

Sureśvara's Vārtika on *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 1.3 [Ⅲ]

Shoun Hino

*yathā-śāstraṁ yathā-yogaṁ varṇa-doṣa-vivarjitam /*  
*varṇoccāraṇa-sāmarthyam mamaivāstu tad īdṛśam //*

‘May I have the capacity of pronouncing different letters, thus: It should be in accordance with the science (of rituals), in accordance with (the science of language<sup>1</sup>), i.e. in language free from faults in respect of letters.’

[141]

<sup>1</sup>This refers to the science of etymology.

*kalyāṇa-vadanotthaṁ yat kṛtsnaṁ devebhya eva tat /*  
*phalaṁ vadana-mātraṁ tu vāca eva na daivikam //*

\* This is the last installment of BUBV 1.3, though more than hundred verses are still left unprinted. This is because this portion of BUBV will be published in a book form under the title of *Sureśvara's Vārtika on Udgītha Brāhmaṇa* (Delhi : Motilal Banarsidass). This book is to be accompanied by Introduction, Select Glossary and others as in the case of foreseen three volumes, and also to include BUBV 3.1, 5.15 and 6.1 in addition, which are related to the topic of Udgītha Upāsanā of BUBV 1.3.

Whatever reward arises from the utterance of (the) auspicious is all of it for the sake of gods, but (that which arises) only from the pronunciation is for Speech — it is not (intended) for the deity. [142]

*tamasy utsāryamāṇe tu vācodgātrā surad-viṣām /*  
*svādhikārāc cyāvyamānās te vidur deva-hṛd-gatam //*

[*te viduḥ* (BU 1.3.2) is explained.]

And when the darkness (in the form) of the haters of the gods<sup>1</sup> was (thus) being dispelled by Speech, the Udgātṛ, they, being thrown away from their own position (of superiority)<sup>2</sup>, understood the thought in the mind (lit. heart) of the gods. [143]

<sup>1</sup>*suradviṣām tamaḥ*, is explained fully in the next verse.

<sup>2</sup>The gods became strong by the purity of speech etc.(= *śāstravīhitakṛman*) and, therefore, the natural tendency of the sacrificer for securing worldly pleasure became weaker and weaker. This was the beginning of the defeat of the demons, who were described in verse 22 above as *jyāyāmsaḥ* .

*anena vācodgātrā no balaṁ dhvāntaṁ tu devatāḥ /*  
*jyotiṣā svena nirjitya yāsyanty agnyādi-rūpatām //*

(Thus did they understand:) 'These gods will have won by their own lustre<sup>1</sup> our strength<sup>2</sup>, this darkness, through, (the help of) this Speech, the Udgātṛ, and will attain the forms<sup>3</sup> of the deities Agni and so on.' [144]

<sup>1</sup>This symbolises their knowledge of the rituals etc. from Śāstric works.

<sup>2</sup>Or alternatively, 'army', by way of pun.

<sup>3</sup>That is to say: Their true nature as deities. Or, excellence; cf. *svaṁ vapuḥ* (mentioned in verse 146 below).

*mahan no bhayam āyātam iti bubudhire 'surāḥ /  
karmaṇy anucite teṣāṁ prahīṇa-manasāṁ tadā /  
vadanādāv abhiṣvaṅga ātma-sambhāvanād abhūt //*

The demons knew that a (matter of) great fear had come to them. Then they, of minds given to bad inclinations, came to have addiction to the improper deed, speaking etc.<sup>1</sup>, out of their pride for themselves. [145]

<sup>1</sup>This means 'speaking bad words, and so on'. This is in opposition to Vāc's *kalyāṇavadana* mentioned in verse 140 above.

*yat kalyāṇam iti cchidrād viduḥ sura-cikīrṣitam /  
anena vai na udgātrā vācā 'styeṣyanti svaṁ vapuḥ //*

(Indeed) they<sup>1</sup> understood from the loop-hole<sup>2</sup>, expressed in their<sup>3</sup> words, 'whatever is auspicious ... '(BU 1.3.2)<sup>4</sup> what the gods wished to do. (Thus:) 'Indeed they<sup>5</sup> will attain through Speech, the Udgātr, their own form, despite us<sup>6</sup>.' [146]

<sup>1</sup>It means 'the demons'.

<sup>2</sup>The word *chidra* is 'short coming' according to Röer and it is 'some spot through which you understand' — cf. NKL: *chidrāt kalyāṇavadanāsaṅgarūpād ity arthaḥ*

<sup>3</sup>That is, of the gods.

<sup>4</sup>*yat kalyāṇām... vadati tad ātmane.*

<sup>5</sup>That is, the gods.

<sup>6</sup>We construe thus: *eṣyanti svam vapuḥ naḥ ati* where *ati* is a *karmapravacanīya* which governs the accusative form *naḥ*

*iti jñātvā hy abhidrutya svair āsaṅga-śarormibhiḥ /*  
*vividhus tān athodgātṛṃs te viddhās tat yajuḥ kriyāḥ //*

[*tam abhidrutya...*(BU 1.3.2) is explained.]

Indeed, having known thus, they attacked (the gods) by means of the surging waves of their arrows (made up of) attachment (to worldly pleasures),

first pierced them (the gods) and then the Udgātṛs<sup>1</sup>. (Subsequently) they<sup>2</sup>, (thus) pierced, gave up their ritual activity. [147]

The intention of this verse is to emphasise the conflict between the natural tendencies of a human being and the knowledge acquired from Śruti — and not what really happened. Therefore, reference to the giving up of ritual activity of the Udgītha refers merely to the activity of the sense-organs. This means Prāṇa 'vital force' remains, in reality, unaffected, i.e. it alone can resist and overcome the natural tendencies.

<sup>1</sup>They are the priests chanting the Udgītha.

<sup>2</sup>It refers to the gods.

*nānād anyasya sāmārthyam vidyate 'sura-nāśane //*  
*anenāpratirūpeṇa vacasā kārya-śāyinā /*  
*pāpmādi-doṣa-saṃparkaḥ kāraṇa-stho 'snumīyate //*

(Indeed) none else than Prāṇa<sup>1</sup> has the capacity for destroying the demons. [148]

The association with faults, viz. sin etc., that abides in the cause<sup>2</sup>, is inferred by the matchless Prāṇa from this speech which is noticed as extending into (lit. lying in) the effect. [149]

This reference to the activities of the sense-organs is only indicative of the basic ignorance, sin etc. on the part of an individual who does non-scriptural activities.

<sup>1</sup>*ana* = Prāṇa.

<sup>2</sup>This stands for the different sense-organs which performed various activities that are their *kārya*.

*vyutthāyākhyāyikārūpāc chrutiḥ svavapuṣādhunā /*  
*ācaṣṭe kāraṇe vṛttaṁ kārya-geṇāsurātmanā //*

[*sa ya pāpmā ... sa eva sa pāpmā* (BU 1.3.2) is explained.]

Having risen above (i.e. given up) this form of the narrative, the Śruti itself<sup>1</sup> now informs about the behaviour in the cause, (viz. the sense-organs), (inferring it) from the effect which is the demoniac nature. [150]

<sup>1</sup>That is, in the form its own statements.

*dṛṣṭenāpratirūpeṇa kārya-geṇānumīyate /*  
*kāraṇe pāpmavedho 'bhūd yo vāci prāk prajāpateḥ //*

The affliction (lit. piercing) caused by sin which earlier (or formerly)

occurred in the case of the cause, viz. the speech of Prajāpati, is inferred from what is seen as a singular (characteristic) in the effect.<sup>1</sup> [151]

<sup>1</sup>This is to state the result of usual inference. In fact, the Brahman (or Prāṇa), which is the cause, is never affected by any fault. Cf. CU 8.12.1: *na vai saśarīrasyas sataḥ priyāpriyayor apahatir asti; apāpavidham .... (Īsopaniṣad 8) ; na ha vai devām .... (BU 1.5.20) (SP).*

*sa yo vācy asuraiḥ kṣiptaḥ pāpmā kārye sa dṛśyate /  
pramā-virodhi yad vākyaṁ tat tat kārya-samāśrayam //*

That sin which the demons had put into Speech is seen in the effect. Whatever statement is opposed to the right knowledge (about the true nature of the Āman ) is all related to the effect (viz. ignorance).<sup>1</sup> [152]

<sup>1</sup>The second line of this verse explains: *sa yaḥ sa pāpmā....(BU 1.3.2).* This means, ill or false speaking is noticeable in the descendents of Prajāpati.

*sa eva sa iti hy uktiḥ kārya-kāraṇa-samsthayoh /  
prajāsu sākṣād yaḥ pāpmā yaś ca tat kāraṇāśrayaḥ //*

For statement in the Śruti *sa eva saḥ* is related to the two states of the cause and the effect. And (it is to be stated that) whatever sin is actually seen in offsprings and that which has a basis in its cause (are the same).

[153]

*ghrāṇaṁ cakṣus tathā śrotraṁ manas caivam anukramāt /  
vavrur devā yathā vāṇīm viddhāḥ sarve tathā 'suraiḥ //*

[Verses 154-163 convey the purpose of BU 1.3.3-6.]

All the gods (then) chose the sense of smell<sup>1</sup>, the sense of sight, the sense of hearing and *manas*, one after another, as they (first) chose Speech; as they were pierced by the demons, (they chose these others) in the order (mentioned in the verse). [154]

<sup>1</sup>The NKL edition reads *prāṇam* in place of *ghrāṇam* ! NKL also cites *prāṇam iti* as the *pratīka* of the Mantra, but does not comment on the same!! Possibly this is a reference to the principle among five breaths.

*karmendriyāṇāṃ sarveṣāṃ vāg evātropalakṣaṇam /*  
*cakṣuḥ-śrotre dhīndriyāṇāṃ mano buddhes tathaiva ca //*

In this<sup>1</sup>, only Speech is indicative of all the organs of activity. Eyes and ears (are indicative) of the sense-organs and likewise *manas* (is indicative) of the intellect<sup>2</sup>. [155]

<sup>1</sup> Context of the narrative of the gods and the demons; the sin which affects divine nature of the deities superintending over the sense-organs.

<sup>2</sup>SP implies from *buddhi* the intention of *citta* and *ahaṃkāra* also, but NKL does not. It is difficult to say if *citta* is meant by Śaṅkara.

*kṛtsnam jagad anādāya naikasyāpi śyate kriyā /*  
*prāṇasya kimu vaktavyaṃ kṛtsnādhyātmendriya-grahaḥ //*

They do not accept even in the case of a single (organ) any activity without

having (lit. taking up or making use of) all of (this) world.<sup>1</sup> What then can be said about Prāṇa? There is (on the part of it) the use of the entire (group of) the organs abiding in the body. [156]

<sup>1</sup>SP refers to *iyam pṛthivī sarvesām bhūtātām madhu* in BU 2.5.1 and adds *iti śrutau sarvasya sarvatra kāraṇatāyā vakṣyamāṇatvāt*.

