, that which is logically apparent can't be given up.
क्रिया हि द्विविधा दृष्टफला-अदृष्टफला च दृष्टफला अपि द्विविधा अनन्तरफला-आगामिफला च, अनन्तरफला	There are two types of actions – one with seen results, and one with unseen results. Within actions with seen results, there are also two types – immediate results and delayed

गतिभुजिलक्षणम् ।	तृतीय खण्ड results. Actions with immediate results are of the type of walking or eating. [You get the result as you do the action.]
कालान्तरफला च कृषिसेवादिलक्षणम् । तत्र अनन्तरफला फला-अपवर्गिणी एव कालान्तरफला तु उत्पन्नप्रध्वंसिनी	And actions with delayed results are of the type of farming, service, etc. There immediate-result actions are different from delayed-result actions, because in the former the result comes as the action is executed (e.g. one gets fuller as one eats, or one moves in a direction or gets tired AS one is walking etc.), but in the latter, the result only comes once the action is over (e.g. one sows seeds and waters crops, but only later gets a crop of vegetables, or one works hard for an employer now, but only gets the paycheck later).
आत्मसेव्यादि अधीनं हि कृषिसेवादेः फलं यतः	The result of farming depends on one's own self (the result of farming depends on the actions and efforts of the farmer himself), but the result of service depends on the served (the result of employment, such as a paycheck, is not determined by the employee himself, but rather by his employer).
न च उभय-न्याय-व्यतिरेकेण स्वतन्त्रं कर्म ततः वा फलं दृष्टम्	Even other than these two cases (i.e. in addition to these two, in all other cases), neither karma nor its result is ever self-determined.
तथा च कर्मफलप्राप्तौ न दृष्टन्यायहानम् उपपद्यते	In receiving results of actions, one must not relinquish the logic that is clearly observed.
तस्मात् शान्तेः यागादि कर्मणि नित्यः कर्तृकर्मफलविभागज्ञ ईश्वरः सेव्यादिवत् यागादि अनुरूपफलदाता उपपद्यते	Therefore, upon the completion of actions like vedic rituals, it only makes sense that the entity who gives the results corresponding to the completed action is one that knows all factors regarding the doer of the action, the action itself, and the appropriate result for the action (including when, where, and by which means that result should be experienced). (Just as the employer gives his employee the results of the employee's work). This entity must be ishvara.
सः च आत्मभूतः सर्वस्य सर्व-क्रिया-फल-	He is the inner self of all and the witness of all thoughts/experiences/actions of all beings; he is of the

	तृतीय खण्ड
प्रत्यय-साक्षी नित्य-विज्ञानस्वभावः संसारधर्मैः असंस्पृष्टः	nature of eternal consciousness, untouched by the characteristics of this transmigratory world.
श्रुतेश्च	This is also supported in upaniṣads
न लिप्यते लोकदुःखेन बाह्यः	“He, being outside of it, is not affected by worldly sorrow.” (kaṭhōpaniṣad 2.2.11)
जरां मृत्युम् अत्येति	“He is beyond decay and death.” (bṛhadāraṇyakōpaniṣad 3.5.1)
विजरः विमृत्युः	“He has no decay nor death.” (chāndogyōpaniṣad 8.7.1)
सत्यकामः सत्यसङ्कल्पः	“His will is the truth. Whatever He wills comes to pass.” (chāndogyōpaniṣad 8.7.1)
एषः सर्वेश्वरः	“He is the lord of all” (māṇḍūkyōpaniṣad 6)
साधु कर्म कारयति	“Meritorious actions are performed for His sake.” (kauṣītaki upaniṣad 3.1)
अनश्नन् अन्यः अभिचाकशीति	“The other [bird] doesn’t eat (consume karma phala), it just watches.” (śvetāśvatara 4.6)
एतस्य वा अक्षरस्य प्रशासने	“According to His command [the sun and moon remain where they are].” (bṛhadāraṇyakōpaniṣad 3.8.9)
इत्यादयः असंसारिणः एकस्य आत्मनः नित्यमुक्तस्य सिद्धौ श्रुतयः	These śruti quotations are about the proof of the one Supreme Self who is ever-free, who is free from the qualities of the transmigratory world.
स्मृतयः च सहस्रशाः विद्यन्ते	And thousands of smṛti quotations indicate the same.
न च अर्थवादाः शक्यन्ते कल्पयितुम्	And it would be wrong to imagine that the previous statements are simply praises of glorification.
अनन्ययोगित्वे सति विज्ञान-उत्पादकत्वात्	Because those aforementioned śruti quotations are not a part of some ritual, so the only possible purpose they could have is to produce knowledge. The idea here is – in vedas there are two sections. The first section (karma kāṇḍa) deals with actions one can perform to achieve certain results. The purpose of sentences from

	<p>this section of vedas is to attain some result. But the second section of the vedas (jñāna kāṇḍa) is comprised of sentences which are not tied to some action – then these sentences can't be for the purpose of attaining some result. And if that is the case, then the only other purpose these sentences could have is to produce knowledge – therefore the earlier quotations, which are from jñāna kāṇḍa, cannot be exaggerations for the sake of praise because those sentences do not serve that purpose.</p>
न च उत्पन्नं विज्ञानं बाध्यते	<p>And the knowledge produced by those sentences is not negated by some other means of knowledge.</p>
	<p>If something in the vedas is exaggeration but not true, strictly speaking, at a later place in the vedas that exaggeration will be negated and clarified.</p>
अप्रतिषेधात् च न च ईश्वरः नास्ति इति निषेधः अस्ति	<p>And among śrutis, there is no negation of īshvara.</p>
प्राप्ति-अभावात् इति चेत् न, उक्तत्वात्	<p>“īshvara is not negated in śruti because īshvara is unproved!” such an argument is wrong, as īshvara's proof has already been explained with direct śruti quotations.</p>
न हिंस्यात् इतिवत् प्राप्ति अभावात् प्रतिषेधः न आरभ्यते इति चेत् न	<p>If someone argues “There won't be any negation of īshvara like there are other negations such as ‘Don't commit violence,’ because the topic of īshvara never even comes up,” this is incorrect.</p>
ईश्वर-सद्भावे न्यायस्य उक्तत्वात्	<p>The earlier analysis of śruti quotations has already established that the vedas assert īshvara's existence.</p>
अथवा अप्रतिषेधात् इति कर्मणः फलदाने ईश्वरकालादीनां न प्रतिषेधः अस्ति	<p>Additionally - “pratishedha” also means that there is no negation of īshvara and time, etc. as necessary in giving the results of karma.</p>
न च निमित्तान्तर-निरपेक्षं केवलेन कर्त्रा एव प्रयुक्तं फलदं दृष्टम्	<p>And without any other sentient cause than the doer of the action, the reception of results are not seen.</p>
न च विनष्टः अपि यागः कालान्तरे फलदः	<p>A ritual which is over (no longer present in any sense)</p>

