

## KĀRIKĀ 27

1. The mode of defining mind again suggests the non-difference between the function and the functioning agent.
2. The meaning is that the senses cannot have desire individually.
3. Cf. S. K. 3.
4. Here starts the reply to the admitting of desire as the collective activity of the senses.
5. The reading of the kārīkā in the Yuktidīpikā is peculiar and the expression is novel.

## KĀRIKĀ 28

(Function of the senses)

समाधिगतं करणपर्व । तस्येदानीं व्यस्तसमस्तवृत्तयो वक्तव्याः । सति चोभयाभिधाने व्यस्तवृत्तिरेव तावदुच्यते, न समस्तवृत्तिः । किं कारणम् ? प्रकरणशेषभूतत्वात् । श्रोत्रादीनां हि सद्भावप्रकरणमिदमनुक्रान्तम् । स चैषां सद्भावः शक्तिविशेषोपालम्भादित्युक्तम् । इदानी-  
मसौ शक्तिविशेषोऽस्माकं व्यस्तवृत्तिरित्युच्यते । तस्मात्तदनुक्रमणं करिष्यामः ।

The phase of the organs is understood. Their individual and collective functions should be mentioned now. Though we have to state the both, yet the individual function is mentioned and not the collective. What is the reason here ? Because it does not form the part of the context. We have undertaken in succession the context of the existence of the ear, etc. And, it is stated that the existence of these is due to the observation of the particular power. That particular power is said to be the individual function now in our theory.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, we shall follow that order.

(Objects of the senses)

आह, यद्येवं तस्मादुच्यतां तस्य करणस्य कस्मिन्नर्थे वृत्तिः, किं लक्षणं वेति ?

Opponent : If it is so, you should state with reference to what object is the function of which organ, or what is the nature of that.

उच्यते— यदुक्तं तस्य कस्मिन्नर्थे वृत्तिरित्यत्र ब्रूमः

रूपादिषु पञ्चानामालोचनमात्रमिद्यते वृत्तिः ।

रूपादिषु शब्दस्पर्शरूपरसगन्धेषु स्वभेदभिन्नेषु पञ्चानां श्रोत्रत्वक्चक्षुर्जिह्वाघ्राणानां श्रवणस्पर्शनदर्शनरसनघ्राणलक्षणो व्यापारो वृत्तिरित्युच्यते । तत्र करणनिर्देशे श्रोत्रेन्द्रियस्य प्राक्पाठान्तद्विषयनिर्देशातिलंघने प्रयोजनं नास्तीति कृत्वा शब्दादिषु पञ्चानामित्येव पठितव्यम् । प्राक्तनस्तु प्रमादपाठः ।

Proponent : With reference to your statement as to in respect of what object is that function of senses, we reply :

**THE FUNCTION OF THE FIVE (SENSES) IS THE PRIMARY ABSTRACT APPREHENSION ONLY IN RESPECT OF THE FORM, ETC.**

The function of the ear, skin, eye, tongue and nose in the form of the act of hearing, touching, seeing, tasting and smelling with respect to word, touch, form, taste and smell which are mutually different due to their own differentiation, is called the function. Since in the mention of the organs ear is enumerated first and there is no purpose in violating the order in the mention of the object of that we have read the kārikā as 'of the five with reference to the word, etc.' The earlier reading is due to carelessness.<sup>2</sup>

(Nature of function of the organs)

यत्पुनरेतदुक्तं किंलक्षणमेति अत्र ब्रूम- आलोचनमात्रमिष्यते । आलोचनं ग्रहणमित्यनर्थान्तरम् । मात्रशब्दो विशेषनिवृत्त्यर्थः । तद्यथा भैक्षमात्रमस्मिन्नामे लभ्यत इत्युक्ते नान्यो विशेष इति ज्ञायते । छन्दोमात्रमधीते माणवक इत्युक्ते नान्यदधीत इति । एवमालोचनमात्रमिन्द्रियाणामिष्यते वृत्तिरित्युक्ते नान्यो विशेष इति गम्यते । तेन किं सिद्धं भवति ? यदुक्तमन्यैराचार्यैः सामान्यज्ञानमिन्द्रियाणां विशेषज्ञानं बुद्धेरिति तत्प्रतिषिद्धं भवति ।

As regards your statement as of what nature is the function, we state-it is intended to be merely the abstract apprehension. Apprehension and getting the impression (or knowledge) are synonymous. The term 'only' is to exclude the particular. For example, when it is stated that the student reads the vedas only, (it is understood) that he does not read anything else (particularly). Similarly, when it is stated that the function of the senses is intended to be the abstract apprehension only, it is understood that nothing else particular (is the function).<sup>3</sup> What is proved thereby? The statement of the other authorities that knowledge of the general ensues from the senses and the knowledge of the particular belongs to the intellect, becomes refuted.

(Abstract apprehension is not the knowledge of generality)

आह, कः पुनरस्मिन्दर्शने दोषो यत एतत्प्रतिषिध्यत इति ?

Opponent : What is the defect in this opinion because of which it is subject to refutation?

उच्यते- सामान्यविशेषयोरितरेतरापेक्षत्वे सत्येकस्मिन्नविरोधादन्यतरपरिकल्पनाऽनर्थक्यम् । यदि खल्विन्द्रियस्य सामान्यज्ञानं न स्यात्तेन विशेषापेक्षं सामान्यं सामान्यपेक्षश्च

विशेष इति यत्र सामान्यज्ञानं तत्र विशेषज्ञानमपि न प्रतिषिध्यत इत्युभयमपीन्द्रियस्य स्यात् । ततश्चान्तःकरणपरिकल्पनाऽनर्थक्यम् । विशेषवतोवाऽन्तःकरणस्य कः सामान्येन विरोध इत्युभयस्यापि तत्र सम्भवादिन्द्रियानर्थक्यम् । तस्मादप्रत्ययमिन्द्रियमिति । इन्द्रियस्य चेत्यत्ययः स्याद्यथा प्रत्ययवतोऽन्तःकरणस्याऽनियतविषयत्वम्, एवमस्यापि स्यात् न तु तदस्ति । तस्मादप्रत्ययमिन्द्रियमिति । किंच कालातिवृत्तिप्रसंगात् । इन्द्रियस्य चेत्यत्ययः स्याद्यथा प्रत्ययवतोऽन्तःकरणस्य त्रिकालविषयत्वमेवमस्यापि स्यात् । न तु तदस्ति । तस्मादप्रत्ययमिन्द्रियमिति । किं चान्यत् स्मृत्यदर्शनात् । इन्द्रियस्य चेत्यत्ययः स्याद्यथा प्रत्ययवतोऽन्तःकरणस्यादिरूपोपपत्तिरेवमत्रापि स्यात् । न तु तदस्ति । तस्मादप्रत्ययमिन्द्रियं सिद्धमिति ।

**Proponent :** The generality and particularity require each other and since they do not stand in contradiction in a single object, the postulation of the other (either of the external or internal organ) is purposeless. If the knowledge of generality only would belong to the senses, the knowledge of generality would not require the knowledge of particularity and similarly the knowledge of generality, but (actually) wherever is the knowledge of generality, the knowledge of particularity is not negated and, hence, both would belong to the senses. Then, the postulation of the internal organ will not serve any purpose. Or, what is the contradiction of the internal organ, which has the knowledge in particular, with the generality ? And, hence, both are possible there and the senses would be purposeless. Therefore, the senses are without understanding. If understanding would belong to the senses, as there is no fixed object of the internal organ, the same would be the case with the senses, But it is not so, Therefore, the senses are without understanding. *Moreover, there will be undesirable contingency of transgression of time.* If the understanding would belong to the senses, as the object of the cognition of the internal organs are the objects of the three points of time, the same would be in case of the senses. But it is not so. Therefore the senses are without cognition. *Moreover, the remembrance is not observed (in case of the senses).* If the cognition would belong to the senses, as there is the possibility of attainment of the initial form (of the object cognised) again in case of the internal organs, the same would be

the case with the senses. This is, however, not so. Therefore, it is established that the senses are without cognition.

(The senses get the form of the objects and do not illumine it)

आह, भवतु तावदप्रत्ययमिन्द्रियम् । ततु ग्रहणरूपं न तु प्रकाशकं प्रदीपवदित्यत्र को हेतुरिति ?

Opponent : Let the senses be without understanding. What is the reason that their function is to receive the (form of the) object and not as of illuminating them as the lamp does ?

उच्यते- न कारणान्तरप्रसंगात् । यदि प्रदीपवदिन्द्रियं प्रकाशकं स्यात्तेन यथा तत्रकाशितेषु घटादिष्वर्थेषु करणान्तरमार्गणमेवमत्रापि स्यात् । न चैतदिष्टम् । अतो न प्रदीपवदिन्द्रियं प्रकाशकमिति । अन्तःकरणसद्भावादयुक्तमिति चेत् स्यान्मतम्- अस्ति करणान्तरं बुद्धिलक्षणं यदिन्द्रियेण प्रदीपवत्प्रकाशितमर्थं गृह्णाति । तस्मात्परवादानुवादोऽयं क्रियते, न प्रतिषेध इति । तच्च नैवम् । कस्मात् ? प्रदीपेन्द्रिययोरन्यतरानुपादानप्रसंगात् । इन्द्रियमपि प्रकाशकम् ; प्रदीपोऽपि । तत्रान्यतरस्यानुपादानं प्रसक्तम् । कस्मात् ? न ह्येकार्थकारिणो युगपत्करणे सामर्थ्यमस्तीति । किं चान्यत् । अन्तःकरणहानेः । इन्द्रियेण प्रदीपवत्प्रकाशितान्बाह्यानर्थान्साक्षादन्तःकरणं गृह्णातीति वदतोऽन्तःकरणमेव हीयते । तस्मादयुक्तमन्तःकरणस्य ग्रहणसामर्थ्यम् । पुरुषस्येति चेन्न करणानर्थक्यप्रसंगात् । साक्षाद्विषयग्रहणसमर्थं पुरुषमिच्छतः करणानर्थक्यं प्रसज्यते । तस्माद्युक्तमेतत् ग्राहकमिन्द्रियं न तु प्रदीपवत्प्रकाशकमिति ।

Proponent : *It is not so, because there will arise the undesirable contingency of (acceptance of) some other cause (of knowledge).* If the senses would be the illuminator like the lamp, as there is the search (i.e., need) for some other instrument in case of the (cognition of) pot, etc., illuminating that, the same would be the case here also. This is, however, not desirable. Therefore, the senses are not the illuminators of the objects like the lamp.<sup>4</sup>

If it is argued that it is wrong due to the existence of internal organs ? If may be like this. There is another organ in the form of intellect which grasps the objects illumined by the senses illumining as lamp? Therefore, it is the exposition of others' theory and not the refutation of it .

