Ivan Andrijanić
(University of Zagreb)

The Authorship of the Commentary
on the *Adhyātmapaṭala* Attributed to Śaṅkara

ABSTRACT: In the currently unpublished study "The general imposters framework and the authenticity of Śaṅkara's prose writings", Ivan Andrijanić and Jacek Bąkowski subject the entire corpus of prose writings traditionally attributed to Śaṅkara to the General Imposters framework, a stylometric method of authorship verification. This statistical test proved the more conservative estimates of Śaṅkara's authorship correct. However, somewhat unexpectedly, the authorship of the commentary on *Adhyātmapaṭala*, the eighth chapter of the Āpastamba law book which has been attributed to Śaṅkara, was verified as genuine. This paper analyses the commentary on the *Adhyātmapaṭala* from the perspective of traditional philological criticism in accordance with Hacker and others' criteria to assess the reliability of the result obtained through computational statistical methods. It appears that the commentary on the *Adhyātmapaṭala* is terminologically consistent with Śaṅkara. However, the commentary on the *Adhyātmapaṭala* also appears to be a work with very limited circulation among traditional scholars with no sub-commentaries, which is unusual for Śaṅkara's authentic works. This leaves room for doubt as to whether this is indeed Śaṅkara's authentic work.

KEYWORDS: *Adhyātmapaṭalavivaraṇa*, Śaṅkara, authorship, stylometry, Advaita Vedānta

Introduction

A large number of texts have traditionally been attributed to Śaṅkara. According to Belvalkar (1930: 241), 432 texts are attributed to Śaṅkara in manuscript colophons. In the currently unpublished study "The general imposters framework and the authenticity of Śaṅkara's prose writings", Ivan Andrijanić and Jacek Bąkowski subject the entire corpus of prose traditionally attributed to Śaṅkara

(8th century)[1] to a state-of-the-art stylometric method – the General Imposters (=GI) framework. This authorship verification method proved reliable in the aforementioned study when applied to a corpus of Sanskrit texts of undisputed authorship. The GI test conducted by Andrijanić and Bąkowski proved the more conservative estimates of Śaṅkara's authorship correct. In addition to the *Brahmasūtra-Bhāṣya*, which largely defines Śaṅkara as an author, the GI method verified that the commentaries on the early Upaniṣads (except the commentary on *Śvetāśvatara-Upaniṣad*), the commentary on the *Bhagavad-Gītā*, and the prose part of the *Upadeśasāhasrī* were all the authentic work of Śaṅkara. In addition to these, the GI classifier has – rather surprisingly – verified the commentary on the *Adhyātmapaṭala* as authentic. With a few exceptions, the commentary on the *Adhyātmapaṭala* (*Adhyātmapaṭalavivaraṇa* =AdhypV), the eighth chapter of the Āpastamba law book, has remained outside the focus of researchers and has rarely been subjected to serious scholarly study, either in terms of its authorship or its content and philosophical teachings.[2] Therefore, this paper aims to provide a brief presentation of the GI method, its advantages and limitations; this will be followed by an analysis of the commentary on the *Adhyātmapaṭala* from the perspective of traditional philological criticism to assess the reliability of the result obtained through this computational statistical method.

The general imposters framework
and the attribution of *Adhyātmapaṭala* to Śaṅkara

The GI method measures the relative statistical distance between texts. In the GI implemented by Andrijanić and Bąkowski, texts are represented by a feature vector consisting of the relative frequency of word occurrence in the text. The GI method relies on a statistical distance measure, which then compares the distance of relative word frequency vectors.

The GI method relies on three categories: the first is the text the authenticity of which is being examined (disputed text); the second is a text (or texts) by the author we suspect may have written the text (candidate author); the third are imposters, texts similar in time, language, and subject matter that could not have been composed by the candidate author. The GI method uses 100 iterations

---

[1] For a critical account of previous attempts to date Śaṅkara and arguments for dating to the 8th century, see Harimoto (2006), who specifies the dating of the *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* to between 756 and 772 CE.

[2] One of the exceptions to the claim that the commentary on the *Adyātmapaṭala* has been completely neglected by researchers is a monograph by Trevor Legget (1978/2018), which will be discussed in this article. A.J. Alston also reports (Alston 2004, Vol. I, p. 45) that his six-volume anthology *A Śaṅkara Source-Book* is based on the *Adhyātmapaṭalavivaraṇa*, among other works.

