

Śaṅkara and the authorship of Śvetāśvataropaniṣad-Bhāṣya

Ivan Andrijačić *

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Department of Indology and
Far Eastern Studies, University of Zagreb

*Corresponding author: iandrij@ffzg.hr

Introduction

The *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad-Bhāṣya* (ŚvUBh) is traditionally regarded as the genuine work of Śaṅkara. At the outset, it should be noted which works are considered ‘genuine’ in this article, and why. The first is *Brahmasūtra-Bhāṣya* (BSBh), which is considered the 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. Sureśvara claims in his *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi* 4.74 and 4.76 that he served Śaṅkara’s lotus feet (as his direct disciple); he composed a commentary on the *Brhadāraṇyakopaniṣad-Bhāṣya* (BĀUBh) in which he mentions Śaṅkara as his teacher (Sureśvara ad BĀUBh 6,5.25). Käthe Marschner (1933) provides evidence of significant agreement between BĀUBh and BSBh. Sureśvara also composed a commentary on the *Taittirīyopaniṣad-Bhāṣya* (TaittUBh). Thus, it is quite safe to consider BSBh, BĀUBh, and TaittUBh as the works of an author named Śaṅkara. Sengaku Mayeda analysed *Upadeśasāhasrī* (Upad) (1965b), *Bhagavadgītā-Bhāṣya* (BhGBh) (1965a), *Kenopaniṣad-Bhāṣya* (KeUBh) (1968) and *Gauḍapādīyakārikā-Bhāṣya* (GKBh) (1967–68) according to a methodology devised by Paul Hacker (1950), and concluded that these works should also be regarded as the genuine works of Śaṅkara. Therefore, when the phrase ‘genuine works of Śaṅkara’ is used, the aforementioned works will be considered, especially BSBh, BĀUBh, TaittUBh, and Upad for practical reasons.

Besides the living tradition of monastic orders that continue the line of Śaṅkara’s teaching, manuscript colophons univocally attribute ŚvUBh to Śaṅkara. According to Hacker (1978, p. 49), the manuscript colophons in ŚvUBh describe it as a work of Śaṅkara-*bhagavat(-pāda)*, and the title *bhagavat(-pāda)* indicates Śaṅkara’s authorship. Spurious or more recent works are usually ascribed to Śaṅkara-*ācārya* in the colophons. Hacker (1978, pp. 44–46) convincingly established that *-bhagavat(-pūjya[-pāda])* was a title preferred by Śaṅkara’s contemporaries and early followers, as well as one used more frequently in manuscript colophons. Nevertheless, Hacker (1978, p. 53) raised doubt in the

authenticity of Śaṅkara's attribution, and called for special investigation to resolve this issue.

Arguments against Śaṅkara's authorship of ŚvUBh in earlier scholarship

As far as the author of the current research is aware, the first to raise doubt in Śaṅkara's authorship was Paul Regnaud (1876, pp. 28–29).¹ He provides three reasons for his doubt: (i) long purāṇa quotations are contrary to Śaṅkara's literary habits, (ii) Ānandagiri (or Ānandajñāna) did not compose a commentary on Śaṅkara's ŚvUBh, as he did for all of Śaṅkara's other Upaniṣad commentaries, (iii) according to Regnaud, the purāṇas are more recent than the tenth century, and thus the author of ŚvUBh must be more recent than the tenth century. Purāṇa quotations are certainly very unusual for Śaṅkara. Ānandagiri truly composed commentaries on most of the works usually attributed to Śaṅkara, but it must be noted that no commentary by Ānandagiri exists for the *Kauṣītaki-Upaniṣad-Bhāṣya*, which is also traditionally regarded as the work of Śaṅkara. Regnaud's argument that the purāṇas are more recent than the tenth century is no longer valid, as we know beyond any doubt that most of the mahāpurāṇas cited by the author of ŚvUBh were composed prior to the tenth century. G. A. Jacob (1886) raised another argument against Śaṅkara's authorship; Nārāyaṇa (eighteenth century) calls himself *śaṅkaroktyupajīvin* 'subsisting on Śaṅkara's words' in his commentaries on Śaṅkara's works, while he calls himself *śrutimātropajīvin* 'subsisting only on śruti' in his commentary on ŚvU, as he does in works he commented upon for which Śaṅkara did not compose a commentary. Jacob's argument is, in the opinion of this author, not definitive, as it indicates that Nārāyaṇa did not know or did not consider ŚvUBh to be the work of Śaṅkara. M. Narayanaswami Aiyer (1900–1901) enumerated seven reasons for doubt, most of which had already been mentioned by Regnaud and Jacob, as well as in the preface to the 1890 Ānandāśrama (ĀSS) edition of ŚvUBh. The first is Regnaud's observation on the abundance of quotations from the purāṇas; the second is (Regnaud's) observation that Ānandagiri did not compose a commentary on ŚvUBh; Aiyer's third reason is taken from the preface of the ĀSS edition of ŚvUBh (p. 1), according to which Dhanapati Sūri (late eighteenth century) did not list ŚvUBh among Śaṅkara's works in his commentary on the *Śaṅkara-Dig-Vijāya* 6,61 (ŚDV),² entitled *ḍiṇḍimā*³; Aiyer's fourth reason for doubt is the observation that Nārāyaṇa (eighteenth century) did not quote ŚvUBh in his commentary on ŚvU, although he did quote Śaṅkara's works frequently in his other commentaries; the fifth reason is Jacob's observation that Nārāyaṇa does not call himself *śaṅkaroktyupajīvin* (subsisting on Śaṅkara's words) in his commentary on ŚvU; the sixth reason is Nārāyaṇa's quotation of Śaṅkara's BhGBh 18.66 in his commentary on ŚvU 6,20, instead of quoting ŚvUBh 6,20, which would have been the logical choice had he considered Śaṅkara

its author; the seventh reason is Aiyer's stylistic remark that ŚvUBh lacks Śaṅkara's vigorousness and compactness. Aiyer (1900–1901, p. 84) admits that 'if not indeed to disprove that Śaṅkara was the author of the Bhashya', this cumulative evidence is 'yet enough to throw a considerable amount of doubt on the accepted view'.

Reasons three through six show with certainty only that Nārāyaṇa and Dhanapati Sūri did not consider ŚvUBh to be the work of Śaṅkara, or that they did not know about it. Purāṇa quotations are unusual for Śaṅkara, and this might be one argument to disprove Śaṅkara's authorship, but only as support for some stronger evidence; the same is the case for the argument that Ānandagiri did not comment on ŚvUBh.⁴ Stylistic observations, such as Aiyer's, may be regarded as subjective and, although useful and indicative, cannot be used as definite proof in resolving authorship issues.

Hauschild (1927, pp. 64–71) provides more reasons to disprove Śaṅkara's authorship. He compared Śaṅkara's ŚvU quotations in BSBh with the text of ŚvUBh, concluding that there are remarkable differences between ŚvU readings in BSBh and in ŚvUBh. Hauschild remains cautious, however, as these differences could be misprints in the ĀSS edition. Hauschild also compared commentaries on verses that ŚvU shares with KaU, BhG, and MuU, which are attributed to Śaṅkara. As these commentaries do not show correspondence, Hauschild sees one more reason to doubt Śaṅkara's authorship.