It is not so.

Why ?

Because there will be the undesirable contingency of non-

acceptance of either of the lamp or the senses. The senses are the illuminator of the objects, as also the lamp. There arises the undesirable contingency of non-acceptance of one of them.

Why ?

There is no capability of operation of the two instruments which produce the same effect at a time.<sup>5</sup> Moreover, there will be the abandonment of (the nature of) the internal organ. The very nature of internal organ will be abandoned in case of one who states that the internal organ grasps the external objects illumined (by the senses) as a lamp. Therefore, it is wrong (to postulate) the capability of grasping the objects by the internal objects.<sup>6</sup> If it is argued that the capability belongs to the conscious entity, (we reply) no because there will arise the purposeless of the organs. The undesirable contingency of purposelessness of the organ arises in the case of the one who holds that the conscious entity is capable of grasping the objects directly. Therefore, it is right that the senses acquire (the form of) the object and are not the illuminator like the lamp.

(Grasping, illuminating and understanding)

आह, भवतु तावद् ग्रहणमात्रमिन्द्रियवृत्तिप्रत्यया । ग्रहणप्रत्ययप्रकाशाभेदः ?

Opponent : Let it be that the activity of the senses is to grasp the objects (and) not to understand the objects. What is the difference amongst grasping, understanding and illuminating the objects ?

उच्यते— विषयसम्पर्कात्ताद्रूप्यापत्तिरिन्द्रियवृत्तिग्रहणं, तथा विषयेन्द्रियवृत्त्यनुकारेण निश्चयौ गौरयं शुक्लो धावतीत्येवमादिः प्रत्ययः । तथा विषयसम्पर्कापगमे श्रोत्रादिवृत्तेः ताद्रूप्यापगमो वर्तमानकालता, ग्रहणस्यानुभवानु संस्काराधानं तत्पूर्विका च स्मृतिरिति त्रिकालविषया प्रत्ययस्येत्ययमनयोर्विशेषः । बाह्यस्तु प्रकाशो न विषयरूपापन्नः । संस्कारानु घटादीनां व्यवधानरूपं पार्थिवं छायालक्षणं धर्ममपहृत्य व्यञ्जकत्वाय कल्पते, चक्षुषोऽनुग्रहाय । उभयोर्वा चक्षुर्विषययोरित्यपरे । तस्मादुपपन्नमेतत् प्रकाशकं प्रदीपादि, ग्राहकं श्रोत्रादि, व्यवसायकमन्तःकरणमिति ।

Proponent : Grasping, the function of the senses, is the attainment of the form of the object by the senses through the contact with the objects. The determination in the form as 'this is the cow' 'it is white', 'it is running', etc., following the operation of the senses is the understanding. The function of the senses is in present time only as with the cessation of the operation of the

senses when the proximity of the object and the senses come to an end, the acquiring the form of that object the senses also comes to an end, there is the acquirement of the impressions (by the internal organs) through the experience of the form of the object acquired by the senses, and the remembrance is caused by that and, thus, the understanding refers to the three periods of time. This is the difference between the two (viz., grasping and understanding). The illumination is external, and not the acquirement of the form of the object. Through the refinement after removing the quality of shade which is earthly in nature and serves as the hindrance for the (knowledge of) pot, etc., one makes them worthy to manifest so that it renders a favour to the eyes. Or, according to others, it (i.e., refinement) refers to both the eyes and the objects.<sup>7</sup> Therefore, it is right to say that the lamp, etc., are agents of illuminating, the ear, etc., of attaining the form of the object and the internal organs of determining the objects.

(Material origination of the senses refuted)

अथ कर्मेन्द्रियाणां का वृत्तिरित्युच्यते- नैयायिकास्त्वेवमाहुः घ्राणरसनचक्षुस्त्वक्-च्छोत्राणीन्द्रियाणि भूतेभ्यः । भूतेभ्य इत्यनेन स्वविषयोपलब्धिलक्षणत्वं हीन्द्रियाणां भूतप्रकृतित्वेसति निर्धहति (?) नान्यथा । तानि पुनरिन्द्रियकारणानि पृथिव्यप्तेजो वायुराकाशमिति भूतानि । एभ्यः पञ्चभ्यो यथासंख्य घ्राणरसनचक्षुस्त्वक्च्छोत्राणि पञ्चेन्द्रियाणि भवन्ति । भूतप्रकृतित्वमिति भूतस्वभावं व्याख्यायमानं पञ्चस्वपि सम्भवति । भूतकारणत्वं त्वन्येषु । चतुर्षु तथैव । श्रोत्रे तु कथंचित्कर्णशङ्कुल्यवच्छिन्ननभोभागाभिप्रायेण व्यवहारतः समर्थनीयम् । एवं भौतिकानीन्द्रियाणि स्वस्वविषयमधिगन्तमुत्सहन्त इति तल्लक्षणत्वमेषां सिध्यतीति, अतो भूतेभ्य इत्युक्तम् । एतत्तु सांख्याचार्याणां नेष्टम् । एवं हि सांख्यवृद्धा आहुः - आहङ्कारिकाणीन्द्रियाणि अर्थ साध्यितुमर्हन्ति नान्यथा । तथा हि कारकं कारकत्वादेव प्राप्यकारिभवति । भौतिकानि चेन्द्रियाणि कथं प्राप्यकारीणि दुरवर्तिनि विषये भवेयुः? आहङ्कारिकाणां तु तेषां व्यापकत्वात् । विषयाकारपरिणामात्मिका वृत्तिर्वृत्तिमतोऽनन्या सती सम्भवत्येवेति सुवचं प्राप्यकारित्वम् अपि च महदणुग्रहणमाहङ्कारिकत्वे तेषां कल्पते, न भौतिकत्वे । भौतिकत्वे हि यत्परिमाणं करणं तत्परिमाणं ब्राह्मं गृह्णीयात् ।

Now it is stated as to what is the function of the organs of action. The Naiyāyikas state like this. The senses, viz., nose, tongue, eye, skin and the ear come out of the elements (N.S. 1.1.12). Through the word 'from the elements' is suggested that the act of cognising

their own object in case of the senses is determined when they are the products of the elements, viz., earth, water, light, air, and the sky. From them come out the nose, tongue, eye, skin and ear respectively. Through the expression 'caused from the elements' the nature of the elements which will be explained later on is possible in all the five. The nature of having elements as the cause is as it is stated in the case of other four. In the case of ear, however, it is to be justified through usage in the senses of the part of the sky occupied by the outer part of the ear. In this way, the senses which are elemental in nature are capable of grasping their own object; hence, their characteristic in the form of that object is proved. Hence, it is stated that they come out of the elements. This is, however, undesirable to the authorities of Sāṃkhya. The propounders of Sāṃkhya say thus. The senses which come out of egoism only accomplish the object (of grasping the objects) and not otherwise. An efficient cause due to its very nature of being so is of the nature of doing the act after reaching the object. How would the senses which are elemental in nature reach the object situated at a distance? In case they come out of the egoism, it is possible because of their being all-pervasive.<sup>8</sup> The nature of reaching the object is well-stated since it is possible when the function of the senses to attain the form of the object is not different from the agents. Moreover, the nature of grasping the objects great and atomic in size is postulated in case of them when they come out of the egoism, and not when they are elemental in nature. In case of the elemental objects the efficient cause would grasp the object and the size of the organs themselves.

(Function of the organs of action)

आह, अथ कर्मेन्द्रियाणां का वृत्तिरिति ?

Opponent : What is the function of the organs of action?

उच्यते—

**वचनादानविहरणोत्सर्गानन्दाश्च पञ्चानाम् ॥ २८ ॥**

वाक्पाणिपादपायूपस्थानां तु वचनादानविहरणोत्सर्गानन्दलक्षणा यथाक्रमं वृत्तयः प्रत्यवगन्तव्याः । तत्रोच्यतेऽनेनेति वचनम् । तस्माद्य एवार्थप्रत्यायनसमर्थो वर्णसमुदायः पद-वाक्यश्लोकग्रन्थलक्षणः स वागिन्द्रियस्थार्थो नाऽन्यः । आदीयतेऽनेनेत्यादानम् । आर्डाभ-विध्यर्थे प्रयुज्यते । ततश्च यदेव प्रक्षालनपरिमार्जनोपस्पर्शनाध्ययनप्रहरणशिल्पव्यायामादि कृत्स्नं ग्रहणं स इन्द्रियार्था नान्यः । विशिष्टं हरणं विहरणम् । अतश्च यदेव समविषमनिम्नो-न्नतचङ्क्रमणपरिवर्तननाट्यव्यायामादिः स इन्द्रियार्थो नान्यः । एवमत्कष्टः सर्ग उत्सर्गः ।

नान्यः । एवमभिव्याप्यानन्दमानन्दः । ततश्च य एवाऽसाधारणप्रीति नयनाभिनिष्पित्तिलक्षणः  
स इन्द्रियार्थो नान्यः ॥ २८ ॥

Proponent : SPEAKING, HANDLING, WALKING, EXCRETION  
AND GRATIFICATION ARE (THE FUNCTIONS) OF THE  
OTHER (FIVE).

