

Ānanda Vallī

Now, *bhāṣyakāra* is introducing the subject matter of the second chapter. The second chapter is called by different names such as, *Brahmavallī*, *Ānandavallī*, and *Brahmānandavallī*. He first recounts, in one sentence, what has gone by so far.

संहितादिविषयाणि कर्मभिरविरुद्धान्युपासनान्युक्तानि ।

Various forms of meditation were presented, the subject matter of which was the conjunction of letters, etc. These meditations were not opposed to *karma*.

अनन्तरं चान्तःसोपाधिकात्मदर्शनमुक्तं व्याहृतिद्वारेण स्वाराज्यफलम् ।
न चैतावता अशेषतः संसारबीजस्य उपमर्दनमस्ति ।

Thereafter, the meditation on *saguṇa-brahma* to be visualised inside, through the symbol of *vyāhṛti* was said along with attainment of sovereign status as a result for the meditation. But by this alone, the total destruction of the cause of *samsāra* does not take place.

अतोऽशेषोपद्रवबीजस्य अज्ञानस्य निवृत्त्यर्थं विधूतसर्वोपाधि-
विशेषात्मदर्शनार्थमिदमारभ्यते ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परम् इत्यादि ।

Therefore, for the purpose of elimination of ignorance, which is the seed of all the problems without exception and for the purpose of unfolding the knowledge of *brahmātmā* which is devoid of attributes belonging to all the various *upādhis*, this chapter is started, and begins with the words 'the knower of Brahman attains the limitless,' etc.

प्रयोजनं चास्याः ब्रह्मविद्यायाः अविद्यानिवृत्तिः । ततः च आत्यन्तिकः
संसाराभावः । वक्ष्यति च 'विद्वान्न विभेति कुतश्चन' (तै.उप. 2.9) इति ।

The benefit of this knowledge of Brahman is removal of ignorance and from that arises total absence of *saṁsāra*. And the *upaniṣad* will go on to say, 'The one who knows Brahman does not fear anything'.

संसार-निवृत्तौ असत्याम् 'अभयं प्रतिष्ठां विन्दते' (तै.उप. 2.7)
इत्यनुपपन्नम्, 'कृताकृते पुण्यपापे न तपतः'²⁴ इति च ।

If the removal of *saṁsāra* does not take place, *śruti*'s statement that 'One gains abidance in the freedom from fear,' would become untenable. So too, the sentence, 'The guilt of both commission of *pāpa-karma* and omission of *punya-karma* does not torment him'.

अतोऽवगम्यतेऽस्माद्विज्ञानात् सर्वात्मब्रह्मविषयात् आत्यन्तिकः
संसाराभाव इति ।

From this, it is clearly understood that by this knowledge, the subject matter of which is Brahman,

स्वयमेवाह प्रयोजनम् 'ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परम्' इति आदावेव
संबन्धप्रयोजनज्ञापनार्थम् । निर्ज्ञातयोर्हि सम्बन्ध-प्रयोजनयोः
विद्याश्रवणग्रहणधारणाभ्यासार्थं प्रवर्तते ।

At the very beginning, the *upaniṣad* itself directly states the benefit: 'The knower of Brahman attains

the limitless.' This is in order to introduce the connection and the result. Indeed, only when the connection and the result are well understood, a student will repeatedly engage himself or herself in regular listening to the teaching, grasping and retaining it.

श्रवणादिपूर्वकं हि विद्याफलम् 'श्रोतव्यो मन्तव्यो निदिध्यासितव्यः'
(बृ.उप. 2.4.5) इत्यादि-श्रुत्यन्तरेभ्यः ।

The gain of the result of knowledge is indeed preceded by listening, etc as it is said in many other *śrutis* like '(The self) should be listened to, should be freed from all doubts and should be contemplated upon'. (Bṛhadāraṇyaka 2.4.5)

Anuvāka (Section) 1

ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परम् । तदेषाऽभ्युक्ता । सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म । यो वेद
निहितं गुहायां परमे व्योमन् । सोऽश्नुते सर्वान् कामान्सह । ब्रह्मणा
विपश्चितेति ।

The knower of Brahman attains the limitless. With reference to this, the following *Rg-mantra* is being quoted thus, 'Brahman is existence, consciousness and limitlessness. The one who knows (that Brahman which) resides in the intellect, within the space (of the heart), fulfills all (his) desires at once, in the form of Brahman which is all-knowledge.

