

**SUREŚVARA'S VĀRTIKA ON  
BRHADĀRANYAKOPANIṢAD 4.4 [545-703]**

Shoun HINO

*In verses 545-560, there is the exposition of BU 4.4.8.*

उक्तब्रह्मविदो मोक्ष इत्यर्थे ब्राह्मणोदिते ।  
श्लोका अपि भवन्त्यत्र ब्राह्मणोक्तविनिश्चितौ ॥५४५॥

After it is pointed out that the Brāhmaṇa text has stated about liberation in the case of the knower of the Brahman, as said, there are in this respect verses also for ascertaining what was said by the Brāhmaṇa text. [545]

अणुस्थूलादिनिःशेषविकल्पातिक्रमादयम् ।  
अणुरात्मैकयाथात्म्यज्ञानं पन्थाः पुरातनः ॥५४६॥

Securing the knowledge of the true nature of this Ātman as atomic in size, after its having transgressed various concepts such as atomic in size, gross etc. in their entirety (and) this then is the way known as the path (to liberation) since the days of yore. [546]

अनन्तात्मैकमेयत्वाद्विततश्चातिविस्तृतः ।  
अनुत्पन्नागमोत्थत्वात्पुराणश्चेति शब्द्यते ॥५४७॥

And it is said to be extensive, i.e. to have spread to a very wide extent, on account of its having the only object of knowing, what is infinite; and is stated in the word *purāna*, because of its not being produced and also of having its rise in traditional scripture (alone). [547]

Verses 548-560 refer to the reading in the *Mādhyandina* recension *vitara* for *vitata* of the *Kāṇva* recension (so it is pointed out in *BUB*).

तरन्त्यनेन विस्पष्टं संसारानर्थसागरम् ।  
यतोऽतो वितरः पन्थाः प्रत्यग्बोधोऽभिधीयते ॥५४८॥

Since they cross over the ocean of the undesired transmigration with certainty (*vispaṣṭam*) by this one (i.e. the knowledge about the *Ātman*); therefore, here is mentioned the knowledge about the inner self as *vitara*, the path (for crossing over misery).

[548]

मां मुक्त्वासंभवो यस्माद्ब्रह्मार्थस्यात उच्यते ।  
मां स्पृष्टो मामनुप्राप्त एष पन्था यथोदितः ॥५४९॥

Since there is no possibility of the existence of the (real) thing, the Brahman; therefore, there is the statement made *mām sprṣṭah*, in the sense of *mām anuprāptah*; this is the path as told.

[549]

SP has taken care to draw attention to the *Samdhi* of *muktvā* and *asambhavaḥ* in *muktvāsambhavaḥ*.

शास्त्राचार्योक्तिः पश्चादनुवित्तो मयैव च ।  
ज्ञेयाज्ज्ञाता परो नास्ति प्रत्यग्ज्ञाने यतस्ततः ॥५५०॥

Since (it is first) known from the statement, i.e. teaching of the preceptor (of the scriptures) and later known accordingly (*anuvittah*) by me (through *manana* etc.), (therefore) the knower is not beyond the object of knowing after there has resulted the knowledge of the inner self.

[550]

Read SP: *brahmajñeyam brahmavijñātā tayor abhedād avadhāraṇam ity arthah*.

प्रागप्यवोचं बहुश इममर्थं यथोदितम् ।  
श्रुतितो न्यायतः स्पष्टं नात्मनोऽन्योऽस्ति वेदिता ॥५५१॥

Even earlier have I many times spoken about this very thing, as stated here; (this matter has been made) clear from the Śruti (-statements) and on the basis of reasoning,<sup>1</sup> that there is not any other knower than the Ātman. [551]

Cf. BU 3.7.23.

<sup>1</sup>Cf. SP: *nyāyataḥ pratīco 'nyasya ghaṭavan na draṣṭṛtetyāder ity arthaḥ.*

तेनानेन पथा धीराः प्रत्यग्ध्वान्तच्छिदा सदा ।  
ब्रह्मापियन्ति निर्द्वन्द्वा आप्तमेव तमोहनुतेः ॥५५२॥

By this way, which destroys the darkness about the inner self, the wise ones having risen above duality (*nirdvandva*) ever attain to the Brahman, which is already obtained, by the removal (lit. concealment) of darkness (i.e. ignorance). [552]

आत्मैव ब्रह्म चात्मापि ब्रह्मैव स्याद्यतः स्वतः ।  
तद्याथात्म्यापरिज्ञानात्तद्विपर्ययधीरियम् ॥५५३॥

Since the individual self is the Brahman and so also the Brahman itself is the individual self; therefore, there arises, on its own, this knowledge; the reversal of the two, viz. the (knowing that) the Brahman and the individual self (are distinct) arises from the absence of the complete (*pari*) knowledge of the true nature of the two (i.e. their oneness). [553]

This verse points to the purpose of *āptam eva* in the preceding verse.

निःशेषमिथ्याविज्ञानहेत्वविद्याविनाशकृत् ।  
नान्योऽस्ति ब्रह्मसंबोधाच्छ्रुतिस्तेनेत्यतोऽवदत् ॥५५४॥

There cannot be anything else than the knowledge about the Brahman that effects the destruction of ignorance which is the cause of the false specific knowledge in its entirety; therefore has the Śruti stated this, viz. *tena*. [554]

स्वर्गोऽयमेव प्राग्वतः स्वर्गकामवचस्यपि ।  
कर्मभिस्तदसिद्धेर्हि वेदान्तज्ञानसिद्धितः ॥५५५॥

Earlier (also), while making a statement about one desirous of heaven, it is pointed out (by the Śruti). 'This itself is heaven'; and since that cannot be attained (or secured) through (the performance of ritual) actions, (it is obtained) by securing the knowledge from the Vedānta text(s). [555]

Cf. BU 4.3.22; here is distinguished liberation as heaven from the commonly known heaven in the Vedic part of rituals.

परमानन्द एवातः स्वर्गशब्देन भण्यते ।  
मोक्षप्रकरणान्नित्यः क्रियोत्थोऽतो न गृह्यते ॥५५६॥

For this reason only is understood (or, is expressed) by the word *svarga*, the highest delight. Therefore, since the topic is that of liberation, the eternal (*svarga*) is not taken to be one which has originated by (the performance of ritual) act. [556]

In BU 4.3.22, the reference is to the highest delight in liberation, though mentioned by the word *svarga*, since the topic (*prakaraṇa*) is that of liberation and any ritualistic idea is not to be entertained.

इत उक्तात्मसंबोधमोहोच्छित्तेरनन्तरम् ।  
स्वत एव यतो मुक्ता मुच्यन्तेऽतस्तमोहनुतेः ॥५५७॥

Thus, after the destruction of delusion through the knowledge

of the Ātman, which has been stated as from this (i.e. the Vedānta text), the liberated ones have attained liberation automatically by the removal of darkness. [557]

The verse explains the words *itah* ....

देहपातव्यपेक्षा स्याद्यत्र कारणसंगतिः ।  
सर्वकारणविध्वस्तौ नान्यद्वोधादपेक्ष्यते ॥५५८॥

Where (however is understood) association with the cause (i.e. ignorance), there is dependence on the fall of the body; (but) when there is destruction of the cause in its entirety (*sarva*), nothing else than the knowledge of the Ātman is required (lit. expected). [558]

मुक्तौ तमोतिरेकेण नान्तरायोऽन्य इष्यते ।  
यतोऽतोऽज्ञानविध्वस्तौ मुक्तः सत्रा विमुच्यते ॥५५९॥

Since it is not accepted that, in respect of liberation, there is any hindrance other than darkness (i.e. ignorance); therefore, after there is destruction of ignorance, a person becomes liberated, that is, he attains liberation. [559]

ब्रह्मैव सन्निति तथा प्रागपीदं श्रुतीरितम् ।  
देहपातव्यपेक्षातो न स्यादूर्ध्वश्रुतेरिह ॥५६०॥

Even earlier there has been made this (very) statement in the Śruti, *brahmaiva san* ...; therefore, because of the statement *ūrdhvam* in this Śruti, there is not here<sup>1</sup> the need of (i.e. dependence on) the fall of the body. [560]

<sup>1</sup>That is, for the attainment of liberation.

*Verses 561-597 are the explanation of BU 4.4.9.*

मोक्षमार्गे यथोक्तेऽस्मिन्नविद्योपप्लुताशयाः ।

दर्शनानि विचित्राणि कल्पयन्ति यथारुचि ॥५६१॥

In the context of (lit. respect of the way to) liberation, those who have been affected in mind by ignorance entertain various theories (or, notions), and describe (the same) according to their liking. [561]

शुक्लं ब्रह्मातिसंशुद्धमिति केचिद्विनिश्चिताः ।  
शरदि व्योमवन्नीलमित्याहुरपरे जनाः ॥५६२॥  
पिङ्गलं तत्परं ब्रह्म वह्निज्वालेव शाश्वतम् ।  
वैदूर्यवच्च हरितं केचिदाहुर्विपश्चितः ॥५६३॥  
अपरे लोहितं प्राहुर्जपाकुसुमसंनिभम् ।  
यथा रूपे तथा ज्ञेया शब्दादिष्वपि कल्पना ॥५६४॥

Some (of them) have decided that the Brahman is bright and extremely pure; others have said that (it is) blue like the sky during autumn. [562]

And some wise ones have said that the highest Brahman is eternally tawny like a flame of fire, while some (others among them) described it to be green (blue?) like the jewel *vaidūrya*. [563]

(Yet) others have described it to be red and similar in colour to *japā* flower. Thus, about the colour (of the Brahman), so there has to be understood, in respect of sound (referring to the Brahman), (a similar variety of) notion. [564]

Verse 562 has a reference to CU 8.6.1; this is also a reference to the various veins in the human body through which there is the journey of the consciousness to attain the Brahman.

Verse 563 refers to BU 4.2.3.

Verse 564 refers to BU 4.3.20.

अविद्यापटसंवीतचेतसामागमादृते ।  
कामापहतबुद्धीनामेवमाद्या विकल्पनाः ॥५६५॥

These and such ones are the various notions of those whose

intellects have been overwhelmed by desires and whose mind (*cetas*) was wrapped by the band of ignorance, (that is when there is) the absence of traditional learning (*āgama*). [565]

एकमेवैकरूपं सद्वस्त्वज्ञातं निरञ्जनम् ।  
जात्यन्धगजदृष्टयेव कोटिशः कल्प्यते मृषा ॥५६६॥

Thus, the existent reality, which is untainted, of only one form and is falsely conceived in numerous (lit. krores of) ways, as it happens in the case of the born-blind men's seeing an elephant.<sup>1</sup> [566]

SP gives ingenuous reasons for the different attributes assigned to the Brahman.

