

THE FOURTH CHAPTER.

ON ABSOLUTE INDEPENDENCE (KAIVALYA).

Sûtra 1.

जन्मौषधिमन्त्रतपःसमाधिजाः सिद्धयः ॥ १ ॥

जन्म Janma, birth. औषधि Auśadhi, drugs. मन्त्र Mantra, incantations. तपः Tapah, purificatory rites. समाधि Samādhi, trance. जाः Jāh, born. सिद्धयः Siddhayaḥ, attainments.

1. The attainments are by birth, drugs, incantations, purificatory action (tapas) or trance.—161.

जन्मौषधिमन्त्रतपःसमाधिजाः सिद्धयः । देहान्तरिता जन्मसिद्धिः श्रोत्रश्रीभिर-
सुरभवनेषु रसायनेनेत्येवमादिः । मन्त्रैराकाशगमनमणिमादिसिद्धिः । तपसा सकल्प-
सिद्धिः । कामरूपी यत्र तत्र कामग इत्येवमादिसमाधिजाः सिद्धयो व्याख्याताः ॥ १ ॥

VYĀSA.

Attainments by birth exist in the body.

By drugs, in the houses of the Asuras, by elixir and such like:

By incantations, motion in space and the powers of attenuation (apimā), &c.

By purificatory action (tapas) the achievement of wishes. He takes such forms and goes to such places as he may like, and does other similar things.

The attainments born of trance have been described.—161.

VĀCHASPATI'S GLOSS.

Now trance, its means and its attainments, have been described chiefly in the first, second and third chapters. Other subjects which it became necessary to take up by context, or by way of introduction, have also been discussed. Here is to be discussed Absolute Freedom (Kaivalya), which is the ultimate of all these practices, &c. And this is impossible to explain without explaining the nature of the mind inclining towards the state of absolute independence, as also the other world and the self which being something beside knowledge alone (Vijñāna), is related to the other world, and which enjoys through the instrumentality of the mind, pleasurable sound, &c. All this has to be described in this chapter, besides what might become necessary by context or by way of introduction.

First of all, he describes the five-fold attainment, with the object of ascertaining which of the minds possessed of attainments is passing towards the state of absolute independence.

'The attainments are by birth, incantations, purificatory action or trance.' He explains:—Exists in the body:—Some one has the power of attenuation in the body, just as he is born because actions done by him as man, which are calculated to cause the enjoyments of Heaven, have developed them into fruition in some heavenly region.

He describes the attainments due to drugs:—'In the houses of the Asuras.' Man passes to the places of the Asuras for some reason. He is met there by lovely Asura damsels, and given an offering of elixir. Using that he comes to possess the attainments of freedom from decay and death, and other attainments. Or, the same may take place even here by the use of elixir, as in the case of the thinker Māndavya, who resided in the Vindhya Mountains and who used the elixir.

He next describes the attainments due to incantations:—'By mantras.'

He next describes the attainments of purificatory actions:—'By purificatory action.'

He next describes the attainment of wishes:—Assuming such forms as desired. Whatever does he desire, be it the attainment of Apimā or any other, that he attains at once. Whatever he desires to hear or to think anywhere, that he hears or thinks there. By the word, &c., seeing, &c., have been included.—1.

Sûtra 2.

जात्यन्तरपरिणामः प्रकृत्यापूरात् ॥ २ ॥

जात्यन्तर Jātyantara, to another life-state. परिणामः Parīṇāmaḥ, change. प्रकृति Prakṛiti, of the creative causes. आपूरत् Āpūrāt, by the filling up.

2. Change to another life-state by the filling up of the creative causes (Prakṛityâpura).—162.

तत्र कायेन्द्रियाणामन्यजातिपरिणतानाम् । जात्यन्तरपरिणामः प्रकृत्यापूरात् । पूर्व-
परिणामापाये उत्तरपरिणामोपजनस्तेषामपूर्वावयवानुप्रवेशाद्भवति कायेन्द्रियप्रकृतयश्च
स्वं स्वं विकारमनुगृह्णन्त्यापूरेण धर्मादिनिमित्तमपेक्षमाणा इति ॥ २ ॥

VYĀSA.

Here 'change to another life-state by the filling up of the creative causes,' takes place of the life-state into which the body and the powers have already changed and exist. On the former change going out comes the close appearance of their next change by the sequential showing forth of organ and parts which did not exist before; and the creative causes of the body and the powers favour each their own modifications by filling up, which again has the necessity of virtue, &c., as the incidental cause (of removing the impediment).—162.

VĀCHASPATI'S GLOSS.

The attainments due to the trance have been described in the previous chapter. It is now desirable to say that the change into another life-state brought about by the four classes of attainments due to the use of herbs, &c., is also of the same body and the powers thereof. This, however, does not come about by mere material causes. The material itself, so far as it goes, does not prove to be competent to intensify or weaken the state of the divine and the not-divine, in him. It is plain that a cause having no elements of difference in itself cannot operate to produce different effects. In order to guard against the possibility of the change being taken as due to accident alone, he completes and reads the aphorism:—'Change to another life-state by the filling up of the creative causes.'

Here it is only the change of the body and the powers as they are in one state, that takes place into those suitable to another state. The change takes place of the body

and the powers as they appear in man, into the life-state of the animals and gods by the filling up of the creative causes.

The creative causes of the body are the elements of Pṛithvī, &c. The creative cause of the 'powers' is the principle of egoism.

'Filling up' means the sequential showing forth, entrance therein, of these causes. By this comes about the change.

Says this:—'By the former change going out, &c.'

Well, but if the change is favoured by the 'filling up' why does it not take place always? For this reason he says:—'Has the necessity of virtue, &c.'

By this have been described the changes of the state of the body into childhood, boyhood, youth, old age; the change of the seed of the Nyagrodha into the tree; the change of the small piece of fire thrown into a heap of straw, into a large fire throwing out flames by thousand and embracing the sky itself.—2.

Sūtra 3.

निमित्तमप्रयोजकं प्रकृतीनां वरणभेदस्तु ततः क्षेत्रिकवत् ॥ ३ ॥

निमित्तम् Nimitam, incidental causes. अमप्रयोजकम् Aprayojakam, are those which do not move into action. प्रकृतीनाम् Prakṛitīnām, the creative causes. वरण Varāṇa, of the obstacle. भेदः Bhedaḥ, piercing through. तु Tu, but. ततः Tataḥ, from that. क्षेत्रिकवत् Kṣetrikavat, like a husbandman.

3. The creative-causes are not-moved-into-action by any incidental-cause; but that pierces-the-obstacle from it like the husbandman.—163.

निमित्तमप्रयोजकं प्रकृतीनां वरणभेदस्तु ततः क्षेत्रिकवत् । नहि धर्मादिनिमित्तं तत्प्रयोजकं भवति प्रकृतीनाम् । न कार्येण कारणं प्रवर्त्यत इति । कथं तर्हि । वरणभेदस्तु ततः क्षेत्रिकवत् । यथा क्षेत्रिकः केदारादपां पूर्णात्केदारान्तरं पिप्लावयिषुः समं निम्नं निम्नतरं वा नापः पाणिनापकर्षत्यावरणं त्वासां भिनत्ति तस्मिन्भिन्ने स्वयमेवापः केदारान्तरमाप्लावयन्ति तथा धर्मः प्रकृतीनामावरणमधर्मं भिनत्ति तस्मिन्भिन्ने स्वयमेव प्रकृतयः स्वं स्वं विकारमाप्लावयन्ति । यथा वा स एव क्षेत्रिकस्तस्मिन्नेव केदारे न प्रभवत्यौदकान्मौमान्वा रसान्धान्यमूलान्यनुप्रवेशयितुम् । किं तर्हि मुद्गवेधुक्श्यामाकादौस्ततोऽपकर्षति । अपकृष्टेषु तेषु स्वयमेव रसा धान्यमूलान्यनुप्रवेशयन्ति । तथा धर्मो निवृत्तिमात्रे कारणमधर्मस्य शुद्धयशुद्धयोरत्यन्तविरोधात् । नतु प्रकृतिप्रवृत्तौ धर्मो हेतुर्भवतीति । अत्र नन्दीश्वरादय उदाहार्याः । विपर्ययेणाप्यधर्मो धर्मं बाधते । ततश्चाशुद्धिपरिणाम इति । तत्रापि नहुषाजगरादय उदाहार्याः । यदा तु योगी बहून्कायान्निर्मिती तदा किमेकमनस्कास्ते भवन्त्यथानेकमनस्का इति ॥ ३ ॥

VYĀSA.

The incidental causes in the shape of virtue, &c., do not move the creative causes into action; because the cause is not moved into action by the effect. How then? 'That pierces the obstacle like the husbandman.'

As the husbandman desirous of carrying water from an already well-filled bed to another, does not draw the water with his own hands to places which are on the same or a lower level; but simply removes the obstacles, and thereupon the water flows down of itself to the other bed, so it pierces through vice which is the obstacle to virtue, and that being pierced through, the creative causes pass through their respective changes.

Or, similarly, the same husbandman does not possess the power of transferring the earthy and watery juices to the roots of rice in the same bed. What then? He weeds the 'ring,' the 'Gavendhuka' and the 'Śyāmaka' out of the common bed, and when they have been weeded out, the juices themselves enter the roots of rice.

Similarly virtue only becomes the cause of the removal of the vice, because purity and impurity are diametrically opposed to each other. It is not that virtue becomes the cause of the creative causes moving into action. On this point Nandiśvara, &c., are illustrations. On the other side, too, vice counteracts virtue and thence comes the change to impurity. Here too Nahuṣa, the Ajagara, &c., should be taken as illustrations.—163.

VĀCHASPATI'S GLOSS.

It has been said, 'By the filling up of the creative causes.' Here the doubt arises. Is this filling up of the creative causes natural, or due to some incidental cause such as virtue and vice? What is proved? Well, because the creative causes, notwithstanding existence, fill up only sometimes, and because it is said that virtue and vice are the incidental causes; it is, therefore, proved that virtue, &c., are the incidental causes of the creative causes moving into action. For this reason he says:—'The creative causes are not moved into action, by any incidental cause; that pierces the obstacle like the husbandman.'

It is true that virtue, &c., are the incidental causes, but they do not set the creative causes into action; because virtue and vice are themselves the effects of creative causes. And the effect does not move the cause into action, because the birth of the effect depending upon the cause, it is subject to the action of the cause. What is self-dependent can only set an action in something which is dependent on it. The jar which is desired to be made or which has already been made, cannot certainly use the clay, the wheel and water for that purpose without the potter. Nor is it similarly the object of the Puruṣa that sets the creative causes into action. It is only Īśvara who does this with that object in view. The object of the Puruṣa is said to be the power which sets in action, by virtue of its being the aim thereof. Further, if it were so, the tending of the aim of the Puruṣa towards fulfilment would very properly become the cause of the stopping of the operations of the phenomenal world.—3.

But it is not by this much that virtue, &c., cease to be the means of change altogether. Because they become the means of effecting changes even by removing the obstacles only, like the husbandman. As to Īśvara, His action too should be understood to be of the nature of the removal of obstacles, so that virtue may be practised. This is what has been commented upon by the Commentary already explained.

Sūtra 4.

निर्माणचित्तान्यस्मितामात्रात् ॥ ४ ॥

निर्माणं Nirmāṇa, of creation, created. चित्तानि Chittāni, minds. अस्मिता Asmitā, from egoism. मात्रान् Mātrāt, alone.

4. Created minds proceed from egoism alone.—164.

निर्माणचित्तान्यस्मितामात्रात् । अस्मितामात्रं चित्तं कारणमुपादाय निर्माणचित्तानि करोति ततः सचित्तानि भवन्तीति ॥ ४ ॥

VYĀSA.

When however the Yogī makes many bodies, then, are these bodies possessed of many minds or all of one mind only? 'Created minds proceed from egoism alone?' Taking as cause the mind which is egoism alone, he makes the created minds. Thence do the bodies become possessed of minds.—164.

VĀCHASPATI'S GLOSS.

Now he considers the unity or manifoldness of the minds in the many bodies made by perfected powers, after the attainments have been achieved by the filling in of the creative causes (Prakṛitis):—'When however.'

Here if the bodies possessed more than one mind, the desire of each such mind would be different from those of the others; and there would not thus be obedience to the desired of one mind and no mutuality in relationship, just as in the case of two individual selves (Puruṣas). It, therefore, comes to this that it is only one mind which pervades more created bodies than one, just as the light of a lamp is diffused on all sides and illuminates more bodies than one. Says he thereupon:—'Created minds proceed from egoism alone.'

All living bodies, as long as they live, are found to be possessed of one ordinary mind each. Take, for example, the bodies of Chaitra and Maitra, etc. So are the created bodies (the Nirmāṇakāyas). Thus is it proved that each of these bodies has a mind of its own.

Says with this in mind:—'Taking as cause the mind which is egoism alone.'—4.

Sūtra 5.

प्रवृत्तिभेदे प्रयोजकं चित्तमेकमनेकेषाम् ॥ ५ ॥

प्रवृत्ति, Pravṛitti, of activity. भेदे Bhede, there being difference. प्रयोजकम् Prayojakam, the director. चित्तम् Chittam, the mind. एकम् Ekam, one. अनेकेषाम् Anekeṣām, of the many.

5. There being difference of activity, one mind the director of-the-many.—165.

प्रवृत्तिभेदे प्रयोजकं चित्तमेकमनेकेषाम् । बाहूनां चित्तानां कथमेकचित्ताभिप्राय-पुरःसरा प्रवृत्तिरिति सर्वचित्तानां प्रयोजकं चित्तमेकं निर्मिमीते ततः प्रवृत्तिभेदः ॥ ५ ॥

VYĀSA.

How may it be that many minds may follow in their activities, the desires of one mind? With this object he makes one mind as the director of all the minds; and thence proceeds the difference of activities.—165.

VĀCHASPATI'S GLOSS.

The aphorism is a reply to what has been said, that in the case of there being more minds than one, there would not be obedience to one mind, nor mutuality of relationship:—'There being difference of activity, one mind the director of the others.' This might be a defect if the Yogī did not make one mind to be the director of more minds than one acting in more bodies than one. When that is made, no defect remains.

It should not be said that there is no use in more minds than one that is one for each body, when one such mind is posited; nor should it be said that there is no use in making a directing mind, because one's own mind can serve that purpose. The reason is that that which has been proved to exist by right reasoning, need no more be subjected to the test of being placed in consonant and dissonant positions.

On this says the Purāṇa:—'The one Lord becomes many by his power of Lordship. For this reason and because having become many he again becomes one, these are certainly born by the differences of the mind, one-fold, two-fold, three-fold and manifold. The Yogīśvara makes his bodies in this way and unmakes them. By some he enjoys objects of enjoyment and by other performs hard penances. He again draws in the bodies as the Sun draws in his ray.' It is with this object that he says:—'How is it that all these minds act according, &c.'—5.

Sūtra 6.

तत्र ध्यानजमनाशयम् ॥ ६ ॥

तत्र Tatra, of these. ध्यानजम् Dhyānajam, the meditation born. अनाशयम् Anāśayam, is free from the vehicles.

6. Of these the meditation-born is free-from-the-vehicles.—166.

तत्र ध्यानजमनाशयम् । पञ्चविधं निर्माणचित्तं जन्मैषधिमन्त्रतपःसमाधिजाः सिद्धय इति । तत्र यदेव ध्यानजं चित्तं तदेवानाशयं तस्यैव नास्त्याशयो रागादिप्रवृत्तिः ततः पुण्यपापाभिसम्बन्धः क्षीणकृते शक्त्वाद्योगिन इति ॥ ६ ॥

VYĀSA.

The created mind is five-fold, as said:—'The attainments are by birth, drugs, incantations, purificatory action or trance.' Of these the one that is born of meditation is alone free from the vehicles. It does not possess the vehicles, which cause the manifestation of desire, &c. Thence is there no coming into relationship with virtue and vice, inasmuch as the afflictions of a Yogī have ceased to exist.—166.

VĀCHASPATI'S GLOSS.

Now he determines the mind, which tends to emancipation, out of the five descriptions of the minds of the perfected ones (siddhās), which have been described:—'The meditation-born is free from the vehicles.' The vehicles are those that take possession of the mind as the impressions of the actions and the impressions of the afflictions. The mind free from the vehicles is that in which these do not exist. The meaning is that it becomes inclined towards emancipation. Inasmuch as there does not exist in this condition the manifestation of desires, &c., there is no coming into relationship with virtue and vice. But then why do not desires, &c., come into manifestation? For this reason he says:—'Because the afflictions of a Yogī have ceased to exist.'—6.

Sūtra 7.

कर्माशुक्लाकृष्णं योगिनस्त्रिविधमितरेषाम् ॥ ७ ॥

कर्मा Karma, Karma, action. अशुक्लं Aśukla, neither white. अकृष्णम् Akṛṣṇam, nor black. योगिनः Yogināḥ, of a Yogi. त्रिविधम् Trividham, threefold. इतरेषाम् Itareṣām, of the others.

