

# Towards a relative chronology of ankara's works

Autor(en): **Andrijani, Ivan**

Objektyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Asiatische Studien : Zeitschrift der Schweizerischen  
Asiengesellschaft = Études asiatiques : revue de la Société  
Suisse-Asie**

Band (Jahr): **70 (2016)**

Heft 2

PDF erstellt am: **24.07.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-696835>

## **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern. Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

## **Haftungsausschluss**

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

Ivan Andrijanić\*

# Towards a Relative Chronology of Śaṅkara's Works

DOI 10.1515/asia-2015-0050

**Abstract:** This article presents philological observations which may help to establish a relative chronology of some of the works attributed to Śaṅkara. Commentaries on the Upaniṣads ascribed to Śaṅkara are compared to his commentaries on those parts of *Brahma-Sūtras* that discuss the same Upaniṣadic passages. Closer investigation of some of these passages might lead to some conclusions about the chronology of these works. The article investigates examples from *Taittirīya-Upaniṣad* 2.1–5 and *Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad* 3.7 respectively discussed in *Brahmasūtra-Bhāṣya* 1.1.12–1.1.19 and 1.2.18–20, an example from *Kaṭha-Upaniṣad* 1.3.1 (3.1), which is presented both in *Brahmasūtra-Bhāṣya* 1.2.11–12 and in *Kaṭhopaniṣad-Bhāṣya* 1.3.1, together with some examples of interpretations of the same verses in different Upaniṣads, such as the verse which occurs as *Muṇḍaka-Upaniṣad* 2.2.10 and *Kaṭha-Upaniṣad* 2.2.15 (5.15) and two verses shared by *Īśā-Upaniṣad*, *Kaṭha-Upaniṣad* and *Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad*. These examples will reveal some textual parallels in these commentaries, which might provide some clues for establishing a chronology of these passages.

**Keywords:** Chronology, Śaṅkara, commentary, advaita, vedānta

## 1 Introduction

In this article, I would like to present some observations which may help us to establish a relative chronology of some of the works attributed to Śaṅkara.<sup>1</sup> As a

---

<sup>1</sup> Hacker (1968) already attempted to establish the chronology of some of Śaṅkara's works. Hacker remarked that Śaṅkara's thought bears a resemblance to the Yoga system, and that there is a transition in Śaṅkara's works from Yoga to Vedānta. Hacker considered Śaṅkara's commentary on *Māṇḍukyopaniṣad-Kārikās* and the 19<sup>th</sup> *prakaraṇa* of the *Padyabandha* of the *Upadeśasāhasrī* to be his earliest Advaitic works, as they stand closer to Yoga than his other works. Hacker considered Śaṅkara's *TaittUBh* to be a transition towards his mature Advaita works (further elaborated in Vetter 1979). According to Biardeau (1959) (criticised by Vetter

---

\*Corresponding author: Ivan Andrijanić, Department of Indology and Far Eastern Studies, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb, Ivana Lučića 3, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia. E-mail: iandrij@ffzg.hr.

starting point I shall attempt to compare examples from commentaries on the Upaniṣads ascribed to Śaṅkara and Śaṅkara's commentary on those parts of *Brahma-Sūtras* (*BS*) which discuss the same Upaniṣadic passages.<sup>2</sup> When one compares, for instance, Śaṅkara's *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad-bhāṣya* (*BAUBh*) 3.7, which discusses the Inner Ruler (*antaryāmin*) with Śaṅkara's commentary on *antaryāmī-adhikaraṇa* in *BS* 1.2.18–20, which discusses the same Upaniṣadic passage, a significant difference between Śaṅkara's two interpretations of the same text is apparent. Such inconsistencies can be understood as indicating some kind of historical development. Closer investigation of such "inconsistencies" might lead us to conclusions about their chronology. On the other hand, similarities in the interpretation of the same Upaniṣadic passage in two different works ascribed to Śaṅkara will also be analysed. The basic premise is that, when obvious similarities between two texts exist, one text must have been used as a model for the construction of the other, which must be considered more recent. Again, closer investigation can provide a key as to which texts might have been used as a model for others. In a way, this procedure is reminiscent of Rüping's<sup>3</sup> analysis of Śaṅkara's and Bhāskara's commentaries on the *Brahma-Sūtras*, in

---

[1979: 16–18]), Śaṅkara turned from "negative" theology to "positive" theology. As *BhGBh* and *BAUBh* contain more negative theology, she considered them to be earlier works. On the other hand, she considered *TaittUBh* and *BSBh* to be later works, as they contain more "positive" theology.

**2** *Brahma-Sūtra-Bhāṣya* is usually considered as a standard for determining Śaṅkara's authorship. Padmapāda mentions Śaṅkara's name at the beginning of his *Pañcapādikā* both as the author of *BSBh* and as his teacher. I believe that there is no reason to doubt Śaṅkara's authorship of some other works as well. Sureśvara, who claims in his *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi* 4.74 and 4.76 that he served Śaṅkara's lotus feet (as his direct disciple), composed a commentary on Śaṅkara's *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad-Bhāṣya* where he mentions Śaṅkara as his teacher (Sureśvara ad *BAUBh* 6.5.25). Marschner (1933) also provided evidence of significant agreement between *BAUBh* and *BSBh*. Sureśvara also composed a commentary on Śaṅkara's commentary on the *Taittirīya-Upaniṣad*. So *BSBh*, *BAUBh*, and *TaittUBh* are surely works of an author named Śaṅkara. On the other hand, Hacker (1947) analysed the colophons of the manuscripts of Śaṅkara's works and concluded that *BSBh*, *BhGBh* and commentaries on the early Upaniṣads, with the exception of *Śvetāśvatara-Upaniṣad*, are Śaṅkara's authentic works (according to Vetter [1979: 12], Hauschild [1927: 64–71], also disproves Śaṅkara's authorship of the *bhāṣya* on *ŚvU*). See also Hacker (1968), where he considers the following works authentic: *Upadeśasāhasrī*, commentaries on the *Brahma-Sūtras*, *Bhagavad-Gītā*, *Adhyātmapaṭala*, *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*-, *Chāndogya*-, *Aitareya*-, *Taittirīya*-, *Kena*-, *Īśā*-, *Kaṭha*-, *Muṇḍaka*- (according to Vetter [1979: 12], Hertel [1924: 17] also acknowledges Śaṅkara's authorship), *Praśna-Upaniṣad*, and *Māṇḍukyopaniṣad-Kārikās*.

**3** Rüping 1977.

which he made convincing arguments<sup>4</sup> supporting the theory that Bhāskara's commentary is greatly based on Śaṅkara's, and not that both are based on an older lost source, as Ingalls<sup>5</sup> and Hacker<sup>6</sup> had claimed.

These examples, however, still cannot provide a comprehensive picture of the chronology of these works. More material needs to be examined. Such a thorough examination would require a much more extensive study. The goal of the present study is solely to propose a manner how material can be examined and the kind of results this can yield. I hope that this methodology if applied to a larger corpus will yield more comprehensive results in the future.

## 2 Antaryāmin or the Inner Ruler in *BSBh* and in *BAUBh*

Antaryāmin, the Inner Ruler, is described in *BAU* 3.7, and this Upaniṣadic passage is discussed in *BS* 1.2.18–20. *Brahma-Sūtra* 1.2.18 mentions Antaryāmin with the claim that “the internal Ruler in the divine and other contexts (is the Supreme Self), since the characteristics of that (Supreme Self) are spoken of”.<sup>7</sup> Śaṅkara's commentary on this *sūtra* starts with a quotation from *BAU* 3.7 where the Inner Ruler (*antaryāmin*) is described. Next, the question is raised as to whether the Inner Ruler is some divine being (*devatā*), an accomplished *yogin*, the Supreme Self (*paramātman*), or something else (*arthāntara*). After this, possible answers as to what Antaryāmin may be are introduced: (a) The term *antaryāmin* is uncommon (*aprasiddha*), so it must be something uncommon, different from other possibilities (*devatā*, *yogin* etc.), (b) Or the term *antaryāmin* is not completely uncommon because the word *antaryamana*

4 Rüping (1977: 27–64) compared Śaṅkara's and Bhāskara's commentaries on *BS* 1.1.12–19; 3.3.12; 1.4.26; 1.1.23, 25, 31; 1.2.6; 2.1.21–23; 2.1.13; 1.4.10; 2.1.6; 2.3.43 and 1.4.22 (according to Śaṅkara's numbering) and showed how Bhāskara's text is nothing more than an abbreviation and simplification of Śaṅkara's text. Because of Bhāskara's process of abbreviation, arguments are sometimes confused and unclear in comparison to Śaṅkara's. One important thing is the fact that in Bhāskara's text one cannot find anything that did not already exist in Śaṅkara's text. Rüping actually claims that Bhāskara did not have access to some old source, but only to Śaṅkara's text. There is still reason to think that Śaṅkara's text draws from some older source now lost. The most striking example is *BSBh* 1.1.12–19 where two conflicting views on *Ānandamaya* are presented, one of which might stem from an old source.

