

**SUREŚVARĀ'S VĀRTIKA ON  
BRHADĀRANYAKOPANISAD 4.4 [973-1161]**

Shoun HINO

*Verses 973-979 discuss BUB: evaṃ tasminn ātmaviśaye sarvo vedah ...*

पूर्वो भागः समस्तोऽपि वेदान्तार्थावबुद्धये ।  
यथा भवति वेदस्य तथाथ प्रतिपाद्यते ॥९७३॥  
वेदान्तार्थं यथायातमनद्य श्रुतिरादरात् ।  
स वा इत्यादिनोक्तार्थं प्रवक्तुमुपचक्रमे ॥९७४॥

Now is stated as to how the entire earlier portion of the Veda results into (lit. becomes the cause of, or, leads to) the knowledge of the matter (stated) in the Vedānta texts; [973]

then, having restated the teaching of the Vedānta texts, as it came (into tradition) in the words *sa vā* ... the Śruti began respectfully to state the matter, already stated. [974]

परामर्शः सशब्देन पूर्वोक्तस्य प्रसिद्धितः ।  
वैशब्दः स्मृतये तस्य मृतिजन्मादिधर्मिणः ॥९७५॥

In the word *sah* is there a reference to what has been already said, (this is so) on the basis of its being known; the word *vai* is for reminding one of that person in whose case there occur the incidents of death, birth, etc. [975]

In this verse, Sureśvara gives the meanings of the two words *sah* and *vai* from the statement about *vividishā*. Also, the word *dharma* is used in some peculiar sense, i.e. of incident, or,

happening.

ध्रुवान्तमन्त्राम्नायोक्त एष इत्यभिधीयते ।  
महानज इति वचस्तद्विशेषणसिद्धये ॥९७६॥

In the word *eṣaḥ* is referred to (that person) who is stated in the Mantra ending with the traditional ending *dhruva*;<sup>1</sup> the statement *mahān ajaḥ* is used for effecting (the sense of) attributes of him. [976]

This is the explanation of *eṣa mahān ajaḥ*.

<sup>1</sup>This refers to BU 4.4.20: *virajaḥ ... mahān dhruvaḥ*.

अन्वयव्यतिरेकार्था योऽयमित्यादिका श्रुतिः ।  
विशेषणविशेष्यार्थं सर्वस्येति तथा वचः ॥९७७॥

The Śruti text which begins with (the words) *yo 'yam* is for (effecting) the Anvaya and Vyatireka (in respect of the Mantra); so also, the word *sarvasya* is for specifying (the nature of) the substantive by (its) adjectives. [977]

यदत्र किञ्चिद्वक्तव्यं तस्य प्रागेव चोक्ततः ।  
सामानाधिकरण्यादेर्नेह तत्पुनरुच्यते ॥९७८॥

Since there has been earlier<sup>1</sup> the statement of whatever that has to be stated here, viz. of being in the same case relation etc.; therefore, that is not stated here again. [978]

<sup>1</sup>This refers to the discussion of *sāmānādhikaranya* etc. in Brahma Kaṇḍikā. Cf. BUBV 1.4.1416-1427.

भूयान्स साधुना नेति ज्ञानस्य फलमुच्यते ।  
एष सर्वेश्वरोक्त्या च यथोक्तस्यैव संस्तुतिः ॥९७९॥

In the words *bhūyān sa sādhuṇā na* there is stated the result of (the acquisition of) knowledge and in the statement *eṣa*

*sarveśvaraḥ* there is praise of what is already stated. [979]

*Verses 980-985 state the purport of the Mahāvākya, sa vā eṣa mahān ....*

एतदुक्तं भवत्यत्र योऽयमित्यादिनोदितः ।  
विविक्तः कामकर्मादेः स्वयंज्योतिश्च शब्दितः ॥९८०॥  
स एष ईश्वरः साक्षादिति श्रुत्या प्रदर्शितः ।  
विशेषणविशेष्यत्वमीशितव्येशयोरिह ॥९८१॥

This is mentioned (or, referred to) in the words *yo 'yam ....* (Then the meaning) intended: In this context, (the person who is) shown to be aloof from desire, action etc. and also called the self-illuminating, [980]

and is mentioned (lit. shown) by/in the Śruti as *sa eṣa īśvaraḥ sākṣāt ...*; this is because there is here the relation of being the qualifier and what is qualified<sup>1</sup> between the one to be controlled and the other, the controller. [981]

<sup>1</sup>Thus there is stated the division of *viśeṣana* and *viśeṣya* in the Śruti statement.

यमपेक्ष्येश्वरत्वं स्यात्तत्तावत्प्रतिषेधति ।  
विशेषणविरोधित्वान्महत्त्वं कुम्भगं यथा ॥९८२॥

The Śruti then (*tāvat*) rejects that with reference to which there would be the lordship (of the master); this is on the basis of the opposition between the adjectives (of the two), as, for example, between the great ether and the ether obtaining in a pitcher.<sup>1</sup> [982]

<sup>1</sup>The example is elucidated in the next verse.

ईशितव्यापनत्तौ च तदपेक्षैकसंश्रयात् ।  
ईशित्वमपि निःशेषं प्रतीचो विनिवर्तते ॥९८३॥

When the one to be controlled is set aside the lordship also in respect of the inner self would not entirely remain (as established), for that lordship is with reference to the expectancy of that (which is to be controlled). [983]

घटाकाशो महाकाश इत्युक्ते कुम्भखहनुतौ ।  
आकाशमात्रताशेषो यथैवेह तथात्मनि ॥९८४॥

As, when it is said for effecting the concealment/denial of ether in a pitcher, in the statement of the ether in a pitcher, it is described as the great ether, there is only ether that remains (in one's understanding), so also, here in the case of the Ātman alone.<sup>1</sup> [984]

This is elucidation of the illustration expressing *mahat* ....

<sup>1</sup>Add to complete the sense; there remains only the Ātman. There remains the immanent with all its attributes given up.

विरुद्धयोरसंसर्गो यथैवमविरुद्धयोः ।  
तदबोधसमच्छिन्नाववाक्यार्थोऽवशिष्यते ॥९८५॥

As there cannot be any connection between two things that are opposed in nature, so also there cannot be any connection of things which are not opposed.<sup>1</sup> (As) there is removal of ignorance about that (i.e. the inner self), what remains is only what is not the meaning of the sentence.<sup>2</sup> [985]

<sup>1</sup>*ghata*, *pata* do not have any connection between them, since there is mutual opposition of the two; so also if *pratyaktva* and *advitīyatva* are but one (that is, they do not have any opposition between them) they do not have between them any connection also.

<sup>2</sup>By *avākyaṛtha* Sureśvara understands the inner self which cannot be the subject or object of usual sentences.

*Verses 986-992 state meanings of different words in the text.*

ऐदंपर्यमिदं तावत्पदार्थोऽथाधुनोच्यते ।  
 स वा इतिवचोऽर्थस्य व्याख्यातत्वान्न यत्यते ।  
 तद्व्याख्यानाय भूयोऽपि तस्य चेहानुवादतः ॥९८६॥

This is, so far, the purport of all this (that is said) in the text. Now is explained the meaning of the (different) words. (Yet) because, the meaning of the words *sa vā* has already been explained, there is not any effort made again for explaining it; therefore, the mention of that is merely a restatement.<sup>1</sup> [986]

<sup>1</sup>It is a restatement for the purpose of stating the reason for the earlier argument and, therefore, it should not be considered as repetition.

आकाशवचसा चोक्तः परोऽज्ञातो जगद्गुरुः ।  
 जगज्जनिस्थितिध्वंसहेतुरात्मविशेषणम् ॥९८७॥

By the word *ākāśa* is here stated the highest, the unknown and the best (lit. venerable or respectable) in the world—the specification of the nature in the case of the Ātman is in the word 'it is the cause of origin, sustenance and destruction of this world'. [987]

क्षेत्रक्षेत्रज्ञयोरेष स्वभावः प्राक्समीरितः ।  
 अप्रबुद्धात्मतत्त्वः सन्कारणात्मतया स्थितः ॥९८८॥

This is thus the nature of the field and the knower of field as stated before—the Ātman, being of unknown nature, is stated there, as being the cause of the world. [988]

सर्वमस्य वशे यस्माद्वशी सर्वस्य तेन सः ।  
 उदासीनस्य तस्य स्याद्वशित्वमिति चेन्मतम् ॥९८९॥  
 वशित्वशक्तिसंबन्धान्मैवं यस्मात्पुनर्वचः ।  
 सर्वस्येशान एवेति सर्वस्येष्टे सदैव सः ॥९९०॥

Since all (the world) is under the control of this one, therefore it is called the master (or, lord) of all. But, if it were held that there could not be the masterhood of all when (i.e. for) it is inactive; [989]

(we say, this is not so) owing to its connection with the power of being a controller; therefore, do not think this way, as there are once again the statements *sarvasyeśāna eva* and *sarvasyeṣṭe sadaiva*. [990]

कुमारनुपवत्तत्स्यादीशानत्वं परात्मनः ।  
इति चेन्नैतदेवं स्याद्यतोऽधिपतिरुच्यते ॥९९१॥  
अधिष्ठायैतमकार्यत्वाद्दुत्पत्तिस्थितिहानिषु ।  
त्रिविधेनाधिपत्येन स जगत्पाति सर्वदा ॥९९२॥

If one were to say, 'This lordship in the case of the highest Ātman would be like that of royalty in a prince', this is not so, because that one is described as *adhipati* 'overlord'. [991]  
That lord ever protects the world, with its threefold mastery, in relation to origin, sustenance and destruction (of the same), since that one has pervaded it by its being the effect of the Ātman. [992]

*Verses 993-998 state: on the basis of the Śruti sa sādhanā— that the overlord does not have any merit and/or demerit.*

धर्माधर्मसमायोगो लोकवच्छासनात्प्रभोः ।  
प्राप्नोति चेन्न तत्प्राप्तिः स नेति वचसः श्रुतेः ॥९९३॥

If it is held that (this overlordship) comes to the Ātman because of its controlling, as in the world where there occurs the connection of merit and demerit, that (acquisition of that master or overlord) is not (real), as it is understood from the statement in the Śruti *sa neti*. [993]

स्वकर्तृफलदायित्वं स्वभावः कर्मणां मतः ।

कर्तृस्वामित्वविरहान्नेशस्य फलसंगतिः ॥९९४॥

It is held that bringing about the result of his own (actions) to the agent is the nature of actions; (but it is not so in the case of the overlord) since there is no connection of the result (of any of its activity) owing to the absence of agency and mastery.<sup>1</sup> [994]

<sup>1</sup>These two are merely attributed to the Ātman—they are not real—and this is explained in the next verse.