<sup>1</sup>This is a reference to the known story of some blind men seeing an elephant and entertaining various notions about its form. Possibly, this is based on the then known Jaina story (or, folklore?).

अस्थूलाशब्दनेतीति सर्वमात्रादिनिहनुतेः ।  
कुतोऽकारणकार्येऽस्मिञ्शुक्लादेः संभवः परे ॥५६७॥

How can there be the possibility (of any colour) such as white in respect of the highest (Brahman), which is not (associated with) cause(s) and effect(s), since there has been the rejection (or, denial) of all the means of knowing etc.,<sup>1</sup> as expressed in the words *asthūla*, *aśabda*, *neti* (etc.). [567]

<sup>1</sup>This refers to the agent etc., i.e. *mātr*, *māna* and *meya*.

यस्तु वेदोदितोपायक्षपिताशेषकल्मषः ।  
ब्रह्मणैवानुवित्तोऽयं तेन पन्था गुरुविततः ॥५६८॥

This path has been experienced (lit. known) by a person himself, i.e. a Brāhmaṇa,<sup>1</sup> through faith in (lit. devotion to) the preceptor, (he) who has wiped away (lit. destroyed) the

entire (mass of) sin by (various) means prescribed in the Vedas.

[568]

<sup>1</sup>Cf. SP: *brahmaśabdena brāhmaṇo gr̥hyate*; here, *brāhmaṇa* is *anuvittah*, i.e. *brahmavittam asya iti brahmavittah*.

अव्यावृत्ताननुगतब्रह्मरूपातिरेकतः ।  
न रूपमात्मनोऽस्त्यन्यच्छ्रुतिन्यायानुभूतितः ॥५६९॥  
यतोऽतो ब्रह्मणैवायं पन्था ज्ञातः प्रमाणतः ॥५७०॥  
ब्रह्मणैवेति च ज्ञेया इत्थंभूतार्थलक्षणा ।  
तृतीयेयं न कर्त्रादौ प्रतीचि तदसंभवात् ॥५७१॥

Since there is not any form of the Ātman (i.e. individual self) other than (or beside) the form of the Brahman, which is neither distinguished from nor similar to (any other thing); (this is known) from the Śruti, reasoning and experience; [569] therefore, this path (to liberation) is known through the Brahman itself, as known from the authoritative means, [570] the word *brahmaṇā*<sup>1</sup> there should be understood (as instrumental form) in the sense of the characteristic of what the thing (that is, the person) has become; this instrumental case is not to be understood (lit. used) to convey the sense of an agent etc.,<sup>2</sup> (for) that (use) is not<sup>3</sup> possible in the case of the inner self. [571]

<sup>1</sup>SP points out that in verses 570 and 571 *brahmaṇaiva* are not to be considered as the words from the Śruti; the Saṃdhi *brāhmaṇā* and *eva* is for the sake of metre, used by Sureśvara himself. The specification by *eva* is not intended by the Śruti.

<sup>2</sup>This refers to the means of knowing (*karāṇa*).

<sup>3</sup>That is, it is *akāraka* 'not related to any activity'. This is clarified in the next verse. Read yet SP: *hastena śareṇa rāmeṇetivat kartrādaui kim na syād ata āha neti*.

क्रियाकारकभेदोऽयं प्रत्यगज्ञानहेतुजः ।  
यतोऽतो न तृतीयेयं कर्त्रादाविह युज्यते ॥५७२॥



Since this distinction of action and its means is the effect of the cause, viz. ignorance about the inner self; therefore, this instrumental case is not used to convey the sense of the agent etc. [572]

ब्रह्मात्मनोरभिन्नत्वं वस्तुतो यद्यपीक्ष्यते ।  
अनन्तानर्थसंप्राप्तिस्तथापि तदबोधतः ॥५७३॥

Even if there is really accepted non-distinction of the Brahman and the individual self, still there is occurrence (*samprāpti*) of infinite variety of the undesired things,<sup>1</sup> owing to ignorance about that (non-distinction). [573]

<sup>1</sup>This refers to transmigratory existence of different lives.

तथा च यदि नाम स्याद्यथोक्तज्ञानपूर्वकम् ।  
पराक्सर्वार्थविज्ञानं वस्तुवृत्तानुरोधतः ॥५७४॥

Further, if indeed that were so, as preceded by the knowledge (of it) which is stated; then there could have been, in accordance with the nature of the things, specific knowledge of all external objects. [574]

तथाप्यब्रह्मवित्तेन न कैवल्यं पथैति तत् ।  
तेनैति ब्रह्मवित्तस्मान्नान्यः पन्था इति श्रुतेः ॥५७५॥

Even thereby<sup>1</sup> a person would not be a knower of the Brahman;<sup>2</sup> one does not attain to that Brahman (lit. the state of singleness) by that (knowledge). A knower of the Brahman goes by that path (as told in the Upaniṣad)—there is no other way (to attain to the Brahman)—so it is learnt/known from the Śruti. [575]

<sup>1</sup>This reference is to *parāksarvārthavijñānam* in verse 574 above.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. note 1 on verse 568 above.

*Sureśvara explains in verses 576-578 the meanings of the words brahmavit and taijasa.*

ब्रह्मवित्त्वे च को हेतुरित्याशङ्क्याह नः श्रुतिः ।  
पुण्यकृतैजसश्चेति भवेद्ब्रह्मविदुत्तमः ॥५७६॥

Having entertained a doubt as to what could be the cause of being a knower of the Brahman,<sup>1</sup> the Śruti has stated the words *punyakṛt taijasaś ca* 'the knower of the Brahman would thus become excellent, i.e. liberated'. [576]

<sup>1</sup>Cf. note 2 on the verse 568 above.

पुण्यकृज्जायते यस्माच्छुद्धधीरिह मानवः ।  
शुद्धसत्त्वोऽथ तद्ब्रह्म साक्षादात्मनि पश्यति ॥५७७॥

Since, in this context of the attainment of liberation, a human being, who has done meritorious deeds, becomes pure in the intellect; therefore, being pure in his being, he then verily sees in his inner self that Brahman. [577]

तेजःशब्देन संशुद्धं सत्त्वमेवाभिधीयते ।  
तस्मिन्भवस्तैजसः स्यात्प्रत्यक्प्रवणधीर्नरः ॥५७८॥

By the word *tejas* is expressed only the extremely pure being; (therefore), one produced from that (*tejas*) would be *Taijasa*,<sup>1</sup> i.e. 'a person who has turned (or, is inclined) towards understanding the inner self'. [578]

<sup>1</sup>Cf. verse 581 below.

ज्ञानमुत्पद्यते पुंसां क्षयात्पापस्य कर्मणः ।  
यथादर्शितलप्रख्ये पश्यत्यात्मानमात्मनि ॥५७९॥

There arises knowledge on the part of human beings after there is complete removal of their sinful activity, so that a human being sees the Ātman, in his inner self, in the way as (one sees oneself) in the clean surface (*prakhya*) of a mirror.

[579]

गाभैर्होमैर्जातकर्मचूडामौञ्जीनिबन्धनैः ।  
महायज्ञैश्च यज्ञैश्च ब्राह्मीयं क्रियते तनुः ।  
योगिनः कर्म कुर्वन्ति सङ्गं त्यक्त्वात्मशुद्धये ॥५८०॥

“By making offerings in relation to a body on the foetus, the performance of Jātakarman, Cūḍākarma and Upanayana,<sup>1</sup> and by sacrifices big and small, this body (of a human being) is turned into that of (i.e. fit to be) the Brahman.”<sup>2</sup> (Also), “The yogins perform activities after giving up attachment (of every kind), in order to purify themselves.”<sup>3</sup> [580]

<sup>1</sup>*Manusmṛti* 2.27ab.

<sup>2</sup>*Manusmṛti* 2.28cd.

<sup>3</sup>*Gītā* 5.11cd.

*Verses 581-582 state another meaning of punyakṛt.*

योगी वा तैजसोऽत्र स्यात्प्रत्यग्दृष्टौ समर्थतः ।  
विषयाकृष्टधीर्यस्मान्न क्षमः प्रत्यगीक्षणे ॥५८१॥

It is only Yogins or a Taijasa<sup>1</sup> who would have the capability for seeing (the true nature of) the inner self, since a person who has his intellect attracted towards the (external) objects is not capable of seeing the inner self. [581]

<sup>1</sup>Cf. verse 578 above.

सर्वभूतस्थमात्मानं सर्वभूतानि चात्मनि ।  
ईक्षते योगयुक्तात्मा सर्वत्र समदर्शनः ॥५८२॥

“A person, who has devoted himself to Yoga, sees the Ātman residing in all beings and also all the beings in his inner self; (thus), having one and the same attitude towards (i.e. outlook on) all everywhere.” [582]

This is a verse from *Gītā* 6.29.

*Verses 583 and 584 adduce the supporting Śrutis for a Taijasa of purified citta.*

इत्येवं स्मृतयः सन्ति श्रुतयश्च सहस्रशः ॥  
कर्माभिः शुद्धसत्त्वस्य सम्यग्ज्ञानस्य जन्मनि ॥५८३॥

There are thus other various Smṛti texts and also the Śruti statements, in thousands, (pertaining to) the rise of the proper knowledge in the case of a person who has purified his being through the performance of actions. [583]

In this verse, Sureśvara states the general purport of the Smṛtis and the Śrutis. There is a stress on *cittaśuddhi* through (Vedic) rituals.

यस्मिन्विशुद्ध इत्येवं सत्त्वशुद्धौ ध्रुवा स्मृतिः ।  
तमेतमिति च स्पष्टं श्रौतानि च वचांसि नः ॥५८४॥

In the words *yasmin viśuddhe* (*Mundakopaniṣad* 3.1.9), and so also in *sattvaśuddhau dhruvā smṛtiḥ* (CU 7.26.2) and further in *tam etam* (BU 4.4.22), there are for us clear statements from the Śruti.<sup>1</sup> [584]

The verse justifies reference to the Śruti texts in the preceding verse.

<sup>1</sup>SP observes on this: this use of *ca* is to commence the statement *yena kena cana yajeta* with what are actually stated above.

