

The Great (divine) Self behind the many deities: the Vedānta connection of the Nirukta tradition

Christophe Vielle, FNRS & UCLouvain

Abstract:

As highlighted by Visigalli and Kawamura (2021), according to Yāska “the plurality of deities can first be reduced to the three main deities and these in turn can be reduced to the one fundamental deity, Agni, the terrestrial/ritual fire, the Great Self.” Thereby Yāska would side with the ‘knowers of the Self’ (*ātmavid* in Durga’s gloss = *ātmapravāda* in Nir. Pariśiṣṭa I) following whom “all names ultimately refer to the one existing deity, the [Great] Self.” The concept of the ultimate (*eka* or *mahat*) *Ātman* is theologically used by Yāska only twice, in Nir. 7. However, in commenting on Vedic *mantras* Yāska also uses four times (in Nir. 3, 10 and 12) the *adhidaivatam/adhyātman* double level of exegesis, that is of knowledge (*jñāna*, com. *ad* Nir. 1.20), the same already found in speculative portions of the Brāhmaṇas, the Āraṇyakas and the early Upaniṣads, and still used, later on, in Śaṅkara’s works. Moreover, the Nir. Pariśiṣṭa II, declaring itself to constitute an *ātma-jijñāsā*, is entirely devoted to the science of the *mahān ātman*, in a cosmogonical, embryogenetic and soteriological perspective. Here the double, deity/self, level of exegesis is extensively used for commenting on *mantras* expressing the Great Self. Therefore, even if it is not perfectly clear whether Yāska himself fully endorses the (*adhy*)*ātmavāda* or early Vedāntic view (according to the definition of Manu 6.83) to which he refers, at least some of his followers did it for him more explicitly. In this respect, the case of the Niruktaślokavārttika is also noteworthy. This elaborate metrical commentary composed in Kerala by a (Vaidika) *saṃnyāsin* bearing the initiatory name of Padmapāda, can be dated from the first half of the 10th century. Although it breaks off at Nir. 6.17, several relevant passages in the treated portion of Yāska’s work allow to judge about the philosophical ideas of this Padmapāda, who seizes every opportunity offered by his source-text to engage in lengthy discussions on ontological or epistemological topics according to a final (Advaita-)Vedānta view. For him, the Nirukta, as the only *vedāṅga* concerned with ‘significance’ (*arthavattva*), provides knowledge that reveals the true meaning of the Veda, whereas the (*pūrva*-)*mīmāṃsāṅga* merely deals with the ‘authoritativeness’ (*pramāṇatva*) of the same. The Nirukta, the Nir. Pariśiṣṭa II and the Niruktaślokavārttika thus testify for a special connection between Vedānta and *nirvacana* traditions throughout the ages.

1. Yāska the *ātmavid*

As highlighted by Visigalli and Kawamura in their recent work on *Nirukta* chapter 7 (2021: 258; cf. Visigalli’s article here above in more details), according to Yāska “the plurality of deities can first be reduced to the three main deities and these in turn can be reduced to the one fundamental deity, Agni, the terrestrial/ritual fire, the Great Self.” Thereby Yāska would side with the ‘knowers of the Self’ (*ātmavidaḥ* in Durga’s gloss *ad* Nir. 7.18, cf. below fn. 9) following whom “all names ultimately refer to the one existing deity, the [Great] Self.” The concept of the ultimate, one (*eka*) or great (*mahat*), *Ātman* is theologically used by Yāska only twice, in 7.4 and 7.18.

In 7.4 he declares that, like deities, also non-deities are part of the one divine Self (*ātman*):

sa na manyetāgantūn ivārthān devatānām | pratyakṣadṛśyam etad bhavati | mähābhāgyād
devatāyā eka ātmā bahudhā stūyate | ekasyātmano ’nye devāḥ pratyāṅgāni bhavanti | api ca

sattvānām prakṛtibhūmabhir ṛṣayaḥ stuvantīty āhuḥ | prakṛtisārvanām<n>yāc ca | itaretarajanmāno bhavanti | itaretaraprakṛtayah | karmajanmānaḥ | ātmajanmānaḥ | ātmaivaīṣām ratho bhavati | ātmāśvaḥ | ātmāyudham | ātmeṣavaḥ | ātmā sarvaṃ devasya ||

Translation Visigalli & Kawamura (2021: 262-263):

One should not consider as adventitious/fortuitous (*āgantū*), as it were, the meanings/objects (*artha*) of the deities.¹ This becomes evident [in what follows].

Because of the great power of the deity (= Self, *ātman*),² one single Self is being praised as multiple. The other gods are limbs of the one Self-trunk. Also, [scholars] say that seers perform praises through the plenitude of the source (= Self) of the beings. And because the source (= Self) has all the names [of the beings].

[Deities] are born from each other; they have each other as their origin; they are born from [ritual] action; they are born from the Self.³ [For example] ‘chariot’ [*Nigh.* 5.3.6] among these [so-called non-deities referred to in *Nigh.* 5.3.1-22; 29-36] is nothing else than the Self; ‘horse’ [*Nigh.* 5.3.1] [among these is nothing else than] the Self; ‘weapon’ (*āyudha*) [= *dhanus* (*Nigh.* 5.3.11) ‘bow’] [among these is nothing else than] the Self; ‘arrows’ [*Nigh.* 5.3.13] [among these is nothing else than] the Self. Everything of the god(s) is the Self (i.e. every manifestation of the gods is nothing but the Self).

Compare Sarup (1921: 115):

But he (the student) should not think that matters relating to gods are adventitious as it were. This is to be clearly seen (by the following): On account of the supereminence of the deity, a single soul [*eka ātmā*] is praised in various ways. Other gods are the individual limbs of a single soul [*ekasya+ātmanah*].⁴ Or else, as people say, seers praise objects according to the multiplicities of their original nature, as well as from its universality. They are produced from each other.⁵ They are the original forms of each other.⁶ They are produced from action (*karma*),⁷ they are produced from the soul. Soul is even their chariot, their horse, their weapon, their arrows; soul is indeed the all-in-all of gods.⁸

¹ In footnote (43): The word ‘meanings/objects’ refer to the entities listed in *Nighaṇṭu*, such as ‘horse’, ‘herb’ etc. Two interpretations are possible: (i) One should not think that objects (*artha*) such as horse and herb have fortuitously ended up being referred to among (taking ‘of the deities’ as a partitive genitive) the other deities mentioned in *Nighaṇṭu* 5; (ii) One should not think that the meanings (*artha*) of words such as ‘horse’, ‘herb’ etc. are fortuitous (taking ‘of the deities’ as ‘[the names of] the deities’); that is, they are not by chance, but there must be a reason why they are recorded in *Nighaṇṭu* together with the other divine names. Yāska explains below that such names, too, are full-fledged divine names, for they ultimately refer to and derive from the one existing deity, the Self (*ātman*).

² I do not see the necessity of the gloss ‘(= Self, *ātman*)’ for ‘the deity’ (cf. Visigalli’s article here above, p. 58 fn. 3, without it). Instead, we would have here the *adhidaivatam* perspective/level, followed in the same sentence by the *adhyātmam* one (see below).

³ In footnote (44): It is unclear whether the first three views about the origin of the deities conflict with, or rather are preliminary too, the fourth view. It is clear however that the last view is endorsed by Yāska.

⁴ In footnote: Cf. Brh.D. iv.143[d: *tasyātmā bahudhā hi saḥ*].

⁵ In footnote: As for instance, Dakṣa is born from Aditi, and Aditi from Dakṣa – Durga [*ad loc.*].

⁶ In footnote: As for instance, fire, lightning, and the sun are the original form of each other – Durga [*ad loc.*].

⁷ In footnote: i.e. To make existence possible by bringing the human works to accomplishment. The will be no crops without the sun and there can be no life without food – Durga [*ad loc.*].

⁸ In footnote: This is Yāska’s rejoinder to the objection that non-deities are praised like deities. The so-called non-deities, says Yāska, are but different manifestations of the same single soul. In other words, Yāska here propounds the doctrine of pantheism. Cf. Brh.D. i.73-74 [*prthak purastād ye tūktā lokāḍipatayas trayah / teṣām ātmaiva tat sarvaṃ yadvad bhaktiḥ prakīrtite // tejastvenāyudham prāhur vāhanaṃ caiva yasya tat / imam aindrīm ca divyām ca vācam evaṃ prthak stutām //* “The Soul (*ātmā*) is all that is proclaimed to be an attribute (*bhakti*) of those three chief lords of the world who have been separately mentioned above. They say that it is the energy (of the Soul) which is the weapon and the vehicle of any (god). Similarly (they say)

In 7.18, commenting on RV 1,164.46, with the view that Agni is all the deities (*ekam sad viprā bahudhā vadanti*, c), Yāska says (the words taken from the *ṛc* are put in italics):

Imam evāgniṃ mahāntam [ca] [ātmānam *ekam*] ātmānaṃ *bahudhā* medhāvino vadanti |
indraṃ mītraṃ varuṇaṃ agniṃ divyaṃ ca garutmantaṃ |

Translation Visigalli & Kawamura (2021: 270):

The wise speak of this very (terrestrial) Agni, the Great Self,⁹ in various ways, as Indra, Mitra, Varuṇa, Agni, and the celestial Garutmat.¹⁰

Moreover, Yāska also uses four times in his work the ‘*adhidaivatam/adhyātmam*’ Brāhmaṇic/Vedāntic (see below) type of exegesis, that is a peculiar manner of displaying two parallel levels of allegorical interpretation in commenting on Vedic *mantras*, the first one relating it to the (main/supreme) deity, the second one to the (individual/supreme) Self. In the case of Yāska, the formula is each time the same: the first level of exegesis is concluded by *ity adhidaivatam*, directly followed by *athādhyātmam* introducing the second level of exegesis, itself concluded by *ity ātmagatim ācaṣṭe*. The first instance is Nir. 3.12 commenting on RV 1,164.21:

“yatrā suparṇā amṛtasya bhāgam animeshaṃ vidathābhi svaranti |
ino viśvasya bhuvanasya gopāḥ sa mā dhīraḥ pākam atrā viveśa ||” [RV 1,164.21]
yatra [suparṇāḥ] supatanā ādityaraśmayah | amṛtasya bhāgam udakasya | animiṣanto vedanenābhisvarantīti vā | abhiprayantīti vā | īśvaraḥ sarveṣāṃ bhūtānāṃ gopāyitādityaḥ | sa mā dhīraḥ pākam atrā viveśeti | dhīro dhīmān | pākah paktavyo bhavati | “vipakvaprajña ādityaḥ” [untraced] ity upaniṣadvarṇo bhavati | ity adhidaivatam | athādhyātmam | yatra [suparṇāḥ] supatanānīndriyāṇi | amṛtasya bhāgaṃ jñānasya | animiṣanto vedanenābhisvarantīti vā | abhiprayantīti vā | īśvaraḥ sarveṣāṃ indriyāṇāṃ gopāyitātmā | sa mā dhīraḥ pākam atrā viveśeti | dhīro dhīmān | pākah paktavyo bhavati | vipakvaprajña ātmā | ity ātmagatim ācaṣṭe ||

Translation Sarup (1921: 46), with quotation marks added:

“Where (birds) of beautiful wings vigilantly invoke the portion of immortality with knowledge. The lord, the guardian of the entire universe, he, the wise one, here approached me, the immature.”

‘Where (birds) [of beautiful wings]’, i.e. rays of the sun falling in a beautiful manner, ‘invoke’, i.e. move towards ‘the portion of immortality’, i.e. of water, with consciousness. ‘The lord, the guardian of’ all created beings, i.e. the sun: ‘he, the wise one, here approached me, the immature one’. ‘Wise’, having intelligence. ‘Immature’, i.e. one who is to be

that Speech (*Vāc*) is praised separately as this (terrestrial) one, as connected with Indra (in the middle sphere), and as celestial.” tr. Macdonell referring in his fn. to Nir. 7.4, Brh.D 4.43 and 3.85 on gods vehicles and weapons].

⁹ Or “[and] the Great Self”, Sarup (1921: 122) taking the [ca] (of his main mss.) into account. Note also the additional [ātmānam *ekam*] in several editions (starting with Roth) and which appears to be reflected in Durga’s commentary *ad loc.*: *kiṃ bahunā ‘imam evāgniṃ’ ‘ekam’ ‘mahāntam’ ‘ātmānam’ ananyatvena paśyataḥ ‘viprāḥ’* (in the *ṛc*) ‘*medhāvinaḥ*’ ātmavidaḥ ‘*bahudhā vadanti*’.

¹⁰ See fn. 70 there for Yāska following the (second) etymology of Garutmat as ‘heavy-souled’ (*gurvātmā*), i.e. great souled’ (*mahātmā+iti*), that is: *garu-* (= *guru* ‘heavy’, i.e. ‘great’) + *-tmān* (< *ātman*).

matured. The sun is called as “of mature wisdom” in the description of the Upaniṣad. This is with regard to the [supreme] deity.

Now about the self. ‘Where (the birds) of beautiful wings’, i.e. senses, easily going astray, ‘vigilantly invoke’, i.e. move towards, ‘the portion of immortality’, i.e. of knowledge, with consciousness. ‘The lord, the guardian of’ all senses, i.e. the soul; ‘he, the wise one, here approached me, the immature’. ‘Wise’, having intelligence. ‘Immature’, i.e. one who is to be matured. “The soul is of mature wisdom” describes the characteristic of the soul.

The second instance is Nir. 10.26 commenting on ṚV 10,82.2:

“viśvakarmā vimanā ādvihāyā dhātā vidhātā paramota saṃdrk |
teṣām iṣṭāni sam iṣā madanti yatrā saptarṣīn para ekam āhuḥ ||” [ṚV 10,82.2]
viśvakarmā vibhūṭamanā vyāptā dhātā ca | vidhātā ca | paramaś ca saṃdraṣṭā bhūṭānām |
teṣām iṣṭāni vā kāntāni vā krāntāni vā gatāni vā matāni vā natāni vā | adbhiḥ saha saṃmodante
yatraītāni sapta ṛṣīnāni jyotiṃṣi | tebhyaḥ para ādityaḥ | tāny etasminn ekaṃ bhavanti |
ity adhidaivatam | athādhyātmam | viśvakarmā vibhūṭamanā vyāptā dhātā ca | vidhātā ca |
paramaś ca saṃdarśayitendriyānām | eṣām iṣṭāni vā kāntāni vā krāntāni vā gatāni vā matāni
vā natāni vā | annena saha saṃmodante yatre māni sapta ṛṣīnānīndriyāṇi | ebhyaḥ para ātmā |
tāny etasminn ekaṃ bhavanti | ity ātmagatim ācaṣṭe | (tatretihāsam ācakṣate...)

Translation Sarup (1921: 162), who this time remarks (in a footnote) that “a comparison of the *adhi-daivata* and *adhy-ātma* expansion of the stanza shows that Yāska intends to bring about a contrast between his two interpretations”:

“Viśvakarman is sagacious, mighty, creator, disposer, and supreme beholder. The objects of their desire rejoice together with food, where beyond the seven seers, they declare (only) one to exist.”

‘Viśvakarman is’ of a penetrating mind, pervading, ‘creator’, ‘disposer’, and the most ‘supreme’ beholder of beings. ‘The objects of their desire’, i.e. objects which are loved or sought after, or approached, or thought about, or aimed at. They ‘rejoice with’ waters. ‘Where’ these ‘seven seers’, i.e. luminaries. ‘Beyond’ them is the sun. In him (the sun) they (the luminaries) become ‘one’. This is with reference to the [supreme] deity.

Now with reference to the soul. ‘Viśvakarman is’ of a penetrating mind, pervading, ‘creator’, and ‘disposer’, and the most ‘supreme’ manifester of the senses. ‘The objects’ of worship of these (senses), i.e. objects desired, or sought after, or approached, or thought about, or aimed at. They ‘rejoice together with food’. ‘Where’ these ‘seven seers’, i.e. the senses. ‘Beyond’ them is the soul. In him (the soul) they (senses) become ‘one’. This expounds the course of the life of the soul. (With reference to it they relate a legend...).

The third and four instances are Nir. 12.37-38 commenting on two Atharvavedic *mantras*:

sapta ṛṣayo vyākhyātāḥ [cf. 10.26 above] | teṣām eṣā bhavati || [36]
“sapta ṛṣayaḥ pratihitāḥ śarīre sapta rakṣanti sadam apramādam |
saptāpaḥ svapato lokam īyus tatra jāgrto asvapnajau satrasadau ca devau ||” [AVP 16,103.11; VS 34.55]
sapta ṛṣayaḥ pratihitāḥ śarīre | rāsmaya āditye | sapta rakṣanti Sadam apramādam |
saṃvatsaram apramādyantaḥ | saptāpanās ta eva svapato lokam astamitam ādityaṃ yanti |
tatra jāgrto ’svapnajau satrasadau ca devau vāyavādityau | ity adhidaivatam | athādhyātmam |
sapta ṛṣayaḥ pratihitāḥ śarīre | ṣaḍ indriyāṇi vidyā saptamy ātmani | sapta rakṣanti sadam
apramādam | śarīram apramādyanti | saptāpanānīmāny eva svapato lokam astamitam
ātmānaṃ yanti | tatra jāgrto ’svapnajau satrasadau ca devau prājñāś cātmā taijasaś ca |
ity ātmagatim ācaṣṭe ||
teṣām eṣāparā bhavati || [37]

“*tiryagbilaś camasa ūrdhvaḥbudhno yasmin yaśo nihitaṃ viśvarūpam |
atrāsata ṛṣayaḥ sapta sākam ye asya gopā mahato babhūvuḥ ||*” [AVP 16,101.5, cf. AVŚ
10,8.9 with var. *tad* for *atra*]
*tiryagbilaś camasa ūrdhvaḥbandhana ūrdhvaḥbodhano vā | yasmin yaśo nihitaṃ viśvarūpam |
atrāsata ṛṣayaḥ sapta saḥādityaraśmayah | ye asya gopā mahato babhūvuḥ | ity adhi-
daivatam | athādhyātmam | tiryagbilaś camasa ūrdhvaḥbandhana ūrdhvaḥbodhano vā | yasmin
yaśo nihitaṃ viśvarūpam | atrāsata ṛṣayaḥ sapta saḥendriyāṇi | yāny asya gopṭīṇi mahato
babhūvuḥ | ity ātmagatim ācaṣṭe || (...)* [38]

Translation Sarup (1921: 195-6):

Seven seers have been explained. The following stanza is addressed to them: [36]

“Seven seers are placed in the body, seven protect the seat without neglect. Seven works went to the world of setting where two gods who never sleep and sit on the sacrifice keep watch.”

‘Seven seers are placed in the body’, i.e. rays in the sun. ‘Seven protect the seat’, i.e. the year ‘without neglect’, i.e. without being negligent. ‘Seven’ pervading ones: they alone ‘go to the world of the sleeping one’, i.e. the setting sun. ‘There wake two gods who never sleep and sit at sacrifice’, i.e. the air and the sun. This is with reference to the deity. Now with reference to the self. ‘Seven seers are placed in the body’, i.e. six senses and the seventh knowledge in the soul. ‘Seven protect the seat without neglect’, i.e. they do ‘not neglect’ the body. ‘Seven works’: these same ‘go to the world of the sleepy one’, i.e. the setting soul. ‘There two gods who never sleep and sit at the sacrifice keep watch’, i.e. the self of wisdom and lustre. Thus he describes the course of the self. The following, another stanza, is addressed to them: [37]
“The ladle having side holes and its bottom turned upwards — wherein is placed the omniform glory. Here sit together the seven seers who became the guardians of this great one.”

