

## द्वितीयं पञ्चभूतविवेकप्रकरणम्

## dvitīyaṃ pañcabhūtavivekaprakaraṇam

In the previous chapter, it was said ‘koshapancakaat vivecanam vidhaaya’ - the Self should be discriminated from the five sheath. How it should be done was not completely explained there. Therefore, that should be the subject matter for the second chapter. In the five sheaths, the base for four of them are elements, this is the reason why the discrimination into the five elements is kept as the second chapter. It is easy to separate the Self from the external elements.

But should we differentiate (discriminate) the Self from the elements or the elements from the Self? But what is the difference; it is the same as the other. But the time between Shivaratri (Feb-Mar) and Navratri (Sep-Oct) is not the same as vice-versa. To answer this, we need to remember the statement from the first chapter ‘vikalpitaḥvalakṣyatvasaṃbandādyaḥkalpitaḥ’ (1.52) – all these are imagined, super-imposed. Thus, there is no difference if it is from Self or from the elements. But, the Self is the Substratum, therefore we should start from the Self and differentiate the elements from it. Though it may seem correct, our problems are in the realm of the elemental world and we have no knowledge about the Self to start from there, therefore we should differentiate these elements from the Self.

Why are we discussing this? This should be our next question. Since, we have already established the elements to be Mithya and thus the elemental too are Mithya, we should not get attached or averse to it, but should ignore (anaadara - aloof), as said in the end of this chapter. Why is it said so? When we are bothered about it, we talk about it, we start giving it reality, which it does not have.

This chapter discusses the statement ‘सदेव सोम्य इदमग्र आसित् एकमेव अद्वितीयम् sadeva soumya idamagra āsit ekameva advitīyam’ - . It is done here like this

1. The Apancikrta (unprocessed) five elements – Character, effect etc. is discussed
2. The discussion about 5 sense-organ of action, 5 sense-organ of knowledge, inner-organ
3. What is Sat-vastu, as said in the statement. This is where the Madhyamika Buddhist – Shunyavadi - Voidist. But as per the logic ‘prakshalanaad pankasya durad asparshanam varam’ – it is better to not go close to gutter, then to wash-off after touching it. Using this logic, we can simply just ignore the Buddhist,

- for this the counter logic is ‘स्थूनानिखनन न्याय sthūnānikhanana nyāya’ – shaking the newly planted pillar is not for removing it, but to make it strong.
4. Maya Shakti Svarupa (nature) and its Lakshana (definition), what is its speaciality, why is it inexplicable etc. Here the ides of Shakti – Shaktimato: Abheda (power – weilder of power are identical) is established.
  5. What is the loci of Avidya. Completely in Brahman or in a portion.
  6. Each element is differentiated from Self.
  7. Thus, the element which are discussed here and differentiated from the Self, does not have a real existence, neither here nor anywhere, therefore, it should be ignored.
  8. The knowledge thus gained through the discrimination will not be negated at anytime or anywhere. Since, there is no other Pramana that is powerful than Vedanta.

नत्वा श्रीभारतीतीर्थविद्यारण्यमुनीश्वरौ ।

पञ्चभूतविवेकस्य व्याख्यानं क्रियते मया ॥

*natvā śrībhāratīīrthavidyāraṇyamunīśvarau /*

*pañcabhūtavivekasya vyākhyānaṃ kriyate mayā //*

This commentary on PancaBhuta Viveka is done by me, Saluting Sri Bharati Teertha Muni and Sri Vidyaranya Muni.

*natvā śrībhāratīīrthavidyāraṇyamunīśvarau* - Saluting Sri Bharati Teertha Muni and Sri Vidyaranya Muni *pañcabhūtavivekasya vyākhyānaṃ kriyate mayā* - This commentary on PancaBhuta Viveka is done by me.

‘सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीदेकमेवाद्वितीयम्’ (छा उ – ६.२.१) इति श्रुत्या जगदुत्पत्तेः पुरा यत् जगत्कारणं सद्वृषमद्वितीयं ब्रह्म श्रुतं तस्याऽवाङ्मनसगोचरत्वेन स्वतोऽवगन्तुमशक्यत्वात् तत्कार्यत्वेन तदुपाधिभूतस्य भूतपञ्चकस्य विवेकद्वारा तदवबोधनायोपोद्घातत्वेन भूतपञ्चकविवेकं प्रतिजानीते –

*‘sadeva somyedamagra āsīdekamevādviitīyam’ (chā u – 6.2.1) iti śrutyā jagadutpatteh purā yat jagatkāraṇaṃ sadrūpamadviitīyaṃ brahma śrutam tasyā’vānmanasagocaratvena svato’vagantumaśakyatvāt tatkāryatvena tadupādhibhūtasya bhūtapañcakasya vivekadvārā tadavabodhanāyopodghātatvena bhūtapañcakavivekaṃ pratijānīte –*

‘*sadeva somyedamagra āsīdekamevādvitīyam*’ - only Sat existed, before the creation as one non-dual, *iti śrutīyā jagadutpatteḥ purā* - with this shruti statement, before the creation. What existed? *jagatkāraṇam* – the cause for the creation, Brahman. How was it? *sadrūpamadvitīyam brahma śrutam* – it is said, was \Existence and non-dual. What is Sat? ‘*trikāla abādhyatvam*’ – that which is not negated in three periods of time. What is Advityam? ‘*dvitīyam vastvantaram yasya na vidyate*’ – for which there is nothing other than itself.

If we know the definition we can understand this Brahman. Therefore, what is its definition? *tasyā'vāñmanasagocaratvena* – since it is beyond the grasp of mind and speech. The Taiterīya Shruti very clearly declares ‘*यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते अप्राप्य मनसा सह यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते अप्राप्य मनसा साहा*’ – from where the speech returns without grasping, along with the mind. *svato'vagantumaśakyatvāt* – it cannot be understood directly, as an object. Then is there no way to understand? *tatkāryatvena tadupādhibhūtasya* – being its effect, that which is its embodiment. What is the effect? *bhūtapāñcakasya* – the five elements. *vivekadvārā* – through the discrimination. Discrimination of the elements from the Self. Since, as we saw, to differentiate the Self from the other things, we do not know the Self immediately. *Tadavabodhanāya* – for the knowledge of that. What is this ‘that’? it is not the elements, which we have knowledge about already, and therefore cannot be the result. Therefore, it is the Self. *upodghātatvena bhūtapāñcakavivekaṃ pratijānīte* – as an introduction, first the five elements are explained.

सदद्वैतं श्रुतं यत्तत्पञ्चभूतविवेकतः ।

बोद्धुं शक्यं ततो भूतपञ्चकं प्रविविच्यते ॥ १ ॥

*sadadvaitam śrutam yattatpañcabhūtavivekataḥ |*

*boddhum śakyam tato bhūtapāñcakam pravivicyate || 1 ||*

*That which is said (in Chandogya) as Existence, non-dual, can be understood by differentiating it from the five elements. Therefore, the five elements are nicely inquired into.*

*sadadvaitam* - Existence, non-dual. That which is the Self. *śrutam* - which is heard about, in the Shruti. The term Shruta - heard, is always read along with Shruti. *yattatpañcabhūtavivekataḥ* - through the inquiry into the five element. The Viveka is through the method taught in the first chapter, Anvaya as If Brahman exists these elements exists, and Vyatireka as If five elements don't exists, still Brahman exists.

*bodddhum śakyam* - it could be understood, *tato* - therefore, *bhūtapañcakam* - the five elements, *pravivicyate* – is explained in detail.

सद्वैतम् इति ॥ १ ॥

*sadvaitam iti ॥ 1 ॥*

तत्र तावदाकाशादीनां पञ्चानां भूतानां गुणतो भेदज्ञापनाय तद्गुणानाह –

*tatra tāvadākāśādīnāṃ pañcānāṃ bhūtānāṃ guṇato bhedajñāpanāya tadguṇānāha –*

*tatra* – in this inquiry, *tāvadākāśādīnāṃ pañcānāṃ bhūtānāṃ* – among the Akasha etc. five elements. Here we are referring to Space the element as Akasha, to differentiate it from the attribute of Akasha, which is to provide space (Avakaasha). *guṇato bhedajñāpanāya* – to show the difference through the attributes, *tadguṇānāha* - their attributes are explained. The attributes of the Akasha (easy to understand then Akasha) etc. are explained to differentiate one from other and all from the Self. The difference between them though is not a point of discussion, it is done because, though we can understand the Akasha to be different from air and they different from fire etc., some are subtle and other gross. And the subtle exists in the gross, therefore there is invariable a commonness, to remove this doubt, this has to be differentiated.

शब्दस्पर्शौ रूपरसौ गन्धो भूतगुणा इमे ।

एकद्वित्रिचतुः पञ्चगुणा व्योमादिषु क्रमात् ॥ २ ॥

*śabdasparsau rūparasau gandho bhūtaguṇā ime |*

*ekadvitricatuḥ pañcaguṇā vyomādiṣu kramāt || 2 ||*

*Sound, touch, form, taste and smell are attributes of the elements. In Akasha etc. (air, fire, water and earth), respectively there are one, two, three, four and five attributes.*

*śabdasparsau* – sound and touch, *rūparasau* – form and taste, *gandho* – smell, *bhūtaguṇā ime* – are the attributes of the elements. These are effects of Brahman, but if there are no attributes they cannot be differentiated, even if they all have the same attributes being an effect of the same cause, still they cannot be differentiated. To show how they differ, the attributes are enumerated, *ekadvitricatuḥ pañcaguṇā* – 1, 2, 3, 4

and 5 attributes, *vyomādiṣu* – in Akasha etc., *kramāt* - respectively. Their common attribute will be said later, the Existence and Maya, this will be referred with Nistatva.

शब्देति । नन्वेते गुणाः किं सर्वेषामुत एकैकस्यैकैकागुण इति विमर्शयन्नोभयथापि किन्तु प्रकारान्तरमस्तीत्यभिप्रायेणाह – एकेति ॥ २ ॥

*śabdeti | nanvete guṇāḥ kiṃ sarveṣāmuta ekaikasyaikaikāguṇa iti vimarśayannobhayathāpi kintu prakārāntaramastītyabhiprāyeṇāha – eketi ॥ 2 ॥*

*nanvete guṇāḥ* – but, will all these attributes exist in all the elements or does each element will have one attribute? *ekaikasyaikaikāguṇa iti vimarśayan* – after enquiring through this, *nobhayatha...asti* – neither of them, but there is another third possibility, *nobhayathāpi kintu prakārāntaramastītyabhiprāyeṇāha* - with this in mind, it is explained. What is this third option? Each one will have one extra attribute. But what will have extra attribute, and how is this decided? The order of creation is said in Taiteriyā Upanishad ‘आत्मनः आकाशः सम्भूतः आकाशात् वायुः वायोः अग्निः अन्नोः आपः अभ्यः पृथ्वी ātmanah ākāśah sambhūtaḥ ākāśāt vāyuh vāyoh agni anneh āpa abhyaḥ pṛthvī’ from Self Akasha came, from Akasha air, from air fire, from fire water, from water earth. And in this order, each one will have extra attribute. Why add extra attribute? There is only one attribute, the effects own attribute, the other one is the causal attribute. It is said ‘kāraṇa guṇātmakatvāt kāryasya’ – the effect will be of the nature of cause. If effect and cause have the same nature, then it cannot be cause-effect, therefore to distinguish itself there is a special attribute of the effect. ॥ 2 ॥

तदेव प्रकारान्तरं विशदयति –

*tadeva prakārāntaram viśadayati* –

*tadeva prakārāntaram viśadayati* – the third option is explained. Each of the attribute is explained with Abhinaya – to show it in gestures or signals.

प्रतिध्वनिर्वियच्छब्दो वायौ वीसीति शब्दनम् ।

अनुष्णाशीतसंस्पर्शो वह्नो भुगुभुगुध्वनिः ॥ ३ ॥

*pratidhvanirviyacchabdo vāyau vīsīti śabdanam |*

*anuṣṇāśītasamsparśo vahnō bhugubhugudhvanīḥ ॥ 3 ॥*

*Akasha has echo as its sound, in air it is 'visi visi' sound and neither hot nor cold touch, in fire 'Bhugu Bhugu' sound.*

**Pratidhvanirviyacchabdo** – echo is the sound of Akasha. In Logic Akasha is defined as 'śabdagaṇakam' – that which has sound as attribute is Akasha. It should have been 'viyat guna shabda' in the shloka, but it is said 'pratidvani'. It is said so, because without the air as the medium, sound cannot travel as seen in vacuum, the sound travels in wave packets pattern and this is explained with two examples, like the petals of the flower (kadamba mukula) and ripples of the water (vici taranga). **vāyau** – In the air, **vīsīti śabdānam** - the sound produced is vice. The sound produced when the air is heard travelling through the window gaps or through a bamboo, this is causal attribute. **anuṣṅāśītasamsparśo** – neither hot nor cold. This is effects own attribute. The reason we feel very hot when the hot air blows in summer, is not the character of the air, but air in association with fire, like water which is naturally sweet will be salty etc. because of the association with the type of earth. **vahnau** – in the fire, **bhugubhugudhvanīḥ** - the sound of 'bhugu bhugu'. The sound produced when charcoal is burnt.

प्रतिध्वनिः इति । आकाशे तावच्छब्द एव गुणः, स च प्रतिध्वनिरूप । वायौ शब्दस्पर्शौ तत्र वायुशब्दमनुकारेण दर्शयति – वीसीति शब्दम् इति । एवमुक्तत्रानुकरणशब्दनं द्रष्टव्यम् । तस्य स्पर्शमाह – अनुष्णाशीतसंस्पर्श इति । वहौ शब्दस्पर्शरूपाणीति त्रयो गुणा, ते क्रमेणाभिधीयन्ते । वहौ भुगुभुगुध्वनिः ॥ ३ ॥

*pratidhvanīḥ iti | ākāśe tāvacchabda eva gaṇaḥ, sa ca pratidhvanirūpa | vāyau śabdasparsāu tatra vāyuśabdamanukāreṇa darśayati – vīsīti śabdānam iti | evamuktaratrānukaraṇaśabdānam draṣṭavyam | tasya sparśamāha – anuṣṅāśītasamsparśa iti | vahnau śabdasparsarūpāṇīti trayo gaṇā, te krameṇābhīdhīyante | vahnau bhugubhugudhvanīḥ || 3 ||*

**ākāśe tāvacchabda eva gaṇaḥ; sa ca pratidhvanirūpa** – the Akasha has only sound as its attribute and it is of the form of echo. Pratidvani means reflection, the reflection of the sound when it is carried by the wind is what is meant here. **vāyau śabdasparsāu tatra vāyuśabdamanukāreṇa darśayati** – in the air, both sound and touch. The sound of air is shown by reproducing it. **evamuktaratrānukaraṇaśabdānam draṣṭavyam** – similarly, we should see the word 'reproduced' in the latter elements too. **tasya sparśamāha** - Its, touch is explained. **vahnau śabdasparsarūpāṇīti trayo gaṇā** – in the fire, there are three attributes namely sound, touch and form. **te krameṇābhīdhīyante** - they are explained in order. **vahnau bhugubhugudhvanīḥ** – in the fire the sound is 'bhugu bhugu'. **|| 3 ||**

उष्णः स्पर्शः प्रभा रूपं जले बुलु बुलु ध्वनिः ।

शीतास्पर्शः शुक्तरूपं रसो माधुर्यमीरितम् ॥ ४ ॥

***uṣṇaḥ sparśaḥ prabhā rūpaṁ jale bulu bulu dhvaniḥ |***

***śītāsparśaḥ śuklarūpaṁ raso mādhyamīritam || 4 ||***

*Touch is hot and form is the shining. In water sound is 'bulu bulu', touch is cold, form is transparent (white) and taste is sweet.*

***uṣṇaḥ sparśaḥ*** - touch is hot, ***prabhā rūpaṁ*** - form is shining, ***jale*** – in water, ***bulu bulu dhvaniḥ*** - the sound is 'bulu bulu'. The sound of water in a stream. ***śītāsparśaḥ*** - cold to touch. The water from ganges will be cold in summer or winter. But the water underground is warmer in the winter and cold in the summer? This is because of the difference in the external temperature, as the underground water maintains a standard temperature. ***śuklarūpaṁ*** - white (transparent) form, ***raso mādhyamīritam*** – the taste is sweet, it is said. This sweetness of the water can be experienced when we drink water after eating gooseberry.

उष्णः स्पर्शः प्रभारूपम् इति । जले शब्दादयो रसाताश्चत्वारो गुणास्तानाह दृ जले बुलुबुलुध्वनिः, शीतः स्पर्शः, शुक्लं रूपं, रसो माधुर्यमीरितम् इति ॥ ४ ॥

***uṣṇaḥ sparśaḥ prabhārūpaṁ iti | jale śabdādayo rasātāścatvāro guṇāstānāha – jale bulubuludhvaniḥ, śītaḥ sparśaḥ, śuklaṁ rūpaṁ, raso mādhyamīritam iti || 4 ||***

***jale śabdādayo rasātāścatvāro guṇāstānāha*** – in water from sound till taster, there are four attributes, it is said. ***jale bulubuludhvaniḥ, śītaḥ sparśaḥ, śuklaṁ rūpaṁ, raso mādhyamīritam iti*** – in water the sound is 'bulu bulu', cold in touch, whit transparent form, sweet in taste. ***|| 4 ||***

भूमौ शब्दादिगन्धान्ता पञ्च गुणास्तानुदाहरति –

***bhūmau śabdādigandhāntā pañca guṇāstānudāharati –***

*bhūmau śabdādigandhāntā pañca guṇāstānudāharati* - in the earth, the smell etc. five attributes are explained.

भूमौ कडकडाशब्दः काठिन्यं स्पर्श इष्यते ।

नीलादिकं चित्ररूपं मधुराम्लादिको रसः । ॥ ५ ॥

*bhūmau kaḍakaḍāśabdaḥ kāṭhinyaṁ sparśa iṣyate* |

*nīlādikaṁ citrarūpaṁ madhurāmlādiko rasaḥ* || 5 ||

*In the earth the sound is 'kata kata', hard in touch, black etc. different colours, sweet, sour etc. are the tastes.*

*bhūmau* – in the earth, *kaḍakaḍāśabdaḥ* - the sound produced is 'kata kata'. When one rock rolls over the other, this is the sound produced. *kāṭhinyaṁ sparśa* – touch is hard, *iṣyate* – is accepted. This can be associated with all the attributes. *nīlādikaṁ citrarūpaṁ* - blue, black etc. varied colours. Innumerable colours. *madhurāmlādiko rasaḥ* - sweet, sour etc. are different taste. They are six in number.

भूमौ कडकडाशब्दः इत्यादिना ॥ ५ ॥

*bhūmau kaḍakaḍāśabdaḥ ityādinā* || 5 ||

‘सुरभीतरगन्धौ द्वौ’ इत्यन्तेनोक्तमर्थमुपसंहरति –

‘*surabhītaragandhau dvau*’ *ityantenoktamarthamupasaṁharati* –

‘*surabhītaragandhau dvau*’ *ityantenoktamarthamupasaṁharati* - With the ‘surabhi’ etc. the current discussion is concluded.

सुरभीतरगन्धौ द्वौ गुणाः सम्यग्विवेचिताः ।

श्रोत्रं त्वक्चक्षुषि जिह्वा घ्राणं चेन्द्रियपञ्चकम् ॥ ६ ॥

*surabhītaragandhau dvau guṇāḥ samyagvivecitāḥ* |



*śrotram tvakcakṣuṣi jihvā ghrāṇaṁ cendriyapañcakam || 6*  
||

*Good and bad two types of fragrance (in earth), the attributes are nicely explained. The five sense-organs are ear, skin, eye, tongue and nose.*

*surabhūtaragandhau dvau* – good fragrance and the other (not good = bad) two types of smells, *guṇāḥ samyagvivecitāḥ* - the attributes are inquired into nicely. We have the knowledge of the attributes; still we cannot rush to start the inquiry into differentiating the Self from them. We should remember, we are not teaching the system of understanding the Self through the creation, because there is no association of Self with creation. We are not establishing the creation to be real. Since we introduced to the topic with a keyword ‘upadhi’ – embodiment. We are trying to understand the ‘upahita’ – embodied, through the ‘upadhi’ - embodiment. Because they are completely non-attached, the difference between Upadhi and Visheshana; viśeṣana – ‘kāryānvayi vyavartako vartamānaśca’ – continues in the effect, differentiates and is present and upādhi – ‘kāryānanvayi vyavartako vartamānaśca’ – does not continue in the effect, differentiates and is present. Being Upadhi, they have no association with the embodied (Self). The attributes are explained, what is the Karya (effect), is explained here *śrotram tvakcakṣuṣi jihvā ghrāṇaṁ cendriyapañcakam* – the five sense-organs are ear, skin, eye, tongue and nose.

गुणा इति । एवं गुणवतो भेदमभिधाय कार्यतो भेदज्ञापनाय तत्कार्याणि ज्ञानेन्द्रियाणि तावदाह – श्रोत्रम् इति ॥ ६ ॥

*guṇā iti । evaṁ guṇavato bhedamabhidhāya* – after explaining the difference based on the attributes, *kāryato bhedajñāpanāya* = to establish the difference through the effect, *tatkāryāṇi jñānendriyāṇi tāvadāha* – their effects sense-organ of knowledge are said. In Shloka 2.102, it is said ‘dvaitājñā susthithā cet advaite dhī sthīrā bhavet’ – if the aversion to duality gets established very nicely, then the mind will be established in the Self. ॥ 6 ॥

तेषां स्थानानि व्यापारांश्च दर्शयति –

*teṣāṁ sthānāni vyāpārāṁśca darśayati* –

*teṣāṁ sthānāni vyāpārāṁśca darśayati* – their place and functionality is explained.

कर्णादिगोलकस्थं तच्छब्दादिग्राहकं क्रमात् ।

सौक्ष्म्यात्कार्यानुमेयं तत्प्रायो धावेद्बहिर्मुखम् ॥ ७ ॥

*karṇādigolakasthaṃ tacchabdādigrāhakaṃ kramāt /*

*saukṣmyātkāryānumeyaṃ tatprāyo dhāvedbahirmukham //*

7 //

*They (sense-organs) staying in its ear etc. places, grasps the sound etc. respective objects. Since they are subtle, they could be inferred only through their effect. They generally travel externally.*

*karṇādigolakasthaṃ* - staying in the ear etc. place. Golaka is the external limb of the sense-organ, in which the sense-organ reside. *tacchabdādigrāhakaṃ* - it grasps the shound etc. objects. As seen in earlier, some travel externally and some stay in the place for grasping. *kramāt* - the respective objects, *saukṣmyātkāryānumeyaṃ* - since they are subtle, it can be infered through the effect. The sense-organ cannot be perceived because they are subtle, they are subtle because they are effect of the Apancikrta-bhuta (unprocessed elements). Then it is non-existent? No, as explained in the **1.12**, using the Sankhya shloka to show eight reasons for the object to be not grasped, though it is existent. Karya-anumeya is also said as karya-lingaka-anumana – inferring through the effect as the pointer. *tatprāyo* – they (sense-organs) generally. Generally, it travels internally, but sometimes it travels internally. *dhāvedbahirmukham* - run externally. The logicians accept the sense-organ of listening to stay in its limb and receive the sound, but Vedanti accepts the sense-organ of listening to travel to the place of sound origin.

कर्णादीति । इन्द्रियसद्भावे किं प्रमाणमित्याकाङ्क्षायां कार्यलिङ्गकानुमानमित्याह – सौक्ष्म्यात् इति ।

*karṇādīti / indriyasadbhāve kiṃ pramāṇamityākāṅkṣāyāṃ kāryaliṅgakānumānamityāha – saukṣmyāt iti /*

*indriyasadbhāve kiṃ pramāṇamityākāṅkṣāyāṃ* - for the doubt. What is the proof for the existence of the sense-organs? *kāryaliṅgakānumānamityāha* - the answer given is, by the inference through the effect.

तच्च 'रूपोपलब्धिः करणजन्या, क्रियात्वात्, छिदिक्रियावत्' इत्यादि द्रष्टव्यम् ।

*tacca 'rūpopalabdhiḥ karaṇajanyā, kriyātvāt, chidikriyāvat' ityādi draṣṭavyam /*

*tacca 'rūpopalabdhiḥ karaṇajanyā, kriyātvāt, chidikriyāvat' ityādi draṣṭavyam* - the syllogism of inference is shown, *'rūpopalabdhiḥ* - gaining of the form, Paksha, *karaṇajanyā* - is done through the instrument (sense-organ), Sadhya. Karana is 'asādhāraṇam kāraṇam karaṇa' - a special cause is instrument, *kriyātvāt* - because it is an effect, Hetu. Gaining the form is an act, *chidikriyāvat* - like the act of felling the tree, Udaharana'. In the act of felling tree, the axe is moved up and down, this movement is accepted to be the cause of the felling. Like the logicians use the syllogism to prove the Iswara - 'kṣityaṅkurādikam - the sprout etc, sakatṛkam - has an instrumental cause, kāryatvāt - being a cause, ghaṭavat - like pot'.

सौक्ष्म्यात् अपञ्चीकृतपञ्चभूतकार्यत्वेन दुर्लक्ष्यत्वादित्यर्थः ।

*saukṣmyāt apañcīkṛtapañcabhūtakāryatvena durlakṣyatvādityarthaḥ /*

*saukṣmyāt* - because of being subtle. Reason of it being subtle is, *apañcīkṛtapañcabhūtakāryatvena* - since, it is an effect of the unprocessed elements. *durlakṣyatvādityarthaḥ* - therefore it cannot be perceived or pointed out.

एतेषां स्वभावमाह - प्राय इति । 'परञ्चि खानि व्यातृणत्स्वयंभूः' (कठ उ - ४.९) इति श्रुतेरित्यर्थः ॥ ७ ॥

*eteṣāṃ svabhāvamāha - prāya iti / 'parañci khāni vyātrṇatsvayaṃbhūḥ' (kaṭha u - 4.1) iti śruterityarthaḥ ॥ 7 ॥*

*eteṣāṃ svabhāvamāha* - their nature is explained. *'parañci khāni vyātrṇatsvayaṃbhūḥ' (kaṭha u - 4.1) iti śruterityarthaḥ* - the Shruti says 'the sense-organs are created by the Brahma to travel outside, generally'. ॥ 7 ॥

'प्रायः' शब्देन सूचितं क्वचित्करणानामन्तरविषयग्राहकत्वं दर्शयति -

*'prāyaḥ' śabdena sūcitam kvacitkaraṇānāmantaraviṣayagrāhakatvaṃ darśayati -*

*'prāyaḥ' śabdena sūcitam kvacitkaraṇānāmantaraviṣayagrāhakatvaṃ darśayati* - the one referred with the word 'generally' that some sense-organs grasp the objects inside of the body too, is explained.

कदाचित्पिहिते कर्णे श्रूयते शब्द आन्तरः ।

प्राणवायौ जाठराग्नौ जलपानेऽन्नभक्षणे ॥ ८ ॥

व्यज्यन्ते ह्यान्तराः स्पर्शाः मीलने चान्तरं तमः ।

उद्गारे रसगन्धौ चेत्यक्षणामान्तरग्रहः ॥ ९ ॥

*kadācitpihite karṇe śrūyate śabda āntaraḥ ।*

*prāṇavāyau jāṭharāgnau jalapāne'nnabhakṣaṇe ॥ 8 ॥*

*vyajyante hyāntarāḥ sparsāḥ mīlane cāntaraṃ tamaḥ ।*

*udgāre rasagandhau cetyakṣāṇāmāntaragrahaḥ ॥ 9 ॥*

Sometimes when we close the ears, because of the movement of the Prana and the sound of the fire in the belly (digestive bile) is heard. When we eat food or drink water the touch is sensed inside. When we close the eyes, we see the darkness. In the burping we see the taste and smell. Thus, the sense-organs do experience things inside.

*kadācitpihite karṇe* – when the ears are closed. *śrūyate śabda āntaraḥ* - we hear the internal sound. If there is internal sound what produces it? *prāṇavāyau* – the movement of the Prana, *jāṭharāgnau* – the burning of the fire in the belly. Jatara is the stomach and agni is fire, here ny fire in the stomach, the digestive juice which secretes in the stomach to digest the things eaten is mentioned. *jalapāne'nnabhakṣaṇe* - when we drink water or eat food, *vyajyante hyāntarāḥ sparsāḥ* - the internal touch is experienced, *mīlane cāntaraṃ tamaḥ* - when we close our eyes we see the internal darkness, *udgāre rasagandhau* – when we burp or vomit, the internal taste and smell, *cetyakṣāṇāmāntaragrahaḥ* - thus, we grasp the internal objects through the sense-organs.

कदाचित् इति द्वाभ्याम् । कदाचित् कर्णस्य पिधाने कृते सति प्राणवायौ जाठराग्नौ च विद्यमान आन्तरः शब्दः श्रूयते ।

*kadācit iti dvābhyām । kadācit karṇasya pidhāne kṛte sati prāṇavāyau jāṭharāgnau ca vidyamāna āntaraḥ śabdaḥ śrūyate ।*

*kadācit karṇasya pidhāne kṛte sati* - sometimes, when we close the ears. *prāṇavāyau jāṭharāgnau ca vidyamāna āntaraḥ śabdaḥ śrūyate* – the internal sound of the Prana and the fire in belly are heard.

जलपानेऽन्नभक्षणे चान्तरस्पर्शा अभिव्यज्यन्ते अभिव्यक्ता भवन्ति । नेत्रनिमीलने कृते आन्तरं तम उपलभ्यते । उद्गारे जाते रसगन्धौ द्वौ गृह्येते ।

*jalapāne'nnabhakṣaṇe cāntarasparśā abhivyajyante abhivyaktā bhavanti / netranimīlane kṛte āntaraṃ tama upalabhyate / udgāre jāte rasagandhau dvau gṛhyete /*

*jalapāne'nnabhakṣaṇe cāntarasparśā* – while drinking water and eating food, we experience the internal touch. *abhivyajyante = abhivyaktā bhavanti* - they manifest. *netranimīlane kṛte āntaraṃ tama upalabhyate* – when we close our eyes, we see the internal darkness. *udgāre jāte rasagandhau dvau gṛhyete* – when we burp, we experience the internal taste and smell.

इत्यनेन प्रकारेणा अक्षानामान्तरग्रहः । अक्षानाम् इति कर्तारि षष्ठी । आन्तरस्य विषयस्य ग्रहो ग्रहणम् , इन्द्रियकर्तृकमान्तरविषयग्रहनं भवतीत्यर्थः ॥ ८-९ ॥

*ityanena prakāreṇā akṣāṇāmāntaragrahaḥ / akṣāṇām iti kartari ṣaṣṭhī / āntarasya viṣayasya graho grahaṇam , indriyakarṭṭkamāntaraviṣayagrahaṇam bhavatītyarthaḥ // 8-9 //*

*ityanena prakāreṇā akṣāṇāmāntaragrahaḥ* - in this way, the sense-organs grasp internal objects. *akṣāṇām iti kartari ṣaṣṭhī* - the word Akshanaam is used in the sixth case to denote the doership. What is the meaning of sixth-case doership? *āntarasya viṣayasya* - internal objects, *graho = grahaṇam* - grasping, *indriyakarṭṭkamāntaraviṣayagrahaṇam bhavatītyarthaḥ* - the sense-organs are the doer in the grasping of the objects of things internal. The sense-organ is though inert, it is explained as doer to be able to differentiate from the Self. Because, the sense-organs are in association with Self and Maya, as said, therefore this identification makes it non-differentiable. This identity is denoted by the doership. *// 8-9 //*

एवं ज्ञानेन्द्रियव्यापारानभिधाय कर्मेन्द्रियासत्त्ववादिनं प्रति तत्सद्भावसमर्थनाय तल्लिङ्गभूतांस्तद्व्यापारानाह –

*evaṃ jñānendriyavyāpārānabhidhāya karmendriyāsattvavādinam prati tatsadbhāvasamarthanāya talliṅgabhūtāṃstadvyāpārānāha –*

*evaṃ jñānendriyavyāpārānabhidhāya* – after explaining the functionality of the sense-organ of knowledge. *karmendriyāsattvavādinam prati* - for the people, who do not accept the existence of the sense-organ of action, *tatsadbhāvasamarthanāya* - to

establish its existence, *tallīṅgabhūtāmstadvyāpārānāha* – to establish its (sense-organ of action) existence, the pointer to that existence, their functions are explained.

पञ्चोक्त्याऽऽदानगमनविसर्गानन्दकाः क्रियाः ।

कृषिवाणिज्यसेवाद्याः पञ्चस्वन्तर्भवन्ति हि ॥ १० ॥

*pañcoktyā'dānagamanavisargānandakāḥ kriyāḥ ।*

*kṛṣivāṇijyasevādyāḥ pañcasvantarbhavanti hi ॥ 10 ॥*

*Speech, receiving, walking, excretion and progeny creation are the functions. Farming, business and service etc. are contained in these five.*

*pañcoktyā'dānagamanavisargānandakāḥ kriyāḥ* - Speech, receiving, walking, excretion and progeny creation are the functions. Why should we limit the actions to five, as we have - *kṛṣivāṇijyasevādyāḥ* - Farming, business and service etc.? The answer is - *pañcasvantarbhavanti hi* - definitely are contained in these five.

पञ्च इति । उक्तिश्चाऽऽदानं च गमनं च विसर्गश्च आनन्दश्चेति द्वन्द्वसमासः ।

*pañca iti luktiścā'dānaṃ ca gamaṇaṃ ca visargaśca ānandaśceti dvandvasamāsaḥ ।*

*pañca iti luktiścā'dānaṃ ca gamaṇaṃ ca visargaśca ānandaśceti dvandvasamāsaḥ* - they are a compound word called Dvanda, where each function is added with the other with an 'ca - and'. Speech and, receiving and, walking and, excretion and, progeny creation.

उक्त्याऽऽदानगमनविसर्गानन्दाख्याः पञ्च क्रियाः प्रसिद्धा इति शेषः ।

*uktyā'dānagamanavisargānandākhyāḥ pañca kriyāḥ prasiddhā iti śeṣaḥ ।*

*uktyā'dānagamanavisargānandākhyāḥ pañca kriyāḥ prasiddhā iti śeṣaḥ* - Speech, receiving, walking, excretion and progeny creation are actions that are well known.

ननु कृष्यादीनां क्रियान्तरानामपि सत्वात्कथं पञ्चेत्युक्तमित्याशङ्क्याह – कृषीति ॥ १० ॥

*nanu kṛṣyādīnāṃ kriyāntarānāmapi satvātkatham pañcetyuktamityāśaṅkyāha – kṛṣīti ॥ 10 ॥*

*nanu kṛṣyādīnām kriyāntarānāmapi satvātkatham pañcetyuktamityāśaṅkyāha* – but farming etc. the other known actions too exist, therefore why should we limit it to five? They are included in these five. // 10 //

कानि तानि क्रियाजनकानीन्द्रियाणीत्यत आह –

*kāni tāni kriyājanakānīndriyāṅītyata āha* –

*kāni tāni kriyājanakānīndriyāṅītyata āha* –

वाक्पाणिपादपायूपस्थैरक्षैस्तत्क्रियाजनिः ।

मुखादिगोलकेष्वस्ते तत्कर्मेन्द्रियपञ्चकम् ॥ ११ ॥

*vākpāṅīpādapāyūpasthairakṣaistatkriyājaniḥ* /

*mukhādīgolakeṣvaste tatkarmendriyapañcakam* // 11 //

Through the organ of speech, hands, legs, anus and organ of precreation these functionalities are performed. All these sense-organs exist in the limbs like the mouth etc.

*vākpāṅīpādapāyūpasthairakṣaistatkriyājaniḥ* - Through the organ of speech, hands, legs, anus and organ of precreation these functionalities are performed. Akshai normally means eye, but eye is sense-organ of knowledge, here it is used to mean the mode or through. *mukhādīgolakeṣvaste* – exist in the limbs like mouth etc., *tatkarmendriyapañcakam* - these five sense-organ of action.

वाक्पाणीति । वागादिभिः अक्षैस्तत्क्रियाजनिः तासां क्रियाणामुत्पत्तिः, भवतीति शेषः ।

*vākpāṅīti* / *vāgādibhiḥ akṣaistatkriyājaniḥ tāsāṃ kriyāṅāmūtpattiḥ, bhavatīti śeṣaḥ* /

*vāgādibhiḥ* - through the organ of speech etc. *akṣaistatkriyājaniḥ* = *tāsāṃ kriyāṅāmūtpattiḥ* - the doorway or means, these functions are performed, *bhavatīti śeṣaḥ* - is the conclusion.

अत्रापि 'उक्तिः करणपूर्विका, क्रियात्वात्' इत्यादिकार्यलिङ्गकमनुमानं द्रष्टव्यम् ।

*atrāpi 'uktiḥ karaṇapūrvikā, kriyātvāt' ityādikāryaliṅgakamanumānaṃ draṣṭavyam /*

*atrāpi* - here too, we have a syllogism, '*uktiḥ* - Speech - Paksha, *karaṇapūrvikā* - function through an organ - Sadhya, *kriyātvāt* - since it is an action - Hetu' *ityādikāryaliṅgakamanumānaṃ draṣṭavyam* - inference based on the effect like these should be seen here. Like we saw in the sense-organ of knowledge, here too since these too are subtle, we need to take refuge in the inference through the effect.

तस्य कर्मेन्द्रियपञ्चकस्य स्थानान्याह – मुखादीति । 'आदि'शब्देन करचरणौ गुदशिश्नच्छिद्रे च गृह्यते ॥ ११ ॥

*tasya karmendriyapañcakasya sthānānyāha – mukhādīti / 'ādi'sabdena karacaraṇau gudaśiśnacchidre ca grhyate ॥ 11 ॥*

*tasya karmendriyapañcakasya sthānānyāha* - the place for these sense-organ of action is said. Where do the other sense-organ of action exist? '*ādi'sabdena karacaraṇau gudaśiśnacchidre ca grhyate* - with the term 'etc.', the organs hands and legs, and anus and procreation are also accepted.

We can establish both the sense-organ of knowledge and action with a single syllogism 'indriyaviṣayaḥ karaṇajanyā, kriyātvāt, cchidikriyāvat' ॥ 11 ॥

इदानीमुक्तदशेन्द्रियप्रेरकत्वेन प्रस्तुतस्य मनसः कृत्यं स्थानं च दर्शयति –

*idānīmuktadaśendriyapreraakatvena prastutasya manasaḥ kṛtyaṃ sthānaṃ ca darśayati*  
–

*idānīmuktadaśendriyapreraakatvena* - now, as the one who makes these sense-organs function, *prastutasya manasaḥ* - the mind which is presented, *kṛtyaṃ sthānaṃ ca darśayati* – its function and its place is explained.