*This verse states the result for punyakṛt and taijasa.*

प्रसिद्धमहिमानौ वा पुण्यकृद्योगिनाविह ।  
ब्रह्मवित्स्तूयते ताभ्यां ब्रह्मविद्याप्रवृत्तये ॥५८५॥

In this world,<sup>1</sup> those who perform meritorious deeds and the Yogins have their greatness known (to all); and the knower-/experiencer of the Brahman is praised by them in order that they enter on (securing) the lore of the Brahman. [585]

This is the gist of BU 4.4.9. Read SP: *yo brahmavittam gacchati sa eva punyakṛt taijasaśceti brahmanavidas tābhyāṃ stutiḥ sā ca mumukṣūṇāṃ brahmanavidyoddeśena śravaṇādīpravṛttāvupakarotīty arthah.*

<sup>1</sup>SP: *iheti jantumātroktiḥ.*

*In verses 586-603 is presented the view of jñānakarmasamuccayavādins and its refutation.*

इह केचिन्महात्मानः प्रत्यङ्मोहच्छिदा सह ।  
पुण्यकृतैजसत्वाभ्यां ज्ञानेनाहुः समुच्चयम् ॥५८६॥

In this context, some great scholars<sup>1</sup> have posited the (theory of) the combination of being a performer of meritorious deeds and having a purified intellect by aquisition of the knowledge about the Brahman which destroys ignorance about the inner self. [586]

Verses 586-589 explain the BU sentence *tena ...* according to those who hold the theory of *jñānakarma-samuccaya*.

<sup>1</sup>This is possibly the reference to Bhartṛprapañca or his followers.

पुण्यकृतपुण्यकर्मा यो योगी तैजस उच्यते ॥५८७॥

By *punyakṛt* is understood a Yogin who has done meritorious

deeds and is also a Taijasa.

[587]

This explains the *samuccaya* understood by them, who are mentioned in the preceding verse.

ब्रह्मज्ञानैकनिष्ठः सन्पुण्यकृतैजसश्च सन् ।  
शास्त्रोपदिष्टमैकात्म्यं शक्तो योगेन वीक्षितुम् ॥५८८॥

Being devoted only to (the acquisition of) knowledge about the Brahman and a performer of meritorious deeds and also (being a) Taijasa; he is able to see through (or, by means of) Yoga<sup>1</sup> the non-duality of the Ātman which is taught in the scripture. [588]

<sup>1</sup>SP explains: *yogah sādhanānām melanam* see the next verse.

परस्परं व्यपाश्रित्य यथोक्तं साधनत्रयम् ।  
एकार्थसिद्धयेऽलं स्यान्नान्यथेदं त्रिदण्डवत् ॥५८९॥

These three means together (to) the acquisition of the knowledge as stated (before) become effective, after having depended on one another; otherwise, this triad would not be sufficient for acquiring the one object/end; like three pieces of straw.<sup>1</sup> [589]

<sup>1</sup>The thatched wall of a hut (*kudiyādi*) built up of straws, say three in number; but if these straws are taken singly they cannot be effective in building a hut. if only they are together, they are suitable for building a hut; in the same way, the three means, mentioned above, have to operate together—this is the idea of *jñānakarmasamuccaya* theorists.

*Verses 590 and 591 are a brief refutation of jñānakarmasamuccaya.*

समुच्चयोऽयमस्माभिर्यथाभाणि तथा यदि ।

व्याख्यायते न दोषः स्यात्तत्र मानस्य संभवात् ॥५९०॥

If this combination (of the three means) is explained in the way as we have said earlier, then there would not be any fault in it, for that can possibly be an/the authoritative means for securing liberation. [590]

इतोऽन्यथा चेद्व्याख्यानं क्रियते बुद्धिलाघवात् ।  
दुर्निवारेह साप्नोति योक्ता दोषपरंपरा ॥५९१॥

If, however, another sort of explanation is offered, through weakness of intellect;<sup>1</sup> there occurs unavoidably a chain of undesired results which has been stated before. [591]

<sup>1</sup>The original word *buddhilāghava* is significantly used with two senses, (i) strength of the intellect and (ii) weakness of the intellect—the first is only mockingly hinted at. Cf. SV 357ab: *vijñānakarmanos tredhā*.

अपुण्यपुण्योपरमे यं पुनर्भवनिर्भयाः ।  
शान्ताः संन्यासिनो यान्ति तस्मै मोक्षात्मने नमः ॥५९२॥

“Salutation to Him, who is (of the nature of) liberation, the one whom they attain to; those who, after merit and demerit have ceased (to function/to produce results), have become free from fear of rebirths, the tranquil ones and the Saṃnyāsins.” [592]

This is *Mahābhārata* 12.47.37.

त्यज धर्ममधर्मं च उभे सत्यानृते त्यज ।  
उभे सत्यानृते त्यक्त्वा येन त्यजसि तं त्यज ॥५९३॥

“Give up both merit and demerit, both truth and untruth; having abandoned truth and untruth, abandon (even) that through (the help of which) you abandon the two.” [593]

This is *Mahābhārata* 12.316.40.

निराशिषमनारम्भं निर्नमस्कारमस्तुतिम् ।  
अक्षीणं क्षीणकर्माणं तं देवा ब्राह्मणं विदुः ॥५९४॥

“Deities have called (i.e. accepted) him a Brāhmaṇa, who does not have any hankering, who does not enter upon any activity, who does not come with salutation and praise, the unexhausted and he who has exhausted (i.e. got over) all the activities.”

[594]

This is *Mahābhārata* 12.255.33.

नैतादृशं ब्राह्मणस्यास्ति वित्तं  
यथैकता समता सत्यता च ।  
शीलं स्थितिर्दण्डनिधानमार्जवं  
ततस्ततश्चोपरमः क्रियाभ्यः ॥५९५॥

“A Brāhmaṇa does not have any (other) wealth which is like his one-mindedness, equanimity, and truthfulness; (also) exemplary conduct, demeanour, the discharge of the right to punish (or, non-violence?), and straightforwardness—from all of them (there is for him) the cessation of all activity (and its effects).”

[595]

This is *Mahābhārata* 12.169.35.

अर्थस्य मूलं निकृतिः क्षमा च  
कामस्य रूपं च वयो वपुश्च ।  
धर्मस्य यागादि दया दमश्च  
मोक्षस्य सर्वोपरमः क्रियाभ्यः ॥५९६॥

“The origin/source of wealth is insult and forgiveness and the nature of desire is beauty and form; that of Dharma is performance of sacrifice, compassion and control over senses;



so also that of liberation is total keeping away (or abstinence) from (ritual) activities.” [596]

Verse 596 is reported to be a composition of Vyāsa as in the text. But no definite text is traceable.

इत्येवं स्मृतिशास्त्राणि सर्वत्यागपुरःसरम् ।  
ज्ञानजन्माभिदधति तथा श्रुतिवचांसि च ॥५९७॥

This and such other various scriptures in the form of the Smṛtis speak about the rise of knowledge (about the Brahman) as preceded by renunciation of everything; so also are there the statements in the Śruti.<sup>1</sup> [597]

<sup>1</sup>For example, BU 1.5.16: *na karmaṇā ...* (SP).

*Verses 598-605 are explanation of BU 4.4.10.*

एकात्म्यदर्शनादुक्ताद्यदन्यद्दर्शनान्तरम् ।  
अन्धं तम इति श्रुत्या तदिहापोद्यतेऽखिलम् ॥५९८॥

Whatever be the view adopted by some person(s), other than what is already stated, viz. knowing (lit. seeing) the non-duality of the Ātman is, the whole of it, rejected by the Śruti in the statement *andham tamaḥ* (BU 4.4.10). [598]

तमोमोहादिभेदेन तमोऽनेकस्वलक्षणम् ।  
यतोऽतोऽन्धं तम इति विशिनष्टि श्रुतिस्तमः ॥५९९॥

Since *tamas* ‘darkness/ignorance’ has various characteristics of its own, varying as want of knowing, delusion etc.;<sup>1</sup> therefore the Śruti specifies darkness as *andham tamaḥ* ‘blinding darkness’. [599]

<sup>1</sup>This refers to *mahāmoha*, *tāmisra*, *andhas* as varieties of darkness.

अन्धं मूढं तमो यान्ति येऽविद्यां समुपासते ॥  
विरक्ता अपि संसारान्नैकात्म्यं ये विदुर्नराः ॥६००॥

Those, who devote themselves to what is really ignorance,<sup>1</sup> reach *andha tamas* where *andha* means delusion— (this refers to) even those men, who, though indifferent to or detached from the transmigratory world,<sup>2</sup> have not known the non-duality of the Ātman. [600]

<sup>1</sup>This refers to those who continue to perform some meditations which also are some kinds of rituals.

<sup>2</sup>In connection with this, SP states *aviraktāḥ kevalakarminas tāmasaṃ dehaṃ grhṇanti viraktā daharādiparā rājasam iti bhedaḥ*.

संभतिवचसापीयमविद्यैवाभिधीयते ।  
अविद्यातो हि संभूतिः सर्वस्य जगतो यतः ॥६०१॥

In (or By) the word *sambhūti* (of the Mādhyandina recension)<sup>1</sup> also, this very ignorance is meant (or, expressed); since (*hi*) the origin of the entire world is (only) from ignorance. [601]

<sup>1</sup>*andham tamah praviśanti ye sambhūtim* where *avidyā* of Kāṇva is replaced by *sambhūti*.

ततो भूयस्तमो यान्ति ये विद्यायां रता जनाः ।  
अणिमादावविद्योत्थे पराक्वित्ततया रताः ॥६०२॥

From that (i.e. the world) do they go to darkness again— they, i.e. the people, who are devoted to *vidyā* ‘worldly knowledge’<sup>1</sup>; (indeed) they are interested in such (*siddhis*) as<sup>2</sup> *aṇimā* ‘minuteness’ etc. which have arisen from ignorance, devoted as they are to that *vidyā*, with their mind turned outwards (away from) reality. [602]

<sup>1</sup>Cf. verse 603 and 604 below.

<sup>2</sup>For instance, *laghimā*, *mahimā*, ... *aiśvarya*.

ग्राह्यग्राहकभेदेन याविद्यामात्रकारणा ।  
विद्येति सेह विज्ञेया नैकात्म्यप्रसमीक्षणम् ॥६०३॥

Here (in this context) *vidyā* is to be known as having a cause merely in *avidyā*, characterized together with distinctions such as *grāhya* and *grāhaka*; implying as this means not mindful of the non-duality (of the Ātman). [603]

This calls for an explanation of a term *vidyā* in verses 604-605.

कर्मार्थद्योतिका वेह विद्यात्राप्यभिधीयते ।  
तस्यामभिरता ये स्युर्वेदान्तार्थानपेक्षिणः ॥६०४॥  
विशन्त्यज्ञास्तु ते सन्तस्ततो भूयः परं तमः ।  
मिथ्याज्ञानाधिकत्वेन भूयस्त्वं तमसो भवेत् ॥६०५॥

Even here also that *vidyā* is intended (lit. expressed) which is the conveyor (lit. revealer) of the objects of activity; those who are devoted to it are (persons) who do not pay heed to the meaning of the Vedānta texts; [604] being ignorant, however, they enter once again from that (*vidyā*) into great/pitch darkness (*param tamah*); the greatness of the darkness is owing to the excessive measure of false knowledge. [605]

In verses 603-605 Sureśvara glosses on the word *vidyā* as *naikātmīyaprasamīkṣaṇam*, *karmārthadyotikā(vidyā)* and *mithyā-jñānādhikā*. It appears in the last line of verse 605 that Sureśvara strikes at the Mīmāṃsakas who hold ritual to be more important than Īśvara himself.