7. A Yogi's karma is neither-white nor-black; of-the-others it is three-fold.—167.

इतरेषां तु विद्यते कर्माशये यतः । कर्माशुक्लाकृष्णं योगिनस्त्रिविधमितरेषाम् । चतुष्पात्खद्विर्यं कर्मजातः । कृष्णा शुक्लकृष्णा शुक्लाऽशुक्लाकृष्णा चेति । तत्र कृष्णा दुरात्मनाम् । शुक्ला तपः स्वाध्यायध्यानवताम् । सा हि केवले मनस्यायत्तत्त्वाद् बहिः साधनानधीना न परान्पीडयित्वा भवति । अशुक्लाकृष्णा संन्यासिनां क्षीणक्लेशानां चरमदेहानामिति । तत्राशुक्लं योगिन एव फलसंन्यासादकृष्णं चानुपादानात् । इतरेषां तु भूतानां पूर्वमेव त्रिविधमिति ॥ ७ ॥

VYĀSA.

The vehicle of actions exists in the case of others. Hence, 'A Yogi's karma is neither white nor black; of the others it is three-fold.'

This class of actions has four locations: the black, the black-white, the white, nor white nor black. Of these, the black is of the wicked. The black-white is brought about by external means, as in this the vehicle of actions grows by means of causing pain to, or acting kindly towards others.

The white is of those who resort to the means of improvement of study and meditation. This is dependent upon the mind alone. It does not depend upon external means and is not, therefore, brought about by injuring others.

The one which is neither white nor black exists in the case of those who have renounced everything (the Sannyāsis), whose afflictions have been destroyed, and whose present body is the last one, they will have. It is not white in the case of a Yogi, because he gives up the fruit of action; and it is not black, because he does not perform actions. Of the other creatures, it is of the three former descriptions only.—167.

VĀCHASPATI'S GLOSS.

Says that the others are possessed of the vehicles, with the object of showing the differences of the other minds from the meditation-born, which is not possessed of the vehicles:—'In the case of others, &c.'

In the same connection he introduces the aphorism as describing the cause thereof:—'A Yogi's karma is neither black nor white; of the others it is three-fold.'

'Has four locations'—Location means place (of manifestation). It has four locations because it manifests in four such places.

'Brought about by external means'—In all such cases injury is sure to be caused to others. It is not that even in action done for the preparation of barley, &c., for food, &c., there exists no injury. It is possible that ants, &c., might be killed at the time of pounding them, and finally the arrangement is that trunk, &c., are produced by the destruction of seeds as such.

'Acting kindly' means the favouring of Brāhmaṇas, &c., by giving them presents, &c. The white is of those who are not Sannyāsis, but who perform purificatory action, study and meditation. He shows how it is white:—'This is dependent upon the mind alone, &c.'

That which is neither white nor black, is the karma of the Sannyāsis (those who have renounced everything. He shows who are the Sannyāsis:—'Whose afflictions have been destroyed, &c.')

Those who have renounced actions (the karma-sannyāsis) are not anywhere found performing actions which depend upon external means. They have not got the black vehicle of actions, because they do not perform such actions. Nor do they possess the white vehicle of actions, because they dedicate to Īśvara the fruits of the vehicle of action brought about by the practice of Yoga. That whose fruit is not bad, is called white. That which has no fruit itself, how can it have any bad fruit?

Having thus described the four-fold division of karma, now he specifies which refers to which:—'Of these it is not white, &c.'—7.

Sūtra 8.

ततस्तद्विपाकानुगुणानामेवाभिव्यक्तिर्वासनानाम् ॥ ८ ॥

ततः Tataḥ, thence. तद् Tad, their (of residual potencies). विपाक Vipāka, fruition. अनुगुण Anuguṇa, following. विपाकानुगुणानाम् Vipākānugūṇānām, of those that are competent to bring about their fruition. एव Eva, only. अभिव्यक्तिः Abhivyaktiḥ, the manifestation, proceeding. वासनानाम् Vāsanānām, of the residual potencies.

8. Thence proceed the residual-potencies competent-to-bring-about their fruition alone.—168.

ततस्तद्विपाकानुगुणानामेवाभिव्यक्तिर्वासनानाम् । तत इति त्रिविधात्कर्मणस्तद्विपाकानुगुणानामेवेति । यज्ञातीयस्य कर्मणेन यो विपाकस्तस्यानुगुणा या वासनाः कर्मविपाकमनुसरेते तासामेवाभिव्यक्तिः । नहि दैवं कर्म विपच्यमानं नारकतिर्यङ्मनुष्यवासनाभिव्यक्तिनिमित्तं संभवति । किंतु दैवानुगुणा एवास्य वासना व्यज्यन्ते । नारकतिर्यङ् मनुष्येषु चैवं समानश्चर्चः ॥ ८ ॥

VYĀSA.

'Thence' means from the three-fold karma.

'Competent to bring about the fruition thereof.' Whatever is the fruition of whichever class of karma, such residual potencies only as are competent to bring about the fruition of those actions, are manifested. When the karma relating to the state of the gods is fructifying, the residual which are adequate to the state of the hell-born, the animals and men cannot manifest. On the contrary, it is only the impressions which are

adequate to the state of the gods that are manifested. The operation of the rule is the same in the case of the hell-born, the human and the animal tendencies.—168.

VĀCHASPATI'S GLOSS.

Having ascertained the vehicle of actions, now he describes the developments of the vehicle of afflictions:—'Thence manifested the residual potencies competent to bring about their fruition.' He describes the impressions which are competent to bring about the life-state, life-experience and life-period, whether hellish or divine, which are the results of the fruition of good and bad karma:—'The residual potencies competent to bring about the fruition thereof.' The residua which are born of divine experience are competent to bring about the fruition of divine karma. It is not possible that in the case of the manifestation of the residua of human experiences, the enjoyment of the fruitage of divine actions should take place. For this reason the impressions whose manifestation is brought about by karma are of the same class as the fruition thereof. This is the meaning of the Commentary.—8

Sūtra 9.

जातिदेशकालव्यवहितानामप्यानन्तर्यं स्मृतिसंस्कारयोरेकरूपत्वात् ॥ ९ ॥

जाति Jāti, of life state. देश Deśa, of locality. काल Kāla, of time. व्यवहितानाम् Vyavahitānām, these being distinct. अपि Api, even. आनन्तर्यम् Ānantaryam, sequential non-interruption. स्मृति Smṛiti, of memory. संस्कारयोः Saṁskārayoḥ, and of potential residue. एकरूपत्वात् Ekarūpātvaṭ, because of their being the same in appearance.

9. Memory and potential-residua being the same in appearance, there is sequential non-interruption, even when there is distinction of life-state, locality and time.—169.

जातिदेशकालव्यवहितानामप्यानन्तर्यं स्मृतिसंस्कारयोरेकरूपत्वात् । वृषदंशविपाकोदयः स्वव्यञ्जकाञ्जनाभिव्यक्तः । स यदि जातिशतेन वा दूरदेशतया वा कल्पशतेन वा व्यवहितः पुनश्च स्वव्यञ्जकाञ्जन एवाद्याद्रागित्येवं पूर्वानुभूतवृषदंशविपाकाभिसंस्कृता वासना उपादाय व्यजेत । कस्मात् । यतो व्यवहितानामप्यासां सदृशं कर्माभिव्यञ्जकं निमित्तीभूतमित्यानन्तर्यमेव । कुतश्च स्मृतिसंस्कारयोरेकरूपत्वात् । यथानुभवास्तथा संस्काराः । ते च कर्मवासनारूपाः । यथा च वासनास्तथा स्मृतिरिति । जातिदेशकालव्यवहितेभ्यः संस्कारेभ्यः स्मृतिः स्मृतेश्च पुनः संस्कारा इत्येवमेतैस्मृतिसंस्काराः कर्माशयवृत्तिलाभवशाद्भवन्त्येव । अतश्च व्यवहितानामपि निमित्तनैमित्तिकभावानुच्छेदादानन्तर्यमेव सिद्धमिति । वासनाः संस्कारा आशया इत्यर्थः ॥ ९ ॥

VYĀSA.

The rise of fruition in the shape of a cat takes place by virtue of the powers competent to show them forth. Even if that rise is separated even by a hundred life-states, or by distance in space, or by a hundred

kalpas, it will rise whenever it does, by the operation of its own appropriate cause. Thus will it appear again by taking up the residua which are present in the mind on account of the experience of the feline state in some former life. Why? Because even if there be an interval between them, the residua are manifested by the similar manifesting karma becoming the operative cause thereof. Thus there is but sequential appearance. And for what other reason? Because memory and residual potency are but one in appearance. As are the experiences, such are the residual potencies; and they are of the nature of the residua of actions. And memory is similar to the residua. Memory comes by the residual potencies separated therefrom by life-state and by time and space. From memory come again residual potencies. Thus it is that memory and residual potency are manifested by virtue of the vehicle of action coming into manifestation. Thus even though separated in time, &c., there is sequential non-interruption, inasmuch as the relation of cause and effect does not break.

The Vāsanas (aroma) are residual potencies, the vehicles.—169.

VĀCHASPATI'S GLOSS.

Let that be. But, when the state of a cat is put on after the death of a man, it must be due to the manifestation of the residua of the human state of existence, inasmuch as the one immediately follows the other. It is not possible that the experience of the day immediately preceding be not remembered, but that the experiences of another day more distant therefrom be remembered. For this reason he says:—'There is sequential non-interruption, even when there is separation in time, life-state and space, on account of the memory and residual potency being the same in appearance.' There may be separation in life-state, &c., from the life of a cat. Still there is non-interruption on account of the fruit thereof, because the same memory is generated when the manifestation is according to its own fruit and in consonance with karma which must fructify into the feline state. 'The rise of a state' is the vehicle of action, because it is from this state that the fruition arises. Further it takes its rise in accordance with its own manifesting cause.

'Manifestation' means tending towards the beginning of fruition.

'Thus will it rise again by taking up the residua which are, &c.' The meaning is that if it does manifest, it would manifest by taking up the residua which manifest its own fruition.

Having established the absence of interruption through the operation of the cause, now he establishes the same through the operation of the effect:—'And for what other reason?'

'One in appearance' means similarity. He says the same:—'As are the experiences, &c.'

The question is that if the experiences are of the same appearance as the residual potencies, then inasmuch as the experiences are seen disappearing very soon, the potencies also must be taken as disappearing very soon. That being the case, how is it possible that the potencies, being subject to speedy dispersion, should be competent to bring about experiences, after a great lapse of time?

For this reason he says :—'And they are of the nature of the residua of actions.' As the new residuum brought about by momentary action is permanent, so also is the potency generated by momentary experience. There must always be some difference in similarity. If it were otherwise and there were no difference, there would be no similarity. The rest is easy.—9.

Sūtra 10.

तासामनादित्वं चाशिषो नित्यत्वात् ॥ १० ॥

तासाम् Tāsām, for them. अनादित्वम् Anāditvam, no beginning. च Cha, and. आशिषः Āśiṣah, of the desire to live. नित्यत्वात् Nityatvāt, owing to the eternity.

10. And there is no-beginning for them, the desire-to-live being eternal.—170.

तासामनादित्वं चाशिषो नित्यत्वात् । तासां वासनानामाशिषो नित्यत्वादानादित्वम् । येयमात्माशीर्मानभूवं भूयासमिति सर्वस्य दृश्यते सा न स्वाभाविकी । कस्मात् । जातमात्रस्याननुभूतमरणधर्मकस्य द्वेषो दुःखानुस्मृतिनिमित्तो मरणवासः कथं भवेत् । न च स्वाभाविकं वस्तु निमित्तमुपादत्ते । तस्मादनादिवासनानुद्भिद्भिर्निमित्तं चित्तं निमित्तवशात्काश्चिदेव वासनाः प्रतिलभ्य पुत्रस्य भोगाद्येपावर्तत इति । घटप्रासादप्रदीपकल्पं संकोचविकासि चित्तं शरीरपरिमाणकारमात्रमित्यपरे प्रतिपन्नाः । तथा चान्तराभावः संसारश्च युक्त इति । वृत्तिरेवाव्य विभुनश्चित्तस्य संकोचविकासिनोत्याचार्यः । तच्च धर्मादिनिमित्तापेक्षम् । निमित्तं च द्विविधम् । बाह्यमाध्यात्मिकं च । शरीरादिसाधनापेक्षं बाह्यं स्तुतिदानाभिवादानादिचित्तमात्राधीनं श्रद्धाद्याध्यात्मकम् । तथा चोक्तम् ये चैते मैत्र्यादयो ध्यायिनां विहारस्ते बाह्यसाधननिरनुग्रहात्मानः प्रकृष्टं धर्ममभिलिखन्ति तयोर्मानसं बलीयः कथं ज्ञानवैराग्ये केनातिशयेते दण्डकारण्यं च चित्तवलयतिरेकेण शरीरेण कर्मणा शून्यं कः कर्तुं मुत्सहेत समुद्रमगस्त्यवद्वा पिबेत् ॥ १० ॥

VYĀSA.

There is no beginning for them, the residua, inasmuch as the desire are ever present. The desire, 'Would that I may not cease to be,' 'Would that I may live on,' is found in everybody. This self-benediction is not inherent. Why not? How could there be fear of death and desire to avoid pain, in any being who has only been born, if he has had no experience of liability to death, it being understood that desire to avoid anything is only caused by remembrance suffered in consequence thereof; and that nothing which is inherent in anything stands in need of a cause. The mind, therefore, possessed as it is of residua from eternity, brings into activity by the operation of exciting causes, certain residua only, for the purpose of giving experience to the Puruṣa.

Some philosophers say that the mind has only a form which is commensurate with the body with which it may, for the time, be connected;

it contracts or expands like light placed in a jar or a house as the case might be. And thus they say that non-interruption and repeated are proper. The author holds that it is the manifestation alone of the self-existing mind that expands or contracts, and that it is this which has the necessity of the operation of the exciting causes of virtue, &c.

These exciting causes are two-fold, external and internal. The external are those that stand in need of body, &c., as instrument, such as praising, giving of charity, and the performance of obeisances. The internal are those that stand in need of the mind alone, such as faith, &c. And so it has been said :—'These acts of friendliness, &c., are the sports of the thinkers; they do not from their very nature depend upon external causes, and cause the expression of the highest virtue.'

Of these two means the mental ones are more powerful. How? What can excel knowledge and desirelessness? Who can without the power of the mind render the Dandaka forest empty, or drink the ocean like Agastya, by the mere action of the mind alone?—170.

VĀCHASPATI'S GLOSS.

It may be so. The residua laid by in a former and yet again in a former life may manifest themselves, if there be authority for the existence of previous and further previous lives. But there is no authority for such a proposition. Merely the pleasure and pain felt by a creature just born cannot be accepted as authority, because that can be explained by taking it to be natural, like the budding and opening of a lotus flower.

For this reason he says :—'And there is no beginning for them, the desire to live being eternal.'

The meaning of 'and' is that the residua are not only un-interrupted in their fruition, but they are eternal as well, because self-benediction, the desire to live is ever-present. Self-benediction does not fall short of eternity, on account of the residua being eternal.

But inasmuch as this is established by taking them to be inherent, the eternity of self-benediction is not established.

For this reason he says :—'The self-benediction, &c.'

The unbeliever asks :—'Why?' The answer is :—'Of the creature who is just born, &c.' For this very reason, how should it be that a child who has not experienced his liability to death in the present life, who does not know, that is to say, from the experience of the present life that death also is a characteristic of his, should, as he may be falling away from the mother's lap, begin to tremble and hold with his hands tightly the necklace hanging on her breast, marked with the suspicious discus, &c? And how is it that such a child should experience the fear of death, which can only be caused by the memory of the pain consequent upon aversion to death, whose existence is inferred by the trembling of the child.

Well, has it not been said that this is inherent and natural?

For this reason he says :—'Anything that is inherent, does not stand in need of an operating cause for its birth.' This is the meaning. Such a trembling as becomes visible in the child must be due to fear, just like our own trembling of the same description. The fear of the child must be taken to have been caused by the memory of aversion and

pain, for the reason that it is fear just like our own, and the fear due to expected losses that might be coming, is not brought about by the mere memory of pain. Further, from whatever one is afraid, he infers to be the cause of some loss, and then expects that loss would even now cause pain. For this reason pain is caused by the aversion brought about by the memory of pain. Remembering that he infers the cause of pain, which is of the same class which is being felt at the time. The child, however, has not in the present life experienced the pain of falling in any other place. Nor has that sort of pain been felt. Thence the experience of a former life only remains as the explanation, by the canon of residues.

And this is thus applied. The memory of the child just born is due to the experience of former lives, because otherwise it would not be memory. It acts just like our own memory. Even the budding and opening of a lotus is not inherent, because what is inherent in anything, does not stand in need of any other cause for its manifestation. Even fire stands in need of other causes for the manifestation of its heat. In the same way, the cause of the opening of a lotus flower is the contact from outside of the rays of the rising sun : and the cause of the shutting up of the petals is the residual potency, which maintains the inactivity. Similarly the happiness of a baby which is inferred from smiles, etc., should also be considered a proof of a previous life.

An 'exciting cause' is action just in point at the time of fruition. 'Bringing into operation,' means manifestation.

As the context demands, he mentions the opposite theory of the mind having a measure, with the object of refuting it :—'The mind contracts and expands like light in a jar or a place, etc.'