ब्रह्मविद् ब्रह्मेति वक्ष्यमाणलक्षणं बृहत्तमत्वाद् ब्रह्म । तद्वेत्ति विजानातीति
ब्रह्मवित् । आप्नोति प्राप्नोति परं निरतिशयम् । तदेव ब्रह्म परम् ।
न हि अन्यस्य विज्ञानादन्यस्य प्राप्तिः । स्पष्टं च श्रुत्यन्तरं ब्रह्मप्राप्तिमेव
ब्रह्मविदो दर्शयति 'स यो ह वै तत्परमं ब्रह्म वेद ब्रह्मैव भवति'
(मु.उप. 3.2.9) इत्यादि ।

In the word 'knower of Brahman', the word Brahman has the definition that is going to follow. Being something that is the biggest, it is called Brahman. The one who knows that Brahman is called *brahmavit*. He gains the limitless. Limitless refers to Brahman only. By knowing one thing, a

person indeed cannot attain something else. Another *śruti* very clearly shows that the attainment of Brahman is there for the one who knows Brahman, in the words, 'He who knows that limitless Brahman indeed, is Brahman alone'.

Pūrvapakṣa:

ननु सर्वगतं सर्वस्य चात्मभूतं ब्रह्म वक्ष्यति । अतो नाप्यम् । आसिश्च
अन्यस्यान्येन परिच्छिन्नस्य च परिच्छिन्नेन दृष्टा । अपरिच्छिन्नं
सर्वात्मकं च ब्रह्मेत्यतः परिच्छिन्नवदनात्मवच्च तस्यासिः अनुपपन्ना ।

Look! *Śruti* will say, 'Brahman is all-pervasive and is the self of all beings'. Therefore (Brahman) is not to be gained. It is seen that the gain of an object is always by someone of something other than himself and (the gain is) also by a limited person of something limited. Since Brahman is limitless and is in the form of everything, it is not tenable to talk about its gain like (the gain of) something limited and not-self.

नायं दोषः । कथम्? दर्शनादर्शनापेक्षत्वाद्ब्रह्मणः आस्यनास्योः ।

This is not a defect. How? The gain or non-gain of Brahman is dependent on the recognition or non-recognition (of Brahman).

परमार्थतो ब्रह्मस्वरूपस्यापि सतः अस्य जीवस्य भूतमात्रा-
कृतबाह्यपरिच्छिन्नान्नमयाद्यात्मदर्शिनः तदासक्त-चेतसः -
प्रकृतसंख्यापूरणस्यात्मनः अव्यवहितस्यापि बाह्य-
संख्येयविषयासक्तचित्ततया स्वरूपाभावदर्शनवत्-परमार्थ-
ब्रह्मस्वरूपाभावदर्शन-लक्षणया अविद्यया अन्नमयादीन् बाह्यान्
अनात्मनः आत्मत्वेन प्रतिपन्नत्वाद् अन्नमयाद्यनात्मभ्यो
नान्योऽहमस्मीत्यभिमन्यते । एवमविद्यया आत्मभूतमपि ब्रह्म
अनाप्तं स्यात् ।

Even though this *jīva*, in reality, is of the very nature of Brahman, he identifies himself as the physical body, etc. made of five subtle elements that are external to the self, and has a mind that is totally engrossed in the body, etc. This is like even a person who himself happens to be the missing tenth man under discussion (in the story). Even though he is never away from himself, he does not see himself (as the tenth man) due to a mind that is totally engrossed in the others outside who are being counted. Similarly, this *jīva*, due to ignorance characterised by non-perception of one's *svarūpa* as Brahman, the ultimate truth, takes the external physical body, etc. that are *anātmās* as oneself and then considers oneself not different from the body, etc that are *anātmās*. Thus, due to ignorance, Brahman becomes something that is not gained, even though one is Brahman.

