CHAPTER IV.

( O! Lord! There is nothing real except Thee.
Again what appears to be existing is not real.
By dint of Mayā, Thou appearest in Multiple forms.) BP III-9-1.

- SAMKHYA TATTVAS — (Contd.)
- PRAKRTI OR MAYA TATTAVA IN BHAGAVATA SAMKHYA.

We have seen so far how the non-dual Absolute which is the
one and the only one Reality, without any duality, stands also in
dual or multiple forms as the Universe as well as the individual
souls. The Indian Philosophers have been declaring even from the
Vedic times 'EKAM SAT,' 'TAT EKAM' and that the Supreme Absolute
(SAT) is the only Reality. Bhagavata in the wake of the Vedic and
Upanishadic Philosophy, has been saying: "At the beginning,
Bhagavan alone existed, He being the soul of all souls; —— He
alone was the subject (Dragy); and He being the only existence
(Eka Rat) could not see anything to be seen; and at that time as
the Mayā (S'akti) was not existing (Supta), He whose consciousness
is always manifest (Asupta Drk) thought 'He himself 'as if' not
existing (A-santam)." Thus Prakrti or Mayā was then merged in the
Lord and had no independent existence. With the thinking or Ṛga
on the part of Lord which is the prelude to creation starts the
beginning of 'Maya' or 'Prakrti'. This only means that Prakrti or
Maya has no reality.

0) सम्भवतुष्टेत भगवनाधि तत्र शुद्ध भाषानुरुपमतिकरणदुर्विशेषिती ||
BP III-9-1

1) RV - I-164-46

2) RV - X-129-2

3) भगवनेन आत्मस्वं आत्माकास्तव मित्रतुः
सत्यप्रथा तत्र शुद्ध नापद्यति दृष्यमेकारात् ||
सैन्यस्यकल्पविद्यायं शुद्धस्यकिं पुरुषोत्तमकर्तव्यं ||
BP III-5-23 and 24.
We have the daily experience of seeing around us the plural phenomena of so many multifarious objects, so many causes for so many effects varying from each other, the existence of distinct elements like time, space, air and still subtler things, the speeding modifications in the elements, the appearances and disappearances, birth and death of the elements etc. We consider that all this finite world round about, though undergoing so many alterations and modifications, is absolutely real by designating it as a 'Reality'. But the Indian thinkers with their vast matured thinking and experience have come to the conclusion that such viewing of the finite world or the Universe as Ultimate Reality is not correct. Bhāgavata in this connection emphasises that one should not take the universe appearing around us as an Ultimate Reality, since whatever appears as object and whatever becomes cognisable is liable to destruction. All that which can be described by words or which can be cognised by intellect, mind and senses is not the real state of the Absolute. All this is objective, being dependent on the Absolute which brings out their origination and dissolution. All the Classical Sāṁkhya categories like the earth, water, light, ether, air, five Tānmātras, their presiding deities, mind (including Ego etc.), senses—which constitute the mobile and immobile world or Universe—are all unreal, being dependent on the Absolute which is the only non-dual Reality. Here is the difference between the Classical Sāṁkhya and the Bhāgavata Sāṁkhya. The whole universe which presents itself to us is

(1) नैसात् ब्रह्मात्स्य पश्चाय विदिषयति \( \text{BP XI-18-26} \)

(2) यदृ यथार्थस्य न्यासस्य जिकलयित भिथाब्रह्मैति भिथा ब्रह्मापत्यत्सत्त्वम् \( \text{BP XI-4-29} \)

(3) अन्य (जैविक) वै सर्वक्षेपिते भाषाणिः सदा भाषाणि देशा भक्तं त्रिश्रवणं \( \text{BP IX-59-30} \)
according to Bhāgavata unreal like a dream and not final. There is thus something else other than this, which is the ultimate Absolute Reality, behind and beyond all creation, transcending it. When we thus examine from the standpoint of the Absolute Truth or philosophical thought, we find that the Reality which presents itself to our naked and bare thinking and which we term and describe as 'Reality', after designating the Real Truth as 'Ideality', and for which reason the Westerners and Modern thinkers consider the Classical Sāmkhya as the Realistic Philosophy, is really unreal.

Māyā in Dvaita and Advaita schools:

