

*A Metaphysical Analysis of the
Kāṭhakopanīṣad
in Dialectical Setting*

Vedānta-Dharmashastra-Acharya, Alankāra-Vidvān

Dr. K.B. Archak

M.A., Ph.D., M.A (Hindi),
MIFAS (India & Sri Lanka)
Reader, Dept. of Sanskrit,
Karnatak University, Dharwad

2007



NEW BHARATIYA BOOK CORPORATION
DELHI (INDIA)

Forword

[The Kāthaka Upaniṣad—A Metaphysical Analysis in Dialectical Setting] is an authentic work brought out by Dr. K.B. Archak M.A. Ph.D., a rare scholar in the field of Oriental studies, who wields his pen with equal felicity in Sanskrit, English, Hindi and Kannada.

A Status of the eternal universal self, and an integrated philosophy of life revealed in the Kāthaka Upaniṣad has been analysed here in a dialectical setting. The reality of experiencing the beatitude in salvation, and individuals imperative need to attain it by means of God's grace, has been shown in this work in well-formulated methods. The physical, psychological and intellectual substratum of human life, an allurements of senses, an upheaval of emotions, indecisive nature of human will are taken into account to make reader locate the pit falls through the way of his life. In order to awaken an individual from the ills of life, the seer prefers the path of Śreyas for the fulfilment one's life. However the esoteric significant message of the upaniṣadic mantras, has brought to light by the great Acharyas of Vedanta Schools such as Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja and Madhva in their commentaries. Further, the glossators of the respective schools have explicated the views of the Acharyas on the metaphysical truths of the Kāthaka Upaniṣad. Contemplating on such original commentaries and glosses thereon Dr. Archak has carried out his researches pertaining to the various topics, of this Upaniṣad in a dialectical style and concluded that the interpretation of the Dvaita exponents is quite realistic appropriate and more faithful to the Upaniṣad. His findings are really commendable. Such a study does make it evident that the author had justifiably observed this. Upaniṣad as being the treasure of philosophical truths and

codes of conduct, through an interesting dialogue between Naciketas and God Yama. The sources of the Yama-Naciketa Akhyayikā have been traced and readily made available to the readers in the book. The opinions of western and modern Indians scholars have also been consulted in the proper contexts. Thus, the author of this work, has proved himself as versatile scholar in Vedanta literature.

Besides, there are other works of him witnessing his versatility in the Dharmashastra-Sahitya and other allied branches of knowledge. Identifying Dr. Archak's deep scholarship, he has been honoured with many prestigious national awards. In addition, a world level organization the international federation of Astrology and Spiritual science, Chandigarh (India) and Matara (Sri Lanka), has enrolled Dr. Archak as a Member there of and awarded him an international Gold Medal, for his allround achievement in the field of Oriental Studies.

The present work of such an eminent scholar will certainly prove as an important contribution to Indian Philosophy and more beneficial to the research scholars and teachers on global level.

Prof. Dr. Vedaprakash Upadhyaya

M.A. (Double), LL.B., D. Phil, D. Litt
Dip. in German & Persian, Acharya
(Veda-Darshana-Dharmashastra etc.)
Gold Medalist (Varanasi, Punjab,
Calcutta, Colombe, Dhaka
Recipient of Various National &
International Awards (India, Srilanka,
Bangladesh, Nepal U.S.A., Australia etc.)
Chairman/Head,
Department of Sanskrit,
Punjab University, Chandigarh

Preface

[This work seeks to appraise in an unbiased way that the import of the metaphysical doctrines of the *Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad* upholds the realism.] Evidently enough, the *Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad* enjoys the status of an eternal, universal, distinctive and self-complete scripture, embodying an integral philosophy of life. It affirms the reality of the concept of *Mokṣa* experience and individual's imperative need to secure it through the grace of God. This *Upaniṣad* does not expect the impossible from the individuals who are frail. Its teaching is psychological and feasible as a way of life. It regards human life both as challenge and as an opportunity. The gift of life is given to us by the Supreme God. The physical basis of human life, the lure of the senses, the upheaval of emotions and the irresolute nature of human will are taken into account in this *Upaniṣad*. It asks the individual to choose the path of *Śreyas* for the fulfillment of his life.

[With view to unveiling integrated value of universal truths of *Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad*, the study continues in the light of traditional fervor.] Like other major *Upaniṣads*, the *Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad* too has been commented upon by the great Achāryas such as Sankara, Rāmānuja and Madhva, the foremost founders of the Advaita, the Visistadvaita and the Dvaita schools of thought respectively. In addition, the succeeding exponents belonging to these respective schools wrote the glosses elucidating and reinforcing the original views of the Achāryas. All such commentaries and the glosses thereupon have been referred to in the contexts of their relevance and necessity. The study of this *Upaniṣad* runs in a dialectical style rather than expository. As such, the esoteric message of the upaniṣadic mantras is evaluated in a comparative and critical style. At the end, it is concluded that

realistic interpretation of the Dvaita exponents is more appropriate and faithful to the *Upaniṣad*.

In the preparation of this volume, I place in record my revered teacher, Dr. D. N. Shanbhag, Professor of Sanskrit (Retd.), Karnatak University, Dharwad, a recipient of Certificate of Honour from the President of India. I express my deep sense of profound respects to him for his ever guiding spirit in my academic pursuits. Shri V. B. Inamati, Shree Graphics, Bangalore has carried out the work of typesetting neatly and attractively with meticulous care. Hence, he deserves my heartfelt thanks. I am deeply indebted to the New Bharatiya Book Corporation, Delhi, for having generously come forward to publish this work in significant manner.

26 April, 2007

– Dr. K.B. Archak

Contents

Title	Page
<i>Forword</i>	<i>v</i>
<i>Preface</i>	<i>vii</i>
I. Triple Canon of Vedānta	1-31
1. Upaniṣads - Primary Sources	1
2. Place and Importance of Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad	7
<i>a. Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad - and Vedas</i>	14
<i>b. Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad and other Upaniṣads</i>	15
<i>c. Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad and Bhagavadgītā</i>	18
<i>d. Kāṭhakopaniṣad and Brahmasūtras</i> <i>(according to Śaṅkara's tradition)</i>	21
<i>e. Kāṭhakopaniṣad and Brahmasūtras</i> <i>(according to Madhva's tradition)</i>	27
II. Principles of Vedānta	32-101
1. Introduction	32
2. Śaṅkara's Advaita Philosophy	33
<i>i. Concept of Pramānas</i>	34
a. Perception [Pratyakṣa]	34
b. Inference [Anumāna]	37
c. Comparison [Upamāna]	38
d. Verbal Testimony [Āgama]	38
e. Presumption [Arthāpatti]	39
f. Non-Apprehension [Anupalabdhi]	39
<i>ii. Concept Of The World</i>	41
a. Three-Fold Existence	41
b. Nature of the world-appearance	42

c. Nature of Ajñāna	43
d. Power of Ajñāna	44
e. Order of the World-creation	45
f. World appearance as Illusory	48
iii. <i>Concept Of Brahman</i>	52
a. Aspects of Brahman	53
b. God – the Creator of the world	55
c. Brahman – Names and Forms	57
iv. <i>Concept Of Individual Soul</i>	58
a. Nature of the Soul	58
b. Transmigration of the Soul	60
c. Is the Soul One or Many ?	61
iv. <i>Concept Of Individual Soul</i>	58
v. <i>Concept Of The Pathway To Realisation</i>	63
a. Karma and Jñāna	63
b. Theory of Bhakti	65
c. Means of Realisation	65
vi. <i>Concept of Liberation</i>	66
a. Nature of Liberation	66
b. Liberation is not a new production	66
c. Theory of Jivanmukti	67
3. Madhva's Dvaita Philosophy	67
a. हरिः परतरः	70
b. सत्यं जगत्	73
c. तत्त्वतो भेदः	76
d. जीवगणाः हरेरनुचराः	78
e. जीवगणाः नीचोच्चभावं गताः	82
f. मुक्तिः नैजसुखानुभूतिः	87
g. अमला भक्तिः तत्साधनम्	91
h. अक्षादित्रितयं प्रमाणम्	94
i. अखिलाम्नायैकवेद्यो हरिः	99

III. Critical Analysis of Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad	102-209
i. Introduction	102
ii. Yama's First Boon	117
iii. Yama's Second Boon	119
iv. Yama's Third Boon	126
a. <i>Path of Sreyas and Preyas</i>	129
b. <i>Nature of Supreme Brahman</i>	136
c. <i>The Relation Between Jīva and Brahman</i>	176
d. <i>Means of Emancipation</i>	202
e. <i>Path of Liberation</i>	206
IV. Conclusion	210-216
Bibliography	217

I. Triple Canon of Vedānta

1. Upaniṣads - Primary Sources :

Since the time immemorial, not only the cultural but also the spiritual heritage of India has been very vast and rich. Especially the spiritual heritage covers all aspects of human life. It is both universal and timeless. Such heritage has remained afresh even today. Verily, the sources of this heritage lies in the Vedas. These are the texts revealed by the seers of ancient India.

The Vedas are generally regarded as earliest literary record of the Indian race. It is indeed impossible to say about the time of composition of the Vedas, because the Vedas have been considered to be the non-human compositions or *Apauruṣeya*. The texts of the Vedas have been handed down from mouth to mouth from period of unknown antiquity. The Vedas in a single unit, are reckoned as *Śruti*. The entire Vedic literature, on the basis of the subject-matter dealt with, is found to be divided into four sections, that is - *Samhitas*, *Brāhmaṇas*, *Āraṇyakas* and the *Upaniṣads*.

The *Samhita* constitutes all the four Vedas - *Rg*, *Yajuh*, *Sāma*, and *Atharva*. After the *Samhitas*, the theological treatises came to light which are called the *Brāhmaṇas*. They reflect "the spirit of an age in which all intellectual activity is concentrated on sacrifice, describing its ceremonies discussing its value, speculating on its origin and significance."¹ The *Āraṇyakas* are

1. A.A. Macdonell - "History of Sanskrit Literature" p.31.

further development of the *Brāhmaṇas*, and are certainly a distinct advancement of the claims of speculation or meditations over the actual performance of the sacrifices. Thus, ritualistic ideas gradually are found here developed into philosophic speculations about the nature of the Truth. This is how, the *Āraṇyakas* could pave the way for the *Upaniṣads*, which are the source of all philosophy.

The *Upaniṣads* contain the essential principles of the philosophy. The *Upaniṣads* are rather concerned with the process of thinking than the conclusion of the thought. Any student of the *Upaniṣads* may say that the philosophical thoughts are scattered here and there in the *Upaniṣads*. But, it is an universal truth that there is cohesion behind these scattered concepts of the philosophy. It is a reader's fault of not identifying any co-hesion. If anybody says that the *Upaniṣads* do not contain any homogeneous philosophy, it is as good as missing the very essence of the *Upaniṣadic* approach. To quote Aurobindo "The *Upaniṣads* are the supreme work of the Indian mind, and that it should be so, that the highest self-expression of its genius, its sublimest poetry, its greatest creation of the thought and word should be not a literary or poetical masterpiece of the ordinary kind, but a large flood of spiritual revelation of this direct and profound character, is a significant fact, evidence of the unique mentality and unusual turn of spirit."² Thus, it is clear that the *Upaniṣads* are the texts of philosophical truths, which have come to light through a revelatory and intuitive mind and its illumined experience.

2. Sri Aurobindo, "The *Upaniṣads*" Sri Aurobindo Ashrama, Pondicherry, 1996. p-1.

Here a question may arise as to what could be the meaning of the term "*Upaniṣad*". This term "*Upaniṣad*" is interpreted by Śāṅkara in different contexts. They are :

In the beginning of his commentary on the *Kāṭhā Upaniṣad*, Śāṅkara explains the term *Upaniṣad* : The term *Upaniṣad* means knowledge. It is derived from the root *sad* to destroy, to reach, to attain, to approach etc., by adding *Upa* (near) and *ni* (certainly) as prefixes and *vip* as a suffix. Here, knowledge is called *Upaniṣad* by virtue of its association with the significance. That is, the knowledge destroys the seeds of worldly existence such as ignorance etc.

The seekers of emancipation, having detached from the desire of worldly comforts, approach a competent teacher, who can instruct the knowledge of Brahman, which cuts off the knot of ignorance and leads him to salvation. This is how, through the derivation of the word *Upaniṣad*, the person particularly qualified for knowledge, has been pointed out.³

Besides, there are some other references to the same meaning of the word *Upaniṣad*.⁴

3. सदेर्धतोर्विशरणगत्यवसादनार्थस्योपनिषदस्य क्विप्रत्ययान्तस्य रूपमुपनिषदिति । उपनिषच्छब्देन च व्याचिख्यासित-ग्रन्थप्रतिपाद्यवेद्यवस्तुविषया विद्योच्यते । केन पुनरर्थयोगेनोपनिषच्छब्देन विद्योच्यते इत्युच्यते । ये मुमुक्षुवो दृष्टानु- श्रविकविषया- वितृणाः सन्त उपनिषच्छब्दवाच्यां वक्ष्यमाणलक्षणां विद्यामुपसद्योपगम्य तन्निष्ठव्या निश्चयेन शीलयन्ति तेषामविद्यादेः संसारबीजस्य विशरणाद्धिसनाद्धिनाशनादिनार्थ- योगेन विद्योपनिषदित्युच्यते । तथा च वक्ष्यति - "निचाय्य तं मृत्युमुखात्प्रमुच्यते" इति । *Kathopaniṣad* with Śāṅkara bhāṣya, Ananda Ashram - Pune, 1977. p-2.

4. उपनिषदिति विद्योच्यते । तच्छालिनां गर्भजन्मजरदिनिशातनात्तदवसादनाद्वा ब्रह्मणो वोपनिगमयितृत्वादुपनिषणं वाऽस्यां परं श्रेय इति । तदर्थत्वाद् ग्रन्थोऽप्युपनिषत् । *Taittiriya-Upaniṣad* with Śāṅkara bhāṣya, Ananda Ashram - Pune, 1977, p-7.

The *Upaniṣads* are so called because they are essence of the Vedas. They inherit the secret knowledge of the statement like तत्त्वमसि, अहं ब्रह्मास्मि..... etc., This is what Śāṅkara says in his commentary on the *Śvetāśvatara-upaniṣad*.⁵

The *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* (III.v.i.) speaks of “*Guhya-ādeśya*” which Śāṅkara identifies with the *Upaniṣad*.⁶

So far as the esoteric meaning of the *Upaniṣad* is concerned, it is said thus : “The title *Upaniṣad* (derived from the root *sad* with the prepositions *Upa* and *ni*) implies something mystical that underlies or is beneath the surface. And these *Upaniṣads* do in fact, lie at the root of what may be called the philosophical side of Hinduism. Not only are they as much *Śruti*, or revelation, as the *Mantra* and *Brāhmaṇa*, but they are practically the only Veda of all thoughtful Hindus in the present day.⁷

Further, Macdonell says “These *Upaniṣads* or esoteric treatises, mark the last stage in the development of the *Brāhmaṇa* literature, being entirely concerned with theosophical speculations on the nature of things. The subject-matter of all the old *Upaniṣads* is essentially

5. वेदगुह्योपनिषत्सु | वेदेष्वृगादिषु गुह्या गोप्या उपनिषत् तत्त्वमस्यहं ब्रह्मास्मीत्याद्या विद्यास्तासु | गूढम् | *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad*, with Śāṅkara *bhāṣya*, V.6, Ananda Ashram, Pune, 1977, p-128.

6. गुह्या गोप्या रहस्या एव आदेशः लोकद्वारीयादिविधयः, उपासनानि च कर्माङ्ग-विषयाणि मधुकृतः | ब्रह्मैव शब्दाधिकारात् प्रणवाख्यं पुष्पम् | *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* with Śāṅkara *bhāṣya*, Holenarasipur, 1956. p-283.

7. Monier Willams - “*Indian Wisdom*”, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, Varanasi, 1963, p.85.

the same, consisting of speculations on the nature of the supreme soul. (Ātma or Brahma).⁸ Thus it can be said, the *Upaniṣads* have been the primary source of Vedānta philosophy.

However, the field of Vedānta consists of the *Upaniṣads*, the *Bhagavadgītā* and the *Brahmasūtras*. Therefore, these three sections have been regarded as the *Prasthāntraya*, Triple canon of Vedānta. The *Upaniṣads* being the pristine springs of Vedāntic metaphysics constitute the revealed texts. Therefore they are marked as *Śruti*.

The *Bhagavadgītā* ranks next only to *Upaniṣads*. It embodies the teachings of Śrī Kṛṣṇa, which is the cream of the *Mahābhārata*. Therefore this Vedānta text occupies an unique place in the philosophical tradition. Bringing out the importance of this *Bhagavadgītā*, the verse compares the *Upaniṣads* to the cows, the *Bhagavadgītā* to the milk, Śrī Kṛṣṇa to the milkman, Arjuna to the calf, and the wise people to the partakers of the milk.⁹ In the words of Śāṅkara, the *Bhagavadgītā* is the quintessence of the teaching of the entire Veda, as this text forms a part of the *Mahābhārata*, which is *Smṛti-Prasthāna*.

The third of the canonical text is the *Brahmasūtra*, which is regarded as *Nyāya-prasthāna*, because it sets forth the teachings of *Vedānta-sūtra*. The author

8. A.A. Macdonell - “*India's Past*”, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1927, p.47.

9. सर्वोपनिषदो गावो दोग्धा गोपालनन्दनः |

पार्थो वत्सः सुधीर्भोक्ता दुग्धं गीतामृतं महत् ||

Vaiṣṇava-Tantrasāra-Q. Śrīmad Bhagavadgītā, Foreword, Sri Vani Vilas Press, Srirangam, p.2.

of the *Brahma-sūtra* is Bādarāyaṇa whom Indian tradition identifies with Vyāsa, the arranger or compiler of the Veda. In the *Brahma-sūtra*, Bādarāyaṇa Vyāsa strings together the leading concepts of Vedānta in an ordered manner. The *sūtra* is an exquisite garland made out of Upaniṣad-blossoms. The *Brahma-sūtra* has four chapters or *Adhyāyas*, and each of them is divided into four *pādas* or parts. Each of these *pādas* is subdivided into *Adhikaraṇas* or sections made up of *sūtras* or aphoristic statements. The number of *sūtras* in each *Adhikaraṇa* varies with the nature of the topic dealt therein.

The **First** chapter deals with *Samanvaya*. It attempts to offer a coherent interpretation of the different texts of the *Upaniṣads*. The **Second** chapter deals with *Avirodha* and shows that the interpretation offered in the first chapter is not inconsistent with the writings of other sages and views of other systems. The **Third** chapter deals with *Sādhana* and is devoted to an exposition of the means for the realisation of Brahman. The **Fourth** deals with *Phala* or the fruit of knowledge.

The Vedānta philosophy is thus based on *Brahma-sūtras*, *Bhagavadgītā*, and the *Upaniṣads*. Of these, *Gītā* and *Brahmasūtra* contain the essence of the Upaniṣadic texts. Hence, it is clear that Vedānta philosophy has its foundation in the Upaniṣads.

After having taken a brief survey of the concepts of the Upaniṣads, one can see various methods which have been employed by the Upaniṣadic seers. As has been rightly pointed out by Dr. R.D. Rande¹⁰ there are

10. R.D. Rande, *A Constructive Survey of Upaniṣadic Philosophy*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1968. p-xxiv.

ten methods, through which Upaniṣadic philosophy is set-forth. They are –

- 1) The enigmatic method.
- 2) The aphoristic method.
- 3) The etymological method.
- 4) The mythical method.
- 5) The analogical method.
- 6) The dialectic method.
- 7) The synthetic method.
- 8) The monologic method.
- 9) The adhoc method.
- 10) The regressive method.

With these methods, the Upaniṣadic philosophy though scattered here and there, can be comprehended in its fullest significance. As such, theories of cosmology, theories of cosmogony, different aspects of psychological reflection, concepts of Eschatology and reflections of later philosophies like Buddhism, Sāṅkhya, Yoga, Nyāya, Vaiśeṣika, Mīmāṃsā, Advaita, Viśiṣṭādvaita, Dvaita, can be traced to the Upaniṣadic source. If the doctrine of salvation is one face of the Upaniṣadic philosophy, then the theory of Ethics is however its another face. Thus, on the path of spiritual experience of an individual soul, the role of Upaniṣadic philosophy is par excellence.

2. Place and Importance of Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad

The *Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad*, a perspicuous and poetical *Upaniṣad*, is one of the more widely known mystic Upaniṣads, as it expounds the highest philosophical doctrines of the revealed scriptures through an interesting dialogue between a young lad Naciketa and God Yama. This *Upaniṣad* is so called because it belongs to the

Kaṭha branch of the *Kṛṣṇa Yajurveda* or the *Taittiriya* school of the *Yajurveda*. "The reason why it is ascribed to the *Yajurveda*, is probably because the legend of Naciketas occurs in the *Brāhmaṇa* (III.1.8.) of the *Taittiriya Yajurveda*.¹¹ The first mention of this legend is found in the *Rgveda* : यस्मिन् वृक्षे सुपलाशे देवैः संपिबते यमः । अत्रा नो विश्वपतिः पिता पुराणो अनु वेनति पुराणां अनुवेनन्तं चरन्तं पापयामुया । असूयन्नभ्यचाकशं तस्मा अस्पृहयं पुनः यं कुमार नवं रथमचक्रं मनसाकृणोः । एकेषं विश्वतः प्राञ्चमपश्यन्नधि तिष्ठसि यं कुमार प्रावर्तयो रथं विप्रेभ्यस्परि । तं सामानु प्रावर्तत समितो नाव्याहितम् कः कुमार-मजनयद्रथं को निरवर्तयत् । कः स्वित् तद्द्य नो ब्रूयोदनुदेयी यथाभवत् यथाभवदनुदेयी ततो अग्रमजायत । पुरस्ताद्बुध्न आततः पश्चान्निरयणं कृतम् इदं यमस्य सादनं देवमानं यदुच्यते । इयमस्य धम्यते नाळीरयं गीर्भिः परिष्कृतः ॥ (X.135.1-7) Besides, this story occurs in the *Mahābhārata* too. It runs as below :

दत्तानां फलसंप्राप्तिं गवां प्रब्रूहि मेऽनघ ।
विस्तरेण महाबाहो न हि तृप्यामि कथ्यताम् ॥ १ ॥
अत्राप्युदाहरन्तीममितिहासं पुरातनम् ।
ऋषेरौद्दालकेर्वाक्यं नाचिकेतस्य चोभयोः ॥ २ ॥
ऋषिरौद्दालकिर्दीक्षामुपगम्य ततः सुतम् ।
त्वं मामुपचरस्वेति नाचिकेतमभाषत ॥ ३ ॥
समाप्ते नियमे तस्मिन्महर्षिः पुत्रमब्रवीत् ।
उपस्पर्शनसकृतस्य स्वाध्यायाभिरतस्य च ॥ ४ ॥
इध्मा दर्भाः सुमनसः कलशश्वाभितो जलम् ।
विस्मृतं मे तदादाय नदीतीरादिहाब्रज ॥ ५ ॥
गत्वानवाप्य तत्सर्वं नदीवेगसमाप्लुतम् ।
न पश्यामि तदित्येवं पितरं सोऽब्रवीन्मुनिः ॥ ६ ॥

11. Max Muller, *The Sacred Books of the East*, Vol. xv. Motilal Banarasi Dass, Delhi, 1975, p-xxi.

क्षुत्पिपासाश्रमाविष्टो मुनिरौद्दालकिस्तदा ।
यमं पश्येति तं पुत्रमशपत्क्रोधमूर्च्छितः ॥ ७ ॥
तथा स पित्राऽभिहतो वाग्बलेण कृताञ्जलिः ।
प्रसीदेति ब्रुवन्नेव गतसत्वोऽपतद्भुवि ॥ ८ ॥
नाचिकेतं पिता दृष्ट्वा पतितं दुःखमूर्च्छितः ।
किं मया कृतमित्युक्त्वा निपपात महीतले ॥ ९ ॥
तस्य दुःखपरीतस्य स्वं पुत्रमनुशोचतः ।
व्यतीतं तदहःशेषं सा चोग्रा तत्र शर्वरी ॥ १० ॥
पित्रयेणाश्रुप्रपातेन नाचिकेतः कुरुद्वह ।
प्रास्यन्दच्छयने कौश्ये वृष्ट्या सस्यमिवाप्लुतम् ॥ ११ ॥
स पर्यपृच्छतं पुत्रं श्लाघ्यं पर्यागतं पुनः ।
दिव्यैर्गन्धैः समादिग्धं क्षीणस्वप्नमिवोत्थितम् ॥ १२ ॥
अपि पुत्र जिता लोकाः शुभास्ते स्वेन कर्मणा ।
दिष्ट्या चासि पुनः प्राप्तो न हि ते मानुषं वपुः ॥ १३ ॥
प्रत्यक्षदर्शी सर्वस्य पित्रा पृष्टो महात्मना ।
अभ्युत्थाय पितुर्मध्ये महर्षीणां न्यवेदयत् ॥ १४ ॥
कुर्वन्भवच्छासनमाशु यातो ह्यहं विशालां रुचिरप्रभासाम् ।
वैवस्वतीं प्राप्य सभामवश्यं सहस्रशो योजनहैमभौमाम् ॥ १५ ॥
दृष्ट्वैव मामभिमुखमापतन्तं गृहं निवेद्यासनमादिदेश ।
वैवस्वतोऽर्घ्यादिभिरर्हणैश्च भवत्कृते पूजयामास मां सः ॥ १६ ॥
ततस्त्वहं तं शनकैरवोचं वृतः सदस्यैरभिपूज्यमानः ।
प्राप्तोऽस्मि ते विषयं धर्मराज लोकानहो यानहं तान्विधत्स्व ॥ १७ ॥
यमोऽब्रवीन्मां न मृतोसि सौम्य यमं पश्येत्याह स त्वां तपस्वी ।
पिता प्रदीप्ताग्निसमानतेजा न तच्छक्यमनुतं विप्र कर्तुम् ॥ १८ ॥
दृष्टस्तेऽहं प्रतिगच्छस्व तात शोचत्यसौ तव देहस्य कर्ता ।
ददानि किंचापि मनःप्रणीतं प्रियातिथेस्तव कामान्वृणीष्व ॥ १९ ॥
तेनैवमुक्तस्तमहं प्रत्यवोचं प्राप्तोऽस्मि ते विषयं दुर्निवर्त्यम् ।
इच्छाम्यहं पुण्यकृतां समृद्धौल्लोकान्द्रष्टुं यदि तेऽहं वरार्हः ॥ २० ॥

यानं समारोप्य तु मां स देवो वाहैर्युक्तं सुप्रभं भानुमत्तत् ।
 संदर्शयामास तदाऽऽत्मलोकान्सर्वास्तथा पुण्यकृतां द्विजेन्द्र ॥ २१ ॥
 अपश्यं तत्र वेश्मानि तैजसानि महात्मनाम् ।
 नानासंस्थानरूपाणि सर्वरत्नमयानि च ॥ २२ ॥
 चन्द्रमण्डलशुभ्राणि किंकिणीजालवन्ति च ।
 अनेकशतभौमानि सान्तर्जलवनानि च ॥ २३ ॥
 वैडूर्यार्कप्रकाशानि रूप्यरुक्ममयानि च ।
 तरुणादित्यवर्णानि स्थावराणि चराणि च ॥ २४ ॥
 भक्ष्यभोज्यमयाञ्जौलान्वासांसि शयनानि च ।
 सर्वकामफलांश्चैव वृक्षान्भवनसंस्थितान् ॥ २५ ॥
 नद्यो वीथ्यः सभा वाप्यो दीर्घिकाश्चैव सर्वशः ।
 घोपवन्ति च यानानि युक्तान्यथ सहस्रशः ॥ २६ ॥
 क्षीरस्रवा वै सरितो गिरींश्च सर्पिस्तथा विमलं चापि तोयम् ।
 वैवस्वतस्यानुमतांश्च देशानदृष्टपूर्वान्सुबहूनपश्यम् ॥ २७ ॥
 सर्वान्दृष्ट्वा तदहं धर्मराजमवोचं वै सर्वदेवं सहिष्णुम् ।
 क्षीरस्यैताः सर्पिषश्चैव नद्यः शश्वत्स्रोताः कस्य भोज्याः प्रवृत्ताः ॥ २८ ॥
 यमोऽब्रवीद्विद्धि भोज्यांस्त्वमेतान्ये दातारः साधवो गोरसानाम् ।
 अन्ये लोकाः शाश्वता वीतशोकैः समाकीर्णा गोप्रदाने रतानाम् ॥ २९ ॥
 न त्वेतासां दानमात्रं प्रशस्तं पात्रं कालो गोविशेषो विधिश्च ।
 ज्ञात्वा देयं विप्र गवान्तरं हि दुःखं ज्ञातुं पावकादित्यभूतम् ॥ ३० ॥
 स्वाध्यायवान्योऽतिमात्रं तपस्वी वैतानस्थो ब्राह्मणः पात्रमासाम् ।
 गोषु क्षान्तं गोशरण्यं कृतज्ञं वृत्तिग्लानं तादृशं पात्रमाहुः ॥ ३१ ॥
 कृच्छ्रोत्सृष्टाः पोषणाभ्यागताश्च द्वारैरेतैर्गोविशेषाः प्रशस्ताः ।
 अन्तर्जाताः सुक्रयज्ञानलब्धाः प्राणक्रीताः सोदकाः सोद्वहाश्च ॥ ३२ ॥
 तिस्रो रात्र्यस्त्वद्विरूपोष्य भूमौ तृप्ता गावस्तर्पितेभ्यः प्रदेयाः ।
 वत्सैः प्रीताः सुप्रजाः सोपचारास्त्र्यहं दत्त्वा गोरसैर्वर्तितव्यम् ॥ ३३ ॥
 दत्त्वा धेनुं सुव्रतां साधुदोहां कल्याणवत्सामपलायिनीं च ।
 यावन्ति रोमाणि भवन्ति तस्यास्तावद्वर्षाण्यश्रुते स्वर्गलोकम् ॥ ३४ ॥

तथाऽनङ्गहं ब्राह्मणेभ्यः प्रदाय दान्तं धुर्यं बलवन्तं युवानम् ।
 कुलानुजीव्यं वीर्यवन्तं बृहन्तं भुङ्क्ते लोकान्संमितान्धेनुदस्य ॥ ३५ ॥
 वृद्धे ग्लाने संभ्रमे वा महार्थे कृष्यर्थं वा सौम्यहेतोः प्रसूत्याम् ।
 गुर्वर्थं वा यज्ञसमाप्तये वा गां वै दातुं देशकालोऽविशिष्टः ॥ ३६ ॥
 नाचिकेत उवाच ।
 श्रुत्वा वैवस्वतवचस्तमहं पुनरब्रवम् ।
 अगोमी गोप्रदातृणां कथं लोकां हि गच्छति ॥ ३७ ॥
 ततोऽब्रवीद्यमो धीमान्गोप्रदानं ततो गतिम् ।
 गोप्रदानानुकल्पात्तु गामृते सन्तु गोप्रदाः ॥ ३८ ॥
 अलाभे यो गवां दद्याद्धृतधेनुं यतव्रतः ।
 तस्यैता घृतवाहिन्यः क्षरन्ते वत्सला इव ॥ ३९ ॥
 घृतालाभे तु यो दद्यात्तिलधेनुं यतव्रतः ।
 स दुर्गात्तारितो धेन्वा क्षीरनद्यां प्रमोदते ॥ ४० ॥
 तिलालाभे तु यो दद्याज्जलधेनुं यतव्रतः ।
 स कामप्रवहां शीतां नदीमेतामुपाश्रुते ॥ ४१ ॥
 एवमेतानि मे तत्र धर्मराजो न्यदर्शयत् ।
 दृष्ट्वा च परमं हर्षमवापमहमच्युत ॥ ४२ ॥
 निवेदये चाहमिमं प्रियं ते क्रतुर्महानल्पधनप्रचारः ।
 प्राप्तो मया तात स मत्प्रसूतः प्रपत्स्यते वेदविधिप्रवृत्तः ॥ ४३ ॥
 शापो ह्ययं भवतोऽनुग्रहाय प्राप्तो मया यत्र दृष्टो यमो वै ।
 दानव्युष्टिं तत्र दृष्ट्वा महात्मन्निःसंदिग्धान्दानधर्माश्चरिष्ये ॥ ४४ ॥
 इदं च मामब्रवीद्धर्मराजः पुनः पुनः संप्रहृष्टो महर्षे ।
 दानेन यः प्रयतोऽभूत्सदैव विशेषतो गोप्रदानं च कुर्यात् ॥ ४५ ॥
 शुद्धो ह्यर्थो नावमन्यस्व धर्मान्पात्रे देयं देशकालोपपन्ने ।
 तस्माद्गावस्ते नित्यमेव प्रदेया माभूच्च ते संशयः कश्चिदत्र ॥ ४६ ॥
 एताः पुरा ह्यददन्नित्यमेव शान्तात्मानो दानपथे निविष्टाः ।
 तपांस्युप्राप्यप्रतिशङ्कमानास्ते वै दानं प्रददुश्चैव शक्त्या ॥ ४७ ॥

काले च शक्त्या मत्सरं वर्जयित्वा शुद्धात्मानः श्रद्धिनः पुण्यशीलाः ।
 दत्त्वा गा वै लोकममुं प्रपन्ना देदीप्यन्ते पुण्यशीलास्तु नाके ॥ ४८ ॥
 एतद्दानं न्यायलब्धं द्विजेभ्यः पात्रे दत्तं प्रापणीयं परीक्ष्य ।
 काम्याष्टम्यां वर्तितव्यं दशाहं रसैर्गवां शकृता प्रसन्नवैर्वा ॥ ४९ ॥
 देवव्रती स्याद्दृषभप्रदानैर्वेदावासिर्गोयुगस्य प्रदाने ।
 तीर्थावासिर्गोप्रयुक्तप्रदाने पापोत्सर्गः कपिलायाः प्रदाने ॥ ५० ॥
 गामयेकां कपिलां संप्रदाय न्यायोपेतां कलुषाद्विप्रमुचेत् ।
 गवां रसात्परमं नास्ति किञ्चिद्गवां प्रदानं सुमहद्वदन्ति ॥ ५१ ॥
 गावो लोकांस्तारयन्ति क्षरन्त्यो गावश्चान्नं संजनयन्ति लोके ।
 यस्तं जानन्न गवां हार्दमेति स वै गन्ता निरयं पापचेताः ॥ ५२ ॥
 यैस्तद्वत्तं गोसहस्रं शतं वा दशार्धं वा दश वा साधुवत्सम् ।
 अयेका वै साधवे ब्राह्मणाय सास्यामुष्मिन्पुण्यतीर्था नदी वै ॥ ५३ ॥
 प्रात्या पुष्ट्या लोकसंरक्षणेन गावस्तुल्याः सूर्यपादैः पृथिव्याम् ।
 शब्दश्चैकः संनतिश्चोपभोगास्तस्माद्गोदः सूर्य इवावभाति ॥ ५४ ॥
 गुरुं शिष्यो वरयेद्गोप्रदाने स वै गन्ता नियतां स्वर्गमेव ।
 विधिज्ञानां सुमहान्धर्म एष विधिं ह्याद्यं विधयः संविशन्ति ॥ ५५ ॥
 इदं दानं न्यायलब्धं द्विजेभ्यः पात्रे दत्त्वा प्रापयेथाः परीक्ष्य ।
 त्वय्याशंसन्त्यमरा दानवाश्च वयं चापिप्रसृते पुण्यशीले ॥ ५६ ॥
 इत्युक्तोऽहं धर्मराजं द्विजर्षे धर्मात्मानं शिरसाऽभिप्रणम्य ।
 अनुज्ञातस्तेन वैवस्वतेन प्रत्यागमं भगवत्पादमूलम् ॥ ५७ ॥

According to Patañjali, the sage Kāṭha, was a pupil of Vaiśampāyana, and he had the disciple by name Khāḍāyana.¹² He is believed to be traditional founder of the Kāṭha school. In this connection Rawson opines that The Kāṭha school now finds its chief home in

12. वैशम्पायनान्तेवासी कठः । कठान्तेवासी खाडायनः ।
 Vyākaraṇa-mahābhāṣya, IV.3.1. p.299.

Kāśmīr, and the commentary on the caraṇa-vyūha¹³ describes how, on the separation of the black yajur veda schools, the Kāṭhas and Kāṭha-Kaṭha-Kaṭha-Kaṭha spread in the Panjāb and Kāśmīr, the Maitrāyaṇīyas in Gujarāt, and the Taittirīyas in the south, while the white Yajur Veda school of the Vājasaneyins spread to the North-east (Kosala and Videha, the home of Buddhism). The original home of all of them was however the madhyadeśa or kuru-pāñcālas; the Rāmāyaṇa (ii.3.16) describes the Kāṭha school, together with the Taittirīya, as being in Ayodhyā; and Uddālaka Āruṇi, from whom the father of Naciketa is supposed to be descended, is described in S.B. xi.4.1, as a kuru-pāñcāla Brahmin.

In the *Black Yajur Veda*, there are normally no separate Brāhmaṇas, the prose explanations of the ritual not being (as in the case of white yajur) separated from the Saṁhitas. The Kāṭhaka Saṁhitā therefore has no Brāhmaṇa. In the Taittirīya school, however, in addition to the Brāhmaṇa material in the Saṁhitā, there is a supplement dealing with certain sacrifices omitted in the Saṁhitā and this is called the *Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa*.

This *Upaniṣad* has its relationship with the *Bhagavadgītā*, of which the spiritual philosophy begins with some great crisis, such as a war of extermination. As the *Bhagavadgītā* has an important place among the spiritual treasure of mankind, though it draws the picture of afflicted hearts of the Kauravas and Pāṇdavas; even so, this *Upaniṣad* has an immortal place among the major philosophical Upaniṣads, though it speaks of a quarrel strife (a war of words) between Naciketa and

13. See Keith, *Veda of the Black Yajur School*, xcii.

Vājaśravas, his father, "The interest of these two great works, however is not in these eternal events, critical as they are, but in the message which they carry for the human soul. They are both essentially problem-studies, and in this respect they resemble Hamlet; but there is this great difference, that while they both give a solution of the problem. Shakespear's immortal drāma, only sets the problem before us without attempting only solution.¹⁴

A close study of the Vedas makes us identify similar statements both in thought and content as comparing to the *Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad*.

Following are some of the examples of similarities :

a. Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad - and Vedas

<i>Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad</i> v.2	<i>Rgveda</i> iv.40.14
हंसः शुचिषद् वसुरन्तरिक्षसद्धोता वेदिषदतिथिर्दुरोणसत् ॥ नृषद् वरसद्धृतसद् व्योमसदब्जा गोजा ऋतजा अद्रिजा ऋतं बृहत् ॥ v.9 & 10	हंस शुचिषद् वसुरन्तरिक्षसद्धोता वेदिषदतिथिर्दुरोणसत् । नृषद् वरसद्धृतसद् व्योमस दब्जा गोजा ऋतजा अद्रिजा ऋतम् ॥ vi.47.18
रूपं रूपं प्रतिरूपो बभूव ।	रूपं रूपं प्रतिरूपो बभूव तदस्य रूपं प्रतिचक्षणाय ।
<i>Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad</i> iv.8	<i>Sāma Veda</i> i.i.2.3.7
अरण्योर्निहितो जातवेदा गर्भ इवेत्सुभृतो गर्भिणीभिः ।	अरण्योर्निहितो जातवेदा गर्भ इवेत्सुभृतो गर्भिणीभिः ।

14. Maitra S.K., *The Kathōpaniṣad* - The story of Naciketa's or Man's search for his soul, Ācārya Dhruva Smāraka Granta, Part - III, Gujarāt Vidyā Sabhā, Ahmedabad, 1946 p.22.

दिवेदिव ईड्यो जागृवद्भिर्हविष्म-
द्भिर्मनुष्येभिरग्निः ॥

दिवेदिव ईड्यो जागृवद्भिर्हविष्म-
द्भिर्मनुष्येभिरग्निः ॥

[Sripada Damodar Stavalikar
सामवेद संहिता Bombay - p.6,
Mantra no : 79.]

Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad

iv.9

यतश्चोदेति सूर्योऽस्तं यत्र च गच्छति ।
तं देवाः सर्वेऽर्पितास्तदु नात्येति
कश्चन एतद्वैतत् ॥

Atharva Veda

10.8.16

यतः सूर्य उदेत्यस्तंयत्र च गच्छति ।
तदेव अन्येऽहं तद् नात्येति किञ्चन ॥

Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad

v.2

हंसः शुचिषद् वसुरन्तरिक्षसद्धोता
वेदिषदतिथिर्दुरोणसत् ।
नृषद् वरसहसद् व्योमसदब्जा गोजा
ऋतजा अद्रिजा ऋतं बृहत् ॥

Taittiriya Samhita

1.8.15

हंसः शुचिषद् वसुरन्तरिक्षसद्धोता
वेदिषदतिथिर्दुरोणसत् ।
नृषद् वरसहसद् व्योमसदब्जा गोजा
ऋतजा अद्रिजा ऋतं बृहत् ॥

b. Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad and other Upaniṣads

Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad

2.5

अविद्यायामान्तरे वर्तमानाः स्वयं
धीराः पण्डितं मन्यमानाः ।
दन्द्रम्यमाणाः परियन्ति मूढा
अन्धेनैव नीयमाना यथान्धाः ॥

3.11

महतः परमव्यक्तमव्यक्तात्पुरुषः परः ।
पुरुषान्न परं किञ्चित्सा काष्ठा सा परा गतिः ॥

Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad

1.2.8

अविद्यायामान्तरे वर्तमानाः स्वयं
धीराः पण्डितं मन्यमानाः ।
जङ्घन्यमानाः परियन्ति मूढा
अन्धेनैव नीयमाना यथान्धाः ॥

2.1.2

दिव्यो ह्यमूर्तः पुरुषः सबाह्याभ्यन्तरो ह्यजः ।
अप्राणो ह्यमनाः शुभ्रो ह्यक्षरात्परतः परः ॥

5.9

अग्निर्यथैको भुवनं प्रविष्टो रूपं
रूपं प्रतिरूपो बभूव ।
एकस्तथा सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा रूपं
रूपं प्रतिरूपो बहिश्च ॥

5.15.

न तत्र सूर्यो भाति न चन्द्रतारकं
नेमा विद्युतो भान्ति कुतोऽयमग्निः ।
तमेव भान्तमनुभाति सर्वं तस्य भासा
सर्वमिदं विभाति ॥

2.22.

नायमात्मा प्रवचनेन लभ्यो न
मेधया न बहुना श्रुतेन ।
यमेवैष वृणुते तेन लभ्यस्तस्यैष
आत्मा विवृणुते तनूं स्वाम् ॥

6.8.

अव्यक्तात्तु परः पुरुषोऽथ नद्यः
व्यापकोऽलिङ्ग एव च ।
यज्जात्वा मुच्यते जन्तुरमृतत्वं
च गच्छति ॥

Kāṭha-Upaniṣad

3.3

आत्मानं रथिनं विद्धि शरीरं रथमेव तु ।
बुद्धिं तु सारथिं विद्धि मनः प्रग्रहमेव च ॥

2.1.4

अग्निर्मूर्धा चक्षुषी चन्द्रसूर्यौ
दिशः श्रोत्रे वाग्विवृताश्च वेदाः ।
वायुः प्राणो हृदयं विश्वमस्य
पद्भ्यां पृथिवी ह्येष सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा ॥

2.2.10.

न तत्र सूर्यो भाति न चन्द्रतारकं
नेमा विद्युतो भान्ति कुतोऽयमग्निः ।
तमेव भान्तमनुभाति सर्वं तस्य भासा
सर्वमिदं विभाति ॥

3.2.3.

नायमात्मा प्रवचनेन लभ्यो न
मेधया न बहुना श्रुतेन ।
यमेवैष वृणुते तेन लभ्यस्तस्यैष
आत्मा विवृणुते तनूं स्वाम् ॥

3.2.8.