तस्यैवम् अविद्यया अनाप्तब्रह्मस्वरूपस्य प्रकृतसंख्या-पूरणस्य
आत्मनः अविद्यया अनाप्तस्य सतः केनचित्स्मारितस्य पुनस्तस्यैव
विद्यया आप्तिर्यथा तथा श्रुत्युपदिष्टस्य सर्वात्मब्रह्मण आत्मत्वदर्शनेन
विद्यया आप्तिरुपपद्यत एव ।

In this manner, just as for that person who fills up the tenth place under discussion and who has not yet been discovered due to ignorance, there is indeed a gain (of the tenth man) through knowledge when pointed out by someone. So too, it is tenable that for a *jīva* who has not discovered the nature of Brahman due to ignorance, there is a gain through knowledge, by seeing Brahman who is the self of all, as oneself, in keeping with the teaching of the *śruti*.

ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परमिति वाक्यं सूत्रभूतं सर्वस्य वल्ल्यर्थस्य ।

The sentence 'The knower of Brahman gains the limitless' is a brief statement of the teaching of the entire (second) chapter.

ब्रह्मविदाप्नोति परमित्यनेन वाक्येन वेद्यतया
सूत्रितस्य ब्रह्मणोऽनिर्धारितस्वरूपविशेषस्य सर्वतो
व्यावृत्तस्वरूपविशेषसमर्पणसमर्थस्य लक्षणस्य अभिधानेन
स्वरूपनिर्धारणाय, अविशेषेण च उक्तवेदनस्य ब्रह्मणः
वक्ष्यमाणलक्षणस्य विशेषेण प्रत्यगात्मतया अनन्यरूपेण विज्ञेयत्वाय,
ब्रह्मविद्याफलं च ब्रह्मविदो यत्परप्राप्तिलक्षणमुक्तं तत् सर्वात्मभावः
सर्वसंसारधर्मातीतब्रह्मस्वरूपमेव नान्यत् इत्येतत्प्रदर्शनाय, एषा ऋग्
उदाह्रियते ।

This *Rg-mantra* '*tadeṣābhyuktā*' is quoted for the following (three) purposes. The first purpose is to ascertain the *svarūpa* of Brahman by presenting a definition of Brahman that has been briefly taught as a reality to be known, by the sentence '*brahmavid āpnoti param*'. But the unique *svarūpa* of Brahman has not yet been ascertained, and the definition is such that it is capable of identifying Brahman's *svarūpa* by distinguishing it from everything else. Secondly, it is meant to reveal that Brahman, which was (earlier) taught in a general way, as something to be distinctly known now as the very inner self. It is to be known as non-separate from oneself, and this description is going to follow. Lastly, it is to point out that the result of knowledge of Brahman that was indicated for the knower of Brahman earlier as 'gain in the form of being the self of all' is nothing else but gain of Brahman alone that transcends all attributes of *saṁsāra*, a life of becoming.

तत् तस्मिन् एव ब्राह्मणवाक्योक्तार्थे एषा ऋक् अभ्युक्ता आम्राता –
सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्मेति । ब्रह्मणो लक्षणार्थं वाक्यम् ।

In the same meaning as given in the sentence of the *brāhmaṇa*, the following *mantra* is quoted. The sentence '*satyaṁ jñānam anantaṁ brahma*' is meant to define Brahman.

सत्यादीनि हि त्रीणि विशेषणार्थानि पदानि विशेष्यस्य ब्रह्मणः ।
विशेष्यं ब्रह्म, विवक्षितत्वाद्देद्यतया । विशेषणविशेष्यत्वादेव सत्यादीनि
एकविभक्त्यन्तानि पदानि समानाधिकरणानि ।

These three words *satyaṁ jñānam anantaṁ*, are meant to serve as adjectives for the substantive Brahman. Since Brahman is intended to be known, Brahman is the substantive. Because of the relationship of adjective-substantive, the words *satyam*, etc enjoy the same case endings and they are all in apposition.