कौटस्थ्यान्नास्य कर्तृत्वमकार्यकारणत्वतः ।  
कार्यकारणभेदेन तदविद्यैव संस्थिता ॥९९५॥

Because of its immutability, there is no agentship (of any activity) in the case of this one and also, because it is neither a cause nor an effect, it has no connection with such discrete things as cause(s) and effect(s); therefore, there is only ignorance that is established. [995]

अस्थलं नेति नेतीति न जायत इति श्रुतिः ।  
अपूर्वानपरेत्याद्या तथा च सति युज्यते ॥९९६॥

(Further) the Śruti (statements): *asthūlam, neti neti, nā jāyate, apūrvānapara* and others would be reasonable only if that be the state (of the Ātman or overlord as stated above). [996]

स्वस्वामित्वादिसंबन्धस्तथा नास्याद्वितीयतः ।  
यत्र हि द्वैतमित्येवं तथा च श्रुतिशासनम् ॥९९७॥

In the same way, there is not in the case of this Ātman (i.e. the overlord) any connection between what is its own and also its mastery on account of its being non-dual; to this effect is there an instruction in the Śruti, viz. *yatra hi dvaitam*. [997]

जन्मादयो विकारा ये संबन्धाश्चापि ये मताः ।

अविद्योपप्लुतस्यैव ते सर्वे स्युर्न तु स्वतः ॥९९८॥

And the modifications such as birth etc. and also the relations which are held (by the opponents to be obtaining in respect of the overlord) cannot be there, on their own, since all of them belong to that Ātman which is overwhelmed by ignorance.

[998]

*In verses 999-1003 is stated the reason for the overlord's not having any connection with merit and/or demerit.*

यत एवमतो नेशो भूयान्स्यात्साधुकर्मणा ।  
कनीयान्नापि पापेन तदकर्तृत्वहेतुतः ॥९९९॥

Since this is so, the Ātman would not be the overlord by its good doing or be less than others by its ill (doings) owing to its not being the cause, i.e. because of the absence of agency (in any action).

[999]

क्षेत्रज्ञस्य सतो यद्वत्पुण्यपापाभिसंगतिः ।  
कर्तृत्वाद्यभिमानित्वान्नेशस्य तदसंभवात् ॥१०००॥

As there is the connection of the Ātman with good and/or evil (doings), while it is the knower of the field and on account of its having consciousness of being an agent (of actions) etc., these are not possible in the case of the overlord.

[1000]

निर्हेतुत्वात्प्रतीचोऽस्य तमस्वित्वस्य सर्वदा ।  
हानिवृद्धी न तस्यातो धर्माधर्मैरसंगतेः ॥१००१॥

Because this one, while it is the inner self, has been never a cause of its being possessed by ignorance; therefore, there cannot be any waxing and decrease (or, waning) on account of its non-connection with merit and demerit.

[1001]

न कार्यकारणं वास्य यत्कर्तृत्वादिकारणम् ।



स्वतोऽसङ्गस्वभावत्वान्निरंशैकत्वतस्तथा ॥१००२॥

Nor is this one (i.e. the Ātman) the cause of some effect, i.e. that which is really the cause of being an agent (of some activity) etc., because of its own nature of being unattached (to anything else) and also because it is one single entity without being comprised of any parts. [1002]

स्वत एवंस्वभावोऽपि तदविद्यासमाश्रयात् ।  
एष सर्वेश्वरो देव ईशितव्यव्यपेक्षया ॥१००३॥

Thus, being of this nature, in its own right, and having a relation to ignorance about itself, this one is called the overlord of all, the shining one in relation to what are to be lorded over. [1003]

*In verses 1004 and 1005, Sureśvara sets aside the notion of repetition with reference to the statement in the Śruti sarvasyeśānah.*

एष सर्वेश्वर इति पुनरुक्तं किमुच्यते ।  
वक्ष्यमाणबुभुत्साया विषयत्वप्रसिद्धये ॥१००४॥

(A question is asked:) 'Why are the words *eṣa sarveśvaraḥ* repeated?' and the answer given is: 'It is for establishing the subject matter for a person's desire to know,<sup>1</sup> as will be stated'. [1004]

<sup>1</sup>On *bubhutsā* refer to verse 1021 below.

अज्ञात एष एवात्मा तावन्मात्रसतत्त्वतः ।  
ईशादेर्विषयान्तस्य कल्पितत्वमतो भवेत् ॥१००५॥

This Ātman is already (*eva*) not known, because it has only that (i.e. being unknown) as its nature; therefore, there occurs falsity in respect of (all things) beginning with the overlord

up to all the objects of knowing.<sup>1</sup>

[1005]

<sup>1</sup>When there is the knowledge of things like the overlord etc.; that is taken to be the product of ignorance and those are all only non-Ātman.

*Verses 1006-1009 state that the overlord does not come to have any merit etc. by doing any favour to its devotees.*

साध्वाद्यनभिसंबन्धे यदि वा हेतुरुच्यते ।  
एष इत्यादिवचसा सर्वेशस्यात्मनः स्फुटः ॥१००६॥

Or rather, in the statement *ēṣa ...*,<sup>1</sup> there is stated a clear reason why there does not obtain any connection of the overlord, i.e. the Ātman, with good etc. [1006]

<sup>1</sup>This has reference to *sa na ...*

धर्माधर्मादितन्त्रोऽर्थस्तत्फलेनेह लिप्यते ।  
विज्ञानात्मा न तु तथा सर्वेशत्वात्परो भवेत् ॥१००७॥  
सर्वस्य कर्मणोऽप्येष कारकस्य च तत्कृतः ।  
स्वतन्त्र ईश्वरो यस्मान्नातो धर्मादितन्त्रता ॥१००८॥

The specifically knowing Ātman depends on merit, demerit etc. and is thus affected by the result(s) of the same; but the lord (the highest Ātman) would not be like that, owing to its lordship of all. [1007]

Also, since it is an independent overlord of all activity (i.e. activities) and also of all the factors of that activity (viz. *kāraṅkas*); therefore, there is no dependence (in the case of it) on (i.e. not its being guided by) merit etc. [1008]

भूतानि जनिमन्त्येष यतः पालयतीश्वरः ।  
भूतपालस्ततो देवः कार्याणां कारणत्वतः ॥१००९॥

Since this overlord protects all the beings, that were born,

therefore, the divine one is the protector of the beings, by being the cause of all effects (or, discrete worldly objects).

[1009]

*This justifies why the overlord is described as the protector of beings.*

कारणेन हि पाल्यन्ते कार्याणीह यतस्ततः ।  
तत्कार्यत्वाच्च भूतानां भूतपालत्वमात्मनः ॥१०१०॥

Since all effects are governed by their cause(s);<sup>1</sup> therefore, the Ātman is the protector of (all) the beings, their being the products of the same. [1010]

<sup>1</sup>SP refers to the idea of BS 1.1.2: *janmādy asya yatah*.

*Verses 1011 and 1012 state the purport of the words bhūtādhipati in the Kāṇva recension and of lokapāla in the Mādhyandina.*

भूताधिपतिशब्देन ब्रह्मा वात्राभिधीयते ।  
इन्द्रो लोकेश्वरश्चात्र वरुणाद्यात्मना तथा ॥१०११॥  
लोकपालोऽपि चाप्येष तथाकार्यस्य दर्शनात् ।  
प्रशासितापि चाप्येष तदेतदभिधीयते ॥१०१२॥

Or, the word *bhūtādhipati* is mentioned here for Brahmadeva<sup>1</sup> and the lord of the worlds here is Indra, so also as being Varuṇa and others. [1011]

This one (i.e. Ātman) is also the protector of the worlds,<sup>2</sup> since there is noticed on its part the activity of a similar kind. Also, this one is the ruler of them—that is mentioned here (thus). [1012]

<sup>1</sup>This has reference to God Hiranyagarbha, who, SP states, is mentioned in the well-known Hiranyagarbha-Sūkta of the Veda.

<sup>2</sup>The word *lokapāla* is read in the Mādhyandina recension of BU and, therefore, Sureśvara offered an explanation of it

also.

*It is stated in verses 1013 and 1014 that the overlord itself is the ruler of the different worlds, by assuming the forms of Indra and others.*

लोकानां रचना यैषा क्षित्यादीनां व्यवस्थिता ।  
सिद्धासंकीर्यमाणेह साप्यस्यैवानुशासनात् ॥१०१३॥

What is established as this arrangement of the worlds like the earth etc. is also made unflittering by the dictates of this one.<sup>1</sup> [1013]

<sup>1</sup>SP explains this nature of the Ātman by referring it to *ato nyad ārtam* (BU 3.4.2; 3.5.1; 3.7.23).

वर्णाश्रमादिहेतूनां व्यवस्थानामसंकरः ।  
नैव सिध्येद्विना हेतुं सेतुरेष इतीक्ष्यताम् ॥१०१४॥

Since there would not be established (among the (people's) castes and stages of life etc.) the non-distinction of the order of the different causes responsible for castes and stages of life; therefore, let this one<sup>1</sup> be accepted (lit. seen) as the bridge. [1014]

<sup>1</sup>Namely, the highest Ātman, existing in all individuals.

*In verses 1015-1021, the bridge is described as the cause for non-mingling (or, order/arrangement) of the (earlier) said distinction.*

यथोदकप्रवाहस्य सेतुर्विधरणस्तथा ।  
सर्वलोकव्यवस्थानां सेतुः स परमेश्वरः ॥१०१५॥  
किमर्थं सेतुरित्येवमाकाङ्क्षायां परं वचः ।  
असंभेदाय लोकानामेषामित्यभिधीयते ॥१०१६॥

As a bridge is the supporter of any stream of water, so also is that overlord the bridge of all kinds of arrangements/orders among all the people. [1015]

The subsequent statement *asambhedāya lokānām* 'to keep (different) worlds apart' is made in the Śruti in answer to the expectation (or, question) as to why the bridge is made. [1016]

असंभिन्नव्यवस्थाः स्युः कथं नाम यथोदिताः ।  
तस्मै तस्मै फलायालं सेतुरीशो भवेत्ततः ॥१०१७॥

(An argument is adduced in the form of a question:) 'How indeed would (people), as stated above, have the definite and arranged order?' For everyone of them, i.e. the various results, is the lord responsible (lit. capable). [1017]

एवं तावत्समासेन षष्ठाध्यायोक्तमादरात् ।  
श्रुत्यानूद्याखिलं वस्तु तस्याथ प्रतिपत्तये ॥१०१८॥  
उपायतां यथा सर्वो वेदोऽयं प्रतिपद्यते ।  
तमेतमिति वाक्येन तदेतदभिधीयते ॥१०१९॥

Thus far, after respectfully restating in brief, all the matter in the sixth (i.e. fourth) Adhyāya, the Śruti has now stated for his (i.e. listeners') understanding, [1018]

that it becomes the means (for that arrangement among them, in the words) *sarvo vedo 'yam*— this is (now) stated in the sentence *tam etam* .... [1019]

एतं विविदिषन्त्युक्तं वेदानुवचनादिभिः ।  
उपायैरीश्वरं साक्षादपेताशेषकल्पनम् ॥१०२०॥

The statement: *etam vividiṣanti* '(Brāhmaṇas) seek to know it' and also the various means in the words *vedānuvacana* etc. are the ways of (getting to know) directly the lord, who is above the entirety of false notions. [1020]

स्वातन्त्र्येणेशविषया बुभुत्साप्यतिदुर्लभा ।  
गम्यते तदुपायानां विधानाद्यत्नतः श्रुतौ ॥१०२१॥

(This is for the reason that) this desire to know about the overlord would be difficult to obtain (in any human being) through his free will (*svātantrya*); therefore, there is a special statement made about those means in the Śruti. [1021]

*This verse points out that distinct sentences occur in the Karma Kāṇḍa and the Vedānta texts, after keeping in view their different viniyogas.*

विनियोगप्रयत्नाच्च कर्मविज्ञानकाण्डयोः ।  
गम्यते भिन्नवाक्यत्वं नैकत्र विनियोगीः ॥१०२२॥

Further, from this attempt to specify the employment of the means in the two different portions of Veda, i.e. those which relate to (ritual) activity and to knowledge there is understood the lack of unanimity/difference. There is not there (in Veda) at one place any statement about the employment (of the same). [1022]

*Verses 1023 and 1024 point to (i.e. speak of) the rituals as the cause for the desire to know the Ātman.*

यद्बुभुत्सापि दुष्प्रापा वद तत्तत्त्वबोधनम् ।  
ततोऽपि दुर्लभतरमुपायाल्लभ्यते कुतः ॥१०२३॥

Give me the information about that reality, the one which is desired to be known (and) which is very difficult to be obtained (among people)--whence is that to be obtained by (the adoption of) the means which are more difficult than that (i.e. the desire)? [1023]

बुभुत्सामात्र एवामी वेदानुवचनादयः ।  
विनियुक्ता यतस्तस्मान्नैते तज्ज्ञानसिद्धये ॥१०२४॥

Since these, i.e. *vedānuvacana*<sup>1</sup> etc., are employed (with an intention to create) only the desire to know (the Ātman); therefore, it follows that they do not result in the knowledge of that (i.e. the Ātman). [1024]

<sup>1</sup>In *veda* and *anuvacana* there is a separate mention of each; the former is Mantra in the Samhitā and the latter, the Brāhmaṇa text(s).