All of these arguments are indicative of problems with the attribution to Śaṅkara. However they offer no conclusive proof to definitively disprove Śaṅkara's authorship of the ŚvUBh. Therefore, it might be useful to follow Hacker's advice and conduct a careful investigation of the content of ŚvUBh and compare it to Śaṅkara's genuine works. The criteria for analysing Śaṅkara's terminological peculiarities proposed by Hacker (1950) seem appropriate for application in this case. Hacker demonstrated that these peculiarities are not shared even by Śaṅkara's direct disciples, and are thus indicative of Śaṅkara's authorship. Sengaku Mayeda applied Hacker's methodology to the Upad (1965b), BhGBh (1965a), KeUBh (1968), and GKBh (1967–68) with convincing outcomes. Hacker analysed the terms *avidyā*, *nāmarūpa*, *īśvara*, and *māyā* and their usage in BSBh, while Mayeda added some new criteria, such as the comparison of quotations and an analysis of the terms *ānanda*, *vivarta*, and *vyāsa*. This study will follow Hacker's procedure together with Mayeda's refinements, which will prove particularly fruitful in solving the authorship issue of ŚvUBh.

Avidyā

The word *avidyā* (ignorance) appears in ŚvUBh 44 times, while *ajñāna* appears 7 times. These two terms are used synonymously. For instance, one can find the

compound *avidyātatkārya* ten times in ŚvUBh, while the compound *ajñānatatkārya* appears with the same meaning in the introduction (pp. 1, 11), and in ŚvUBh 6,20 pp. 74, 13.

a) The nature of *avidyā*

In BSBh (Hacker 1950, pp. 248–49), *avidyā* is identified as *adhyāsa*. In ŚvUBh, *avidyā* is never identified as *adhyāsa* (or *adhyāropa*[*ṇa*]) ‘superimposition’, nor do any of these terms appear in close association with *avidyā*. The second important synonymous expression for *avidyā* in BSBh is *mithyājñāna*, in contradistinction to other Advaitins, for whom *avidyā* is the cause of *mithyājñāna*. The current research located no usage of *mithyājñāna* in ŚvUBh, except for a quotation from Viṣṇudharma 96.29 in intro. p. 11, 15.

b) *avidyā* and related factors

Hacker (1950, pp. 249–50) remarked that, for later Advaitins, *avidyā* is something unique, while Śaṅkara frequently mentions *avidyā* together with related factors such as *kāma*, *karman*, *rāga*, *dveṣa*, *bhaya*, *moha*. In BSBh 1,3.2; 3,3.32; 3,4.34 and 4,2.7, *avidyā* is the first in the chain of afflictions (*kleśa*), just as in *Yoga-Sūtra* (YS) 2,3. This feature, typical for Śaṅkara, appears in ŚvUBh 1,5 and 1,11, where the same chain of *kleśas* from YS 2,3 appears. However, it must be noted that the word *kleśa* is mentioned in ŚvU 1,11, and that the commentator enumerated the list in the commentary to explain the word; the same might be said for ŚvUBh 1,5, where the enumeration of five *kleśas* in the commentary has been triggered by the notion of five sections (*pañca-parvan*) of five types of sorrow in ŚvU 1,5. In addition to *kleśas*, ŚvUBh enumerates related factors on a few other occasions; in 1,3, *ajñāna* is one of eight states of being (*bhavāṣṭaka*) besides *dharma*, *jñāna*, *vairāgya*, *aiśvarya*, *adharma*, *avairāgya*, and *anaīśvarya*; in 1,8 *sukha*, *duḥkha*, *moha*, *ajñāna*, etc.; 2,8 *avidyā*, *kāma*, and *karman*⁵; 4,6 *avidyā*, *kāma*, *vāsanā*.⁶ In many other passages, related factors are indicated by the compound *avidyādi* ‘ignorance and others’ (ŚvUBh 1,10; 11; 2,15; 4,20; 6,13–14). In this respect, the usage of *avidyā* in ŚvUBh appears compatible with BSBh and Śaṅkara’s other works.

c) *avidyā* and its effects

In the table below, the first column denotes the effects of *avidyā*; the second contains expressions describing this causal relation. Hacker (1950, pp. 253–54) remarked that *avidyā* is an efficient cause in BSBh, while his disciples use *avidyā* as a material cause out of which its effects are produced. Śaṅkara’s typical terms to denote the causal relation are (*avidyā*)-*adhyasta*, -*adhyāropita*, -*pratyupasthāpita*, -*vijrmbhita*, -(*pra*)*kalpita*. The terms -*kṛta* and -*nimitta* are more

What does <i>avidyā</i> cause?	How is the causal action described?
1. Makes the fulfilment of desires a human aim.	<i>avidyā-parikalpita</i> (intro. p. 1)
2. All of creation is created by ignorance.	<i>avidyā-kṛta</i> (intro. p. 8)
3. (The limiting adjunct of ignorance) Differentiates the supreme Self	(<i>avidyā-upādhika</i>) <i>bheda</i> (intro. p. 16)
4. Causes the world	<i>ajñānasyaiva kāraṇatvaṃ</i> (ŚvUBh 1, 3)
5. The rivers of transmigration came forth through ignorance	<i>avidyā-pracarita</i> (ŚvUBh 2, 8)
6. An effect is composed of ignorance	<i>avidyā-ātmaka</i> (ŚvUBh 3, 18)
7. Subjugated to ignorance, a person wanders in the sea of transmigration	<i>avidyā-vaśaga</i> (ŚvUBh 4, 9)
8. Limiting adjuncts are born from ignorance	<i>avidyā-janita</i> (ŚvUBh 4, 11)
9. Cause of death	<i>avidyā</i> is <i>marāṇa-hetu</i> (ŚvUBh 4, 20)
10. The reason for the (world)-flowing, the cause of transmigration	<i>avidyā</i> is <i>kṣaraṇahetuḥ saṃsrtikāraṇam</i> (ŚvUBh 5, 1)
11. Cause for the union with the body	<i>avidyā</i> is <i>śarīra-saṃyoga-nimitta</i> (ŚvUBh 6, 5)
12. Cause of bondage	<i>avidyā</i> is <i>bandha-kāraṇam</i> (ŚvUBh 6, 14)

indefinite. Śaṅkara's followers use the expressions *upādāna-kāraṇa* (material cause) and *prakṛti*.

From the table, three things can be ascertained.

- (i) The terms *upādāna-kāraṇa* (material cause) and *prakṛti*, typical for later Advaita, are not used in ŚvUBh.
- (ii) The expressions (*avidyā*)-*adhyasta*, -*adhyāropita*, -*pratyupasthāpita*, -*vijṛmbhita* typical for Śaṅkara to describe the effects of *avidyā* are also not used. An example from BĀUBh can be presented here simply to show how Hacker's list of typical expressions from BSBh shows a remarkable similarity to BĀUBh; in BĀUBh, one can find *avidyādhyaṛopita* (1,4.7; 1,4.10; 2,1.15; 2,1.18; 2,4.5; 4,3.19); *avidyādhyaṛopana* (1,4.10; 2,3.1); *avidyāpratyupasthāpita* (1,4.2; 2,1, 20; 2,4.13; 4,3.30; 4,3.31); *avidyākālpita* (2,4.14; 2,5.14; 4,3.32; 4,4.6). The same is the case with e.g. BhGBh, for which Mayeda (1965a, pp. 162–66) shows how often – *adhyāropita*, -*kalpita*, and other similar expressions appear.
- (iii) *Avidyā-parikalpita* is used in the introduction to ŚvUBh, while the synonymous expressions -*kalpita* and -*prakalpita* are typical of Śaṅkara (Hacker 1950, p. 254; Mayeda 1965a, pp. 162–66; pp. 180–81). The expression *avidyā-nimitta*, typical of Śaṅkara, is used once, but it is only a quotation from ŚvU 6,5.