to measure the distance between the disputed text, the candidate's text, and the imposter's text, determining whether the disputed text is statistically closer to the candidate or to the imposters. If the disputed text is closer to the candidate than the imposters in most iterations, the text can be attributed to the candidate. In Andrijanić & Bąkowski (forth.), the relative frequencies of occurrence of individual words and *n*-grams measured by two statistical distance measures (Cosine Delta and MinMax) were tested on texts of undisputable authorship. When the relative frequencies of *n*-grams and words were measured by the Cosine Delta measure, as many as 80% of the texts were attributed to their actual authors, which testifies to the high reliability of the method.[3] However, this does not mean that 20% of the works were attributed to the wrong authors. In fact, 10% of the works tested have been wrongly attributed to authors who did not write them, and the GI classifier did not make an unambiguous decision about authorship for the remainder.[4] Furthermore, in all four setups, all four works of Śaṅkara (BSBh, BĀUBh, TaittUBh and the prose part of the Upad) for which we can be reasonably certain of his authorship were unmistakably attributed to him. However, a success rate of 80% means that, if we verify someone's authorship, we can only say: according to the GI method, there is an 80% chance that this work was written by a certain author and a 10% chance that it was not. However, Śaṅkara's authentic works were correctly attributed to Śaṅkara in all setups without exception, which confirms that Śaṅkara has a strong authorial signature. Therefore, every positive verification of Śaṅkara's authorship can be taken seriously.

In Andrijanić & Bąkowski (forth.), 18 philosophical prose works traditionally attributed to Śaṅkara were subjected to the GI method. Twelve of them were verified as authentic. Ten of these 12 were, according to older philological and historical research (Belvalkar 1929; Hacker 1950, 1968/69, 1978), considered authentic.[5] Also, six works that were considered spurious in previous

---

[3] When the Cosine Delta distance measure was used on a feature vector consisting of word frequency, 32 out of 40 works were successfully attributed to their authors (80% successful attributions); when the same measure was used on *n*-grams, 31 out of 40 works were attributed to their real authors (77.5% successful attributions).

[4] This means that, in some iterations, the text being tested was closer to the candidate, and others closer to the imposters. A special operation based on the total corpus calculates an iteration ratio sufficient to positively determine authorship. In our case, this ratio ranged between 60 and 70 percent, which means that if the work was statistically closer to the candidate in more than 60–70 percent of iterations, they were considered authentic. On the other hand, if in only 30 percent or less the work is closer to the candidate, then they are not considered authentic. If the result is between 30 and 60 percent, the classifier has not reached a decision.

[5] *Aitareyopaniṣad-Bhāṣya, Bhagavadgītā-Bhāṣya, Chāndogyopaniṣad-Bhāṣya, Gauḍapādīya-Bhāṣya, Īśopaniṣad-Bhāṣya, Kaṭhopaniṣad-Bhāṣya, Kenopaniṣad-(Pada)-Bhāṣya, Kenopaniṣad-(Vākya)-Bhāṣya, Muṇḍakopaniṣad-Bhāṣya, Praśnopaniṣad-Bhāṣya.*

Indological scholarship were not confirmed as authentic.[6] This leaves two rather questionable works that were confirmed as authentic by the GI method: the *Adhyātmapaṭalavivaraṇa* and *Nṛsiṃhapūrvatāpanīyopaniṣad-Bhāṣya*. There are two possible interpretations of this result: the first is that both works were written by Śaṅkara, and the other is that one or both belong to the 10% margin of incorrect authorship verification. Due to Śaṅkara's otherwise strong authorial signal, there is a statistically greater chance that these are authentic works. In order to confirm or dispute the GI result, this paper will focus on the *Adhyātmapaṭalavivaraṇa* and subject it to traditional philological research in line with Hacker's (1950, 1978) and other more traditional philological criteria for determining authorship.

The *Adhyātmapaṭala* and the commentary ascribed to Śaṅkara

The *Adhyātmapaṭalavivāraṇa* is a rather short commentary on the *Adhyātmapaṭala* "The Chapter of the Self", a part of the Āpastamba law book (*Āpastambadharmaśāstra* 1,22.1–1,23.6). *The Adhyātmapaṭala* comprises only 14 short prose passages that discuss the attainment of the Self. The *vivaraṇa*, attributed to Śaṅkara, consists of an introduction and a running commentary on each of the 14 prose passages of the *Adhyātmapaṭala*.

The *Adhyātmapaṭalavivaraṇa* was edited and printed by Gaṇapati Śāstrī in 1915 in the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series.[7] AdhypV is included in only one[8] of Śaṅkara's collected works.[9] The work has been quite neglected in studies dedicated to Śaṅkara's philosophy; its philosophical tenets have rarely been

---

[6] *Hastāmalakastotra-Bhāṣya, Lalitātriśatistotra-Bhāṣya, Śvetāśvataropaniṣad-Bhāṣya, Sanat-sujātīya-Bhāṣya, Viṣṇusahasranāma-Bhāṣya, Pātañjalaśāstra-Vivaraṇa.*

[7] The *Adhyātmapaṭala* of the *Āpastambadharma* [being Prasna Patala 8, treating of the spiritual life], with *Vivaraṇa* [purporting to be the work] of Śrī Śaṅkara Bhagavatpāda. Edited by T. Ganapati Sastri, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series XLI, 1915.

