

Upanishadic Terms for Sense-Functions

A characteristic feature of Upanishadic ideology is its peculiar theory of cognitive and conative functions in the individual which is enunciated in close affinity with the theory of vital breaths (*prāṇāḥ*). The Upanishads present various classifications and enumerations of these and therefore a careful study of all relevant data is necessary before a general theory of Upanishadic sense-functions is formulated as we propose to do elsewhere.¹ What is attempted in this paper is an examination of the import of the terms *devāḥ*, *devatāḥ*, *prāṇāḥ* and *indriyāṇi* as applied to such functions in the principal Upanishads. The determination of the exact meanings of these terms will, it is intended, help to resolve the confusion that at present exists among the translators and students of the Upanishads and throw some light on the nature of sense-functions as referred to in these treatises.

Although the problem of Upanishadic chronology cannot be said to have been finally settled as yet, it is nevertheless possible to set forth the historical evolution of any given concept with a fair degree of accuracy. The best attempt so far made to fix a chronological stratification of Upanishadic thought is set out by Belvalkar and Ranade in their *History of Indian Philosophy* (Vol. II) and it is on this basis of the suggestions offered by them that we shall essay in the following paragraphs to trace the evolution of the four terms indicated above.²

Of these four terms the one with the widest application in the Ṛgveda is *deva* occurring there mostly in its mythological and cosmological sense. The only approximation to a psychological application is found in a somewhat late hymn in the first maṇḍala where the human soul or mind hypostatised is called *devam manas*³—a usage echoed in the Atharvaveda⁴ and Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā.⁵ This application is continued in the early Upanishads; for instance, Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upanishad 1.5.19 says that “out of the sky and out of the sun the *divine mind* enters him [*i.e.* the father about to depart from this world when he has made over to his son his mortal faculties (*prāṇāḥ*)] along with the other two divine immortal faculties (*śaivāḥ prāṇā amṛtāḥ*) namely speech (*Vāc*) and breath (*Prāṇa*).” It is important to observe here that the distinction is made between the divine-immortal and the human-

1. In a forthcoming publication on *Ancient Indian Vitalism*.

2. GI, GII, etc., coming after the textual references, indicate the four groups into which the Upanishadic texts are divided by Belvalkar and Ranade at page 135

3. “*devam manas kuto 'dhi prajātam*” RV. 1. 164. 18.

4. “*punarehi vācaspatē devena manasā saha*” AV. 1. 1. 2.

5. VS. 34. 1.

UPANISHADIC TERMS FOR SENSE-FUNCTIONS

mortal.⁶ In the light of these contexts it is not difficult to see why at Bṛhad. Up. 4 3 14 the mind or soul in the dream state is called *deva*, a usage recurring at Praśna Up. 4.1 where it is asked "which is the god (*deva*) that sees dreams?" and answered in 4 2 5 that it is *manas*, the highest god. This is almost the sense adumbrated in the Yajurveda (Vājasaneyi Saṃhitā) passage already referred to where the mind in both the states of waking and sleeping is called *daiva*.⁷ The conception that emerges from these passages is that the mind possesses a super-human or macrocosmic aspect indicated by the epithets *deva* and *daiva*. With the growing tendency in the Upanishads to regard *manas* as one of the sense-functions,⁸ in fact as the sense function *par excellence*, the term *deva* is extended by analogy to apply to other cognitive and conative senses in the human body. This usage is attested to in passages belonging to the earlier strata of Upanishadic texts; for instance at Bṛhad. Up. 1.3.12-18 the functions smelling, seeing, hearing and thinking (*manas*) are called *devas* and Śaṅkara justifies the application by stating that these are *devas* by virtue of their capacity to illumine their respective objects.⁹ The plural *devāḥ* occurring at Īśā Up. 4 which too is very early though not so early as Bṛhad. Up. 1.3.12-18 clearly implies sense powers as Hume too renders it, Śaṅkara's explanation being the same.¹⁰ In the light of such evidence there need not be any confusion about the term *devānām* at Ait. Up. 4.5 where it occurs in a verse quoted from the Ṛgveda—the first verse of the Vāmadeva hymn.¹¹ The translators of the Ṛgveda have generally followed Sāyana¹² and have rendered the term as 'gods' or 'divinities.' Röer¹³ gives the same meaning for *devānām* for the parallel Ait. Up. quotation, and so does Hume.¹⁴ The latter authority adds a footnote to his translation to the effect that the term *gods* is "here applied to the successive births of the individual soul, *ātman*, from father to son," which makes the matter more confused. A careful study of the Vedic verse referred to and the implications of its Upanishadic citation makes one convinced that when Vāmadeva is reported to have said 'Being yet in embryo, I observed (*anu-avedam*) all the births of the *devas*...' ¹⁵ what he meant was that while he was yet in the