मनो दशेन्द्रियाध्यक्षं हृत्पद्मगोलके स्थितम् ।

तच्चान्तःकरणं बाह्येष्वस्वातन्त्र्याद्धिनेन्द्रियैः ॥ १२ ॥



*mano daśendriyādhyakṣaṃ hr̥tpadmagolake sthitam /*

*taccāntaḥkaraṇaṃ bāhyeṣvasvātantryādvīnendriyaiḥ // 12*

//

*Mind the one who is the master of all these ten sense-organs stays in the lotus of the heart. Since it is not free to be associated with the external objects without the help of the sense-organs, it is called as inner-organ.*

*mano* – the mind, *daśendriyādhyakṣaṃ* - which is the leader of the ten sense-organs, *hr̥tpadmagolake sthitam* - stays in the lotus of the heart, *taccāntaḥkaraṇaṃ* - and it is called as inner-organ, *bāhyeṣvasvātantryādvīnendriyaiḥ* - as it is not free to travel externally, without the help of the sense-organs.

मन इति । तस्यान्तरिन्द्रियत्वं सनिमित्तकमाह – तच्चेति ॥ १२ ॥

*mana iti / tasyāntarindriyatvaṃ sanimittakamāha – tacceṭi // 12 //*

*tasyāntarindriyatvaṃ sanimittakamāha* - it being a sense-organ is explained with the reason. Here the mind is established as a sense-organ, since there are two schools here, accepting and not accepting. In Vedānta-paribhasha etc., mind is not accepted as a sense-organ.

Place of mind is said to be heart. There are two schools, one accepting it on the right side, as we refer to Me there. And the second Bhagavan Bhaṣyakara says, it is inside the physical heart. And as it is said in Bhagavad Gīta, for focusing the mind inbetween the eyebrow. All these are only for focusing at a single point and they are Mithya, therefore there need not be debate over it. // 12 //

दशेन्द्रियाध्यक्षत्वमेव विशदयति -

*daśendriyādhyakṣatvameva viśadayati* -

*daśendriyādhyakṣatvameva viśadayati* - (mind) being the leader for all the sense-organ is explained.

अक्षेष्वापि तेऽप्येतद्गुणदोषविचारकम् ।

सत्त्वं रजस्तमश्चास्य गुणा विक्रियते हि तैः ॥ १३ ॥

*akṣeṣvarthārpiteṣvetadguṇadoṣavicāraḥ* ।

*sattvaṃ rajastamaścāsyā guṇā vikriyate hi taiḥ* ॥ 13 ॥

*When the sense-organs are in association with the sense object, their good and bad attributes are enquired about by this mind. Sattva, Rajas and Tamas are the three attributes of the mind. Only because of them, the mind undergoes transformation.*

Why is the inner-organ the leader of the sense-organs? *akṣeṣvarthārpiteṣvetadguṇadoṣavicāraḥ* - when the sense-organ are sense-object this mind is what distinguishes its good and bad nature. The sense-organs do not have the capacity to distinguish the nature of the objects, they just grasp them and present it to the mind for it to dissect. *sattvaṃ rajastamaścāsyā guṇā* – Sattva, Rajas and Tamas are its attributes. *vikriyate hi taiḥ* - it undergoes transformation through these. Sattva is illuminating, Rajas is active and Tamas is inert.

अक्षेष्वापि । अक्षेषु इन्द्रियेषु अर्थापितेषु विषयेषु स्थापितेषु सत्सु एतत् मनो गुणदोषविचारकम् । 'इदं समीचीनम् , इदमसमीचीनम्' इत्यादिविचारकारीत्यर्थः ।

*akṣeṣviti* । *akṣeṣu indriyeṣu arthārpiteṣu viṣayeṣu sthāpiteṣu satsu etat mano guṇadoṣavicāraḥ* । *'idaṃ samīcīnam , idamasamīcīnam'* ityādivicāraḥ ।

*akṣeṣu = indriyeṣu* - the sense-organs, *arthārpiteṣu = viṣayeṣu sthāpiteṣu satsu* - when is associated with the sense-objects, *etat mano guṇadoṣavicāraḥ* - this mind is that which inquires about its good and bad nature. *'idaṃ samīcīnam , idamasamīcīnam'* ityādivicāraḥ - the inquiry in the form of 'this is good, this is bad'.

But what has that to do with establishing the mind as a leader? This is established here through the Pramana of Postulation (Arthapatti pramana or Anyatha anupapatti). Arthapatti is Since it is not through any other means, this is the conclusion. There are two types 1) Shruta - heard and 2) Drshta - seen. Shruta – after hearing someone say, 'the husband has gone' when asked 'is you husband there?' we postulate that it does not mean he is dead, but has gone out. And the second Drshta is, when we see the Devadutta

healthy and fat, but he is not eating anything in the day time, we postulate he is eating in the night.

अयं भावः - आत्मनः प्रमातृत्वेन सर्वज्ञानसाधारण्याच्चक्षुरादीनां रूपादिज्ञानजननमात्रेण चरितार्थत्वात् तद्गुणदोषविचारस्योपलभ्यमानस्य अन्यथानुपपत्त्या तत्कारणत्वेन मनोऽभ्युपगन्तव्यमिति ।

*ayaṃ bhāvaḥ - ātmanaḥ pramātr̥tvena sarvajñānasādhāraṇyāccakṣurādīnāṃ rūpādijñānanamātreṇa caritārthatvāt tadguṇadoṣavicārasyopalabhyamānasya anyathānupapattyā tatkāraṇatvena mano'bhyupagantavyamiti ।*

*ayaṃ bhāvaḥ* - this is the idea. Why not accept the Atma itself as the leader of the sense-organs? *ātmanaḥ pramātr̥tvena sarvajñānasādhāraṇyāt* - Atma is common for all the knowledge. The Atma does not differentiate Good from Bad. Why not atleast one of the sense-organs as the leader? *cakṣurādīnāṃ rūpādijñānanamātreṇa caritārthatvāt* - the sense-organs complete their job by bringing the knowledge of the objects, form etc. *tadguṇadoṣavicārasyopalabhyamānasya anyathānupapattyā* - the knowledge of the good and bad attributes of the objects are gained, therefore through the postulation or deduction logic we understand. If the good and bad nature of the objects are not gained, then we need not get into this discussion, but we do gain them therefore, *tatkāraṇatvena mano'bhyupagantavyamiti* - the mind should be accepted as its cause.

मनसो वैराग्यकामाद्यनेकविधवृत्तिमत्त्वप्रदर्शनाय सत्त्वादिगुणवत्त्वं दर्शयति - सत्त्वमिति । तेषां तद्गुणत्वे कारणमाह - विक्रियते इति । हि यतः तैः गुणैः विक्रियते, विकारं प्राप्नोतीत्यर्थः ॥ १३ ॥

*manaso vairāgyakāmādyanekavidhavṛttimattvapradarśanāya sattvādiguṇavatvaṃ darśayati – sattvamiti । teṣāṃ tadguṇatve kāraṇamāha – vikriyate iti । hi yataḥ taiḥ guṇaiḥ vikriyate, vikāraṃ prāpnotītyarthaḥ ॥ 13 ॥*

*manaso vairāgyakāmādyanekavidhavṛttimattvapradarśanāya* - to show the different kinds of thought function like dispassion, desire etc. With etc. we understand lazy etc. *sattvādiguṇavatvaṃ darśayati* - . its Sattva etc. attributes are shown. When thought function is Sattva – happiness, dispassion etc., when Rajas – anger, desire etc. and when Tamas – laziness, inertia etc. *teṣāṃ tadguṇatve kāraṇamāha* - the reason for the mind to be of these Gunas. *hi yataḥ taiḥ guṇaiḥ vikriyate, vikāraṃ prāpnotītyarthaḥ* - the mind undergoes the transformation into thought function according to these Gunas. ॥ 13

//

गुणैस्तस्य विक्रियमाणत्वमेव प्रपञ्चयति -

*guṇaistasya vikriyamāṇatvameva prapañcayati -*

*guṇaistasya vikriyamāṇatvameva prapañcayati* - because of the Gunas, the transformation it undergoes is explained.

वैराग्यं क्षान्तिरौदार्यमित्याद्याः सत्त्वसंभवा ।

कामक्रोधौ लोभयत्नावित्याद्या रजसोत्थिताः ॥ १४ ॥

आलस्यभ्रान्तितन्द्राद्याः विकारास्तमसोत्थिताः ।

*vairāgyam kṣāntiraudāryamityādyāḥ sattvasaṃbhavā ।*

*kāmakrodhau lobhayatnāvityādyā rajasotthitāḥ ॥ 14 ॥*

*ālasyaubrāntitandrādyāḥ vikārāstamasotthitāḥ ।*

*Dispassion, Patience, Kind-heartedness etc. are due to Sattva Guna. Desire, Anger, Greed, Effort etc. are due to Rajas Guna. Laziness, Delusion, inertness etc. are due to Tamas Guna.*

*vairāgyam kṣāntiraudāryamityādyāḥ* - Dispassion, Patience, Kind-heartedness etc., *sattvasaṃbhavā* - are the nature of Sattva Guna, *kāmakrodhau lobhayatnāvityādyā rajasotthitāḥ* - Desire, Anger, Greed, Effort etc. are due to Rajas Guna. *ālasyaubrāntitandrādyāḥ vikārāstamasotthitāḥ* - Laziness, Delusion, inertness etc. are due to Tamas Guna.

वैराग्यम् इति । स्पष्टत्वान्न व्याख्यायते ॥ १४ ॥

*vairāgyam iti । spaṣṭatvānna vyākhyāyate ॥ 14 ॥*

*spaṣṭatvānna vyākhyāyate* - since it is very clear, we are not commenting. ॥ 14 ॥

वैराग्यादीनां कार्याणी विभज्य दर्शयति दृ

*vairāgyādīnām kāryāṇī vibhajya darśayati –*

*vairāgyādīnām kāryāṇī vibhajya darśayati –*

सात्त्विकैः पुण्यनिष्पत्तिः पापोत्पत्तिश्च राजसैः ।

तामसैर्नोभयं किन्तु वृथायुःक्षणं भवेत् ॥ १५ ॥

*sāttvikaiḥ puṇyaniṣpattiḥ pāpotpattiśca rājasaiḥ ।*

*tāmasairnobhayaṃ kintu vṛthāyuhkṣapaṇaṃ bhavet ॥ 15*

॥

*Because of the Sattva Guna Punya is gained. And Papa is gained due to the Rajas Guna. Due to Tamas Guna, neither of them but only time waste.*

*sāttvikaiḥ puṇyaniṣpattiḥ* - Due to the Sattva Guna, *pāpotpattiśca rājasaiḥ* - And Papa is gained due to Rajas Guna, *tāmasairnobhayaṃ kintu vṛthāyuhkṣapaṇaṃ bhavet* - neither of them are gained due to Tamas Guna, but waste of time. This is dangerous than the Rajas Guna produced Papa. Because, sleep is considered a product of Punya, and due to Tamas induced sleep, we loose the hard earned Punya. And the erroneous knowledge also becomes the cause for the wrong action, which produces Papa. And this becomes very big obstacle for the Sadhaka (seeker), because this puts one in Manorajya (day-dreaming).

सात्त्विकैः इति ॥ १५ ॥

*sāttvikaiḥ iti ॥ 15 ॥*

एतेषां बुद्धिस्थत्वादन्तःकरणादीनां सर्वेषां स्वामिनमाह –

*eteṣām* - all these organs (external and internal), *buddhisthatvād* – are established in the intellect, *antaḥkaraṇādīnām sarveṣām svāminamāha* – The one who is the lord of the inner-organ etc. is explained.

अत्राहंप्रत्ययी कर्तेत्येवं लोकव्यवस्थितिः ॥ १६ ॥

*atrāhaṃpratyayī kartetyevaṃ lokavyavasthitiḥ ॥ 16 ॥*

*In this mind, the one who has the identification of 'I' is the doer. This is the way of the world.*

*atrāhaṃpratyayī* – the one who has the idea (identification or knowledge) of 'I'. *kartetyevaṃ* - is called as the doer. *lokavyavasthitih* - this is the world rule.

अत्र इति । 'अहं' इति प्रत्ययवान्कर्ता, प्रभुरित्यर्थः । लोके हि कार्यकारी प्रभुरित्येवमुपदिश्यते

॥ १६ ॥

*atra iti / 'ahaṃ' iti pratyayavān kartā, prabhurityarthaḥ / loke hi kāryakārī prabhurityevamupadiśyate*                      **॥ 16 ॥**

*'ahaṃ' iti pratyayavān = kartā = prabhurityarthaḥ* - the one who has the thought function identity as I, is the doer, the lord (of all the organs). This is otherwise said as 'aham pratyaya viśiṣṭa ātmā' or 'aham ṛtti viśiṣṭa ātmā' or 'aham ṛtti uapahita caitanya' – the Atma which is associated with the thought function of I. *loke hi kāryakārī prabhurityevamupadiśyate* – the one who makes do the activity is called as the lord in the world. Why this sudden enquiry? Sankhya and Yoga accepts the Prakṛti to be the doer and the Atma (Puruṣa) to be experiencer, but for Vedānta Aham is the 'as though doer' and 'as though experiencer'. **॥ 16 ॥**

एवं जगतः स्थितिमभिधाय इदानीं तस्य भौतिकत्वज्ञानोपायमाह –

*evaṃ jagataḥ sthitimabhidhāya idānīm tasya bhautikatvajñānopāyamāha* –

*evaṃ jagataḥ sthitimabhidhāya* – after explaining the nature of the creation. The elements are the creation. *idānīm tasya bhautikatvajñānopāyamāha* – now to gain the knowledge of the elemental, that which is created by elements, is explained. Though mind is subtle, it is elemental too. Though as said, it cannot be perceived through our sense-organs, still it can be understood through inference and śāstra.

स्पष्टशब्दादियुक्तेषु भौतिकत्वमतिस्फुटम् ।

अक्षादावपि तच्छास्त्रयुक्तिभ्यामवधार्यताम् ॥ १७ ॥

*spaṣṭaśabdādiyukteṣu bhautikatvamatisphuṭam /*

*akṣādāvapi tacchāstrayuktibhyāmavadhāryatām ॥ 17 ॥*

*In the objects that are endowed with clear sound etc., the elemental knowledge is very clear. In the sense-organs too it exists (elemental), this can be understood through Shastra and logic.*

*spāṣṭaśabdādiyukteṣu* – in the objects endowed with clear sound etc., *bhautikatvamatisphuṭam* - they being elemental is very clearly known, *akṣādāvapi* – in the eyes etc. sense-organ too. In all the eleven organs (5 knowledge + 5 action + 1 Inner organ), *tacchāstrayuktibhyāmavadhāryatām* - that can be established through the Shastra and logic.

स्पष्टेति । स्पष्टशब्दादियुक्तेषु स्पष्टैः शब्दस्पर्शादिगुणैः सहितेषु घटादिषु वस्तुषु भूतकार्यत्वं स्पष्टमेवात्रावगम्यते ।

*spāṣṭeti / spāṣṭaśabdādiyukteṣu spāṣṭaiḥ śabdasparsādiguṇaiḥ sahiteṣu ghāṭādiṣu vastuṣu bhūtakāryatvaṃ spāṣṭamevātrāvagamyate /*

*spāṣṭaśabdādiyukteṣu = spāṣṭaiḥ śabdasparsādiguṇaiḥ sahiteṣu* - in the things which are endowed with clear attributes of sound, touch etc., *ghāṭādiṣu vastuṣu* - in the objects like pot etc. All the creation. *bhūtakāryatvaṃ spāṣṭamevātrāvagamyate* - they being elemental is clearly understood.

इन्द्रियादिषु कथं भूतकार्यत्वनिश्चय इत्याशङ्क्य आगमानुमानाभ्यामित्याह – अक्षादावपि इति ।

*indriyādiṣu katham bhūtakāryatvaniścaya ityāśaṅkya āgamānumānābhyāmityāha – akṣādāvapi iti /*

*indriyādiṣu katham bhūtakāryatvaniścaya ityāśaṅkya* - how come we understand the elemental creation in the sense-organs etc., for this doubt. As said, this sense-organ is a product of this element etc., how does one come to understand this? *āgamānumānābhyāmityāha* - through the Shruti (verbal testimony) and the inference. Agama is synonym for Shruti and should not be confused with Shaiva, Shakta or Pancaratra (vaishnava) Agama etc. Agama, Shruti, Shastra, Nigama, cchandasa etc. are synonyms.

‘अन्नमयं हि सोम्य मन आपोमयः प्राणस्तेजोमयी वाक्’ (छा उ – ६.५.४) इत्यादि शास्त्रम्,

*‘annamayam hi somya mana āpomayah praṇastejomayī vāk’ (chā u – 6.5.4) ityādi śāstram,*

*‘annamayam hi somya mana āpomayah prānastejomayī vāk’ (chā u – 6.5.4) ityādi śāstram* – the Shruti example is ‘the Mind is made of food, Prana is made of water and Speech is made of fire’.

अनुमानं च ‘विमतानि श्रोत्रादीनि भूतकार्याणि भवितुमर्हति, भूतान्वयव्यतिरेकानुविधायित्वात्, यद्यदन्वयव्यतिरेकानुविधायि तत्तत्कार्यं दृष्टं, यथा मृदन्वयव्यतिरेकानुविधायी घटो मृत्कार्यो दृष्टः य तथा चेमानि तस्मात्तथा’ इति ।

*anumānam ca ‘vimatāni śrotrādīni bhūtakāryāṇi bhavitumarhati, bhūtānvayavyatirekānuvidhāyivāt, yadyadanvayavyatirekānuvidhāyi tattatkāryam dr̥ṣṭam, yathā mṛdanvayavyatirekānuvidhāyī ghaṭo mṛtkāryo dr̥ṣṭaḥ ; tathā cemāni tasmāttathā’ iti ।*

*anumānam ca* - the inference (syllogism) is. *‘vimatāni śrotrādīni* - the object of contention Sense-organ of hearing etc. - Paksha, *bhūtakāryāṇi bhavitumarhati* – aer possible to be the effect of the elements - Sadhya, *bhūtānvayavyatirekānuvidhāyivāt* - since there is a co-presence and co-absence of the elements - Hetu, *yadyadanvayavyatirekānuvidhāyi tattatkāryam dr̥ṣṭam, yathā mṛdanvayavyatirekānuvidhāyī ghaṭo mṛtkāryo dr̥ṣṭaḥ* - Whichever is seen to be co-existent and co-absent, they are seen to be effect, for example, there is co-existence and co-absence of clay in pot, therefore we understand pot is effect of clay - Upanaya; *tathā cemāni tasmāttathā’ iti* - similar is the case of these organs, therefore they are elemental – Nigama. Co-existence – when clay exists, pot exists. Co-absence – when clay does not exist, pot too does not exist.

तदन्वयव्यतिरेकानुविधायित्वं च ‘षोडशकलः सोम्य पुरुषः’ (छा उ – ६.७.९) इत्यादिना छान्दोग्यश्रुतौ मनसः श्रुतं तद्वदन्वयत्रापि द्रष्टव्यम्  
॥ १७ ॥

*tadanvayavyatirekānuvidhāyivam ca ‘ṣoḍaśakalaḥ somya puruṣaḥ’ (chā u – 6.7.1) ityādinā chāndogyaśrutau manasaḥ śrutam tadvadanyatrāpi draṣṭavyam ॥ 17 ॥*

*tadanvayavyatirekānuvidhāyivam ca* - they being co-existent and co-absent is seen in, *‘ṣoḍaśakalaḥ somya puruṣaḥ’ (chā u – 6.7.1)* – the Purusha is of sixteen kalas. *ityādinā chāndogyaśrutau* - like these, it is said in the Chandogya Upanishad. From Prana->Shraddha->Elements->10 Sense-organs->Mind->Food->Strength->Penance->Mantra->Karma->Loka (worlds)->Name. The sixteen Kalas are 1. Prana, 2. Shraddha, 3. Akasha, 4. Vayu, 5. Agni, 6. Apa, 7. Prthvi, 8. Sense-organs, 9. Mind, 10. Food, 11. Strength, 12. Penance, 13. Mantra, 14. Karma, 15. Loka (worlds) and 16. Name *manasaḥ śrutam tadvadanyatrāpi draṣṭavyam* - the mind is explained as elemental, similarly in other paces too we should understand. *॥ 17 ॥*



एवं भूतानि भौतिकानि च विविच्य दर्शयित्वा प्रकृतां 'सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीत्' (छा उ ६.२.१) इत्याद्यद्वितीयब्रह्मप्रतिपादिकां श्रुतिं व्याचक्षणस्तद्वाक्यस्थेदंपदस्यार्थमाह -

*evam bhūtāni bhautikāni ca vivicya darśayitvā prakṛtām 'sadeva somyedamagra āsīt' (chā u 6.2.1) ityādyadvitīyabrahmapratipādikām śrutim vyācakṣāṇastadvākyasthedampadasyārthamāha -*

*evam bhūtāni bhautikāni ca vivicya darśayitvā* - thus, showing clearly the elements and the elementals, *prakṛtām 'sadeva somyedamagra āsīt' (chā u 6.2.1) ityādyadvitīyabrahmapratipādikām śrutim vyācakṣāṇaḥ* - to explain the current topic of discussion, the Shruti 'one Self existed before the creation, one without duality' *tadvākyasthedampadasyārthamāha* - the meaning of the word 'idam' – this, from the statement is explained. There may be a doubt, when we are only interested in knowing the Self, why this useless talk? To answer this, we should understand the conclusion statement of this topic in Chandogya Upanishad, which says 'aitadātmyam idam sarvam' – all this is only of the nature of Self. Therefore, this discussion is not useless.

एकादशेन्द्रियैर्युक्त्या शास्त्रेणाप्यवगम्यते ।

यावत्किञ्चिद्भवेदेतदिदंशब्दोदितं जगत् ॥ १८ ॥

*ekādaśendriyairyuktyā śāstreṇāpyavagamyate ।*

*yāvatkimcidbhavedetadidaṃśabdoditam jagat ॥ 18 ॥*

*All that whichever is understood through the eleven sense-organs (5 Knowledge + 5 Action + Inner organ), Logic and Shastra is, this creation is referred to by the word 'idam' – this.*

*ekādaśendriyaiḥ* - through the eleven organs. The five sense-organ of Knowledge, five sense-organ of Action and the inner organ, *yuktyā* – through logic, *śāstreṇāpyavagamyate* - and through the Shastra. Through Pratyaksha (Perception), Anumana (Inference) and Shabda (verbal testimony). *yāvatkimcidbhaved* – whatever and whichever exists, *etadidaṃśabdoditam jagat* - that is this creation is said through the word 'idam' - this.

एकादशेति । प्रत्यक्षादिभिः सर्वैः प्रमाणैः 'अपि' शब्दादर्थापत्त्यादिप्रमाणज्ञानैश्च यावत्किञ्चित् जगत् अवगम्यते तत्सर्वं 'सदेव' (छा उ ६. २.१) इत्यादिवाक्यस्थेन 'इदं' पदेनाभिहितमित्यर्थः ॥ १८ ॥

*ekādaśeti* / *pratyakṣādibhiḥ* *sarvaiḥ*  
*pramāṇaiḥ* 'api' 'śabdādarthāpattiyādipramāṇajñānaiśca yāvatkimcit jagat avagamyate  
 tatsarvaṃ 'sadeva' (chā u 6.2.1) ityādivākyasthena 'idaṃ' padenābhīhitamityarthaḥ //  
 18 //

*pratyakṣādibhiḥ sarvaiḥ pramāṇaiḥ* - through the Perception etc. all the Pramana. As said Pratyaksha, Anumana and Shabda Pramana. 'api' 'śabdādarthāpattiyādipramāṇajñānaiśca' - through the word 'api' Arthapatti (Postulation) is accepted too. Normally this term 'api' is associated with the Shastra to conclude, also through Shastra, that is why it is differentiated. Since, we established the Mind through Postulation, here too we can use it. *yāvatkimcit jagat avagamyate* – whatever world we see. *tatsarvaṃ* - all that. Normally, the word 'idaṃ' is used in the sense to point out to the one in front of us. We refer to pot etc. in the same way we refer to the body etc. too, and this proves the body – sense-organ complex is not the Self. 'sadeva' (chā u 6.2.1) ityādivākyasthena 'idaṃ' padenābhīhitamityarthaḥ - with the word 'idaṃ' in the statement 'sadeva' it is said. // 18 //

एवम् 'इदं' शब्दस्यार्थमभिधाय इदानीं तां श्रुतिं स्वयमेवार्थतः पठति –

*evam 'idaṃ' śabdasyārthamabhidhāya idānīm tāṃ śrutim svayamevārthataḥ paṭhati –*

*evam 'idaṃ' śabdasyārthamabhidhāya* - after explaining the meaning of the word 'idaṃ', *idānīm tāṃ śrutim svayamevārthataḥ paṭhati* - now the said Shruiti is literally quoted here.

इदं सर्वं पुरा सृष्टेरैकमेवाद्वितीयकम् ।

सदेवाऽऽसीन्नामरूपे नास्तामित्यारुणैर्वचः ॥ १९ ॥

*idaṃ sarvaṃ purā sṛṣṭerekamevādvitīyakam* /

*sadevā' sīnnāmarūpe nāstāmityāruṇervacaḥ* // 19 //

All these were one non-dual existence, before the creation. There was no name and form, this is the statement of Aaruni (Uddhalaka).

*idaṃ sarvaṃ* - all these, *purā* - before, *sṛṣṭer* – the creation, *ekamevādvitīyakam* *sadevā' sīt* – was one, non-dual existence only, *nāmarūpe nāstāmīti* – there were no name and form, *āruṇervacaḥ* - this is the statement of Aaruni.

इदम् इति । अरुणस्यापत्यमारुणिरुद्दालकः तस्य वचनमित्यर्थः ॥ १९ ॥

*idam iti / aruṇasyāpatyamāruṇiruddālakaḥ tasya vacanamityartha ॥ 19 ॥*

*aruṇasyāpatyamāruṇiruddālakaḥ* - son of Aruni is Aaruni, i.e. Uddalaka. This Aruna becomes Aaruni, when referring to his progeny. Like in Taittiriya Upanishad vaaruni is varuna's son, Brgu. *tasya vacanamityartha* - his statement. ॥ 19 ॥

‘एकमेवाद्वितीयम्’ इति पदत्रयेण सद्वस्तुनि स्वगतादिभेदत्रयं प्रसक्तं निवारयितुं लोके स्वगतादिभेदत्रयं तावद्दर्शयति –

*‘ekamevādvitīyam’ iti padatrayeṇa sadvastuni svagatādibhedatrayam prasaktaṁ nivārayituṁ loke svagatādibhedatrayam tāvaddarśayati –*

*‘ekamevādvitīyam’ iti padatrayeṇa* - with the three words of ‘ekam’ – one, ‘eva’ – only, ‘advitīyam’ non-dual, *sadvastuni* - in the Self, *svagatādibhedatrayam* - the three types of duality, *prasaktaṁ* - that is possible, *nivārayituṁ* - to negate, *loke svagatādibhedatrayam tāvaddarśayati* – first these three types of dualities existing in the world is shown. Since, there is a rule, ‘prāpte satyāṁ niṣedhaḥ’ – negation only where there is a possibility, first we need to establish the possibility, which is shown with example we see in the world. Since, we establish the exemplified through an example, and the examples seen in the world are full of these dualities only, therefore it needs to be negated.

वृक्षस्य स्वगतो भेदः पत्रपुष्पफलादिभिः ।

वृक्षान्तरात्सजातीयो विजातीयः शिलादितः ॥ २० ॥

*vṛkṣasya svagato bhedaḥ patrapuṣpaphalādibhiḥ ।*

*vṛkṣāntarātsajātīyo vijātīyaḥ śilāditaḥ ॥ 20 ॥*

*Svagata-Bheda for the tree is its leaf, flower, fruit etc. Sajatiya is it being different from another tree. And Vijatiya is the tree being different from stone etc.*

*vṛkṣasya* – for the tree, *svagato bhedaḥ* - the duality in itself (Svagata), *patrapuṣpaphalādibhiḥ* - is from the leaf, flower and fruit etc., *vṛkṣāntarātsajātīyo* –

duality from another tree is Sajatiya. Here duality from tree of same class can also be taken. *viḥāṭīyaḥ śīlādītaḥ* - and duality from different thing is Vijatiya. Here duality from tree of different class can also be taken. Or in a human being, his hand, leg etc is Svagata bheda, from different human being is Sajatiya bheda and from animals etc., is Vijatiya bheda.

वृक्षस्य इति ॥ २० ॥

Here, the example is worldly, in the exemplified, with the word ‘ekam’ the Sajatiya bheda is negated, with ‘eva’ Sajatiya bheda is negated and with ‘advitiyam’ Vijatiya bheda is negated too. // 20 //

एवमनात्मनि भेदत्रयं प्रदर्शय सद्दस्तुन्यपि प्रसक्तं तत् भेदत्रयं श्रुतिः पदत्रयेण निवारयतीत्याह -

*evamanātmani bhedatrayaṃ pradarśya sadvastunyapi prasaktaṃ tat bhedatrayaṃ śrutiḥ padatrayeṇa nivārayatītyāha -*

*evamanātmani* - thus in the non-self, *bhedatrayaṃ* - the three dualities, *pradarśya* - after showing. After showing it in the example, to show its absence in the Self, *sadvastunyapi prasaktaṃ tat bhedatrayaṃ* - the duality is possible in the Self, too, *śrutiḥ padatrayeṇa nivārayatītyāha* - this Shruti negates them with three words.

तथा सद्दस्तुनो भेदत्रयं प्राप्तं निवारयते ।

ऐक्यावधारणद्वैतप्रतिषेधैस्त्रिभिः क्रमात् ॥ २१ ॥

*tathā sadvastuno bhedatrayaṃ prāptaṃ nivāryate ।*

*aikyāvadhāraṇadvaitapraṭiṣedhaistribhiḥ kramāt ॥ 21 ॥*

Similarly, in the ‘Sat’ too there is a possibility of these is negated by these three words ‘eka’ – one, ‘eva’ – only and ‘advitiya’ - non-dual, respectively.

*tathā sadvastuno* – similarly (as in the non-self), in the ‘Sat’ too, *bhedatrayaṃ prāptaṃ* - the possible three types of duality, *nivāryate* – is negated,

*aikyāvadhāraṇadvaitapraṭiṣedhaistribhiḥ* - with the three words denoting oneness, assertion and negation of duality (ekam, eva and advitiyam), *kramāt* - respectively.

तथा इति । वस्तुत्वसामान्यादनात्मनीव सद्वृत्तात्मवस्तुन्यपि प्रसक्तं स्वगतादिभेदत्रयं ऐक्यावधारणद्वैतप्रतिषेधाभिधायकैः 'एकमेवाद्वितीयम्' (छा उ – ६.२.१.) इति त्रिभिः पदैः क्रमेण निवार्यत इत्यर्थः ॥ २१ ॥

*tathā iti / vastutvasāmānyādanātmanīva sadrūpātmavastunyapi prasaktaṃ svagatādibhedatrayaṃ aikyāvadhāraṇadvaitapraṭiṣedhābhīdhāyakaiḥ 'ekamevādvitīyam' (chā u – 6.2.1.) iti tribhiḥ padaiḥ krameṇa nivāryata ityarthah ॥ 21 ॥*

*vastutvasāmānyād* – since being an 'object' is common. Vastu means thing or object, with reference to the worldly thing though this may fit completely with reference to the Self, it is used for convenience of understanding. Because, for the one who does not know the Self, may think the Self to be an object of knowledge, from his standpoint this is said. For the one who understands the Self from the scriptures, for him it is said 'nirvikalpa' – without attributes, 'nishkriya' – activity-less etc. *anātmanīva* – as in the non-self, *sadrūpātmavastunyapi* – in the Self too, *prasaktaṃ svagatādibhedatrayaṃ* - the possibility of the Svagata etc. three types of dualities, *aikyāvadhāraṇadvaitapraṭiṣedhābhīdhāyakaiḥ 'ekamevādvitīyam' (chā u – 6.2.1.) iti tribhiḥ padaiḥ krameṇa nivāryata ityarthah* - through the words denoting oneness, assertion and negation of duality in the statement with the three words 'ekam', 'eva' and 'advitiyam' the three dualities Svagata, sajatiya, vijatiya respectively, are negated. ॥ 21 ॥

सद्वस्तुनस्तावन्न स्वगतभेदः शङ्कितुं शक्यते, अस्य निरवयवत्वादित्याह -

*sadvastunastāvanna svagatabhedah śāṅgītuṃ śakyate, asya niravayavatvādityāha -*

*sadvastunastāvanna svagatabhedah śāṅgītuṃ śakyate* – we cannot doubt the existence of the Svagata etc. dualities in the 'Sat', *asya niravayavatvādityāha* - since it is attributeless, is explained.

सतो नावयवाः शङ्क्यास्तदंशस्यानिरूपणात् ।

नामरूपे न तस्यांशौ तयोरद्याप्यनुद्भवात् ॥ २२ ॥

*sato nāvayavāḥ śāṅkyāstadaṃśasyānirūpaṇāt /*

***nāmarūpe na tasyāṁśau tayoradyāpyanudbhavāt // 22 //***

*Since, there is no way to establish the 'Sat' to have parts (limbs), we cannot doubt it having limbs. Name and Form cannot be its limbs, since they are not existent now (before the creation).*

***sato nāvayavāḥ śaṅkyāḥ*** - cannot doubt 'Sat' to have limbs, ***tadaṁśasyānirūpaṇāt*** - since it is not established to possess limbs. This should not be understood as, we have not established yet, but should be understood as the Shruti has not established it. ***nāmarūpe na tasyāṁśau*** – Name and Form cannot be its limbs. Since we saw earlier, in the end the creation also is said to be Self in Chandogya Upanishad, the Name and Form will definitely be the limbs of 'Sat' is negated here ***tayoradyāpyanudbhavāt*** – since, it has manifested yet (before the creation). We should not interpret the word 'adyapi' as even now, since we are talking about the state before creation. And then again, we cannot doubt, is it possible to be limb of the Self after creation? Because, 'vācārambhanam vikāro nāmadheyam mṛttiketyeva satyam' – the Name and Form are existent only as words, the Clay (cause) is the only Truth.

सत इति । नामरूपयोः सदवयवत्वं किं न स्यादित्याशङ्क्य सृष्टेः पुरा तयोरभावान्न सदंशत्वमित्याह - नाम इति ॥ २२ ॥

***sata iti / nāmarūpayoḥ sadavayavatvaṁ kiṁ na syādityāśaṅkyā sṛṣṭeḥ purā tayorabhāvānna sadaṁśatvamityāha – nāma iti // 22 //***

***nāmarūpayoḥ sadavayavatvaṁ kiṁ na syādityāśaṅkyā*** - why we cannot doubt the Name and Form to be the limbs of the 'Sat'? ***sṛṣṭeḥ purā tayorabhāvānna sadaṁśatvamityāha*** - Since they have no existence before the creation, therefore they cannot be the limbs of 'Sat'. ***// 22 //***

कृतो नामरूपयोरभाव इत्याशङ्क्याह –

***kuto nāmarūpayorabhāva ityāśaṅkyāha*** –

***kuto nāmarūpayorabhāva ityāśaṅkyāha*** - why is it said, there is absence of Name and Form, this doubt is explained.

नामरूपोद्भवस्यैव सृष्टित्वात्सृष्टितः पुरा ।

न तयोरुद्भवस्तस्मान्निर्गमं सद्यथा वियत् ॥ २३ ॥

*nāmarūpodbhavyaiva sṛṣṭivātsṛṣṭitaḥ purā /*

*na tayorudbhavastasmānniraṃśaṃ sadyathā viyat // 23 //*

*Creation means the manifestation of Name and Form, therefore they cannot exist before the creation. Thus, the Self is limbless like the space (Akasha).*

*nāmarūpodbhavyaiva sṛṣṭivāt* – Manifestation of the Name and Form is called as creation, *sṛṣṭitaḥ purā na tayorudbhavaḥ* - before the creation, they have no manifestation, *tasmānniraṃśaṃ sad* – therefore, the Self is limbless, *yathā viyat* – like the space (Akasha).

नामरूपेति । फलितमाह – तस्मात् इति । अत्रायं प्रयोगः – सद्वस्तु स्वगतभेदशून्यं भवितुमर्हति, निरवयवत्वात्, गगनवदिति ॥ २३ ॥

*nāmarūpeti / phalitamāha – tasmāt iti / atrāyaṃ prayogaḥ – sadvastu svagatabhedaśūnyaṃ bhavitumarhati, niravayavtvāt, gaganavaditi // 23 //*

*phalitamāha* – The result for this discussion on Name and Form is explained, with ‘tasmāt’ – Therefore. *atrāyaṃ prayogaḥ* - this is the syllogism here, *sadvastu* - The Self – Paksha, *svagatabhedaśūnyaṃ bhavitumarhati* - is devoid of the Svagata in duality triad – Sadhya, *niravayavtvāt* - since it is limbless - Hetu, *gaganavaditi* - like the Space – Udharana. This example is said from the viewpoint of the worldly understanding, since according to Vedanta, since Space also is an effect from the ‘Self’. As, explained we do not accept the Space to be eternal. **// 23 //**

मा भूत्स्वगतभेदः, सजातीयभेदः किं न स्यादित्याशङ्क्य तत्सजातीयं सदन्तरमिति वक्तव्यं, न तन्निरूपयितुं शक्यतेय सतो वैलक्षण्यभावादित्याह –

*mā bhūtsvagatabhedah, sajātīyabhedah kiṃ na syādityāśaṅkya tatsajātīyaṃ sadantaramiti vaktavyaṃ, na tannirūpayituṃ śakyate; sato vailakṣaṇyābhāvādityāha –*

*mā bhūtsvagatabhedah, sajātīyabhedah kiṃ na syādityāśaṅkya* - Let there be no Svagata duality, but why not Sajatiya duality? Is answered, *tatsajātīyaṃ sadantaramiti vaktavyaṃ* - another ‘Sat’ should be accepted for the Sajatiya duality. Logicians accept the Atma to be without parts, but there are multiple Atma, therefore Sajatiya duality is

possible, and is different from Paramanu etc. therefore, Vijatiya duality is possible. *na tannirūpayitum śakyate* – and it cannot be established; *sato vailakṣaṇyābhāvādityāha* - since there is nothing other than ‘Sat’.

सदन्तरं सजातीयं न वैलक्ष्ण्यवर्जनात् ।

नामरूपोपाधिभेदं विना नैव सतो भिदा ॥ २४ ॥

*sadantaram sajātīyaṃ na vailakṣaṇyavarjanāt /*

*nāmarūpopādhibhedam vinā naiva sato bhidā // 24 //*

Since there is nothing other than ‘Sat’, there cannot be Sajatiya duality. Without the embodiment of Name and Form, there cannot be duality in the ‘Sat’.

