

attachment, etc., and endowed with qualities of tranquillity, etc., rid of the states of being, spite, greed, expectation, bewilderment, etc., with his mind unaffected by ostentation, self-sense and the like, he lives. He alone who is possessed of these qualities is the Brāhmaṇa. This is the view of the Vedic texts and tradition, ancient lore and history. The accomplishment of the state of the Brāhmaṇa is otherwise impossible. Meditate on *Brahman*, the Self who is being, consciousness and bliss, without a second; meditate on *Brahman*, the Self who is being, consciousness and bliss without a second. This is the Upaniṣad.

six infirmities: old age, death, sorrow, delusion, hunger and thirst.
six states: birth, being, growth, change, waning and perishing.

Many texts declare that the determining factor of caste is character and conduct and not birth.

*śṛṇu yakṣa kulaṁ tāta na svādhyāyo na ca śrulam
kāraṇam vā dvijātve ca vṛttam eva na saṁśayah.*

Listen about caste, Yakṣa dear, not study, not learning is the cause of rebornness. Conduct is the basis, there is no doubt about it.
M.B. *Aranya-parva* 312. 106.

*satyam, dānam, ksamā, śilam anṣamsyam tapo ghrṇā
dṛśyante yatra nāgendra sa brāhmaṇa iti smṛtiḥ.*

O King of serpents, he in whom are manifest truthfulness, charity, forbearance, good conduct, non-injury, austerity and compassion is a Brāhmaṇa according to the sacred tradition.

*yatraital lakṣyate sarpa vṛttam sa brāhmaṇas smṛtaḥ,
yatraitan na bhavet sarvaṁ tam śūdrām iti nirdiśet.*

O serpent, he in whom this conduct is manifest is a Brāhmaṇa, he in whom this is absent, treat all such as Śūdra. M.B. *Aranya-parva* 180. 20, 27. The gods consider him a Brāhmaṇa (a knower of *Brahman* who has no desires, who undertakes no work, who does not salute or praise anybody, whose work has been exhausted but who himself is unchanged).

*nirāśiṣam anārambham nirnamaskāram astutim
akṣiṇam kṣiṇakarmāṇam tam devā brāhmaṇam viduh.*

M.B. XII. 269. 34.

See *Dhammapada*, Chapter XXVI.

Sanatsujāta defines a Brāhmaṇa as one who is devoted to truth:
sa eva satyānāpaiti sa jñeyo brahmaṇas tvayā.

It is valuable to recall the teaching of this Upaniṣad which repudiates the system that consecrates inequalities and hardens contingent differences into inviolable divisions.

APPENDIX A

FOREWORD

By RABINDRANATH TAGORE
to *The Philosophy of the Upaniṣads*

NOT being a scholar or a student of philosophy, I do not feel justified in writing a critical appreciation of a book dealing with the philosophy of the Upaniṣads. What I venture to do is to express my satisfaction at the fact that my friend, Professor Radhakrishnan, has undertaken to explain the *spirit* of the Upaniṣads to English readers.

It is not enough that one should know the meaning of the words and the grammar of the Sanskrit texts in order to realize the deeper significance of the utterances that have come to us across centuries of vast changes, both of the inner as well as the external conditions of life. Once the language in which these were written was living, and therefore the words contained in them had their full context in the life of the people of that period, who spoke them. Divested of that vital atmosphere, a large part of the language of these great texts offers to us merely its philological structure and not life's subtle gesture which can express through suggestion all that is ineffable.

Suggestion can neither have fixed rules of grammar nor the rigid definition of the lexicon so easily available to the scholar. Suggestion has its unanalysable code which finds its depth of explanation in the living hearts of the people who use it. Code words philologically treated appear childish, and one must know that all those experiences which are not realized through the path of reason, but immediately through an inner vision, must use some kind of code word for their expression. All poetry is full of such words, and therefore poems of one language can never be properly translated into other languages, nay, not even re-spoken in the same language.

For an illustration let me refer to that stanza of Keats' 'Ode to a Nightingale,' which ends with the following lines:—

The same that oft-times hath
Charmed magic casements, opening on the foam
Of perilous seas, in faery lands forlorn.