*Verses 606-608 are the explanation of BU 4.4.11.*

यदि ते तत्तमो यान्ति को दोष इति चोदिते ।  
अनन्दा इति वाक्येन तद्दोषोऽथाभिधीयते ॥६०६॥

(If it is excepted:) ‘What fault is seen in that they go to darkness?’—this being argued, the answer is: ‘The fault in that is expressed in the sentence *anandāḥ* ...’ [606]

अनानन्दाभिधा लोकास्तीव्रदोषसमन्विताः ॥६०७॥

Those worlds, which are beset with (lit. accompanied by) severe difficulties/faults are called by the name *anānanda*.<sup>1</sup> [607]

<sup>1</sup>This is the paraphrase of *ananda*, for the sake of metre.

तांस्ते प्रेत्याभिगच्छन्ति येऽविद्वांसोऽबुधो जनाः ।  
अविद्वांसो न सामान्यात्किंतु येऽत्राबुधो जनाः ॥६०८॥

Having died, they go to those worlds; those who have not known (the nature of the Ātman) and are therefore unwise;<sup>1</sup> they are not to be taken as non-knowers (about the Ātman)—not in a general way—but that they are persons who are (entirely) ignorant<sup>2</sup> (about the same). [608]

<sup>1</sup>This is almost a quotation from BU 4.4.11; *abudhaḥ* = *abudhāḥ* from the root-noun *budh*.

<sup>2</sup>This means ‘unaware of’.

*Verses 609-615 explain BU 4.4.12.*

आत्मानं चेद्विजानीयात्सर्वधीवृत्तिसाक्षिणम् ।  
अशनायाद्यतिक्रान्तं कथंचित्सत्त्वशुद्धितः ॥६०९॥  
कथं तमभिजानीयादित्युक्त इदमुच्यते ।  
पुरुषः परमात्मायमयमस्मीतिवाक्यतः ।  
किमिच्छन्कस्य वार्थाय शरीरं संज्वरेत्तदा ॥६१०॥

‘If a person would know the Ātman as the witness of all the modifications of the intellect, and as one which has transgressed hunger etc., somehow through purification of

himself (or his intellect), [609]  
 how should one know that person?' If this is asked, the following is said (in answer): 'This individual being (*puruṣa*) is the highest Ātman, as understood from the sentence *ayam asmi*'.<sup>1</sup> Then (i.e. in that modification)<sup>2</sup> how would the body feel torment, with the want of which thing and for the sake of what thing?' [610]

<sup>1</sup>This is quoted from BU 4.4.12. Also SP adds there the well-known Mahāvākya *tat tvam asi*.

<sup>2</sup>This refers to the second half of BU 4.4.12.

सर्वेच्छानां समाप्तत्वादात्मकामप्रबोधतः ।  
 आक्षिप्यतेऽत इच्छेह किमिच्छन्नितिवाक्यतः ॥६११॥

Since all the desires have been obtained through knowing about the (real) desire the Ātman, there is, therefore, in the sentence *kim icchan* ... snapped aside (i.e. rejected) desire (in its entirety). [611]

प्रत्यगात्मातिरेकेण यस्माच्चान्यत्र पश्यति ।  
 कस्य कामाय वा चातोऽप्यनात्माक्षिप्यतेऽखिलः ॥६१२॥

Since (this person)<sup>1</sup> does not see anything else than the individual (or, lit. inner) self, there is the question asked in the words *kasya kāmāya vā ca*, with reference to all (of) the non-Ātman. [612]

<sup>1</sup>This refers to one who has obtained the knowledge of the Brahman.

शरीरज्वरमन्वेष संज्वरेद्ब्रह्म सन्कथम् ।  
 निःसङ्गस्य हि संबन्धो देहेनास्य न कश्चन ॥६१३॥

How would he, being the Brahman itself, feel torment after the torment of the body? Indeed, in the case of the person,

who is non-attached (to the body), there is not any connection of him with the body. [613]

नातो देहादिदुःखेन दुःखित्वं प्रत्यगात्मनः ।  
निःशेषदुःखसंबन्धहेतूच्छित्तेः प्रबोधतः ॥६१४॥

Therefore, in the case of the individual self, there is no feeling of sorrow on account of the torment of the body; for (already) there is complete destruction of every connection with misery (or sorrow) on account of the knowledge of the Ātman. [614]

भयोऽसह्यमहादुःखनीडदेहप्रवेशन-  
हेत्वविद्यासमुच्छित्तेर्देहं चानुविशेत्कृतः ॥६१५॥

How would he again enter into a body since there is destruction of ignorance which is the cause of (his) entry into the body, i.e. the abode of extremely unbearable misery? [615]

This is based on the reading of the Mādhyandina recension *śarīram anusāñcaret* for the Kāṇva recension's *anusamjvaret*.

*Verses 616-623 explain BU 4.4.13.*

शास्त्राचार्यप्रसादात् क्षपिताशेषपाप्मनः ।  
वित्तो बुद्ध्यादिसाक्षीशः प्रतिबुद्धस्तथैकलः ॥६१६॥

However, through the favour of the preceptor and the scripture(s), the person has his entire sin destroyed; therefore, being an experiencer of the Brahman, he becomes the witness of the intellect etc.<sup>1</sup> and also alone (that is separated from the body) and enlightened (*pratibuddha*). [616]

This is the meaning of the Mantra beginning with *yasya* and connected with *sa hi sarvasya kartā*.

<sup>1</sup>This refers to the various organs.

अत्रात्तेजोभिरत्यर्थं देहः संदिह्यते यतः ।  
संदेहस्तेन देहोऽयं संदेघश्छान्दसत्वतः ॥६१७॥

Since this body is fattened<sup>1</sup> by food, i.e. various types of lustres; therefore, this body is described as *saṁdeha*. In the text of the Upaniṣad, the reading *saṁdegha* is to be regarded as a Vedic peculiarity.<sup>2</sup> [617]

<sup>1</sup>The word is *saṁdihyate* is paraphrased by SP as *samyag upacīyate*.

<sup>2</sup>It seems Sureśvara has accepted that the reading in BU 4.4.13 is *saṁdegha*, as reported by Limaye, under BU 4.4.13, as a reading in some mss. of the Mādhyandina recension. There are however two other readings, viz. *saṁdehye* and *saṁdehe* read by the mss.

आध्यात्मिकाधिभूताधिदैविकार्थातिसंकरात् ।  
गुणप्रधानभावेन गहनोऽयं ततो मतः ॥६१८॥

Owing to a complete intermixture of objects that pertain to the body, to the elements, and to the divine world, there is connection among them as the principal and its subordinates—and, therefore, this (worldly body) is very complex (i.e. very difficult to grasp). [618]

संदेहे गहनेऽत्रात्मा प्रविष्टो जलसूर्यवत् ।  
विविच्य येन विज्ञातः स स्याद्विश्वकृदीश्वरः ॥६१९॥

In this very complex *saṁdeha* (for *saṁdehya* in the text of BU) this Ātman has entered, as the sun (enters) into waters, by whom having discriminated/deliberated, it was known specifically it would become the creator of all, the Lord. [619]

This verse explains the meaning of *praviṣṭa* and *sa viśvakṛt*.

प्रत्यग्याथात्म्यसंबोधात्सर्वं तेन कृतं भवेत् ।

निःशेषपुरुषार्थाप्तेर्न कार्यं शिष्यते परम् ॥६२०॥

By knowing the nature of the inner self, it would have done all (that has to be done); (for) after obtaining all the ends of human life, there would not remain for it anything else to be done (or accomplished). [620]

स हि सर्वस्य कर्तेति तस्मादेवाभिधीयते ।  
कृतकृत्यत्वतो हेतोर्लोकोऽयं तस्य लोकिनः ॥६२१॥

Therefore, it is said *sa hi sarvasya kartā ...*; therefore, for the reason of his being one who has accomplished all the tasks to be performed, there is for him, the world, it belongs to the master of this world. [621]

*Verses 622-629 explain sa viśvakṛt.*

निःशेषजनिमत्कार्यहेतोर्वा ज्ञाततत्त्विनः ।  
विश्वकृत्त्वं भवेदेवं हीतिहेतुपरिग्रहात् ॥६२२॥

Or (rather), being the performer of all the tasks of the life (lit. birth), i.e. by being the knower of the tasks of life, he would have the nature of the performer of everything (*viśvakṛt*); (the word) *hi* (in the text) is for the sake of conveying the cause (of his being *viśvakṛt*). [622]

तस्य साक्षादयं लोको योऽहं ब्रह्मेतिबोधितः ।  
भेदाशङ्कापनुत्त्यर्थं स उ लोक इतीर्यते ॥६२३॥

The words *sa u loka* are used in the statement for averting any doubt about his distinction (from the world); since this world is for him directly perceptible, as he is awakened (to the knowledge) *aham brahma*. [623]

We have followed the text *aham brahmetibodhitaḥ* which could be read as *aham brahmetibodhataḥ*.



Verses 624-629 explain BU 4.4.14.

इहैव कृतकृत्यत्वात्सन्तः स्याम परं यदि ।  
ब्रह्म प्रत्यक्तया विद्मः कथञ्चित्कल्मषक्षयात् ॥६२४॥

(It may be asked:) 'If we would have accomplished what is to be accomplished and become the highest (Brahman) in this very (transmigratory existence), then, somehow, we would understand it being its inner self, owing to the wearing away/destruction of all the sin'. [624]

This is to explain the sentence *ihaiva* ... pointing to the result of knowing the non-distinction between the Ātman and the non-Ātman.

न चेदथ परं विद्मः शास्त्राचार्यानुसारतः ।  
अवेदिनं तदा बालं विनष्टिर्महती व्रजेत् ॥६२५॥

'If, on that knowing (*atha*), we do not know the highest (Brahman) by following the preceptor and the scripture(s), then to this non-knower of the Vedas,<sup>1</sup> the ignorant one,<sup>2</sup> there would come great loss (i.e. destruction).' [625]

This explains *na ca* ....

<sup>1</sup>That is, one who has not been able to distinguish between the Ātman and the non-Ātman.

<sup>2</sup>The word in the original BU text is *avedi*, which is paraphrased by SP *vedanahīnah*.