*yady apīdam jagat kṛtsnam gṛhyate saṁhatahvataḥ /*  
*tathāpi codito 'trārtha upāsyo nāgato 'srthataḥ //*

Even if this entire world is taken up (for use) owing to its being one collected (mass)<sup>1</sup>, yet here (i.e. in this context) only that object which is put forth in the Śruti<sup>2</sup> is (alone) to be worshipped and not the one which is understood by implication<sup>3</sup>. [157]

<sup>1</sup>This has a basis in a possible doubt originating in the need of the entire world for any activity (as said in the preceding verse).

<sup>2</sup>This refers to *vāgādi* as the objects of worship.

<sup>3</sup>Both SP and NKL point to the rule of interpretation: *yaś cārthād artho na sa codayitavyaḥ* .

*kalyāṇetara-rūpeṇa pariśiṣṭeṣv apīkṣyate /*  
*vibhāga āsuro vedhas tena teṣv anumīyate //*

In (the case of) the remaining (i.e. other, organs<sup>1</sup> also) is accepted (i.e.inferred) the demoniac part (or aspect)<sup>2</sup> obtaining in the form of what is other than auspicious; therefore, the piercing (by demoniac inclination) of them also is inferred. [158]



<sup>1</sup>That is, *tvac* etc. which are not mentioned in the Śruti.

<sup>2</sup>This has a reference to *daiva* and *āśura* categories among all objects of creation as in the case of Prajāpati's offsprings.

*atas tad artham āheyam evam v iti punaḥ śrutiḥ /*  
*yathā vāgādayo viddhās tadvaj jñeyās tvagādayaḥ //*

Therefore, in order to convey that (happening), the Śruti once again stated (the words) *evam u ...* (BU 1.3.6). (That is to say:) as Speech and others were pierced, in the same way, the sense of touch and others (also) are to be understood (as pierced). [159]

*siddhān vāgādi-dṛṣṭāntān puras kṛtrāta ucyate /*  
*evam v ity ukta-śeṣāṇām pāpma-viddhatva-siddhaye //*

Therefore, having brought forth the well-proven examples of Speech and others, the Śruti states *evam u ...* (the piercing by sin) (in the case) of the remaining (organs also), in order that their being affected by that sin is proved. [160]

*avidhyann iti yo 'rtho 'sya tad-vyākhyānāya yatyate /*  
*svaiḥ svais tān indriyāsaṅgaiḥ pāpmabhis ta upāsṛjan //*

And now we make an effort to explain that, which is expressed by the verb *avidhyān* . (This is to say:) They (viz. the demons) attacked them (viz. the gods)<sup>1</sup> by their own attachments to the organs, their sins. [161]

<sup>1</sup>This refers to the gods which superintend over the sense of touch etc. Mark the masculine form *tām* .

*yat saṁsargaṁ purā cakrur avidhyaṁs tad ihocyate /*  
*yā viddhā devatās tāsāṁ prakriyā-saṁhṛtiḥ prthak //*

Since they first became attached to (the pleasures of the sense-organs), (therefore) it is stated here: *avidhyan* 'They pierced'; whichever of the deities were pierced had each a different (statement about) the happening and its end.<sup>1</sup> [162]

<sup>1</sup>Namely, being attached to pleasures in the case of them, then being pierced, and later getting freed. This is stated with a view to pointing out the purposefulness of the Śruti statement *evam u khalu devatāḥ...*

*āsaṅga-pāpmabhir viddhā yasmād vāgādayo 'suraiḥ /*  
*varjanīyās tatas tāḥ syur nopāsyāḥ śreya īpsbhiḥ //*

Since Speech and others were pierced by the demons by means of the sins in the form of attachment, therefore, they are to be avoided; they are not to be worshipped by those who wish for bliss.<sup>1</sup> [163]

<sup>1</sup>It would look better if *śreya īpsubhiḥ* is read as a compound word. AnSS edition and NKL edition however read two words; *śreya* and *īpsubhiḥ*, — such (rare) use of this latter word as an unbound form is noticed in *Mahābhārata* 12.84.44: *tasmāt sarvair guṇair etair upapannāḥ supūjitāḥ/mantriṇaḥ, prakṛ-tijñāḥ syus tryavarā mahad īpsavaḥ ?*; *Nīlamata purāṇa* 493.760 (which belongs to a period between 500 AD –1000 A.D.): *umāsampūjanaṁ . kāryaṁ tasyāṁ*

*saubhāgyam īpsunā .*

*Verses 164-193 explain BU 1.3.7.*

*evam nirāsāḥ pūrvāsu devatāsv asurādanāt /  
pāriṣeṣyād athājagmur madhyamaṁ prāṇam ādarāt //*

[*atha heman* is explained.]

Thus, feeling despair in respect of the previously mentioned (superintending) deities (of organs), on account of the afflictions inflicted by the demons, (the gods) then respectfully approached the individual self(= *madhyama prāṇa*)<sup>1</sup>, as the remaining (i.e. last possible, resort). [164]

<sup>1</sup>Between the heavenly wind and the earthly wind, there is the middle one (viz. *madhyama*), called *Prāṇa*.

*athety-anantaroktiḥ syāt tathābhinaya-vṛttaye /  
imam ity aprasiddhatvāt prāṇasyeha tvagādivat //*

The word *atha* is expressive of the sense 'then'; so also does the word *imam* (serve) the purpose of conveying this (other, i.e. symbolic) activity<sup>1</sup> (of them), because the *Prāṇa* is not (primarily or easily) known (in daily life) like the sense of touch and others.<sup>2</sup> [165]

<sup>1</sup>*abhinaya* is explained in SP as *vivakṣitārthadyotako dehatadavayavavyāpāraviṣeṣaḥ* and in NKL as *saṁketavaśāt vivakṣitārthaprakāśakaḥ kāyāvayavavyāpārah*.

<sup>2</sup>SP explains *iha* as *dehe* . Our translation 'in daily life' has the force of 'in the

life of the embodied state'. The idea is: Prāṇa is not known to have one particular organ as its abode. Also, it is not *necessarily* known to be abiding in their ensemble.

*asti yasmād asur nityam āsanyo 'syam ato mataḥ /  
vāgādibhyo vibhāgārthaṁ viśeṣaṇam asor idam //*

Since Prāṇa is ever abiding (in the mouth), therefore it is known as this (viz. having the name Āsanya) and this (*āsanya*) is an adjective of the Prāṇa for making it from Speech and others. [166]

Prāṇa is the life principle and moves in the whole body.

*japamantrābhideyo 'tra pāriśeṣyāt pratīyatām /  
udgītha-devatā prāṇa ity abhūt sura-niscayaḥ //  
mantra-prayoge sarveṣāṁ saṁnidhau tat-prakāśitam /*

Finally, let it be known as the remaining possible conclusion that the decision of the gods was thus: 'Here'<sup>1</sup>, Prāṇa is the deity of the Udgītha and (it is) addressed in the Japamantra<sup>2</sup>. [167]

That<sup>3</sup> is revealed in the employment of the Mantra<sup>4</sup> in the presence of all.<sup>5</sup> [168<sup>ab</sup>]

<sup>1</sup>This is a reference to 'the ensemble of organs of sense and also other organs in the body and their activities.'

<sup>2</sup>See note 1 on verse 136 above; *abhidheya*, 'one (to be) addressed'.

<sup>3</sup>This means 'the fact about Prāṇa as the deity of Udgītha.'

<sup>4</sup>Namely, in the Japamantra *asato mā sad gamaya ...*

<sup>5</sup>It appears to us probable that Sureśvara made verse 167 a verse of three lines — the third line is read in the printed editions as the first line of verse 168. For such a construction, cf. verse 145 above. This last line of the verse 167 then justifies the first word of the verse.

*bhāram utsahate voḍum̐ yo 'no yādmas tam āśrayam //*

We shall approach him, our resort, that Prāṇa, who can bear the burden (of protecting us)<sup>1</sup>. [168<sup>cd</sup>]

<sup>1</sup>It is possible to read the second line of verse 168 as one full verse. For such a verse of one line, cf. verses 134 and 148 above.

*parīkṣamāṇās te trāṇam̐ yathoktākhyāna-vartmanā /  
krameṇāsedur āsanyaṁ prāṇam̐ pāpma-parābhavāt //*

Looking around<sup>1</sup> for protection (against defeat<sup>2</sup>) in their course (of search), as described in the course of the narrative, they found (lit. arrived at) Prāṇa that resides in the mouth, after overcoming the sin. [169]

<sup>1</sup>It is necessary to read the literal meaning of *parīkṣamāṇāḥ* .

<sup>2</sup>That is the defeat by the demoniac tendency, viz. sin etc.

*śreyorthinām̐ manuṣyāṇām̐ upāśya-pratipattaye /  
īyam̐ ākhyāyikā cakṣur nānyathopāśya-nīścitiḥ //*

This narrative is an eye for men who wish for bliss, (that is to say:) in order that they understand (the real) object of the worship; the object of

worship cannot (indeed) be decided otherwise.<sup>1</sup>

[170]

<sup>1</sup>That is, to be another, viz. other than Prāṇa.

*yaḥ prāṇe bhoga iti na pūrvavad bhanyate 'tra kim /  
vāgādīnām iva yato nāsor bhogo viśiṣyate //*

(A question is asked:) 'Why is it not stated in the Śruti here *yaḥ prāṇe bhogaḥ* ....as (it did) before?'<sup>1</sup> (Our answer is:) 'Because the enjoyment of Prāṇa cannot be distinguished (from any other) as (that) of Speech and others (from any other enjoyment).'

[171]

<sup>1</sup>The argument proceeds from the notion of *prakaraṇabhaṅga*. This is to say: The Śruti does not state here *yaḥ prāṇe bhogaḥ taṁ devebhya āgāyat* ...is missing! This is not in continuation of the tenor of the whole argument.

*akṛtsna-bhogato yuktaṁ vāgādīṣu viśeṣaṇam /  
sarvasyaivāsubhogatvāt kiṁ kuto 'tra viśiṣyate //*

'(Such) distinguishing of enjoyment in the case of Speech and others is proper since theirs is not full enjoyment. However, since all (enjoyment) is (but) the enjoyment by the Prāṇa, from what<sup>1</sup> (enjoyment) then can that be distinguished here?<sup>2</sup>

[172]

This continues the answer which began in the second line of the preceding verse.

<sup>1</sup>The word *kutaḥ* can be alternatively translated as 'for what reason'.

<sup>2</sup>SP supports this (last line) by verse 165 above: *aprasiddhatvāt ... tvagādivad*

*abhisam̐dhir avivyatsan nitya-bhūt sura-vidviṣām /*  
*aniṣṭhita-kriyārambho 'vivyatsann iti bhanyate //*

There arose in the mind of the haters of the gods a thought (lit. an intention) which was (finally) not going to pierce (them)<sup>1</sup>. The word *avivyatsan* is used (in the sense of) the beginning (or undertaking) of an activity which is not finally accomplished. [173]

<sup>1</sup>Namely, a thought which did not materialize; this is explained in the second half of the verse. The word 'them' refers to the gods.