*Verses 1025-1027 affirm that śama etc. are the cause of knowledge.*

अत एव श्रुतिर्यत्नाच्छमादीनेव वक्ष्यति ।  
उपायानात्मयाथात्म्यविज्ञानाय यमात्मकान् ॥१०२५॥

(It is) just for this reason that the Śruti will specifically state the means *śama* etc., which are of the nature of *yama* etc., as the means to the knowledge of the Ātman as it is. [1025]

SP, following BUB, refers to *yama* as *ahimsā*, *satya* etc.—so stated in the *Yogasūtra*. Possibly, this refers to the view of Bhartṛprapañca or his followers.

बुभुत्सासाधनेष्वेषु वेदानुवचनादिषु ।  
अधिकारोऽविशेषेण ह्याश्रमाणां यथायुति ॥१०२६॥

In respect of these means for satisfying the desire to know (the nature of the Ātman), i.e. *veda*, *anuvacana* etc., various stages of life have eligibility without any differentiation (among them), and in accordance with (what is stated) in connection with each (*yathāyuti*).<sup>1</sup> [1026]

<sup>1</sup>AnSS edition records another reading *yathāśruti* in place of *yathāyuti*.

यथायोगं यथाश्रद्धं तद्बुभुत्साप्रसिद्धये ।  
सर्वाश्रमैरमी कार्या वेदानुवचनादयः ॥१०२७॥

Persons belonging to all the stages of life should take to *vedānuvacana* etc., according to their connection with them and (also) according to their faith, in order that their desire to know that (Ātman) is fulfilled. [1027]

*There follow in verses 1028-1031, the meanings of vedānuvacana etc.*

वेदानुवचनोक्त्यात्र वेदाध्ययनमन्वहम् ।  
श्रुत्येह भण्यतेऽस्मभ्यं नित्यस्वाध्यायलक्षणम् ॥१०२८॥

(Hence,) the Śruti has stated in the word *vedānuvacana* the daily study of the Veda which features as one's daily study for (all of) us. [1028]

This has reference to *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 11.5.6.3; 11.5.7.2; 11.5.7.11.

ब्राह्मणग्रहणं चात्र द्विजानामुपलक्षणम् ।  
अविशिष्टाधिकारित्वात्तेषामात्मावबोधने ॥१०२९॥

The mention here (in the Śruti) of a Brāhmaṇa is indicative of all the twice-borns,<sup>1</sup> because, with respect to getting to know the nature of the Brahman, there is not any specific qualification (of a Brāhmaṇa). [1029]

<sup>1</sup>This refers to Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya and Vaiśya, all of whom have the same eligibility for acquiring the knowledge of the nature of the Brahman.

विविदिषन्तीतिगिरा संबन्धः प्रतिसाधनम् ।  
साकाङ्क्षत्वादिह ज्ञेयो निराकाङ्क्षत्वसिद्धये ॥१०३०॥



The word *vividīṣanti* has connection with every means (mentioned in *vedānuvacana* etc.); here, owing to the expectancy (of the knowers for knowing the Brahman), it is to be known for effecting the state of being desireless. [1030]

वेदानुवचनोक्त्या वा कर्मकाण्डपरिग्रहः ।  
व्याख्यानायाथ तस्यैव यज्ञेनेत्यादिरुच्यते ॥१०३१॥

Or, in the statement *vedānuvacana*, there is mention (lit. acceptance) of (only) that portion of the Veda which is related to (ritual) activity, because there is (later) stated *yajñena* etc. in order to explain the idea of that very (statement). [1031]

*In verses 1032-1034, Sureśvara refutes the view of Bhartṛprapañca on the purport of vedānuvacana.*

प्रकाश्यमानमात्मानं वेदानुवचनेन तु ।  
इति व्याचक्षते ये तु तेषां वेदान्तमात्रकम् ।  
प्राप्तं वेदानुवचनं तदन्यस्याप्रकाशनात् ॥१०३२॥

However, for them, who explain that it is only by *vedānuvacana* that (the nature of) the Ātman is revealed, there is, in the word *vedānuvacana*, mention made of only the Vedānta texts, because the parts of the Veda other than that do not reveal that. [1032]

विरह्य न वेदान्तान्वेदेऽन्येन कथं चन ।  
ग्रन्थेनाविष्कृतिः साक्षादात्मनोऽस्योपपद्यते ॥१०३३॥

(They think) that the Vedānta works, being kept apart, it is not reasonable to hold that the other works in (i.e. portions of) the Veda do not in any way directly reveal the nature of this Ātman. [1033]

तं त्वौपनिषदमिति नियमार्थे सतीष्यते ।  
श्रौतं वाक्यमिदं न्याय्यं न तु सर्वोक्तिभासने ॥१०३४॥

In the words, *taṃ tv aupaniṣadam ...*, there is accepted (the study of only the Vedānta texts) for restricting (one's attention to the Upaniṣads); this statement of the Śruti is thus reasonable, but it is not to be taken with reference to (the nature of) all the statements (in the Vedānta texts as are capable of) revealing (the nature of the Ātman). [1034]

This is how they accept a kind of *niyamavidhi* in *taṃ tv ...*

*Sureśvara states in verses 1035-1037 the faults in his own Siddhānta.*

ननु सर्वस्य वेदस्य त्वत्पक्षेऽपि न सिध्यति ।  
ग्रहणं यज्ञदानादिवाचकस्यैव संश्रयात् ॥१०३५॥

(A hypothetical objection is:) 'But, indeed, in your view also, this (revealing the nature of the Ātman) does not become established in respect of the entire extent of the Veda, because there is support taken in the mention which is expressive of (the performance of) sacrifice, (making) gifts etc.' [1035]

मैवं विविदिषामात्रहेतोरेव परिग्रहात् ॥१०३६॥  
वेदानुवचनस्येह न तु तत्त्वावबोधिनः ।  
त्रय्यन्तस्य ग्रहोऽत्र स्यात्साक्षाज्ज्ञाने तु तद्ग्रहः ॥१०३७॥

(The answer is made:) 'Do not think so, because that was accepted (by us) only for the desire to get to know'. [1036]  
With reference to the statement *vedānuvacana*, however, showing there is not acceptance with reference to what reveals the nature of reality; the acceptance here of Vedānta, lit. the end or sequel of triad, also is reasonable, since there is acceptance of that for directly knowing (the Brahman). [1037]

अप्यभ्युपगमे नायं दोषोऽस्मान्प्रति ढौकते ।  
कृत्स्नवेदग्रहादाद्यव्याख्याने दोष एव न ॥१०३८॥

In case even that<sup>1</sup> is accepted, there will not come to us any fault, because there is, in our first explanation, the mention of the acceptance of the entire Veda and, therefore, there is not any fault. [1038]

<sup>1</sup>Namely, the blame given to the Siddhāntin by Bhartṛprapañca or his follower, as stated in verse 1025.

*In verses 1039-1041, Sureśvara states that the opponents consider vedānuvacana etc. as leading to the desire to know the Brahman and finds fault with their view.*

प्रकाश्यमाने मानेन बुभुत्सापि न युज्यते ।  
साक्षात्त्वाद्बुभुत्सो माप्तेर्बुभुत्सा प्राक्प्रमायुतेः ॥१०३९॥

Also, when (the nature of the Ātman) is taken to be revealed by the means of knowing (i.e. by Vedānta), it is not reasonable to talk about any desire to know, since, owing to having obtained (what is to be known), i.e. the nature of the Ātman directly, that desire to know the Ātman (has to be taken) before one has acquired the right knowledge of it. [1039]

वेदानुवचनोक्त्यात्र नित्यं कर्मोपदिश्यते ।  
यज्ञदानादिभिस्तस्य साहचर्येण हेतुना ॥१०४०॥

Here, i.e. in the sentence regarding *vedānuvacana*, there is mention made only of the daily duty (of the twice-born) for the reason that it has an intimate connection (*sāhacarya*) with the performance of sacrifice, making gifts etc. [1040]

सिद्धिर्विविदिषायाः स्याद्वेदानुवचनादिभिः ।  
कथमित्युच्यते तेषां बुद्धिसंशुद्धिहेतुतः ॥१०४१॥

If a question is asked as to how there can be established the desire to know (the nature of the Brahman) by such

(means) as *vedānuvacana*, it is stated (in answer) that it is so because they effect the purification of the intellect. [1041]

*Verses 1042-1050 adduce authorities for holding the ritual performance to be a means of purification of the intellect.*

इदं मेऽङ्गमनेनेति पुंसंस्कारश्रुतेस्तथा ।  
यज्ञो दानं तपश्चेति स्मृतेरपि वचः स्फुटम् ॥१०४२॥

So also, from the Śruti referring to the purification of (the intellect of) a person in the words *idam me 'nigam ...* (the same has to be understood). So also, there is a clear statement in a Smṛti *yajño dānaṁ tapaś ca ....*<sup>1</sup> [1042]

<sup>1</sup>This is from *Gītā* 18.5.

यस्मिन्विशुद्ध इति च सत्त्वशुद्धौ ध्रुवा स्मृतिः ।  
इत्येवमादिवाक्यानि श्रौतान्युक्तार्थसिद्धये ॥१०४३॥

So also in sentences like *yasmin viśuddhe*<sup>1</sup> and *sattvaśuddhau dhruvā smṛtiḥ*,<sup>2</sup> there is a statement made of the Śruti's effecting the said purpose. [1043]

<sup>1</sup>Not traced.

<sup>2</sup>Not traced.

ज्ञानमुत्पद्यते पुंसां क्षयात्पापस्य कर्मणः ।  
यथादर्शतलप्रख्ये पश्यत्यात्मानमात्मनि ॥१०४४॥

By the destruction of evil activity (which is effected by the above means), there arises, in human beings, the knowledge (of the nature of the Ātman), just as (there is) recognition of one's own self while one is looking at oneself in a clear mirror. [1044]

This is *Mahābhārata* 12.198.8.