स्यन्दमानाः समुद्रेऽस्तं
गच्छन्ति नामरूपे विहाय ।
तथा विद्वान्नामरूपाद्विमुक्ताः परात्परं
पुरुषमुपैति दिव्यम् ॥

Śvetāśvatāra-Upaniṣad

2.8

त्रिरुन्नतं स्थाप्य समं शरीरं
हृदीन्द्रियाणि मनसा संनिरुध्य ।
ब्रह्मोऽप्येन प्रतरेत विद्वान्ब्रह्मोऽप्येन
सर्वाणि भयावहानि ॥

6.17

अद्भुष्टमात्रः पुरुषोऽन्तरात्मा सदा
जनानां हृदये संनिविष्टः ।
तं स्वाच्छरीरात्प्रवृहेन्मुञ्जादिवेषीकां धैर्येण ।
तं विद्याच्छुक्रममृतं तं विद्याच्छुक्रममुमिति ॥

6.9

न संदृशे तिष्ठति रूपमस्य च चक्षुषा
पश्यति कश्चनैनम् । हृदा मनीषा
मनसाऽभिक्लृप्तो य एतद्विदुरमृतास्ते भवन्ति ॥

2.20

अणोरणीयान्महतो महीयानात्मास्य
जन्तोर्निहितो गुहायाम् ।
तमक्रतुः पश्यति वीतशोको धातुः
प्रसादान्महिमानमात्मनः ॥

1.17

त्रिणाचिकेतस्त्रिभिरेत्य सन्धिं
त्रिकर्मकृत्तरति जन्ममृत्यू ।
ब्रह्मजज्ञं देवमीड्यं विदित्वा
निचाय्येमां शान्तिमत्यमेति ॥

6.9

न संदृशे तिष्ठति रूपमस्य न
चक्षुषा पश्यति कश्चनैनम् ।
हृदा मनीषा मनसाऽभिक्लृप्तो य
एतद्विदुरमृतास्ते भवन्ति ॥

5.12

एको वशी सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा
एकं रूपं बहुधा यः करोति ।

3.13

अद्भुष्टमात्रः पुरुषोऽन्तरात्मा सदा
जनानां हृदये संनिविष्टः ।
हृदा मनीषो मनसाभिक्लृप्तो य
एतद्विदुरमृतास्ते भवन्ति ॥

3.13

अद्भुष्टमात्रः पुरुषोऽन्तरात्मा सदा
जनानां हृदये संनिविष्टः ।
हृदा मनीषो मनसाभिक्लृप्तो य
एतद्विदुरमृतास्ते भवन्ति ॥

3.20

अणोरणीयान्महतो महीयानात्मा
गुहायां निहितोऽस्य जन्तोः ।
तमक्रतुं पश्यति वीतशोको धातुः
प्रसादान्महिमानमीशम् ॥

4.11

यो योनि योनिमधितिष्ठत्येको
यस्मिन्निदं संच व्याप्तं विचैति सर्वम् ।
तमीशानं वरदं देवमीड्यं
निचाय्येनां शान्तिमत्यन्तमेति ॥

4.20

न संदृशे तिष्ठति रूपमस्य न
चक्षुषा पश्यति कश्चनैनम् ।
हृदा हृदिस्थं मनसा य एनमेवं
विदुरमृतास्ते भवन्ति ॥

6.12

एको वशी निक्त्रियाणां
बहूनामेकं बीजं बहुधा यः करोति ।

तमात्मस्थं येऽनुपश्यन्ति धीरास्तेषां
सुखं शाश्वतं नेतरेषाम् ॥

5.13

नित्यो नित्यानां चेतनश्चेतनामेको
बहूनां यो विदधाति कामान् ।
तमात्मस्थं येऽनुपश्यन्ति धीरास्तेषां
शान्तिः शाश्वती नेतरेषाम् ॥

5.15

न तत्र सूर्यो भाति न चन्द्रतारकं
नेमा विद्युतो भान्ति कुतोऽयमग्निः ॥
तमेव भान्तमनुभाति सर्वं तस्य
भासा सर्वमिदं विभाति ॥

c. Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad and Bhagavadgītā

Kāṭhaka-Upaniṣad

II.6

न साम्परायः प्रतिभाति बालं
प्रमाद्यन्तं वित्तमोहेन मूढम् ।
अयं लोको नास्ति पर इति मानी
पुनः पुनर्वशमापद्यते मे ॥

II.7

श्रवणायापि बहुभिर्यो न लभ्यः
शृण्वन्तोऽपि बहवो यं न विद्युः ।
आश्चर्यो वक्ता कुशलोऽस्य लब्धाऽऽ
श्चर्यो ज्ञाता कुशलानुशिष्टः ॥

II.15

सर्वे वेदा यत्पदमामनन्ति
तपासि सर्वाणि च यद्वदन्ति ।

तमात्मस्थं येऽनुपश्यन्ति धीरास्तेषां
सुखं शाश्वतं नेतरेषाम् ॥

6.13

नित्यो नित्यानां चेतनश्चेतनामेको
बहूनां यो विदधाति कामान् ।
तत्कारणं सांख्ययोगाधिगम्यं ज्ञात्वा
देवं मुच्यते सर्वपाशैः ॥

6.14

न तत्र सूर्यो भाति न चन्द्रतारकं
नेमा विद्युतो भान्ति कुतोऽयमग्निः ॥
तमेव भान्तमनुभाति सर्वं तस्य
भासा सर्वमिदं विभाति ॥

Gītā

IV-40

अज्ञश्चाश्रद्धधानश्च संशयात्मा
विनश्यति ।
नायं लोकोऽस्ति न परो न सुखं
संशयात्मनः ॥

II.29

आश्चर्यवत् पश्यति कश्चिदेनम्
आश्चर्यवद् वदति तथैव चान्यः ।
आश्चर्यवच्चैनमन्यः श्रुणोति
श्रुत्वाप्येनं वेद न चैव कश्चित् ॥

VIII.11

यद्धक्षरं वेदविदो वदन्ति
विशन्ति यद् यतयो वीतरागाः ।

यदिच्छन्तो ब्रह्मचर्यं चरन्ति
तत्ते पदसंग्रहेण ब्रवीम्यमित्येतत् ॥

II. 18 & 19

न जायते म्रियते वा विपश्चिन्नायं
कुतश्चिन्न बभूव कश्चित् ।
अजो नित्यः शाश्वतोऽयं पुराणो
न हन्यते हन्यमाने शरीरे ॥

हन्ता चेन्मन्यते हन्तुः हतश्चेन्मन्यते हतम् ।
उभौ तौ न विजानीतो नायं हन्ति
न हन्यते ॥

V-11

सूर्यो यथां सर्वलोकस्य चक्षुर्न
लिप्यते चाक्षुषैर्बाह्यदोषैः
एकस्तथा सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा
न लिप्यते लोकदुःखेन बाह्यः ॥

V-15

न तत्र सूर्यो भाति न चन्द्रतारकं
नेमा विद्युतो भान्ति कुतोऽयमग्निः ।
तमेव भान्तमनुभाति सर्वं
तस्य भासा सर्वमिदं विभाति ॥

VI-1

ऊर्ध्वमूलोऽवाक्शाख एषोऽश्वत्थः सनातनः ।
तदेव शुक्रं तद्ब्रह्म तदेवामृतमुच्यते ।
तस्मिन्लोकाः श्रिताः सर्वे तदु नात्येति
कश्चन । एतद्वै तत् ॥

यदिच्छन्तो ब्रह्मचर्यं चरन्ति
तत्ते पदसंग्रहेण प्रवक्ष्ये ॥

II. 19 & 20

य एनं वेत्ति हन्तारं यश्चैनं
मन्यते हतम् ।
उभौ तौ न विजानीतो नायं
हन्ति न हन्यते ॥

न जायते म्रियते वा कदाचित्
नायं भूत्वा भविता वा न भूयः ।
अजो नित्यः शाश्वतोऽयं पुराणो
न हन्यते हन्यमाने शरीरे ॥

XIII-31 to 33

यदा भूतपृथग् भावमेकस्थमनुपश्यति ।
तत एव च विस्तारं ब्रह्म सम्पद्यते तदा ॥
अनादित्वाग्निर्गुणत्वात् परमात्मायमव्ययः
शरीरस्थोऽपि कौन्तेय न करोति न लिप्यते ॥
यथा सर्वगतं सौक्ष्म्यादाकाशं नोपलिप्यते ।
सर्वत्रावस्थितो देहे तथात्मा नोपलिप्यते ॥

XV-6

न तद् भासयते सूर्यो न शशाङ्को
न पावकः ।
यद् गत्वा न निवर्तन्ते तद्गम परमं
मम ॥

XV-1

ऊर्ध्वमूलमधः शाखमश्वत्थं
प्राहुरव्ययम् ।
छन्दांसि यस्य पर्णानि यस्तं वेद
स वेदवित् ॥

VI-4	V-23
इह चेदशकद्बोद्धुं प्राकशरीरस्य विस्त्रसः । ततः सर्गेषु लोकेषु शरीरत्वाथ कल्पते ॥	शक्नोतीहैव यः सोढुं प्राक् शरीरविमोक्षणात् । कामक्रोधोद्भवं वेगं स युक्तः स सुखी नरः ॥
II.23	XI.53 & 54
नायमात्मा प्रवचनेन लभ्यो न मेधया न बहुना श्रुतेन । यमेवैष वृणुते तेन लभ्यस्तस्यैष आत्मा विवृणुते तनूःस्वाम् ॥	नाहं वेदैर्न तपसा न दानेन न चेज्यया । शक्यं एवंविधो द्रष्टुं दृष्टवानसि मां यथा ॥ भक्त्या त्वनन्यया शक्यं अहमेवंविधोऽर्जुनः । ज्ञातुं द्रष्टुं च तत्त्वेन प्रवेष्टुं च परन्तप ॥
III.9	VIII.21
विज्ञानसारथिर्यस्तु मनः प्रग्रहवान्नरः । सोऽध्वनः परमाप्रोऽति तद्विष्णोः परमं पदम् ॥	अव्यक्तोऽक्षर इत्युक्तस्तमाहुः परमां गतिम् । यं प्राप्य न निवर्तन्ते तद्धाम परमं मम ।
III. 10 & 11	III.42
इन्द्रियेभ्यः परा ह्यर्था अर्थेभ्यश्च परं मनः । मनसस्तु परा बुद्धि बुद्धेरात्मा महान्परः । महतः परमव्यक्तमव्यक्तात्पुरुषः परः । पुरुषान्न परं किञ्चित्सा काष्ठा सा परा गतिः ॥	इन्द्रियाणि पराण्याहुरिन्द्रियेभ्यः परं मनः । मनसस्तु परा बुद्धिर्यो बुद्धेः परतस्तु सः ॥
III.17	XVIII.68
य इमं परमं गुह्यं श्रावयेद् ब्रह्मसंसदि । प्रयतः श्राद्धकाले वा तदानन्त्याय कल्पते । तदानन्त्याय कल्पत इति ॥	य इदं परमं गुह्यं मद्भक्तेष्वभिधास्यति । भक्तिं मयि परां कृत्वा मामेवैष्यत्यसंशयः ॥
V.6	X.19
हन्त त इदं प्रवक्ष्यामि गुह्यं ब्रह्म सनातनम् । यथा च मरणं प्राप्य आत्मा भवति गौतम ॥	हन्ते ते कथयिष्यामि दिव्या ह्यात्मविभूतयः । प्राधान्यतः कुरुश्रेष्ठ नास्त्यन्तो विस्तरस्य मे ॥

d. Kāṭhakoṇiṣad and Brahmasūtras (according to Śaṅkara's tradition)

<i>Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad</i>	<i>Brahmasūtras</i>
स त्वमग्निं स्वर्गमध्येषि मृत्यो प्रब्रूहि त्वं श्रद्धधानाय मह्यम् । स्वर्गलोका अमृतत्वं भजन्त एतद् द्वितीयेन वृणे वरेण ॥ 1.1.13	त्रयाणामेव चैवमुपन्यासः प्रश्नश्च । I.iv.6
लोकादिमग्निं तमुवाच तस्मै या इष्का यावतीर्वा यथा वा । स चापि तत्प्रत्यवदद्यथोक्त- मथास्य मृत्युः पुनरेवाह तुष्टः ॥ 1.1.14	त्रयाणामेव चैवमुपन्यासः प्रश्नश्च । I.iv.6
येयं प्रेते विचिकित्सा मनुष्ये- ऽस्तीत्येके नायमस्तीति चैके । एतद्विद्यामनुशिष्टस्त्वयाऽहं वराणामेष वरस्तृतीयः ॥ 1.1.20	त्रयाणामेव चैवमुपन्यासः प्रश्नश्च । I.iv.6 गुहां प्रविष्टावात्मानौ हि तदर्शनात् । I.ii.11
देवैरत्रापि विचिकित्सितं पुरा न हि सुविज्ञेयमणुरेष धर्मः । अन्यं वरं नचिकेतो वृणीष्व मा मोपरोत्सीरति मा सृजैनम् ॥ 1.1.21	त्रयाणामेव चैवमुपन्यासः प्रश्नश्च । I.iv.6
शतायुषः पुत्रपौत्रान्वृणीष्व बहून्पशून् हस्तिहिरण्यमश्वान् । भूमेर्महदायतनं वृणीष्व स्वयं च जीव शरदो यावदिच्छसि ॥ 1.1.23	निर्मातारं चैके पुत्रादयश्च । III.II.2
एतत्तुल्यं यदि मन्यसे वरं वृणीष्व वित्तं चिरजीविकां च । महाभूमौ नचिकेतस्त्वमेधि कामानां त्वा कामभाजं करोमि ॥ 1.1.24	निर्मातारं चैके पुत्रादयश्च । III.II.2

अविद्यायामन्तरे वर्तमानाः स्वयं धीराः पण्डितमन्यमानाः । दन्द्रम्यमाणाः परिरयन्ति मूढा अन्धेनैव नीयमाना यथान्धाः ॥ 1.2.5	कम्पनात् । 1.3.39
न साम्प्रयायः प्रतिभाति बालं प्रमाद्यन्तं वित्तमोहेन मूढम् । अयं लोको नास्ति पर इति मानी पुनः पुनर्वशमापद्यते मे ॥ 1.2.6.	संयमने त्वनुभूयेतरेषामारोहावरोहौ तद्गतिदर्शनम् । 3.1.13
कामस्याप्तिं जगतः प्रतिष्ठां क्रतोरनन्त्यमभयस्य पारम् । स्तोममहदुरुगायं प्रतिष्ठां दृष्ट्वा धृत्या धीरो नचिकेतोऽत्यसाक्षीः ॥ 1.2.11	स्मरन्ति च । 2.3.47
तं दुर्दर्शं गूढमनुप्रविष्टं गुहाहितं गह्वरेष्ठं पुराणम् । अध्यात्मयोगाधिगमेन देवं मत्वा धीरो हर्षशोकौ जहाति ॥ 1.2.12	गुहां प्रविष्टावात्मानौ हि तद्दर्शनात् । 1.2.11 विशेषणाच्च । 1.2.12
अन्यत्र धर्मादन्यत्राधर्मा दन्यत्रास्मात्कृताकृतात् । अन्यत्र भूताच्च भव्याच्च यत्तत्पश्यसि तद्वद ॥ 1.2.14	दर्शनाच्च । 4.3.13 शब्दादेव प्रमितः । 1.3.24 निर्मातारं चैके पुत्रादयश्च । 3.2.2 तत्तु समन्वयात् । 1.1.4
सर्वे वेदा यत्पदमामनन्ति तपांसि सर्वाणि च यद्वदन्ति । यदिच्छन्तो ब्रह्मचर्यं चरन्ति तत्ते पदं सग्रहेण ब्रवीम्यमित्येतत् ॥ 1.2.15	त्रयाणामेव चैवमुपन्यासः प्रश्नश्च । 1.iv.6 गुहां प्रविष्टावात्मानौ हि तद्दर्शनात् । 1.2.11 इयदामननात् । 3.3.34 कम्पनात् । 1.3.39
	दर्शयति च । 3.3.4 सवपिक्षा च यज्ञादिश्रुतेरश्ववत् । 3.4.26

न जायते म्रियते वा विपश्चिन्नायं कुतश्चिन्न बभूव कश्चित् । अजो नित्यः शाश्वतोऽयं पुराणो न हन्यते हन्यमाने शरीरे ॥ 1.2.18	प्रकरणाच्च । 1.2.10 त्रयाणामेव चैवमुपन्यासः प्रश्नश्च । 1.4.6 नात्माऽश्रुतेर्नित्यत्वाच्च ताभ्यः । II.2.3.17
अशरीरं शरीरेष्वनवस्थेष्ववस्थितम् । महान्तं विभुमात्मानं मत्वा धीरो न शोचति ॥ 1.2.22	महद्वच्च । 1.4.7 तत्तु समन्वयात् । 1.1.4 उत्तराच्चेदाविभूतस्वरूपस्तु । 1.3.19
यस्य ब्रह्म च क्षत्रं च उभे भवत ओदनः । मृत्युर्यस्योपसेचनं क इत्या वेद यत्र सः ॥ 1.2.25	प्रकरणाच्च । 1.2.10
ऋतं पिबन्तौ सुकृतस्य लोके गुहां प्रविष्टौ परमे परार्धे । धायतपौ ब्रह्मविदो वदन्ति पञ्चाग्नयो ये च त्रिणाचिकेताः ॥ 1.3.1	गुहां प्रविष्टावात्मानौ हि तद्दर्शनात् । 1.2.11 विशेषणाच्च । 1.2.12 इयदामननात् । 3.3.34
यः सेतुरीजानानामक्षरं ब्रह्म यत् परम् । अभयं तितीर्षतां पारं नाचिकेतं शक्रेमहि ॥ 1.3.2	इयदामननात् । 3.3.34
आत्मानं रथिनं विद्धि शरीरं रथमेव तु । बुद्धिं तु सारथिं विद्धि मनः प्रग्रहमेव च ॥ 1.3.3	अन्तराविज्ञान मनसी क्रमेण । 2.3.15 विशेषणाच्च । 1.2.12 आनुमानिकमप्येकेषामिति चेन्न शरीरूपक विन्यस्तगृहीतेदर्शयति । 1.4.1
इन्द्रियाणि हयानाहुर्विषयांस्तेषु गोचरान् । आत्मेन्द्रियमनोयुक्तं भोक्तेत्याहुर्मनीषिणः ॥ 1.3.4	तत्तु समन्वयात् । 1.1.4 आनुमानिकमप्येकेषामिति चेन्न शरीरूपक विन्यस्तगृहीतेदर्शयति । 1.4.1 यथा च तक्षोभयथा । 2.3.40
विज्ञानसारथिर्यस्तु मनः प्रग्रहवान्नरः । सोऽध्वनः पारमाप्नोति तद्विष्णोः परमं पदम् ॥ 1.3.9	विशेषणाच्च । 1.2.12 आत्मशब्दाच्च । 3.3.15

इन्द्रियेभ्यः परा हार्था अर्थेभ्यश्च परं मनः । मनसस्तु परा बुद्धिः महद्वच्च ॥ 1.5.7 बुद्धेरात्मा महान्परः ॥ 1.3.10	आनुमानिकमप्येकेषामिति चेन्न शरीररूपक विन्यस्तगृहीतेदर्शयति । 1.4.1 आधानाय प्रयोजनाभावात् । 3.3.14 वदतीति चेन्न प्राज्ञो हि प्रकरणात् । 1.4.5 आधानाय प्रयोजनाभावात् । 3.3.14 आनुमानिकमप्येकेषामिति चेन्न शरीररूपक विन्यस्तगृहीतेदर्शयति । 1.4.1 तत्तु समन्वयात् । 1.1.4 ईक्षतिकर्मव्यपदेशात्सः । 1.3.13 तदधीनत्वादर्थवत् । 1.4.3
महतः परमव्यक्तमव्यक्तात्पुरुषः परः । पुरुषान्न परं किञ्चित्सा काष्ठा सा परा गतिः ॥ 1.3.11	आनुमानिकमप्येकेषामिति चेन्न शरीररूपक विन्यस्तगृहीतेदर्शयति । 1.4.1 तत्तु समन्वयात् । 1.1.4 ईक्षतिकर्मव्यपदेशात्सः । 1.3.13 तदधीनत्वादर्थवत् । 1.4.3
एष सर्वेषु भूतेषु गूढोऽऽत्मा न प्रकाशते । दृश्यते त्वग्रयया बुद्ध्या सूक्ष्मया सूक्ष्मदर्शिभिः ॥ 1.3.12	आनुमानिकमप्येकेषामिति चेन्न शरीररूपक विन्यस्तगृहीतेदर्शयति । 1.4.1 वदतीति चेन्न प्राज्ञो हि प्रकरणात् । 1.4.5 आत्मशब्दाच्च । 3.3.15
यच्छेद्वाङ्मनसी प्राज्ञस्तद्यच्छेज्ज्ञान आत्मनि । ज्ञानमात्मनि महति नियच्छेत्तद्यच्छेज्ज्ञान्त आत्मनि ॥ 1.3.13	आनुमानिकमप्येकेषामिति चेन्न शरीररूपक विन्यस्तगृहीतेदर्शयति । 1.4.1 वदतीति चेन्न प्राज्ञो हि प्रकरणात् । 1.4.5 आत्मशब्दाच्च । 3.3.15
अशब्दमस्पर्शमरूपमव्ययै तथाऽरसं नित्यमगन्धवच्च यत् । अनाद्यनन्तं महतः परं ध्रुवं निचाय्य तन्मृत्युमुखात् प्रमुच्यते ॥ 1.3.15	न स्थानतोऽपि परस्योभयलिङ्गं सर्वत्र हि । 3.2.11 अन्तस्तद्धर्मोपदेशात् । 1.1.20 अरूपवदेव हि तत्प्रधानत्वात् । 3.2.14 आधानाय प्रयोजनाभावात् । 3.3.14
पराञ्चि खानि व्यतृणत् स्वयम्भू स्तस्मात्पराङ्पश्यति नान्तरात्मन् । कश्चिद्धीरः प्रत्यगात्मा मैक्ष दावृत्तचक्षुरमृतत्वमिच्छन् ॥ 2.1.1	अपि च संराधने प्रत्यक्षानुमानाभ्याम् । 3.2.24

यदेवेह तदमुत्र यदमुत्र तदन्विह । मृत्योः स मृत्युमाप्नोति य इह नानेव पश्यति ॥ 2.1.10	त्रयाणामेव चैवमुपन्यासः प्रश्नश्च । 1.4.6 ध्रुवाध्यायतनं स्वशब्दात् । 1.3.1
मनसैवेदमाप्तव्यं नेह नानाऽस्ति किञ्चन । मृत्योः स मृत्युं गच्छति य इह नानेव पश्यति ॥ 2.1.11	अपि चैवमेके । 3.2.13
अद्भुष्टमात्रः पुरुषो मध्य आत्मनि तिष्ठति । ईशानं भूतभव्यस्य न ततो विजुगुप्सते ॥ 2.1.12	शब्दादेव प्रमितः । 1.3.24
अद्भुष्टमात्रः पुरुषो ज्योतिरिवाधूमकः । ईशानो भूतभव्यस्य स एवाद्य स उष्वः । एतद्वै तत् । 2.1.13	शब्दादेव प्रमितः । 1.3.24
यथोदकं शुद्धे शुद्धमासिक्तं तादृगेव भवति । एवं मुनेर्विजानत आत्मा भवति गौतम ॥ 2.1.15	अविभागेन दृष्टत्वात् । 4.4.4
न प्राणेन नापानेन मर्त्यो जीवति कश्चन । इतरेण तु जीवन्तितद्योगात् । 1.1.31 यस्मिन्नेतावुपाश्रितौ ॥ 2.2.5	जीवमुख्यप्राणलिङ्गान्नेति चेन्नोपासात्रैविध्यादाश्रितत्वादिह
य एष सुप्तेषु जागर्ति कामं कामं पुरुषो निर्मिमाणः । तदेव शुक्रं तद्ब्रह्म तदेवामृतमुच्यते ॥ तस्मिँल्लोकाः श्रिताः सर्वे तदु नात्येति कश्चन । एतद्वै तत् ॥ 2.2.8	निर्मातारं चैके पुत्रादयश्च । 3.2.2
सूर्यो यथा सर्वलोकस्य चक्षु र्न लिप्यते चाक्षुषैर्बाह्यादोषैः । एकस्तथा सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा न लिप्यते लोकदुःखेन बाह्यः ॥ 2.2.11	स्मरन्ति च । 2.3.47

ऊर्ध्वमूलोऽवाक्शाख एषोऽश्वत्थः सनातनः । तदेव शुक्रं तद्ब्रह्म तदेवामृतमुच्यते । तस्मिँल्लोकाः श्रिताः सर्वे तदु नात्येति कश्चन । एतद्वै तत् ॥ 2.3.1	कम्पनात् । 1.3.39
यदिदं किं च जगत् सर्वं प्राण एजति निःसृतम् । महद्भयं वज्रमुद्यत् य एतद्धिदुरमृतास्ते भवन्ति ॥ 2.3.2	कम्पनात् । 1.3.39 दर्शयति च । 3.3.4 अधिकोपदेशात्तु बादरायणस्यैवं तद्दर्शनात् ॥ 3.4.8
तां योगमिति मन्यन्ते स्थिरामिन्द्रियधारणाम् । अप्रमत्तस्तदा भवति योगो हि प्रभवाप्ययौ ॥ 2.3.11	एतेन योगः प्रत्युक्तः । 2.1.3
अस्तीत्येवोपलब्धव्यस्तत्त्वभावेन चोभयोः । अस्तीत्येवोपलब्धस्य तत्त्वभावः प्रसीदति ॥ 2.3.13	दर्शनाच्च । 3.2.21 प्रकृतैतावत्त्वं हि प्रतिषेधति ततो ब्रवीति च भूयः । 3.2.22
यदा सर्वे प्रभिद्यन्ते हृदयस्येह ग्रन्थयः । अथ मर्त्योऽमृतो भवत्येतावद्वयनुशासनम् ॥ 2.3.15	वदतीति चेन्न प्राज्ञो हि प्रकरणात् । I.4.5
अद्भुष्टमात्रः पुरुषोऽन्तरात्मा सदा जनानां हृदये संनिविष्टः । तं स्वाच्छरीरात्प्रब्रहेन्मुञ्जादिवेषीकां धैर्येण । तं विद्याच्छुक्त्रममृतं तं विद्याच्छुक्त्रममृतमिति ॥ 2.3.17	हृद्यपेक्षया तु मनुष्याधिकारत्वात् । 1.3.25
मृत्युप्रोक्तां नचिकेतोऽथ लब्ध्वा विद्यामेतां योगविधिं च कृत्स्नम् । ब्रह्मप्राप्तो विरजोऽभूद्धिमृत्यु रन्योऽप्येवं यो विदध्यात्ममेव ॥ 2.3.18	एतेन योगः प्रत्युक्तः । 2.1.3

e. Kāṭhakoṇiṣad and Brahmasūtras (according to Madhva's tradition)

<i>Kāṭhakoṇiṣad</i>	<i>Brahmasūtras</i>
स्वर्गे लोके न भयं किचनस्ति न तत्र त्वं न जरया बिभेति । उभे तीर्त्वाऽश्नायापिपासे शोकातिगो मोदते स्वर्गलोके ॥ 1.1.12	स्वाययसम्पत्तोरन्यतरापेक्षमाविष्कृतं हि ॥ 4.4.16
सत्वमग्निं स्वर्गमध्येषु मृत्यो प्रब्रूहि त्वं श्रद्धधानाय मह्यम् । स्वर्गलोका अमृतत्वं भजन्त एतद् द्वितीयेन वृणे वरेण ॥ 1.1.13	त्रयाणामेव चैवमुपन्यासः प्रश्नश्च ॥ 1.4.7
प्र ते ब्रवीमि तदु मे निबोध स्वर्गमग्निं नचिकेतः प्रजानन् । अनन्तलोकाप्तिमथो प्रतिष्ठां विद्धि त्वमेतं निहितं गुहायाम् ॥ 1.1.14	त्रयाणामेव चैवमुपन्यासः प्रश्नश्च ॥ 1.4.7
येयं प्रेते विचिकित्सा मनुष्ये ऽस्तीत्येके नायमस्तीति चैके । एतद्विद्यामनुशिष्टस्त्वयाऽहं वराणामेष वरस्तृतीयः ॥	त्रयाणामेव चैवमुपन्यासः प्रश्नश्च ॥ 1.4.7
देवैरत्रापि विचिकित्सितं किल त्वं च मृत्यो यन्न सुज्ञेयमात्थ । वक्ता चास्य त्वादृगन्यो न लभ्यो नान्यो वरस्तुत्य एतस्य कश्चित् ॥ 1.1.22	त्रयाणामेव चैवमुपन्यासः प्रश्नश्च ॥ 1.4.7
नैषा तर्केण मतिरापनेया प्रोक्तान्येनैव सुज्ञानाय प्रेष्ठ । यां त्वमापः सत्यधृतिर्बतासि त्वादृङ् नो भूयान्नचिकेतः प्रष्टा ॥ 1.2.9	कामाच्च नानुमानापेक्षा ॥ 1.1.18

सर्वे वेदा यत्पदमामनन्ति तपांसि सर्वाणि च यद्वदन्ति । यदिच्छन्तो ब्रह्मचर्यं चरन्ति तत्ते पदं संग्रहेण ब्रवीम्योमित्येतत् ॥ 1.2.15	शास्त्रयोनित्वात् ॥ 1.1.3 ईक्षतेर्नाशब्दम् । 1.2.5 प्राणादयो वाक्यशेषात् । 1.4.13
अणोरपीयान्महतो महीया- नात्मास्य जन्तोर्निहितो गृहायाम् । तमक्रतुः पश्यति वीतशोको धातुप्रसादान्महिमानमात्मनः ॥ 1.2.20	अन्यभावव्यावृत्तेश्च । 1.3.12 वदतीति चेन्न प्राज्ञो हि । 1.4.5 प्रकाशवच्चावैशेष्यम् ॥ 3.2.25
अशरीरं शरीरेष्वनवस्थेष्ववस्थितम् । महान्तं विभुमात्मानं मत्वा धीरो न शोचति । 1.2.22	महद्वच्च । 1.4.8
नायमात्मा प्रवचनेन लभ्यो न मेघया न बहुना श्रुतेन । यमेवैष वृणुते तेन लभ्य स्तस्यैष आत्मा विवृणुते तनूं स्वाम् ॥ 1.2.23	अथातो ब्रह्मजिज्ञासा । 1.1.1 अम्बुवदग्रहणात् न तथात्वम् । 3.2.19
ऋतं पिबन्तौ सुकृतस्य लोके गुहां प्रविष्टौ परमे परार्धे(र्ध्ने) छायातपौ ब्रह्मविदो वदन्ति पञ्चाग्नयो ये च त्रिणाचिकेताः ॥ 1.3.1	प्रकरणाच्च । 1.2.10 असद्व्यपदेशान्नेति चेन्न धर्मान्तरेण वाक्यशेषात् । 2.1.18 गुहां प्रविष्टावात्मानौ हि तद्दर्शनात् । 1.2.11
यः सेतुरीजानानामक्षरं ब्रह्म यत् परम् । अभयं तितीर्षतां पारं नाचिकेताँ शकेमहि ॥ 1.3.2	विशेषणाच्च । 1.2.12 अन्तर उपपत्तेः । 1.2.13
विज्ञानसारथिर्यस्तु मनः प्रग्रहवान्नरः । सोऽध्वनः पारमाप्रोति तद्विष्णोः परमं पदम् ॥ 1.3.9	प्रकरणात् । 1.3.6; 1.4.6

इन्द्रियेभ्यः परा ह्यर्था अर्थेभ्यश्च परं मनः । मनसस्तु परा बुद्धिर्बुद्धेरात्मा महान्परः ॥ 1.3.10	ज्योतिरुपक्रमात्तु तथा ह्यधीयत एके ॥ 1.4.10
महतः परमव्यक्तमव्यक्तात्पुरुषः परः । पुरुषान्न परं किञ्चित्सा काष्ठा सा परा गतिः ॥ 1.3.11	आनुमानिकमप्येकेषामिति चेन्न शरीररूपकविन्यस्त- गृहीतेर्दर्शयति च । 1.4.1 तदधीनत्वादर्थवत् । 1.4.3
यच्छेद्वाङ्मनसी प्राज्ञस्तद्यच्छेज्ज्ञान आत्मनि । ज्ञानमात्मनि महति नियच्छेत्तद्यच्छेच्छान्त आत्मनि ॥ 1.3.13	अन्तरा विज्ञानमनसी क्रमेण तल्लिङ्गादिति चेन्नाविशेषात् । 2.3.15
अशब्दमस्पर्शमरूपमव्ययं तथाऽरसं नित्यमगन्धवच्च यत् । अनाद्यनन्तं महतः परं ध्रुवं निचाय्य तन्मृत्युमुखात् प्रमुच्यते ॥ 1.3.15	वदतीति चेन्न प्राज्ञो हि । 1.4.5 तत्तु समन्वयात् । 1.1.4 आकाशोऽर्थान्तरत्वादिव्यपदेशात् । 1.3.41
या प्राणेन संभवत्यदितिर्देवतामयी । गुहां प्रविश्य तिष्ठन्तीं या भूतेभिर्विजायत । एतद्वै तत् । 2.1.7	अवस्थितेरिति काशकृत्स्नः । 1.4.23 सम्भोगप्राप्तिरिति चेन्न वैशेष्यात् । 1.2.7
यतश्चोदेति सूर्योऽस्तं यत्र च गच्छति । तं देवाः सर्वे अर्पितास्तदु नात्येति कश्चन । एतद्वै तत् ॥ 2.1.9	स्वाययसम्पत्त्योरन्यतरापेक्षमाविष्कृतं हि । 4.4.16
मनसैवेदमाप्तव्यं नेह नानाऽस्ति किञ्चन । मृत्योः स मृत्युं गच्छति य इह नानेव पश्यति ॥ 2.1.11	स्वपक्षदोषाच्च । 2.1.30 प्रतिषेधाच्च । 3.2.31
अद्भुष्टमात्रः पुरुषो मध्य आत्मनि तिष्ठति । ईशानं भूतभव्यस्य न ततो विजुगुप्सते । एतद्वै तत् ॥ 2.1.12	शब्दादेव प्रमितः । 1.3.24 अपि स्मर्यते । 1.3.23

यथोदकं दुर्गे वृष्टं पर्वतेषु विधावति । एवं धर्मान् पृथक् पश्यंस्तानेवानु विधावति ॥ 2.1.14	स्वपक्षदोषाच्च । 2.1.30
यथोदकं शुद्धे शुद्धमासिक्तं तादृगेव भवति । एवं मुनेर्विजानत आत्मा भवति गौतम ॥ 2.1.15	भोक्त्रापत्तेरविभागश्चेत्त्याल्लोकवत् । 2.1.14
पुरमेकादशद्वारमजस्यावक्रचेतसः । अनुष्ठाय न शोचति विमुक्तश्च विमुच्यते । एतद्वै तत् । 2.2.1	भेदव्यपदेशाच्च । 1.1.17 अथातो ब्रह्मजिज्ञासा । 1.1.1
ऊर्ध्वं प्राणमुन्नयत्यपानं प्रत्यगस्यति । मध्ये वामनमासीनं विश्वे देवा उपासते ॥ 2.2.3	अपि स्मर्यते । 1.3.23 हृद्यपेक्षया तु मनुष्याधिकारत्वात् ॥ 1.3.25 अकरणत्वाच्च न दोषस्तथा हि दर्शयति । 2.4.1
हन्त त इदं प्रवक्ष्यामि गुह्यं ब्रह्म सनातनम् । यथा च मरणं प्राप्य आत्मा भवति गौतम ॥ 2.2.6	अनुकृतेस्तस्य च । 1.3.22
योनिमन्ये प्रपद्यन्ते शरीरत्वाय देहिन्ः । स्थाणुमन्येऽनुसंयन्ति यथाकर्म यथाश्रुतम् ॥ 2.2.7	आनुमानिकमप्येकेषामिति चेन्न शरीररूपकविन्यस्तगृहीतेर्दर्शयति च । 1.4.1
य एष सुप्तेषु जागर्ति कामं कामं पुरुषो निर्माणाः । तदेव शुक्रं तद्ब्रह्म तदेवामृतमुच्यते । तस्मिँल्लोकाः श्रिताः सर्वे तदु नात्येति कश्चन । एतद्वै तत् ॥ 2.2.8	निर्मातारं चैके पुत्रादयश्च । 3.2.2
अग्निर्यथैको भुवनं प्रविष्टो रूपं रूपं प्रतिरूपो बभूव । एकस्तथा सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा रूपं रूपं प्रतिरूपो बहिश्च ॥ 2.2.9	अनुकृतेस्तस्य च ॥ 1.3.22

एको वशी सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा एकं रूपं बहुधा यः करोति । तमात्मस्थं येऽनुपश्यन्ति धीरा- स्तेषां सुखं शाश्वतं नेतरेषाम् ॥ 2.2.12	अनुकृतेस्तस्य च । 1.3.22
नित्योऽनित्यानां चेतनश्चेतनाना- मेको बहूनां यो विदधाति कामान् । तमात्मस्थं येऽनुपश्यन्ति धीरा- स्तेषां शान्तिः शाश्वती नेतरेषाम् ॥ 2.2.13	अनुकृतेस्तस्य च । 1.3.22
तदेतदिति मन्यन्तेऽनिर्देश्यं परमं सुखम् । कथं नु तद्विजानीयां किमु भाति विभाति वा ॥ 2.2.14	अल्पश्रुतेरिति चेतदुक्तम् । 1.3.22 अनुकृतेस्तस्य च । 1.3.22
न तत्र सूर्यो भाति न चन्द्रतारकं नेमा विद्युतो भान्ति कुतोऽयमग्निः । तमेव भान्तमनुभाति सर्वं तस्य भासा सर्वमिदं विभाति ॥ 2.2.15	अनुकृतेस्तस्य च । 1.3.22 अपि स्मर्यते । 1.3.23
यदिदं किं च जगत् सर्वं प्राण एजति निःश्रुतम् । महद्भयं वज्रमुद्यतं य एतद्विदुरमृतास्ते भवन्ति ॥ 2.3.2	श्रवणाध्ययनार्थप्रतिषेधात्स्मृतेश्च । 1.3.38
शतं चैका च हृदयस्य नाड्य स्तासां मूर्धानमभिनिःश्रुतैका । तयोर्ध्वमायन्नमृतत्वमेति विषड्डन्त्या उत्क्रमणे भवन्ति ॥ 2.3.16	तदोकोऽग्रज्वलनं तत्प्रकाशितद्वारो विद्या सामर्थ्यात्तच्छेषगत्यनु- स्मृतियोगाश्च हार्दानुगृहीतः शताधिक्या । 4.2.17

II. Principles of Vedānta

(A) Introduction :

The entire literature of the Vedas comprising of rich material regarding the performance of ritual, also contains the esoteric teachings of philosophy. The Upaniṣads mark the culmination of the Vedic speculation, as such the Upaniṣadic philosophy literally is what the term *Vedānta* means. Hence, *Vedānta* is obviously that philosophy which takes its lead from the Upaniṣads. Precisely, the term *Vedānta* means “end of the *Veda*” (*veda+anta*). By considering the upaniṣads as having been the last section of *Brāhmaṇa* or *Āraṇyaka*, it is evident that the position they occupy in the Vedic literature is significant; and these upaniṣads have their place in the portion which is in fact, the end of the Vedic canon handed down by each branch. In this sense, the upaniṣads have been termed as *Vedānta*. Besides, the word *Vedānta* is used also in the sense of the “Ultimate purport of the Vedas” or “secret principle of the Vedas”. These meanings do bear homogeneity with the meaning of “final portion of the sacred canon of the Vedas.”

“*Vedānta* is regarded as the perfect system of the Hindus. Hinduism is the popular name for the religion of the *Vedānta*. It stands out as the most significantly, ‘Clear native philosophy of India.’ It is the most impressive attempt at system building made in India. It answers at once to the strict demands of metaphysics

and the deep requirements of a sound religion that does not surrender the claims of reason or the needs of humanity. *Vedānta* in one form or another has become a contemporary spiritual force working for the good of humanity.”¹

Besides the *Upaniṣads*, the *Vedānta* philosophy has an addition to itself the *Brahmasūtras* and *Bhagavadgīta*. Thus, the *Upaniṣads*, the *Brahmasūtras* and the *Bhagavadgīta* comprise what is considered to be the triple texts of perfect authority for the *Vedānta* philosophy. The *Upaniṣads* are the *Śruti* texts while the *Brahmasūtras* and the *Bhagavadgīta* are the *Smṛti* texts embodying the meaning of the former. Wide portions of these texts are concerned with niceties of language and it is mainly in later times that philosophers make bold to compose independent treatises in which the elements of the *Vedānta* philosophy are set forth according to the logic of the views themselves, rather in an order determined by that scriptural authority.

These triple texts of the *Vedānta* have been interpreted by the commentators with different emphasis in the way of defending their own schools of *Vedānta*. Of the Vedāntic schools, Śaṅkara’s Advaita system, Rāmānuja’s Viśiṣṭādvaita system and Madhva’s Dvaita system have been more prominent as they have large quantity of philosophical literature of sufficient weight and quality.

2. Śaṅkara’s Advaita Philosophy :

An inquiry into the nature of valid proofs in fact, is the beginning point in any system of Indian philosophy.

1. P. Nagaraja Rao, *Introduction to Vedānta*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1966, pp. 42-43

As such, each system of philosophy has given much priority to formulate the theory of *pramāṇas* and ascertain how its philosophical concepts are firmly based on the *pramāṇas*.

i. Concept of Pramāṇas :

Like Bhaṭṭa Mīmāṃsakas, the advaitins too accept the six *pramāṇas* :

- a) Perception (*Pratyakṣa*)
- b) Inference (*Anumāna*)
- c) Comparison (*Upamāna*)
- d) Verbal Testimony (*Āgama*)
- e) Presumption (*Arthāpatti*)
- f) Non-apprehension (*Anupalabdhi*)¹

a. Perception [*Pratyakṣa*]

In the *Vedāntaparibhāṣa*, the perception is defined as being the instrument of valid perceptual knowledge. And, according to the Advaita *Vedānta*, the perceptual knowledge is nothing but *cit* or *pure-consciousness*.² Despite the fact that the Pure-consciousness is beginningless pervading everywhere and devoid of sense-organs, it is revealed through the mental state – *Antahkaraṇa-vṛtti*. In case of perception of a pot, when eye is fixed on a pot, the mental state comes out through the eye, illuminates the pot by its own light

1. For details, see Swamy Madhavānanda, *Vedānta Paribhāṣā* of Dharmarāja Adhvarindra, Advaita Ashram, Calcutta, 1989, pp. 4-149
2. प्रत्यक्षप्रमायाः करणं प्रत्यक्षप्रमाणम् । प्रत्यक्षप्रमा चात्र चैतन्यमेव, “यत् साक्षादपरोक्षाद् ब्रह्म” इति श्रुतेः ।
Dharmarāja Adhvarindra, *Vedānta Paribhāṣā*, p. 8

and assumes its shape. Further, the *cit* within the pot manifests in the mental state, then the pot is seen.³

Manas is not Indriya :

Whether *Manas* is a sense-organ or not is a disputed question. Vacaspati Mishra holds that *Manas* is a sense organ. Śāṅkara in his commentary on the *Brahma-sūtras*, says that the scriptural texts hold the mind not to be a sense-organ, where as *Smṛti* texts characterise it as a sense-organ. Dharmarāja Adhvarindra regards *Manas* as not a sense-organ. *Manas* is an auxiliary to *Pramāṇa*. It is the locus but not the instrument of valid cognition. The *Kāṭhākopaniṣad* expressly declares that *Manas* is not a sense-organ “greater than the senses are the objects; greater than the objects is the mind.” [III.10]⁴

Kinds of Perception :

The perception is two-fold; one is *Savikalpaka* i.e. *Determinate* and the other being *Nirvikalpaka* i.e. *Indeterminate*. In the determinate perception, there is

3. यथा तडागोदकं छिद्रान्निर्गत्य कुल्यात्मना केदारान् प्रविश्य तद्देव चतुष्कोणाद्याकारं भवति, तथा तैजसमन्तःकरणमपि चक्षुरादिद्वारा निर्गत्य घटादिविषयदेशं गत्वा घटादिविषयाकारेण परिणमते । स एव परिणामो वृत्तिरित्युच्यते । ----- तथाच “अयं घटः” इति घटप्रत्यक्षस्थले घटाकारवृत्तेर्घटसंयोगितया घटावच्छिन्नचैतन्यस्य तद्दृश्यवच्छिन्नचैतन्यस्य चाभिन्नतया तत्र घटज्ञानस्य घटांशे प्रत्यक्षत्वम् । *Ibid.* p. 14-15
4. ननु अन्तःकरणस्येन्द्रियतयाऽतीन्द्रियत्वात् कथं प्रत्यक्षविषयतेति ? उच्यते । न तावदन्तःकरणमिन्द्रियमित्यत्र मानमस्ति । “मनः षष्ठानीन्द्रियाणि” इति भगवद्गीतावचनं प्रमाणमिति चेत्, न, अनिन्द्रियेणापि मनसा षट्त्वसंख्यापूरणाविरोधात् ।----- “इन्द्रियेभ्यः परा ह्यर्था अर्थेभ्यश्च परं मनः” इत्यादिश्रुत्या मनसोऽनिन्द्रियत्वावगमश्च । *Ibid.*, p. 11

distinction between the thing determined, the jar and the determining attribute i.e. jariness. In an example 'I know the jar', the object of knowledge i.e. jar and its qualifying attribute i.e. jariness are apprehended. Thus it is a cognition apprehending relatedness. In the Indeterminate perception, there is no apprehension of relatedness. All determinate perception is the knowledge arising from the sentences like "This is that Devadatta." "Thou art That" etc.⁵

Perception is again said to be two-fold. That is, *Jiva-Sākṣi* or the witness within the individual self and *Īśvara-Sākṣi* or the witness within God. As has been stated in the *Vedāntaparibhāṣa*, Jiva is nothing but ultimate consciousness limited by the *Antahkaraṇa* or the mind; and *Sākṣi* however is the consciousness that has the *Antahkaraṇa* as its limiting adjunct [*Upādhi*].

When the cosmic illusion or *Māyā* is a qualifying attribute of consciousness, that consciousness is called God; and when the cosmic illusion is limiting adjunct or *Upādhi* of the consciousness, it is called the witness in God.⁶

-
5. तच्च प्रत्यक्षं द्विविधम्, सविकल्पकनिर्विकल्पकभेदात् । तत्र सविकल्पकं वैशिष्ट्यावगाहिज्ञानम् । यथा "घटमहं जानामि" इत्यादिज्ञानम् । निर्विकल्पकन्तु संसर्गानवगाहि ज्ञानम् । यथा "सोऽयम् देवदत्तः," "तत्त्वमसि" इत्यादिवाक्यजन्यं ज्ञानम् । *Ibid.*, p. 32
6. तच्च प्रत्यक्षं पुनर्द्विविधम् - जीवसाक्षी ईश्वरसाक्षी चेति । तत्र जीवो नाम अन्तःकरणावच्छिन्नं चैतन्यम्, तत्साक्षी तु अन्तःकरणोपहितं चैतन्यम् । अन्तःकरणस्य विशेषणत्वोपाधित्वाभ्यामनयोर्भेदः । ----- ईश्वरसाक्षी तु मायोपहितं चैतन्यम् । तच्चैकम्, तदुपाधिभूतमायया एकत्वात् । *Ibid.* p. 37-39

b. Inference [Anumāna]

Inference is the instrument of inferential knowledge (*Anumiti*). This inferential knowledge is produced by the knowledge of invariable concomitance (*Vyāpti*). This invariable concomitance is the co-existence of the probandum (*Sādhyā*) with the probans [*Liṅga or Hetu*] in all the substratums where in the probans may be found. The instrument which generates the inferential knowledge is *Vyāptijñāna*. The residual impression of *Vyāpti* and the perception of the probans (*Liṅgadarśana*) are the causes of inference.⁷

Advaitins admit only one type of inference i.e. *Anvayī* or the method of agreement in presence. It admits other two types of Inference such as *Svārthānumāna* and *Parārthānumāna*. The former is meant for oneself and the latter for convincing others, which requires the help of syllogisms.⁸

The Advaita *Vedānta* advocates only three premises in the *Parārthānumāna*, namely,

- 1] *Pratijñā* - hill is fiery.
- 2] *Hetu* - because it has smoke;
- 3] *Udāharaṇa* - as in the kitchen.

OR the other three namely, *Udāharaṇa*, *Upanaya* and *Nigamana*.⁹

-
7. अनुमितिकरणमनुमानम् । अनुमितिश्च व्याप्तिज्ञानत्वेन व्याप्तिज्ञानजन्या । व्याप्तिज्ञानानुव्यवसायादेवस्तत्त्वेन तज्जन्यत्वाभावात्प्रामुमितित्वम् । *Ibid.*, p. 68
8. तच्चानुमानमन्वयिरूपमेकमेव । न तु केवलान्वयि, सर्वस्यापि धर्मस्यास्मन्मते ब्रह्मनिष्ठात्यन्ताभावप्रतियोगित्वेन अत्यन्ताभावप्रतियोगिसाध्यकत्वरूपकेवलान्वयित्वस्यासिद्धेः । *Ibid.*, p. 73
9. तच्चानुमानं स्वार्थपरार्थभेदेन द्विविधम् । तत्र स्वार्थानुक्तमेव, परार्थन्तु न्याय →

The *Vedānta* does establish only subjective and formal validity for inference but not any material validity.

c. Comparison [*Upamāna*]

Both the Mīmāṃsaka and the Advaitins admit *Upamāna* as being an independent means of valid knowledge. It is otherwise called analogical reasoning. The instrument of the valid knowledge of similarity is comparison. It is exemplified thus : A person who has seen a cow in the town, goes to the forest, finds the *gavaya* and notices its similarity to the cow. He then compares the cow with *gavaya* and entertains the conviction that the cow resembles the *gavaya*. The conviction itself is *Upamiti* which is nothing but the knowledge of similarity. And noticing cow's similarity in *gavaya* seen in the forest, is the instrument.¹⁰

d. Verbal Testimony [*Āgama*]

Verbal testimony or *Āgama* is the fourth means of valid knowledge as accepted by the Advaitins. Like the Mīmāṃsakas, the Advaitins too regard the Truth as revealed by the scriptures. Therefore, this means of knowledge has been vitally important. That *Āgama* is means of valid knowledge in which the relation among

→ साध्यम् । न्यायो नामावयवसमुदायः । अवयवश्च त्रय एव - प्रतिज्ञाहेतूदाहरण-
रूपाः, उदाहरणोपनयनिगमनरूपा वा । *Ibid.*, p. 75

10. सादृश्यप्रमाकरणमुपमानम् । तथा हि - नगरेषु दृष्टगोपिण्डस्य पुरुषस्य वनं गतस्य
गवयेन्द्रियसन्निकर्षे सति भवति प्रतीतिः "अयं पिण्डो गोसदृशः" इति । तदनन्तरश्च
भवति निश्चयः "अनेन सदृशी मदीया गौः" इति । तत्रान्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां गवयनिष्ठ
गोसादृश्यज्ञानं करणम्, गोनिष्ठगवयसादृश्यज्ञानं फलम् । *Ibid.*, p. 83

the meanings of the words intended by the sentence is not contradicted by any means of valid knowledge like perception. The knowledge arises from such sentence due to four causes :

- i) Expectancy [*Akāṅkṣā*]
- ii) Consistency [*Yogyatā*]
- iii) Proximity [*Āsatti*]
- iv) Knowledge of purport [*Tātparya-Jñāna*]¹¹

e. Presumption [*Arthāpatti*]

This means of knowledge consists in the postulation of an explanatory fact [*Upapādaka*] through the knowledge of a thing to be explained [*Upapādyā*]. For instance, "Devadatta who is alive, is not at home." Here it is known that Devadatta is alive but not found at home. In order to reconcile the two facts of his being alive and absent from house, we assume that he must be somewhere outside his house. Thus, the knowledge of a thing to be explained i.e. the absence from home of the person who is alive, is instrumental to the knowledge of what explains i.e. Devadatta exists somewhere outside the house, and this itself is the result.¹²

f. Non-Apprehension [*Anupalabdhi*]

This means of valid knowledge which consists in *non-apprehension*, is the distinctive cause of that

11. यस्य वाक्यस्य तात्पर्यविषयीभूतसंसर्गो मानान्तरेण न बाध्यते तद्वाक्यं प्रमाणम् ।
वाक्यजन्यज्ञाने च आकांक्षायोग्यताऽऽसत्तयस्तात्पर्यज्ञानञ्चेति चत्वारि कारणानि ।
Ibid., p. 86

12. तत्रोपपाद्यज्ञानेनोपपादक कल्पनमर्थापत्तिः । तत्रोपपाद्यज्ञानं करणम्, उपपादकज्ञानं
फलम् । येन विना यदनुपपन्नं तत् तत्रोपपाद्यम् । यस्याभावे यस्यानुपपत्तिः →

experience of non-existence [*Abhāva*] which is not generated by an instrumental [*Karaṇa*] of knowledge. As there is no contact of sense-organ with non-existence, the cognition of non-existence does not arise from sense-organ. The cognition of non-existence arises from sense-organ. The cognition of non-existence arises when a perceptible object is not seen. For example, when there is a jar on brightly lit ground, there is an apprehension of the jar. If the jar is not perceived on such ground, non-existence of the jar is ascertained. And this non-existence of the jar is to be known through non-apprehension.

The author of the *Vedāntaparibhāṣa* mentions four kinds of non-existence :

- i) Prior non-existence [*Pragabhāva*]
- ii) Annihilative non-existence [*Pradhvaṃsabhāva*]
- iii) Absolute non-existence [*Atyantābhāva*]
- iv) Mutual non-existence [*Anyonyābhāva*]

The cognition of the above four types of non-existence is through non-apprehension which is possessed of capacity. Hence non-apprehension is a separate means of valid knowledge.¹³

→ तत् तत्रोपपादकम् । यथा रात्रिभोजनेन विना दिवाऽभुञ्जानस्य पीनत्वमनुपपन्नम्, इति तादृशं पीनत्वमुपपाद्यम्, यथा वा रात्रिभोजनस्याभावे तादृशपीनत्वस्यानुपपत्तिः, इति रात्रिभोजनमुपपादकम् । *Ibid.*, p. 116.

13. ज्ञानकरणाजन्याभावानुभवासाधारणकारणमनुपलब्धिरूपं प्रमाणम् । ----- ननु "भूतले घटो न" इत्याद्यभावानुभवस्थले भूतलांशे प्रत्यक्षत्वमुभयसिद्धिमिति तत्र वृत्तिनिर्गमनस्यावश्यकत्वेन भूतलावच्छिन्नचैतन्यवत् तन्निष्ठघटाभाववच्छिन्नचैतन्यस्यापि प्रमात्रभिन्नतया घटाभावस्य प्रत्यक्षतैव सिद्धान्तेऽपि इति चेत्, सत्यम्, →

ii. Concept Of The World

The validity of means of knowledge which has been explained so far, is of two types. Of the two, the first type of validity belongs to all means of knowledge (except the verbal testimony) that set forth the empirical reality. Because prior to the realisation of one's identify with Brahman, there is no sublation of the objects of those means of knowledge during the empirical state of existence. The second type of validity however, belongs to the scriptural and the Vedāntic texts that have the identity of the individual soul with the Absolute Brahman for their purport. Accordingly, the consideration of nature and scope of the objects that have phenomenal state of existence is taken up here.

a. Three-Fold Existence

The Advaita *Vedānta* regards the three orders of reality or existence.

i) *Pāramārthika* or Absolute

This existence represents the Absolute Brahman which remains uncontradicted at all times.

ii) *Vyāvahārika* or Phenomenal

This existence belongs to the ether etc. This existence abides till the realisation of the absolute reality i.e. one's identity with Brahman.

→ अभावप्रतीतिः प्रत्यक्षत्वेऽपि तत्कारणस्या-नुपलब्धेरमान्तरत्वात् । नहि फलीभूत-ज्ञानस्य प्रत्यक्षत्वे तत्कारणस्य प्रत्यक्षप्रमाणतानियतत्वमस्ति ।----- स चाभावश्चतुर्विधः- प्रागभावः प्रध्वंसाभावोऽत्यन्ताभावोऽन्योन्याभावश्चेति । ---- एवं चतुर्विधानामभावानां योग्यानुपलब्ध्या प्रतीतिः, तत्रानुपलब्धिरमान्तरम् । *Ibid.*, p. 125-143

iii) *Prātibhāsika* or Illusory

This existence refers to silver in the conch-shell, which disappears as soon as the obstacles to a proper vision, such as distance etc. are removed.

Thus, the last two kinds of existence are false impressions due to defect. The distinction between phenomenal and illusory existence is that the defect of the phenomenal perception gets removed after salvation, whereas the defect of illusory perception is vanished as soon as the obstacle is removed. Hence illusory experience lasts for a much shorter period than the phenomenal experience.

b. Nature of the world-appearance

The Advaita theory of the world is founded on the basis of the doctrine of *Ajñāna* or *Avidya*. The world of multiplicity is false. But it does not mean that the world is absolutely non-existent like horn of hare or the son of a barren woman. The world is only relatively *Mithya*. As long as the knowledge of Absolute Brahman is not obtained, the world of experience is considered to be real.

The individual souls on account of their inherent *Ajñāna* consider themselves to be different from Brahman and mistake It for this world of plurality. It is just like mistaking a rope for a snake.¹⁴ Thus, it is *Ajñāna* that binds individual soul in the circle of birth and death. As *Ajñāna* plays an important role in the sphere of the world-experience, its nature needs to be known at this juncture.