विनष्टिं महतीं चेयाद्योऽवेद्यात्माविचक्षणः ॥६२६॥  
विनष्टिर्महती चेह विनाशादिप्रसतितः ।  
आत्माविद्यैव निर्दिष्टा सामानाधिकरण्यात् ॥६२७॥

And a person, who has not known the Veda and has therefore been unable to distinguish between the Ātman and the

individual self, would come to great loss. [626]

And here (in this situation), great loss (would result) into the effect, viz. perishing etc., (for, in these words) there is mention made of ignorance about the Ātman by the use of the same case relation between the two words. [627]

In the first line the words *avedī avicakṣaṇa* repeat the thought expressed by the words *avedin* and *bāla* in the preceding verse.

उक्तार्थस्य प्रकाशार्थमुत्तरार्धेन भण्यते ।  
ये तद्विदुरिति श्रुत्या स्पष्टार्थप्रतिपत्तये ॥६२८॥

In order to express this thought, which is (just) mentioned, there is stated by the Śruti in the latter half (of the sentence) *ye tad viduh*, in order that one understood the thought very clearly. [628]

Read SP for details: *ye tad vidur iti śrutirūpenottarārdhena pūrvārdhārtha eva prapañcārtham ucyate prapañcanam coktārthasya spaṣṭatāpratipattiyartham iti yojanā tatra prathamapādārthas tritīyapādena prapañcyate dvitīyapādārthas caturthapādeneti vibhāgaḥ.*

ब्रह्मैव सन्तो विज्ञानात्प्रागतो ब्रह्मबोधतः ।  
भवामो ब्रह्म नानासं दशमो दशमं यथा ॥६२९॥

Therefore, being the Brahman itself before knowing the Brahman, i.e. even before acquiring the specific knowledge (about it from the sentence), we become the Brahman which has not been obtained, just like a person (in a group of ten persons knows himself) as the tenth one. [629]

*Verses 630-634 are explanation of BU 4.4.15.*

ब्रह्मास्मीति यदैवैतमात्मानं देवमञ्जसा ।  
अनुपश्यति साक्षात्तमीश्वरं भूतभव्ययोः ॥६३०॥

ईश्वरप्रत्यगात्माप्तेस्तदा तद्भेदनाशतः ।  
ईशितव्यत्वसंक्रान्तेर्न ततो विजुगुप्सते ॥६३१॥

When (the individual being) sees this (inner self), the shining one, the divine (being) as 'I am Brahman', in a clear (or, smooth) way, then does he directly perceive the Lord of both of what was and what will be. [630]

Then, because of the removal (lit. destruction) of the distinction between the two, that is through knowing (lit. obtaining) the nature of the Lord as the inner self, and by turning into the one having the nature of what is to be controlled, the individual self does not (anymore) wish to conceal itself from (lit. censure) it.<sup>1</sup> [631]

The word *an̄jasā* 'in a smooth way' is paraphrased as *sākṣāt* 'directly' in the second line.

<sup>1</sup>Cf. *guptim icchati* in just the next verse; also *nindati* in verse 634 below.

गुप्तिमिच्छति सर्वोऽपि यत ईशाद्भयातुरः ।  
अयं तु तदभिन्नत्वान्न ततो गुप्तिमिच्छति ॥६३२॥

(This is so said) since everyone wishes to conceal (himself) from the Lord, being overpowered by fear; but this one (i.e. the individual self), owing to the non-difference from that (i.e. the Lord), does not wish to remain concealed from him. [632]

This means that, on knowing the non-distinction between himself and the Brahman, the individual self does not entertain any fear any more. Cf. *abhayam vai janaka prāpto 'si* (BU 4.2.4).

यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते अप्राप्य मनसा सह ।  
आनन्दं ब्रह्मणो विद्वान्न बिभेतीति शास्त्रगीः ॥६३३॥

Such is the statement in the scripture: 'An individual self, knowing the bliss in the form of the Brahman, does not feel

fear'—'(That Brahman) from which all speech, together with *manas*, withdraws (itself), not having obtained it.' [633]

This is *Taittirīyopaniṣad* 2.4 and 2.9; this is adduced as the scriptural support for the thought in the preceding verse.

न वा निन्दति निःशेषद्वैतहेतुविनाशतः ।  
ऐकात्म्यदर्शनाद्विद्वान्यत्र त्वस्येतिशास्त्रतः ॥६३४॥

On the basis of the scriptural text *yatra tv asya* (BU 4.5.15); it is clear that (the individual self), now the knower, does not (any more) censure himself because of the complete removal (lit. destruction) of the cause of all duality and because of the (direct) perception of its non-duality (or, non-difference from it). [634]

*Verses 635-639 are the explanation of BU 4.4.16.*

निःशेषविक्रियाहेतुकालातिक्रमहेतुतः ।  
जन्मादिविक्रियाषट्कसंगतिस्तस्य नेष्यते ॥६३५॥

The association with the group of six modifications, viz. birth etc.,<sup>1</sup> is not accepted in the case of that (the Ātman), since that overcomes (lit. transgresses) the causes and periods of time (as well) of all the modifications. [635]

<sup>1</sup>This refers to the six *bhāvavikāras* recorded in *Nirukta* 1.2.

अर्वाग्यस्मादयं कालो विकुर्वञ्जनिमज्जगत् ।  
संवत्सरः स्वावयवैरहोभिः परिवर्तते ।  
ज्योतिषामपि तज्ज्योतिरायुर्देवा उपासते ॥६३६॥

This time (which is down) below whom (i.e. the Brahman), (named) as the year, keeps on rotating together with its own parts, viz. days, modifying the world that has an origin—the divine ones wait on (or, are devoted to) that light of luminaries

as the very life,.

[636]

कौटस्थ्यादमृतं ज्योतिर्मृत्युभूम्यतिलङ्घनात् ।  
कालस्य जरणादात्मा श्रुतौ कालंजरो मतः ॥६३७॥

Owing to its immutability, the immortal light, i.e. the Ātman, (mentioned) as *kālañjara* is known in the Śruti on account of its transgressing the region of death and its reducing *kāla* (to nothingness). [637]

Cf. *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad: upāc dyuh* (5.5) and *jñāh vidyāh* (6.16); also SP states *uktaṃ hi--*

*kālah pacati bhūtāni sarvāny eva satātmanā /*  
(*Maitrāyanyupaniṣad* 6.15ab);

and

*kālah pakvo yam anveti yas taṃ veda sa vedavit //*  
*kālah sa pacyate yatra na kālas tatra vai prabhuh /*  
*kālasyaiva ca mṛtyoś ca jaṅgamasthāvarasya ca //*  
*īśate bhagavān ekaḥ satyam etad bravīmi te /*  
(not traced);

and also cites from *Mahābhārata* 12.238.9:

*āhatya sarvasaṅkalpān sattve cittam niveśayet /*  
*sattve cittam samāveśya tataḥ kālañjaro bhavet //*

भावाभावात्मकस्यास्य कार्यकारणवस्तुनः ।  
परमात्मा स्वतः सिद्धेरायुरस्य परार्थतः ॥६३८॥

The highest Ātman, because of its existence in its own right (or on account of itself), is in reality the very life of this thing (lit. world) consisting of effect(s) and cause(s), which is of the nature of positive and negative entities. [638]

गन्धर्वाः पितरो देवा रक्षोभिश्च सहासुराः ।  
यस्मिन्पञ्चजनाः पञ्च विद्यदन्ताः प्रतिष्ठिताः ॥६३९॥

That is the Ātman (in whom) are supported (alternatively,

abiding) five tribes, viz. Gandharvas, Pitṛs, Gods, demons and Asuras;<sup>1</sup> or they are the five (elements ending with) sky.<sup>2</sup>

[639]

<sup>1</sup>The distinction is made between *rākṣasa(s)* and *asuras* in keeping with the Vedic practice.

<sup>2</sup>They are *pṛthivī*, *ap*, *tejo*, *vāyu*, *ākāśa*.

*Verses 640-642 are the explanation of BU 4.4.17.*

पञ्च प्राणादयो वा स्युरन्नान्तास्तच्छ्रुतत्वतः ।  
अत्राभावे विवक्ष्यन्ते काण्वानां ज्योतिषा सह ।  
तमेव कारणात्मानं विद्वान्मन्येऽमृतोऽमृतम् ॥६४०॥

The five would as well be the five *prānas* mentioned with food in the end, for they are so heard; in the absence of the mention of the food, the five are intended by the followers of the Kāṇva recension (as four which are specifically stated in the text) together with light (*jyotis* as the fifth); that one, do I, the immortal knower, understand as the immortal Ātman which is the cause (of all). [640]

This is specifically so mentioned in BU 4.4.17 of the Mādhyandina recension.

In this verse, Sureśvara has stated two interpretations of *pañca jana* (i) according to the Mādhyandina tradition and (ii) according to the Kāṇva tradition, but, in this latter, there is no reading of *anna* which is replaced by the word *jyotiṣām jyotiḥ* as the fifth one, from BU 4.4.16. Cf. BS 1.4.12.

कार्यकारणयोस्तत्त्वं यस्मादात्मैव निर्द्वयः ।  
मन्य आत्मानमेवातः कार्यकारणवज्जगत् ॥६४१॥

Since the reality (truth) of effect(s) and cause(s) is only the Ātman, which is without duality; therefore, do I consider only the Ātman itself as this world which consists in effect(s) and

cause(s).

[641]

The verse explains the idea of the word *kāraṇātman* in the preceding verse.

प्रध्वस्तभेदहेतुत्वात्कारणादेरसंभवात् ।  
अमृतोऽमृतमित्याह स्वयं विद्वानिति श्रुतिः ॥६४२॥

And the Śruti itself has declared that this (individual self) knows the immortal (i.e. the Ātman) and itself (thereby) becomes immortal, because there is destruction of the cause of distinction and because there does not any more remain any cause as possible. [642]

*Verses 643-647 are the explanation of BU 4.4.18.*

यतः प्राणादिभावोऽयं प्राणादीनां तमेव ये ।  
निचिक्युस्ते विदुः साक्षादग्र्यं ब्रह्म सनातनम् ॥६४३॥

Since there is this becoming (of the Brahman) as *prāṇas* etc.; therefore, they have directly known only that one, which is the foremost among all the *prāṇas* and which has been in existence all the time. [643]

This explains the same thought as in *prāṇasya prāṇam ...* in BU 4.4.18 itself.