सत्यादिभिः त्रिभिर्विशेषणैर्विशेष्यमाणं ब्रह्म विशेष्यान्तरेभ्यो निर्धार्यते ।

Brahman is distinctly ascertained from all other substantives by being qualified by three adjectives, *satyam*, etc.

एवं हि तज्ज्ञातं भवति यद्यन्येभ्यः निर्धारितम्। यथा लोके नीलं
महत्सुगन्ध्युत्पलमिति ।

When Brahman is distinctly ascertained from others
in this manner, then alone it becomes known. Just
as in the world, a lily is known by the words blue,
big and fragrant.

ननु विशेष्यं विशेषणान्तरं व्यभिचरद्विशेष्यते यथा नीलं रक्तं चोत्पलमिति ।
यदा ह्यनेकानि द्रव्याणि एकजातीयानि अनेकविशेषणयोगीनि च, तदा
विशेषणस्यार्थवत्त्वम् ।

Wait. A substantive is qualified by negating other
attributes, just as a lily is qualified by blue, negating
red. When there are many substances belonging
to the same species and capable of taking many
attributes, then alone the adjectives are meaningful.

Now the *pūrvapakṣī* gives a counter example.

न हि एकस्मिन्नेव वस्तुनि विशेषणान्तरायोगात् । यथा असौ एकः
आदित्यः इति । तथा एकमेव ब्रह्म, न ब्रह्मान्तराणि, येभ्यो विशेष्येत
नीलोत्पलवत् ।

But if the thing is only one of its kind there is no
possibility of using any other adjectives. Just as,
there is one sun. Similarly, there is only one Brahman
and there are no other Brahman from which this
(Brahman) has to be distinguished.

अतो विकारोऽनृतम्। 'वाचारम्भणं विकारो नामधेयं मृत्तिकेत्येव सत्यम्' (छा.उप. 6.1), एवं सदेव सत्यम् इत्यवधारणात्। अतः 'सत्यं ब्रह्म' इति ब्रह्म विकारान्निवर्तयति।

Therefore an effect is unreal. 'Centred on your tongue or speech alone are all the effects. They are nothing but names. Clay alone is *satyam*.' (Chāndogya Upaniṣad 6.1). Thus, it has been ascertained that *sad-vastu* alone is *satyam*. Therefore, by saying Brahman is *satyam*, Brahman is released from being an effect.

अतः कारणत्वं प्राप्तं ब्रह्मणः। कारणस्य च कारकत्वम्, वस्तुत्वात् मृद्वत् अचिद्रूपता च प्राप्ता। अतः इदमुच्यते - ज्ञानं ब्रह्मेति।

Therefore, Brahman gains the status of being the (material) cause. The (material) cause gains the status of the accessory of action, being a substance like clay, and also the status of being inert. Therefore, this is said - Brahman is *jñānam*.

ज्ञानं ज्ञप्तिः अवबोधः। भावसाधनः ज्ञानशब्दः ब्रह्मविशेषणत्वात् सत्यानन्ताभ्यां सह।

Jñānam means knowledge as such. The word *jñānam* is derived to get the root meaning. That is because it is a *lakṣaṇa* of Brahman along with the words *satyam* and *anantam*.

न हि सत्यता अनन्तता च ज्ञानकर्तृत्वे सत्युपपद्यते । ज्ञानकर्तृत्वेन हि विक्रियमाणं कथं सत्यं भवेदनन्तं च? यश्चि न कुतश्चित्प्रविभज्यते तदनन्तम् । ज्ञानकर्तृत्वे च द्वेयज्ञानाभ्यां प्रविभक्तमित्यनन्तता न स्यात् ।

If *jñānam* is given the meaning of 'knower', Brahman cannot indeed be *satyam* and *anantam*. With the status of being a knower, it is constantly changing, so how can then Brahman be *satyam* and *anantam*? That alone which is undivided by any factor can be *anantam*. If Brahman has the status of knower, then being limited by known and knowledge how can Brahman be limitless?

