CHAPTER - IV

Critical Evaluation of the Commentaries of Śaṅkara and Madhva

At the outset, the Kathaka-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 Katha-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: उज्जवळ व वाजास्वारस सर्विद्वसं ददी। This mantra in the light of the interpretation of Śaṅkara and Madhva does not underline any remarkable difference in theme. However the word उज्जवळ is used in the sense of ‘desirous’ by both the commentators. They interpret it as कामयमानः।

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

1. a) उज्जवळ कामयमानो इ च इति .... | S.Ku.Bh., p.6.
   b) उज्जवळ वाजास्वारस सर्विद्वसं ददी सर्वेदिक्षणम् | M.Ku.Bh., p.1.
   c) The word उज्जवळ is derived from the root वस्म् (स्मृति) - 1st conjugation, Vide, वस्म् 1156 कार्याल्य नाकार्याल्य | Pāñinīsūtra (P.S.) 7.4.53; Siddhānta-Kauṭumika (S.K.) - 2488. Here, व य is substituted for व of the root वस्म्; hence the form is उज्जवळ।
   d) Raṅgarāmānuja has no different interpretation of Usan from that of Śaṅkara or Madhva. Nevertheless Veerarāghavācārya, a glossator says that उज्जवळ is the name of Vājaśravas. Vide : उज्जवळ वाजास्वारस नामथथव, दृविदुः सतकः सतानुकुलपुरुषपानोभतिःनित्य तत्त्वानंतरं देवं दर्शनादिति | Katha-Upaniṣad bhāṣya, Udbhaya Vedānta granthamala, Madras - 1972. p.27.
meaning of Visvajit 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 khaṇḍāratha 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 भाजङ्ग्वस is very interesting i.e., he splits this term as भाज and ङ्ग्वस. Here भाज means food, and ङ्ग्वस 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 Vajasravas can also be treated as a proper noun.

Śaṅkara says that भाजङ्ग्वस is the son of भाजङ्ग्वव. But, both the Vādirājātirtha and Vedeśatirtha in their commentaries on Madhva’s bhāṣya, give their opinions that भाजङ्ग्वस is a grandson of a sage called भाजङ्ग्वव.3 He is otherwise called उद्धालक.

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: Vajasravas is called Āruṇi Auddālakī Gautama, the father of Naciketa. The father of Svetaketu, another enlightened pupil (See Khaṇḍ- 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 Auddālaki. Auddālaki is a son of Uddālaka, but Śaṅkara (Kath. Up. I.1) takes Auddālaki as possibly the same as Uddālaka.4

2. Raṅgarāmānuja too reiterates the same opinion: भाजङ्ग्वस भाज अनेन दाहारिकामभुम्तेन श्रव: - कौन्ति:। यशस्व स भाजङ्ग्वव:। तस्मात्व भाजङ्ग्वस:। Ibd. p. 27-28.
3. उद्धालकी भाजङ्ग्वस इत्यद भाजङ्ग्वव नाम कविचुग्यः। तस्म मा पौर्णम:। उद्धालकायः। भाजङ्ग्वस इत्यद्वै। काठाकोपिनिहायार्गित्यं। श्री वादिसानाय प्रकाश सातित्व।। उद्धालकी - Saka-1890. p.1.
However, any researcher finds no harm to the philosophical aspect of the *Upaniṣad*, in accepting either of the renderings.

The first word (उपनिषद्) 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: "One who is free from desire beholds Him." This is the note on which the *Upaniṣads* ends. "Then mortal man becomes immortal, – Even here to Brahman he attaineth ---- Sometimes in the *Upaniṣads* of the former." 5

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 denunciably manner. He wills to ask his father 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 Upanisadic phrase सोप्रामन्तं | [I.1.2] The mantra वेतत्ताका ज्ञानतुरुणा ---- (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.”

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 fulfillment of the former. In the Brāhmaṇas sacrifice had become mechanical and soulless. But, there was a right idea behind it.”

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. Therefore, he approaches his father and says thus:

---

As this mantra declares, the young lad Naciketa asks 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 immaturesed. His words are as irritating as that of a grown up person.  

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: मा दत्त्वा अपि न ते गायो दात्वयाख्‌ इति || [M.Ku.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.

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

10. सन्तुं किल्ल उपाय "पृथ्वीकैव कैवसताक्य त्व त्वं ददामि" इति || S.Ku.Bh. p.8.
could be performed in a right manner, thereby a good fruit could be acquired.\textsuperscript{11}

Referring to the statement मृत्युवर्ती ला देदार्थिति, Rawson remarks “these words are equivalent with that of an angry Englishman ‘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.”\textsuperscript{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 Vājaśravas 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 वाक्सिदिर would come true and never go futile. Accordingly, Bhavabhūti states -

“\textit{कृपाणं पुनराध्यानं वाचमयोज्यावलिति।}”\textsuperscript{13}

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

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: \textit{वहृतनेमोग्यम प्रथमा वहृतनेमोग्यम मध्यम।} \textsuperscript{(I.5)} that is - "Of many, I go the first; of many, I go midmost". Interpreting this line, Śaṅkara accounts for a behaviour of disciple before one’s teacher. In precise, according to Śaṅkara, Naciketa means to say that among many sons or

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{11} ते वेदसतिर्थ सुतं गायको न दातव्य: | न वै वनव गोदाम प्रतिज्ञाप्य। | मा दत्तवृति तत्त्वा: पूणायत्ववात् इज्ञत: | Vedesatirtha’s com. p.36.
  \item \textsuperscript{12} \textit{Op.cit.}, Rawson, p.65.
  \item \textsuperscript{13} उनस्मृतिः of Bhavabhūti 1.10. p.42
\end{itemize}
disciples he ranks first owing to the best conduct of a disciple; and as a middling one, he behaves in a middling manner. Simplifying this idea, Anandagiri 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.

On the other hand, 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 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. Naturally one fines no in consistency therein.

Rangarāmānuja too welcomes the same meaning. Śaṅkara’s interpretation of बहुनामेि मध्यमः is quite appealing one and ideal too.

---

14. बहुनामेि मध्यमः वेदिन न्यायाश्रयी मध्यमवर्त्तमाणी; सत्युख्यव विभावात् न्यायाश्रयीस्वायत्तमाणी। | मध्यमाणां च बहुनामेि मध्यमवर्त्तमाणी हृदयादिबृहस्पत्यम् | Śaṅkara’s bhāṣya, Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad. p.9.
15. अनादगिरिकिताः कोशिस्त जात्वा श्रुत्वनामं प्रकृतिमुखः आज्जावस्यं मध्यमम | तद्यपाश्चात्तन्त्राद्वित्यम् | अनादगिरिकिताः on S. Ku.Bh, p.9.
16. बहुनामेि मध्यमाणां मध्यमवर्त्तमाणी; सत्युख्यव वाश्रयी महानं मध्यमद्वर्त्तमाणी वाचमेमी | ति मध्यमम मयां किं स्तिर्तु किं तद बङ्कहरिम किं जात्तू सत्यस्य किं मयां मध्यमाणां मध्यमद्वर्त्तमाणी | Dasopanisad - Khaṇḍārthasahitā, Part-I Poornaprajña Vidyapeetha, Bangalore, 1985. pp.24-25.
Naciketa is applied with a behaviour of middling disciple. No doubt, it is appropriate one. But, such application is absent in his interpretation of बहुरामेमि प्रमादः। 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: मर्यादा पचने सत्यमिवासः जायते 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 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 is not advisable. Realising this truth, Naciketa directly addresses his father: अनुप्रयो तथा पुरूषं ----। 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.

---

17. अनुप्रयो तथा पुरूषं। न च तेन गुणकारण वृत्तं वर्तमानं कालित। Anandagiritika on Ś.Ku.Bh. p.10.
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.

The previous mantra अनुपंशय यथा पूर्वः 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, Nāciketa does not feel sorry for being admonished to go to Yama’s abode.

The succeeding mantra [वेश्यानः प्रविष्टिः — 1.7]\(^{19}\), when read, appears to be not in tune with the preceding one, as it indicates an injunction of 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 Nāciketa 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.”\(^{20}\)

---

20. स एवमुक्ते सिद्धान्तम् सर्वाध्यायः प्रेमप्राप्याः सं च यमभवनं गत्वा तिर्थो वर्तिन्तवासम् यये प्रोक्ते | प्रेमाचारं यममालयं भाष्यं व च | S. Ku.Bh. p.11
Although Madhva put forth\textsuperscript{21} the same thing in a crisp sentence, Raghavendrayati is quite explicit in his words.\textsuperscript{22}

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

While reading Śaṅkara’s interpretation, the sentence \textsuperscript{21}\textsuperscript{22}`\textsuperscript{21}.\textsuperscript{22}` 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 \textit{Kātha-Upanisad}. Madhva remains silent on this point.

As is evident, the \textit{mantra} \textit{Vaiśvānaraḥ प्रतिवर्णित} \textemdash \textsuperscript{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."\textsuperscript{23}

This \textit{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

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[21.] \textit{Fotya} सम्पूर्णमनातिविज्ञाहायादिक्क ० तु | आग्ने तु यमं प्राह यम्म सोदकमाहय | M. Ku.Bh. p.2-3.
\item[22.] अव यमस्तेसं गतो नविकेत: | तदा यमोऽवस्तोनकं गतवा स्थितोस्वम | यमभार्यवा कृतकालतिथिपुंजो यमास्ताभावान् गुहामौलयुक्ता दिनागययुक्तपञ्चाश्च पुरुष एव स्थिताव | ततो यमे चालो यमं प्रति भायोभिक्रियाभाय | Vaiśvānara हित | R. Ku.khd. p.25
\item[23.] \textit{Op.cit.}, Radhakrishnan, p. 598.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
brahmin quest if properly not received, destroys all happiness of a householder.\textsuperscript{24}

Of course, this \textit{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 \textit{mantra} as being told by his wife.\textsuperscript{25} Raṅgarāmānuja too accepts the first option of Śaṅkara but does not include.\textsuperscript{26} Madhva and his glossators consider this \textit{mantra} to be an address by Yama’s wife.

Of course, such diverse interpretations do not let up the implication of the present \textit{mantra} that to make Yama know the arrival of the brilliant guest.

Further, the \textit{mantra} आशाप्रवृत्तेः महान्तं चुद्वतं \textsuperscript{[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, प्रतीश्च, महान्त, सूनता, इष्टापूर्त, पुत्र, पशु etc.

In verse above, some words are certainly technical. The terms आशा and प्रतीश्च and महान्त may be translated as desire, expectation and the fruit of good association respectively. Śaṅkara interpret आशा (hope) as asking

\textsuperscript{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 respectful offering called Arghyam, consisting of rice, flower, Dūrvā, water, etc., and then he should be satisfied by food and other gifts. Vide \textit{Manusmṛti}, III. 99-118.