निरपेक्षात्मनैवेह सर्वस्यात्मवतो यतः ।  
प्राणादेरात्मवत्ता स्यात्प्राणस्य प्राणमित्यतः ॥६४४॥

Since the state of being sentient belongs to all vital breaths possessed of sentience, by nature without having any expectancy, therefore, (that) Prāṇa is the life of the *prāṇas* (i.e. organs). [644]

अनात्मा हि स्वतोऽसिध्यन्स्वतःसिद्धमपेक्षते ।

आत्मनस्तु स्वतः सिद्धेर्नापेक्षानात्मसंश्रयात् ॥६४५॥

Indeed (*hi*) all the non-Ātman, which cannot exist in its own right, does expect (i.e. depends on the Ātman), that exists in its own right; but since the Ātman has been existent, in its own right, it does not have a resort in any non-Ātman.

[645]

अन्यतः संगतिः सेयमविचारितसिद्धिका ।  
अविद्योत्सङ्गसंस्थैव तत्त्वज्ञानाद्विनश्यति ॥६४६॥

This is then the association of the Ātman with another, being established (even) without (any deliberate) consideration (*avicāritasiddhika*), resting only on the lap of ignorance; it gets destroyed through knowledge of reality.<sup>1</sup>

[646]

This refers to *prānādeḥ ātmavattvam*.

<sup>1</sup>This is the result of knowing the relation between the Ātman and the non-Ātman.

अकार्याकारणात्मैव कार्यकारणवस्तुनः ।  
तत्त्वमुक्तं पृथिव्यादेर्नभोन्तस्याक्षरं परम् ॥६४७॥

Thus is stated the true nature of this (world) consisting of effect(s), and cause(s), as the Ātman having the nature of non-cause and non-effect; that is, of all, which begins with (the mention of) earth and ends with sky; namely, in reality, the highest imperishable self.

[647]

*Verses 648-672 are the explanation of BU 4.4.19.*

तस्यास्य दर्शनोपायः कः स्यादित्यभिचोदिते ।  
मनसैवेत्यतः प्राह श्रुतिर्ब्रह्मावबोधने ॥६४८॥

Now one might ask: 'What can be the means of the sight of this one, which is (so far described)? The Śruti states (in



answer), 'With *manas* only (there can be the seeing)'; in order that one should well (*ava*) know the Brahman. [648]

अवदधे यतश्चेयं मनसैवेति च श्रुतिः ।  
मनोतिरेकतोऽपेक्षा नैवातः साधनान्तरे ॥६४९॥

Also, since this Śruti again<sup>1</sup> emphasised (or specified the Brahman as what can become known) only with (i.e. by means of) *manas*, therefore, there is no need (lit. expectancy) of any other means for knowing it. [649]

<sup>1</sup>This refers to *Kāthopanīśad* 4.11: *manasaivedam āptavyam*; this is understood by force of the second *ca* in this verse.

आत्मानात्मपदार्थेषु विज्ञानोत्पत्तिसाधनम् ।  
मनः साधारणं दृष्टं सर्वज्ञानैकहेतुतः ॥६५०॥

In respect of the objects, such as the Ātman and the non-Ātman, it is known that *manas* is the common means that brings about the rise of the specific knowledge (*vijñāna*) about them; for the reason that it is the only cause that gives rise to all types of knowledge. [650]

Here the oneness of *manas* and the intellect is the basis of this thought; this reminds us of the two inseparable (yet distinguishable) aspects of the inner organs (*antahkaraṇa*) of human beings. Therefore, instead of the intellect, *manas* is mentioned as what grasps; as it is said: it takes the shape of the object grasped (and not the intellect, as is usually mentioned).

प्रत्यक्चिदाकृतिस्तत्र सर्वदा धर्मधर्मिणोः ।  
हेत्वन्तरानपेक्षत्वादात्मत्वात्संनिधेः सदा ॥६५१॥  
आत्माकृतिरतो नित्या तद्धेतोः संभवात्सदा ।  
अज्ञानादेश्च चिद्रूपं तद्याथात्म्यान्न वार्यते ॥६५२॥

In that respect (*tatra*), there would always be the shape of

the sentience within, since there has always been the proximity of the Ātman and what grasps and what is grasped (*dharmadharmin*)<sup>1</sup> since there is no other cause of the expected/necessary proximity. [651]

Therefore, the shape of the Ātman (which *manas* comes to have) is ever abiding (*nitya*), on account of there being the possibility of the ever existent cause of it<sup>2</sup> and such form of ignorance etc., as the shape of the sentience cannot be overruled (lit. averted); because of its being the true nature of the same (i.e. *manas*). [652]

This verse presupposes the question: *manodhūnā ced ātmasiddhir ātmano jādavaṃ syād atrāha ... pratyag iti* (NKL ms. p.751); and then NKL (ms. p.751) explains verse 651 thus: *buddhitaddharmayoḥ svarūpalābhamātreṇa cidābhāsavyāptatvāt buddhyādisādhakatvād ātmano na jādyam ity arthaḥ*. Then it introduces verse 652: *na kevalam buddhyādeḥ svarūpatvena tatra sadātanaś cidābhāsaḥ kiṃ tu sarvatrety āha -- ātmeti*.

On these two verses SP states *ātmaprasādād eva sarvasya sattā sphūrtiś cetyātmano na jādyam taddarśane manasaḥ sādhanatvoktis tu sadā tadākārasya tasya śravaṇādisaṃskārāpekṣayā kādācitkatadrūpaparināmādhāritvād iti vārtikayos tātparyārthaḥ*.

<sup>1</sup>*dharmin* is the intellect which grasps and *dharma* is knowledge, which is grasped.

<sup>2</sup>This is the ever existing proximity of the Ātman and *manas*.

धर्माधर्माद्यपेक्षत्वादन्यत्वाच्चान्यवस्तुनः ।

शब्दाद्याकारता तस्मात्कादाचित्की धियो भवेत् ॥६५३॥

Therefore, on account of its (i.e. of *manas*) dependence on *dharmādharma* and its being different from other thing (i.e. Ātman), the state of having the shape of a sound etc. on the part of the intellect<sup>1</sup> is only occasional. [653]

<sup>1</sup>SP explains *dhī* as *manas*.

In verses 654-658 there is a discussion that every object taking the shape of the Ātman can lead to ignorance about the knowledge of it.

यद्यपीमौ जगत्यस्मिन्नात्मज्ञानपुरःसरौ ।  
 शब्दाद्यनात्मविज्ञानभावाभावौ स्वभावतः ॥६५४॥  
 तथाप्यनुभवादेव प्रत्यक्तत्त्वानभिज्ञता ।  
 अनात्मबोधवत्सिद्धाविद्यातः प्रत्यगात्मनि ॥६५५॥

Even if, in this world, the positive and negative forms of specific knowledge of the non-Ātmans, e.g. sound etc. are preceded by the knowledge of the Ātman; [654]  
 there is yet ignorance (about the Ātman) owing to its being inside (the body)—as understood from experience; therefore, this absence of knowledge in respect of the inner self is established as having been beset with ignorance about the Ātman. [655]

उत्पन्नस्यापि चोत्पत्तिः कृपाकाशादिवत्ततः ।  
 प्रत्यग्याथात्म्यबोधस्य व्युत्पत्तेर्गुरुशास्त्रतः ॥६५६॥

And, this rise of knowledge about the true nature of the inner self, though (thus) produced (by the proximity of the Ātman and *manas*) from learning (imparted to an individual) by a preceptor and scriptures, is just like (the origination) of the sky which is (delimited by) a well. [656]

प्रसादादनु शास्त्रादेर्मनसैवेत्यतः श्रुतिः ।  
 द्रष्टव्यमात्मनस्तत्त्वमित्याहास्मद्वितैषिणी ॥६५७॥

Therefore, the Śruti, which desires good for us, has said that, after clear understanding (*prasādād anu*)<sup>1</sup> of the scripture, one should experience (lit. see) the true nature of the Ātman with the help of *manas*. [657]

This is a kind of the concluding remark about the meaning

of the sentence *manasā* ....

<sup>1</sup>However SP states *anuśabdo draṣṭavyam ity anena sambadh-  
yate*.

दृश्यं चेन्मनसैवैतद्द्रष्टृत्वादिप्रभेदतः ।  
पुनः प्रसक्तं नानात्वं मैवं यस्मान्निषिध्यते ॥६५८॥

If it is said that there is again contingency of accepting variety (of distinct objects) owing to this distinguishing of the faculty of seeing etc., when it is observed (in the Śruti) that the Ātman is to be seen with the help of *manas*; then the answer is: 'Let this not be said, since (that variety) is rejected'. [658]

A doubt in this verse is at the basis of the BU statement *neha* ....

*Verses 659-661 explain the Śruti neha nānāsti* ....

नेह प्रमाणतो मेयं यस्मान्नानास्ति किं चन ।  
अज्ञातं यदि वा ज्ञातं वस्तु नानात्वभाङ्गन हि ॥६५९॥  
नानात्वबुद्धये नालममितोऽर्थो यतस्ततः ।  
अज्ञातः संशयज्ञातो मिथ्याज्ञातो न भित्तये ॥६६०॥  
सम्यग्ज्ञातोऽपि नैवार्थो द्वैतबोधकृदिष्यते ।  
द्वैतकारणबाधेन सम्यग्ज्ञातत्वसिद्धितः ॥६६१॥

Here (i.e. in Vedānta) there is not any object to be known by any means of knowing, since there is nothing which has a variety in it; be it unknown or known; the (real) thing does not have any variety in it. [659]

Since the (immanent lit. unlimited) thing is not such as to give rise to the cognition of variety; there is, therefore, not any distinct part in it (which is) not known, doubtfully known, or falsely known. [660]

And even if that (real) thing were well known, it is not regarded as causing the cognition of duality by its effecting removal of the cause of duality and by establishing the nature

of itself as what is well known.

[661]

*In verses 662 and 663, there is reasoning presented for the absence of variety (in knowledge).*

मेयव्याप्तिश्च मानानां नान्यव्यावृत्तिवर्त्मना ।  
व्यावर्त्येष्वपि तत्सक्तेर्न चापि लभतेऽवधिम् ॥६६२॥  
मेयेनैव समाप्तत्वात्ततोऽन्या व्यापृतिर्न च ।  
नातो वस्त्वन्तरव्याप्तिं व्यावृत्तिं वाश्नुते प्रमा ॥६६३॥

Grasping (lit. pervading) the object(s) to be known by any/all means of knowing is (not to be understood as) by way of excluding other (things), since that<sup>1</sup> would contingently follow in the case also of those which are to be excluded and, thus, it (i.e. a means of knowing) would not have any scope. [662] Since in only its object of grasping is (the function of a means of knowing completed), there is no other function (of it) whatever; therefore, right knowledge does not involve grasping of any other object of knowing or even excluding (the same).

[663]

<sup>1</sup>Namely, *anyavyāvṛtti*.

