

CHAPTER V

"COMMENTATORS"

Introduction

The Ups. mainly deal with the inner 'Being' or with what is called the spiritual knowledge. The knowledge of the 'Self' can be distinguished from the knowledge of the material world. The Ups. are an earnest inquiry into the ultimate truth. The subject matter is about the spiritual life that leads to eternal peace and immortality. The Ups. revolt against the path of ritualism. The seers of the Ups. placed aside the performance of the sacrifices, while they emphasise the intellectual efforts to know the ultimate truth. As they propound philosophical thoughts, they serve as the source of different traditional philosophical thoughts.

The Ups. expound principles which can not be easily grasped or which cannot be experienced by everyone through the senses. On the contrary that highest principle is realisable only by those persons who become introvert through penance, meditation etc. and after their spiritual progress the truth reveals Itself to the person concerned.

This principle is exposed and explained vividly in various Ups. in various ways by the seers as they have realised It. All the Ups. expound the same principle but the

way in which they establish the Brahman is different; so the number of commentaries are written on this subject to suit it. The BRS deals and discusses Upaniṣadic Śrutis. There are many commentaries on the BRS. The commentators systematically explain the varying doctrines of the Ups.

The commentator aims to give the consistent interpretation of the BRS according to his philosophical ideology. The five principal bhāṣyakārs viz. (1) Ś (2) R, (3) M (4) V (5) N; have developed their views on the basis of ups. and interpret the BRS in relation to their philosophical ideas and views. They modify the Śrutis to suit their views. These great ācāryas founded their own schools. They try to explain the Śruti and, try to co-relate the BRS according to their philosophical line of thinking.

The commentators discuss the Śrutis which suit to their philosophical thoughts, With the rational arguments. Such discussions are grasped by the intellectuals. The theories put forth by the commentators appealed to the highly educated people and thus their scholarship is recognised by these intellectuals. Similarly the commentators create the different ways of attracting the people from the religious point of view. Any ācārya preached his own thought in such a way which can be easily digestible by all; which can be understood by a common man. The ācārya made the philosophy in a

dialute form which suits to his line of thinking; and this simple approach, the way of the interpretation in easiest manner captured the mind of a common person. The ācārya emphasised on the god by various symbols viz. Om etc. by the different stotras; by the ways of worship to the gods etc. which can be easily followed. Naturally a person knew how to achieve the god's grace and he came to know what Brahman means etc. Thus an ācārya collected the followers to his school.

The study of the Ups. show how a commentator has an ample scope to interpret the Upanisadic text in relation to the philosophical ideology which he represents. Thus it is worthwhile to examine how these five bhāṣyakāras explain their own views with the help of the Śrutis. From this point of view in the fifth chapter some of the Śrutis are taken up and explained according to Śaṅkar, Rāmānuja, Vallabha, Madhva and Nimbārka . The words from the Śruti on the relevant portion are explained according to these bhāṣyakāras. The first section (A) of the fifth chapter deals with the explanation of the Śrutis by the above mentioned commentators. The complicated references and varied discussions on the relevant portion are not taken up while explaining the Śrutis.

In the section B of this Chapter the BRS is studied in relation to the explanations given by the five ācāryas. From the Śrutis which are under consideration the ācāryas draw their conclusions in the respective adhikaraṇa. Sometimes a particular adhikaraṇa in the BRS discusses the Śrutis from different Ups. on the same subject. In this discussion it is shown how the ācāryas reconcile various Śrutis. The Section contains what is relevant to the present discussion. The Main teachings of the ancient ācāryas, as presented in the adhikaraṇas are set forth. Thus the section serves as a background to the stories and dialogues as well as the teachings of the Ups. The commentators and the BRS are studied in this section in order to see how far they contribute to the concept of the Vara (boon) which is dealt in the Chapter I. The attempt is done in order to examine whether these great ācāryas add more or not to the concept or they merely go on discussing and drawing the conclusions.

The original bhāṣyas of these five ācāryas on all the Ups. are not available. The Rāmānuja's bhāṣya on the CHU, BRU, KATU is not available; so the portion on the above mentioned Ups. is studied with the help of the Raṅgarāmānuja-bhāṣya. The Raṅgarāmānuja has written the commentary on the basis of Rāmānuja's views; so it is taken into account. Śaṅkara and Madhva's bhāṣya on CHU, BRU and KATU is available.

The portion on these above mentioned Ups. are studied with the help of the Śaṅkara and Madhva. Vallabha's bhāṣya on any one of the relevant Ups. is not found. K A U is studied with the help of Śaṅkarānanda's bhāṣya on the MAU , Rāmatīrtha's bhāṣya is available so it is studied with the help of Rāmatīrtha's commentary.

The chart showing the functional similarities on the basis of the bhāṣyas of the five great ācāryas, viz., Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja, Vallabha, Madhva, is added in this thesis. Deussen has given a chart showing the Pañcāgnividyā from the ŚB- 14.9.1-12-16 to the CHU 5.3.9; and the BRU 6.2.9-13. ¹

The CHU and the BRS are dealt by N.A. Kansara² and he tries to conclude that almost all the five ācāryas agree with the explanation of the process by which the water is called 'Puruṣa' after the fifth oblation.

1. Deussen Paul " Sixty Upanishads of the Veda " (Tran. by Bedekar V.M. and Palsule G.B.) Vol. I, p.140.

2. Kansara N.A. , 'Sambodhi' Vol. 10 p.43 ft.

Section A:-BRU 1.3.28.

Ś - The Prastotr recites the sāmāns. The mantra viz., "tamaso mā jyotirgamaya " etc. is repeated at the time of recitation when the Prastotr begins to chant the Sāman. These mantras are repeated and this repetition results into one's further advanced movement. This repetition of the mantras is to be done by the sacrificer.

M - He prefers to take these three different prayers and not three distinct mantras. This is the prayer for the removal of the obstacles to the divine world, it produces the best reward.

The phrase viz. " Asato mā sadgamaya " is explained by both the ācāryas differently as follow:-

Ś - It means from the evil actions and ignorance lead me to actions and thoughts, that are regulated by the Scriptures. That is to say the phrase indicate - through the request to help the recitor of the mantra for identifying himself with those objects which lead to the immortality or the divinity. The prayer conveys the thought of making immortal through it. Ś follows Brahmana's explanation while interpreting i.e. evil means death, that is natural actions and thoughts.

Rj- He does not explain.

M - He takes "asat" as death or sorrow and sat means bliss or immortality. The phrase denotes the meaning as follow:-
 " from sorrow lead me to the bliss " i.e. it conveys the same meaning following the Ś's explanation viz. " make me immortal.

(2) Tamaso mā jyotir gamaya --

Ś - The word tamas means darkness, death or all ignorance. It has the nature of a veil. Darkness also means the death, being the cause of it.

The vocable jyotir means the light, the immortality. It is one's divine nature. Since the knowledge being the luminous, is called the light; therefore, the knowledge denotes the immortality. Knowledge is of an imperishable nature according to Ś. So the phrase denotes to help one for realising the divine entity. Thus it means to make him the immortal.

Ś - He does not explain .

M - The vocable tamas means the ignorance or the death and "jyoti" renders the meaning as the knowledge or immortality. So the prayer denotes to lead the recitor to the knowledge from the ignorance.

(3) " mr̥tyor mā amṛtam gamaya ."

Ś - He interpretes the phrase in a simple way viz., to lead to mukti from the death. He tells that " mr̥tyoh amṛtam kuru " means to make free from the saṁsāra; that amṛtatva is nothing but to becoming free from the saṁsāra according to R.

M - " mr̥tyu" means the death; and amṛta means mokṣa according to M. Thus it means " from bondage lead to the mukti.

In all to survey, Ś explains the first mantra denoting to help the prayee to identify himself with the objects of realisation instead of those which are not true as such. while the second mantra means, to help him to go beyond that because it is the form of the ignorance and attain the salvation. The third mantra should be taken literally.

M - He disagrees with Ś in the explanation of the some of the words. (1) The vocable 'asat' is not ignorance but it means the "sorrow" according to M's view. So it is called the death. (2) "Śat" is bliss, it is called the immortality (3) " Tamas " is the ignorance in its very nature. So also it is called the death. (4) " Jyotir " is the knowledge naturally it is of the immortal nature. (5) Mr̥ta is the ordinary death and that can be overcome through the mokṣa. A mukta is never born under the law of the existence.

Ś - Then after chanting for the sacrifice with the three mantras, the chanter of a mantra should secure eatables for himself by chanting. The chanter is able to obtain the desired object, he is the knower of the vital force.

M - He propounds that the person who knows and meditates with respect on the Vāyu (Prāṇa) called as the Sāman is sure to get the desired world.

M contradicts with Ś and holds a view that Ś' interpretation is not proper. He further argues that if Ś' explanation is accepted then the japa of this mantra would be devoid of the fruits. M explains the words mr̥tyu and amṛta as denoting the well-known meaning viz. the death and the mokṣa respectively. And so they do not require explanation as Ś adds to them. The Śruti has not explained them and M following the Brāhmaṇa sentence viz. " na atra tirohitam iva asati ", says the words are very clear and therefore they should not be explained.

M further tells that the Śruti suggests the meaning as - one who knows the meaning of these three prayers viz. asato mā etc. The Śruti does not convey the meaning which Ś explains viz. one who knows the mystery of the Prāṇa because a true udgītha is always a manifestation of the Prāṇa.

BRU 4.3.1

I. Sa mene na vadiṣya ...

{ }

Ś - Yājñavalkya approached Janaka to see Yogakṣema i.e. to inquire about the welfare of the king Janaka. While going there he thought that he should not speak about cosmos.

R - He agrees with the Ś's comments.

M - He does not follow Ś and R and observes that Yājñavalkya went to Janaka wishing to hold a conversation and to discuss with him.

S.Radhakrishnan comments on M's view that if the line is read " Sam enena vadiṣya iti " (" came to Janaka intending to speak with him ") it is only an ingenious conjecture.¹

Formerly when Janaka Vaideha and Yājñavalkya had held a discussion on Agnihotra , Yājñavalkya had granted him a boon. Janaka chooṣe the right to ask any question when he desired; the king, therefore, starts putting questions.