*vivyatsod deśamātreṇa prāṇe hantā suradviṣām /*  
*ityartha-pratipattiyartham īdṛg-dṛṣṭānta ucyate //*

On account of (the) mere desire to pierce (the gods),<sup>1</sup> Prāṇa is the destroyer of the haters of the gods. (Now), in order to convey this, is given an illustration which is as follows: [174]

This explains the meaning of *saḥ* in *sa yathā ....*(BU 1.3.7).

<sup>1</sup>The words 'which was entertained by the demons' are to be supplied.

*vibhitsāyai yathā vegāl loṣṭaḥ kṣipto 'śmano 'ntikāt /*  
*naśyet svavegāc chatadhā hy ākhaṇāśma-samāgamāt //*  
*apradhṛṣyam tathā prāṇam ṛtvā neśuḥ sahasradhā /*  
*daityās tan-nāśato devā devā evābhavan sadā //*

[*yathāśmānam ṛtvā ...* (BU 1.3.7) is explained.]

As a sod of clay is forcefully thrown with the desire of breaking a stone<sup>1</sup>, even from nearness, would (itself) get destroyed, by its own force, into a hundred (pieces), at the very contact with the unbreakable<sup>2</sup> stone, [175]  
In the same way, (the demons) having attacked the invulnerable Prāṇa got destroyed into thousands (of pieces), then, on account of their destruction, the gods could ever remain gods. [176]

<sup>1</sup>NKL reads *bibhitsayā* instead of *bibhitsāyai*.

<sup>2</sup>Read NKL: *na khanitum śakyate taṅkādibhir iti akhana eva ākhaṇaḥ*.

*ata eva manīṣyatva-hetavo 'py asurāḥ samam /*  
*vineśur viśvag-gatayo loṣṭaḥ kṣipto yathāsmāni //*

For this very reason, the demons who are the cause of manhood,<sup>1</sup> fleeing into all directions, got at once destroyed, in the same way as a sod of clay (when) thrown on a stone. [177]

<sup>1</sup>This refers to any gross or subtle form of a human sacrificer, viz. any manifest form of Prajāpati.

*prāṇa-svabhāva-sāmpatteḥ prāṇavad devato api /*  
*devā evābhavan daitya-kṛtsna-pāpma-vināsataḥ //*

[*tato devāḥ abhavan* (BU 1.3.7) is explained.]

On attaining the nature of Prāṇa,<sup>1</sup> the deities also, like Prāṇa,<sup>2</sup> became gods<sup>3</sup> on account of the destruction of all sins (inflicted on them)



by the demons,

[178]

<sup>1</sup>Read NKL: *asmād vpāsanāt prāṇabhāvāt* .

<sup>2</sup>That is to say: as it retained its nature of a deity (by remaining unaffected by demoniac sins).

<sup>3</sup>Read NKL: *cakṣurādayaḥ evaṁ cādityādibhāvaṁ gatā ity arthaḥ* .

*vāgadīndriya-saṁghāto yajamāno yathā purā /*  
*prāṇātma-bhāvād dhritvāgo vairājaṁ rūpaṁ āptavān //*

[*bhavaty ātmanā* (BU 1.3.7) is explained.]

as formerly the sacrificer, who was a conglomeration of the organs, speech and others, obtained the form of (= became) Virāj after having struck down sin<sup>1</sup> by becoming possessed of the nature of the Prāṇa. [179]

This verse is a continuation of the sentence in the preceding verse.

<sup>1</sup>*āgaḥ* = *pāpaṁ* (as paraphrased in the next verse).

[*tathā purā kalpena varṇitaḥ* ....(BUB p.63) is explained.]

*tathā tas tam upāsīta yathoktākhyāna-vartmanā /*  
*virājaivātmanā hatvā pāpaṁ bhavati so 'cirāt //*

In the same way, whosoever worships that (Prāṇa) in the manner stated in the narrative that is told, soon becomes (identical with Prāṇa) after having struck down sin by having the nature (i.e. strength) of Virāj<sup>1</sup>. [180]

<sup>1</sup>Read SP: *virādātmanopāsako bhavati*.

*ñivāviṣṭa upāsyo 'tra devatāvigrahaḥ sadā /*  
*prāṇo hiraṇyagarbhātmā yāvat tad abhimāna(ni?)tā //*

In this context, what is to be worshipped is ever the body of a deity which is pervaded by Sentience, i.e. Prāṇa of the nature of Hiraṇyagarbha, so long as there remains (or exists) consciousness on its part of being that<sup>1</sup>.

[181]

<sup>1</sup>We follow the reading *abhimānitā* which the NKL edition has adopted and shown by the AnSS edition as a variant, because that makes a better sense. Also, cf. *adhimānasya bhāvaḥ yāvat* (SP).

*bhāvanopacayād dhitvā paricchedaṁ svam āsuram /*  
*devtātmānam ety āśu sadā tad bhāva-bhāvitāḥ //*

Having (first) destroyed his own demoniac limitation by increase in devotion<sup>1</sup>, (that sacrificer) soon<sup>2</sup> attains the nature of the deity, ever full of thought of becoming that<sup>3</sup>.

[182]

<sup>1</sup>*bhāvā* = *bhakti* '(awareness) of being that'. SP invites attention to *Bhagavadgītā* 8.6: *yaṁ yaṁ vāpi smaran ... taṁ tam evaiti kaunteya*. The Upaniṣad has this sense of *bhakti*: One becomes what one thinks about at the time of death; therefore, one thinks of becoming a deity at the time of death, and becomes that.

<sup>2</sup>That is, within very short time.

<sup>3</sup>Or alternatively, 'ever devoted'.

*tat tamo-mātra-vidhvamsān na tu prāṇādir āpyate /  
kāryatvāt kāraṇam muktvā na hi tat-kārya-sambhavaḥ //  
devo bhūtvēha devo asau bhāvanopacayād bhavet /  
pum-vyāpārodbhavatvaṁ naḥ śrutyāpi pratipāditam //*

(The state of) Prāṇa etc.<sup>1</sup> is not obtained by mere destruction of ignorance about (the nature of) it, because that (viz. being Prāṇa etc.) is itself an effect. Indeed leaving aside the cause, there does not follow (what is) an effect (of it).<sup>2</sup> [183]

The worshipper becomes a god (i.e. the deity) in this (mundane existence) and becomes the god (i.e. that deity) owing to the increase in devotion; (this so happens) thanks to human activity — so it is told us even by the Śruti<sup>3</sup>. [184]

SP reiterates the importance of the statement of the *Bhagavadgītā* noted under verse 182 above.

<sup>1</sup>This is the purport of 'Prāṇa etc.' which is the literal meaning.

<sup>2</sup>This verse anticipates an objection: As the knowledge of the Brahman is attained by mere destruction of the ignorance about it, so does one obtain the knowledge of (the deities) Prāṇa (and others) by mere removal of the ignorance about them and consequently there is no need of any worship ( *upāsana* ) of the same. The answer is: Attaining the nature of Prāṇa etc. is itself an effect ( *kārya* ) and therefore it needs some means, i.e. cause ( *kāraṇa* ); this *kāraṇa* is, it is implied, worship ( *upāsana* ).

<sup>3</sup>SP cites the purport of the Śruti passage: *ihaiva dehe bhāvanāprakarṣād devabhāvam anubhūya dehapātād ūrdhvam upāsyō devaḥ syāt*. Becoming Prāṇa etc. is thus pointed out as what is attainable by human effort or activity ( *puṇya-tantra* ) — this implies the short-time-lasting nature of the result which is unlike

the attainment of the nature of the Brahman which is irrespective of human effort or activity (*vastutantra*). This is expressed in the following verse.

*brahmaivāpyeti brahmaiva prāg apy āsīd yato 'dvayam /*  
*tan-moha-mātra-vidhvaṁsād ity apy śruti-sāsanam //*

And there is also instruction (i.e. declaration) in the Śruti : By mere destruction of ignorance about it, he merges into the Brahman itself, since he was, even before, only the unique Brahman. [185]

*svataḥsiddhau tad anyeṣāṁ śruti-kopaḥ prasajyate /*  
*ato 'nyad ārtam tadvac cāpy ekam eveti ca śrutiḥ //*

If (it is held that) those others (viz. the deities who are other than that Brahman) are self-established, there would arise the contingency of the opposition to (lit. anger of) the Śruti. (Indeed , there is a statement in) the Śruti: 'Everything else than this is affliction'; so also '(it is) but one'.<sup>1</sup>

[186]

<sup>1</sup>NKL cites the following Śruti passages: *ato 'nyadārtam* (BU 5.4.2); *neha nānāsti kimcana*(BU 6.4.19); *sarvaṁ khalv idam brahma* (CU 3.10.1). Cf. SP: *eko devaḥ sarvabhūteṣu gūḍhaḥ* (Śvetaśvararopaniṣad 6.11) and *eka eva tu bhūtātmā* (untraceable).

*nāvyaḥkṛtadeḥ saṁsiddhau paramātmā tirekataḥ /*  
*brahmavan mānam astīha tathā nirmokṣatāpatet //*

There is no proof here<sup>1</sup> for establishing (the existence of) the unmanifest

(Prāṇa) etc. apart from the highest Reality as there is in respect of the Brahman. (If that were) so,<sup>2</sup> there would result absence of liberation. [187]

<sup>1</sup>That is, in *pramāṇaprameya* relation which is accepted in the discussion.

<sup>2</sup>That is, if the unmanifest were self-established.

*athātmāvidyāvyaktādi-rūpeṇa prathate tadā /  
tan-nivṛttau nivṛttiḥ syān nivṛttiḥ kevalātmata //*

If (it were argued that) ignorance about (the true nature of) the Ātman reveals itself in the form of the unmanifest etc., then, in case ignorance ceases to be, there would be ceasing to be (of even the unmanifest); but cessation (of ignorance) consists indeed in the Ātman's being alone. [188]

In the preceding verse, the argument was based on the assumed reality of Prāṇa etc. Now, in this verse, the argument proceeds from the assumption that the ignorance about Prāṇa etc. consists in the ignorance about the Brahman — this latter ignorance being removed, the former ignorance also would be removed only naturally. The removal of the latter ignorance is but the absence of duality.

*prāṇasyeva parābhūto dviṣan pāpmāsuro khilah /  
upāsīnasya tam prāṇam kṛtsno naśyet tathāsurah /  
dviṣaṁś cāpy adviṣaṇ chatrur āsurād anya iṣyate //*

[*parāsyā dviṣan bhrātṛvyo bhavati* is explained.]