6. cp Tait. Up. 3.10.2 *et seq.*, *daivī* opposed to *mānuṣī*, the latter qualifying speech, in-and out-breath, hands, feet, anus.

7. Cp. Jwala Prasad, *Introduction to Indian Philosophy*, p. 152

8. See Bṛhad. Up. 1.3.18; 2.4.11; 4.5.12; Praśna Up. 2.3; Kauś. Up. 1.7. Cp. Sāṅkhya—Kārikā 27.

9. " *te vāgādāyo devāḥ svaviṣayadyotanād devāḥ* " Ā.Ā. Series edition, p. 76.

10. " *devā dyotanād devāś cakṣurādīṅdriyāṇi* " *ibid.* p. 8.

11. RV. 4.27.

12. " *indrādīnām devānām* "

13. *The Twelve Principal Upanishads* (Translated), Bombay, 1906, p. 8.

14. Hume, *The Thirteen Principal Upanishads*, p. 298.

15. RV. 4.27.1.

mother's womb he possessed the unusual ability to observe the growth and the development of the foetus along with its organic functions. That the ṛṣi Vāmadeva possessed this unusual power of embryonic observation¹⁶ as one who had attained the perfection of a Brahma-knower is suggested in an Upanishadic passage of the same period.¹⁷ The idea that a developed consciousness can exercise its powers of discrimination etc., even in the embryonic stage is met with even in the early Buddhist texts where four types of the entry of consciousness into the embryo (*gabbhāvakkantiyo*) are enumerated.¹⁸

In a later Upanishadic passage¹⁹ *ātman* as the actual (*sat*) is distinguished from the sense-powers and the vital functions. Here Hume renders *deva-bhyaḥ* as "other than the sense organs" but this is doubtful inasmuch as the term 'organ' may refer both to the physical organ and to its function whereas what is meant here is only the function; however doubtful Hume's rendering may be, it is clearly an advance on Cowell's²⁰ "gods presiding over the senses" and Vidyārṇava and Sandall's²¹ just "gods." The same remark applies to Hume's rendering of *devāḥ* at Muṇḍaka Up. 3.2.7, a text as late as the previous one, which declares that all the sense-functions are absorbed in their corresponding divinities (*devatāḥ*) at the moment of union with the Imperishable. In a very late Upanishadic passage²² the term *deva* is applied to refer not only to the functions of speech, sight, mind (thinking) and hearing but to the five cosmic elements space, wind, fire, water and earth, appearing in the same list.²³ This extended application of the term *deva* to imply non-personal elements clearly indicates the lateness of the passage²⁴ and is a confusion of the earlier application of *deva* in the Ṛgveda to mean cosmic or natural phenomena such as Agni etc.

It is clear from the above that in the Upanishads the term *devāḥ* is applied to the powers behind the sense-organs ultimately held to be super-human. These sense-powers or hypostatised cognitive and conative functions in the individual or the microcosm are distinguished from their macrocosmic correlates called *devatās* in the Upanishads. From the time of the Puruṣa

16. Cp. Ait. Āraṇyaka 2.5; Keith, Aitareya Āraṇyaka p. 234, n.9.

17. Brhad. Up. 1.4.10. Keith contends the idea that Vāmadeva here refers to his former births, *op. cit.*, p. 571 and p. 609 f.n. 2. But it is doubtful if this is Śaṅkara's interpretation, Brhad. Up. Bhāṣya, p. 165 (Ā.Ā. ed.). Belvalkar and Ranade take this, in accordance with RV. 4.18; 4.27, to mean that Vāmadeva observed "the innumerable births of the gods," *op. cit.*, pp. 165, 185.

