

A STUDY OF THE ŚVETĀŚVATAROPANIṢADBHĀṢYA

ATTRIBUTED TO ŚAṂKARA: AN ANNOTATED TRANSLATION

by Warwick Vincent Jessup

submitted for the degree of Master of Philosophy at The School of Oriental
and African Studies, London University.



ProQuest Number: 10731565

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10731565

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. T. Gelblum, who supervised this thesis, for his advice and support. I would also like to thank Alexis Sanderson, my tutor in my undergraduate days at Oxford, who first introduced me to this field of study, as well as Dr. Jog in Pune, and Anthony Alston, who helped me to choose this text, and also Dr. M. Weltzman of University College, London, who gave me guidance on the subject of the use of computers in determining authenticity. Finally, I am very grateful for the untiring efforts of my mother in typing this thesis.

ABSTRACT.

The Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad is not usually considered to be among the ten Upaniṣads commented on by Śaṅkara. The Upaniṣad questions the origin of creation, and explores the relationship between the soul and the Supreme Deity, emphasizing the importance of meditation in realising the Deity. The commentary has a long introduction teaching that liberation comes through knowledge, not rites, quoting profusely from the Purāṇas and other sources. The commentary on the text itself further expands the Kevalādvaitavedānta of Śaṅkara's School, inculcating the unity of the Self, which is the real, and the unreality of all else. Gods spoken of, such as Rudra, are taken as referring to the nondual Brahman, and the various means spoken of are interpreted as means of realising Brahman.

Whether this commentary is actually the work of Ādiśaṅkara has been disputed for over a century. Indeed, the authenticity of many works attributed to Śaṅkara has been called into doubt. In the case of the Śvetāśvataropaniṣadbhāṣya, no thorough-going tests have been applied and published. The present study, by a combination of Hacker's litmus-test of authenticity, and other evidence gleaned, proves fairly conclusively that the commentary is not the work of Ādiśaṅkara, but of a later follower, thus vindicating the view that Ādiśaṅkara wrote commentaries on only ten Upaniṣads.

TABLE OF CONTENTS		Page
(A) AUTHENTICITY		
1. QUESTIONS RELATING TO RESEARCH ON AUTHENTICITY		7
1.1 Why question authenticity?		7
1.2 Is the author necessarily an individual?		8
1.3 Will the results of the investigation of authenticity have credibility?		11
2. REVIEW OF RESEARCH ALREADY UNDERTAKEN ON THE AUTHENTICITY OF WORKS ATTRIBUTED TO ŚAṂKARA		12
2.1 P. Regnaud 1876		12
2.2 Lieut. Colonel G.A. Jacob 1886		15
2.3 Shridhar Shastri Pathak 1919		16
2.4 Pandit Vidhusekhara Bhattacharya 1925		17
2.5 S.K. Belvalkar 1925		22
2.6 R. Hauschild 1927		25
2.7 B.N. Krishnamurti Sarma 1933		27
2.8 P. Hacker (1) 1947		30
2.9 R.D. Karmakar 1958		38
2.10 S. Mayeda 1961		39
2.11 W.R. Antarkar 1962		42
2.12 P. Hacker (2) 1968		43
2.13 T. Vetter 1968		46
2.14 S.K. Caturvedi 1979		47
2.15 A. Wezler 1983		48
2.16 Swāmī Gambhirānanda 1984		48
3. CONSIDERATION OF POSSIBLE METHODS OF ASSESSING THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE TEXT		49
3.1 Statistics and the use of computers		49
3.2 Appreciation of style		51
3.3 Analysis of doctrines		53
3.4 Circumstantial evidence		54

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

	Page
4. APPLICATION OF METHODS TO ASSESS THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE TEXT	54
4.1 Hacker's method, further developed by Mayeda	54
4.2 Statistical analysis of style	68
4.3 General style	70
4.4 Doctrines	73
4.5 Circumstantial evidence	75
4.6 Conclusion	76
(B) A TRANSLATION OF THE ŚVETĀŚVATARA UPANIṢAD WITH THE COMMENTARY ATTRIBUTED TO ŚĀṆKARA	77
INTRODUCTION	78
Chapter 1	124
Chapter 2	175
Chapter 3	193
Chapter 4	208
Chapter 5	227
Chapter 6	237
(C) NOTES ON THE TRANSLATED TEXT	259
(D) APPENDICES	
Appendix 1 Manuscripts and editions	325
Appendix 2 Bibliography	326
Appendix 3 Abbreviations	332
Appendix 4 Additional note	335

AUTHENTICITY

1. QUESTIONS RELATING TO RESEARCH ON AUTHENTICITY

1.1 Why question authenticity?

In August, 1985, a monk of the Śaṅkarācārya Order, when questioned as to whether the commentary on the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad attributed to Śaṅkara was really composed by 'Ādiśaṅkara', 'The first Śaṅkara', the author of the commentary on the Brahma Sūtras and many other Upaniṣads, replied that there was no reason to doubt the authenticity. The implication was that an understanding of the text itself was far more important than any question of authorship, particularly for one whose interest is in the practice of the teachings expounded by the text. The same argument, when applied to various types of composition, makes good sense; when listening to a piece of music, we appreciate its intrinsic qualities, and are not concerned with the identity of the composer.

Discussing authenticity has become fashionable in recent decades. Returning to the comparison of music, we find that the 'authenticity' of many compositions has been questioned, so that, for example, some of the works formerly attributed to Vivaldi are now considered 'spurious' by some. Ultimately, the value of any work of art must be judged on its own merits, regardless of its composer.

However, if we wish to make a study of a particular author, it is necessary to identify the works he has composed. Here the intelligent application of an analytical method can be useful. In the case of Śaṅkara, the founder, or perhaps reviver of a prodigious tradition, such an enquiry can be justified. Aufrecht in *Catalogus Catalogorum* shows that more than three hundred works have been traditionally ascribed to Śaṅkara. The huge volume of these writings, as well as their variety, has led scholars to doubt that they could all have been composed by one man. This has, for some, led to the view that all works attributed to the author are spurious unless they can be proved genuine. However, proof per se of the authorship of a work written perhaps over a thousand years ago, and transmitted from manuscript to manuscript, and even from mouth to mouth is rarely established. Much of what has been written on the authenticity of Śaṅkara's works has often rather naively assumed that a text we have today has not been greatly changed over the centuries. Although fidelity of transmission is traditionally much-prized in the Sanskrit tradition, in practice the ideal cannot always be matched. This leads to our next question.

1.2 Is the author necessarily an individual?

Some schools of historic thought argue that traditional history is unrealistic, since it portrays momentous events involving whole nations as being dependent on the actions of a few leaders. The second world war could be seen as essentially a conflict between Churchill and Hitler, rather than the sum total of the experiences undergone by the millions of individuals involved. Both approaches have their limitations, the first since it may lead to over-simplification, the second since it is not easily quantifiable.

Being more readily comprehensible, the first view normally predominates, particularly as events fade further into the past, and known details are fewer and less reliable.

This tendency seems to have been even more marked in the Sanskrit culture. The theme is taken up in the Bhagavad Gītā, one of the most celebrated Sanskrit texts:

'yad yad ācarati śreṣṭhas/tat tad evetaro janāḥ
sa yat pramāṇam kurute/lokaś tad anuvartate.'

'Whatever the best man does, that alone do other men do; whatever standard he sets, that the world follows.' (Bhagavad Gītā 3:21)

The Bhagavad Gītā itself, like the many heroes of the Indian tradition, has become the subject of universal eulogy. Whole volumes of traditional scripture are said to be the work of one individual, whose capabilities are seen as super-human. Monier Williams, (whose Sanskrit-English dictionary is itself indebted to the work of several German scholars who helped) enumerates the achievements of Vyāsa (a word that literally could mean 'arranger') as 'the original compiler and arranger of the Vedas, Vedānta-Sūtras etc., compiler of the Mahābhārata, the Purāṇas and other portions of Hindu sacred literature; but the name Vyāsa seems to have been given to any great typical compiler or author.' We may suspect that a similar process of attribution has taken place under the name 'Śaṅkara.'

Among the works attributed to Śaṅkara, it may be possible to detect several works of a teacher who went by the name Śaṅkara. Alternatively, we may decide to take the view that it is unrealistic to assume that a particular work is the composition of a single man, and rather attribute it to a School, perhaps to a certain period in the development of that School. A text can be regarded as an archaeological site, having undergone various accretions and amendments over the centuries as different monks of the Śaṅkarācārya Order saw fit. It has become common to speak in these terms concerning the epics of ancient India, though the same approach may also be applied to other works. In the fourth Oriental Conference at Allahabad, for example, G.H. Bhatt argued that the Aṇu bhāṣya of Vallabhācārya has dual authorship. Hacker in ŚŚ p.53 recognised that a similar phenomenon is perhaps witnessed in the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad Bhāṣya, which, he said 'can hardly be regarded as genuine in its present shape. It may perhaps have been interpolated and remodelled by a later author, but this question will require special investigation.'

It is probably easier to envisage passages being interpolated into sections of thousands of śloka, yet there is no doubt that one familiar with the commentarial style, and steeped in Śaṅkara's commentaries, as such monks would have been, would have no difficulty in introducing new quotations and arguments into the text.

1.3 Will the results of the investigation of authenticity have credibility?

No enquiry into the authorship of a text such as this can come to categorical conclusions. Circumstantial evidence that would indisputably prove the works to be the composition of a particular individual, is sparse. Indeed, when the very dates of Śaṅkara are so hotly disputed, it is hardly surprising to find that there is some uncertainty about what he actually composed. It would be of little value attempting to assess the authorship of, say, an early Upaniṣad; the best we can do is to quote the tradition on the subject.

However, it has been shown, as the survey of research already undertaken in this field will demonstrate, that sufficient evidence is available from this period of time to make a reasoned assessment of what is likely to be the work of Śaṅkara himself, and what not. The criteria of the most successful investigations have been centred on use of vocabulary both in terms of the frequency of use of a particular term, and the precise context in which it is used, with all its doctrinal implications. Of itself, a mere analysis of the broad doctrine of different texts ascribed to Śaṅkara is unlikely to be fruitful, since often there would be little to distinguish them. However, even Śaṅkara's closest disciples, such as Sureśvara, whose works are clearly authentic, use the terminology in a distinctive manner. Later works of Vedānta are clearly demarcated by their use of new technical vocabulary which Śaṅkara did not employ. This process then, of combining consideration of doctrine and style, may produce some credible results. It is only surprising that, given the

potential importance of a work such as this, being the foremost commentary on a major Upaniṣad, and attributed to one of the most renowned expositors of the Hindu scriptures, a more thorough enquiry into its authenticity has not been undertaken.

2. REVIEW OF RESEARCH ALREADY UNDERTAKEN ON THE AUTHENTICITY OF WORKS ATTRIBUTED TO ŚAMKARA.

2.1 P. Regnaud 1876

Reasons for doubting the authenticity of the commentary on the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad attributed to Śamkara were expressed by P. Regnaud, though the assumptions upon which he makes his judgement are controversial:

'Enfin je doute, malgré l'autorité des manuscrits, que le commentaire de cette Upaniṣad attribué à Śamkara soit réellement de lui. Ce qui est sûr, c'est qu'il est rempli de longues citations empruntées à la Bhagavad Gītā, au Brahma Purāṇa, à Yājñavalkya, au Viṣṇu Purāṇa etc., et je m'étonne que, bien que cette particularité, contraire aux habitudes littéraires de Śamkara, ait été remarquée par M. Weber, le savant indianiste ne soit pas demandé comment un auteur qui vivait, selon l'opinion commune, au huitième siècle de notre ère aurait pu citer les Purāṇas, dont lui-même ne fait pas remonter l'ancienneté au-delà de dix siècles, soit au neuvième siècle après J.-C.'

'At length, despite the authority of manuscripts, I doubt whether the commentary on this Upaniṣad attributed to Śaṃkara was really his work. It is certainly filled with long quotations from the Bhagavad Gītā, Brahma Purāṇa, from Yājñavalkya, the Viṣṇu Purāṇa etc., and I am surprised that although M . Weber noticed this peculiarity, contrary to Śaṃkara's usual literary practices, the erudite Indologist did not ask how an author who, according to popular opinion lived in the eighth century A.D., could have cited the Purāṇas, which he himself traces back ~~no more~~ than ten centuries, that is in the ninth century after Christ.'

The citations in the text had been noted as unusual for Śaṃkara, though Weber's dating of the Purāṇas is suspect and Regnaud's reasoning therefore brought into question. Regnaud also raises the possibility that the text has undergone later interpolations:

'Peut-être considérait-il (Weber) ces citations comme interpolées postérieurement à Śaṃkara....'

'Perhaps he (Weber) considered these quotations to have been interpolated after Śaṃkara's time....'

Finally, Regnaud makes an observation of circumstantial evidence exterior to the text itself:

'Du reste, ce commentaire, s'il était bien de Śaṁkara, présenterait encore une autre particularité; il n'est pas accompagné comme tous les autres commentaires du même auteur sur les Upaniṣads de la glose d'Ānanda Giri. M. Röer qui a édité la Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad avec le commentaire attribué à Śaṁkara, dit qu'il n'a pu se procurer la glose d'Ānanda Giri, ni savoir si elle existe encore; il eût pu ajouter sans doute, si elle a jamais existé. Quoi qu'il en soit, le rapprochement de ces diverses circonstances permet, ce me semble, le doute que je viens d'exprimer, et par suite, il est possible que la Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad soit postérieure au célèbre docteur védantin.'

'Moreover this commentary, if it were really by Śaṁkara, would present another peculiarity; it is not accompanied by Ānanda Giri's gloss, like all the other commentaries of the same author on the Upaniṣads. M. Röer who edited the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad with the commentary attributed to Śaṁkara said that he was unable to find Ānanda Giri's gloss, and could not find out whether it still existed. He could have added, no doubt, 'if it has ever existed.' In any case, the coincidence of these various factors it seems to me raised the doubt that I have just expressed, and consequently it is possible that the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad postdates the famous scholar of Vedānta.'

Regnaud was certainly right to draw attention to the lack of a gloss by Ānanda Giri, though his conclusion concerning the dating of the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad Commentary is not proved.

Regnaud further argues that Śaṅkara was not aware of 'māyā' meaning 'cosmic illusion', and that since the commentary uses the word with that meaning, it must come from a later period (see P.37 Hacker). Regnaud's method of analysing the precise use of certain technical terms is a foretaste of Hacker's epoch-making 'Eigentümlichkeiten der Lehre und Terminologie Śaṅkaras,' 'Characteristics of the teaching and terminology of Śaṅkara.'

2.2 Lieut. Colonel G.A. Jacob 1886

Jacob made some independent observations a decade later, noting that Nārāyaṇa's Dīpikās on the Upaniṣads normally plagiarize Śaṅkara's commentary if it is available:

'...I then carefully compared the Dīpikā on the Śvetāśvatara with what is supposed to be Śaṅkarācārya's Bhāṣya on the tract, and found no similarity whatever between them. In the colophon to his Dīpikā on the Māṇḍūkya, Praśna, Muṇḍaka, and Nṛsiṃhapūrvatāpanī Upaniṣads, where these plagiarisms occur, Nārāyaṇa styles himself 'Śaṅkaroktyupajīvin' (which is perhaps his way of acknowledging his indebtedness); whereas at the end of those on the Nṛsiṃhottāratāpanī, the Śvetāśvatara, Mahānārāyaṇa, and the minor Ātharvaṇa Upaniṣads, he describes himself as śrutimātropajīvin.'

Jacob concludes that there was no commentary by Śaṅkara on the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad available to Nārāyaṇa. Nārāyaṇa like Ānandagiri, either did not have the text available to him, or else considered it not to be the work of Śaṅkara. Jacob adds a note on the style of the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad commentary:

'...and I cannot understand how it can be maintained that the Bhāṣya bearing Śaṃkara's name is really from his pen - so different is it in style from what we know to be really his...'

For Jacob, the evidence against the authenticity of the work was to be found both inside and outside the text.

2.3 Shridhar Shastri Pathak 1919

At the First Oriental Conference in Pune in 1919 Pathak gave a paper on 'The Pada and Vākya Bhāṣyas of Kenopaniṣad.' Here he addressed the question of whether the two commentaries, the Pada ('Word') commentary and the Vākya ('Sentence') commentary are both by Śaṃkara, or whether one is spurious. Why would Śaṃkara write only one commentary on the Bhagavad Gītā, the Brahma Sūtras, and many Upaniṣads, then write two on the Kenopaniṣad? Perhaps, Pathak suggests, Śaṃkara felt it needed to be explained twice, then adds:

'athavānyatarad bhāṣyam anyasya tatpīṭhārūḍhasya kevalam nāmasādrśyāt
tannāmnā vyavahriyate.'

'Or else one of the two commentaries (was written) by another who held his (Śaṃkara's) seat, the similarity only being in name, he being called by his (Śaṃkara's) name.'

Without giving full details of how he comes to his conclusions, Pathak declares that the Padabhāṣya is genuine, the Vākyaabhāṣya spurious. Towards the end of this short paper he states:

'tato bhedaññānārthaṃ vākyabhāṣyetai yā paścāttanabhāṣyasya sañjñā
tām anurudhya padabhāṣyamiti pūrvasya sañjñā babbhūveti suśliṣṭataram.'

'Therefore, in order to distinguish between the two, it can be quite
conclusively said that the name of 'Vākyabhāṣya' having been given to the
later commentary, the name of the earlier one became the 'Padabhāṣya.'

Two important points regarding the investigation of the authenticity
of Śaṅkara's works had been raised by Pathak:

i) That all the teachers who took the seat of Śaṅkarācārya after
Śaṅkara's demise were called 'Śaṅkara', so that from colophons it is
difficult to distinguish the first Śaṅkara.

ii) That texts, in the course of time, assuming Pathak's theory to be
correct, can be renamed, and works from quite different eras be
arranged together, the compositions of later Śaṅkaras not being
distinguished from that of the first Śaṅkara.

Pathak names the author of the Vākyabhāṣya as Vidyāśaṅkara.

2.4 Pandit Vidhusekhara Bhattacarya 1925

In a paper entitled 'Śaṅkara's Commentaries on the Upaniṣads'
Bhattacarya sets out to prove that several commentaries attributed to
Śaṅkara are spurious.

Bhattacharya first deals with the question of the two commentaries on the Kena Upaniṣad. Discarding the argument that the same author wished to deal with the text in two different ways, he affirms:

'But the internal evidence is strongly against it, for not only is the language in the two commentaries different, but also the argument. Even the great Śaṅkara's well-known views are misrepresented in the 'Sentence Commentary.'

Bhattacharya then turns his attention to the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad commentary:

'I have also reason to believe that Śaṅkara was not the author of the commentary on the Śvetāśvatara. The style and the mode of interpretation are far different from and inferior to these in the commentary of the Brahmasūtras. The long extracts from the Purāṇas with which the Śvetāśvatara commentary is filled are never to be found in any commentary of Śaṅkara the authorship of which is beyond dispute.

After these general observations, Bhattacharya homes in on a specific detail. The commentary introduces the quotation of one of Gaudapāda's kārīkās with:

'tathā ca śukaśiṣyo gaudapādācāryaḥ'

'And likewise the teacher Gaudapāda, the pupil of Śuka (says)....'

Bhattacharya claims that Śaṃkara, for his teacher's teacher, would have used an honorific epithet, or would not have used his name, as happens in his commentary on the Brahma Sūtras. Shiv Kumar Chaturvedi, over half a century later in 1979, argues against all the arguments Bhattacharya puts forward, believing the commentary to be genuine (see P.47 S.K. Chaturvedi.)

Bhattacharya's argument against the authenticity of the Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad commentary attributed to Śaṃkara is less convincing. First stating that the style of the benedictory stanzas betrays them as not being the work of Śaṃkara, he goes on to argue that where such verses appear in Śaṃkara's works, they are later interpolations (see note 1 of page 78). This discussion, then, has no bearing on the authenticity of this actual commentary. However, it does teach us to be distrustful of basing our judgment of authorship on such features as introductory verses and colophons (see P.31).

Bhattacharya claims that if Śaṃkara had written a commentary on the Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad, he would have quoted from it where it was relevant in his other commentaries. He adds:

'But in all probability the Māṇḍūkya itself was not written before or even in the time of Śaṃkara.'

In the introduction to 'The Āgamaśāstra of Gauḍapāda' he writes: 'The Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad is mainly based on the Kārikās, and not vice versa.' Hacker later disagreed with this view (see P.45). Establishing the date of the actual text commented upon is of course important in

determining the identity of the commentator. In the case of the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad, however, there is no doubt that it was composed before Śaṅkara's time, since Śaṅkara himself in his commentary on the Brahma Sūtras quotes it over fifty times.

Bhattacharya's argument against the authenticity of the Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad commentary then turns to style. Śaṅkara would never couple the expression 'duḥkhātmaka' 'of the nature of misery' with 'ātman' in:

'rogārtasyeva roganivṛttau svasthā tathā duḥkhātmakasya ātmano dvaitaprapaṅcopaśame svasthā.'

'As a man suffering from a disease regains health when the disease comes to an end, so the (individual) self, being miserable, regains its true state on the cessation of the creation, which is (based on) duality.'

The word 'ātman' however, may have a whole spectrum of meanings; here it probably means the individual Self or soul, as opposed to the universal Self. The epithet 'duḥkhātmakasya' is necessary for the analogy.

Observing that parts of the commentaries on the Māṇḍūkya and Nṛsiṃhapūrvatāpanīya Upaniṣads are very similar, Bhattacharya convincingly argues that the two commentators are different writers, and that the author of the latter commentary has plagiarized the former text. Bhattacharya remarks on the poor grammar of the Nṛsiṃhapūrvatāpanīya Upaniṣad commentary. The author is the same as that of the Prapañcasāra.

Bhattacharya concludes his paper with:

'It follows, therefore, from what we have stated above, that there are at least three different authors of the Upaniṣad commentaries who are all known by the name of Śaṁkara: first and foremost, the commentator of the Brahmasūtras, Chāndogya, Bṛhadāraṇyaka, Gītā, etc., second, the author of the Māṇḍūkya commentary, and the third, the commentator of the Nṛsiṁhapūrvatāpanīya Upaniṣad.

Though it has been proved that the authors of the Vākyabhāṣya of the Kena Upaniṣad and the commentary of the Śvetāśvatara are different from the great Śaṁkara, I am not yet in a position to say whether they may be identified with either of the commentators of the Māṇḍūkya or Nṛsiṁhapūrvatāpanīya Upaniṣads.'

Bhattacharya showed that within the later school of Śaṁkara, plagiarization of others' works was unashamedly carried out; two almost identical passages found in different works do not necessarily indicate that they are both by the same author. The paper also raises the intriguing question of whether, among those works we deem spurious, it is possible to identify two or more works of the same author. Such an enquiry would be entering largely uncharted areas of research in the study of the question of authorship within the later stages of Śaṁkara's school.

2.5 S.K. Belvalkar 1925

In a series of lectures on Vedānta, S.K. Belvalkar delivered one entitled 'Śaṁkara - His Life and Times.' In it, he reports that there are about four hundred works generally attributed to Śaṁkara, and often bearing the colophon:

'iti śrīmatparamahāṁsaparivrājakācāryaśrīmacchāṁkara-
bhagavatpūjyapādakṛtau...'

'Here ends.... composed by the venerable divine Śaṁkara whose feet are adorable, the venerable and most excellent ascetic, a wandering renunciate and teacher...'

Belvalkar identifies three main divisions within this corpus:

Group 1) commentaries

Group 2) hymns of praise

Group 3) miscellaneous tracts

He then embarks upon a comprehensive statement of how he regards the likelihood of different works being authentic, considering each of the divisions of type of work in turn. The results from group 1 are best expressed in tabular form:

Class 1	Class 2	Class 3
Authentic	Doubtful authenticity	Unauthentic
Commentaries on....Brahma Sūtras and on the Upaniṣads...	Commentaries on the Upaniṣads... Māṇḍūkya	Aparokṣānubhāvavyākhyā
Īśā	Māṇḍūkya Kārikās	Amaruśatakaṭīkā
Kena (Word commentary)	<u>Śvetāśvatara</u>	Ānandalāharīṭīkā
Kaṭha	Nṛsiṃha Pūrva Tāpanīya	Ātmabodhaṭīkā
		Upadeśasāhasrī- vṛtti
Praśna	Kena (Sentence commentary)	Dakṣiṇāmūrtyaṣṭ-
Muṇḍaka	Kauṣītaki	akaṭīkā
Taittirīya	Maitrāyaṇīya	Pañcīkaraṇaprak-
Aitareya	Kaivalya	riyāvyākhyā
Chāndogya	Mahānārāyaṇa	Pātañjala Yoga-
Bṛhadāraṇyaka	Others:	sūtrabhāṣya Viv-
Bhagavad Gītā	Hastāmālakastotrabhāṣya	araṇa
	Viṣṇusahasranāmabhāṣya	Bhaṭṭīkāvyākhyā
	Sanatsujātīyabhāṣya	Rājayogabhāṣya
	Adhyātmapaṭalabhāṣya	Laghu Vākya Vṛtti
	Gāyatrībhāṣya	Ṭīkā
	Saṁdhyābhāṣya	Śataślokaṭīvyākhyā
		etc.

The thirty-one commentaries in class 3 are too numerous to completely list. This table gives us an impression of how the authenticity of the commentary on the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad was regarded in relation to the probability of other works being genuine. The following points should be noted:

1) The main works of the Vedāntic 'triple canon' the Brahma Sūtras, Bhagavad Gītā and all ten principal Upaniṣads, excepting the Māṇḍūkya are thought to have authentic commentaries. Belvalkar's doubts over the Māṇḍūkya re-echo those of Bhattacharya.

2) The Kena Upaniṣad Word commentary is in class 1, while the Sentence commentary on the same Upaniṣad falls into class 2. Belvalkar comments:

'There is perhaps discernable a similarity of style and contents amongst some of the works falling under class 2, as also amongst a few others falling under class 3. We can thus distinguish the hands of at least two other 'Śaṅkarācāryas' that have helped to gratuitously swell the number of works to be ascribed to the first Śaṅkarācārya.'

Of the hymns of praise attributed to Śaṅkara, Belvalkar says:

'...one cannot fail to notice, in the first place, a sort of artificiality about them.'

One of the criteria used by Belvalkar in judging the authenticity of these is whether an ancient, reliable commentary on them exists, particularly one by a close disciple.

Of the miscellaneous tracts Belvalkar comments:

'Some of them in their style and contents bear so little relation to Śaṅkarācārya that their ascription to his great name seems little more than a downright mistake.' Coming to discuss Upadeśasāhasrī, 'A Thousand Teachings,' consisting of a prose then a verse section, he judges that 'The latter alone appears to be genuine, several verses from it being quoted in Sureśvara's Naiṣkarmyasiddhi,' a work by Śaṅkara's closest disciple based on the Upadeśasāhasrī. Vivekacūḍāmaṇi 'The Crest Jewel of Wisdom,' a text which has done much to popularise Advaita Vedānta in the West, and is highly acclaimed within the Śaṅkarācārya tradition is assigned to class 2.

2.6 R Hauschild 1927

In 'Die Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad', Hauschild wrote a chapter entitled 'Die Frage nach der Echtheit des grossen, dem Śaṅkara zugeschriebenen Kommentars zur Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad. Verzeichnis der übrigen indischen Erläuterungstexte zu ihr' - 'The question of the authenticity of the large commentary on the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad attributed to Śaṅkara. Note on the other Indian commentaries on it.'

Hauschild refutes Regnaud's theory that the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad was written after Śaṅkara's time.¹ Apart from quoting the upaniṣad fifty-three times, Śaṅkara's commentary on the Brahma Sūtras mentions the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad three times by name.

Hauschild further disagrees with Regnaud that Śaṅkara did not use the term 'māyā' as meaning 'cosmic illusion' quoting Śaṅkara's commentary on the Brahma Sūtras to prove his case.

However, Hauschild was not defending the authenticity of the text. Apart from the very existence of so many quotations in the text, Hauschild notes that it is unusual for Śaṅkara to give the titles of his sources.

Perhaps Hauschild's most original contribution towards an answer to our enquiry is his comparison of the commentaries attributed to Śaṅkara where the texts of the Śvetāśvatara Muṇḍaka and Kaṭha Upaniṣads and the Bhagavad Gītā have common elements. In one case where the text of all three Upaniṣads is the same, the commentaries on the Muṇḍaka and Kaṭha Upaniṣads are almost identical, while that of the Śvetāśvatara is shortened and introduces two quotations with 'uktaṁ ca.' Hauschild comments:

'Man hat den Eindruck, dass der Kommentator der Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad mit Śaṅkara's Erklärungstexten wohl vertraut gewesen ist und sie stark plagiiert und gekürzt hat.'

'One has the impression that the commentator on the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad has probably become familiar with Śaṅkara's commentaries and has considerably plagiarized and shortened them.'

¹ Hauschild probably misunderstands Regnaud, who no doubt refers to ŚvBh (see page 14).

Hauschild, concluding that no credence can be given to the native tradition that the text was written by the first Śaṅkara, then states:

'Die Frage, wenn denn nun eigentlich dieser Kommentar zur Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad abgefasst ist, kann nicht präzise beantwortet werden. Wir müssen auch hierbei mit einer relativen Fixierung zufrieden sein.'

'The question of when this commentary on the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad was actually written cannot be answered precisely. Here also we must content ourselves with a relative placing (of the date).'

Hauschild notes that part of the commentary on the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad 1:4 is derived from a Sāṅkhya tract written in aphoristic style called Tattvasamāsa, which is dated at some time before the middle of the sixteenth century.

2.7 B.N. Krishnamurti Sarma 1933

Krishnamurti Sarma, in a paper entitled 'Śaṅkara's Authorship of the Gītā Bhāṣya,' refuted those who doubted its authenticity.

In the introduction to his argument, he makes some remarks concerning the contrast between traditional and modern scholarship in this

field, saying that the latter 'has been cautious to scepticism in admitting the genuineness of the works attributed to the Ācārya.' In the face of this 'traditional scholars were visibly alarmed.' He continues 'the craze for speculation and the inward self-satisfaction arising out of adumbrating a new and startling theory in the field, had critical scholars too much by the throat to permit them take a level headed view of things.'

Pitting himself against the argument that the language and style of the commentaries on the Gītā and Brahma Sūtras are too dissimilar to have emanated from one author, the latter being far more sophisticated and discarding the view that the inclusion of a benedictory verse in the Gītā commentary indicated it was spurious, Sharma opines:

'Śaṅkara himself, to judge from the astonishing development of his style, as disclosed in his Brahma sūtra Bhāṣya in comparison with the Gītā Bhāṣya and other works, appears to have gradually discarded the wooden formalities of 'commentary making' not only in the matter of the observance of the benediction but also in the elevation of style.'

The idea of differences in style and procedure being attributed to a development of the writing technique of Śaṅkara through his lifetime later in 1968 led Hacker to assert that Śaṅkara was originally a Yogin, at which time he wrote a sub-commentary on the Yoga Sūtras, and subsequently was converted to Avaita Vedānta (see Hacker P.44).

Sharma then contrasts the 'amusing simplicity' of the style of the Gītā commentary with the 'grand manner' of that on the Brahma Sūtras. The example is quoted of the Gītā commentary using the singular 'I' where the Sūtra commentary used the plural 'we'.

Gītā commentary:

athas tadarthavivarāṇe yatnaḥ krīyate mayā

'So I try (to write) a commentary for that purpose.'

Brahma Sūtra commentary:

vayam asyām śārīrakamīmāṃsāyām pradarśayiṣyāmaḥ

'We shall expound it in these Brahma Sūtras.'

Sharma rules out the possibility of the Gītā commentary being an imitation of Śaṅkara, for, he argues, no imitation would be so poor at mimicking the style of the Brahma Sūtra commentary. Or as Sharma rather amusingly puts it:

'For, in fairness to any imitator with a minimum degree of efficiency for the task he has essayed, it must be admitted that the copy will not limp behind the original to any miserable extent.'

Such considerations will be important when we come to judge whether the commentary on the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad could be an imitation of Śaṅkara.

More substantial evidence of the authenticity of the Gītā commentary comes as Sharma states and at length illustrates that Śaṅkara's opponents Rāmānuja and Madhva actually wrote commentaries to counter the views in his work.

Content that the case for the authenticity of the Gītā commentary had been confirmed without doubt, Sharma turns his attention to the 'fashionable argument of the possibility and probability always of any given work having been produced or added to, at different times, by different personages. Sharma proceeds to establish unity of authorship by referring to three instances in the commentary where Śaṅkara gives cross-references to other parts of his Gītā commentary.

Since Hacker has called into question the unity of authorship of the commentary on the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad, Sharma's investigation of this question is pertinent to our immediate enquiry.

2.8 P Hacker (1) 1947 (including some subsequent development of ideas up to 1978)

Following the Second World War, P. Hacker took up the question of the authorship of the works attributed to Śaṅkara, returning to the subject intermittently over a period of decades. Hacker showed a great deal of originality, in one paper developing a 'litmus-test' for Śaṅkara's authentic works which has not since been rivalled, on another occasion coming to some questionable hypotheses, to the effect that Śaṅkara was at first a Yogin (see P.44).

In his earliest article 'Śaṃkarācārya and Śaṃkarabhagavatpāda, Preliminary remarks concerning the authorship problem,' Hacker enumerates various explanations for wrong attribution:

- i) forgery
- ii) all the Jagadgurus ('Teachers of the World') of the Sṛṅgeri Maṭha ('Monastery') have been called Śaṃkarācārya.
- iii) less renowned authors may have preferred the honorary title 'Śaṃkarācārya'.
- iv) anonymous text-books of the Maṭhas may have been attributed to their founder, Śaṃkarācārya
- v) Śaṃkara is a fairly common name
- vi) legends such as that of Śaṃkara entering the body of King Amaru has led to the ascription of Amaruśataka ('The hundred verses of Amaru') to Śaṃkarācārya.

He was not, Hacker argues, commonly called Śaṃkarācārya by his contemporaries and immediate successors. Various titles were given:

- i) apart from 'Śaṃkara', Sureśvara gives the designations Bhagavatpāda ('One with blessed feet') and Bhagavatpūjyapāda ('The blessed one with adorable feet.')
- ii) Vācaspatimiśra and Padmapāda, who both wrote sub-commentaries on Śaṃkara's commentary on the Brahma Sūtras often call him 'Bhāṣyakāra' 'Writer of the Commentary.'
- iii) Jñānottama, who comments on Sureśvara, never uses the appellation 'Śaṃkara' but prefers either 'Bhāṣyakāra' 'Bhagavatpādācārya' 'Bhagavatpūjyācārya' or simply 'Ācārya.'

The designation 'Śaṃkarācārya' Hacker observes, is, it appears, a later phenomenon. However, these alternative names are applied not only to Śaṃkara. Govinda, Śaṃkara's teacher, (as for example in the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad commentary), is called Bhagavatpūjyapāda.

In the works attributed to Śaṃkara, Hacker concludes that within one, given text Bhagavat, Bhagavatpāda and Bhagavatpūjyapāda will alternate, but will not interchange with Śaṃkarācārya, except through the error of a more recent scribe. Where the word Śaṃkarācārya is included, a teacher usually is not. Hacker attributes this to the transcribers knowing 'Śaṃkarācārya' as a title rather than a name, designating an office which would not be held by one who was still a disciple; furthermore, if an anonymous text were attributed to Śaṃkara at a later date, the scribe would be more likely to use a title including the word Ācārya 'teacher' rather than one including the term 'pupil', particularly since the former appellation came into vogue as time progressed.

Hacker concludes:

'Since Śaṃkara's contemporaries styled him Bhagavat, Bhagavatpāda and Bhagavatpūjyapāda in the colophons, we are entitled to regard provisionally as genuine those works that are described in their colophons as productions of the Bhagavat, whereas all the works that are usually attributed to Śaṃkarācārya in the colophons are suspicious of being spurious.'

Further evidence of the Sanatsujātīyabhāṣya being spurious is:

- i) The sources of quotations are named, which is uncharacteristic of Śaṅkara.
- ii) The Brahma Sūtra commentary is quoted, introduced by 'uktaṁ hi', 'for it has been said.'
- iii) Sureśvara is quoted, being referred to as ācārya 'teacher', which Hacker believes Śaṅkara would not do.

Hacker also disproves the authenticity of the Sarvasiddhāntasaṅgraha, a 'compendium of all philosophical views,' with the following evidence:

- i) The colophons read 'Śaṅkarācārya.'
- ii) A Brahma Sūtra commentary written by Bhagavatpāda is mentioned, evidently that of Śaṅkara.
- iii) The author considers the aphorisms of Jaimini and Vyāsa to constitute one work, which Śaṅkara does not.
- iv) There are the terms 'vivarta' and 'saccidānanda' two terms never found in Śaṅkara's works.
- v) The 'ekajīvavāda' 'doctrine that there is one soul', is contrasted with the view that there are many individual souls; this argument was not current in Śaṅkara's time.

vi) 'nāmarūpa' is not discussed in the Vedānta section, which we would expect.

vii) The author appears to be a Kṛṣṇaite, declaring the Bhāgavata Purāṇa to be the highest wisdom.

In 1950 Hacker published an article that, in a historical perspective, revolutionized the study of the authenticity of Śaṅkara's works. Vetter appropriately describes it as 'epochemachend' 'epoch-making.' It was entitled 'Eigentümlichkeiten der Lehre und Terminologie Śaṅkaras: Avidyā, Nāmarūpa, Māyā, Īśvara,' 'Characteristics of Śaṅkara's Teaching and Terminology,' Śaṅkara's particular usage of the four terms mentioned at the end of the title being studied in the article.

We shall summarise Hacker's observations:

1) Avidyā

a) Definition

i) Avidyā is 'adhyāsa', the mutual imposition of Self and non-Self.

ii) Adivyā is 'mithyājñāna', 'false knowledge', while for Śaṅkara's followers avidyā is the material out of which mithyājñāna is made.

b) As an element of a category

Avidyā is regarded as i) a kleśa 'ailment' the first and foremost
and ii) a doṣa 'fault'

c) Avidyāvasthā and Avidyāviśaya

i) Avidyāvasthā means 'the state of ignorance,' as an affliction,
not a cosmic power.

ii) It is synonymous with avidyāviśaya 'the realm of ignorance'.

d) As a cause

In Śaṅkara avidyā is an efficient cause, in others a material
cause (upādāna or prakṛti).

Avidyā (or sometimes mithyājñāna) appears compounded with words
such as:

- pratyupasthāpita 'called forth by avidyā'
- adhyasta 'supposed through avidyā'
- adhyāropita 'superimposed through avidyā'
- vijṛmbhita 'made to appear through avidyā'
- kalpita 'fabricated by avidyā'
- kṛta 'made by avidyā'

e) Attributes missing

The avidyā portrayed in Śaṅkara is not:

- i) jada 'inert'
- ii) bhāvarūpa 'really existing'
- iii) an 'āvaraṇaśakti' 'possessing the power of covering'
- iv) a 'vikṣepaśakti' 'possessing the power of dispersion'
- v) anādi 'without beginning'
- vi) anirvacanīya 'indescribable'

In Śaṅkara, there is no speculation about avidyā. These compounds are not used:

vii) avidyāśraya 'the support of avidyā'

viii) avidyāviṣaya 'the object of avidyā'

2) Nāmarūpa

a) Avyākṛte nāmarūpe 'unmanifest name and form' is a primary material, or 'Urstoff.'

b) Vyākṛte nāmarūpe 'manifest name and form' is the phenomenal world.

Śaṅkara recognises usages a) and b), others only usage b).

c) Nāmarūpa is juxtaposed to 'karman.'

d) Nāmarūpa is given the epithet 'anirvacanīya' which can be preceded by tattvānyatvābhyām NOT sadasadbhyām or sattvāsattvābhyām.

e) Nāmarūpa may be the effect of avidyā, its cause.

3) Māyā

- a) The word 'māyā' is comparatively rarely used in Śaṅkara.
- b) Śaṅkara never calls his doctrine māyāvāda.
- c) Usages of māyā:
 - i) Meaning 'deception'
 - ii) Meaning 'magic'
 - iii) As an object of comparison, to illustrate something illusory.
 - iv) As the power of the creator. These three concepts, avidyā, māyā and nāmarūpa, though distinct, are closely related to each other in Śaṅkara.

4) Īśvara

- a) Used frequently in Śaṅkara's work compared with his disciples.
- b) Īśvara, (param) brahma(n) and paramātmā are interchangeable in Śaṅkara. Īśvara in later works is defined as Brahman associated with māyā.

2.9 R D Karmakar 1958

In an article appearing eight years later to be found in the 'Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute', Karmakar, refuting Sharma, argues against the authenticity of the Gītā commentary.

Śaṅkara, he asserts, always expressed himself in the plural or the passive, never in the first person singular, as happens in the Gītā commentary (see Sharma P.28). It is worthy of note here that this same piece of evidence has been used both to substantiate and deny the authenticity of the text, by Karmakar and Sharma respectively!

The introductory portion also, Sharma contends, contains elements uncharacteristic of Śaṅkara, such as referring to the Lord as Nārāyaṇa and Viṣṇu, statements more likely to have emanated from a Vaiṣṇavite or follower of the Bhakti School. The text refers to Bādarāyaṇa without adding the word 'ācārya' as is Śaṅkara's custom. If Śaṅkara wrote the Brahma Sūtra commentary at the age of sixteen, as tradition suggests, there would not have been time for his style to have developed. Furthermore, being smṛti, Śaṅkara would not have troubled to write a commentary on it. He even, when quoting the work in the Brahma Sūtra commentary, appears unsure of its name.

Identifying one of the opponents in the commentary as Rāmānuja, Karmakar suggests that the text post-dates Rāmānuja, quite the reverse of Sharma's argument (see P.29). It is, he maintains, unlike Śaṅkara to make no comment at all on the first chapter and first ten verses of the second chapter.

Karmakar next investigates the commentary of the Gītā on verses which are also discussed in the Brahma Sūtra commentary, and detects that in the commentary on the Gītā 15:7, much appears that is not strictly relevant, brought in from the commentaries on a number of sūtras in the Brahma Sūtra Commentary:

'The writer of the Gītābhāṣya having before him Śaṅkara's comment, puts all this in his work.'

We shall also analyse the relationship of the commentary on the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad to the Brahma Sūtra commentary.

2.10 S Mayeda (1961 onwards)

In the early 1960s S. Mayeda, as part of a PhD thesis entitled 'The Upadeśasāhasrī of Śaṅkarācārya, Critically edited with Introduction,' considered thoroughly the question of this text's authenticity. Mayeda applies Hacker's method of verification, and subsequently applied the same test to the commentaries attributed to Śaṅkara on the Bhagavad Gītā, both the sentence and word commentaries on the Kena Upaniṣad, and on the Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad with Gauḍapāda's Kārikās, on each occasion adding his own observations depending on the text.

Apart from the four terms proposed by Hacker (see P.34), Mayeda considers how the words 'ānanda' 'bliss' 'vivarta' 'illusory transformation' and the name Vyāsa are used in the Upadeśasāhasrī as compared with Śaṅkara's commentary on the Brahma Sūtras:

1) Ānanda

BSBh The word ānānda is used only where the text requires it.

US Brahman or ātman is only characterised as ānanda where quotations from the śruti make it necessary.

2) Vivarta

Like BSBh, US does not use the term.

3) Vyāsa

BSBh Śaṁkara understands by the term Vyāsa the author of the Mahābhārata and other smṛtis, not Bādarāyaṇa.

US There is no contradictory evidence.

Then Mayeda embarks upon a comparison of the quotations in the two texts. In BSBh the most frequently quoted Upaniṣads are the Chāndogya and Bṛhadāraṇyaka. However, allowing for the far greater number of quotations of the Chāndogya Upaniṣad in the Brahma Sūtras themselves upon which Śaṁkara comments, Mayeda concludes that the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad is 'Śaṁkara's most important authority.' Since the Bṛhadāraṇyaka is the most frequently cited Upaniṣad in Upadeśa-sāhasrī, there is no discrepancy here between the two texts; (it must be said, however, that Mayeda should have expected this, for the Bṛhadāraṇyaka is the longest Upaniṣad - see Page 64).

Finally, Mayeda examines the references other authors have made to this text.

1) Sureśvara

Śaṅkara's pupil Sureśvara imitates Upadeśasāhasrī, and quotes from it.

2) Bhāskara

In his commentary on the Bhagavad Gītā, Bhāskara, who is thought to have lived shortly after Śaṅkara, quotes the Upadeśasāhasrī. It is implied in what Bhāskara writes that he considers the Upadeśasāhasrī as a work of Śaṅkara.

3) Vidyāraṇya

In Pañcadaśī Vidyāraṇya quotes the Upadeśasāhasrī, attributing the statements to 'the authors of the Bhāṣya and the Varttika.'

4) Sadānanda

In Vedāntasāra Sadānanda quotes the Upadeśasāhasrī, though gives no indication of its author.

Mayeda argues that the existence of a commentary by Ānandajñāna must further contribute towards our acceptance of the authenticity of Upadeśa Sāhasrī.

In his analysis of the commentary on the Bhagavad Gītā, which he considers genuine, the higher than usual frequency of the term 'māyā'

is accounted for by its appearance six times in the text. This consideration will, of course, be particularly necessary with the commentary on the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad. The high ratio of the number of Śvetāśvatara quotations as opposed to Bṛhadāraṇyaka quotations in the Bhagavad Gītā commentary (1:3) compared with the same figure in the Brahma Sūtra commentary (1:10) may also be accounted for by the nature of the Bhagavad Gītā, namely its similarity to the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad in highlighting the personal Īśvara.

By the time of writing his argument for the authenticity of the Sentence commentary on the Kena Upaniṣad, Mayeda was firmly convinced of the efficacy of Hacker's method:

'Śaṃkara shows his doctrinal peculiarities in some technical terms such as avidyā, māyā, nāmarūpa and Īśvara in his Brahma Sūtra commentary to such an extent that we can tell Śaṃkara's genuine works from even those of his direct disciples with considerable certainty.'

Mayeda also finds that 'at the present stage of research, the commentary on the Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad and Gauḍapādīya Kārikās must be considered genuine according to this method, and adds the observation that 'śiva' is only used as an adjective in Śaṃkara.

2.11 W.R. Antarkar 1962

In reply to Karmakar's refutation of the authenticity of the commentary on the Gītā ascribed to Śaṃkara, Antarkar raises a few extra matters which are of relevance to the present study:

- i) Where Karmakar had detected in Śaṅkara's commentary a reference back to Rāmānuja's commentary on the Brahma Sūtras, therefore concluding that the commentary ascribed to Śaṅkara postdates Rāmānuja, Antarkar remarks that Rāmānuja was probably only repeating what had been said by several generations of earlier teachers in his tradition. This warns us against taking chronological evidence at face-value.
- ii) The reference to Nārāyaṇa in the introductory verses of the Gītā commentary, far from being evidence against authenticity, are only to be expected of Śaṅkara, who, as all the biographies agree, was a devout Vaiṣṇavite. Although the factual basis of many of the biographies has been questioned, Antarkar has a good argument for assuming that such a strength of tradition is based on historical verity. The possibility is also mentioned of some passages having been inserted by an author with Vaiṣṇavite propensities.
- iii) Dr Sahasrabudhe has shown that the Yogavāsiṣṭha in its formative stages did not necessarily postdate Śaṅkara. This is important, since the work is also quoted in the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad commentary.

2.12 P. Hacker 1968

Although the idea of discerning stages in Śaṅkara's development of style was not new (see Sharma P.27), the concept of Śaṅkara being at first a Yogin then converting to Advaita was quite novel. In 'Śaṅkara the Yogin and Śaṅkara the Advaitin: some observations,' Hacker suggests the following progression in Śaṅkara's lifetime:

Beliefs

Works

Yogin, believing subject and object are one
(draṣṭṛdrśyasamyoga)

Sub-commentary on the commentary of Vyāsa on the Yoga Sūtras.

Conversion to Advaita, believing that there is an illusory differentiation of subject and object, caused by vibration in the mind

Commentary on the Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad with Gauḍapāda's Kārikās and Prakaraṇa 19 of the Padyaprabandha of Upadeśasāhī
'A Thousand Teachings.'
(early period as Advaitin, still influenced by Yoga)
Commentary on the Taittirīya Upaniṣad
(transitional period)

Belief that subject which is real, and object which is unreal, are distinct, but are mutually superimposed.

Other works
(mature Advaita works)

Hacker justifies his view that Śaṅkara was a Yogin first by the existence of the sub-commentary attributed to him on the Yoga Sūtras, and secondly by hints of Yogic influence in his later works:

i) samyagdarśana is a term peculiar to Śaṅkara in Vedānta, and is probably culled from Yoga.

ii) As in Yoga, in Śaṅkara avidyā 'ignorance' is mithyājñāna (false knowledge) and not a material cause.

.iii) 'pratyupasthāna' is a term in Yoga meaning 'the being present of'

'pratyupasthāpita' is a term characteristic of Śaṅkara's terminology.

Hacker sees the commentary on the Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad with the Gauḍapāda Kārikās as most heavily influenced by Yoga. The analogy of illness being cured by the teaching, found in the introduction of this commentary is paralleled by the introductory passage of the sub-commentary on the Yoga Sūtras. In Chapter 19 of the Padyabandha of Upadeśasāhasrī also, a similar analogy appears, suggesting it too is an early composition in the main stream of Śaṅkara's thought, Hacker argues:

'Śaṅkara's Vedānta dagegen will keine Methode lehren, die durch Übungen kontinuierlich zum Ziel der Erlösung führe.'

'On the other hand Śaṅkara's Vedānta does not set out to teach a method which continuously leads to the goal of liberation through practices.'

The presence of a benedictory verse preceding the Taittirīya Upaniṣad commentary is one reason for Hacker judging it to be from Śaṅkara's earlier period. He conjectures that works with such verses were composed while Śaṅkara's teacher was still alive.

Hacker also observes a change in the view towards the relationship between subject and object over the period of his lifetime. In the earlier works, the unity of subject and object is emphasised, differentiation being caused by a vibration in the mind. In the later works, it is taught that subject and object are quite distinct, the subject real, the object unreal.

Although highly speculative, Hacker's ideas must not be discounted. They were subsequently questioned by Halbfass in his appendix to 'Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik,' entitled 'Notes on the Yogasūtrabhāṣyavivarāṇa,'

In 'Notes on the Māṇḍūkyaopaniṣad and Śaṅkara's Āgamaśāstravivarāṇa,' Hacker warns us that Śaṅkara will always follow the authority of the text upon which he comments:

'It may be noted in passing that proper attention to the reverential flexibility of Ś's mind does not allow us to deny his authorship simply on the grounds that a text he commented upon includes ideas which he did not uphold when speaking independently of an authoritative text.'

2.13 T. Vetter (1968)

T. Vetter affirmed that Śaṅkara was the author of the commentary on the Āgamaśāstra (Gauḍapāda's initial verses connected with the Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad). In this work, he attests, there is the absence of terms that are common in other Advaita works but are never used by Śaṅkarabhagavat, namely vivarta 'illusionary transformation', sphūrṭi/sphuraṇa 'vibration' and jaḍa 'unconscious'. As is Śaṅkara's genuine works, there is a reserve towards an unqualified characterization of Brahman as sat (existence) and ānanda (bliss). This, we should note, is another feature which distinguishes the compositions of Śaṅkara from those of other Advaitins, particularly Maṇḍana Miśra, who laid great emphasis on ānanda (bliss), as in the opening passages of his Brahmasiddhi.

2.14 S.K. Caturvedi (1979)

Caturvedi succinctly refutes Bhattacharya's arguments against the authenticity of the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad commentary attributed to Śaṅkara in the only article¹ I can find (excluding Hauschild's chapter devoted to the question) solely dealing with the authorship of this particular work.

Caturvedi takes three main objections that Bhattacharya has, and gives counter-arguments:

- 1) It is wrong to compare this commentary with that of the Brahma Sūtras saying the former is inferior, for the two are of quite different natures.
- 2) The long Puranic quotations are included because of the sectarian nature of the Upaniṣad itself.
- 3) R.M. Sastri² observes that elsewhere Śaṅkara quotes Śuka, mentioning his bare name, without an honorific epithet. When referring to himself Gauḍapāda uses the simple name. Śaṅkara has merely added 'ācārya' in reverence.

Caturvedi concludes 'This leaves nothing to suspect authenticity of this commentary.'

1 'On the Authorship of the Śvetāśvataropaniṣad Bhāṣya' Journal of the Ganganath Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha, Allahabad 1979.

2 At the 5th All India Oriental Conference 1928 p. 691f.

2.15 A. Wezler (1983)

In his article 'Philological Observations on the so-called Pātañjalayogasūtrabhāṣyavivaraṇa' Wezler notes that while Hacker, presupposing the identity of Śaṅkara and the author of the Vivaraṇa, has done much to show the influence of Yoga upon Śaṅkara, he has not proved his supposition. He calls for an examination of the non-technical and non-philosophical expressions in the Vivaraṇa compared to those of Śaṅkara, such as the Vivaraṇa's most frequent use of 'nanu ca' in introducing objections. Such an argument to prove the identity of the authors, he stated would have to be 'cumulative.'

2.16 Swāmi Gambhīrānanda (1984)

In the introduction to his translation of the Śvetāśvataropaniṣadbhāṣya, having stated a few of the arguments against authenticity, Gambhīrānanda adds 'this gloss omits to explain many words and phrases of the text, a habit very unusual with Śaṅkarācārya.' To balance the argument he quotes Swāmi Nikhilānanda, who asserts, 'As regards his lavish use of quotations from the Bhagavadgītā and the Purāṇas... it can be said that Śaṅkarācārya may have felt a special need to establish his thesis of non-dualism on the evidence of smṛti.'

1. The Upaniṣads, Harper and Brothers Publishers, New York, 1951.

3. CONSIDERATION OF POSSIBLE METHODS OF ASSESSING THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE TEXT.

3.1 Statistics and the use of computers.

Several attempts have been made to determine authenticity by conducting a statistical analysis of the text in question, and comparing it with a similar analysis of an accepted work or works of the author to whom the text in question is attributed. The 'accepted work' may be termed the 'control material.'

T.R. Trautmann¹ mentions various methods, such as the analysis of sentence length, compound length, and noun vocabularies. He investigates the frequency of 'mundane' words, in the belief that these may be the best indicators. In a 'pilot' study he considers the number of times 'ca' is used per sentence in different parts of the Arthaśāstra. Trautmann conceded that the method has failings:

'...for it will often turn out that two authors will have similar rates for some words, just as a great number of people, probably the greater part of the world's population, will answer to the description 'brown eyes and black hair.'

The Sanskrit language lends itself to particular types of analysis, such as the frequency of the uses of the different types of past tense, of the suppressed 'asti' and particles such as atha, api and eva. Within a particular genre however, particularly in a field like

1 In 'Kautilya and the Arthaśāstra' Leiden 1971.

Vedānta, where there is an accepted commentarial style, and authors attempt to reflect a tradition rather than express their own individuality, such a statistical analysis is likely to prove less meaningful. As any salesman will confirm, statistics can be used to support any argument. Their interpretation is beleaguered with pitfalls. The method can never prove anything beyond doubt; it simply may be used as corroborative evidence. Before entering this minefield, Trautmann significantly says 'Let us cross our fingers and proceed.'

The obvious development of the statistical method is, of course, the use of computers. On enquiring into the utility of this method, Dr. Michael Weltzman of University College, London, helped by outlining three possible areas of investigation:

- 1) The commonest words or grammatical features. One may calculate the frequency of a given feature per thousand (say) words of text, and compare these figures for different passages.