In view of the acceptance of the Māyā theory by the S'rutis and Smṛtis, this Māyā is accepted by all schools of thought in Indian Philosophy, both Dvaita and Advaita. The followers of Qualified Monism who accept the Saguna Brahman as the Ultimate Reality, conceive the Māyā as the eternal power of the Lord. The followers of Madhva to whom Hari is the Absolute (Hari Sarvottama) consider Māyā as Lakṣmī who is by the side of Lord Hari, but without a material body, co-eternal and all pervading, Nityamukta and is the personification of the God's creative energy. She is the intelligent Prakṛti but dependent always on the Lord. Dasgupta while explaining the Māyā theme of this school says:— "The Māyā, by the help of which God creates the world, is like the mother of the world and is called, in the theological terminology of the Madhva school, Lakṣmī. The creative Māyā, or will of God, is also called Svarūpa Māyā, because she always abides with the Lord. The Māyā as Prakṛti, or as her guiding power (Māyas'rayin), is outside of God but
completely under his control." The followers of Chaitanya school who follow both Ramanuja and Madhva schools, who consider that Lord Vishnu or Krishna has none of the evil qualities but possesses all excellent qualities, accept Maya as the Supra-logical (Acintya) power of the Lord. The Vallabha school who holds that the whole world is real and in a subtle way Brahman in essence, accepts Jiva, Kala and Maya as eternal existences. These are referred to the being of Brahman and have no separate existence. While the Advaitins trace the world to Brahman through Maya, Vallabha holds that Brahman creates the world without any connection with the principle like Maya. This school accepts the Saguna Brahman as the Absolute, but they admit that the liberated soul becomes one with the Lord and that the world is not an illusionary appearance. The Nimbarka school which is called 'devaitadvaita' accepts Maya as the power of the Lord and according to this school, the Universe cannot be dismissed as a mere illusion. The Advaita school denies reality to the Maya and its evolutes, by interpreting Maya as illusion or unreal. Though it is a Sakti or power to this school it has no Reality (Satyata). The Classical Sankhyas accept Prakrti as an eternal entity independent of Purusha and as the main cause for the creation of Universe.

Maya, Prakrti and its History in Indian Philosophy:

We have already dealt with this problem in the foregoing portions and it appears redundant to repeat the same here.
Conception of 'Māyā' or 'Prakṛti' in Bhāgavata:

The term 'Māyā' is freely used by S'rimad Bhāgavata in the sense of 'illusion' or 'appearance' or 'unreality' and also as S'akti or power without Satyatva. It is for this Bhāgavata aspect and other reasons also that the followers of Rāmānuja are not showing the required respect towards Bhāgavata Tattva of this Purāṇa. B.N.K. Sharma has remarked: "Rāmānuja in the 11th Century had, however, ignored it; probably because it had not so much ostensible support to give to his doctrine of 'Abhinannimittapādāna vāda'.' It is also explained already that this Bhāgavata Pañcarātra school differed from that of the Pravṛttipara school which Sri Rāmānuja vehemently supported and therefore, he has always tried to substitute the Pañcarātra' manual (Pravṛttipara) for the Vaikānasa-saṁhitā of the Bhāgavata school. Bhāgavata Purāṇa is no doubt theistic but the theism of Bhāgavata is pro-monism.

S'rimad Bhāgavata explains Māyā as: "That which merely appears (Pratiyeta) without a reality of its own and which does not become visible or escapes or eludes appearance (or detection) sometimes though it is there with the Ātman (having its Adhisthāna in Ātman) - is Māyā, like the reflection or the unreal appearance (Abhāsa) or like the misconception or ignorance (Tamas)." Vasugupta, who generally construes Māyā as eternal S'akti, takes it as the manifestation of the external power of the God and interprets this S'loka to mean: "Illusion or Māyā is defined as that

(2) Ph. b, II, p. xii
(3) ज्ञेस्व अधिश्रवः स्वात्त्वीयेत न प्रतीयितात्तात्केव तत्‌ रचयोऽविभीमायेः यथा रामानुजस्तेषाः पथात्माः II
(4) Uṣṇik, IV, pp 16 and 42 (foot-note)
which manifests non-existent objects but is not manifested itself" for importing 'eternal 'S'akti' sense in the term Māyā. This translation of Dasgupta is missing the true translation of the S'loka. So also some other commentators are not hitting at the clear meaning of the words 'unreality' 'illusion' or 'appearance' and have wasted their valuable intelligence in interpreting Māyā as 'power' or 'S'akti' with reality. Here the use of the words "Ātme Arthe" "Abhāsā" and "Tamaś" in this S'loka are relevant to connect 'Māyā' with unreality, illusion or delusion, there being no cogent reason to force the sense of eternal 'S'akti' on the word 'Māyā'.

The Kārṣya Brahman who gets associated with Māyā and becomes engaged with its activities in the process of creation of the universe and the beings therein, requests the Absolute to keep him away from the influence of the Māyā and its egohood, in reply to which prayer, the Absolute Lord reveals to him the secrets of the Bhāgavata Jñāna or Sāmkhya, along with the Vijnāna as well as the respective ways (Āngas) that lead to it by stating "Only I (Absolute Reality) alone existed before the creation of the universe. At that time, there was nothing else like 'Sat' or 'Asat'. That which appears as all this universe (Tad Etat) after creation (Pacat) is 'I'; that which remains residuum (after dissolution) is 'I'. The Absolute Lord wants at the same time the Kārṣya Brahman to have in his view that "to conceive any other thing besides 'I' (the Absolute) as Reality and to fail to recognise 'I' (the Absolute) only as the Reality, simply because it escapes easy recognition is itself hallucination or illusion

1) अर्धमैत्रेयसंहितायां गौतमसंहितायां मध्यान्तरसंहिताय एवं ब्रह्मसंहितायां परस्परवर्तनं विवेकयोगयोग्यस्तत्संबोधनं श्रीमद्भागवतम्

BP II-7-32
(Mayā); and that if he were to realise this Truth or Knowledge which is all-pervasive and eternal (Sarvatra and Sarvada) with earnestness and if he were to concentrate in Samādhi on this Reality, he would never be overcome by the illusion of Mayā (Na Vimuhya).

