

(No blending together of function of senses)

उच्यते—अत्रापि नास्तीन्द्रियाणां स्वविषयग्रहण व्यतिकरः । किं तर्हि

स्वां स्वां प्रतिपद्यन्ते परस्पराकूतहेतुकी वृत्तिम् ।

पुरुषार्थ एव हेतुर्न केनचिन् कार्यते करणम् ॥ ३१ ॥

यस्य करणस्य या वृत्तिरपदिष्टा तद्यथा श्रोत्रस्य शब्दग्रहणम् चक्षुषो रूपग्रहणम् इत्यादि । तामेव प्रतिपद्यन्ते—स्वविषयजिघृक्षयाऽवलम्बन्त इत्यर्थः परस्परस्याकूतं परस्पराकूतम् । आकूतमभिप्रायोऽभिसन्धिरित्यर्थः । परस्पराकूतं हेतुः प्रतिपत्तेरस्याः, सेयं परस्पराकूतहेतुकी । परस्पराकूतं प्रतिपत्तेः कारणमिति कृत्वा ताच्छब्दं लभते । तद्यथा दधित्रपुसंज्वरः । एतदुक्तं भवति यदा चक्षुषाऽऽम्रदाडिमादि रूपमुपलब्धं भवति तदा रसनेन्द्रियमुपात्तविषयस्य चक्षुषो वृत्तिं संवेद्य स्वविषयजिघृक्षयौत्सुक्यवद्विकारमापद्यते, रसनस्य वृत्तिं संवेद्य पादौ विहरणमारभेते हस्तावादानं, तावद्यावदसौ विषयो रसनेन्द्रिययोग्यतां नीतः । ततो रसनं स्वविषये प्रवर्तते । एवमितरेष्वपि वक्तव्यम् ।

Proponent : Here also there is no blending together of the organs in cognising their respective objects. On the contrary

EACH OF THE ORGANS PERFORMS ITS RESPECTIVE FUNCTION CAUSED BY MUTUAL INTENTION. THE PURPOSE OF THE PURUSA IS THE CAUSE (IMPELLOR) AND THE ORGAN IS NOT IMPELLED TO ACT BY ANYTHING ELSE.

The organs resort to (or perform) that function which is said with reference to that particular organ, just as the cognition of word by ears and the cognition of form by the eye and so on. They attain that only the sense is that they take resoures to that only with the intention of cognising the own object. The compound 'mutual intention' means the intention of each other. Intention means impulse or purpose. The compound 'caused by the mutual intention' means 'the cause of the resort to which is the mutual intention.' Since the mutual intention is the cause, it attains the same word just as the expression as 'curd in association with the zink is the fever'. This is what is to be stated. When the form of a mango or a pomegranate fruit is observed by the eye, then after understanding the function of the eye which has come into contact with the object, the tongue gets deviated from its natural state and becomes endowed with an intention to take or seize its object. After understanding the function of the tongue the feet start walking and the hands start grasping. It happens so until the object is not brought under the capacity (or reach) of the tongue. Then, the tongue proceeds to its object.³ Similar

should be said about the other organs.

(Senses do not have understanding)

आह. यद्येवं तेन तर्हीन्द्रियान्तरवृत्तिसंवेदनेऽक्षप्रत्ययवत्प्रसंगः। यदि तर्हीन्द्रियान्तर-
णेन्द्रियान्तरस्य वृत्तिः संवेद्यते, प्राप्तमस्य प्रत्ययवत्त्वम्। अथाऽप्रत्ययमिन्द्रियं परस्पराकृतसं-
वेदनं, तर्हि न वाच्यमिति। किं च परस्परद्वारिद्वारभावप्रसंगश्च। इन्द्रियान्तर चेदिन्द्रियान्तर-
स्य वृत्तिं संवेद्य स्वार्थमाकांक्षेत्, प्राप्तमस्य द्वारित्वमितरस्य च द्वारत्वम्। तदयुक्तमिन्द्रियाणां
परस्पराकृतसंवेदनमिति।

Opponent : If it is so (i.e. if the function of one organ is supposed to be understood by the other), there arises the undesirable contingency of admitting that the organs are endowed with (the power of) understanding in respect of understanding the function of the other organ. If the function of one organ is understood by other, it becomes, by implication, endowed with the understanding. If the sense is devoid of understanding, its understanding of mutual intention should not be mentioned. Moreover, there arises (in this case) the undesirable contingency of admitting the relation of a gate and gate-keeper. If one sense would aspire for its object after understanding the function of the other it would be the gate-keeper (principal) and the rest the gates (subordinate).² Therefore, the understanding of mutual intention is incompatible in case of the senses.

उच्यते- न, उपचारात्। प्रागेवोपदिष्टमस्माभिरप्रत्ययमिन्द्रियमिति। किं तर्हि स्वविष-
यस्य पटोः सहचारिणमर्थमिन्द्रियान्तरविषयतामापन्नं संस्पृश्य स्वभावत इन्द्रियान्तरं स्वविषयं
प्रति साकांक्षं भवति, तत्सन्निधौ विक्रियादर्शनात्। तत्र संवेदनमुपचर्यैवमुच्यते इत्यदोषः। किं
चान्यत्। भौतिकावयवप्रत्ययविवृत्तिवत्तद्विवृत्तेः। यथा बद्धेः प्रसादसमनन्तरं भौतिकानामव-
यवानां मुखनयनादीनां प्रसादो भवति, न चैषां प्रत्ययवत्त्वम्, एवमिहापि स्यात्। न च प्रत्यय-
वत्त्वम्। एतेन द्वारिद्वारभावः प्रत्युक्तः।

Proponent : No, because it is metaphorical. It is already stated by us in the beginning that the senses are devoid of understanding. On the contrary, after touching (i.e. coming into contact with) its respective object which is in contact with the other sense, the same naturally becomes desirous of its own object, because the deviation from its natural state is observed in the vicinity of that. This is stated so after ascribing metaphorically the under-

standing to that and, hence, this is no fault. Moreover, because its expression is like the expression of understanding in the elemental components (of the body) just as with the tranquility or happiness of the intellect, there becomes the tranquility in the elemental components (of the body), like face and the eye and they are not possessed of understanding.⁴ Similar may be the case here. And they are not possessed of understanding. By this only, the (argument based upon) the relation of the gate-keeper and the gate is refuted.

(Another interpretation of mutual intention)

मनोऽधिष्ठानसामर्थ्याद्वा । अथवा परस्परविषयमाकूतं परस्परकूतम्, यथा जलविषयः पुरुषः जलपुरुषः । आकूतमिच्छा संकल्पः मन इत्यर्थः । स हेतुरस्याः सेयंपरस्परकूतहेतुकी ताम् । एतदुक्तं भवति, यता किंचिद्दिन्यं विषये प्रवृत्तं भवति तदा तदद्वारेण समस्तमर्थमुपलभ्य तत्सहचारिणमर्थान्तरमाकांक्षदिन्द्रियान्तरं वृत्त्या प्रतितिष्ठते । तेनाकांक्षावता मनसाऽधिष्ठितमिन्द्रियं विक्रियामापद्यते । तथा च तन्त्रान्तरेऽप्युक्तं – “यस्य यस्येन्द्रियस्य विषयं मनो ध्यायत्यभिसम्पत्त्यर्थेन तस्य तस्यौत्सुक्यं प्रवृत्तिश्च भवतीति ।” एतदुक्तं स्वां स्वां प्रतिपद्यन्ते परस्परकूतहेतुकीं वृत्तिमिति ।

Or, it may be due to the capability of controlling in Mind. Or, the compound 'mutual intention' means the intention about (i.e. related to) each other, just as the compound 'water-man' means the 'man related to water'. Intention means desire, resolution, i.e. the mind. The compound 'caused by mutual intention' means that function whose cause is that (mind). This is what is to be stated : When some senses starts its function with reference to its object, then after cognising the whole object through that the mind desiring for the other object related to the former object stands in need of the function of the other sense. Controlled by the Manas having the desire the organ gets disturbed. It is stated so in the other system also : “Whose object the mind ponders over with the purpose of accomplishing in that very sense arises eagerness and activity.” Thus is explained that each sense takes recourse to its respective function caused by mutual intention.

(Mind does not physically operate the senses)

किमिन्द्रियं मनोवृत्त्याधिष्ठाय स्वविषये प्रवर्तयति यथा परश्वादीश्चैत्र इति ?

Opponent : Does the mind operate the sense towards the object through its own function as Chaitra does something with the

axe etc?

नेत्युच्यते । किं तर्हि स्वविषयसंकल्पानुगृहीतस्य मनसः संस्पर्शात्स्वय-
मेवेन्द्रियं स्वविषयं प्रतिपद्यते । कस्मात् ? प्रयोगशक्त्यसिद्धेः । न हि यथा
चैत्रस्य परश्वादिप्रयोगशक्तिः सिद्धा एवं मनस इन्द्रियप्रयोगशक्तिः । तस्मादयु-
क्तमिन्द्रियस्य मनः प्रेरकमिति । रज इति चेत्स्यान्मतम्, रजसो हीन्द्रियान्तरप्र-
योगसामर्थ्यं विद्यते । तस्मादयुक्तमुक्त प्रयोगशक्त्यसिद्धेर्नेन्द्रियाणां मनः प्रयो-
जकमिति । एतच्चायुक्तम् ? कस्मात् ? अविशेषात् । इन्द्रियान्तरेऽपि हि तर्हि
रजोऽस्तीत्यत आत्मभूतेनैवास्य निमित्तेन प्रवृत्तिरप्रतिषिद्धा, किं मनसा परिक-
ल्पितेनेति ? किं चान्यत्, करणान्तरानुपपत्तेः । चैत्रो हि परश्वादीनां प्रयोगं
करणान्तरेण करोति । न तु मनसः करणान्तरमस्तीत्यसमानम् । पाणिवादिति
चेन्न, चैत्रव्यापारपक्षत्वात् । तदपि हि चैत्रव्यापारपक्षं प्रवर्तते न स्वतः । किंच
तद्व्यतिवेरेण प्रवृत्त्युपलब्धेः । यस्य हि प्रयोजकान्तरापेक्षा प्रवृत्तिः न तस्य
कदाचिदपि स्वतन्त्रस्य भवति । अस्ति तु संकल्पव्यतिरेकेण मेघस्तनितादि-
ष्विन्द्रियस्य प्रवृत्तिः । तस्मान्नेन्द्रियान्तरस्य मनः कारकम् । न चेत्कारकं यथा
मौलानां गुणानामेवमिहापि पुरुषार्थं एवं हेतुर्न केन चित्कार्यते करणमिति
सिद्धम् ॥ ३१ ॥

No, on the contrary, after coming in contact with the mind which is possessed of the desire for its object the sense by itself goes to its respective object.

Why?

Because the power of employing (others to activity) is not proved (in case of mind). The power of employing the senses (to activity) is not proved in case of the mind as the power of employing the axe, etc., is proved in the case of Caitra, etc. Therefore, it is wrong that mind is the impellor of the senses. If it is argued that it is the Rajas,⁵ it may be like this. There is the power of employing (or impelling) the senses to activity in Rajas.⁶ Therefore it is wrong to say that on account of the non-establishment of the power of employing, the mind is not the impellor of the senses.

This is also wrong.

Why?

Because it is common. The Rajas exists in the other senses as well and, hence, its activity is not obstructed in case of Rajas forming the senses itself and serving as the cause of the activity. What is, then, the use of postulation of (impelling by) mind.

Moreover, there is no possibility of some other organ. Caitra

employs the axe, etc., through some other organ. There is, however, no organ of the mind and hence, there is this dissimilarity (in the example). If it is argued that it may be (motivated) like the hands, etc., we reply, no, because it (hand) also requires function of Caitra. That (hand) also while functioning requires the function of Caitra, and does not function by itself. Moreover, because the act (of the sense) is observed without that (mind). In the case of one requiring the activity of the other impellor for its activity, the activity is never observed independently. The activity of the senses (independently) is there in case of the thundering of the cloud, etc. Therefore, mind is not the impellor of the senses. When there is no impellor, it is proved that the cause is the purpose of the puruṣa (and) the organ is not activated by anything else, as is the case with (the activity of) the original constituents.⁶

KĀRIKĀ 31

1. It suggests that the eye and the tongue act upon the same object.
2. The object is the same but there is no blending together of the activities of the organs. Each of them has a separate function.
3. The organ the activity of which precedes would be like a gate and the other organ which is said to understand the activity would function like a gate-keeper (principal). But such a relation is admitted in case of external and internal organs only and not amongst the external organs mutually.
4. The expression of face, etc., are changed in happiness, misery, etc., even though happiness, etc., are located in Intellect. The face, etc., being material in nature, cannot understand misery or happiness of the intellect to reflect them through expression. Similarly, the organs though insentient, may act in accordance with the impression in the other organ.
5. Since rajas is active and motivating and the mind has it as one of its constituents, the mind may be considered as an impeller or motivating force.
6. It suggests that the constituents automatically act and purpose of the conscious entity is served with the activities of the constituents.