The problems with this approach are:

- i) the difference in frequency of a given feature may be due to context rather than style.
- ii) When two passages record the same frequency with one feature, but different frequencies with another, are the passages to be said to be by the same author or not?

2) The extent to which an author tends to repeat words can be calculated. This is a method pioneered by G.V. Yule.¹ V_1 is the number of words occurring just once, V_2 is the number of words occurring just twice, and so on. Using these figures, Yule could calculate the probability that two words chosen at random in the text should be from the same vocabulary item. This figure has the advantage that it is independent of the length of the text. It is difficult, however, to see how such a figure could be used to prove or disprove authenticity. At best it would provide an interesting footnote in the discussion. The temptation to draw far-reaching conclusions from figures calculated with such assiduity would be great.

3) The frequency of hapax legomena per thousand (say) words is calculated. Again, a high frequency may be due to differing content. How meaningful such a figure is in our current investigation is debatable.

With the use of computers, the inherent difficulties involved in trying to determine authorship through the statistical analysis of a literary text are compounded. General observations may be useful, and figures appreciated within reason may be helpful, but we should beware of their indiscriminate application.

3.2 Appreciation of Style.

However desirable it may be, style is not quantifiable in mathematical terms. An appreciation of the style of an author comes with experience of reading his works.

¹ The Statistical Study of Literary Vocabulary, Cambridge, 1944.

In the case of Śaṅkara, we must be aware that Sanskrit commentaries themselves have a particular style to which authors conform. Within this framework we have to identify what is peculiar to Śaṅkara.

Hacker has been successful in recognising certain technical terms of Vedānta which, he, for the most part, convincingly maintains are used in distinctive ways by Śaṅkara.

It is also valid to consider whether his use of non-technical vocabulary is distinctive. However, as ever we are left with the possibility that Śaṅkara went through different stylistic phrases during his life.

One aspect of general style which it is useful to consider is the treatment of quotations. Here, as Mayeda has shown, it can be informative to consider the relative frequency of quotation from different sources, and indeed how often quotations appear.

Another important aspect is the general 'register' of the composition, again unquantifiable, but perceptible. The simple style of the commentary of the Bhagavad Gītā as compared with the sophisticated tenor of the commentary on the Brahma Sūtras has already been mentioned. It was also shown that this is not necessarily proof of different authorship.

3.3 Analysis of Doctrines.

Again, when comparing works from the same school, obviously the doctrine found in the works concerned will be very similar. Indeed, works compared within the tradition of Śaṅkara's Advaita will deliberately closely reflect and even plagiarize Śaṅkara. This phenomenon is at the heart of the difficulty of differentiating authors within the field.

Sometimes the objectors' views in commentaries inform us of the time in which the commentator lived. However, we cannot necessarily assume that the objectors portrayed are contemporaries of the authors. They may be imagined objectors, either to emphasize the teaching propounded, or copied from previous commentaries.

It is also important to recognise that the doctrine of the commentary may be influenced by the text commented upon. The commentators in this field regard the Śruti as the ultimate authority, and hence the nature of a particular text may well determine how the commentator expresses ideas.

3.4 Circumstantial evidence

Probably the most satisfactory method of adjudging authenticity is by considering factors surrounding the text such as commentaries on it, references to other texts made in the work, colophons, passages similar or identical to those found in other works etc. It is these considerations, together with those of style and ideas, that we shall take into account when assessing the authenticity of the work.

4. APPLICATION OF METHODS TO ASSESS THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE TEXT.

4.1 Hacker's method, further developed by Mayeda.

1) avidyā

Discounting simple repetitions of the text, the ŚvBh uses avidyā thirty-five times.

a) Definition.

Śaṅkara's definition of avidyā as adhyāsa (superimposition) in BSBh is generally followed in ŚvBh, as is shown by such expressions as:

'śarīrasaṃyoganimitānām avidyānām hetuḥ' (G.P. page 301)

'the cause of ignorance which brings about the identification with the body.'

b) Powers similar to avidyā

It is Ś's usual practice to place avidyā (or ajñāna) at the beginning, not in the midst of a list of similar powers, as ŚvBh does in:

'yonih kāraṇam avyākṛtam ākāśam paramavyoma

māyā prakṛtiḥ śaktis tamo 'vidyā chāyājñānam (G.P. page 109)

'source, cause, unevolved, physical space, the highest heaven,
the illusion, Nature, power, darkness, ignorance, shade, nescience...'
In BSBh avidyā is often the first in a list of 'kleśa'
'afflictions' or 'doṣa' 'faults.'

For example:

'avidyākāmakarmakṛtam' (BSBh 1:2:17)

'formed through ignorance, desire and action...'

'avidyākāmakarma' is a combination used four times in ŚvBh, as in:

'mucyate sarvapāśair avidyākāmakarmabhiḥ' (G.P. page 292)

'One is liberated sarpapāśaiḥ from ignorance, desires and actions.'

These lists in ŚvBh normally do follow the pattern in BSBh of avidyā
being first:

'avidyāsmītārāgadveṣābhīniveśāḥ pañca kleśabhedāḥ' (G.P. page 122)

'avidyāder haraṇāt' (G.P. page 151)

'avidyākāmaavāsanāśrayalingopādhir' (G.P. page 244)

'avidyādibandha' (G.P. page 317)

BSBh and ŚvBh then broadly concur in this respect.

c) avidyāvasthā and avidyāviṣaya

Neither of these important expressions meaning the 'realm of' avidyā
occur per se in ŚvBh. The one similar expression in ŚvBh however
does not conflict with the BSBh meaning of avidyāviṣaya as an
affliction, not a cosmic power:

'avidyāvadviṣaya evāyaṁ kurvanneveti'

'Indeed by performing works here (one should wish to live for a
hundred years) is (shown to apply to) the realm (viṣaya) of
ignorance.'

Mayeda found a similar lack of these terms in US, though concluded ultimately that the text was genuine. Hence we cannot take this absence as evidence of ŚvBh being spurious.

d) As a cause.

The majority of compounds in ŚvBh containing the word 'avidyā' are in some respects similar to those of BSBh, though a somewhat different range of final members is noticeable:

avidyā - parikalpita (G.P. page 14)

avidyā - kṛta (G.P. page 48)

avidyopādhika (G.P. page 78)

Compare BSBh:

avidyā - kalpita (1:1:4 etc)

avidyā - kṛta (1:2:11 etc)

avidyādhyāropita (2:1:9)

avidyā is not directly connected with the terms upādānakāraṇa or prakṛti, as it often is in works postdating Ś. However, avidyā is not compounded with adhyāropita, kalpita, or prakalpita, expressions which Mayeda judges are 'peculiar to Ś.' No definite conclusions are to be drawn here and only 'svaviśayayāvidyayā' seems to indicate a later author with some certainty.

e) Attributes missing.

No attributes of avidyā appear in the text which later Vedāntins associate with avidyā but which Ś does not.

2) nāmarūpa

The one point at which nāmarūpa appears in ŚvBh its usage is in keeping with that of Ś in juxtaposition with karmaṇi:

'pradhānajair avyaktaprabhavair nāmarūpakarmabhis tantusthānīyair

(G.P. page 309)

'pradhānajaīh with names, forms and actions arising out of the Unmanifest, which are comparable to the threads (of a spider).'
This is in keeping with Ś's usage of nāmarūpa, as in:

'ātmano nāmarūpakarmaprapaṇcākāraṇatām vyācakṣāṇaḥ' (BSBh 1:4:19)

'It says tht the Self is the cause of the creation which is (made up) of names, forms and actions.'

This test of authenticity would not suggest the text is by a hand other than Ś. However, that nāmarūpa only occurs once is surprising, since in BSBh the frequency of nāmarūpa and avidyā appearing is in the ratio 7:10. Since there were 35 appearances of avidyā (independent of textual quotation), we would expect about 25 appearances of nāmarūpa. Even if we assume that US is genuine and take its ratio 5:15, we would expect about 12 appearances. This suggests a somewhat different use of vocabulary in the texts. We may deduce that either ŚvBh and BSBh had different authors, or the same author's work is seen at different stages in his life.

3. Māyā

In ŚvBh the term māyā is used 20 times independently of the Upaniṣadic text. If we now consider the ratio of the frequency of the appearance of the terms māyā and avidyā, we find that since this ratio was 2:10 in BSBh we would expect only 7 appearances of māyā in ŚvBh, given that there are 35 appearances of avidyā. The ratio for māyā and nāmarūpa in BSBh was 2:7, so given there was one appearance of nāmarūpa in ŚvBh, on this basis we would expect probably no appearances of māyā. Here we encounter the difficulty of formulating statistics and interpreting them; however, the point is made that ŚvBh uses māyā much more than BSBh does. A high frequency of the use

of māyā is a feature of the writings of later Advaitins (see Mayeda US page 184). However, ŚvU itself uses the term māyā three times, and māyin twice, and the nature of text may in some measure explain why the commentator was moved to use māyā more in his commentary. I can find no instance in ŚvBh where māyā undoubtedly simply means 'fraud' or 'magic', nor any occasions when it is used as an object of comparison, all of which occur in BSBh. On one or two occasions 'māyā' could be interpreted as meaning magic:

'avināśyeva brahma māyātmakatvād vikārasya'

'Brahman is surely imperishable, for change is magic by nature.'

Here, however, as elsewhere, māyā is better interpreted as 'illusory power.' This is almost always the meaning in ŚvBh, as it is very frequently in BSBh. Mayeda in GBh summed up neatly Ś's view of māyā: 'Māyā is therefore, Viṣṇu's power which, being more or less illusory, creates, controls, and deludes the whole world.'

In BSBh māyā is not identical with avidyā as it is with Ś's followers, though there is a close relationship between the two. ŚvBh generally accords with BSBh in this respect. This can be seen in such expressions as:

'avidyātatkāryādiviśvamāyānivṛtṭyā' (G.P. page 254)

'...owing to the cessation of the illusion of the universe, of ignorance and its effects etc'

Māyā is not the material cause of the illusory in BSBh as it is with later Advaitins. ŚvBh is ambiguous on this point, at one point declaring that māyā is not a substance, at another suggesting that māyā is endowed with being (or perhaps the appearance of being):

'māyayā anirvācyatvena vastutvāyogāt' (G.P. page 147)

'For, since illusion is indecribable, it does not make sense to attribute substance to it.'

'māyīnam māyāyāḥ sattāspḥurtyādīpradam'

'māyīnam (Him - the Lord) who gives being and manifestation etc. to illusion.'

The emphasis of the dependancy of māyā on the Lord, however, diminishes its substantiality, and leads us to believe that the word is not being used in a way significantly different from Ś's usage. Māyā in ŚvBh then is not used in a way which radically varies from Ś's application of the term in BSBh. However, there are some indications of a different style of writing, particularly in the increased frequency of its usage.

Close relationship and identification of avidyā, māyā and nāmarūpa.

In accordance with Hacker's findings in BSBh, there is a fairly close relationship between the first two of these in ŚvBh, although nāmarūpa occurs too infrequently to take into consideration. When describing the Supreme Lord or liberation, the two terms are alike negated:

māyāvinirmuktānandaikaghaṇaḥ parameśvaro... (G.P. page 252)

'the supreme Lord, a single being full of bliss, free from illusion...'

kevalo'vidyāvikalpaśūnyaḥ (G.P. page 266)

'kevalaḥ devoid of the false notion of ignorance.'

avidyānivr̥ttīlakṣaṇasya mokṣasya (G.P. page 15)

'liberation, characterized by the cessation of ignorance.'

The correspondence is most clearly shown by the ŚvBh comment on ekanemim (1:4), where māyā and avidyā are spoken of as positive states:

māyā prakṛtiḥ śaktis tamo' vidyā chāyājñānam anṛtam avyaktam
ityevamādiśabdair abhīlāpyamānaikā kārṇāvasthā...

'the single causal state spoken of by words such as illusion (māyā), Nature, power, darkness, ignorance (avidyā), shade, nescience.'

Compare the doctrinally similar but stylistically much more ornate BSBh on 2:1:14:

'avidyākālpite nāmarūpe tattvānyatvābhyām anirvacanīye
samsāraprapañcabījabhūte sarvajñasyeśvarasya māyāśaktiriti'

'Name and form which are the seeds of phenomenal existence, created by ignorance, called the power of illusion of the omniscient Lord, and which cannot be designated as real or unreal.'

4. Īśvara

The term Īśvara (or parameśvara) occurs forty times in ŚvBh, more frequently than any other term we are considering. Its common occurrence is in keeping with the BSBh, although, as Mayeda found with the GBh, no doubt this is partially due to the nature of the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad, in that its tendency is to describe the personalised Godhead. Had the term been used infrequently in commenting on this text, we would have had substantial grounds to assert that ŚvBh is a work of one of Ś's disciples.

In ŚvBh however, (param) brahma(n), and paramātmā are not always interchangeable with Īśvara, which is the tendency in BSBh:

Īśvarātmā māyirūpeṇāvatīṣṭhate brahma (G.P. page 100)

'Brahman is found as the Lord (Īśvara) possessing illusion (māyā).' Here, Īśvara seems to be regarded as a possible repository for māyā, while Brahman is kept aloof from any connection.

The following also seems to indicate that the author regards Īśvara as brahman associated with māyā, which usage was common among later advaitins:

'paramātmanah svarūpeṇa śaktirūpeṇa ca nimittakāraṇopādānakāraṇatvaṁ māyitveneśvararūpatvaṁ devatātmatvasarvajñatvādirūpatvaṁ amāyitvena satyajñānānandādvitīyarūpatvaṁ ca' (G.P. page 105-6)

'The Supreme Self (paramātman) is, in its own nature and in its nature as a power, respectively an efficient and material cause. As ruler of illusion (māyā) it has the nature of the Lord (Īśvara), and a deity, and is omniscient etc., while its non-illusory nature is non-dual, truth, knowledge and bliss.'

The term Īśvara is often used when some idea of duality is involved, as for example the Lord and the individual soul. Our author even defines his view of Īśvara:

'parasparamvukto vyaṣṭisamaṣṭirūpa Īśvara'

'The Lord is of the nature of individuality (vyaṣṭi) and totality (samaṣṭi) mutually conjoined.'

Īśvara is regarded as the first element in the multiplicity of the phenomenal world:

'bhaved ayam Īśvarādy avibhāgaḥ yadi prapañcāsiddhir eva syāt'

(G.P. page 146).

'If the phenomenal world were admissable, then there would be no such differences as the Lord (Īśvara) etc.'

Īśvara is likewise equated with a power, as for example when devātmaśaktim in 1:3 is glossed:

devātmaśaktim devātmanēśvararūpeṇāvasthitām śaktim

'devātmaśaktim means the power that exists as identical with the Deity in the form of the Lord (Īśvara).'

It would be wrong to maintain that Ś. uses Īśvara, parameśvara, (param) brahma(n) and paramātman indiscriminately in different contexts. On the contrary, as with ŚvBh, he seems to use Īśvara predominately in contexts of saguṇa brahman (Brahman with qualities).

In commenting on Katha Upaniṣad 4:1 'parāñci khāni vyatṛṇat svayambhūḥ' 'the self-existent injured the outgoing senses,' svayambhūḥ, 'the self-existent,' obviously functioning as a power, is glossed as 'parameśvaraḥ.' Ś. will, however, relate parameśvara with paramātmān, particularly when the context demands, as in glossing Īśā in the Īśā Upaniṣad I:

'Īśitā parameśvaraḥ paramātmā sarvasya'

'He who is the supreme ruler (Īśitā) and Supreme Self (paramātmā) of all is the Supreme Lord (parameśvara).'

As has been shown the doctrinal issues are not clear-cut, though the association of Īśvara with māyā in ŚvBh, and the consequent lack of interchangeability of the terms Īśvara or parameśvara and paramātmān etc., does make one suspect that ŚvBh is the work of a later Advaitin.

5. Ānanda

Whereas the study of the terms so far has not led to any firm conclusions, a consideration of the use of the word ānanda in ŚvBh leaves us with the sure impression that the work is not by Ś. Ānanda is repeatedly used as a positive characteristic, principally of brahman, but also of ātmān and parameśvaraḥ.

Of the thirty-two occasions on which ānanda is used, it is coupled with pūrṇa 'full' eighteen times, normally to describe the non-dual Brahman.

'yas tu pūrṇānandabrahmarūpeṇātmānam avagacchati sa mucyate.'

(G.P. page 124)

'One who understands the Self, with its nature as Brahman full of bliss, is liberated.'

The way in which these references are evenly spread through the work would also make us discard the idea that part of the commentary may

be by Ś, although the term ānanda is only used once in the introductory section.

The term saccidānanda 'being, consciousness and bliss' appears twice. This is used by most advaitins apart from Ś. A variant of this citsadananda, appears five times.

'śivā śuddhāvidyātatkāryavinirmuktā saccidānandādvayabrahmarūpā'

(G.P. page 215)

'śiva means pure, free from ignorance and its effects, of the nature of the non-dual Brahman, being, consciousness and bliss.'

No such expression would appear in a genuine work of Ś.

Vivarta

In keeping with BSBh, ŚvBh does not use the term vivarta.

Vyāsa

The author refers to the author of the Brahma Sūtras as 'sūtrakāra' and not Vyāsa, which would have betrayed an authorship postdating Vācaspatimīśra, who, it seems, was the first to identify Veda - Vyāsa with Bādarāyaṇa in a benedictory verse of his Bhāmatī.

A Comparison of Quotations

The frequency with which an author quotes different texts should give us some indication of the relative importance he attaches to them.

Taking our yard-stick as BSBh again, we might compare the frequency with which different Upaniṣads are quoted in BSBh and in ŚvBh.

Before embarking on statistics, we should be aware of the limitations of this approach to test authenticity:

1) the sources of quotation will often be dictated by the text commented on.

2) the disciples of Śaṅkara are likely to attach similar relative importance to different texts.

In BSBh and in ŚvBh, the respective Upaniṣads are quoted the following number of times:

Upaniṣad	BSBh	ŚvBh
Chāndogya	810	23
Bṛhadāraṇyaka	567	44
Taittirīya	142	4
Muṇḍaka	129	8
Kāṭhaka	103	15
Kauṣītaki	88	0
Śvetāśvatara	53	35
Agnirahasya	40	0
Praśna	39	7
Aitareya	22	1
Jābāla	13	0
Nārāyaṇīya	9	0
Īśā	8	9
Paṇḍi	6	0
Kena	5	7

It is also useful to compare how frequently non-Vedic texts are quoted

Bhagavad Gītā	56	35
Mahābhārata	34	8
Viṣṇu Purāṇa	0	24
Līṅga Purāṇa	0	6
Brahma Purāṇa	0	2
Yājñavalkya Yatidharma	0	3
Yoga Vāsiṣṭha	0	1
Yājñavalkya Smṛti	0	1

As Mayeda rightly remarks in his PhD thesis (1961) for the University of Pennsylvania entitled 'The Upadeśasāhasrī of Śaṅkarācārya, critically edited with Introduction,' although the Chāndogya Upaniṣad is quoted more frequently than the Brhadāraṇyaka in BSBh, since the Brahma Sūtras themselves quote Chāndogya Upaniṣad more than twice as much as the Brhadāraṇyaka, we can conclude that Ś. had a higher regard for the Brhadāraṇyaka. So it is not surprising that it is the most frequently quoted Upaniṣad in ŚvBh. However, in his Naiṣkarmyasiddhi, Sureśvara, Ś's immediate disciple, quotes the Brhadāraṇyaka almost twice as frequently as the Chāndogya showing that Ś's disciples will not necessarily be at variance with Ś. in this respect.

It is not surprising that ŚvBh quotes the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad more frequently than the Chāndogya, since the former is actually being commented on. ŚvBh and BSBh correlate well in terms of the sources of their quotations, until we consider the abundance of Purāṇa quotations in ŚvBh, and their absence in BSBh. In ŚvBh the Viṣṇu Purāṇa alone is quoted more frequently than the Chāndogya Upaniṣad. Ś. does quote the Purāṇas in the works considered genuinely his, as for example in ChBh and BrBh as well as BGBh, but never with the frequency he does here. The long technical passage on Yoga (page 112), and the quotation of Yājñavalkya Yatidharma (1:7) and the Kalpa Upaniṣad reference (1:4) are unprecedented in Ś.

Although these unusual types of quotation alone are not enough to disprove the authenticity of ŚvBh, it is the most obviously 'unśaṅkaran' element that strikes the reader.

Equally remarkable is the similarity of some passages in ŚvBh with those in Ś's commentaries, almost as if the author of ŚvBh had Ś's works in front of him, and was unashamedly copying or paraphrasing, and occasionally elaborating (cf. Hauschild page 25, and see Notes 4, 5 and 14 of page 78, Note 3 of page 85 and Note 1 of 3:20).

It could be argued that the similarities, and indeed identical passages, give the impression that Ś. is indeed the author of ŚvBh. To take the example of the passage giving the derivation of the word 'upaniṣad' which is in places identical with the explanation given in the Kaṭha Upaniṣad (see Note 3 of page 85), considering the variety of explanations given for the word in other places in his commentaries, it seems unlikely that he would revert to copying his own previous work. ŚvBh also seems to précis the argument of BSBh (see Note 2 of page 110 and Note 1 of page 100). Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad 3.1.1 is identical with Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad 4:6, but the ŚvBh on this verse gives the impression of being a shortened version of MuBh on the same verse. By contrast Kaṭha Upaniṣad 2:23 and Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad 3:2:3 are identical, but their commentaries, both indisputedly by Ś, distinct.

All the indications are that a good deal of plagiarization has taken place in ŚvBh.

A further complication is that the very opening of ŚvBh has a passage identical with the Sanatsujātīyabhāṣya, a work which has certainly been spuriously attributed to Ś. It is hard to say which was the original, and which the copy. In view of the expression 'svāśrayayā svaviṣayāvidyayā svānubhavagamyayā' (Note 8 of Page 78) betraying a post-Śaṅkaran doctrine, an impression reinforced by 'citsadānanda' (see Note 7 of page 78), one is led to conclude that ŚvBh is a work postdating Ś, drawing freely on both Ś's work and on the current advaita vedantic ideas (and perhaps, texts) of its time.

Similarly we know that the ŚvBh on part of 1:4 is derived from the Tattvasamāsa, a short Sāṃkhya text of only 54 words written in aphoristic style. The only indication of a date we have for this text is that it must have existed before the middle of the sixteenth century, so we are not given any meaningful help with dating ŚvBh.

References to the text in works of other writers.

In the case of ŚvBh, it is the lack of references to the work by other authors that lends further support to our conclusion that the work is not by the hand of Ś.

In the Bibliotheca Indica (Vol. VII) edition of the Śvetāśvatara, Taittirīya and Aitareya Upaniṣads, (Calcutta 1850) Dr. E. Roer says that the works are 'accompanied by the bhāṣya of Śaṃkara Ācārya and the ṭīkā of Ānanda Giri, with the exception of the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad, which is only followed by the bhāṣya of Śaṃkara, as I was not able to procure a copy of Ānanda's ṭīkā, nor even information, whether or not it is yet extant.'

Ānanda's gloss being absent could be explained in three principal ways:

- 1) Being normally considered the eleventh most important Upaniṣad, Ānandi Giri did not consider the work significant enough to write a ṭīkā on it.
- 2) Ānanda Giri was unaware of the existence of Ś's commentary, or
- 3) did not believe it was the work of Ś, for he wrote ṭīkāś on all the other ten main Upaniṣad commentaries by Ś.

Even firmer evidence against ŚvBh being a genuine work of Ś. is that Nārāyaṇa at the end of the sixteenth century did not plagiarize it in his dīpikā on the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (cf Note 3 of 6:3).

Both Ānandagiri and Nārāyaṇa either were unaware of the ŚvBh, or did not believe it to be the work of Ś.

The 'litmus test' of authenticity developed by Hacker and Mayeda has, then, proved negative. We shall now investigate the question of authenticity by considering further style, ideas, and circumstantial evidence.

4:2 Statistical analysis of style.

Although, as has been stated, the limitations of statistical analysis of style is great, it is an avenue that merits some investigation. When giving a seminar on this thesis, and expressing my doubts as to the usefulness of statistical analysis in solving the problem of the authenticity of ŚvBh, it was suggested that an investigation of what Trautmann called the 'mundane' words, the common particles, etc., be made.

Samples of texts of a thousand words from both ŚvBh and a range of works of Śaṅkara the authenticity of which is generally accepted, were chosen, in each case choosing five hundred words from straight verse commentaries, and five hundred words from 'utsūtra' passages where the author speaks himself, not directly alluding to the text. Most of the commentarial texts were on verses which appear both in the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad and other Upaniṣads. Since most of the commentary analysed then, was on identical verses, there would be less chance of the different Upaniṣad texts adversely influencing our results, the commentators being swayed in their usage of words by the different texts commented upon.

Probably the most significant finding of this investigation was a by-product and not the main aim of the analysis. All the ŚvBh commentaries on identical verses commented on by Ś, were shorter than those of Ś. The average length of commentary on these verses in ŚvBh was 75 words, but 111 for the commentaries attributed to Ś. The consistency with which the ŚvBh was shorter, compared with a range of

commentaries on identical verses in the Kāṭha and Muṇḍaka Upaniṣads as well as the Bhagavad Gītā, was, arguably, the sign of a different author being at work in ŚvBh.

After some experimentation I chose five 'mundane' words, namely eva, api, ca, hi and iti, and counted how frequently they appeared in the sample.

The ŚvBh sample was passages from the introductory section, as well as the beginning of the commentary on the verses, and also the commentary on 3:16, 4:6, 4:7 and 6:14.

The Ś. sample was utsūtra passages from the beginning of the BSBh, and TaiBh BrBh, BGBh and the commentary on BhG 13:13, Kāṭha Upaniṣad 5:15 Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad 2:2:10, 3:1:1 and part of 3:1:2.

The results were as follows:

	ŚvBh	Ś.
eva	37	21
api	23	13
ca	35	41
hi	4	19
iti	<u>77</u>	<u>56</u>
Totals:	<u>176</u>	<u>150</u>

The author of ŚvBh tends to use eva more, desiring to emphasise particular words. The more frequent use of iti in ŚvBh is no doubt explained by its author's propensity towards quotation, which has already been mentioned (see Page 12). The larger total of these 'mundane' words indicates a generally more staccato style in ŚvBh. The only large discrepancy, however, is the use of 'hi' which Ś. employs fairly frequently, but ŚvBh seldom.

Although it would be difficult to base an argument against the authenticity of ŚvBh solely on these figures, they do perhaps indicate a different style at work in ŚvBh.

nanv anekātmakam brahma yathā vrkṣo'nekaśākhah evam
 anekaśaktipravṛtṭiyuktam brahma ata ekatvam nānātvāñcobhayam apī satyam
 eva yathā vrkṣa ityekatvam śākhā iti ca nānātvam yathā ca
 samudrātmanaiktvam pheṇatarāṅgādyātmanā nānātvam yathā ca mṛdātmanā
 ekatvam ghaṭaśarāvādyātmanā nānātvam tatra ekatvāmsena jñānān
 mokṣavyavahārah setsyati nānātvāmsena tu karmakāṇḍāśrayau
 laukikavaidikavyavahārau setsyata iti evam ca mṛdādidṛṣṭāntā anurūpā
 bhaviṣyantīti (BSBh 2:1:14)

'But Brahman consists of many things. As a tree has many branches, so Brahman has many powers and activities. Hence both unity and diversity are quite true, just as a tree, considered as a tree, is one, but is diverse in respect of its branches; or as the ocean, considered as the ocean, is one, but is diverse in its aspects of foam, waves, etc., or as clay, considered as clay, is one, but is diverse in its aspects of pot, plate etc. That being so, liberation will be accomplished through knowledge from the standpoint of the unity of Brahman, whereas worldly and Vedic affairs can be justified from the standpoint of diversity. And in this way the analogies of clay, etc., will become appropriate.' It is possible to make the following stylistic observations about this passage from the BSBh, which is fairly typical of the work:

- i) The language is complex in its structure, and the sentence long and ornate.
- ii) There is a pattern and symmetry with the yathā clauses, giving an almost poetic ring to the prose.
- iii) The examples are stock, but numerous.
- iv) Despite complexity, words are not wasted.
- v) The argument is thorough-going and intellectually rigorous.

tasmañ viduṣaḥ kartavyābhavād avidyāvadviṣaya evāyaṁ

kurvannevetyādikarmaniyamaḥ kurvanneveti ca nāyaṁ karmaniyamaḥ kintu
vidyāmāhātmyaṁ darśayitum yathākāmaṁ karmānuṣṭhānam eva draṣṭavyam
etaḍ uktam bhavati yāvajjīvaṁ yathākāmaṁ punyapāpādikāṁ kurvaty api
viduṣi na karmalepo bhavati vidyāsāmarthyād iti (ŚvBh G.P. P.42)

Therefore, since for a wise man there is no task left, the
prescription of works in (this statement beginning) 'Indeed by
performing works here (one should wish to live for a hundred years)'
(Īśā Upaniṣad 2) is (shown to apply to) the realm (viṣaya) of
ignorance.

And the statement 'Indeed by performing ritual acts here (one should
wish to live for a hundred years)' should be understood not as
prescribing ritual action, but rather as showing praise for the
knowledge whereby one indeed performs ritual action at one's
pleasure. What is meant is this: in consequence of his capacity for
knowledge, ritual action leaves no mark on the wise man, even though
he performs good and bad ritual acts according to his pleasure the
whole of his life.'

This passage is a fair comparison with the previous one, for it too
is a discussion independent of commentary on text. It does refer to
the Īśā Upaniṣad, but in view of the more copious quotation in ŚvBh,
it does not seem unfair to choose such a passage; indeed, it is
difficult to find a passage of comparable length in ŚvBh which does
not mention a śruti or smṛti text. The following stylistic
observations may be made about this passage:

- i) The language is simpler in its structure, and the sentences shorter and less ornate.
- ii) There is no pattern or symmetry in the sentences, and it does not rise to any poetic level.
- iii) There are no illustrations or analogies (although illustrations are elsewhere given in ŚvBh).
- iv) The argument shows less intellectual rigour.

The study of these two passages endorses the view that BSBh has a far more sophisticated style than that of ŚvBh. (see also 4:18 Note 1-the author of ŚvBh is capable of witty word-play, but never rises to the linguistic levels of BSBh). Is this due to different authors, or does it show the same author at different stages of literary development, showing as much contrast as the Shakespeare of Titus Andronicus compared with the Shakespeare of, say, King Lear? The main caucus of works genuinely ascribed to Ś., tend towards the sophistication of BSBh, with the exception of BGBh. This evidence must further add to our doubts of the authenticity of ŚvBh.

There are several stylistic indications in the text of the ŚvBh which would make us suspect further that the commentary is not the work of Ś; these have been dealt with in detail in the notes. Three technical terms, namely karaṇa meaning 'reasoning' (Page 101, Note 2), prārabdhakarma 'results of works which have already begun to fructify' (1:10 Note 3) and sūtrātman 'the self which is the thread of creation' (4:11 Note 3) all appear to be used in ŚvBh in ways they are not used in BSBh.

At other times ŚvBh passages resemble parts of undoubtedly genuine works so much that we are unsure if this is due to plagiarisation, or whether this is evidence to suggest Ś's hand is indeed at work in ŚvBh, whether partially or wholly. The opening of ŚvBh is one such passage (Page 78, Note 5), but this is most clearly shown in the passage giving the etymology of the word 'Upaniṣad' (Page 85, Note 3). Sometimes ŚvBh seems to précis Ś's genuine commentaries, as for example when ŚvBh is parallel to BSBh (Page 99, Note 2 and Page 100, Note 1), or when a verse in ŚvU is the same as a verse in another Upaniṣad upon which Ś. has commented (3:20 Note 1).

Whether the whole of ŚvBh is the work of one hand is another question that has been raised, namely by Hacker (Page 78, Note 4), who suspects that the introduction was added at a later date. There are, however, some indications of a constant author, namely the use of citsadānanda in both portions (see 1:1, Note 10), and the passage about the individual soul ("being drawn hither and thither by passion, etc., as though by crocodiles",) which first appears at the beginning of the introductory section, being echoed exactly in the commentary on 6:20 (see 6:20, Note 2).

4:4 Doctrines.

Assuming that ŚvBh is a later work of S's school, we would expect it to show a very similar set of doctrines to those of Ś. There may be one or two discrepancies, but these will be difficult to detect. On considering the doctrines of ŚvBh, this is indeed the impression one receives. One would also expect to find doctrines propounded by Ś. elaborated or formalised over the centuries.

Within ŚvBh we find Ś's doctrine of adhyāsa 'superimposition' assumed if not rigorously set out (see Page 89 Note 2), and Ś's view of transmigration stated in Upadeśa Sāhasrī closely adhered to (Page 78 Note 14). References are made in ŚvBh to the 'sādhana-catustaya' 'the four means' (to liberation) outlined in BSBh (4:14 Note 1 and 1:11 Note 6) on occasions closely reflecting Upadeśa Sāhasrī (4:7 Note 2). It is not the doctrine here which makes one suspect Ś. is not writing, but the use of the formalised term 'sādhana-catustaya', which suggests that the doctrine has been taught as the 'four means' as a systematized view of what is found in BSBh. It is a term which Ś. himself is hardly likely to use, and I can find no example of it being used in his commentaries.

The main opponents appear to be Mīmāṃsakas in the introductory section, claiming that liberation can be attained through performance of rites. This is a view which Ś. repeatedly refutes throughout his genuine commentaries. The opponent then proposes jñānakarmasamuccayavāda, the doctrine that knowledge combined with rites leads to emancipation. As in Ś's introductory commentary to the Taittirīya Upaniṣad this is refuted again at great length until the objector, still of a Mīmāṃsaka persuasion, insists that bondage has no elimination, and that there is no possibility of superimposition, since the nature of the Self is quite different from everything else. None of this will come as a surprise to one acquainted with Ś's commentaries.

The only two doctrinal differences that can be found have already been mentioned, namely with 'svāśrayayā svaviśayāvidyayā' and 'citsadānanda' (see Page 62). Otherwise it is only the presentation of the sādhana-catustaya doctrine that would make us suspect a later author.

4:5 Circumstantial evidence.

Most of this type of evidence has already been explored, such as the absence of a commentary by Ānanda giri, and Nārāyaṇa not plagiarising ŚvBh, mentioned by Regnaud and Jacob respectively in the last century (see Pages 13 and 14).

Hacker's colophon study would have us believe ŚvBh is genuine, but Hacker in the same breath says he doubts this (see Page 32).

Besides, colophons could always be later interpolations. Bhattacharya claims that Ś. would have used an honorific epithet for Gauḍapāda (see Page 18). It is also interesting to note that ŚvBh refers to Upadeśa Sāhasrī in 6:22. The commentary speaks of the need for a teacher to test the qualifications of a disciple, and ends:

'etac ca bahudhā prapañcitam upadeśasāhsrīkāyām ity atra saṁkocaḥ kṛtaḥ'

'This has been expounded in various ways in the Upadeśa Sāhasrī, and so it is dealt with in brief here.'

Ś. does not cross-refer to other of his own works: the author gives the impression of referring to a work which is well-established as part of the canon of Śaṁkara's teachings, betraying that he post-dates this work.

The absence of a benedictory verse in ŚvBh is in favour of its authenticity (see Page 78 Note 1) though such arguments are tenuous.

The passages identical with those found in the Sanatsujātīyabhāṣya, a non-authentic work of Ś., and certainly later since it quotes

Sureśvara, (see Page 32), as well as in the Tattvasamāsa, a Sāṁkhya tract thought to date from the sixteenth century (see Page 27), add to the impression that ŚvBh is quite a late work.

Conclusion.

Circumstantial evidence, as was the case with the evidence on style and doctrines, is heavily against ŚvBh being a genuine work of Ś.

Hacker's test also showed this.

The question now arises as to who did write the commentary on the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad. It is not within the scope of this thesis to attempt to answer this question, but some remarks can be made. The colophons must make us assume that this is a work of a Śaṅkarācārya. Presuming that a section of ŚvBh is derived from the Tattvasamāsa, and that the latter text has not been culled from ŚvBh, we must suppose that ŚvBh is a work significantly later than Ś's genuine commentaries, perhaps written in the sixteenth century or later. A small genre of similar works attributed to Ś. though undoubtedly unauthentic, can be identified, with a style similar to that of SvBh.

This includes Viṣṇusahasranāmabhāṣya, which has a style simpler than that of ŚvBh; Sanatsujātīyabhāṣya, which has a passage identical to one found in ŚvBh, and a style that seems in keeping with it;

Nṛsimhapūrvatāpanīyopaniṣadbhāṣyam, which uses the term saccidānanda; and Adhyātmapaṭalavivaraṇam, which along with the three aforementioned, is said to be the work of 'Śaṅkarabhagavat' in the colophon.

A TRANSLATION OF THE ŚVETĀŚVATARA UPANIṢAD WITH THE COMMENTARY ATTRIBUTED
TO ŚAMKARA

THE ŚVETĀŚVATARA UPANISAD WITH THE COMMENTARY ATTRIBUTED TO ŚAMKARA¹

Om. That is perfect. This is perfect. Perfect comes from perfect. Taking perfect from perfect, perfect alone remains.

O gods, may we hear the good with our ears. While sacrificing, may we see the good with our eyes. While praising with steady limbs and bodies, may we enjoy a life that is worthy of God.

May he protect us both. May he take pleasure in us both. May we show courage together. May that which is studied be lit up for us. May we not hate one another.

Om. Peace, peace, peace.

INTRODUCTION^{2,3}

This short treatise is a commentary⁴ undertaken in order to help the understanding of those who desire to know Brahman.⁵

This (individual) Self (Ātman) is of the very nature of Brahman. Brahman is by nature without a second, consciousness (cit), being (sat) and bliss (ānanda).^{6,7} However, through ignorance the individual Self becomes subject to the whole range of natural human desires. This ignorance is self-supporting, has its own domain (svaviṣaya), is known through experience of it,⁸ and has a phantom existence (sābhāṣā). Thus the (individual) Self acquires all that is detrimental⁹ to his welfare, by means which are themselves imagined through ignorance, and believes that the attainment of desired objects, in reality the ruin of a man, is to his benefit.¹⁰ He does not understand that liberation is the aim of life. With passions voracious like crocodiles,^{11,12} powerless to resist he is drawn hither and thither¹³ experiencing the various births of different orders of being, such as those of gods, men and animals.¹⁴

Now as a result of good works (karman)¹ he attains an embodiment eligible for Vedic study such as that of a Brāhmaṇa.² Through the performance of works dedicated to the Lord, impurities such as attachment³ are dissipated. He shows dispassion for the experience of objects in this world and the next, when he realises that they are transient by nature.⁴ He approaches a teacher through whom he hears the Upaniṣads. By hearing, (reflecting and meditating)⁶ on these, he comes to realise the truth about Brahman and the (individual) Self, that 'I, (the individual Self), am Brahman.'⁷ Ignorance and its effects disappear and he is free from grief.

Liberation, characterised by the cessation of ignorance,⁸ depends on knowledge. Hence it is fitting that the Upaniṣad is undertaken for the purpose of knowledge.

In this way by knowing that Brahman in practice one becomes immortal.

For the scriptures testify:

'(Therefore this (song) is the supreme Brahman, consisting of being, consciousness and bliss.)⁹ One who knows it as such becomes immortal even in this world.' (Nṛsimhapūrvatāpanīya Upaniṣad 1:6)

'(Knowing Him (the Supreme Being (Puruṣa)) in this way one goes beyond death). There is no other way to go (there).'¹⁰ (Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad 3:8 and 6:15)

'If one should not understand (Brahman) in this world there is great destruction.'¹¹ (Kena Upaniṣad 2:5)

'Those who know that (Self (Brahman)) become immortal.'¹² (Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 4:4:14)

'(If a man knew the Self as 'I am this (Self)',) (then) desiring what, and for love of what would he suffer along with the body?' (ibidem 4:4:12)

'Knowing that (greatness of a Brāhmaṇa) one is not marked by bad action.'
(ibidem 4:4:23)

'One who knows the Self goes beyond grief.' (Chāndogya Upaniṣad 7:1:3)

'Realizing that¹ (Self), one is released from the mouth of death.' (Kaṭha Upaniṣad 3:15)

'My friend,² the man who knows that (Brahman) set in the secret place³ (the heart), destroys the knot of ignorance in this world.' (Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad 2:1:10)

'When that⁴ (Self), which is both high and low, is realized, then the knot of the heart is untied, all doubts are resolved, and all one's actions are dissipated.' (ibidem 2:2:8)

'Just as rivers flowing into the ocean lose their identity and give up name and form, even so the wise man, freed from name and form, reaches the⁵ divine Supreme Being, which is beyond the highest.

Truly one who knows that supreme Brahman becomes that very Brahman.'
(ibidem 3:2:8-9)

'My friend', one who realizes that shadowless, bodiless, colourless, pure Imperishable attains the supreme Imperishable itself.' (Prašna Upaniṣad 4:10)

'He becomes all.'

'I know Him as the Supreme Being to be known. So let not death afflict you.'¹
(Prašna Upaniṣad 6:6)

(When for the wise man all beings have become the Self alone,) then what delusion, what sorrow is there for him who sees unity?² (Īśā Upaniṣad 7)

'Through knowledge he attains the immortal.'³ (ibidem 11)

'The wise perceive (Brahman) in all beings,⁴ leave this world behind and become immortal.' (Kena Upaniṣad 2:5)

'(One, indeed, who knows it (the esoteric doctrine) wards off sin and becomes established in the infinite, most excellent heavenly world.'⁵ (ibidem 4:9)

'(The gods and sages who in former times knew that (Brahman),) they, being unified with that (Brahman), indeed became immortal.' (Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad 5:6)

'So when indeed one who is embodied sees the truth about the Self, he becomes unified, his aims are fulfilled,(and) he becomes free from grief.'
(ibidem 2:14)

'Those who know this (Brahman) become immortal.'⁶ (ibidem 3:10)

'When they have known Him (Brahman) as the Lord they become immortal.'

(ibidem 3:7)

'They go only to That.'

'By revering (Īśāna), one goes for ever to this peace.'

(Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad 4:11)

'By knowing Him (the Ruler (Īśāna)) one cuts through the fetters of death.'

(ibidem 4:15)

'The gods and sages of former times who knew Him (God (deva)), (they, being of His nature, indeed have become immortal.)² (ibidem 5:6)

'Eternal peace is for those wise men who perceive Him (the inner controller (antarātman)) in themselves. It is not for others.' (Kaṭha Upaniṣad 5:13)

'One who is endowed with wisdom (buddhi) renounces in this world both good and bad ritualistic deeds.' (Bhagavad Gita 2:50)

'For the wise, endowed with wisdom (buddhi), give up the results of ritual acts. Freed from the bonds of (re-)birth they go to the place where there is no disease.'

(ibidem 2:51)

'With the raft of knowledge you will indeed cross over all sin.'

(ibidem 4:36)

'(O Arjuna, just as a fire when lit reduces its fuel to ashes,)

so the fire of knowledge reduces all ritual acts to ashes.' (ibidem 4:37)

'On knowing this (teaching),(a man) becomes wise (buddhimat) O Bharata, and (all) works to be performed are accomplished.' (ibidem 15:20)

'Then, knowing Me in truth, he immediately enters into Me.' (ibidem 18:55)

'Moreover all these declare the knowledge of the Self to be the highest (knowledge). That is the foremost of all knowledges, for from it is attained the immortal.

The twice-born man, attaining this (knowledge), has (all) works to be performed accomplished, (but) not otherwise.

One who in this way by means of the Self sees the Self in all beings, he becomes unified with all and comes to the eternal Brahman.

Endowed with right vision he is not bound by ritual acts. Without (true) vision, however, he enters into transmigratory existence.'

A man (jantu) is bound by ritual action and is liberated through knowledge. Therefore, those who have restrained the senses and who see the Supreme do not perform ritual action. (Mahābhārata Śāntiparva 241.7; Brahma Purāṇa 237.7)

The wise (vṛddha) who see in certainty have declared knowledge to be supreme (niḥśreyas).

Therefore through pure knowledge(a man) is released from all sins' (cf. Mahābhārata Āśvamedhikaparva 50.3)

'In this way knowing the source of death, through knowledge the wise man attains the eternal light. For there is no other way for him. Understanding thus, the sage rests tranquil.'

'The complete purity (viśuddhi) of the observer (kṣetrajña) which comes from the knowledge of the Lord (Īśvara) is considered the highest.

'This is the highest practice (dharma), by means of which one sees the Self.'

'The knower of the Self who has transcended sorrow feels no fear from any quarter, whether from the proximity of death (or) death (itself) or fear from any other cause.'

'That is not born, does not die, is not slain, and does not slay, is not bound, nor does it bind, is not liberated, and does not liberate.

It is the Supreme Being, the Supreme Self, and whatever is apart from it is not real.'

Thus since in such scriptures as the śruti, smṛti¹ and traditional legends it is knowledge alone which is understood as being the means to liberation, it is indeed fitting that the Upaniṣad is undertaken. Moreover, by the very name 'Upaniṣad' it becomes clear that it is only through knowledge² that Man's principal purpose³ is achieved. Thus they say that the form of the word 'upaniṣad' is derived from the verbal root 'sad' with the meanings of 'dissolving', 'attaining' and 'overcoming', preceded by 'upa' and 'ni'.⁴ By the word Upaniṣad is denoted the knowledge of the real which is to be taught in the text (the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad) which it is intended to explain.

Since it has that aim, this text is indeed an Upaniṣad.¹ Those desiring liberation, who no longer crave for objects both seen and unseen, contemplate the knowledge communicated in the Upaniṣads with steadiness and certainty. As our designation of the word 'upaniṣad' itself shows, for them ignorance which is the seed of transmigratory existence² is 'dissolved' or 'destroyed', the Supreme Brahman is 'attained' and the calamities of life in the womb, birth, old age and death are 'overcome'.³ Therefore the Upaniṣad that teaches the knowledge of Brahman is said to be supreme, surpassing all other works.

Objection⁴

The undertaking of the Upaniṣad would be for the reason you state if knowledge were the only means to liberation. But it is not. For we understand ritual acts also to be a means to liberation, in accordance with such statements as 'We drank the Soma and became immortal', and 'The good act of one who performs the Caturmāsya sacrifice verily becomes imperishable.'

Answer:

No, this is not so, for it contradicts śruti and smṛti,⁵ and does not accord with reason. It is inconsistent with the following quotations from śruti:

'Just as here on earth the world earned by works⁶perishes, even so in the life to come the world earned by merit⁷perishes.'

(Chāndogya Upaniṣad 8:1:6)

'(Therefore this (song) is the supreme Brahman, consisting of being, consciousness and bliss). One who knows it as such becomes immortal even in this world.' (Nṛsimhapūrvatāpanīya Upaniṣad 1:6)

'(Knowing Him (the Supreme Being (Puruṣa)) in this way one goes beyond death). There is no other way to go (there).'⁸ (Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad 3:8 and 6:15)

'Some have attained immortality, not through works, progeny or wealth, but through renunciation.'

(Kaivalya Upaniṣad 2 and Mahānārāyaṇa Upaniṣad 10:21)

'These unsteady boats in the form of sacrifice are the eighteen in which inferior works are expressed.' The deluded who delight in these (works) as better go again to old age and death.'

(Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad 1:2:7)

'The (world) that is not effected cannot be (effected) through works.'

(Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad 1:2:12)

'A man is bound by works, and liberated through knowledge. Therefore, those who have restrained the senses and who see the Supreme do not perform works.'

(Mahābhārata Śāntiparva 241.7)

'An old man is said to be defiled when he is full of the filth of ignorance. Only on its destruction may there be liberation, and not otherwise, even through the performance of countless ritual acts.' (Līṅga Purāṇa (Śarma edition volume 2 56:89-90))

'For good men are not liberated by progeny, works or wealth. Through renunciation alone may there be liberation. Without it they are condemned to wander in delusion.' (Līṅga Purāṇa (Śāstri edition Part 1 86:20))

'They who carry on thus, on the undertaking of works becoming attached to the results of works, do not go beyond death.'

(Mahābhārata Udyogaparva, Sanatsujāta 42.9)

'The wise man reaches the eternal light through knowledge. No other path is open to him.'

'Thus following the law of the three Vedas, fostering desires they gain (the world of) coming and going.' (Bhagavad Gītā 9:21)

'The āśramas,¹ in the true sense of the word, are so that efforts (śrama) may be made. Also the different classes of men (varṇa) (are so that efforts may be made.) Not through (duties appropriate to) the stages of life,³ nor through (study of) the Vedas, sacrifices, likewise not through numerous² vows, various, harsh ascetic practices and many different kinds of charitable act do men receive that Self. The wise (jñānin) themselves receive it.' (Līṅga Purāṇa (Śarma edition volume 2 56:46-7))

'The three Vedas (trayīdharma) are the cause of unrighteousness. Even as an unripe fruit, there is no happiness to be found in them, my son, for they are a collection of hundreds of miseries. Therefore, how could I, who seek liberation, follow the path of the three Vedas?'

'The tradition declares that a man is not free when he is caught in the snare of ignorance. That (ignorance) may be dispelled by knowledge, just as darkness by light. Therefore, when ignorance has disappeared, there may be liberation through knowledge.'

'Vows, gifts, austerities, sacrifices, truthfulness and the ritual action performed at holy bathing-places and in (the various) stages of life (āśrama) lead only to heaven, which is inauspicious and impermanent. Knowledge is permanent, gives rise to peace, and is a great boon.'

'Through sacrifices one attains the status of a god, through austerities that of a Brāhmaṇa, through generosity various enjoyments, and from knowledge one may receive liberation.'

'With the rope of righteousness one may ascend, and with the rope of sin one may descend. Those established in knowledge cut loose both, and free from the body they attain peace.'

'Renounce both righteousness and unrighteousness. Renounce both truth and untruth. Then renounce that by which you renounce.'

(Mahābhārata Śāntiparva 329.40, 331.44)

Thus immortality is achieved not through works, since the śruti and smṛti deny it and reason also denies it.¹ If liberation were attained by that means, then it would be included among the four types of ritual act,² and would therefore be impermanent. Since there is no permanence seen in that which is achieved through ritual acts,³ the rule is that whatever is made is transient. Yet all the schools of thought agree that liberation is eternal. Moreover in the section on the Cāturmāsya sacrifice the śruti says:

'O mortal, you propagate again and again; that is your immortality.'

Furthermore it is said that good deeds are never destroyed. And the words 'good deed' are used in the sense of 'works'.

Objection:

But therefore without doubt works, since they lead to the attainment of states such as those of the gods, are indeed the cause of bondage.

Answer:

True, they are themselves the cause of bondage. The śruti substantiates this:

'Through works one attains the world of the ancestors.'

(Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 1:5:16)

'(There are three divisions of duty...)

All those (who perform these) attain to the world of the virtuous.'

(Chāndogya Upaniṣad 2:23:1)

'The deluded, believing the merit accumulated through rites to be their best asset,' do not know any other good. Having experienced (existence) at the top of the heaven achieved by their good deeds, they enter this world or a lower one.'

(Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad 1:2:10)

'Thus those who watch over all things[^] are without attachment to works.'

'The scriptures say that this Supreme Being (Puruṣa) consists of knowledge, not of works.'

(Mahābhārata Āśvamedhikaparva 51.32)

'In this way following the injunctions of the three Vedas (trayīdharma), conceiving desires they reach the world of coming and going.'

(Bhagavad Gītā 9:21)

However, when men perform works dedicated to the Lord, regardless of a result, then this becomes a way to liberation, creating purity of mind, which in turn leads to knowledge, itself the means to emancipation. Accordingly Kṛṣṇa says:

'One who performs works offering them to Brahman, giving up attachment, is not tainted by evil, just as a lotus-leaf (is not stained) by water. Renouncing any claim, Yogins, for purity of self, perform action with the instruments of body, discursive mind (manas), discriminative faculty (buddhi) and with senses detached (kevala).' (Bhagavad Gītā 5:10-11)

'Whatever you do, whatever you eat, whatever you sacrifice, whatever you give, whatever austerities you undertake, do it as an offering to Me, O Arjuna.

In this way you will be released from the bonds of action with their good and bad results, (and) equipped with the Yoga of renunciation, liberated, you will come to Me.' (Bhagavad Gītā 9:27-28)

And likewise in 'The Statutes of Lord Viṣṇu' it speaks of the steps to liberation, how there is no emancipation without purity of mind, and how that purity of mind comes through performance of works:

'The Yogin should be liberated in stages, (at first) being learned, then sacrificing, (and) after that coming to knowledge.'

'When the collection of evils accumulated in the passage (saṁsāra) through many births is dispelled, devotion to Govinda arises in men.'

'Through the austerities knowledge and meditation practised in thousands of other births, a love of Kṛṣṇa is born in the hearts of men whose sins have been dispelled.'

'For in this world the store of evil works forms a great barrier to liberation. An effort to overcome this should be made by one who is tired (bhīru) of the cycle of birth and death (saṁsāra).'

'By making such generous gifts as those of gold, by bathing in sacred waters, and on experiencing the great sufferings (kleśa) of bodily existence, (all) spoken of in the scriptures, let a man (be in) tranquillity.'

'By hearing the deities, the śruti and the teaching of the wise,¹ by seeing the good (puṇya), and by obeying one's teacher, the bond of sin disappears.'

Yājñavalkya also shows how purity is necessary, and how it is achieved:

'The renunciate (bhikṣuka) in particular must purify the mind, for thereby knowledge arises and (a man) develops self-dependence (svatantra).'

(Yājñavalkya Yatidharma 'The Duty of the Renunciate' 62)

'Just as a soiled mirror is not able (to reflect) form and light, so one who is not fully purified as a result of (former) deeds (karma) is not fit for knowledge of the Self.' (ibidem 141)

'Attendance on the teacher; discernment of the meaning of the Vedas and scriptural teachings (śāstra); the performance of good works²; keeping good company; pure speech; avoidance of gazing at or touching women; seeing oneself in all creatures and renouncing what is accepted; wearing well-worn ochre robes (kāṣāya);

Restraining the senses from their objects; avoiding slumber and idleness; keeping the body in good order(śarīraparisaṁkhyāna); seeing the error of one's ways (pravṛtti);

Freedom from activity (rajas) and inertia (tamas); purification of the mind (sattva); desirelessness (and) peacefulness; one endued with purity (sattva), completely purified by these means would become immortal.' (ibidem 156-159)

'From those (ascetics) come the Vedas, the Purāṇas, the sciences (vidyā) and the Upaniṣads, verses (śloka), aphorisms (sūtra), commentaries, and all else depending on speech.'^{3,4}

From them proceed the recitation of the Vedas, sacrifice, the continence of the student, ascetic practice (tapas), restraint, faith, fasting and freedom of will (svātantrya), which are the means to the knowledge of the Self.'

(ibidem 189-190)

Likewise in the Atharva Veda it speaks of purity being necessary for knowledge of the Self:

'When in the course of thousands of other births their faults have been dispelled, through union (yoga) they then see the great cessation of transmigration (saṁsāra).'

(Yogaśikhā Upaniṣad 1:78-79)

'With a pure and undefiled mind those renunciates whose defects have been dispelled see all as the Self.'

'The Brāhmaṇas seek to know Him through recitation of the Vedas, sacrifice, generosity, ascetic practice and fasting.' (Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 4:4:22)

Thus the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad shows that sacrifices (are performed) because there is a desire for knowledge.

Objection:

But we understand ritual acts also to be the cause of the attainment of immortality, from such statements as:

'One who knows both knowledge and rites (avidyā)² together attains immortality.'

