

प्रयत्नमपि महद्दकारादिरूपयिसदृशपरिणामेन सता भाव्यं कदापित्सदृशपरिणामेनापि ।
 सदृशपरिणामभाष्य साम्यावस्था । स च महाप्रलय । तस्मान्मन्त्रार्थदृष्टप्रणयानात्परद्रव्यतो
 विगलितरजस्वामोभलावरणतया परित प्रयत्तमानं बुद्धिसच्चामर्येणम् । तथा
 याभ्युदयनिश्चयेसोपदेष्टव्योऽपि वेदराशिरीश्वरप्रणीतस्तद्बुद्धिसचप्रकर्षादेव भवितुमर्हति । न च
 सत्त्वोत्कर्षे रजस्वामप्रभवो विश्वमधिप्रलयो संभवतः । तस्मिन् प्रकृतसच्चनिमित्तं ज्ञानमिति।
 स्मादेत् । प्रकर्षकार्यतया प्रकर्षं बोधयच्छास्त्रं श्रेयवदनुमानं भवेत् तानाम् इत्यत आह--
 एतयोरीति । न कार्पदेन बोधयत्यपि तनादिवायवाचकभावसंबन्धेन बोधयतीत्यर्थः । ईश्वरस्य हि
 बुद्धिसच्चे प्रकर्षो वर्तते, ज्ञानमपि तद्भावकत्वेन तत्र वर्तत इति । उपसंहरति--
 एतस्मादीश्वरबुद्धिसच्चप्रकर्षवाचकाच्छास्त्रादेतद्भवति ज्ञायते विषयेण विद्यारिणो लक्षणात्सदेवेश्वरः
 सदेव मुक्त इति । तदेवं पुरुषान्तराद्यवच्छिद्येश्वरान्तरादपि व्यवच्छिन्नति-- तथ तस्येति ।
 अतिश्रयविनिर्मुक्तिमाह-- न तावदिति । कृत-- यदेवेति । कस्मात्सर्वातिश्रयविनिर्मुक्त
 तदेष्वयमित्यत आह-- तस्माद्यवेति । अतिश्रयनिष्ठामप्रधानामोपचारिकमेश्वरमित्यर्थः ।
 साम्यविनिर्मुक्तिमाह-- न च तत्समानमिति । प्राकाम्यमविहतेच्छता । तद्विधानादूनवम् । अतूनव
 वा इत्येवमपि प्राकाम्यविधातः कार्यानुत्पत्तेः । उत्पत्ते वा विरुद्धधर्मसमाहित्विमेकवा
 कार्यमुपलभ्येतेत्याश्रयवधानाह-- द्वयोश्चेति । अतिरुद्धभिप्रायत्वे वा प्रत्येकमीश्वरदे कृतमन्त्रैः
 । एकेनेवेश्वरनायाः कृतत्वात् । संभूयकारित्वे वा न कश्चिदेश्वरः परिषद्वात् । नित्येजानायोगिनां च
 पर्यायायोगात्कत्स्नानागौरवप्रसङ्गश्चेति द्रष्टव्यम् । तस्मात्सर्वमवदात् ॥ २४ ॥

YS 1.25

[Preface by VB:]

-And what (more must be said) (*kim ca*)?

-THEREIN THE SEED OF THE OMNISCIENT ONE HAS NO EQUAL
(OR IS UNSURPASSED).

[*atra niratiśāyān sarvajña-bījān*]

[VB:]

-The seed of the omniscient pertains to cognizing that goes beyond ordinary sense capacities (*aiन्द्रिया-grahana*) and has to do with what is great or what is small or what is past, future and present or what is singular or collective. It increases (among various sentient beings). Wherein this seed has reached its unsurpassable limit, therein is the omniscient one.

-This means the attainment of the highest measurable level, since the seed of the omniscient one involves comparability (*sa-atiśāyā-va*) as (is the case with anything) having magnitude.

-Wherein there is the attainment of this highest level of knowledge, therein is the omniscient one.

-And that is (none other than) God mentioned in the previous *sūtra*.

[*Isa ca puruṣa-viśeṣa iti*].