The entire demoniac sin, hating Prāṇa as it were, was defeated. In the same way, the entire demoniac (sin), (hating) him who is worshipping that

Prāṇa, would perish (i.e. get destroyed). (A person) who is (actually) hating and even he who is not, is considered as an enemy, (but he is) other than the demoniac sin. [189]

*nitya-vighna-kṛd evaiṣa prāṇāptāv āsuro mataḥ /  
ato viśeṣyate śrutyā dviṣan bhrātṛ-vyarūpayā //*

In respect of attaining (i.e. becoming one with) Prāṇa, this demoniac (sin) is known to be a cause of obstacles for ever. Therefore, the word '(who is) the hating' is specified (by the Śruti) in the form of the word 'rival'. [190]

This explains how the word *dviṣan* in *dviṣan bhrātṛvyaḥ* is significant.

*uktāsura-parābhūtau nānyo 'rir avaśiṣyate /  
ya evaṁ vedeti vidhiḥ phalokter arthavādataḥ //*

When there occurs the defeat of the demoniac (sin) as mentioned (in the narrative), there does not remain any other enemy. Then the words : *ya evaṁ veda* are an injunction<sup>1</sup>, since there is the statement of the result, (i.e. there is) the Arthavāda<sup>2</sup> [191]

<sup>1</sup>Regarding the worship of Prāṇa, or rather the Sūtrātman.

<sup>2</sup>The argument is: There cannot be any Arthavāda unless it is connected with some injunction already laid down. The statement of a reward becomes meaningful only if a performance has been already prescribed by some injunction.

*ānuṣaṅgi-phaloktyā vā tad upāsā mimuktaye /*

*ātma-vidyādhikāre 'smiṃs tad upāsāvidhānataḥ //*

Or by the statement of the incidental reward is prescribed the worship of that (viz. the Ātman) so that liberation is achieved; for, in this discussion on the topic of the knowledge (of the Ātman), there is prescription of the worship of that (viz. Sūtrātman). [192]

*atma-vidyāpakāritvaṃ tasmād vākyaḥ ca gamyate //*

And from that statement (in the Śruti)<sup>1</sup> is understood the usefulness (of that) for the lore of the Ātman<sup>2</sup>. [193]

<sup>1</sup>SP quotes BU 6.2.1: *ukto paṇiṣatkaḥ ito vimucya mānaḥ kva gamiṣyasi* which refers to *kramamukti*, i.e. first there occurs the *sūtrātmavāpti* and later *mokṣa-prāpti*.

<sup>2</sup>The significance of the Śruti is clarified in the next verse.

*Verses 194-197 state the purpose of BU 1.3.8-1.3.16.*

*athāyāsyaṅgirodūrbhir viśiṣṭam asukarmakam /  
upāsanaṃ vidhāsyāmīty ārabdhaiṣottarā śrutiḥ //*

This subsequent section of the Śruti has begun with the intention: 'Now let me prescribe the worship which has the Ātman as its object, is specified by (the names) Ayāsyā, Āṅgiras and Dūr).' [194]

*anuvādād vidhir jyāyān anuvāde dṛthā śramaḥ /  
puruṣārthābhisambandhād ato vidhir ihāśritaḥ //*

(One might say:) ‘An injunction is more important than its Anuvāda (re-statement); therefore, there is a futile effort in stating an Anuvāda.’ (Our answer is:) ‘Here (i.e. in the Anuvāda) is taken an injunction as its basis, because of its close connection with the purpose of human activity.’ [195]

*śrūyate phala-saṁbandho yāsūpāsāsu tāsv iha /  
dadhnendriyādivaj jñeyo vidhir guṇa-samāśrayaḥ //  
pradhāna-phala-saṁbandho yatra tu syāc chruter mukhāt /  
viśiṣṭaḥ sa vidhir jñeyo yathāgneyādayas tathā //*

[Verses 196 and 197 clarify the characteristics respectively of a Guṇavidhi and (Guṇa-)Viśiṣṭavidhi.]

In those various worships, in which is heard (in the Śruti) the connection of a reward (with the knowledge about the nature of the Ātman), an injunction related to some subordinate aspect of it is to be understood in the same way as (in the subordinate injunction) ‘by curds, (one desirous of) organs etc.’ [196]

Where, however, the connection of a reward with the principal reward is heard directly from the statement in the Śruti, that (injunction) has to be understood as a Viśiṣṭavidhi, like (the injunctions) pertaining to Āgneya (*aṣṭakapāla*) etc. [197]

This example from the ritual-procedure is introduced for explaining how Ayasya Upāsana is to be considered as a means towards the Ātman Upāsana . Curds are a means towards the principal rite, viz. that prescribed in *juhuyāt svargakāmaḥ* . The sentence *dadhnā indriya* ... refers to the pouring of curds into



fire by the use of the instrumental form *dadhnā* in *dadhnā juhōti* and it is somehow related to the principal rite by (1) prescribing the *yāga* and (2) prescribing the material for the *yāga* in addition. SP refers to the discussion of *pradhānān uvādena guṇavidhiḥ* in the SV. NKL states the similarity between *bhartā śreṣṭhaḥ purogantā* (which is relevant here) and *dandhnā ... juhuyāt*.

*Verses 198-208 explain BU 1.3.8.*

*avāptāgnyādi-rūpas te prāṇāliṅgana-saṁśrayāt /  
kṛpopakāraṁ smṛtvocūḥ prāṇā vāgādayas tadā //*

Those *prāṇas*<sup>1</sup>, viz. speech and others, which obtained the nature of fire etc. by resorting to Prāṇa, remembered the good turn done to them (by it) and said (to themselves). [198]

<sup>1</sup>The word *prāṇas* refers to the Sūtrātman in its various manifest forms (viz. the various organs), not to the principal Prāṇa; cf. BSB 1.1.23.

*anantāgnyādi-bhāvena yo naḥ sañcitavān asuḥ /  
kva nv asau vartate hy ātmā yo 'smac chatru-vināśakṛt //*

“Where indeed is that Prāṇa who won (i.e. united us) together by granting perennial nature of fire etc. (Sūtrātman), the Ātman, which has destroyed our enemies?” [199]

*vitarkayantas te prāṇā ukṭvaivam pratyagātmasu /  
kurvāṇam upakāraṁ taṁ dadṛśuḥ prāg ivādarāt //*

(Thus) wondering about (the Prāṇa), those *prāṇas* (=sense-organs) said this to themselves and then, as before, respectfully looked upon him, who had done good turn to them, in (i.e. connected with) all the inner selves (i.e. individuals). [200]

*loke 'pi hi vicāryārtham atha samvidate janāḥ /  
yathā vāgādayas tadvad vijajñuḥ prāṇātmani //*

As in worldly life also<sup>1</sup>, people first think about things and then come to realize (their nature etc.), so also did Speech and others come to know the Prāṇa<sup>2</sup> within themselves<sup>3</sup>. [201]

Here is stated the basic principle which guides people's behaviour.

<sup>1</sup>The word 'also' implies the ritualistic activities.

<sup>2</sup>This is *mukhya prāṇa*, the Ātman.

<sup>3</sup>The word *ātmani* refers to the body; cf. SP: *kāryaka*(v.l. *kā*)*raṇasaṁghātaḥ*.

*sāmānyoktāv āsya iti tad-viśeṣaṇam ucyate /  
antarityan yathā mā bhūt prasaṅgaḥ prāṇa-niścitaḥ //*

After stating (merely) *āsye*, in order to convey the general sense, there is used in the Śruti a modifier *antaḥ*<sup>1</sup>, with a view to that in respect of ascertaining (the exact) Prāṇa<sup>2</sup> there might not arise the contingency (viz. difficulty). [202]

<sup>1</sup>After the word *āsye* wherein the locative case-suffix was otherwise sufficient to convey the sense of the location.

<sup>2</sup>The word *āsye* alone would refer even only to the sense of touch that occupied

the place in the mouth. This is *clearly stated* in the next verse.

*tvagādayo 'pi santy āsyē yato 'tas tad-viśeṣaṇam /*  
*viśinaṣṭi tataḥ prāṇam āsyāntar-bilacāriṇam //*

Since the sense of touch etc. also are (seen to abide) in the interior of the mouth, therefore, there is the modifier of that (Prāṇa)<sup>1</sup>, that specifies the Prāṇa which moves in the hollow within the mouth. [203]

<sup>1</sup>Namely, *antaḥ* after *āsyē* as referred to in the preceding verse.

*āsyā-paryanta-śāyini tvagādīni na madhyataḥ /*  
*prāṇas tu madhya āsyasya tasmād antar-viśeṣaṇam //*

The sense of touch etc. (are seen to) abide only up to the (farthest visible) end within the mouth, but (they are) not (seen occupying) the interior (hollow) of it; contrary to this, Prāṇa<sup>1</sup> (abides) in the interior (hollow) of the mouth (also). Therefore, there is here the use of modifier *antaḥ*. [204]

<sup>1</sup>This is *mukhya prāṇa*.

*sarvendriyāṇām atha vā prāṇa ātmeti kathyate /*  
*ayam āsyē 'ntarityeva maranābhinidarśanāt //*

Or, 'the nature<sup>1</sup> of all organs is (finally that of) Prāṇa'; this is said (in the words) 'this one in the interior (hollow) of the mouth' This (is stated on the basis of) the example of the spokes of a wheel (fixed in the hub<sup>2</sup>). [205]

<sup>1</sup>This is an alternative explanation of *antaḥ* ; cf. NKL: *antaḥśabdena vāgādīnaṁ svarūpam prāṇa ucyate*.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. BU 2.5.15. The intended comparison is: As the spokes lie within (i.e. inside) the rim of a wheel, being firmly fixed in the hub, so do the organs, being firmly fixed (i.e. dependent) on the Ātman, lie within the circle of worldly existence.

*ayam āsye 'ntarītyevam prāṇam dṛṣṭvā yataḥ purā /  
vyājāhruram amarās tasmāt prāṇa āyāsya saṁjñitaḥ //*

[The meaningfulness of the name Āyāsya for Prāṇa is explained. ]

Since, (on that occasion) in the past, the gods thus saw Prāṇa to be abiding in the interior of the mouth and affirmed it, therefore Prāṇa is named Ayasya<sup>1</sup>. [206]

<sup>1</sup>Sureśvara cites the name as Āyāsya which can be explained thus: *ayāsya eva āyāsyaḥ*

*aṅgānāṁ karaṇānāṁ ca rasaḥ sāro yatas tataḥ /  
prāṇa āṅgirasah proktas tadvidbhis tad-guṇāśrayāt //*

Since it is the essence, i.e. strength, of the limbs, i.e. organs; therefore Prāṇa is called Āṅgirasa by them who have known that, basing (the name) on that property (of that). [207]

*katham āṅgirasah prāṇa ity asya pratipattaye /  
anvayavyatirekābhyām upariṣṭāt pravakṣyate //*

So that it may be known as to why Prāṇa is called Āṅgīrasa, there will be stated (an argument) later by the method of Anvaya and Vyatireka. [208]

*tathā 'nyo 'pi guṇo 'nasya dūr iti pratipādyate /  
udāra-phala-siddhyartham sā vā eṣety atah śrutiḥ //*

[Verses 209-218 explain BU 1.3.9 which states that Prāṇa is away from having any property.]