Seeing that action takes place only where the body is found to be, there is no authority for the existence of the mind at any place outside the body. The mind further is not atomic in size, because in that case it would mean the simultaneous non-production of the five sorts of sensation when the large cake is devoured. Further there is no justification for adopting the theory that there is a succession in the case of these sensations, and that they are not being felt simultaneously. No such thing is seen. One atomic mind cannot be competent to come into relationship with the sensations located in more places than one. Hence the only theory that remains is that, the mind is of the dimensions of the body it inhabits, like the light of lamp which is confined either to a jar or a palace. Contraction and expansion of the mind in the bodies of an ant and an elephant manifest themselves therein. The opposite theorists thus say that the form, i. e., the dimensions of the mind are the same as those of the body.

The question arises that if it be so, how can it come into contact with the seed and the field? It does not certainly go out of the dead body without any support, to come into contact with the germ and sperm cells in the bodies of the parents, being dependent as it is for its actions upon others. The shadow of a pillar and such other things does not move if the things themselves do not move. Nor do the pictures disappear, when the picture cloth comes in. This being so, there would not be evolution of souls through births and deaths (Samsāra).

For this reason he says :—'For this reason the absence of interruption and for that reason Samsāra is proper.'

And further, if there were a measure for it like that of the body, then the leaving of the former body and the taking up of the other body would be secured for it, by taking in the interval another body which would serve for it as a vehicle for the intermediate space. It is of course along with this vehicle that it moves in the other body. So also says the Purāna :—'The Yama drew out of the body with force the Puruṣa of the size of

the thumb.' This then is the meaning of the absence of interval (Antara). And for this reason evolution by repeated birth is proper.

Not agreeing with this view, the author states his own theory :—'It is the manifestation alone of the self-existing mind that contracts and expands.' The Āchārya (author) here is the Svayambhu.

The doubt here is that if the mind cannot move into another body without some vehicle to support it on its way, how is it that it enters the intermediate vehicle itself? If another body is posited for that purpose also, then there would be no stopping anywhere. Nor is it possible that the mind should go out of the body along with the intermediary vehicle, because it is understood to take up the intermediary vehicle after it has left the previous body.

In that case let us posit a subtle body, existing permanently from the beginning of creation up to the Great Latency. It would then be that this subtle body would remain in the physical body, and it is along with this that the mind would enter the bodies appropriate to the different regions from the Satyaloka down to the Avichi. It would further be proper to speak of this body as being drawn out, because that being permanent, the difficulty of providing for an interval would also disappear.

But then there is no authority for such a proposition, that a subtle body of this description exists. It is certainly not visible to the senses. Nor can it be inferred as a necessity of evolution by passing from one body to another, because that can be explained even on the theory of the author. As to the verbal authority cited, the texts speak of the being drawn out of the Puruṣa, not of the mind, nor of a subtle body, but of the self. The self, however, the power of consciousness is non-transferable from one place to another. This drawing out, therefore, is to be described as being spoken of in a metaphorical sense. And thus the drawing out of the mind or of consciousness means wherever it may be, the absence of manifestation. It does not mean anything else.

We allow what has been said in the Purāṇas, the Itihāsas and the Smṛitis about the mind coming after death possess the body of a Preta (departed spirit) and also the release from that Preta body by the performance of the ceremonies of Sapiṇḍikaraṇa, etc. But we do not submit to that body being the intermediary vehicle. There is no authority in the Vedas for the existence of such an intermediary vehicle. What happens is that the mind takes up the body of a Preta, and is therein taken away by the men of Yama ; not that this body serves as the intermediary vehicle. For this reason, the mind being of the nature of the principle of individuality, and that principle like Ākāśa in all the three worlds, the mental principle is all-pervading.

If this be so, then its functioning also must be all-pervading, and this would mean that the mind is omniscient. For this reason, has it been said, that the manifestation alone of this all-pervading principle is liable to contract or expand.

Let us grant that, but then how is it that the contraction and expansion of the manifestation of the mind take place only now and then. For this reason he says :—'And the mind has need of virtue and vice.'

Divides the cause of the manifestation :—'And the cause is two-fold.'

By the, '&c.' in body, &c., the senses and wealth, &c., are meant.

'Faith, &c.' :—Here too energy, memory, &c., are to be understood.

Mentions the consensus of opinion of the Āchāryas, on the question of intermediation :—'As has been said.'

Vihāra means activity (Vyāpāra).

The 'highest virtue' means the white Karma.

'Of the two' :—Out of the internal and external.

Knowledge and desirelessness :—The Dharmā born of these is understood here.

By what? This means by what Dharma brought about by external means. It is knowledge and desirelessness alone that overpower these, i.e., destroy their seed-power. This is the meaning.

He mentions in this case the well-known illustration.—'The Daṇḍaka forest empty.'—10.

Sūtra 11.

हेतुफलाश्रयालम्बनैः संगृहीतत्वादेषामभावे तदभावः ॥ ११ ॥

हेतु Hetu, cause. फल Phala, motive. आश्रय Āśraya, substratum. आलम्बन Ālambana, object by all these four. संगृहीतत्वात् Saṅgrihitatvāt, being held together. एषान् Eṣān, of these. अभावे Abhāve, on the disappearance. तद् Tad, of them. अभावः Abhāvaḥ, disappearance.

11. Being held together by Cause, Motive, Substratum and Object they disappear on-the-disappearance of these.—171.

हेतुफलाश्रयालम्बनैः संगृहीतत्वादेषामभावे तदभावः । हेतुर्धर्मात्सुखमधर्माद्दुःखम् । सुखाद्रागो दुःखाद् द्वेषस्ततश्च प्रयत्नस्तेन मनसा वाचा कायेन वा परिस्पन्दमानः परमनुगृह्यात्युपहन्ति वा ततः पुनर्धर्माधर्मौ सुखदुःखे रागद्वेषाविति । प्रवृत्तिमिदं षडक्षरं संसारचक्रमस्य च प्रतिक्षणमावर्तमानस्याविद्या नेत्री मूलं सर्वकृद् शानामित्येष हेतुः । फलं तु यमाश्रित्य यस्य प्रत्युत्पन्नता धर्मादेः । नह्यपूर्वोपजनः । मनस्तु साधिकारमाश्रयो वासनानाम् । नह्यवसिताधिकारे मनसि निराश्रया वासनाः स्थातुमुत्सहन्ते । यदभिमुखीभूतं वस्तु यां वासनां व्यनक्ति तस्यास्तदालम्बनम् । एवं हेतुफलाश्रयालम्बनैरैतैः संगृहीताः सर्वा वासनाः । एषामभावे तत्संश्रयाणामपि वासनानामभावः ॥ ११ ॥

VYĀSA.

The cause :—By virtue comes pleasure, by vice pain. From pleasure comes attachment ; from pain aversion. Thence comes effort. Thereby, acting by mind, body and speech, one either favours or injures others. Thence come again virtue and vice, pleasure and pain, attachment and aversion. Thus it is that revolves the six-spoked wheel of the world. And the driver of this wheel is Nescience, the root of the afflictions. This is the Cause.

Motive or Fruit is that with a view to which appropriate virtue, &c., is brought about. There is no non-sequential manifestation.

The Substratum is the mind which has yet a duty to perform. It is there that the residua live. They no longer care to live in a mind which has already performed its duty ; their substratum is gone.

The Object (ālambana) of the residua is the substance which when placed in contact calls them forth.

Thus are all the residua held together by Cause, Fruit, Substratum and Object.

When these exist not, the residua which depend upon them for existence, disappear too.—171.

VACHASPATI'S GLOSS.

Now if these mental modifications and the residua are without beginning, how can they be destroyed? The power of consciousness which is eternal is not destroyed. For this reason he says:—'Being held together by Cause, Fruit, Substratum and Object, they disappear in the absence of these.'

It is observed that those that have no beginning are also destroyed. Take, for example, the case of futurity. The proposition, therefore, fails and is no proof. The power of consciousness is not destroyed, because there is cause which might cause its destruction, not because it has no beginning. And the aphorism too mentions the causes of the destruction of the residua although they are without a beginning. Kindness and injury too point to the causes of virtue and vice, &c. By this the use of spirituous liquors, &c., is also understood.

He mentions the reason thereof :—'The root of the afflictions, &c.'

'Is brought about' means that it is present. It does not mean that the substance virtue is produced.

Mentions reason thereof :—'There is no, &c.'

'With a view to which' means the substance which is in front, contact with the beloved, &c. The meaning of the aphorism is that, in the absence of the pervader the pervaded is absent.—11.

Sūtra 12.

अतीतानागतं स्वरूपतोऽस्त्यध्वभेदाद्धर्माणाम् ॥ १२ ॥

अतीत Atīta, the past. अनगतं Anāgatam, the future. स्वरूपतः Svarūpatāḥ, in reality. अस्ति Asti, exist. अश्व Adhva, of the paths of being. भेदात् Bhedāt, there being difference. धर्माणाम् Dharmāṇām, of the characteristics.

12. The past and the future exist in-reality, there being difference of the paths of being of the characteristics.—172.

नास्त्यसतः सम्भवः । न चास्ति सतो विनाश इति द्रव्यत्वेन सम्भवन्त्यः कथं निवर्तिष्यन्ते वासना इति । अतीतानागतं स्वरूपतोऽस्त्यध्वभेदाद्धर्माणाम् । भविष्यद्द्रव्यत्तिकमनागतमनुभूतव्यक्तिकमतीतं स्वव्यापारोपारूढं वर्तमानं त्रयं चैतद्वस्तु ज्ञानस्य ज्ञेयम् । यदि चैतत्स्वरूपतो नाभविष्यन्नेदं निर्विषयं ज्ञानमुदपत्स्यत तस्मादतीतानागतं स्वरूपतोऽस्तीति । किंच भोगभागीयस्य वा पवर्गभागीयस्य वा कर्मणः फलमुत्पित्सु यदि निरूपाख्यमिति तदुद्देशेन तेन निमित्ते न कुशलानुष्ठानं न युज्येत । सतश्च फलस्य निमित्तं वर्तमानिकरणे समर्थं नापूर्वोपजनने सिद्धं निमित्तं नैमित्तिकस्य विशेषानुग्रहं कुस्ते नापूर्वमुत्पादयतीति । धर्मी चानेकधर्मस्वभावतस्य चाध्वभेदेन धर्मा प्रत्यवस्थिताः । न च यथावर्तमानं व्यक्तिविशेषापन्नं द्रव्यतोऽस्त्येवमतीतमनागतं च । कथं तर्हि स्वेनैव व्यङ्ग्येन स्वरूपेणानागतमस्ति स्वेन चानुभूतव्यक्तिकेन स्वरूपेणातीतमिति । वर्तमानस्यैवाध्वनः स्वरूपव्यक्तिरिति । न सा भवत्यतीतानागतयोरध्वनोरैकस्य चाध्वनः समये द्वावध्वानौ धर्मिसमन्वागतौ भवत एवेति नाभूत्वा भावस्त्रयाणामध्वानामिति ॥ १२ ॥

VYĀSA.

There is no existence for that which exists not, and no destruction for what exists. How then can residua which exist as substances be destroyed? 'The past and the present exist in reality, there being difference of the paths of being of the characteristics.'

The future is the manifestation which is to be. The past is the appearance which has been experienced. The present is that which is in active operation. It is this three-fold substance which is the object of knowledge. If they did not exist in reality, there would not exist the knowledge thereof. How could there be knowledge in the absence of anything that might be known. For this reason the past and the present exist in reality. Further, if the fruit of either the actions which cause experience, or those which cause absolute freedom were impossible of being defined for the aspirer, the actions of the wise with that aim and object would not be proper. And the means has the power of only bringing into the present state the actually existing though as yet unmanifested fruit, not of creating it anew. The means when in full manifestation specifically favours the sequential manifestation of its object; it does not create it anew.

Besides, the substratum exists as characterized by more characteristics than one; and its characteristics have a distinct order of existence in consequence of the distinctions of the paths of being.

It is not that the past and the future states of the object exist in substance in the same sense in which the specific appearance of the present exists. How then? The future exists as an appearance in itself to be manifested. The past exists by an appearance of its own which has been experienced. The present path of being alone is that which shows its own appearance as such. The same does not happen with reference to the past and the future paths of being. Of course at the time of one of these paths of being, the others remain conjoined with the substratum. Hence the existence of the three paths of being does not come out of non-existence.—172.

VĀCHASPATI'S GLOSS.

With the object of introducing the next aphorism the Commentator expresses a doubt:—'There is no existence for the non-existing, &c.'

There is no existence for the non-existent:—This may either be taken as a necessary sequence of the preceding, or, it may be taken as having been introduced anew as an illustration.

'The past and the future really exist, there being difference of the paths of being of the characteristics.'

The non-existent is not born and the existent is not destroyed. The meaning of the aphorism is that the change of the path of being of the existing characteristics alone

means the rise and disappearance of the characteristics. The appearance which has been experienced, means the appearance which it has taken up already, or in other words, that of which there is no manifestation in the present. Thus the characteristic is existent in all three times.

He says this:—'If they did not exist in reality, &c.' The non-existent does not become the object of knowledge: it is therefore indefinable.

Knowledge is but the shining out of its object in consciousness. It cannot exist in the absence of the object. Whether it be the knowledge of the Yogī which has all the three times for its sphere of operation, or the knowledge of men like ourselves, it cannot be born in the absence of the object. But the knowledge is born. For this reason, the knowledge of him who feels that the past and the future ordinarily exist along with the present, is said to be a reason for the existence of the object itself.

Now he says that even on account of its being the aim (the object of action) the yet unmanifested exists:—'Further, the fruit of either the action which causes experience, &c.'

The wise are those who can distinguish. And even in the case of what is to be done, whatever may be the cause of whatever, becomes specialized in case of the existence of the object alone. As is the case with the farmer and the student of the Veda, so is the case here. They do not certainly create non-existing things. Similarly, the potter, &c., are the causes of the coming into present existence of the jar which already exists. He says this:—'And the means has only the power of bringing the future into present existence, &c.' If, however, the past and the future do not exist because they do not exist in the present, why then, the present also does not exist, because it does not exist in the past and the future. The existence of all the three, however, is unqualified, on account of there being no specialization of the substratum, and the paths of being. With this object he says:—'Besides a substratum exists, &c.'

Have a distinct order of existence:—This means that each exists established in itself.

In reality: means the real object, the substratum.

If the past and the future did not exist as such in the past and the future, they would not exist even in the present, because then, they would be nothing in reality. For this reason he says:—'Of course at the time of one of these paths of being, &c.'

He summarizes the subject:—'Hence the existence of the three paths of being, &c.'—12.

Sūtra 13.

ते व्यक्तसूक्ष्मा गुणात्मानः ॥ १३ ॥

ते Te, they. व्यक्त Vyakta, manifested. सूक्ष्मः Sūkṣmāḥ, and subtle. गुणात्मानः Guṇa-Ātmāṇaḥ, and of the nature of the (आत्मन्) qualities (गुण).

13. They are manifested and subtle, and of the nature of the qualities.—173.

ते व्यक्तसूक्ष्मा गुणात्मानः । ते खल्वमी व्यध्वानो धर्मा वर्तमाना व्यक्तमानोऽती-
तानागतः सूक्ष्मात्मानः पञ्चविशेषरूपाः । सर्वमिदं गुणानां सन्नियेशविशेषमात्रमिति ।
परमार्थतो गुणात्मानस्तथा च शास्त्रानुशासनम् । गुणानां परमं रूपं न दृष्टिपथमृच्छति ।
यत्तु दृष्टिपथं प्राप्तं तन्मायेव सुतुच्छकमिति ॥ १३ ॥

VYĀSA

They, *i.e.*, these characteristics which are possessed of the three paths of being, are of the nature of the manifested, when they exist in

the present, and are of the nature of the subtle when they passed into the past or are yet unmanifested. They are the six unspecialized appearances. All this is but the specific arrangement of the 'qualities.' In truth, therefore, they are of the nature of the 'qualities.' So teaches the Śāstra:—'The real appearance of the qualities does not come within the line of vision. That, however, which comes within the line, is but paltry delusion.'—173.

VĀCHASPATI'S GLOSS.

Let that be. This detail, however, of the differences of the world which puts forth the appearance of the changes of the characterized, the characteristic, the secondary quality and condition in many ways, is not capable of appearance from one Mūlaprakṛiti. For this reason says:—They are manifested and subtle and of the nature of the 'qualities.' They, the characteristics possessed of the three paths of being, are both manifested and subtle, and they are of the nature of the qualities. There is nothing beyond the three qualities. The variety of manifestation is due to the variety which comes in sequence of the eternal miseries and their residua which they have given birth to.

As has been said in the Vāyu Purāṇa:—This change of the Pradhāna is wonderful on account of showing forth all appearances. It is the six unspecialized manifestations, which in such a way as it may be, constitute the past, the present and the future of the manifested Pṛithvī, &c., and of the eleven instruments of action, sensation and thought.

Now describes the eternal appearance of the universe, with the object of dividing the appearances thereof into the eternal and the non-eternal: All this is but the specific appearance of the 'qualities.' The meaning is that evolutionary changes which are visible, consist of different arrangements and forms. On this subject is the teaching of the Śāstra possessed of sixty Tantras.