-And in regard to this conclusion being only a general conclusion, (it is to be recalled that) an inference by reason of being limited (to the level of generalization) is not capable of providing (cognition) in terms of apprehending specific features. In terms of apprehending specific features of God (*īśvara*), for example, his name, and so forth, such apprehending must be sought from *āgama* (scripture). Although the need for reaching out (*anugraha*) is absent from within (*bhūta*) itself, a reaching out (*anugraha*) (for God). He, as it were, thus says, "I shall lift up people who are transmigrating endlessly in the cycles of aeons (*kalpa*), dissolutions (*pralaya*) and great dissolutions (*mahāpralaya*) by way of providing teaching in regard to proper knowledge and behavior."

-And so it has been said, "The primal knower (*ādi-vidvān*) assuming a finite awareness as the blessed (*bhagavān*) supreme Rishi [that is, **Kapila**], because of his great compassion, declared the truth (Tantra) to Āsuri who was desiring to know (the truth)."

[TV:]

-Having discussed the Śāstra as the means of knowing (*pramāṇa*) in

regard to the power of action and knowledge of God (*asya*), he (the *Sūtrakāra*) then discusses epistemologically the (requisite) inference (*anumāna*) in regard to the power of knowledge (of God). The commentator Vyāsa indicates this with his comment, "What more (must be said)?" (*kim ca?*)

[VM then quotes the *sūtra*, YS I.25.]

-He (Vyāsa) then explains beginning with, "that which . . . "
(*vad idam . . .*).

-There is cognition (*grahaṇa*) (of things) which are functioning beyond the sense capacities in the past, future and present, either individually or collectively, and are proportionately distributed (divided) in terms of their being free from the *tamas* covering ordinary awareness (*buddhi-sattva*). The scope of such cognition is either small or great (among various sentient beings). The cause of such cognition is known as "the seed of the omniscient" (*sarvajña-bīja*).

-Someone cognizes something that is past [or future], and so forth; someone else cognizes something large; yet another cognizes something larger; or someone else cognizes the largest possible thing. Smallness and largeness of cognition refers to the apprehension or cognition (*grahaṇa*) of objects (*grāhya*).

-Such increments when there is no further increase possible because the ultimate limit has been attained, that is the omniscient cognition.

-Thus far, only what is to be proved has been discussed.
-He (Vyāsa) then proceeds to discuss (a full proof) epistemologically when he says, "there is the attainment of an ultimate limit . . . "
(*asti kāsīhā-prāptih . . .*)

-This is the statement "to be proved" (*sādhyā*) (in formulating the inferential proof).

-The ultimate limit (*kāsīhā*) cannot be surpassed, since there is nothing higher.

-This is not just a matter of limit (*avadhī-mātra*), a proving of what has already been proved (*siddha-sādhana*).

-It is, rather, the "reason" (*hetu*)

[that is, the main part of an inference that establishes invariable concomitance or *vyāpti*].

namely, ". . . since the seed of the omniscient one involves comparability (*sa-tiśaya-tva*). . . . "

-He then illustrates (*darśayati*) [implying here the *dśānta* in the inferential sequence] the invariable concomitance (*vyāpti*) in the

following manner. Whatever has comparability (*sātīśaya*), any such thing has an ultimate limit, like, for example, a largest limit (*mahatva*) with respect to a jujube fruit, a palm-tee fruit, a wood-apple fruit or with respect to a self (*ātman*). He (Vyāsa) is referring to this [that is, he is referring to the invariable concomitance and the requisite illustration] when he says, ". . . as (is the case with anything) having magnitude (*parimāṇa-va*)."

-And there is no fault (*vyabhicāra*) involved with speaking about the qualities of things having weight (or magnitude) (*garīman*).

-For indeed no weight (or magnitude) of a whole thing is greater than the weight of its parts.

-To the contrary, whatever things have weight (or magnitude) from the smallest atoms as far as the greatest eternal wholes, all of them functioning each one separately, nevertheless taken together may be conceived as an increasing continuum of weight (or magnitude).
-Moreover, knowledge is not finished or concluded in terms of what can be known in a limited fashion. Thus, it is appropriate to speak of measurable magnitude with regard to single, dual or plural objects. Hence, there is no mistaken reasoning (in applying the notion of magnitude or degree of fullness to knowledge itself).