(Īśā Upaniṣad 11)

'For a wise man ascetic practice and knowledge are the best means to final emancipation.'

Answer:

True. (Works are the cause, but) are to be understood only as a means to purity of mind, upon which that (knowledge) depends, and not as a direct cause. So the scriptures first of all say that knowledge and works are the causes of ultimate liberation with such statements as 'One who knows both knowledge and rites together attains immortality' (Īśā Upaniṣad 11), and 'For a wise man ascetic practice and knowledge are the best means to final emancipation.' Then, in anticipation of (the question of) how both these two could be the cause, it is shown that works lead to the eradication of impurity while knowledge is the cause of the attainment of immortality with other scriptural declarations such as:

'Through ascetic practice one does away with sin, and through knowledge one attains immortality.'

'One crosses over death with rites, then enjoys immortality through knowledge.'
(Īśā Upaniṣad 11)

In texts where the preparatory practices such as purity are not taught they should be supplied according to the general rule from another branch of the Veda.

Objection:

But the scripture 'Indeed, performing works here, one should wish to live for a hundred years', prescribes the performance of works for the whole of life. How then may knowledge be the means to liberation?'

Answer:

This is the law for one who is entitled to perform works, not for a follower of the doctrine of Brahman who has no (such) entitlement and is beyond injunction. And likewise the śruti shows that a wise man is not entitled to perform works:

'One who knows That is not subject to the ordinance of the Ṛṣi. One who acts in accordance with the Word is not restricted by Vedic injunction.'

'Indeed the wise in ancient times did not perform the Agnihotra sacrifice.'

'Truly, when Brāhmaṇas have known that Self they give up the desire for sons, wealth and worlds then live a mendicant's life.'

(Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 3:5:1)

'The wise Kāvāṣeya Ṛṣis say 'What would be the purpose of our studying and performing sacrifices?

(Aitareya Āraṇyaka 3.2.6.12)

How would that knower of Brahman behave? However he behaves, he is just such (a knower of Brahman). (Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 3:5:1)

As Kṛṣṇa says:

'That man whose delight is in the Self alone², content with the Self and satisfied in the Self alone, has nothing (left) to do.'

He has no interest whatsoever in works performed or not performed in this world. Nor is he dependent on any being for anything.' (Bhagavad Gītā 3:17-18)

And likewise the Blessed Supreme Lord says in the story of the poison produced at the churning of the ocean in the Liṅga Purāṇa:

'O best of the wise, the embodied sage who has given up attachment through that knowledge¹ has no duty. If he does (have duties), he does not know reality.

There is no duty for him either in this world or the next,² and since he is liberated while living, he is a knower of Brahman in the true sense of the word.

Ever delighting in the practice of knowledge,³ he is detached and spontaneously (svayam) knowledgeable about things (arthavit)⁴. Abandoning the inclination (bhāva) to perform duties,⁵ he comes to knowledge alone.

O best of the twice-born, the fool discards knowledge and delights in other things, imagining (himself to belong to a particular) class of men (and to be at a certain) stage of life. He is an ignorant man, of that there is no doubt.

Such men are subject to anger, fear, so also greed, delusion, duality (bheda), lust, dullness,⁶ righteousness and unrighteousness, and as a result take on a body.⁷ (Liṅga Purāṇa (E) 105-9)

There is affliction (kleśa) on account of the body. Having repressed ignorance through knowledge in this world, the steadfast Yogin should then give up ignorance completely.

Anger and the rest come to an end, as well as righteousness and unrighteousness,¹ and consequently he is not bound to the body again.

He is indeed liberated from the cycle of death and rebirth, free from the three miseries. (ibidem 112-114)

Likewise in the sequel (to the chapter entitled) 'The Statutes of Śiva' (in Nandikeśvara Saṁhitā):

'For the Yogin who has fulfilled his task and is content with the nectar of knowledge,² there is nothing whatsoever to be done. If there is, he is not a knower of reality.

Even in the two worlds there is nothing for him to do.³ Let him be liberated even in this world, fulfilled, looking on all with an equal eye.'

Therefore, since for a wise man there is no task left, the prescription of works in (this statement beginning) 'Indeed by performing works here (one should wish to live for a hundred years)' (Īśā Upaniṣad 2) is (shown to apply to) the realm (viṣaya) of ignorance.⁴

And the statement 'Indeed, by performing ritual acts here (one should wish to live for a hundred years)' should be understood (draṣṭavya) not as prescribing ritual action, but rather as showing praise for the knowledge (whereby) one indeed performs ritual action at one's pleasure. What is meant is this; in consequence of (his) capacity (sāmarthya) for knowledge, ritual action leaves no mark on the wise man, even though he performs good and bad ritual acts⁵ according to his pleasure the whole of his life. For thus (it is said in scripture) beginning 'All this should be covered by the Lord' and continuing 'through that renunciation you may enjoy'⁶ (Īśā Upaniṣad 1). Thus it states that a wise man guards the Self through the renunciation of all ritual action.

Objector: (thinking, alarmed)¹

Surely it is wrong to maintain² that renunciation is enjoined upon a knower of who is not subject to injunction.

Answer:

But the Veda has not said that it is a wise man's duty (kartavyatā) to renounce. He should wish to live his whole life in this world performing incidental³ good and bad works (karman). He should not renounce merit etc. for fear of becoming bound to them and remain inactive.⁴ Thus, so long as you, a wise man, perform works in this world for as long as (you) live, there will be no change (anyathābhāva) no falling from your (true) nature, no persisting (anvaya) in the cycle of birth and death (saṃsāra) as conditioned (nimitta) by merit etc. Or otherwise expressed, there will be no change (anyathābhāva) no persisting in the cycle of birth and death as conditioned by merit etc. occurring in the time subsequent to the performance of works. For this reason no works cling and accrue to you. Likewise another śruti says:

'(Having known that (greatness of Brahman)) one is not marked by bad works (karman)' (Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 4:4:23)

'(As water does not adhere to a lotus leaf) so bad works do not cling to one who knows thus.' (Chāndogya Upaniṣad 4:14:3)

'What has been performed and what has not been performed do not afflict him.' (Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 4:4:22)

'In this way all sins are consumed by fire for him (who, knowing thus, performs the Agnihotra sacrifice.)' (Chāndogya Upaniṣad 5:24:3)

In the Liṅga Purāṇa (it is stated):

'Thus the fire of knowledge burns all works to ashes. For the man of knowledge, all works are dissolved - of this there is no doubt. Though playing his part he is not marked by even evil works of various kinds.'

(Liṅga Purāṇa (E) 118)

Also in the sequel (to the chapter entitled) 'The Statutes of Śiva' (in Nandikeśvara Saṁhitā, it is stated):

'Therefore swiftly lopping off with the sword of knowledge all attachment to works formed by desire and aversion, the man of purity also is established in the Self.

Just as a large fire when lit would burn up the dry and the damp (fuel), so the fire of knowledge instantaneously burns up good and bad works.

Just as a lotus leaf is not wetted by even pure waters, so the man of knowledge is not tainted by the floods of sense-objects such as those of sound (touch, sight, taste and smell.)

Just as one who has access to the power of spells (mantras) may play with snakes and not be bitten, so he (the man of knowledge) is not defiled by those serpents, the senses, even though he disports himself (amid them.)'

Just as poison when taken is neutralised by the power of spells (mantras) and herbs, so all the sins of the man of knowledge are neutralised instantaneously.'

And likewise the composer of the aphorisms¹ (sūtras) first states that 'Bāḍarāṇyaya's view is that the aim of man is achieved through this (knowledge) because the revealed texts declare so,' (BS 3:4:1) thereby explaining that the supreme goal of man (liberation) has knowledge alone as its cause.²

(Then) doubts are raised to the effect that knowledge is subservient to works (karman) (in aphorisms (sūtra)) such as ('Jaimini believes that) since it (the Self) stands as subservient, this is a glorification of the agent, as (in other places)'¹ (BS 3:4:2) thereby proposing that there is an agent dependent on works. Next, (to refute this argument, aphorisms are brought in) such as 'But Bādarāyaṇa's (view stands as it is) because it is taught that it (the Self) is greater; (for so it is revealed).' (BS 3:4:8)

Through these it is established that since it is taught that Brahman is of the nature of sinlessness and so on, devoid of the qualities of transmigratory existence such as agency,² eligibility for works (karman) must be preceded by the knowledge of those (works). It is also established that the views that there is an option (between knowledge and works on the path to liberation) or that they both work together, or that one is the primary cause and the other the subsidiary, are mistaken. For we observe that the nature of the whole manifest creation, arising from ignorance, characterized by actions (kriyā), casual factors (kāraṇa) and results, and the cause of eligibility for works prescribed by injunction, is destroyed by the power (sāmarthya) of knowledge. (These views) are untenable since (in all cases) the ability to perform works would be denied (through the presence of knowledge), for (knowledge and works) pertain to distinct realms and have separate effects. (Now the sūtra is brought in) 'And for this very reason, there is no dependence on the 'lighting of the fire' and other such (works).' (BS 3:4:25) This (aphorism (sūtra)) shows that since knowledge leads to the supreme goal of man, it (the supreme goal) is not dependent on the ritual acts prescribed for the different orders of life such as 'lighting of the fire', for knowledge produces its own result (svārthasiddha).

Now the conclusion is reached from the foregoing section that there is no dependency whatsoever (of knowledge on ritual action). To correct this view (the next aphorism states) 'On the authority of the śruti concerning sacrifices etc., all (ritual actions) as well are necessary. This is the same as in the case of a horse' (BS 3:4:26). Thus (knowledge) is not completely independent (of ritual action). Once knowledge has emerged, it does not depend on any other factor in producing its (own) result (i.e. liberation); but it does depend (on other factors) for its emergence.' In the śruti 'They desire to know through sacrifice...' through the efficacy of this desire to know, we have been shown the usefulness of ritual actions. Accordingly the two aphorisms 'This does not apply (to the wise man) since there is no specification (to that effect)' (BS 3:4:13) and 'Or rather the consent (to perform ritual actions) is in order to glorify' (BS 3:4:14) show that the sacred text (mantra) 'Indeed by performing ritual actions here (one should wish to live for a hundred years)' applies to the ignorant man, and (at the same time) glorifies knowledge, thus having two purposes. Therefore since knowledge alone is the means to liberation in the way described, it is fitting that the following Upaniṣad is undertaken.

Objection:

If bondage were a false entity² it could be removed by knowledge, (and hence)immortality would come through knowledge. But this is not so. For it (bondage) has been perceived and cannot be denied. (Furthermore) since the Self is different from the natures of 'you' and 'I' and so on, there is no similarity of nature (sādrśya) (between the two), and superimposition (adhyāsa) is impossible.

Answer: .

In the first place you cannot assert the reality (of bondage merely) on the basis of its being perceived, for reality and falsity alike can apply to something perceived. Even without reference to an anulment (of the alleged superimposition, the reality of bondage) cannot be established, for it may be annulled¹ by scriptural injunctions and reasoning (kāraṇa)². Accordingly the śruti shows that the manifest creation is a false entity caused by the power of illusion³, with such statements as:

'There is not, however, that second thing (other than it, separate, which it can see).' (Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 4:3:23)

'(It is) Unity.'

'There is no duality.'

'Once known in any way there is nothing to be known.'

'(In the beginning this was non-existence alone), one only without a second.'
(Chāndogya Upaniṣad 6:2:1)

'The modification (vikāra) is a name that has its beginning in speech.'
(ibidem 6:1:4)

'One alone, truth.'

'There is no diversity whatsoever in it (Brahman).'
(Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 4:4:19)

'It (Brahman) should be perceived only as a unity.'

(ibidem 4:4:20)

'He should know that nature is an illusion.'

(Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad 4:10)

'The Lord of illusion creates this Universe.' (ibidem 4:9)

'(Indra) through his powers of illusion (māyā) goes about in many forms.'

(Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 2:5:19)

'Though I am unborn, of imperishable nature, and though I am the Lord of beings, yet ruling over My own nature, I am born by my own illusion (māyā).'

(Bhagavad Gītā 4:6)

'And (that Brahman is) undivided, yet abiding divided, as it were, in beings.'

(ibidem 13:16)

And likewise in the Brahma Purāṇa:

'Righteousness and unrighteousness, birth and death, imagining (kalpānā) oneself to be in pleasure and pain,¹ as well as class and stage of life, abode,² heaven and even hell -

These do not exist anywhere for the man whose aim is the Supreme. The nature of the world, though unreal, appears as if real.

It is just as there is the illusion of water in a desert mirage, and the appearance of silver in the hard (shining) surface of mother-of-pearl, and just as a piece of rope in the middle of a room at night appears like a snake, or one moon in the sky (is seen as) two by an eye infected by timira¹ disease.

Likewise the sky appears as an unbroken (expanse) of resplendent blue (when it is really colourless.) Also (the light of) the one sun gives the appearance of many (suns) (as it penetrates) a bank of clouds (in different places.) And in the same way the supreme Self appears to stand amid all its limiting adjuncts. The illusion (bhrānti) of duality called ignorance (avidyā) is a fiction (vikalpa), and does not correspond to reality.

Let the body be a prison-house in the world to come for those who are self-conceited. Let this error of imagining that the body is the Self provide them with a body again and again.

The viśva and taijasa quarters² lead up to the prājña quarter.³ They come with the waking (jāgrat), dreaming (svapna) and deep sleep (suṣupta) states, which are the three found at the beginning, middle and end, formed through error. They begin in the empty.

Let Him delude his own Self through his own illusion which is of the nature of duality, and then he will attain Viṣṇu himself as his own Self, hidden (in the heart (guhāyām)).

And Viṣṇu's creation, which is His nature, is extended through duality; it appears in various shapes (ākṛti) (even) as thunder-bolts, fire and wreaths of flames in the sky.

The Lord appears always and everywhere as tranquil in a tranquil mind, excited (ghora) in an excited mind, and befuddled in a befuddled mind. But in reality He is not like this.

And (just as) there is no change in (the substance when) iron or a lump of clay or some gold (is moulded into different shapes, so) in truth there is no duality inherent in animate and inanimate beings.

Ignorance resides in the conscious Self which is all-pervasive and not restricted to any place (nirādhāra) (and) from the support of the Self, it brings forth the creation, which is by nature dual.

There is no existence of rope in the snake, nor snake in the rope. There is no cause of creation or dissolution of the world.

This ignorance is fashioned so that the worlds may function. It is said to perplex (men), (and is) of the nature of duality and non-duality.

A man should always reflect on the non-dual, divisible (sakala) and indivisible (niṣkala) Brahman. The knower of the Self, who has escaped from sorrow, has no fear from any quarter.

(He has no fear) from the proximity of death, dying (itself) or from any other danger. He is not born, does not die, cannot be killed and does not kill.

The Supreme Being, the Supreme Self, is not bound, nor does it cause bondage; it is not liberated, nor does it give liberation. Anything other than that is unreal.

Thus having realised that the form of the world is false, made up of Viṣṇu's illusion, let him become free from attachment to enjoyment after he has renounced all false notions (vilkapanā).

The Yogin, when he has renounced all false notions, and made the mind abide unmoving in his own self, should become peaceful, like a fire the fuel of which has been consumed.

This is the illusion, the supreme Nature (prakṛti) separated into twenty-four divisions. From it arise desire (kāma) and anger, avarice and delusion, as well as fear, dejection and grief, and the net of false notions.

(Also comes) righteousness and unrighteousness and happiness and misery, creation, destruction and ripening (of former actions), going to hell, life in heaven, and classes, and stages of life, longing (rāga) and hatred and various diseases.

(Also) childhood, youth and old-age, separation and union, eating, and vows of fasting.

Having settled this as such, one sits silently. Know (such a one) to be intelligent (sumati).

And likewise in 'The Statutes of Śrī Viṣṇu' containing six chapters:

This Knower of the field (kṣetrajña)¹, joined with ignorance (avidyā) which contains beginningless bonds, by virtue of division sees that which resides in the Self, the reality of Brahman. And as long as a creature sees himself as other than the supreme Self, so long does it wander (in transmigration) deluded by innate (former) action (karman)².

When all his (former) action (karman) has totally dwindled away (samkṣīna) he perceives the supreme Brahman as pure (and) no different from himself. By virtue of (this) purity he becomes indestructible.

And they call all rituals (kriyā) 'avidyā' (ignorance) (and) knowledge (jñāna) 'vidyā'. Through action (karman) a creature is born, and through knowledge it is released.

For non-duality is the highest truth, (and) duality is said to be different from it. O king, domesticated animals, wild beasts, men and creatures of hell - these four categories are motivated by the false cognitions 'I am different, this is different and those others here are likewise different.'

This false knowledge is called duality. Listen to the sublime (topic of) non-duality. (The concepts of) 'mine' (and) 'I' however, are devoid of wisdom (prajñā).

The unchanging, unnameable, non-dual is experienced as duality consisting of the modes of functioning (vṛtti) of the mind (manas), (which is) in reality non-dual.

Therefore the modes of functioning of the mind caused by righteousness and unrighteousness should be restrained. When they are restrained, indeed no duality arises.

All this, whatever moves and does not move, is within the scope of the mind. When the mind (manas) ceases to act as the mind, one may attain that state of non-duality.

This thinking (bhāvanā) of works stands in the way of Brahman. Through thoughts about works, knowledge of the same kind arises.

Worldly knowledge (vijñapti) corresponds to the type of thought one has. When that (thought) is dispelled the supreme Brahman itself shines forth.

O best of men, the separation (vibhāga) from the Highest Self (Parātman) is imagined through ignorance. When that (ignorance) is destroyed, (from that very moment) there is no distinction (vibhāga) between oneself and the Highest.

The (individual) Self (Ātman) is called 'the knower of the field' (kṣetrajña) when it is conjoined with the qualities (guṇa) of nature (prakṛti.) (When) it (the individual Self (Ātman)) is devoid of those very (qualities) (and) is pure, it is called the Supreme Self (Paramātmān.).

And likewise in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa:

O master (pati) of the world, you alone are one, the Supreme Self, there is no other. This is your greatness, by which all this that moves and does not move is pervaded.

This (world), which is seen as (solid) form (mūrta), (in reality emanates) from You whose nature is knowledge. The non-Yogins erroneously perceive the nature of the world. The unintelligent (abuddhi), seeing this whole world, which is of the nature of knowledge, as having the nature of an object, wander about in the flood of delusion (moha).

But those who know knowledge (jñāna) whose minds are pure, regard the whole world as of the nature of knowledge, (and) as Your nature, (the nature) of the Supreme Lord.' (Viṣṇu Purāṇa 1:4:38-41)

'I am Hari. All this is Janardana; that which is born of cause and effect is none other than that. For a man of such mind the ills of duality arising from worldly existence (bhāva) are no longer (experienced.) (ibidem 1:22:87)

He who is in reality of the nature of knowledge, eternal and undefiled, (and) who indeed through false appearances (bhrāntidarśanatas) stands (known) in the nature of objects...' (ibidem 1:2:6)

The Lord (Viṣṇu) is of the nature of knowledge. Therefore He contains all forms, yet is not a substance. Know then that the divisions of mountains, oceans etc. are manifestations of the mind (vijñāna).' (ibidem 2:12:39)

Is there anywhere any entity (vastu) which has no beginning, middle and end, and is always one and the same? Where is reality in that which is born again (dviḥ) (and) is subject to change (anyathātvā) and on earth does not resume its original form?

Earth (becomes) a pot; from a pot (when broken in two) a bowl; from a bowl powder; (then) dust, then (down to) an atom.

Say, can this be reality (vastu) here (when it is) seen by men whose certainty (as to the knowledge) of the Self is blocked (stīṁita) by their own works?

Therefore, O twice-born, apart from knowledge (vijñāna) there is no (other) sort of real thing anywhere at any time.

(This) knowledge is one, (but appears) to be made manifold (when viewed) through minds separated by the difference in (men's) own works.

(This) knowledge is completely pure, spotless, devoid of grief, with attachment to covetousness etc. completely destroyed. It is one, ever one, the supreme Viṣṇu. He is Vāsudeva, besides whom there is nothing.

Thus what is ultimately real has been conveyed by me to you. In this way knowledge is truth, all else untrue. Also however, what constitutes behaviour¹ in the (three) worlds has been described to you.' (ibidem 2:12:41-45)

'And those works which are accumulated in ignorance (are found) in all creatures.

The Self is pure, imperishable, tranquil, without qualities and beyond nature (prakṛti). Being one in all creatures it is without increase or diminution.' (ibidem 2:13:70-71)

'Moreover, O King, what object (other than the Self) is there that on account of change does not go by a different name in course of time?' (ibidem 2:13:100)

'If somebody were quite separate from me, O best of kings, then it may thus be said that 'This is I' and 'That is another.' When (however) one spirit (pūṁs) is present (vyavasthita) in all bodies, then it is mistaken to say 'Who are you?' (and) 'I am he.'

You are a king. And this is your palanquin. We are your bearers going before. And these are your attendants. (Yet) it is not true to say they are (really) yours.' (ibidem 2:13:90-92)

The things which in the world are called 'king', 'the servant of a king' and 'kingship' or likewise things called by any other (name), are all the makings of imagination (saṁkalpanā.)' (ibidem 2:13:99)

'And the ultimate reality (paramārtha) is agreed by the wise to be imperishable.' (ibidem 2:14:24)

'Hear in brief from me O King, about the ultimate reality.

It is the one Self (Ātman) (all-) pervasive, uniform, pure, without qualities (guṇa), beyond nature (prakṛti), without birth, growth etc., omnipresent, unchanging.

O king, the Lord (prabhu), made up of supreme knowledge, is not connected with real names, species etc. He was not connected nor will He be connected (thus).

Its relation to one's own and others' bodies is one and the same. That knowledge is the ultimate reality. Those who believe in duality do not preceive the truth.' (ibidem 2:14:28-31)

Knowing thus, this whole world is the one undivided nature of the supreme Self, called Vāsudeva.' (ibidem 2:15:35)

'And with that instruction Nidāgha became intent on non-duality.

He saw all beings as no different from himself. Thus, O twice-born, he attained Brahman (ultimate reality), then supreme liberation.

Just as one sky appears in different (colours) white, blue etc., so the one Self (ātman) appears to those whose perception is erroneous as separate (individuals).' (ibidem 2:16:19-20)

That One, which is everything whatsoever there is here, is Acyuta (viṣṇu); there is nothing other than that. I am He; and you are He; and all is He. This universe is His nature. Abandon the delusion of division.

Thus addressed by him (ṛbhu) that best of kings, seeing the ultimate reality, abandoned division, and that (ṛbhu), who had attained knowledge through memory of (previous) births, attained emancipation (apavarga) in that very birth. (ibidem 2:16:23-24)

Likewise in the Liṅga Purāṇa:

Therefore the worldly existence (saṃsāra) of all souls is rooted in ignorance. For upon reflection (it is clear that) there is no difference between the independent (the Supreme Self) and the dependent (the individual). ((E) 86.16,95)

Where there is not even oneness, how can there be duality? Where there is no 'one' and no 'mortal', how can there be death? (ibidem 86 96)

He is not aware of the internal, nor the external. Neither is He aware of both. He is not a mass of sentiency, and likewise not sentient, nor indeed insentient. (ibidem 86 97)

And there is nothing left to be known once He is known. (This is) 'nirvāṇa' in the true sense of the word (paramārthataḥ).

All (arises) from the darkness of ignorance. There should be no doubt in this matter. (ibidem 86,98,100)

O twice-born, both knowledge and indeed bondage are not of the Self (ātman), nor even liberation. For the soul (jīva) is not this Nature (prakṛti), and is not a modification (brought about) through a transformation.

(In reality) there is no transformation; this is the illusion (māyā), distinct from both existents and non-existents (sadasadvyaktivarjita).

Likewise the blessed Parāśara said:

'For from this is born the universe, (and) here indeed it is dissolved. He, the magician, joined (baddha) with illusion (māyā) creates various bodies.

And in this way He does not transmigrate, neither does anything else transmigrate. He is not an agent, nor indeed an experiencer, nor Nature (prakṛti) nor the Supreme Self (puruṣa).

He is not illusion (māyā) neither is he the vital breath (prāṇa), but in reality (paramārthataḥ) consciousness (caitanya). Therefore the transmigration (saṁsāra) of all souls (dehin) is rooted in ignorance.

For the Self is eternal, in all, unaffected (kūṭastha)¹ (and) free from faults (doṣa). He, (being) one, is divided by his power (śakti), by illusion (māyā), not due to His own nature.

Therefore the sages call it indeed 'advaita' 'non-dual' in the true sense of the word. The wise (vicakṣaṇa) say that this world is of the nature of knowledge.

Others who hold false views (kudṛṣṭi), through ignorance see (this world) as having the nature of an object. For that which is (all-)pervading, unchanging, without qualities, by nature consciousness, is seen by men who hold mistaken views as being of the nature of an object. And when one sees that the Self is in reality unconnected with anything (kevala) (and) that this duality is only illusion (māyā), then one becomes tranquil (nivṛta). Therefore there is only knowledge (vijñāna); there is no creation (prapañca) (or) transmigration (saṁsṛti).'

Creation (prapañca) is thus confirmed as false (bādhita) by śruti and so on, through the mention of causes (kāraṇa) such as name, as well as by reason of its own nature. Therefore it is understood as unreal (mithya). The appearance (ākāra) of the material (sthūla) (world), which is opposed to Brahman characterized by the subtle and so on, must be unreal. This is analogous to the case of the appearance of a second moon which is opposed to the (reality of a) single moon.

And likewise the composer of the aphorisms says 'Not even with regard to place can the Supreme (Para) have a twofold characteristic, for everywhere (it is taught otherwise)' (Brahma Sūtras 3:2:11) (thereby affirming) that it is impossible for there to exist two opposed aspects (rūpa), the natural and the qualified. This having been proven, (with the aphorism beginning) 'No, for there are differences (bheda) (in the scripture),' (ibidem 3:2:12) it is objected that on account of differences met with in the śruti, is it not to be

agreed that Brahman also has characteristics? (In reply, with the rest of the same aphorism,) 'No, for the scriptures deny each of these (differences) individually' it is proved that (Brahman) is indeed without characteristics, since the differences (created by) limiting adjuncts (upādhī) are contradicted by the śruti itself and since, on the strength of the śruti (proclaiming) non-difference, it does not make sense to understand (Brahman) as having characteristics.

(This is proved according to the aphorism) 'Moreover, some (declare) thus,' (ibidem 3:2:13) (meaning that) the followers of some schools, after condemning the dualistic (view) (bheda), affirm together non-duality, as in:

'This (Brahman) is to be attained through the mind alone.' (Kaṭha Upaniṣad 4:11)

'There is no multiplicity here whatsoever.' (Kaṭha Upaniṣad 4:11 and Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 4:4:19)

'One who sees here duality as it were attains death after death.' (Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 4:4:19)

'It is to be looked upon only as a unity.' (ibidem 4:4:20)

'After reflecting on the experiencer, the thing experienced, and the Actuator (preritṛ), all has been said. This is the threefold Brahman.' (Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad 1:12)

Thus the creation characterised by all experiences, experiencers and the Controller (niyantr) is declared to be in essence the one Brahman.

With the view that (Brahman) is without characteristics (nirviśeṣa) firmly established, it is once again objected 'But is it not contradictory to say 'Brahman, by nature one (ekasvarūpa) is heard of (in the scriptures) as being indeed formless, both natures (Brahman with form and without form) being impossible (together).''

(In reply there is the aphorism) '(Brahman) is only formless (arūpavat) for that is the predominant tenor (of the scriptures),' (Brahma Sūtras 3:2:14) Thus it should be ascertained (avadhārayitavya) that Brahman is quite devoid of any appearance such as colour etc. Why? Because this is the predominant tenor (of the scriptures, as in):

'(That Brahman) is not coarse, nor fine, nor short, nor long...'

(Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 3:8:8)

'(Realising that (Self)), which is without sound, touch, (or) form, (and is) unchanging (one is released from the mouth of death).' (Kaṭha Upaniṣad 3:15)¹

'That which is called space (ākāśa) is the producer (nirvāhitr) of name and form. That in which they are contained is Brahman.' (Chāndogya Upaniṣad 8:14:1)

'This Brahman has nothing coming before or after, (and is) without interior or exterior. This Self (Ātman) the perceiver of everything, is Brahman. This is the teaching.'² (Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 2:5:19)

(Statements) such as these and others³ primarily (teach) the reality of Brahman which is the (individual) Self (ātman) and which is not subject to

multiplicity (niṣprapañca). Other (scriptural statements) which deal with Brahman as a cause do not primarily teach this. (Scriptural statements) which do have (Brahman free from multiplicity) as their main purport, are more authoritative (balīyas) than those that do not. Therefore, since it is found that this is the chief import of the śruti it should be understood that Brahman is indeed without characteristics, not the opposite.

(This said), it is objected that having justified the case for a Brahman that is without characteristics, then what is the fate (gatī) of those śruti texts which speak of (different) appearances (ākāra)?

(In reply, there is the aphorism) 'And (Brahman) like light, (can be said to have different appearances) for the scriptures cannot be meaningless.'

(Brahma Sūtras 3:2:15) And just as the (light of) the sun or moon etc. appears diverse because it meets adjuncts such as water etc., so also Brahman appears diverse because of adjuncts. This being so, the teaching of particular appearances of Brahman, for the sake of contemplation (upāsanā) is not contradictory.

Thus, (a reply has been given to the objection) that the scriptural statements (vākya) dealing with the various appearances of Brahman (according to the thesis proposed of Brahman without characteristics) would be meaningless. It has been said that (these) śrutis are not meaningless, (here) dealing with Brahman as limited by adjuncts. And again in order to confirm that Brahman is indeed with characteristics (the aphorism is quoted) '(The scripture) also declares (Brahman) to be (consciousness) alone.' (Brahma Sūtras 3:2:16)

(Now) the śruti is cited:

'It is just as a mass of salt which has no interior or exterior is verily a complete mass of taste (rasa), even so my dear, this Self has no interior or exterior, and is indeed a complete mass of knowledge (prajñāna).'

(Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 4:5:13)

After asserting, by adducing this śruti, that no extraneous appearance (rūpa) separate from knowledge (vijñāna) exists, (the aphorism is quoted) 'Moreover the śrutis reveal this: likewise it is also attested to in the śruti.'

(Brahma Sūtras 3:2:17)

'Hence now there is the teaching 'Not this, not this.' (Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 2:3:6)

'It is indeed other than the known and moreover above the unknown.' (Kena Upaniṣad 1:4)

'That (Brahman) from which words, failing to reach It, turn back, along with the mind...' (Taittirīya Upaniṣad 2:4:1)

'That in which division has come to an end, which is pure being, beyond the realm of speech, and which has self-awareness (ātmasaṁvedya), that is knowledge called Brahman.'

The characteristic of the Supreme Self (paramātmān) is different from the nature of the universe.'

With the citing of such śruti and smṛti texts as these, it has been proved that Brahman is indeed that in which diversity has come to an end. (Now the aphorism is quoted) 'Hence indeed there are comparisons like that of the sun etc.' (Brahma Sūtras 3:2:18). Accordingly the Supreme Self is indeed of the nature of pure consciousness (caitanyamātra). Its essence is 'Not this, not this.' It is other than the known and the unknown, (and) beyond the range (gocara) of speech. In it diversity has come to an end, (the Supreme Self) having a nature quite different from that of the world. This is why comparisons with water and the sun etc. are given in the teachings (śāstra) concerning liberation to represent (abhipretya) the lower (aparamāṛthika) nature of (the Supreme Self) as having distinctive characteristics caused by adjuncts.

'For just as the ether is one, (but appears) severally (when contained) in pots etc., so the one Self (appears as) many, like the moon (reflected) in pools of water.' (Yājñavalkya Smṛti 3:144)

'The Self of (all) beings (Bhūtātman) is present in every being. It is seen as one and as many, like the water and the moon.'

Just as this Sun (Vivasvat), whose essence is light, being one, (becomes) many, reflected in diverse waters, even so this god, the Self, who is unborn, through limiting adjuncts is made to (appear to) have diverse forms in (different) bodies (kṣetra).'

Thus also through the power of illustrations, it is proved (upapatti) that Brahman is indeed without characteristics. (Now, there is a doubt raised with the aphorism) '(But the parallelism is not (valid),) for nothing is seen to be

similar to water' (Brahma Sūtras 3:2:19). Thus since the Self is bodiless and all-pervading, the doubt is raised that there is no similarity between the illustration and what it illustrates, for similes like that of the (pools of) water and the sun do not apply in a bodiless state.

(In reply, the aphorism is quoted:)

'(Since (Brahman) inheres (in the bodies)) it participates in increase and decrease. (So the illustration is apt, for both (the illustration and what it illustrates) are fitting from this point of view.)' (Brahma Sūtras 3:2:20)

Once the point (of similarity) between the illustration and what it illustrates has been stated, no-one can show equality (between the two) in every respect. If there were a complete similarity, the very relationship of illustration and thing illustrated would come to an end. Here, the participation in increase and decrease is intended. The reflections of the sun in the water increase as the amount of water increases, and decrease with its reduction. It (the sun) moves when the water moves, (and) its reflection is broken up when the water is disturbed. Thus (the sun) conforms to the characteristics of the water; but in reality (paramārthataḥ) this is never the true state (tattva) of the sun. In this way Brahman, though in reality (paramārthataḥ) remaining unmodified (avikṛta) (and) of one and the same nature, does conform (bhajate) to the characteristics of the limiting adjunct, such as increase and decrease, since it enters into limiting adjuncts such as the body.

Through this exposition of the point intended, the comparability (sāmañjasya) of illustration and thing illustrated is set forth.

(Now the aphorism is brought in) 'And (this is also) in accordance with (the Vedic) revelation.' (Brahma Sūtras 3:2:21)

Thus:

'He made citadels with two feet, (and) citadels with four feet. That Supreme Being (Puruṣa) entered the citadels as a bird.' (Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 2:5:18)

'Indra with his illusory powers (māyā) appears of manifold nature.' (ibidem 2:5:19)

'One should know Nature (prakṛti) as illusion, and the Great Lord (Maheśvara) as the magician.' (Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad 4:10)

'(As a) magician He (the Supreme Being (Puruṣa)) creates this universe.' (ibidem 4:9)

'(As the one wind (vāyu), when it entered the world, became of this nature and that depending on whatever nature it assumed), so the one Self, dwelling in all beings, takes on this and that nature, (depending on whatever nature it enters.) And (It (the self) also exists) without.' (Kaṭha Upaniṣad 5:9)

'The one God, hidden in all beings.' (Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad 6:11)

'Making an opening at the parting of the hair, He (the Self) entered through that door.' (Aitareya Upaniṣad 1:3:12)

'This (Self) has entered into the world (iha) up to the tips of the finger-nails.'

(Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 1:4:7)

'He having created that, entered into it.' (Taittirīya Upaniṣad 2:6:1)

Having shown, with these and other (quotations), that the supreme Brahman itself is united with limiting adjuncts, (it is proved that) Brahman is indeed without characteristics. As for the division like that (shown in the example) of the sun and the water it depends on limiting adjuncts, and is maintained by illusion. This is the conclusion.

Moreover, the experience (anubhava)¹ of the knowers of Brahman opposes (the existence of) creation (prapañca). This is because they hold (darśana) that the Self is beyond the creation. Their experience shows likewise.

'(The man) in whom all beings have become the very Self of the one who knows, there (in him), what delusion, what grief (could there be) for him who sees unity?' (Īśā Upaniṣad 7)

'When that has been known nothing is left to be known.'

This is the teaching on final extinction (nirvāṇa).

'Where there is, as it were, another, there one may see the other...'²
(Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 4:3:31)

'But when for this man all has become the Self, then what should he see and through what?' (ibidem 4:5:15)

'This which is seen is the form of you whose nature is knowledge. The non-Yogins erroneously perceive the nature of the world.' (Viṣṇu Purāṇa 1:4:39)

'But those who know knowledge, whose minds are pure, regard the whole world as of the nature of knowledge (and) as Your nature, the nature of the Supreme Lord.' (ibidem 1:4:41)

'And with that instruction Nigāḍha became intent on non-duality. He saw all beings as no different from himself. Thus, O twice-born, he attained Brahman (ultimate reality) then supreme liberation.' (Viṣṇu Purāṇa 2:16:19-20)

'One who here, through the discrimination of the Self, does not see a second, he indeed is said in the Vedic teachings (śāstra) to have become Brahman in this world.'

The Upaniṣad is undertaken since thus through śruti, smṛti, reason (yukti), and experience, the (existence of the) creation has been disproved. It has also been seen that there is a mutual superimposition of completely distinct, dissimilar natures such as sweet and sour, white and yellow, as well as a superimposition of the (notion of) a surface, and dirtiness etc. on space (ākāśa) which is formless (amūrta). And likewise there is the union (saṁbhava) of the Self and non-Self which are (in fact) completely distinct, (the union) of form and formless. (Furthermore) there is the experience of the superimposition of the Self on the body (with such notions as) 'I am fat' 'I am thin.'

We observe such śruti texts as:

'If the slayer thinks (himself) to slay, and if the slain thinks (himself) slain, both of these do not understand. This one does not slay, nor is he slain.' (Kāṭha Upaniṣad 2:19)

And we witness such smṛti texts as:

'Whoever knows Him as the slayer, (and whoever thinks of Him as the slain, both of these do not understand. He does not slay, nor is He slain.)'

(Bhagavad Gītā 2:19)

(Actions (karman)are everywhere) performed by the three forces (guṇa)(of nature (prakṛti)).' (Bhagavad Gītā 3:27)

(For all these reasons), for the removal of superimposition, (and) for the attainment of the knowledge of unity, the Upaniṣad is undertaken.

CHAPTER 1

The Upaniṣad, (consisting of) sacred verses (mantra) of the Śvetāśvataras' begins (with the words) 'Those who discourse on Brahman say...' This short treatise, being a commentary (vṛtti) on that (Upaniṣad), is (here) undertaken.

hariḥ om brahmavādinō vadanti

kiṁ kāraṇaṁ brahma kutaḥ sma jātā/jīvāmaḥ kena kva ca sampratisthāḥ

adhiṣṭhitāḥ kena sukhetaṛeṣu/vartāmahe brahma-vido vyavasthām

1. 'Hari Om. Those who discourse on Brahman say:

'What is the cause? (Is it) Brahman? Whence are we born?

By what do we live? And where is our final rest? O knowers of Brahman, overlooked by whom do we, in pleasures and pains, live out our various conditions?''

brahmavādinō vadanti etc. brahmavādināḥ, those accustomed to speaking of

Brahman all gather together and ask kiṁ kāraṇaṁ brahma. The use of kiṁ here (indicates that) a) this question is about the nature (of Brahman), or else (it asks) b) whether Brahman is the cause or time etc. as will be questioned (in the next verse) with kālaḥ svabhāvaḥ... 'time, inherent nature...'

Another possibility is that c) kiṁ kāraṇaṁ brahma means 'Is the perfect (Brahman) a material cause?' Or else by that it is implied (ucyate) that, since the etymology (of 'Brahman') given by the śruti itself, states that the Supreme Brahman has increased and causes to increase, kiṁ kāraṇaṁ brahma questions whether Brahman is an efficient cause (nimitta) or a material cause (upādāna), or both. Is the cause Brahman, or is it time etc? Or indeed is (Brahman) not a cause? Given that it is a cause, is it an efficient or a material cause? Or is it both? What are its characteristics? The questions are to be considered separately or collectively, according to how they are answered later. For answers follow the form of questions.

Kutah sma jātāh Whence have we, having duties and the means (to fulfil them),³
been born? For souls in reality could not be born etc.
And accordingly the śruti (says):

'The wise man (vipaścit) is not born, does not die.' (Kāṭha Upaniṣad 1:2:18)

'Verily, when the soul (jīva) has left it, this (tree) dies. But the soul
does not die.' (Chāndogya Upaniṣad 6:11:3)

'It is the body which undergoes old age and death.'

'This Self, my dear, is indeed imperishable and has the property (dharma) of
being indestructible.' (Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 4:5:14)

And likewise the smṛti (says):

'The unborn is said to be born through the assuming of a body.'

Moreover, jīvāmaḥ kena having been created, by whom do we live? Thus this
question concerns (the period of) continued existence (sthiti). kva ca
saṁpratiṣṭhāh Where do we find ourselves at the time of dissolution?
adhiṣṭhitāh controlled kena (by whom) sukhetareṣu in pleasures and in pains...
vartāmahe brahmavido vyavasthām O knowers of Brahman, being overlooked by whom
do we follow the regulation of pleasures and pains? Thus to summarize the
questions: 'What cause regulates creation, maintenance and dissolution?'

Now (the Upaniṣad) in an investigation (vicāra) presents time etc. (as possible causes) to act as rival views to the doctrine that Brahman is the cause:

kālaḥ svabhāvo niyatir yadṛcchā/bhūtāni yoniḥ puruṣa iti cintyā
saṁyoga eṣāṁ na tvātmabhāvād/ātmāpy anīśaḥ sukhaduḥkhaheṭoḥ

2. 'Is (the cause) to be considered as time, inherent nature (svabhāva), necessity, chance, the elements, the womb or a man (puruṣa)? It cannot be a combination of these, because they exist for the (individual) self (ātman). The (individual) self too is not master on account of pleasure and pain.'

kālaḥ svabhāvaḥ... The (words) 'kāla ' (time) and 'svabhāva' (inherent nature) etc. are to be connected with the word 'yoni ' (source). Why should time be the source (or) cause? It is time that is the cause of the transformation of all beings. svabhāvaḥ inherent nature, is the power fixed for every object (padārtha), like (the power of) heat in fire. Or is niyatir (fate), the balance of works of merit and demerit, the cause? yadṛcchā a chance occurrence (prāpti). Or are bhūtāni (the elements), ether etc. the source? Or is puruṣa, the intelligent Self (vijñānātman) the source? iti in the way shown (the possibilities) cintyā should be considered, (or) reflected upon (nirūpanīya) as to what the cause is. Some explain the word yoniḥ as meaning Nature (prakṛti). According to this view, the previously mentioned word 'kāraṇa' in 'kiṁ kāraṇaṁ brahma,' (What is the cause? Is it Brahman?) should also be supplied (anusaṁdheya) here.

The text shows that time etc. are not the causes, with the words beginning samyoga eṣām. The meaning is this; are time etc. the cause a) one at a time or b) as a combination? Now, a) it is not possible that time etc. be a cause one at a time for that would be inconsistent with common experience (dṛṣṭa). For in the world it is when place, time and cause are in combination that an effect is perceived. However, b) neither is samyoga a combination eṣām of these, time etc. the cause, for since a combination or collection implies and, extraneous entity as its goal, there is a self which constitutes that entity. Hence (this combination) being not independent, cannot be the cause of that effect characterised by the regulation of creation, maintenance and dissolution.

Objection: In that case the (individual) Self might indeed be the cause.

Answer: Hence (the Upaniṣad) says Ātmāpy anīśaḥ sukhaduḥkhaḥetoḥ. ātmā the (individual) Self also is anīśaḥ not independent (asvatantra), not the cause. The meaning is that also the (individual) Self cannot be the cause of creation etc., since it is indeed not independent. In what way is it not independent? The meaning is that since there are works characterised by merit and demerit sukhaduḥkhaḥetoḥ which are the cause of pleasure and pain, and since (the (individual) Self) is not independent, being subservient to works, it is not indeed able to regulate the creation and maintenance of the three worlds. Or else, not being the Lord of the world, which is divided up into parts such as souls, etc. (adhyātmikādibheda) (and) which is the cause of pleasure and pain, it is not a cause.

Thus having rejected other views, seeing no other way (to perceive) something beyond the range of other valid means of knowledge (pramāṇa), they themselves attained the supreme first Cause through following the yoga of meditation.

Thus it says:

te dhyānayogānugatā apaśyan/devātmaśaktim svaguṇair nigūḍhām
yaḥ kāraṇāni nikhilāni tāni/kalātmayuktāny adhiṣṭhatyekah

3. Those who followed the yoga of meditation saw the self-power of God hidden by His own qualities. He is the One who rules over all these causes from time to time (individual) Self.

te dhyānayoga... dhyāna is one-pointedness of mind. That is the same as yoga i.e. that by which one is united, namely the means of identifying with that to be meditated on. anugatāḥ joined to that apaśyan (they) saw the self-power of God.

In what follows (the upaniṣad) will set forth one by one, a string of answers to the group of questions previously raised. Here are the questions on this matter assembled together; 'Is Brahman the cause? Or is it time etc.?' Also 'Is Brahman the cause? Or is It distinct from cause and effect?' Or else 'Is It a cause, or is It not?' Even if It is a cause, is It a material or an efficient cause?' Or 'What would be the characteristic of Brahman if It were both (the material and efficient) causes?' Or 'What would be the characteristic of Brahman if It were not the cause?'

The reply to this is: It (Brahman) is not a cause, neither is It not a cause, nor both, nor even distinct from both. Nor is It an efficient cause, nor a material cause, nor both. It is said that the non-dual Supreme Self is not of itself a cause, a material cause or an efficient cause.

The upanīṣad, after establishing that very entity as the cause, an efficient cause, which as a limiting adjunct enables It (Brahman) to become a cause etc., shows it as the source by drawing it out (in the text) with devātmaśaktim... They saw as the cause the power identical with the Self, not independent, not separate and self-willed like the Nature (pradhāna) imagined by the Sāṃkhya¹ - of the deity endued with light etc., the possessor of illusion, the great Lord, the supreme Self.

And it will explain:

'One should know that Nature (Prakṛti) is illusion (māyā) and that the Great Lord (Maheśvara) is a magician.' (Śvetāśvatara Upanīṣad 4:10)

Likewise in the Brahma Purāṇa:

'This illusion, divided up into twenty-four parts, is the supreme Nature (prakṛti) and springs from Him.' And likewise 'With Me looking on, nature sends forth the moving and the unmoving.

(Bhagavad Gītā 9:10)

(This power is) nigūḍhām covered with the form of effects. svaguṇaiḥ with the effects of Nature such as earth etc. The meaning is that it is not possible to see it in its own nature separate from its effects, since the form of a cause is eclipsed by the form of its effects. And likewise Vyāsa² shows that the qualities (guṇa) are the effects of Nature (Prakṛti):

'The qualities purity (sattva) activity (rajas) and inertia (tamas) are born of Nature.' (Bhagavad Gītā 14:5)

Who is that god whose power is thought to give rise to the universe? On this matter (the upaniṣad) says: yah kāraṇāni... The meaning of the sentence is that they saw the śakti, cause, of that ekaḥ, Supreme Self without a second, who adhiṣṭhāti regulates all those causes inherent nature etc., spoken of previously kālātmayuktāni connected with time and the individual (Self) (or) connected with time and the intelligent Self (puruṣa), spoken of in the verse (mantra) 'Time, inherent nature...' (1:2)

Or else devātmaśaktim means the power that exists (avasthita) as identical with the Deity (deva) in the form of the Lord (Īśvara).

And likewise:

'O supreme Lord, the Self of all, your lower (apara) power is in all beings; a bow to that eternal (power), the abode of qualities.

I worship the supreme goddess who is transcendent (atīta) beyond the sphere of words and mind, who is without attributes (and) is to be discriminated through knowledge (jñāna) and meditation (dhyāna).'

(The upaniṣad) will (later) explain that inherent nature etc. are not the causes but rather ignorance (ajñāna):

'Some wise men, (being deluded) speak of inherent nature (as the cause), (others likewise of time). (Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad 6:1)

'The magician (māyin) sends forth this Universe.' (ibidem 4:9)

'For Rudra is one; they did not stand for a second.' (ibidem 3:2)

The One (who), without colour, by the manifold application of his power (distributes many colours. They saw the power) which is hidden. (ibidem 4:1)

svagūṇaiḥ by the qualities of the Lord, omniscience etc., or by purity (sattva) etc. which is not perceived as the non-dual Brahman itself which is full of bliss and free from effect and cause.

Who is that god? yaḥ kāraṇāṇi... etc. as before. Or else (devātmaśaktim refers to) power identical with the deity, the Supreme Lord, the cause of the rise, maintenance and dissolution of the world, of the nature of Brahmā Viṣṇu and Śiva. (respectively).

And accordingly it is said:

'The powers of that god are of the nature of Brahmā Viṣṇu and Śiva⁴.'

And: 'The primary (pradhāna) powers of Brahman are Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva³, O Brahmin.

svagūṇaiḥ by purity (sattva) activity (rajas) and inertia (tamas). On account of being connected with the limiting adjuncts, purity, etc. Viṣṇu with purity, Brahmā with activity and the Śiva with inertia, they are not perceived in their own nature as the non-dual Brahman, full of bliss, without limiting adjuncts.

The activity (vyavahāra) of the diverse powers of the supreme Brahman which gives rise to creation etc., depends on diverse conditions (avasthā) and not on a diversity of reality (tattva). And accordingly it is said:

'Janardana, who is One alone, the blessed, takes the name Brahmā Viṣṇu and Śiva accordingly as he creates, maintains or dissolves.'

(Viṣṇu Purāṇa 1:2:66).

First, Brahman is found as the Lord (Īśvara) possessing illusion (māyā). Again, He, with regard to form (mūrti) appears in three ways. And through those forms, he performs the function (kārya) of the regulation (niyamana) etc. of the phases (rūpa) of creation, maintenance and dissolution (saṁhāra).

And accordingly the śruti shows the function of the Supreme in regulation etc. by means of powers as is known from the description 'Īśanībhiḥ' 'by (his) supreme powers etc. of generation' in:

'(For Rudra is one; they did not stand for a second). He rules (these) worlds with his ruling powers (Īśanībhiḥ) He stands opposite men. He, the protector (gopā), having created all worlds, destroyed them at the end of time.'
(Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad 3:2).

From the smṛti 'O Brahmin, Brahmā Viṣṇu and Śiva are the primary powers of Brahman (it is evident that) by the words 'with his ruling powers' we should understand 'with the supreme deities (devatā).'

Or else, devātmaśaktim, i.e. power (śakti) which is (identical with) the Deity (deva) and the (individual) self (ātman), these being the diverse conditions of the supreme Brahman; they saw this (śakti), which essentially consists of Nature (prakṛti) Supreme Being (puruṣa), and the Lord (Īśvara) and which subsists in the nature of Brahman, to be the highest cause.⁶

And accordingly (the Upaniṣad) will point out (That Brahman) which is the essential nature of (these) three:

'After recognising the experiencer, the object of experience and the Actuator (preritṛ) all has been said. This is the threefold Brahman (Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad 1:12).

'When one finds this triad,⁷ that is Brahman.' (ibidem 1:9).

Thus (the meaning is) 'covered svagunaiḥ-with limiting adjuncts having the distinguishing marks of nature (prakṛti) etc. and dependent on Brahman.' And likewise (the Upaniṣad) will explain:

'There is one Deity hidden in all beings' (ibidem 6:11)

There are these other śruti texts:

'(Considering as the Deity) Him who is hard to see, who has entered into the hidden (the wise man renounces excitement and grief.) (Kaṭha Upaniṣad 2:12)

'One who knows (Brahman) as set down in the cavity (of the heart) (gūhā) (he attains all desires.)⁵ (Taittirīya Upaniṣad 2:1:1)

Another Śruti text says:

'Though He is present in this very world, the gods do not know Him.'

(The explanation of) 'yaḥ kāraṇāni' (in this interpretation) is as before.

Or else (it means) they saw śaktim power to regulate the rise, maintenance and dissolution of the world devātmanah of the Supreme Self (paramātmān) whose essence is illumination, of the nature of light, the luminary (jyotiḥ) of luminaries, undifferentiated consciousness (prajñānaghana)⁹ its very nature. svaguṇāḥ with its own individual omniscience, sovereignty etc. nigūḍhām not being perceived, since it subsists (avasthita) entirely in powers which are its own nature, of this and that particular form. And likewise (the upaniṣad) will explain that this power cannot be known from any other evidence:

'No action (kārya) or organ⁸ of his is to be found.' His equal or better is not seen. His supreme power is said in the scriptures to be various indeed. And the working of his knowledge and power is innate.' (Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad 6:8)

The rest would be explained as before.

The different views which have been expressed with regard to the question 'What is the cause?' and its answer 'devātmaśaktim' have all been gathered together (in brief). For later on all will be explained in detail, (and) it is not appropriate to expound at length what has not yet been mentioned. Moreover questions and answers are in evidence, and the wise find it desirable to have (scripture expressed) in short and at length. And likewise it is

said: 'In the world the wise desire to have (scripture expressed) in brief and at length.' By the same token in another śruti the difference in explanation of the word 'gopām' which appears only once is shown by the śruti itself:

'He said, 'I saw the gopā.' The gopā is the vital force (prāṇa).'

'He said, 'I saw the gopā.' That sun is the gopā.'

(Another śruti) begins 'Now why is it called Brahman?' 'It grows great and causes great growth - that is why it is called the supreme Brahman.' Thus that, 'the Lord, Brahman' may refer to (either) an efficient or material cause is shown by the śruti itself, (even though) the word only appears once (in the passage).

Thus (the śruti speaks of) 'the self-power of God' and 'the One who rules over all these causes connected with time and the (individual) Self.' Thereby, through the two meanings of the śruti there is mentioned in brief that the one non-dual Supreme Self is, in its own nature and in its nature as a power, (respectively) an efficient and material cause. As Ruler of illusion (māyā) it has the nature of a Lord, and a deity, and is omniscient etc., while its non-illusory nature is non-dual, truth, knowledge and bliss. Now (the upaniṣad) shows that very (Self) as the Self of all, by teaching that effect and cause are not different.

'(My friend, as through one lump of earth, all things made of earth are known,) change has speech as its basis, (and is merely) a name. The earth alone is real.' (Chāndogya Upaniṣad 6:1:4)

By this illustration it intends to show that the nature of Brahman is knowledge, existence and bliss,¹⁰ non-dual, without cause (pūrva) and effect (apara) of a nature (referred to as) 'not this, not this', beyond the realm of speech, untouched by hunger etc., and devoid of division. (The śruti) shows the meditation (upāsanā) of the supreme Brahman - which, through Nature (prakṛti) itself, has taken the illusory appearance of the creation, as the Lord who is omniscient and free from sin etc., as a deity of the nature of Brahmā etc.,¹¹ as effects etc.,¹² and as Vaiśvānara¹³ etc., - for the purpose of purity required for liberation, for the sake of universal lordship as in 'If he becomes desirous of the world of fathers, ((then) from his resolution (saṁkalpa) alone fathers arise.)' (Chāndogya Upaniṣad 8:2:1), for the sake of attainment of union with deities as in 'He goes forth (and comes) to me, or the eternal auspicious (śaṁkara)¹⁴' and for the sake of attaining Vaiśvānara etc. It also shows the accomplishment of all wordly and Vedic rites.

If it were not present as cause and effect and in its true nature the non-dual Brahman which is knowledge, existence and bliss, then in the absence of object of experience, experiencer and regulator there would indeed be no transmigration or liberation. For since there would be no-one eligible (for liberation) (adhikārin) there would be no creation (prapañca) to act as a means, and there would be no Lord to dispense the fruits (accruing) from them.

(The scripture) accordingly shows the Lord as the cause of transmigration etc. in 'He is the cause of transmigration, liberation, existence and bondage. And if this were so there would indeed be no transmigration or liberation.

(Scripture) shows that the continued existence (avasthāna) of creation etc. has as its purpose (transmigration and liberation). Sanatsujāta also shows this by 'does not lift up one if its feet' in:

A wild goose (haṁsa)¹⁵ gliding above the water does not lift one of its feet. If he found bliss, there would be neither truth nor untruth.' (Mahābhārata Udyogaparva Sanatsujātaparva 46:14)

And likewise the śruti says:

'All beings are one of His feet. The immortal three-footed one is in heaven.'