'Is but paltry delusion':—This means that it is paltry as if it were delusion, not that it is delusion and nothing else. Paltry means destructible. As delusion changes even in a day, so also the modifications possessing the characteristics of manifestation and disappearance assume other appearances every second. The Prakṛiti is possessed of the characteristic of eternity, and in this way is different from the Māyā, it is so far real.—13.

Sūtra 14.

परिणामैकत्वाद्भस्तुतत्त्वम् ॥ १४ ॥

परिणाम Paripāma, of modification. एकत्वात् Ekatvāt, on account of the unity. वस्तु Vastu, of the object. तत्त्वम् Tattvam, the reality.

14. The reality of the object on account of the unity of modification.—174.

यदा तु सर्वे गुणाः कथमेकः शब्द एकमिन्द्रियमिति । परिणामैकत्वाद्भस्तुतत्त्वम् । प्रख्याक्रियास्थितिशीलानां गुणानां ग्रहणात्मकानां करणभावेनैकः परिणामः । श्रोत्रमिन्द्रियं ग्राह्यात्मकानां शब्दतन्मात्रभावेनैकः परिणामः शब्दो विषय इति । शब्दादीनां मूर्ति-समानजातीयानामेकः परिणामः पृथिवीपरमाणुस्तन्मात्रावयवस्तेषां चैकः परिणामः पृथिवी गौवृक्षः पर्वत इत्येवमादिर्भूतान्तरेष्वपि स्नेहौषध्यप्रणामित्वावकाशदानान्युपादाय सामा-

न्यमेकविकारारम्भः समाधेयः । नास्त्यर्थो विज्ञानविसहचरः । अस्ति तु ज्ञानमर्थविसहचरं स्वप्नादौ कल्पितमित्यनया दिशा ये वस्तुस्वरूपमपह्नवते ज्ञानपरिकल्पनामात्रं वस्तु । स्वप्नविषयोपमं तु न परमार्थतोऽस्तीति ये आहुस्ते तर्हेति । प्रत्युपस्थितमिदं स्वमाहात्म्येन वस्तु कथमप्रमाणात्मकेन विकल्पज्ञानबलेन वस्तुस्वरूपमुत्सृज्य तदेवापलपन्तः श्रद्धेय-वचनाः स्युः ॥ १४ ॥

VYĀSA.

When all are 'qualities,' how is it that one modification is sound and the other the sense? 'The reality of the object on account of unity of modification.' One modification of the qualities possessed of the nature of illumination, activity and inertia, and being of the nature of an instrument, appears in the shape of organs. This is the sense of hearing. Another modification of the 'qualities' appears in the objective state as the soniferous ultimate atom (Śabda Tanmātra). This is the object sound.

The atom of Pṛithvī is a modification of sound, &c., existing along with the generic quality of form (mūrti). It is a portion of the tanmātra. Single modifications of these atoms are the earth, the cow, the tree, the hill and so forth. In the case of other elements also, taking up the generic qualities of smoothness, temperature, impulsion and space, single modifications are to be understood by meditation.

There is no object not co-existent with ideas. There are, however, ideas, which are not co-existent with objects, such as those that are fancied in dreams.

There are people who try to do away with the reality of objects by this reasoning, saying that objects are but the fabrications of the mind, like the fancies of a dream, and that they are nothing real. The objective world is present by its own power. How is it that they give up the objective world on the strength of imaginative cognition, and even then go on talking nonsense about it? How is it possible to have faith in them?—174.

VĀCHASPATI'S GLOSS.

Well there may be this sort of variety of modification of the three qualities. But how is a single modification brought about in the shape of any one element, say the Pṛithvī or the Apas. This unity is contradicted by its nature. With this doubt the author introduces the aphorism:—'The reality of the object on account of the unity of modification.' A single modification of more than one is also observed. That as follows:—The cow, the horse, the buffalo, the elephant, all of them modify into a single substance, the salt, when they are thrown into a mine of salt. Wick, oil and fire change into a lamp. In this way, although the qualities are more than one, a single modification does take place. For this reason, the Tanmātra, the elements and the objects made of the elements have each a real unity.

In the case of instrumental appearances, being as they are the effects of the principle of individuality, and possessed as they are of the nature of illumination on account of the preponderance of the quality of essentiality (Sattva), the modification is a single one in

the shape of an organ, such as the organ of hearing. Of the same qualities, another single modification in the shape of Tanmātra is sound, the object, when they appear as objective phenomena, in the shape of non-intelligent appearances with the quality of Tamas preponderating.

Sound, the object :—Sound here means the soniferous ether (tanmātra). The word 'object' (viṣaya) signifies non-intelligence, because the tanmātra cannot possibly become the object of sensation. The rest is easy.

Now brings in the Vaiśeṣika with his idealistic theory :—'There is no object which is not co-existent with an idea.'

If the elements and physical objects be something different from mere ideation, then it may be that such a Prakṛiti be put up as the cause of their production. They are not, however, different from ideas in reality. How is it then that the Pradhāna is put up as a cause? How is it again that the instrumental appearances are fancied to exist as the modifications of the principle of individuality? Thus seeing that a non-intelligent object is not self-illuminative, it does not exist unless it co-exist with the idea. Co-existence means relation. The denial of co-existence means its absence. The meaning is that without coming into relationship with the idea it is of no use in practice. The idea, however, exists without being co-existent with the object, because it is self-illuminative. It can exist as its own field of knowledge. It does not stand in need of a non-intelligent object in practice. These are the two rules that are brought to notice by idealistic philosophers as going along with knowability. They are applied thus :—That which is known by any act of knowledge, does not differ therefrom, in the same way as knowledge does not differ from the self. And the elements and the physical phenomena thereof are known by an act of knowledge. This leads to a knowledge of the pervaded which contradicts it. Knowability as it is seen, is pervaded by similarity, which contradicts the difference to be denied, bringing into consciousness the similarity which pervades itself, it does away with the difference which contradicts it. Thus :—That which is perceived with something else always invariably, does not differ from it. Just as one moon does not differ from another moon. And an object is invariably perceived together with the idea. This knowledge is perceived as being contradictory of the pervader. It contradicts the rule of the pervader consisting of the difference to be denied. This rule does away with arbitrariness, and brings into consciousness the difference which consists in the pervaded.

Let it be. If the object is not different from the idea, how is it that it looks as if it were different. For this reason he says :—'Fancied &c.' As say the Vaiśeṣikas :—There is no difference on account of the rule of coincident perception. The difference between the yellow and the blue, &c., and their ideas, is brought about by delusive cognitions.

Explains the nature of the fancy :—'An object is merely an ideation,' &c. Refutes :—'How is it possible, &c.' This is connected with the words 'have faith in them.'

'Is present as contradictory knowledge' :—How is it present? 'In the way, &c.' In whatever way it shines as being the meaning of the word 'this,' in the same way it is present by its own power.

Now he shows that the object is the cause of the idea :—'Inasmuch as the object has given birth to the idea thereof by the power of its own perceptibility, it is not for this reason the perceiver of the object. Such a real object cannot be done away with by the unauthoritative force of imaginative cognitions. Inasmuch as imagination is unauthoritative, its power also is unauthoritative, because the power is of the same nature with it.

'The giving up of the objective world thereby' means ignoring it as if it were removed from sight.

In some places the reading is 'Upagrihyate' in place of 'Utspijyate.' The meaning is the same in either case. They ignore the existence of the outside world, and yet go on talking about it. How can there be faith in them? The meaning here is this. The causes which have been mentioned, *i. e.*, invariable coincident perception and knowability, are not final, because application to the canon of difference is doubtful. Further the externality and the grossness which are perceived to exist in the elements and the physical phenomena thereof, which possess the forms of the ideas, are not possible of existence in the case of ideas themselves. Because externality means being related to separate space. Grossness means the pervading of more portions of space than one. It is not possible that one idea may exist in more places than one, and also exist in a place separated from itself. When a certain thing exists in a certain place, there cannot exist in the same place, something else characterized by a quality opposite to the characteristic of being present in the same place. If it were possible the three worlds themselves would become but one.

It may be said, let then there be difference of ideas. If this be so, whence does this consciousness of grossness come in the case of notions, whose sphere of operations is very subtle, and which do not know of the existence and operation of each other, and which are only in relation to their own sphere of operation only. There should be no high talk about its being the sphere of imagination only, because there is in that case no contact and because the reflection is very clear. Further the gross has never been made the object of thought, so that the idea qualified thereby may be clearly perceived, even though at the back of it there may exist imaginative cognition. Further imagination is not confined to the knowledge of the thing itself as it exists in its own sphere, in the same way as knowledge free from the taint of imagination is. Further as imagination is not gross, it is not proper that it should be acting in the sphere of the gross. Therefore it is not possible that in the external cause there should be perceived grossness and externality, and hence it should be considered to be false. And the false is not inseparable from the idea, because if it were, the idea itself would become contemptible like the false, on account of its not comprehending everything. Further knowability being not pervaded by identity, how can it be the opposite of difference (bheda). As to the rule of coincidence of perception of the idea and of grossness, it is capable of explanation like that of the Sat and the Asat (the existent and the non-existent) either by their nature or by obstruction from some cause, even though both of them exist independently. Hence these two arguments are not complete, and are therefore merely false similitudes of arguments, and they merely give rise to an imaginary conception of the non-existence of the external. Further the power of perception cannot be done away with by mere imagination. It is therefore well said, 'How do they give up the objective world on the strength of imaginative cognitions?'

By this also stands refuted the assertion that notions may be generated without there being any actual basis for them, as in the case of dream cognitions.

The imaginative creation of the thing to be known, has been refuted by establishing the existence of the substratum, the whole as being independent of the parts. Details will be found in the Nyāya-Kanika. More details need not be entered into here.—14.

Sūtra 15.

वस्तुसाम्ये चित्तभेदात्तयोर्विभक्तः पन्थाः ॥ १५ ॥

वस्तु Vastu, in the case of the external object. साम्ये Sāmye, in the being the same. चित्त Chitta, of mentality. भेदात् Bhedāt, there being difference. तयोः Tayoh, their. विभक्तः Vibhaktah, different. पन्थाः Panthāh, ways of being.

15. There being difference of mentality in the case of the external-object being the same, their ways-of-being are different.—175.

कुतश्चैतदन्याय्यम् । वस्तुसाम्ये चित्तभेदात्तयोर्विभक्तः पन्थाः । बहुचित्तालम्ब-
नीभूतमेकं वस्तु साधारणं तत्खलु नैकचित्तपरिकल्पितं नाप्यनेकचित्तपरिकल्पितं किंतु
स्वप्रतिष्ठम् । कथं वस्तुसाम्ये चित्तभेदाद्धर्मापेक्षं चित्तस्य वस्तुसाम्येऽपि सुखज्ञानं भव-
त्यधर्मापेक्षं तत एव दुःखज्ञानमविद्यापेक्षं तत एव मूढज्ञानं सम्यग्दर्शनापेक्षं तत एव
माध्यस्थ्यज्ञानमिति । कस्य तच्चित्तेन परिकल्पितम् । न चान्यकल्पितेन चित्तेनार्थेनान्यस्य
चित्तोपरागो युक्तस्तस्माद्द्वस्तुज्ञानयोग्याह्यग्रहणभेदभिन्नयोर्विभक्तः पन्थाः । नानयोः सङ्क-
रान्धोऽप्यस्तीति । साङ्ख्यपक्षे वस्तु पुनस्त्रिगुणं चलं च गुणवृत्तमिति । धर्मादिनि-
मित्तापेक्षं चित्तैरभिसम्बन्धते निमित्तानुरूपस्य च प्रत्ययस्योत्पद्यमानस्य तेन तेनात्मना
हेतुर्भवति । केचिदाहुः । ज्ञानसहभूरेवार्थो भोग्यत्वात्सुखादिवदिति । त एतया द्वारा
साधारणत्वं बाधमानाः पूर्वोत्तरक्षणेषु वस्तुस्वरूपमेवापह्नवते ॥ १५ ॥

VYĀSA.

And how otherwise is it untrue? 'There being difference of mentality in the case of the external object being the same, their ways of being are different.'

One thing coming within the sphere of many minds is common to them all. It has certainly not been imagined by one mind. Nor yet has it been imagined by more minds than one. It is established in itself. How is this? There being difference of mentality when the external object is the same. Even though the external object be the same the mind feels pleasure on account of virtue. The same object excites a feeling of pain on account of vice. The same causes forgetfulness on account of Nescience. The same causes the feeling of indifference on account of right knowledge. Now by whose mind has all that been imagined? Further it is not proper that another mind be coloured by an object which has been imagined by another. For this reason the lines of existence of the external objects and the ideas are different, as they exist as objective and instrumental appearances. There is not even the least suspicion of confusion between them.

Further in the Sāṅkhya philosophy, an object is made of the three qualities, and the functioning of the qualities is ever changeful. The object comes into relationship with the minds on account of the exciting causes of virtue, &c.; and it becomes the cause of the notions as they are produced, each as such, in accordance with the exciting causes.

Some say that the object is co-existent with the idea, inasmuch as it is to be enjoyed thereby like the feelings of pleasure and pain. They

do away by means of this conception, the common nature of the object with reference to minds, and this but do away with the being of the object in previous and subsequent moments.—175.

VĀCHASPATI'S GLOSS.

Having now mentioned the reasons for believing that the object is different from and independent of the idea, the Commentator now introduces another reason given in the aphorism to establish the same:—And how otherwise is it untrue?

'There being difference of mentality, even though the external object remains the same, their paths of existence are different.' When a certain thing remains the same although the other changes into many states, they both differ from each other altogether. As the one idea of Chaitra differs from the different ideas of Devadatta, Viṣṇumitra and Maitra, and although the ideas are different the object remains the same, the object must be different from the idea. And the identity of the object even in the case of the difference of ideas, is ascertained by the knowers by comparison of notes. If one woman is beloved, hated, ignored and approached with indifference by many different people, they can always compare notes that the object of all these varying feelings is the same. For this reason, there being difference of mentality, i. e. of feeling, the paths of being of the two, i. e. of the object and the idea, are different. The path of being means that by which one thing differs from another in nature. The lover feels pleasure in the society of the beloved. The co-wife feels pain. Chaitra who has not been able to possess her, feels disappointed and forgets himself.

Let it be so. But wherever an object in the shape of a beautiful woman has been fancied by the mind of one man, the minds of others also admit of being coloured by the same fancied object, and it is for this reason that the object even though fancied, becomes the common object of all the minds.

For this reason says:—'It is not proper that the object fancied by one mind, &c.' If that were so, then in case one of them possessed the knowledge of blue, all would come to possess the knowledge of the blue.

The question arises that inasmuch as there is but one object in the opinion of those, who believe in the independent existence of objects, how is it that one object becomes the cause of different feelings of pleasure and pain, &c. It is not proper that the cause remaining the same, the effects should be different. For this reason says:—'In the case of the Sāṅkhya philosophy, &c.' Even a single external object changing according to the three qualities, admits of three-fold appearance. But in this way too, all without distinction would have the three-fold knowledge of pleasure, pain and forgetfulness with reference to the same object. For this reason says:—'Depends upon the operative causes of virtue, &c.' The Sattva together with the Rajas gives birth to the feeling of pleasure which depends upon virtue. The same Sattva when free of the Rajas, creates the feeling of indifference which depends upon knowledge. And these virtues, &c., do not exist, all of them, in all the Puruṣas everywhere. It is only any one of them that exist anywhere at any time. Therefore the difference is proper.

Some talkers say on this subject:—'The object certainly co-exists with the idea, because it is enjoyable by the Puruṣa like pleasure and pain. The meaning is this. Let an object be different from the idea. Still it being non-intelligent, does not admit of being known without the idea. The idea it is that illuminates it. Similarly it exists at the time of being known only. It cannot be said to be existing at any other time, because there is no authority for its existence at a time when it is not the object of immediate knowledge.

This the Commentator refutes without the help of the aphorism :—' They by this, &c., An object is certainly common to all minds. It keeps on being cognized for a succession of more moments than one as possessed of the characteristic of change. If that co-exists with the idea, it will be thus, it is such. Now what check is there upon the portion 'It,' that this may not disappear too?—15.

Sūtra 16.

न चैकचित्तन्त्रं चेद्वस्तु तत्प्रमाणकं तदा किं स्यात् ॥ १६ ॥

न Na, not. च Cha, and. एकचित्त Eka-chitta, on one mind. तन्त्रम् Tantram, dependent. चेद् Ched, if. वस्तु Vastu, an object. तत् Tat, by that. प्रमाणकम् Pramāṅakam, to be cognized by that. तदा Tadā, then. किम् Kim, what (only to denote the question). स्यात् Syāt, would it exist.