KĀRIKĀ 32

(Number of organs is thirteen)

आह, करणं प्रत्याचार्यविप्रतिपत्तेः [तदवधारणं कर्तव्यम् । इाचार्यणां करणं प्रति विप्र-
तिपत्तिः] । एकादशविधमिति वार्षगणाः । दशविधमिति तान्त्रिकाः पञ्चाधिकरणप्रभृत्यः ।
द्वादशविधमिति पतञ्जलिः । तस्माद् भवतः कतिविधं करणमभिप्रेतमिति वक्तव्यमेतत् ।

Opponent : On account of the difference of opinion amongst the
authorities regarding the organs, its decision should be made.
There is the controversy amongst the authorities about the or-
gans. According to the followers of Vārṣaganya they are of
eleven kinds; according to the followers of the Tantra,¹ Pañcād-
hikaraṇa etc., they are of ten kinds; according to Patāñjali they
are of twelve kinds. Therefore, it should be stated as to how
many kinds of the organs are intended by you.

उच्यते—

करणं त्रयोदशविधं तदाहरणधारणप्रकाशकरम् ।

पञ्च कर्मेन्द्रियाणि पञ्च बुद्धिन्द्रियाणि मनोऽहङ्कारो बुद्धिश्चेत्येतत्सर्वं पुरुषार्थोपयो-
गिकरणम् । कस्मात् ? अपुरुषार्थोपयोगित्वे तत्त्वान्तरानुपपत्तिप्रसंगात् । यदि यथा वार्षगणा
आहुः— लिङ्गमात्रे महानसंवेद्यः कार्यकारणरूपेण विशिष्टाविशिष्टलक्षणेन, तथा स्यात्तत्त्वान्त-
रम् । तत्र स्यात्, अनर्थकत्वात् ।

**THE ORGANS ARE OF THIRTEEN KIND AND PERFORM THE
ACT OF SEIZING, RETAINING AND ILLUMINATING**

The five organs of action, five organs of sense, mind, egoism
and the intellect—all these form the organs for conscious entity.

Why?

Because if they are not useful to conscious entity's purpose,
there would arise the undesirable contingency of impossibility of
their being distinct category. If it is accepted as hold the followers of
Vārṣaganya—the intellect which is the only internal organ is not cog-

nisible in the form of the effect and cause or in the form of the specific or the non-specific, it may be such a distinct category (if any). That (kind of distinct entity) would not exist because it will not serve any purpose.

आह, सत्यम्, प्रधानलक्षणानां गुणानां वैषम्यमात्ररूपत्वेऽपि तत्त्वान्तरमसौ भविष्यतीति । कस्मात् ? साम्याद्वैषम्यमुपाख्यानन्तरमिति ।

Opponent : It is true, inspite of being the form of merely the unequilibrium of the constituents also it would be a distinct category. How?

Since the unequilibrium bears the other name than the equilibrium.

एतच्चायुक्तम् । कस्मात् ? तत्त्वानवस्थाप्रसंगात् । एवं हि परिकल्प्यमाने प्रधानमह-
तोऽर्थदन्तरालं तत्त्वान्तराणां तदपि च क्रियारूपत्वादक्रियावत् उपाख्यानन्तरमिति
तत्त्वान्तरऽनवस्थाप्रसंगः । अभ्युपगमे वा महतस्तत्त्वान्तराणां च क्रियाकालविरोधः । तस्मात्त-
त्त्वान्तराऽनुपपत्तिरनवस्था वा, त्रयोदशविधं करणमित्यन्यतरवदवश्यमभ्युपगन्तव्यम् । तत्र
चाऽस्मत्प्रतिज्ञातमेव निर्दोषं लक्ष्यते । तस्मादुपपन्नमेतत् त्रयोदशविधं करणमिति ।

Proponent : This is also wrong.

How?

Because it would lead to the undesirable contingency with regard to the (number) of categories. If this is postulated so, the intermediate state between the cosmic matter and the intellect as also the other elements, which is not possessed of activity since it is of the nature of activity itself, will bear some other name and, thus, there would arise the undesirable contingency of the infinite regress regarding the distinct categories. If it is admitted so, there would be the contradiction with the time of activity in the intellect as well as the other categories. Therefore, either there would be the impossibility of distinct category or the infinite regress with reference to the categories. It should be accepted as a midway alternative that organs are of thirteen kinds. In that case the view established by us only seems to be faultless. Therefore, it is justified that the organs are of thirteen kinds.

(Activity of the organs)

आह, करणमिति क्रियाकारकसम्बन्धगर्भोऽयं निर्देशः । कथम् ? येन तत्करणमिति ।
तत्र वक्तव्यम् का क्रिया, किं च तत्क्रियते यदपेक्ष्य बुद्ध्यादीनां करणत्वमिति ?

Opponent : The mention of organ implies its relation between the

activity and the agent.

How?

Because due to that (relation) it is an organ. There, it should be stated as to what is the activity here; and what is the object accomplished from the standpoint of which there is the instrumentality in the case of intellect etc.

उच्यते - यदुक्तं का क्रियेत्यत्र ब्रूमः - तन्निर्वर्तकमिहाभिप्रेतम् न दण्डादिवत्, किं तर्हि तदाहरणधारणप्रकाशकरम् । तत्राऽऽहरणं कर्मेन्द्रियाणि कुर्वन्ति विषयार्जनसमर्थत्वात् । धारणं बुद्धीन्द्रियाणि कुर्वन्ति, विषयसन्निधाने सति श्रोत्रादिवृत्तेस्तद्रूपापत्तेः । प्रकाश-मन्तःकरणं करोति, निश्चयसामर्थ्यात् ।

As to the statement what is that act, we say - here, that (organ) is intended to be the accomplisher of that (act) but not like a stick etc.² On the contrary, they accomplish the function of seizing, retaining and illuminating. Out of these, the organs of actions perform the act of seizing, because they are capable of procuring the objects. The organs of sense perform the act of retaining because after coming in contact with the object the function of ear, etc., attain the form of that. The internal organs perform the act of illuminating because of their capability of determining.

(Another mode of assigning seizing, retaining and illuminating)

अपर आह-आहरणं कर्मेन्द्रियाणि कुर्वन्ति । धारणं मनोऽहंकारश्च । प्रकाशनं बुद्धीन्द्रियाणि बुद्धिश्चेति । एतदभिसन्धाय बुद्ध्यादीनां करणत्वमुच्यत इति ।

The other explain as - the organs of action perform the act of seizing, the mind and the egoism perform the act of retaining and the organs of sense and the intellect perform the act of illuminating. With this intention is stated the instrumentality of the organs.

(Objects of the organs)

यत्तुक्तं किं कार्यमिति, उच्यते-

कार्यं च तस्य दशधा

दशधेति पञ्च विशेषाः पञ्चाऽविशेषाः । तदप्यत एव कार्यशब्दं लभते

। आहार्यं धार्यं प्रकाश्यं च ॥ ३२ ॥

तद्व्यवहर्तव्यं धारणीयं प्रकाशयितव्यं च । अतः कार्यमित्युच्यते, न निर्वर्त्य-त्वात् ॥३२॥

As regards the statement as to what is the object accomplished,

we say that :

AND THE OBJECTS ACCOMPLISHED ARE OF TEN KINDS.

The ten kinds consist of five specific and five non-specific objects.³ Therefore, these also are called the accomplished objects : *to be seized, retained and illumined.*

They are to be seized, retained and illumined. They are, therefore, called the accomplished objects, and not because they are produced (by the senses).⁴

KĀRIKĀ 32

1. Tantra may refer either to the philosophical school of Sāṃkhya or the Śaṣṭitantra, a work of some unknown author.
2. They are not the means of producing something like a stick but the action performed by them is of a different kind.
3. The specific and non-specific objects signify the gross elements and the subtle elements respectively.
4. The karaṇa may be used to produce something or to operate on something already accomplished. The function of the organs is of the latter type.

KĀRIKĀ 33

(Internal organs)

एतस्मिन्त्रयोदशविधे तु करणे त्रयोदशं कतरदिति ?

Opponent : In this group of thirteen organs what are these thirteen organs?

उच्यते - बुद्धिरहंकारो मनश्च । तस्मात् ।

अन्तःकरणं त्रिविधम्

कस्मात् ? विषयाऽनभिस्सन्धानात् । श्रोत्रादिप्रणालिकया च विषयसंप्रतिपत्तेः । अविशेषाऽभिधानाद् बुद्ध्यादिप्रतिपत्तिरयुक्तेति चेत्स्यान्मतम्, अविशेषेणेदमुक्तमाचार्येण अन्तःकरणं त्रिविधमिति । तत्र कथमिदमवगम्यते बुद्ध्यहंकारमनसां ग्रहणमिहाभिप्रेतं, न पुनरन्येषामिति ? उच्यते - न, प्रथमसंख्याव्यतिक्रमहेतुनपपत्तेः । बुद्धयदिसंख्यां हि व्यतिक्रममाणस्य प्रतिपत्तौ नास्ति हेतुः । तस्मात्तेषामेव ग्रहणम् । यथा वसन्ताय कपिञ्जलानालभत इति । श्रोत्रस्यान्तःकरणत्वप्रसंगादयुक्तमिति चेत् स्यादेतत् - बुद्धिमहंकारं चोक्त्वा तत आह बुद्धीन्द्रियाणि कर्णत्वक्चक्षूरसननासिकाख्यानीति (का. २६) । तस्माच्छ्रोत्रमन्तःकरणं प्रसज्यत इति । एतदनुपपन्नम् । कस्मात् ? मनसः पृथग्भिधानात् । अत एवेदमाचार्येणापेक्ष्य मनसोऽन्तःकरणत्वं पृथगुक्तम् - तच्चेन्द्रियमुभयथा समाख्यातम्, अन्तस्त्रिकालविषयमिति (का. २७) । तस्मादुपपन्नमन्तःकरणं त्रिविधं बुद्ध्यादीति ।

(These include) intellect, egoism and the mind. Therefore,

THE INTERNAL ORGANS ARE OF THREE KINDS.

How?

Because they do not come in contact with the object (directly). And, because they observe the object through the channel of ear, etc.¹

If it is argued since the mention is without some specification it becomes wrong to understand intellect etc., (here)? It may be like this. It is stated by the authority without some specification that the internal organs are three. Then, how is it known that here the mention of intellect, egoism and mind is intended and not of others? No,

because there is no possibility of the reason for transgressing the number stated first. There is no ground for correct understanding in case of the one who transgresses the number of intellect, etc., and therefore, it is the mention of them only as is the case with the idea that he kills the *cātaka* bird for the spring season.

If it is argued that it is wrong because it involves the undesirable contingency of applying the nature of internal organ to the ear? It may be like this. After stating intellect and egoism, the author has stated that the organs of knowledge are those called ear, skin, eye, tongue and nose (Kā. 26). Therefore, it involves the undesirable contingency that the ear is an internal organ.²

This is also wrong.

How?

Because the mind is stated separately. From this viewpoint the nature of the internal organ in the mind is distinctly stated by the authority that is said to be the sense of both kinds (external and internal); the internal organ has the object of three periods of time as their object etc. Therefore, it is right (to say) that the internal organs are of three kinds — intellect and the other.

(External organs)

दशधा बाह्यम् ।

पञ्च बुद्धीन्द्रियाणि पञ्च कर्मेन्द्रियाणीत्येत्द् बाह्यं दशप्रकरमाचार्यैराख्यायते ।

THE EXTERNAL (ARE) OF TEN KINDS

The five organs of knowledge and the five organs of action (together) are said to be ten kinds of external (organs).

आह, दशधा बाह्यमित्यस्यानर्थक्यम्, परिशेषबुद्धेः । अन्तःकरणं त्रिविधमित्युक्ते गम्यत एतत्परिशेषादेव दशधा बाह्यमिति । तस्मात्तदग्रहणमनर्थकमिति ।

Opponent : There is no use of stating that the external are of ten kinds because it is known through remainder. When it is stated that the internal organs are of three kinds, it becomes known through remainder that the external are of ten kinds. Therefore, the mention of that is useless.

उच्यते—न, विषयार्थत्वात् । त्रयस्य विषयाख्यमित्येवं वक्ष्यामीत्याचार्य आरभते । अक्रियमाणे त्वस्मिन् किन्तत् त्रयस्य विषयाख्यमिति न ज्ञायते ।

Proponent : *No, because it is for the (statement) of the object. Therefore, said to be the objects of the three ; 'this I shall state' thus the authority starts. If the (mention) is not made, it is not known as to what is said to be the object of the three.*

आह, एवमपि विषयग्रहणात्सिद्धेर्बाह्यग्रहणपार्थक्यमिति ।

Opponent : This is also accomplished through the mention of the word object, and the mention of the term external serves no purpose.

उच्यते—वक्तव्यं तावदिदमवश्यं विषयभावप्रतिपत्त्यर्थम् । तत्र शेषे वा यथान्यासं वोच्यमाने न कश्चिद्विशेषः । अथवा नेदं बाह्यसंज्ञाप्रतिपत्त्यर्थमारभ्यते, किं तर्हि नियमार्थम् । कथम् ? दशधा बाह्यं शब्दादिविषयग्रहणभूतमेव त्रयस्यापि विषयाख्यं यथा स्यात्, मा भूदन्तःप्राणादिभूतम् । अथवा दशधैव बाह्यम् । भेदविषयं बाह्यमित्यर्थः । प्राणादिभूतस्य तु भेदो नास्तीत्यदोषः ।

Proponent : It should necessarily be stated for the understanding of their being of the nature of object. Then, understanding it as the remainder or stating it as it is done involves no difference. Or, it is not stated for the understanding of the designation of external with reference to it. On the contrary, it is for restriction (or specification).³

How?