5 Ingalls 1954: 294.

6 Hacker 1953: 26.

7 Tr. Gambhirananda 1956: 133. *BS* 1.2.18: *antaryāmy adhidāivādiṣu taddharmavyapadeśāt* |

is known, and because of that it can be some deity (*devatā*) presiding over the Earth etc. and controlling it from within. As Antaryāmin is designated in the text (BAU 3.9.10) as the one whose dwelling is in the Earth, and as the one who has *agni* as sight and *manas* as light,<sup>8</sup> he is endowed with what has to be performed and with instruments of action (*kāryakaraṇa*). This means that rulership (*yamayitṛtva*) is ascribed to him. (c) Rulership could also belong to an accomplished *yogin* who is able to enter and rule all things from within.<sup>9</sup> This passage is finished with a claim (d) that Antaryāmin cannot be the Supreme Self, because the Supreme Self does not possess what has to be performed and instruments of action (*kāryakaraṇa*) required for ruling.

Śaṅkara answers with the claim that Antaryāmin is the Supreme Self. This is so because the characteristics of the Supreme Self are described in the Upaniṣad. Antaryāmin rules over all things including the realm of the gods and others while dwelling within them. He also possesses the qualities of selfhood and immortality (*ātmatvāmṛtatva*) suitable for the Supreme Self. Śaṅkara dismisses the argument that Antaryāmin is a deity of Earth etc. because the Upaniṣad text says that the Earth does not know Antaryāmin.<sup>10</sup> This means that Antaryāmin is not known by the Earth deity, so he must be different from it. Furthermore, attributes like “unseen”, “unheard” etc. from BAU 3.7.23<sup>11</sup> also point to a Supreme Self which is devoid of form. At the end, Śaṅkara rejects the objection that Antaryāmin cannot exercise rulership without instruments of action (because of that he cannot be the Supreme Self) with a claim that Antaryāmin takes control of the instruments of the deities of Earth and others whom he rules from within.

Śaṅkara’s commentary on the Upaniṣad itself (BAUBh 3.7.3) claims that Antaryāmin is not a deity (*devatā*) and that he does not possess what has to be performed and the instruments of action (*kāryakaraṇa*), but the instruments of action of deities serve as his own. Essentially this is the same as in BSBh, where he enters and rules the organs of deities from within.<sup>12</sup>

**8** BSBh 1.2.18, BWS p. 79, 16ff: *tasmāt pṛthivyādyabhimānī kaścīd devo ’ntaryāmī syāt | tathā ca śrūyate – pṛthivy eva yasyāyatanam agnir loko mano jyotiḥ (BAU 3.9.10) ity ādi | sa ca kāryakaraṇavattvāt pṛthivyādīn antastiṣṭhan yamayatīti yuktaṃ devatātmano yamayitṛtvam |*

**9** BSBh 1.2.18, BWS p. 79, 19f: *yogino vā kasyacit siddhasya sarvānupraveśena yamayitṛtvam syāt |*

**10** BAU 3.7.3: *yam pṛthivī na veda |*

**11** BAU 3.7.23 *adr̥ṣṭo draṣṭāśrutah śrotāmato mantāvijñāto vijñātā |* “He sees, but he can’t be seen; he hears, but he can’t be heard; he thinks, but he can’t be thought of; he perceives, but he can’t be perceived”. (Tr. Olivelle 1998: 89)

**12** BSBh 1.2.18, BWS p. 80, 4f: *yat tv akāryakaraṇasya paramātmano yamayitṛtvam nopapadyata iti | naiṣa doṣaḥ | yān niyacchati tatkāryakaraṇair eva, tasya kāryakaraṇavattvopapatteḥ |* (“The objection that the highest Self is destitute of the organs and action, and hence cannot be the

In *BAUBh* 3.7.3, with the words *tatraitat syāt pṛthivīdevataiva antaryāmīty ...* (“With regard to that, there might be such [a view] viz., ‘Antaryāmin is none other than the Earth deity’ ...”) Śaṅkara presents an objection that is the same as his opponent’s objection from *BSBh* 1.2.18 where it is said that Antaryāmin is a deity identified with the Earth: *tasmāt pṛthivyādyabhimānī kaścīd devo ’ntaryāmī syāt* | (“Because of that, Antaryāmin must be some deity identifying itself with Earth etc.”). Śaṅkara refutes this idea in *BAUBh* with exactly the same argument he uses in *BSBh* 1.2.18, according to which Antaryāmin cannot be the Earth deity because the Upaniṣadic text (*BAU* 3.7.3) says that the Earth does not know the Inner Ruler.

In *BAUBh* we do not encounter the possibilities from *BSBh* that Antaryāmin might be an accomplished *yogin* or something unknown (*aprasiddha*). This can be explained in a way that Śaṅkara may have chosen only the most important objection from his *BSBh* and that he incorporated it into his commentary on *BAU*. Śaṅkara’s commentary on *BAU* would in that case be a simplified version of the commentary on *BS* in which only the most important objections are dealt with, while minor ones are omitted.

Another interesting fact in *BAUBh* is that Antaryāmin, the Inner ruler, is here not understood as the Supreme Self. This is in contrast to Śaṅkara’s claims in the *BSBh* where Antaryāmin is clearly interpreted as the Supreme Self. In his commentary on *BAU* 3.8.12, Śaṅkara describes a progressive amounting of limiting adjuncts. Endowed with limiting adjuncts of ignorance, desire, work, body and ignorance, the Supreme Self is known as the individual soul undergoing rebirth (*jīva*, *saṃsārin*).<sup>13</sup> The Supreme Self with adjuncts of the power of unsurpassed and eternal knowledge is called Antaryāmin and Īśvara.<sup>14</sup> Without any limiting adjuncts (*nirupādhi*), it is called *akṣara* or the Highest (*para*).<sup>15</sup> Here we can see a tripartite progressive amounting of limiting adjuncts: *saṃsārin*>*antaryāmin*>*akṣara* or *jīva*>*īśvara*>*para*. *Jīva* stands for *saṃsārin*,

---

ruler, is without force, because organs and action may be ascribed to him owing to the organs of action of those whom he rules.” tr. Thibaut 1890[I]: 132).

*BAUBh* 3.7.3, TPU p. 822, 3f: *parāthakartavyatāsvabhāvatvāt parasya yat kāryaṃ karaṇaṃ ca tad evāśya, na svataḥ* | (“Because his nature is that he has to work for others, what has to be preformed and instruments of action [action and organs] of others serve as his own, they are not his own.”).

**13** *BAUBh* 3.8.12, TPU, p. 832, 17: *avidyākāmakarmaviśiṣṭakāryakaraṇopādhir ātmā saṃsārī jīva ucyate* |

**14** *BAUBh* 3.8.12, TPU, p. 832, 18: *nityaniratisayajñānaśaktyupādhir ātmāntaryāmiśvara ucyate* |

**15** *BAUBh* 3.8.12, TPU, p. 832, 19: *sa eva nirūpādhiḥ kevalaḥ śuddhaḥ svena svabhāvenāḅkṣaram para ucyate* |

Antaryāmin for Īśvara, and *akṣara* for *para*. In a similar way Antaryāmin is described as lower Brahman in the commentary on the *Aitareya-Upaniṣad* (*AiU*) 3.3 traditionally attributed to Śaṅkara.<sup>16</sup> *AiUBh* 3.3 describes how Brahman is gradually diversified by different limiting adjuncts. First, the highest Brahman is freed from any distinction, without stain etc.<sup>17</sup> Next Antaryāmin is described as the all-knowing Lord (Īśvara) connected with the pure limiting adjuncts of discrimination (*prajñā*).<sup>18</sup> After Antaryāmin there comes Hiraṇyagarbha, next are Virāṭ and Prajāpati with their respective limiting adjuncts, and the deities (*devatā*) following Virāṭ and Prajāpati.<sup>19</sup> We have here a description of how Brahman gets its name and forms from the highest one to a clump of grass in accordance to what limiting adjunct it is connected with.