14. असर्पभूतायां रज्जौ सर्पशिपवत् वस्तुनि अवस्त्वारोपः अध्यारोपः | वस्तु सच्चिदानन्दाद्वयं ब्रह्मः अज्ञानादिसकलजडसमूहः अवस्तु | – Dr. K.B. Archak, *Vedāntasara and its Teachings*, Dharwad, 1995, p-9

c. Nature of *Ajñāna*

Ajñāna being the cause of all illusions is beginningless and positive (*bhāvarūpa*) and removable by the knowledge of the Absolute Reality. It is said to be beginningless as it is associated with the pure-consciousness which is beginningless. Based on the fact of positivity of *Ajñāna*, it cannot be urged that it is real. Because, it ceases to exist at the dawn of knowledge of the non-dual self which means liberation. If it is unreal it should never appear like the son of a barren woman or sky-flower. If it is inexplicable,¹⁵ it then becomes impossible to know the nature thereof. Hence, it obviously comes to the stage of non-existence.

In order to subvert these ideas, the Advaitins hold that *Ajñāna* is heterogeneous in character and is composed of the three qualities *Sattva*, *Rajas* and *Tamas*. Due to its association with pure-consciousness it comes to be known as positive. But the positivity of *Ajñāna* does not mean here the opposite of negation (*Abhāva*). It is called positive because it is not a mere negation. Thus, it is not the absence of apprehension but it is mis-apprehension. This is the basis of experience such as 'I am an ignorant.'

Ajñāna is only one in true sense. Yet it is felt to be many owing to its association with many individual souls. This idea is further made clear by accepting two categories of *Ajñāna*, one being the collective (*Samaṣṭi*) and the other Distributive (*Vyaṣṭi*).¹⁶

15. अज्ञानं तु सदसद्भयामनिर्वचनीयं त्रिगुणात्मकं ज्ञानविरोधि भावरूपं यत्किञ्चिदिति वदन्ति | *Ibid.*, p-9

16. इदमज्ञानं समष्टिव्यष्ट्यभिप्रायेण एकमनेकमिति च व्यवहियते | *Ibid.*, p. 9

d. Power of Ajñāna

Ajñāna has two-fold power. One is the power of concealment (*Āvaraṇa-śakti*) and the other power of projection (*vikṣepa-śakti*). It is the power of concealment which conceals the *Sat-cit-ānanda-svarūpa* of Brahman. It is the *Power of Projection* which lets the entire universe proceed from Brahman. These two are different sides of the same *Ajñāna*, and they never separate from each other. The Absolute Brahman though is declared to be undiscerned (*Aparicchinnā*), Self-luminous (*Svaprakāśa*), All-full being partless (*Akhaṇḍa-paripūrṇa*), gets its *svarūpa* concealed by *Ajñāna*. But how? In this connection, an example of a small cloud covering the disc of the Sun may be given. Here, it is not the Sun which gets covered by a small cloud. The cloud obscures the path of the vision of the beholder. The Sun remains always bright, uncovered by any veil. So too, *Ajñāna* though in fact, does not have the capacity of concealing Brahman, obscures the intellect of the Self. As such it does not come within Soul's experience. Ātman is neither bound nor released. It is the working of *Ajñāna* obscuring one's intellect. As a result of concealing power of *Ajñāna*, soul experiences all mundane conditions as an agent, an enjoyer etc.¹⁷

Furthermore, when the Absolute Brahman is conditioned by the power of projection of *Ajñāna*, It comes to be called the cause of the universe. This power

17. अस्याज्ञानस्य आवरणविक्षेपनामकमस्ति शक्तिद्वयम् । आवरणशक्तिस्तावत् अल्पोऽपि मेघः अनेकयोजनायतमादित्यमण्डलमवलोकयितुं नयनपथापिधायकतया यथा आच्छादयति इव तथाज्ञानं परिच्छिन्नमपि आत्मानमपरिच्छिन्नम् असंसारिणमवलोकयितुंबुदिपिधायकतया आच्छादयति इव तादृशं सामर्थ्यम् । *Ibid.*, p. 11

by itself projects ether and the world of multiplicity, on the Ātman, just as *Ajñāna* regarding a rope, by its own power raises up the form of a snake, on the rope which is covered by it. Thus, *Ajñāna* with its two-fold power finds Ātman as its locus (*Adhiṣṭhāna*) and the object (*Viśaya*) as well; and further, it conceals the lustrous nature of Ātman and projects Jiva, Īśvara and Jagat.¹⁸

e. Order of the World-creation

At the beginning of creation, Īśvara associated with *Ajñāna* attended by its projective power, first conceives in its mind the entire universe consisting of names and forms and resolves "I should do this". For, the *Chāndogya* text states "It reflected; let Me multiply, let Me be effectively born" (VI.ii.3). From this Īśvara, non-quintuplicated (*Apañcikṛta*) five elements signified by their *Tanmātras*, are produced. Of these, the property of the ether is sound (*śabda*); of the Air, Sound and Touch (*sparsā*); of the fire, sound, touch and colour (*rūpa*); of the water, sound, touch, colour taste and smell (*gandha*).¹⁹ Sound is not the property of the ether

18. अनया एव आवरणशक्त्या अविच्छिन्नस्यात्मनः कर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्व सुखदुःख-मोहात्मकः तुच्छसंसारभावनापि सम्भाव्यते यथा स्वाज्ञानेन आवृतायां रज्ज्वां सर्पत्वसम्भावना । विक्षेपशक्तिस्तु यथा रज्ज्वज्ञानं स्वावृतरज्जौ स्वशक्त्या सर्पादिकमुद्भावनयति । एवमज्ञानमपि स्वावृतात्मनि विक्षेपशक्त्या आकाशादिप्रपञ्चमुद्भावनयति, तादृशं सामर्थ्यम् । *Ibid.*, p.11
19. तमः प्रधानविक्षेपशक्तिमदज्ञानोपहितचैतन्यादाकाशः, आकाशाद्वायुः वायोरग्निः, अग्नेरापः, अद्भ्यः पृथिवी च उत्पद्यते, "एतस्मादात्मन आकाशः सम्भूतः (तौ उप० 2.1.1) इत्यादिश्रुतेः । तेषु जाड्याधिक्यदर्शनात् तमःप्राधान्यं तत्कारणस्य । तदानीं सत्त्वस्जस्तमांसि कारणगुणप्रक्रमेण तेष्वकादिषु उत्पद्यन्ते । एतान्येव सूक्ष्मभूतानि तन्मात्राणि अपञ्चीकृतानि चोच्यन्ते । *Ibid.*, p. 12

alone, as it is found in other elements also. These five elements being the effects of cosmic *Māyā* which is made up of the three ingredients, are composed of those three ingredients *sattva*, taken singly, are produced in order, the five sense-organs. That is, from *sattva* essence of the ether, the ear is produced; from *sattva* essence of the fire, the eye; from the *sattva* essence of the water, the tongue; from the *sattva* essence of the earth, the nose. And, from these five elements that characterised by *sattva* quality taken in combination, are produced the mind (*Manas*), the intellect (*Buddhi*), the ego (*Ahaṅkāra*) and the *citta*.²⁰

Similarly, from these same five elements taken singly, as particularly possessed of the ingredient of *Rajas* are produced in order, the five organs of action. And from the same five elements taken in combination, possessed of *Rajas* quality, the five vital airs are produced. Of these, *Prāṇa Vāyu* moves forward and has its seat in the region of nose etc. *Apāna Vāyu* is that which moves downwards and has its seat in the region of the anus (*pāyu*) etc. *Vyāna Vāyu* is what moves in all directions and pervades the whole body. *Udāna Vāyu* is that which moves upwards and helps the soul's departure from the body, and has its seat in the region of the throat. *Samāna Vāyu* is what

20. ज्ञानेन्द्रियाणि श्रोत्र-त्वक्-चक्षु-जिह्वा-घ्राणाख्यानि । एतानि आकाशादीनां सात्त्विकान्शेभ्यः व्यस्तेभ्यः पृथक् पृथक् क्रमेणोत्पद्यन्ते । बृद्धिर्नाम निश्चयात्मिकान्तःकरणवृत्तिः । मनो नाम सङ्कल्प विकल्पात्मिकान्तःकरणवृत्तिः । अनयोरेव चित्ताहङ्कारयोः अन्तर्भावः । अनुसन्धानात्मिकान्तःकरणवृत्तिः चित्तम् । अभिमानात्मिकान्तःकरणवृत्तिः अहङ्कारः । एते पुनः आकाशादिगतसात्त्विकान्शेभ्यो मिलितेभ्यो उत्पद्यन्ते । एतेषां प्रकाशात्मकत्वात् सात्त्विकान्शकार्यत्वम् । *Ibid.* p.12

metabolises the food etc. which we eat and drink and has its seat in the region of the navel.²¹

Further, out of the five elements mentioned above, is made the (*liṅga śarīra*) consisting of the five sense-organs, the five organs of action, the *Manas*, the *Buddhi*, and the five vital airs as said above. This subtle body helps the soul's passage to other world and lasts till liberation.

There are two types of the subtle body, superior and inferior. The superior type of subtle body is the subtle body of *Hiraṇyagarbha*. The subtle body of *Hiraṇyagarbha* is called *Mahat-tattva*. He is the first individual to be born and is different from *Brahmā*, *Viṣṇu* and *Śiva*. The inferior one is the subtle body of an individual soul and his body is called the ego. (*Ahaṅkāra*).

And out of these non-quintuplicated five elements as particularly possessed of the ingredients of *Tamas*, gross elements are produced by the working of quintuplication (*Pañcikaṛaṇa*) of the subtle elements. According to the will power of *Īśvara*, all five elements combine with one another in a fixed ratio to make themselves perceived in the phenomenal world.²²

21. वायवः प्राणापानव्यानोदानसमानाः । प्राणो नाम प्राग्गमनवान् नासाग्रस्थानवर्ती । अपानो नाम अवाग्गमनवान् पाय्वादिस्थानवर्ती । व्यानो नाम विष्वग्गमनवान् अखिलशरीरवर्ती । उदानो नाम कण्ठस्थानीय ऊर्ध्वगमनवान् उत्क्रमणवायुः । समानो नाम शरीरमध्यगोऽशितपीतान्नादिसमीकरणकरः । *Ibid.*, p.12

22. पञ्चानां पञ्चात्मकत्वे समानेऽपि तेषु च "वैशेष्यान्तु तद्वादस्तद्वादः" (ब्र.सू. 2.4.22) इतिन्यायेन आकाशादिव्यपदेशः सम्भवति । तदानीमाकाशे शब्दोऽभिव्यज्यते, वायौ शब्दस्पर्शावग्नौ शब्दस्पर्शरूपाण्यप्सु शब्दस्पर्शरूपरसाः, पृथिव्यां शब्दस्पर्श-रूपरसगन्धाश्च । *Ibid.*, p.14

f. World appearance as Illusory

The theory of world-appearance as illusory has been technically called *Adhyāropa* or *Adhyāsa* i.e., superimposition. The superimposition or an erroneous cognition is one whose content is contradicted by a subsequent cognition. A person sees a rope as snake due to illusion. His cognition of snake is invalid as it is falsified by subsequent experience when he sees it as a rope. Thus, it is superimposing upon the real what is not real.

As the world of space, time etc. is not present at all times, it cannot be real. The objects of the world never are, but always become. In the words of Śaṅkara "That which is eternal cannot have beginning and whatever has a beginning is not eternal."²³ This suggests that whatever is non-eternal is unreal and the eternal one is real. Since the world is the projection of Īśvara, it becomes endowed with a quality of beginning. As world has a beginning, it is not eternal hence is not real.

But, this world of experience cannot be said all at once to be unreal. Because our perception grasps the world-appearance in its manifold aspects. It does not disprove its reality. Therefore, it may be asked as to how we can deny its reality. The *Vedānta* gives the solution that the notion of reality or unreality cannot be adjudged by sense-organs. We perceive the Sun to be very small. This perception goes false when he is proved to be very big by means of inference. Consequently, our

23. नित्यत्वान्मोक्षस्य | न हि नित्यं किञ्चिदारभ्यते | लोके यदारब्धं तदनित्यमिति | Śaṅkara's *Taittiriya Upaniṣad-bhāṣya*, Ananda Ashram, Pune, 1977, p.6.

perception being contradicted by inference, becomes erroneous. The cause of erroneous knowledge is nescience of it.

When the locus of *Avidyā* i.e., the Supreme Reality is concealed by *Avidyā*, the association with *Antaḥkaraṇavṛttis* becomes necessary for removing the veil of *Avidyā*. As soon as complete realization of the blissful self-luminous Brahman is acquired, all illusions vanish themselves. This vanishing of phenomena of the world-appearance means nothing but the realization of the Absolute Reality.²⁴

Moreover, one's illusory experience of the world is different from that of the other. Because, in accordance with one's good or bad deeds done in the past life and in accordance with one's impressions (*Samskāras*) of the past life, one gets a particular kind of world-experience, and one's impressions do not affect the formation of the illusory experience of another. The phenomena of world-appearance exists in a certain unknowable state even before one's cognition. Therefore, the experience of the world-appearance is not completely a subjective creation for every person.

Besides, the world-appearance is not as illusory as the perception of silver in the nacre. Because, the latter type of illusion is called *prātibhāsika* as it is contradicted by other later experience. But the illusion of the world appearance does not get contradicted in

24. समस्तस्य प्रपञ्चस्य मायामात्रत्वम् | प्रोक्तु ब्रह्मात्मत्वदर्शनात् वियदादिप्रपञ्चो व्यवस्थितरूपो भवति | Śaṅkara *Brahmasūtra-bhāṣya* - III.ii.4. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi - 1985, p. 347

the empirical level. Therefore the illusoriness of the world-appearance is called *Vyāvahārika*. This world-appearance is *Asat* as it does not continue to exist at all times, and it disappears at the dawn of knowledge of Brahman. Moreover, the world of manifold nature is *sat*, since it exists, for a time. But one and the same object cannot be both *sat* and *asat*. Hence the falsehood of the world-appearance is neither *sat* nor *asat* in an absolute sense, therefore it is *sadasadvilakṣaṇa* which means inexplicable. It is in this sense the world-appearance has been regarded as illusory.

In addition to this, the Advaita theory of the world-appearance as illusory has rational foundation. Not only the revealed scriptures, but also perception and reasoning as well prove the illusory nature of the world. The basic point of consideration is that the effect is non-different from the cause. The perception tells us that there is anything other than clay in pot made of clay. A pot cannot be separated from the clay. The effect does not exist without cause. Hence it is not legitimate to suppose that effect is a new thing as it is produced now. It persists in substance always in the material cause. It is even unwise to think of non-existent entity coming into existence. If it could be ever possible, then pressing oil out of sand would have become possible. But it is not so. The effect therefore has to be admitted to be non-different from the cause.²⁵

25. 1) इतश्च कारणादनन्यत्वं कार्यस्य, यत्कारणं भाव एव कारणस्य कार्यमुपलभ्यते, नाभावे | Vide. Śaṅkara *bhāṣya* on *Bra. Su.* II.i.15; p. 202
2) मृध्व्यतिरेकेण मृक्षो यथा अन्यद् घटाद्याकारेण परिणमयितृकुलादिनिमित्त-कारणं दृष्टम्, तथा सद्ध्यतिरेकेण सतः सहकारिकारणं द्वितीयं वस्त्वन्तरं →

Another important point is that the change of form does not imply the change in reality. The form is but a state of the material or substance and it cannot be separated from the latter even in thought. Therefore, it is not reasonable to think that perception of a change in form as a change of reality. Devadatta and his sitting or standing is recognised as identical. Thus a form or quality is not distinct from substance.²⁶ So any distinction between quality and its substance would be indefensible.

- प्रासं प्रतिषिद्यते अद्वितीयम् इति द्वितीयं वस्त्वन्तरं विद्यत इत्यद्वितीयम् || Śaṅkara *bhāṣya* on *Chan.Up.* Holenarasipur 1956, VI.II.1. p.658
- 3) यदिदं किंच | तत्सृष्ट्वा | तदेवानुप्राविशत् | तदनु प्रविश्य | सच्च त्यज्वाभवत् | Śaṅkara's commentary - (*Tatti. Up.* II.6)
तदेवेदमाकाशादिकारणं कार्येसृष्ट्वा तदनुप्रविष्टमिवान्तर्गुहायां बुद्धौ द्रष्ट श्रोतृमन्तु विज्ञानित्येवं विशेषवदुलभ्यते | p.78
- 4) नेवेह किञ्चनाग्र आसीन्मृत्युनैवेदमावृतमासीत् | *Brh. Up.* I.ii.1; Śaṅkara's commentary -
तस्मात् येन आवृतं कारणेन यच्च आवृतं कार्यं प्रागुत्पत्तेः तदुभयं आसीत् | श्रुतेः प्रामाण्यात् | अनुमेयत्वाच्च | p.28
- 5) विकारो हि सः | विकारः च व्यभिचरति, यथा घटादि संस्थानं चक्षुषा निरूप्यमाणं मृद्व्यतिरेकेण अनुपलब्धेः असत् तथा सर्वो विकारः कारण-व्यतिरेकेण अनुपलब्धेः असन् | जन्मप्रध्वंसाभ्यां प्राग् उर्ध्वं च अनुपलब्धेः | Vidyavachaspati. V. Panoli, "Gita in Śaṅkara's own words. The Mathrubhumi Printing & Publishing Co.Ltd., Calicut 1990, Part-I, p.56
26. युक्तेः शब्दान्तराञ्च || Śaṅkara *bhāṣya* on *Bra. Su.* II.i.18
तत्रेदंशब्दाच्चस्य कार्यस्य प्रागुत्पत्तेः
सच्छब्दवाच्येन कारणेन सामानाधिकरण्यस्य
श्रूयमाणत्वात्सत्त्वानन्यत्वे प्रसिध्यतः | यदि तु प्रागुत्पत्तेरसत्कार्यं
स्यात्पश्चोत्पद्यमानं कारणे समवेयात्तदान्यत्कारणात्स्यात् |
Śaṅkara's commentary - p.207

Pure Being, the common cause of the entire world is itself formless though appearing in various forms. It is infinite though it appears in all finite forms. In fact, consciousness is present in every appearance of existence. When we perceive clay modifying into a pot, our clay-consciousness is changed into pot consciousness.²⁷

Thus all these arguments constitute a strong rational foundation of the Advaita theory of world-appearance as illusory.

iii. Concept Of Brahman

Śaṅkara believes and posits the reality of only one category and that is nothing besides Brahman. All that is *Brahman*. It is non-dual. This doctrine of Brahman has been established on the authority of the scriptural texts.

Śaṅkara's Absolute Brahman is not substance but is the pure spirit. As there is nothing but Brahman, It cannot be defined in terms of categories. Brahman is beyond the sphere of the relational ways of knowledge. It is impersonal transcendent being. It is unthinkable in terms of predicates. It is the seer of the objects. The sights are many but the seer is one. It has no *Jāti* no *Guṇa*. It does not undergo any change. It is existence itself. It is identical with the self of all beings. It is neither a subject nor an object, nor even the unity of the subject and object. It is an unchanging indeterminate and subject-objectless consciousness. The statement say

27. न सतः सदन्तरमुत्पद्यते | किं तर्हि सदेव संस्थानान्तरेणावतिष्ठते | यथा सर्पः कुण्डली भवति | यथा च मृत् चूर्णपिण्डघटकपालादिप्रभेदैः | Śaṅkara's *bhāṣya* on *Chan. up.*, Holenarasipur, 1956, V.ii.2. p.669

that Brahman cannot be described, does not mean that It does not exist. It can be known indirectly, and realised directly through spiritual experience.

a. Aspects of Brahman

Śaṅkara formulates two types of definitions with regard to two aspects of Brahman. One is *svarūpa-lakṣaṇa* and the other being *Tatastha-lakṣaṇa*. The first definition speaks of the essential nature of Brahman, which is of the nature of Existence (*sat*) Knowledge (*cit*) and Bliss (*ānanda*). In fact, these are not so much the attributes of Brahman. The description of these phrases has to be negatively interpreted. That is, Brahman is not unreality, nor ignorance nor sorrow. Thus, in the light of appositional construction, if those phrases are understood the true essence of the *svarūpa-lakṣaṇa* of Brahman can be obtained. Moreover, there is no distinction between the quality and substance in Brahman. The Absolute Brahman which is spoken of as *Sat*, *Cit* and *Ānanda* is same as *Nirguṇa* Brahman. That is, the Absolute Brahman is attributeless (*Nirguṇa*), without any activity or movement (*Niṣkriya*), without any part (*Niravayava*), unconditioned (*Nirupādhika*), having no distinguishing element in It (*Nirviśeṣa*) and having in Itself no difference either *sajātiya*, *vi-jātiya* or *svagata*.

Tatastha-lakṣaṇa demarcates an object from the rest by indicating some accidental qualifications. For instance, when showing a particular house to a strange man. We point it out to the crow which is sitting on the roof. A sitting crow is not an essential character of the house. It only serves to distinguish the object while not being originally related to the defined object.

Śaṅkara gives an ordinary example of actor to illustrate both the essential nature and accidental nature of Brahman. That is, a shepherd appears on the stage in the role of a king, wages war, conquers a country and rules it. The description of the actor as shepherd gives what he is from the real point of view. It is an essential description. But the description of him as a king, ruler and conqueror, is applied to him only from the point of view of the stage and his role there; it is merely a description of what is accidental to the person and does not touch his essence.²⁸

So too, the description of this aspect of Brahman as creator, sustainer and destroyer of the world or by any other characteristic connected with the world is a mere accidental description. Brahman described by accidental attributes, is nothing but Saguṇa Brahman. According to the Advaita, Saguṇa Brahman or God is conceived as an object of worship or meditation and through a deeper meditation upon Saguṇa Brahman it is realized that the relation of the unreal to the real cannot be itself real. Thus arises the realisation of the Supreme Reality which is beyond all multiplicity and devoid of all ascribable attributes.

The reality of the self like that of a worldly object is based on *Ajñāna* on the failure to realize that God is the only Reality. God is worshipped because He is thought of as the creator, the controller etc., of the world. Hence worship and the God worshipped are

28. तथा मूलकारणमेवान्त्यात्कार्यत्तिन तेन कार्याकारेण नटवत्सर्वव्यहारास्पदत्वं प्रतिपद्यते । एवं मुक्तेः कार्यस्य प्रागुत्पत्तेः सत्त्वमनन्यत्वं च कारणादवगम्यते ।
Ś. *Brahmasūtra-bhāṣya*, II.i.18 p. 207.

bound up with the phenomenal standpoint. The world therefore appears as real and God as endowed with the attributes.

But from the transcendental point of view, the God is indeterminate and cannot be described by any positive attributes. To quote : "The metaphysical idea, put in terms of theology, is nothing but the conception of God as the creator of the world and possessed of a magical creative power, *Māyā*".²⁹

b. God – the Creator of the world

Brahman conditioned by *Ajñāna* with its two-fold power, is both the efficient cause and the material cause, when respectively *caitanya* and *Ajñāna* are chiefly considered. Just as a piece of iron moves here and there due to its contact with magnet, so also *Ajñāna*, though itself insentient gets awakened into action when it is associated with *Ātman*. The non-eternity of the world results from the superimposition. *Ātman* does not modify Itself into the world. The world-perception takes place due to the working of *Ajñāna*. Hence *Ātman* need not lose its *Caitanya-svarūpa* by being the material cause. In this connection, an example of a spider and a web may be given for more clarification.

A spider produces a web out of itself. Mere an insentient body cannot produce a web out of itself. Also, mere consciousness without body cannot accomplish the work of producing a web. The fact is, the web is produced when both body and consciousness get

29. Chatterjee & Datta, *An Introduction to Indian Philosophy*, University of Calcutta, 1950, p.400

together. Since, a spider gets the material out of its body to produce a web, it is regarded as material cause. Since the spider itself is the producer of the web, it comes to be called the efficient cause too. Thus it is seen that when the body of spider is chiefly considered in the process of producing the web, it is called the material cause; and when the spider itself is chiefly considered, it becomes the efficient cause.

Similarly, Brahman associated with two powers of *Ajñāna* is regarded as efficient cause when *caitanya* is chiefly considered. And when its associate i.e. *Ajñāna* is chiefly considered the same Brahman is regarded as the material cause. Thus Brahman is both the efficient cause and the material cause of the world. This is known as the doctrine of *Abhinna-nimittopādāna*.

God's creation of the world proceeds without implements. He needs no external co-operation as He possesses all necessary powers perfect within Himself. As God is essentially free, He cannot be under any compulsion to create the world. As He is *Nityatrpta* and *Āptakāma*. He has no motive. God's act of creating the world is but the spontaneous overflow of His nature (*Svabhāva*), just as the nature of man to breath in and out.³⁰ At the close of each *kalpa*, the world gets merged through God, in non-distinct *prakṛti*, while the individual souls lie in deep slumber as it were. But the

30. यथा लोके कस्यचिदासैषणस्य वा व्यतिरिक्तं किञ्चित्प्रयोजनमभिसंधाय केवलं लीलारूपाः प्रवृत्तयः क्रीडाविहारेषु भवन्ति, यथा चोच्छ्वासप्रश्वासादयोऽनभिसंधाय इह किञ्चित्प्रयोजनं स्वभावादेव संभवन्ति एवमीश्वरस्याप्यनपेक्ष्य किञ्चित्प्रयोजनान्तरं स्वभावादेवं केवलं लीलारूपा प्रवृत्तिर्भविष्यति । Śaṅkara's *bhāṣya* on the *Brahmasūtras* II.i.33, p. 216

embodied souls which have not yet worked out the fruits of their deeds, have again to enter the embodiment, as soon as God sends forth a new material world.

c. Brahman - Names and Forms

Names and forms are superimposed on Brahman. There may be a number of day-dreams fitting across the material arena, but no embodied one pays any heed to them. They are evanescent, ever fleeting; so too are the names and forms and their phenomenal usage. But, when the nature of the names and forms are recognised to be unreal, the intellect is set free to indulge in the meditation upon Brahman. Just as the rocks that lie buried in the river-bed remain unaffected by the flow of the stream. So also the immutable Brahman remains unchanged inspite of the fleeting things of the world. When Absolute Brahman which is of the nature of Existence, Knowledge and Bliss is realized, the cognition of names and forms vanishes of its own accord.³¹

31. ब्रह्मण्येते नामरूपे पटे चित्रमिव स्थिते ।
उपेक्ष्य नामरूपे द्वे सच्चिदानन्दधीर्भवेत् ॥ ९३ ॥
जलस्थेऽधोमुखे स्वस्य देहे दृष्टेऽप्युपेक्ष्य तम् ।
तीरस्य एव देहे स्वे तात्पर्यं स्याद्यथा तथा ॥ ९४ ॥
मनोरज्याद्विशेषः कः क्षणध्वंसिनि लौकिके ।
अतोऽस्मिन् भासमानेऽपि तत्सत्यत्वधियं त्यजेत् ॥ ९८ ॥
निश्छिद्रे दर्पणे भाति वस्तुगर्भं बृहद्वियत् ।
सच्छिद्घने तथा नाना जगद्गर्भमिदं वियत् ॥ १०१ ॥
अदृष्ट्वा दर्पणं नैव तुदन्तःस्थेक्षणं तथा ।
अमत्वा सच्चिदानन्दं नामरूपमतिः कुतः ॥ १०२ ॥

In fine, Brahman is foundational though It is in no sense substance. To say that Brahman is Absolute Reality is to say that it is different from the phenomenal, the spatial and temporal. There is nothing similar to It, nothing different from It and no internal differentiation, because all these are phenomenal distinctions. Due to its nature opposed to all empirical existence, It is understood as the negative of everything which is positively known. Though the words used are negative, what is meant, is intensely positive. Here negation means only an affirmation of absence. It is eternal because Its completeness and perfection are not at all related to time. It is the Highest Truth, perfect Being and fullest freedom.

iv. Concept Of Individual Soul

a. Nature of the Soul

The Advaita *Vedānta* has its aim to lead an individual soul to the reality of the one Absolute Self. The individual soul is nothing but Brahman Itself. The distinction between the individual soul and Brahman is experienced due to the illusory adjuncts. The soul in its intrinsic state, is not a finite miserable being. It does not separate itself from the rest of the existence and does not limit itself by a feeling of the 'I' 'This' or 'That'. It is also free from all worries that arise from hankerings after worldly objects. The self really then is unlimited consciousness and bliss. The soul is said to be *Vibhu* or all-pervading but not of atomic size. If the soul were to be minute, it could not feel throughout the whole body.³²

32. परमेव चेत् ब्रह्म जीवस्तस्माद्यावत्परं ब्रह्म तावानेव जीवो भवितुमर्हति । परस्य च ब्रह्मणो विभुत्वमागतात् । तस्माद्विभुर्जीवः । तथाच 'स वा एष महानज आत्मा →

There is difference of opinion regarding atomic size of the *jīva*. "Those who hold that the soul is atomic, argue that an infinite soul cannot move, where as it is seen to leave one body and return to another. This passage, according to Śaṅkara, does not touch the soul as such, but only its limitations. The objection that if the soul be atomic, it can only be in one place in the body, and so cannot perceive throughout the body, is set aside, by the example that even as a piece of sandal-wood refreshes the body all over, even though it touches the body only at one spot. So the atomic soul can feel throughout the body by means of the sense of touch which pervades the whole body. Śaṅkara refutes the suggestion by urging that the thorn on which one treads is also connected with the whole sense of feeling, though the pain is felt only on the sole of foot and not on the whole body. The advocates of the atomic view suggest that the atomic soul pervades the whole body by means of the quality of spirit or *caitanya*, even as the light of a lamp placed in one spot extends from there to the whole room. Śaṅkara declares that quality cannot extend beyond substance. The flame of a lamp and its light are not related as substance and quality. Both are fiery substances; only in the flame the parts are drawn closer together. While in the light they are more widely separated. If the quality of *caitanya* or spirit pervades the whole body, then the soul cannot be atomic. The passages of the Upaniṣads which refer to the soul as *Aṇu* have in view not the Ātman but the nucleus of the qualities of understanding and mind. They are intended to show the subtlety of the Ātman which escapes perception. It is admitted that the empirical self, bound down by *Manas*. etc., is not

infinite while the Supreme Reality is infinite, if associated with *buddhi*. All the statements about the soul's abiding in the heart are due to the theory of the location of the *buddhi* in it.

Again, what is everywhere can certainly be in one place, though what is confined to a place cannot be everywhere. In this way, Śaṅkara explains all the passages of the Upaniṣads, which assert a spatial limitation of the soul.³³

“The individual self when seen *sub specie aeternitatis*, is Brahman itself. When this fact is realized in one's own experience, what is denied is not the *jīva* as a spiritual entity, but only certain aspects of it, such as its finitude and its separateness from other selves. Its conception may thereby become profoundly transformed, but the important point is that it is not negated (*bādhita*) in the same way in which the physical world is. It is, on the other hand, reaffirmed, though only as Brahman.³⁴

b. Transmigration of the Soul

In the light of the Upaniṣadic declaration, the Advaita *Vedānta* holds the view that there are three paths or stages as to the condition of the individual soul after death. The enlightened souls after death, will be carried through the *Devayāna* or the 'path of

→ योऽयं विज्ञानमयः प्राणेषु (बृ.उ.4.4.22) इत्येवंजातीयका जीवविषया विभुत्ववादाः श्रौताः स्मार्ताश्च समर्थिता भवन्ति | न चाणोर्जीवस्य सकलशरीरगता वदनोपपद्यते | Ś.BS.Bh., II.iii.29, p. 285

33. S. Radhakrishnan, *Indian Philosophy*, Vol.II.1977, pp. 598-99.

34. M. Hiriyanna, *Essentials of Indian Philosophy*, George Allen and Unwin Ltd. Bombay, 1973, p. 157

the Gods' onwards into Brahman, whence there is no return. Secondly the doers of rituals daily and occasional, go upwards through the *Pitryāna* or the 'Path of Fathers' into the luminous realm of the moon, enjoy there the fruit of their good deeds and again descend once more to the earth with new incarnation with much distinction of the moral character. And those who possess neither knowledge nor the merit of good deeds are reborn as animals, birds, plants etc.

Both the *Devayāna* and the *Pitryāna* are said to be valid only in the exoteric sense. That is, only for him, to whom this world of multiplicity still appears as real, the two paths can be real. The Advaita *Vedānta* regards the liberation attained through the *Devayāna* as being not yet complete. It becomes so only when those who go through the lower knowledge have entered into the Saṅga Brahman, there obtain the perfect knowledge, the *samyagdarsana*. For only the latter that is the knowledge of the identity of one's own soul with Brahman, brings about absolute liberation.

c. Is the Soul One or Many ?

From the standpoint of the Absolute, a question about the number of the *jīvas* does not arise at all, as there is no world and no *jīva* in that transcendental level. But from the empirical point of view multiplicity of the *jīvas* has to be acknowledged. It is a known fact that the experience of one individual soul is however not same as that of another. Hence, a doubt here arises as to whether there is one individual soul or many.

The Advaitins hold that there is but one *jīva* and all this world as well as all *jīvas* in it are seen due to wrong apprehension. The world-appearance and

multiplicity of the individual souls are just because of the limiting adjuncts being different. This is general understanding of the view of the *Eka-jīva-vāda*.

To be specific, the view is that there is only one jīva animating only one body. The other bodies that we see, are non-animated like the ones seen in the dream. This world of the living and the non-living is a fiction created by a single jīva animating a single body. This view therefore is known as *Eka-sārīraka-jīva-vāda*.³⁵

Another group of the *Eka-jīva-vādin*s contends that Hiraṇyagarbha, the reflection of Brahman is the one principal jīva. And the other jīvas are mere the reflections of this principal jīva. This view of single jīva with many distinct bodies is known as *Saviśeṣa-anekaśārīra-ekajīva-vāda*. Besides, there are other explanations regarding the theory of the *Eka-jīva-vāda*. Yet all different views of *Eka-jīva-vāda* agree that there is no distinction between the bound and the released as only a single jīva is there; and the non-recollection of one's happiness or pain by another is on account of the difference of bodies.

Such of the Advaitins who do not agree with the views set forth above, uphold the view of the plurality of jīvas. It is that there are many individuals and the world-appearance has no permanent illusion for all souls. Each individual creates for itself its own illusion. As for instance, ten persons see a rope in darkness, and having the illusion of a serpent run away. They all agree in their individual perceptions that they have all

35. Appayya Dikṣita, *Siddhāntaleśa-Saṅgraha*, Vol.II, Ed. S:S. Suryanarayana Shastri, University of Madras, Madras, p. 27.

seen one and the same serpent. But, there is no serpent at all. This doctrine is mainly based on the point that jīvas are many or different owing to the association with the *Vyaṣṭi-Ajñāna*. According to this view, the distinction between the bound and released exists on account of the plurality of jīvas.³⁶

v. Concept Of The Pathway To Realisation

a. Karma and Jñāna

It has been pointed out that *Jñāna* alone is the direct means to liberation. But, enlightenment of knowledge arises in him who is completely detached from the pleasure-giving mundane ends. The sense of absolute detachment from worldly objects of enjoyment results from the purification of the mind which is usually swayed by the selfish passions and desires. But how this purification of the mind be gained ? It is but through the performance of the obligatory works (*Nityakarmas*), Śaṅkara states in this connection that "When a man performs higher kinds of works (*Nityakarma*), his mind unsoiled by desire for fruits becomes regenerated and pure; when thus purified, the mind becomes fit for contemplation of the self. Thus the man whose mind has been purified by the performance of obligatory works and who is prepared to acquire the self-realization, may gradually attain *Jñāna*."³⁷

36. *Ibid.*, p. 28

37. यः अधिकृतः पुरुषः पूर्वोक्तेन प्रकारेण कर्मयोगानुष्ठानेन क्रमेण संस्कृतात्मा सन् जन्मादिविक्रियारहितत्वेन निष्क्रियम् आत्मानम् आत्मत्वेन संबुद्धः सः 'सर्व' →

All deeds good and bad demand their retribution in the following existence. Hence, no performance of deeds of whatever kind it may be, ever leads to liberation, but only back again to *Samsāra*. It is not certain that there may not be works demanding for their atonement for several lives and even if one were successful in getting rid of the evil deeds by ceremonies yet the good works would still be left. These ceremonies bring with not only annihilation but in addition, positive fruits to be enjoyed in a future life. Further it is practically impossible to avoid all works throughout entire life, so long as the natural disposition of the soul to action and enjoyment persists. Therefore, so long as this natural disposition is not removed through perfect knowledge, there is no hope of liberation. The liberation if were dependent upon the merits of deeds, it would necessarily be transitory due to consumption of the works, and be graduate owing to their different value; these two factors contradict the conception of liberation as an eternal and paramount state. The view that "liberation is not possible through works" amounts to the saying that it is not attainable by moral purification too. Liberation does not come about like a quality of the mirror which absorbs the reflection into it through the action of cleaning. But the goal of man, liberation is to be achieved only through the knowledge of Ātman. And this knowledge is independent of performance of works and of moral improvement but in itself alone suffices for liberation.³⁸ Thus the *Muṇḍaka*

→ कर्माणिमनसा संन्यस्य 'नैव कुर्वन्न कारयन् आसीनः' नैष्कर्म्यलक्षणां ज्ञाननिष्ठाम् अश्नुते | Vidyavachaspati V. Panoli, 'Gita in Śaṅkara's own words' Part-II, The Mathrubhumi Printing & Publishing Co.Ltd., Calicut 1990, pp. 310-11.

38. *Ibid.*, III.iv. 1-17

Upaniṣad declares "He who knows Brahman, becomes Brahman." (III.2.9). The fruit of knowledge is not like the fruit of work, consists of something future but is based on inner perception.

The discussion leaves a clear understanding of the essentiality of *Karma* and *Jñāna* as Śaṅkara holds. It is therefore not correct to say that the works have no room in the Advaita *Vedānta*. On the contrary higher works must always be performed so long as the dawn of spiritual knowledge, where all works, all duties find their completion and the highest fulfilment.³⁹

b. Theory of Bhakti

Besides *Karma*, *Bhakti* has also been accepted as an indirect means of self-realisation. *Bhakti* is contemplation on one's self (*Nijasvarūpānusandhāna*).

c. Means of Realisation

It is an admitted fact that the self-realization is possible through only the spiritual knowledge; and the spiritual knowledge takes its birth in him whose mind is purified by the performance of the obligatory duties. This does not mean here that the purification of the mind does consequently beget the knowledge. Yet, the person whose mind is purified, has to undergo some necessary accomplishments through which the knowledge dawns. Those accomplishments are mainly four :

- 1) Hearing (*Śravaṇa*)
- 2) Reflection (*Manana*)

39. कृतं कृत्यं कर्तव्यं येन स कृतकृत्यो विशिष्टजन्मप्रसूतेन ब्राह्मणेन यत् कर्तव्यं तत् सर्वं भगवत्तत्त्वे विदिते कृतं भवेद् इत्यर्थः | न च अन्यथा कर्तव्यं परिसमाप्यते कस्यचिद् इति अभिप्रायः | *Ibid.*, Part II. pp. 255

- 3) Meditation (*Nididhyāsana*)
- 4) Absorption (*Samādhi*)

Through the repeated practice of these accomplishments, the forces of deep-rooted beliefs of the past gradually disappear. When wrong beliefs thus become removed and firm faith in the truth of the Vedānta remain permanent, the aspirant is instructed by the preceptor - Thou Art Brahman. He then starts contemplating on this truth steadfastly till at last he has an immediate realization of the truth in the form of I am Brahman. Thus, the illusory distinction between the individual soul and Brahman at last disappears and liberation is attained.

vi. Concept of Liberation

a. Nature of Liberation

Liberation is nothing else than our true self existent from all eternity. In the words of Dharmarājādharin the attainment of Brahman which is Bliss as also the cessation of grief, is liberation.⁴⁰ But, entering the higher world or experiencing the joy produced there, is however not liberation; for that being non-eternal as something generated and there is the contingency of a fresh return to *Samsāra* for the released one.

b. Liberation is not a new production

Although, the liberation is said to be our true self, it is hidden from us due to ignorance, whence also the

40. आनन्दात्मकब्रह्मावाप्तिश्च मोक्षः शोकनिवृत्तिश्च, “ब्रह्म वेद ब्रह्मैव भवति”, “तरति शोकमात्मचित्” इत्यादि श्रुतेः। Swami Madhavānanda - “Vedānta Paribhasha of Dharmarāja Adhvarindra” - p. 204.

knowledge of Ātman has not to produce anything new whatever as its fruit, but only to remove the obstacles in the way of liberation.

c. Theory of Jivanmukti

Jivanmukti is a kind of liberation even when the soul is associated with an embodiment. In precise, even on the attainment of liberation the embodiment of the individual soul may continue to exist, if there is the product of karma which had already borne its effect (*prārabha-karma*). The knowledge of the Highest Reality destroys no doubt, the karmas that still lie accumulated (*Sañcita*) and prevents the karmas which being gathered here in this life (*Sañciyamāna*), thus makes transmigration impossible. But the *prārabdha-karmas* cannot be prevented; they have to be experienced by *Jivanmukta*. After the exhaustion of the *Prārabdha-karmas*, his gross and subtle bodies perish; the vital force of *Jivanmukta* merges in the Absolute Brahman; and thus he attains the disembodied state of liberation i.e. *Videhamukti*.

In fine, there is no bondage or liberation. It is all false. Jīva has neither destruction nor origin. He is neither aspirant nor aspiring for liberation. He is always free and not other than Absolute Brahman.

In a nutshell, the philosophy of Advaita as advocated by Śaṅkara, may be summarised under a single declaration : ब्रह्म सत्यं जगन्मिथ्या जीवो ब्रह्मैव नापरः ॥

3. Madhva's Dvaita Philosophy :

Madhva's philosophy represents one of the main points of departure in the *Vedānta* system on the issue of Theism versus Monism.

He is the most prolific writer among the great Bhāṣyakāras of the *Vedānta* system. He has left thirty-seven works in all, of which only six are minor ones, comprising poems, stotras and miscellaneous works.

The following are the thirty-seven works of Madhva, from which his doctrines have been culled out :

Commentaries on the ṚgVeda & the Upaniṣads -

- | | | | |
|---------------|----------------|---------------|----------|
| 1) ऋग्भाष्यम् | 2) ईश | 3) केन | 4) कठ |
| 5) षट्प्रश्न | 6) मुण्डक | 7) माण्डूक्य | 8) ऐतरेय |
| 9) तैत्तिरीय | 10) बृहदारण्यक | 11) छान्दोग्य | |

Commentaries on Brahmasūtras -

- | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------|
| 12) ब्रह्मसूत्रभाष्यम् | 13) अनुव्याख्यानम् |
| 14) ब्रह्मसूत्राणुभाष्यम् | 15) न्यायविवरणम् |

Commentaries on the Gītā -

- | | |
|-----------------|--------------------|
| 16) गीताभाष्यम् | 17) गीतातात्पर्यम् |
|-----------------|--------------------|

On the Mahābhārata and the Bhāgavata -

- | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------|
| 18) महाभारततात्पर्यनिर्णयः | 19) भागवततात्पर्यम् |
|----------------------------|---------------------|

Monographs (प्रकरणग्रन्थाः) -

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 20) प्रमाणलक्षणम् | 21) कथालक्षणम् |
| 22) उपाधिखण्डनम् | 23) मायावादखण्डनम् |
| 24) प्रपञ्चमिथ्यात्वानुमानखण्डनम् | |
| 25) तत्त्वसंख्यानम् | 26) तत्त्वविवेकः |
| 27) तत्त्वोद्योतः | 28) विष्णुतत्त्वविनिर्णयः |
| 29) कर्मनिर्णयः | |

Poems etc. -

- | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------|
| 30) यमकभारतम् | 31) नृसिंहनखस्तुतिः |
| 32) द्वादशस्तोत्रम् | 33) कृष्णामृतमहार्णवः । |

Religious tracts -

- | | |
|--------------------|----------------------|
| 34) सदाचारस्मृतिः | 35) तन्त्रसारसंग्रहः |
| 36) यतिप्रणवकल्पम् | 37) जयन्तीनिर्णयः |

Some hold कन्दुकस्तुतिः to be the 38th work of Madhva. Vidwan Bannanje Govindacharya says that, he has procured palm-leaf manuscripts of two more works of Madhva and they are : 1) *Nyāsapaddhati*; and 2) *Tithinirṇaya*. He has mentioned it in his kannada booklet '*Granthāñjali - Ācārya Madhvara Mūlagraṅthagalu*'.

Madhva's Dvaita philosophy is based on the statement :

स्वतन्त्रमस्वतन्त्रं च प्रमेयं द्विविधं मतम् । (*Tattvaviveka.1*)

"There are two orders of reality - the independent and the dependent."

However, the cardinal doctrines of Madhva's Dvaita *Vedānta* have been summed up as nine in a verse attributed to Vyāsātīrtha (1478-1539 A.D.), one of his illustrious followers. The verse runs as follows :

श्रीमन्मध्वमते हरिः परतरः सत्यं जगत्तत्त्वतो
भेदो जीवगणा हरेरनुचरा नीचोच्चभावं गताः ।
मुक्तिर्नेजसुखानुभूतिरमला भक्तिश्च तत्साधनं
ह्यक्षादित्रितयं प्रमाणमखिलाम्नायैकवेद्यो हरिः ॥

The nine doctrines enlisted in this verse are :

1) हरिः परतरः - In all respects Lord Viṣṇu alone is Supreme and the Highest; 2) सत्यं जगत् - This entire universe is truly and ultimately real; 3) तत्त्वतो भेदः - The five-fold difference is fundamental; 4) जीवगणाः हरेरनुचराः - The manifold embodied souls are all dependent on Lord Viṣṇu; 5) (जीवगणाः) नीचोच्चभावं गताः -

The embodied souls are inherently graded as higher and lower (mainly three-fold); 6) मुक्तिः नैजसुखानुभूतिः – Liberation is enjoying the bliss befitting to one's original form; 7) अमला भक्तिः तत्साधनम् – The means to secure liberation is pure devotion to Lord Viṣṇu; 8) अक्षादित्रितयं प्रमाणम् – The means of valid knowledge are only three; viz, perception, inference and verbal testimony; 9) अखिलाम्नायैकवेद्यो हरिः – Lord Viṣṇu alone is known by the entire mass of scriptures.

a. हरिः परतरः –

“God is the Independent Being possessed of all adequate and unrestricted powers in regard to the *cit* and *Acit* and who is all-knowing. He is the one who controls the *cit* and *Acit* (sentient and insentient reals) which are of a different nature from Him.”

Over-all supremacy of Lord Hari - is declared in the scriptural texts.

- (1) The entire universe is indwelt by the Lord.⁴¹
- (2) God is dwelling invisible in all beings and hence is not manifest.⁴²
- (3) That of whom these beings are born, by whom when born they live, into whom they go and dissolve, desire to know That, That is Brahman.⁴³

41. ईशावास्यमिदं सर्वम् | [Iśā.Up., mantra-1]

42. एष सर्वेषु भूतेषु गृहोऽऽत्मा न प्रकाशते | [Kath.Up., III.12]

43. यतो वा इमानि भूतानि जायन्ते | येन जातानि जीवन्ति यत्प्रयन्त्यभिसंविशन्ति | तद्विजिज्ञासस्व | तद्ब्रह्म || [Tait.Up., III.1]

- (4) He is the overlord; He is omniscient; He is the Indweller; He is the source of all; He is the origin and dissolution of all beings.⁴⁴
- (5) He is the Father of this world, the Nourisher and the Grandsire.⁴⁵
- (6) O Sage, in reality there is nothing higher than Lord Vāsudeva – neither Matter, nor Action [non Destiny], nor Time, nor Innate nature, nor embodied soul.⁴⁶
- (7) Lord Viṣṇu is devoid of all defects. He is the embodiment of all virtues. He is independent and all are under His control. He is considered to be the highest.⁴⁷
- (8) Viṣṇu is *parama* i.e., the highest. In the communion of gods, Viṣṇu was the highest.⁴⁸
- (9) Supreme is the abode of Viṣṇu; always it is witnessed by the liberated.⁴⁹

These scriptural statements reveal the Supremacy of Lord Viṣṇu.

44. एष सर्वेश्वर एष सर्वज्ञ एषोऽन्तर्याम्येष योनिः सर्वस्य प्रभवाप्ययौ हि भूतानाम् | [Mund.Up., 1.6]

45. पितामहस्य जगतो माता धाता पितामहः || [Gita, IX.17]

46. द्रव्यं कर्म च कालश्च स्वभावो जीव एव च | वासुदेवात्परो ब्रह्मन् न चान्योऽर्थोऽस्ति तत्त्वतः || [Bhāg., II.5.14]

47. वर्जितः सर्वदोषैर्यो गुणसर्वस्वमूर्तिमान् | स्वतन्त्रो यद्वशाः सर्वे स विष्णुः परमो मतः || [Paramopaniṣad quoted in the VTN, III.1]

48. विष्णुः परम उत्तमः देवतानां संगतानामुत्तमो विष्णुरासीत् | Quoted by Dr. B.N.K. Sharma, *op.cit.* p.8, fn.2

49. तद्विष्णोः परमं पदं सदा पश्यन्ति सूरयः | [Rgveda, 1.22.20]

The attributes and actions of Brahman are the same as itself. They are not different. There is no mutual difference either, among them. There is an intrinsic peculiarity in things (called *Viśeṣa*) by which, even in the absence of actual difference, a relation of '**Substance and attributes**' is rendered possible for purpose of reference.

"Brahman is formless because it transcends Prakṛti and others and controls them all."⁵⁰

All forms, so far as our minds can conceive, are either *prākṛtic* or *bhautika* (constituted of the five elements). This is, however, impossible in Brahman, which is admittedly above the sway and influence of Prakṛti and bhūtas (elements). Hence it follows that it is formless.

There is no independent potency anywhere in the universe (in *Prakṛti*, *Puruṣas* etc.) It is Īśvara Himself that directs properly, the various potencies of nature and of the souls for production, growth, development etc., which are always dependent on Him.⁵¹

The Supreme Being, possessed of infinite powers, enters into various stages of evolution of matter and brings about each and every such manifestation of things, Himself."⁵²

50. प्रकृत्यादिप्रवर्तकत्वेन तदुत्तमत्वात्, नैव रूपवत् ब्रह्म | Madhva *Brahmasūtra-bhāṣya* (B.S.Bh.), iii.2.14

51. अन्यत्र क्वापि शक्तिर्न स्वातंत्र्येण एव हि | शक्तीस्ताः प्रेरयत्यंजः तदधीनाश्च सर्वदा || *Anuvyākhyāna*, p.13b

52. तत्र तत्र स्थितो विष्णुस्तत्तच्छक्तिप्रबोधकः | एक एव महाशक्तिः कुरुते सर्वमंजसा || Madhva *Brahmasūtra-bhāṣya*, ii.3.11

This idea gives point to the conception of God as the infinite one whose presence is felt everywhere and in everything that exists. This is how the Supreme chooses to reveal His *pūrṇatva* in a very real and active sense : 'तेनेदं पूर्णं पुरुषेण सर्वम् ।'

b. सत्यं जगत् -

The ultimate reality or otherwise of this material world is one of the much discussed topics in *Vedānta* metaphysics. And Madhva, on the basis of the *pramāṇas* or valid means of knowledge, holds the reality of this world consisting of the sentient souls and insentient matter with all its effects. He declares सत्त्वं चास्य अनुभूतितः ॥⁵³. The firm foundation on which the ultimate reality of this world depends, according to Śrī Madhvācārya, is *anubhūti* or consolidated human experience.

