Introduction

The Śvetāśvatara-Upaniṣad-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 Brahmāsūtra-Bhāṣya (BSBh), which is considered the standard for determining Śaṅkara’s authorship. Padmapāda mentions Śaṅkara’s name at the beginning of his Pañcapādikā as both the author of BSBh and as his teacher. Suresvara claims in his Naśkarmyasiddhi 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 (Suresvara ad BĀUBh 6,5.25). Käthe Marschner (1933) provides evidence of significant agreement between BĀUBh and BSBh. Suresvara also composed a commentary on the Taittirīyopaniṣad-Bhāṣya (TaitUBh). Thus, it is quite safe to consider BSBh, BĀUBh, and TaitUBh as the works of an author named Śaṅkara. Sengaku Mayeda analysed Upadesāsahasri (Upad) (1965b), Bhagavadgītā-Bhāṣya (BhGBh) (1965a), Kenopaniṣad-Bhāṣya (KeUBh) (1968) and Gaudapādiyakārikā-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, TaitUBh, 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). He provides three reasons for his doubt: (i) long puraṇa 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 puraṇas are more recent than the tenth century, and thus the author of ŚvUBh must be more recent than the tenth century. Puraṇa 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 Kauṣitaki-Upaniṣad-Bhāṣya, which is also traditionally regarded as the work of Śaṅkara. Regnaud’s argument that the puraṇas are more recent than the tenth century is no longer valid, as we know beyond any doubt that most of the mahāpuraṇas 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 śāṅkaroktyupajīvin ‘subsisting on Śaṅkara’s words’ in his commentaries on Śaṅkara’s works, while he calls himself śrutimāropajīvin ‘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 (ĀS) edition of ŚvUBh. The first is Regnauld’s observation on the abundance of quotations from the puraṇas; the second is (Regnauld’s) observation that Ānandagiri did not compose a commentary on ŚvUBh; Aiyer’s third reason is taken from the preface of the ĀS 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-Dīg-Vījāya 6,61 (ŚDV),2 entitled Diṇḍiṇā3; 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 is Jacob’s observation that Nārāyaṇa does not call himself śāṅkaroktyupajīvin (subsisting on Śaṅkara’s words) in his commentary on ŚvU; the sixth is Nārāyaṇa’s quotation of Śaṅkara’s BhG Bh 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 vigorously 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 Śūri 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. 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 ASS 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, iśvara, 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 avidyātatākārya ten times in ŚvUBh, while the compound ajñānatatākārya 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 adhyāropā[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, dveša, 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, aśvārya, adharma, avairāgya, and anaśvārya; in 1,8 sukha, duḥkha, moha, ajñāna, etc.; 2,8 avidyā, kāma, and karman5; 4,6 avidyā, kāma, vāśanā.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 (vidyā)-adhyāsta, -adhyāropita, -pratyupasthāpita, -vijrmbhita, -(prakalpita. The terms -kṛta and -nimitta are more
What does avidyā cause? | How is the causal action described?
--- | ---
1. Makes the fulfilment of desires a human aim. | avidyā-parikalpita (intro. p. 1)
2. All of creation is created by ignorance. | avidyā-kṛta (intro. p. 8)
3. (The limiting adjunct of ignorance) Differentiates the supreme Self | (avidyā-upādhi) bheda (intro. p. 16)
4. Causes the world | ajñānasāvita kāraṇatvam (ŚvUBh 1, 3)
5. The rivers of transmigration came forth through ignorance | avidyā-pracarita (ŚvUBh 2, 8)
6. An effect is composed of ignorance | avidyā-ātmaka (ŚvUBh 3, 18)
7. Subjugated to ignorance, a person wanders in the sea of transmigration | avidyā-vāsa (ŚvUBh 4, 9)
8. Limiting adjuncts are born from ignorance | avidyā-janitā (ŚvUBh 4, 11)
9. Cause of death | avidyā is maraṇa-hetu (ŚvUBh 4, 20)
10. The reason for the (world)-flowing, the cause of transmigration | avidyā is kṣaṇaḥhetuh samśrutikāraṇam (ŚvUBh 5, 1)
11. Cause for the union with the body | avidyā is sārira-sanyoga-nimitta (ŚvUBh 6, 5)
12. Cause of bondage | avidyā is bandha-kāraṇam (ŚvUBh 6, 14)