The table also implies that *avidyā* is indeed an efficient cause in most cases, as the terms *kāraṇa*, *pracarita*, *janita*, and *hetu* might be understood to imply instrumentality. Only in no. 6. might *-ātmaka* suggest a material cause. However Hacker (1950, pp. 253–54) has already remarked that there is only a general tendency towards instrumentality in the genuine works of Śaṅkara, and that no sharp distinction should be drawn, as the term *-ātmaka* itself, which implies material cause, sometimes appears to denote the relationship between *avidyā* and its effect. Therefore, in this respect, ŚvUBh also appears similar to Śaṅkara's genuine works.

The terms *jaḍa* and *bhāvarūpa*, the later attributes of *avidyā* that are not found in Śaṅkara, do not appear in ŚvUBh either.

The most important characteristic of Śaṅkara's interpretation of *avidyā* is that he did not theorise about its locus (*āśraya*) and object (*viṣaya*), an issue that had already become important in Advaita-vedānta for Śaṅkara's disciples Sureśvara and Padmapāda. Although ŚvUBh does not theorise at length about the locus (*āśraya*) of *avidyā*, something is said about the locus of *avidyā* in three rather casual remarks.

ādīḥ sa saṃyoganimittahetuḥ (ŚvU 6.5)

One sees him as the beginning, as the basis and cause of the joining (Tr. Olivelle 1998, p. 431)

ādīḥ kāraṇaṃ sarvasya śarīrasaṃyoganimittānām avidyānām hetuḥ (ŚvUBh 6,5)

... the beginning, the origin of everything, the basis of ignorance which is a cause for the union with the body.

The compound *saṃyoganimittahetu* (basis and cause of the joining) from ŚvU 6,5 is glossed in the commentary with the word *avidyā*. The cause (*hetu*) of *avidyā* is the beginning (*ādī*). This interpretation might be influenced by later *advaitic* teachings that the highest *brahman* is the locus of *avidyā* because *ādī* here means *brahman*.⁷

The opposite situation is present in the commentary on ŚvU 4,6 (p. 55), where it is said that the subtle body (*liṅga*), the limiting adjunct of the cognising Self (*vijñānātman*), is the locus (*āśraya*) of *avidyā*.

dvā suparṇā sayujā sakhāyā samānaṃ vṛkṣaṃ pariśvasajāte/

tayor anyañ pippalaṃ svādv atty anaśnann anyo abhicākaśīti//ŚvU 4.6 and MuU 3, 1.1//

'Two birds, who are companions and friends, nestle on the very same tree. One of them eats a tasty fig; the other, not eating, looks on.' Tr. Olivelle 1998, p. 425; 449.

tayor anyo 'vidyākāmaśāśrayaliṅgopādhir vijñānātmā ... ŚvUBh 4, 6

'One of these two is the cognising (individual Self) whose limiting adjunct is the subtle body that is the locus of ignorance, desire and impressions ...'

This interpretation is actually the same as the one in the commentary on MuU 3,1.1 (although the wording is not always the same) which has been attributed to

Śaṅkara, where the same compound *avidyākāmaṁvāsanāśrayalingopādhi* appears. MuU 3,1.1 and ŚvU 4,6 share the same verse. Both commentaries (on MuU 3,1.1 and on ŚvU 4,6) are very much the same, while the mentioned compound is shared by both commentaries. The compound is used in the interpretation that the first bird, who tasted the tasty fig, is the individual soul (*kṣetrasaṁjñaka* in MuUBh/*vijñānātman* in ŚvUBh) with the limiting adjunct of subtle body that is the locus of ignorance, desire, and impressions. Although this implies a standpoint nearer to the Bhāmatī school of Advaita, which considers the individual soul (*jīva*) as the locus of *avidyā*, this might also be a result of indifference to the question of *āśraya*. Here, one of the commentaries might be a paraphrase of another, or both might be reflections of some common (written or oral) source.

To complicate things further, the locus of *avidyā* is mentioned in the introduction (pp. 1, 4), where it is said that ignorance is its own locus (*svāśraya*). Thus we have three possibilities: (i) *ādi*, the beginning (*brahman*) is the cause (*hetu*) of *avidyā* (ŚvUBh 6, 5), (ii) subtle body (*liṅga*) is the locus (*āśraya*) of *avidyā* (ŚvUBh 4,6), and (iii) *avidyā* bears itself (*svāśraya*) in the introduction. If nothing else, these three different standpoints imply (i) indifference towards the theoretical implications of the strict definition of the term, (ii) that there is a striking similarity between ŚvUBh and MuUBh. Both points argue in favour of Śaṅkara's authorship.

Nāmarūpa

Hacker (1950, p. 258) remarked that the compound *nāmarūpa* (name and form) is frequently used in BSBh, often in the sense of a primary material or the primary state of the world. In this respect, the concept differs from the usage in the works of his followers, who used *nāmarūpa* synonymously with *avidyā* and *māyā* (Mayeda 1965, p. 182). The compound *nāmarūpa* appears only five times in ŚvUBh. Hacker, however, does not insist that the lower frequency of usage is dismissive of Śaṅkara's authorship. Harimoto (2014, p. 245) also emphasises this with the claim that the work should not be eliminated if the compound is not used frequently. Mayeda (1968, p. 45), analysing the issue of the authorship of KeUBh, also stresses that it is normal not to find the compound in KU, which does not deal in cosmology as a topic. Although ŚvU deals with cosmology to some extent, *nāmarūpa* does not appear very frequently.

The introduction to ŚvUBh (p. 14) claims that *śruti*, which are the foremost in expounding the cause of the name and others (*nāmādi*) ('others' are most probably form and action) annulled (*bādhita*) the world, which is interpreted as unreal.⁸ In ŚvUBh 1,7, the commentator claims that name, form, and action (*nāmarūpakarman*) is the triad in the highest *brahman* mentioned in ŚvU 1,7,⁹ and that *nāmarūpakarman* are created by Virāj and Sūtra. In ŚvUBh 5,7 (p. 64), *viśvarūpa* from ŚvU 5,7 is interpreted as name and form because it accumulated effect and cause (*kāryakāraṇa*).¹⁰ ŚvUBh 5,14 (p. 66) is interesting because the word *kalāśargakara* (the one who produces both creation and its constituent parts¹¹)

from ŚvU 5,14 is interpreted as the one who produces creation (*sarga*) and its constituent parts, sixteen in number, starting with life-force (*prāṇa*), ending with name (*nāman*)¹² explained in 'ātharvaṇa' (PraśU 6,4). Now, observing PraśUBh 6,4, which is attributed to Śaṅkara, it is apparent that there is a remarkable accordance with ŚvUBh 5,14, as all 16 parts beginning with *prāṇa* and ending with name (*nāman*) are enumerated and described in PraśUBh 6,4. This shows that these passages are analogous, only that PraśUBh is more elaborated and detailed, while ŚvUBh appears simplified and condensed.