Here the word 'Vimuhya' is very pertinent and important as it indicates the delusive characteristic of Mayā. Mayā in Bhāgavata is thus without its 'own' Reality. Still Mayā is here, as in Advaita, a 'bhāva' element. Not only this but also it is a dynamic power in itself. (Sakti). This position is made clear by stating: "Before the commencement of creation (Idam Agre) the Absolute Bhagavan alone existed. Mayā (which was merged or latent in the Absolute) is that which is energy (within herself), which brings out homogeneity between the subject and object, which is both Sat and Asat i.e., Bhāva and Ābha. It is through this Mayā that the Lord created this Universe." Since this Mayā is powerful in itself and capable of being both 'Sat' and 'Asat', and thus wearing different colours, which change in antithesis to each other, is delusive. This dualistic Universe (Dvitiyaṁ), which is different from Ātman and which is sometimes short, big, subtle, gross, Asat, Sat, animate and inanimate should be taken as the outcome of Mayā, which acts in the name of Dravya, Svabhāva, As'aya, Kāla and Kārma. It should be understood that all creations through Mayā are also of the latter (Similar) nature (Svarūpa) and thus equally delusive. Lord Kṛṣṇa while explaining to Uddhava the Sāmkhya principles states: "Know this objective world..."
which is being perceived by mind, words, eyes, ears – as unreal and as due to the illusion."

One should determine through valid reasoning that this universe along with mind, speech and breath is an imposition upon the Atman and is Maya itself, and he should rest himself in his own self-state discarding the unreal Maya and never think of it."

The whole purport of all these authorities from the Bhagavata is to show the unreality of all dualities which owe their existence to the deceptive and illusory Maya and therefore to prove beyond doubt the reality of the non-dual Absolute Truth. Lord Karya Brahman, therefore, states:—" O Lord! There is nothing real except Thee (Na anyat twadast). Again what appears to be existing is not real (Na Sv'uddham). By dint of Maya only, Thou appearst in Multiple forms."

Absolute Lord, Maya or Prakrti and the Universe:

We thus see the unreality of Maya, Prakrti and the universe from the ultimate point of view and the reality of the Absolute. This position poses difficult logical problems. It goes very difficult to establish through logical deductions and analysis, the exact relation between the Brahman and the world, since the real cannot be expected to have any connection with the unreal. A connection or association in the real sense presupposes the reality of both the entities. Bhagavata, therefore, states:—" There is no possibility of union or association and separation of Atman with the Asat." Her the Jagat is unreal and the Atman is real and in the phenomenal

(1) अस्तित्वं नास्ति बौद्ध-नास्तिक अवगतिदिविज्ञ नस्ते गुःसहस्त्राणाः स वर्तिक्ष्यायं क्षेरभण्डम

(2) नारसिंह वद्याय-कर्माकारस्वभावस्तं सर्वोदयेनिष्ठ नरस्यस्यस्यस्यस्यस्याः सक्षम्याधिकारगतं

(3) धर्ममन्दिरयात्रा भगवाना तत् एहूँ भायारुपण्वतिकाविषेषिकाः स कैलासाः स्त्रियान 

(4) नारसिंहस्य स्वयं सव्याहते विश्वासस्य शान्तिस्य स्वीर्याः सप्तेऽव नारसिंहस्य स्वाभाविकम्

(5) अग्निभूति सत्त्वस्य सव्याहते विश्वासस्य शान्तिस्य स्वीर्याः सप्तेऽव नारसिंहस्य स्वाभाविकम्
world, we, despite the logical statement, perceive the empirical Jivatman associating himself with the objective world. Bhagavata comes to our rescue, for reconciling this position by stating: "There can be no relation possible between the Atman and the world except through Maya (Atma mayamrte), just as the connection of the (dreaming) person with the objects seen in the dream is inconceivable." This means to say that the so-called association or connection which presents to us is illusory and ascribed as one due to Maya or illusion. It is this inexplicable Maya or the illusion that is put forth to explain such a connection. To explain this connection as due to 'Supra-logical' reasoning or as 'super-human thinking or power' would not be logically consistent and it would be to admit a logical defeat and irrational thinking. The only alternative left is to hold the connection itself as illusory or unreal in the way in which Bhagavata puts forth this theory of Maya, on Advaita lines, on the authority of the various Upanisadic and Vedic statements.