All these words have their synonyms in our Bengali language. But if through their help I try to understand these

lines or express the idea contained in them, the result would be contemptible. Should I suffer from a sense of race superiority in our own people, and have a low opinion of English literature, I could do nothing better to support my case than literally to translate or to paraphrase in our own tongue all the best poems written in English.

Unfortunately, the Upaniṣads have met with such treatment in some parts of the West, and the result is typified disastrously in a book like Gough's *Philosophy of the Upaniṣads*. My experience of philosophical writings being extremely meagre, I may be wrong when I say that this is the only philosophical discussion about the Upaniṣads in English, but, at any rate, the lack of sympathy and respect displayed in it for some of the most sacred words that have ever issued from the human mind, is amazing.

Though many of the symbolical expressions used in the Upaniṣads can hardly be understood to-day, or are sure to be wrongly interpreted, yet the messages contained in these, like some eternal source of light, still illumine and vitalize the religious mind of India. They are not associated with any particular religion, but they have the breadth of a universal soil that can supply with living sap all religions which have any spiritual ideal hidden at their core, or apparent in their fruit and foliage. Religions, which have their different standpoints, each claim them for their own support.

This has been possible because the Upaniṣads are based not upon theological reasoning, but on experience of spiritual life. And life is not dogmatic; in it opposing forces are reconciled—ideas of non-dualism and dualism, the infinite and the finite, do not exclude each other. Moreover the Upaniṣads do not represent the spiritual experience of any one great individual, but of a great age of enlightenment which has a complex and collective manifestation, like that of the starry world. Different creeds may find their sustenance from them, but can never set sectarian boundaries round them; generations of men in our country, no mere students of philosophy, but seekers of life's fulfilment, may make living use of the texts, but can never exhaust them of their freshness of meaning.

For such men the Upaniṣad-ideas are not wholly abstract, like those belonging to the region of pure logic. They are concrete, like all truths realized through life. The idea of Brahma when judged from the view-point of intellect is an

abstraction, but it is concretely real for those who have the direct vision to see it. Therefore the consciousness of the reality of Brahma has boldly been described to be as real as the consciousness of an *amlaka* fruit held in one's palm. And the Upaniṣad says:—

*yato vāco nivartante aprāpya manasā saha
ānandam brahmaṇo vidvān na bibheti kadācana.*

From Him come back baffled both words and mind. But he who realizes the joy of Brahma is free from fear.

Cannot the same thing be said about light itself to men who may by some mischance live all through their life in an underground world cut off from the sun's rays? They must know that words can never describe to them what light is, and mind, through its reasoning faculty, can never even understand how one must have a direct vision to realize it intimately and be glad and free from fear.

We often hear the complaint that the Brahma of the Upaniṣads is described to us mostly as a bundle of negations. Are we not driven to take the same course ourselves when a blind man asks for a description of light? Have we not to say in such a case that light has neither sound, nor taste, nor form, nor weight, nor resistance, nor can it be known through any process of analysis? Of course it can be seen; but what is the use of saying this to one who has no eyes? He may take that statement on trust without understanding in the least what it means, or may altogether disbelieve it, even suspecting in us some abnormality.

Does the truth of the fact that a blind man has missed the perfect development of what should be normal about his eyesight depend for its proof upon the fact that a larger number of men are not blind? The very first creature which suddenly groped into the possession of its eyesight had the right to assert that light was a reality. In the human world there may be very few who have their spiritual eyes open, but, in spite of the numerical preponderance of those who cannot see, their want of vision must not be cited as an evidence of the negation of light.

In the Upaniṣads we find the note of certainty about the spiritual meaning of existence. In the very paradoxical nature of the assertion that we can never know Brahma, but can realize Him, there lies the strength of conviction that comes

from personal experience. They aver that through our joy we know the reality that is infinite, for the test by which reality is apprehended is joy. Therefore in the Upaniṣads *satyam* and *ānandam* are one. Does not this idea harmonize with our everyday experience?

The self of mine that limits my truth within myself confines me to a narrow idea of my own personality. When through some great experience I transcend this boundary I find joy. The negative fact of the vanishing of the fences of self has nothing in itself that is delightful. But my joy proves that the disappearance of self brings me into touch with a great positive truth whose nature is infinitude. My love makes me understand that I gain a great truth when I realize myself in others, and therefore I am glad. This has been thus expressed in the *Īsopaniṣad*:—

*ya tu sarvāṇi bhūtāni ātmany evānupaśyati
sarvabhūteṣu cātmanam tato na vijugupsate.*

He who sees all creatures in himself, and himself in all creatures, no longer remains concealed.