‘यत्र नान्यद्विजानाति स भूमा । अथ यत्रान्यद्विजानाति तदल्पम्’ (छा.उप. 7.24.1) इति श्रुत्यन्तरात् ।

Another *śruti* says, ‘*Bhūmā* is where one does not know another thing. And where one knows something else, that is insignificant,’ (Chāndogya Upaniṣad 7.24.1).

‘नान्यद्विजानाति’ इति विशेषप्रतिषेधात् आत्मानं विजानातीति चेत् ।

Suppose we say that by the statement, ‘One does not know another thing’, the *upaniṣad* is only negating the knowledge of other things, (therefore the statement means) ‘One knows oneself’.

न । भूमलक्षणविधिपरत्वाद्वाक्यस्य । 'यत्र नान्यत्पश्यति' इत्यादि भूम्नो लक्षणविधिपरं वाक्यम् ।

No. The (Chāndogya) sentence is committed to presenting the definition of *bhūmā*. The sentence 'Where one does not see anything else,' etc is only committed to presenting the definition of *bhūmā*.

यथाप्रसिद्धमेव अन्यः अन्यत्पश्यतीत्येतत् उपादाय यत्र तन्नास्ति स भूमेति भूमस्वरूपं तत्र ज्ञाप्यते ।

(The *śruti*) accepting the idea of duality that is well-known that 'one sees the other', reveals the nature of *bhūmā* by saying, 'where "one seeing the other" is not there, that is *bhūmā*.'

अन्यग्रहणस्य प्राप्तप्रतिषेधार्थत्वात् न स्वात्मनि क्रियास्तित्वपरं वाक्यम् ।

This (Chāndogya) sentence is meant for negating the common experience of seeing something separate from oneself and so it has no commitment to reveal an act (of knowing) in oneself.

स्वात्मनि च भेदाभावाद्विज्ञानानुपपत्तिः । आत्मनश्च विज्ञेयत्वे
ज्ञात्रभावप्रसङ्गः । ज्ञेयत्वेनैव विनियुक्तत्वात् ।

The (knower-known) division not being there in the *ātmā*, the act of knowing is not possible in *ātmā*. If *ātmā* gets the status of being known there will be no knower because *ātmā* has already been presented as an object of knowledge.

Pūrvapakṣa:

एक एव आत्मा ज्ञेयत्वेन ज्ञातृत्वेन च उभयथा भवतीति चेत्?

Suppose one *ātmā* alone becomes both the known and the knower?

Siddhānta:

न युगपत् अनंशत्वात् ।

It is not true. *Ātmā* cannot be simultaneously both, as it has no parts.

न हि निरवयवस्य युगपज्ज्ञेयज्ञातृत्वोपपत्तिः ।

It is not indeed tenable for *ātmā* that is free of parts to be simultaneously both known and knower.

आत्मनश्च घटादिवद् विज्ञेयत्वे ज्ञानोपदेशानर्थक्यम् । न हि
घटादिवत्प्रसिद्धस्य ज्ञानोपदेशोऽर्थवान् । तस्मात् ज्ञातृत्वे सति
आनन्त्यानुपपत्तिः ।

And if *ātmā* is an object of knowledge like the pot,
etc then teaching of this knowledge will be
meaningless. There is no meaning indeed in the
teaching of knowledge (of *ātmā*) that is very well
known like the pot, etc. Therefore, if *ātmā* is taken
to be the knower, limitlessness is not tenable.

सन्मात्रत्वं चानुपपन्नं ज्ञानकर्तृत्वादिविशेषवत्त्वे सति । सन्मात्रं
च सत्यम् 'तत्सत्यम्' (छा.उप. 6.8.7) इति श्रुत्यन्तरात् ।
तस्मात्सत्यानन्तशब्दाभ्यां सह विशेषणत्वेन ज्ञानशब्दस्य
प्रयोगाद्भावसाधनो ज्ञानशब्दः ।

Brahman's status of pure existence also is not
tenable, if Brahman is qualified with the attributes
like knower, etc. Pure existence is the meaning
of *satyam* as revealed by another *śruti*; 'That *sat* is
satyam' (Chāndogya Upaniṣad 6.8.7). Since, the
word *jñānam* is used as a defining adjective along
with *satyam* and *anantam*, it has the abstract sense
of the root *jñā*.