In this sense, Śaṅkara's description of Antaryāmin in his commentaries on *BAU* and *AiU* are very much the same, and are quite different from the description of Antaryāmin in *BSBh*. Śaṅkara's *BAUBh* and *BSBh* have the same objection that regards Antaryāmin as an Earth deity, and in both commentaries Śaṅkara uses the same argument to refute such a claim. However, when it comes to the interpretation of what Antaryāmin truly is, the difference between *BSBh* and the commentaries on *BAU* and *AiU* becomes apparent. This means that the commentaries on *BAU* and *AiU* show both similarities to each other and differences from *BSBh*. It can therefore be assumed that the commentaries on *BAU* and *AiU* belong to a group of texts composed in some kind of proximity to each other, but at a distance from the commentary on *BS*. If we assume that this distance is temporal, it can be assumed that Śaṅkara composed his *BSBh* during one period of his activity and his commentaries on both Upaniṣads in another period.

<sup>16</sup> *Aitareyopaniṣad-bhāṣya* is traditionally considered as Śaṅkara's work. Hacker (1947: 12–13; Hacker 1968: 135 and 147), according to his analysis of manuscript colophons, included *AiUBh* in his list of genuine Śaṅkara's works. As modern scholarship until now did not propose any arguments against the claim of Śaṅkara's authorship, I shall treat *AiUBh* as his work as a working hypothesis.

<sup>17</sup> *AiUBh* 3.3 TPU, p. 349, 10f: *tad etat pratyastamitasarvopādhiviśeṣaṃ sannirañjanam nirmalaṃ niṣkriyaṃ śāntam ekam advayaṃ "neti neti" iti* (*BAU* 2.3.6, 3.9.26, 4.2.4, 4.5.15) *sarvaviśeṣāpohasaṃvedyaṃ sarvaśabdapratyayāgocaram* |

<sup>18</sup> *AiUBh* 3.3 TPU, p. 349, 11f: *tadatyantaviśuddhaprajñopādhisambandhena sarvajñam īśvaram sarvasādhāraṇāvyaḥkṛtajagadbijapravartakaṃ niyantrtvād antaryāmisamjñam bhavati* |

<sup>19</sup> *AiUBh* 3.3 TPU, p. 349, 13f: *tad eva vyāḥkṛtajagadbijabhūtabuddhyātmābhimānalakṣaṇam hiraṇyagarbhasamjñam bhavati* | *tad evāntaraṇḍodbhūtaprathamaśarīropādhimadvirāṭprajāpatīsamjñam bhavati* |

### 3 Ānandamaya in *BSBh* 1.1.12–1.1.19 and *TaittUBh* 2.5

In *BS* 1.1.12–1.1.19 we find two conflicting interpretations of Ānandamaya from *Taittirīya-Upaniṣad* 2.5.<sup>20</sup> The discussion focuses on whether Ānandamaya refers to Brahman or to the individual soul. In the first part, which comprises the commentaries on *BS* 1.1.12–1.1.19, it is claimed that Ānandamaya designates the highest Brahman. This position is defended against objections according to which Ānandamaya refers to a secondary Self (*amukhyātman*) or bodily Self (*śārīrātman*). Śaṅkara defended his claim that Ānandamaya is the Supreme Brahman up to the second part of his commentary on *BS* 1.1.19 (BWŚ p. 40,6 ff.), where he offers arguments that Ānandamaya does not refer to the highest Brahman at all. This second interpretation is the same as Śaṅkara's interpretation of *TaittU* 2.5.

*BSBh* 1.1.12 starts with an introduction to a passage from *TaittU* 2.1–5, which deals with a row of selves consisting of the essence of food (*annarasamaya*), of breath (*prāṇamaya*), of mind (*manomaya*), of intelligence<sup>21</sup> (*vijñānamaya*), and of bliss (*ānandamaya*). Next, the doubt (*tatra saṁśayaḥ*) is raised whether Ānandamaya is to be understood as the highest Brahman (*param eva brahma*) or something else that is similar to the other four selves. Immediately after, the objection is raised according to which Ānandamaya is a secondary self (*amukhyātman*). There are two arguments for this: (a) Ānandamaya occurs in

<sup>20</sup> For Deussen (1883: 150–151) the second interpretation was possibly a later interpolation. If this should be true, Deussen assumed, then the attribution of the *Taittirīya-Upaniṣad-Bhāṣya* to Śaṅkara may not be correct, because the attribution is based on the identity of the teaching found in the *Taittirīya-Upaniṣad-Bhāṣya* with this second interpretation. A first objection to Deussen's supposition was raised already by Thibaut (1890[I]: xxxiii, ft. 1). Later Kanakura (1926: 383–385) claimed that this last part of *BSBh* 1.1.19 is not an interpolation due to the fact that Vācaspati Miśra commented on this text passage in his *Bhāmatī* where he claims that the second opinion is Śaṅkara's genuine interpretation. Kanakura's second argument is that Sureśvara in his sub-commentary on *TaittUBh* favored the second interpretation from *BSBh* 1.1.19 contained also in Śaṅkara's *TaittUBh* 2.5. The second interpretation is not some late interpolation, because there is no doubt that the *TaittUBh* is a genuine work of Śaṅkara. To this I can add that the main argument for this is that Sureśvara, who himself claimed that he is Śaṅkara's direct disciple (*BAUBhV* 6.5.24, *NaiS* 4.76–77), wrote a commentary on the *TaittUBh*. Because of that, the time gap between Śaṅkara and Vācaspati is not so important. If the second interpretation really is an addition, it is possible that Śaṅkara inserted the passage himself, maybe even after he composed the commentary on *TaittU* 2.5 which is the same as his second interpretation in *BSBh* 1.1.19.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Olivelle (1998: 303), who translated *vijñānamaya* as “consisting of perception”.



the same sequence as *annamaya* (*pravāhapatita*) and therefore must be some similar entity. (b) Some properties are attributed in the *TaittU* to *Ānandamaya* which do not suit the Supreme Brahman, such as being embodied (*śarīratva*) and having pleasure as its head. Śaṅkara answers these arguments with a claim that *Ānandamaya* can be only the highest Self (*para evātmānandamayo bhavitum arhati*). This claim is further explained in detail.

The text of the commentary on the next few *sūtras* (1.1.13–17) tries to prove that *Ānandamaya* is the highest Brahman against various objections, of which the most interesting is the claim from *BSBh* 1.1.13 that the suffix *-maya* denotes modification (*vikāra*). This is answered with the claim that the suffix *-maya* means “abundance” (*prācurya*); according to this argument, *Ānandamaya* means “abundant bliss” or “in which bliss is abundantly established”.<sup>22</sup>

In *BSBh* 1.1.19 the conclusion is reached that *Ānandamaya* is identical with the highest Self (*tasmād ānandamayaḥ paramātmēti sthitam*).<sup>23</sup>

Immediately after these words, Śaṅkara offers a completely contrary interpretation with the words *idaṃ tv iha vaktavyam* “but here this has to be said”. In their commentaries on Śaṅkara’s *BSBh* 1.1.19, *Ānandagiri* and *Govindānanda* attributed the first part from 1.1.12–19 to *Vṛttikāra/Vṛttikṛt*<sup>24</sup> (an author of an older commentary) while *Vācaspati Miśra* attributed the same passage to *ekadeśin* (one whose knowledge is partial),<sup>25</sup> while all three sub-commentators consider the part that begins with the words *idaṃ tv iha vaktavyam* (*BWŚ* p. 40,6 ff.) as Śaṅkara’s own opinion.<sup>26</sup> In his second interpretation Śaṅkara uses the same arguments the objector presented in *BSBh* 1.1.12–13. Śaṅkara’s arguments that *Ānandamaya* is not the highest Self in *BSBh* 1.1.19 are: (a) the suffix *-maya* in the sequence *annarasamaya*, *prāṇamaya*, *manomaya* and *vijñānamaya* cannot first express a modification and then suddenly mean “abundance” in the compound *Ānanda-maya*. (b) *Ānandamaya* occurs in the same sequence as the other four terms and thus belongs to the same category.

<sup>22</sup> Translation by Bronkhorst 2004: 5. The argument that *-maya* denotes abundance may originate from the *Kāśikā-Vṛtti ad Pāṇini* 5.4.21 (*tat prakṛtavacane mayat*), where the word *prakṛta* is understood as *prācuryeṇa prastutam* (“abundantly established (?), Bronkhorst 2004: 5). *Kāśikā-Vṛtti ad Pāṇini* 5.4.21 mentions the example of *annamaya* for illustrating that the suffix *-maya* means abundance.

<sup>23</sup> The first interpretation starts in *BWŚ* on p. 39,21 and finishes on p. 40,6.

<sup>24</sup> *Govindānanda* uses the plural form *vṛttikṛtām*. It is not clear whether there were older commentaries or *Govindānanda* uses the honorific plural. See also Rüping 1977: 27–28.

<sup>25</sup> *BSŚWC* p. 125.