His Truth is revealed in him when it comprehends Truth in others. And we know that in such a case we are ready for the utmost self-sacrifice through abundance of love.

It has been said by some that the element of personality has altogether been ignored in the Brahma of the Upaniṣads, and thus our own personality, according to them, finds no response in the Infinite Truth. But then, what is the meaning of the exclamation: '*Vedāhametaṁ puruṣam mahāntam.*' *I have known him who is the Supreme Person.* Did not the sage who pronounced it at the same time proclaim that we are all *amṛtasya putrāḥ*, the sons of the Immortal?

Elsewhere it has been declared: *tam vedyam puruṣam veda yathā ma vo mṛtyuḥ parivyathāḥ.* *Know him, the Person who only is to be known, so that death may not grieve thee.* The meaning is obvious. We are afraid of death, because we are afraid of the absolute cessation of our personality. Therefore, if we realize the Person as the ultimate reality which we know in everything that we know, we find our own personality in the bosom of the eternal.

There are numerous verses in the Upaniṣads which speak of immortality. I quote one of these:—

*eṣa devo viśvakarmā mahātmā
sadā janānām hṛdaye sanniviṣṭaḥ
hṛdā manisā manasābhikṣpto
ya etad vidur amṛtās te bhavanti.*

This is the God who is the world-worker, the supreme soul, who always dwells in the heart of all men, those who know him through their mind, and the heart that is full of the certainty of knowledge, become immortal.

To realize with the heart and mind the divine being who dwells within us is to be assured of everlasting life. It is *mahātma*, the great reality of the inner being, which is *viśvakarmā*, the world-worker, whose manifestation is in the outer work occupying all time and space.

Our own personality also consists of an inner truth which expresses itself in outer movements. When we realize, not merely through our intellect, but through our heart strong with the strength of its wisdom, that *Mahātmā*, the Infinite Person, dwells in the Person which is in me, we cross over the region of death. Death only concerns our limited self; when the Person in us is realized in the Supreme Person, then the limits of our self lose for us their finality.

The question necessarily arises, what is the significance of this self of ours? Is it nothing but an absolute bondage for us?

If in our language the sentences were merely for expressing grammatical rules, then the using of such a language would be a slavery to fruitless pedantry. But, because language has for its ultimate object the expression of ideas, our mind gains its freedom through it, and the bondage of grammar itself is a help towards this freedom.

If this world were ruled only by some law of forces, then it would certainly have hurt our mind at every step and there would be nothing that could give us joy for its own sake. But the Upaniṣad says that from *ānandam*, from an inner spirit of Bliss, have come out all things, and by it they are maintained. Therefore, in spite of contradictions, we have our joy in life, we have experiences that carry their final value for us.

It has been said that the Infinite Reality finds its revelation in *ānanda-rūpam amṛtam*, in the deathless form of joy. The supreme end of our personality also is to express itself in its creations. But works done through the compulsion of necessity, or some passion that blinds us and drags us on with its impetus,

are fetters for our soul; they do not express the wealth of the infinite in us, but merely our want or our weakness.

Our soul has its *ānandam*, its consciousness of the infinite, which is blissful. This seeks its expression in limits which, when they assume the harmony of forms and the balance of movements, constantly indicate the limitless. Such expression is freedom, freedom from the barrier of obscurity. Such a medium of limits we have in our self which is our medium of expression. It is for us to develop this into *ānanda-rūpam amṛtam*, an embodiment of deathless joy, and only then the infinite in us can no longer remain obscured.

This self of ours can also be moulded to give expression to the personality of a business man, or a fighting man, or a working man, but in these it does not reveal our supreme reality, and therefore we remain shut up in a prison of our own construction. Self finds its *ānanda-rūpam*, which is its freedom in revelation, when it reveals a truth that transcends self, like a lamp revealing light which goes far beyond its material limits, proclaiming its kinship with the sun. When our self is illuminated with the light of love, then the negative aspect of its separateness with others loses its finality, and then our relationship with others is no longer that of competition and conflict, but of sympathy and co-operation.

