

VOLUME CIV

**Annals of the
Bhandarkar Oriental
Research Institute
2023**

EDITED BY

Pramod P. Joglekar

Shilpa Sumant

Managing Editor: Shreenand L. Bapat



PUNE

ISSN: 0378-1143

2024

BHANDARKAR ORIENTAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE
Pune – 411004

MANAGEMENT FOR 2020-2025

(As on August 16, 2024)

GENERAL BODY

President

Adv. Sadanand Phadke

REGULATING COUNCIL

Chairman*

Shri Abhay Firodia

Vice-Chairman*

Prof. Pradeep Apte

Members

Shri Sudheer Vaishampayan
(Honorary Secretary)

CA Sanjay Pawar
(Treasurer)

Prof. S. S. Bahulkar
Shri Vishwas Chitrao
Shri Aniruddha Deshpande
Prof. Pramod P. Joglekar
Shri Shrinivas Kulkarni
Prof. Ravindra Muley
Shri Amit Paranjape
Shri Bhupal Patwardhan
Dr. Shilpa Sumant
Shri Sunil Trimbake

Dr. Vijay Bedekar
Prof. Mahesh Deokar
Dr. Maitreyee Deshpande
Shri Ashutosh Joshi
Prof. Sadanand More
Shri Arun Nahar
Shri Rajaram Pathak
Shri Apoorv Sontakke
Prof. G. U. Thite
Shri Sushrut Vaidya

Shri Vasant Vaidya

TRUSTEES^

Shri Rahul Solapurkar

Shri Pradeep Rawat

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Shri Bhupal Patwardhan (Chairman)*

Shri Sudheer Vaishampayan
(Honorary Secretary)

CA Sanjay Pawar
(Treasurer)

Prof. S. S. Bahulkar
Shri Shrinivas Kulkarni

Dr. Maitreyee Deshpande
Prof. Sadanand More

* To be elected annually

^ Members of RC *Ex-officio*

CONTENTS

Volume CIV

Ṛṣipañcamī, Śaka 1946 – 99th Puṇyatithi of Sir R. G. Bhandarkar
(September 08, 2024)

ARTICLES	PAGES
A Sociolinguistic Survey of the Hindu and Christian Konkani Speakers in Mangalore with Special Focus on their Migration Histories * — by Ruta Paradkar	1 – 21
Modernizing the Traditions: Dharma, Dharma Sudhāraṇā and Sanskrit Traditions in 20th Century Wai * — by Hemant Rajopadhye	22 – 36
A Second Pune Copperplate Charter of Bādāmi Cālukya Ruler Vinayāditya, Dated April 16, 683 CE, and the Anomaly of His Regnal Years — by Shreenand L. Bapat	37 – 43
Seven Distinct Icons of Viṣṇu from Śilparatna — by Shilpa Sumant and Shrikant Pradhan	44 – 51
Yāska's Theology: Classifying and Defining Deities in the Late Vedic Age — by Paolo Visigalli and Yūto Kawamura	53 – 56
Nominalistic Monism: The Etymological Roots of Yāska's Theology ^ — by Paolo Visigalli	57 – 72

The Great (Divine) Self Behind the Many Deities: the Vedānta Connection of the Nirukta Tradition ^ — by Christophe Vielle	73 – 116
Agni, Vāyu and Sūrya. The Vedic Triad in the Nirvacana Tradition ^ — by Ilya Comet	117 – 144
‘Artha’ in Ārthapatya (Nirukta 7.1) ^ — by Amruta Natu	145 – 152
Understanding the Ṛgvedic deity Apām Napāt: A mystico-religio-linguistic journey through the Vedas ^ — by Mau Das Gupta	153 – 164

* : Based on the work done by the respective authors under the Academic Development Programme supported by the Infosys Foundation.

^ : Revised version of the paper presented under the special panel devoted to Yāska’s theology at the 18th World Sanskrit Conference held online in January 2023.

YĀSKA’S THEOLOGY: CLASSIFYING AND DEFINING DEITIES IN THE LATE VEDIC AGE¹

By

Paolo Visigalli and Yūto Kawamura

Both ancient and modern scholars alike consider Yāska’s Nirukta as a fundamental text of late Vedic Sanskrit literature. As is well known, the Nirukta is the foundation text of the Indian tradition of etymology (nirvacana or nirukta), one of the disciplines deemed to be essential for preserving and interpreting the Vedas. The core of the Nirukta, chapters 2–12, is a commentary on the Nighaṇṭu, a list of words mostly expected from the Ṛgveda. Since Yāska explains these words by quoting and commenting on hundreds of Vedic stanzas, the Nirukta can be regarded as the earliest systematic commentary on the Ṛgveda. Furthermore, Yāska’s work is also the fountainhead of many ideas concerning linguistics and the philosophy of language, ideas that would reverberate across later Indian linguistic and philosophical traditions.

Despite its recognized centrality, and even though mentions of the Nirukta are met in most writings dealing with ancient and traditional India, it seems undeniable that comparatively little scholarly work has been done on this text. Part of the reason is systemic: specialist laborers are few, and other Sanskrit texts and traditions have attracted more attention. Partly responsible for this state of affair is probably an assessment lingering over from earlier scholarship: though surely important within the history of Sanskrit literature, the Nirukta does not offer much of intrinsic interest—after all, Yāska’s etymologies seem to conflict with modern linguists’ etymologies. However, the best recent scholars have pushed back against this misunderstanding resulting from the forceful projection of modern interpretive categories onto Yāska’s thought. Among the most representative achievements, we may here

¹ Introductory Note to the papers that are edited by Paolo Visigalli and Yūto Kawamura and are being published together here onwards in this volume. The papers were presented under the special panel devoted to Yāska’s theology at the 18th World Sanskrit Conference held online in January 2023.

mention the contributions by Madhukar Anant Mehendale, Eivind Kahrs, and Johannes Bronkhorst.

There is, however, an aspect which, though crucial in the Nirukta, has not yet received the attention it deserves—Yāska's theology. Theological speculations are a key dimension of Yāska's Nirukta. To appreciate this point, it suffices to consider that half of Nirukta, 7 out of 12 chapters, is devoted to commenting on the third and last section of the Nighaṇṭu wordlist, the daivatakāṇḍa 'section of divine [names]'. In addition, Yāska informs us that he himself selected the divine names to be included in the daivatakāṇḍa section, which confirms the central place this section and the commentary thereon has in Yāska's intellectual and exegetical program. Further, and more importantly, in Nirukta 7 Yāska articulates several sophisticated theoretical discussions pertaining to the nature and classification of gods. It thus seems proper to consider this chapter as India's earliest veritable theological treatise whose logically rigorous and dialogical structure foreshadow the later developments in the mature śāstric traditions.

Visigalli and Kawamura, sharing the view sketched above concerning the insufficiently recognized importance of Nirukta 7, tried to address this gap in Indological research by providing the first (richly annotated) English translation of that chapter to appear in almost one hundred years (See Visigalli and Kawamura 2021 cited in the essays below). While working on that translation, they both became aware that Yāska's theology and its complex relation to other Indian intellectual achievements entail a wide range of problems that are best addressed in the form of a collaborative project. To explore such issues further, we were able to convene a special panel devoted to Yāska's theology at the 18th World Sanskrit Conference. The essays collected here are a revised version of the papers read at that conference.

We begin with Paolo Visigalli's investigation into what he proposes identifying as an essential characteristic of Yāska's theology, what he terms 'nominalistic monism': namely, the view that all the Vedic deities' names are mere names that do not denote any corresponding individual existing deities (hence 'nominalistic') but denote multiple aspects or properties of the one existing deity (hence 'monism'). Visigalli argues that 'nominalistic monism' coordinates closely with Yāska's etymology-driven exegesis of the Veda, on the one hand, and with his belief that the Veda is eternal and cannot, therefore, reference individuals, on the other. The next three papers investigate the relation between Yāska's ideas and later traditions. Christophe Vielle explores the connection between the

nirvacana tradition and the Vedānta, focusing on the adhidaivatam/adhyātmam double level of exegesis and how the latter ties in with the belief that all deities refer to the ultimate (eka or mahat) Ātman. Through a careful philological and conceptual analysis, Vielle shows that this double level of exegesis—which is already found in the speculative portions of Vedic literature and is characteristically used, later, in Śaṅkara's works—occurs in the Nirukta but is then extensively employed in the Nirukta Paṇīṣa II and again discussed in Padmapāda's early 10th-century Niruktaśloka-vārttika. Vielle examines how this hermeneutic device is used to convey a Vedānta-like commitment to the existence of a Great Self, thus bearing witness to a special connection between Vedānta and nirvacana traditions throughout the ages.

Ilya Comet provides an in-depth commentary on a crucial Nirukta passage (7.5) recording the etymologists' (nairuktas) view that there exist only three deities, namely Agni, Vāyu/Indra, and Sūrya. Comet begins by noting that this triad, whose forerunners can be traced to the Ṛgveda, was commonplace in late Vedic texts. He then devotes the core of his paper to a detailed exploration of how this triad remains alive and popular after Yāska, paying special attention to Vararuci's Nirukta-samuccaya—of which relevant extracts are presented along with its first annotated translation—and the opening of the Nirukta-śloka-vārttika.

A fundamental element in Yāska's theology is his definition of mantra or ritual formula. In her paper, Amruta Natu scrutinizes Yāska's definition, focusing on the meaning to be assigned to the term artha that is there employed. Through a close reading of Durga's and Skanda-Maheśvara's commentaries on the Nirukta as well as through considering relevant statements in another text belonging to the nirvacana tradition, Śaunaka's Bṛhaddevatā, Natu argues that artha has several connotations, which include but are not limited to, 'wealth'. Referring to a multi-layered exegetical approach resembling that explored by Vielle, Natu argues that artha also conveys the additional meanings of 'knowledge of deities' and 'knowledge of self'.

The papers by Vielle, Comet, and Natu shed light on Yāska's theological ideas by exploring how the latter are reflected and expanded upon in later Indic traditions, focusing on texts belonging to the nirvacana tradition. The final paper by Mau Das Gupta pursues this line of inquiry further, engaging with a modern etymology-cum-yogic interpretation that can broadly be conceived as likewise belonging to the nirvacana tradition. Das Gupta concentrates on a Ṛgvedic deity and its interpretations, the mysterious Apām Napāt. Das Gupta examines

Yāska's etymological interpretation of the deity in relation to modern scholars' often-conflicting analyses and details the interpretation propounded by Anirvan, a famous modern-day yogin-cum-scholar, in his Bengali treatises.