‘The ladle having side holes’ and a top-knot, or which expands at the top, ‘wherein is placed the omniform glory’. ‘Here sit together the seven seers’, i.e. rays ‘who became guardians of this mighty one’. This is with reference to the deity. Now with reference to the self. ‘The ladle having holes on the sides’ and held fast at the top, or arousing at the top, ‘wherein is placed the omniform glory’. ‘Here sit together the seven seers’, i.e. the senses ‘which became the guardians of this mighty one’. Thus he describes the course of the self. [38]

These examples allow us to say a bit more about Yāska’s conception of the (Great) Self, which assembles the concepts of (individual) senses (*indriyāṇi*), numbering seven, viz. the six ones “in the body” (the common five senses + the *manas*?) and the seventh as the knowledge (*vidyā* or *jñāna*), and, beyond them, the (supreme) *ātman* which manifests them (*saṃdarśayitr*, 10.26) and within which they become one. “The *ātman* [is] the one whose *prajñā* is mature” (*vipakva-prajñā ātmā*, 3.12), this “*ātman* of wisdom and lustre” (*prājñāś cātmā taijasaś ca*, 12.37)¹¹.

In Nir. 1.20, Yāska also tells us that with this double, and even triple (adding the ritual/sacrificial one, *adhiyajñam*),¹² level of exegesis, i.e. of knowledge, the meaning of

¹¹ This shed additional light on the early Upaniṣadic term *prajñātman* discussed by Bodewitz 2002: 89-91. On the Middle/Late Vedic concept of *mahān ātman*, see the studies of Buitenen 1964 and Norelius 2017.

¹² However, there is only one example of interpretation with the “sacrifice/deity” levels and the parallel formula (*ity adhiyajñam | athādhi-daivatam*), in Nir. 11.4.

the Vedic *mantra* is fully reached: *arthaṃ vācaḥ puṣpaphalam āha* | *yājñadaivate puṣpaphale* | *daivatādhyātme vā* | “The meaning of speech is called its flower and fruit. The flower and fruit are either [the meaning/knowledge] according/relating to¹³ the sacrifice and to the deity, or [the meaning/knowledge] according/relating to the deity and to the Self.”

The *ity adhidaivatam/athādhyātmam* formula occurs once again in a passage of *Parīṣiṣṭa* I¹⁴ (Nir. 13.11):

āditya iti putraḥ śākapūṇeh | eṣarg bhavati yad enam arcanti pratyṛcaḥ sarvāṇi bhūtāni tasya yad anyan mantrebhyas tad akṣaraṃ bhavati | raśmayo 'tra devā ucyante ya etasminn adhiniṣannā ity adhidaivatam | athādhyātmam | śarīram atra ṛg ucyate yad enenārcanti pratyṛcaḥ sarvāṇīndriyāṇi tasya yad avināśidharma tad akṣaraṃ bhavati | indriyāṇy atra devā ucyante yāny asminn ātmany (adhiniṣannāny) ekaṃ bhavantīty ātmapravādāḥ ||

Here the parallel is between the Sun (*āditya*) and all the *bhūtāni* at the *adhidaivatam* level, and, at the *adhyātmam* level, the body (*śarīra*) and the *indriyāṇi*, which are one in the *ātman*. Noteworthy (compared to Yāska), the *adhyātmam* level ends this time with the variant concluding words *ity ātmapravādāḥ* (instead of *ity ātmagatim ācaṣṭe*), reminding

¹³ Pace the translation of Sarup (1921: 19: “Or the sacrificial stanzas, and stanzas addressed to deities, or the deity and the soul are its fruit and flower”), we must here follow both Durga (*yājñaparijñānam yājñam, devatāparijñānam daivatam, ātmany adhi yad vartate tad adhyātmam*), Skanda-Maheśvara (*yājñam iti yājñajñānam ucyate, daivataṃ devatājñānam, ādhyātmam adhyātmajñānam*) and the NŚV 1.6.161bc-162ab (p. 208: *atha vā yājñavijñānam yājñam ity atra saṃmatam / daivataṃ devatājñānam adhyātmam cātma-vedanam* //). Skanda-Maheśvara then explains how this knowledge rises gradually through these two couples of levels which are in each case like ‘flower’ and ‘fruit’: *teṣāṃ* [i.e. *yājña-*, *devatā-* and *adhyātma-jñānānām*] *pūrvapaścājjanmasāmānyād dhetuhetur adbhāvasāmānyāc ca ‘yājñadaivate puṣpaphale’ ucyate ‘daivatādhyātme vā’, yathā hi pūrvaṃ puṣpaṃ jayate paścāt phalam, evaṃ pūrvaṃ yājñajñānam jayate paścād devatājñānam, tac ca pūrvaṃ paścād adhyātmajñānam*. Durga refers also to the three types of interpretation in his commentary *ad Nir. 2.8: tatraivaṃ sati lakṣaṇoddeśamātram evaitasmiṃ chāstre nirvacanam ekaikasya kriyate, kva cic cādhyātmādhyādhivijñānopadarśanārtham | tasmād eteṣu yāvanto 'rthā upapadyeran – adhidaivādhyātmādhyādhivijñāśrayāḥ sarva eva te yojyāḥ, nātrāparādhō 'sti*. And Skanda-Maheśvara *ad 7.5: sarvadarśaneṣu ca sarve mantrā yojanīyāḥ | kutaḥ | svayam eva bhāṣyakāreṇa sarva-mantrāṇāṃ triprakāraṣya viṣayasya pradarśanāya ‘arthaṃ vācaḥ puṣpaphalam āha’ iti yājñādīnāṃ puṣpaphalatvena pratijñānāt* |

¹⁴ Nir. 13.1-13, forming the first *Parīṣiṣṭa*, is considered to belong to the Nirukta core by the author of the *Niruktasamuccaya* (1.1) as well as by Sāyaṇa (RVBh introduction, quoted in Nir. B ed. p. 1167 fn. 2, S ed. pp. 227-228 fn. 13), who both quote the last words of Nir. 13.13 as being (at) the end of the whole work; cf. also the 16th century testimony of Madhusūdhana Sarasvatī who in his commentary on *Mahimnastotra* st. 7 describes the Nirukta as a work in thirteen *adhyāyas*, *trayodaśādhyāyātmakam niruktam* (in his case, it could even include the second *Parīṣiṣṭa* too, as it will be seen with the quotations of Vijñāneśvara and Jīva Gosvāmin discussed below, fn. 24 and 25); Kumārila in *Tantravārttika* 1,3 *adhik. 4* (*ad MSBh 1,3.7*) quotes the sentence *yad eva kiṃ cānūcāno 'bhyūhaty āṛṣaṃ tad bhavati* = Nir. 13.12 (cf. Sarup *ad loc.*). But Durga himself declares in his commentary that he deals with a work in twelve *adhyāyas* only (*dvādaśādhyāyī*). Therefore, according to Sarup (intr. pp. 44, 53), this first *Parīṣiṣṭa* must be later than Durga (a hasty conclusion in fact, that can be challenged, see below), and the commentary attributed to Durga found for this *parīṣiṣṭa* (except its §§5-8, left without gloss) has to be rather ascribed to one of his followers.

us of Durga's use of the term *ātmavid* (see above fn. 9).¹⁵ In *Pariśiṣṭa* II, as we will see soon, the full formula (with again the concluding *ity ātmagatim ācaṣṭe*) is used extensively.

2. The *adhidaivatam/adhyātmam* double level of Vedic and Vedāntic exegesis

The *adhidaivatam/adhyātmam* double level of exegesis, with the use of the same *ity adhidaivatam/athādhyātmam* formula, goes back to the *Brāhmaṇas*. The formula is already found in *Aitareya-Br.* (2,40.11/10,8) under the reverse form *ity adhyātmam athādhidaivatam* — the subsequent *ĀiĀ* uses it in 1,3.8 (reversing the order of the levels), 2,1.2 and 3,1.1, and it refers also to both levels in 1,3.3, 1,3.6, and 2,1.5, here usually translated “with regard to/as regards the gods/the deities” or “the body/the self” by Keith. It is also in *Jaiminīya-Up. Br.* (*Āraṇyaka*) 1,57.7-8, 3,4.2-3, 4,21.4-5 [= *KeU* 4.4-5] (the formula) and 1,57.8-9, 3,4.12, 3,33.2-3 (the couple of levels). The two levels are presented together in *Kauṣītaki-Br.* 3,4.16, 7,9.13, 9,3.7 (with thrice the sentence *tair yat kiṃca pañcavidham adhidaivatam adhyātmam tat sarvam āpnoti*; cf. *ŚāṅkhāyanaŚS* 16,20-30 for the ten repetitions of ...*adhidaivatam adhyātmam tat sarvam enenāpnoti*); several times with the formula in the subsequent *Kauṣītaki-/Śāṅkhāyana-Ār.* 4,12 (= *KauU* 2.12), 6,2 (= *KauU* 4.2), 6,10 (= *KauU* 4.10; “Voilà pour/sur le plan divin. Voici pour/sur le plan du Soi/individuel” transl. Renou), 7,2, 7,4, 7,5, 7,6, 7,7, 7,21, 8,2 (cf. also 10,1: *athāto 'dhyātmikam*); and in the later *Gopatha-Br.* 1,2.5 (the formula), 1,4.2-5 (with clear parallels on each level: *candramā vai brahmādhidaivaṃ mano 'dhyātmam... ādityo vā udgātādhidaivaṃ cakṣur adhyātmam... agnir vai hotādhidaivaṃ vāg adhyātmam... vāyur vā adhvaryur adhidaivaṃ prāṇo 'dhyātmam*), 1,4.11.

¹⁵ Before in this *Pariśiṣṭa* I (*Nir.* 13.9), the same *ity ātmapravādāḥ* is used for concluding an interpretation of *RV* 1,164.45 (on the four *parimita-padas* of *vāc*, viewed accordingly as *paśuṣu tūṇaveṣu mrgeṣv ātmani ca*), here without the *adhidaivatam/adhyātmam* double level and contrastively (or additionally) to the, different, interpretations (of the said four *padas*) by the grammarians (*iti vaiyākaraṇāḥ*), ritualists (*iti yājñikāḥ*), etymologists (*iti nairuktāḥ*) and others (*ity eke = ātithāsikāḥ* [*om. B*] *adhibhūtavidaḥ* according to *Durga; cf., with a text for a part very close to the latter, *Sāyaṇa* in his *RVBh ad loc.* quoting from this *Nir.* [*Par.*] passage). On the (*adhy*)*ātmavid* ‘School of Vedic interpreters’, see *Agrawala* 1939 and *Gupta* 1958-1959: 148 (for whom these *ātmapravādas* “appear to have an influence of natural sciences on their outlook and interpretations”); the latter (by misunderstanding of the *ity adhidaivatam/adhyātmam* and *ity ārṣam* formulas — the last one probably because it is found glossed over *ad loc.*: *vedavādinām ṛṣṇām matam iti śeṣaḥ*) wrongly conceives additional distinct ‘*Adhidaivata*’/‘*Ārṣa*’ and ‘*Adhyātma*’ schools of interpretation (cf. *Id.*: 144). In the so-called ‘early *Sāṃkhya*’ teaching of *Sulabhā* (a rather unique teaching if really a ‘*Sāṃkhya*’ one), in *MBh* 12,308.114d, reference is made to the *adhyātmacintaka* thinkers (cf. *Fitzgerald* 2002: 663; they are also named in 12,178.7d, 212.40b, 267.18d, 298.10d/15b, 299.6f, 302.3d, 306.43d, 13,16.32ab, 136.11cd, 14,39.23f, 41.4a, etc.), who appear to correspond to these *ātmapravādas* or early Vedāntins (cf. *Manu* 6.83 quoted below), concerned by the science of the embodied *ātman* and, as *saṃnyāsins*, by the inner sacrifice of the Self (cf. *Bodewitz* 1973: 226, 230-231, 258 fn. 8, 304-305). See below fn. 43.

The double level of exegesis is extensively used in the Śatapatha-Br. (here referred to in the M recension), with the formula in 6,5,3.3-4, 6,6,1.8-9, 6,7,1.19-20, 8,7,4.18-19, 10,1,2.2-3, 10,3,3.6-7 (reversing the order), 10,3,5.3-4, 10,4,1.22-23, 10,5,2.23-24, 10,6,2.3-4, 10,6,2.6-7, 10,6,2.9-10, 13,6,1.10-11, 14,4,3.32-33 (= BĀU 1,5.21-22, reversing the order), 14,5,3.5-6 (= BĀU 2,3.3-4), or the couple of levels in 9,5,2.8/13,6,1.7 (*adhidevatam adhyātmaṁ tad enena sarvām āpnoti*, cf. KauB and ŚāṅkhŚS quoted above), 10,3,5.7, 12,1,1.14/12,9,1.4, 14,6,1.12 (not in K/BĀU; see also the occurrences of *adhyātmaṁ* used alone in 4,1,3.1, 4,1,4.1, 6,2,1.34, 11,1,6.29, 11,2,4.5-7, 12,1,4.3/12,2,4.16/12,3,3.4/12,9,4.3, 14,5,5.1-13 = BĀU 2,5.1-13, 14,8,15.6 = BĀU 5,14.4). However the ŚB introduces (for the first time?), between the two levels, a third, sacrificial one, in three instances: 10,2,6.9-10/13-14, 16-18 and 10,5,2.10-12 (*ity adhidevatam | athādhiyajñam... ity u evādhiyajñam | athādhyātmaṁ...*); and in one occasion, in 14,6,7.16-20 (Āraṇyaka/Upaniṣad portion), it even presents an exceptional sixfold structure of correspondences (here K/BĀU 3,7.15-16 has the text of the two last levels only): *adhidevatam-adhilokam-adhivedam-adhiyajñam-adhibhūtam-adhyātmaṁ*.¹⁶

Coming to the earliest Upaniṣads, viz. the Bṛhadāraṇyaka (K recension, which has not all the occurrences found in ŚBM 14,4-9; see above BĀU), Chāndogya, Aitareya ('longer'

¹⁶ On these ŚB passages, see Minard (1949: 35 §96, 69-70 §188a, on the translation of *adhyātmaṁ*, 115 §324b, 134 §375) and Gonda (1988: 10). This survey in the Brāhmaṇa- and Āraṇyaka-literature shows that the twofold (*adhidaivatam/adhyātmaṁ*) scheme is the earliest one, and was by far the usual one, as confirmed by Bodewitz in his study of the JB (1973: 235-242, 266-269), despite the absence in this text of the two terms themselves (occurring in the subsequent JUB). Bodewitz (1985: 12 = 2019: 72, cf. 1973: 215) further highlights the threefold approach of the sacrifice in the Brāhmaṇas, viz. ritualistic, (macro)cosmic and microcosmic (itself illustrated through a series of examples), which would correspond to the (later) threefold (*adhiyajñam/adhidaivam/adhyātmaṁ*) division in the levels of interpretation (first attested in the ŚB). On this basis, Bodewitz (1985: 25 = 2019: 84-85, cf. *ibid.* fn. 55), differently from Śāṅkara's *bhāṣya*, explains in Kātha-Up. (a relatively late, metrical, Vedic Up.) 1.17-18, on the triple Naciketas-fire sacrifice, the words *tribhiḥ* ('[union] with the three', = "father, mother and *ācārya*" [on the basis of BĀU 4,1.2: *mātrmān pitrmān ācāryavān brūyāt*] or "Veda, *smṛti* and *śiṣṭas* [good men]" or "perception, inference and scriptures" [*pratyakṣa-anumāna-āgama-*] KUBh; "ou bien les trois Veda" Renou; or the three closest *pitṛs*/paternal ancestors, the ones called by their names in the *śrāddha*-rituals?), *trikarmakṛt* ('doer of the triple work', = *ijyā-adhyayana-dāna-* KUBh) and *trayam* ('[having known this] triad', = the threefold Naciketas-fire itself, its bricks, how many, and how arranged [*triṇācīketas trayam*] *yathoktaṁ yā iṣṭakā yāvatīr vā yathā vety 'etad viditvā'*, cf. st. 15] KUBh; or again "sacrifice, étude et don" Renou) as esoterically referring to these 'three levels (i.e. ritualistic, cosmic and microcosmic)' of interpretation of the sacrifice — this 'tripartite homology' corresponding to the *adhidaivam* (as the macrocosmic level related to the deities), *adhiyajñam* (as the mesocosmic level related to ritual), and *adhyātmaṁ* (as the microcosmic level related to the body of the *yajamāna*) division (cf. Haas 2019: 1035-1036, who underlines the further reference to *adhyātma-yoga* in KU 2.12). The threefold division including the ritual level (beside the one where the third level is the perishable being, *adhi-bhūtam* instead of *-yajñam*; see below fn. 17) is more commonly found in later sources such as the Nirukta (which uses the three terms but only according to a double twofold division; see fn. 12-13 above), ŚāṅkhGS (1,2,5.1; with the same word *trayam* as in KU), Manu (6.83) and Bhartṛhari (see below).

version, cf. David 2017; see above AiĀ 2-3), Kena and Kauṣītaki (see above KeU and KauU), it is the double, *adhidaivatam/adhyātmam*, level, which is in use with its formula. So ChU 1,2.14/3.1 (reversing the order of the levels), 1,5.2-3, 1,6.8/7.1, 3,18.1-2 (both reversing the order of the levels and concluded by *ity ubhayam evādiṣṭaṃ bhavaty adhyātmam cādhidaivatam ca*), 4,3.2-3. The Taittirīya-Up. provides an original fivefold scheme of correspondences *adhilokam-adhijyautiṣam-adhividyam-adhiprajam-adhyātmam* in 1,3.1-4, and the *ity adhibhūtam/athādhyātmam* variant scheme in 1,7.1. The translations of *adhidaivatam* and *adhyātmam* in these Upaniṣads sometimes vary (e.g. the Sénart's ones), despite the identity of the mode of interpretation as clear as the one of the formulation. This is probably because of the nature of the *ātman* level in these occurrences, which deals with the embodiment of the *ātman*, viz. the Self in its individual physicality (constituted by the senses). It is interesting to look at Śaṅkara's commentary on these Upaniṣadic passages (where, in translations, *ātman* is usually rendered by 'body').