यज्ञदानतपःकर्म न त्याज्यं कार्यमेव तत् ।  
 यज्ञो दानं तपश्चैव पावनानि मनीषिणाम् ॥१०४५॥  
 चत्वारिंशत्तथाष्टौ च संस्कारा इति च स्मृतिः ।  
 योगिनः कर्म कुर्वन्ति सङ्गं त्यक्त्वात्मशुद्धये ॥१०४६॥  
 योगयुक्तो विशुद्धात्मा विजितात्मा जितेन्द्रियः ।  
 सर्वभूतात्मभूतात्मा कुर्वन्नपि न लिप्यते ॥१०४७॥

“Sacrifice, charity, penances and (ritual) activity should not be given up; (each) has to be done. (Indeed) sacrifice, charity and also penances are, for the wise ones, purifiers.”<sup>1</sup> [1045]

So also, there is a Smṛti (statement): “There are (in all) forty-eight *saṃskāras*.”<sup>2</sup> “Yogins do (various ritual) activities, after they have abandoned attachment (to all the desires); and (this) for the purification of their intellect.”<sup>3</sup> [1046]

“One who is devoted to Yoga, who has purified his intellect, who has overcome his *manas* and who has subdued the sense-organs, and who is of the nature of the essence of all beings—even if this one is doing (action) is not affected by them.”<sup>4</sup> [1047]

The word *ātman* means here ‘the intellect’.

<sup>1</sup>This is *Gītā* 18.5.

<sup>2</sup>Not traced.

<sup>3</sup>This is *Gītā* 5.11.

<sup>4</sup>This is *Gītā* 5.6.

गाभैर्होमैर्जातकर्मचडामौञ्जीनिबन्धनैः ।  
 बैजिकं गार्भिकं चैनो द्विजानामपमृज्यते ॥१०४८॥

“Sin of the twice-borns which has come from the semen<sup>1</sup> and/or from the state of being in the womb<sup>2</sup> is wiped off by performance of offering(s) in fire after the time of conception, at the time of birth, cutting of hair, tying of the string of Muñja grass.” [1048]

This is *Manusmṛti* 2.27.

<sup>2</sup>Seminal sin is regarded as paternal-relating to the father.

<sup>3</sup>This is regarded as maternal-relating to the mother.

स्वाध्यायेन व्रतैर्होमैस्त्रैविद्येनेज्यया सुतैः ।  
महायज्ञैश्च यज्ञैश्च ब्राह्मीयं क्रियते तनुः ॥१०४९॥

“This (body of theirs) is made into a body suitable for the knowledge of the Brahman by means of the daily study of Vedic triad, by various vows, by offerings into fire, by sacrifices, by (having) sons and by performing sacrifices, great and small.”

[1049]

This is *Manusmṛti* 2.28.

इत्येवं शतराः सन्ति यथोक्तार्थप्रसिद्धये ।  
स्मृतिवाक्यानि पुंबुद्धिशुद्धिशंसीनि कर्मभिः ॥१०५०॥

This and such others, hundreds of them, are sentences from Smṛti texts which speak of the purification of human intellect by various (ritual) activities, in order that there is acquisition of the things which are stated.

[1050]

*This verse states that kāmya acts are to be given up— so is the dictate of the Veda.*

संसारानर्थहेतुत्वज्ञानायैव च कर्मणाम् ।  
काम्यानामिह निर्देशस्तज्जिहासाप्रसिद्धये ॥१०५१॥

There is here mention made of the desired activities only for getting to know the nature of the cause of the undesirable transmigration and also for effecting a desire to know that (i.e. the Brahman).

[1051]

*Verses 1052 and 1053 state that even kāmya activities give rise to the desire to know the Ātman.*

यद्वा विविदिषार्थत्वं काम्यानामपि कर्मणाम् ।  
तमेतमिति वाक्येन संयोगस्य पृथक्त्वतः ॥१०५२॥

Or perhaps, even the *kāmya* activities have the purpose of creating (in a human being) a desire to know (the Brahman); because the connection with the Śruti statement *tam etam* ..., is separately mentioned. [1052]

This has reference to what is stated in SV 322.

देशे काले च पात्रे च दानं श्रद्धादिपूर्वकम् ।  
शुद्धिकृत्स्याद्वियः पुंसो बहिर्वेद्यपि शास्त्रतः ॥१०५३॥

Making of gifts,<sup>1</sup> at some (appropriate) place,<sup>2</sup> at some (appropriate) time,<sup>3</sup> to a deserving person,<sup>4</sup> with faith etc.<sup>5</sup> would be effecting purification of the intellect of a person, even if (any of) them is made outside the altar but according to scripture. [1053]

This refers to *Gītā* 17.20.

<sup>1</sup>SP supports this making of gifts by citing a sentence *dāne sarvam pratiṣṭhitam tasmād dānam paramam vadanti* (source not traced).

<sup>2</sup>Kurukṣetra etc.

<sup>3</sup>Time of eclipse of the sun or the moon by the force of Rāhu.

<sup>4</sup>*śrotriya* the knower of matters pertaining to the Ātman etc.

<sup>5</sup>The word etc. indicates devotion.

*Verses 1054-1056 explain the meaning of the word tapas.*

नियमाद्द्वन्द्वसंपातसहनं तप उच्यते ।  
तस्यापि बुद्धिसंशुद्धिहेतुत्वं शास्त्रतो मतम् ॥१०५४॥

By the word *tapas* 'penance' is meant (lit. mentioned) what

is forbearing, as a rule,<sup>1</sup> the occurrence of pairs of opposites<sup>2</sup> because it is known from the scriptures that it also has the capacity to cause purification of the intellect. [1054]

<sup>1</sup>Or, with a specific intention (*saṃkalpa*).

<sup>2</sup>For example, *sukhaduḥkha*, *lobhamoha*, *rāgadveṣa* ....

विजिज्ञासस्व तद्ब्रह्म तपसैवेति च श्रुतिः ।  
तपसा कल्मषं हन्तीत्यपि च स्मृतिशासनम् ॥१०५५॥

There is also a statement in the Śruti ‘Do you desire to know that Brahman by means of austerity?’ and also a teaching of a Smṛti: ‘He destroys the (moral) stain by penance’.

[1055]

The first line is *Taittiyīyopaniṣad* 3.2; and the second line is not traced, but compare *Manusmṛti* 12.104, where *kilbiṣam* for *kalmaṣam*.

यद्दुस्तरं यद्दुरापं यद्दुर्गं यच्च दुष्करम् ।  
सर्वं तत्तपसा साध्यं तपो हि दुरतिक्रमम् ॥१०५६॥

Whatever is difficult to get over, whatever is difficult to obtain, whatever is difficult to approach and whatever is difficult to perform—all that becomes obtainable (i.e. obtained) through penance; indeed penance is inevitable. [1056]

SP states the example of drinking of ocean by Sage Agastya—this indicates the greatness of penance.

*Verses 1057-1060 state that fasting unto death is also to effect purification of the intellect.*

अनाशकं चानशनं कामानशनलक्षणम् ।  
रागद्वेषवियुक्तैस्तु विषयानिति चाह हि ॥१०५७॥  
कामानशनबोधार्थं वेदव्यासोऽपि यत्नतः ।



मृत्यवन्तं वा सनियमं तदप्यत्यन्तशुद्धिकृत् ॥१०५८॥

Because (the lord) has said: ‘The object of desires (should be overcome) by those who are free from desire and hatred<sup>1</sup>—thus is the definition of not enjoying desires in the words *anāśaka, anaśana*. [1057]

Even Vyāsa, the redactor of Veda, has specifically made a statement that (not enjoying the desires) up to one’s death or together with some vows effects purification in a very great measure—this is for the sake of informing others about not enjoying desires (as significantly important). [1058]

<sup>1</sup>This is *Gītā* 2.64.

प्रत्यग्विदिषामात्रहेतुत्वान्न मृतेर्भयम् ।  
अनेकजन्मसंसिद्धस्ततो यातीति च स्मृतेः ॥१०५९॥

So also, there is a statement in the Smṛti: ‘A person, who has reached the perfection/completed (his penance) in the course of many births, attains (liberation),’<sup>1</sup> to convey that there is not any fear from death, because it has become merely the cause of the desire for getting to know the inner self. [1059]

<sup>1</sup>This is from *Gītā* 6.43.

भावितैः करणैश्चायं बहुसंसारयोनिषु ।  
आसादयति शुद्धात्मा मोक्षं वै प्रथमाश्रमे ॥१०६०॥

This person who has purified his intellect obtains, (even) in the first stage of life, the liberation, with his sense-organs that are (thus) well-disposed in many transmigratory existences.[1060]

*This verse states an authority for holding the view that fasting unto death (also) is a cause of liberation.*

पृथूदकादितीर्थेषु तथा च मरणं स्मृतौ ।  
श्रूयते मुक्तये साक्षात् भयं स्यादतो मृतेः ॥१०६१॥

So also it is heard in Smṛti<sup>1</sup> that death in holy places such as Pṛthūdaka results in liberation; therefore, there should be no direct fear of death. [1061]

<sup>1</sup>SP cites *brahmajñānena mucyante prayāgamaraṇena vā* (*Skandapurāṇa* 7(4).31.37).

*Verses 1062-1070 state that one who is capable for śravaṇa etc. should not enter on fasting to death.*

साक्षात् वस्तुविज्ञाने श्रुत्या यत्र नियुज्यते ।  
विद्वान्परिहरेत्तत्र मृतिहेतुं प्रयत्नतः ॥१०६२॥

But when (lit. where) a person is specifically enjoined by the Śruti to get to know the (real) thing by direct perception, that learned man should avoid, with every effort, any cause of death. [1062]

Here, there is stress on the pursuit of the knowledge of the Brahman in preference to waiting for death at some holy places etc.

चतुर्णामाश्रमाणां वा वेदानुवचनादिना ।  
श्रुत्येह ग्रहणं ज्ञेयं तद्बुभुत्साप्रसिद्धये ॥१०६३॥

Or, it should be understood here that, in referring to the four stages (in a man's life) there is intended (lit. mentioned) by the Śruti, which uses the words *vedānuvacana* etc. for giving rise to (or, effecting) the desire to get to know that Brahman. [1063]

This is the meaning of *grahaṇa*; the following two verses clarify this.

ब्रह्मचर्यान्तवाक्येन ब्रह्मचारिपरिग्रहः ।  
 तपसा तापसस्यैव यज्ञेन गृहिणस्तथा ॥१०६४॥  
 श्रद्धानाशकवाक्यं तु सर्वार्थमिति गम्यते ।  
 एतमेव विदित्वेति पारिव्राज्यं च वक्ष्यति ॥१०६५॥

In the statement ending with (the word) *brahmacarya*,<sup>1</sup> there is inclusion of a celibate, so also, by the word *tapasā* there is inclusion of only an ascetic; as also (*tathā*) by the word *yajñena* that of a householder. [1064]

And yet, the sentence pertaining to *śraddhānāśaka*<sup>2</sup> is understood to refer to all of them; (for) the Śruti will say about leading the life of a mendicant: 'after having known this very Brahman ...'. [1065]

<sup>1</sup>Reference to a celibate in this portion of BU is according to the Mādhyandina recension.

<sup>2</sup>This refers to the reading in the Mādhyandina recension, *tam etam ... dānena tapasānāśakena*.