Each of the papers summarized above explores a specific issue bearing on Yāska's theology and can therefore be read autonomously. At the same time, the papers share several common themes—whose presence has been highlighted by internal references—and can, therefore, mutually clarify each other.

We are fully aware that the papers collected here do not exhaust the many complex and fascinating issues surrounding Yāska's theology. Yet they take a first step in that direction. It is our hope that these papers may stimulate further interest in Yāska's theology and in the Nirukta in general, and will inspire other scholars to further explore this rewarding yet somewhat neglected text.

THE GREAT (DIVINE) SELF BEHIND THE MANY DEITIES: THE VEDĀNTA CONNECTION OF THE NIRUKTA TRADITION¹

By

Christophe Vielle

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 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 | mātābhāgyād devatāyā eka ātmā bahudhā stūyate | ekasyātmāno 'nye devāḥ pratyāṅgāni bhavanti | api ca sattvānām prakṛti-bhūmabhir ṛṣayaḥ stuvantīty āhuḥ | prakṛtisārva-nām<n>yāc ca | itaretara-janmāno bhavanti | itaretaraprakṛtayaḥ | karmajanmānaḥ | ātma-janmānaḥ | ātmaivaiśāṃ ratho bhavati | ātmāśvaḥ | ātmāyudham | ātmeśavaḥ | ātmā sarvaṃ devasya ||*

Translation Visigalli & Kawamura (2021: 262-263)

One should not consider as adventitious (*āgantū*), as it were, the meanings (*artha*) of the deities.² This becomes evident [in what follows].

¹ Revised version of the paper presented under the special panel devoted to Yāska's theology at the 18th World Sanskrit Conference held online in January 2023. Paolo Visigalli and Yūto Kawamura have edited this paper.

² 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

Because of the great power of the deity (= Self, *ātman*),³ 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.⁴ [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*].⁵ 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.⁶ They are the original forms of each other.⁷ They are produced from action (*karma*),⁸ they are

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*).

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

⁴ 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.

⁵ In footnote: Cf. Brh.D. iv.143[d: *tasyātmā bahudhā hi saḥ*].

⁶ In footnote: As for instance, Dakṣa is born from Aditi, and Aditi from Dakṣa – Durga [*ad loc.*].

⁷ In footnote: As for instance, fire, lightning, and the sun are the original form of each other – Durga [*ad loc.*].

⁸ 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.*].

produced from the soul. Soul is even their chariot, their horse, their weapon, their arrows; soul is indeed the all-in-all of gods.⁹

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 *evāgnim* mahāntam [ca] [ātmānam *ekam*] ātmānam *bahudhā*
medhāvino *vadanti* | *indraṃ mitraṃ varuṇam agniṃ divyaṃ ca*
garutmantam |

Translation Visigalli & Kawamura (2021: 270) :

The wise speak of this very (terrestrial) Agni, the Great Self,¹⁰ in various ways, as Indra, Mitra, Varuṇa, Agni, and the celestial Garutmat.¹¹

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 *athā-dhyātmam* 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:

⁹ 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 lokādīpatayas trayah / teṣām ātmaiva tat sarvaṃ yadvad bhaktiḥ prakīrtite // tejastvenāyudhaṃ prāhur vāhanaṃ caiva yasya tat / imām aindrīm ca divyāṃ 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) 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].

¹⁰ 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.*: *kim bahunā ‘imam evāgnim’ ‘ekam’ ‘mahāntam’ ‘ātmānam’ ananyatvena paśyataḥ ‘viprāḥ’ (in the ṛc) ‘medhāvinaḥ’ ātmavidaḥ ‘bahudhā vadanti’*.

¹¹ 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* (< *ātmān*).

“yatrā suparṇā amṛtasya bhāgam animesaṃ vidathābhi svaranti |
ino viśvasya bhuvanasya gopāḥ sa mā dhīraḥ pākam atrā viveśa ||”
[RV 1,164.21]

yatra [suparṇāḥ] supatanā ādityaraśmayah | amṛtasya bhāgam udakasya |
animiśanto 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] supatanānīndriyāni | amṛtasya bhāgam jñānasya
animiśanto vedanenābhisvarantīti vā | abhiprayantīti vā | īśvaraḥ
sarveṣāṃ indriyānāṃ 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 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 RV 10,82.2:

“viśvakarmā vīmanā ādviḥyā dhātā vidhātā paramota saṃdr̥k |
teṣāṃ iṣṭāni saṃ iṣā madanti yatrā saptaṛṣṇ para ekam āhuḥ ||” [RV 10,82.2]

viśvakarmā vibhūtaṃ vyāptā dhātā ca | vidhātā ca | paramaś ca
saṃdraṣṭā bhūtānāṃ | teṣāṃ iṣṭāni vā kāntāni vā krāntāni vā gatāni vā
matāni vā natāni vā | adbhiḥ saha saṃmodante yatraitāni sapta ṛṣṇāni
jyotīṃṣi | tebhyaḥ para ādityaḥ | tāny etasminn ekam bhavanti |

ity adhidaivatam | athādhyātmam | viśvakarmā vibhūtamā vyāptā dhātā
 ca | vidhātā ca | paramāś ca saṃdarśayitendriyāṇām | eṣām iṣṭāni vā
 kāntāni vā krāntāni vā gatāni vā matāni vā natāni vā | annena saha
 saṃmodante yatremāni sapta ṛṣṇānīndriyāṇi | ebhyaḥ para ātmā |
 tāny etasminn ekam 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* explanation 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 | raśmaya āditye | *sapta rakṣanti*
sadam apramādam | saṃvatsaram apramādyantaḥ | *saptāpanās ta eva*
svapato lokam astamitam ādityaṃ yanti | tatra jāgrto 'svapnajau
satrasadau ca devau vāyvādityau | ity adhidaivatam | *athādhyātmam |*
sapta ṛṣayaḥ pratihitāḥ śarīre | ṣaḍ indriyāṇi vidyā saptamy ātmani |
sapta rakṣanti sadam apramādam | śarīram apramādyanti | *saptāpanā-*
nīmāny eva svapato lokam astamitam ātmānaṃ yanti | tatra jāgrto



'svapnajau satrasadau ca devau prājñāś cātmā taijasaś ca |
ity ātmagatim ācaṣṭe || teṣāṃ eṣāparā bhavati || [37]

“tiryagbilaś camasa ūrdhvabudhno 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 ūrdhvabandhana ūrdhvabodhano vā | yasmin yaśo
nihitaṃ viśvarūpam | atrāsata ṛṣayaḥ sapta sahādityaraśmayah | ye asya
gopā mahato babhūvuḥ | ity adhidaivatam | athādhyātmam | tiryagbilaś
camasa ūrdhvabandhana ūrdhvabodhano vā | yasmin yaśo nihitaṃ
viśvarūpam | atrāsata ṛṣayaḥ sapta sahendriyāṇi | yāny asya goptṛṇi
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)¹².

In Nir. 1.20, Yāska also tells us that with this double, and even triple (adding the ritual/sacrificial one, *adhiyajñam*),¹³ level of exegesis, i.e. of knowledge, the meaning of 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 to¹⁴ the sacrifice and to the deity, or [the meaning/knowledge] according/relating to the deity and to the Self."

¹² 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.

¹³ However, there is only one example of interpretation with the "sacrifice/deity" levels and the parallel formula (*ity adhiyajñam | athādhidaivatam*), in Nir. 11.4.

¹⁴ 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 (*yajñaparijñānaṃ yājñam, devatāparijñānaṃ daivatam, ātmany adhi yad vartate tad adhyātman*), Skanda-Maheśvara (*yājñam iti yajñajñānam ucyate, daivatam devatājñānam, ādhyātman adhyātmajñānam*) and the NŚV 1.6.161bc-162ab (p. 208: *atha vā yajñavijñānaṃ yājñam ity atra saṃmatam | daivatam devatājñānam adhyātman cātmavedanam ||*). 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*] *pūrvapaścājjanma-sāmānyād dhetuhetum adbhāvasāmānyāc ca 'yājñadaivate puṣpaphale' ucyate 'daivatādhyātme vā', yathā hi pūrvam puṣpaṃ jayate paścāt phalam, evaṃ pūrvam yajñajñānam jayate paścād devatājñānam, tac ca pūrvam paścād adhyātmajñānam*. Durga refers also to the three types of interpretation in his commentary *ad Nir. 2.8: tattraivaṃ sati lakṣaṇoddeśamātram evaitasmiñ chāstre nirvacanam ekaikasya kriyate, kva cic cādhyātmādhidaivādhiyajñopadarśanārtham | tasmād eteṣu yāvanto 'rthā upapadyeran – adhidaivādhyātmādhiyajñāśrayāḥ sarva eva te yojyāḥ, nātrāparādho 'sti*. And Skanda-Maheśvara *ad 7.5: sarvadarśaneṣu ca sarve mantrā yojanīyāḥ | kutaḥ | svayam eva bhāṣyakāreṇa sarvamantrānām triprakārasya viṣayasya pradarśanāya 'arthaṃ vācaḥ puṣpaphalam āha' iti yajñādīnām puṣpaphalatvena pratijñānāt |*

The *ity adhidaivatam/athādhyātmam* formula occurs once again in a passage of *Parīśiṣṭa I*¹⁵ (Nir. 13.11):

āditya iti putraḥ śākapūṇeh | eṣarg bhavati yad enam arcanti pratyṛcaḥ
sarvāṇi bhūtāni tasya yad anyan mantrebhyas tad akṣaram bhavati |
raśmayo 'tra devā ucyante ya etasminn adhiniṣannā ity adhidaivatam |
athādhyātmam | śārīram atra ṛg ucyate yad enenārcanti pratyṛcaḥ sarvāṇi-
ndriyāṇi tasya yad avināśidharma tad akṣaram bhavati | indriyāṇy atra
devā ucyante yāny asminn ātmany (adhiniṣannāny) ekaṁ bhavantī-
ty ātmapravādāḥ ||

Here the parallel is between the Sun (*āditya*) and all the *bhūtāni* at the *adhidaivatam* level, and, at the *adhyātmam* level, the body (*śārīra*) 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 us of *Durga*'s use of the term *ātmavid* (see above).¹⁶ In *Parīśiṣṭa II*, as we

¹⁵ Nir. 13.1-13, forming the first *Parīśiṣṭa*, 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*, *trayodaśādhyāyātmakaṁ niruktam* (in his case, it could even include the second *Parīśiṣṭa* 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 kiṁ cānūcāno 'bhyūhaty āṛṣaṁ 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 *Parīśiṣṭa* 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 *parīśiṣṭa* (except its §§5-8, left without gloss) has to be rather ascribed to one of his followers.