\textsuperscript{25} Supra, fn. 18.

\textsuperscript{26} CRTs 1TTM 3TFRT M SPFSjf <pJT -------I RR- Ku.Bh. p.31.
for desirable, yet, unknown objects such as heavenly enjoyment etc., and प्रेमिका (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 'सद्वृत्तम्' as 'सत्वंयोगं 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, यौगो देवताध्यानं तत्र सद्वृत्तमित्यर्थं - i.e., 'Yoga means meditation on God, and whatever merit results from such meditation is Saṅgata', 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 viewpoint. For him, आशा means asking for the objects like wealth etc., that is, obtained by oneself but remaining beyond the control of प्रेमिका - means looking forward for the objects which are not obtained. Of course, this interpretation though literally differs from that of Śaṅkara, yet, both the interpretations would not contaminate the significance of the mantra.

Moreover, the word अन्योगमाः applied as an adjective to पुरुष and householder - read in the verse above is meant as ‘a man of little intelligence’, according to Śaṅkara. Of course, 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 a householder could be anyone: necessarily, he need not be either अन्योग or उत्तमेघ. 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.”

---

Or, the word अन्यमेंद्रस is 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 तिस्यो रात्रीर्वदव--- [1.9.]. This mantra offers a secret current of compliment paid by Yama to the brahmin guest. The phrase - खलि मेंज्यु “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 in 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.
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 - शाण्तसंक्षेपः सुमनः तथा स्याहीलमन्यीयत्वो माओभ मृत्योऽ (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 शाण्तसंक्षेपः, सुमनः and वीतमन्युः describe the epithets of Vājasravas, to be bestowed upon him by means of the first boon. The term शाण्तसंक्षेपः 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 सुमनः 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 Śaṅkara and Raṅgarāmānuja do not differ from each other in their interpretations. Madhva of course, keeps silent to remark on this mantra. Yet, his followers like Vādirājatīrtha, Rāghavendrayati, 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

28. शाण्तसंक्षेपः सुमनः तथा स्याहीलमन्यीयत्वो माओभ मृत्योऽ (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 शाण्तसंक्षेपः, सुमनः and वीतमन्युः describe the epithets of Vājasravas, to be bestowed upon him by means of the first boon. The term शाण्तसंक्षेपः 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 सुमनः 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 Śaṅkara and Raṅgarāmānuja do not differ from each other in their interpretations. Madhva of course, keeps silent to remark on this mantra. Yet, his followers like Vādirājatīrtha, Rāghavendrayati, 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

28. 'facTT TTRIT TJcR^sfq
ck^wftld | M. Ku.Bh. with the gloss by Vādirājatīrtha. pp.2-3.
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 प्रतीति: - (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 वाज्ञावरस: [1.1], गीतम [1.10], ओदानकिरि and आपणी [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 - तत्प्रसृतं मार्गिष्ठेद्वलित - [1.10.] and वीतमन्युस्वः टुंगिवास: मृत्युमुखाय: प्रमुखेत् | [1.11.] Naciketa in the former 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 : मृत्युप्रयोक्ता नन्देश्वलोकाय लभ्या - (vi.18) declares that Naciketa attains Supreme Brahman.

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: भव त्वमिनि स्वर्गमन्येषि मृत्योऽधि - (1.13). Here, the phrase स्वर्गलोको अमृतलवं भजने declares that they whose
world is स्वर्ग, attain liberation. This meaning lacks homogeneous sense, i.e., the matter of one’s being in स्वर्ग 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 कर्म or the performance of any ritual cannot procure the attainment of liberation. If the liberation were to be achieved by means of कर्म, 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 स्वर्ग-लोक and स्वर्गयम् well in tune with the former. i.e., for Śaṅkara अमृतत्व mean देवत - ‘divinity’ as a product of the performance of the sacrifice with the knowledge of its significance.29 Thus, as Śaṅkara posits, the knowledge 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 ब्रह्मि तदु मे निधोध स्वयंस्विनि निवक्षेत्रः प्रज्ञानः |---- (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 स्वामिनिविवा.

29. येनानन्दन ब्रह्म्तस्वर्गलोकः स्वर्गलोकं वेष्यं ते स्वर्गलोकं यत्मन अमृतलोकस्य देवतं भजने प्रमुखाति सददनिविवा द्वितीयं चरणं जृष्णे | Ś.Ku.Bh. Anadagiriṭikā. p.15.
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.

Of course, 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 - ‘वर्गलोक अग्नि भजने’ - a knower of svargyāgni attains the eternal abode of the Supreme Brahman who is designated here as Viṣṇu.  

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 अनन्तलोकाभ्य, प्रतिष्ठा, गुहानिः, read in the mantra: प्रेते ब्राह्मण तदा मे निवधेय -- निश्चित गुहायों | (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 svara-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: लोकादिमनि webinar तुद | (1.15), Yama imparts him the knowledge of *Svargyāgni* - which includes the knowledge of the deity, number and the size of the

30. (a) स्वर्गलोका अग्नि भजने | स्वर्ग लोको येषा हि | परम्परद ज्ञाता इत्यादि | RR. *Ku.Bh.* p.36.
   (b) अपनयतादनिः सदिः प्रविष्टे निः | स्वर्ग लोको विषयं तत्त्वादिः | *M. Ku.Bh.* p.3.
sacrificial bricks in sacrifice. The word लोकादि in the mantra above is an adjective of the word अनि which means Viṣṇu. Hence, the word लोकादि should be 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:

\[
\text{तम्रवीत्रीयमाणो महात्मा} \quad \text{---------}
\]
\[
\text{--------- अनेकरूपं गृहाण} \quad \text{[1.1.16.]} \]

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, Śaṅkara gives two meanings for the word गृहाण -

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 गृहाण accruing in the mantra (2.3). In this connection, it is a notable point: "Garland - (Srṅka) - 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.\textsuperscript{31}

For both Raṅgarāmānuja\textsuperscript{32} and Madhva\textsuperscript{33} the term गुर्ज च मी means a ‘golden necklace’. Going a step further a glossator Veeraraghavacarya on the commentary of Raṅgarāmānuja, finds contradiction in the second meaning of अग्नि given by Śaṅkara, i.e., \textit{not censurable or glorified} course of the performance of the religious rite. Precisely, for Śaṅkara the path of rites is not conducive to realise the nature of oneself. The path of \textit{karma} is for the persons incapable of apprehiending the same.\textsuperscript{34} In this sense, the path of karma is censurable according to Śaṅkara. As a contrary to this view, Śaṅkara himself makes a statement here that the path of \textit{karma} is not censurable. This is what the contradiction is pointed out by Veeraraghavacarya.\textsuperscript{35}

God Yama further concludes his instruction on the \textit{Nāci deletagni} sacrifice in the \textit{mantars} : त्रिनाचिकेति त्रिभिरेव सन्धि \textemdash \textemdash \textit{निचार्येयों शालिमतयानमेवति} \textsuperscript{(1.17)}\textsuperscript{36}, त्रिनाचिकेति तमभेदतः विदितवा \textemdash \textemdash \textit{शोकालिगों मोदते खर्मंतोके} \textsuperscript{(1.18)}, wherein he glorifies karma and the fruits thereof.

Of the above \textit{mantras}, the former one proclaims that a person who performs \textit{Nāci deletagni} sacrifice three times, attains everlasting peace. Of course, 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 : त्रिनाचिकेति, त्रिभिरेव and तिर्कर्ममुनार.

\textsuperscript{32} किंतु यव्युत चेववमनेकर्त्युः गुर्ज च \textemdash \textit{विचित्रं यव्युतं श्रवणस्तृ रुपमालं स्वविनिब्यव्यथ} | RR. Ku.Bh. p.38.
\textsuperscript{33} ब्रह्म वस्त्रमालं वेब विष्णुवमालपं अद्वर्तः | M. K.Bh. p.4.
\textsuperscript{34} अनेकतरं अनामभ्रजतां आन्तप्रणावाणाखानर्ददस्य \textit{उपद्रवस्तीति मनः कुर्वत्वमेति} | S. Ku.Up.Bh. p.17.
\textsuperscript{35} शाहुरे अव मने अकुस्तितति, तव च कृतितति \textit{पावित्रश्रेष्ठश्रीमणीरावयवं स्वर्यं पूर्णम्} | न तु यव्युतायां \textit{स्वर्यं} | Veeraraghavacarya. RR. Ku.Bh. p.38.
\textsuperscript{36} Half of the third line and fourth line recur at \textit{Śvet.Upaniṣad} 4.11.
According to Śaṅkara the word नासिकेत 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 अागम or the Vedas, the Smṛtis and the declarations of wise persons.

Then, the word त्रिकर्मकृत् means one who executes daily दान - 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 - ऋग्वेद, यजुर्वेद and सामवेद 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 दान, 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 तम्ब्रवत्ती प्रीयमाणो -------, त्रिणाचिकत्सिरित्य सन्धि ----, and त्रिप्रत्येकस्यमेतत्त्वद्वित्त्वा------- elucidated above are said to be later addition by Max Muller. 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 an irrelevant interpolation as previous translations have suggested.”

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.

Third Boon

The elucidation of the third boon asked by Naciketa encompasses the whole of Kāṭhaka-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:

येव येव प्रेते विचित्रिता मनुष्येऽस्तीत्वेकं नायमस्तीति चैके।
एकधिष्ठानुषिष्ठित्वाहं वरणामेव वर्ष्टौतीव। ॥ (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 गमने 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.

On the other hand, 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 प्रकृतें इति. The word प्रकृत here implies utmost superior (state), and the predicate इति derived by the root इति 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 Nāciketa 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

39. चेत्विषिविक्षित्संसरां; प्रेते पूर्वे गमने अतिपरवेश्येको अस्वतीनिन्फ्रीमनेवुद्धि-व्यविविधो देहनिरस्वसमन्वयानेको निरपमतित पैकेः | Ś. Ku. Bh. p.19.
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-Vedânta.

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 where 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: "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 वर्षश्च मेवरणीयम् 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, goals, 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

\(^{40}\) Vide, अपने संस्कृतवर्तमान स्थानां अपूर्वतः हि भायते | | Vācaspati’s Bhāmati I.1.1.

\(^{41}\) तु गृहः अन्य वर्ष्य सत्तितिवित्वोलकः | R.Ku.KHD. p.7.
Naciketa has points of similarity with that related to Gautama, the Buddha.42

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 मुद्यमः नात्म तस्माय विचेताः वृणीते (1.1.29) and keeps himself silent before his preceptor God Yama.