Maya to the Bhagavata is the same as Prakrti, in view of its statement, "This Prakrti is the subtle, insurmountable Maya energy". Prakrti is not the mere physical world here but also covers the psychological world of mind, senses, intelligence also. Here the Bhagavata adopts the SU statement, "Know then that Prakrti is Maya and the wielder of Maya is Mahes'vara." Bhagavata for explaining the theory of cosmology, uses both the terms Maya and Prakrti as the causes without making any distinctions between the

1. आत्मायण्यां शान्ति परस्यापि तदनं धा तद्यथं सर्वेऽ यज्ञरापकारसिद्धिः || ६-१-१
2. इत्येव अत्माः सूक्ष्म भवति भगवद्भक्ष्यस्य || ७-१-११
3. मयः सु प्रकृति विदायाविवेचिनुहि महेश्वरस्य || ६४-३-१०
4. केवलामयदेशीतां संविधाय विज्ञानाविवेचिन भोज्यते शरीरं यस्मात्तयं || ६-१-७
5. स च ाग्नेभुवं स्युनं श्वेताद्ये विज्ञानाविवेचिने ६४-३-१४
two concepts, meaning thereby that Prakṛti is the same as Māyā and both the terms are synonymous. It has made this position more clear through the sage Antarikṣa who in reply to the question 'What is Māyā?' equates it with the Prakṛti which becomes the cause for the origination and etc. of the Universe. Māyā need not necessarily be taken as the producer or Originator of Prakṛti as done by Siddhaśvara Bhaṭṭācārya who says:" Bhāgavat takes Māyā to evolve into Prakṛti which brings the Universe into existence." Bhāgavata explains Prakṛti and Pradhāna by stating," That which being unmanifest(unreal) (Avis'esa) appears as manifest(real), which consists of three gunas and at the same time eternal and which appears as 'Sat' and 'Asat' is Prakṛti or Pradhāna." Such an explanation fits well also with the definition of Māyā as mentioned above.

If according to this explanation, Prakṛti or Māyā were to be taken as eternal, then when the Puruṣa is eternal, the relation between the Absolute and Prakṛti will also have to be considered eternal, and the empiricism of the Jīvātmā will have to be considered as eternal. There can then be no relief to the Jīvātmā from the miseries and mysteries of the world. Devahūti, the mother of the sage Kapila, facing such a difficult problem, asks Kapila," Puruṣa and Prakṛti will be eternally dependent on each other. By reason of this, Prakṛti does never sever her connection with Puruṣa. If that be so, how

1) गुण माया आकृति । रत्नसिर्षयसनादारिकी । टिन्य बर्मतालामारिरिव किं मूर्यः सूर्यः एव। श्रीकृष्ण एव।
2) प. १, प. २३७
3) धरितिशुक्रमारिव निक्षेप महाराष्ट्रकालमेव । भ्रात । इत्यद्विव्याहः इव। ज्ञानविश्वविद्याविदुः।
5) पुरुषः प्रकृतिरपेक्षा दृष्टान्तस्य कर्मभिरय । अर्थशास्त्रविज्ञानस्य विद्याविदुः।

येदा विशेषत शुक्लस्य ना विदा विद्याविदुः। अर्थशास्त्रविज्ञानस्य यद्यपि।
क्रियाशृवाविशेषाय निरन्तरे श्रेयस्वत्तूर्वः। अंतिति तत्त्वज्ञानस्य विशेषतः।

कृपया वर्नित श्रवणस्य विद्यामुक्तिवर्त्तिकः प्रस्थापितस्य एव। श्रीकृष्ण एव।
can Puruṣa attain emancipation? Just as 'Prthvi' and its attribute 'Gandha' (Scent) or just as 'Water' and its attribute liquidity (Rasa) have mutual inextricable co-existence and exist as not-distinct from each other (Na vytileka-bhāva), so also Prakṛti and Puruṣa will have to be considered as interdependent or reciprocally inseparable from each other. So long as the Guṇas of Prakṛti serve as the fetters of the Puruṣa, how can the Puruṣa, though himself a witness can attain emancipation? There may be sometimes temporary relief from the dreadful fear but the (eternal) relation which has not totally ceased may revive and reappear after the temporary phase fades away. The sage Kapila by clarifying the Sāmkhya position denies the eternal inseparable connection between the two and states, "The relation which develops into an inseparable tie or bondage (Bandhana) between the Puruṣa and Prakṛti which is the same as Maya or Avidyā can be cast away." The Prakṛti or the Maya of the Puruṣa can be burnt with efforts made day and night and destroyed through the following ways, viz,(1) performing Niṣkāma Karma (2) following his own Dharma with faith, (3) purifying one's own mind after purging all impurities, (4) Unflinching and intense devotion unto the Lord, (5) constant hearing of the glories of the Lord, (6) Knowledge or Sāmkhya amounting to realisation of the truth, (7) Strong Vairāgya (8) Yoga with peace. (9) Intense or acute state of Sāmādhi on Ātman. All these measures or processes are to be adopted by the mind as they pertain to the faculty of Prakṛti only. They will burn away their own source viz., Prakṛti, just like the fire burning its own source
Arani or the fuel. The limitations or bondage is the covering of the Prakrti caused by its own Guṇas. The Guṇas originate from Maya and function in the field of Maya only. The Ātman, being Nirguṇa, has no cause for any bondage or Salvation. The Avidyā which superimposes an eternal relation or bondage upon the Puruṣa withdraws the same when the Sāmkhya path is resorted to. When the Prakṛti which has become a source of enjoyment for the Puruṣa (Bhukta Bhoga) and whose imperfections like unreality are noticed (by the Puruṣa) (Drśta Dosa) and discarded by the Individual Puruṣa eternally, it cannot (stand before him) and do harm (or influence) any longer to him who is established in his native state (Mahimni sthitīḥ). Even the Classical Sāmkhya Kārikās more or less accept this position. Kārikā 61 states: "Nothing is more modest than the Prakṛti. Once aware of (her unrealiies or imperfections) her having been seen, she does not expose herself to the view of the Puruṣa."