18. Dīgha Nikāya III, p. 103; see also Sumaṅgala-vilāsini III, pp. 885—886.

19. Kaus. Up. 1.6. (G.III, early)

20. *The Twelve Principal Upanishads* (Translated), Bombay 1906, p. 21.

21. S.B.H. Vol. XXXI, Part I, p. 14.

22. Praśna Up. 2.2.

23. Cp. Hume, *op. cit.*, p. 381, f.n.1.

24. Group III, middle (?).

UPANISHADIC TERMS FOR SENSE-FUNCTIONS

Sūкта²⁵ the tendency is found to distinguish and compare the microcosm and the macrocosm : what relates to the macrocosmic phenomena is brought together within the category of the divine—celestial (*adhidaivatam*), what relates to material existences falls within the category of the physical (*adhibhūtam*), what relates to the individual or the microcosm is included in the category of the self (*adhyātman*).²⁶ It is clear from this very division that these early thinkers did appreciate the difference between the physical and the functional (psychological) aspects of the sense-organs but were labouring under the difficulty of a lack of proper terminology as well as a certain confusion of thought resulting from the mythical conceptions of the age. Even as early as the Ait. Up.²⁷ from which the following table is extracted a clear distinction is made between the physical sense-organs and their functions which latter are correlated respectively with their macrocosmic counterparts.

<i>Physical organ</i>	<i>Function (deva)</i>	<i>Cosmic divinity (devatā)</i>
mukham	vāc	Agni
nāsike	prāṇaḥ	Vāyu
akṣiṇī	caḁṣuḥ	Ādityaḥ
karṇau	śrotram	diśaḥ
tvac	[lomāni]	ośadhayaḥ
hrdayam	manas	Candramās

The confusion evidenced in *lomāni* as the function of *tvac* is got over in the same chapter (I. 3. 7) where *sparsana* (*spṛṣtvā*) is implied as the activity of *tvac*. It is obvious from these occurrences that the early Upanishads distinguished the physical organ from its function. There is, therefore, no justification to maintain, as does Prof. Keith²⁸ that “in the Vedic view²⁹ between the organ and the activity there was no very clear distinction : the ear is what hears and hearing, the eye what sees and the sight and so on”. The microcosmic sense-powers (*vāc* etc.) are not only differentiated from their cosmic counterparts (*Agni* etc.) but are clearly held to vivify and impel the sense-organs to activity.

An examination of the contexts in which the term *devatā* occurs in the Upanishads confirms the above idea that it is primarily used there to denote the “cosmic divinities”³⁰ (*Agni, Vāyu, Āditya, diśaḥ* etc.) which are by *bandhutā* correlation regarded as the macrocosmic aspects or the bases of the “psychic divinities” (*vāc, prāṇa, caḁṣuḥ, śrotra* etc.). In the Rgveda the term *devatā* occurs only in two places,³¹ cited by Grassmann in his *Wörterbuch zum Rig-*