Moreover, Śaṅkara himself uses the same double (and in his case sometimes triple) level of exegesis, with similar formulas, also when commenting on other passages of these Upaniṣads. For instance, in BĀUBh 1,5.3 (*trīṇy annānītha phalabhūtāni karmaṇām manovākprāṇākhyāni adhyātmam adhibhūtam adhidaivam ca vyācikyāsītāni... vyākhyātāny ādhyātmikāni manovākprāṇākhyāny annāni*), 2,3.6 ("yo 'yaṃ dakṣiṇe 'kṣaṇ puruṣaḥ" [BĀU 2,3.5] *iti liṅgātmā prastuto 'dhyātme, adhidaive ca* "ya eṣa etasmin maṇḍale puruṣaḥ" [BĀU 2,3.3, 5,5.2-3]), 3,1.4 (*sādhanaadvayam adhyātmādhibhūtaparicchedaṃ hitvā adhidaivatātmanā drṣṭaṃ yat sa muktiḥ*), 3,1.6 (*tatrādhyātmam yajñasya yajamānasya yad idaṃ prasiddhaṃ manaḥ so 'sau candro 'dhidaivatam / mano 'dhyātmaṃ candramā adhidaivatam iti hi prasiddham*), 6,2.12 (*prāṇānām devatvopapatteḥ / adhidaivam indrādayo devas ta evādhyātmam prāṇās te cānnasya puruṣe prakṣeptāraḥ*). See also his commentaries on TU 1,1.1 (*oṃ śāntiḥ śāntiḥ śāntir iti trir vacanam ādhyātmikādhibhautikādhidaivikānām vidyāprāptiyupasargāṇām praśamārtham*); and 1,7.1 (see above), where *adhibhūtam* is understood as implying *adhidaivatam*,¹⁷ both

¹⁷ On *adhibhūtam* as a (cosmological and analogical) level, see already ŚB/BĀU and TU (above), MBh 12,300.17-301.13 and 14,42.27-39 (two lists of correspondences on three levels — *adhyātmam*, *adhibhūtam* and *adhidaivatam*), and the famous BhG passage involving a fourfold division (beside the supreme *brahman* and the *karman*, each of these six concepts being here precisely defined):

te brahma tad viduḥ kṛtsnam adhyātmam karma cākhilam || 7.29cd ||
sādhibhūtādhidaivam māṃ sādhijajñam ca ye viduḥ |
(...) || 7.30 || arjuna uvāca:
kiṃ tad brahma kim adhyātmam kiṃ karma puruṣottama |

constituting the ‘external’ fivefold one (*bāhyam*) versus the ‘personal’ fivefold one (*ity adhibhūtam ity adhiloḥkādhidaivatapāṅktadvayopalakṣaṇārtham / lokadevatāpāṅktayoś cābhihitatvāt / athānantaram adhyātmam pāṅktatrayam ucyate – prāṇādi vāyupāṅktam / cakṣurādīndriyapāṅktam / carmādi dhātupāṅktam / etāvad dhīdam sarvam adhyātmam*); on Praśna-Up. 3.8 (*ādityo ha vai prasiddho hy adhidaivatam bāhyaḥ prāṇaḥ sa eṣa udayaty udgacchati / eṣa hy enam ādhyātmikam cakṣuḥ bhavam cākṣuṣam prāṇam prakāśenānu-grhṇāno rūpopalabdḥau cakṣuḥ ālokaḥ kurvann ity arthaḥ*); on Kaṭha-Up. 4.9 (*yataś ca yasmāt prāṇād udeत्य uttiṣṭhati sūryo ’staṁ nimlocanam yatra yasminn eva ca prāṇo ’hanyahani gacchati, taṁ prāṇam ātmānam devāḥ sarva agnyādayo ’dhidaivam vāgādayaś cādhyātmam sarve viśve ’rā iva rathanābhāv arpitāḥ sampraveśitāḥ sthitikāle / so ’pi brahmaiva / tad etat sarvātmakam brahma*); and on Īśa-Up. 17 (*athedānīm mama marīṣyato vāyuh prāṇo ’dhyātmaparicchedam hitvādhidaivatātmānam sarvātmakam anilam amṛtam sūtrātmānam pratipadyatām iti vākyaśeṣaḥ*).

Also in Śaṅkara’s commentary on Brahma-sūtra 2,4.13 (*tad ucyate – ādhidaivakena samaṣṭivyāṣṭirūpeṇa hairaṇyagarbheṇa prāṇātmanaivaitad vibhutvam āmnāyate nādhy-ātmikena*; transl. Thibaut: “To which we reply that the all-pervadingness of which this text speaks belongs to the Self of the *prāṇa* in its *adhidaivata* relation, according to which it appears as Hiranyagarbha in his double – universal and individual – form, not in its *adhyātma* relation”; the two concerned words, here left without translation, being referred to in the index with the respective translations ‘relating to the gods’/‘relating to the Self’) and 3,3.23 (about the Brahman having its abode in the heart, “*eṣa ma ātmāntar hṛdaye*” [ChU 3,14.3]: *evam tatra tatra tad tad ādhyātmikam āyatanam etāsu vidyāsu pratīyate / [...] nanv etāsv apy ādhidaivikyo vibhūtaḥ śrūyante*; transl. Thibaut: “In all these *vidyās* Brahman is described as residing in the body [...]; but the *vidyās* [of the Chāndogya] likewise mention such powers of Brahman as are connected with the Devas (i.e. external

adhibhūtam ca kiṁ proktam adhidaivam kim ucyate || 8.1 ||
 adhiyajñāḥ katham ko ’tra dehe ’smin madhusūdana |
 (...) || 8.2 || śrībhagavān uvāca:
 akṣaram brahma paramam svabhāvo ’dhyātmam ucyate |
 bhūtabhāvodbhavaḥ karṣaṇaḥ karmasamjñitah || 8.3 ||
 adhibhūtam kṣaro bhāvaḥ puruṣaś cādhipaiva |
 adhiyajño ’ham evātra dehe (...) || 8.4 ||

More anecdotally, in MBh 13,16.18 the supreme Lord, who is everything, gets six names related to our levels (*adhipauruṣam adhyātmam adhibhūṭādhidaivatam / adhiloḥkādhivijñānam adhiyajñas tvam eva hi* //). The derived concept of triple/threefold suffering, *duḥkha-* or *tāpa-traya*, that is *ādhyātmika*, *ādhidaivika* and *ādhibhautika*, found in (com. *ad*) SK 1, medical literature etc. (e.g. JaiSa 2.64, 50.50; cf. Smets 2013: 99-100 fn. 40) is out of the scope of the present study (see thereon, Angermeier & Vukadin 2024).

nature)”; cf. BSBh 2,2.1 (*tathedaṃ jagad akhilaṃ pṛthivyādi nānākarmaphalopabhoga-yogyam bāhyam ādhyātmikaṃ ca śārīrādi nānājātyanvitaṃ pratiniyatāvayavavinyāsam anekakarmaphalānubhavādhiṣṭhānaṃ dṛśyamānam*; transl. Thibaut: “Now look at this entire world which appears, on the one hand, as external (i.e. inanimate) in the form of earth and the other elements enabling [the souls] to enjoy the fruits of their various actions, and, on the other hand, as animate, in the form of bodies which belong to the different classes of beings, possess a definite arrangement of organs, and are therefore capable of constituting the abodes of fruition”) and 3,2.21 (*ayaṃ prapañco dehādilakṣaṇa ādhyātmiko bāhyaś ca pṛthivyādilakṣaṇaḥ*) for the *ādhyātmikaṃ* (*śārīrādi* or *dehādi*)/*bāhyam* (*pṛthivyādi*) division of the world.

Therefore, even if it is sometimes used by Śaṅkara according to his own more specific Advaita view, this means of thought-structuring and discourse-leveling proves to belong to the earliest Vedānta tradition. Before Śaṅkara, Bhartṛhari too in his *Vākyapadīya* refers to the variable meaning of a Vedic *mantra* according to these different levels, including here the ritual *adhi-kratu* or *-yajñam* one:

eko mantras tathādhyaṭmam adhidaivam adhikratu |
 asaṃkareṇa sarvārtho bhinnāśaktir avasthitaḥ || 2.254 ||
 [vṛtti:] padānām avabhedāntarakatvena (?) yā tulyāvacchedānām cārthāntaraparigraheṇa
 kuṣṇīnām ca pravṛttinimittasya savyāpāratvena sa eva nañō ’dhyātmam adhidaivam
 adhiyajñam ca saty api sarvaśaktive viṣayo ’vacchidyamānasāmarthyo ’rthapadarūpādibhir
 asaṃkīrṇaviṣayaṃ tathaiva nityam avasthitaḥ || 2.254 ||

Leaving aside the *vṛtti*¹⁸, Bhartṛhari’s *kārikā* can be translated:

One and the same *mantra*, according as it is considered with reference to the *ātman*, to the deity or to the ritual, is having a [specific/separate] meaning for all [these different levels

¹⁸ This passage of the *vṛtti*, provided by a single manuscript, is obviously corrupted. Here is, relying on the critical and exegetical suggestions by our estimated colleagues Charles Li and Hugo David (personal communications), a tentative translation of the second part, starting from *sa* (after which Li proposes to emend *sa eva nañō* to *sa eva mantrō*, or *sa eko mantrō*, and *viṣayo* ’*va*° to *viṣayāva*°): “the same *mantra* may pertain to the *ātman*, the deity, or the sacrifice. Even if [the *mantra*] has the ability to mean anything, its capacity is delimited by the [three different] fields/contexts [in which it is used]. Therefore, without the [three] fields being confused through its meanings, word-forms, etc., always [the *mantra*] remains [the same].” As for the initial part, one can observe a group of three parallel gen. pl. followed by an instr.: *padānām avabhedāntarakatvena* (?) *yā*, *tulyāvacchedānām ca+arthāntaraparigraheṇa*, *kuṣṇīnām* (?) *ca pravṛttinimittasya savyāpāratvena*. The lonely *yā* remains problematic (is it what Iyer indicates in his edition with the sign ‘(?)’ put before? unless it is because of the preceding uncommon *-antaraka-* form with the abstract suffix *-tva*, within a compound starting with the aberrant *avabheda-* that Aklujkar/David would correct into *avaccheda-*): portion of an indecl. like *yathā*, or of a word preceding *tulyā*° in the same compound, or (David) the sequence *yā... cā*° to be read *vā... vā*° (= because either the *mantra* can be re-cut to give it a second meaning, or the words can be given a different meaning without re-cutting)? The third syntagm, except its first ‘meaningless’ word *kuṣṇīnām* (that Li propose to correct into *vivakṣīnām* or something like; the corruption could be here more important, David), can be translated: “and because its function depends on the reason [of a particular speaker?] for using it” (Li).

referred to = suitable for each one] without any confusion, [because it is] relying on distinct [inner] powers (= because it is able to divide its significative power accordingly).¹⁹

This threefold division, already attested in ŚB (cf. above and fn. 16) and, as applied more specifically to the exegesis of meaningful *mantras*, explained by Yāska and his commentators as functioning by couples of levels (cf. above Nir. 1.20 and fn. 13), with the *adhyātmam* level at the top, enables a full understanding of the Veda, as reminded in ŚāṅkhGS 1,2.5, on *śrutam* or the heard (Vedic revelation) as threefold: *adhidaivam athādhyātmam adhiyajñam iti trayam*; and in Manu 6.82-83, in the section on the fourth *āśrama*, the one of the *saṃnyāsin*, that is the Vedāntin:

dhyānikaṃ sarvaṃ evaitad yad etad abhiśabditam |
na hy anadhyātmavit kaś cit kriyāphalam upāśnute || 82 ||
adhiyajñam brahma japed ādhidaivikam eva ca |
ādhyātmikam ca satataṃ vedāntābhihitam ca yat || 83 ||

All [the Veda] that is word-uttered aloud is also object of meditation, for no one can enjoy the [full] fruit of the ritual if he is not a knower of the highest Self.
[The *saṃnyāsin*] should pray on the Veda at its ritual level as well as at the level of its deities, and constantly at the level which is the one of the highest Self and is called the Vedānta one.²⁰

3. The second *Parīṣiṣṭa* of the *Nirukta*

Coming to the second *Parīṣiṣṭa* of the *Nirukta* (Nir. 13.14-48 or 14.1-37; see the whole text given below in Appendix), we can describe it rightly as a short ‘early’ Vedāntic

¹⁹ See Puṇyārāja’s *ṭīkā ad loc.*: *tathā caika eva mantra ātmany api japāvasare deveṣv api kratau yajanasamaye ’pi viniyuṣyate bhinnāśaktitvād aśāṃkaryeṇa pratinyatārthayā vyavasthitiṃ labhate ity arthaḥ*. Cf. Iyer’s translation of the *kārikā* (1977: 110-111): “One and the same hymn is accepted, without any confusion, as having many meanings and different powers according as it is considered from the point of view of the *ātman*, or of the gods, or of the ritual”, with the additional explanation: “A sacred hymn remains the same even if it is used for different purposes such as meditation, muttered prayer and sacrifice. On each occasion, it would have a different meaning but the mantra is looked upon as the same.” Compare Pillai’s translation (1971: 95): “Thus the same hymn having various meanings and possessing different potentialities, is established as functioning in regard to the self, to a god and to the sacrifice, without its functions getting mixed up.” The problem with these two translations is that here only the individual *mantra* is concerned, not the whole *sūkta* (‘hymn’). Cf. Tzohar 2018: 223 fn. 6 (“[th]e example of a single mantra, which, although pronounced identically on all occasions, is accepted as having various meanings in different contexts and for different agents, without any apparent confusion”); Ruegg 1959: 27-28; and Renou 1960: 53: “Suivant ceux qui croient à l’immutabilité du mot, les *śabdābheda* [as opposed to the *śabdabhedavādins*], au contraire, le *mantra* ne varie pas, mais il est affecté de potentialités différentes (*bhinnāśakti*), selon qu’il se rattache au plan individuel (*adhyātmam*), au plan cosmique (*adhidaivam*), au plan rituel (*adhikratu*) ; les mots qui le composent sont donc éminemment sujets à revêtir des acceptions indirectes (*gauṇārtha*).”

²⁰ This confirms the identity of *adhyātmavāda* and early Vedānta (see above fn. 15). The next *śloka* (84):

idam śaraṇam ajñānām idam eva vijānatām |
idam anvicchatām svargam idam ānantyam icchatām ||

presenting the Veda as “the refuge for those who are ignorant”, that is “for those who want to get to heaven”, as well as “for those who have the knowledge”, that is “for those who long for eternity”, sounds as a veiled criticism of the ritualistic (pūrva-)Mīmāṃsakas, as opposed to the Vedāntins.

treatise, closer to the (early) Upaniṣadic doctrines than to the later Vedānta tradition. In the introduction, its author declares, with quotation of illustrative Vedic *mantras*, that, after the explanation of the divinity and the requisite (?) of the sacrifice (*daivataṃ yajñāṅgaṃ ca*), he will now explain the high(er) path/way (*ūrdhva-mārgagatiṃ*),²¹ the one concerning the *mahān ātman*. His work purports to be “an inquiry about the ātman” (*ātma-jijñāsā*) as it is repeated in his conclusion at the very end (*saiṣā+ātmajijñāsā | saiṣā sarvabhūtajijñāsā*).²² After the introduction (§§1-2 = 13.14-15), it is divided in two parts, the first one (§§3-11 = 13.16-24) theoretical, the second one (§§12-37 = 13.25-48) illustrative, commenting on *mantras*.

The first part starts by giving the various names of the *mahān ātman*, here clearly identified with the (supreme) *brahman* (*athaiṣa mahān ātmā sattvalakṣaṇas tat paraṃ tad brahma tat satyaṃ tat salilaṃ tad avyaktaṃ tad asparśaṃ tad arūpaṃ tad arasaṃ tad agandhaṃ tad amṛtaṃ tac chakraṃ tan niṣṭho bhūtātmā* etc.), and by describing the cosmogonic threefoldness of this *ātman* corresponding to the division into the three ‘Sāṃkhya’ *guṇas* (*athaiṣa mahān ātmā trividho bhavati | sattvaṃ rajas tama iti*), which, through the generation of the five *bhūtas* and corresponding five senses (*indriyāṇi*) and the reverse resorption, generating *manas*, *vidyā*, *mahān ātman*, *pratibhā* and *prakṛti*, creates the perpetual cycle of days and nights (§§3-4 = 13.16-17). Then are described the conception of the human being according to the five *mahābhūtas*, the embryological evolution month per month, with the quotation of a few untraced *ślokas*, and several physiological data (§§5-7 = 13.18-20), close to the Garbha-Up.²³ There follows the after-life cycle, with the return into the world for the performers of the Vedic ritual, and the reaching of the Brahma-loka for the followers of the path of knowledge (§§8-9 = 13.21-22), close to BĀU 6,2.15-16. This part ends with a comment on RV 10,82.7, contrasting the knowers and the non-knowers, and a listing of the various names of the *mahān ātman* (§§10-11 = 13.23-24).

The second part is a commentary on a series of (26) Vedic *mantras* (one untraced) ‘telling’ the *mahān ātman*. On the model of Nir. 3.12, 10.26 and 12.37-38, the *adhidaivatam/adhyātmam* device is explicitly used no less than twelve times

²¹ The sentence *athāta ūrdhvamārgagatiṃ vyākhyāsyāmaḥ* reminds us of the opening sentences of the Vaiśeṣika-sūtra (1,1.1): *athāto dharmam vyākhyāsyāmaḥ*; or of the Rasavaiśeṣika-Sūtra (1,1): *athāta ārogya-śāstraṃ vyākhyāsyāmaḥ*.

²² Cf. Mīmāṃsā- and Brahma-sūtra 1,1.1: *athāto dharma-/brahma-jijñāsā*.

²³ Samely, in the (I dare to say ‘early Vedāntic’) teaching of Sulabhā, the enumeration of the 30 *guṇas/kalās* is followed by a short embryological outline (MBh 12,308.97-120; cf. Fitzgerald 2002: 661-663).

(§§12,13,14,15,16,18,19,21,23,24,25,27 = 13.25,26,27,28,29,31,32,34,36,37,38,40), with sometimes noteworthy contrasts in the parallel readings of the *mantra* at the two levels (e.g. §23 = 13.36: *paśyaty ādityaṃ na candramasaṃ* versus *paśyaty ātmānam na manaḥ*). In the conclusion it is cryptically stated: *sarvāṇi prajñānāny upamānāya manuṣyahito 'yam ādityo 'yam ātmā* (§37 = 13.48; cf. *sarvāṇi prajñānāni prajānan* 9.15, *sarvāṇi prajñānāni pratimuñcate medhāvī* 12.13).