*sadantaram sajātīyaṃ na* – there is no another ‘Sat’ to establish the Sajatiya duality. Because, there cannot be anything other than ‘Sat’ to show the duality of same class. *vailakṣaṇyavarjanāt* - since there is nothing other than Self, *nāmarūpopādhibhedam vinā* – without the embodiment of Name and Form, *naiva sato bhidā* – we cannot establish the duality in the ‘Sat’.

सदन्तरम् इति । ननु घटसत्ता पटसत्तेति सतो भेदः प्रतिभासते इत्याशङ्क्य घटाकाशमटाकाशवदौपाधिको भेदो न स्वतो भातीत्याह – नामरूपोपाधिभेदम् इति ।

*sadantaram iti / nanu ghaṭasattā paṭasatteti sato bhedaḥ pratibhāsate ityāśaṅkya ghaṭākāśamaṭhākāśavadaupādhiko bhedo na svato bhātītyāha – nāmarūpopādhibhedam iti / nanu ghaṭasattā paṭasatteti sato bhedaḥ pratibhāsate ityāśaṅkya* - there is a doubt possibility, because there are different existence which we see, as in pot exists, cloth exists etc.. Here one pot existence is different from another pot existence, therefore Sajatiya duality and Pot existence is different from cloth existence therefore Vijatiya duality. *ghaṭākāśamaṭhākāśavadaupādhiko bhedo na svato bhātītyāha* – They are dualities with respect to the embodiments like pot space and room space and not in itself.

अत्रायं प्रयोगः – सद्वस्तु सजातीयभेदरहितं भवितुमर्हति, उपाधिपरामर्शमन्तरेणाविभाव्यमानभेदत्वात् , गगनवदिति ॥ २४ ॥



*atrāyaṃ prayogaḥ – sadvastu sajātīyabhedarahitaṃ bhavitumarhati, upādhiparāmarśamantareṇāvibhāvyamānabhedatvāt , gaganavaditi // 24 //*

*atrāyaṃ prayogaḥ* - this is the syllogism. *sadvastu* - the Sat - Paksha, *sajātīyabhedarahitaṃ bhavitumarhati* – is devoid of Sajatiya duality - Sadhya, *upādhiparāmarśamantareṇāvibhāvyamānabhedatvāt* – without the knowledge of the embodiment they cannot be differentiated - Hetu , *gaganavaditi* - like the space – Udharana. // 24 //

भवतु तर्हि विजातीयाद्भेद इत्याशङ्क्य सतो विजातीयमसत्तस्या सत्त्वेनैव प्रतियोगित्वासंभवेन तत्प्रतियोगिकोऽपि भेदो नास्तीत्याह –

*bhavatu tarhi vijātīyadbheda ityāśaṅkya sato vijātīyamasattasyā sattvenaiva pratiyogitvāsambhavena tatpratiyogiko'pi bhedo nāstītyāha –*

*bhavatu tarhi vijātīyadbheda ityāśaṅkya* - let it be so, there is possibility of the Vijatiya duality, this doubt is answered. This doubt stems from the idea of the first teaching, when we talk about Viveka – Self is real all the rest is non-real. Now, there is Self and non-self, therefore there is possibility of Vijatiya duality. *sato vijātīyamasattasyā* - the contradictory one to Sat (existence) is Asat (non-existence). Sat is that which is not negated in all the three periods of time and Asat is that which is negated through Knowledge, and therefore is illusory. *sattvenaiva pratiyogitvāsambhavena* - and it cannot be grasped as existence. Absence cannot be gained as existence; the knowledge of Absence is the knowledge of the substratum and nothing more. *tatpratiyogiko'pi bhedo nāstītyāha* – And thus based on that there can be no duality. From here the Madhyamika Buddhist (voidist) is brought as an opponent. They accept everything as non-existence. According to them, From void, In void and To void, they quote 'आदौ अन्तौ यन्नास्ति मध्येऽपि तत् तथा ādau antau yannāsti madhye'pi tat tathā' – that which was non-existent earlier (before creation) and later (after destruction), is so in-between also. This is the biggest example for oxy-moron, non-existent was, is and will be. But we do understand the absence? This is what is called as Vikalpa, and is defined in Yoga-Sutra as 'śabdajñānānupāti vastuśūnyo vikalpaḥ' – when it is being objectified through the words, but without any object it is called as Vikalpa, like Mare's horn etc.

विजातीयमसत्तत्तु न खल्वस्तीति गम्यते ।

नास्यातः प्रतियोगित्वं विजातीयाद्भिदा कुतः ॥ २५ ॥

*vijātīyamasattattu na khalvastīti gamyate ।*

*nāsyātaḥ pratiyogitvaṃ vijātīyādbhidā kutaḥ // 25 //*

*The one which is Vijatiya for the Sat is Asat, and it does not have any existence. And therefore it cannot be object of discussion (Pratiyogi). And then, how can there be duality through Vijatiya.*

*vijātīyamasattattu* – Vijatiya to Sat is Asat, *na khalvastīti gamyate* - and it is not understood as existent, *nāsyātaḥ pratiyogitvaṃ* - therefore there cannot be a Pratiyoginess for that. Pratiyogi is the technical term used by logicians defined as ‘yasya abhava’ – about whose absence we are talking (vessel of absence). This need not be always be in Absence, therefore we can just say, the object of discussion. And the other term with reference to Pratiyogi is ‘Anuyogi’, which is defined as ‘yasmin abhava’ – in which we talk about the absence. When we cannot objectify, *vijātīyādbhidā kutaḥ* - And thus, how can there be duality from Vijatiya object. And Vedanta does not accept the Abhava to have adjectives, though for transactional purpose we do say Prior-Absence (Praag-Abhaava), Post-Absence (Pradhvamsa-Abhaava) etc, they cannot have any reality. We cannot say duality exists between the barren woman’s son and mare’s horn.

All the tree dualities are negated through three reasons (Hetu) – absence of limbs (parts), without the embodiment we cannot objectify, and Asat is not an object.

विजातीयम् इति ॥ २५ ॥

*vijātīyam iti ॥ 25 ॥*

फलितमाह –

*phalitamāha* –

*phalitamāha* - the conclusion is explained. After explaining through Shruti and Yukti (logic).

एकमेवाद्वितीयं सत्सिद्धमत्र तु केचन ।

विह्वला असदेवेदं पुरासीऽऽदित्यवर्णयन् ॥ २६ ॥

*ekamevādvitīyaṃ satsiddhamatra tu kecana ।*

*vihvalā asadevedaṃ purāsī'adityavarṇayan ॥ 26 ॥*

*The Sat is one without duality is established. Some because of the confusion say ‘there was only non-existence before’.*

*ekamevādvitīyaṃ satsiddham* – the Sat is one without any duality is established, *atra tu kecana vihvalā* – some people who are confused say, *asadevedaṃ purāstī'dityavarṇayan* - Only Asat was there before the creation. By 'kecana' the Voidist Buddhist is said here. This is not just a logic, this is Shruti quotation.

एकमेवेति । इदानीं स्थूणानिखननन्यायेन सदद्वैतमेव द्रढयितुं पूर्वपक्षमाह – अत्र तु इति ॥ २६ ॥

*ekameveti / idānīm sthūṇānikhanananyāyena sadadvaitameva draḍhayitum pūrvapakṣamāha – atra tu iti ॥ 26 ॥*

*idānīm sthūṇānikhanananyāyena* - now, through the logic of 'sthūṇānikhanana' – after planting the pillar, we try to move it or shake it, which is not to dislocate the pillar, but to make it more strong incase it is still shaking. Similarly, here we introduce the opponent's view, not to confuse the seeker, but to make his knowledge resolute. What is that we want to make steady? *sadvaitameva draḍhayitum pūrvapakṣamāha* - to establish without any doubt the non-sual Sat, we bring in the opposition. Through this the blaberring 'all path leads to the same Truth' is negated, since the Truth can only be gained through the Pramana (means of right knowledge – the Shruti). **॥ 26 ॥**

विस्वलत्वे दृष्टान्तमाह –

*vihvalatve drṣṭāntamāha –*

*vihvalatve drṣṭāntamāha* – an example for the confusion. Vihvala means to be shocked, and this is because of the confusion.

मग्नस्याब्धौ यथाऽक्षाणि विस्वलानि तथाऽस्य धीः ।

अखण्डैकरसं श्रुत्या निष्प्रचारा बिभेत्यतः ॥ २७ ॥

*magnasyābdhau yathā'kṣāṇi vihvalāni tathā'sya dhīḥ /*

*akhaṇḍaikarasam śrutya niṣpracārā bibhetyataḥ ॥ 27 ॥*

*Like the sense-organs are completely disabled for the one who is drowning in the water. Similarly, when this person hears about the one, non-dual Self, because of not being able to grasp becomes afraid.*

*magnasyābdhau* – when somebody is drowning in the water, *yathā'kṣāṇi* – his sense-organs, *vihvalāni* – are completely out of control or completely shocked and the eyes open with surprise, *tathā'sya* – similarly for this one, *dhīḥ* - the intellect (becomes disabled), *akhaṇḍaikarasam śrutyā* – after listening about the one, non-dual Self, *niṣpracārā* – because of not being able to grasp, *bibhetyataḥ* - is afraid of it. If one does not understand, there maybe confusion, but how is fear possible? We are not afraid of the things we know more than the thing we do not know. We are afraid of Ghost, though not anyone has seen it, we are afraid to enter dark place alone etc., is because of the fear of unknown.

मग्नस्य इति । दार्ष्टान्तिके योजयति – तथा इति । अस्य असद्वादिनः । जातावेकवचनम् । धीः अन्तःकरणम् अखण्डैकरसं वस्तु श्रुत्या निष्प्रचारा साकारवस्तुनीवाखण्डैकरसे वस्तुनि प्रचाररहिता सती अतोऽस्माद्वस्तुनो बिभेति ॥ २७ ॥

*magnasya iti / dārṣṭāntike yojayati – tathā iti / asya asadvādinah / jātāvekavacanam / dhīḥ antaḥkaraṇam akhaṇḍaikarasam vastu śrutyā niṣpracārā sākāravastunīvākhaṇḍaikarase vastuni pracārarahitā satī ato'smādvastuno bibheti // 27 //*

*dārṣṭāntike yojayati* – the example is shown in the exemplified. *asya = asadvādinah* - for this one who accepts the Asat (non-existence). *Jātāvekavacanam* – singular is used to denote the class. Though there are many followers of this school, it is said in singular to denote the whole group. All the other who speak against the Sat, is Asad-vadi too, and not just voidist. *dhīḥ = antaḥkaraṇam* - the mind, *akhaṇḍaikarasam = vastu* - the one non-dual Self, the Truth, *śrutyā* - after hearing it, *niṣpracārā = sākāravastunīvākhaṇḍaikarase vastuni pracārarahitā satī ato'smādvastuno bibheti* - seeing the mind not functioning in this one, non-dual Self in a similar way with the objects with form, and therefore is afraid of this Self. // 27 //

उक्तार्थे आचार्यसंमतिं दर्शयति –

*uktārthe ācāryasaṃmatim darśayati –*

*uktārthe ācāryasaṃmatim darśayati* – the aforesaid idea is in acceptance with the teaching of the Acharya, is explained.

गौडाचार्या निर्विकल्पे समाधवन्धयोगिनाम् ।

साकारब्रह्मनिष्ठानामत्यन्तं भयमूचिरे ॥ २८ ॥

*gauḍācāryā nirvikalpe samādhāvanyayoginām /*

*sākārabrahmaniṣṭhānāmatyantam bhayamūcire // 28 //*

*Sri Gaudapada Acharya says, with respect to this Nirvikalpa Samadhi (Samadhi without attributes), the other Yogis who are established in the attributed Self, Iswara (or established in Savikalpa Samadhi), become afraid.*

*gauḍācāryā* – Sri Gudapada Acharya, *nirvikalpe samādhāu* – in the Nirvikalpa Samadhi, *anyayoginām* – the other practitioners, *sākārabrahmaniṣṭhānām* – the one established in the attributed Self, Iswara, *atyantam bhayamūcire* – are completely afraid. The one who is established in the void, which is without any dualities (leaving the Vedanti) and attributed which is with duality are both afraid.

गौडाचार्या इति ॥ २८ ॥

*gauḍācāryā iti // 28 //*

*gauḍācāryā iti* – Sri Gaudapāda Acharya is Guru of Sri Govinda BhagavatPāda, who is the Guru of Sri Shankara BhagavatPāda Acharya. *// 28 //*

केन वाक्येनोक्तवन्त इत्याकाङ्क्षायां तदीयं वार्तिकमेव पठति -

*kena vākyenoktavanta ityākāṅkṣāyām tadīyaṃ vārtikameva paṭhati -*

*kena vākyenoktavanta ityākāṅkṣāyām* - when we have the doubt regarding the statement they said this, *tadīyaṃ vārtikameva paṭhati* - their own statement is literally taken here.

अस्पर्शयोगो नामैष दुर्दर्शः सर्वयोगिभिः ।

योगिनो बिभ्यति ह्यस्मादभये भयदर्शिनः ॥ २९ ॥

*asparśayogo nāmaiṣa durdarśaḥ sarvayogibhiḥ /*

*yogino bibhyati hyasmādabhaye bhayadarśinaḥ // 29 //*

*The Yoga called 'Asparsha Yoga' (placing the mind in the Self which is not not touched by anything), is difficult for everyone. Because, the Yogis are afraid of that, where there is no reason for fear.*

*asparśayogo nāmaīṣa* – this yoga is called 'Asparsha Yoga' – attribute-less Self or Nirvikalpa Samadhi or as said in the first chapter Dharmamegha Samadhi, *durdarśaḥ* - is very difficult (not impossible), *sarvayogibhiḥ* - for all the Yogis who meditate on the Self, *yogino bibhyati hyasmād* - the others who practice the meditation on the attributed Self are afraid of this, *abhaye bhayadarśinaḥ* - they see fear in the fearless, in that which is our true nature.

अस्पर्शेति । योऽयमस्पर्शयोगाख्यो निर्विकल्पः समाधिः एष सर्वयोगिभिः साकारध्याननिष्ठैर्दुर्दर्शः दुःखेन द्रष्टुं योग्यः, दुष्प्राप इत्यर्थः ।

*asparśeti / yo'yamasparśayogākhyo nirvikalpaḥ samādhiḥ eṣa sarvayogibhiḥ sākāradhyānaniṣṭhai durdarśaḥ duḥkhena draṣṭuṃ योग्याḥ, druṣprāpa ityarthāḥ /*

*yo'yamasparśayogākhyo nirvikalpaḥ samādhiḥ* - the Yoga which is called Asparsha Yoga, which is nothing but Nirvikalpa Samadhi. That which is our Nature. This is the subject matter till the end of the chapter. *eṣa sarvayogibhiḥ = sākāradhyānaniṣṭhai* - by all the Yogis. People who leave the Dheya (meditated) and only stay with the Meditator and Meditation OR the Upasakas (people meditating on the attributed Self), who stay with the Dheya, Dhyana and Dhyata (Meditated, Meditation and Meditator). *durdarśaḥ = duḥkhena draṣṭuṃ योग्याḥ, druṣprāpa ityarthāḥ* - it is very difficult to attain. But it is not attainable by the people who practice the other Sadhana. But, if the practice does not bring one to Shastra, it is useless. Because these practices, if done properly, at the best take one to the different worlds and from there one attains the knowledge and gets released from that world along with the Iswara of the world, this is called Krama Mukti – liberation in stages.

तत्रोपपत्तिमाह - योगिन इति । हि यस्मात् कारणात् योगिनः पूर्वोक्तद्वैतदर्शिनः अभये भयशून्ये समाधौ निर्जने देशे बाला एव भयदर्शिनः भयहेतुत्वं कल्पयन्तः अस्मादस्पर्शयोगाद्भीतिं प्राप्नुवन्ति ॥ २६ ॥

*tatropapattimāha - yogina iti / hi yasmāt kāraṇāt yoginaḥ pūrvoktadvaitadarśinaḥ abhaye bhayaśūnye samādhau nirjane deśe bālā eva bhayadarśinaḥ bhayahetutvaṃ kalpayantaḥ asmādasparśayogādbhītiṃ prāpnuvanti ॥ 29 ॥*

*tatropapattimāha* - the logic is shown for that. *hi = yasmāt kāraṇāt* - for this reason, *yoginaḥ = pūrvoktadvaitadarśinaḥ* - the Yogis, who is practicing the meditation on duality, *abhaye = bhayaśūnye samādhau* – in the Samadhi, whose nature is to give fearlessness, *nirjane deśe bālā eva bhayadarśinaḥ = bhayahetutvaṃ kalpayantaḥ* - in a place which is empty (where there is no reason for fear), kids are afraid, they imagine

reasons for fear, *asmādasparśayogādbhūtiṃ prāpnuvanti* - similar is the case of these people of duality, who see fear in this Yoga which is not touched by anything. // 29 //

श्रीमदाचार्यैरप्येतदभिहितमित्याह-

*śrīmadācāryairapyetadabhihitamityāha-*

*śrīmadācāryairapyetadabhihitamityāha* – this very thing is said by Sri Shankara BhagavatPada Acharya too, is explained.

भगवत्पूज्यपादाश्च शुष्कतर्कपटूनमून् ।

आहुर्मध्यमिकान्भ्रान्तानचिन्त्येऽस्मिन्सदात्मनि ॥ ३० ॥

*bhagavatpūjyapādāśca śuṣkatarkapaṭūnamūn /*

*āhurmadhyamikānbhrāntānacintye'sminsadātmani // 30*

//

*Madhyamika Buddhist who are clever in using dry logic, with respect to this Self which is beyond the grasp of mind, are referred to as Confused people by Sri Shankara BhagavatPada Acharya.*

*bhagavatpūjyapādāśca* - Sri Shankara BhagavatPada Acharya, *śuṣkatarkapaṭūnamūn* – the one who is good at using dry logic. Logic without the support of the Shruti is called as Dry logic. Because this logic does not give any good result, it is called as dry logic and we are not completely negating logic, as many believe, because Shravana etc. even is not possible without logic. Bhagavan Bhashyakara himself has said 'śrutimataḥ tarko'nusandhīyatām' – Follow the logic accepted by the Shruti. Who are they? *Āhurmadhyamikān* – calls the Madhyamika Buddhist. *Bhrāntān* – who are confused, *acintye'sminsadātmani* – the one which is not graspable through the mind, in this Self.

भगवत् इति ॥ ३० ॥

*bhagavat iti // 30 //*

Where is it said?

तद्वार्तिकं पठति -

***tadvārtikaṃ paṭhati -***

***tadvārtikaṃ paṭhati*** - the very Vartika (Shloka) is said here verbatim.

अनादृत्य श्रुतिं मौर्ख्यादिमे बौद्धास्तमस्विनः ।

आपेदिरे निरात्मत्वमनुमानैकचक्षुषः ॥ ३१ ॥

***anāḍṛtya śrutim maurkhyādime bauddhāstamasvinaḥ ।***

***āpedire nirātmavamanumānaikacakṣuṣaḥ ॥ 31 ॥***

*The Buddhist who have their sight on inference, because of their confusion (stupidity) disregarding the Shruti, because of ignorance came to the conclusion of Voidism.*

***anāḍṛtya śrutim*** - disregarding the Shruti, ***maurkhyādime bauddhāḥ*** - because of the stupidity, these buddhists, ***tamasvinaḥ*** - who are ignorant, ***āpedire nirātmavam*** – gained the Selfless state (state devoid of Self) - Void, ***anumānaikacakṣuṣaḥ*** - one who is one-eyed based on inference. One who accepts inference only as the Pramana. All these words anumānaikacakṣuṣaḥ, tamasvinaḥ, anāḍṛtya śrutim, maurkhyād are adjectives for ime bauddhāḥ.

अनादृत्य इति ॥ ३१ ॥

***anāḍṛtya iti ॥ 31 ॥***

इदानीमसद्वादं विकल्प्य दूषयति -

***idānīmasadvādaṃ vikalpya dūṣayati -***

***idānīmasadvādaṃ vikalpya dūṣayati*** - now, showing the possible choices of Voidism and it is negated. Since their logic is good, we may give a benefit of doubt for their logic, to negate it completely we are bringing the choice and negating both the possibilities, through logic.

शून्यमासीदिति ब्रूषे सद्योगं वा सदात्मताम् ।

शून्यस्य न तु तद्युक्तमुभयं व्याहृतत्वतः ॥ ३२ ॥

***śūnyamāsīditi brūṣe sadyogaṃ vā sadātmatām ।***



***śūnyasya na tu tadyuktamubhayaṃ vyāhatatvataḥ // 32 //***

You say 'Void (non-existence) existed', is this word 'existed', endowed with existence or of the nature of existence? Both are not possible as it is contradictory.

*śūnyamāsīditi brūṣe* – you say 'void existed', *sadyogaṃ vā* – is it in association with the Sat (existence). Sat-yoga means Samyoga (association) with Sat. *sadātmatām* - or is its nature existence. Sadatma means Tadatmya (identity) with Sat. *śūnyasya na tu tadyuktam* – in Void it is not possible. Void cannot have class, to be referred as void-ness and it cannot have the nature of existence, which makes the Asat, a Sat. *ubhayaṃ vyāhatatvataḥ* - since both are contradictory.

शून्यम् इति । शून्यमासीत् इत्यनेन वाक्येन शून्यस्य सत्ताजातीययोगं वा सद्वृपतां वा ब्रूषे इति विकल्पार्थः । तदुभयं सत्तासंबन्धसद्वृपत्वलक्षणं शून्यस्य व्याहतत्वान्न युज्यत इत्यर्थः ॥ ३२ ॥

***śūnyam iti / śūnyamāsīt ityanena vākyena śūnyasya sattājāṭīyayogaṃ vā sadrūpatām vā brūṣe iti vikalpārthaḥ / tadubhayaṃ sattāsaṃbandhasadrūpatvalakṣaṇaṃ śūnyasya vyāhatatvānna yujyata ityārthaḥ // 32 //***

*śūnyamāsīt ityanena vākyena* - with this statement 'Void existed', *śūnyasya sattājāṭīyayogaṃ vā sadrūpatām vā brūṣe iti vikalpārthaḥ* - what is that you are implying, is it association with the class of Sat as Sattva (existence-ness) or are you implying it is Sat. The class (Jati) for cow is cowness, for pot is potness similarly for Sat is Satness. Another thing, association is possible between two things, and here the two things associated are Asta and Sat. And in the second option, the Void which is non-existence, will be of the nature of existence, i.e. Asat as Sat. *tadubhayaṃ = sattāsaṃbandhasadrūpatvalakṣaṇaṃ* - both of them, i.e. association with the Sat and being of the nature of Sat, *śūnyasya vyāhatatvānna yujyata ityārthaḥ* - is contradictory for the Void, therefore it is not logical. // 32 //

व्याहतत्वमेव दृष्टान्तपूर्वकं द्रढयति –

***vyāhatatvameva drṣṭāntapūrvakaṃ draḍhayati*** –

***vyāhatatvameva drṣṭāntapūrvakaṃ draḍhayati*** – This contradiction is established through an example.

न युक्तस्तमसा सूर्यो नापि चासौ तमोमयः ।

सच्छून्ययोर्विरोधित्वाच्छून्यमासीत्कथं वद ॥ ३३ ॥

*na yuktastamasā sūryo nāpi cāsau tamomayaḥ ।*

*sacchūnyayorvirodhitvācchūnyamāsītkathaṃ vada ॥ 33*

॥

*Sun is neither associated with darkness nor is of the nature of darkness. Since, Sat and Void as contradictory to one another, how can you say, 'Void existed'.*

*na yuktastamasā sūryo* – the sun is neither associated with the darkness. In the exemplified sattāsaṃbandha, *nāpi cāsau tamomayaḥ* - nor is it of the nature of darkness, in the exemplified sadrūpatva, *sacchūnyayorvirodhitvāt* – since the Sat and Void are contradictory, *sūnyamāsītkathaṃ vada* - please tell how 'Void existed'.

न युक्त इति ॥ ३३ ॥

*na yukta iti ॥ 33 ॥*

Opponent wants to show a similar situation in Vedanta. The Self which is devoid of Name and Form has superimposition of Name and Form. Since it is said this yoga is AsparshaYoga, the Self which is not associated with anything, and again in the same breath it is said 'ātmanaḥ ākāśaḥ sambhūtaḥ' – Akasha came from that Self. Therefore, similarly Void which is devoid of Sat, is superimposed with the Sat. If the problem is same, the solution is same too, therefore we accept whatever you accept, is the contention of Buddhist.

ननु भवन्मते वियदादीनां निर्विकल्पे ब्रह्मणि सत्त्वं व्याहृतमित्याशङ्क्याह –

*nanu bhavanmate viyadādīnāṃ nirvikalpe brahmaṇi sattvaṃ vyāhatamityāśaṅkyāha –*

*nanu bhavanmate* – but in your system (Vedanta), *viyadādīnāṃ nirvikalpe brahmaṇi sattvaṃ vyāhatamityāśaṅkyāha* – Akasha etc. has existence in the Brahman which is attributeless, is contradictory, for this doubt.

वियदादेर्नामरूपे मायया सुविकल्पिते ।

शून्यस्य नामरूपे च तथा चेज्जीव्यतां चिरम् ॥ ३४ ॥

*viyadāderṇāmarūpe māyayā suvikalpite ।*

*śūnyasya nāmarūpe ca tathā cejjīvyatām cīram ॥ 34 ॥*

Name and Form of Akasha etc. are nicely superimposed on the Self by Maya. If you say, similarly too, Name and Form are superimposed on the Void, then 'Live Long'.

*viyadādernāmarūpe* – Name and Form of the Akasha etc., *māyayā suvikalpīte* - are nicely superimposed by Maya, *śūnyasya nāmarūpe ca tathā cet* – If you say, similarly in the Void also Name and Form are superimposed, *jīvyatām cīram* – We bless you 'Live Long'.

वियदादेः इति । तर्हि शून्यस्यापि नामरूपे सद्वस्तुनि कल्पिते इति वदतो बौद्धस्यापसिद्धान्त इत्यभिप्रायेणाह – शून्यस्य इति ॥ ३४ ॥

*viyadādeḥ iti / tarhi śūnyasyāpi nāmarūpe sadvastuni kalpīte iti vadato bauddhasyāpasiddhānta ityabhiprāyeṇāha – śūnyasya iti ॥ 34 ॥*

*tarhi śūnyasyāpi nāmarūpe sadvastuni kalpīte iti vadato bauddhasyāpasiddhānta ityabhiprāyeṇāha* – for the Buddhist, who accept the Void Name and Form too are superimposed, by accepting that (void) has an existence, it is against the accepted philosophy in Buddhism. Since you are accepting the the substratum Void as existence or accepting the Name and Form to be existence, whichever way it is contradictory. ॥ 34 ॥

The contradiction shown was, the Substratum becomes Real or the Superimposed becomes Real, thus either way you loose the standpoint of accepting everything is Void.

ननु तर्हि शून्यस्येव सद्वस्तुनोऽपि नामरूपे कल्पिते एवाङ्गीकर्तव्ये भवन्मते वास्तवयोर्नामरूपयोरभावादिति शङ्कते –

*nanu tarhi śūnyasyeva sadvastuno'pi nāmarūpe kalpīte evāṅgīkartavye; bhavanmate vāstavayornāmarūpayorabhāvādīti śaṅkate –*

*nanu tarhi śūnyasyeva* - but again, as in the case of Void, *sadvastuno'pi* - in the Sat too, *nāmarūpe kalpīte evāṅgīkartavye* – when we have to accept the Name and Form to be superimposed, *bhavanmate vāstavayornāmarūpayorabhāvādīti* - there is no real Name and Form in your Vedanta too, *śaṅkate* – is the doubt. For the superimposition to take place, one should accept the real existence of that in another place. If it is real there, that is the non-negatable world which we are talking about, then this creation cannot be dismissed as illusory, is the contention of Opponent.

सतोऽपि नामरूपे द्वे कल्पिते चेत्तदा वद ।

कुत्रेति निराधिष्ठानो न भ्रमः क्वचिदीक्ष्यते ॥ ३५ ॥

*sato'pi nāmarūpe dve kalpīte cettadā vada /*

*kutreti nirādhiṣṭhāno na bhramaḥ kvacidīkṣyate ॥ 35 ॥*

*In the Sat too both the Name and Form are superimposed, if be said (by you Buddhist), please tell us how? Nowhere superimposition is seen devoid of substratum.*

*sato'pi nāmarūpe dve kalpīte cet* – in the Sat too both the Name and Form are superimposed, if be said, *tadā vada* – then, please tell us, *kutreti* – how is it possible, *nirādhiṣṭhāno na bhramaḥ kvacidīkṣyate* – Because, nowhere have we seen the superimposition devoid of a Substratum.

सतोऽपि इति । विकल्पासहत्वादयं पक्ष एवानुपपन्न इत्यभिप्रायेण परिहरति – तदा इति ।

*sato'pi iti / vikalpāsahatvādayaṃ pakṣa evānupapanna ityabhiprāyeṇa pariharati – tadā iti /*

*vikalpāsahatvādayaṃ pakṣa evānupapanna ityabhiprāyeṇa pariharati* – Since it wont withstand scrutiny, this option is not tenable, in this way it is refuted. The refutation of the accepting the Name and Form as superimposed on Sat, which the opponent want to show as error.

अयमभिप्रायः – सतो नामरूपे किं सति कल्पिते, उतासति, अथवा जगति ?

*ayamabhiprāyaḥ* - this is what is meant here. *sato nāmarūpe kiṃ sati kalpīte, utāsati, athavā jagati ?* - The Name and Form that is Sat, is it superimposed on the Sat or on Asat or on the Creation?

नाद्यः अन्यस्य रजतादेर्नामरूपयोरन्यत्र शुक्तिकादावारोपदर्शनात् , सतो नामरूपयोः सत्येव कल्पनायोगात् ।

*nādyā; anyasya rajatādernāmarūpayoranyatra śuktikādāvāropadarśanāt , sato nāmarūpayoḥ satyeva kalpanāyogāt /*

*nādyā* – not the first option (On Sat); *anyasya rajatādernāmarūpayoranyatra śuktikādāvāropadarśanāt* - The Name and Form of Silver etc. are seen to be superimposed on the Nacre etc. , *sato nāmarūpayoḥ satyeva kalpanāyogāt* - the Name and Form of Sat, cannot be superimposed on Sat itself. Superimposing of myself on

myself is a defect called ‘Karma-kartru virodha’ – contradiction of accepting the doer and done as same.

न द्वितीयः, असतो निरात्मकस्य चाधिष्ठानत्वायोगात् ।

***na dvitīyaḥ, asato nirātmakasya cādhiṣṭhānatvāyogāt ।***

***na dvitīyaḥ*** - not the second option (On Asat), ***asato nirātmakasya cādhiṣṭhānatvāyogāt*** - the Asat which does not have any existence cannot be Substratum.

न तृतीयः य सत उत्पन्नस्य जगतः सन्नामरूपकल्पनाधिष्ठानत्वानुपपत्तेरिति ।

***na tṛtīyaḥ ; sata utpannasya jagataḥ sannāmarūpakalpanādhiṣṭhānatvānupapatteriti ।***

***na tṛtīyaḥ*** - not the third option (on the creation); ***sata utpannasya jagataḥ sannāmarūpakalpanādhiṣṭhānatvānupapatteriti*** – The creation which has come from the Sat, cannot be the substratum for the superimposition of Name and Form that are Sat.

मा भूदधिष्ठानम्, अनयोः कल्पना किं न स्यात् इत्याशङ्क्याह – निरधिष्ठान इति ॥ ३५ ॥

***mā bhūdadhiṣṭhānam , anayoḥ kalpanā kiṃ na syāt ityāśaṅkyāha – niradhiṣṭhāna iti***  
**॥ 35 ॥**

***mā bhūdadhiṣṭhānam*** - let there be no substratum, ***anayoḥ kalpanā kiṃ na syāt ityāśaṅkyāha*** – why cannot they, the Name and Form, cannot be superimposed. This doubt is negated through – the substratum-less superimposition is not seen anywhere. In the superimposition of blue dotted, red coloured Pot, though all the three Pot, red and blue are superimposition, they are seen on the substratum of ground. There can be superimposition upon superimposition, but when they are boiled down there needs to be a substratum, this is the rule. **॥ 35 ॥**

We have to understand one thing here, even before refuting the idea of the opponent, the opponent has fallen from his standpoint by quoting the Shruti, which they do not accept. Some people who are from different Religion want to quote the Shruti to establish their Philosophy or God, but the moment you quote the Shruti for establishing the existence of your God, you are accepting the Vedic tradition. If you want to accept the Vedic tradition, why not completely accept it. Why this logic of ‘half egg for baking the other half for hatching’ called ‘ardajaratiya nyaya’ – the logic of accepting half body aged, and the other half youth.

ननु ‘असदेवेदमग्र आसीत्’ (छा उ - ३.१६.१) इत्यत्र यथा व्याघात उक्तः, तथा ‘सदेव सोम्येदमग्र आसीत्’ (छा उ - ६.२.१) इत्यत्रापि दोषोऽस्तीति शङ्कते -

*nanu 'asadevedamagra āsīt' (chā u – 3.19.1) ityatra yathā vyāghāta uktaḥ, tathā 'sadeva somyedamagra āsīt' (chā u – 6.2.1) ityatrāpi doṣo'stīti śaṅkate -*

*nanu 'asadevedamagra āsīt' (chā u – 3.19.1) ityatra yathā vyāghāta uktaḥ -* but the contradiction that was said for the Shruti statement 'non-existent existed before the creation', *tathā 'sadeva somyedamagra āsīt' (chā u – 6.2.1) ityatrāpi doṣo'stīti śaṅkate* – this situation is same for the statement 'only existence existed before the creation' too, is the doubt raised. Here 'Sat' and 'aasit' both are synonym, there is a 'punarukti dosha' (defect of repetition), both by words and by meaning. Punarukti is of two types, Shabata – by the words and Arthata – by the meaning. If they are accepted to be one and same then Atmashraya (dependent on itself); if different Anyonyashraya (dependent one each other); Chakraka (cyclic) and finally Anavastha (regress-ad-infinitum), as we saw in the first chapter Shloka 1.50. Shloka 2.20 there is a contradiction with this, there it was said, since there is a worldly example we should not doubt the duality triad, but here we say there is an example for this in the world. The Answer to this is, just because there is an example we cannot fit it in the exemplified, but if it is the exemplified we can definitely find an example from the world.

सदासीदिति शब्दार्थभेदे वैगुण्यमापतेत् ।

अभेदे पुनरुक्तिः स्यान्मैवं लोके तथेक्षणात् ॥ ३६ ॥

*sadāsīditi śabdārthabhede vaigunyamāpatet /*

*abhede punaruktiḥ syānmaivaṃ loke tathekṣaṇāt ॥ 36 ॥*

*In the statement 'sat aasit' (existence existed), if the meaning of the words are different there will be contradiction (to Vedanta accepting one existence). If there is no difference in the meaning, then it will lead to Punarukti dosha (defect of repetition). (If be said) not so, since such usage is seen in the world.*

*sadāsīditi* – in the statement 'sat aasit' (existence existed), *śabdārthabhede* – if the meaning is different (for both the words 'sat' and 'aasit'), *vaigunyamāpatet* - there will be contradiction. Since in Vedanta, there is only one existence that is accepted as Truth. There is also another reading *dvaigunyamāpatet* – there will be a case of double Sat. *abhede* – if they are not different, *punaruktiḥ syāt* – then it is defect of repetition, *maivaṃ* - Not so. This is the reply by the Vedanti, the reason is, *loke tathekṣaṇāt* - since that kind of usage is seen in the world.

सदासीदिति । तथा हि सदासीदिति शब्दभेदयोरर्थभेदोऽस्ति न वा ?

*sadāsīditi / tathā hi sadāsīditi śabdabhedayorarthabhedo'sti na vā ?*

*tathā hi sadāsīditi śabdabhedayorarthabhedo'sti na vā ?* - Does the words 'Sat' and 'Aasit' have difference in their meanings or not?

अस्ति चेदद्वैतहानिः, नास्ति चेतुनरुक्तिः स्यात्; अतः 'सदासीत्' इत्यनुपपन्नमिति द्वितीयं पक्षमादाय परिहरति - मैवमिति।  
पुनरुक्तिदोषस्य कः परिहारः इत्याशङ्क्याह - लोके इति ॥ ३६ ॥

*asti cedadvaitahāniḥ , nāsti cetpunaruktiḥ syāt ; ataḥ 'sadāsīt ' ityanuppannamiti  
dviṭīyaṃ pakṣmādāya pariharati - maivamiti / punaruktidoṣasya kaḥ parihāraḥ  
ityāśaṅkyāha - loke iti ॥ 36 ॥*

*asti cedadvaitahāniḥ* - if there is difference in the meaning, then Advaita (non-duality) will be refuted. As said, there are two existence accepted here, and Vedanta accepts only one existence, of Brahman. *nāsti cetpunaruktiḥ syāt* - if the answer is No, then there is defect of repetition. *ataḥ 'sadāsīt' ityanuppannamiti dviṭīyaṃ pakṣmādāya pariharati* – since the statement 'sat aasit' (existence existed) becomes illogical, therefore this is negated (by Vedanti) by accepting the second option. The idea is, we do accept the non-difference between these words, but there is no Punarukti defect. *punaruktidoṣasya kaḥ parihāraḥ ityāśaṅkyāha* - but the second option had the defect of repetition, what will happen to that? It is answered with the simple worldly usage. *॥ 36 ॥*

लोके एवंविधेषु प्रयोगेषु पुनरुक्त्यभावः कुत्र दृष्ट इत्याशङ्क्याह -

*loke evaṃvidheṣu prayogeṣu punaruktyabhāvaḥ kutra dr̥ṣṭa ityāśaṅkyāha -*

*loke evaṃvidheṣu prayogeṣu punaruktyabhāvaḥ kutra dr̥ṣṭa ityāśaṅkyāha* - when the doubt arises, where have we seen, in places like this the absence of the defect of repetition? Is explained.

कर्तव्यं कुरुते वाक्यं ब्रूते धार्यस्य धारणम् ।

इत्यादिवासनाविष्टं प्रत्यासीत्सदित्तिरणम् ॥ ३७ ॥

*kartavyaṃ kurute vākyaṃ brūte dhāryasya dhāraṇam /*

*ityādivāsanāviṣṭaṃ pratyāsītsaditiraṇam ॥ 37 ॥*

For the one who is used to the usages of 'doing what needs to be done', 'speaking the words', 'wearing the thing that is to be worn' etc., this teaching of 'existence existed' is said.

*kartavyam kurute* – ‘doing what is to be done’, *vākyaṃ brūte* – ‘speaking the words’ i.e. ‘speaks what needs to be spoken’, *dhāryasya dhāraṇam* - ‘wearing the one to be worn’, *ityādivāsanāviṣṭam* - to the person who is endowed (filled) with these types of thought imprints, *pratyāsāditīraṇam* – to him the Shruti says ‘existence existed’.