(Chāndogya Upaniṣad 3:12:6)

On this matter (tatra) Brahman the Self of all, is shown in the next verse as a wheel, and in the following verse as having the nature of a river:

tam ekanemiṁ trivṛtaṁ ṣoḍaśāntaṁ/śatārdhāraṁ viṁśati pratyarābhīh
aṣṭakāhī ṣaḍbhir viśvarūpaikapāśaṁ/trimārgabhedaṁ dvinimittaikamoham

4. '(We understand) Him (as a wheel) with one rim, three tyres, sixteen outer sections (anta), fifty spokes, twenty counter spokes, (and) six sets of eights, whose one cord is manifold, which has three different paths, whose one delusion (arises) from two causes.'

tam eka...² (We understand) him who, having one rim, alone rules over all causes. He is the non-dual ruler, the Supreme Self, whose rim is the substratum of all, a rim as it were, to which belongs the single causal state spoken of by words such as 'source, cause, unevolved (avyākṛta) physical space, (ākāśa), the highest heaven, the illusion, Nature, power, darkness (tamas) ignorance, (avidyā) shade, nescience (ajñāna) falsehood, and unmanifest,' that (is what is meant by) ekanemiṁ. trivṛtaṁ, covered with the three qualities of nature, sattva, rajas and tamas.

ṣoḍaśāntaṁ... having a sixteen-fold transformation,¹ the five elements and eleven organs for its ends as its full manifestation (vistāra). Or else (we understand) That which has as its extent (avasāna) sixteen parts ending with

'name' in accordance with (the statements) in the Praśna Upaniṣad beginning '(O friend, even here within the body is that Supreme Being (puruṣa)) in whom originate these sixteen parts,' (Praśna Upaniṣad 6:2) and continuing 'He created the breath of life. From the breath of life (he created) faith...' (ibidem 6:4) etc. Or else 'ekanemim' speaks of the unevolved (avyākṛta) state of being a cause. ṣoḍaśāntam (refers to) that which exists in the form of creation and which has as its anta, end, the two threads of Virāḍ the totality of the effects of that (unevolved state), and the fourteen worlds, the earth etc., which are its differentiated forms.

śatārdhāram... śatārdhāram (refers to) Him who has, as it were, spokes which (represent) fifty different notions, classified as misconceptions (viparyaya), disabilities (aśakti), satisfactions (tuṣṭi) (and) attainments (siddhi). There are five types of misconception: darkness (tamas) delusion (moha) great delusion (mahāmoha) gloom (tāmisra) and complete darkness (andhatāmisra). There are twenty-eight kinds of disability, nine kinds of satisfaction and eight kinds of attainment. These are the fifty kinds of notion. Of these darkness is of eight types. For it is seen that there are eight types of object (mentioned) when the Self is observed to be amid eight categories of Nature⁵ which are not the Self. And there are eight forms of delusion. Delusion is the power of becoming minute, etc.³ Great delusion is of ten kinds. This is the love (abhiniveśa)⁴ of the five objects of sense such as sound etc., both seen and heard of. Since they are either seen or heard, there are ten of them. Gloom is of eighteen kinds. The gloom of one who strives with the eight types power (aiśvarya) (to attain) the ten objects of sense (both) seen and heard of, and who fails is called tamisra. Complete darkness (andhatāmisra) is also of eighteen kinds. One who, after acquiring for enjoyment the eight types of power (aiśvarya) and the ten kinds of object of sense, and having enjoyed them partially is snatched away by death (thinking)

'These were attained with great trouble (kleśa) and (yet) I have not enjoyed them - and now the time of death is at hand,' his grief is called complete darkness.

The different misconceptions (viparyaya) have (now) been explained.

Disabilities (aśakti) are said to be twenty-eight in number. The outer disabilities of the eleven sense-organs (indriya), are dumbness, deafness, blindness, etc. The nine disabilities of the inner organ (antaḥkaraṇa) are the opposites of the satisfactions which constitute the ability to fulfil the human goals (puruṣārtha). Eight disabilities correspond to the opposites of the attainments (siddhi).

The satisfactions are nine in number: four are called nature (prakṛti), acquisition (upādāna) time (kāla) and fortune (bhāgya). Five result from the giving up of sense objects. From a knowledge of Nature someone thinks 'I have fulfilled my aim.' Again another acquiring the guise of a mendicant thinks 'I have fulfilled my aim.' Yet another, after thinking, 'What is the use of knowing Nature, or taking up a stage of life etc., when after a long period of time liberation of a necessity comes about?' becomes satisfied. Someone again thinks 'Without good fortune (bhāgya) nothing at all is acquired. If I had good fortune then indeed in this very world there would be liberation.' Thus he is satisfied. (Realizing) that the attainment of sense objects is impossible, (and) desisting from them, another is satisfied. Believing that it is possible to find and attain (objects of sense), (realizing) it is impossible to guard what has been attained, then desisting from them, someone else is satisfied. Another, seeing faults such as superabundance (sātīśayatva) etc. and desisting from them, is satisfied. Sense objects give rise to even more desire, and no satisfaction arises from their repeated enjoyment.

'Desire is never pacified through the enjoyment of desires. Like the fire with the oblation, it grows even more.' (Śrīmad Bhagavatām 9:19:14)

Therefore, someone seeing the error of attachment thinking 'Enough of this enjoyment which again and again causes dissatisfaction,' desists from it and is content.

Enjoyment is impossible without harming creatures. Evil (adharma) comes from the enjoyment of harming creatures. From evil hell (naraka) etc. is attained. Someone who sees the error of causing harm in this way desists and is content.

Thus the nine satisfactions have been explained, the four consisting of Nature (prakṛti), acquisition (upādāna), time (kāla) and fortune (bhāgya), and the five satisfactions which arise from (seeing) the defect of acquiring and protecting things, or the defects in objects themselves, and the defects of attachment and injury.

The attainments (siddhi) are (now) considered. The (first) three attainments are ūha, śabda and adhyayana. (Then) there are the three removers of misery, (duḥkha-vighāta) and the two attainments of making friends and generosity. ūha is the knowledge concerning Nature etc. which comes without instruction to one desiring to know the truth, powered by latent impressions (saṁskāra) from other births, in one who so desires. This is the first attainment. śabda is the knowledge which arises from listening alone and (comes) without study (abhyāsa). This is the second achievement. adhyayana is the knowledge which arises from the study (abhyāsa) of the scriptures. This is the third achievement. The knowledge which comes to a forbearing person who endures the miseries caused by hot and cold etc., by becoming indifferent to the three types of misery, relating to the body (adhyātmika), the material

world (adhibhautika) (and) the world of the gods, is threefold corresponding to the divisions of body etc. Accordingly the attainments are of three kinds. The attainment (siddhi) of knowledge (jñāna) which (one gains) after forming a friendship is called suhṛtprāpti. The attainment of knowledge (vidyā) which (one gains) by giving something beneficial to one's teacher is called dāna. Thus the eight attainments have been explained.

In this way we have explained the fifty different notions called misconceptions (viparyaya) disabilities (aśakti) satisfactions (tuṣṭi) and attainments (siddhi). They are set forth similarly in the sixtieth chapter of the Brahma Purāṇa where it comments on the Kalpa Upaniṣad.

Otherwise śatārdhāram refers to Him whose fifty powers are like spokes, (and) which are thought of as the very nature of the Supreme in the Purāṇa (with the words) 'having fifty powers as its nature.'

viṃśatipratyarābhiḥ The twenty counter-spokes (represent) the ten organs and their objects, sound, touch, form, taste, smell, speaking, grasping, walking, excreting and (sexual) enjoyment. pratyara refers to counter spokes of the previously mentioned spokes, which are wedges fixed against the spokes to make them secure. (We understand Him) as joined with those counter-spokes.

(We understand Him) as having six sets of eight; the word 'having' (yukta) needs to be supplied.

The eight aspects of Nature (prakṛti) are described in:

'Earth, water, fire, air, ether, the discursive faculty of mind (manas) and also the discriminative faculty of mind (buddhi), egoism (ahaṁkāra) - thus is my nature (prakṛti) divided eightfold.' (Bhagavad Gītā 7:4)

(These are) the eight (aspects of) nature. (The eight constituents of the body (dhātu) are skin (tvak), hide (carman), flesh (māṃsa), blood (rudhira), fat (medas), bone (asthi), marrow (majjan) and sperm (śukra). The eight powers (aiśvarya) are that of becoming minute etc. The eight states of being are called righteousness (dharma), knowledge (jñāna), dispassion (vairāgya), power (aiśvarya), unrighteousness (adharma), ignorance (ajñāna), absence of dispassion (avairāgya) (and) powerlessness (anaśvarya).

The eight divine beings (deva) are Brahma, Prajāpati,⁶ the gods (deva), Gandharvas, Yakṣas, demons (rākṣasa), deceased ancestors (pitṛ) and Piśācas.

The eight good qualities (guṇa) of the mind (ātman) should be known as: compassion towards all living beings (dayā), patience (kṣānti), absence of ill will (anasūya), purity (śauca), absence of stress (anāyāsa), happiness (maṅgala), generosity (akārpaṇya) and desirelessness (asprṇhā) - this is the sixth (set) of eight qualities. (We understand Him) as having these six.

viśvarūpaikapāśam... viśvarūpaikapāśam having one fetter called desire, viśvarūpa-of many forms on account of the diversity of objects such as heavens, sons, food etc. (It is said to have) three distinct paths because of the different paths of righteousness, unrighteousness and knowledge. (It is said that) its one delusion arises from two causes, since its single moha, the mistaken notion (abhimāna) of oneself (existing) in the not-Self, the⁷ body, organs, the discursive mind (manas), the intellect (buddhi), birth, etc. is the cause of merit and demerit. The verb apaśyan 'they saw' is supplied (from the previous verse). Or else we supply the verb adhīmah 'we understand' appearing in the next verse.

(Brahman) was previously shown (compared) with the form of a wheel. Now (the Upaniṣad) shows it (compared) with the nature of a river:

pañcasroto' mbum pañcayony ugravakrām/pañcaprāṇormim pañcabuddhyādimūlām
pañcāvartām pañcaduḥkhaughavegām/pañcaśadbhedām pañcaparvām adhīmaḥ

5. 'We understand Him as a river (ambu) of five streams from five sources, fierce, and crooked, whose waves are the five vital breaths, whose original source is fivefold perception with five whirlpools, an impetuous flood of five miseries, with fifty divisions and five limbs.

pañcasroto' mbum ... pañcasroto' mbum a river, which has five streams, being the five organs of knowledge, the eye etc. analogous to the water. 'We understand' is supplied in all cases. pañcayony ugravakrām made turbulent and winding by the five sources (yoni), the five elements, which are the causes.

pañcaprāṇormim whose waves are the five vital breaths or the organs of action, the voice, hand etc. The first cause of the five types of cognition (buddhi) arising from the eye etc. is the mind. (pañcabuddhyādimūlām) that river of transmigration whose root (mūla) is the mind, since all cognitions are of the nature of functions (vṛtti) of the mind. And accordingly (scripture) shows that the mind is the cause of all.

'All that there is, that which moves and all that which does not move is spread out by the mind. When the mind becomes nullified no duality is perceived.' (similar to Māṇḍūkya Kārikās 3:31)

pañcāvartām whose five objects of sense, i.e. sound etc., are like whirlpools in which living beings drown. pañcaduḥkhaughavegām whose impetuous flood is five miseries, those of the womb, birth, old-age, disease and death.

pañcaparyāṃ whose five members are the five divisions of affliction (kleśa):
ignorance, egoism, attachment, hatred and love of life (abhiniveśa).¹

In this way Brahman and its manifestations, of the nature of cause and effect, have been spoken of here with the analogies of the river and the wheel of Brahman. Now, to show the causes of transmigration and liberation, (and) why one rotates in this wheel of Brahman, the nature of which is cause and effect, or why one is liberated, (the upaniṣad) says:

sarvājīve¹ sarvasaṁsthe brhante/tasmin haṁso bhrāmyate brahmacakre
prthagātmānam preritāram ca matvā/justas tatas tenāmṛtatvam eti.

6. In that vast wheel of Brahman which gives life to all (and) appears in all, the soul (haṁsa)² flutters about, thinking itself and the Actuator to be separate. Then, favoured by Him, it attains immortality.

sarvājīve... sarvājīve in this which is the livelihood of all,³ sarvasaṁsthe in which is the saṁstha completion, dissolution of all, in this great (wheel of Brahman) there is the haṁsa the individual soul (jīva). haṁsa (is from the root) 'han' 'to go on a journey'.⁴ It wanders about, thinking of itself as the not-Self, the body etc., (being born into) various different kinds of wombs, (those of) gods, men and animals etc. The meaning is that thus being tossed about, it keeps returning.

For what reason is it reborn into various wombs? (In answer) to this it says that it thinks itself and the Actuator (preritṛ) to be separate. The meaning is that it thinks of ātmānam the soul, and preritāram the Lord, as separate, and believes 'He is one, and I am another'; and since it sees the soul and the Lord as different, it is reborn in transmigratory existence.

How is it released? The Upaniṣad says of this juṣṭah - when it is honoured (as being at one) tena with the Lord, of the nature of the non-dual Brahman, that is knowledge, truth and bliss, meditating on 'I am Brahman.' This is the meaning. Thereby, honouring the Lord, he becomes immortal. One who understands the Self, with its nature as Brahman full of bliss, is liberated. But one who believes himself to be other than the Supreme Self is bound. And accordingly in the Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad it is shown that the perception (darśana) of difference is the cause of transmigration:

'Whoever thus knows 'I am Brahman' becomes all this. The gods also have no power over him, for he becomes their Self. But one who worships another god thinking 'He is one and I am another,' does not know. He is just like an animal of the gods.' (Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 1:4:10)

And likewise in the 'Statutes of Lord Viṣṇu':

'Indeed as long as one sees oneself as different from the Supreme Self, so long does the deluded being wander (propelled) by its innate (former) works.

But when all works have been completely dissolved (saṃkṣīna) he sees the supreme Brahman as pure, no different from himself. Through purity he may become imperishable.'

Objection:

tam ekanemim etc. shows Brahman along with the creation. And this being so, even when one realizes Brahm as oneself knowing 'I am Brahman,' it is Brahman with a creation that is realised as oneself. Therefore (in accordance with the statement) 'In whatever way he worships Him, even so he becomes' Brahman with the creation will be attained. Consequently, since the creation is never left behind, liberation cannot be effected. And so the teaching on liberation 'Then honoured (as being at one) with Him, one attains immortality,' is inconsistent (anupapanna).

This doubt having been raised, (the Upaniṣad) says:

7. udgītam etat paramam tu brahma/tasmīns trayam supratisthākṣaram ca
atrāntaram brahmayido 'viditvā/līnā brahmaṇi tat parā yonimuktāh

'This has been sung as the supreme Brahman. In it is the triad. It is the firm foundation, the imperishable. The knowers of Brahman, after knowing what is therein, merged in Brahman, are intent thereon and are freed from (re-entering) the womb.'

udgītam... If Brahman is (permanently) with the creation, then indeed there is no liberation. But this is not so. Why? Since It has been udgītam, raised up and praised in song, (and) taught by the Upaniṣads to be (distinct) from the creation, which is characterized by cause and effect.

The meaning is that Brahman is understood as being indeed untouched by the creation from such texts as:

'It is truly different from the known (and) likewise above the unknown.'

(Kena Upaniṣad 1:4)

'(That with which they say thought is thought), know that indeed as Brahman, not that which they worship as this.' (ibidem 1:5)

'(That, O Gārgī, Brāhmaṇas call the Imperishable.) It is not coarse...'

(Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 3:8:8)

'(By realizing That which is) without sound, touch, (form (and is) unchanging... one is released from the bonds of samsāra...)

(Kaṭha Upaniṣad 3:15)

'He is 'not this, not this.' (similar to Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 3:9:26)

'That which is beyond (this whole world is without form and without ill.)

(Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad 3:10)

'Other than righteousness, (other than unrighteousness... what you see as that, speak that.)' (Kaṭha Upaniṣad 2:14)

'(When there is no darkness (tamas), then there is neither day nor night,) nor being nor non-being, only the auspicious, the Absolute (kevalaḥ).'

(Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad 4:18)

'He is beyond darkness (tamas).' (similar to Kaivalya Upaniṣad 7 and

Mahānārāyaṇa Upaniṣad 1:5)

'One is not subject to fear at any time if one knows the bliss of Brahman, failing to reach which,) words, (along with the mind (manas),) turn back.'

(Taittirīya Upaniṣad 2:4)

'Where one sees nothing else, hears nothing else, knows nothing else, that is the infinite (bhūman). (But where one sees something else, hears something else, knows something else, that is the small.)'

(Chāndogya Upaniṣad 7:24:2)

'(Which one, O Yajñavalkya, is in all things?)

That one which passes beyond hunger and thirst, grief, delusion, old age and death.' (Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 3:5:1)

'(Divine (and) formless is the Supreme Being (puruṣa), He is without and within, unborn) without vital breath (prāṇa) (or) mind (manas), pure, higher than the supreme imperishable.' (Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad 2:1:2).

'My friend, in the beginning this was existence alone,) One only without a second.' (Chāndogya Upaniṣad 6:2:1).

'My friend, just as with one piece of clay, all made of clay may be known,) so change is based on speech, and is name. (The clay alone is true.)' (ibidem 6:1:4).

'There is no difference here whatsoever.' (Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 4:4:19 and Kāṭha Upaniṣad 4:11)

It (Brahman) should be realised in one form only.' (Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 4:4:20)

Since in this way Brahman is devoid of the characteristics of creation, therefore the text states Brahman is indeed (tu) supreme (para).' The particle tu is used for emphasis. By 'supreme' (para) is meant 'best', for it is not subject to the characteristics of transmigration. Brahman is best (as is shown) by its being proclaimed as such. The sense is that according to the rule 'In whatever way he worships Him, even so he becomes,' through the worship of the best Brahman there comes the result which is best, called indeed liberation.

Objection:

In that case since Brahman does not mix with creation, and creation does not mix with Brahman, as the Sāṃkhyas say; creation too is proven to be separate, and hence must be independent. Therefore, first seeing in keeping with the text 'change is based on speech, and is name,' that creation is dependent (on Brahman) and hence is false, (we say that) the teaching on the non-dual Brahman as the (individual) Self is inconsistent.'

This doubt having been raised (the Upaniṣad) says:

tasmiṃstrayam Although Brahman is untouched by creation and is independent, creation is not independent. But yet in that very Brahman is a triad, which is spoken of as the experiencer, the experienced and the Impeller (see 1:12), characterized by the experienced, the experiencer and the Controller. And with 'It is one unborn employed (yukta) for the purpose of bringing into being the experiencer and the objects of experience' (see 1:9), It (Brahman) is stated to be of the nature of the experiencer and the objects of experience. Or elsewhere this is proved by Śruti, (as) by the two aphorisms on the Sovereign (Virāj) that (in Brahman) is based a nature of name, form and works,

of the viśva taijasa and prāñña quarters, (that come with) the waking (jāgrat), dreaming (svapna) and deep sleep (susupti) states, just as on the rope (is based the illusion of) the snake. Since the whole nature of creation, characterized by the experiencer etc., is based on this, therefore Brahman is supraṭiṣṭha, the excellent foundation of the creation, which is of the nature of the triad of experiencer etc. Since anything other than Brahman is by nature unsteady, other foundations are unsteady. Since Brahman is unmoving it (forms) a firm foundation.

Objection:

In that case (Brahman) like the curd etc., must be non-eternal, because it undergoes transformations, being the support of a creation which undergoes changes.

This doubt having been raised, (the Upaniṣad) says akṣaram ca ('And It (Brahman) is imperishable'.) Even if the support of creation is a transformation, the Imperishable (akṣara) is (indeed) akṣara, does not perish. The word 'ca' is for emphasis. Brahman is surely imperishable, for change is illusory. The meaning is that despite being the support of change Brahman remains indeed imperishable and unchanging. And the illusory nature of creation has already been explained at length. Therefore the purport is that although Brahman is omnipresent, it does not mix with creation, for the creation is by nature false. Hence for one who sees himself as Brahman, full of bliss, the supreme goal of Man called liberation is available.

How does the perfection of liberation (come about) for him who sees the Self? In reply, (the Upaniṣad) says: atra in this body, (ranging) from (the sheath) of food to (the sheath) of bliss, or in this creation, (ranging) from the

Sovereign (Virāj) to the unmanifest, brahmavido viditvā (the knowers of Brahman, after knowing) that which is beyond speech, and which with the dissolving of each limiting adjunct, is with each one (found to be) untouched by hunger etc., līnā brahmaṇi being dissolved by the withdrawal of the universe etc., they remain identified with the very nature of Brahman (knowing) 'I am Brahman.' This is the meaning, tatparāh intent on concentration (samādhi), what do they do? They are yonimuktāh meaning that they are released from the fear of transmigration (consisting of the passage through) the womb, birth, old-age, and death. And likewise the Yogin Yājñavalkya shows that concentration has its abode (avasthita) in the Self alone, which is Brahman:

'That is called concentration (samādhi) for the purpose of (achieving) which the (individual) Self contemplates none other than this supreme Self, which is non-dual, brilliant, the cause of all, bliss, immortal, eternal, residing in all beings... After attaining (the supreme Self) through the (individual) Self, however, the (individual) Self is dissolved into that (Supreme Self).

Having brought the sense organs under control, endowed with the qualities of restraint etc., he should set his mind (manas) in the Self, (and) set the (individual) Self in the Supreme Self.

Having himself become the Supreme Self he would thenceforth have no thoughts. Then the (individual) Self would dissolve in the partless inner Self (pratyagātman.) Those who teach Brahman declare that he himself becomes the inner Self.

Objection:

It is agreed that the Supreme Self is non-dual. Furthermore there is no

difference between the individual soul (jīva) and the Lord (Īśvara).

Therefore 'līnā brahmaṇi' (devoted to Brahman), (as) a śruti teaching merger (laya), primarily concerned with the oneness of Brahman and the individual souls, is inconsistent, (since it implies duality.)²

This doubt having been raised, (the Upaniṣad), after showing that in the worldly state of affairs there is a difference between the individual soul and the Lord caused by limiting adjuncts, teaches that through a practical knowledge (vijñāna) of that (Brahman) there is immortality:

saṁyuktam etat kṣaram akṣaram ca/vyaktāvyaktam bharate viśvamīśan
anīśaścātmā badhyate bhoktrbhāvāj/jñātvā devaṁ mucyate sarvapāśaih

8. The Lord supports all this, a combination of the perishable and the imperishable, the manifest and the unmanifest. And the (individual) Self, not being the Lord, is bound, because it is an experiencer; by knowing God, it is released from all fetters.

saṁyuktam etat The vyakta (manifest) born of change (and) the avyaktam (unmanifest) the cause, are both kṣaram and akṣaram, the vyakta (manifest) being kṣaram, perishable, the avyakta (unmanifest) being akṣaram, imperishable. Those two, mutually conjoined as the universe, being of the nature of effect and cause, īśa the Lord bharate supports.

And likewise the blessed Lord says:

'The perishable is all beings, (and) the imperishable is called the unchanging.'

'But other (than these) is the Highest Being (Puruṣa), spoken of as the supreme Self, who, entering the three worlds, supports them as the unchanging Lord.' (Bhagavad Gītā 15:16-17)

It is not only the Lord who supports the manifest and the unmanifest, but also anīśaḥ he who is not the Lord, the (individual) soul, which is bound by ignorance and its effects, the body and sense-organs etc., because it is an experiencer. It is said that the Lord is of the nature of individuality (vyaṣṭi) and totality (samaṣṭi) mutually conjoined. The anīśa, possessed of body and sense organs, the individual (form of the Lord), is the soul (jīva). Thus the soul and the Supreme are of the nature of individuality and totality because of the existence of division as a limiting adjunct. Having known the Lord who is without limiting adjuncts, through the worship of these adjuncts, (a man) is liberated. Therefore there is nothing wrong with speaking about the unity of the experiencer and the Self.

And likewise the blessed Yājñavalkya shows that division arises only from limiting adjuncts:

'For just as the one ether (ākāśa) may be in many jars, etc., (or) the (one) sun (reflected) in many pools, so the Self may be one and many.' (Yājñavalkya Smṛti 3:144)

And likewise in 'The Statutes of Śrī Viṣṇu':

'O Lord of men, the division of the Supreme and the (individual) Self is, imagined (kalpita) through ignorance. For when it is destroyed, there is verily no division between the (individual) Self and the Supreme.

This Self, when conjoined with the qualities of nature, is called the 'Knower of the Field' (kṣetrajña). Free from those (qualities) (and) pure, it is called the supreme Self.

This Knower of the Field, when connected with ignorance involving beginningless bondage, sees Brahman which is inherent in himself as different.

And likewise in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa:

'When ignorance, which gives rise to division, is completely eradicated (nāśa) (then) who can create division (between) the (individual) Self and Brahman, when it does not exist? (Viṣṇu Purāṇa 6:7:16)

And likewise in Vasiṣṭha's Yogaśāstra it is shown (in a passage) beginning with a question:

'If the Self is without qualities and pure, truth and bliss, unaging and undying, then to whom, sir, may transmigration or liberation through knowledge pertain?

How is it known whether a man's embodiedness is destroyed, O blessed Lord?
Now you should duly tell me all this.

Vasiṣṭha:

The wise declare that transmigration (pertains to) the individual soul which is separated from that very Self, which consists of truth and bliss, ever pure.

For the Self of embodied beings is one alone, residing in various beings, but is seen as one and many, like the moon's reflection in water.

That very Self when fallen into error should ever be known as the individual soul.'

And likewise in the Brahma Purāṇa it shows that the Supreme Itself comes to have distinctions of the soul etc., due to limiting adjuncts.

How then do the states of bondage and liberation etc. come about through limiting adjuncts? This doubt having been raised it shows the state of affairs with the help of an illustration:

'The one sun is seen as many (when reflected) in pools; and the Supreme Self appears (as many) when situated in all its limiting adjuncts.

Brahman is in all bodies, outside and inside. Just as ether is in all beings, so the Self (exists) in the discriminative faculty (buddhi), not in any other way.

This being so, through the error of the Self identifying with the non-Self, he thinks 'I am the body'. That is the cause of being bound in transmigration.

But the conscious Self when free from all false notions (vikalpa) is pure, intelligent, unageing, undying, peaceful, pervasive like the sky, and ever effulgent.

Just as the sky is not tainted by smoke, clouds and dust, so the Supreme Being is not tainted by the changes of nature.

Just as when the space in a certain pot is filled with water and smoke etc., no other spaces at a distance are soiled anywhere at any time, so when a certain individual soul is soiled by several pairs of opposites, no other individual souls are soiled anywhere.

And likewise Gaudapāda, the disciple of Śuka (says):

'Just as when the space in a certain pot is filled with dust and smoke etc., not all pots are affected, so individual souls, when filled with happiness etc., (do not affect other souls). (Māṇḍūkya Kārikās 3:5)

Therefore it has been proved that a state of division exists between individual souls and between the individual soul and the Lord, because of limiting adjuncts (superimposed) on the non-dual supreme Self. For this reason, happiness, misery, delusion and ignorance etc., which exist in the individual soul with its impure limiting adjuncts, do not pertain to the Lord, which has pure being as its adjunct.

And likewise the blessed Parāśara (said):

'Or what is there in this world unknown to That which is seated in the hearts of all men, who is of the nature of knowledge, teeming with undefiled purity, free from faults, always existent.' (Viṣṇu Purāṇa 5:17:32)

Nor is there any relation between one individual soul which is enlightened or liberated, and another (affected by) pleasure, pain and delusion etc., for it is possible to have (different) states produced by limiting adjuncts.

Therefore, your objection that when one is liberated, all would be liberated, is inapplicable.

Moreover (the upaniṣad) speaks of this other difference:

jñā jñāu dvāv ajāv īśānīśāv/ajā hy ekā bhoktr-bhogyārtha-yuktā
ananta' cātmā viśva-rūpo hy akartā/trayaṁ yadā vindate brahman' etat.

- 9 There are two unborn ones, the knowing and the unknowing, the powerful and the powerless. She is unborn, connected with the enjoyer the enjoyable and the objects (of enjoyment.) And there is infinite Self, which is universal, and not an agent. When one finds this triad, that is Brahman.

jñā jñāu dvau Not only does the Lord support the manifest and the unmanifest, and the soul, being powerless, is bound, but also there are the two jñā jñāu the one who knows (jñā) the Lord (and) the ignorant (ajñā), the individual soul, who are ajau, without birth etc.

For the unchanging Brahman Itself (appears in the different) conditions of the individual soul and the Lord.

And likewise the śruti says:

'He made bodies (pura) with two feet and bodies with four feet. That supreme Being, first becoming a bird, entered the bodies.' (Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 2:5:18)

'(Just as fire, though one, having entered the world takes on different forms in respect of different shapes,) in the same way the Self residing in all beings, though one, takes on different forms in respect of different shapes; and yet it is outside.' (Kaṭha Upaniṣad 2:2:9)

In Īśanīsau the short 'a' (as opposed to Īśanīśau) is Vedic.

Objection:

If the proponent of non-duality is right that creation is characterized by an experiencer and the object of experience then the treatment of the soul and the Lord as different must be justified in such statements as 'the supreme Lord is all-powerful and the soul is powerless; the supreme Lord is omniscient, while the soul has limited knowledge; the supreme Lord creates all, while the soul creates nothing; the supreme Lord supports all while the soul supports the body etc.; the supreme Lord is omnipresent, while the soul is not; the supreme Lord is omnipotent, and satisfied, while the individual soul has limited power and is dissatisfied' and in such statements as:

'On every side (the Supreme Being (Puruṣa)) has a hand and a foot.'

(Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad 3:16)

'(The Supreme Being (Puruṣa)) has a thousand heads...' (ibidem 3:14)

'He (the one God) is the eternal among the eternal.' (ibidem 6:13) etc.

But there is no proof that the creation is (made up of) experiencer etc., for of itself reality, which is immovable, unchanging and non-dual is by nature a non-experiencer etc. Nor does anything come from any other source, since apart from Brahman there is no other reality which is the cause of creation consisting of experiencer etc. If something were to exist other than reality, (as you seem to suggest), then there would cease to be non-duality.

This objection having been raised, (the Upaniṣad) says ajā hy ekā
bhoktrbhogyārthayuktā 'She is unborn, connected with the enjoyer and the objects of enjoyment.'

If there were this absence of difference between the Lord and the individual soul etc., then indeed there would be no proof that the creation existed. And the existence of the creation can be proved. 'Hi' is in the sense of 'for'. For the existence of ajā the unborn Nature (Prakṛti), which is by nature procreative, is proved.

'With one unborn (red, white and black producing many creatures like herself, there lies one unborn...)'

(Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad 4:5)

'One should know, however, that Nature (Prakṛti) is illusion.' (ibidem 4:10).

'Indra, with his magic powers (māyā) goes about in many forms.'

(Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 2:5:19)

'The supreme Nature (Prakṛti) is illusion (māyā)'

'I am born by my own illusion (māyā)' (Bhagavad Gītā 4:6)

The existence of the One, whose nature is the self-power of gods, who gives rise to the universe, is proven in these and other śruti and smṛti texts. It stands as a servant, acting alongside the Lord, employed for the purpose (of producing) experience and the experienced, its own products (vikāra). Therefore, also that magician (māyin), the Supreme Lord, because of his proximity with the limiting adjunct of illusion, seems possessed of it. He stands possessed of a body etc., that are the effects (of illusion) or divided in the form of the Lord etc., by diverse objects. Therefore, though the Supreme Self is understood as being of a certain single essence (rasa), all usages, both worldly and Vedic, indicating all the differences between the individual soul and the Lord etc., are admissible. Nor is there any possibility of duality because of the existence of one of the two apart from the other. For, since illusion is indefinable, it cannot be a substance. Thus it has been said 'For this, O blessed one, is illusion, devoid of real and unreal appearances.'

Since the unborn one alone has assumed the nature of an experiencer etc., all that is contained within it is proved to be of false reality. Hence anantaścātmā the Self is infinite. The word 'ca' is used for emphasis. The Self is indeed infinite. It has no anta limit caused by time, place or matter. It is viśvarūpa in that its appearance (rūpa) is the universe, for the Supreme does not have a universal form. The meaning is that even though the universe is an appearance, the infiniteness (of the Supreme) is proved, for according to the text 'Change begins in speech, and is a name' (Chāndogya Upaniṣad 6:1:4) (there is no form (rūpa) without a holder of the form). The word 'hi' is used in the sense of 'since.' The meaning is that the appearance

of the Self is the universe as according to (statements) such as 'For the the Supreme Self is indicated by having diverse forms appearing as the universe' etc. Since indeed the Self is infinite and has the universe as Its manifestation, therefore it is 'akartā,' meaning that it is devoid of the characteristics of transmigration such as agency.

Thus when does the (soul) which is (in reality) infinite, which has the universe as its appearance and is devoid of all the characteristics of transmigration such as agency etc., stand released as the non-dual Brahman, by nature full of bliss? (In reply, the Upaniṣad) here says: trayam yadā vindate brahman etat. trayam (the triad), is that of experiencer, experience and experienced, does not exist separate from Brahman because of its illusory nature, but is Brahman Itself. yadā vindate when (the soul) realizes this, it stands free from grief, with all duties fulfilled, devoid of all the characteristics of transmigration such as agency, etc. identified with the non-dual Brahman full of bliss, with all doubts come to an end. This is the import.

Or else when vindate 'one realizes' as Brahman the triad comprising the individual soul, the Lord and Nature (prakṛti) of the nature of the knowing, the unknowing and the unborn, then one is liberated. The word 'brahman' ends with the letter 'm' like it does in the Vedic (verse):

'brahman etu mām. madhum etu mām, (brahman eva madhum etu mām.)'

'May Brahman come to me. May that which is sweet come to me. (May Brahman alone, who is sweet, come to me.)' (Taittirīya Āraṇyaka 10:38)

After showing the difference between the individual soul and the Lord, it was explained that through knowledge of that (Brahman) there is immortality. Now, after showing the difference between primary matter (pradhāna) and the Lord, (the Upaniṣad) shows that through knowledge of that (Brahman) there is immortality:

kṣaram pradhānam amṛtākṣaram haraḥ/ksarātmānav īśate deva ekaḥ
tasyābhidhyānād yojanāt tattvabhāvād/bhūyaś'cānte viśvamāyānivṛttiḥ

- 10 'What is perishable is the primary matter. What is immortal and imperishable is Hara. The one God rules over both the perishable and the (individual) Self. By meditation on Him, by union with Him, and by entering into reality more and more, in the end there is the cessation of all illusion.'

kṣaram pradhānam amṛtākṣaram hara The Supreme Lord is (known as) Hara because He removes ignorance etc.² The meaning is that the Lord is the immortal Brahman Itself amṛtākṣaram, both immortal and imperishable. That Lord, deva ekaḥ the Supreme Self, non-dual, knowledge, existence, and bliss, īśate, rules over, ksarātmānav primary matter and the Supreme Being (puruṣa). Through meditation on that Supreme Self - how? yojanāt through the union of the

Supreme Self with individual souls, tattvabhāvād (repeating) 'I am Brahman' bhūyaś ca, again and again, ante when the results of actions which have already begun to fructify have come to an end.³ Otherwise anta (means) the completion of Self-knowledge (svātmajñāna) (and ante) at that time when the knowledge of one's own Self arises.

viśvamāyānivṛtti the cessation of the illusion, which takes the form of the whole creation, of the nature of happiness, misery and delusion.

Now (the Upaniṣad) explains the different results which are achieved through knowledge and meditation by the knower and meditator on that (Brahman):

jñātvā devaṁ sarvapāśāpahāniḥ/ksīnaiḥ kleśair' janmamṛtyuprahāniḥ
tasyābhidhyānāt tritīyaṁ dehabhede/viśvaiśvaryaṁ kevala āptakāmaḥ

11 'When one knows God, all fetters fall away. When afflictions have been dispelled, birth and death cease. Through meditation on Him, on the dissolution of the body, there is the third state, universal Lordship: being absolute, one's desires are fulfilled.'

jñātvā Knowing God as 'I am This,' sarpapāśāpahāniḥ all ignorance etc., being of the nature of fetters, fall away. When kleśaiḥ ignorance etc. are dispelled, their effects, birth and death cease, (and) the cause of the miseries of birth, death, etc. is extinguished. (Thus) the result of knowledge has been shown.

(The text) speaks of a particular form of liberation in stages (kramamukti)² in the case of meditation. Through meditation on tasya the Supreme Lord

dehabhede, on the fall of the body, (and) travelling by the path of the gods, (consisting) of light etc., one enters into communion with the Supreme Lord. (For such a one) the result is the third (state) counting from the state of Sovereign (Virāj), the Lord as the cause of the unmanifest supreme space, marked by universal lordship. He, after experiencing that, and there having known the unqualified Self, remains kevalaḥ with all lordship and the powers which are its limiting adjuncts discarded. Having relinquished the third state of universal lordship, in which the Lord is the cause of the unmanifest supreme space, he remains āptakāma loving the Self, of the nature of the non-dual Brahman, full of bliss.

It is being said that since seeing aright is concerned with a thing as it is, therefore complete knowledge has as its object the non-dual Brahman that is complete bliss beyond any realm. Therefore, through the abandonement of ignorance and its effects, he remains as the Unbroken which is knowledge, of the very nature of the non-dual Brahman which is complete bliss.

The mind (buddhi) engaged in meditation does not all of a sudden revert to the formless state. Hence, since meditation is in the realm of the differentiated Brahman, therefore in accordance with the rule of attaining a result just as one meditates on Him, one experiences universal lordship by attaining² to the differentiated Brahman (itself) characterized by universal lordship, then knowing the (individual) Self as the undifferentiated Brahman, full of bliss, one is liberated, loving only the Self, with the goal of Man fully attained.

Likewise, in the latter section of 'The Institutes of Śiva' it is explained that the fruit of meditation and knowledge is respectively characterized by universal lordship and the desire for the absolute Self (kevala) with all desires fulfilled:³

'From meditation comes unrivalled power (aiśvarya) from power, supreme happiness. After renouncing that through knowledge, one should be detached from the body and attain liberation.'

And likewise it is shown that those who meditate on the differentiated qualified (saguna) (Brahman) as small etc. (receive) divine powers as their reward, with statements such as 'If he becomes desirous of the world of the fathers, by his very wish fathers arise' etc. (Chāndogya Upaniṣad 8:2:1)

And likewise in the Praśna Upaniṣad it first gives instruction for one who meditates on the Supreme Being (Puruṣa), about the path of light etc., with such statements as 'Again, one who meditates on that Supreme Being with the three elements of this very imperishable Om becomes unified in the sun which is light' (Praśna Upaniṣad 5:5). (Then the Upaniṣad) shows that one who goes to the world of Brahma there attains right vision with 'He sees the Supreme Being (puruṣa) dwelling in the body that is higher than this aggregate of living creatures.' (ibidem)

(The Upaniṣad goes on) to teach that through this right vision liberation (is attained) with 'With Om itself as a support, the wise man reaches Him who is peaceful, unaging, immortal, fearless and supreme.' (ibidem 5:7)

(The scripture further) shows that without going along the path of light, etc., the wise man attains immortality in this very world:

'(Therefore this (song) is the Supreme Brahman, consisting of being, consciousness and bliss.) One who knows it as such becomes immortal even in this world.' (Nṛsiṃhapūrvatāpanīya Upaniṣad 1:6)

It is taught that even before passing away the wise man (achieves) liberation with such (scriptural texts) as that which begins with 'Now the man who does not desire... his vital breaths do not depart. Being Brahman alone he goes to Brahman.' (Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 4:4:6) It is (further) shown in the form of question (and answer) that (the vital breaths) do not leave (the body):

'(When this man dies) do the vital breaths go up from him, or not? No, replied Yājñavalkya.' (ibidem 3:2:11)

And likewise in the Brahma Purāṇa it explains liberation while still living and the absence of transmigration (gati):

'When the Yogin knows his own Self as absolute (kevala), from that time he is liberated while living. Liberation includes no such thing as going anywhere else. The supreme goal attained by the Yogins is not the highest.

Liberation is the breaking of the bonds of ignorance, the dissolution in Brahman.'

Likewise in the Liṅga Purāṇa it shows the wise man (attaining) liberation while still living:

'Since the knower of Brahman is actually liberated while living, therefore he has no duty in this world or the next.'

In the sequel to 'The Statutes of Śiva':

'And when desire has passed away he has no duty at all; in this very world he is released, fulfilled (sāmpūrṇa)⁴, seeing the same (in all).'

Therefore the meditator leaves the body and travelling along the path of the gods, the rays of the sun, etc., attains Brahman possessed of universal lordship. After experiencing universal lordship, there indeed he comes to know the absolute Self as the non-dual Brahman full of bliss, devoid of all division. Loving the absolute Self, he is released.

The wise man knows in practice⁵ the non-dual Brahman which is full of bliss as having no distinctions. (In this knowledge) all differences of transmigrator (gantr) births (gantavya) and transmigration are cast aside. Therefore immediately following the knowledge of Brahman the man liberated while living does not leave the body and travel along the path of the gods. Immediately after knowing Brahman, he experiences the bliss of Brahman, (and) finds joy in the Self. With the Self he has inner happiness, delight and inner light. In the Self he finds play and joy. He is coupled with the Self and finds bliss in the Self. He indeed, in the land of his own kingdom, in his own greatness, stands immortal.

For that reason, by renouncing external objects he dedicates (all works) to Brahman. Then, after performing works achieved by speech, mind and body, (prescribed) in śruti and smṛti, his mind becomes purified, and he becomes established in yoga (yogārūḍha), endowed with the means such as peacefulness etc.⁶ As the smṛti says:

'Remaining in retreat, let the Yogin unite with himself at all times, alone, with mind and body restrained, free from expectations and grasping.'

(Bhagavad Gītā 6:10)

'Always uniting with himself in this way, the Yogin, with all sin gone, easily enjoys the infinite happiness of contact with Brahman.

Himself joined in union, he sees himself in all beings, and all beings in himself, (and) sees (all) as the same everywhere.' (ibidem 6:28-29)

'For seeing the same Lord residing everywhere, he himself does not harm the Self, (and) therefore goes to the supreme goal.' (ibidem 13:28)

Since the supreme goal of Man is attained immediately (on the arising of) knowledge, therefore.

etaḥ jñeyam nityam evātmasamsthānātaḥ param veditavyam hi kiṃcit
bhoktā bhogyaṁ preritāraṁ ca matvā/sarvaṁ proktaṁ trividhaṁ brahmaṁ etat.

12 That which is eternal, and abides in oneself should be known. For there is nothing beyond this to be known. By knowing the experiencer, the object of experience and the Actuator, all has been said. This is the threefold Brahman.'

etat (That) which is under consideration, of the nature of Brahman, the absolute Self comparable to space, should surely be known. In this regard, should it be known as existing somewhere else? No, it should be known as existing in oneself, not as something that is exterior and not the Self.

And the śruti says:

'The wise who see Him (the inner Self (antarātman)) as residing in oneself have eternal peace, not others.' (Kaṭha Upaniṣad 5:13)

And likewise in the sequel to 'The statutes of Śiva' (there is described) the state of Yogins (who rest) in the Self:

'Yogins see Śiva in themselves, and not in images. One who disregards that Śiva which resides within, worshipping Him as being exterior, is like one who, disregarding the ball of food in his hand, licks his own elbow. Since they are bereft of the eye of knowledge, they do not see the peaceful, auspicious one who resides everywhere here,

Just as a blind man cannot see that the sun has risen. He who sees the all-pervasive peaceful one, has Śiva residing in his heart.

Those who do not see Him as residing in themselves seek for Śiva in holy places. One who ignores the holy place within himself, and resorts to outer holy places etc., (is like one who) abandons a priceless jewel in the palm of his hand, and seeks for glass.'

Or else (the meaning is) This, which is directly perceived is the indwelling Self. It should be known as eternal and indestructible, abiding in its own greatness, being Brahman Itself. Why? The word 'hi' is in the sense of 'since.' Since there is absolutely nothing beyond this to be known. :

And it says in the Brhadāraṇyaka (Upaniṣad):

'Of all these, this Self should be realized (pādanīya)' (Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 1:4:7)

How should this be known? In answer it says that bhoktā the individual soul bhogyam the enjoyable objects and preritāram the inner controller, the Supreme Lord. All these three which have been spoken of are Brahman itself. The meaning is that one should know oneself as the undifferentiated Brahman, after verily removing all the manifestation of differences such as enjoyer.

And likewise it is said in the song of Kāvāṣeya¹²:

'Abandoning all false conceptions, (and) bringing the mind to rest unmoving in one's own Self, the Yogin should become peaceful, like a fire with its fuel burnt out.'

And likewise in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa:

'For the understanding of His nature as devoid of falsity (kalpanā) may be attained by the mind in meditation (dhyāna). That is called samādhi.'

Since according to the śruti texts:

'(Again, one who meditates) on that Supreme Being (with the three elements) of this very imperishable Om becomes unified (in the sun which is light) (Praśna Upaniṣad 5:5).

'One should unite with the Self as Om.' (Mahānārāyaṇa Upaniṣad 24:1)

'One should meditate on the Self as Om.'

it is enjoined that one should meditate on Om when one engages in meditation on the supreme Reality, (the Upaniṣad) now shows (the place of) Om in meditation on the Supreme:

vahner yathā yonigatasya mūrtir/na drśyate naiva ca liṅganāśah
sa bhūya evendhanayonigrhyas/tad vobhayam vai pranavena dehe

- 13 Just as the material form (mūrti) of fire, when latent in its source, is not seen and yet its subtle form (liṅga) has not been destroyed, (and) it (still) may be perceived again and again by means of the drill in its source, so it is in both cases. (The Self must be perceived) in the body with Om.

vahner yathā... It is just as the mūrtiḥ 'form', of fire yonigatasya in a kindling stick which is not seen until friction (is created), and yet its liṅga, subtle body, is not destroyed. That fire in the kindling stick may be perceived bhūyaḥ 'again and again' by rubbing with its yoni 'source', the drill. The word 'yoni' here means 'cause.' With the drill as its cause, it is perceived again and again through rubbing. In tadvobhayam (tad vā ubhayam) the word 'vā' is in the sense of 'as it were.' And both of these, both of these as it were are not perceived before rubbing. And with rubbing they are perceived. In the same way the Self, represented by the fire, through reflection (manana) is perceived in the body, represented by the lower fire-stick, with (the help of) Om, represented by the upper fire-stick.

(The Upaniṣad) expands on this very matter:

svadeham arañim kṛtvā/pranavam cottarāraṇim
dhyānanirmathanābhyāsād/devam paśyen nigūdhavat

- 14 By making one's own body the (lower) fire-stick, and On the upper fire-stick, through the practice of the friction of meditation, one may see God hidden as it were.

svadeham One makes one's own body the fire-stick (that is) the lower fire-stick. Friction is indeed meditation. Through the practice of that friction, one may see God, of the nature of light, hidden as the fire was.

To affirm the meaning of what has been said (the Upaniṣad) gives many examples:

tileṣu tailaṁ dadhinīva sarpir/āpas śrotassv aranīṣu cāgniḥ
evam ātmātmani grhyate' sau/satyenainaṁ tapasā yo' nupaśyati

- 15 As oil in sesamum seeds, as butter in coagulated milk, as water in (dry) river-beds and as fire in fire-sticks, so that Self is perceived in oneself if one looks for Him with true ascetic practice.

tileṣu Just as oil is seen to be (in sesamum seeds) when they are crushed in a (squeezing) device, butter in coagulated milk when it is churned, water śrotasṣu in (dry) rivers when the earth is dug up and fire in firesticks when they are rubbed, in the same way That is seen to be ātmani in one's own Self when reflected upon. The meaning is that it is realised in one's own Self, which is unconditioned and absolute bliss, after the removal of all limiting adjuncts, such as the sheaf consisting of food considered as one's own Self. What man in that case perceives (That) as being in himself? (In answer to this the Upaniṣad) therefore says: He who sees that Self satyena with speech of things as they are for the welfare of beings, as according to the smṛti 'Truth has been said to be that which is beneficial to beings.' tapasā (by ascetic practice) characterized by the one-pointedness of mind (manas) and sense faculties as according to the smṛti 'The supreme ascetic practice is the one-pointedness of both mind (manas) and sense faculties.'

How does He see that (Self)? (In answer to this the Upaniṣad) therefore says:

sarvavyāpinam' ātmānam/ kṣīre sarpirivārpitam
ātmaavidyātapomūlaṁ/ tad brahmopaniṣat param
tad brahmopaniṣat param

16 (He sees) the Self which pervades all, as butter is inherent in milk, the root of the knowledge of the Self and ascetic practices, that is Brahman, the highest esoteric doctrine (upaniṣad). That is Brahman, the highest esoteric doctrine.

sarvavyāpinam The Self which pervades all, from Nature (Prakṛti) down to various objects, (and) resides in them, and does not merely reside in one's own individual body, and sense organs etc. It is as butter in milk, since it inheres in everything as its essence, as the Self, without any discontinuity. Contained in all, it is the mūlaṁ source of ascetic practices and self-knowledge.

And as the Śruti says:

'For this (Self) indeed gives rise to good works².' (Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad 3:8)

'(To those, who, ever united, worship with love (prīti)), I give union with knowledge, by which they come to Me.' (Bhagavad Gītā 10:10)

Or else (the text refers to) That for whose self-revelation self-knowledge and ascetic practices are the mūlaṁ source.

And likewise the Śruti says:

'Through knowledge one enjoys immortality.' (Īśā Upaniṣad 11)

'Crave to know Brahman through ascetic practices.' (Taittirīya Upaniṣad 3:2)

brahmopaniṣat param i.e. in this (Brahman) is established the highest good (Śreyas). One who is endowed with such means as truth etc. see this Self that pervades all, like the butter inherent in milk - as the root of the knowledge of the Self and ascetic practices, as Brahman in which is established the highest good. The all-pervading is perceived only in oneself by one who sees himself as Brahman. It is not perceived by one who identifies himself with the limited Brahman, consisting (of the sheaths) of food etc.³, who is attached to untruth etc. And the Śruti says:

'For this Self is attained through constant adherence to truth, ascetic practice, right knowledge (and) celibacy (brahmacharya).' (Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad 3:1:5) '(For them is that taintless world of Brahman) in whom there is no crookedness,⁴ falsehood or deception (māyā)' (Praśna Upaniṣad 1:16)

The repetition (of tad brahmopaniṣat param) means that the chapter is complete.

Here ends the first chapter of the commentary on the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad, composed by the venerable divine Śaṅkara, the most excellent ascetic, a wandering renunciate and teacher, the pupil of the venerable divine Govinda, whose feet are adorable.⁵

CHAPTER 2

Meditation has been spoken of as the means of realizing the Supreme Self with the words 'Through the practice of the friction of meditation, one may see God who is hidden as it were.' Now, in order to ordain the means required for that (meditation), the second chapter is being undertaken. First, in order to establish that (namely, that meditation is indeed the means of realizing the Self, the Upaniṣad) teaches about Savitr:

yuñjānaḥ prathamam manas/tattvāya savitā dhiyaḥ
agner jyotir nicāyya/prthivyā adhyābharat

- 1 'Savitr, first controlling the mind and thought for truth, perceived the light of Agni, and brought it out of the earth.'

yuñjānaḥ prathamam manah First, at the beginning of meditation, the mind (manas) should be fixed on the Supreme Self as well as thoughts and the other vital organs², as according to the śruti 'The vital organs indeed, (and) thoughts...' Or else dhiyaḥ (refers to) perceptions of external objects.

For what purpose? tattvāya For the knowledge of truth, Savitr, dhiyaḥ from the perception of external objects, nicāyya having seen jyotiḥ the light of Agni ābharat brought (it) prthivyā adhi into this body.³

This has been said - When I am turned towards knowledge, (and) have restrained my mind (manas) from the perception of external objects, in order to fix it on the Supreme Self alone, may Savitr, through whose grace one attains yoga, bring to our speech etc. the whole power of Agni etc., and the others who are by nature favourable deities, to light up all things. The meaning is that through His grace, union is attained. The word 'Agni' has the sense of implying also other favourable deities.

yuktena manasā vayam/devasya savituh save
suvargeyāya śaktyā

- 2 With mind controlled we are in the inspiration of the god Savitr, with the strength to obtain heaven.

yuktena Controlling the mind for the sake of truth, by receiving the power of the favourable deities, one makes the body and sense-organs stable. Then, with Savitr united, with mind fully controlled in the Supreme Self, we save are under the command of that god Savitr. We devote ourselves, according to our ability, to the performance of meditation, suvargeyāya in order to obtain heaven. Here the word 'heaven' indicates the Supreme Self, because the context indicates It, and It alone is of the nature of happiness and other happiness is a part of It. And likewise the śruti says:

'Other beings live on a particle of this very bliss'

(Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 4:3:32)

With the words 'yuktvāya...' it is again requested that He (Savitr) do as asked:

yuktvāya manasā devān/suvarayato dhiyā divam
brhaj jyotiḥ kariṣyatah/savitā prasuvāti tām

- 3 'Having controlled with mind the gods that through thought go to the bright heaven, may Savitr inspire them to make a great light.'

yuktvāya having controlled the gods, the organs of mind etc. Their special suvaḥ heaven, happiness, is Brahman, full of bliss. yataḥ is in the plural of the second case-ending, (meaning) 'going' to Brahman full of bliss, not to the sense objects sound etc.

Again dhiyā through right vision there is something else which is special, and is divam of the nature of light, always centred in consciousness, (namely) bṛhad the great Brahman, and jyotiḥ light (which the gods) kariṣyataḥ are revealing as Brahman, full of bliss. Here (kariṣyataḥ) is in the plural of the second case-ending'. May Savitṛ inspire tān, the organs. The meaning is 'May Savitṛ grant that the sense organs, turned away from their objects, and turned towards the Self, make manifest the light of the Self alone.

(Now, the Upaniṣad) says that He who grants this deserves great praise:

yuñjate mana uta yuñjate dhiyo/viprā viprasva bṛhato vipaścitaḥ
vi hotrā dadhe vayunāvid eka/in mahī devasya savituh pariṣtutiḥ

- 4 The sages of the great wise Sage control their mind and control their thoughts. The One who knows the rules has ordained the priestly functions. Great is the praise of the god Savitṛ.

yuñjate... Those wise men who yuñjate control their minds uta yuñjate dhiyah and (control) the other sense organs. The word 'dhī' is used for the organs, since they are the causes of dhī (knowledge).

And likewise another śruti text says:

'When the five (organs of) knowledge, together with the mind (manas), come to rest, (and the faculty of discrimination does not move, that they call the supreme state.)' (Kaṭha Upaniṣad 5:10)

viprasya the fully pervasive br̥hataḥ great vipaścitaḥ omniscient god Savitr
deserves mahī great praise. From whom? The sages.

(The Upaniṣad) qualifies Him still further: vi hotrā dadhe... ekah the one
without a second who has ordained hotrāḥ rituals is vayunāvit a knower of
wisdom through his omniscience being a witness. The sages who have restrained
the organs of mind etc. from their objects and who centre (them) in the Self
alone should give great praise to the great wise Sage, the one Savitr who,
being wise, has ordained rituals.

yuje vām brahma'pūrvyam namobhir viśloka etu pathy eva sūreḥ
sr̥nvantu viśve amṛtasya putrā ā ye dhāmāni divyāni tasthuḥ

5 I join your ancient Brahman with adorations. Let my verse go forth on the
very path of the sun. May all the sons of the Immortal, those who have
reached their divine abodes, hear.

yuje vām... The meaning is yuje vām I concentrate on Brahman who is related
vām, to you both, the sense organ and the (corresponding) god,² since it is
revealed by its being made manifest (by you). Or else 'vām' is in the plural
sense³: I concentrate on the pūrvyam primordial (pūrva) ancient Brahman which
is your source namobhir with adorations, with fixing of mind (citta), etc.

