

Bhartṛprapañca and the eight Sstates of Brahman

Ivan Andrijanić¹
University of Zagreb (Croatia)

Recibido: noviembre 13 de 2015 - Revisado: enero 12 de 2016 - Aceptado: febrero 25 de 2016

Referencia formato APA: Andrijanić, I. (2016). Bhartṛprapañca and the eight states of Brahman. *Rev. Guillermo de Ockham*, 14(1), 57-67. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21500/22563202.2306>

Abstract

A gradual evolution of Brahman in eight successive states is described and criticized in Śaṅkara's commentary on *Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad* and in Sureśvara's and Ānandagiri's sub-commentaries, where the teaching is attributed to Bhartṛprapañca, an ancient Bhedābheda-vādin whose commentary on BĀU is now lost. This paper examines fragmentary records of the teaching of Brahman's evolution and tries to interpret different categories mentioned in different accounts of the teaching by comparing these terms with same or similar categories in other philosophical and religious systems of ancient India in order to understand Bhartṛprapañca's original eight-fold scheme and its meaning. Tentative conclusion might be that Ānandagiri conveyed Bhartṛprapañca's scheme literally while Śaṅkara and Sureśvara paraphrased it very freely.

Keywords: Bhedābheda, Bhartṛprapañca, Advaita, Vedānta, monism, illusionism

Bhartṛprapañca y los ocho estados de Brahman

Resumen

Una evolución de Brahman en ocho estados sucesivos es descrita y criticada en el comentario de Śaṅkara a la *Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad* y en los subcomentarios de Sureśvara y Ānandagiri, donde las enseñanzas se le atribuyen a Bhartṛprapañca, un antiguo Bhedābheda-vādin cuyo comentario sobre la BĀU se ha perdido. El artículo examina registros fragmentarios de las enseñanzas relativas a la evolución de Brahman y trata de interpretar las diferentes categorías mencionadas en diferentes versiones de las enseñanzas, comparando estos términos con categorías iguales o similares en otros sistemas religiosos y filosóficos de la India antigua, para entender el original esquema óctuple de Bhartṛprapañca y su significado. Una conclusión tentativa podría ser que Ānandagiri transmitió literalmente el esquema de Bhartṛprapañca mientras que Śaṅkara y Sureśvara lo parafrasearon muy libremente.

Palabras clave: Bhedābheda, Bhartṛprapañca, Advaita, Vedānta, monismo, ilusionismo

Bhartṛprapañca e os oito estados de Brahman

Resumo

Uma evolução do Brahman em oito estados sucessivos é descrito e criticado no comentário Śaṅkara em *Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad* e os sub-comentários de Sureśvara e Ānandagiri onde os ensinamentos são atribuídos a Bhartṛprapañca, um ex-Bhedābheda-vādin cujo comentário sobre bau está perdido agora. O artigo examina registros fragmentados dos ensinamentos da evolução do Brahman e tenta interpretar as diferentes categorias mencionadas em várias contas dos ensinamentos comparando estes termos com os mesmos ou similares categorias em outros sistemas religiosos

1. Doctor and Head of the Department of Indology and Far Studies from Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences of University of Zagreb, Croatia. E-mail: ivan.andrijanic@ffzg.hr



e filósofos da Índia antiga para compreender o regime inicial de oito dos Bhartṛprapañca e seu significado. Uma conclusão preliminar pode ser que Anandagiri transmitiu literalmente o esquema Bhartṛprapañca enquanto Śaṅkara e Sureśvara parafraseado-lo muito livremente.

Palavras-chave: Bhedābheda, Bhartṛprapañca, Advaita, Vedānta, monismo, ilusionismo

Introduction

In Śaṅkara's commentary on *Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad* (BĀU) there is a number of passages where Śaṅkara introduces Upaniṣadic interpretations different from his. These most probably originate from older, now lost works. These opinions Śaṅkara in almost all cases treats as objections which he criticizes. However, Śaṅkara did not specify on whose views he refers.

One of such passages where Śaṅkara explains an opinion of some other is to be found in *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad-Bhāṣya* (from now on BĀUBh) 3.8.12 where eight states of Brahman are mentioned. It seems that the teaching of eight states of Brahman is not directly connected to the exegesis of some particular BĀU passage. It probably belongs to the tenets of someone's philosophical (or theological) view criticized by Śaṅkara. In Ānandagiri's sub-commentary (*Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣadbhāṣya-Ṭikā*, from now on BĀUBhṬ) on Śaṅkara's BĀUBh 3.8.12 nothing is said about the author of this view. However, the eight states of Brahman are discussed in *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣadbhāṣya-Vārttika* (from now on BĀUBhV), Sureśvara's² versed sub-commentary on Śaṅkara's BĀUBh, and in Ānandagiri's commentary on Sureśvara's BĀUBhV called *Śāstraprakāśikākhyā-Ṭikā* (from now on ŚPT). It is important to note that Ānandagiri's commentaries on Śaṅkara's BĀUBh and on Sureśvara's BĀUBhV are different works.³ Besides Śaṅkara's BĀUBh 3.8.12 and Ānandagiri's BĀUBhṬ 3.8.12, the teaching of eight states is also mentioned in Sureśvara's BĀUBhV 1.4.487 and in Ānandagiri's ŚPT ad BĀUBhV 1.3.314 and 1.4.1043. Only in ŚPT ad BĀUBhV 1.4.1043 the teaching of eight states of Brahman is attributed to Bhartṛprapañca.

This article will try to examine these passages and its context in some detail in order to shed some light on the

teaching of the eight states of Brahman⁴ and the context in which its critique appears in Śaṅkara's text.

Bhartṛprapañca

Rau (1960:295) identified 30 passages in Śaṅkara's BĀUBh where he mentions other views considering them as remnants of older scholia on BĀU.⁵ Rau (ibid.) marked twenty such passages as referring to Bhartṛprapañca's lost commentary on BĀU according to Ānandagiri's notes in his sub-commentary on Śaṅkara's commentary. At least four centuries earlier than Ānandagiri, Sureśvara wrote his own sub-commentary on Śaṅkara's commentary that not only expounds Śaṅkara's passages on rival views but sometimes also introduces other opinions on BĀU, not previously mentioned by Śaṅkara. However, it seems that Sureśvara mentioned Bhartṛprapañca's name for only four times,⁶ so we have to rely on Ānandagiri's commentary (ŚPT) where these passages are precisely marked to identify where Sureśvara speaks about Bhartṛprapañca.

Bhartṛprapañca must have been an important exponent of early Vedānta philosophy and an early commentator of the Upaniṣads. Although none of his work is anymore available, fragmentary records, possible text fragments and paraphrases of his commentary on *Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad* are preserved in Śaṅkara's BĀUBh, Sureśvara's BĀUBhV and Ānandagiri's BĀUBhṬ and ŚPT.

From all this accounts it is possible to establish a pretty accurate picture of Bhartṛprapañca's main philosophical views that are different from Śaṅkara's illusionistic monism. For him, the essence of Brahman is in the same time dual and non-dual. In one aspect Brahman is non-differentiated while in other it is differentiated. Both aspects are real in opposition to Śaṅkara's Advaita where differentiated aspect is unreal. According to Śaṅkara, Bhartṛprapañca explains that unity and plurality of ātman is the same as with "the cow" which possesses unity as sub-

2. Sureśvara is traditionally considered as Śaṅkara's direct disciple. In his *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi* 4.74 and 4.76 Sureśvara mentions Śaṅkara's name together with a remark that he served his lotus feet. Sureśvara also mentions Śaṅkara's name in BĀUBhV 6.5.25.
3. Śaṅkara's BĀUBh with Ānandagiri's BĀUBhṬ is printed in ĀnSS 15, while Sureśvara's BĀUBhV is printed together with Ānandagiri's ŚPT in ĀnSS 16 in three volumes.
4. For a study of the teaching of the eight states of Brahman see Nakamura 2004:140-149.
5. A list of passages where Śaṅkara, Sureśvara and Ānandagiri mention Bhartṛprapañca's views can be found in Nakamura (2004: 128-129) and Andrijanić (2015).
6. BĀUBhV 1.4.1164 (ĀnSS 16, p. 666); BĀUBhV 1.4.1188, (ĀnSS 16, p. 671); BĀUBhV 4.4.412, (ĀnSS 16, p. 1789); 4.4.741, (ĀnSS 16, p. 1843).

stance (cowness as universality) on one side and individual properties on the other side that differentiate a particular cow.⁷ Brahman evolves into phenomenal world through eight gradual states that will be described in this paper. Liberation is achieved through combined path of knowledge and action (*jñānakarmasamuccaya*) that encompasses combination of religious rites and knowledge.⁸ As Śaṅkara holds that action cannot produce knowledge, Śaṅkara criticizes such a view throughout his works and teaches that liberation is to be achieved through knowledge alone, and not through religious rites.

