

## SUREŚVARA'S VĀRTIKA ON BRHADĀRANYAKOPANISAD 4.4 [1-146]

Shoun HINO

*Verses 1-62 discuss BU 4.4.1, with an introductory remark on the relation between 4.3 and 4.4.*

यत उत्क्रान्तिरुक्तेयं विशिष्टफलसंगतेः ।  
सर्वेषामविशिष्टातः स यत्रेत्युच्यतेऽधुना ॥१॥

Now that (lit. since, *yataḥ*) thus far (*iyam*) is discussed (lit. stated) the departure (of the Ātman, viz. Jīva), owing to its association with (some) specific result(s) of action and as non-distinguished (in the case) of all (the Jīvas),<sup>1</sup> therefore is now (re-)stated *sa yatra* .... [1]

Read SP: *adhunā mokṣasyaiva susuptidārṣṭāntikasya śiṣṭatvāt tasmin vaktavye punaḥsaṃsāroktir ayuktā punarukter ity āsāṅkya brāhmaṇāntaram avatārayati*. Also NKL (ms. p.710): *jāgrat-svapnaśaṃcārākyadrṣṭāntasyehalokaparalokasaṃcārāḥ saṃsāro dārṣṭāntikaḥ svapnadrṣṭāntasya mokṣo dārṣṭāntikaḥ. tatra saṃsārarūpadārṣṭāntikasya varṇitatvāt ... ucyate*.

<sup>1</sup>Cf. *evamvidam sarvāṇi bhūtāni pratikalpante* (BU 4.3.37 above).

करणानां समुत्क्रान्तिर्गमनं च तयोः समम् ।  
प्रागुक्तं तत्र यत्रोक्तं तदेवेहोच्यतेऽधुना ॥२॥

It is already stated<sup>1</sup> that the departure of (all) the organs and that (lit. the movement (out of the body)) of the two<sup>2</sup> is similar (or, the same, i.e. together); here is now stated only that which was not stated (earlier).<sup>3</sup> [2]

<sup>1</sup>Cf. *tad yathā rājānam prayiyāsantam ...* (BU 4.3.38 above).

<sup>2</sup>This refers to Jīva and Prāṇa (i.e. *mukhya prāṇa*).

<sup>3</sup>That is, *tejomātrādānādi* 'taking up particles of light etc.', referring to the powers of other organs.

संसारस्याधिकारोऽयमा श्लोकोदाहतेर्मतः ।  
स यत्रेत्यत आरभ्य पुंसः संसारवर्णनम् ॥३॥

It is accepted that this<sup>1</sup> topic of transmigration (of Jīva) (continues) up to the mention of the verse (later in Kaṇḍikā 6);<sup>1</sup> therefore, beginning with *sa yatra ...*, (there occurs) the description of the transmigration of an individual being.<sup>2</sup> [3]

This verse sets aside the idea that the whole of BU 4.4 pertains to transmigration.

<sup>1</sup>Cf. *tad eṣa śloko bhavati. tad eva saktah saha karmanā ...* before *atho 'kāmayamāno yo 'kāmah ...* in BU 2.6. This is to convey that, after there is description of the transmigration of the Jīva, there will follow discussion on liberation.

<sup>2</sup>*pum* refers to an individual Jīva which is subjected to transmigration.

पुंसः संसरणं पूर्वं सूत्रितं यत्समासतः ।  
विस्तरस्तस्य वक्तव्य इत्यर्था वा परा श्रुतिः ॥४॥

Or, (possibly,) there is now to be described in full extent what was earlier told in brief, viz. the transmigration of an individual being and therefore (now begins) the subsequent (part of the) Śruti (to convey that sense). [4]

It seems that, in the first two verses of this Brāhmaṇa (i.e. 4.4), Sureśvara has explained the connection between 4.3 and 4.4 in two ways—this is his own view. In this verse, he follows the thought of BUB—cf. *bhāṣyād bahir eva sambandhoktyā punaruktim samādhāya bhāṣyoktasambandham anusṛtya tām*

*samādhate* (SP). Read BUB: ... *savistaram saṁsaraṇam varṇa-yitavyam ity ārabhyate*.

तत्संप्रमोक्षणं कस्मिन्पंसः कालेऽभिजायते ।  
कथं वेत्यादिकोऽत्रार्थो विस्तरेणोपवर्ण्यते ॥५॥

At what time occurs that detachment of the individual being (from the organs) and in what manner (or, how), etc.<sup>1</sup> is the matter that is described here in full extent. [5]

<sup>1</sup>The word 'etc.' refers to the other body, other activities etc. of the newly acquired organs of the individual and the other means; cf. SP: *ādīpadena dehāntaropādānopakaraṇārambhādi gṛhyate*.

प्रकृतात्मपरामर्शः सशब्देन विवक्ष्यते ।  
संसारानर्थसंबन्धविज्ञानाय तमस्विनः ॥६॥

The word *sah* 'that' intends to convey the reference to the Ātman<sup>1</sup> which is the topic of the discussion, in order that there follows a complete understanding (*vijñāna*)<sup>2</sup> of the relationship with the undesired transmigration of (the self) overpowered by (lit. having) darkness. [6]

The verse refers to BU 4.3.35: *anaḥ susamāhitam ...*

<sup>1</sup>This is as individual self, i.e. really ignorant (*ajñā*).

<sup>2</sup>Namely, complete knowledge.

य आत्मा प्रस्तुतोऽविद्वान्स यदेदं शरीरकम् ।  
कार्श्यं प्राप्य पूर्वोक्तैर्जरारोगादिहेतुभिः ॥७॥

The Ātman which is mentioned as the subject matter of the discussion is the non-knowing self (*avidvat*); and that brings this insignificant body (*śarīraka*) to a reduced size by the earlier stated causes, viz. old age, disease etc. [7]

This explains the meaning of *abalyam ny etya ...*

SP adds *yadā sammoham iva yāti tadainam vāgādayaḥ sāmāyantīti sambandhaḥ*. Therefore, we have to understand that as the remainder of the sentence and then the organs *vāc* etc. fall in stupour, as it were.

यदि वा स्वयमेवैत्य देहाभेदत्वहेतुतः ।  
दौर्बल्यमेवं संप्राप्य संमोहमिव यात्यथ ॥८॥

Or (it could be understood in another way:) (that Ātman) because of its non-distinction<sup>1</sup> from the body thus attains to weakness and then<sup>2</sup> falls in a stupour, as it were. [8]

This is another explanation of the sentence *abalyam ...* and clarifies the meaning of *kārśyam prāpayya* in the preceding verse.

<sup>1</sup>This is the result of the absence of *adhigāti* 'I am Brahman', i.e. ignorance.

<sup>2</sup>This refers to *atha* in the sense of *nairantarya* 'immediately following'.

मूर्च्छादाविव संमोहमिहाप्यात्मा निगच्छति ।  
बौधमात्रैकयाथात्म्यान्नायं संमोहभाग्यतः ।  
संमूढबुद्धिसाक्षित्वात्संमूढ इव भात्यतः ॥९॥

In this<sup>1</sup> (moment) also, this Ātman becomes unconscious, as in stupour, and, since this one, owing to its having the real nature of being one who is the only knowing, it does not fall in a stupour and looks like<sup>1</sup> one in stupour on account of its being the witness of the intellect which is overpowered by ignorance (*sammoha*). [9]

We should note the use of *sammoha* in two different senses; (i) physical stupour, referring to individual being, (ii) being ignorant, referring to the intellect.

<sup>1</sup>This is to justify the use of the word *iva* in the Śruti sentence.

संमोहहेतुकं कार्यं संमोहात्मकमिष्यते ।  
अकार्यकारणं प्रत्यग्ज्योतिः संमुह्यते कुतः ॥१०॥

It is accepted that an effect which has ignorance for its cause is also of the nature of ignorance. How can the inner light (*pratyagjyotiḥ*), which is neither an effect nor a cause, fall in stupour? [10]

The last line refers to the oneness in the nature(s) of cause and effect and the second line to what is neither a cause nor an effect and, therefore, does not have ignorance (lit. stupour) associated with it. What appears as transmigration of the self is really not transmigration at all.

कार्श्यसंमोहसंबन्धो यतो नास्य स्वतस्ततः ।  
मोहोत्थदेहबुद्ध्यादिसंगतेरिवगीरियम् ॥११॥

Since this one does not have by/in its own nature any connection with a reduced size and/or a stupour, therefore, there is the use of the word *iva* (in the Śruti sentence), owing to the association (of the Ātman) with a body, the intellect etc., (which) have arisen from ignorance. [11]

Refer to note on verse 9.

*Verses 12-14 state another meaning of the word sammoha.*

उत्क्रान्तिकाले प्राणानां स्वस्थानादाढ्यहेतुका ।  
स्वगोचरेष्वशक्तिर्या संमोहोऽसाविहात्मनः ॥१२॥

What is in the case of organs,<sup>1</sup> at the moment of their departure (from the worldly body), viz. incapacity with reference to their objects, which has resulted from their unstability in their support (lit. a abode, i.e. body),<sup>2</sup> is here the stupour, which is taken as that of the Ātman. [12]

This explains the significance of the word *sammoha* which has been so far mentioned in these verses. This refers to the basic ignorance.

<sup>1</sup>See verse 16 below for *prāṇas* as organs.

<sup>2</sup>Refer to verse 18 below.

दाहच्छेदादयो यद्वददाह्याच्छेद्यतन्विनः ।  
परोपाधिनिमित्ताः स्युर्दुर्बलत्वादयस्तथा ॥१३॥

As burning and/or cutting etc. in the case of the embodied Ātman, which is in reality what cannot be burnt and what cannot be cut, are having a cause in the delimiting adjuncts of the highest self, so also are weakness etc. (said to be of the Ātman). [13]

Refer to *Gītā* 2.24. *sammoha* really belongs to the body with which the inner self identifies itself through ignorance.

बाह्या तावदियं वृत्तिर्व्याख्याता प्रत्यगात्मनः ।  
कार्यसंमोहरूपा या प्रसिद्धा जगतीदृशी ॥१४॥

Thus far is explained the external modification (lit. functioning) of the inner self, viz. which has been known in this world to be thus having the nature of being reduced in size and falling in stupour. [14]

This is a brief statement of what is earlier discussed with a view to introducing the Śruti *athainam* ....

*In verses 15-18, is explained the same (i.e. the word sammoha) as the internal functioning.*

मरिष्यतोऽस्य या वृत्तिरान्तरी साधुनोच्यते ।  
हृत्सद्मन्युपसंहारो यथा स्यादिन्द्रियात्मनाम् ॥१५॥

That, which is the internal modification (lit. functioning) of this one, who is about to die,<sup>1</sup> is now stated. And so also (is stated) the withdrawal of those which are of the nature of organs in the abode, viz. the heart. [15]

The word *vṛtti* conveys at just one time both the external and the internal modification which can be taken as the functionings.

<sup>1</sup>This refers to the inner self identified with the body.

अथैनमुच्चिक्रमिषुं विज्ञानात्मानमीश्वरम् ।  
प्राणा वागादयः सर्वे तं समायन्ति कृत्स्नतः ॥१६॥

Then, when this specifically knowing *Ātman* (*vijñānātman*),<sup>1</sup> the lord, is about to depart (from the body); the organs, viz. *vāc* etc. merge into it in their entirety.<sup>2</sup> [16]

This verse explains the different words in the sentence *athainam*

....  
<sup>1</sup>This qualification of the *vijñānātman* has in view its capacity to control the activities of the organs.

<sup>2</sup>This adverb, viz. *kṛtsnataḥ* seeks to distinguish the cessation of the (existence of) organs and their activities in the final sense and not as in sleep.

अभीति चाभिमुख्येऽर्थे सं तु सामस्त्य इष्यते ।  
अवध्यर्थे तथाऽत्र यन्तीत्यस्य विशेषणम् ॥१७॥

The preposition *abhi* has the sense of 'being prone towards', and (*tu*) the preposition *sam* is accepted in the sense of wholeness/fullness; and so also the preposition *āni* (= *ā*) is in the sense of the limit—(all these) are modifiers of the verb *yanti*. [17]

This is the grammatical explanation of the form *abhisamāyanti*. Thus, Sureśvara sees the significance in each of the prepositions

which was normally noticeable in early Vedic language.

स्वाश्रयेभ्यो यियासन्ति करणानि हृदीश्वरम् ।  
यदैषां स्थानसंबन्धविमोक्षः स्यात्तदैव तु ॥१८॥

When the organs seek to go from their own abodes to the lord in the heart—only then is this the release (i.e. separation)<sup>1</sup> of these from their abodes. [18]

<sup>1</sup>The Upaniṣad has the intention of comparing the departure of the organs from the body into the lord in the heart with the release or getting loose of the horses of a chariot at the final destination.

SP points out the cessation of the activities of the organs as not temporary like that in a dream, sleep etc.; the same is the final one, as at the time of death, for, otherwise, there would not be proper understanding of death.

*In verses 19-21 is mentioned the departure of the organs.*

कथं तमभिसंयान्तीत्युक्ते श्रुत्याभिधीयते ।  
आत्मानमभिसंयान्ति वागादीनि यथा स्फुटम् ॥१९॥

If (or, when) it is asked as to how they (i.e. the organs) move into that (*vijñānātman*), the Śruti clearly states that *vāc* etc. move into the Ātman. [19]

This clarifies the Śruti sentence *sa etā ...* together with question that could be asked.

Sureśvara has dropped the preposition *ā* which was used in the original, perhaps for the sake of metre.

स आत्मा प्रकृतस्त्वेताश्चक्षुःश्रोत्रादिलक्षणाः ।  
तेजोमात्रा यथादेशं समये मृतिकर्मणः ॥२०॥

By the word *sa* (in the sentence of the Śruti) is introduced



the Ātman<sup>1</sup> and (*tu*) (the Ātman takes)<sup>2</sup> these portions<sup>3</sup> of lustre etc. which are known (or characterized) as the eye, the ear etc. from their respective regions at the time of death.

[20]

<sup>1</sup>This refers to the *avidvān ātman* as mentioned in verse 7 above.

<sup>2</sup>This refers to the use of the word *samabhyādadānah* with reference to the Ātman which conveys the sense of *ādhāya mṛtikāle gacchati*.

<sup>3</sup>This is to convey the idea of various organs which are the modifications (*vikāras*) of lustre etc. This is the meaning of *mātrā* in this verse; for this explanation see verse 24 below.

उद्धृताकृतविज्ञानो मृतिं प्रति यदा तदा ।  
आकूतानुविधायीनि जायन्ते करणान्यथ ॥२१॥

When (this *vijñānātman*) has a specific awareness of the intention with reference to death, then the organs also become prone to activities in accordance with its intention. [21]

This verse brings out the significance of the word *īśvara* for the individual self (verses 16 and 18 above) and the relation of the organs to it as being the followers of the same.

*Verses 22-24 explain the meaning of ādāna as specific awareness of the form.*

स्वाकूतानुविधायित्वं यत्तदा करणात्मनाम् ।  
अभ्याददान इति तत्कर्तृत्वं स्यादिहात्मनः ॥२२॥

When following of the intention (of the individual self)<sup>1</sup> is mentioned by what have the nature of the organs; then there would be the nature of the agent of their activities in the case of the individual self—this is conveyed by the word *abhyādadānah*. [22]

<sup>1</sup>This is the meaning of the word *sva* in the verse, i.e. the non-knowing individual self which is about to die.