1. Radhakrishnan S. , vide The Principal Upanishads.BRU.p. 255

II. $\hat{\text{ત્રિ}} \text{ યોતિ} ? \text{ જાતમ આત્મા} ?$

The words " $\hat{\text{ત્રિ}} \text{ યોતિ}$ " and " જાતમ આત્મા " refers to the self or Brahman according to $\hat{\text{S}}$ and Rq . The Self is the light different from one's body and organs and illumines them though it is itself not illuminated by anything else. The self is present in all the states of waking, dream and deep sleep.

$\underline{\text{M}}$ - The question proposed by Janaka is about the innermost light in man.

$\underline{\text{V}}$ - BRU 4.3.2 refers to the nature of Puruṣa for the first time in the Ups.

III. BRU 4.3.7

$\text{જાતમ આત્મેતે યોડયં વિજ્ઞાનમયઃ પ્રાણેઽ - - -}$
 $\text{લોજાતમિત્તમાતે મૃત્યો રૂપાણીઃ ॥}$

$\hat{\text{S}}$ - The Up. answers the nature of the Self (Ātman).

" Vijñānamaya " means intellect. The Self is perceived as inhaving contact with the intellect just as a night is associated with the Sun and the Moon. The intellect helps in every king of knowledge. It serves the purpose of the lamp in darkness.² $\hat{\text{S}}$. cites the Śruti.

2. cf. BRU 1.4.3.

It is through the mind that one sees and hears. The objects are lighted up by a lamp in the darkness. Every object is perceived because of its association with intellect.

Ś criticises those who explain the word "Vijñānamaya" as a modification of the consciousness i.e. to say this explanation goes against the Śruti. According to Ś the suffix mayat in the word "Vijñānamaya" denotes something else than modification. The Self stays in the heart; it illumines the body and organs with its own intelligence.³ The examples from BG. are quoted to prove that the Self is the light within intellect; infinite, all pervading like the ether. The self is self-effulgent.

The Self effulgent light pervades the intellect; the Self assumes the likeness of the intellect and seems to think (dhyāyatīva) just as the light looks coloured. The Self seems to become whatever the intellect resembles it. So when the intellect turns into a dream, the Self also assumes that form.

Ś argues that it is only the likeness of the intellect

3. BG. 13.33 . As the Sun illumines the whole world, so the Self, the owner of the field of this body illumines the body.

that gives rise to the delusion that the Self moves between the two worlds and has such other activities.

The words 'mṛtyo rūpāṇi' in the Śruti are explained as the forms of death referring to work, ignorance and death has no other forms of its own.

Rj - He explains ^{and} discusses the Śruti with the help of BG and BRS.

M - He takes the word Ātman (Self) referring to the Lord Bhagavat. The Ātman is alone the light of the man. To strengthen his point he cites the quotations from the Skanda Purāṇa.⁴ Ātmā is the great light and guide. According to M, the Ātmic light does not mean the light of one's own Self but the light supreme . He further explains that the Ātman is the Supreme one, all knowledge who lives in the heart. He remain steady and makes the Jīva to do activities. He quotes the Mahamīmāṃsā to illustrate the Ātman more promptly.

The terms 'dhyāyativa' 'lelāyativa' means " grasps " according to M. And the word 'vijñānamaya' is taken in the sense of " all knowledge ". He produces the changes in the Jīva. He causes the Jīva to travel in both the worlds. He

BRJ

4. vide ~~Bṛhadaranyaka~~ Upaniṣad with Madhva's commentary .

is called " $\text{सं हि स्वप्नो भूत्वा}$ " (Saṁ hi svapno bhūtvā) because he is responsible for creating the dreams in the dream state.

Ś - The phrase "Imam Lokam " means the state of consciousness. It is called "forms of death" because it causes to commit all sorts of the sins and the sin is nothing but death.

" svapno bhūtvā " means He becomes the carrier of the soul to antarikṣa or dream world after death. In this world the jivas are subject to death, so it is " mṛtyorupāni ".

M - He interpretes the word " imam lokam " as a synonymous of the waking state in the same way, The word 'heaven' (Svarga) as Susupti and āntarikṣa as a dream condition. M. adds two meanings to the word ' lokau ' in the ' ubhau lokau ' i.e. (1) Worlds (2) States of consciousness.

Ś refutes Yogācāra school of the Buddhist in the Śruti by the words ' एवं स्वप्नो भवतः ' ; - According to the Buddhist, the above quoted phrase refers to the two abodes, i.e. this and the next world.

IV. BRU 4.3.8 - द " स वा अयं पुरुषो जाग्रतः --- " "

The dream state is a junction between the waking condition and the deep sleep. In it one feels joys and sufferings, which consist the impressions of the experiences of the previous lives. On the other hand the glimpses of the rewards of the merits and the demerits, those are to be happen in the future life are experienced through the urge of those merits and demerits, or through the grace of the god.

S - He supposes that one sees many objects in the dreams those are not experienced in this life.

Rj - According to him one sees this world in the dream; or sometimes the person sees the other world viz. svarga, naraka, in the dream. That is why the dream condition is "vilakṣaṇa" , in which one experiences the objects from two worlds.

M - According to M the Śruti refers to (1) Lord (2) Jīva. M shows distinction between the Jīva and the Īsvara. M. wants to prove that the condition of susupti and death are the same with the help of BRS 1.3.42 ⁵.

5. BRS 1.3.42 - " Susuptyutkrāntyo bheden "

Actually there is no need to take the help of the vedānta Sutra in this portion . The BRU is the earlier work though M quotes Vedānta Sūtras for explaining his views without the necessity.

The doctrine set forth by the Yājñavalkya has a prominent place among the various philosophical schools. On this particular passage Ś , R, M builds up their theories and developed their views.

V. BRU 4.3.10 " न तत्र रथा न रथयोजा - - - सृजते ये हि ज्ञाता "

Ś - Ś states that He himself creates the objects like the chariots, animals, roads etc. Really there are neither objects nor activities of the organs exist in the dream state, but their impressions are visible. In the dream condition the self becomes distinct altogether. He is Himself the light. One dreams only when the organs have ceased to function . Therefore no other light (than the Self) can exist in that state. Moreover the dream state cannot be supposed as the waking-state. In the waking-state the self is engaged in many objects; it is mixed up with the living objects.

३१- He states that the objects like chariots, ways, wells etc. which are experienced in the dream could not seen in the waking condition but those objects are created by the Paramātmān.

He argues that the objects seen in the dream is not seen in the same form in the waking-state. Moreover their marks of presence or their marks of destruction are not available and the objects which are visible in the dream-state, are created by the Paramātmā.

M - The Śruti is explained according to his principle by M. i.e. the world is the real, and he contradicts with the non-dualism - the point viz. the world is unreal. M. denotes the Vedānta Sūtra ⁶ for making his argument solid. M. refutes Ś on the ground of the difference between the waking state and the dreamstate. The objects perceived in the dream-state by a person exist in the world really. The unseen objects are not seen in the dream. M. criticises that the pleasures and pains created by the objects are not false or unreal but they are real, since one experiences them in whateverstate. Ś takes the world as unreal because a stage comes when one realises that in the past the world was not existing; the world does not come into existence in the future.

According to the Ś the agency attributed to the self is only figurative. The light of the Self which is pure intelligence, illumines the body and the organs and thus they perform their functions being illumined by Him.

6. BRS 2.2.9 " Vaidharmyāc ca na svapnādivat "

According to R⁷ the agent is the Supreme Lord. The self is unattached in the dream-state because the effects produced from the contact of the objects, are not found to it.

M - supposes that the Kesava performs all the activities. He is not seen by Jiva even at the time of the death of the dreaming-state. M. does not recognise the dream-state as the separate one. M states that the lord is always the light of the jiva even in the waking-state. The lord is independent and he is seen by the Muktas only.

S - does not regard the dream condition and the death as one condition. The self transcends the forms of the death and not death itself. In dream though the Self is separated from the body and the organs it experiences joy, fear etc. However the death is not the nature of the self. The self is unattached in the dream-state because the effects produced from the contact of the objects, are not found to it. The Self in the sound sleep gets the highest serenity. While in the waking state a man gets impurities due to the mixture of the innumerable activities of the body.

The Self makes the body to sleep but the Self remains awake and notices the impressions of the deeds, that have been

7. vide. RaṅgaRāmaṇuja's comm. on BRU p. 213

" सिकलं प्रपञ्चं नाटकं सूत्रधारः सर्वेश्वरः स्वर्गं लज्जं कर्त्तुम् "

left upon the mind. The self causes the body to awake. In sleep condition there is respite from the craving and the aversions, fear and anxieties. In it the individual is absolutely one with the divine one.

VI. BRU 4.3.15,16,17.

The Up. establishes that the self is Itself the light and distinct from the body organs and their stimulating causes - desire, work, on account of its non-attachment. It is unattached because it moves by turn from the waking to the dream-state, from this to the deep sleep, then again to the dream, then to the waking-state; Thus the Self is distinct from the three-states. The example of a fish is given for the support of this point i.e. just as a fish moves freely to both the banks of a river, similarly the Self moves to both these states.

Ś - Ś takes the Self as eternal, free is superimposed by the ignorance. The person fancies himself in good or bad position due to the impressions on the created by ignorance, viz. The person has a dream that the robber comes and goes to kill him. Actually nobody is going to kill him. Here the impressions are falsely manifested. When the ignorance goes away and the knowledge reaches its perfection, the identity with the Self is attained. Ignorance presents the things other than the self those are non-existent, and makes the Self as limited. Then the desire arises for that from which

he is separated, that desire prompts him to do the action which produces the result. Ignorance is not a natural characteristic of the self, because it automatically decreases as the knowledge increases and when the knowledge is at its highest level, ignorance disappears completely.