[8] *Works of Shankaracharya in Original Sanskrit*, Vol. IV: Minor Works. Ed. by Hari Raghunath Bhagavat, Poona: Ashtekar & Co., 1929. AdhypV can be found on pp. 422–435. The text appears to be a retyped Trivandrum 1915 edition. The only difference between the two editions is that in Bhagavat's text all citations are identified. In this paper, I will refer to the 1915 Trivandrum edition of Gaṇapati Śāstrī.

[9] First printed collected works of Śaṅkara (*Sri Sankaracharya's Miscellaneous Works* in 4 vols., ed. by A. Mahadeva Sastri and K. Rangacharya, Mysore: Government Branch Press, 1898–1899) comprises only smaller treatises. The first major collection is *Works of Sri Sankaracharya* printed by Sri Vani Vilas Press in Srirangam, 1910. This collection was retyped and printed twice; first in Śrīraṅgam as *Śrīśaṃkaragranthāvaliḥ*, and then in *Complete Works of Sri Sankaracharya in the original Sanskrit*, Madras: Samanta Books, 1981–1983. Widely used Motilal Banarsidass edition *Works of Śaṅkarācārya in Original Sanskrit* in 3 vols. (1964–1985) is based on a four-volume edition edited by Hari Raghunath Bhagavat (Poona: Ashtekar & Co.). However, the final volume

discussed in the secondary literature on Śaṅkara. Perhaps this is because AdhypV is not included in most of Śaṅkara's collected works, which contain numerous spurious works in and of themselves.

Nevertheless, a number of authors seem to be inclined to attribute the work to Śaṅkara. Thus, Belvalkar (1929: 219), Kane (1930: 43), Hacker (1968/69: 147), and Alston (2004, vol. I: 44) speak briefly in favour of Śaṅkara's authorship.[10] Nakamura (1983: 306) cautiously notes that the work belongs, if not to Śaṅkara himself, then at least to an author of a similar education and views who is temporally close to Śaṅkara. On the other hand, Legget (2018: 218–228) and Pande (1994: 109–110, 113) articulate their arguments for Śaṅkara's authorship more precisely.

According to Pande (1994: 109–110), AdhypV is consistent with Śaṅkara's genuine works in its ideas, style of argument, directness and simplicity of language, preference for short quotations from ancient works, concepts of *doṣa* and *jñāna*, and absence of benediction. Unfortunately, Pande simply mentions these issues without elaborating upon them or providing any specific examples for his claims. Legget (2018: 218–228) elaborates upon his arguments in greater detail. His strongest argument is based on similarities of the juxtaposition of certain quotations in AdhypV and in works considered genuine. Legget focuses first on a sequence of quotations from BĀU 3,7.23 and ChU 6,8.6 that appear in BSBh 2,3.30 and in AdhypV 4, and then on two quotations from the *Mahānārayaṇa-Upaniṣad* and four quotations from the *Mahābhārata* that occur in a similar order in some works that can be considered to have been authored by Śaṅkara with some certainty. Quotations from the *Mahānārayaṇa-Upaniṣad* 78,12; 12,15 and the *Mahābhārata* 12,316.40 appear one after another in AdhypV intro. and BhGBh 3 intro.; in ĪUBh, the quotation from MBh 12,316.40 follows a quotation from *Mahānārayaṇa-Upaniṣad* 12,15, just like in AdhypV intro. Legget believes that such sequences reveal the author's fingerprints; moreover, a special coincidence with the BhGBh, according to Legget, suggests that the works originated at about the same time, while Śaṅkara still had the same formulation in his mind. Furthermore, two quotations from ĀpDhŚ appear in AdhyPV and in BhGBh, but not in such close sequence as in the previous example.[11]

---

with *Adhyātmapaṭalavivaraṇa* is excluded from the Motilal Banarsidass edition. Cf. Reigle & Reigle 2005.

[10] Legget (2018: 219) claims that Mayeda accepts Śaṅkara's authorship of the AdhypV in his Encyclopedia Britannica entry on Śaṅkara, but Mayeda's present entry on Śaṅkara (Mayeda 2017) contains no such claim.

[11] However, in AdhypV, quotations from 2,21.13 and 2,2.3 appear in sequence; ĀpDhŚ 2,21.13 appears in BhGBh 18,55, while ĀpDhŚ 2,2.3 appears in BhGBh 18,44 and 66.