indivisible. 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)-adhyaśa, -adhyāropita, -pratyupasthāpita, -vijṛmbhīta 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 BS Bh shows a remarkable similarity to BĀUBh; in BĀUBh, one can find avidyādhyāropita (1,4.7; 1,4.10; 2,1.15; 2,1.18; 2,4.5; 4,3.19); avidyādhyāropāṇa (1,4.10; 2,3.1); avidyāpratyupasthāpita (1,4.2; 2,1, 20; 2,4.13; 4,3.30; 4,3.31); avidyākalpita (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 jāda 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 (āsraya) and object (viśaya), an issue that had already become important in Advaita-vedānta for Śaṅkara’s disciples Suresvara and Padmapāda. Although ŚvUBh does not theorise at length about the locus (āsraya) of avidyā, something is said about the locus of avidyā in three rather casual remarks.

\[\text{ādiḥ sa sanyoganimittahetuḥ (ŚU 6.5)}\]
One sees him as the beginning, as the basis and cause of the joining (Tr. Olivelle 1998, p. 431)

\[\text{ādiḥ kāraṇam sarvasya śarīrasanyoganimittānām avidyānām hetuḥ/(ŚvUBh 6,5)}\]
...the beginning, the origin of everything, the basis of ignorance which is a cause for the union with the body.

The compound sanyoganimittahetu (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 (ādi). This interpretation might be influenced by later advaitic teachings that the highest brahman is the locus of avidyā because ādi 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 (linḍa), the limiting adjunct of the cognising Self (vijñānātmman), is the locus (āsraya) of avidyā.

\[\text{dvā suparṇaḥ sayujā sakhāyā samānāṃ vrksam pariṣasvajāte/}
\text{tayor anyoḥ pippalāṃ svādv atty arenaṃ ny abhicākaśiti//ŚvU 4.6 and MuU 3, 1.1//}
\text{‘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.}
\[\text{tayor anyoḥ vidyākāmaśasanāśrayalingopādhv vijñānātmā ... ŚvUBh 4, 6}
\text{‘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 avidyākāmavāsanāśrayalingopādhi 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 (kṣetrasamijñaka 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 (linga) 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 (nāmadī) (‘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 Śātra. 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 kalāsargakara (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) explained in ‘ātharvāṇa’ (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 avyākta ‘unevolved’, uniquely used by Śaṅkara in BSBh with nāmarūpa, is not used. Hacker examined only BSBh, but the phrase avyākta nāmarūpa indeed appears in Śaṅkara’s other works besides BSBh. The phrase appears in BĀUBh 2,5.18 (avyākta nāmarūpe); 1,4.7 (avyākta 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 (prapāñca) have the nature of or are composed of māyā; in 1,9, the triad of enjoyer, enjoyment, and the enjoyable (bhoktābhogabhoga) have the nature of or are composed of māyā; in 5,3 p. 63 the Field (ksetra) is māyātmaka.

b) māyā as a cause in general

In intro. p. 8, māyā is the cause (kāraṇa) of the manifested world (prapāñca). 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.

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 (sakti), his own māyā.

d) māyā and upādhis
In intro. p. 16, distinction (bheda) is due to the limiting adjuncts caused by māyā; in 1,9, paramesvara is the Lord of māyā due to his proximity to the limiting adjuncts of māyā; in 3,1, the Lord (īśa) rules by assuming māyā as His limiting adjunct; in 4,9, the imperishable (aṅkṣara) is the creator of the world by assuming māyā as its limiting adjunct; in 4,7, the lower self is described as divided by the limiting adjuncts born from ignorance, whose essence is māyā.

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 (svaśāktavāsa 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; (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.
The terms īśvara, paramēśvara, and mahēśvara appear quite frequently in ŚvUBh—eighty-six times altogether (mahēśvara 5, paramēśvara 29, īśvara 52). In two passages, the term denotes Lord Śiva (paramēśvara 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/paramēśvara/mahēśvara 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), mahēśvara 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 paramēśvara is free of māyā and is one mass of bliss (māyāvinirmuktānandaikaghanaḥ). On the other hand, in ŚvUBh 1,8 p. 30, īśvara has the limiting adjunct of pure sattva (visūddhatsvopādher 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 paramēśvara 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 paramēśvara denotes Śiva, 1,11, where paramēśvara is the object of meditation, and 6,21, where one acquires liberation through the grace of paramēśvara).