While I am thus absorbed in profound meditation, this my verse is to be
sung (and) etu should go forth in diverse directions pathyeva sūreḥ on the
virtuous path of a wise man. Or else (it should go forth like) the fame of a
wise man. May all the sons of the immortal Brahmā, of Hiraṇyagarbha who is
identified with the sun hear this utterance in the form of a prayer, a fitting
eulogy. Who are those sons? Those who ātasthuḥ inhabit dhāmāni divyāni
dwellings⁴ in heaven.

A petition to Savitr and other (gods) was set forth with the words 'first controlling the mind' etc. However, one who does not make (such) a supplication, and without being given leave by those (gods), turns to engage in Yoga, engages merely in works which generate experience. Thus (the Upaniṣad) says:

agnir yatrābhimathyate/vayur yatrādhirudhyate
somo yatrātiricyate/tatra saṁjāyate manah

- 6 Where the fire is kindled by rubbing, where the wind is directed, where the Soma juice overflows, there mind is born.

agnir yatra... Where fire is kindled by rubbing, i.e. in a receptacle etc., where air is directed i.e. at the Pravargya ceremony etc, (in which the air,) impelled by the sun, makes sound manifest. Where the Soma¹ juice, being strained by the filtering cloth, is abundant, tatra in the ritual, mind is born.

But there is another explanation of 'agnir yatrābhimathyate': Agni is the Supreme Self, since it burns up ignorance and its effects.

And it is said:

'(Out of compassion for those who are ever devoted) I, abiding in their Self, destroy the darkness born of ignorance with the radiant light of knowledge.'
(Bhagavad Gītā 10:11)

yatra A man in whom mathyate (there is a stirring) with the friction of meditation previously spoken of in 'by making his own body the lower fire-stick' etc. (see 1:14) and in whom air is directed makes an imperceptible sound through exhaling breath (recaka) etc. somo yatrātiricyate When (in a man) Soma is abundant through service (of the fire) in many lifetimes, tatra in him, whose inner organs of mind have been completely purified through sacrifice, generosity, ascetic practices, control of the vital breath and concentration, saṁjāyate there arises mind of the form of the non-dual Brahman, total bliss; but not in another whose inner organ of mind is impure.

And it is said:

'The śruti declares that since one who has been completely purified by control of the vital force (prāṇāyāma) sees that Supreme, there is nothing superior to control of the vital force.

'When the legion of sins accumulated in passing through many births has been destroyed the inclination to turn to Govinda arises in men.

When the sins of men have been destroyed through austerity, knowledge and concentration in thousands of previous births, devotion for Kṛṣṇa arises.'

Therefore, first (one should perform) sacrifice, then control the vital breath etc., then practise concentration. From that there arises knowledge of the meaning of the sentences² (of the śruti). At that time, all duties are fulfilled.

Since one who has not been given leave (by the gods) engages merely in works which generate experience, therefore:

savitṛā prasavena/juṣeta brahma pūrvyam
tatra yonim kṛnavase/na hi te pūrtam akṣipat

- 7 With Savitr as the inspirer, one should delight in the ancient Brahman. If you make your source there, works do not attach (themselves) to you.

savitṛā prasavena (Being permitted) by the producer of grains (the sun) juṣeta one should adore the pūrvyam ancient Brahman. kṛnavase make yonim a firm stand in that Brahman, in the form of concentration. If I do this, what will happen? (In reply the Upaniṣad) says:

na hi te... pūrtam rituals prescribed in the smṛti as also iṣṭa, those prescribed by śruti na hi will certainly not akṣipat bind you again for the purpose of enjoyment, since they are burnt up along with their seeds by the fire of knowledge. And it is said:

'Just as the fibre of reed laid on a fire is burnt up, even so all the sins of one (who, knowing thus, performs the Agnihotra sacrifice) are burnt up.'

(Chāndogya Upaniṣad 5:24:3)

(O Arjuna, just as a kindled fire reduces its fuel to ashes,) so does the fire of knowledge reduce all works to ashes.' (Bhagavad Gītā 4:37)

It has been said 'Make your source there...' (see previous verse.) But how is that made one's source? This doubt having been raised, (the Upaniṣad) shows how it is attained:

trirunnatam sthāpya samam śarīram/hṛdīndriyāṇi manasā saṁniveśya
brahmodupena pratāreta vidvān/srotāṁsi sarvāṇi bhayāvahāni

8 Holding up the body balanced (sama), with the three (upper parts of the body) erect, with mind causing the senses to enter fully into the heart, the wise man with the raft of Brahman should cross all the streams that bring fear.

trirunnatam... The balanced body is held up trirunnatam, with the three, chest, neck and head erect. In the heart, saṁniveśya one should restrain with mind (manas) indriyāni the manas, eyes etc.¹ brahmodupena with the raft of Brahman as the means of crossing. Some interpret the word 'brahman' as 'Om.' (The meaning is) 'with 'Om'', represented by the raft; (here 'brahmodupena') can be understood with both (words, saṁniveśya and pratāreta) in the manner of the eye of a crow (which, as occasion requires, is believed to move from one socket to the other.)²

Restraining (the senses) with that Om the wise man with this (raft) pratāreta should cross srotāṁsi the streams of transmigration set in motion by inherent ignorance, desire and works bhayāvahāni causing (embodiment) as a departed spirit, animal or human (ūrdhva), i.e. causes of rebirth.

Prāṇāyāma is presented since the heart (citta) of one in whom the filth of the mind has been diminished through prāṇāyāma is established in Brahman. First of all the nerves need to be purified. Then one is eligible for (practising) prāṇāyāma. Closing off the right nostril with the finger, with the left one should fill (the lungs) with air to their capacity. After that, releasing the nostril, in the same way one should exhale with the right nostril, and one should close the left (nostril). Again having filled (the lungs) with the right (nostril) one should exhale as much (air) as is possible with the left. One who practises thus a number of times³ in each of the four periods of the

day,⁴ the last part of the night, at noon⁵, the period after dusk,⁶ and at midnight, after a fortnight⁷ (or) a month becomes completely pure. The three types of prāṇāyāma are exhaling (recaka), inhaling, (pūraka) and retention of the breath (kumbhaka).

So the scripture says:

'After practising the postures (āsana) according to one's liking and as stated in the scriptures, then O Gārgi, sitting in a posture that one has mastered, one should practise prāṇāyāma.

After fully spreading grass and an antelope skin on a soft seat one should honour Gaṇeśa⁸ with fruit and water and food.

Settled comfortably on that seat, placing on the left hand the other hand, with neck and head straight, completely closing the mouth, totally motionless, facing east or north the eyes should be cast down towards the tip of the nose. Making efforts to avoid eating too much or not eating at all, one should diligently purify the nerves in the way described. One who does not carry out this purification would be making efforts in vain.

Fixing on the tip of the nose both eyes and visualising the universally pervasive seed syllable of the moon⁹ suffused with moonlight, and the (mantra made by) the fourth letter of the seventh rank, dotted, he should fill (the lungs) with the outside air through the idā tubular vessel for twelve moments.

Then as before he should meditate on a fire, which is alongside a row of blazing torches. He should then meditate on ram existing in a circle of fire, (and) again should exhale air slowly through the piṅgalā tubular vessel. Again filling up the right nostril through the piṅgalā the wise man should likewise slowly exhale the air through the idā. For three or four years or even three or four months, in a quiet place he should practise in the way advised by his teacher. In the morning, at midday and in the evening, after bathing, and performing the sandhyā ritual etc. he should practise this six times. He should also do this at midnight every day.

Hence one attains purification of the nerves. The signs of this are seen one by one. Ease of body, brightness, an increase in the gastric juices, (and) clarity of sound are the signs indicating their purification.

They are not purified by repetition of mantras, so mantras are not the causes of purity of feeling. Hence one should perform prāṇāyāma, by exhaling, inhaling and retaining the breath.

The connection (samāyoga) between the upward and downward breaths (prāṇa and apāna) is known as prāṇāyāma. Om has a threefold nature, O Gārgi, exhaling, inhaling and retaining the breath. Know this to be Om - I speak of its real nature. The vowel that is spoken of at the beginning of the Vedas and the (u) that exists in the Upaniṣads, as well as the fifth letter of the fifth rank (m) that follows these two - of them, know, O Gargi that exhaling (recaka), is first. Inhaling (pūraka) is known as the second. Retaining the breath (kumbhaka) is said to be the third. The control of breath is threefold by nature. Brahman, which is of the nature of light and the origin of all, is the cause of these three.

Exhaling and retaining the breath, O Gārgi, are of the nature of creation and maintenance respectively. But inhaling is dissolution, and is the cause (of the success of Yogins in this world.

One should inhale to the count of sixteen, (filling) from head to foot, then exhale to the count of thirty-two, while remaining completely composed.

When one holds the breath steady in the head to the count of sixty-four, like a pitcher (kumbhaka) completely full, this is called kumbhakam O Gārgi.

O beautiful one, other sages, however, who are intent on prāṇāyāma, and who, their inners purified, have become pure, and who delight in subduing the breath, say (as follows):

First, one should hold the breath in kumbhaka to the count of sixty-four, then exhale through one nostril to the count of sixteen.

And (then) one should gradually inhale air through both nostrils to the count of sixteen. In this way, one who is victorious and powerful should control the vital force. These vital forces are said to be five in number. The airs depend on the vital forces. The (one called) prāṇa (the outgoing breath) is always the most important of them, in all living creatures.

The prāṇa resides between the lips and in the nose, in the heart and in the navel, in the toes of the feet and in all the limbs.

One should regularly practise the sixteen prāṇāyāmas. One achieves whatever is desired by the mind, and conquers all the vital forces. One should burn up faults by controlling the breath, sins by concentration (dhāraṇā), attachment through restraint of the senses (pratyāhāra), and through meditation one's ungodly qualities.

One who, having bathed, performs control of the breath a hundred times every day, even though he kills his mother, father and teacher, is expiated after three years.'

So (the Upaniṣad) says 'prāṇān...' etc.

prāṇān prapīdyeha saṃyuktaceṣṭaḥ/kṣīṇe prāṇe nāsikayo' cchvasīta
dustāśvayuktam iva vāham enaṃ/vidvān mano dhārayetāpramattah

- 9 Controlling his vital forces here in the body (and) restraining his movements, he should exhale through the nose with diminished breath. The wise man undistracted should restrain the mind as he would a chariot yoked with wild horses. Controlling the vital forces here in the body and restraining his movements... saṃyuktaceṣṭaḥ refers to one whose movements are controlled in the way spoken of in the verse:

'(Yoga is) not for him who eats too much (nor for him who does not eat at all, nor for him who is in the habit of sleeping too much, neither for him who is (always) awake, O Arjuna.)' (Bhagavad Gītā 6:16)

kṣīṇe, with the mind (manas) subdued by a reduction of its power, one should exhale gently through the nostrils, not through the mouth. (The meaning is that) after restraining the breath, one should gently breathe out through the nose. apramattaḥ concentrating, one should control the mind (manas) through reflection, (manana) as one would the driver of a chariot yoked with rearing horses.

same śucau śarkarāvahnivālukā/vivarjite śabdajalāśrayādibhiḥ
mano'nukūle na tu cakṣupīḍane/guhānivātāśrayaṇe prayojayet

- 10 Let him practise Yoga on level ground, in a clean hidden retreat, protected from the wind, free from pebbles, fire and gravel, that is quiet, dry and not a public shelter, agreeable to the mind but not offensive to the eye.

same... same on ground which does not undulate śucau in a clean (place) free from sarkarāḥ small stones fire and vālukāḥ small stones which have been pounded, likewise śabdajalāśrayādibhiḥ (free from) śabdaḥ the sound of quarrels etc. (and free from) water used by all and sundry, and on ground which is not an āśrayaḥ temple that is manokule pleasant and not cakṣupīḍane repugnant. There is the Vedic elision of the visarga (after the 'u' of cakṣu). guhānivātāśrayaṇe resorting guhāyām to a solitary (place), without wind, prayojayet he should turn the mind to the Supreme Self.

Now the outward signs of the manifestation (of Brahman) resulting from the practice of yoga are spoken of with nīhāra... etc.

nīhāradhūmārkānilānalānām/khadyotavidyut sphaṭikaśaśīnām
etāni rūpāni purassarāni/brahmany abhivyaktikarāni yogē

- 11 Mist, smoke, sun, wind, fire, fireflies, lightning, crystals, a moon, these are the preliminary forms which make Brahman manifest in Yoga.

nīhāra mist - the modification of the mind comes forth in this form together with the vital forces. Then it appears like smoke, then the sun, then wind. Next there blows a wind, scorching like fire, effulgent and burning, blowing like the agitated, strong external wind. Sometimes the mind appears like the sky studded with fireflies. It is seen as dazzling like lightning, and at times it has the shape of crystals, at other times that of the full moon. These forms purassarāni are the precursors, when their cause, Brahman, is being made manifest in the performance of yoga. Then (follows) the attainment of the supreme yoga.

prthvyāptejo' nilakhe samutthite/pañcātmake yogaguṇe pravṛtte
na tasya rogo na jarā na mṛtyuḥ/praptasya yogāgnimayaṁ śarīram

- 12 When earth, water, fire, air and ether arise, and the fivefold qualities of Yoga have emerged, then there is no longer sickness, old-age and death for him who has attained a body made of the fire of Yoga.

laghutvam arogyam alolupatvam/varṇaprasādam svarasauṣṭhavam ca
gandhaḥ śubho mūtrapurīṣam alpaṁ/yogapravṛttiṁ prathamāṁ vadanti

- 13 They say that the first (signs of) progress in yoga are lightness, health, desirelessness, clearness of complexion and a fine voice, a sweet odour and minimal excretions.

prthvi... prthvyāptejo'nilakhe The elements earth etc. are indicated in a compound (dvandva)' in the singular 'When the fivefold qualities of Yoga have emerged...' is explained by when the five elements become manifest. But what quality is produced from Yoga? The Yogin has the sense of smell prthvyāh from earth. Likewise the sense of taste from water.² The others likewise. And it has been said:

'There are said to be four manifestations (pravṛtti), one of light, one of touch, another of taste, and yet another of smell.

Even if only one of these manifestations of Yoga emerges, the Yogins proficient in Yoga say that (the aspirant) has begun (on the path of) Yoga.

Neither disease, nor old-age, nor death have power over that Yogin. Over whom? Over him who has obtained a body made of the fire of Yoga, a body from which all faults has been burnt away by the fire of Yoga.

The rest (of the text) is straightforward.

Moreover:

yathaiva bimbam mṛdayopaliptam/tejomayam bhrājate tat sudhāntam
tad vātmataṭṭvam prasamīkṣya dehī/ekam kṛtārtho bhavate vītaśokaḥ

- 14 Even as a mirror besmirched with dirt shines brightly when cleaned, so the embodied one, when he has seen the true nature of the Self, becomes unified, his purpose fulfilled, and free from sorrow.

Yathā... (It is) just as a disc¹ made of gold or silver which is at first mṛdayopaliptam filthy with dirt etc. which when sudhāntam a Vedic usage meaning 'well cleansed' - that is made clean by fire, etc., afterwards shines full of light. prasamīkṣya having seen tad vā that very true nature of the Self he becomes ekah non-dual, his purpose is fulfilled and he becomes free from sorrow. Others recite² 'tadvatsatattvam prasamīkṣya dehī' but even with this version the meaning is the same.

By knowing what does he become free from sorrow? In answer, (the Upaniṣad) says:

yadātmātattvena tu brahmatattvam/dīpopameneha yuktaḥ prapaśyet
ajam dhruvaṁ sarvatattvair viśuddham/jñātvā devaṁ mucyate sarvapāśaiḥ

- 15 When one who has practised Yoga sees the true nature of Brahman by means of the true nature (tattva) of the Self, comparable to a lamp, (then), by knowing God who is unborn, unmoving and unaffected by all natures of the creation (tattva), he is freed from all fetters.

yadā... When in the state in which ātmātattvena through one's own Self... How (is this Self) portrayed? As being dīpopamena comparable to a lamp, by nature luminous... (by this) he would see the true nature of Brahman. The word 'tu' is for emphasis. The meaning is that he should know the supreme Self through his own self alone. And it has been said:

'(In the beginning this world was Brahman.) It knew only itself as 'I am Brahman.' (Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 1:4:10)

What kind (of a Self)? By knowing God who is not born from anything else, who is dhruvam of unfallen nature (and) viśuddham untouched by all natures of the creation i.e. by ignorance and its effects, one is released sarvapāśaih from all fetters, from ignorance etc.

It has been said that one should know the Supreme Self through one's (own) Self. Showing how this is possible, (the Upaniṣad) says:

eṣa ha devaḥ pradiśo'nu sarvāḥ/pūrvo ha jātaḥ sa u garbhe antaḥ
sa eva jātaḥ sa janiṣyamānaḥ/pratyāḥ janāṁstīṣṭhati sarvatomukhaḥ

- 16 This is the God who is all the directions and all the intermediate directions. He was the first-born and exists in the womb. He has been born and will be born. He is the one in front of people, having his face everywhere.

eṣa ha... This very God is pradiśaḥ the directions east etc.¹ and all the intermediate directions. He was born before everything as a golden egg. (hiraṇyagarbha)² He is in the womb, He is jātaḥ the one born the infant, and also janiṣyamānaḥ the one going to be born. He indeed tīṣṭhati stands pratyak opposite³ sarvān janān all people. Since his faces appear in all living beings he is said to be sarvatomukhaḥ facing in all directions.

Now in order to show that, like Yoga, other practices such as salutation (to the deity) etc. are necessary, (the Upaniṣad) says:

yo devo agnau yo apsu'yo visvaṁ bhuvanam āviveśa ya oṣadhīṣu yo vanaspatīṣu
tasmai devāya namo namaḥ

17 The God who is in the fire and in the waters, who has entered the whole universe, who is in plants and in the trees, a bow to that God, a bow.

yo deva... He who entered this whole universe, the cycle of transmigration, created by Himself, and who is oṣadhīṣu in rice-plants etc. vanaspatiṣu in fig trees etc., to Him, the Self of the universe, the root of the world, the supreme Lord, a bow, a bow. The repetition is in order to show respect and to bring the chapter to a close.

Here ends the second chapter of the commentary on the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad, composed by the venerable divine Śaṅkara, the most excellent ascetic, a wandering renunciate and teacher, the pupil of the venerable divine Govinda, whose feet are adorable.

How can conditions such as ruling and being ruled over pertain to the non-dual supreme Self? This doubt having been raised, (the Upaniṣad) says:

ya eko jālavān īśata īśanībhiḥ/sarvān lokān īśata īśanībhiḥ
ya evaika udbhave sambhave ca/ya etad vidur amṛtās te bhavanti

1. They become immortal who know this one who, being unified, extending his net, rules with his powers, rules over all the worlds with his powers, who verily remains unified while (the Universe) arises and continues to exist.

ya ekaḥ... He who is the one supreme Self is jālavān, possessor of a net which is the cosmic illusion (māyā), (so called) since from it, it is difficult to escape. And accordingly the blessed one has said:

'From (this my divine) illusion (made up of the qualities (guṇas)), is difficult to escape.' (Bhagavad Gītā 7:14)

The suffix-vān has the sense of containing or possessing.¹ The meaning of jālavān is 'containing or possessing the cosmic illusion.' He, with the cosmic illusion as a limiting adjunct, īśate rules. By what means (does he rule)? īśanībhiḥ through his own powers. And accordingly it has been said: 'He rules with his powers,' (3:2) i.e. with his supreme powers. Over whom? He rules over all worlds with his powers. When? udbhave when in association with divine forces (vibhūti) and sambhave when it appears. They who know Him become amṛtāḥ not subject to death.

Why again (do we call Him) 'the extender of a net'? With this doubt raised, (the Upaniṣad) says:

eko hi rudro na dvitīyāya tasthan/ya imān lokān īśata īśanībhiḥ
pratyān janān tiṣṭhati sañcukocāntakāle/samsṛjya visvā bhuvanāni gopāh

- 2 For Rudra is one. They did not stand for a second. He rules all the worlds with his ruling powers. He stands opposite creatures. He, the protector, after creating all the worlds, merges them together at the end of time.

eko hi The word 'hi' is in the sense of 'since.' Since Rudra is one alone by nature, those who know Brahman, who see the supreme goal¹, I did not stand dvitīyāya for any other entity. And so it has been said 'Rudra is one, they did not stand for a second.' He it is who īśate controls these worlds with his powers. He is within all people, residing in each man. The meaning is that he assumed different forms in each shape.

Moreover, antakāle at the time of dissolution, he merges (all the worlds) together. After doing what? After creating all the worlds, being gopāh their protector. The following has been said; the Supreme Self is non-dual and does not (create) in the manner of a potter, taking the absolute Self as a material cause, as (a potter would take) a lump of clay. What does happen then? Since it subsists as its own powers, it is called a creator or controller. The following verse teaches that it creates in the form of the Universal Ruler (virāj).

viśvataścaksur uta viśvato mukho/viśvatobāhur uta viśvataspāt
sam bāhubhyām dhamati sampatatir/dyāvābhūmī janayan deva ekah

3 With an eye on every side, and a face on every side, an arm on every side and a foot on every side, the one God, creating heaven and earth, forges them together with His arms and wings.

Viśvataś cakṣuḥ... viśvataś cakṣuḥ means that the eyes of all living creatures are His. Therefore He is called viśvataścakṣuḥ since He is the eye everywhere, having the power to see forms just as He wills. What follows should be construed in the same way.

With His arms sam... dhamati, means here He 'forges them together'¹ for roots (dhātu) can have several meanings. And He conjoins birds and bipeds such as men etc. with wings (and feet respectively) While doing what? The meaning is that the one God created virāt, while creating heaven and earth.

Now, explaining the creation of Hiranyagarbha (sūtra)² by that very Self (the Upaniṣad) prays for what is dear to the seers³:

yo devānām prabhavaś codbhavaś ca/viśvādhipo rudro maharṣiḥ
hiranyagarbham janayāmāsa pūrvam/sa no buddhyā śubhayā saṁyunaktu

4 He who is the source and origin of the gods, the ruler of the universe, Rudra the great sage, who in former times gave birth to the golden egg (hiranyagarbha), may He endow us with clear understanding (buddhi).

yo devānām He who is the cause of the origin devānām of Indra etc. and the cause of their divine powers. The (word) 'udbhava' means performance of divine powers (vibhūti). viśvādhipaḥ means the ruler of the universe, the protector.

5.
maharṣiḥ... maharṣiḥ means a sage (ṛṣi) who is great (mahā) (and) implies He is omniscient. pūrvam at the beginning of creation He gave birth to (hiraṇyagarbha), to that the garbha 'inner essence' of which is knowledge, which is beneficial, delightful and beautiful. May he endow naḥ us with clear understanding. (The meaning is) 'May we attain the supreme place (pada).'

And again explaining His nature, (the seer) makes a petition for his most beloved object with two verses:

yā te rudra śivā tanūr/aghorāpāpakāśinī
tayā nas tanuvā śantamayā/giriśantābhicākaśīhi

- 5 Your body, O Rudra, which is benign causes no fear, and shows no evil - with that most benign body, O dweller in the mountains, appear to us!

yā te rudra O Rudra, your body is auspicious and does not cause fear. And it is said 'He has two bodies, one which is terrifying and the other benign.' Or else śivā means pure, free from ignorance and its effects, of the nature of the non-dual Brahman, being (sat), consciousness (cit), and bliss (ānanda), but not terrifying (rather) a cause of delight like the orb of the moon. apāpakāśinī making sin disappear, simply when it is remembered, making virtue (puṇya) manifest. tayā with that body śantamayā which is most agreeable, of the nature of full bliss, O Giriśānta, one who, standing on a mountain (giri), spreads happiness (śam) abhicākaśīhi means 'see, behold', i.e. endow naḥ us with the bliss of final emancipation (śreyas).

Moreover:

yām iśum giriśanta/haste bibharsy astave

śivām giritra tām kuru/mā himsīh puruṣaṁ jagat

- 6 O dweller in the mountains, make auspicious the arrow which you hold in your hand to throw. O protector of the mountains, do not injure man or beast.

yām iśum O dweller in the mountains, make auspicious that arrow which bibharsī you hold in your hand astave to throw at men, giritra 'O protector of the mountains.' Do not injure any man of ours or our whole world. The text has prayed for the cherisehd object with 'Show us Brahman with form.'

Now, showing that very Being's existence in a causal state, (the Upaniṣad) speaks of immortality through knowledge:

tataḥ param brahma param bṛhantaḥ/yathānikāyaṁ sarvabhūteṣu gūḍham

viśvasyaikaṁ pariveṣṭitāram/īśaṁ taṁ jñātvāmṛtā bhavanti

- 7 Beyond this is Brahman, the supreme, the great hidden in all creatures according to their bodies, the one who envelops the universe, knowing Him, the Lord, (men) become immortal.

tataḥ param The meaning is beyond (tataḥ) the world associated with men, (Brahman), since it is a cause, pervades the creation, which is an effect. Or else it means beyond (tataḥ) Virāj, whose body (ātman) is the world. What is that (which is beyond)? brahma param bṛhantaṁ that which is superior to Hiranyagarbha, bṛhantaṁ great on account of its pervasiveness, and yathānikāyaṁ in each body, gūḍham residing in all beings. Having known īśaṁ that supreme Lord viśvasyaikaṁ pariveṣṭitāram that resides pervading all, containing all in its own Self, they become immortal.

Now in order to confirm what has been said, (the Upaniṣad) gives the seer's own experience, and shows that it is only through the complete knowledge that the (individual) Self is Brahman, full of bliss and non-dual, that Man's supreme goal is achieved, and not by any other means:

vedāham etam puruṣam mahāntam/ādityavarṇam tamasaḥ parastāt
tam eva viditvā atimṛtyum eti/nānyaḥ panthā vidyate'yanāya

8 I know this great Supreme Being (puruṣa) of sunlike colour, beyond the darkness. Only by knowing Him does one go beyond death. There is no other path for going there.

vedāham etam... veda I know tam this supreme Self, that is this individual self (pratyagātman), which is the Witness, the Supreme Being, (puruṣa), perfect, (pūrṇa), and great in that it is the Self of all. ādityavarṇam of the nature of light, tamasaḥ beyond ignorance. Having known Him alone atimṛtyum eti, one goes beyond death. Why (should one know that)? There is no other way apart from this ayanāya for attaining the highest place.

Why is it again that after knowing Him alone one goes beyond death?

Thus it is said:

yasmāt param nāparam asti kiṁcit/yasmān nānyo na jyāyo'sti kaścit
vrkṣa iva stabdho divi tiṣṭhaty ekas/tenedam pūrṇam puruṣeṇa sarvam

9 There is nothing higher than He, nothing smaller, nothing greater. Being one, He stands like a tree established in heaven. By Him, the Supreme Being (puruṣa) this whole (universe) is filled.

yasmāt... yasmāt param in relation to the Supreme Being there is nothing param superior or aparam inferior. In relation to Him there is nothing anīyah smaller, nor anything jyāyah greater. ekah being non-dual, the Supreme Self stands like a tree, stabdhah unmoving, divi in its own greatness, of the nature of light. All this is pūrṇam completely filled, tena by that non-dual Supreme Self, the perfect Supreme Being.

Now explaining the nature of Brahman as mentioned before, as both effect and cause, (the Upaniṣad) shows that men of knowledge become immortal, while others are subject to transmigration:

tato yad uttaratarām/tad arūpam anāmayam
ya etad vidur amṛtās te bhavanti/athetare duḥkham evāpiyanti

10 That which is beyond this world is without form and without disease. Those who know this become immortal, while others go only to sorrow.

tataḥ... The meaning is that the cause is tataḥ beyond the world expressed by the word 'idam' (and) beyond even that is Brahman Itself spoken of as free from effect and cause. tad arūpam, it is devoid of any form etc., (and) without disease, since it is free from the three afflictions relating to the body etc.

Those who know that they exist as immortal become amṛtaḥ not subject to death. But others who do not know this go only to sorrow.

Now (the Upaniṣad) teaches that It (Brahman) is the Self of all:

sarvānanaśirogrīvaḥ/sarvabhūtaguhāśayaḥ
sarvavyāpī sa bhagavān/asmāt sarvagataḥ śivaḥ

11 He is in the faces, heads and necks of all, dwells in the heart of all beings (and) is all-pervading, the Lord (and) therefore the omnipresent Śiva.

sarvānana... Since all faces, heads and necks are His, He is said to be in all faces, necks and heads. Since He lies guhāyām in the intellect (buddhi) of all beings he is said to dwell in the heart of all beings. That Lord (bhagavān) is all-pervading, an aggregate of powers etc. And it has been said;

'All power, righteousness, fame, beauty, as also knowledge and dispassion - the name of these six is bhaga.' (Viṣṇu Purāṇa 6:5:74)

Since these are in the Lord thus, therefore he is the omnipresent Śiva.

Moreover:

mahān prabhur vai puruṣaḥ/sattvasya iṣa pravartakah
sunirmalām imām prāptim/Īśāno jyotir avyayah

12 This Supreme Being is indeed the great Lord, the impeller of the highest being (sattva). (He has the power of) reaching the highest attainment, the ruler, the imperishable light.

mahān... The great Lord is without doubt able to give birth to, maintain and dissolve the world. He is the pravartakah impeller sattvasya of the internal organ (antaḥ karaṇa)¹. For what purpose? For prāptim, the attainment of the supreme goal, sunirmalam which consists of abiding in one's own nature². He is the Īśāna ruler, jyotiḥ the totally pure light of knowledge, and avyayah indestructible.

angusṭhamātrah puruṣo' ntarātmā/sadā janānām hrdaye sanniviṣṭhah
hrdā manvīśo manasābhikṣpto/ya etad vidur amṛtās te bhavanti

13 The Supreme Being of the measure of a thumb is the inner Self, ever dwelling in the heart of men. He is the Lord of knowledge framed by the heart and the mind. Those who know this become immortal.

angusṭhamātrah... puruṣah (The Supreme Being), (so called) because of its fullness, or since it resides in the city (of the body), is the size of a thumb appearing to measure the size of the cavity of the heart, the place where it manifests (in the body) (and is) antarātmā, seated as the inner Self of all, ever dwelling in the heart of men, manvīśah the Lord of knowledge who is hidden by the mind and resides in the heart. Those who know this become immortal.

It has been said that the Puruṣa (Supreme Being) is the inner Self. Now again (the Upaniṣad) shows that it is the Self of all, in order to explain that its dimensions encompass all. And it has been said:

'Through wrong attribution (adhyāropa) and denial (apavāda) the non-create comes into manifestation.'

sahasraśīrṣā puruṣah/sahasrākṣah sahasrapāt
sa bhūmim viśvato vṛtvā/atyatiṣṭhad daśāṅgulam

14 The Supreme Being has a thousand heads, a thousand eyes, a thousand feet. He surrounds the earth on every side and stands ten fingers' breadth beyond.

The Puruṣa, the perfect one, has sahasraśīrṣaḥ a thousand, i.e. infinite heads. This should be likewise understood with what follows. He vṛtvā pervading bhūmim the earth sarvataḥ within and without atyatiṣṭhat remains extending beyond the world. The meaning of daśāṅgulam is endless, without bounds. Or else it means that the heart is found at that point ten fingers' breadth above the navel.

Objection:

Since it is the Self of all, Brahman must coexist with creation, for if it did not, there would be no creation.

Thus (the Upaniṣad) says:

puruṣa evedam sarvam/yad bhūtam yac ca bhavyam
utāmṛtatvasyeśāno/yad annenātirohati

15 This whole (world) is only the Supreme Being, whatever has been and whatever will be. He is also the ruler of immortality and whatever grows up by food.

puruṣa evedam All this is indeed the Supreme Being, whatever grows up by food, whatever is seen to exist, whatever has existed and whatever bhavyam will exist. Moreover, (He is) also amṛtatvasyeśānaḥ lord of immortality, of absolute unity (kaivalya). yac cānnenātirohati He is the Lord of whatever lives.

And again, in order to teach that (Brahman) is undifferentiated (the Upaniṣad) explains:

sarvataḥ pāṇipādām/tat sarvato' kṣiśīromukham
sarvataḥ śrutimal loke/sarvam āvṛtya tiṣṭhati

- 16 On every side it has a hand and foot, on every side an eye, head and face. It has an ear everywhere. It stands encompassing everything in the world.

sarvataḥ... sarvataḥ pāṇipādam means that it has hands and feet everywhere. sarvato' kṣiṣiromukham refers to Him who has eyes, heads and faces everywhere. śrutimat means that it has śruti an ear everywhere. It exists, āvṛtya pervading all loke in the body of living creatures.

In order to set at rest the doubt that since That which is to be known has superimposed upon It the limiting adjuncts of sense organs, hand and foot, etc. it must contain (those limiting adjuncts), there is the following verse:

sarvendriyaguṇābhāsam/sarvendriyavivarjitam
sarvasya prabhum īśānam/sarvasya śaraṇam brhat

- 17 Reflecting the qualities of all the faculties, yet devoid of all the faculties, It is the Lord and ruler of all, the great refuge of all.

sarvendriya... And all those faculties, those of hearing etc. the final being the inner organ, are included under the term 'sarvendriya.'

sarvendriyaguṇābhāsam means that, with the limiting adjuncts of inner and outer faculties, it appears to have qualities by virtue of the qualities of the faculties, effort, resolution, hearing etc. The meaning is that That which is to be known is engaged as it were with all the faculties.

For it says in the śruti:

'(That Supreme Being) meditates as it were, moves about as it were.'

(Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 4:3:7).

Now why were the words engaged 'as it were' (with the senses) used? To answer this, (the Upaniṣad) says sarvendriyavivarjitam meaning 'devoid of all faculties' And therefore It is not to be known as engaged with the operation of the sense faculties. It is the Lord and ruler of the whole world. It is the śaraṇam supreme refuge of all, and the great cause.

Moreover:

navadvāre pure dehī/haṁso lelāyate bahiḥ
vaśī sarvasya lokasya/sthāvarasya carasya ca

- 18 The soul (haṁsa) embodied in the city of nine gates, disports itself in the exterior world, (and is) the controller of the whole world, of the stationary and the moving.

navadvāre... haṁsa is the Supreme Self, (and is given this name) since it kills off (hanti) effects which are of the nature of ignorance. It is the controller of the whole world, the stationary and the moving. Having become embodied as the Self identified with the intellect (viññānātman) with the limiting adjuncts of body (kārya) and faculties (karāṇa) in that city (of the body) with nine gates, seven in the head, and two below, lelāyate (the embodied self) moves to grasp outer objects.

In this way Brahman, the Self of all, has been expounded. Now, in order to teach the Supreme Self as being by nature of unchanging bliss, (and) established in a state of knowledge which is beginningless and endless, (the Upaniṣad) says:

apāṇipādo javano grahītā/paśyaty acakṣuḥ sa śṛṇoty akarṇaḥ
sa vetti vedyam na ca tasyāsti vettā/tam āhur agryam puruṣam mahāntam

19 Without hand or foot (yet) swift and grasping, He sees without an eye and hears without an ear. He knows what is to be known, yet no-one knows Him. They call Him the foremost, the great Supreme Being.

apāṇipādaḥ... apāṇipādaḥ means that this (Supreme Being) has no hand or foot. He is javanaḥ far-ranging. Though without hands grahitā he embraces all. Though without eyes, he sees all. Though without ears, he hears. Though without a mind, he knows what is to be known, on account of his omniscience. Yet no-one knows Him, for the śruti says:

'There is none other than the observer.'

(Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 3:7:23)

They call Him agryam the first, since He is the cause of everything, the great Puruṣa, the perfect one.

Moreover:

aṇor aṇīyān mahato mahīyān/ātmā guhāyām nihito'sya jantoḥ
tam akratum paśyati vītaśoko/dhātuḥ prasādān mahimānam īśam

20 The Self, subtler than the most subtle, greater than the great is set in the heart of this creature. One sees Him as beyond rites and becomes free from sorrow when, through the grace of the Creator, one sees the Lord and His greatness.

aṇoranīyān ... It is aṇīyān more subtle² aṇoḥ than the fine¹. It is mahīyān greater mahataḥ than what is great in measure.³

And at the same time the Self nihitaḥ has come to reside guhāyām in the heart asya jantoh of the class of living beings from Brahmā down to a blade of grass - this is the meaning. One who sees that Self akratum, as devoid of the intention (saṁkalpa) to have experience (bhoga) of objects (viṣaya), as the greatness of himself, and as the Lord, free from increase and decrease caused by acts, who knows directly that 'I am this one', he becomes free from sorrow.

By virtue of what then does he see? Through the grace dhātoḥ of the Lord. For when the Supreme Lord is graceful there is the knowledge of one's true nature. Or else dhātu (refers to) the sense-faculties of the body, and prasādāt (means) through their clearness resulting from the removal of evil by seeing faults in objects etc. (this removal itself) resulting from the control of those (bodily faculties). Otherwise common men (prākṛtapuruṣa) who have desires would find it difficult to realise the Self.

In order to emphasize what has been said (the Upaniṣad) shows the experience of the seer (mantradṛk):

vedāham etam ajaram purāṇam/sarvātmānam sarvagataṁ vibhūtvāt
janmanirodham pravadanti yasya/brahmavādinō hi pravadanti nityam

21 I know this undecaying, ancient Self of all, present in all on account of its being everywhere, who, they say, is exempt from birth. For those who discuss Brahman declare Him to be eternal.

vedāham etam... veda I know this sarvātmānam Self of all, which is ajaram free from change, purāṇam ancient, and is everywhere, vibhūtvāt, since it is pervasive like the ether. And those who discuss Brahman speak of It as janmanirodham, without birth and eternal. The meaning is clear.

Here ends the third chapter of the commentary on the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad,
composed by the venerable divine Śaṅkara, the most excellent ascetic, a
wandering renunciate and teacher, the pupil of the venerable divine Govinda,
whose feet are adorable.

CHAPTER 4

Since this matter is (so) profound, it should be spoken of again and again.

So the fourth chapter begins:

ya eko' varno bahudhā śaktiyogād/ varnān anekān¹ nihitārtho dadhāti
vicaiti cānte viśvam ādau ca devaḥ/ sa no buddhyā śubhayā saṁyunaktu

1 The one who, without colour, by the manifold application of His power, distributes many colours, His purpose hidden, from whom and into whom the universe appears and dissolves at the beginning and end, He is the God. May He endow us with clear understanding (buddhi).

ya ekaḥ The meaning is 'who is ekaḥ the non-dual Supreme Self avarṇaḥ, devoid of status accorded by birth (jāti) etc. (and) undifferentiated.' Through the application of bahudhā various powers, dadhāti He distributes at the beginning many colours, nihitārthaḥ meaning 'with no purpose in mind², not dependent on personal interest.' In whom the viśvam universe vi caiti recedes cānte at the time of dissolution, and - as is understood from the word 'ca' - (in whom the universe exists) in the intervening period, sa devaḥ the meaning is 'He whose nature is light,³ (and) who is knowledge alone' may He saṁyunaktu endow naḥ us with clear understanding.

Since He alone is the Creator, (and) in Him alone there is dissolution, so He is all, and there is nothing apart from Him. This is expressed in three verses:

tad evāgnis tad ādityas/ tad vāyus tad u candramāḥ
tad eva śukraṁ tad brahma/ tad āpas tat prajāpatiḥ

2 That, indeed, is fire, that is the sun. That is the wind, (and) that is the moon. That, indeed, is pure. That is Brahman. That is the waters. That is the Lord of Creatures (Prajāpati).

tadeva ... That very true nature of the Self is fire. That is the sun. The word 'eva' (used to emphasize) is connected to each of the words, as we observe in 'tad eva śukram.' The rest is straightforward. That indeed is śukram pure, like other luminous things such as stars etc. tad brahma that is Brahma existing in the form of a golden egg. That is the waters, that is Prajāpati, existing as the Sovereign (Virāj).

tvam strī tvam pumān asi/tvaṁ kumāra uta vā kumārī
tvam jīrṇo daṇḍena vañcasi/tvaṁ jāto bhavasi viśvatomukhaḥ

3 You are woman. You are man. You are the youth and also the maiden. As an old man, you totter along with a stick. Taking birth, you have faces in every direction.

The meaning of this verse is clear.

nīlaḥ pataṅgo harito lohitākṣas/taḍidgarbha ṛtavas samudrāḥ
anādimat tvaṁ vibhutvena vartase/yato jātāni bhuvanāni viśvā

4 You are the dark-blue butterfly and the green parrot with red eyes. You are the (cloud), with lightning in its womb. You are the seasons and the oceans. You have no beginning, and abide as omnipresent, you from whom all worlds are born.

nīlaḥ ... tvam eva (you indeed) is supplied in every case. You indeed are the dark-blue patāṅga butterfly i.e. that which moves by flying. haritaḥ lohitākṣaḥ ... The meaning is 'You indeed are such humble creatures as parrots etc. (You are) taḍidgarbhah a cloud, (as well as) the seasons and the oceans. Since you indeed are the Self of all, therefore you are without beginning, indeed you are without beginning or end, (and) vibhutvena, you abide as omnipresent, from whom all worlds are born.

Now, (the Upaniṣad) shows, likening her to a she-goat, Nature (prakṛti), consisting of fire, water and food, as is well known from the Chāndogya Upaniṣad.

ajām ekām lohitaśuklakṛṣṇām/bahvīḥ prajāḥ sṛjamānām sarūpāḥ
ajo hy eko juṣamāno' nuśete/jahaty enām bhuktabhogam ajo' nyah

5 One He-goat, taking pleasure in (her) lies by the side of one she-goat, red white and black, who produces many creatures, similar in nature (to herself). Another he-goat gives her up, when pleasure has been experienced.

ajām ekām ... ajo'hy ekaḥ the (individual) conscious self (vijñānātman), which is ruined by endless desires and works, believing itself to be the Self, juṣamānaḥ while enjoying (Her) anuśete adores ajām (that is) Nature, which is red, white and black, i.e. consisting of fire, water and food, (and) sṛjamānam which produces many creatures sarūpāḥ of similar form or (produces) the self-power of God, which is seen by one who practices the Yoga of meditation.

Another, the darkness of ignorance having been destroyed by the light of the instruction of a teacher, jahāti renounces.

Now these two succinct (verses) are spoken in order to affirm the reality of the supreme truth (paramārtha).

dvā suparṇā sayujā sakhāyā/samānam vrkṣam pariśasvajāte
tayor anyah pippalam svādv/atty anaśnann anyo'bhicākaśīti

- 6 Two birds, united companions, cling to the same tree. Of these two one eats the sweet berry, while the other looks on without eating.

dvā ... dvā two, the (individual) conscious self identified with the intellect and the supreme Self, suparṇā i.e. suparṇau birds, who fly and glide beautifully - or else (they are called) 'suparṇau' since they are like birds - are sayujā i.e. sayujau companions, always united, sakhāyā i.e. sakhāyau two friends with similar names and the same cause of manifestation. This being their nature, they pariśasvajāte have clung to, dwelt in samānam the same vrkṣam tree as it were, the tree (standing for) the body, since they can both be uprooted.

Of these two, one, the (individual) self identified with the intellect (vijñānātman) with the limiting adjunct of the subtle (body) (līṅga) where the latent impressions (vāsanā) of ignorance and desire dwell, atty eats due to no discrimination pippalam the fruits of works characterized by happiness and misery svādu savoury by nature holding many and various experiences (vedanā). Another, the Supreme Lord, abhicākaśīti remains watching over all, by nature eternal, pure, enlightened, and free.

samāne vrkṣe puruṣo nimagno/'nīśayā śocati muhyamānaḥ
juṣṭam yadā paśyaty anyam/īśam asya mahimānam iti vītaśokah

7 On the same tree, a man immersed (in the world) is deluded and grieves on account of his helplessness. When he sees the Other, the Lord who is worshipped, and His greatness, he becomes free from sorrow.

In the same tree, (that is) in the body, a man wearied by the heavy burden of the ignorance, desire, the fruits of works and passion etc. which he has experienced, is like a bottle-gourd¹ immersed in the water of the ocean. He feels certain that his body is the Self, having such notions as 'This is I. I am that man's son, and his grandson. I am thin. I am fat. I have good qualities (guṇa). I have no good qualities (guṇa). I am happy. I am miserable.' Thinking 'there is nothing other than this' he is born, dies, and becomes associated with friends and relations. Therefore anīśayā helpless, feeling depressed (dīna) he thinks 'I am no use for anything. My son has perished. My wife is dead. What is the point in my being alive?' Thus, in that (helpless state) śocati he grieves muhyamānaḥ through lack of discrimination, becoming involved in the variety (of creation) in many idle ways.

He, descending into the wombs of departed spirits, animals and men etc., becomes miserable. (Then) at some time or other as a result of accumulating pure righteous conduct (dharma) in many births, someone supremely compassionate shows him the way of Yoga. He is intent on harmlessness, truth, chastity and renouncing all, (and) is endowed with peacefulness etc.² yadā at the time when, he sees, while meditating, the other, juṣṭam the one who is worshipped, through the many paths of Yoga, the Supreme Self who is within all, devoid of characteristics such as the limiting adjunct of the 'tree' etc., who does not transmigrate, (and) is untouched by hunger etc. When he sees the Lord and knows 'I am this, the Self, the same in all, within all

beings, and not the other whose nature is illusion and who is conditioned by the limiting adjuncts born of ignorance,' when he sees that such is the power (vibhūti) and mahimānam the greatness, in the form of the world, asya of the Supreme Lord, then he becomes free from the sorrow. The meaning is that he is freed from the whole ocean of sorrow, and has done what is to be done. Or else, when he sees the other, the adorable Lord, (and) the greatness of this very individual Self, then he becomes free from sorrow.

Now (the Upaniṣad) shows how those who know that (Self) are fulfilled (kṛtārtha):

ro akṣare parame vyoman/yasmin devā adhi viśve niṣeduh
yas tam na veda kim rcā kariṣyati/ya it tad vidus ta ime samāsate¹

- 8 For him who does not know that indestructible being of the Ṛg Veda within which in the highest heaven all the gods reside, of what use is the Ṛg Veda to him? They who do know that (indestructible being) abide (in it).

rcāh ... What is the use of the Ṛg Veda for one who does not know tam the Supreme Self, the imperishable which is to be known through the three Vedas, the highest vyoman heaven, like the ether in which all the gods adhi¹niṣeduh rest? Those who know that Self, they samāsate are fulfilled.

Now (the Upaniṣad) shows in different ways how that very imperishable being creates the world with its illusory limiting adjuncts, and how it is the efficient cause (nimitta):

chandamsi yajñāh kratavo vratāni/bhūtam bhavyam yac ca vedā vadanti
asmān māyī srjate viśvam etat/tasmiṁś cānyo māyayā saṁniruddhaḥ

9 The Vedas, sacrifices, rituals, vows, the past, future, and what the Vedas say, the magician (māyin) sends forth this universe (viśvam) out of this, (and) in this the other is confined by illusion (māyā).

chandāmsi ... chandāmsi The Vedas called Rg, Yajus, Sāma and Atharvāṅgīrasa¹ yajñāḥ the sacrifices etc. to the gods and ordained rites which are not associated with the sacrificial stake. kratavaḥ the Jyotiṣṭoma etc.² vrātāni, vows such as Cāndrāyaṇa etc.³ bhūtam the past bhavyam the future. The word 'yat' indicates what is in between these two, the present. The word 'ca' has a conjunctive sense. The sense is that the Vedas are the authority as concerns works achieved through sacrifice etc., (as well as) creation and the elements etc. The word 'yat' should be supplied in all cases. The construction is this: asmāt from this imperishable Brahman under discussion everything spoken of before arises.

Objection:

How can Brahman which does not change, be the material cause of creation?

Answer:

This is why (the Upaniṣad) speaks of a 'magician'. For though unchanging, it is able to create everything through its own power (śakti).⁴ srjate it gives rise to viśvam the universe previously spoken of. The meaning is that tasmin in the universe of elements etc. formed by his own illusion, another, is as it were saṁniruddhaḥ bound by the illusion, coming under the power of ignorance, and wanders in the ocean of transmigration.

(Now the Upaniṣad) says that the Nature (prakṛti) spoken of before is illusory. Furthermore, Brahman, its ruler, whose nature is being, consciousness and bliss, is like a magician by virtue of having it as a limiting adjunct. Also all this earth etc. is observed to be a world pervaded by aggregates of bodies (kārya) and faculties (karaṇa)⁵, parts (avayava) formed by the power of illusion of that which is knowledge by nature.

māyām tu prakṛtiṁ viddhi/māyinaṁ tu maheśvaram
tasyāvayavabhūtais tu/vyāptam sarvam idam jagat

10 One should know that Nature is magic (māyā), and that the great Lord is the magician. This whole world is pervaded by beings that are parts of Him.

māyām tu ... vidyāt one should know that the Nature (prakṛti) which was said everywhere earlier to be the constituent cause (prakṛti) of the world, is indeed illusion. The word 'tu' is for emphasis.

maheśvaraḥ means the Lord who is great. This is connected with what precedes in the sense that one should know that māyinaṁ, who gives being and manifestation etc. to illusion, and who likewise by being a ruler is its actuator. Through superimposition all this earth etc. is vyāptam full of the illusory parts of that Supreme Lord being discussed, they being like the snake etc. imagined where there is a rope etc. The word 'tu' is for emphasis..

The Upaniṣad (now) shows that the unchanging, which is the source of illusion and its effects, rules by means of its own power. Furthermore, it is the cause of the appearance of effects such as ether etc. (The Upaniṣad) also shows that through that very nature (vapus) of existence, knowledge and bliss, which is implied from its rulership over all, there is liberation with the knowledge of unity in the form 'I am Brahman':

yo yoniṁ yoniṁ adhiṭiṣṭhaty eko/yasmin idaṁ saṁ ca vicaiti sarvaṁ
taṁ Iśānaṁ varadaṁ devam īdyam/nicāyyemaṁ śāntim atyāntam eti

- 11 By worshipping that One who rules over every single womb (and) in whom all this comes together and dissolves, who is the Lord, the bestower of blessings, (and) the adorable God, one goes forever to this peace.

yo yoniṁ ... yaḥ the supreme Lord, a single being full of bliss, free from illusion yoniṁ yoniṁ by the repetition there is indicated primal substance (prakṛti) illusion (māyā) and secondary constituent causes such as ether etc. Ruling over those constituent causes by giving them being (sattā) and manifestation (sphūrati) He stands as the inner controller. This is testified in such śruti texts as:

'He who dwells in the ether, yet is other than the ether.' (Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 3:7:12)

He is One, without a second. yasmin in the Lord who rules over illusion idaṁ sarvaṁ the whole world at the time of dissolution saṁeti comes together, is absorbed. Again, at the time of creation it takes on various constituent causes such as the ether etc., and becomes diverse. nicāyya having directly seen, (aparokṣīkṛtvā) with certainty that 'I am Brahman', taṁ the Ruler being discussed Iśānaṁ governor varadaṁ who grants liberation devam by nature shining īdyam worthy of praise by the Vedas etc. (one attains) imāṁ śāntim the well-known peace which is evident in the states of deep sleep etc., characterized by the cessation of all, which begets all, this is the peace being spoken of by 'imāṁ', that is liberation, the nature of which is the one continuous flow (ekatāna) of a happiness free from all misery. (This takes place) atyantam fully, i.e. in such a way that one is free from rebirth owing to the cessation of the illusion of the universe, of ignorance and its effects etc., through knowledge of the reality (tattva) which is born of sentences such as 'Thou art that' etc. spoken by a teacher. That is, he becomes unified (ekarasa).

(The Upaniṣad now) makes a request for the attainment of uninterrupted knowledge of reality (tattva) to the supreme Lord, who, always being present,² (abhimukhatayā) looks towards the self which is the thread (of creation) (sūtrātman)³:

yo devānām prabhavaś codbhavaś ca/viśvādhipo rudro maharṣiḥ
hiranyagarbham paśyata jāyamānam/sa no buddhyā śubhayā samyunaktu

- 12 He who is the source and origin of the gods, the ruler of the universe, Rudra, the great seer, who beheld the golden egg when it was produced, may he endow us with clear understanding.

yo devānām ... The meaning of this has already been explained.

(The Upaniṣad now) speaks of the Supreme Lord as master over the gods headed by Brahmā, as the resting place of the worlds, (and) of the ether etc., as controller of those with true notions (pramāṭṛ) etc. who is prayed to by those who desire liberation for the attainment of right knowledge through purity of intellect (buddhi).

yo devānām adhipo/yasmīḥ lokā adhiśritāḥ
ya īśe asya dvipadaś catuṣpadaḥ/kasmai devāya haviṣā vidhema

- 13 He who is the overlord of the gods, in whom the worlds rest, who rules over these two-footed and four-footed creatures, to what god shall we offer our oblations?

yo devānām adhipaḥ ... The meaning is that He who is the supreme Lord being discussed, adhipaḥ the master devānām of Brahmā etc., adhi upon which supreme Lord, who is the cause of all, the worlds i.e. earth etc.¹ adhiśritāḥ, rest i.e. are superimposed... He who is the supreme Lord being discussed īśe² - the

elision of the 't' (of ṛṣṭe) is as in the Veda - rules over these dvipadaḥ men etc. and catuspadaḥ animals etc., kasmai³ i.e. kāya to Him whose nature is joy (ka) - the 'smai' ending (of ka) is Vedic. vidhema may we attend to that god whose nature is light haviṣā with sacrificial materials such as oblations, offerings etc. This (vidhema) is a form of (the verb) vidhā, in the sense of attending to.

Although it has been set forth many times earlier that the Supreme is extremely subtle and exists in the wheel of the world,⁴ as its witness, and that it creates the whole world and is the Self of all, and that men, being at one with that (Supreme) are liberated, for ease of understanding (buddhi) (the Upaniṣad) says again:

sūkṣmālisūkṣmaṁ kalilasya madhye/viśvasya sraṣṭāram anekarūpaṁ
viśvasyaikam pariveṣṭitāram/jñātvā śivaṁ śāntim atyāntam eti

- 14 By knowing as auspicious that which is subtler than the subtle in the midst of confusion, the creator of all of manifold nature, the one who embraces everything, one attains peace for ever.

sūkṣma ... Given that there are ever increasing degrees of subtlety from earth to the unmanifest, (the Upaniṣad) speaks of the Lord as the most subtle compared with them, (saying He is) 'subtler than the subtle'. In the midst kalilasya of the impenetrable stronghold of ignorance and its effects. The rest has been explained.

(The Upaniṣad now speaks of) the existence of the Supreme as an Observer, and how Sanaka etc. the gods Brahmā etc. and (other) eligible men attained the Supreme as their own selves, and how men like ourselves may attain liberation when endowed with the four requisite means etc.¹

sa eva kāle bhuvanasya goptā/visvādhipaḥ sarvabhūteṣu gūḍhaḥ
yasmin yuktā brahmaṛṣayo devatāś ca/tam evam jñātvā mṛtyupāśānś chinatti

15 He indeed is the protector of the world in time, the ruler of the universe hidden in all beings, in whom the seers of Brahman and the deities are united, by knowing Him thus one cuts the fetters of death.

sa eva He indeed who is being discussed, kāle in bygone ages(kalpa)¹, at the time of the fruition of works stored up by the individual soul (jīva), is bhuvanasya goptā a protector in accordance with the fruits of the various works performed. (He is) visvādhipaḥ the master of the Universe, sarvabhūteṣu gūḍhaḥ present in everything from Brahma down to a tuft of grass only as a witness. yuktāḥ they are united yasmin in this supreme body full of consciousness and bliss. Who are they? brahmaṛṣayaḥ, the seers of Brahman, Sanaka etc. (and) devatāḥ the deities, Brahma etc. jñātvā realizing directly as 'I am Brahman' tam the Lord Himself chinatti one destroys mṛtyupāśān i.e. mṛtyu which is ignorance, that is darkness and forms etc. these being pāśāḥ the fetters which bind. Of these (fetters) the śruti says 'The darkness is indeed death' (Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 1:3:28).

chinatti It dissolves the effects of those (fetters), which are desires and works. The meaning is that it burns (them) up with the fire of self-illumination which is unified by nature.