I feel strongly that this, for us, is the teaching of the Upaniṣads, and that this teaching is very much needed in the present age for those who boast of the freedom enjoyed by their nations, using that freedom for building up a dark world of spiritual blindness, where the passions of greed and hatred are allowed to roam unchecked, having for their allies deceitful diplomacy and a widespread propaganda of falsehood, where the soul remains caged and the self batters upon the decaying flesh of its victims.

APPENDIX B

AN INTRODUCTION

By EDMOND HOLMES

to *The Philosophy of the Upaniṣads*

PROFESSOR RADHAKRISHNAN'S work on *Indian Philosophy*, the first volume of which has recently appeared, meets a want which has long been felt. The Western mind finds a difficulty in placing itself at what I may call the dominant standpoint of Indian thought, a difficulty which is the outcome of centuries of divergent tradition, and which therefore opposes a formidable obstacle to whatever attempt may be made by Western scholarship and criticism to interpret the speculative philosophy of India. If we of the West are to enter with some measure of sympathy and understanding into the ideas which dominate, and have long dominated, the Indian mind, India herself must expound them to us. Our interpreter must be an Indian critic who combines the acuteness and originality of the thinker with the learning and caution of the scholar, and who has also made such a study of Western thought and Western letters as will enable him to meet his readers on common ground. If, in addition to these qualifications, he can speak to us in a Western language, he will be the ideal exponent of that mysterious philosophy which is known to most of us more by hearsay than by actual acquaintance, and which, so far as we have any knowledge of it, alternately fascinates and repels us.

All these requirements are answered by Professor Radhakrishnan. A clear and deep thinker, an acute critic and an erudite scholar, he is admirably qualified for the task which he has set himself of expounding to a 'lay' audience the main movements of Indian thought. His knowledge of Western thought and letters makes it easy for him to get into touch with a Western audience; and for the latter purpose he has the further qualification, which he shares with other cultured Hindus, of being a master of the English language and an accomplished writer of English prose.

But the first volume of *Indian Philosophy* contains over 700 closely printed pages, and costs a guinea; and it is not every one, even of those who are interested in Indian thought,

who can afford to devote so much time to serious study, while the price, though relatively most reasonable, is beyond the means of many readers. That being so, it is good to know that Professor Radhakrishnan and his publisher have decided to bring out the section on *The Philosophy of the Upaniṣads* as a separate volume and at a modest price.

For what is quintessential in Indian philosophy is its spiritual idealism; and the quintessence of its spiritual idealism is in the Upaniṣads. The thinkers of India in all ages have turned to the Upaniṣads as to the fountain-head of India's speculative thought. 'They are the foundations,' says Professor Radhakrishnan, 'on which most of the later philosophies and religions of India rest. . . . Later systems of philosophy display an almost pathetic anxiety to accommodate their doctrines to the views of the Upaniṣads, even if they cannot father them all on them. Every revival of idealism in India has traced its ancestry to the teaching of the Upaniṣads.' 'There is no important form of Hindu thought,' says an English exponent of Indian philosophy, 'heterodox Buddhism included, which is not rooted in the Upaniṣads.'¹ It is to the Upaniṣads, then, that the Western student must turn for illumination, who wishes to form a true idea of the general trend of Indian thought, but has neither time nor inclination to make a close study of its various systems. And if he is to find the clue to the teaching of the Upaniṣads he cannot do better than study it under the guidance of Professor Radhakrishnan.

It is true that treatises on that philosophy have been written by Western scholars. But the Western mind, as has been already suggested, is as a rule debarred by the prejudices in which it has been cradled from entering with sympathetic insight into ideas which belong to another world and another age. Not only does it tend to survey those ideas, and the problems in which they centre, from standpoints which are distinctively Western, but it sometimes goes so far as to assume that the Western is the only standpoint which is compatible with mental sanity. Can we wonder, then, that when it criticizes the speculative thought of Ancient India, its adverse judgment is apt to resolve itself into fundamental misunderstanding, and even its sympathy is sometimes misplaced?