Second Valli

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 Sreyas and that of preyas. The Kātha statement is quite conspicuous -

शत्रु हि धीरोजिमिः प्रेयसं वृणीते प्रेयसं मन्दो योग्यं एवाद 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. Of course, 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

and the latter the Radhakrishnan understands as the path of house holders. 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 śvetambara. 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 persuits, is the one who does reach the final state of transcendedal joy. In the same spirit, Yama further says -

दुर्मते विपरीते विपूली अविद्या या च विस्थते जाता। (1.2.4) - that the path of Śreyas and preyas in correspondence with the path of Vidyā or knowledge and the path of Avidyā 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.

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

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.
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:

\[
\text{न सामरायः प्रतिभानि बालं प्रमाध्युं विलमोहेन मूढः } \quad (1.2.6)
\]

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.

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:

\[
\text{आश्चर्यः बक्ता कुशलोऽय लक्ष्मिक्ष्योऽया कृता कुशलानुपिनिः } \quad (1.2.7)
\]

The *Kathopanisad* here spells out a well accepted fact regarding the importance of a preceptor who can take the disciple to a higher flights

---

44. Cf. *Mund.Up.* II.8,
with the themes of transcendental contemplation. And the disciples who have come up to 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.

(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 नरेन्द्रवेण प्रोक्त एव 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.

46. Cf. Bhagavadgītā, II.29
47. Cf. Mund.Up. II.4
Adding to the necessary qualification of a preceptor, the *Kathaka* text makes a statement:

अनन्यप्रोक्ते गतिरत्र नास्लि अणीयान् छाृत्त्वर्य्यू अणुप्रमाणात् (1.2.8)

Here, the term अनन्यप्रोक्ते gives diverse meanings through the interpretations of Śaṅkara and Madhva. Firstly Śaṅkara 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.

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.

Of course, four-fold meaning of the term अनन्यप्रोक्ते given by Śaṅkara 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 Śaṅkara’s conclusion in toto.”

On the other hand, Madhva’s interpretation of the statement अनन्यप्रोक्ते गतिरत्र नास्लि states that no right knowledge arises when taught

by a person, who himself thinks to be identical with Brahman. This implies that अन्तः is one who does not realise the difference between oneself and Brahman.49

In precise, according to Madhva’s statement the Upaniṣadic term नरेण्य 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 subdinate to matter etc. Therefore, their concept of God is inferior and hence they have not understood him correctly.50 Thus, it is explicit that jiva and Brahman 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 jiva 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 वाक्योपायः.

In this spirit, the succeeding mantra :

नैषा तर्केण मतिरापनेत्या प्रोक्तान्येव सुज्ञानाय प्रेष । (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

49. अन्तः भगवन्योज्यासिंज्ञात्मानहस्त: | तेन प्रेक्षो गविजिनं नासित । प्रोक्ताश्चेत्येव सुज्ञानाय अभेज्य वाक्यसेवात् । M.Bh. Ku. p.8.
50. नैषात्मक्यात्मव्यावहरण प्रेक्षः; अक्नः; अक्रृतः; कुतः। भवते प्रकृत्युपवेदाकाव्यपूवन्तप्रकृत्युपवेदाकाव्यस्वदेवतादि नानाप्रकाशेय विन्यमाण: सन् तीर्थ: यथायक्ष्यमी येन न भवति | R.Ku.Khd. p.10
51. जीवानेचं विषोश ये न वेच्य भिन्दा पुममाद । कस्तुज्ञात्र ये केवल्य तेवां जान्न जायते । | इति ब्रह्मवैद्यवेदः | M.Ku. Bh. p.8.
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 *Upasāṅhāra 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 jīvātman and Brahman; and he desires to impart this knowledge to his disciple. Naciketa who has approached him to receive the same with unstinted devotion.

**A) 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 शेषविधित्वनित्यं न हि अरुः। प्राप्ते हि धृतवं 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 (शेषवधि) 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.\textsuperscript{52}

Raṅgārāmānuja too interprets the \textit{mantra} in the same manner.\textsuperscript{53}

Along the current of the Upaniṣadic thought, Madhva interprets this \textit{mantra} as to describe the nature of Supreme Brahman with some epithets like \textit{शेषवधि}, \textit{अनित्य} etc. In clear terms -

1. The word शेषवधि means the most excellent and final goal i.e., Supreme Brahman.

2. The term अनित्य also is referred to Brahman as He is conveyed by अकार and who is ever-eternal.

3. The term धृवर्व 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.\textsuperscript{54}

Surprisingly enough, this interpretation appears to be unusual, for it applies the words like अनित्य 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 \textit{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

\textsuperscript{51} S.Ku.Bh. p.42

\textsuperscript{52} S.Ku.Bh. p.42

\textsuperscript{53} Rangaramanuja Ku.Bh. pp 66-67.

\textsuperscript{54} M.Ku.Bh. p.8
preceding mantra [नेषा तर्कण ---- 1.2.9] and the succeeding mantra [कामस्यालिनि ---- 1.2.11]. As such, to maintain singular balance in the prakaraṇa the mantra requires to be understood without being affected. If so, the present mantra [जानामयं शेषविधि --- 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 Raṅgārāmānuja’s interpretation too. Thus, Madhva interpretation is closer to the Upaniṣadic context.

The Kāṭhaka Upaniṣad unveils the nature of the Supreme Brahman with some more epithets like कामस्यालिनि, जगतः प्रतिष्ठा, क्रत्रोः आनन्दम्, अभवय पारः, स्तोमः, महतुर्गायः, प्रतिष्ठा etc. in the mantra कामस्यालिनि (1.2.11).55 However, these words represent the Supreme Brahman as Saguṇa Brahman or Hiranyagarbha56 according to Śaṅkara.57 In precise, he means कामस्यालिनि the end of 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.; क्रत्रोः आनन्दम् the infinitude of meditation which is nothing but the state of Hiranyagarbha; अभवय पारः the utmost limit of

56. Commenting on the Śvetāsvatara text : हिरण्यगर्भ जन्मायास् पूर्वस्त | (111.4), Śaṅkara says : जिति समाजे अद्वैतलं ज्ञानं गाधेः अतः सारं यथं तथ। Therefore Hiranyagarbha is the creator and is of the nature of knowledge; since ‘desire’ attends knowledge, Hiranyagarbha is said to be possessing of the faculty of the power of desire.
57. कामस्यालिनि समाजे, अद्वैतव सर्वं कामः परिभाषा; जगतः साध्वभविदन्यत्वदादेव, प्रतिष्ठामायं सर्वास्तखचाय, क्रत्रोः कल्ले कामस्य पद्मस्यालिनिनस्य | Ś.Ku.Bh. p.43.
fearlessness; उत्सर्गायिः the existensive course of Hiranyagarbha;⁵⁸ स्लोम महत विस्मृति (से कायाः) यथासिद्धिः - praise worthy as it is abounding in super-excellence. In addition to this, Naciketa too is raised to the state of Hiranyagarbha 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, कामस्थानि etc., are the epithets applied to Hiranyagarbha aspect of Brahman by Śaṅkara; while, Madhva construes word कामस्थानि with an adverbial noun अन्वयस्वाभाविकः and applies to the subject in the sentence i.e., Naciketa. Thus is the statement हे हिरण्यगर्भ विराज्ञि अन्वयस्वाभाविकः - “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 adjectives like .... क्रीतं आनन्दम, अभयय पारं, स्लोम महत, उपनामम, प्रतिष्ठा इत्यदि. All these adjectives represent Brahman as Supremely Superior i.e., क्रीतं आनन्दम = Brahman who bestows endless fruits for the deeds and knowledge dedicated to Him, अभयय पारं = Bestower of fearlessness, स्लोम महत = He who cannot be fully described even by Vedic hymns, उपनामम = He who is sung by great⁶⁰ Caturmukha Brahma and other souls aspiring for liberation, प्रतिष्ठा = He who is the Refuge of liberated souls.

⁵⁸. Through this course is attained the state of Hiranyagarbha, lasting for a long time till final dissolution. Vide, अनेकाकलस्वाधि हिरण्यगर्भपर्यं गमन्त इति यजुर्वेद बिस्मृतितिस्तुवद् | Gopalyati’s gloss on Ś.Ku.Bh. p.44.
⁵⁹. नामकरणायोजना यथाश्च। फलेचारं कार्यसाधनशुचिकारणस्तु सत्यं सत्यर्हेष यजुरवेद बिस्मृतितिस्तुवद् | अते प्राथानुवर्तनोऽतिसि | Ś.Ku.Bh. p.43. वल्लभानुवर्तनोऽतिसि वल्लभानुवर्तनोऽतिसि | Gopalyati’s gloss on Ś.Ku.Bh. p.44.
This is how Madhva upholds manifold facets of the Supreme Brahman, but does not bring in Hiranyagarbha or Saguṇa 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, दूर्दर्श्म्, गूढमनुप्रविष्टम्, गूढाहितिम्, गद्धरेष्टम्, 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) दूर्दर्श्म् = (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)
     (2) He has entered all to regulate them. (M)

(c) गूढाहितिम् = (1) It is located in the intellect. (Ś)
     (2) It is hidden in the hearts of liberated jivas. (M)

(d) गद्धरेष्टम् = (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 तत्तर धर्माद्वितीयाध्यात्मकम् speaks of the fruit obtained by a man who knows Brahman as described above.

The mantra अन्तः धर्माद्वितीयाध्यात्मकम् तत्तत्प्रस्तुतम् तत्तद् speaks of 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 प्रत्येकातारं गृहं पृथ्वीप्रत्येकातारं परम्. Here the word अम्बर read along with ओऽम् occurring in the previous mantra is quite significant in its designating Brahman as Supremely Superior.