Besides his religious and philosophical views, the only thing we know for sure about Bhaktiprapaṇca is that he must have lived before Śaṅkara and that he authored a commentary (*bhāṣya*) on *Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad*.⁹ Ānandagiri (ĀnSS 15, p. 2) reports that Bhaktiprapaṇca composed his commentary on the *Mādhyamīna* recension of BĀU and that his commentary was larger in extent than Śaṅkara's commentary on the *Kāṇva* recension.¹⁰

Nakamura (2004:131) reports that according to Gopala Yogin's (17th century) sub-commentary on Śaṅkara's *Kāthopaniṣad-Bhāṣya*, Bhaktiprapaṇca also wrote a commentary on *Kātha-Upaniṣad*. Śaṅkara, however, in his own commentary on *Kātha-Upaniṣad* never mentioned or criticized such a commentary as he did in BĀUBh; having also in mind how late Gopala Yogin is, we can seriously doubt his claims.¹¹ According to Nakamura (2004:131), from a statement made by Ānandagiri in his sub-commentary on Sureśvara's BĀUBhV 1.4.1717¹² it can be inferred that Bhaktiprapaṇca authored a commentary on Īśā-Upaniṣad.¹³ However, as opposed to fragments of Bhaktiprapaṇca's commentary on BĀU that are extensively paraphrased and cited by Śaṅkara,

Sureśvara and Ānandagiri,¹⁴ I am not aware of any reference to Bhaktiprapaṇca's supposed commentary on IU in Śaṅkara's works or in works of other authors.

Regarding his date, Nakamura (2004:131) tentatively dates Bhaktiprapaṇca around 550 A.D.

Sureśvara lays out an interesting claim in BĀUBhV 1.4.490 where he claims that only from a boon from Vaiśvānara (Agni, fire God), and not from authoritative sources can one claim that the supreme Self has means for knowing because, according to Sureśvara, the Self knows itself. The claim that Bhaktiprapaṇca did not gain his knowledge from scriptural authority but from the boon of some form of Agni, the fire God, is laid out many times in BĀUBhV. In this particular case Agni appears in the form of Vaiśvānara, understood as the fire common to all men. Ānandagiri commented that Sureśvara is mocking (*prahasati*) Bhaktiprapaṇca with this claim.

Eight states of Brahman in Śaṅkara's BĀUBh and Ānandagiri's BĀUBhT

In his commentary on BĀU 3.8.12 Śaṅkara presents a following remark:

tatra kecid ācakṣate | parasya mahāsamudrasthānīyasya brahmaṇo 'kṣarasyāpracalitatvarūpasyeṣatpracalitāvasthāntaryāmi | atyantapracalitāvasthā kṣetrajño yastaṃ na vedāntaryāmiṇam | tathānyāḥ pañcāvasthāḥ parikalpayanti | tathāṣṭāvasthā brahmaṇo bhavanti vadanti | (BĀUBh 3.8.12, ĀnSS 15, pp. 467-468)

“Therein some declare - Inner ruler (*antaryāmin*) is a slightly agitated state of the imperishable Brahman of an immovable nature corresponding to the great ocean. Excessively agitated state (of the imperishable Brahman) is a Knower of the field

7. BĀUBh 4.3.30.

8. Hiriyanna opened the field of research of Bhaktiprapaṇca with two articles (Hiriyanna 1924a and 1924b) where he analysed extant fragments in Śaṅkara, Sureśvara and Ānandagiri and drew a sketch of his philosophy identifying it as Bhedābheda. Nakamura gave a more precise picture of his philosophy in Nakamura 2004:128-152. From a philosophical point of view some aspects had been analysed by Arvind Sharma (“Some differences in the jñānakarmasamuccaya approach of Bhaktiprapaṇca and Bhāskara”, *Journal of the Oriental Institute* 31, 1981: 113-116) and Satyadeva Miśra (“Bhaktiprapaṇca - a Vedāntin of pre-Śaṅkara era”, *Journal of Oriental Research* 40-41, 1970-72: 125-134). Nakamura (2004:130) mentions Sangam Lal Pandey's book “Pre-Śaṅkara Advaita Philosophy”, Allahabad: Darshan Peeth, (1974) where valuable discussions on Bhaktiprapaṇca can be found (pp. 209-228) and Kanakura's study “A Study of Vedānta Philosophy” in Japanese language where Bhaktiprapaṇca's views presented in Śaṅkara's BĀUBh are analysed. Shōun Hino and K. P. Jog did an extremely important work in editing and translating Sureśvara's sub-commentary on Śaṅkara's BĀUBh into English where numerous Sureśvara's accounts of Bhaktiprapaṇca had been identified with the help of Ānandagiri's sub-commentary. Remarks on Bhaktiprapaṇca and Bhedābheda can also be found in Dasgupta 1922(II):43-44, Satchidānandendra 1989:213-259 and in Srinivasachari 1950:152-154. At the end, my article on Bhaktiprapaṇca (Andrijanić 2015) should also be mentioned where I tried to present arguments in favour of the claim that Ānandagiri cites Bhaktiprapaṇca's commentary literally while Śaṅkara and Sureśvara only paraphrased his work.

9. Sureśvara in BĀUBhV 1.4.1188a (ĀnSS 16, vol. II, p. 671) refers to his work as “Bhaktiprapaṇca's commentary” (Bhaktiprapaṇcabhāṣya...). Sureśvara mentions his commentary (*bhāṣya*) also in BĀUBhV 1.4.1164 (p. 666), and BĀUBhV 3.1.46 (ĀnSS 16, vol. III, p. 1155). Ānandagiri also frequently refers to his work as *bhāṣya*.

10. Rau (1960:294-294) presented a lot of examples where Śaṅkara followed *Mādhyamīna* text of BĀU. Because of that, Rau thinks that he must have had both recensions in front of him while composing his commentary. However, Rau also thinks that it is possible that Śaṅkara knew about *Mādhyamīna* recension only from Bhaktiprapaṇca's commentary.

11. Śaṅkara can most probably be dated to the middle of the 8th century (for Śaṅkara's date see Harimoto 2006). Sureśvara was his younger contemporary.

12. ĀnSS 16, vol. II, p. 771.

14. For the problem of paraphrases and quotations from Bhaktiprapaṇca see Andrijanić 2015.

(*kṣetrajña*) who does not know the Inner ruler; in such a manner they postulate another five states - thus there are eight states of Brahman, they say.”