A few remarks should be made on Legget's careful comparison. While the mentioned quotations are indeed similarly juxtaposed, this phenomenon can be tentatively explained the other way around. While it is not unreasonable to claim that one author repeats the same quotations by discussing the same topics in different works, it is also possible that another, later author deeply familiar with the works of Śaṅkara simply repeated the great teacher's procedures. Legget's argument shows a close connection between the passages mentioned, but in scholastic circles where Śaṅkara's works have been studied, it is normal for scholars well acquainted with Śaṅkara's works to consciously or unconsciously repeat the same or similar procedures. On the other hand, these appear to be the only quotations in close juxtaposition. This shows that we may be on thin ice when determining authorship based on reproducible similarity. In my opinion, this type of evidence may be indicative, but not decisive.

Other arguments raised by Legget are also quite indecisive. For example, the untraceable quotation *ākāśavat sarvagataś ca nityaḥ* appears in AdhyPV 4 and in BSBh 3,2.37.[12] However, the quotation in question also appears in the works of other authors. Legget (2018: 222) indicates Madhusūdana Sarasvatī's commentary on BhG (Gūḍhārtha Dīpikā),[13] but other examples can be cited as well, such as Madhusūdana Sarasvatī's *Siddhāntabindu* 3 and Ānandagiri's *Śāstraprakāśikākhyaṭīkā*[14] 2,1.485. The biggest problem in Legget's argumentation is his claim (2018: 222) that "Śaṅkara frequently quotes and refers to this Chapter of the Self." In fact, I was able to trace only two quotations from Adhyp in works that can be considered authentic with some degree of certainty: Adhyp 4 (=ĀpDhŚ 1,[8]22.4) in *Upadeśasahasrī* 2,1.38 and Adhyp 10 (=ĀpDhŚ 1,[8.]23.2) in BSBh 2,1.1. All Legget's examples appear to be very loose paraphrasings of the second example. Contrary to Legget's argument, the fact that Adhyp appears in Śaṅkara's works extremely rarely does not support the claim that it was a text of importance to him and provides even less reason to assume that he would have composed a commentary on it.

Other arguments provided by Legget (2018: 223–228) show that there is no essential doctrinal difference between AdhypV and works considered authentic. All in all, while Legget does indicate a certain degree of congruence and doctrinal similarity, there is no strong, strictly philological evidence to determine whether

---

[12] Besides BSBh 3,2.37, mentioned by Legget (2018: 222), the quotation also appears in BSBh 1,1.20; 1,2.3; 2,3.4; 2,3.7; 2,3.21 and 4,3.14. It also appears in Śaṅkara's BĀUBh 2,1.20 and in ChUBh 6,3.2. In the last example, Śaṅkara mentions that the quotation belongs to "Vājasaneyaka". By "Vājasaneyaka", Śaṅkara usually means the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Upaniṣad* and *Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa*, where this quotation cannot be found.

[13] According to Legget (2018: 222), the quotation appears in the commentary on BhG 4,6, where I was unable to locate it. However, it does appear in the commentary on BhG 2,24.

[14] Ānandagiri's sub-commentary on Sureśvara's versified commentary on Śaṅkara's BĀUBh.

Śaṅkara is truly the author of AdhypV. On the other hand, there are no obvious disqualifying features either. Therefore, the remainder of this paper will subject AdhypV to Hacker's (and Mayeda's) criteria for establishing authenticity. It is especially important to subject the work to criteria that may disqualify it as authentic. If such suspicion is removed, positive criteria that indicate a match between the texts may have more weight.

Analysis of manuscript colophons (Hacker 1947, rev. 1978)

According to Hacker (1947/1978), Śaṅkara-bhagavat(-pūjya[-pāda]) is the title preferred by Śaṅkara's contemporaries and early followers; therefore, works carrying this title in the manuscript colophons should be considered genuine, while the title Śaṅkara-ācārya in the colophons indicates spurious or more recent works.

It must first be noted that Hacker did not subject AdhypV to this test, even though he did test a considerable amount of works attributed to Śaṅkara.[15] Therefore, I decided to check the colophons in descriptive catalogues. First, a search in Aufrecht's *Catalogus Catalogorum* provided no results; this explains why Hacker did not consider AdhypV in his 1947/1978 paper. However, the *New Catalogus Catalogorum*, vol. 1 (p. 147) lists the Trivandrum manuscripts catalogue,[16] where two AdhypV manuscripts can be found. Thus, Trivandrum IV,2 lists a Grantha manuscript from a private collection attributed to Śaṅkara-bhagavatpāda, while another Malayalam manuscript, also from a private collection in the same catalogue (II,3), carries the title Śaṅkarācārya. This very Malayalam manuscript was used as the main source for Gaṇapati Śāstrī's 1915 printed edition. However, his edition reads "Śaṅkara-bhagavat-pāda"; this colophon may appear in the second, corrupted manuscript that Śāstrī obtained from the Thekke Maṭhom