भवति	can't be the giver of results after it stops existing.
सेव्यबुद्धिवत् सेवकेन सर्वज्ञ-ईश्वर-बुद्धौ तु संस्कृतायां यागादि कर्मणा विनष्टे अपि कर्मणि सेव्यात् इव ईश्वरात् फलं कर्तुः भवति इति युक्तम्	Impressions are created on the mind of the Master according to the actions of the servant, and the servant receives the result of action from his master based on those impressions. In the same way, actions like yāga-s etc. leave an impression on the omniscient mind of īshvara, and the result of those actions are received by the doer of the action from īshvara based on those impressions. This is the correct understanding.
न तु पुनः पदार्थाः वाक्यशतेन अपि देशान्तरे कालान्तरे वा स्वं स्वं स्वभावं जहति	Objects do not give up their intrinsic nature, regardless of hundreds of assertions, or removed by any amount of space or time.
न हि देशकालान्तरेषु च अग्निः अनुष्णः भवति	Indeed, fire, in any place or time, does not become non-hot. (or loses heat as its nature)
एवं कर्मणः अपि कालान्तरे फलं द्विप्रकारम् एव उपलभ्यते	In the same way, from karma there are two types of results one can obtain after doing the karma (delayed-result karma)
बीज-क्षेत्र-संस्कार-परिरक्षा-विज्ञानवत्-कर्तृ-अपेक्ष-फलं कृष्यादि विज्ञानवत्-सेव्यबुद्धि-संस्कार-अपेक्षफलं च सेवादि	For karmas like farming, etc. the result depends on the conscious doer – the way that he sows seeds, cares for crops, etc. For karmas like service/employment, etc. the result will depend on the intelligence of the served/employer
यागादेः कर्मणः तथा अविज्ञानवत्-कर्तृ-अपेक्षफलत्व-अनुपपत्तौ कालान्तरफलत्वात्, कर्मदेशकालनिमित्तविपाकविभागबुद्धिसंस्कार-अपेक्षं फलं भवितुम् अर्हति, सेवादिकर्म अनुरूपफलज्ञ-सेव्यबुद्धि-संस्कार-अपेक्षफलस्य इव	For karmas like yāga, etc. the result is not dependent on the ignorant doer of the action. Because the result is given after elapsed time, it must come based on the impressions created in a mind (read: īshvara's mind) which knows the action, the action's time and place and precedent causes, and maturation of that particular karma to the point when it is ready to give result. This is like karmas such as service, etc. where the result depends on the impressions created on the mind of the master.
तस्मात् सिद्धः सर्वज्ञः ईश्वरः सर्वजन्तु-बुद्धि-कर्म-फल-विभाग-साक्षी सर्वभूत-	Therefore, all-knowing īshvara's existence is proved. It is established that He is the witness of all creatures' minds,

अन्तरात्मा	karmas, and their particular results, and the inner self of all.
“यत् साक्षात् अपरोक्षात् ब्रह्म यः आत्मा सर्वान्तरः” इति श्रुतेः	Śruti says, “That Brahman (īshvara) which is directly and immediately the self of all” (Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 3.4.1)
सः एव च अत्र आत्मा जन्तूनां न अन्यः अतः अस्ति द्रष्टा श्रोता मन्ता विज्ञाता “न अन्यत् अतः अस्ति विज्ञातृ” इत्यादि आत्मान्तर-प्रतिषेध-श्रुतेः	He alone is the Self of all creatures, therefore He (īshvara), and nothing else, is the seer hearer thinker and knower. “Therefore there is no other knower,” (Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 3.8.11) in this way Śruti negates the possibility of the Self (Ātman) different from īshvara.
तत्त्वमसि इति च आत्मत्व उपदेशात्	“That thou art” (Chandogya Up. 6.8-16) from this teaching also īshvara’s Selfhood (i.e. that Brahman is the Self) is indicated.
न हि मृत्पिण्डः काञ्चन आत्मत्वेन उपदिश्यते	A ball of mud is never indicated as being gold.
ज्ञान-शक्ति-कर्म-उपास्य-उपासक-शुद्ध-अशुद्ध-मुक्त-अमुक्त-भेदात् आत्मभेद एव	PP: Differences such as knowledge, strength, action, worshipped and worshipper, pure and impure, free and bound, surely indicate differences between self and īshvara.
इति चेत् न भेद-दृष्टि-अपवादात्	S: If argued thus, it is wrong, because perceived differences should be negated.
यदुक्तं संसारिणः ईश्वरात् अनन्याः इति तत् न	PP: You said that those living in Saṁsāra (jīvas) are not different than īshvara; that is not right.
किं तर्हि?	S: What do you mean?
भेदः एव संसारि-आत्मनाम्	PP: There’s definitely a difference between jīva and īshvara.
कस्मात्?	S: Why?
लक्षणभेदात् अश्वमहिषवत्,	PP: Because of different characteristics like that of a horse and a buffalo.
कथं लक्षणभेद इति उच्यते ईश्वरस्य तावत्	And if you ask how there are such differences, īshvara