No commentary for the *Pariśiṣṭa* II appears to be known. The Sanskrit language it displays has been described as incorrect (see notes B *ad* §§3 etc.); it is true that some corrections are needed for a translation to be possible (more than one passage is not understandable in the second part). When it was composed, in which milieu, how it became appended to the *Nirukta* (in the latter's secondary expanded form already including the *Par. I*) and how it was itself interpolated in some places (cf. notes B *ad* §§26, 29 = 13.39, 44) remain unclear. For the dating of the text, Sarup's argument according to which it must have been composed later than *Durga* since he did not comment on it, may not be as conclusive as it looks like: for it would have been normal for *Durga* not to comment a portion which was considered by scholars of his time as a purely 'additional' one (a mere *pariśiṣṭa*, not belonging to the true original work of Yāska). Such a supplement or appendix could nevertheless have already been in existence at his time (5th century? cf. Kahrs 1998: 14). The *Niruktasamuccaya* (1.3) could allude once to *Pariśiṣṭa* II (and/or to *Durga*; see Comet here below p. 136 and fn. 84), although it refers only to *Pariśiṣṭa* I as being at the end of the *Nirukta* (see fn. 14 above). Two important data must be taken into account for building up a relative chronology: on the one hand, the fact that the *Pariśiṣṭa* II comments on a stanza from the *Bhagavadgītā* (8.17; see §4 = 13.17), even if it is without naming it (but the source of the quoted stanzas is usually not named in the *Nir.*), and on the other hand, the fact that *Vijñāneśvara* in his *Mitākṣara* (early 12th century), *ad* YVS 3.83, quotes from the *Pariśiṣṭa* II as being "in the 18th section [actually the 19th *pāda* of the 13th *adhyāya*] of the *Nirukta*,"²⁴ showing therefore that his own ('tertiary') version of the *Nirukta* included it. The embryological part of the *Pariśiṣṭa* was also sometimes confused with the

²⁴ "jātaḥ sa vāyunā spr̥ṣṭo na smarati pūrvam janma maraṇam karma ca śubhāśubham" iti niruktasyāṣṭādaśe 'bhīdhanāt. Note the variant readings in *Nir.* 13.19 (= *Par. II* §6): *jātaś ca vāyunā spr̥ṣṭo na smarati janma maraṇam / ante ca śubhāśubham karmaitac charīrasya prāmānyam*.

Garbhopeniṣad (to which the text is close)²⁵ and, for the §§6-7 (13.19-20), has, later on, circulated in an independent way as the ‘Nirukta-Upaniṣad’ (cf. its edition as such).

4. The Niruktaśloka-vārttika

Even if it is not perfectly clear whether Yāska fully endorses the early Vedāntic view, in the broad sense of the term (cf. his ‘nominalistic monism’ according to the words of Visigalli here above), to which he alludes in Nir. 7, we have seen with the second Pariśiṣṭa that at least one of his followers did it for him in a quite explicit manner. In this respect, the case of the Niruktaśloka-vārttika is also noteworthy. This important work, edited for the first time in 1982 only, is authored by a certain Nīlakaṇṭha, a Vaidika *saṃnyāsin* from the village of Koṇṭṭayūr (modern Kondayur, near Deśamaṅgalam on the banks of the river Nīlā/Bharathappuzha) in Kerala, bearing the initiatory name of Padmapāda.²⁶ Despite the fact that this ambitious commentary (longer than Kumārila Bhaṭṭa’s *pūrva-Mīmāṃsaka śloka-vārttika*)²⁷ breaks off at Nir. 6.17, other relevant passages in Yāska’s text (e.g. Nir. 1.8: *brahma pari-vṛḥham/vṛdham sarvataḥ*)²⁸ may serve to judge about the metaphysical

²⁵ Cf. already Vijñāneśvara *ad* YVS 1.52: *tathā garbhopeniṣadi “etat śāṭkauśikaṃ śarīraṃ trīṇi pītṛtas trīṇi mātṛto ’sthisnāyumaḥjānaḥ pītṛtas tvaṇmāmsarudhirāṇi mātṛtaḥ” iti tatra tatrāvayavānvayapratipādanāt*; not in the GaU but, after *śarīraṃ*, close to Nir. 13.18 = §5 of the Par. II: *trīṇ mātṛtas trīṇ pītṛtaḥ | asthisnāyumaḥjānaḥ pītṛtaḥ | tvaṇmāmsaṣoṇitāni mātṛtaḥ* (this Mit. passage, which could be the direct source of JaiSa 47.45, cf. also MBh. 12,293.16-17, has escaped the attention of Smets 2013: 202-205, who, pp. 179-181, has shown that in Mit. *ad* YVS 3.78, the two quotations which, like in Aparārka’s com. *ibid.*, are ascribed to the GaU, *iti garbhopeniṣaddarśanāt*, are not to be found there but instead in the *Suśrutasaṃhitā*). Cf., later on, (16th century) Jīva Gosvāmin’s com. (Kramasaṃdarbha) *ad* BhgP 3,31.11, quoting extracts from Par. II §6: *tathā ceti nairuktamate ca trividhā janā labhyante – eke pūrva-pūrva-janma-mātraṃ smaranti | eke sāṅkhyayogādikam abhyasyanti | eke tu paramapuruṣam iti | yathoktaṃ tatraiva – “navame sarvāṅga-saṃpūrṇo bhavati” iti paṭhitvā*

“mrtaś cāhaṃ punarjāto jātaś cāhaṃ punarmṛtaḥ |”

ityādi tadbhāvanāpāthāntaram –

“avānmukhaḥ pīḍyamāno jantuś caiva [jantubhiś ca var. lect.] samanvitaḥ |

sāṅkhyayogaṃ samabhyaset puruṣam vā pañcaviṃśakam ||

tataś ca daśame māse prajāyate” ityādi | atra “puruṣam vā” iti vāśabdāt kasya cid eva bhagavajjñānam iti gamyate |

which in Viśvanātha’s com. becomes: *ata eva nairuktā api paṭhanti... puruṣam vā iti garbhopeniṣadvākyam.*

²⁶ He belonged to a famous family of Yajurveda scholars; well versed in the four Vedas, his father, Kīraśarman, performed sacrifices and was expert on rituals (*yajvā yajñaviśāradaḥ*), like his grandfather, Rudraśarman, who had performed several *yāgas*; he himself studied the Vedas before to become a *saṃnyāsin* and be given the name Padma by his Vedāntic preceptor. See Kunjunni Raja 1964: 252-253, commenting on the autobiographical colophon at the close of the third section = NSV 3,4.435-445 (pp. 521-522), the end of which is quoted here below (see fn. 37).

²⁷ For instance, *adhyāya* 1, *pāda* 1, devotes 882 *śloka*s to the commentary of Nir. 1.1-3.

²⁸ Vijayapāla (1982: 46) has noted for this passage the closeness of Padmapāda’s commentary with the one ascribed to Skanda-Maheśvara. Whereas Durga’s gloss *ad loc.* is: *ṛgadi paraṃ cobhayam api tat parivṛdham sarvāsu dikṣu*; Skanda-Maheśvara has (with the the root BRMH/VRH explained by VṚDH):

brahma hy evaṃ ṛgyajuḥsāmalakṣaṇam aparaṃ jagataḥ kāraṇam aparaṃ (/param var. lect.) annaṃ tat sarvaṃ parivṛddham sarvato ’nyataḥ |

ideas of this Padmapāda, who in the introductory *maṅgala* already equates the Agni-Vāyu-Sūrya triad²⁹ to the *jyotir ekaṃ tridhā sthitam*, and further seizes every opportunity offered by his source-text to engage in lengthy philosophical discussions on ontological or epistemological topics according to a final (Advaita-)Vedānta view.³⁰

For instance, on Nir. 3.12 presenting the double level (*adhidaivatam/adhyātmam*) of exegesis (cf. here above; note the use in NŚV of the term *adhidaivam* instead of *adhidaivatam* in Nir., the former being much more common in later sources), the problem of the double meaning of a single *mantra* is raised³¹:

adhidaivam ataś caivaṃ vyākhyātāṃ devatātmani |
rahasyajñānarūpatvād adhyātmam api yojyate ||319||
katham ekasya vākyasya dvāv arthāv iha saṃśritau |
dvayor api pratītatvād viśeṣānavadhāraṇāt ||320||

In this way, the *adhidaivam* level has just been explained [in relation] to the self of the deity. And since it consists of secret knowledge, the *adhyātmam* level too is being undertaken [for explanation]. How do we have two meanings for a single sentence here? [It is] because both [meanings] are justified [and] because there is no special emphasis [on one of them].

And the NŚV 1,3.83c-85b (pp. 130-131):

prasaṅgenaiva nirvakti brahma yat kāraṇaṃ param ||
tad dhi sarvagataṃ brahma pravṛddhaṃ karyārūpataḥ |
dehādyaṭmapravṛddhatvād brahmānnaṃ api kathyate ||
tathā karmapravṛddhatvād ṛgyajuḥsāmalakṣaṇam |

Kunjunni Raja (1964: 262) remarked that the author of the NŚV “does not seem to be older than Durga and Skandasvāmin, though he does not quote them.” Nonetheless (as just seen here), even if he does not refer to them by name, Vijayapāla (1982: 46-49) has shown that he “echoes Skanda-Maheśvara” or “refutes ‘with pleasant words’ views met with in the commentary of Skanda-Maheśvara” (Kahrs 1998: 22).

²⁹ On this *nairukta* triad, see Comet here below.

³⁰ On the eternity of the *ātman* (versus the perishability of the body), a quotation of Nir. 7.4 (discussed here above) is already made in NŚV 1,1.790d, just after having declared that the true eternity of the *ātman* has been established ‘in the Vedānta [scriptures]’ (pp. 87-88):

ity evaṃ kalpyate bhāvaḥ śarīram idam ucyate |
jananādir vikāro hi śarīrasyaiva nātmanaḥ ||787||
vikārair īdṛśair ātmā katham cid upayujyate |
nityatvād anyathā tasya vināśitvaṃ prasajyate ||788||
ātmanaś ca vināśitve śāstram etad anarthakam |
nityatvaṃ ātmanas tv evaṃ ucyate śāstrasiddhaye ||789||
sadbhāvinitiyat<v>e cāsya vedānteṣu vyavasthite |
tasyaiva stūyamānatvaṃ eka ātmeti (Nir.) vakṣyati ||790||

Just before (śl. 781-782), a reference appears to be made to Bhartṛhari’s concept of *sattā*, (supreme) ‘beingness/existence’ (cf. VP 3,1.33-34), called by some *mahāsāmānya*, the ‘great universal’ (the two concepts are seen equivalent by later commentators or pūrva-Mīmāṃsaka contradictors, cf. Śālikanātha, Jātinirṇaya PrP p. 99/2: *yo hi mahāsāmānyaṃ sattām saṅgirate so ’pi...*; and already Kumārila, ŚV 4 [pratyakṣa].114ab: *mahāsāmānyaṃ anyais tu dravyaṃ sad iti cocyate*), or, by other Vedāntins, *brahman* (Bhartṛhari himself says about this *sattā*, loc. cit. 34c: *sā nityā sā mahān ātmā*):

mahāsāmānyaṃ ity āhus sattām brahmeti cāpare ||782cd||

In a previous discussion on *pratyabhijñā*, the Buddhists are tackled (p. 76):

pūrvadrṣṭaṃ punardrṣṭaṃ ātmīyaṃ vā tadetaram |
bauddhā eva na jānanti jānanti paśavo ’pi tat ||676||

³¹ NŚV 3,2 (pp. 424-427). A first version of the translation here proposed for this passage and the next one was kindly prepared by Ilya Comet.

It is further solved by invoking several Upaniṣadic (*mahā-*)*vākyas* (here in italics)³² in support of the secondary character (*gauṇa*) of the difference (*bheda*, merely apparent), concluding with the enumeration of the three possible levels of interpretation and how they have to be used accordingly, with reference to Nir. 1.20 thereon (cf. fn. 13 above):

paramātmāmakāḥ sarve kṣetrajñā yady api sphuṭam ||338||
bhinnā eva tathāpy ete dehe 'haṁbhāvamohitāḥ |
tattvamasyādivākyais tu kṣetrajñāparamātmānoḥ ||339||
mukhyam ekatvam evoktaṁ bhedo gauṇas tathāśritaḥ |
adhyātmam cādhidaivam ca tathāikyam upapāditam ||340||
tad yo 'haṁ sa ca yaś cāyam ityādyair vacanaiḥ sphuṭam |
tatrābhyudayaakāmasya bhedenopāsanaṁ viduḥ ||341||
saguṇam nirguṇam caiva mumukṣor aikyatas tathā |
aḥam brahmeti vākyena tad aikyam pratipāditam ||342||
atha yo 'nyām itīdam ca bhedajñānasya vārakam |
ity ātmagatim ācaṣṭe (Nir.) mantrō 'yam svātmabodhanam ||343||
adhiyajñam tu mantrasya vyākhyānam kleśato yataḥ |
upekṣitam atas tasya vyākhyānam iti gamyate ||344||
pratimantram trayam vācyam ity artho na vivakṣitaḥ |
adhiyajñam kva cid vācyam adhidaivam tathā kva cit ||345||
adhyātmam ca kva cid vācyam dvitayam tritayam kva cit |
yad yājñadaivate (Nir. 1.20) vākyam saṁbhavotprekṣyam eva tat ||346||

Although it is [made] clear that all the individual selves belong to the nature of the Supreme Self, within the body they remain different, being misled by the sense of 'I'. Sayings like "Thou art that" have shown that the unity of the individual selves and the Supreme Self is what matters most, while their difference is secondary. Both [with the explanations] at the *adhidaivam* and at the *adhyātmam* levels, the unity has been proven. It is [made] clear with sayings such as "What I am he is" and "And this which is [the Supreme Self]". [In the same way,] for the one desirous of good result in seeking liberation, we know that there is meditation on both the qualified and the non-qualified [*brahman*], that is through the difference and through the unity. The unity is proven by the saying "I am *brahman*"; and the opposite [saying] "Now, he who [meditates upon] another [deity]" belongs to the knowledge involving the difference. "Thus he describes the course of the self" (Nir.): the *mantra* [under study] is a description of the individual self. As for the explanation at the *adhiyajñam* level, it is only logical that it has been left aside [here] because of [too great] a difficulty. This is not to say that all three [levels of explanation] should be given for every single *mantra*. At some place the *adhiyajñam* [explanation] should be given, at some other place the *adhidaivam*, at yet another place the *adhyātmam* — and in some instances one should explain two or three of these levels. The [Nir.] sentence "[The flower and fruit are either the meaning/knowledge] according/relating to the sacrifice and to the deity [, or the meaning/knowledge according/relating to the deity and to the Self]" has to be considered according to the possibility [of the context].

³² Respectively ChU 6,8,7 (*tat tvam asi*), AiĀ 2,2,4 (*tad yo 'haṁ so 'sau yo 'sau so 'haṁ*; commented by Śaṅkara in the longer version of his AiUBh, cf. David 2017), BĀU 2,5,1-14 (where the same formula *yaś cāyam... yaś cāyam adhyātmam* is repeated), BĀU 1,4,10 (*aḥam brahmāsmi* puis *atha yo 'nyām devatām upaste*). Note also the references of NŚV 3,2,300bc (*saiṣānandasya mīmāṃsā purā syād iti ca śruteḥ*), p. 422, to TU 2,8,1; 3,3,71d-72a (*prāṇann eveti ca śruteḥ / praṇo nāma bhavati*), p. 435, to BĀU 1,4,7; 3,3,99b (*satyam jñānam iti śruteḥ*) and 100c (*mṛttiketyādivākyena*), p. 438, to TU 2,1,1 (*satyam jñānam anantaṁ brahma*) and ChU 6,1,4 (...*mṛttikety eva satyam*); 3,3,220cd and 225 (...*ity evaṁ bṛhad-āranyakam...*) to BĀU 4,3,21 and 1,5,7.

The date of the NŚV remains uncertain. On the one hand, the work is assuredly no later than the 14th century, for it is quoted, at the very end of the same century, in the commentary (entitled *Gopālikā*) on Maṇḍana Miśra's *Sphoṭasiddhi* authored by Payyūr Bhaṭṭa Parameśvara [II].³³ What could correspond to an earlier quotation is found in the *Niruktasamuccaya* 1.3.³⁴ Noteworthy too, a reference is made in the NŚV to a Kerala king named Godavarman alias 'the Lion' (*siṃha*).³⁵ Pace Kunjunni Raja (1964: 261), this king can be identified, since not many kings of the Cera Perumāl dynasty of Makōtai/Mahodayapuram bear that name. According to the epigraphical research of M.G.S. Narayanan (2013: 67), it seems that between c. 913 and 943 AD there was a "ruler who had Kōta Kōta [= Goda(varman)] as his personal name and Kēraḷa Kēsari [(*āraṇya*-

³³ See Kunjunni Raja (1964: 256-260) for the list of these quotations. The NŚV is also quoted, later on, in Kellalūr Nīlakaṇṭha Somayājīn's commentary on the *Āryabhaṭīya*, for instance (t. 3, p. 161):

niruktavārtike sāmānyenāpy ukta[m] padmapādācāryena –

vidyāsthānāni nityāni teṣāṃ granthāḥ sakartṛkāḥ || iti [= NŚV 1,1.25ab, p. 5, incomplete]

And in the *Vacanamālā*, a sub-commentary on Viśvarūpa's commentary *Bālakrīḍā* on the *Yājñavalkyasmṛiti* (p. 4), again a work produced in Kerala:

tathā coktaṃ niruktavārtike –

boddhavyaṃ hi prayatnena mantrārthaṃ boddhum icchatām |

mantrārthaviśayaṃ jñānaṃ na vinā tena sidhyati || [= NŚV 1,1.2cd-3ab, p. 4; with var. *vinānena vidyate*]

³⁴ tathā cāhur nairuktikācāryāḥ –

ādyam naighaṇṭukaṃ kāṇḍam dvitīyam naigamaṃ tathā |

tṛtīyam daivatam kāṇḍam śāstram etat tridhā sthitam || [= NŚV 1,6.257cd-258ab, p. 217]

A verse very close (with variant reading in cd), but followed by four and a half other *śloka*s (not in the NŚV), is given by the 12th century Keralan commentator Ṣaḍguruśiṣya *ad* RVSAṇu 2.12 (Ṣaḍguruśiṣya's peculiar sequence, most probably composed by him, is itself quoted in full by Sāyana in the introduction of his RVBh, where it is said to come from the *anukramaṇikābhāṣya*, that is Ṣaḍguruśiṣya's work). Cf. Comet here below p. 133 and fn. 57.

³⁵ NŚV 3,4 (pp. 470-472):

siṃho' yaṃ keralo rājā godavarmeti bhāṣite |

siṃhenaivāsya sādṛśyaṃ [saṃla]panti vicakṣaṇāḥ ||12|| (in d the ms. has: ...patti, or ...vetti vicakṣaṇāḥ)

kutas tatpratrayas teṣāṃ na tāvac chandato bhavet |

siṃhaśabdasya vācya 'rthas tv āraṇyakesarī mṛgaḥ ||13||

kṣatriyasyābhiṣiktasya rājaśabdo 'pi vācakaḥ |

keralo godavarmāyam ity apy asya viśeṣaṇam ||14||

keralatvam na siṃhasya siṃhatvam keralasya vā |

viśeṣaṇaviśeṣyatvam na nīlotpalavat tayoh ||15||

(...)

siṃhena vidyate rājñāḥ sādṛśyaṃ godavarmaṇaḥ ||23cd||

tad evaitena vākyena siṃho 'yam iti gamyate |

(...)

śūraḥ prasahyakārī ca siṃho 'yaṃ saṃmato yathā |

tathā rājāyam ity arthaḥ siṃho rājeti gamyate ||28||

rājānam siṃhatulyaṃ yaḥ parasmai vaktum icchati |

siṃho rājeti nirdiśya kṛtī sampadyate 'py asau ||29||

pratipattuś ca vijñānam siṃhasādṛśyarañjitaḥ |

jāyate godavarmāyam iti siddham udīritam ||30||

]kesarin = *siṃha*] as his coronation name.”³⁶ Accordingly, we could tentatively date the NSV to the first half of the 10th century AD.