(The Upaniṣad now) speaks of the Supreme as by far the most subtle, being exceedingly blissful, (and) faultless. It (also) shows that the Supreme, being very subtle, naturally resides in individual souls (and) by giving existence etc. to everything, pervades all. Furthermore, the fetters are destroyed through the knowledge of identity with oneself.

ghṛtāt param maṇḍam ivātisūkṣmaṁ/jñātvā śivaṁ sarvabhūteṣu gūḍham
viśvasyaikam pariveṣṭitāraṁ/jñātvā devaṁ mucyate sarvapāśaiḥ

- 16 By knowing Him, Śiva¹, hidden in all beings, like the exceedingly fine film that rises out of the clarified butter, like the one embracer of the universe, by knowing that god one is released from all fetters.

ghṛtāt ... Just as maṇḍam the cream which floats on top of clarified butter is an object of much joy to its possessors, so for those who desire liberation the Supreme Self is an object of unsurpassed joy, since it bestows the most quintessential bliss. Having known śivaṁ - this has already been explained - as that which is exceedingly subtle on account of its blissful nature that is like the cream of the clarified butter and which is hidden in all beings, i.e. in beings from Brahmā down to a tuft of grass, since although He is directly visible, being the witness of the experience of the fruit of works, still those beings cover His divinity. The second half of the verse has already been explained
(see 3:7 and 2:15).

(The Upaniṣad next) speaks of the undivided Self which is continuous (ekatāna) happiness as the creator of the universe, (as also) its all-pervasiveness and its nature as the liberation to be attained by renunciates (saṁnyāsīn):

eṣa devo viśvakarmā mahātmā/sadā janānāṁ hṛdaye sanniviṣṭaḥ
hṛdā maṇiṣā manasābhikṛpto/ya etad vidur amṛtās te bhavanti

- 17 That god, the maker of all, the great Self, is ever established in the hearts of creatures, and is revealed by the heart, thought and mind. They who know that become immortal.

esah This god being discussed, who is himself light, whose work is the universe, the universe consisting of Mahat etc., which is the karma i.e. that which is done. He is viśvakarmā since the universe is a product of Him, due to the entrance of illusion (māyā). mahātmā means that that Self which is great, that is, all-pervading, is sadā always janānām hrdaye in the supreme space, in the space in the heart, sanniviṣṭa, that is firmly seated, like the reflection of the sun in limiting adjuncts such as water etc.

He indeed, by nature a witness, is abhikṛptah illumined, manifest by virtue of being a partless, single essence, hrdā - this is from the verbal root 'hr', which according to smṛti means 'remove', and therefore hr̥t signifies 'that which removes' - by that (in the form of) the teaching of the negation 'not this, not this' manīṣā through the intellect (buddhi) to discriminate between the Self and the non-self, what is the human goal, and what is not the human goal and manasā through knowledge of unity attained through reflection (vicāra).

The meaning is that those persons, renunciates endowed with the four means (of discrimination between the eternal and non-eternal etc.), who viduḥ know directly as 'I am Brahman' etat the partless, single essence, by nature one, propounded in the great sayings (ādivākya)' such as 'Thou art that', ke the men of knowledge thus spoken of amṛtā bhavanti become immortal, by nature free from rebirth.

Of a certainty the Supreme Self does not change in the three times, or in release (mukti) and dissolution etc.; however through error there appears to be duality in the (states of) waking and dream (svapna). In reality, however, it is always without division. Thus (the Upaniṣad) says:

15
yadātamaḥ tan na divā na rātrir/na san na cāśac chiva eva kevalaḥ
tad akṣaram tat savitur vareṇyam/prajñā ca tasmāt praṣṭā purāṇī

18 When there is no darkness, then there is neither day nor night, neither being nor non-being, only the auspicious One, the perfect. That is the imperishable, the excellent splendour of the Sun (savitr), and from that ancient wisdom proceeded.

yadā... yadā in that state in which there is atamaḥ no darkness, since darkness, which is of the nature of ignorance and its effects has been burnt up by knowledge, born of the great sayings such as 'Thou art that' etc., tadā then na divā there is not even the superimposition of day na rātriḥ nor even of that (night) na sat there is neither the superimposition of being nāsat nor of non-being. Everywhere should be understood the phrase 'there is not even the superimposition of ...'

(In that case it could be said), in accordance with the Buddhist doctrine, that the truth always appears only as emptiness.

Answer:

(For this reason the Upaniṣad) says śiva eva... śiva eva, by nature pure, the force of the particle (eva) being 'not empty.' kevalaḥ devoid of the false notion of ignorance. tad akṣaram... tad that very thing which has been spoken of is akṣaram, does not perish, is eternal and may be indicated by various terms. It is vareṇyam to be honoured savitur by one identifying himself with the disc of the sun. Wisdom is from the instruction of the teacher. It is the truth, the understanding born of the great sayings. The particle 'ca' has an emphatic sense. tasmāt since it is pure (this wisdom) is praṣṭā spread out in its fullness among the renunciates who are able to discriminate the eternal (from the non-eternal), and is purāṇī deriving its infinite power from the succession (of teachers) beginning with Brahman.

And (now the Upaniṣad) states that the unchanging Brahman that is found in the upward direction etc. cannot be grasped, and being non-dual, cannot be compared with anything else and by nature shows a glory that is not divided by time and direction etc.

nainam ūrdhvaṁ na tiryāñcam/na madhye na parijagrabhāt
na tasya pratimā asti/yasya nāma mahad yaśaḥ

19 Neither above, across or in the middle has anyone grasped Him. There is no image of Him whose name is great glory.

nainam... No-one parijagrabhat could grasp enam Him who is under discussion in the upward direction etc. since He is indivisible by nature, without parts or portions. There is no pratimā comparison tasya of that very Lord, since (through Him) one experiences undivided happiness, and there is none other like Him. Yasya nāma mahadyaśaḥ the name of which Lord is Great Glory - yaśaḥ glory which is mahat not divided into directions etc. (but) complete everywhere.

(The Upaniṣad now) states that the Lord is not an object of the senses etc. by nature inward (pratyāñc), and that through knowledge of its unity there is liberation:

na saṁdrśe tiṣṭhati rūpam asya/na cakṣuṣā paśyati kaś canainam
hrdā hrdisthaṁ manasā ya enam/evam vidur amṛtās te bhavanti

20 His form is not visible; no-one sees Him with the eye. Those who through heart and mind know Him as abiding in the heart become immortal.

na saṁdrśe... The rūpam nature asya of the Lord who is being discussed, who is devoid of form etc., without distinctions, experiencing the uninterrupted happiness of His own light na tiṣṭhati is not found in the realm saṁdrśe in any region that can be perceived by the faculties, viz. sight etc. The implication is that the eye (does not see) that (Lord) under discussion, since He is beyond the range of the senses. This being its realm, na kaścana, no-one, even with any of his faculties present paśyati can perceive (Him). This is in accordance with such śruti texts as:

'That which man does not see with the eye, (but) that by which he sees the eyes... (know that alone to be Brahman).' (Kena Upaniṣad 1:7)

Those eligible renunciates endowed with the four means etc.¹, hrdā - this has been explained (see 4:17) - with pure intellect - through the mind vidur evam thus seeing clearly that 'I am Brahman,' know enam the Self which is the Brahman a being considered (knowing) hrdistham that which is in the secret space in the heart, which being inward resides there. They, through the power of their clear vision (aparokṣīkaraṇa) amṛtā bhavanti become no longer subject to death. The meaning is that they do not partake again of another body, since ignorance etc. the cause of death, is burnt up by the knowledge of truth (tattva).

Now, considering that the attainment or removal of desires is according to His grace, (the ṛṣi) supplicates that very supreme Lord with two verses:

ajāta ity evaṁ kaścīd bhīruḥ prapadyate
rudra yat te dakṣiṇaṁ mukhaṁ tena mām pāhi nityam

21 Since (You are) birthless, some fearful people take refuge in You. O Rudra, may that face of yours which is propitious, protect me for ever.

ajāta... The word 'iti' is in the sense of 'since.' Since you alone are birthless, devoid of the law (dharma) of death, old age, hunger and thirst, whereas all (else) is accompanied by destruction and misery, therefore someone bhīruḥ being fearful of transmigratory existence which is accompanied by birth, old age, death, hunger, thirst, grief and delusion (and) one by one, coming under the control of another (paratantra), they approach you alone as a refuge. Or else (the ṛṣi) uses the third person meaning 'Someone like myself approaches.'

O Rudra, that face of yours, which is dakṣiṇam generates courage when meditated upon, and brings joy. Or else dakṣiṇam mukham refers to being in the southern quarter. With that protect me nityam always.

Moreover:

mā nas toke tanaye mā na āyusi/mā no goṣu mā na aśveṣu rīriṣaḥ
vīrān mā no rudra bhāmito/vadhīr haviṣmantah sadam it tvā havāmahe

220 Rudra, do not harm our children, grandchildren, health, cattle or horses. Do not slay our men in anger, for we call upon you always with oblations.

mā naḥ... 'mā rīriṣaḥ' should be understood in all the expressions. mā rīriṣaḥ do not harm, kill destroy naḥ our toke sons tanaye grandsons, our health, cattle, horses or souls (śarīrin). And do not, O Rudra slay bhāmitah in anger our vīrān servants who show valour. Why? For haviṣmantah with our oblations sadam it tvā havāmahe, meaning that we call upon you always for protection.

Here ends the fourth chapter of the commentary on the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad,
composed by the venerable divine Śaṁkara, the most excellent ascetic, a
wandering renunciate and teacher, the pupil of the venerable divine Govinda,
whose feet are adorable.

CHAPTER 5.

In order to set forth outstanding matters not dealt with in the fourth chapter, the fifth chapter is undertaken beginning with the words 'dve akṣare'

dve akṣare brahmapare tv anante/vidyāvidye nihite yatra gūḍhe
kṣaram tv avidyā hy amṛtaṁ tu vidyā/vidyāvidye īśate yas tu so'nyah

1 In the imperishable, infinite supreme Brahman there are placed two which are hidden, knowledge and ignorance. Ignorance is perishable while knowledge is immortal. He who controls knowledge and ignorance is different from them.

In which imperishable brahmapare or 'in the supreme Brahman' which is endless, not limited in respect of place, time or objects, beyond the golden egg of Brahman, are two, knowledge and ignorance nihte which are placed gūḍhe unmanifest. Having examined knowledge and ignorance (the Upaniṣad) shows that kṣaram tv avidyā the origin of transmigration (saṁsṛti) is the cause of destruction (kṣaraṇa). But vidyā, the cause of liberation, is immortal. But He who īśate rules over knowledge and ignorance is other than them, since He is a witness.

(In reply to the question) 'Who is He?' (the Upaniṣad) says:

yo yonim yonim adhiṣṭhaty eko/viśvāni rūpāni yonīś ca sarvāḥ
ṛṣim prasūtaṁ kapilaṁ yas tam agre/jñānair bibharti jāyamānaṁ ca paśyet

2 He, who being one, rules over every single source, over all forms and all sources. He who bears in his thoughts and beholds when born the golden seer when he was engendered¹ in the beginning.

yo yonim... He who yonim yonim in every place adhitiṣṭhati rules on the earth etc., as is said in such statements as 'He who dwelling in the earth (yet is other than the earth)...' (Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 3:7:3).

ekaḥ the non-dual Supreme Self who rules over all colours, red etc. and (all) yonih sources, who bibharti i.e. bibhāra filled jñānaih with righteousness, knowledge, dispassion and lordship 'ṛṣim' i.e. omniscient; kapilam golden in colour prasūtam when he was projected from Himself - for His birth and not that of any other is spoken of in 'He projected the golden egg in the beginning,' for elsewhere (in this Upaniṣad) it says 'He who, in the beginning, created Brahmā and who delivered the Vedas to Him... (to that God I resort for refuge) (Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad 6:18) - whom He paśyet i.e. apaśyat saw jāyamānam as he was being born.

From the proclamation in the Purāṇas that 'Kapila is the first-born' it follows that the golden egg is indicated by the word kapila.

'The sage Kapila is a part of the blessed Viṣṇu who is in all. He has come to destroy the delusion of the world.

In the Golden Age² the Self of all creatures, taking on such forms as Kapila etc., bestows the highest knowledge which is beneficial to the whole world.

You are the Indra of all the gods, Brahmā among the knowers of Brahman. Among the powerful, you are the god of the wind (Vāyu) (and) you are the ever-youthful (Kumāraka)³ among Yogins.

And you are Vasiṣṭha⁴ among sages, Vyāsa⁵ among the knowers of the Veda, Kapila⁶ among Sāṃkhyas, and among the Rudras Śiva⁷.

The supreme seer is well-known as such.

It is said in the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad⁸

'Then, at that time this world existed in this (Hiraṇyagarbha). After that, Kapila among the sages, who exists beyond darkness, came out of Viṣṇu. He is the person possessing sixteen weapons.' He (Hiraṇyagarbha) was well-known as Kapila agre at the time of creation.

Moreover:

ekaikaṁ jālaṁ bahudhā vikurvann/asmin kṣetre saṁharaty eṣa devaḥ
bhūyaḥ sṛṣṭvā patayas tathesaḥ/sarvādhipatyam kurute mahātmā

- 3 That God, who, after spreading out one net after another in various ways draws them together in this field. He, the Lord, the great Self, having again created the lords in like manner, rules over all.

ekaikaṁ... That God, ekaikaṁ one by one creates nets of gods, men and animals at the time of creation, spreading them out bahudhā in various ways, (then) draws (them) together in this field of illusion. The Lord, the great Self, having created bhūyaḥ again as before in the previous cycle the lords of the worlds such as Marīci rules over all.

Moreover:

sarvā diśa ūrdhvaṁ adhaś ca tiryak/prakāśayan bhrājate yad vanadvān
evam sa devo bhagavān vareṇyo/yonisvabhavān adhitiṣṭhaty ekah

4 He shines as the sun, illuminating all regions, above, below and across. In this way that one blessed excellent God, rules over creatures born from the womb.

sarvā diśaḥ... The meaning is that yad u as the sun bhrājate shines with light prakāśayan (and) illuminates with the light of its own consciousness sarvā diśaḥ the eastern etc. quarters as well as ūrdhvam above adhas below and tiryak across... just as anadvān the sun is engaged in illumining the wheel of the world, so that vareṇyaḥ excellent honourable God, whose nature is light (who is) bhagavān endowed with lordship etc. is yonih the cause of the whole world (and) ekaḥ being the non-dual Supreme Self, (and) adhitiṣṭhati controls svabhāvān the entities (bhāva) that are identical with him earth etc., or else all those that are sources, the earth etc.

yac ca svabhāvaṁ pacati viśvayoniḥ/pacyamś ca sarvān pariṇāmayed yah
sarvam etad viśvam adhitiṣṭhaty eko/guṇānś ca sarvān viniyojayed yah

5 The source of all, who develops His own nature, who brings to maturity everything that can be ripened, the One who distributes all the qualities, (and) who rules over this whole Universe.

yac ca svabhāvaṁ... yac ca and He - the word yat is to change its gender¹ to yah - who is the source viśvasya of the Universe who pacati develops His own nature like fire does heat, who transforms pācyān things which can be changed such as earth etc. The One adhitiṣṭhati controls this whole Universe. And He distributes the qualities of the nature of goodness (sattva) activity (rajas) and inertia (tamas). This is the inference (lakṣaṇa).

Moreover:

tad vedaguhyopaniṣatsu gūḍham/tad brahmā vedate brahmayonim
ye pūrvam devā ṛṣayaś ca tad vidus/te tanmayā amṛtā vai babhūvuh

- 6 That which is hidden in the Upaniṣads, the secrets of the Veda, that Brahman knows as the source of the sacred Word (brahman). The gods and seers of old who knew That came to be of Its nature, and have verily become immortal.

tad... vedaguhyopaniṣatsu in the secret Upanisads of the Vedas there is gūḍham concealed tat the nature of the Self under discussion. The meaning is that brahmā the Golden Egg, vedate knows brahmayonim that which has the Veda as its source of valid knowledge. Or else the gods of old, Rudra etc. and the seers, Vamadeva etc. knew the source of Brahman of the Golden Egg, or of the Veda. Being tanmayāḥ that by nature they become amṛtāḥ undying. There should be understood 'likewise also someone today, having known That, becomes immortal.'

So far the meaning of the word 'tat' has been described. Now, in order to describe the meaning of the word 'tvam' the following verses declare:

guṇānvayo yah phalakarmakartā/kṛtasya tasyaiva sa copabhoktā
sa viśvarūpas triguṇas trivartmā/prāṇādhīpaḥ saṁcarati svakarmabhiḥ

- 7 Whoever has qualities, and is the performer of works which have fruits, he surely experiences the consequences of what has been performed. He takes on many forms, has three qualities (guṇa) and treads three paths, and is the ruler of the vital breaths moving about according to his (past) actions.

guṇānvayah... He who has a relation with qualities that are the result of deeds impressions (vāsanā) acquired from actions and knowledge is termed guṇānvayah. He indeed is the experiencer, kṛtasya of the results of actions, the performer works for the sake of results. He is viśvarūpaḥ manifold for he is made up of causes and effects.¹ He is called 'triguṇaḥ' for he has three qualities goodness (sattva) etc.² He is named 'trivartmā' for He treads three³ different paths, the path of the gods etc.³ or else the different paths of righteousness, unrighteousness and knowledge. He is the ruler of the five functions of the vital breaths (prāṇa) and moves about. By what? By his own (past) actions.

aṅguṣṭhamātro ravitulyarūpaḥ/saṁkalpāhaṁkārasamanvito yah
buddher guṇenātmaguṇena caiva/ārāgramātro'py aparo'pi dr̥ṣṭaḥ

8 He is the size of a thumb, in appearance like the sun, endowed with will (saṁkalpa) and egoism (ahaṁkāra), but with only the qualities of the faculty of discrimination and the body, the lower (Self) appears to be only the size of the point of an awl.

aṅguṣṭhamātraḥ... He is the size of a thumb, in relation to the cavity in the heart⁴ being the size of a thumb, and ravitulyarūpaḥ¹ is self-shining by nature accompanied by resolution,² egoism etc., the qualities of the faculty of discrimination and the qualities of the body,³ old age etc. - it has been said 'Old age and death pertain to the body - and He is dr̥ṣṭaḥ seen aparo'pi as the Self that is consciousness by nature as ārāgramātraḥ only the size of a metal point fixed on to the end of a goad. The word 'api' has the sense of something being imagined. The meaning is that aparo'pi the individual soul is imagined when there are limiting adjuncts, just as the sun (though one, reflected) in the water (appears as many).

And again (the Upaniṣad) shows this with another example:

vālāgraśatabhāgasya/śatadhā kalpitasya ca
bhāgo jīvaḥ sa vijñeyah/sa cānantyāya kalpate

⁹ This individual soul is to be known as a part of the hundredth part of a point[~] of hair divided into a hundred: and yet it is fit for infinity.

vālāgra... The individual soul is to be known as part of the hundredth part of a point of hair itself imagined to be divided into a hundred. It is designated to be that size because it is the subtle body. It is so from the standpoint of its nature as the individual soul but in its true nature it is fit for infinity itself.

Moreover:

naiva strī na pumān eṣa/na caivāyam napuṃsakaḥ
yad yac charīram ādatte/tena tena sa rakṣyate

¹⁰ That is not female, nor male; nor is this neuter. Whatever body it takes to itself, by that it is held.

naiva strī... Since it is by nature non-dual, the visible Self which is Brahman, it is not female, nor male, nor is this neuter. Whatever body, whether it be female, male or neuter, that it takes to itself, by that is the individual self identified with the intellect (vijñānātmā) rakṣyate¹ held.

Superimposing this and that quality on the Self it is imagined that 'I am fat' 'I am thin' 'I am a man' 'I am a woman' 'I am a eunuch.'

Why does that Self take on bodies? (To answer this the Upaniṣad) says:

saṁkalpanasparśanadr̥ṣṭimohair/grāsāmbuvr̥styā cātma vivṛddhijanma
karmānugāny anukramena dehī/sthāneṣu rūpāny abhisamprapadyate

¹¹ By the delusions of will, touch and sight and by the abundance of food and drink, the body is born and grows. According to his works, the embodied Self successively assumes forms in various states.

saṁkalpana!... First there is will. From that follows touch, the function of the sense faculty of skin. From that there is the application of sight. Then delusion. Through these, will, touch, vision and delusion, auspicious and inauspicious works are brought about.

Therefore dehī the mortal karmānugāni, following (the course of his past) works anukramena, according to when they ripen assumes forms (such as those) of male, female, or neither male nor female, in different places among gods, animals, men etc. Here (the Upaniṣad) gives an illustration. In just the same way ātman the body is born and grows when there is poured in food and drink in abundance.

sthūlāni sūkṣmāni bahūni caiva/rūpāni dehī svaguṇair vṛnoti
kriyāguṇair ātmaguṇais ca teṣāṁ/samyogahetur aparo'pi dr̥ṣṭaḥ

¹² The embodied Self according to its own qualities chooses many forms, coarse and subtle. He himself uniting with them, owing to the qualities of his acts and through the qualities of his mind¹, is seen as another.

sthūlāni... dehī The individual self identified with the intellect svagūṇaiḥ through its tendencies formed by experience of (acts) ordained and prohibited vyṇoti chooses many bodies, those of gods etc. coarse ones like those of stone etc. and subtle ones like those with fire etc. as their essence. Therefore that embodied Self (appears) as another, assuming a different body according to the qualities of various acts and one's propensities.

Thus overcome by the heavy burden of ignorance, desire, the results of actions and attachment etc., like a gourd-shell plunged in deep water, having the certitude of being identified with the body, he spends lifetimes being born as departed spirits, animals, men etc., and remains identified with the soul. Somehow, through good deeds (puṇya) (and) the performance of works dedicated to the Lord, he is rid of the impurities of attachment etc. By perceiving the impermanence etc. (of the creation), there is dispassion for the experience of the fruits of objects here and hereafter, (and) endowed with the attainments of peacefulness, restraint etc., having known the Self, he is liberated. Thus (the Upaniṣad) says:

anādy anantaṁ kalilasya madhye/viśvasya sraṣṭāram anekarūpaṁ
viśvasyaikam pariveṣṭitāram/jñātvā devaṁ mucyate sarvapāśaiḥ

- ¹³ Knowing the God who is without beginning and end, in the midst of chaos, the creator of all manifold form, who alone embraces the universe, one is liberated from all fetters.

anādy anantam... One is liberated sarvapāśaiḥ from ignorance desire and actions, having known the God whose nature is light, the supreme Self, (who is) anādy anantam without beginning or end kalilasya madhye in the midst of the thick impenetrable round of birth and death, viśvasya sraṣṭāram the creator of the universe who has many natures and who is ekam pariveṣṭitāram one pervading all with its own Self, residing in all.

But by what is that Self apprehended? To answer this the Upaniṣad says:

bhāvagrāhyam anīdākhyam/ bhāvābhāva-karam śivam
kalāsarga-karam devam/ ye vidus te jahus tanum

¹⁴ They who know the God who is apprehended by the mind, who is called 'incorporeal' who is auspicious, the maker of existence and non-existence, of creation and its parts, they have left the body behind.

bhāvagrāhyam... nīdam means 'body' (therefore) anīdākhyam means one who is called 'incorporeal' the creator and destroyer (who is) śivam pure, i.e. freed from ignorance and its effects. Those who know as 'I am He' that God who creates the sixteen aspects of creation beginning with the vital breaths etc. and ending with name spoken of in the Atharva Veda with 'He created the vital breath' etc. (Praśna Upaniṣad 6:4) they jahuḥ may leave behind tanum the body.

Here ends the fifth chapter of the commentary on the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad, composed by the venerable divine Śaṅkara, the most excellent ascetic, a wandering renunciate and teacher, the pupil of the venerable divine Govinda, whose feet are adorable.

CHAPTER 6

Objection:

Others believe that time etc. are the cause. So how can then the Lord be the creator of the parts (mentioned in Praśna Upaniṣad 6:4)?

This doubt being raised, (the Upaniṣad) says:

svabhāvam eke kavayo vadanti/kālaṁ tathānye parimuhymānāḥ
devasyaiṣa mahimā tu loke/yenedam bhrāmyate brahmacakram

- 1 Some wise men, being deluded, speak of inherent nature (as the primary cause) others likewise of time. But this greatness in the world by which this wheel of Brahman is made to turn, is surely God's.

svabhāvam... Some kavayaḥ wise men speak of (the cause as being) inherent nature, others likewise of time. The use of the words 'kāla' and 'svabhāva' implies also the other (possibilities) indicated in the first chapter.¹
parimuhyamānāḥ the indiscriminate, the worldly-minded, (who) do not have right knowledge. The word 'tu' is for emphasis. It is the mahimā power of God by which this Brahma-wheel bhrāmyate turns.

(The Upaniṣad now) explains this greatness in detail:

yenāvṛtam nityam idaṁ hi sarvaṁ/jñāḥ kālakāro guṇī sarvavid yah
tenesītam karma vivartate ha/prthivyaptejo'nilakhāni cintyam

- 2 (This) work (of creation) unfolds itself, having as its ruler Him by whom this whole world is constantly enveloped, the knower, the creator of time, the possessor of qualities, who is omniscient. It is regarded as earth, water, fire, air and ether.

yena... yena by the Lord idam the world is nityam invariably āvṛtam pervaded. (He is) the knower, and kālakāraḥ the creator of time. (He is) guṇī, free from sin etc. He is (called) sarvavid since he knows everything. īśitam impelled tena by the Lord, work (karma) - that which is performed is karma - (is superimposed) like a snake on a garland. The word 'ha' implies that this is well-known. It is well-known that this work impelled by the Lord unfolds itself through the nature of the world and also that His work is prthivyāptejo'nilakhāni the manifest creation (prapañca) of the elements earth etc.

(The Upaniṣad now) explains in detail what it was said 'should be reflected upon' in the first chapter.

tat karma kṛtvā vinivartya bhūyas/tattvasya tattvena sametya yogam
ekena dvābhyāṃ tribhir aṣṭabhir vā/kālena caivātmaguṇaiśca sūkṣmaiḥ

3 (He is to be reflected upon who) performed this work, and rested again, who entered into union with principle (tattva) after principle, with one, two three or eight, and with time too as well as with the subtle qualities of the self.

tat... (He is to be reflected upon who) having created tatkarma earth etc. and vinivartya looking back at it bhūyaḥ again yogam sametya (it should be noted that the suffix nic is omitted)¹ brought about the union of that self tattvena with earth etc.² In how many different ways? Either with one, earth, two, three or with the eight principles³ of Nature (prakṛti) which have been stated in:

'Earth, water, fire, air, ether, mind and also intellect and egoism, thus is my Nature divided eightfold' (Bhagavad Gītā 7:4) (He brought about the union of that Self) also with time, and ātmaguṇaiḥ, with the qualities of the internal organ, desire, etc., which are subtle.

Now (the Upaniṣad) shows the main purpose of works:

ārabhya karmāṇi guṇānvitāni/bhāvāṁśca sarvān viniyojayed yaḥ
teṣāṁ abhāve kṛtakarmanāśaḥ/karmakṣaye yāti sa tattvato'nyah

- 4 One who, having begun works associated with the qualities, offers up all attachments (bhāvān), then, in their absence has the work which he has performed removed, he, when this work has wasted away, becomes detached from the principles (of Nature).

ārabhya... ārabhya having performed works associated with the qualities, goodness (sattva) etc. viniyojayet one surrenders the multifarious attachments to the Lord - (and) due to their having been offered to the Lord, does not become connected with them. In the absence (of attachment), for one who (acts thus) the results of work performed earlier disappear¹. And it has been said:

'O son of Kunti whatever you do, whatever you eat, whatever you sacrifice, whatever you give, whatever disciplines you undertake, do it as an offering to Me.²

Thus you will be liberated from the bonds of works productive of good and bad works.' (Bhagavad Gītā 9:27:28)

'One who performs actions, offering them to Brahman, abandoning attachment, he is not tainted by sin, just as a lotus leaf is not (made wet) by water.

Yogins perform work only with body, mind, intellect and senses, renouncing attachment for self-purification.' (ibidem 5:10-11)

When the results of works have wasted away, (karmakṣaye) he, with a pure mind, i.e. by realising himself as the non-dual Brahman which is consciousness (cit) being (sat) and bliss (ānanda), freed from ignorance and its effects, yāti becomes tattvato'anyaḥ, different from the principles, the elements of Nature. If (the verse) is recited with 'anyad' (then it means that) he goes to that Brahman which is different from the principles of Nature.

The following verses are sung³ in order to affirm (draḍhimne) the meaning already enunciated. (In answer to the question of) how (people) blinded by objects may know Brahman, (the Upaniṣad) says:

ādiḥ sa saṁyoganimittahetuḥ/paras trikālād akalo'pi dr̥ṣṭaḥ
taṁ viśvarūpaṁ bhavabhūtaṁ īdyaṁ/devaṁ svacittasthaṁ upāśya pūrvam

5 He is the beginning, the cause (hetu) of the causes (nimitta) which unite.

Having worshipped Him whose nature is the Universe, who is being, the adorable God, the primordial, who resides in one's own heart (citta), one sees that He is beyond time and without parts.

ādiḥ... ādiḥ the cause (kāraṇa) of everything, the cause (hetu) of occurrences of ignorance which bring about the connection (saṁyoga) with the body. And it has been said:

'It is this one indeed who makes him perform good action and it is this one indeed who makes him perform bad action.'

(Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad 3:8)

He is beyond the three times, i.e. past, future and present. And it has been said:

'That below which the year revolves with its days, that light of lights the gods worship as immortal life.' (Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 4:4:16)

Why? Since this one is akālaḥ without parts; the parts (enumerated) from the vital force up to name do not exist in it. For that which has parts, being limited by the three times, appears and disappears. This one, however, is partless, beyond creation. Therefore, It neither appears nor disappears, as it would by being limited by the three times.

pūrvam before the rise of knowledge of the meaning of the sentences (of the Upaniṣads) upāśya after meditating, (with the sentence) 'I am this one' on that adorable God who resides in one's own heart, (and) who is viśvarūpam possessed of all forms, and who is bhāva the source (and) bhūtam by nature Truth, (one becomes different from the principles of Nature).²

Again (the Upaniṣad) speaks of Him:

sa vṛkṣakālākṛtibhiḥ paro'anyo/yasmāt prapañcaḥ parivartate'yam
dharmāvahanṁ pāpanudaṁ bhageśaṁ/jñātvātmastham amṛtam viśvadhāma

⁶ He because of whom this creation revolves, is beyond and other than the forms of the (world) tree and time. Knowing (Him who) brings righteousness, who removes evil, the lord of prosperity, who is one's own Self, immortal, (and) the support of the universe (one becomes different from the principles of Nature).

sa vrkṣaḥ... He is vrkṣakālākṛtibhiḥ paraḥ beyond the forms of the tree and time. The tree is the tree of transmigration (saṃsāra). And it has been said:

'This is the eternal fig-tree with its roots above and branches below.'

(Kaṭha Upaniṣad 6:1).

anyaḥ means (He) is untouched by creation (prapañca). yasmāt because of that Lord the creation revolves. jñātvā by knowing bhageśam, the Lord (svāmin) of divine powers (aiśvarya) etc. as ātmastham residing in oneself, in the intellect¹ and anṛtam undying, one goes to the viśvadhāma the support of the universe. 'One becomes different from the principles of Nature' should be supplied in all cases.

Now, presenting the experience of the wise, (the Upaniṣad) reaffirms the matters already mentioned:

tam īśvarāṇām paramam maheśvaram/tam devatānām paramam ca daivatam
patim patīnām paramam parastāt/vidāma¹ devam bhuvaneśam īdyaṃ

- 7 Let us know Him, who is supreme, the great Lord of Lords, and who is the highest deity of deities, the master (pati) of masters, higher than the high, the God who is the adorable Lord of the worlds.

tam īśvarāṇām... we know devam the luminous one Him who is supreme īśvarāṇām among Vaivasvata, Yama etc. and a great lord, supreme devatānām among Indra etc. the deity who is the ruler patīnām of the Prajāpatīs paramam higher parastāt than the high, the imperishable (akṣara) bhuvaneśam, the lord of the worlds, who is īdyaṃ to be praised.

How is He the great Lord?

(In reply, the Upaniṣad) says:

na tasya kāryam karaṇam ca vidyate/na tatsamaścābhyadhikaśca dr̥ṣyate
parasya śaktir vividhaiva śrūyate svabhāvikī jñānabalakriyā ca

- 8 He has nothing to achieve, nor any instrument (to achieve it) and neither his equal or his superior is seen. His supreme power is revealed (śrūyate) as indeed diverse. The working of his knowledge and strength is natural.

na tasya... He has no kāryam body (or) karaṇam eye etc. None is seen, or revealed by the scriptures (śrūyate) to be His equal or superior. His supreme power (śakti) is revealed to be indeed diverse. And that is natural (svabhāvikī) jñānabalakriyā ca (that) is jñānakriyā and balakriyā. jñānakriyā is the ability to know all subjects, balakriyā control by having power over everything merely through His proximity.

Since this is so, therefore:

na tasya kaścit patir asti loke/na ceṣitā naiva ca tasya liṅgam
sa karaṇam karaṇādhipādhipo/na cāsyā kaścij janitā na cādhipaḥ

- 9 He has no father in the world, nor ruler, nor indeed is there any mark of Him.

He is the cause, the Lord of the lords of sense-organs; He has neither progenitor nor lord.

He has no father in the world; therefore He has no īśitā controller. Nor indeed does He have any liṅga indication comparable to smoke¹, through which he is inferred. He is the karaṇam the cause of all, karaṇādhipādhipaḥ the supreme Lord. Since this is so, therefore He has no janitā procreator nor lord.

Now the seer of the mantras requests his desired object:

yas tantunābha iva tantubhiḥ/pradhānajaḥ svabhāvataḥ
deva ekaḥ svam āvṛnot/sa no dadhāt brahmāpyayam

10 The one God who, according to His nature, covered Himself like a spider with threads produced from unmanifest Nature (pradhāna), may He grant us entry into Brahman.

yas tantunābhaḥ... Just as a spider completely covers itself with threads produced from itself, so āvṛnot He covered himself pradhānajaḥ with names, forms and actions (karma) arising out of the Unmanifest, which are comparable to the threads. The meaning is dadhāt may He grant naḥ me brahmāpyayam entry into Brahman, unification.

Once again showing directly that very (deity) like a myrobalan (amalaka) fruit placed in the palm of one's hand ~~with~~ the next two verses show that the supreme human goal is attained from knowledge alone, and not through anything else.

eko devaḥ sarvabhūteṣu gūḍhaḥ/sarvavyāpī sarvabhūtāntarātmā
karmādhyaḥṣaḥ sarvabhūtādhivāsaḥ/sākṣī vettā^a kevalo nirguṇaśca

11 The one God hidden in all beings pervades all, being the inner Self of all beings. He is the supervisor of actions, dwelling in all beings, the witness, the knower, absolute (kevala) and devoid of qualities.

eko devaḥ... ekaḥ the non-dual God whose nature is light is sarvabhūteṣu
gūḍhaḥ hidden in all living beings. He is all-pervading, the inner Self of

a Or cetā

all beings i.e. their own nature (svarūpa.) He is karmādhyaṅkṣaḥ the ordainer of the diverse actions performed by all living creatures. sarvabhūtādhivāsaḥ i.e. he lives in all living beings. (He is) sākṣī the seer of all, of all beings. As it says in the smṛti the word sākṣāt indicates a direct seer, cetā the one who gives understanding kevalaḥ without limiting adjuncts nirguṇaḥ devoid of the qualities of sattva etc.

eko vaśī niṣkriyānām bahūnām/ekaṁ bījaṁ bahudhā yaḥ karoti
tam ātmastham ye'nupaśyanti/dhīrās teṣām sukham śāśvataṁ netareṣām

12 Eternal happiness belongs to those - and not to others - who perceive as abiding in their own Self Him who is the one controller of many who are actionless, and who makes the one seed manifold.

eko vaśī... Eternal happiness belongs teṣām to knowers of the Self who are dhīrāḥ wise - and not to others, ignorant of the Self - ye'nupaśyanti who know directly as ātmastham abiding in the intellect Him who is one and vaśī independent who makes manifold the one seed - the subtle elements which are like seeds - of the many individual souls who are actionless. For all actions inhere not in the Self but in the sense organs etc. The Self, however, which is without action, qualitiess, devoid of sattva etc. and unchanging, superimposes on Itself qualities (dharma) which do not belong to it and thinks 'I am a doer, I am an experiencer, I am happy, I am miserable, I am thin, I am fat, I am a human being, I am that man's son, I am his grandson...'

It has also been said:

'While actions are being performed entirely by the constituents (guṇa) of Nature (prakṛti), one who is deluded by egoism (ahaṁkāra) thinks 'I am the doer.'

But one who knows the truth, O mighty-armed, about the divisions of the constituents (guṇa) and actions is not attached, thinking that the constituents are acting upon (other) constituents.

Those who are deluded by the constituents of Nature (prakṛti) are attached to the activities of the constituents. (Bhagavad Gītā 3:27-29)

Moreover:

nityo nityānām cetanaścetanānām/eko bahūnām yo vidadhāti kāmān
tat kāraṇam sāmkhya-yogādhiḡamya/jñātvā devaṁ mucyate sarvapāśaiḥ

- 13 One is freed from all fetters having known the deity who is the cause, and who is apprehended by Sāmkhya and Yoga¹, who, being the eternal among the eternal, the conscious among the conscious, the one among the many grants desires.

nityo... He is the eternal nityānām among the individual souls, the sense being that their eternality comes from His eternality. Or else (nityānām may mean) among the earth etc. Likewise He is the conscious cetanānām among the knowers. He is the one among many individual souls, who vidadhāti grants kāmān objects of enjoyment to which desire gives rise. By knowing the god of all who is made of light, and who is discovered through Sāmkhya and Yoga, one is freed from all bonds, ignorance etc.

How is He the conscious among the conscious? This is spoken of:

na tatra sūryo bhāti na candratārakam/nemā vidyuto bhānti kuto'yam agniḥ
tam eva bhāntam anubhāti sarvaṁ/tasya bhāsā sarvaṁ idaṁ vibhāti

14 There the sun does not shine, nor the moon and the stars; nor do these flashes of lightning shine. Whence then is this fire? When He shines, all these shine too. By His light all this shines.

na tatra... There (tatra) in the Supreme Self, the sun (sūrya) though it illuminates all, does not shine, that is, it does not make Brahman visible. For it is through the light of Him who is the Self of all that the sun illuminates all forms. It has no power of itself to illumine. Likewise, neither do the moon and the stars. Neither do these flashes of lightning (have power of themselves to) shine. Whence is this fire that is perceived by our senses? In short, that this world shines is so because, He Himself bhāntam shining, being of the nature of light, (the world) anubhāti shines also, just as iron etc. do not burn by themselves but as fire does so. It is only through His bhāsā light that all this, the sun etc., shines. And it has been said, 'Being illumined by whose light the sun shines' (Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa 3:12.9.7)

'Neither the sun nor the moon nor fire illumines That.' (Bhagavad Gītā 15:6)

It has been said that by knowing the deity one is liberated. Why is it that having known Him alone one becomes liberated, and not through any other means?

In answer to this (the Upaniṣad) says:

eko haṁsaḥ bhuvanasyāśya madhye/sa evāgniḥ salile saṁniviṣṭaḥ
tam eva viditvā atimṛtyum eti/nānyaḥ panthā vidyate' yanāya

15 There is one swan in the midst of this world. That is indeed the fire that has entered into the ocean. Having known Him alone one goes beyond death; there is no other path leading there.

ekaḥ... There is one hamsaḥ the supreme Self (understood in its etymological derivation as) one who destroys¹ the cause of bondage, ignorance etc. is in the midst of bhuvanasya these three worlds. There is no-one else at all. Why? For He Himself is fire. He is agniḥ like fire, in that He burns away ignorance and its effects. It has also been said 'The Lord is the fire beyond the sky.' He is sāmniviṣṭaḥ fully present as the Self in the water (salile) which has been transformed into the body. And it has been said 'Thus in the fifth oblation water comes to be spoken of as a person.'
(Chāndogya Upaniṣad 5:9:1)

Or else the meaning is that He is sāmniviṣṭaḥ established as the scorcher of ignorance and its effects in the full knowledge arising from the meaning of the Upaniṣadic sentences. Therefore, having known Him alone one goes beyond death; there is no other path leading there. For the attainment of the supreme goal, once again He is especially shown by the Upaniṣad:

sa viśvakṛd viśvavid ātmayonir/jñāḥ kālakāro guṇī sarvavidyāḥ
pradhānakṣetrajñāpatiḥ guṇeśaḥ/sāṃsāramokṣasthitibandhahetuḥ

16 He is the maker of all, the knower of all, the self-caused, the knower, the maker of time, the possessor of qualities, the knower of everything. He is the ruler of Nature (pradhāna) and Spirit (kṣetrajñā) the lord of qualities, the cause of transmigration, liberation, existence and bondage.

sa viśvakṛt... sa viśvakṛt He is the creator of the universe. He is (said to be) viśvavit since He is the knower of the universe. He is ātmayoniḥ the Self and the source - the Self of all and the source of everything¹. He is jñāḥ the knower. He is omniscient, that is He is the light of consciousness. He is kālakārah the maker of time. He is guṇī possessed of (qualities) such as being free from sin. (This is all) an exposition of viśvavit. He is patiḥ the protector of pradhāna the Unmanifest and kṣetrajñāḥ the individual self ; identified with the intellect (viññānātman). He is the Lord of the qualities sattva rajas and tamas. He is the hetuḥ cause of transmigration, liberation, existence and bondage.

Moreover:

sa tanmayo hy amṛta īśasamsthō/jñāḥ sarvago bhuvanasyāśya goptā
ya īśe'sya jagato nityam eva/nānyo hetur vidyata īśanāya

17 Thus constituted, He is immortal, existing as the Lord, the Knower, omnipresent, the protector of this universe (bhuvana), who rules over this world eternally. No other cause exists who could rule.

sa tanmayah... He is tanmayah the Self of the Universe. Or else tanmayah means 'full of light.' This interpretation is taken based on connecting the expression with 'by His light all this shines.' (6:14). He is amṛtaḥ undying, īśasamsthaḥ perfectly established īśe in being the Lord, jñāḥ the knower, sarvagaḥ ranging everywhere, goptā, the protector of this universe, who īśe rules eternally according to law over this world. There is no other cause capable of īśanāya of ruling over the world.

Since He alone is the cause of transmigration, liberation, existence and bondage, therefore the seeker after liberation with his whole being should fly to Him alone for refuge.

In order to teach this the Upaniṣad says:

yo brahmāṇām vidadhāti pūrvam/yo vai vedāśca prahinoti tasmai
taṁ ha devam ātmabuddhiprakāśam/mumukṣur vai śaraṇam aham prapadye

18 I, who am most desirous of liberation, fly for succour to that deity who reveals the knowledge of the Self, who created Brahmā in the beginning, and who indeed sent Him the Vedas.

yo brahmāṇām... He who vidadhāti created brahmāṇam the Golden Egg (hiranyagarbha) pūrvam at the beginning of creation, and who indeed sent him the Vedas, I fly for succour taṁ ha - ha is used for emphasis - to that very Supreme Self. And it has been said:

'The wise Brāhmaṇa, having known that (Self) (ātman) alone, should attain knowledge. He should not think of many words, for that tires out speech.'
(Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 4:4:21)

And:

'Know that very Self which is one.' (Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad 2:2:5)

(I fly to) the god who is full of light (jyotirmaya), who makes the knowledge (buddhi) of the Self favourable, for when the Supreme Lord is gracious, intelligence also, the knowledge of Him, which is Brahman who is by nature beyond creation, stands, exists by itself. (In place of (ātmabuddhiprasādam) others recite ātmabuddhiprakāśam the illuminator of the knowledge of the Self. Or else ātmabuddhiprakāśam implies that the Self itself is knowledge (buddhi), and He who shows Himself as knowledge is ātmabuddhiprakāśam. I, mumukṣur ; vai - vai is used for emphasis - being verily desirous of liberation and not being desirous of any other result, seek refuge (in Him).

Up to this point the true nature of reality that can be observed through creation etc. has been shown. Now (the Upaniṣad) shows (this reality) in itself:

niṣkalam niṣkriyam śāntam/niravadyam nirañjanam
amṛtasya param setum/dagdhendhanam ivāṇalam

19 (I seek refuge in Him who is) partless, actionless, tranquil, irreproachable, taintless, the supreme bridge to immortality, like a fire with burning fuel.

niṣkalam... (I seek refuge in) Him who is niṣkalam, without kalāḥ parts i.e. without limbs (avayava) (and) actionless, established in Its own glory i.e. unchanging (kuṭastha) tranquil, with all modifications absorbed, niravadyam irreproachable, nirañjanam taintless, param setum like a bridge amṛtasya to immortality, for the attainment of liberation, since it is a means to cross the great ocean of transmigration, like a brilliant, blazing fire with burning fuel.

Is it that one is liberated by knowing Him alone and not by anything else?

On this matter the Upaniṣad says:

yadā carmavad ākāśam/veṣṭayiṣyanti mānavaḥ
tadā devam avijñāya/duḥkhasyānto bhaviṣyati

20 When men will roll up the sky as if it were a piece of leather, (only) then ,
will there be an end of sorrow without knowing God.

yadā... When, just as one would roll up leather, men veṣṭayiṣyanti will roll
up the sky which is non-corporeal and pervasive then there will be antaḥ a
destruction of sorrow arising in oneself and coming from nature and the gods,¹
without knowing devam the effulgent one the supreme Self, who exists by nature
as knowledge, having neither beginning nor end, untouched by hunger etc. For
transmigration is caused by ignorance of the Self.

So long as one does not know the supreme Self as one's self, so long does one,
being deluded, transmigrate and, though birthless, is overcome by the three
afflictions (tāpa) and is drawn hither and thither by passion etc. as though
by crocodiles, receiving the form of an individual soul among departed
spirits, animals, human beings etc.² When again one directly knows as one's
self the Supreme Self which is without cause or effect, characterized as 'not
this, not this', untouched by hunger etc. and which exists by nature as
knowledge, beginningless and endless, as full bliss, then, having cast out
ignorance and its effects, one becomes full of bliss. It has also been said:

'Knowledge is covered by ignorance. Thereby creatures become deluded. But
for those whose ignorance is destroyed through knowledge of the Self,
knowledge, like the sun, illuminates that supreme.

Those whose intellects are directed to That, whose Self is That, who are steadfast in That, (and) who have That as their supreme goal, they go never to return again, their sins shaken off by knowledge.' (Bhagavad Gītā 5:15-17)

In order to show that the knowledge of Brahman, when transmitted through the traditional line of teachers, gives liberation, (the Upaniṣad) speaks of the tradition as well as the person eligible for knowledge:

tapah prabhāvād devaprasādāt ca/brahma ha śvetāśvatara'tha vidvān
atyāśramibhyaḥ paramaṁ pavitraṁ/provāca samyag ṛṣisaṁghajustam

- 21 Through the power of austerity (tapas) and the grace of god, the wise Śvetāśvatara spoke in the proper manner to complete renunciates (atyāśramin) of Brahman, the supreme, the purifier, which is adored by hosts of seers.

tapah prabhāvād...(Through the power) of painful ascetic practices such as the cāndrāyana¹; for that is the conventional (rūḍha) meaning of tapas.² This suggests daily obligatory (nitya) rites and rites (karma) undertaken according to injunction. For the smṛti say 'One pointedness of mind and sense-organs is the highest ascetic practice. Since all these austerities were correctly (niyamena) practised by Śvetāśvatara therefore, tatprabhāvād through their power, devaprasādāt ca and through the grace of the supreme Lord who had been properly propitiated (ārādhita) in many past lives in order to acquire fitness (adhikāra) for liberation (kaivalya) he, the sage called Śvetāśvatara, after hearing of the (knowledge of) the aforesaid Brahman from his teacher as it had been handed down in succession, realised directly the Indivisible as 'I am Brahman' through reflection (manana) meditation (nididhyāsana) and attention (ādarana), constancy (antarya) and devotion (satkāra) etc. - and thereafter, after he had gained firmness from his own experience, provāca taught in the

proper manner (samyak) - this word can be connected with both (provāca and justam) after the manner of a crow's eye³ (which, as occasion requires, is believed to move from one socket to the other) - brahma (Brahman who is) unlimited greatness ha - this is used to indicate a well-known fact atyāśramibhyaḥ to those belonging to the most adorable stage of life - for the smṛti says 'The word ati signifies adoration - to those who, on account of the power derived from the fulfillment of the four (requisite) disciplines (sādhana catuṣṭaya) were not dependent even on their own bodies or on wealth or a livelihood etc. - therefore (we may interpret) to those who are completely detached. It has been said:

'If there is not complete detachment (vairāgya) the knowledge (darśana) of Brahman does not fructify. Therefore a wise man should always remain assiduously (yatnena) unattached (virati).'

And also in another smṛti (it is said):

'When detachment (vairāgya) from all objects arises in the mind then only should a wise man (vidvān) take up the life of a renunciate (saṁnyāset). Otherwise he will be degraded (patita).'

atyāśramibhyaḥ then refers to the paramahansa saṁnyāsins, renunciates of the highest order. In confirmation of this, the śruti says:

'The word nyāsa means Brahma. Brahma is the supreme. The supreme is Brahma. Those ascetic practices are indeed inferior. Renunciation (nyāsa) alone surpassed them. (Mahānārāyaṇa Upaniṣad 21:2)

The smṛti also says:

'Monks (bhīkṣu) are of four types; bahūdaka⁴ kuṭīcaka haṁsa and paramahansa, each succeeding one being better than the previous one.

To those complete renunciates (he taught in the proper manner) in the way that It is directly realised (aparokṣīkṛta) as the Self, the supreme Brahman which is being considered (prakṛta), which is the paramam most excellent, free from all ignorance and its effects unsurpassed (niratisāya), uniform (ekarasa) happiness, pavitram the pure, devoid of the impurity of Nature (prakṛti) the base (prakṛta) etc.⁵ ṛṣisaṅghajustam justam worshipped as the Self saṅghaiḥ by hosts (of sages), Vāmadeva, Sanaka etc., resorted to as the most cherished (priyatama) bliss that has been perfectly meditated on. For the śruti says '...but all is loved for the sake of the Self.' (Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 4:5:6).

The knowledge (of Brahman) should be imparted after the disciple has been tested in the manner described. Now (the Upaniṣad) sets forth the error (dosa) of imparting that (knowledge) without the (prior testing), the Vedic nature of the knowledge, how it is hidden, and how it is passed on through a succession of teachers:

vedānte paramam guhyam/purākalpe pracoditam
nāprasāntāya dātavyam/nāputrāyaśiṣyāya vā punah

22 This supreme secret in the Upaniṣads was taught in a former day of Brahmā (kalpa). It is not to be given to one who is not peaceful, nor to one who is not either a son or a disciple.

vedānte... The word vedānta is in the singular since it denotes a class. It means 'in all the Upaniṣads.' paramam guhyam that which, among those things that need to be protected, most needs to be protected (gopyatama), which is by

nature (svarūpa) the supreme goal of Man (puruṣārtha) pracoditam was taught, pointed out purākalpe in a previous day of Brahmā (kalpa) - this is to show the tradition of teachers. dātavyam i.e. it should be taught to a self-controlled (prasanta) son whose mind is completely free from all impurities such as passion, or to a similar disciple. The knowledge of Brahman should not be taught out of affection (sneha) etc. to one who is not a son or a disciple, who is the opposite of this.¹ The meaning of the word punaḥ is that there will be evil consequences (pratyavāyapattiḥ) otherwise. Therefore the sense (bhāva) is that a teacher who wishes to instruct in the knowledge of Brahman should teach the knowledge of Brahman after testing for a long period and knowing the qualities of the disciple. Accordingly the śruti says:

'Live for a year, again with ascetic practice chastity (brahmacharya) and faith. (Then) ask what questions you please.' (Praśna Upaniṣad 1:2)

And in another śruti:

'Indeed Indra lived a life of chastity for a hundred and one years in Prajāpati's house.' (Chāndogya Upaniṣad 8:11:3)

This has been expounded (prapañcita) in various ways in the Upadeśa Sāhasī, and so it is dealt with in brief here.

Here (the Upaniṣad) also shows that the knowledge brought to light (prakāśita) by the teacher is only known in experience by those who are devoted to the deity and the teacher.

yasya deve parā bhaktir/yathā deve tathā gurau
tasyaite kathitā hyarthaḥ/prakāśante mahātmanah prakāśante mahātmanah

23 These matters that have been spoken of light up for the great-souled one who shows supreme devotion towards the deity, and as much (devotion) towards his teacher as towards the deity. (Indeed) they light up for the great-souled one.

yasya... The competent (adhikārin) man (puruṣa) yasya who has parā supreme, unpremeditated (nirupacaritā) devotion - this suggest both steadiness (acāñcalya) and faith - both as much gurau to the teacher of the knowledge of, Brahman as deve, to the supreme Lord, who is by nature the supreme light which is undivided (akhaṇḍa) uniform (ekarasa) consciousness, being and bliss, as shown by the text so far - he who has both of these, to him mahātmanah the highest one, the most competent person, who is quick to realise that without the compassion of the teacher the knowledge of Brahman is difficult to obtain, just as there is no other expedient (sādhana) for someone with his head on fire than to seek for water, and no other expedient for one who is hungry than to eat - these matters kathitā which have been taught by the great-souled seer (kavi) Śvetāśvatara in this Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad prakāśante are known in experience.

The repetition (of prakāśante mahātmanah) is to show a) that it is rare to find an eminent disciple who has the means (sādhana) etc. (to realise the knowledge of Brahman) b) that the chapter is complete, and c) to show respect for the deity.

Here ends the sixth chapter of the commentary on the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad composed by the venerable divine Śaṅkara, the most excellent ascetic, a wandering renunciate and teacher, the pupil of the venerable divine Govinda, whose feet are adorable.

This commentary on the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad is now complete.

Om tat sat.¹ Om May he protect us both. May he take pleasure in us both.

May we show courage together. May that which is studied be lit up for us.

May we not hate one another.²

Om. Peace, peace, peace.

1. Words in block capitals are headings supplied by the translator.
- There is no benedictory verse. Of the works attributed to Ś. which are considered genuine, only a few begin with such verses, namely MāBh TaiBh and USP 17 and 18. At the beginning of BrBh there is a short prose salutation to Brahman and the line of teachers, then in KaBh to Yama and Naciketas. Ś's works are exceptional in mostly omitting benedictory verses, which are included by most authors as a convention. A possible explanation for this omission is found in KeVBh where Ś states:

na hi svarājye' bhisikto brahmatvaṁ gamitaḥ kāmāna namitum icchati.