The phrase प्रत्येकातारं गृहं 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 (Hiranyaagarbha or Saguna Brahman) - and the Supreme Brahman (i.e., Nirguna Brahman). As Śaṅkara states that the phrase प्रत्येकातारं गृहं 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 Oṁ is symbolically used. One who knows Supreme Brahman as signified by Oṁ accepts it as knowable, and if the inferior Brahman is acknowledged by Oṁ. It becomes attainable. And the same phrase repeated for the third time, is applied to the result thereof. For a knower of inferior Brahman, it becomes attainable object. So also, for a knower

62. प्रत्येकातारं गृहं पृथ्वीप्रत्येकातारं परः च। तथेहि प्रतिक्षेतदंश्चारम्। प्रत्येकातारं ज्ञात्वपि यो विद्यति परमपरं वा तस्य तद्भवति। प्रर्वं चेष्टात्वम् (य) परं चेष्टात्वायम्। Ś.Ku. Bh. p.48.
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 एतद्वेवाः स्वामी as Imperishable Brahman. He finds no difference between Saguna Brahman [Hiranyagarbha] and Supreme Brahman. For Him, both are the one and the same. अवर्त denotes Brahman’s being imperishable and परं वर्त 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 एतद्वेवाः स्वामी 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 एतद्वेवाः स्वामी 1.2.17 repeated thrice

63. एतद्वेवाः स्वामी विष्णुकाः परमात्माः | सर्वस्यातपि जातामुच्यते नात्र संशयं इति च | M. Ku.Bh. p.9.
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 *Kāṭhaka-Upaniṣad* has emphasis on the point of realisation of Brahman brought about by knowing the Supreme Brahman in its macrocosm nature. Now, the *Kāṭhaka-Upaniṣad* from the mantra 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 जावते प्रियते, न हन्यते, अजस्, in the *mantra* 1.2.18 and नायं 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 अजस् means the same as the phrase न जावते. The Supreme Brahman is everlasting hence it is called *Purāṇah*. 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,

---

64. न जावते नोप्यते प्रियते च न प्रियो चाय किंचित्तसे वस्तुन्द्रियस्मानेकोष्ठिक्षिप्यासामावळो जन्मविनासस्वरुपे विनिर्विभिन्न सर्वाविनािसांशिष्यो न जावते प्रियते बैलो | ।

| S.Ku.Bh. p.49-51 |
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 [विपरि] 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 Brahmā-loka. 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 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 tauch-stone of the context in which the mantra न जायते ---- |(1.2.18) is read. The preceding mantra : एतदालम्बनं जात्वा 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 Brahmā). When this expressive meaning holds

65. भावाभावी न बिद्वेशो सम्माजोऽरो न कर्तव्य | जायते स्मिरय वापिव स्वरूपेन कर्तव्य | अरो स्मिरयोऽविषयः जीवः
   पूर्णसत्त्वार्थाय | अरो भावाभावी कुलेषिकाः न बभूषण सम्माजात्वार्थाय विषयभावनात्माः जायते न ध्रुवतेः च | वत्स: कल्याणाः स्वतः
   न ध्रुवः | देहसम्बन्धसदृशो निर्विशेषतादेहसम्बन्धामाः जायते न ध्रुवते च | M.Ku.Bh. p.10.

66. अतक्रूर्तम् न सकेन्द्रसन्तोष साधिते भ्राता तत् कृष्णिनिर्योविकारार्हितवायस्य | R.Ku.Khd. p.146.
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 meaning of ब्रह्मान्तोऽह महोदयेि is kept alive
with that of विश्वस्थित् 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 अग्निर्विव्रद्धिन महतो महोदयेि in the mantra 1.2.20,67 पुरुषात्र परं किंचित्
and सा काम्या सा परा गतिः in the mantra 1.3.11 as well as दुःत्ते त्वग्न्या बुद्ध्या
सुभ्यर्य सुभ्यदशिशिः 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, अग्नित्व or महत्तव of
Brahman do not come in the purview of the Highest Brahman in its
absolute sense.68

68. अग्नित्व यद्यति सोऽके वर्तु तत्रभवाःस्नमन नित्यगःस्नलक्षस्मिं | तदात्मा विनियुक्तमस्चितं महोदयोि तस्मादस्यस्वेताः-
वेङा। | S.Ku.Bh. p.52
Excepting the intervention of limiting adjuncts to represent Brahman as अपि or महान्, Madhva finds no difference from Śaṅkara in interpreting the mantra अण्णोरीवान् 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 धानुप्रसाद - 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, पुरुषाः न परं किंचित् and सा काश्च सा परा मातिः । 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 [परामर्श्य]. In this way Brahman's being without second is the point of main emphasis.

69. R.E. Hume - ‘Thirteen Principal Upaniṣad’, p.352
70. पुरुषाः न परं किंचित् | समस्ताति पुरुषाः ब्रह्मभवनार्थं किंचिदि वस्तवते तस्मात्स्वभावभवत्वा तस्मात्तत्वमहत्त्वमहाभवते तस्मात् | अति विनन्दितेन आर्येऽपि सृष्टिभविनिर्माते भवति | अति एते च गुणां सर्वं भविन्यां सङ्गारिणीं परं प्रकृति गति ||
M.Ku.Bh. p.69; यद्वा न निवर्तिले वद्यम परं माती । - B.G. (8.21), (15.6)
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 आसीनः दूरं व्रजति शायानौ याति सर्वतः | (1.2.21).72 The phrase आसीनः and दूरं व्रजति, as well as शायानः 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 शायानः and याति सर्वतः speak of contradictory meanings. It appears to be sleeping, but, 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

71. पुरुषार्थं किसिच्चाति या पुरुषं क्रांतं अवस्थं देवतात्रादिप्रश्नतपूर्ति | R.Ku.Khd. p.16.
73. यदा चैं क्रमसामस्याविज्ञानस्तुविन्यत यतीत्व यदा विशेषविज्ञानस्तु स्वेच्छ रूपेण स्थित एव सम्भवं आदित्यतिः तदुपाधिक्लास्तूरं व्रजति | S.Ku.Bh. p.53.
74. करणामपुष्पादिल्लस्मा शुपने करणजनतिभःत्वः विज्ञानस्योपयोगः शायानस्य भवति | Ibid., p.53.
75. अयामाय स्थिरतिगतिनिर्दिष्टविद्वानकेश्वरस्बिधि कर्मविज्ञानस्य रूपं तद्विधिकिलावं चतुष्क्षणेऽवा | Ibid., p.53.
On the other hand, Madhva shows, the opposite qualities of Supreme Brahman like आसीनों 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 अकाशा. 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 अजगीरं शरीरेऽः अनन्वेषयु अवस्थितम् | [1.2.22]

As the Upaniṣadic dictum एष सबं भूतेऽपि गृहोऽस्मान न प्रकाशते | (1.3.12) putsforth that since the self is covered by avidyā, the embodied soul does not perceive the same self within Himself and within all other creatures too. So that the self does not appears 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: नायमतमा प्रवचनेन लभयो न मेधया न बहुना श्रुतेऽन | (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

76. आसीनों दूरं व्रजति शरीरेऽः वाति सर्वत्र | ऐश्वय्येदं भग्नावर्य प्रियु: विरूद्ध पठयावयमाति च | M.Ku.Bh. p.11
77. अजगीरं शरीरेऽः कल्याणकाल्य आत्मा लग्नेऽविः शरीरेऽः तेषपिपुष्मण्विदिशीनािरावयायमहितेच्य नित्येयवस्थितम् नित्याविकुतःसनत्येत | Ś.Ku.Bh. p.55
78. एष पुरुषं सबं भ्रातिन्यस्ययेऽस्मान शरीरेऽपि गृहोऽस्मान न प्रकाशते | (1.3.12)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
79. Cf.I. 7-9; Mund.Up. III. 2, 3; Bhag. Gita, 1.53.
80. तत्त्वादिन्यन्तकांमात्रेऽ आत्मा विबृहते प्रकाशयति पत्ताकार्याः तत्रू प्रथमा विषयात्मत्तमस्तस्ताः | Ś.Ku.Bh. p.56.
Despite, Madhva has left this mantra uninterpreted, one can refer to Raghavendrayati’s interpretation to seen 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 प्रकाश्ये in the mantra above, 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 Munḍaka 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 प्रामु शाक्यो 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. गुरुस्वः अंत्तिन्त्राः सन् न प्रकाश्ये तत्त्वं कि दर्शनाय प्रवाहन्नेव्यत उक्तं। दर्श्यं इति तुथ्यत्क्षतब्रह्मरूपात्मामात्र।| R.Ku.Khd. p.16.
In the words of Śaṅkara’s interpretation, the word अशाल्म 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 अशाल्म, अस्पष्ट, अरूप, अव्यय, असरस, अनन्त, अनादि etc., culminate into a single aspect of Brahman as ultimately Eternal. Besides, all such negations reject mundane relations with Supreme Self.

For Madhva, the terms अशाल्म, अस्पष्ट etc., speak of transemphirical 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.

83.  अशाल्ममपरमप्रभवं तथावस्तस्तितमनवध्व्य यत् | एतद्वशेषार्थं ब्रह्मच्चत | पदी प्रादित्याः शचित्तं श्वस्मादाव-मन्त्रव्यवस्तं न भैरवति न भैरवति न भैरवति तदनियमितं तः न व्याहारिनिलयम् | Ś.Ku.Bh. p.75.
84.  यथा कर्तव्यै: फलारिकायैः पदविनापनिताः पूर्वं न च स्त्रेाच्छन्नात्तदं ब्रह्माणोऽत्मितं नित्यम् | Ś.Ku.Bh. pp.75-76.
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 Nirguna 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 महावर्ग that is enjoyer of the fruit of the deeds: य इम महावर्ग बद्र आत्मां जीवमलिकात् (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 महावर्ग 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 महावर्ग 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 अन्तःक्रमो एतरां [Maitri. Upaniṣad. 6.10]
(2) अस्य निगुणो भोक्ता [Ibid. 6.10]
(3) भोक्ता च प्रभुर्व च [Gītā 9.24]
(4) भर्तर्भोक्ता महोक्तरस् [Ibid. 13.22] etc.
The phrase ‘एतद्व तन्त्र’ 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.\(^\text{85}\)

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

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{या प्राणेन संभवत्वदिनिदिव्यरत्नामे} & \\
\text{गुहां प्रविश्य तिथिं यथा भूतपूर्वविभायते} & \text{एतद्वत्} \quad (2.1.7)
\end{align*}
\]

In general, this mantra proclaims Brahman as manifesting with Prāṇa, 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. This aspect of Hiranyagarbha’s birth is reiterated by another phrase - भूतपूर्वविभायत। 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.\(^\text{86}\)

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 *Upanisad* 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.

---

\(^\text{85}\) एतद्व तन्त्र पवित्रव एतद्व एतद्व वायुमायुर्वकं तैः | R.Ku.Khd. p.19b

\(^\text{86}\) या सविद्वायमयी सविद्वायस्तत्विका प्राणेन हिरण्यगर्भरूपेण पवित्रव श्रद्धा। संभवति सविद्वायमयी नामदिव्यदिव्य || तामेव विविधताः यथा भूतपूर्वविभायत। समासिता व्यज्ञायत | Ś.Ku.Bh. p.86.
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 मलय, कूम, etc., along with creating many things - animate and inanimate.87

In the light of Madhva's commentary on this particular mantra the phrase प्राणेन संविविषेत implies indwellership of Brahman; अदिति designates Brahman as the destroyer; देवतामयी represents Brahman as Supremely Superior to all gods, and भूतेपभविन्नतत्त describes Brahman as creator or the universe. In addition to this explanation the use of the pronoun त्त 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 त्त in feminine gender finds significance.