एतत्कर्तृत्वमापेक्ष्य श्रुत्यैवमभिधीयते ।  
अभ्याददान इति तु तेजोमात्राः स्वदेशतः ॥२३॥

Having this capacity of the individual self's being the agent, the Śruti thus employs the word *abhyādadānaḥ* (and has for its object) the portions of lustre etc. from their respective regions. [23]

Sureśvara has in mind the words *dhyāyatīva* (BU 4.3.7) and, therefore, the capacity of the individual self as the agent is to be understood only metaphorically

मीयन्ते विषया याभिर्मात्रास्ताश्चक्षुरादयः ।  
तेजोविकृतिहेतुत्वात्तेजोमात्राश्च ताः स्मृताः ॥२४॥

The organs (i.e. those *mātras*), viz. the eye etc., are those by which (various) objects become known; and because they are modifications of lustre (etc.) they are known as portions of lustre (etc.).<sup>1</sup> [24]

<sup>1</sup>This explains the meaning of *tejomātrāḥ*. This is but the result of ignorance and, therefore, there is reference to modifications like lustre etc. Refer to *Gītā* 2.14 and Śaṅkara's explanation of the word *mātrā* there.

सत्त्वं तेजोऽत्र विज्ञेयं तदेव करणात्मना ।  
प्रविभक्तं हि तच्छब्दस्पर्शाद्यर्थावभासनात् ॥२५॥

Here (i.e. in this context) lustre is to be understood as Sattva and which has differentiated itself in the form of (various) organs owing to its revealing such objects as the word, touch etc. [25]

Sureśvara brings out the sense of the word *tejas*, viz. *sattva* as mentioned by the Sāṃkhyas. Cf. *sattvaṃ laghuprakāśakam* in *Sāṃkhyakārikā* 13.

पित्ताख्यं वा भवेत्तेजस्तदंशाश्चक्षुरादयः ।  
इत्येवमायुर्वेदज्ञाः करणानि प्रचक्षते ॥२६॥

Or, *tejas* can be what is called *pitta* 'bile' and its portions are the eye etc.—thus do the knowers of *Āyurveda* explain (the nature of) the organs. [26]

SP supports this saying: *uktam hi— agnir eva śarīre pītāntaragataḥ kupitākupitāni śubhāśubhāni karotīti* and also *anyo 'pyāha*

*āmāśayāśrayam pittaṃ rañjakam rasarañjanāt /  
buddhime dhābhimānādyair abhipretārthasādhanāt //  
sādhakam hr̥dgatam pittaṃ rūpālocanataḥ smṛtam /  
dr̥ksthām ālocakam tvaksthām bhrājakam bhrājanāt tvacaḥ //  
(Aṣṭāṅgahr̥daya 1.12.13-14).*

For further clarification, read SP with profit.

*Sureśvara's siddhānta in this regard is stated in verses 27-28.*

यदा पञ्चावतिष्ठन्ते ज्ञानानि मनसा सह ।  
इति प्रकाशरूपत्वं करणानां श्रुतिर्जगौ ॥२७॥

The Śruti has declared (lit. sung) the nature of the organs of being only the light in the passage *yadā pañcāvatiṣṭhante jñānāni manasā saha ....* [27]

Sureśvara has taken the support of *Kāthopaniṣad* 6.3.1 and *Maitrāyaṇyupaniṣad* 6.30.

भौतिकस्तु प्रकाशोऽयं भौतिकार्थप्रकाशनात् ।  
प्रदीपवन्न भूतेभ्यो जात्यन्तरमतो भवेत् ॥२८॥

And (*tu*) this light is the product of the elements, since it reveals (to view) the objects which (also) are the products of the elements, in the same way as a lamp (is the product of the elements); therefore, it (i.e. light) does not belong to any species other than the elements. [28]

SP refers to the view of Bhartṛprapañca thus:

*ekaikādhikayuktāni khādīnām indriyāṇi ca /; and  
khādīni buddhir avyaktam ahaṁkāras tathāṣṭamaḥ /  
bhūtaprakṛtir uddiṣṭā vikārāḥ ṣoḍaśaiva tu //  
buddhīndriyāṇi pañcaiva pañca karmendriyāṇi ca /  
samanaskāś ca pañcārthā vikārā iti sanjñitāḥ //  
(Carakasamhitā 4.1.63-64).*

*In verses 29-31 are stated the Śruti view that the organs are the products of the elements, not of ahaṁkāra etc.*

स्पष्टं च वक्ष्यतेऽथोर्ध्वमेतेभ्य इति हि श्रुतिः ।  
अक्षाणि भौतिकान्येव नातः शक्तय आत्मनः ॥२९॥

And further (*atha*) will there be clearly stated the later Śruti, viz. the sentence *etebhyah*<sup>1</sup> to say 'the organs (*akṣāṇi*) are the products only of the elements'; therefore, they are not the powers of the Ātman.<sup>2</sup> [29]

<sup>1</sup>BU 2.4.12; 4.5.13.

<sup>2</sup>This statement sets aside the view of some fellow Vedāntins (*svayūthyas*), who, on the basis of the statement in SP, seem to hold the organs to be the modifications of the Ātman. Sureśvara has used the word *śaktayaḥ* to convey the notion of *vikārah*.

लिङ्गात्मकानां भूतानां निर्देशोऽविद्यया सह ।  
तन्नाशमनु नाशः स्याद्यतो दुःखात्मनस्ततः ॥३०॥

(This is) the mention of the elements which are of the nature of (or, parts of) the subtle body together with ignorance,<sup>1</sup> since there is a destruction of them, viz. that which follows<sup>2</sup> the destruction of that (ignorance); therefore, there is (the destruction of) what is of the nature of misery. [30]

<sup>1</sup>This refers to the invisible seventeen organs in the form of the subtle body which is the product of ignorance. Read SP for yet further clarification of the idea. Also there is further the statement: *bhūtaśabdenoktalingaparigrahaḥ*.

<sup>2</sup>This refers to the Upaniṣadic verb *anuvinaśyati* that does not go with the individual self, but with only the elements in their subtle form.

पिण्डनाशेऽपि नैवास्य नाशः संसारिणो यतः ।  
अविद्यादीनि भूतानि तत्रोच्यन्ते ततो ध्रुवम् ॥३१॥

Since there is no destruction of this (individual self) which has become transmigratory in nature; even when there is destruction of the body; therefore, it is certainly the elements having their beginning in ignorance that are mentioned there.<sup>1</sup>

[31]

<sup>1</sup>That is, in the sentence of the Śruti.

*Verses 32-35 are indicative of the organs as the modifications of the elements.*

मात्रासंसर्ग एवास्य तथा चैव प्रवक्ष्यते ।  
विज्ञानेनाथ विज्ञानमादायेत्यपि चावदत् ॥३२॥

So also it will be specifically (*eva*) stated that this one (viz. the individual self) has association only with organs; and the Śruti also has said *vijñānenātha vijñānam ādaya* (BU 2.1.17).

[32]

This refers to the word *vijñāna* which is used in two senses: (i) organs which can perceive (objects), and (ii) the specific knowledge.

अस्य लोकस्य चेत्युक्तं शुक्रमित्यादि चापरम् ।  
सर्वेष्वेषु प्रदेशेषु भूतमात्राग्रहः श्रुतौ ॥३३॥

Also, there is another statement in the Śruti: *asya lokasya* ... (BU 2.1.17) and yet (*ca*) another statement: *śukram* ... (BU 4.3.11). In all these regions (i.e. states) there is in the Śruti the understanding of the portions (i.e. the organs) of the elements. [33]

भूतेभ्यो नापरं वस्तु यस्मादात्मन ईक्ष्यते ॥३४॥  
अतो विवेको भूतानां यः परोऽतीव शुद्धितः ।  
तेजोमात्रादिवचसा स एवात्राभिधीयते ॥३५॥

Since there is not noticeable (*na īksyate*)<sup>1</sup> anything else than the Ātman, viz. the elements; [34]  
therefore, there is distinctly the manifestation (*viveka*) of the elements which is beyond (visible organs) and extremely pure in nature—and that alone is expressed here by the word *tejomātrā*.<sup>2</sup> [35]

<sup>1</sup>According to the variant reading, 'accepted' (*isyate*).

<sup>2</sup>This refers to *tejomātrāḥ samabhyādādānaḥ* ....

*Verses 36-72 refute the notion of the organs being the modifications of the Ātman.*

इन्द्रियाणीन्द्रियार्थाश्च न विकारः परात्मनः ।  
अतो न जायत इति तद्विकारनिषेधतः ॥३६॥

The organs and the objects of the organs are not modifications<sup>1</sup> of the highest self; (this is understood) from the rejection of the modification(s) of the same (*paramātman*)

in the Śruti *atah ...*,<sup>2</sup> *na jāyate ....*<sup>3</sup>

[36]

<sup>1</sup>*vikārah* is singular for *vikārāḥ* (plural) — *jātāv ekavacanam*.

<sup>2</sup>BU 3.4.2; 3.6.1; 3.7.23.

<sup>3</sup>*Kathopanīṣad* 2.18; cp. also the Smṛti, viz. *Gītā* 2.20.

जन्मादिविक्रियाषटकं साक्षात् परमात्मनः ।  
अपूर्वानपराद्युक्तेनेति नेत्यादिवाक्यतः ॥३७॥

The group of the six modifications, beginning with the birth etc., cannot be directly (understood as) of the Ātman, (as this is clear from) the statement (about it) as *apūrvam anaparam ...*<sup>1</sup> (and also from) the sentence *neti neti ....*<sup>2</sup> [37]

<sup>1</sup>BU 2.5.19: *tad etad brahmāpūrvam anaparam anantaram abāhyam ...*; and BU (Mādhyandina) 3.8.8: *apūrvam anaparam ... abāhyam*.

<sup>2</sup>BU 2.3.6; 3.9.23; 4.4.22; 4.5.15.

न च वेदान्तसिद्धान्ते परमात्मातिरेकतः ।  
इष्टं विकारवद्वस्तु यथा कापिलशासने ॥३८॥

And, in the doctrine of the Vedānta, there is not accepted anything that undergoes modifications and is beside the highest Ātman, as there it is in the doctrine of Kapila.<sup>1</sup> [38]

<sup>1</sup>The verse refers to the Sāṃkhya doctrine which accepts *īśvara* and various modifications as distinct objects of reality.

स्वतः कटस्थतत्त्वस्य तदसंबोधतस्ततः ।  
जन्मादिविक्रियाषटकसंगतिः स्यात्परात्मनः ॥३९॥

(It follows) that there is acceptance (or, postulation) of the group of the six modifications beginning with birth etc. in association with the highest Ātman as (coming) from the absence of the knowledge of that which in itself has the nature

of immutable reality.

[39]

SP cites *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad* 4.10 to support this argument  
*māyāṃ tu prakṛtim ....*

आत्मकारणवादोऽयमेवं सत्युपपद्यते ।  
न तु विध्वस्तनिःशेषजन्मनाशादिकारणे ॥४०॥

This being accepted thus, this doctrine of the Ātman as the (supposed) cause of (the organs etc.)<sup>1</sup> becomes reasonable; but indeed not when there is (the mere statement about it) as being the cause of all the removal of (the notions of) the birth and destruction. [40]

The first line states the reason when and why knowledge of *ātmakāraṇavāda* is necessary for liberation. The mere mention of the nature of the Ātman is not sufficient.

<sup>1</sup>Cf. verse 29 above.

तेजोऽतो भौतिकं सर्वमन्यत्र परमात्मनः ।  
स्वयंज्योतिःप्रसङ्गेन तदुक्तं प्रागपि श्रुतौ ॥४१॥

There is, therefore, everywhere else than in the highest Ātman, all elemental lustre. And that has been stated earlier also in the Śruti in the context of the self-shining (Ātman).<sup>1</sup> [41]

<sup>1</sup>This refers to contents of *Jyotis Brāhmaṇa*.

आदित्यादीनि तेजांसि तथाध्यात्माधिभूतयोः ।  
भौतिकान्येव तानीति प्रत्यङ् तेभ्यो विलक्षणः ॥४२॥

So also, the lustres such as the sun which pertain to the bodies and the elements, are but the products of the elements and the inner self is (altogether) of another distinct form from theirs. [42]



ता एतास्तेजसो मात्राः समस्ताश्चाभिमख्यतः ।  
सामस्त्येनाददानः सन्त्सद्मन्युपसर्पति ॥४३॥

The Ātman, taking up in their entirety all these portions of lustres and being their master,<sup>1</sup> enters into the abode of the heart. [43]

This is the meaning of *sa ...* and *hr̥dayam ...*

अभ्याददान एवायमन्वक्रामतीश्वरः ।  
न त्वाक्रम्य समादत्ते कथं तदिति भण्यते ॥४४॥

(Thus) this lord, taking up (these portions of lustres) enters into (the subtle form); but it does not step on the same and takes then (i.e. the portions of lustres)—how that is explained (in the following verses).<sup>1</sup> [44]

<sup>1</sup>This verse explains the relation of the form *abhyādadānah*, with the addition of the suffix *-sānac* to the verb in the sentence. This indicates the simultaneity of the two actions, as clarified in the second line and also in the following verses again.

विशेषज्ञानलाभोऽस्य लिङ्गात्मानुविधानतः ।  
यतस्तदपकर्षेण विज्ञानात्मोपसंहतिः ॥४५॥  
तद्व्याप्तौ चापि संव्याप्तिरापादतलमस्तकम् ।  
स्वतस्तु व्याप्तिसंहाररहितत्वात्परात्मनः ॥४६॥

Since, for this one (Ātman), there is acquisition of the specific knowledge by entering into what has the nature of the subtle form, there is the inclusion of the specifically knowing Ātman by this entering; [45]  
and by pervading that (subtle form), there is the complete pervasion from head to foot (of the subtle form)—for the highest Ātman is, by its very nature, without any activity of pervading and collecting (various properties etc.). [46]

SP makes a relevant observation: *liṅgasāṅkocavikāśāv eva tadupādher ātmanas tāv iti.*

सैन्धवादिरसव्याप्ते पीयमाने यथोदके ।  
पानं सलवणस्यैवं लिङ्गात्मानुविधायिता ॥४७॥

As the water, which is pervaded by the taste of salt etc. being drunk, there is drinking of salty (water), there is similarly the action of the Ātman, viz. entering into the subtle form.

[47]

This gives an example for the entry of the Ātman into the subtle form as similar to the taste of salt which is entering into the water that is being drunk.

सोऽभ्यादानस्य कर्तात्र लिङ्गं योऽस्मीति मन्यते ।  
आक्रामद्भृदयं लिङ्गमन्ववक्रामतीव सः ॥४८॥

That Ātman, which is the agent of activities, viz. taking up (those forms) is here the one who considers, 'I am this subtle form (*liṅga*)'; and the one, entering into the subtle form, is mentioned as one entering into it, as it were.

[48]

This is once again to stress the real absence of any action on the part of the Ātman.

तथा हृदयशब्देन तत्स्था धीरभिधीयते ।  
एवेत्यवधृतिश्चात्र स्वप्नप्राज्ञनिवृत्तये ॥४९॥

So also, the word *hr̥daya* is expressive of the intellect which resides in it.<sup>1</sup> And the specification with the use of word *eva* here results into the warding off of the self, in both the dream and the deep sleep states.

[49]

<sup>1</sup>This refers to the intellect as having its abode in the heart, as mentioned earlier in BU 4.1.35 which begins with the

discussion about transmigration of an individual.