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 paramēśvara (6,23). This manner of usage is, in fact, not attested in BSBh, BĀUBh, TaithUBh, 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 Bhāmaṭī. It is beyond the scope of this study to establish when exactly the phrase appeared. However, Sarvajñātman (tenth or eleventh century) uses sac-cit-ānanda (Sāmkṣepa-Śārīraka 1,226; 1,236) and sac-cit-sukha (Sāmkṣepa-Śārīraka 1,174; 1,540). Sukha is interchangeable with ānanda, as the term sukha appears in Jnānāgahana’s (tenth–eleventh century?) Tattvaśuddhi 37 (TS p. 234–39) where Jnānāgahana defends the theory that sukha belongs to ātman’s own nature (svabhāva) and is not an attribute of ātman (guna).

In ŚvU_bh, 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 (sac-cid-ānanda); 6,23 p. 76 (sac-cid-ānanda). Hacker (1950, p. 286) remarked that, after Vimuktātman, Advaitins never discussed the attributes or qualities (gunas or dharmas) of brahman, but only his form (svarūpa). This is clearly apparent in Jnānāgahana’s Tattvaśuddhi 37, where sukha (used synonymously with ānanda) is brahman’s own nature (svabhāva), and not his attribute (guna) as claimed by the pūrvapāṇin. In ŚvU_bh, sac-cid-ānanda is indeed never interpreted as guna or dharma of brahman/iśvara/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 (citsadānanda dvitīyābrahmasvarūpāpyātma) by virtue of its own form; in 1,4 p. 22, svarūpa citsadānanda dvitīyābrahmātmanā; in 6,23 p. 76, paramesvarā’s own form is the supreme light of consciousness, existence, and bliss (saccidānanda dvayābrahamasvarūpinī paramesvare). In 4,11 p. 57, it is said that liberation manifests itself through the one whose form is existence, knowledge, and bliss (tenaiva...saccidānandavapusā). 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...saccidānandadvayabrahamārupā).