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


tataḥ चतुष्कोटिः सूर्योऽस्मिन च गच्छति ।  
taṁ देवां समेऽ अर्पितास्तु नात्मेऽनिः कश्चन । एतहैं 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.

87. अदनदितिविविषूः, प्राणसहित, स्थितं । उत्तमं देवताभ्यां योज्यते विविष्यतो । मलयकूमादिशेषोऽपि गुहासंज्ञातांजन्तु ।  
भूतेपभविन्नतत्त। स्वाभासा च चरित्री च । देवतामयी देवतोत्तमा । M.Ku.Bh. p.16.
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 Hiranyaagarbha.\(^8\)\(^9\) Thus, Śaṅkara gives here a room for Hiranyaagarbha’s role, which in fact is not directly proposed in the Upaniṣad.

As said before, Madhva does not see any difference between Saguna Brahman and Nirguna Brahman; for him, Supreme Brahman is the only one and He imbibes in Himself both Saguna and Nirguna 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 viewpoint. 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 Raghavendrayati’s interpretation. The rising of the sun at the time of creation, setting down of the sun at the time destruction, is verily due to the Supreme Brahman, denoted by the term तद्व 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 नात्म्यतं कर्षणं । is an expressive of unsurpassable nature of the Supreme Brahman in anyway.\(^9\)\(^0\)

Providing an introduction,\(^9\)\(^1\) Śaṅkara says that as the nature of Supreme Brahman is difficult to know, another method of ascertaining the nature of Supreme Reality is applied in the following mantra:

---

89. तद्वधच्च सम्माचारणादुपूर्वपुत्रदिव्यतिः सुरूवीरानां निम्नोऽसां यद्यस्मिन्नेव च प्राणःहन्यान्ति गच्छति।

90. | ^ ^ | 4 ^ ^T; 3Tfe cWlfarq

91. TfRft 3TRWT; WMi s.Ku.Bh. p.92.

---

\(^8\)\(^9\) Ś. Ku. Bh. p.87

\(^9\)\(^0\) R. Ku.Kh. p.20b.

\(^9\)\(^1\) S. Ku. Bh. p.92.
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 शोचति, विमुक्तः and विमुख्यते respectively.

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

(1) 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) विमुख्यते - 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 commentatories 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 शुचिप्रयुग्नतरिक्षसदृष्टा वेदिष्टहृदयतिरंगसन्।
गुप्तदर्स्तृनमित्योगसद्वर्गो गोजा ऋतुता अद्विता ऋतु ऋतु। (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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Śaṅkara</th>
<th>Madhva</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) हंस = Mover</td>
<td>(1) हंस = Free from blemishes and the essence of all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) शुचिप्रयुग = Dweller as the Sun in the sky.</td>
<td>(2) शुचिप्रयुग = Indweller of Vāyu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) वसु = One who provides dwelling for all.</td>
<td>(3) वसु = The form of a bliss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) अन्तरिक्षसन्त = A dweller in the intermediate space.</td>
<td>(4) अन्तरिक्षसन्त = Dwelling in the firmament.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) होता = Fire</td>
<td>(5) होता = Enjoyer of His own objects like शब्द etc. being dwelt in the essence of jiva.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) वेदिपत् = Resider on the earth.</td>
<td>(6) वेदिपत् = Dweller in the sacrificial altar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) अतिचिह = Soma juice</td>
<td>(7) अतिचिह = He who has the best collection of the objects of enjoyment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

92. Cf. Rg.veda. IV. 40,5; Vajasaneyi Samhitā - X.24; XI.14; Taittiriya Samhitā : 3.2.10.1; Satapatha Brahmana : 6.7.3.11
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>द्वीरोणसद्ध =</td>
<td>He who dwells in a jar of soma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>नृपतत् =</td>
<td>Indweller of all men.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>वसससा =</td>
<td>Indweller of gods like Brahman etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>वृत्तसादि =</td>
<td>Dweller in the space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>भोमसादि =</td>
<td>Dweller of goddess Lakṣmī in whom the universe is woven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>अभ्ज =</td>
<td>Born in water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>गोज =</td>
<td>Born on the earth as paddy, barely etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>कृत्तज =</td>
<td>Born in the sacrifice as its appendages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>अद्धि =</td>
<td>Born from mountains as rivers etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>कृत्तं =</td>
<td>Unchanging in nature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>वृहत्त =</td>
<td>The cause of all.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(8) द्वीरोणसद्ध = A dweller in a jar or as a Brāhmaṇa guest dwelling in houses.
(9) नृपतत् = Indweller of all men.
(10) वसससा = Indweller of gods.
(11) वृत्तसादि = Dweller in the sacrifice.
(12) भोमसादि = Dweller in the space.
(13) अभ्ज = Born in water.
(14) गोज = Born on the earth as paddy, barely etc.
(15) कृत्तज = Born in the sacrifice as its appendages.
(16) अद्धि = Born from mountains as rivers etc.
(17) कृत्तं = Unchanging in nature.
(18) वृहत्त = The cause of all.
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 other hand, 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 Kathopanisad as below -

उर्व भ्रानामृतर्वपायं भ्रान्मस्यति।
महें वामनमाती 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 [अन्य] 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 necessitated here as is experienced by one and all in the physical world. And hence this remark is unwanted.

93. यदेन्न वद्युक्तान्वमस्य भाववृत्तप्वयप्येण स: अन्य: सिद्ध इति वाक्यायं। | Ś.Ku.Bh. p.95.
Madhva has not interpreted this mantra as the meaning of it is clear by itself. Yet, reading Rāghavendrayati’s gloss on this mantra makes it explicit that the Supreme Brahman directs the prāṇa vāyu upward and the apāṇa 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) अस्त्यमात्रः पुरुषो मध्य आत्मिन तिष्ठति | (2.1.12)96
(2) अस्त्यमात्रः पुरुषोज्जरात्मा सदा जनानां हृदये समिनिविश्यते | (2.3.17)

In addition to the idea contained in the previous mantra, the Upanişad declares that both prāṇa and apāṇa can not be the source of life. Because, they for their own maintenance, have resorted to the Supreme Source of life i.e., the Supreme Brahman. This is explained in the mantra - म प्राणेन नापातेन मन्यों जीवितं कर्त्तन | (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 एवं सुपक्ष जागरि कामं कामं पुरुषो निर्विमाणम् ----- | (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 describes the nature of Brahman by illustrating two examples of Agni and Vāyu - अनिन्यकों भुवनं प्रविष्टं रूपं रूपं प्रतिरूपो भूमृत् । (2.2.9); वायुविकों भुवनं प्रविष्टं रूपं रूपं प्रतिरूपो भूमृत् । (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 भूमृत् Madhva differs from Śaṅkara in bringing out its metaphysical importance.

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.

---

⁹⁸ Cf. Bṛh.Ar. II.5.19.
⁹⁹ Cf. Brih.Ar. II.5.19.
¹⁰⁰ Cf. Bṛh.Ar. II.5.19.
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 -

एकत्वत्वा सर्वभूतानन्तरत्वा न लिपते लोकदुःखेन बाध्यः । (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 uneffected by the defects of the eternal eye.

In the understanding of this mantra, Śaṅkara explains the pure nature of the Supreme Brahman 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. Sorrow 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 at least 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 सर्वभूतानाम् - - - (2.2.12),102 नित्ये नित्यानां चेतनश्चेतनानां - - - (2.2.13).103 His unequivocal nature lies in his manifold manifestations. This is conveyed by the Upaniṣadic phrase एकं रूपं बहुं वचनिष्ठं 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 :

अ तत्र सूर्यां भाति न चन्द्रतत्त्वकम् इ
तेन विभवे भाति कुलोद्यम्ममिद् इ
tपेष भाति महं भाति सर्वम् इ
tथस्य भासा सर्वसिद्धि विभाति इ (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 lustruous 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 lumanaries such as - the fire, the sun and other higher gods like .... Indra, Vāyu, Yama, shine and execute their duties from the fear of the Brahman. Thus, the entire universe functions under the command of the Supreme Brahman.105

Thus, declares the *Upaniṣad* -

\[
\text{यदियं किं च जगत् सर्वं प्राण एतं तत् निःसृतं}
\text{।}
\text{महद्भयं वज्रमुखतं श्रव्यं एतच्छ्वेदुपः भवनि} \| (2.3.2)
\text{भयद्वयाधिनिदयः प्रभवति प्रभवति} \| (2.3.3)\]

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 - "अर्थमूलोऽवाक्षाय एपिमक्वत्यं समातनं" (2.3.1).107 In the light of Śaṅkara’s commentary, the mantra provides with a reason why the saṁsāra 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 Hiranyagarbha 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.

105. Cf. कम्मलु || B.S. 1.3.39.
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 consisting of the realisation of one’s identity with Supreme Brahman.\textsuperscript{108}

This tree of the world which is called \textit{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.\textsuperscript{109}

Following Madhva’s interpretation, this \textit{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 \textit{Aśvattha}. The \textit{Aśvattha} is thus derived from आष्ट्रु quick + व्या to go + क (अ) affix = अष्ट्र ‘quick moving’. The elision of उ and the shortening of आ into अ are Vedic anomalies. अष्ट्र + व्य = अष्ट्र अष्ट्रिणिनिति or अष्ट्रय स्यम् अस्य = अष्ट्रवय: that which stands firm like the fig tree or अष्ट्रवय may mean “the abode of God or the food of God” : अष्ट्र means then “He who goes very quickly,” i.e., the all-pervading God, and व is elided form of स्या to stand or व = food.

Lord Hari is called \textit{Aṣṭa} because of His quick motion. As this universe is pervaded by Hari, and as it is the food (व=food) of Hari, it is

\textsuperscript{108} सोंसाृष्टु अष्ट्रकार्यादि स्वाधानान: संसारात्यु प्राप्तमुल: | कृत्तिक ब्रह्मचार:|----- अविनास कमकर्म-अक्षम-चोन्दकपो- अपकर्मिणिकृपेन: शकिवमयान्यसं-श्रीमणांपरंदोऽकुः। संस्कर्णिनिलिङ्गेन श्रवण-चन्द्रेऽइलारायोऽद्रितियः विवधानलंकृतः:। भूस्वरूप्यं-चन्द्र-चन्द्रोपदेश-चन्द्रः, यथा, द्वि-तप-अचानकांकियः भुक्तम्:----- तुत्तुत्तवालसरसंसुलकुः नरक-रहकवृक्षं-दुर्ग-दुर्गमुन्त्रान:। सावधानादिन समन्तकंक्रिष्टादि-भृकुटिकः-कृपागांडः।----- वेदाबनिष्ठत-व्रह्मसादसरि:सुः: | सावधानक्षोत्कृतेऽस---| S.Ku.Bh. pp.107-108.