---

[15] Hacker subjected a total of 44 works to this test; 21 of these, including commentaries on the *Brahma-Sūtras*, principal *Upaniṣads*, and *Bhagavadgītā*, are attributed in colophons exclusively to Śaṅkara-bhagavat(-pūjya[-pāda]). The remaining 23, mostly spurious works, were attributed either only to Śaṅkara-ācārya or both to Śaṅkara-ācārya and Śaṅkara-bhagavat. Hacker (1978: 9) also mentions a further 32 spurious works attributed to Śaṅkara, which appear in manuscript catalogues no more than once each. Of the 21 works attributed to Śaṅkara-bhagavat(-pūjya[-pāda]), Andrijanić (2019) and Andrijanić & Bąkowski (forth.) deny Śaṅkara's authorship of the *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad-Bhāṣya* on both philological and stylometric grounds. The GI result was negative for the *Hastāmalakabhāṣya* (Andrijanić & Bąkowski forth.). Gussner (1976 and 1977) and Andrijanić & Bąkowski (2021) also argue against Śaṅkara's authorship of the *Harimīḍestotra* and *Vivekacūḍāmaṇi*. Hacker's list of works attributed in colophons only to Śaṅkara-bhaga-vat(-pūjya[-pāda]) also contains the *Svātmapūja* and *Haritattvamuktāvali*, for which no authenticity studies currently exist to the best of this author's knowledge.

[16] *A Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts Collected by T. Gaṇapati Śāstrī*. Trivandrum, 1912.

monastery, which is not listed in the *New Catalogus Catalogorum*. According to the testimony of the printed edition and catalogues, it can be concluded that three manuscripts are known, two with "Śaṅkara-bhagavat-pāda" and one with "Śaṅkarācārya" in the colophons. Hacker lists such examples in his 1947/1978 paper, but all of them are spurious works. Therefore, the attribution of AdhypV to Śaṅkarācārya in one of two (or three) known manuscripts casts doubt on the possibility that the work is authentic.

While searching the manuscript catalogues for AdhypV, another important issue came to light. As only two manuscripts are mentioned in the *New Catalogus* (in addition to one more from the testimony in the printed edition), it became obvious that manuscripts of AdhypV, unlike Śaṅkara's authentic works, have circulated in scholarly circles to a very limited extent, which casts serious doubt on Śaṅkara's authorship. It can be claimed that fewer manuscripts of AdhypV exist than any of the many works studied by Hacker. Another problem is that I was unable to trace any sub-commentary on the AdhypV. This is very unusual, because Śaṅkara's genuine works and those that can be reasonably assumed to have been written by him are often commented on. As an example, Mayeda (2006: 1) traces 70 manuscripts for the Upadeśasāhasrī and four commentaries. For Śaṅkara's commentary on the Īśopaniṣad,[17] which is comparable in size to AdhypV, the *New Catalogus Catalogorum*, vol. 2 (pp. 268–269) cites twice as many manuscripts as the Upad in a number of different collections across India. The *New Catalogus* also records commentaries by Ānandagiri, Anubhūtisvarūpācārya, Kīka, Narendrapuri, and Śivānandayati.

Because there are so few manuscripts and because there are no commentaries, it is obvious that AdhypV had a very limited circulation and influence among the members of the Advaita Vedānta school; this is certainly an argument against Śaṅkara's attribution.

Terminological peculiarities according to Hacker's criteria

In his 1950 article, Paul Hacker singles out various peculiarities of the usage of the terms *avidyā* 'ignorance', *nāmarūpa* 'name and form', *māyā* 'illusion', and *īśvara* 'lord'. Sengaku Mayeda (1965a, 1965c, cf. also Mayeda 1967, 1967–68) adds to these peculiarities the notion of *ānanda*, which does not qualify the supreme *brahman* in Śaṅkara's authentic works (unless stated in the commented text), *vivarta*, which belongs to later Advaita Vedānta, and Vyāsa, whom Śaṅkara does not consider the author of the *Brahmasūtra*. I argued in Andrijanić 2022 that Hacker's criteria is still a remarkably powerful tool for authenticating Śaṅkara's

---

[17] For arguments in favour of Śaṅkara's authorship, see Andrijanić 2020.

prose works, even after more than 70 years.[18] It, therefore, seems appropriate to verify whether AdhypV corresponds with the peculiarities singled out by Hacker and Mayeda. It should first be emphasized that AdhypV is a very concise work, and many of these peculiarities will likely not be found. However, the most important thing is to verify whether some peculiarities in AdhypV also belong to later developments in Advaita Vedānta, thus disqualifying AdhypV as Śaṅkara's authentic work.