M - He explains the vocable ~~And~~ Avidyā differently from Ś. M supposes that the word 'avidyā' is a compound (३॥ + ॥८॥) - '३॥' (ā) refers to the Viṣṇu and the vidyā means the knowledge. So M interpretes the word avidyā thus - the knowledge obtained through Viṣṇu is 'avidyā'. And this avidyā causes to have dreams in the dream-condition or to perceive the objects in the waking condition.

M supposes the Self as no other but the lord Viṣṇu; and he is eternal, fearless, free from all the sins. There is no other than Him. That thing exists which is seen by the Lord Viṣṇu. The gods like Brahmā and other see the objects due to the favour of the Viṣṇu, They are not independent seers.

VIII. BRU 4.3.32.

सर्वतो एवो दृष्टो सत्यतो भवत्येष - - - - -

आर्य परमा गतिः ।

Ṣ - The state in which one sees nothing else; hears nothing else, knows nothing else, is the highest of all the attainments. It reveals the identification with all.

" This is its Supreme glory " (Paramā gati).

It is the highest of all the splendours and it is not attached artificially to it; it is its own nature. Other glories are artificial.

" This is his highest world ":- The other worlds which are the effects of its past work, are inferior to it. This world cannot be secured by any action.

" This is his Supreme bliss " :- This bliss is eternal; the other pleasures and delights, which are rewards of the enjoyments, are produced from the contact of the organs with various objects. Therefore they are momentary; but this highest bliss is everlasting, so the BRU 4.3.32 says others live on a particle of this highest bliss.

Ṣ takes the literal meanings to the words like man, god, emperors, gandharvas, prajāpati etc. and the world of Brahman is taken in the sense of Hiranya garbha.

R₃- He propounds that the Jīva becomes one with Para-mātman, but the jīva is not completely merge with Brahman. The Brahman and the Jīva are not one. On the contrary the Jīvas are many due to the association with the Prajñātman. The jīva is very pure, devoid of any doṣa like the water, and just as a drop of water added in the water becomes one with it. Similarly the Jīva goes to Brahman . There is no complete identification between the Jīva and the Brahman. Herein R differs from Ś's doctrine viz. Jīva and Brahman are the same. While according to R Jīva is the part of Paramātman. There is no identification. R further teaches that the difference between the devas etc. goes away.

R₃ states that in this condition the objects which have difference, and their knowledge due to their contacts with the sense organs, and their relation with the merits; all of them are not seen . Thus only no other entity is experienced and this is the highest gati. R takes the meaning of Paramā gatiḥ differently viz. the gatiḥ which is obtained through the arcīr-mārga by the Jīva. This is the highest wealth. R takes this phrase in the sense, the wealth which is obtained by the tattvajñānins . This the highest world - means this is the immutable place for enjoyment according to the view of R. This is the highest bliss. - which is unsurpassed and favourable

M - M refutes the principle set forth by Ś with the argument; scriptures do not prove the world as unreal or the perception of the world is a wrong notion on the mind of a jīva produced by the error. With the help of Gītā⁸, M emphasises on the point that the scriptures follow his view by mentioning " those persons who think the world to be false, they are called Asuras. "

M refers to the sensations like the taste, the smell, the touch and the functions like the thinking, the hearing; the touching etc. for proving the point that there is the distinction between the Lord and the world. M splits the words in two ways: - (1) referring to the Lord;
(2) referring to the world.

According to M the highest entity is one alone , (ekah advitīyah) ; without second ; He exists at the time of the dissolution. Prakṛti pervades the whole universe in the form of the water and no other living being exists at the time of dissolution. The epithet in the Śruti viz. " Brahmālōka " means the perfect knowledge. The term 'Brahma' means 'perfect' and loka is knowledge in the vocable "brahma-lōka".

Jīva enters into the heart at the time of the death. Then he perceives the Lord Viṣṇu only, which dwells in the

heart. Jīva depends on the Lord and becomes unconsciousness. The Jiva does not cognise anything else. The Viṣṇu shines out with his own glory and illumines the upper part of the heart and the lord goes out through this passage. He takes him and Prāṇa along with. The other devas (lower Prāṇas) follow this chief Prāṇa; Vidyā, Karma are also with them. Vidyā, Karma, Yogyatā are taken to be referring to the several devatas of those names, i.e. Garuḍa is presiding deity of the knowledge etc. All of them follow the Viṣṇu when He goes out of the body at the time of the Mukta's death. Mukta leaves the body through Suṣumnā nādi. The Lord throws away the body of the Jīva and takes the hold of the subtle form of the Jīva; just as a leech takes the hold of the another blade of the grass before quitting the grass on which it is moving.

The lord creates new body of a Jīva according to his merit just as a goldsmith destroys the impurity of the gold, He gives the knowledge to the Jīva by removing avidyā. The Jīvas get the body accordingly to which class they belong i.e. to say if the Jīva belongs to the class of the Pitrs, He creates Pitrs body and so on. The released soul reaches the Lord Hari and acquires the quantity of the bliss.

M supposes that all the Jīvas have true existence. In fact Lord and Jīva are distinct from each other. Since no one sees that the Jīva is the all-knowing one as the Lord is. The Jīva has little powers. It is not present every where.

Śankarānanda on Paryāṅkavidyā

Āruni ordered his son to handle the priest-hood of the Citra Gargyāni king. When the Śvetaketu went to the assembly of the Citra, he was well received. At that time, the king asked a question that what will be the fruit of the sacrifice i.e. if the king would go to the heaven or would be tied down to the earth. Śvetaketu could not reply and therefore, he took the king's permission to go back and learn the answer from his father. On his return Śvetaketu put those same questions to the Āruni for which Āruni confessed his ignorance. Then after the Āruni decided to learn them from the king himself. Both of them went to the king's assembly. Āruni with the sacrificial twigs in his hand as a token of accepting his apprenticeship went there. The king Citra was pleased with him for his very act refined behaviour, and the king praised the Āruni and promised him to explain the mystery. The king fully expounds the vidyā as follow:-
In the beginning it is told that all the departed souls go to the region of the Moon to reap the fruit of their deeds.

KAU directly mentions the paths by which the souls travel i.e. if one dies in the bright half of the month, he goes beyond the region of the Moon but if anyone dies in the dark half, he is thrown down to the earth through the rains to be born as a reptile, serpent, mosquito or any other animal. Therefore the moon is said to be the entrance to the heaven. It can be said with this context that the Moon is the check post for the onward journey of a soul.

The KAU 1.1 expressly refers to Devayāna path though both the paths viz the Devayāna and the pitryāna are mentioned as leading for the other world. When one ascends up, he reaches the region of Brahmā by stages. First he enters to the region of the fire god, then to the air god; then to the Sun-god; then to the varuṇa ; to the Indra and to the Prajāpati; step by step, and ultimately to the region of the Brahmā. The world of Brahmā is full of the tanks; the rivers; the trees; the cities; the palaces protected by the Indra and the Prajāpati. The descriptions of the Brahmā's world is figurative. There is the Brahmā's hall where the intelligence is the throne and also a couch of the incomparable splendour. The favourite is imaginary which the scholars take to be the nature (matter) and the reflection is visual. The scriptures and the understanding are considered as the two nymphs. At the command of the

Brahmā five hundred nymphs go to welcome him at once. Then he if being the knower of Brahmā, then adorned in Brahmic form, goes to Brahmā. He crosses the pond made of the cupidity and the anger if any ignorant soul reaches the pond he falls into it.

S. K. Belvalkar and R.D. Ranade opine that the chapter of the KAU starts the discussion between the king Citra Gārgyāyāni and the Svetaketu by which the soul's progress towards the world of the Brahmā is explained. According to him the world of the Brahmā is the highest goal and a true place of the safety. A departed soul travels by the two paths leading to the another world; these two paths run up together upto the world of the Moon, and then divert into the two directions i.e. the upward and the downward. Belvalkar summarises the Upanisadic passage.

According to the view of the Deussen all the souls that depart from this world reach to the Moon first. The vital breaths of the souls are responsible for the waxing and the waning of the Moon. i.e. it is said, " through their life, the waxing lunar half (of the month) grows and by the virtue of its, wanning half, it conveys them to the rebirths." ⁷ The

7. op cit. Deussen Paul. " The sixty upanishads of the veda"

(translated by Bedekar V. M. and Palsule G.B.)Vol.I, p.25.

Moon is the door of the higher region . There the soul's knowledge is tasted, if he is able to answer goes by the Devayāna path. The Devayāna path stands in higher degree than the Moon and if the ascending soul does not pass in the test, he goes to the Pitryāna path. That means the Moon is the responsible entity who allows the departed soul to become the rain etc. and to rain down below. It seems that the Deussen wants to emphasis that the departed soul whether it may be the doer of the good deed or the evil deeds reach the Moon by one and the same way. From the Moon the paths diverts. On the other hand the CHU and the BRU describes in the state way that a person who acts in good manner or performs the tapas or the sacrifice etc. obtains the fruit of the good deeds and he goes by the Devayāna, while the other person goes by the Pitryāna.

Sankarānanda on KAU 3.1

The KAU 3.1 starts expounding the knowledge through a discourse between the Pratardana and the Indra. Pratardana went to the abode of Indra by means of Prowess and his heroic struggles. Indra was so much pleased with him that he wanted to grant a boon to be chosen by Pratardana. But Pratardana left it to the choice of Indra. Indra refuses to do so by stating that a superior has no right to choose for inferior and he asked to select it to the Pratardana. At that time Pratardana refuses and forces Indra to give knowledge which is wholesome to the mankind. Indra then propounded him the mystery and imparted that " know Himself " who is the truth. Indra preached the self. Indra further preached that the vital air is the life and it is the Self. There is life in the animals because the bodily organs and the breath functions cooperatively. It is the consciousness of 'self' in the every act of perception which is again the function of the human brain. It is the introspection. The life persists as long as the vital air is present in the body. The vital air works uniformly with the organs. That is why one sees forms with the eyes, hears sounds with the ears etc. The life force with the vital breath which is stated in the Up. is the "Self" or "Brahmā". And the worship of this 'self' leads to the immortality.