विशेषकार्यवाहिभ्यः स्रोतोभ्यः स्वप्नभूमिगः ।  
विशेषाननुसृप्यात्मा यात्वा हृदयमाश्रयम् ॥५०॥  
पुरीतत्प्रमुखं देहं वृत्त्या सामान्यरूपया ।  
तप्तलोहादिवद्व्याप्य शेते प्राणात्मतां गतः ॥५१॥

The individual, resting in the abode of the dream state, flows out from the organs (*srotas*) which bear particular effects (of activity etc. due to ignorance) unto some particular (objects) and then proceeds<sup>1</sup> to its (own) support, viz. the heart,<sup>2</sup>

[50]

(and) that (into the body) having the *purītat* (*nādī*) as prominent among *nādīs*, in its general form<sup>3</sup> and having become the nature of the *prānas* (viz. the winds) remains there, occupying it, as (heat etc.) resides in a heated piece of iron.

[51]

<sup>1</sup>*yātvā* is for *yāti*.

<sup>2</sup>This stands for the intellect.

<sup>3</sup>This is in the form of impressions. Cf. BU 4.3.

इह त्वेवेति निःशेषा लिङ्गस्यास्योपसंहतिः ।  
विशेषेभ्योऽविशेषेभ्यो युक्तं प्रत्यवसर्पणम् ॥५२॥

In this (world) here, there is a complete withdrawal (of the organs) in the subtle form; (for) it is reasonable (to understand) the going back (i.e. withdrawal) from all particulars (and) non-particulars.<sup>1</sup>

[52]

<sup>1</sup>This word indicates withdrawal in the subtle form of particular (i.e. individual) effects of ignorance and the Ātman which is not an effect.

*Verses 53-55 conclude the thought in hr̥dayam anvavakrāmati.*

अवदधेऽत एवेति मा भूत्स्वप्नादिवत्स्थितिः ।  
 सामान्यं वा विशेषो वा न यतोऽत्रावशिष्यते ।  
 कार्त्स्न्येन हृदय एव पिण्डीभावं व्रजत्यतः ॥५३॥

Therefore, the Śruti has made specification,<sup>1</sup> by the use of the word *eva*, to convey that there should not be (after death) a state like the dream etc.<sup>2</sup> and, whatever it be, general or particular in nature, it does not remain here (i.e. in the body); (since,) from this (body), it becomes wholly as a lamp in the heart. [53]

This is the sense of the Śruti statement *hrdayam ....*

<sup>1</sup>Sureśvara uses the Ātmanepada form significantly, i.e. to indicate that this situation is not for the service of any other body.

<sup>2</sup>This refers to deep sleep state.

विधिराकर्षणे तावत्तेजोमात्राश्रयो गतः ।  
 अथासंवेदनविधिर्मूर्षोरुच्यते यथा ॥५४॥

So far is mentioned the manner in which there is withdrawal (*ākaraṣaṇa*)<sup>1</sup> in relation (*āśraya*) only to the portions of lustres. And then there is stated here the manner of non-knowing on the part of the individual which is about to die. [54]

The first line refers to the gist of the entire sentence *sa yatra ...* and the second line explains how, at the time of death, the individual self ceases to have the knowledge of word etc. (which is being discussed later).

<sup>1</sup>This is for *apakarṣa* in verse 48 above.

साधारणात्मनो योऽशो भोक्तृकर्मवशीकृतः ।  
 अद्यात्मं चक्षुषि रवेश्चक्षुर्व्यापारसिद्धिकृत् ॥५५॥

Whatever portion of the sun which, being in general nature, does the activity of the eye is what belongs to the body (and

is of particular nature), as controlled by the activity of the experiencer and enjoyer. [55]

This is to explain the meaning of the word *cākṣuṣa* in *sa cākṣuṣah*.

*Verses 56-61 explain the withdrawal of the portions of divinities (in the organs) which have favoured them.*

कर्मोपभोगसिद्धयर्थं परिच्छिन्नः स्वचक्षुषा ।  
चाक्षुषोऽतः स विज्ञेयः सामान्यात्मापि भास्करः ॥५६॥

Therefore, that (portion of lustre) is to be known as *cākṣuṣa* 'what belongs to the eye' (qualities), limited by that individual self's eye for effecting the experience and enjoyment (of the result) of its activity. And the sun is to be known as of general nature (i.e. the pervader). [56]

Sureśvara points to *Aitareyopaniṣad* 1.3.4: *ādityaś cākṣur bhūtvākṣiṇī prāviśat* (cp. *Jaiminīyopaniṣad* 8.11.12) for explaining the significance of the word *cākṣuṣa*.

स एष पुरुषो यत्र तत्प्रयोक्तृक्रियाक्षये ।  
क्षेत्रज्ञार्थात्पराडेव पर्यावर्तत आत्मनि ॥५७॥

When (*yatra*) there is the cessation of the activity of the impeller (i.e. the force) of that (i.e. the eye), it is this Puruṣa who resides in the Ātman, away from the objects<sup>1</sup> for the knower of the field. [57]

The verse explains the meaning of *arūpajñō bhavati*.

<sup>1</sup>The refers to *rūpa*.

निरनुग्रहतैवास्य पर्यावर्तनमुच्यते ॥५८॥  
हल्लिङ्गप्रसृतो योऽश उपभोगार्थमक्षिणि ।  
सोऽस्य कर्मक्षयादक्षणः पराडावर्तते हृदि ॥५९॥

By the word *parāvartana* is expressed the character of this one<sup>1</sup> as not being a favouring (deity of an organ). [58]

Whatever portion (of the lustre), which has been in the eye, for (an individual's) experience or enjoyment and has proceeded to the subtle form, viz. heart,<sup>2</sup> and (this is to mean:) it, owing to the cessation of the activity of this one, has turned away from the eye.<sup>3</sup> [59]

Verse 58 explains the word *parāvartate* in the preceding verse. Verse 59 explains in detail the process called *parāvartana*.

<sup>1</sup>This means, not being associated with the objects.

<sup>2</sup>This stands for the intellect in the subtle form.

<sup>3</sup>This refers to the abode in the body of lustre.

चाक्षुषे पुरुषे तस्मिन्नावृत्ते कर्मणः क्षयात् ।  
देवता देवतामेति लिङ्गैक्यं करणं तथा ॥६०॥

When, after the cessation of the activity (of the eye), that Puruṣa (i.e. the individual self), residing in the eye, has returned,<sup>1</sup> (the superintending) deity also becomes the deity (of general nature) and the organs also become one with *liṅga* 'the subtle form' (i.e. heart, i.e. the intellect). [60]

<sup>1</sup>The word *āvṛtta* stands for *parāvṛtta*; 'to the heart' is to be supplied.

अथैवं सत्यरूपज्ञो देवताकरणच्युतेः ।  
आत्मैवमुक्तानुक्तेषु योज्यं प्राणेष्वशेषतः ॥६१॥

When this is so,<sup>1</sup> the individual self itself is thus the non-knower of the form of the object(s).<sup>2</sup> This process has to be understood<sup>3</sup> in the case of all the *prāṇas* 'organs' whether mentioned or non-mentioned. [61]

This refers to the mention of *caṅśus*, which has to be taken

as indicative of other organs and their superintending deities.

<sup>1</sup>*atha* here stands for *tadā*.

<sup>2</sup>This is ceasing to favour the activity of knowing (*anugrahakanivṛtti*).

<sup>3</sup>Literally, it means 'has to be used', or 'connected with (an organ)'.  
[62]

*Verses 62-66 argue the non-noticing of any activity in an insentient (object/organ) from which the sentient (deity) has withdrawn itself.*

चेतनावदधिष्ठानात्करणादेर्जडात्मनः ।  
प्रवृत्तिर्नियता दृष्टा लोकेऽतो न विपर्यये ॥६२॥

It is seen in the world that there is an activity of organs etc., which are (lit. is) insentient in nature, (only) as controlled by the support of what has sentience, and this is not (noticed) where there is the opposite of it.<sup>1</sup> [62]

Cp. the argument with BSB 2.2.2 (p.492-493): *na hi mṛdādayo vā svayam acetanāḥ ... drśyante*; and also SP points a statement in BU 3.4.1 *yaḥ prāṇena prāṇīti*

<sup>1</sup>And, when not supported by any sentient individual.

*Now follows the discussion on BU 4.4.2 in verses 63-125.*

अरूपज्ञत्वहेतुः क इत्याशङ्क्योत्तरं वचः ।  
लोकप्रसिद्धिमाचष्ट एकीत्यादि मुमूर्षति ॥६३॥

The subsequent statement of the Śruti (has proceeded), having in view the objection, viz. 'what would be the cause of (the individual self's) not-knowing form?'; It states what is popularly known in the case of a dying person, in the words *ekī(bhavati ...)*. [63]

SP states the *lokaprasiddhi* as: *devatākaranacyutir eva rūpajñatvahetuḥ*.

एकीभवति सावित्रः सवित्रांशस्तथैव च ।  
लिङ्गांशश्चाक्षुषो व्यूढो लिङ्गैक्यं प्रतिपद्यते ॥६४॥

The portion of Savitr (i.e. Āditya) becomes one with Savitr and so also the portion of the subtle form which is limited by<sup>1</sup> the Āditya (i.e. superintended over by the sun) becomes one with the subtle form. [64]

<sup>1</sup>*vyūḍha* stands for *avachinna* 'limited by'.

स्वांशिभ्यामेकतापत्तौ देवतालिङ्गभागयोः ।  
अथारूपज्ञतामेति यः प्राग्रूपादिवेद्यभूत् ॥६५॥

Thus, when the deity and the portion of the deity have become one with the subtle form, that one becomes a non-knower of forms, viz. the one which had been formerly a knower of forms etc. [65]

अथैनं पार्श्वगाः प्राहुर्बन्धवोऽस्य मुमर्षतः ।  
वाक्यमेकीभवतीति निराशास्तस्य जीविते ॥६६॥

Then, at this time, the relations around this dying individual say this sentence:<sup>1</sup> *ekībhavati*, being hopeless about (the continuity of) his life. [66]

<sup>1</sup>That is, 'he is now a non-knower of form'.

*Verses 67-70 point to the absence of any indication of the order in the cessation of the activities of the organs—though that of the eye is mentioned.*

करणे देवता यस्मिन्पूर्वं मुञ्चत्यनुग्रहम् ।  
तस्यैव प्रथमं वृत्तिनिरोध उपजायते ॥६७॥

There occurs the cessation of the activity of that organ first



in the case of which the deity gives up its favouring (or superintending over) it first. [67]

In this verse is not mentioned any specific order of the cessation of activities of various organs. The reference is only to what is experienced in this order or another of the cessation of the organs' activities.

कस्मिंश्चित्करणे वृत्तिनिरोधः पूर्वमीक्ष्यते ।  
अयौगपद्येनोत्क्रान्तौ तल्लिङ्गं देवतात्मनाम् ॥६८॥

(This is so said), because the cessation of activity is seen first in any one of the organs. With respect to the non-simultaneous departure of what has the nature of the deity (of the organ), that (viz. cessation of activity) is an indication.<sup>1</sup> [68]

<sup>1</sup>The word *linga* here does not refer to the subtle form of organ/deity, but it conveys the sense of or an indication of departure of the same. The singular means the plural (i.e. all the organs in general).

यदालोचनमात्रं स्याद्रूपादौ चक्षुरादिभिः ।  
प्रविवेकता तु रूपादेः सम्यङ्नैव पुमान्भवेत् ॥६९॥  
तदोत्क्रान्तां विजानीयान्मनसो देवतामितः ।  
केवलालोचनाल्लिङ्गात्तथा बुद्धेश्च देवताम् ॥७०॥

When a person stops becoming a proper seer (lit. discriminator) of form etc., when there is merely noticing by the eye etc. in the case of form etc.; [69]

then should one know that the deity of *manas* has departed from this (his body); and so also should one know the deity of the intellect only from indication, viz. (mere) seeing. [70]

*Verses 71-72 explain the intended meaning of ekībhavati.*

एवं तद्देवतोत्क्रान्तावेकीभावेन संगतेः ।

मनुते नो न जानातीत्येवमाहुस्तथा जनाः ॥७१॥

Thus, when the deities of those (organs) have departed, i.e. when they have been understood as associated together (*ekībhavana*), the people say, *no manute* 'he does not know'.<sup>1</sup>

[71]

<sup>1</sup>Cp. BU 4.3.28.

उक्तं विमोक्षणं तावत्करणानां स्वदेशतः ।  
असंविज्ञानता चोक्ता हृदये चोपसंहतिः ॥७२॥

Thus is stated in the beginning (*tāvat*), the release of the organs from their abodes (in the body) and so also is explained the state of having no knowledge whatever and the withdrawal (of the organs and the sentience) in the heart. [72]

*In verses 73-76 are stated some thoughts on the Ātman's movements from region to region.*

अथोपसंहताशेषकरणस्यात्मनो यथा ।  
लोकान्तरोपसंक्रान्तिस्तथैतदभिधीयते ॥७३॥

Now is being stated as to how there is a departure of this (individual self) which has withdrawn itself from all of the organs, viz. its departures to other worlds. [73]

This refers to the shining (or effulgence) at the opening of the heart for another world.

तस्यैतस्य यथोक्तस्य कृत्स्नप्राणोपसंहतेः ।  
नाड्यग्रं हृदयस्याथ प्रकर्षेण प्रकाशते ॥७४॥

Now, when there is withdrawing from all the *prāṇas* of this Ātman, viz. this one which has been stated earlier, the tip of the vein of the heart begins to shine exceedingly. [74]

The verse is a fuller explanation of the word *atha* in the preceding verse.

सर्वेषु संहतेष्वेवं करणेषु सवायुषु ।  
बुद्धेः प्रद्योततेऽथाग्रं हृदयस्य यियासतः ॥७५॥

Then, when all the organs together with (all the five types of) winds, are withdrawn,<sup>1</sup> then the tip of the intellect<sup>2</sup> which is the heart of (the Ātman) that is about to move out of the body, begins to shine. [75]

<sup>1</sup>That is to say: have been abandoned by the individual self.

<sup>2</sup>The words 'of the intellect' is the paraphrase/explanation of 'of the heart'.

स एष कर्मजो बुद्धेः प्रकाशो जायते मृतौ ।  
स्वकर्मनिर्मितं लौकं येनात्मायं प्रपश्यति ॥७६॥

This then is the effulgence of the intellect, produced from the activity (of the individual being);<sup>1</sup> this becomes visible (lit. born) at the time of death; (this is so said) since this individual self sees well the other (world) which is produced by the activity (or activities) of itself. [76]

<sup>1</sup>This is the explanation of the word *pradyota* which occurs in verse 80 below.

*Verses 77-82 describe how 'ego' of the next body comes into being.*

कर्मणैवास्य विज्ञानं तादात्म्यमुपनीयते ।  
पश्चादापन्नतद्भावो देहमेतं विमुञ्चति ॥७७॥

By the very activity of this one (i.e. the individual self) specific knowledge (of it) is turned into (lit. brought to the stage of)

oneness with (the specific knowledge of the individual self).<sup>1</sup>  
And then later (the individual self) having obtained the nature  
(*bhāva*) of that<sup>2</sup> gives up this (present body). [77]

SP clarifies that the awareness of a dying individual of what  
it is going to be in the next birth is identified with the individual  
self itself (*tādātmya*).

<sup>1</sup>SP points to the awareness of this specific knowledge on  
the part of the individual, since six months before its death—this  
is the individual's awareness 'I am going to be so and so' and  
that is called *pradyota*.

<sup>2</sup>This is related to verses 96 and 102 (= *Gītā* 8.6) below.