16. And if an object dependent upon one mind were not cognized by that, would it then exist?—176.

न चैकचित्तन्त्रं चेद्वस्तु तत्प्रमाणकं तदा किं स्यात् । एकचित्तन्त्रं चेद्वस्तु स्यात्तदा चित्ते व्यग्रे निरुद्धे वा स्वरूपमेव तेनापरामृष्टमन्यस्याविषयीभूतमप्रमाणकमगृहीतस्य भावकं केनचित्तदानौ किं न स्यात् । सम्बन्धमानं वा पुनश्चित्तेन कुत उत्पद्येत ये चास्यानुपस्थिता भागास्ते चास्य न स्युरेवं नास्ति पृष्ठमित्युदरमपि न गृह्येत तस्मात्स्वतन्त्रोऽर्थः सर्वपुरुषसाधारणः स्वतन्त्राणि च चित्तानि प्रतिपुरुषः प्रवर्तन्ते तयोः सम्बन्धादुपलब्धिः पुरुषस्य भोग इति ॥ १६ ॥

VYĀSA.

If an object were dependent upon the mind, then in case the mind were restrained, or attending to some other object, the object would not be touched thereby, nor would it come into objective relationship with any other mind. It would not be cognized, *i. e.*, its nature would not be taken in, by any mind. Will it cease to exist at the time? Or, coming into relationship again with the mind, whence would it come back to life?

Further the parts of an object which are not in contact with the mind, would not exist. Thus there would be no back, and how could then there be the front itself? For this reason, the object is self-dependent, and common to all the Puruṣas. Minds also are self-dependent. They come into relationship with the Puruṣas. By their relationship is secured perception, which is enjoyment (bhoga).—176.

VĀCHASPATI'S GLOSS.

Or, there may not be this disappearance of a portion; let the object be co-existent with the idea. On this also says :—'And if an object dependent upon one mind were not cognized by that, would it then exist? If the mind which cognizes a jar, does not at any time turn towards it on account of attention being directed towards a cloth, or if an object having been the object of discrimination the mind thereby becomes restrained, then the idea of the jar and the knowledge of discrimination would not be in existence at the time,

and the jar and the knowledge being dependent for their existence upon the co-existence of the idea thereof in the mind, would no doubt cease to exist. Says this :—' One mind, &c.'

'Would it then exist? :—Means it would not exist.

Further coming into relationship with the mind, how would the jar or the discrimination be born again. Effects have constant causes and lead to them invariably by both the canons of agreement and difference. Effects cannot be born from causes other than their own appropriate causes. In the absence of the cause there would be no occasion for their existence. For, is it proper that an object being the cause of the knowledge thereof, it should also be the cause of itself? If this were so, then the sweets which one might be expecting to get, and the sweets which one might be really using, would be equally placed with reference to taste, strength and digestion. It has therefore been well said :—'If it come into relationship with the mind, &c.'

Further the front portion of any object is always pervaded by the middle and posterior parts, *i. e.*, it cannot exist without the simultaneous existence of the middle and posterior parts. If the existence of an object depended upon being perceived, then the middle and posterior parts would not exist, and thus on account of the cessation of pervasion the front part also would cease to exist. The object itself would not thus be in existence, how then would it be in existence along with the idea itself? Says this :—'The portions thereof which are in contact, &c.' Not in contact means not known. Concludes :—'For this reason, &c.' The rest is easy.—16.

Sūtra 17.

तदुपरागापेक्षित्वाच्चित्तस्य वस्तु ज्ञाताज्ञातम् ॥ १७ ॥

तद् Tad, thereby. उपराग Uparāga, colouring. अपेक्षित्वात् Apekṣitvāt, because of the needing. चित्तस्य Chittasya, for the mind, by the mind. वस्तु Vastu, an object. ज्ञात Jñāta, known. अज्ञातम् Ajñātam, or unknown.

17. The mind needing to be coloured thereby an object may be known or unknown.—177.

VYĀSA.

तदुपरागापेक्षित्वाच्चित्तस्य वस्तु ज्ञाताज्ञातम् । अयस्कान्तमणिकल्पा विषयाः । अयः सधर्मकं चित्तमभिसम्बन्धोपरञ्जयन्ति येन च विषयेणोपरकं चित्तं स विषयो ज्ञातस्ततोऽन्यः पुरुषोऽज्ञातः । वस्तुनो ज्ञाताज्ञातस्वरूपत्वात्परिणामि चित्तम् ॥ १७ ॥

'The mind standing in need of being coloured thereby, an object may be known or unknown.' Objects are in nature similar to that of loadstone; the mind is similar in characteristic to iron. Objects coming into contact with the mind colour it. Whatever object colours the mind, that object becomes known. That which becomes known is an object. That which is not thus known is the Puruṣa and is unknown. The mind is changeful, because it assumes the natures of known and unknown objects.—77.

VĀCHASPATI'S GLOSS.

Let that be. If the object were self-dependent and also unintelligent, it would never be illuminated. If now it were to become illuminated, its non-intelligence too would disappear. No existence can remain as such when it gives up its nature. Nor is it proper

that the nature of an unintelligent object should receive the illumination of its characteristic by being the receptacle of the action of the senses. Because if it became the characteristic of the object then it would, like the qualities of blueness, &c., be the common attribute of all the Puruṣas. This being so, if one man became learned, all would become learned. No one would remain ignorant. Nor is it proper that the present should be characteristic of the past and the yet unmanifested. Hence to say that an object is self-dependent and that it is the sphere for the act of perception is but a wish of the mind. For this reason says :—'The mind needing to be coloured by contact therewith, an object may be known or unknown.' Even though an object is by nature non-intelligent, it colours the mind by coming into contact therewith through the passage of the senses, because such is the mirror of the mind, the power of consciousness being reflected into it, enlivens the mind with the colour of the object therein, and thus knows it. It does not however produce any sort of clearness, &c., in the object. Nor is it that the power of consciousness is unrelated to the mind, because it has been said that its reflection passes into it. Although the mind being all-pervading, and the senses being of the nature of the principle of individuality, cannot come into relationship with the object, still the relationship of the object is with the mind which functions in the body. It is for this reason that they have been said to be of the nature of the loadstone, and that the mind possesses a characteristic similar to iron and that they colour it by having come into contact with it through the passage of the senses. Says that it is for this reason that the mind is changeful : 'On account of the object being known, &c.'—17.

Sūtra 18.

सदा ज्ञाताश्चित्तवृत्तयस्तत्प्रभोः पुरुषस्यापरिणामात् ॥ १८ ॥

सदा Sadā, always, ज्ञाताः Jñātāḥ, are known, चित्तवृत्तयः Chitta-vṛttayah, the modifications of the mind. तत्प्रभोः Tat-prabhoh, to its lord, पुरुषस्य Puruṣasya, the Puruṣa. अपरिणामात् Apariṇāmāt, on account of the unchangeability.

18. To its lord, the Puruṣa, the modifications of the mind are always known on-account-of-unchangeability.—178.

यस्य तु तदेव चित्तं विषयस्तस्य सदा ज्ञाताश्चित्तवृत्तयस्तत्प्रभोः पुरुषस्यापरिणामित्वात् । यदि चित्तवत्प्रभुरपि पुरुषः परिणामेत्तत्तद्विषयाश्चित्तवृत्तयः शब्दादिविषयवज्ज्ञाताज्ञाताः स्युः सदा ज्ञातृत्वं तु मनसस्तत्प्रभोः पुरुषस्यापरिणामित्वमनुमापयति ॥ १८ ॥

VYĀSA.

To its lord, the Puruṣa, whose sphere of functioning the mind itself is, mental modifications are ever known, because he is unchangeable. If the lord, Puruṣa, too changes like the mind, the mental modifications too in which it functions would be both known and unknown, like the objects of sound, &c. The mind however is always known to its lord the Puruṣa. By this is inferred its unchangeability.—178.

VĀCHASPATI'S GLOSS.

Having thus established the mind and the object to be separate from each other, the author now reads the aphorism, filling up the omissions, with the object of showing that

the self is different from these changeful objects and that the characteristic of the Puruṣa is unchangeability, which is the opposite of the characteristic of the objects and the mind. 'To the lord, Puruṣa, whose sphere of functioning the mind itself is, &c.' The modifications of the mind are always known to the Puruṣa, because he is unchangeable. The mind with its modifications is always followed by the Puruṣa in all its modifications of the wandering, the distracted, the one-pointed, up to the state of inhibition. By what reason then is the Puruṣa, unchangeable? 'If the Puruṣa were unchangeable, it would both be known and unknown like the mind (chitta). It is however always known. It is therefore unchangeable and for this reason differs from other changeable objects. Says this :—'If the lord Puruṣa changed, &c.' The lord who is the enjoyer of the mind knows it constantly along with its modifications. This fact establishes by inference the unchangeability of the Puruṣa. Thus the meaning is that this unchangeable Puruṣa is different from the changing mind.—18.

Sūtra 19.

न तत्स्वाभासं दृश्यत्वात् ॥ १९ ॥

न Na, is not. तत् Tat, it. स्वाभासम् Svābhāsam, self-illuminating. दृश्यत्वात् Dṛśyatvāt, because of its knowability; because it is the knowable.

19. It is not self-illuminating, being the knowable.—179.

स्यादाशङ्का चित्तमेव स्वाभासं विषयाभासं च वैनाशिकाणां चित्तात्मवादिनां च भविष्यतीत्यभिप्रेतम् । न तत्स्वाभासं दृश्यत्वात् । यथेतराणीन्द्रियाणि शब्दादयश्च दृश्यत्वाच्च स्वाभासानि तथा मनोऽपि प्रत्येतद्यम् । न चाग्निरत्र दृष्टान्तः । न ह्यग्निरात्मस्वरूपमप्रकाशं प्रकाशयति । प्रकाशश्चायं प्रकाश्यप्रकाशकसंयोगे दृष्टो न च स्वरूपमात्रेऽस्ति संयोगः । किंच स्वाभासं चित्तमित्यग्राह्यमेव कस्चिदिति शब्दार्थः । तद्यथा स्वात्मप्रतिष्ठमाकाशमित्यप्रतिष्ठमेवेत्यर्थः । स्वबुद्धिप्रचारप्रतिसंवेदनात्स्त्वानां प्रवृत्तिर्दृश्यते । कुद्धोहं भीतोऽहममुत्र मे रगोऽमुत्र मे क्रोध इत्येतत्स्वबुद्धेरग्रहणेन युक्तमिति ॥ १९ ॥

VYĀSA.

A doubt may arise that the mind itself may be self-illuminating as well as the illuminator of the objects, as in fact it is believed by the Vaināśikas to be like fire, which illuminates itself as well as other objects. Therefore says :— 'It is not self-illuminating being the knowable.' As the other organs and the object of sound, &c., are not self-illuminative on account of their being knowable, so also should the mind be understood to be. Fire is no analogy here. Fire does not illuminate any form of itself which might have been non-luminous before.' The illumination spoken of here is meant to be the illumination which is brought about by the contact of the luminous and the dark, not of the self-luminous. There can be no contact of anything with its own nature. Further, the statement that the mind is self-illuminating means that it is not perceivable by any other entity. This is in the same way as when it is said that the Ākāśa is self-supporting, it is meant that it has no support at all. Living beings

are seen acting in accordance with the consciousness of the movements of their Will-to-be. 'I am angry,' 'I am afraid,' 'I am attached here,' 'I am repelled there,' these notions are proper only on account of the knowledge of self-identification not being taken in.—179.

VĀCHASPATI'S GLOSS.

Mentions the Vaināśikas:—'A doubt may arise, &c.' This is the meaning. It may be so if the mind be the sphere for the functioning of the Self. The mind however is self-illuminative and it illuminates other objects also as it illuminates itself. How then can it be the sphere for the constant knowledge of the Puruṣa? How moreover does it in its unchangeability differ from the changeable mind. Therefore, 'It is not self-illuminating, being knowable.' It might be so if the mind were self-illuminating, (self-knowing), but it is not. Being changeable, the mind is pervaded by perceptibility, like the colours of blue, &c. Whatever is pervaded by perceptibility, is not capable of becoming self-illuminative, because the modification contradicts itself. The act and the object cannot both be the same. The cooking is not cooked: the cutting is not cut. The Puruṣa, however, being unchangeable as he is, is not the object of the act of consciousness. In him therefore self-illumination is not improper. His illuminativeness does not depend upon any other, he is self-illuminative and is not the object of the act of consciousness. Hence the mind is the object of the act of knowing on account of its being the knowable; it is not self-illuminative. The meaning is that because the mind is seized of the reflection of the self the object of its modifications are illuminated.

But the fire is both the knowable and the self-illuminous as a jar, &c., are brought to light by fire not so fire is brought to light by another fire. For this reason says:—Fire is no analogy here. Why not? 'The fire does not illuminate, &c.' The meaning is that fire may not be brought to light by other fire, but it is illuminated by consciousness. It is thus not illuminated by itself, and for this reason there is no over-lapping (Vyabhichāra). 'The illumination spoken of here, &c.' The words 'spoken of here' differentiate from the illumination which is of the nature of the Puruṣa, the illumination, that is to say, which is of the form of the action. This is intended to be said: Whatever action there may be, it is seen in relation to the subject, the instrument and the object. As cooking is seen in relation to Chaitra, fire and rice, so also illumination. Illumination also is action. This also must therefore be like that. Relation lives in different objects; it is not possible in the absence of distinction. Further the assertion that the mind is self-illuminating, means that the mind is not perceivable by any other entity.

Let that be. Let the mind be not perceivable by any other entity. The mind would not cease to be if the act of knowing, which is neither its cause, nor its pervade, ceased to be. For this reason he says: 'By the consciousness of the movements of his own Will-to-be,' The Will-to-be is the mind. Its movements are its functionings. Living beings are creatures. The various mental modifications of anger, greed, &c., are felt by each mind for itself, together with their substratum the mind, and also together with their objects. They in this way establish the objectivity of the mind. Renders the consciousness of the movements of the Will to-be plainer:—'I am angry, &c.'—179.

Sūtra 20.

एकसमये चोभयानवधारणम् ॥२०॥

एकसमये Eka-samaye, at the same time. च Cha, and. उभय Ubhaye, of both. अनवधारणम् Anavadhāraṇam, impossibility of being cognised.

20. Nor can both be cognized at the same time.—180.

एकसमये चोभयानवधारणम् । न चैकस्मिन्क्षणे स्वपररूपावधारणं युक्तं क्षणिक-
वादिना यद्भवन्न सैव क्रिया तदेव च कारकमित्यभ्युपगमः ॥ २० ॥

VYĀSA.

And it is not proper that in one moment both one's own nature and the nature of other objects may be ascertained. The conception of the advocates of momentary existence however is that acting is the same as being; and the subject, object, instrument, &c., are the same too.—180.

'And both cannot be cognized at the same time.' To him who says that the mind is both self-illuminating and the illuminator of objects, it cannot of course be possible that the object may be understood at the same time as the self of the mind, and by the same act. An act which is not different from any other is not competent to bring about an effect which is not different. Therefore a difference of function must be recognized. And to the Vaināśikas there is no separation of operation for difference of effects. And it is not possible that there should be a difference of effects brought about by a single birth which is common to all and does not differ from itself. For this reason the knowledge of the object and the act of knowledge cannot be ascertained in one moment of time. This is what the Commentary renders clear:—'And in one moment of time, &c.' And so the Vaināśikas say:—Whatever is the being of a thing the same is their action and the same the subject object. 'Instrument, &c.' Hence the knowability of the mind is for ever; and this removes the idea of its being self-illuminating. This also shows that the seer is unchangeable. Thus all is proved.—20.

Sūtra 21.

चित्तान्तरदृश्ये बुद्धिबुद्धेरतिप्रसङ्गः स्मृतिसङ्करश्च ॥२१॥

चित्तान्तरदृश्ये Chittāntara-dṛśye, in case of being knowable by another mind. बुद्धि-बुद्धेः Buddhi-Buddheḥ, of the wills to know, the wills to know. अतिप्रसङ्गः Atiprasaṅgah, too many, abundance, superfluity. स्मृति-सङ्करः Smṛiti-Saṅkaraḥ, confusion of memories. च Cha, and.

21. In case of being knowable by another mind, there will be too many wills-to-know the Wills-to-know; and there will be confusion of memories.—181.

स्यान्मतिः स्वरसनिरुद्धं चित्तं चित्तान्तरेण समनन्तरेण गृह्यत इति । चित्तान्तरे
दृश्ये बुद्धिबुद्धेरतिप्रसङ्गः स्मृतिसङ्करश्च । अथ चित्तं चेच्चित्तान्तरेण गृह्येत बुद्धि बुद्धिः
केन गृह्यते सायन्यया सायन्ययेत्यतिप्रसङ्गः स्मृतिसङ्करश्च । यावन्तो बुद्धिबुद्धिनाम-
नुभावास्सावत्यः स्मृतयः प्राप्नुवन्ति तत्सङ्कराच्चैकस्मृत्यनवधारणं च स्यादित्येवं बुद्धि-
प्रतिसंवेदिनं पुरुषमपलपद्भिर्वैनाशिकैः सर्वमेवाकुलीकृतं ते तु भोक्तृस्वरूपं यत्र क्वचन
कल्पयन्तो न न्यायेन सङ्गच्छन्ते । केचित्तु सत्त्वमात्रमपि परिकल्प्यास्ति ससत्त्वा य
एतान्पञ्चस्कन्धान्निक्षिप्यान्त्याश्च प्रतिसन्द्धातीत्युक्त्वा तत एव पुनस्तप्यति तथा स्क-

न्धानां महश्चिद्वेदाय विरागायानुत्पादाय प्रशान्तये गुरोरन्तिके ब्रह्मचर्यं चरिष्यामीत्युक्त्वा सत्त्वस्य पुनः सत्त्वमेवापह्नुवते । साङ्ख्ययोगादयस्तु प्रवादाः स्वशब्देन पुरुषमेव स्वामिनं चित्तस्य भोक्तारमुपयन्तीति ॥ २१ ॥

VYĀSA.