So that the ten kinds of external (organs) which have become knowledge (modified into the form) of object like word may be called the object of these and so that the internal (vital airs) in the form of vital air etc., should not be so. Or, (the statement should be understood as) the external are of ten kinds only. The sense is that external are the object causing differentiation (to be differently cognies). There is, however, nodifferentiation in the vital air, etc.⁴ Thus there is no fault.

(External organs are objects of internal organs)

तदेतत्

त्रयस्य विषयाख्यम् ।

बुद्ध्यहंकारमनोलक्षणस्य हि त्रयस्योपात्तविषया बुद्धीन्द्रियकर्मेन्द्रियवृत्तयः सम्पर्काद्विषयरूपप्रत्यवभासनिमित्ततामुपगच्छन्त्यो विषयाख्यतां लभन्ते । तथा मनोऽहंकारावपि बुद्धे । बुद्धिस्तु निश्चयरूपत्वात्करणान्तरनिरपेक्षा सर्वमर्थं प्रवृत्तौ प्रति निश्चयरूपेणाऽध्यस्तं

पुरुषायोपसंहरति ।

तत्र शब्दादिसन्निधाने वृत्तीनां ताद्रूप्यापत्तेस्तदपगमे च ताद्रूप्यापगमात् प्राप्यकारि ।

THAT IS SAID TO BE THE OBJECT OF THE THREE

The functions of the organs of sense and the organs of action which have taken (the form of) the object and becoming the cause of apprehension or assuming the form of the object through their contact (with the object and the internal organs) get the (name 'object' of the internal organs).⁵ Similarly, the mind and the egoism also (become the object) of intellect. However, intellect which does not require any other organ on account of its being of the form of determination submits to the conscious entity all the objects superimposed on it in the form of determination towards activity.

They attain the object because their function attains the form of the objects in the contact of the object, and with the cessation of that (contact) their attaining the form of that also comes to an end.

(The external organs act at present only while
the internal at the three points of time)

साम्प्रतकालं बाह्यम् ।

उपात्तविषयेन्द्रियवृत्तिसन्निधानात् तदाकारसंस्काराधाननिमित्तस्मृतिप्रत्ययवशात्
त्रिकालमाभ्यन्तरं करणम् ॥ ३३ ॥

THE EXTERNAL ORGANS ACT AT PRESENT TIME ONLY.⁶

Due to having the knowledge in the form of memory which is caused by the impression of form brought about by the contact of the function of the senses which has brought (or attained the form of the object): —

THE INTERNAL ORGANS (ACT) AT ALL THE THREE POINTS OF TIME.

KĀRIKĀ 33

1. This is the reason as to why they are called internal.
2. If the three are understood to be the first three in the order of enumeration, ear may be wrongly understood as the internal organ because the author discusses the intellect in the 23rd kārīkā, egoism in the 24th and 25th and proceeds to enumerate the sense-organs in the 26th kārīkā as ear, skin, eye, tongue and nose. If the first three of all these are understood as internal organs, the enumeration would cover intellect, egoism and the ear. Thus, ear would undesirably fall under the internal organs.
3. I.e., the restriction to the external organs excludes the vital airs, as it is discussed further.
4. The external organs are differently cognised, while the vital airs are not cognised so.
5. Here, it should be observed that the statement refers primarily to the sense-organs and secondarily to the organs of action which help the sense-organs in bringing the object within their reach.
6. It is because they act only after coming in contact with the object.

KĀRIKĀ 34

(Objects of organs of sense)

आह, प्राक्छब्दादिषु श्रोत्रादीनामालोचनमात्रं वृत्तिरित्यविशेषेणोक्तम् । तत्र किं तथैव प्रतिपत्तव्यमथेन्द्रियाणां विषयविशेषोऽस्तीति ? अथ चोक्तं कार्यं च तस्य दशधा विशेषलक्षणमविशेषलक्षणं च । तत्र केन कारणेन कस्य विषयस्य ग्रहणमिति ?

Opponent : It is stated in general earlier that the function of the ear, etc., with reference to the sound, etc., is the mere apprehension.¹ In that context should it be understood as it is, or as the object of the senses is the particular object only? And, it is also stated that the object (operated) is also of ten kinds : specific as well as non-specific. Then which object is cognised by which organ?

उच्यते—

बुद्धीन्द्रियाणि तेषां पञ्च विशेषाऽविशेषविषयाणि ।

तेषां पूर्वोक्तानामिन्द्रियाणां यानि बुद्धीन्द्रियाणि पञ्च श्रोत्रादीनि तानि विशेषाऽविशेषविषयाणि प्रतिपत्तृभेदेन । तत्र देवानां यानि इन्द्रियाणि तानि धर्मोत्कर्षाद्विशुद्धान्यविशेषानपि गृह्णन्ति प्रागेव विशेषात्, योगिनां च संप्राप्तविशेषाणाम् । अस्मदादीनां तु विशेषानेव तमसा परिवृतत्वात् ।

Proponent : OF THESE, FIVE ARE THE SENSORY ORGANS ; THESE HAVE THE SPECIFIC AND NON-SPECIFIC THINGS AS THEIR OBJECTS.

Out of those organs mentioned above the five sensory organs have specific as well as non-specific things as their objects, due to the differentiation of the cogniser.² The senses of the gods are pure due to the dominance of Sattva in them (and as such) cognise the non-specific also even earlier to cognising the specific, and the senses of the yogins having cognised specific objects cognise non-specific too. The senses of the beings like us cognise specific objects only since they are covered (or dominated) by Tamas.³

(Objects of organs of action)

आह, किं कर्मेन्द्रियाणामपि प्रतिपत्तृभेदाद् ग्रहणभेदो भवति ?

Opponent : Is there the difference of operation due to the difference of the cogniser in the case of the organs of action also.

नेत्युच्यते । किं तर्हि सर्वेषामेव

वाग्भवति शब्दविषया ।

वागिन्द्रियस्य वाय्वभिहतेषु वदनप्रदेशेषु तात्वादिषु उध्वेनेर्वर्णपदवाक्यश्लोकग्रन्थभावेन विकारापादनं सर्वप्राणिनामविशिष्टम् ।

Proponent : No, on the contrary, of all :

SPEECH HAS SOUND AS ITS OBJECT

The attainment of the modification by the sound in the form of letters, word, sentence, verse and book in the parts of body striking the air, like palate, etc., is the function of the organs of speech, common to all.

आह, अथेतराणि कर्मेन्द्रियाणि कथमिति ?

How are the rest of the organs of action?

उच्यते—

शेषाण्यपि पञ्चविषयाणि ॥ ३४ ॥

पाणिपादपायूपस्थास्तु आदानविहरणोत्सर्गानन्दलक्षणैः कर्मभिः शब्दस्पर्शरसरूपगन्धसमुदायरूपा मूर्तीर्विकुर्वन्तीति ।

Proponent : THE REST ALSO HAVE THE FIVE OBJECTS AS THEIR OBJECTS.

The hand, feet, anus and the generative organ affect the form which is the combination of word, touch, taste, form and handling, walking, excretion and gratification.

(The acts of organs of action are not restricted)

आह, यदि पञ्चविषयाण्येवाऽविशेषाणीति नियमोऽभ्युपगम्यते तेनैकैकरणेष्वादानादिक्रियाऽनुपपत्तिप्रसंग इति ।

Opponent : If the rule that their objects are commonly five objects only is admitted, there will arise the undesirable contingency of

the impossibility of the act of handling etc., in the organs individually.

उच्यते न, नियमप्रतिषेधार्थत्वात् । स्वविषयनियमो बुद्धीन्द्रियवत्कर्मेन्द्रियाणामपि मा विज्ञायीत्यतो नियमप्रतिषेधार्थमिदमारभ्यते । तदर्थमेव चापिशब्दमाचार्योऽधिजगे । सम्भावनाऽर्थमपि च पञ्चविषयाण्येतानि प्रागेव तु चतुस्त्रिविषयाणीति ।

Proponent : No, because it is for the purpose of negating such a rule.

The restriction to the own object may not be understood in the case of the organs of action, as it is found in the case of the organs of sense—hence, the present discussion commences to negate the restriction. For that purpose only the authority has uttered the word 'also'. It also indicates possibility, viz., it has these five objects meaning that it has four or three (also) like the previous one.

(The objects in operation are not non-existent or unreal)

आह, कथमेतदवगम्यते विशेषविशेषविषयाणीन्द्रियाणि, न पुनरसद्विषयाणि इति ?

Opponent : How is it known that senses have the specific and non-specific object, and they are not having non-existent objects as their objects?

उच्यते—विशेषाणामसत्त्वाऽसिद्धेः । प्रत्यक्षतस्तावद्विशेषा उपलभ्यन्ते । तस्मादेषामसत्त्वमशक्यं प्रतिज्ञातुम् । अथापि स्यात्साध्यमेतत्प्रत्यक्षमेवैतदनवद्यम्, बाह्यवस्तुविषयमय-मृगतृष्णिकादिविज्ञानवत्प्रत्यक्षाभासम् । एतच्चायुक्तम् । कस्मात् ? विकल्पानुपपत्तेः । सर्वमभूतमभ्युपगन्तव्यम् । यत्रो नास्ति किञ्चिद् भूतार्थेन प्रत्यक्षं यदपेक्ष्येतरत् । प्रत्यक्षाभासं स्यात् । उक्तस्त्वयं विकल्पः । तस्मादयुक्तं ज्ञानमात्रमिदमिति । किं चान्यत् । विपरीतदर्शनप्रसंगात् । मृगतृष्णिकास्वप्नविषयैरसिद्धिः सतामसत्त्वमिच्छतस्तद्भूदेव विपरीतदर्शनप्रसंगः । तथा हि गन्धर्वनगरादिषु कदाचित्तमेवार्थं गां पश्यति, कश्चिद् गजं पश्यति, कदाचित्पताकाम् । स्वप्ने चैकमूर्तिपतितानां गोपुरुषाश्वरासभनदीवृक्षप्रभृतीनां दर्शनं स्मरणे विपर्ययेण दृष्टम् । तथा वातायनेन हस्तियूथप्रवेशने..... । विच्छिन्नानां चावयवानां पुनः सन्धानं आकाशगमनमनीश्वरस्यानिमित्तं राज्यलाभ इति । तदितरत्रापि स्यात् । न त्वस्ति । तस्मादयुक्तं मृगतृष्णिकास्वप्नादिवदसत्त्वं भावानाम् । अर्थक्रिया च न स्यात् । यथा स्वप्ने स्नातानुलिप्ताशितपीतवस्त्राच्छादितानामफलत्वं दृष्टम्, एवमिहापि स्यात् । शुक्रविसर्गवदिति चेत्, स्यादेतत्—यथा द्वयसमापत्तिपूर्वकः शुक्रविसर्गः स च तदभावेऽपि स्वप्ने भवति, एवमितरत्स्यादिति । तदयुक्तम्, रागादिनिमित्तत्वात् । तथाहि जाग्रतोऽपि तत् द्वयसमापत्तिमन्तरेण भवति । तस्मान्मनोरञ्जनानिमित्तं तत् । प्रेतवदिति चेत् स्यादियं मम सदबुद्धिः, यथा प्रेतानाम-

सद्धिःपूयनद्यादिभिरर्थक्रिया, नरकपालैश्च बाधनम् । एवमत्रापि स्यादिति । तदयुक्तम् । असिद्धत्वात् । न ह्येतदसदिति सिद्धम् । किंच प्रत्यक्षेण चाप्रत्यक्षबाधनात् । इह प्रत्यक्षं बलीय इत्यप्रत्यक्षस्य तेन प्रत्याख्यानमुपपद्यते । भवन्तस्त्वप्रत्यक्षेण प्रत्यक्षं प्रत्याचक्षते । तस्मादयुक्तं नरकपालादिवदसतामर्थक्रियेति । स्वभावभेदात्तदसत्त्वमिति चेत्, स्यादेतत्—यदि परमार्थतो नरकपालाः स्युस्तेषामपि दुःखसम्बन्धः स्यात्, मूर्तिमत्त्वाविशेषात् । न तु तेषां बाधाऽस्ति । तस्माद् भ्रान्तिरसाविति । एतदयुक्तम् । कस्मात् ? कर्मशक्तिवैचित्र्यात् । प्रत्यक्षमेव तावत्कर्मनिमित्तो वाग्बुद्धिस्वभावाहारविहारशक्तिभेदभिन्नो विचित्रः संसार उपलभ्यते । स निपुणमवेक्षितुमशक्यः, गम्भीरत्वात् । किं पुनरप्रत्यक्षकर्मणां विपाकवैश्वरूप्यमत-कर्मगोचरमस्मादादिबुद्ध्यः परिच्छेत्स्यन्ति ? तस्मान्मनोरथमात्रमेतत् । धर्माऽधर्मानुपपत्तिश्च स्यात् । यथा स्वप्ने ब्रह्महत्यासुरापानागम्यगमनादीनामफलत्वम्, एवमितरत्रापि स्यात्, असदविशेषात् । मिद्धोपधातात्तद्विशेष इति चेत् न, अविशेषात् । असत्त्वे तुल्ये क्वचिदुपधातः क्वचिन्नेतीच्छामात्रमेतत् । एवं चेत् नासन्तः पृथिव्यादयः । न चेदसन्तो युक्तमुपदिष्टं बुद्धीन्द्रियाणि तेषां पञ्च विशेषाविशेषविषयाणीति ॥३४॥

॥ इति श्रीयुक्तिदीपिकायां सप्तममाह्निकम् ॥

Proponent : *Because the non-existence of the specific objects is not established. The specific objects are directly cognised. Therefore, it is impossible to recognise (or establish) their non-existence.*

It may also be argued that it is still to be proved that it is the true perceptive knowledge only without some fault (in it), it may be apparent perception like the knowledge in mirage, etc., which also have the external object and appears like perceptive knowledge.