From this, it can be ascertained that (i) name and form are mentioned three times together with their related factors and two times with *karman*, and that this is typical of the usage in BSBh (BSbh 1,3.22; 1,4.19; 1,4.22; 4,3.14) (see Hacker 1950, p. 261) (ii) the adjective *avyākṛta* 'unevolved', uniquely used by Śaṅkara in BSBh with *nāmarūpa*, is not used. Hacker examined only BSBh, but the phrase *avyākṛte nāmarūpe* indeed appears in Śaṅkara's other works besides BSBh. The phrase appears in BĀUBh 2,5.18 (*avyākṛte nāmarūpe*); 1,4.7 (*avyākṛte ātmabhūte nāmarūpe*); 3,1.1 (*avyākṛtadharminyanāmarūpātmake*); in TaittUBh 2,6.1 (*avyākṛtanāmarūpe*).

It can be concluded that the usage of *nāmarūpa* in ŚvUBh neither promotes nor disproves Śaṅkara's authorship. The interpretations of ŚvUBh 5,14 and PraśUBh 6,4 are very similar. However, the fact that ŚvUBh 5,14 seems to abbreviate the content of PraśUBh 6,4 might indicate that PraśUBh is older and served as a model for the composition of ŚvUBh 5,14.

Māyā

The term *māyā* in ŚvUBh is, however, used in a different fashion than in Śaṅkara's genuine works. This difference is reflected in two ways: (i) The concept and its usage is different in ŚvUBh and in Śaṅkara's genuine works, (ii) the frequency of its usage is also remarkably different.

1. usage of the term *māyā* in ŚvUBh

Hacker (1950, p. 269) noted that the term *māyā* does not have any terminological weight in Śaṅkara's genuine works. While the term blends different concepts, Śaṅkara does not develop a theory of *māyā*. Śaṅkara usually does not use the term in the philosophical sense, but rather to denote magic, illusion, or mirage. Śaṅkara's disciples reflected on the nature of *māyā* and began to develop a theory of it. To Śaṅkara, *māyā* is not a material cause or substance of the illusory world, rather the world is either compared to *māyā* 'magic' or is described as *māyā*. Five distinctions are characteristics of BSBh: (i) Śaṅkara does not use the word *māyāvāda*, and the word is not used in ŚvUBh, (ii) At one point in BSBh (2, 3.6), *māyā* means 'fraud' in a non-philosophical sense, while the word is not used in this

way in ŚvUBh, (iii) *māyā* is used frequently in the sense of ‘magic’ in BSBh, but *māyā* is never used in this sense in ŚvUBh. The great importance of this is apparent through the example of BĀUBh, where the word *māyā* appears six times (BĀUBh 1,5.2; 2,3.6; 2,4.12; 2,5.19; 3,5.1; 4,3.9), in the sense of magic in all cases, (iv) in BSBh *māyā* often appears as an object of comparison (with *yathā*, *iva* or *-vat*), but in ŚvUBh it never appears in this sense, (v) *māyā* is, according to Hacker (1950, p. 271), regarded as the magical power of God in half of the passages in BSBh, while the term is not used as the magic power of God at all in ŚvUBh. This is actually very significant because in ŚvU 4.9 and 4.10 the term *māyin* is used in the sense of a magician or illusionist that creates this whole world. If the author of ŚvUBh really is Śaṅkara, it would be very unusual for him to pass this up as this is the usual way for him to understand what *māyā* is.

In ŚvUBh, *māyā* is always used in the philosophical sense, and it appears as a fully developed philosophical concept. The term appears 35 times (9 times as *māyin* in the sense of God as the Lord of *māyā*). The following paragraphs describe examples of the typical usage of *māyā*.

a) *māyā-ātmaka*

In three passages (1,7; 1,9; 5,4), different aspects of the manifested universe have the nature of or are composed of *māyā* (*māyātmaka*), implying that *māyā* might here signify a material cause. In 1,7 p. 28, transformation (*vikāra*) and the manifested world (*prapañca*) have the nature of or are composed of *māyā*¹³; in 1,9, the triad of enjoyer, enjoyment, and the enjoyable (*bhokṛbhogabhogya*) have the nature of or are composed of *māyā*¹⁴; in 5,3 p. 63 the Field (*kṣetra*) is *māyātmaka*.¹⁵

b) *māyā* as a cause in general

In intro. p. 8, *māyā* is the cause (*kāraṇa*) of the manifested world (*prapañca*).¹⁶ The same is the case in 1,4, where *māyā* is one of the names for the causal state of the supreme Self (*kāraṇāvasthā*), together with a chain of related factors such as source, cause, the undeveloped, open space, supreme heaven, illusion, nature, power, darkness, ignorance, shadow, nescience, falsehood, and the unmanifested.¹⁷

c) *māyā* as a material cause

ŚvUBh 4,9 describes how *brahman* as the Lord of *māyā* (*māyin*) becomes the material cause (*upādāna*) of the manifested universe through his own power (*śakti*), his own *māyā*.¹⁸

d) *māyā* and *upādhis*

In intro. p. 16, distinction (*bheda*) is due to the limiting adjuncts caused by *māyā*¹⁹; in 1,9, *parameśvara* is the Lord of *māyā* due to his proximity to the limiting adjuncts of *māyā*²⁰; in 3,1, the Lord (*īśa*) rules by assuming *māyā* as His limiting adjunct²¹; in 4,9, the imperishable (*akṣara*) is the creator of the world by assuming *māyā* as its limiting adjunct²²; in 4,7, the lower self is described as divided by the limiting adjuncts born from ignorance, whose essence is *māyā*.²³

e) Lower *brahman* is conditioned by *māyā*

In 1,3, *brahman* firstly exists with the form of the Lord of *māyā* (*māyin*), whose self is *īśvara*; in 1,4, *māyin* is again *īśvara*. In previous instances (1,9; 3,1; 4,9), it is also shown how the highest *brahman* appears conditioned by limiting adjuncts.

It seems that ŚvUBh (1,3; 1,4) teaches that the highest *brahman* associated with limiting adjuncts appears first as the Lord of *māyā* (*māyin*), out of which he creates the world through his own power (*svasāktavaśa* in 4,9); *māyin* then rules the world by assuming *māyā* as his limiting adjunct (1,3). In 1,4 (p. 21), it is also suggested that the highest *brahman* as the Lord of *māyā* appears as *īśvara*, while, devoid of *māyā*, he is truth, knowledge, and bliss (*satyajñānānanda*). Numerous passages in ŚvUBh, however, insist that this conditioning is only illusory.

2. Relative frequency of the word *māyā*

The term *māyā* does not appear very often in Śaṅkara's genuine texts. The occurrence of *māyā*: *nāmarūpa*: *avidyā* in BSBh is 2:7:10 (Hacker 1950, p. 268). In Upad, the frequency is 2:2.5:7.5 (4:5: 15). The frequency of *māyā* is even lower in BĀUBh, where the ratio is only 2:22:74 (6:65:221), while the term does not appear at all in TaittUBh. In ŚvUBh, *māyā* occurs thirty-five times, and the ratio is 2:0.3:3 (35:5:51). It can be argued that the high frequency of *māyā* is due to the appearance of the word in ŚvU (1,10; 4,9; 4,10). In the commentaries on these three verses, the word *māyā* appears twelve times, leaving another twenty-three occurrences in passages where the usage is not triggered by commented text. Even if one was to leave out these twelve appearances, the frequency is still much higher than in Śaṅkara's genuine works.

These examples show that (i) *māyā* is a fully developed philosophical concept in ŚvUBh, and important part of commentator's cosmological teachings—special emphasis is placed on the Lord of *māyā* (*māyin*), a concept unknown in Śaṅkara's genuine works;²⁴ (ii) the term is never used in the sense of 'magic' as it is most commonly used, if not exclusively (as in BĀUBh), in BSBh, BĀUBh, Upad, BhGBh, and KeUBh; (iii) it appears much more frequently than in the mentioned works.