There may be an opinion that the mind restrained in its own being may be known by another mind just in contact with it. 'In case of being known by another mind there will be too many wills-to-know the Wills-to-know; and there will be confusion of memories.' If the mind be cognized by another mind, by what may the wills-to-know the Wills-to-know be cognized. Even that by another; and that again by another. There will thus be too many of such Wills-to-know. And there will be confusion of memories. As many will be the cognitions of the various Wills-to-be, so many will be the memories. One memory will not be capable of determination on account of their confusion. Thus the Vaināśikas have confused everything by denying the existence of the Puruṣa who knows by reflex action the Will-to-know. Further, they are not logical in imagining as they do, the existence of the Puruṣa in some places. Some there are who say that there does exist a pure being, and that that being throws away the existing five Skandhas and takes up others. Having asserted so much they fight shy again of the same.

Further they say that for the purpose of entirely doing away with the Skandhas, and for securing desirelessness, non-production and calmness, they would go to a teacher and with him live the life of a student. And having said this they begin again to conceal the very existence of that being.

As to the Sāṅkhyayoga theories, they declare by the word SVA (on one's own) applied to the mind that there does exist the lord in the shape of the enjoyer of the mind.—181.

VĀCHASPATI'S GLOSS.

Introduces the Vaināśikas again :—There may be a theory that although the mind may not know itself by its own life, on account of its being objective by nature, yet even that fact does not prove the existence of the self-restrained moment of the mind which generates the next may well be taken in by the last mental moment of its own succession. This is the meaning. 'Another mind just in contact therewith. This other mind is equal in knowledge, and between the two there is nothing else intervening.' Therefore, 'In case of being knowable by another mind, &c.' The Will-to-be stands here for the mind. If the last act of mentality is not itself perceived, it cannot have the power of perceiving the previous act of mentality. It is not proper that the previous Will-to-know should be known without coming into contact with the present Will-to-know itself. No one who does not take hold of the connecting rod can reach the holder of the rod himself. Hence there is a *regrussum ad infinitum*.

The Skandhas are five :—Vijñāna, Vedanā, Saṃjñā, Rūpa and Saṃskāra.

'The theories of the Sāṅkhya yoga, &c.' This means the theories of the Sāṅkhyas and the Yogas and of the Vaiśeṣikas, &c., which are preceded by the Sāṅkhyas and the Yogas. The rest is easy.—21.

Sūtra 22.

चित्तेरप्रतिसङ्क्रमायास्तदाकारापत्तौ स्वबुद्धिसंवेदनम् ॥ २२ ॥

चित्ते: Chitteh, of the consciousness. अप्रतिसंक्रमायाः Apratisamkramāyāh, of such as is notable to transform from place to place. तद् Tad, its. आकारपत्तौ Ākārāpattau, by transforming appearance. स्वबुद्धिसंवेदनम् Sva-Buddhi Samvedanam, knowing of. संवेदनम्, its own. स्व, will to be. बुद्धि.

22. Consciousness knows its own Will-to-be by transforming its appearance, though not-itself moving-from place-to-place.—182.

कथम् । चित्तेरप्रतिसङ्क्रमायास्तदाकारापत्तौ स्वबुद्धिसंवेदनम् । अपरिणामिनो हि भोक्तृशक्तिरप्रतिसङ्क्रमा च परिणामिन्यर्थे प्रतिसङ्क्रान्तेव तद्वृत्तिमनुपतति तस्याश्च प्राप्त्यैतन्न्योपग्रहस्वरूपाया बुद्धिवृत्तेरनुकारमात्रतया बुद्धिवृत्त्यविशिष्टा हि ज्ञानवृत्तिराख्यायते । तथा चोक्तम् । न पातालं न च विवरं गिरीणां नैवान्धकारं कुक्ष्या नेदधीनां गुहा यस्यां निहितं ब्रह्म शाश्वतं बुद्धिवृत्तिमविशिष्टां कवयो वेदयन्त इति ॥ २२ ॥

VYĀSA.

How? 'Consciousness knows its own Will-to-be by transforming its own appearance, though not itself moving from place to place. The power of enjoyment is of course unchanging. It does not also go from place to place. In the changing object it looks as though transferred thereto; and there it follows its manifestations. And it imitates, as it were, the modifications of the Will-to-be whose form is now enlivened by the consciousness which has entered therein. By that imitation it is called a manifestation or modification of consciousness, without being actually qualified by the modifications of the Will-to-be. This means that it does not at all appear to be different from the modifications thereof.

And so it has been said :—

Nor nether worlds, nor mountain caves, nor darkness, nor seas, nor ravines are the hollows in which is placed the Eternal Brahma. The wise points out to the modification of the Will-to-be which does not look different from him.—182.

VĀCHASPATI'S GLOSS.

Let that be. If however the mind is not self-illuminative nor knowable by another mind, how should it be enjoyed by the Self himself? For although the Self is no doubt self-illuminating, it does not put forth any action anywhere. Without putting forth any

action he cannot be the actor. Nor can he be the enjoyer of the mind without coming into relationship with the mind through action. That would be going beyond the ordinary rule.

With this in mind puts the question :—'How?'

Gives the answer by the aphorism :—'Consciousness knows its own Will-to-be by transformiug into its own shape, although not itself moving from place to place.'

What was said before, 'Identification with modifications elsewhere' (P. I. 4) has its origin here. The knowing by the Puruṣa of his Will-to-be is achieved when the Will-to-be takes the form of the Puruṣa, i.e., when it takes on the appearance thereof by receiving into itself the reflection of the Puruṣa. Similarly is the case with the moon, when reflected in pure water. Although the moon is not in motion, yet she appears to be in motion on account of the movements of the water, without any action of her own. In the same way without any sort of action on the part of consciousness, the mind in which the reflection of consciousness has taken its place, shows the power of consciousness to be active by its own movements, and makes it appear to be following itself, although in reality it does not follow it. It is by acting in this way that the mind brings about the experience of the Puruṣa and gives him the nature of the enjoyer. This is the meaning of the aphorism. The commentary does not explain the meaning here, because it has explained the same in many places already here and there. The Commentary here describes the meaning of the modifications of consciousness as not being independent of the modifications of the Will-to-be. As has been said :—'Neither the nether worlds, &c.' They say that the mental modification in which the reflection of consciousness has made its place is on account of that very reflection, the cave of Brahma, who is pure in nature, eternal and auspicious. It is in that cave alone that the hidden Brahma is to be found. When that is removed, he shines by his own light, there being no obstruction and no defect. This is the case with the revered one who has reached his last body.—22.

Sūtra 23.

द्रष्टृदृश्योपरक्तं चित्तं सर्वार्थम् ॥ २३ ॥

द्रष्टृदृश्योपरक्तम् Draṣṭri-Dṛiṣya-Uparaktam, being coloured by. उपरक्तम्, the knower (द्रष्टृ), and the knowable. दृश्यं, चित्तम् Chittam, the mind. सर्वार्थम् Sarvārtham, omni-objective.

23. The mind being coloured by the knower and the knowable is omni-objective (sarvārtha).—183.

अतश्चैतदुपगम्यते । द्रष्टृदृश्योपरक्तं चित्तं सर्वार्थम् । मनो हि मन्तव्येनार्थेनोपरक्तं तत्स्वयं विषयत्वाद्भिषयिणा पुरुषेणात्मीयया वृत्त्याभिसम्बद्धं तदेतच्चित्तमेव द्रष्टृदृश्योपरक्तं विषयविषयिनिर्भासं चेतनाचेतनस्वरूपापन्नं विषयात्मकमप्यविषयात्मकमिवाचेतनं चेतनमिव स्फटिकमणिकल्पं सर्वार्थमित्युच्यते । तदनेन चित्तसारूप्येण भ्रान्ताः केचित्तदेव चेतनमित्याहुः । अपरे चित्तमात्रमेवेदं सर्वं नास्ति खल्वयं गवादिर्घटादिश्च सकारणां लोक इति । अनुकम्पनीयास्ते कस्मादस्ति हि तेषां भ्रान्तिबीजं सर्वरूपाकारनिर्भासं चित्तमिति । समाधीप्रज्ञायां प्रज्ञेयोऽर्थः प्रतिबिम्बी भूतस्तस्यालम्बनीभूतत्वादयः स चेदर्थश्चित्तमात्रं स्यात्कथं प्रज्ञयैव प्रज्ञारूपमवधार्येत तस्मात्प्रतिबिम्बीभूतोऽर्थः प्रज्ञायां येनावधार्यते स पुरुष इति । एवं ग्रहीतृग्रहणप्राह्यस्वरूपचित्तभेदात्रयमप्येतज्जातितः प्रविभजन्त ते सम्यग्दर्शिनस्तैरधिगतः पुरुषः ॥ २३ ॥

VYĀSA.

And it is known in this way :—'The mind being coloured by the knower and the known, is omni-objective.' The mind is of course coloured by the objects of thought. The mind being itself an object comes into relationship with the subjective Puruṣa through its modification as Self. Thus it is that the mind is coloured by both subjectivity and objectivity, the knower and the knowable ; it assumes the nature of both the conscious and unconscious. Although it is of the very nature of the objective, it appears as if it were of the nature of the subjective. Although it is devoid of consciousness by its nature, it appears as if it were consciousness. Being of the nature of the crystal, it is termed omni-objective.

It is by this similarity of mental appearance that some people are deceived into saying that the mind itself is the conscious agent. There are others again who say that all this is but the mind only and that there is nothing in existence of the objective world, such as the cow or jar, all of which are governed by the law of causation. They are to be pitied. For what reason? Because they are possessed of a mind which is the cause of confusion, shining forth as it does in the shape of all appearances.

In the case of the trance cognition, the cognizable object is reflected into the mind, and it is different from the trance cognition, because it is the object upon which the act of cognition rests. If that object were the mind alone, how could it be that the phenomenon of cognition would be taken in by the cognition itself. For this reason, he who takes in the object reflected in the mind, is the Puruṣa. Thus those who teach that the knower, the knowable and the means of knowledge are the three modifications of the mind, and thus divide the phenomena into three classes are the only true philosophers. It is to them that the Puruṣa is known.—183.

VĀCHASPATI'S GLOSS.

Thus has been established the existence of the Puruṣa, the unchangeable as a separate entity from the mind which is by nature changeable, being as it is by nature the knowable. Now he gives also the authority of the perceptions of the world to prove the same, 'And it is known in this way.' The meaning is that it must be so. 'The mind coloured by both the knower and the knowable is omni-objective.' As the mind coloured by the blue and other objects establishes their existence by perception itself, so also coloured by the reflection of the knower into itself, the mind establishes the existence of the knower too by perception. A notion is evidently made up of two percepts 'I know the blue object.' Therefore the subject also is of a nature similar to that of the object. Although proved by perception, it is not shown thereby as existing separately from the mind, like the reflection of the moon which is perceived to be quite distinct from the water into which it is reflected. The mental perception of the Self does not cease to be perception merely by this much.

Further inasmuch as the reflection in the water does not exist in reality as a moon it cannot be said that because the reflection is only a reflection and not the substance itself, that therefore the moon herself does not exist. In the same way, although consciousness becomes the objective in its state of mental reflection, it does not so become in its own nature. This is what is meant by the mind being *omni-objective*. Says this :— 'The mind coloured by the object of thought, &c.' It is not by the external object alone that the mind is coloured by assuming its shape ; it is coloured by the Puruṣa too. The reflection of the Puruṣa is his, the Self's manifestation (*vritti*). This reflection of the Puruṣa is to be accepted by the *Vaināsikas* also. How? If this be not so they must fasten the consciousness upon the mind, saying that there is consciousness in the mind. Says so :— 'Misled by this similarity of the mind, &c.' There are some *Vaināsikas* who speak of the existence of an eternal object. There are others who speak of the existence of an idea. The question now is that, if the mind shines forth both as a subject and an object, there must certainly be a difference between the knower and the knowable. As they say :—Although the Self of the Will-to-be is not different, yet those who are given to seeing things separated from each other, see it as possessed of the differences of the concepts of the subjective and the objective. This being the case, how are they to be pitied? Says for this reason :— 'In the case of the trance cognition, &c.' They must be brought round by first convincing them by the above reasoning that the Puruṣa must be something different from the mind, and then bringing them into touch with the trance cognition, which has the self as the sphere of its operation by teaching them the eight branches of Yoga. That is to be done in this way. In the trance cognition the object of knowledge is the Self reflected into the mind. It is different from the real Self, because it becomes the support to that Self (*Ātmā*). If he begin to say notwithstanding that he is given the reasons, that the support may be the mind itself, it is said :— 'If the object which appears as the Self, be the mind itself and nothing different from it, then how is it possible that the mind may be known by the mind itself (the act of knowing that is to say, by the act of knowing itself). It is self-contradictory to speak of the action of a mental modification upon itself. Concludes :— 'Therefore, &c.' They are to be pitied and taught the truth. Says this :— 'In this way, &c.' Class means nature.

Sūtra 24.

तदसङ्ख्येयवासनाभिश्चित्तमपि परार्थं संहत्यकारित्वात् ॥२४॥

तद् Tad, that. असङ्ख्येय-वासनाभिः Asaṅkheya-Vāsanābhiḥ, (variegated) by innumerable. (असङ्ख्येय) residua (वासनाभिः). चित्तम् Chittam, mind. अपि Api, also. परार्थम् Parārtham, exists for another. संहत्य-कारित्वात् Samhatya-Kāritvāt, because it acts by combination.

24. And the mind exists-for-another, also because it is variegated by innumerable residua, inasmuch as it acts by combination.—184.

कुतश्चैतत् । तदसङ्ख्येयवासनाभिश्चित्तमपि परार्थं संहत्यकारित्वात् । तदेतच्चित्तमसङ्ख्येयामिवासाभिरेव चित्रिकृतमपि परार्थं परस्य भोगापवर्गार्थं न स्वार्थं संहत्यकारित्वाद् गृहवत्संहत्यकारिणा चित्तेन न स्वार्थेन भवितव्यं न सुखं चित्तं सुखार्थं न ज्ञानं ज्ञानार्थमुभयमप्येतत्परार्थं यश्च भोगेनापवर्गेण चार्थोनार्थवाद्गुरुः स एव परो न परः सामान्यमात्रम् । यत् किञ्चित्परं सामान्यमात्रं स्वरूपेणादाहरेद्वैनाशिकत्तत्सर्वं संहत्यकारित्वात्परार्थमेव स्यात् । यस्त्वसौ परो विशेषः स न संहत्यकारी पुरुष इति ॥ २४ ॥

VYĀSA.

And for what other reason is this the case? 'And it exists for another, also because it is variegated by innumerable residua, inasmuch as it acts by combination.' This mind is variegated by innumerable residua. It must therefore exist for another, *i.e.* for achieving the enjoyment and emancipation of another, not for the achievement of its own object. Because it acts by combination. As a house which has assumed its shape as such, by various materials being brought together, cannot come into existence for itself, so also the mind which assumes a particular shape by more things than one coming together. The mental phenomenon of pleasure does not exist for its own sake; nor does knowledge exist for itself. On the contrary both these exist for the sake of another. That other is the Puruṣa who has objects to achieve in the shape of enjoyment and emancipation. It cannot be another of the same class. Whatever else the *Vaināsika* speaks of beyond this as being of the same class, all that must be of the same class, acting as that also would do by combination. The other however is peculiar to itself and differs from the others in not acting by combination. That is the Puruṣa.—184.

VĀCHASPATI'S GLOSS.

Introduces another reason for believing that the mind is different from the Self :— And for what other reason? 'And it exists for another, also because it is variegated by innumerable residua, inasmuch as it acts by combination.' The meaning of the aphorism is this. Although innumerable residua of action and affliction live in the mind and not in the Puruṣa, and although further, the fruitions depending upon the residua also live in the mind and this fact seems to establish the contention that the mind itself is both the enjoyer and the object of enjoyment existing for the enjoyer, and that everything therefore exists for the mind, still that mind, notwithstanding its being variegated by innumerable residua exists for another. Why? Because it acts by combination. This is the meaning of the aphorism. Explains :— 'The mind, &c.'

Some one may say that although it may be granted that the mind acts by combination, yet notwithstanding this, why should it not be conceived as existing and acting for the sake of itself? Where is the contradiction in this theory? Says to him :— 'Because it acts by combination.'