"Puruṣa is verily not bound or emancipated; nor does he migrate. It is Prakṛti only, that having vehicles, is bound or is released or migrates." This Prakṛti is compared with a dancing girl, by stating: "As a dancing girl, having exhibited herself to the spectators of the stage, ceases to dance, so does Prakṛti cease to operate when she has made herself manifest to the Puruṣa."

When, after enjoying the romantic unrealistic dance performed by

1. Arani or the fuel. The limitations or bondage is the covering of the Prakṛti caused by its own Guṇas. The Guṇas originate from Maya and function in the field of Maya only. The Ātman, being Nirguṇa, has no cause for any bondage or Salvation. The Avidyā which superimposes an eternal relation or bondage upon the Puruṣa withdraws the same when the Sāmkhya path is resorted to. When the Prakṛti which has become a source of enjoyment for the Puruṣa (Bhukta Bhoga) and whose imperfections like unreality are noticed (by the Puruṣa) (Drśta Dosa) and discarded by the Individual Puruṣa eternally, it cannot (stand before him) and do harm (or influence) any longer to him who is established in his native state (Mahimni sthitīḥ). Even the Classical Sāmkhya Kārikās more or less accept this position. Kārikā 61 states: "Nothing is more modest than the Prakṛti. Once aware of (her unrealiies or imperfections) her having been seen, she does not expose herself to the view of the Puruṣa."

"Puruṣa is verily not bound or emancipated; nor does he migrate. It is Prakṛti only, that having vehicles, is bound or is released or migrates." This Prakṛti is compared with a dancing girl, by stating: "As a dancing girl, having exhibited herself to the spectators of the stage, ceases to dance, so does Prakṛti cease to operate when she has made herself manifest to the Puruṣa."

When, after enjoying the romantic unrealistic dance performed by
the Prakrti, the Purusa notices that her performances are directed for enticing him and entangling him in her actions and when he does not show response towards her, the Prakrti gets disappointed and exasperated and will never attempt to influence him. The retirement of Prakrti from the presence of the Purusa, leaving him to his own status, shows that the Purusa can stay without the Prakrti and admits an independent position to the Purusa. If the Purusa can function without the company or the help of the Prakrti at a certain stage, he can be independent at other stages also. It is only the lame Prakrti, who is insentient, that requires the blind (indifferent) Purusa's help, for borrowing Chaitanya from him and that it is always after him for help. Prakrti is thus dependent on Purusa and it would not be cogent on the part of the Classical Smākhyas to plead that their Prakrti is an independent principle.

This process of discarding or burning all dualities like Prakrti or Maya by the Purusa and his reverting to his own Absolute or non-dual state as explained by the Sage Kapila is strictly Advaita.

Prakrti or Maya, and its forms:

The Prakrti or Maya of Bhāgavata has its own dynamic powers, though insentient, and can assume various forms due to this power. But it cannot wield any influence on the Supreme Lord. The Bhāgavata describes this position by stating, "Maya which is capable of assuming manifold
forms and capable of creating sense of distinctions (Bhedā
Buddhi) in the minds of created beings, is still unable to
influence the (Supreme) Ātman. With this Māyā of variegated
powers under his control, the Supreme Lord creates the Universe,
without himself modifying being independent. In view of her
extensive powers of illusion, she is described as one who
sometimes becomes the enticer of even the Lord Māyā himself.
Then what of her enticing or deluding others? Her ways, when
they are not known to the Lord himself, cannot be made out by others.