The vital breath controls the functioning of the organs. One can live without the tongue or the sight etc. but without the vital breath the life is impossible. The bodily organs do not discharge their respective functions without the co-operation of the vital breath. The functions of organs merge into the vital breath, while one is asleep or in a swoon. All the organs are active due to its existence in the body and stop to discharge their respective functions when the vital breath ceases to act. This vital breath or the Prāṇa is superior over all the sensory and the motor organs. According to the medical science the vital breath is the action of lungs, depending on the action of the heart.

Then the function of the brain or the nervous system is under the term 'Prajñā' is described. The functions of the organs depend on the nervous system. All the bodily organs discharge their functions by intelligence viz. the speech without the intelligence do not convey any meaning. The activity of a person depends upon the mind i.e. to say sometimes a person engrossed in the work does not notice the sound of the clock. There are three factors in a cognition of the object: (1) the perceiver, the perceived object and the act of perception. The act of perception is done by the help of intelligence which is called as 'Prajñā' in the Up.

The 'Prajñā' is identified with the vital breath and it is all in all; end in all . It is the lord of the universe. Indra goes on to identify viz. " It is myself" ; it is yourself". It is the supreme soul.

The KAU 3.1 expounds the term Prāṇa in the co-relation of Prajñā very excellently. It shows how the sense organs and the motor organs depend on each other for their respective work from the point of the modern science also. Therefore Deussen agrees with 'KAU follows well ordered and excellently presented consideration based on the essentially right psychological view about the dependence of the sense-objects on the sense organs and of these sense organs on the Prāṇa or "Prajñātman"¹⁶.

The Prāṇa and the 'Prajñātman' are explained as identical because they live together in the body and go out of it togetherly. Thus $Prāṇa + Prajñā = Ātman$
It does not increase or decrease on the effect of good or bad deeds. This is the Indra (Ātman) which one should know.

¹⁶. vide Deussen , Sixty Upanishads of the Veda .

(translated by Bedekar V.M. and Palsule G.B.)

Vol. I, p. 43.

MAU with Rāmatirtha's Commentary

The discourse between the king Brhadratha and a the sage Śākāyanya^{which} deals with Brahnavidyā. The king was totally fade up with the world and so decided to go in the forest to perform the tapas. After some days the sage called Śākāyanya was pleased with the king and asked him to select a boon. The king wished to know the Ātman's knowledge. Śākāyanya stressed on the view that the king's request was very difficult to attain. The Brahnavidyā is not easily learnt and so advised the king to ask for some worldly gain. But the king has formed a strong concept that the worldly pleasures, worldly enjoyments did not give bliss. They are not satisfied but on the other hand they increased day by day because they are connected with the cupidity, anger, greed, delusion, fear etc. Thus they are transient and perishable. so the king considered them useless. This frame of the king's mind moved the sage to consider him as a worthy person for imparting the Ātman's knowledge. The speech of the king shows his mental capacity and the earnest desire to know the 'self'.

Śākāyanya thereafter explained the 'Self' as
 'Suddhaḥ Putaḥ Śāntoprāṇa niratmantokṣayaḥ Sthirah- aśā-
 savath etc. In the human body there is one subtle substance

which is intelligent, incomprehensible and invisible.

This self stimulates the body to act.

The body is compared with a chariot, the motor organs with the horses, the sensory organs with the reins, the mind with the driver and the inborn nature with the whip. The body goes round like a wheel. In this way the body moves and appears intelligent. The self is the mover of it.

SECTION B

Upaniṣads and Brahma-Sūtras(1) BRS 3.3.6

The BRU 1.3.7 is discussed in the BRS 3.3.6 in which it is shown that some vidyās are different though they apparently look similar.

The BRU 1.3.7 is discussed with the CHU 1.2.7; the subject matter of which is the worship of the Prāṇa.

Ś (788-820 A.D.) He takes the two vidyās separately because the subject matter differs in both the Śrutis. In the CHU 1.2.7 it is stated that only the part of the Udgītha viz 'aum' is to be meditated on as the Prāṇa, while in the BRU 1.3.7 the entire udgītha is meditated on as Prāṇa. So both the vidyās enjoined by the Śrutis are different.

R (1017-1127 A.D.) He agrees with Ś since both the vidyās are regarded as different.

M - (1197-1273 A.D.) He does not follow the Ś, R's view while interpreting the Sūtras. He holds the view that this adhikarana establishes the contemplation of the Supreme. Being with all the attributes having the equal importance though the attributes may be positive or negative.

-
1. The dates of the five ācāryas are following to the Radhakrishnan S. The Brahma-sūtra (The philosophy of spiritual life).

V - (1479-1531 A.D.) He does not refer .

N - (Later half of 15th century) He follows
R's interpretation.

(2) BRU 4.3.2-5 *Kutama ātmā iti* --- is referred in
the Sūtra *karṇāśāstrāṅghatvāt* (BRS 2.3.33). The Sutra
discusses the nature of the self.

Ś - He takes the Śruti as referring to the Brahman
and to the Jiva. Jiva has no powers to play himself according
to Ś .

R - He refers these Srutis in the BRS 2.3.33 also.
The topic of the Sutra is the 'Self'. He describes the
Ātman as *हृत्कर्महं मध्यमेतं प्राणं शब्देनैवैवमिति मध्यमेन विज्ञानं धर्मकः*. The order of
the words in the text of the tika by ^{Rg} R.R. instead of
कर्म आत्मा शब्देनैवैवमिति as given in the Upanisadic text
and this B text.

M - He interpretes this Sūtra in a different way. The
Sūtra deals with the *karṇāśāstra*, is attributed to the Jīva, if the
jīva is accepted as the doer then only the injunctions lead
by the scriptures prove to be true otherwise all the Śāstras
would be invalid. The Sūtra therefore, emphasises the jīva
as the agent in his own accord with certain limits. According
to the view of M the injunctions and the prohibitions of the
Śāstras apply to the agent in the person of the jīvas. They
can not apply to the supreme self because if they are considered

as referring to the Self, the self will be liable to merit and demerit and thereby will lose his higher status. Thus the agency of the jīva has to be accepted in order to preserve the meaningfulness of the injunctions and prohibitions of the scriptures.

M disagrees with the Ś, R' views and he concludes that this adhikaraṇa resolves the conflict of testimony regarding the self's agency. The conflict is seen between the texts like BRU 4.4.5, which refers to the self, reaping the fruits of its actions and others which consider the supreme self, the sole agent; that there is in the world.

V - He quotes the Śruti in the same Sūtra and explains that it is asked for the first time that what is the nature of the Puruṣa in the Ups. According to V, it seems that the Śruti states two objects viz. (1) Jīva-because Jīva is the Brahman as Ups. describe, while on the other hand it refers (2) to the Brahman since it states the root "jñā" as its object. V supposes that the Brahman is the object of the knowledge and It shines in the heart and the body. Though Jīva lives in the heart and in the organs, the Śruti refers to the Brahman. Jīva and Brahman are similar to each other partly; but the actions of the Jīva depends on the Brahman. The Jīva has no powers to play himself.

N - He does not refer this Śruti in this Sūtra.

(3) BRU 4.3.7 "Katama Ātma hr̥ dyantarjyotiḥ"
is discussed in the BRS 2.3.42 and 43 for the second time.

The "Susuptyutrāntyadhikaraṇam" has a subject from this Śruti. It is as follow: The word Vijñānamayaḥ (he who consists of the knowledge) referred to, is the Brahman and not the individual Soul. In the condition of the deep sleep and with reference to the departure of it from the body; the individual soul and the Highest soul are spoken as different from each other. Since the Śruti viz BRU 4.4.22 uses the words like Vāsi, isānaḥ, adhipati etc.

Ś - Ś takes these two sūtras viz. BRS 2.3.42 and 43 as the beginning of a new topic, while R takes the three sūtras viz. 41-43 as a one section dealing with the question whether the ether in the CHU 8.14 refers to the Brahman or the individual soul. According to Ś the adhikaraṇa deals with state of the deep sleep and the going out of It from the body at the time death. The sūtra 42 points out the difference of the Highest Soul and the individual soul in the states of the deep sleep and the time of death. The Śruti refers to the Highest self only according to the view of Ś because the beginning and the end of the chapter deals with one topic always. Ś quotes BRU 4.3.14-22 for strengthening his view. Further he argues that the description of the nature the embodied Self does not lead to the highest achievement. So the topic is regarding the difference of the Highest self from such conditions.

R - The Śrutis are quoted as a reply to the objector's point. R supposes that the Paramātmā is a different entity from the Pratyagātmā ~~is~~ who goes to the Paramātmā in the deep sleep condition and who leaves the body at the time of Utkrānti. Therefore the goer and the one gone to must be distinct. R cites BRU 4.3.7 to introduce the view that the Paramātmā and the Jīvātmā both are not identical. Similarly R quotes the other two Śrutis viz. (1) BRU 4.3.21 (2) BRU 4.3.35 to show the Paramātmā different from the Jīva.

M - BRU 4.3.9 is quoted in the BRS 2.2.3.9 for the refutation of Ś's doctrine. M strongly opposed to the principle of Ś i.e. Jīva is not a doer (Kartā), M feels that the Kartṛtva should be attached to the Jīva because the scriptures enjoins various Yāgas like jyotiṣtoma etc. to the Jīva. He feels that if a person does not perform the enjoined work then he would remain without getting its reward and then the scriptures would be useless.

So according to the V Jīva is a doer of the actions but it does not have the power of Brahman that is why he does ahita-karma. Jīva has two powers (1) Prakriyā Śakti and (2) Jñāna-Śakti. That is the Kartṛtva of Jīva is natural.

V - He supposes that the Jīva and the Brahman are distinct to some extent. One is happy and the other is unhappy. The two conditions viz. Susupti and Utkrānti show the variant nature of the Jīva and the Brahman. The Lord himself makes him to go to the other world. The Utkrānti is not a natural act of the Jīva. The acts done in the dream condition are unreal. In the waking condition also the असंगतत्व स्तौति is told with reference to the Jīva. V gives the example of the fish i.e. to say though the fish lives in the river; both the river and the fish are not the same all the time. Similarly Jīva acts in the waking and the dreaming state, the knowledge that is produced vary from one another. The fish moves on the both banks of the river having no attachment for that place, in the same way Jīva has no attachments for both the conditions. In susupti jīva gets Brahman means his actions are ceased. It may be observed that the Śrutis are splitted according to V's principles.