नित्यं सर्वविषयं ज्ञानं सवितृ-प्रकाशवत्, तद्विपरीतं संसारिणां खद्योतस्य इव ।	has eternal knowledge of everything as bright as the Sun. And opposed to that, the jīva's [knowledge] is insufficient like a firefly.
तथा एव शक्तिभेदः अपि नित्या सर्वविषया च ईश्वरशक्तिः विपरीत इतरस्य ।	And there's even a difference in strength. ishvara's strength is eternal and all-capable as opposed to the jīva's relative weakness.
कर्म च चित्स्वरूप-आत्म-सत्ता-मात्र- निमित्तम् ईश्वरस्य औष्ण्य-स्वरूप-द्रव्य- सत्तामात्र-निमित्त-दहन-कर्मवत्	And about karma: ishvara is of the nature of pure consciousness, so His presence alone causes karma, like with something extremely hot - by its presence alone burning takes place.
राजा-अयस्कान्त-प्रकाश-कर्मवत् च स्वात्म-अविक्रियास्वरूपम् । विपरीतम् इतरस्य ।	ishvara is similar to a king, a magnet, and light, which cause things to function in their proximity, but are themselves unaffected by the karma they have caused. This is much different than the jīva.
उपासीत इति वचनात् उपास्य ईश्वरः गुरु- रजवत् उपासकः च इतरः शिष्यभृत्यवत् अपहतपाप्मादि श्रवणात् नित्यशुद्धः ईश्वरः पुण्यः वै पुण्येन इति वचनात् विपरीत इतरः	Also the word "worshipped" is used with regard to ishvara; ishvara is to be revered like a teacher or a king. And the word "worshipper" refers to a jīva, student, or servant, respectively (to ishvara, teacher, and king). From Vedas we hear that "ishvara destroys sin" and is therefore ever-pure. "Merit is gained through meritorious deeds" (Bṛhadāranyaka Upaniṣad 3.2.13) such quotations indicate that jīva is of opposite nature to ishvara.
अतः एव नित्यमुक्तः एव ईश्वरः नित्य अशुद्धियोगात् संसारी इतरः	Therefore only ishvara is ever-pure, and jīva, being ever impure, is a transmigratory entity.
अपि च यत्र ज्ञानादिलक्षणभेदः अस्ति तत्र भेदः दृष्टः यथा अश्व-महिषयोः	And wherever there are differences in knowledge, etc. differences between entities are seen, like between horse and buffalo.
तथा ज्ञानादिलक्षणवेदादि ईश्वरात् आत्मनां भेदः अस्ति इति चेत्	Therefore, because there ARE such differences between ishvara and jīva, they are different entities. If argued thus....
न	S: Nope
कस्मात् ?	PP: Why?

अन्यः असौ अन्यः अहम् अस्मि इति न सः वेद	S: ““That is different and I am different,’ is not known by him,” (Bṛhadāranyaka Upaniṣad 1.4.10).
ते क्षय्यलोकाः भवन्ति	“They attain mortal worlds” (Chandogya 7.25.2)
मृत्योः सः मृत्युम् आप्नोति	“They go from death to death” (Katha 2.1.10)
इति भेददृष्टिः हि अपोह्यते	Thus Upaniṣads criticize seeing difference (between jīva and īshvara)
एकत्वप्रतिपादन्यः च श्रुतयः सहस्रशः विद्यन्ते	And there are thousands śruti quotations which indicate the oneness.
यदुक्तं ज्ञानादि लक्षणभेदाद् इति अत्र उच्यते न अनभ्युपगमात्	As you said, because of differences in knowledge, etc. there are differences between jīva and īshvara, this we don’t accept.
बुद्ध्यादिभ्यः व्यतिरिक्ताः विलक्षणाः च ईश्वरात् भिन्नलक्षणाः आत्मानः न सन्ति	Jīvas are different than their mind/intellect. Fundamentally, the jīva cannot have different characteristics than īshvara.
एकः एव ईश्वरः च आत्मा सर्वभूतानां नित्य-मुक्तः अभ्युपगम्यते	That one īshvara alone, who is ever free, is known as the inner Self of all.
बाह्यः चक्षुः बुद्ध्यादि समाहार-सन्तान-अहंकार-ममत्वादि विपरीत प्रत्यय प्रबन्ध अविच्छेद लक्षणः	The CONDITIONINGS of the jīva – the external coverings such as sense organs and intellect, etc. which give rise to the I-ness and my-ness – is different than the jīva itself.
नित्य-शुद्ध-बुद्ध-मुक्त-विज्ञान-आत्मा-ईश्वर-गर्भः नित्य-विज्ञान-अवभासः चित्त-चैत्य-बीज-बीजि-स्वभावः कल्पित अनित्यविज्ञानः ईश्वरलक्षण-विपरीतः अभ्युपगम्यते	The inner self of the jīva is īshvara, the eternal, pure, free, light of knowledge. In that jīva a reflection of the eternal knowledge principle illuminates the mind, experiences, ignorance, ignorance-created objects. That jīva, <i>characterized by its conditionings</i> , is said to have limited knowledge, and is different than īshvara
यस्य अविच्छेदे संसारव्यवहारः विच्छेदे च मोक्षव्यवहारः	The jīva, if the aforementioned conditionings are not negated, will transmigrate <i>as though*</i> , and if they are negated, then he will be freed, <i>as though*</i> .