सर्वेऽपि क्रमशस्त्वेते सेव्यमाना यथाविधि ।  
 यथोक्तकारिणं विप्रं नयन्ति परमां गतिम् ॥१०६६॥

All of these (stages of life), being followed in their due order, according to ordinance or precept, lead a Brāhmaṇa, who does what is stated or prescribed in the scriptures, to the highest goal. [1066]

चतुर्भिराश्रमैरेभिर्यथाशास्त्रमनुष्ठितैः ।  
 अत्यन्तं क्षेममाप्नोतीत्यापस्तम्बोऽप्यभाषत ॥१०६७॥

Āpastamba also has said (this): '(A person) obtains the highest well-being by leading (all) the four stages of life, performing (his duties) according to the scriptures'. [1067]

This is reference to *Āpastambadharmasūtra* 2(9).21.1-2.

यं तं विविदिषन्त्युच्चैर्यथोक्तैः साधनैः परम् ।  
एतमेव विदित्वाथ मुनिः स्यात्प्राग्यथोदितः ॥१०६८॥

(Concluding himself) with (performances) which are the means, as prescribed, and (thus) wishing to know (the nature of) whom—the one (known from the Upaniṣad), does (lit. would) one become a sage as stated in (the words) *etam eva viditvātha munih.* [1068]

पाण्डित्यबाल्ययोर्निष्ठां मुनित्वं प्रागवादिषम् ।  
सर्वकर्ममुक्त्वा यस्मान्न तत्साधारणं ततः ॥१०६९॥

I have already spoken<sup>1</sup> about the nature of a Muni 'sage' on his being devoted to wisdom and his strength (arising from the study of the Veda); since this is not common (in relation to) all those who give up doing actions. [1069]

<sup>1</sup>This refers to BU 3.5.1.

योगस्य च समस्तस्य प्रत्यग्विज्ञानजन्मने ।  
उपयोगो यतस्तस्मान्नात्मज्ञानोदयात्परः ॥१०७०॥

Since there is utility of the entire (practices of) Yoga for the rise of the specific knowledge about the inner self; therefore, there is no other (Yoga) than the rise of knowledge of the Ātman. [1070]

*In verses 1071 and 1072, it is pointed out that only those who have renounced can be Munis 'sages, the knowers of the Brahman'.*

शमादीन्येव विद्यायाः साधनानि यतस्ततः ।  
कुतोऽसंन्यासिनस्तत्स्यान्मुनित्वं निष्प्रमाणकम् ॥१०७१॥

Since tranquillity (*śama*) etc. alone are the means of (acquiring)

the lore (of the Brahman), therefore, how could Munihood be attributed to one who has not renounced? His attaining the status of a sage would be (understood) without any authority. [1071]

मननात्मकमेवास्य कर्म नान्यद्यतस्ततः ।  
मुनित्वं न्यासिनो युक्तं मौनाच्चाप्यस्य सर्वदा ॥१०७२॥

Since, for this one (Muni), there is no activity other than what consists in meditation etc., therefore, it is reasonable to understand the status of a sage in the case of one who has renounced and also on account of (or, through) his (observing) speechlessness.<sup>1</sup> [1072]

<sup>1</sup>SP clarifies *mauna* thus: *satatam atiniyatavāgādīvyāpārātvaṅ ca tasya munitvaṃ yuktaṃ*.

*Incidentally Sureśvara refutes in verses 1073-1078 the view of Mandanamiśra on this topic.*

प्रत्यग्याथात्म्यविज्ञाननिष्ठता मुनिता यतः ।  
तज्ज्ञानजन्मनो नोर्ध्वं मुनिता तत्फलत्वतः ॥१०७३॥

Since Munihood (thus) means being devoted to (acquiring) specific knowledge about the inner self, as it is, therefore, there is nothing more than (effecting) the rise of the knowledge of that, for Munihood which is the result of that (activity etc. of him). [1073]

एतमेवेत्यवधृतेरस्यैवैकस्य वस्तुनः ।  
तदज्ञानैकहेतुत्वात्सर्वस्यानात्मवस्तुनः ॥१०७४॥

(This is so) because, in the words *etam eva*, there is the specification of just one single thing and because all the non-Ātmans<sup>1</sup> have only one cause, i.e. ignorance (about the nature) of that (Ātman). [1074]

<sup>1</sup>The plural is meant, though the singular form is used.

सामर्थ्याच्च ततोऽस्यैव प्रत्यग्याथात्म्यवेदिनः ।  
मुनित्वं प्रत्यगज्ञानहेतुकर्मापवर्जनात् ॥१०७५॥

Therefore, (it follows) that there is Munihood in the case of only a knower of the inner self, as it is, on account of his strength acquired by avoiding all activities which are caused by ignorance about (the nature) of the inner self. [1075]

किं चैतमेवमात्मानं सर्वानर्थैककारणम् ।  
मोहमात्रव्यवहितमाप्तुमिच्छन्त आदरात् ॥१०७६॥  
आत्मयाथात्म्यविज्ञानसर्वाविद्योपमर्दिना ।  
सम्यग्ज्ञानप्रदीपेन प्रत्यक्प्रवणबुद्धयः ॥१०७७॥  
विरक्ताः सर्वसंसारादाग्रजाद्बुद्धिशुद्धितः ।  
उत्पन्ननिखिलानर्थतित्यक्षा दोषदर्शनात् ॥१०७८॥  
वाङ्मनःकायकर्मभ्योऽतः प्रव्रजनशीलिनः ॥१०७९॥  
एतमेवेत्यवधृतेर्न लोकत्रयकामिनाम् ।  
पारिव्राज्येऽधिकारोऽस्तीत्ययमर्थोऽवगम्यते ॥१०८०॥

Moreover, persons wishing, through respect to obtain (or, know) this very Ātman, which is the single cause of all undesirables, namely in being affected by mere delusion, (renounce)<sup>1</sup> [1076] with their intellect inclined towards getting to know (the actual nature of the inner self) by means of the lamp in the form of right (or proper) knowledge which destroys the entire ignorance about the specific knowledge of the real nature of the Ātman,<sup>2</sup> [1077]

becoming averse to the entire transmigratory existence up to the state of being the first-born (Hiranyagarbha), through the purification of the intellect and such in whom there has arisen a desire to abandon all the undesired things on seeing the faults in the same [1078] and, therefore, have become inclined towards renunciation of

(i.e. keeping away from all) activities of *manas*, speech and body— [1079]

thus, from the specification *evam eva*, it is understood (or, learnt) that there is eligibility for renunciation in the case of (all) those who desire to secure the three worlds. [1080]

<sup>1</sup>SP concludes this verse by adding the verb *pravarjanti* 'they renounce'; it appears for us that from 1076 up to 1080 form one complete unit of meaning, though too long!

<sup>2</sup>SP concludes this verse by adding the phrase *ātmānam āptum icchanti* 'they wish to get to know the Ātman', but that is perhaps unintended.

*From verse 1081 up to verse 1088, there is given the meaning of etam eva lokam.*

असाधारणसाध्यानि पुत्रादीनि यथा तथा ।  
पुत्रादिकामत्यागोऽपि स्यादसाधारणोऽर्थवान् ॥१०८१॥  
परस्परविरोधाच्च पराक्प्रत्यक्फलात्मनाम् ।  
पुत्रादिसाधनानां च तत्यागस्य च वर्त्मनः ॥१०८२॥

Since (*yathā*) having a son etc. are uncommon means (of happiness), therefore, in the same way (*tathā*), abandoning of desires for a son etc. is also an uncommon significant means (to the same effect). [1081]

(This is so,) because such means as having a son etc. have mutual opposition among them and also have results that are in the form of keeping away the inner self and, therefore, giving them up is the way to that (i.e. to the knowledge about the Ātman). [1082]

पूर्वे समुद्रे यः पन्था न स गच्छति परिचमम् ।  
एकः पन्था हि मोक्षस्येत्यपि व्यासोऽपि चावदत् ॥१०८३॥

That path which leads to the ocean in the east does not ever lead to the west—thus has even Vyāsa said, 'Indeed there

is only one way to liberation’.

[1083]

*ekah panthā hi mokṣasya ... is Mahābhārata 12.266.4. SP supports this argument with SV 215.*

प्रव्राजिनोऽत्र गृह्यन्ते प्रसिद्धेर्यदि वा परे ।  
त्रिदण्डिनः समाख्यायास्तेष्वेवातिप्रसिद्धितः ॥१०८४॥

Here are mentioned (i.e. understood) only the wandering mendicants owing to their being the knowers, or the other *tridaṇḍins*,<sup>1</sup> because of their becoming more known. [1084]

SP adds *pāramahṃsīm vṛttim grhṇantīti bhāvaḥ*.

<sup>1</sup>Regarding *tridaṇḍins* cf. *Manusmṛti* 12.10:

*vāgdaṇḍo ’tha manodaṇḍaḥ kāyadaṇḍas tathaiva ca /  
yasyaite nihitā buddhau tridaṇḍīti sa ucyate //*

In the case of this type of Saṃnyāsins, it is noticed that they hold in their right hand three staffs (*daṇḍas*) bound together—these indicate restraint on *manas*, speech and body. The tuft of hair on the head, the sacred thread and the normal way of wearing the lower garment are not to be given up by them. They can return to a householder’s life, if and when they wish.

पराञ्चि खानीत्यादीनि श्रौतानि च वचांसि नः ।  
तानि वा इति निन्दित्वा न्यासो ब्रह्मेति शासनात् ॥१०८५॥

This is from the instruction of the Śruti, i.e. Upaniṣads in the words: *parāñci khāni*<sup>1</sup> and also *tāni vā*,<sup>2</sup> which occurs after censuring them (i.e. *khāni*); as there is stated ‘renunciation is Brahman’.<sup>3</sup> [1085]

<sup>1</sup>*Kāthopaniṣad* 4.1.

<sup>2</sup>CU 3.5.4.

<sup>3</sup>This is *nyāsa*, which is a word shortened for *saṃnyāsa* for metre’s sake. The same is the case in the following verse.



उपायो न्यास एवातः प्रत्यग्ज्ञानस्य जन्मने ।  
प्रत्यग्ज्ञानविरुद्धत्वान्मनोवाक्कायकर्मणाम् ॥१०८६॥

Therefore, the means to the rise of the knowledge (of the nature of) the inner self is only renunciation (*nyāsa*) of the activities of *manas*, speech and body; since they which are opposed to the knowledge about (the nature of) inner self.

[1086]

Read SP for some more detail on this point.

शब्दादिप्रकृतीन्येव कार्याणि करणानि च ।  
प्रत्यग्ज्ञानाय नैवालमतस्तानि विरोधतः ॥१०८७॥

Since all the effects and means of producing (or achieving) them are but rooted in words etc.; therefore, they are not capable of (or, sufficient/useful for) effecting the knowledge of the inner self, on account of their opposition (to the same).

[1087]

आत्मलोकपरीप्सायां तस्मात्साधनमुत्तमम् ।  
त्याग एव हि विज्ञेयं मनोवाक्कायकर्मणाम् ॥१०८८॥

Therefore, the best means of the desire of attaining to that *ātmaloka* (which is equal to *brahmaloka* as stated before) is only renunciation of the activities of *manas*, speech and body.