¹⁶ Before in this *Parīśiṣṭa 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 mṛgeṣu 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 = aitiḥāsikāḥ* [om. B] *adhibhūtaḥ* 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 āṛṣaṁ* formulas — the last one probably because it is found glossed over *ad loc.*: *vedavādinām ṛṣṇām matam iti śeṣaḥ*) wrongly conceives additional distinct 'Adhidaivata'/'Āṛṣa' and 'Adhyātma' schools of interpretation (cf. *Id.*: 144). In the so-called 'early Sāṃkhya' teaching of

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 athādadhidaivatam* — the subsequent AiĀ 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 10 repetition 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.

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 (*adhidaivatam adhyātmam tad enena sarvam āpnoti*, cf. KauB and

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.

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 *adhyātmam* 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 | athādhyātmam...*); and in one occasion, in 14,6,7.16-20 (Āraṇyaka/ Upaniṣad portion), it even presents an exceptional sixfold structure of correspondances (here K/BĀU 3,7.15-16 has the text of the two last levels only): *adhidevatam-adhilokam-adhivedam-adhiyajñam-adhibhūtam adhyātmam*.¹⁷

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' version, cf. David 2017; see

¹⁷ On these ŚB passages, see Minard (1949: 35 §96, 69-70 §188a, on the translation of *adhyātmam*, 115 §324b, 134 §375) and Gonda (1988: 10). This survey in the Brāhmaṇa- and Āraṇyaka-literature shows that the twofold (*adhidaivam/adhyātmam*) 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/adhyātmam*) 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 Kaṭha-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 *trayaṃ* ('[having known this] triad', = the threefold Naciketas-fire itself, its bricks, how many, and how arranged [*triṇāciketas trayam*] *yathoktaṃ 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 *adhyātmam* (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 *trayaṃ* as in KU), Manu (6.83) and Bhartṛhari (see below).

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 correspondances *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 annānīha phalabhūtāni karmaṇām manovāk-prāṇākhyāni 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 adhyātmādhībhūtaparicchedaṃ hitvā adhidaivatātmānā drṣṭaṃ yat sa muktiḥ*), 3,1.6 (*tatrādhyātmam yajñasya yajamānasya yad idaṃ prasiddhaṃ manaḥ so 'sau candro 'dhidaivatam / mano 'dhyātmam candramā adhidaivatam iti hi prasiddham*), 6,2.12 (*prāṇānām devatvopapatteḥ / adhidaivam indrādayo devās ta evādhyātmam prāṇās te cānnasya puruṣe prakṣeptāraḥ*). See also his commentaries on TU 1,1.1 (*om śāntiḥ śāntiḥ śāntir iti trir vacanam ādhyātmikādhībhautikādhidaivikānām vidyāprāptyupasargānām praśamārtham*); and 1,7.1 (see above), where *adhibhūtam* is understood as implying *adhidaivatam*,¹⁸ both constituting the 'external' fivefold one

¹⁸ 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 correspondances 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 cākḥilam || 7.29cd ||
sādhībūtādhidaivam māṃ sādhiyajñam ca ye viduḥ |

(*bāhyam*) versus the ‘personal’ fivefold one (*ity adhibhūtam ity adhikā-dhidaivatapāṅktadvayopalakṣaṇārtham / 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 cakṣuṣi bhavam cākṣuṣam prāṇam prakāśenānugrḥṇāno rūpopalabdau cakṣuṣa ālokaṁ kurvann ity arthaḥ*); on *Kaṭha-Up.* 4.9 (*yataś ca yasmāt prāṇād ude ty 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 mariṣyato vāyuh prāṇo ’dhyātmaparicchedam hitvādhidaivatātmānam sarvātmakam anīlam amṛtaṁ sūtrātmānam pratipadyatām iti vākyaśeṣaḥ*).

Also in Śaṅkara’s commentary on *Brahma-sūtra* 2,4.13 (*tad ucyate – ādhidaivakena samaṣṭivyastirūpeṇa hairaṇyagarbheṇa prāṇātmanai vaitad vibhutvam āmnāyate nādhyātmikena*; 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 *Hiraṇyagarbha* 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*

(...) || 7.30 || arjuna uvāca:

kiṁ tad brahma kim adhyātmam kiṁ karma puruṣottama |
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 |
bhūtabhāvodbhavadakaro visargaḥ karmasamjñitah || 8.3 ||
adhibhūtam kṣaro bhāvaḥ **puruṣaś cādhipaiva** |
adhiyajño ’ham evātra dehe (...) || 8.4 ||

More anecdotically, in MBh 13,16.18 the supreme Lord, who is everything, gets six names related to our levels (*adhipauruṣam adhyātmam adhibhūtādhidaivatam / adhilocyādhivijñānam adhiyajñas tvam eva hi*).

The derived concept of triple/threefold suffering, *duḥkha-* or *tāpa-traya*, that is *ādhyātmika*, *ādhidaivika* and *adhibhautika*, 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 forthcoming).

vidyāsu pratīyate / [...] *nanv etāsv apy ādhidaivikyo vibhūṭayaḥ 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 nature)”; cf. BSBh 2,2.1 (*tathedaṃ jagad akhilaṃ pṛthivyādi nānā-karmaphalopabhogayogyam bāhyam ādhyātmikam ca śarīrādi nānā-jātyanvitam pratiniyatāvayavavinyāsam anekakarmaphalānubhavādhi-ṣṭhānam drśyamānam*; 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 *ādhyātmikam* (*śarīrādi* 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 tathādhyātmam adhidaivam adhikratu |
asaṃkareṇa sarvārtho bhinnāśaktir avasthitaḥ || 2.254 ||
[vṛtti:] padānām avabhedāntarakatvena (?) yā tulyāvacchedānām
cārthāntaraparigraheṇa kuṣṭhīnām ca pravṛttinimittasya savyāpāratvena sa
eva nañō ’dhyātmam adhidaivam adhiyajñam ca saty apī sarvaśaktitve
viṣayo ’vacchidyamānasāmarthyō ’rthapadarūpādibhir asaṃkīrṇa-
viṣayaṃ tathaiva nityam avasthitaḥ || 2.254 ||

Leaving aside the *vṛtti*¹⁹, Bhartṛhari’s *kārikā* can be translated:

¹⁹ This passage of the *vṛtti*, provided by a single manuscript, is here 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 mantro*, or *sa eko mantro*, 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*, *kuṣṭhīnām*

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 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).²⁰

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

(?) *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 preceeding *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 *kukṣīnām* (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).

²⁰ See Puṇyārāja's *īkā ad loc.*: *tathā caika eva mantra ātmany api japāvasare deveṣv api kratau yajanasamaye 'pi viniyujyate bhinnasaktivād asāṃkaryeṇa pratinyatārthayā vyavasthītiṃ 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* pakṣin [as opposed to the *śabdābheda* vādins], au contraire, le *mantra* ne varie pas, mais il est affecté de potentialités différentes (*bhinnasakti*), 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*)."

section on the fourth *āśrama*, the one of the *saṃnyāsin*, that is the Vedāntin:

dhyānikam sarvam evaitad yad etad abhiśabditam |
na hy anadhyātmavit kaś cit kriyāphalam upāśnute || 82 ||
adhiyajñam brahma japed ādhidaivikam eva ca |
ādhyātmikam ca satatam 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.²¹

3. *The second Pariśiṣṭa of the Nirukta*

Coming to the second Pariśiṣṭa 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 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-mārgagatim*),²² 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 (*saiśā+ātma-jijñāsā | saiśā sarvabhūtajijñāsā*).²³ 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* (*athaiśa mahān ātmā sattvalakṣaṇas tat paraṃ tad brahma tat satyaṃ tat salilaṃ tad avyaktaṃ*

²¹ This confirms the identity of *adhyātmavāda* and early Vedānta (see above fn. 15). The next *śloka* (84):

idaṃ śaraṇam ajñānām idam eva vijānatām |
idam anvicchatām svargam idam ānanyam 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.

²² The sentence *athāta ūrdhvamārgagatim 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*.

²³ Cf. Mīmāṃsā- and Brahma-sūtra 1,1.1: *athāto dharma-/brahma-jijñāsā*.

tad asparśaṃ tad arūpaṃ tad arasaṃ tad agandhaṃ tad amṛtaṃ tac chukraṃ 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.²⁴ 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 (§§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 candramasam* versus *paśyaty ātmānam na manah*). 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 *Parīṣiṣṭa* 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, the

²⁴ 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).

argument of Sarup 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 *Parīśiṣṭa* II (and/or to Durga; see Comet here X), although it refers only to *Parīśiṣṭa* 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 *Parīśiṣṭa* 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 *Parīśiṣṭa* II as being “in the 18th section [actually the 19th *pāda* of the 13th *adhyaṃya*] of the Nirukta,”²⁵ showing therefore that his own (‘tertiary’) version of the Nirukta included it. The embryological part of the *Parīśiṣṭa* was also sometimes confused with the Garbhopaniṣad (to which the text is close)²⁶ and, for

²⁵ “*jātaḥ sa vāyūnā spr̥ṣṭo na smarati pūrvam janma maraṇam karma ca śubhāśubham*” *iti niruktasyāṣṭādaśe ’bhīdhānāt*. Note the variant readings in Nir. 13.19 (= Par. II §6): *jātaś ca vāyūnā spr̥ṣṭo na smarati janma maraṇam / ante ca śubhāśubham karmaitac charīrasya prāmāṇyam*.

²⁶ Cf. already Vijñāneśvara *ad* YVS 1.52: *tathā garbhopaniṣadi “etat śātkauśikam śarīram trīṇi pītṛtas trīṇi mātṛto ’sthisnāyumañjānaḥ pītṛtas tvañmāṃsarudhirāṇi mātṛtaḥ” itī tatra tatrāvayavānvayapratipādanāt*; not in the GaU but, after *śarīram*, close to Nir. 13.18 = §5 of the Par. II: *trīṇ mātṛtas trīṇ pītṛtaḥ | asthisnāyumañjānaḥ pītṛtaḥ | tvañmāṃsaśoṇitāni 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 garbhopaniṣaddarśanāt*, 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-mātram smaranti | eke sāṅkhyayogādīkam abhyasyanti | eke tu paramapurūṣam iti | yathoktaṃ tatraiva – “navame sarvāṅgasampūrṇo bhavati” itī paṭhitvā

“mṛtaś cāhaṃ punarjāto jātaś cāhaṃ punarmṛtaḥ |”

ityādi tadbhāvanāpāṭhāntaram –

“avāñmukhaḥ pīḍyamāno jantuś caiva [jantubhiś ca var. lect.] samanvitaḥ | sāṅkhyayogaṃ samabhyaset puruṣaṃ vā pañcaviṃśakam ||

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

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), to which he alludes in Nir. 7, we have seen with the second Paṇiṣṭa 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 Koṇṭṭāyūr (modern Kondayur, near Deśamaṅgalam on the banks of the river Nīlā/Bharathappuzha) in Kerala, bearing the initiatory name of Padmapāda.²⁷ Despite the fact that this ambitious commentary (longer than Kumārila Bhaṭṭa’s *pūrva-Mīmāṃsaka śloka-vārttika*)²⁸ breaks off at Nir. 6.17, other relevant passages in Yāska’s text (e.g. Nir. 1.8: *brahma pari-vṛḥam/vṛdham sarvataḥ*)²⁹ may serve to judge about the metaphysical ideas of this

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

²⁷ 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 = NŚV 3,4.435-445 (pp. 521-522), the end of which is quoted here below (see fn. 37).