'For he who has been led to Brahman and consecrated in sovereignty does not wish to bow to anyone.'

Hacker in ŚY speculates that Ś only retained the practice of writing benedictory verses while his teacher lived, thereby distinguishing his earlier works.

Bhattacharya in ŚC argues that where such verses do appear in Ś's works they are later interpolations, for 'they are generally seen in comparatively modern works... Following the example of ancient teachers Ś generally plunges at once into his subject.'

2. In GP there appear the headings prathamo' dhyāyaḥ 'Chapter 1' and saṁbandhabhāṣya, probably meaning a commentary (bhāṣya) on the relationship (saṁbandha) between the subject-matter and the present treatise, the upaniṣad, this being one of the four anubandhas, or questions traditionally raised by an author at the beginning of a work (see note 1 of Page 85). These headings do not appear in AA and BI, nor in MS.T, and are probably additions to the original text.

3. śvetāśvataropaniṣad This word is missing in BI. Perhaps it was a title added by the copier of a manuscript and not part of the first sentence of the original text. In MS.T there appears kṛṣṇayujurvedīyaśvetāśvataropaniṣadbhāṣyam, perhaps also an addition.

4. vivarāṇam The ChBh refers to itself as a vivarāṇa with very similar wording (see quotation below, note 5.) Hacker in ŚŚ surmises that this long introduction has been prefixed to the original introductory formula which is similar to that of many Upaniṣadbhāṣyas by Ś (see Page 32):

brahmavādino vadantītyādi śvetāśvatarāṇām mantropaniṣat tasya
alpagranthā vṛttirārabhyate. (GP p.86)

5. The text here reads:

idaṁ vivarāṇam alpagrantham brahmajijñāsūnām sukhāvabodhāyārabhyate.

Many of Ś's genuine commentaries are described by the author as alpagrantha, as in KaBh ChBh and BrBh. Compare the second sentence of ChBh:

tasyāḥ saṁkṣepato arthajijñāsubhya rjuvivarāṇaṁ alpāgrantham idam
ārabhyate.

Also compare the opening of KaBh:

atha kāṭhakopaniṣadvallīnāṁ sukhārthaprabodhanārtham alpāgrantham
vṛttirārabhyate.

6. BI introduces a less concise expression here nanu
citsadānandādvitīyabrahmasvarūpaścedātmā nānāndādvitīyabrahmasvarūpo
pyātmā. 'You are mistaken if you object that "Surely (your argument
is not sound) for the Self is of the nature of Brahman, which is
without a second, consciousness, being and bliss", we reply that
although the Self is of the nature of Brahman which is without a
second and bliss.....' The retention of ānanda in the second
compound, while omitting cit and sat is uncharacteristic of Ś.
Hacker notes in ŚY that 'Meist beschreibt er das Selbst positiv nur
als Geist (cit und andere Worte'.) 'Mostly he describes the Self
positively only as consciousness (cit and other words.)'
7. The order of citsadānanda is contrary to the later Advaita
formulation of saccidānanda. This is noted by Deussen in SV p.212:
'But what are the positive characteristics of this esoteric Brahman
which presupposes the negation of all differences? The later Vedānta
names three of them, which form the famous name of Brahman:
Sac-cid-ānanda, that is 'Existence, Intelligence and Bliss;' this
compound which, as far as I know, occurs first in the Nṛsimhatāpanīya

Upaniṣad is nowhere found in Śaṅkara's Commentary, and appears as yet unknown to our author. It is true that he repeatedly explains that, where Brahman is spoken of as Bliss, this limitation refers to the esoteric, attributeless Brahman, but here, in the strictly esoteric part, this is not spoken of, perhaps, because Śaṅkara counts it among the negative limitations as freedom from suffering; thus besides Existence, as the only positive quality of the esoteric Brahman, remains intelligence....'

8. Hacker in ŚŚ claims that this phrase svāśrayayā svaviśayāvidyayā svānubhavagamyayā implies theories developed by Śaṅkara's contemporaries and successors, (see Page 32). This whole passage is almost identical to a passage found in the introduction to the Sanatsujātīyabhāṣya, a work which Hacker deems definitely spurious since the author quotes Sureśvara, Ś's pupil, which he argues Ś himself would never do. Hacker also notes that this work gives the sources of quotations given in the text, seldom done in Ś's genuine works. The ŚvBh also adopts this practice in the long introduction.
9. There is some word-play on 'artha' here, first meaning 'aim' then 'worth'.
- GP pratibaddhasvabhāvikāśeṣapuruṣārthaḥ prāptāśeṣānārthaḥ....'he is endowed with natural human aims, then acquires all that is worthless.'
- BI and MS.T svabhāvikapuruṣapūmarthaḥ ...'Pūm' seems unnecessary here.

10. GP & AA iṣṭaprāptiṁ cāpuruṣārtham puruṣārtham manyamāno...
 MS.T iṣṭaprāptiṁ cāpuruṣārthamokṣārthamalabhamāno
 'not understanding that the attainment of desires does not benefit a man, nor lead to liberation.'
 BI iṣṭaprāptimāṣṭaprāptiṁcāpuruṣārtham 'not considering that the attainment of desires is the attainment of the undesirable and does not benefit the man.'
11. makarādibhiḥ What '-ādi' 'etc.' refers to here is uncertain. It is not felt necessary to translate '-ādi' since its inclusion, perhaps best rendered by 'and other such beasts' would be cumbersome. This practice of omitting to translate '-ādi' is adopted elsewhere where the rendition would be too long-winded.
12. rāgādibhiḥ Literally 'with passions etc.' probably meaning rāga, 'passion' dveṣa 'hatred' and moha 'delusion.'
13. saṁākṛṣyamānaḥ Here the words 'powerless to resist' are an attempt to bring out the force of 'sam-' and the immediately subsequent '-a-', which do not seem adequately accounted for in MW with its English rendition.
14. suranaratiryagādiprabhedabheditanānāyoniṣu samācaran 'experiencing the various births of different orders of being, such as those of gods, men and animals.'
 Compare USG 1:12 evam evāham anāḍau saṁsāre devamānuṣyatiryanniraya-
sthāneṣu svakarmavaśād upāttam upāttam śarīraṁ tyajan... 'Thus in this beginningless cycle of birth and death on account of my own karma I have been giving up bodies of gods, men, animals and denizens of hell and ever assuming new ones.'

1. GP and AA (see before) samācaran kenāpisukrtakarmanā
brāhmaṇādyadhikāriśarīraṁ prāpta īśvarārthakarmānusthānena...
BI and MS.T ...bhediteneśvarārthakarmānusthānena. The BI and MS.T
version here is much briefer. This illustrates how easily the text
may be added to or simplified in its transmission.
2. brāhmaṇādyadhikāriśarīraṁ prāpta. 'Presumably brāhmaṇādi 'the
Brāhmaṇa etc.' refers to the three classes of men eligible for Vedic
study, the Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya and Vaiśya.
3. rāgādimalo Out of the context of the crocodile analogy the rendering
of 'rāga' as 'attachment' seems better here, highlighting the
teaching of Ś's school on false identification with the body, etc.
4. GP anityatvādidarśanenotpannehāmutrārthabhogavirāga... This is
reminiscent of two of the four prerequisites for the deliberation on
Brahman in BSBh 1:1:1, namely nityānityavastuviveka 'discrimination
between the eternal and non-eternal' and ihāmutrārthabhogavirāga
'dispassion for the experience of objects in this world and the
next.' BI, MS.T and AA 'anityādi...'
5. BI does not have this phrase, instead introducing 'veti', 'he knows
through the teacher.'
6. vedāntaśravaṇādina This probably refers to the triad śravaṇa manana
nididhyāsana, originally culled from the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 2:4:5
ātmā vā are draṣṭavyah śrotavyo mantavyo nididhyāsitavyo...

7. aham brahmāsmi One of the four mahāvākyas or 'great sentences.'

8. GP and AA vītaśoko bhavati. avidyānivṛttilakṣaṇasya mokṣasya
BI and MS.T vītaśoko vṛttilakṣaṇasya mokṣasya.

Dr. E. Roer, the editor of BI reports that he was working from 'an ancient and most excellent manuscript. This was the only manuscript I had of the Śvetāśvataropaniṣadbhāṣya; but as it is written with the utmost care and correctness, and as I could compare it with the printed copy of the Tattvabodhini Sabha, which has been taken from a different manuscript, another manuscript was not required for collation.'

9. The context here involves saccidānanda, a compound similar to the one our commentator has just used (see note 7 of page 78):

(tasmād idam (sama) saccidānandamayam param brahma) tamevaṁ vidvānamṛta iha bhavati.

'Therefore this song is the supreme Brahman, consisting of being, consciousness and bliss. One who knows it as such becomes immortal even in this world.'

Since this Upaniṣad is quoted in Ś's genuine commentaries, although it is significant that as such the compound saccidānanda never appears in Ś, it must have been familiar to Ś.

The author quotes the śruti only in part, giving the key phrase of a passage to illustrate the argument. It is assumed that his audience knows the śruti by heart, so that extensive quotation is unnecessary. For less well informed readers, however, the relevant accompanying words and sentences from the śruti are included in the translation in brackets.

10. GP and AA nānyaḥ panthā vidyate'yanāya. BI nānyaḥ panthāyanāya vidyate. MS.T nānyaḥ panthāḥ (new line) ayanāya vidyate.

In context this is preceded by tamevaṁ viditvāti mṛtyumeti.

'Knowing Him (the Puruṣa - 'Supreme Being') in this way one goes beyond death.) This verse is from Vājasaneyisaṁhitā 31:18.

11. Here ya etad vidur amṛtās te bhavanti... 'Those who know that (Self) become immortal.' But LV reads ye tad vidur amṛtās te bhavanti ... with no difference in meaning. The previous KeU quotation seems to have prompted this citation, which is immediately preceded by na ced avedīn mahatī vinaṣṭih.

'If you have not known (that Self) there is great destruction.'

Page 80

1. The predicate of 'that' is unspecified in the immediate context: aśabdamasparśamarūpamavyayam tathā' rasam nityamagandhavacca yat, anādyanantam mahataḥ param dhruvam nicāyā tam (GP tan) mṛtyumukhātpramucyate.

'That which is soundless, touchless, formless, imperishable, likewise tasteless, eternal and odourless, without beginning and end, higher than the great, unmoving - having realised that, one is released from the mouth of death.'

GP's reading 'tan' would be translated by 'That' referring to Brahman. LV, as well as AA MS.T and BI however, have 'tam' suggesting a reference back to ātmā 'Self' in 1:3:12.

2. Somya Literally 'O you with the face resembling the moon!' The sage Aṅgiras is addressing the householder Śaunaka. 'My friend' is the most apt rendering in less effusive modern idiom.
3. Guhāyām Literally 'in the secret place' but often understood as 'in the heart'. Compare ŚvU 3:20 ātmā guhāyām nihito sya jantoh 'the Self is set in the heart of the creature.'
4. The context of the Upaniṣad is again taken into consideration in order to judge what 'tad' 'that' represents. Here 'ātman' which has so far been rendered as 'Self' appears as the subject of the previous verse.

Page 81

1. Here Pippalāda is answering the grandson of Sūrya.
2. The Upaniṣad here reads: (yasmin sarvāṇi bhūtāni ātmaivābhud vijñānataḥ) tatra ko mohah kah śoka ekatvamanupaśyataḥ.'

(When for the wise man all beings have become the Self alone,) then what delusion, what sorrow is there for him who sees unity?'

As with all this sequence of quotations, the author's aim is to quote scripture to confirm his argument that liberation depends on knowledge.

3. In ĪśBh Ś. interprets this phase not in terms of liberation being attained through knowledge, as it is being interpreted in this commentary:

vidyayā devatājñānenāmṛtaṁ devatātmabhāvam aśnute prāpnoti.'

vidyayā 'through vidyā', the knowledge of the deities, aśnute 'he attains', amṛtam 'immortality', 'identification with the deities.'

4. GP bhūteṣu bhūteṣu vicitya... 'Having realised (That) in all beings'
BI and AA sarvāṇi rūpāṇi vicitya... 'Having realised all forms...'
MS.T sarvāṇi rūpāṇi vicintya

5. (yo vā etamevaṁ veda) apahatya pāpmānāmanante sarge loke jyeye pratitiṣṭhati.

'(One, indeed, who knows it (the Upaniṣad or 'esoteric doctrine')) wards off sin and becomes established in the infinite, most excellent heavenly world.'

The word 'Upaniṣad' is often to be understood in the sense of 'esoteric, secret doctrine,' for it would only be imparted to the initiated.

6. ya etad vidur amṛtās te bhavanti (LV)

'They who know this become immortal.' (SvU 3:10)

GP AA MS.T and BI all have this reading. GP gives the source of the quotation as Br U 4:4:14, yet LV for this reads ye tad vidur...

Page 82

1. nicāyyemāṁ śāntim antyantam eti

'By revering (the Ruler(Īśāna)), one goes for ever to this peace.'

The quotation given occurs in ŚvU 4:11 and KaU 1:1:17. Although GP gives KaU as the source, ŚvU is equally if not more likely in the author's mind, the quotation being among other ŚvU quotations. In KaU the object of 'nicāyya' can be either understood as 'God' (deva) or 'the fire' (brahmajajña perhaps an epithet for Agni), taking 'nicāyya' as 'having laid, built up.'

2. ye pūrvam devā ṛṣayaś ca tad vidus te tanmayā amṛtā vai babhūvuh (LV)

GP AA MS.T and BI all read 'tam viduḥ.' Hence, 'The gods and sages of former times who knew Him (God (deva)), (they, being of His nature, indeed have become immortal.)'

1. 'śruti', is the scripture heard by the sages, 'smṛti' the scripture remembered by human authors.
2. The commentator states his principal thesis, that liberation comes through knowledge alone, not through any ritualistic act. This is a very common theme in Ś's commentaries (see TaiBh preamble).
3. paramapuruṣārtha - 'Man's principal purpose,' that is liberation (mokṣa), the foremost of the four 'puruṣārthas', or goals of men, the others being righteousness (dharma) wealth (artha) and pleasure (kāma).
4. 'Upa' and 'ni' are verbal prefixes. The meanings given for 'sad' are those found in the Dhātupāṭha, a grammatical work, literally a 'recitation of verbal roots'.

1. This constitutes the sambandha (see note 2 of Page78) because it shows the relationship between the subject-matter (liberation) and the text
(the Upaniṣad, which deals with knowledge, the means to liberation.)

2. Avidyādeḥ saṃsārabhījasya - compare BSBh 1. 1.1.K.84 'Brahmāvagatirhi puruṣārthaḥ, niḥśeṣasaṃsārabhījāvidyādyanarthanirbarhaṇāt'

The expressions are very similar. Although, as Hacker in Eigen. remarks, Ś. occasionally describes avidyā as a 'bīja', he does not normally portray avidyā as the causa materialis of saṃsāra. Hacker's analysis does not help us conclusively here.

3. Ś's Kāṭha Upaniṣad commentary portrays the etymology of the word 'Upaniṣad' in an almost identical fashion. We either conclude that the author has copied Ś at times verbatim or that fragments of an original commentary by Ś himself are showing through. The former explanation is more likely: such word-for-word imitation of the master would not be seen as to the author's discredit, and may be a further reason for a false attribution of this introductory section to Ś.

A comparison of the two sections in question is interesting:

Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad Commentary

Kāṭha Upaniṣad Commentary

kimcapaniṣatsamākhyayaiva
jñānasyaiva paramapuruṣārtha-
sādhanaatvamavagamyate tathā hi
upaniṣadity

saderdhātorviśaraṇagatyavasādanār-
thasyopanipūrvasya kvippratyayānt-
asya rūpamidamupaniṣaditi

upanipūrvasya saderviśaraṇagaty-
avasādanārthasya rūpamācakṣate
upanīṣacchabdena vyācikyāsītā
granthapratipādyavastuvisayā
vidyocyate

(identical)

tādarthyādgrantho' pyupanīṣat

kena punararthayogenopanīṣacch-
abdena vidyocyata ityucyate

ve mumukṣavo drṣṭānuśravika-
viśayavitrṣṇāḥ santa

(identical)

upanīṣacchabditavidyām

upanīṣacchabdavācyaṁ
vakṣyamāṇalakṣaṇām
vidyāmupasadyopagamyā

tanniṣṭhatayā niścayena
śīlayanti teṣāmavidyādeḥ
saṁsārabījasya

(identical)

viśaraṇādvinaśātparabrahma-
gamayitṛtvād garbhajanma
jarāmaraṇādyupadravāvasādayitr-
tvād upanīṣatsamākhyayāpy-
anyakṛtāt param śreya iti
brahmavidyopanīṣaducyata

viśaraṇāddhīmsanād-
vināśād ityanenārtha-
yogena vidyo-
panīṣadityucyate

Translation of Kaṭha Upaniṣad commentary passage:

'The form of the word 'upaniṣad' is derived from the verbal root 'sad' with the meanings of 'dissolving' 'attaining' and 'overcoming' preceded by 'upa' and 'ni' and followed by the suffix 'kviṣ.' And by the word 'Upaniṣad' is denoted the knowledge of the knowable reality, which is to be taught by the text (the Kaṭha Upaniṣad) which it is intended to explain.

And it shall (now) be stated with relation to which (particular) meaning knowledge is denoted by the word 'Upaniṣad.' Knowledge is called 'Upaniṣad' because of its connection with the meaning that it dissolves, slays and destroys the seeds of transmigratory existence such as ignorance, in the case of those desiring liberation, who no longer crave for objects both seen and unseen, who approach (upa sad) the knowledge called 'Upaniṣad', the characteristics of which are about to be explained, and who then deliberate on it with steadiness and certainty.'

An alternative derivation is offered in the introduction to¹ MuBh:

'ya emām brahmavidyāmupayantyātmabhāvena śraddhābhaktipuraḥsarāḥ
santaḥ teṣām garbha janmajarārogādyanarthapūgam nīśātayati param vā
brahma gamayatyavidyādisamsārakāraṇam vā atyantamavasādayati
vināśayatītyupaniṣat

'It is called Upaniṣad because it cuts asunder (niṣad) the numerous evils of the womb, birth, old age, disease, etc., for those whose individual souls approach (upa (yā)) this knowledge of Brahman with faith and devotion; or it is so called because it 'leads' to the supreme Brahman or completely 'dissolves' and 'destroys' ignorance and so on, the cause of transmigratory existence.'

Here the first interpretation relies on the introduction of a new derivational verbal root 'niṣad' the second again referring to the Dhātupāṭha.

4. BI and MS.T omit 'nanu' introducing the objection, while GP and AA retain it.
5. GP and AA 'śrutismṛtivyirodhān'. BI and MS.T omit 'smṛti'. The formulation nyāyavirodhācca is common in Ś. Compare 'śrutismṛtinyāyah sarvagatatvamātmano vabodhayanti' (BSBh 3:2:37) 'the śruti, smṛti and reason show the all-pervasiveness of the Self.'
6. GP MS.T and BI 'karmajito' 'conquered, earned by works' AA 'karmacito' 'heaped up' with works'.
7. As before GP MS.T and BI 'puṇyajito' 'conquered by merit' AA 'puṇyacito' 'accumulated by merit.'
8. In order to refute the objection that ritual acts may also be a means to liberation, the Vedāntin, the author of the commentary, uses two quotations, Nṛsimhapūrvatāpanīya Upaniṣad 1:6 and Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad 3:8, which are identical with the quotations he initially used in his argument (see Page 79).

1. GP and AA avaram yeṣu karma

'in which inferior works (are expressed)'

MS.T avaram yeṣṭakarma

BI avaram yeṣṭakarmma (ārṣametat)

MW gives 'yeṣ' as meaning 'to boil up' in Ṛg Veda and Atharva Veda, which would accord with 'ārṣametat' 'this is Vedic'. It may have been construed as a further derogatory term to describe 'karma', but is almost certainly a misreading.

1. The author presumably intends this quotation to highlight his argument that worldly activity, all connected with the āśramas, the 'stages of life', and the varṇas, the 'orders' of men in society, only leads to 'śrama' 'toil', not (directly, at least) to liberation.
2. sāṃkhyair This could either mean 'numerous', an unattested meaning coming from sāṃkhyā 'to enumerate', or perhaps, more akin to its usual usage 'philosophical reckonings.' The pattern of the verse, however, makes it more likely to be an adjective agreeing with 'vratais', a longer expression to round off before the virāma (pause.) Hence 'by numerous vows.'
3. āśramakarma Āśrama could here mean 'hermitage' or 'stage of life.' Āśrama has already been used in this passage to mean 'stage of life', and since it is natural to speak of 'karma' 'ritual action' in this context, it is the preferred translation.

1. GP and AA nyāyavirodhācca 'and since reason denies (it)'
MS.T and BI nyāyavirodhāt 'since reason denies it,' in the latter
edited as a separate sentence.
2. caturvidhakriyā
'The four types of ritual act,' probably referring to the Mīmāṃsā
School's classification of ritual acts into:

1) utpadya
2) saṃskāra
3) vikāra
4) prāpti
3. This is a theme that appears in the Upaniṣads. Compare Kaṭha
Upaniṣad 1:2:10, where Yama tells Naciketas:

'na hyadhruvaih prāpyate hi dhruvaṃ tat'
'For that which is permanent cannot be attained through impermanent
things.'

Compare also TBh:

'na hi nityaṃ kimcidārabhyate loke yadārabdhaṃ tadanityamiti ato na
karmārabdho mokṣah.'

'For nothing permanent in the world has a beginning. The rule is
that anything that has a beginning is impermanent. Therefore
liberation is not caused by ritual acts.'

1. GP and AA iṣṭapūrtam manyamānā variṣṭam...pramūdhāḥ 'the deluded, thinking the merit accumulated by rites to be the best...'
BI iṣṭapūrtam manyamānā variṣṭā...pramūdhāḥ. Here the number and gender of 'manyamāna' seems to have been transferred to 'variṣṭam' through its proximity. MS.T does not make good sense here.
2. pāradarśinaḥ - this can here be understood as literally 'beholding the opposite shore', that is viewing with detachment. Since there is this observation from detachment, the observer is not confused with the observed. This interpretation would correspond with Śaṅkara's teaching on adhyāsa:

'asmatpratyayagocare viṣayini cidātmake yuṣmatpratyayagocarasya viṣayasya taddharmānām cādhyāsa.' (Brahma Sūtra Bhāṣya Introduction).

'The superimposition of the observed, known as 'you', and its attributes, on the observer, known as 'I', by nature consciousness, (should be impossible.)

1. GP and AA 'pāpakarmāśayo hyatra mahāmukti - virodhakṛt' 'For in this world the store of evil deeds forms a great barrier to liberation.'
BI and MS.T 'na tvakarmāśayo hyatra... GP and AA are obviously the better readings, for BI and MS.T do not make good sense.

1. GP and AA 'devatāśruti...sravanaiḥ' 'This may either be interpreted as a tatpuruṣa compound 'the sound of the deities,' or as part of a dvandva compound (through hearing) the deities and the śruti...' The latter seems most apposite. BI and MS.T offer the reading 'devatāstuti' 'through worship of the gods.'
2. GP and AA 'satkarmānuṣṭhānam' 'the performance of good works'
BI 'tatkarmānuṣṭhānam' 'the performance of works (prescribed) in those (Vedas and śāstras.)'
MS.T tatkarmanām anuṣṭhānam
3. varimayam - literally 'that which consists of the Goddess of Speech, Vāk.'
4. Dutt's text has some different readings:

For 'purāṇāni' 'purāṇāṅca'

For 'yaccānyadvāṇmayam' 'yacca kiṁcana varimayam'

For 'svātantryam' 'svatantryam'

1. kṣīṇadoṣāḥ Despite the inelegance of using 'dispelled' twice within a short space in the English translation, it is felt correct since both Sanskrit texts use 'kṣīṇa'.
2. avidyām Here, Ś's interpretation of the word in Īś Bh is used, namely as 'rites.'

1. G.P. and A.A. abhidhāya katham anayos taddhetutvam ity ākāṅkṣāyām...

'having said (this), in anticipation of (the question of) how both these two could be the cause...'

B.I. abhiprāyakathanayos taddhetutvam ity ākāṅkṣāyām...

The B.I. reading does not make good sense, while the MS.T reading seems to show incorrect sandhi:

MS.T abhiprāyakathanayos tatdhetutvam ity ākāṅkṣāyām...

1. The Vedic concept of a full life-time is a hundred years. Manu Smṛti (1:83) quotes this as the life span in the Kali Yuga.

2. G.P. and A.A. yas tv ātmaratir eva 'That man whose delight is in the Self alone...'

B.I. and MS.T yas tv ātmavidhir eva 'That man whose injunctions are from the Self alone...'

G.P.'s reading is the commonly accepted one, and makes much better sense. Ś. himself takes this reading in his commentary on the Bhagavad Gītā. This casts further doubt on the accuracy of the sources for the B.I. edition, which appear to be similar to MS.T.

1. G.P. and A.A. jñānenaitena 'through that knowledge'
B.I. and MS.T tena naitena This reading appears corrupt.
2. G.P. and A.A. iha loke pare caiva 'in this world and the next.'
B.I. and MS.T iha loke param ca
3. G.P. and A.A. jñānābhyāsarato nityam 'ever delighting in the practice of knowledge.'
B.I. and MS.T jñānābhyāsarato yas tu 'but one who delights in the practice of knowledge.'
4. G.P. and A.A. virakto hy arthavit svayam 'detached and spontaneously knowledgeable about things.'
B.I. and MS.T sarvatattvārthavit svayam 'spontaneously knowing the truth of all.'
5. G.P. and A.A. kartavyabhāvam utsrjya
'abandoning the inclination to perform duties.'
MS.T and B.I. kartavyābhāvam utsrjya, a less likely reading, perhaps to be translated 'abandoning (the tendency) to avoid duties.'
6. G.P. and A.A. bhedo madas tamaḥ 'diversity, lust, dullness...'
B.I. and MS.T bhedekṣaṇam tamaḥ 'the dualistic view, dullness...'

7... G.P. and A.A. tadvaśāc ca tanugrahaḥ 'and because of their power he takes on a body.'

B.I. and MS.T tadvaśāt tad anugrahaḥ 'and because of their power he fosters them.'

The following śarīre sati 'when he has a body' makes MS.T and B.I.'s readings less concise.

Page 96

1. G.P. and A.A. dharmādharmau ca naśyataḥ 'and righteousness and unrighteousness come to an end.'

B.I. and MS.T nāśam āyanti dharmādharmau ca dehajau 'and righteousness and unrighteousness, born of the body, come to an end.'

2. G.P. jñānāmṛtena trptasya 'for (him) content with the nectar of knowledge.'

B.I. jñānāmṛtasya trptasya

A.A. notes both these readings.

MS.T jñānāmṛtatasya trptasya - a clear mistake.

3. G.P. lokadvaye 'pi kartavyam... 'even in the two worlds (there is nothing) to be done...'

B.I. and MS.T lokadvayena kartavyam '(there is nothing for him) to be done with the two worlds...'

4. G.P. A.A. and B.I. avidyāvadviṣaye MS.T avidyāviṣaye 'in the realm of ignorance.' When Ś. uses the term 'avidyāviṣaya' it means the 'sphere of ignorance,' not 'the object of ignorance.'

5. puṇypāpādikam Although it is easy to surmise what 'ādi' 'etc.' might stand for here, it is uncertain whether the author has a specific standard list in mind as is usual with the use of this term. The compound 'puṇypāpā' occurs a number of times in BSBh but never followed by 'ādi.' On one occasion it appears alongside the very same expression we find here, 'vidyāsāmarthyāt' 'in consequence of knowledge,' 'anārabdhakarmayoḥ puṇypāpāyor vidyāsāmarthyāt kṣaya uktah' 'It has been said that good and bad deeds that have not yet begun to fructify are destroyed by the power of knowledge.' (BSBh 4:1:19)

6. bhuñjīthāḥ The Dhātupāṭha gives two possible senses in which 'bhuja' is used, namely 'guarding' and 'taking food.' However, the word is normally found in the latter sense, commonly with the allied meaning of 'to enjoy' (see MW p. 759.) Our author therefore chooses the far less usual meaning of the word when he interprets 'bhuñjīthāḥ.' It is interesting to note that this follows Ś's glossing of the word in IsBh:

'bhuñjīthāḥ pālayethāḥ'

'bhuñjīthāḥ here means 'you may guard.'

1. cakitaḥ san 'being alarmed.' The construction dictates that 'san' 'being' should have the same subject as 'matvā' 'having thought' and so it is the objector who is alarmed, not the answerer.

2. G.P. - uktir apy ayuktaivokteti 'surely it is wrong to maintain...'

A.A. - uktirayapy uktaivokteti

B.I. and MS.T - uktir apy uktaivokteti

G.P. seems to be the best reading. A.A.'s reading does not make sense. B.I. and MS.T use three consecutive forms derived from dhātu vāc.

3. vidyamānam literally 'occurring' therefore 'incidental.' The idea is that it is not incumbent on the wise man to perform ritual actions, but that he performs them incidentally.

4. tūṣṇīm - literally 'silent.'

Page 98

1. sūtrakāraḥ 'the composer of the aphorisms', i.e. Bādarāyaṇa, who composed the Brahma Sūtras.

2. Compare BSBh 3:4:1 'srutir vidyāyāḥ kevalāyāḥ puruṣārthahetutvaṁ śrāvayati.' 'The śruti makes known that knowledge alone is the cause (the attainment of) the goal of Man (i.e. liberation).'

Page 99

1. Compare BSBh 3:4:7, in which the opponent argues that knowledge is subservient to works.

2. 'karṭṛtvādisaṃsārādharmarahitāpahatapāpmādirūpabrahmopadeśāt...'

'Since it is taught that Brahman is of the nature of sinlessness and so on, devoid of the qualities of transmigratory existence such as agency...'

Compare BSBh 3:4:8 'asamsārīśvaraḥ karṭṛtvādisaṃsārādharmarahito' ; pahatapāpmātvādiviśeṣaṇaḥ paramātmā...' 'the Lord, not subject to transmigration, devoid of the qualities of transmigratory existence such as agency, the supreme Self, endowed with such attributes as freedom from sin is taught...' This whole passage seems to precis the BSBh argument.

1. 'utpannā hi vidyā phalasiddhiṃ prati na kiṃcid anyad apekṣate.

utpattiṃ praty apekṣata eva.' In BSBh were Ś comments on the sūtra being referred to here (3:4:26), he uses almost identical wording, the final phrase differing slightly: 'utpattiṃ prati tv apekṣate.'

'Once knowledge has emerged, it does not depend on any other factor in producing its (own) result (i.e. liberation); but it does depend (on other factors) for its emergence.'

2. G.P. bandhasya mithyatve sati 'if bondage were a false entity.'

1. G.P. bādhāsambhavāt

B.I. MS.T and A.A. bādhāsambhavāt 'for it may be annulled...'

The B.I. MS.T and A.A. reading must be correct for the passage to make good sense.

2. kāraṇamukhena Ś's usual word for 'reasoning' is 'yukti,' although

obviously kāraṇa must be taken as meaning the same here. Halbfass in 'Studies in Kumārila and Śaṅkara' (p. 64) lists alternative terms for human reasoning as tarka, upapatti and anumāna. It would be unusual, then, to use 'kāraṇa' in this sense. The meaning is clear, particularly since another word for 'cause' 'hetu', may also denote 'argument, reason.'

3. For a discussion of the word 'māyā' and its importance in detecting Ś's authentic works, see Authenticity P.37 and 57. In the Upaniṣadic quotations immediately following, māyā seems to mean either 'illusory appearance' or 'illusory power.'

1. sukhaduḥkheṣu kalpanā literally 'imagination in pleasure and pain.'

2. vāsaḥ 'abode' The notion is that the wise man is not attached to any place.

1. timira An eye disease causing partial blindness.
2. This verse refers to the teaching of the Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad, and Ś's commentary on it. Four quarters indicating Ātman, the Self, are taught. The first quarter is called 'viśva,' with the waking state as its sphere. The second is 'taijasa,' with the dreaming state as its sphere, the third 'prājñā' with the state of deep sleep as its sphere. 'Tuccha' 'empty' here probably refers to 'turīya' 'the fourth' (quarter), which is the Self.
3. 'ā prājñam' literally 'up to (but not including) the prājñā state.'

1. The field (kṣetra) is prakṛti (Nature). The 'knower of the field' (kṣetrajñā) is the Self. In the Bhagavad Gītā Vāsudeva tells Arjuna: 'kṣetrajñam cāpi mām viddhi sarvakṣetreṣu bhārata' 'And also know Me as the knower of the field in all fields, O Bhārata.'
2. nijakarmanā 'by innate (former) acts.' Here karman is used in the sense of 'vāsanā' 'latent impression.' Former acts leave an impression on the being, and fructify as future acts.

1. 'He' here refers back to 'puruṣottama', a name of Viṣṇu.

1. vyavahāra 'behaviour', referring to the activities of common life, all wordly acts, as opposed to the 'paramārtha,' the ultimate reality.

Page 110

1. vidvan - The Kalikatanagaryat edition of the Viṣṇu Purāṇa here has 'viddhi,' which Wilson translates as 'know,' a much more likely reading.

Page 111

1. nirvāṇa This term is used in Buddhism, and literally means 'blowing out.' It refers to the extinction of wordly existence.

Page 112

1. kūṭastha Literally 'standing on the peak of a mountain.'

Page 114

1. The quotation from the Kaṭha Upaniṣad seems to spark off the memory of the similarly worded Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad passage in the mind of the author. It is easy to appreciate how this occurs when one considers that the author would have known these texts by heart.

Page 115

1. Another part of this verse was quoted on page 3.
2. G.P. MS.T A.A. and B.I. ityetadanuśāsanam 'this is the teaching.'
L and V ityanuśāsanam.
3. ityevamādīni '(Statements) such as these and others.' From the parallel passage in BSBh, it is obvious that 'vākyāni' '(scriptural) statements' is here understood.

1. A.A. avaiyarthyam 'not meaningless' B.I. avaiyarthye
G.P. seems to have an error avaiyarpyam. Similarly MS.T
avayarthyam. However, as stating the objector's view, 'vaiyarthyam'
would be a more coherent reading, and this is how we have translated,
vaiyarthyam nānākārabrahmaviṣayānām vākyaṇām
'The scriptural statements dealing with the various appearances of
Brahman are meaningless.'

1. kṣetreṣu kṣetra, apart from meaning 'field', may refer to the human
body, as in Bhagavad Gītā 13:1 (see Note 1 of Page 28)

1. The Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad commentary here provides numerous
quotations, as is our author's wont, while the parallel BSBh passage
has only two quotations here, the first the same as the initial
citation here, the second from the Chāndogya Upaniṣad.

1. anubhava 'experience.' This word indicates direct awareness, and not
just theoretical knowledge.

1. śvetapīta Literally 'white and yellow,' though the idiom in English
would be 'black and white.'

Chapter 1.

1:1

1. śvetāśvatarāṇām mantropaniṣad 'the Upaniṣad, consisting of sacred texts of the Śvetāśvataras.'

The Śvetāśvataras are cited in the Caranavyūha, a treatise on the schools of the Veda, as belonging to the Kṛṣṇayajurveda. However, 6:21 of this Upaniṣad suggests that the sage Śvetāśvatara personally spoke the verses to 'ascetics, who had gone beyond the four stages of life.'

2. jīvāmaḥ(iv) There is the variant reading jivāma which makes less good sense, in GP. and AA, probably an unaugmented Vedic subjunctive.
3. kāryakaraṇavantaḥ 'having duties and the means (to fulfil them). Gbh translates 'possessed of body and organs', though the word is kārya 'duty' (not kāya 'body') in all three editions.

1:3

1. sāṃkhyaparikalpitapradhāna 'the primary cause imagined by the Sāṃkhyas.' This refers to the dualistic Sāṃkhya view of there being Puruṣa, 'the Supreme Being', juxtaposed to, and separate from, Prakṛti or pradhāna, 'Nature.'

triguṇam avivekī viśayaḥ sāmānyam acetanam prasavadharmi
vyaktaṁ tathā pradhānaṁ tadviparītas tathā ca puṁś.

'The manifest is composed of the three qualities, not discriminated, an object, general, non-intelligent and creative. Likewise is Nature (pradhāna.) The Spirit (puṁś) is opposed to that, as well as similar.' (Sāṃkhya kārikās 11).

2. vyāsaḥ The Bhagavad Gītā is found as part of the great Sanskrit epic, the Mahābhārata. This is attributed to Vyāsa, the sage who arranged the Vedas. The name literally means 'arranger' and this was probably his function with respect to the Mahābhārata.
3. brahmaviṣṇuśivā brahmanpradhānā brahmaśaktayah 'The primary powers of Brahman are Brahmā Viṣṇu and Śiva.' There is an important distinction here between Brahmā, a power of the universal Self, and Brahman, the universal Self itself. Maheśvara is another name for Śiva.
4. brahmaviṣṇuśivātmikāḥ 'of the nature of Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva.' These three gods are known as trimūrti the 'three forms' of the supreme deity, and are responsible for the rise, maintenance and dissolution of the world respectively. Compare Kumārasambhavam 2:4 'namas trimūrtaye tubhyam prāk sṛṣṭeḥ kevalātmāne guṇatrayavibhāgāya paścād bhedam upeyuse'

'A bow to you of three forms - but of the nature of the absolute self prior to creation - with the qualities as your parts, you who later attained differentiation.'
5. The same quotation appears in Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad 2:1:10, in a slightly different context:

'etad yo veda nihitam guhāyām so' vidyāgranthim vikiratīha saumya.'

'My friend, one who knows That as set down in the heart, in this world rends asunder the knot of ignorance.'

1:3 (cont'd)

6. devātmaśaktim Gambhirānanda translates 'Or, they saw as the source, devātma-śaktim, the power of that supreme Brahman, of which (power) the Deity, the self and energy are different states, and which is the reality of Nature, soul and God, and which exists as Brahman and is higher than the highest.'
7. trayam yadā... Our commentator here alludes briefly to two other verses of the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (4.v.)
8. G.P. here reads 'kāraṇam,' 'cause' obviously a mistake for 'karaṇam,' 'organ.'
9. prajñānaghana 'undifferentiated consciousness' 'ghana' means a compact mass, and at the end of a compound means 'nothing but', hence 'undifferentiated.'
10. citsadānanda This is the same formula 'knowledge, existence and bliss' which appeared at the beginning of the introductory section to the Upaniṣad (see page 78 notes 6 and 7). Its appearance here may suggest that the main body of the commentary has the same author, or has come under the same influences as the introductory section.
11. brahmādi - referring to Brahmā Viṣṇu and Śiva
12. kāryādi - presumably referring to kāryakāraṇa 'effect and cause.'
13. vaiśvānara This is the name given to the first of the quarters described in the Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad (see note 2 for Page 103).

1:3 (cont'd)

'jāgaritasthāno bahiṣprajñāḥ saptāṅga ekonaviṃśatimukhaḥ
sthūlabhugvaiśvānaraḥ prathamāḥ pādāḥ.'

'The first quarter is the Vaiśvānara, whose sphere is the waking state, who is conscious of the external, has seven limbs and nineteen mouths and who experiences the coarse.' (Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad 3)

So we find in Vedāntasāra lll etat samastīyupahitaṁ caitanyaṁ
vaiśvānaraḥ 'consciousness associated with this aggregate (of gross bodies) is called Vaiśvānara.'

14. śaṁkaram The use of this term in an untraceable quotation is intriguing from the point of view of authorship, but gives no firm indication. Gambhirānanda in translating Śaṁkara here seems to be indicating the belief that the commentary was written well after Śaṁkara, sufficiently long after for a text to have been written including a reference to Śaṁkara as a great seer, and for our present author to have quoted it as a probably well-known text.
15. hamsaḥ The wild goose here it would seem represents the Self, which, just as the goose keeps its foot in the water, maintains the appearance of the creation.

1:4

1. ṣoḍaśako vikāra 'sixteen-fold transformation.'

This passage reflects the Sāmkhya text Tattvasamāsa, in such a way that it is almost undoubtedly taken from it. The parallel passages are:

ŚvBh 1:4 (G.P. 109 onwards)	Tattva Samāsa (with sūtra number)
ṣoḍaśako vikāraḥ...	3 ṣoḍaśakas tu vikāra
aśaktiraṣṭaviṃśatidhā	13 aṣṭaviṃśatidhā śaktiḥ
tuṣṭirnavadhā	14 navadhā tuṣṭiḥ
aṣṭadhā siddhiḥ	15 aṣṭadhā siddhiḥ

Narendranātha Tattvanidhi's commentary on the Tattvasamāsa, written in 1793, also shows a similarity of ideas to this passage in ŚvBh, with almost identical lists found in both texts, for example, 'tamo moho mahāmohas tāmistro hyandhatāmisra iti.' (G.P. 111).

2. tam ekanemim... It seems more appropriate to consider this verse as sharing the same verb as verse 5, since both verses deal with enumerations. Hence the translation 'we understand' for adhīmaḥ, as opposed to Gambhirānanda's 'they saw' from 'apaśyan' in verse 3. At the end of the commentary on this verse, our commentator allows both options.

3. aṇimādi 'becoming minute, etc.' aṇiman is spoken of in Yoga Sūtras 3:45 Patañjali comments: tatrāṇimā bhavatyāṇuḥ 'Aṇiman is when one becomes the size of an atom.'

The other powers mentioned in the commentary on this sūtra are:

- 1) laghimā - lightness, that is when one becomes light.
- 2) mahimā - largeness, that is when one becomes large.
- 3) prāpti - attainment, when one can touch the moon with one's fingertips.
- 4) prakāmya - irresistible will, by which one can go through solid earth or cannot be immersed in waters.
- 5) vaśitva - control, by which one can have control over the elements (bhūta)
- 6) īśitṛtva - mastery, by which one can control the appearance, disappearance, and aggregation of the elements.
- 7) yatrakāmāvasāyitva - resolution, by which one can determine at will the elements and their nature.

4. abhiniveśaḥ Here this may have the same meaning as in the Yoga Sūtras 2:3, where the afflictions are enumerated:

'avidyāsmittārāgadveṣābhiniveśāḥ kleśāḥ.'

'The afflictions are ignorance, egoism, attachment, aversion, and love of life (abhiniveśa.)

5. aṣṭasu prakṛtiṣu 'amid eight categories of Nature.' (see Bhagavad Gītā 7:4)

6. Brahmā - the Creator

Prajāpati - the 'lord of creatures.'

Gandharvas - a class of heavenly beings, known as physicians and celestial singers

Yakṣas - attendants of Kubera, the god of riches. In Kalidāsa's Meghadūta, a certain Yakṣa is punished by Kubera by a year's separation from his beloved:

kaścit kāntāvirahaguruṇā svādhikārāt pramattaḥ
śāpenāstaṃgamitamahimā varṣabhogyena bhartuḥ
yakṣaścakre janakatanayā snānapuṇyodakeṣu
snigdhačchāyātaruṣu vasatim rāmagiryāśrameṣu

'A certain Yakṣa, who had neglected his duty, and was deprived of his greatness by his lord's curse to be suffered for a year, which was onerous since (it meant) separation from his beloved, took up residence in the hermitages on Rāmagiri which had thick shady trees about them and where the waters were made holy by the ablutions of Janaka's daughter.' (Meghadūta:Pūrvamegha 1)

Here the Yakṣa is portrayed with affection, but sometimes they are grouped with demonic beings.

Piśācas - a class of demons.

1:5

1. This expression also appears in Yoga Sūtras 2:3 (see Note 3 for 1:4). Hacker has argued in ŚY that the works of Ś betray an earlier adherence to the Yoga system. The use of an expression such as this, however, proves little as regards authenticity.

1:6

1. sarvajīva literally 'the livelihood of all.'
2. haṁsa literally 'goose,' but used commonly as a symbol for the soul.
3. sarveṣām ajīvānām asmin 'in this there is the livelihood of all.'
'asmin' appears to have been the reading taken by the commentator in this verse. LV, however, has 'tasmin' 'in that.'
4. This derivation is partly gleaned from one of the series of grammatical aphorisms called the 'Uṇādi sūtras':
'vṛtṛvadihanikasikaṣibhyaḥ saḥ' 3:62
'The affix 'sa' comes after the roots vṛ 'to select' tṛ 'to cross' vad 'to speak' han 'to kill(or to go)' kas 'to shine' and kaṣ 'to injure.''

1:7

1. annamayādyānandamayānte dehe 'in (this) body (ranging) from (the sheath) of food to (the sheath) of bliss.' This reference presupposes a knowledge of the teaching on the five sheaths (kośa) covering the Self, consisting respectively of food (anna) vital breath (prāṇa), mind (manas), knowledge (vijñāna) and bliss (ānanda). This doctrine is alluded to frequently in Vivekacūḍāmaṇi 'The Crest-jewel of Discrimination' attributed to Śaṅkara:

kośairannamayādyaiḥ pañcābhirātmā na saṁvṛto bhāti

nijaśaktisamutpannaiḥ saivālapaṭalairivāmbu vāpistham (149)

Covered by the five sheaths, that of food, etc., which arise from its inborn power, the Self ceases to appear, like the water in a tank covered by an accumulation of sedge.

2. līnā brahmaṇīti jīvanam brahmaikatvaparā layaśrutir anupapannā 'līnā brahmaṇi' (as) a śruti teaching merger (laya) primarily concerned with the oneness of Brahman with the individual souls is inconsistent.' The objector tries to emphasize the inherent duality in the statement 'līnā brahmaṇi.' Therefore it is here rendered 'devoted to Brahman' as opposed to 'merged in Brahman.'

1:9

1. īśanīśau 'the powerful and the powerless.' This is a dvandva samāsa (copulative compound) consisting of īśa and anīśa, which, when together, would normally form īśanīśau by the Pāṇini aphorism 6:1:101 'akaḥ savarṇe dīrghaḥ.' 'When a i u ṛ or ḷ is followed by a vowel of the same family, a corresponding long vowel acts in place of both.'

2. We would expect the form 'brahma,' according to the Pāṇinian system of grammar:

brahman + am (the accusative singular ending)

brahman + luk (by svamor napuṁsakāt 7:1:23 'There is luk (elision) in place of su and am following a neuter.')

brahma + lopa + luk (by nalopaḥ prātipadikāntasya 8:2:7 'There is lopa (elision) in place of the 'n' at the end of a noun in its uninflected state.')

brahma (final form)

The commentator explains this unusual form by comparing it with a verse from the Taittirīya Āraṇyaka, where we also read 'brahman' where we would expect 'brahma,' though in the Āraṇyaka it is probably the nominative case rather than the accusative.

1:10

1. tattvabhāvād bhūyaśca 'by entering into reality more and more' tattva 'reality' could be interpreted as referring more specifically to a tattva or 'true principle' of the Sāṃkhya philosophy, perhaps the highest principle, namely the puruṣa or Supreme Being.
 2. avidyāder haraṇāt 'because (He) removes ignorance etc.' The word for removing here is 'haraṇa.' The play on words with Hara is typical of how Sanskrit commentators will suggest etymologies.
 3. prārabdhakarmānte 'when the results of works which have already begun to fructify have come to an end.' 'Karma' is here in the sense of the results of previous works ready to fructify. These are usually said to be of three types in Vedānta:
 1. saṃcita 'accumulated,' the results of works from former births which have not yet begun to bear fruit.
 2. prārabdha 'commenced,' the results of works which have begun to bear fruit, and which form the present life.
 3. kriyamāṇa 'about to be played out,' the result of works which are being accumulated in this life, and will be played out in a future birth.
- Ś in BSBh does not use the term 'prārabdha.'

1:11

1. kṣīṇaiḥ kleśair 'when afflictions have been dispelled.' See Page 61 Note 2 for the kleśas as they are listed in the Yoga Sūtras.
2. kramamukti 'liberations in stages.' krama literally means a 'step.'

3. G.P. kevalātmakāmāptakāmalakṣaṇam

B.I. and A.A. kevalātmāptakāmalakṣaṇam (missing in MS.T)

kevala in this verse is translated 'absolute.' It has the sense of there being nothing else present, in a state of wholeness. 'In solitude' or 'alone' can give the wrong impression of the meaning of this word.

4. sāmpūrṇaḥ 'fulfilled' The meaning of this word is not dissimilar to, that of kevala (see Note 3).

5. vijñāna This word could be interpreted as 'knowledge in experience.' Hence 'in practice' is added, taking the prefix 'vi' as emphatic.

6. śamādisādhana 'the means (for knowledge) such as peacefulness etc.' This is obviously an old formulation, since it is mentioned in Śaṅkara's commentary on the Brahma Sūtras. In the commentary on 1.1.1 one of the prerequisites for the deliberation on Brahman is 'śamadamādisādhanasāmpat' 'the attainment of the means (for knowledge) such as peacefulness, restraint etc.'

Most probably the expression śamadamādi refers to a passage in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, which according to the Kāṇva recension reads: 'tasmād evaṁ v icchanto dānta uparatas titīkṣuḥ samāhito bhūtvātmānyevātmānam paśyati'

'Therefore, one who knows this having become peaceful, restrained, indifferent, patient and collected, sees the Self in himself.'

The Madhyandina recension, instead of 'samāhito bhūtvā,' reads:

'śraddhānvito bhūtvā' 'having become endowed with faith.'

The Vedāntasāra of Sadānanda, probably written in the 15th century, takes both of these readings to form a list of six 'sādhana,' 'means' for the attainment of knowledge, they being śama, dama, uparati, titīkṣā, samādhāna and śraddhā.

1:12 1. kāvaṣeya a patronymic of Tura, a preceptor and priest.

1:16 1. sarvavyāpinam The accusatives here are probably agreeing with 'enam' in the previous verse.

2. G.P. MS.T A.A. and B.I. eṣa hyeva sādhu karma kārayati

L.V. eṣa hyevainaṁ sādhu karma kārayati

'For this (Self) indeed gives rise to these good works.'

3. annamayādi Another reference to the 'koṣa' 'sheafs' (see Note 2 for 1:7)

4. G.P. na eṣu jihmam 'in those there is no crookedness.'

B.I. MS.T A.A. L.V. na yeṣu jihmam '(those) in whom there is no crookedness.'

5. See 'Authenticity' pages 30-31 for a discussion of the clues to the authorship of the work given by this colophon.

Chapter 2

2:1 1. The first five verses of this chapter are taken directly from Taittirīya Saṁhitā 4:1:1 1-5.

2. itarānapi prāṇān 'and the other vital organs.' With 'prāṇa' here perhaps the commentator has in mind the group of five organs referred to in Chāndogya Upaniṣad 2:7:1, namely prāṇa, vāc, cakṣus, śrotra and manas.

3. prthivyā adhyasmin śarīre 'adhi' would normally here be understood as taking the ablative, having the meaning 'from.' The commentator, by glossing the expression with a locative, indicates that interprets the force of 'adhi' here as 'into.'

2:3

1. dvitīyabahuvacanam 'bahuvacanam' is the term for plural. In the grammatical system of Sanskrit, there are seven vibhakti, or inflections, of the noun. Here the second (dvitīya) is referred to, often equivalent to accusative in Western grammar. 'yataḥ' agrees with 'devān' the object of 'yuktvāya.'

2:5

1. brahma 'prayer' or 'Brahman' Although brahma is often translated as 'prayer' in the Veda, our commentator seems to have Brahman itself in mind as an interpretation.

2. karaṇānugrahaḥ 'the sense organ and the (corresponding) god'.

In Vedānta each of the organs is said to be presided over by a particular deity, or ruler (niyantr):

- | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1) eye - sun | 8) foot - Viṣṇu |
| 2) ear - the quarters of the world | 9) anus - Mitra |
| 3) nose - the two Aśvins | 10) parts of generation - Prajāpati |
| 4) tongue - Pracetas | 11) manas - the moon |
| 5) skin - wind | 12) buddhi - Brahman |
| 6) voice - fire | 13) ahaṁkāra - Śiva |
| 7) hand - Indra | 14) citta - Viṣṇu as Acyuta |

3. vām iti bahuvacanārthe 'vām' has the sense of plural. This interpretation would not be allowed by Pāṇini. First he states:

yuṣmadasmadoḥ saṣṭhīcaturthīdvitīyāsthayor vānnāvau 8:1:20

'There is vām and nau for yuṣmad and asmad in the presence of the sixth, fourth or second case endings when they follow a pada (word), though not at the beginning of a hemistich.'

Pāṇini then restricts the use of 'vām' to the dual:

bahuvacanasya vānasau 8:1:21

'There is vas and nas for yuṣmad and asmad coming under the conditions mentioned above, in the plural.'

The following two rules complete the restriction of 'vām' to the dual.

4. bhavāni Although this reading occurs in all three editions, it is taken as meaning 'bhavanāni' 'dwellings.'

2.6 1. Soma is the juice produced in rituals, which was offered in libations to the gods, or was drunk by Brahmins, having an exhilarating effect. recakādi 'exhaling etc.' This refers to prāṇāyāma 'control of the vital force.' There are three aspects of this, namely recaka, pūraka and kumbhaka, respectively exhaling, inhaling and retaining the breath. In the commentary to verse 2:9 this process is explained in detail.

2. vākyārtha 'the meaning of the sentences' i.e. the mahāvākyas (see 4:17 note 1.)

2.8 1. manaścakṣurādīni manasā saṁniveśya 'restraining with mind (manas) the manas, eye etc.' It is evident that the second 'manas' is used here to indicate the aspects of 'mind', the broad term in English which may apply to various parts of the 'antaḥkaraṇa' 'inner organ.'

Mayeda in T.T. has noted that in Ś. the two terms manas and buddhi seem interchangeable at times, and that on occasions manas seems to be used as a term covering the whole range. The commentator here includes manas among the indriyāṇi 'senses.' Mayeda states that sometimes Ś. appears to likewise include manas, sometimes not, depending upon the scriptural tradition he is following. The use of 'manasā' here, however, is obviously primarily a result of it appearing in the Upaniṣad: however, it is unglossed.

2. kākāksivat 'like the eye of a crow.' The Sanskrit idiom here involves the analogy of the crow, which, it was thought, had only one eye-ball, which could shift from socket to socket as the occasion required. In commentaries, the expression comes to mean 'in such a way as to belong to both the preceding and the subsequent (M.W.)

Ś. never uses this term in BsBh.

Thus, 'with 'Om' as a raft' can be either understood in the context of restraining the sense organs or crossing the streams of transmigration.

3. trih pañcakṛtvah literally 'three of five times,' this being the Sanskrit idiom. The most apt translation seems 'a number of times.'

4. savanacatuṣṭayam literally 'the four Soma-pressing periods of the day' (usually considered as three) 'Savana' thus comes to mean simply 'a period of the day.'

5. madhyāhne 'The middle of the day', i.e. 'noon.'

6. pūrvārātre 'the time from dusk to midnight' (M.W.)

7. pakṣāt literally 'after a half of a lunar month.'

8. lambodaram 'having a large or protuberant belly, pot-bellied' (M.W.)

The word is used as a name for Gaṇeśa, whose pot-belly symbolises prosperity, and who causes obstacles and removes them, and is invoked at the beginning of undertakings.

9. śaśabhr̥dbījam 'the seed syllable of the moon.' bīja here no doubt refers to the syllable which forms the essential part of a mantra. The reference to mantras here is cryptic, no doubt intentionally for secrecy. śaśabhr̥dbīj would refer to Śiva, His syllable being the m of Om, 'suffused with moonlight' perhaps referring to the candrabindu (moon and dot), indicating the mantra 'mam.' What is meant by 'the fourth letter of the seventh rank' is also uncertain.