The functions of speech, hand, feet, the anus and generative organ should be understood as speaking, handling, walking, excretion and gratification respectively. Out of them, speech is that by which something is spoken. Therefore, the group of letters in the form of word, sentence, verse and book, capable of conveying some meaning, is the object of the organ of speech and not of anything else. Handling is that by which something is handled. Therefore, the group of letters in the form of word, sentence, verse and book, capable of conveying some meaning? is the object of the organ of speech and not of anything else. Handling is that by which something is handled. The prefix *anga* and *bhi* are used in the sense of practice or mode. All that which is the act of handling or seizing in case of washing, cleaning, touching, studying, striking, art and craft, exercise, etc., is the object of this sense and not of anything else. Walking means a particular act of carrying. Whatever is the particular act of walking or carrying involved in walking in even, uneven, low and high places, change (of place), acting and exercise, etc., is the object of this sense and not of anything else. Similarly, excretion is the act of excreting. Hence, the excretion of the modification of eatern and drunk, through the way of proper canal of nutriment in the body, is the object of this sense and nothing else. Gratification is the pleasure covering (the Whole body). Hence, that which results from the eyes full of exceptional love is the object of this sense and of nothing else.

## KĀRIKĀ 28

1. The particular power or function forms the definition of organs as also serves as a probans for their existence.
2. The correct reading should be sabdbādiṣu, etc. , in place of rūpādisu.
3. It is implied that the senses have no knowledge but get the form of the object and submit it to the internal organs which transform this apprehension into knowledge. In that stage there is no particularity in knowledge.
4. Only the illumination does not serve the purpose. The impression of that object is to be carried to the internal organs. If the senses would only manifest the object, the purpose of carrying the impression would not be fulfilled.
5. If the senses would reveal the object like lamp, one could see the object in darkness as well because the purpose of lamp could be served by the senses themselves. Moreover, in the presence of lamp or in light there would be no purpose to be served by the senses.
6. The very nature of the internal organs implies that they do not come in contact with the external objects directly. If they do so, they would deviate from their very nature.
7. The refinement is to help the revealing of the object as also the help to the senses to turn them fit to get the form of the object.
8. The idea of all-pervasiveness of the senses is against the statement of the Sāṃkhya that the cosmic matter is all-pervasive while the evolutes are limited in magnitude (Kārikā 10).

## KĀRIKĀ 29

(Function of the internal organs)

आह, प्रागन्तःकरणवृत्तिनिर्देशः, सर्गक्रमानुगमात्पूर्वं बुद्ध्यहंकारमनसां वृत्तिनिर्देशः कर्तव्यः। किं कारणम् ? एवं हि सर्गक्रमोऽनुगतो भवति। क्रमभेदे वा प्रयोजनं वक्तव्यमिति।

Opponent : The function of the internal organs should be mentioned first. There should be the mention of the function of the intellect, egoism and mind first in accordance with the order in the evolution.<sup>1</sup>

What is the reason here ?

In this way (only) the order in evolution is followed. Or, the purpose of deviation from the order should be stated.

उच्यते- न, इन्द्रियवृत्तिपूर्वकत्वात्। अन्तःकरणस्य हि इन्द्रियवृत्तिप्रर्वकः प्रत्ययः। तथा च वक्ष्यति- दृष्टे तथाऽप्यदृष्टे त्रयस्य तत्पूर्विका वृत्तिरिति (का. ३०)। तस्मात्सर्गक्रमेण विना तन्निर्देशः प्रागाचार्येण क्रियते इति।

Proponent : No, because that (function of the internal organs) follows the function of the senses. The understanding of the internal organs follows the function of the senses. The author will also state: with regard to the perceptible as also with regard to the imperceptible, the function of the three follows that (function of the senses). Therefore, the mention of that is made by authority first ignoring the order in evolution.

आह, तदसम्भवः, शास्त्रे प्रागाभमानाभिधानात्। शास्त्रं ह्येवमाह- का नु भोः संज्ञा मातुरुदरेऽवस्थितं कुमारं प्रत्याभिनिर्विशत इति ? अस्मीत्येषा माहात्मी संविदिति। तथा कार्यकारणव्यूहसमकालं माहात्म्यशरीरोऽस्मीति प्रतिबुद्ध्यते। प्रवृत्ताश्चैव ह्यव्यक्ता भवन्त्यस्मीत्यस्मितामात्रा। प्रमाणं च शास्त्रम्। तस्मात्प्रागन्तःकरणनिर्देशः कर्तव्यः।

Opponent : That is impossible because the 'I notion' is mentioned first in the scripture. The scripture states like this: 'What no-

tion is attached to a body situated in the fetus of the mother ? The great knowledge 'I am'. At the time of formation of the body, it is known 'I am the mahātmya body'.<sup>2</sup> The egoism which proceeds afterwards lies latent. The scriptures are the authority here. Therefore, the mention of the internal organ should be made first.

उच्यते- तन्निमित्तार्थेन विवक्षितत्वात् । सत्यमेतत् कार्यकारणव्यूहनिष्पत्तिसमकालमस्मीत्येषा माहात्मी सवित् प्रत्युपधीयते । शब्दादिविषयस्त्वन्तःकरणप्रत्ययः श्रोत्रादिनिमित्त इति । एतत्पूर्वशब्देन विवक्षितम् । न च निमित्तमतिक्रम्य नैमित्तिकाभिधानं न्याययम् ।

अथवा नैव वयमिदं प्रष्टव्या यथा प्रागन्तःकरणवृत्तिनिर्देशः कर्तव्य इति । किं कारणम् ? यस्मात्

### स्वालक्षण्यं वृत्तिस्त्रयस्य

स्वलक्षणमेव स्वालक्षण्यम् । स्वार्थे तद्धितवृत्तिः, अन्यभावस्तु कालशब्दव्यवायादिति । [यथा बुद्ध्यहंकारमनसां हि सौक्ष्म्यात् शक्यं स्वरूपमभिधातुमित्यतो वृत्तिरेव लक्षणभावेनोपदिश्यते] श्रोत्रादीनामपि च सौक्ष्म्याल्लक्षणमपदेष्टुमशक्यमिति वृत्तिरेवोच्यते, न लक्षणम् । तदेव चैषा लक्षणं भवति । यच्छब्दालोचनसमर्थं तच्छ्रोत्रम् । एवमितरेष्वपि वक्तव्यम् । बुद्ध्यहंकारमनसां च लक्षणमध्यवसायाद्युक्तम् । तदेव वृत्तित्वेनाचक्षाणः श्रोत्रादीनामेव चाभिधानं लक्षणं चाप्याचक्षाणो वृत्तिवृत्तिमतोरन्यत्वं ज्ञापयति । अन्यथा तु यथाऽध्यवसायादि लक्षणमेवं रूपादिषु पञ्चानामोलचनमात्रं लक्षणमित्युच्यते, न तु वृत्तिरिति । श्रोत्रादिवद् बुद्ध्यदीनामपि व्यवसायादयो वृत्तिरित्युच्यते, न तु लक्षणम् । तस्मान्न्यथा निर्देशो ज्ञापकं वृत्तिवृत्तिमतोरन्यत्वस्येति व्याख्याता करणवृत्तिः ।

Proponent : Because that (function of the senses) is desired to be stated for the purpose of considering it as the cause (of the function of the internal organs). It is true that the great knowledge that 'I am' is imposed upon it at the time of the production of the body. The cognition of the internal organs with reference to the objects like word, etc., is caused by the ear, etc., This is denoted by the word caused. It is not right to mention the effect overlooking the senses. Or, we should not be told that the mention of the function of the internal organ should be made first.

What is the reason here ?

Because

### THE FUNCTIONS OF THREE INTERNAL ORGANS ARE THEIR RESPECTIVE CHARACTERISTIC FEATURES (DEFINITION)

The respective characteristics mean the individual characteristic of their own. The grammatical operation, viz., taddhita is in the sense of its own. The state of difference is caused by the intervention of time and words. The function only is stated in the form of definition in case of the intellect, egoism and the mind since their (other) essential nature is not capable of being stated because of their subtleness. Similarly, it is not possible to state the definition (or the peculiar characteristic) of ear, etc., on account of thier subtleness, and hence their function only is stated and not the definition or peculiar characteristic. Their functions only serve as their definition. That which is capable of getting abstract apprehension of the word is the ear. Similarly, should be said in the case of other senses also. The peculiar characteristic of the intellect, egoism and mind are stated to be the ascertainment, etc. Stating the same as the function and stating the peculiar characteristic also in the form of that as also the same in case of ear, etc., the author suggests the non-difference between the function and the agent. Otherwise, as the ascertainment, etc., are the characteristic, the function of grasping the form, etc., would be stated as the characteristic only and the function. As in the case of ear, etc., the ascertainment, etc., are said to be the function and not the characteristic in case of intellect, etc. Therefore, the mention in the other form is suggestive of the non-difference between the function and the agent.<sup>3</sup> Thus is explained the function of the organ.