It should first be noted that the terms *nāmarūpa*, *māyā*, *vivarta*, and the proper name Vyāsa do not appear in AdhypV. This means that only the terms *avidyā*, *īśvara*, and *ānanda* can be considered here. The notion of *avidyā*, for which Hacker identifies four groups of peculiarities (Hacker 1950: 248–254), occurs in AdhypV only nine times (the synonym *ajñāna* also appears once). In Śaṅkara's authentic works, *avidyā* is identified with *adhyāsa* and *adhyāropaṇa* 'superimposition', but these terms do not appear in AdhypV; the same goes for *mithyājñāna* 'false knowledge', which Śaṅkara equates with *avidyā*[19] (in other Advaita Vedāntins, *mithyājñāna* is the cause of *avidyā*). On the other hand, according to Hacker, Śaṅkara does not consider ignorance to be unique, but often rather one of the afflictions. Hacker notes that *kleśa* 'affliction' is a general term than includes terms for afflictions including *avidyā*. However, Hacker (1950: 249) claims that the term *doṣa* 'fault' does not appear as a general term that includes *avidyā*.

The fact that AdhypV treats this as part of a group is apparent in the compound *avidyādi* 'ignorance and others' (p. 3, line 5). On p. 4, line 17, *avidyā* is called *doṣa* 'fault'. In AdhypV 4 (p. 8, line 5), the compound *avidyādidoṣa* 'ignorance and other faults' appears, which obviously means that *doṣa* is a general term that includes ignorance and other afflictions. While it can be claimed that AdhypV differs from Śaṅkara's BSBh in this respect, this exact same compound (*avidyādidoṣa*) appears in the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad-Bhāṣya* (=BĀUBh) 1.3.1 (TPU p. 627, line 12) and 1.4.10 (TPU p. 677, line 18). As BĀUBh is beyond any doubt Śaṅkara's work, it seems that this peculiarity cannot be taken as evidence against Śaṅkara's authorship.[20]

---

[18] Hacker bases his analysis solely on the *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya*; in my 2022 article, I attempted to show that the commentaries on the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* and *Taittirīyopaniṣad*, for which there is also external evidence of Śaṅkara's authorship, agree with BSBh in the peculiarities singled out by Hacker.

[19] *Mithyājñāna* 'false knowledge' appears twice in the introduction, but it is not clear whether the word is used as a synonym for *avidyā*.

[20] It is worth noting that a small terminological inconsistency is found in the commentary on Adhyp 3, which states that ignorance (*ajñāna*) is the seed of all (other) *doṣa*s. AdhypV 3 (p. 7, p. 8) …*sarvadoṣabījabhūtam ajñānam*…

In contradistinction to Śaṅkara's followers, who follow Maṇḍanamiśra, *avidyā* is not inexplicable (*anirvācanīya*) in AdhpV.[21] Also, in Śaṅkara's authentic works, *avidyā* is an efficient cause in contradistinction to other Advaitins, for whom *avidyā* is a material cause. AdhypV also does not mention any of Śaṅkara's typical terms denoting the causal relation between *avidyā* and its effects, such as (*avidyā*)-*adhyasta*, -*adhyāropita*, -*pratyupasthāpita*, -*vijṛmbhita*, -(*pra*)*kalpita*. Śaṅkara's followers use the expressions *upādāna-kāraṇa* and *prakṛti* 'material cause', *jaḍa* 'insentient', and *bhāvarūpa* 'having the form of existing' to qualify *avidyā*. However, none of these disqualifying concepts are linked to ignorance in AdhpV. Also, *avidyā* is never equated with *māyā*, nor is *māyā* used as a synonym for *avidyā*.

An interesting case occurs in the commentary on Adhyp 4 (p. 8, lines 4–5), which states: "*guhāśayaḥ* ('the one who has a resting place in the cave' [sūtra 4]) means that he lies in the resting place of the intellect[22] which has become a cover (*āvaraṇa*) of ignorance".[23]

This passage is important because Hacker (1950: 255) notes that the attributes of ignorance "the power of projection" (*vikṣepaśakti*) and "the power of covering" (*āvaraṇaśakti*) come from later Advaita Vedānta and do not appear in the BSBh. According to Andrijanić 2022, they do not appear in most of Śaṅkara's other works. However, this fact also does not speak against Śaṅkara's authorship, as the term *āvaraṇa* 'covering' appears as an attribute of ignorance (*ajñāna*) in two BĀUBh passages: in BĀUBh 1,3.28 (TPU p. 644, line 21) and 2,1.12 (TPU p. 721, line 5). In both passages, the word *ajñāna* 'ignorance' comes from BĀU; Śaṅkara interprets *ajñāna* as *āvaraṇātmaka* "which has the nature of concealing".

What remains of Hacker's criteria that is applicable to AdhpV is the notion of *īśvara* 'Lord, God'. Hacker distinguishes as many as seven peculiarities in Śaṅkara's use of the term *īśvara*, of which we can highlight that Śaṅkara uses the terms *brahman* / *ātman* and *īśvara* interchangeably for highest *brahman*.

