COLEBROOKE, in his essay on the Vedas, gives a brief account of the Kaushitaki Brahma Upanishad, of which however he had only seen a small fragment among Sir R. Chambers’ MSS., besides an abridgement of it in Vidyaranya’s metrical paraphrase of twelve principal Upanishads. The Upanishad itself has always been highly esteemed by the Hindús, and Sankaracharya frequently quotes it in his commentary on the Vedanta Sutras. It appears, however, to be now but rarely met with: there is, I believe, no copy of the original in any of the libraries of Europe, and for some time I failed in my search for copies in India. At last I succeeded beyond my hopes, and the following is the list of the MSS. from which the present edition has been prepared.

A. An old MS. of the text only, 22 fol. Asiatic Society’s Library.*

B. An old MS. (73½ fol.) of Sankarananda’s commentary, containing the Kaushitaki-Brahmana Upanishad-Dipika in four adhyayas, and the Kaushitaki-Brahmana Upanishat-pada-yojanika. The latter is continuously numbered from the former as the fifth to the ninth adhyayas,—the ninth is unfinished, and the work has no proper close.† As. Soc.

* This and the next two were found in a puthi numbered 701 and called in the Catalogue Upanishad-Dipika. It contains, besides these three MSS., Sankarananda’s commentary on all the Atharva Upanishads, besides a commentary on several of them by another author.

† It is evident from this change of title as well as from Sankaranaanda’s remarks in his introduction, that the Kaushitaki Brahmana
Preface.

C. A MS. (foll. 87½) of Śankarānanda's Dīpikā only; this, however, seems only a less accurate transcript of B.'s original. As. Soc.

D. A modern but good copy of the text and the Dīpikā only, borrowed, through Professor Griffith, from a pundit of Benares.

E. A MS. (47 foll.) of the Dīpikā, in the Tailanga character, given by Walter Elliot, Esq. C. S. to Dr. Röer, and which the latter kindly left with me on his leaving India. It is a recent transcript and generally agrees with B. C. with one very important difference, viz. that it agrees with D. in noticing certain various readings, which are everywhere omitted in B. and C.*

F. A MS. (7 foll.) from the Benares College Library, containing the text only of the third and fourth adhyāyas.

Upanishad ends with the fourth adhyāya. He commences his introduction to the fifth adhyāya, Śaṅkūpānishad uttarasūktaḥ adhyāya vākṣyate; tatrāya bhagavati Sūtraś uttama evāptatpadam vodanti mangalāc'aranam karoti. The Upanishad commences (after the well-known formula ritam vadiṣṭhyāmi, &c.)

Thus far it agrees with the beginning of the third part of the 3rd part of the Aranyaka quoted in the Ind. Studien vol. ii. p. 212, but after this it seems to differ, but it is very difficult to determine the readings from the illegibility of the MS. The first words of the other adhyāyas are—

VI.—प्रशों वेश दत्ते स्मारक स्वर्णव: भाक्षः

VII.—तत्प्रज्ञाते स्वेरः

VIII.—चालोः प्रज्ञाते

IX.—प्रजायते राम पुष्पसत्सन

* Thus in p. 4, l. 13-15 B. C. omit चालोः • लोक रामः; and similarly elsewhere, as e.g. p. 49, l. 19—p. 50, l. 3; p. 50, ll. 19-21; p. 56, l. 20; p. 68, l. 19; p. 70, l. 20 (the omission here extends to p. 71, l. 11); p. 84, l. 4.
G. An inaccurate transcript from a Tailanga MS, belonging to Bábú Rajendralála Mitra; this, like E., has only the text of the third and fourth adhyáyas.

I also had a copy of the MS. of the Dipiká and Padayojaniká in the Benares College Library, but it was too inaccurate to be of use for my collation. It was in fact an inaccurate copy of an inaccurate original, as I have since found by a sight of the MS. itself.