The appearance and usage of the term sac-cid-ānanda suggests a later dating for ŚvU_bh, 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 Regnaut had already raised doubts over Śaṅkara’s authorship of ŚvU_bh because of purāṇa quotations, while M. Narayanaswami Aiyer claimed that long purāṇa quotations in ŚvU_bh are contrary to Śaṅkara’s literary habits. These remarks make it important to examine quotations in ŚvU_bh. This is a comprehensive but not exhaustive list of quotations in ŚvU_bh:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad</th>
<th>45</th>
<th>Taittirīya-Upaniṣad</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bhagavad-Gītā</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Śivadharmottara-Puruṣa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Aitareya-Upaniṣad</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chāndogya-Upaniṣad</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Viśnudharma-Puruṣa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Aitareya-Āranyaka</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahma-Sūtra</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Māṇḍūkya-Kārikā</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Aṣṭādhyāyī</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaṇṭha-Upaniṣad</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Nṛsiṃhapūrvatāpani-Upaniṣad</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bhāgavata-Puruṣa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viśnu-Puruṣa</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Yājñavalkyadhārma-Śāstra</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kauśitaki-Brāhmaṇa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iśā-Upaniṣad</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Atharvaśiras-Upaniṣad</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Māṇḍūkya-Upaniṣad</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munḍaka-Upaniṣad</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Prakīrṇadhikāra</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Maitreyī-Upaniṣad</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liṅga-Puruṣa</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kaivalya-Upaniṣad</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahābhārata</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kauśitaki-Upaniṣad</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Subāla-Upaniṣad</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praśna-Upaniṣad</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kūrma-Puruṣa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Taittirīya-Śamhitā</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kena-Upaniṣad</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ṛk-samhitā</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yogaśīkhā-Upaniṣad</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahma-Puruṣa (?)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Śāṅḍilya-Upaniṣad</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yoga-Vāsiṣṭha</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahānārāyaṇa-Upaniṣad</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Taittirīya-Āranyaka</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quotations are not marked in the ÅSS edition of ŚvUBh. The list presented here was mostly compiled using Gambhirananda’s translation (1986), where the translator attempted to identify the quotations. However, upon careful inspection of the text, it is apparent that Gambhirananda 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 Bṛhgu-Saṁhitā (Prakīrṇadhikārā) 30,128 and 30,131[32] are quoted. This quote is extremely important for this research, as it offers the most important evidence against Śaṅkara’s authorship. Prakīrṇadhikāra is a part of Bṛhgu-Saṁhitā, a collection of texts hailing from the Vaikhānasa tradition. Bṛhgu-Saṁhitā 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, Bṛhgu 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 Prakīrṇadhikāra as one of the more recent Bṛhgu-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 Bṛhgu-Saṁhitā is a few centuries younger than Śaṅkara, while ŚvUBh must be younger than Bṛhgu-Saṁhitā.
The purānic 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), BhUBh (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 purānic quotations or very few. The list of quotations in ŚvUBh presented here might seem unimportant, as the purānic frequencies do not appear very high, with Viṣṇu-Purāṇa (ViP) in sixth place and Liṅga-Purāṇa 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 sūkas 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 sūkas, which we can find in the present form of Viṣṇudharma-Purāṇa and twenty-eight sūkas from ViP. After this, five sūkas from Liṅga-Purāṇa are quoted, followed by eight sūkas from Kūrma-Purāṇa—a grand total of seventy-eight purānic sūkas in a row. The author of ŚvUBh had a habit of long purānic quotations, and furthermore frequently names the source. In Śāṅkara’s genuine works, purānic quotations appear very rarely, while Śāṅkara does not have a habit of naming his sources. For instance, the current research located only four purānic 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 purānas 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 purānic citations appear in TaittUBh and Upad. Mayeda identified two one-sūka 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/paramēśvara/mahēśvara 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 Bṛhma-Samhitā 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 Bṛhma-Samhitā 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 (Pañcadasā 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 Pañcadasā was composed.

Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AiUBh</td>
<td>Aitareya-Upaniṣad-Bhāṣya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ĀSS</td>
<td>Ānandārāma Sanskrit Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BĀU</td>
<td>Bṛhadāranyaka-Upaniṣad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BĀUBh</td>
<td>Bṛhadāranyaka-Upaniṣad-Bhāṣya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BhG</td>
<td>Bhagavad-Gītā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BhGBh</td>
<td>Bhagavad-Gītā-Bhāṣya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BhS (P)</td>
<td>Bṛhma-Samhitā (Prakīrṇādhikāra)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BrahP</td>
<td>Bṛhma-Purāṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSBh</td>
<td>Bṛhma-Sūtra-Bhāṣya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChU</td>
<td>Chāndogya-Upaniṣad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GKBh</td>
<td>Gaudapādiya-Kārikā-Bhāṣya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU</td>
<td>Īśā-Upaniṣad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUBh</td>
<td>Īśā-Upaniṣad-Bhāṣya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KaU</td>
<td>Kaṭha-Upaniṣad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KaUBh Kaṭha-Upaniṣad-Bhāṣya
KeUBh Kena-Upaniṣad-Bhāṣya
KṣUBh Kauṣītaki-Upaniṣad
LīṅP Liṅga-Puruṣa
MBh Mahābhārata
MuU Muṇḍaka-Upaniṣad
MuUBh Muṇḍaka-Upaniṣad-Bhāṣya
PraŚUBh Praśna-Upaniṣad-Bhāṣya
RS Ṛk-Saṃhitā
ŚDV Śaṅkara-Dīg-Vijaya
ŚvU Śvētāvatara-Upaniṣad
ŚvUBh Śvētāvatara-Upaniṣad-Bhāṣya
TaittUBh Taittirīya-Upaniṣad-Bhāṣya
Upad Upadeśasāhasrī
ViP Viṣṇu-Puruṣa
YS Yoga-Sūtra
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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 Suresvara’s Vārtika or Anandagiri’s Tiṅka should be considered authentic.