<sup>26</sup> *Svamata* in *Bhāmatī* as opposed to *ekadeśimata* and to *vṛttikāramata* in *Govindānanda’s Bhāṣyaratnaprabha*.

(c) Ānandamaya is mentioned in *TaittU* 2.5 as having pleasure as its head.<sup>27</sup> Since pleasure is not a predicate of Brahman, Ānandamaya and Brahman cannot be identical. (d) Ānandamaya is not designated as Brahman in the *TaittU*; Brahman is actually mentioned in *TaittU* 2.5 as *brahma pucchaṃ pratiṣṭhā* (“... the bottom on which it rests is the *brahman*”<sup>28</sup>). According to Śaṅkara, Brahman in the highest sense is this bottom, on which Ānandamaya rests. The claim that highest Brahman is meant with the words *brahma pucchaṃ pratiṣṭhā* is the same as in *TaittUBh* 2.5. This means that Śaṅkara in *BSBh* 1.1.19 used the same arguments which the objector raised in *BSBh* 1.1.12. To see what Śaṅkara’s genuine (or later) position on Ānandamaya is, we should consult his commentary on *TaittU*.

In *TaittUBh* 2.5, Śaṅkara provided almost the same four arguments for the claim that Ānandamaya is not the highest but the lower Self (*kāryātman*; “self which has to be accomplished” or “active self”).<sup>29</sup> In *TaittUBh* 2.5 Śaṅkara also claimed that the highest Brahman is referred to in the passage *brahma pucchaṃ pratiṣṭhā*.

Therefore it should be assumed that Śaṅkara’s second interpretation from *BSBh* 1.1.19 and his interpretation in *TaittUBh* 2.5 represent his genuine, most possibly later, understanding of Ānandamaya attached to the end of his earlier interpretation as recorded in *BSBh* 1.1.12–19 after the concluding words *tasmād ānandamayaḥ paramātmēti sthitam*.<sup>30</sup> I find this much more likely than the possibility that Śaṅkara firstly composed *TaittUBh* and later took the trouble to compose a completely opposite interpretation in *BSBh* 1.1.12–19 only to criticize it in the last part of 1.1.19 according to *TaittUBh* 2.5.

I find that it is most probable that Śaṅkara first composed *BSBh* 1.1.12–1.1.19 together with his other interpretation as a polemic against an older, well respected, source on which he relies in *BSBh* 1.1.12–19. After that he composed *TaittUBh* on the example of his second interpretation from 1.1.19, offering only this second interpretation of Ānandamaya. The other possibility is that Śaṅkara first composed *BSBh* 1.1.12–19, only later composing *TaittUBh* 2.5 with a new interpretation of Ānandamaya. After that he may have reworked his *BSBh* by adding his interpretation from *TaittUBh* after the words *tasmād ānandamayaḥ paramātmēti sthitam*. In any case, *TaittUBh* might represent a later development in Śaṅkara’s thought, at least in the interpretation of Ānandamaya.

<sup>27</sup> In his translation of *TaittU* 2.5 Olivelle (1998: 305) translates *priya* as “pleasure”.

<sup>28</sup> Tr. Olivelle 1998: 305.

<sup>29</sup> Regarding argument (a), Śaṅkara’s expression in *TaittUBh* is *adhikārapatita*, while the objector in *BSBh* used the word *pravāhapatita*.

<sup>30</sup> BWS p. 40,6 ff.

## 4 The two in the cavity of the heart from *KaU* 1.3.1 (3.1)

*ṛtaṃ pibantau sukṛtasya loke guhāṃ praviṣṭau parame parārdhe |*  
*chāyātapau brahmavido vadanti pañcāgnayo ye ca triṅcīketāḥ ||*

Knowers of brahman, men with five fires, and with the three fire-altars of Naciketas, They call these two “Shadow” and “Light”, the two have entered – the one into the cave of the heart, the other into the highest region beyond, both drinking the truth in the world of rites rightly performed.<sup>31</sup>

In this example, Śaṅkara’s interpretations of *KaU* 1.3.1 in *BSBh* 1.2.11–12 and the commentary on *KaU* 1.3.1 attributed to Śaṅkara<sup>32</sup> do not contradict each other. In *BSBh* 1.2.11, Śaṅkara claims that the two who are drinking the truth from *KaU* 1.3.1 are the Self as intelligence (*vijñānātman*) and the Supreme Self (*paramātman*).<sup>33</sup> This interpretation seems to agree with his commentary on *KaU* 1.3.1–3, where two Brahmans/selves are discussed.<sup>34</sup> The first one is lower and the second one is the highest. These two Selves had to be known by the knowers of (sacrificial) action and the knowers of Brahman respectively. In *KaUBh* 1.3.2 it is said that these two are the same selves who are drinking the truth from *KaU* 1.3.1.<sup>35</sup> In *KaUBh* 1.3.3 the lower one is designated as *samsārin*. In *KaUBh* 1.3.1 they are called two selves (*dvāv ātmanau*): attainer (*prāptṛ*) and what has to be attained (*prāpya*), the goer (*gantṛ*) and the goal (*gantavya*).<sup>36</sup> Indication that

31 Tr. Olivelle 1998: 287. Olivelle assigns *guhām* (“cave of the heart” according to Olivelle) to one and *parame parārdhe* to the other, as Rau did (1971: 166f). Most other translators (P. Deussen, Max Müller, J. Charpentier, R.E. Hume, S. Radakrishnan et al.) do not distinguish *guhām* and *parame parārdhe* as locations designated to a specific entity; according to them both enter these two locations. I decided to use Olivelle’s translation mostly because it is in accordance with Śaṅkara’s understanding and because of the general reliability of Olivelle’s translation.

32 The authorship problem of the *KaUBh* is similar to *AiUBh*. Traditionally it is considered as Śaṅkara’s work and Hacker (1947: 12–13; Hacker 1968: 135 and 147) included the text in his list of genuine Śaṅkara’s works.

33 *BSBh* 1.2.11 BWS p.72, 7: *vijñānātmaparamātmānāvihocyātām* | The terms *gantṛ* and *gantavya* appear together in *BSBh* 3.2.27 and 4.3.7. *Prāptṛ* and *prāpya* seem to be uncommon in other Śaṅkara’s works.

34 In *KaUBh* 1.3.1 they are called two selves (*dvāv ātmānau*) and in *KaUBh* 1.3.2 lower and highest Brahman (*parāpare brahmaṇī*).

35 *KaUBh* 1.3.2 TPU, p. 79, 15f: *etayor eva hy upanyāsaḥ kṛta ṛtaṃ pibantāv iti* |

36 *KaUBh* 1.3.1 TPU, p. 78, 22f: *evaṃ ca prāptṛprāpyagantṛgantavyāvivekārtharatharūpakadvārā dvāv ātmānāv upanyasyete* |

*gantṛ* and *gantavya* from *KaUBh* 1.3.1 are lower Self (or individual soul) and higher Self can be corroborated by *BSBh* 1.2.12 where Śaṅkara, while discussing the chariot simile from *KaU* 1.3.3, claims that the goal to be reached (*gantavya*) is the Supreme Self (*paramātman*).<sup>37</sup> In *KaUBh* the lower one is called attainer (*prāpṛ*), goer (*gantṛ*), *saṃsārin* and *apara* Brahman, while in *BSBh* he is called *viññānātman*; the highest one is designated as *paramātman* in *BSBh* and *para-brahman* in *KaUBh* and *gantavya* in both commentaries. Thus it can be said that *KaUBh* and *BSBh* are generally in agreement.

In these parallel passages, we see some correspondences between both commentaries. *BSBh* presents a complex structure of arguments while *KaUBh* is much simpler. First question in *BSBh* 1.2.11 is whether the two described in *KaU* 1.3.1 are intellect (*buddhi*) and soul (*jīva*, sometimes in *BSBh* 1.2.11 also called *kṣetrajña* “knower of the field”) or *jīva* and the Supreme Self (*paramātman*). A denier (*ākṣeptṛ*) claims neither interpretation is possible. Then the opponent’s view (*pūrvapakṣa*) is given according to which the two must be intellect (*buddhi*) and knower of the field (*kṣetrajña*). After that Śaṅkara presents his final answer according to which the phrase *ṛtaṃ pibantau* (“both of them are drinking the truth”) refers to the Self as intelligence (*viññānātman*) and the Supreme Self (*paramātman*).