N - He quotes BRU 4.3.7 " Yoyam vijñānamaya Prāṇesu etc. in the different adhikāraṇa as different from the other acāryas . BRS 2.3.2 ² other acāryas.

2. नाजुगतच्छेदिरिति चेन्नैतद्विराधिकारात् ।

BRS 2.3.21.

The Śruti is quoted for declaring the objector's view i.e. the soul is not atomic because the Śruti mentions the greatness. N takes the topic of the Śruti distinct from the objector. The subject of it is about the supreme soul. N also quotes the BRU 4.3.7 in the BRS 2.3.24 to prove that the soul is of the atomic size. He abides in one part of the body i.e. in the heart (hr̥dyantajyotir).

In BRS 2.3.21 the Śruti of the BRU 4.3.7 is taken for referring to the supreme soul. How in BRS 2.3.24 N mentions the abode of the Jīva with the help of the same Śruti.

((4) BRU 4.3.9-10

" Na tatra rathā rathayogā panthānaḥ sa hi kartā." The Śrutis are quoted in BRS 3.2.1.³

The adhikaraṇa deals with the cognition in the dream. The dream condition is an intermediate state between the waking and the deep sleep. A

Ś - According to Ś the topic of this adhikaraṇa is whether the dream condition is real or it is unreal. The opponent takes this Śruti in support of his view. i.e. the

3. BRS 3.2.1 " Sandhyeṣṭirāḥa "

objects created in dream condition are real as those of the waking state since the Śruti BRU 4.3.10 tell that " He creates tanks, lotus pools, rivers etc. Ś contradicts with the objector's view by arguing that the objects perceived in the dream condition are not real because they are not bound by the rules of the space, time etc. viz. One may have a dream that he is walking on the road in the summer's afternoon though he sleeps in winter's night. Similarly the materials for creating the objects are not found in a dream state. Moreover the objects in the dreams are sublated every day when he wakes up. So the dream condition is a mere cognition. Further Ś states that sometimes the dreams are prophetic of the future good or bad; may be real just as the appearance of silver in pearl oyster is false yet it produces the joy in us.

Moreover Ś emphasises that because the individual soul is the part of the Brahman, he produces the objects like chariots, rivers etc. only with volition in the dreams; cannot be agreed. The individual soul is covered by the ignorance and so its power of creation is hidden like a fire in wood. Its power of creation becomes manifest when the bondage of avidyā is removed through meditation. The soul is a subject of avidyā, therefore it cannot be a real creator. Therefore all that is cognized in the dream is not real.

R - R also discusses these Śrutis in the BRS 3.2.1. The dream creation is done by the individual soul or by the Lord is the subject matter discussed in this adhikarana. R differs from Ś regarding the adhikarana's topic.

R quotes those śrutis when he discusses on the waking, dream and deep sleep states associated with the individual soul. He tells that the dream creation can be assigned to the Param-puruṣa since it is an extra-ordinary and wonderful creation. Such creation cannot be attributed to the Jīva when the jīva is not fully manifested in the Saṁsāra. Moreover R thinks the appearance of the objects in the dreams is absolute māyā in the sense that they are wonderful. Māyā means wonderful power according the view of R. R means to say that the Śruti viz. BRU 4.3.9 emphasises that the objects are not perceived by any other person except the dreaming one. So the creation of the dreams is attributed to the supreme soul and not to the individual soul, since the nature of the individual soul is hidden owing to the wish of the highest self.

M - He affirms that the dreams are the real and valid experiences. The objects like the chariots, horses, roads which are perceived in the dream are created by the supreme Being and then after they are withdrawn by the supreme Being himself. Thus M removes the contradiction in the Śruti viz. " There were no chariots, horses or roads there (before).

By making such type of argument M tries to silence Ś's doctrine viz. the objects which are seen in the dream are not real; on the other hand M emphasises his principle with the help of the Śruti that the objects which are cognized in the dreams, do come into the existence by the supreme Being and at the same time they are withdrawn after their presentation by the supreme self at his own will. Thus they are not unreal.

M further propounds that the 'vāsanās' or the subtle impressions left by the experiences of the past, serve the purpose of the material cause of the dream creations and God's will operates as the efficient cause. The dream creations are not competent to the objects of the waking life because they are due to the gross elements.

V - He mentions the BRS 3.2.1 adhikarana consists of the dream creation as its subject matter. He agrees with Ś on this point.

He does not contradict with Ś on the main point that the various objects like the horse, the road, the chariot which are created in the dream state are unreal. He tells that the objects seen in the dream condition are perceived in the different form from the objects which are seen in the waking state. Moreover in the dreaming state there is no consistency between the two incidence. V criticises on R when he argues the Śruti does not insist whether those are real or unreal. Secondly He teaches that the Śruti insists the world as real and not the

dreams. V differs from Ś in the explanation of reasons while taking the dream creation as unreal.

N - N takes the subject matter of the adhikarana different from Ś and V. He agrees with R on this point viz. the dream creation is due to the individual soul or the lord, is the topic discussed in this adhikarana.

N supposes that the appearance of the objects in the dream condition must be attributed to the supreme soul alone because such a wonderful creation cannot be made by the individual soul. The attributes of the the Jīva are hidden through the wish of the supreme Lord. They are not manifested naturally. Lord Vāsudeva creates the objects in dreams through His own powers, who is the expert in the act of creating and destroying all wonderful objects.

R and N unnecessarily interpret this Śruti as involving the discussion about the act of the dream creation belonging to the individual soul or to the supreme soul. The BRU 4.3.10 tries to evaluate the objects in the waking and the dream states. The śruti is mentioned in the context of the subject whether the objects in the waking state and in the dream state are the same or not. Moreover, the Śruti differentiates the objects from both the conditions and states that the cognition of the number of the objects in the dreams is distinct from

the cognition of the waking condition.

V - V does not put strong and firm statement to criticise \dot{S} ' principle i.e. the objects in the dreams do not manifest fully, clearly, as they are manifested in the waking. They are perceived distinctly.

The difference between the two ācāryas :- $v_1 \angle$
 \dot{S} and V, do not appear much. Both of them emphasis on the same point in some or other way, in different words. V follows the tradition and tries to expound new doctrine with the same ideas. While \dot{S} ' interpretation appears more apt and natural citing appropriate and logical reasons to convey his ideas. \dot{S} takes into account the Upaniṣadic cream and remains faithful to the \dot{S} rutī more than any other ācāryas.

(5) BRU 4.3.11 is quoted in the BRS 2.3.18⁴ .

The adhikaraṇa consists of the discussion regarding the soul's nature i.e. it is nitya or it is anitya. The individual soul is of the nature of intelligence. So the question dealt in the adhikaraṇa is regarding this intelligence, if it is natural to it or it is adventitious.

Ś - He expounds that the intelligence is the very Svarūpa of the Jīva. It is not a quality but it is Brahman Itself. It is manifested as the Jīva because of its contact with the limiting adjuncts. Ś refutes Vaiśeṣikas view i.e. the soul is itself non-intelligence. Ś explains 'jñā' as "nitya-coitanya" .

R - He criticises on Ś' interpretation of 'jñā' . 'jñā' means Jñātr (knower) according to R. R uses this Sūtra to refute the Sāṃkhya doctrine and the Advaitins. He argues that the soul is a knowing agent instead of the intelligence. R takes it as the 19th Sūtra instad of 18; wherein he discusses the size of the individual soul and its residence.

M - M disagrees with all the ācāryas while the interpretation of the Sūtra is considered. M argues that the Jīvatman too has birth from the Brahman. He put forth the reason for his stand point that all the intelligent beings enter into the supreme light of the Brahman and all the beings come into existence from the supreme Being. They are not dissolved into the Brahman. Thus M's doctrine viz the jīvas are separate from the Brahman is present herein. The jīva is not merged into the Brahman, while jīva and Brahman both are distinct elements.

V - ' ज्ञा ' denotes the object as Brahman. Brahman is the object of the knowledge.

N - He follows R.

BRU 4.3.21.

' Prājñenātmanā saṃpariśvaktō na bāhyaṃ kiñcana veda
nāntaram ' is quoted in the BRS 1.4.18.

Ś - He anticipates that the Sūtrakāra refers this Śruti to indicate the knowledge about Brahman.

R - He quotes the Śruti in BRS 1.4.18 in ŚrīBhāsyam.
R adopts Ś' view. He attacks on the Sāṃkhya theory of Pradhāna.

N - He quotes this Śruti in order to show the difference between the Jīva and the Brahman in the deep sleep and the death.

(6) KATU 1.2.25 ^{is quoted in the} BRS 1.2.9-10

The Śruti is a subject matter of the adhikaraṇa. The adhikaraṇa discusses the eater of the world. As Upanishads contradict with each other (MU 3.1.1 and BRU 1.4.6) the confusion is settled about if the eater is fire or the individual soul or the Highest Self.

Ś - He regards the eater as the Highest self since the description of KATU 1.2.25 viz. 'the eater of movable and immovable as his food.' Can be applied to Brahman only because all the elements are created, sustained and reabsorbed in him.

Ś holds this view from the context. Ś referred the KATU 1.2.18.22-23 to prove the Brahman as the eater as mentioned in KATU 1.2.25.

R - He agrees with the interpretation of Ś regarding the adhikaraṇa as whole. According to R, eating of carācara with mṛtyu as the appetiser means the withdrawing of the carācara world in him body by Paramātmā. But his adhikaraṇa starts with Sūtra 9 to 12.

M - He disagrees from all the commentators. He regards BRU 1.2.5 as adhikaraṇa subject matter Ś quotes BRU 1.2.5 in this adhikaraṇa but the Śruti discussed in it is from KATU. Similarly M holds the view that the present adhikaraṇa does not involve the Ś's doctrine of identity of Brahman and Jīva.