[1088]

*It is pointed out in verses 1089-1093 that renunciation is the only means of accomplishing the knowledge of the Ātman.*

प्रतिसाध्यं सुतादीनि यथा लोकत्रयार्थिनाम् ।  
नियतानि तथैवेह प्रत्यग्लोकाप्तिमिच्छताम् ॥१०८९॥  
सर्वकर्मपरित्यागः साधनं परमं मतम् ।  
असंभवे हि कर्माणि विधीयन्तेऽस्य सर्वतः ॥१०९०॥

As the means of getting a son etc., are with reference to every one of the ends to be achieved and fixed with reference to them alone who hanker for the three worlds; so here also, in the case of those who wish to attain *pratyagloka*, [1089] it is held that abandoning all activities is the best means —indeed all activities are prescribed, when there is a complete impossibility of this one (viz. renunciation). [1090]

रागाद्याकृष्टचेतस्त्वान्न चेच्छक्नोत्यशेषतः ।  
 कर्माणि मानवस्त्यक्तुं स करोतु यथाविधि ॥१०९१॥  
 कर्माणि कर्मसंत्यागसामर्थ्यार्थं दिवानिशम् ।  
 न कर्मणामनारम्भात्तथा च स्मृतिशासनम् ॥१०९२॥

If a human being is not able to abandon completely his activities, owing to his mind being attracted by attachment etc., then let him do them, day and night according to the prescription in the Śruti, with a view to acquiring the capacity for abandoning those activities. To this effect is there the instruction of the Smṛti *na karmanām ....*<sup>1</sup> [1091-1092]

<sup>1</sup>This is *Gītā* 3.4.

आरुरुक्षोर्मुनेर्योगं कर्म कारणमुच्यते ।  
 योगारूढस्य तस्यैव शमः कारणमुच्यते ॥१०९३॥

‘For a Muni, who is about to begin practising Yoga, action is a means (of the same); and in the case of just the same, who is (already) established in Yoga, the means is tranquillity.’ [1093]

This is *Gītā* 6.3.

Now is stated in verses 1094-1096 the purposes of abandoning all activity.

कोऽभिप्रायोऽखिलं कर्म त्यजतां साधनैः सह ।  
आत्मलोकार्थिनां पुंसामिति पृष्टेऽर्थ उच्यते ॥१०९४॥

(When it is asked:) 'What is the intention (or, purpose/desired end) of men, who are giving up their entire activity, together with their means, and are thus wishing for (attainment to) *ātmaloka*?'; there is now stated that intention— [1094]

एतद्ध स्मेति वचसा पारिव्राज्येऽभिधीयते ।  
अर्थवादस्वरूपेण हेतुः श्रुत्या प्रयत्नतः ॥१०९५॥

In the words *etad dha sma ...*<sup>1</sup> there is statement made with reference to renouncing —(and) this is the reason stated by the Śruti, very carefully, in the form of an Arthavāda. [1095]

<sup>1</sup>This refers to BU 4.4.22.

तदेतत्कारणं स्पष्टं पारिव्राज्येऽभिधीयते ।  
ऐतिह्यार्थं च ह स्मेति वैशब्दः स्मरणाय च ॥१०९६॥

The words *tad etat* clearly state the cause for renunciation. And the words *ha sma* are used for conveying the matter of traditional instruction and the word *vai* is only for reminding (one of what is said). [1096]

*In verses 1097-1100 is stated the purpose of the word prajām, i.e. an indication of the desire for vitta, loka etc.*

पूर्वेऽतिक्रान्तकालीना विद्वांसो ज्ञाततत्त्वकाः ।  
तिसृणामेषणानां स्यात्प्रजामित्युपलक्षणम् ॥१०९७॥

The word *pūrve* means those who belonged to the times of the past and *vidvāṃsah* are those who have known the truth (i.e. reality). The word *prajām* is (lit. should be taken as) indicative of the three desires.<sup>1</sup> [1097]

<sup>1</sup>Cf. verse 1104 note 1.

न कामयन्ते नेच्छन्ति पुत्रोत्पत्त्यादिलक्षणाः ।  
एषणाः सकला एताः कस्मादित्यभिधीयते ॥१०९८॥

*na kāmāyate* means: 'They do not wish (for) ... Why are these desires stated here, viz. all the three desires which are for begetting a son etc.?' [1098]

एषणास्त्यजतां तेषामभिप्रायमिमं शृणु ।  
एषणात्रितयस्यापि किमित्याक्षेप उच्यते ॥१०९९॥

Hear now this as the intention of them who are giving up their desires. In the use of the word *kim* is stated the question relating to the intention about/of the three desires. [1099]

प्रजया किं करिष्यामः कनीयःफलया वयम् ।  
स्वतःसिद्धैकलो ह्यात्मा येषां लोको ध्रुवोऽक्षयः ॥११००॥

'What shall we do by having an offspring which yields a lower result?' (For) them, there is the eternal and never-perishing *loka*, as it is, viz. the *Ātman*, which is established by itself as (all) alone. [1100]

*Verses 1101-1103 affirm that attainment of the knowledge of the Ātman is the best of results acquired by one.*

आत्मत्वादेव चावाप्तः सर्वसाधननिःस्पृहः ।  
वस्तूत्पत्त्यादिमद्यस्मात्साधनानि व्यपेक्षते ॥११०१॥

Having obtained (lit. reached) the (real) thing, which is (through ignorance) whatever has origin etc., the person, because of (himself) being the *Ātman* itself, becomes desireless with respect to all the means (of activity) and, therefore, ignores them all. [1101]

यच्चोत्पत्त्यादिमद्वस्तु तत्तुच्छं स्वप्नवस्तुवत् ।  
आत्मज्ञाने तु निःशेषफलान्तर्भावकारणात् ॥११०२॥

Whatever thing has an origin etc. is worthless like an object (obtained or seen) in the dream state, for the reason that there is the inclusion of all of the results only (*tu*) in the knowledge of the *Ātman*. [1102]

नात्मलाभात्परो लाभः कृत्स्नेऽपि जगतीक्ष्यते ।  
सर्वप्राप्यार्थसंप्राप्तेः सर्वहेयनिराकृतेः ॥११०३॥

In the whole of the world, there is not seen any gain higher than the acquisition of the *Ātman*, because there is, through that, the acquisition of all the objects to be gained and (also) the setting aside of all that is worth abandoning. [1103]

इति चेतसि संधाय ह्याक्षिपन्ति प्रजादिकम् ।  
नृलोकादिफलं सर्वमेषणात्रयमादरात् ॥११०४॥

Having kept this in mind do they respectfully question (or, doubt) about offspring etc., viz. the results such as are of the world of men and of the entire triad<sup>1</sup> of desires. [1104]

<sup>1</sup>That is, *putra*, *vitta* and *loka*.

उत्पाद्यमाप्यं संस्कार्यं विकार्यं चैषणाफलम् ।  
तस्मिन्नेवंविधे कः स्यात्संतोषो विदुषामपि ॥११०५॥

The result of the desires is either that which is produced, that which is to be reached (or obtained), that which is to be purified, and that which is to be modified. And in (achieving) them (i.e. the results) which are of this nature, what satisfaction could there be for the learned? [1105]

*Verses 1106-1113 state that even a person ignorant (about the nature of the *Ātman*) can renounce, if he is averse to worldly*

life.

आत्मब्रह्मानलोम्येन ह्येषणात्याग इष्यते ।  
साधनं ब्रह्मविद्येव ब्रह्मज्ञानस्य जन्मने ॥११०६॥

Abandoning of desires is accepted as a means lower in order with reference to the Ātman and the Brahman; but, it is also like the lore of the Brahman, a means for the rise of the knowledge of the Brahman. [1106]

आप्ताशेषपुमर्थस्य प्रत्यग्याथात्म्यबोधिः ।  
दग्धात्मतमसः पुंसो नैषणापेक्षितेष्यते ॥११०७॥

There is not to be accepted (or, entertained) any desire by (or, in the case of) a person who has obtained all of the ends of human life, (the one) who is possessed of knowledge of nature of the inner self and has burnt his ignorance in respect of the Ātman. [1107]

सर्वभतात्मभतस्य सर्वैकात्म्यं प्रपश्यतः ।  
आप्ताशेषपुमर्थस्य त्यक्ताशेषासुखस्य च ॥११०८॥  
प्राप्तस्य परमं स्वास्थ्यं वद किं स्यात्प्रजादिभिः ।  
इति निश्चित्य निःसङ्गाः प्रव्रजन्त्येव सर्वतः ॥११०९॥

'Tell me what use can there be of having offspring etc. for a person who sees the complete oneness of the one and has become the nature of all, who has obtained all the ends of human life, who has abandoned sorrows/afflictions in its entirety and who has obtained the highest'—having thus decided, do those, who become unattached to the desires, wholly renounce them. [1108-1109]

धावतोऽविदुषो दृष्ट्वा मृगतृष्णोदकार्थिनः ।  
तत्तोयतत्त्ववित्करिचन्न हि धावति मूढवत् ॥१११०॥

Having seen the non-learned, who are running with a thirst

for the water of mirage, no knower of knowledge, who knows the truth of that water, runs like the one that is deluded.

[1110]

SP invites attention to the break-up of the Saṁdhi as *dhāvato* and *aviduṣah*.

यथैवं श्रुतितोऽशेषवाङ्मनःकायसाधन-  
प्रवृत्तिविषयप्रत्यग्याथात्म्यज्ञानिनामिह ॥११११॥  
अविद्यापटसंवीतधिषणान्कामिनो नरान् ।  
पुत्रोत्पत्त्यादिसाध्येषु प्रवृत्तान्वीक्ष्य यत्नतः ।  
अस्माकं न प्रवृत्तिः स्यात्कृतार्थत्वाच्च कारणात् ॥१११२॥

As this is so, there would not be any activity on the part of us, who have, with the help of the Śruti, knowledge of the real nature of the inner self which has for the object of his entire activity with the means of speech, *manas* and body, after seeing men who are full of desires, their intellects being wrapped by the bondage of ignorance, and proceeding with every effort towards getting those objects, e.g. the birth of a son etc.?

[1111-1112]

यदज्ञानात्प्रवृत्तिर्या तज्ज्ञानात्सा कुतो भवेत् ।  
तस्मात्सर्वप्रवृत्तीनां हानिः स्यादात्मबोधतः ॥१११३॥

Whence (or, How) can there be that inclination to (performing) activity, which has proceeded from whatever is the knowledge of that, through the ignorance of which (it has been there)? Therefore, (know that) there is abandoning of all activities as a result of the knowledge of the Ātman.