This reality as a whole is expressed in a system of five-fold distinction, which gives its philosophical designation of "*Prapañca*" :

प्रकृष्टः पञ्चविधो भेदः प्रपञ्चः ।

"This valuable five-fold difference is "*Prapañca*".

The word "*Prapañca*" is derived from the substantive "*Pañcan*" with the suffix "*ḍa*" signifying "kind", the prefix 'pra' denotes 'excellence' or value. It is excellent in the sense that knowledge of this five-fold difference constitutes right knowledge that leads to *Mokṣa*.

53. Madhva, *Anuvyākhyāna*, Ed. K.T. Pandurangi, Bangalore, p. 775

“This five-fold difference is the difference that exists between Jivas, Jaḍas (material principles) and Brahman on the one hand and mutually Jivas and Jaḍas themselves on the other.”⁵⁴

“This scheme of *Pañcabheda* is not illusory as it is cognized by God, maintained and controlled by Him; for there can be no illusion for God.”⁵⁵

According to Madhva, those who hold this world to be a product of illusory experience forget the fundamental and essential phenomenon governing all cases of illusion. To understand this phenomenon, one has to analyse any case of illusion. Let us take the familiar example of silver seen in the shell. Here an analysis will show that when one beholds the shell, one mistakes it to be a piece of silver on the basis of *Sādrśya* or resemblance between the two. So, it means that the person had previously seen a piece of silver elsewhere and when he sees the shell he remembers the silver previously seen and due to the resemblance between the two and the inadequate perception due to distance and brilliant light, he mistakes it for a piece of silver. That is, the piece of silver seen elsewhere previously is real; the shell seen for the time being is also real. Without two similar and real things, there cannot happen the phenomenon of illusion or superimposition. Thus, one can see that illusions depend

54. जीवेश्वरभिदा चैव जडेश्वरभिदा तथा ।
जीवभेदो मिथश्चैव जडजीवभिदा तथा ।
मिथश्च जडभेदोऽयं प्रपंचो भेदपंचकः ॥ M. *Viṣṇutattvanirṇaya*, p. 27

55. परमेश्वरेण ज्ञातत्वात् रक्षितत्वाच्च न द्वैतं भ्रान्तिकल्पितम् । न हीश्वरस्य भ्रान्तिः ।
Ibid., p. 27

upon a number of real factors, like the sense-organ being influenced by the impressions left by a similar object seen in a different context; and the object in front itself distorted by insufficient light (rope-snake) or placed at an inappropriate distance or in an environment which is favourable to erroneous knowledge (shell-silver). The main condition is that the illusions are possible only in the event of resemblance between two similar and real entities.

Madhva concludes the reality of this material world on the basis of intuitive experience of one and all, and also on the evidence of logical reasoning. This conclusion of Madhva has the support of the authoritative scriptures, which are quoted by him in his works :

- 1) विश्वं सत्यम् ॥ (ऋग्वेद, II.24.6) (The Universe is real)
- 2) यच्चिकेत सत्यमित् । तन्न मोघम् ॥ (*Ibid.* X.55-6) (God's creation is all real ! not false)
- 3) कविर्मनीषी परिभूः स्वयंभूर्याथातथ्यतोऽर्थान् व्यदधाच्छाश्वतीभ्यः समाऽभ्यः ॥ (ईशापनिषद्, 8b) (God is omniscient, the controller of all minds, omnipresent and independent. He created real things in their proper forms eternally. And the world is God's creation.)

“World-experience is sometimes likened in our śāstras to dreams etc., not on account of its factual unreality; but in virtue of the impermanent and changing character of the world and its dependent nature.”⁵⁶

56. अनित्यत्व-विकारित्व-पारतन्त्रयादिहेतुतः ।
स्वप्नादिसाम्यं जगतो, न तु बोधनिवर्त्यता ॥ *Ibid.*, p. 25

It is therefore to be given an indisputable reality in the sense of being 'anāropitaṁ' (non-superimposed) and *pramitiviṣayaḥ* (being an object of valid experience, albeit impermanent and subject to change and modifications. Its reality is naturally based on the concept of 'difference' which, in its five-fold aspect, constitutes the "pra-pañca", as already explained.

c. तत्त्वतो भेदः -

Difference is one of the pivotal concepts of Madhva's ontology.

Difference is not merely a component part of reality, but constitutes its very essence.

The concept of 'difference' (*bheda*) has, however, been severely criticized by many eminent dialecticians of the Advaita school - such as Maṇḍana, Vimuktātman and Śriharṣa. Madhva has taken due note of all their criticism, in formulating his own conception of 'difference', with the help of a new category of "viśeṣa", which he uses to overcome the difficulties which are supposed to stand in the way of an intelligible conception of 'difference' in relation to objects :

Difference is of the nature of thing (*dharmi*). It cannot be argued that difference cannot be viewed as the nature of things, as it is apprehended only relatively to the perception of a given object and that from which it differs. Just as identity of Jīva and Brahman, tho' the same as the nature of the Ātman, is yet apprehended only in relation to the terms : Jīva and Brahman, similarly, in the case of difference."⁵⁷

57. पदार्थस्वरूपत्वात् भेदस्य | न च धर्मिप्रतियोग्यपेक्षा, भेदस्य अस्वरूपत्वम् ऐक्यवत् स्वरूपस्यैव तथात्वात् | *Ibid.*, p. 21

Such, in brief, is Madhva's theory of difference. It is plainly different from the *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika* and *Mīmāṃsā* view and this is another striking proof that the logico-philosophical bases of Madhva's system are in no way borrowed from or inspired by these pre-Madhva realisms and that they are the result of independent cogitation on the problems of philosophy.

We have seen that God, matter and souls constitute the three major realities of Madhva's system.

These manifold differences are generally classified under these heads : 1) *Sajātīya* or difference of one thing from other of its own kind. 2) *Vijātīya* or difference from those of another kind and 3) *Svagata* or internal distinctions within an organic whole. The last one is not admitted by Madhva in its absolute sense. In the sphere of the other two differences he has adumbrated a scheme of "five-fold difference" (*Pañcabheda*).

"This difference, though, partaking of the nature of things, is yet colourfully identical with it and through such colourful identity it is mentally and linguistically differentiated from the object, wherever exigencies require it. "Viśeṣas" are the basis of such colourful identity."⁵⁸ Madhva offers his theory of "Saviśeṣābheda" between the object and its difference, as a way out of the riddle.

Difference is thus the nature of the thing (*dharmisvarūpa*) itself. It is perceived simultaneously with the perception of an object. In one and the same act of perception, an object and its individuality, (which

58. एकस्मिन्नेव वस्तुनि विशेषस्तैरयंगीकृत एव | 'नेति नेती' - त्यत्र सर्ववैलक्षण्याङ्गीकारत्त्वं | *Ibid.*, p. 21.

is the same as its difference from all else) are both perceived in a flash as it were.

Madhva rightly concludes :

The monist should specify his position regarding the acceptability of the perception and the inference as *pramāṇas*. He cannot eat the cake and have it too. He should not place his legs on two boats. Does he accept the knowledge derived through these two *pramāṇas* as valid or not ? If yes, then he should not disrespect that verdict and consequently he cannot dismiss the भेदश्रुतिः as unauthoritative. If no, then the भेदश्रुतिः are not contaminated by the 'defect of अनुवादकत्व' and hence are not unauthoritative. On any count, he cannot prove the भेदश्रुति to be unauthoritative.⁵⁹

d. जीवगणाः हरेनुचराः

Madhva holds the self to be established by *Sākṣyānubhava*. His definition of the self is :

“अहमित्येव यो वेद्यः स जीव इति कीर्तितः ।

स दुःखी स सुखी चैव स पात्रं बन्धमोक्षयोः ॥”

(*Viṣṇutattvanirāṇya* p. 26)

“He who enjoys the happiness and suffers the ills of life, who is eligible for bondage and release, is the *jīva*. He is indeed in a position to know himself, in all his states, as 'I am'”.

This implies that the *jīva* is permanent entity which endures its changing states of consciousness and experiences, which constitute the sum total of its life,

59. अतः प्रमाणसिद्धत्वे तदपलापायुक्तेः, अप्रमाणसिद्धत्वे च भेदप्रमाणस्य अनुवादिभावाच्च न भेदवाक्यानां दौर्बल्यम् | *Ibid.*, p.9

here and in the hereafter. The pragmatic necessity of assuming a permanent self can well be understood in the light of the primary instinct to be and so survive. That is why our Upanisads emphasize the indestructibility of self and its attributes as well (*Brh.Up.* अनुच्छित्तिधर्मा). These attributes of the self are the potential powers of conscious life here and in the 'beyond'. Without such a continuity and survival of individual consciousness, the goal of *mukti* would be void of meaning and purpose.

At this stage, one must note how Madhva declares and substantiates the distinction lying inherently between Brahman and the individual soul.⁶⁰ *Jīva-paramātma-abheda* cannot be the purport of Veda as it is opposed to all *pramāṇas*.

It is opposed to one's own experience. No one experiences that he knows all, he is the master of all, he is free from the sorrow and he is free from the drawbacks. On the contrary every one experiences in the opposite way. (viz., he knows very little, he is not the master, he experiences sorrow etc.). These experiences cannot be considered as untrue as these are not opposed by any *pramāṇa*.

The individual soul, as a sentient being, is admitted by Madhva to be self-luminous (स्वप्रकाश). It is not merely of the form of knowledge (ज्ञानस्वरूप), but it is a knower (ज्ञातृ). The conception of the self as a conscious personality is the same as it is in respect of God.⁶¹

60. कथं जीवपरमात्मैक्ये सर्वश्रुतीनां तात्पर्यं युज्यते | सर्वप्रमाणविरुद्धत्वात् | *Ibid.*, p.14

61. स्ववेत्ता वेदनं च स्वं स्वेन वेद्यश्च केशवः | परस्य वेत्ता वित्तिश्च वेद्यश्च स्यात् परैः क्वचित् || (*Gitā-Tātparyā* x.iii), Sarvamūla-granthaḥ, Vol.I, Akhila Bharata Madhva Mahamandala, Bangalore, 1969, *Adh.* XIII, p.126

Except for the fact that even the self-luminosity of the jīva is dependent on the Supreme, which makes bondage possible.⁶²

The bonds and impurities of the souls are not, however, their essential nature (*svarūpa*), at any rate, of those of the highest order.⁶³ They are foreign to the core of their being, like the rust on copper and are taken to be associated with them from the beginning, at the pleasure of the Lord. This event is beginningless in time; but is, all the same, subject to the Lord's pleasure. He is thus ultimately responsible (metaphysically) for their bondage, not in the sense that He threw them into it at a certain point of time in history, but that its continuous association with them is, in every way, subject to Him and its riddance will depend on His grace and cooperation.⁶⁴ Its onset is rendered possible by the power of concealment or obscuration of the true nature of souls, which is vested in the Lord,⁶⁵ and which corresponds to the "Tirodhāna-Śakti".

Madhva calls his view of the origin of bondage as "Svabhāvājñānavāda" or the theory of the souls' ignorance of their true nature and of their dependence on the Supreme : स्वस्य भावो धर्मः पारतंत्र्यादिः तद्विषयकमज्ञानं जीवस्य, इति वादः "स्वभावाज्ञानवादः" (*Nyāya Sudhā* – p-64).

62. जीवानां स्वप्रकाशत्वं तत्प्रसादात् स्ववेदनम् | *Ibid.*, p.126

63. बलमानन्द ओजश्च सहो ज्ञानमनाकुलम् | स्वरूपाण्येव जीवस्य
(*Brahmasūtra-bhāṣya* - II.3.31)
एतच्च सज्जीवविषयम् | (*Tattva prakāśikā*)

64. पराभिध्यानात् तुरोहितं ततो ह्यस्य बन्धविपर्ययौ | (*Brahma-sūtra-iii-2-5*)

65. मत्तः स्मृतिर्ज्ञानमपोहनं च | (*Gītā*, XV.15) (*Śvet.Up.*, vi.16)

The term "Svabhāva", here, has been explained by Jayatīrtha in six different ways. The first explanation is as given above. The second takes "Svabhāva" to mean what is in fact and what is not imagined by ignorance. On this view, *Ajñāna* which is the cause of the soul's bondage exists in reality and is not merely something which is imagined to exist. Thirdly, "Svabhāva" signifies, "Independent Being" or God; fourthly, the Jīva's own nature of metaphysical dependence. Thus, "Ajñāna" of the true nature of God and of one's own dependence is "Svabhāvājñāna". It is also explained as "Ajñāna" that is induced in the jīva by the independent Being i.e. God.⁶⁶

Madhva finds the basis of the doctrine of plurality of selves in the intrinsic diversity of their essences, which he shows to be the inevitable presupposition of the (Hindu) theory of *Karma*. It is accepted that the inequalities of an individual equipment and endowment are regulated by one's past life and its karma. But, by its very nature, the Karma theory would be powerless to explain the why of such inequalities, in the remotest past, without recourse to the hypothesis of an intrinsic peculiarity (*anādiviśeṣa*) that is uncaused. It is this *anādiviśeṣa*, says Madhva, that distinguishes one soul from another.

66. i) तथा स्वयमेव भवत्यस्तीति स्वभावो नाज्ञानकल्पित इति यावत् |
ii) स्वश्चासौ भावश्चेति स्वभावो जीवः तदाश्रितं तदावरणं चाज्ञानमिति वादः
स्वभावाज्ञानवादः |
iii) स्वः स्वतन्त्रोभावः परमात्मा | स्वस्य भावो धर्मः पारतंत्र्यादिर्वा स्वभावः |
तद्विषयमज्ञानं जीवस्य इति वादः स्वभावाज्ञानवादः |
iv) तथा स्वभावभूतमेव अज्ञानं, न मिथ्या, इति वादः |
v) तथा स्वभावेन स्वतन्त्रेण परमेश्वरेण अज्ञानं जीवस्य इति वादः || (*Nyāya Sudhā* p. 64.b)

“unseen merit, which accounts for similar merit in the present, should pre suppose a like merit. This series should regress ad infinitum. If it breaks down in any particular instance, the principle of unseen merit might as well as dispensed with, even at the outset. If it holds good in all cases without exception, as far back as human thought could reach, it is a clear admission of the fact that such unseen merit is ingrained in the nature of individuals.”⁶⁷

Madhva adduces the disparity of sādhanas practised by different orders of beings, as an additional ground for the persistence of plurality in the released state :

“Variations in results, in accordance with diversity of means, is inevitable in release.”⁶⁸

Hence Madhva concludes :

“सत्यमेनमनु विश्वे मदन्ति रातिं देवस्य गृणतो मघोनः” इति सर्वजीवानां भगवदनुजीवनं च सत्यमित्येवोच्यते । (बृहदारण्यकभाष्य, सर्वमूलग्रन्थाः - १ पृ. ३४३) (All beings are dependent upon Him. They rejoice through His grace who is a friend of Indra praising Him - This is the truth).

e. जीवगणाः नीचोच्यभावं गताः

Madhva's doctrine of the soul insists not only upon the distinctiveness of each soul, but also upon an intrinsic gradation among them based on varying

67. यद्यनादिविशेषो न, साम्प्रतं कथमेव सः ?
आकस्मिको विशेषश्चेददृष्टे ऋचिदिष्यते ।
सर्वत्राकस्मिकत्वं स्यात्, नादृष्टापेक्षिता ऋचित् ।
अदृष्टाच्चेद्विशेषोऽयमनादित्वं कुतो न तत् ? (Anu-uyākhyāna-iii. p. 49)
68. युक्तं च साधनाधिक्यात् साध्याधिक्यं सुरादिषु । Ibid., p. 45

degrees of knowledge, power and bliss. This is known as *Tāratamya* or *Svarūpatāratamya*, which comes out all the more clearly in the released state, where the souls realize their true status. This position is peculiar to Madhva and is not found in any other school of Indian Philosophy. Together with the allied doctrine of *Jīva-traividhya* or tripartite classification of souls into - (1) *Muktiyogya* (salvable) (2) *Nitya-Samsārin* (ever-transmigrating), and (3) *Tamoyogya* (damnable), it has come in for a good deal of adverse criticism at the hands of modern scholars.

It has been emphatically stated in the *Mahā-bhārata-tātparya-nirṇaya* that the Lord Viṣṇu is always the absolute controller of everything else, both sentient and insentient in this universe. Anybody aspiring for liberation or eternal bliss should necessarily realise the truth of the over-all supremacy of Lord Viṣṇu and also the inherent gradation among souls.⁶⁹

The sentient too is two-fold : *duḥkhaspṛṣṭa* or sorrow-touched and *duḥkhāspṛṣṭa* or sorrow-untouched. The sorrow-touched involve two varieties : *duḥkha-samstha* or continuing in sorrow. The latter are again two-fold. *Mukti-yogya* or eligible for liberation and *mukti-ayogya* or ineligible for it. The *mukti-yogyas* are five-fold : gods, sages, manes, monarchs and the best among human beings. Those ineligible for liberation are two-fold : *tamoga* or the condemned souls fit for dark hells and *Sṛṭisamsthita* or those who remain for

69. सर्वेषां च हरिर्नित्यं नियन्ता तद्गशाः परे ।
तारतम्यं ततो ज्ञेयं सर्वोच्चत्वं हरेस्तथा ॥
एतद्विना न कस्यापि विमुक्तिः स्यात्कथञ्चन ॥ (I. 80-81)

ever in the worldly bondage. The *tamoyogyas* are four-fold each having two varieties :

दैत्यरक्षः पिशाचकाः । मर्त्याधमाश्चतुर्धैव तमोयोग्या प्रकीर्तिताः ।
ते च प्राप्तान्धतमसः सृतिसंस्था इति द्विधा ॥ (तत्त्वसंख्यानम्)

It means that those souls who are only fit for eternal sorrow and misery are four kinds : 1) demons; 2) devils; 3) goblins and 4) the worst among men. The two-fold sub-variety of each of the four consists of those who have reached the darkest hells or nether regions⁷⁰ and those who are still languishing in this mortal world having not yet reached those regions.

We can take any aspect and we will come across inequality between any two beings. One has to discover the root cause of this inequality and gradation. Certainly the element of *karma* or previous action cannot be the root cause because an action is an effect of the thinking of the being. A particular thought propels a particular action. Even the thought cannot be the root cause because it depends upon the particular tendency or the bent of mind of the person. Now even the tendency cannot be the root cause because it depends upon the peculiar nature of the person. This nature is unique to the soul. And this is the exact conclusion to which Madhva arrives at when he delves deep to find out the root cause of the gradation among the souls experienced by one and all in this universe. Hence he

70. Read : "Those who appear to be incurable from the enormity of their sins are hurled down to Tartarus whence they never come forth again". - Plato, Prof. B. Venkatesachar in his English translation of *Tattvasaṅkhyāna*, Bangalore, 1964, p. 24

declares the souls are by their very nature graded as superior, mediocre and inferior.⁷¹

The term 'Śraddhā' stands for the individual nature of the embodied soul. And this 'Śraddhā' differs from one soul to another. Hence due to this distinction the souls should be understood to be graded as the best or superior, the mediocre or middling and the worst or inferior or condemned.⁷²

Secondly, Madhva brings to light another outstanding ingredient of this inherent nature of the souls. And that is, as a popular saying goes, स्वभावो दुरतिक्रमः or 'the nature is unchangeable.' He states :

"The souls get the form of gods, demons, men and so on due to their own unique nature. This unique nature possessed by them cannot be changed by anybody, at any time."⁷³

The gradation among souls is beginningless and endless. It cannot be changed by anybody, at any time.⁷⁴

This is an important factor worth serious perusal. The unique nature of a soul, just as it is limited to himself and cannot be shared by anybody else, so too

71. स्वभावतस्त्रिविधा जीवा उत्तमाधममध्यमाः | Madhva, *Gītā-tātparya*, III.30, p. 45.

72. श्रद्धा स्वरूपं जीवस्य तस्माच्छ्रद्धाविभेदतः |
उत्तमाधममध्यास्तु जीवा ज्ञेयाः पृथक् पृथक् || *Ibid.*, XVII.3, p. 146.

73. देवासुरनरत्वाद्या जीवानां तु निसर्गतः |
निसर्गो नान्यथैतेषां केनचित्क्वचिदेव वा || *Ibid.*, XVI.24, p. 145

74. तस्मादनाद्यनन्तं हि तारतम्यं चिदात्मनाम् |
तच्च नैवान्यथा कर्तुं शक्यं केनापि कुत्रचित् || (महाभारत तात्पर्यनिर्णयः, 1.92)

it can never be changed for good or bad by anybody at any time, however anybody try at it.

To point out this gradation from human beings upto the Lord, he quotes many authoritative passages in his works depending upon relevant context. This is what he states in the *Mahābhārata-tātparyanirṇaya* :

क्षितिपा मनुष्यगन्धर्वा देवाश्च पितरश्चिराः ।
 आजानजाः कर्मजाश्च देवा इन्द्रः पुरन्दरः ॥
 रुद्रः सरस्वती वायुमुक्ताः शतगुणोत्तराः ।
 एको ब्रह्मा च वायुश्च वीन्द्रो रुद्रसमस्तथा ॥
 एको रुद्रस्तथा शेषो न कश्चिद्वायुना समः ।
 मुक्तेषु श्रीस्तथा वायोः सहस्रगुणिता गुणैः ॥
 ततोऽजन्तगुणो विष्णुर्न कश्चित्तत्समः सदा ।
 इत्यादि वेदवाक्यं विष्णोरुत्कर्षमेव वक्तव्यञ्चैः ॥ (1.72.75)

It means : In the scheme of gradation if one starts from human beings, first of course, there come the best among them. Then in order – (2) Monarchs; (3) Manuṣya-gandharvas (the messengers of gods who receive orders indirectly), (4) Devagandharvas (who receive orders directly from gods); (5) Manes; (6) Ciras or Superior manes; (7) Ājānajas (born as gods) (8) Karmajas (those who earn godhood); (9) Gods (gods by nature itself); (10) Divine preceptor Bṛhaspati; (11) Indra (12) Rudra (13) Sarasvati and (14) Vāyu.

Among these the latter excel hundred-fold over the former. Vāyu and Brahmā are equal in status because the present Vāyu is the future Brahmā. So too Rudra, Garuḍa and Śeṣa are equal in status. But these are never equal to Vāyu. Then, on the upper limit is Goddess Lakṣmī who is thousand-fold superior to Vāyu. The highest is Lord Viṣṇu who is infinite-fold superior

to Lakṣmī. These and other scriptural passages declare the over-all supremacy of Lord Viṣṇu, the Bestower of liberation and bliss.

In conformity with the inherent and eternal जीवतारतम्य Madhva points out the अधिकारितारतम्य or gradation in eligibility to study the *Vedānta* or God-knowledge, in his introduction to the *Brahmasūtra-bhāṣya*.⁷⁵

f. मुक्तिः नैजसुखानुभूतिः

In each system of thought, the doctrine of salvation is determined by the conception of the nature of souls and God.

The final state, according to Madhva, is marked by a complete absence of all traces of pain, evil and suffering, coupled with a positive enjoyment of inherent spiritual *ānanda*. This bliss has nothing material about it and is not conditioned by the possession or enjoyment of material objects. There is no fear of its being ever diminished or tainted by evil or otherwise becoming tiresome :

विरजो ब्रह्मलोको न येषु जिह्वं अनृतं न माया चेति ।

(*Praśna.Up.*I.16)

Madhva, lays great stress on the survival of every individual personality, as such, in release. This is the

75. अधिकारश्चोक्तो भागवतन्त्रे - "मन्दमध्योत्तमत्वेन विविधा ह्यधिकारिणः । तत्र मन्दा मनुष्येषु य उच्चमगणा मताः । मध्यमा ऋषिगन्धर्वा देवास्तत्रोत्तमा मताः । इति जातिकृतो भेदस्तथाऽन्यो गुणपूर्वकः ॥ भक्तिमान्परमे विष्णौ यस्त्वध्ययनवात्ररः । अधमः शमादिसंयुक्तो मध्यमः स उदाहृतः ॥ आब्रह्मास्तम्बपर्यन्तमसारं चाप्य- नित्यकम् । विज्ञाय जातवैराग्यो विष्णुपादैकसंश्रयः ॥ स उत्तमोऽधिकारी स्यात्संन्यस्ताखिलकर्मवान् ॥" इति । (1.1.1)

corollary of his belief in the distinctiveness of the *Svarūpa* of each *Jīva*. As release is the realization of the intrinsic bliss of selfhood by each one of us, it must be a positive experience, to be felt and be realized by each and at the same time, incommunicable to others.

The first and foremost fact about *Mokṣa* emphasized by Madhva is its positive aspect. He opposes the purely negative view of *Mokṣa*, held by the *Sāṃkhyas* and the *Naiyāyikas*. To be a "*Puruṣārtha*" and the highest one at that, it must be a state of Supreme bliss. This bliss must be fully manifested, i.e., capable of being actually felt and enjoyed with a full consciousness that it is being enjoyed.

Madhva, therefore, regards *Mukti* as a complete self-expression, self-manifestation and self-realization, in short, a complete unfolding of the self in all its promise and potency :

परंज्योतिरूपसंपद्य स्वेन रूपेणाभिनिष्पद्यते । (Chān.Up.)

मुक्तिर्हित्वान्यथारूपं स्वरूपेण व्यवस्थितिः । (Bhāg.ii.10,6)

The realization of the truth does not mean the abolition of the plurality of the world; but only a removal of the false sense of separateness and independence.⁷⁶ It is a new insight that changes the face of the world and makes all things new. The *Mukta* sees everything thro' the eyes of God,⁷⁷ as dependent on God, in their proper perspective, which he has failed to do in *Samsāra*.

76. यो हि ब्रह्मक्षत्रादिकं जगदात्मनोऽन्यत्र स्वातंत्र्येण लब्धसद्भावं पश्यति, तं मिथ्यादर्शिनं जगत्पराकरेति ।। (Śaṅkara B.S.B. 1.4.19)

77. स ब्रह्मणा पश्यति, ब्रह्मणा शृणोति ब्रह्मणैवेदं सर्वमनुभवति । (Madhva B.S.B. iv.4.5)

There is no prescribed round of activities or code of conduct in *Mokṣa*, which means there is unlimited scope for spontaneous, creative work of every kind, - *Karma*,⁷⁸ *Jñāna*, and *Bhakti*.⁷⁹ There is no call for activity in that, there is no one to call upon you to do this or that. The urge is from within, entirely :

कदाचित्कर्म कुर्वन्ति कदाचिन्नैव कुर्वते ।

नित्यज्ञानस्वरूपत्वान्नित्यं ध्यायन्ति केशवम् ॥ (B.S.B. iii.3.30)

The worship and activity in *Mokṣa*, such as they are, are an end in themselves. They are not means to an end :

साध्यानंदस्वरूपैव भक्तिर्नैवात्र साधनम् । (G.T. p-663)

हरेरुपासना चात्र सदैव सुखरूपिणी ।

न तु साधनभूता सा सिद्धिरेवात्र सा यतः ॥ (B.S.B. iv.4.21)

The *Mokṣa* in which he liberated souls experience the befitting enjoyment is four-fold; (1) *Sālokya*, (2) *Sāmīpya*, (3) *Sārūpya*, (4) *Sāyujya*.

(1) *Sālokya* - Some enjoy to their full contentment residing anywhere in Lord's Realm.

(2) *Sāmīpya* - Some enjoy to their full contentment being in Lord's vicinity.

(3) *Sārūpya* - Some bear four arms and conch, disc and other weapons and enjoy to their full contentment.

78. कृष्णो मुक्तैस्त्रियते वीतमोहैः । (Mbh. xiii.18.16)

79. आत्मारामाश्च मुनयो निर्ग्रन्था अप्युरुक्रमे ।

कुर्वन्त्यहैतुर्को भक्तिमित्थंभूतगुणो हरिः ॥ (Bhāg.i.7.10)

- (4) *Sāyujya* - Some enjoy to their full contentment having entered Lord's body.⁸⁰

Even in the case of liberated Brahmā and others, they do not have the function of world's creation and the like. But, they necessarily have the control over their inferiors. The liberated do not return to this worldly life.⁸¹ Madhva lays more stress on the survival of every individual personality, as such, in *Mokṣa*.

"The released though" capable of realizing all their wishes have their sovereignty limited. They have no power to carry on the cosmic functions of the Supreme Being, such as the creation, preservation etc., of the world."⁸²

"There is natural gradation among the released souls as also disparity in their Sādhanas. The difference in the nature and quality of Sādhanas must necessarily have a relation to the result. The existence of such a gradation in *Mokṣa* is established by reason and revelation. How can any one oppose it ?"⁸³

80. तत्र भोगाश्चतुर्विधाः । सालोक्यसामीप्यसारूप्यसायुज्य भोगवन्त इति । केचन भगवल्लोके यत्र कुत्रचित्स्थिता यथेष्टभोगवन्तः । केचन चतुर्भुजाश्शङ्खचक्राद्यायुधवन्तो यथेष्टभोगिनः । केचन भगवच्छरीरं प्रविश्य यथेष्टभोगवन्तः । Dr. D.N. Shanbhag - "A Primer of Dvaita Vedānta", p.36

81. मुक्तब्रह्मादीनां जगत्सृष्ट्यादिव्यापारो नास्ति । मुक्तस्वकीयावरनियामकत्वं चास्त्येव । पुनस्संसारे नावर्तते मुक्ताः । *Ibid.*, p. 37

82. जगद्ध्यापारवर्जम् (B.S. iv.4.17) "सर्वान्कामानात्वा अमृतः समभवत्" इत्युच्यते । तत्र सृष्ट्यादिभ्योऽन्यान् व्यापारानाप्नोति । जीवानां तादृक्सामर्थ्यविदूरत्वात् ॥ (B.S.B. iv.4, 17-18)

83. तारतम्यं च मुक्तानां, साधनानां च दृश्यते । साध्यसाधनवैरूप्यमदृष्टं केन कल्प्यते ? श्रुतियुक्तिबलादेव तारतम्यं विभाव्यते । मुक्तावपि, ततः केऽत्र विरोधं कर्तुमीशते ? (AV. p. 486)

Thus does Madhva conclude his exposition of the subject of *Mokṣa* with an interesting and spirited defence of the concept of *Ānandatāratamya*. The significance of this unique doctrine lies as much in its logical trenchancy as in its mystic in-wardness. Anyway, here is a conception which applies the principle of peaceful co-existence and fellowship to the whole community of the released souls.

g. अमला भक्तिः तत्साधनम्

The means to secure liberation is pure devotion to Lord. Madhva gives a new and refreshing lead in tackling the problem of relative position of *Bhakti* and *Jñāna* as means of release and determining their mutual relation. *Bhakti* in fact is a deep love of God inspired by and based upon an adequate knowledge of His majesty. It is a blend of both. He does not look upon them as unrelated much less mutually exclusive. They invariably go together in true *Bhakti*. This will be clear from his definition of *Bhakti* :

"That firm and unshakable love of God, which rises above all other ties of love and affection based upon an adequate knowledge and conviction of His great majesty, is called "*Bhakti*". That alone is the means of *Mokṣa*."⁸⁴

Stages of Bhakti :

Spiritual knowledge or realization according to Madhva, is not a mere cold intellectual apprehension of

84. माहात्म्यज्ञानपूर्वस्तु सुदृढः सर्वतोऽधिकः । स्नेहो भक्तिरिति प्रोक्तस्तथा मुक्तिर्नचान्यथा ॥ (Mbh.T.N.i.86)

Reality. It is a vivid preception of the Supreme Reality as the pivot of one's own reality, consciousness and bliss (*sarva-sattāpratīti-pravṛtti-nimittam*), with the utmost warmth of love and attraction for one's own *Bimba* that the soul is capable of, which is known as *Bhakti*. Such *Bhakti*, according to Madhva, both precedes and follows the attainment of knowledge :

“From *Bhakti* one reaches (mediate) knowledge, thence again ripe *Bhakti*, thence vision and thence again very ripe devotion to the Lord. Then comes *Mukti* (release) and thereby *Bhakti* again, which is of the essence of bliss and an end in itself.”⁸⁵

Highest Bhakti an end in itself :

A very striking and almost unique feature of Madhva's philosophy of *Bhakti* is that it is viewed, not as a means to an end, but as an end in itself.

Says Madhva of this state : “The worship of the Lord, there is an unalloyed bliss in itself. It is not a means to any further end. It is an end in itself and a fulfilment of our selfhood.”⁸⁶

It is not open to us, in *Samsāra*, to peep into the released state and try to describe in detail the behaviour of the blessed ones in release towards the Lord or towards one another. That state of blessedness

85. भक्त्या ज्ञानं ततो भक्तिस्ततो दृष्टिस्ततश्च सा ।
ततो मुक्तिस्ततो भक्तिः सैव स्यात् सुखरूपिणी ॥

Madhva, *Anuvyākhyāna*, Sarvamūla Vol, I, III.iv.
Śloka.215, p. 187

86. हरेरुपासना चात्र सदैव सुखरूपिणी ।

न तु साधनभूता सा सिद्धिरेवात्र सा यतः ॥ (B.S.B. iv.4.21)

is something beyond our comprehension in its richness and glory.⁸⁷

He emphasizes two aspects of devotion : the positive and the negative. It is worthy of note that the theory and practice of *Bhakti*, as taught by Madhva and his followers, are free from all traces of erotic manifestations, which dominate or at least colour the conception of *Bhakti* in certain forms of North Indian Vaiṣṇavism, like those of Jayadeva, Caitanya and Vallabha.

In his view, *Kāma-Bhakti* or erotic devotion is the special privilege of *Apsarasas* and ought not to be practised by others. He indicates a variety of stand points of devotion with reference to different orders of *Jīvas* and harmonizes the various accounts on the basis of *adhikāras*.

Madhva's concept of *Bhakti* avoids these emotional excesses and identifications and remains at its exalted intellectual and spiritual level of firm philosophic devotion to the Supreme Lord of the universe who is to be worshipped with loving attachment as the *Bimba* of all *pratibimbas* (*Jīvas*). But it is not, on that account lacking in intensity of fervor and feeling. For, Madhva has recognized in the clearest terms, that *Bhakti* is in essence an ineffable blending of the emotion and the intellect.

It is what the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* refers to as the intrinsic devotion of God-intoxicated souls like Sanaka,

87. सुखमात्यन्तिकं यत्तद् बुद्धिग्राह्यमतीन्द्रियम् ।

वेत्ति यत्र न चैवायं स्थिश्चलति तत्त्वतः ॥ (Gītā.vi.21)

who feel a natural bond of attraction to the Lord and go on practising *Bhakti* even after *siddhi* (*Mokṣa*) :

आत्मारामाश्च मुनयो निर्ग्रन्था अप्युरुक्रमे ।
कुर्वन्त्यहेतुकीं भक्तिं इत्थंभूतगुणो हरिः ॥ (1.7.10)

h. अक्षादित्रितयं प्रमाणम्

The means of valid knowledge are only three; viz., **perception, inference and verbal testimony.**

“*Pramāṇa*” in the first sense of valid knowledge refers to the capacity of true knowledge to reveal the nature of an object as it really is : यथावस्थितज्ञेयविषयीकारि ।

Madhva has done a distinct service to epistemology in distinguishing these two senses and usages of the term and coining two separate terms “*Kevala*” and “*Anu*” *Pramāṇa*, to denote them, without ambiguity. He defines *Pramāṇa* in both the above senses as यथार्थम्.⁸⁸

Kevala-Pramāṇa is divided into four types, in the descending order of merit as *Īśvara-jñāna*, *Lakṣmī-jñāna*, *Yogī-jñāna*, and *Ayogī-jñāna*, on the basis of intrinsic difference in quality, luminosity and range. The first two are in the nature of *Svarūpa-jñāna* alone while the other two include *vṛtti-jñāna* (sensory knowledge) also.⁸⁹

Kevala-pramāṇa has two aspects : knowledge consisting of the essence of selfhood and that arising from mental processes. These are graded in regard to validity as regards both, into *uttama*, *madhyama*, and *adhama*.

88. यथार्थं प्रमाणम् । तद्विधम् । केवलमनुप्रमाणं च । Madhva, *Pramāṇa-lakṣaṇa*, *Daśaprakaraṇa* Vol.I. A.B.M.M. Bangalore - 1969 p. 9

89. केवलं चतुर्विधम् । ईशलक्ष्मीयोग्ययोगिभेदेन । *Ibid.*, p. 16

The *Anupramāṇa* constitutes *Pratyakṣa* - perception, inference and *Āgama* - verbal. Thus, the means of valid knowledge in the Dvaita system of *Vedānta*, are only three.

Madhva defines *pratyakṣa* as knowledge produced by the right type of contact between flawless sense-organs and their appropriate objects.⁹⁰ Such contact would be in the nature of an *Anu-pramāṇa*.

In the case of *pratyakṣa*, the right kind of reapproachment between the sense-organs and the objects as well as other conditions of suitable distance, angle of observation, adequate light and so on are meant to be conveyed by the term ‘*nirdoṣa*’. These conditions are applicable to the object the sense-organs and their contact as well. Perception becomes faulty through excessive remoteness, nearness or smallness of objects or intervening obstructions or being mixed up with things similar to them or through similarity to others knowledge, arising when all these conditions of flawlessness are fulfilled, is bound to be true and valid; *Yathārtham*.

The *Sākṣi* intuits its own self (*ātman*) and its characteristics of bliss etc., as well as the mind and its processes, *Avidyā*, knowledge arising from external senses, the feelings of pleasure and pain etc., Time, Space and God. The mind comprehends external reality through the sense organs and acts as the independent instrument of memory (aided by *Samskāras*).

The other sense have their own well-defined sphere of objects.

90. निर्दोषार्थेन्द्रियसन्निकर्षः प्रत्यक्षम् । *Ibid.*, p. 33.

According to Madhva, *inference* consists in the knowledge of the mark of inference as pervaded by the *sādhya* and invariable concomitant with it, leading to the ascertainment of the *Sādhya*.⁹¹ *Pratyakṣa* (perception), the means of valid knowledge is eight-fold : *Sākṣin*, six sense-organs (including mind) and valid knowledge.⁹²

Anumāna (Inference) is three-fold : *Kevalānvayin* (affirmative alone), *Kevalavyatirekin* (negative alone) and *Anvaya-Vyatirekin* (affirmative and negative).

The *Kevalānvayin* possesses that *vyāpti* which is understood as associated with only an affirmative illustration. It is independently the cause of inferential knowledge.

The *Kevalvyatirekin* possesses the *vyāpti* which is understood as associated with only negative illustration. It is not a direct (independent) cause of inferential knowledge; but becomes the cause through the knowledge of the *Vyāpti* associated with only affirmative instance. Because negative concomitance is dissociated from the subject under discussion.

The *Anvaya-Vyatirekin* possesses the *Vyāpti* which is understood as associated with both (affirmative and negative instances). Here also, only the knowledge of the *Anvaya-vyāpti* is the cause of the inferential knowledge. [Even though *Anvaya-vyāpti* is thus the cause of the inferential knowledge], the three-fold

91. निर्दोषोपपत्तिरनुमानम् | *Ibid.*, p. 34

92. प्रत्यक्षप्रमाणमष्टविधम् | साक्षिषडिन्द्रिययथार्थज्ञानभेदात् |

Dr. D.N. Shanbhag, *Madhva Siddhānta Sāra* of Padmanabhasuri, Dvaita Vedānta Studies and Research Foundation, Bangalore, 1994, p. 21.

division of inference is because of the distinction in the cause of the knowledge of *Vyāpti*.⁹³

Again inference is two-fold; *Svārtha* (for oneself) and *parārtha* (for others). The *Svārtha* is the cause of one obtaining inferential knowledge for oneself and the *parārtha* is the cause of imparting inferential knowledge of others.⁹⁴

Āgama [verbal testimony] is two-fold : *Pauruṣeya* [human composition] and *Apauruṣeya* [not human composition]. The human composition of only the trustworthy persons are valid and authoritative. The trustworthiness of the speaker consists of (1) perfect and true knowledge of the subject intended to impart. (2) absolute absence of wrong understanding, carelessness, deceitful desire, defective sense-organs and others; and (3) following the Vedas; for example, the *Mahābhārata*. The entire Veda which is not human composition is valid and authoritative. The fact that the Veda is not human composition is proved by the Veda itself.

That Veda alone, the meaning of which has been determined by six-fold interpretational canons viz.

93. अनुमानं त्रिविधम् | केवलान्वयि केवलव्यतिरेक्यन्वयव्यतिरेकिभेदात् | अन्वय-सहचारमात्रग्राह्यव्याप्तिकं केवलान्वयि | स्वातन्त्र्येणानुमितिहेतुः | व्यतिरेकसहचार-मात्रग्राह्यव्याप्तिकं केवल व्यतिरेकि | व्यतिरेकव्याप्तिज्ञानमन्वव्याप्तिज्ञानद्वारानुमिति-हेतुः | न तु साक्षात् | व्यधिकरणत्वाद्व्यतिरेकव्याप्तेः | उभयसहचारग्राह्य व्याप्तिक-मन्वयव्यतिरेकि | अत्राप्यन्वयव्याप्तिज्ञानमेवानुमितिहेतुः | व्याप्तिज्ञानकारणभेदान्द्वेदः | *Ibid.*, p. 21.

94. स्वार्थं परार्थं चेति पुनर्द्विविधमनुमानम् | स्वार्थं स्वानुमितिहेतुः | परानुमितिहेतुः परार्थम् | यावता विना नानुमितिस्तावदवयवाः प्रयोक्तव्याः | न तु पञ्चावयव-नियमः | *Ibid.*, p. 21.

Upakrama (commencement) and others causes true knowledge. Otherwise it causes wrong knowledge.⁹⁵

The sense of the Veda is three-fold : The Lord, gods like Brahmā and others, and the Lord's forms residing in them. The Lord is expounded through the super-primary word power. All else is expounded through primary power (denotation), implication, indication, metaphor, conventional metaphor, and conventional implication.

The primary or expressive power (denotation) is also three-fold : etymological, conventional and etymologico-conventional. *Rūḍhi* or convention is ample usage; e.g. the words '*gauh*', '*ghaṭah*' etc., denoting the cow, the pot, etc. *Yoga* or etymology is expressive power of the parts of a word; e.g. the words '*pācaka*' etc. denoting (cooks like) Devadatta and others. Combination of both is *Yogarūḍhi*, e.g. the words '*pañkaja*' etc. denoting the lotus and the like.⁹⁶

95. आगमो द्विविधः । पौरुषेयापौरुषेयभेदात् । पौरुषेय आतोक्त एव प्रमाणम् । वक्तुरासता च विवक्षितार्थतत्त्वज्ञानम् । भ्रमप्रमादविप्रलिप्साकर्णपाटवादिशून्यत्वं च । वेदानुसारित्वं वा । यथा भारतादि । अपौरुषेयस्तु सर्वोऽपि वेदः प्रमाणम् । वेदापौरुषेयत्वं च वेदेनैव सिद्धम् । उपक्रमादिषु द्विधातात्पर्यलिङ्गैर्निर्णीतार्थक एव वेदः प्रमाणकः । अन्यथा भ्रमजनकः । *Ibid.*, p. 21

96. वेदार्थस्त्रिविधः । परमात्मा ब्रह्मादिदेवास्तदन्तर्गतभगवद्रूपाणि चेति । परममुख्यया वृत्त्या परमात्मप्रतिपादकः । तदन्यप्रतिपादकता च मुख्यया लक्षणया गौण्योपचारेण रूढोपचारेण रूढलक्षणया चेति ।

मुख्यवृत्तिरपि त्रिविधा । योगो रूढिर्योगरूढिश्चेति । प्रयोगबाहुल्यमात्रं रूढिः । यथा गोघटादिशब्दानां गोघटादिषु । अवयववृत्तिः र्योगः । यथा पाचकादिशब्दानां देवदत्तादौ । तदुभयं योगरूढिः । यथा पङ्कजादिशब्दानां पद्मादौ । मुख्यान्वयानुपपत्तिपूर्वकं मुख्यसम्बन्धवति वृत्तिर्लक्षणा । यथा गङ्गायां घोष इत्यत्र गङ्गापदस्य तीरे । मुख्यार्थसादृश्यवति वृत्तिर्गौणी । यथाग्निशब्दस्य माणवके । →

i. अखिलाम्नायैकवेद्यो हरिः -

Lord Hari is known by the entire sacred Vedic literature. Such अखिलाम्नाय or entire mass of Vedic literature constitutes all Vedas and other texts following the line thereof. In precise, it is thus -

R̥gVeda, *YajurVeda*, *SāmaVeda* and *AtharvaVeda*, *Mahābhārata*, the entire *Pañcarātra*, original *Rāmāyaṇa*, the *Purāṇas* that are not contrary to these all such works that follow these are the sacred scripture. The other texts that are opposed to these and indifferent to the tenets in these, are perverted texts. These do not help to know *Nārāyaṇa*.⁹⁷

The theory of knowability of Lord Hari through Vedas alone, is well supported by the authorities. He who does not know the Veda etc., sacred scripture will

→ उपचार मात्रं यथा । चित्रलिखितसिंहादौ सिंहशब्दस्य । तत्र प्रयोगबाहुल्यं चेद्गूढोप-
चारः । यथा तसायः पिण्डे दग्धशब्दस्य । रूढलक्षणा यथा । मार्गाश्चलन्तीत्यादौ
मार्गादिशब्दानां तत्स्थे ।

लक्षणापि त्रिविधा । जहदजहल्लक्षितलक्षणाभेदात् । मुख्यार्थ परित्यागो
यत्र तत्र जहल्लक्षणा । गङ्गापदस्य तीरे । मुख्यार्थस्यापरित्यागो यत्र तत्र
जहल्लक्षणा । छत्रिपदस्याच्छत्रिष्वपि । लक्ष्यं सम्बन्धी कृत्य तत्सम्बन्धिनि
वृत्तिर्लक्षितलक्षणा । एकीभवन्तीत्यादौ च्विप्रत्ययस्य मत्वैक्यद्वारा मतिमत्सु । एता
वृत्तयो जगति ।

परमात्मनि महायोगो महारूढिश्च । इन्द्रादिजगद्वाचिशब्दानां परमात्मनि
महायोगः । योगार्थस्यैश्वर्यदिः परमात्मनि निरवधिकत्वात् । इन्द्रादिगताल्पैश्वर्यस्यापि
परमात्माधीनत्वाच्च । नारायणादि शब्दानां महायोगरूढिः । *Ibid.*, p. 21-22

97. ऋगाद्या भारतं चैव पञ्चरात्रमथाखिलम् ।
मूलरामायणं चैव पुराणं चैतदात्मकम् ॥
ये चानुयायिनस्तेषां सर्वे ते च सदागमाः ।
दुरगमास्तदन्ये ये तैर्न ज्ञेयो जनार्दनः ॥

not be able to comprehend the Supreme God who possesses infinite attributes and who is omniscient. The Veda teaches the Supreme God to enable the seeker to obtain the liberation-thus states the *Taittirīya Śruti*.

Not the senses, nor the inferences help one to comprehend the God. Vedas alone enable to comprehend him - thus states *Pippalāda Śruti*.

The entire Veda consisting of *Vidhi, Arthavada, Saṅkalpa, Prārthanā* etc., is eternal and always of the same form. It is present in the mind of the Supreme God always in the same form. At the commencement of each creation the Vedas are uttered by the Supreme God in the same order, with the same letters, and with the same accent without any change. The Vedas are only heard by all and therefore are designated as *Śruti*. These are partly revealed to the seers who had heard them in the previous births, by the grace of the Supreme God. These are seen by the Supreme God and heard by others. Therefore, these are designated as *Śruti* and described as seen by the ancients.

The Vedas and the other sacred literature convey the Supreme God *Nārāyaṇa* who is omniscient, creator of all, free from the defects and inadequacies, and Supreme. *Veda, Itihāsa, Purāṇa* and other scriptures chiefly convey him. The other things i.e., *Dharma* etc., are conveyed only to enable us to understand his glory.⁹⁸

98. उक्तं च नारदीये -

सर्वज्ञं सर्वकर्तारं नारायणमनामयम् ।
सर्वोत्तमं ज्ञापयन्ति महातात्पर्यमत्र हि ।
सर्वेषामपि वेदानामितिहासपुराणयोः ।
प्रमाणानां च सर्वेषां तदर्थं चान्यदुच्यते ॥

Prof. K.T. Pandurangi "*Viṣṇutattvavirṇaya*", p. 38

The *Mahopaniṣat* states that the entire scripture chiefly conveys the Supreme God who possesses unlimited number of attributes, who is absolutely free from the drawbacks who is unique and distinct from all others. The scriptures does not convey anything else.⁹⁹



99. सर्वोत्तमं सर्वदोषव्यपेतं गुणैः अशेषैः पूर्णमन्यं समस्तात् ।
वैलक्षण्यात् ज्ञापयितुं प्रवृत्ताः सर्वे वेदाः मुख्यतो नैव चान्यत् ॥ इति महोपनिषदि ॥
Ibid., p. 212

III. Critical Analysis of Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad

i. Introduction :

At the outset, the *Kāṭhaka-Upaniṣad* relates its subject-matter to an *ākhyāyikā* wherein Vājaśravas and Naciketa play an important role. Also, it is evident, the character of Naciketa has thrown its effect on the metaphysics elucidated in the *Upaniṣad* throughout; while Vājaśravas' role carries its effect in the beginning portion only, and forms an introduction to the elucidation of the puport of the *Upaniṣad*.

In this vein, the seer of the *Kāṭhaka-Upaniṣad* narrates the story that begins with the performance of *Viśvajit* sacrifice, in which all wealth owned by oneself, should be given away in charity. Thus, the *Upaniṣad* reads the *mantra* : उशन् ह वै वाजश्रवसः सर्वविदसं ददौ । This *mantra* in the light of the interpretation of Śaṅkara and Madhva does not underline any remarkable difference in theme. However the word उशन् is used in the sense of 'desirous' by both the commentators. They interpret it as कामयमानः ।¹

Of course, there is no word in the *mantra* naming the sacrifice as *Viśvajit*, being performed by Vājaśravas. Yet, the word सर्वविदसम् implies the meaning of *Viśvajit*

1. a) उशन् कामयमानो ई वा इति | R.Kāth.Up.Bh., p.6.
- b) इच्छन् वाजश्रवसो नप्ता ददौ सर्वदक्षिणाम् | M.Kāth.Up.Bh., p.1.
- c) The word उशन् is derived from the root वश् (इच्छायां) - 1st conjugation, Vide, वश 1156 कान्तौ कान्तिरिच्छा | Pāṇinisūtra →

sacrifice. It may be, on the basis of this, Śaṅkara names the sacrifice as *Viśvajit* in his commentary. Although Madhva does not make a mention of *Viśvajit* as such; Rāghavendrayatī in his *khandāratha* names the same. Even otherwise, there would be no lacuna in understanding the meaning of the *mantra* in particular.