(Definition as the peculiar function)

**सैषा भवत्यसामान्या ।**

सेति पूर्वकृतां वृत्तिमभिसम्बन्धाति । एषेति सर्वनाम्ना प्रत्याकृष्टां तामेव प्रत्यक्षं प्रति निर्दिशति । भवतीति वक्ष्यमाणेन धर्मान्तरेणास्यास्तद्वृत्ताऽनुभावित्वं ख्यापयति । असामान्येति धर्ममाचष्टे । सामान्या साधारणेत्यर्थः । न सामान्याऽसामान्या । प्रतिकरणं नियतेत्युक्तं भवति । या हीयमनुक्रान्ता करणवर्णोऽध्यवसायादिका वृत्तिरियं व्यस्तानां करणानां प्रतिस्वं नियता । ततश्चैषां बुद्ध्यादीनां कार्यविशेषनिमित्तभावसंसूचितस्य स्वरूपस्यासंकरः सिद्धः ।

**THIS IS PECULIAR TO EACH**

The pronoun 'that' refers to the function stated earlier. With

the pronoun 'this' the author relates to directly presented (discussion) the same which is drawn from above. The expression 'is' proclaims the understanding (or indication) of its identity with the other property to be mentioned later on. The term 'peculiar' refers to the property or quality. The term 'general' means common. That which is not general is uncommon. It is to be stated that it is fixed with (or is peculiar to) each organ. The functions of the phases of the organs, ascertainment, etc., which are enumerated earlier in succession are fixed with (i.e., is peculiar to) each of the organs taken separately. Thus is proved the absence of commingling of the nature of these intellect, etc., which is suggested through the state of being the cause of a particular effect (i.e., activity).

(Common function of all the senses)

आह, सामान्यविशेषयोरितेरेतरापेक्षत्वादसामान्यभिधानेन सामान्यस्याप्यभिधानादध्यवसायादिका करणानामसामान्या वृत्तिरित्युक्तेऽर्थादापत्रमेषां सामान्यापि वृत्तिरस्तीति । तस्मादसावपि वक्तव्येति ।

Opponent : When it is stated that ascertainment, etc., are the uncommon function of the senses, it means by imilication that there is their common function also because with the mention of uncommon the common also becomes mentioned since the common and uncommon require (i.e., depend upon) each other. Therefore, that (common) also should be stated.

उच्यते—

**सामान्यकरणवृत्तिः प्राणाद्या वायवः पञ्च ॥२९ ॥**

सामान्या चासौ करणवृत्तिः सामान्यकरणवृत्तिः । प्राणश्चाद्यो येषां ते प्राणाद्याः प्राणापानसमानोदाव्यानाः पञ्च समस्तकरणवृत्तिः प्रत्यवगन्तवेयति । तैः सर्वैः सहितः प्राण इति वेदान्तेष्वपि ।

Proponent : THE FUNCTION COMMON TO ALL THE ORGANS IS (CIRCULATION OF) THE FIVE VITAL AIRS, PRANA ETC.

The expression 'the function common to all the organs 'means the function of the organs which is common. The expression prana etc.' means those of which prana is the first. The circulation of the five vital airs, viz., prana, apana, samana, udana and vyana should be understood as the function of the organs collectively. It is stated in the Upaniṣads also that prana is with (or common to all of them).

आह, अयुक्तमेतत् । कस्मात् ? धर्मिणो धर्म्यन्तरवृत्तिभावानुपपत्तेः । वृत्तिरित्ययं शब्दो व्यापारमाचष्टे । न च धर्मान्तरं धर्मान्तरस्य व्यापारो भवितुमर्हतीति ।

Opponent : This is wrong. Why ? Because there is no possibility of becoming a function of a qualified object by some other qualified object (i.e., an object cannot be the function of the other object). The word function denotes activity. And, one qualified object cannot be the function of other qualified object.<sup>4</sup>

उच्यते—न कार्ये कारणोपचारात् । सत्यमेतत् । धर्मा धर्म्यन्तरस्य वृत्तित्वेनाशक्यः परिकल्पयितुम् । किं तु सामान्यकरणवृत्त्या प्रेर्यमाणो वायुस्तत्प्रवणत्वात्तत्कार्यतां प्रतिपद्यते । तत्र प्राणादिकार्ये वायौ प्राणोपचारं कृत्वा एवमुच्यते—प्राणाद्या वायवः पञ्च ।

Proponent : No because the effect is metaphorically spoken to be the cause. It is true that a qualified object cannot be postulated as function of some other qualified object. However, the air circulated by the function of the organs common to all is said to be a function of them because it is circulated by them. Thus, metaphorically applying the name *prāṇa* (i.e., activity in circulation of the air) to the air, which is the object of activity involved in *prāṇa*, etc., it is stated—the five vital airs *prāṇa*, etc.,

तत्प्रेरणाऽसिद्धेरयुक्तमिति चेत् स्यादेतत्, कथमेतदवगम्यतेऽर्थान्तरप्रेरितस्य वायोरियं क्रिया भवति न पुनः स्वतन्त्रस्येति ?

Opponent : If it is argued that it is wrong because the circulation of that (by the organs) is not yet established? It may be like this. How is it known that the activity in air is when it is circulated by other object and not independently?

उच्यते—न स्वतः, तदव्यतिरिक्तत्वाऽनुपपत्तेः । इहेयमकस्माद् भिन्ना क्रियावायोः स्वतो वा स्यात्, करणवृत्तिव्यतिरिक्तताद्वा ? किं चातः ? तत्र तावत्स्वत उपपद्यते । कस्मात् ? सर्वत्र प्रसंगात् स्वाभाविके हि वायोदिकसंचारेऽभ्युपगम्यमाने सर्वत्र तत्संभवः स्यात् । ततश्च तिर्यक्पातादिवृत्तिर्हन्येत, न चान्यतः । कस्मात् ? अदर्शनात् । न हि पृथिव्यादीनां वायुप्रेरणसामर्थ्यं क्वचिदुपलब्धम् । भस्मादिषु दृष्टमिति चेन्न, अन्यनिमित्तत्वात् । अत्राऽपिचैत्रव्यापार उपलभ्यते इत्यवश्यमन्यनिमित्तमुपलभ्यते इत्यभ्युपगन्तव्यम् । आत्मेति चेन्न, क्रियाप्रतिषेधात् । उपपादितमेतत्पूर्वमात्मा निष्क्रिय इति । न च निष्क्रियस्य प्रेरणमुपप-

घटे । न च निर्निमित्ता स्वभावभेदानामनाकस्मिकत्वात् । तस्माद्यत्तन्निमित्तं सा समस्तकरण-  
वृत्तिः ।

Proponent : It is not of its own because there is no possibility of being different from that. The activity of the air which is accidentally different from it may be independently of its own or due to some other reason different from the function of the senses.

What does it prove ?

The activity is not possible independently.

Why ?

*Because it would involve the undesirable contingency of its presence everywhere. If the circulation of the air in the direction is admitted to be natural, there will be the possibility of its presence everywhere. In that case the act of falling down (or flying) in the direction (or the function of the flying or falling down of a bird) could come to an end.<sup>5</sup> It is not caused by some other object.*

Why ?

*Because it is not observed. The capacity of circulating the air is not observed anywhere in the earth, etc. If you argue that it is observed anywhere in case of balloons, etc., (we reply) no, because it is caused, by something else. In this case the activity of Caitra etc., is observed and, hence, it should be admitted that some other cause is certainly observed. If it is argued that it is the soul (which activates), we reply, no, because the activity is already negated (in case of soul). It is established earlier that the soul is inactive. The act of instigating is not possible in case of the inactive entity. It is not that it is not caused because the objects which differ in nature (or differ from other naturally) are not causeless since they are not accidental. Therefore, whatever is that cause, it is the activity of all the senses.*

(Prāṇa, etc., are not a single air)

स चायं वायुरेक एव स्थानसंचारविशेषान्नाख्या भवति । यथैको देवदत्तः पाचको लावक इति क्वचित् । तदयुक्तम् । कस्मात् ? युगपत्परस्परतिशयविरोधात् । पूर्वस्मात्पूर्वस्मादुत्तर उत्तरो वायुर्बलीयानिति ह्यभ्युपगमः । तदेतदेकस्यैकस्मिन्काले नोपपद्यते । तस्मादुपपन्नं प्राणाद्या वायवः पञ्च ।

That air is one but is given different names due to its particularity of circulation at different places. Just as the same person Devadatta by name is somewhere a cook and somewhere a wood-cutter.

That is wrong .

Why ?

Because of its contradiction with the mutual pre-eminence at a time. It is admitted that the later air is pre-eminent in comparison to the earlier. This is not possible in case of one at a time. Therefore, it is right that prāṇa, etc., are the five airs.

(Prāṇa)

किं पुनरेषां प्राणादीनां लक्षणमिति ?

Opponent : What is the definition of prāṇa ,etc. ?

उच्यते—द्विविधाः प्राणादयः। अन्तर्वृत्तयो बहिर्वृत्तयश्च । तत्र मुखनासिकाभ्यां प्रगमनात्प्रणतेश्च प्राणः। योऽयं मुखनासिकाभ्यां सञ्चरति सोऽन्तर्वृत्तिर्वायुः प्राण इत्यभिधीयते । या काचित्प्रणतिर्नाम भूतेषु तद्यथा प्रणतेयं सेना, प्रणतोऽयं वृक्षः, प्रणतोऽयं धर्म, प्रणतोऽयमर्थे, प्रणतोऽयं कामे, प्रणतोऽयं विद्यायाम् । तद्विपरीतेषु वा बाह्यप्राणवृत्तिरेषा । प्राणिष्वप्येवैषा भवति । स खल्वयमत्राऽभिव्यक्तो भवति । तद्यथा महता वा दुःखेनाऽभिप्लुतस्य महता वा बन्धुना वियुक्तस्य, सहितस्य वा सौरभेयस्य, निपानावतीर्णस्य वा महिषस्यावगतेः ।

Proponent : The prāṇa, etc., are of two kinds —coming inside and going outside the body—It is called prāṇa because it goes (inside) through the nose and the mouth, and because of the inclination (of being towards it). That internal air which enters (inside) through mouth and the nose is the prāṇa. That inclination is observed in the beings sometimes. For example, the Army is inclined; the tree is inclined; this fellow is inclined for virtues; this (man) is inclined for wealth, this (man) is inclined for pleasure; this (man) is inclined for learning. Or the activity of the external vital airs is observed in the case opposite to these. This is observed in the case of the beings also. The same becomes manifest here. For example , after knowing the one overpowered with great misery, separated from a near relative, accompanied with a herd of cattle, or the buffalo fallen in the pool.<sup>6</sup> (Apāna)