कर्तव्यम् इति । भवत्वेवं लोके, श्रुतौ किमायातमित्यत आह - इत्यादि इति ॥ ३७ ॥

*kartavyam iti / bhavatvevaṃ loke, śrutau kimāyātamityata āha - ityādi iti ॥ 37 ॥*

After the Vedantin’s answer, the opponent says *bhavatvevaṃ loke* – let it be so in the world, *śrutau kimāyātamityata āha* – what difference does it make for the Shruti. The opponent has forgotten the reason for this dialog that is the reason for this kind of aloofness in his reply; because, we started with saying there is example similar to this statement ‘sat asit’, in the world. ॥ 37 ॥

The opponent tries to defend himself, for asking the above question of ‘so what?’.

ननु अद्वितीये वस्तुनि भूतकालाभावात् ‘अग्र आसीत्’ इत्युक्तिरनुपपन्नेत्याशङ्क्याह -

*nanu advitīye vastuni bhūtakālābhāvāt ‘agra āsīt’ ityuktiranupapannetyāśaṅkyāha-*

*nanu advitīye vastuni bhūtakālābhāvāt ‘agra āsīt’ ityuktiranupapannetyāśaṅkyāha* – but, in the non-dual Self there is no Past (or for that matter present or future), therefore the statement ‘existed earlier’ is not possible. Time and Space are accepted to be two dimensions of the same thing. This time and space are ‘effects’ which are caused by the ‘association’ of Self and Maya. When there is no association before, where can there be ‘before’ in that Self. For this doubt we say.

कालाभावे पुरेत्युक्तिः कालवासनया युतम् ।

शिष्यं प्रत्येव तेनात्र द्वितीयं न हि शक्यते ॥ ३८ ॥

*kālābhāve puretyuktiḥ kālavāsanayā yutam /*

*śiṣyaṃ pratyeva tenātra dvitīyaṃ na hi śakyate ॥ 38 ॥*

*In the Self devoid of time, the statement of past is used for the disciple endowed with the imprints of time. Therefore there is no possibility of another thing.*



The opponents idea though is correct, the reason for the statement to mention past is, *kālābhāve* – in the Self devoid of time. *puretyuktiḥ* - the statement of past ‘earlier / before’, *kālavāsanayā yutam śiṣyaṃ pratyeva* – is for the disciple who is endowed with the thought imprints of time. For us, we cannot understand anything devoid of time and space. *tenātra dvitīyaṃ na hi śakyate* – therefore, there is no possibility for another to exists. If the word is understood as *śankyate* it means, therefore one should not doubt about another object (Self).

कालेति । ननु जगदुत्पत्तेः पुरा जगदभावेन सद्वितीयत्वं ब्रह्मण इत्याशङ्क्य श्रुतिप्रवृत्तेः द्वैतवासनाविष्टश्रोतृप्रतिबोधनार्थत्वात् नातिशङ्कनीयमित्याह - तेनेति ॥ ३८ ॥

*kāleti / nanu jagadutpatteḥ purā jagadabhāvena sadvitīyatvaṃ brahmaṇa ityāśankya śrutipravṛtteḥ dvaitavāsanāviṣṭaśrotṛpratibodhanārthatvāt nātīśaṅkanīyamityāha – teneti ॥ 38 ॥*

*nanu jagadutpatteḥ purā jagadabhāvena* - but, before the creation there is no creation (world), *sadvitīyatvaṃ brahmaṇa* - another existence along with the Self; i.e., the existence of time along with the Self. *ityāśankya* - doubting thus. *śrutipravṛtteḥ dvaitavāsanāviṣṭaśrotṛpratibodhanārthatvāt* - for teaching the listener one who is filled with the knowledge of duality, it was said. *nātīśaṅkanīyamityāha* - therefore one should not doubt the undoubtful. Doubting where the doubt is not possible. From the standpoint of the Guru though there is nothing other than the Self, when the disciple who is tormented by the Samsara asks for the method to get rid of it, the answer should not be ‘there is no creation, everything is illusory’. This will not clear the doubt about the Samsara, but maybe about the person one who answers ‘that he is in illusion’ instead of the right knowledge ‘he is an illusion’. Because, he is tormented by it, we should give him the hope by letting him understand, that we understand his situation. Just because one likes Maths, does not mean he can talk about Math with someone who does not even know arithmetic. The effort the Shruti puts is for making the ignorant one understand, therefore one should not find fault with it. **॥ 38 ॥**

इदानीं सिद्धान्तरहस्यमाह –

*idānīm siddāntarahasyamāha* –

*idānīm siddāntarahasyamāha* – the secret of Vedanta is explained.

चोद्यं वा परिहारो वा क्रियतां द्वैतभाषया ।

अद्वैतभाषया चोद्यं नास्ति नापि तदुत्तरम् ॥ ३६ ॥

*codyam vā parihāro vā kriyatām dvaitabhāṣayā /*

*advaitabhāṣayā codyam nāsti nāpi taduttaram ॥ 39 ॥*

The Question or Answer is done in the language of duality (accepting the duality). In the language of non-duality (not accepting the duality), there can neither be question nor an answer to it.

*codyam vā parihāro vā* – the question or the answer, *kriyatām dvaitabhāṣayā* – can be done in the language of the duality. Only when we accept the duality can there be a question or an answer to it. *advaitabhāṣayā* – in the language of non-duality. Not accepting anything other than the Self. *codyam nāsti nāpi taduttaram* – there can neither be question nor an answer to it. This is the reason in Dakshinamurty Shloka it is said ‘maunavyākhyā’ – this can be understood as ‘maunasya vyākhyā’ – commentary on silence, but this is not the question or ‘maunam eva vyākhyā’ – silence itself is the commentary, which is the proper reply for the questions.

चोद्यम् इति । व्यवारदशायां चोद्यादि कर्तव्यं, परमार्थतस्तु अद्वैतमेव तत्त्वमित्यर्थः ॥ ३६ ॥

*codyam iti / vyavāradaśāyām codyādi kartavyam, paramārthatastu advaitameva tattvamityarthaḥ ॥ 39 ॥*

*vyavāradaśāyām codyādi kartavyam* - in the transactional reality, one should ask question etc. This is said to negate the doubt, should I not ask any questions? Without asking the proper question one cannot get a proper answer. *paramārthatastu advaitameva tattvamityarthaḥ* - from the standpoint of Truth, non-duality is the Absolute Truth. ॥ 39 ॥

परमार्थतो द्वैताभावे स्मृतिं प्रमाणयति –

*paramārthato dvaitābhāve smṛtiṃ pramāṇayati* –

*paramārthato dvaitābhāve smṛtiṃ pramāṇayati* – in reality there is absence of duality is established through Smṛti. The strange situation here is, when we ask for a Pramana for something, we bring Shruti. Since, there is no ultimate Pramana other than the Shruti. Smṛti is weaker Pramana than the Shruti. But here, to validate Shruti, we are quoting Smṛti. We established Shruti through Yukti (logic) and to validate logic, we are bringing Smṛti. If we give Pramana from Shruti again, then it is a situation for Anyonyashrya

dosha (defect of inter-dependence). For example, when we ask, what is the proof for Iswara? We answer Shruti is. Then the next question, who is the author of Shruti? Iswara. Here a statement from YogaVaashishta – teaching of Vashita to Shri Rama, is given as proof to establish the one which is beyond the grasp of words and Mind.

तदा स्तिमितगम्भीरं न तेजो न तमस्ततम् ।

अनाख्यमनभिव्यक्तं सत्किंचिदवशिष्यते ॥ ४० ॥

*tadā stimitagambhīraṃ na tejo na tamastatam ।*

*anākhyamanabhivyaktaṃ satkiṃcidavaśiṣyate ॥ 40 ॥*

Then; without any movement, strong (deep), without light or darkness, omnipresent, inexplicable (nameless), without manifestation (formless); only the Sat remained.

*tadā* – then, when there was no creation, and not when you were not born. *Stimita* – devoid of movement (change). *gambhīraṃ* - deep, that which is incomprehensible. *na tejo na tamas* – without light or darkness, *tatam* - omnipresent, *anākhyam* – that which is nameless (inexplicable), *anabhivyaktaṃ* - that which is formless (unmanifest), *satkiṃcidavaśiṣyate* – only that something, Sat remained.

तदा इति । स्तिमितं निश्चलं, गम्भीरं दुरवगाहं मनसा विषयीकर्तुमशक्यम् ,

*tadā iti । stimitaṃ niścalaṃ, gambhīraṃ duravagāhaṃ manasā viṣayīkartumaśakyam ,*

*stimitaṃ = niścalaṃ* - that which is without any movement. *gambhīraṃ = duravagāhaṃ = manasā viṣayīkartumaśakyam* - that which is deep, difficult to understand, i.e. that which cannot be grasped by the mind.

न तेजः तेजस्त्वानधिकरणं, न तमः तमसो विलक्षणं अनावरणस्वभावं, तत् व्याप्तम् ,

*na tejaḥ tejastvānadhikaraṇaṃ, na tamaḥ tamaso vilakṣaṇaṃ anāvaraṇasvabhāvaṃ, tataṃ vyāptam ,*

*na tejaḥ = tejastvānadhikaraṇaṃ* - it is not light, it is not substratum for light. *na tamaḥ = tamaso vilakṣaṇaṃ = anāvaraṇasvabhāvaṃ* - it is not darkness, it is different from the darkness, i.e. it is that which is not of the nature of veiling (hiding). *tataṃ = vyāptam* - that which is all-pervading, omnipresent.

अनाख्यं व्याख्यातुमशक्यम् , अनभिव्यक्तं चक्षुरादिभिरप्यविषयीकृतं, सत् शून्यविलक्षणं अत एव किञ्चित् इदन्तया निर्देष्टुमशक्यमत्र अवशिष्यते । द्वैतनिषेधावधित्वेनावतिष्ठत इत्यर्थः ॥ ४० ॥

*anākhyam vyākhyātumaśakyam , anabhivyaktaṃ cakṣurādibhirapyaviṣayīkṛtaṃ, sat śūnyavilakṣaṇam ata eva kiñcit idantayā nirdeṣṭumaśakyamatra avaśiṣyate / dvaitaniṣedhāvdhitvenāvatiṣṭhata ityarthah // 40 //*

*anākhyam* = *vyākhyātumaśakyam* - without any name, that which cannot be commented upon (inexplicable). *anabhivyaktaṃ* = *cakṣurādibhirapyaviṣayīkṛtaṃ* - without any form, that which cannot be grasped through the eyes etc. sense-organs. *sat* = *śūnyavilakṣaṇam* - Sat, that which is different from Void. *ata eva* - for this reason, *kiñcit* = *idantayā nirdeṣṭumaśakyam* – something, that which cannot be pointed out to as ‘this’, *atra avaśiṣyate* - remains here. *dvaitaniṣedhāvdhitvenāvatiṣṭhata ityarthah* - meaning, it remains as the substratum for the duality that is negated. If it cannot be expressed through words etc and cannot be grasped through the mind, then what is the use of studying the Shastra? It is answered here as the substratum for all the duality and thus by negating the duality we understand the Sat. Even the name Sat is to make us understand, this is used to differentiate it for Asat. And sometimes it is called as Shunya (Void), not to be confused with the Void of Buddhist, here Shunya means, devoid of the manifestation of name and form. **// 40 //**

When it was said, the end of the negation of duality is this Self. Now, after hearing this, Logicians who want to save the space (Akasha) from destruction raise this opposition.

ननु जनिमत्त्वेनानित्यस्य भूम्यादेरसत्त्वमस्तु, नित्याकाशस्य असत्त्वं कथमङ्गीक्रियत इति शङ्कते –

*nanu janimattvenānityasya bhūmyāderasattvamastu, nityākāśasya asatvaṃ kathamaṅgīkriyata iti śaṅkate –*

*nanu janimattvenānityasya bhūmyāderasattvamastu* – let the Earth etc that are non-eternal because they are created, be non-existent. That which is born out of the association of the atoms, right from the di-atom till the biggest of the creation are Jani (born - that which gets existence from non-existence). Logicians accept the Earth atom to be eternal but not the di-atom of earth etc. *nityākāśasya asatvaṃ kathamaṅgīkriyata iti śaṅkate* – how can one accept the absence of the Space that is eternal, is the doubt raised. And here he is not just asking how do you accept the absence of space, but instead saying the space that is eternal. For the Self to exist there needs to be the existence of Space.

ननु भूम्यादिकं मा भूत्परमाण्वन्तनाशतः ।

कथं ते वियतोऽसत्त्वं बुद्धिमारोहतीति चेत् ॥ ४१ ॥

*nanu bhūmyādikam mā bhūtparamāṅvantanaśataḥ /*

***kathaṃ te viyato'sattvaṃ buddhimārohaṭī cet ॥ 41 ॥***

*Let there be absence of the earth etc. because they all disintegrate to the state of Atom. But how can you even think of the absence of the Space. If be asked.*

*nanu* - but, *bhūmyādikaṃ* - earth etc. Here by earth etc. what is meant was earth, water, fire and air. *mā bhūtparamāṅvantānāśataḥ* - let them be non-existent, as they disintegrate till the atom. *kathaṃ te viyato'sattvaṃ buddhimārohati* - how can you even think of the absence of Space. The absence of space cannot be comprehended. Since, we are used to seeing every existence and non-existence in the space. *iti cet* - if be asked. The answer is given in the next shloka.

ननु इति ॥ ४१ ॥

*nanu iti ॥ 41 ॥*

दृष्टान्तावष्टम्भेन परिहरति –

***dr̥ṣṭāntāvaṣṭambhena pariharati –***

***dr̥ṣṭāntāvaṣṭambhena pariharati*** – by holding on to an example, the doubt is negated. This is though an answer, this is not correct answer (ASaduttaram). A correct answer (Saduttaram) is that which helps us to understand the Truth. A non-correct answer (ASaduttaram) is that which shuts the mouth of the opponent. This is otherwise called Pratibandi uttara.

अत्यन्तं निर्जगद्व्योम यथा ते बुद्धिमाश्रितम् ।

तथैव सन्निराकाशं कुतो नाश्रयते मतिम् ॥ ४२ ॥

***atyantaṃ nirjagadvyoma yathā te buddhimāśritam ।***

***tathaiva sannirākāśaṃ kuto nāśrayate matim ॥ 42 ॥***

*As you can think of the existence of space, in the absence of all the other creation, similarly too why cannot one comprehend the Sat, in the absence of space.*

***atyantaṃ nirjagadvyoma*** – in the complete absence of the creation. ***yathā te buddhimāśritam*** - as you can comprehend. ***tathaiva sannirākāśaṃ*** - similarly too, the Sat devoid of Space. ***kuto nāśrayate matim*** - why cannot your intellect comprehend.

अत्यन्तम् इति । अत्यन्तं निर्जगत् , जगन्मात्ररहितमित्यर्थः ॥ ४२ ॥

*atyantam iti / atyantam nirjagat , jaganmātrarahitamityarthaḥ ॥ 42 ॥*

*atyantam nirjagat = jaganmātrarahitamityarthaḥ* - complete absence of the creation means the absence of anything created. When space is defined logicians say ‘avakāśapradātrtvam’ – that which gives space. That which gives space for the object to exist or that which exists inbetween two objects is space. When one can comprehend that space, in the absence of a referral point, object. Then surely, one can comprehend the absence of Space too. ॥ 42 ॥

‘न हि दृष्टेऽनुपपन्नम्’ इति न्यायमाश्रित्य चोदयति –

*‘na hi dr̥ṣṭe'nupapannam’ iti nyāyamāśritya codayati –*

*‘na hi dr̥ṣṭe'nupapannam’ iti nyāyamāśritya codayati* – ‘when it is perceived’ then it is not impossible, is the logic, based on this Vedanti asks.

निर्जगद्व्योम दृष्ट चेत्प्रकाशतमसी विना ।

क्व दृष्टं किं च ते पक्षे न प्रत्यक्षं वियत्खलु ॥ ४३ ॥

*nirjagadvyoma dr̥ṣṭa cetprakāśatamasī vinā /*

*kva dr̥ṣṭam kiṃ ca te pakṣe na pratyakṣam viyatkhalu ॥ 43*

॥

*If one can perceive the Space in the absence of anything else, where can one perceive it in the absence of light and darkness? And also, in your philosophy space is not accepted to be directly perceived.*

*nirjagadvyoma dr̥ṣṭa cet* – in the absence of the creation, if you have seen the space. *prakāśatamasī vinā* - without light and darkness. These two words were said in the shloka 2.40. When we say we see the space, which is not an object of direct perception (Pratyaksha), through the light getting refracted or by superimposing the darkness (rainy day or like seeing impurity in the sky). *kva dr̥ṣṭam* - where is it seen? *kiṃ ca te pakṣe na pratyakṣam viyatkhalu* – And again, space is not accepted to be directly perceived in your philosophy.

निर्जगत् इति । दर्शनमेवासिद्धमिति परिहरति – प्रकाशेति । अपसिद्धान्तोऽपीत्याह – किं चेति ॥ ४३ ॥

*nirjagat iti / darśanamevāsiddhamiti pariharati – prakāśeti / apasiddhānto'pītyāha –  
kiṃ ceti // 43 //*

*darśanamevāsiddhamiti pariharati* – Perceiving the space itself is impossible without light and darkness. We are not talking about the absence of the Intellect in the absence of the creation, but understanding the absence of everything NOW. *apasiddhānto'pītyāha* – not just this, it is also against your philosophy. Because space is not an object of sense-organ perception. **// 43 //**

ननु दर्शनाभावः सद्वस्तुन्यपि समान इत्याशङ्क्य सतः सर्वानुभवसिद्धत्वान्नैवमित्याह –

*nanu darśanābhāvaḥ sadvastunyapi samāna ityāśaṅkya sataḥ  
sarvānubhavasiddhatvānmaivamityāha –*

*nanu darśanābhāvaḥ sadvastunyapi samāna ityāśaṅkya* - the opponent doubts, but the Sat also is beyond the grasp of sense-organs, therefore the problem is same. *sataḥ sarvānubhavasiddhatvānmaivamityāha* – Vedanti answers, not so, Sat is experienced by everyone. Not just by the Yogis or Gnanis, but everyone. We are not just saying about the experience of our own existence, but also the existence of pot etc. as 'ghata san', pata san' etc. The commonality between the Opponent and Vedanti is like Space, Self too is not an object of sense-organ. But the difference is, Self is experiential, whereas space is not.

सद्वस्तु शुद्धं त्वस्माभिर्निश्चितैरनुभूयते ।

तूष्णीं स्थितौ न शून्यत्वं शून्यबुद्धेश्च वर्जनात् ॥ ४४ ॥

*sadvastu śuddham tvasmābhirniścītairanubhūyate /*

*tūṣṇīm sthitau na śūnyatvaṃ śūnyabuddheśca varjanāt //*

**44 //**

*The Pure Sat, is definitely experienced by us clearly when we are silent. It cannot be the experience of Void, as the thought of Void is absent.*

*sadvastu śuddham* - the Pure Self. Existence and absence of thought function is witnessed by Sat, but when the thought function exists there is an illusion of it function by itself, when thought function does not exist, the witness is seen clearly, this is the reason for referring to it as Pure. *tvasmābhirniścītairanubhūyate* - is clearly experienced by us definitely. There is another version of the shloka with the word

*niścintair* – when we are thoughtless. *tūṣṇīm sthitau* – when we are silent. This should be connected with earlier and later points. When we stay silent without any thought function, we do experience the Self. But when we stay silent we do not experience the Void, because there is someone who perceives this Void. *na śūnyatvaṃ* - not the Void. *śūnyabuddheśca varjanāt* – since we do not possess the knowledge of Void.

सद्वस्त्विति । ननु तूष्णीम्भावे शून्यमेव, इतरस्य कस्यापि प्रतीत्यभावादित्याशङ्क्य शून्यस्यापि शून्यप्रतीत्यभावाच्छून्यमपि न संभवतीत्याह – न शून्यत्वमिति ॥ ४४ ॥

*sadvastviti / nanu tūṣṇīmbhāve śūnyameva, itarasya kasyāpi pratītyabhāvādityāśaṅkya śūnyasyāpi śūnyapratītyabhāvācchūnyamapi na saṃbhavatītyāha – na śūnyatvamiti ॥ 44 ॥*

*nanu tūṣṇīmbhāve śūnyameva* – but, when we stay silent only the Void is seen. Even for some practitioners of Vedanta, this doubt arises. When we negate all the Sheaths, there exists nothing but blankness or Void. *itarasya kasyāpi pratītyabhāvādityāśaṅkya* - the doubt is because there is not other knowledge during that state. *śūnyasyāpi śūnyapratītyabhāvācchūnyamapi na saṃbhavatītyāha* – even for the void, the knowledge of void does not take place, therefore Void also is not possible. The knowledge of Absence is not Pratyaksha (directly perceived) for any one. If it is experienced that is Self, and if it is not experienced than it is not just not Self, it does not exist. ॥ 44 ॥

ननु तर्हि सद्बुद्धयभावात् सत्त्वमपि न घटत इति शङ्कते -

*nanu tarhi sadbuddhyabhāvāt sattvamapi na ghaṭata iti śaṅkate -*

*nanu tarhi sadbuddhyabhāvāt sattvamapi na ghaṭata iti śaṅkate* - but, then there is no knowledge of the Sat also, therefore this Sat also is not possible, is the doubt raised.

सद्बुद्धिरपि चेन्नास्ति माऽस्त्वस्य स्वप्रभत्वतः ।

निर्मनस्कत्वसाक्षित्वात्सन्मात्रं सुगमं नृणाम् ॥ ४५ ॥

*sadbuddhirapi cennāsti mā'stvasya svaprabhatvataḥ /*

*nirmanaskatvasākṣitvātsanmātraṃ sugamaṃ nṛṇām ॥ 45*

//



*There is absence of the knowledge of Sat too, if be said, let it not be, since it is self-effulgent. It is the witness for the state of no-mind too; therefore this Sat is common experience for everyone.*

**Sadbuddhirapi** – the knowledge of the Sat too does not exist. It is a fact, as this Sat is not an object of thought function. Then, as said in earlier, since it is not experienced it can be said to be non-existent. **cennāsti** - If this is said. **mā'stvasya** – Let there be no knowledge of Sat. This does not make it non-existent, because **svaprabhatvataḥ** - it is self-effulgent. The definition for Svamprakasha is 'avedyatatve sati aparokṣavyavahārayogyatvam' – being not objectified, that which is transacted as immediately perceived. Sat fits this definition, both the adjective (avedyatatve) and adjectified (aparokṣavyavahārayogyatvam). Void fits the adjective part and not the adjectified part. The other objects fit the objectified part and not the adjective part. **nirmanaskatvasākṣitvāt** - since it is the witness for the no-mind state. Here Sakshi is Self, Sat as there is absence of Mind, thus absence of creation. Everything is superimposed on the mind, and mind itself is superimposed on the Ignorance (Agnana). Since there is no ignorance, there is no mind, when there is no mind there is no ignorance too. This discussion is based on the DrshtiSrshti vada – we see, the creation exists. And later we will see SrshtiDrshti vaada – when the creation exists, we see it. Whichever be the methodology, the mind is the cause for Samsara, this mind is superimposed on Ignorance, which is inturn superimposed on the Self. Superimposition means imagination, i.e. illusory. **sanmātraṃ sugamaṃ nṛṇām** - Pure Sat is easily cognized by everyone.

सद्बुद्धिरिति । तस्य स्वप्रकाशत्वान्न तद्बुद्ध्यभावोऽनिष्टः इति परिहरति - माऽस्त्वस्येति । स्वगोचरबुद्ध्यभावे कथं सद्वस्त्ववगन्तुं शक्यत इत्यत आह - निर्मनस्कत्वेति ॥ ४५ ॥

**sadbuddhiriti / tasya svaparakāśatvānna tadbuddhyabhāvo'niṣṭaḥ iti pariharati - mā'stvasyeti / svagocarabuddhyabhāve kathaṃ sadvastvavagantum śakyata ityata āha – nirmanaskatveti ॥ 45 ॥**

**tasya svaparakāśatvānna tadbuddhyabhāvo'niṣṭaḥ iti pariharati** - Since it is accepted to be self-effulgent, and therefore absence of the its knowledge is not something undesirable, thus the opponent is answered. With respect to Sat and Maya, whatever theother see as defect, is really an ornament. **svagocarabuddhyabhāve kathaṃ sadvastvavagantum śakyata ityata āha** – when there is no thought function objectifying Sat, then how can it be understood, is answered, through the witness of no-mind. **॥ 45 ॥**

एवं निष्प्रपञ्चस्य साक्षिणस्तूर्णी स्थितौ भानं प्रदर्शयैतद्दृष्टान्तबलेन सृष्टेः पुरापि सद्वस्तु तथाऽवगन्तुं शक्यत इत्याह –

*evaṃ niṣprapañcasya sākṣīnastūṣṇīm sthītau bhānaṃ pradarśyaitadṛṣṭāntabalena sṛṣṭeḥ purāpi sadvastu tathā'vagantum śakyata ityāha –*

*evaṃ niṣprapañcasya sākṣīnastūṣṇīm sthītau bhānaṃ pradarśya –* thus, after showing the effulgence of the Self, when there is no thought function, as the witness of the absence of creation. *etadṛṣṭāntabalena sṛṣṭeḥ purāpi sadvastu tathā'vagantum śakyata ityāha –* using this example, we can understand the same state before the creation also, is explained. Now there is absence of thought function of mind and earlier there is absence of thought function of Maya.

मनोजृम्भणराहित्ये यथा साक्षी निराकुलः ।

मायाजृम्भणतः पूर्वं सत्तथैव निराकुलम् ॥ ४६ ॥

*manoḥjṛmbhaṇarāhitye yathā sākṣī nirākulaḥ ।*

*māyājṛmbhaṇataḥ pūrvaṃ sattathaiva nirākulam ॥ 46 ॥*

*As the Sakshi (witness) is devoid of impurity (Pure), when the mind is devoid of any activity; so too, before the activity of Maya, the Sat is devoid of impurity.*

*manoḥjṛmbhaṇarāhitye –* when the mind is devoid of any activity. *yathā sākṣī nirākulaḥ* - as the Sakshi is without any impurity. *māyājṛmbhaṇataḥ pūrvaṃ* - before the activity of Maya. *sattathaiva nirākulam* - the Sat too is without any impurity.

मन इति ॥ ४६ ॥

*mana iti ॥ 46 ॥*

मायायाः किं लक्षणमित्यत आह –

*māyāyāḥ kiṃ lakṣaṇamityata āha –*

*māyāyāḥ kiṃ lakṣaṇamityata āha* - what is the definition of Maya? Is explained.

निस्तत्त्वा कार्यगम्याऽस्य शक्तिर्मायाग्निशक्तिवत् ।

न हि शक्तिः क्वचित्कैश्चिद्बुध्यते कार्यतः पुरा ॥ ४७ ॥

*nistattvā kāryagamyā'sya śaktirmāyāgniśaktivat ।*

*na hi śaktiḥ kvacitkaiścidbudhyate kāryataḥ purā ॥ 47 ॥*

*That which is without any substance, understood only through the effect, like the power of fire, the power of Sat is Maya. The power cannot be understood before the effect, by anyone anywhere.*

*nistattvā* – that which is without any substance. Tattva mean the real nature (yataartha), therefore nistattva means not the real nature (ayataartha). *kāryagamyā* – it could be understood through the effect. The logic, whatever is not seen cannot be established is not true here, because though it is not seen, it can be inferred through the effect. The Sat does not transform into creation, since it is without any limbs and does not undergo any transformation. And the creation is experienced, there should be somother cause. If it is existent, then there is dual existence of Sat and Maya, Advaita cannot be established, as that which exists cannot be negated. If it is completely Asat, then there can be no transformation of creation. Through the effect we can understand the Maya and not the Sat, which is of no use as it is not our goal. *asya śaktirmāyā* – Maya, the power of this Self. *agniśaktivat* - like the power of fire. *na hi śaktiḥ kvacitkaiścibudhyate kāryataḥ purā* - the power cannot be understood by anyone anywhere, before the effect.

निस्तत्त्वेति । निस्तत्त्वा जतम्कारणभूताद्वस्तुनः पृथक्तत्त्वरहिता,

*nistattveti / nistattvā jatagkāraṇabhūtādvastunaḥ pṛthaktattvarahitā,*

*nistattvā = jatagkāraṇabhūtādvastunaḥ pṛthaktattvarahitā* - that which has no separate existence than being the cause of the creation.

कार्यगम्या वियदादिकार्यलिङ्गगम्या अस्य सद्वस्तुनः शक्तिः वियदादिकार्यजननसामर्थ्यं माया इत्युच्यते ।

*kāryagamyā viyadādikāryaliṅgagamyā asya sadvastunaḥ śaktiḥ viyadādikāryajananasāmarthyam māyā ityucyate /*

*kāryagamyā = viyadādikāryaliṅgagamyā* that which is inferred through the effect of Space etc. Likga means ‘linam artham gamayati’ – that which points out tho the hidden thing. For inference, we need a pointer. For example to infer fire on the mountain, we need to have the pointer of smoke. *asya = sadvastunaḥ śaktiḥ = viyadādikāryajananasāmarthyam māyā ityucyate* - the power of Self that has the power of manifesting the effect of Space etc. is called as Maya.

वस्तुस्वरूपातिरिक्तशक्तिसद्भावे दृष्टान्तमाह – अग्नीति ।

*vastusvarūpātiriktaśaktisadbhāve dṛṣṭāntamāha – agnīti /*

*vastusvarūpātiriktaśaktisadbhāve dṛṣṭāntamāha* - example to show the existence of power that is different from the Sat is said, like the power of fire. Though the power is

established to be different form the Fire, Vedanta accepts the ‘śakti śaktimatorabhedāt’ – attribute (power) and the attributed (fire) are not different.

यथा अग्न्यादिस्वरूपातिरिक्तं स्फोटादिकार्यलिङ्गगम्यं वह्न्यादिनिष्ठं सामर्थ्यमस्ति तद्वदित्यर्थः ।

*yathā agnyādisvarūpātiriktaṃ sphoṭādikāryaliṅgagamyam vahnnyādiniṣṭhaṃ sāmārthyamasti tadvadīyarthah ।*

*yathā agnyādisvarūpātiriktaṃ sphoṭādikāryaliṅgagamyam vahnnyādiniṣṭhaṃ sāmārthyamasti tadvadīyarthah* - like the power of fire, effulgence and heat, that is different form the Fire is understood through the cracking sound while burning, which shows the power existing in the fire. Similarly, here too it is understood.

शक्तेः कार्यलिङ्गगम्यत्वं व्यतिरेकमुखेन द्रढयति – न हि शक्तिरिति ॥ ४७ ॥

*śakteḥ kāryaliṅgagamyatvaṃ vyatirekamukhena draḍhayati – na hi śaktiriti ॥ 47 ॥*

*śakteḥ kāryaliṅgagamyatvaṃ* - the power is inferred through the effect, *vyatirekamukhena draḍhayati* - is shown through the inverse logic (co-absence). Nowhere and by anyone is the power seen before the effect. This kind of Karyalingaka Anumana is not possible for Sat, as it is Nishkriya (activity-less). Here we can understand a syllogism: sadvastu – Self - Paksha, māyāśaktimat – has Maya as its power - Sadhya, viyadādikāryajanakatvāt – as it is produces the effect of Space etc.- Hetu, agniśaktivat – like the power of fire - Udharana. Loci for Maya is Sat. ॥ 47 ॥

एवं शक्तेः कार्यलिङ्गगम्यत्वमुपपाद्य निस्तत्त्वरूपतामुपपादयति –

*evaṃ śakteḥ kāryaliṅgagamyatvamupapādyā nistattvarūpatāmupapādayati –*

*evaṃ śakteḥ kāryaliṅgagamyatvamupapādyā nistattvarūpatāmupapādayati* – thus, after establishing the Maya to be understood through the effect, it being devoid of any substance is established here.

न सद्वस्तु सतः शक्तिर्न हि वहेः स्वशक्तिता ।

सद्विलक्षणतायां तु शक्तेः किं तत्त्वमुच्यताम् ॥ ४८ ॥

*na sadvastu sataḥ śaktirna hi vahneḥ svaśaktitā ।*

*sadvilakṣaṇatāyāṃ tu śakteḥ kiṃ tattvamucyātām ॥ 48 ॥*

*The power (Maya) of Sat cannot be Sat too, because fire cannot be its own power. If it is different from the Sat, then please tell what its nature is.*

*na sadvastu sataḥ śaktirna* – The power of Sat (Maya) cannot be Sat too. *hi vahneḥ svaśaktitā* – definitely fire cannot be its own power. If the power cannot be Sat, then it should be Asat, this choice is discussed, *sadvilakṣaṇatāyāṃ tu* – if it is different from the Sat. *śakteḥ kiṃ tattvamucyātām* – tell us what its nature is.

न सद्वस्त्विति । अयमभिप्रायः – सद्वस्तुनः शक्तिः किं सति उत असती ?

*na sadvastviti / ayamabhiprāyaḥ – sadvastunaḥ śaktiḥ kiṃ sati uta asatī ?*

*ayamabhiprāyaḥ* - this is the idea behind this inquiry. *sadvastunaḥ śaktiḥ kiṃ sati uta asatī ?* - the power of Sat, is it Sat or Asat. This line of discussion we did in Shloka 2.35.

न तावत्सती; तथात्वे सतोऽभिन्नत्वेन तच्छक्तित्वायोगात् । उक्तार्थे दृष्टान्तमाह – न हि वह्नेरिति ।

*na tāvatsatī; tathātve sato'bhinnatvena tacchaktitvāyogāt / uktārthe dṛṣṭāntamāha – na hi vahneriti /*

*na tāvatsatī* - it cannot be Sat. The power cannot be Sat too, like the substratum; *tathātve sato'bhinnatvena tacchaktitvāyogāt* - if it be so, then being not different from the Sat, it cannot be its power. Then they are synonyms, different names for the same thing as Sat and Shakti. Just because it is called in a different name, the nature of the object does not differ. We should not be confused about the idea of Shakti and Shaktiman (power and the one which has power) to be different, as Vedanta clearly states they are not different, this will be shown here in Shloka 1.53. Here we are only trying to establish the nature of Maya. *uktārthe dṛṣṭāntamāha* - an example for the aforesaid idea is, fire cannot be its own power.

द्वितीयेऽपि किं नरविषाणतुल्या उत सद्विलक्षणेति विकल्पाभिप्रायेण पृच्छति – सद्विलक्षणतायामिति ॥ ४८ ॥

*dvitīye'pi kiṃ naraviṣāṇatulyā uta sadvilakṣaṇeti vikalpābhiprāyeṇa pṛcchati – sadvilakṣaṇatāyāmiti ॥ 48 ॥*

*dvitīye'pi kiṃ naraviṣāṇatulyā* - if we choose the second option of different from Sat, then is it similar to the Human's horn (or Mare's horn or barren women's son). This type is called as Alika, that which does not have existence in all the three periods of time. *uta sadvilakṣaṇeti vikalpābhiprāyeṇa pṛcchati* – or something that is different from the Sat. We are used to the extremes, if it is not light it is dark, if it is not white it is black or if it is not cow it is goat. But there is a third option, dawn or dusk, grey or blue, donkey or

elephant, respectively. This is why, after negating Sat and Asat, the question about it being different from Sat is asked. // 48 //

तत्राद्यं पक्षमनूद्य दूषयति –

*tatrādyam pakṣamanūdyā dūṣayati* –

*tatrādyam pakṣamanūdyā dūṣayati* – Taking the first choice, it is negated.

शून्यत्वमिति चेच्छून्यं मायाकार्यमितीरितम् ।

न शून्यं नापि सद्यादृक्तादृक्तत्वमिहेष्यताम् ॥ ४६ ॥

*śūnyatvamiti cecchūnyam māyākāryamitīritam* /

*na śūnyam nāpi sadyādr̥ktādr̥ktattvamihēṣyatām* // 49 //

If we say it is Shunya (Void), it is not possible as Void is accepted to be the effect of Maya. Therefore, it is neither Sat nor Void. Accept Maya to be 'whatever way it is perceived that is it's nature that way'.

*śūnyatvamiti* – if it is accepted to be Void. *cecchūnyam māyākāryamitīritam* – then, we already Void is an effect of Maya. *na śūnyam nāpi sad* – it (Maya), is neither Shunya nor Sat. *yādr̥ktādr̥ktattvamihēṣyatām* – whatever way it is perceived accept it's nature to be that way. This should be understood as, *yādr̥k na śūnyam tādr̥k nāpi sad* – as it is not Shunya, similarly it is no Sat too.

शून्यत्वमिति । 'शून्यस्य नामरूपे च तथा चेज्जीव्यतां चिरम्' (प्र उ – २.३४) इत्यत्रेत्यर्थः।

*śūnyatvamiti* / 'śūnyasya nāmarūpe ca tathā cejjīvyatām cīram' (pra u – 2.34) *ityatretyarthaḥ* /

'śūnyasya nāmarūpe ca tathā cejjīvyatām cīram' (pra u – 2.34) *ityatretyartha* - if the Name and Form is of the Shunya, then we bless you to live long, in Shloka 2.34. We explained, then they will become illusory, as we Vedanti accept, and therefore you slip away from your philosophy and will become a follower of Vedanta.

तस्मात् द्वितीयः पक्षः परिशिष्यत इत्याह – न शून्यमिति । मायास्वरूपं सत्त्वासत्त्वाभ्यां निर्वचनानर्हमित्यभिप्रायः ॥ ४६ ॥

*tasmāt dvitīyaḥ pakṣaḥ pariśiṣyata ityāha – na śūnyamiti / māyāsvarūpaṃ sattvāsativābhyāṃ nirvacanānarhamityabhiprāyaḥ // 49 //*

*tasmāt dvitīyaḥ pakṣaḥ pariśiṣyata ityāha* – therefore we have the second option which remains. Parishesha is logic of deduction. This is the way, in a place where there are two options, we have four choices 1) Sat, 2) Asat, 3) Both Sat and Asat, and 4) Neither Sat nor Asat. Out of these these four choices, we have already negated the first two. The third one of it being both Sat and Asta is contradictory, therefore we are left with the fourth choice, neither Sat nor Asat. Then the next question will be, what is it then, to answer this it is said inexplicable. And there is no point in asking about something which is useless, like inquiring about the number of teeth for a crow. The Logicians accept Shakti to be different and Shaktiman to be different. *māyāsvarūpaṃ sattvāsativābhyāṃ nirvacanānarhamityabhiprāyaḥ* - the nature is, it cannot be established as Existence or Non-existence, and is inexplicable. This is the definition for Maya is based on Bhagavan Bhashyakara's definition 'sadasadbhyām anirvacanīyam' – being different from Sat and Asat, at the same time is inexplicable. AdvaitaSiddhi accepts this as the first of the five definitions for Maya, 'sadvilakṣaṇatve sati asadvilakṣaṇatve sati anirvacanīyam OR sadasadubhayabhinnatve sati anirvacanīyam'. *// 49 //*

अस्मिन्नर्थे श्रुतिं प्रमाणयति –

*asminnarthe śrutim pramāṇayati –*

*asminnarthe śrutim pramāṇayati* – In this very meaning, Pramana Shruti is quoted.