Apart from this, Śaṅkara's interpretation of the word वाजश्रवसः is very interesting i.e., he splits this term as वाज and श्रवसः । Here वाजं means food, and श्रवसः means fame. Thus it means, it is he whose fame is consequent on the giving of food. This is how Śaṅkara upholds the significance of this term.² This term *Vājaśravas* can also be treated as a proper noun.

Śaṅkara says that वाजश्रवसः is the son of वाजश्रवा । But, both the Vādirājatīrtha and Vedeśatīrtha in their commentaries on Madhva's *bhāṣya*, give their opinions that वाजश्रवस is a grandson of a sage called वाजश्रव ।³ He is otherwise called उद्दालकः ।

- (P.S.) 7.4.53; *Siddhānta-Kaumudī* (S.K.) - 2488. Here, उ is substituted for व of the root वश्; hence the form is उशन् ।
- d) Rāṅgarāmānuja has no different interpretation of *Uśan* from that of Śaṅkara or Madhva. Nevertheless Veerarāghavācārya, a glossator says that उशन् is the name of Vājaśravasa. Vide : उशन्निति वाजश्रवसस्य नामधेयम्, श्रुतिषु तत्तन्नाम तत्तत्कुलपूर्वपुरुषनामोभयनिर्देशेन तत्तत्कीर्तनस्यैव सर्वत्र दर्शनादिति | *Kāṭhaka-Upaniṣad bhāṣya*, Ubhaya Vedānta granthamala, Madras - 1972. p.27.
2. Rāṅgarāmānuja too reiterates the same opinion : वाजश्रवसः वाजेन अग्नेन दानादिकर्मभूतेन श्रवः - कीर्तिः यस्य स वाजश्रवा । तस्यापत्यं वाजश्रवसः । *Ibid.* p. 27-28.
3. उशन्हवै वाजश्रवस इत्यत्र वाजश्रवो नाम कश्चिदृषिः । तस्य नसा पौत्रपुत्रः उद्दालकाख्यः वाजश्रवस इत्युच्यते । 'काठकोपनिषदाध्यटिप्पणी' श्री वादिराजग्रन्थ प्रकाश समिति । उदुपि - *Śaka*-1890. p.1.

In this manner both Śaṅkara and Madhva differ from each other in giving its connotative meaning; for, former one renders it as the *son of*, while the latter one as *grandson of*. In this connection, Max Muller's remark may be taken note of : Vājaśravas is called Āruṇi Auddālakī Gautama, the father of Naciketa. The father of Svetaketu, another enlightened pupil (See *Khānd-Up. VI.i.1*) is also called Āruṇi (Uddālaka, comm. Kaush Up.1.1) Gautama. Svetaketu himself is called Āruṇeya, i.e. the son of Āruṇi, the grandson of Aruna, and likewise Auddālakī. Auddālakī is a son of Uddālaka, but Śaṅkara (*Kath. Up. I.1*) takes Auddālakī as possibly the same as Uddālaka.⁴

However, any researcher finds no harm to the philosophical aspect of the *Upaniṣad*, in accepting either of the renderings.

The first word (उशन्) of the *Upaniṣad* strikes the key-note of the religion of the Brahmanas, – desire for earthly or heavenly gain, prompting sacrifices to the gods and gifts to the priests. The key-note of the *Upaniṣads* is sounded in II.20 : [तमक्रतुः पश्यति वीतशोको -----] “One who is free from desire beholds Him.” This is the note on which the *Upaniṣads* ends. [ब्रह्मप्राप्तो विराजोऽभूद्विमृत्युः अन्योऽप्येवं यो विदध्यात्ममेव] “Then mortal man becomes immortal, – Even here to Brahman he attaineth ---- Sometimes in the *Upaniṣads* of the former.”⁵

4. F. Max Muller, 'The Sacred Books of the East', Vol. 15, *Kāṭha-Upaniṣad*, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1975, p.3., fn.1.
5. Rawson - *The Kāṭha-Upaniṣad*, Oxford University Press, London - 1934, p.58.

In this connection, S. Radhakrishnan remarks that “He is represented as making a voluntary surrender of all that he possessed, Samnyāsa, in order to secure his spiritual interest.” Further the same philosopher points out that “He performs the sacrifice and makes gifts which are unworthy.”⁶

In fact, these two statements are contrary to each other. Besides, the former statement does not go well with the *Upaniṣad*. No doubt, performance of the sacrifice in the proper manner successively leads to liberation. But as the *Upaniṣad* emphatically states, the manner in which Vājaśravas is seen performing the sacrifice does not beget any spiritual gain. This is however crystal clear in the *Upaniṣad*. Nevertheless, the above statement makes a remark that Vājaśravas performs sacrifice to secure his spiritual interest. Further the latter statement though contrary to the former one, is in tune with that of the *Upaniṣad*. Thus, Radhakrishna's opinion is not agreeable as a whole.

As it is clear from the second and third mantras of the first *valli*, Naciketa is pure at his intellect; as such he can see what to do and what ought not to do.

It is but natural that Naciketa in the beginning with all curiosity and devotion, observes the performance of the sacrifice. Also he pondered himself that his father gives away decrepit old cows in charity to the brahmins in the sacrifice. Such an act leads the person to the joyless regions. Naciketa could not resist his feelings aroused by seeing the sacrifice, being performed in a denounceable manner. He wills to ask his father

6. S. Radhakrishna, *The Principal Upaniṣads* p.593.

about the importance and utility of the sacrifice. So that, his father would perform the same in the manner it is prescribed. This explanation is focused in the Upaniṣadic phrase सोऽमन्यत् । [I.1.2] The *mantra* पीतोदका जग्धतृणा ---- (1.1.3) makes an assertion that a sacrificer whosoever he is, if gives away unworthy articles as gifts, will enter the joyless sorrowful world. In this connection it is said : "Quality of mercy is twice blessed" indeed. All actions of piety convey great satisfaction both to the giver and to the receiver. But one who makes a bad gift, does not enjoy this. He suffers from the pricks of conscience; and remains always in a joyless state."⁷

This part of the story of Naciketa is valuable as it shows true way of regarding the performance of sacrifice. In this connection, Rawson remarks thus : "The story links up the religion of the Brāhmaṇas and the religion of the Upaniṣads and shows that the latter was not merely the antithesis but also the true fulfilment of the former. In the Brāhmaṇas sacrifice had become mechanical and soulless. But, there was a right idea behind it."⁸

In the context of fourth *mantra*, Śaṅkara gives an hint that Naciketa thought himself that he should ward off the evil result befalling his father as a consequence of the imperfection of the sacrifice.⁹ Therefore, he approaches his father and says thus :

7. Chitrita Devi, 'Upaniṣads for all', S. Chand & Co. (Pvt.) Ltd., Delhi, 1973, p.36.

8. Joseph Nāḍin Rawson "The Kāṭha Upaniṣad" Oxford University Press. London 1934. P.58.

9. तं ह नाचिकेतसं कुमारं प्रथमवयसं सन्तम् अप्राप्तप्रजननशक्तं बालमेव श्रद्धा आस्तिक्यबुद्धिः पितृहितकामप्रयुक्ता आविवेश प्रविष्टवती । Ś.Kāth.Up.Bh. p.7

स होवाच पितरं तत कस्मै मां दास्यतीति ।
द्वितीयं तृतीयं तं होवाच मृत्यवे त्वां ददामीति ॥ (1.1.4)

As this *mantra* declares, the young lad Naciketa ask his father to give rather his own son (Naciketa himself) than such useless cows. But his father ignores his speech; even then he insisted the same for a second and a third time. Being incensed, the father curses him saying "you are given to death." Here, Naciketa thinks that a son also belonged to his father. So when his father had promised to give away his everything, he should give away his son too.

Another point that Śaṅkara makes clear that though Naciketa is a lad by age, his intellect is not immatured. His words are as irritating as that of a grown up person.¹⁰

So far as Madhva's interpretation of this *mantra* is concerned, there is no conspicuous difference of opinion from that of Śaṅkara. Nevertheless, Madhva supplies a reason for Naciketa offering to the death. Madhva's cryptic sentence runs thus : मां दत्त्वा अपि न ते गावो दातव्या ईदृशा इति ॥ [M.Kāth.Up.Bh. p.1] It means that Naciketa wants father's sacrifice fulfilled on any count. If such poor cows be given as *Dakṣiṇā*, then bad fruit would result in. And, bad result would add to the incompleteness of the sacrifice. Therefore, Naciketa asks to his father "To whom will you give me". Thus, by giving Naciketa away as '*Dakṣiṇā*' let father obtain good fruit. This is an intended meaning here.

10. नायं कुमारस्वभावं इति क्रुद्धः सन् पिता तं ह पुत्रं किल उवाच "मृत्यवे वैवस्वताय त्वा त्वां ददामि" इति । Ś.Kāth.Up.Bh. p.8.

Another line of suggestion that Madhva makes, is that Naciketa may have entertained a thought that if he speaks in an irritating manner by sacrificing himself, the eyes of his father might be opened, and so, his father might stop giving such useless cows as *dakṣiṇā*. Thus the sacrifice could be performed in a right manner, thereby a good fruit could be acquired.¹¹

Referring to the statement मृत्यवे त्वा ददामिति, Rawson remarks "these words are equivalent with that of an angry englishmen 'goes to hell' Further he states that his words were probably a mere expression of announces but Naciketa, in his piety, takes them literally, and sets out for the house of Yama, the God of death."¹²

An objection may be raised here that verily, Vājaśravas spoke in anger to Naciketa : "to death I offer you" : but how is it that mere incensed words of Vājasravas made Naciketa leave for the realm of death.

It is not legitimate. Because, it has been an admitted fact that through the ages in Indian culture, the words spoken by a spiritual personality who has acquired वाक्सिद्धि would come true and never go futile. Accordingly, Bhavabhūti states -

“ऋषीणां पुनराद्यानां वाचमर्थोऽनुधावति ।”¹³

Therefore, one should understand here that the words of Vājaśravas because of his having वाक्सिद्धि resulted Naciketa to go to the God of Death.

11. ते त्वया ईदृशाः ईदृश्यः गावो न दातव्याः । न चैवं गोदानं प्रतिज्ञाभंगः । मां दत्त्वापि तस्याः पूणीयत्वात् इत्यर्थः । Vedeśatīrtha's com. p.36.

12. *Op.cit.*, Rawson, p.65.

13. उत्तरामचरितं of Bhavabhūti 1.10. p.42

When the father Vājaśravas exiled Naciketa into the realm of Death, Naciketa wishes to retire from presence of his father. In that quietude, Naciketa spells out : बहूनामेमि प्रथमः बहूनामेमि मध्यमः । (I.5) that is - "Of many, I go the first; of many, I go midmost". Interpreting this line, Śāṅkara accounts for a behaviour of disciple before one's teacher. In precise, according to Śāṅkara, Naciketa means to say that among many sons or disciples he ranks first owing to the best conduct of a disciple; and as a middling one, he behaves in a middling manner.¹⁴ Simplifying this idea, Ānandagiri states that the best disciple is that who engages himself in the service of the teacher by reading his heart at the proper time. That disciple is a middling one who acts on the command of the teacher; and a disobedient one is considered to be the worst. So much so that being commanded by his father, Naciketa wishes to leave for the realm of Yama.¹⁵

On the otherhand, Dvaita interpretation of the line above, begets a simpler meaning i.e., Naciketa being scolded by his father unhesitatingly says that being the first among the men who will die, he goes to Yama; and being the middle one among many who are dead, he goes to Yama. Death being an unavoidable event in the life Naciketa has no fear of it. Naciketa sees that many have died before and many will die

14. बहूनां शिष्याणां पुत्राणां वेमि गच्छामि प्रथमः सन्मुख्यया शिष्यादिवृत्त्येत्यर्थः । मध्यमानां च बहूनां मध्यमो मध्यमयैव वृत्त्यैमि । Śāṅkara's *bhāṣya*, *Kāthaka Upaniṣad*. p.9.

15. यथावसरं गुरोरिष्टं ज्ञात्वा शुश्रूषणे प्रवृत्तिर्मुख्या । आज्ञावज्ञेन मध्यमा । तदपरिपालनेनाधमा । Ānandagiriṭika on *S.Kāth.Up.Bh.*, p.9.

hence foreword. Usually when a gift is give away to some one it is taken for granted that the gift serves some purpose of the receiver but here in the case Naciketa, though he is given away to God Yama by his father, no purpose of the receiver that is Yama, will be served by the death of Naciketa. Therefore, Naciketa remarks that - one need not be afraid of death. This is what highlighted in the dvaita interpretation.¹⁶ Naturally one fines no in consistency therein.

Raṅgarāmānuja too welcomes the same meaning. Śaṅkara's interpretation of बहूनामेमि मध्यमः is quite appealing one and ideal too. Naciketa is applied with a behaviour of middling disciple No doubt, it is appropriate one. But, such application is absent in his interpretation of बहूनामेमि प्रथमः । Hence, former part of his interpretation appears not balancing balancing.

Further, for his being free from the fear of death. Naciketa explains the reason with an illustration of a plant. Here, Naciketa gives an hint to his father that life must necessarily end after a period of existence. This resembles a plant that rots to be reborn : मर्त्यः पच्यते सस्यमिवाऽऽजायते पुनः । [1.6.]

Śaṅkara induces here a significant advice which is to be noted by all true seekers. Many are the moments when a faithful seeker feels himself lost on the path of life, being incapable of discriminating the

16. बहूनां मरिष्यमाणानां मध्येऽहं प्रथमः सन् यममेमि यामि बहूनां मृतानां मध्ये मध्यमस्सन्वा यममेमि । ती यमस्य मया किं स्वित् किं वा कर्तव्यं स्यात् । यन्मयाद्य करिष्यति न तत् किमस्ति किमपि ॥ *Daśopaniṣad - Khaṇḍārthasahitā, Part-I* Poornaprajña Vidyapeetha, Bangalore, 1985. pp.24-25.

do's and don'ts. This is however the practical tip for an aspirant. At such moment the *Upaniṣad* advises "Remember how our forefathers acted, consider also how others act." With reference to the good actions of the great persons of the past and of the present, the *Upaniṣad* here instructs what is to be followed and what is not.¹⁷

This *mantra* indicates that Vājaśravas, being repented at his abrupt spelling the words, desires to take his words back. But breaking ones own words his not advisable. Realising this truth, Naciketa directly addresses his father : अनुपश्य यथा पूर्वे ---- । Naciketa ask his father not to break his own words and to protect the tradition of the long past. Thus, finally Naciketa requests his father to send him to death.

Both Madhva and Raṅgarāmānuja do not differ from the former.

The word जायते is read by some without आ, which of course makes no difference from one another.

Explaining this *mantra*, it is remarked that "the doctrine of rebirth is assumed here."¹⁸ In this remark the word *assumed* appears to be not suitable as it gives linguistically a room for the want of proof. Thereby it leaves a question to the authority of the *Upaniṣads*, which is unquestionable. The word 'Suggested' or 'implied' may be substituted for it.

17. अनुपश्याऽऽलोचय निभालयानुक्रमेण यथा येन प्रकारेण वृत्ताः पूर्वेऽतिक्रान्ताः पितृपितामहादयस्तव । तान्दृष्ट्वा च तेषां वृत्तमास्थातुमर्हसि वर्तमानाश्चापरे साधवो यथा वर्तन्ते तांश्च प्रतिपश्याऽऽलोचय तथा । न च तेषु मृषाकरणं वृत्तं वर्तमानं वाऽस्ति । *Ānandagīritika on Ś.Kāth.Up.Bh.* p.10.

18. S. Radhakrishna, "The Principle *Upaniṣads*" p.597.

The previous *mantra* अनुपश्य यथा पूर्वे --- [1.6] suggests that any individual soul does not gain eternal wealth in this perishable world. That is why, a mortal thing withers and is born again like a plant. As a death is quite natural to one and all, Naciketa does not feel sorry for being admonished to go to Yama's abode.

The succeeding *mantra* [वैश्वानरः प्रविशति ---- 1.7];¹⁹ when read, appears to be not in tune with the preceding one, as it indicates an injunction of a receiving the guest in due manner. So any close reader does feel a gap of understanding the import between the preceding *mantra* and the succeeding one. At this juncture, commentators help the readers.

Providing a link between the *fifth mantra* and *sixth* one, Śaṅkara states that "Having been addressed thus, the father sent Naciketa for sake of his own veracity. And he, having gone to Yama's abode, lived for three nights (i.e. days), as Yama was out. When Yama returned from his sojourn, his councillors or wives said to him by way of advice."²⁰

Although Madhva putforth²¹ the same thing in a crisp sentence, Raghavendrayati is quite explicit in his words.²²

19. Cf. Vāsishtā XI, 13; Sacred Books of the East, Vol. XIV, p.51
20. स एवमुक्तः पिताऽऽत्मनः सत्यतायै प्रेषयामास | स च यमभवनं गत्वा तिस्त्रो रत्रोरुवास यमे प्रोषिते | प्रोष्याऽऽगतं यमममात्या भार्या वा उचुः | S. Kāth.Up.Bh. p.11
21. पत्न्या सम्पूज्यमानोऽपि जग्राहार्थ्यादिकं न तु | आगते तु यमे प्राह यमं सोदकमाहर | M. Kāth.Up.Bh. p.2-3.
22. अथ यमलोकं गतो नाचिकेताः | तदा यमोऽन्यलोकं गत्वा स्थितोभूत् | यमभार्यया कृतामतिथिपूजां यजमानाभावान्न गृह्णामीत्युक्त्वा दिनत्रयपर्यन्तमुपवासेन तद्दृह एव स्थितवान् | ततो यमे चागते यमं प्रति भार्योक्तिप्रकारमाह | वैश्वानर इति | R. Ku.khd. p.25

The point that Śaṅkara emphasizes here that Vājaśravas sends his son Naciketa to Yama' abode for sake of making himself truthful, which his ancestors maintained throughout their life.

While reading Śaṅkara's interpretation, the sentence पिताऽऽत्मनः सत्यतायैः प्रेषयामास - fills in the sense of selfishness in the mind of Vājaśravas when it underlines that at the cost of Naciketa's life his father Vājaśravas strives hard to protect his being truthful, by making his son obey his words. Of course, this point does not add any ethical value but, rather it churns away an integrated value of Naciketas' episode, the basis of philosophy of the *Kāṭha-Upaniṣad*. Madhva remains silent on this point.

As is evident, the *mantra* वैश्वानरः प्रविश्यति ---- [1.7] lays down an Indian custom of ancient period to consider a guest as a veritable embodiment of divine personality. Here, Radhakrishnan's words are worthy of note : "As fire is appeased by water, so is a guest to be entertained with hospitality. The word for fire used here is Vaiśvānara, the universal fire, which affirms the unity of all life. The guest comes as the embodiment of the fundamental oneness of all beings."²³

This *mantra* raises the guest arrived, to the place of God Agni. As Agni or fire, if not attended to, may consume the whole house. So a brahmin quest if properly not received, destroys all happiness of a householder.²⁴

23. *Op.cit.*, Radhakrishnan, p. 598.

24. (a) The first thing that a host should offer him is water (pādyam) by which he should wash his feet, then a seat (Āsanam), next he should worship him with a →

Ofcourse, this *mantra* bears no philosophical idea; as such, no distinction in the interpretations of Śaṅkara and Madhva is found.

The verse dealt with here, is said to be addressed by Yama's concillors in Śaṅkara's interpretation. Also it is suggested to treat this *mantra* as being told by his wife.²⁵ Raṅgarāmānuja too accepts the first option of Śaṅkara but does not include.²⁶ Madhva and his glossators consider this *mantra* to be an address by Yama's wife.

Ofcourse, such diverse interpretations do not let up the implication of the present *mantra* that to make Yama know the arrival of the brilliant guest.

Further, the *mantra* आशाप्रतीक्षे सङ्गतं सूनुतां ---- [1.8.] states the adverse consequences of a brahman-guest remaining in a householder's residence without food. In precise, if a brahmin-guest resides without food, it results in the destruction of आशा, प्रतीक्षा, सङ्गतं, सूनुता, इष्टापूर्त, पुत्र, पशु etc.

In verse above, some words are certainly technical. The terms आशा and प्रतीक्षा and सङ्गत may be translated as desire, expectation and the fruit of good association respectively. Śaṅkara interpret आशा (hope) as asking for desirable, yet, unknown objects such as heavenly

→ respectful offering called Arghyam, consisting of rice, flower, Dūrvā, water, etc., and then he should be satisfied by food and other gifts.

Vide *Manusmṛti*, III. 99-118.

(b) दयाया भगिनी मूर्तिर्धर्मस्यात्माऽतिथिः स्वयम् ।।

अग्नेरभ्यागतो मूर्तिः सर्वभूतानि चात्मनः ।। भागवत 6.7.30.

25. *Supra*. fn. 18.

26. ततः प्रोष्य आगतं यमं द्वारस्थां वृद्धा उन्नुः, वैश्वानरः ----- वैवस्तोदकम् ।
RR. *Kāth.Up.Bh.* p.31.

enjoyment etc., and प्रतीक्षा (expectation) as looking forward with a view to obtaining known objects, such as wealth and other means of worldly enjoyments.

Fruit of good associations - Śaṅkara explains the original text 'सङ्गतम्' as 'सत्संयोगजं फलम्', i.e., the merit acquired by the association with good people. But, the Ācārya's annotator, Gopālayatindra interprets the passage of the commentary in a different way. He says, योगो देवताध्यानं तज्जं सङ्गतमित्यर्थः - i.e., 'Yoga means meditation on God, and whatever merit results from such meditation is *Sanḡata*', but, this is apparently a far-fetched meaning of both the text and the commentary.

Though, Madhva does not touch on this point, Raghavendrayati unfolds his view point. For him, आशा means asking for the objects like wealth etc., that is, obtained by oneself but remaining beyond the control : प्रतीक्षा - means looking forward for the objects which are not obtained. Ofcourse, this interpretation though literally differs from that of Śaṅkara, yet, both the interpretations would not contaminate the significance of the *mantra*.

Moreover, the word अल्पमेधसः applied as an adjective to पुरुष and householder - read in the verse above is meant as 'a man of little intelligence', according to Śaṅkara. Ofcourse, this is quite acceptable meaning. Yet, it contributes a doubt as to why a householder not receiving the guest, should be of a little intelligence. Rather, such an householder could be anyone : necessarily, he need not be either अल्पमेधा or उत्तममेधा. However, this doubt may be seen removed in the words of Swami Chinmayananda - "A householder who insults a saintly guest is called by *śruti* as an idiot."²⁷

27. *Kāthopaniṣad* - Chinmaya Publication Trust, Madras, 1976. p.19.

Or, the word अल्पमेधसः may be taken in the sense that an householder who does not receive the guest in the proper manner, is verily a man of little intelligence. It means, an a householder of great intelligence never turns his face away from receiving the guest in the proper manner. Thus, a negative aspect of Upaniṣadic injunction is here implied.

In immediate response to the words of his wife as read in the preceding *mantra* [1.9.], Yama readily comes forth in a modest way as can be seen in the succeeding *mantra* तिस्रो रात्रीर्यदवा--- [1.9.]. This *mantra* offers a secret current of compliment paid by Yama to the brahmin guest. The phrase - स्वस्ति मेऽस्तु "may peace befall me" - is a request to a brahmin guest, of Yama who is the Lord of the *Mṛtyu-loka*. It is however, surprising that such a Divine power Yama himself should bow down in modesty before his guest and beg of him to pardon the householder's inevitable lapses. Undoubtedly, this is the true spirit of Indian culture. An householder, whosoever, he is bound by the rules of ethics in respect of receiving the guest. And if there are any lapses of the host, those can be made good by humble prostration and due reverence shown. It is here, clear that Lord Yama apologises for his unintentioned misconduct and begs the brahmin-guest, Naciketa to accept in return an atonement in the form of three boons. In this manner Yama being the Lord of *Mṛtyu-loka* and an embodiment of Dharma, follows the course of human righteousness. Thus, Yama preaches a lesson to the world of mankind that laws of Dharma are applicable not only to the human beings, but also to the author thereof.

This is how, the present *mantra* highlights the words of ethics to be followed by public at large.

However, there is no difference of opinion among the traditional commentators are not directly taken for comparative consideration.

ii. Yama's First Boon

As Lord Yama has assured Naciketa of giving him three boons as an atonement to his misconduct in his duty of receiving the guest, Naciketa asks for the very first boon in favour of his father. As the *mantra* states - शान्तसंकल्पः सुमना यथा स्याद्वीतमन्युर्गौतमो माऽभि मृत्यो । --- (1.10), Naciketa wants his father be pacified, be of good heart and be free from anger towards him. The words in the *mantra* above such as शान्तसंकल्पः, सुमनसः and वीतमन्युः describe the epithets of Vājaśravas, to be bestowed upon him by means of the first boon. The term शान्तसंकल्पः means calm of thought i.e., Naciketa's father should be free from anxiety on his account or not troubled with thought that how Naciketa would stand before Yama ! Similarly, other two epithets सुमनाः and वीतमन्युः represent the good qualities forming the part and the parcel of the first boon. Although, Naciketa is in the realm of Yama, as dutiful son, Naciketa asks the first boon for the welfare of his father. Such a loving consideration for the well-being of one's own parents is here presented as hall-mark of an expansion of one's own individuality.

Both Śāṅkara and Raṅgarāmānuja do not differ from each other in their interpretations. Madhva ofcourse, keeps silent to remark on this *mantra*. Yet, his followers like Vādirājatīrtha, Rāghavendrayatī, etc., do write the glosses. One of the remarkable points that Vādirājatīrtha suggests that though Naciketa, leaving his mortal body on the earth, sets for Yama's abode, he in a new body,

should be identified and well-received by his parents as before.²⁸

Naciketa here highlights a cardinal point that to achieve the acme of perfection, an aspirant must begin with a considering love, selflessness first towards his parents. In a nutshell this *mantra* is a clear restatement of an ideal duty of a son towards his elders.

Fulfilling the demands of Naciketa in the form of the first boon, Yama declares in his words यथा पुरस्तात् भविता प्रतीतः ---- (1.11). Here, Yama means to say that when Naciketa would be sent back by him, he will be identified by his father. Also, he assures that Vājaśravas will become free from anger having seen his son Naciketa freed fully from the jaws of death.

It is evident from the *mantras* of this *Upaniṣad* that the father of Naciketa is addressed with four names such as वाजश्रवसः [1.1.], गौतम [1.10], औद्दालकिः and आरुणिः [1.11]. In a *mantra* if a person like a father of Naciketa is addressed once with one name, it holds its significance. But, if a singular person is addressed more than once with different synonymous names in the same sentence or in the same *mantra*, then the very purpose of addressing with the same names becomes questioned. Also no solution is found in any of the traditional commentaries; it is left out untouched.

As is obvious from the *Upaniṣadic* statements - त्वत्प्रसृष्टं माऽभिवदेत्प्रतीत ---- [1.10.] and वीतमन्युस्त्वां ददृशिवान् मृत्युमुखात् प्रमुक्तम् । [1.11.] Naciketa in the former

28. औद्दालकः पिता अरुणा माता पूर्वदेहस्य मृतत्वेऽपि अभिनवदेहे त्वयि पुत्रवात्सल्यापूर्ववन्मातापितरौ प्रीतिं कुरुतामित्यभिप्रायेण वरदानमिति भावः । M. Kāth.Up.Bh. with the gloss by Vādirājatīrtha. pp.2-3.

statement expects his father to receive him happily; and Yama in the latter favours the same. It is quite clear that Naciketa wants to come back home. Nevertheless this desire of Naciketa is seen not taken care of at the end; for, the concluding *mantra* : मृत्युप्रोक्तां नचिकेतोऽथ लब्ध्वा ---- (vi.18) declares that Naciketa attains Supreme Brahman.

iii. Yama's Second Boon

Further, in the following *mantra* - Naciketa beseeches Lord Yama in the form of second boon, to impart the knowledge of *svargyāgni* leading successively to the attainment of liberation : स त्वमग्निं स्वर्गमध्येऽपि मृत्यो ---- (1.13). Here, the phrase स्वर्गलोका अमृतत्वं भजन्ते declares that they whose world is सर्ग, attain liberation. This meaning lacks homogeneous sense, i.e., the matter of one's being in *svarga* does not necessarily bring in immortality. The meaning of this phrase as it is, would contaminate the very basis of Vedantic teachings. Especially, according to Śaṅkara's Advaita, the knowledge of *karma* or the performance of any ritual cannot procure the attainment of liberation. If the liberation were to be achieved by means of *karma*, then the knowledge of the Brahman would become futile. In order to ward off such type of disharmony, Śaṅkara interprets the word अमृतत्वम् - 'immortality' keeping the meaning of *svarga-loka* and *svargyam* well in tune with the former. i.e., for Śaṅkara अमृतत्व mean देवत्व - 'divinity' as a product of the performance of the sacrifice with the knowledge of its significance.²⁹ Thus, as Śaṅkara posits, the knowledge

29. येनाग्निना चितेन स्वर्गलोकाः स्वर्गो लोको येषां ते स्वर्गलोका यजमाना अमृतत्वमरणतां देवत्वं भजन्ते प्राप्नुवन्ति तदेतदग्निविज्ञानं द्वितीयेन वरेण वृणे । Ś.Kāth.Up.Bh. Anadagiriṭikā. p.15.

of Agni is the means for the attainment of heaven, the abode of divinities.

But, keeping away any traditional commentary, yet on the logical ground one may have a close observation of the meaning of the above *mantra* and the succeeding *mantra* प्र ते ब्रवीमि तदु मे निबोध स्वर्गमग्निं नचिकेतः प्रजानन् ।---- (1.14). The beginning *mantras* pertaining to the second boon (1.12), (1.13), speak of the immortality the state of which exists in the liberation itself; and it is an admitted fact, that the state of being immortal is possible in *Mokṣa* only. A man who attains liberation becomes immortal. Moreover, the term अनन्तलोक in the *mantra* above (1.14) is in consonance of immortality spoken of in the previous *mantra* (1.13). The notes pertaining to अमृतत्व, स्वर्गलोक and अनन्तलोक certainly refer to the *Mokṣa* itself. It tends to state that the term स्वर्गलोक (1.12, 1.13) is synonymous with अनन्तलोक bearing the meaning of liberation wherein a liberated soul enjoys immortality for endless time.

Thus, this logical approach makes understand here that the second boon does refer to the aim of vedantic teachings in the form of स्वर्गाग्निविद्या, and not to perishable fruit obtained by the performance of ritual. This is what a crystal clear essence of the *mantras* dealing with the second boon asked by the Naciketa.

Ofcourse, the above explanation appears contrary to the interpretation given by Śaṅkara, still the above explanation can not be ambiguous before Śaṅkara's interpretation. On the other hand, the import of the second boon in the light of other commentaries of Raṅgarāmānuja and Madhva should also be studied here. A perusal of these two commentaries makes it

evident that Raṅgarāmānuja and Madhva hold the same view, to interpret the Upaniṣadic phrase - 'स्वर्गलोका अमृतत्वं भजन्ते' - a knower of *svargyāgni* attains the eternal abode of the Supreme Brahman who is designated here as Viṣṇu.³⁰

As Madhva states in terms of the *Gatisāra*, the term Agni here is referred to *Lord Viṣṇu* : Such that, Yama's teaching on Agni is nothing but the teaching on the nature of Lord Viṣṇu. This is clear from the adjectives given here namely अनन्तलोकाग्नि, प्रतिष्ठा, गुहानिहित, read in the *mantra* : प्रेते ब्रवीमि तदु मे निबोध ---- निहितं गुहायां । (1.14). However, these adjectives cannot refer to the deity Agni. In this spirit, the word *Svarga* (1.11) is taken as referring to Viṣṇu-loka. Besides, Madhva refers it to the usual *Svarga-loka*, and explicates that an aspirant who performs *Naciketagni* sacrifice, would enter the usual *Svarga-loka* and stays there for a period of one Manvantara, then he attains Viṣṇu-loka. Madhva's reference to both usual *svarga-loka* and Viṣṇu-loka is in tune with double Upaniṣadic use of *Svarga-loka* in the *Mantra*. (1.11.).

In response to Naciketa's behest, as read in the *mantra* : लोकादिमग्नि ---- पुनरेवाह तुष्टः । (1.15), Yama imparts him the knowledge of *Svargyāgni* - which includes the knowledge of the deity, number and the size of the sacrificial bricks in sacrifice. The word लोकादि in the *mantra* above is an adjective of the word अग्नि which means Viṣṇu. Hence, the word लोकादि should be

30. (a) स्वर्गलोका अमृतत्वं भजन्ते । स्वर्गो लोको येषां ते । परमपदं प्राप्ता इत्यर्थः ।
RR. *Kāth.Up.Bh.* p.36.
(b) अग्रयत्वादिग्निनामासौ नाचिकेताग्निगो हृदि । लोको विष्णोरनन्तस्य
तज्ज्ञानान्नित्य आप्यते । M. *Kāth.Up.Bh.* p.3.

understood as Lord Viṣṇu who is the cause of all worlds. Giving philosophical meaning to the sacrifice, Madhva informs that Lord Viṣṇu Himself is the deity of sacrificial bricks to be used in preparing the sacrificial altar.

Surprisingly enough, Naciketa repeats the same as taught to him by Yama. Listening to this, Yama is extremely pleased with him :

तमब्रवीत्प्रीयमाणो महात्मा -----
----- अनेकरूपां गृहाण । [1.1.16.]

Therefore, in addition to the second boon, Yama declares that the *Svargyāgni* taught to Naciketa would hence forward be known as *Nāciketagni*, and presents him with a golden chain studded with jewels. This is how, in the *mantra* (1.16) above anybody can identify sharp intelligence and extra-ordinary retentive capacity of Naciketa which have brought-forth and applause from his own preceptor God Yama !

Interpretating this *mantra*, Śāṅkara gives two meanings for the word *सृङ्गा* -

- (1) garland or necklace and
- (2) the course consisting of rites and is not ignoble.

It may be indicated here that Lord Yama would have initiated Naciketa into some more secret methods of fulfilling the desires of the performer through mystic rituals. With this implication, the second meaning holds good in the context. Also, this second meaning is in accordance with his interpretation of the word *सृङ्गा* accruing in the *mantra* (2.3). In this connection, it is a notable point : "Garland - (*Sṛṅka*) - It was believed that the performance of a Yajna led to great results. It used to cause a chain of effects to happen in succession.

So, by teaching Naciketa, how to perform the fire sacrifice, it was as if Yama gave him a garland of jewels, that is a chain of cause and effects.³¹

For both Raṅgarāmānuja³² and Madhva³³ the term *सृङ्गा* means a 'golden necklace'. Going a step further a glossator Veeraraghavacarya on the commentary of Raṅgarāmānuja, finds contradiction in the second meaning of *अ* given by Śāṅkara, i.e., *not censurable* or *glorified* course of the performance of the religious rite. Precisely, for Śāṅkara the path of rites is not conducive to realise the nature of oneself. The path of *karma* is for the persons incapable of apprehending the same.³⁴ In this sense, the path of *karma* is censurable according to Śāṅkara. As a contrary to this view, Śāṅkara himself makes a statement here that the path of *karma* is not censurable. This is what the contradiction is pointed out by Veeraraghavacarya.³⁵

God Yama further concludes his instruction on the *Naciketagni* sacrifice in the *mantars* : त्रिनाचिकेतः त्रिभिरेत्य सन्धिं ----- निचारयेमां शान्तिमत्यन्तमेति । (1.17)³⁶,

31. *Op.cit.* Chitrita Devi, p.41.

32. किञ्च सृङ्गां चेमामनेकरूपां गृहाण - विचित्रां सृङ्गां शब्दवतीं रत्नमालां स्वीकुवित्यर्थः । RR. *Kāth.Up.Bh.* p.38.

33. शृङ्गां स्वर्णमयीं चैव कण्ठमालाम् अदात् । M. *K.Bh.* p.4.

34. अथेतरस्य अनात्मज्ञतया आत्मग्रहणायाशक्तस्येदम् उपदिशति मन्त्रः कुर्वन्नवेति ॥ S. *Ku.Up.Bh.* p.17.

35. शाङ्करे अत्र मन्त्रे अकुत्सितेति, तव च कुत्सितेति गतिविशेषणमौचित्यात् स्वयं पूरितम् । न तु सृङ्गाशब्दार्थः । मिथो विरोधप्रसङ्गात् । Veerarāghavācārya. RR. *Kāth.Up.Bh.* p.38.

36. Half of the third line and fourth line recur at *Svet. Upaniṣad* 4.11.

त्रिणाचिकेतः त्रयमेतद् विदित्वा ----- शोकातिगो मोदते स्वर्गलोके ।
(1.18), wherein he glorifies karma and the fruits thereof.

Of the above *mantras*, the former one proclaims that a person who performs *Nāciketagni* sacrifice three times, attains everlasting peace. Ofcourse, there is no difference in the views of traditional commentators, so far as the ultimatum is concerned. Yet, there lies difference in their interpretations of some words, namely : त्रिणाचिकेतः, त्रिभिः and त्रिकर्मकृत्.

According to Śaṅkara the word त्रिणाचिकेतः means :

- (1) One who has performed thrice, the Naciketa fire sacrifice;
- (2) He who learns, knows and performs the Naciketa-fire-sacrifice.

Similarly the term त्रिभिः means :

- (1) With mother, father and teacher, i.e., he who has these three supporters of blessings.
- (2) The source of knowledge प्रत्यक्ष, अनुमान and आगम or the *Vedas*, the *Smṛtis* and the declarations of wise persons.

Then, the word त्रिकर्मकृत् means one who executes daily यज्ञ - sacrifice, अध्ययन - studying the *Vedas* and दान giving away the gifts in charity.

In comparison with this, Śaṅkara's interpretation of the term mentioned above, Madhva's interpretation appears to be slim. Consequently, it does not mean that Madhva's interpretation is weak. According to him, the word त्रिभिः means as per the three *Vedas* - ऋग्, यजुस् and साम i.e., the performance of Naciketa fire-sacrifice should be as per the rules laid down in the three *Vedas*. If the performance is in this spirit, then the act of the

sacrificing and sacrificer become glorified and well-received by one and all. Śaṅkara's double interpretation of the same term is quite wide and convincing, while, the Madhva's single meaning fetches an essential requirement of the performance of *Nāciketagni* sacrifice. Therefore, Madhva finds no need of giving another meaning. And, as far as his interpretation of त्रिकर्मकृत् is concerned, Madhva thinly differs from Śaṅkara. He substitutes *Tapas* for Śaṅkara's inclusion of *Adhyayana*. This difference leaves no disharmony in the import of the *Upaniṣad*.

Similarly, Raṅgarāmānuja perfectly agrees with the meaning of the term त्रिकर्मकृत् as यज्ञ, अध्ययन and दान. Yet, he differs from Śaṅkara while interpreting the term त्रिभिः. For him, Naciketa fire includes the three forms of sacrificial fire viz., *Gārhapatya*, *Āhavanīya* and *Dakṣiṇāgni*. This meaning however carries no special point as all types of sacrificial fires include the three forms of Agni said above.

The *mantras* तमब्रवीत् प्रीयमाणो -----, त्रिणाचिकेत-स्त्रिभिरेत्य सन्धिं ----, and त्रिणाचिकेतस्त्रयमेतद्विदित्वा----- elucidated above are said to be later addition by Max Muller.³⁷ But this remark may be said baseless, as three *mantras* form the very concluding effect of the second boon and without which the second boon would become handicapped.

Going a step ahead R.E. Hume considers that "Stanzas - 16-18 are not quite apt here. They may be

37. Max Muller 'Sacred Books of the East', (S.B.E.) Volume - XV p.5 - 'Verses 16-18 seem a later addition' fn.1.

an irrelevant interpolation as previous translations have suggested.”³⁸

This Hume’s remark too stands baseless as he has not given any proof to his opinion and this western view on the sacred upaniṣadic philosophy, vitiates the authority and self-validity of the upaniṣadic texts which has been the vital part of the Vedic canon.

iv. Yama’s Third Boon

The elucidation of the *third boon* asked by Naciketa encompasses the whole of *Kāthaka-Upaniṣad* in its metaphysical value. Therefore, the third boon may be considered as most comprehensive one and most covetable by an aspirant like Naciketa. The particular *mantra* dealing with a key-note on the third boon is as below :

ये यं प्रेते विचिकित्सा मनुष्ये अस्तीत्येके नायमस्तीति चैके ।

एतद्विद्यामनुशिष्टस्त्वयाजहं वराणामेष वरस्तृतीयः ॥ (1.1.20)

This *mantra* in its general understanding means that the living force i.e., Ātman exists in all the embodiments; but, there arises a doubt on the consequent of death, whether it exists or does not exist. While, interpreting the first half of this *mantra* Śaṅkara understands the phrase प्रेते मनुष्ये as when man dies and completes the sense hidden here by saying that the self which is distinct from the body senses, mind and intellect, gets connected with a fresh body in the next life.³⁹ Thus, here the doubt is that whether the self remains even after leaving the body.

38. R.E. Hume, ‘The Thirteen Principal Upaniṣads’ Oxford University Press, Madras, 1949, p.344.

39. येयं विचिकित्सा संशयः प्रेते मृते मनुष्ये अस्तीत्येके अस्ति शरीरिन्द्रिय-मनोबुद्धि-व्यतिरिक्तो देहान्तरसंबन्ध्यात्मेत्येके नायमस्तीति चैके । Ś.Kāth.Up.Bh. p.19

On the otherhand, Madhva’s interpretation of the same phrase differs from the former one. In precise, the word प्रेते is understood with two meanings.

- (1) The Jīvātman which has left the embodiment and about to get another body.
- (2) The liberated soul which has left away its *liṅgaśarīra*.

The second meaning given here is however quite technical one. This meaning can be had when the word प्रेते is split as प्रकृष्टेन इते. The word प्रकृष्ट here implies utmost superior (state), and the predicate इते derived by the root इण गतौ indicates (jīva’s) attainment of liberation.

However, both Śaṅkara and Madhva do not differ to give the first meaning. Although Śaṅkara does not stretch the meaning, Madhva proceeds to give the second meaning, where actually difference lies. Further, Madhva says regarding the doubt that Naciketa poses, that whether the Supreme Brahman is the controller of the jīvātman in the state of *Samsāra* and in the state of liberation. The persons who agree on this point positively are to be considered as *jñānins*, and those who do not are *Ajñānins*.

After regarding both the interpretations of Śaṅkara and Madhva, it may be said that Madhva does not contradict with Śaṅkara. And yet, one does find difference between them and the second meaning given by latter is to uphold all-controllership of the *Supreme Brahman*, one of the ingredients of *Dvaita-Vedānta*.

The *third boon* asked by Naciketa recalls an instruction on the nature of Brahman. Yama considers this instruction to be very esoteric. Therefore, he desires to examine Naciketa whether he possesses the

eligibility of receiving such esoteric nature of Brahman. For, Yama says that an inquiry into the nature of Brahman is very terse. Such that, even the gods were incapable of realising the subtle nature of the Supreme Brahman. Yama insists Naciketa on asking for another boon. But, Naciketa does not find no other similar boon than what he has asked for earlier. Here, Naciketa confidently states : जीविष्यामो यावदीशिष्यसि त्वं ---- | (1.1.27) i.e., “we shall live as long as you will rule. In other words, he is certain of our continuance in this cosmic cycle presided over by Yama, and permanence till the dissolution of the primal elements is called immortality.”⁴⁰

Also it is true, as Naciketa spells out, that a preceptor like Yama is very difficult to be had. Therefore, Naciketa being very much intent upon realising the nature of Brahman, invoked Yama for the same boon. In this connection it should be taken note of that the particle तु in वरस्तु मे वरणीयः स एव | (1.27) which speaks of utmost covetability of the third boon.⁴¹

Nevertheless, Yama tries to divert the mind of Naciketa by saying that he would offer any object of worldly pleasure like sons, grandsons, cattle, elephants, goats, horses, long life, chariots, nymphs, etc. “The story of the temptation by *Mṛtyu* occurs for the first time in the *Upaniṣad* and not in the account in the *Taittiriya Brāhmaṇa*. The temptation of Naciketa has points of similarity with that related to Gautama, the Buddha.”⁴²

40. Vide, अभूत संप्लवं स्थानं अमृतत्वं हि भाष्यते | | Vācaspati's *Bhāmāti* I.1.1.

41. तु शब्दः अस्य वरस्य सर्वातिशयद्योतकः | *R.Kāth.Up.Khd.* p.7.

42. *Op.cit.*, Radhakrishnan, p.605.

Yet, Naciketa's mind remained unstinted and unattracted by those enjoyable things. Further, Naciketa illustrated that all sorts of mundane and heavenly enjoyable things are in one or other way, are perishable and useless.

With such unshakable and unstinted devotion, Naciketa beseeches Yama for the same boon relating to the subtle nature of Supreme Brahman. Thus, he spells out the words योज्यं वरो गूढमनुप्रवष्टो नान्यं तस्मान्नचिकेतां वृणीते | (1.1.29) and keeps himself silent before his preceptor God Yama.

a. Path of Sreyas and Preyas

Having found Naciketa fit for receiving the instruction on the nature of the Supreme Brahman, Yama starts imparting the secrets of obtaining the the knowledge of the nature of Brahman leading to liberation. At the outset, he unfolds the difference between the path of *Śreyas* and that of *Preyas*. The *Kātha* statement is quite conspicuous -

श्रेयो हि धीरोऽभि प्रेयसो वृणीते प्रेयो मन्दो योगक्षेमाद् वृणीते | (1.2.2) The difference between them lies in their being followed. i.e., a man of wisdom rather prefers the celebrated path of *Śreyas*, and ignorant one selects the path of *preyas*, where on he desires for the well-being of his life in the phenomenal world. Ofcourse, the meaning of the terms *Śreyas* and *preyas* is evident. Madhva understands *Śreyas* in the sense of the *knowledge of Brahman* whereas, *preyas* in the sense of the path of worldly life, wherein one desires for the enjoyable things. Thus, the former one begets आमुष्मिकफल and the latter the ऐहिकफल. Radhakrishnan understands

as the path of house holders.⁴³ But, it does not hold good here. Because, the path of householders is not exclusively open to the pleasures of mundane world. Householders who follow the path of worldly pleasures are rather looked upon as fools. But, householders who tread the path of Śreyas are the seekers after liberation. Therefore, it is not wise to identify them as the followers of the प्रेयोमार्ग. However, no difference is found in the understanding of these two terms between Śaṅkara and Madhva.

A beautiful idea hinted at the beginning of second Valli offers to the readers the theory and the logic of self-efforts. It is these two paths Śreyas and preyas of choice freely open for any individual. As stated here, one is good while another is pleasant. That which is good need not necessarily be always pleasant. An aspirant who consistently sticks to the path of good, bereft of unpleasantness and material privations and who requires to face difficulties in course of higher pursuits, is the one who does reach the final state of transcendental joy. In the same spirit, Yama further says -

दूरमेते विपरीते विषूची अविद्या या च विद्यते ज्ञाता । (1.2.4)

- that the path of Śreyas and preyas in correspondence with the path of Vidya or knowledge and the path of Avidya or ignorance, are both ever different from each other, as they diverge to reach two different destinations which in their very nature are as opposing as light and darkness.

43. This verse means that the fool prefers the ease of the householder to the hard life of the yogi. *Op.cit.*, Radhakrishnan. p.608.

Further, Yama states the nature of the path of Avidya by adducing an impressive simile of the blind, which has made the following stanza proverbial one criticizing self-concieted persons :

अविद्यायामन्तरे वर्तमानाः स्वयं धीराः पण्डितमन्यमानाः ।
दन्द्रम्यमाणाः परियन्ति मूढा अन्धेनैव नीयमाना यथान्धाः ॥ (1.2.5)⁴⁴

This *mantra* proclaims that the ignorant persons who live in the midst of ignorance pretend themselves to be wise. Śaṅkara calls such persons fit for worldly existence. They go round and round being entangled in hundreds of fetters forged by craving for sons, cattle, etc. Such persons consider themselves in the duties of guiding the society for its betterment. But, factually they are the ignorants; still for false fame, they think of themselves very great and make a show of uplifting another ignorant from cavern of ignorance. This is in close resemblance with a simile of the blind leading another blind one, to unknown destination.⁴⁵ Further Yama, declares that a person who is completely befooled by the glamour of wealth, thinks that there is no other world here after than this :

न साम्परायः प्रतिभाति बालं प्रमाद्यन्तं वित्तमोहेन मूढम् । (1.2.6)

His mind always lies in the false values of life and keeps instinctive identification of oneself with ones own body. Such person does not come to feel easily any thirst for knowledge and entertain any urge to go beyond the shackles of mortal limitations.

44. Cf. *Mund.Up.* II.8,

45. Cf. "If a blind man leads a blind man, both will fall into a pit." Mathew, XV.14, *Holy Bible*, the New Testament, International Bible Society, New Jersey. USA. 1984. p.692.

Elucidating the secrets of the path of Śreyas or Vidyā the Śruti texts state that a preceptor who is quite proficient in the Scriptures and who can instruct the science of Brahman in a proper way to his disciple, is very rare to obtain :

आश्चर्यो वक्ता कुशलोस्य लब्धाऽश्चर्यो ज्ञाता कुशलानुशिष्टः ।
(1.2.7)

The Kāthopaniṣad here spells out a well accepted fact regarding the importance of a preceptor who can take the disciple to a higher flights with the themes of transcendental contemplation.⁴⁶ And the disciples who have come upto the required evolutionary progress in the inner instruments of thought, always seek a proficient and noble-hearted preceptor to acquire the knowledge of Brahman. In this way, the Supreme Brahman is rarest highest truth; because, He cannot be completely comprehended by means of Sravana. Although, even when the Supreme Truth is well-heard, many will not comprehend the Truth as their minds are not purified. Therefore, the Upaniṣad here declares that a true preceptor is He who is not only a spiritual man in his subjective experience of Truth, but also should be proficient in the scriptures. Both these qualities are necessary ingredients of a preceptor. It is with this idea in the mind that Yama exclaims that “a true teacher is a wonder”. Thus, in pursuit of the knowledge of the Truth there are three riddles, such as -

- (1) Supreme Brahman is rare to comprehend.
- (2) Preceptor who has properly acquired the knowledge of that Brahman is another rare personality.

46. Cf. Bhagavadgītā, II.29

- (3) A true seeker who is fit in all respects to receive the instructions from his preceptor. When the latter two objectives are at hand, there would be every possibility of lessening Supreme Brahman's being rare.

With a View to emphasizing efficiency of a preceptor, the śruti text further suggests with these words :

न नरेणावरेण प्रोक्त एष सुविज्ञेयो बहुधा चिन्त्यमानः । (1.2.8)⁴⁷
where, it is said that by a preceptor of inferior intellect the nature of Supreme Truth can not be known properly.

Adding to the necessary qualification of a preceptor, the Kāthaka text makes a statement :

अनन्यप्रोक्ते गतिरत्र नास्ति अणीयान् ह्यतर्क्यम् अणुप्रमाणात् ।
(1.2.8)

Here, the term अनन्यप्रोक्ते gives diverse meanings through the interpretations of Śāṅkara and Madhva. Firstly Śāṅkara basing on the term अनन्यप्रोक्ते provides four types of meanings.