Thus, it must be concluded that the usage of the term *māyā* in ŚvUBh points towards later developments in *advaita* doctrine, and offers an argument against Śaṅkara's authorship.

īśvara

The terms *īśvara*, *parameśvara*, and *maheśvara* appear quite frequently in ŚvUBh—eighty-six times altogether (*maheśvara* 5, *parameśvara* 29, *īśvara* 52). In two passages, the term denotes Lord Śiva (*parameśvara* intro. p. 7, 3; ŚvUBh 1,10 p. 32,26). In all other cases, the terms are used rather unsystematically to denote either the highest *brahman* or the conditioned *brahman*. In the sense of the highest *brahman*, the terms *īśvara/parameśvara/maheśvara* are used synonymously with (*para*)*brahma*, (*param*)*ātman*. For instance, in ŚvUBh 1,3 (p. 19), it is said that *māyin* (the Lord of *māyā*), *maheśvara* is *paramātman*.²⁵ But in the commentary on the same verse (p. 21), it is said that first (in the beginning of creation) *brahman* becomes manifest as *īśvara* in the form of *māyin*.²⁶ In ŚvUBh 1,6, it is said that *īśvara* is non-dual *brahman*, who is *sac-cid-ānanda*.²⁷ In 4,11, it is said that *parameśvara* is free of *māyā* and is one mass of bliss (*māyāvinirmuktānandaikaghanah*). On the other hand, in ŚvUBh 1,8 p. 30, *īśvara* has the limiting adjunct of pure *sattva* (*viśuddhasattvopādher īśvarasya*), which denotes the conditioned *brahman*. This qualification actually corresponds to the description of *antaryāmin* in AiUBh 3,3, which is designated there as *īśvara* connected with the pure limiting adjuncts of discrimination (*prajñā*).²⁸ However, the term *parameśvara* is used more or less systematically to a certain extent, as it seems that there is a general tendency to use the term for the highest *brahman* (except intro. p. 7 and 1, 10, where *parameśvara* denotes Śiva, 1,11, where *parameśvara* is the object of meditation, and 6,21, where one acquires liberation through the grace of *parameśvara*).

Hacker (1950, p. 276) remarked that Śaṅkara does not identify *īśvara* (and *brahman*) with *ānanda*. ŚvUBh does not fulfil his criteria, as *ānanda* is used three times to describe *īśvara* (1,4; 1,6; 4,15) and once to describe *parameśvara* (6,23). This manner of usage is, in fact, not attested in BSBh, BĀUBh, TaittUBh, and Upad.

In ŚvUBh, as in Śaṅkara's genuine works, *īśvara* may denote both highest and lower *brahman*, thus making the use of the term comparable to usage in the genuine works. On the other hand, the fact that *cit-sad-ānanda* is used to denote *īśvara*'s self in ŚvUBh 1,6 (see ft. 29) provides an argument against Śaṅkara's authorship. The phrase *sac-cid-ānanda* does not appear only with *īśvara*, but also with other words denoting the highest *brahman*. As this usage characterises later developments in Advaita, the appearance of this term will be studied in the next paragraph.

sac-cid-ānanda

Hacker (1950, p. 267) remarked that Śaṅkara uses the term *ānanda* only when it appears in the text he interprets (see also Mayeda (1965, p. 186) and Ingalls (1952, p. 7)). For this reason, Mayeda introduced the analysis of the term *ānanda* as an elimination criterion. The traditional concept of *sac-cid-ānanda* (existence-consciousness-bliss) is never used in works considered to have been genuinely

authored by Śaṅkara. As far as this research was able to determine, the phrase was used by neither Padmapāda nor Sureśvara, and it was certainly not used by Vācaspati-Miśra in his *Bhāmatī*. It is beyond the scope of this study to establish when exactly the phrase appeared. However, Sarvajñātman (tenth or eleventh century)²⁹ uses *sac-cit-ānanda* (*Samkṣepa-Śārīraka* 1,226; 1,236) and *sac-cit-sukha* (*Samkṣepa-Śārīraka* 1,174; 1,540). *Sukha* is interchangeable with *ānanda*, as the term *sukha* appears in Jñānaghana's (tenth–eleventh century?)³⁰ *Tattvasūddhi* 37 (TŚ p. 234–39) where Jñānaghana defends the theory that *sukha* belongs to *ātman*'s own nature (*svabhāva*) and is not an attribute of *ātman* (*guṇa*).

In ŚvUBh, the phrase appears nine times in different forms: intro. p. 1 (*cit-sad-ānanda*); 1,4 p. 22 (*cit-sad-ānanda* [2x]); 1,6 p. 26 (*cit-sad-ānanda*); 3,5 p. 48 (*sac-cid-ānanda*); 4,10 p. 57 (*sac-cid-ānanda*); 4,11 p. 57 (*sac-cid-ānanda*); 6,4 p. 68 (*cit-sad-ānanda*); 6,23 p. 76 (*sac-cid-ānanda*). Hacker (1950, p. 286) remarked that, after Vimuktātman, Advaitins never discussed the attributes or qualities (*guṇas* or *dharma*s) of *brahman*, but only his form (*svarūpa*). This is clearly apparent in Jñānaghana's *Tattvasūddhi* 37, where *sukha* (used synonymously with *ānanda*) is *brahman*'s own nature (*svabhāva*), and not his attribute (*guṇa*) as claimed by the *pūrvapakṣin*. In ŚvUBh, *sac-cid-ānanda* is indeed never interpreted as *guṇa* or *dharma* of *brahman*/*īśvara*/*ātman*, but always as his form (*svarūpa*), his Self (*ātman*), or form (*vapus*). Thus, in intro. p. 1, it is said that Self is non-dual *brahman*, consciousness, existence, and bliss (*citsadānandādvitīyabrahmasvarūpo 'py ātmā*) by virtue of its own form; in 1,4 p. 22, *svarūpeṇa citsadānandādvitīyabrahmātmanā*; in 6,23 p. 76, *parameśvara's own form is the supreme light of consciousness, existence, and bliss (saccidānandaparajyotiḥsvarūpiṇi parameśvare)*. In 4,11 p. 57, it is said that liberation manifests itself through the one whose form is existence, knowledge, and bliss (*tenaiva . . . saccidānandavapuṣā*). In 3,5 p. 48, it is said that *śiva* (a word from ŚvU 3, 5) means the one whose form is non-dual *brahman*, existence, knowledge, and bliss (*. . . śivā . . . saccidānandādvayabrahmarūpā*³¹).

The appearance and usage of the term *sac-cid-ānanda* suggests a later dating for ŚvUBh, likely after the eleventh century, and offers an important argument against Śaṅkara's authorship.

Comparison of quotations

In his analysis of the authorship of Upad and BhGBh (1965b, p. 187; 1965a, p. 187), Mayeda proposes a comparison of quotations as indicative of Śaṅkara's authorship; later (1968, p. 52; 1967–68, p. 80), he employs the analysis on KeUBh and GKBh.