भाविलोकात्मिका यास्य प्रत्यक्चैतन्यबिम्बिता ।  
वासनैवात्मनः प्रोक्ता प्रद्योतवचसा स्फुटम् ॥७८॥

That desire, which is said to have been reflected in the  
sentience of that individual self and has the nature of the  
ensuing world or form is itself stated clearly by the word  
*pradyota*. [78]

मात्रोपादानरूपेण स्वेन भासा पुराब्रवीत् ।  
स्वेनैव ज्योतिषा स्वप्ने यथा तद्वदिहापि तत् ॥७९॥

As the Śruti has stated earlier that there is awareness of the  
individual self of its own semblance, owing to its assuming  
in the dreaming state the various portions of lustre (or various  
organs) by its own light, so is it to be understood here also.<sup>1</sup>

[79]

The verse refers to BU 4.3.

<sup>1</sup>In BU 4.3, reference is to the dream state and here in this  
verse to conditions at death.

प्रद्योतेन यथोक्तेन प्रद्योतितपथा कृत-  
कर्मकार्योऽथ हृदयान्निष्क्रामति यथासुखम् ॥८०॥

Then, at the time of death, this one (i.e. the individual self) moves out of the heart happily or unhappily (*yathāsukham*),<sup>1</sup> after it has accomplished all its activities and intended results in the way which is illuminated (or shown) by the effulgent light mentioned earlier. [80]

This refers to verse 79 above.

<sup>1</sup>This can be dissolved as *yathā* and *sukham* or *yathā* and *asukham* (SP).

साधवेवातः प्रयत्नेन कर्म कार्यं विपरिचता ।  
पश्यता प्राणिनामेवं कर्ममूलामिमां गतिम् ॥८१॥

The wise one should do well his activities with every effort, on knowing 'such is the movement of the living beings (after death) as rooted in the activities (of themselves)'. [81]

आत्मा स्वकर्मणोपात्तं प्रद्योतेन यथोचितम् ।  
लोकं पश्यन्स्वहृदयान्निष्क्रामति यथायथम् ॥८२॥

Then, the individual self (Ātman), seeing, with the help of (this) *pradyota*, the next world which is suitable to what is achieved through its (own) activities, moves out of its own heart accordingly. [82]

*Verses 83-86 state what controls the movement of the individual self.*

चक्षुष्टो वाथ मूधर्नो वा यं यं लोकं प्रपत्स्यते ।  
तद्द्वारेणैव निष्क्रामन्न क्वचित्प्रतिहन्यते ॥८३॥

Or, it moves out from (or through) the eye, or from (or through) the head to whichever world it is to go; that is going out through that way, it is nowhere obstructed. [83]

This verse clarifies the world *yathāyatham* in the preceding verse (SP).

आदित्यलोकसंप्राप्तौ चक्षुष्टोऽयं निगच्छति ।  
ब्रह्मलोकपरिप्राप्तौ मूर्ध्नि आत्मा निगच्छति ॥८४॥

This (individual self) goes out from (or through) the eye in order to reach the world of the sun and it moves out from (or through) the head, when it is to reach the world of the Brahman. [84]

In the preceding verse, two alternatives *caṅsuṣṭah* or *mūrdhnaḥ* were stated; the reason for this is given in this verse.

कर्मश्रुतानुरोधेन ह्यन्येभ्यो वा यथायथम् ।  
हृदयसृतनाडीभिरित आत्मा निगच्छति ॥८५॥

The individual self moves out of this body (*ataḥ*) through other veins that have proceeded from the heart, or from other organs accordingly and following the activity accomplished by it and/or the knowledge (acquired by it). [85]

लिङ्गं च सर्वतो गच्छन्न क्वचित्प्रतिहन्यते ।  
अतिसूक्ष्मस्वभावत्वादपि लोहसमुद्रगम् ॥८६॥

This (individual self) going out from all these (organs) to the subtle form is not anywhere obstructed, owing to its having extremely subtle nature or form, even if it (viz. the subtle form) belonged to the ocean or iron.<sup>1</sup> [86]

<sup>1</sup>The meaning of the word *lohasamudraga* which qualifies *linga* is not clear. One could see the variant reading *loham samudgatam*, but that would not be very useful. However, SP states: *abhedyād api lohādeḥ samudgacchet tenāpratihatam lingam!*

उत्क्रामन्तं तमात्मानं यथोक्तेनेह वर्त्मना ।  
प्राणोऽनूत्क्रामति ततः प्राणं प्राणास्तथा परे ॥८७॥

Prāṇa 'the principal wind' follows it, viz that individual self (which is departing from the body) in the way that is stated<sup>1</sup> here; and then the *prāṇas* 'organs' follow that Prāṇa. [87]

This is the explanation of the *Śruti tam utkrāmantam ....*

<sup>1</sup>Cf. *yathoktena hṛdayāgrapradyotāprakāśitena patha* (SP).

*In verses 88-93 are stated the objection on the basis of śrutakrama and its answer.*

नन्वात्मप्राणवागादेरन्योऽन्यव्यतिमिश्रणात् ।  
देशकालाद्यसंभेदात्क्रमेणोत्क्रमणं कथम् ॥८८॥

(An objection is raised:) 'But indeed how can there be the departure of these, viz. of the individual self, Prāṇa, and the organs, viz. *vāc* etc., for the reason that they are mixed with one another and also that there is the mixture of time, place etc.?' [88]

नैष दोषो यतो नेह क्रमकालो विवक्ष्यते ।  
प्रयोजकप्रयोज्यत्वं यतोऽमीषां विवक्षितम् ॥८९॥

(The answer is:) 'There is not a fault in this, since it is not intended here to state the sequence in point of time; but it is intended to state the relation of these as what are to be incited (to the depart) and what incite (the others to depart)'. [89]

इहोच्चिक्रमिषा यास्य विज्ञानात्मैकसंश्रया ।  
प्राणोत्क्रान्तेः प्रयोक्त्री सा वागाद्युत्क्रमणस्य च ॥९०॥

In this context (*iha*), that which is the desire of this (individual self) for departure, resulting from (lit. resting in) the nature

of the specific knowledge on the part of it, is what causes the departure of Prāṇa and that is, in consequence, (the cause) of the departure of *vāc* etc. [90]

The verse explains the thought of the preceding verse.

मुख्यप्राणस्य योत्क्रान्तिः प्रयोक्त्री सैव नापरा ।  
विज्ञानात्मैकनीडाया भावनायाः प्रधानता ॥९१॥

That departure of the principal Prāṇa itself is the cause (of the departure of *vāc* etc.) and not any other (can be the cause); there is here the principal role of the impression which is resting in what is of the nature of the specific knowledge of the individual self, viz. that which is of (i.e. identified with) the intellect. [91]

The second line of the verse is for introducing the Śruti statement *savijñānah* ....

सा हि देहान्तरप्राप्तावात्मनो मार्गदर्शिनी ।  
तया प्रयुक्तः प्राणोऽयं प्राणानादाय चैतरान् ॥९२॥

Indeed that is the one who leads the way of (the individual self) for reaching (or attaining to) another body; and, therefore, impelled by that one, this Prāṇa moves out taking with it the other organs. [92]

This verse explains how *bhāvanā* becomes the leading or principal force in the departure of Prāṇa etc.

आत्मनानन्यभतः सञ्जलपात्रार्कवद्बहिः ।  
निष्क्रामति यथाकर्म सविज्ञानो भवत्यथ ॥९३॥

(The individual self) not becoming different from itself, departs from the body like the sun moving out of a pot filled with water,<sup>1</sup> (and) according to its activity and (at that time)



becoming possessed of that specific knowledge.

[93]

<sup>1</sup>The simile points to the fact that the reflection of the sun going away from the pot of water does not mean the real movement of the sun. In this same way, we have to understand the individual self which seems to move out of body, is not really (so doing) or different from sentience, viz. the Ātman.

*Verses 94-106 explain the intention of the Mādhyandina reading sanjñāno bhavati.*

ननूपसंहृताशेषकरणत्वादधीः पुमान् ।  
तदाकूतानुगुण्यं स्यात्प्राणादेः कथमुच्यते ॥९४॥

(An objection is raised:) 'But indeed this Puruṣa (viz. the individual self), because it has withdrawn itself from all the organs and is, therefore, without any knowledge; how could there be stated in the case of *prāṇa* etc. their becoming subordinate to the intention (or desire) to that (intention)?'

[94]

In verses 94-99 Sureśvara has taken up the statement of the Mādhyandina recension of BU: *sanjñānam evānvavakramati ... sa eṣa jñāḥ savijñāno bhavati* as the basis of the objection.

प्रत्यभिज्ञात्मकं ज्ञानं संज्ञानमिति भण्यते ।  
पूर्वं यद्बुद्धयस्याग्रद्योतनेन प्रकाशितम् ॥९५॥  
भाविनोऽर्थस्य विज्ञानं प्रत्यभिज्ञानमुच्यते ।  
स तथोद्भूतविज्ञान आत्मा देहान्निगच्छति ॥९६॥

(The answer is given:) 'Knowledge, which is of the nature of specific awareness, is stated by the word *sanjñāna*, viz. the one which is revealed by the illumination at the opening of the heart, as stated earlier.

[95]

Specific knowledge of what is going to result in future is stated (here) as *pratyabhijñāna* 'specific awareness'. Then that

individual self moves out of the body, in which that specific knowledge has been produced in that way'. [96]

हृदयाग्रप्रकाशेन निष्क्रान्तस्यापि देहतः ।  
निःसंबोधस्य गमनं कथं देहान्तरं प्रति ॥९७॥

(An objection is raised:) 'How can there be the movement to another body (of the individual self) which is without any knowledge even as it has gone out of one body through the force of the illumination at the opening of the heart?' [97]

इत्यस्य परिहाराय स इत्यादि परं वचः ।  
स एष ज्ञः परो देवः सविज्ञानो भवत्यथ ॥९८॥

Therefore, in order to answer away this objection, 'There is the subsequent statement of the Śruti, beginning with *sa*, viz. *sa eṣa jñāḥ paro devaḥ* 'this is the knower, the highest divine being,' and he becomes possessed of that specific knowledge'. [98]

संहृताशेषकरणो भावनाकर्महेतुतः ।  
सविज्ञानो यथा स्वप्ने तथोत्क्रान्तावपीष्यते ॥९९॥

(The individual self) which has withdrawn itself from all the organs becomes possessed of the specific knowledge for the reason that there is the activity proceeding from desire; as this (happens) in the dream state, so is it accepted (to happen) also in (the movement of this final) departure. [99]

विशेषज्ञानसंबन्धः कर्मणैवास्य हेतुना ।  
न तु स्वातन्त्र्यतो लभ्यः स्वातन्त्र्यासंभवादिह ॥१००॥

The relation of this one (viz. the individual self) to the specific knowledge here (i.e. on death) is only for one reason, viz. (the cessation of) its own activity; that (relation) cannot be effected (lit. obtained by it) independently, since there is no

possibility of any independence on the part of it. [100]

कृतकृत्यो भवेत्सर्वो विशेषज्ञानसंगतिः ।  
स्वातन्त्र्येणेह चेल्लभ्या न तु लभ्या तथाह च ॥१०१॥  
यं यं वापि स्मरन्भावं त्यजत्यन्ते कलेवरम् ।  
तं तमेवैति कौन्तेय सदा तद्भावभावितः ॥१०२॥

Every person (i.e. individual self) who has done all the duties to be performed comes to have association with (that kind of) specific knowledge; if that (association ...) is (to be obtained by it) independently; but it is not to be so obtained—and (the Lord said:) [101]

“A person who, at the time of death, leaves the body, remembering whatever states he has been in, comes to attain that, O son of Kunti. (It is even so) becoming what he had cherished as his desire.” [102]

Verse 102 is *Gītā* 8.6.

NKL (ms. p.716) states *pāṭhadvaye 'pi vākyaṛtham upasaṃharati evam iti. atha karmavaśād iti yāvat.*

एवमात्मा सविज्ञानो गन्तव्यं यत्पुरार्जितम् ।  
तदात्मभावविज्ञानस्तदेवातो निगच्छति ॥१०३॥

Thus, the individual self, being possessed of the specific knowledge, moves out from this body unto that goal (i.e. region to be attained to), which is secured (by it) earlier (through activities), and having the specific knowledge of itself being that (the reaching that goal). [103]

NKL (ms. p.716): *yasmāt karmamūlā gatis tasmān mṛtikāle śubhadehe viṣayajñānārtham puṇyam eva vivekibhiḥ anupeyam ity āha ata iti.*

यत् एवमतः पुंभिः स्वातन्त्र्यार्थं प्रयत्नतः ।  
योगादिसाधनाभ्यासः कर्तव्यः पुण्यसंचयः ॥१०४॥

Since this is so, therefore, men (i.e. the individual selves) have to make an effort to acquire (i.e. make a collection of) merit and to follow the repeated practice<sup>1</sup> of *yoga*;<sup>2</sup> in order that (they secure) independence.<sup>3</sup> [104]

<sup>1</sup>Alternatively, *sādhana* can stand for (the pursuit of) the means towards liberation.

<sup>2</sup>This 'etc.' indicates various *upāsanās*.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. verse 100 above. SP puts it thus: *mṛtikāle kāla-vaśyavyāvṛttyartham*.

सर्वशास्त्रसमारम्भस्तदर्थोऽयं महानिह ।  
वाङ्मनःकायसाध्यानामुपायानां प्रबुद्धये ॥१०५॥

In this regard,<sup>1</sup> this is thus significant (lit. great, or potential) activity of (the expositions in) all Śāstric texts, and also for conveying various means (of achieving independence), viz. those which can be accomplished by means of speech, *manas* and body. [105]

<sup>1</sup>That is, *svātantryārtham* mentioned in the preceding verse.

तथानर्थपरिप्राप्तावुपायानां निषेधनम् ।  
एतावानेव शास्त्रार्थः कर्त्रधीनः सुखाप्तये ॥१०६॥

Similarly, (there is in the Śāstric texts) the rejection of (the pursuing or adopting of) the means for securing what are undesirable (effects). Only this (lit. this much) is the meaning of the Śāstric texts; it (viz. the teaching of the means of that) is related to (or dependent on) the person who practises (i.e. adopts the means) in order to acquire happiness. [106]

SP sums up the thought thus: *svātantryārtham dharmo 'nuṣṭheyo 'dharmaś ca tyājyaḥ*.

In verses 107-111, there is explained the intention in *tam vijñānakarmanī*.

मात्रालक्षणमादानं कृत्वा स्वप्नस्य सर्जनम् ।  
यथेह न तथा किञ्चिदुपादानं समीक्ष्यते ॥१०७॥

As the dream state is effected (for an individual self) after it has taken up (the organs etc.) characterized as the portions (of lustres etc.), there is not noticed here, at the time of death, any adopting of any organs (by the individual self).

[107]

अथैवं देवतात्यक्ते लिङ्गे देहाद्बहिर्गते ।  
लोकान्तरगतौ हेतुर्लोकारम्भे च भण्यताम् ॥१०८॥

When, as the subtle form, which is bereft of the (various) deities (of the organs), has thus gone out of the body,<sup>1</sup> the question is asked as to what is the cause for the movement unto another world, or activities in (the newly acquired) world.

[108]

The verse explains the purpose of some of the following verses.

<sup>1</sup>This means *dehāntaragatyārambha*.