In Gough's *Philosophy of the Upaniṣads* we have a contemptuously hostile criticism of the ideas which dominate

¹ Bloomfield: *The Religion of the Veda*.

that philosophy, based on obstinate misunderstanding of the Indian point of view—misunderstanding so complete that our author makes nonsense of what he criticizes before he has begun to study it. In Deussen's work on the same subject—a work of close thought and profound learning which deservedly commands respect—we have a singular combination of enthusiastic appreciation with complete misunderstanding on at least one vital point. Speaking of the central conception of the Upaniṣads, that of the ideal identity of God and the soul, Gough says, 'this empty intellectual conception, void of spirituality, is the highest form that the Indian mind is capable of.' Comment on this *jugement saugrenu* is needless. Speaking of the same conception, Deussen says, 'it will be found to possess a significance reaching far beyond the Upaniṣads, their time and country; nay, we claim for it an inestimable value for the whole race of mankind . . . one thing we may assert with confidence—whatever new and unwonted paths the philosophy of the future may strike out, this principle will remain permanently unshaken, and from it no deviation can take place.' This is high praise. But when our author goes on to argue that the universe is pure illusion, and claims that this is the fundamental view of the Upaniṣads, he shows, as Professor Radhakrishnan has fully demonstrated, that he has not grasped the true inwardness of the conception which he honours so highly.

With these examples of the aberration of Western criticism before us, we shall perhaps think it desirable to turn for instruction and guidance to the exposition of the Upaniṣads which Professor Radhakrishnan, an *Indian* thinker, scholar and critic, has given us. If we do so, we shall not be disappointed. As the inheritor of a great philosophical tradition, into which he was born rather than indoctrinated, Professor Radhakrishnan has an advantage over the Western student of Indian philosophy, which no weight of learning and no degree of metaphysical acumen can counterbalance, and of which he has made full use. His study of the Upaniṣads—if a Western reader may presume to say so—is worthy of its theme.

The Upaniṣads are the highest and purest expression of the speculative thought of India. They embody the meditations on great matters of a succession of seers who lived between 1000 and 300 B.C. In them, says Professor J. S. Mackenzie, 'we have the earliest attempt at a constructive theory of the

cosmos, and certainly one of the most interesting and remarkable.'

What do the Upaniṣads teach us? Its authors did not all think alike; but, taking their meditations as a whole, we may say that they are dominated by one paramount conception, that of the ideal oneness of the soul of man with the soul of the universe. The Sanskrit word for the soul of man is *Ātman*, for the soul of the universe Brahman. 'God's dwelling place,' says Professor Radhakrishnan in his exposition of the philosophy of the Upaniṣads, 'is the heart of man. The inner immortal self and the great cosmic power are one and the same. Brahman is the *Ātman*, and the *Ātman* is the Brahman. The one supreme power through which all things have been brought into being is one with the inmost self in each man's heart.' What is real in each of us is his self or soul. What is real in the universe is its self or soul, in virtue of which its All is One, and the name for which in our language is God. And the individual soul is one, potentially and ideally, with the divine or universal soul. In the words of one of the Upaniṣads: 'He who is the Brahman in man and who is that in the sun, these are one.'

The significance of this conception is more than metaphysical. There is a practical side to it which its exponents are apt to ignore. The unity of the all-pervading life, in and through its own essential spirituality—the unity of the trinity of God and Nature and Man—is, from man's point of view, an ideal to be realized rather than an accomplished fact. If this is so, if oneness with the real, the universal, the divine self, is the ideal end of man's being, it stands to reason that self-realization, the finding of the real self, is the highest task which man can set himself. In the Upaniṣads themselves the ethical implications of their central conception were not fully worked out. To do so, to elaborate the general ideal of self-realization into a comprehensive scheme of life, was the work of the great teacher whom we call Buddha.