By 1876, Paul Regnaud had already raised doubts over Śaṅkara's authorship of ŚvUBh because of purāṇa quotations, while M. Narayanaswami Aiyer claimed that long purāṇa quotations in ŚvUBh are contrary to Śaṅkara's literary habits. These remarks make it important to examine quotations in ŚvUBh. This is a comprehensive but not exhaustive list of quotations in ŚvUBh:

Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad	45	Taittirīya-Upaniṣad	5	Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa	2
Bhagavad-Gītā	33	Śivadharmottara-Purāṇa	5	Aitareya-Upaniṣad	1
Chāndogya-Upaniṣad	24	Viśnudharma-Purāṇa	4	Aitareya-Āraṇyaka	1
Brahma-Sūtra	19	Māṇḍūkya-Kārikā	3	Aṣṭādhyāyī	1
Kaṭha-Upaniṣad	18	Nṛsiṃhapūrvatāpanī-Upaniṣad	3	Bhāgavata-Purāṇa	1
Viśnu-Purāṇa	16	Yājñavalkyadhārma-Śāstra	3	Kauṣītaki-Brāhmaṇa	1
Īśā-upaniṣad	12	Atharvaśīras-Upaniṣad	2	Māṇḍūkya-Upaniṣad	1
Muṇḍaka-Upaniṣad	11	Prakīrṇādhikāra	2	Maitreyī-Upaniṣad	1
Liṅga-Purāṇa	9	Kaivalya-Upaniṣad	2	Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa	1
Mahābhārata	9	Kauṣītaki-Upaniṣad	2	Subāla-Upaniṣad	1
Praśna-Upaniṣad	7	Kūrma-Purāṇa	2	Taittirīya-Saṃhitā	1
Kena-Upaniṣad	6	R̥k-saṃhitā	2	Yogaśikhā-Upaniṣad	1
Brahma-Purāṇa (?)	5	Śāṇḍilya-Upaniṣad	2	Yoga-Vāsiṣṭha	1
Mahānārāyaṇa-Upaniṣad	5	Taittirīya-Āraṇyaka	2		

Quotations are not marked in the ĀSS edition of ŚvUBh. The list presented here was mostly compiled using Gambhiranada's translation (1986), where the translator attempted to identify the quotations. However, upon careful inspection of the text, it is apparent that Gambhiranada did not identify all quotes, although upaniṣad quotes seem to be well documented. The current research has managed to locate some unidentified quotations, however, the sources of some quotations are still unknown. For example, ŚvUBh 1,7 p. 28 features a quotation consisting of five unidentified verses, while a very long unidentified quotation of twenty-seven verses in ŚvUBh 2, 9 pp. 42ff describes the yogic practice of *prāṇāyāma*. For the scope of this investigation, however, this incomplete list is quite sufficient.

The most important quotation for our investigation (not identified by Gambhirananda) is found in ŚvUBh 2,7 (pp. 41, 6–9), where *Bhṛgu-Saṃhitā* (*Prakīrṇādhikāra*) 30,128 and 30,131³² are quoted. This quote is extremely important for this research, as it offers the most important evidence against Śaṅkara's authorship. *Prakīrṇādhikāra* is a part of *Bhṛgu-Saṃhitā*, a collection of texts hailing from the Vaikhānasa tradition. *Bhṛgu-Saṃhitā* as a whole has been dated by Jan Gonda (1977, p. 145) to approximately the twelfth century. Goudriaan (1969–70, p. 162) roughly estimates that the entire corpus (including other Vaikhānasa texts ascribed to Atri, Marīci, Kāśyapa) is a millennium or more old. But according to Gonda, *Bhṛgu* texts seem to be the youngest part of the Vaikhānasa text-corpus, showing 'some changes and innovations in their ritual traditions' in portions dedicated to image worship (Gonda 1977, p. 145). Gonda (1977, p. 151) especially mentions *Prakīrṇādhikāra* as one of the more recent *Bhṛgu*-texts. As Śaṅkara's has been reasonably dated to the eighth century (Harimoto 2006, p. 106 even narrows the date of BSBh to between 756 and 772), it is obvious that *Bhṛgu-Saṃhitā* is a few centuries younger than Śaṅkara, while ŚvUBh must be younger than *Bhṛgu-Saṃhitā*.

The purāṇic quotations already mentioned by Regnaud and Narayanaswami Aiyer as indicative of non-Śāṅkarian authorship are also worthy of note. At first sight, the frequency of upaniṣadic quotations appears to be in accordance with the frequencies of citations in Śāṅkara's genuine works, which usually feature BĀU and ChU as the most quoted texts (apart from the text after which the commentary is composed). BĀU is the most quoted text in Upad (Mayeda 1965b, p. 188), BhGBh (Mayeda 1965a, p. 188), KeUBh (Mayeda 1968, p. 52), and GKBh (Mayeda 1967–1968, p. 80), while ChU is the second, except for KeUBh. Only in BSBh is ChU the most quoted text followed by BĀU (Deussen 1883, p. 32). However, in other commentaries and Upad, we find either no purāṇic quotations or very few. The list of quotations in ŚvUBh presented here might seem unimportant, as the purāṇic frequencies do not appear very high, with *Viṣṇu-Purāṇa* (ViP) in sixth place and *Liṅg* in ninth place. However, this list does not show how long these quotations truly are. For instance, from pp. 9, 17 on, ŚvUBh first quotes twenty-three ślokas from '*Brahma-Purāṇa*' (*Brahma-Purāṇa* quotations in ŚvUBh are marked as such by the commentator, but in the extant BrahP these verses are nowhere to be found), which are immediately followed by fourteen ślokas, which we can find in the present form of *Viṣṇudharma-Purāṇa* and twenty-eight ślokas from ViP. After this, five ślokas from *Liṅga-Purāṇa* are quoted, followed by eight ślokas from *Kūrma-Purāṇa*—a grand total of seventy-eight purāṇic ślokas in a row. The author of ŚvUBh had a habit of long purāṇic quotations, and furthermore frequently names the source. In Śāṅkara's genuine works, purāṇic quotations appear very rarely, while Śāṅkara does not have a habit of naming his sources. For instance, the current research located only four purāṇic quotations in BĀUBh—one from *Viṣṇu-Purāṇa* in BĀUBh 6,2.15, two quotations from *Śiva-Purāṇa* in BĀUBh 1,2.3; 1,4.7, and one from *Vāyu-Purāṇa* in BĀUBh 1,4.2. In BSBh, the purāṇas are quoted only eight times according to Deussen (1883, p. 36). He identifies only two in BSBh 1,2.32 and 3,3.16, both of which hail from the *Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa* 45.64. As far as is known to this author, no purāṇic citations appear in TaittUBh and Upad. Mayeda identified two one-śloka quotations from ViP in BhGBh 3,37 (1965a, p. 188). Closer inspection of these quotations reveals that they always comprise only one verse per quotation.

In his analysis, Mayeda also uses the terms *vivarta* and the name Vyāsa as indicative of Śāṅkara's authorship. However, *vivarta* is not used in ŚvUBh, and Vyāsa is mentioned once (intro. p. 20, 2) as the author of the BhG. Thus, these terms do not provide any clue for the authorship of ŚvUBh.