V - He cites and discusses the KATU Śruti in the adhikaraṇa with reference to the interpretation of Brahman and Jīva . According to V the God ^{is} or the enjoyer of the fruits . V also quotes the KATU 1.2.18-20 to strengthen his view in the Sūtra viz. attācarācargrahanat .

N - In this adhikaraṇa N shows the absence of any experience of pleasure and pain due to karma on the part of Brahman. N regards the Highest Self as eater alone because the terms 'Brāhmaṇa' and 'kṣatṛiya' implies 'movable and immovable metaphorically (edible objects - food)'.

(7) BRS 1.2.11-12

The adhikaraṇa deals with the KATU 3.1. *ṛtam pibantau - sukṛtasya loke - - - - - Je ca triṇācīketā* in BRS1.2.11-1

Ś - The two who have entered in the heart's cavity referred to Brahman and the individual soul for numerals denote things of the same class. The description of the succeeding passages apply to them only and not to sāmkyas buddhist and Jīva.

Ś quotes KATU 1.3.3 *ātmanān rathinān - - -* and 1.3.7 to prove his point.

R - He agrees with Ś in respect of the two viz. 'Brahman and Soul' referred in the Śruti but he contradicts

the explanation and remarks on Ś that Ś's explanation is unconvincing and implies prayojya ~~prayoka~~ prayojaka bhavaḥ i.e. jīva is prayoja while Brahman is prayojaka. R quotes KATU 2.12, 4.7, 1.14 to strengthen his point. R takes this sūtra in the last adhikaraṇa 1.2.10.

M - He introduces the Śruti-kATU 3.1 as similar to Ś's adhikaraṇa consisting its very, as its subject. M refuses to consider Ś and R's interpretations as proper since it does not imply the primary sense of the words. He emphasises that characterly mark, as the enjoyer of fruit of deeds and the use of dual, should be granted in such a way that it would not harm the divine's oneness. He differs from Ś and R and suggests the enjoyers as the two forms of Brahman known as Ātma and the Antrātmā or the inner controller.

Ś and R use this adhikaraṇa for the refutation of sāṃkhya while M criticises on Ś, R as well as the sāṃkhyas also.

V - He agrees with Ś and R, regarding the subject matter of the adhikaraṇa but he differs in interpretation of the Śruti. He explains the sruti in the following manner.

The word ^{rta} denotes to drink suarupāṃrta and that meaning is applicable to both viz Brahman and Jīva. The word sukṛta means Brahman (as referred in TU 2.7) according to V-^{The word}chāyā conveys jīva. it is equal to parabrahman. Just as the shadow is with the ~~body~~ body; similarly the jīva is like Brahman since it attains the sāyujya mokṣa. But Brahman is higher than jīva; because it has ānanda. That is why he is mentioned by 'ātapa' word in the śruti. The śrutis 1.120, 1.2.16, 1.33, etc. are quoted to strengthen his view by V. This is how the words like 'chāyātapau sukṛta' etc. are applicable to jīva and Brahman according to the view of V.

N - He explains the adhikaraṇa like Ś and R regarding the entrance of two in the heart viz. Brahman and Jīva because both of them are sentient beings, but he quotes KATU 1.17, 3.2 to elaborate his view that the Śrutis mention the object to be known, and the knower specifically.

(8) BRS 1.3.24.25

The KATU 2.4.12 is referred in the BRS 1.3.24.25.

Ś - He refers KATU 2.4.12 "aṅguṣṭhamātrah puruṣomadhya-
ātmani tiṣṭhati" and 2.4.13 aṅguṣṭhamātrah puruṣo jyotiṣivā --
etadvai tat " in the sūtra śabdādeva pramitah . MU 2.2.11
is discussed in the adhikaraṇa. The person referred in KATU
is Brahman , a ruler of past and present; future. the limita-
tion is size of a thumb and residence in heart can be
applicable to Him only. Yama replies the Being of the size
of a thumb thus: " that which you wanted to know is this."

R - He takes KATU 2.4.12 as Viśayavākya of the adhi-
karaṇa which constitutes sutras from 23 to 41.

He states that Brahman abides in the heart which is
a size of thumb for the sake of worship by the human beings.

M - He refers KATU v.12.14 as a Viśayavākya which
speaks the characteristics of Brahman viz " Bliss " as eternal,
inexhaustible and the highest. " It shines forth only by its
grace", is the answer of Yama to Naci^{Ketoś}, because all shining
forth of things in the world is derived from the Supreme. It

is the (His) Light that illumines others, every thought, activity, movement including the flashing forth of Svarūpasukha of Jñānis is but an acting after the activity of the supreme. M puts here the bliss of Jñānis also and argues that it is the subject of same law. It becomes manifested only by the gracious wish of the Lord. The supreme Being is one described as the highest ineffable bliss and the primary source of every form of thought activity and experience including the experience of joy by God-intoxicated souls.

V - V refers this Śruti while discussing in the Sūtra Sabolādeva ^{Purvita} (MB) . He tells that it is this anguṣṭhamātra Purv which controls the past and future, without the God, no other entity can control it.

N.- 1.3.24

In the BRS 1.3.24 He refers to the KATU 4.12, The Adhikarana deals with the question, ^{vid} the Śruti refers to individual soul or the Highest person. Brahman is to be meditated on as of the size of merely a thumb. He refers KATU 6.17 to strengthen his point.

(9) The KATU 2.3.2; and 2.3.3 are referred in the BRS 1.3.39.

Ś - The term Prāṇa is the Śruti denotes to Brahman and not vital air because the preceeding and subsequent passages refer to the Brahman. It is in the Prāṇa which is the Brahman, everything tremble. Brahman is responsible for the activities such - burning of fire or Sun's shining. The Śruti speaks attribute of Brahman here.

The KATU 2.3.3 bhayādayā - - - - - pañcamah also proves the same matter.

R - R quotes this Śruti in the Sūtra 1.3.40 viz. "Kṛṣṇanāt He refers this passage which comes between aṅguṣṭhamātrā puruṣaḥ and aṅguṣṭhamātrā puruṣo nīlātmaḥ. He agrees with Ś's explanation. R and N do not take it as a new section but only resume discussion of section about the person measured as of the size of a thumb.

M - He does not discuss this Śruti under this Sūtra.

V - He begins a new section and discusses how vajra suggests bhagavānarūpa, vajra is not only a weapon of Indra because TB 1.1.3 speaks of vajra as agni's heart, it is applied to bhagavāna it does not state Prāṇa's worship of Indra worship.

N - According to N this Sūtra does not begin the new adhikaraṇa but only resumes the last adhikaraṇa.

He quotes this Śruti in the BRS 1.3.40 'Kampānāt' . The term vital breath in the Śruti denotes the supreme Being because the Lord alone is the cause of trembling the entire universe, produced by Himself. Mahat is also a synonym used for Brahman. He concludes that the Śruti declares Him as a cause of fear of all the objects which are enmated in Him. The Lord gives immortality to the knower of Him.

Ś differs in the interpretation. He takes this Sūtra as forming the new adhikaraṇa itself and the Sūtra deals with the question viz. whether the term Prāṇa in KATU 6.2 denotes the Brahman or not .

(10) KATU 1.3.10-11 - Indriyebhyaḥ Parahyaṁsthā - - - - mahānparaḥ || and
mahatāḥ Paramavyakta - - - - Sā Kāsthā Sā parā gatiḥ

^{are} is discussed in the BRS 1.4.1-7.

The expression of the words in KATU viz mahat, avyakta, Puruṣa etc. do not include the sāmkhya doctrine, but they apply to the supreme self.

Ś - Ś utilizes this adhikaraṇa to refute Sāmkhya and establishes his view that the whole discussion is about the Supreme Self in which Naciketas asked Yama three questions only. viz. about the fire, individual soul and the Supreme Self Pradhāna is mentioned herein . The Śruti 3.10 " the mahat (great) is Superior to the intellect " clearly shows it is used in a different sense from the intellect and refer to the

Self in reality. The passage under discussion comes after another passage where the simile of chariot is used. The Śruti shows hirarcy among indriya, object, mahat etc. avyakta indicate the nature of the highest abode. Ś quotes KATU 1.3.3-4, 1.3.12, 1.1.2, 1.1.5.10, 1.4, 2.1.10, 1.2.22 etc. to point out the difference.

R - R also uses this adhikarāṇa for Sāṃkhyas refutation. He rejects ^{that} mahat, avyakta etc. denotes Prakṛti, Pradhāna. R argues that avyakta denotes the body described in chariot simile. R interprets the adhikarāṇa in different way.

M - M regards this adhikarāṇa containing the Sūtras 1 to 9. The adhikarāṇa establishes harmony in the terms like Avyakta, Jīva, Mahat etc. The term avyakta indicates the supreme Brahman itself which is contained in the principle of avyakta and resides in it. The latter part of the sutra 1 refers to Brahman's being present in avyakta which on account of its inferiority of status is treated like a 'body'. because M quotes KATU 1.3.3 but also extends to Subāla Up and RU to give witness to the all-pervasive Brahman residing in {avyakta}-(tuccha). He disagrees with Ś and R, in interpretation of avyakta as 'body' because it is gross while avyakta means subtle. Similarly Brahman deserves to be called invisible the attributes denoted by avyakta, jīva etc. are controlled by Brahman in the sense that their presence in them is determined by Its will.

V - He also refutes Sāṃkhyas in this adhikarāṇa since Sāṃkhya doctrine is not vaidic. He differs from Ś and R in interpreting the words avyakta , Bhagavatkṛpā or akṣarbrahma . It implies dharma-dharmi relation like a lamp and its light . (Bhagavatkṛpā and Brahman have relation of this kind.) avyakta is not jñeya, but avyakta is a object (व्यक्ति) . He agrees with Ś and R in stating the view that the context shows it is the chapter of Brahman and not of Prakṛti . He quotes KATU various times merely to strengthen his point viz. 1.1.14 1.1.20, 1.1.22, 1.2.14.1.2.15, 1.3.1, 1.2.22, 1.1.13, 1.1.12, 1.1.16 it is a Naciketa Upākhyana.