On the other hand, Nīlakaṇṭha-Padmapāda is clearly a disciple of Śaṅkara. Without going so far as declaring that he might be the ‘true’ Padmapāda (to whom is ascribed the Pañcapādikā), at least when becoming a *saṃnyāsin* he was given that same meaningful name by his revered *guru* — studying the scriptures and being initiated in Vedānta, he composed the *niruktaśloka-vārttika* in these circumstances, as he tells us at the end of the autobiographical colophon at the close of the third section.³⁷ Moreover, he adds then a kind of post-colophon where he refers directly to the great *ācārya*, quoting the latter’s consecrated *mantras* in one *śloka* followed by an ornate stanza dedicated to the same, and adding a precious, so far unnoticed, final *ārya* verse giving the time when the (Brahmasūtra-) *bhāṣya* was composed and, consequently, providing the best approximative date for Śaṅkara himself!

namo nārāyaṇāyāstu namo ’stu brahmaṇe sadā |
 namo maheśvarāyāstu gurubhyaś ca sadā namaḥ ||445c-f||
 iti bhavārṇavadīrṇasadātmatā-
 prathanavedaśiro’nvayalakṣaṇaḥ |
 kara{drg}bandhamunigrathitāgamam
 gamitavān bhagavān muniśaṅkaraḥ ||446||³⁸
 śrīmati vijayāditye vallabharāje jayaty ajātaripau |
 bhāṣyam bhagavacchaṅkaramukhāravindāt pravṛttam idam ||447||³⁹
 “Let there always be ‘Salutation to Nārāyaṇa!’, ‘Salutation to the *brahman*!’, ‘Salutation to Maheśvara!’, ‘Salutation to the *gurus*!’”
 Thus [said/proclaimed] the one thanks to whom both the overall meaning (*anvaya*) and the indirect meaning (or implication, *lakṣaṇā*) of the main texts of the Veda (*veda-śīras* = *śruti-śīras*) manifest (*prathana*) the true nature of the [one] Self (*sad-ātmātā*) scattered in the flood

³⁶ The same character appears to correspond to the Kerala prince (then not yet ruling) Goda(varman) *kerala-ketu* referred to in Mūṣikavaṃśa 12.52 (Unni 1980: 100-101, 235; Narayanan 2013: 97-98).

³⁷ NSV 3,4 (pp. 521-522):

padma ity aparām saṃjñām labdhavān sa guroḥ punaḥ |
 śrutvā kiṃ cit sa śāstrāṇām vedānteṣu kṛtāśramaḥ ||442||
 akaroc chraddhayā yukto niruktaśloka-vārttikam |
 padavākyapramāṇajñāḥ śraddhāvān anasūyakaḥ ||443||
 gurubhaktas tapasvī ca śakto voḍhum idam yataḥ |
 tasmin naighaṇṭukaṃ kāṇḍam samāptam idam añjasā ||444||

The same expression *padavākyapramāṇajñāḥ*, denoting the complete literate scholarship of the author, is used by Bhavabhūti in the introduction of his *Uttararāmacarita*, and by Śaṅkara in BSBh 1,1.5 (it does not necessarily refer in those cases, metaphorically, to the three corresponding involved disciplines themselves, that is grammar, Mīmāṃsā and logic, even if these authors display an excellent knowledge of the three).

³⁸ The beginning of the third quarter of this *drutavilambita* metre is incorrect (as hinted by Kunjunni Raja 1964: 254, whom I follow here for the variant reading °ronvaya- = °ro’nvaya- instead of °ronmaya- ed.): the third syllable should have been light. I suggest to correct the sequence into *karaṇa-bandha-* (with *karaṇa* meaning *karma*).

³⁹ I follow here the text given by Kunjunni Raja (1964: 254), *contra* the variant readings *arājaripau* and *bhāṣyam idam* (hypermetr.) of the edition.

of [multiple] existences, the holy Muni Śaṅkara, he who caused to die/decline the [other/previous] textual tradition arranged by the Munis in connection with the [ritual] act (? and therefore with *karman* and rebirths).

It is under the victorious [reign] of the glorious Vallabha king Vijayāditya, who has no enemy, that the Commentary (*bhāṣya*) has come out of the lotus face of the holy Śaṅkara.

To elaborate on what Kunjunni Raja (1964: 255) said about the last verse, we have to observe that the crucial information it gives is that a (viz. ‘the’/his famous) *bhāṣya*⁴⁰ was composed by Śaṅkara Bhagavān during the reign of a certain *vallabha* king called Vijayāditya. The epithet (*śrī-prthvī-*)*vallabha* was the usual one of the kings of the first Cālukya dynasty (they used it for styling themselves, and it was also used by their enemies, e.g. the Pallavas, for designating them). It is therefore difficult not to assume that the king named here must be Vijayāditya, who ruled from 696 to 733 AD.⁴¹

5. Conclusion

The Nirukta, the Nir. Pariśiṣṭa II and the Niruktaśloka-vārttika thus testify for a special connection between Vedānta and *nirvacana* traditions throughout the ages. Concerning the Pariśiṣṭa II, even if it is, for its contents, in several ways close to the early Upaniṣadic teachings, the absence here of explicit textual references to early (Vedic) Upaniṣads, never quoted as such, is noteworthy: this small *ātma-jijñāsā* remains built, like the Nirukta itself, as a commentary on (mainly ṚV) *mantras* only, differently from the ‘proto’ Brahma-sūtras (whatever they may have been, the BS originally aimed to resolve, from a monistic perspective, the discrepancies between statements of the few earliest Upaniṣads) or from the works of pre-Bhāvya or even pre-Śaṅkara Vedāntins (for whom the ‘Vedānta doctrine’, *vedānta-śāstra*, means at first the Upaniṣadic textual one)⁴².

⁴⁰ The *bhāṣya* here named cannot designate the NSV itself, as stressed on by Kunjunni Raja (1964: 255), “since we know [from the preceding autobiographical *śloka* 435 — *gārgyeṇa nīlakaṇṭhena sūnūnā kīraśarmaṇaḥ / naighaṇṭukam idaṃ kāṇḍaṃ vyākhyātam anupūrvaśaḥ //*, as well as from the other colophons, quoted by the same *ibid.* 252-254] that the author of the *Niruktaśloka-vārttika* is Nīlakaṇṭha alias Padmapāda or Padmabhaṅgavān, and since the *Vārttika* is never referred to as *Bhāṣya*.” The same author also remarks that within the NSV, “the text of Yāska’s work is generally referred to as *Bhāṣya* or *Niruktabhāṣya* and its author as Bhāṣyakṛt,” but of course it is not the work of Yāska which is here concerned.

⁴¹ Without entering here into a discussion on the much-debated question of the date of Śaṅkara (cf. Harimoto 2006), it may already be noted that the present date agrees with the (frequently referred to, but, unfortunately, nowhere critically published, as far as I know) Śringeri maṭha ‘record(s)’ according to which Śaṅkara was born in the 14th year of the rule of a king named Vikramāditya, since the Cālukya king Vikramāditya I reigned from 654/5 to 681 AD (see the close date of 670-700 AD reached, on the basis of relative chronology combined with the tradition of a young death, by Slaje 2007: 116 fn. 1; cf. also Bronkhorst 2007: 12 fn. 14).

⁴² See e.g. Ādiśeṣa’s Paramārthasāra st. 87 and Rāghavānanda’s com. *ad* st. 4 and 65. However, as noted by Bronkhorst (2007: 25-28), the (Vedic) Upaniṣadic reference is rather weak with the ‘not Mīmāṃsaka’ (which would here mean ‘not followers of the BS’) Vedāntins such as Gauḍapāda and Ādiśeṣa. Despite their non-

If the early Vedic Upaniṣads can be considered, strictly speaking, as constituting the very first ‘Vedānta’, it has been shown here that the use of the *adhyātmam* level of Vedic interpretation is even earlier; and this traditional point of view has also been preserved, and applied in a formalised manner, by the Nirukta for its own exegesis of meaningful Vedic *mantras*. It must have been a relevant aspect of the general hermeneutics of the *adhyātma-vada*, that is of the early, pre- or para-BS, Vedānta⁴³. This way of making sense of, and, in the same time, of meditating on, Vedic *mantras* at the *adhyātmam* level, probably lose its importance when the Vedānta evolved, on the firm basis of the BS, as an *uttara-mīmāṃsā*, in which the main concern were the Upaniṣadic *vākyas*. It is on the *mīmāṃsā* (dis- or re-)connection of the Vedānta tradition that scholarship has until now focused mainly⁴⁴, neglecting the connection of the latter with the Nirukta tradition through their common interest in the (true, ultimate or deepest) ‘meaning’ (*artha*) of the Veda itself.

However, it is still in this way that the self-declared (Advaita-)Vedāntin author of the later NŚV, who does sometimes make use of Upaniṣadic sayings, purports to “explain the meaning of the Nirukta according to both [Vedāntic?] wisdom and [Vedic?] scriptures” (*vyācakṣe hi niruktārthaṃ yathāprajñam yathāgamam*, 1,1.5cd). For him, the Nirukta, as the only *vedāṅga* (here close to becoming a *vedāntāṅga*) concerned with ‘significance’ (*arthavattva*), provides knowledge that reveals the true meaning of the Veda, whereas the (*pūrva*-)*mīmāṃsāṅga* merely deals with the ‘authoritativeness’ (*pramāṇatva*) of the same (1,1.6-11). He can therefore conclude (3,4.445ab) by repeating⁴⁵ that the Nirukta “has

ritual aim (cf. Gonda 1988: 1), the early Upaniṣadic (BĀU) statements are still (rightly) termed as *brāhmaṇas* in Śabara’s MSBh (cf. *mantrēṣu brāhmaṇe caiva śrutam ity abhidhīyate*, ŚāṅkhGS 1,2.5; Smith 2019), whereas Kumāṛila, ŚV 5[18:] *ātmavāda*, 114d, refers to them as *vedānta* (see Slaje 2007: 118, 131-150).

⁴³ See fn. 15 above. The use of *brahma-vādin* (VaikhGS 1,5.1; cf. *parabrahma-vādin* in Aśvaghoṣa’s Buddh. 12.42, hinted by Bronkhorst 2007: 32), instead of (*adhy*-)*ātma-pravāda/vid/-cintaka*, for designating the early Vedāntins, may be seen as the sign of the growing importance of the BS-*mīmāṃsā* tradition (in its primitive form, possibly also referred to in BhG 13.4cd).

⁴⁴ Bronkhorst’s volume (2007) is a good example.

⁴⁵ He had indeed already declared the same at the level of the single *mantra* in 1,1.2 (cf. also 1,1.880, p. 98):
 niruktam nāma vedāṅgam mantravyākhyānalakṣaṇam |
 boddhavyam hi prayatnena mantrārtham boddhum icchatām ||

Later on, the Advaitin Madhusūdhana Sarasvatī, in his commentary on Mahimnastotra st. 7, also describes the Nirukta as focused on *artha*, but here the reached meaning is said restricted to the (individual) words (*pada*) of the Vedic *mantras*, and this (analytical) knowledge is thus subordinate to the (higher, synthetic) knowledge of the (true, global) meaning of the (Veda-, that is Upaniṣadic *mahā*-)*vākyas* themselves, as provided by the Vedānta:

vaidikamantrapadānām arthajñānākāṅkṣāyām tadarthaṃ bhagavatā yāskena... niruktam āracitam | tatra ca nāmākhyātanipāto<pa>sargabhedena caturvidhaṃ nirūpya vaidikamantrapadānām arthaḥ pradarśitaḥ | mantrāṇām cānuṣṭheyārthaprakāśanadvareṇaiva karaṇatvāt padārthajñānādhīnatvāc ca vāk्यārthajñānasya mantrasthapadārthajñānāya niruktam avaśyam apekṣitam |

indeed to be known carefully by those who wish to know the (true) meaning of the Veda”
(*boddhavyaṃ hi prayatnena vedārthaṃ boddhum icchatā*).

The only science “which is an investigation into the meaning of the Upaniṣads as a whole” (*sarva-vedāntārtha-mīmāṃsanam*) and “whose aim is to elucidate the real nature of the essence of the Brahman and nothing else” (*brahmavastusvarūpamātrayāthātmyaprakāśanaparam*) is indeed the one of the BS, according to Śaṅkara’s disciple Sureśvara (in his *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi*, here quoted according to Bronkhorst 2007: 14).

Appendix: Nirukta-Pariśiṣṭa II

[om]

vyākhyātaṃ daivataṃ yajñāṅgaṃ ca | athāta ūrdhvamārgagatiṃ vyākhyāsyāmaḥ | “sūrya ātmā” [RV 1,115.1d] ity uditasya hi karmadraṣṭā | athaitad anupravadanti | athaitaṃ mahāntam ātmānam eṣarggaṇaḥ pravadaṭi (pravadanti B) | “indram mitraṃ varuṇam agniṃ āhuḥ” [RV 1,164.46a] iti | athaiṣa mahān ātmā+ātmajijñāsāyā+ātmānam provāca | “agnir asmi janmanā jātavedāḥ” [RV 3,26.7a], “aham asmi prathamajāḥ” [ĀrS 1.9; TB 2,8,8.1 etc.] ity etābhyām ||1|| [=13.14]

“agnir asmi janmanā jātavedāḥ ghr̥taṃ me cakṣur amṛtaṃ ma āsan |
arkas tridhātūrajaso vimāno 'jasro gharṃ havir asmi nāma ||” [RV 3,26.7]

“aham asmi prathamajā ṛtasya pūrvam devebhyo amṛtasya nāma |
yo mā dadāti sa id eva māvad aham annam annam adantam admi ||” [ĀrS 1.9; cf. TB 2,8,8.1, TĀ 9,10.6, TU 3,10.6 with var. nābhiḥ for nāma and mā'vāḥ for māvad] iti |
sa ha jñātvā prādurbabhūva | evaṃ taṃ vyājahāra+ayaṃ tam ātmānam adhyātmajam antikaṃ anyasmā ācacakṣveti ||2|| [=13.15]

“apaśyaṃ gopām anipadyamānam ā ca parā ca pathibhiś carantam |
sa sadhr̥cīṭṭi sa viśūcīr vasāna ā varīvarti bhuvaneṣv antaḥ ||” [RV 1,164.31, 10,177.3]
ā varīvarti bhuvaneṣv antar iti | athaiṣa mahān ātmā sattvalakṣaṇas tat paraṃ tad brahma tat satyaṃ tat salilaṃ tad avyaktaṃ tad asparśaṃ tad arūpaṃ tad arasaṃ tad agandhaṃ tad amṛtaṃ tac chuklaṃ (chukraṃ B) tan niṣṭho bhūtātmā | saiṣa bhūtaprakṛtiḥ ity eke | tat kṣetraṃ tajjñānāt kṣetrajñam anuprāpya nirātmakam | athaiṣa mahān ātmā trividho bhavati | sattvaṃ rajas tama iti | sattvaṃ tu madhye viśuddhaṃ tiṣṭhaty abhito rajastamasī | raja iti kāmadvēṣas tama ity avijñātasya viśudhyato vibhūtiṃ kurvataḥ kṣetrajñaprthaktvāya kalpate | prati(/pari B)bhāti liṅgo mahān ātmā tamoliṅgaḥ | vidyāprakāśaliṅgas tamaḥ⁴⁶ | api niścayaliṅga ākāśaḥ ||3|| [=13.16]⁴⁷

ākāśaguṇaḥ śabdaḥ⁴⁸ | ākāśād vāyur dviguṇaḥ sparśena | vāyor jyotiḥ triguṇaṃ rūpeṇa | jyotiṣa āpaś caturguṇaḥ rasena | adbhyaḥ pṛthivī pañcaguṇaḥ gandhena | pṛthivyā bhūtagrāmasthāvarajaṅgamāḥ | tad etad ahar yugasahasraṃ⁴⁹ jāgati | tasyānte suṣupsyann aṅgāni pratyāharati | bhūtagrāmāḥ pṛthivīm api yanti | pṛthivy āpaḥ | āpo jyotiṣam | jyotiḥ vāyur | vāyur ākāśam | ākāśo manaḥ | mano vidyā | vidyā mahāntam ātmānam | mahān ātmā pratibhā | pratibhā prakṛtiḥ | sā svapiti yugasahasraṃ rātriḥ | tāv etāv ahorātrāv ajasraṃ parivartate | sa kālas tad etad ahar bhavati |
“yugasahasraparyantam ahar yad brahmaṇo viduḥ |
rātriṃ yugasahasrāntāṃ te 'horātravido janāḥ ||” [BhG 8.17, cf. Manu 1.73, BD 8.98] iti ||4|| [=13.17]⁵⁰

taṃ parivartamānam anyo 'nupravartate | sraṣṭā draṣṭā vibhaktātīmātro 'ham iti gamyate | sa mithyādarśanedaṃ⁵¹ pāvakaṃ mahābhūteṣu cironvākāśād⁵² vāyoḥ prāṇaḥ (B; prāṇas S) cakṣuś ca vaktāraṃ ca tejaso 'dbhyaḥ snehaṃ pṛthivyā mūrthiḥ | pāṛthivāms tv aṣṭau guṇān vidyāt |

⁴⁶ S reads: pratibhāti liṅgo mahān ātmā tamoliṅgo vidyā prakāśaliṅgas tamaḥ |

⁴⁷ Note B *ad* §3: kāmadvēṣaḥ should have been kāmadvēṣau, and viśudhyataḥ must be corrected into viśuddhasya. The Sanskrit of the whole of this *Khaṇḍa* is corrupt and incorrect.

⁴⁸ Note S: cf. Manu 1.75.

⁴⁹ Note S: cf. BhG 8.16-19.

⁵⁰ Note B *ad* §4: we should read bhūtagrāmāḥ sthāvarajaṅgamāḥ for bhūtagrāmasthāvarajaṅgamāḥ, and suṣupsan for suṣupsyan; jyotiṣam should have been jyotiḥ; rātriḥ should be rātrim; and yad should be ye.

⁵¹ Double sandhi = sa mithyādarśanaḥ + idam > -a i- > e, or = sa-mithyā-darśane + idam > -a i- > e (sa.mithyā.darśane'idam Tokunaga).