	<p>*“As though” is included with reference to Ananda Giriji’s note that jīva is essentially pure consciousness which neither transmigrates nor attains freedom, hence Bhagavan Shankaracaryaji’s usage of the word “vyavahāra” indicating only the appearance of transmigration/bondage, and liberation.</p>
<p>अन्यः च मृत्प्रलेपवत् प्रत्यक्ष-प्रध्वंसः देव-पितृ-मनुष्यादिलक्षणः भूतविशेषसमाहारः न पुनः चतुर्थः अन्यः भिन्नलक्षण ईश्वराद् अभ्युपगम्यते</p>	<p>The outer conditionings of individual beings, like the name and form of a deva, ancestor, and man, etc., all are like an anointment of clay, with a definite end and external to the true self. But the Ātman, the innermost self, is not different than īshvara.</p>
<p>बुद्ध्यादि-कल्पित-आत्म-व्यतिरेक-अभिप्रायेण तु लक्षणभेदात् इति आश्रय असिद्धः हेतुः ईश्वरात् अन्यस्य आत्मनः असत्त्वात्</p>	<p>The opinion “The individual self, conditioned by the intellect, etc. is different than īshvara because of different characteristics,” is baseless and unsubstantiated because any supposed ātman which is different than īshvara cannot exist.</p>
<p>ईश्वरस्य एव विरुद्धलक्षणत्वम् अयुक्तम् इति चेत् सुखदुःखादियोगः च</p>	<p>PP: If Ātman and īshvara aren’t different/separate, then in īshvara alone the presence of contradictory, qualities is not proper, like having joy and sorrow. Isn’t it wrong?</p>
<p>न, निमित्तत्वे सति लोकविपर्यय अध्यारोपणात् ऽसवितृवत्</p>	<p>S: No. It being the case that īshvara is the ultimate cause, people have such erroneous notions because of superimposition, like with the Sun.</p>
<p>यथा हि सविता नित्यप्रकाशरूपत्वात् लोक-अभिव्यक्ति-अनभिव्यक्ति-निमित्तत्वे सति लोकदृष्टि-विपर्ययेण उदय-अस्तमय अहोरात्रादि कर्तृत्व-अध्यारोपभाक् भवति एवम् ईश्वरे नित्यविज्ञानशक्तिरूपे लोक-ज्ञान-अपोह-सुख-दुःख-स्मृत्यादि निमित्तत्वे सति लोकविपरीतबुद्ध्या-अध्यारोपितं विपरीतलक्षणत्वं सुख-दुःख-आश्रयः च न स्वतः</p>	<p>Example: the sun is eternally shining, but because its presence alone is the cause of perception and non-perception, by people’s erroneous understanding, the sun becomes the subject of superimpositions like ‘rising,’ ‘setting,’ ‘day,’ and ‘night.’ Similarly in īshvara, who is of the nature of eternal consciousness and all-powerful, whose presence alone is the reason joy, sorrow, memory is known. Because of this, the erroneous notion of people superimposes such opposing qualities onto īshvara, such as the support of joy and sorrow, when in actuality in īshvara there is no such idea.</p>
<p>आत्मदृष्टि-अनुरूप-अध्यारोपात् च</p>	<p>Superimposition is according to one’s own perspective (i.e. everyone superimposes based on their own vision of</p>

	life)
यथा घनादि-विप्रकीर्णं अम्बरे येन एव सवितृ-प्रकाशः न दृश्यते सः आत्मदृष्टि-अनुरूपम् एव अध्यस्यति सविता इदानीम् इह न प्रकाशयति इति सत्य इव प्रकाशे अन्यत्र भ्रान्त्या	The way cloud-cover in the sky causes the sun to be unseen, perceiving which the individual perspective alone superimposes; "Now, in this place, the sun is not shining," thinking erroneously that the light (by which they are seeing) is coming from somewhere else.
एवम् इह बौद्धादि-वृत्ति-उद्भव-अभिभव-आकुल-भ्रान्त्या-अध्यारोपितः सुख-दुःखादियोगः उपपद्यते	Similarly, from the rising and setting etc. of the thoughts of the intellect, through delusion, association with joy and sorrow is superimposed here onto Ātman.
तत्-स्मरणात् च	This is also known through smṛti (Bhagavad Gita).
तस्य एव ईश्वरस्य एव हि स्मरणम् - मत्तः स्मृतिर्ज्ञानमपोहनं च - नादत्ते कस्यचित्पापं इत्यादि	There are the following bhagavad gīta quotations indicating the oneness between jīva and īshvara: "I alone am the cause for an individual to remember, know, or even be ignorant." (BG 15.15) "īshvara doesn't accept any sin."
अतः नित्यमुक्तः एकस्मिन् सवितरि इव लोक-अविद्या-अध्यारोपितम् ईश्वरे संसारित्वम्	Therefore, like how people superimpose movement, setting, rising, et cetera in the sun, in the ever-free īshvara also people have superimposed worldliness out of ignorance.
शास्त्रादि-प्रामाण्यात् अभ्युपगतम् असंसारित्वम् इति अविरोधः इति	The fact that īshvara is NOT transmigratory(worldly) is told by śruti pramāṇa, establishing that there is in fact no contradiction.
एतेन प्रत्येकं ज्ञानादि-भेदः प्रयुक्तः सौक्ष्म्य-चैतन्य-सर्वगतत्वादि अविशेषे च भेद-हेतु-अभावात्	By this (discussion on superimposition of worldliness onto īshvara), the differences perceived by people, like knowledge and ignorance, were negated because subtleness (in the superlative degree), consciousness, and all-pervasiveness (these are 3 examples of īshvara-lakshanas), are non-different from one another, so there is no tenable reason for differences in īshvara.
विक्रियावत्त्वे च अनित्यत्वात्	If jīva is considered as subject to modification, then jīva would be impermanent, limited.