Īśvara occurs only twice in AdhpV, both times in the commentary on Adhyp 10. In the first case, *īśvara* obviously denotes the highest principle, while *sarveśvara* is used as a synonym for *paramātman*, which Śaṅkara uses only to denote the highest principle, and never conditioned *brahman* (unlike *īśvara*, which occurs in both roles interchangeably).

---

[21] For Śaṅkara, the term *anirvācanīya* usually qualifies name and form, which he considers a kind of primordial matter.

[22] Upadeśasāhasrī 1,5.2 states that the Self abides in the intellect. Cf also Upad 1,7.

[23] AdhypV 4 (p. 8, lines 4–5): *ato 'vidyāvaraṇātmabhūtāyāṃ buddhiguhāyāṃ śeta iti guhāśayaḥ |*

> *AdhypV 10 (p. 14, lines 14–15) sa sarveśvaraḥ sarvajñaḥ eko vijñeya
> ity arthaḥ | sa paramātmā…*
> "*sa* ('he' [sūtra 10]) is the Lord of all, omniscient, the only one to be
> known, this is the meaning; *sa* is the supreme Self…"

The second case is far more ambiguous, as *parameśvara* 'supreme Lord' is
associated with the term *paramārtha* 'highest truth', which Śaṅkara uses to
denote supreme Brahman; however, in the same sentence, *parameśvara* appears
as the material cause of the world, which Śaṅkara never claims to be supreme
Brahman.

> *AdhypV 10 (p. 14, lines 14–15) jñeyād jñātavyāt paramārthasvarūpādvayāt
> parameśvarād ghaṭāder iva mṛdaḥ |*
> "*Jñeyāt* ([non-different] from what has to be known [sūtra 10]) from
> what has to be known, from the supreme Lord who is non-dual and
> who is the own form of the supreme sense. Like clay and the pot."

It is precisely this terminological inconsistency that is typical of Śaṅkara, but
also of his successors, Sureśvara and Padmapāda (cf. Andrijanić 2022).

Conclusion

The terminological analysis shows that we cannot find any disqualifying feature in
the text. More specifically, no characteristics of later Advaita Vedānta are present,
such as the materialization of *avidyā*; *māya* is not a developed philosophical
concept; *īśvara* is not treated solely as lower Brahman. No typical later
terminology is found. The only two possible disqualifying factors (the afflictions
including *avidyā* covered by the generic term *doṣa* and the term *āvaraṇa*) are
also found in the commentary on the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad*, which should
certainly be attributed to Śaṅkara.

We must admit that AdhypV is terminologically consistent with Śaṅkara, and
this analysis fully confirms the results of the stylometric analysis. This means that
we could also confirm Śaṅkara's authorship if not for one serious shortcoming
that must be emphasized – this is the very poor circulation of this work in the
past, which is manifested in the mention of only two manuscripts in the *New
Catalogus Catalogorum*, while no sub-commentaries on AdhypV are known.
These are two characteristics that significantly distance AdhypV from other
works by Śaṅkara. Unfortunately, I must consider the issue of the authorship
of the commentary on the *Adhyātmapaṭala* unresolved for now. Terminological
compatibility with Śaṅkara certainly indicates that the text is very close in time

to the historical Śaṅkara because it would be difficult for an educated Advaita Vedānta scholar, like the author of AdhypV, to so easily bypass doctrines that developed immediately after Śaṅkara's death. It is, however, difficult to explain why an authentic work of Śaṅkara work would have been so poorly received and nearly forgotten.

Abbrevations

Adhyp   – *Adhyātmapaṭala*
AdhypV   – *Adhyātmapaṭalavivaraṇa*. *Adhyātmapaṭala* of the *Āpasambadharma* with *Vivaraṇa*
           of Śrī Sankara Bhagavatpāda. Ed. T. Gaṇapati Śāstrī. Trivandrum Sanskrit Series
           No. XLI. Trivandrum, 1915.
ĀpDhŚ   – *Āpastamba-Dharma-Śāstra*
BĀUBh   – *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣadbhāṣya* (TPU). *Ten Principal Upaniṣads with Śaṅkarabhāṣya,*
           Works of Śaṅkarācārya in Original Sanskrit, vol. 1, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass
           1964. Reprint 2007.
BhG   – *Bhagavad-Gīta*
BhGBh   – *Bhagavad-Gītā-Bhāṣya*
BSBh   – *Brahma-Sūtra-Bhāṣya*
ChU   – *Chāndogya-Upaniṣad-Bhāṣya*
ĪUBh   – *Īśā-Upaniṣad-Bhāṣya*
TaittUBh   – *Taittirīya-Upaniṣad-Bhāṣya*
TPU   – BĀUBh
Upad   – *Upadeśasāhasrī*

Bibliography

Alston, A.J. 2004. *Śaṅkara On The Absolute. A Śaṅkara Source-Book*. Volume I. London: Shanti Sadan. [First edition London: Santi Sadan, 1980.]