I had not long commenced my collation, which at first included only the MSS. A. B. C., before I discovered an unexpected difficulty, viz. that my three MSS. represented two different recensions of the original text; and the fresh MSS., which I subsequently procured, only made the fact more evident. The text, as given in A. and D., represents one recension; and the MSS. of the commentary B. C. D. E., represent another, which is also given, with a very few verbal differences, by F. and G., so far as regards the third and fourth adhyáyas.

That the former recension is a real S’ákhá is proved by the fact that many of its more important variations are noticed in two of the MSS. of the commentary, though, as I before observed, two MSS. (B. and C.) omit all these allusions. Dr. Weber also, in his Catalogue of the Chambers MSS. in Berlin, gives an account of an imperfect MS. of the Kaushitaki Kramyaka, containing two books and a short fragment of a third, by which it appears that the third book was the commencement of the present Upanishad, and its fragment, as printed by Dr. Weber, follows the recension of A. D.* Similarly S’ankaráchárya, in his commentary on the Vedánta Sútras, fol-

---

* The first book commences प्रजायतिव संवधनसहीव, the second निष्ठारण प्रत्ययतन एतद्वर्त्क. The fragment of the third is as follows, विषयं च च च साधनायानिरिक्ष्यमाणं न्यायं विषयं स तु पूव चेतनेतुं न्यायायम् यात्रायतनं संस्कारं प्रत्ययतनं पुष्पः पुष्पं व यात्रायतनं साधनायानि च साधनायानि तथा मात्रायतनं सर्वापेक्षा न्यायायं न्यायायं न्यायायं सर्वापेक्षा न्यायायं (Catalogue, p. 20).
lows the same recension in his quotations from this Upanishad.*

Under these circumstances, I have given the text from these two MSS., adding at the foot of the page the more important various readings of the other recension as followed by the commentary. It is not always easy to decide the exact words of the text which S’ankaránanda had before him, as he often covers each word with such a cloud of interpretation, and I have therefore not attempted to give a copy of his recension for the first two books; but I have added, at the end of the Upanishad, the text of the third and fourth books, according to this recension, as found in the two MSS. F. and G. The differences are seldom more than verbal, and the commentary will generally serve to explain either recension, so far as regards the meaning. I may add that there exists a third recension of the fourth book, as given in the first chapter of the second book of the Brhád Aranyaka; and this is more than once alluded to by S’ankaránanda (e. g. p. 112, l. 14) as śákhán-
tara.

I have edited the commentary from a careful collation of B. and D.; C. and E. (especially the latter) have been used as ancillary, but neither gave much help except in occasional difficulties. Of the former two, D. presented the best readings, but in several places the words of the original appear to have been altered in the commentary to suit the recension of the text of the Upanishad, as in this text D. agrees with A. In the first adháyá, I sometimes admitted these into the commentary and gave the readings of B. C. E. at the foot (as in p. 17), but maturer consideration has convinced me that this was an error, and that in nearly every case the latter should be advanced to the text of the comm., and the reading of D. relegated to the foot-note.

The origin of these two recensions and the source of the Upanishad itself, are questions which I cannot solve; and the

* e. g. compare infra p. 125 with Vedánta Sátras, p. 379, (Bibl. Ind. ed.)
MSS. only make the matter more difficult. I have followed the reading of D. (in its text) and, perhaps, the commentary of all the MSS. in calling the Upanishad the first four books of an Aranyaka, but I am by no means certain that this is correct. The MS. A. gives these four books as the sixth, seventh, eighth and ninth books of an Aranyaka,* (its concluding line is (रात्रिके नत्मिष्टायाय); while F. gives the third and fourth as the fifth and sixth of the Kaushitaki Aranyaka (रति कौशिकार्य्याणेष्ट्र्स्त्रायाय). G. only gives them as the third and fourth books of the Kaushitaki Brähmana Upanishad. It would at first seem as if F. agreed with the Kaushitaki Aranyaka of the Berlin library, as it is not improbable that, if complete, this would have given the four books of the Upanishad in its third and three following adhyāyas. But here we are met by the difficulty that these two belong to different recensions; while A., which does give the recension of this third adhyāya of the Berlin MS., calls it not the third but the sixth book of the Aranyaka.