अपक्रमणाच्चापानः। योऽयं रसं धातून् शुक्रं मूत्रं पुरीषं वातार्तवगर्भाश्चाकर्षन्नधोगच्छन्नयमन्तर्वृत्तिर्वायुरपान इत्यभिधीयते । यच्चापि किञ्चिदपक्रमणं नाम भूतेषु तद्यथा अपक्रान्तोऽयं धर्मादिभ्यस्तद्विपरीतेभ्यो वा इति बाह्या खल्वपानवृत्तिरेषा ।

अपानविषय एवैष भवति । बलवत्तरश्चायं प्राणोद्वायोः कस्मात् ? एषा ह्येतं प्राणमूर्ध्वं वर्तमानमर्वागेव सन्नियच्छति अर्वागेव सन्निरुणद्धि । एषोऽत्राभिव्यक्तो भवति । तद्यथा उपकूपमुपश्वभ्रं वा परिवर्तमानस्या— शतपदीं लङ्घयतः ।

And the apāna is called so because it goes down. The air inside the body which goes downward and pulls down the fluid, secretion or the ingredients of the body, semen virile, urine, excrement (which are constituents of the body) menstrual fluid, and the embryo is called the apāna. The external function of the apāna is the function of going down or retreating in the beings just as this has gone down from the virtue or from the opposite of that. That is the object of apāna. This is more powerful than the prāna air.

Why ?

It brings down the prāna air which is at a higher place and it controls it though seated below. It is manifested in these cases : One moving around the well or a hole or in the case of one crossing a centipede.

(Sāmāna)

हृद्यवस्थानात्सह भावाच्च समानः । यस्त्वयं प्राणापानयोमध्ये हृद्यवतिष्ठते से समानो वायुरन्तर्वृत्तिः यश्चापि कश्चित्सह भावो नाम भूतेषु द्वन्द्वारामता । तद्यथा सह दास्ये, सह यक्ष्ये, सह तपश्चरिष्यामि सह भार्यापुत्रैर्बन्धुभिः सुहृद्भिश्च वर्तिष्य बाह्या समान वृत्तिरेषा । समानविषय एवैष भवति इति । बलवत्तरः खल्वयं प्राणापानाभ्याम् । एष ह्येतौ प्राणापानौ ऊर्ध्वमवाक्च वर्तमानौ मध्य एव सन्नियच्छति, मध्य एव सन्निरुणद्धि, स चैषौऽत्राभिव्यक्तो भवति । तद्यथा स्तुतसारस्य वा सारमेयस्य अनडुहो वोढभारस्य, घर्माभितप्ताया वा एडकाया अर्धाधिकायं शकशकेति । प्राणान्ते सर्वप्राणिनां प्राणापानावुत्सृज्योर्ध्वमधश्च मुक्तयोक्त्रौ हयाविव विषमं संचारयन् शरीरं स परास्यति ।

The Samāna is called so because it is located in the heart and stays in its association. The air which is located in the midst of prāna and apāna is the samāna air functioning inside the body. Whatever is associated in the being in collecting together with the other partner is the external function of the samāna air just as I shall give in association with other; I shall sacrifice with others; I shall practise penance together with others, I shall stay with wife, sons, brothers and friends. This is the object of samāna. This is more powerful than prāna and apāna. It controls the prāna and apāna which are present above and below it respectively, itself remaining in the middle. It becomes manifest in the following cases: the dog giving forth the essential part (of the body) or the bull carrying load, or the restling noise of the sheep afflicted by heat. When the life of the beings comes to

an end, it moves irregularly up and down the prāṇa and apāna air (which are at that time) like the ununited horses and leaves (casts off) the body.<sup>7</sup>

### (Udāna)

मूर्धारोहणादात्मोत्कर्षणाच्चोदानः । यस्त्वयं प्राणपानसमानानां स्थानान्यतिक्रम्यरसं धातृश्चादाय मूर्धानमारोहति ततश्च प्रतिहतो निवृत्तः स्थानकरणानुप्रदानविशेषाद्गर्णपदवाक्यश्लोकग्रन्थलक्षणस्य शब्दस्याऽभिव्यक्तिनिमित्तं भवति अयमन्तर्वृत्तिर्वायुरुदान इत्युच्यते । यश्चापि कश्चिदात्मोत्कर्षो नाम भूतेषु तद्यथा हीनादस्मि श्रेयान्, सदृशेनवा सदृशः, सदृशादस्मि श्रेयान्, श्रेयसा वा सदृशः, श्रेयसो वा श्रेयान् । एतस्मिस्तथा रूपाभिमानो वा प्राप्तविद्यस्तु । दद्यथा बहन्तरविशेषादल्पान्तरविशेषोऽस्म्यगुणवतो वा गुणवानस्मीति बाह्योदानवृत्तिरेषा । उदानविषय एवैष भवति । बलवत्तरः खल्वयं पूवभ्यः कथम् ? एष होता-न्प्राणादीनूर्ध्वमवाङ्मध्ये च वर्तमानानूर्ध्वमेवोन्नयति, ऊर्ध्वमेवोत्कर्षति । स चैषोऽत्राभिव्यक्तो भवति शीतोदकेन वा पर्युक्षितस्य प्रासमसिं विकोशं चोद्यतमभिपश्यतः ।

The udāna is called so because it goes upto, i.e., mounts the head and because it moves the soul upward. The air inside the body is called udāna which mounts the head above the places of prāṇa, apāna and samāna taking with it the fluid and secretion and returning from there after being obstructed and due to the particular contact (lit. attaining the particular place and organ) it becomes the cause for the manifestation of the word in the form of letter, word, sentence, verse and a book. Whatever is the notion of self-superiority in the being as 'I am superior to the lower (persons)', 'I am equal to my equals', 'I am superior to those similars to me', 'I am equal to the great man', or 'I am superior to superiors' (is due to this). Or, it is the 'I notion' with reference to the form or status like 'I am so in this' in case of an educated person. For example, beginning from the major particular difference to the minor particular difference is the external function of the udāna as 'I belong to the non-virtuous' or 'I am a virtuous man'. This is the object of udāna. It is more powerful than the earlier.

### How ?

Because it takes upwards the prāṇa, etc., present upward, downward or in the middle; it draws them upward only. It is manifested in the case of one sprinkled with cold water or the one seeing a man with a unsheathed sword and ready for discharging it.

### (Vyāna)

शरीरव्याप्येतरत्यन्ताविनाभावाच्च व्यानः । यस्त्वयमालोमनखाच्छरीरं व्याप्य रसादीनां धातूनां पृथिव्यादीनां व्यूहं मर्मणां च प्रस्पन्दनं प्राणादीनां च स्थितिं करोति सोऽन्तर्वृत्ति-

व्यानः । यश्चापि कश्चिदत्यन्ताऽविनाभावो नाम भूतेषु तद्यथा पतिव्रता भर्तारं मृतमप्यनुगच्छति भवान्तरेऽप्ययमेव भर्ता स्यात् तथा धर्मादिभिस्तद्विपरीतैश्चेति बाह्यो व्यानविषय एवैष प्रभवति । बलवत्तमश्चायं सर्वेभ्यः । कथम् ? अनेन हि व्याप्ते शरीरदण्डके तद्वशीकृतानां प्राणादीनां समा स्थितिर्भवति । स एषोऽन्तकाले प्राणभृतामविनाभावेन वर्तमानोऽभिव्यज्यते । तद्यथा हा तर्हि पादौ हैमौ शीतौ भूतौ गुल्फे जङ्घे ऊरु कटिरुदरमुरःकण्ठेऽस्यखुरघुरो वर्तते हू (?) इत्यवैषो बाह्यो व्यान इति । एवमेते प्राणाद्याः स्थानकार्यविशेषसूचिताः पञ्च वायवो व्याख्याताः तेषां प्रेरिका सामान्यकरणवृत्तिः ।

The vyāna is called so because it pervades the body, and because of its being in the case of intimate association. The air inside the body which sustains the prāṇa, etc., and which pervading the whole body right from the nail to the hair and causes the movement in vital parts and the group of the gross (earth) elements, fluid and secretion (in the body) is the vyāna. Whatever is the state of absolute non-separation in the being, is the external object of vyāna. For example, a chaste and virtuous wife follows her husband (after his) with an intention that she may get the same husband in other births also. Similarly, (the absolute non-separation) from virtue, etc., and their opposites. It is the most powerful of all.

How ?