25. See Keith, *op. cit.*, p. 486.

26. Bṛhad. Up. 3.7.3-23 cp. Keith, *op. cit.*, p. 486; cp. Bṛhad. Up. 1.5.21; Ch. Up. 1.3.1; Kauś. Up. 2.13.

27. Ait. Up. 1.1.4 (G. II, early).

28. Keith, *op. cit.*, p. 453.

29. Prof. Keith includes the Upanishads in the term “Vedic” throughout his work.

30. Cp., on the use of these terms, Keith, *op. cit.*, p. 518.

31. RV. 10.19.13, 14.

Veda (s. *devatā*), where the meaning does not seem to have developed beyond the idea of 'divine being (existence, nature)' or 'divine strength' or 'derivative from the gods'. In the Brāhmaṇas we have definitive evidence for the technical use of *devatā* to signify the macrocosmic correlates spoken of above. The Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa says that "he who knows (the supremacy of Vāyu) departing from this world enters Fire with his speech, Sun with his sight, Moon with his mind, quarters with his hearing and Wind (Vāyu) with his breath, and becomes whatever divinity he desires out of those several divinities (*devatāmām*).³² It is significant that this list does not mention *tvac* or its function (*lomāni*) with the divinity (*oṣadhayaḥ*), showing that there was yet no clear conception of the organ of touch in the Brāhmaṇa period. In a "Brāhmaṇic"³³ passage occurring at Tait. 1. 5. 1 the limbs (*aṅgāni*) of the universal Brahman or Ātman are called *devatā* and it is clear from 1. 5. 3 that *devatā* refers to *Agni*, *Vāyu* etc. In the "Brāhmaṇo-Upanishadic"³⁴ passages of the Ait. Up. the term *devatā* is used for the *Loka-pālas* (world-guardians)³⁵ viz. *Agni*, *Vāyu*, *Āditya* etc. Similarly at Bṛhad. Up. 1. 5. 22 *Vāyu* etc. are called *devatā*. It may be seen that *Vāyu* is only the cosmic correlate of Prāṇa or the Life-Breath and it is no wonder that the term *devatā* is applied to the latter in a passage belonging to the same stratum.³⁶ At Ch. Upan. 4. 17. 1³⁷ fire, wind and sun are called the three *devatās*. In a comparatively late passage³⁸ the microcosmic sense-powers (*devas*) are said to enter into their respective divinities (*devatās*),³⁹ when the individual unites with the world-soul. In passages still later the term *devatā* is used for newer conceptions as when Ch. Up. 6. 3. 1-2⁴⁰ calls the three sources [*bījāni* viz. oviparous, viviparous, and sprouting] of all living objects *devatās*. At Ch. Up. 6. 3. 3 (cp. Ch. 4. 17. 1) which belongs to the same stratum the three elements heat, water, earth (food) are called *devatās* and it is said that the three when consumed become speech, breath and mind respectively.⁴¹ In the same Upanishad⁴² in a passage

32. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 10.3.3.8; 2.5.2.2 (*devatāḥ* referring to the psychic functions leaving the body); cp. Aitareya Brāhmaṇa 8.28.

33. Group I, late; Śāṅkara: "*devatāgrahaṇam upalakṣaṇārtham lokādīnām*".

34. Thus designated by Belvalkar and Ranade, *loc. cit.*

35. Ait. Up. 1.1.3.4; 1.3.1; cp. Śāṅkara on Ait. Up. 1.1.3. "*Agnyādayo devatā akupālatvena samkalpya.*"

36. Bṛhad. Up. 1.5.14 (G. II, early).

37. Group II, late.

38. Muṇḍ. Up. 3.2.7 (G. III, early).

39. Śāṅkara: "*devāścā dehāśrayāścakṣurādīkaraṇasthāḥ sarve prati devatāsvādīlyā-diṣu gatā bhavanti.*"

40. Group III, middle.

41. Cp. Ch. Up. 6.5. 1-4; also Bṛhad. Up. 5.12 (G. IV, early) where *anna* and *prāṇa* are called *devatās*.

42. Ch. Up. 6.8.6 (G. III, middle).

UPANISHADIC TERMS FOR SENSE-FUNCTIONS

giving the order of the cessation of functions at death it is stated that the ultimate divinity (*parā devatā*) is *Sat* or Being—a metaphysical abstraction which implies a marked development of the sense of *devatā* from its earlier macrocosmic application.

From the above quoted passages it becomes clear that although in the earlier strata of Vedic thought the term *devatā* is applied only to the cosmic phenomena like *Agni*, *Vāyu*, *Āditya* etc. yet owing to confusion resulting from correlation with their microcosmic aspects the word *devatā* begins gradually to be applied even to individual processes like *prāṇa* or the vital breath. Thus from a very early period we find the term applied to psychic divinities such as speech, *prā a* (in-breath), seeing, hearing, mind and *Prā a* (in the mouth).⁴³ This leads in the latest period⁴⁴ to the application of *devatā* to the individual sense-powers *manas*, *cakṣuh*, *śrotam* and *vāc* where it is used just like *deva*. At Kauś. Up. 2. 3 these along with intelligence (*prajñā*) are called *devatā*, a fact which clearly indicates that the confusion of the earlier sense of cosmic phenomena with that of purely psychic powers has by now proceeded so far as to remove altogether the distinction between the two terms *devāḥ* and *devatāḥ*—the distinction that is clearly maintained at Muṇḍ. Up. 3. 2. 7 where it is said that at liberation all the sense-powers (*devas*) go into their corresponding divinities (*devatās*). Thus the term *devatā* may also be regarded as a term for sense-functions in the Upanishads.