This is also wrong.

Why?

Because the alternative (of real and unreal) would not be impossible. Everything should be (in that case) admitted to be non-existent (i.e., without essence); because there is no perception of anything as real from the viewpoint of which the other may be the apparent perception. The alternative is, however, already discussed. Therefore, it is wrong that this (object) is merely of the form of knowledge. Moreover, because there would arise the undesirable contingency of opposite (or contradictory) knowledge always. In case of the one who believes in the non-existence of the existents through (on the analogy of) the non-existent objects like mirage and dream, there arises the undesirable contingency of opposite (or perverted) knowledge always like that of the non-existent objects. For example, in the case of city of the gandharvas, etc., one perceives the same objects sometimes as a cow, sometimes as an elephant and some-

times as a flag. The perception, in the dream, of cow, man, horse, donkey, river and tree, etc., in a single form is observed to take place in the opposite way in the memory of that afterwards. for example, in case of the entrance of a group of elephants through window⁴..... the joining of the broken parts of the body, going through the sky and the attainment of the kingdom by the incapable person without cause, etc. That would be the case elsewhere also. This is, however not so. Therefore, it is wrong that the objects are non-existent like the mirage and dream. *And there would not have been the action with some purpose.* As the futility of the acts in case of persons who have bathed, applied ointment, eaten, drunk and covered themselves with clothes in dream, similar would be the case here. If it is argued that it would be like the discharge of semen? It may be like this. Just as the discharge of the semen caused by coming together of the couple, takes place without that in the dream, the same may be the case elsewhere as well. That is wrong, because it (discharge of semen) is caused by attachment, etc. Similarly that takes place ever without coming together of the couple in case of waking persons also. That is why that is not caused by mutual process. If it is like a ghost? It may be like this. The contention of mine may be right. As there is the purposeful activity of the ghosts with the river of the purbulent water, etc., which are non-existent in nature, and also their being with the skull of a man, similar may be the case here. That is also wrong because it is not established. It is not established that those (objects) are non-existent.⁵ Moreover, because the non-perceptible is obstructed with the perceptible. Here, the perception is more powerful, and hence, the negation of the non-perceived is possible through that. In your case, however, the perception is negated through non-perception. Therefore, it is wrong to say that there is purposeful activity of the non-existent like that of the human-skull, etc. If it is argued that their non-existence is due to the difference of nature (from the existent worldly objects)? It may be like this. If the human skulls would really exist, their association with the misery would also be there because they are not different from those possessed of form. There is, however, no obstruction in them. Therefore, this is also wrong.

Why?

Because of the difference of the power of the acts. The world casued by actions is directly perceived to be differentiated due to the difference in power of speech, knowledge, nature and character (lit. acts of eating and going). It is impossible to see it thoroughly, be-

cause of its depth. How will then the intellect of the people like us thoroughly know the different objects of the world caused by variegated fruits of acts, which is not directly perceived, and which is beyond the approach of logic. Therefore, it is merely a wishful thinking. Moreover, there would be impossibility of virtuous and vicious deeds. As there is no result of the killing of a Brahmin, drinking wine and cohabiting and prohibited lady, etc., in the dream, same would be the case elsewhere also because non-existence of the objects is common in both the cases. If it is argued that the difference is caused by the assault of sloth (in the dream), the reply is, no, because it is common. When the non-existence is common it is only a wishful thinking as to the assault is effective at some places and not at the others. If it is so, earth, etc., are non-existent. If these are non-existent, it is rightly stated that out of these organs five are the sensory organs, these have the specific and non-specific things as their objects.

Here ends the seventh discourse in the Yuktidīpikā.

KĀRIKĀ 34

1. The sense is that the objects of the sense-organs are not specified. Now, the question naturally arises whether all the senses act upon all the objects or there is some specification.
2. The term *viśeṣa* stands for gross objects while *aviśeṣa* denotes subtle elements. The former are cognised by the ordinary worldly people while the latter are cognised by the gods and yogins. This is explained in the subsequent lines.
3. It is not that the senses about in *tamas*, but the text means that the senses of human beings have got more *tamas* than those of gods.
4. Here some portion of the text is missing.
5. It proves the belief of the *Sāṃkhya*s in super natural objects, ghosts, ect.

KĀRIKĀ 35

(Relation of warder and gates between the
internal and external organs)

द्वारिद्वारभावमेषामिदानीं वक्ष्यामः । तत्र बाह्यं करणं द्वारम्, अन्तःकरणं द्वारीति

Now we shall speak of the relation of warder and the gate in them. Here, the external organ is the gate and the internal organ, a warder.

आह, करणाऽविशेषादयुक्तम् अन्तःकरणस्य हीन्द्रियाणां च करणत्वमविशिष्टम् । तत्र को हेतुरन्तःकरणं द्वारि, द्वाराणीन्द्रियाणीति ?

Opponent : It is wrong because of their commonness as the organs.

The nature of being organ is in case of both the internal organ and the other senses. Then, what is the reason here that the internal organ is the warder and the (external) senses are the gates ?

उच्यते—

सान्तःकरणा बुद्धिः सर्वं विषयमवगाहते यस्मात् ।

तस्मात् त्रिविधं करणं द्वारि द्वाराणि शेषाणि ॥ ३५ ॥

सहान्तःकरणेन वर्तते या साऽन्तःकरणा बुद्धिः । अहंकारमनोभ्यां सहिता बुद्धिरित्यर्थः । अत्र चान्तःकरणग्रहणेनैव बुद्धेर्ग्रहणे सिद्धे भूयो बुद्धिग्रहणं प्राधान्यख्यापनार्थम् । भवति हि प्रधानस्य सामान्येऽन्तर्भूतस्यापि पृथगुपदेशः । तद्यथा

जगाम तं वनोद्देशं व्यासः सह महर्षिभिः ।

इति महर्षिग्रहणे व्यासोऽप्यन्तर्भूतः प्राधान्यात्पृथगुच्यते, एवं साऽन्तःकरणा बुद्धिः सर्वं विषयमवगाहते, विशिष्टानविशिष्टांश्च शब्दादीन्सन्निकृष्टविप्रकृष्टव्यहितान्प्रमाणबलेन स्ववृत्ते विषयीकरोतीत्यर्थः । एतदुक्तं भवति अनियतविषयो द्वारी, नियतविषयाणि द्वाराणि । तद्यथा प्रासादस्य पूर्वोत्तरदक्षिणपश्चिमानां स्वदिङ्नियमो न पूर्वमुत्तरं दक्षिणं पश्चिमं वा कदाचिद् भवति, तथेतराण्यपि द्वारीणि । तत्राऽनियताः सर्वदिगवस्थितैर्द्वारैः प्रवर्तन्त एवमिहापि श्रोत्रादीनि स्वविषयनियतानि । सान्तःकरणा तु बुद्धिः सर्वं विषयमवगाहते यस्मात् तस्मादनियतविषयत्वादुपपन्नमेतत्त्रिविधं करणं द्वारि, द्वाराणि शेषाणीति ॥ ३५ ॥

Proponent : SINCE THE INTELLECT ALONG WITH THE (OTHER) INTERNAL ORGANS ASCERTAINS (LIT. EXTENDS OVER) ALL THE OBJECTS, THEREFORE, THE THREE KINDS OF (INTERNAL) ORGANS ARE THE WARDERS AND THE REST ARE THE GATES.

The expression 'the intellect along with the internal organs' means intellect which is in association with the (other) internal organs. The meaning is 'the intellect along with the egoism and the mind'.¹ Here, the mention of intellect is made through the mention of the internal organs yet the mention of the intellect again is to suggest its superiority. There is (found) the separate mention of the superior (even though it is) included in the common objects. For example, in the statement as 'Vyāsa with the (other) great seers went to the forest', Vyāsa who is also included in the mention of the great seers is mentioned separately on account of his superiority. Similarly, is (the expression that) 'intellect along with the (other) internal organs ascertains (i.e. extends over) all the objects'. The meaning is that it makes objects of its activity the word, etc., which are qualified or non-qualified, through the force of means of knowledge.² What is meant is this. The warder is that the objects of which are not fixed, and those whose objects are fixed are gates. As in case of a palace there is fixation of directions of its gates towards east, north, south or west. The same may be considered sometimes to east, north, south or west, as is the case with the other gates. There are activities through the doors situated, in all directions without restricting any. Similarly, here also the ear, etc., are restricted to their own objects. The intellect along with the internal organs, however, ascertains (or extends over) all the objects and, hence, since their objects are not fixed, it is right that the three (internal) organs are the warder and the others are the gates.

KĀRIKĀ 35

1. It suggests that the intellect decides the nature of the objects with the help of the egoism and mind.
2. The objects situated near are known through perception; those situated at a distance and beyond the sense-object contact are known through inference and those which are beyond the reach of them can be known through verbal testimony.

KĀRIKĀ 36

(Mind and egoism submit the objects to intellect)

एते प्रदीपकल्याः परस्परविलक्षणा गुणविशेषाः ।

कृत्स्नं पुरुषस्यार्थं प्रकाश्य बुद्धौ प्रयच्छन्ति ॥ ३६ ॥

एते इत्यनेन त्रयमभिसम्बध्नाति श्रोत्रादीनामन्यतमं मनोऽहंकारश्च । प्रदीपकल्पाइत्यनेन प्रकाशसाम्यं करणपर्वण आचष्टे, यथा प्रदीपः प्रकाशक एवं करणमपि, तद्व्यापारे सति विषयाविर्भावानुपपत्तेः । परस्परविलक्षण इत्यनेन व्यस्तवृत्तिं पूर्वोक्तामाकर्षति । तथा ह्येषां वैलक्षण्यमनुमीयते, आलोचनसंकल्पाभिमानभेदात् । गुणविशेषा इत्यनेन सत्त्वादीनां पुरुष-विज्ञानमुद्दिश्य तद्भावेन परिणामं ख्यापयति । कृत्स्नं पुरुषस्यार्थमिति विशेषाऽविशेषलक्षणं कार्यं आहार्यधार्यप्रकाश्यतया यथासम्भवं प्रकाश्य स्ववृत्त्यनुगुणं कृत्वा विषयत्वमापाद्येत्यर्थः । बुद्धौ प्रयच्छन्ति बुद्धावादधति । एतदुक्तं भवति—यदा श्रोत्रादीनामन्यतमं करणं शब्दादौ विषये प्रवर्तते तदा तदद्भारेणाहंकारो मनो वा तं विषयं स्वव्यापारेणानुभूय बुद्धावाधते, तद्विषयतामापादयतीत्यर्थः । कदाचित्तु बुद्धिरेव बाह्यकरणसंकल्पाभिमानान्निश्चिनोति विषयं, कदाचित्संकल्पाभिमानान्निश्चिनोति विषयं तावत्कदाचित्संकल्पाभिमानगृहीतम् । सर्वथा त्वयं शास्त्रार्थो येन वा तेन करणेन विषयमुपात्तं बुद्धिरध्यवस्यति । तथा चाध्यवसायरूपापन्नया चेतनाशक्तिरनुगृह्यते । न करणान्तरस्य पुरुषेण सम्बन्धोऽस्ति । ततश्च द्वारिणां बहुत्वादर्शनविशेषस्वातन्त्र्यसमुच्चयान्तःकरणपुरुषकर्तृत्वदोषाणामप्रसंगः ॥ ३६ ॥

THESE (THE CONCERNED EXTERNAL ORGAN, MANAS AND THE EGOISM) MUTUALLY DIFFERENT, (DISTINCT) MODIFICATIONS OF THE THREE CONSTITUENTS, AND RESEMBLING A LAMP (IN RESPECT OF THEIR FUNCTIONS) ILLUMINING THE ENTIRE PURPOSE OF THE PURUSA PRESENT IT TO THE INTELLECT.