मोक्षे च विशेष अनभ्युपगमात् अभ्युपगमे च अनित्यत्व-प्रसङ्गात्	In liberation, no differences are perceived, if they were then the Self would be impermanent.
अविद्यावत्-उपलभ्यत्वात् च भेदस्य	Differences are only accepted by ignorant people.
तत्-क्षये अनुपपत्तिः इति सिद्धम् एकत्वम्	Thus it is established that upon the destruction of ignorance, differences are rendered untrue, and oneness remains.
तस्मात् शरीर-इन्द्रिय-मनो-बुद्धि-विषय-वेदना-सन्तानस्य अहङ्कार-सम्बन्धात् अज्ञान-बीजस्य नित्य-विज्ञान-अन्य-निमित्तस्य आत्म-तत्त्व-याथात्म्य-विज्ञानात् विनिवृत्तौ अज्ञान-बीजस्य विच्छेदः आत्मनः मोक्ष-संज्ञा विपर्यये च बन्ध-संज्ञा स्वरूप-अपेक्षत्वात् उभयोः	The seed of ignorance, which is the idea of self in body, sense organs, mind, intellect, objects, and the thoughts directed toward them, is rooted in erroneous understanding, an understanding which is different from the Self which is eternal consciousness. The destruction of this seed of ignorance, by knowing the Self as it is, is called moksha, liberation. Knowing the Self otherwise is known as bondage.

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

ब्रह्म ह इति ऐतिह्यार्थः	“Ishvara was...” (Kena 3.1) is to indicate a historical context to the mantra.
पुरा किल देव-असुर-संग्रामे जगत्-स्थिति-परिपालयिषया-आत्म-अनुशासन-अनुवर्तिभ्यः देवेभ्यः अर्थिभ्यः अर्थाय विजिग्ये अजैषीत् असुरान्	It is said that earlier, in the war between demi-gods (Devatas) and asuras, Ishvara – out of a desire to protect the state of the universe – caused the victory-desiring Devatas, who respect the will of Ishvara, to win over the asuras.
ब्रह्मणः इच्छा-निमित्तः विजयः देवानां बभूव इत्यर्थः	The will of Ishvara was the cause for the victory of the Devatas.
तस्य ह ब्रह्मणः विजये देवाः अमहीयन्त	In that victory of Ishvara, the Devatas gained glory.
यज्ञादि-लोक-स्थिति-अपहारिषु असुरेषु पराजितेषु देवाः वृद्धिं पूजां वा प्राप्तवन्तः	In the defeat of those demons who would destroy the rituals that are for the good of the universe, the Devatas grew, i.e. they became increasingly worshipped.

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

ते ऐक्षन्त इति मिथ्या-प्रत्ययत्वात् हेयत्व
ख्यापनार्थम् आम्नायः

“They thought...” etc. (Kena 3.2) these sentences are to indicate that false notions were taken up by the Devatas.

ईश्वर-निमित्ते विजये स्वसामर्थ्य-निमित्तः
अस्माकम् एव अयं विजयः अस्माकम् एव अयं
महिमा इति आत्मनः जयादि श्रेयोनिमित्तं सर्व-
आत्मानम् आत्मस्थं सर्व-कल्याणास्पदम्
ईश्वरम् एव आत्मत्वेन अबुद्ध्वा पिण्ड-मात्र-
अभिमानाः सन्तः यं मिथ्या-प्रत्ययं चक्रुः तस्य
पिण्ड-मात्र-विषयत्वेन मिथ्या-प्रत्ययत्वात् सर्व-
आत्म-ईश्वर-याथात्म्य-अवबोधेन हातव्यता
ख्यापनार्थः तत् ह एषाम् इत्यादि आख्यायिका
आम्नायः

In the victory that was caused by Ishvara, the Devatas thought “This victory is won by our own strength,” “This glory is gained by our own strength.” Ishvara is the cause for all their gain, like the victory etc., who is the self of all, residing in the heart, who wants only the prosperity and happiness for everyone. Not understanding the truth that Ishvara alone is their own Self, they instead identified themselves with [their bodies, which are nothing more than insentient] lumps. This erroneous notion they entertained. That notion was erroneous because it identified the Self with an insentient lump (the body). The second line of this mantra, “Ishvara came to know of the pride of the Devatas, etc.,” indicates Ishvara’s intention for the Devatas to drop their erroneous notions by the declaration of the proper understanding that Ishvara is the Self of all.

तत् ब्रह्म ह किल एषां देवानाम् अभिप्रायं मिथ्या
अहङ्कार-रूपं विजज्ञौ विज्ञातवत्

It is said that Ishvara came to know about the feeling of false pride of the Devatas.

ज्ञात्वा च मिथ्या-अभिमान-शातनेन तत्
अनुजिघृक्षया देवेभ्यः अर्थाय तेषाम् एव
इन्द्रिय-गोचरे न अतिदूरे प्रादुर्बभूव

And having known this false pride, with the desire to help them by cutting that pride, for the benefit of the Devatas, Ishvara manifested close by in a form they could perceive with their senses.

महेश्वर-शक्ति-माया-उपात्तेन अत्यन्त-अद्भुतेन
प्रादुर्भूतं किल केनचित् रूप-विशेषेण

It is said that the Lord Ishvara, by His Maya power, obtained an awesome and unbelievable form.

तत् किल उपलभमानाः अपि देवाः न व्यजानत

Upon seeing that form, the Devatas were unable to recognize – ‘Who is this Yaksha, who is so

न विज्ञातवन्तः किम् इदं यत् एतत् यक्षं पूज्यम्
इति

worshipful?