[1113]

*In verses 1114-1117, there is justification/pleading for ignoring all results of activity, viz. production and others.*

सदोत्पत्तेरनुत्पाद्योऽनाप्यश्चापि तथात्मनः ॥१११४॥  
असंस्कार्योऽक्रियाङ्गत्वान्निर्गुणत्वात्तथात्मनः ।

कौटस्थ्यादविकार्योऽयं वद स्यात्कर्मणा हि किम् ॥११५॥

Similarly, because the Ātman has ever been existent (lit. has originated— *bhūta*), it is not to be created and not also to be obtained. [1114]

In the same way, since it is not subordinate to any activity and has no proper quality (whatsoever), it is not to be purified and, because of its immutability, this one cannot be modified. (Now) tell me what is the use of the (performance of) action? [1115]

नोत्पत्त्यादि स्वतो यस्य स्वत एवास्ति यस्य तत् ।  
न तस्य कर्मापेक्षास्ति कर्मापेक्षा ततोऽन्यतः ॥११६॥

Since it (i.e. the Ātman) does not have origination etc., by its very nature, and which has existed also by its own nature. As such, it has no need of actions; the need (lit. expectancy) of the (performance of) action is in respect of someone other than that. [1116]

उत्पत्त्यादौ समर्थं यद्धेतुमात्रमपेक्षते ।  
फलवत्कर्म तत्रैव ततोऽन्यत्राफलं भवेत् ॥११७॥

(The performance of) action would be having a result only when it is capable of origination etc. (of others) and which expects for its rise merely some cause; elsewhere than in that, that activity would be without any result. [1117]

*Verses 1118 and 1119 are an injunction for renouncing.*

उक्तहेतुबलात्तस्माद्धिदित्वात्मानमात्मना ।  
प्रव्रजेयुः समस्ताभ्य एषणाभ्यो द्रुतं बुधा ॥११८॥

Therefore, the wise ones should quickly proceed away from all of the desires, after having known the Ātman by themselves through the force of the cause which is already stated.<sup>1</sup> [1118]



<sup>1</sup>On this, read SP: *caturvidhakriyāphalavilakṣaṇatvalakṣaṇo-  
ktahetu ...*; cf. verses 1114 and 1115 above.

पुत्रोत्पत्तिं समुद्दिश्य ह्येषणा दारसंग्रहः ।  
पुत्रैषणेति सेहोक्ता यदि वातोऽन्यथैषणा ॥१११९॥

Indeed, taking a wife with the intention of begetting a son is an *eṣanā*; and that desire is here mentioned as the desire for a son; or, (perhaps) it would be another desire as well.

[1119]

*Verses 1120 and 1121 are the explanation of te ha sma  
putraisaṇā ...*

मनुष्यलोकसंप्राप्तिं समुद्दिश्यास्य यैषणा ।  
पुत्रोत्पत्त्येह तत्प्राप्तौ सात्र पुत्रैषणोच्यते ॥११२०॥

That desire of a person for attaining the world of men is here called the desire for begetting a son, because by begetting a son that (world of men) is obtained.

[1120]

This is based on BU 1.5.16.

दैवं च मानुषं वित्तं कर्मणो यत्प्रयोजकम् ।  
देवतादिपरिज्ञानं दैवं पशवादि मानुषम् ॥११२१॥

Wealth, divine and human<sup>1</sup> are what cause activity; divine wealth is the full knowledge about the deity etc. (of the ritual activity) and human wealth is what consists in animals etc.

[1121]

<sup>1</sup>Cf. BUBV 1.4.1847-1849.

*In verses 1122-1127 it is stated that divine wealth is not the knowledge of the Brahman—it means only knowledge about the*

*deities of the rituals.*

संसारकारणध्वंसि यत्तु ज्ञानं विमुक्तिदम् ।  
वित्तश्रुत्या न तद्ग्राह्यं तस्य कर्मविरोधतः ॥११२२॥

That knowledge which brings about liberation, is destructive of the cause(s) of transmigratory existence, but that should not be understood from the statement about wealth, because of its being opposed to (ritual) action. [1122]

यस्य साधनभावः स्यात्प्रवृत्तौ सर्वकर्मणाम् ।  
गर्तादेरिव वित्तत्वं तस्य ज्ञानस्य कर्मसु ॥११२३॥

That kind of knowledge is of the nature of being wealth in relation to the activities by its being the means towards inclination to all kinds of (ritual) activities, as in the case of a ditch<sup>1</sup> etc. [1123]

<sup>1</sup>This stands for the place for the *āhavanīya* fire etc. as SP reports. In the place of *gartāder iva*, AnSS has a variant reading (noted and explained by SP also): *gavāder iva* and that sounds better, for it refers to cows etc. that are necessary for the performance of ritual etc. SP refers also to the existence of thorns etc. beside ditch, as deterrents of any ritual activity—this is an alternative explanation for that referring to the *āhavanīya*.

कर्महेतुविरुद्धं तु न वित्तं ज्ञानमिष्यते ॥११२४॥  
कर्मप्रकरणाकाङ्क्षि ज्ञानं कर्मगुणो भवेत् ।  
यद्धि प्रकरणे यस्य तत्तदङ्गं प्रचक्षते ॥११२५॥

But (*tu*) knowledge, which is opposed to the causes that promote activity, is not to be considered as wealth. [1124]  
(Yet) knowledge, which has the expectation for it in the topic of (religious) activity, would become subordinate to the activity. That which occurs in the context of another becomes subordinate to it—they say. [1125]

स्वरूपलाभमात्रेण यत्त्वविद्यां निहन्ति नः ।

न तदङ्गं प्रधानं वा ज्ञानं स्यात्कर्मणः क्वचित् ॥११२६॥

But, that knowledge, which by mere coming into existence destroys our ignorance, is not subordinate to or principal (aspect) of an action anywhere. [1126]

एतद्धलेन संन्यास एषणाभ्योऽवसीयते ।

देवलोकफलं ज्ञानमेषणैवेति गम्यते ॥११२७॥

On the strength of these (arguments in the preceding verses) is the renunciation superior to desires—so it is concluded. From this it follows that knowledge, which results in one's attaining to the world of gods, is only (a kind of) desire. [1127]

*This verse states that lokaiṣanā is intended in vittaiṣanā.*

लोकैषणाग्रहेणैव वित्तान्तर्भावसिद्धितः ।

फलोद्देशेन या चेष्टा सैव लोकैषणा यतः ॥११२८॥

Since, by the mention of the word *lokaiṣanā*, there is inclusion of wealth in them (i.e. *lokas*); therefore, that (ritual) activity (which is performed) with the intention of (securing) some result, is also *lokaiṣanā*. [1128]

*Verses 1129 and 1130 point out vittaiṣanā, because of what is stated in the preceding verse, is nityakarman.*

यत्तु चोदितमित्येव क्रियते कर्म निष्फलम् ।

वित्तैषणेति तां ब्रूमो जामित्वविनिवृत्सया ॥११२९॥

And that action, which is performed only for the reason that it is enjoined (in the scriptures) and is without any result to be produced, we call *vittaiṣanā*,<sup>1</sup> with a desire to keep

away from any connection (of it with activity).

[1129]

<sup>1</sup>This refers to *nityakarman* and means to achieve it. SP: *vittaśabdena nityam karma tatsādhanam ca punaruktiparihārārtham grāhyamityarthah.*

लोकोद्देशेन या चेष्टा वाङ्मनःकायसाधना ।  
लोकैषणेति तामाहुरेषणार्थविदो जनाः ॥११३०॥

That activity, which has for its means speech, *manas* and body and is (performed) with a desire for *lokas*, have the knowers of the meaning of *eṣaṇā* called *lokaiṣaṇā*.<sup>1</sup> [1130]

<sup>1</sup>This refers to *kāmyakarman* and means to achieve it. SP: *kāmyam karma tatsādhanam cātra vivakṣitam iti na paunaruktyamityarthah.*

*Verses 1131-1133 explain the word vyutthāna.*

क्रियाकारकरूपाभ्य एषणाभ्यः प्रबोधतः ।  
प्रातिलोभ्येन यत्स्थानं व्युत्थानमिति तद्विदुः ॥११३१॥

Acquiring that state (by a person) through acquiring knowledge (for keeping himself away) from desires, which have the form of *kāraṅkas* of activities, i.e. by being averse to them, is known as *vyutthāna*. [1131]

इत्येवमादि व्याख्येयं व्याख्यातं पूर्वमेव तु ।  
कहोलब्राह्मणे नातस्तद्व्याख्यानाय यत्यते ॥११३२॥

This and other matter, that is to be explained, has been already explained in *Kahola Brāhmaṇa*;<sup>1</sup> therefore, there is no effort made here for explaining that again. [1132]

<sup>1</sup>This is BU 3.5.

प्रव्रजेयुरतो लोकमीप्सन्तो ब्राह्मणा बुधाः ।  
प्रव्रजन्तीति च विधिरर्थवादेन संगतेः ॥११३३॥

Therefore, the knowing (or, wise) Brāhmaṇās who wish for the *loka* (of the Brahman) should renounce—this, (the word) *pravrajanti* '(they) renounce' is an injunction as it is connected with Arthavāda. [1133]

The idea of the verse is to relate the statement *pravrajanti* to the statement about the results which are stated in the form of an Arthavāda.

*In verses 1134 and 1135, it is pointed out that in the case of the form pravrajanti there is an Arthavāda proper.*

नार्थवादान्तरापेक्षा ह्यर्थवादस्य युज्यते ।  
विधिनैवैकवाक्यत्वमर्थवादस्य युज्यते ॥११३४॥

Indeed, it is not reasonable to hold that an Arthavāda is dependent on another Arthavāda; having unanimity, i.e. the same purport as only that of an injunction is reasonable in the case of Arthavāda. [1134]

Hereby it is affirmed that the statement *pravrajanti* should not be taken as mere Arthavāda but it should be taken as an injunction and has the sense of *pravrajeyuh*. This is clarified in just the next verse.

अर्थवादेन लिङ्गेन तस्माद्विधिरयं स्फुटः ।  
विधिशेषत्वमुज्झित्वा नार्थवादो यतोऽन्यतः ॥११३५॥

Therefore, by the very indication, viz. Arthavāda, is this (i.e. the statement *pravrajanti*) a clear injunction; the reason is: an Arthavāda does not consist elsewhere than in being subordinate to an injunction. [1135]

Verses 1136-1143 state that the *visiṣṭa-vidhi* in *viditvā vyutthāya* is for leading one to *Ātmaloka*.

समानकर्तृकत्वोक्तेर्विभागोक्तेः फलस्य च ।  
प्रव्रजन्तीत्येष विधिरर्थवादेन चान्वयात् ॥११३६॥

(Thus) this injunctive statement in *pravrajanti* gets connected with the *Arthavāda* on account of the statement in them about one and the same agent and also by stating the result separately. [1136]

विज्ञानेन विदित्वेति श्रूयतेऽस्यैककर्तृता ।  
विविनक्ति फलं चापि येषामित्येवमादिना ॥११३७॥

The sameness of the agent (in these two) is clearly heard in the *Śruti vijñānena viditvā*. Further, by making a statement beginning with *yeṣām ...*, *Śruti* distinctly states the result. [1137]

प्रव्रजन्तीति नाप्येतत्सकृच्छ्रुतमिहेष्यते ।  
प्राप्तवल्लोकनृत्यर्थमर्थवादव्यपेक्षि च ।  
प्रधानवदतो नैदं लोकस्तुतिपरं भवेत् ॥११३८॥

Also this word *pravrajanti* is not heard here only once,<sup>1</sup> this does not purport to praise *loka* as already obtained and like the principal (injunction), nor does it expect an *Arthavāda* for praising (or leading to) *loka*. [1138]

<sup>1</sup>SP: *tatra tatrabhyasyate pravrajinaḥ pravrajanti vyutthāya bhikṣācaryam caranti viditvā munirbhavati*.