Ānandagiri in his commentary on this particular passage enumerates five other states mentioned, but not enumerated by Śaṅkara: *piṇḍa* (“individual”), *jāti* (“class”), *virāj* (“a wide-ruling one” or “a wide-shinning one”), *sūtra* (“string”) and *daiva* (“divine, divinity”). With *avyākṛta* (“unevolved”, “unexpounded”), *sākṣin* (“witness”) and *kṣetrajña* (“knower of the field”) these are eight states of Brahman according to Ānandagiri (ĀnSS 15, p. 468). Instead of Ānandagiri’s *kṣetrajña*, *sākṣin* and *avyākṛta* as the first three states, Śaṅkara mentions *akṣara* (*parasya ... brahmaṇaḥ*), *antaryāmin* and *kṣetrajña* as the first three. The problem in Ānandagiri’s account is *kṣetrajña* on the first place because Śaṅkara clearly said that *kṣetrajña* is excessively agitated state of the highest imperishable Brahman and thus cannot be placed at the top of the list. It is possible that his list should be read from behind and that *avyākṛta* is the topmost category; *antaryāmin* in that case corresponds to *sākṣin* while *kṣetrajña* is the lowest one. Little bit further Śaṅkara mentions some of other eight states mentioned by Ānandagiri:

*Tathā hiraṇyagarbhāvyākṛtadevatājātipiṇḍamanuṣyatiryakpre
tādikārya-karaṇopādhibhir viśiṣtas tadākhyas tadrūpo bhavati*
| (BĀUBh 3.8.12, ĀnSS 15, p. 469).

“In this manner, distinguished by limiting adjunct of the body and organs¹⁵ of *hiraṇyagarbha*, *avyākṛta*, *devatā*, *jāti*, *piṇḍa*, men, animals, spirits etc., one becomes of such a name and of such a form”.

In this list most probably the first five belong to the eight states of Brahman while other three (men, animals and spirits) represent a further gradual development depending on the progressive amounting of limiting adjuncts (See Table 1).

Terminological inconsistency is here striking: *hiraṇyagarbha* (“golden embryo”), a lower Brahman,¹⁶ that stands at the beginning of Brahman’s evolution poses no problem as for Śaṅkara the states of Brahman are not a real transformation of Brahman but illusory appearance that depends on progressive amounting of limiting adjuncts. The problem is that it is not sure for what entity *hiraṇyagarbha* stands on this place. For Śaṅkara,

Table 1

List of Śaṅkara’s two accounts and the account of Ānandagiri

Śaṅkara’s BĀUBh 3.8.12, ĀnSS 15, p. 467-468	Ānandagiri ad BĀUBh 3.8.12, ĀnSS 15, p. 468	Śaṅkara’s BĀUBh 3.8.12, ĀnSS 15, p. 469
para brahman akṣara	kṣetrajña	hiraṇyagarbha
antaryāmin	sākṣin	
kṣetrajña	avyākṛta	avyākṛta
Another five states (anyāḥ pañcāvasthāḥ)	Daiva Sutra Virāj Jāti piṇḍa	devatā - - jāti piṇḍa

the highest Brahman stands beyond the eight states, while for someone like Bhartṛprapañca, who accepts a real transformation of Brahman, the first state is most probably the highest Brahman.

Eight states of Brahman in Sureśvara’s BĀUBhV and Ānandagiri’s ŚPT

At BĀUBhV 1.4.487 Sureśvara criticizes the theory that the inner Self (*pratyagātman*) appears as *īśvara* (“Lord”), *avyākṛta* (“unevolved”), *prāṇa* (“breath”), *virāj* (“a wide-ruling one” or “a wide-shinning one”), *bhūta* (“elements”), *indriya* (“sense-organs”) etc. without being projected by ignorance:

īśvarāvyākṛtaprāṇavirāḍbhūtendriyādikam |

nāvidyopāśrayaṃ muktva saṃbhāvyaṃ pratyagātmani || 487 ||

It is not possible to entertain (that there exists) in the inner self (the group of what are called eight states, viz.) *īśvara*, Unmanifest, *Prāṇa*, *Virāj*, element(s), sense-organs etc. without (having the support of) ignorance. (Tr. Hino & Jog 1993:161)

In his commentary on this śloka Ānandagiri did not attribute the idea that the inner Self transforms into eight states to Bhartṛprapañca. The term *īśvara* encompasses both *antaryāmin* and *sākṣin*, elements (*bhūta*) are individuals (*vyaktayah*) as opposed to *ādi* (etc.) that refers to class (*jāti*) while organs (*indriya*) means divinities (*devatā*) according to Ānandagiri (ĀnSS 16, vol. II, p. 532). In such an enumeration eight states would be: *antaryāmin*, *sākṣin*, *avyākṛta*, *prāṇa*, *virāj*, *vyakti*, *devatā* and *jāti*. If

15. Dvāndva compound *kāryakaraṇa* “cause and effect” or “what has to be preformed and instrument of action” is used by Śaṅkara in the sense of “body and organs”.

16. *Hiraṇyagarbha* is usually referred to as lower Brahman by Śaṅkara throughout BĀUBh. In BĀUBh 1.4.6 *hiraṇyagarbha* is defined as a supreme Self endowed with limiting adjuncts of extraordinary purity while individual soul (*samsārin*, *jīva*) is endowed with impure limiting adjuncts. The supreme Self has no adjuncts at all. (BĀUBh 1.4.6: *hiraṇyagarbhas tūpādhisuddhyatisāyāpekṣayā prāyaśaḥ para eveti śrūtismṛtivādāḥ pravṛttāḥ | samsāritvam tu kvacid eva darsayanti | jīvanām tūpādhiḡatāsuddhibāhulyāt samsāritvam eva prāyaśo ‘bhilapyate | vyāvṛttakṛtsnopādhibhedāpekṣayā tu sarvaḥ paratvenābhidhīyate śrūtismṛtivādāḥ | [ĀnSS 15, p. 105].*)

vyakti (“individual” or “particular”) is the same as *piṅḍa* (“material object”, “body”) and *prāṇa* (“breath”) as *sūtra* (“string”), the list is the same as in ŚPT 1.3.314 and 1.4.1043¹⁷. The problem is here that, if Ānandagiri is right and *indriya* means *devatā* and *prāṇa* is *sūtra*, the states are not enumerated in their order, besides a striking terminological inconsistency. If Sureśvara had Bhaktiprapaṅca’s commentary on BĀU (where we expect a systematic account) at his hand, why would he make such a mess out of these eight states? First possible answer might be that Sureśvara composed his text loosely paraphrasing Bhaktiprapaṅca out of remembrance without relaying on the manuscript at hand; second explanation might be that a literal enumeration would not fit the meter because Sureśvara composed his text in a śloka verse of a *pāthya* form and a literal enumeration we supposedly find in Ānandagiri would not fit in the *pāthya* scheme where a long syllable is expected on fifth syllable followed with two short syllables.

In BĀUBhV 1.4.1043 Sureśvara criticizes the teaching of eight states of the inner Self (without enumeration) and Ānandagiri in his commentary on this particular verse finally attributes this teaching to Bhaktiprapaṅca (ĀnSS 16, vol. II, p. 634).

yasya tv aṣṭāsv avasthāsu pratyaktvaṃ samamiṣyate |

tasyāntaratama iti durghaṭaṃ vacanaṃ bhavet || 1043 ||

But, in the case of him who holds that the nature of the inner self is the same in all of its eight states, the word (lit.

expression) *antaratamaḥ* would be very difficult (to explain or understand). (Tr. Hino & Jog 1993:327)

According to Sureśvara, Bhaktiprapaṅca claimed that the inner Self gets modified or undergoes a modification in eight states but stays unchanged in the process of transformation. From Sureśvara’s claim it looks like the word *antaratamaḥ* (one who resides deep inside) comes from BĀU because Sureśvara wants to say that the claim about the inner Self that undergoes a modification clashes with the word *antaratama*. Question is where this word appears as in BĀU we do not find it. BĀUBhV 1.4.1042 actually helps us to find the Upaniṣadic passage on which Sureśvara refers because it says that the passage starts with *vācaknavī* and finishes with *akṣara*; this means that the passages BĀU 3.6-8 have to be examined. In BĀU 3.8.3-4, 6-7 the word *antanā* appears. However in Śaṅkara’s commentary on BĀU 3.7.1 we can find even *antaratama*¹⁸. Most probably Sureśvara here did not allude to a specific word in BĀU but to the concept of being at the deepest place in the interior that is discussed in BĀU 3.6-8.

It is important to note that Sureśvara in BĀUBhV 1.4.1178 has an expression “*avyākṛta* and other (states) ending with *piṅḍa*” (*avyākṛtādipiṅḍāntam*) indicating that *avyākṛta* should be placed at the head of the eight states (*piṅḍa* is the last in all accounts) (See Table 2).