*This verse states that any means of knowing cannot be related to exclusion, distinguishing or any non-existent distinction.*

व्यावृत्तेश्चाप्यवस्तुत्वात् सद्रस्तुपलम्भनैः ।  
प्रमाणैरपि संबन्धः प्रत्यक्षप्रमुखैः क्वचित् ॥६६४॥

Also, even the means of knowing, such as direct perception and others, which are for grasping existent things, do not anywhere have any connection (with exclusion), on account of its being a non-existent thing.

[664]

*Sureśvara in verses 665-667 refutes the idea of the sixth pramāṇa i.e. negation or non-apprehension as the means of effecting*

*exclusion.*

अभावमात्रबोधित्वान्नाभावादपि भेदधीः ।  
भावाभावावभावेन प्रत्यक्षेणैव नेक्षते ॥६६५॥

Since negation (the sixth means of knowing) can give cognition of only non-existence, it also cannot give cognition of distinction. As by perception, so by negation (i.e. non-apprehension) existence and non-existence both cannot be apprehended. [665]

योऽपि प्रत्यक्षतोऽभावं वादी कश्चित्समीक्षते ।  
तावन्मात्रावसायित्वाद्द्वैतं नासावपीक्षते ॥६६६॥

And whichever disputant might see here a negative entity (or the absence of a thing) by means of direct perception, even he does not (really) see duality (i.e. the existence of another thing), since that (direct perception) would have accomplished (i.e. got exhausted after achieving) its purpose.<sup>1</sup> [666]

<sup>1</sup>Cp. *anyā vyāptir na* in verse 663 above.

प्रत्यक्षस्यानुवृत्तिं च व्यावृत्तिं तद्विदां च सः ।  
प्रत्यक्षेणैव संपश्येत्कथमित्यभिधीयताम् ॥६६७॥

Now, let it be told as to how that (person)<sup>1</sup> will see only by direct perception the continuity of what is directly perceptible and also the exclusion of those that are different from it. [667]

<sup>1</sup>This refers to the *vādī* 'disputant' in the preceding verse.

*Verses 668-678 affirm the absence of any means of knowing which grasps variety.*

यतो मानं न हीहास्ति नानात्वप्रतिपत्तये ।

खकाष्ण्यवदतस्तत्स्यादविचारितसिद्धिकम् ॥६६८॥

Since here (in respect of the (real) thing) there is not any means of knowing, which can simultaneously result in the awareness of a variety among things; it is established, (even) without (any deliberate) consideration, just like darkness associated with the sky. [668]

अज्ञातवस्तुहेत्वेव यस्मान्नाना ततोऽवदत् ।  
मृत्योः स मृत्युमाप्नोति योऽत्र नानेव पश्यति ॥६६९॥

Since variety of things is caused merely by non-existent things; therefore has (the Śruti) stated *mṛtyoḥ sa mṛtyum āpnoti yo 'tra nāneva paśyati* 'One who sees variety here goes from death to death'. [669]

This is for BU 4.4.19; it is noted in *Kāthopaniṣad* 4.10 also.

मृत्युर्हिरण्यगर्भः स्यात्स्वकार्यप्रलयत्वतः ।  
तस्यापि मृत्युर्विज्ञेयो यत आविरभूदसौ ॥६७०॥

Mṛtyu 'death' should be understood as Hiraṇyagarbha, since it is associated with (or accompanied by) complete merger (dissolution) of its own effect(s); therefore, death should be known of itself (i.e. that death) also, since it has appeared (as a modification). [670]

Whatever is related as a cause to some effect is perishable—this is the basic idea in this verse.

मिथ्यादर्शनदोषित्वान्मिथ्यादर्शनकारणम् ।  
मृत्योर्मृत्युमसावेति यो नानेवेह वीक्षते ॥६७१॥

He, who sees here<sup>1</sup> (what is) like variety, keeps on moving from death to death, which has for its cause false knowledge because of its having the fault of wrong (or false) viewing

(of reality).

[671]

<sup>1</sup>This is to mean 'while there exists only the Brahman'.

पूर्वं ज्ञानसमुत्पत्तेर्नानैवेति ह्यभून्मतिः ।  
ज्ञानोत्पत्तौ तु तद्वाधात्रानेवेति प्रयुज्यते ॥६७२॥

(That person) had a thought that there exists variety (of things) in this world, before there was the rise in him of knowledge (about the Ātman) and, when the knowledge has arisen, there is the removal of that (ignorance or wrong viewing) and therefore (in the Śruti) are used the words *nāneva*.<sup>1</sup> [672]

<sup>1</sup>This explains the force of *iva* after *nānā*.

*Verses 673-703 are the explanation of BU 4.4.20.*

वस्तुवृत्तं यतोऽद्वैतं नानात्वं मोहहेतुजम् ।  
एकधैवात् आत्मायं द्रष्टव्यः श्रुतिवर्त्मगैः ॥६७३॥

Since the existence (*vr̥tta*) of the (real) thing is that of non-duality, therefore the variety (of things) is a product of delusion and, as a result, this Ātman has to be seen as only of one form, (as explained) by them who follow the path of the Śruti. [673]

This is the meaning of the sentence *ekadhā* ....

एकेनैव प्रकारेण भास्वच्चिन्मात्ररूपिणा ।  
शास्त्रैकमानतो ब्रह्म द्रष्टव्यं प्रत्यगात्मना ॥६७४॥

(This means that) the Brahman is to be seen by the individual self with the help of only one authoritative means, i.e. the scriptures only, in one way, i.e. as having the form of mere bright sentience.<sup>1</sup> [674]



<sup>1</sup>Here the instrumental case in *bhāsvaccinmātrarūpiṇā* is in accordance with the Sūtra *ittham bhūtalakṣane* (SP *itthambhāve*) *tr̥tīyā*.

समस्तव्यस्ततादृष्टिरेकधैवेतिवाक्यतः ।  
मिथ्येति गम्यते श्रौतान्मृत्योरिति च निन्दनात् ॥६७५॥

It is understood from the sentence *ekadhaiva* ... that whatever has the view of totality and of particularity is false; for, there is censure (of duality) in the Śruti (in the words) *mṛtyoh* ....

[675]

This refers to verses 669-671 above. Read SP: *vākyasya śrautārtham uktvādhikārtham āha* as introductory to this verse.

एतदप्रमयं ब्रह्म मृत्युहेतोर्निषेधनात् ।  
मृत्युर्वै तम इत्युक्तं तच्च बोधान्निराकृतम् ॥६७६॥

This Brahman is ever obtaining (lit. never failing) as understood from the censure of the cause of death; as stated in *mṛtyur vai tamah* (BU 1.3.28); and (death) is removed (lit. discarded) by the knowledge (arising) from the Śruti.<sup>1</sup>

[676]

AnSS reads a variant *-aprameyam* for *-apramaya* (only in one ms.); this word is used for the sake of metre.

<sup>1</sup>Read NKL (ms. p.753): *vākyottharthajñānam ajñānanivartakātvena mānam na tu vastubodhakatvenety abhipretyāprameyatvam ucyata ity āha etad iti* (as introductory to this verse).

एकधैव यतस्तत्त्वं सर्वस्य जगतस्ततः ।  
क्रियाकारकसंभेदधीर्मृषेत्यवधार्यताम् ॥६७७॥

Since the true nature of the whole world is then (*tatah*, or, from that statement), only (in being) the Ātman of just one form; therefore, the awareness of distinctions such as activity

and the means of activity is to be firmly considered as false.

[677]

यत्र हि द्वैतमित्येवं यत्र त्वस्येति च श्रुतिः ।  
नानात्वदृष्टेर्मिथ्यात्वं स्वयमेवावदत्पुरा ॥६७८॥

Further, the Śruti *yatra hi dvaitam ...* and also the other, *yatra tv asya* have themselves<sup>1</sup> declared already the falsity of viewing the variety of things in the universe.

[678]

The two parts of the Śruti stated are from BU 2.4.14 and 4.5.15.

<sup>1</sup>This is for *svayam*; it could be alternatively translated into 'itself' as well—thus referring to but one text.

*Verses 679-684 pertain to the discussion on the internal contradiction involved in ekadhā draṣṭavyah.*

एकधा चेत्परं ब्रह्म द्रष्टव्यं कथमुच्यते ।  
द्रष्ट्रादिभेदसद्भावे द्रष्टव्यत्वप्रसिद्धितः ॥६७९॥  
अप्रमेयं कथं वस्तु प्रमाणेन प्रमीयते ।  
मीयते चेत्प्रमाणेन नाप्रमेयं तदिष्यते ॥६८०॥

(An objection is raised:) 'If the highest Brahman has to be seen as only of one form,<sup>1</sup> how then is it said that the Brahman is to be seen?'<sup>2</sup> ('This is so,' the awareness has arisen), 'because the nature of things to be seen can be established only when there is existence of duality consisting of *draṣṭr* etc.'

[679]

(This means to say:) 'How can a thing, that cannot be known (or, be said to be) the knower with the help of some means of knowing; if it becomes known by some means', it is (not to be) accepted as an object not to be known.'

[680]

Regarding verse 679: a general rule stated in the second line is for justifying the question raised in the first line.

<sup>1</sup>That is, non-dual.

<sup>2</sup>In the absence of duality, there cannot be the seeing of the Brahman by someone else.

नैष दोषः पुरोक्तत्वात्परिहारस्य चाञ्जसा ।  
भूयोऽपि परिहारोक्तौ भवेत् पिष्टस्य पेषणम् ॥६८१॥

(The answer is given:) 'This is not a fault, because the refutation (of this argument) has been already stated clearly as such, (and) in stating the refutation (of that question) once again would be (the same) as grinding what is already ground'.

[681]

प्रमात्रादेरुपादानमैकात्म्यप्रतिबन्धकम् ।  
यतोऽतस्तत्प्रबोधेऽस्मिन्न प्रमात्राद्यपेक्षते ॥६८२॥

Here, accepting (the notions of) the knower etc. is to be precluded in respect of this awareness (lit. knowing) of the non-duality of the Ātman and, this (duality), i.e. of the knower etc. is not expected (or required) in the knowing of that (i.e. non-dual Ātman).

[682]

The verse has a verb *apekṣate* which should have been *apekṣyate* instead, but Sureśvara has often used such active and passive forms (for each other) in the entire BUBV.

मेयस्य मानसंबन्धे प्रमेय इति गीरियम् ।  
प्रमाफलं त्वप्रमेयं यतो नातो विरुद्धता ॥६८३॥  
अज्ञातवस्तुना योगो मानस्येह यतस्ततः ।  
ज्ञातस्य चाप्रमेयत्वान्नापेक्षा मानसंगतौ ॥६८४॥

(The use of) the word *prameya* is (possible) only when there is connection of what has to be known with what knows it (i.e. the means of knowing); but, since the result (here), consisting in the right knowledge, is what is not to be known, therefore there is no contradiction (involved in the statement

of the Śruti). [683]

Since here (i.e. in this context)<sup>1</sup> there is the connection of knowing with the (real) thing, which has not been known, therefore, there has not been any dependence (noticeable) in the association of the means of knowing with the object (to be known); (this is) owing to the non-knowability of what has been already known. [684]

<sup>1</sup>This refers to *pramāṇabhūmi*, or *vyavahārabhūmi*.