Through the expression 'these' the author relates the three—one of the ear, etc., mind and egoism. Through the statement of the resemblance to the lamp the author speaks of the similarity of illuminating resting in the phase of the senses. As the lamp is the illuminator so is an organ because with the function of that (organ) the production of the object is impossible. Through the expression 'mutually distinct' the author draws here respective distinct function

of an organ mentioned above. Through that (separate function) only is inferred their distinction on account of the distinction of (mere) grasping, pondering over and I-notion. Through the expression modification of the constituents, the author suggests that they (the constituents) modify in their (present) form with the purpose of fulfilling (or with a view to) the purpose of the conscious entity. The meaning is that after illuminating, i.e., after making as far as possible an object of knowledge through the respective specific and non-specific acts in the form of 'to be grasped' to be retained, 'to be illumined' the entire purpose of the conscious entity they submit it to the intellect i.e., put (the form) on the intellect. When any one of the (external) organs like ear proceeds to the objects like word, the mind as well as egoism experiencing the object through the former (i.e., operation of the senses) put its form upon the intellect i.e., make it the object of intellect. Sometimes the intellect ascertains the objects through the external object, pondering (i.e. desiring) and the relation to I-notion; sometimes it ascertains through pondering over (desiring and I-notion), while sometimes (it ascertains) the pondering (desiring) and the I-notion. The meaning always in the scripture is that the intellect ascertains the object presented to it by any of the organs. The power of consciousness is favoured by that intellect after the latter has attained the form of ascertainment.¹ There is no (direct) relation of any other organ with the conscious entity. And through this theory on account of the multiplicity of the gate-keepers there does not arise the undesirable contingency of involvement of defects/like the rise of particular knowledge independently (conscious entity), blending together of knowledge at a time and admitting the agency in the complex of internal organs and conscious entity.

KĀRIKĀ 36

1. The act of attaining the form of the object in the case of the conscious entity is apparent or attributed and not real.

KĀRIKĀ 37

(Mind and egoism come in contact of the conscious entity indirectly)

आह, कः पुनरत्र हेतुर्येन द्वारित्वाविशेषे सत्यहंकारमनसी बुद्धौ विषयाधानं कुरुतो न पुनरनयोः साक्षात्पुरुषेण सम्बन्ध इति ?

What is the reason that even though the nature of being warder is common (to egoism and mind), yet they put the form of the object upon the intellect only and there is no direct relation (of them) with the conscious entity?

उच्यते —

सर्वं प्रत्युपभोगं यस्मात् पुरुषस्य साधयति बुद्धिः ।

अहंकारमनसोर्हि, नास्ति निश्चयरूपता, संकल्पाभिमानमात्ररूपत्वात् । अनिश्चितविषयया च करणवृत्त्या पुरुषस्य सम्बन्धोऽनर्थकः स्यात् । स्वयं वा निश्चेतुरस्य कर्तृत्वं स्यात् । ततश्चाऽऽमिश्रनिश्चयकारणत्वादयमप्यामिश्ररूपः स्यात् । सर्वं चैतदुक्तोत्तरं निश्चयरूपा हि बुद्धिः । अतस्तद्वृत्त्युपनिपाती विषयः सन्निधानमात्रात्पुरुषेण संचेतितो नास्यौदासीन्यं बाधितुमुत्सहते, नो खल्वप्यानर्थक्यमनुषज्यते । एतदुक्तं सर्वं प्रत्युपभोगं यस्मात्पुरुषस्य साधयति बुद्धिरिति ।

BECAUSE THE INTELLECT ACCOMPLISHES THE EXPERIENCE OF THE CONSCIOUS ENTITY IN RESPECT OF ALL THE (OBJECTS).

The egoism and mind are not of the form of ascertainment because they are of the nature of pondering (desiring) and I-notion only. The relation of the conscious entity with the function of the organs the object of which is not fixed would serve no purpose.¹ Or, there would be the activity in conscious entity if it ascertains the objects by itself.² Then, on account of its being the cause for the mixed ascertainment (the ascertainment of the complex object) it would also be of a mixed (complex) form (nature).³ To all this the reply is already given that the intellect is of the form of ascertainment. Therefore, the object which follows the function of the transformation (of the organs) is made known to the conscious entity merely through

proximity and thus it does not tend to disturb (obstruct) its neutrality, nor does it cling to purposelessness. Thus is explained 'because the intellect accomplishes the experience of conscious entity with respect to all the objects'.

(Intellect discriminates between cosmic matter and conscious entity)

आह, एवमपि शब्दादिलक्षणो विषयः प्रकृतः, स च बुद्ध्या सर्वः प्रतिपाद्यते । तत्र विषयान्तरमप्यस्ति प्रधानपुरुषान्तरलक्षणम् । तथाचाहुः । "उपभोगस्य शब्दाद्युपलब्धिरादिः गुणपुरुषोपलब्धिरन्तः" । तस्मात्तत्प्रतिपत्त्यर्थं करणान्तरं वक्तव्यमिति ।

Opponent : In this way also only the object like word which is undertaken for discussion, is completely known by intellect. There is, however, another object in the form of the distinction between the cosmic matter and the conscious entity. It is stated also—'the beginning of the experience is the knowledge of the word, etc., and culmination (of it) is the knowledge of the constituents and the conscious entity. Therefore, some other organ should be mentioned for the knowledge of that (discriminative knowledge of conscious entity and the constituents).

उच्यते—न वक्तव्यम् । किं कारणम् ? यस्मात्

सैव च विशिनष्टि पुनः प्रधानपुरुषान्तरं सूक्ष्मम् ॥ ३७ ॥

यतो यस्मात्कारणात् सा बुद्धिरेव हि काष्ठापन्नेन तमसाऽभिभूतत्वाद्धर्मादीनां सत्त्व-धर्माणां प्रकृतिभूतान्विकारभूतान्परतन्त्रानुपकार्यानुपकारकानचेतनान्संसर्गिधर्मिणश्च गुणानात्मत्वेनाऽध्यवस्य पुरुषायोपहरित । स च मिथ्याज्ञानाभ्यासवासनाऽनुरञ्जितं बुद्धिप्रत्ययमनुरुध्यमानो दर्शितविषयत्वात्तथैव प्रतिपद्यते । यदा तु धर्माद्यभ्यासात्तमोरूपापगमे सत्युत्तरोत्तराणां सत्त्वधर्माणामुत्कर्षस्तदा विनिवृत्तमिथ्याप्रत्यया वृत्तिः । न प्रकृतिविकारभूतः स्वतन्त्रोऽनुपकार्योऽनुपकारकश्चेतनोऽसंसर्गधर्मा च । ततो विपरीताश्च गुणा इति शुद्धाध्यवसायं करोति । पुरुषश्च परोपहृतवृत्तित्वात्तथैव प्रतिपद्यते । तदेतद् गुणानां पुरुषस्य चान्तरं द्वयोरपि निश्चयस्वभावत्वादस्मात्पूर्वोक्तधर्मभेदेऽपि सति सूक्ष्मं गम्भीरं दुर्ज्ञेयम् । अतश्च सूक्ष्मं यद् बुद्धिमात्रमवलम्ब्य तदविशिष्टायाश्चेतनाशक्तेर्ग्राह्यग्राहकः ॥ ३७ ॥

Proponent : No, it should not be mentioned.

What is the reason here ?

Because:

THAT (INTELLECT) ONLY DISCRIMINATES THE SUBTLE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN COSMIC MATTER AND CONSCIOUS ENTITY

Since when the Tamas becomes intense and when virtue, etc., the qualities of Sattva, etc., are overpowered, the intellect itself after ascertaining the constituents (modifications of the constituents) which are actually the causes and effects, dependents, requiring assistance, assisting others, non-sentient and having the nature of mutual association, as the soul offers the (idea) to the conscious entity. The conscious entity also having past impression of the practice of perverted knowledge and confining himself to the knowledge of (given by) intellect understands in that way only because the object is presented to him.⁴ When there is the gradual elevation of the qualities of the Sattva and the form of Tamas is removed through the repeated practice of virtue, etc., the function (of the intellect) becomes devoid of perverted knowledge. The intellect comes to have the pure right ascertainment that (soul) is not the modification of the cosmic matter, is independent, requiring no favour or assistance, not assisting any other, sentient and having no nature of association; and the constituents are opposed to that in nature.⁵ Since the conscious entity is that to whom the function is presented by other (i.e. intellect), it knows it in this form only. The distinction between the conscious entity and constituents is subtle, deep and difficult to understand even though there lies the above difference because both the types of knowledge related to the conscious entity's identity to or difference from the constituents is of the nature of ascertainment.⁶

KĀRIKĀ 37

1. If the conscious entity is supposed to come in contact with the senses directly, it would not get the form of the object in an ascertained form. Consequently, no one would have determined knowledge.
2. If the conscious entity is accepted to be a determining principle, it would be active and consequently non-eternal.
3. It would appear in the form of the object the form of which is attained by it. Consequently, it would be of many forms and whatever gets many forms is non-eternal.
4. This happens in the process of bondage.
5. It proves that the discriminative knowledge is located in the intellect, and is presented to the conscious entity.
6. Some portion of the text is missing at the end.

KĀRIKĀ 38

(Phase of the objects)

व्याख्यातं करणपर्व । कार्यपर्वेदानीं वक्तव्यम् । तस्य च पुरस्तादुद्देशः कृतः — कार्यं च तस्य दशधा पञ्च विशेषा इति । साम्प्रतं तु निर्देशं करिष्यामः ।

The subject of the organs is explained. Now, the subject of the effects should be stated.¹ That is mentioned by name earlier as the effects are ten— including the five specific (objects). Now we shall discuss them.

(Subtle elements are called non-specific)

आह, यद्येवं तस्मादिदमेव तावदुच्यतां के विशेषाः, केऽविशेषा इति ।

Opponent : If it is so, it should be stated as to what are the specific and what are non-specific.

उच्यते—

तन्मात्राण्यविशेषाः

यानि तन्मात्राणि पञ्चाहंकारादुत्पद्यन्ते इति प्रागपदिष्टम् । ते खल्वविशेषाः । कानि पुनस्तन्मात्राणीत्युच्यते शब्दतन्मात्रं, स्पर्शतन्मात्रं रूपतन्मात्रं, रसतन्मात्रं गन्धतन्मात्रमिति ।

Proponent : THE SUBTLE ELEMENTS ARE NON-SPECIFIC.

The subtle elements are the same which are spoken earlier as those originating from the egoism.² They are indeed the non-specific.

What are those called subtle elements ?

To this the reply is—they are the subtle elements of sound, touch, form, taste and smell.

कथं पुनस्तन्मात्राणीति ?

Opponent : Why are these the subtle elements ?

उच्यते— तुल्यजातीयविशेषानुपपत्तेः अन्ये शब्दजात्यभेदेऽपि

सति विशेषा उदात्तानुदात्तस्वरितानुनसिकादयस्तत्र न सन्ति तस्माच्छब्दतन्मात्रम् । एवं स्पर्शतन्मात्रे मृदुकठिनादयः । एवं रूपतन्मात्रे शुक्लकृष्णादयः । एवं रसतन्मात्रे

मधुराऽम्लादयः । एवं गन्धतन्मात्रे सुरभ्यादयः । तस्मात्तस्य तस्य गुणस्य सामान्यमेवात्र, न विशेष इति तन्मात्रास्वेतेऽविशेषाः ।

Because there is no possibility of the further particularities of the same class. Though there is no difference with reference to the genus in the case of many words, yet there (in the subtle elements) are no further particularities like high pitch, low pitch and circumplexed (which are found in gross words). Therefore, that is the subtle element of word. Similarly, (there is no) softness and hardness in the subtle element of touch. Similarly, (there is no) whiteness, blackness, etc., in the subtle element of form. Similarly, (there are no) sweetness and sourness in the subtle element of taste. Similarly, (there are no) good smell, etc., in the subtle element of smell. There is only the generality of that quality and not the particularity (of it) and thus there is no further particularity in the subtle elements.

(Gross elements are called specific and evolve from subtle elements)

आह, अथ के पुनर्विशेषा इति ?

Opponent : What are the specific (objects) then?

उच्यते—यानि खलु

तेभ्यो भूतानि पञ्च पञ्चभ्यः ।

उत्पद्यन्ते

एते स्मृता विशेषाः

तत्र शब्दतन्मात्रादाकाशम्, स्पर्शतन्मात्राद्वायुः, रूपतन्मात्रात्तेजः, रसतन्मात्रादापः, गन्धतन्मात्रात्पृथिवी । तेभ्यो भूतानीत्येतावति वक्तव्ये पञ्च पञ्चयभ्य इति ग्रहणं समसंख्याकतस्तदुत्पत्तिज्ञापनार्थम् । तेनैकैकस्मात्तन्मात्रादेकैकस्य विशेषस्योत्पत्तिः सिद्धा । ततश्चयदन्येषामाचार्याणामभिप्रेतम् एकलक्षणेभ्यस्तन्मात्रेभ्यः परस्परानुप्रवेशादेकोत्तरा विशेषाः सृज्यन्ते इति तत्प्रतिषिद्धं भवति । किन्तर्हि अन्तरेणापि तन्मात्रानुप्रवेशमेकोत्तरेभ्यो भूतेभ्य एकोत्तराणां भूतविशेषामुत्पत्तिः । तत्र शब्दगुणाच्छब्दतन्मात्रादाकाशमेकगुणम्, शब्दस्पर्शगुणात्स्पर्शतन्मात्राद् द्विगुणो वायुः, शब्दस्पर्शरूपगुणाद्रूपतन्मात्राद्विगुणं तेजः, शब्दस्पर्शरूपरसगुणाद्रसतन्मात्राच्चतुर्गुणा आपः, शब्दस्पर्शरूपरसगन्धगुणाद् गन्धतन्मात्रात्पञ्चगुणा पृथिवी । अत्र च वायोः शीतः स्पर्श अपां च, तेजस उष्णः, अनुष्णाशीतः पृथिव्याः । रूपं च शुक्लं भास्वरं च तेजसोऽपां च, कृष्णं पृथिव्याः । रसो मधुरोऽपाम्, साधारणः पृथिव्याः । गन्धस्तु पार्थिव एव तदवयवानुप्रवेशाद् भूतान्तरेषूपलभ्यते । इत्येते पृथिव्यादीनां धर्माः । अन्ये च परस्परानुग्राहकाः । के पुनस्त इत्याह—

आकारो गौरवं रौक्ष्यं वरणं स्थैर्यमेव च ।
 स्थितिभेदः क्षमा कृष्णच्छाया सर्वोपभोग्यते ॥
 इति ते पार्थिवा धर्मास्तद्विशिष्टास्तथा परे ।
 जलाग्निपवनाकाशव्यापकास्तान्निबोधत ॥
 स्नेहः सौक्ष्म्यं प्रभा शौक्ल्यं मार्दवं गौरवं च यत् ॥
 शैत्यं रक्षा पवित्रत्वं सन्तानश्चौदका गुणाः ॥
 ऊर्ध्वगं पावकं दग्धं पाचकं लघु भास्वरम् ।
 प्रध्वंस्योजस्विता ज्योतिः पूर्वाभ्यां सविलक्षणम् ॥
 तिर्यग्गतिः पवित्रत्वमाक्षेपो नोदनं बलम् ।
 रौक्ष्यमच्छायता शैत्यं वायोर्धर्माः पृथिव्यधाः ॥
 सर्वतोगतिरव्यूहो विष्कम्भश्चेति ते त्रयः ।
 आकाशधर्मा विज्ञेयाः पूर्वधर्मविरोधिनः ॥
 संहतानां तु यत्कार्यं सामान्यं ते गवादयः ।
 इतरेतरधर्मेभ्यो विशेषान्नात्र संशयः ॥

Those which are:

FROM THESE FIVE THE FIVE GROSS ELEMENTS

Proceed :

These (latter) are said to be specific.