'The mental phenomenon of pleasure.' These words indicate the experience side of nature and the painful mind is also understood thereby. The knowledge indicates the emancipation side. This is the meaning. The pleasurable and painful minds consisting as they do of similar and opposite impressions are not possible of the Self, because the manifestations in that case would contradict themselves. Nor can anything else acting by combination either directly or indirectly and thus causing pleasure or pain, be either favoured or disfavoured by them. Therefore he alone who does not operate as pleasure and pain directly or indirectly can either be favoured or disfavoured by them. This can only be the Puruṣa who is always indifferent and who can thus be emancipated. His knowledge too being dependent upon the object of knowledge, and being thus contradictory in its own manifestation, it cannot be said that the knowledge is its own object. For this reason emancipation from external objects becomes impossible, in the same way

as emancipation is not possible in the case of the Videhas and the Prakritilayas. Therefore knowledge also exists for the sake of the Puruṣa, not for the sake of the mind itself.

Nor is the mind in existence for the sake of another of the same kind, because that would mean infinite regression. He therefore for whose sake the mind exists must be the Puruṣa Who does not act by conjunction.—24.

Sūtra 25.

विशेषदर्शिन आत्मभावभावनाविनिवृत्तिः ॥ २५ ॥

विशेष Viśeṣadarśinaḥ (दर्शिनः), for the seer (दर्शिनः) of the distinction (विशेष), आत्म Ātma, of the self. भाव Bhāva, of the nature and relation of. भावना Bhāvanā, of the curiosity. विनिवृत्तिः Vinivṛtīḥ, the cessation. आत्म विनिवृत्तिः ceases the curiosity as to the nature and relations of the Self.

25. For the seer of the distinction, ceases the curiosity as to the nature-and-relations of the Self.—185.

विशेषदर्शिन आत्मभावभावनाविनिवृत्तिः । यथा प्रावृषि तृणाङ्कुरस्योद्भेदेन तद्बीज-
सत्ता नुमीयते तथा मोक्षमार्गश्रवणेन यस्य रोमहर्षाश्रुपातौ दृश्येते तत्राप्यस्ति विशेषदर्शन-
बीजमपवर्गभागीयं कर्मभिर्निर्वर्तितमित्यनुमीयते तस्यात्मभावभावना स्वाभाविकी प्रवर्तते
यस्याभावादिदमुक्तं स्वभावं मुक्त्वा दोषाद्येषां पूर्वपक्षे ह्यभिर्भवत्यहचिश्च निर्णये भवति
तत्रात्मभावभावनाकोऽहमासं कथमहमासं किंस्विदिदं कथंस्विदिदं के वा भविष्यामः
कथं भविष्याम इति । सा तु विशेषदर्शिना निवर्तते । कुतः । चित्तस्थैवैष चित्त्रपरिणामः
पुरुषस्त्वसत्यामविद्यायां शुद्धश्चित्तधर्मैरपरामृष्ट इति । ततोऽप्यस्यात्मभाव भावनाकु-
शलस्य विनिवर्तत इति ॥ २५ ॥

VYĀSA.

As the existence of seeds is inferred from blades of grass shooting forth in the rainy season, so it is inferred that he whose tears flow and whose hair stand on end when he hears of the path of liberation, has a store of Karma tending to liberation as the seed of the recognition of the distinction (between the Puruṣa and the Sattva). The curiosity as to the nature for the Self is naturally manifested in him. In the absence thereof, however, he gives up the nature thus described; and by the defect he loves the antithesis and dislikes the thesis.

Here the curiosity as to the nature of the Self appears as—

'Who was I?' 'How was I?' 'What is this?' 'How is this?'

'What shall we become?' 'How shall we become?' This however ceases in the case of him who sees the distinction (between the Puruṣa and the mind). Why? This varied change is of the mind alone. The curiosity however in the absence of Nescience is pure, that is, not touched by the characteristics of the mind. For this reason too the curiosity as to the nature and relations of Self ceases for the wise.—185.

VĀCHASPATI'S GLOSS.

Having thus described the reasoned philosophy of the Self, which is the very seed of absolute independence, he now shows that the Puruṣa who has reached that stage of fitness is different from any other Puruṣa, who has not reached that stage of fitness. 'For the seer of the distinction, ceases the curiosity as to the nature and relations of the Self.'

The curiosity as to the nature of the Self ceases in the case of him who possesses that curiosity, when he sees the distinction between the Subjective Puruṣa and the Objective Existence, by the practice and effective achievement of the means of the Yoga. As to the nihilist who does not possess this curiosity, he is not fit to be taught. There can be teaching in the case of him who has not first ascertained the fact of the existence of the Self in the world outside the present body. He cannot, therefore, come to know the distinction between the two and hence in the case of him there cannot be the possibility of any curiosity ceasing to be.

But the question is. How is the curiosity to know the nature of the Self known to be existing in any mind? Says he for this reason:—'As in the rainy season, &c.' It is inferred that there exists some Karma done in the previous birth in the shape of the practice of the eight accessories of Yoga or of some portion thereof. Which is the seed out of which is to grow the knowledge of the reality, and which tends towards emancipation. And in the case of such one, the curiosity to know the nature of the Self must necessarily exist without even the necessity of practice.

Shows who has not the capacity, by the authority of the Āgamis. 'In the absence, &c.' The antithesis is that there is no fruit of action, there being no entity existing in another sphere of existence, or say there being no other world beyond this. The nihilist is he who likes this view, but does not like the thesis, which has the determination of the twenty-five tattvas in view. The curiosity as to the nature of the Self has been described before. Speaks of the thought of him who sees the distinction:—'This varied change, &c.' The meaning is that the curiosity as to the nature of the Self ceases in the case of him who is wise enough to know the distinction.—25.

Sūtra 26.

तदा विवेकनिम्नं कैवल्यप्राग्भारं चित्तम् ॥ २६ ॥

तदा Tadā, then. विवेक-निम्नम् Viveka-nimnam, inclining towards discrimination. (निम्नम् विवेक) कैवल्य Kaivalya, absolute independence. प्राग्भारम् Prāghāram, gravitating towards. चित्तम् Chittam, the mind.

26. Then the mind inclines towards discrimination and gravitates towards absolute-independence (kaivalya).—186.

तदा विवेकनिम्नं कैवल्यप्राग्भारं चित्तम् । तदानो यदस्य चित्तं विषयप्राग्भारमज्ञान-
निम्नमासीत्तदस्यान्यथा भवति कैवल्यप्राग्भारं विवेकज्ञाननिम्नमिति ॥ २६ ॥

VYĀSA.

The mind which ere now was heavy with sensuous enjoyment and tended towards ignorance, takes now the reverse course.

It is now heavy with independence and tends towards discriminative knowledge.—186.

VĀCHASPATI'S GLOSS.

Now describes the nature of the mind of him who sees the distinction :—'The mind' is then inclined towards discrimination and gravitates towards absolute independence. 'This has been explained.'—126.

Sūtra 27.

तच्छिद्रेषु प्रत्ययान्तराणि संस्कारेभ्यः ॥ २७ ॥

तच्छिद्रेषु Tachchhidreṣu, in the breaks in it. प्रत्ययान्तराणि Pratyayāntarāṇi, arise other thoughts (प्रत्यय). संस्कारेभ्यः Saṃskārebhyaḥ, from residua.

27. In the breaks arise other thoughts from residua.—187.

तच्छिद्रेषु प्रत्ययान्तराणि संस्कारेभ्यः । प्रत्ययविवेकनिम्नस्य सत्त्वपुरुषान्यताख्याति-
मानप्रवाहारेहिणश्चित्तस्य तच्छिद्रेषु प्रत्ययान्तराण्यस्मीति वा ममेति वा जानामीति
वा कुतः क्षीयमाणबीजेभ्य पूर्वसंस्कारेभ्य इति ॥ २७ ॥

VYĀSA.

In the mind inclining towards discriminative knowledge of the notions, and which has just entered the stream of the distinctive knowledge of the Puruṣa and Objective Existence, other thoughts appear in the intervals such as 'I am,' 'This is mine,' 'I know,' &c. Whence? From previous residua, whose seeds are being destroyed.—187.

VĀCHASPATI'S GLOSS.

It may be so if discriminative knowledge is established in discrimination and never inclines towards outward activity. It is, however, seen in the case of one who is begging his food, that is, inclined towards outward activity. For this reason says :—'In the breaks arise other thoughts from residua.'

Thoughts (Pratyaya) are those by which something is known, the essence of the mind. By that arises the discrimination of consciousness. It is of him that are shown the notions, 'I know,' when absolute freedom is directly shown as separated from anything else. Or the forgetfulness that I do not know. As also the egoism with reference to that, 'I am,' or 'This is mine.' By previous residua means the residua of outgoing activities.—27.

Sūtra 28.

हानमेषां क्लेशवदुक्तम् ॥ २८ ॥

हानम् Hānam, removal. एषाम् Eṣām, their. क्लेशवत् Kleśavat, like that of the afflictions. उक्तम् Uktam, has been described.

28. Their removal has been described like that of the afflictions.—188.

हानमेषां क्लेशवदुक्तम् । यथा क्लेशा दग्धबीजभावा न प्ररोहसमर्था भवन्ति तथा
ज्ञानाग्निना दग्धबीजभावः पूर्वसंस्कारो न प्रत्ययप्रसूभवति । ज्ञानसंस्कारास्तु चित्ता-
धिकारिसमाप्तिमनुशेरत इति न चिन्त्यते ॥ २८ ॥

VYĀSA.

As the afflictions are no longer capable of budding forth when their seed-power has been singed, so also does not the conserved energy of previous residua give birth to notions when its seed-power has been singed by the fire of knowledge. The residua of knowledge, however, live on until the duty of the mind has been fulfilled. They are, therefore, not considered.—188.

VĀCHASPATI'S GLOSS.

Let that be. But if in the face of the existence of discriminative knowledge too, other thoughts arise, what is the cause of their utter removal so that these other thoughts may not rise again at all? For this reason says :—'Their removal has been described like the afflictions.' The outgoing activities in their potential state are not altogether destroyed as long as the discriminative knowledge is not firmly established. In the case however of discriminative knowledge being firmly established the other thoughts are utterly destroyed and are no longer fit to be born again.

By what cause does it come about that the afflictions born in the intervals of discrimination even cease to give birth to other potentialities? The cause is that the seed-power of the afflictions is burnt up by the fire of discriminative knowledge. In the same way the residua of the outgoing activities are burnt up.

But the residua of outgoing activities are to be restrained by the residua of discriminative knowledge, and the residua of discrimination are to be restrained by the potencies of restraint. And it has been shown that the potencies of restraint have not the external objects for their sphere of operation. The means of restraint are, therefore, to be considered. For this reason says :—'The residua of knowledge, however, &c.' The residua of knowledge are the potencies of higher desirelessness.—28.

Sūtra 29.

**प्रसङ्ख्यानेऽप्यकुसीदस्य सर्वथा विवेकख्यातेर्धर्ममेघः
समाधिः ॥ २९ ॥**

प्रसङ्ख्याने Prasakhyāne, in the highest intellections. अपि Api, even. अकुसीदस्य Akusīdasya, having no interest left. सर्वथा Sarvathā, constant. विवेकख्यातेः Vivekakhyāteḥ, from discrimination. धर्म-मेघः Dharma meghaḥ, the cloud of virtue. समाधिः Samādhīḥ, the trance.

29. Having no-interest left even in the Highest-Intellection there comes from constant discrimination, the trance known as the Cloud-of-Virtue.—189.

प्रसङ्ख्यानेऽप्यकुसीदस्य सर्वथा विवेकख्यातेर्धर्ममेघः समाधिः । यदायं ब्राह्मणः
प्रसङ्ख्यानेऽप्यकुसीदस्ततोऽपि न किञ्चित्प्रार्थयते तत्रापि विरक्तस्य सर्वथा विवेकख्याति-
रेव भवतीति संस्कारबीजक्षयान्नास्य प्रत्ययान्तराण्युत्पद्यन्ते तदास्य धर्ममेघो नाम समा-
धिर्भवति ॥ २९ ॥

VYĀSA.

When this Brāhmaṇa has no interest left in the Highest Intellection, i.e., desires nothing even from that, then unattached even to that, he

has discriminative knowledge ever present, and thus by destruction of the seed-power of potencies, other thoughts are not born. Then does he attain the trance known as the Cloud-of-Virtue.—189.

-VÂCHASPATI'S GLOSS.

Thus the author of the Aphorism having described the Highest Intellection to be the means of the restraint of outgoing activities, now speaks of the means of restraining even the Highest Intellection :—'Having no interest left even in the Highest Intellection there comes from constant discrimination the trance known as the Cloud of Virtue.' By that Highest Intellection, he does not desire the possession of anything, even of the power of becoming the master of all existence. Nay he begins to feel pain even there. Having become desireless even there by seeing the defect of change, he comes to the possession of constant discriminative knowledge (undisturbed). Explains the same :—'Thus unattached even to that, &c.' As long as the notions of outgoing activities exist, the Brâhmana does not come to possess the constant manifestation of discriminative knowledge. When however he arrives at the stage when all other thoughts cease to exist, then he becomes possessed of constant discriminative knowledge. Then comes to him the trance known as the Cloud of Virtue (dharma-megha). This is the meaning. Dissatisfied with the Highest Intellection and desiring restraint of that even, let him practise the trance known as the Cloud of Virtue. By the practice of that he becomes constantly possessed of discriminative knowledge.—29.

Sûtra 30.

ततः क्लेशकर्मनिवृत्तिः ॥३०॥

ततः Tatah, thence. क्लेश-कर्म Kleśa-karma, of action and afflictions. निवृत्तिः Nivṛtiti, the removal.

30. Thence the removal of actions and afflictions—190.

ततः क्लेशकर्मनिवृत्तिः । तल्लाभादविद्यादयः क्लेशाः समूलकापं कषिता भवन्ति । कुशलाकुशलाश्च कर्माशयाः समूलघातं हता भवन्ति । क्लेशकर्मनिवृत्तौ जीवन्नेव विद्वान्विमुक्तो भवति । कस्मात् । यस्माद्विपर्ययो भवस्य कारणम् । नहि क्षीणक्लेशविपर्ययः कश्चित्केनचित्क्वचिज्जातो दृश्यत इति ॥ ३० ॥

VYĀSA.

By the attainment thereof, the affliction of Nescience, etc., are removed, even to the very root. And the good and bad vehicles of action are utterly uprooted. On the afflictions and the actions being removed, the wise man becomes free even while alive (the Jivanmukta). How? Because Unreal Cognitions are the cause of existence. No one being free from the affliction of Unreal Cognitions is seen being born by anybody anywhere.—190.

VÂCHASPATI'S GLOSS.

Thus does he become capable of restraining that. And now describes the object thereof :—'Thence the removal of actions and afflictions.' But then how does it come to

pass that the wise become free while yet in the bonds of life? Gives the answer :—'Because, &c.' It is the vehicle of action grown strong by the residua of afflictions and actions that surely becomes the cause of life-state, &c.' And when there is no root, the shoots thereof cannot exist. As says on this subject the revered Akṣapāda :—'By not seeing the birth of one who has no desires.'—30.

Sûtra 31.

तदा सर्वावरणमलापेतस्य ज्ञानस्यानन्त्याज्ज्ञेयमल्पम् ॥ ३१ ॥

तदा Tada, then. सर्वावरणमलापेतस्य Sarva-avarāṇa, mala, apetasya, from which is removed (अपेत) all (सर्वे) obscuring (आवरण) impurities (मल). ज्ञानस्य Jñānasya, of knowledge. अनन्त्यात् Ānntyāt, because of the infinity of. ज्ञेयम् Jñeyam, the knowable. अल्पम् Alpam, but little.

31. The knowable is but little then, because of knowledge having-become-infinite, on account of the removal of all obscuring impurities.—191.

तदा सर्वावरणमलापेतस्य ज्ञानस्यानन्त्याज्ज्ञेयमल्पम् । सर्वैः क्लेशकर्मावरणैर्विमुक्तस्य ज्ञानस्यानन्त्यं भवति । तमसाभिभूतमावृतमनन्तं ज्ञानसत्त्वं ऋचिदेव रजसा प्रवर्तितमुद्घाटितं ग्रहणसमर्थं भवति । तत्र यदा सर्वैरावरणमलैरपगतं भवति तदा भवत्यज्ञानस्य ज्ञानस्यानन्त्याज्ज्ञेयमल्पं सम्पद्यते । यथाकाशे खद्योतः । यत्रेदमुक्तम् । अन्धो मणिमविच्यत्तमनङ्गुलिरावयत् । अग्नीवस्तं प्रत्यमुञ्चत्तमजिह्वोऽप्युज्जयदिति ॥ ३१ ॥

VYĀSA.

Knowledge when rid of all the impurities of affliction and action, becomes infinite. The essence of knowledge covered by the veil of Tamas, is but seldom shown forth and becomes capable of recognition by the activity of Rajas. Here, when all the impurities have been removed, then knowledge becomes infinite. When knowledge becomes infinite, but little remains to know, like the shining insect in space. On this it has been said :—'The blind man pierced the pearl; the fingerless put a thread into it; the neckless wore it and the tongueless praised it.'—191.

VÂCHASPATI'S GLOSS.