The same difficulty applies to the name; no MS. calls it the Kaushitaki Upanishad, except A. and F. and even there it is only inserted in a later hand and ink, at the end of the MSS. The commentary every where calls it the Kaushitaki Brähmana Upanishad, but how it obtained this name is doubtful, as the proper Kaushitaki Brähmana, containing thirty books,† has no trace in it of this Upanishad. Vinayaka Bhatta in his commentary to the Kaushitaki Brähmana frequently refers to the Mahā-Kaushitaki-Brähmana, and Dr. Weber conjectures that this may be the Brähmana, to which our Upanishad

* This would partly agree with Poley's addition to his translation of Colebrooke's Essays (Ind. Stud. i. 392), where he speaks of the Kaushitaki Upanishad as forming the first, seventh, eighth and ninth books of the Kaushitaki Brähmana.

† If Dr. Weber's conjecture be correct (Indische Stud. i. p. 146) the commentary to Pânini v. 1, 62, proves that it never had more than thirty adhyāyas.
belongs. Most probably there were two different recensions of the Kaushítaki Áranyak, and from these come our two recensions of the Upanishad.* S’aṅkaránanda calls it Kaushítaki-Bráhmaṇopanishad, as the Juñakánḍa is one part of the Bráhmaṇa portion of the Veda.†

The Kaushítaki Upanishad is placed by Dr. Weber in his first or oldest class of the Upanishads. It was one of those translated from the Persian by Anquetil, who calls it Kokhenk. The Persian translator has generally followed the recension in S’aṅkaránanda, whose remarks he often interpolates in his text; but occasionally he seems to have taken his notes from another source. The Bengal Asiatic Society has a M.S. of the Persian translation, which I have occasionally consulted; the style is much simpler than Anquetil’s barbarous jargon; but the mixture of Sanskrit words, marvellously disguised, makes it difficult.

The Áranyakas appear to belong to a class of Sanskrit writings, whose history has not yet been thoroughly investigated. Their style, if we may judge from that of the Taittiriya and Kaushítaki, is full of strange solecisms which sometimes half remind us of the gáthás of the Lalita Vistara. The present Upanishad has many peculiar forms, some of which are common to both recensions, while others appear only in one. Such are निदिष्ट in p. 10; चेतन for प्रवचन in p. 51; चविश्नयन in p. 56; बन्धित for बन्धित in p. 78; चुरुं in p. 89; &c.

In the Sarvopanishadārthañubhiṭiprakas’ā† by Vidyāranya—

* The two before-mentioned commentaries on the Atharva Upanishads contain similar discrepancies in their respective texts.
† वाट्टुपासि विविध विधिध्वस्याद्यादूष्ण तदुद्धविल्लभाष—विधिध्वस्यादेशाविन्धै च त्वं वेदान्तवाच्योऽ तदुद्धविल्लभाष—विधिध्वस्यादेशाविन्धै च त्वं वेदान्तवाच्योऽ Madhusúdana’s prasthána-bheda.
muni,* we have an analysis of the last two chapters of the Kaushāntaki Upanishad, as the Pratardana-vidyā and the Ajātasātrū-vidyā.

From his analysis of the fourth chapter, we find that Vidyārānya followed the recension of the commentary, as he gives the following order of Bālāki's assertions of adoration, after the first (or ēdityā), of pp. 135-138.

चन्द्र विद्यारथिः संयमस्य वाचः पिवचित्रः।
आदेशं तत्वमेव द्वव्याहततायविधिः।
एवं सर्वं द्विषिविशिष्ठिः सर्वं ब्रह्मान्यत्र स्रावस्य।
सर्वं राज्या प्रत्युपकार्याविश्वास्यम्यथः।

As this analysis is in fact a second commentary on the Upanishad, I have added it as an Appendix.