There, the space proceeds from the subtle element of word; the air from the subtle element of touch; the fire from the subtle element of form; water from the subtle element of taste; and earth from the subtle element of smell. In spite of the statement of that 'from those proceed the gross elements the mention' 'five from the five' is for the purpose of suggesting their production from the same number of object.⁴ Therefrom is established the production of one gross element from one (a single) subtle. Therefore, the following view of the other seers that the succeeding specific (objects) proceed from the mutual combination of the subtle elements which are having single quality each, is negated. On the contrary, even without the combination of the subtle elements from the succeeding elements (subtle) is the origination of the succeeding specific element. The space having one quality proceeds from the subtle element of word, which has a single quality of word. The air having two qualities proceed from the subtle

element of touch which has the qualities of word and touch. The fire having three qualities proceed from the subtle element of colour which has the qualities of word, touch and colour. The water having four qualities proceeds from the subtle element of taste which has the qualities of word, touch, colour and taste. The earth having five qualities proceeds from the subtle element of smell which has the qualities of word, touch, colour, taste and smell.⁵ Here the touch of air and water is cold, hot is the touch of fire, and of the earth the touch is neither hot nor cold. The colour also is white and bright in case of the fire and water and black in the case of the earth. The taste is sweet in case of the water and general in the earth. The smell belongs to earth only and is observed in the other elements due to the combination of the part of that (earth) in them.⁶ These are the qualities of the earth, etc. The other qualities (than these) are for mutual favour.

What are those others ? To this the reply is :

Form, heaviness, roughness, covering, firmness, stability, partition, resistance, black shade are enjoyed by all, these are the qualities of the earth. Others are (not) endowed with them. Now you know the qualities which pervade water, fire, air and sky. Lubricity, fineness, splendour, brightness, softness, heaviness, coldness, protection, purification and continuous flow are the qualities of water. The light shoots upwards, is purifier, burner, cooker, light (as opposed to heavy), bright, destroyer and shining. It is, thus, different from others. The peculiar qualities of the air are transverse movement, purification, removing or throwing away, impelling, inspiring, roughness, going near, coldness. The qualities of the sky which are opposite to the qualities stated above should be known as the approach everywhere, non-obstruction and fixity. The collective effects of these are the general objects, cow etc. There is no doubt in it that they originate from the specific objects (having the qualities of each other).⁷

(Mutual favour in gross elements through qualities)

तत्राकारादिभिर्धर्मैः पृथिव्या लोकस्य चोपक्रियते भूतान्तराणां च । तत्राकारात्तावत्
गवादीनां घटादीनां चाकारनिर्वृतिः गौरवादेशामवस्थानम् । रौक्ष्यादपां संग्रहौ वैशद्यं च भूता-
नाम् । वरणादनभिप्रेतानां छदनम् । स्थैर्याद् वृत्तिः प्रजानां भूतान्तराणां च । स्थितेर्मात्रादिस-
न्निधानाधनुग्रहः । भेदाद्धटादिनिष्पत्तिः । व्यूहश्चावयवानाम् । क्षान्तेरुपभोगयोग्यता । कृष्ण-
च्छायत्वाद्गन्धसम्पच्छायाकार्यप्रसिद्धिश्च । सर्वोपभोग्यत्वात्सर्वभूतानुग्रहः । एवं स्नेहादिभि-
र्लोकस्योपकारः क्रियते भूतान्तराणां च । स्नेहाद्रूपसंपद्मायुप्रतीकारोऽग्निशमनं संग्रहश्चप-

थिव्याः । सौक्ष्म्यादनुप्रवेशः । शौक्याच्चन्द्रादिनिर्वृतिः । मार्दवात्सानानावगाहनमेकक्रिया कठिनानां । चावनामनम् । गौरवात्सन्तानाच्च भूतानुग्रहार्थं स्त्रोतस्त्वम् । शैत्यादुष्णप्रतीकारः । रक्षातः प्रजासु घोरशमनम् । पवित्रत्वाद्धर्मोपचयः शौचविधिरलक्ष्योपघातश्च । सन्तानाद्द्रव्यसंघातः । तथोर्ध्वगत्यादिभिर्धर्ममात्रैस्तेजसां लोकस्य चोपक्रियते भूतान्तराणां च । ऊर्ध्वगतेः पाकप्रकाशसिद्धिः । पावकत्वाद् द्रव्यशौचं च । दाहकत्वात्क्षारोत्पत्तिः । शीतप्रतीकारो नभसश्चोष्णत्वं शब्दनिष्पत्यर्थम् । पाचकत्वात्स्वेद्यं स्वेदनमन्नपक्तिः पृथिव्यवयवानां क्रियायोग्यता, तथा बाह्यान्तरपरिणामः, रसलोहितमांसस्नाय्वस्थिमज्जाशुक्राणां लाघवाद् दाह्यातिक्रमः । भास्वरत्वाद् द्रव्यान्तरप्रकाशनम् । प्रध्वंसित्वाद् दग्धपक्वानामुपभोगः । तैजसः प्रजापालनम् । तथा तिर्यक्पातादिभिर्धर्मैर्वायुना लोकस्य चोपकारः क्रियते भूतान्तराणां च । तिर्यक्पाताद् दृष्टिविक्षेपो गन्धसंवहनं च । पवित्रत्वात्पूतिद्रव्यपवनम् । आक्षेपनोदनाभ्यामुत्कर्षः प्रथनं धर्माभ्यसः । व्यूहश्च शरीरे रसादीनां धातूनां च । अग्नेश्चोपधानमभिघातश्चाकाशस्य । बलात्समीकरणं सर्वेषाम् । रौक्ष्याद्विशोषणम् । अच्छाद्यत्वादहोरात्रप्रसिद्धिः । शैत्यादुष्णप्रतीकारः । तथा सर्वतोगत्यादिभिर्धर्मैर्नभसा लोकस्योपकारः क्रियते भूतान्तराणां च । सर्वतोगतेः समन्तात्तुल्यदेशश्रवणनामेकश्रुतित्वम् । अव्यूहविष्कम्भाभ्यां सर्वेषामवकाशतादानमित्युक्ताः पृथिव्यादयः । एते विशेषा इत्युच्यन्त इति ।

Through the qualities like shade found in the earth, etc., a favour is rendered to whole (material) world and the substances. Due to form there is the accomplishment of the shape in the pot, cow, etc. and their sustenance (present at one place) is due to their heaviness. Through roughness is the collection of water and the distinctness in the objects. Through the quality of covering there is the covering of undesirable (things). Through firmness is the existence of the public as also of the other beings. Through stability is the favour for quantity, and gathering together, etc. Through partition is the origination of pot, etc., and also the joining of the parts. Through resistance is the capability for enjoyment.⁸ Through the black shade is the accomplishment of the night as also the common awareness of the effects of shade. Since it is enjoyable to all, it renders favour to all the beings. In this way by lubricity, etc., also there is rendered service to the world and also to all the beings. Through lubricity is the accomplishment of the form, prevention from the air, extinguish of the fire, and putting together as the earth (i.e. earthly things). Due to its being subtle is its entrance (in other object). Due to its brightness is the production of the Moon, etc., (form it).⁹ Through softness is accomplished the act of bathing and diving as also the bowing of the hard things. There is a flow (in the water) for the favour to the beings through its heaviness and continuous flow. Through coldness (in water) is the prevention from heat. Through its purity is the accumulation of the virtues, the procedure of purifying and the

destruction of the unseen.¹⁰ Through the continuous flow is the collecting together of the substances. Similarly, through the qualities like going upward, etc., the fire renders favour to the world as also the beings.¹¹ Through the (tendency of) going upward is the accomplishment of cooking and giving light. Through its purity is rendered the purity of the substances. Through the burning is the production of acid as also the prevention from cold, and also the heat in the sky for the purpose of the production of the word there. Through its having the power of cooking there is perspiration of what is to be treated by suborific means, the digestion of food, the capability of activity in the parts of the earth and the modification—outer and inner. Due to lightness the acid, blood, flesh, arteries, bones and semen virile transcending the things liable to be burnt. Through its brightness is the illumination of the other objects. Due to its being a destroyer is the enjoyment of burnt and cooked. Through light is the preservation of the people. Similarly, through the qualities like transverse movement, etc., is the favour rendered to the world as also to the beings by the air. Through transverse movement is the casting of glance and the carrying of the odour. Through its purity is the purification of the pure substances. Through removing and impelling is the going up and the spread of the heat and the water as also the collection of fluid and the (solid) ingredient in the body, so are the blowing of the fire and striking in the sky. Through the inspiring is the assimilation of everything. Through roughness is drying of the objects. Through its covering is the accomplishment of day and night. Through coldness is the prevention from the heat. Through the quality of all-pervasiveness, etc., is rendered by the sky the favour to the world as also to the beings. Through the all-pervasiveness there is the hearing of the same sound from all directions in case of those the ears of whom are situated at the same place. Through non-obstruction and fixity is the allotment of the space for all. Thus, are stated the (gross elements like) earth, etc. These are called specific.

(Cause of terming gross elements specific)

आह, कथं पुनरेते विशेषा इत्युच्यन्ते ?

Opponent : Why are they called specific ?

यस्मात्

शान्ता घोराश्च मूढाश्च ॥ ३८ ॥

तत्र शान्तास्तावत् स्वसंस्कारविशेषयोगात्तत्सन्निधौ प्रसादादिधर्मोत्पत्तेः। घोरास्तु शेषादिधर्मनिमित्तत्वात्। मूढाश्च वरणादिधर्महेतुत्वात्। तन्मात्राणि पुनरशान्तघोरमूढानि

अतोऽविशेषा इत्युच्यन्ते । तदेते यथा व्याख्याता अविशेषा विशेषाः पुरुषार्थसिद्धयर्थं बहुधा व्यवतिष्ठन्ते । कस्मात् ? न ह्येतेषामेकधाऽवस्थाने पुरुषार्थः सिद्ध्यतीति ॥ ३८ ॥

Because :

(THEY ARE) CALM TURBULENT AND DELUDING

They are calm because there is the origination of the qualities like calmness in the vicinity of them due to the particular impression of ones own.¹⁰ They are turbulent because they are the causes of the qualities like remainder (?). They are deluding because of their being the cause of the quality of covering, etc. The subtle elements, however, are not calm, turbulent and deluding and, hence, are called non-specific. The above mentioned specific and non-specific as explained earlier are present variously for the accomplishment of purpose of conscious entity.

Why ?

Because the purpose of the conscious entity is not accomplished if they are placed in a homogeneous form.

KĀRIKĀ 38

1. The 'subject of effect' here refers to the objects of the senses, which are stated to be ten in kārīkā 32.
2. Cf. kārīkā 22.
3. Thus etymologically aviśeṣa means having no inter differentiations.
4. I.e. the one gross element from one subtle element, first from the first and so on.
5. The view of the Yuktidīpikā about the nature of the subtle elements is worth noting. Here, the succeeding subtle element is said to possess the qualities of the preceding subtle element.
6. For example, if there is some smell in water or air, it should not be understood as their inherent quality, but belongs to the part of earth mixed in them.
7. The qualities of cause are found in the effect also. In the objects like cow all these qualities are available because they are composed of all these elements. These mutually favour each other and are not contradictory because they are found together.
8. According to the Sāṃkhya philosophy every object is composed of three constituents. Rajas is always active and stimulating and, hence, always brings the change in the objects. If the resistance to this change is not by tamas, no object would subsist even for a short time and it would not be enjoyed.
9. Since the moon gives pleasant cool touch, and is bright, it is inferred to be abounding in water as its components.
10. Since water is purifying, the water at the sacred places purifies the beings which again leads to virtue and destroys sins.