Next we may take up the term *prāṇāḥ* (pl.) which too can be shown to have developed the meaning of sense-functions in the Upanishadic period, though originally it meant any and every kind of vital (*prāṇaic*) activity as at Bṛhad. Up. 6. 1. 1-6. The restricted use⁴⁵ of the term in the Upanishads to mean the vital breaths (*prāṇa*, *apāna* etc.) seems the more natural as its derivation from *Prāṇa* or Life (*lit.* Breath)⁴⁶ clearly indicates.⁴⁷ This latter sense is distinctly maintained even in the Middle Upanishadic period as at Kauś. Up. 1. 6 (cp. 3. 3; 4. 20) where it is stated: "Whatever is other than the sense-functions (*devāḥ*) and the vital airs (*prāṇāḥ*)—that is the actual (*sat*)." The plural *prāṇāḥ* never occurs in the R̥gveda though there are clear references to the Life-principle, *Prāṇa*⁴⁸ (sg.), which is equated to *āyus*.

43. Bṛhad. Up. 1. 3. 2—7, 10; cp. Ch. Up. 1. 2. 2—7 (G. I, early); cp. Bṛhad Up; 3. 1. 9 (G. III, middle) where *manas* is called *devatā*.

44. Kauś. Up. 2. 1—2 (G. III, late); cp. 2. 13, 14; 3. 3; Bṛhad. Up. 6. 1. 1—14. Ch. Up. 5. 1.

45. See Bṛhad. Up. 1. 5. 3; 3. 1. 10; 3. 4. 1; 4. 2. 24; 5. 14. 3; 6. 4. 12; Ch. Up 3. 13. 1—6; 5. 19—23; Tait. Up. 1. 5. 3.

46. See Wijesekera, *Ceylon University Review*, Vol. 1, No. 1, Article: "Vitalism and Becoming . . ."

47. The *prāṇas* are said to be the cause of the continuation of all living beings (Ch. Up. 3. 16. 1).

48. RV. 1. 66. 1; 10. 59. 6.

It is in the Atharvaveda that we may see the growth of the plural use to denote vital functions.⁴⁹ We may surmise with Keith⁵⁰ that the origin of the various notions regarding *prānas* may be traced in part at least to AV. 10. 8. 9 where the head is compared to a drinking bowl with seven seers in the apertures. The seven here appear to refer to the two eyes, two ears, two nostrils and the mouth as is seen from the explanation proffered at Bṛhad. Up. 2. 2. 3-4 where the Atharvaveda verse is quoted in full, and also supported by Muṇḍ. Up. 2. 1. 8 where commenting on the 'seven *prānas*', Śaṅkara says that they are "called seven because there are seven orifices in the head which lead to them," an explanation tallying with the Atharvaveda statement. In several Brāhmaṇa texts⁵¹ *prāṇāḥ* occurs with probably the same connotation viz. vital functions, but in none of these can we be certain that the application is restricted to sense-functions. Nevertheless in the earliest stratum of Upanishadic texts designated "Brāhmanic" by Belvalkar and Ranade we have at least one clear reference to the occurrence of the word *prāṇāḥ* to mean sense-functions, namely, at Ch. Up. 2. 7. 1 (cp. 2. 11. 1) where *prāṇa*, *vāc*, *cakṣuḥ*, *śrotam*, *manas*, the five *prānas*, are given as the most excellent (*parovarīyāmsi*). In a somewhat later passage⁵² Prajāpati is said to have created the active functions (*karmāṇi*) of speech, seeing, hearing etc. where it is added that these are called *prāṇāḥ* because when Death (*Mṛtyu*) took possession of them they became so many forms of the central life-principle (*madhyamaḥ prāṇaḥ*). In the legend of the rivalry of the bodily functions at Ch. Up. 5. 1. 1-15 *vāc*, *cakṣuḥ*, *śrotam*, and *manas* are ultimately made to recognise breath (*prāṇa*) as their most excellent superior and it is added "Verily they do not call them 'Speeches', nor 'Eyes,' nor 'Ears,' nor 'Minds.' They call them the 'Breaths' (*prāṇāḥ*) for the vital breath is all these." In what may be considered to be a later version of the same dispute occurring at Bṛhad. Up. 6. 1. 1-6 (cp. 6. 3. 2; Kau'. 3. 3) the term *prāṇāḥ* applies to the above functions plus a sixth, namely, procreation. On the term *prāṇāḥ* occurring at Ch. Up. 5.1.6 Hume⁵³ makes the significant observation that the "word might almost be translated 'Senses' but 'Functions' would perhaps more accurately represent the quaint old idea in the modern scientific terminology." It will be remembered that the term *devāḥ* was also used in the same sense at this period. The earliest⁵⁴ enumera-