- (1) When a teacher who has realised the non-duality instructs his disciples on the nature of Brahman, there does not remain any cogitation of various kinds as to whether it exists or not; it means that the disciple would realise the non-dual nature of the Supreme Reality.
- (2) When the Supreme Reality which is non-different from, and is one's own self, is adequately instructed by a teacher there remains no other comprehension, as there is nothing else to be known.

47. Cf. Mund.Up. II.4

- (3) When the non-different Supreme-Reality is taught, there remains no transmigration for liberation follows immediately.
- (4) When the Supreme Brahman is well spoken of by a preceptor, who has become identified with Brahman, there remains no non-realisation.

Ofcourse, four-fold meaning of the term अनन्यप्रोक्ते given by Śāṅkara is very wide in its intelligent way. Therefore, it is said that "it would be a compliment to our own intelligence, if we were to accept Sri Śāṅkara's conclusion in toto."⁴⁸

On the otherhand, Madhva's interpretation of the statement अनन्यप्रोक्ते गतिरत्र नास्ति states that no right knowledge arises when taught by a person, who himself thinks to be identical with Brahman. This implies that अनन्य is one who does not realise the difference between oneself and Brahman.⁴⁹

In precise, according to Madhva's statement the Upaniṣadic term नरेण means an ignorant person. This meaning leaves an understanding that inferior thinkers have taught about God in many inferior ways such as -

He has only a few qualities, he has material body, he is subodinate to matter etc. Therefore, their concept of God is inferior and hence they have not understood him correctly.⁵⁰ Thus, it is explicit that jīva and Brahman

48. Swami Chinmayananda, "Kāthaka Upaniṣad", p.70.

49. अनन्यो भगवानन्योऽहमित्यजानन्नन्यः । तेन प्रोक्ते गतिर्ज्ञानं नास्ति । प्रोक्ताऽन्येनैव सुज्ञानाय प्रेष्ठेति वाक्यशेषात् । M.Bh.Ku. p.8.

50. नरेण अज्ञानिमनुष्येण प्रोक्तः अवरः अप्रकृष्टः । कुतः । बहुधा प्रकृत्युपसर्जन-त्वात्पगुणत्वप्राकृतदेहत्वादि नानाप्रकारेण चिन्त्यमानः सन् तैरेषः सु सम्यक् यथावत्तथा ज्ञेयो न भवति । R.Ku.Khd. p.10

are different as they possess opposite attributes and the knowledge of their identity is false knowledge. This difference of attributes is mentioned as अणुप्रमाणात् अणीयान् । Brahman is subtler than jīva who is अणु.⁵¹

In order to show the correctness of his interpretation, Madhva shows coherence between the present *mantra* (1.2.8) and the succeeding one - (1.2.9). The succeeding one is emphatic to show the sense of difference between the individual and the Supreme Brahman. This is suggested by Madhva in his phrase वाक्यशेषात्.

In this spirit, the succeeding *mantra* :

नैषा तर्केण मतिरापनेया प्रोक्तान्येनैव सुज्ञानाय प्रेष्ठ । (1.2.9)

Here, the word अन्येन एव lays an emphasis that knowledge of Brahman cannot be obtained by logic. But, by that preceptor only who has realised the difference between himself and Brahman. Brahman can rightly be understood.

Thus, for maintaining the coherence between *Upakrama mantra* (1.2.8) and *Upasāṁhāra mantra* (1.2.9), the application of the theory of the difference between the individual soul and Brahman, is brought-out, and it holds good in the context. Therefore, it substantiates that Yama has realised the knowledge of difference between jivātman and Brahman; and he desires to impart this knowledge to his disciple. Naciketa who has approached him to receive the same with unstinted devotion.

51. जीवानां चैव विष्णोश्च यो न वेत्ति भिदां पुमान् । तदनुव्रताश्च ये केचित् तेषां ज्ञानं न जायते । इति ब्रह्मवैवर्ते । M.Kātha.Up.Bh. p.8.

b. Nature of Supreme Brahman

By way of fulfilling the desire of Naciketa with an offer of the third boon, Yama explains the Nature of Supreme Brahman who is imperishable and eternal. Certainly, the nature of Supreme Brahman is very subtle one. This Subtle nature of the Supreme Reality is well realised by Yama and wishes to impart the same to Naciketa. Therefore, confidently Yama tells : जानाम्यहं शेवधिरित्यनित्यं न हि अधुवैः प्राप्यते हि ध्रुवं तत् । (1.2.10). Thus, it is evident that Yama relates the subject-matter here with the Supreme Brahman.

Śaṅkara interprets this *mantra* to make the reader understand its idea highlighting the value of perishable treasure. As such, in the light of Śaṅkara's interpretation it is known by Yama that the treasure (शेवधि) comprising the fruits of action is *Anitya*. i.e., impermanent. And this non-eternal treasure cannot be the means for the attainment of eternal nature of Supreme Reality. Therefore, Nāciketa-fire sacrifice was accomplished with non-eternal things. Having acquired an essential merit thereby, Yama says, he has achieved the eternal abode of Yama which is known as heaven.⁵²

Raṅgarāmānuja too interprets the *mantra* in the same manner.⁵³

52. न हि यस्मादनित्यैरधुवैर्नित्यं ध्रुवं तत्प्राप्यते । परमात्माख्यः शेवधिः । यस्त्वनित्यसुखात्मकः शेवधिः स एवानित्यैर्द्रव्यैः प्राप्यते । हि यतस्ततस्तस्मान्मया जानताऽपि नित्यमनित्यसाधनैर्न प्राप्यत इति ना (न) चिकेतश्चित्तोऽग्निरनित्यैर्द्रव्यैः पशुवादिभिः स्वर्गसुखसाधनभूतोऽग्निर्निर्वर्तित इत्यर्थः । तेनाहमधिकारापन्नो नित्यं याम्यं स्थानं स्वर्गाख्यं नित्यमापेक्षिकं प्राप्तवानस्मि ।। Ś.Kāth.Up.Bh. p.42

53. अनित्यफलसाधनभूतैः अनित्यद्रव्यसाध्यैर्वा कर्मभिरित्यर्थः । ----- एवं ज्ञातवता मया ब्रह्मप्राप्तिसाधनज्ञानोद्देशेन अनित्यैरिष्टकादिद्रव्यैर्नाचिकेतोऽग्निश्चितः । →

Along the current of the Upaniṣadic thought, Madhva interprets this *mantra* as to describe the nature of Supreme Brahman with some epithets like शेवधि, अनित्यं etc. In clear terms -

- (1) The word शेवधि means the most excellent and final goal i.e., Supreme Brahman.
- (2) The term अनित्यं also is referred to Brahman as He is conveyed by अकार and who is ever-eternal.
- (3) The term ध्रुवं means Supremely eternal being. This eternal Brahman can not be obtained by non-eternal entities i.e., the weak-minded ones who lack in knowledge and devotion.⁵⁴

Surprisingly enough, this interpretation appears to be unusual, for it applies the words like अनित्यं also as an epithets of Brahman which are seemingly contradictory to each other. Nevertheless, Madhva's interpretation can be said to be most proper and unequivocal statement in the interest of the context of the *mantra* mentioned above. Because,

(1) The subject matter of the third boon is unquestionably related to the instruction in nature of the Supreme Brahman; described in the preceding *mantra* [नैषा तर्केण ---- 1.2.9] and the succeeding *mantra* [कामस्यासिं ---- 1.2.11]. As such, to maintain

→ तस्माद्धेतोर्नित्यफलसाधनं ज्ञानं प्राप्तवानस्मीत्यर्थः । अतः ब्रह्मप्राप्तेर्ज्ञानैकसाध्यत्वस्य न विरोधः । Raṅgarāmānuja Kāth.Up.Bh. pp 66-67.

54. आख्यं विष्णुवाख्यं नित्यं शेवधिरिति जानामि । नित्यमाख्यविष्णुविषयै-र्द्रव्यैर्मन-आदिभिः । आख्यनित्यविषयैर्विष्णुवाख्यनित्यविषयैर्द्रव्यैः । नित्यं भावन्तं प्राप्तवानस्मि । ध्रुवो भगवान् । अधुवैस्तद्भक्तिवर्जितैर्न प्राप्यते । M.Kāth.Up.Bh. p.8

singular balance in the *prakaraṇa* the *mantra* requires to be understood without being affected. If so, the present *mantra* [जानाम्यहं शेवधि --- 1.2.10], should be understood along the current of the context i.e., it should be interpreted in such a manner that one can acknowledge the nature of the Supreme Brahman.

On the contrary to the current of the subject matter held sway over the *prakaraṇa* dealing with the third boon, Śaṅkara interprets the *mantra* bringing out the values of material fruit i.e. heaven, brought about by the performance of Nāciketa fire sacrifice. This, however is not well in tune with the message of the *Upaniṣad*. Such incongruity appears in case of Raṅgarāmānuja's interpretation too. Thus, Madhva interpretation is closer to the *Upaniṣadic* context.

The *Kāthaka Upaniṣad* unveils the nature of the Supreme Brahman with some more epithets like कामस्यासिः, जगतः प्रतिष्ठा, क्रतोः आनन्त्यम्, अभयस्य पारः, स्तोमः, महदुरुगायः, प्रतिष्ठा etc. in the *mantra* कामस्यासिं (1.2.11).⁵⁵ However, these words represent the Supreme Brahman as Saguṇa Brahman or Hiraṇyagarbha⁵⁶ according to Śaṅkara.⁵⁷ In precise, he means कामस्यासिः the end of

55. Cf. *Chānd.Up.* VII.12.2.

56. Commenting on the Śvetāśvatara text : हिरण्यगर्भे जनयामास पूर्वम् | (111.4), Śaṅkara says : हितं रमणीयं अत्युज्वलं ज्ञानं गर्भः अन्तः सारः यस्य तम् | Therefore Hiraṇyagarbha is the creator and is of the nature of knowledge; since 'desire' attends knowledge, Hiraṇyagarbha is said to be possessing of the faculty of the power of desire.

57. कामस्याऽऽसिं समासिम्, अत्रैवैहैव सर्वे कामाः परिसमासाः, जगतः साध्यात्माधिभूताविदैवादेः प्रतिष्ठायाश्च सर्वैकत्वात्, क्रतोः फलं ह्यैरण्यगर्भे पदमनन्त्यमानन्त्यम् | *Ś.Kāth.Up.Bh.* p.43.

desire or it is that, where indeed all desires end; जगतः प्रतिष्ठा the support of the world comprising all that is personal, elemental, heavenly etc.; क्रतोः आनन्त्यम् the infinitude of meditation which is nothing but the state of Hiraṇyagarbha; अभयस्य पारः the utmost limit of fearlessness; उरुगायः the existensive course of Hiraṇyagarbha;⁵⁸ स्तोम महत - praise worthy as it is abounding in super-excellence. In addition to this, Naciketa too is raised to the state of Hiraṇyagarbha in Śaṅkara's interpretation. It means in the words of the Śaṅkara, Naciketa possesses all requisite qualities of an aspirant who is very closer to attain oneness with Brahman.⁵⁹

Madhva's commentary can be said to be more practical. For all the words ending with accusative case terminations like, कामस्यासिं etc., are the epithets applied to Hiraṇyagarbha aspect of Brahman by Śaṅkara; while, Madhva construes word कामस्यासिं with an adverbial noun अत्यस्त्राक्षीः and applies to the subject in the sentence i.e., Naciketa. Thus is the statement हे नचिकेतो, (तं) कामस्यासिं अत्यस्त्राक्षीः - "O Naciketa, you have renounced fulfilment of worldly and heavenly desire - according to Madhva. Further, Madhva says, renouncement of desire is fairly possible in case of Naciketa because he has properly understood the nature of Brahman as described by the

58. Through this course is attained the state of Hiraṇyagarbha, lasting for a long time till final dissolution. Vide, अनेक-कालवस्थायि हिरण्यगर्भपदं गम्यत इति व्युत्पत्त्या विस्तीर्णगतिरित्युच्यते | Gopalyati's gloss on *Ś.Kāth.Up.Bh.* p.44.

59. नचिकेतोऽतोऽयस्त्राक्षीः परमेवाऽऽकाङ्क्षन्नतिसृष्टवानसि सर्वमेतत्संसारभोगजातम् | अहो बतानुत्तमगुणोऽसि | | *Ś.Kāth.Up.Bh.* p.43. त्यक्तवानसीत्यपेक्षायां प्रोक्तहिरण्यगर्भपर्यन्तसंसारभोगजातमित्याहसर्वमेतदिति | Gopalyati's gloss on *Ś.Kāth.Up.Bh.* p.44.

adjectives like क्रतोः आनन्त्यम्, अभयस्य पारं, स्तोम महत्, उरुगायम्, प्रतिष्ठां etc. All these adjectives represent Brahman as Supremely Superior i.e., क्रतोः आनन्त्यम् = Brahman who bestows endless fruits for the deeds and knowledge dedicated to Him, अभयस्य पारं = Bestower of fearlessness, स्तोम महत् = He who cannot be fully described even by Vedic hymns, उरुगायं = He who is sung by great⁶⁰ Caturmukha Brahmā and other souls aspiring for liberation, प्रतिष्ठां = He who is the Refuge of liberated souls.

This is how Madhva upholds manifold facets of the Supreme Brahman, but does not bring in Hiranyagarbha or Saṅga aspect of the Brahman - which is not made explicit in the *Upaniṣad*.

In like manner, Yama preaches the nature of Brahman with some more details by means of significant adjectives. As such, the epithets like., दुर्दर्शम्, गूढमनुप्रविष्टम्, गुहाहितम्, गह्वरेष्ठम्, अध्यात्मयोगम् and so on, are interpreted by both Śaṅkara and Madhva with a metaphysical touch. Still distinction between their views remains. This can be noticed from their interpretation one below the other.

- (a) दुर्दर्शम् = (1) Hard to see, as it is very subtle. (Ś)
 (2) It is very difficult to be realised. (M)
- (b) गूढमनुप्रविष्टम् = (1) It is hidden by knowledge that changes in accordance with worldly objects. (Ś)

60. Cf. "उरुगाय = Sung or praised by the great" - V.S. Apte. *The Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. p.301.

- (2) He has entered all to regulate them. (M)
- (c) गुहाहितम् = (1) It is located in the intellect. (Ś)
 (2) It is hidden in the hearts of liberated jīvas. (M)
- (d) गह्वरेष्ठम् = (1) He who is in the midst of sources of miseries i.e., in the body and the senses which are the sources of all grief. (Ś)
 (2) He who dwells in the liberated soul. (M)
- (e) अध्यात्मयोगम् = (1) According to Śaṅkara this term does not represent Brahman. But, it is said to be a means of attainment of liberation. (Ś)
 (2) According to Madhva this word represents Brahman and implies means of liberation as well. For, *adhyātma* is split into *adhi* + *ātma* which means Supreme Self; *Yoga* is a means of getting liberation. Thus, *adhyātmayoga* = the highest Brahman is itself the means of getting liberation. (M)

The rest of the *mantra* मत्वा धीरो हर्षशोकौ जहाति । (1.2.12) speaks of the fruit obtained by a man who knows Brahman as described above.

The *mantra* अन्यत्र धर्मान्यत्राधर्मा ---- यत्तपश्यति तद्वद । (1.2.14) puts forth the unique nature of the Supreme self which is set to the different from all types of things of the world of experience. There is no glaring difference between the views of Śaṅkara and Madhva.

With a view to quenching the thirst of knowledge in the mind of Naciketa, Yama imparts the subtle nature of the Supreme Brahman with the *mantra* एतद्ध्येवाक्षरं ब्रह्म एतद्ध्येवाक्षरं परम् ---- । (1.2.16). Here the word अक्षर read along with ओम् occurring in the previous *mantra* : ---- ओमित्येतत् (1.2.15),⁶¹ is quite significant in its designating Brahman as Supremely Superior.

The phrase एतद्ध्येवाक्षरं ब्रह्म in the *mantra* (1.2.16) quoted above is repeated thrice as can be observed. Śaṅkara treats this repetition of the phrase with its metaphysical implication and picking up first two repetitions, he tries to synthesize both inferior Brahman (Hiraṇyagarbha or Saṅga Brahman) - and the Supreme Brahman (i.e., Nirguṇa Brahman). As Śaṅkara states that the phrase एतद्ध्याक्षरं ब्रह्म read for the first time in the *mantra* denotes the inferior Brahman. And, the same phrase read for the second time signifies the Supreme Brahman, where the letter *Om* is symbolically used. One who knows Supreme Brahman as signified by *Om* accepts it as knowable, and if the inferior Brahman is acknowledged by *Om*. It becomes attainable.⁶² And the same phrase repeated for the third time, is applied

61. Cf. *Śvet.Up.* IV.9; *Bhag.Gītā* VIII.II.

62. एतद्ध्येवाक्षरं ब्रह्मापरमेतद्ध्येवाक्षरं परं च । तयोर्हि प्रतीकमेतदक्षरम्, एतद्ध्येवाक्षरं ज्ञानोपास्य ब्रह्मेति यो यदिच्छति परमपरं वा तस्य तदभवति । परं चेज्जातव्यम् (म) परं चेत्प्राप्तव्यम् । *Ś.Kāth.Up.Bh.* p.48.

to the result thereof. For a knower of inferior Brahman, it becomes attainable object. So also, for a knower of Supreme Brahman, it becomes knowable object. The consequent meaning is that the Supreme Brahman can not be said to be known. But, experienced. In such case, if an aspirant says that he has known the Supreme Brahman, it means, he has not known it. Therefore, Śaṅkara says, "if it is the Supreme Brahman it becomes knowable." It is thus, Śaṅkara has shown the difference between the faculty of knowing the object and the experiencing.

On the other hand, Madhva regards three times repetition of एतद्ध्येवाक्षरं ब्रह्म ---- । as Imperishable Brahman. He finds no difference between Saṅga Brahman [Hiraṇyagarbha] and Supreme Brahman. For Him, both are the one and the same. अक्षर denotes Brahman's being imperishable and परं ब्रह्म signifies Brahman's being Supreme. The fruit of knowing this Brahman as imperishable and Supreme is acquiring whatever the aspirant desires. Here, it is obvious that a person who has realised Brahman desires nothing but liberation. Thus, it means that the knower of Brahman attains liberation.⁶³

When a reader goes a step ahead to compare both the views of Śaṅkara and Madhva, he does feel that Śaṅkara's interpretation is here swerving. Change of interpretation of the same phrase from one to the other is however not necessary. Even without change of interpretation, the significance of एतद्ध्येवाक्षरं ब्रह्म ---- ।

63. एतद्ध्येवाक्षरं ब्रह्म विष्ण्वाख्यं परमव्ययं । सर्वस्यालम्बनं ज्ञात्वामुच्यते नात्र संशय इति च । *M. Kāth.Up.Bh.* p.9.

can very well be understood in the light of Śaṅkara's interpretation itself. i.e., "That Supreme Brahman is imperishable one as designated by *Om*." Thus, it is difficult to see the integrated value of the nature of Supreme Brahman without second, in a swerving interpretation of single phrase repeated thrice. This difficulty does not arise in case of Madhva's interpretation.

A similar type of discrepancy can be noted in Śaṅkara's interpretation of the phrase एतदालंबनं श्रेष्ठम् ----- | 1.2.17 repeated thrice in the subsequent *mantra*. The only and very simple meaning of this phrase is "It is the Supreme Substratum of all." For this meaning, any reader does not feel necessary to refer to the interpretation of either Śaṅkara or Madhva.

In the earlier discussion it is seen that how the *Kāthaka-Upaniṣad* has emphasis on the point of realisation of Brahman brought about by knowing the Supreme Brahman in its macrocosm nature. Now, the *Kāthaka-Upaniṣad* from the *mantra* न जायते म्रियते --- | 1.2.18 puts forth the microcosm nature of the ever witnessing spark in the form of Highest Reality. Under this head, the respective *mantras* represent the Supreme Brahman with significant philosophical phrases. These phrases are dealt with as below in their analytical and exegetical perspective :

(1) *Supreme Brahman is imperishable* - The phrases न जायते म्रियते, न हन्यते, अजः, in the *mantra* 1.2.18 and नायं हन्ति न हन्यते in the *mantra* 1.2.19 speak of Supreme Brahman being imperishable. In the words of Śaṅkara, Brahman is free from all modifications. An impermanent thing that has origination is naturally subject to many types of changes. With a view to

denying all modifications in itself, the birth and death are denied.

So also, the word अजः means the same as the phrase न जायते | The Supreme Brahman is everlasting hence it is called *Purāṇaḥ*. When Brahman is said to be birthless it is obvious that it does not die. Therefore, it is न हन्यते - it is not killed because of the fact of its unchangeability, as in the case of *ākāśa*.⁶⁴

According to Śaṅkara, the Supreme Reality which is nothing but pure consciousness is only one and without a second. It is therefore, obvious that in reality there is no other separate entity as *jīvātman* than Supreme consciousness. Hence, whatever is said in connection with the Supreme Brahman that applies even to the intelligent self which may be called *jīvātman*. Thus, the terms न जायते etc., speaking of the nature of an intelligent self [विपाश्चित] do represent the Supreme consciousness with equal force.

So far as Madhva's interpretation is concerned, the terms न जायते etc., speak of the nature of an individual soul who has attained *Brahmāloka*. In this spirit, it should be here understood that birth and death pertain to the body only. Though, the *jīva* has the bondage of body it is not born nor dies, but, is eternal and changeless in its essential form. As such, it goes without saying that in liberation too, it is not born nor dies. Therefore, the *mantra* declares that in the

64. न जायते नोत्पद्यते म्रियते वा न म्रियते चोत्पत्तिमतो वस्तुनोऽनित्यस्यानेक-
विक्रियास्तासामाद्यन्ते जन्मविनाशलक्षणे विक्रिये इहाऽऽत्मनि प्रतिषिध्येति प्रथमं
सर्वविक्रियाप्रतिषेधार्थं न जायते म्रियते वेति | ---- विक्रियत्वादात्मनस्तथा न
हन्यत आकाशवदविक्रियत्वादेव | *Ś.Kāth.Up.Bh.* p.49-51

bondage also, the jīva is not killed even though the body is destroyed.⁶⁵

When the Supreme Brahman who is the *bimba*, is eternal and changeless, the jīva which is *pratibimba* is also eternal and changeless. The same idea regarding the nature of Brahman being devoid of any modification.⁶⁶

The point of contrast between the interpretations of Śaṅkara and Madhva is however clear as above. But, to examine the correctness of both interpretations, one has to take them to the touch-stone of the context in which the *mantra* न जायते ---- । (1.2.18) is read. The preceding *mantra* : एतदालम्बनं ज्ञात्वा ब्रह्मलोके महीयते । (1.2.17) is quite explicit to declare the *knower of chief Support (Supreme Brahman)* is honoured in the *Brahmāloka (the world of Brahṁā)*. When this expressive meaning holds good in the present context, there requires no necessity of the resorting to the secondary meaning as 'the world of inferior Brahman' as Śaṅkara writes. Indeed, there is no incongruity in Śaṅkara's interpretation. But, it feeds unnecessary element to understand the *mantra* in the light of Advaita theory.

While, the Upaniṣadic understanding is seen clearly reflected in Madhva's interpretation and the

65. भावाभावौ न विदुषो यस्माज्जीवो न कश्चन । जायते म्रियते वापि स्वरूपेण कथंचन । अजो नित्योऽविकारश्च जीवः पुरमणन्नपीति च । अयं भगवान् कुतोऽपि न बभूव यस्मादतद्वृत्ताऽपि विपश्चिन्न जायते न म्रियते च । यतः कश्चिज्जीवः स्वतो न बभूव । देहसम्बन्धादि जायते विपश्चितस्तु देहसम्बन्धाभावात् न जायते न म्रियते च । *M.Kāth.Up.Bh.* p.10.

66. अनवस्थेषु नश्वरेषु शरीरेषु प्राणिदेहेषु अशरीरं तत् शरीरनिमित्तकविकार-रहिततयावस्थितं । *R.Ku.Khd.* p.146.

meaning of ब्रह्मलोके महीयते is kept alive with that of विपश्चित् in Madhva's interpretation; wherein, the knower of Brahman is referred to here but not Brahman whether be inferior or superior.

(2) *Brahman is Subtler than Subtlest and Supreme* : The phrase अणोरणीयान् महतो महीयान् ---- । in the *mantra* 1.2.20,⁶⁷ पुरुषान्न परं किञ्चित् and सा काष्ठा सा परा गतिः in the *mantra* 1.3.11 as well as दृश्यते त्वग्रया बुद्ध्या सूक्ष्मया सूक्ष्मदर्शिभिः in the *mantra* 1.3.12 declare the Highest Self as subtler than the subtle and greater than the great. As Śaṅkara interprets, the Highest Self is represented as subtler than the subtle and the greater than the great, because, the Highest Self is conditioned by all names and forms, and activates the things that are Its limiting adjuncts. As a matter of fact, whatever subtle or great thing there be, in the world of phenomena, can be so by being possessed of its Reality through that Eternal Self. Being greater or subtler can be reduced to unreality when they are deprived of the Self. Thus, Brahman being great and subtle are taken here to be the results limiting adjuncts. Such that, अणुत्व or महत्व of Brahman do not come in the purview of the Highest Brahman in its absolute sense.⁶⁸

Excepting the intervention of limiting adjuncts to represent Brahman as अणु. or महान्, Madhva finds no

67. Cf. *Śvet.Up.* III.20; *Taitt.Ar.* X.12.1

68. अणु महद्वा यदस्ति लोके वस्तु तन्नैवाऽऽत्मना नित्येनाऽऽत्मवत्संभवति । तदात्मना विनिर्मुक्तमसत्संपद्यते । तस्मादसा-वेवाऽऽत्माऽणोरणीयान्महतो महीयान्सर्वनामरूपवस्तुपाधिकत्वात् । *Ś.Kāth.Up.Bh.* p.52

difference from Śaṅkara in interpreting the *mantra* अणोरणीयान् महतो महीयान् ----- । (1.2.20). It means, for Madhva the Supreme Brahman being smaller than the smallest and bigger than the biggest is declared to be Supremely Superior. By the knowledge of Brahman so explained, the seeker becomes free from sorrow and by *the grace of the Lord*, the seeker gains His direct vision, which in due course brings salvation. Thus, the word धातुप्रसाद - grace of Lord - plays an important role in the fulfilment of the life of a seeker. In contrast to this Madhva's interpretation, Śaṅkara says that through the tranquility of the senses in accordance with the practice of Yoga-method Brahman's identity with oneself is attained. Reading Madhva's interpretation R.E. Hume says "the development of the doctrine of the 'salvation by grace' by the vishnuites, proceeds through the Epic."⁶⁹ This Hume's consideration does not hold good with the antiquity of the *Upaniṣads*. It is an admitted fact in the history of vedic philosophy, that *Upaniṣads* are quite older than the epics. On account of this reason, *the doctrine of 'salvation by grace' proceeding through the epic* has no scope at all. Hence remark made by Hume is historically controversial.

In this vein, पुरुषान् न परं किञ्चित् and सा काष्ठा सा परा गतिः । 1.3.11 declare अद्वितीयत्व of the Supreme Brahman. In precise, as there is no other thing beyond the Supreme Brahman which is nothing but pure consciousness, it is said, there is nothing Higher than the Puruṣa i.e., Highest Brahman. And this highest self is the ultimate culmination of subtleness greatness etc., therefore, this Supreme Reality is the Supreme goal [परागतिः]. In this

69. R.E. Hume - 'Thirteen Principal Upaniṣad', p.352

way Brahman's being without second is the point of main emphasis.⁷⁰

According to Madhva, the Supreme Brahman is the last and Supreme point of hierarchy among the gods.⁷¹

The Supreme Brahman is described as possessing of contradictory adjectives in the *mantra* आसीनो दूरं व्रजति शयानो याति सर्वतः । (1.2.21).⁷² The phrase आसीनः and दूरं व्रजति, as well as शयानः and याति सर्वतः makes two pairs of mutually contradictory terms. Yet, literally आसीनः means *remaining motionless*, and दूरं व्रजति means *going farther*. In the light of Śaṅkara's interpretation, this pair of opposite words indicates conditioned form of Brahman. That is, when Brahman is in the state of particularized consciousness, though really stationary by its own nature, It appears to travel further in accordance with the movement of the mind etc., because, It is conditioned by the mind etc. In reality, the Supreme Consciousness continues to be there in the body itself.⁷³

So also, the terms शयानः and याति सर्वतः speak of contradictory meanings. It appears to be sleeping, but,

70. पुरुषात्र परं किञ्चिदिति । यस्मान्नास्ति पुरुषाच्चिन्मात्रघनात्परं किञ्चिदपि वस्त्वन्तरं तस्मात्सूक्ष्मत्वमहत्त्वप्रत्यगात्मत्वानां सा काष्ठा निष्ठा पर्यवसानम् । अत्र हीन्द्रियेभ्य आरभ्य सूक्ष्मत्वादिपरिसमाप्तिः । अत एव च गन्तृणां सर्वगतिमयां संसारिणां परं प्रकृष्टा गतिः । *M.Kāth.Up.Bh.* p.69; यदत्वा न निवर्तन्ते तद्धाम परमं मम् । - B.G. (8.21), (15.6)
71. पुरुषात्परं किञ्चिन्नास्ति सा पुरुषः काष्ठा अवधिः देवतातारतम्यविश्रांतभूमिः । *R.Ku.Khd.* p.16.
72. Cf. *Tala.Up.* 5.
73. यदा चैवं केवलसामान्यविज्ञानत्वात्सर्वतो यातीर्व यदा विशेषविज्ञानस्थः स्वेन रूपेण स्थित एव सन्मन आदिगतिषु तदुपाधिकत्वाद्दूरं व्रजतीव । *Ś.Kāth.Up.Bh.* p.53.

at the same time goes everywhere. It means, sleep is the cessation of the activities of the senses. The delimitation of consciousness caused by the sense organs ceases for a sleeping man. When a person is in the state of sleeping, its consciousness being of a general character remains present everywhere.⁷⁴ Thus, since Supreme Consciousness when conditioned by various contradictory limiting adjuncts, is possessed of opposite qualities like rest and motion, permanence and impermanence etc. Therefore, it appears variously like a prism or a philosopher's stone.⁷⁵

On the other hand, Madhva shows, the opposite qualities of Supreme Brahman like आसीनो दूरं व्रजति etc., bring out the Lordly Supreme unique power of Him.⁷⁶

Similarly, the absolute self true to its nature is divided of embodiment like ākāśa. Yet, it dwells in the bodies of gods, human beings, etc. It remains unchanging though residing amidst the impermanent bodies.⁷⁷ Therefore, the Upaniṣad declares the Supreme Self as अशरीरं शरीरेषु अनवस्थेषु अवस्थितम् । [1.2.22]

As the Upaniṣadic dictum एषु सर्वेषु भूतेषु गूढोऽऽत्मा न प्रकाशते । (1.3.12) puts forth that since the self is covered by avidyā, the embodied soul does not perceive the

74. करणानामुपशमः शयनं करणजनितस्यैकदेशविज्ञानस्योपशमः शयानस्य भवति । *Ibid.*, p.53.

75. अयमात्मा स्थितिगतितिन्यादिविरुद्धानेकधर्मोपाधित्वाद्विरुद्धधर्मवत्त्वाद्विश्वरूप इव चिन्तामणिवदवभासते । *Ibid.*, p.53.

76. आसीनो दूरं व्रजति शयानो याति सर्वतः । ऐश्वर्यात् भगवान् विष्णुः विरुद्धं घटयत्यसाविति च । *M.Kāth.Up.Bh.* p.11

77. अशरीरं स्वेन रूपेणाऽऽकाशकल्प आत्मा तंशरीरं शरीरेषु देवपितृमनुष्यादि-शरीरेष्वनवस्थेष्ववस्थितिरहितेष्व नित्येष्ववस्थितं नित्यमविकृतमित्येतत् । *Ś.Kātha. Up. Bh.* p.55

same self within Himself and within all other creatures too. So that the self does not appear न प्रकाशते as the self of anyone. Nevertheless in reality, the self is identical with Supreme Self.⁷⁸

Further, the Upaniṣad asserts how the Supreme Self should be realised. Thus reads the *mantra* : नायमात्मा प्रवचनेन लभ्यो न मेधया न बहुना श्रुतेन । (1.2.23)⁷⁹ the Absolute Self cannot be realised by any means like studying the Vedas, or the power of grasping the meaning of the scriptural text, or thought continuous hearing. If so, how could it be known, Śāṅkara's says that the absolute Self is nothing but aspirant's one's self; the seeker *prays to* - by this the absolute Self is known. The meaning here is that, a person who is devoid of desire, seeks for his own self, and his own self becomes known to him on its own accord. The real nature of His Self is revealed to him by itself.⁸⁰

Despite, Madhva has left this *mantra* uninterpreted, one can refer to Raghavendrayati's interpretation to see the Dvaita point of view in this connection. Therein it is said that the Supreme Brahman who is supremely Superior to all gods, dwells in all the beings. Yet, He cannot be seen by all. Those, who have gained the real knowledge of all the scriptural texts can visualize the Supreme Brahman directly through His grace. Thus, the phrase न प्रकाशते in the *mantra* above,

78. एष पुरुषः सर्वेषु ब्रह्मादिस्तम्बपर्यन्तेषु भूतेषु गूढः सर्वतो दर्शनश्रवणादि-कर्माऽऽविद्यामायाछत्रोऽत एवाऽऽत्मा न प्रकाशत आत्मत्वेन कस्यचित् । *Ś.Ku. Bh.* p.70

79. Cf. I. 7-9; *Mund.Up.* III. 2, 3; *Bhag. Gitā*, 1.53.

80. तस्याऽऽत्मकामस्यैष आत्मा विवृणुते प्रकाशयति पारमार्थिकीं तनूं स्वां स्वकीयां स्वयाथात्म्यमित्यर्थः । *Ś.Ku. Bh.* p.56.

pertains to a general vision and it is said simultaneously that he can be seen through his grace. An essentiality of Brahman's grace is said to be suggested by the particle तु in the *mantra*.⁸¹

To quote in this connection - "according to Dualistic interpreters, the worlds mean : 'whom the Supreme Lord chooses.' Obviously this emphasizes the divine grace. But, according to the Non-dualist Śaṅkara, it is the self, that is to say, the lower, phenomenal self, that seeks and worships the Supreme Self, or Brahman. There is however, no real contradiction between the two interpretations. Both Self-effort and divine grace are necessary for the realisation of Ātman. Through self-effort the seeker removes obstacles and prepares the ground; next there is the spontaneous revelation of Ātman."⁸²

The same *mantra* can be seen reiterated in the *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* with no change of even a syllable and the same subject matter is explained in another *mantra* of the *Upaniṣad* : नैव वाचा न मनसा प्राप्तुं शक्यो न चक्षुषा । (2.3.12).

In the third section of the first *Valli*, the *Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad* defines Brahman with some negative adjectives in order to highlight its inexplicable nature. The particular *mantra* reads, thus :

81. गूढोत्मा अंतर्हितस्वरूपः सन् न प्रकाशते तर्हि किं दर्शनार्थं प्रयत्नेनेत्यत उक्तं । दृश्यत इति तुर्भगवत्प्रसादरूपहेतुद्योतकः । R.Ku.Khd. p.16.

82. Swami Nikhilananda 'The Upaniṣads', Happer & Row Publication George Allen & Unwin Ltd., New York, 1964, p.74.

अशब्दमस्पर्शमरूपमव्ययं तथारसं नित्यमगन्धवच्च यत् ।
अनाद्यनन्तं महतः परं ध्रुवं निचाय्य तन्मृत्युमुखात् प्रमुच्यते ॥
(1.3.15)

In the words of Śaṅkara's interpretation, the word अशब्दम् means soundless, i.e., that which is possessed of the sound usually diminishes; but the Supreme Self is soundless and hence, it is devoid of decaying. Therefore, it is declared to be अव्ययम्. As it does not decay, It is नित्य - eternal. It is eternal for another reason that - It has no beginning or cause. On the contrary that which has a cause is impermanent, because, whatever is an effect, it merges into the cause. But, the Supreme Self being the cause of all, cannot be regarded as an effect. Thus, the Supreme Self is not an effect. Therefore, Brahman can not be an effect. Thus, it is eternal.⁸³

So also, as said above, the Supreme Self has no cause into which it can merge. As the plantain etc., are seen to be impermanent after yielding their products in the form of fruits etc., not even in that way has Brahman any finitude; hence too, it is eternal.⁸⁴

In this manner, a reader can introspect here that all negative terms such as अशब्दं, अस्पर्शं, अरूपं, अव्ययं, अरसं, अनन्तं, अनादि etc., culminate into a single aspect of

83. अशब्दमस्पर्शमरूपमव्ययं तथारसं नित्यमगन्धवच्च यत् । एतद्व्यख्यातं ब्रह्माव्ययम् । यद्धि शब्दादिमत्तद्व्येतीदं त्वशब्दादि-मत्त्वादव्ययं न व्येति न क्षीयते, अत एव च नित्यं यद्धि व्येति तदनित्यमिदं तु न व्येत्यतो नित्यम् । Ś.Kāth.Up.Bh. p.75.

84. यथा कदल्यादेः फलादिकार्योत्पादनेनाप्यनित्यत्वं दृष्टं न च तथाऽप्यन्तवत्त्वं ब्रह्मणोऽतोऽपि नित्यम् । Ś.Kāth.Up.Bh. pp.75-76.

Brahman as ultimately Eternal. Besides, all such negations reject mundane relations with Supreme Self.

For Madhva, the terms अशब्दं, अस्पर्श etc., speak of transempirical nature of Supreme Brahman. Though Madhva's Supreme Brahman has possessed of endless attributes by nature, He is beyond the reach of any sound or touch etc. of empirical level. Therefore, the negative prefix to all the terms spell out superiority of Supreme Brahman in a negative aspect.

When we compare both the interpretations of Śaṅkara and Madhva, negation of mundane relations with the Supreme Brahman, is found to be a common factor. Nevertheless, there remains a difference so far as the basic nature of the Supreme Brahman is concerned. For Śaṅkara, negation affirms Nirguṇa aspect of Brahman; and for Madhva negation unfolds over-all Supremacy of Brahman, the embodiment of endless auspicious qualities.

Moreover, the *Upaniṣad* calls the Supreme Brahman मध्वदं that is enjoyer of the fruit of the deeds : य इमं मध्वदं वेद आत्मानं जीवमन्तिकात् । (2.1.4). Representing it as the enjoyer of the fruit would however go against the very principle of the philosophy of the Vedānta as it is neither enjoyer nor a doer. In case the reader accepts the Ātman which is pure consciousness and one without second, to be an enjoyer, it would be contaminated by the defects of empirical world. But, here the *Upaniṣad* calls the Ātman as an enjoyer of the fruits of the good acts, *only in its conditioned aspect*. Although, this point is not implied in the Śaṅkara's interpretation, it fits in well with Śaṅkara's theory of *Māyā and Brahman*.

Similarly, as Madhva notes, this term मध्वदं connotes Brahman's being Enjoyer, but not in its conditioned form. In the Dvaita Vedānta, the Supreme Brahman under any circumstance does not get conditioned. He is ever free. In Madhva's words, the word मध्वदं characterizes Brahman as the enjoyer of the essence being present in the body. However, this idea is in perfect harmony with other authoritative texts like -

- (1) भोक्ता पुरुषो अन्तःस्थः [Maitri. Upaniṣad. 6.10]
- (2) अस्य निर्गुणो भोक्ता [Ibid. 6.10]
- (3) भोक्ता च प्रभुरेव च [Gitā 9.24]
- (4) भर्ता भोक्ता महेश्वरः [Ibid. 13.22] etc.

The phrase 'एतद्वै तत्' at the end of the *mantra* quoted above, implies that Yama assertively says here that this is exactly the nature of Brahman which is asked by Naciketa.⁸⁵

Further more, the *Upaniṣad* characterises the Supreme Brahman in the following *mantra* :

या प्राणेन संभवत्यदितिर्देवतामयी ।

गुहां प्रविश्य तिष्ठन्ती या भूतेभिर्ब्रजायते । एतद्वैतत् । (2.1.7)

In general, this *mantra* proclaims Brahman as manifesting with Praṇa, as dwelling in the cavity of all individual souls, and as manifesting with the great elements. He is known by the epithets of अदिति and देवतामयी ।

Interpreting the phrase प्राणेन संभवति, Śaṅkara understands प्राणेन as Hiranyagarbha, and states that Hiranyagarbha takes birth from the Supreme Brahman.

85. एतद्वै तत् यत्त्वया पृष्ठं तत् एतद्वै प्रागुक्तगुणकं वै । R.Ku.Khd. p.19b

This aspect of Hiranyagarbha's birth is reiterated by another phrase - भूतेभिर्यजायत । The epithet of अदिति shows Brahman's enjoying all the things like sound etc; and it is called देवतामयी as it comprises all the deities.⁸⁶

Any close reader can note the point that Śaṅkara reads the pronoun - या - in the feminine gender along with in adjective : देवतामयी; no doubt it is the order in which the first line of the *mantra* should be read. But, Śaṅkara's interpretation leaves a doubt as to why the *Upaniṣad* uses the words in feminine gender. Also, Śaṅkara's interpretation does fetch the reader with the significance of using the words in feminine gender. Even glossators on Śaṅkara's commentary give no clarification regarding the same.

Besides, Madhva's interpretation of the above *mantra* throws a different light as comparing to that of Śaṅkara, He says the Supreme Brahman who is over all Superior to all the gods, who resides (enters) with *prāṇa* [Mukhyaprāṇa] in the body, who is designated as अदिति for he eats up everything at the time of dissolution and who assumes many incarnate forms like मत्स्य, कूर्म, etc., along with creating many things - animate and inanimate.⁸⁷

In the light of Madhva's commentary on this particular *mantra* the phrase प्राणेन संविशति implies

86. या सर्वदेवतामयी सर्वदेवतात्मिका प्राणेन हिरण्यगर्भरूपेण परस्माद् ब्रह्मणः संभवति शब्दादीनामदनाददितिस्तां पूर्वचद्रुहां प्रविश्य तिष्ठन्तीमदितिम् । तामेव विशिनष्टि या भूतेभिर्भूतैः समन्विता व्यजायत । Ś.Kāth.Up.Bh. p.86.

87. अदनाददितिर्विष्णुर्यः प्राणसहितः स्थितः । उत्तमो देवताभ्यश्च सोत्मानं विविधात्मना । मत्स्यकूर्मादिरूपेण गुहासंस्थमजीजनत् । भूतैस्सहमहाविष्णुः परमात्मा युगेयुग इति च । देवतामयी देवतोत्तमा । M.Kāth.Up.Bh. p.16.

indwellership of Brahman; अदिति designates Brahman as the destroyer; देवतामयी represents Brahman as Supremely Superior to all gods, and भूतेऽभिवेजायत describes Brahman as creator or the universe. In addition to this explanation the use of the pronoun या in the feminine gender suggests that in the light of Madhva's commentary that Brahman though assuming female form of His own, never subject to any type of lower degree; rather His assuming multi forms indicates the omnipotence of the Supreme Brahman. Thus, in the light of Madhva's commentary, the pronoun या in feminine gender finds significance.

Furthermore, utter dependence of gods on the Supreme Brahman is upheld by Yama in the following *mantra* :

यतश्चोदेति सूर्योस्तं यत्र च गच्छति ।

तं देवाः सर्वे अर्पितास्तदु नात्येति कश्चन । एतद्वै तत् ॥ (2.1.9)

Indeed, the meaning of this *mantra* is just clear by itself. Śaṅkara's interpretation here entertains a role of Hiranyagarbha, which is identified with *prāṇa* referred to in the preceding *mantra*. It is quite legitimate with Śaṅkara because for him, Nirguṇa Brahman possesses no action, no quality, no form and nothing else than just pure consciousness. But, Brahman qualified by action, quality, form etc., is the instrument for all activities within the universe. Therefore, Śaṅkara qualifies all the things of the universe to the qualified Brahman which is otherwise known as Hiranyagarbha.⁸⁹ Thus,

89. यतश्च यस्मात्प्राणादुदेत्युत्तिष्ठति सूर्योऽस्तं निम्ळोचनं यत्र यस्मिन्नेव च प्राणेऽह्न्यहनि गच्छति तं प्राणमात्मानं देवा अग्न्यादयो अधिदैवं वागादयश्चाध्यात्मं सर्वे विश्वोऽय इव स्थनाभावर्यताः संप्रवेशिताः स्थितिकाले । Ś.Kāth.Up.Bh. p.87

Śaṅkara gives here a room for Hiranyagarbha's role, which in fact is not directly proposed in the *Upaniṣad*.

As said before, Madhva does not see any difference between Saguṇa Brahman and Nirguṇa Brahman; for him, Supreme Brahman is the only one and He imbibes in Himself both Saguṇa and Nirguṇa aspects. Therefore, He is stated to be unique and supremely Superior. Keeping this idea of Madhva's theory on one hand, one can read the *mantra* above; consequently the reader finds that the *Upaniṣad* is closer to Dvaita view point. As the meaning of this *mantra* is evident enough, Madhva has not commented on it. Despite this, one can read the *mantra* in the light of Raghavendra-yati's interpretation. The rising of the sun at the time of creation, setting down of the sun at the time of destruction, is verily due to the Supreme Brahman, denoted by the term यतः in the *mantra*. Apart from this the *Upaniṣadic* asserts that all gods are dependent because they have been surrendered unto Him for His protection for ever. Thus, they are dependent. The last quarter of the *mantra* : तदु नात्येति कश्चन । is an expressive of unsurpassable nature of the Supreme Brahman in anyway.⁹⁰

Providing an introduction,⁹¹ Śaṅkara says that as the nature of Supreme Brahman is difficult to know,

90. सूर्यः सृष्टिकाले यतो यस्मादुदेति । यत्र च यस्मिंश्च हरौ प्रलयकाले अस्तमदर्शनं गच्छति । तं सर्वे देवाः अर्पिताः तमाश्रित्य स्थिता इत्यर्थः । तत् तं सर्वदेवाश्रयं गुणतः स्वरूपतो वा काश्चन कोपि न उ नैवात्येति नातिक्रामति । R. Kāth. Up. Khd. p.20b.

91. पुनरपि प्रकारान्तरेण ब्रह्मतत्त्व निर्धारणार्थं अयम् आरम्भः दुर्विज्ञेयत्वात् ब्रह्मणः । Ś.Kāth.Up.Bh. p.92.

another method of ascertaining the nature of Supreme Reality is applied in the following *mantra* :

पुरमेकादशद्वारमजस्यावक्रचेतसः ।

अनुष्ठाय न शोचति विमुक्तश्च विमुच्यते । एतद्वै तत् ॥ (2.2.1)

Generally this *mantra* means that, the body with eleven outlets compared to the city is of the unborn, Brahman who is the nature of knowledge. This Brahman should be meditated upon, thereby the seeker does not grieve and gets liberation.

Both Śaṅkara and Madhva have no glaring difference so far as Brahman's controllership of the body is concerned. However, the three stages of attaining emancipation by a meditator are spoken of in this *mantra*. They are - (1) grieflessness, (2) becoming free from bondage of desire and duty created by ignorance while still living, (3) attaining emancipation. These are the three facts of liberation suggested by Śaṅkara through the *Upaniṣadic* terms न शोचति, विमुक्तः and विमुच्यते respectively.

Almost Madhva's interpretation too is in consonance with that of the former. This can be seen as below -

- (1) न शोचति - becoming free from grief so long as one thinks that the body is his, there is sorrow; but, when one realises that it belongs to the Lord and is under his control, all grief due to the body cease to exist.
- (2) विमुक्तः - becomes free through *Aparokṣa* while still living.
- (3) विमुच्यते - attaining final liberation.

Towards the end of *fourth valli*, the *Upaniṣad* repeats similar aspect of Brahman who is of the size of

a thumb, and who dwells in the heart of the individual soul as their Impeller, who is the ruler of the past, present and future. There is no glaring doctrinal difference between the commentaries of Śaṅkara and Madhva.

Moreover in *fifth valli*, the *Upaniṣad* describes the nature of the Brahman with a glimpse of significant epithets as below -

हंस शुचिषद्वसुरन्तरिक्षसद्भोता वेदिषदतिथिर्दुरोणसत् ।
नृषद्वरसद्वृतसद्व्योमसदब्जा गोजा ऋतजा अद्रिजा ऋतं बृहत् ॥
(2.2.2)⁹²

The meaning of all the epithets according to Śaṅkara and Madhva are given below side by side for easy comparative understanding.

Śaṅkara	Madhva
(1) हंसः = Mover	(1) हंसः = Free from blemishes and the essence of all.
(2) शुचिषद् = Dweller as the Sun in the sky.	(2) शुचिषद् = Indweller of Vāyu.
(3) वसुः = One who provides dwelling for all.	(3) वसुः = The form of a bliss.
(4) अन्तरिक्षसत् = A dweller in the intermediate space.	(4) अन्तरिक्षसत् = Dwelling in the firmament.

92. Cf. *Rg.veda*. IV. 40,5; *Vajasaneyi Samhitā* - X.24; XI.14; *Taittiriya Samhitā* : 3.2.10.1; *Sātapatha Brahmana* : 6.7.3.11

(5) होता = Fire	(5) होता = Enjoyer of His own objects like शब्द etc. being dwelt in the essence of jīva.
(6) वेदिषत् = Resider on the earth.	(6) वेदिषत् = Dweller in the sacrificial altar.
(7) अतिथिः = Soma juice	(7) अतिथिः = He who has the best collection of the objects of enjoyment.
(8) दुरोणसद् = A dweller in a jar or as a Brāhmaṇa guest dwelling in houses.	(8) दुरोणसद् = He who dwells in a jar of soma.
(9) नृषत् = Indweller of all men.	(9) नृषत् = Indweller of all men.
(10) वरसत् = Indweller of gods.	(10) वरसत् = Indweller of gods like Brahman etc.
(11) वृतसत् = Dweller in the sacrifice.	(11) वृतसत् = Essence of the Vedas which reveal Him as He is.
(12) व्योमसत् = Dweller in the space.	(12) व्योमसत् = Indweller of goddess Lakṣmī in whom the hole universe is woven.

(13) अब्जा = Born in water.	(13) अब्जा = Indweller of the things like ... pearl etc., born in the water whose value has been increased by His indwelling.
(14) गोजा = Born on the earth as paddy, barely etc.	(14) गोजा = Indweller of the creatures living on the earth.
(15) ऋतजा = Born in the sacrifice as its appendages.	(15) ऋतजा = Controller of liberated soul.
(16) अद्रिजा = Born from mountains as rivers etc.	(16) अद्रिजा = Indweller of the rivers etc. born of mountains.
(17) ऋतं = Unchanging in nature.	(17) ऋतं = He who is principally established by the Vedas.
(18) बृहत् = The cause of all.	(18) बृहत् = Full of attributes.