‘ज्ञानं ब्रह्म’ इति कर्त्रादिकारकनिवृत्त्यर्थं मृदादिवदचिद्रूपतानिवृत्त्यर्थं च प्रयुज्यते ।

Brahman is defined as *jñānam* to negate the *kāraṅkas* such as knower and also to negate the insentiency like pot, etc.

‘ज्ञानं ब्रह्म’ इति वचनात्प्राप्तमन्तवत्त्वम् । लौकिकस्य ज्ञानस्य अन्तवत्त्वदर्शनात् । अतः तन्निवृत्त्यर्थमाह अनन्तमिति ।

By defining Brahman as *jñānam*, there arises (for Brahman) the status of being limited because one sees any worldly knowledge has limitations. Therefore, in order to negate that, *śruti* says Brahman is *anantam*.

Pūrvapakṣa:

सत्यादीनाम् अनृतादिधर्म-निवृत्तिपरत्वात् विशेष्यस्य च ब्रह्मणः उत्पलादिवत् अप्रसिद्धत्वात् ‘मृगतृष्णाम्भसि स्नातः खपुष्पकृतशेखरः । एष वन्ध्यासुतो याति शशशृङ्गधनुर्धरः’ इतिवत् शून्यार्थता एव प्राप्ता सत्यादिवाक्यस्येति चेत् ।

The words *satyam*, etc are for the purpose of negating attributes such as unreality, and the substantive Brahman is not available commonly like lily. We only get into a situation where the sentence ‘*satyam jñānam anantaṁ brahma*’ would mean that Brahman

jñānam anantam brahma' would mean that Brahman is non-existent. It is like this sentence: Having had a bath in mirage waters, having decorated himself with flowers plucked from the sky, and wielding a bow made of rabbit's horn, the son born of a *vandhyā*³⁰ goes.

Siddhānta:

न लक्षणार्थत्वात् । विशेषणत्वेऽपि सत्यादीनां लक्षणार्थ-
प्राधान्यमित्यवोचाम ।

No. They are meant to define Brahman. We have already said that even though *satyam*, etc are adjectives, their primary job is of revealing Brahman.

शून्ये हि लक्ष्येऽनर्थकं लक्षणवचनम् । अतः लक्षणार्थत्वान्मन्यामहे न
शून्यार्थेति ।

If what is to be defined is non-existent, the defining words are useless. Since they are meant to define, we consider that they do not have the meaning of *śūnyam*.

विशेषणार्थत्वेऽपि च सत्यादीनां स्वार्थापरित्याग एव । शून्यार्थत्वे
हि सत्यादिशब्दानां विशेष्य-नियन्तृत्वानुपपत्तिः । सत्याद्यर्थैरर्थवत्त्वे
तु तद्विपरीतधर्मवद्भयो विशेष्येभ्यो ब्रह्मणो विशेष्यस्य नियन्तृत्वम्
उपपद्यते ।

And even though the words *satyam*, etc have the status of adjectives, they do not give up their own meaning. If the words *satyam*, etc do not have a meaning of their own, they will not have the capacity to determine the meaning of the substantive Brahman. On the other hand if the words *satyam*, etc have their own meaning, then it is possible to distinguish Brahman from everything else possessing the opposite attributes.

ब्रह्मशब्दोऽपि स्वार्थेनार्थवानेव ।

The word Brahman also is meaningful with its own derived meaning.

तत्र अनन्तशब्दः अन्तवत्त्वप्रतिषेधद्वारेण विशेषणम् । सत्यज्ञानशब्दौ तु स्वार्थसमर्पणेनैव विशेषणे भवतः ।

Among the three words, the word *anantam* becomes a revealing adjective through negating any kind of limitation in Brahman; whereas the words *satyam* and *jñānam* become adjectives to Brahman by contributing their own basic meaning.