Attempts are made by some thinkers especially of the
S'akti school, to treat 'Māyā' as the eternal Parā S'akti of
the Lord. Radhakrishnan says, 'The moment we try to link up
'Māyā' with Brahman, the latter becomes transformed into Īśvāra
and Māyā denotes the 'S'akti' or the energy of the Īśvāra.'
There seems no objection to accept 'Māyā' as the power of the
Savis'esaṇa Brahman even according to the Advaitins, since the
the Savis'esaṇa Brahman is Māyā-uphitā-caitanya. It is because
of this Māyā and its power that the Lord becomes the 'Karta' of
the Universe. The Su stated: Those who resort to Dhyāna-Yoga
saw the Divine Lord with the power (Māyā) hidden in its Gupas.'
The 'Deva' referred to in this Su.loka is the Savis'esaṇa
Brahman, as he is here an aspect of 'being seen' or 'seen' which
involves the sense of distinction. Māyā may be taken as the
'power' or 'Sakti' of such Brahman or Īśvāra. But 'Māyā' has
nothing to do with 'Cit' of the Absolute, or the Niravachhinna
Brahman. 'Cit' is the essence or Svarūpa of such Absolute
Brahman and accordingly is a reality, whereas 'Māyā' is an

[1] अदृश्य अवलोकन अणु नाधिकारिक जन्मते हि तदुपराय तत्स्थविषयात्मकाः तत्स्या न स्तुति तत्स्यानिदान ||
[2] अदृश्य अवलोकन अणु नाधिकारिक जन्मते हि तदुपराय तत्स्थविषयात्मकाः तत्स्या न स्तुति तत्स्यानिदान ||
[3] अदृश्य अवलोकन अणु नाधिकारिक जन्मते हि तदुपराय तत्स्थविषयात्मकाः तत्स्या न स्तुति तत्स्यानिदान ||

\[1\] \[2\] \[3\]
an unreality according to the Bhāgavata definition (Rte Arthe).

The concept of Cit-Sakti requires some explanation, as it is connected with Māyā or Prakṛti. The views of Aurobindo and Bhaṭṭacārya on Cit Sakti are indicated on pp 383 respectively.

This term Cit-Sakti appears in BP in S'loka 1-7-20 when Arjuna describes Lord Kṛṣṇa "Though art the Prime Ordeal Purusa, the Paramesvāra himself transcending the Prakṛti (Māyā). Thou art remaining in Thy Absolute State after overpowering or dubbing or destroying the Avidyā (Māyā) through the Cit-Sakti." The BP also gives a similar description of Kapila through Sage Karṣṇa: "My salutations to Thee! Thou art the Purusa beyond Prakṛti (Param Pradhānam). Thou art the cosmic Mahat, Kāla, Omnipotent, the Āhamkara, Tattva, the Presiding Deities! Thou art the Self-Experience itself and underlying the Emancipation. The Cit Sakti is subordinate to Thee (Svachchanda Sakti). S'rīdharasvāmin annotates Svachchanda Sakti as "Cit Sakti subordinate to the Lord and that if Māyā (Avidyā) leads to empiricism (Pradhana and its evolutes), the Cit-Sakti leads to emancipation (Nir-Frāṇa) , and due to the Cit-Sakti the Pradhana etc get merged in the Atman and thus destroyed. The Absolute is thus free from any Sakti in its native State, but when Māyā or Avidyā expresses before the Lord, the Cit-Sakti will dub or overpower or control the Avidyā. When there is no Avidyā or Māyā there is no question of the working of Vidyā or Cit-Sakti. Under BP S'loka 1-7-6, S'rīdharasvāmin describes the Lord as the one who will be controlling Māyā or Avidyā through Vidyā Sakti (Cit Sakti) quoting the authority of Vijnu Śvāmin who is a great Advaita writer. This aspect is also put forth by Bhaṭṭacārya in his Saubhāgya Bhaṭṭacārya, a commentary on Lalitā Sahasranāma, while explaining the names "Cit-Sakti, Cetana Rupa." Thus the Cit-Sakti or Vidyā Sakti is a relative power for control of Avidyā; and the Supreme is beyond Vidyā or Avidyā according to SU. (So anyā). BP classes Vidyā and Avidyā as caused by Māyā. Thus the Absolute is beyond the Cit-Sakti or Māyā Sakti in its native state of Bliss or Vijnana.

Māyā cannot be classed only as Avidyā. It is also called Divine Māyā due to its Vidyā aspect. Bhāgavata gives various apppellations to this Māyā. We need not consider each of these names as different and distinct aspects and divide Māyā into different categories. It is used in different senses. The term 'Yoga-Māyā' is used

in one context as a power adopted by the Sage Sanaka through his Yogic power. This Yogic power need not be mixed up with the creative or cosmological Mâyā. The term 'Maha Mâyā' is used as the great magical power which Sri Pradyumna, son of Lord Kṛṣṇa mastered, when he was kidnapped by the great Śambarāsura and used it against the Mayās of the Asura. The worshippers of Mâyā worship Her as 'Durgā', 'Bhadra Kālī', 'Vijayā', 'Vaisnavī', 'Kumudā', 'Candikā', 'Kṛṣṇā', 'Madhavi', 'Kanyāka', 'Māyā', 'Nārāyaṇī', 'Is'āni', 'Śāradā' and 'Āmbika'. The greatness of Mâyā is helpful to bring out the glories of the Lord who is still greater and more magnanimous than the great Mâyā. Bhāgavata desires that one should not indulge very much in glorifying the unreal elements and warns us that "One should not speak high or low of this Para, (i.e. Mâyā or the Universe)". Since the duality (caused by Mâyā) is an unreality and has no existence (Avastu) what is good or bad (Bhadra or Abhadra) in eulogizing it? After all, that which becomes manifest through Upādhis like speeches or human fancies is untrue or unreal (and has no value)."