\textsuperscript{109} एष संसारानां-अक्षम-अक्षया-संतत्तात् स्वरूपमुक्तांकतिकातितिभिः। शाक्षाभिबाक्षासः। | समारामानानादिकाजिंगिफ्याः। | यदद्य संसारानांतु पूछे सदैव तुषिध ज्योतिष्याचार्यायानम्। | स्वामिणाम् तदर्भ ब्रह्म संस्कारात्: | तदेवामृतविश्वविश्वाभिभुतायां कथ्यते साक्षात्। | \textit{Ibid.}, p.108.
called Asvattha. This universe is beginningless as an eternal current of existence, but the highest eternal and immortal is the Lord Hari. This Asvattha or universe is called Sanatana or eternal in the sense that there is no beginning of it. It is a pravaha 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 Śaṅkara, it is Hiranyagarbha 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) Śaṅkara gives the idea that the world tree is due to ignorance, whereas Madhva understands it to be real.

(3) Madhva brings in the Lakṣmi tattva in describing the picture of world-tree, and said that Lakṣmi is the root of this world-tree. According to Madhva, goddess Lakṣmi, 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 Lakṣmi is the root of the tree. Thus, the intermediation of Lakṣmi in the description of Aśvattha tree may be considered to be not out of the context.

In this connection, Swami Bhakti Vedānta Prabhupada makes a convincing and interesting note: “there is no ready experience in this

110. 3 I | 3H|ld*Ri |

M.Ku.Bh. p.23.
world of a tree situated with its branches down and its roots upward; but there is such a thing. That tree can be found beside a reservoir of water. We can see that the tree on the bank reflect upon the water with their branches down and roots up. In other words, the tree of this material world is only a reflection of the real tree of the spiritual world. This reflection of the spiritual world is situated on desire, just as a tree's reflection is situated on water. Desire is the cause of things being situated in this reflected material light. One who wants to get out of this material existence must know this tree thoroughly through analytical study. Then he can off his relationship with it.

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 Prākṛti, Puruṣa, then the three guṇas, 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 prākṛti is the external energy of the Supreme Lord, and the puruṣa is the Supreme Lord Himself, and that is explained in Bhagavad-gitā. 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:

अत्तर्वोपलब्ध्यात्मकः प्रविषयति || (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 śuddhasattva 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

111. तमादत्त्व-अमृतापम-अमुर्क-अत्तर्वोपलब्ध्यात्मकः प्रविषयति || यदा तु तद्हि-अत्तर्वोपलब्ध्यात्मकः प्रविषयति || स्‌अत्मायुः प्रविषयति || S.Ku.Bh. p.120.
Śaṅkara, Chinmayananda remarks thus: “according to the above textbooks, 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 (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).”

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 (भावते) 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. अभिहृ; सत्तोर्यं भगवानुर्यर्यम्यादिपि केरेजुः। अस्तििं नामस्तत्त्वमयुजताछ्ज: तत्त्वच च। \| प्रकृत्योऽः पुरुषाणां च तत्त्व भावपरि प्रसर्तम्।| तत्त्वभाभवताती विश्वं तत्त्वस्वाद्यस्तत्त्व हि \| | अभिहृथ्य ज्ञात्यो नास्ति: प्रसादस्य तत्त्वविषयः \| | M.Ku.Bh. p.24.
B) The Relation Between Jiva and Brahman

In the philosophical sphere, jiva 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 Kathopanisad earlier. And at this juncture, a reader should know how jiva is related with Brahman. In this connection, the Kathopanisad reads the following mantra -

\[ \text{अनं पिबलो दुःखस्य लोक गुहा प्रविष्टे परमे परायो|} \]
\[ \text{छायातपि ब्रह्मविदो वदलि पञ्चान्यो ये च त्रिभचिकितः॥ [1.3.1]} \]

As the Upanisad records on the basis of the dual form of the terms पिबल्लो, प्रविष्टे existence of two entities is suggested. Yet, in the opinions of the commentators, the upaniṣadic view slightly gets changed. For, Śaṅkara dual form of पिबल्लो and प्रविष्टे refers to two entities - jiva 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 jiva, the real enjoyer in the phenomenal world. This is expressed on the analogy of the umbrella.\(^{114}\)

The phenomenal truth of the desparity between jiva and Brahman is illustrated by the world छायातपि. It is here implied that the non-difference between jiva and Brahman is ultimate truth.\(^{115}\)

So far as Madhva’s view is concerned, one should say that this mantra has no bearing on jīva and Brahman. Rather, his interpretation

---

\(^{114}\) 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.

\(^{115}\) अनं मन्यायतःभागवताकर्मकालं पिबल्लो | एकस्तौ कर्मकालं पिबल्लो दुःखानि नेतस्तथापि पत्नस्वर्ग्यानातिभिविन्यासं द्रूतिन्यायनं | ..... ते च चायातपिविबिष्टाय विलक्षणी संसारलिङ्गं सविस्तरेण्येकं वदलि कथयन्ति | Ś.Ku.Bh. p.58.
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 (ḥṛdaya-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 विवत्तो in 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, विवत्तो, गुहां प्रविष्टी carry balanced meaning. So also, according to Madhva the dual form of विवत्तो 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.

116. आलंकारत्ततीति किसुरेक एक द्विभा स्थित। | म स क्रिया वार्णी परम्परा-पूर्वपक्ष | सुभाषितति भोगान्तकारे विद्वान् प्रथु। | आत्मच चाविन्ते नित्यं मर्यादेन विष्णुपालिनी। | M.Ku.Bh.p.12.
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 “Pibantu” 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 individual soul (jivātman) and the universal (Paramātman). But how can the self which is represented as looking on without eating, be treated as experiencing the rewards of deeds? Śaṅkara, Ramanuja and Srinivas in his commentary-Nimbarka, 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 Brhat 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 disparateness of the individual and the universal souls.118

Then it is said that the two “drinkers” are the jiva and the Lord. The Lord also drinks or experiences the fruit of karma metaphorically. For being always associated with the jiva, He is said figuratively to drink, while the jiva 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 jiva at all, but to Isvara alone. The two that drink are the two aspects of the one and the same Isvara - one as Ātmā dwelling in the heart of the cosmos; and the other as Antarātmā dwelling in the heart of every jiva. This explains the phrase “guham praviṣṭau” also: for both these aspects of the Lord are in the guhā or heart.” However, this remark is false. The phrase “some think” directly applies to Śaṅkara. Yet, as a matter of fact, Śaṅkara does not refer to jiva and Buddhi, but to Jiva and Isvara, 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 jiva and Isvara. 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.

120. Tjpqi 3## | S.Ku.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 Brāhmaṇas, as little as Xenophon need have consulted our Upaniṣad. (II.2) in writing his prologue of prodikos.” Max Müller. ‘SBE’ p.12.
The jiva is called भोक्ता - the enjoyer when it is associated with the body, organs and mind.

\[
\text{आत्मानं रविनं विविक्ष शरीरं रथमेव तु।}
\]
\[
\text{वुद्धि तु सारस्वि विविक्ष मनं प्ररहमेव च॥ (1.3.3)}
\]
\[
\text{इन्द्रियाणि हयानाहुविविश्वासेऽपि गोवर्ण्।}
\]
\[
\text{आत्मेन्द्रियमनोत्सुकं भोक्तत्वाहुर्मनीषण॥ (1.3.4)}
\]

The speciality of Śaṅkara’s interpretations of these two *mantras* lies in explaining the reasons of comparison between the jiva - 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 enjoyership. Its being an enjoyer is due to the limiting adjuncts

---

122. A similar comparison is found in the *Svetāsvatara Upaniṣad* - II 1-9.
such as intellect etc.\textsuperscript{123} Śaṅkara substantiates his view by quoting an authority from the \textit{Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad} - स समान सत्त्वभी लोकानुसंचरति व्यास्तीय तेलाभीय | [IV.III.7]. “It thinks, as it were, and shakes, as it were, etc.” Thus, jiva’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 \textit{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 तत्वद्वाराति यस्माद्विषयो न जावते | (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 \textit{mantra} as below:

\begin{quote}
\begin{center}
123. \textsuperscript{123} श्रीरं रथसेव तु रथवद्यः सः मन्त्रकृत्वापरस्याक्षरां रथसङ्गमाः सरदिः विचिद्र भूमिनः\\
\textsuperscript{123} \textsuperscript{123} \textsuperscript{123} तु, अथवासङ्करकामनाः सरदिः विचिद्र भूमिनः\\
\textsuperscript{123} \textsuperscript{123} \textsuperscript{123} तु, अथवासङ्करकामनाः सरदिः विचिद्र भूमिनः\\
\textsuperscript{123} \textsuperscript{123} \textsuperscript{123} तु, अथवासङ्करकामनाः सरदिः विचिद्र भूमिनः\\
\end{center}
\end{quote}
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 'तद्विष्णोऽर्थम् 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 Saguna 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 Hiranyagarbha; then he explains the etymolgical 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.

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 Vāsudeva,’ the Paramātman.”126

124. Ś.Ku.Bh. p.66.
The mantra इन्द्रियेऽपि तथा ह्यं । (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 - इन्द्रियेऽपि तथा ह्यं । 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 'इन्द्रियेऽपि तथा ह्यं' 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, 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 परमात्मन्यकृत्वकालिकाम्य एवं इति' (1.3.11). Śaṅkara says that the अवज्ञा 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 अवज्ञा. This Puruṣa is so called as he fills up everything and rules out the possibility of anything being higher

---

\(^{127}\) Cf. इन्द्रियानि पाण्यासहितंद्रियेऽपि पर मन: || मनस्तु पद: शुद्धियाः कुद्रे: पततस्तु स: || Bhagavadgītā, 3.42.

\(^{128}\) ब्रह्मसत्त्वं सर्वज्ञानुकूल्यां अवज्ञणात्म्यतावदायम् महान्सर्वं सत्यवद्यथायात्मायथम् जाते हृदयार्थतत्वं श्रौधार्थकमः महामान्यम् कुद्रे: पर हृदयात् || S.Ku.Bh. p.66.
than Him. Thus, there is no substance subtler or more pervasive than Puruṣa, as such the Upaniṣad declares - ‘पुरुषाय परं किंचित्ता कांज्या सा परा गतिः’ (1.3.11). The Puruṣa-tattva here is identified with the Supreme Truth which is well-confirmed in the statement - ‘सा काज्या 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 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, अर्ध, मनस्, वुञ्छि, 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, बार्त्ती and पार्वती. Of the five objects such as शब्द, स्पर्श, रूप, रस, and गन्ध, सौपर्णी and बार्त्ती preside over two each, and पार्वती presides over the fifth object. These gods are higher than the presiding deities of the senses [five जानन्दिय + five कर्मन्दिय] who are सोम, कुबेर, सूर्य, वर्ण, अख्विन्स, अनि, इन्द्र, जयन्त, सम and दक्ष.