49. AV. 6. 135. 2, 3.

50. Keith, *op. cit.*, p. 553.

51. Kauṣītaki Brāhmaṇa 4.4.20; Taittirīya Āraṇyaka 10.3.7.1; Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa 3.7.6.8; Aitareya Brāhmaṇa 8.22.8.

52. Bṛhad. Up. 1.5.21 (G. II, early).

53. Hume, *op. cit.*, p. 227, f.n. 1.

54. Ch. Up. 2.7.1; 2.11.1 (G.I, early)

UPANISHADIC TERMS FOR SENSE-FUNCTIONS

tion of *prāṇas* as sense-functions gives the usual five viz. *prāṇa* (smell),⁵⁵ *vāc*, *cakṣuḥ*, *śrotam*, *manas*; the same list of *prāṇas* occurs in later texts⁵⁶ too but in these contexts the first ' *prāṇa* ' is used in the sense of the ' breath ' —the general function, of which 'smelling' is considered as an aspect. The *prāṇas* are also given as six,⁵⁷ namely, the above five plus *retas*; seven, as previously indicated; eight, the latter seven plus *vāc*⁵⁸; or even, ten⁵⁹. This last enumeration of *prāṇas* as ten (which are called the ten *Rudras*) is important for the Sāṃkhya theory of sense-functions inasmuch as they probably refer to the five motor functions (*karmendriya*) and the five cognitive functions (*buddhīndriya*), as Śaṅkara himself explains⁶⁰. The general sense of sense-functions is found for *prāṇāḥ* in several other Upanishadic passages belonging to the middle period.⁶¹ In a late passage at Kauś' Up. 2. 15⁶² the word *prāṇāḥ* is applied to a multitude of categories which include the sense-functions as well, showing a marked development of its earlier sense.

None of the above discussed terms denoting sense-functions have survived in the post-Upanishadic period, and the usual term for the sense organ or function in all later systems of Indian philosophy is *indriya*. Although the origin of this term can be traced to the Ṛgveda and it occurs also in the Atharvaveda, yet it is curious that the term is never found in the plural referring to sense-functions in Upanishadic texts such as are included within the first two groups by Belvalkar and Ranade in their stratification. At Ṛgveda I. 165. 8 Indra says that he slew Vṛtra with *indriya*. On this term Max Müller observes that "we must . . . translate it here not only by might but by Indra's peculiar might. *Indriya* as derived from *indra* means originally *Indra-hood*, then power in general, just as *verethraghna* in *Zend* means victory in general though originally it meant the slaying of *Vṛtra*".⁶³ At Ṛgveda I. 85. 2 where the Maruts as *Rudras*⁶⁴ are said to generate the might of *Indra*⁶⁵ it is clear that the term has the same significance.⁶⁶ The plural

55. Cp. Śaṅkara : " *prāṇo ghrāṇam* . . ." on Ch. Up. 2.7.1; cp. Bṛhad. Up. 2.1.17; Ch. Up. 5.1.1—15, 5.19—23.

56. Ch. Up. 5.1.1—15 (G. II, middle); Bṛhad. Up. 2.1.17 (G. III, middle).

57. Bṛhad. Up. 6.1.1—6; cp. 6.3.2.

58. Bṛhad. Up. 2.2.3 (G. III, late); cp. Ait. Up. 1.1.4 where for taste and speech are substituted skin and heart.

59. Bṛhad. Up. 3.9.4 (G. III, middle); cp. Ch. Up. 3.16.1.

60. " *karmabuddhīndriyāṇi prāṇāḥ* . . ." on Bṛhad. Up. 3.9.4.