N - He refutes the Sāṃkhyas in this Sūtra-that the KATU 3.11 does not establish the Pradhāna of the Sāṃkhyas but all the words from the Śruti refers to the Brahman . He agrees with S, R, V in taking the subject matter of the KATU Śruti. He states that the term unmanifest is to be understood in the sense of body which is put down in the simile of the chariot. The text shows the body by stating the mode of subduing the sense organs. In this Śruti, a man who wishes the emancipation, which is the road of the transmigratory existence, and who is the enjoyer, is the main person who is presented as the lord of the chariot metaphorically, his body which is subordinate to him as the place of his enjoyment is represented as the chariot; the sense organs when controlled by the manas , reach the place of the Viṣṇu . The KATU 3.9 and 3.11 denote

that nothing is higher than the place of the Viṣṇu. The "higher than the great" denotes the superiority of the Supreme Being than the individual soul according to the view of N.

(11) The KATU 1.3.10 is discussed in the BRS 3.3.14-15

The Śruti aims at teaching the Ātman as the superior one than all those mentioned in the passage. The Sūtra refutes the view that the purpose of the passage is to state of the hi of senses, objects and so on. The Śruti gives information about them for the sake of meditation; it has purpose which results in the final release. KATU 1.3.15 viz is referred "one is freed from the mouth of death", to strengthen the view.

KATU 1.3.12 is referred in 15th sūtra. *ātmasabdāt ca* for the confirmation of the subject which is explained in the last Sūtra. The enumeration of the series helps to turn the mind towards the Ātman, which is hard to realize without the deep meditation.

R - R refers to TU 11.5 because the Brahman cannot possessors a head, wings, tail in reality, it can be said figuratively, it is intended for the purpose of meditation for the sake of easy comprehension.

M - He makes separate Adhikaraṇa of 15 and 16 and the adhikaraṇa determines the *upasaṁhāra* and *anupasaṁhāra* of attributes in the sense already defined in adhikaraṇa third. He comments on Ś that Ś uses this adhikaraṇa to carry out his found.

V - He does not explain the Śruti. He does not take this as a separate adhikarana.

N - N follows R's interpretation.

(12) ~~BRS 3.3.34 KATU 1.3.1~~. The KATU 1.3.1 is discussed in the BRS 3.3.34. - *etam pibantau sukṛtasya loke* - - -

also the MU - *dvā suparṇā sayujā* - - -

The topic deals with the question if two texts state different vidyās or one ^{vidyā} only.

Ś - The Sūtra states that both the texts describe one vidyā since both mention the supreme self as existing in the form of individual soul and show the identity of supreme Brahman and individual soul. Both the texts teach the object of meditation as one. So the vidyās are same. Ś refers this Śruti for the second time.

R - According to R the Sūtra answers to an objection forward against the conclusion in the last Sūtra. He does not cite KATU in this Sūtra.

M - He does not discuss this Śruti under the very Sūtra. He takes this Sūtra in reply of objection based on the conclusion of the previous Sūtra that there is no restriction in the matter of all Aprokṣajñānins attaining mokṣa.

V - He discusses TU in this Sūtra regarding the attribute of bliss pertaining to last Sūtra.

N - He does not refer KATU in this adhikarana.

(13) KAU and BRS

The BRS deals with the problem of Devayāna in the 4.3.1 to the 4.3.14. It is told that one who knows Saguna Brahman, he goes by Devayāna after the death. The Devayāna path is stated differently in the various Ups. as follows: The CHU 8.6.5, 5.10.1. The BRU 6.2.15 . The MU 1.2.11, The Prasna Up.1.10 The KAU 1.3. etc.

Ś quotes the above mentioned Śrutis and discusses the question that if there are various paths or there is only one path having different dharmas by which the knower (K jñāni) attains Brahmaloaka. Ś concludes that Ups. do not mention various paths for attaining the world of Brahman though some of the differences in the Śrutis which they are mentioned in the number of vidyās, i.e. dahar vidyā; Prāna vidyā; Upakosala vidyā etc. The path which leads to Brahmaloaka describes various stops but there is only one path because the person who attains Brahmaloaka, obtains the same fruit. Ś gives the gradation of the various Śrutings which deal with the Devayāna.

The KAU which says that he comes to the world of Vāyu should be placed after the CHU 5.10.1, 2 that means the person reaches to the world of Vāyu after the year (Saṁvatsara) and before the world of Āditya. The Śruti of the BRU 5.10.1 supports to Ś's opinion when it is said the person comes to the world of Vāyu after death, then Vāyu gives him a way just as a "hole of the chariot" , by that entrance he goes higher

and then to the "Āditya". KAU only mentions that he comes to the Varuna, then to the Indra, then to the World of the Prajāpati, but this Up. does not mention the order. According to Ś , " Sa varunalokam " of the KAU should be placed after the CHU 4.15.5⁵ because there is a connection between the vidyut and the Varuna. It is observed that when there is rumbling in the clouds the rain fall. The CHU 7.11.1 describes the same eternal fact⁶. Varuna is a god of rain is a well-known fact. After these sentences " Sa Indralokam " " Sa Prajāpatilokam " of the KAU should come in the arcirādimārga according to the view of Ś.

BRS (4.3.1) Arcirādhikarāṇa and BRS (4.3.2) Vāyuadhikarāṇa

Ś - The Śrutis taken up for the discussion are as follow-

The BRU 6.2.15; KAU 1.3; CHU 5.10.1; CHU 5.10.2.

The paths described by the various Ups. are shown below⁷:-

(i) KAU
 World of Agni (fire)
 ↓
 World of Vāyu (air)
 ↓
 World of Varuna
 ↓
 World of Indra
 ↓
 World of Prajāpati
 ↓
 World of the Brahman

5. CHU 4.15.5

6. CHU 7.11.1

7. vide Bhatakhanda S.M. : The Chandogya Upanishad and the Brahmasūtras (a comparative study) pp 31-33

(ii) CHU

Light
 ↓
 day
 ↓
 Bright half of the month
 ↓
 Six months of the norther
 path of the Sun(Uttarāyana)
 ↓
 Year
 ↓
 Sun
 ↓
 Moon
 ↓
 Lightening
 ↓

(iii) BRU

Light
 ↓
 day
 ↓
 Bright half of the month
 ↓
 Six months when the Sun
 progress to the north
 ↓(Uttarāyana)
 World of gods
 ↓
 Sun
 ↓
 Lightening

It may be observed from the above mentioned paths, that the Śrutis describe the Devayāna - mārga with addition and deduction. Ś reconciles the various Śrutis from the Ups. to make Devayāna path complete⁸. So the Devayāna path may be shown fully according to Ś as follow:-

Deity identified with Arcis (rays or light)
 ↓
 day
 ↓
 Bright half of the month ('Suklapakṣa)
 ↓
 Six months of the Sun's progress towards the northern
 ↓
 Year
 ↓
 World of gods
 ↓
 World of Vāyu
 ↓
 Sun
 ↓
 Moon
 ↓
 Lightening
 ↓

8. For more details vide BRS ŚBH on BRS 4.3.1, BRS 4.3.2 and also Bhatakhanda S.M "The Chandogya Upanishad and the Brahmasutras. (A Comparative Study)

World of Varuna
 ↓
 World of Indra
 ↓
 World of Prajāpati
 ↓
 World of Brahman

R - He takes the problem of placing the order of the
 Śrutis in his Bhāṣya.

R mentions the Devayāna path as follow:-

Light (the world of fire)

↓
 day

↓
 half month

↓
 half year

↓
 Year

↓
 The World of devas

↓
 Vāyu

↓
 Sun

↓
 Moon

↓
 Light

↓
 World of Varuna

↓
 World of Indra

↓
 World of Prajāpati

R takes the agniloka as a synonymous with arcis (Light)
 so he put it at the first.

M M also handles the problem of reconciliation of the
 Upanisadic Śrutis . He places the order of the various desti-
 nations according to its goal which come within the route.

He contradicts with all the other ācāryas and states that the soul does not travel by the two paths viz. Devayāna and Pitryāna after he passes away. M concerns only one route which begins with the Arcis. The Jñānis travel by this path after Utkrānti from their bodies through Brahmanādi, is the argument set forth by M. The Arcirādimārga is as follow:-

```

arci
  ↓
vāyu (ātivāhika)
  ↓
day
  ↓
bright half of the month when the Sun moves northward
  ↓
Year
  ↓
Vidyut
  ↓
varuna
  ↓
prajāpati
  ↓
Moon
  ↓
Indra
  ↓
lightening (dyaus bharati)
  ↓
vāyu
  ↓
purusottamam

```

M criticises on Ś when he places the varuna, Indra etc. after vidyut . M seems that such a order of places in the path puts in the difficulty viz. it loses the link between the person who leads the 'Knower' to the Brahman and vidyut. (BRS 4.3.5 vaidyutor) He argues that the act of handing over the knower to the hands of Brahman is the one which takes place at the

end of the journey and not at some intermediate stage on the journey. Thus M inserts two 'vidyuts' and two vāyu to be reached in the path. He interpretes the Tadidadhikarāṇa and Vāyugatyadhikarāṇa i.e. 4.3.3, 4.3.2 respectively; distinctly from Ś and R .

The first Vāyu is Ātivāhika and the second vāyu is the mukhya-Prāṇa. Similarly the first vidyut is the deity of lightening and the second vidyut is the dyaus Bhārati which takes the man to the Brahman.

M does not consider the vidyut and varuna as one and the same stage, like those of Ś and R, because he tells that the lightening is seen because of its lustrous form and not due to its being below the waters. Thus the lightening and varuna both are distinct stations mentioned by the CHU and KAU Śrutis .

V - He does not touch to the question of placing the order of the Śrutis relating to Devayāna.