²⁸ For instance, *adhyāya* 1, *pāda* 1, devotes 882 *ślokas* to the commentary of Nir. 1.1-3.

²⁹ 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 *VRDH*):

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

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

prasaṅgenaiva nirvakti *brahma* yat kāraṇaṃ paraṃ ||
tad dhī sarvagataṃ brahma pravṛddham karyārūpataḥ |
dehādyaṭmapravṛddhatvād brahmānnaṃ api kathyate ||
tathā karma pravṛddhatvād 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).

Padmapāda, who in the introductory *maṅgala* already equates the Agni-Vāyu-Sūrya triad³⁰ 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.³¹

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 raised³²:

adhidaivam ataś caivaṃ vyākhyātaṃ 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

³⁰ On this *nairukta* triad, see Comet here.

³¹ 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 nātmanah ||787||
 vikārair idrśair ātmā katham cid upayujyate |
 nityatvād anyathā tasya vināśitvaṃ prasajyate ||788||
 ātmanaś ca vināśitve śāstram etad anarthakam |
 nityatvam ātmanas tv evaṃ ucyate śāstrasiddhaye ||789||
 sadbhāvinityat<v>e cāsyā vedānteṣu vyavasthite |
 tasyaiva stūyamānatvam 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 mahāsāmānyam sattām saṅgirate so ’pi...*; and already Kumārila, ŚV 4 [pratyakṣa].114ab: *mahāsāmānyam anyais tu dravyam sad iti cocyate*), or, by other Vedāntins, *brahman* (Bhartṛhari himself says about this *sattā*, loc. cit. 34c: *sā nityā sā mahān ātmā*):

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

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

pūrvadrṣṭam punardrṣṭam ātmīyam vā tadetaram |
 bauddhā eva na jānanti jānanti paśavo ’pi tat ||676||

³² 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.

[meanings] are justified [and] because there is no special emphasis [on one of them].

It is further solved by invoking several Upaniṣadic (*mahā-*)*vākyas* (here in italics)³³ 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):

paramātmātmakāḥ sarve kṣetrajñā yady api sphuṭam ||338||
bhinnā eva tathāpy ete dehe 'haṁbhāvamohitāḥ |
tattvamasyādivākyais tu kṣetrajñāparamātmanoh ||339||
mukhyam ekatvam evoktam bhedo gauṇas tathāśritaḥ |
adhyātmam cādhidaivam ca tathaikyam upapāditam ||340||
tad yo 'haṁ sa ca yaś cāyam ityādyair vacanaiḥ sphuṭam |
tatrābhyudayaakāmasya bhedenopāsanaṁ viduḥ ||341||
saguṇam nirguṇam caiva mumukṣor aikyatas tathā |
ahaṁ brahmeti vākyena tad aikyam pratipāditam ||342||
atha yo 'nyām itīdam ca bhedajñānasya vāraṁ |
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 sambhavotprekṣyam 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

³³ 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 (*ahaṁ brahmāsmi* puis *atha yo 'nyām devatām upaste*). Note that NŚV 3,3,99b (*satyam jñānam iti śruteḥ*) and 100c (*mṛttiketyādivākyena*), p. 438, refer to TU 2.1 (*satyam jñānam anantaṁ brahma*) and ChU 6,1,4 (...*mṛttikety eva satyam*) respectively.

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].

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].³⁴ What could correspond to an earlier quotation is found in the *Niruktasamuccaya* 1.3.³⁵ Noteworthy too, a reference is made in the

³⁴ 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] padmapādācāryeṇa –
vidyāsthānāni nityāni teṣāṃ granthāḥ sakartṛkāḥ || iti [= NŚV 1,1.25ab, p. 5, incomplete]

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

tathā cokaṭaṃ niruktavārtike –
boddhavyaṃ hi prayatnena mantrārthaṃ boddhum icchatām |
mantrārthaviśayaṃ jñānaṃ na vinā tena sidhyati || [= NŚV 1,1.2cd-3ab, p. 4; with var. *vinānena vidyate*]

³⁵ tathā cāhur nairuktikācāryāḥ –
ādyam naighaṇṭukaṃ kāṇḍam dvitīyam naigamaṃ tathā |
tṛtīyam daivataṃ kāṇḍam śāstram etat tridhā sthitam || [= NŚV 1,6.257bc-258ab, p. 217]

A verse very close (with variant reading in cd), but followed by four and a half other *ślokas* (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 Sāyaṇa in the introduction of his RVBh, where it is said to come from the *anukramaṇikābhāṣya*, that is Ṣaḍguruśiṣya’s work). Cf. Comet here fn. X.

NŚV to a Kerala king named Godavarman alias ‘the Lion’ (*siṃha*).³⁶ Pace Kunjunni Raja (1964: 261), this king can be identified, since not many kings of the Cera Perumāḷ 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*)-*kesarin* = *siṃha*] as his coronation name.”³⁷ Accordingly, we could tentatively date the NŚV 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.³⁸ Moreover, he adds then a kind of post-colophon where he

³⁶ 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 vācyo ’rthas tv āraṇyakesarī mṛgaḥ ||13||
 kṣatriyasyābhiṣiktasya rājaśabdo ’pi vācakaḥ |
 keralo godavarmāyam ity apy asya viśeṣaṇam ||14||
 keralatvaṃ na siṃhasya siṃhatvaṃ keralasya vā |
 viśeṣaṇaviśeṣyatvaṃ na nīlotpalavat tayoḥ ||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 saṃpadyate ’py asau ||29||
 pratipattuś ca vijñānam siṃhasādrśyarañjitaḥ |
 jāyate godavarmāyam iti siddham udīritam ||30||

³⁷ 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).

³⁸ NŚV 3,4 (pp. 521-522):

padma ity aparāṃ saṃjñāṃ labdhavān sa guroḥ punaḥ |
 śrutvā kiṃ cit sa śāstrāṇāṃ vedānteṣu kṛtāśramaḥ ||442||
 akaroc chraddhayā yukto niruktaśloka-vārttikam |

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 nārāyaṇyāstu namo 'stu brahmaṇe sadā |
 namo maheśvarāyāstu gurubhyaś ca sadā namaḥ ||445c-f||
 iti bhavārṇavadīrṇasadātmata-
 prathanavedaśiro'nvayalakṣaṇaḥ |
 kara{drg}bandhamuni-grathitāgamam
 gamitavān bhagavān muniśaṅkaraḥ ||446||³⁹
 śrīmati vijayāditye vallabharāje jayaty ajātaripau |
 bhāṣyam bhagavacchaṅkaramukhāravindāt pravṛttam idam ||447||⁴⁰

“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-ātmata*) scattered in the flood 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

padavākyapramāṇajñāḥ śraddhāvān anasūyakaḥ ||443||
 gurubhaktas tapasvī ca śakto voḍhum idam yataḥ |
 tasmin naighaṇṭukaṁ 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).

³⁹ 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*).

⁴⁰ I follow here the text given by Kunjunni Raja (1964: 254), *contra* the variant readings *arājaripau* and *bhāṣyam idam* (hypermetr.) of the edition.

(viz. ‘the’/his famous) *bhāṣya*⁴¹ 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.⁴²

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 RV) *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-Bhāvyā or even pre-Śaṅkara Vedāntins (for whom the ‘Vedānta doctrine’, *vedānta-śāstra*, means at first the Upaniṣadic textual one)⁴³.

⁴¹ The *bhāṣya* here named cannot designate the NŚV itself, as stressed on by Kunjunni Raja (1964: 255), “since we know [from the preceeding 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 NŚV, “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.

⁴² 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) Śrīṅgeri 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).

⁴³ 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-ritual aim (cf. Gonda 1988: 1), the early Upaniṣadic (BĀU) statements are still (rightly) termed as *brāhmaṇas*

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, Vedānta⁴⁴. 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 mainly⁴⁵, 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 repeating⁴⁶ that the Nirukta “has indeed to be known

in Śābara’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).

⁴⁴ See fn. 15 above. The use of *brahma-vādin* (VaikhGS 1,5.1; cf. *parabrahma-vādin* in Aśvaghōṣa’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).

⁴⁵ Bronkhorst’s volume (2007) is a good example.