129. भागवद्याने तालम्यानालब्ने कार्यमिदि भावेन देखवातालम्यमाह | R.Ku.Khd. p.16b
‘अर्थां भवत् परं मनों’ - the presiding deities - श्रव, गरुद्ध and गं मनस् are higher than the deities presiding over अर्थां.

‘मनसस्तु परा बुद्धिः’ - goddess Sarasvatī presiding over बुद्धि is higher than the deities presiding over मनस्.

‘बुद्धिरात्मा महान् पराः’ - god Brahmā presiding over Mahat-tattva is superior to the deity presiding over बुद्धि.

‘महान् परम अवक्ताम्’ - goddess Lakṣmī presiding over अवक्तान [prakṛti] is superior to the deity presiding over Mahat.

‘अवक्तान् पुरुषः पराः’ - Lastly, Supreme Brahman identified as Puruṣa is superior to the deity presiding over अवक्तान. 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 अर्थां 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 अर्थां means not only रूप, रस, गंभ ... 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 पराः’ [1.3.10]. Śaṅkara understands ‘महान् आत्मा’ as Hiranyagarbha the great soul.

---

¹³⁰ Ś. Ku.Bh. p.66
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 [Hiranyagarbha] 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.

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 : इत्त्रिज्ञेयं परा द्व्यर्थं - (1.3.10) and महतः परमेष्ठकंम् - (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 - पुरुषाः चिन्मात्रत्रवनात् i.e., the mass of pure consciousness - which is nothing but Nirguṇa Brahman. But, the very connotative meaning of the term puruṣa - [पुरुष देहे प्रपन्हो वा शेले]131 indicates Brahman as all-indweller and all-pervasive. Thus, a

reader requires to understand *Puruṣa* as *Saguna Brahman*, but not *Nirguna Brahman*. Thus, 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 काङ्गा सा परा मन्त्व' establishes over all supremacy of Lord Viṣṇu [नर्व विरः परम 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 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

---

¹³². देवेश्वर हिंदुवात्मको ज्यासोंसों भाविमानिनि | सोभवितसमुपात्यो अरुःनन्देदेन्दुसुन्द | यथो दक्षश्चन्तिभिक्षुसागुच्छि बावलो तथा | उमति चार्यमहाइविस्तारो इद्द्रोक देवता | मन्त्रभिमानिनि रहस्तरसपत्यमेवति तु | न श्रेष्ठ बर्माप्रितश्चन्तिभिमानिनि बुद्धस्थःस्वाति | तस्या ब्रह्म महानात्या ततोऽत्थन्तस्वाति तर्क | तत्सात्तु पुरुषो विषुध्यु पूर्वपात्यर्वेन तस्यः | कविधुवतातिरिच्चंद्रस्तु ज्ञाति किमु सा कथा | *M.Ku.Bh.* pp.12-13.
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 पथ्यति... (2.1.10) and मनसेषेवेदमालत्थम् नेह नानास्ति किजलन... (2.1.11)

In both the mantras, the phrases ‘इह नानेव पथ्यति’, ‘नेह नानास्ति किजलन’ and ‘इह नानेव पथ्यति’ 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 इह suggests the sense of ‘as it were’. The phrase ‘इह नानेव पथ्यति’, repeated twice, posits phenomenal truth of the difference and the statement ‘नेह नानास्ति किजलन’ 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.’

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].’

133. उपाधिस्वरुपेदुप्तिःकेशादिविद्याम् भोजति: सत्य इह प्रामाण्यनानाभिरते परमात्मायोऽद्विधाता प्रस्ववं ज्ञानाविद्या प्रतिज्ञाति नानेव पिशाचिक भिलार्थ विषयकृपों स मूर्त्यमक्षान्तरं मूर्त्यम एव पुरांत्वमार्त्यमांस्ववत्स्वित्त्र एव। S.Ku.Bh. pp. 87-88.
134. आते च नानास्तिप्रयथिविद्याय अवशिष्याय निन्दुसवादिह ब्रह्माणि नान नानास्तिकिजलनालम विद्याय। S.Ku.Bh. p.89.
In this manner, the couplet of the two mantras negates the diversity of the word and affirms jivas 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 jiva 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 Vaikuntha 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 says in his commentary on the Brahmāsūtra: ‘न स्यातनतोपि परस्योभवतिदुः सत्वत 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 Brahmāsūtra : ‘उभयव्यपदेशात् त्वहिनिकृप्तवत्’ (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 Brahmāsūtra ‘प्रतिविधात्’ (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

135. यदाप्रियस्य विद्युद्धादितो न संदिप्त । स एव मूलरूपः साक्षात्विद्याभिभ । मूलरूपः वो विद्युद्धादितो न स। गुणस्वरूपतः वापि विदितवां योः परम्परां । अवथितपरं मृणा तस्माद्वयं वास्तवं । भेदार्थस्वरूपत: तस्मा वालि न संस्या । तत्त्वशास्त्रां च गुणां च परस्नम् । क्रियान्ति तेषां भेदविचित्वोऽर्थो विदितः । यात्त्येवांतमात्र नात्र कार्योऽर्थधारणात् । च | M.Ku.Bh. p.18.

136. सम्बन्धशास्त्रां चप्पानां न भिन्न रूपः । सर्वोऽयूथविद्यात्वक्ताय देव ॥ च. आ. 3.2.2.1 ॥ दिति श्रुतः । एकरूपः वो विद्युद्धादितो न संदिप्त । सः सर्वस्वरूपः वापि न संस्या । एवः वाद्यत्वार्थोऽर्थः । चूर्तः च। दिति भालये । मन्तुश्च नर्मनादेशे यस्मिनित्वम् । सत्त्वाविद्याय समाधिरीतिः । विद्युद्धादितो च । च | M.BS.Bh. pp. 759-761.

137. आचार्य भानो विद्युतः (३.२.४) अवधेष एवं एवं अन्तः (३.६.३.३३) दिति उभयव्यपदेशात् त्वहिनिकृप्तवत् पुनः । यदथ आः । कृपः कृपः च । च | M.BS.Bh. p.794

138. ‘एकनेवानदीयम्’ (३.६.२.१) नेत्र स्तावस्ति क्रियन्तः दिति भेदस्य । | M.BS.Bh. pp. 796-797.
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 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-bhedha-varjita*.

Following the commentary of Raṅgarāmānuja, Veerarāgavācārya 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.


मनुष्यानां विद्वानाप्रमाणाय वर्तमानमयम् | अयुद्भने भक्तिमयेन भक्तिमयेन वर्षति | अनेकं ब्रह्म न भक्तिमयेन भक्तिमयेन वर्षति | *Veerarāgavācārya* - *Ku.Bh.* p.114.
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 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:

यथाद्राकं दुर्गत्वा वर्षितपरमितु पवित्रावति | (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:

यथाद्राकं शुद्धादिः शुद्धमात्रिकं तात्घे वभवति | (2.1.15)

Here, the phrase तात्घे वभवति is quite helpful to Madhva to show that the *Upaniṣad* conspicuously supports the theory of difference between jiva 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 jivas. And when Vāyu is liberated, he becomes similar to the Supreme Brahman but not identical. In such case, there is no question of other jivas becoming identical with the Supreme Brahman.140

However, the same phrase does not support the Advaita theory of identity between jiva and Brahman. But, Śaṅkara’s words are explicit to

140. न तु तत्र दुःखान्यो न तिक्ष्णते देवावते | आभासात्मतारूपस्नातु कर्मोदगमस्य सर्ववः || M.Ku.Bh. p.19.
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 jivas in the world of experience go round and round through births and deaths. Such births and deaths are due to the past deeds down by embodied souls in its previous life. Taking this fact into account the Upaniṣad states: स्वायुपमेऽनुसंवति यथाकर्म वधाश्रुतम्। (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 “अने” as ignorant fools as they enter into the womb for assuming the bodies. And some jivas who are extremely inferior follow continuously the state of motionless objects like plants etc. All such diversified embodiments come to be possessed by the jivas under the impulsions 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.

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: “वयांगः परीव द्वृजोऽति तथा गर्द्वर्षलोके छायात्पंयोरिव श्रवणलोके। (2.3.5).

---

141. यथोद्व सुदृढः माते सुदृढः प्रसन्नसिद्धिः प्रक्ष्यात्मकाः समेत जन्यता तद्विघ्र भवायता अन्येष्ठे भवति। Ś.Ku.Bh. p.91.
143. यथाकर्म वधाश्रय कर्म तद्विघ्र भवायता अन्यंकाः कर्मसंह जगन्निः लुस्तार्यावते। तथा च वयांगः द्वृजोऽति च विज्ञानमुपायितं तद्विघ्रैतवर्षर शरीर प्रविशान इत्यर्थ। Ś.Ku.Bh. p.98.
144. या, द्वृजोऽति।
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 Pitṛ loka; as in waters a little more visible, so in the Gandharva loka; and in the Brahma loka, the Lord is seen as in the day, when there is proper light and shade.

In the light of the commentaries of Śaṅkara 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 Pitṛ loka as in the waters. And lastly, in the world of Brahma, 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 Brahma-loka.145

In the frame-work of Śaṅkara'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.