An account in *Aitareyopaniṣad-Bhāṣya* (AiUBh) 3.3 should be added that mentions four categories that resemble the list of eight states of Brahman. In this passage Śaṅkara describes how Brahman is gradually diversified

Table 2

This is a list of all enumeration of the eight states of Brahman in our four works

Śaṅkara’s BĀUBh 3.8.12, ĀnSS 15, p. 467-468	Śaṅkara’s BĀUBh 3.8.12, ĀnSS 15, p. 469	Ānandagiri ad BĀUBh 3.8.12, ĀnSS 15, p. 468	Ānandagiri’s ŚPT ad Sureśvara’s BĀUBhV, 1.3.314, ĀnSS 16 (II), p. 412	Ānandagiri’s ŚPT ad Sureśvara’s BĀUBhV 1.4.1043 ĀnSS 16 (II), p. 643	Sureśvara’s BĀUBhV 1.4.487 ĀnSS 16 (II), p. 542	Sureśvara’s BĀUBhV 1.4.1178 ĀnSS 16 (II), p. 669	Ānandagiri ad BĀUBh 1.4.487, ĀnSS 16 (II), p. 532
para brahman akṣara	hiranyagarbha	kṣetrajña	sākṣin	sākṣin	īśvara	avyākṛta	sākṣin
antaryāmin		sākṣin	Antaryāmin	antaryāmin			antaryāmin
kṣetrajña	avyākṛta	avyākṛta	avyākṛta	avyākṛta	avyākṛta		(avyākṛta)
Another five states more (anyāḥ pañcāvasthāḥ)	devatā	daiva	Daiva	daiva	indriya	-	devatā
	-	sūtra	Sūtra	sūtra	prāṇa	-	sūtra
	-	virāj	Virāj	virāj	virāj	-	(virāj)
	jāti	jāti	Jāti	jāti	adi	-	jāti
	piṅḍa	piṅḍa	piṅḍa	piṅḍa	bhūta	piṅḍa	vyakti

17. *avyākṛta* is not mentioned but there are reasons to put it on the head of the list (see later in the paper).

18. BĀUBh 3.7.1: *idāniṃ brahmalokānāṃ antaratamaṃ sūtraṃ vaktavyam iti tadartha ārambhaḥ | tac cāgamaiva praṣṭavyam itihāsenāgamopanyāsaḥ kriyate |* (ĀnSS 15, p. 446)

by different limiting adjuncts. First is the highest Brahman freed from any distinction, without stain, taint and action, quiescent, one without second, to be known as “not-, not-” (*neti, neti* [BAU 2.3.6, 3.9.26, 4.2.4, 4.5.15 etc.]) by the elimination of attributes and beyond words and thought.¹⁹ Next is *antaryāmin* connected with the pure limiting adjuncts of discrimination (*prajñā*).²⁰ After *antaryāmin* comes *hiranyabarbhā* who is the seed of the manifest world, next is *virāj* or *prajāpati* (“lord of creatures”) with his limiting adjuncts and the deity (*devatā*) after *virāj/prajāpati*.²¹ Here we have a description of how Brahman gets its name and forms from the highest one to a clump of grass in accordance to what limiting adjunct he is connected with. It should be noted that *virāj* is identified with *prajāpati* and both of whom are placed below *hiranyagarbha*.

a) *Piṇḍa* and *jāti*

Piṇḍa (“material object”, “body”) and *jāti* (“class²²”) are the lowest of all states; in Sureśvara’s account *piṇḍa* is called *bhūta* while Ānandagiri calls it *vyakti* (“individual” or “particular”). The term *vyakti* actually helps to shed some light on the possible function of this category in the eight-fold system as the terms *vyakti* and *jāti* are characteristic for Grammar, Nyāya, Vaiśeṣika and Mīmāṃsā.²³ *Jāti* appears already in Pāṇini 4.1.63 and Patañjali cites two verses to explain the nature of *jāti* mentioned in the Pāṇini’s *sūtra*.²⁴ In *Nyāya-Sūtra* (NS) 2.2.67 *vyakti* is defined as substratum of specific qualities (*vyaktir guṇaviśeṣāśrayo mūrtili*) while *jāti* is the term used for universals in NS. *Vaiśeṣika-Sūtras* and *Padārthadharmā-Saṃgrāha* seem to prefer the word *sāmānya* for universals. According to

Halbfass (1992:120-122) *jāti*, a term used for “specific universal” (*sāmānyaviśeṣa*) in NSBh,²⁵ corresponds to lower or nonultimate universal (*aparāṃ sāmānyam*) in *Padārthadharmā-Saṃgrāha*. Halbfass (ibid.) also showed that later Vaiśeṣika authors²⁶ used the term *jāti* to denote “real” universals. This terminological distinction is important for our small examination because the term *piṇḍa* denotes concrete individuals in Mīmāṃsā (see for instance Kumārila, Ākṛtivāda, vs. 25).

Piṇḍa means “lump” and than “solid mass”, “material object”, “body”. In BSBh it seems that Śāṅkara does not use the word except for 1.1.13 where it means gross body; in BĀUBh the word *piṇḍa* is sometimes used as “lump” as in compound *māṃsapīṇḍa* “lump of flesh” but it is also used quite frequently in the meaning “body”.²⁷

From all this it seems that the categories *piṇḍa* and *jāti* in the system of eight states mean “concrete individual” and “real universal” or “class of real individuals”. *Jāti* in this more specific sense might be taken from later Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika systems, not from earlier systems where *jāti* is still not distinguished from *sāmānya*.

b) *Virāj*

The term *virāj* (“a wide-rulling one” or “a wide-shinning one”) denotes in BĀU 4.2.3 the wife of Indhu cryptically called Indra who resides in the left eye,²⁸ in ChU 1.13.2 it denotes speech (*vāc*) and in ChU 4.3.8 *virāj* denotes ten, the highest throw of the dice, eater of the food who has sunk his teeth in the whole world.²⁹ In the Vedic context, *virāj* is a meter consisting of four

19. AiUBh 3.3: tad etat pratyastamitasarvopādihiviśeṣaṃ sannirañjanam nirmalaṃ niṣkriyam śāntam ekam advayaṃ “neti neti” iti (BAU 2.3.6, 3.9.26, 4.2.4, 4.5.15) sarvaviśeṣāpohasaṃvedyaṃ sarvasābdapratyayāgocaram | (TPU, p. 349)

20. AiUBh 3.3: tadatyantaviśuddhaprajñopādihisambandhena sarvajñam iśvaraṃ sarvasādharmañvyākṛtajagadbijapravartakaṃ niyantrivād antaryāmisamjñam bhavati | (TPU, p. 349)

21. AiUBh 3.3: tad eva vyākṛtajagadbijabhūtabuddhyātmābhīmānalakṣaṇam hiranyagarbhasamjñam bhavati | tad evāntaraṇḍodbhūtaprathamaśāriropādihimadvirāṭprajāpatisamjñam bhavati | (TPU, p. 349)

22. Scharf (1996:30) understands the term *jāti* as “generic property”.

23. *Vyakti* and *jāti* are discussed together with the term *ākṛti* (form) in Nyāya-Sūtra 2.2.67-69, see also Vātsyāyana’s Bhāṣya and Uddyotakāra’s Vārttika (ad 2.2.58-66). For *vyakti* and *jāti* in Śābara, Prabhākara and Kumārila see for instance Jha 1942:61-68. Kumārila takes *jāti*, *sāmānya*, *ākṛti* and *śakti* as synonyms (ŚV Ākṛtivāda, vs. 3, vs. 18, Vānavāda, vs. 16). For a discussion on the term *ākṛti* and other generic terms see Scharf 1996.

24. See Scharf 1996:30-34. Patañjali and Kātyāyana (ad Pāṇini 1.2.64 and elsewhere) discuss whether generic term denotes a class property or an individual substance of the class (see Scharf 1996:30 and in many other passages in the book).