⁴⁶ 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):

niruktaṃ nāma vedāṅgaṃ mantravyākhyānalakṣaṇam |
boddhavyaṃ hi prayatnena mantrārthaṃ 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)

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

Appendix: Nirukta-Pariśiṣṭa II

[om]

vyākhyātaṃ daivatam yajñāṅgaṃ ca | athāta ūrdhvamārgagatiṃ
vyākhyāsyāmaḥ | “*sūrya ātmā*” [RV 1,115.1d] ity uditasya hi karma-
draṣṭā | athaitad anupravadanti | athaitaṃ mahāntam ātmānam eṣarggaṇaḥ
pravadati (pravadanti B) | “*indraṃ mitraṃ varuṇam agniṃ āhuḥ*” [RV
1,164.46a] iti | athaiṣa mahān ātmā+ātmajijñāsayā+ātmānam provāca |
“*agnir asmi janmanā jātavedāḥ*” [RV 3,26.7a], “*aham asmi prathama-
jāḥ*” [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 gharṇo havir asmi nāma*” [RV
3,26.7]

“*aham asmi prathamajā ṛtasya pūrvaṃ 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 taṃ
ātmānam adhyātmajam antikam anyasmā ācacakṣveti ||2|| [=13.15]

“*apaśyaṃ gopāṃ anipadyamānam ā ca parā ca pathibhiś carantam |
sa sadhr̥ciṭṭ sa viṣūcīr 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)

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 arthajñānākāṅkṣāyāṃ tadarthaṃ bhagavatā yāskena...
niruktaṃ āracitaṃ | tatra ca nāmākhyātanipāto<pa>sargabhedena caturvidhaṃ
nirūpya vaidikamantrapadānām arthaḥ pradarśitaḥ | mantrāṇām
cānuṣṭheyārthaprakāśanadvāreṇaiva karaṇatvāt padārthajñānādhīnatvāc ca
vākyārthajñānasya mantrasthapadārthajñānāya niruktaṃ avaśyam apekṣitaṃ |

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” (*brahmavastusvarūpamātrayāthātmya-
prakāśanaparam*) is indeed the one of the BS, according to Śaṅkara’s disciple Sureśvara
(in his *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi*, here quoted according to Bronkhorst 2007: 14).

tan niṣṭho bhūtātmā | saiṣa bhūtaprakṛtir ity eke | tat kṣetram 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 aviññātasya viśudhyato
vibhūtiṃ kurvataḥ kṣetrajñaprthaktvāya kalpate | prati(/pari B)bhāti liṅgo
mahān ātmā tamoliṅgaḥ | vidyāprakāśaliṅgas tamaḥ⁴⁷ | api niścayaliṅga
ākāśaḥ ||3|| [=13.16]⁴⁸

ākāśaguṇaḥ śabdaḥ⁴⁹ | ākāśād vāyur dviguṇaḥ sparśena | vāyor jyotis
triguṇaṃ rūpeṇa | jyotiṣa āpaś caturguṇā rasena | adbhyaḥ pṛthivī
pañcaguṇā gandhena | pṛthivyā bhūtagrāmasthāvarajaṅgamāḥ | tad
etad ahar yugasahasraṃ⁵⁰ jāgarti | tasyānte suṣupsyann aṅgāni pratyā-
harati | bhūtagrāmāḥ pṛthivīm api yanti | pṛthivy āpaḥ | āpo jyotiṣam |
jyotir vāyur | vāyur ākāśam | ākāśo manaḥ | mano vidyām | vidyā
mahāntam ātmānam | mahān ātmā pratibhām | pratibhā prakṛtim | sā
svapiti yugasahasraṃ rātriḥ | tāv etāv ahorātrāv ajasram parivartete | sa
kālas tad etad ahar bhavati |

“yugasahasraparyantam ahar yad brahmaṇo viduḥ |
rātriṃ yugasahasrāntām te 'horātravido janāḥ ||” [BhG 8.17, cf. Manu
1.73, BD 8.98] iti ||4|| [=13.17]⁵¹

taṃ parivartamānam anyo 'nupravartate | sraṣṭā draṣṭā vibhaktātimātro
'ham iti gamyate | sa mithyādarśanedaṃ⁵² pāvakaṃ mahābhūteṣu
cironvākāśād⁵³ vāyoḥ prāṇaḥ (B; prāṇaś S) cakṣuś ca vaktāraṃ ca tejaso
'dbhyaḥ snehaṃ pṛthivyā mūrṭiḥ | pṛthivāms tv aṣṭau guṇān vidyāt |
trīn mātṛtas trīn pitṛtaḥ | asthisnāyumaḥ pṛthivāḥ pitṛtaḥ | tvaṇmāmsaṇitāni
mātṛtaḥ | annaṃ (B; anna- S) pānam ity aṣṭau | so 'yaṃ puruṣaḥ
sarvamayaḥ sarvajñāno 'pi klptaḥ ||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) | imām

⁴⁷ S reads: pratibhāti liṅgo mahān ātmā tamoliṅgo vidyā prakāśaliṅgas tamaḥ |

⁴⁸ 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.

⁴⁹ Note S: cf. Manu 1.75.

⁵⁰ Note S: cf. BhG 8.16-19.

⁵¹ Note B *ad* §4: we should read *bhūtagrāmāḥ sthāvarajaṅgamāḥ* for *bhūtagrāmasthāvarajaṅgamāḥ*, and *suṣupsan* for *suṣupsyan*; *jyotiṣam* should have been *jyotiḥ*; *rātriḥ* should be *rātriṃ*; and *yad* should be *ye*.

⁵² Double sandhi = sa mithyādarśanaḥ + idam > -a i- > e, or = sa-mithyā-darśane + idam > -a i- > e (sa-mithyā-darśane'idam Tokunaga).

⁵³ ?; cironv.ākāśād Tokunaga.

yonim saṃdadhyāt | tad idam atra matam (manah N) | śleṣmā (śleṣma- N)
retasaḥ saṃbhavati⁵⁴ | śleṣmaṇo rasaḥ | rasāc choṇitam | śoṇitān
māmsam | māmsān medaḥ | medasaḥ snāvā | snāvno 'sthīni | asthibhyo
majjā | majjāto retaḥ | tad idam yonau retaḥ siktaṃ puruṣaḥ saṃbhavati |
śukrātireke pumān bhavati | śoṇitātireke strī bhavati | dvābhyām samena
napuṃsako bhavati | śukreṇa bhinnena yamo bhavati | śukraśoṇita-
saṃyogān mātṛpitṛsaṃyogāc ca | tat (om. N) katham idam śārīraṃ param
saṃyamyate | saumyo bhavati | ekarātroṣitaṃ kalalaṃ bhavati |
pañcarātrād budbudāḥ | saptarātrāt peśī | dvisaptarātrād arbudaḥ | pañca-
vimṣatirātraḥ svasthito (-rātrasvasthito B, -rātrasthito yonau N) ghano
bhavati | māsamātrāt kaṭhino bhavati | dvimāsābhyantare śiraḥ saṃ-
padyate | māsatrāyeṇa grīvavyādeśaḥ | māsacatuṣkeṇa tvag-vyādeśaḥ |
pañcame māse nakharomavyādeśaḥ | ṣaṣṭhe mukhanāsikākṣi
śrotraṃ⁵⁵ ca saṃbhavati | saptame calanasamartho bhavati | aṣṭame
buddhyādhyavasyati (°vasyate N) | navame sarvāṅgasampūrṇo bhavati |
“mṛtaś cāhaṃ punarjāto jātaś cāhaṃ punarmṛtaḥ |
nānāyonisahasrāṇi mayoṣitāni yāni (mayā yāny uṣitāni N) vai ||
āhārā vividhā bhuktāḥ pītā nānāvidhāḥ stanāḥ |
mātāro vividhā dr̥ṣṭāḥ pītarāḥ suhr̥das tathā ||
avāṇmukhaḥ pīḍyamāno jantuś caiva samanvitaḥ |
sāṃkhyam yogam samabhyasyet (°bhyasya N) puruṣam vā (hyperm.;
om. N) pañcaviṃśakam ||” [untraced] iti | tataś ca daśame māse prajāyate |
jātaś ca vāyunā spr̥ṣṭo na smarati janma maraṇam (maraṇe B) | ante ca
śubhāśubham karmaitac charīrasya prāmāṇyam ||6|| [=13.19]⁵⁶

aṣṭottaram saṃdhiśatam aṣṭākapālaṃ śiraḥ saṃpadyate | ṣoḍaśa
vapāpalāni | nava snāyusātāni | saptaśatam puruṣasya marmaṇām |
ardhacatasro romāṇi koṭyaḥ | hr̥dayam hy aṣṭa kapālāni | dvādaśa
kapālāni jihvā | vṛṣanau hy aṣṭa suparṇau | tathopasthagudapāyvan etan (-
gudayony etan N) mūtrapurīṣam kasmād āhārapānasiktatvād anu-
pacitakarmāṇāv (anupacati | karmāṇā N) anyonyam jāyete - iti⁵⁷ | taṃ
vidyākarmaṇī samanvārebhete pūrvaprajñā ca | mahaty ajñānatamasi

⁵⁴ saṃcyavate... saṃbhavati: sañcaratam imam yonim sandadhyāt tad idam atra manah
śleṣmaretasaḥ sambhavati | N.

⁵⁵ mukhanāsikākṣiśrotraṃ N.

⁵⁶ 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] avāṇmukhaḥ
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 śubhāśubham karma is almost identical with Garbhopaniṣad 2-4 [cf. note 13 S].

⁵⁷ B reads: tathopasthagudapāyvan etan mūtrapurīṣam kasmād āhārapānasiktatvāt |
anupacitakarmāṇāv anyonyam jāyete iti |.

magno (B S *add.*; magnau S) jarāmarāṇakṣutpipāsāsokakrodha(droha *add.* N) lobhamohamadabhayamatsaraharṣaviṣādersyāsūyātmakair dvandvair abhibhūyamānaḥ so 'smād ārjavaṃ javībhāvānāṃ tan (-bhāvanāntaṃ N) nirmucyate | so 'smāpānnaṃ ('smāt pāpāt B, 'smādāntaṃ N) mahābhūmikāvac charīrān nimeṣamātraiḥ prakramya prakṛtir adhiparītya⁵⁸ (abhi- N) taijasaṃ śarīraṃ kṛtvā karmaṇo 'nurūpaṃ (karmanānurūpaṃ N) phalam anubhūya tasya saṃkṣaye punar imaṃl lokaṃ pratipadyate ||7|| [=13.20]

atha ye hiṃsām āśritya vidyām utsrjya mahat tapas tepire cireṇa vedoktāni vā karmāṇi kurvanti te dhūmam abhisambhavanti | dhūmād rātrim | rātrer apakṣīyamānapakṣam | apakṣīyamānapakṣād dakṣiṇāyanam | dakṣiṇāyanāt pitṛlokaṃ | pitṛlokāc candramasaṃ | candramaso vāyum | vāyor vṛṣṭim | vṛṣṭer oṣadhayaś caitat bhūtvā tasya saṃkṣaye punar evemaṃl lokaṃ pratipadya[n]te ||8|| [=13.21]⁵⁹

atha ye hiṃsām utsrjya vidyām āśritya mahat tapas tepire jñānoktāni vā karmāṇi kurvanti te 'rcir abhisambhavanti | arcīṣo 'haḥ (B S *corr.*; arcīśarahāḥ S) | ahna āpūryamānapakṣam | āpūryamānapakṣād udagayanam | udagayanād devalokaṃ | devalokād ādityam | ādityād vaidyutam | vaidyutān mānasam | mānasaḥ puruṣo bhūtvā brahmalokaṃ abhisambhavanti | te na punar āvartante | śiṣṭā dandaśūkā ya (B; yata S) idaṃ na jñānti | tasmād idaṃ veditavyam | athāpy āha ||9|| [=13.22]⁶⁰

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

na taṃ vidyayā viduṣo yam evaṃ vidvāṃso vadanti | akṣaraṃ brahmaṇaspatim anyad yuṣmākam⁶¹ antaraṃ anyad eṣāṃ antaraṃ babhūveti | nīhāreṇa prāvṛtās tamasā jalpyā cāsutṛpa ukthaśāsaḥ prāṇaṃ sūryaṃ yatpathagāmināś caranti | avidvāṃsaḥ kṣetrajñāṃ anupravadanti | athāho vidvāṃsaḥ kṣetrajño 'nukalpate | tasya tapasā sahāpramādam (B S *corr.*; mahāpramādam S) eti | athāptavyo bhavati | tenāsaṃtatam icchet | tena sakhyam icchet | eṣa hi sakhā śreṣṭhaḥ saṃjñānti bhūtaṃ

⁵⁸ Note B: *prakṛtir adhiparītya* – this should be *prakṛtim adhiparītya*.