⁵² ?; cironu.ākāśād Tokunaga.

trīn mātṛtas trīn pitṛtaḥ | asthisnāyumajjānaḥ pitṛtaḥ | tvañmāmsaṣṇitāni mātṛtaḥ | annaṃ (B; anna-S) pānam ity aṣṭau | so 'yaṃ puruṣaḥ sarvamayaḥ sarvajñāno 'pi kṛptaḥ ||5|| [=13.18]

sa yady anurudhyate tad bhavati | yadi dharmo 'nurudhyate tad devo bhavati (tad evodbhavati N) | yadi jñānam anurudhyate tad amṛto bhavati | yadi kāmam anurudhyate saṃcyavate (sañcaratām N) | imāṃ yoniṃ saṃdadhyāt | tad idam atra matam (manaḥ N) | śleṣmā (śleṣma- N) retasaḥ saṃbhavati⁵³ | śleṣmaṇo rasah | rasāc choṇitam | ṣṇitān mām̐sam | mām̐sān medaḥ | medasaḥ snāvā | snāvno 'sthīni | asthibhyo majjā | majjāto retaḥ | tad idam yonau retaḥ siktaṃ puruṣaḥ saṃbhavati | śukrātireke pumān bhavati | ṣṇitātireke strī bhavati | dvābhyāṃ samena napuṃsako bhavati | śukreṇa bhinnena yamo bhavati | śukraṣṇitasam̐yogān mātṛpitṛsam̐yogāc ca | tat (om. N) katham idam śarīraṃ paraṃ sam̐yamyate | saumyo bhavati | ekarātroṣitaṃ kalalaṃ bhavati | pañcarātrād budbudāḥ | saptarātrāt peṣī | dvisaptarātrād arbudaḥ | pañcaviṃśatirātraḥ svasthito (-rātrasvasthito B, -rātrasthito yonau N) ghano bhavati | māsamātrāt kaṭhino bhavati | dvimāsābhyantare śiraḥ saṃpadyate | māsatrāyeṇa grīvāvyādeśaḥ | māsacatuṣkeṇa tvagvyādeśaḥ | pañcame māse nakharomavyādeśaḥ | ṣaṣṭhe mukhanāsikākṣi śrotraṃ⁵⁴ ca saṃbhavati | saptame calana-samartho bhavati | aṣṭame buddhyādhyavasyati (°vasyate N) | navame sarvāṅgasam̐pūrṇo bhavati | “mṛtaś cāhaṃ punarjāto jātaś cāhaṃ punarmṛtaḥ | nānāyonisahasrāṇi mayoṣitāni yāni (mayā yāny uṣitāni N) vai || āhārā vividhā bhuktāḥ pītā nānāvidhāḥ stanāḥ | mātāro vividhā dr̥ṣṭāḥ pitarāḥ suhr̥das tathā || avāñmukhaḥ pīḍyamāno jantuś caiva samanvitaḥ | sām̐khyam̐ yogam̐ samabhyasyet (°bhyasya N) puruṣam̐ vā (hyperm.; om. N) pañcaviṃśakam̐ ||” [untraced] iti | tataś ca daśame māse prajāyate | jātaś ca vāyunā spr̥ṣṭo na smarati janma maraṇam (maraṇe B) | ante ca śubhāśubham̐ karmaitac charīrasya prāmānyam ||6|| [=13.19]⁵⁵

aṣṭottaram saṃdhiśatam aṣṭākapaḥ śiraḥ saṃpadyate | ṣoḍaśa vapāpalāni | nava snāyuśatāni | saptaśatam puruṣasya marmaṇām | ardhacatasro romāṇi koṭyaḥ | hṛdayam̐ hy aṣṭa kapālāni | dvādaśa kapālāni jihvā | vṛṣanau hy aṣṭa suparnau | tathopasthagudapāy etan (-gudayony etan N) mūtrapurīṣam̐ kasmād āhārapānasiktatvād anupacitakarmāṇāv (anupacati | karmāṇā N) anyonyam̐ jāyete - iti⁵⁶ | tam̐ vidyākarmaṇī samanvārebhete pūrvaprajñā ca | mahaty ajñānatamasī magno (B S add.; magnau S) jarāmaraṇakṣutpipāsāśokakrodha(droha add. N) lobhamohamadabhaya-matsaraharṣaviṣādersyāsūyātmakair dvandvair abhibhūyamānaḥ so 'smād ārjavam̐ javibhāvānām̐ tan (-bhāvanāntam̐ N) nirmucyate | so 'smāpānam̐ ('smāt pāpāt B, 'smādāntam̐ N) mahābhūmikāvac charīrān nimeṣamātraiḥ prakramya prakṛtir adhiparītya⁵⁷ (abhi- N) taijasam̐ śarīraṃ kṛtvā karmaṇo 'nurūpaṃ (karmaṇānurūpaṃ N) phalam̐ anubhūya tasya saṃkṣaye punar imaṃ lokaṃ pratipadyate ||7|| [=13.20]

atha ye himsām āśritya vidyām utsrjya mahat tapas tepire cireṇa vedoktāni vā karmāni kurvanti te dhūmam̐ abhisam̐bhavanti | dhūmād rātrim̐ | rātrer apakṣīyamāṇapakṣam̐ | apakṣīyamāṇapakṣād dakṣiṇāyanam̐ | dakṣiṇāyanāt pitṛlokaṃ | pitṛlokāc candramasam̐ | candramaso vāyum̐ | vāyor

⁵³ saṃcyavate... saṃbhavati: sañcaratām imāṃ yoniṃ sandadhyāt tad idam atra manaḥ śleṣmaretasah saṃbhavati | N.

⁵⁴ mukhanāsikākṣiśrotraṃ N.

⁵⁵ Note B ad §6: śukrātireke pumān bhavati: cf. AiB 2,5.5, 3,3.13. For the verses [1] mṛtaś cāhaṃ and [3] āhārā vividhā, cf. Garbhopaniṣad 4. The verse [3] avāñmukhaḥ pīḍyamāno is not traced [cf. notes 10-11-12 S]. The lines tataś ca daśame māse etc. are superfluous after the verses above, and better be omitted. The passage rasāc choṇitam... to śubhāśubham̐ karma is almost identical with Garbhopaniṣad 2-4 [cf. note 13 S].

⁵⁶ B reads: tathopasthagudapāyū | etan mūtrapurīṣam̐ kasmād | āhārapānasiktatvāt | anupacitakarmāṇāv anyonyam̐ jāyete iti |.

⁵⁷ Note B: prakṛtir adhiparītya – this should be prakṛtim adhiparītya.

vr̥ṣṭim | vr̥ṣṭer oṣadhayaś caitat bhūtvā tasya saṃkṣaye punar evemaṃ lokam pratipadya[n]te ||8||
[=13.21]⁵⁸

atha ye hiṃsām utsrjya vidyām āśritya mahat tapas tepire jñānoktāni vā karmāṇi kurvanti te
'rcir abhisambhavanti | arcīṣo 'haḥ (B S corr.; arcīṣarahā S) | ahna āpūryamānapakṣam |
āpūryamānapakṣād udagayanam | udagayanād devalokam | devalokād ādityam | ādityād
vaidyutam | vaidyutān mānasam | mānasah puruṣo bhūtvā brahmalokam abhisambhavanti | te na
punar āvartante | śiṣṭā dandaśūkā ya (B; yata S) idam na jānanti | tasmād idam veditavyam |
athāpy āha ||9|| [=13.22]⁵⁹

“na tam vi dātha ya imā jajānānyad yuṣmākam antaram babhūva |
nīhāreṇa prāvṛtā jalpyā cāsutrpa ukthaśāsaś caranti || [RV 10,82.7; VS 17.31; TS 4,6,2.2; KS
18.1; MS 2,10.2, 135.1]

na tam vidyayā viduṣo yam evaṃ vidvāṃso vadanti | akṣaram brahmaṇaspatim anyad
yusmākam⁶⁰ antaram anyad eṣām antaram babhūveti | nīhāreṇa prāvṛtās tamasā jalpyā cāsutrpa
ukthaśāsaḥ prāṇam sūryam yatpathagāmināś caranti | avidvāṃsaḥ kṣetrajñam anupravadanti |
athāho vidvāṃsaḥ kṣetrajño 'nukalpate | tasya tapasā sahāpramādam (B S corr.; mahāpramādam
S) eti | athāptavyo bhavati | tenāsaṃtatam icchet | tena sakhyam icchet | eṣa hi sakḥā śreṣṭhaḥ
saṃjānāti bhūtam bhavad bhaviṣyad iti | jñātā kasmāt | jñāyateḥ (jāyateḥ B) | sakḥā kasmāt |
sakhyateḥ | saha bhūtendriyaiḥ śerate | mahābhūtāni sendriyāṇi | prajñayā karma kārayatīti (vā add.
B) | tasya yadāpaḥ pratiṣṭhā | śīlam⁶¹ upāśama ātmā brahmeti sa brahmabhūto bhavati | sāksimātro
vyavatiṣṭhate 'bandho jñānakṛtaḥ |
athātmano mahataḥ prathamam bhūtanām adheyāny anukramiṣyāmaḥ ||10|| [=13.23]

haṃsaḥ | gharmah | yajñah | venah | meghah | kṛmiḥ | bhūmiḥ | vibhuḥ | prabhuḥ | śambhuḥ | rābhuḥ |
vardhakarmā | somah | bhūtam | bhuvanam | bhaviṣyat | āpaḥ | mahat | vyoma | yaśah | mahah |
svarṇikam | smṛtikam | svṛtikam | satīkam | satīnam | gahanam | gabhīram | gahvaram | kam | annam |
haviḥ | sadma | sadanam | ṛtam | yoniḥ | ṛtasya yoniḥ | satyam | nīram | haviḥ | rayiḥ | sat | pūrnam |
sarvam | akṣitam | barhiḥ | nāma | sarpiḥ | apaḥ | pavitram | amṛtam | induḥ | hema | svaḥ | sargāḥ |
śambaram | ambaram | viyat | vyoma | barhiḥ | dhanva | antarikṣam | ākāśam | āpaḥ | pṛthivī | bhūḥ |
svayambhūḥ | adhvā (adhva B) | puṣkaram | sagaraḥ (sagaram B) | samudraḥ | tapaḥ | tejaḥ |
sindhuḥ | arṇavaḥ | nābhiḥ | ūdhaḥ | vṛkṣaḥ | tat | yat | kim | brahma | vareṇyam | haṃsaḥ | ātmā |
bhavanti | vadhanti | adhvānam | yadvāhiṣṭhyā | śarīrāṇi | avyayam ca saṃskurute | yajñah | ātmā |
bhavati | yad enaṃ tanvate |
athaitam mātāntam ātmānam etāni sūktāny⁶² etā ṛco 'nupravadanti ||11|| [=13.24]⁶³

“somaḥ pavate janitā matīnām janitā divo janitā pṛthivyāḥ |
janitāgner janitā sūryasya janitendrasya janitota viṣṇoḥ ||” [RV 9,96.5]
somaḥ pavate janayitā matīnām janayitā divo janayitā pṛthivyā janayitāgner janayitā sūryasya
janayitendrasya janayitota viṣṇoḥ | (B/'longer version' add.): somaḥ pavate | somaḥ sūryaḥ
prasavanāt | janitā matīnām prakāśakarmanām ādityaraśmīnām | divo dyotanakarmanām

⁵⁸ Note B ad §8: oṣadhayaḥ should be oṣadhīḥ. [dhūmam abhisambhavanti... oṣadhayaḥ]: See BĀU 6,2.16. pratipadyate singular, should have been the plural pratipadyante, to agree with other verbs in the previous sentence [cf. add. note S: The reading of the text is pratipadyate but as the subject is ye I suggest pratipadyante].

⁵⁹ Note B ad §9: ['rcir ... brahmalokam abhisambhavanti]: Cf. BĀU 6.2.15. śiṣṭā dandaśūkāḥ etc.: Cf. BĀU 6,2.16.

⁶⁰ B reads: vadanty akṣaram brahmaṇaspatim | anyad yusmākam...

⁶¹ S reads pratiṣṭhāśīlam.

⁶² Note B: etāni sūktāni – There are no sūktas as such quoted below. But all the quotations are ṛiks only.

⁶³ S gives in footnotes references to the Nigh. for most of these words, as synonyms of earth, water, atmosphere etc.

ādityaraśmīnām | *prthivyāḥ* prathanakarmanām ādityaraśmīnām | *agner* gatikarmanām ādityaraśmīnām | *sūryasya* svīkaraṇakarmanām ādityaraśmīnām | *indrasyaiśvarya*karmanām ādityaraśmīnām | *viṣṇor* vyāptikarmanām ādityaraśmīnām | ity adhidaivatam | athādhyātmam | *soma* ātmāpy etasmād⁶⁴ evendriyānām janitety arthaḥ | api vā sarvābhir vibhūtibhir vibhūtata ātmā | ity ātmagatim ācaṣṭe (*om.* S) ||12|| [=13.25]

“*brahmā devānām padavīḥ kavīnām ṛṣir viprānām mahiṣo mṛgānām* | *śyeno gṛdhrānām svadhitir vanānām somaḥ pavitram atyeti rebhan* ||” [RV 9,96.6; VS 37.7; TĀ 10,10.4]

brahmā devānām iti | eṣa hi *brahmā* bhavati *devānām* devanakarmanām ādityaraśmīnām | *padavīḥ kavīnām* iti | eṣa hi *padam* vetti *kavīnām* kavīyamānānām ādityaraśmīnām | *ṛṣir viprānām* iti | eṣa hi *ṛṣiṇo* bhavati *viprānām* vyāpanakarmanām ādityaraśmīnām | *mahiṣo mṛgānām* iti | eṣa hi *mahān* bhavati *mṛgānām* mārgaṇakarmanām ādityaraśmīnām | *śyeno gṛdhrānām* iti | *śyena* ādityo bhavati śyāyater gatikarmanāḥ | *gṛdhra* ādityo bhavati gṛdhyateḥ sthānakarmano yata etasmiṃs tiṣṭhati | *svadhitir vanānām* iti | eṣa hi *svayam* karmāṇy ādityo *dhatte vanānām* vananakarmanām ādityaraśmīnām | *somaḥ pavitram atyeti rebhan* iti | eṣa hi *pavitram* raśmīnām atyeti | stūyamāna eṣa evaitat⁶⁵ sarvam akṣaram | ity adhidaivatam | athādhyātmam | *brahmā devānām* iti | ayam api *brahmā* bhavati *devānām* devanakarmanām indriyānām | *padavīḥ kavīnām* iti | ayam api *padam* vetti *kavīnām* kavīyamānānām indriyānām | *ṛṣir viprānām* iti | ayam apy *ṛṣiṇo* bhavati *viprānām* vyāpanakarmanām indriyānām | *mahiṣo mṛgānām* iti | ayam api *mahān* bhavati *mṛgānām* mārgaṇakarmanām indriyānām | *śyeno gṛdhrānām* iti | *śyena* ātmā bhavati śyāyater jñānakarmanāḥ | *gṛdhrānām* indriyāṇi gṛdhyater jñānakarmano yata etasmiṃs tiṣṭhanti (tiṣṭhati B) | *svadhitir vanānām* iti | ayam api *svayam* karmāṇy ātmani *dhatte vanānām* vananakarmanām indriyānām | *somaḥ pavitram atyeti rebhan* iti | ayam api *pavitram* indriyāṇy atyeti | stūyamāno ’yam evaitat sarvam anubhavati | ity (*om.* B) ātmagatim ācaṣṭe ||13|| [=13.26]

“*tisro vāca īrayati pra vahnir ṛtasya dhītiṃ brahmaṇo manīṣām* | *gāvo yanti gopatiṃ prcchamānāḥ somaṃ yanti matayo vāvaśānāḥ* ||” [RV 9,97.34]
vahnir ādityo bhavati | sa *tisro vācaḥ prerayaty* ṛco yajūṃṣi sāmāni | *ṛtasyā* dityasya karmāṇi⁶⁶ *brahmaṇo* matāni | eṣa evaitat sarvam akṣaram | ity adhidaivatam | athādhyātmam | *vahnir* ātmā bhavati | sa *tisro vāca īrayati prerayati* vidyām atibuddhimatām | *ṛtasyā* tmanāḥ⁶⁷ karmāṇi *brahmaṇo* matāni | ayam evaitat sarvam anubhavati | ity (*om.* B) ātmagatim ācaṣṭe ||14|| [=13.27]

“*somaṃ gāvo dhenavo vāvaśānāḥ*⁶⁸ *somaṃ viprā matibhiḥ prcchamānāḥ* | *somaḥ sutaḥ pūyate ajyamānaḥ some arkās triṣṭubhaḥ saṃ navante* ||” [RV 9,97.35]
eta eva *somaṃ gāvo dhenavo* raśmayo vāvaśyamānāḥ kāmāyamānā ādityaṃ yanti | evam eva *somaṃ viprā* raśmayo matibhiḥ prcchamānāḥ kāmāyamānā ādityaṃ yanti | evam eva *somaḥ sutaḥ pūyate ajyamānaḥ* | etam evārkaś ca triṣṭubhaś ca saṃnavante | tata etasminn āditya ekam bhavanti | ity adhidaivatam | athādhyātmam | eta eva *somaṃ gāvo dhenava* indriyāṇi vāvaśyamānāni kāmāyamānāny ātmānaṃ yanti | evam eva *somaṃ viprā* indriyāṇi matibhiḥ prcchamānāni kāmāyamānāny ātmānaṃ yanti | evam eva *somaḥ sutaḥ pūyate ajyamānaḥ* | imam evātmā ca sapta ṛṣayaś ca saṃnavante | tāny (imāny add. B) etasminn ātmany ekam bhavanti | ity ātmagatim ācaṣṭe ||15|| [=13.28]

“*akrān samudraḥ prathame vidharmañ janayan prajā bhuvanasya rājā* | *vṛṣā pavitre adhi sāno avye bṛhat somo vāvṛdhe suvāna induḥ* ||” [RV 9,97.40]

⁶⁴ S reads: soma ātmā | apy etasmād.

⁶⁵ B reads: atyeti stūyamānaḥ | eṣa evaitat.

⁶⁶ S reads: prerayati | ṛco yajūṃṣi sāmāny ṛtasyā dityasya karmāṇi.

⁶⁷ S reads: atibuddhimatām ṛtasyā tmanāḥ.