25. NSBh 2.2.69.

26. Halbfass (1992:134, ft. 55) refers to Śivāditya who in his Saptapadārthī distinguishes in *sāmānya* (universal) *jāti* (“real universal” like *sattā* “reality”) and *upādhi* (“imposed universal” like *pācakatva* “cookeness”).

27. See BĀUBh 1.3.7; 1.4.8; 1.4.16; 1.5.3; 1.6.3 etc. In BĀUBh 1.6.3 *piṇḍa* is defined as an aggregate of *kāryakaraṇa* “cause and effect” of “body and organs” while in other passages it is taken synonymously with other words for body (*śarīra* BĀUBh 4.2.3, *deha* BĀUBh 5.13.4).

28. BĀU 4.2.3: athaitad vāme ‘kṣaṇi puruṣarūpam eṣāya patnī virāṭ | tayor eṣa samstāvo ya eṣo ‘ntar hrdaya ākāśah | athainayor etad annam ya eṣo ‘ntar hrdaye lohitaṇḍaḥ | athainayor etad antar hrdaye jālakam iva | “What looks like a person in the left eye, on the other hand, is his wife Virāj. Their meeting place is the space within the heart, their food is the red lump in the heart, and their garment is the meshlike substance within the heart.” (tr. Olivelle 1998:109)

29. ChU 4.3.8: te vā ete pañcānye pañcānye daśa santas tat kṛtam | tasmāt sarvāsu dikṣv annam eva daśa kṛtam | saiṣa virāḍ annādi | tayedaṃ sarvaṃ dṛṣṭam | sarvaṃ aśya idam dṛṣṭam bhavaty annādo bhavati ya evaṃ veda ya evaṃ veda || “The former five and the latter five make a total of ten. And they are the highest throw of the dice. In all the quarters, therefore, ten, the highest throw of the dice, is just food. It is the Virāj meter, the eater of food. Virāj has sunk its teeth into this whole world. When someone knows this—he sinks his teeth into the whole world; he becomes an eater of food.” (tr. Olivelle 1998: 219)

pādas of ten syllables each; in ṚS 10.130.5 this meter is connected to Mitra and Varuṇa, in *Puruṣa-Sūkta* (RS 10.90.5) *virāj* is born from *puruṣa* and *puruṣa* is born from *virāj*;³⁰ in AiBr 1.4 *virāj* is, like in ChU, regarded as food. In AV, a hymn 8.9 extolls the *virāj* meter, in 8.10 *virāj* is female, she was this Universere in the beginning. In post Vedic literature *virāj* becomes a sort of secondary creator, in Manu 1.32-33 the One divides itself into two, male and female and out of the female *virāj* was born, who brought forth Manu himself.³¹ In Śaṅkara's BĀUBh the term *virāj* appears quite often; in BĀUBh 1.2.2 *virāj* is first-born and identified with *agni* and *prajāpati*.³² At his introduction to BĀUBh 2.1.1 Śaṅkara describes *virāj* as conditioned Brahman who has one common external body, Sun and other are his parts. In BĀUBh 3.3.2 the world where people reap the fruits of actions is described as the body of *virāj*.³³ The body of *virāj* is again mentioned in BĀUBh 1.3.7 where the ancient patron of sacrifice (*pūrvayajamāna*) identifies himself with the body of *virāj*, the present state of *prajāpati*.³⁴ In BĀUBh 2.1.1 *prāṇa* is one god whose external body is designated by words *virāj*, *vaiśvānara* ("fire common to all men"), the Self of a human form (*ātmā puruṣavidbah*), *prajāpati*, *ka*, *hiraṇyagarbha*.³⁵ In BĀUBh 1.4 Śaṅkara uses these terms *prajāpati* and *virāj* interchangeably to denote a lower Brahman. In BĀUBh 1.4.3 *virāj* created a body, a man and woman without changing himself. In BĀUBh 3.6.1 again the word *prajāpatiloka* from BĀU 3.6.1 is interpreted as elements composing the body of *virāj*.³⁶ These accounts are in accordance with AiUBh 3.3, mentioned before, where *virāj* is identified with *prajāpati*. In BSBh the term *virāj* does not appear, but in Upad 1.17.64 *virāj* is an external ātman as opposed to *prajāpati* who remembers within.³⁷ This account is in a way different than BĀUBh 2.1.1 where *prajāpati* denotes an external body (*bāhyaḥ piṇḍaḥ*) and

other accounts where *virāj* and *prajāpati* are understood as the same categories.

c) *Sūtra*

Sūtra ("thread") is a category that appears in all Ānandagiri's accounts while in Sureśvara's account appears as *prāṇa* (Ānandagiri glosses *prāṇa* as *sūtra*). *Sūtra* is most probably for Bhārṭṛprapañca a threadlike cosmic all-pervading category. The term *sūtra* appears in BĀU 3.7.1-2 where *sūtra* by which this life, the next life, and all beings are held together is designated as wind (*vāyu*). Śaṅkara designates *sūtra* as the innermost of the world of Brahman.³⁸ Earth, gods and Vedas, are held together by the *sūtra* and controlled by the inner ruler (*antaryāmin*). Śaṅkara in BĀUBh 5.5.1 has an account of creation where Brahman as truth (*satyabrahman*) is the first-born from the Waters. His birth is the birth of *sūtrātman* or *hiraṇyagarbha*, or manifestation of *avyākṛta* (undifferentiated universe).³⁹ Further on, this *satyabrahman* (*sūtrātman*, *hiraṇyagarbha*) produced *virāj* or *prajāpati*. This account is interesting because *virāj* is again the same as *prajāpati* and belongs to a lower step on the cosmological ladder than *sūtrātman* which is the same as *hiraṇyagarbha* similar to AiUBh 3.3. This hierarchy is the same as in most of the lists of eight states of Brahman where *virāj* comes after *sūtra*.

d) *Daiva/devatā*

Higher than *sūtra* is a category named *daiva* ("divine", "celestial") or *devatā* ("divinity"). Sureśvara calls it *indriya* ("what belongs to Indra", "organ of sense").⁴⁰ In Upaniṣads often the term refers to various vital functions of the body. In BĀU 1.3.2-9 *devatās* are speech (*vāc*), breath (*prāṇa*), sight (*cakṣus*), hearing (*śrotra*),

30. According to Keith (1925[II]:438) *virāj* here denotes waters in their cosmic aspect.

31. Olivelle (2005:388). Olivelle (2005:239) considers Manu 1.32-41 to be an interpolation.

32. BĀUBh 1.2.2: ... agniḥ so 'ṇḍasyāntar virāḥ prajāpatiḥ prathamajaḥ kāryakaraṇasamghātavān jātaḥ | "sa vai śarīri prathamah" iti smaraṇāt | ĀnSS 15, p. 32.

33. BĀUBh 3.3.1: yatra vairājam śarīraṃ yatra ca karmaphalopabhogāḥ prāṇinām ... ĀnSS 15, p. 417.

34. BĀUBh 1.3.7: yathā purākalpena varṇitāḥ pūrvayajamāno 'tikrāntakālika etām evākhyāyikārūpām śrutim drṣtvā tenaiva krameṇa vāgādidevatāḥ parikṣya tās cāpohyāsaṅgapāpṃspadadoṣavattvenādoṣāspadam mukhyaṃ prāṇam ātmatvenopagamyā vāgādhyātmikapiṇḍamātrāparicchinātām abhimānaṃ hitvā vairājapiṇḍabhimānaṃ vāgādyagnyadyātmaniṣayaṃ vartamānaprajāpatitvaṃ śāstraprakāśitam pratipannas tathaiṣāyaṃ yajamānas tenaiva vidhinā bhavati prajāpatisvarūpeṇātmanā parā cāsyā prajāpatitvapatipakṣabhūtaḥ pāpmā dviṣaṇa bhrātṛvyo bhavati | ĀnSS 15, p. 63.