⁵⁹ 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*].

⁶⁰ Note B ad §9: [*'rcir ... brahmalokaṃ abhisambhavanti*]: Cf. BĀU 6.2.15. *śiṣṭā dandaśūkāḥ* etc.: Cf. BĀU 6.2.16.

⁶¹ B reads: *vadanty akṣaraṃ brahmaṇaspatim | anyad yuṣmākam...*

bhavad bhaviṣyad iti | jñātā kasmāt | jñāyateḥ (jāyateḥ B) | sakḥā kasmāt | sakhyateḥ | saha bhūtendriyaiḥ śerate | mahābhūtāni sendriyāni | prajñayā karma kārayatīti (vā *add.* B) | tasya yadāpaḥ pratiṣṭhā | śīlam⁶² upāsama ātmā brahmeti sa brahmabhūto bhavati | sāksimātro vyavatiṣṭhate 'bandho jñānakṛtaḥ | athātmano mahataḥ prathamam bhūtanāmadheyāny anukramiṣyāmaḥ ||10|| [=13.23]

haṁsaḥ | gharmah | yajñah | venah | meghah | kṛmiḥ | bhūmiḥ | vibhuḥ | prabhuḥ | śambhuḥ | rābhuḥ | vardhakarmā | somaḥ | bhūtam | bhuvanam | bhaviṣyat | āpaḥ | mahat | vyoma | yaśaḥ | mahah | svarṇīkam | smṛtikam | svṛtikam | satīkam | satīnam | gahanam | gabhīram | gahvaram | kam | annam | haviḥ | sadma | sadanam | ṛtam | yoniḥ | ṛtasya yoniḥ | satyam | nīram | haviḥ | rayiḥ | sat | pūrṇam | 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 | haṁsaḥ | ātmā | bhavanti | vadhanti | adhvānam | yadvāhiṣṭhyā | śārīrāni | avyayam ca saṁskurute | yajñah | ātmā | bhavati | yad enaṁ tanvate | athaitam mātāntam ātmānam etāni sūktāny⁶³ etā ico 'nupravadanti ||11|| [=13.24]⁶⁴

“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 janayītendrasya janayitota viṣṇoḥ | (B/‘longer version’ *add.*.) somaḥ pavate | somaḥ sūryaḥ prasavanāt | janitā matīnām prakāśakarmaṇām ādityaraśmīnām | divo dyotana-karmaṇām ādityaraśmīnām | pṛthivyāḥ prathanakarmaṇām ādityaraśmīnām | agner gatikarmaṇām ādityaraśmīnām | sūryasya svīkaraṇa-karmaṇām ādityaraśmīnām | indasyaiśvryakarmaṇām ādityaraśmīnām | viṣṇor vyāptikarmaṇām ādityaraśmīnām | ity adhidaivatam | athādhyātmam | soma ātmāpy etasmā⁶⁵ evendriyāṇām janitety arthaḥ | api vā sarvābhīr vibhūtibhir vibhūtata ātmā | ity ātmagatim ācaṣṭe (*lom.* S) ||12|| [=13.25]

⁶² S reads pratiṣṭhāśīlam.

⁶³ Note B: *etāni sūktāni* – There are no *sūktas* as such quoted below. But all the quotations are ṛiks only.

⁶⁴ S gives in footnotes references to the Nigh. for most of these words, as synonyms of earth, water, atmosphere etc.

⁶⁵ S reads: soma ātmā | apy etasmād.

“*brahmā devānām padavīḥ kavīnām ṛṣir viprāṇām mahiṣo mṛgāṇām |
śyeno gṛdhrāṇām 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* devana-
karmaṇām ādityaraśmīnām | *padavīḥ kavīnām* iti | eṣa hi *padam* vetti
kavīnām kavīyamānānām ādityaraśmīnām | *ṛṣir viprāṇām* iti | eṣa hi *ṛṣiṇo*
bhavati *viprāṇām* vyāpanakarmaṇām ādityaraśmīnām | *mahiṣo*
mṛgāṇām iti | eṣa hi *mahān* bhavati *mṛgāṇām* mārgaṇakarmaṇām āditya-
raśmīnām | *śyeno gṛdhrāṇām* iti | *śyena* ādityo bhavati śyāyater
gatikarmaṇaḥ | *gṛdhra* ādityo bhavati gṛdhyateḥ sthānakarmaṇo yata
etasmimś tiṣṭhati | *svadhitir vanānām* iti | eṣa hi *svayam* karmāṇy ādityo
dhatte vanānām vananakarmaṇām ādityaraśmīnām | *somaḥ pavitram*
atyeti rebhan iti | eṣa hi *pavitram* raśmīnām *atyeti* | stūyamāna eṣa
evaitat⁶⁶ sarvam akṣaram |

ity adhidaivatam | athādhyātmam | *brahmā devānām* iti | ayam api
brahmā bhavati *devānām* devanakarmaṇām indriyāṇām | *padavīḥ*
kavīnām iti | ayam api *padam* vetti *kavīnām* kavīyamānānām indriyāṇām |
ṛṣir viprāṇām iti | ayam apy *ṛṣiṇo* bhavati *viprāṇām* vyāpana-
karmaṇām indriyāṇām | *mahiṣo mṛgāṇām* iti | ayam api *mahān* bhavati
mṛgāṇām mārgaṇakarmaṇām indriyāṇām | *śyeno gṛdhrāṇām* iti | *śyena*
ātmā bhavati śyāyater jñānakarmaṇaḥ | *gṛdhrāṇām* indriyāṇi gṛdhyater
jñānakarmaṇo yata etasmimś tiṣṭhanti (tiṣṭhati B) | *svadhitir vanānām* iti |
ayam api *svayam* karmāṇy ātmani *dhatte vanānām* vanana-
karmaṇām indriyāṇām | *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 |
ṛtasyādityasya karmāṇi*⁶⁷ *brahmaṇo matāni* | eṣa evaitat sarvam akṣaram |
ity adhidaivatam | athādhyātmam | *vahnir* ātmā bhavati | *sa tisro vāca*
*īrayati prerayati vidyām atibuddhimatām | ṛtasyātmanah*⁶⁸ *karmāṇi*
brahmaṇo matāni | ayam evaitat sarvam anubhavati | ity (*om.* B) ātma-
gatim ācaṣṭe ||14|| [=13.27]

⁶⁶ B reads: atyeti stūyamānaḥ | eṣa evaitat.

⁶⁷ S reads: prerayati | ṛco yajūṃṣi sāmāny ṛtasyādityasya karmāṇi.

⁶⁸ S reads: atibuddhimatām ṛtasyātmanah.

“*somaṃ gāvo dhenavo vāvaśānāḥ*⁶⁹ *somaṃ viprā matibhiḥ prcchamānāḥ | somaḥ sutaḥ pūyate aḥyamānaḥ 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 aḥyamānaḥ* | 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 aḥyamānaḥ* | imam evātmā ca sapta ṛṣayaś ca *saṃnavante* | tāny (imāny *add.* B) etasminn ātmāny ekam bhavanti | ity ātmagatim ācaṣṭe ||15|| [=13.28]

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

atyakramīt *samudra ādityaḥ parame vyavane*⁷⁰ *varṣakarmanā janayan prajā bhuvanasya rājā sarvasya rājā | vṛṣā pavitre adhi sāno avye brhat somo vāvṛdhe suvāna induḥ* | ity adhidaivatam | athādhyātmam | atyakramīt *samudra ātmā parame vyavane jñānakarmanā janayan prajā bhuvanasya rājā sarvasya rājā | vṛṣā pavitre adhi sāno avye brhat* (mahat B) *somo vāvṛdhe suvāna induḥ* | ity ātmagatim ācaṣṭe ||16|| [=13.29]

“*mahat tat somo mahiṣaś cakārāpāṃ yad garbho 'vṛṇīta devān | adadhād indre pavamāna ojo 'janayat sūrye jyotir induḥ* ||” [RV 9,97.41]
mahat tat somo.mahiṣaś cakārāpāṃ yadgarbho 'vṛṇīta devānām ādhi-patyam adadhād indre pavamāna ojo 'janayat sūrye jyotir indur ādityaḥ | indur ātmā ||17|| [=13.30]⁷¹

“*vidhuṃ dadrāṇaṃ samane bahūnāṃ 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

⁶⁹ vāvaśānāḥ = vā + avaśānāḥ.

⁷⁰ Note B: *parame vyavane* cf. Nir. 13.10. *prathame vidharman* = *parame vyavane*.