Andrijanić, Ivan. 2019. "Śaṅkara and the Authorship of Śvetāśvataropaniṣad-Bhāṣya." *The Journal of Hindu Studies* 12(3), 273–291.

Andrijanić, Ivan. 2020. "Śaṅkara and the Authorship of the Īśopaniṣad- and Kaṭhopaniṣad-Bhāṣya." *International Journal of Hindu Studies* 24, 257–282. 10.1007/s11407-020-09279-z

Andrijanić, Ivan & Bąkowski, Jacek. 2021. "Stylometry then and now: Authorship verification of Vivekacūḍāmaṇi and Vedāntic stotras." In *Challenges of Interdisciplinary and Multidisciplinary Approach: New Horizons in Oriental Studies*, Edited by Agata Bareja-Starzyńska. Prace Orientalistyczne, vol. 44. Warsaw: Polish Academy of Sciences, Committee of Oriental Studies, pp. 30–46.

Andrijanić, Ivan. 2022. "The Reliability of Hacker's Criteria for Determining Śaṅkara's Authorship." *Journal of Dharma Studies* 5, 83–105. doi:10.1007/s42240-022-00123-8.

Andrijanić, Ivan & Jacek Bąkowski (forthcoming). "General imposters Framework and the Authenticity of Śaṅkara's Prose Writings".

Belvalkar, S.K. 1929. *Shree Gopal Basu Mallik Lectures on Vedānta Philosophy.* Part one: *Lectures 1–6*. Poona: Bilvakuñja Publishing House.

Gussner, Robert E. (Apr.–Jun.) 1976. "A Stylometric Study of the Authorship of Seventeen Sanskrit Hymns Attributed to Śaṅkara." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 96(2), 259–267.

Gussner, Robert E. 1977. "Śaṅkara's Crest Jewel of Discrimination: A Stylometric Approach to the Question of Authorship." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 4(3/4), 265–278.

Hacker, P. 1950. "Eigentümlichkeiten der Lehre und Terminologie Śaṅkaras: Avidyā, Nāmarūpa, Māyā, Īśvara," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 100, 246–286. [Reprinted in *Kleine Schriften*, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, pp. 69–109 (1978)].

Hacker, P. 1968/69. "Śaṅkara der Yogin und Śaṅkara der Advaitin. Einige Beobachten." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens* 12–13, 119–148.

Hacker, P. 1978. "Śaṅkarācārya and Śaṅkarabhagavatpāda. Preliminary Remarks concerning the Authorship Problem," (Korrigierte Neufassung), Kleine Schriften, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, pp. 41–59. [Originally published in *New Indian Antiquary* 9 (1947), 175–186].

Harimoto, Kengo. 2006. "The Date of Śaṅkara: Between the Cāḷukyas and the Rāṣṭrakūtas." *Journal of Indological Studies* 18, 85–111.

Kane, Pandurag Vaman. 1930. *History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol. I. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.

Legget, Trevor. 1978. *The Chapter of the Self. Yoga and the Discovery of the Universal Self.* The Buddhist Society Trust, 2018. [First edition: London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.].

Mayeda, Sengaku. 1965a. "The Authenticity of the Bhagavadgītābhāṣya ascribed to Śaṅkara." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens und Archiv für indische Philosophie* 9, 155–197.

Mayeda, Sengaku. 1965b. "The Authenticity of the Upadeśasāhasrī Ascribed to Śaṅkara". *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 85(2), 178–196.

Mayeda, Sengaku. 1967–1968. "On the Author of the Māṇḍūkyopaniṣad and the Gauḍapādīyabhāṣya." *Adyar Library Bulletin* 31–32, 73–94.

Mayeda, Sengaku. 1967. "On Śaṅkara's Authorship of the Kenopaniṣadbhāṣya." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 10(1), 33–55.

Mayeda, Sengaku. 2006. *Śaṅkara's Upadeśasāhasrī*, Vols. I and II. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. [First edition, Hokuseido Press, 1973].

Mayeda, Sengaku. (18 Jan.) 2017. "Shankara" *Encyclopedia Britannica*, https://www.britannica.com/biography/Shankara. [Accessed 18 February 2022].

Nakamura, Hajime. 1983. *A History of Early Vedānta Philosophy*. Part One. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Pande, Govind Chandra. 1994. *Life and Thought of Śaṅkarācārya*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Raghavan, Venkatarama ed. 1966. *New Catalogus Catalogorum.* Volume Two. Madras: University of Madras.

Raghavan, Venkatarama ed. 1968. *New Catalogus Catalogorum*. Volume One (revised edition). Madras: University of Madras.

Reigle, David & Nancy Reigle. 2005. *Śaṅkarācārya's Collected Works: An Annotated Bibliography of Published Editions*. Cotopaxi, Colorado, U.S.A: Eastern Tradition Research Institute.