There is the equal position of the prāṇa, etc., which when controlled by him pervade the whole body. At the time of death it is manifested as present in non-separable states in the living beings. For example, when the feet become cold in snow, the sound exists in ankle, shank, hips, belly, chest and throat. This is the external vyāna. In this way are explained the five airs, prāṇa, etc., indicated by their particular location and activities (location, activities or particularities). The instigation of them is the common function of the organs.<sup>8</sup>

(Life or Eight Prāṇas)

एषा च तन्त्रान्तरेषु प्रयत्न इत्युच्यते । स च धर्मादिसंस्कारभावनावशादनुपरतो जीवन्म् । आह च

वृत्तिरन्तः समस्तानां करणानां प्रदीपवत् ।

अप्रकाशा क्रियारूपा जीवनं कायधारिका ॥

सा यावदनिरुद्धा तु हन्ति वायुं रजोऽधिका ।

धर्माद्यनावृत्तिवशात्तावज्जीवति मानवः ॥

अत्र च सामान्यकरणवृत्तिग्रहणसामर्थ्यात्प्राणाद्याः पञ्च वायवः। बुद्धीन्द्रियाणि षष्ठम्। कर्मेन्द्रियाणि सप्तमम्। पूरुष्टमम्। पूरित्यहंकारावस्थासंविदमधिकुरुते। यस्मादाह-तत्र

संविदहंकारगतं कार्यं कारणं पूरयति यस्मात् ।  
तस्मात्पूरित्युक्ता प्रत्यवभासाऽष्टमं भोक्तुः ॥  
सा चाहङ्कारगता संविद् बुद्धिगतैव पुरुषेणोपलभ्यते ।

यस्माद्बुध्यति-

एते प्रदीपकल्पाः परस्परविलक्षणा गुणविशेषाः ।  
कृत्स्नं पुरुषस्यार्थं प्रकाश्य बुद्धौ प्रयच्छन्ति ॥ (का० ३६)  
सर्वं प्रत्यपभोगं यस्मात्पुरुषस्य साधयति बुद्धिः ॥ (का० ३७)

तस्मात्सैव पूरिति। शास्त्रं चैवमाह-प्राणापानसमानोदानव्यानाः पञ्च वायवः। षष्ठं मनः। सप्तमी पूरुष्टमी वाक्। वाग्ग्रहणेन कर्मेन्द्रियपर्वणो ग्रहणम्। मनोग्रहणेन बुद्धीन्द्रियपर्वणः। तदेतत्प्राणाष्टमं वैकारिकं गुणशरीरस्य परिद्रष्टुः क्षेत्रज्ञस्य शरीरमादानस्य नित्यंस्तम्भस्थानीयं प्रत्यङ्गं भवति, अच्छेद्यमभेद्यमदाह्यमविनाश्यमविकम्प्यम्। अनित्यानि पुनर्भौतिकानि बाह्यानि शरीराणि कुशमृत्तिकास्थानीयानि उपवीयन्ते चेति।

In other systems it is called effort. And, not desisting from its activities due to the manifestation of the past impressions of virtuous deeds, etc., it is called life. It is said also :

The internal function of the organs collectively is like a lamp, without the light (of their own)<sup>9</sup> and is of the nature of the activities, the sustainer of the body and is the life. A human being keeps alive upto the time that (function) abounding in Rajas is not restrained and strikes the air, and continues due to the non-return (non-cessation) of the virtue, etc.

Here, through the force of the mention of the common activities of the senses the prāṇa, etc., are the five airs. The senses of knowledge are the sixth (prāṇa) the senses of the action the seventh, and the egoism, the eighth. The word pūr refers to the knowledge at the state of egoism because it is stated:

Since the knowledge as an act in the egoism completes the causes, it is called pūr, which is the eighth knowledge of the enjoyer (i.e., experiencer conscious entity).

The knowledge residing in the egoism is experienced by the conscious entity present in the intellect only<sup>10</sup> since the author will speak as -

These mutually different modifications of the three constituents and resembling a lamp illumining the entire purpose of the conscious entity present it to the intellect (K. 36). And, because the intellect accomplishes the experience of the conscious entity in respect of all the (objects) (Ka 37.)

Therefore, that (knowledge) only is the pūr. The scripture also says so: the five (are) the airs, namely prāṇa, apāna, samāna, udāna and vyāna. Sixth is the mind seventh is the pūr (knowledge in egoism), eighth is the speech. Through the mention of speech is the mention of the phase of organs of action. Through the mention of mind is the mention of the phase of organs of knowledge. This group of eight prāṇas which are related to the modification becomes (i.e., serves) as the eternal part as a place of support for the seer soul which has attained a body.<sup>11</sup> It is unbreakable, undivisible, uncombustible and undestructible. The external bodies which are non-eternal in nature and serve as the (water) and clay are non-eternal and grow.

(Source of Action)

आह, कुतः पुनरियं प्राणादिवृत्तिः प्रवर्तत इति ? उच्यते-सा कर्मयोनिभ्यः । महतः प्रच्युतं हि रजो विकृतम् अण्डस्थानीयाः पञ्च कर्मयोनयो भवन्ति-धृतिः श्रद्धा सुखा विविदिषा अविविदिषेति । आह च

प्रच्युतो महतो यस्तु न प्राप्तो ज्ञानलक्षणम् ।

व्यापारो ज्ञानयोनित्वात्सा योनिः कुक्कुटाण्डवत् ॥

तासां लक्षणविषयसतत्वगुणसमन्वया भवन्ति । तत्र लक्षणं तावत् व्यवसायादप्रच्यवनं धृतिः । फलमनभिसन्धाय शास्त्रोक्तेषु कार्येष्ववश्यकर्तव्यताबीजभावः श्रद्धा । दृष्टानुश्रविकफलाभिलाषद्रारको हि बद्धेराभोगः सुखा । वेत्तुमिच्छा विविदिषा । तन्निवृत्तिरविविदिषा । तत्र यदाऽयं जन्तुः शुभाशुभेषु कार्येषु वृत्त्यनुसारी जिज्ञासुरजिज्ञासुर्वा शरीरं परित्यजति तामेव कर्मयोनिमुपपद्यते । तस्यामुपपन्नस्तामेव भावयति । एतत्तावल्लक्षणसतत्वम् । आह च

वाचि कर्मणि संकल्पे प्रतिज्ञां यो न रक्षति ।

तन्निष्ठस्तत्प्रतिज्ञश्च धृतेरेतैर्द्धि लक्षणम् ॥

अनसूया ब्रह्मचर्यं यजनं याजनं तपः ।

दानं प्रतिग्रहः शौचं श्रद्धायां लक्षणं स्मृतम् ॥

सुखार्थी यस्तु सेवेत विद्यां कर्म तपांसि वा ।

प्रायश्चित्तपरो नित्यं सुखायां स तु वर्तते ॥

द्वित्वैकत्वपृथक्त्वं नित्यं चेतनमचेतनं सूक्ष्मम् ।  
 सत्कार्यमसत्कार्यं विविदिषितव्यं विविदिषायाः ॥  
 विषपीतसुप्तमत्तवदविविदिषा ध्यानिनां सदा योनिः ।  
 कार्यकरणक्षयकरी प्राकृतिका गतिः समाख्याता ॥

विषयसतत्त्वं पुनः सर्वविषयिणी धृतिः । आश्रमविषयिणी श्रद्धा । दृष्टानुश्रविकविष-  
 यिणि सुखा । व्यक्तविषयिणी विविदिषा । अव्यक्तविषयिण्यविविदिषा । गुणसमन्वयस्तु  
 रजस्तमोबहुला धृतिः । सत्त्वरजोबहुला श्रद्धा । सत्त्वतमोबहुला सुखा । रजोबहुला विवि-  
 दिषा । तमोबहुलाऽविविदिषा इति । उक्तं च

लक्षणविषयसतत्त्वं त्रैगुण्यसमन्वयं च पञ्चानाम् ।  
 योनीनां यो विद्याद्यतिवृषभं तं त्वहं मन्ये ॥

इत्युक्ताः प्राणादयो योनयश्च ।

How (or wherefrom) does this function of prāṇa, etc., proceed?

Reply: That (function) proceeds from the sources of the ac-  
 tion. The Rajas fallen from the intellect is affected by passion or  
 emotion; the five sources of activities are like the egg (which are) —  
 determination, faith, desire for pleasure, desire for knowledge and  
 the absence of desire for knowing. It is stated also:

That which has fallen down from the intellect and has not at-  
 tained the characteristic (state) of knowledge is the (mediate) opera-  
 tion and is the source of knowledge like the egg, for a cock.

To them (sources of action) belong the characteristics and their  
 objects, with essence, the quality and mutual connection. Out of  
 them, the characteristics are as — not deviating from the resolution is  
 the determination, faith is state of the seed of the notion that the  
 acts prescribed in śruti must be performed without aiming at their  
 results; desire for pleasure is the expansion (enjoyment) of intellect  
 caused by the desire for the fruit of the perceptible (means) and the  
 means prescribed in the scriptures; desire for knowing is the lust to  
 know the objects; absence of that desire for knowing is the cessation  
 (or destruction) of it. When the being having the inclination for vir-  
 tuous or vile actions, having or not having the desire to know leaves  
 the body, attains the source fit for that activity. Attaining that he  
 promotes his interest in that only. This is the characteristic along  
 with the essence. It is stated also:

When one does not keep his promise in words, acts, determina-

tion, and afterwards becomes firm and determined in that; this is the definition of determination, absence of envy, celibacy, sacrifice for himself, sacrifice for others, austerity, charity, to accept charity and purity—are said to be the characteristics of faith.

When the one desirous of happiness is engaged in learning, (religious) acts or austerities, he always makes an atonement, and always remains with a desire for happiness.<sup>12</sup> The definition of desire is in the form that the duality, oneness, distinctness, eternal, sentient, non-sentient, subtle, the (theory of) pre-existence of effect should be known.

The state of those engaged in meditation is always (in the form of) the absence of desire to know just like that of the one who has drunk the poison, is in the sleeping condition and is intoxicated, and it brings about the destruction of the effect and means (body). It is called the natural state (of the yogins).<sup>13</sup>

These are its objects with the essence. The determination refers to all object. The faith is with reference to the stages of life. The desire of happiness is about the perceptible objects and those mentioned in the scripture. The desire to know is about the manifest objects. The absence of desire is about the non-manifest objects. The combination of constituents is like this. The Rajas and Tamas dominate in the case of determination. The faith abounds in Sattva and Rajas. The desire for pleasure abounds in Sattva and Tamas. The desire to know abounds in Rajas. The absence of desire to know abounds in Tamas. It is stated also:

One who knows the definition, the object with essence and the combination of three constituents belonging to the five causes, him I consider the best of the strives (or an eminent striver).

Thus are explained the prāṇa, etc., and the source of action.