‘तस्माद्वा एतस्मादात्मनः’ (तै.उप. 2.1.1) इति ब्रह्मण्येव आत्मशब्दप्रयोगात् वेदितुः आत्मा ब्रह्म । ‘एतमानन्दमयमात्मानमुपसंक्रामति’ (तै.उप.2.8.5) इति च आत्मतां दर्शयति ।

By the sentence, 'from that Brahman which is indeed this self', the word *ātmā* is used only in the sense of Brahman. Therefore, the *svarūpa* of the knower is Brahman. By saying 'Brahman transcends this *ānandamaya-ātmā*,' the *śruti* shows Brahman as having the status of being the self.

तत्प्रवेशाच्च । 'तत्सृष्ट्वा तदेवानुप्राविशत्' (तै.उप. 2.6.1) इति च तस्यैव जीवरूपेण शरीरप्रवेशं दर्शयति । अतो वेदितुः स्वरूपं ब्रह्म ।

And because of the entry of Brahman (into it). By the sentence 'Brahman having created that, entered into it,' the *śruti* shows the entry of that Brahman alone into the body in the form of *jīvātmā*. Therefore, Brahman is the content of the knower.

Pūrvapakṣa :

एवं तर्हि आत्मत्वाज्ज्ञानकर्तृत्वम् । आत्मा ज्ञातेति हि प्रसिद्धम् । 'सोऽकामयत्' (तै.उप. 2.6.1) इति च कामिनो ज्ञानकर्तृत्वप्रसिद्धिः । अतो ज्ञानकर्तृत्वाज्ज्ञप्तिर्ब्रह्मेत्युक्तम् ।

If that is so, Brahman, being the self, gets the status of knower. It is well known that self is the knower. The status of knower for the one who desires is well known from the *śruti*, 'He desired' (Taittirīya. 2.6.1). Therefore, being a knower, it is not tenable to say Brahman is knowledge as such.

अनित्यत्वप्रसङ्गश्च । यदि नाम ज्ञप्तिः ज्ञानमिति भावरूपता
ब्रह्मणः, तथापि अनित्यत्वं प्रसज्येत, पारतन्त्र्यं च । धात्वर्थानां
कारकापेक्षत्वात् । ज्ञानं च धात्वर्थः अतोऽस्यानित्यत्वं परतन्त्रता च ।

And there will be the scope for time-boundedness.
Even if we take the root meaning for the word
jñānam, and say Brahman is *jñaptiḥ*, still Brahman
will become limited in time and also dependent,
because root meanings depend on accessories
of action. *Jñānam* is taken to be its root meaning.
Therefore, Brahman will have timewise limitation
and dependency.

Siddhānta:

न, स्वरूपाव्यतिरेके कार्यत्वोपचारात् । आत्मनः स्वरूपं ज्ञप्तिर्न ततो
व्यतिरिच्यते । अतो नित्यैव ।

No. Knowing action is non-separate from *jñaptiḥ*
and therefore knowing is only a figurative
expression. *Jñaptiḥ* is the *svarūpa* of *ātmā* and
knowing is never separate from *ātmā*. Therefore
jñaptiḥ is eternal only.

तथापि बुद्धेः उपाधिलक्षणायाः चक्षुरादिद्वारैः विषयाकारपरिणामिन्याः
ये शब्दाद्याकारावभासाः ते आत्मविज्ञानस्य विषयभूताः उत्पद्यमानाः
एव आत्मविज्ञानेन व्याप्ताः उत्पद्यन्ते ।

Still, the modifications of the *buddhi*, which is called an *upādhi*, that take the form of objects and reveal the form, sound, etc through the sense organs like eyes, etc which are objects of consciousness, are pervaded by the consciousness that is *ātmā* as even they arise.

तस्मात् आत्मविज्ञानभास्याश्च विज्ञानशब्दवाच्याश्च ते धात्वर्थभूताः
आत्मनः एव धर्माः विक्रियारूपाः इत्यविवेकिभिः परिकल्प्यन्ते ।

Therefore, those thoughts which are illuminated by consciousness, the *ātmā*, are the direct meaning of the word *vijnānam* and refer to the meaning of the root (*jnā*, to know). They are constantly changing in nature. But they are mistakenly taken to be the attributes of *ātmā* itself by those who lack discriminative mind.