61. Bṛhad. Up. 2.1.17; 2.1.20; 4.3.38; Ch. Up. 6.5.3 (G. III, middle); Kauś. Up. 3.2 (G. III, late).

62. Group III, late.

63. S.B.E. Vol. XXXII, p. 198.

64. Cp. the ten *Rudras* at Bṛhad. Up. 3.9.4.

65. Cp. Macdonell, *Vedic Reader*, p. 23.

66. Cp. RV. 4.30.23.

indriyāni occurs in connection with Indra in the Ṛgveda in more than one place,⁶⁷ but it is difficult to agree with Sāyana that they refer to sense-faculties.⁶⁸ In the Atharvaveda *indriyam* occurs in several places⁶⁹ without any particular reference to Indra, referring to 'human strength' and in one instance,⁷⁰ perhaps, bordering on the notion of sense-power, as Whitney has taken it.⁷¹ This surmise is strengthened by the fact that "*pañcendriyāni manah śaṣṭhāni*" at Atharvaveda 19. 9. 5 must refer to some kind of sense organ or function. The singular *indriyam* occurs three times⁷² in the Upanishads and in the sense, probably, of the power of the sense-organs taken collectively, as Śaṅkara has understood it.⁷³ It is, however, only in late Upanishads, Kaṭha etc., that the plural *indriyāni* occurs in the sense of faculties.⁷⁴ A curious occurrence of the plural use is found at Kauś. Up. 2. 15 where in the dying father's bequest of his various powers to his son it is said that "the son having come lies down on top touching organs with organs (*indriyair syendriyāni samsprśya*)" where the sense of the term possibly is 'limb'. This is exactly the sense in which Śaṅkarānanda's Commentary understands it (*indriyāni*) and therefore to regard the term in this context as referring to the functions of smelling, seeing, hearing, tasting etc. as Keith has done,⁷⁵ seems to depend on a wrong reading of the passage.

Apart from the sporadic use of two or three other terms signifying different aspects of sense-functions, the four terms we have discussed above must be considered as the usual designations of sense-functions in the Upanishads. The isolated use of the term *karmāni* for active functions⁷⁶ at Bṛhad. Up. 1. 5. 21 occurs in a passage already referred to above, which says that "Prajāpati created the active functions (*karmāni*, lit. activities) and when created they strove with one another: 'I am going to speak' the voice began. 'I am going to see' said the eye. 'I am going to hear' said the ear. So spake the other functions, each according to his activity (*karma*)."⁷⁷ It is not difficult to see the importance of this term for the later

67. Plural, RV. 1. 107. 2; 3. 37. 9; 5. 31. 3; AV. 3. 22. 9.

68. See Sāyana on RV. 3. 37. 9; "*yānindriyāni rupagrahaṇḍisāmarthyāni sthitāni te tvadriyāni tānindriyāni. . .*"

69. AV. 3. 22. 5; 20. 20. 2.

70. AV. 5. 9. 8.

71. Whitney, *Atharva Veda Translation*, p. 235; cp. *Pet. Wörterbuch*, s. *indriya* (c).

72. Ch. Up. 3. 1. 3 (G.II, early); Bṛhad. Up. 6. 4. 7. (G.IV, late); Praśna Up. 6. 4 (G.III?)

73. On Ch. Up. 3. 1. 3: "*sāmarthyopetairindriyairavaikalyam*" on Praśna Up. 6. 4: "*dviprakārambuddhyartham karmārtham ca daśasaṅkhyam*"

74. Kaṭha Up. 3. 4; 6. 7; Muṇḍ. Up. 2. 1. 3; Praśna Up. 3. 9.

75. Keith, *op. cit.*, p. 554.

76. Cp. Śaṅkara: "*karmāni karamāni vāgādāni karmārthāni hi tānīti karmāṇityucyante*"; cp. Hume, *op. cit.*, p. 90: "active functions."