Concluding remarks on the authorship and dating of ŚvUBh

The author of ŚvUBh uses the term *avidyā* in very much the same way as Śāṅkara. He considers *avidyā* a leading member of the group of factors that causes affliction; the effects of *avidyā* are no different than in Śāṅkara's genuine works. However,

the same expressions are not used as they are in works considered to have been genuinely authored by Śaṅkara. *Avidyā* is also not used in the sense of Śaṅkara's disciples and later Advaitins. The author of ŚvUBh did not care to speculate much about the locus of *avidyā*. The usage of the compound *nāmarūpa* in ŚvUBh neither supports nor disproves Śaṅkara's authorship. The frequency and usage of the terms *īśvara/parameśvara/maheśvara* are similar to Śaṅkara's usage, as the term is not distinguished from (*param*)ātman/(*para*)brahman. On the other hand, the content of the term *māyā* in ŚvUBh is completely different than in works considered to have been authored by Śaṅkara, and this argues in favour of later developments in *advaita* doctrine. The usage of the term *māyā* together with the unusually high frequency of its appearance in ŚvUBh offer arguments against Śaṅkara's authorship. Even more indicative is the frequent usage of the phrase *sac-cid-ānanda*, which appears in Advaita after Śaṅkara, at least from Sarvajñātman on. The strongest evidence that disproves Śaṅkara's authorship are quotations from *Bhṛgu-Saṃhitā* dated much later than Śaṅkara. This new evidence, added to all other doubts raised by previous researchers, builds a strong case against Śaṅkara's authorship of ŚvUBh.

Regarding the issue of the possible dating of ŚvUBh, *terminus post quem* might be around the twelfth century, when *Bhṛgu-Saṃhitā* came into being. *Terminus ante quem* might be the time when *īśvara* became exclusively used to denote lower *brahman*. According to Hacker (1950, p. 285), there is no interchangeability between *īśvara* and *brahman* in later Advaita (*Pañcadaśī* and *Vedāntasāra*). ŚvUBh, in which the terms are still interchangeable, might be considered older. If this can be used as an argument for dating, ŚvUBh might have been composed tentatively between the twelfth century (if we follow Gonda's dates of Bhṛgu's collection) and the fourteenth century, when *Pañcadaśī* was composed.

Abbreviations

AiUBh	Aitareya-Upaniṣad-Bhāṣya
ĀSS	Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series
BĀU	Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad
BĀUBh	Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad-Bhāṣya
BhG	Bhagavad-Gītā
BhGBh	Bhagavad-Gītā-Bhāṣya
BhS (P)	Bhṛgu-Saṃhitā (Prakīrṇādhikāra)
BrahP	Brahma-Purāṇa
BSBh	Brahma-Sūtra-Bhāṣya
ChU	Chāndogya-Upaniṣad
GKBh	Gauḍapādīya-Kārikā-Bhāṣya
IU	Īśā-Upaniṣad
IUBh	Īśā-Upaniṣad-Bhāṣya
KaU	Kaṭha-Upaniṣad

KaUBh	Kaṭha-Upaniṣad-Bhāṣya
KeUBh	Kena-Upaniṣad-Bhāṣya
KṣUBh	Kauṣītaki-Upaniṣad
LiñP	Liṅga-Purāṇa
MBh	Mahābhārata
MuU	Muṇḍaka-Upaniṣad
MuUBh	Muṇḍaka-Upaniṣad-Bhāṣya
PraśUBh	Praśna-Upaniṣad-Bhāṣya
RS	R̥k-Saṃhitā
ŚDV	Śaṅkara-Dig-Vijāya
ŚvU	Śvetāśvatara-Upaniṣad
ŚvUBh	Śvetāśvatara-Upaniṣad-Bhāṣya
TaittUBh	Taittirīya-Upaniṣad-Bhāṣya
Upad	Upadeśasāhasrī
ViP	Viṣṇu-Purāṇa
YS	Yoga-Sūtra

References

Primary Sources

- Kṛṣṇayajurvediya-śvetāśvataropaniṣad-chāṃkara-bhāṣyopetā tathā Śaṃkarānandaḥkṛtā śvetāśvataropaniṣad-dīpikā, Nārāyaṇakṛtā śvetāśvataropaniṣad-dīpikā, Vijñānabhagavat-kṛtaṃ śvetāśvataropaniṣad-vivaraṇam; ānandāśrama-saṃskṛta-granthāvaliḥ granthāṅkaḥ 17. Edited by V. G. Āpaṭe. Pune: Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series, 1890. = ĀSS 17;
- Śaṅkara. *Ten Principal Upaniṣads with Śaṅkarabhāṣya, Works of Śaṅkarācārya in original Sanskrit*, vol. 1, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass 1964. Reprint 2007. = TPU
- Jñānaghana. *Tattvaśuddhi of Jñānaghanapāda*. Edited by Shastri Suryanarayana and Radhakrishnan E.P.. Madras: University of Madras, 1941. = TŚ

Secondary Sources

- Aiyer, M. N. 1900–1901. ‘Did Sankara write a commentary on Svetasvatara upanisad?’. *Siddhanta Deepika*, IV, 83–4.
- Bader, J. 2000. *Conquest of the four quarters, traditional accounts of the life of Śaṅkara*. Delhi: Aditya Prakashan.
- Deussen, P. 1883. *Das System des Vedānta*. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus.
- Gambhirananda, S. 1986. *Śvetāśvatara upaniṣad with the commentary of Śaṅkarācārya*. Kolkata: Advaita Ashrama.
- Gonda, J. 1977. *Medieval religious literature in sanskrit, a history of indian literature*, Vol. II, Fasc. I. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Goudriaan, T. 1969–70. ‘Vaikhāṇasa daily worship: according to the handbooks of Atri, Bhṛḡu, Kāśyapa, and Marīci’. *Indo-Iranian Journal*, 12, 161–215.
- Hacker, P. 1950. Eigentümlichkeiten der Lehre und Terminologie Śaṅkaras: Avidyā, Nāmarūpa, Māyā, Īśvara, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 100,

- 246–86. Reprinted in *Kleine Schriften*, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, pp. 69–109 (1978).
- Hacker, P. 1978. Śaṅkarācārya and Śaṅkarabhagavatpāda. Preliminary remarks concerning the authorship problem, (Korrigierte Neufassung), *Kleine Schriften*, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, pp. 41–59. Originally published in *New Indian Antiquary* 9 (1947), pp. 175–86.
- Harimoto, K. 2006. 'The Date of Śaṅkara: between the Cālukyas and the Rāṣṭrakūtas'. *Journal of Indological Studies*, **18**, 85–111.
- Harimoto, K. 2014. *God, reason, and yoga: a critical edition and translation of the commentary ascribed to Śaṅkara on Pātañjalayogaśāstra 1.23–28*. Hamburg: Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies.
- Hauschild, R. 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.
- Ingalls, D. H. H. 1952. 'The study of Śaṅkarācārya'. *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, XXXIII, 1–14.
- Jacob, G. A. 1886. The Nrisimhatapaniya-Upanishad, *Indian Antiquary*, XV, 70.
- Kanakura, E. 1926. 'Pañcīkaraṇa'. *Journal of Philosophy*, (Tokyo), **41**.
- Kocmarek, I. 1985. *Language and release: sarvajñātman's Pañcaprakriyā*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Marschner, K. 1933. *Zur Verfasserfrage des dem Śaṅkarācārya zugeschriebenen Bhāḍāranyakopaniṣad-Bhāṣya*, Berlin-Charlottenburg: Alfred Lindner Verlag.
- Mayeda, S. 1965a. 'The authenticity of the Bhagavadgītābhāṣya ascribed to Śaṅkara'. *Wiener Zeitschrift Für Die Kunde Südasiens Und Archiv Für Indische Philosophie*, **55**, 181–97.
- Mayeda, S. 1965b. 'The authenticity of the Upadeśasāhasrī ascribed to Śaṅkara'. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, **85**, 178–96.
- Mayeda, S. 1968. 'On Śaṅkara's authorship of the Kenopaniṣadbhāṣya'. *Indo-Iranian Journal*, **10**, 33–55.
- Mayeda, S. 1967–1968. 'On the author of the Māṇḍūkyaopaniṣad and the Gauḍapādīyabhāṣya'. *Adyar Library Bulletin*, **31–32**, 73–94.
- Olivelle, P. 1998. *The early upaniṣads*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Potter, K. (ed.) 2006. *Encyclopedia of Indian philosophy volume 10: advaita philosophy up to Citsukha*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Regnaud, P. 1876. *Matériaux pour servir à l'histoire de la philosophie de l'Inde, première partie, Bibliothèque De L'École Des Hautes Études* 28. fascicule, Paris: F. Vieweg.
- Vetter, T. 1972. *Sarvajñātman's Samksepasāriakam* (1. Kapitel: Einführung, Übersetzung und Anmerkungen), Wenen: Hermann Böhlau Nachf. Kommissionsverlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Notes