नाऽसदासीन्नो सदासीत्तदानीं किं त्वभूत्तमः ।

सद्योगात्तमसः सत्त्वं न स्वतस्तन्निषेधनात् ॥ ५० ॥

*nā'sadāsīnno sadāsīttadānīm kiṃ tvabhūttamaḥ /*

*sadyogāttamasah sattvaṃ na svatastanniṣedhanāt // 50 //*

'Then there was no Asat, no Sat but only Maya'. The existence of Maya too is because of the association with the Sat, and not in itself, as that is negated.

*nā'sadāsīnno* – There was no Asat. *sadāsīttadānīm* - There was no Sat. *kiṃ tvabhūttamaḥ* - but only Maya. Tamas here is, as said in the first chapter, synonym for Maya, as Avidya, Chaya etc. are synonyms. Then there were two existence one of Brahman and the other of Maya. Or better, there was only Maya and no Sat, as explained. We should not understand Tamas as darkness, as it will establish Void and

will negate what we said earlier in Shloka 2.43, ‘prakāśatamasī vinā’. And in Sloka 2.47 it was said, ‘na hi śaktiḥ kvacitkaiścidbudhyate kāryataḥ purā ’ – before the effect the power cannot be understood and in Shloka 2.40 too, it is said with respect to Sat, ‘na tejo na tamastatam’ – no light and no darkness, then how can we understand ‘kiṃ tvabhūttamaḥ’. Since the discussion is about Maya, which is illusory, and that which is inexplicable, without being Sat and Asta, there is no contradiction here. **sadyogāttamasah sattvaṃ** - it gains existence because of the association with the Sat. They don’t co-exist, but having the Self as the substratum, this Maya exists. As the Maya depends and objectifies this Self as said in Sankshepashaariraka - ‘āśrayatva viṣayatva bhāginī nirvibhāga citireva kevalā’. **na svataḥ** - and not by itself. **tanniṣedhanāt** - as it’s existence is negated.

नासदिति । ‘तम आसीत्तमसा गूढमग्रे’ (ऋ सं – ८.७.१७.१) इत्यादिश्रुतिः प्रमाणमित्यर्थः ।

**nāsaditi / ‘tama āsāttamasā gūḍhamagre’ (ṛ saṃ – 8.7.17.1) ityādiśrutiḥ  
pramāṇamityarthaḥ /**

**‘tama āsāttamasā gūḍhamagre’ (ṛ saṃ – 8.7.17.1) ityādiśrutiḥ pramāṇamityarthaḥ** - the Shruti ‘Maya existed before the creation, and that it was very dense’ is Pramana.

तर्हि तम आसीदिति कथं सत्त्वमुच्यत इत्यत आह – सद्योगादिति । कृत इत्यत आह – तन्निषेधनादिति ॥ ५० ॥

**tarhi tama āsāditi kathaṃ sattvamucyata ityata āha – sadyogāditi / kuta ityata āha –  
tanniṣedhanāditi // 50 //**

**tarhi tama āsāditi kathaṃ sattvamucyata ityata āha** – then how can we say ‘Maya existed’ and give it existence is explained through the association of Self. **kuta ityata āha** – why is it so?, because it’s existence is negated. **// 50 //**

After negating ‘sadabhinnatvam’ the identity with the Self. Then there will be a doubt about it’s independent existence, to negate ‘sadbhinnatvam’ – different from Sat, we say.

फलितमाह –

**phalitamāha** –

**phalitamāha** – this is the conclusion.

अत एव द्वितीयत्वं शून्यवन्न हि गण्यते ।

न लोके चौत्रतच्छक्त्योर्जीवेतं लिख्यते पृथक् ॥ ५१ ॥



*ata eva dvitīyatvaṃ śūnyavanna hi gaṇyate ।*

*na loke caitratacchaktyorjīvetam likhyate pṛthak ॥ 51 ॥*

For this reason (as Maya is the power), it is not another existence, like Shunya (is not accepted to have an existence). In the world too, we do not write the history of Chaitra (name of a person) and his power seperately.

*ata eva* – for this reason. *dvitīyatvaṃ* - it having another existence is not accepted. *śūnyavanna hi gaṇyate* – as it was not accepted for Shunya. *na loke caitratacchaktyorjīvetam likhyate pṛthak* – in the world we do not see the history of Chaitra and his valour being written seperately .

अत एव इति । यतः स्वतः सत्त्वं मायाया नास्ति, अतः शून्यस्येव मायाया अपि द्वितीयत्वं न गण्यते हि, नैवाद्रियत इत्यर्थः ।

*ata eva iti । yataḥ svataḥ sattvaṃ māyāyā nāsti, ataḥ śūnyasyeva māyāyā api dvitīyatvaṃ na gaṇyate hi, naivādriyata ityarthah ।*

*yataḥ svataḥ sattvaṃ māyāyā nāsti* – since Maya does not have an independent existence, *ataḥ śūnyasyeva māyāyā api dvitīyatvaṃ na gaṇyate hi, naivādriyata ityarthah* - we do not accept, support the independent existence for Maya too, as was not accepted for Shunya. If it is neither different nor non-different are we hinting at the system of ‘bheda-abheda’ – accepting duality and non-duality? No, we say it to be inexplicable. How can this be so, when we see it? Let us take an example, something weighing 1 Kilogram, when we start wnquiring about wht is this 1 Kg we will come to a conclusion, that it is an imagined entity. As 1 Kg here, is not same in another continent, or planet.

अनृतस्य द्वितीयत्वानङ्गीकारे दृष्टान्तमाह – न लोक इति ॥ ५१ ॥

*anṛtasya dvitīyatvānaṅgikāre dṛṣṭāntamāha – na loka iti ॥ 51 ॥*

*anṛtasya* – for the illusory, *dvitīyatvānaṅgikāre dṛṣṭāntamāha* – not accepting its indepentnt existence, an example is given, for Chaitra and his power. ॥ 51 ॥

ननु शक्त्याधिक्ये जीविताधिक्यं दृश्यते, अतः शक्तेरपि पृथक् जीवितत्वमस्तीति शङ्कते -

*nanu śaktyādhikye jīvitādhikyaṃ dṛśyate, ataḥ śakterapi pṛthak jīvitatvamastīti śaṅkate*

-

*nanu śaktyādhikye jīvitādhikyam dṛśyate* – but, because of the more power the life span also is seen to be more. This is said as, survival of the fittest. Therefore you cannot say, we do not write the power and the owner to be different. *ataḥ śakterapi pṛthak jīvitatvamastīti śaṅkate* - therefore, we should accept the independent existence of the power too, doubting thus. This is a doubt by Purva Mimamsaka. It is not necessarily a doubt by an opponent, but the doubt of a seeker who has undergone the training in Purva Mimamsa school.

शक्त्याधिक्ये जीवितं चेद्वर्धते तत्र वृद्धिकृत् ।

न शक्तिः किंतु तत्कार्यं युद्धकृष्यादिकं तथा ॥ ५२ ॥

*śaktyādhikye jīvitam cedvardhate tatra vṛddhikṛt /*

*na śaktiḥ kiṃtu tatkāryam yuddhakṛṣyādikaṃ tathā ॥ 52 ॥*

*When the power is greater, the history also grows, if be said, the reason for the growth is not the abundance of power, but its effects war, farming etc. Similarly here too.*

*śaktyādhikye* – with abundance of power. *jīvitam cedvardhate* - the life history too grows, if be said. *tatra vṛddhikṛt* - the reason for the growth in the life span or history. *na śaktiḥ* - is not the power. *kiṃtu tatkāryam* - but its effect. *yuddhakṛṣyādikaṃ* - war, farming etc. As, sometimes though there may be great power, but due to lack of chance for it to manifest, the life history is not great. Sometimes, there is not too great a power, but strenuous effort, helps one to achieve great heights. *tathā* – similarly here too.

शक्त्याधिक्य इति । न शक्तिर्जीवितवर्धने कारणम् , अपि तु तत्कार्यं युद्धकृष्यादीति परिहरति – तत्रेति । दार्ष्टान्तिके योजयति – तथेति ॥ ५२ ॥

*śaktyādhikya iti / na śaktirjīvitavardhane kāraṇam , api tu tatkāryam yuddhakṛṣyādīti pariharati – tatreti / dārṣṭāntike yojayati – tatheti ॥ 52 ॥*

*na śaktirjīvitavardhane kāraṇam* - it is not just the power that which is the cause for the growth. *api tu tatkāryam yuddhakṛṣyādīti pariharati* - but its effect of war, farming etc. *dārṣṭāntike yojayati* - that was said in the example is shown in the exemplified. *॥ 52 ॥*

सर्वथा शक्तिमात्रस्य न पृथग्गणना क्वचित् ।

शक्तिकार्यं तु नैवास्ति द्वितीयं शङ्कते कथम् ॥ ५३ ॥

*sarvathā śaktimātrasya na prthaggaṇanā kvacit /*

*śaktikāryaṃ tu naivāsti dvitīyaṃ śaṅkate katham // 53 //*

Nowhere and in no manner is mere power counted separately. Since, there was no effect of the Maya before the creation, how can it be counted as second.

*sarvathā* - always. *śaktimātrasya* – the mere power. *na prthaggaṇanā* – is not counted separately. *kvacit* - anywhere. *śaktikāryaṃ tu* – the effect of the Maya (the power here). *naivāsti* – never existed, before the creation. *dvitīyaṃ śaṅkate katham* – how can it be counted as the second. This was said in the Shloka 47 ‘na hi śaktiḥ kvacitkaiścidbudhyate kāryataḥ purā’.

सर्वथेति । मा भूच्छक्त्या सद्वितीयत्वं सतः, अपि तु तत्कार्येण तद्भवत्येवेत्याशङ्क्य तस्य तदानीमसत्त्वात्तेनापि न सद्वितीयत्वमित्याह – शक्तिकर्यं त्विति ॥ ५३ ॥

*sarvatheti / mā bhūcchaktyā sadvitīyatvaṃ sataḥ, api tu tatkāryeṇa tadbhavatyevetyāśaṅkya tasya tadānīmasattvātenāpi na sadvitīyatvamityāha – śaktikāryaṃ tviti // 53 //*

*mā bhūcchaktyā sadvitīyatvaṃ sataḥ* - let the Maya power not differentiate itself from the Self, thus there is no duality, *api tu tatkāryeṇa tadbhavatyevetyāśaṅkya* – but, duality is established through its effect, doubting thus. *tasya tadānīmasattvātenāpi na sadvitīyatvamityāha* – since there is no effect then (before the creation), thus there is no possibility of duality. ॥ 53 ॥

After establishing Self to be the substratum and Maya the power super-imposed on that. How does this Maya exist in the Self is to be understood.

ननु सच्छक्तिः सति सर्वत्र वर्तते, उतैकदेशे? नाद्यः, मुक्तैः प्राप्यब्रह्माभावप्रसङ्गात् । न द्वितीयः, निरंशत्वेन विरोधित्वादित्याशङ्क्याद्यानङ्गीकारात् द्वितीये परिहारो वक्ष्यत इत्यभिप्रायेणाह –

*nanu sacchaktiḥ sati sarvatra vartate, utaikadeśe? nādyah, muktaiḥ prāpyabrahmābhāvaprasaṅgāt / na dvitīyah, niraṃśatvena virodhitvādityāśaṅkyādyānaṅgīkārāt dvitīye parihāro vakṣyata ityabhīprāyeṇāha –*

*nanu sacchaktiḥ sati sarvatra vartate, utaikadeśe?* – But where does this Maya exist in the Self, completely or in one portion? Here *sacchaktiḥ* means the power of Self, Maya

and *sati* means in the Sat. Normally in other places this *sati* is interpreted as ‘existing in that, also’, i.e. it is to denote the seventh case to show inclusiveness. *nādyah* - the first choice is not possible. *muktaiḥ prāpyabrahmābhāvaprasaṅgāt* - there will be no Self, that can be attained by the realized. We study Shastra in the desire of gaining the liberation, as something which is completely covering the Self, will not and cannot be removed, because the whole Self is now creation and therefore there is no Self devoid of attributes. And this state of being devoid of name and form is possible before the creation or after the dissolution, thus there is no liberation possible. *na dvitīyah* - not the second. *niraṃśatvena virodhitvād* - since Self does not have any parts. We established Self to be devoid of Svagata etc. duality. And the liberations is not possible here too, since the liberated will be knowing only about the portion of Self which is not engulfed by the Maya, and not completely. *ityāśaṅkya* - doubting thus. *ādyānaṅgīkārāt* - since the first is not acceptable. *dvitīye parihāro* - the second it accepted with some exceptions. *vakṣyata ityabhiprāyeṇāha* - to show this, it is said. As negated by the opponent, the second is also defective. Therefore it cannot be accepted as it is, it has to be shown with some adjustments.

न कृत्स्नब्रह्मवृत्तिः सा शक्तिः किं त्वेकदेशभाक् ।

घटशक्तिर्यथा भूमौ स्निग्धमृद्येव वर्तते ॥ ५४ ॥

*na kṛtsnabrahmavṛttiḥ sā śaktiḥ kiṃ tvekadeśabhāk ।*

*ghaṭaśaktiryathā bhūmau snigdhamaṛdyeva vartate ॥ 54 ॥*

*Maya is not covering the Self completely. But that is only in one portion of the Self. As the ability to become pot exists only in the clay that is wet.*

*na kṛtsnabrahmavṛttiḥ* - it does not engulf the Self completely. *sā śaktiḥ* - that power. We have already discussed why this Maya should not be interpreted as ‘She’ in feminine, as it is madeup of three Gunas that is inert. *kiṃ tvekadeśabhāk* - but, only in one portion. *ghaṭaśaktiryathā* - as the power to become Pot. *bhūmau snigdhamaṛdyeva vartate* - exists only in the clay that is wet.

न कृत्स्नेति । एकदेशवृत्तौ दृष्टान्तमाह - घटेति ॥ ५४ ॥

*na kṛtsneti । ekadeśavṛttau drṣṭāntamāha - ghaṭeti ॥ 54 ॥*

*ekadeśavṛttau drṣṭāntamāha* - example for Maya existing in one portion is gives, as the wet clay for the pot. We should not extend this example to Sand etc, because we have mythological story which says this, Renuka devi mother of Parashurama brings water in a

pot made of sand, and it is said Shri Rama made a Linga for Shiva with the sand on the seashore. These examples can be used to show that anything is possible in Maya. // 54 //

But, how Maya can exist in one portion of the Self, when Self is accepted to be partless?

शक्तिरेकदेशवृत्तित्वे प्रमाणमाह -

***śaktirekadeśavṛttitve pramāṇamāha -***

***śaktirekadeśavṛttitve pramāṇamāha*** – For Maya to exist in one part, there is Pramana, it is explained.

पादोऽस्य सर्वा भूतानि त्रिपादस्ति स्वयंप्रभः ।

इत्येकदेशवृत्तित्वं मायाया वदति श्रुतिः ॥ ५५ ॥

***pādo'sya sarvā bhūtāni tripādasti svayaṃprabhaḥ ।***

***ityekadeśavṛttitvaṃ māyāyā vadati śrutiḥ ॥ 55 ॥***

*'The whole creation exists in quarter portion of the Self, and the rest three quarters is pervaded by this Self-effulgent one', in this way, the Shruti clearly explains the Maya to be in one portion.*

***pādo'sya sarvā bhūtāni tripādasti svayaṃprabhaḥ*** - In one quarter the Maya exists and the three quarters is the self-effulgent Self. This is said in Purusha Sukta etc. shruti, where it is said 'pādo'sya viśvā bhūtāni tripādasya *amṛtam divi*', divi is from the root word 'divu prakashane' – to shine. When we say in a quarter, it is just for explanation sake, and should not be understood as the Maya is sent to a corner. For example, when we say in 2 exists, 1, 1.05, 1.25, 1.5 etc. In that, particularly this 1.5 which exists in 2, the 1 does not exist in one corner and 0.5 in another OR 0.75 in one and the other 0.75 in another. ***ityekadeśavṛttitvaṃ*** - thus, the existence in one portion of the Self. ***māyāyā*** – of the Maya. ***vadati śrutiḥ*** - says the Shruti.

पादोऽस्येति ॥ ५५ ॥

***pādo'syeti.*** Here the explanation of Maya existing in one portion of the Self is just imaginary, and should not be accepted literally. If the Maya can be accepted to be existent then it existing in one portion of the Self too is possible. Since, according to Vedanta only Self exists. What is said in this shloka will be negated in Shloka 58. // 55

//

न केवलं श्रुतिरेव, स्मृतिरप्यस्तीत्याह –

*na kevalam śrutireva, smṛtirapyastīyāha –*

*na kevalam śrutireva, smṛtirapyastīyāha* – it is not just the shruti which is Pramana, but there is Smṛti to substantiate this, is explained.

विष्टभ्याहमिदं कृत्स्नमेकांशेन स्थितो जगत् ।

इति कृष्णोऽर्जुनायाह जगतस्त्वेकदेशताम् ॥ ५६ ॥

*viṣṭabhyāhamidaṁ kṛtsnamekāṁśena sthito jagat ।*

*iti kṛṣṇo'rjunāyāha jagatastvekaśatām ॥ 56 ॥*

*Maya existing in one portion of the Self is explained by Krishna to Arjuna (B.G. 10.42), 'I exist by holding the whole creation in one portion of Self'.*

*viṣṭabhyāham* – by engulfing. In Isa Upanishad it is said, 'isāvāsyam idam sarvam' - Everything is covered by Isvara. *idaṁ kṛtsnam* – all this. *ekāṁśena* – in one portion. *sthito jagat* - the creation exists. This whole creation exists in one portion of Me. *iti kṛṣṇo'rjunāyāha* – thus. Krishna said to Arjuna. *jagatastvekaśatām* - the creation in one portion (of the Self).

विष्टभ्येति ॥ ५६ ॥

*viṣṭabhyeti*. We should always understand these from the standpoint of Vedānta. For example the compound term 'kūpapatitaḥ'. If it is generally translated we get the meaning, kūpa – well, patitaḥ - fallen. 'kūpe patitaḥ' - The one who has fallen in the well, will be the meaning. But this is not the only meaning, it can be interpreted as 'kūpa samīpe patitaḥ' – the one who has fallen by the side of the well. Or 'kūpam eva patitaḥ' – the well itself has fallen.

Similarly, here too from the Vedānta viewpoint, We should not understand the shloka as '*idaṁ kṛtsnam jagat ekāṁśena viṣṭabhya aham sthitaḥ*' - I (Krishna) stay in one corner of the creation. Maya neither exists in complete Self nor in a portion of the Self, but has no existence, as it is superimposed or imaginary. We are answering all these from the viewpoint of the disciple, from the point of duality. **॥ 56 ॥**

इदानीं निर्मायस्वरूपसद्भावे प्रमाणमाह –

*idānīm nirmāyasvarūpasadbhāve pramāṇamāha –*

*idānīm nirmāyasvarūpasadbhāve pramāṇamāha* – Now, the Pramana to establish the existence of the Self devoid of Maya, is said. *Nirmāya* – Devoid of Maya and this should not be understood as, after creating, as in *nirmān*.

स भूमिं विश्वतो वृत्त्वा ह्यत्यतिष्ठदशाङ्गुलम् ।

विकारावर्ति चात्रास्ति श्रुतिसूत्रकृतोर्वचः ॥ ५७ ॥

*sa bhūmiṃ viśvato vṛtvā hyatyatiṣṭhadaśāṅgulam ।*

*vikārāvartī cātrāsti śrutisūtrakṛtorvacaḥ ॥ 57 ॥*

‘Self (He) after completely engulfing the creation, it also stays 10 inches above it’ and ‘there is also the nature, that doesn’t exist in the creation that which changes’. These are statements from the Veda and of the Sutrakaara (the author of the Aphorism).

*sa bhūmiṃ viśvato vṛtvā hyatyatiṣṭhadaśāṅgulam* – It (Self), engulfing the creation stays 10 inches beyond it. Even understanding it exists 10 inches above the creation is wrong, as we say I need a shirt that is 10 inches bigger than him etc. Because, here when we say 10 inches above, it just means it is greater than the creation. Otherwise, the Self will become limited, as we say in Maths n+1, the size of the Self is creation + 10 inches, and thus being limited Self becomes non-eternal. This is just to show, there is some state which is not engulfed by Maya. It should not be understood as, it exists 10 inches above, i.e. it should be meditated 10 inches above the navel. *vikārāvartī cātrāsti śrutisūtrakṛtorvacaḥ* - There is aphorism (Brahma Sutra), showing this and Shruti to support this. *vikārāvartī cātrāsti* - There is a state that is Devoid of transformation as name and form. The Shruti is ‘tāvān asya mahimā’ – this creation is its greatness, and it is beyond creation.

भूमिमिति । ‘विकारावर्ति च तथाहि स्थितिमाह’ (ब्र सू – ४.४.१६) इति सूत्रकारवचनमित्यर्थः ॥ ५७ ॥

*sa bhūmimiti । ‘vikārāvartī ca tathāhi sthitimāha’ (bra sū – 4.4.19) iti sūtrakāravacanamityarthaḥ ॥ 57 ॥*

‘*vikārāvartī ca tathāhi sthitimāha’ (bra sū – 4.4.19) iti* – the Sutra, that says about Self, That which does not come under the grasp of transformation, also is said. *sūtrakāravacanamityarthaḥ* this is the statement of the Sutrakara, the author of Sutra, Sri Veda Vyasa. *॥ 57 ॥*

There are many things that are discussed here, instead of answering the question raised in the introduction of the sloka 54, i.e. “na dvitīyaḥ, niraṃśatvena virodhitvādityāśaṅkyādyānaṅgīkārāt dvitīye parihāro vakṣyata ityabhiprāyeṇāha”. Therefore the opponent raises it again.

तर्हि निरंशत्वे विरोध इत्यस्य कः परिहार इत्याशङ्क्य वास्तवनिरंशत्वाभ्युपगमान्न विरोध इत्यभिप्रायेणोदाहृतश्रुत्यभिप्रायमाह –

*tarhi niraṃśatve virodha ityasya kaḥ parihāra ityāśaṅkya vāstavaniraṃśatvābhyupagamāna virodha ityabhiprāyeṇodāhṛtaśrutyabhiprāyamāha*

*tarhi niraṃśatve virodha ityasya kaḥ parihāra* – but then, what is the solution to the opposition, ‘since it is devoid of parts, there is contradiction’?. The examples given from the shruti also seem to discuss only the parts. *ityāśaṅkya* - doubting this, *vāstavaniraṃśatvābhyupagamāna virodha ityabhiprāyeṇa* – since in reality, the Self is accepted to be without parts, there is no contradiction, with this in mind. *udāhṛtaśrutyabhiprāyamāha* - the Shruti that is given as example is explained. Since from the standpoint of the Truth, there is no duality, the meaning of the Shruti given as example is explained, from this standpoint.

निरंशोऽप्यंशमारोप्य कृत्स्नोऽशे वेति पृच्छतः ।

तद्भाषयोत्तरं ब्रूते श्रुतिः श्रोतृहितैषिणी ॥ ५८ ॥

*niraṃśe'pyaṃśamāropya kṛtsneṃ'se veti pṛchataḥ ।*

*tadbhāṣayottaraṃ brūte śrutiḥ śrotṛhitaiṣiṇī ॥ 58 ॥*

*In that which is devoid of parts (limbs), for the one who superimposing the limb and asking the question ‘in the whole or in a part’, the Shruti which wishes well for everyone, answers using his own language.*

*niraṃśe'pyaṃśamāropya* – in the onw without parts, superimposing the parts. *kṛtsneṃ'se veti pṛchataḥ* - for the one who asks, in the whole or in a part. *tadbhāṣayottaraṃ brūte śrutiḥ* - the Shruti answers him in his won language. The language of duality, of ignorant. *śrotṛhitaiṣiṇī* - The shruti that well wisher of the listner.

We answered the opponent earlier, as with limbs because we don’t want to get into a non-ending dialog. If we say the clay has the potentiality of becoming into pot, when the opponent asks, ‘does this potency (quality) exist in whole of clay or a part’, in order to avert the non-ending questions of ‘how then can it become a brick etc’ if we say in the whole, we say, in one portion. Thus, though both answers are erroneous, we accept the one with less degree of error. Because we already told the opponent, there is nothing



other than the Self and the Maya we are accepting is explained as to be different from existence and non-existence. Therefore, asking about its nature is like asking about the nature of Mare's horn or barren womans son.

निरंशोऽपि इति ॥ ५८ ॥

*niraṁśe'pi iti ॥ 58 ॥*

But the answer given is not correct? Still, when he is asking the question instead of rebuking him, as a well wisher, the answer is given. I have a disease, therefore, even if the medicine is bitter, I will take it, why should you add honey or water to dilute it, if be asked, the reason for that is said here.

यदर्थं ब्रह्मणि माया समर्थिता, तदिदानीमाह –

*yadarthaṁ brahmaṇi māyā samarthitā, tadidānīmāha –*

*yadarthaṁ brahmaṇi māyā samarthitā, tadidānīmāha* – For whichever reason, Maya was accepted in Brahman, that is explained now. After saying, Maya is the power of Brahman and its nature cannot be explained, its effect, namely the five elements are said.

सत्तत्त्वमाश्रिता शक्तिः कल्पयेत्सति विक्रियाः ।

वर्णा भित्तिगता भित्तौ चित्रं नानाविधं यथा ॥ ५९ ॥

*sattattvamāśritā śaktiḥ kalpayetsati vikriyāḥ ।*

*varṇā bhittigatā bhittau citraṁ nānāvidhaṁ yathā ॥ 59 ॥*

*As the colours on the wall make different forms of images, similarly the Power (Maya) based on the Self too, imaginarily manifests the creation.*

*sattattvamāśritā śaktiḥ* - the Power (Maya) based on the Sat. *kalpayet* – imaginarily manifests (superimposes). *sati vikriyāḥ* - transformation on the Sat. *varṇā bhittigatā bhittau citraṁ nānāvidhaṁ yathā* – as the colours on the wall, manifests many types of images on the wall. The transformations of colour of paint are seen as the transformation on the wall.

सत्त्वम् इति । विक्रियाः विविधत्वेन क्रियन्ते इति विक्रियाः, कार्यविशेषा इत्यर्थः । तत्र दृष्टान्तमाह – वर्णा इति । वर्णा रक्तपीतादयो धातुविशेषाः ॥ ५९ ॥

*sattattvam iti / vikriyāḥ vividhatvena kriyante iti vikriyāḥ, kāryaviśeṣā ityarthāḥ / tatra dr̥ṣṭāntamāha – varṇā iti / varṇā raktapītādayo dhātuvīśeṣāḥ ॥ 59 ॥*

*vikriyāḥ = vividhatvena kriyante iti vikriyāḥ* - that which makes different forms, is Vikriyaa, *kāryaviśeṣā ityarthāḥ* - i.e. all that which is seen as the effect. *tatra dr̥ṣṭāntamāha* – an example for that is given, like the colour of the paint seen on the wall. *varṇā = raktapītādayo dhātuvīśeṣāḥ* - colours, red, yellow etc, the colours produces from some chemicals. The idea is, though the colours make different forms on the wall, the wall does not undergo any change, similarly the Self too does not undergo any change due to the transformation of the Maya that has the Self as its loci. ॥ 59 ॥

तत्र प्रथमं कार्यविशेषं दर्शयति –

*tatra prathamam kāryaviśeṣam darśayati –*

*tatra prathamam kāryaviśeṣam darśayati* – the first effect is shown here, along with its nature and attribute. First the inherent nature of the element is discussed, followed by the attributes of the element.

आद्यो विकार आकाशः सोऽवकाशः स्वरूपवान् ।

आकाशोऽस्तीति सत्त्वमाकाशेऽप्यनुगच्छति ॥ ६० ॥

*ādyo vikāra ākāśaḥ so'vakāśaḥ svarūpavān /*

*ākāśo'stīti sattattvamākāśe'pyanugacchati ॥ 60 ॥*

*The first transformation is Akasha. That Akasha which has as its nature the providing space. As we say 'Akasha exists', we understand the Sat exists in the Akasha too.*

*ādyo vikāra ākāśaḥ* - the first transformation is Akasha. *so'vakāśaḥ svarūpavān* - and it is of the nature of providing space. *avakāśaḥ* is defined as 'dravyāntara praveśa योग्यात' the ability to give space for the other substance to enter. *ākāśo'stīti* – in the usage, Akasha exists. *sattattvamākāśe'pyanugacchati* – we see the existence of the Sat too pervasive in the Akasha.

आद्य इति । तत्स्वरूपमाह – सोऽवकाश इति । आकाशस्य ब्रह्मकार्यत्वे हेतुमाह – आकाश इति ॥ ६० ॥

*ādyā iti / tatsvarūpamāha – so'vakāśa iti / ākāśasya brahmakāryatve hetumāha – ākāśa iti // 60 //*

*tatsvarūpamāha* – its nature is said. *ākāśasya brahmakāryatve hetumāha* - the reason for the Akasha to be the effect of the Self is explained. Akasha is explained as the first effect, because this is the order that is followed in Taittiriya Upanishad etc., ‘ātmanah ākāśa sambhūtaḥ’ – From Self, Akasha came into existence. Based on this Akasha is explained as first creation of Self, but the logical understanding of the same is by seeing the existence in the usage ‘Akasha exists’. *// 60 //*

ततः किमित्यत आह –

*tataḥ kimityata āha –*

*tataḥ kimityata āha* – The opponent as usual asks the question, So what? This is answered.

एकस्वभाव सत्त्वमाकाशो द्विस्वभावकः ।

नावकाशः सति व्योम्नि स चौषोऽपि द्वयं स्थितम् ॥ ६१ ॥

*ekasvabhāva sattatvamākāśo dvisvabhāvakaḥ /*

*nāvakāśaḥ sati vyomni sa caṣo'pi dvayaṃ sthitam // 61 //*

*Sat is with one inherent nature (of existence). Akasha has two natural qualities. In Sat there is no gap (space) and in Akasha both that and this exists (existence and space), therefore it is of two natural qualities.*

*ekasvabhāva* – one inherent nature. *Sattatvam* - Sat. *ākāśo* - Akasha. *dvisvabhāvakaḥ* - is of two natures. *Nāvakāśaḥ sati* – in Sat there is no space. *vyomni sa caṣo'pi* – In Akasha both that (existence) and this (space). *dvayaṃ sthitam* – both exists.

एकेति । उक्तमर्थं विशदयति – नावकाश इति । सति सद्रस्तुन्यवकाशो नास्ति किन्तु सत्स्वभाव एक एवय आकाशे तु स च सत्स्वभावश्च एषोऽपि अवकाशस्वभावोऽपीति द्वयं स्थितं विद्यत इत्यर्थः ॥ ६१ ॥

*eketi / uktamarthaṃ viśadayati – nāvakāśa iti / sati sadvastunyavakāśo nāsti kintu satsvabhāva eka eva; ākāśe tu sa ca satsvabhāvaśca eṣo'pi avakāśasvabhāvo'pīi dvayaṃ sthitaṃ vidyata ityārthaḥ // 61 //*

*uktamarthaṃ viśadayati* – The aforesaid idea is explained in detail. *sati = sadvastuni* - in the Sat, *avakāśo nāsti* - there is no space. *kintu* - but, *satsvabhāva eka eva* – there is only the nature of Sat; *ākāśe tu* - but in the Akasha, *sa ca = satsvabhāvaśca* - the nature of Sat, *eṣo'pi = avakāśasvabhāvo'pīi* and this, the nature of providing space, *dvayaṃ sthitaṃ = vidyata ityārthaḥ* - both exists. Here we are discussing about the nature of the Akasha element, and in the next the attribute of the Akasha element will be discussed. Here by nature we are referring to the subtle attribute to differentiate it from the gross quality which is explained as attribute. The nature of Sat was explained as without any qualities or nature, and it was given a name ‘anakhyaṃ’ – that which cannot be named. And the name Sat itself is only to differentiate it from the Asat. Here, Sat is explained as to be having one nature ‘sat’, this should be understood in the light of the earlier teaching. And we should not understand this ‘sat’ as its attribute. *// 61 //*

सदाकाशयोरेकद्विस्वभावत्वं प्रकारान्तरेण व्युत्पादयति –

*sadākāśayorekadvisvabhāvatvaṃ prakārāntareṇa vyutpādayati –*

*sadākāśayorekadvisvabhāvatvaṃ prakārāntareṇa vyutpādayati* – Sat and Akasha having the single and double nature is shown in a different method. Here the word svabhava is appended with a ‘tva’ – ness. This ‘ness’ denotes class, which here should be understood as superimposed, as said ‘niramshe amshamaaropya’ – superimposing parts in the partless. Otherwise, the Sat will become something with the attribute if sat, which will not just imply duality, but interdependence too (is Sat sat because of the sat attribute or is the sat attribute existent due to the sat of the Sat).

यद्वा प्रतिध्वनिर्व्योम्नो गुणो नासौ सतीक्ष्यते ।

व्योम्नि द्वौ सद्वनी तेन सदेकं द्विगुणं वियत् ॥ ६२ ॥

*yadvā pratidhvanirvyomno guṇo nāsau satīkṣyate ।*

*vyomni dvau saddvanī tena sadekaṃ dviguṇaṃ viyat // 62*

//

*Otherwise, echo is the nature of the Akasha. That (echo) is not seen in the Sat. In Akasha both ‘sat’ and sound exists. Thus, Sat has one attribute and Akasha has two attributes.*

*yadvā* - otherwise. *Pratidhvanir* - echo. *vyomno* – of the Akasha. *guṇo* - attribute. *Nāsau* – This is not. *satīkṣyate* – accepted in the Sat. *vyomni dvau* – in the Akasha there are two attributes. *saddhvanī* – sat (Existence) and sound. *tena sadekaṃ dviguṇaṃ viyat* - . Thus, there is one attribute in the Sat and two in the Akasha.

यद्वा इति । प्रतिध्वनिर्व्योम्नो गुण इत्युपपादितमधस्तात् । असौ प्रतिध्वनिः सद्वस्तुनि नेक्ष्यते नोपलभ्यते ।

*yadvā iti / pratidhvanirvyomno guṇa ityupapāditamadhastāt / asau pratidhvanīḥ sadvastuni nekṣyate nopalabhyate /*

*yadvā* – otherwise, by this it is established that the same Sat and Akasha we differentiated earlier, is differentiated in a different method. *pratidhvanirvyomno guṇa ityupapāditamadhastāt* - we have already established the echo as the attribute of Akasha earlier, in 3<sup>rd</sup> sloka. *asau pratidhvanīḥ sadvastuni nekṣyate = nopalabhyate* – this echo is not seen in the Sat, does not exist in the Sat. Here after saying it is not seen (ikshyate), he is clarifying it with a synonym, does not exist (nopalabhyate), to remove the doubt - it may not be seen, but may exist. The idea is simple; the attribute of the cause will be in the effect and not vice-versa.

व्योम्नि तु सद्वहनी सच्छब्दौ उभावप्युपलभ्येते, तेन कारणेन सत् एकस्वभावम् , वियत् द्विगुणम् , द्विस्वभाकमित्यर्थः ॥ ६२ ॥

*vyomni tu saddhvanī sacchabdau ubhāvapyupalabhyete, tena kāraṇena sat ekasvabhāvam , viyat dviguṇam , dvisvabhākamityarthaḥ ॥ 62 ॥*

*vyomni tu saddhvanī = sacchabdau ubhāvapyupalabhyete* – in the Akasha, both the Sat and Sound exists as attribute., *tena kāraṇena sat ekasvabhāvam* - for this reason, Sat is of one nature, *viyat dviguṇam = dvisvabhākamityarthaḥ* - Akasha is of two attributes, ॥ 62 ॥

नन्वाकाशस्य सद्वह्नकार्यत्वे आकाशस्य सत्तेति सत आकाशधर्मता कुतः प्रतिभातीत्याशङ्क्याह –

*nanvākāśasya sadbrahmakāryatve ākāśasya satteti sata ākāśadharmatā kutaḥ pratibhātītyāśaṅkyāha –*

*nanvākāśasya sadbrahmakāryatve* - but, if Akasha is an effect of the Brahman, *ākāśasya satteti sata ākāśadharmatā kutaḥ pratibhātītyāśaṅkyāha* – how can one perceive the existence in Akasha, as in ‘existence of Akasha’, as the attribute of the Akasha, doubting thus, it is explained. This is the funny thing about Maya, it creates a contradictory Dharma-Dharmi (attribute – attributed) relationship. For example, we see in the world

that clay is the cause and pot is the effect, and the rule is attribute should exists in the attributed, thus instead of saying rightly, the pot (attribute) exists in the clay (attributed), we say clay exists in the pot.

या शक्तिः कल्पेयेद्वयोम सा सद्द्वयोम्नोरभिन्ताम् ।

आपद्य धर्मधर्मित्वं व्यत्येनावकल्पयेत् ॥ ६३ ॥

*yā śaktiḥ kalpeyedvyoma sā sadvyomnorabhinnatām ।*

*āpadya dharmadharmitvaṃ vyatyenāvakalpayet ॥ 63 ॥*

*That Power (Maya) which superimposes the Akasha, creates a state of non-difference between the Sat and Akasha and also interchanges the attribute - attributed relationship.*

*yā śaktiḥ* - that power (Maya). *kalpeyedvyoma* – which superimposes the Akasha. *sā sadvyomnorabhinnatām āpadya* – it brings about the non-difference between the Sat and Akasha. *dharmadharmitvaṃ* - and the attribute, attributes state. *vyatyenāvakalpayet* – it superimposes the interchanged relationship.

या शक्तिः इति । या माया सद्द्वस्तुनि आकाशं कल्पयति, सा प्रथमतः सद्द्वयोम्नोः अभेदं कल्पयित्वा पश्चात्तद्धर्मधर्मिभावं वैपरीत्येन कल्पयति अत आकाशस्य सत्तेति भानमुपपद्यते इत्यर्थः ॥ ६३ ॥

*yā śaktiḥ iti । yā māyā sadvastuni ākāśaṃ kalpayati, sā prathamataḥ sadvyomnoḥ abhedaṃ kalpayitvā paścāttaddharmadharmibhāvaṃ vaiparītyena kalpayati; ata ākāśasya satteti bhānamupapadyate ityarthaḥ ॥ 63 ॥*

The root of the doubt by logicians is, if the Dharmi (attributed) is Akasha and Dharma (attribute) is Sat (existence), then in the absence of Akasha, there can be no Sat. First, the superimposition of the association between Sat and Akasha and this is called as Sambandha-adhyasa, and then the reverse association is imagined by the Maya, and this is called as Svarupa-adhyasa.