*Verses 685-691 argue that being subjected to the function of knowing is merely imagined (kalpita) and, as a result, there cannot really be any result to be achieved. This leads to the idea that the Brahman is aprameya.*

फलात्मनैव तन्मानं न तु मात्रादिरूपतः ।  
अभिव्यनक्ति नो ज्ञातं नातोऽस्य स्यात्प्रमेयता ॥६८५॥

That can be a means of knowing (in any context) which leads only to what is of the nature of result, and not by its having the forms such as the knower.<sup>1</sup> Further, it (i.e. that means of knowing) reveals to us what is (already) known (and) therefore this (Ātman) does not have the nature of what is to be known (with the help of some means). [685]

Read NKL (ms. p.753): *svaprabhe pravṛttam mānaṃ svaprabhātmanaiva bodhayati na viśayatayety arthaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup>This refers to *māna*, *meya* ....

तरावेव चिच्छदा यद्बद्धैधीभावे तु नेष्यते ।  
प्रमेयत्वं तथाज्ञाते न तु ज्ञाते फलात्मता ॥६८६॥

It is not accepted that (some non-duality) becomes divided (into duality), as in the case of a tree (such a division into two) is accepted/effectuated by some acts (which cut it); therefore, in respect of the so-called unknown, there can be (only) its

nature as what has to be known—however, in respect of what has been already known, there is not (accepted) the peculiarity of being the result. [686]

Read NKL (ms. p.753) the introductory to this verse:  
*mānakṣptasya mānāviṣayatvaṃ dr̥ṣṭāntena sādhayati tarāv iti.*

आमगोऽपीममात्मानं तत्तमोऽवस्तिवत्तर्मना ।  
अवबोधयतीत्येवं भण्यते दृष्टितत्त्वतः ॥६८७॥

Traditional scripture also makes known to us this Ātman by way of removing (lit. destroying) the darkness (i.e. ignorance) about it; that is why (*dr̥ṣṭavyam*) is stated with the notion of seeing one as the true nature of the Ātman. [687]

Read SP: *na hi vrttivyāpyatvād ṛte pratīcaḥ samvidvyāpyatvaṃ kalpyaṃ tadātmatvād ity arthaḥ.*

स्वतःसिद्धाद्यतः सिद्धिरज्ञातादपि चात्मनः ।  
सिद्ध्यसिद्ध्योः प्रमात्रादेस्तत्सिद्धौ किमपेक्षते ॥६८८॥

And, since this establishing of the unknown Ātman, which has already existed in its own right becomes established; therefore, what can be expected<sup>1</sup> for establishing it, viz. the knower etc., when establishing and non-establishing are concerned? [688]

<sup>1</sup>See note on verse 682 above.

ज्ञानव्याप्तिर्हि शब्दादौ स्यादेकप्रकृतित्वतः ।  
अकार्यकारणे व्याप्तिः कथं स्यात्प्रत्यगात्मनि ॥६८९॥

Indeed, grasping (lit. pervading) some knowledge could be (understood/accepted) in respect of sound etc. owing to their having only one nature;<sup>1</sup> how then could there be (such) a grasping (lit. pervading) in respect of the inner self which

is not (of the nature of) cause(s) and effect(s)?<sup>2</sup> [689]

<sup>1</sup>This refers to sound etc. produced by the activity of organs and the intellect.

<sup>2</sup>Because of the non-duality of the Ātman, there can be no case of things having just one (or, uniform) nature.

शब्दप्रवृत्तिहेतूनां प्रत्यगात्मन्यसंभवात् ।  
नाभिधानाभिधेयत्वसंगत्यातः प्रबोध्यते ॥६९०॥

Therefore, it is conveyed to us that, owing to the impossibility (the existence) of cause(s) of the function of words etc., in the case of the individual self, there is not (any) association of it (i.e. the inner self) with names and what are named.

[690]

प्रत्यगज्ञानहेतूत्थो यत्रानात्मा प्रसिध्यति ।  
ज्ञातृज्ञेयप्रभेदः स्यात्तत्र प्रत्यगनात्मनोः ॥६९१॥

Where, (however), the non-Ātman gets established, arisen as it has from ignorance about the inner self, there could (or, can) be distinction of knower, object of knowing in respect of the inner self and the non-Ātman.

[691]

This refers to the Śruti statement *yatra hi dvaitam iva ...* (BU 2.4.14).

*In verses 692 and 693, it is stated that, in respect of the Ātman (in Vedānta), there cannot be the triad mātr, māna and meya—the Ātman being the meya.*

यत्र त्वात्मैव मेयः स्यात्तत्र मेयातिरेकतः ।  
कः प्रमाता प्रमाणं वा यमेवेति तथा श्रुतिः ॥६९२॥  
मानापेक्षयेव यो भावः स एवामानतो न सन् ।  
मानानपेक्षसिद्धिस्तु कस्मान्मानमपेक्षते ॥६९३॥

But, where the Ātman alone is to be the object of knowing, whence could there be, beside that knowledge, a knower or a means of knowing, because there is the statement to this effect, viz. *yam eva ....* [692]

Whatever be the thing, which has the need of an authoritative means of proving its existence, it is not an external entity, because there has been the absence of any authoritative means of knowing it.<sup>1</sup> However, how can there be the existence of what is (in existence) without any dependence on a certain means (of proving its existence)—how would that expect some means? [693]

Verse 692 refers to *Kāthopaniṣad* 2.20 and *Muṇḍakopaniṣad* 3.2.3.

Regarding verse 693, SP clarifies the idea thus: *svaparakāśasya na mānāpekṣā*.

<sup>1</sup>This refers to the absence of *śrutiprāmānya*.

*Verses 694-698 seek to establish the Ātman as aprameya.*

मातृमानप्रमेयाणां प्रत्यक्त्वादात्मवस्तुनः ।  
नातः प्रमेयता तस्य स्वतश्चावगमात्मनः ॥६९४॥

Since the (real) thing, i.e. the Ātman is the inner self, there is not here (the need of supposing) a knower, means of knowing and object to be known; therefore, the Ātman being itself by nature self revealing it is not made an object of knowing.

[694]

प्रमातृत्फलयोर्भित्तेर्नेह चोद्यस्य संभवः ।  
क्रिययोर्हि प्रभेदे तत्किं पूर्वमिति चोद्यते ॥६९५॥

There is no scope here for any doubt (or, objection) which can proceed from the accepted distinction between (the act of) knowing and its result; for, only when there is distinction between two activities,<sup>1</sup> a doubt can be raised as to what

precedes it.

[695]

<sup>1</sup>These means: *pramā* is *pramāprāpti*, that is one action and *phala* is for *phalaprāpti* which is the second action.

अपीतकरणग्नमः पुमान्यद्वत्सुषुप्तगः ।  
शब्दान्निद्रामपास्याथ यथावस्त्ववबोधयते ॥६९६॥

‘As a person who has been in deep sleep and has the entire group of his organs merged within the inner self, comes out of (lit. gives up) his sleep on account of a call aloud (*śabda*) by someone, so also (should it be known) that the individual self is awakened (as to the nature of the (real) thing by word etc. (of Vedānta).’

[696]

अगृहीत्वैव संबन्धमभिधानाभिधेययोः ।  
हित्वा निद्रां प्रबुध्यन्ते यथेहापि तथात्मनि ॥६९७॥

As men are awakened after giving up sleep even without apprehending the connection between words and what they signify, so is the case here in the context of the Ātman. [697]

In the verse there is stress on *abhidhānābhidheyasambandhāgrahaṇa* ‘non-grasping of the association of names and those that are named’.

शब्दशक्तेरचिन्त्यत्वादात्मत्वाद्वोधरूपिणः ।  
तत्साक्ष्यत्वाच्च निद्राया विद्मस्तं मोहहानतः ॥६९८॥

Owing to the impossibility of ascertaining (lit. thinking about) the capacity of words (for signifying the Ātman), and also because of the nature of the Ātman that has the form (only) of knowledge and also being the object to be seen in that (i.e. sleep), we know that (i.e. the Ātman) after giving up the ignorance about it.

[698]



In this context, SP states: *uktam hi- codanā hi bhūtam bhavantam ityādi.*

*Verses 699-703 explain virajah para ākāśāt ....*

धर्माधर्मौ रजो ज्ञेयं रजोवत्तन्मलत्वतः ।  
तदकर्तृत्वतो ब्रह्म विरजोऽकारणत्वतः ॥६९९॥

By *rajas* are to be understood *dharma* and *adharma*, (the Brahman is to be understood as) possessed of *rajas*, i.e. possessed of the impurity, connected with it; therefore, on account of not being the agent of (effecting) them, the Brahman is to be understood as devoid of *rajas* (i.e. impurity), since it is not the cause (of them). [699]

असम्यग्ज्ञानयाथात्म्यो जनिमत्प्रकृतित्वतः ।  
आत्मैवाकाशशब्देन श्रुत्येह प्रतिपाद्यते ॥७००॥

In the Śruti is stated here, i.e. in the word *ākāśa*,<sup>1</sup> the Ātman itself, because it is the origin of all that has birth, its true nature not being well known. [700]

This describes the nature of *ākāśa* which is merely stated as the Ātman.

<sup>1</sup>SP has pointed out that the instrumental forms *śrutyā* and *ākāśaśabdena* are *samānādhikarāṇa*.

जनिमत्कारणादात्मा योऽस्थूलादिविशेषणः ।  
आकाशात्स परो ज्ञेयस्तस्यापूर्वादिरूपतः ॥७०१॥

The Ātman, which is the cause of what has birth, described with qualifications such as *asthūla*, has to be known as beyond (that) *ākāśa* as having the forms of being *apūrva* etc. [701]

This verse explain the significance of the word *para*.

अव्यावृत्ताननुगतेर्महानात्मेति भण्यते ।  
कौटस्थ्याच्च ध्रुवो ज्ञेयो विकारोच्छ्रित्यसंभवात् ॥७०३॥

Since it is neither differentiated from nor is similar to (anything else); therefore, the Ātman is mentioned as the great one. And, owing to its immutability, it is to be known as permanent; for, there is no possibility of the destruction of (any of) modification (which are not related to it). [703]

THIS IS THE END OF BU 4.4.20.

\*\*\*\*\*