- 1 Cited and partly criticised by Hauschild (1927, p. 65).
- 2 In ŚDV 6,61 (between 1650 and 1789, see Bader (2000, p. 55)), it is only mentioned that Śaṅkara composed commentaries on the Upaniṣads.
- 3 See also ĀSS 17, p. 1.
- 4 Mayeda (1965b, p. 192) reports that E. Kanakura (1926) proposed that works with Sureśvara's Vārtika or Ānandagiri's Ṭikā should be considered authentic.
- 5 The compound *avidyākāmakarman* appears in BSBh 1,2.17; BĀUBh 3,8.12; Upad 5,21.
- 6 The compound *avidyākarmavāsanā* appears in Upad 15,24.

- 7 It is not usual for Śaṅkara to call *brahman ādi* 'beginning', but in this case commentator follows ŚvU 6,1–6,23 where the Highest lord is described with different attributes of which one is *ādi*.
- 8 *evam śrutyādinā nāmādikāraṇopanyāsamukhena svarūpeṇa ca bādhitatvāt prapañcasya mithyātvam avagamyate* / (Intro. p. 14, 30).
- 9 *udgītam etat paramaṃ tu brahma tasmīṃs trayam svapratīṣṭhākṣaram ca / atrāntaram brahmavido viditvā linā brahmaṇi tatparā yonimuktāḥ* // ŚvU 1.7 //
- 'This highest brahman, however, has been extolled thus: There is a triad in it—oneself, the foundation, and the imperishable. When those who know brahman have come to know the distinction between them, they become absorbed in and totally intent on brahman and are freed from the womb.' (Tr. Olivelle 1998, p. 415).
- 10 ŚvUBh 5,7 *sa viśvarūpo nāmarūpaḥ kāryakāraṇopacitatvāt* p. 64, 20f.
- 11 Tr. Olivelle (1998, p. 429).
- 12 ŚvUBh 5,14 *kalānām śoḍaśānām prāṇādināmāntānām* ... pp. 66, 22f.
- 13 ŚvUBh 1,7 *māyātmakatvād vikāryasya / ... māyātmakatvaṃ ca prapañcasya pūrvam eva prapañcitam* / p. 28, 5f.
- 14 ŚvUBh 1,9 *trayam bhoktrbhogabhogyarūpam / māyātmakatvād adhiṣṭhānabhūtabrahmavatyarekeṇa nāsti kiṃtu brahmaiveti* ... pp. 32, 18f.
- 15 ŚvUBh 5,3 ... *asmin māyātmake kṣetre* ... pp. 63, 17.
- 16 Intro. *tathāhi śrutiḥ prapañcasya mithyātvam māyākāraṇatvaṃ ca darśayati* pp. 9, 10f.
- 17 ŚvUBh 1,3 ... *yonih kāraṇam avyākṛtam ākāśam paramavyoma māyā prakṛtiḥ śaktis tamo 'vidyā chāyājñānam anṛtam avyaktam ity evam ādīśabdair abhilapyamānaikā kāraṇāvasthā ... yasyādhiṣṭhātur advitīyasya paramātmanas* ... pp. 22, 24ff.
- 18 ŚvUBh 4,9 *avikāribrahmaṇaḥ katham prapañcopādānatvaṃ ity ata āha-māyiti / kūṭas-thasyāpi svaśāktavaśāt sarvasraṣṭṛvam upapannam ity etat / viśvam pūrvoktaprapañcam sṛjate utpādayati / svamāyayā kalpate tasmin bhūtādīprapañce māyayaivānya iva saṃniruddhaḥ saṃbaddho 'vidyāvaśago bhūtvā saṃsārasamudre bhramatīty arthaḥ* // pp. 56, 21.
- 19 Intro. *bhedas tu jalasūryādivad aupādhiko māyānibandhanaḥ* ... pp. 16, 27.
- 20 ŚvUBh 1,9 *tasmāt so 'pi māyī parameśvaro māyopādhisaṃnidheḥ* ... pp. 31, 29.
- 21 ŚvUBh 3,1 *īśata iṣṭe māyopādhīḥ san* ... p. 47, 12.
- 22 ŚvUBh 4,9 ... *akṣarasya māyopādhikam jagatsraṣṭṛtvam* ... pp. 56, 15.
- 23 ŚvUBh 4,7 ... *ātmā sarvasya samaḥ sarvabhūtāntarastho netaro 'vidyājanitopādhiparicchinno māyātmēti* ... pp. 55, 24.
- 24 The word *māyavin* appears in BSBh (1,1.17; 1,3.19; 2,1.1; 2,1.9; 2,1.21; 2,1.28), but it is never used in the sense of conditioned *brahman*, but rather always in the sense of 'magician' or 'illusionist'.
- 25 ŚvUBh 1,3 *devasya dyotanādiyuktasya māyino maheśvarasya paramātmanaḥ* ... pp. 19, 23f.
- 26 ŚvUBh 1,3 *prathamam īśvarātmanā māyirūpeṇāvatīṣṭhate brahma* / pp. 21, 3.
- 27 ŚvUBh 1,6 ... *teneśvareṇa citsadānandādvitīyabrahmātmanā* ... pp. 26, 15f.
- 28 AiUBh 3.3 *tadatyantaviśuddhāprajñopādhisambandhena sarvajñam īśvaram sarvasādharaṇāvyaḥkṛtajagadbijapravartakam niyantrtvād antaryāmisajñam bhavati* /TPU, p. 349, 11f.
- 29 For Sarvajñātman's dating, see Vetter (1972, p. 16), who uses the year 900 as a working hypothesis. Kocmarek (1985, p. 11) assigns him to the latter half of the

- 10th century or the early 11th century at the latest. Potter (ed.) 2006, p. 436 provides the year 1027.
- 30 In (ed.) Potter 2006, p. 163, the date is 1000, and in the electronic version of the bibliography, the date is 900. See: <https://faculty.washington.edu/kpotter/xtxt3.htm> (last accessed 12th January 2018.).
- 31 Śivā is in the feminine in ŚvU 3,5, because it used adjectivally with *tanū*, f.
- 32 BhS (P) 30.128
janmāntarasahasreṣu tapodhyāna(tapojñāna in ŚvUBh)samādhībhīḥ /
narāṇāṃ kṣīṇapāpānāṃ kṛṣṇe bhaktiḥ prajāyate //
BhS (P) 30.131
aneka janmasaṃsārācīte pāpasamuccaye /
vārṣiṇe(tatkṣiṇe in ŚvUBh) jāyate puṃsāṃ govindābhimukhī matiḥ //
The electronic text is available on GRETEL http://gretl.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretl/1_sanskrit/4_rellit/vaisn/bhrgus_u.htm