This statement may seem to savour of paradox. In the West the idea is still prevalent that Buddha broke away completely from the spiritual idealism of the Upaniṣads, that he denied God, denied the soul, and held out to his followers the prospect of annihilation as the final reward of a righteous life. This singular misconception, which is not entirely confined to the West, is due to Buddha's agnostic silence having been mistaken for comprehensive denial. It is time that this mistake

was corrected. It is only by affiliating the ethics of Buddhism to the metaphysics of the Upaniṣads that we can pass behind the silence of Buddha and get into touch with the philosophical ideas which ruled his mind, ideas which were not the less real or effective because he deliberately held them in reserve. This has long been my own conviction; and now I am confirmed in it by finding that it is shared by Professor Radhakrishnan, who sets forth the relation of Buddhism to the philosophy of the Upaniṣads in the following words: 'The only metaphysics that can justify Buddha's ethical discipline is the metaphysics underlying the Upaniṣads. . . . Buddhism helped to democratize the philosophy of the Upaniṣads, which was till then confined to a select few. The process demanded that the deep philosophical truths which cannot be made clear to the masses of men should for practical purposes be ignored. It was Buddha's mission to accept the idealism of the Upaniṣads at its best and make it available for the daily needs of mankind. Historical Buddhism means the spread of the Upaniṣad doctrines among the people. It thus helped to create a heritage which is living to the present day.'

Given that oneness with his own real self, which is also the soul of Nature and the spirit of God, union with the ultimate is the ideal end of man's being; the question arises: How is that end to be achieved? In India, the land of psychological experiments, many ways to it were tried and are still being tried. There was the way of *jñāna*, or intense mental concentration. There was the way of *bhakti*, or passionate love and devotion. There was the way of *Yoga*, or severe and systematic self-discipline. These ways and the like of these might be available for exceptionally gifted persons. They were not available, as Buddha saw clearly, for the rank and file of mankind. It was for the rank and file of mankind, it was for the plain average man, that Buddha devised his scheme of conduct. He saw that in one's everyday life, among one's fellow men, there were ample opportunities for the higher desires to assert themselves as higher, and for the lower desires to be placed under due control. There were ample opportunities, in other words, for the path of self-mastery and self-transcendence, the path of emancipation from the false self and of affirmation of the true self, to be followed from day to day, from year to year, and even—for Buddha, like the seers of the Upaniṣads, took the reality of re-birth for granted—from life to life. He who walked in that path had set his face

towards the goal of his own perfection, and, in doing so, had, unknown to himself, accepted the philosophy of the Upaniṣads as the ruling principle of his life.

If this interpretation of the life-work of Buddha is correct, if it was his mission to make the dominant idea of the Upaniṣads available for the daily needs of ordinary men, it is impossible to assign limits to the influence which that philosophy has had and is capable of having in human affairs in general and in the moral life of man in particular. The metaphysics of the Upaniṣads, when translated into the ethics of self-realization, provided and still provides for a spiritual need which has been felt in divers ages and which was never more urgent than it is to-day. For it is to-day, when supernatural religion is losing its hold on us, that the secret desire of the heart for the support and guidance which the religion of nature can alone afford, is making itself felt as it has never been felt before. And if the religion of nature is permanently to satisfy our deeper needs, it must take the form of devotion to the natural end of man's being, the end which the seers of the Upaniṣads discerned and set before us, the end of oneness with that divine or universal self which is at once the soul of all things and the true being of each individual man. In other words, it is as the gospel of spiritual evolution that the religion of nature must make its appeal to our semi-pagan world. It was the gospel of spiritual evolution which Buddha, true to the spirit of the Upaniṣads, preached 2,500 years ago,¹ and it is for a re-presentation of the same gospel, in the spirit of the same philosophy, that the world is waiting now.

¹ It was the gospel of spiritual evolution which Christ preached in a later age, to a different audience and through the medium of other forms of thought. Such at least is my earnest conviction. Of the two pivotal sayings, 'I and my Father are one,' and 'Be ye perfect even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect,' the former falls into line with the spiritual idealism of the Upaniṣads, the latter into line with the ethical idealism of Buddha. The notation, as might be expected, is different: but the idea and the ideal are the same.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

English Translations

- E. Roer: *Nine Upaniṣads*. 1853.
 F. Max Müller: *The Upaniṣads*. Sacred Books of the East. Vol. I. 1879; Vol. II. 1884.
 G. R. S. Mead and J. C. Chattopādhyāya: *The Upaniṣads*. 2 Vols. 1896.
 S. Sītārāma Śāstri and Gaṅgānātha Jhā: *The Upaniṣads*. 5 Vols. 1898-1901.
 Sītānāth Tattvabhūṣan: *The Upaniṣads*. 2 Vols. 1900, 1904.
 S. C. Vāsu: *Īśa, Kena, Kaṭha, Praśna, Muṇḍaka and Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣads*. 1909.
 R. E. Hume: *The Thirteen Principal Upaniṣads*. 1931.
 Swāmi Prabhavānanda and Frederick Manchester: *The Upaniṣads*. 1947.
 Swāmi Nikhilānanda: *The Upaniṣads*. 1951.