In the same way, another quality of Prāṇa also is conveyed in (the name) Dūr. (And the statement) in the Śruti *sā vā eṣa* (proceeds) to establish the excellent reward (accruing from Prāṇa). [209]

*upāstīta-krama-siddhyartham krama-bhaṅgo 'yam iṣyate /  
yato 'to 'ṅgīrasam tyaktvā dūr ity evābhidhīyate //*

Since this deviation from the order<sup>1</sup> (in the names of Prāṇa stated in the Śruti) is accepted with a view to establishing the process in worship<sup>2</sup>, therefore (the name) Dūr is expressed (i.e. explained) earlier, having set aside (the name) Āṅgīrasa. [210]

<sup>1</sup>This refers to the *Pāṭhakrama* in the Brāhmaṇa (i.e. the Upaniṣad).

<sup>2</sup>It literally means 'order in the various acts which comprise worship'.

*vīṣiṣṭopāstir eveyam pradhāna-phala-kīrtanāt /  
nāyam guṇo-vidhir jñeyas tat-phalasyāśrutatvataḥ //*

This (worship of Dūr) is but the worship of what is qualified, since the reason is that there is the mention of the principal reward (as accruing from it). (Indeed) this should not be taken as a Guṇavidhi since there is no mention (lit. hearing) in it of its reward.<sup>1</sup> [211]

<sup>1</sup>That is to say: the reward for the worship alone is going to accrue to the worshipper; there being no separate reward for the worship of Dūr, which is but the same as Prāṇa, merely qualified by the name. This is explained in the next verse.

*kriyāyām guṇo-bhūto 'rtho devatety upadiśyate /*  
*asty upāsi-kriyā-yogo devatā 'to 'na ucyate //*

A live being (lit. thing) which has been subordinate<sup>1</sup> in any activity is called the deity and since here (in respect of the act of worship to Dūr) there is such a connection with the act of worship, therefore, it is Prāṇa that is mentioned as the deity. [212]

Rites comprise of *dravya* 'material', *devatā* 'deity (to whom material is offered)' and *karman* '(towards which) the act (is directed)' and the pleasure of the gods are regarded as subordinate.

<sup>1</sup>That is, of secondary importance. Read SP: *yāgādaḥ kartratrekeṇa cetano guṇo 'gnyādir devatā*.

*dūram evaṁ-vidahḥ pāpmā katham adhyavasīyate /*  
*evaṁ-vittva-virodhitvād dūram pāpmā bhavet atah //*

(A question may be asked:) 'How is it decided that the sin of the knower of this (is sent) afar?' (The answer is:) 'Since the sin goes away on account of its being opposed to the state of one's being the knower of such (a name of Prāṇa).' [213]

*viṣayendriya-saṁbandhajo hi pāpmāsure yataḥ /*  
*śrautāntād ahammānāt paricchinno virudhyate //*

Since the demoniac sin is what results from the contact of organs and their objects, (therefore, that sin), limited as it is, is distinguished from (lit. opposed to) the infinite Ego (which is) heard in the Śruti.<sup>1</sup> [214]

<sup>1</sup>This refers to the (so-called) Ego (*aham brahmāsmi*) which arises from the knowledge of the Śāstra.

*cakṣurādi-paricchedaḥ prākṛta-jñāna-hetutaḥ /*  
*yukto 'dhyātmaika-rūpasya bādhaḥ śāstrābhimānataḥ //*

Being limited of the eye etc.<sup>1</sup> is on account of the ignorance which is natural to human beings. Therefore, it is only proper that there is the removal of it which has the form only of some bodily organs by coming to have the awareness (of the true nature of the inner self) by having great regard for (or, with the help of) the Śāstra. [215]

<sup>1</sup>This refers to *cakṣurādyabhimāna* on the part of the deities other than Prāṇa.

*parispandātmikā vṛttiḥ śrotrādiṣv api vidyate /*  
*prāṇasyāthendriyāṇāṁ tu śabdādyarthāvalehinī //*

*śabdādi-grāhinī vṛttiḥ svair āsaṅgātma-pāpmabhiḥ/  
dūṣitā na parisṇando dūram mṛtyur asos tataḥ//*

The function of Prāṇa which is of the nature of throbbing is noticed to exist also in the case of the ear etc.<sup>1</sup> But the function of the organs related to (lit. touches, i.e. is connected with, various) objects, viz. words and others.<sup>2</sup> [216]

(Yet,) the function, viz. getting connected with the objects, words etc., is affected by the sin in the form of wanton attachment (to these objects); not so the throbbing of Prāṇa. Therefore death is far (from that).<sup>3</sup> [217]

<sup>1</sup>This explains how Prāṇa would be noticed as connected with sin.

<sup>2</sup>This is an expression of doubt against the said connection. The argument is: Ear etc. are connected only with their own objects — not with sins!

<sup>3</sup>Verse 217 answers away the doubt. The reason for the said connection is attachment to the objects. The throbbing Prāṇa does not get attached to any of the objects and is therefore away from death.

*mṛtyur dūram yathā prāṇāt tad-ātmatvāt tathāsurah /  
tadvidaś ca bhaven mṛtyur dūram ity upadiśyate //*

As death is far from Prāṇa, so also is the demoniac (sin far from it<sup>1</sup>) since it is the nature of that (viz. death). And it is declared here that death would be far from him who is the knower of that (viz. Prāṇa).<sup>2</sup> [218]

<sup>1</sup>Namely, Prāṇa.

<sup>2</sup>This indicates the purity, freedom from the fear of death etc. of the worshipper of Prāṇa, even as Prāṇa is away from death etc.



Verses 219-227 explain BU 1.3.10.

*diśām anta iha grāhyo madhya-deśopalakṣitaḥ /*  
*anantākāśa-deśatvān nāñjasā 'nto diśām yataḥ //*

[This explains *yatrāsām diśām antaḥ*...(BU 1.3.10). Here the explanation given by Śaṅkara — and Sureśvara following him — is not wholly philosophical; it is socio-philosophical, since it reveals some of the bias of their times as is noticed from SP.]

Here the end of quarters is to be taken as that which is defined (or indicated)<sup>1</sup> by the middle region<sup>2</sup>, since it is not reasonable to say that there is the end (i.e. boundary) of quarters, for the region is very wide in space. [219]

<sup>1</sup>The word 'indicated' shows that the division of regions is not so rigid, it only points to two regions of people of two different tendencies.

<sup>2</sup>Region described in the Smṛtis as *Āryāvarta*, viz. the region between Mt. Himalaya and Mt. Vindhya; (rather the plains of the Gaṅgā). People of those times believed that the people of *Āryāvarta* followed the religion prescribed by the Śruti and the Smṛti. Therefore, they were pure in their mind and activity and the people other than these did not follow the religion (prescribed by the Śruti and the Smṛti). Therefore, they were impure. Thus there is a division of persons of divine tendencies and those of demoniac tendencies. Consequently, Mṛtyu or death is for them who did not follow the religion of the Śruti and the Smṛti — this religion prevailed in the form of (worldly) religion.

*śruti-smṛti-sadācāra-saṁskṛtāsayavaj janam /  
avadhikṛtyantatvokter na tu doṣo manāg api //*

Since there is a statement (made in the Śruti) about the boundary, after having marked out the people who has thoughts purified by (the study of) the Śruti, the Smṛti and the exemplary conduct (of the elite), there is not even a little defect<sup>1</sup>. [220]

NKL states the purpose of this verse. A Smṛti text reads: *vindhyasya dakṣiṇe bhāge kalau vāsaḥ praśasyate / tatra vedās ca yajñās ca yatra godāvarī nadī //* (untraceable); and this indicates that the middle region is the one which is a suitable abode for the learned men ( *śrautas-mārtakarmasam-skṛtabuddhīnām puruṣānām vāsavyogyaḥ* ). This is the purpose of *upalakṣita* in *Madhyadeśopalakṣita*.

<sup>1</sup>This stands for 'defective doing'.

*madhya-deśāvadhis tasmād dig anta iti gṛhyate /  
prātyantika-janoddeśaḥ pāpīyojana-saṁśrayāt /  
varjyate 'taḥ prayatnena tadvidbhir adhunātanaiḥ //*

Therefore, by the boundary of the middle region is understood the boundary of the quarters. (And) because the region of the people residing beyond that boundary is resorted to by people that are full of sin(s), it is hence carefully avoided by (even) the moderns who know (that). [221]

This underlines the significance of the contents in the note on the previous verse.

*teṣu pratyantadeśeṣu tan-nivāsiṣu cāsurān /*

*yato vinyadadhāt prāṇas tasmāt tad-varjayed dvayam //*

Since Prāṇa fixed the demons down there in those regions beyond the limits (of the middle region) and also in the people residing there, therefore one should avoid the two of them. [222]

This explains the reason (briefly) stated in the preceding verse.

*jano viśiṣṭo deśena deśo jana-viśeṣitaḥ /  
pāpmopasprṣṭam ubhayaṁ śiṣṭās tad-varjayanty ataḥ //*

A people is marked out by (its own) region and (so also) is a region marked out by the people (residing in it). Therefore, the elite avoid them both, both of them being affected by sin. [223]

This makes the word *dvayam* 'the two of them' in verse 222 doubly clarified.

*samāhāro 'tha vā bhedo nedityetat padaṁ bhavet /  
anīpsitā-nivṛttiḥ syāt samāhāre 'vivakṣite //*

The word *net* could be either a compound or two different words (joined in Saṁdhi). When the compound (i.e. a single word) is not intended, it would mean 'not desisting from some undesired (activity or tendency)'. [224]

*itthaṁ na deda ahaṁ kuryāṁ pratiṣedha-śrutīritam /  
anvavāyāni pāpmānaṁ pratiṣedhātīlaṅghanāt //*

(In that case the meaning of the sentence would be:) If I shall not do this way (i.e. behave in this manner), as is declared by the prohibitive Śruti<sup>1</sup>, I might incur (lit. follow) sin by transgressing the prohibition. [225]

<sup>1</sup>The prohibitive rule is *tasmān na janam* ...(BU 1.3.10).

*iti bheda-vivakṣāyām vyākhyā kāryā pada-dvaye /*  
*mān arthas tu tathā 'bhede vyākhyeyaḥ pratiṣedhakṛt //*

Such should be the explanation given of the two words, if it is the intention to understand two different words. So also, if there is (intended) non-difference, (as two words),<sup>1</sup> it is necessary to bring forth the meaning of the prohibitive particle *mā* which conveys the sense of prohibiting<sup>2</sup>. [226]

<sup>1</sup>That is, (if) 'net' (is accepted) only as one word.