KĀRIKĀ 39

(States of specific objects)

आह, अतिसामान्योक्तमिदमित्यतो न प्रतिपद्यामहे । तस्माद्वक्तव्यं कथं विशेषाणामवस्थानमिति ?

Opponent: It is stated in a very general form and, hence, we do not understand it. Therefore, it should be stated as to what is the condition of the specifics.

उच्यते—

सूक्ष्मा मातापितृजाः सह प्रभूतैस्त्रिधा विशेषाः स्युः ।

तत्र सूक्ष्मा नाम चेष्टाश्रितं प्राणाष्टकं संसरति । मातृपितृजास्तु द्विविधाः । जरायुजा अण्डजाश्च । तेषां कोशोपहताः कोशाः लोमरुधिरमांसास्थिस्नायुशुक्रलक्षणः । तत्र लोमरुधिरमांसानां मातृतः सम्भवः । अस्थिस्नायुशुक्राणां पितृतः । तत्रैवाशितपीताध्यासा दष्टौ कोशानपरे व्याचक्षते ।

Proponent : THE SPECIFIC IS THREEFOLD—SUBTLE (BODY), THOSE BORN OF PARENTS, ALONGWITH THOSE OF THE OTHER BEINGS.

Out of these subtle are eight prāṇas located in the substratum of the physical activities which transmigrate (to some other body).¹ Those born of the parents are of two kinds: those originating from the womb or those originating from the egg.

There are the sheaths of them put in other sheaths—hair, blood, flesh, bones, arteries and semen virile. Out of these the origination of hair, blood and flesh is from the mother, and that of the bones, arteries and semen virile from the father. Some others speak of eight sheaths on account of superimposing the (nature of sheaths) on what is eaten and drunk.

(The specific work as sheaths)

कथं पुनरेषां कोशत्वम् ?

Opponent : How are these known as sheaths ?

आवेष्टनसामर्थ्यात् । यथा कोशकारः कोशेनावेष्टितोऽस्वतन्त्रः, एवं सूक्ष्मशरीरं सप्राणमेतैरावेष्टितमस्वतन्त्रं तत्तत्कर्मोपचिनोति ।

Proponent : Because of their capability of covering. Just as a silk-worm does not remain independent when covered by the cover, similarly, the subtle body alongwith the prāṇas when covered by them becomes dependent and accumulates the acts (i.e. impressions of what he does).²

(Kinds of living beings)

प्रभूतास्तूद्भिज्जाः स्वेदजाश्च तदेतैस्त्रिविधैर्विशेषैर्दैर्घ्यमानवतैर्यग्योनलक्षणस्त्रिविधो भूतसर्ग आरभ्यते । तत्र देवानां चतुर्विधं शरीरं प्रधानानुग्रहात्, यथा परमर्षेर्विरिञ्चस्य च । तत्सिद्धिभ्यो यथा ब्रह्मणः पुत्राणां तत्पुत्रपुत्राणां च । मातापितृतो यथाऽदितेः कश्यपस्य च पुत्राणाम् । केवलाद्वा यथा पितृतौ मित्रावरुणाभ्यां वशिष्ठस्य । मनुष्याणां तु जरायुजम् । धर्मशक्तिविशेषात्तु कस्यचिदन्यथाऽपि भवति । यथा द्रोणकृपकृपीधृष्टद्युम्नादीनाम् । तिर्यग्योनीनामपि चतुर्विधम् ।

जरायुजं गवादीनामण्डजं चैव पक्षिणाम् ।

तृणादेश्चोद्भिज्जं क्षुद्रजन्तूनां स्वेदजं स्मृतम् ॥

एवं त्रिविधा विशेषा व्याख्याताः ।

Those which germinate as a plant and those which are generated by sweating (heat and moisture) belong to other beings. From the three kinds of above specific, there proceeds the creation of three kinds of beings in the form of gods, human beings and the animal (and insects). The body of the gods is of four kinds—due to the favour of the cosmic matter just as that of Brahmā, viṣṇu and Śiva; produced through attainment (of supernatural power) just as that of the sons of Brahmā and of their sons; that produced from the parents (both the father and mother) just as that of the sons of Aditi and Kashyapa; that produced from father only just as that of Vasiṣṭha from Mitra and Varuṇa. The body of the human beings are born of womb. In case of some, however, it is otherwise (i.e. without womb) also on account of the particularity of the power of virtue; just as that of Droṇa, Kṛpa, Kṛpi, Dhṛṣṭadyumna, etc. The body of the animal (and insects) also is of four kinds :

The body of cow, etc., is said to be generated from womb, that of the birds as generated from the egg; that of the grass etc., as generated by sprouting and that of the small creatures from sweating (heat or moisture).³

Thus, are explained the specifics of three kinds.

(Perishable and imperishable specific)

तत्र केचित्रियताः केचिदनियता इत्याह—के पुनरत्र नियताः, के वाऽनियताः ?

Opponent : Out of them some are said to be constant and some perishable. What are the constant, and what are perishable?

सूक्ष्मास्तेषां नियता मातापितृजा निवर्तन्ते ॥३९॥

सूक्ष्मा आसर्गप्रलयान्नित्याः मातापितृजा निवर्तन्ते । सह प्रभूतैरिति वर्तते । केचित् प्रभूतग्रहणेन बाह्यानामेव विशेषाणां ग्रहणमिच्छन्ति । तेषामुद्भिज्जस्वेदजयोरग्रहणम् । तस्मादुभयथा प्रभूता इत्येतदनवद्यम् ।

Proponent : OUT OF THESE THE SUBTLE ARE CONSTANT AND THOSE BORN OF THE PARENTS ARE PERISHABLE.

The subtle are constant from the creation to the dissolution of the universe (while) those born of parents perish. The expression is taken together with belonging to other beings. Some intend to include the mention of external specifics only through the mention of prabhūta. In their view, there remains no mention of those germinating as sprout and those born from sweating. Therefore correct interpretation both ways would be the other two (generated sprouting and sweathing) beings.

आह, सूक्ष्माभिधानमप्रसिद्धत्वात् । मातापितृजाश्च प्रभूताश्च प्रसिद्धा इत्यतो युक्त एषां परिग्रहः । सूक्ष्मास्त्वप्रसिद्धाः । तस्माद्वक्तव्यं कथमेषामुत्पत्तिरस्तित्वं वेति ?

The subtle should be explained because they are not well known. Those born from parents and the two (generated by sprouting and sweathing)/other kinds of beings are well-known and, hence, their inclusion is right. The subtle, however, are not well known. Then, it should be spoken of as to how is their origination or existence.

उच्यते—पूर्वसर्गे प्रकृतेरुत्पन्नानां प्राणिनां सत्त्वधर्मोत्कर्षादन्तरेण द्वयसमापत्तिं मनसैवाऽपत्यमन्यद्वा यथेप्सितं प्रादुर्बभूव । तदेतदद्यापि चानुवर्तते—यत्कच्छपिका निरूपितेनाण्डधारणं करोति । प्रियं खल्वपि चक्षुषा निरीक्ष्य कृतार्थमात्मानं मन्यते । तस्यामपि क्षीणायां वाक्सिद्धिर्बभूव । अभिभाष्य प्राणिनो यदिच्छन्ति तदापादयन्ति । तदद्याप्यनुवर्तते—यच्छङ्खी विरतेनाऽपत्यं बिभर्ति । प्रियं खल्वपि सम्भाष्य महतीं प्रीतिमनुभवति । तस्यामुपक्षीणायां हस्तसिद्धिर्बभूव । संस्पृश्य पाणिमीप्सितमर्थमुपपादयन्ति । तदेतदद्याप्य-

नुवर्तते—यत्त्रियं चिरादालोक्य पाणौ संस्पृश्य प्रीतिर्भवति । अस्यामुपक्षीणायामाश्लेषसिद्धिर्बभूव । आलिङ्गनेन प्राणिन ईप्सितं लभन्ते । तदेतदद्याप्यनुवर्तते—यत्त्रियमालिङ्ग्य निर्वृतिर्भवति । तस्यामुपक्षीणायां द्वन्द्वसिद्धिरारब्धा । स्त्रीपुंसौ संधृष्याऽपत्यमुत्पादयेतां ममेदं ममेदमिति च परिग्रहाः प्रवृत्ताः । एतस्मिन्नेवावसरे संसारो वर्ण्यते ।

Proponent : In the initial creation of (prior to creation) the son or otherwise (daughter) were born from the living being from the cosmic matter in accordance with their will through the mind without coming together of the couple because the qualities of Sattva were dominant in them. The practice is found even at present—the female tortoise conceives the egg only by reflecting upon, it indeed considers itself satisfied only at seeing its lover. When that power was destroyed, there became the accomplishment through speech. The living beings get whatever is desired after speaking together. This is also found even now. The couch shell (insect in it) conceives through crying only. It indeed feels great pleasure after speaking to her lover. When that (power) came to an end, the accomplishment was (started) through hand. The beings accomplish the desired object through touching the hand. This is found even now that after seeing the lover for a long time and touching the hands there arises the pleasure. When this (power) also was destroyed, there became the accomplishment through embracing. The living beings get the desired object through embracing. This is also found even now that after embracing the beloved they are satisfied. When that (power) also was destroyed, the accomplishment through copulation started. The man and a woman give rise to a baby after coming into collision and hoarding started 'this is mine', 'this is mine'. At this occasion only the world (i.e. transmigration) is explained.

(Different views about subtle body)

तत्र चाचार्याणां विप्रतिपत्तिः । पञ्चाधिकरणस्य तावद्वैवर्तं शरीरं मातापितृसंसर्गकाले करणाविष्टं शुक्रशोणितमनुप्रविशति । तदनुप्रवेशाच्च कललादिभावेन विवर्धते । व्यूढावयवं तूपलब्धप्रत्ययं मातुरुदरात्रिस्तस्य यौ धर्माधर्मौ षट्सिद्ध्युपभोगकाले कृतौ तद्वशादवतिष्ठते । यावत्तत्क्षयाच्छरीरपातस्तावत् । यदि धर्मसंस्कृतं करणं ततो ह्युदेशं सूक्ष्मशरीरेण

प्राप्यते, तद्विपर्ययात् यातनास्थानं तिर्ग्यग्योनिं वा, मिश्रीभावेन मानुष्यम् । एवमातिवाहिकं सूक्ष्मशरीरमिन्द्रियाणां धारणप्रापणसमर्थं नित्यं बाह्येनाऽपायिना परिवेष्ट्यते परित्यज्यते च । पतञ्जलेस्तु सूक्ष्मशरीरं यत्सिद्धिकाले पूर्वमिन्द्रियाणि बीजदेशं नयति तत्र तत्कृताशयवशात् द्युदेशं यातनास्थानं वा करणानि वा प्राप्य निवर्तते । तत्र चैवं युक्ताशयस्य कर्मवशादन्यदुत्पद्यते यदिन्द्रियाणि बीजदेशं नयति तदपि निवर्तते, शरीरपाते चान्यदुत्पद्यते । एवमनेकानि शरीराणि । विन्ध्यवासिनस्तु विभुत्वादिन्द्रियाणां बीजदेशे वृत्त्या जन्म । तत्त्यागो मरणम् । तस्मान्नास्ति सूक्ष्मशरीरम् । तस्मान्निर्विशेषः संसार इति पक्षः । एषा सूक्ष्मशरीरस्योत्पत्तिः ॥ ३९ ॥

There are different views of the authorities in this connection. In the view of Pañcādhikaraṇa, the vaivarta body covered by the organs enters the semen and blood at the time of the intercourse of the father and mother, and after its entrance it grows in the form of an embryo. When the limbs are accumulated after attaining the knowledge (pratyayas), coming out of the womb of the mother it subsists due to the virtuous and vile acts done during the experience of the six attainments (powers). It remains (in the corporeal body) upto the destruction of that. If the (internal) organ is purified by virtuous deeds, the subtle body attains the sky, through the opposite to that it attains the place of miseries or the birth of an animal (or insect) through the mixture (of virtuous and vile deeds). One attains the birth of a human being. In this way, the subtle body which is very swift and capable of getting the senses is eternal and is embraced and left by the external body which is perishable. According to Patanjali, the subtle body transmits the senses to the place of the seed before the accomplishment of the body and disappears after taking the body to the upper reign or the place of miseries or the organs in accordance with the impressions of the deeds done in past life. And there some subtle body arises due to the past deed for the one endowed with past impressions which again transmits the senses to the place of seed and then this also disappears. At the time of destruction of the body some other is born. In this way there are many subtle (bodies). According to Vindhyavāsin, as the senses are all-pervasive birth is the function of the senses at the place of seed.⁴ Death is the renouncement of that. Therefore, there is no subtle body at all. Therefore, transmigration is not specific (or prompted by something specific) Thus is the origination of a subtle body.

KĀRIKĀ 39

1. Since the vital airs are of the nature of air, they are specific, and since they are not as gross as the objects like pot, they may be called subtle. The sixth, seventh and eighth are the organs of knowledge, organs of action and egoism (including mind and intellect).
2. Sheath has two conditions : it covers the things and takes away the independence. Since these cover the subtle body and take away its independence, they are called sheaths.
3. These are technically called born of womb (jarāyuja), born of egg (aṇḍaja), born of sweat (svedaja) and born of sprouting (udbhija).
4. Since the senses are all-pervasive according to him, they are available everywhere and, hence, there arises no need of subtle body to carry them to other body.