(Control over the Vital airs)

एतद् द्वयमधिगम्य सम्यङ्मार्गानुगमनं कुर्यात् । रजस्तमोधर्मादिसाधनभावविनिवृत्तिस्तस्वत्र प्राणानामन्तर्वृत्तिरनुपाधिकत्वादनिवर्त्या । बहिवृत्तिस्तु मार्गामार्गविषयतया प्रयोक्तव्या । कथमित्युच्यते—प्राणविषया तावत्प्रणतिर्धर्मादि विषय एवापरोद्धव्या । ततो ह्यस्य सत्त्ववृद्धिः, सत्त्ववृद्धेश्चोत्तरोत्तरबुद्धिरूपाधिगमः । अपानविषयस्त्वपक्रमणं धर्मादिविषय एवापरोद्धव्यमेवं ह्यस्य ख्यातिविषयाऽऽकारकस्य तमसो निर्हासः । ततश्चोत्तरोत्तरबुद्धिरूपाऽधिगमः । तथा समानविषयं साहचर्यं सत्त्वधर्मानुगुणं कुर्यात् । यस्माच्छास्त्रमाह—सत्त्वारामः सत्त्वमिथुनश्च सदा स्यादिति । आत्मोत्कर्षं तूदानविषयम् । अविद्यापर्वणोऽन्त्यं रूपं विवर्ज्यं तत्प्रतिपक्षैर्निवर्तयेत् । अत्यन्ताऽविनाभावं च व्यानविषयं ज्ञानविषय एव भाव-

येत् । योनीनां चतसृणां धर्मताबीजतामेवादद्यात् । अविदिदामपि अनिष्टफलहेतुषु भाव-  
येत् । सोऽयं धर्मादिषु प्रवणस्तत्रतिपक्षापक्रान्तः सत्त्वारामो विनिवृत्ताभिमानो ज्ञाननिष्ठः  
सविशुद्धयोनिरचिरेण परं ब्रह्मोपपद्यत इति । आह च

बाह्यां प्राणविवृतिं सम्यङ्मार्गे बुधः प्रतिष्ठाप्य ।  
विनिवृत्तविखरकलुषो ध्रुवममृतं स्थानमभ्येति ॥  
पञ्चानां योनीनां धर्मादिनिमित्ततां च संस्थाप्य ।  
परिपक्वमित्यधस्तान्न पुनस्तद्भावितो गच्छेत् ॥  
इति व्याख्याता व्यस्तसमस्ता करणानां वृत्तिः ॥ २९ ॥

After understanding these two one should follow the right path.<sup>14</sup> The internal operation of the vital airs being unconditioned cannot be terminated through the termination of attainment of the states of the Rajas, Tamas and the means of virtue, etc. Since the external function is related to virtue etc., it should be employed. If it is asked how, (the reply is)—The (act of) going down of the prāṇa should be restricted to (i.e., exclusively concentrated upon) the objects like virtue, etc. From this follows the increase in Sattva and with the increase in Sattva there follows gradually an understanding of the form of the intellect. The act of going upward pertaining to apāna should be exclusively concentrated upon the objects like virtue, etc. In this way there is the complete decrease of the Tamas which is situated in the form of the object of discriminative knowledge, and then follows gradually the understanding of the form of the intellect. In this way, one should make the association of the objects of samāna and vyāna leading to the Sattva constituent. Because the scripture states: “One should always take delight in and be associated with Sattva.” The object of Udāna is the upliftment of the soul. After completely giving up the last form of the phase of ignorance one should completely resort to the opposite of that. One should cherish the invariable concomitance which forms the object of the vyāna in the object of knowledge only. One should reduce the potency (dharmatā) of the four causes to the causal potency of virtue. One should cherish the absence of the desire to know with reference to causes leading to the undesired results. One who takes delight in virtue, etc., and is devoid of the opposites of them, taking pleasure in Sattva, is devoid of egoism, is devoted to knowledge, has purified the causes, attains supreme Brahman quickly. It is stated also:

The wise man after firmly establishing the absence of the

operation of the prāṇas with reference to the external objects and establishing them in the right path, and devoid of injurious dirt, attains the immortal and eternal place.

After establishing the five causes in the causal potency of virtue, etc., and advanced in that should not deviate from it absolutely (even from bottom).

Thus is explained the individual and the collective activity of the organs.

## KĀRIKĀ 29

1. The Sāṃkhyas proceed from intellect to the gross elements in discussing the categories. Thus, the place of internal organs precedes the external organs.
2. The māhātmya body perhaps refers to the notion of 'I'.
3. The manuscript read *anyatvasya*. Pandey suggests *ananyatvasya*. We have followed his suggestion.
4. The sense is that *prāṇa*, etc., spoken as the objects of the internal organs are of the nature of air which is an element while the activity should be of the nature of action. *Prāṇa*, etc., therefore, cannot be spoken as the activity of some other object. The reading *dharmāntaram* by Ch. and Pandey both should be *dharmyantarah*.
5. If the air is supposed to blow of its own, its activity would never come to an end and as a result a bird in the sky could always fly due to the activity in air and it would not be required to act for the circulation of the air to fly. Consequently, if the activity is always in the air, a bird could never fall on the ground.
6. This is the air going outside the body in much quantity.
7. It keeps the balance of the other airs in the body and controls their movements.
8. Perhaps it refers to the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika. The function is attributed to the soul in those systems.
9. They serve as the substratum of light and manifest it. The light stands for consciousness.
10. It is because the conscious entity does not have direct contact with the egoism. The function of egoism is also experienced through the intellect itself.
11. The soul accompanied with these eight can be termed *jiva*.
12. Such a man always keeps repenting, and neither does he enjoy fully nor does he act satisfactorily.
13. It is the state of meditation in which the basic aim is not the knowledge.
14. It suggests that only the Sāṃkhya way of liberation is the right path.

## KĀRIKĀ 30

(Opponent's view of simultaneous function of the organs)

आह, येयमेकैकस्मिन् रूपादावर्थे करणचतुष्टयस्य वृत्तिः सा किं युगपत् आहोस्वित् क्रमेणेति? कुतः संशय इति चेत् उभयथा दृष्टत्वात् । इहैकार्थविषयाणां युगपदपि वृत्तिर्दृष्टा । तद्यथा चन्द्रमण्डले चक्षुषां मनसो वा । क्रमशश्च तद्यथा घटे मधूकपयसाम् । एकार्थविषयं च करणचुष्टयम् । अतो नः संशयः किं चक्षुर्मनोवद्युगपदस्य वृत्तिः, आहोस्विन्मघ्वादि-वक्रमेणेति ?

Opponent : Is the operation of the four organs with reference to a single object, like form, etc., simultaneous or gradual.<sup>1</sup> If it is asked (why) does the doubt arise, (the answer is) because it is observed in both the ways. The function of the objects with a single object is observed to be simultaneous also just as that of the eyes or the mind with reference to the disc of the moon;<sup>2</sup> and gradual also just as that of the honey, water and milk with reference to a pot. The four organs have a single object. Therefore, there arises a doubt in us as to whether the function belongs to the organs working simultaneously as the function of the eyes and the minds, or whether it takes place gradually as that of the honey, etc.

उच्यते—यथादर्शनमपि तावदुच्यताम् । किमत्र युक्तं भवान् मन्यते ? स चेत्सम्यगुप-  
देक्ष्यसि को निर्बन्धस्तदेव प्रतिपद्यामहे इति ।

Proponent : Tell as you experience it.

What do you think proper in this case?

If you rightly teach, what is the obstinacy? We will accept that only.

यद्यत्वं तस्मादिदमस्मदर्शनम्

युगपच्चतुष्टयस्य तु वृत्तिः

तुशब्दोऽवधारणार्थः युगपदेवेत्यर्थः । बुद्ध्यहंकारमनसां हि बुद्धीन्द्रियाणां च समान-

देशत्वम् । तत्र न शक्यत एतद्भक्तुं सति शक्तिसदभावे विषयसम्बन्धे च कस्यचित्तत्र वृत्तिः कस्यचिन्नेति । किं चान्यत् । मेघस्तनितादिषु क्रमानुपलब्धेः । यदि हि क्रमेण श्रोत्रादीनामन्तःकरणस्य च बाह्येऽर्थे वृत्तिः स्यादपि तर्हि मेघस्तनितकृष्णसर्पालोचनादिष्वप्युपलभ्यते क्रमः । न तूपलभ्यते । तस्माद्युगपदेव बाह्येऽर्थे चतुष्टयवृत्तिरिति ।

Opponent's Reply : If it is so, the following is our theory here :

*The function of the four is simultaneous only.* The word *tu* means restriction. The sense is 'it is simultaneous only'. Intellect egoism and the mind, as also the sense organs are located at the same place. It cannot be stated that even though the power (in the organ) and their contact with the object is present, yet the function of some takes place while that of the other does not. *Moreover, the successive order is not observed in case of the thunder of the cloud, etc.* If there would be the successive function of the ear, etc., and the internal organ with reference to the external object, that successive order would be observed in case of the abstract knowledge of thunder of the cloud and also at the sight of a black snake. It is, however, not observed. Therefore, the function of the four with reference to the external object is simultaneous only.