⁶⁸ vāvaśānāḥ = vā + avaśānāḥ.

atyakramīt samudra ādityaḥ parame vyavane⁶⁹ varṣakarmanā janayan prajā bhuvanasya rājā sarvasya rājā | vṛṣā pavitre adhi sāno avye bṛhat somo vāvṛdhe suvāna induḥ | ity adhidaivatam | athādhyātmam | atyakramīt samudra ātmā parame vyavane jñānakarmanā janayan prajā bhuvanasya rājā sarvasya rājā | vṛṣā pavitre adhi sāno avye bṛhat (mahat B) somo vāvṛdhe suvāna induḥ | ity ātmagatim ācaṣṭe ||16|| [=13.29]

“mahat tat somo mahiṣaś cakārāpām yad garbho ’vr̥ṇīta devān |
adadhād indre pavamāna ojo ’janayat sūrye jyotir induḥ ||” [RV 9,97.41]
mahat tat somo.mahiṣaś cakārāpām yadgarbho ’vr̥ṇīta devānām ādhipatyam adadhād indre pavamāna ojo ’janayat sūrye jyotir indur ādityaḥ | indur ātmā ||17|| [=13.30]⁷⁰

“vidhuṃ dadrāṇaṃ samane bahūnām yuvānaṃ santaṃ palito jagāra |
devasya paśya kāvyaṃ mahitvādyā mamāra sa hyaḥ sam āna ||” [RV 10,55.5; AVŚ 9,10.9]
vidhuṃ vidhamanaśīlaṃ dadrāṇaṃ damanaśīlaṃ yuvānaṃ candramasaṃ palita ādityo girati | sadyo mriyate sa divā samuditā | ity adhidaivatam | athādhyātmam | vidhuṃ vidhamanaśīlaṃ dadrāṇaṃ damanaśīlaṃ yuvānaṃ mahāntaṃ palita ātmā girati | rātrau mriyate | rātriḥ samuditā | ity ātmagatim ācaṣṭe ||18|| [=13.31]⁷¹

“sākamjānām saptatham āhur ekajaṃ ṣaḥ id yamā ṛṣayo devajā iti |
teṣām iṣṭāni vihi tāni dhāmaśaḥ sthātre rejante vikṛtāni rūpaśaḥ ||” [RV 1,164.15; AVŚ 9,9.16]
sahajātānām ṣaṇṇām ṛṣīnām ādityaḥ saptamaḥ | teṣām iṣṭāni vā kāntāni vā krāntāni vā gatāni vā matāni vā natāni vādbhiḥ saha saṃmodante | yatraitāni sapta ṛṣīnāni jyotiṃṣi tebhyaḥ para ādityaḥ | tāny etasminn ekaṃ bhavanti | ity adhidaivatam | athādhyātmam | sahajātānām ṣaṇṇām indriyāṇām ātmā saptamaḥ | teṣām iṣṭāni vā kāntāni vā krāntāni vā gatāni vā matāni vā natāni vānnena saha saṃmodante | yatremāni sapta ṛṣīnānīndriyāṇy ebhyaḥ para ātmā | tāny etasminn ekaṃ bhavanti | ity ātmagatim ācaṣṭe ||19|| [=13.32]⁷²

“striyaḥ satīs tām̐ u me puṃsa āhuḥ paśyad akṣaṇvān na vi cetad andhaḥ |
kavir yaḥ putraḥ sa imā ciketa yas tā vi jānāt sa pituṣ pitāsat ||” [RV 1,164.16; AVŚ 9,9.15] striya evaitāḥ śabdasparśarūparasagandha hāriṇyaḥ | tā amuṃ puṃśabde (-śabdena B) nirāhāraḥ prāṇa⁷³ iti paśyan kaṣṭān na vijānāty andhaḥ | kavir yaḥ putraḥ sa imā jānāti | yaḥ sa imā jānāti sa pituṣ pitāsat | ity ātmagatim ācaṣṭe ||20|| [=13.33]

“saptārdhagarbhā bhuvanasya reto viṣṇoḥ tiṣṭhanti pradiśā vidharmani |
te dhītibhir manasā te vi paścitaḥ paribhuvaḥ pari bhavanti viśvataḥ ||” [RV 1,164.36; AVŚ 9,10.17]

⁶⁹ Note B: parame vyavane cf. Nir. 13.10. prathame vidharman = parame vyavane.

⁷⁰ Note B ad §17: The second half of the ṛik is merely quoted in both the places and no explanation of it is given. indur ātmā – The ātmapara meaning of the ṛik is not given.

⁷¹ Note B ad §18: samane bahūnām, and devasya paśya kāvyaṃ mahitvādyā – These words are not explained in the comment.

⁷² Note B ad §19: teṣām iṣṭāni... to [2nd] ekaṃ bhavanti [and ity ātmagatim ācaṣṭe] – This whole passage is taken from Nir. 10.26, and is out of place here as it does not give the meaning of the second half of the stanza. Compare Nir. 10.26 (commenting on RV 10,82.2):

(...) teṣām iṣṭāni vā kāntāni vā krāntāni vā gatāni vā matāni vā natāni vādbhiḥ saha saṃmodante | yatraitāni sapta ṛṣīnāni jyotiṃṣi tebhyaḥ para ādityaḥ | tāny etasminn ekaṃ bhavanti | ity adhidaivatam | athādhyātmam | (...) | eṣām iṣṭāni vā kāntāni vā krāntāni vā gatāni vā matāni vā natāni vānnena saha saṃmodante | yatremāni sapta ṛṣīnānīndriyāṇy ebhyaḥ para ātmā | tāny etasminn ekaṃ bhavanti | ity ātmagatim ācaṣṭe | (...)

⁷³ Note B: tā amuṃ puṃśabdena nirāhāraḥ prāṇaḥ – This is unintelligible. It cannot be made out, of what words of the ṛik, this is the explanation.

saptaitān ādityaraśmīn ayam ādityo girati madhyasthānordhvaśabdaḥ | yāny asmiṃs tiṣṭhanti (tiṣṭhati S) *tāni dhītibhiś ca manasā ca viparyayanti paribhuvah⁷⁴ paribhavanti sarvāṇi karmāṇi varṣakarmanā | ity adhidaivatam | athādhyātmam | saptemānīndriyāṇy ayam ātmā girati madhyasthānordhvaśabdaḥ | yāny asmiṃs tiṣṭhanti tāni dhītibhiś ca manasā ca viparyayanti paribhuvah paribhavanti sarvānīndriyāṇi jñānakarmanā | ity ātmagatim ācaṣṭe ||21|| [=13.34]⁷⁵*

“*na vi jānāmi yadi vedam asmi niṇyah saṃnaddho manasā carāmi | yadā māgan prathamajā ṛtasyād id vāco āsnuve bhāgam asyāḥ ||*” [RV 1,164.37; AVŚ 9,10.15]
na vijānāmi yadi vedam asmi | niṇyah prasaṃnaddho manasā carāmi | na hi vijānan buddhim atah puṣṭiḥ putraḥ parivedayante 'yam ādityo 'yam ātmā ||22|| [=13.35]⁷⁶

“*apāṇ prāṇ eti svadhayā gr̥bhīto 'martyo martyenā sayoniḥ | tā śasvantā viśūcīnā viyantā ny anyam cikyur na ni cikyur anyam ||*” [RV 1,164.38; AVŚ 9,10.16]
apāñcayati prāñcayati⁷⁷ svadhayā gr̥bhīto⁷⁸ 'martya ādityo martyena candramasā saha | tau śasvadgāminau viśvagāminau bahugāminau vā⁷⁹ | paśyaty ādityam⁸⁰ na candramasam | ity adhidaivatam | athādhyātmam | apāñcayati prāñcayati svadhayā gr̥bhīto 'martya ātmā martyena manasā saha | tau śasvadgāminau viśvagāminau bahugāminau vā | paśyaty ātmānam na manah | ity ātmagatim ācaṣṭe ||23|| [=13.36]

“*tad id āsa bhuvaneṣu jyeṣṭham yato jajña ugras tveṣanṛmṇah | sadyo jajñāno ni riṇāti śatrūn anu yaṃ viśve madanty ūmāḥ ||*” [RV 10,120.1]
tad bhavati bhūteṣu bhuvaneṣu jyeṣṭham ādityam⁸¹ yato jajña ugras tveṣanṛmṇo dīptinṛmṇah | sadyo jajñāno niriṇāti śatrūn iti | niriṇātiḥ (riṇātiḥ S) prītikarmā dīprikarmā vā | anumadanti yaṃ viśva ūmāḥ⁸² | ity adhidaivatam | athādhyātmam | tad bhavati bhūteṣu bhuvaneṣu jyeṣṭham avyaktam yato jāyata ugras tveṣanṛmṇo jñānanṛmṇah | sadyo jajñāno niriṇāti śatrūn iti | niriṇātiḥ (riṇātiḥ S) prītikarmā dīptikarmā vā | anumadanti yaṃ sarva ūmāḥ | ity ātmagatim ācaṣṭe ||24|| [=13.37]

“*ko adya yuṅkte dhuri gā ṛtasya śimīvato bhāmino durhṛṇāyūn | āsann iṣūn hr̥tsvaso mayobhūn ya eṣāṃ bhr̥tyām ṛnadhat sa jīvāt ||*” [RV 1,84.16]
ka ādityo dhuri gā yuṅkte raśmīn karmavato bhānumato durādharṣān asūnyasunavanti+iṣūn iṣūnanvanti mayobhūni sukhabhūni | ya imaṃ sambhṛtaṃ veda katham sa jīvati | ity adhidaivatam | athādhyātmam | ka ātmā dhuri gā yuṅkta indriyāṇi karmavanti bhānumanti durādharṣān⁸³ asūnyasunavanti+iṣūn iṣūnavanti mayobhūni sukhabhūni | ya imāni sambhṛtāni (imaṃ sambhṛtaṃ S) veda ciraṃ sa jīvati | ity ātmagatim ācaṣṭe ||25|| [=13.38]

⁷⁴ B reads: viparyayanti | paribhuvah.

⁷⁵ Note S ad §21 (concerning the restoration of the text from the comparison of the shorter and longer recensions): (...) a comparison of these two parts [of the passage, viz. the commentary relating to the supreme deity, and the one relating to the supreme soul] shows that the same words are repeated, except that *indriyāṇi* corresponds to the rays and actions, *ātmā* to the sun (...).

⁷⁶ Note S ad §22: [only] the Mss. of the longer recension (...) add the second hemistich of the [RV] stanza. Notes B: See Nir. 7.3 for *na vi jānāmi yadi vedam asmi. na hi vijānan buddhim atah puṣṭiḥ putraḥ parivedayante* – This is unintelligible.

⁷⁷ Note B: *apāñcayati*, *prāñcayati* – Cf. ‘*añcu acū vā aci vā gamane*’ – Dhātup. 1.887. Thus *añc* is a root of the first conjugation only, and not of the tenth as the *bhāṣya* has taken it.

⁷⁸ Note B: *gr̥bhītaḥ* should have been *gr̥hītaḥ*.

⁷⁹ Note B: The *vā* after *bahugāminau* is superfluous.

⁸⁰ Note B: *paśyaty ādityam* – *paśyati* being the explanation of *cikyuh* in the ṛik, should have been in the plural.

⁸¹ Note B: *ādityam* should be *ādityaḥ*.

⁸² Note B: *ūmāḥ* – This word is unintelligible.

⁸³ Note B: *durādharṣān* should have been *durādharṣāṇi*.

“*ka īṣate tujyate ko bibhāya ko maṁsate santam indram ko anti | kas tokāya ka ibhāyota rāye 'dhi bravat tanve ko janāya* ||” [RV 1,84.17]
*ka eva gacchati ko dadāti ko bibheti ko maṁsate santam indram | kas tokāya+apatyāya mahate ca no raṇāya ramaṇīyāya darśanīyāya*⁸⁴ ||26|| [=13.39]

“*ko agnim īṭṭe haviṣā ghr̥tena srucā yajātā ṛtubhir dhruvebhiḥ | kasmai devā ā vahān āśu homa ko maṁsate vītihoṭraḥ sudevaḥ* ||” [RV 1,84.18]
ka ādityam pūrayati (pūjayati B) haviṣā ca ghr̥tena ca srucā yajātā ṛtubhir dhruvebhir iti | kasmai devā āvahān āśu homārthān | ko maṁsate vītihoṭraḥ sudevaḥ kalyāṇadevaḥ | ity adhidaivatam | athādhyātman | ka ātmānam pūrayati (pūjayati B) haviṣā ca ghr̥tena ca srucā yajātā ṛtubhir dhruvebhir iti | kasmai devā āvahān āśu homārthān | ko maṁsate vītihoṭraḥ suprajñāḥ kalyāṇa-prajñāḥ | ity ātmagatim ācaṣṭe ||27|| [=13.40]

“*tvam aṅga pra śaṁsiṣo devaḥ śaviṣṭha martyam | na tvad anyo maghavann asti marḍitendra bravāmi te vacaḥ* ||” [RV 1,84.19]
*tvam aṅga*⁸⁵ *praśaṁsīr devaḥ śaviṣṭha martyam | na tvad anyo asti maghavan*⁸⁶ *pātā vā pālayitā vā*⁸⁷ *jetā vā sukhayitā vā | indra bravāmi te vaca iti stutiyuktam (-saṁyuktam B)* ||28|| [=13.41]

“*haṁsaḥ śuciṣad vasur antarikṣasad dhotā vediṣad atithir duroṇasat | nṛṣad varasad ṛtasad vyomasad abjā gojā ṛtajā adriajā ṛtam* ||” [RV 4,40.5; VS 10.24, 12.14]
haṁsa iti | haṁsāḥ sūryaraśmayāḥ | paramātmā param jyotiḥ | pṛthivī vyāpteti (B; pṛthivyāpteti S) vyāptam sarvaṁ vyāptam vananakarma(nān B)+abhyāsenā+ādityamaṇḍaleneti | tyajatīti (tyayatīti B) lokāḥ | tyajatīti (tyayatīti B) haṁsaḥ (haṁsayan B) | tyajantīti (tyayatīti B) haṁsāḥ paramahaṁsāḥ | paramātmā sūryaraśmibhiḥ prabhūtagabhīra(B; gabhīta S)vasatīti | tribhir vasatīti vā | vahnir vasatīti vā | raśmir vasatīti vā | suvarṇaretāḥ pūṣā garbhāḥ | riphir iti riphātā (ribheti ribhantā B) camakuṭilāni (vana-ku° B) kuṭantā rephantā(ribhantā B)+antarikṣam (°kṣā- B) cared artheti (caret pathā B) | antarikṣam (°kṣā B) caratīti (carad iti B) divi | bhumi(bhuvi B)gamanam vā | sva(su B)bhānuḥ suprasūto(bhūto B) hotā (om. B) | hotādityasya gatā bhavanti | atithir duroṇasat | (sarve duroṇasad dravam add. B) | ravanti (om. B) sarve rasās cikīrṣayanti (vikarṣayati B) | raśmibhiḥ (raśmir B) cikīrṣayantīti vā (vikarṣayati B) | vahnir vikarṣayati | natam (vananam B) bhavatīty (bhavati B) aśvagojā adrigojā dhana(dharitri B)gojāḥ sarvagojātīrca iti tejo bahujo śabdo bhavati (sarve gojā ṛtajā bahuśabdā bhavanti B) | nigamo nigamavyo (nigamavyati B) bhavanty eṣa nirvacanāya ||29|| [=13.44]⁸⁸

“*dvā suparṇā sayujā sakhāyā samānam vṛkṣam pari śasvajāte | tayor anyah pippalaṁ svādv atty anaśnann anyo abhi cākaṣṭi* ||” [RV 1,164.20; AVŚ 9,9.20]
dvaṁ dvaṁ pratiṣṭhitau sukr̥tau dharmakartārau | duṣkr̥tam pāpam parisārakam ity ācakṣate | suparṇā sayujā sakhāyety ātmānam durātmānam paramātmānam pratyuttiṣṭhati | śarīra eva taj jāyate vṛkṣam | ṛkṣam (rakṣa B) śarīram | vṛkṣe (vṛkṣam B) pakṣau pratiṣṭhāpayati | tayor anyad

⁸⁴ Note B: *mahate ca no raṇāya ramaṇīyāya darśanīyāya* – This is the explanation of *mahe raṇāya cakṣase* RV 10,9.1c, for which see Nir. 9.27 [...*mahate ca no raṇāya ramaṇīyāya darśanīyāya*...]; and we cannot understand why it is inserted here. As in the case of other ṛiks in this adhyāya, we have not here the *ādityapara* and *ātmapara* explanations. The ṛik therefore seems to be a later addition to the adhyāya.

⁸⁵ Note B: *tvam aṅga* – The *ādityapara* and the *ātmapara* meanings are not given in the case of this ṛik too.

⁸⁶ Note B: *asti maghavan* – The order of the words in the ṛik is *maghavann asti*. It is changed in the bhāṣya, which is against the practice of Yāska.

⁸⁷ Note B: *pātā vā pālayitā vā* – These words are interpolated here from the explanation of the word *pāti*.

⁸⁸ The place of this section is according to B. See its different place in S, after 32. The sentencing is according to S (compare the different sentencing of B).

Note B: All bhāṣya from *pṛthivī vyāpteti* onwards is meaningless and the language used is ungrammatical. Besides it does not explain the words of the ṛik. The whole seems to be a later interpolation.

bhuktvā+annam (anyad S) *anaśnann* anyāṃ sarūpatām salokatām aśnute | ya evaṃ vedān (vidvān B)⁸⁹ *anaśnann anyo 'bhiṇṇaśīti* | ity ātmagatim ācaṣṭe ||30|| [=13.42]

“ā yāhīndra pathibhir īḷitebhir yajñam imam no bhāgadheyaṃ juṣasva |
trptām jahur mātulasyeva yoṣā bhāgas te paitṛṣvaseyī vapām iva ||” [RVKh 2,14.6 (7,55.10)]
āgamiṣyanti śakro devatās tās tribhir tīrthebhiḥ śakrapratarair īḷitebhis tribhis tīrthair yajñam imam
no yajñabhāgam agnīṣomabhāgāv indro juṣasva | trptām evaṃ mātulayogakanyābhāgam sartṛkeva
sā yā devatās tās tatsthāne śakraṃ nidarśanam ||31|| [=13.4X]⁹⁰

“vipraṃ viprāso 'vase devaṃ martāsa ūtaye |
agniṃ gīrbhir havāmahe ||” [RV 8,11.6]
vipraṃ viprāso 'vase viduḥ | veda vindater veditavyam | vimalaṃ śarīraṃ (vimalaśarīreṇa B)
vāyunā | vipras tu (hṛt- B) padmanilaya (sthita B) ṃ hṛdisthitam (om. B) akārasaṃhāritam (-saṃ-
hitam B) ukāraṃ pūrayan (pūrayen B) makāranilayaṃ gamayati (gataṃ B) | vipraṃ⁹¹ prāṇeṣu
binduḥ siktaṃ (bindusiktaṃ B) vikasitaṃ vahnitejaḥ prabhuṃ (-prabhaṃ B) kanakaṃ (kanaka- B)
padmeṣv amṛtaśarīraṃ amṛtajātasthitam amṛtavādām (-vācām B) ṛtamukhā (-mukhe B) vadanti |
agniṃ gīrbhir havāmahe | agniṃ saṃbodhayet “agniḥ sarvā devatāḥ” [KS 12.1; AiB 1,1.1] iti |
tasyottarā bhūyase nirvacanāya ||32|| [=13.43]⁹²

“jātavedase sunavāma somam arātīyato ni dahāti vedāḥ |
sa naḥ parṣad ati durgāṇi viśvā nāveva sindhum duritāty agniḥ ||” [RV 1,99.1]
jātavedasa iti | jātam idam sarvaṃ sacarācaram sthityutpattipralayanyāyena(+ā/acchāya B pro
+arcāya) jātavedasyāṃ vaivaṃ jātavedase 'rcāya (jāta... om. B)⁹³ | sunavāma somam iti | prasavāya
(prasavena B)+abhiṣavāya somam rājānam amṛtam | arātīyato yajñārtham iti smo (°thamanismo S)
nirdahāti niścayena (niścaye nidahāti B) dahati bhasmīkaroti | somo dadad ity arthaḥ | sa naḥ
parṣad ati durgāṇi viśvāni (om. B) durgamāni (°gamanāni B) sthānāni nāveva sindhum | nāvā
sindhum (om. B) yathā yaḥ (om. B) kaścit kaṇadhāro nāvā (nāveva B) sindhoḥ syandamānānam
(syandanān B) nadīm jaladurgām mahākūlām tārayati | duritāty agnir iti | duritāni tārayati |
tasyaiṣāparā bhavati ||33|| [=13.46]⁹⁴

“idam te 'nyābhir asamānam adbhīr yāḥ kās ca sindhum pra vahanti nadyaḥ |
sarpo jīrṇām iva tvacaṃ jahāti pāpaṃ saśirasko 'bhyupetya ||” [untraced]
idam te 'nyābhir asamānābhir⁹⁵ yāḥ kās ca sindhum patim kṛtvā nadyo vahanti | sarpo jīrṇām iva
sarpas⁹⁶ tvacaṃ tyajati | pāpaṃ tyajanti⁹⁷ | āpa āpnoteḥ | tāsām eṣā bhavati⁹⁸ ||34|| [=13.4Y]⁹⁹

⁸⁹ B reads: aśnute ya evaṃ vidvān |.