English Translations of Single Upaniṣads

- E. Roer: *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad*. 1856.
 S. C. Vāsu: *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad, with the Commentary of Sri Śaṅkarācārya*. 1913-1916.
 Swāmi Mādhavānanda: *Bṛhad-āraṇyaka Upaniṣad with Śaṅkara's Commentary*. 1934.
 Rājendralāl Mitra: *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*.
 S. C. Vāsu: *Chāndogya Upaniṣad with Commentary of Sri Madhvācārya*. 1917.
 H. M. Bhadkamkar: *Aitareya Upaniṣad*. 1899.
 S. C. Vidyārṇava and Mohan Lāl Sandal: *Aitareya Upaniṣad*. 1925.
 A. Mahādeva Śāstri: *Taittirīya Upaniṣad with the Commentaries of Śaṅkarācārya, Sureśvarācārya and Śāyana*.
 S. C. Vidyārṇava and Mohan Lāl Sandal: *Taittirīya Upaniṣad, text and translation with notes and commentaries*. 1925.
 S. C. Vāsu and A. C. Thirlwall: *Kena Upaniṣad, with the Sanskrit text, anvaya, vṛtti, word-meaning, translation, notes and index*. 1902.
 M. Hiriyanna: *Kena Upaniṣad with the Commentary of Śaṅkarācārya*. 1912.
 W. D. Whitney: *Kaṭha Upaniṣad, with the Sanskrit text, anvaya, vṛtti, word-meaning, translation, notes and index*, 1890.
 S. C. Vāsu: *Kaṭha Upaniṣad*. 1905.
 R. L. Pelly: *Kaṭha Upaniṣad*. Introduction, text, translation and notes. 1924.
 Rawson: *Kaṭha Upaniṣad*. 1934.
 Krishna Prem: *Kaṭha Upaniṣad*.¹

¹ No date is mentioned in the book.

- Sir William Jones: *Īśa Upaniṣad*. 1799.
 S. C. Vāsu and A. C. Thirlwall: *Īśa Upaniṣad*. 1902.
 M. N. Dvivedi: *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*. 1894.
 Swāmi Nikhilānanda: *Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad*.
 Siddheśvar Varma: *The Svetāśvatara Upaniṣad*. 1916.
 E. B. Cowell: *Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad*. 1861.
 S. C. Vidyārṇava and Mohan Lāl Sandal: *The Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad*,
 with notes and commentary. 1925.
 E. B. Cowell: *The Maitrī or Maitrāyaṇīya Upaniṣad*, with the
 commentary of Rāmatīrtha, edited with an English translation.
 1870.

Expository and Critical Works

- A. E. Gough: *The Philosophy of the Upaniṣads and Ancient Indian
 Metaphysics*. 1882.
 Paul Deussen: *The Philosophy of the Upaniṣads*. E.T. 1906.
 L. D. Barnett: *Brahma Knowledge*. 1911.
 S. C. Vidyārṇava: *Studies in the first Six Upaniṣads*. 1919.
 R. Gordon Milburn: *The Religious Mysticism of the Upaniṣads*. 1919.
 B. M. Barua: *A History of Pre-Buddhistic Indian Philosophy*. 1921.
 S. N. Dasgupta: *History of Indian Philosophy*. Vol. I. 1922.
 A. B. Keith: *The Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and the
 Upaniṣads*. 2 Vols. 1925.
 R. D. Ranade: *A Constructive Survey of Upaniṣadic Philosophy*.
 1926.
 S. K. Belvalkar and R. D. Ranade: *History of Indian Philosophy*.
 Vol. II. The Creative Period: Brāhmaṇa and Upaniṣadic
 Philosophy and post Upaniṣadic Thought, 1927.