<sup>2</sup>That is, it should mean 'let me not follow sin'.

*sāmānya-viṣayaś cāyam niṣedho nānavid-gataḥ /*  
*balavat prakriyāto hi vākyaṁ sāmānyamātragam //*

And this prohibition pertains to (individuals in general), it does not pertain to the knower of Prāṇa, because the sentence of the Śruti pertains only to individuals in general, thanks to the (accepted) procedure in respect of a strong (proof which determines the meaning). [227]

Mīmāṃsā holds relative strength of proofs for determining the meaning of scriptural texts: *śruti*, *līṅga*, *vākya*, *prakaraṇa*, *sthāna* and *samākhyā*. Here *prakaraṇa* 'context' or 'topic' is in conflict with *vākya* and is considered inferior to

its precedents, in accordance with the rule regarding the weakness of the subsequent in comparison with its preceding (*pāradaurbalya*).

The basis for the verse is the following (possible doubt): ‘What does the prohibition (*māñarthah*) in the preceding verse pertain to, to the worshipper of Prāṇa (the subject of the *prakaraṇa*) or to the worshipper of all deities (the subject of *vākya*)?’ The answer is: ‘to the latter’.

*āsureṇāvaruddhāṁs tān vāgādīn hata-pāpmanah /*  
*devatvaṁ prāpayat prāṇah katham ity etad ucyate //*

[Verses 228-236 explain the purpose of BU 1.3.11-16, i.e. worship of Speech and others secures the reward, becoming the deities, Agni etc.]

(An objection is raised:) ‘How has Prāṇa brought to divinity Speech and others who were (first) overpowered by the demoniac (nature) and who had their sins later destroyed?’ — this is answered. [228]

*jñānato 'jñāna-hāniḥ syād devatvaṁ bhāvanā-balāt /*  
*ānantarye kriyādvitvād atha-śabdo bhaved dhruvam //*

‘From (the acquisition of) knowledge there follows the destruction of ignorance, and, owing to the strength of devotion, there would be divine character (secured). (As such), the word *atha* (here in this context) certainly for (conveying) the sense ‘then’ or ‘later’, for there are two actions<sup>1</sup>.’ [229]

This explains: *athainā mṛtyum atyavahat*.

<sup>1</sup>Namely, meditation (or worship) and knowing.

*mṛtyum atyavahat prāṇaḥ sāmānyokter viśeṣataḥ /*  
*viśiṣṭa-devatāvāptir vāgādīnāṃ prapañcyate //*

By the general statement (is conveyed the meaning:) 'Prāṇa took (them) over Mṛtyu' and by the particular statement is explained in detail the attainment of (the nature of) some particular deities by Speech and others.

[230]

*nedīyasī yato 'nyebhyo vāg evodgītha-karmaṇi /*  
*prāṇasya tena sodgātuh pratham ety abhidhīyate //*

Since in the Udgītha ritual Speech is, in comparison with others, nearer to Prāṇa,<sup>1</sup> therefore it is described as the first (among the deities of the organs) of the Udgātr.

[231]

This explains the qualifier *prathamām* of *vācam* in *sā vai vācam eva prathamām atyavahat*.

<sup>1</sup>SP significantly adds: *audgātre karmaṇi sādhatamatvena prāṇasyodgātur atyantasaṁnihitatvāt*.

*vāgādy-agnyādy-avāptyaivaṃ pāpmano 'pāsya sarvataḥ /*  
*vairājyaṃ padam ety evaṃ yajamānaḥ subhāvitaḥ //*

Having wholly separated (lit. thrown away) Speech and others from the sin by the attainment of (the nature of) Agni etc. (who are their deities), the sacrificer, who is thus well developed in devotion<sup>1</sup>, attains the status of Virāj.

[232]

<sup>1</sup>That is, who has strengthened the devotion, or who is ardently devoted.

*kalyāṇasaṅga-saṁbandhād vāgādy-adharma-kāraṇam /*  
*tyaktvā 'naṁ mukhyam ātmānam āśrayen mṛtyur varjitam //*  
*vāgādyair pañcabhir yuktaṁ virājaṁ sādhibhautikam /*  
*hitvādhyātmaparicchedaṁ tatas taṁ pratipadyate //*  
*sādhibhūtādhidaivaṁ ca nāma-rūpa-kriyātmakaḥ /*  
*sūtraṁ prāṇo aṅgirāḥ satyam ṛk-sāmetyana ucyate //*

Having abandoned (i.e. thrown away) the cause, viz. impiety of Speech and others (which had resulted) from the connection (of them) with an attachment to the (so-called) auspicious, (the sacrificer) should resort to the Ātman, the principal Prāṇa, who is free from death, [233]

(that sacrificer), having abandoned the limitation of the body, (resorts to) that Virāj, together with what has a basis in the elements (viz. body) which is connected with the five (sense-organs) speech and others<sup>1</sup>, he attains Prāṇa.<sup>2</sup> [234]

Sentience<sup>3</sup> is called the Sūtrātman<sup>4</sup>, the (principal) Prāṇa, Aṅgiras, Satya, Ṛc and Sāman, having the nature of name, form and activity and connected with the elements and divinities. [235]

<sup>1</sup>SP and NKL point out: 'this indicates the inclusion of the sense of touch etc.'

<sup>2</sup>That is, status of Prāṇa.

<sup>3</sup>This translation distinguishes *ana* from *mukhya prāṇa*. Sentience is for *ana*.

<sup>4</sup>Read SP: *napuṁsakaṁ sūtreṇādhyāhṛtaprapaṇcena ca puṁān sambadhyate*.

*taṁ ekaṁ sarvabhūteṣu jñāna-karma-phalāśrayam /*

*āsvabhāvātma-vijñānād upāste yaḥ sa taṁ vrajet //*

He, who worships that one, the unique, who alone exists in all beings, who is the support of knowledge, (ritual) action and rewards, till (he acquires) the knowledge of (his own) nature (as that) of the Ātman<sup>1</sup>, becomes one with it<sup>2</sup>. [236]

<sup>1</sup>The editor of NKL writes the following note: *sūtram prāṇa iti ābhyām padābhyām kriyātmakatvam uktam , aṅ girāḥ satyam ity ābhyām rūpātmakatvam, ṛ ksāmapadābhyām nāmātmakatvam ca prāṇasyoktam bodhyam.*

<sup>2</sup>It literally means 'attains that'.

*uktam abhyudayārthaṁ yad vāgādīnām athādhunā /  
āgānam avaśiṣṭeṣu stotreṣūdgātur ucyate //*

[Verses 237-245 explain BU 1.3.17.]

As to what was stated in the case of speech and others, (viz. the singing of the Udgītha) is for the material prosperity (for them, i.e. the sacrificer); now is stated, in respect of the remaining prayers, (that for the sake) of the Udgātr (priest). [237]

Among the twelve prayers (*pavamānas*) earlier referred to, the first three are said to bring the reward to the sacrificer, viz. material prosperity. The remaining prayers stand in similar connection with the Udgātr priest.

*sāmānya-bhojya-viśayas tv anna-śabdo yatas tataḥ /  
ādyam ity ucyate tasya viśeṣaṇatayā vacaḥ //*



Since the word *anna* refers to the commonly accepted eatable (foods), therefore, a statement is made about that in the word *ādya* 'fit to be eaten'<sup>1</sup> (which is) its qualifier. [238]

This verse explains the second member *ādya* in the compound *annādyā* and sets aside the possible doubt of repetition.

<sup>1</sup>Cf. SP: *tasyaiva* (= *annasya*) *saṃskṛtatvaṃ viśeṣam*.

*yataḥ ādāv idaṃ vṛttam annāgānam anātmani /*  
*tasmāt tat-kārya-bhūtāsu prajāsv adyāpi dṛśyate //*

Since this incident, viz. the singing for food, first<sup>1</sup> occurred in respect of the non-Ātman<sup>2</sup>, therefore that<sup>3</sup> is noticed even today in the case of people (lit. the offsprings of that Prāṇa) who are but the product of the same.

[239]

<sup>1</sup>This refers to Prajāpati who was connected with Speech and others. Therefore, there is a reference to this as the first occurrence. Prajāpati is understood as other than the Ātman.

<sup>2</sup>This emphasises the notion about Prajāpati as non-Ātman.

<sup>3</sup>It signifies people's satisfying their own desire for food (cf. the note of the editor of NKL: *svārtham annasvīkaraṇam iti śeṣaḥ*).

*yaddhi kiṃceti sarvārtham evety atrāvadhāraṇam /*  
*prāṇenaiva tu tat sarvaṃ loko 'nnaṃ hy atti sarvadā //*

In the words *yadd hi kiṃ ca* (in the Śruti statement) there is the

specification, 'for the sake of all', (expressed) in the word *eva*. (The sense of the sentence is:) Therefore, people ever eat all food only through Prāṇa indeed. [240]

*annṛpakārah sarveṣām aviśiṣṭaḥ samīkṣyate //*  
*athāvadhāraṇaṁ kasmād anenaiveti bhāṇyate /*  
*prāṇa-dvāraka evaiṣām upakāro na tu svataḥ //*

This benefit (resulting) from food is noticed to be the same<sup>1</sup> for all. [241]  
Now (a question could be asked:) 'Why then is this specification "only through Prāṇa" ?' Therefore, (to answer this it is said:) 'This benefit for (all) these (people) occurs only through Prāṇa and not on (the basis of merit or strength) of their own.' [242]

<sup>1</sup>It means 'not specified or distinguished as different in different individuals'.

*katham tad-dvārakas teṣām upakāra itīryate /*  
*nanu dūriti hi prāṇa ukto vāgādivat katham /*  
*ātmārthānnādya-saṁgīter viddho nāsura-pāpmabhiḥ //*

Now is stated<sup>1</sup> as to how this benefit of (accrues) to them (i.e. the people) through that (Prāṇa). (A question is asked:) 'How indeed is Prāṇa, who is called Dūr was not pierced by the demoniac sins like Speech and others on account of the singing for food for its own sake<sup>2</sup> ?' [243]

<sup>1</sup>This refers to the sentence: *iha pratitiṣṭhati*.

<sup>2</sup>The word *ātman* in the compound *ātmārtham* is a reflexive pronoun.

*sthitimātrābhisāmbandhān nāyaṁ doṣa iheṣyate //*

(The answer is:) 'It is understood here<sup>1</sup> that this is not a fault, for there is connection (of food etc.)<sup>2</sup> merely for the sustenance (of worldly life.)<sup>3</sup>

[244]

<sup>1</sup>The word *iha* means 'in the statement of the Śruti': *ihānnaṁ pratitiṣṭhati* where *iha* stands for *Prāṇa*.

<sup>2</sup>The words 'with *Prāṇa*, the inner self called *Dūr*' is to be supplied.