UPANISHADIC TERMS FOR SENSE-FUNCTIONS

Śāṅkhyan conception of *karmendriya* which, however, has been restricted to apply only to the motor functions. A different aspect of the sense functions appears at Bṛhad. Up. 3. 2. 1—9 where the organs of smell, speech, tongue, eye, ear, mind, hands and skin are enumerated as the eight *grahas* and their corresponding objects odour, name, taste, form, sound, desire, action and touch are set over against them as the *atigrahas*. Keith, perhaps following Śāṅkara, sees here "possibly an indication since Graha may mean seizer, that the soul was fettered by the organs and their activities, an idea carried out in the phrase 'bands of the heart' which is first found in the Chāndogya Upanishad"⁷⁷. But a comparison of this passage with Ait. Up. 1. 3. 3—10 where the inability of the sense-functions to grasp (*grahītum*) food without the vivifying power of *Ātman* is mentioned, and, with Kauś. Up. 3. 4 where the functions are said to obtain (*āpnoti*) their objects, confirms the view that the term *graha* here refers, as Keith himself is compelled to admit later,⁷⁸ to the power of the senses in seeking out their objects and enjoying them, as is implied in Hume's rendering of *graha* as 'apprehender'⁷⁹. That such a conception is not unusual in the Upanishads is proved by the fact that at Kauś. Up. 2. 3 the divinities (*devatāḥ*) speech, breath, eye, ear, mind and intelligence are called *avarodhin*'s, rendered 'procurers' by Hume.⁸⁰

In conclusion it may be pointed out that a study of the above terms shows the importance of the Upanishadic view of sense-functions and vital activities for later Indian speculation. The ascription of 'divinity' *i.e.* macrocosmic or super-human power, to the cognitive and conative senses in the individual has clearly left its mark on the later conception that the Yogin by practice of meditation can acquire the supernormal faculties of 'the divine eye' and 'the divine ear'. It is perhaps in the Buddhist books⁸¹ that this conception is for the first time clearly enunciated. An intermediary stage in the development of the Buddhist conception may be seen at Ch. Up. 8. 12. 5⁸² where *manas* is called the divine eye (*daivam cakṣuḥ*) of the *Ātman* by means of which one sees the desires in the Brahman-region and rejoices. According to Śāṅkara this means that the mind (of the yogin) apprehends all things, subtle as well as hidden and remote. In view of the above it is unnecessary to connect *dibba-cakkhu* and *dibbasota* of early Buddhism, as does Mrs. Rhys Davids, with the mythological *deva* or *devatā*

77. Keith, *op. cit.*, p. 554.

78. *Ibid.*, p. 557.

79. *Op. cit.*, p. 109; cp. Keith, "graspers or apprehenders," *op. cit.*, 556.

80. *Ibid.*, p. 309, in accordance with Śāṅkarānanda's Commentary.

81. Dīgha Nikāya I, 76 *et seq.* Majjhima Nikāya 2· 17 *et seq.* 'dibbacakkhu' 'dibbasota' as 'abhiññās'; cp. Bhagavadgītā 11· 8, *divyacakṣus*; Bhāgavata Purāna 1· 4· 18; Bṛhat Saṃhitā 5· 13, *divya-drś*.

82. Group III, late.

UNIVERSITY OF CEYLON REVIEW

worthy men of the other worlds " with whom in *jhāna* one converses in order to " profit by their wider knowledge of life." According to her the prefix *dibba* (*divya*) means " belonging to devas " and refers to " deva-conditions." ⁸³ The foregoing discussion should have made it amply clear that in the early Indian view the *mind* as the sense-power *par-excellence* is potentially super-human as is indicated by the epithets *daiva*, *deva*, *devatā* etc. and is the most important *psychological* aspect of the individualised Prāṇa ⁸⁴ or universal Vital Force identified as *prajñātman* with the empirical Brahman. ⁸⁵

O. H. de A. WIJESEKARA.