आत्मनः परलोकाय यत्स्याद्गमनकारणम् ।  
भुङ्क्ते गत्वा च यत्तत्र देहारम्भे च कारणम् ॥१०९॥  
लिङ्गानस इतो देहाद्देहमन्यं निगच्छतः ।  
संभारः कोऽस्य गत्यर्थो देहारम्भे च कथ्यताम् ॥११०॥

Let it be said (as to) what would be the reason for the individual self's moving towards the other world and what it experiences on reaching there and what is the cause of the activities of that body

[109]

(that is) for this (individual self) which has a vehicle<sup>1</sup> in (the form of) the subtle form, while it is going from this body to another, and what are its belongings (*sambhāra*) for the

journey (lit. movement— *gatyārtha*) and activities in (the other) body. [110]

*Verses 108-110 have raised some questions which are answered in the verses to follow, viz. 111-116.*

इतो जिगमिषुं विद्याकर्मणी ये पुरार्जिते ।  
तं समन्वारभेते ते या चाभूत्पूर्ववासना ॥१११॥

(In answer it is to be pointed out:) 'When that (individual self) is about to go from this world (to another world),<sup>1</sup> knowledge and activities which were secured by it earlier, follow it and also what was the impression (effected on the intellect of it) earlier'. [111]

The verse conveys in brief the thought that the knowledge and activity of the previous life become the cause of the next world.

<sup>1</sup>That is, from this body to the future body.

*The meaning of the word vidyā is stated in verses 112-114.*

विज्ञानं संशयज्ञानं मिथ्याज्ञानमथापि वा ।  
प्रमाणतोऽप्रमाणाद्वा सर्वं विद्येति भण्यते ॥११२॥

Specific knowledge is what is (beset with) some doubt, or even false knowledge, which is obtained through the use of authoritative means or unauthoritative means; all is understood (lit. expressed) by the word *vidyā*. [112]

SP puts it succinctly as *jñānamātram atra vidyety arthah*.

संसारकारणध्वंसि यत्तु ज्ञानं परात्मगम् ।  
तदत्र न परिग्राह्यं सर्वापत्कारणापनुत् ॥११३॥

But/And (*tu*) that knowledge pertaining to the highest Ātman

(and) the destruction which effects the transmigration, viz. that which removes all the causes of misery, has not to be understood here (i.e. in/by the word *vidyā*.) [113]

This specific knowledge of not having in view (*brahma*)*vidyā* has a reference to the death of the transmigratory being, i.e. its movement from one body to another.

संसारकारणं तस्मादात्माज्ञानाविरोधि यत् ।  
अप्राप्तपरमार्थार्थं ज्ञानमात्रं जिघृक्षितम् ॥११४॥

Therefore, the cause of transmigration is only that knowledge which is not opposed to the ignorance about the (highest) Ātman,<sup>1</sup> that which cannot have secured the highest reality— that is here intended to be expressed (or, understood). [114]

<sup>1</sup>AnSS edition notes a variant reading *tasmād ātmajñānavirodhi* ..., but the reading also would yield the same sense (as stated above); therefore, we have ignored it.

*Verses 115-121 explain what is karman.*

वाङ्मनःकायसाध्यं च शास्त्रतो यदि वान्यतः ।  
दृष्टादृष्टार्थरूपं यत्तच्च कर्मेति गृह्यते ॥११५॥

It is understood (here) that activity is what can be accomplished through (the use of) speech, *manas*, bodily organs, and which is learnt from scripture or some other sources (of knowledge) and which has for/as its purpose what is seen or unseen. [115]

अन्वारभेते गच्छन्तं यथोक्ते ज्ञानकर्मणी ।  
गच्छन्तं पुरुषं यस्मादन्वेते स्वस्वभावतः ।  
गच्छतोऽतौऽनुशब्दोऽत्र पश्चादर्थे प्रयुज्यते ॥११६॥

These knowledge and activity, as are stated, follow the departing individual self, since these two, by their own nature, follow the one in the moment of its moving out. Therefore, the word/preposition *anu* here (in the word *anvārabhete*) is used in the sense of (following the movement of going). [116]

This is merely an explanation of *tam samanvārabhete*.

Sureśvara takes *anvārabhete* for *gacchantam anu* and *ārabhete*, i.e. he takes the word *anu* as a preposition governing the accusative form *gacchantam* (as a *karmapravacanīyam*).

गमनादिविधौ पुंसः साधनत्वं निगच्छतः ॥११७॥  
 कर्मणः क्रियमाणस्य संस्कारो यो हृदि श्रितः ।  
 तत्फलस्य च भुक्तस्य पूर्वप्रज्ञेति सोच्यते ॥११८॥

Knowledge acquired earlier (by the individual self) in its activity of going out unto (another body) is (in other words) the impression of the activity which is being performed and that which has found a support in the heart, which is becoming (a means) for the transmigration, and also of the result of which is enjoyed. [117-118]

See the next two verses and also verses 95-96 above.

पूर्वोपचितसंस्कारहेतुभ्यः साभिजायते ॥११९॥  
 षण्मासशेषप्रोद्धृता वासना यास्य देहिनः ।  
 मरिष्यतोऽन्यदेहार्थं पूर्वप्रज्ञेति तां विदुः ॥१२०॥

That 'specific awareness acquired before' is produced from the causes in the form of the impressions acquired by (the intellect of a transmigratory being) in the previous life; [119] and what they have known as 'specific awareness acquired before', viz. which is the desire produced in the person who is going to die (and who is moving unto) another body as a remainder of (the preceding six months before). [120]



समर्था सैव ते यस्माद्बुद्धं ज्ञानकर्मणी ।

नरस्यातः प्रधानत्वात्पृथक्तस्या ग्रहः कृतः ॥१२१॥

Only that is capable of conveying the knowledge and activity of a man (i.e. a transmigratory being) who is about to die which are mentioned separately from 'specific awareness acquired before', since it is more prominent (than the two).

[121]

In the Upaniṣadic sentence knowledge and activity are mentioned together in a compound and 'specific awareness acquired before' is also mentioned separately and for this reason, Sureśvara has mentioned them here and the same thought is explained in the next verse.

*Verses 122-125 state the reason as to why vidyākarmaṇī is expressed in a compound whereas there is a separate mention of pūrvaprajñā.*

समासेनैव निर्दिष्टे कारणत्वाविशेषतः ।

अन्योऽन्यकारणत्वाच्च श्रुत्येह ज्ञानकर्मणी ॥१२२॥

पूर्वप्रज्ञात उद्भूतिर्विद्यायाः कर्मणो यतः ।

ताभ्यां च भावनोद्भूतिर्निर्देशोऽतो यथोदितः ॥१२३॥

Here, knowledge and activity are mentioned by the Śruti as in a compound, because both of them do not have a cause which is distinct (in the case of each), and because each is the cause of the other. [122]

Since the rise of knowledge and (also) activity is from the 'specific awareness acquired before'; therefore, there is, as said before (in the previous life), the rise of the two from impression (*bhāvanā*).<sup>1</sup> [123]

<sup>1</sup>This is for *pūrvaprajñā*.

कर्मणो भुज्यमानस्य परिशेषो हि भावना ।  
मूलं च जायमानस्य प्रधानं तेन भण्यते ॥१२४॥

The remainder (of the result) of an activity is called *bhāvanā* 'impression' (and), since it is the root cause of what is being born, it is described as significant/prominent. [124]

परिच्छेत्री विनिर्मात्री विद्या लोकान्तरस्य हि ।  
विकर्तृ कर्म वोद्री च पूर्वप्रज्ञेह पूर्वयोः ॥१२५॥

Indeed knowledge is the delimiter and the creator of the other world (i.e. birth), and it is the 'specific awareness acquired before' which is the performer of modifying activity for the first two.<sup>1</sup> [125]

<sup>1</sup>This refers to knowledge and activity.

*Now follows the discussion on BU 4.3.3 in verses 126-136.*

नानाविकल्पसद्भावात्संदेहो गमनं प्रति ।  
पक्षीव वृक्षात्किं तावत्परिच्छिन्नो व्रजत्ययम् ॥१२६॥

Since there are various notions (among thinkers, about the movement of the individual self from one body to another), there can be doubts: (i) does this one, being delimited, move (to another body) like a bird from one tree to another?,<sup>1</sup> [126]

SP points out the holders of these views; they are: (i) Digambara Jainas, (ii) Devatāvādins, (iii) Sāṃkhyas, (iv) Vaiśeṣikas, and (v) Vedāntins.

<sup>1</sup>This simile is adduced by the Digambara Jainas.

*Verses 127-136 are explanation of BU 4.4.3.*

आतिवाहिकदेहेन किं वा देहान्तरं प्रति ।

गतिर्विकाशसंकोचौ भिन्नकुम्भस्थदीपवत् ।  
मतं वा किं मनोमात्रं देहादेहान्तरं व्रजेत् ॥१२७॥

(ii) does it move to another body with the help of some another body as its carrier?,<sup>1</sup> (iii) or, is the movement of this one but the expansion or contraction like (the light) of one lamp (put) in different pitchers?,<sup>2</sup> (iv) or, is it considered to be only *manas* which goes from one body to another?<sup>3</sup> [127]

<sup>1</sup>SP states *devatā yena dehena viśiṣṭau jīvam paralokam nayati so 'yam ativāhiko dehaḥ*.

<sup>2</sup>SP states this as the Sāṃkhya view.

<sup>3</sup>This is, as SP points out, the view of the Vaiśeṣika.

किं वा सर्वगतानां स्यात्करणानामिहात्मनि ।  
श्रुतकर्मानुरोधेन वृत्तिहान्युद्भवौ क्वचित् ॥१२८॥

(v) Or, could it be that there is here<sup>1</sup> the origination and destruction at some time,<sup>2</sup> as all the organs belonging to all transmigratory beings on account of the (highest) Ātman's knowledge and activity? [128]

<sup>1</sup>This refers to what is held by the Siddhāntin.

<sup>2</sup>This refers to the time of death in the case of some transmigratory beings and the moment of liberation of some others.

इति भूरिविकल्पायां भूमौ सिद्धान्त उच्यते ।  
अनन्ताः सर्व एवैते वाङ्मनःप्राणलक्षणाः ॥१२९॥

Thus, there being various notions in this context, i.e. *bhūmi* (the moment of transmigration of a being from one life to another), the Siddhānta is to be stated now. Indeed, all these beings, which are characterized by speech, *manas* and *prāṇas* are innumerable. [129]

In verses 130-136 is stated the final opinion as given by the Śruti.

प्राणिकर्मानुरोधेन प्लुष्यादिपरिमाणता ।  
इति श्रुत्युक्तितस्तेषां प्रतिप्राणि यथामति ।  
यथाकर्म गतिः स्थानं परिच्छेदोऽथ विस्तृतिः ॥१३०॥

(Now) in accordance with the activity of (different) living beings, there is their being possessed of magnitude, such as (that of) a gnat—this is from the statement (of this) in the Śruti.<sup>1</sup> Here is the mention of their states (viz. goals)<sup>2</sup> in accordance with their thoughts at the end of (the earlier) life, in accordance with their activities as also (*atha*) their delimitations and their expanse. [130]

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Bu 1.3.22; BUBV 1.3.205.

<sup>2</sup>The singular form in the original is indicative of the plural form (*jātāv ekavacana*).

स्वातन्त्र्यं पारतन्त्र्यं वाणिमाद्यैश्वर्यमेव वा ।  
करणानामिदं सर्वं ज्ञानकर्मादिहेतुकम् ॥१३१॥

Be it dependence or independence (of them), or (having the characteristics of being minute etc., or being the lord of these organs, it is all but caused by *jñāna*<sup>1</sup> and activity etc.<sup>2</sup> [131]

Regarding movement to the state of animals etc. and attainment of *aiśvarya*, some commonly known injunction is given.

<sup>1</sup>That is, *vidyā*

<sup>2</sup>This refers to various modifications of the three *guṇas* of the various *Jīvas*.

अस्मदादेर्यथा तद्वद्विद्याकर्मानुरोधतः ।  
अनात्मनोऽपि चानन्त्यं न स्वतः सिद्धमात्मवत् ॥१३२॥

As on our part, so also on the part of non-Ātman,<sup>1</sup> there

is infiniteness (in number) in accordance with its knowledge<sup>1</sup> and activity. But it is not existent, in its own right, like the (highest) Ātman. [132]

<sup>1</sup>This distinguishes the living beings from those bodies which have no life in them (i.e. things).

इतीमं पक्षमाश्रित्य श्रुत्या दृष्टान्त उच्यते ॥१३३॥  
 तृणाग्रस्था जलूकेह प्राप्य तस्मात्तृणान्तरम् ।  
 संहरत्यात्मनात्मानं पूर्वस्मात्तत्र सा क्रमात् ॥१३४॥

Having resorted to this view (of the Vedānta) has the Śruti expressed an example: [133]

As (while becoming) a leech, which is sitting on the tip of some blade of grass, contracts itself (= *ātmanī* equal to *svāvayavas*) and, from that earlier (body), gradually moves unto another blade of grass in its new body (*ātmānam*). [134]

यथैवमेवमात्मेदं शरीरं कर्मणः क्षयात् ।  
 निहत्याचेष्टमापाद्य स्वात्मलिङ्गोपसंहतेः ॥१३५॥  
 गमयित्वा तथाविद्यां जाड्यं निःसंज्ञतामिदम् ।  
 अतोऽन्यमाक्रमं देहं प्राप्य भावनयाञ्जितः ।  
 पूर्वदेहस्थमात्मानं संहरत्यात्मनात्मनि ॥१३६॥

As it happens in this way, so also does this one individual self strike down, what is made devoid of the body, owing to the time of the loss of its activity, through the withdrawal of itself (that is, from the organs, into the subtle form and by bringing about the loss of ignorance, inactivity and lifelessness and then attaining to another state, viz. body, and being tainted with *bhāvanā*, it enters into another body, taking itself away from the earlier body. [135-136]

This explains the *dārṣṭāntika* 'exemplified' of the *drṣṭānta* 'example' in verse 133.

Now follows the discussion on the example in BU 4.4.4 in verses 137-146.

जलूकावद्गतिरियमात्मनः प्रतिपादिता ।

This is (thus) presented as an exposition on the individual self's movement to another goal as that of a gnat. [137ab]

तत्र देहान्तरारम्भ उपादानं किमात्मनः ॥१३७॥  
उपमृद्योपमृद्यास्य नित्योपात्तं किमिष्यते ।  
पुनः पुनरपूर्वं वा देहारम्भाय कल्पते ॥१३८॥

(A question is asked:) 'There, in that coming into another body, what is the means<sup>1</sup> for this individual self?' [137cd]

(The question continues:) 'What is accepted (as the material cause) (by that individual self) ever for creating (another body), i.e. by repeatedly crushing it again and again? and whether it is some new (material cause)?' [138]

SP, while explaining the verse 137cd, gives some more details: whether or not there is any material cause which the individual self has for the means and, if there is none, there would not be produced another body, which is a positive entity, and, if there is any material means, that requires to be stated.

Under verse 138 also, SP supplies yet more details involving this explanation which can be useful for a clearer understanding of the thought.

<sup>1</sup>This is material cause.