35. BĀUBh 2.1.1: prāṇa eko deva ity ucyate | tasyaiva bāhyaḥ piṇḍa ekaḥ sādharāṇo virāḥ vaiśvānara ātmā puruṣavidhaḥ prajāpatiḥ ko hiraṇyagarbha ity ādibhiḥ piṇḍapradhānaḥ śabdair ākhyāyate sūryādipravibhaktakaraṇaḥ | ĀnSS 15, p. 239.

36. BĀUBh 3.6.1: ... indralokā virāḥsarīrārambhakeṣu bhūteṣu prajāpatilokeṣu ... ĀnSS 15, p. 445.

37. Upad 1.17.64: virāḥ vaiśvānaro bāhyaḥ smarann antaḥ prajāpatiḥ | pravilīne tu sarvasmin prājño 'vyākṛtam ucyate || 64 || "When [ātman] is external [it is called] Virāj or Vaiśvānara. When [it] remembers within, [it is called] Prajāpati. But when everything vanishes [it] is called Prājña or Avyākṛta." (tr. Mayeda 2006[II]:166).

38. BĀUBh 3.7.1: idāniḥ brahmalokānām antaratamaṃ sūtraṃ vaktavyam iti tadartha ārambhāḥ | ĀnSS 15, p. 446

39. tāḥ punar āpaḥ satyam aṣṭajanta | tasmāt satyaṃ brahma prathamajam | tad etad dhiraṇyagarbhasya sūtrātmano janma yad avyākṛtasya jagato vyākaraṇam (see Ježić 1999: 260-261) | ĀnSS 15, p. 717-718

40. The word *indriyāni* — meaning organs in classical Sanskrit — may be explained using the Kauṣītaki-Upaniṣad, where it appears for the first time in Vedic literature (KṣU 2.14). In KṣU 3, we find a discourse between Indra and Prataradana Daivodāsi, who exclaims that Indra is breath (*prāṇa*), and the organs are also called breaths (*prāṇāḥ*). So it becomes understandable how it came to be that the "measures of cognition" (*prajñāmātrāḥ*) were covertly and enigmatically termed "Indra's (faculties)" - *indriyāni*.

mind (*manas*).⁴¹ The other term used in older Upaniṣads for this five faculties is *prāṇa*.⁴² Vital functions are called *devatā* in Upaniṣads because to them analogous deities are attached.⁴³ For instance, in BĀU 3.2.13 when man dies, speech returns to fire (*agnī*), breath to wind (*vāta*), sight to the Sun (*āditya*), hearing to quarters (*diś*), mind to the Moon (*candra*) etc. AiU 1.4 has a tripartite analogy: from the mouth sprang speech, and from speech, fire (*agnī*), from the nostrils sprang breath (*prāṇa*), and from breath, the wind (*vāyu*) etc.⁴⁴ In AiU 2.1 these elements are called deities (*devatā*).

e) *Avyākṛta*

The category *avyākṛta* (“unevolved”) appears in almost all accounts of *aṣṭāvasthā* except for Śaṅkara’s first account in BĀUBh 3.8.12. The term appears in BĀU 1.4.⁴⁵ where the world before any distinctions brought by name and form is described. Sureśvara in BĀUBhV 1.4.1646 calls the evolution of the world “manifestation of the unevolved” (*avyākṛtavayākaraṇa*) and Ānandagiri in his gloss on this verse⁴⁶ attributes this idea to Bhartṛprapañca. Because of this, Nakamura (2004:141) thinks that *avyākṛta* should be placed at the head of the five states of Brahman. This can be justified by Sureśvara’s claim in BĀUBhV 1.4.1178 “*avyākṛta* and others (states) with *piṇḍa* on the end” (*avyākṛtādipiṇḍāntam*). It is however curious that in BĀUBhV 1.4.487 Sureśvara places *īśvara* at the head and *avyākṛta* on the second place. This terminological inconsistency is striking and might be attributed to metrical reasons. But than it would be hard to explain why Ānandagiri in his other lists placed *sākṣin* on the first place, and not *avyākṛta* if he had access to Bhartṛprapañca’s Bhāṣya on BĀU where a systematic exposition of Brahman’s evolution is expected. This might be explained as Sureśvara’s terminological carelessness because to him the process of Brahman’s evolution is not important as it

belongs to the relative sphere of illusory existence. In this case *avyākṛta* was not on the head of the eight states and Ānandagiri’s accounts should be trusted. Second possibility is that they did not have access to the integral text but to some fragmentary records from secondary sources or to some oral tradition. As there are good reasons to believe that Ānandagiri sometimes quotes Bhartṛprapañca’s Bhāṣya,⁴⁷ we can ask ourselves about the state of his text in the times of Śaṅkara and Sureśvara who have greatest terminological inconsistencies.

f) *Antaryāmin*, *sākṣin* and *kṣetrajña*

Antaryāmin, the Inner Ruler, is described in BĀU 3.7, and this Upaniṣadic passage is discussed in BS 1.2.18 - 20. *Antaryāmin* is described in BĀU 3.7.3-23 as a Self (*ātman*) who is present within, but is different from the earth, waters, fire, intermediate region, wind, sky, sun, quarters, moon, space etc. and who controls all these elements from within. At the end (BĀU 3.7.23) it is said that *antaryāmin* sees but he can’t be seen, he hears, but he can’t be heard, he thinks, but he can’t be thought of; he perceives, but he can’t be perceived. Besides him, there is no one who sees, no one who hears, no one who thinks, and no one who perceives.⁴⁸ It is obvious that *antaryāmin* is an epistemological and metaphysical category and not a cosmological category like *sūtra*, *devatā*, *virāj* and *avyākṛta*. In his commentary on BĀU 3.8.12, Śaṅkara says that highest Brahman limited with adjuncts of the power of unsurpassed and eternal knowledge (*nityanira tiśayajñānaśaktyupādhi*) is called *antaryāmin* or *īśvara*.⁴⁹ At the beginning of the paper AiUBh 3.3 is mentioned where *antaryāmin* is also understood as *īśvara* endowed with limiting adjunct of *prajñā*.

The term *sākṣin* (“witness”) does not appear in BĀU or other ancient prose Upaniṣads,⁵⁰ but it appears in

41. The same group of five faculties can be found in RS 10.90.13-14, Aitareya-Āraṇyaka 2.1 and in older Upaniṣads (KṣU 2.1-2; 3.2-8; BĀU 1.3, 4.1, 4.7-14; ChU 5.1 etc.).

42. In KṣU 4.20 they are called *ātman*.

43. Finding these hidden hierarchically arranged connections between micro-and macrocosmic elements is extremely important for the thinkers of later Vedic period when older Upaniṣads were composed. For the meaning of these connections and the term Upaniṣad see Olivelle 1998:24-27 where one can also find all important references for further reading.

44. AiU has eight triple connections and in RS 10.90.13-14 one can find five out of eight of these connections although RS does not have three elements in every connection but two (mouth-Fire; breath-Wind; sight-Sun; hearing-quarters; mind-Moon). RS also has three connections more. Similar connections with those from RS 10.90 can be found in ChU 3.13.1-5; 4.3.1-4; KṣU 2.11-12; ŚBr 10.3.3.7.

45. BĀU 1.4.7: tad dhedaṃ tarhy avyākṛtam āsit | tan nāmarūpābhyāṃ eva vyākriyātāsau nāmāyam idaṃ rūpa iti |

“At that time this world was without real distinctions; it was distinguished simply in terms of name and visible appearance.” (tr. Olivelle 1998:47)

46. ĀnSS 16, p. 758.