As seen above, there lies slight difference between the interpretations of Śaṅkara and Madhva. Within the purview of limiting adjuncts Śaṅkara says, Brahman is seen in different forms like fire, sacrifice, rivers, earth, etc. On the otherhand, Madhva brings

out the idea of Brahman's being indweller of all the objects of the universe even in the transcendental level. Thus, for Śaṅkara the epithets speaks of phenomenal value of various aspects of the Supreme Brahman; while Madhva upholds the glory of the Supreme Brahman not only from the phenomenal aspect but also transcendental.

Another facet of the nature of Supreme Brahman is spoken of in the *Kāthopaniṣad* as below -

ऊर्ध्वं प्राणमुन्नयत्यपानं प्रत्यगस्यति ।

मध्ये वामनमासीनं विश्वे देवा उपासते ॥ (2.2.3)

The greatness of the Supreme Brahman is highlighted here by saying that all deities worship Brahman sitting in the middle [of the heart] and who pushes *Prāṇa* upwards and impels *apāna* inward. The most remarkable point in this regard that Śaṅkara has highlighted is Brahman's absolute difference from all-else. In his words, the purport of the sentence is that for who, and under whose direction, exists all activities of the organs and the vital force, is proved to be different from them.⁹³

This statement is remarkable not because Śaṅkara has used the word *different* [अन्यः] which may appear to a Dvaitin as upholding the *concept of difference* accepted by Dvaita philosopher, but because, he has shown the difference between the body constituted of organs and Brahman. Showing this difference is not necessiated here as is experienced by one and all in the physical world..And hence this remark is unwanted.

93. यदर्था यत् प्रयुक्ताश्च सर्वे वायुकरणव्यापाराः सः अन्यः सिद्ध इति वाक्यार्थः ।
Ś.Kāth.Up.Bh. p.95.

Madhva has not interpreted this *mantra* as the meaning of it is clear by itself. Yet, reading Rāghavendra-yati's gloss on this *mantra* makes it explicit that the Supreme Brahman directs the *prāṇa vāyu* upward and the *apāna vāyu* downward.

All deities adore the glory of Brahman who is designated as Vāmana dwelling in the middle i.e., the heart.⁹⁵

The Supreme Brahman referred to here is same as spoken of in the *mantras* :

(1) अद्भुष्टमात्रः पुरुषो मध्य आत्मनि तिष्ठति । (2.1.12)⁹⁶

(2) अद्भुष्टमात्रः पुरुषोऽन्तरात्मा सदा जनानां हृदये संनिविष्टः ।
(2.3.17)

In addition to the idea contained in the previous *mantra*, the *Upaniṣad* declares that both *prāṇa* and *apāna* can not be the source of life. Because, they for their own maintainance, have resorted to the Supreme Source of life i.e., the Supreme Brahman. This is explained in the *mantra* - न प्राणेन नापानेन मर्त्यो जीवति कश्चन । (2.2.5). This *mantra* establishes that Brahman is the Supreme Substratum of all. In this regard, there lies no remarkable difference of opinions of Śaṅkara and Madhva.

Another aspect of nature of Brahman is described by Yama thus : य एषु सुप्तेषु जागर्ति कामं कामं पुरुषो

95. यो अंगुष्ठमात्रत्वादिना प्रागुक्तः प्राणं प्राणवायुं ऊर्ध्वमुन्नयति ऊर्ध्वगतिमतया प्रेरयति । अपानं च वायुं प्रत्यगधः विष्णुत्रादिनिष्कासनहे तुतया अस्यति प्रेरयति । तं मध्ये हृदि आसीनं वामनं विश्वे सर्वे देवाः उपासत इति । R.Ku.Khd. p.22b

96. Cf. *Śvet.Up.* III.13

निर्मिमाणः ---- । (2.2.8).⁹⁷ The Supreme Brahman denoted by the term पुरुष herein is described as keeping itself awake in those who sleep when all *prāṇas* stop-working within the body, and creates through ignorance the desirable things like women etc. Thus, Brahman remains unaffected by any physical or mental operations of the embodied souls; and this Brahman is declared to be immortal in all the Vedānta texts, to whom all worlds are resorted and none can transcend Him.⁹⁸

Here Śaṅkara does not add anything else to what *Upaniṣad* actually declares. Madhva too reiterates the same.

Further, Yama continues to describe the nature of Brahman by illustrating two examples of Agni and Vāyu - अग्निर्यथैको भुवनं प्रविष्टो रूपं रूपं प्रतिरूपो बभूव ---- । (2.2.9);⁹⁹ वायुर्यथैको भुवनं प्रविष्टो रूपं रूपं प्रतिरूपो बभूव । (2.2.10)

As Śaṅkara interprets, fire or air though one appears in different forms corresponding to the limiting forms of physical things. So too, Brahman in respect of different limiting adjuncts appears in respective forms. In interpreting *Upaniṣadic* phrase रूपं रूपं प्रतिरूपो बभूव । Madhva differs from Śaṅkara in bringing out its metaphysical importance.

97. Cf. *Brh.Ar.* IV.9; VI.1.

98. य एषु सुप्तेषु प्राणादिषु जागर्ति न स्वपिति । कथम् । कामं कामं तं तमभिप्रेतं स्त्र्याद्यर्थमविद्यया निर्मिमाणो निष्पादयज्जागर्ति पुरुषो यस्तदेव शक्रं शुभ्रं शुद्धं तद्ब्रह्म नान्यद्गुह्यं ब्रह्मास्ति । तदेवामृतमविनाशयुच्यते सर्वशास्त्रेषु । किंच पृथिव्यादयो लोकास्तस्मिन्नेव सर्वे ब्रह्मण्याश्रिताः सर्वलोककारणत्वात्तस्य । Ś.Kāth.Up.Bh. p.99

99. Cf. *Brh.Ar.* II.5.19.

Madhva brings in *bimba-pratibimba bhāva* between Brahman and the individual souls. Madhva makes it explicit that Brahman alone is independent and the only one; yet, He has many *bimba* forms. On the other hand, the individual souls are the *pratibimbas* of Brahman. Thus, each individual soul is *pratibimba* form of *bimba* form the Supreme Brahman.¹⁰⁰ It is to be noted here that the Supreme Brahman is one and homogeneous. Yet, His *pratibimbas* are infallible variety. In the sense that the experience of those individual souls are of infinitely diverse type. If the Supreme Brahman is the innerself of all, He must suffer the pains of individual souls, because, He is inside them. To this doubt, the succeeding *mantra* supplies the reply as below -

एकस्तथा सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा न लिप्यते लोकदुःखेन बाह्यः ।
(2.2.11).¹⁰¹

Though, the Supreme Brahman dwells in all the beings which are full of miseries. He is not effected by their miseries, for He is distinct from them and independent. This is explained by a simile of the sun. The sun is present in the eyes of all and regulates them to see. Still the sun remains unaffected by the defects of the eternal eye.

In the understanding of this *mantra*, Śaṅkara explains the pure nature of the Supreme Brahman

100. रूपं रूपं प्रतिद्वेति सन्त्यचेतनवह्यः । एवं देवो वायुरपि धारकोऽन्यो न विद्यते ।
रूपं रूपं तथाप्यस्य प्रत्यभूत्प्रतिरूपकः । अचेतनः स्पर्शगम्यो योऽयमेवं
जनार्दनः । एकस्वतन्त्रो नान्योऽस्ति सर्वजीवान्तरस्थितः । रूपंरूपं प्रतिद्वेति
प्रतिबिम्बाश्च चेतनाः । बाह्याश्च ते ततो नास्य स्वरूपं ते कथञ्चन । M.Kāth.
Up.Bh. p.21

101. Cf. Bhag.Gītā XIII, 52.

within the relative value of the example of the sun. The sun residing in the eyes does not get affected by the impurities of the external or physical eye. It is the ultimate truth that the Supreme Brahman is of the nature of pure consciousness. And the self within the bodies is nothing but the pure consciousness. A doubt here is that, as the self resides in the body; it gets affected by the impurities of the external body. If so, how could the self, indentified with pure consciousness, be said unaffected ? To remove this doubt, Śaṅkara bring in an idea of superimposition. Sorrows of the world due to the attachment with external body are superimposed on the self within the body. And this superimposition remains there as long as its cause - अज्ञान is not removed. On the dawn of the knowledge that the self within the body and the pure consciousness are one and the same, there remains no superimposition, but the Supreme Brahman itself.

Here, the intermediation of superimposition fits in well with the self in the body according to Śaṅkara. Here, it should not be forgotten that the nature of the Supreme Self is explained on the basis of the illustration of the sun. So, it is not illegitimate to apply the intermediation of superimposition even in the case of sun residing in the eye. In such case, due to the superimposition, the sun atleast appears to be affected by the defects of the eyes and accordingly, it should have become an experience of all embodied souls. On the contrary, no embodied soul says that the sun within the eye is affected by the defects of the eyes. Thus, the superimposition on phenomenal sphere does not go well with the sun within the eye. In this manner, the illustration of the sun according to Śaṅkara does not work well on the objective plane.

At the end of the fifth *valli* the *Upaniṣad* in similar terms emphasises Brahman being the Supreme all controller, all indweller, and bestower of the desires of the aspirants. Thus, it is in words of *Upaniṣad* - एको वशी सर्वभूतान्तात्मा ---- । (2.2.12);¹⁰² नित्यो नित्यानां चेतनश्चेतनानां ---- । (2.2.13).¹⁰³ His unequivocal nature lies in his manifold manifestations. This is conveyed by the *Upaniṣadic* phrase एकं रूपं बहुधा यः करोति --- । (2.2.12). However, a perusal of the commentaries conveys that there is no difference between the views of Śaṅkara and Madhva. Thus, being asked by Naciketa, Yama expresses the secrets thread of Brahman's all supremacy. It is nothing but Brahman's Self-effulgence. Brahman is self-effulgent and makes others shine :

न तत्र सूर्यो भाति न चन्द्रतारकम् ।
नेमा विद्युतो भान्ति कुतोऽयमग्निः ॥
तमेव भान्तमनुभाति सर्वम् ।
तस्य भासा सर्वमिदं विभाति ॥ (2.2.15)¹⁰⁴

As declared here, the sun, the moon, the stars, the lightning, the fire - all these are indeed natural elements of lustre. The *Upaniṣad* professes the truth that these lustrous elements do not shine on their own. They shine deriving the light from the self-effulgent Brahman. They all are illuminated by His effulgence. Even after deriving the light from the self-effulgent Brahman, the luminaries such as - the fire, the sun and other higher gods like Indra, Vāyu, Yama, shine and execute their duties from the fear of

102. Cf. *Śvet.Up.* VI.12.

103. Cf. *Śvet.Up.* VI.13,

104. Cf. *Śvet.Up.* VI.14; *Mund.Up.* II.2,10; *Gītā.* XV.6.

the Brahman. Thus, the entire universe functions under the command of the Supreme Brahman.¹⁰⁵

Thus, declares the *Upaniṣad* -

यदिदं किं च जगत् सर्वं प्राण एजति निःसृतम् ।
महद्भयं वज्रमुद्यतं य एतद्विदुरमृतास्ते भवन्ति ॥ (2.3.2)
भयादस्याग्निस्तपति भयात्तपति सूर्यः ।
भयादिन्द्रश्च वायुश्च मृत्युर्धावति पञ्चमः ॥ (2.3.3)¹⁰⁶

Hence, Brahman is Supremely Superior. This is the nature of Brahman imparted by Yama to Naciketa.

The *Upaniṣad* further elaborates the nature of Brahman in relation to the universe adducing a metaphor of *Aśvattha* tree - ऊर्ध्वमूलोऽवाक्शाख एषोऽश्वत्थः सनातनः---- । (2.3.1).¹⁰⁷ In the light of Śaṅkara's commentary, the *mantra* provides with a reason why the *saṃsāra* has been compared to the tree. In Sanskrit, the tree is called अ because, of its being felled. Further, on the basis of the characteristic features of the world of ignorance, Śaṅkara describes the method in which the tree is grown. This tree grows from out of the seed of ignorance. It has for its sprout *Hiraṇyagarbha* comprising the two powers of knowledge and action. Its trunk is the diverse subtle bodies of all creatures. It grows through the sprinkling of the water of desire. Its leaves are the Vedas, the *smṛtis* etc. Its flowers are the many deeds like sacrifice charity, penance etc. It has its nests the seven worlds. It is felled by the weapon of detachment

105. Cf. कम्पनात् || B.S. 1.3.39.

106. Cf. *Taitt.Up.* II.8,1.

107. Cf. *Bhag.Gītā.* XV, 1-3.

consisting of the realisation of one's identity with Supreme Brahman.¹⁰⁸

This tree of the world which is called *Aśvattha* is ever unsteady by the wind of desire and deeds. Its downward branches are in the form of heaven, hell, and states of beasts and ghosts. It has no beginning. The root of this tree of the world is the Supreme Brahman which is Pure, Resplendent, Greatest of all, Imperishable and the Supreme Truth.¹⁰⁹

Following Madhva's interpretation, this *mantra* gives the picture of the world of the tree existed in the receptacle of the Supreme Brahman. The earth is the soil in which all trees have their roots. The Lord Viṣṇu, the highest of all, is the root-soil of this tree called the universe. Its branches are the devas all being lower than that root-soil. The goddess Ramā is the root. This tree is called *Aśvattha*. The *Aśvattha* is thus derived from आशु quick + √वा to go + क (अ) affix = अश्व 'quick moving'. The elision of उ and the shortening of आ into अ are Vedic anomalies. अश्व + त्थ = अश्व अस्मिन्न तिष्ठति or

108. सोऽयम् अव्यक्तादि स्थावरान्तः संसारवृक्ष ऊर्ध्वमूलः । वृक्षश्च व्रश्चनात् ।----
अविद्या कामकर्म-अव्यक्त-बीजप्रभवो-अपरब्रह्मविज्ञाक्रिया-शक्तिद्वयात्मक-
हिरण्यगर्भाङ्कुरः सर्वप्राणि-लिङ्भेद-स्कन्ध-तृष्णा-जलासेक उद्भूतदर्पो
बुद्धीन्द्रिय-विषयप्रवलाङ्कुरः श्रुतिस्मृति-न्याय-विद्योपदेश-पलाशो, यज्ञ, दान-
तप-आद्यनेकक्रिया-सुपुष्पः----- तृष्णासलिलावसेक प्ररूढ-जडीकृत-दृढ-
बद्धमूलः सत्यनामादि ससलोकब्रह्मादि-भूतपक्षि-कृतनीडः --- वेदान्त विहित-
ब्रह्मात्मदर्शनासङ्ग-शस्त्रकृतोच्छेद---- | *Ś.Kāth.Up.Bh.* pp.107-108.

109. एष संसारवृक्षो-अश्वत्थो-अश्वत्थ ---- स्वर्गनरकतिर्यकप्रेतादिभिः
शाखाभिरवाक्शाखः । सनातनोऽनादित्वाञ्ज्वरं प्रवृत्तः । यदस्य संसारवृक्षस्य मूलं
तदेवं शुक्रं शुभ्रं शुद्धं ज्योतिष्मज्जैतन्यात्मज्योतिः स्वभावं तदेव ब्रह्म
सर्वमहत्त्वात् । तदेवामृतमविनास्वभावमुच्यते कथ्यते सत्यत्वात् । *Ibid.*, p.108.

अश्वस्य थम् अन्नं = अश्वत्थः that which stands firm like the fig tree or अश्वत्थ may mean "the abode of God or the food of God" : अश्व means then "He who goes very quickly," i.e., the all-pervading God, and थ is elided form of स्था to stand or थ = food.

Lord Hari is called *Aśva* because of His quick motion. As this universe is pervaded by Hari, and as it is the food (थ=food) of Hari, it is called *Aśvattha*. This universe is beginningless as an eternal current of existence, but the highest eternal and immortal is the Lord Hari. This *Aśvattha* or universe is called Sanātana or eternal in the sense that there is no beginning of it. It is a *pravāha* or current changing but ceaseless and eternal. But Lord is the true eternal, for He is both changeless and eternal.

He alone is the one and true eternal; the world is eternal only as a phenomenal current.¹¹⁰

A comparative reading of both the interpretations above provides some points of difference there between.

(1) According to Śāṅkara, it is Hiraṇyagarbha to which, the tree of universe is resorted; while the Supreme Brahman acknowledged as Viṣṇu, is the place of shelter for that world-tree.

(2) Śāṅkara gives the idea that the world tree is due to ignorance, whereas Madhva understands it to be real.

110. सर्वोच्चो भगवान्विष्णुर्मूलं भूमिवदस्य तु । जगदाख्यस्य वृक्षस्य शाखा
देवास्ततोऽवमाः । वृक्षमूलं रमादेवी सोऽश्व आशुगतेर्हृदि । तद्व्यास त्वात्तदन्न
त्वादश्वत्थोऽयं प्रकीर्तितः । प्रवाहतस्त्वनादिश्च मुख्यतस्त्वमृतो हरिः ।
मुख्यामृतस्स एवैको जगन्नित्यं प्रवाहतः । *M.Kāth.Up.Bh.* p.23.

(3) Madhva brings in the *Lakṣmī tattva* in describing the picture of world-tree, and said that *Lakṣmī* is the root of this world-tree. According to Madhva, goddess *Lakṣmī*, the consort Lord Viṣṇu is considered to be the presiding deity insentient prakṛti, which itself is identified as *Aśvattha* tree. Thus, Lord Viṣṇu is the ground of the entire world tree, and goddess *Lakṣmī* is the root of the tree. Thus, the intermediation of *Lakṣmī* in the description of *Aśvattha* tree may be considered to be not out of the context.

This tree, being the reflection of the real tree, is an exact replica Everything is there in the spiritual world. The impersonalists take Brahman to be the root of this material tree, and from the root, according to Sankhya philosophy, come *Prakṛti*, *Puruṣa*, then the *three gunas*, then the five gross elements (*Pañca-*

mahā-bhūta), then the ten senses (*dasendriya*), mind, etc. In this way they divide up the whole material world into twenty-four elements. If Brahman is the center of all manifestations, then this material world is a manifestation of the center by 180 degrees, and the other 180 degrees constitute the spiritual world. The material world is the perverted reflection, so the spiritual world must have the same variegatedness, but in reality. The *prakṛti* is the external energy of the Supreme Lord, and the *puruṣa* is the Supreme Lord Himself, and that is explained in *Bhagavad-gītā*. Since this manifestation is material, it is temporary. A reflection is temporary, for it is sometimes seen and sometimes not seen. But the origin from whence the reflection that is reflected, is eternal. The material reflection of the real tree has to be cut off. When it is said that a person knows the *Vedas*, it is assumed that he knows how to cut off attachment to this material world. If one knows that process, he actually knows the *Vedas*. One who is attracted by the ritualistic formulas of the *Vedas* is attracted by the beautiful green leaves of the tree. He does not exactly know the purpose of the *Vedas*. The purpose of the *Vedas*, as disclosed by the personality of Godhead Himself, is to cut down this reflected tree and attain the real tree of the spiritual world.”

The absolute Brahman is declared to be pure existence according to Śaṅkara. In this perspective, knowing Him to exist as *Sat*, and realising Him as He really is, are the two factors of Its nature. The knowledge of both these factors is necessary for one to get one's nature manifested. In this regard, the *Upaniṣad* reads thus :

अस्तीत्येवोपलब्धव्यस्तत्त्वभावेन चोभयोः ।

अस्तीत्येवोपलब्धस्य तत्त्वभावः प्रसीदति ॥ (2.3.13)

Interpreting this *mantra*, Śaṅkara says that the Ātman should be raised as existing, as the productive of effects in which existence inheres, and as having the intellect etc., as Its limiting adjuncts. It means that the nature of the Ātman as existing in all the objects of the universe which are seen due to their being conditioned by limiting adjuncts. Thus, the Ātman as existent is known through the idea of existence called up by the limiting adjuncts which are themselves the effects of the Ātman.

When all the limiting adjuncts get vanished the non-dual nature of the Ātman is raised and this realisation of It is *suddhasattva* i.e. *Pure Existence*.

Further, Śaṅkara says that the Upaniṣadic text here wants the seeker against meditating upon Brahman as manifested with limiting adjuncts; and further the text vigorously advocates that meditation upon the Absolute Brahman which is devoid of all attributes presupposed by limiting adjuncts, should be taken up.¹¹¹ Reading this interpretation of Śaṅkara, Chinmayananda remarks thus : "according to the above text-books, Śaṅkara's commentary falls short of the mark, and that a closer hit would have been gained by directly explaining the *mantra* to hint at a warning the meditator should meditate upon Truth as Existence

111. तस्मादपोह्य-असद्वादि-पक्षम्-आसुरम्-अस्तीत्येव-आत्मोपलब्धव्यः सत्कार्यो बुद्ध्याहुपाधिः । यदा तु तद्रहितो-अविक्रिय आत्मा कार्यं च कारण-व्यतिरेकेण नास्ति वाचा आरम्भणं विकारो नामधेयं मृतिकेत्येव सत्यमिति श्रुतेस्तदा तस्य निरूपाधिकस्य अलिङ्गस्य सदसदादि प्रत्ययविषयत्व-वर्जितस्य-आत्मनः तत्त्वभावो भवति । Ś.Kāth.Up.Bh. p.120.

(*Asti*) and not as Non-existence (*Nāsti*) ---- as some of the Buddhistic schools of philosophers maintain along with a section of the Indian Logicians (Naiyyaikas)."¹¹²

This *mantra* according to Madhva, states the method of acquiring the knowledge to get the grace of the Supreme Lord, because, finally all depends on His grace. In this light, the *mantra* means that one has to realise that not only Brahman exists but exists as the Supreme Being. It is he who causes the reality of both *Prakṛti* and *Puruṣa*. One can get this knowledge only with the grace of Brahman. He bestows his full grace on those who realise the fact of his being a Supreme Being.

In the light of Madhva's commentary, the indeclinable - अ accuring in the *mantra* two times, refers to two different types of aspirants namely - (1) those who know the Highest Brahman from the beginning.

(2) those who do not know so. In case of the first type of aspirant, the grace of Brahman increases the knowledge; whereas in case of the second type of aspirant the grace produces the knowledge of Brahman.

Further, Madhva explains that Viṣṇu is called तत्त्वभाव because He produces or unfolds distinctly (भावयते) the reality of be-ness (तत्त्व) of both the *Prakṛti* and *Puruṣa*. His greatness over all is known through His grace; and His grace is obtained through the knowledge of His superiority to all. Because of Brahman's superiority to all. He is designated as अस्ति.¹¹³

112. Swami Chinmayananda, "Discourses on Kāthopaniṣad", p.237.

113. अधिकः सतोऽयं भगवान् सर्वस्मादपि केशवः । अस्तीति नामकस्तस्मात् ज्ञातव्यः स तथैव च ॥ प्रकृतेः पुरुषाणां च तत्त्वं भावयति स्फुटम् । तत्त्वभावस्ततो विष्णुः तद्वत्प्रसादस्तु तस्य हि ॥ आधिक्यं ज्ञायते सत्तः प्रसादश्च तथाविधः ॥ M.Kāth.Up.Bh. p.24.

c. The Relation Between Jīva and Brahman

In the philosophical sphere, jīva and Brahman are the two entities close to each other and the former one aspiring for the latter one. Indeed, the nature of Brahman has been enumerated in words of *Kāṭhopaniṣad* earlier. And at this juncture, a reader should know how jīva is related with Brahman. In this connection, the *Kāṭhopaniṣad* reads the following *mantra* -

ऋतं पिबन्तौ सुकृतस्य लोके गुहां प्रविष्टौ परमे परार्धे(र्ध्ने) ।
छायातपौ ब्रह्मविदो वदन्ति पञ्चाग्नयो ये च त्रिणाचिकेताः ॥

[1.3.1]

As the *Upaniṣad* records on the basis of the dual form of the terms पिबन्तौ, प्रविष्टौ existence of two entities is suggested. Yet, in the opinions of the commentators, the upaniṣadic view slightly gets changed. For, Śaṅkara dual form of पिबन्तौ and प्रविष्टौ refers to two entities - jīva and Brahman, both being enjoyers. A question might be asked as to how Brahman, the other entity be the enjoyer. Śaṅkara's rejoinder is that though Brahman is not *Bhoktā*, still He is so called because of His association with the jīva, the real enjoyer in the phenomenal world. This is expressed on the analogy of the umbrella.¹¹⁴

The phenomenal truth of the disparity between jīva and Brahman is illustrated by the world छायातपौ. It is here implied that the non-difference between jīva and Brahman is ultimate truth.¹¹⁵

114. When a king with his retinue moves out in a procession with umbrellas, people say, '*Chatrinaḥ yanti* - people with umbrellas are going', though most of the people in the procession do not possess umbrellas.

115. ऋतं सत्यमवश्यंभावित्वात्कर्मफलं पिबन्तौ । एकस्तत्र कर्मफलं पिबति भुङ्क्ते नेतरस्तथाऽपि पातृसंबन्धात्पिबन्तावित्युच्यते छत्रिन्यायेन । ---- तौ च →

So far as Madhva's view is concerned, one should say that this *mantra* has no bearing on jīva and Brahman. Rather, his interpretation infuses *two forms* of the same entity i.e., the Supreme Brahman, which are called *Ātmā* and *Antarātmā*. Madhva recommends here that this *mantra* describes two forms of Brahman which should be meditated upon by knower of Brahman. In precise, there are two forms of Lord Viṣṇu called *Ātmā* and *Antarātmā* dwelling in vāyu, the best of all jīvas and who is in the cavity of the heart (*hrdaya-guhā*) of a man whose body is formed by the merit of good deeds, He experiences the fruit of the good deeds of all the jīvas. The knowers of Brahman, who perform five sacrifices and observe triple - Nāciketa - fire sacrifice, say that these two forms are shade and heat. It is also clarified that the words *chāyā* and *ātapa* do not mean shade and heat respectively; but it is that the Lord who is like cool shade to the good bestowing them with happiness. He is like heat to the wicked, i.e., He punishes them.¹¹⁶

In this manner, the *mantra* above describes the nature of Brahman according to Madhva, while the relation between jīva and Brahman in the phenomenal world according to Śaṅkara.

Both the interpretations can be said to be in tune with the Upaniṣadic view. Because, the word पिबन्तौ in

→ छायातपविव विलक्षणौ संसारित्वासंसारित्वेन ब्रह्मविदो वदन्ति कथयन्ति ।
Ś.Kāth.Up.Bh. p.58.

116. आत्माऽतरत्मेति विभूरेक एव द्विधा स्थितः । स विष्णुः परमे वायौ परेभ्योऽप्यृद्धरूपके । शुभान्पिबति भोगान्सच्छायेव विदुषां प्रभुः । आतपः पापिनां नित्यं मर्यादा विष्णुयाजिनां । M.Kāth.Up.Bh. p.12.

dual form refers to jīva who is really a भोक्ता, and to Brahman as well. So the enjoyer of the fruits of the deeds is no other than jīva itself; but, Brahman is in association with jīva in the cavity of the heart. Thus, पिबन्तौ, गुहां प्रविष्टौ carry balanced meaning. So also, according to Madhva the dual form of पिबन्तौ refers to two forms of Brahman, Ātmā and Antarātmā dwelling in Mukhya-prāṇa residing in the cavity of the heart. Mukhya-prāṇa's dwelling in the hearts of all individual souls is one of the cardinal truths of Madhva's philosophy.

B.D. Basu in connection with Śaṅkara's commentary remarks as below : "Some think that the two drinkers, referred to in this *mantra*, are the jīva and Buddhi; because "Pibantau" is in dual number. But Buddhi being insentient cannot be the enjoyer of the fruit of action. Moreover, the jīva is sentient, and Buddhi is insentient, and so the reference in "पिबन्तौ" cannot be to two such entities belonging to two different classes - one sentient and the other insentient. If the jīva be taken as the "drinker" then Buddhi must be also taken to be a sentient entity which doctrine no one holds. Nor can it be said that the reference is to two jīvas dwelling in the same body. For, it is impossible for two personalities (jīvas) to dwell in the same body and to be enjoyers of both."¹¹⁷

Offering his critical remarks, Radhakrishnan writes as below : "The two referred to here are the individual soul and the Supreme Self, which go back to *Rgveda* 1.164.20. Sāyana, commenting on this verse, says that the reference is to the two forms of the ātman, the

117. *Op.cit.* B.D. Basu. *Kāṭhakopaniṣad* p.98.

individual soul (jīvātman) and the universal (Paramā-tman). But how can the self which is represented as looking on without eating, be treated as experiencing the rewards of deeds ? Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja and Srinivas in his commentary-Nimbārka, argue that it is loose usage of *chattri-nyaya*. When two men walk under an umbrella, we say there go the umbrella-bearers. Madhva is more to the point when he quotes *Bṛhat Samhitā* and says, 'the Lord Hari dwells in the heart of beings and accepts the pure pleasure arising from their good works.' The Supreme in its cosmic aspect is subject to the changes of times. Īśvara as distinct from Brahman participates in the processes of the world. Madhva finds support in this verse for his doctrine of the entire disparate-ness of the individual and the universal souls.¹¹⁸

Then it is said that the two "drinkers" are the jīva and the Lord. The Lord also drinks or experiences the fruit of karma metaphorically. For being always associated with the jīva, He is said figuratively to drink, while the jīva really drinks. But this view is incorrect. For here also, recourse is to a figure of speech in order to make Lord experience the fruit of action. The result therefore is that this verse has no reference to the jīva at all, but to Īśvara alone. The two that drink are the two aspects of the one and the same Īśvara - one as Ātmā dwelling in the heart of the cosmos; and the other as Antarātmā dwelling in the heart of every jīva. This explains the phrase "*guham praviṣṭau*" also : for both these aspects of the Lord are in the *guhā* or heart."¹¹⁹ However, this

118. *Op.cit.*, Radhakrishnan. p.621.

119. B.D. Basu, *Sacred Books of the Hindus*, Prasna, Kāṭha Etc. Upaniṣad & Mitaksara, Bharatiya Publishing House, Delhi, 1979, pp.38-39.

remark is false. The phrase "some think" directly applies to Śaṅkara. Yet, as a matter of fact, Śaṅkara does not refer पिबन्तौ to jīva and *Buddhi*, but to Jīva and Īśvara, as is clear from the foot note No. 115. Rather Śaṅkara understands and relates *Buddhi* in some other manner - "the drinkers of the results of the deeds done by oneself within the body are entered into the cavity, into the intellect [*Buddhi*]." Thus, the *Buddhi* is taken into account by Śaṅkara as a receptacle for jīva and Īśvara.¹²⁰ Thus, B.D. Basu's contention is baseless.

In this section, one can read the famous and immortal metaphor of the chariot. Herein, one has the picture of a chariot in the form of body, and the individual soul is the master of the chariot. The intellect is the charioteer. The sense organs are horses fastened to the chariot, and the reins with which the intellect guides, the moments of the body are the mind.¹²¹

The jīva is called भोक्ता - the enjoyer when it is associated with the body, organs and mind.

आत्मानं रथिनं विद्धि शरीरं रथमेव तु ।

बुद्धिं तु सारथिं विद्धि मनः प्रग्रहमेव च ॥ (1.3.3)

इन्द्रियाणि हयानाहुर्विषयास्तेषु गोचरान् ।

आत्मेन्द्रियमनोयुक्तं भोक्तेत्याहुर्मनीषिणः ॥ (1.3.4)

120. लोके अस्मिन् शरीरे । गुहां गुहायां बुद्धौ प्रविष्टौ । Ś.Kāth.Up.Bh. p.59.

121. "The simile of the chariot has some points of similarities with the well known passage in Plato's phaedros, but Plato did not borrow this simile from the Brahmānas, as little as Xenophon need have consulted our Upaniṣad. (II.2) in writing his prologue of prodikos." Max Muller. 'SBE' p.12.

The speciality of Śaṅkara's interpretations of these two *mantras* lies in explaining the reasons of comparison between the jīva - the master of the chariot, the body - the chariot etc.¹²² That is :

(1) The *body* is said to be the chariot because the former is pulled by the organs which occupy the place of horses tied to the chariot.

(2) The *Buddhi* or *intellect* is characterised as a charioteer, since the intellect plays chief role of guiding the body. Indeed, the intellect directs all physical work.

(3) The *sense organs* are called horses, because of the similarity of drawing the chariot and the body.

(4) The *mind* is characterised as the bridle, for just as the horses act when held in by the reins. Similarly, the organs like eyes etc., act when held in by the mind.

(5) The *individual soul* is said to be भोक्ता- the enjoyer of the fruits of his deeds, in the *phenomenal world*. Because the Absolute Self can have no enjoyer-ship. Its being an enjoyer is due to the limiting adjuncts such as intellect etc.¹²³ Śaṅkara substantiates his view

122. A similar comparison is found in the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad - II 1-9.

त्रिरुन्नतं स्थाप्य समं शरीरं हृदीन्द्रियाजि मनसा संनिरुध्य ।

ब्रह्मोडुपेन प्रतरेत विद्वान्स्त्रोतांसि सर्वाणि भयावहानि ॥ [2.8]

123. शरीरं रथमेव तु रथबद्धहयस्थानीयैरिन्द्रियैराकृष्यमाणत्वाच्छरीरस्य । बुद्धिं तु, अध्यवसायलक्षणां सारथिं विद्धि बुद्धिनेतृ-प्रधानत्वाच्छरीरस्य । ----- सर्वं हि देहगतं कार्यं बुद्धिकर्तव्यमेव प्रायेण । मनः संकल्पविकल्पादिलक्षणं प्रग्रहं रशनां विद्धि । मनसा हि प्रगृहीतानि श्रोत्रादीनि करणानि प्रवर्तन्ते रशनयेवाश्वाः ॥३॥ ----- न हि केवलस्याऽऽत्मनो भोक्तृत्वमस्ति बुद्ध्याद्युपाधिकृतमेव तस्य भोक्तृत्वम् । Ś.Kāth.Up.Bh. pp. 61-62.

by quoting an authority from the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* - स समानः सन्नुभौ लोकावनुसंचरति ध्यायतीव लेलायतीव । [IV.III.7]. "It thinks, as it were, and shakes, as it were, etc." Thus, jīva's enjoyership is due to limiting adjuncts according to Śaṅkara. For Madhva, there lies no incompatibility regarding the description of the parable of the chariot described above.

Further, it is described that the person who lacks knowledge of discrimination and whose mind is not under control, has his sense organs beyond his control just like the vicious horses of a charioteer. One who is thus not constantly bringing his discriminative understanding in curbing the impulses of mind is one who is unyoked. He who fails to keep up an intelligent self-control over his own sense-demands, not only fails to climb up the ladder of perfection and thus cannot attain the Supreme Brahman, but also, states the *Upaniṣad*, gets into whirl of births and deaths.

On the contrary just as, an intelligent charioteer controls the horses along the path with the help of intelligent grip over the reins, so too a person who possesses knowledge of discrimination with the help of unpolluted intellect restrains his sense organs and the mind. As such, he guides his life along the path, through which he attains the eternal abode of the Supreme Brahman, whence he never comes back : स तु तत्पदमाप्नोति यस्माद्भूयो न जायते । (1.3.8). This upaniṣadic statement positively asserts that a person who has self-control, is always pure, enjoys the spiritual growth and attains eternal, and immortal state of perfection. There is no glaring difference between Śaṅkara and Madhva with regard to the above upaniṣadic explanation.

A positive approach towards the Supreme Brahman is repeated and strengthened by another *mantra* as below :

विज्ञानसारथिर्यस्तु मनः प्रग्रहवान्नरः ।
सोऽध्वनः पारमाप्नोति तद्विष्णोः परमं पदम् ॥ (1.3.9)

He who has his discriminating intellect as his charioteer, who controls the rein of his mind, will reach the other end of the path [of transmigration] i.e., the Lord Viṣṇu.

The upaniṣadic phrase 'तद् विष्णोः परमं पदम्' reflects over-all supremacy of Lord Viṣṇu upheld by Madhva. Surprisingly enough, Śaṅkara in his interpretation of the above phrase, supports the same idea in crystal clear terms.¹²⁴ Rather, Śaṅkara should have identified Viṣṇu as one of the forms of Saṅga Brahman, which he elsewhere says. Laying more emphasis on this point of supremacy of Viṣṇu, Gopalayati, a glossator on Śaṅkara's commentary, first of all words off a doubt that whether Viṣṇu is identified as Hiraṇyagarbha; then he explains the etymological meaning of the term 'Vāsudeva' [used by Śaṅkara] reinforcing the supremacy of Lord Viṣṇu. He says, Viṣṇu is called Vāsudeva as He provides dwelling place [Vāsa] for all in Himself and is self-effulgent.¹²⁵ These points are explicit in themselves to highlight Madhva's view of supremacy of Viṣṇu.

124. तद्विष्णोर्व्यापनशीलस्य ब्रह्मणः परमात्मनो वासुदेवाख्यस्य परमं प्रकृष्टं परं स्थानं सतत्त्वमित्येतद्यदसावाप्नोति विद्वान् । | Ś.Kāth.Up.Bh. p.66.

125. ब्रह्मण इति । हिरण्यगर्भं व्यावर्तयति - वासुदेवाख्यस्येति । वासुदेव इत्याख्या यस्य सः । वासयति भूतानि स्वस्मिन्निति वासुः स चासौ देवश्च दीव्यत इति स्वप्रकाशः स वासुदेव इत्यर्थः । Gopalayati. Ś.Kāth.Up.Bh. tika p.66.

In this connection, Chinmayananda's words are noteworthy. "This Supreme Goal is mentioned here as the place of Viṣṇu. It would be absurd if a student of Vedānta were to understand that the 'place of Viṣṇu' is the Puranic concept of Vaikuntha. For purpose of explaining the scripture, Viṣṇu is to be conceived of as one of the Trinities; but here, the meaning is, 'the all-pervading Vāsudevā,' the Paramātman."¹²⁶

The *mantra* इन्द्रियेभ्यः परा ह्यर्था ----- । (1.3.10) explains the gross and subtle manifestations of the Absolute Truth and ultimately introduces the very realm of the subtlest of the subtle, the Ātman.¹²⁷ The sense-objects are the causes for sense organs. Since cause is always subtler than its effects. The *Upaniṣad* justifies to the reader that - इन्द्रियेभ्यः परा ह्यर्थाः । Thus, the word पर is used in two senses - (1) Subtle and (2) All-pervasive.

In this vein, the meaning of various portions present the degrees of the subtler principles culminating in the Absolute Truth. Thus, the phrase 'इन्द्रियेभ्यः परा ह्यर्थाः' means the sense-objects by which those senses were created, are-subtler and more-pervasive than the senses. Similarly the mind is subtler and more pervasive than sense-object, the intellect is more-subtler and more-pervasive than the mind and the great-soul which is the inner-most principle of the intelligence of all things is subtler and more pervasive than intellect.

The phrase महान् आत्मा is understood in the sense of Hiranyagarbha who is endowed with the knowledge,

126. Swami Chinmayananda, "Kāthopaniṣad", Chinmaya Publication Trust, Madras, 1976, p.131.

127. Cf. इन्द्रियाणि पराण्याहुरिन्द्रियेभ्यः परं मनः ।
मनसस्तु परा बुद्धिर्यो बुद्धेः परतस्तु सः ॥ *Bhagavadgītā*, 3.42.

action and power. महान् आत्मा which is declared as subtler and more pervasive is here identified with Hiranyagarbha because the latter too dwells in the intellect of all individual souls, as their self.¹²⁸

Further, in the interpretation of the next *mantra* - 'महतः परमव्यक्तमव्यक्तात्पुरुषः परः ।' (1.3.11). Śaṅkara says that the अव्यक्त i.e., unmanifest which is the seed of the whole universe is subtler and more pervasive than the great soul Hiranyagarbha. The Puruṣa is then said to be subtler and more pervasive than अव्यक्त. This Puruṣa is so called as he fills up everything and rules out the possibility of anything being higher than Him. Thus, there is no substance subtler or more pervasive than Puruṣa, as such the *Upaniṣad* declares - 'पुरुषान्न परं किञ्चित्सा काष्ठा सा परा गतिः ।' (1.3.11). The *Puruṣa-tattva* here is identified with the Supreme Truth which is well-confirmed in the statement - सा काष्ठा सा परा गतिः । In this manner the *Puruṣa-tattva* is that principle where all the loose ends get rewinded into one cord. Thus, the *upaniṣad* declares "that is the end."

Through the enquiry into the preceding *mantra* in the light of Śaṅkara's commentary the reader seeks from the grossest external manifestations of the Supreme Truth, through layers of greater and greater subtleties to the Supreme point all pervasiveness and subtlety, the Absolute Truth. On the otherhand, the same two *mantras* when read in the light of Madhva's commentary the reader gets an idea of hierarchy

128. बद्धेरात्मा सर्वप्राणिबुद्धीनां प्रत्यगात्मभूतत्वादात्मा महान्सर्वमहत्त्वादव्यक्ताद्य-
त्प्रथमं जातं हैरण्यगर्भं तत्त्वं बोधाबोधात्मकं महानात्मा बुद्धेः पर इत्युच्यते ॥
Ś.Kāth.Up.Bh. p.66.

among the gods upheld by Madhva as one of the major doctrines of the Dvaita Vedānta. In this connection, it is said that meditation on the Supreme Truth be undertaken with the knowledge that the Supreme God is the highest in the hierarchy of gods. For this reason, hierarchy among the gods is described here.¹²⁹

The terms इन्द्रिय, अर्थ, मनस्, बुद्धि, etc., stand for respective presiding deities. In this spirit, the *mantras* above, should be understood. i.e., The presiding deities over the objects [शब्द, स्पर्श, रूप, रस, गन्ध] are सौपर्णी, वारुणी and पार्वती. Of the five objects such as शब्द, स्पर्श, रूप, रस, and गन्ध, सौपर्णी and वारुणी preside over two each, and पार्वती presides over the fifth object. These gods are higher than the presiding deities of the senses [five ज्ञानेन्द्रियs + five कर्मेन्द्रियs] who are सोम, कुबेर, सूर्य, वरुण, अश्विनs, अग्नि, इन्द्र, जयन्त, यम and दक्ष.

‘अर्थेभ्यश्च परं मनः’ - the presiding deities - रुद्र, गरुड and शे, I over मनस् are higher than the deities presiding over अर्थs.

‘मनसस्तु परा बुद्धिः’ - goddess Sarasvatī presiding over बुद्धि is higher than the deities presiding over मनस्.

‘बुद्धेरात्मा महान् परः’ - god Brahmā presiding over *Mahat-tattva* is superior to the deity presiding over बुद्धि.

‘महत्तः परम अव्यक्तम्’ - goddess Lakṣmī presiding over अव्यक्त [prakṛti] is superior to the deity presiding over *Mahat*.

‘अव्यक्तात् पुरुषः परः’ - Lastly, Supreme Brahman identified as *Puruṣa* is superior to the deity presiding

129. भगवद्भयानं तारतम्यान्तगत्वेन कार्यमिति भावेन देवतातारतम्यमाह | R.Ku.Khd. p.16b

over अव्यक्त. And there is non-higher than this *Puruṣa*. He is the ultimate end and the final goal. Thus, it is out of question that anyone should be greater than Him, when no one is equal to Him.

The word अर्थाः is understood by Śaṅkara as sense-objects by which those senses are created for their own revelation, and these are the inner-self of the senses.¹³⁰

On the other hand, as Madhva understands the term अर्थाः means not only रूप, रस, गन्ध ... etc., but also the presiding deities over them.

It is evident that the Indriyās, Arthās, Manas, Buddhi, spoken of in the *mantra* above are insentient objects. Still they have their own limit in form and space. Keeping this in the mind, Śaṅkara has explained the degree of subtlety and pervasiveness of respective insentient elements. In this sense, his interpretation is cohesive and meaningful. But, while interpreting the phrase : ‘आत्मा महान् परः’ [1.3.10]. Śaṅkara understands ‘महान् आत्मा’ as Hiraṇyagarbha the great soul.

At this juncture, this *mantra* under review provides to an imbalanced meaning in the light of Śaṅkara’s commentary. Because, the elements accounted for in the *mantra* are insentient ones, and great soul [Hiraṇyagarbha] is alone sentient being. However, the sentient being whosoever, is naturally subtler than the insentient matter. In a single line speaking of insentient matters and sentient being in the frame of same line of thought is not happy and colloquial.

130. यैः अर्थैः आत्मा प्रकाशनाय आरब्धानि तेभ्यः इन्द्रियेभ्यः स्वकार्येभ्यः ते परा अर्थाः सूक्ष्मा महान्तश्च प्रत्यगात्म भूताश्च | Ś.Kāth.Up.Bh. p.66

Further, Śaṅkara reads the word महान् in [1.3.10] as an adjective to Ātmā. Also, he gives reason that since Hiranyagarbha is most pervasive of all, महान् holds good with Ātmā. It is a fact that both the *mantras* : इन्द्रियेभ्यः परा ह्यर्थाः---- | (1.3.10) and महतः परमव्यक्तम्---- | (1.3.11) have been considered as a single unit. Moreover, to show the sense of the higher degree than the lower, the ablative case termination for lower degree and nominative case termination for higher degree can be read pertinently in the *mantras*. In such case, the word महतः in the *mantra* - (1.3.11) in the ablative case is followed by its nominative case form - i.e., महान् in the *mantra* (1.3.10). As such, महान् and महतः should be taken together though are in different *mantras*. An introspection of the colloquial line of the phrases in both the *mantras*, tends to say that the term महान् should be referred to *Mahat tattva* and not to Ātmā. Ofcourse, Śaṅkara's reading of महान् along with Ātmā is not unsound, as both the words are in nominative case. But, when the succeeding *mantra* is taken for consideration together with preceding one, his application appears to be not happy.

Furthermore, Śaṅkara interprets the term - पुरुष as चिन्मात्रघनात् i.e., the mass of pure consciousness - which is nothing but Nirguṇa Brahman. But, the very connotative meaning of the term *puruṣa* - [पुरि देहे प्रपञ्चो वा शेते]¹³¹ indicates Brahman as all-indweller and all-pervasive. Thus, a reader requires to understand *Puruṣa* as Saguṇa Brahman, but not Nirguṇa Brahman. Thus,

131. Read : "The original source of the universe described in *Puruṣa-sūktā.*, V.S. Apte, The Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary., p.626.

Śaṅkara's interpretation does not fulfil the upaniṣadic requirement of the term *puruṣa*.

In the light of Madhva's interpretation of this unit of the two *mantras* a reader gets the unformation regarding the hierarchy among the gods presiding over the objects.¹³² But, one may remark that Madhva unnecessarily imposes his theory of "hierarchy among the gods" on the upaniṣadic thought which does not give even small clue to Madhva's doctrine. Thus, Madhva's interpretation appears to be biased and unwanted to a general reader.

But, in the interest of Vedāntic teaching within the frame-work of upaniṣadic thought, that is destined to propound absolute superiority of the Supreme Truth, the *mantras* should be understood. No doubt, Madhva takes the expressive meaning of the word पर i.e., superior or higher. The degree of superiority among the insentient things is slackening one. And when the *Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad* in its declaration 'सा काष्ठा सा परा गतिः' establishes over all supremacy of Lord Viṣṇu [तद् विष्णोः परमं पदम् |] the *mantras* succeeding the same should be understood in that line itself in a corollary manner. If so, the reading of the degree of the superiority among the insentient things like - *Indriya, Artha, etc.*, with its culminating point of *Supreme - Sentient Being*, the Supreme

132. देवेभ्य इन्द्रियात्मभ्यो ज्यायांसोऽर्थाभिमानिनः | सोमवित्तपसूर्याऽप्या अश्व्यग्नी-न्द्रेन्द्रसूनवः | यमो दक्षश्चेन्द्रियेशास्सुपर्णी वारुणी तथा | उमेति चार्थमानिन्यस्तिस्त्रो द्विह्येक देवताः | मनोभिमानिनो रुद्रवीन्द्रशेषास्त्रयोऽपि तु | ते श्रेष्ठा अर्थमानिभ्य-स्तेभ्यो बुद्धिस्सरस्वती | तस्या ब्रह्मा महानात्मा ततोऽव्यक्ताभिधा रमा | तस्यास्तु पुरुषो विष्णुः पूर्णत्वान्नैव तत्समः | कश्चित्कुतश्चिच्छ्रेष्ठस्तु नास्तीति किमु सा कथा | *M.Kāth.Up.Bh.* pp.12-13.

Brahman, does not speak of healthy understanding. Therefore, Madhva takes *Indriya*, *Artha*, etc., as the presiding deities over them. However, as pointed before, superiority of Brahman to the insentient things is beyond question. But, His superiority among the sentient beings, gods and goddesses should be unveiled. Therefore, Madhva's application of hierarchy among the gods fits well in the context; and so it is not imposed and unwanted. But, essential and true to the upaniṣadic spirit as well.

Another couplet of the *mantras* appears to negate the difference between the entities - यदेवेह----- य इह नानेव पश्यति ---- । (2.1.10) and मनसैवेदमाप्तव्यम् नेह नानास्ति किञ्चन । ----- य इह नानेव पश्यति । (2.1.11)

In both the *mantras*, the phrases 'इह नानेव पश्यति', 'नेह नानास्ति किञ्चन' and 'इह नानेव पश्यति' lays much stress on the negation of multiple differences in the world of experience. The term नाना seen in all phrases, denotes the sense of difference; the term इव suggests the sense of 'as it were'. The phrase 'इह नानेव पश्यति', repeated twice, posits phenomenal truth of the difference and the statement 'नेह नानास्ति किञ्चन' affirms the negation of difference. And this expressive meaning is quite congenial to Śaṅkara. In this connection, Śaṅkara writes that a person being deluded by ignorance that consists in seeing differences which are natural to the limiting adjuncts, feels such differences as "I am different from the Supreme Self, and the Supreme Brahman is different from me." Such person becomes subject to repeated births and death. Therefore, in order to get read of the entanglement of the repeated births and deaths, one should not perceive like that; rather one should realise thus : 'I am, indeed, Brahman which is

homogeneous consciousness and which pervades everything through and through like space.¹³³

This realisation dawns on the instruction by a competent teacher on the science of Brahman. Thus the seeker after realisation, says 'there exists not even a little diversity [and Brahman is none but myself].¹³⁴ In this manner, the couplet of the two *mantras* negates the diversity of the word and affirms jīvas absolute identity with Brahman.