इति दृष्टान्तवचसा निर्णयोऽस्योपवर्ण्यते ॥१३९॥  
पेशस्कारी यथा मात्रामुपादायेह पेशसः ।  
विमृद्य रचनां पूर्वां कुरुते रचनान्तरम् ॥१४०॥  
नवान्नवतरं रूपं कल्याणतरमेव च ।  
कल्याणादिति दृष्टान्तो यथा तद्वदिहापि च ॥१४१॥

This (i.e. the number of questions above) is decided with the

statement of an example: [139]

As a goldsmith takes from gold a little piece of it and, after crushing the earlier shape of it, creates another shape, [140]

thus creating a newer and newer and more and more beautiful form of it than which it had earlier—this is the example. As it is there,<sup>1</sup> so it is here<sup>2</sup> also. [141]

On verse 140 SP states: *nityopāttam eva bhūtapañcakam ārambhakam ity asyārthasya dr̥ṣṭāntena nirṇayo na ca māyāvādavirodhaḥ pratyakcāitanyāśritamāyāvivartabhūtapañcaka-pariṇāmo jagad iti sthiter iti bhāvaḥ*. See verse 149 below which is the basis of this explanation.

<sup>1</sup>In the activity of the goldsmith.

<sup>2</sup>In the case of the creation of a new body.

आपेक्ष्य नवमादानं तत्कार्यं नवमुच्यते ।

श्रुत्या नवतरं रूपं कल्याणतरमेव च ॥१४२॥

With this in view, viz. the (individual's or the organs') taking up (of their materials),<sup>1</sup> the effect of them is described by the Śruti as new; and (every) newer form is (indeed) more blissful. [142]

<sup>1</sup>This refers to the five elements, as stated in just the next verse.

नित्योपात्तानि भूतानि करणानि च देहिनः ।

द्वे वाव ब्रह्मणो रूपे इति पूर्वमवादिषम् ॥१४३॥

And thus are the various elements which always taken (as the material for creating another body), the various organs of a living being. And I have already stated<sup>1</sup> that there are indeed two forms of the Brahman. [143]

<sup>1</sup>Cf. BU 2.3.1. This explains the subtle form of the five elements as also the gross form of the same which are related to the two forms of the Brahman.

Here also SP gives a detailed note which can be read with profit.

उपमृद्योपमृद्यैषां रचनां प्राक्तनीं पुनः ।  
यथाकर्म यथाज्ञानं कुरुते रचनान्तरम् ॥१४४॥

(This means:) In repeatedly crushing earlier shape, the individual self creates another shape, in accordance with the activity and in accordance with the knowledge of the earlier life. [144]

पित्रादियोग्यं पित्र्यादि ह्युत्तमाधममध्यमम् ॥१४५॥  
पित्र्यादिलोकेष्वात्मायं यथाकर्म यथाश्रुतम् ।  
तनुते देहजातानि भूरिरूपाण्यविद्यया ॥१४६॥

This individual self creates (lit. extends the net of) various bodies which have different forms owing to its ignorance thus: viz. those who are suitable for the forefathers, varying as the best, less and lowest in the worlds of the manes, in accordance with the activity and with knowledge (*śruta*) of the earlier life. [145-146]

*Now follows in verses 147-234 the discussion on BU 4.4.5.*

न तु चैतन्यवत्साक्षात्संसारोऽस्य स्वतो मतः ।  
इत्यर्थप्रतिपत्त्यर्थमाजगामोत्तरं वचः ॥१४७॥

But/And (*tu*) this transmigration of this individual self is not held to be in its own right directly perceptible, as is sentience; (then) in order to expand this (particular) thought, there now follows every later statement (of the Śruti). [147]

*Verses 148-152 explain the two forms of the Ātman, viz. the real and the other which is imagined.*

यच्चास्य वास्तवं रूपं यच्चाविद्योत्थमात्मनः ।



स वा इत्यादिना तस्य निर्णयः क्रियतेऽधुना ।  
तन्निर्णयादशेषोऽर्थोऽनिर्णीतः स्यात्कथं न्विति ॥१४८॥

Now there is a decision made in the Śruti statement *sa vai* ... as regards: the real form (or nature) of this individual self and that which has arisen from ignorance, but, the words *katham nu* indicate the question: How is the whole thought not decided by the decision of that? <sup>1</sup> [148]

<sup>1</sup>This refers to what is mentioned earlier in as regards ....

संसारी यो यथोक्तेन ग्रन्थेन प्रतिपादितः ।  
तद्गृहीत्यै सशब्दोऽयं तत्स्मृत्यर्थं तथा च वै ॥१४९॥

The word *sa* in this sentence is for including<sup>1</sup> in the discussion (that the individual self) which is described as a transmigratory being in the statement already made; and so also the word *vai* is used for reminding one of the thought of that. [149]

<sup>1</sup>This is for 'referring to'.

अनात्मभूत एतस्मिन्कार्यकारणलक्षणे ।  
संसारे प्रथते योऽर्थ आत्मनानन्यमानगः ॥१५०॥

(This individual self) reveals itself (i.e. appears) in this transmigratory existence, characterized by effects and their causes,<sup>1</sup> the non-Ātman by itself (i.e. in its true nature); it is not to be grasped by any other means,<sup>2</sup> (i.e. other than the Śruti). [150]

<sup>1</sup>Cp. BUBV 4.3.1154, and also verses 153 and 155 below, but SP explains *kāryakāraṇa* as *avidyā* and *tatkārya*.

यत्साक्षिकौ यथोक्तस्य भावाभावौ प्रसिध्यतः ।  
संसारवस्तुनः सोऽयमात्मेत्यत्राभिधीयते ॥१५१॥

व्यभिचारो न यस्यास्ति सर्वेषु व्यभिचारिषु ।  
तदवष्टम्भतः सिद्धेर्व्यभिचारस्य सर्वदा ॥१५२॥

That one, on whose being the the witness of what are established as positive and negative entities, is stated (in the words), ‘This one is the Ātman,’ the the already mentioned things,<sup>1</sup> viz. the transmigratory world [151] and which does not vary even while all (the transmigratory things) are varying, because of their variableness becomes established ever through their dependence on that (Ātman). [152]

<sup>1</sup>-*vastu* is for -*vastūni*— viewed severally.

*Verses 153-161 pertain to the propriety in referring to the individual self as ‘this’.*

प्रत्यक्तयास्य साक्षात्त्वादक्रियाकारकत्वतः ।  
अनन्यबोधमानत्वादयमित्युच्यते ततः ॥१५३॥

Therefore, this one is mentioned as *ayam* because it is inside (every other being or thing), directly perceptible, and is not of the nature of any instrument of activity and because it has only the knowledge (from the Śruti) as the means of knowing (it). [153]

This explains why the Ātman is referred to by the demonstrative pronoun *idam* which yields the form *ayam*, i.e. directly perceptible, not beyond the ken of the means of perception.

निःशेषानात्मतद्धेतुनिराकरणवर्त्मना ।  
आत्मत्वमात्मनः सिध्येन्नान्यशेषमनात्मवत् ॥१५४॥

The nature of the individual self of being the Ātman gets established by way of the removal of (the notion/acceptance of the) entire non-Ātman (things) and their cause(s); it is

not dependent on any other thing as is every non-Ātman. [154]

The verse points to the real non-delimited character of the individual self.

असाधारणसिद्धयैव सिद्धिः स्यादात्मवस्तुनः ।  
यतोऽत आत्मवस्त्वेव कार्यकारणवज्जगत् ॥१५५॥

Since the thing called the Ātman would get established only by the uncommon (means of) establishing (it);<sup>1</sup> therefore, the thing called the Ātman is itself this world which is made up of (what are called) effects and causes. [155]

This is to emphasise the nature of the transmigratory world as the result of *adhyāsa*.

<sup>1</sup>That is, by the Śruti.

न हीदमात्मनः स्थानं ततोऽन्यत्रापि वाश्नुते ।  
आत्मनोऽव्यतिरेकेण यतोऽनात्मा प्रसिध्यति ॥१५६॥

This (world) does not come to have any abode (or support, or place) for itself elsewhere than in the Ātman; since the non-Ātman (which is identified with the world) does not get established as being different from the Ātman, i.e. without it. [156]

This supports the nature of the transmigratory world as the result of *adhyāsa*.

आत्मा त्वनात्मप्रत्यक्त्वाद्द्वयतिरेकं न सोऽर्हति ।  
स्र्जीव सर्पदण्डादेः स्र्गविद्योत्थवस्तुनः ।  
स्र्क्तत्वव्यतिरेकेण सिद्धिर्नान्यत्र कुत्रचित् ॥१५७॥

And (*tu*) that Ātman cannot be (mentioned as) being distinct (from the non-Ātman), because of its being within the inner part of it. (This is) as there cannot be established in a garland

the existence of a serpent or a stick etc. which is a thing arising out of non-cognition of the garland, as it cannot be elsewhere (than in that garland etc.<sup>1</sup>) as apart from being the real thing, (viz. garland). [157]

<sup>1</sup>This word 'etc.' is demanded by *ādi* in *sarpadaṇḍādeḥ*.

न चाभावसाय्येतदभावस्यापि भाववत् ।  
प्रत्यङ्मात्रैकयाथात्म्यादश्रुतत्वान्न चार्थतः ॥१५८॥

Also the non-existence of this (world) does not end in non-existence just like the existence of the same, because its true nature is being one with the inner sentience alone; because it is not so heard (or, known) and also not because (there exists) another object. [158]

SP supports the last statement by citing the Śruti, *neti neti*.

अनद्य निखिलं विश्वं तत्तत्त्वप्रतिपत्तये ।  
आत्मैवेति श्रुतं यस्मान्नातोऽन्यत्किञ्चिदिष्यते ॥१५९॥

(This is so, also) because it is heard *ātmaiva* ... after there was the statement made about the entire world with a view to the exposition of the nature of that Ātman; therefore, there is nothing else than that which is accepted. [159]

The reference in this verse to the Śruti passage is for setting aside every possible notion of the existence of anything other than the Ātman.

प्रत्याख्याय न चात्मानमनात्मा व्यतिरिच्यते ।  
व्यतिरेकस्वभावत्वान्नापि चात्मनि सिध्यति ॥१६०॥

Further, the non-Ātman does not have any distinct existence apart from (or beside) being the Ātman; similarly, it does not get established, while there exists only the Ātman, owing

to its having a nature distinct from that of the Ātman. [160]

The thought in this verse is: The word, being insentient, cannot exist while there exists only the sentient Ātman; so also for the same reason, it cannot come from any non-sentient thing.

प्रत्याचष्टे श्रुतिरतः सर्वं नेतीति चात्मनि ।  
सर्वमात्मेति च तथा व्यतिरेकं निषेधति ॥१६१॥

Therefore, the Śruti denies the existence (of) all, (while there exists only) the Ātman, in the words *neti*; also, (the Śruti) denies (the existence of any object) distinct (from it) in the words *sarvam ātmā ....* [161]

*Verses 162-166 explain the meaning of the word brahman in the Mantra.*

अपूर्वानपरानन्तराबाह्यं ब्रह्मलक्षणम् ।  
उक्तात्मवस्तुस्वाभाव्यादात्मा ब्रह्मेत्यतो वचः ॥१६२॥

The definition of the Brahman is (stated as what is) *apūrva*, *anapara*, *anantara* and *abāhya*; therefore, because of having that nature as stated, the Ātman (i.e. the individual self) is described as the Brahman. [162]

प्रत्यक्त्वं ब्रह्मणस्तत्त्वं ब्रह्मत्वं चात्मनस्तथा ।  
परोक्षद्वयहानेन ह्यात्मा ब्रह्मेति बोध्यते ॥१६३॥

The true nature of the Brahman is being within (every living being); similarly, (that of) the individual self is being of the nature of the Brahman itself—thus, by the rejection of (being) imperceptible and duality, the individual self is made known to be the Brahman. [163]

The first line points to the direct perception of the Brahman as the individual self and also the non-existence of anything else

than the Ātman--this is *parokṣa-dvaya-hāna*.

अव्यावृत्ताननुगतो ब्रह्मशब्दार्थ इष्यते ।  
नात्मनोऽन्यत्र लभ्योऽसौ नाप्यात्मा ब्रह्मणोऽन्यतः ॥१६४॥

It is accepted that the thing signified by the word *brahman* is what is not distinguished from another and similar to any other thing; and that cannot be perceived (lit. obtained) elsewhere than in respect of the Ātman and the Ātman also is not found elsewhere than (i.e. apart from) the Brahman.

[164]

आत्मनोऽपि परोक्षत्वं ब्रह्मणोऽविद्यया यथा ।  
आत्मनः सद्वितीयत्वं ब्रह्मणोऽपि तथा मम ॥१६५॥

As there is non-perceptibility of the Ātman (within an individual being) owing to its non-knowing of the Brahman through ignorance; so also is my self (i.e. the Ātman in me<sup>1</sup>) accompanied by a second (i.e. the objective world) and the Brahman also is likewise.

[165]

<sup>1</sup>This sudden reference to me (i.e. myself) indicates an individual's awareness of a distinct existence.

अतोऽविद्यासमुच्छित्तौ यथावस्त्ववबोधतः ।  
आत्मा ब्रह्मैव सन्नेष ब्रह्माप्येति स्वतोऽद्वयम् ॥१६६॥

Therefore, when there is the destruction of ignorance that results from knowing of the real thing as the Ātman (of an individual), being one with the Brahman, (that individual) attains the nature of the Brahman, which is in its own right without any second.

[166]

*Verses 167-169 explains the words vijñānamaya, manomaya etc.*

यथोक्तबोधविरहादस्यानर्थपरंपरा ।

विज्ञानाद्यभिसंबन्धो यथा तदधुनोच्यते ॥१६७॥

Owing to the absence of that knowledge which is mentioned (earlier)<sup>1</sup> there is for this individual self a series of (causes of the) undesired results and also the association with the specific knowledge etc.—how that is explained now. [167]

This begins the exposition of the supposed transmigratory state of the Ātman which is mentioned in *vijñānamaya*.

आत्मा ब्रह्मैव सत्रेष धर्मैर्यावद्विरन्वितः ।  
अज्ञानात्संसरत्यत्र वर्ण्यते तत्समासतः ॥१६८॥

This Ātman of an individual, being just one with the Brahman, keeps on transmigrating owing to its (association with) ignorance, being possessed of whatever properties (seen or assumed it)—that is described here in brief. [168]

This is an explanation of BUB *yasya* ....

यतोऽविद्यान्वयेऽशेषसंसारानर्थसंगतिः ।  
तद्धवस्तावात्मनस्तस्मात्पुरुषार्थः समाप्यते ॥१६९॥

Since, while there is a connection (of the Ātman of an individual self) with ignorance, there is smooth understanding (*saṅgati*) of the entire mass of the undesired (results of) the transmigratory world; therefore, the (highest) end of human life is obtained for that Ātman (viz. the individual self) when that ignorance is destroyed. [169]

*Verses 170-174 point out: the subsequent portion of the Upaniṣad is for conveying that all the undesired effect is produced from ignorance.*

अविद्यामात्रहेतूत्था ह्यात्मनोऽनर्थसंगतिः ।  
इत्यस्य प्रतिपत्त्यर्थं परो ग्रन्थोऽवतार्यते ॥१७०॥

Indeed the connection of the Ātman (of an individual being) with the undesired results is arising only from ignorance. (Therefore), to convey this thought, there is now introduced the subsequent (portion of) the Śruti. [170]

यद्यविद्यैकहेतु स्यात्संसारित्वं तदात्मनः ।  
विद्यार्थोऽयं समारम्भो युज्यते नान्यथा सति ॥१७१॥

This beginning of the Śāstra is for acquiring the knowledge of the true nature of the Ātman; this is understandable only if the Ātman (within an individual being) is (taken as) transmigratory owing to mere ignorance, not otherwise. [171]

प्राणात्मत्वाभिमानि सन्यतः प्राणः प्रस्यते ।  
प्राणप्राणोऽपि सन्मोहात्प्राणनादि प्रपद्यते ॥१७२॥

Since Prāṇa is produced (or impelled) while it identifies itself as having the nature of Prāṇa, then, being the Prāṇa of *prāṇas*; i.e. it comes to have (the activities) breathing etc. [172]

This is the explanation here of the word *prāṇamaya*, even if it is mentioned in the text later after *viññānamaya* etc.—this is setting aside the *pāthakrama* in the Śruti. SP supports the argument in this verse by citing *Muṇḍakopaniṣad* 2.1.3; *Praśnopaniṣad* 6.4 and BU 4.4.18. There is notable a play on the word *prāṇa*.