*yā māyā* - that power Maya, *sadvastuni ākāśaṃ kalpayati* - which superimpose the Akasha on the Sat, *sā prathamataḥ sadvyomnoḥ abhedaṃ kalpayitvā* – that same power, firstly by bringing about the superimposition of non-difference between the Sat and Akasha, *paścāttaddharmadharmibhāvaṃ vaiparītyena kalpayati* – later superimposes the attribute-attributed relationship in contradiction; *ata ākāśasya satteti bhānamupapadyate ityarthaḥ* - thus the experience of ‘Akasha’s existence’ becomes

possible. That which has more existence is Dharmi, Fire and that which has less existence is called as Dharma, Smoke. Thus, here Sat should be Dharmi and Akasha should be Dharma, but is seen in reverse. // 63 //

मायाया वैपरीत्यं कथं कृतमित्याशङ्क्याह –

*māyayā vaiparītyaṃ kathaṃ kṛtamityāśaṅkyāha* –

*māyayā vaiparītyaṃ kathaṃ kṛtamityāśaṅkyāha* – How does Maya make it in this contradictory way, doubting thus, it is explained. We say smoke of the fire and not fire of the smoke. Here if, the attribute-attributed is established as the opponent says, then the Sat will become the attribute of the Akasha and thus making it non-eternal. Even accepting it to be Dharma and Dharmi in a proper sense is not acceptable in Vedanta, how can the contradictory be accepted. The Dharma – Dharmi relationship is not accepted because, it brings duality.

सतो व्योमत्वमापन्नं व्योम्नः सत्तां तु लौकिकाः ।

तार्किकाश्चावगच्छन्ति मायाया उचितं हि तत् ॥ ६४ ॥

*sato vyomatvamāpannaṃ vyomnaḥ sattāṃ tu laukikāḥ ।*

*tārkikāścāvagacchanti māyayā ucitaṃ hi tat ॥ 64 ॥*

*Akasha is attribute of Sat, but the worldly people and logicians understand it as Sat to be attribute of Akasha. Ant that is apt (proper) for the Maya.*

*sato vyomatvamāpannaṃ* - the Sat has (as though) become Akasha. *vyomnaḥ sattāṃ tu* – but, the Sat (existence) for the Akasha. *laukikāḥ tārkikāśca* – by the worldly and logicians. *avagacchanti* – they understand. *māyayā ucitaṃ hi tat* – and it is fit for the Maya. The mixing of attribute and attributed is fit for the stature of Maya, which makes existent into non-existent and non-existent into existent.

सत इति । वस्तुतत्त्वविचारे क्रियमाणे मृदो घटरूपत्वमिव सतो व्योमत्वमापन्नं सद्वस्तुन आकाशरूपत्वं प्राप्तं लौकिकाः प्राणिनः शास्त्रेषु मध्ये तार्किकाश्च तद्वैपरीत्येन व्योम्नो गगनस्य धर्मिणः सत्तां सद्व्युपधर्मजातिं च अवगच्छन्ति जानन्ति । ननु अन्यस्यान्यथा प्रतीतिरनुपपन्ना इत्याशङ्क्य – मायाया इति । तद्विपरीतदर्शनहेतुत्वं मायाया युक्तमित्यर्थः ॥ ६४ ॥

*sata iti । vastutattvavicāre kriyamāṇe mṛdo ghaṭarūpatvamiva sato vyomatvamāpannaṃ sadvastuna ākāśarūpatvaṃ prāptaṃ laukikāḥ prāṇinaḥ śāstreṣu madye tārkikāśca tadvaiparītyena vyomno gaganasya dharmiṇaḥ sattāṃ*

*sadrūpadharmajātiṃ ca avagacchanti jñanti / nanu anyasyānyathā  
pratīranupapannā ityāśaṅkya – māyāyā iti / tadviparītadarśanaheturvaṃ māyāyā  
yuktamīyarthah // 64 //*

*vastutattvavicāre kriyamāṇe* – if we do a proper inquiry into the nature of Truth, *mṛdo ghaṭarūpatvamiva* – like the pot form of the clay. We say, the paint is on the Wall and not the Wall is on the Painting. *sato vyomatvamāpannaṃ = sadvastuna ākāśarūpatvaṃ prāptaṃ* - the Sat has taken the form of Space. *laukikāḥ = prāṇinaḥ* - the worldly, general public. *śāstreṣu madye* – and among the Shātra, people who have the knowledge of Shāstra. *tārikāśca* - the Logicians too. *tadviparītyena* – in a contradictory way. *vyomno = gaganasya dharmiṇaḥ* - the Akasha, Space that is the Dharmi – attributed, *sattāṃ = sadrūpadharmajātiṃ ca avagacchanti = jñanti* having taken the Existence, thus they understand. But, this is not logical even according to the logicians, because an attribute is accepted to differentiate it from other, like in ‘blue lotus’ the blue-ness is to differentiate it from the red-ness. But, here the attribute Sat cannot be differentiating it from anything except from the non-existence (asat), because sat is seen in ‘pots existence’, ‘waters existence’ etc. But again, there are not many Akasha, to distinguish it from the other nor is there different Akasha which has the attribute of asat (non-existence). The opponent doubts, *nanu anyasyānyathā pratīranupapannā ityāśaṅkya* - but one taking the form of the other is not logical, doubting this, it is answered with Maya etc. The idea is, no one understands something as something else, as said by Gertrude Stein ‘A Rose is a Rose is a Rose’. *tadviparītadarśanaheturvaṃ māyāyā yuktamīyarthah* - The contradictory way of manifestation is fit for the Maya. Since, it is of that nature. It is said about Maya ‘aghaṭanā ghaṭanā paṭīyasī māyā’ – Maya is of the nature to make the impossible possible.

The Maya referred to in Shloka 49 is referred to as Tama in Shloka 50 is given the name Shakti in Shloka 51 and in Shloka 65 this is given Bhrama, and in Shloka 70 Mithya. //

64 //

मायाया विपरीतप्रतीतिहेतुत्वं लौकिकन्यायप्रदर्शनेन स्पष्टीकरोति –

*māyāyā viparītapratītihetutvaṃ laukikanyāyapradarśanena spaṣṭīkaroti –*

*māyāyā viparītapratītihetutvaṃ laukikanyāyapradarśanena spaṣṭīkaroti* – Mayas nature of showing things in contradiction is clarified by showing a worldly logic. The statement in Bhashya of Brahma Sutra introductory bhashya says “atasmin tadbuddhi” is explained in shloka form.

यद्यथा वर्तते तस्य तथात्वं भाति मानतः ।



अन्यथात्वं भ्रमेणेति न्यायोऽयं सार्वलौकिकः ॥ ६५ ॥

*yadyathā vartate tasya tathātvam bhāti mānataḥ ।*

*anyathātvam bhrameṇeti nyāyo'yaṃ sārvalaukikaḥ ॥ 65 ॥*

The knowledge of things seen as it is gained through Pramana (Valid Testimony) and otherwise is through Bhrama (Erroneous knowledge), this is a general worldly logic.

*yadyathā vartate* – whatever exists here. *tasya tathātvam* - the knowledge of that as it is. *bhāti mānataḥ* - is gained through Prmana (means of right knowledge). *anyathātvam bhrameṇeti* – gained otherwise through Bhrama (erroneous knowledge). *nyāyo'yaṃ sārvalaukikaḥ* - this is logic accepted by everyone (sarvatantra siddhanta).

यद्यथा इति । यत् शुक्त्यादि यथा येन शुक्तिकादिरूपेण वर्तते तस्य तथात्वं शुक्त्यादिरूपत्वं प्रमाणतः स्फुरति । अन्यथात्वं रजतादिरूपत्वं तद्भ्रमेण भ्रान्त्या प्रतिभातीत्ययं न्यायः सर्वलोकप्रसिद्ध इत्यर्थः ॥ ६५ ॥

*yadyathā iti । yat śuktyādi yathā yena śuktikādirūpeṇa vartate tasya tathātvam śuktyādirūpatvam pramānataḥ sphurati । anyathātvam rajatādirūpatvam tadbhrameṇa bhrāntyā pratibhātītyayaṃ nyāyaḥ sarvalokaprasiddha ityarthāḥ ॥ 65 ॥*

*yat = śuktyādi* - that object, mother of pearl etc., *yathā = yena = śuktikādirūpeṇa* - in whatever form, as mother of pearl etc, *vartate* - exists, *tasya* - that object, *tathātvam = śuktyādirūpatvam* - in the form of the mother of pearl etc, *pramānataḥ sphurati* - is gained through Pramana, means of right knowledge. The knowledge of nacre in nacre, rope in rope etc, is through Pramana. *anyathātvam = rajatādirūpatvam* - in other ways, as silver etc. The knowledge of silver in nacre, snake in rope etc., is through Bhrama. *tadbhrameṇa = bhrāntyā* - is through the Bhrama, erroneous knowledge. This is said as Adhyasa. *Pratibhāti* – is seen, perceived. *ityayaṃ nyāyaḥ* - this logic is, *sarvalokaprasiddha ityarthāḥ* - is accepted by everyone in the world. ॥ 65 ॥

एवं भ्रान्त्या विपरीतप्रतिभानं दर्शयित्वा तन्निवृत्त्युपायमाह –

*evaṃ bhrāntyā viparītapratibhānaṃ darśayitvā tannivṛtтыupāyamāha –*

*evam bhrāntyā* - thus, through the erroneous knowledge, *viparītapratibhānaṃ darśayitvā* - showing the reason for contradictory knowledge, *tannivṛtтыupāyamāha* – the means for negating (removing) this (erroneous knowledge) is explained.

एवं श्रुतिविचारात्प्राग्यथा यद्वस्तु भासते ।

विचारेण विपर्येति ततस्तच्चिन्त्यतां वियत् ॥ ६६ ॥

*evam śrutivicārātpṛāgyathā yadvastu bhāsate ।*

*vicāreṇa viparyeti tatastaccintyatām viyat ॥ 66 ॥*

Thus, before the inquiry into the statements of Shruti, whatever object is seen (erroneously), through the inquiry becomes otherwise. Therefore we should inquire about that Akasha.

*evam* - Thus. *śrutivicārātpṛāg* – before the inquiry of the Shruti. *yathā yadvastu bhāsate* - whatever is seen in whichever way. *vicāreṇa* – through the inquiry. *viparyeti* – it becomes otherwise. Whatever is seen as sat now will be seen as erroneous knowledge. We will not see it as asat (non-existent), otherwise, it will be a fallacy, non-existence is seen. *tatastaccintyatām viyat* - therefore inquire into the nature of Akasha, in the method we are going to explain and this is not a rule for meditating upon the Akasha.

एवम् इति । एवम् उक्तेन प्रकारेण श्रुतिविचारात्प्राक् श्रुत्यर्थविचारात्पूर्वं यद्वस्तु यत्सद्रूपं ब्रह्म भ्रान्त्या यथा येन गगनादिरूपेण वर्तते तच्छ्रुत्यर्थपर्यालोचनेन विपर्येति गगनादिभावं परित्यज्य सद्रूपं ब्रह्मैव भवति ।

*evam iti । evam uktena prakāreṇa śrutivicārātpṛāk śrutyarthavicārātpūrvam yadvastu yatsadrūpaṃ brahma bhrāntyā yathā yena gaganādirūpeṇa vartate tacchrutyarthaparyālocanena viparyeti gaganādibhāvaṃ parityajya sadrūpaṃ brahmaiva bhavati ।*

*evam uktena prakāreṇa śrutivicārātpṛāk = śrutyarthavicārātpūrvam* - thus, in the aforesaid way, before inquiring into the Shruti, i.e. inquiring into the meaning of the Shruti. *yadvastu = yatsadrūpaṃ brahma* - the thing, by the thing we are not talking about the worldly things, but the Self. Though Self is not an object, still for convenience it is referred to as object. *bhrāntyā* - due to the erroneous knowledge. *yathā = yena gaganādirūpeṇa vartate* – it is seen as the Akasha etc forms. Since it is already said, there is nothing other than the Self, and whatever is seen is superimposition on the Self. Whatever superimposed does not have any other reality other than the substratum. Therefore, when we say Akasha etc. it is really nothing but the erroneous knowledge of

the substratum. *tacchrutyarthaparyālocanena viparyeti* - this erroneous knowledge, becomes otherwise because of inquiring into the Shruti. Earlier it was said cintyatam, vicarena etc, here too it maybe used, but the reason for using the term paralocanena is to establish the idea of inquiring into completely, till one understands the Truth and this happens when one gets the complete knowledge of the illusory world. The Viparyaya is, the confusion of the attributed and attribute becomes resolved. *gaganādibhāvaṃ parityajya sadrūpaṃ brahmaiva bhavati* – by giving its superimposed state, the knowledge takes the form of the substratum, the Self.

ततः श्रुतिविचारेण वस्तुयाथात्म्यदर्शनसंभवात् तद्वियच्चिन्त्यताम् , विचार्यतामित्यर्थः ॥ ६६ ॥

*tataḥ śrutivicāreṇa vastuyāthātmyadarśanasambhavāt tadviyaccintyatām , vicāryatāmityarthaḥ ॥ 66 ॥*

*tataḥ śrutivicāreṇa* - therefore, through the inquiry into the Shruti. *vastuyāthātmyadarśanasambhavāt* - the right knowledge of the Self takes place. Generally Sambhavat means it is possible, but here we should understand it as, it will definitely take place. *tadviyaccintyatām = vicāryatāmityarthaḥ* - we need to do the inquiry into the meaning of the Shruti. The inquiry into the nature of the Akasha etc., is not to reestablish its existence, but to negate it and gain the knowledge of its illusoriness.

॥ 66 ॥

विचारस्वरूपमेव दर्शयति –

*vicārasvarūpameva darśayati* –

*vicārasvarūpameva darśayati* – the method of doing the inquiry is shown. First, the erroneous knowledge as the cause for the contradictory knowledge was shown (bhrantya viparita pratipatti), then the method to negate it was shown (nivr̥tti upayam). Now, the method of doing the inquiry was prescribed (vicaryatam). This inquiry is shown here. In Kena Upanishad, the disciples are taught and left to inquire about the Self, themselves, after the Inquiry the Best disciple declares his clarity when asked by the Guru. In Taiteriyā Upanishad, Brghu son of Varuni, a mediocre disciple was guided at every step of the inquiry, when he returns back after doing the inquiry and understanding the non-self as Self. But, here for us dull disciples, the inquiry process is spoonfed.

भिन्ने वियत्सती शब्दभेदाद्बुद्धेश्च भेदतः ।

वाख्यादिष्वनुवृत्तं सन्न तु व्योमेति भेदधीः ॥ ६७ ॥

*bhinne viyatsatī śabdabhedādbuddheśca bhedataḥ ।*

*vāyvādiṣvanuvṛttaṃ sanna tu vyometi bhedadhīḥ // 67 //*

Both Sat and Akasha are different, since the words differ (Sat and Akasha) and their knowledge differs too. The Sat exists in the Air etc. and not Akasha, therefore the knowledge of their difference is gained.

*bhinne* – they are different. *viyatsatī* – both Akasha and Sat. *śabdabhedād* – due to difference in the words, as Akasha and Sat. The syllogism here is ‘vimatam satākāśe bhinne, śabdabhedāt. *buddheśca bhedataḥ* - and also due to the difference in the knowledge. The syllogism here is ‘vimatam satākāśe bhinne, arthabhedāt’. *vāyvādiṣvanuvṛttaṃ sat* – in air etc, other elements, Sat continues its existence. *na tu vyom* – but not Akasha. But, the cause should have existence in the effect? But, we are talking from the existence standpoint of inherent nature (svarupa) and not from the standpoint of attribute (guna) (see Shloka 60 and 61), as ‘air exists’, ‘fire exists’ etc, and not as ‘air Akasha’, ‘fire Akasha’ etc. *iti bhedadhīḥ* - this way they being different is understood.

भिन्न इति । भिन्ने इति प्रतिज्ञार्थे हेतुमाह – शब्देति । वियत्सच्छब्दयोरपर्यायत्वात् इत्यर्थः । हेत्वन्तरमाह – बुद्धेश्चेति ।

*bhinna iti / bhinne iti pratijñārthe hetumāha – śabdeti / viyatsacchabdayoraparyāyatvāt ityarthāḥ / hetvantaramāha – buddeśceti .*

*bhinne iti pratijñārthe hetumāha* – they are different for this Pratigna (declaration), reasoning is given, ‘Shabda’ word etc. *viyatsacchabdayoraparyāyatvāt ityarthāḥ* - Akasha and Sat are not synonyms. They are not synonyms like ‘Ghata, Kalasha’ (pot, jar) are synonyms. *hetvantaramāha* – another reason is given, because of difference in the meaning.

तमेव हेतुं विशदयति – वाय्वादिषु इति । यत् वाय्वादिषु भूतेषु सन् वायुः सत्तेज इत्येवं प्रकारेण अनुवृत्तं भासते, व्योम तु नैवं भासते इति यज्ज्ञानं सा भेदधीः, भेदबुद्धिः इत्यर्थः ॥ ६७ ॥

*tameva hetuṃ viśadayati – vāyvādiṣu iti / yat vāyvādiṣu bhūteṣu san vāyuh satteja ityevaṃ prakāreṇa anuvṛttaṃ bhāsate, vyoma tu naivaṃ bhāsate iti yajjñānaṃ sā bhedadhīḥ, bhedabuddhiḥ ityarthāḥ // 67 //*

*tameva hetuṃ viśadayati* – the reasons are explained in detail. *yat vāyvādiṣu bhūteṣu* - in the elements air etc, *san vāyuh satteja ityevaṃ prakāreṇa anuvṛttaṃ bhāsate* – there is a retribution (its continued existence) as ‘air exists’, ‘fire exists’ etc., *vyoma tu naivaṃ bhāsate* - but the Akasha is not seen so. *iti yajjñānaṃ sā bhedadhīḥ = bhedabuddhiḥ ityarthāḥ* - this knowledge is that which creates the difference, creates the idea of duality. // 67 //

Earlier we just said the attribute and attributed are mixed up due to the erroneous knowledge. Without giving any reason, here we are presenting with the reason for that.

एवं सदाकाशहयोर्भेदं प्रसाध्य, व्योम्नः सत्तेति भ्रान्त्या प्रतीतस्य धर्मिधर्मभावस्य विचारेण व्यत्ययं दर्शयति –

*evam sadākāśhayorbhedaṃ prasādhyā, vyomnaḥ satteti bhrāntyā pratītasya dharmidharmabhāvasya vicāreṇa vyatyayaṃ darśayati –*

*evam sadākāśhayorbhedaṃ prasādhyā* – thus after showing the Sat and Akasha to be different. *vyomnaḥ satteti bhrāntyā pratītasya* - the knowledge ‘Akasha’s existence’ which was gained due to the confusion, *dharmidharmabhāvasya* - in the state of the attribute and attributed. *vicāreṇa vyatyayaṃ darśayati* – is shown in the contradictory (correct) way through the inquiry.

सद्वस्त्वधिकवृत्तित्वाद्धर्मि व्योम्नस्तु धर्मता ।

धिया सतः पृथक्कारे ब्रूहि व्योम किमात्मकम् ॥ ६८ ॥

*sadvastvadhikavṛttitvāddharmi vyomnastu dharmatā ।*

*dhiyā sataḥ pṛthakkāre brūhi vyoma kimātmakam ॥ 68 ॥*

*Sat exists in more place therefore it is Dharmi (attributed) and Akasha is Dharma only (as it exists only in lesser place). If we separate out the Sat, then pray tell us what is the nature of Akasha.*

*sadvastvadhikavṛttitvāddharmi* – Sat has existence in more places therefore it is Dharmi. That which has existence in more places is Dharmi or Vyapaka. For example, fire has existence in more place than smoke, therefore Fire is Dharmi and Smoke is Dharma. Even when there is no smoke, fire exist, this is its greater existence. There is no concomitance rule, ‘where there is Sat, there is Akasha’, but the concomitance will definitely be there ‘where there is Akasha, there is Sat’. *vyomnastu dharmatā* – Akasha is only Dharma. *dhiyā sataḥ pṛthakkāre* – if we separate the Sat with our intellect, from the Akasha, Vayu etc. *brūhi vyoma kimātmakam* – please tell us, what is the nature of Akasha. If we remove Sat, Akasha will cease to exist and therefore it cannot be cognized.

सद्वस्तु इति । रूपरसादिष्वनुवृत्तस्य द्रव्यस्येव आकाशवाय्वादिष्वनुवृत्तस्य सतो धर्मित्वं रसादिभ्यो रूपस्येव वाय्वादिभ्यो व्यावृत्तस्य नभसो धर्मत्वमित्यर्थः ।

*sadvastu iti / rūparasādiṣvanuvṛttasya dravyasyeva ākāśavāyvādiṣvanuvṛttasya sato dharmitvaṃ rasādibhyo rūpasyeva vāyvādibhyo vyāvṛttasya nabhaso dharmatvamityarthaḥ /*

*rūparasādiṣvanuvṛttasya dravyasyeva* - there is a continuous existence of Dravyatva (substanceness), in form, taste etc. similarly in *ākāśavāyvādiṣvanuvṛttasya sato* - the Sat existing continuously in the Akasha, air etc. *dharmitvaṃ* - is Dharmi, attributed. *rasādibhyo rūpasyeva* - like the taste etc. from form *vāyvādibhyo vyāvṛttasya nabhaso* – the Akasha, which is different from the air etc. *dharmatvamityarthaḥ* - is Dharma, attribute. In the example, Dravya (substance) is Dharmi and form, taste etc. are Dharma and in the exemplified, Sat is Dharmi and Akasha, air etc. are Dharma.

ननु तर्हि घटाद्भिन्नरूपस्ययथा वास्तवत्वं, तथा सतो भिन्नस्य नभसोऽपि स्यादित्याशङ्क्य सद्व्यतिरिक्तस्य नभसो दुर्निरूपत्वान्मैवमित्याह – धिया इति ॥ ६८ ॥

*nanu tarhi ghāṭādbhinnarūpasya yathā vāstavatvaṃ, tathā sato bhinnasya nabhaso'pi syādityāśaṅkya sadvyatiriktasya nabhaso durnirūpatvānmaivamityāha – dhiyā iti*  
**// 68 //**

*nanu tarhi ghāṭādbhinnarūpasya* – but, the form (colour) that is different from the pot. *yathā vāstavatvaṃ* - in which way they are accepted to be real. Here, we are not talking, with *ghāṭādbhinnarūpasya* the forms different from pot, which is cloth etc. because they too are Mithya, but the form (colour) which is different from the Pot, i.e. Pot is Dharmi and form (colour) is Dharma. But, the form also is Mithya? Yes, but according to the opponent, the logician, who is rising the doubt, the form is real. Because though this pot is destroyed, the potness is not destroyed, as they are seen in flower etc. The root of the doubt is, since the Vedanti accepts, that which (Akasha etc.) is different from Sat is asat, to negate this idea the opponent says, though colour is different from pot, it is not asat, but a different sat. *tathā sato bhinnasya nabhaso'pi syādityāśaṅkya* – similarly, the Akasha, that is different from the Sat, maybe considered so (real), doubting thus, it is answered by Vedanti. This doubt is because, the opponent is not able to conceive the absence of Akasha. *sadvyatiriktasya nabhaso durnirūpatvānmaivamityāha* – Since, it is difficult to establish the existence of Akasha that is different from Sat. Sat is that which gives existence to everything, in the absence of Sat, nothing can exist. **// 68 //**

दुर्निरूपत्वमसिद्धमिति शङ्कते –

*durnirūpatvamasiddhamiti śaṅkate* –

*durnirūpatvamasiddhamiti śaṅkate* – The opponent doubts the impossibility of the existence of Akasha in the absence of Sat being established. And it is negated by Vedanti in this very Shloka.

अवकाशात्मकं तच्चेदसत्तदिति चिन्त्यताम् ।

भिन्नं सतोऽसच्च नेति वक्षि चेद्व्याहतिस्तव ॥ ६६ ॥

*avakāśātmakaṃ tacedasattaditi cintyatām ।*

*bhinnaṃ sato'sacca neti vakṣi cedvyāhatistava ॥ 69 ॥*

*Akasha is that which gives space to everything, if be said (by opponent), (we Vedanti say) know it to be non-existent. If you (opponent) say, it is neither Sat nor asat, then (we Vedanti say) understand your statement to be self-contradictory.*

*avakāśātmakaṃ taced* – if you (opponent) say. *asattaditi cintyatām* – you should understand that Akasha to be asat. Since it is asat (non-existent), it cannot have any attribute. *bhinnaṃ sato* - different from Sat. *asacca neti vakṣi ced* – and not Asat too, If you say. The idea is, it is neither Asat nor Sat. We Vedanti can say this, but not anyone else, because they do not accept the base idea Mithya. *vyāhatistava* - it is self-contradictory.

अवकाशात्मकम् इति । तर्हि सतो विलक्षणत्वादसदेव स्यादिति परिहरति – असत् इति । सतो विलक्षणस्यासत्त्वं नास्तीति वदतो दोषमाह – भिन्नम् इति ।

*avakāśātmakaṃ iti । tarhi sato vilakṣaṇatvādasadeva syāditi pariharati – asat iti । sato vilakṣaṇasyāsatvaṃ nāstīti vadato doṣamāha – bhinnam iti ॥ 70 ॥*

*tarhi sato vilakṣaṇatvādasadeva syāditi pariharati* – Then, since it is different from Sat, it should be Asat, this is negated. *sato vilakṣaṇasyāsatvaṃ nāstīti vadato doṣamāha* – if you do not accept, that which is different from Sat, not to be Asat, then there is a problem, is explained. *॥ 70 ॥*

असत्त्वे भानं न स्यादित्याशङ्क्य तुच्छविलक्षणत्वाद्भानं न विरुध्यत इत्याह –

*asattve bhānaṃ na syādityāśaṅkya tucchavilakṣaṇatvādbhānaṃ na virudhyata ityāha –*

*asattve bhānaṃ na syādityāśaṅkya* - but, if it is Asat, it will not shine. To shine means to be perceived. This doubt is answered *tucchavilakṣaṇatvādbhānaṃ na virudhyata ityāha* – since, it is different from Tuccha (absence), it being perceived is not contradiction, is explained. Tuccha is something which does not have any existence, in any period, like mare’s horn, barren woman’s son or mirage water.

भातीति चेद्भातु नाम भूषणं मायिकस्य तत् ।

यदसद्भासमानं तन्मिथ्या स्वप्नगजादिवत् ॥ ७० ॥

*bhātīti cedbhātu nāma bhūṣaṇaṃ māyikasya tat /*

*yadasadbhāsamānaṃ tanmithyā svapnagajādivat // 70 //*

If you say ‘it shines’, let it be so. This is an ornament for the effect of Maya. That which is seen, though is absent is Mithya, like the dream elephant.

*bhātīti ced* – if you (opponent) say, ‘it shines’. Since it is perceived it cannot be non-existent. *bhātu nāma* – let it shine. *bhūṣaṇaṃ māyikasya tat* – that (shining) is a decorative ornament for Maya’s effect. *yadasadbhāsamānaṃ* - that which shines though is non-existent. *tanmithyā* – is called as Mithya. *svapnagajādivat* – like the elephant (or any object) in the dream.

भातीति चेदिति । अविरोधं दर्शयितुं मिथ्यावस्तुनो लक्षणं सदृष्टान्तमाह – यदसदिति । यद्वस्तु स्वरूपेणाविद्यमानमपि भासते तत्स्वप्नगजादिवन्मित्यर्थः ॥ ७० ॥

*bhātīti cediti / avirodhaṃ darśayitum mithyāvastuno lakṣaṇaṃ sadṛṣṭāntamāha – yadasaditi / yadvastu svarūpeṇāvidyamānamapi bhāsate tatsvapnagajādivanmithyetyarthaḥ // 70 //*

*avirodhaṃ darśayitum* - to show that there is no contradiction. *mithyāvastuno lakṣaṇaṃ sadṛṣṭāntamāha* – the definition for Mithya objects is given along with an example. *yadvastu svarūpeṇāvidyamānamapi bhāsate tatsvapnagajādivanmithyetyarthaḥ* - that object which though does not have any existence, is perceived, it is Mithya, like the elephant in the dream. *// 70 //*

ननु नियमेन सहोपलभ्यमानयोर्भेदो न दृष्टचर इत्याशङ्क्याह –



*nanu niyamena sahopalabhyamānayorbhedo na dṛṣṭacara ityāśaṅkyāha –*

*nanu niyamena sahopalabhyamānayorbhedo na dṛṣṭacara ityāśaṅkyāha –* But, that which is seen together always, cannot be differentiated. And this kind of separating the two is not seen anywhere, doubting this, Vedanti says. If we separate the Sat from Akasha, if it be said there is no Akasha, then there is nothing called as Akasha, to explain this, we say.

जातिव्यक्ती देहिदेहौ गुणद्रव्ये यथा पृथक् ।

वियत्सतोस्तथैवास्तु पार्थक्यं कोऽत्र विस्मयः ॥ ७१ ॥

*jātivyaktī dehidehau guṇadravye yathā pṛthak ।*

*viyatsatostathaivāstu pārthakyaṃ ko'tra vismayaḥ ॥ 71 ॥*

*As class – individual, the one with embodiment – embodiment, attribute – substance, all of them are different (though not being able to separate), similarly, let the Akasha and Sat be inseperable, what is the surprise?*

*jātivyaktī* – inbetween class and individual. Cowness is class, and Cow is individual, though they exist in all the cows, they are not same. *dehidehau* – between embodied and embodiment. Self is embodied, and body is embodiment, though they are not separated, they are different. *guṇadravye* – attribute and substance. red is attribute and pot is substance, though they cannot be separated (as they are in inseperable relationship (samavaya sambandha), they are different. *yathā pṛthak* – as they are accepted to be seperate. *viyatsatostathaivāstu* – let it be similar between Akasha and Sat. *pārthakyaṃ* - separate (individuality). *ko'tra vismayaḥ* - what is there to be suprised.

जाति इति ॥ ७१ ॥

*jāti iti ॥ 71 ॥*

भेदो यद्यपि बुध्यते तथापि न भवतीति शङ्कते –

*bhedo yadyapi budhyate tathāpi na bhavatīti śaṅkate –*

*bhedo yadyapi budhyate tathāpi na bhavatīti śaṅkate* - though I understand the duality, it does not get established clearly, doubting this, it is answered.

बुद्धोऽपि भेदो नो चित्ते निरुद्धं याति चेत्तदा ।

अनैकार्यात्संशयाद्वा रूढ्यभावोऽस्य ते वद ॥ ७२ ॥

*buddho'pi bhedo no citte nirūḍhiṃ yāti cettadā /*

*anaikāgryātsaṃśayādvā rūḍhyabhāvo'sya te vada ॥ 72 ॥*

Though the duality is understood, it is not getting established in the mind, if be said, then, what is the reason for that, is it 1) absence of focus or 2) because of doubt.

*buddho'pi bhedo* – though the duality is understood. *no citte nirūḍhiṃ yāti cet* – it is not getting established in the mind. *tadā anaikāgryāt* – then, is it due to absence of single-pointedness. One cannot grasp in the absence of single-pointedness of the mind. *saṃśayādvā* – or is it because of doubt. *rūḍhyabhāvo'sya te vada* – you are not able to be established in that.

बुद्धोऽपि इति । तस्य परिहारं वक्तुं निश्चयाभावे कारणं पृच्छति – अनैकार्यात् इति ॥ ७२ ॥

*buddo'pi iti / tasya parihāraṃ vaktuṃ niścayābhāve kāraṇaṃ pṛcchati – anaikāgryāt iti ॥ 72 ॥*

*tasya parihāraṃ vaktuṃ niścayābhāve kāraṇaṃ pṛcchati* - to explain a proper solution, the reason for not being established, is asked. ॥ 72 ॥

आद्ये परिहारमाह -

*ādye parihāramāha -*

*ādye parihāramāha* – the solution for the first is explained. Here solution for the second is as well explained in the second part of the Shloka.

अप्रमत्तो भव द्यानादाद्येऽन्यस्मिन्विवेचनम् ।

कुरु प्रमाणयुक्तिभ्यां ततो रूढतमो भवेत् ॥ ७३ ॥

*apramatto bhava dyānādādye'nyasminvivecanam /*

*kuru pramāṇayuktibhyāṃ tato rūḍhatamo bhavet ॥ 73 ॥*

*For the first, stay established in meditation without slipping away. If it is the other (Second), through Pramana and logic, do inquiry. Then, one will become completely established in it.*

*apramatto bhava* – be very careful. Carefulness is without letting the mind slipaway into other things other than the object of meditation. where and how should one be careful? *dyānād* – through meditation. Meditation is focusing the mind on something like a form, mantra etc. This is said by Sri Patanjali Maharshi “yahā abhimata dhyānāt vā” – through meditation on any object. *ādye* – this is the solution for the first problem. *anyasmin* – for the other one, the second problem. *vivecanam kuru* – do the inquiry (into the nature of Self). Manana (reflection) is referred to here. This inquiry is not possible without first listening (Shravana) to the Shastra. *pramāṇayuktibhyāṃ* - through the Pramana and Yukti. Pramana is Shastra and Yukti is logic accepted or based on Shastra. The Pramana is “sadeva soumya idamagra āsit” – o dear, only Sat existed before the creation etc. The logic of Anvaya and Vyatireka (direct and indirect concomitance) as said earlier. *tato rūḍhatamo bhavet* - Thereafter, one will become established completely in that.

अप्रमत्त इति । आद्ये प्रथमे विकल्पे ध्यानात् “तत्र प्रत्ययैकतानता ध्यानम्” इत्युक्तलक्षणात् अप्रमत्तो भव, सावधानमना भवेति यावत् । द्वितीये परिहारमाह दृ अन्यस्मिन् इति । ततः किमित्यत आह – तत इति ॥ ७३ ॥

*apramatta iti / ādye prathame vikalpe dhyānāt “tatra pratyayaikatānatā dhyānam” ityuktalakṣaṇāt apramatto bhava, sāvadhānāmanā bhaveti yāvat / dvitīye parihāramāha – anyasmin iti / tataḥ kimityata āha – tata iti ॥ 73 ॥*

*ādye = prathame vikalpe* - in the first choice, among the problems, *dhyānāt* - through meditation. What is meditation? “*tatra pratyayaikatānatā dhyānam*” *ityuktalakṣaṇāt* – as defined in Yoga Sutra ‘there having one continuous flow of thought function is called as Dhyana’. *apramatto bhava = sāvadhānāmanā bhaveti yāvat* - be very careful, focussed. This gives the eligibility for doing the Shravana. *dvitīye parihāramāha* – for the second (choice in the problem) the solution is said. *tataḥ kimityata āha* – So what happens, due to that is explained. One becomes nicely established in that. ॥ 73 ॥

Even after saying one become nicely established in that, since the opponent forgot what is happening, asks the same old question.

ततोऽपि किमित्यत आह –

*tato'pi kimityata āha –*

*tato'pi kimityata āha* – even so what? is explained.

ध्यानान्मानाद्युक्तितोऽपि रूढे भेदे वियत्सतोः ।

न कदाचिद्वियत्सत्यं सद्वस्तु च्छिद्रवन्न च ॥ ७४ ॥

*dhyānānmānādyuktito'pi rūḍhe bhede viyatsatoḥ ।*

*na kadācidvīyatsatyam sadvastu cchidravana ca ॥ 74 ॥*

Through meditation, Pramana and logic when the duality between the Sat and Akasha gets nicely established, the Akasha will never be seen as real. And, the Sat will never be seen with a space.

*dhyānānmānādyuktito'pi* – through meditation, Pramana and Logic too. i.e. through Sadhana, Shravana and Manana. *rūḍhe bhede* – when the duality is established. *vīyatsatoḥ* - between the Sat and Akasha. Now, there can be a doubt in our minds – till now, we were negating the duality and now we are into establishin it, why? Because we are talking about the confusion which raises due to the creation of Maya, 'satyāṅṛte mithunīkṛtya' – by combining the real and non-real. Therefore, to negate this confusion we need to distinguish between them, and this is Viveka. *na kadācidvīyatsatyam* - Akasha will never be seen as real. I may not have the idea of Akasha in Sat, but I may have the idea of Sat in Akasha? This is negated, because our declaration statement in the beginning of this chapter was to distinguish Sat from the five elements and five elements from the Sat. *sadvastu cchidravana ca* - and Sat will never be seen as with space.

ध्यानात् इति । ध्यानं पूर्वोक्तलक्षणम् , मानं 'भिन्ने वियत्सती शब्दभेदाद्बुद्धेश्च भेदतः' (प्र उ – २.६७) इत्यत्रोक्तम् । युक्तिस्तु 'सद्वस्तुवधिकवृत्तित्वात्' (प्र उ – २.६७) इत्यादावुक्ता । एतैः ध्यानादिभिः वियत्सतोः भेदे चित्ते निरूढिं याते सति वियत् कदाचिन्न सत्यं किन्तु सर्वदा मिथ्यैवावभासते, सद्वस्तुपि च्छिद्रवत् अवकाशवत् नैव, भवतीति शेषः ॥ ७४ ॥

*dhyānāt iti । dhyānaṃ pūrvoktalakṣaṇam , mānaṃ 'bhinne viyatsatī śabdabhedādbuddheśca bhedataḥ' (pra u – 2.67) ityatroktam । yuktistu 'sadvastvadhikavṛttivāt' (pra u – 2.67) ityādāvuktā । etaiḥ dhyānādibhiḥ viyatsatoḥ bhede citte nirūḍhiṃ yāte sati viyat kadācinna satyam kintu sarvadā mithyaivāvabhāsate, sadvastvapi chidravat avakāśavat naiva, bhavatīti śeṣaḥ ॥ 74 ॥*

*dhyānaṃ pūrvoktalakṣaṇam* - meditation as said earlier in the previous Shloka. *mānaṃ 'bhinne viyatsatī śabdabhedādbuddheśca bhedataḥ' (pra u – 2.67) ityatroktam* - Pramana was said in Shloka 67. *yuktistu 'sadvastvadhikavṛttivāt' (pra u – 2.67)*

*ityādāvuktā* – and the logic was said in Shloka 67. *etaiḥ dhyānādibhiḥ* - through these dhyana etc. *viyatsatoḥ bhede citte nirūḍhiṃ yāte sati* - when the duality of the Akasha and Sat is completely established in the mind. *viyat kadācinna satyaṃ kintu sarvadā mithyaivāvabhāsate* – Akasha will never be seen as real, but will always be perceived as non-real (illusory). *sadvastvapi chidravat = avakāśavat naiva, bhavatīti śeṣaḥ* - And, Sat too will never be seen to be having Space. To provide space is the nature of Akasha, Sat will not be seen in that nature. // 74 //

वियत्सत्त्वविवेचने फलमाह –

*viyatsattvavivecane phalamāha* –

*viyatsattvavivecane phalamāha* – the result of inquiring into Akasha and Sat is explained.