तेऽग्निमब्रुवन् जातवेद एतद्विजानीहि किमेतद्यक्षमिति तथेति ॥ ३ ॥

तदभ्यद्रवत्तमभ्यवदत् कोऽसीत्यग्निर्वा अहमस्मीत्यब्रवीज्जातवेदा वा अहमस्मीति ॥ ४ ॥

तस्मिंस्त्वयि किं वीर्यमित्यपीदं सर्वं दहेयं यदिदं पृथिव्यामिति ॥ ५ ॥

तस्मै तृणं निदधावेतदहेति तदुपप्रेयाय सर्वजवेन तन्न शशाक दग्धुं स तत एव निववृते नैतदशकं
विज्ञातुं यदेतद्यक्षमिति ॥ ६ ॥

अथ वायुमब्रुवन् वायवेतद्विजानीहि किमेतद्यक्षमिति तथेति ॥ ७ ॥

तदभ्यद्रवत्तमभ्यवदत्कोऽसीति वायुर्वा अहमस्मीत्यब्रवीन्मातरिश्वा वा अहमस्मीति ॥ ८ ॥

तस्मिंस्त्वयि किं वीर्यमित्यपीदं सर्वमाददीय यदिदं पृथिव्यामिति ॥ ९ ॥

तस्मै तृणं निदधावेतदादत्स्वेति तदुपप्रेयाय सर्वजवेन तन्न शशाकादातुं स तत एव निववृते नैतदशकं
विज्ञातुं यदेतद्यक्षमिति ॥ १० ॥

तत् विज्ञानाय अग्निम् अब्रुवन्

In order to know (who is that Yaksha), the Devas told Agni (the Devata of Fire) [to go find out].

तृण-निधाने अयम् अभिप्रायः अत्यन्त-
सम्भावितयोः अग्नि-मारुतयोः तृण-दहन-
आदान-अशक्त्या-आत्म-सम्भावना
शातिता भवेत् इति

Ishvara placed a blade of grass; the opinion of Ishvara was that these very famous, well-established Devas, Agni (fire) and Vayu (wind), wouldn't be able to burn or lift up the blade of grass, and by this their self-pride would be destroyed.

अथेन्द्रमब्रुवन्मघवन्नेतद्विजानीहि किमेतद्यक्षमिति तथेति तदभ्यद्रवत्तस्मात्तिरोदधे ॥ ११ ॥

<p>इन्द्रः आदित्यः वज्रभृत् वा अविरोधात्</p>	<p>Indra's names also are Aditya (The Sun), and Vajrabhrat (the one with the lightning bolt), because the meanings don't contradict one another.</p>
<p>इन्द्र-उपसर्पणे ब्रह्म तिरोदध इत्यत्र अयम् अभिप्रायः इन्द्रः अहम् इति अधिकतमः अभिमानः अस्य सः अहम् अग्नि-आदिभिः प्राप्तं वाक्-सम्भाषण-मात्रम् अपि अनेन न प्राप्तः अस्मि इति अभिमानं कथं न नाम जह्यात् इति तत् अनुग्रहाय एव अन्तर्हितं तत् ब्रह्म बभूव</p>	<p>When Indra came close, Ishvara disappeared, here the thinking is – Indra had the pride that “I am Indra, I'm the greatest,” – then Indra thought “Even just the conversation that Agni and Vayu were able to get with the yaksha – even that I'm not able to get.” Thinking like this, some way or the other Indra dropped his pride. For the grace (of destroying false pride) alone, Ishvara disappeared (when Indra approached).</p>

स तस्मिन्नेवाकाशे स्त्रियमाजगाम बहु शोभमानामुमां हैमवतीं तां होवाच किमेतद्यक्षमिति ॥ १२ ॥

<p>सः शान्त-अभिमानः इन्द्रः अत्यर्थं ब्रह्म विजिज्ञासुः यस्मिन् आकाशे ब्रह्मणः प्रादुर्भावः आसीत् तिरोधानं च तस्मिन् एव स्त्रियम् अतिरूपिणीं विद्याम् आजगाम, अभिप्राय-उद्धोध-हेतुत्वात् रुद्रपत्नी उमा हैमवती इव सा शोभमाना विद्या एव</p>	<p>Indra, now being with quietened pride, having intense desire to know, he went to that very place where Ishvara had disappeared. In that place a very beautiful woman was standing – she was Knowledge, and Indra went close to her. Because Ishvara disappeared there, she – who was equal in appearance to the wife of Lord Shiva, the daughter of the Himalayas, Parvatiji – Knowledge stood in his place.</p>
<p>विरूपः अपि विद्यावान् बहु शोभते</p>	<p>Even if one lacks physical beauty, if he has Knowledge, he shines greatly.</p>

चतुर्थ खण्ड

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

तस्माद्वा एते देवा अतितरामिवान्यान्देवान्यदग्निर्वायुरिन्द्रस्ते ह्येनन्नेदिष्टं पस्पर्शुस्ते ह्येनत्प्रथमो विदाञ्चकार ब्रह्मेति ॥ २ ॥

तस्माद्वा इन्द्रोऽतितरामिवान्यान्देवान्स ह्येनन्नेदिष्टं पस्पर्श स ह्येनत्प्रथमो विदाञ्चकार ब्रह्मेति ॥ ३ ॥

तां च पृष्ट्वा तस्याः एव वचनात् विदाञ्चकार विदितवान्	Have asked her, from her words Indra came to know about Ishvara.
अतः इन्द्रस्य बोध-हेतुत्वात् विद्या एव उमा	Because she was the cause of Indra's knowledge, Uma herself is Knowledge.
विद्या-सहायवान् ईश्वरः इति स्मृतिः	And it is said in a Smriti "Ishvara is he who is helpful in Knowledge."
यस्मात् इन्द्र-विज्ञान-पूर्वकम् अग्नि-वायु- इन्द्राः ते हि एतत् नेदिष्टम् अतिसमीपं ब्रह्म- विद्यया ब्रह्म प्राप्ताः सन्तः पस्पृशुः स्पृष्टवन्तः ते हि प्रथमः प्रथमं विदाञ्चकार विदाञ्चक्रुः इति एतत् तस्मात् अतितराम् अतीत्य अन्यान् अतिशयेन दीप्यन्ते अन्यान् देवान् ततः अपि इन्द्रः अतितरां दीप्यते, आदौ ब्रह्म-विज्ञानात्	With Indra attaining knowledge, He, Agni and Vayu came very close to Ishvara, and through knowledge of Him they as though "touched" Him. They were the first to know, that is why they surpass others, they shine more brilliantly than the rest of the Devatas. Amongst those three Indra is the most brilliant, because he was the first one to get Knowledge.