ततो बुद्धिसमुत्पत्तौ विज्ञानोऽस्मीतिभावतः ।  
विज्ञानमयतामेति स्रक्सर्पमयतामिव ॥१७३॥

Then, at the time of the creation of the intellect, it becomes mostly of the nature of the specific knowledge (*viññāna*), owing to its having the impression, 'I am *viññāna* (= *buddhi*),' as a garland comes to have mostly the nature of a serpent.<sup>1</sup>



[173]

<sup>1</sup>Here the suffix *-mayat* is the sense of *prācuryārtha* 'mostly consisting of'.

मनसो ग्रहणं चात्र बुद्धिवृत्त्युपलक्षणम् ।  
असुबुद्धी यतो हेतू सर्वेषामिन्द्रियात्मनाम् ॥१७४॥

And, here, the mention of the word *manas* is indicative of the modification (*vṛtti*) of the intellect; (this is so), since Prāṇa and the intellect are the cause (i.e. origin) of all of them which have the nature of the organs. [174]

कर्मेन्द्रियाणां सार्थानां प्राणः कारणमुच्यते ।  
स एव बुद्ध्यतिशयः श्रोत्रादेरपि कारणम् ॥१७५॥

It is said that Prāṇa is the cause (origin) of the various organs of activity, together with the objects of them; and that itself is the excellence of the intellect, viz. it is the cause of the ear etc. [175]

Prāṇa itself becomes the intellect and then that becomes modified as the ear and its objects etc.

SP refers to some Ātharvaṇa Śruti *ātmā hi ... srjati* (not traced) as the support for the argument in the verse.

*Verses 176-182 state that the cause of transmigration is the ignorance about the Ātman.*

स्वाभ्यस्तभावनातोऽस्य श्रुतकर्मानुरोधतः ।  
प्राणो बुद्धिर्मनश्चक्षुःश्रोत्राद्यज्ञस्य जायते ॥१७६॥

Prāṇa, the intellect, *manas* eye, ear etc. are produced (lit. become born) of this individual self (viz. the ignorant one) in accordance with its (worldly) knowledge (*śruta*) and activity.

[176]

A product of the organs in a (new) body is owing to the knowledge and activity of the self in its previous life—that is, it is the material cause of the same.

प्रायार्थे च मयङ्ज्ञेयो विकारादेर्निषेधनात् ।  
अविज्ञातात्मतत्त्वस्य विकारो वास्त्वदोषतः ॥१७७॥

The suffix *-mayat* is to be understood in the sense of *prāya* 'mostly consisting in', since there is a denial of modification etc.;<sup>1</sup> or let it be understood, without involving any fault, as the modification of the Ātman whose nature has not been known. [177]

In the case of the Ātman, there cannot be any modification—it is clear. But, in the case of the Ātman, affected by ignorance, modification can be accepted. SP supports the argument in this verse by citing the rejection in *Mundakopaniṣad* 2.2 and *Kathopaniṣad* 2.1.10.

<sup>1</sup>This refers (very possibly) to the six modifications (*bhāva-vikāras*) and also to their consequent effect.

सर्पादयो यथा रज्ज्वा विकाराः स्युरबोधतः ।  
अज्ञानादात्मनस्तद्वत्तेजोबन्नादिविक्रिया ॥१७८॥

As there can be the modifications such as a serpent (understood) of a rope, owing to the non-grasping (of its real nature), similarly there can be the modification(s), viz. fire, water, food etc. of the Ātman, owing to the ignorance about it. [178]

न हि वेदान्तसिद्धान्ते ह्यज्ञातात्मातिरेकतः ।  
सांख्यानामिव सिद्धान्ते लभ्यते कारणान्तरम् ॥१७९॥

Indeed, in the doctrine of the Vedānta (there is not noticed) any cause other (than the Ātman) as there is (or, are) noticed

some other cause (or causes) (than Prakṛti) in (the doctrine of) the Sāṃkhyas.<sup>1</sup> [179]

The word 'indeed' in the verse points to the support of the Śruti, the Smṛti and the reason for the Vedānta doctrine to be in contrast with that which has the support of the sage Kapila, as for the Sāṃkhyas. Cp. the *smṛti-adhikaraṇa* of BS.

<sup>1</sup>This refers to *mahat*, *pradhāna* etc. which are the causes of every subsequent modification.

प्राणादिमयतां यात्वा तद्वृत्तीनामबोधतः ।  
आत्माकर्तापि कर्तृत्वमेति तासां समुद्भवे ॥१८०॥

The individual self, though a non-agent (of any activity) comes to have the nature of the agent (of the same), when they (i.e. various activities) appear, on account of the non-knowing (*abodhatah*) of its having become mostly as Prāṇa etc. and as (performing) their functions. [180]

In verses 172-175 references are made to the Ātman becoming its modifications Prāṇa etc.; this is not a real happening—it is this that this verse points to. SP adds: *uktam hi—*

*kāraṇam puruṣas tasmāt kāraṇajñair udāhṛtaḥ /  
na cet kāraṇam ātmā syāt khādayaḥ syur ahetukāḥ //*  
(not traced).

चक्षुषश्चक्षुरप्येवं यथा चक्षुर्मयस्तथा ।  
श्रोत्रादिमयताप्यस्य व्याख्येया प्रत्यगात्मनः ॥१८१॥

Similarly, (it is) the eye of the eye; so that it is consisting mostly in the nature of the eye; its being mostly of the nature of the eye etc.; this is to be explained similarly in the case of the inner self. [181]

This explains the meaning of *caḥsurmaya* and *śrotrādimaya*

....

स विज्ञानमनःप्राणचक्षुःश्रोत्रादि मोहजम् ।  
मन्वानोऽविद्ययात्मैति तन्मयत्वं न तु स्वतः ॥१८२॥

That individual self considers itself through its ignorance, (to be possessed of) the specific knowledge (of itself as) being *manas* Prāṇa, eye, ear etc., the products of ignorance, but this (does) not belong to it, by its own nature. [182]

This is to point to the effect of ignorance (*bhrānti*) on the part of the individual self. SP supports this argument by citing *uktam hi—avyaktam ātmā kṣetrajñāḥ śāsvato vibhur avyayaḥ iti* (not traced).

*In verses 183-185, it is stated that Ātman, which has the nature of Virāj, consists mostly in the five elements.*

समासव्यासतस्तद्वत्पञ्च भूतान्यविद्यया ।  
अशब्दादिमयोऽप्यात्मा तन्मयत्वं निगच्छति ॥१८३॥

The Ātman, though not consisting in word etc.,<sup>1</sup> becomes through ignorance (as it were) what consists mostly of them, viz. the five elements in their totality or in each one of them individually.<sup>2</sup> [183]

<sup>1</sup>SP supports this by citing *Kāthopaniṣad* 4.3.15.

<sup>2</sup>SP clarifies this thus: *avidyayā pṛthivyādibhūtāni virādātmanā sūtrātmanā ca sāmastyena vaiyastyena ca pratyekam abhimanyamāno bhūtamayatvam āpnotīty arthaḥ.*

लिङ्गदेहाविमावेवं पञ्चभूतमयावुभौ ।  
प्रधानगुणवृत्त्योक्तौ सूक्ष्मस्थूलविभागतः ॥१८४॥

Thus, both of these two, viz. the subtle form<sup>1</sup> and the gross form,<sup>2</sup> are made up of five elements, one of them being the principal in relation to the subsequent as its subordinate and

also as divided into the subtle and the gross (forms). [184]

<sup>1</sup>This is mentioned in the BU sentence *vijñānamayah* ... before *prthivīmayah*.

<sup>2</sup>This is mentioned in the subsequent part of sentence, i.e. *prthivīmayah* ... *kāmamayah*.

उक्तयोरात्मनोरन्तर्यद्रूपं भावनामयम् ।  
कामादिमयतोक्त्येह तदिदानीं विभाव्यते ॥१८५॥

Now is explained here what are the forms of the two *ātman*s,<sup>1</sup> mentioned in the statement of its becoming inside the body (and) mostly of the nature of desire etc., which is product of *bhāvanā*. [185]

<sup>1</sup>This stands for 'bodies'.

*Verses 186-187 explain the intention of kāmamaya.*

कामं क्रोधं तथा धर्मं तद्विरुद्धं च मोहतः ।  
संभावयन्प्रतीच्यात्मा तन्मयत्वं निगच्छति ॥१८६॥

The *Ātman*, imagining desire, anger and also merit and its opposite to be existent in the inner self attains the nature of them through its ignorance. [186]

प्रवृत्तय इहेक्ष्यन्ते वाङ्मनःकायसाधनाः ।  
यावत्यो भावनाः पुंसामपि तावत्य एव तु ॥१८७॥

Impressions, of individual beings are known to be as many as there are noticed their activities and have *vāc*, *manas* and body as their instruments. [187]

*Verses 188-194 are explanation of idammaya and adomaya.*

इत्येवमादयोऽनेके कोशाः स्युर्भावनामयाः ।

असंख्येया बहुत्वात्ते संक्षेपोऽतोऽत्र भण्यते ॥१८८॥

These and many others are the sheaths<sup>1</sup> of the Ātman, consisting of *bhāvanās*— since many, they are uncountable; and there is here the mention of them in brief. [188]

<sup>1</sup>This refers to the entire mass of the worldly causes and effects.

इदमित्येव यत्साक्षात्किञ्चित्कर्मोपलक्ष्यते ।  
परोक्षं भावनारूपं तेनादोमयतेष्यते ॥१८९॥

In the word *idam* is conveyed (*upalakṣyate*)<sup>1</sup> some activity which is directly perceptible; therefore, the form of impression(s), which is beyond perception (*parokṣa*), is considered to have the nature of what can be (signified by the word) *adomaya*. [189]

<sup>1</sup>In the case of the directly perceptible thing, 'conveying' means directly referring to it and in the case of the other, that word means 'indicated (suggested) by that'.

इदंमयेन लिङ्गेन संबन्धोऽदोमयात्मनः ।  
प्रत्यक्ष आत्मनि यथा तथान्यत्रापि लिङ्ग्यते ॥१९०॥

This thing which is of the nature of *adomaya* has its connection with that which is of the nature of *idammaya*;<sup>1</sup> as this is understood in the case of the directly perceptible body, so is it inferred elsewhere<sup>2</sup> also. [190]

<sup>1</sup>This means: whatever regarding the body etc. of the directly perceptible thing is mentioned can be mentioned of what are signified by the word *adomaya*.

<sup>2</sup>That is, when not directly perceptible.

धूमाग्न्योरिव संबन्धस्तयोर्दृष्ट इहात्मनि ।

अकामप्रमुखैर्योगैस्तथा कामादियोगतः ॥१९१॥  
 धर्माधर्ममयो भूत्वा पुमान्सर्वमयो भवेत् ।  
 धर्माधर्मैकहेतुत्वात्सर्वस्य जगतस्ततः ॥१९२॥

The relation between the two (viz. *idammaya* and *adomaya*) is seen (as obtaining) here in the Ātman<sup>1</sup> (as is that obtaining) between smoke and fire, because of their connections with the absence of desire as the principal (among them) and, in the same way, with desire etc. [191]

Having (first) become possessed of<sup>2</sup> merit and demerit, this man (i.e. the transmigratory being) then becomes possessed of all, since all (that exists in/belong to this) world is effected (or, caused) only by merit and demerit.<sup>3</sup> [192]

<sup>1</sup>That is, with reference to the two subtle and gross bodies which the Ātman is said to be possessed of.

<sup>2</sup>Literally, mostly consisting in.

<sup>3</sup>Alternatively, has only merit and demerit as its cause.

अदोमयत्वं लिङ्गं स्याल्लिङ्गेनेदंमयात्मना ।  
 भावनाकर्मविद्यानामेवमुक्तेन वर्त्मना ।  
 भूरिभेदान्न शक्यन्ते वक्तुं रूपाण्यशेषतः ॥१९३॥

By the subtle body, which has the nature of *idammaya*, there can be (indicated) the subtle form as having the nature of *adomaya*.<sup>1</sup> Thus, since there is much variety in respect of the impressions, activities and knowledges, in the way stated so far, it is not possible to state (i.e. enumerate) the forms in their entirety. This is the meaning of the sentence *tad yad etad*. [193]

This refers to the impressions on the intellect.

<sup>1</sup>Here Sureśvara uses the word *liṅga* in two senses: (i) *liṅgam*—subtle form of the Ātman which is suggested. Thus the word *liṅga* stands for what is *liṅgin* ‘having some characteristic’ for its inference, and (ii) *liṅgena* which is mentioned in *idammaya*

is a characteristic for inference of the subtle form. Cp. the first line of verse 190 above.

किं कारणं पुमान्यस्माद्यथाकारी भवत्ययम् ।  
यथाचारी च लोकेऽस्मिस्तथारूपो भवत्यसौ ॥१९४॥

(A question is asked:) 'What could be the cause owing to which this individual self becomes *yathākārin* 'doing as told' and also *yathācārin* 'behaving as seen'?—that is, why does he become so?' [194]

*In verses 195-197 the two karaṇa and caraṇa are distinguished.*

करणं नियतं चैव ततोऽन्यच्चरणं तथा ।  
करणं कर्मशक्तिर्वा चरणं प्रत्ययात्मकम् ॥१९५॥

*karaṇa* is what is laid down (for one by scripture etc.) and (that which is) other than that is *caraṇa*. Or, *karaṇa* refers to the eligibility or capacity of a person for doing some (activity) and *caraṇa* is of the nature of what is experienced (in the case of) a person's behaviour (or doing at his will). [195]

साधुकारी पुमान्यः स्यात्साधुरेव भवत्यसौ ।  
पितृगन्धर्वदेवादौ साधुसाधनसंपदा ॥१९६॥

An individual being is called a good man, if he does what is good;<sup>1</sup> then, he (becomes born among) the *pitṛs*, the *gandharvas*, the *devas* etc., owing to his being possessed of the means for good (states of various lives).<sup>2</sup> [196]

<sup>1</sup>This refers to *dharma* and *dharmakaraṇa*.

<sup>2</sup>Being born as a god is also the stage of transmigration of a being—this is particularly noticeable in Jaina writings in numerous details.