47. See Andrijanić 2015.

48. BĀU 3.7.23: adṛṣṭo draṣṭāśrutah śrotāmato mantāvijnāto vijñātā | nānyo ‘to ‘sti draṣṭā nānyo ‘to ‘sti śrotā nānyo ‘to ‘sti mantā nānyo ‘to ‘sti vijñātā | eṣa ta ātmāntaryāmy amṛtaḥ | ato ‘nyad ārtam | “He sees, but he can’t be seen; he hears, but he can’t be heard; he thinks, but he can’t be thought of; he perceives, but he can’t be perceived. Besides him, there is no one who sees, no one who hears, no one who thinks, and no one who perceives. It is this self of yours who is the inner controller, the immortal. All besides this is grief.” (Tr. Olivelle 1998:89)

49. In Śaṅkara’s commentary on the Aitareya-Upaniṣad (AiU) 3.3 it is said that *antaryāmin* is *īśvara* connected with the pure limiting adjuncts of discrimination (*prajñā*). These two accounts are in clear contrast to his BSBh 1.2.18 - 20 where *antaryāmin* is described as the supreme Self.

50. Deussen (1899:23-24) divided the principal Upaniṣads into three groups: ancient prose Upaniṣads (BĀU, ChU, Taittirīya-, AiU, KṣU and Kena-), metrical Upaniṣads (Kāṭha-, Īśā-, SvU, Muṇḍaka- and Mahānārāyaṇa-Up.) and later prose Upaniṣads (Praśna-, Maitrāyaṇīya- and Māṇḍūkya-Up.).

ŚvU 6.11 as a god hidden in all beings, pervading the universe, the inner Self of all beings devoid of all qualities.⁵¹ *Sākṣin* appears in BhG 9.18 where Kṛṣṇa says for himself that he is *sākṣin*⁵² and in *Maitrāyaṇīya-Upaniṣad* 6.16. Śaṅkara does not mention often the term *sākṣin* in BĀUBh; however, BĀUBh 4.4.12 should be mentioned where the supreme Self is a witness (*sākṣin*) of the cognition of all beings.⁵³

The term *kṣetrajña* (“knower of the field”) appears in ŚvU 6.16, MaiU 2.5⁵⁴ and many times in MBh (especially in *Mokṣadharmā-parvan*) where *kṣetra-* (field) was synonymous for *prakṛti*.⁵⁵ In MBh *kṣetrajña* is the highest spiritual principle higher than *buddhi*⁵⁶ and in MBh 12.187.12 and 12.239.15 *kṣetrajña* is called *sākṣin* (“witness”). In the number of passages,⁵⁷ *kṣetrajña* as a spiritual principle is a counterpart to *sattva*, which van Buitenen (1988:88) designates as sum-total of world creation. It also appears in Manu 8.96 and most famously in BhG 13.1-2, 26. The term appears always in the context of Sāṃkhya philosophy and Frauwallner (2003:188) considers it to be a term for the soul (*Seele*) in early Sāṃkhya.⁵⁸ In BhG 13.2 Kṛṣṇa is *kṣetrajña* while in 13.26 it appears that *kṣetrajña* is individual *puruṣa* who constitutes a being when he is connected with *kṣetra* (*prakṛti*).⁵⁹

The term is used by Śaṅkara in the context of the eight states of Brahman and once by Ānandagiri together with *sākṣin* and *avyākṛta* on the place where the term *antaryāmin* is more usual. In Śaṅkara’s terminology *kṣetrajña* is usually understood as the lower Self or individual soul.⁶⁰

Antaryāmin (“inner ruler”) and *sākṣin* (“witness”) are on the top of Ānandagiri’s lists and if Ānandagiri had access to Bhartṛprapañca’s text and these categories really were the first ones, than the eight states should not be

interpreted in a cosmological sense. *Sākṣin* as an epistemological category most probably means a witness or subject of cognition and the subject of cognition is regarded as the highest ātman in BĀU.⁶¹ Such a category is expected to be on the top of the list before a cosmological account of differentiation of the universe starting with *avyākṛta*. It is however not clear what might be the exact difference between *sākṣin* and *antaryāmin* in Bhartṛprapañca’s scheme.

Concluding remarks These states are on the head of the lists in the times of Śaṅkara and Sureśvara to the original text but to some fragmentary re

If the notion that Bhartṛprapañca’s teaching of the eight states of Brahman starts with non-cosmological categories *sākṣin* and *antaryāmin* is correct, than it can be supposed, with a grain of salt, that Bhartṛprapañca’s list of the eight states of Brahman are literary delivered by Ānandagiri in both of his commentaries. In that case Śaṅkara and Sureśvara loosely paraphrased Bhartṛprapañca with a striking terminological inconsistency. If this is true, Bhartṛprapañca’s scheme starts with the epistemological category of witness (of cognition?) as the highest state of Brahman, than the evolution proceeds with *antaryāmin*, a metaphysical category, who is present in everything and rules everything from within. These terms are most probably in different accounts of Śaṅkara and Sureśvara paraphrased with terms *kṣetrajña* (“knower of the field”), *īśvara* (“Lord”) and *hiranyagarbha* (“golden embryo”). After these two topmost categories, cosmological account starts with unevolved principle which evolves gradually first into divinities (Gods, planets) on macrocosmical level corresponding to the vital functions of the body on the microcosmical level. Than comes the all-pervading *sūtra* and *virāj* who represents the one body of the universe. After *virāj* comes the class (generic property) and at the

51. ŚvU 6.11: eko devaḥ sarvabhūteṣu gūḍhaḥ sarvavyāpī sarvabhūtāntarātmā |

karmādhyakṣaḥ sarvabhūtādhiṣaḥ sāksī cetā kevalo nirguṇaś ca || 11 || “The one God hidden in all beings, pervading the universe, the inner self of all beings, the overseer of all work, dwelling in all beings, the witness, the avenger, alone, devoid of qualities.” (tr. Olivelle 1998:430)

52. BhG 9.18ab: gatir bhartā prabhūḥ sāksī nivāsaḥ śaraṇaṃ suhṛt | (I am) “goal, master, lord, witness, abode, refuge...” (tr. van Buitenen 1981:107)

53. BĀUBh 4.4.12: ...para ātmā sarvaprāṇīpratyayasāksī... ĀnSS 15, p. 647.

54. *Kṣetrajña* already appears in Taittirīya-, Aitareya- and Śatapatha-Bṛāhmaṇa but not in theological/philosophical sense.

55. See MBh 12.187.37; 12.233.18; 12.240.19-20; in 12.294.37-39, 12.295.18-22; 12.339.6. For instance, in 12.294.37-39 *kṣetrajña* is identified as 25th tattva, the highest *puruṣa*.

56. MBh 12.187.11; 12.239.14; 12.267.16.

57. MBh 12.187.37, 42-43; 12.228.31.

58. Van Buitenen (1988:102) equates the terms *puruṣa* and *kṣetrajña*.

59. BhG 13.26: yāvat saṃjāyate kiṃcit sattvaṃ sthāvaraṅgamam | kṣetrakṣetrajñasamyogāt tad viddhi bhāratarābha || 26 ||

“Whatever creature is born, whether moving or standing, springs from the union of “field” and “guide” - realize that, bull of the Bharatas.” (Tr. van Buitenen 1981:125)

60. Śaṅkara uses it two times in BĀUBh (besides BĀUBh 3.8.12) to denote a lower Self (BĀUBh 3.5.1; 4.3.21) and frequently in BSBh to denote individual soul (e.g. 1.2.11-12; 1.3.7; 1.4.10; 2.4.6 etc.). In the introduction to BhG 13 Śaṅkara describes two *prakṛtis* of *īśvara*, the lower which is eightfold and consists of the three *guṇas* and the superior one who has *īśvara*’s nature and is endowed with life and marked as *kṣetrajña* (...sūcite dve prakṛtī īśvarasya | triguṇātmikāṣṭadhā bhinnāparā saṃsārahetutvāt parā cānyā jīvabhūtā kṣetrajñalākṣaṇesvarātmakā | (ĀnSS 34, p. 355).