⁷¹ 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 *ātmāpara* meaning of the ṛik is not given.

yuvānaṃ mahāntaṃ palita ātmā girati | rātrau mriyate | rātriḥ samuditā |
ity ātmagatim ācaṣṭe ||18|| [=13.31]⁷²

“sākamjānāṃ saptatham āhur ekajaṃ ṣaḥ id yamā ṛṣayo devajā iti |
teṣāṃ iṣṭāni vihi tāni dhāmasaḥ sthātre rejante vikṛtāni rūpaśaḥ ||” [RV
1,164.15; AVŚ 9,9.16]

sahajātānāṃ ṣaṇṇāṃ ṛṣīnāṃ ādityaḥ saptamaḥ | teṣāṃ iṣṭāni vā kāntāni vā
krāntāni vā gatāni vā matāni vā natāni vādbhiḥ saha saṃmodante |
yatraitāni sapta ṛṣīnāni jyotiṃṣi tebhyaḥ para ādityaḥ |
tāny etasminn ekam bhavanti | ity adhidaivatam | athādhyātmam |
sahajātānāṃ ṣaṇṇāṃ indriyāṇāṃ ātmā saptamaḥ | teṣāṃ iṣṭāni vā kāntāni
vā krāntāni vā gatāni vā matāni vā natāni vānnena saha saṃmodante |
yatremāni sapta ṛṣīnānīndriyāṇy ebhyaḥ para ātmā | tāny etasminn ekam
bhavanti | ity ātmagatim ācaṣṭe ||19|| [=13.32]⁷³

“striyaḥ satīs tām u me puṃsa āhuḥ paśyad akṣaṇvān na vi cetad andhaḥ |
kavir yaḥ putraḥ sa imā ciketa yas tā vi jānāt sa pituḥ pitāsat ||” [RV
1,164.16; AVŚ 9,9.15] striya evaitāḥ śabdasparśarūparasagandha
hāriṇyaḥ | tā amuṃ puṃśabde (-śabdena B) nirāhāraḥ prāṇa⁷⁴ iti paśyan
kaṣṭān na vijānāty andhaḥ | kavir yaḥ putraḥ sa imā jānāti | yaḥ sa imā
jānāti sa pituḥ pitāsat | ity ātmagatim ācaṣṭe ||20|| [=13.33]

“saptārdhagarbhā bhuvanasya reto viṣṇos tiṣṭhanti pradiśā vidharmaṇi |
te dhūtibhir manasā te vi paścitaḥ paribhuvāḥ pari bhavanti viśvataḥ ||”
[RV 1,164.36; AVŚ 9,10.17]

saptaitān ādityaraśmīn ayam ādityo girati madhyasthānordhvaśabdaḥ |
yāny asmiṃs tiṣṭhanti (tiṣṭhati S) tāni dhūtibhiḥ ca manasā ca
viparyayanti paribhuvāḥ⁷⁵ paribhavanti sarvāṇi karmāṇi varṣakarmanā |

⁷² Note B ad §18: *samane bahūnāṃ*, and *devasya paśya kāvyaṃ mahitvādyā* – These words are not explained in the comment.

⁷³ Note B ad §19: *teṣāṃ iṣṭāni...* to [2nd] *ekam 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):

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

⁷⁴ 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.

⁷⁵ B reads: *viparyayanti | paribhuvāḥ*.

ity adhidaivatam | athādhyātmam | *saptemānīndriyāṇy* ayam ātmā girati
madhyasthānordhvaśabdaḥ | yāny asmiṃs *tiṣṭhanti* tāni *dhātibhiś* ca
manasā ca viparyayanti *paribhuvāḥ paribhavanti* sarvānīndriyāṇi
jñānakarmaṇā | ity ātmagatim ācaṣṭe ||21|| [=13.34]⁷⁶

“*na vi jānāmi yadi vedam asmi niṇyaḥ saṃnaddho manasā carāmi* |
yadā māgan prathamajā ṛtasyād id vāco aśnuve bhāgam asyāḥ ||” [RV
1,164.37; AVŚ 9,10.15]

na vijānāmi yadi vedam asmi | *niṇyaḥ prasānaddho manasā carāmi* | *na*
hi vijānan buddhim atah puṣṭiḥ putraḥ parivedayante
’yam ādityo ’yam ātmā ||22|| [=13.35]⁷⁷

“*apān prān eti svadhayā gr̥bhīto ’martyo martyenā sayoniḥ* |
tā śāsvantā viśūcīnā viyantā ny anyam cikyur na ni cikyur anyam ||” [RV
1,164.38; AVŚ 9,10.16]

*apāñcayati prāñcayati*⁷⁸ *svadhayā gr̥bhīto*⁷⁹ *’martya ādityo martyena*
candramasā saha | *tau śāśvadgāminau viśvagāminau bahugāminau vā*⁸⁰ |
*paśyaty ādityam*⁸¹ *na candramasam* | *ity adhidaivatam* | *athādhyātmam* |
apāñcayati prāñcayati svadhayā gr̥bhīto ’martya ātmā martyena manasā
saha | *tau śāśvadgāminau viśvagāminau bahugāminau vā* |
paśyaty ātmānam na manah | *ity ātmagatim ācaṣṭe* ||23|| [=13.36]

“*tad id āsa bhuvaneṣu jyeṣṭhaṃ yato jajña ugras tveṣanṛmṇaḥ* |
sadyo jajñāno ni riṇāti śatrūn anu yaṃ viśve madanty ūmāḥ ||” [RV
10,120.1]

⁷⁶ 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 (...).

⁷⁷ 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.

⁷⁸ 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.

⁷⁹ Note B: *gr̥bhītaḥ* should have been *gr̥bhītaḥ*.

⁸⁰ Note B: The *vā* after *bahugāminau* is superfluous.

⁸¹ Note B: *paśyaty ādityam* – *paśyati* being the explanation of *cikyur* in the ṛik, should have been in the plural.

*tad bhavati bhūteṣu bhuvaneṣu jyeṣṭham ādityam*⁸² *yato jajña ugras tveṣanṛmṇo dīptinṛmṇaḥ | sadyo jajñāno niriṇāti śatrūn iti | niriṇātiḥ (riṇātiḥ S) prītikarmā dīprikarmā vā | anumadanti yaṁ viśva ūmāḥ*⁸³ *| ity adhidaivatam | athādhyātmam | tad bhavati bhūteṣu bhuvaneṣu jyeṣṭham avyaktam yato jāyata ugras tveṣanṛmṇo jñānanṛmṇaḥ | sadyo jajñāno niriṇāti śatrūn iti | niriṇātiḥ (riṇātiḥ S) prītikarmā dīptikarmā vā | anumadanti yaṁ sarva ūmāḥ | ity ātmagatim ācaṣṭe ||24|| [=13.37]*
“ko adya yuṅkte dhuri gā r̥tasya śimīvato bhāmino durhṛṇāyūn | āsann iṣūn hr̥tsvaso mayobhūn ya eṣāṁ bhr̥tyām ṛṇadhat sa jīvāt ||” [RV 1,84.16]

*ka ādityo dhuri gā yuṅkte raśmīn karmavato bhānumato durādharṣān asūnyasunavanti+iṣūn iṣuṇavanti mayobhūni sukhabhūni | ya imaṁ saṁbhr̥taṁ veda katham sa jīvati | ity adhidaivatam | athādhyātmam | ka ātmā dhuri gā yuṅkte indriyāṇi karmavanti bhānumanti durādharṣān*⁸⁴ *asūnyasunavanti+iṣūn iṣuṇavanti mayobhūni sukhabhūni | ya imāni saṁbhr̥tāni (imaṁ saṁbhr̥taṁ S) veda ciraṁ sa jīvati | ity ātmagatim ācaṣṭe ||25|| [=13.38]*

“ka iṣate 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*⁸⁵ *||26|| [=13.39]*

“ko agnim iṭte haviṣā ghr̥tena srucā yajātā ṛtubhir dhruvebhiḥ | kasmai devā ā vahān āśu homa ko maṁsate vītihotraḥ 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 vītihotraḥ sudevaḥ kalyāṇadevaḥ | ity adhidaivatam | athādhyātmam | ka ātmānam pūrayati (pūjayati B) haviṣā ca ghr̥tena ca srucā yajātā ṛtubhir dhruvebhir iti | kasmai devā āvahān āśu homārthān | ko maṁsate vītihotraḥ suprajñāḥ kalyāṇaprajñāḥ | ity ātmagatim ācaṣṭe ||27|| [=13.40]

⁸² Note B: *ādityam* should be *ādityaḥ*.

⁸³ Note B: *ūmāḥ* – This word is unintelligible.

⁸⁴ Note B: *durādharṣān* should have been *durādharṣāni*.

⁸⁵ 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.

“*tvam aṅga pra śaṁsiṣo devaḥ śaviṣṭha martyam |
na tvad anyo maghavann asti marḍitendra bravāmi te vacaḥ* ||” [RV
1,84.19]

*tvam aṅga*⁸⁶ *praśaṁsīr devaḥ śaviṣṭha martyam | na tvad anyo asti
maghavan*⁸⁷ *pātā vā pālayitā vā*⁸⁸ *jetā vā sukhayitā vā | indra bravāmi te
vaca iti stutiyuktam (-saṁyuktam B) ||28|| [=13.41]*

“*haṁsaḥ śuciśad vasur antarikṣasad dhotā vediśad atithir duroṇasat |
nṛśad 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(ṇān
B)+abhyāsenā+ādityamaṇḍaleneti | tyajātīti (tyayatīti B) lokaḥ | tyajātīti
(tyayatīti B) haṁsaḥ (haṁsayan B) | tyajantīti (tyayatīti B) *haṁsāḥ*
paramahaṁsāḥ | paramātmā sūryaraśmibhiḥ prabhūtagabhīra(B; gabhīra
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 (cared 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 rasāś cikīrṣayanti (vikarṣayati B) | raśmibhiś (raśmir B)
cikīrṣayantīti vā (vikarṣayati B) | vahnir vikarṣayati | natam (vananam B)
bhavatīty (bhavati | B) aśvagojā adrigojā dhana(dharitri B)gojāḥ
sarvagojātīrṇa iti tejo bahujo śabdo bhavati (sarve gojā ṛtajā bahuśabdā
bhavanti B) | nigamo nigamavyo (nigamavyati B) bhavanty eṣa
nirvacanāya ||29|| [=13.44]⁸⁹

“*dvā suparṇā sayujā sakhāyā samānam vṛkṣam pari śasvajāte* |

⁸⁶ Note B: *tvam aṅga* – The *ādityapara* and the *ātmāpara* meanings are not given in the case of this ṛik too.

⁸⁷ 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.

⁸⁸ Note B: *pātā vā pālayitā vā* – These words are interpolated here from the explanation of the word *pati*.