पापकारी च पापश्च स्थाण्वादावभिजायते ।  
कामक्रोधादिभूयिष्ठः पुमानुग्रेण कर्मणा ॥१९७॥

A sinful man, who does sinful activity (or, activities), becomes born among trees/pillars, having as the most part of its nature in desire, anger, etc.—on account of his fearful activity (or, activities). [197]

*Verses 198-208 state the exposition of BUB on the suffix conveying tendency of an individual (tācculya).*

साध्वादि भूयोऽभ्यासात्स्यात्ताच्छील्यप्रत्ययश्रुतेः ।  
फलमित्यतिशङ्क्याह पुण्य इत्यादिकं वचः ॥१९८॥

The Śruti has made a statement *punyah* ..., (as is clear) from the repeated use of (the words) *sādhu* etc. and also the hearing of the suffix conveying the idea of *tāccilya*, (having to convey) the result. [198]

नैवाभ्यासव्यपेक्षास्ति पुण्यपापफलाप्तये ।  
सकृदप्यनुतिष्ठन्ना प्राप्नोत्येव फलं तयोः ॥१९९॥

In respect of obtaining the result of merit or sin, there is not any relation to the expectation of repetitive performance; doing either of the two, even once, a person acquires the result. [199]

फलातिशीतिरभ्यासाज्जायते पुण्यपापयोः ।  
तत्फलस्य तु या प्राप्तिः सा सकृत्करणादपि ॥२००॥

From the repetitive performance of merit or sin there arises excellence in respect of the result; so far as the obtaining of the result is concerned, that occurs even by a single performance (of the same). [200]

कामक्रोधादिपूर्वैव कर्तृता पुण्यपापयोः ।

पुंसः सर्वमयत्वस्य हेतुः संसारकारणम् ॥२०१॥

(Thus) being an agent as the nature of an individual self in respect of merit and demerit is necessarily (*eva*) preceded by desire, anger etc. That would be the cause of its being made up of all and also the cause of transmigration. [201]

This is the purport of BU sentence *yathākārī ... before atho khalv āhuh.*

धर्माधर्मात्मकं कर्म संसारानर्थकारणम् ।  
एतद्विषयमेवैतद्वेदशास्त्रमधीयते ॥२०२॥

In consisting in *dharma* and *adharma* lies the cause of undesired transmigration with this subject matter (of it). Thereby do they study Vedic scriptures relating to the subject (of rituals). [202]

कर्मैव वेदशास्त्रेऽस्मिन्प्रधानं निश्चितं यतः ।  
पुंसोऽभ्युदयदुःखाप्तौ कार्यं वर्ज्यं च तत्ततः ॥२०३॥

Since, in this Vedic scripture, it is activity alone which is decided to be (of) principal importance; therefore, the activity relating to that (*tat = vedaśāstravihita*) is to be avoided with respect to (acquiring) worldly prosperity (and averting) the experience of misery. [203]

This is clarified in the next verse.

कर्म साधवेव कर्तव्यमिच्छताभ्युदयं चिरम् ।  
पापं तु सर्वदा हेयं दुःखेभ्यस्त्रस्यता भृशम् ॥२०४॥

Only good activity has to be performed by one who desires worldly prosperity (to last) for long and (*tu*) sinful activity has ever to be avoided (lit. abandoned) by one who very much fears miseries. [204]

संसारानर्थनिष्पत्तौ सर्वेषामविशिष्टता ।  
 आरम्भकाणां विज्ञानप्रमुखाणामिहात्मनः ॥२०५॥  
 यद्यप्येवं तथापीह धर्माधर्मात्मकं ब्रधाः ।  
 कर्म प्रधानमिच्छन्ति यतः कर्म प्रयोजकम् ॥२०६॥  
 प्रयोज्यमितरत्सर्वं विज्ञानादि यदीरितम् ।  
 प्रयोजकं प्रयोज्याच्च प्रधानमिति निश्चितम् ॥२०७॥  
 पुण्य इत्यादिवचसा कर्मप्राधान्यवाञ्छया ।  
 कर्मोपसंहतं श्रुत्या यथोक्तेनैव हेतुना ॥२०८॥

In respect of the occurrence (lit. coming into existence) of the transmigratory existence, which is the undesired, all activities which begin to produce a result, there it is *vijñāna* 'specific knowledge' etc.<sup>1</sup> that are not peculiar to an individual self. [205]

Even if this is so, the wise ones have considered (lit. desired) activity consisting in *dharma* and *adharma* as the principal one, since activity is productive (lit. inciter) of (a result); [206] everything else is what to be produced (lit. incited), viz. that which is described as specific knowledge etc.; and (that activity) is productive; therefore, it is decided that what produces (an activity) is more prominent than what one has to produce, [207]

by the statement *punyaḥ* ... has the Śruti completed the statement of (or, briefly stated) that activity, together with (that of) the reason, as is already stated.<sup>2</sup> [208]

The second line of verse 207 reaffirms what is stated in 205-207ab.

<sup>1</sup>This refers to *buddhi*, *bhāvanā*, *karma*.

<sup>2</sup>*yathokta* stands for *prayojakatva*.

*Verses 209-213 state the decision in atho khalu.*

कर्म प्रधानमित्येवं साक्षाच्छ्रुत्योपसंहतम् ।

पूर्वपक्षेऽथ सिद्धान्तः खलवाहुरिति भण्यते ॥२०९॥

Thus has the Śruti directly (or, expressedly) stated that activity is the principal one--this is by way of (the statement of) the *prima facie* view and the answer to it (viz. the Siddhānta) is then stated in the words *atho khalv āhuh*. [209]

अथो खल्वत्र पूर्वोक्ते प्राहुरुच्चैर्विपरिचतः ।  
न कर्ममय एवायं पुमान्सर्वमयः कुतः ॥२१०॥  
यतः काममयो भत्वा प्राप सर्वमयात्मताम् ।  
प्रयोजकप्रयोज्यत्वे ज्ञानादीनां प्रयोजकम् ॥२११॥  
कर्मैवावधृतं यद्वत्कर्मान्तानां प्रयोजकः ।  
काम एवेति तत्स्पष्टं स यथेति विभाव्यते ॥२१२॥

In the sentence, which is earlier stated in the word *atho khalu* ..., the wise ones have (already) stated that 'this individual being is not made up of (only) activity', 'Then why is it called *sarvamaya*?' [210]

Since this one, having first become full of desire, has later become of (attained) the nature of one full of all (activity etc.); therefore, the nature of what produces and the nature of what is produced become productive of knowledge etc. [211]

As it is only activity that is specified, so also it is desire that is specified for all as ending in all--this is very clear, as it is noticed in (the use of) the word *yathā* .... [212]

प्रयोजकत्वे कर्मादेः कामप्राधान्यमीरितम् ।  
प्रयोजकानां निष्ठात्वे न तु कामो विवक्षितः ॥२१३॥

In the case of activity etc., being productive (of others), there is conveyed the notion of the desire as the principal one, but the desire is not intended to be firmly rooted in what are productive (of transmigration etc.). [213]

*Verses 214-217 state adhyāsa as the cause of all desire.*

यथावस्त्वपरिज्ञानं कामस्यापि प्रयोजकम् ।  
 आप्तशेषसुखापास्तदुःखत्वादात्मवस्तुनः ॥२१४॥  
 नानवाप्तं सुखं किञ्चिन्नानपास्तं तथा सुखम् ।  
 यो वै भूमेति वचनाद्योऽशनायेति चात्मनि ॥२१५॥

In the case of desire also, absence of complete knowledge (*prajñāna*) of the thing (i.e. reality) is productive of it, because the thing, viz. the Ātman has the nature of what has obtained every kind of bliss and thrown away every kind of misery.

[214]

There is not any happiness which is not obtained by the Ātman and so also there is not any happiness which is not thrown away by it—this is on the basis of the Śruti statement *yo vai bhūmā ...*<sup>1</sup> and also *yo 'śanāyā ...*<sup>2</sup> in respect of the Ātman.

[215]

<sup>1</sup>CU 8.3.1.

<sup>2</sup>BU 3.5.1.

स्वत एवविधं वस्तु यतोऽतस्तदबोधतः ।  
 कामद्वेषादिसंभृतिर्मिथ्याज्ञानत्वकारणात् ॥२१६॥

Since the thing (i.e. reality) is, in its own right, of this nature; therefore, owing to the ignorance about it, i.e. on account of the reason of its being false knowledge, there is the rise of desire, hatred etc.

[216]

अज्ञातं वस्तु चोद्दिश्य तत्तत्त्वप्रतिपत्तये ।  
 प्रमाणानां प्रवृत्तिः स्यादन्यथा नोपपद्यते ॥२१७॥

Keeping in view the unknown thing do the means of knowing begin their activity, i.e. in order that there is understanding of the true nature of the same; it does not stand to reason (if it is) otherwise.

[217]

This verse states the purpose of what are called *pramāṇas*. This is to lead to that the Śruti is the means of knowing the nature of the Ātman which has been earlier unknown.

*Verses 218-220 state that the ignorance is the cause of any worldly activity of an/the individual self.*

प्रयोजकत्वेऽविद्येयं यदि नामेह न श्रुता ।  
मितिप्रवृत्तिहेतुत्वात्तथाप्यत्राश्रितैव सा ॥२१८॥

Even if indeed, this ignorance has not been heard<sup>1</sup> in getting to know other things (in respect of) its being productive of (desire etc.), this is yet positively taken as the basis here (i.e. in respect of them), because of its being the cause of any (so-called knowing) activity. [218]

सर्वेषामपि मानानां प्रमाणं परमं श्रुतिः ।  
सर्वमेयातिवर्त्यात्मयाथात्म्यप्रतिबोधतः ॥२१९॥

Among all the means of knowing, the highest (lit. final) means of knowing is the Śruti, on account of its giving rise to the knowledge of the true nature (of the Ātman) which is beyond all objects to be known (by any other means). [219]

तस्मादज्ञात आत्मैव कामादेः स्यात्प्रयोजकः ।  
यतोऽबोधस्य विध्वस्तौ पुंसः स्यात्कृतकृत्यता ॥२२०॥

Since the Ātman, which has been not known (before as thus) (i.e. when there has occurred) productive of desire etc.; therefore, in the destruction of this absence of knowledge, there consists in an individual being's state of having achieved what had to be achieved. [220]

*Verses 221-225 explain the words sa yathokāmah.*

वाङ्मनःकायसाध्यायाः प्रवृत्तेः काममूलता ।

यथा तत्प्रतिपत्त्यर्थं स यथेत्युत्तरा श्रुतिः ॥२२१॥

The subsequent Śruti begins with the words *sa yathākāmah* for giving rise to the knowledge that every activity, which is to be accomplished by means of *vāc*, *manas* and body, has its root in desire. [221]

सर्वस्य जगतो हेतू पुण्यापुण्ये समीरिते ।  
यद्यपीह परो हेतुः काम एव तयोरपि ॥२२२॥

Even if merit and demerit have been mentioned here to be the two causes of the entire world, the ultimate (*para*) cause of the same, viz. the two, is desire alone. [222]

अकामस्य क्रिया काचिद्दृश्यते नेह कस्यचित् ।  
यद्यद्वि कुरुते जन्तुस्तत्तत्कामस्य चेष्टितम् ॥२२३॥

There is not noticed in the case of anyone any activity, in case that one is without any desire; (for, it is said:) whatever a being does is the activity of desire. [223]

This was earlier referred to in BUBV 1.4.1816 and 2.1.578; cp. *Manusmṛti* 2.4.

निष्फलं कर्म सर्वं स्यान्न चेतकामपुरःसरम् ।  
अपराधलघुत्वं च दृष्टं पुंसोऽप्यकामतः ॥२२४॥

Every activity would be without any product of it, were it not prompted by desire; (for), in the case of a person, there is noticed (or recorded) the least of an offense at least, if (he has done an activity) without a lead of desire. [224]

SP states for the gist of the fault as stated in *Dharmaśāstra* thus:

*caṇḍālānnaṃ pramādena yadi bhuijīta yo dvijaḥ /  
tataś cāndrāyaṇam kuryānṃ āsam ekaṃ vratam caret //*

(*Parāśarasmṛiti* 11.1); *Kūrmapurāṇa* 2.34 conveys the same.

कामप्रयुक्तो हि नरः संचिनोति शुभाशुभे ।  
आत्मैवेदमिति गिरा श्रुत्यैतत्प्रागपीरितम् ॥२२५॥

Indeed, a person, prompted by desire, collects (or acquires) the auspicious and inauspicious (results)—this has been already stated by the Śruti in the words *ātmaivedam agra āsīd eka eva, so 'kāmayata*.<sup>1</sup> [225]

<sup>1</sup>BU 1.4.17.

*The meaning of kāma is explained in verses 226-234.*

कामो गर्धोऽभिलाषश्च तृष्णेत्येकार्थवाचकाः ।  
आसङ्गपूर्वकः कामो नासङ्गविरहादसौ ॥२२६॥

Desire, greed, longing and thirst are (all words) expressive of (but) one meaning, viz. that the desire is preceded by some attachment (to objects); that, viz. desire, cannot be without any attachment. [226]

ध्यायतो विषयान्पुंसः सङ्गस्तेषूपजायते ।  
सङ्गात्संजायते काम इति सर्वज्ञशास्त्रतः ॥२२७॥

In the case of a man, who is thinking about the objects of desire, there arises his attachment to them; from that attachment arises (further) desire—this is learnt from the preaching<sup>1</sup> by the all-knower.<sup>2</sup> [227]

<sup>1</sup>*Gītā* 2.62.

<sup>2</sup>Sureśvara uses the word *sarvajña* for Kṛṣṇa, not for Buddha.

पुंसो या विषयादित्सा स काम इति भण्यते ।  
तद्गुणस्मरणाभ्यासादिच्छा पुंसोऽभिवर्धते ॥२२८॥



Whatever is the desire of a person for taking up (an object), (also) arising from that is called *kāma* and the desire of a person goes on increasing owing to the repeated memory of the excellence (of that object). [228]

कामिताद्विषयान्नान्यस्तदा तस्येह रोचते ।  
निराकर्तुं न च ततः शक्यते येन केनचित् ॥२२९॥

Then (i.e. in that state) a person does not like any other (object) than the desired object and it is not possible that the person is warded off from that (i.e. from pursuing that) by anyone (or anything). [229]

इत्येवं वर्धमानः सन्क्रतुत्वं प्रतिपद्यते ।  
यदनन्तरमेवेहा स कामः क्रतुरुच्यते ॥२३०॥

Thus, (ever) increasing, it comes to be (an individual's) thought (*kratu*), because that desire, viz. longing, comes to be called *kratu* only after that being there. [230]

क्रतुना यादृशेनायं यत्क्रतुः स्यात्पुमानिह ।  
कुरुते तादृशं कर्म वाङ्मनःकायसाधनैः ॥२३१॥

Having that kind of thought, viz. by that kind of thought, this individual being in this world (being possessed, i.e. overcome) does that kind of activity by the means of *vāc*, *manas* and body. [231]

यत्कर्म कुरुते चायं शुभं वा यदि वाशुभम् ।  
संपद्यतेऽथ तत्साक्षादात्मत्वेन पुमानयम् ॥२३२॥

Whatever activity, be it auspicious or inauspicious, this individual self performs, the person becomes that itself, because of its attaining the nature of the same. [232]

अपूर्वमिति चेदं स्याददृष्टमिति चोच्यते ।

पुण्यापुण्यमय इति प्राक्चैतदुपवर्णितम् ॥२३३॥

And this would be called *apūrva* or it is also called as *adr̥ṣṭa*—viz. this, which is already described as consisting in merit and demerit. [233]

पुमान्काममय एव कर्मादेः स्यात्प्रयोजकः ।  
यथा तदुक्तं श्रुत्येह मन्त्रोऽप्यत्र निगद्यते ॥२३४॥

An individual being, only full of desire, would be the cause (*prayojaka*) of inciting (i.e. performing) of any activity etc. As that is said here in the Śruti, so also in the Mantra.<sup>1</sup> [234]

<sup>1</sup>This refers to what follows as a Mantra at BU 4.4.6.

\*\*\*\*\*