GENERAL INDEX

- Abailard, Peter 590
 Abbāva 448
Abhidharma-Kośa, see Vasubandhu
 Abhinavagupta 113 n
 Aeschylus's *Agamemnon* 553
Agāñña Sutta 686
 Ahura Mazda 32 n, 33, 60 n
Aitareya Aranyaka 47 n, 91 n, 125 n,
 270, 298, 418, 458, 513, 555, 568
Aitareya Brāhmaṇa 47 n, 304, 395,
 418, 561, 615, 758, 770, 775
 Ālayavijñāna 492, 837
 Alcibiades 178
 Alexander 464
 Alexandrian Christian Mystics 17 n
 Al Ghazzālī 103 n, 562
 Ali 687
Amara-Kośa 30 n, 67 n, 176, 218
 Amos 112 n
An Advanced History of India by
 R. C. Majumdar, H. C. Ray
 Chauduri and K. Datta 144 n
 Ānanda 271-2
Ānanda-lahari 734
 Ānandagiri passim
 Anaxagoras 452
 Anaximander 33 n, 38 n
 Anaximenes 404
 Annambhatta's *Tarahasamgraha* 448
Annāpūrṇa Upaniṣad 73 n
 Anselm, St. 53 n
 Antony, St. 585
Anubhūti-prakāśa 801
 Āpastamba 769, his *Yajña-pari-
 bhāṣa* 30 n
 Appaya Dīkṣitā's *Yoga Darpaṇa* 137 n
 Aquinas, St. Thomas 65 n, 103 n,
 107 n, 144 n, 245, 777
 Aristotle 23 n, 35 n, 59, 121, 293,
 328, 464, 533, 547, 557, 652, 671
Ariyaparyesana Sutta 563
Āruneya Upaniṣad 47 n
 Āryadeva's *Cūta-visuddhi-prakarana*
 129 n
 Āśmarathya 286, 440
Āśtāvakra Gītā 702, 846
Āśvalāyana Grhya Sūtra 329, 330,
 615, 768, 769
 Athenagoras 23 n
Ātma-bodha 79 n
 Auḍulomi 124 n, 286
 Augustine, St. 121 n, 558, 575 n,
 591, 699; his *Confessions* 55 n, 557
 Aurobindo, Sri 21 n
 Avesta 31
 Avidyā 88-90
 Bādarāyaṇa 71, 125, 126
 Bādari 125, 440
 Bailey Shackleton, D. R. 194
 Baladeva 27
 Bardosa 144 n
 Baron von Hugel's *The Mystical
 Element of Religion* 749
 Barth, Karl, his *The Knowledge of
 God and the Service of God* 65 n
 Barua, B. M., his *Ceylon Lectures*
 575 n
 Basilides 65 n
 Bede, The Venerable, his *Ecclesiastical
 History of the English Nation* 81 n
 Belvalkar, Dr. S. K., his *Four Un-
 published Upaniṣadic Texts and the
 Paryāṇha Vidyā* 751, 753, 755 n,
 756 n, 757 n
 Benedict, St. 680
 Bernard, St. 85 n, 102 n, 263, 411,
 646, 749
Bhagavad-gītā, 9, 70, 397, 485, 493,
 528, 560, 572, 576, 593, 610, 615,
 616, 617, 625, 636, 649, 677, 680,
 687, 701, 710, 712, 713, 714, 720,
 721, 727, 729, 744, 746, 747, 769,
 806, 835, 886, 914, 916
Bhāgavata 24 n, 51 n, 108 n, 113 n,
 136 n, 137 n, 140 n, 141 n, 280,
 718, 907
 Bhāgavata religion 625
Bhakti-mārtāṇḍa 141 n
 Bhartṛprapañca 25
 Bhāskara 27
 Bhāskara Laugākṣi, his *Ariha-sam-
 graha* 50 n
 Bhattachārya Siddheśvar 10
 Bhavabhūti 549
 Birth Control 324
 Blake 60 n; his *Auguries of Inno-
 cence* 612
 Bloomfield, his *Religion of the Veda*
 17 n, 29 n, 946
 Bodhisattva 274
 Boehme 36 n, 128 n, 645, 884
 Boethius 94; his *Consolations of
 Philosophy* 113 n
 Bonaventura, St. 620; his *Itinerary
 of the Mind* 620