<sup>3</sup>There is no common 'desire' for food and, therefore, no sin.

*asāv annaṁ sthitaṁ yasmād dehaṁ prāṇān avaty ataḥ /*  
*yatnāc chrutir ato vakti tv ihānnaṁ pratitiṣṭhati //*

Since food is resting on the Ātman,<sup>1</sup> therefore it protects *prāṇas* (the sense-organs) (and) the body — therefore, the Śruti states, with emphasis (or special care): *ihānnaṁ pratitiṣṭhati*. [245]

A first interpretation is made here of *ihānne pratitiṣṭhati*. Read SP: *iha prāṇe doṣo noddhāvyaḥ sarvasādhāraṇasthityarthatayā tenānnasvikārāt prāṇasthityadhīnā hi vāgādisthitiḥ*. Or NKL: *tasmin prāṇe pratiṣṭhitaṁ sad annaṁ dehaṁ prāṇānś cāvati*.

<sup>1</sup>That is *mukhya prāṇa*.

*sthitimātraṁ hy asor annaṁ yad vā saṅgo na śaṅkyate /*  
*bhartā śreṣṭho puro gantā hy annādo 'dhipatis tathā /*  
*ityādi-guṇa-vidhyarthaṁ paro grantho 'vatāryate //*

[Verses 246-252 explain BU 1.3.18.]

Or rather, food (for the Prāṇa) is merely for the sustenance (of the body); any attachment to food (and the consequent sin) cannot be thought of (in the case of Prāṇa).<sup>1</sup> (Now) the subsequent Śruti is introduced for prescribing the Guṇavidhi: 'the supporter, the best of them, the one who marches ahead, the eater of food and the Lord' etc.<sup>2</sup> [246]

<sup>1</sup>A second interpretation of *ihāṇne pratitiṣṭhati*. Read SP: *sarvasādhāraṇa-sthityarthānnayogāt prāṇasya pāpmavedho na*. This is Śaṅkara's alternative explanation: *iha dehākārapariṇate āne prāṇaḥ tiṣṭhati*.

<sup>2</sup>The word 'etc.' refers to gold and other belongings. This is the ultimate result of the Śruti statement: *te devā abruvan / etāvad va idaṁ sarvaṁ yad annam ātmane āgāsīḥ / anu no annam ābhajasva*.

*ayaṁ guṇa-vidhir jñeyahḥ praty ekam tat-phala-śruteḥ //*  
*jagdham annaṁ yato deha-līṅga-bhāvena yāti naḥ /*  
*pariṇāmaḥ vrajat tasmād etāvad iti bhāṇyate //*

Let this<sup>1</sup> be understood as a Guṇavidhi, because there is heard a reward in the case of each (of the two sentences).<sup>2</sup> [247]

Since the food that is eaten by us becomes transformed into the body and (also) its subtle form, thus developing its modification(s); therefore is the word *etāvat* 'this much' stated in the Śruti<sup>3</sup>. [248]

<sup>1</sup>Refer to *te devā abruvan*...quoted in note 2 on the preceding verse. But this verse explains the significance of *etāvat*.

<sup>2</sup>The second sentence (i.e. *vidhi*) is: so *ayāsya*... (BU 1.3.19).

<sup>3</sup>This refers to *etāvad va idaṁ sarvaṁ yad annam ātmane āgāsīḥ*.

*tvayaivātmārtham āgīte tvayy evānnam ato 'kḥilam /*  
*vayaṁ cānnam ṛte sthātum nālaṁ kṣaṇam apīśvara //*

When you yourself have sung for your own sake, all food is (resting, lit. obtained) in you. And, as for us<sup>1</sup>, we cannot live without food even for a moment, O Lord! [249]

This explains: *tad ātmana āgāsīḥ*.

<sup>1</sup>Refer to the word *ca*. And the popular maxim: *svāmini bhṛtyenātmīyāpan nivedyā*; 'simile of master-servant relationship, viz. the feeder-fed or the supporter-supported relationship'. (cf. *Laukikanyāyāñjaliḥ*. vol. 2, Bombay: Nirnaya Sagar Press, 1925, p.90)

*saṁtarpyātaḥ svam ātmānam annenāsmān apīśvara /*  
*ābhājayasva kṣudhitāṁś chanda-satvāṇ ṇico 'śravaḥ //*

Therefore, 'O Lord! Having satisfied yourself by this food, make us, the hungry ones<sup>1</sup> also share of that food. (In the Śruti) is not heard the causal form, owing to its the character of Chandas.<sup>2</sup> [250]

This verse explains: *aun no 'sminn anna ābhajasva*.

<sup>1</sup>The use of 'O Lord' and 'us, the hungry ones', which are used in contrast, points to the relation of one who favours and the one who is favoured. 'The Lord' is a reference to the sacrificer(s) (cf. note by of the editor of NKL: *īśvaraśabdaḥ yajamānaparaḥ*). The hungry ones are then the priests.

<sup>2</sup>The Śruti uses the verbal form *ābhajasva* which Sureśvara has paraphrased

as *ābhājayasva* (a causal form). Then, he points to the practice of Chandas, i.e. Veda, of using primitive verbal forms in the place of causal ones.

*mām ṛte 'nnaṁ na vaḥ śaktaṁ poṣṭuṁ kṣaṇam api kvacit /*  
*annārthino 'sto mām sarve 'py abhisamviśatāṣu vai //*

“Without me food cannot, by any chance (*kvacit*)<sup>1</sup>, nourish you even for a moment, therefore, all of you, who desire for food, (do you) enter into me quickly indeed”. (So said Prāṇa to them). [251]

This explains: *te vai mābhisamviśateti / tatheti taṁ samantam pariṇyaviśanta /*  
*tasmād yad annenānnam atti tenaitās tṛpyanti.*

<sup>1</sup>Or alternatively, ‘anywhere’.

Verses 253-280 explain how the deities of Speech and others are satisfied when Prāṇa has eaten the food.

*tenaitā devatāḥ sarvās tṛpyanty annena sarvaśaḥ /*  
*ityarthasya kutaḥ siddhir iti ced ucyate yataḥ //*  
*tridhā jagdhaṁ bhavaty annaṁ pariṇām aviśeṣataḥ /*  
*sthavīyān madhyamo 'ṇīyān ityevaṁ kālato 'gnitāḥ //*  
*sthavīyān yāty adho-bhāgo rasādi-kramaśo 'paraḥ /*  
*sthūlaṁ hy upacinotīmaṁ kuḍyaṁ mṛtsneva sarvadā //*  
*yas tv aṇīyān rasaḥ sūkṣmaḥ sa ūrgamṛtam ucyate /*  
*nādīḥ sūkṣmāḥ praviśyāsau devatāḥ prīṇayaty atha //*

[SP calls verses 253 ff. as an explanation which has no basis in both BU and BUB. NKL states: there is *udgrantha* (-*parihāra*).]

(The Śruti says:) 'All these deities ever<sup>1</sup> become satisfied by that food<sup>2</sup> 'whence<sup>3</sup> can this meaning be established?' If (this is asked), here is given the answer: 'Since [252]

food that is eaten becomes threefold owing to the particular different modifications of it: digested in the forms: gross, subtle and of middle size, owing to passage of time and to the fire (within the belly). [253]

The gross (modification) goes as the lower part<sup>4</sup> (i.e. bodily excretion) and the other as *rasa* etc. in sequential order and indeed (together) that ever forms this (gross body) like the soft clay<sup>5</sup> which forms a thatched wall. [254]

And<sup>6</sup> that (part) which is thinner (than the first two), is the subtle (*rasa*) that is called *ūrj* (or, 'energy'), the nectar after it has entered (these) very thin veins, it pleases the deities<sup>7</sup> also<sup>8</sup>. [255]

This has a basis in some other Śruti : *annam aśitam tredhā vidhīyate* (CU 6.5.1), (NKL).

<sup>1</sup>Translation follows the variant *sarvadā* for *sarvaśaḥ* 'in every way' read in the in AnSS and NKL texts.

<sup>2</sup>That is, through Prāṇa's eating of food.

<sup>3</sup>That is, on what basis.

<sup>4</sup>This should be *adhobhāgam* 'to the lower part (as excretion)'.

<sup>5</sup>Cf SP : *praśastā saṁskṛtā mṛm mṛtsnety ucyate*.

<sup>6</sup>Or alternatively, 'As for, that...'

<sup>7</sup>This signifies the different sense-organs.

<sup>8</sup>This is for *atha* in the sense of *api* (SP).

*svāmyartha eva cottambhas tṛptir āpūra ucyate /*

*tatas tu yā sukhodbhūtir vijñānātmana eva sā //*

The sustenance (of the body) is only for the sake of the master (i.e. Prāṇa)<sup>1</sup>. Satisfaction is what is called filling and, whatever happiness then results is for (i.e. accrues to) only the knowing Ātman (the inner self, viz. Prāṇa)<sup>2</sup>. [256]

<sup>1</sup>The stress on the *svāmi-bhṛtya* (or *sva-svāmi*) relation is for ruling out the elemental nature (*bhautikatva*) of Prāṇa. *svāmyartha* is *kāryakaraṇasaṁghātārtha* (i.e. *dehārtha*).

<sup>2</sup>This sets aside the possible doubt that happiness also belongs to the *kāryakaraṇasaṁghāta*.

*tā etā devatāḥ sapta-daśa jñāna-kriyātmikāḥ /*  
*so 'yaṁ sapta-daśa-grāmo bhoktuḥ karaṇa-lakṣaṇaḥ //*

Thus, these are the seventeen deities, having the nature of knowledge and activity and this is the group of the seventeen, having the form of the organs of the enjoyer. [257]

This explains the nature of the deities pleased by *rasa* (mentioned in verse 255 above).

*buddhindriyāṇi pañcaiva pathā karmendriyāṇy api /*  
*vāyavaḥ pañca buddhiś ca manaḥ sapta-daśaṁ viduḥ //*

They<sup>1</sup> know (the group of) the seventeen thus: The five organs of sense as also (the five organs) of activity, the five winds, intellect and *manas*. [258]



This refers to the *liṅgaśarīra* 'subtle body' (SP).

<sup>1</sup>Namely, those who can make out (i.e. who are knowers).

*apās tādhyātma-rūpāṇām devatānām samāśrayaḥ /*  
*bhūta-pañcakam evedaṁ sādharmaṇyād bhavet sadā //*

(And) ever<sup>1</sup> this group of five elements itself became the support of the deities which have (thus) given up their bodily forms, owing to its being (shared by them) in common. [259]

<sup>1</sup>This stresses the idea of the support available for both the gross and the subtle bodies.