तस्यैष आदेशो यदेतद्विद्युतो व्यद्युतदा इतीन्द्र्यमीमिषदा इत्यधिदैवतम् ॥ ४ ॥

<p>तस्य एषः आदेशः तस्य ब्रह्मणः एषः वक्ष्यमाणः आदेशः उपासना-उपदेशः इत्यर्थः</p>	<p>The teaching given for knowing Brahman is this: <i>Tasya brahmanah</i> of that Brahman, <i>eshah adesha</i> this teaching that will be told is an upasana teaching.</p>
<p>यस्मात् देवेभ्यः विद्युत् इव सहसा एव प्रादुर्भूतं ब्रह्म द्युतिमत् तस्मात् विद्युतः विद्योतनं यथा यत् एतत् ब्रह्म व्यद्युत् विद्योतितवत्</p>	<p>The way that in front of devatas, Brahman is like a sudden flash of lightning. Brahman is of the nature of illumination, which is why it is comparable to the shine of a sudden flash of lightning.</p>
<p>आ इव इति उपमार्थः आशब्दः</p>	<p>“Aa” (the prolated vowel) indicates a comparison.</p>
<p>यथा घन-अन्धकारं विदार्य विद्युत् सर्वतः प्रकाशतः एवं तत् ब्रह्म देवानां पुरतः सर्वतः प्रकाशवत् व्यक्तीभूतम् अतः व्यद्युत् इव इति उपास्यम् यथा सकृत् विद्युत् इति च वाजसनेयके</p>	<p>The way that thick darkness is cut through in all directions by the shine of lightning, that Brahman also manifested in front of the Devatas brilliantly illuminating everything; therefore it is said that Brahman should meditated on as similar to an illuminating flash of lightning. Similarly it is said in the Vajasaneyaka branch of the Shukla Yajur Veda, “it is like one sudden flash of lightning.”</p>
<p>यस्मात् च इन्द्र-उपसर्पणकाले न्यमीमिषत्, यथा कश्चित् चक्षुः निमेषणं कृतवान् इति</p>	<p>Like when Indra approached Ishvara, He disappeared, the way an eye blinks for an instant.</p>
<p>इति इत् इति अनर्थकौ निपातौ; निमिषितवत् इव तिरोभूतम्, इति एवम् अधिदैवतं देवतायाः अधि यत् दर्शनम् अधिदैवतं तत्</p>	<p>Ishvara’s disappearance was comparable to the blink of an eye. This upasana is in reference to how the devata, Indra, saw the form of Ishvara (yaksha). Hence “<i>adhidaivatam</i>”. <i>Iti it</i> are two interjections without specific meaning.</p>

अथाध्यात्मं यदेतद्गच्छतीव च मनोऽनेन चैतदुपस्मरत्यभीक्षणं सङ्कल्पः ॥ ५ ॥

अथ अनन्तरम् अध्यात्मम् आत्म-विषयम् अध्यात्मम् उच्यते इति वाक्यशेषः	Thereafter, <i>adhyatmam</i> - is called the subject of the Self. This is unsaid in the mantra, but should be understood.
यत् एतत् यथा उक्त-लक्षणं ब्रह्म गच्छति इव प्राप्नोति इव विषयी-करोति इव इत्यर्थः	This mind, which has the qualities that were explained in previous mantras (such as immediacy, illumination, etc.) goes to Brahman, i.e. attains Brahman, or makes it an object of its understanding.
न पुनः विषयी-करोति मनसः अविषयत्वात् ब्रह्मणः अतः मनः न गच्छति	But in reality, the mind cannot make Brahman an object of knowledge, because Brahman is not an object (it is the subject). Therefore in reality the mind doesn't "understand" Brahman (see the explanation given in chapter 2).
येन आहुः मनः मतम् इति हि च उक्तम्	It was also said that Brahman is that because of which the mind thinks.
तु गच्छति इव इति मनसः अपि मनस्त्वात्	Therefore, because Brahman is the 'Mind of the Mind' (chapter 1) it is said in the mantra "the mind that goes to Brahman."
आत्मभूतत्वात् च ब्रह्मणः तत्-समीपे मनः वर्तते इति	Meaning, the mind, being of the nature of Brahman, goes close to Brahman.
उपस्मरति अनेन मनसा एव तत् ब्रह्म विद्वान् यस्मात् तस्मात् ब्रह्म गच्छति इव इति उच्यते	By this mind, the wise person always remembers that Brahman, therefore it is said as though, "the mind that goes to Brahman."
अभीक्षणं पुनः पुनः च सङ्कल्पः ब्रह्म प्रेषितस्य मनसः	<i>Abhikshnam</i> i.e. again and again, the mind, which is prompted by [the presence of] Brahman, thinks of That only.
अतः उपस्मरण-सङ्कल्पादिभिः लिङ्गैः ब्रह्म मनः अध्यात्मभूतम् उपास्यम् इति अभिप्रायः	Therefore, the meaning of this mantra is that the mind should be meditated on as Brahman as one's own self, through focusing on the qualities of remembrance and thinking.