-He (Vyāsa) thus concludes that there is a ". . . highest degree of knowledge."
-An objection is mentioned at this point (*nanu*). There are many Jain ascetics, Buddhas, Arhats, the seer (*ṛsi*) Kapila, and so forth. Therefore, based on this inference, are not all these also "omniscient ones"? In reply to this, he (Vyāsa) asserts that inferential knowledge is "only general."

-How, then, can a specific apprehension of God occur? Such occurs only because of *āgama* (or knowledge deriving from scripture).
-The meaning here is that what is taught by the Buddha, and others, is only a semblance of *āgama*, but not really authentic *āgama*. This is the case since it is clear that teachers such as the Buddha, and so forth, are caught up in a situation of deception (*vipratītiambhakatva*). They teach doctrines such as momentariness, no self (or substanceless-ness), and so forth, which are destructive of all correct means of knowing (*pramāṇa*).

-The expression "scripture" ("*āgama*") has to do with the means for attaining spiritual release (*nirśreyasa*) and prosperity (*abhyudaya*) because of that (*āgama*). These means lead to a correct mental attitude (*buddhi*). They occur from *āgama* [literally "what comes forth"] as defined in Śruti, Smṛti, Itihāsa and Purāṇa.

-Thus, there can be the cognition of specific aspects regarding the name of God, and so forth, for example, Śiva, and others, established in *śruti*, and so forth.

-By the word "primal" or "first" (*ādi*) "knower" (*ādi-vidvān*), the ten-fold imperishability and the sixfold subsidiary framework are to be understood. The sixfold subsidiary framework is set forth in *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* 12.33 as follows:

"Knowers of the law declare that omniscience (*sarvajñata*), contentment (*tiptī*), beginningless awareness (*anādibodha*), independence (*svatantrata*), eternally undiminished power (*nityam alupta-śakti*), and unending power (*ananta-śakti*) are the six "limbs" of Maheshvara." In *Viṣṇu Purāṇa* 10.64-65, the tenfold imperishability is set forth as follows:

"Knowledge, renunciation, power, austerity, truth, patience, fortitude, creativity, awareness of Self, and lordship. These are the ten imperishables that are eternally present in Śaṅkara (Śiva)."

-Such may be the case, but here is another objection that should be answered (*syād etat*). There can be no arising of thirst (or longing) of God for his own benefit because God is eternally satisfied. God is likewise endowed with the highest level of renunciation. (Even if God were creatively involved in the world), a compassionate God would only be involved in producing well being or happiness (*sukha*) (for devotees) and could not be involved in bringing about the multitude of suffering (in the world). Creative activity in the world for such a wise and transcendent God, who has no purpose whatever for creating (a world full of suffering), is simply not the case (or makes no sense), even though God is fully capable of creative action. In view of this sort of objection, he (Vyāsa) answers beginning with the words, "Although the need for reaching out (*anugraha*) is absent from within (divinity) itself . . ."

[That is, God has no need within himself for anything.]

-The expression "purpose" (*prayojana*) "of beings" refers to living or sentient creatures.

-Now, ordinary awareness (*citta*), since it brings about the forms of "discriminative realization" (*viveka-khyāti*) as well as everyday experience (*Upabhoga*) through scripture (*śabda*), and other means of knowledge, ceases to function when it has fulfilled its task (*carita-artha*).

-[Because of this ability of awareness to bring about discriminative realization,] consciousness (*puruṣa*) shows itself as being different (from all functions of ordinary awareness or *citta*).

-Hence, for the sake of assisting awareness in its function (of providing discriminative realization), the compassionate one [that is, *puruṣa*] declares the means for attaining discriminative realization.

-Thus, or, in other words (*tena*), since ordinary awareness (*citta*) has not yet accomplished its task (of providing discriminative realization), God, assisted by the force of merit and demerit (earned by beings), hereby allowing (*bhāṣayan*) living beings (*jantu*) to abide in pleasure and pain, is not non-compassionate.

-In declaring the means to discriminative realization, he sets forth a door (to release) "by means of instruction in knowledge and conduct" (through the *Śāstra*).

-"Knowledge" and "appropriate conduct" are two separate things. Progress towards enlightenment occurs by instruction in both of these. At the end of the day of Brahmā, the world comes to a (temporary) end (*kalpa-pralaya*) except for the realm of truth (*satya-loka*) wherein those who have attained a mature discriminative realization based on a combination of knowledge and conduct reside.