5 The compound avidyākāmakarman appears in BSBh 1,2,17; BĀUBh 3,8,12; Upad 5,21.

6 The compound avidyākarmavāsanaṇ appears in Upad 15,24.
It is not usual for Śaṅkara to call brahma 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.

evam śrutiādīnā nāma-dikārāṇopanyāsāmukhena svarūpeṇa ca bādhitavat prapaṇcasya mithyātvam avagamya

‘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).

ŚVU Bh 5,7 sa viśvarūpa nāmarūpaḥ kāryakārana-pacitvāt p. 64, 20f.


ŚVU Bh 5,14 kālaṁ ca śodāsāṁ prāṇindamāntāṁ... pp. 66, 22f.

ŚVU Bh 1,7 māyātmakavād vikārasya /...māyātmakatvam ca prapaṇcasya pūrvam eva prapaṇcitam / p. 28, 5f.

ŚVU Bh 1,9 trayām bhoktrabhogabhogarupam /māyātmakatvād adhiśṭhānabhūtabrahma
yatirekāna nāsti kimu brahmaevi ... pp. 32, 18f.

ŚVU Bh 5,3... asmin māyātmaṃ kṣetre ... pp. 63, 17.

Intro. tathāḥ śrutī prapaṇcasya mithyātvam māyākārāṇatvam ca darśayati pp. 9, 10f.

ŚVU Bh 1,3... yoniḥ kāraṇam avyākārtam ākāśaṁ paramavyoma māyā prakṛtīḥ sāktīs tamo
vidyā chāyājunānam antram avayaktaṁ ity evam ādīsaṁbādī abhilaṃyānākā kāraṇāvasthā ... yasyādiśṭhaṁtīrāt advitiṣyastra paramātmānaṁ ... pp. 22, 24ff.

ŚVU Bh 4,9 avikāribrahmaṁ kathām prapaṇcopādāṅatvam ity ata āha-māyīti / kāṭsthāsyāpi svaśāktavāṣṇaḥ sarvābhogaṁ upapannam ity etat / viśvam prāvṛktrapraṇicṣa
srjata utpādayati / svamāyā kalpate tasmābhūtādipraṇaṇe māyayaivaṁyā iva saṃniruddhaṁ saṁbadhāḥ ‘vidyāvāsagā bhūtvā saṁsārasamudre bhramatīty arthaḥ / pp. 56, 21.

Intro. bhedas tu jalaśūryādvad aupādikā māyānibandhanah ... pp. 16, 27.

ŚVU Bh 1,9 tasmāt so ‘pi māyī parameśvaro māyopādhisamānīheḥ ... pp. 31, 29.

ŚVU Bh 3,1 iṣata iṣte māyopādhiḥ sam... p. 47, 12.

ŚVU Bh 4,9... aksarasya māyopādhiḥkam jagatisraṣṭratvam ... pp. 56, 15.

ŚVU Bh 4,7... aṁā sarvasya samāh sarvabhātīcāntarastro netaro vidyājanipādhipa
ricchinno māyātmēri ... pp. 55, 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’.

ŚVU Bh 1,3 devasya dyotanādīyuktasya māyino mahēśvarasya paramātmānaḥ ... pp. 19, 23f.

ŚVU Bh 1,3 prathamam īśvarātmānaḥ māyirūpeṇāvatīṣṭhate brahma /pp. 21, 3.

ŚVU Bh 1,6... tenesvarenā cittādānandādīvityābrahamātmānaḥ ... pp. 26, 15f.

AīU Bh 3,3 tadatantavāsvādhipraṇādhisambandhena sarvajñam īśaram sarvasādh-
raṇāyaśyā-vajagāyābhirpravartakam niyantarāvadyānām bhavati /TPU, p. 349, 11f.

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(tapojña in ŚvUBh)saṃādhibhiḥ /
narāṇām ksīnappāṇāṁ kṛṣṇe bhaktih praśāyate //
BhS (P) 30.131
aneka janmasaṁsārace pāpasamuccaye /
vārśine(tarkśine in ŚvUBh) jāyate pumśām govindādbhimukhi matiḥ //
The electronic text is available on GRETIL http://gretil.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretil/1_sanskr/4_rellit/vasn/bhrgus_u.htm