(Simultaneous functions of the organs refuted)

उच्यते—यदुक्तं श्रोत्रादीनामन्तःकरणस्य चाऽभिन्नकालं वृत्तिरित्यत्र ब्रूमः, अयुक्तमेतत् । किं कारणम् ? यस्मादस्माकं

**क्रमशश्च तस्य निर्दिष्टा ।**

तस्येति चतुष्टयमपिसम्बध्यते । चशब्दोऽवधारणार्थः । क्रमश एवेत्यर्थः । क्रमश एव हि बाह्यान्तःकरणवृत्त्योरेकार्थनिपातः ।

यतूक्तं समानदेशानां शक्तिसम्बन्धसदभावे वृत्त्यभावानुपपत्तिरिति, अत्र ब्रूमः—चक्षुरादिवदेतत्स्यात् । तद्यथा चक्षुस्त्वचोः समानदेशत्वे शक्तिविषयसम्बन्धोपपत्तौ रजोधूमातपादिगतः स्पर्श एवोपलभ्यते, न रूपम् । एवमिहापि स्यात् । तस्मात्

**दृष्टे तथाऽप्यदृष्टे**

क्रमश एव चतुष्टयस्य वृत्तिः । अदृष्टग्रहणेन पुनरत्रातीतानागतव्यवहितविषयग्रहणम् । तत्रातीतं द्विविधम्, दृष्टविषयदृष्टविषयं च । अत्रापि दृष्टविषयं प्रत्यभिज्ञानमित्यभिप्रेतम्, अदृष्टविषयं स्मृतिः । सा तु लिङ्गागमाभ्यामकस्माद्वा भवति । तथा च वृषगणवीरेणाप्युक्तं भवति— अनागतव्यवहितविषयज्ञानं तु लिङ्गागमाभ्याम् । आह, च

**विषयेन्द्रियसंयोगात्प्रत्यक्षज्ञानमुच्यते ।**

**तदेवातीन्द्रियं जातं पुनर्भावनया स्मृतिः ॥**

तदेव भावनापेक्षज्ञानं कालान्तरे पुनः ।  
तत्रैव सेन्द्रियं जातं प्रत्यभिज्ञानमुच्यते ॥

तत्र दृष्टे क्रमः प्रति नास्ति सन्देहः

यत्पुनरेतदुक्तं दृष्टे मेघस्तनितकृष्णसर्पालोचनादौ क्रमानुपलब्धेर्युगपच्चतुष्टयस्य  
वृत्तिरित्यत्र ब्रूमः— एतदप्ययुक्तम् । किं कारणम् ? यस्यात्

त्रयस्य तत्पूर्विका वृत्तिः ॥ ३० ॥

न तावद् बुद्ध्यहंकारमनसां साक्षाद् बाह्यार्थग्रहणसामर्थ्यमस्ति, अन्तःकरणानुपपत्तिप्र-  
संगात्, श्रोत्रादिवैयर्थ्यप्रसंगात्, द्वारिद्वारभावव्याघातप्रसङ्गाच्च । तस्मात्पूर्वं श्रोत्रादीनामर्थ-  
सम्बन्धोऽस्ति मेघस्तनितादावप्यवश्यमेतदभ्युपगन्तव्यम् । पश्चात् तद्वृत्त्युपनिपाता-  
दन्तद्वक्त्रणस्येत्यस्ति क्रमोऽत्रापि । तत्र यदुक्तं मेघस्तनितादिषु क्रमाऽननुगते युगपच्चतुष्ट-  
यस्य वृत्तिरित्येतदयुक्तम् ।

Reply : As regards the statement that the function of the ear, etc.,  
and the internal organ is at a time (simultaneous), we reply that  
it is wrong.

What is the reason here?

Because according to us :

**AND, OF THAT (GROUP OF THOSE FOUR) SUCCESSIVE  
(FUNCTIONING) ONLY IS MENTIONED.**

Through the expression 'of that' all the four are related here.  
The term *ca* (and) is in the sense of restriction.<sup>3</sup> It is successive only.  
The falling of the function of the external organ and the internal  
organ into a single object is gradual only.

As regards the statement that there is no propriety of the ab-  
sence of the function of those having the same location, in the  
presence of the power and the contact (of the senses with the ob-  
ject), we reply : it may be like the eyes, etc. Just as even though there  
is the (possibility) of the capacity and the contact with the object in  
the case of the eye and the skin even when the eye and the skin are  
located at the same place the touch only of dust, shade and heat or  
sunshine is apprehended, not the form. Similar may be the case here  
also. Therefore,

### IN THE CASE OF THE PERCEPTIBLE, SIMILARLY IN THE CASE OF THE IMPERCEPTIBLE (OBJECTS)

The function of the four is successive only. Here, through the mention of the word imperceptible is denoted, the knowledge of the objects of past and future time and those obstructed (and hence imperceptible). The knowledge of the past is of two kinds : That of the object directly perceived and of the object which is not directly perceived. Here also that the object of which is not perceived at that time is described to be the recognition, and that the object of which is not directly perceived is desired to be remembrance.<sup>4</sup> That takes place through either of the probandum, scripture or suddenly. It is stated by the powerful varṣagaṇa vīra also.....The knowledge of the objects of future and obstructed ones arises through probans and the scripture. It is stated also :

Knowledge arising through the sense—object contact is called the perceptive knowledge. And when the same object is recollected through past impression when it had become invisible, it becomes remembrance. The same knowledge which depends upon past impression when after some time comes under the purview of the senses is said to be recognition. There is no doubt, the successive order in case of the perceptible object.

As regards the statement that on account of the absence of observation of succession, there is the simultaneous function of the four with reference to perceptive knowledge of the objects like the thunder of the cloud and the sight of the black snake, we reply that this is also wrong.

What is the reason here?

Because

### THE FUNCTION OF THE THREE FOLLOWS THAT (FUNCTION OF THE RESPECTIVE EXTERNAL ORGANS).

The intellect, egoism and mind do not have the capacity of cognising the external objects directly because of (otherwise) undesirable contingency or the impropriety of impossibility of their being the internal organs, of the uselessness of ear, etc., and of the contradiction with their (relation) of the gates and the gatekeeper. Therefore, there is first the contact of the ear etc., with the object.

The same case must be accepted in case of the thunder of the cloud, etc. Afterwards, is the function of the internal organ also because it follows the function of that (external organ); thus there is the succession in this case also. In that case, it is wrong to say that since the succession is not found in case of the thunder of the cloud, etc., the function of the four is simultaneous.

(Another interpretation of the Kārikā)

अन्यैस्त्वन्यथाऽन्वयो दर्शितः। तद्यथा चतुष्टयस्येति मनोऽहंकारबुद्धीनामन्तः — करणानां बाह्येनैकेन करणेन श्रोत्रेण वा चक्षुषा वा सह चतुष्टयस्येत्यर्थः। अस्य दृष्टे वर्तमाने-युगपद्भूतिः पूर्वाचार्यैर्निर्दिष्टा। आचार्येण तु क्रमेणेत्यर्थः। अदृष्टेऽतीतादावपि क्रमशश्च क्रमेणैव, यतस्त्रयस्यान्तःकरणस्य तत्पूर्विका बाह्येन्द्रियपूर्विका वृत्तिः। यदा यथाऽनुभवस्तथा संस्कारः यथा च संस्कारस्तथा स्मृतिरित्येवं वृत्तिर्बाह्येन्द्रियपूर्विकेति ॥ ३० ॥

By others, however, the connection of the words (in the present Kārikā) is shown (or mentioned) in a different way. It is like this. Of the four, etc., means of the internal organs, viz., mind, egoism and intellect with the one external organ as the ear or the eye. The simultaneous function of this (group of four) in case of the perceptible i.e. the present time is suggested by the earlier authorities by the (present) authority (Īśvarakṛṣṇa) however, successive (function is suggested). In the case of imperceptible, i.e. the objects of past also it is successive only because the function of the three internal organs follows that of the external organ. Whatever kind of experience is there the impression is of that nature. As the impression, so is the remembrance. In this way, the function (of the internal organs) follows that of the external organ.

## KĀRIKĀ 30

1. The four organs meant here are the three internal organs, mind, egoism and intellect and the one respective external organ involved in perception.
2. When moon is seen, its knowledge arises as soon as it is observed. The function of the eye and the internal organs seems to be simultaneous.
3. It is still a matter of deep consideration whether Īśvarakṛṣṇa takes it in the sense of grouping together or restriction.
4. This is the distinction between the remembrance and recognition. The common factor in both the cases is the knowledge of the object cognised earlier. But, in case of recognition, the object is present at the time of recognition while the object is not present at the time of remembrance.
5. Some portion of the text is missing here.

## KĀRIKĀ 31

(Each sense performs its individual function)

आह, किं पुनरेषां करणानां स्वविषयनियमेन वृत्तिर्भवति आहोस्विदव्यतिकरेणोति ?

Opponent : Dose the function of these organs take place with the restriction to their own objects (or otherwise) blending together?

उच्यते-ननु च प्रागेव रूपादिषु पञ्चानामालोचनमात्रमिष्यते वृत्तिरिति (का. २८) चोक्तवाऽऽचार्येणान्तेऽपदिष्टं सैषा भवत्यसामान्येति (क. २९) । तत्रैवं गते भवतः संशयः ।

Proponent : Of course, earlier only after stating that the function of the five is the primary abstract apprehension in respect of the form, etc, (K. 28), it is finally taught by the 'authority' that is the uncommon', etc., (K. 29). In spite of this much you are entertaining doubt.

कुतः इत्युच्यते-सत्यमेवैतत् । तथापि जायते संशयः । कुतः करणान्तरेण स्वविषयो-पलब्धौ करणान्तरोत्सुक्यदर्शनात् । इह करणान्तरेणा चक्षुषाऽऽम्रदाडिमादिरूपोपलब्धौ सत्यां करणान्तरस्य जिह्वालक्षणस्योत्सुक्यं प्रवृत्तिश्चोपलब्धा । तद्यदि स्वविषयनियतानीन्द्रियाणि, नैषां करणान्तरविषयोपलम्भात्साहचर्यपिक्षः स्वविषयग्रहणभावः स्यात् । अस्ति च । तस्मादुपपन्नः संशयः । तत्रेदानीं भवतः प्रतिपत्तिरिति ।

Opponent: You are asking why does the doubt arise, we reply, it is true. But still the doubt arises.

why?

*Because the eagerness in an organ is observed when the respective object is cognised by the other organ. The eagerness and activity in the other organ, viz., tongue is observed when the form of the mango or a pomegranate fruit is perceived by the eye.<sup>1</sup> If the senses would have been restricted to their respective objects, there would not have been the cognition of its own object as dependent upon the help of the other organ because the object of that organ is already cognised by that respective organ.<sup>2</sup> And that is there. Therefore, the doubt is valid. What is your resolution here?*