Now describes the state of the mind at the time when the Cloud of Virtue has been reached :—'The knowable is but little then because of knowledge having become infinite on account of their removal of obscuring impurities. The impurities which cover up the essence of the mind, are spoken of as the obscuring impurities. These are the afflictions and actions. When the mental essence is freed from alloy these obscuring impurities, knowledge, i. e., the power of knowing becomes infinite, i. e., immeasurable, and therefore the knowable remains but little. As in the season after the rains, the sun being freed of the clouds shines brightly all round and his light becomes infinitely strong, and for this reason, the jar and other such things that are to be lighted remain but little, so also the light of the essence of the mind, when freed from the Rajas and Tamas, becomes infinite, and but little remains to be lighted up. Says the same :—'When that becomes freed from all the impurities &c. Renders the same plainer by means of the canon of

difference :—' When overpowered, &c.' The meaning is that the Tamas is put into motion by the active Rajas and is for this very reason carried away from the place. For this very reason it is called the Cloud of Virtue, inasmuch as it pours forth showers of light upon all the virtues of things to be known.

Well, this trance, the Cloud of Virtue, may be the cause of the calming down of the vehicle of actions along with the afflictions and the residua ; but then how is it that when the Cloud of Virtue makes its appearance, the man is not born again? For this reason says :—'As has been said on the subject.'

If an effect can be brought into existence even when the cause no longer exists, then the acts of piercing the pearl, &c., may well be performed by blind people, &c. Or, it may well be that whatever nonsense an ignorant world may talk about improper things, may be considered as very proper.—31.

Sūtra 32.

ततः कृतार्थानां परिणामक्रमसमाप्तिर्गुणानाम् ॥ ३२ ॥

ततः 'Tatah, by that. कृतार्थानाम् Kṛitārthānām, having fulfilled their object. परिणाम परिणामा, of the changes. क्रमः Krama, of the succession. समाप्तिः Samāptih, end. गुणानाम् Guṇānām, of the qualities.

32. By that, the qualities having fulfilled their object, the succession of their changes ends.—192.

ततः कृतार्थानां परिणामक्रमसमाप्तिर्गुणानाम् । तस्य धर्ममेघस्योदयात्कृतार्थानां गुणानां परिणामक्रमः परिसमाप्यते । नहि कृतभोगापवर्गाः परिसमाप्तक्रमाः क्षणमप्यवस्थातुमुत्सहन्ते ॥ ३२ ॥

VYĀSA.

By that, i.e., by the rise of the Cloud of Virtue, the succession of the changes of the qualities is over, inasmuch as they have fulfilled their object, by having achieved experience and emancipation, and their succession having ended, they no longer care to stay even for a moment.—192.

VĀCHASPATI'S GLOSS.

Well, the highest culmination of the Cloud of Virtue being the purity of the light of knowledge, which is the same as the Higher desirelessness, it may well uproot the potencies of the vehicles of outgoing activities and of trance together with the vehicles of afflictions and actions. But the qualities are of the nature of things which go on performing their actions of their own power. How is it then that they do not go on making the same sort of a body for such Yogis as they do for all men? For this reason says :—' By that, qualities having fulfilled their object, the succession of their changes ends.' The meaning is that the nature of the qualities, that they do not function with respect to him for whom they have already achieved their object.—32.

Sūtra 33.

क्षणप्रतियोगी परिणामापरान्तनिर्ग्राह्यः क्रमः ॥ ३३ ॥

क्षण Kṣaṇa, of moments. प्रतियोगी Pratiyogī, the uninterrupted sequence. परिणाम परिणामा, of evolutionary change. अपरान्तः Aparānta, on the cessation. निर्ग्राह्यः Nigrāhyaḥ, to be cognised as distinct. क्रमः Kramah, succession.

33. Succession is the uninterrupted-sequence of moments, cognised as distinct on the cessation of evolutionary change.—193.

अथ कोऽयं क्रमो नामेति । क्षणप्रतियोगी परिणामापरान्तनिर्ग्राह्यः क्रमः । क्षणानन्तर्यात्मा परिणामस्यापरान्तेनावसनेन गृह्यते क्रमः । नह्यननुभूतक्रमक्षणाक्षवपुराणता वस्त्रस्यान्ते भवति । नित्येषु च क्रमो दृष्टः । द्वयी चेयं नित्यता कूटस्थनित्यता परिणामिनित्यता च । तत्र कूटस्थनित्यता पुरुषस्य । परिणामिनित्यता गुणानाम् । यस्मिन्परिणाममाने तत्त्वं न विहन्यते तन्नित्यम् । उभयस्य च तत्त्वाभिघातान्नित्यत्वं तत्र गुणधर्मेषु बुद्ध्यादिषु परिणामापरान्तनिर्ग्राह्यः क्रमो लब्धपर्यवसानो नित्येषु धर्मेषु गुणेष्वलब्धपर्यवसानः । कूटस्थनित्येषु स्वरूपमात्रप्रतिष्ठेषु मुक्तपुरुषेषु स्वरूपास्तिता क्रमेणैवानुभूयत इति तत्राप्यलब्धपर्यवसानः शब्दपृष्ठेन अस्तिक्रियामुपादाय कल्पयत इति । अथास्य संसारस्य स्थित्वा गत्या च गुणेषु वर्तमानस्यास्ति क्रमसमाप्तिर्न वेति । अवचनीयमेतत् । कथम् । अस्ति प्रश्न एकान्तवचनीयः सर्वो जातो मरिष्यति मृत्वा जनिष्यत इति । ॐ भो इत्यथ सर्वो जातो मरिष्यतीति मृत्वा जनिष्यत इति विभज्य वचनीयमेतत्प्रत्युदितव्यातिः क्षीणतृष्णः कुशलो न जनिष्यत इतरस्तु जनिष्यते । तथा मनुष्यजातिः श्रेयसी न वा श्रेयसीत्येवं परिपृष्टे विभज्य वचनीयः प्रश्नः पशूनधिकृत्य श्रेयसी देवानुर्षोश्चाधिकृत्य नेति । अयं त्ववचनीयः प्रश्नः संसारोऽयमन्तवाननन्तवान्वाथानन्त इति । कुशलस्यास्ति संसारक्रमपरिसमाप्तिर्नैतरस्येति । अन्यतरावधारणे दौषस्तसाद्वाचकरणीयं एवायं प्रश्न इति ॥ ३३ ॥

VYĀSA.

Well, but what is this succession? 'Succession is the uninterrupted flow of moments ; it is taken in by last end, the cessation of changes. A cloth which has not undergone the succession of moments, does not give up its newness and become old all at once in the end.

Further, succession is found in the permanent also. This permanence is two-fold, the Eternal in Perfection ; and the Eternal in Evolution. Of these, the perfect eternity belongs to the Puruṣa. The evolutionary eternity belongs to the qualities. The Permanent or Eternal is that in which the substance is not destroyed by changing appearances. Both are permanent because their substance is never destroyed.

Now with regard to the appearances of the qualities, the Will-to-be and others, succession has an end which is cognized by the cessation of the changes. In the eternal qualities however, whose appearances these are, it has no end. In the case of the Permanent ones, the existence of the released Puruṣas who are established in their own natures, is also known by succession. In their case too, therefore, it has no end. It is however conceived there, with reference to the necessary conception of the act of being attached to the word.

But then is there or is there not an end to the succession of evolutionary changes of the universe, which is ever present in the qualities, by motion or by cessation of motion? This cannot be answered as such. How?

There is a question to which only a one-sided answer may be given:—'All that is born must die and having been dead be born again.' Well, but if the question is put in this form—

Is it that all that is born must die, and having been dead be born again?

The answer that can be given to this is not a single one but must be divided in two.

He in whom the light of knowledge has appeared, and whose desires have been destroyed, that wise man is not born; the rest are born. Similarly the question is, Is mankind good or not? The answer is again to be divided in two. The humankind is better in comparison with the animals, but is inferior in comparison with gods and seers (Riṣis).

As to the question, Has the universe an end or has it not? Why this question cannot be answered as such? For the wise there is cessation of the successions of the universe. Not for the others. There is defect in formulating any other theory. Hence the question must necessarily be divided into two.—193.

VĀCHASPATI'S GLOSS.

Puts a question in the context about the succession of changes (krama):—'Well but what is this succession?' The answer is:—'Succession is the uninterrupted sequence of moments cognized as distinct on the cessation of evolutionary change.'

That to which is mutually related the moment relating backward and forward to the moment of the succession of changes is so called. The meaning is that succession is that which is the support of a group of moments. There can of course be no succession ascertained without the existence of that of which it is the succession. Nor can there be a succession of one moment only. The inference by residue therefore points only to the dependence thereof upon a group of moments. Says this:—'Succession is the uninterrupted flow, &c.' Mentions authority for the existence of the succession of changes:—'It is taken in by the last end, the cessation of changes.'

Even in new cloth preserved with care, oldness becomes visible after a long time. This is the last end of change, otherwise called its cessation. It is for this very reason that a succession of change exists. And before that too is inferred the smallness, the greater smallness and the greatest smallness as well as the grossness, the greater smallness and the greatest smallness of oldness in regular sequence of one after the other.

Shows the same by the canon of difference:—'A cloth which has not undergone, &c.' That which has not been subjected to the succession of moments, is spoken of as not having undergone that.

Well, but this succession cannot be posited of the Pradhāna, because that is eternal. For this reason says:—'Succession is seen in those that are permanent. By using the plural number shows that succession pervades all permanent objects.'

Now shows the modes of permanence and then establishes how succession pervades the eternal:—'Permanence is two-fold, &c.'

Well, the constantly eternal may be eternal, because it never gives up its nature such as it is. As to the changing substances, they are constantly giving up their appearances; how can they be called permanent? For this reason says:—'The Permanent or Eternal is that, &c.' Characteristic, secondary quality and condition possess the qualities of appearance and disappearance; the characterized however remains the same in substance.

Well, are all successions known by the cessation of changes? Says, No:—'Now with regard to the appearances of the qualities, the Will-to-be, etc.' Because the succession of the characteristics ends on account of their being destructible. Not so however the succession of the Pradhāna ends.

Well, the Pradhāna might be said to be possessed of the succession of changes, because of the change of its characteristics. But the Puruṣa never changes. How then can there be a change of succession in the case of the unchanging Puruṣa? For this reason says:—'In those that are constantly permanent, &c.'

There in the case of those that are bound, they have the notion of non-separation from the mind; there is therefore a fastening of the change on them on account of the changes of the mind. In the case of those however that have been released, the existence of an unreal change has been fancied by ignorance with reference to the action of the word to be. Because the word precedes, fancy comes thereafter and puts on the appearance of the action of the word to be.

It has been said that the succession of changes does not find an end in the qualities. Not suffering that assertion puts the question, 'Is there an end to succession, &c.?'

Cessation of motion means the Great Latency, the Mahāpralaya. Motion signifies creation. This is the meaning.

If there were no end of the change of the universe (Saṃsāra) on account of eternity, how then should it be in the Great Latency, that all the Puruṣas should all at once have an end of the succession of changes in their case, and again should the same succession of changes come into being all at once at the beginning of a manifestation? For this reason it would follow that one Puruṣa alone being released, the universe of evolution would cease to exist for all, and thus all the Puruṣas would become released. In this way would come the end of the succession of the changes of the Pradhāna, and the Pradhāna also would thus come to be impermanent.

Further it is not allowed that the manifestation of existence which did not exist before is possible, and this assertion cannot therefore be taken to prove its infinity. When this becomes the case, it can no longer be said that the Pradhāna is beginningless. All the teachings of the Śāstras thus come to be futile. This is the meaning.

Gives the answer:—It cannot be answered; the question does not deserve to be answered. With the object of showing that this question cannot be answered, shows a question which admits of a one-sided answer. 'There is a question, &c.' The answer to the question, Will all those that are born die? Is Yes. This is true. Now speaks of a question which admits of an answer after being divided into two:—'Are all those that are born bound to die and dying be born again? The answer that can be given to this is only possible after a division.'

In order to make the matter clear, mentions another question which admits of an answer only after being divided:—'Similarly the question, &c.' This question does not admit of a one-sided answer. It is impossible to say that the evolution of the wise and unwise is in general indefinite or finite. There can be no community between them.

This is similar to the impossibility of ascertaining the goodness or otherwise of every living being all at once. The same is the case with the death of one who is just born. This can, however, be ascertained after a division. Says this:—The wise man is not born, &c. This is the meaning.

The inference is that there being emancipation of all in the case of the freedom of one only from succession, the world must come to end. And this depends upon the emancipation proved to exist by the authority of the Śāstras. Thus here is the authority of the means of knowledge known as verbal authority, which establishes the emancipation understood. How can it be that the same Śāstras should, by a certain teaching of theirs, stultify another authority of the Śāstras establishing the eternity of the modifications of the Pradhāna? Therefore, the inference which militates against the authority of the Āgama cannot be considered an authority. It is of course in the Veda, the Smṛiti and the Purānas that the succession of creation after creation is without beginning and without end. Further it is not possible that all the souls should cease to be born and die all at once. Even in the case of learned men who have been practising and working for more lives than one to achieve discriminative knowledge, this knowledge does not become well established. How is it then possible that in the case of all living beings, whether they belong to the class of the moving or the unmoving creatures, it should manifest all at once by some chance?

Further it is not proper that the effects should manifest at one and the same time although the causes are not in existence at one and the same time. In the case of the manifestation of discriminative knowledge by succession, innumerable souls may be released by succession, but the destruction of the universe will not follow, because creatures are infinite and innumerable. Thus all is plain.—33.

Sūtra 34.

पुरुषार्थशून्यानां गुणानां प्रतिप्रसवः कैवल्यं स्वरूपप्रतिष्ठा
वा चितिशक्तिरिति ॥३४॥

पुरुषार्थ-शून्यानाम् Puruṣārtha-Śūnyānām, of those that are devoid of the object of the Puruṣa. गुणानाम् Guṇānām, of the qualities. प्रतिप्रसवः Pratiprasavaḥ, becoming latent. कैवल्यम् Kaivalyam, absolute freedom. स्वरूप-प्रतिष्ठा Svarūpa-pratiṣṭhā, established in its own nature. वा Vā, or. चितिशक्तिः Chiti-Śaktiḥ, the power of consciousness. इति Iti, so, thus.

34. Absolute freedom comes when the qualities, becoming devoid of the object of the Puruṣa, become latent; or the power of consciousness becomes established in its own nature.—194.

VYĀSA.

गुणाधिकारक्रमपरिसमाप्तौ कैवल्यमुक्तं तत्स्वरूपमवधार्यते । पुरुषार्थशून्यानां गुणानां प्रतिप्रसवः कैवल्यं स्वरूपप्रतिष्ठा वा चितिशक्तिरिति । कृतभोगापवर्गाणां पुरुषार्थशून्यानां यः प्रतिप्रसवः कार्यकारणत्मकानां गुणानां तत्कैवल्यं स्वरूपप्रतिष्ठा पुनर्बुद्धिसत्त्वानभिसम्बन्धात्पुरुषस्य चितिशक्तिरेव केवला तस्याः सदा तथैवावस्थानं कैवल्यमिति ॥ ३४ ॥

It has been said that absolute freedom comes when the succession of the functioning of the qualities in the performance of their duties is over. Its nature is now ascertained. Absolute freedom is the latency of the qualities on becoming devoid of the object of the Puruṣa, or it is the power of consciousness established in its own nature. Absolute freedom is the becoming latent by inverse process, of the qualities, when they are devoid of the object of the Puruṣa, after having achieved the experience and emancipation of the soul.

The power of consciousness is absolute when it is not again limited.—194.

Thus ends the Commentary of Vyāsa, the Sāṅkhya-pravachana, the Fourth Chapter on Absolute Freedom. THE BOOK IS FINISHED.

VĀCHASPATI'S GLOSS.

Describes the connection of the aphorism defining the nature of absolute freedom (kaivalya) with the previous aphorism:—'It has been said, &c.' Absolute freedom is the becoming latent of the qualities when they become devoid of the objects of the Puruṣa.'

The becoming latent of the qualities in their cause, the Pradhāna, when they are devoid of the objects of the Puruṣa, having achieved them:—The out-going and the trance and the inhibitive potencies of the qualities which appear both as the causes and the effects, become latent in the mind. The mind becomes latent in the principle of egoism. The principle of egoism becomes latent in the undifferentiated phenomenal, and the undifferentiated phenomenal into the noumenal.

This backward disappearance of the qualities which appear as both the causes and the effects, is called absolute freedom of the Puruṣa, in relation to the Pradhāna from which he is released. Or, freedom is the establishment of the Puruṣa in his own nature. Says this, 'Or, it is the power, &c.' Inasmuch as in the Mahāpralaya, too, the power of consciousness is established in its own nature, but that is not Mokṣa, he says:—'Does not come into relationship again, &c.' The word 'ITI' in the aphorism means the end of the book.

In this Chapter have been described the mind fit for freedom, and the trance known as the Cloud of Virtue, for establishing the Puruṣa, as he appears in the other world; also two descriptions of Mukti have been described and other things also by context.

The root of the afflictions has been described, as also the afflictions; both the Yogas are described together with the eight accessories. The way of Mokṣa in the shape of the knowledge of the distinction between the Puruṣa and the qualities has been rendered plainer. Absolute freedom has been ascertained to be the power of consciousness free from the afflictions.

Thus ends the Fourth Chapter of Absolute Freedom in the Gloss of Vāchaspati Mīra on the Commentary of Vyāsa.—34.

OM TAT SAT.

For the service of Brahma.