⁸⁹ 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.

tayor anyah pippalam svādv atty anaśnann anyo abhi cākaśīti ||” [RV 1,164.20; AVŚ 9,9.20]

*dvaṁ dvaṁ pratiṣṭhitau sukṛtau dharmakartārau | duṣkṛtaṁ pāpaṁ
parisārakam ity ācakṣate | suparṇā sayujā sakhāyety ātmānaṁ durātmā-
naṁ paramātmānaṁ pratyuttiṣṭhati | śarīra eva taj jāyate vṛkṣam | ṛkṣam
(rakṣa B) śarīram | vṛkṣe (vṛkṣam B) pakṣau pratiṣṭhāpayati |
tayor anyad bhuktvā+annam (anyad S) anaśnann anyāṁ sarūpatām
salokatām aśnute | ya evaṁ vedān (vidvān B)⁹⁰ anaśnann anyo
'bhicākaśīti | ity ātmagatim ācaṣṭe ||30|| [=13.42]*

*“ā yāhīndra pathibhir īlītebhir yajñam imam no bhāgadheyaṁ juṣasva |
trptām jahur mātulasyeva yoṣā bhāgas te paitṛṣvaseyī vapām iva* ||”
[RVKh 2,14.6 (7,55.10)]

*āgamiṣyanti śakro devatās tās tribhir tīrthebhiḥ śakrapratarair
īlītebhis tribhis tīrthair yajñam imam no yajñabhāgam agnīśomabhāgāv
indro juṣasva | trptām evaṁ mātulayogakanyābhāgam sartṛkeva sā yā
devatās tās tatsthāne śakraṁ nidarśanam ||31|| [=13.4X]⁹¹*

*“vipraṁ viprāso 'vase devaṁ martāsa ūtaye |
agniṁ gīrbhir havāmahe* ||” [RV 8,11.6]
*vipraṁ viprāso 'vase viduḥ | veda vindater veditavyam | vimalaṁ śarīram
(vimalaśarīreṇa B) vāyunā | vipras tu (hṛt- B) padmanilaya (sthita B) m
hṛdisthitam (om. B) akārasaṁhāritam (-saṁhitam B) ukāram pūrayan
(pūrayen B) makāranilayaṁ gamayati (gataṁ B) | vipraṁ⁹² prāṇesu
binduḥ siktam (bindusiktam B) vikasitam vahnitejaḥ prabhuṁ (-prabham
B) kanakaṁ (kanaka- B) padmeṣv amṛtaśarīram amṛtajātasthitam
amṛtavādām (-vācām B) ṛtamukhā (-mukhe B) vadanti | agniṁ
gīrbhir havāmahe | agniṁ saṁbodhayet “agniḥ sarvā devatāḥ” [KS 12.1;
AiB 1,1.1] iti | tasyottarā bhūyase nirvacanāya ||32|| [=13.43]⁹³*

*“jātavedase sunavāma somam arātīyato ni dahāti vedaḥ |
sa naḥ parṣad ati durgāṇi viśvā nāveva sindhuṁ duritāty agniḥ* ||” [RV
1,99.1]

⁹⁰ B reads: aśnute ya evaṁ vidvān |.

⁹¹ 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 ātmapara meaning.

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

⁹² B reads: ...gataṁ vipraṁ....

⁹³ Note B ad §32: The bhāṣya does not explain the ṛik.

jātavedasa iti | *jātam idam sarvaṃ sacarācaram sthityutpattipralaya-*
nyāyena(+ā/acchāya B *pro* +arcāya) *jātavedasyām vaivam jātavedase*
'rcāya (*jāta... om. B*)⁹⁴ | *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 durgāni viśvāni*
 (*om. B*) *durgamāni* (°gamanāni B) *sthānāni nāveva sindhum* | *nāvā*
sindhum (*om. B*) *yathā yaḥ* (*om. B*) *kaścit karṇadhāro nāvā* (*nāveva B*)
sindhoḥ syandamānānām (*syandanān B*) *nadīm jaladurgām mahākūlām*
tārayati | *duritāty agnir* iti | *duritāni tārayati* | *tasyaiṣāparā bhavati* ||33||
 [=13.46]⁹⁵

“*idam te 'nyābhir asamānam adbhīr yāḥ kās ca sindhum pra vahanti*
nadyaḥ |

sarpo jīrṇām iva tvacaṃ jahāti pāpaṃ saśirasko 'bhyupetya ||” [untraced]
*idam te 'nyābhir asamānābhir*⁹⁶ *yāḥ kās ca sindhum patim kṛtvā nadyo*
vahanti | *sarpo jīrṇām iva sarpaḥ*⁹⁷ *tvacaṃ tyajati* | *pāpaṃ tyajanti*⁹⁸ | *āpa*
āpnoteḥ | *tāsām eṣā bhavati*⁹⁹ ||34|| [=13.4Y]¹⁰⁰

“*tryambakaṃ yajāmahe sugandhim puṣṭivardhanam* |
urvārukam iva bandhanān mṛtyor mukṣīya mām ṛtāt ||” [RV 7,59.12]
tryambako rudraḥ | *taṃ tryambakaṃ yajāmahe sugandhim* | *sugandhim*
suṣṭhugandhim | *puṣṭivardhanaṃ puṣṭikārakam iva*¹⁰¹ | *urvārukam iva*
phalaṃ bandhanād ārodhanān mṛtyoḥ sakāśān muñcasva mām | *kasmād*
*iti*¹⁰² | *eṣāparā* (*eṣām itareṣāparā B*) *bhavati*¹⁰³ ||35|| [=13.45]¹⁰⁴

“*śataṃ jīva śarado vardhamānaḥ śataṃ hemantān chatam u vasantān* |

⁹⁴ 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.].

⁹⁵ The place of this section is according to B.

⁹⁶ Note B: The *bhāṣya* wrongly reads *asamānābhiḥ* for *asamānam adbhīḥ* of the [untraced] ṛik.

⁹⁷ Note B: *sarpo jīrṇām iva sarpaḥ* – one of the two *sarpa* words is superfluous.

⁹⁸ Note B: *pāpaṃ tyajanti* – This should be *pāpaṃ tyajati*.

⁹⁹ Note B: *tāsām eṣā bhavati* – These words serve no purpose here and should be omitted.

¹⁰⁰ No proper number in S for this section, which is omitted by several Mss.

¹⁰¹ Note B: *puṣṭikārakam iva* – The *iva* in this is useless.

¹⁰² Note B: *kasmād iti* – The words should better be read before *mṛtyoḥ sakāśāt*.

¹⁰³ 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]

¹⁰⁴ The place of this section is according to B.

śatam indrāgnī savitā bṛhaspatiḥ śatāyuṣā haviṣemaṃ punar duḥ ||” [RV 10,161.4)

śatam jīva śarado vardhamāna ity api nigamo bhavati | *śatam* iti | *śatam* dīrgham āyuh¹⁰⁵ | maruto māṃ (maruta enā B) vardhayanti | *śatam* (enam add. B) eva *śatam* ātmānaṃ (śatātmānaṃ B) bhavati¹⁰⁶ | *śatam* anantaṃ bhavati | *śatam* aiśvaryam bhavati | *śatam* iti | *śatam* dīrgham āyuh ||36|| [=13.47]

“mā te rādhāṃsi mā ta ūtayo vaso ’smān kadā canā dabhan |
viśvā ca na upa mīmīhi mānuṣa vasūni carṣaṇibhya ā ||” [RV 1,84.20]
mā ca te dhānāni (dhāmāni B) mā ca te kadā canā (ca naḥ B) sariṣuḥ |
sarvāṇi prajñānāny upamānāya manuṣyahito ’yam ādityo ’yam ātmā
athaitad anupravadati (-vadanti B) | athainaṃ (°aitam B)¹⁰⁷
mahāntam ātmānaṃ 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)¹⁰⁸
namo yāskāya | brahma śuklamasīya | brahma śuklamasīya ||37|| [=13.48]
[|| iti pariśiṣṭam ||]

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
com-mentary, t. 3, ed. S. Kunjan
Pillai, *Trivandrum Sanskrit Series*
185, 1957.
AVP: Atharvaveda-Saṃhitā,
Paippālada rec.

¹⁰⁵ Note B: *śatam* iti *śatam* dīrgham āyuh – The bhāṣya explains the word *śatam* in the ṛik in this way; but there *śatam* qualifies *śaradaḥ*, *hemantān* and *vasantān*.

¹⁰⁶ Note B: *maruta enā vardhayanti* and *śatam enam eva śatātmānaṃ bhavati* are explanations which correspond to no word in the ṛik.

¹⁰⁷ Note B: *atha* should be *iti* as the group treating the ātmapara ṛiks ends here.

¹⁰⁸ Note B: *namaḥ pāraskarāya* – Does this show that the author of this adhyāya was Pāraskara?

AVŚ: Atharvaveda-Saṃhitā, Śaunaka rec.
 BĀU: Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad.
 BĀUBh: Śāṅkara's Bhāṣya on BĀU.
 BhG: Bhagavad-Gītā.
 BhgP: Bhāgavata-Purāṇa.
 BD/Bṛh.D.: Bṛhaddevatā.
 BS: Brahma-Sūtra.
 BSBh: Śāṅkara's Bhāṣya on BS.
 Buddh.: Aśvaghoṣa's Buddhacarita.
 ChU: Chandogya-Upaniṣad.
 GaU: Garbha-Upaniṣad.
 GoB: Gopatha-Bṛāhmaṇa.
 JaiSa: Jaiminīyasamhitā of the Brahmāṇḍa-Purāṇa. See Smets 2013.
 JUB: Jaiminīya-Upaniṣadbrāhmaṇa.
 KauĀ: Kauṣītaki-Āraṇyaka.
 KauB: Kauṣītaki-Bṛāhmaṇa.
 KauU: Kauṣītaki-Upaniṣad.
 KeU: Kena-Upaniṣad.
 KS: Kāṭhaka-Saṃhitā of the Yajurveda.
 KU: Kātha-Upaniṣad.
 KUBh: Śāṅkara'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: Śābara's Bhāṣya on Mīmāṃsāsūtra.

N: Niruktopaniṣad, 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 GRETEL.

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 *Prakarapañcikā*, 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.
 RVSAṇu: Kātyāyana's RV-Sarvānukramaṇī, with Ṣaḍguruśiṣya's commentary (Vedārthadīpikā), ed. A. A. Macdonell, Oxford, 1886.
 ŚāṅkhGS: Śāṅkhāyana-GṛhyaSūtra.
 ŚāṅkhSS: Śāṅkhāyana-ŚrautaSūtra.
 ŚB K/M: Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa, Kāṇva/Mādhyamīdina 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: Śāṅkara's Bhāṣya on TU.
 Vacanamālā: See YVS.
 VaikhGS: Vaikhānasa-GṛhyaSūtra.
 VP: Bhartṛhari's Vākyapadīya (mūlakārikās) with the commentary of Puṇyārāja, *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. forthcoming. "Causes of Suffering: Unravelling Suśruta and Sāṅkhya", *Studia Orientalia Electronica*.

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*.

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 Cāḷukyas and the Rāṣtrakūṭas", *Journal of Indological Studies* 18: 85-111.
- Iyer, K. A. Subramania. 1977. (trans.) *The Vākyapadīya of Bhartṛhari, 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-Brahmaṇa*, 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 Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa: 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-sloka-vārttikam*. Bahalgarh (Kolkata) : Ramlal Kapur Trust.

Visigalli, Paolo. 2024. "Nominalistic Monism: The Etymological Roots of Yāska's Theology", *ABORI*.

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