In the preliminary discussion the denier (*ākṣeptṛ*) offers an argument against the claim that the two are the soul (*jīva*) and Supreme Self (*paramātman*) or soul (*jīva*) and intellect (*buddhi*) because the Upaniṣad uses dual number in the syntagm *ṛtaṃ pibantau* (“both of them are drinking the truth”). This means that both entities are drinkers, and this means that one of them cannot be the Supreme Self, as the description of drinking is not suitable for the Supreme Self.<sup>38</sup>

1. Arguments by a) denier (*ākṣeptṛ*) and b) *pūrvapakṣin* in *BSBh* 1.2.11:

- (a) *ṛtaṃ pibantau* (two of them are drinking the truth) means experiencing the fruits of action. Dual means that both are drinking, which means that neither of them can be the Supreme Self which does not experience fruits of action.<sup>39</sup>

37 *BSBh* 1.2.12 BWŚ p.73, 3f: “so ’dhvanaḥ pāram āpnoti tad viṣṇoḥ paramaṃ padam” | (*KaU* 1.3.9) *iti ca paramātmānaṃ gantavyam* |

38 *BSBh* 1.2.11, BWŚ p.71, 13f: *ata eva kṣetrajñāparamātmapakṣo ’pi na saṃbhavati, cetane ’pi paramātmāni ṛtapānāsambhavāt* | Same goes for *buddhi* and *jīva* because *buddhi* is insentient and cannot experience the fruit of action.

39 *BSBh* 1.2.11, BWŚ, p.71, 10f: *ṛtapānaṃ karmaphalopabhogaḥ, sukṛtasya loke, iti ca divacānena dvayoḥ pānaṃ darśayati śrutiḥ* |

- (b) The two are intellect (*buddhi*) and the knower of the field/individual soul (*kṣetrajña*) because the two have entered the cavity and it is impossible to imagine any particular location for the Supreme Brahman.<sup>40</sup>
2. Answers and counterarguments in *BSBh* 1.2.11:
- (a) The umbrella example appears as a tentative answer to the denier: The statement is “people with an umbrella”, although only one person is truly carrying an umbrella: one gives the figurative epithet to the whole group, so the individual soul gives the epithet of enjoyment to the Supreme Self.<sup>41</sup> Both selves are of the same conscious nature (*cetanau samānasvabhāvau*), and when a number is mentioned, it is understood that beings of the same class are meant. The same is the case here, where the Upaniṣad wanted to qualify only the *viññānātman* and *jīva* as the one experiencing. This answers also the objection according to which *buddhi* cannot experience fruits of action because of its insentient nature. To this one can add that Śaṅkara uses the umbrella analogy in *BSBh* 3.3.34 where *KaU* 1.3.1 (3.1) is also discussed.<sup>42</sup> Here Śaṅkara also uses the analogy to prove that the two mentioned in *KaU* are the individual soul (*jīva*) and the Supreme Self (*paramātman*). Here, the umbrella analogy is briefly described; it is not elaborated upon like in *BSBh* 1.2.11.<sup>43</sup>
- (b) The final answer to the *pūrvapakṣin*’s argument that the two are intellect (*buddhi*) and knower of the field (*kṣetrajña*) because they have entered a cave is that there are many Upaniṣadic passages that undoubtedly mention the Supreme Self being in some kind of cavity (*KaU* 1.2.12, *TaittU* 2.1 etc).

<sup>40</sup> *BSBh* 1.2.11, BWS, p.71, 1ff: *yadi śarīraṃ guhā, yadi vā hṛdayaṃ, ubhayathāpi buddhikṣetrajñau guhāṃ praviṣṭāv upapadyete | na ca sati saṃbhava sarvagatasya brahmaṇo viśiṣṭadeśatvaṃ yuktaṃ kalpayitum |*

<sup>41</sup> *BSBh* 1.2.11, BWS, p.71, 15ff: *chatrīṇo gacchantīty ekenāpi chatrīṇā bahūnāṃ chatritvopacāradarśanāt | evam ekenāpi pibatā dvau pibantāv ucyete |*

<sup>42</sup> In *BSBh* 3.3.34 the context is somewhat different; the text discusses whether several Upaniṣadic passages have the same meaning. The *pūrvapakṣin* claims that the passages in *MU* and *ŚvU* are different from *KaU* 1.3.1 (3.1) because in *MU* 3.1.1 and *ŚvU* 4.6 one bird is enjoying, the other not, and in *KaU* both entities are enjoying. Śaṅkara uses the umbrella analogy to prove that in *KaU* also one is drinking and the other one not.

<sup>43</sup> *BSBh* 3.3.34, BWS, p.409, 7ff: “*ṛtaṃ pibantau*” *ity atra tu jīve pibaty aśanāyādyatītaḥ paramātmāpi sāhacaryāc chatrīnyāyena pibatīty upacaryate |*

In *KaUBh* 1.3.1, the umbrella example is also mentioned. However, an objection as to why the dual number was used in *KaU* (*pibantau* “two of them are drinking”) is not mentioned. The commentary also does not mention the problem that the Supreme Self cannot drink/enjoy; the commentary supposes that the reader understands this automatically. The umbrella analogy is here also introduced, according to which only one is drinking, the individual Self.<sup>44</sup>

It is important to note that the umbrella analogy and its application is explained in *BSBh* in full detail, while in the commentary on *KaU*, it is only mentioned briefly in the expression *chattrinyāyena*. Someone unfamiliar with the use of the umbrella analogy in this particular Upaniṣadic passage can possibly grasp the argument in *KaUBh*. We must understand this analogy and its application in this particular instance, and this requires knowledge of its explanation and application in *BSBh* 1.2.11 (and 3.3.34). Although it is difficult to decide the extent to which ancient readers were familiar with the umbrella analogy, it must have been known in Śaṅkara’s times. In Śabara’s commentary on the *Mīmāṃsā-Sūtras* (*MimSBh*),<sup>45</sup> the umbrella analogy is used twice in the context of ritual exegesis. In *MimSBh* 1.4.28, Śabara describes the analogy and its application in detail, while in 3.8.44 he only mentions it. Śabara uses the analogy in order to prove that the word *prāṇabhṛt* (brick used for the building of the sacrificial altar) stands for other words like *śṣṭi* when brick altars are constructed. A mantra containing the word *prāṇabhṛta upadadhāti* is used during the building of brick altars, and mantras like *śṣṭīr upadadhāti* should not be rendered useless, but should be understood as “*prāṇabhṛta upadadhāti*” according to the analogy of the umbrella, where people not carrying an umbrella are called umbrella-bearers because of one single man in the group who actually does have an umbrella (It says *chattriṇo gacchanti*, “people with an umbrella are going”, although only one of them actually has an umbrella).

In his *BSBh* 1.2.11, Śaṅkara describes the umbrella analogy and its application to *KaU* 1.3.1 in detail. But in the commentary on *KaU*, the author assumes that the reader is completely familiar with the analogy and its application and explains neither its usage nor its application. In my opinion, the author of

---

<sup>44</sup> *KaUBh* 1.3.1, TPU, pp.78–79: *ekas tatra karmaphalaṃ pibati bhūṅkte netaras tathāpi pāṭṣambandhāt pibantāv ity ucyate cchattrinyāyena* | (One drinks, enjoys, the fruit of the action, not the other; still both are called drinkers because they are connected to the drinker according to the umbrella analogy.).

<sup>45</sup> I use Andreas Pohlus’ electronic text of *MimSBh* found at the GRETEL website ([http://gretel.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretel/1\\_sanskr/6\\_sastra/3\\_phil/mimamsa/msbh1-7u.htm](http://gretel.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretel/1_sanskr/6_sastra/3_phil/mimamsa/msbh1-7u.htm)).

*KaUBh* assumed that the reader was familiar with *BSBh* 1.2.11 (and 3.3.34). Even a reader familiar with the analogy could not have deciphered the meaning because in *KaUBh* the reason why the analogy is introduced is not even mentioned. Because of that it can be argued that the whole idea was first expounded in an earlier text (*BSBh*) and condensed and shortened in a later text (*KaUBh*). It is unlikely that it was first condensed and rendered unintelligible only to be expanded and made more understandable later. Something similar already happened in *BSBh* 3.3.34 where the analogy is used in the same context with less elaboration. However, even there the reason why the analogy is introduced is mentioned.