Prakṛti or Mâyā and its unreality from the ultimate point of view:

Mâyā though an unreality, is accepted as a 'Bhāva' entity. Bhāgavata, like the Upaniṣads and the Vedas, accepts it as both 'Sat' and 'Asat'. The Absolute is neither 'Sat' nor 'Asat' as it is not Mâyā. This Mâyā has got the Creative power as well as the encompassing power. When the Absolute allows the Mâyā to play or function, and appears also as Savikalpaka, he appears as if...
entering into It, though he is outside it and transcending it. The Maya appears as if limiting Him through its 'Avarana' power. By this way of encompassing the Reality, the Maya presents also the unreal world against the Reality. The world which is thus presented to us through Maya or Avidya and which manifests to us extrinsically in many forms is not real but is false like water in the mirage. Bhagavata states in this connection, "All this universe consisting of earth, water, light, the Antahkaraṇa (manas), the senses etc. which constitute the moveable and immoveable world - all these (Sāmkhya categories) are (simply) Bhramas (misconceptions) and therefore unrealities and have no existence or reality (of their own), being dependent on the Absolute which is the only non-dual Reality." All these entities (Bhavas), other than the Soul are held as unreal (Asatva).

Consequently it wants that the objective world or its entities should be perspectively examined and not to be taken at their face value, since all such extrinsic aspects are misleading, and warns, "Whoever considers the objective world (Dra'ya Gunā) as real and independent of Lord (Sva-vyatireka) is not intelligent, (A-budha), though with so much close consideration and experience it is established that the objective world cannot have any reality without the background of the Absolute (Vinā Anuvādām)." Such a person will be accepting as real those which are discarded (or wanting in Reality) (Tyaktam Upadadat)." It is the Maya or Avidya or Bhrama or Ajñana that is giving different colour or coating to the Reality.
present, mobile, immobile great or small, that which is being seen or heard—nothing of these, which are without the background of the Absolute Achyta (and which are thus caused by Mâyā) can be said to have any Reality. Only the Lord who is all this (Sarvam) is the Ultimate Reality. The BG therefore, states that Jñāna is veiled by Ajñāna which misleads the creatures. Brahman which is Jñāna and nondual and free from Guṇas or Mâyā, appears on account of Bharantī (ignorance) in the form of objects (Artha rūpeṇa) as possessing the characteristics of Śabda to those, who will be viewing them with extrinsic organs. Therefore, the perceptible form is an unreality, just like things which are seen in dreams by a person, appear unreal, to him when he awakes after the dreams. The world that presents itself to our perception—either physical or mental—with an appearance different from the Reality—is nothing but a Gandharvanagāra in the sky, a dream, fictitious fancy of imagination, or the water of a mirage after which ignorant people run. Just as the clouds appear and disappear in the sky, so also the universe becomes manifest once with various forms and names, and becomes nonmanifest at another time against the Absolute like illusions, dreams or imaginations of the mind. Therefore, the universe should be looked upon as a delusion or a play of mind (Manaso Tilīṣṭa) or the fire brand that appears circular (Alāta Cakra) (though not really circular). It should not be mistaken for an independent Reality.
Had this world (which appears to us on account of Mayā) any reality even to the slightest extent (Apyāpi) independent of Ātman, it would have been identical with the Ātman. This is not, however, the case in view of its origination and destruction, just as the world has no reality, but owes its existence to Mayā, so also the multiplicity of the Jīvātmanas and their seeming independence and getting entangled in the empirical world, is also due to Mayā as explained previously. Bhāgavata emphatically states that "A wise man should note that miseries, happiness, fear, anger, covetousness, enticement, desire, even birth and death - all these belong to the Ahamkāra-Tattva i.e. Antahkaraṇa (Liṅga body) (Avidyā) and not to the Ātman." All these states are created by the Avidyā and are superimposed upon the Jīvātman, who feels himself as a sufferer or enjoyer after getting entangled in them. He loses his own personality. He will be dreaming in waking state, just as one is awake when he is in dreams. The waking experiences, dreams and dreamless states are also called by the Bhāgavata as the functions of the mind or Buddhī caused by the Guṇas. The designations of Viṣāva, Taijasa, and Prājña which the Jīvātman gets on account of his connection with the three states of waking, dreams and dreamless conditions of the Antahkaraṇa do not bring out any difference in the Jīvātman, he remaining the same as Sākṣīn without any change in him. The Ātman is beyond them (Turīya) which is called the real state. All this unreality caused by the Avidyā as explained by the Bhāgavata is purely Advaitic.