KĀRIKĀ 40

(Characteristics and constituents of subtle body)

आह, एवमनेकनिश्चयेष्वाचार्येषु भवतः का प्रतिपत्तिरिति ?

Opponent : When there are many types of decided opinions amongst the authorities, what is your assertion about it ?

उच्यते—यत्तावत्पतञ्जलिराह सूक्ष्मशरीरं विनिवर्तते पुनश्चान्यदुत्पत्ते, तत् सूक्ष्मास्तेषां नियता इति वचनादस्माभिर्नाऽभ्युपगम्यते । तस्मात्

पूर्वोत्पन्नमसक्तं नियतं महदादिसूक्ष्मपर्यन्तम् ।

संसरति निरुपभोगं भावैरधिवासितं लिङ्गम् ॥ ४० ॥

तत्र पूर्वोत्पन्नमित्यनेन महदादेः सूक्ष्मपर्यन्तस्य लिङ्गस्यासर्गप्रलयात्रित्यत्वमाह । असक्तमित्यनेन गूढस्थिरबीजानुप्रवेशमाचष्टे । न हि लिङ्गं क्वचिद्व्याहन्यते, किं तर्हि लिक्षादि बीजमप्याविशति । बदरगोलमपि भित्त्वा प्रविशति । नियतमित्यनेन प्रतिपुरुषव्यवस्थां प्रतिजानाति । साधारणो हि महान्त्रकृतित्वादिति वार्षगणानां पक्षः । महदादीत्यनेन प्राणाष्टकं परिगृह्णाति पूर्वात्मानः प्राणाद्याश्च पञ्च वायव्य इति । सूक्ष्मपर्यन्तमिति तत्त्वान्तरप्रतिषेधमाह, एतावदेव नाऽतोऽन्यदिति । संसरतीति गतिमाचष्टे, ततश्चाऽविभुत्वाद् बीजावेशात्प्राणौ प्रख्यातो भवतः । निरुपभोगमिति शरीरान्तरस्यावकाशं करोति । सूक्ष्मशरीरस्य ह्युपभोगसामर्थ्येऽभ्युपगम्यमाने शरीरान्तरस्य निरवकाशत्वादनुत्पत्तिप्रसंगः स्यात् । भावैरधिवासितमित्यनेन भावाष्टकपरिग्रहं द्योतयति । बुद्धिरूपैरिह धर्मादिभिरधिवासितम् । तत्सामर्थ्यात्सर्वत्राऽप्रतिहतं प्राणाष्टकं सूक्ष्मशरीरेऽवस्थानगमनमात्रफले व्यवस्थितम् । द्युतिर्यक्प्रेतेषु संसरतीति तेनैव चार्थसिद्धौ शरीरान्तरपरिकल्पनाऽनर्थक्यमतो न बहूनि शरीराणि ॥ ४० ॥

Proponent : Whatever Patañjali said that the subtle body is destroyed and the other (body) is produced is not accepted by us through our statement 'out of them the subtle are eternal' (Kā 39.)

Therefore,

The subtle body formed primevally, unimpeded, eternal, (composed of the elements) beginning from intellect to the subtle elements migrates invested with dispositions and devoid of experience.

Through the expression formed primevally is stated the eternity of the subtle body composed of the elements beginning from intellect

up to the subtle elements from the time of (initial) creation to the dissolution. Through the expression 'unimpeded' the author states its entrance into the concealed and the hard seed. The subtle body is nowhere impeded. On the contrary, it enters even the seed of a unit. It enters even after breaking the jujube fruit. Through the word 'eternal' the author asserts its adjustment with every conscious.¹ The thesis of the followers of Vārṣaganya is that the intellect being the cause (of the rest of the elements) is common to all. Through the expression intellect, etc., the author states the eight vital airs. The five vital airs like prāṇa are the same (mentioned) earlier.² Through the expression 'upto the subtle elements' the author expresses the exclusion of some other elements, as it is this much only and not different from it. Through the expression 'migrates' (the author) states the motion and from this are said entrance into and abandonment of the seed since it is non-pervasive. Through the expression 'devoid of experience' (the author) leaves scope for the other (i.e., the gross body). If the subtle body itself is admitted to be capable for enjoying, since there will be no scope for the other body, there will arise the undesirable contingency of non-origination of the gross body. Through the expression 'endowed with disposition'. the author suggests that the eight dispositions should be taken here. It is endowed with virtue, etc., forms of the intellect. The eight vital airs are unobstructed everywhere as they are due to their own capacity attached to subtle body which has the only purpose of staying (in the body) and going (out of it). Since it migrates in the animals in the sky and as spirit of the dead person, and since (consequently) the purpose is fulfilled with that only, there is no purpose in postulating some other body (different subtle body). Hence, there are many (subtle) bodies.

KĀRIKĀ 40

1. This adjustment brings out the differentiation in the living beings.
2. Through the term ādi the author of the Yuktidīpikā seems to understand the vital airs also. However, no other commentator includes vital airs in subtle body. The organs of senses, organs of action and egoism (including mind and intellect) are the further three to raise the number to eight.

KĀRIKĀ 41

(All-pervasiveness of the senses criticised)

यत्पुनरेतदुक्तम्-विभुत्वादिन्द्रियाणां स्वात्मन्यवस्थानं वृत्तिलाभो वृत्तिनिरोधश्च संसार इति, अयुक्तमेतत् । कस्मात् ? विभुत्वासिद्धेः । न हि विभुत्वमिन्द्रियाणां कश्चिदभ्युपगच्छति । किं कारणम् ? सततोपलब्धिप्रसंगात् । युगपदुपलब्धिप्रसंगाच्च । कार्यकरणपुरुषाणां हि विभुत्वे सततोपलब्धिप्रसंगोः । विषयाणां प्रतिबन्धाभावात्प्रसज्यते । प्राप्त्यविशेषाच्च सर्वविशेषाणां युगपदुपलब्धिप्रसंगः । व्यवहितविषयग्रहणं च । सर्वत्र सन्निधानात्सन्निकृष्टविप्रकृष्टयोः प्रत्यक्षानुमानागमानां चाऽविशेषः प्रसज्यते । वृत्तिविशेषात्तद्विशेष इति चेत् न, हेत्वभावात् । विभूनामिहाऽस्ति वृत्तिविशेष इत्यत्र हेतुरनुक्तः । तस्मान्न करणानां विभुत्वमुपपद्यते । तस्मात्

चित्रं यथाऽऽश्रयमृते स्थाण्वादिभ्यो विना यथा च्छाया ।

तद्वद्विना विशेषैर्न तिष्ठति निराश्रयं लिङ्गम् ॥ ४१ ॥

यथा हि चित्रस्य कुड्यमृतेऽवस्थानं नास्ति, स्थाणुपुरुषादिभ्यो वा विना च्छायायाः तद्वद्विना विशेषैर्न तिष्ठति निराश्रयं लिङ्गम् । तस्मादुपपन्नमेतत् सविशेषः संसारः ।

The statement that since the senses are all-pervasive, transmigration is the attainment and cessation of the functions in their form in a body, is also wrong.

Why ?

Because the all-pervasiveness is not established. No one accepts the all-pervasiveness of the senses.

What is the reason here ?

Because it would involve the undesirable contingency of continuation of knowledge all the time and because of the undesirable contingency of the simultaneity of knowledge. When the organs and the conscious entity are all-pervasive, there arises the undesirable contingency of the knowledge of the object at all the times because of the absence of some obstruction (in knowledge). And, since they are common to all the objects, there would arise the undesirable contingency of simultaneous knowledge of all the specific object.¹ (or specific qualities). And, there would also be (undesirable contingency of) the knowledge of the objects obstructed by other object. Because of

the contact everywhere, there would arise the undesirable contingency of non-difference between the (knowledge of) the objects situated near and at a distance (from the knower) as also the (knowledge arising of) perception, inference and verbal testimony. If it is argued that the differentiation is due to the particular function (of the senses, we reply) no, *because there is no reason here*. No reason is stated to establish that there is a particular kind of function, in case of the objects of senses which are all-pervasive in nature.² Therefore, the all-pervasiveness of the organs is not (justified).

Therefore,

JUST AS A PICTURE (DOES NOT EXIST) WITHOUT A SUBSTRATUM, A SHADOW WITHOUT A (SOLID OBJECT) PILLAR, ETC., SIMILARLY, THE SUBTLE BODY DOES NOT SUBSIST SUPPORTLESS, WITHOUT THE SPECIFIC OBJECTS.

Just as there is no subsistence of a picture without a wall as also that of a shadow without a pillar or a man, etc., similarly, the subtle body does not subsist supportless without the specific objects. Therefore, it is justified to say that the transmigration is with the specific objects.

आह, यदि सविशेषः संसार बीजदेशगमने शरीरमुपलभ्येत । न त्वेवम् । तस्मादयुक्तमेतत् ।

Opponent : If the transmigration is with specific objects, the body would have been available by going at the place of its seed. It is, however, not so. Therefore, this is wrong.

उच्यते-न, विशेषितत्वात् । सूक्ष्मं तत्क्षरीरमिति विशेषितम् । ततो नाऽस्याहेतुकमग्रहणमिति ।

Proponent : No, *because of the peculiar characteristic*. The peculiar characteristic of that body is that it is subtle. Therefore, its non-perception (or non availability) is not without a person.

आह, सूक्ष्मशरीरयोगात्पूर्वैश्वरत्वप्रसंगः । तस्मादयुक्तं तन्निमित्तमस्याग्रहणमिति ।

Opponent : There arises the undesirable contingency of its being all-powerful in case of the earlier (gross body) due to its being related to the subtle body.³ Therefore, it is wrong to say that its cause is not perceived.

उच्यते-न अनेकान्तात् । तद्यथा क्षुद्रजन्तूनां सूक्ष्मशरीरं लघिमा च, न चैषामीश्वरत्वमेवं सर्वप्राणिनां स्यात् । अथ मतमगृह्यमाणेन सम्बन्धात् स्थूलस्यापि शरीरस्याग्रहणं प्रेताञ्जनसिद्धमाल्यादिवत् । तदप्यनुपपन्नम् । अनेकान्तात् । तद्यथा करणैरगृह्यमाणैः शरीरस्य सम्बन्धः । न चाऽग्रहणम्, पिशाचादिभिर्वा तथैतदपि स्यात् । किञ्च अन्तःकरणाऽनुविधाने चैश्वर्याभिमानात् । यस्य चाध्यवसायमनुविदधत्यणिमादीनि तस्यैश्वर्यमभिप्रेतम् । न तु यस्य स्त्रभावसिद्धानि । अन्यथा तु पिपीलिकादीनामप्याकाशगमनादैश्वर्यं स्यात् ।

No, because it is non-conclusive. Just as both—the subtle body and the small size is observed in vile creatures, but still there is no lordliness in them, similarly, may be the case with all the beings. If it is argued that there would be the non-perception of the gross body also because of its association with non-perceptible just as the wreath formed with a fabulous serpent belonging to a ghost and the ghost; it is also wrong because it is non-conclusive. It may be like the relation of the body with the organs when organs are not perceived and there is no absence of knowledge of (gross body) or the one possessed by the ghost etc.⁴ Moreover, the notion of possessing the lordly powers is when it is connected with the internal organ. The lordly powers are intended in case of one whose powers of being small in size, etc., are controlled by the determination.⁵ It is not in the case of him in whom those are natural. Otherwise, the lordly powers would be (considered) in the case of small red ant or the female ant on account of its going in the sky.

आह, न, शरीराऽनुपपत्तिप्रसंगात् । सूक्ष्मशरीरोत्पत्तौ तर्हि चरितार्थयोः शरीरान्तरसामर्थ्यं विरुध्यते । तस्मादयुक्तम् सविशेषः संसारः ।

Opponent : No because that involves the undesirable contingency of impossibility of the body. The power for producing some other body is obstructed in case of those two (dharma and adharma mentioned later on) which have fulfilled their purpose in producing the subtle body.⁶ Therefore, it is wrong that the transmigration is with the specific elements.

उच्यते-न अनभ्युपगमात् । न धर्माधर्मनिमित्तं वैवर्त शरीरम्, किं तर्हि आधिकारिकमित्यदोषः । न चानेकशरीरत्वमभ्युपगम्यते । तस्मात्पक्षान्तरोपालम्भोऽयम् । किं च कृत्स्नाशयपरिणामाऽप्रतिज्ञानात् । कृत्स्नस्याशयस्य परिणामं जानन्नेवमुपालभ्यः स्यादेकदेशस्तु नो विपरिणामी । तस्मान्न किञ्चिदेतत् । निमित्तावशेषादाशयैकदेशाभिव्यक्तिरयुक्तेति चेत्, स्यान्मतम्-इह निमित्तानामल्पबहुत्वविशेषादाशयाभिव्यक्तिविशेषो दृष्टः । तद्यथा वाय्वादि-क्रोधादिषु । प्रायणकालश्चायं फलाभिव्यक्तौ निमित्तम् । अविशिष्टश्चासौ । तस्मादाशयैक-