145. नीवे स्थितमतु भाववतं दृष्टं ज्ञातिष्ठितिः। अद्वैत सुखवतं सम्पृवद्व तथा पिण्डसीयकः।
ततः स्मृतिः भस्मत्वश्रवणे हस्तं हरि जम्वालयं नियोगायं कर्मवाहिनि दृष्टं हि।
स्पष्टं तथा ब्रह्मात्मिकं दृष्टं अनुभवयाम्। सति च। || M.Ku.Bh. p.24.
The vision arising for mental impressions in the dream is not distinct. So also, indistinct is the vision of the self in Pitṛloka. 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.\textsuperscript{146}

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, an 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

\textsuperscript{146}Tapasyāśabdāh pratiñānādityamānaṁ paramād ātmano ātmanādityamānaṁ sarvānātmanātmano deśe tathā devāyaṁ. | \textsuperscript{16}Pradyatā saḥ kṛṣṇo prāṇamayaṁ gajagajāṇātmano dasikāt. | \textsuperscript{17}Sahajātyā deśe tathā gajagajāṇātmano dasikat. | \textsuperscript{18}\textsuperscript{19}Sahajātyā deśe tathā gajagajāṇātmano dasikat. | S.Ku.Bh. p.112.
clearly, then, why should after all one try to realise the Eternal Self within oneself [during his life time].\textsuperscript{147} The answer to this question is given in the next mantra that runs as below:

\begin{quote}
इन्द्रियाणां पृयम्भाक्ष्यमहत्म्यमयै च यत् । (2.3.6)
\end{quote}

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, Ākāśa, 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:

\begin{quote}
इन्द्रिया यं परं मनो मनसः सत्त्वमुत्तमम् ।
सत्त्वादिधि महानात्मा महतोध्वस्तमुत्तमम् || (2.3.7)
अव्यक्तातु परं पुरुषो खापकोलिङ्ग एव च । (2.3.8)
\end{quote}

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

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{147} इन्द्रियाणां श्रोतादीनां स्वभविषयाग्रहणोपेतेऽस्मि स्वकारणाय अति विनयात्मकं पृथग्युप्त, उपराज्यामात्रमयः विद्युते नाति केवलान्त्विजुमात्मास्वप्नांपूर्वे भवे स्वभाव विलक्षणादिकताः तथा स्मार्तेदिर्द्विष्प्रमुद्वास्यायिनी जोत्सनामिलानी जागतात्मा परस्योपेतेऽन्तः कत्वमन हि मनवा ज्ञातव विवेकतो भोजे पीयाने शोचति | S.Ku.Bh. p.113.
\end{quote}
hierarchy among the gods and shows that the functions of gods and the sense organs are under the command of the Supreme Brahman.\footnote{For details, \textit{Supra.} pp.13-15.}

Of course, 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 \textit{Upanisad} declares to Naciketa the nature of jiva and Brahman with the employment of an analogy of \textit{Munja} grass:

\begin{quote}
\begin{verbatim}
तं स्वाच्छरीतत्त् प्रवहेनमुज्ञादिविपकः धेरेण \।
तं विद्याचुक्रमृगं नं विद्याचुक्रमृगमृतमिति \। (2.3.17)
\end{verbatim}
\end{quote}

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 (\emph{शीक्षच्छम}) from the reed (\emph{मुज्ञ्व}) 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.\footnote{\textit{S.Ku.Bh.} p.124}

It is a surprising thing to a reader that the same analogy has been taken by Madhva to illustrate absolute difference between jiva 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 Jīvasvarūpa-heart. One should realise the distinction between himself and the Brahman who is present as inner controller. The word Śarīra here refers to Jīva. 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.

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. Of course, the distinction between the body and the soul is beyond doubt. This distinction is not denied by any philosopher, 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.

150. शतोपूर्वो विष्णूसः जीवस्वद्दशनो यत् | अविभिन्नतं तेनेवं बिजातेऽनातु पुर्वकः तत् | स्वाभावतः शतियतु जीवातु प्रवहिते | विष्णुमूलयमः | ---- देहाकुटुंबिंशो देहेऽजीवाकुटुंबिंशा हति | जीवस्य स तु जितेऽजीवाद्भदेन पुक्तयेः | M.Ku.Bh. p.25.
The epithets of Brahman such as गुरु, अमृतं clarify the distinction between the Brahman the inner controller and the jiva.151

C) Means of attaining Liberation

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:

पराजिते खानि व्यतृणत् स्वयम्भूस्तमात्याराज्यति नानारात्मन्।
कविष्ठाधीर्य: प्रत्यागात्मनैमेयात्वत्स्यदृश्युस्मृत्वमिच्छन्॥ [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.

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, hiṁsitavān 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

151. संसारसिद्धिः अभेदो चाहिता केषापि नहाहृतकं। न लोकसिद्धिः। न जीवोऽहृतम्। अति विक्षणविवाह भेदः उक्त।।
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 _Kathopanishad_ reads a glimpse of three _mantras_ one after the other as below:

\[
\text{वदा सर्वं प्रसुचल्ये कामा ये ज्ञ्य हृदि बिनाः।}
\text{अथ मन्योभृतो भवति ब्रह्म समझुने॥ (२.३.१४)}
\]

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.\(^\text{152}\)

Here, remains a moot question that when again will the desires be totally uprooted? As an answer, the succeeding _mantras_, reads thus:

\[
\text{वदा सर्वं प्रभवल्ये हृदयप्रभव ग्रन्थयः।}
\text{अथ मन्योभृतो भवत्वेलावद्भयनुशासनम्॥ (२.३.१५)}
\]

The desires originating from the knots of the heart\(^\text{153}\) become totally destroyed when the bondages of ignorance are disappeared by the rise of

\(^\text{152. अथ तदा तष्णोऽपि यस्य भावं तदृश्यो विद्यै। कामकर्मसम्मतं अपराधामयिनास्तु भवति। यज्ञवर्धकयो यज्ञवर्धकोऽपि यज्ञवर्धास्तु कर्मसम्मतं अनौपल्लोकास्तु भवति। S.Ku.Bh. p.121.}

\(^\text{153. "The bonds of Avidya (nescience), kama (desire), and karma (action) are together called the knots of the Heart in vedantic philosophy." Swami Chinmayananda, 'Kathopanishad', p.240.}
the opposite knowledge of the identity of the jīva and Brahman in the form of ‘I am Brahman’\textsuperscript{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.

\begin{quote}
\textit{शतं चैका च इदयस्य नाग्ने तासं मूढ्रानसेनमिनि सूक्तेका।}
\textit{तयोध्यभायमृतत्तलमिति विषेश्या उत्तममेण भवति।} (2.3.16)
\end{quote}

At the time of death, a jīvanmukta brings his mind under control through Śuṣumṇā 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 issue out in different directions become the causes for attainment\textsuperscript{155}.

Thus, all the three mantras explained above refer to the course of attainment of Brahman for jīvanmuktas according to Sanākra.

Like Śaṅkara, 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

\textsuperscript{154} अहम्मद शरीरं ममेदं वर्ण सुखी दुःखी चाहुं इदेवमादित्यश्चान्त्याक्षरंमन्यदिश्यामर्गीयानानादोषानामभावस्मि अस्मातीति विनियन्त्रित्वाविद्या ग्रस्तयु तत्सरित्वात् कामां मूलमेण विनिरपयति | Ś.Ku.Bh. p.122.

\textsuperscript{155} तत्व नाडोध्यवंस्यायां नाधर्ष्णात्विद्यादिनांमूढ्रानसेनमानामभावस्मि अस्मातीति विनियन्त्रित्वाविद्या ग्रस्तयु तत्सरित्वात् कामां मूलमेण विनिरपयति | Ś.Ku.Bh. p.123.
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 Nādi. As is clear, it is Śuṣmanā Nādi, through which jñānin departs from his last body and attains Mokṣa.156

D) Path of Liberation

After enumerating the nature of Brahman in different aspects, the Kāthaka-Upaniṣad tells about the means of attaining the Supreme Brahman referred to above. In this line, the mantra –

वच्छेदद्वारा प्राज्ञस्तम्भमेव आत्मनि ।
ज्ञानमात्मनि महति नियंचेतकस्तव्यात्मनि ॥ (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 [Hiranyagarbha] 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

156. हृदयंतर्सर्वकामयान् कट्त्र इवात् ततु कारण-अविद्याहकारमेवं हृदयंतर्सर्वोष्ठः यद्य त्यात् । यद्यति । इह मातुपदेभो इत्ययः सर्वं प्रथमः इत्ययः अविद्याहकारमेवं हृदयंतर्सर्वोष्ठः यद्य प्रभवति । अत्यन्तीय अथ तदा सर्वकामप्रहणणे मत्ये अमृतो मुक्तो भवति । ——— हृदयंतर्सर्वकामयान्तो नाडङ्कः नाडङ्कः प्रवृत्तो भवति । तत्त्वं मथे ——— सतौतरया सुवुभव्याया जवः गच्छन् अमृतला एति । R.Ku.Khd. pp. 27b.
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.\textsuperscript{157}

Madhva's understanding of this mantra is all together different from that of Śaṅkara, in so far as the meaning of the phrases like वाङ्क मनसि etc., is concerned. Madhva maintains the idea of hierarchy among the gods, following his interpretation of the previous mantras - इन्द्रियेन्मह परा हि अयं

\textsuperscript{---} [1.3.10], महतः परम्यकलाम् \textsuperscript{---} [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.\textsuperscript{158}

Śaṅkara interpretes the term वच्छत् 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, Śesha and Garuḍa [Suparna] presiding over the mind, as the controller of the presiding deities over Vāk namely: Pārvati, Vāruṇi and Sauparni 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 :

\begin{verbatim}
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{157.} एवं पुरुष आत्मनि सर्व प्रविठतया नामरुपकमांऽद्विद्धया तत्तत्वविद्धिभं त्रियाकारप्रतीत्तत्त्तरं स्वामयायात्स्मारेने

मयेन्मेज्जन्यरुपणमामत्स्मारं मयेन्तरकमुक्कमामत्स्मारं स्वामयायात्स्मारेने। \textsuperscript{Ś.Ku.Bh. p.74.}

\textsuperscript{158.} सम्मात् कांगासिका देवीः उपमायायुः सिवाभिरुः | सिवाभिरुः ब्रह्मवाच्योऽद्विच्छेद्य निर्पच्छेद्य महातमायुः। | तै सम्मात् पञ्चनादे सी विर्भी परमानि | तद्दश्वनं तद्दश्वनं निवयी नाम नापे। \textsuperscript{M.Ku.Bh. p.14.}
Here, the *Upanisad* 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’.\(^\text{159}\)

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.\(^\text{160}\) There is no doctrinal distinction between the two, Śaṅkara and Madhva.

Thus, a perusal of the commentaries of Śaṅkara and Madhva on the *Kāṭhaka Upanisad* brings to light that an inquiry into the nature of Brahman as explained by the divine preceptor, god Yama to Naciketa, deals 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 *Upanisad* is flowed throughout the *Upanisad* 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.

\(^{159}\) अनाद्विष्ठिन्यस्मृति उत्तिष्ठत हे जननव आप्तारामभिमुखा भवत जगताजानिनिवया घोरामपया सर्वनिपथिनभुताया। सर्वविषयिनप्रकटै। किं पुरुषः! \(\text{S.Ku.Bh. p.74.}\)

\(^{160}\) उत्तिष्ठत ननाधिबिधिष्ठिन्यसद्वैवद्विनिवृत्ता भवत। जगत जाग्रत आलम्ब मुन्नत। प्रायज वक्तव्रः महंत्रवः वक्तव्य। \(\text{R.Ku.Khd. p.17b.}\)