- ॐ
- | | | | | | |
|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1. | ka | ca | ṭa | ta | pa |
| 2. | kha | cha | ṭha | tha | pha |
| 3. | ga | ja | ḍa | da | ba |
| 4. | gha | jha | ḍha | dha | bha |
| 5. | ṇa | ṅa | ṇa | na | ma |
| 6. | ha | śa | ṣa | sa | |
| 7. | | ya | ra | la | va |

If we take the above layout of the alphabet, the fourth letter of the seventh rank, the antaḥsthāḥ or semi-vowels, is va, ha not coming into the count because it is a sibilant. Dotted no doubt means 'with anusvāra', indicating the mantra 'vam.'

10. īḍayā īḍā and pingalā are two types of tubular vessels which are the principal channels of the vital spirit.

11. vargapañcakapañcamam 'the fifth letter of the fifth rank' i.e. ma (see above).

12. ṣoḍaśairmātrair 'to the count of sixteen' Since the precise measurement of time is not known, 'mātra' probably being akin to the English 'moment', 'to the count of', seems the best translation.

2:10

visargalopah 'elision of the visarga' The word cakṣus, according to Pāṇini's grammar, first has its final 's' replaced by a nasalised ru, as ordained by:

sasajuṣo ruḥ 8:2:66

'Instead of 's' final in a word, and of the word sajus there is ru.'

Then there operates:

upadeśe 'janunāsika it

'In a upadeśa (an 'original pronouncement', one of the elements of grammar), a nasal vowel is called 'it.'

The element called 'it' is elided, and there comes into operation the aphorism:

'kharavasānayoṃ visarjanīyaḥ' 8:3:15

In place of 'r' final in a word, there is visarga, when one of the letters known as 'khar' (of which 'p' is one) follows, or when there is a pause.

Here, however, in cakṣupīḍane, there is no visarga following the 'u', of 'cakṣus' nor an upadhmanīya, which would optionally replace the visarga according to Pāṇini. Our commentator says that this elision of visarga is a Vedic phenomenon.

2:13

1. dvandva is a particular type of compound, of which Pāṇini says:

'cārthe dvandvaḥ' (2:2:29)

'When several words come together in the relation of 'and' the compound so formed is called 'dvandva.'

Thus, this type of compound may be used for lists.

2.G.P. and A.A. pr̥thivyā gandhavatyā gandho yogino bhavati tathādhbyo

B.I. and MS.T pr̥thivyā gandhaḥ tathā' dbho rasaḥ

B.I. has the more concise version; its omission of 'y' in adbho is no doubt a misprint.

2:14

1. bimbam In the Upaniṣad 'bimba' could mean a mirror. However, the commentator here describes the bimba as 'made of gold or silver', so it is likely he is thinking of a metal disc of some kind.

2. pāthe literally 'in the recitation,' since the Upaniṣad would have been more commonly recited than written.

2:16 1. The four cardinal points are:

- 1) prācī - east
- 2) dakṣiṇā - south
- 3) pratīcī - west
- 4) udīcī - north

The four intermediate points (padis) are also referred to here.

2. hiranyagarbhātmanā 'as a golden egg'. The 'golden egg' was found in the waters at the beginning of creation, and from it came Brahmā the creator.

3. pratyak 'opposite' There is no good reason why 'pratyak' should not mean 'opposite' here, referring to God present in every creature facing one. Gambhirānanda translates the word as 'in' here, a meaning possible but less common.

2:17

1. yo devo agnau yo apsu The L.V. edition does not follow the usual rules of sandhi in this verse.

Chapter 3

3:1

1. tadvāmstadashyāsti 'the suffix van has the sense of containing or possessing.' see Pāṇini 5:2:94 'tadasyāstyasminniti matup . The affix matup (vatup) comes after a word in first case in construction in the sense of 'Whose it is or 'in whom it is.'

3:2

1. paramārtha 'the supreme goal' or 'the paramount object, the highest reality.'

3:3

1. sam bāhubhyām dhamatī The root 'dham' or 'dhmā' primarily means 'to blow', and is given in the Dhātupāṭha, 'the recitation of roots' as: 'dhmā śabdāgnisamyogayoḥ' 'dhmā is found in the senses of making a sound and in joining together with fire.'

Perhaps the author of our commentary had this Dhātupāṭha reference in mind. The image is of a blacksmith forging together two pieces of metal with fire, aided by a blast of air; in the same way Rudra forges together heaven and earth. The blacksmith analogy is particularly appropriate for Rudra 'the Howler' the god of tempests, who is associated with Agni, 'the god of fire, which, as a destroying agent, rages and crackles like the roaring storm.' (MW p. 883).

2. sūtra 'Hiraṇyagarbha' or literally 'thread,' that which runs through the universe connecting all.

3. mantradṛk 'the seer of verses,' referring to the ṛṣi who, according to tradition, was divinely inspired to set down or speak the verses of the Upaniṣad.

3:5

1. saccidānanda 'being, consciousness and bliss.' Here, as compared with the compound 'citsadānanda' used at the beginning of the introductory passage (see page 1 notes 6 and 7) 'cit' and 'sat' have been transposed. However, the form here is the more common expression of later Vedānta.

3:8

1. prakāśa 'light' The Supreme Being is often spoken of as prakāśa, incorporating the concepts of consciousness knowledge and awareness. Compare 3:12 jyotiḥ pariśuddho vijñānaprakāśa jyotiḥ, the totally pure light of knowledge.'

3:10

1. idam is often used in the sense of 'this corporeal world.'

3:11

1. Hume gives another reading 'maghavan' 'bountiful', and compares the verse with Rg Veda 10.81.3 and 10.90.1.
2. bhagavān The verse following from the Viṣṇu Purāṇa gives an etymology of this word. The verse explains bhāga. The affix matup (changed to vat) is added in the sense of 'who possesses that', or 'which contains it' according to the Pāṇini sūtra:
tadasyāstyasminniti matup (5.2.94)

3:12

1. sattvasyāntaḥkaraṇasya 'sattvasya of the internal organ.' This is an interesting interpretation of sattva. In other texts sattva refers to buddhi.
2. svarūpavasthālakṣaṇam 'which consists of abiding in one's own nature.' Compare Yogasūtras 1:3 'tadā drastuḥ svarūpe`vasthānam
'Then the seer abides in his own nature.'

3:20

It is interesting to compare the commentary here with Śaṅkara's commentary on an almost identical verse in the Kaṭha Upaniṣad (2:20)
The commentaries are distinctive, with some identical phrasing.
Both commentaries have:

1. anoh sūkṣmāt 'anoh than the subtle',
2. anīyān anutarah 'anīyān subtler,' Śaṅkara bringing in the analogy of the śyāmāka grain.

3. mahato mahattvaparimāṇān (S mahatparimāṇān) mahīyān mahattarah
'mahīyān greater mahataḥ than what is great in measure,' Ś. bringing in
the comment 'such as the earth etc.' in Kaṣh.

While our present commentary says nothing more on the matter, Ś. then
brings out the full import of these statements.

Chapter 4

4:1 1. varṇān anekān

'many colours' 'Varṇa' however, could also refer to caste or social
division.

2. nihitārthaḥ gṛhītāprayojanaḥ 'nihilārthaḥ' meaning 'with no purpose
in mind' compare BS IIi33 'lokavat tu līlākaivalyam' 'But (creation for
Brahman is) a mere pastime like what is seen in the world.'

3. devato dyotanasvabhāvo devaḥ 'He whose nature is light.' This
accords with Pāṇini's indication given for div, the dhātu from which
deva is said to come, and which includes 'dyuti' 'brightness.'

4:5

1. aja may mean 'unborn' or 'he-goat' ajā meaning 'she-goat.' This
leads to varied interpretations of this verse.

4:6

1. dvā suparṇā sayujā sakhāyā These are Vedic forms of the dual.

4:7

1. The gourd is a large fleshy fruit. When the fruit is emptied,
leaving the rind, it is used as a bottle.

2. śamādisampannaḥ 'endowed with peacefulness etc.' Compare Upadeśa
Sāhasrī 1:2 'śamdamaḍādayādiyuktāya śāstraprasiddhaśiṣyaguṇasampannāya'
(to a pupil' who is endowed with peacefulness, control, compassion
etc., as well as with other qualities of a disciple well versed in the
scriptures.'

4:8

1. ime samāsate 'abide in it.' This could also be translated as 'are here assembled.'

4:9

1. chandāmsi rgyajuḥsāmātharvāṅgirasākhyā... chandāmsi... The Vedas called Ṛg, Yajus, Sāma and Atharvāṅgirasa...

It is interesting to compare how Nārāyaṇa interprets these terms:

chandāmsi the Gāyatrī etc. yajñāḥ cooked sacrifices without soma, kratavaḥ sacrifices with Soma vratāni continence etc.

2. jyotiṣṭomādayaḥ The Jyotiṣṭoma ceremony is the name of a Soma ceremony.

3. vratāni cāndrāyaṇādīni vratāni vows such as the Cāndrāyaṇa etc. Cāndrāyaṇa literally means '(one who watches) the course (āyana) of the moon (candra)'. Manu explains (xi 217):

'If one diminishes (one's food daily by) one mouthful during the dark (half of the month) and increases (it in the same manner) during the bright half, and bathes (daily) at the time of the three libations (morning, noon and evening), that is called a lunar penance (cāndrāyaṇa).' (Trans. Georg Bühler).

4. svaśaktivaśāt 'through its own power' It is through śakti 'power' that the Brahman is able to create in the system of Advaita Vedānta. Compare BSBh 1:4:9 'pārameśvarīyāśca śakteḥ samastajagad vidhāyinyā vākyaopakrame 'vagamāt' 'Thus it is the power of the Supreme Lord which creates this universe that we come across here in the very beginning of the text.' Characteristically, Ś does not use the term māyā himself, whereas the ŚvBh commentator does in this passage.

5. G.P. kāryakāraṇasaṃghātaiḥ 'by mixtures of the bodies and organs

A.A. and B.I. kāryakāraṇasaṃghātaiḥ .

Again we must read 'kāya' for 'kārya,' (compare Page 48 Note 1 and Note on 3:18), anticipating the personification of Mahēśvara in the next verse. Our translation must take into account the commentator's gloss on 6:8 the verse reading, 'na tasya kāryam karanam ca vidyate...' where he states:

'na tasya kāryam śarīraṃ karanam cakṣurādi vidyate.'

'He has no kāryam body (or) karanam eye etc.'

4:10

1. māyām tu prakṛtiṃ viddhi Some readings have the potential 'vidyāt' 'one should know' here.

4:11

1. susuptyādaḥ Referring to the states enumerated in the Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad (see Page 103 Note 2).

2. abhimukhatayā I have preferred to translate 'being present'. Swāmi Gambhirānanda translates 'with a gracious disposition,' but Monier-Williams gives 'abhimukhatā' as meaning only 'presence, proximity.' 'abhimukha' can mean 'disposed in a friendly way,' but the commentator it seems has been repeatedly playing down the poetic personification of the supreme Self that the Upaniṣad portrays. In the commentary to the previous verse (4:11) for example, varadam, which Swāmi Gambhirānanda translates 'the Benevolent' our commentator glosses as simply 'mokṣapradam' 'giving liberation.' Similarly, when glossing goptā in 4:15 the commentary reads 'tattatkarmānugūṇatayā rakṣitā' 'a protector in accordance with the fruits of the various works performed,' a definition which again removes any connotations in 'protector' of a personal godhead.

3. sūtrātmānam 'the self which is the thread (of creation).' I cannot find this term in BSBh. It may well be that this is a term of later Vedānta. It appears in Vedāntasāra, probably a work of the fifteenth century A.D. This term seems to provide further evidence that ŚvBh is not the work of Ś.

4:13

1. bhūrādayo lokāḥ 'the worlds, i.e. earth etc.' This refers to the names of the seven worlds (viz. bhūr, bhuvar, svar, mahat, janar, tapar, satya, the first three of which are called the great vyāhṛtis.

2. The classical Sanskrit form is iṣṭe 'he is ruler over,' but this appears as īṣe in the Veda.

3. Here translated 'to what.'

4. B.I. and A.A. jagaccakre 'in the wheel of the world.' The reading of B.I. and A.A. seems to make the best sense in the context.

4:14

1. sāadhanacatuṣṭaya 'The four means,' referring to the means spoken of by Śaṅkara in his commentary on the first aphorism in the Brahma Sūtras:

- 1) nityānityavastuviveka Discrimination between the eternal and the non-eternal.
- 2) ihāmutrārthaphalabhogavirāga Dispassion for the experience of the fruits of objects achieved in this world and the next.
- 3) śamadamādisādhanasāmpat A perfection of such achievements as peacefulness and restraint etc.
- 4) mumukṣutvam A desire for liberation.

- 4:15 1. kalpa Of this term Monier Williams says 'a fabulous period of time (a day of Brahmā or one thousand Yugas, a period of 4,320,000,000 years of mortals, measuring the duration of the world... fifty years of Brahmā's are supposed to have elapsed, and we are now in the Śvetavārāhakalpa of the fifty-first.)'
- 4.16 1. śivam This could be translated 'kindly.' By knowing Him as kindly...'
- 4.17 1. ādivākya A reference to the mahāvākyas or 'great sentences' namely:
- i) aham brahmāsmi 'I am Brahman.'
 - ii) tat tvam asi 'Thou art that.'
 - iii) ayam ātmā brahma 'This Self is Brahman.'
 - iv) prajñānam brahma 'Brahman is knowledge.'
- 4.18 1. vikalpaśunya 'empty of false notions.' The commentator plays on words here, first refuting the Buddhist doctrine that the Self is per se 'śunya' 'empty,' then in the next phrase asserting that the Self is indeed 'śunya' 'empty' of the false notions of ignorance! The word play is witty, but hardly smacks of the sophistication of the author of the commentary on the Brahma Sūtras.
- 4.20 1. sādhana-catustaya see Note 1 on 4:14

4:21

1. prathamapurusa literally 'first person,' for this is how the designation of a neutral party, he, she, it, they two, or they (many) is regarded in Sanskrit grammar:

Traditional Sanskrit Grammar	Western View
prathama puruṣa (lit. '1st person')	3rd person 'he, she, it, they'
madhyama puruṣa (lit. 'middle person')	2nd person 'you'
uttama puruṣa (lit. 'best person')	1st person 'I, we'

4:22 1. toke 'sons' The Sanskrit actually expresses the singular.

Chapter 5

5:2

1. ṛṣim prasūtam kapilam 'the golden seer who was engendered...' This could refer to Kapila, the founder of the Sāṃkhya philosophy, but in the similar verse 4:12 the reference is clearly to hiraṇyagarbha 'the golden egg.'

2. kṛte yuge 'in the golden age.' There are said to be four 'yuga' or ages in the Sanskrit tradition, each successive age being shorter, and marking a physical and moral deterioration:

kṛta yuga	1,728,000 years
treta yuga	1,296,000 "
dvāpara yuga	864,000 "
kali yuga	432,000 "

The kali is that in which we live, and began at midnight between 17th and 18th of February 3102 B.C.

3. kumāraka i.e. Sanatkumāra - one of the mind-born sons of Brahmā who is said to have instructed Nārada in the knowledge of Brahman. The word often applies to any great ascetic.

4. Vasiṣṭha - one of the most celebrated sages, and owner of Nandinī, the cow of plenty, which grants all desires, making Vasiṣṭha the master of every vasu, or desirable object, as his name implies.

5. Vyāsa - often called Veda-Vyāsa, the arranger of the Vedas.

6. Kapila - the founder of the Sāṃkhya system a genuine reference this time it seems. (See note 1 of this verse).

7. Saṃkaraḥ - Saṃkara is a name for Śiva, whose eleven inferior manifestations are called Rudras.

8. No such verse occurs in the known versions of the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad. The meaning of the text is also unclear.

5:5

1. liṅgavyatyayah 'change of gender.' We would expect the masculine form 'yah' here, but instead have the neuter form 'yat.'

5:6

1. tatpadārtha The first six verses in this chapter speak of the Brahman (tat) and now the Upaniṣad deals with 'tvam' presumably referring to the 'jīva' or 'individual soul,' as in 'tat tvam asi' 'You (the individual soul) are That (the Brahman).'

This is the message that Śvetaketu is given by his father Uddālaka in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad 6:8:7

5:7

1. kāryakāraṇapacitatvāt 'for he is made up of causes and effects.' Gambhirānanda prefers to read kāya 'body' for kārya 'effect', translating the expression as 'because of the assemblage of body and organs.' Either solution is feasible, though it is perhaps better to remain faithful to the text when possible. Gambhirānanda is probably influenced by the gloss of kāryaṃ karaṇam ca in 6:8.

2. sattvādayaḥ This refers to the three guṇa 'qualities' namely sattva (goodness) rajas (activity) and tamas (inertia). It must be said, however, that any English equivalents of these terms are pitifully inadequate.

3. devayānādayaḥ This refers to the devayāna 'the path of the gods,' the 'pitṛyāna,' 'the path of the fathers,' and the 'manuṣyayāna' 'the path of men.'

5:8

1. ravitulyarūpaḥ 'in appearance like the sun.' rūpa may mean either form or colour, so 'appearance' seems a good translation.

2. saṁkalpa 'will' This word may mean either 'imagination' or 'resolution.' Both shades of meaning seem relevant here, so 'will' would be an appropriate translation.

3. ātmaguṇena 'with the qualities of the body.' ātma could equally mean 'mind' or 'individual self' here.

4. hṛdayasuśīrāpekṣayā 'in relation to the cavity in the heart.'

Compare Kaṭha Upaniṣad 6:17

'anguṣṭhamātraḥ puruṣo' ntarātmā sadā janānām hṛdaye saṁniviṣṭaḥ.

'The Supreme Being, the size of a thumb, the inner self, ever seated in the hearts of men.'

5:10

1. rakṣyate 'is held' Limaye reads 'yujyate' here, having a similar meaning.

5:11

1. see 5:8 Note 2.

5:12

1. ātma seems best translated as 'mind' here. (see 5:8 Note 3)

Chapter 6

6:1 1. kāla See 1:2

6:3

1. nilopo draṣṭavyaḥ 'it should be noted that the suffix nic is omitted.' 'Nic' is the causative suffix, as according to Pāṇini's aphorism 'hetumati ca' 3.1.26 'The affix nic is employed after a root, when the operation of a causer is to be expressed.'

In 'sametya' the suffix 'nic' is not present, though our commentator considers it is implicit in the meaning, namely 'having caused to come together.' Hence the commentary says there is 'lopa' (literally, according to Pāṇini, a 'non-seeing') for 'nic.'

2. prthivyādi We have been told in the previous verse what this stands for, namely prthvyāpatejo'nilakhāni 'earth, water, fire, air and ether.'

3. ekena dvābhyām tribhīr aṣṭabhīr vā 'with one, two, three or eight (principles.)' This is one of the passages which is said to give the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad affinities with the teaching of Sāṃkhya. One is said to represent the Person (puruṣa), two, puruṣa and Nature (prakṛti), and three, the three qualities (guṇa). The Vedāntic commentary here, while not denying the connection, does not involve itself in expanding the significance of one, two and three.

ॐ
Vijñānabhaḡavat explains these terms as referring to the numbers of means to the knowledge of the unity of the Lord (Īśvara). 'By two' he glosses as 'by devotion to the teacher and the Lord,' 'by three' as 'by hearing, reflecting and meditating' (śravaṇamananaṇididyāsanaiḥ) 'by eight' as meaning by the eight steps to the attainment of nirvikalpa samādhī, restraint (yama) etc.

Nārāyaṇa interprets these figures as referring to the number of births necessary before liberation, depending on the efforts of aspirant.

6:4

1. nāśa It is significant that both Monier-Williams and Apte give 'disappearance' as a meaning of 'nāśa' before 'destruction.' In translating a Vedāntic treatise, in which works are viewed as ultimately illusory, it is surely better to translate karmāṇāṃ nāśa as 'works disappear' rather than Swāmi Gambhīrānanda's rendering of nāśa here as 'become destroyed.' Similarly, 'kṣaya', often used in this context, as with 'karmakṣaye' in this verse, in Monier-Williams is given the meanings 'loss, waste, wane, diminution,' before 'destruction.' Hence I translate 'kṣaya' here as 'wasting away.' In contexts where an alternative English expression is needed 'dissolution' or 'dissipation' seem appropriate.

2. The capital letter signifies that 'me' here refers to Kṛṣṇa.

3. prastūyante 'are sung.' The vocabulary used by the commentator often becomes clear if we remember that the Vedic tradition was predominantly oral. There is no need to resort to the less central meaning of the dhātu 'prastu' translating the word as 'are commenced,' as Swāmi Gambhīrānanda does.

1. upāsyāyam aham asmīti samādhānam kṛtvā... 'upāsyā, after meditating (with the sentence) 'I am this one...' Swāmi Gambhirānanda, simply translating 'upāsyā' as 'after meditating,' has not made it clear that the commentator is actually glossing 'upāsyā' with this phrase. There are no grounds here for ignoring this fact on the basis of producing a readable translation of the commentary.

2. In verses 5 and 6 we have to supply 'yāti tattvato'nyaḥ 'one becomes different from the principles of Nature' from verse 4. It is valid to include this in the translation of the commentary, since the commentator himself mentions the need for this phrase to be supplied at the end of his comments on verse 6. However, he is rather unspecific about where it should be supplied, simply saying 'sarvatra sambadhyate' 'is to be supplied everywhere.'

1. Here the commentary is 'ātmastham ātmani buddhau sthitam.'

I have translated this as 'ātmastham residing in oneself, in the intellect.' Swāmi Gambhirānanda has not translated 'ātmani,' no doubt considering that the commentator includes it simply to show that grammatically, ātman here should be construed as locative. It may be contended that the commentator's primary purpose is to emphasise that the Lord resides in oneself. buddhau 'in the intellect' is added as further explanation, since Vedāntic doctrine holds that the self is reflected in the intellect.

1. vidāma Hume translates 'let us know.' Swamī Gambhirānanda, whose translation of the Upaniṣad is in accordance with the commentary's interpretation, translates 'we know', probably on the basis of the commentary's introduction to the verse in which it is said that the verse gives 'vidvadanubhava' 'the experience of the wise,' who would know the Lord directly. However, the normal form of the present tense would be 'vidmaḥ.' The expected imperative form would be 'vedāma.' The derivation in stages according to Pāṇini would be in the following manner (the numbers referring to the reference for the aphorism in Pāṇini's Aṣṭadhyāyī):

1. vid (the root) + lot (imperative) (3.3.162)
2. vid + śap + lot (3.1.68)
3. vid + luk + lot (2.4.72)
4. vid + luk + mas (3.4.78)
5. vid + āṭ + mas (which is as if it had an indicator 'p')(3.4.92)
6. ved + āṭ + mas (7.3.84)
7. ved + āṭ + ma (3.4.99)
8. ved + ā + ma (1.3.3)

'vidāma' is a possible form for the Rg Veda, and perhaps it is this influence which is operating here. The other alternative is that we have a form based on the root 'vid' 'to find' in a thematic aorist injunctive 'mā vidāma' 'let us not find,' the removal of 'mā' here being taken to give the positive meaning 'let us find.'

But probably the most satisfactory explanation is to treat 'vidāma' as a Vedic form, for which 'we know' and 'let us know' are both possible translations. Since the surrounding verses in the Upaniṣad speak of the deity with such authority, 'we know' is perhaps the best rendition.

As for the possibility of the verb coming from root 'vid' 'to find,' 'vid' 'to know' is more likely for the same reason, namely that the deity is already found.

6:9

1. dhūmāsthānīyam 'comparable to smoke.' The means of valid knowledge (pramāṇa) inference (anumāna) is here referred to. The stock example of inference in the system of Nyāya is that of fire on a mountain being inferred from seeing smoke (dhūma.)

6:12

1. sattvādiguṇarahitaḥ 'devoid of the constituents of Nature sattva etc.' By 'guṇa' here is meant the three constituents of Nature (Prakṛti) enumerated in the Sāṃkhya system, namely sattva, rajas and tamas, which, although untranslatable, can be crudely rendered as goodness, activity and inertia.

6:13

1. sāṃkhyayogādhigamyam 'who is discovered through Sāṃkhya and Yoga.' These two expressions, Sāṃkhya and Yoga, could either refer to the respective formal systems of the two Schools, or could be construed as being used in the general senses of 'discrimination' and 'discipline' respectively.

6:15

1. paramātmā hanti... Here haṃsa is taken as being derived from the root 'han', meaning 'kill, destroy.'

6:16

1. ātmā cāsau yoniścetyātmayoniḥ 'ātmayoniḥ' is here glossed as a dvandva, or copulative compound. Hence this sentence may be translated 'ātmayoniḥ the Self and the source.'

1. duḥkhasyādhyātmikasyādhībhautikasyā dhidaivikasyāntaḥ 'the destruction of sorrow arising in oneself and coming from nature and the gods...' The sequence of adhyātma, adhibhūta, and adhidaivata, with slight variations, can be seen a number of times in the Upaniṣads (e.g. Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad 2:3:1-6)

2. makarādibhir iva rāgādibhir itas tataḥ kṛṣyamānaḥ
pretatiryānmanuṣyādiyoṇiṣu... jīvabhāvam āpannaḥ

'being drawn hither and thither by passion etc. as though by crocodiles, receiving the form of an individual soul among spirits, animals, human beings etc.....'

This is very similar to the first part of the introduction to this commentary:

'makarādibhiriva rāgādibhir itas tataḥ samākṛṣyamānaḥ
suranaratiryagādiprabheditanānāyoṇiṣu samcaran'

Such similarities support the view that there is a unity of authorship, and that the author of the introductory section is the same as that of the main body of the work.

1. cāndrāyaṇādi 'the Cāndrāyaṇa etc' (see note on Page 135)
2. tapasśabdasya rūḍhatvāt 'for that is the conventional meaning of tapas.' rūḍha words have their meaning by convention, not directly through etymology. tapas comes from the root tap which primarily means 'be hot' and only secondarily means 'undergo self-mortification.'
3. kākākṣinyāyena 'after the manner of a crow's eye.' See note for page 104.

4. bahūdaka... These four types of bhikṣu are described in the Āśrama Upaniṣad:

- i) bahūdakas (the water-friends) are they who, equipped with the three-staff, water-pot, water-flask, side-bets, water-filter, drinking bowl, shoes... and reddish brown garments, carry on begging in well brought-up families of Brāhmaṇas, and aspire after the Ātman.
- ii) kuṭīcaras (hut-visitors) are they who, carrying on begging in the houses of their children, strive after the Ātman.
- iii) hamsas (wandering birds) are they who, carrying a single staff, without hair-locks, wearing a sacrificial thread... staying for one night only in a village, still... undertaking... difficult vows... aspire after the Ātman.
- iv) paramahamsas (highest wandering birds) are they who, without staff, bald-headed, clad in rags and loin-cloth, without any particular mark and without any particular mode of life, moving about like an insane one although not insane... begging alms among all the four castes where they happen to be, liberate their soul, - liberate their soul.

5. prakṛtiprakṛtādimalavinirmuktam 'devoid of the impurity of Nature (prakṛti), the base etc.' Swāmi Gambhirānanda translates 'prākṛta' as 'effects', and although this meaning accords with the word's etymology, its usual meaning of 'vile, base' fits well here.

6:22

1. tadviparītāyāputrāyāśiṣyāya vā 'to one who is not a son or a disciple, who is the opposite of this.'

Swāmi Gambhirānanda's translation does not follow the Sanskrit here 'to a son or a disciple who is the opposite of this.'

Swāmi Gambhirānanda seems to take his lead from the commentary's praśāntāya śiṣyāya 'to a self-controlled son' which suggests that the son must be self-controlled, and that the simple filial relationship is

not sufficient. The Sanskrit of the second statement, however, does not reiterate precisely the same statement, leaving snehādīnā out of affection etc. not making such good sense, and causing one to be more sympathetic towards Swāmi Gambhīrānanda's paraphrase.

- 6:23 1. Om tat sat These words, literally 'That is good,' traditionally come at the end of a work.
2. sahanāvavatu 'May he protect us both.' This 'śāntipāṭhaḥ' or 'peace chant' appears in G.P. but not in A.A. or B.I. It may be simply the addition of a copier or printer. °

APPENDIX 1

Manuscripts and editions.

Although it did not prove crucial to the investigation of authenticity, it was useful to work from three editions in translating, namely those of the Gītā Press (G.P.), Ānandāśrama (A.A.) and Bibliotheca Indica (B.I.). Some of the differences in readings are mentioned in the notes. The Bibliotheca Indica edition was inferior, as was the incomplete manuscript from Trivandrum (MS.T.) to which reference was made.

- Alston, A.J. Śamkara on the Absolute, Shanti Sadan, London, 1980.
- Alston, A.J. Śamkara on Rival Views, Shanti Sadan, London, 1989.
- Antarkar, W.R. Śrī Śamkarācārya's Authorship of the Gītā Bhāṣya
Oriental Thought, Vol. 6, 1962.
- Aranya, Swāmi Hariharānanda Yoga Philosophy of Patañjali
State University of New York Press, Albany 1983.
- Ballantyne, J.R. The Laghukaumudī, Motilal Banarsidass, Dehli, 1981.
- Basu, Major B.D. Sāṃkhya Philosophy
Sacred Book of the Hindus, Vol XI, Allahabad 1915.
- Belvalkar, S.K. Shree Gopal Basu Mallik Lectures on Vedānta
Philosophy Part 1. Poona, 1929.
- Bhagavat, Hari Raghunath Minor Works of Śamkarācārya
Ashtekar & Co., Poona, 1925.
- Bhattacharya, V. Journal of the Ganganath Jha Kendriya Sanskrit
Vidyapeetha Volume 35. Allahabad, 1979.
- Bhattacharya, V. Śamkara's Commentaries on the Upaniṣads
Sir Asutosh Mookerjee Silver Jubilee Volumes Vol III, 1925.
- Buitenen, J.A.B. van A Source Book of Advaita Vedānta
University Press of Hawaii, Honolulu, 1971.

- Caturvedi, S.K. On the Authorship of the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad Bhāṣya
Journal of the Ganganath Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha, Allahabad, 1979.
- Deussen, P. The System of the Vedānta
The Open Court Publishing Society, Chicago, 1912.
- Deussen, P. Sixty Upanisads of the Veda (Parts 1 and 2)
Motilal Banarsidass, Dehli, 1980.
- Despande, R.R. Kalidāsa's Kumārasambhava (Cantos 1 to 5)
The Popular Book Store, Poona.
- D'sa, Francis X. Word Index to Śaṅkara's Gītābhāṣya
Institute of the Study of Religion, Poona, 1985.
- Dutt, M.N. Viṣṇu Purāṇam (Based on Professor H.H. Wilson's
translation), Calcutta, 1896.
- Gambhirānanda, Swāmī Brahma Sūtra Bhāṣya of Śrī Śaṅkarācārya
Advaita Āshrama, Calcutta, 1977.
- Gambhirānanda, Swāmī Chāndogya Upaniṣad with the Commentary of Śrī
Śaṅkarācārya, Advaita Āshrama, Calcutta, 1983.
- Gambhirānanda, Swāmī Eight Upaniṣads (Volumes 1 and 2) with the Commentary
of Śaṅkarācārya, Advaita Āshrama, Calcutta, 1977.
- Gambhirānanda, Swāmī Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad with the Commentary of
Śaṅkarācārya Advaita Āshrama, Calcutta, 1986.
- Gough, A.E. The Philosophy of the Upaniṣads
Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. London, 1903.

- Hacker, P. Kleine Schriften
L. Schmithausen, Wiesbaden, 1978.
- Hacker, P. Śaṅkara der Yogin
Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd-und Ostasiens (P. 119-148) 1968/1969.
- Hacker, P. Untersuchungen über Texte des Frühen Advaitavāda
1) 'Die Schüler Śaṅkaras' Wiesbaden 1951.
- Halbfass, W. Studies in Kumārila and Śaṅkara Studien Zur
Indologie und Iranistik (Monographie 9) Reinbek 1983.
- Hauschild, R. Die Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad Deutsche
Morgenländische Gesellschaft. Leipzig 1927.
- Hume, R.E. The Thirteen Principal Upaniṣads
Oxford University Press, 1931.
- Jacob, Colonel G.A. A Concordance to the Principal Upaniṣads and the
Bhagavadgītā. Motilal Banarsidass Dehli, 1985.
- Kale, M.R. The Meghadūta of Kalidāsa
Motilal Banarsidass, Dehli, 1983.
- Kalidāsa Kumārasambhavam edited by R.R. Deshpande
The Popular Book Store, Poona.
- Karmakar, R.D. Did Śaṅkarācārya Write a Bhāṣya on the Bhagavadgītā?
Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1958.
- Keith, A.B. A History of Sanskrit Literature
Oxford University Press, London, 1920.

- Limaye, V.P. Eighteen Principal Upaniṣads, Vol.1
Vaidika Samsodhana Mandala, Poona, 1958.
- Macdonell, Arthur A. A Sanskrit Grammar for Students
Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1975.
- Macdonell, Arthur A. A Vedic Grammar for Students
Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1983.
- Mādhavānanda, Swāmī The Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad with the Commentary of
Śaṅkarācārya. Advaita Āshrama, Dehli, 1965.
- Mahadevan, Dr T.M.P. Word Index to the Brahma Sūtra Bhāṣya of
Śaṅkara. Parts 1 and 2. University of Madras 1971 & 1973.
- Monier-Williams, Sir M. A Sanskrit-English Dictionary.
Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1976.
- Nikhilānanda, Swāmī Vedāntasāra of Sadānanda
Advaita Āshrama, Calcutta, 7th impression, 1978.
- Pathak, Shridhar Shastri
(editor) Kenopaniṣad.
Poona, 1919.
- Potter, K.H. Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies
Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1981.
- Roodbergen, J.A.F. Mallinātha's Ghaṇṭāpatha on the Kirātārjunīya
I-IV.
E.J. Brill, Leiden, 1984.
- Sadānanda Vedāntasāra
Advaita Āshrama, Calcutta, 1978.

- Śaṁkarācārya Bhagavadgītā with Śaṁkara's Commentary.
Motilal Banarsidass, Dehli, 1981.
- Śaṁkarācārya Brahmasūtrabhāṣya
Bibliotheca Indica, Calcutta, 1863.
- Śaṁkarācārya The Māṇḍūkyaopaniṣad with Gauḍapāda's Kārikā and
Śaṁkara's Commentary. Śrī Rāmakriṣṇa Āshrama, Mysore, 1974.
- Śaṁkarācārya Śvetāśvataropaniṣad (with Śaṁkara's Commentary
and the Commentaries of Śaṁkarānanda, Nārāyaṇa and Vijñānabhagavat)
Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Press, 1982.
- Śaṁkarācārya Śvetāśvataropaniṣad (with Śaṁkara's Commentary)
Gītā Press, Gorakhpur.
- Śaṁkarācārya Ten Principal Upaniṣads with Śaṁkarabhāṣya
Motilal Banarsidass, Dehli, 1978.
- Śaṁkarācārya Upadeśa Sāhasrī (translated by Swāmī Jagadānanda).
Śrī Rāmakriṣṇa Math, Madras, 1979.
- Śarma, Pdt Śrīram Liṅga Purāṇa Volume 2.
Sanskriti Samsthan Bareilly.
- Sastri, A.M. The Bhagavad Gītā with the Commentary of Śrī
Śaṁkarācārya. Samata Books, Madras, 1979.
- Sehgal, Dr. S.R. Kalidāsa's Kumārasambhavam
Navyug Publications, New Dehli, 1966.
- Sharma, K.B.N. Śaṁkara's Authorship of the Gītā Bhāṣya
Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1933.

- Shastri, J.L. Dhātupāṭhāḥ
Motilal Banarsidass, Dehli, 1984.
- Shastri, J.L. The Liṅga Purāṇa (Part 1) Ancient Indian
Tradition and Mythology, Volume 5. Motilal Banarsidass, Dehli, 1973.
- Stutley, M. & J. A Dictionary of Hinduism
Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1977.
- Tarkaratna, Rāmamaya The Nṛsiṃha Tāpanī of the Atharva Veda
Bibliotheca Indica, 1871.
- Trautmann, T.R. Kauṭilya and the Arthaśāstra
E.J. Brill, Leiden, 1971.
- Upaniṣads (see Limaye)
- Vasu, S.C. The Aṣṭadhyāyī of Pāṇini (Volumes 1 & 2)
Motilal Banarsidass, Dehli, 1980.
- Vasu, S.C. The Siddhānta Kaumudī of Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita
Motilal Banarsidass, Allahabad, 1906.
- Vetter, T. Zur Bedeutung des Illusionismus bei Śaṅkara
Weiner Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd und Ostasiens 12-13, 1968.
- Wezler, A. Philological Observations on the so-called
Pātañjalayogasūtrabhāṣyavivarāṇa. Indo-Iranian Journal 25, 1983.
- Wezler, A. Kleine Schriften
Franz Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden, 1974.
- Witney, W.D. The Roots, Verb-forms and Primary Derivatives of the
Sanskrit Language. American Oriental Series Volume 30. New Haven, 1945.

ABBREVIATIONS

AA....	Ānandāśrama edition of the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad with the commentary attributed to Śaṁkara, and the commentaries of Śaṁkarānanda, Nārāyaṇa and Vijñānabhagavat.
BG....	The Bhagavad Gītā
BGBh....	Bhagavad Gītā Bhāṣya, Śaṁkara's commentary on the Bhagavad Gītā.
BI....	Bibliothèque Indica edition of the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad with the commentary attributed to Śaṁkara.
BṛBh....	Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad Bhāṣya, Śaṁkara's Commentary on the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad.
BṛU....	Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad.
BSBh....	Brahma Sūtra Bhāṣya, Śaṁkara's Commentary on the Brahma Sūtras.
ChBh....	Chāndogya Upaniṣad Bhāṣya, Śaṁkara's Commentary on the Chāndogya Upaniṣad.
GP....	Gītā Press Gorakhpur edition of the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad with the commentary attributed to Śaṁkara in Sanskrit.
KaBh....	Kaṭha Upaniṣad Bhāṣya, Śaṁkara's Commentary on the Kaṭha Upaniṣad.
KaU....	Kaṭha Upaniṣad.

APPENDIX 3

- KeVBh.... Kena Upaniṣad Vākya Bhāṣya, the 'sentence' commentary on the Kena Upaniṣad attributed to Śaṅkara.
- LV.... Limaye, V.P. Eighteen Principal Upaniṣads, Vol. 1, Vaidika Saṁśodhana Maṇḍala, Poona, 1958.
- MāBh.... Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad Bhāṣya, Śaṅkara's Commentary on the Māṇḍūkya Upaniṣad.
- Mayeda US.... The Authenticity of the Upadeśasāhasrī ascribed to Śaṅkara by S. Mayeda, Journal of the American Oriental Society vol. 85 (1965) No 2, P.178.
- MS.T.... Manuscript 7420, Śvetāśvataropaniṣad of Śrīsaṅkarabhagavat (introductory passage and first three adhyāyas) supplied by the Oriental Research Institute and Manuscripts Library University of Kerala, Trivandrum.
- MuBh.... Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad Bhāṣya, Śaṅkara's Commentary on the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad.
- Ś.... Śaṅkara, Ādiśaṅkara, 'the first Śaṅkara.'
- ŚC.... 'Śaṅkara's Commentaries on the Upaniṣads' by Pandit Vidhusekhara Bhattacharya, Sir Asutosh Mookerjee Silver Jubilee Volumes vol. III (1925) pp. 101 ff.
- ŚŚ.... Śaṅkarācārya and Śaṅkarabhagavatpāda, by P. Hacker, 'Kleine Schriften', published by L. Schmithausen, Wiesbaden, 1978.

APPENDIX 3

- SV.... The System of Vedānta by P. Deussen (see Bibliography).
- SvBh.... Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad Bhāṣya, the Commentary on the
Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad attributed to Śaṅkara.
- SvU.... Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad.
- SY.... Śaṅkara der Yogin, by P. Hacker, Wiener Zeitschrift für die
Kunde Süd-und ostasiens 1968/1969. P. 119-148.
- TaiBh.... Taittirīya Upaniṣad Bhāṣya, Śaṅkara's Commentary on the
Taittirīya Upaniṣad.
- US.... Upadeśasāhasrī, 'A Thousand Teachings,' attributed to
Śaṅkara.
- USG.... Upadeśasāhasrī, 'A Thousand Teachings' Gadyabandha
(Prose Portion).

APPENDIX 4

Additional note on evidence relating to the authenticity of the commentary on the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad attributed to Śaṅkara, considering the usage of the terms avidyā, īśvara and ānanda.

a) avidyā

The expression 'svāśrayayā svaviṣayāvidyayā' in ŚvBh (GP Page 14) has been said to be uncharacteristic of Ś. (see pages 56, 74 and 262). At the time Ś. was writing, and for a long period afterwards, there was a debate as to what the āśraya (support) and viṣaya (object) of avidyā are. The argument is important, because the Kevalādvaita teaching, which is that there is one indivisible reality, has to explain our experience of diversity. This is done through the doctrine of avidyā, ignorance, which, it is said, gives rise to this illusory appearance. Avidyā cannot be admitted to be real, or this would disprove the teaching on ultimate unity. On the other hand, avidyā cannot be unreal, or it would have no role. Hence the need was felt by many Vedāntins to develop a theory of where avidyā is situated (its āśraya, support) and what the object (viṣaya) of avidyā is, in order to justify it intellectually. Ś.'s contemporary, Maṇḍana Miśra said:

'yat tu kasyāvidyeti jīvanām iti brūmah'

'If you ask 'To whom does avidyā belong?' we say 'To the individual souls.'

1 Brahmasiddhi, edited by Professor Kuppuswami Sastri, Madras, 1937, page 10.

This avidyā, Maṇḍana says, obscures the true nature of Brahman, and so has Brahman as its object (viṣaya.) Maṇḍana's view later became associated with Vācaspati's school.

Sureśvara, Ś's disciple, however, maintains that Brahman is both the āśraya and viṣaya of avidyā:

'kiṃ viṣayaṃ punas tad ātmano' jñānam ātma viṣayaṃ iti brūmaḥ'¹

'If you again ask 'What is the object of the ignorance of the Self?' we say the Self is its object.'

When Ś. faces this question, he deals with it in quite a different way, by saying that the ignorance belongs to the questioner²:

'kasya punar ayam aprabodha iti cet yas tvam pṛcchasi tasya ta iti vadāmaḥ nanvahaṃ Īśvara evoktaḥ śrutyā yadyevaṃ pratibuddho' si nāsti kasyacid aprabodhaḥ' (BSBh 4:1:3)

If you ask 'To whom does this ignorance belong?' we say 'You who ask, it is yours.' Then if you reply 'But the scriptures say that I am the Lord,' we say 'If that is so, you are enlightened (so as to realize) that ignorance belongs to no-one.'

1 Naiṣkarmyasiddhi, edited by Colonel G.A. Jacob, Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series No.38, page 106.

2 See D.H.H. Ingalls 'Śaṅkara on the question: Whose is avidyā?' Philosophy East and West, Volume 3, 1953, pp.69-72.

Ś. does not involve himself in trying to answer these theoretical questions, and this distinguishes him from other Advaitins. In Upadeśasāhasrī, which has been argued as genuine by Mayeda (see Mayeda US) avidyāviṣaya is not explained explicitly, the question being ignored in favour of the teaching on the Self:

'kā sā avidyā kiṁ viṣayā vā vidyā ca kā yayā svabhāvaṁ
pratipadyeyeti

gururuvāca tvaṁ paramātmānaṁ santam asaṁsāriṇaṁ
saṁsāryahamasmīti viparītaṁ pratipadyase'

'What is ignorance? What is its seat? (What is its object?) and what is knowledge by means of which I may come by my own nature?'

The teacher said 'You are the non-transmigratory Supreme Self, but you wrongly think you are one liable to transmigration.'¹

Avidyāviṣaya in Ś. means normally 'the realm of ignorance', not the 'object of ignorance.'

1 US translated by Swāmi Jagadānanda, Śrī Rāmakriṣṇa Math, P.35

Hence the expression in ŚvBh 'svāśrayayā svaviṣayāvidyayā' which could be rendered 'through ignorance, which has the (individual) Self as both its support and object' does seem to presuppose this argument, and gives a view without further ado, as if, perhaps, the subject has been well discussed before and does not merit elaboration. For this reason it is contended by Hacker that this expression 'can hardly have been written by Śaṅkara-Bhagavat ... The theories implied by this phrase have been developed by the Bhagavat's contemporaries and successors, not by him.' (ŚŚ. Page 54)

This piece of evidence against Ś.'s authorship of ŚvBh is made stronger in that exactly the same expression is used in the Sanatsujātīyabhāṣya which is almost certainly spurious since it quotes BSBh and Sureśvara. It is unlikely Ś. would quote his own disciple.

b) Īśvara

It has been pointed out (see page 37) that Hacker maintained that Īśvara, (param) brahman and paramātmā are interchangeable in Ś. Again, as with avidyā, there is a tendency for Ś. not to attempt to classify terms. Later Advaitins categorized the terms Īśvara and brahman as the Self associated with māyā and not associated with māyā respectively. Perhaps the reason that Ś. did not designate Īśvara in these terms is that it would have given credibility to something other than Brahman itself, a charge to

which later Advaitins perhaps lay themselves open. Sadānanda, writing in probably the fifteenth century states:

etadupahitam caitanyam sarvajñatvasarveśvaratvasarvaniyantrtvādi-
guṇakam avyaktam antaryāmī jagatkāraṇam Īśvara iti ca vyapadiśyate
(Vedāntasāra 38) 'Consciousness associated with this (aggregate of
ignorance) is endowed with such qualities as omniscience, universal
lordship, all-controlling power, etc., and is designated as the
undifferentiated, the inner guide, the cause of the world and
Īśvara...'

Dasgupta in 'A History of Indian Philosophy'¹ cites other examples:

'According to the Siddhānta-leśa, it is said in the
Prakaṭārthavivarāṇa that, when this pure consciousness is reflected
through the beginningless, indescribable māyā, it is called Īśvara
or God ... Sarvajñātma Muni thinks that, when the pure
consciousness is reflected through avidyā, it is called Īśvara ...'

Vidyāraṇya in Pañcadaśī² defines Īśvara:

'māyābimbo vaśīkṛtya tām syāt sarvajña Īśvaraḥ'

'The reflection of Brahman in māyā is known as Īśvara who has
māyā under his control and is omniscient.' (1:16)

Hacker in 'Eigentümlichkeiten der Lehre und Terminologie Ś.'s by
contrast states:

1 Volume II Cambridge 1932, page 72

2 Edited by M.S. Rau Srirangam 1912

'Ś. in der Verwendung des 'persönlichen' und des 'unpersönlichen' Gottesbegriffs keinen Unterschied macht; der Īśvara an sich und der Īśvara als Seele ist dasselbe wie das Höchste Brahman'.¹

'Ś. makes no distinction between the use of the concepts of a 'personal' and 'impersonal' God: the Lord as himself and the Lord as a person are the same as the highest Brahman.'

Ś. will not admit any suggestion of a creator who exists in reality:

'lokaśṛṣṭiśca parameśvarādhiṣṭhitenāpareṇa kenacid Īśvareṇa kriyata iti śrutismṛtyor upalabhyate ...

yatra tu ātmaivedam agra āsīd ityevam ādau puruṣavidha ityevamādi viśeṣaṇāntaram śrūyate bhavet tatra viśeṣavad ātmano grahaṇam ...

(BSBh 3:3:16)

Opponent: And from the śruti and smṛti it is gathered that creation of the worlds is the act of some other Lord (Īśvara) under the direction of the Supreme Lord (parameśvara) ...

Śaṅkara: But the Self with limitations must be the meaning in such texts as that beginning with 'In the beginning this universe was but the Self (virāt)' where occur such other qualifying terms as 'of a human form.'

¹ Kleine Schriften, L. Schmithausen, Wiesbaden, 1978, page 279.

The gods spoken of in the scriptures have no power of their own, Ś. emphasizes:

'aiśvaryam api parameśvarāyattam na svābhāvikam bhīṣāsmād vātaḥ pavate ... iti mantravarṇāt.' (BSBh 1:2:17)

The majesty (of the gods) too is dependent on the Supreme Lord and is not intrinsic, for the mantra says 'Out of His fear the wind blows...'

The association of Īśvara with māyā in ŚvBh has already been noted as a reason for doubting that Ś. is the author of the text (see Pages 60-62). In fact, of the forty times that Īśvara is used in ŚvBh, only on three occasions could Īśvara be said to refer to a nirguṇa brahman (in the commentaries on 1:10 twice and once in the commentary on 4:20) but even these are in arguably devotional contexts, 1:10 referring to Hara. On sixteen occasions Īśvara seems to be used to mean saguṇabrahman.

In the following quotation from ŚvBh, Īśvara is clearly distinguished from parabrahman:

'prakṛtyaiva prapañcabhrāntām avasthām prāptasya parabrahmaṇa Īśvarātmanā sarvajñatvāpahatapāpmādirūpeṇa devātmanā brahmādirūpeṇa kāryādirūpeṇa' (GP Page 106)

...'the Supreme Brahman (parabrahman) - which, through Nature (prakṛti) itself, has taken the illusory appearance of the creation, as the Lord (Īśvara) who is omniscient and free from sin etc., as a deity of the nature of Brahmā etc., as effects etc...'
(see Page 136).

Īśvara is elsewhere described as having a limiting adjunct (upādhi) of sattva:

'na viśuddhasattvopādher Īśvarasyaviśuddhopādhijīvagatāḥ
sukhaduḥkhamohajñānādayaḥ (GP Page 141).

'Happiness, misery, delusion and ignorance, which exist in the individual soul with its impure limiting adjuncts, do not pertain to the Lord (Īśvara), which has pure being (sattva) as its adjunct.'

The unchanging Brahman is said to exist in the condition (avasthāna) of the Lord (Īśvara):

'brahmaṇa evāvikṛtasya jīveśvarātmanāvasthānāt' (GP Page 144)

'For the unchanging Brahman itself (appears in the different conditions of the individual soul (jīva) and the Lord (Īśvara)).'

The state of being the Lord (Īśvara) is described as the third condition before the realization of the non-dual Brahman:

'tṛtīyaṁ virāḍrūpāpekṣayāvyākṛtaparamavyomakāraṇeśvarāvasthaṁ
viśvaiśvāryalakṣaṇaṁ phalaṁ bhavati sa tad anubhūya tatraiva
nirviśeṣaṁ ātmānaṁ jñātvā...' (GP Page 153)

'The result is the third (state) counting from the state of
Sovereign (virāj), the Lord as the cause of the unmanifest supreme
space, marked by universal lordship. He, after experiencing that,
and there having known the unqualified Self...' (Page 164)

This usage of Īśvara is much more reminiscent of the later
Advaitins than of Ś.

c) ānanda

In 'The System of the Vedānta', Deussen makes an important
observation:

'But what are the positive characteristics of this esoteric Brahman
which presupposes the negation of all differences? The later
Vedānta names three of them, which form the famous name of Brahman:
sac-cid-ānanda, that is 'Existence, Intelligence and Bliss:' this
compound, which, as far as I know, occurs first in the
Nṛsimhatāpanīya-upaniṣad is nowhere found in Ś.'s commentary², and
appears to be as yet unknown to our author.'

I have never found any usage of sac-cid-ānanda in those works
normally deemed to be by Ś. The occurrence in ŚvBh of saccidānanda
twice and citsadānanda five times has already been mentioned as a

1 Page 212, Translation by Charles Johnston

2 i.e. BSBh

persuasive piece of evidence that the text is not authentic (see Page 63).

Hacker in 'Eigentümlichkeiten der Lehre und Terminologie Ś.'¹ states:

'die in Vedānta traditionell gelehrtē Ānandanatur des Brahman wird von Ś. nicht bestritten aber auffälligerweise nur an solchen Stellen besprochen, wo ein zu erklärender Grundtext sie erwähnt.'

'The nature of Brahman as bliss which is traditionally taught in Vedānta is not opposed by Ś., but it is noteworthy that it is only spoken of when a text being explained mentions it.'

The reason for this reticence is perhaps disclosed in Ś's commentary on 'vijñānam ānandaṁ brahma' (BrU 3:9:28)

'tadā mukta ānandātmakam ātmānam vedayata ityetaḍ anarthakam vākyam atha brahmānandam anyah san mukto vedayate pratyagātmānam cāham asmyānandasvarūpa iti tadaikatvavirodhaḥ'

'Then to say that the liberated man knows the blissful Self does not make sense. If he, being separate from Brahman, knows the bliss of Brahman and the individual self as 'I am of the nature of bliss' then the oneness of Brahman is contradicted.'

Hence Ś. does not emphasize ānanda, it seems, in case it is interpreted as an object of cognition, which creates a second entity apart from Brahmam. He adds:

'tasmāt vijñānam ānandam iti svarūpānvākhyānaparaiva śrutir
nātmānandasamvedyārthā'

'Hence the text 'knowledge, bliss' etc., must be interpreted as setting forth the nature of Brahman, and not signifying that the bliss of the Self is cognised.' Ś. ends the commentary on this passage with:

'tasmād eṣo'sya parama ānanda itivat sarvāṇy ānandavākyaṇi
draṣṭavyāṇi'

'Hence all passages containing the word 'bliss' should be interpreted like the sentence 'This is the supreme bliss' (BrU 4:3:32)

In glossing 'This is the supreme bliss' Ś. says 'in comparison with the other joys that are produced by the contact of the organs with their objects, since it is eternal.' So Ś. underplays ānanda it seems, so that it was not taken as, for example, his contemporary Maṇḍana Miśra interpreted it:

'tad evaṁ duḥkhanivṛtter anyat sukhaṁ sa cānandaśabdasya
mukhyo'rthaḥ śabdapramāṇake ca yathāśabdaṁ pratipattir yuktā'

'The primary meaning of the word 'bliss' is pleasure, as something other than the cessation of frustration. Something for which the

1 Brahmasiddhi, edited by Kuppuswami Sastri, Madras 1937, page 3.

Vedic word is the only authority should be understood in accordance with the word.

Maṇḍana refutes the possibility of there being duality when bliss is experienced in Brahman:

'tasmāt samvedyam ātmaprakāśatvāt'

'Therefore it is experienceable as being self-luminous.'

Maṇḍana's stance is very different from Ś's and perhaps it was views of this kind that Ś. was opposing, even if he did not know Maṇḍana himself.

When the ŚvBh repeatedly uses ānanda without the term appearing in the text commented upon, and further describes Brahman as 'full of bliss' eighteen times, we must suspect an author other than Ś. (see Page 62).

The possible date of the text

Finally, there is one piece of circumstantial evidence hitherto unmentioned by any scholar as far as I know, which is that Nṛsiṃhāśrama, whom Potter¹ dates as living in the middle of the sixteenth century, has written a commentary on ŚvBh which was catalogued in Oudh. Hence ŚvBh must predate Nṛsiṃhāśrama. Probably the best evidence for the lower limit of dates we can estimate is provided by the fact that the text Tattva Samāsa is quoted.

¹ Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies Volume I, Delhi, 1970 Page 258.

However, it is always possible that both Tattva Samāsa and ŚvBh are copying from an earlier text, so the date of Tattva Samāsa is not a definite guide. Winternitz¹ dates the Tattva Samāsa as being before the sixteenth century, and Potter² as it being written at about 1300 to 1400 A.D. With all these estimates in mind, one could hazard a guess that ŚvBh was written in either the sixteenth, fifteenth or fourteenth centuries, or possibly earlier.

1 History of Indian Literature Volume III Part 2 , Dehli 1967 Page 514

2 Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophy Volume IV edited by G.J. Larson and Ram Śaṅkara Bhattacharya Dehli 1987 Page 16.