नाप्यनुष्ठेयरूपेण पारिव्राज्येन संस्तुतिः ।  
आत्मलोकस्य युक्ता स्यान्नापि तज्ज्ञानसंस्तुतिः ॥११३९॥

There is not here any praise stated for leading a life of an ascetic as some activity to be performed; also the praise of the knowledge of that (*pārvirāja* 'renunciation') would not

be reasonable with reference to *ātmaloka*.

[1139]

अथानुष्ठेयमपि संस्तुत्यर्थं भवतेष्यते ।  
अनुष्ठेयस्य दर्शादेः स्तुत्यर्थत्वं प्रसज्यते ॥११४०॥

(An objection:) 'If you think that what is to be performed (i.e. an action), is also stated as a thing for the sake of praise; then in the case of (sacrifices like) *darśa* etc., which have to be performed, the state of being what is (stated) for the sake of praise would follow.

[1140]

कर्तव्यता न च ज्ञाता पारिव्राज्यस्य कुत्रचित् ।  
स्तुत्यर्थत्वं यतोऽस्येह भवता परिकल्प्यते ॥११४१॥

'And nowhere is it known that taking to the stage of a mendicant is a thing to be performed, so that you have now taken here that as the state of being what is for the purpose of praise.'

[1141]

अन्यत्रापि विधौ कल्प्य इहैवासौ समर्थ्यताम् ॥११४२॥  
भूमिष्ठे मधुनि प्राप्ते को विद्वान्पर्वतं व्रजेत् ।  
लब्धेऽपि प्रव्रजन्तीति विधावन्यत्र किं श्रमः ॥११४३॥

(If it is said:) 'Elsewhere also that has to be accepted in connection with an injunction. Let that be understood so even here.'

[1142]

(The reply is:) 'When honey is available (lit. obtained) in the field,<sup>1</sup> who wise would go to a mountain (to get it)? (Therefore), when an injunction is available in the word *pravrajanti*, why then take the trouble (to find injunction) elsewhere?'

[1143]

<sup>1</sup>In fact the well-known adage refers to a bush called Arka, not to a field, cf. SP: *arke cen madhu vindeta*.

*Verses 1144 and 1145 refute the notion that renunciation is for*

*one who is not eligible to perform a ritual.*

काणकुण्ठादिविषये यत्तु कैश्चित्प्रकल्प्यते ।  
पारिव्राज्यं न तद्युक्तमननुष्ठेयरूपतः ॥११४४॥

As to what some have thought, that the state of a wandering ascetic has a reference to the squint-eyed, the maimed and others, that is not proper because it does not have the nature of what is to be done (or performed). [1144]

कर्तव्यत्वेन न ज्ञातं वृक्षाद्यारोहणं यथा ।  
संन्यासोऽपि तथैवायं नैव कार्यतया मतः ।  
प्रव्रजन्तीत्यतो नास्य स्तुतिगन्धोऽपि विद्यते ॥११४५॥

As climbing a tree is not known to be a thing to be performed, so also leading the life of an ascetic is not held to be a matter to be performed; therefore, in the use of the word *pravrajanti*, there is not even a bit of praise. [1145]

*Verses 1146-1148 are an objection to there being an injunction for renouncing.*

ननु चात्मप्रबोधेन विधिगोचरलङ्घिनः ।  
कृतकृत्यस्य मुक्तस्य विधिरेष कथं भवेत् ॥११४६॥

(A question is asked:) 'But, indeed, how could this be an injunction for him who has thought that his knowledge of the Ātman has transgressed (the nature of) an objection falling within the purview of any injunction, for (this one), who has accomplished whatever was to be done and is liberated? [1146]

परिहारोऽस्य चोद्यस्य कहोलब्राह्मणेऽखिलः ।  
यतोऽभाणि मया पूर्वं नेहातः पुनरुच्यते ॥११४७॥

Since the refutation of this hypothetical objection has been stated by me in full in the Kahola Brāhmaṇa (BU 3.5) earlier,



therefore it is not stated here again.

[1147]

ब्रह्मचर्यं समाप्येतिप्रत्यक्षश्रुतिमूलतः ।

चतुर्णामाश्रमाणां स्यान्नोपेक्षातोऽनुमानतः ॥११४८॥

It is on the direct basis of the Śruti (that we get the knowledge of) one's having completed the state of celibacy and, on that basis, we should not show neglect for the four stages of life as thus understood by inference.

[1148]

SP refers to *aikāśramyaṃ tv ācāryāḥ pratyakṣavidhānād gārhaṣṭhyasya* as a statement of Gautama (*Gautama Dharma Sūtra* 1.3.35).

*Verses 1149 and 1150 state that the authority of the Śruti does not depend on (that of) any Smṛti.*

न च वेदैकमूलत्वविरहात्स्यात्प्रमाणता ।

आचारस्य स्मृतेर्वापि बौद्धाद्याचारवद्ध्रुवम् ॥११४९॥

And being an authoritative means of knowledge (in the case of any statement) is not possible in the absence of any Vedic basis (for it), even if it be the practice (of the learned) or sanctioned by any Smṛti— indeed like the conduct of a Buddhist.

[1149]

धर्मस्य वेदमूलत्वादवेदस्य न धर्मता ।

इत्येवं न्यायवद्वाक्यमाहुर्वेदप्रमाणकाः ॥११५०॥

Religious duty (*dharma*) has its root in the Veda; whatever is non-Vedic does not have the character of religious duty—thus have those who have held the Veda as the authority said as a dictate.<sup>1</sup>

[1150]

SP refers to *śabdāmūlako hi dharmah* (*Śābarabhāṣya* 1.3.1).

<sup>1</sup>Cf. the word *nyāyavat* in the original; it literally means 'what

is like a rule’.

वेदशास्त्रानपेक्षत्वं स्मृतिशास्त्रस्य चेन्मतम् ।  
निर्ग्रन्थशास्त्रतुल्यत्वं स्मृतीनां वः प्रसज्यते ॥११५१॥

If it is held that the scriptures called the Smṛtis do not depend on (or, are not based on) the Vedic scriptures, then in the case of these Smṛtis there will be a similarity with the scriptures of the Nirgranthas.<sup>1</sup> [1151]

SP supports this argument stating *yathāhuh— yuktam śruti-virodhāt smṛtir apramāṇam iti* (not traced).

<sup>1</sup>This is a reference to the Jainas.

नापि स्मृतिव्यपेक्षास्ति श्रुतेः स्वातन्त्र्यकारणात् ।  
स्मृत्यर्थस्यानुवादोऽयं पारतन्त्र्येऽसति श्रुतेः ॥११५२॥

Further, the Śruti does not have any dependence on the Smṛti, because of its independence. Therefore, when there is not such dependence of the Śruti (on any other work), this should be taken as matter repeated from a Smṛti. [1152]

SP refers to *ataś ca pramāṇamanapekṣatvāt (Śābarabhāṣya 1.1.5)*. Also, read SP: *śruter asati pāratantrye nāsti smṛtyarthā-nuvāditvam iti pūrvanāi anivayena yojanā*.

स्वतन्त्रयोर्मिथोऽपेक्षा नापि स्यात्परतन्त्रयोः ।  
पारतन्त्र्यान्न चापेक्षा स्वतन्त्रस्य स्वतः क्वचित् ॥११५३॥

Again, independent works do not have any mutual dependence; so also that (mutual dependence) is not observed in the case of two works that are dependent (on some other or others); nowhere an independent work has, of itself, any dependence on what is not independent. [1153]

*This verse states that the Śruti does not restate any matter from*

*the Smṛti.*

स्मृत्यर्थं न श्रुतिस्तस्मादनुवक्तीह कुत्रचित् ।  
स्मृतिस्त्वनुवदत्येव श्रुत्यर्थं परतन्त्रतः ॥११५४॥

The Śruti does not anywhere state any matter (which is already) stated in the Smṛtis; but it is the Smṛti that restates the matter which is stated in the Śruti, because of its dependence. [1154]

SP states *uktam hi— pramāṇam eṣā smṛtir vijñātam tat kim ity anyathā bhavātīti* (not traced).

*Verses 1155-1161 explain sa eṣa neti neti.*

आत्मा चेदिष्यते लोकः कर्माण्येव न किं नराः ।  
तत्प्राप्त्यर्थं प्रयत्नेन कुर्वन्तीह दिवानिशम् ॥११५५॥  
पारिव्राज्येन किं कार्यमिति चेदुच्यते शृणु ।  
अस्यात्यन्तमसंबन्धादात्मलोकस्य कर्मभिः ॥११५६॥

If the *ātma-loka* is desired, 'why then do not men perform, with every effort, actions for getting the same, day and night?' [1155]

If it is asked: 'What is the use of (or, to be done through) being an ascetic?'; (then the answer is:) 'Listen, that is being stated—this *ātmaloka*, has not at all any connection whatever with actions'. [1156]

नोत्पत्त्याद्यभिसंबन्ध आत्मनोऽस्योपपद्यते ।  
यतोऽतः कर्मणां कार्यं नेह संभाव्यतेऽण्वपि ॥११५७॥

Since it does not stand to reason that this Ātman has any connection with origination etc.; therefore, not even a little of action is to be imagined (or, understood, or done) here (in this context of this Ātman). [1157]

तदसंभावनायाश्च को हेतुरिति भण्यते ।

स एष नेति नेत्यात्मा यस्मात्प्रागपि वर्णितः ॥११५८॥

If one asked, 'What is the reason for the absence of any possibility of it?', then (in answer) it is to be said, 'This is so, since, even earlier, it has been stated (in the Śruti): *sa eṣa neti nety ātmā*'.<sup>1</sup> [1158]

<sup>1</sup>BU 3.9.26; 4.3.4; 4.4.22; 4.5.15.

प्रध्वस्तैकात्म्यसंमोहो नेति नेत्यात्मविद्यया ।  
अग्रह्याद्यात्मतां यातः स्वमहिम्नि व्यवस्थितः ॥११५९॥

A person, who has destroyed his ignorance about the nature of his inner self as its being only a single entity, through the pursuit of the lore of the Ātman which is stated in *neti neti*, becomes possessed of the nature of the Ātman, which is ungraspable etc. and becomes steady in his own greatness. [1159]

कर्मणां चात्मविद्यायां चरितार्थत्वकारणात् ।  
विद्ययापि न चेत्कार्यं कर्माभिः स्यात्कथं नु तत् ॥११६०॥

Further, how indeed could it be that,<sup>1</sup> since (ritual) actions have already fulfilled their purpose<sup>2</sup> here, in respect of the lore of the Ātman, that lore also does not have anything to do with actions? [1160]

<sup>1</sup>Read SP: *utpannāyāṃ vidyāyāṃ tatkārye cāvidyāatkārya-dhvaṃse siddhe vidyāpi kāryaṃ na kiṃ cid asti cet karmakāryam ātmaloke nāstīti kim u vaktavyam ity arthaḥ*.

<sup>2</sup>This is by way of purification of a person's intellect.

एवं चतुर्भिरध्यायैर्यथाव्याख्यातवर्त्मना ।  
मुमुक्षुः प्रापितः स्वास्थ्यं परमैकात्म्यलक्षणम् ॥११६१॥

Thus, in these four Adhyāyas, a seeker of liberation is brought

to the state of his own, i.e. that which is characterized by  
(or, as) the highest Ātman, in the way as explained. [1161]

\*\*\*\*\*

[This article comprises research financed by the Grant-in-Aid  
for Scientific Research (C)-(2) for the years 2001/2003.]