N - He agrees with Ś and R on the point i.e. to say there is only one path alone which is described through various Śrutis . N reconciles these Śrutis differently from Ś and R

N discusses the question of removing inconsistency between the Śrutis and arranges the order of its stages as

follow:-

light
 ↓
 bright fortnight
 ↓
 the six months when the Sun goes to the north
 ↓
 year
 ↓
 air
 ↓
 Sun
 ↓
 Moon
 ↓
 Lightening
 ↓
 world of varuna
 ↓
 world of Indra
 ↓
 world of Prajāpāti

N identifies the world of gods with the air. Ś does not identify the world of gods with the air but takes them to be the two separate places. R also identifies the world of gods with the air.

Thus the departing soul reaches the Brahman through various stages. The destination mentioned in the Śrutis is the same viz. " Brahmaloka ".

(15) 'Prāṇas tathā nu gamāt' BRS 1.1.28 discusses the KAU 3.3. viz. "atha khalu Prāṇa eva Prajñātmedam Śarira."

Ś - He takes Prāṇa in the sense of Brahman and not in the sense of breath or the individual soul or the vital air. According to Ś this passage i.e. KAU 3.3 refers to the single type of meditation, the Brahman is the subject matter of the Śruti in the form of its two adjuncts of the individual soul and the life as referred to. Indra imparts Pratardana about the supreme one through the words "know me only". Indra preached that His self is identical with the Highest Self.

R - He quotes KAU 3.3 to establish his view that in Viśayavākya viz. 'Sarvam khalu idam brahma' the Paramātmā alone is described everywhere.

M - He remarks⁹ Indra asked Pratardana to worship him who was Prāṇa and Prajñātman. According to him the reference to the Paramātmā as in the expression ānandō, ajara, amṛta etc. shows that Indra is not ajara, amṛta etc. Though Indra tells to worship Him only, that does not mean Indra is Paramātmā. The Śruti refers to the Paramātmā and He is the Viṣṇu.

N - He cites the KAU 3.2 in the BRS 1.1.29 and supposed that the object mentioned by the term 'vital breath' is the

9. " अत्रापि प्राणे तद्विषये, तं देवाः प्राणधनः ब्रह्मधनुगमात् "

Highest Self because the qualities like highest auspiciousness, endlessness are applicable to the Highest Self. According to him Prāṇa or Indra does not denote the individual soul. The topic deals about the Highest Self alone. N gives very reasonable argument in the support of his view:- It is said that Pratardana requested Indra to give the boon which is beneficial to the mankind. That means he wished for the highest goal of the men. Thereafter the vital-breath was taught to Pratardana as the object to be worshipped (KAU 3.2) The adjective beneficial does not apply to anything else except to the attainment of Brahman . Hence the words Indra, Prāṇa and so on were used by Indra with a view to denote the Brahman. By knowing him alone one surpasses the death. There is no other way to salvation.

According to the view of N, the characteristics are mentioned for the sake of teaching the threefoldness of meditation, just as three kinds of meditations on Brahman are referred to viz. TU. 2.1, 3.6.

R agrees with N on the point that threefold meditation of the Brahman is mentioned in Pratardana vidyā.

It may be observed that the adhikarana 1.1.29 discusses Pratardana vidyā about the Brahman as the supreme one. The ācāryas like Ś, R, N propound their philosophical views and explain the adhikarana. According to them the Indra taught

in the KAU 3.1.4 and so on is a different god. Indra is not a very principle of the universe, Indra is not a 'lightening' (meghasthāniya vidyut) as referred in the RV, Ātman's principles are attached with it. Sātavalekar in the Daivata saṁhitā of the RV emphasises this point clearly with many examples. Indra is Ātman, He is the supreme Being, the ruler of the universe. If the Rgvedic concept is taken into account it clearly shows that Pratardana vidyā do preaches Indra as "Prāṇa + Prajñā = Ātman . The ācāryas goal is different in name, due to least concerning to Indra as Devatā.

KLU 3.3 in the BRS 3.4.20 to p

Ś - quotes the KLU 3.3 in the BRS 3.4.20 to prove that there are no works for the person who is grounded in the Brahman.

The above mentioned Śruti declares that the mendicants whose minds have become purified, and also who have realised i.e. to say which is to be known in the vedānta vākya, such persons are liberated by following the Sannyāsa. The mendicants do not have effect when they renounce all the actions.

Śaṅkarācārya on the Kathopanīṣad

There is no special need to state explanation of the KATU passages since it will be a repetition. Herein the question about the Śaṅkarācārya's commentary on the KATU and the BRS is tried to examine. While reading the Ś-bhāṣyas on the KATU and BRS one feels some difference in the interpretational and stylistic methodology. It is, therefore, proposed to touch it here.

Ś on the KATU and Ś on the BRS could not be considered as one person since there are minute variations in their commentaries. This very question is touched with reference to the passages which are explained and discussed by Ś in the BRS. The BRS mostly deals with the following KATU passages in it:¹⁰ e.g. KATU -1.2.25, 1.3.1.2, 2.4.12-15, 2.3.2, 1.3.10-11, in the BRS 1.29, 1.2.11-12, 1.3.24, 1.3.39, 1.4.1 respectively. The number of passages which are quoted in support of the running arguments, are not dealt with here. It appears from the study of the both the texts, that the method followed by Ś is distinct in the KATU from that of the BRS.

The Ś on the KATU explains the Upaniṣadic text in which some of the words are explained in brief, following the upaniṣadic principles, while Ś on the BRS interprets and

14- The KATU passages are illustrated in the Appendix No.2.

discusses the words with arguments. Ś shows how the meaning of the word applies to Brahman, e.g. in the KATU 1.2.25, Ś tells that the "Brāhmaṇa" and "Kṣatriya" are the Brahman's food and the mrtyu is just like a upasecana (infusion). Ś explains these words literally in the KATU; while Ś from the BRS shows why the words 'Brāhmaṇa' and 'Kṣatriya' are applied to Brahman. He derives the meaning of the word 'food' from √at to destroy. The words "Brāhmaṇa" and "Kṣatriya" in the passage implies the "carācara". Thus the passage intends to say that the Brahman destroys the movable and immovable with the help of mrtyu, so that mrtyu is called Upasecana.

If the passage KATU 1.2.25 is explained literally the meaning is not clear. There arises a doubt as to what is conveyed by the words "Brāhmaṇa", "Kṣatriya" and "Upasecana" etc. The passage needs to be explained clearly. The manner of interpretation in both the texts also differs. When Ś propounds his teaching, he goes on explaining and discussing certain words. He anticipates the objection and then after he answers them while interpreting the passage. This can be illustrated by the following comments. viz. BRU 4.3.7 - अतम आत्मेति येषां विज्ञानमयः प्राणिषु हृदन्तेत्येति - - - - - मृत्यो रुपाजि .

when he comments on this passage he explains the meaning

of the words कृतम आत्मा in two ways, viz. , कृतम इति व्याख्येयं कृतमर्थं
दुर्विज्ञेयं त्वदुपपद्यते भ्रान्तिः । अथ वा शरीरव्यातिरिक्ते सिद्धेऽपि करणानि सर्वाणि विज्ञानवन्ति,
निरूपकमः आत्मनोऽनुपलब्धत्वात्, अतोऽहं पृच्छामि - कृतम आत्मेति, कृतमोऽसौ देहेन्द्रिय-प्राणमनःसु,
यस्त्वद्योक्त आत्मा, येन ज्योतिषोऽस्ति शक्ति उक्तम् ॥

अथवा योऽयमत्मा त्वयामिमेतो विज्ञानमयः सर्व इमे प्राणा विज्ञानमया इव, एषु प्राणेषु
कृतम ! यथा स्मृतेषु ब्राह्मणेषु सर्व इमे तेजस्विनः कृतम एव
षडङ्गविधीति ॥

It may be observed that the 'S' on the BRU and 'S' on the BRS,
there is complete harmony and no discrepancy regarding the
methodology of the interpretation. When he explains the BRU
passages in the BRS, he has a mastery of the material which
he is handling.

There is a difference in methodology style, language
etc. in the case of the KATU and the BRS. When 'S' discusses
the KATU 1.2.1-2, 1.3.1-2 etc in the BRS he clearly points out
how the particular word denotes Brahman and in which sense the
word should be taken in that particular passage. In the
"Guhā pravi stādhikarāṇa" (BRS 1.2.11-12) 'S' comments, 'अस्मात्
आत्मनो हि तन्नुभावापि चेतनो समानश्चेत्तनो' when he concludes the dual in
"Pibantau", "Chayatapau" conveys the jiva and Paramātmān and
not the Buddhi and Jiva. In this argument the चेतनत्वं of
both the elements (viz. jīva and Brahman) is more important.
While in the KATU, such explanations on the passages are not
found e.g. 'S' explains the KATU passage in the following way:-

कर्मफलं पिबन्ती, एवमस्मिन् कर्मफलं पिबति भुङ्क्ते नेतरः - - -

It cannot be claimed that the Ś on the KATU and Ś on the BRS (On the relevant Up.) does not agree in their teaching. No doubt, the Ś on the BRS and Ś on the KATU follows the doctrines stated by the Ups. but the style, usage of the words, methodology create a little doubt regarding the authorship. It gives rise to suspect two different persons, though the final conclusions drawn in both the texts are identical. Further it can be said that the conclusions should be identical because even if there are two Śaṅkarācāryas, both of them belong to the same philosophical tradition. They must propound one and the same doctrine.

This section acquaints with the doctrines stated in the BRS, in their simple form, avoiding the complicated references and discussions which are put forth by the ācāryas. It is not claimed that the section contains everything which consists in the BRS but it is tried to give main philosophical tendencies and thoughts, on the basis of the commentaries by the five ācāryas which are presented in the BRS. The BRS is a systematic work on the Ups. and the commentators try to discover the views which are suitable to their philosophical schools. They split the words, passages, suitable to their schools. Similarly if the ācārya follows the Upaniṣadic thought or he does not follow it, may be observed from their comments noted in the relevant passages.

At the end one may conclude the present research work
with the prayer:-

" Om Pūrṇamadāḥ Pūrṇamidam
Pūrṇat Pūrṇamudacyate
Pūrṇasya Pūrṇamādāya Pūrṇamevāvāsiṣyate . "

Om, Śāntiḥ Śāntiḥ Śāntiḥ .