*payombhovad idaṁ liṅgaṁ nānā-rūpaiḥ samanvitam /*  
*āvirbhāva-tirobhāvaiḥ kāraṇātmani vartate //*

This subtle body which is possessed of many forms on account of the manifestations and concealments (of some of them) remains (permanently) in the nature of its own cause<sup>1</sup>, just like milk and water<sup>2</sup>. [260]

<sup>1</sup>This is a reference to the manifestation of the Ātman in the collective and individual (*samastavyasta*) forms.

<sup>2</sup>That is to say: As milk appears in the form of curds etc. and water, in the form of ice etc. The illustration and terminology reveal the basic Sāṃkhya notion about the so-called creation.

*kūṭhastha-bodha-tan-moha-cid-ābhāsaikamātra-trayā /*

*jāgrat-svapnāv ayam pītvā hy āste prāṇātmanā prabhuḥ //*

[The stress on the word *ābhāsa* may be noted. This is of cardinal importance in Sureśvara's writing. Verse 261 is the description of the deep sleep state of the Ātman, viz. Prājña, verse 262 of Sūtrātman and verse 263 of the waking state of the Ātman. These verses are *anuka* portion 'not in Bhāṣya but implied elsewhere'.]

By means of the unique *mātrā*<sup>1</sup>, which is but the appearance of Sentience owing to the widely known ignorance about (the nature of) in respect of the immutable knowledge (i.e. Ātman), this Lord first absorbs into Himself (lit. drinks) the waking and dream states of Himself and then remains in the state of Prāṇa alone. [261]

<sup>1</sup>*mātrā*=Prājña state of the Ātman. It seems NKL holds this verse as an explanation of *m* (= *makāra*) in *aum* ; it symbolises sleep.

*apāsta-śeṣa-bāhyārthas taj-javāsanayāñcitaḥ /*

*adhyavasta-pratyag-ajñāno viriñcaḥ para ucyate //*

(And Prāṇa who is beyond this (i.e. the inner self etc.) is called Viriñca (= the first sacrificer), the one who has thrown away all of the external objects, who is marked by the impressions produced by them<sup>1</sup> and whose ignorance about the inner self is not (yet fully) destroyed. [262]

NKL holds this as an explanation of what is symbolised by *u* (= *ukāra*) in *aum*, viz. the Sūtrātman.

<sup>1</sup>This refers to *aśeṣabāhyārtha*.

*jāgrat-kāle viśeṣeṇa sthitvā hṛdaya-sadmani /  
dvāsaptati-sahasrāṇi nāḍī vyāpyāvatiṣṭhate //*

Residing in the home, viz. the heart, at the time of the waking, in some particular way, (the Lord) remains there occupying the seventy-two thousand veins. [263]

This is, according to NKL, referring to *a* (= *akāra*) in *aum*.

*sa eṣa paramātmāiva svātma-moha-sahāyavān /  
prāṇātmanā karoty eṣa paśyaty agnyātmanā tathā //*

And this one<sup>1</sup> is but (i.e. none other than) the highest Ātman itself— He, who has a companion in<sup>2</sup> the ignorance about His own nature. It does his functions, being in the form of *prāṇas* organs and also sees (all), being in the form of Agni. [264]

<sup>1</sup>This one who is described in verses 261-263 above. It asserts the oneness of all the three mentioned in those verses.

<sup>2</sup>In other words; who is aided by.

*indrāgnī tāv imāv uktau prāṇa indras tayor mataḥ /  
prakāśakatvād vāgāgnir evam ekaḥ prajāpatiḥ//  
attr-ādyā-bhedato dvau vā yadi vārdhyardha ucyate/  
yadi vāyam trayas triṁśad-dvāsaptatir athāpi vā//*

These two<sup>1</sup> are called Indra and Agni and *prāṇa* is understood to be Indra

of the two on account of his illumining<sup>2</sup>. Thus is Speech Agni<sup>3</sup> — thus, there is (but) one Prajāpati<sup>4</sup>. [265]

If he is declared to be two owing to (the existence of) the two discrete individual objects, viz. the eater and the eatables, or (perhaps as) one and half<sup>5</sup>, or thirty three<sup>6</sup> or seventy two<sup>7</sup> (he is just one). [266]

<sup>1</sup>*prāṇa* 'organs' and Agni mentioned in the preceding verse.

<sup>2</sup>That means 'bringing sensation etc. or knowledge'.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. verse 324 below.

<sup>4</sup>Read SP: *uktanītyā kriyāśaktimadrūpeṇa kartā jñānaśaktimadrūpeṇa jñātety ekaḥ paramātmānaiva sūtradeham āpannaḥ san kartrādyātmana tiṣṭhatīti*.

<sup>5</sup>Prāṇa is one and the world is half — thus one and half (NKL).

<sup>6</sup>These are eight Vasus, eleven Rudras, twelve Ādityas, Indra and Prajāpati — these are the *vibhūti*s 'special manifestations' of Prāṇa.

<sup>7</sup>The same as in the preceding note with minor divisions of them, so that they correspond to the number of the veins in a body.

*ananta-bhedabhinno vā eka evāna ucyate /*

*sarvo 'py eṣa vikalpaś ca punar ekaikaśas tathā //*

Or, even though only Prāṇa, he is differentiated in innumerable discrete individual objects and each of all these is further divided in the same way (i.e. infinitely). [267]

*devāsurādi-bhedena jāti-rūpa-kriyā-guṇaiḥ /*

*ekaiko 'nantatām yāti punar ekātmatām ataḥ //*

(Thus) by (such) division into the gods and the demons, on the ground of

the (different) genera, forms, activities and qualities, each one (of these distinct objects) becomes infinite and finally once again attains the nature of only one (Ātman). [268]

*samasta-vyastataiveha pratyag-ajñāna-bhūmikā /*  
*na tv apāsta-samasta-vyastāndhye neti neti parātmani //*

Here unity and multiplicity<sup>1</sup> is but the phase of the ignorance (about the nature) of the inner self, but (it does) not (exist) in the highest Ātman from whom all darkness (i.e. ignorance) is removed (as expressed) in the words *neti neti*. [269]

<sup>1</sup>Or alternatively, 'collectivity and individuality'.

*sarveṇaiva vikalpena yathoktenāvatīṣṭhate /*  
*yathādhikāraṁ sarvatra paro jagati sarvathā //*

At all events (then), the highest one abides in the world in the form of all these discrete objects etc., as described before, according to the requirement of each (of them). [270]

*na hi kṛtsna-manādāya jagad-etan manāg api /*  
*kriyāyai kārakaṁ kiṁcit tasmāt sarvātmanehate //*

Indeed, no agent is capable of any activity without taking even a little of this entire world, therefore (it is said: it is the highest Ātman) who, assuming the forms of all of these, acts<sup>1</sup>. [271]

<sup>1</sup>The verbal root *īh* has the sense 'to act'; cf the word *īhā* in verse 126 above.

*kāraṇātmā jagat kṛtsnaṁ śrauta-darśana-sādhanaḥ /*  
*yataḥ prāg akarot karma tat-kārye 'spi tathā tataḥ //*

Since the Ātman, who is of the nature of the cause (of everything and) who has as his means what is prescribed (lit. seen) in the Śruti, has formerly produced (lit. made) (varied) objects, viz. the whole of the world, therefore there exists similar activity in his products (viz. in the world) also. [272]

*ekāpūrva-prayuktatvāt samasla-vyasta-rūpiṇām /*  
*sarvaḥ sarvam upādāya sarvatrātaḥ pravartate //*

Since they are impelled by the unique *apūrva* 'not preceded by anything'(viz. the Sūtrātman) , therefore, all of (those who have the) forms of unity and of multiplicity proceed to act everywhere, taking up all (other things as the means of activity). [273]

*adhyātmādy-adhibhūtādhidaivataṁ sarvadākhilam /*  
*sarvaṁ sarva-kriyāḥ kuryād ekāpūrva-prayuktitaḥ //*

All of it<sup>1</sup>, viz. what begins with bodily forms<sup>2</sup> and what rests on elements and what on deities, would ever<sup>3</sup> perform all activities, thanks to the impulse by the unique *apūrva* (viz. the Sūtrātman), [274]

<sup>1</sup>This refers to the agents of various activities noticed in the world.

<sup>2</sup>The word 'etc.' indicates minor divisions of these forms (SP and NKL).

<sup>3</sup>SP remarks: *sarvadety ādāne karaṇe ca sambadhyate*. This should require the

following translation: ...would ever perform all activities, always taking up the various means, thanks....

*yataḥ prajāpatiḥ pūrvam etasmin darśane sthitaḥ /  
yajñena karmaṇāsrākṣīj jagad etac carācaram //*

since, in this lore (of this Upaniṣad), Prajāpati who has appeared earlier (than all creation), has therefore produced by his activity (viz. the performance of) sacrifice this world, movable and immovable. [275]

*nāḍyo 'sya raśmayo 'nantā hṛdayaṁ maṇḍalaṁ raveḥ /  
aho-rātrāṇi tāvac ca śata-saṁvatsarāyuṣaḥ //  
etayā saṁpadā pūrvam yajamānena tadvidā /  
agnayo 'rkāś citā āsan ṣaṭ ca triṁśat-sahasraśaḥ //*

The innumerable veins of this one<sup>1</sup> are rays, this one's heart, the orb of the sun. Of him<sup>1</sup>, who has the life of a hundred years, the days and nights are also as many; [276]

as the thirty six-thousand (bricks), (called) Agni and Arka, were earlier collected with this amplitude<sup>2</sup> (of transformation in the sacrifice performed) by him, the sacrificer who knows that (amplitude). [277]

<sup>1</sup>Namely, the sacrificer.

<sup>2</sup>This refers to *saṁkhyāsāmānyayoga* 'connection with similarity in number'.

*ekaikasmin parispanda evaṁ sarvāpi devatā /  
ekā cāneka-rūpā ca hy adhyātmādi-vibhāgataḥ //*

Thus, the deity in its fullness was present in each of the activities (of that first sacrificer) of one (particular form) and of many forms on account of the division based on bodily forms etc.<sup>1</sup> [278]

<sup>1</sup>Cf. verse 274 above and the next.

*bibhṛī sarvagatā 'nantā samāptā ca pratikriyam /  
prati dravya-phalaṁ kṛtsnā khaṇḍādaṁ gotvavat sthitā //*

(That) one deity, all pervading, residing in many, infinite and which fulfils<sup>1</sup> its purpose in every activity, abides in its full form (in all the effects) in the same way as cowness abides in various parts (i.e. bodies of cows). [279]

<sup>1</sup>The word *samāptā* is for *samāptavatī* (= *samāpayantī*).

*eṣa prajāpater ukto mahimā tadvad eva tu /  
yajamāno 'pi tādātmyāt tathaiva bhavati dhruvam //*

Thus is described (here) the greatness of Prajāpati. And, indeed, just in the same way does the sacrificer also become possessed of similar greatness owing to his (attaining) oneness with him (= Prajāpati). [280]

*Then follows the Vārtika on enaṁ vā enam...ya evaṁ veda (BU 1.3.18).*