ज्ञस्य भाति सदा व्योम निस्तत्त्वोल्लेखपूर्वकम् ।

सद्वस्त्वपि विभात्यस्य निश्छिद्रत्वपुरःसरम् ॥ ७५ ॥

*jñasya bhāti sadā vyoma nistattvollekhapūrvakam /*

*sadvastvapi vibhātyasya niśchidratvapuraḥsaram // 75 //*

*For the knowledgeable the Akasha will be always be seen as not to have the Sat-ness (see to have no reality). And the Sat too will be seen by him, as not to have space in it.*

*jñasya* – for the knowledgeable. *bhāti sadā vyoma nistattvollekhapūrvakam* – Akasha always is seen as to have no reality. What is the use of knowing it to be Mithya? Because, people may misconstrue this statement, to show, the Gnani will always see negativity in the world. To remove this *sadvastvapi vibhātyasya niśchidratvapuraḥsaram* – Sat too will be seen by him to have no space in it. The idea is, Sat will be known by him without any association with the attributes of Akasha etc.

ज्ञस्य इति ॥ ७५ ॥

*jñasya iti // 75 //*

After explaining the result of understanding the things as it is, the result of such result is being asked by the opponent. This is because of the habit of result oriented thinking.

वियन्मिथ्यात्वं सतो वस्तुत्वं च सदा चिन्तयतः किं भवतीत्यत आह –

*viyanmithyātvaṃ sato vastutvaṃ ca sadā cintayataḥ kiṃ bhavatītyata āha –*

*viyanmithyātvaṃ sato vastutvaṃ ca sadā cintayataḥ kiṃ bhavatītyata āha –* what happens, for the one who thinks about the illusoriness of Akasha and reality of Sat, is explained.

वासनायां प्रवृद्धायां वियत्सत्यत्ववादिनम् ।

सन्नात्राबोधयुक्तं च दृष्ट्वा विस्मयते बुधः ॥ ७६ ॥

*vāsanāyāṃ pravṛddhāyāṃ viyatsatyatvavādinam ।*

*sanmātrābodhayuktaṃ ca dṛṣṭvā vismayate budhaḥ ॥ 76 ॥*

*When this thought impression becomes very strong, the knowledgeable will be astonished to see the person who says Akasha to be real, and the one who has no knowledge of the Sat.*

*vāsanāyāṃ pravṛddhāyāṃ* - when the thought impression has become very strong. Repetitive though function of a particular form will produce a thought imprint, and this is called as Samskara or Vasana. This was called as DharmaMegha Samadhi in the first chapter. *viyatsatyatvavādinam* - the one who says Akasha is real. *sanmātrābodhayuktaṃ ca* – and the one who does not have the knowledge of Sat. ‘sanmātra’ is said instead of just ‘sat’ it means ‘san itara shunyatve sati sattvam’ – devoid of anything other than Sat, only Sat is said. The one who has the knowledge of everything other than the Self, the ignorant is said. *dṛṣṭvā* – seeing them. *vismayate budhaḥ* - the knowledgeable one becomes astonished. ‘vismayate’ though means astonished, but here it should be understood as causeless compassion.

वासनायाम् इति । बुधो वियत्सतोस्तत्त्ववेत्ता गगनस्य सत्यत्वं ब्रुवाणं निरवकाशसद्वस्त्ववबोधरहितं च दृष्ट्वा विस्मयं प्राप्नोतीत्यर्थः ॥ ७६ ॥

*vāsanāyām iti । budho viyatsatostattvavettā gaganasya satyatvaṃ bruvāṇaṃ niravakāśasadvastvavabodharahitaṃ ca dṛṣṭvā vismayaṃ prāpnotītyarthaḥ ॥ 76 ॥*

*budho* = *viyatsatostattvavettā* - knowledgeable is the one who knows the reality of the Sat and Akasha. *gaganasya satyatvaṃ bruvāṇaṃ* - the one who says about the reality of the Akasha, *niravakāśasadvastvavabodharahitaṃ ca* - and the one who does not know the Sat being devoid of the Akasha's attributes. *dr̥ṣṭvā* - on seeing them. *vismayaṃ prāpnotītyarthaḥ* - becomes astonished. There is nothing to be surprised for the Gnani, because the Shruti clearly declares surprise or astonishment or wonder is for the ignorant 'āścaryavad paśyati kascid enam mūḍham'. Therefore the term *vismayam* should be understood as a memory of his own past, and due to which he gains compassion for the ignorant seeing his situation. // 76 //

उक्तन्यायमन्यत्राप्यतिदिशति –

*uktanyāyamanyatrāpyatidiśati* –

*uktanyāyamanyatrāpyatidiśati* – This same logic is shown in other place. Showing the meaning of the statement gained somewhere, somewhere else is called atidesha.

एवमाकाशमिथ्यात्वे सत्सत्यत्वे च वासिते ।

न्यायेनानेन वाग्वादेः सद्वस्तु प्रविविच्यताम् ॥ ७७ ॥

*evamākāśamithyātve satsatyatve ca vāsīte ।*

*nyāyenānena vāyvādeḥ sadvastu pravivicyatām ॥ 77 ॥*

Similarly, if the knowledge that Akasha is Mithya and Sat is eternal, is established clearly, then with the same logic one should separate Vayu etc. from the Sat.

*evamākāśamithyātve satsatyatve ca vāsīte* – thus, if the Akasha is clearly understood as Mithya and Sat as eternal. *nyāyenānena* – with this same logic. *vāyvādeḥ* - in Vayu etc. *sadvastu pravivicyatām* – one should separate the Sat.

एवम् इति ॥ ७७ ॥

*evam iti ॥ 77 ॥*

This is a very beautiful and interesting opposition, because the point raised here is – it is ok if we differentiate the Akasha and Sat, since they are in Karya–Karana-bhava (cause

effect relationship), but Vayu has no relationship with the Sat, why and how should it be differentiated ?

नन्वाकाशकार्यस्य वायोरकारणभूतेन सद्वस्तुना तादात्म्यप्रतीत्ययोगात्सतो विवेचनमप्रयोजकमित्याशङ्क्य साक्षात्संबन्धाभावेऽपि परम्परया संबन्धोऽस्तीत्याह –

*nanvākāśakāryasya vāyorakāraṇabhūtena sadvastunā tādātmyapratītyayogātsato vivecanamaprayojakamityāśaṅkya sākṣātsaṁbandhābhāve'pi paramparayā saṁbandho'stītyāha –*

*nanvākāśakāryasya vāyor* - but Vayu, which is an effect of Akasha. Here the opponent is as though reminding the Vedanti his system, 'ātmanah ākāśah sambhūtaḥ ākāśāt vāyuh vāyoh agni'. *akāraṇabhūtena sadvastunā* – from the Sat which has no association with it (Vayu). *Tādātmyapratītyayogāt* – since there is no possibility of identity. *sato vivecanamaprayojakamityāśaṅkya* – differentiating it (Vayu) from Sat is not of any use, doubting thus, it is answered *sākṣātsaṁbandhābhāve'pi paramparayā saṁbandho'stītyāha* – though there is no direct relation, there is definitely a indirect relation, it is explained.

सद्वस्तुन्येकदेशस्था माया तत्रैकदेशगम् ।

वियत्तत्राप्येकदेशगतो वायुः प्रकल्पितः ॥ ७८ ॥

*sadvastunyekadeśasthā māyā tatraikadeśagam ।*

*viyattatrāpyekadeśagato vāyuh prakalpitaḥ ॥ 78 ॥*

*Maya is in one portion of Sat. In that (Maya), Akasha is in one portion. In that (Akasha) too, Vayu is superimposed.*

*sadvastunyekadeśasthā māyā* – Maya is in one portion of Sat. *tatraikadeśagam viyat* – in that (Maya), Akasha is in one portion. *tatrāpyekadeśagato vāyuh* - in that (Akasha) too, Vayu is in one portion. *prakalpitaḥ* - it is imagined (superimposed).

The cause does not cease to exist in the effect itself, but continues its existence till the final portion of the effect of effect. For example, we make thread from Cotton, this cotton does not cease to exist in the effect thread itself, but it continues its existence in cloth and the dress which is made in it. OR milk becomes Curd, but this very milk is the base for the butter and clarified butter.

But, one should remember there is no Amsa – Amsi (whole – part) relationship here. This can be explained with the example, 1 + 2 = 3, 1 + 1 + 1 = 3 or 2 + 1 = 3, but is it



correct to ask where in this 3, the 1 and 2 resides, in the left, idle or right. Similarly, here too, the classification in parts is only imagination.

सद्वस्तुनि इति ॥ ७८ ॥

*sadvastuni iti ॥ 78 ॥*

एवं सद्वस्तुनिः संबन्धं प्रदर्शय, तयोर्धर्मतो भेदज्ञानाय वायौ प्रतीयमानान्धर्मानाह -

*evaṃ sadvāyvoḥ saṃbandhaṃ pradarśya, tayordharmato bhedajñānāya vāyau pratīyamānāndharmānāha -*

*evaṃ sadvāyvoḥ saṃbandhaṃ pradarśya* - thus, showing the relation between Sat and Vayu. *tayordharmato bhedajñānāya* - to show they differ because of the attributes. *vāyau pratīyamānāndharmānāha* - the attributes that are seen in the Vayu are explained.

शोषस्पर्शौ गतिर्वेगो वायुधर्मा इमे मताः ।

त्रयः स्वभावाः सन्मायाव्योम्नां ये तेऽपि वायुगाः ॥ ७९ ॥

*śoṣasparśau gatiurvego vāyudharmā ime matāḥ ।*

*trayaḥ svabhāvāḥ sanmāyāvvyomnāṃ ye te'pi vāyugāḥ ॥ 79*

॥

*To dry, touch, movement and speed are the attributes of Vayu. The attributes of Sat, Maya and Akasha all three too are seen in Vayu.*

*śoṣa* - to dry. *sparśau* - touch. *gati* - movement. *vego* - speed. *vāyudharmā ime matāḥ* - these are accepted to be the attributes of Vayu. *trayaḥ svabhāvāḥ* - the attributes (nature) of the three. *sanmāyāvvyomnāṃ* - Sat, Maya and Akasha. *ye te'pi vāyugāḥ* - they too are seen in Vayu.

शोषस्पर्शौ इति । एवं प्रातिस्विकान्धर्मानभिधाय कारणतः प्राप्तांस्तानाह - त्रय इति । सन्मायाव्योम्नां ये त्रयः स्वभावाः शीलविशेषा धर्माः तेऽपि वायुगाः । वायौ विद्यन्ते इत्यर्थः ॥ ७९ ॥

*śoṣasparśau iti / evaṃ prāṭisvikāndharmānabhīdhāya kāraṇataḥ prāptāṃstānāha -  
traya iti / sanmāyāvyomnām ye trayaḥ svabhāvāḥ śīlaviśeṣā dharmāḥ te'pi vāyugāḥ /  
vāyau vidyante ityārthaḥ // 79 //*

*evaṃ prāṭisvikāndharmānabhīdhāya kāraṇataḥ prāptāṃstānāha* – Thus, after explaining its natural attributes, the attributes that are gained from the cause is explained. *sanmāyāvyomnām ye trayaḥ svabhāvāḥ = śīlaviśeṣā = dharmāḥ te'pi vāyugāḥ = vāyau vidyante ityārthaḥ* - The nature of Sat, Maya and Akasha all the three too will be seen (exist) in the Vayu. *// 79 //*

के ते धर्मा इत्यत आह –

*ke te dharmā ityata āha* –

*ke te dharmā ityata āha* – what are those attributes is explained. The attributes that come from the cause.

वायुरस्तीति सद्भावः सतो वायौ पृथक्कृते ।

निस्तत्त्वरूपता मायास्वभावो व्योमगो ध्वनिः ॥ ८० ॥

*vāyurastīti sadbhāvaḥ sato vāyau prthakkrte /*

*nistattvarūpatā māyāsvabhāvo vyomago dhvaniḥ // 80 //*

*The nature of Sat is seen in 'Vayu exists' (when we say/know). When this Sat is separated form the Vayu, since it becomes devoid of any existence is Maya nature and the sound is the nature of Akasha.*

*vāyurastīti sadbhāvaḥ* - 'Vayu exists' this is because of the nature of Sat. *sato vāyau prthakkrte nistattvarūpatā māyāsvabhāvo* – when Sat and Vayu are separated, it becomes devoid of any nature (even existence), this is the nature of Maya. When the Sat and Vayu is separated it becomes non-existent, this is an important idea presented here, this will be discussed in the Shloka 83, with a very good question raised by opponent. *vyomago dhvaniḥ* - the sound in Vayu is from the Akasha.

वायुः इति । वायुरस्तीति व्यवहारहेतुसद्रूपत्वं सद्दस्तुनो धर्म एकः । वायौ सद्दस्तुनो विवेचिते सति यन्निस्तत्त्वरूपत्वं स मायाधर्मो द्वितीयः, शब्दो व्योमनः सकाशादागतो धर्मस्तृतीय इत्यर्थ ॥ ८० ॥

*vāyuh itī / vāyurastīti vyavahārahetusadrūpatvaṃ sadvastuno dharma ekaḥ / vāyau sadvastuno vivecite sati yannistattvarūpatvaṃ sa māyādharmo dviṭīyaḥ, śabdo vyomnaḥ sakāśādāgato dharmastṛīya ityartha // 80 //*

*vāyurastīti vyavahārahetu sadrūpatvaṃ = sadvastuno dharma ekaḥ* - The transaction of 'Vayu exists', this is the attribute of the Sat. *vāyau sadvastuno vivecite sati yannistattvarūpatvaṃ sa māyādharmo dviṭīyaḥ* - the second attribute is, when Sat and Vayu are inquired into, separated / differentiated, the state of non-existence is the nature of Maya. *śabdo vyomnaḥ sakāśādāgato dharmastṛīya ityartha* - the sound is the third attribute that has come from the Akasha. *// 80 //*

ननु व्योमविवेचनप्रस्तावे 'वाय्वादिश्वनुवृत्तं सत् न तु व्योमेति भेदधीः' (प्र उ दृ १.५६) इत्यत्र वाय्वादावाकाशानुवृत्तिर्निवारिता । इदानीं व्योमानुवृत्तिरभिधीयते । अतः पूर्वोत्तरविरोध इति शङ्कते –

*nanu vyomavivecanaprastāve 'vāyvādiśvanuvṛttaṃ sat na tu vyometi bhedadhīḥ' (pra u – 2.67) ityatra vāyvādāvākāśānuvṛttirnivāritā / idānīm vyomānuvṛttirabhidhīyate / ataḥ pūrvottaravirodha itī śaṅkate –*

*nanu vyomavivecanaprastāve* - but, when we were inquiring into the nature of Akasha. *'vāyvādiśvanuvṛttaṃ sat na tu vyometi bhedadhīḥ' (pra u – 2.67) ityatra* – in the Shloka 67. *vāyvādāvākāśānuvṛttirnivāritā* - the nature of Akasha to continue its existence in Vayu etc. was negated. *idānīm vyomānuvṛttirabhidhīyate* – and here, the existence of Akasha in Vayu is said. *ataḥ pūrvottaravirodha itī śaṅkate* - therefore, there is a contradiction with the previous and current statement, the opponent raises a doubt.

सतोऽनुवृत्तिः सर्वत्र व्योमो नेति पुरेरितम् ।

व्योमानुवृत्तिरधुना कथं न व्याहतं वचः ॥ ८१ ॥

*sato'nuvṛttiḥ sarvatra vyomno neti pureritam /*

*vyomānuvṛttiradhunā katham na vyāhataṃ vacaḥ // 81 //*

*Earlier it was said, Sat has existence in everything and not Akasha. And now, if it is said Akasha has existence in everything, is it not self-contradictory?*

*sato'nuvṛttiḥ sarvatra* – Sat has its existence everywhere. *vyomno neti pureritam* – and not Akasha does not exist. *vyomānuvṛttiradhunā* – now, you are talking about the existence, of attribute sound of Akasha. *katham na vyāhataṃ vacaḥ* - how can it not be self-contradictory.

सत इति । व्योमानुवृत्तिरधुना उच्यते इति शेषः ॥ ८१ ॥

***sata iti / vyomānuvṛttiradhunā ucyate iti śeṣaḥ ॥ 81 ॥***

***vyomānuvṛttiradhunā ucyate iti śeṣaḥ*** - you are talking about the continual existence of Akasha, is the completing statement. Here the question asked by the opponent is in contradiction with the question asked by him in the earlier shloka, Shloka 78. ***॥ 81 ॥***

पूर्वमवकाशलक्षणस्वरूपानुवृत्तिर्निवारिता, इदानीं धर्मानुवृत्तिरेवाभिधीयते, न स्वरूपानुवृत्तिः य अतो न व्याहतिरिति परिहरति –

***pūrvamavakāśalakṣaṇasvarūpānuvṛttirnivāritā, idānīm dharmānuvṛttirevābhidhīyate, na svarūpānuvṛttiḥ ; ato na vyāhatiriti pariharati –***

***pūrvamavakāśalakṣaṇasvarūpānuvṛttirnivāritā*** – earlier the continual existence of space providing nature was negated, ***idānīm dharmānuvṛttirevābhidhīyate*** – here the continual existence of the Dharma, sound is said, ***na svarūpānuvṛttiḥ*** - and not the nature. ***ato na vyāhatiriti pariharati*** – therefore there is no self-contradiction, thus it is answered.

छिद्रानुवृत्तिर्नेतीति पूर्वोक्तिरधुना त्वियम् ।

शब्दानुवृत्तिरेवोक्ता वचसो व्याहतिः कुतः ॥ ८२ ॥

***chidrānuvṛttirnetīti pūrvoktiradhunā tviyam /***

***śabdānuvṛttirevoktā vacaso vyāhatih kutaḥ ॥ 82 ॥***

Earlier, it was said the space wont be pervasive in the effect, but now, only the continuous existence of sound is said, therefore where is the self-contradiction in the statements.

***chidrānuvṛttirnetīti pūrvoktir*** - earlier it was said, the space nature will not pervade. ***adhunā tviyam śabdānuvṛttirevoktā*** – but now, only the continuous existence of the sound is said. ***vacaso vyāhatih kutaḥ*** - therefore, where is self-contradiction in the statements.

छिद्रेति ॥ ८२ ॥

***chidreti ॥ 82 ॥***

ननु वायोः सद्ब्रह्मविलक्षणत्वादसत्त्वलक्षणं मायामयत्वं यद्युच्यते तर्हि अव्यक्तस्वरूपमायावैलक्षण्यादमायामयत्वमपि किं न स्यादिति चोदयति –

*nanu vāyoh sadbrahmavilakṣaṇatvādasattvalakṣaṇaṃ māyāmayatvaṃ yadyucyate tarhi avyaktasvarūpamāyāvailakṣaṇyādamāyāmayatvamapi kiṃ na syāditi codayati –*

*nanu vāyoh sadbrahmavilakṣaṇatvād* - but, that Vayu which is different from the Sat Brahma *asattvalakṣaṇaṃ māyāmayatvaṃ yadyucyate* - and therefore Maya is defined as Asat. *tarhi avyaktasvarūpamāyāvailakṣaṇyādamāyāmayatvamapi kiṃ na syāditi codayati* – then, since it is different from the Maya that is of the nature of Avyakta (unmanifest), therefore why not it be Amayamaya (different from Maya), is the question raised by opponent. Here the question is, since the Vayu is perceived through the sense-organ, it should be different from the Maya, since Maya is not grasped through sense-organs. IF it is accepted to be different from Maya, then it will become Sat. Like two negative becomes positive. Or in shastra, the absence of absence of pot is existence of Pot (in old school of logic).

ननु सद्ब्रह्मविलक्षणत्वादसत्त्वं चेत्तदा कथम् ।

अव्यक्तमायावैषम्यादमायामयतापि नो ॥ ८३ ॥

*nanu sadvastupārthakyādasatvaṃ cettadā katham /*

*avyaktamāyāvaiṣamyādamāyāmayatāpi no ॥ 83 ॥*

*But, if it is different from the Sat, and therefore is Asat then why it cannot be Amayamaya (different from Maya or not of the nature of Maya), since it is different form Maya.*

*nanu* - but. *sadvastupārthakyādasatvaṃ cet* – if it is different from Sat, it is Asat. *tadā* - then. *katham avyaktamāyāvaiṣamyādamāyāmayatāpi no* – since it is different from the unmanifest Maya, it cannot become contradictory to Maya (asat), that is it will become Sat. Because Maya is unmanifest, and thus not an object of sense-organ and since Vayu is manifest, it is definitely different from Maya, thus will become Sat. This situation does not exist in Akasha, as it is not perceived through sense-organ.

ननु इति ॥ ८३ ॥

*nanu iti ॥ 83 ॥*

नाव्यक्तत्वं मायामयत्वे प्रयोजकं, किन्तु निस्तत्त्वरूपत्वं, तत्तु मायायामिव वाय्वादावप्यस्तीति न मायामयत्वहानिरिति परिहरति –

***nāvyaktatvaṃ māyāmayatve prayojakaṃ, kintu nistattvarūpatvaṃ, tattu māyāyāmiva vāyvādāvapyastīti na māyāmayatvahānirīti pariharati –***

***nāvyaktatvaṃ māyāmayatve prayojakaṃ*** - the state of being unmanifest is not the cause for being Maya, ***kintu nistattvarūpatvaṃ*** - but to be without any substance (reality), ***tattu māyāyāmiva vāyvādāvapyasti*** – and this state of being devoid of any reality is existent in Vayu etc., as in Maya. This was said in Shloka 2, that not only Sat, but also the absence of reality (nature of Maya) too continuous its existence in all the creation. ***iti na māyāmayatvahānirīti pariharati*** - therefore, there is no defect of Maya losing its nature.

निस्तत्त्वरूपतैवात्र मायात्वस्य प्रयोजिका ।

सा शक्तिकार्योस्तुल्या व्यक्ताव्यक्तत्वभेदिनोः ॥ ८४ ॥

***nistattvarūpataivātra māyātvasya prayojikā ।***

***sā śaktikāryayostulyā vyaktāvyaktatvabhedinoḥ ॥ 84 ॥***

*The state of being devoid of any reality is the only reason for the Maya-ness. And this exists equally in both Shakti and its effect, viz. the unmanifest and manifest.*

***nistattvarūpataiva*** – only the state of being devoid of any reality. ***atra māyātvasya prayojikā*** – is the reason for the Maya-ness. ***sā śaktikāryayostulyā*** – and that exists equally in both Shakti and its effect. The effect of Akasha etc. ***vyaktāvyaktatvabhedinoḥ*** - which is, the unmanifest and the manifest.

निस्तत्त्वेति ॥ ८४ ॥

***nistattveti ॥ 84 ॥***

ननु शक्तिकार्योरुभयोरपि निस्तत्त्वरूपतायामविशिष्टायां व्यक्ताव्यक्तत्वलक्षणो भेदः कुत इत्याशङ्क्य तद्विचारः प्रस्तुतानुपयुक्त इति परिहरति –

***nanu śaktikāryayorubhayorapi nistattvarūpatāyāmaṣiṣṭāyāṃ vyaktāvyaktatvalakṣaṇo bhedaḥ kuta ityāśaṅkya tadvicāraḥ prastutānupayukta iti pariharati –***

*nanu śaktikāryayorubhayorapi nistattvarūpatāyāmaviśiṣṭāyām* - but, if in the both Shakti and its effect, the state of being devoid of any reality is equal. But, then the cause and effect are same, it is like calling the cause of pot is pot and the effect of clay is clay. Then what is the difference between the cause and effect. *vyaktāvyaktatvalakṣaṇo bhedaḥ kuta* - how are they different by manifest and unmanifest state. Though this question is a very important one, the answer is equally important for a seeker. *ityāśaṅkya* - doubting thus. *tadvicāraḥ prastutānupayukta iti pariharati* - is answered with, this line of inquiry is not useful for the topic of discussion. It is like splitting the hair, useless or to check the number of teeth in crows mouth.

सदसत्त्वविवेकस्य प्रस्तुतत्वात्स चिन्त्यताम् ।

असतोऽवान्तरो भेद आस्तां तच्चिन्तयाऽत्र किम् ॥ ८५ ॥

*sadasattvavivekasya prastutatvātsa cintyatām /*

*asato'vāntaro bheda āstāṃ taccintayā'tra kim // 85 //*

The topic of discussion is to inquire into the Sat and Asat., we should only inquire into that. Let the sub-divisions in the Asat be there, what is the use of that inquiry.

*sadasattvavivekasya prastutatvāt* – since we started this discussion of inquiry into the Sat and Asat. *sa cintyatām* – let us stick to that. *asato'vāntaro bheda āstāṃ* - let the sub-division in the Asat be there. *taccintayā'tra kim* – what is the use of the inquiry into that. Because, we will later see, one should not give any importance to the creation itself 'sṛṣṭau anādarau kartavya'.

सदसत्वेति । असतो मायातत्कार्यरूपस्यावान्तरभेदो व्यक्ताव्यक्तत्वरूप इत्यर्थः ॥ ८५ ॥

*sadasatveti / asato māyātatkāryarūpasyāvāntarabhedo vyaktāvyaktatvarūpa ityarthah*  
**// 85 //**

*asato māyātatkāryarūpasyāvāntarabhedo vyaktāvyaktatvarūpa ityarthah* - the sub-division of the Maya and its effect is Umanifest and Manifest state. **// 85 //**

फलितमाह –

*phalitamāha* –

*phalitamāha* – this is the conclusion.

सद्वस्तु ब्रह्म शिष्टोऽशो वायुर्मिथ्या यथा वियत् ।

वासयित्वा चिरं वायोर्मिथ्यात्वं मरुतं त्यजेत् ॥ ८६ ॥

*sadvastu brahma śiṣṭom'śo vāyurmithyā yathā viyat /*

*vāsayitvā ciraṃ vāyormithyātvaṃ marutaṃ tyajet // 86 //*

*Sat is Brahma. All the rest, like Akasha is Mithya so is the Vayu. By establishing the Mithya-ness of Vayu, one should giveup the Vayu.*

*sadvastu brahma* – Sat (in the Vayu) is nothing other than Brahma. *śiṣṭom'śo* – all the rest. *vāyurmithyā yathā viyat* – as the Akasha is Mithya, so is Vayu. *vāsayitvā ciraṃ* - by holding this though steadily. Here as said in Sankhya Karika 'ekānta atyantata' is meant, i.e., one's for all, it should be understood as Mithya. *vāyormithyātvaṃ* - of Vayu being Mithya. *marutaṃ tyajet* – one should giveup the Vayu.

सद्वस्तु इति । वायौ यः सदंशस्तद्ब्रह्मरूपम् । शिष्टोऽशो निस्तत्त्वादिर्वायोः स्वरूपम् , स च वायुः निस्तत्त्वरूपत्वादेव आकाशवन्मिथ्या । इत्थं वायोर्मिथ्यात्वं चिरं वासयित्वा मरुतं त्यजेत् , मरुत्सत्य इति बुद्धिं त्यजेत् इत्यर्थः ॥ ८६ ॥

*sadvastu iti / vāyau yaḥ sadamśastadbrahmarūpam / śiṣṭom'śo nistatvādirvāyoh svarūpam , sa ca vāyuh nistatvarūpatvādeva ākāśavanmithyā / itthaṃ vāyormithyātvaṃ ciraṃ vāsayitvā marutaṃ tyajet , marutsatya iti buddhiṃ tyajet ityarthah // 86 //*

*vāyau yaḥ sadamśastadbrahmarūpam* - The Sat portion in the Vayu is Brahman. *śiṣṭom'śo nistatvādirvāyoh svarūpam* - all the rest, being devoid of reality etc, as the nature of Vayu, *sa ca vāyuh nistatvarūpatvādeva ākāśavanmithyā* – that Vayu just because of it being devoid of any reality, is Mithya like the Akasha. *itthaṃ vāyormithyātvaṃ ciraṃ vāsayitvā* - thus, by steadily meditating on the Mithya-ness of the Vayu. *marutaṃ tyajet = marutsatya iti buddhiṃ tyajet ityarthah* - one should giveup the Vayu, i.e. the idea of reality in the Vayu. **// 86 //**

वायौ उक्तं विचारं तेजस्यप्यतिदिशति –

*vāyau uktaṃ vicāraṃ tejasyapyatidiśati* –

*vāyau uktaṃ vicāraṃ tejasyapyatidiśati* – The idea expounded in Vayu is carried forward in Agni (fire).



चिन्तयेद्वह्निमप्येवं मरुतो न्यूनवर्तिनम् ।

ब्रह्माण्डावरणेषु न्यूनाधिकविचारणा ॥ ८७ ॥

*cintayedvahnimapyevaṃ maruto nyūnavartinam ।*

*brahmāṇḍāvaraṇeṣveṣā nyūnādhikavicāraṇā ॥ 87 ॥*

Agni should also be meditated about similarly. It has lesser existence than Vayu. This discussion about the lesser and greater is only limited to the things in this Brahmanda (creation).

*cintayedvahnimapyevaṃ* - Meditate on the Agni too, similarly. *maruto nyūnavartinam* – it has lesser existence than the Vayu. *brahmāṇḍāvaraṇeṣveṣā* – only with respect to the things in the creation. *nyūnādhikavicāraṇā* – the discussion about the lesser and greater existence is limited to.

चिन्तयेत् इति । ननु 'सद्वस्तुन्येकदेशस्था माया तत्र' (प्र उ – २.७८) इत्यादिना वियदादीनां न्यूनाधिकभाव उक्तः, स लोके न क्वापि दृश्यत इत्याशङ्क्याह – ब्रह्माण्डेति ॥ ८७ ॥

*cintayet iti । nanu 'sadvastunyekadeśasthā māyā tatra' (pra u – 2.78) ityādinā viyadādīnāṃ nyūnādhikabhāva uktaḥ, sa loke na kvāpi dṛśyata ityāśaṅkyāha – brahmāṇḍeti ॥ 87 ॥*

*nanu* - but, '*sadvastunyekadeśasthā māyā tatra' (pra u – 2.78) ityādinā* - in the Shloka 78 etc. *vīyadādīnāṃ nyūnādhikabhāva uktaḥ* - for Akasha etc. the gradation of existence was said. *sa loke na kvāpi dṛśyata ityāśaṅkyāha* – but, nowhere it is seen in the world by anyone. ॥ 87 ॥

वायोः कियतांशेन न्यूनो वह्निरित्यताह –

*vāyoh kiyatāṃśena nyūno vahnirityatāha –*

*vāyoh kiyatāṃśena nyūno vahnirityatāha* – In what degree Agni exists in Vayu. Maya was said to exist in one quarter of the Brahman. In that Maya, each element exists in one tenth portion.

वायोर्दशांशतो न्यूनो वह्निर्वायौ प्रकल्पितः ।

पुरोक्तं तारतम्यं दशांशैर्भूतपञ्चके ॥ ८८ ॥

*vāyordaśāṁśato nyūno vahnirvāyau prakalpitaḥ /*

*puroṅoktaṁ tāratamyam daśāṁśairbhūtapañcake ॥ 88 ॥*

Agni imagined in Vayu exists in reduced size of one tenth portion of the Vayu. This one tenth of each of the five elements existence gradation is said in the Puranas.

*vāyordaśāṁśato nyūno* – in a less place of one tenth portion of Vayu. *vahnirvāyau prakalpitaḥ* - Agni is imagined in Vayu. *puroṅoktaṁ tāratamyam* - this gradation is explained in the Puranas. *daśāṁśairbhūtapañcake* – one tenth of each of the five elements. All this are only imagination, as in Pancikarana, just to establish they are Mithya as said in Shloka 85.

वायोः इति । तस्य वास्तवत्वशङ्कां वारयति – वायौ इति । नन्दयं न्यूनाधिकभावः स्वकपोलकल्पित इत्याशङ्क्याह – पुराणोक्तम् इति ॥ ८८ ॥

*vāyoḥ iti / tasya vāstavatvaśaṅkāṁ vārayati – vāyau iti / nanvayam nyūnādhikabhāvaḥ svakapolakalpita ityāśaṅkyāha – purāṅoktam iti ॥ 88 ॥*

*tasya vāstavatvaśaṅkāṁ vārayati* - the doubt about it being Absolute is negated – it is only imagined. *nanvayam nyūnādhikabhāvaḥ svakapolakalpita ityāśaṅkyāha* – but this gradation of on tenth is one's own imagination, this doubt is answered – it is explained in the Puranas. ॥ 88 ॥

वहेः स्वरूपमाह -

*vahneḥ svarūpamāha –*

*vahneḥ svarūpamāha* – the nature of Agni is explained.

वहिरुष्णः प्रकाशात्मा पूर्वानुगतिरत्र च ।

अस्ति वहिः स निस्तत्त्वः शब्दान्स्पशवानपि ॥ ८९ ॥

*vahniruşṇaḥ prakāśātmā pūrvānugatiratra ca /*

*asti vahniḥ sa nistattvaḥ śabdavānsparsāvānapi ॥ 89 ॥*

*Agni has the nature of heat and light. The previous (causal) nature will pervade here too. Agni exists, it is devoid of any reality and it has sound and touch as its attribute.*

*vahniruşṇaḥ prakāśātmā* – Agni has heat and light. *pūrvānugatiratra ca* – the nature of the previous ones pervade here too. How so? *asti vahniḥ* - Agni exists, the nature of Sat. *sa nistattvaḥ* - it is devoid of any reality, the nature of Maya. *śabdavānsparsāvānapi* – it has sound and touch attributes, sound of Akasha and touch of Vayu.

वह्निरिति । अत्रापि वायाविव कारणधर्मा अनुगता इत्याह - पूर्वैति । के ते धर्मा इत्याकाङ्क्षायामाह - अस्ति इति ॥ ८९ ॥

*vahniriti / atrāpi vāyāviva kāraṇadharmā anugatā ityāha – pūrveti / ke te dharmā ityākāṅkṣāyāmāha- asti iti ॥ 89 ॥*

*atrāpi vāyāviva kāraṇadharmā anugatā ityāha* – here too as seen earlier, the causal attributes will continue its existence in the effect too, is explained. *ke te dharmā ityākāṅkṣāyāmāha* – for the doubt, what are the attributes? It is answered with ‘asti’ etc. *॥ 89 ॥*

एवमग्नौ कारणधर्मानुगत्यनुवादपूर्वकं स्वकीयं धर्मं दर्शयति –

*evamagnau kāraṇadharmānugatyanuvādapūrvakaṃ svakīyaṃ dharmam darśayati –*

*evamagnau kāraṇadharmānugatyanuvādapūrvakaṃ svakīyaṃ dharmam darśayati* – thus, by explaining the existence of the causal attributes, its own attribute is shown.

सन्मायाव्योमवाय्वंशैर्युक्तस्याग्नेर्निजो गुणः ।

रूपं तत्र सतः सर्वमन्यद्बुद्ध्या विविच्यताम् ॥ ९० ॥

*sanmāyāvvyomavāyvaṃśairyuktasyāgnernijo guṇaḥ /*

*rūpaṃ tatra sataḥ sarvamanyaadbuddhyā vivicyatām ॥ 90*

॥

*Agni along with the portions of Sat, Maya, Akasha and Vayu, has rupa (form) as its own attribute. We should distinguish everything else from the Sat.*

*sanmāyāvyomavāyvaṁśairyuktasyāgner* – For the fire, along with the portions of Sat, Maya, Akasha and Vayu. *nijo guṇaḥ* - its own attribute is. *rūpaṁ* - form. *tatra sataḥ sarvamanadbuddhyā vivicyatām* – we should distinguish everything else from the Sat. We should establish everything else other than the Sat as Mithya.

सन्मायेति । इत्थं सविशेषणं वह्निस्वरूपं व्युत्पाद्य, इदानीं सद्वस्तुनो वह्निं विविनक्ति – तत्र इति । तत्र तेषु मध्ये सतः सद्वस्तुनोऽन्यत्सर्वं धर्मजातं मिथ्येति बुद्ध्या विविच्यताम् , पृथक् क्रियतामित्यर्थः ॥ ९० ॥

*sanmāyeti / itthaṁ saviśeṣaṇaṁ vahnisvarūpaṁ vyutpādya, idānīm sadvastuno vahnim vivinakti – tatra iti / tatra teṣu madhye sataḥ sadvastuno'nyatsarvaṁ dharmajātaṁ mithyeti buddhyā vivicyatām , pṛthak kriyatāmityarthaḥ ॥ 90 ॥*

*itthaṁ saviśeṣaṇaṁ vahnisvarūpaṁ vyutpādya* – thus, establishing the nature of Agni along with its attributes (speacially). *idānīm sadvastuno vahnim vivinakti* – Agni is separated from the Sat, to establish its Mithya nature. *tatra = teṣu madhye sataḥ = sadvastuno'nyatsarvaṁ = dharmajātaṁ mithyeti buddhyā vivicyatām = pṛthak kriyatāmityarthaḥ* - among them, from the Sat, whatever is different, understand them to be Mithya. Through the logic of Anvaya-Vyatireka explained earlier. What should be done after separating was said in Shloka 86, ‘vāsaitvā ciraṁ’ – be established in it. ॥ 90 ॥

एवं वह्नेर्मिथ्यात्वनिश्चयानन्तरमपां मिथ्यात्वं चिन्तयेदित्याह –

*evaṁ vahnermithyātvaniścayānantaramapāṁ mithyātvaṁ cintayedityāha –*

*evaṁ vahnermithyātvaniścayānantaramapāṁ mithyātvaṁ cintayedityāha* – thus, after establishing the Mithaness in Agni, one should meditate on the Mithyaness of Apa (water).

सतो विवीचिते वह्नौ मिथ्यात्वे सति वासिते ।

आपो दशांशतो न्यूनाः कल्पिता इति चिन्तयेत् ॥ ९१ ॥

*sato vivīcite vahnau mithyātve sati vāsīte /*

*āpo daśāṁśato nyūnāḥ kalpitā iti cintayet ॥ 91 ॥*

*After distinguishing Sat from Agni and establishing its Mithyaness. Apa should be understood to be imagined in one-tenth of it (Agni).*

*sato vivīcīte vahnau* – after distinguishing Agni from Sat. *mīthyātve satī vāsīte* – and the Mithyaness is established in Agni. To be established means, there should be no doubt at any point of time later. *āpo* – Apa - water. *daśāṃśato nyūnāḥ kalpitā iti cintayet* – should be understood as to be imagined in one-tenth of the Agni.

सत इति ॥ ९१ ॥

*sata iti ॥ 91 ॥*

अस्यापि कारणधर्मान्स्वधर्माश्च विभज्य दर्शयति –

*asyāpi kāraṇadharmānsvadharmāṃśca vibhajya darśayati* –

*asyāpi kāraṇadharmānsvadharmāṃśca vibhajya darśayati* - for this Apa too, the causal attribute and its own attribute are distinguishably explained.