## 5 The Entity that shines through all

*BS* 1.3.22–23 (according to the commentators) discusses the *Muṇḍaka-Upaniṣad* (*MU*) 2.2.10.<sup>46</sup> This same verse appears in *KaU* 2.2.15 (5.15) and *ŚvU* 6.14.<sup>47</sup> Śaṅkara's opponent in *BSBh* maintains that the light (*bhāsa*) from *MU* 2.2.10 is the Self as perceiving (*prājñā evātman*), and Śaṅkara considers it to be Supreme Self. In *MUBh* 2.2.10, the Entity that shines through all is Brahman, Parameśvara whose light shines through the Sun and other luminous entities. Although in *BSBh* 1.3.22–23 Śaṅkara also considers the light to be the Supreme Self, there are no similarities in expression and wording with the commentaries on the Upaniṣads. In contrast to this, the commentaries on *MU* 2.2.10 and *KaU* 2.2.15 (5.15) are practically identical. Here are both commentaries, with differences boldfaced:

*KaUBh* 2.2.15 (5.15) TPU p. 96, 21f:

*na tatra tasmin svātmabhūte brahmaṇi sarvāvabhāsako 'pi sūryo bhāti tad brahma na prakāśayatīty arthaḥ | tathā na candratāraḥ, nemā vidyuto bhānti, kuto 'yam asmad dr̥ṣṭigocarō 'gniḥ? kiṃ bahunā, yad idam ādikaṃ sarvaṃ bhāti tat tam eva parameśvaraṃ bhāntaṃ dīpyamānam anubhāty anudīpyate | tathā jalolmukādy agniṣaṃyogād agniṃ dahantaṃ anu dahati na svatas tadvat | tasyaiva bhāsādīptyā sarvaṃ idaṃ sūryādi vibhāti | yata evaṃ tad eva brahma bhāti ca vibhāti ca | kāryagatena vividhena bhāsā*

<sup>46</sup> *na tatra sūryo bhāti na candratāraḥ nemā vidyuto bhānti kuto 'yam agniḥ | tam eva bhāntam anubhāti sarvaṃ tasya bhāsā sarvaṃ idaṃ vibhāti* || “There the sun does not shine, nor the moon and the stars; There lightning does not shine, of the common fire need we speak! Him alone, as he shines, do all things reflect; this whole world radiates his light.” (Tr. Olivelle 1998: 447–449).

<sup>47</sup> In the commentary attributed to Śaṅkara on *ŚvU* 6.14 we find no such correspondences as in *KaUBh* 2.2.15 and *MUBh* 2.2.10. For the question of attribution of *ŚvUBh* to Śaṅkara see fn. 2.

*tasya brahmaṇo bhārūpatvaṃ svato 'vagamyate | na hi svato 'vidyamānaṃ bhāsanam anyasya kartuṃ śaktam | ghaṭādīnām anyāvabhāsakatvadarśanād bhārūpāṇām cādityādīnām taddarśanāt |*

*MUBh* 2.2.10, TPU p. 164, 1–10:

*na tatra tasmin svātmabhūte brahmaṇi sarvāvabhāsako 'pi sūryo bhāti | tad brahma na prakāśayati arthaḥ | sa hi tasyaiva bhāsā sarvam anyad anātmajātaṃ prakāśayati | na tu tasya svataḥ prakāśanasāmarthyam | tathā na candratārakaṃ, nemā vidyuto bhānti | kuto 'yam agnir asmad gocaraḥ? kiṃ bahunā, yad idam jagad bhāti tat tam eva parameśvaraṃ svato bhārūpatvād bhāntaṃ dīpyamānam anudīpyate | tathā jalolmukādy agniśamyogād agniṃ dahantam anu dahati na svataḥ | tadvat tasyaiva bhāsādīptyā sarvam idaṃ sūryādi jagat vibhāti | yata evaṃ tad eva brahma bhāti ca vibhāti ca kāryagatena vividhena bhāsā, atas tasya brahmaṇo bhārūpatvaṃ svato 'vagamyate | na hi svato 'vidyamānaṃ bhāsanam anyasya kartuṃ śaktam | ghaṭādīnām anyāvabhāsakatvadarśanād bhārūpāṇām cādityādīnām taddarśanāt |*

*MUBh* 2.2.10 has one sentence more than *KaUBh*, it has an additional phrase (*svato bhārūpatvāt*), and the word *jagat* appears in *MUBh* instead of *ādikaṃ sarvaṃ* in *KaUBh*. These changes can be explained in two ways. First, during the text transmission scribe(s) added these additional phrases or second, the author, copying his own text, added and enlarged it. As such a degree of intervention would be unusual for a scribe, I am more inclined to believe that *MUBh* is a more recent text, and that the sentence was added as a small clarification together with *jagat*, which fits better than the phrase *ādikaṃ sarvaṃ*. If *KaUBh* were a newer abbreviation, I would find it strange only to omit this single sentence which fits perfectly into the context and to replace *jagat* with *ādikaṃ sarvaṃ*. Also, if *KaUBh* were more recent, why would the author copy the whole commentary only to omit such a sentence? For this reason, I suppose that the commentary on *MU* 2.2.10 might be a slightly reworked version of the commentary on *KaU* 2.2.15 (5.15).

## 6 Parallels between *BAUBh*, *IUBh* and *KaUBh*

*BAU*, *IU* and *KaU* share some of the same verses. Here I would like to examine Śaṅkara's<sup>48</sup> commentaries on two such parallel verses.

<sup>48</sup> With *IUBh* and *KaUBh* we encounter the same authorship problem as with *AiUBh*. Both commentaries are traditionally ascribed to Śaṅkara and Hacker's analysis of the manuscript colophons confirms the tradition.



a) *BAU* 4.4.10 (K) = *IU* 9 (K)/*IU* 12 (M).

*andhām tāmaḥ prāviśanti yé (á)vidyām upāsate |*

*tāto bhūya iva té tāmo yá u vidyāyām ratāḥ ||*

Into blind darkness they enter, people who worship ignorance;

And into still blinder darkness, people who delight in learning.<sup>49</sup>

*BAU* 4.4.10 has a slightly different reading in the *Kāṇva* and *Mādhyamīna* recensions (*BAU* [M] 4.4.13) while *IU* has both versions. So *BAU* (K) 4.4.10 appears as *IU* (K) 9 (and [M] 12), while *BAU* (M) 4.4.13 appears as *IU* (K) 12 (and [M] 9).

Śaṅkara says that the sentence *yé (á)vidyām upāsate* (“who worship ignorance”) from *IU* (K) 9 discusses those who only worship ignorance in the form of rites, *agnihotra* and others (...*tām avidyām agnihotrādīlakṣaṇām eva kevalām upāsate*). *Yá u vidyāyām ratāḥ* (those who delight in knowledge) from the same verse is interpreted as “those who delight in knowledge of the deities after renouncing a [ritual] act” (*karma hitvā [yá u] ye tu [vidyāyām] eva devatājñāna eva [ratāḥ] abhiratāḥ*). *Vidyā* is here not understood as the knowledge of the Supreme Self because it has a different result.<sup>50</sup> This is illustrated with citations from *BAU* 1.5.16 (where it is said that *vidyā* leads to the world of Gods) and *ŚB* 10.5.4.16<sup>51</sup> which speaks about the southern path. Such a *vidyā* can be combined with Vedic rites but the knowledge of the Self cannot.<sup>52</sup>

Śaṅkara’s commentary on this same verse in *BAU* (K) 4.4.10 is different from *IUBh* 9 in one important detail. In *BAUBh* 4.4.10, “those who delight in knowledge” (*ya u vidyāyām ratāḥ*) are not described as those who delight in knowledge of the deities, as in *IUBh* 9, but as those who delight in the ritualistic portion of the Vedas. They disregard the Upaniṣads and heed only those portions of Veda which deal with injunctions and prohibitions.<sup>53</sup> Śaṅkara speaks here most probably about the followers of the Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā philosophy.

By interpreting “Those who delight in ignorance” (*BAU* 4.4.10ab and *IU* 9ab) as those who perform Vedic rites, both commentaries (*BAUBh* 4.4.10

49 Tr. Olivelle 1998: 407.

50 *IUBh* 9, TPU, p. 8, 18f: *tad daivaṃ vittaṃ devatāviśayaṃ jñānaṃ karmasambandhitvenopanyastaṃ na paramātmajñānam “vidyayā devalokaḥ” (BAU 1.5.16) iti pṛthakphalaśravaṇāt |*

51 *BAU* 1.5.16 *karmanā pītṛlokaḥ | vidyayā devalokaḥ |* “... the world of ancestors through rites, and the world of gods through knowledge” (tr. Olivelle 1998: 57); *ŚB* 10.5.4.16: *...na tatra dakṣiṇā yanti |* “...by (following) the southern route they do not reach there.”