61. See BĀU 3.4.2: na drṣṭer draṣṭāraṃ paśyeh | na śruteḥ śrotāraṃ śṛṇuyeh | na mater mantāraṃ manvithā | na vijñāter vijñātāraṃ vijānyāh | eṣa ta ātmā sarvāntaraḥ | “You can’t see the seer who does the seeing; you can’t hear the hearer who does the hearing; you can’t think of the thinker who does the thinking; and you can’t perceive the perceiver who does the perceiving. The self within all is this self of yours. (tr. Olivelle 1998:83). In BĀU 3.7.23 this Self which sees but cannot be seen and is the only seer is *antaryāmin* and in 3.8.11 *akṣara* (“imperishable”).

end individual beings. Six upper states of Ānandagiri's list come from BĀU with the exception of the term *sākṣin* which does not appear in BĀU although the concept is present in the concepts of *draṣṭṛ* (seer), *śrotṛ* (hearer), *manṭṛ* (thinker), *vijñāṭṛ* (cognizer); the term *sākṣin* probably stands for these terms. The last two categories do not appear in BĀU neither as terms, neither conceptually: they are most probably borrowed from late Nyāya/Vaiśeṣika (where *jāti* is a concrete type of *sāmānya*). Because of this it might be supposed that Bhartṛprapañca's teaching of the eight states was formulated as a result of the exegesis of these particular terms and concepts from BĀU where the ancient interpreter had to order these different accounts of Brahman in a systematic fashion.

References

Primary sources:

- ĀnSS 16, (1892) Vol 1: ānandāśramasaṃkṛtagranthāvaliḥ / granthāṅkaḥ 16 / bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣadbhṣyavārtikam / ānandagirikṛtāśāstraprakāśikākhyatikāsaṃvalitam / (tatra sambandhavārtikam) etat pustakaṃ ve. śā. rā. rā. kāśinātha śāstrī āgāśe ity etaiḥ saṃśodhitam / tac ca mahādeva cimanāji āpaṭe ity anena punyākhyapattane ānandāśramamudraṇālaye āyasākṣarair mudrayitvā prakāśitam / śālivāhanaśakābdāḥ 1814 / Khristābdāḥ 1892.
- ĀnSS 16, (1893) Vol2: ... (tatra prathamādhyāyadvitīyādhyāyārūpo dvitīyo bhāgaḥ) ... śālivāhanaśakābdāḥ 1815 / Khristābdāḥ 1893.
- ĀnSS 16, (1893) Vol 3: ... (tatra tṛtīyādhyāyadārabhya ṣaṣṭhāntatṛtīyo 'ntyo bhāgaḥ)... śālivāhanaśakābdāḥ 1815 / Khristābdāḥ 1893.
- ĀnSS 15, (1891) ānandāśramasaṃkṛtagranthāvaliḥ / granthāṅkaḥ 15 / bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣat / ānandagirikṛtāśikāsaṃvalitāśā mkarabhāṣyasametā / etat pustakaṃ ve. śā. rā. rā. kāśinātha śāstrī āgāśe ity etaiḥ saṃśodhitam / tac ca mahādeva cimanāji āpaṭe ity anena punyākhyapattane ānandāśramamudraṇālaye āyasākṣarair mudrayitvā prakāśitam / śālivāhanaśakābdāḥ 1813 / khristābdāḥ 1891.
- ĀnSS 34, (1897) Shṛmat Bhagavadgīta with the Bhāṣya by Śrīmat Śāṅkarācārya, the Commentary by Anāgiri on the Same. Ed. Pandit Kāśinātha Śāstrī Āgāśe. Poone: Ānandāśrama Press.
- Brahmasūtra with Śāṅkarabhāṣya, Works of Śāṅkarācārya in original Sanskrit*, vol. III., Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass (1965, reprint 2007).
- Ten Principal Upaniṣads with Śāṅkarabhāṣya, Works of Śāṅkarācārya in original Sanskrit*, vol. 1, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass (1964, reprint 2007).

Secondary sources:

- Andrijanić, I. (2015). Quotations and (lost) commentaries in Advaita Vedānta. Some philological notes on Bhartṛprapañca's 'fragments'. *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 43, 257-276.
- Dasgupta, S. (1922). *A History of Indian Philosophy I-V*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Deussen, P. (1899). *Die Philosophie der Upanishad's, Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie, I. 2*. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus.
- Frauwallner, E. (2003). *Geschichte der indischen Philosophie, I. Band*. Aachen: Shaker Verlag.
- Halbfass, W. (1992). *On Being and What There Is, Classical Vaiśeṣika and the History of Indian Ontology*. Albany: State University of New York.
- Harimoto, K. (2006). The Date of Śāṅkara: Between the Cālukyas and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, *Journal of Indological Studies*, 18, 86-111.
- Hino, S., & Jog K. P. (Eds.). (1993). *Sureśvara's vārtika on Puruṣavidya Brāhmaṇa*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Hirianna, M. (1924a). *Bhartṛprapañca, an old Vedāntin, Indian Antiquary*. Mysore: Kavyalaya Publishers.
- Hirianna, M. (1924b). Fragments of Bhartṛprapanca. *Proceedings of the All-India Oriental Conference* 3, 439-450.
- Ježić, M. (1999). *Rgvedske upaniṣadi*. Zagreb: Matica hrvatska.
- Jha, G. (1942). *Purva-Mīmāṃsā in its Sources*. Varanasi: the Banaras Hindu University.
- Keith, A. B. (1925). *The Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads*. MA: Harvard University Press.
- Mayedá, S. (2006). Śāṅkara's Upadeśasāhasī Vols I & II. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Nakamura, H. (2004). *A History of Early Vedānta philosophy*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Olivelle, P. (Ed.). (1998). *The Early Upaniṣads*. NY: Oxford University Press.
- Olivelle, P. (2005). *Manu's Code of Law, A Critical Edition and Translation of Mānava-Dharmaśāstra*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rau, W. (1960.). Bemerkungen zu Śāṅkara's Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣadbhāṣya, *Paideuma* 7, 115-121.
- Scharf, P. M. (1996). *The Denotation of Generic terms in Ancient Indian Philosophy: Grammar, Nyāya, and Mīmāṃsā*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.
- Satchidānandendra, S. S. (1989). *The Method of Vedānta: A critical Account of the Advaita Tradition*, London: Kegan Paul Internat, Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press.

Van Buitenen, J. A. B. (1981). *Bhagavadgītā in the Mahābhārata*. Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press.

Van Buitenen, J. A. B. (1988). *Studies in Indian Literature and Philosophy, Collected Articles of J.A.B. van Buitenen*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Abbreviations:

- AiBr: Aitareya-Brāhmaṇa
- AiUBh: Aitareya-Upaniṣad-Bhāṣya (TPU 1964)
- AiU: Aitareya-Upaniṣad
- ĀnSS: Ānandaśrama Sanskrit Series
- BĀU: Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad
- BĀUBh: Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad-Bhāṣya (Śaṅkara ĀnSS 15)
- BĀUBhT: Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad-Bhāṣya-Ṭikā (Ānandagiri ad BĀUBh, ĀnSS 15)
- BĀUBhV: Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad-Bhāṣya-Vārttika (Sureśvara ad BĀUBh, ĀnSS 16)
- BhG: Bhagavad-Gītā
- BhGBh: Bhagavad-Gītā-Bhāṣya (Śaṅkara, ĀnSS 34)
- BS: Brahma-Sūtra
- BSBh: Brahma-Sūtra-Bhāṣya (Śaṅkara)
- ChU: Chandogya-Upaniṣad (Olivelle 1998)
- IU: Īśā-Upaniṣad (Olivelle 1998)
- KṣU: Kauṣītaki-Upaniṣad (Olivelle 1998)
- Manu: Mānava-Dharmaśāstra (Olivelle 2005)
- NS: Nyāya-Sūtra
- NSBh: Nyāya-Sūtra-Bhāṣya
- RṢ: Ṛk-Saṃhitā
- ŚBr: Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa
- ŚPT: Śāstraprakāśikākhyā-Ṭikā (Ānandagiri ad BĀUBhV, ĀnSS 16)
- ŚV: Śloka-Vārttika
- ŚvU: Śvetāśvatara-Upaniṣad (Olivelle 1998)
- TPU: Ten Principal Upaniṣads with Śaṅkarabhāṣya (1964)
- Upad: Upadeśasāhasrī (Mayeda 2006)