सन्त्यापोऽमूः शून्यतत्त्वाः सशब्दस्पर्शसंयुताः ।

रूपवत्योऽन्यधर्मानुवृत्त्या स्वीयो रसो गुणः ॥ ९२ ॥

*santypō'mūḥ sūnyatattvāḥ saśabdasparsasamyutāḥ ।*

*rūpavatyo'nyadharmānuvṛtṭyā svīyo raso guṇaḥ ॥ 92 ॥*

*Apa exists (Sat), it does not have any reality (Mitya), and with the attributes sound (Akasha), touch (Vayu), form (Agni) that pervades from its cause has as its own Rasa (taste).*

*santypō* - Apa exists, this is the attribute of Sat. Here with water (Apa), instead of 'asti' (to exist) the term 'santi' is used, because the term Apa is always used in plural. *amūḥ sūnyatattvāḥ* - it is devoid of any reality, this is the attribute of Maya. *saśabdasparsasamyutāḥ rūpavatyo'nyadharmānuvṛtṭyā* – with the causal attributes sound, touch and form pervading. *svīyo raso guṇaḥ* - has as its own attribute taste.

सन्त्याप इति । शब्देन सह वर्तते इति सशब्दः, सशब्दश्चासौ स्पर्शश्च सशब्दस्पर्शः, तेन युक्ता इत्यर्थः ॥ ९२ ॥

*santyaṅpa iti / śabdena saha vartate iti saśabdah, saśabdaścāsau sparśaśca saśabdasparsah, tena yuktā ityarthah // 92 //*

*śabdena saha vartate iti saśabdah* - that which exists along with the sound is called as 'sasabdha'. Sa is a prefix used in the place of 'saha' to denote along with. *saśabdaścāsau sparśaśca* = *saśabdasparsah* - along with sound at the same time it has the touch is sashabdasparsah, this is a compound word, *tena yuktā ityarthah* - it is endowed with them. // 92 //

विवेकध्यानाभ्यामपां मिथ्यात्वं निश्चित्यानन्तरं भूमिर्मिथ्यात्वं चिन्तनीयमित्याह –

*vivekadhyānābhyāmapāṃ mithyātvaṃ niścityānantaraṃ bhūmirmithyātvaṃ cintanīyamityāha* –

*vivekadhyānābhyāmapāṃ mithyātvaṃ niścitya* – through discrimination and meditation, establishing (understanding) the Mithyaness of Apa. *anantaraṃ* - after this. *bhūmirmithyātvaṃ cintanīyamityāha* – to establish the Mithyaness of Bhumi (Prtvi), it is explained.

सतो विवेचितास्वप्सु तन्मिथ्यात्वे च वासिते ।

भूमिर्दशांशतो न्यूना कल्पिताऽप्रवीति चिन्तयेत् ॥ ९३ ॥

*sato vivecitāsvapsu tanmithyātve ca vāsīte /*

*bhūmirdaśāṃśato nyūnā kalpitā'psvīti cintayet // 93 //*

when the Apa is differentiated from Sat, and its (Apa) Mithyaness is established. Meditate on the Bhumin, that is imagined in one tenth of Apa.

*sato vivecitāsvapsu* – when the Apa is differentiated from Sat. *tanmithyātve ca vāsīte* – and its Mithyaness is established. *bhūmirdaśāṃśato nyūnā* – one tenth lesser is bhumi (earth). Here the term Bhumi is the causal earth and not the earth we see, which is the effect after the Panchikarana (processing). This effectual Bhumi is called as Brahmanda here, in Shloka 95 and was discussed in Shloka 86. *kalpitā'psvīti* – imagined in the Apa. *cintayet* – meditate thus.

सत इति ॥ ९३ ॥

*sata iti // 93 //*

तस्या मिथ्यात्वचिन्तनाय तद्धर्मानपि विभज्यते –

*tasyā mithyātvacintanāya taddharmānapi vibhajyate –*

*tasyā mithyātvacintanāya taddharmānapi vibhajyate* – to meditate on the Mithyaness of Bhumi too, its attribute is classified.

अस्ति भूस्तत्त्वशून्यास्यां शब्दस्पर्शौ सरूपकौ ।

रसश्च परतो गन्धो नैजः सत्ता विविच्यताम् ॥ ९४ ॥

*asti bhūstattvaśūnyāsyāṃ śabdasparsāu sarūpakau ।*

*rasaśca parato gandho naijaḥ sattā vivicyatām ॥ 94 ॥*

*Bhumi exists (Sat), it has no reality (Maya), it has sound, touch, form and taste which have come from the other elements and its one attribute is Gandha (smell). We should differentiate Sat from it.*

*asti bhūstat* – Bhumi exists (Sat). *tvaśūnyāsyāṃ* - does not have any reality (Maya). *śabdasparsāu sarūpakau rasaśca parato* – from the causal elements sound (Akasha), touch (Vayu), form (Agni) and taste (Apa). *gandho naijaḥ* - and its own attribute is smell. *sattā vivicyatām* – differentiate Sat from it.

अस्ति भूः इति । तेभ्यः सत्तामात्रं पृथक् कर्तव्यमित्याह - सत्ता इति ॥ ९४ ॥

*asti bhūḥ iti । tebhyaḥ sattāmātraṃ pṛthak kartavyamityāha- sattā iti ॥ 94 ॥*

*tebhyaḥ sattāmātraṃ pṛthak kartavyamityāha* - differentiate Sat from them. ॥ 94 ॥

सत्तापृथक्करणे फलमाह –

*sattāpṛthakkarāṇe phalamāha –*

*sattāpṛthakkarāṇe phalamāha* – the result of differentiating Sat is explained.

पृथक्कृतायां सत्तायां भूमिर्मिथ्याऽवशिष्यते ।

भूमेर्दशांशतो न्यूनं ब्रह्माण्डं भूमिमध्यगम् ॥ ९५ ॥

*prthakṛtāyām sattāyām bhūmirmithyā'vaśiṣyate /*

*bhūmerdaśāṃśato nyūnaṃ brahmāṇḍaṃ*

*bhūmimadhyagam ॥ 95 ॥*

When Sat is differentiated Bhumi will remain as Mithya. And Brahmanda, which exists in one tenth of the Bhumi.

*prthakṛtāyām sattāyām* - when Sat is differentiated. *bhūmirmithyā'vaśiṣyate* – the Bhumi remains as Mithya. *bhūmerdaśāṃśato nyūnaṃ* - in one tenth lesser place. *brahmāṇḍaṃ bhūmimadhyagam* – Brahmanda exists in the Bhumi.

पृथग् इति । इदानीं भौतिकेभ्यो ब्रह्माण्डादिभ्यः सतो विवेचनाय तदवस्थानप्रकारं दर्शयति – भूमेरिति ॥ ९५ ॥

*prthag iti / idānīm bhautikebhyo brahmāṇḍādibhyaḥ sato vivecanāya tadavasthānaprakāraṃ darśayati – bhūmeriti ॥ 95 ॥*

*idānīm bhautikebhyo brahmāṇḍādibhyaḥ* - now, from the elemental Brahmanda etc. Brahmanda means the whole universe. As said in Shastras, even in the dust of Iswara, there are multiple universes, with each having a creator. *sato vivecanāya* - to differentiate the Sat. Here by discriminating as said 'vishayeshu dosham pashya', 'vishayam visha tulya' etc., we are not giving a negative mind set, but are trying to establish the Mithyaness in the creation. *tadavasthānaprakāraṃ darśayati* – its (elemental creation), existence is explained. ॥ 95 ॥

ब्रह्माण्डमध्ये तिष्ठन्ति भुवनानि चतुर्दश ।

भुवनेषु वसन्त्येषु प्राणिदेहा यथायथम् ॥ ९६ ॥

*brahmāṇḍamadye tiṣṭhanti bhuvanāni caturdaśa /*

*bhuvaneṣu vasantyeṣu prāṇidehā yathāyatham ॥ 96 ॥*

In the midst of the Brahmanda, the fourteen worlds exist. The beings have the proper body appropriate for each of these worlds.



*brahmāṇḍamadhye* – in the middle of the Brahmanda. *tiṣṭhanti* – exists. *bhuvanāni caturdaśa* – the fourteen worlds. The seven higher worlds Bhu, Bhuva, Suva, Maha, Jana, Tapa and Satyam and seven nether worlds Atala, Vitala, Sutala, Pataala, Rasaatala, Talaatala and Mahatala. *bhuvaneṣu vasantyeṣu prāṇidehā yathāyatham* – the bodies of the beings in these worlds are made appropriate for each of these world. The body of one world does not have any eligibility to enter the other world.

ब्रह्माण्डेति । स्पष्टम् ॥ ९६ ॥

*brahmāṇḍeti / spaṣṭam ॥ 96 ॥*

तेषु सद्विवेचने फलमाह –

*teṣu sadvivecane phalamāha* –

*teṣu sadvivecane phalamāha* – result of differentiating these from Sat is explained.

ब्रह्माण्डलोकदेहेषु सद्वस्तुनि पृथक्कृते ।

असन्तोऽण्डादयो भान्तु तद्भानेऽपीह का क्षतिः ॥ ९७ ॥

*brahmāṇḍalokadeheṣhu sadvastuni pṛthakkr̥te /*

*asanto'ṇḍādayo bhāntu tadbhāne'pīha kā kṣatiḥ ॥ 97 ॥*

*When the Sat is differentiated from the Brahmanda, the worlds in it, the bodies in those worlds, they will 'shine' without any reality. What is the loss, if they shine so (without any reality).*

*brahmāṇḍalokadeheṣhu* – in the Brahmanda, the different worlds in it and the bodies in it. *sadvastuni pṛthakkr̥te* – if we differentiate the Sat from them. *asanto'ṇḍādayo bhāntu* – the Brahmanda etc. will 'shine' without any reality. Because we ourselves condemned when the opponent said 'asat āsit' – the non-existence existed, saying it is self-contradictory. Then how can we ourselves accept. The reason to show shine in quotes is, in the absence of Sat nothing can exist, so shining here really means the illusory existence like the mirage water or the rope - snake. And we said in Shloka 85, we are not interested in these offtrack topics, and earlier it was said it is like talking about the power of barren womens son. In Shloka 53, we clearly said 'śaktikāryam naiva asti' - there is never any existence for the effect of the Maya. *tadbhāne'pīha kā kṣatiḥ* - what

is the loss even if it shines so. There is no loss, because even if the Maya' effect are seen, they are understood to be Mithya.

ब्रह्माण्डेति ॥ ९७ ॥

*brahmāṇḍeti ॥ 97 ॥*

तद्भाने का क्षतिरित्युक्तमेवार्थं स्पष्टीकरोति-

*tadbhāne kā kṣatirityuktamevārthaṃ spaṣṭīkaroti-*

*tadbhāne kā kṣatirityuktamevārthaṃ spaṣṭīkaroti* – the very question of ‘what is the loss even if it shines so?’ said earlier, is clearly explained.

भूतभौतिकमायानामसत्त्वेऽत्यन्तवासिते ।

सद्वस्त्वद्वैतमित्येषा धीर्विपर्येति न क्वचित् ॥ ९८ ॥

*bhūtabhautikamāyānāmasattve'tyantavāsīte ।*

*sadvastvadvaitamityeṣā dhīrviparyeti na kvacit ॥ 98 ॥*

*When the elements, their effects the elemental and the Maya is established as illusory, once for all. The knowledge of Sat is non-dual will never be lost.*

*bhūtabhautikamāyānāmasattve'tyantavāsīte* – when the elements, elemental and Maya are established as illusory, once for all. When we say atyantavasite, what we mean is immediate knowledge and not mediate knowledge. Because, only this immediate knowledge of all these to be Mithya can negate the knowledge of all of them to be real. Mediate knowledge from listening to Shastra, without any understanding will not be sufficient to remove it. As we see, the mediate knowledge of Iswara in a statue does not remove the immediate knowledge of stone. Mediate and immediate knowledge can co-exist. *sadvastvadvaitamityeṣā dhīrviparyeti na kvacit* - The immediate knowledge Sat is non-dual, will never be lost. The substratum remains without any duality. The Shruti says this, ‘ato anyad ārtam’ - there is nothing other than Self, the rest are Mitya. The knowledge of dvaita (duality) will be established as Mithya in all the three periods as ‘nāsti, nāsīd, na bhaviṣyati’

भूतेति । भूतानामाकाशादीनां भौतिकानां ब्रह्माण्डादीनां मायायाश्च तत्कारणभूताया मिथ्यात्वे विवेकध्यानाभ्यां चित्ते दृढं वासिते सति सदस्तुनोऽद्वैतबुद्धिः कदाचिन्न विहन्यते इत्यर्थः ॥ ९८ ॥

*bhūtetī / bhūtānāmākāśādīnām bhautikānām brahmāṇḍādīnām māyāyāśca tatkāraṇabhūtāyā mithyātve vivekadhyānābhyām citte dṛḍhaṃ vāsīte sati sadvastuno'dvaitabuddhiḥ kadācinna vihanyate ityārthaḥ ॥ 98 ॥*

*bhūtānāmākāśādīnām* - the elements, Akasha etc. *bhautikānām brahmāṇḍādīnām* - the elements, Brahmāṇḍa etc. *māyāyāśca* - and the Maya. *tatkāraṇabhūtāyā* - Maya which is the cause for all of them. *mithyātve* - the illusoriness. *vivekadhyānābhyām citte dṛḍhaṃ vāsīte sati* - if Mithyaness, is established in the mind very clearly through discrimination (differentiating) and meditation. *sadvastuno'dvaitabuddhiḥ kadācinna vihanyate ityārthaḥ* - the knowledge of Sat, as non-dual will never become otherwise. Here by the term 'kadācinna' - the states when one does not understand himself, like deep-sleep, unconsciousness or coma too are included, because they are states of the body - sense-organ complex, and not of the Self. And thus, they (Body - sense-organ complex), elemental, are already established as Mithya. ॥ 98 ॥

After explaining the cause and effect for the creation will become negated as Mithya, i.e there is nothing real other than the Sat, there will be this doubt in the mind of every seeker, which is worded by the opponent.

ननु भूम्यादीनामसत्त्वे विदुषो व्यवहारलोपः प्रसज्जेतेत्याशङ्क्य विवेकेन मिथ्यात्वनिश्चयेऽपि भूम्यादेः स्वरूपोपमर्दनाभावान्न व्यवहारो लुप्यत इत्याह -

*nanu bhūmyādīnāmasatve viduṣo vyavahāralopaḥ prasajjetetyāśaṅkya vivekena mithyātvaniścaye'pi bhūmyādeḥ svarūpopamardanābhāvānna vyavahāro lupyata ityāha -*

*nanu bhūmyādīnāmasatve viduṣo vyavahāralopaḥ prasajjetetyāśaṅkya* - but, when the Bhūmi etc. are established as Asat, then there will be no transaction possible in the Knowledgeable, doubting thus, it is answered. *vivekena mithyātvaniścaye'pi bhūmyādeḥ svarūpopamardanābhāvānna vyavahāro lupyata ityāha* - though the Bhūmi etc. are established as Mithya through the discrimination (differentiation), their existence per say (nature) is not destroyed, thus there is no problem of the transaction becoming annulled, is explained. We will discuss in detail later, with Iswara-srushti - Iswara's creation and Jiva-srushti - Jiva's creation.

सदद्वैतात्पृथग्भूते द्वैते भूम्यादिरूपिणि ।

तत्तदर्थक्रिया लोके यथा दृष्टा तथैव सा ॥ ९९ ॥

*sadadvaitātprthagbhūte dvaite bhūmyādirūpiṇi /*

*tattadarthakriyā loke yathā dṛṣṭā tathaiva sā ॥ 99 ॥*

When we separate from the Sat, the duality of Bhumi etc., its natural use and functionality in the world of each of them will remain as was seen earlier.

*sadadvaitātprthagbhūte* – from the Sat, the nondual we separate. *dvaite bhūmyādirūpiṇi* – the duality of the form of Bhumi etc.. *tattadarthakriyā* – its use and functionality. ‘arthakriyā’ – the object and its particular functionality, for example water is for quenching the thirst, fire is for generating heat and light etc. *loke yathā dṛṣṭā* – as seen in the world earlier. *tathaiiva sā* – will remain so even after. Even after understanding the pot is nothing but name and form of clay, one uses pot for keeping water, curd or even for cooking. Here we use the logic of ‘tushyatu durjana’ – let the idiot be happy. We are answering in the language of duality (codyam vā parihāro vaa kriyate dvaita bhāshayā), as the question. Because, we see in case of some Siddha’s, the burn lamp with water instead of oil, or bring eatables from air etc. IF this cause effect is negated even in ordinary people with some supernatural powers, should we even talk about the Gnani.

सदद्वैतात् इति ॥ ९९ ॥

*sadadvaitāt iti ॥ 99 ॥*

ननु सत्तत्त्वस्याद्वैतरूपत्वे सांख्यादिभिरभिधीयमानस्य भेदस्य कुतो न निरासः क्रियते इत्याशङ्क्य व्यावहारिकभेदस्यास्माभिरभ्युपगतत्वान्न तन्निरास प्रयत्यते इत्याह –

*nanu sattattvasyādvaitarūpatve sām̐khyādibhirabhidhīyamānasya bhedasya kuto na nirāsaḥ kriyate ityāsaṅkya vyāvahārikabhedasyāsmābhirabhyupagatatvānna tannirāsa prayatyate ityāha –*

*nanu sattattvasyādvaitarūpatve* - but if the Sat is non-dual. *sām̐khyādibhirabhidhīyamānasya bhedasya* - the duality that is expressed by Sankhya philosophers etc. *kuto na nirāsaḥ kriyate* - why are you not negating. *ityāsaṅkya* - doubting thus. Sankhyans accept Prakṛti and Puruṣa to be different, and accept the Puruṣa to be experiencer (Bhokta) and not doer (Karta), and explain the Prakṛti to be the cause of creation for the sake of experience and liberation of the Puruṣa etc.

*vyāvahārikabhedasyāsmābhirabhyupagatatvānna tannirāsa prayatyate ityāha* – since, we too accept the duality in the worldly transaction (ephemeral), therefore we don't put any effort to negate it, is explained. We do negate these in the Brahma Sutra etc. Vedanta texts only to negate the idea of they being True, not the way it is accepted.

सांख्यकाणादबौद्धाद्यैर्जगद्भेदो यथा यथा ।

उत्प्रेक्ष्यतेऽनेकयुक्त्या भवत्त्वे तथा तथा ॥ १०० ॥

*sāṅkhyakāṇḍabauddhādyairjagadbhedo yathā yathā ।*

*utprekṣyate'nekayuktyā bhavatveṣa tathā tathā ॥ 100 ॥*

*In whichever way the philosophies of Sankhya (of Kapila Maharshi), Kanaada Maharshi's Nyaya, Buddha's Buddhism explain the dualities of the world with many different logics, let it be so.*

*sāṅkhyakāṇḍabauddhādyair* – by Sankhya, Logicians and Buddhist etc. *jagadbhedo* – the plurality of the world. *yathā yathā utprekṣyate'nekayuktyā* – is seen in whatever way, through many logics. *bhavatveṣa tathā tathā* - let it be so.

सांख्येति ॥ १०० ॥

*sāṅkhyeti ॥ 100 ॥*

ननु प्रमाणसिद्धस्य सत्त्वभेदस्य अवज्ञा अनुपपन्नेत्याशङ्क्याह –

*nanu pramāṇasiddhasya sattvabhedasya avajñā anupapannetyāśaṅkyāha* –

*nanu pramāṇasiddhasya sattvabhedasya avajñā anupapannetyāśaṅkyāha* – but, the knowledge of duality of the existence is gained through Pramana, therefore should not disrespect it, doubting this, it is explained.

अवज्ञातं सदद्वैतं निःशङ्कैरन्यवादिभिः ।

एवं का क्षतिरस्माकं तद्वैतमवजानताम् ॥ १०१ ॥

*avajñātam sadadvaitam niḥśaṅkairanyavādibhiḥ ।*

*evaṃ kā kṣatirasmākaṃ tadvaitamavajānatām ॥ 101 ॥*

*The one non-dual Sat is disrespected by the other philosophers (philosophies) without any doubt. In that case, what is the problem if we discard their duality?*

*avajñātaṃ sadadvaitaṃ* - The Sat that is non-dual is discarded. *niḥśaṅkairanyavādibhiḥ* - without any doubt by the other philosophers. 'niḥśaṅkaiḥ' – without any Pramana, is the right interpretation. *evaṃ kā kṣatirasmākaṃ* - so, in that case, what is the problem (loss) for us. *taddvaitamavajñatām* - if we discard their duality. Because, we negate it through the Pramana and not just logic.

अवज्ञातम् इति । यथाऽन्यवादिभिः सांख्यादिभिः निःशङ्कैः श्रुत्यादिसिद्धस्यापि सदद्वैतस्यावज्ञा क्रियते, श्रुतियुक्तयनुभवावष्टम्भेनास्माभिस्तदीयद्वैतानादरणे किं हीयते इत्यर्थः ॥ १०१ ॥

*avajñātaṃ iti / yathā'nyavādibhiḥ sāṅkhyādibhiḥ niḥśaṅkaiḥ śrutyādisiddhasyāpi sadadvaitasyāvajñā kriyate, śrutiuktayanubhavāvaṣṭambhenāsmābhīstādīyadvaitānādarāṇe kiṃ hīyate ityarthaḥ ॥ 101 ॥*

*yathā'nyavādibhiḥ = sāṅkhyādibhiḥ* - like the other philosopher – the Sankhyans etc. *niḥśaṅkaiḥ = śrutyādisiddhasyāpi sadadvaitasyāvajñā kriyate = śrutiuktayanubhavāvaṣṭambhenāsmābhīstādīyadvaitānādarāṇe* - discard the teaching of non-dual Sat which is established by the Shruti, the Absolute Pramana. Supported by Shruti, Yukti (logic) and Anubhava (one's own experience) if we discard their duality. *kiṃ hīyate ityarthaḥ* - what is the loss for us? But, the loss is for them who do not understand this. ॥ 101 ॥

ननु निष्प्रयोजनेयं द्वैतावज्ञा इत्याशङ्क्य, जीवन्मुक्तिलक्षणप्रयोजनसद्भावान्मैवमित्याह –

*nanu niṣprayaneyam dvaitāvajñā ityāśaṅkya, jīvanmuktilakṣaṇaprayojanasadbhāvānmaivamityāha –*

*nanu niṣprayaneyam dvaitāvajñā ityāśaṅkya* – but, there is no use in discarding the duality, doubting this. It is answered, *jīvanmuktilakṣaṇaprayojanasadbhāvānmaivamityāha* – do not say so, since there is the result of being JivanMukta (liberated while alive).

द्वैतावज्ञा सुस्थिता चेदद्वैते धीः स्थिरा भवेत् ।

स्थैर्ये तस्याः पुमानेष जीवन्मुक्त इतीर्यते ॥ १०२ ॥

*dvaitāvajñā susthitā cedadvaite dhīḥ sthirā bhavet /*

*sthairye tasyāḥ pumāneṣa jīvanmukta itīryate // 102 //*

When the idea of ignoring the duality is clearly established, the knowledge of non-duality will become established. When the knowledge of non-duality is established completely, he is called as JivanMukta.

*dvaitāvajñā susthitā ced* – when one has completeness in ignoring the duality. ‘susthitā’ – completely established, without any doubt. *advaite dhīḥ sthirā bhavet* – the knowledge of the non-duality becomes established. *sthairye tasyāḥ* - when this becomes established clearly. *pumāneṣa jīvanmukta itīryate* – that person is called as JivanMukta.

द्वैतेति ॥ १०२ ॥

*dvaiteti // 102 //*

Maybe, till the end of life, while being alive, one does not have delusion, but after the death, it is definitely possible for the liberated, one who has gained the glimpse of the Self, one who does not have a steadfast knowledge; this doubt is removed.

न केवलं जीवन्मुक्तिरेव प्रयोजनम् , अपि तु विदेहमुक्तिरपीत्यभिप्रायेण कृष्णवाक्यमप्युदाहरति –

*na kevalam jīvanmuktireva prayojanam , api tu videhamuktirapītyabhiprāyeṇa kṛṣṇavākyamapyudāharati –*

*na kevalam jīvanmuktireva prayojanam* – JivanMukti is not the only result. *api tu videhamuktirapītyabhiprāyeṇa kṛṣṇavākyamapyudāharati* – but, there is also VidehaMukti (liberated after death), accepted as result, with this in mind, Sri Krishna’s statement is shown as Pramana.

एशा ब्रह्मी स्थितिः पार्थ ! नैनां प्राप्य विमुह्यति ।

स्थित्वाऽस्यामन्तकालेऽपि ब्रह्म निर्वाणमृच्छति ॥ १०३ ॥

*eśā brahmī sthitiḥ pārtha ! naināṃ prāpya vimuhyati /*

*sthitvā'syāmantakāle'pi brahma nirvāṇamṛcchati // 103 //*

*O Arjuna! This is the state of being Self. After gaining this, one does not become deluded. If one is established in this at the end of ones life, he attains the Bliss of the Self.*

*eśā brahmī sthitiḥ* - This is the state of being Brahman. In Bhashya this 'brahmī sthitiḥ' is explained as 'sarvakarma sanyāsa pūrvaka' – the state attained through renunciation of all the Karmas. *pārtha !* – O Partha. Partha means son of Prthu – Kunti. *naināṃ prāpya vimuhyati* – after gaining this, one does not become deluded. *sthītvā'syāmantakāle'pi* – being established even at the end of one's life. 'antakāle'pi' – even at the deathbed, but this thought of the Self is not easy when it is not practiced during the lifetime. *brahma nirvāṇamṛcchati* - he attains the Bliss of the Self.

एषेति ॥ १०३ ॥

*eṣeti ॥ 103 ॥*

‘अन्तकाल’शब्देन वर्तमानदेहपातोऽभिधीयते इत्याशङ्कां वारयितुं विवक्षितमर्थमाह –

*'antakāla'śabdena vartamānadehapāto'bhidhīyate ityāśaṅkāṃ vārayituṃ vivakṣitamarthamāha* –

*'antakāla'śabdena vartamānadehapāto'bhidhīyate ityāśaṅkāṃ* - with the term 'antakāle' – at the deathbed, the coming to end of the current body is said, doubting thus. *vārayituṃ vivakṣitamarthamāha* - To negate this doubt, the idea behind the word is explained.

सदद्वैतेऽनृतद्वैते यदन्योन्यैक्यवीक्षणम् ।

तस्यान्तकालस्तद्भेदबुद्धिरेव न चेतः ॥ १०४ ॥

*sadadvaite'nṛtadvaite yadanyonyaikyavīkṣaṇam ।*

*tasyāntakālastadbhedabuddhireva na cetaraḥ ॥ 104 ।*

*The end period of the erroneous knowledge, of seeing the identity between the non-dual Sat and illusory duality, by differentiating them and nothing else.*

*sadadvaite'nṛtadvaite* – the non-dual Sat and illusory duality. *yadanyonyaikyavīkṣaṇam* – which has become as-though inseparable. *tasyāntakālastadbhedabuddhireva* – this



differentiating their identity is what is referred through the term 'antakāla'. *na cetaraḥ* - and not anything else.

सदद्वैते इति । सद्वृपेऽद्वैतेऽनृतरूपे द्वैते च यदन्योन्याध्यासलक्षणमैक्यज्ञानमस्ति, तस्य ऐक्यभ्रमस्य अन्तकालो नाम तयोरद्वैतद्वैतयोः सत्यानृतरूपेण भेदबुद्धिरेव, नापरो वर्तमानदेहपात इत्यर्थः ॥ १०४ ॥

*sadadvaite iti / sadrūpe'dvaite'nṛtarūpe dvaite ca yadanyonyādhyāsalakṣaṇamaikyajñānamasti, tasya aikyabhramasya antakālo nāma tayoradvaitadvaitayoḥ satyānṛtarūpeṇa bhedabuddhireva, nāparo vartamānadehapāta ityārthaḥ ॥ 104 ॥*

*sadrūpe'dvaite'nṛtarūpe dvaite ca yadanyonyādhyāsalakṣaṇamaikyajñānamasti* – the knowledge of identity between the non-dual Sat and the illusory Duality, that is of the form of superimposing one on the other. *tasya aikyabhramasya antakālo nāma* - end to that erroneous knowledge of identity means. The current knowledge is of the form of 'atasmin tad buddhi' – the knowledge of that in not that. *tayoradvaitadvaitayoḥ satyānṛtarūpeṇa bhedabuddhireva* - only the differentiative (discriminative) knowledge of those duality and non-duality (between the Self and inert) in the form of real and illusory, is said here as antakāla. The discrimination (viveka) said earlier in the prerequisite is general, and of the form of desire for that knowledge and not a clear knowledge as it is gained now. *nāparo vartamānadehapāta ityārthaḥ* - and not the death of the current body. ॥ 104 ॥

इदानीं लोकप्रसिद्धार्थस्वीकारेऽपि न दोष इत्यभिप्रायेणाह-

*idānīm lokaprasiddhārthasvīkāre'pi na doṣa ityabhiprāyeṇāha-*

*idānīm lokaprasiddhārthasvīkāre'pi na doṣa ityabhiprāyeṇāha* – Now, even if we accept eht meaning generally accepted in the world to be the meaning there is no problem. This this idea in mind, it is explained.

यद्वाऽन्तकालः प्राणस्य वियोगोऽस्तु प्रसिद्धितः ।

तस्मिन्कालेऽपि न भ्रान्तेर्गतायाः पुनरागमः ॥ १०५ ॥

*yadvā'ntakālaḥ prāṇasya viyogo'stu prasiddhitaḥ /*

*tasminkāle'pi na bhrāntergatāyāḥ punarāgamaḥ ॥ 105 ॥*

Otherwise, let 'antakale' be understood as the time the vital air leaves the body, as accepted in the world. Even then the erroneous knowledge which is removed, cannot come back during that time.

*yadvā'ntakālaḥ* - otherwise, the term 'antakale'. *prāṇasya viyogo'stu* – be understood as the time of the vital air leaving the body. *prasiddhitāḥ* - as it is the famously accepted meaning. *tasminkāle'pi* – even during that time. *na bhrāntergatāyāḥ punarāgamāḥ* - the erroneous knowledge which is annihilated, does not come back.

उक्तमेवार्थं प्रपञ्चयति –

*uktamevārthaṃ prapañcayati* –

*uktamevārthaṃ prapañcayati* – the aforesaid idea is explained in detail. This should be understood for the one with immediate knowledge and not just mediate knowledge.

नीरोग उपविष्टो वा रुग्णो वा विलुठन्भुविः ।

मूर्च्छितो वा त्यजत्वेष प्राणान्भ्रान्तिर्न सर्वथा ॥ १०६ ॥

*nīroga upaviṣṭo vā rugṇo vā viluṭhanbhuvih* /

*mūrcchito vā tyajatveṣa prāṇānbhrāntirna sarvathā* // 106

//

Let him leave the Prana while sitting with good health, or afflicted by disease, or turning on the ground or without any consciousness, he will never get deluded.

*nīroga upaviṣṭo vā* – let him sit with a healthy physic. *rugṇo vā* – or be afflicted by disease. *viluṭhanbhuvih* - or turning or moving around on the ground. *mūrcchito vā* – or be without any consciousness. With 'vā' – we should understand the other options which are not specified. *tyajatveṣa prāṇān* – let him leave the Prana. *bhrāntirna sarvathā* – he will never be afflicted by the delusion. Or it can be read as 'sarvadhā' – in all places.

नीरोग इति ॥ १०६ ॥

*nīroga iti* // 106 //

ननु प्राणवियोगकाले मूर्च्छादिना ज्ञाननाशे भ्रान्तिः स्यादेव इत्याशङ्क्या ज्ञाननाशाभावे दृष्टान्तमाह –

*nanu prāṇaviyogakāle mūrccchādinā jñānanāśe bhrāntiḥ syādeva ityāśaṅkyā jñānanāśābhāve dr̥ṣṭāntamāha –*

*nanu prāṇaviyogakāle* - but, during the time of Prana leaving the body (death). *mūrccchādinā jñānanāśe* - with the unconsciousness etc. on loses his knowledge. *bhrāntiḥ syādeva* – he will definitely be afflicted with delusion. *ityāśaṅkyā* - doubting thus. *jñānanāśābhāve dr̥ṣṭāntamāha* – an example for the absence of knowledge is explained.

दिने दिने स्वप्नसुप्त्योरधीते विस्मृतेऽप्ययम् ।

परेद्युर्नानधीतः स्यात्तद्वद्विद्या न नश्यति ॥ १०७ ॥

*dine dine svapnasuptyoradhīte vismr̥te'pyayam /*

*paredyurnānadhītaḥ syāttadvadvidyā na naśyati ॥ 107 ॥*

*Every day in the dream or deep sleep states the Vedas which was studied is though forgotten, he does not become illiterate the next day. Similarly, the knowledge does not get destroyed.*

*dine dine* - everyday. *svapnasuptyor* – in dream or deep sleep state. *adhīte vismr̥te'pi* – the things studied are though forgotten. *ayam paredyur* – this person, the next day. *nānadhītaḥ syāt* – does not become illiterate. *tadvadvidyā na naśyati* - similarly, the knowledge too does not get destroyed. This answer is said, from the standpoint of the dull and Mediocre seeker, because when we have already established in Shloka 98, the ignorance is destroyed, once for all, how can it come back?

दिने दिने इति । यथा प्रत्यहमधीते वेदे स्वप्नसुप्त्याद्यवस्थायां विस्मृतेऽपि परेद्युर्नधीतवेदत्वं नास्ति, तथा मृतिकालेऽपि तत्त्वानुसंधानाभावेऽपि ज्ञाननाशाभाव इत्यर्थः ॥ १०७ ॥

*dine dine iti / yathā pratyahamadhīte vede svapnasuṣṭyādyavasthāyāṃ vismr̥te'pi paredyuranadhītavedatvaṃ nāsti, tathā mṛtikāle'pi tattvānusaṃdhānābhāve'pi jñānanāśābhāva ityarthāḥ ॥ 107 ॥*

*yathā pratyahamadhīte vede* - as in the case of, the Vedas studies everyday. *svapnasuṣṭyādyavasthāyāṃ vismr̥te'pi* - though is forgotten in the states of dream and deep sleep. *paredyuranadhītavedatvaṃ nāsti* – one does not become completely illiterate. *tathā mṛtikāle'pi* - similarly, even during the time of death.

*tattvānusamdhānābhāve'pi* - though there is absence of inquiry into the Self (memory of the Self). *jñānanāsābhāva ityarthah* - there is absence of the destruction of knowledge. We have already established, the knowledge gained through the Mahavakya, which produces 'akhandākāra vrtti' and this thought function destroys all the other and itself - 'sva para nivartya'. // 107 //

ज्ञाननाशाभावमेवोपपादयति –

*jñānanāsābhāvamevopapādayati* –

*jñānanāsābhāvamevopapādayati* - this state of knowledge not getting destroyed is proven through logic.

प्रमाणोत्पादिता विद्या प्रमाणं प्रबलं विना ।

न नश्यति न वेदान्तात्प्रबलं मानमीक्ष्यते ॥ १०८ ॥

*pramāṇotpādītā vidyā pramāṇaṃ prabalaṃ vinā ।*

*na naśyati na vedāntātprabalaṃ mānamīkṣyate ॥ 108 ॥*

The knowledge gained through Pramana, cannot be destroyed except through a powerful Pramana. And there is no powerful Pramana, than Vedanta.

*pramāṇotpādītā vidyā* – the knowledge gained through Pramana. Pramana here is Vedantic statements, and more importantly Mahavakya. *pramāṇaṃ prabalaṃ vinā* – cannot be destroyed, without a powerful Pramana. *na naśyati* – (therefore the knowledge) is not destroyed. *na vedāntātprabalaṃ mānamīkṣyate* - and there is no powerful Pramana, that is known.

For example, we see the moon to be of the size of a small pizza. But, this direct perception is negated through the verbal testimony, like the jyotish-shastra (astrology). And this is negated by the most powerful Pramana shruti, which says it is Mithya. And there is more powerful than the Shruti.

If there is contradiction between other Pramanas and smriti (texts written by great people based on the Shruti), smriti is powerful Pramana. But, when there is contradiction between the smriti and shruti, shruti is most powerful Pramana.

But, if there is contradiction between two shruti statements like statements which describe the creation, is negated by the Vedanta statements.

प्रमाणेति ॥ १०८ ॥

*pramāṇeti ॥ 108 ॥*

उपपादितमर्थमुपसंहरति –

*upapāditamarthamupasaṃharati –*

*upapāditamarthamupasaṃharati –* the topic established is concluded.

तस्माद्वेदान्तसंसिद्धं सदद्वैतं न बाध्यते ।

अन्तकालेऽप्यतो भूतविवेकान्निर्वृतिः स्थिता ॥ १०९ ॥

*tasmādvēdāntasaṃsiddham sadadvaitam na bādhyate ।*

*antakāle'pyato bhūtavivekānnirvṛtiḥ sthitā ॥ 109 ॥*

*Therefore the knowledge of non-dual Self which is established through the Vedanta is not negated even at the end of one's life. Therefore, the Bliss (liberation), stays eternal which is gained through the discrimination of the elements.*

*tasmādvēdāntasaṃsiddham* - therefore, the knowledge established through Vedanta. *sadadvaitam* - of the non-dual Self. *na bādhyate* – does not get negated. *antakāle'pi* – even during the time of death. *ato bhūtavivekānnirvṛtiḥ sthitā* – therefore, the Bliss gained through the discrimination of the elements is eternal.

॥ इति श्रीविद्यारण्यमुनिविरचितायां पञ्चदश्यां पञ्चभूतविवेकः समाप्तः ॥

*॥ iti śrīvidyāraṇyamuniviracitāyāṃ pañcadaśyāṃ pañcabhūtavivekaḥ samāptaḥ ॥*

तस्मात् इति ॥ १०९ ॥

*tasmāt iti ॥ 109 ॥*

॥ इति परमहंसपरिव्राजकाचार्यश्रीमद्भारतीतीर्थविद्यारण्यमुनिवर्यकिंकरेण रामकृष्णेन विरचितायां तात्पर्यदीपिकाख्यायां पञ्चभूतविवेकाख्यं  
द्वितीयप्रकरणं समाप्तम् ॥

॥

iti

*paramahaṃsaparivrājakācāryaśrīmadbhāratīīrthavidyāraṇyamunivaryakiṅkareṇa  
rāmakṛṣṇeṇa viracitāyāṃ tātparyadīpikākhyāyāṃ pañcabhūtavivekākhyāṃ  
dviṭīyaprakaraṇaṃ samāptam ॥*