áryaka, 1193 1.1; 19. Talavakāra (Kena), 100 s1. 20. Nṛśīn- kottaratāpaniṣya, 153 s1.

* Colebrooke calls Vidyārānya the preceptor of Mādhavāchārya, but Dr. Hall, in his excellent Catalogue, p. 133, identifies them as the same person. The whole question of the relation of Mādhava and Sāyana, and the authorship of the different works under their respective names, as well as the various spiritual teachers of each, has never yet been thoroughly investigated. Dr. Hall, in his Catalogue, p. 98, mentions Sankara Ananda as the guru of Mādhava Achārya,—he may probably be the author of the present commentary.
VARIOUS READINGS OF THE COMMENTARY.

Page 8 l. 12. खेमानवां B. C.
10 l. 10. शुद्धाप चढ़ना: B. C. E.
16 l. 5, 7. खेमाव: B. C. for खेमावः; -सः.
18 l. 8. प्रस्ता B. C. for द्वा.
22 l. 9. सत्तादारस्मास्व B. C. E.

1. 16. काणचतुर्थे D.
23 l. 5. खेमानकिरिय B. C. E.
24 l. 6. काणयो यथा समयो कालः। सम कालायण: तथा
    ताहेनस्मेदेन प्राप्येत: D.

2 l. 9, 11. उपासकार्याणां B. C. E.
27 l. 16. एते and एते are here and elsewhere frequently confused in the MSS. of the commentary
30 l. 14. मुखायतां D.
31 l. 4. विीयवः B. C. E. उपासकः D.
48 l. 12. सभार अवस्थापमल D. B. C. E.
49 l. 15. खेमावायाः खेमावाय रसेद शास्त्र्यु—B. C. E.
56 l. 15. हर्दयपुष्परक्षा खेमावायाः विसंदिष्ट B. C. E.
61 l. 8. निपिणे D. for निपिण.
62 l. 16. को ते भवेन सौंदर्यावेक्षको वेयाश्च को B. C. E.
66 l. 11. अनुभाग (query अनुभाग? ) B. C. for तनुभाग.
E. corrupt.
67 ll. 17, 20. सन्मतंसं B. C. सम्मतं E. सम्मतं D.
75 l. 16. ननु किं तव श्रानन तवाश्चारात् यदि कष्टानिष्ठा
    भवति D.
79 l. 15. प्रप्रपश्च B. C. प्रपश्च E.
82 l. 9. उदायस्त B. C. E. उदायस्त D.
95 ll. 11, 17. प्रपश्च B. C. E.
96 l. 8. B. C. E. end Section 7 here at शायावगमत इत्यादि: and
    in ll. 12, 13 read उदायस्त: मद्य इत्यादि:। दृढ़ीं:
    यदि प्रजाशास्त्रमेव। ननु तं सामायः &c. (correct लं
    into लं in the printed text).
Various Readings.

Page 102 l. 12. D., after लोकाधिपति; reads पितादिवद्वितिशये राजाधिपति: तत्तो इत्यतर्थं राजाधिपति:। अष्टं राजाधिपति द्वयं खास अन्य एव इत्यादि लोकाधिपति:

" 103 l. 13. सबम स. Query सबम? A. D. F. G. have सबम, but B. has सबम, C. नाबन, E. बनम.

I. 15. All the MSS. have here अबवसंति, though they all have अबवसंत in l. 12.

" 104 l. 15. लघुग्रामय: D.

" 118 l. 13. चतुर्वाढकारो B. C. E. (cf. Raghuv. ii. 53.) चतुर्वाढकारो D.

" 122 l. 11. उपाधावानन्द- B. C. for उपाधावानन्द.

" 123 l. 9. नागाधिपियान्त वर्धूमितलेश्वर B. C. E.

In Adhy. i. B. C. end § 2 at चदेऽत p. 10, l. 5; § 5 at एष: p. 25, l. 16; § 6 closes in p. 30.—In Adhy. ii. they join together §§ 1, 2; §§ 7, 8; §§ 9, 10; and §§ 12, 13.