52 *IUBh* 9, TPU, p. 8, 16f: *yadātmaikatvavijñānam, tan na kenacit karmanā jñānāntareṇa vā hy amūḍhaḥ samuccicīṣati |*

53 *BAUBh* 4.4.10, TPU, p. 924, 15ff: *ya u vidyāyām avidyāvastupratipādikāyām karmārthāyām trayyām eva vidyāyām ratā abhiratāḥ vidhipratīṣedhapara eva vedo nānyo ’stīty upaniṣadarthānapekṣiṇa ity arthaḥ |*

and *IUBh* 9)<sup>54</sup> are in agreement. In his commentary on *IU* 11, Śaṅkara also offers an explanation of *vidyā* as knowledge of the deities (*devatājñāna*) and *avidyā* as the performance of Vedic rites (*karman*). When combined, they lead to the attainment of immortality in the sense of reaching the state of identity with the deities (*devatātmagamana*).<sup>55</sup> This means that those who delight in the knowledge of deities tend to combine knowledge and Vedic rites. Those might be *bhedābhedavādins* who are often criticized by Śaṅkara in *BAUBh*.<sup>56</sup>

Śaṅkara expressed this same idea in his introduction to *BAU* 6.2 and in *BAUBh* 6.2.2, saying that rites lead to the route of the Fathers (*pitṛyāna*) and that knowledge and rites combined with knowledge lead to the route of the Gods (*devayāna*).<sup>57</sup> Also *BAU(Bh)* 1.5.16 speaks about ritual action (*karman*), which leads to the world of the Fathers (*pitṛloka*), and about knowledge/meditation (*vidyā*), which leads to the world of the Gods (*devaloka*).<sup>58</sup>

Even more clues for what Śaṅkara exactly meant by the phrase “knowledge of the deities” (*devatājñāna*) can be found in *BAUBh* 6.2.15. There the path to *devaloka* and further is described. It leads through the flame, day, fortnight of the waxing moon, six months when the sun moves north to the world of Gods (*devaloka*), from where the route proceeds to the sun, the region of the lightning from where the person consisting of the mind leads one to the worlds of *brahman*.<sup>59</sup> Śaṅkara in his commentary regards all these entities as

54 *BAUBh* 4.4.10, TPU, p.924, 14: *ye 'vidyāṃ vidyāto 'nyāṃ sādhyasādhanalakṣaṇam upāsate karmānuvartanta ity arthaḥ | IUBh* 9, TPU, p.9, 3f: *ye 'vidyāṃ vidyāyā anyā avidyā tām karmety arthaḥ, karmaṇo vidyāvirodhītvāt; tām avidyām agnihotrādīlakṣaṇām eva kevalām upāsate tatparāḥ santo 'nutiṣṭhantīty abhiprāyaḥ |*

55 *IUBh* 11, TPU, p.9, 20ff: *yata evam ato vidyāṃ cāvidyāṃ ca devatājñānaṃ karma cety arthaḥ | ... avidyayā karmaṇā agnihotrādīnā mṛtyuṃ svābhāvikaṃ karma jñānaṃ ca mṛtyuśabdavācyaṃ ubhayaṃ tīrtvā atikramya vidyayā devatājñānenāmṛtaṃ devatātmabhāvam aśnute prāpnoti | tad dhy amṛtam ucyate yad devatātmagamanam |*

56 In *IUBh* the term *bhedābhedavāda* is not mentioned. However, the idea of combination (*samuccaya*) of knowledge and rites, one of important tenets of *bhedābhedavāda*, is criticized throughout the text.

57 *BAUBh* 6.2.1, TPU, p.983, 19f: *tatrāpi kevalena karmaṇā pitṛloko vidyayā vidyāsamyuktena ca karmaṇā devaloka ity uktam |*

58 *BAUBh* 1.5.16, TPU, p.705, 9f: *karmaṇā agnihotrādīlakṣaṇena kevalena pitṛloko jetavyo na putreṇa nāpi vidyayā | vidyayā devaloko na putreṇa nāpi karmaṇā |*

59 *BAU* 6.2.15 *te ya evam etad vidur ye cāmī araṇye śraddhāṃ satyam upāsate te 'rcir abhisambhavanty arciṣo 'har ahna āpūryamāṇapakṣam āpūryamāṇapakṣād yān ṣaṇ māsān udaṇṇ āditya eti māsebhyo devalokaṃ devalokād ādityam ādityād vaidyutam | tān vaidyutān puruṣo mānasa etya brahmalokān gamayati | te teṣu brahmalokeṣu parāḥ parāvato vasanti | teṣāṃ na punar āvṛtīḥ ||* *BAU* 6.2.16 describes the path through smoke, night, fortnight of the waning moon, six months when the sun moves south to the world of the Fathers (*pitṛloka*).

deities (*devatā*)<sup>60</sup> and it does not come as a surprise that in *IUBh* 9 (and 10) he considers knowledge (*vidyā*) as knowledge of the deities.

Because of this understanding of the flame, day and other entities as deities on the route of the Fathers and on the route to the Gods, which both belong to the world of transmigration (*saṃsāra*, see *BAUBh* 6.2.2), Śaṅkara in *IUBh* 9 claims that those who delight in the knowledge of the deities enter in utmost darkness; but he does not mention which deities he is speaking about.

Thus, the model for such a conception where *vidyā* corresponds to *devatājñāna* and *avidyā* corresponds to *karman* stems from *BAU*. The claim from *IUBh* 9 that those who delight in meditation/knowledge (*vidyā*) delight in knowledge of the deities is well attuned to Śaṅkara's commentary on *BAU* 6.2.2 and 6.2.15 where he claims that the route of the Fathers and the route of the Gods belong to the world of transmigration (*saṃsāra*) and cannot lead to the absolute immortality.<sup>61</sup>

These parallels may lead to the assumption that, in *IUBh* 9, Śaṅkara abandoned his interpretation of *vidyā* as a Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā ritual speculation from *BAUBh* 4.4.10 and that he attuned his commentary on *IU*, which could be more recent, to his earlier commentaries on *BAU* 1.5.16 and 6.2.1–2 and 15. He did so by connecting *vidyā* with the route of the Gods (*devayāna*) and nescience (*avidyā*) the route of the Fathers (*pitryāna*) because *vidyā* in *BAUBh* 4.4.10 is still not connected to the teachings of *pitryāna/pitṛloka* and *devayāna/devaloka*. Furthermore, in *IUBh* he did not explain that the deities belong to the routes of Fathers and Gods.

(b) *BAU* 4.4.15cd = *KaU* 2.1.5 (4.5) cd and *IU* 6d

The verse “*iśānaṃ bhūtabhavyasya na tato vijugupsate*” (“... the lord of what was and what will be, He will not seek to hide from him”<sup>62</sup>) appears in *BAU* 4.4.15cd (*K*), and in *KaU* 2.1.5 (4.5) cd. The phrase “*na tato vijugupsate*” is also found in *IU* 6d. The commentaries on *BAU* 4.4.15 and *KaU* 2.1.5 (4.5) show some similarities both in their wording and expression. In both commentaries, *iśānaṃ bhūtabhavyasya* (the lord of what was and what will be) is understood as the Lord of the three times (*kālatraya*):

<sup>60</sup> *BAUBh* 6.2.15, TPU, p. 995, 1ff: *arcir api nāgnijvālāmātraṃ kiṃ tarhy arcir abhimāniny arcīḥ śabdavācyā devatottaramārgalakṣaṇā vyavasthitaiva | tām abhisambhavanti | ... tena devataiva pariḡrhyate 'rciḥśabdavācyā | ... ahaḥśabdo 'pi devataiva |*

<sup>61</sup> *BAUBh* 6.2.2, TPU, p. 986, 6f: *aṇḍakapālayor madhye saṃsāraviṣaye evaite sṛtī nātyantikāmṛtatvagamanāya |*

<sup>62</sup> Tr. Olivelle 1998: 123.

*BAUBh* 4.4.15:...sākṣād īśānaṃ svāminaṃ bhūtabhavyasya kālatrayasyety etat |  
*KaUBh* 2.1.5 (4.5):...samīpa īśānaṃ īsitāraṃ bhūtabhavyasya kālatrayasya |

In both commentaries, *vijugupsate* from *pāda* d (“he will not seek to hide”) is interpreted as *na gopāyitum icchati* (“he does not wish to hide”):

*BAUBh* 4.4.15:... *na tatas tasmād īśānād devād ātmānaṃ viśeṣeṇa jugupsate gopāyitum icchati* | ... *ayaṃ tv ekatvadarśī na bibheti kutaścana* |

*KaUBh* 2.1.5 (4.5): ... *na vijugupsate na gopāyitum icchaty abhayaprāptatvāt* |

The major difference between the two commentaries is how the word *tatas* from the Upaniṣadic text is understood. In *KaUBh* 2.1.5 *tatas* is understood adverbially: *tatas tadvijñānād ūrdhvam* (“after the knowledge of that”), while in *BAUBh* 4.4.15 *tatas* is the object of *na gopayitum icchati* which means “one does not wish to hide from him”, from *Īśāna*, mentioned in line c.