तद्ध तद्धनं नाम तद्धनमित्युपासितव्यं स य एतदेवं वेदाभि हैनं सर्वाणि भूतानि संवाञ्छन्ति ॥ ६ ॥

तस्य च अध्यात्मम् उपासने गुणः विधीयते	And an upasana of Brahman as one's own self with attributes has been given:
तत् ह तद्वनम् तत् एतत् ब्रह्म तत् च तद्वनं च तत् परोक्षं वनं सम्भजनीयम्	"Brahman is <i>Tadvanam</i> " that Brahman is Tadvanam. <i>Tat</i> means apart, distant, and <i>vanam</i> means worthy of worship.
वनतेः तत् कर्मणः तस्मात् तद्वनं नम	<i>Tat</i> (Brahman) is given as the object for which the verb <i>vanate</i> (meaning - to worship well) is given, <i>tadvanam</i> is derived in this manner.
ब्रह्मणः गौणं हि इदं नाम, तस्मात् अनेन गुणेन तत् वनम् इति उपासितव्यम्	The meaning of " <i>Tadvanam</i> " is meant here qualified Brahman. Because of that quality, it is adorable and worshipped; in this way one should do upasana.
सः यः कश्चित् एतत् यथा उक्तम् एवं यथा उक्तेन गुणेन वनम् इति अनेन नाम्ना अभिधेयं ब्रह्म वेद उपास्ते तस्य एतत् फलम् उच्यते	For the one who does upasana (in the mantra the word given for this is veda) on Brahman with this quality, the result is said:
सर्वाणि भूतानि एनम् उपासकम् अभिसंवाञ्छन्ति इह अभिसंभजन्ते सेवन्ते स्म इत्यर्थः	All beings will praise/worship this meditator and serve him – this is the meaning of the mantra.
यथा गुण-उपासनं हि फलम्	As the qualities are of the object meditated upon, so shall be the result of the meditation.

उपनिषदं भो ब्रूहीत्युक्त्वा त उपनिषद्वाह्नीं वाव त उपनिषदमब्रूमेति ॥ ७ ॥

उपनिषदं भोः ब्रूहि इति उक्तायाम् अपि
उपनिषदि शिष्येण उक्ते आचार्यः आह
उक्ता कथिता ते तुभ्यम् उपनिषद् आत्मा
उपासनं च अधुना ब्राह्मीं वाव ते तुभ्यं
ब्रह्मणः ब्राह्मण-जातेः उपनिषदम् अब्रूम
वक्ष्याम इत्यर्थः

"Oh, please tell me this Upanishad," upon this being said by the student, even though the Upanishad has already been told. Then the teacher says, "I have already told you this Upanishad (Knowledge of Brahman) and also Upasana of Atma. Now we'll tell you the Upanishad of Brahmanas."

वक्ष्यति हि	It will be told later.
ब्राह्मी न उक्ता उक्ता तु आत्मा उपनिषत्	This Upanishad of Brahmanas hasn't been told; what was told is the Upanishad of Atma (knowledge of Self).
तस्मात् न भूत अभिप्रायः अब्रूम इति अयं शब्दः	Therefore, <i>abruvan</i> is not used in past tense in this mantra (although grammatically it would be).

तस्यै तपो दमः कर्मेति प्रतिष्ठा वेदाः सर्वाङ्गानि सत्यमायतनम् ॥ ८ ॥

तस्यै तस्याः वक्ष्यमाणायाः उपनिषदः तपः ब्रह्मचार्यादि दमः उपशमः कर्म अग्निहोत्रादि इति एतानि प्रतिष्ठ-आश्रयः	Of that Upanishad which is going to be told, austerity, celibacy, etc., sense control, mind control, rituals, fire sacrifice, etc. all these are <i>pratishtha</i> i.e. the support.
एतेषु हि सत्सु ब्राह्मि उपनिषत् प्रतिष्ठिता भवति	When these all are present, then only this Upanishad of Brahman can be well received and understood.
वेदाः चत्वारः अङ्गानि च सर्वाणि	And all the [knowledge contained in the] branches of the four Vedas.
प्रतिष्ठा इति अनुवर्तते	The word <i>pratishtha</i> should also be applied to the branches of the four Vedas.
ब्रह्म-आश्रया हि विद्या	Because Knowledge is held in the Vedas.
सत्यं यथा भूत-वचनम् अपीडाकरम् आयतनं निवासः सत्यवत्सु हि सर्वं यथा उक्तम् आयतनः इव अवस्थितम्	Truth, i.e. words spoken about things as they are, which does not produce any harm to anyone is the dwelling place of Knowledge; because only in truthful people do all aforementioned qualities (tapas etc.) reside.

यो वा एतामेवं वेदापहत्य पाप्मानमनन्ते स्वर्गे लोके ज्येये प्रतिष्ठति प्रतिष्ठति ॥ ९ ॥

ताम् एतां तपआद्यङ्गां तत्-प्रतिष्ठां ब्राह्मीम् उपनिषदं
सायतनाम् आत्म-ज्ञान-हेतु-भूताम् एवं यथावत् यः
वेद अनुवर्तते अनुतिष्ठति तस्य एतत् फलम् आह

This Brahaman Upanishad which is has tapas etc. as its parts, and also reside there where those qualities of tapas, etc. are present, is the cause for Self-Knowledge; the one who knows it and follows [its teachings] diligently – for him this result is said:

अपहत्य पाप्मानम् अपक्षीय धर्म-अधर्मौ इति अर्थः
अनन्ते अपारे अविद्यमानान्ते स्वर्गे लोके सुख-प्राये
निर्दुःख-आत्मनि परे ब्रह्मणि ज्येये महति सर्व-महत्तरे
प्रतिष्ठति सर्व-वेदान्त-वेद्यं ब्रह्म-आत्मत्वेन अवगम्य
तत् एव ब्रह्म प्रतिपद्यते इत्यर्थः ।

Having destroyed sin, i.e. destroyed both dharma and adharma, he attains that “swarga” [literally “heaven” but here it means the state of knowledge which is itself Bliss which is itself one’s own Self] which has no end, i.e. whose end is unknowable, which is without sorrow, full of bliss, boundless, and the greatest, greater than all else; he becomes established in this supreme Brahman. Having known that Brahman as one’s own self, which is known through understanding the essence of Vedanta, he attains that Brahman.

हरिः ॐ तत् सत्