The same couplet of the *mantras* above in the light of Madhva's commentary indeed, declares the theory of non-difference. But this theory of non-difference is not between jīva and Brahman, but between the different forms of the Supreme Brahman. Here, it is explained that the original form of Lord Viṣṇu as in the Vaikuṅṭha and His incarnated forms on the earth are one and the same. There is not even the slightest difference between His attributes His actions, His limbs and Himself.¹³⁵ In order to strengthen this idea Madhva

-
133. उपाधिस्वभावभेददृष्टिलक्षणयाऽविद्यया मोहिताः सन्य इह ब्रह्मण्यनानाभूते परस्मादन्योऽहं मत्तोऽन्यत्परं ब्रह्मेति नानेव भिन्नमिव भिन्नमिव पश्यत्युलभते स मृत्योमरणान्मरणं मृत्युं पुनः पुनर्जन्ममरणभावमाप्नोति प्रतिपद्यते । Ś.Kāth. Up.Bh. pp. 87-88.
134. आसे च नानात्वप्रत्युपस्थापिकाया अविद्याया निवृत्तत्वादिह ब्रह्माणि नाना नास्ति किञ्चनाणुमात्रमपि । Ś.Kāth.Up.Bh. p.89.
135. यः प्रादुर्भावगतो विष्णुर्देहादिषु च संस्थितः । स एव मूलरूपश्च साक्षा-त्रारयणाभिधः । मूलरूपश्च यो विष्णुः प्रादुर्भावादिकश्च सः । गुणतस्स्वरूपतो वापि विशेषं योऽत्र पश्यति । अत्यल्पमपि मृत्वा स तमोऽन्धं यात्यसंशयम् । भेदाभेदविदश्चात्र तमो यान्ति न संशयः । तथैवावयवानां च गुणानां च परस्परम् । क्रियाणां तेन चैतेषां भेदविच्चोभयं विदुः । यान्त्येवांधन्तमो नात्र कार्या काचिद्विचारेणेति च । M.Kāth.Up.Bh. p.18.

says in his commentary on the *Brahmāsutra* : 'न स्थानतोऽपि परस्योभयलिङ्गं सर्वत्र हि' (III.ii.11) that in spite of His being in different places, there is no difference of essential nature (or His attributes) within Brahman, since He has identical character of infinite perfections among all creatures.¹³⁶ In the same spirit, another *Brahmāsutra* : 'उभयव्यपदेशात् त्वहिकुण्डलवत्' (3.2.28) advocates that just as there is oneness between the coil and serpent, so also there is perfect identity between Brahman and His qualities like blissfulness, etc.¹³⁷ So also, the *Brahmāsutra* 'प्रतिषेधाच्च' (3.2.31) substantiates that the attributes of Brahman are His essence and no attribute is different from Him.¹³⁸ If any man thinks that there is the slightest difference between Brahman and His qualities, actions, etc., or sees *bhedābheda* within Himself, the *Upaniṣad* says that he slips back into the endless wheel of births and deaths.

As noted above, Śaṅkara's explanation of this couplet, is undoubtedly based on its expressive meaning. It is not unhealthy. Yet, this meaning whether holds good in the context, in which the couplet is read. The preceding and succeeding *mantras* of the couplet in fact advocate the glory of the Divine Supreme. In this

136. स्थानापेक्षयाऽपि परमात्मनो न भिन्नं रूपम् । सर्वेषु भूतेष्वेतमेव ब्रह्मेत्याचक्षते [ऐ.आ.३.२.३.] इति श्रुतिः । एकरूपः परो विष्णुः सर्वत्रापि न संशयः । ऐश्वर्याद्रूपमेकं च सूर्यवद्बहुधेयते ॥ इति मात्स्ये । प्रतिदृशमिव नैकधार्कमेकं समधिगतोऽस्मि विधूतभेदमोहः । इति च भागवते । *M.BS.Bh.* pp.759-761.

137. आनन्दं ब्रह्मणो विद्वान् (तै.2.4) अथैष एव परं आनन्दः (बृ.6.3.33) इति उभयव्यपदेशात् अहिकुण्डलवदेव युज्यते । यथा अहिः कुण्डली कुण्डलं च । *M.BS.Bh.* p.794

138. 'एकमेवाद्वितीयम्' (छा.6.2.1) 'नेह नानाऽस्ति किञ्चन' इति भेदस्य ॥ *M.BS.Bh.* pp. 796-797.

setting of upaniṣadic spirit, the present couplet also should be understood. This tends to say that Śaṅkara's interpretation of this couplet negating the diversity of the word in Brahman does not go along the Upaniṣadic spirit.

And when a reader looks into Madhva's interpretation, he comes to know that Madhva has not only retained the expressive meaning of the *mantras*, but also made some addition to get the purport thereof. That is, within the frame of the theory of oneness, Madhva describes the nature of Brahman as being identical with His manifold forms, actions, attributes, and His limbs under the caption of *Svagata-bhedavarjita*. Following the commentary of Raṅgarāmānuja, Veerarāghavācārya expresses the same view.¹³⁹

A man of wisdom requires to cultivate himself for the acquisition of knowledge more and more till he attains *Mokṣa*. In course of his cultivation, he may have to face unexpected difficulties which may block his path of realisation. Even in such condition, he should not give himself any heed to them. In spite of his efforts due to weakness of his own mental faculty, he would fall into the pit of wrong knowledge or ignorance. This tragedy in pursuit of the knowledge has come to pass as he has lost his capacity to control the promptings of his mental faculty. As a result, the wisdom gets

139. स च, अहमिहैवास्मीति देशान्तरव्यावृत्ततयाऽनुसन्धीयते । Raṅgarāmānuja. *Kāth.Up.Bh.*, p.114.

चतुर्मुखादिसर्वानुग्राहकः मनुष्येद्भयो देवाराध्यश्च परमात्मेत्युक्तम् । अथ देशभेदेन कालभेदेन भिन्नः स्यादीश्वर इति मतिमपाकरोति यदेवेति । अनेकं ब्रह्म न भवतीत्यस्यैवैतदर्थत्वे स्पष्टे किमिति जगन्मिथ्यात्वपरतया व्याख्याय सर्वप्रमाण-विरोधसंपादनम्, एवं यथा परमपदे वर्तते तथैवावावतारेष्वपि अजहत्स्वस्वभाव इत्ययमर्थोऽप्यत्र सुवचः । तेनावतारेऽप्युपास्यत्वसिद्धिः । Veerarāghavācārya - *Kāth.Up.Bh.* p.114.

scattered and flows in different rivulets and gets lost in its downward transit. This condition is indicated by the *Upaniṣad* with a beautiful analogy of water that has rained on the top of mountain :

यथोदकं दुर्गे वृष्टं पर्वतेषु विधावति । (2.1.14)

But a man of wisdom who does not get diminished his power of mental faculty will see a rise in his spiritual life with the sacred knowledge he has gained. Ultimately the *Upaniṣad* declares that the man of wisdom does attain the Supreme Divine Truth. Here, the analogy is very interesting one :

यथोदकं शुद्धे शुद्धमासिक्तं तादृगेव भवति । (2.1.15)

Here, the phrase तादृगेव भवति is quite helpful to Madhva to show that the *Upaniṣad* conspicuously supports the theory of difference between jīva and Brahman even in the state of liberation.

In clear terms, just as the pure water when mixed into pure water becomes one with each other. But, one does find a rise in quantity of water and both the waters become similar by virtue their being pure. Thus it is clear that the liberated souls become similar to Brahman but not identical with Him. In Madhva's philosophy Vāyu is considered to be the chief among the knowers of Brahman and other jīvas. And when Vāyu is liberated, he becomes similar to the Supreme Brahman but not identical. In such case, there is no question of other jīvas becoming identical with the Supreme Brahman.¹⁴⁰

140. सर्वेषां ज्ञानिनामात्मा देवानां च विशेषतः । मुक्तो वायुश्च सादृश्यमेव विष्णोस्तु गच्छति ॥ न तु तद्रूपतां याति किम्बन्ये देवमानुषाः । आभासाभासरूपास्तु वायोर्देवस्य सर्वशः ॥ M.Kāth.Up.Bh. p.19.

However, the same phrase does not support the Advaita theory of identity between jīva and Brahman. But, Śaṅkara's words are explicit to show the identity between the two. He says as in the case of pure water the self too becomes so, which means realisation of identity.¹⁴¹

It has been an accepted fact that the jīvas in the world of experience go round and round through births and deaths. Such births and deaths are due to the past deeds done by embodied souls in its previous life. Taking this fact into account the *Upaniṣad* states :
स्थाणुमन्येऽनुसंयन्ति यथाकर्म यथाश्रुतम् । (2.2.7)¹⁴²

This *mantra* professing the law of *karma* and the theory of *rebirth*, in a negative approach awakens a man from ignorance to lead the path of knowledge. Śaṅkara calls 'अ' as ignorant fools as they enter into the womb for assuming the bodies. And some jīvas who are extremely inferior follow continuously the state of motionless objects like plants etc. All such diversified embodiments come to be possessed by the jīvas under the impulses of the fruits of the deeds they have accomplished in the previous life and the knowledge they have possessed.¹⁴³

Madhva's interpretation of this *mantra* does not give any different opinion from that of Śaṅkara.

141. यथोदकं शुद्धं शुद्धे प्रसन्ने शुद्धं प्रसन्नमासिक्तं प्रक्षिप्तमेकरसमेव नान्यथा तादृगेव भवत्यात्मा अप्येवमेव भवति । Ś.Kāth.Up.Bh. p.91.

142. Cf. Brih.Ār. II.2, 13.

143. यथाकर्म यद्यस्य कर्म तद्यथाकर्म यैर्यादृशं कर्मैह जन्मनि कृतं तद्वशेनेत्येतत् । तथा च यथाश्रुतं यादृशं च विज्ञानमुपाजितं तदनुरूपमेव शरीरं प्रतिपद्यन्त इत्यर्थः । Ś.Kāth.Up.Bh. p.98.

On the other hand, when a man aspiring for liberation accomplishes meritorious deeds, and there by in a successive order obtains the knowledge of Brahman. Such a man of wisdom with a continuous practice of meditation realises the nature of the Supreme Truth. Consequently, he gains direct vision of the Supreme Truth. In this context the *Upaniṣad* declares : “यथाऽसु परीव ददृशे¹⁴⁴ तथा गन्धर्वलोके

छायातपयोरिव ब्रह्मलोके । (2.3.5).

The general meaning of this *mantra* is this - as reflection in the mirror so in the *jīva*, Brahman is seen; as one sees in a dream so in the *Pitr loka*; as in waters a little more visible, so in the *Gandharva loka*; and in the *Brahmā loka*, the Lord is seen as in the day, when there is proper light and shade.

In the light of the commentaries of Śāṅkara and Madhva, the four analogies of the mirror, the dream, the waters and of the light and shade serve the purpose of the amount of beatific vision of Brahman that is experienced by the men of wisdom. According to Madhva, a beatific vision for the *jñānins* is not of uniform nature. It differs in accordance with the class to which *jñānins* or realised souls belong. As such, in the mirror as the face is fully reflected. So also, Brahman is seen completely reflected in one's self by the sages; similarly in the world of fathers there is not complete realisation as in the dream; because, the dream objects are not as vivid as the picture in the mirror.

In like manner, in the world of *Gandharvas* - His vision is seen a little more distinct than in the *Pitr loka*

144. पा. दृश्यते ।।

as in the waters. And lastly, in the world of *Brahmā*, the beatific vision is very clear as in the proper light and shade. In other words, it means that as in the morning day light when there is neither too much glare of the noon nor too much darkness of the evening but, when it is both light and darkness, an object is distinctly seen, so the Supreme Person is visioned in the *Brahmā-loka*.¹⁴⁵

In the frame-work of Śāṅkara's commentary, the same analogies give similar meaning. i.e., as in the spotless mirror, one can see one's face distinctly. It means, when the intellect has become spotless like mirror, there springs a distinct vision of the self.

The vision arising for mental impressions in the dream is not distinct. So also, indistinct is the vision of the self in *Pitrloka*. It is due to the entanglement in the enjoyment of the results of the deeds, As one's forms in the waters appears to be without clear demarcation. Similarly, is the vision of the self in world of *Gandharvas*. In the world of *Brahmā* the vision of *Ātman* is very distinct.

It is further said by the *Upaniṣad* that the beatific vision that one gets in the *Brahmā-loka* is very difficult to attain. Because, it is the result of many special kinds of rites and meditation.¹⁴⁶

145. जीवे स्थितस्तु भगवान् दृश्यते ज्ञानदृष्टिभिः । आदर्शे मुखवत् सम्यङ् न तथा पितृलोकगः ।। ततः किञ्चित् स्पष्टतया गन्धर्वे दृश्यते हरिः । नात्यातपे नच्छायायां यथैवाहनि दृश्यते ।। स्पष्टं तथा ब्रह्मलोके दृश्यते पुरुषोत्तमः । इति च ।। *M.Kāth.Up.Bh.* p.24.

146. यथाऽऽदर्शं प्रतिबिम्बभूतमात्मानं पश्यति लोकोऽत्यन्तविविक्तं तथेहाऽऽत्मनि स्वबुद्धावादर्शवन्निर्मलीभूतायां विविक्तमात्मनो दर्शनं भवतीत्यर्थः । यथा →

Comparing both the interpretations one may find that they are not completely dissimilar. According to Madhva, the analogy of mirror shows the vision more clearly, and for Śaṅkara it is spotless. The dream analogy for Madhva indicates incomplete realisation, and for Śaṅkara it is not distinct. The water analogy for Madhva implies the quality of vision as little more distinct, whereas for Śaṅkara, it is without clear demarcation. And Lastly, the analogy of light and shade suggests the quality of a vision as very clear for both Śaṅkara and Madhva.

So far as, the analogy of water is concerned as said above, for Madhva the vision is little more distinct, while Śaṅkara says the vision is without clear demarcation. In this regard, Śaṅkara's understanding of this analogy is more proper than that of Madhva. Because, the reflection in the water can never be little more distinct as Madhva says.

After reading the previous *mantra* in the light of Śaṅkara's commentary that prefers the vision of Ātman within oneself, a question may be asked that if the vision of Ātman can be had within oneself very clearly, then, why should after all one try to realise the Eternal Self within oneself [during his life time].¹⁴⁷ The answer

→ स्वप्नेऽविविक्तं जाग्रद्वासनोद्भूतं तथा पितृलोकेऽविविक्तमेव दर्शनमात्मन कर्मफलोपभोगासक्तत्वात् । यथा चाप्स्वविभक्तावयवमात्मरूपं परीव दृष्टौ परिदृश्यत् इव तथा गन्धर्वलोकेऽविविक्तमेव दर्शनमात्मनः । ----- छायातपयोरिवात्मन्तविविक्तं ब्रह्मलोक एवैकस्मिन् । स च दुष्पापोऽत्यन्त-विशिष्टकर्मज्ञानसाध्यत्वात् । Ś.Kāth.Up.Bh. p.112.

147. इन्द्रियाणां श्रोत्रादीनां स्वस्वविषयग्रहणप्रयोजनेन स्वकारणेभ्य आकाशादिभ्यः पृथग् उत्पद्यमानानामत्यन्त विशुद्धात् केवलाञ्चिन्मात्रात्मस्वरूपात्पृथग् भावं स्वभाव विलक्षणात्मकतां तथा तेषामेवेन्द्रियाणामुदयास्तमयौ चोत्पत्तिप्रलयौ जाग्रत्स्वा पस्थापेक्षया नाऽऽत्मन इति मत्वा ज्ञात्वा विवेकतो धीरो धीमान् शोचति । Ś.Kāth.Up.Bh. p.113.

to this question is given in the next *mantra* that runs as below :

इन्द्रियाणां पृथग्भावमुदयास्तमयौ च यत् । (2.3.6)

This *mantra* appears to show the dissimilarity between the senses and the self.

As the *mantra* declares, the sense organs are distinctly separate from the eternal changeless Truth, that dwells in a man. The senses are separate from the Ātman because, they are produced out of some causes, whereas, the Ātman has no cause. Moreover, the sense organs are different from one another. They are not only different not only in themselves, but in their very original sources like, Ākāṣa, etc.

Further, Śaṅkara remarks that the Self in relation to which, the dissimilarity of senses has been pointed out is not to be realised outside. Because, it is the inmost Self of all. This nature of being inmost Self of all, is described in the further *mantra* :

इन्द्रियेभ्यः परं मनो मनसः सत्त्वमुत्तमम् ।

सत्त्वादधि महानात्मा महतोऽव्यक्तमुत्तमम् ॥ (2.3.7)

अव्यक्तातु परः पुरुषो व्यापकोऽलिङ्ग एव च । (2.3.8)

The idea contained in the above *mantras* is already enumerated before in 1.3.10.

Madhva's interpretation of the *mantras* given above is quite different as comparing to that of Śaṅkara. He brings in the idea of hierarchy among the gods and shows that the functions of gods and the sense organs are under the command of the Supreme Brahman.¹⁴⁸

148. For details, *Supra*. pp.13-15.

Ofcourse, both the commentaries of Śaṅkara and Madhva are quite different in their nature. The respective interpretations appear to be correct in their frame work, hence they are left with no comment.

It is quite appropriate that Yama at the end of the *Upaniṣad* declares to Naciketa the nature of jīva and Brahman with the employment of an analogy of *Munja* grass :

तं स्वाच्छरीतात् प्रवृहेन्मुञ्जादिवेषीकां धैर्येण ।
तं विद्याच्छुक्रममृतं तं विद्याच्छुक्रममृतमिति ॥ (2.3.17)

As Śaṅkara writes, the analogy used here shows how through discrimination seeker attains the final state of cognising the Absolute Consciousness. Drawing out the stalk (इषीका) from the reed (मुञ्ज) needs a softness of touch and a measured application of force. So also, Naciketa is here advised to extricate the element of Pure Consciousness from the illusory consciousness of the body. For this, continuous, well-balanced and deep practice of meditation is essential, as a result of which all illusory envelopments would disappear. There remains then Absolute Consciousness alone, which is all pure and immortal.

Thus, Śaṅkara reveals the nature of the Truth in the light of the analogy that the Supreme Brahman is the only Truth without second.¹⁴⁹

It is a surprising thing to a reader that the same analogy has been taken by Madhva to illustrate

149. अद्भुष्टमात्रः पुरुषोऽन्तरात्मा सदा जनानां सम्बन्धिनि हृदये सन्निविष्टः, तं स्वादात्मीयात् शरीरात् प्रवहेत् उद्यच्छेत् निष्कर्षेत् पृथक् कुर्यात् । ---- मुञ्जादि-वेषीकाम्-अन्तस्थां धैर्येण-अप्रमादेन । तं शरीरात्-निकृष्टं चिन्मात्रं विद्यात् विजानीयात्-शुक्रममृतं यथोक्तं ब्रह्मेति । *Ś.Kāth. Up. Bh.* p.124

absolute difference between jīva and Brahman. Yama here, according to Madhva stresses the importance of the knowledge of distinction between Brahman and jīva. Brahman is present at the heart of all at all times. He is not only present in the heart of the body but he is also present in *Jivasvarūpa*-heart. One should realise the distinction between himself and the Brahman who is present as inner controller. The word *Śarīra* here refers to Jiva. Jīva is *śarīra* of Brahman in the sense that he is always under the control of Brahman. The word *śarīra* is used here to convey jīva to bring out this special relation. The jīva who is the body of Brahman in this sense should be distinguished from Brahman. The method of distinguishing is explained with a beautiful simile. While preparing the *Munja girdle*, one has to remove the *Ishikā* grass mixed with it. Similarly, Brahman who is present as inner controller has to be distinguished from jīva who is his body. It is the knowledge of this distinction that is very essential for liberation. This distinction is clearly brought out by pointing out that two distinguishing characteristics of God viz., *Sukra*-flawless and *amṛta*-immortal.¹⁵⁰

As is clear from Śaṅkara's interpretation, this verse mentions the distinction between Brahman and jīva's body. But this *mantra* does not mention the distinction between body and the soul. Ofcourse, the distinction between the body and the soul is beyond doubt. This distinction is not denied by any philosopher,

150. शरीरभूतो विष्णोस्तु जीवस्वद्वशगो यतः । अधिष्ठितश्च तेनैव विजानीयात् पृथक् ततः । स्वाख्यात् शरीरात् जीवात् प्रवहेद् विष्णुमव्ययम् । ---- देहाद्भुष्टमितो देहे जीवाद्भुष्टमितो हृदि । जीवस्य स तु विज्ञेयो जीवाद् भदेन मुक्तये ।

except the Cārvāka. Therefore, there is no special need to mention the same. Therefore, it is the distinction between Brahman and jīva's i.e., conveyed here.

As already pointed out the question of identity between Brahman and jīva's body is never posed, and hence there is no need of solving it by pointing out the distinction between Brahman and jīva's body. This tends to say that Śaṅkara's interpretation does not suit the context. The epithets of Brahman such as शुक्रं, अमृतं clarify the distinction between the Brahman the inner controller and the jīva.¹⁵¹

d. Means of Emancipation

The upaniṣadic seer declares that the sorrow and limitations of the physical world should be neglected by a seeker, and for which he is asked to get out of these limitations and further to tread the right path towards the Supreme Truth :

पराञ्चि खानि व्यतृणत् स्वयम्भूस्तस्मात्पराङ्पश्यति नान्तरात्मन् ।
कश्चिद्धीरः प्रत्यगात्मानमैक्षदावृत्तचक्षुरमृतत्वमिच्छन् ॥ [2.1.1]

The out-going senses attracting the external objects are made censurable by the Self-existent Brahman. Despite this, a person who is not sufficiently capable to check the alluring effects, sees the outer things, but does not see the inner self. Yet, a discriminating person, curious to acquire the knowledge of Brahman, turns away his sense organs from alluring objects of the world. Such a seeker would perceive the indwelling self within himself.

151. संसारिशरीरिणा अभेदो वादिना केनापि नाङ्गीकृतः । न लोकसिद्धः । न जीवोऽद्भुष्ट-
मात्रः । अतो विष्णोर्जावाद् भेदः उक्तः । *M.Kāth.Up.Bh.* pp.25-26.

In this manner, the upaniṣadic statement above, advises the seeker after liberation, to cultivate an intelligent control over the senses, and wise direction of one's faculties towards self-perfection. Śaṅkara makes out that he cursed or injured them by turning them outward, *hiṃsitavān hananam kṛtavān*. Such observations which are disparaging to the legitimate use of the senses give the impression of the unworldly character of much of our best efforts. Śaṅkara's opinion is opposed to the view set forth in the previous section that senses are like horses, which will take us to our goal, if properly guided.

In the journey of the discovery of the Supreme Truth a man of wisdom is curious to become immortal and attain Brahman. For, the absence of desires is very much essential. In this regard, the *Kāṭhakopaniṣad* reads a glimpse of three *mantras* one after the other as below :

यदा सर्वे प्रमुच्यन्ते कामा येऽस्य हृदि श्रिताः ।
अथ मर्त्योऽमृतो भवति ब्रह्म समश्नुते ॥ (2.3.14)

Śaṅkara is of the opinion that owing to the absence of the desires that cling to the heart, a man of wisdom before the enlightenment becomes immortal. And, after enlightenment by virtue of the elimination of the death constituted by ignorance desire etc., there remains nothing to be destroyed. It means owing to the cessation of all types of bondage that man of wisdom attains Brahman i.e., experiences himself as Brahman.¹⁵²

152. अथ तदा मर्त्यः प्राक्प्रबोधात् आसीत्स प्रबोधोत्तरकालमविद्या कामकर्मलक्ष्मस्य
मृत्योर्विनाशादमृतो भवति । गमनप्रयोजकस्य मृत्योर्विनाशाद्गमनानुपपत्तेरेहैव
प्रदीपनिर्वाणवत्सर्वबन्धनोपशमाद्ब्रह्म समश्नुते ब्रह्मैव भवतीत्यर्थः । *Ś.Kāth.*
Up.Bh. p.121.

Here, remains a moot question that when again will the desires be totally uprooted ? As an answer, the succeeding *mantras*, reads thus :

यदा सर्वे प्रभिद्यन्ते हृदयस्येह ग्रन्थयः ।

अथ मत्सोऽमृतो भवत्येतावद्भ्यनुशासनम् ॥ (2.3.15)

The desires originating from the knots of the heart¹⁵³ become totally destroyed when the bondages of ignorance are disappeared by the rise of the opposite knowledge of the identity of the jīva and Brahman in the form of 'I am Brahman'.¹⁵⁴

In the same line of the context of *jīvanmukti* the *upaniṣad* further describes the process of the attainment of the fruit of the knowledge obtained by man of wisdom.

शतं चैका च हृदयस्य नाड्यः तासां मूर्धानमभिनिः सृतैका ।

तयोर्ध्वमायन्नमृतत्वमेति विष्वङ्ङन्या उत्क्रमणे भवन्ति ॥ (2.3.16)

At the time of death, a *jīvanmukta* brings his mind under control through *Śuṣumnā* nerve, and gets it concentrated in the heart. Further, through that nerve going up, he attains immortality. As the statement from the *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* declares, after having enjoyed incomparable pleasures abounding in the world of *Brahmā*, this enlightened person attains immortality in the primary sense of the world. In due course, the other nerves that

153. "The bonds of Avidya (nescience), kama (desire), and karma (action) are together called the knots of the Heart in vedantic philosophy." Swami Chinmayananda, '*Kāthopaniṣad*', p.240.

154. अहमिदं शरीरं ममेदं धनं सुखी दुःखी चाहम् इत्येवमादिलक्षणास्तद्विपरीत-ब्रह्मात्मप्रत्ययोपजननाद्ब्रह्मैवाहमस्मि असंसारीति विनष्टेष्वविद्या ग्रन्थेषु तन्निमित्ताः कामा मूलतो विनश्यन्ति | *Ś.Kāth.Up.Bh.* p.122.

issue out in different directions become the causes for attainment.¹⁵⁵

Thus, all the three *mantras* explained above refer to the course of attainment of Brahman for *jīvanmuktas* according to Sanakra.

Like Saṅkara, even Madhva has accepted the theory of *jīvanmukti*. According to him, the *Aparokṣa-jñānin* is otherwise known as *jīvanmukta*. In connection to his liberation, it is natural that the shackles of material bondage fall off at the down of *Aparokṣa-Jñāna*. As result, that *jñānin* casts away his material body through *karma-nāśa* and *Utkrānti*. He continues to live in his physical frame as long as the arrears of *Prārabdha* continue to exact their debt. In this context, the *mantras* quoted above, declare that when the fetters of false knowledge are cut as under, worldly desires are renounced, and immortality is attained. There is release when the soul passes out of the *Brahma Nāḍī*. As is clear, it is *Śuṣmanā Nāḍī*, through which *jñānin* departs from his last body and attains *Mokṣa*.¹⁵⁶

155. तथा नाड्योर्ध्वमुपर्यायन् गच्छन्नादित्यद्वारेणामृतत्वममरणधर्मत्वं-आपेक्षिकम् । "अभूत-संप्लवं-स्थानं-अमृतत्वं विभाव्यते" (वि.पु.2.8.97) इति स्मृतेः । ब्रह्मणा वा सह कालान्तरेण मुख्यं-अमृतत्वं एति भुक्त्वा भोगान् अनुपमान् ब्रह्मलोक गतान् । विष्वङ्ङनाना विध-गतयः अन्या नाड्य उत्क्रमणे निमित्तं भवन्ति संसार-प्रतिपत्त्यर्था एव भवन्तीत्यर्थः । *Ś.Kāth.Up.Bh.* p.123.

156. हृदयगतसर्वकामत्यागः कदा इत्यतः तत् कारण-अविद्याहंकारकर्मणां हृदयग्रन्थीनां यदा त्यागः तदेत्याह । यदेति । इह मानुषदेहे हृदयस्य सर्वे ग्रन्थयः हृदयस्थ अविद्यादि ग्रन्थयो यदा प्रभिद्यन्ते । अपयन्ती अथ तदा सर्वकामप्रहाणेन मर्त्यः अमृतो मुक्तो भवति । ---- हृदयस्य हृदयसंबन्धिन्यो नाड्यः शतं चैका च एकोत्तरशतं नाड्यो भवन्ति । तासां मध्ये ---- शतोत्तरया सुषुम्नाख्यया ऊर्ध्वं गच्छन् अमृतत्वं एति । *R.Ku.Khd.* pp. 27b.

e. Path of Liberation

After enumerating the nature of Brahman in different aspects, the *Kāṭhaka-Upaniṣad* tells about the means of attaining the Supreme Brahman referred to above. In this line, the *mantra* –

यच्छेद्वाङ्मनसी प्राज्ञस्तद्यच्छेज्ज्ञान आत्मनि ।

ज्ञानमात्मनि महति नियच्छेत्तद्यच्छेच्छान्त आत्मनि ॥ (1.3.13)

straight way dictates the terms dealing with the means of attainment of liberation. This *mantra* speak of merging of the organ of speech into the mind, mind into the intelligent self, the intelligent self into the great soul [Hiraṇyagarbha] and the great soul into the peaceful self, the real self which is within all and is the witness of all modifications of the intellect. Interpreting this *mantra*, Śaṅkara explains the meaning of this *mantra* in an illustrative manner : just as the water in a mirage, the snake on a rope, and dirt in the sky, are eliminated through the preception of the real nature of the mirage, rope, and the sky, similarly by dissolving in the *Puruṣa* - the self - through the knowledge of the true nature of one's own self, all that is projected by unreal ignorance, which is characterised by action, instrument, and result, and which is but constituted by the three-name, form, and action - one becomes established in the self and peaceful in mind, and he has his goal achieved.¹⁵⁷

157. एवं पुरुष आत्मनि सर्वं प्रविलाप्य नामरूपकर्मत्रयं यन्मिथ्या ज्ञानविजृम्भितं क्रियाकारकफललक्षणं स्वात्मयाथात्म्यज्ञानेन मरीच्युदकरज्जुसर्पगगनमलानीव मरीचिरज्जुगगनस्वरूपदरशनेनैव स्वस्थः प्रशान्तात्मा कृतकृत्यो भवति । *Ś.Kāth.Up.Bh.* p.74.

Madhva's understanding of this *mantra* is all together different from that of Śaṅkara, in so far as the meaning of the phrases like वाङ् मनसि etc., is concerned. Madhva maintains the idea of hierarchy among the gods, following his interpretation of the previous *mantras* - इन्द्रियेभ्यः परा हि अर्थाः ---- [1.3.10], महतः परमव्यक्तम् ---- [1.3.11]. Madhva's understanding of this *mantra* though brings out hierarchy among the gods, demarcates the line of meditation. But the method of meditation that Madhva indicates here is different.¹⁵⁸

Śaṅkara interpretes the term यच्छेत् in the sense of उपसंहार - merging, while Madhva understands this term in the sense of ध्यान or meditation. According to Madhva, a man of wisdom inculcating the discipline of meditation, should meditate that god Śiva, Śeṣha and Garuḍa [Suparṇa] presiding over the mind, as the controller of the presiding deities over *Vāk* namely; *Pārvatī*, *Vāruṇī* and *Sauparṇī* the locative case applied to the words like मनसि, आत्मनि etc., according Madhva means 'resort'. The sense hidden here is that the gods presiding over the *vāk* have resorted to the higher gods presiding over *Manas*. In the same manner, other phrases too should be understood. Both the interpretation of Madhva and Śaṅkara appear to be faithful to the *Upaniṣad*.

The path of attaining the salvation is not easy treadable. Hence, it is compared to the moving on the edge of a razor in the following *mantra* :

158. तस्मात् वागात्मिका देवीः उमाद्यास्तु शिवादिषु । शिवादीन् ब्रह्मवाय्वोस्तु नियच्छेन् महदात्मनोः । तौ रमायां परानन्दे तां विष्णौ परमात्मनि । तद्वशत्वेन तद्भयानं नियमो नाम नापद्ये । *M.Kāth.Up.Bh.* p.14.

उत्तिष्ठत जाग्रत प्राप्य वरान् निबोधत ।

क्षुरस्य धारा निशिता दुरत्यया दुर्गे पथस्तत् कवयो वदन्ति ॥

(1.3.14)

Here, the *Upaniṣad* awakens the seeker who may happen to get bound by the hopes and desires etc. in the physical world. The seeker is alerted here with the imperative words - उत्तिष्ठत, जाग्रत and निबोधत in the light of Śaṅkara's commentary उत्तिष्ठत means - turning oneself towards the knowledge of the self; जाग्रत - putting an end to the sleep of ignorance which is terrible by nature and is the seed of all evil; निबोधत - understanding the all pervading self taught by competent teachers as 'I am that'.¹⁵⁹

In words of Raghavendrayati, उत्तिष्ठत means being free from manifold desires; जाग्रत means abandoning laziness and निबोधत means acquiring the knowledge of the Lord through the competent teachers.¹⁶⁰ There is no doctrinal distinction between the two, Śaṅkara and Madhva.

Thus, a perusal of the commentaries of Śaṅkara and Madhva as well as of Raṅga Rāmānuja wherever necessary on the *Kāthaka Upaniṣad* brings to light that an inquiry into the nature of Brahman as explained by the divine preceptor, god Yama to Naciketa, deals

159. अनाद्यविद्याप्रसुप्ता उत्तिष्ठत हे जन्तव आत्मज्ञानाभिमुखा भवत जाग्रताज्ञाननिद्राया घोररूपायाः सर्वानर्थबीजभूतायाः क्षयं कुरुत । कथम् ? प्राप्योपगम्य वरान् प्रकृष्टानाचार्यास्तद्विदस्तदुपदिष्टं सर्वान्तरमातमानमहमस्मीति निबोधतावगच्छत । Ś.Kāth.Up.Bh. p.74.

160. उत्तिष्ठत नानाविधविषयचिंतनान्निवृत्ता भवत । जाग्रत जाग्रत आलस्यं मुञ्चत । प्राप्य वरान् महद्भयो वरान्प्राप्य । परानिति पाठे महतः प्राप्य भगवन्तं निबोधत । R.Ku.Khd. p.17b.

with a quest into the constitution of the individual soul with reference to his experiencing the bliss of *Mokṣa*. The story of Naciketa here is well backed up with metaphysical spirit. A deep inner urge of bringing his father on the right path has been the basis for Naciketa to achieve the welfare of his father and himself as well. This secret current of the theme of *Upaniṣad* is flowed throughout the *Upaniṣad* in a graduated scale. This point however is well observed by both the commentators in an effective manner. Their commentaries are found quite explanatory and significant.



IV. Conclusion

The foregoing study of the *Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad* in the light of the commentaries of Śaṅkara and Madhva reveals that the *Upaniṣad* comprises of the *mantras* facilitating the postulation of the doctrines of both Advaita and Dvaita systems. As has been brought out, the *Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad* holds a special fascination for all students of philosophy, as it is a happy blend of charming poetry, deep mysticism and profound philosophy, in the frame of interesting dialogue between god Yama, the preceptor and young Naciketa the disciple. In order to show the valuable merits of *Upaniṣad* in the light of the interpretations of both Śaṅkara and Madhva, the story of the *Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad* runs through the following chapters.

With a view to understanding the nature, scope and importance of the *Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad*, it is unveiled in brief, the features of the important facets of the Vedānta such as *Upaniṣads*, the *Bhagavad-gīta* and the *Brahmasūtras*. In order to show the relationship between the *Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad* and Vedas, major *Upaniṣads*, the *Bhagavadgīta* and the *Brahma-sūtras*, similar passages from respective texts are quoted.

Further, the subject matter pertaining to Upaniṣadic philosophy in general, *Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad* in Vedic literature, which covering the four *Vedas*, *Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad*, *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad*, the *Bhagavadgīta*, the *Brahmasūtras*, (3) A Brief outline of the major *Upaniṣads*. The subject-matter under these sections

traces a wide and a deep influence of the *Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad* on the entire Vedic literature.

The *second chapter* dealing with the salient features of the systems of Advaita and Dvaita schools, runs into two sub-divisions each of which is dedicated to explain the doctrines of respective systems. As is well known, the Advaita philosophy advocated by Śaṅkara, has the main theme of ब्रह्म सत्यं जगत् मिथ्या जीवो ब्रह्मैव नापरः। The enumeration of this single line-theme follows under many sub-topics which are grouped into two, such as : (1) Epistemology of Advaita and (2) Its metaphysics. Śaṅkara's Advaita admits six means of knowledge such as : *Pratyakṣa*, *Anumāna*, *Upamāna*, *Śabda*, *Arthāpatti*, and *Anupalabdhi*. In order to give the picture of the phenomenal world of experience, the topics that are dealt with, are : nature of *Ajñāna*, power of *Ajñāna*, order of world-creation, world appearance as illusory. Similarly, the aspect of Brahman, its names and forms are also explained. With a view to showing Brahman's nature of oneness with the soul, the nature of individual soul, transmigration of the soul, are also explicated. Further, the theory of *karma* and *jñāna* have been briefly dealt with to pinpoint the path way to the realisation. Lastly, the nature of liberation is explicated as well.

So also, Madhva's philosophy has the basis of nine doctrines such as, Lord Viṣṇu is the Supreme Brahman, the universe is truly real, the five-fold difference is fundamental, *jīvas* are dependent on the Lord, the embodied souls are inherently graded as higher and lower, liberation is enjoying the bliss befitting to one's original form, the means to secure liberation is pure devotion to Lord Viṣṇu, the means of valid knowledge are only three, viz., perception, inference

and verbal testimony, Lord Viṣṇu alone is known by the entire mass of scriptures. These points are elaborated in brief.

Being the cream of this work, it is dealt with a comparative and critical evaluation of the commentaries of Śaṅkara and Madhva on the *Kāthaka Upaniṣad*. The *Upaniṣad* opens its subject-matter introducing in simple language, the performance of the *Viśvajit-sacrifice* which in question demands the giving away of all possessions as gifts. Vājaśravas is a performer of sacrifice and Naciketa is his son. As Vājaśravas is giving away as gifts the useless cows, Naciketa starts watching its proceedings intently. Being fortified with an accession of *śraddhā*, Naciketa thinks within himself about Vājaśravas' proceedings of the sacrifice. Being a truthful son, he cannot reconcile himself to it. Naciketa reminds his father suggestively that he, as his son is also meant to be given away, and he wants to know to whom his father proposed to give him. When the same question is asked by him for third time, his father loses his temper and explodes in anger "Unto Death I give you."

Naciketa is found as lover of the Truth; Therefore, hearing the angry words from his father, he is not perturbed. The mind and heart of Naciketa have become fearless due to his deep love of Truth. Even god Yama holds no terror for Naciketa when he enters the former's realm. Thus, Naciketa is a shining example for human society, ancient or modern. Yama keenly feels a sense of guilt of being outside for three nights, and decides to make amends by offering him three boons.

The first boon asked by Naciketa is in favour of his father. Such a loving consideration of Naciketa for

the well-being of his parents may be remarked as hallmark of an expansion of one's own individuality. The young lad Naciketa in this context, pinpoints a cardinal truth of achieving the acme of perfection.

Then, Naciketa formulates his second boon for securing the heaven through the knowledge of sacrificial fire. Readily granting his boon, Yama explains to him the nature of sacrificial fire, which is the source of the world. And Naciketa on his part, repeats everything as told. Yama is wonderstruck by the sharp intelligence and memory of Naciketa. In return, being pleased as this, Yama proclaims its estimate of the fruit of sacrifice by naming it as *Nāciketa-sacrifice*. In this context, Śaṅkara means '*Svargaloka*' as the famous heaven. But, on the basis of the subject-matter dealt with in the *Upakrama* and *Upasamhāra*, it is shown that *svargaloka* does not mean here as famous heaven but *Mokṣa* itself.

Being called upon by Yama, the brahmin-guest Naciketa selects the third boon that stands at the cross-roads of human thought and destiny Naciketa at this stage wills to investigate precisely the mysterious internal nature of man with its faculty to transcend himself and perceive himself in the act of direct vision. Naciketa's question relating to this tremendous theme however is to Yama like the bursting of a bombshell. How could he dare to impart this truth to a mere stripling? But Yama is bound by his promise to grant whatever the boon Naciketa seeks. In order to test Naciketa's heart, Yama offers him attractive temptations. But, Naciketa stands firm. Yama is impressed with his plain speaking and admires his single-minded devotion to know the nature of the Highest Truth. Naciketa rejects sense-pleasures, firstly because they are transient

and secondly because indulgence in them beyond a organs and arrests the onward march of the soul to the self-fulfilment. This is the universal truth; and this truth is well honoured by both the commentaries, Śaṅkara and Madhva.

Yama is highly pleased with Naciketa; he finds in him a fit student of *Ātmāvidyā*. Therefore, he begins his exposition with a pointed reference to *śreyas* and *preyas* as the ethical pre-condition to spiritual striving and realization. Yama's exposition of *preyas* shows that the unbridle pursuit of sensate satisfactions is not the way to the realization of one's spiritual nature. On the other hand, the path of *śreyas* which has two levels - the good life (*dharma*) and the divine immortal life (*amṛta*) leads to the realization of the Supreme Brahman. There lies no difference in the opinions of Śaṅkara and Madhva in bringing out the import of *śreyas* and *preyas*. In the same spirit, Yama further contrasts *Vidyā*, with *Avidyā* which are indentified with *śreyas* and *preyas* respectively.

Further more, it is explicated the nature of the Supreme Brahman which is well defined in the following *mantra* :

जानाम्यहं शेवधिरित्यनित्यं
न हि अध्वैः प्राप्यते हि ध्रुवं तत् । (1.2.20)

Śaṅkara's commentary on this *mantra* is not very technical, whereas, Madhva understands each term of this *mantra* in its metaphysical application. To illustrate, the word अनित्यम् speaks Brahman's being ever eternal.

More often, Madhva's interpretation becomes more practical. This can be very well witnessed from the forgoing

explanation of the *mantra* : कामस्यासिं ----- अत्यसाक्षीः। (1.2.11). Though Śaṅkara and Madhva interpret the words like दुर्दर्शम्, गूढमनुप्रविष्टम् etc. with metaphysical touch, the difference lies in the purport thereof.

At times, Śaṅkara shows difference between Saguṇa Brahman and Nirguṇa Brahman; while Madhva regards them as the one whole. This Madhva's idea of unification of two into the single whole is quite extra-ordinary. This is adjudicated in showing the meaning of the *mantra* - एतद्धयेवाक्षरं ब्रह्म। ---. (1.2.16). Thus, the *Upaniṣad* reads a number of adjectives declaring the nature and glory of the Supreme Brahman.

The Upaniṣadic text - नेह नानास्ति किञ्चन (2.1.11) in the light of Śaṅkara's interpretation negates manifoldness of the phenomenal world, and affirms that Brahman alone is the only real entity. The same text in the light of Madhva's interpretation, however negates difference between various forms of the Supreme Brahman, and His attributes, His actions etc. He is all independent and inheres within Himself no difference. Thus Madhva upholds the view that Brahman is *svagatabheda - varjita*.

Further, it is systematically putforth the relation between jīva and Brahman. In the *mantra* ऋतं पिबन्तौ सुकृतस्य लोके । -- (1.3.1), the terms पिबन्तौ and प्रविष्टौ speak of two forms of the same entity i.e., the Supreme Brahman, which are called *Ātmā* and *Antarātmā*. This is what Śaṅkara says. So too, Madhva here shows two forms of Lord Viṣṇu; but *Antarātmā* form of Brahman dwells in Vāyu, the best of all souls, and *Ātmā* form is the Supreme Brahman Himself.

The immortal metaphor of chariot in the *Upaniṣad* (1.3.3) focuses much elevated metaphysical

value. Śaṅkara's interpretation of this parable is quite phenomenal, while Madhva's is philosophical. In this manner the relation between jīva and Brahman has been regarded in accordance with their own philosophical doctrines.

This work ends with an elucidation of the means of attaining liberation, the *jīvanmukti* concept and other allied details. In such context too, lively differences between Śaṅkara and Madhva are particularized. Although both the interpretations are self-sufficient to understand the *Upaniṣad* in the light of the respective opinions, Śaṅkara's lucid commentary is found to be more prejudiced than that of Madhva to the *Upaniṣad*.

In a nutshell, it is that Naciketa does not come to philosophy with just an intellectual curiosity. As has been seen in the beginning of the *Upaniṣad*, Naciketa has forceful urge to realise the truth about human life and destiny. Accordingly he receives the same from his preceptor, and its entire technical aspects. With the help of the knowledge that he obtained, Naciketa realizes the true nature of the Supreme Brahman, becomes pure, spotless, immortal, and joins the unbroken procession of eternal children of the spirit. Thus, declares the *Upaniṣad* -

ब्रह्मप्राप्तो विरजोऽभूत्द्विमृत्यु
रन्योऽप्येव यो विदध्यात्ममेव ॥ (2.3.18)



Bibliography

1. Apte V.S., *The Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, Motilal Banarasi Dass, Delhi, 1978.
2. Aurobindo, *'The Upaniṣads'*, Sri Aurobindo Ashram, Pondicherry, 1996.
3. Basu B.D., *The Sacred Books of the Hindus*, Bharatiya Publishing House, Delhi, 1976.
4. Chatterjee & Datta, *An Introduction to Indian Philosophy*, University of Calcutta, 1950.
5. Chinmayananda, *Discourses on Kāthakoṇiṣad*, Chinmaya Publication Trust, Madras, 1976.
6. Chitrita Devi, *Upaniṣads for All*, S. Chand & Co. (Pvt.) Ltd., New Delhi - 1973.
7. Gough A.E., *The Philosophy of the Upaniṣads*, Ess Ess Publications, Delhi, 1975.
8. Hiriyanna M., *Essentials of Indian Philosophy*, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., Bombay, 1973.
9. Jacob G.A., *A Concordance to the Principal Upaniṣads & Bhagavadgīta*, Motilal Banarasidass, Delhi, 1971.
10. Jayatirtha, *Nyāya Sudhā*, Dharwad, Śaka 1953.
11. Jayatirtha, *Brahmasūtrabhāṣyatattvapraṅkāṣika*, Karnatak Historical Research Society, Dharwad, 1980.
12. Keith A.B., *Veda of the Black Yajur School*, Motilal Banarasidass, New Delhi.
13. Macdonell A.A., *'India's Past'*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1927.

14. Macdonell A.A., *History of Sanskrit Literature*, New Delhi.
15. Madhva, *Brahmasūtra-bhāṣya*, Bangalore, 1969.
16. Madhva, *Mahābhārata-tātparya-nirṇaya*, Sarvamula-grantha, Vol.II, Bangalore, 1971.
17. Madhva, *Pramāṇalakṣaṇa, Daśaprakaraṇa* Vol.I. A.B. M.M. Bangalore - 1969.
18. Madhva, *Aṇuvyākhyāna*, Sarvamūla Granthah - Vol.I, Akhila Bharata, Madhva Maha Mandala, Bangalore - 1969.
19. Maitra S.K., *The Kāṭhōpāniṣad.*, Ācārya Dhruva Smārka Granta, Part-III, Gujarat Vidya Sabha, Ahmedabad, 1946.
20. *Manusmṛti*, Chaukhamba Sanskrit Series, Office, Varanasi, 1970.
21. Mathew, *Holy Bible*, The New Testament, International Bible Society, New Jersey, USA, 1984.
22. Max Muller F., *Sacred Books of the East*, Vol.15, The Upaniṣad, Part-II Motilal Banarsidas, Delhi, 1975.
23. Monier Williams, *Indian Wisdom*, Chaukhamba Sanskrit Series Office, Varanasi, 1963.
24. Nagaraja Rao P., *Introduction to Vedānta*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1966.
25. Nagesh D.S., *The Commentary of Śrī Madhva on Kāṭha Upaniṣad*, Vasantik Prakashan, Bombay, 1998.
26. Nikhilananda Swami, *The Upaniṣads*, Harper and Row Publishers, New York, 1963.
27. Pandurangi K.T., *Īśāvāsya-Talavakāra-Kāṭhaka-Upaniṣad*, Sriman Madhva Siddhantonnahini Sabha, Chirtanur, 1985.

28. Pandurangi K.T., *Viṣṇutattvavanirṇaya*, Vidyadhisha Granthamala, Bangalore, 1985.
29. Panoli V., *Gītā in Śaṅkara's Own Words*, The Mathrubhumi Printing & Publishing Co.,Ltd., Calicut, 1990.
30. Radhakrishnan S., *The Principal Upaniṣads*, George Allen & Unwin Ltd., London, 1951.
31. Radhakrishnan S., *Indian Philosophy*, George Allen & Unwin Ltd., London, 1951.
32. Raghunath Kashinath Shastri, *Vyākaraṇa - Mahābhāṣya*, Nirnaya-Sagar Press, Bombay - 1932.
33. Raghavendrayati, *Daśopaniṣadaḥ-Khandārthasahita*, part-I, Poornaprajna Vidyapeetha, Bangalore, 1985.
34. Rande R.D., *A Constructive Survey of Upaniṣadic Philosophy*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1968.
35. Ranganathananda Swami, *The Message of the Upaniṣads*. Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay-1971.
36. Raṅgarāmānuja, *Kāṭhōpāniṣad-bhāṣya*, Ubhaya Vedanta Granthamala, Madras, 1972.
37. Rawson Joseph, *The Kāṭhōpāniṣad*, Oxford University Press, London, 1934.
38. Śaṅkara., *Kāṭhōpāniṣad-bhāṣya*, with Anandagiri's ṭīka, Ananda Ashram, Pune, 1977.
39. Śaṅkara., *Taittiriya-Upaniṣad bhāṣya*, with Anandagiri's ṭīkā, Ananda Ashram, Pune, 1977.
40. Śaṅkara, *Śvetāśvatāra-Upaniṣad-bhāṣya*, with Anandagiri ṭīka, Ananda Ashram, Pune, 1977.
41. Śaṅkara, *Chāndogya Upaniṣad-bhāṣya*, Holenarasipur, 1956.

- 220 *A Metaphysical Analysis of the Kāṭhakopaniṣad*
42. Śāṅkara, *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya*, Motilal Banarasidass, Delhi, 1985.
43. Shanbhag D.N., *Madhva-Siddhānta-Sāra of Padmanābhasūri*, Dvaita Vedānta Studies & Research Foundation, Bangalore, 1994.
44. Shanbhag D.N., *Śrī Madhvācārya and His Cardinal Doctrines*, Bharat Book Depot & Prakashan, Dharwad, 1990.
45. Sharma B.N.K., *Philosophy of Madhvācārya*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1962.
46. Sharma B.N.K., *Madhva's Teachings in His Own Words*, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1970.
47. Suryanarayan Shastry S.S., *Siddhāntaleśa-saṅgraha*, University of Madras, Madras.
48. Swami Gambhirananda, *Kaṭha Upaniṣad*, with the commentary of Śāṅkarācārya. Advaita Ashrama, Calcutta. 1996.
49. Swami Madhavananda, *Vedānta Paribhāṣā of Dharmarāja Adhvarindra*, Advaita Ashram, Calcutta, 1989.
50. Tridandi Sri Bhakti Prajnana Yati, *Twelve Essential Upaniṣads*. Vol.I. Sri Gaudiya Math, Madras, 1982.
51. Vadirajatīrtha, *Kaṭhakopaniṣad-Prakāṣika*, Udupi, 1954.
52. *Vaiṣṇava-Tantrasāra*, Sri Vani Vilas Press, Srirangam.
53. Vasu S.C., *Siddhānta Kaumudi of Bhattoji Dikṣit*, Motilal Banarasidass, Delhi, 1979.
54. Vedavyāsa, *Śrīmad-bhāgavata Purāṇam*, Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1902.
55. Vedavyāsa, *Mahābhāratam*, Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1902.
56. Vedeśatīrtha, *Kāṭhaka-Upaniṣad-bhāṣya-ṭippani*, Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, 1907.
57. Prof. Venkateshachar B., *Tattvasāṅkhyāna of Madhva.*, Bangalore, 1964.
58. Vidyaranya, *Pañcadaśī*, Ramakrishna Ashram, Mysore, 1996.
-