*Pāda* d also occurs in *IU* 6, and the phrase “*na gopāyitum icchati*” (“does not wish to hide”), that is used in *BAUBh* and *KaUBh*, is not used in *IUBh*. Instead, “*ghṛṇāṃ na karoti*” (“he feels no aversion”) is used when *vijugupsate* is interpreted, which is different both from *BAUBh* and *KaUBh*. Here, *BAUBh* and *KaUBh* stand closer to each other than either of them to *IUBh*.

## 7 Concluding remarks

The first conclusion that can be drawn from these examples is that both the commentaries on the *Brahma-Sūtras* and the commentaries on the Upaniṣads show similarities both in sense and in expression and wording. The same applies to the commentaries on the same verses in different Upaniṣads. Even in the situations where the final outcome of the interpretation is different, expressions and wording show parallels, as in the case of *Antaryāmin*, which in *BSBh* is interpreted as the Supreme Self, but in *BAUBh* and *AiUBh* as lower Brahman and in the case of *Ānandamaya* not interpreted as Brahman in *TaittUBh*, whereas it is interpreted both as Brahman and some lower Self in *BSBh*.

In conclusion, a rough sketch of the relative chronology established on these few examples of the Upaniṣad Bhāṣyas can be outlined now. If the assumption that the interpretation of *IU* 9–11 is grounded in *BAUBh* 1.5.16, 6.2.1–2 and 6.2.15 is correct, then we may assume that *IUBh* is more recent than *BAUBh*. Also, if the assumption that the commentary on *MU* 2.2.10 is a reworked version of the commentary on *KaU* 2.2.15 (5.15) is correct, then *MUBh*

must be more recent than *KaUBh*. Commentaries on the same verse in *BAU* and *KaU* also show closeness, but both are more distant from the same verse in *IU* which fits well with the afore-mentioned assumption that *IUBh* is later than *BAUBh*.

A tentative indication that the *KaUBh* might be more recent than *BSBh* is the fact that the argument with the umbrella example in *BSBh* is more elaborate than it is in the *KaUBh*. If the *KaUBh* is more recent, the author must have assumed that the reader was familiar with the details of argumentation and that there was no need to elaborate upon them again. Rüping<sup>63</sup> argued that, in such cases, more elaborate variants of a text must be understood as an earlier model for more recent, shorter variations because shortening makes it harder to understand the meaning of a given text (we can add: without being familiar with the original). On the other hand, elaborating upon a defective portion of text would not repair it.

The interpretation of *Ānandamaya* shows a later development in *TaittUBh* than in *BSBh* and a possible later reworking of the passage. This means that *TaittUBh* might be later than *BSBh*.

This list is, of course, not conclusive because it was created based upon a small sample of texts. I am convinced that there are many more passages in Śaṅkara's texts (and texts attributed to Śaṅkara) to find further insights into the chronology and historical development of his work.

## Abbreviations

AiU	Aitareya-Upaniṣad
AiUBh	Aitareya-Upaniṣad-Bhāṣya
BAU	Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad
BAUBh	Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad-Bhāṣya (Śaṅkara)
BhGBh	Bhagavad-Gītā-Bhāṣya
BSŚWC	Brahmasūtra-Śaṅkarabhāṣyam with the Commentaries: Bhāṣyaratnaprabha of Govindānanda, Bhāmatī of Vācaspati Miśra, Nyāyanirṇaya of Ānandagiri
BS	Brahma-Sūtra
BSBh	Brahma-Sūtra-Bhāṣya (Śaṅkara)
BWŚ	Brahmasūtra with Śaṅkarabhāṣya
ChU	Chāndogya-Upaniṣad
ChUBh	Chāndogya-Upaniṣad-Bhāṣya
IU	Īśā-Upaniṣad
IUBh	Īśā-Upaniṣad-Bhāṣya
K	Kāṇva

<sup>63</sup> Rüping 1977: 34.

KaU	Kaṭha-Upaniṣad
KaUBh	Kaṭha-Upaniṣad-Bhāṣya
M	Mādhyamīna
MimS	Mīmāṃsā-Sūtra
MimSBh	Mīmāṃsā-Sūtra-Bhāṣya (Śabara)
MU	Muṇḍaka-Upaniṣad
MUBh	Muṇḍaka-Upaniṣad-Bhāṣya
ŚB	Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa
ŚvU	Śvetāśvatara-Upaniṣad
TaittU	Taittirīya-Upaniṣad
TaittUBh	Taittirīya-Upaniṣad-Bhāṣya
TPU	Ten Principal Upaniṣads with Śāṅkarabhāṣya

## Texts (original and translations)

- Brahmasūtra with Śāṅkarabhāṣya, Works of Śāṅkarācārya in original Sanskrit*, vol. III., Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass (1965, reprint 2007).
- Gambhirananda, Swami (transl.) (1956): *Brahma-Sutra-Bhashya of Sri Sankaracarya*, Calcutta: Advaita Ashrama.
- Olivelle, Patrick (ed. and transl.) (1998): *The Early Upanisads*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Shastri, J. L. (ed.) (1980): *Brahmasūtra-Śāṅkarabhāṣyam with the Commentaries: Bhāṣyaratnaprabha of Govindananda, Bhāmatī of Vācaspati Miśra, Nyāyanirṇaya of Ānandagiri*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass (reprint 2010).
- Thibaut, George (transl.) (1890): *The Vedānta Sūtras Part I and II*, Oxford: Oxford Clarendon Press, Sacred Books of the East 34 and 38 (reprint Kessinger Publishing 2004).
- Ten Principal Upaniṣads with Śāṅkarabhāṣya, Works of Śāṅkarācārya in original Sanskrit*, vol. 1, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass (1964, reprint 2007).

## Bibliography

- Biardeau, Madeleine (1959): “Quelques réflexions sur l’apophatisme de Śāṅkara”. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 3: 81–101.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (2004): “More on the Sources of Kāśikā” In: *Problems in Vedic and Sanskrit Literature, Ganesh Umakant Thite Felicitation Volume*. Edited by Maitreyee Deshpande. Delhi: New Bharatiya Book Corporation, 47–54, online edition 1–8 [https://serval.unil.ch/resource/serval:BIB\\_BC98BFE01B6F.P001/REF\(03/11/2014\)](https://serval.unil.ch/resource/serval:BIB_BC98BFE01B6F.P001/REF(03/11/2014)).
- Deussen, Paul (1883): *Das System des Vedānta*. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus.
- Hacker, Paul (1947): “Śāṅkarācārya and Śāṅkarabhagavatpāda. Preliminary remarks concerning the authorship problem”. *New Indian Antiquary* 9: 175–186. [Korrigierte Neufassung], Reprinted in: *Kleine Schriften*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 41–59.

- Hacker, Paul (1953): *Vivarta. Studien zur Geschichte der illusionistischen Kosmologie und Erkenntnistheorie der Inder*. Mainz: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse.
- Hacker, Paul (1968): "Śaṅkara der Yogin und Śaṅkara der Advaitin. Einige Beobachtungen". In: *Beiträge zur Geistesgeschichte Indiens. Festschrift für Erich Frauwallner. Aus Anlaß seines 70. Geburtstags*. Edited by G. Oberhammer. Wien 1968 (= WZKSO 12–13. 1968–69: 119–148). Reprinted in: *Kleine Schriften*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 213–242.
- Hauschild, Richard (1927): *Die Śvetāśvatara-Upaniṣad: Eine kritische Ausgabe mit einer Übersetzung und einer Übersicht über ihre Lehren*. Leipzig: Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, XVII. 3.
- Hertel, Johannes (1924): *Muṇḍaka-Upaniṣad: kritische Ausgabe mit Rodarneudruck der Erstausgabe (Text und Kommentare) und Einleitung*. Indo-Iranische Quellen und Forschungen III. Leipzig: H. Hässel Verlag.
- Ingalls, Daniel HH (1954): "Śaṅkara's Arguments Against the Buddhists". *Philosophy East and West* 3: 291–306.
- Kanakura, Yensho (1926): "Über die Interpolation des Śāṅkarabhāṣya zum Brahmasūtra". In: *Beiträge zur Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte Indiens, Festgabe Hermann Jacobi*. Edited by Willibald Kierfel. Bonn: Kommissionsverlag Fritz Klopp.
- Marschner, Käthe (1933): *Zur Verfasserfrage des dem Śāṅkarācārya zugeschriebenen Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad-Bhāṣya*. Berlin-Charlottenburg: Alfred Lindner Verlag.
- Rau, Wilhelm (1971): "Versuch einer deutschen Übersetzung der Kāṭhaka-Upaniṣad". *Asiatische Studien* 25: 158–174.
- Rüping, Klaus (1977): *Studien zur Frühgeschichte der Vedānta-Philosophie*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH.
- Vetter, Tilmann (1979): *Studien zur Lehre und Entwicklung Śāṅkaras*. Wien: Publications of De Nobili Research Library.