⁹⁰ No proper number for this section in S.

Note B: The second half of the ṛik is very difficult to interpret and possibly have no connection as regards the meaning with the first half. Beside the ṛik is out of place in this adhyāya as it cannot yield the ātmāpara meaning.

Note S: The entire section is omitted by MSS of the shorter recension.

⁹¹ B reads: ...gataṃ vipraṃ....

⁹² Note B ad §32: The bhāṣya does not explain the ṛik.

⁹³ Note B: *acchāya* or *ācchāya* – The meaning of this word is not clear [see S = *arcāya*, written *arccāya* in Mss.; the passage omitted by B is given in brackets by S because it is omitted by several Mss.].

⁹⁴ The place of this section is according to B.

⁹⁵ Note B: The bhāṣya wrongly reads *asamānābhiḥ* for *asamānam adbhīḥ* of the [untraced] ṛik.

⁹⁶ Note B: *sarpo jīrṇām iva sarpaḥ* – one of the two *sarpa* words is superfluous.

⁹⁷ Note B: *pāpaṃ tyajanti* – This should be *pāpaṃ tyajati*.

⁹⁸ Note B: *tāsām eṣā bhavati* – These words serve no purpose here and should be omitted.

⁹⁹ No proper number in S for this section, which is omitted by several Mss.

“tryambakaṃ yajāmahe sugandhiṃ puṣṭivardhanam |
 urvārukam iva bandhanān mṛtyor mukṣīya mām ṛtāt || [RV 7,59.12]
 tryambako rudrah | taṃ tryambakaṃ yajāmahe sugandhiṃ | sugandhiṃ suṣṭhugandhiṃ | puṣṭi-
 vardhanam puṣṭikārakam iva¹⁰⁰ | urvārukam iva phalaṃ bandhanād ārodhanān mṛtyoḥ sakāśān
 muñcasva mām | kasmād iti¹⁰¹ | eṣāparā (eṣām itareṣāparā B) bhavati¹⁰² ||35|| [=13.45]¹⁰³

“śataṃ jīva śarado vardhamānaḥ śataṃ hemantān chatam u vasantān |
 śataṃ indrāgnī savitā bṛhaspatiḥ śatāyusā haviṣemaṃ punar duḥ ||” [RV 10,161.4]
 śataṃ jīva śarado vardhamāna ity api nigamo bhavati | śataṃ iti | śataṃ dīrgham āyuh¹⁰⁴ | maruto
 mām (maruta enā B) vardhayanti | śataṃ (enam add. B) eva śataṃ ātmānam (śatātmānam B)
 bhavati¹⁰⁵ | śataṃ anantaṃ bhavati | śataṃ aiśvaryam bhavati | śataṃ iti | śataṃ dīrgham āyuh ||36||
 [=13.47]

“mā te rādhāṃśi mā ta ūtayo vaso 'smān kadā canā dabhan |
 viśvā ca na upa mimīhi mānuṣa vasūni carṣaṇibhya ā ||” [RV 1,84.20]
 mā ca te dhānāni (dhāmāni B) mā ca te kadā canā (ca naḥ B) sariṣuh | sarvāṇi prajñānāny
 upamānāya manuṣyahito 'yam ādityo 'yam ātmā | athaitad anupravadati (-vadanti B) | athainaṃ
 (°aitam B)¹⁰⁶ mahāntam ātmānam eṣarggaṇaḥ pravadati | vaiśvakarmaṇo (°ṇe B) “devānām nu
 vayaṃ jānā” [RV 10,72.1a] “nāsad āsīn no sad āsīt tadānīm” [RV 10,129.1a] iti ca |
 saiṣā+ātmajijñāsā | saiṣā sarvabhūtajijñāsā | brahmaṇaḥ sāṣṭim (sāriṣṭam B) sarūpatām salokatām
 gamayati ya evam veda ||
 namo brahmaṇe | namo mahate bhūtāya | (namaḥ pāraskarāya add. B)¹⁰⁷ namo yāskāya | brahma
 śuklamasīya | brahma śuklamasīya ||37|| [=13.48]

[|| iti pariśiṣṭam ||]

¹⁰⁰ Note B: *puṣṭikārakam iva* – The *iva* in this is useless.

¹⁰¹ Note B: *kasmād iti* – The words should better be read before *mṛtyoḥ sakāśāt*.

¹⁰² Note B: *eṣām itareṣāparā bhavati* – Roth’s reading is *eṣāparā bhavati*; the syllable *mitareṣā* are wrongly inserted and must be omitted. [See the current transition formula *tasya/teṣām/tāsām/tayor eṣā (aparā) bhavati* used in Nir. 2.19-21, 7.15, 8.14-20, 9.1-40, 10.2-46 etc.; here above at the end of §§33-34]

¹⁰³ The place of this section is according to B.

¹⁰⁴ Note B: *śataṃ iti śataṃ dīrgham āyuh* – The bhāṣya explains the word *śataṃ* in the ṛik in this way; but there *śataṃ* qualifies *śaradaḥ*, *hemantān* and *vasantān*.

¹⁰⁵ Note B: *maruta enā vardhayanti* and *śataṃ enam eva śatātmānam bhavati* are explanations which correspond to no word in the ṛik.

¹⁰⁶ Note B: *atha* should be *iti* as the group treating the ātmapara ṛiks ends here.

¹⁰⁷ Note B: *namaḥ pāraskarāya* – Does this show that the author of this adhyāya was Pāraskara?

References

Primary Sources

- AiĀ: Aitareya-Āraṇyaka.
AiB: Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa.
AiU: Aitareya-Upaniṣad.
AiUBh: Śaṅkara's Bhāṣya on AiU.
ĀrS: Āraṇya-Saṃhitā of the Sāmaveda, ed. Jibananda Vidyasagara, Calcutta, 1873.
Āryabhaṭīya of Āryabhaṭa, with Kellalūr Nīlakaṇṭha Somayājīn's commentary, t. 3, ed. S. Kunjan Pillai, *Trivandrum Sanskrit Series* 185, 1957.
AVP: Atharvaveda-Saṃhitā, Paippālada rec.
AVŚ: Atharvaveda-Saṃhitā, Śaunaka rec.
BĀU: Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad.
BĀUBh: Śaṅkara's Bhāṣya on BĀU.
BhG: Bhagavad-Gītā.
BhgP: Bhāgavata-Purāṇa.
BD/Bṛh.D.: Bṛhaddevatā.
BS: Brahma-Sūtra.
BSBh: Śaṅkara's Bhāṣya on BS.
Buddh.: Aśvaghoṣa's Buddhacarita.
ChU: Chandogya-Upaniṣad.
GaU: Garbha-Upaniṣad.
GoB: Gopatha-Brāhmaṇa.
JaiSa: Jaiminīyasamhitā of the Brahmāṇḍa-Purāṇa. See Smets 2013.
JUB: Jaiminīya-Upaniṣadbrāhmaṇa.
KauĀ: Kauṣītaki-Āraṇyaka.
KauB: Kauṣītaki-Brāhmaṇa.
KauU: Kauṣītaki-Upaniṣad.
KeU: Kena-Upaniṣad.
KS: Kāṭhaka-Saṃhitā of the Yajurveda.
KU: Kaṭha-Upaniṣad.
KUBh: Śaṅkara's Bhāṣya on KU.
Mahimnastotra of Puṣpadanta with the commentary of Madhusūdhana Sarasvatī, 5th ed. Pandurang Jawaji, Bombay : Nirnaya Sagar Press, 1922.
Mūṣikavaṃśa of Atula, ed. K. Raghavan Pillai, *Trivandrum Sanskrit Series* 246, 1977.
Manu: Mānava-Dharmaśāstra.
MBh: Mahābhārata (cr. ed.)
Mit.: Mitākṣarā. See YVS.
MS: Maitrāyaṇī-Saṃhitā of the Yajurveda.
MSBh: Śabara's Bhāṣya on Mīmāṃsāsūtra.
N: Niruktopeniṣad, ed. C. Kunhan Raja, *Aprakaśitā Upaniṣadaḥ*, Adyar, 1933.
Nigh.: Nighaṇṭu. See Nir.
Nir.: Nirukta.
B/Durga = ed. H. M. & R. G. Bhadkamkar, *The Nirukta of Yāska (with Nighaṇṭu)*, edited with Durga's commentary (Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series, 73 & 85), Bombay, 1918 & 1942 (repr. 1985 & 2019).

- S = ed. Lakshman Sarup, *The Nighaṇṭu and the Nirukta, the oldest Indian treatise on etymology, philology and semantics*, [vol. 3:] *Sanskrit Text*. University of Panjab, 1927 (repr. with the vols of intr., trans. & ind., Delhi : Motilal Banarsidass, 1962).
- Skanda-Maheśvara = *Fragments of the Commentaries of Skandasvāmin and Maheśvara on the Nirukta*, ed. Lakshman Sarup, 3 vols, University of Panjab, 1927-1928, 1931, 1934.
- Tokunaga = the input of Nir. B/S by Muneo Tokunaga on GRETIL.
- NS: Niruktasamuccaya, ed. C. Kunhan Raja, *Annals of Oriental Research [of the] University of Madras*, vol. 2, 1938.
- NŚV: Niruktaśloka-vārttika. See Vijayapāla 1982.
- Par.: Pariśiṣṭa.
- Paramārthasāra of Ādiśeṣa, with Rāghavānanda's commentary, ed. T. Gaṇapati Śāstrī, *Trivandrum Sanskrit Series* 12, 1911.
- PrP: Śālikanātha's *Prakaraṇapañcikā*, ed. A. Subrahmanya Sastri, *Banaras Hindu University Darśana Series* 4, 1961.
- RV: R̥gveda-Saṃhitā.
- RVBh: Sāyaṇa's Bhāṣya (Vedārthaprakāśa) on RV.
- RVKh: RV-Khila, ed. J. Scheftelowitz, 1906.
- RVSAnu: Kātyāyana's RV-Sarvānukramaṇī, with Ṣaḍguruśiṣya's commentary (Vedārthadīpikā), ed. A. A. Macdonell, Oxford, 1886.
- ŚāṅkhGS: Śāṅkhāyana-GṛhyaSūtra.
- ŚāṅkhŚS: Śāṅkhāyana-ŚrautaSūtra.
- ŚB K/M: Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, Kāṇva/Mādhyam̐dina rec.
- SK: Sāṃkhya-Kārikā.
- Sphoṭasiddhi of Maṇḍana Miśra with the commentary of Payyūr Bhaṭṭa Parameśvara (Gopālikā), ed. by S. K. Rāmanātha Śāstrī, *Madras University Sanskrit Series* 6, 1931.
- ŚV: Kumārila Bhaṭṭa's Śloka-vārttika on Mīmāṃsāsūtra.
- TĀ: Taittirīya-Āraṇyaka.
- TB: Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa.
- TS: Taittirīya-Saṃhitā of the Yajurveda.
- TU: Taittirīya-Upaniṣad.
- TUBh: Śaṅkara's Bhāṣya on TU.
- Vacanamālā: See YVS.
- VaikhGS: Vaikhānasa-GṛhyaSūtra.
- VP: Bhartṛhari's Vākyapadīya (mūlakārikās) with the commentary of Puṇyarāja, *Benares Sanskrit Series* 11, 19, 24, 1887.
- Bhartṛhari's Vākyapadīya with the vṛtti, ed. K. A. Subramania Iyer, 4 vols, Poona : Deccan College, 1963-1983. See Pillai 1971 and Iyer 1977.
- VS: Vājasaneyi-Saṃhitā of the Yajurveda.
- YVS: Yājñavalkya-smṛti, with the commentary Mitākṣarā of Vijñāneśvara, 4th ed. Wāsudev Laxman Śāstrī Panśikār, Bombay : Nirnaya Sagar Press, 1936.
- Vacanamālā, a sub-commentary on Viśvarūpa's commentary Bālakṛīḍā on Yājñavalkya-dharmaśāstra, ed. Patrick Olivelle, Delhi : Motilal Banarsidass, 2022.

Modern works

- Agrawala, Vasudeva S. 1939. "The Vedas and the Ādhyātma Tradition", *Indian Culture* 5: 285-292.
- Angermeier, Vitus & Vukadin, Anja. 2024. "Causes of Suffering: Unravelling Suśruta and Sāṅkhya", *Studia Orientalia Electronica* 12/1: 1-23.
- Bodewitz, Hendrik W. 1973. (trans.). *Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa I, 1-65: translation and commentary, with a study: Agnihotra and Prāṇāgnihotra*. (Orientalia Rheno-Traiectina 17.) Leiden : Brill.
- Bodewitz, H. W. 1985. "Yama's second boon in the Kaṭha Upaniṣad", *WZKS* 29: 5-26 (repr. in Id. 2019: 66-85).
- Bodewitz, H. W. 2002. (trans.) *Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad: translation and commentary with an appendix Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka IX-XI*. (Groningen Oriental Studies 16.) Groningen : Forsten.
- Bodewitz, H. W. 2019. *Vedic Cosmology and Ethics: Selected studies*, ed. D. H. Heilijgers, J. E. M. Houben & K. van Kooij. (Gonda Indological Studies 19.) Leiden : Brill.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes. 2007. "Vedānta as Mīmāṃsā". In: *Mīmāṃsā and Vedānta: Interaction and Continuity*, ed. Id. (Papers of the 12th World Sanskrit Conference 10,3.) Delhi : Motilal Banarsidass. 1-91.
- Buitenen, J. A. B. van. 1964. "The Large Ātman", *History of Religions* 4: 103-114.
- Comet, Ilya. 2024. "Agni, Vāyu and Sūrya: The Vedic Triad in the Nirvacana Tradition", *ABORI* 104: 117-144.
- David, Hugo. 2017. "Towards a Critical Edition of Śaṅkara's 'Longer' *Aitareyopaniṣadbhāṣya*: a Preliminary Report based on two Cambridge Manuscripts". In: *Indic Manuscript Cultures through the Ages: Material, Textual, and Historical Investigations*, ed. V. Vergiani, D. Cuneo & C. A. Formigatti (Studies in Manuscript Cultures 14.) Berlin : De Gruyter. 727-754.
- Fitzgerald, James L. 2002. "Nun befuddles King, shows *karmayoga* does not work: Sulabhā's Refutation of King Janaka at MBh 12.308", *JIPh* 30: 641-677.
- Gonda, Jan. 1988. *Mantra Interpretation in the Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa*. (Orientalia Rheno-Traiectina 32.) Leiden : Brill.
- Gupta, S. K. 1958-1959. "Ancient Schools of Vedic Interpretations", *Journal of the Ganganatha Jha Research Institute* 16: 143-153.
- Haas, Dominik. 2019. "Ritual, Self and Yoga: On the Ways and Goals of Salvation in the Kaṭha Upaniṣad", *JIPh* 47: 1019-1052.
- Harimoto, Kengo. 2006. "The Date of Śaṅkara: Between the Cālukyas and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas", *Journal of Indological Studies* 18: 85-111.
- Iyer, K. A. Subramania. 1977. (trans.) *The Vākyapadīya of Bharṭṛhari, Kāṇḍa II: English Translation with Exegetical Notes*. Delhi : Motilal Banarsidass.
- Kahrs, Eivind. 1998. *Indian semantic analysis: The nirvacana tradition*. Cambridge UP.
- Minard, Armand. 1949. *Trois Enigmes sur les Cent Chemins: Recherches sur le Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa*, I. (Annales de l'Université de Lyon, 3^e série, 17.) Paris : Les Belles Lettres.
- Kunjunni Raja, K. 1964. "The *Niruktaśloka-vārttika* of Nīlakaṇṭha: A metrical commentary on Yāska's *Nirukta*", *ALB* 28: 250-262.
- Narayanan, M G. S. 2013. *Perumāḷs of Kerala: Brahmin Oligarchy and Ritual Monarchy. Political and Social Conditions of Kerala under the Cēra Perumāḷs of Makōtai (c. AD 800-AD 1124)*. Calicut : CosmoBooks.

- Norelius, Per-Johan. 2017. “‘Mahān puruṣaḥ’: The Macranthropic Soul in Brāhmaṇas and Upaniṣads”, *JIPh* 45: 403-472.
- Pillai, V. Raghavan. 1971. (trans.) *Studies in the Vākyapadīya*, vol. 1: The *Vākyapadīya: Critical Text of Cantos I and II, with English translation, summary of ideas and notes*. Delhi : Motilal Banarsidass.
- Renou, Louis. 1960. *Études védiques et pāṇinéennes*, t. 6 (Publications de l’Institut de Civilisation indienne, 10.). Paris : De Boccard.
- Ruegg, David Seyfort. 1959. *Contributions à l’histoire de la philosophie linguistique indienne* (Publications de l’Institut de Civilisation indienne, 7.) Paris : De Boccard.
- Sarup, Lakshman. 1921. (trans.) *The Nighaṇṭu and the Nirukta, the oldest Indian treatise on etymology, philology and semantics*, [vol. 2:] *English translation and notes*. Oxford UP. (repr. with the vols of intr., crit. ed. & ind., Delhi : Motilal Banarsidass, 1962).
- Slaje, Walter. 2007. “Yājñavalkya-brāhmaṇas and the Early Mīmāṃsā”. In: *Mīmāṃsā and Vedānta: Interaction and Continuity*, ed. J. Bronkhorst (Papers of the 12th World Sanskrit Conference 10,3.) Delhi : Motilal Banarsidass. 115-158.
- Smets, Sandra. 2013. *La question de la non-dualité dans la Jaiminīyasaṃhitā du Brahmanḍapurāṇa: Le Janakaprasna édité, traduit et commenté* (Publications de l’Institut orientaliste de Louvain, 63). Louvain-la-Neuve : Peeters.
- Smith, Caley C. 2019. “Adhiyajña: Towards a Performance Grammar of the Vedas”, *Religions* 10: 394.
- Tzohar, Roy. 2018. *A Yogācāra Buddhist Theory of Metaphor*. Oxford UP.
- Unni, N. P. 1980. *A History of Mushikavamsa*. Trivandrum : Kerala Historical Society.
- Vijayapāla, V. 1982. *Nirukta-śloka-vārttikam*. Bahalgarh (Kolkata) : Ramlal Kapur Trust.
- Visigalli, Paolo. 2024. “Nominalistic Monism: The Etymological Roots of Yāska’s Theology”, *ABORI* 104: 57-72.
- Visigalli, Paolo & Kawamura, Yūto. 2021. “Classifying and Defining Deities in the Late Vedic Age: A Study and an Annotated Translation of Yāska’s Nirukta Chapter Seven”, *JRAS* [Series 3] 31/2: 243-82