-At the time of the great dissolution (*mahāpralaya*) when even Brahmā comes to an end together with the realm of truth (*sa-satya-loka*), all transmigrating beings dissolve into the primordial cause (*sva-kāraṇa*) [that is, *mūlaprakṛti*]. At that point (*atas*) (all transmigrating beings) share in the suffering of death.

-The word "world period" (*kalpa*) is sometimes (*anyadā*) also (*apī*) meant metaphorically (*Upalākṣaṇa*).

-The basic meaning here is that (God says), "I shall sustain beings (*puruṣa*) who are partaking in the process of birth, death, and so forth, by reason of the force of the ripening of their self-acquired previous actions (*karman*)." Having (finally) attained spiritual liberation (*kaivalya*), such beings (*puruṣa*) are (permanently) sustained (in spiritual liberation).

-And this instruction having to do with knowledge and conduct of the one associated with compassion (namely, God) is also accepted (or established) among the followers of Sāṅkhya (*kāplānām*). Thus, he (Vyāsa) comments, "And so it has been said."

-The quotation in the text is attributed to the Ācārya Pañcaśikha, [the Sāṅkhya teacher] and refers to the "primal knower" (*ādi-vidvān*), Kapila.

-The expression "primal knower" (*ādīdivān*) in the quotation from Ācārya Pañcaśikha has reference to the "primal released one" (*ādīmuḥta*) and/or the "primal teacher" (*ādīguru*) in our own lineage (or era) (*sva-saṃtān*). It does not have reference, however, to the "supreme Guru" (God) (*parama-guru*) whose release is beginningless (that is, the truly transcendent God).

-Among the various "primal released" and "primal knowers," Kapila alone is the primal released and primal knower of our tradition

[that is, the tradition of Sāmkhyayoga].

-Kapila's attainment of knowledge was communicated at the moment of his birth through the grace of Maheśvara

[usually identified as Śhiva, but literally mahā-śhivara].

-It is usually also established that the figure Kapila, by name, is a particular (incarnational) embodiment (*avatāra*) of Viṣṇu.

-The self-existent one (*svayambhū*) is also known as Hiranyagarbha.

-According to the Veda, the origin of Sāmkhya-yoga came from him.

-The meaning is that he (Hiranyagarbha) is God, whether called by the name, Kapila, Viṣṇu or Svayambhū.

-Also, it might be said that God (*śhivara*) is the source of all Self-existent ones (*svāyambhuvānām*). That is the meaning!

[It might be said that Vācaspati is suggesting here that all "primal knowers" whether Kapila, Viṣṇu, Svayambhū, or whomever (known from the authority of the Veda or Śāstra)—or put another way, all *vikalpa* or verbal-forms of God—derive from the beginningless *śhivara* or God.]

किं च-

तत्र निरतिशयं सर्वत्रोच्चम् । १.२५ ।

यदिदमतीतानागतप्रत्युत्पन्नप्रत्येकसमुच्चयातीन्द्रियग्रहणमत्तं ब्रूहि त सर्वत्रोच्चमेतद्विषयमानं यत्र
निरतिशयं स सर्वत्रः । अस्ति काष्ठाप्रतिः सर्वत्रोच्चस्य सातिशयवत् परिमाणवदिति । यत्र
काष्ठाप्रतिर्ज्ञानस्य स सर्वत्रः । स च पुरुषविशेष इति ।

सामान्यमात्रोपसंहारे च कृतेपक्षयमनुमानं न विशेषप्रतिपत्ते सम्पत्तिरिति । तस्य
संज्ञातिशेषप्रतिपत्तिर्यागमतः पर्यन्तेष्वपि । तस्यात्मानुग्रहाभावे ऽपि भूतानुग्रहः प्रयोजनम् ।
ज्ञानधर्मोपदेशेन कल्पप्रलयमहाप्रलयेषु संसारिणः पुरुषानुद्धरिष्यामीति । तथा चोक्तम्-
आदिचिद्वान् निर्माणचित्तमपिष्ठाय कारुण्याद्भावात् परमर्षिरासुरये जिज्ञासमानाय तन्नं शोकावति
॥ २५ ॥