1) विषयक अवाचारण प्रत्ययात्मात्माप्रकाशप्रज्ञांत्राणां विभिन्नताः विद्युत्तमस्व शास्त्रात् शास्त्रात् स्वाभाविकः।
2) स्मार्थ्यायस्य भृगुस्मार्थूपसङ्केतविद्वृत्ताः भृगुस्मार्थूपसङ्केतविद्वृत्ताः अन्नमात्र अन्नवद कालाणी।
3) यथाविन्दिकोत्तरविद्युत्तमस्व आपस्वरूपायाः स्मार्थ्यायस्य भृगुस्मार्थूपसः अन्नमात्र अन्नवद कालाणी।
4) अन्नमात्र अपना सूक्ष्म अन्नवद भृगुस्मार्थूपसः अन्नमात्र अन्नवद कालाणी।
5) भेद दृष्टः सत्यत्यसयात्मात्मात्माप्रकाशप्रज्ञांत्राणां विभिन्नताः विद्युत्तमस्व शास्त्रात् शास्त्रात् स्वाभाविकः।
Conventional Reality of Prakṛti or Maya:-

Thus the Bhāgavata explains the universe as unreal like Vaikalpika Bhrama; like the Advaita, it also does not knock it away, simply because its appearance is illusory. Bhāgavata does not at the same time deny the conventional Reality of the universe, when the sage Jaḍa-Bharata who was carrying the palanquin of the Dauvīra king Rāhugaṇa, was admonished by the king in taunting words for his irregular carrying of the cabin, he said to him in philosophical terms, "O king! Except from the phenomenal or conventional point of view, I do not see any difference amongst us (our souls) like king and subject. (From the ultimate point), who is the Ruler and who is Ruled?" The king is not convinced about this philosophical statement and he, in the manner of an ordinary person in the world, said, "Your statement that king-ship and subjectship (is'a and Ís'ítā) is acceptable only at the phenomenal or conventional (Vyāvarhārika) level and not from the point of ultimate Truth is not convincing to me, as this is an obvious fact or Reality which is before us. If reality is denied to an existing pot before us, whereby should we fetch water? The objects existing before us as they are, will have to be accepted as real." Jaḍa-Bharata replied, "The learned ones never accept the conventional or phenomenal Reality as the Absolute Reality." So long as the mind (Linga body) exists, till then all this conventional reality will manifest (Avīp) to the Jīvātman, both in the wakened state and...
dream state, in gross and subtle forms. Therefore, the wise man states that the mind is the cause (Ringa) for the Jīvātman being attached to Guṇas or being freed from Guṇas and also for his benevolence and malevolence.

Thus, the conventional Reality which presents to us in the living world will be meaningful to a being so long as he is joined with the apparatus of the Linga body or Avidyā or Māyā and one will have to grope in the world so long as this upādhi of Māyā or Avidyā is not annihilated.

Thus, from the phenomenal or conventional point of view, the universe cannot be dismissed by ignoring it as illusory. The illusion will have to be conquered and vanquished. All this Māyā and its evolutes are so close to the Ultimate and they are so strongly covering the Ultimate that they will not show a clearance signal without one getting himself entitled to it. Mere objections against the unreality of the conventional Reality will not damage its position, because the entire complex of phenomenal existence is felt by the mind as real and this state will continue till then, when so long as the knowledge of the Self as being the same as Paramātman has not arisen and is not actually felt. It is this high knowledge that destroys the Māyā or Avidyā or Antahkaraṇa which is the cause for this conventional Reality. Just as the phantoms of dream are felt as true, until the sleeper awakes, and just as the dreamer will be facing all the dreamy obstacles while he is in his dreams, and just as they will not trouble him when he wakes up, so also, so long as the soul has connections (under the influence of Māyā) with the body senses and breath, till then this
phenomenal worldly existence will overpower such a person and remain with him but will not delude him any longer after he attains the knowledge of Brahma. The shadow, echo, reflection and error (Bhrama) will be having no reality no doubt; yet they are to be supposed to be realities and causing effects like fears to those who are under their influence. Similarly all objects of nature like gross and subtle bodies, though they have no ultimate reality, will continue as phenomenal realities and will be inspiring action or actions fear etc. till they exist. This Maya or Prakrti, it should be noted, is given an eternal continuity though not the Satyatva and hence the conventional reality which we face and feel in our phenomenal existences, considering the latter as real, like births, deaths, sufferings, miseries, or happiness (though caused to the mind) will continue to exist, till the Maya is uprooted from one's existence.

This Maya which has the appearance of conventional Reality and has no Satyatva, secures the ultimate Reality. By following the Reality, it complements the ultimate and coexists with the same till it is extirpated from that position. The Ultimate as Saguna Brahma is immanent in the world, though He is not himself the unreal world itself. He is the substrate for this unreal Maya. The Maya assumes, by this position of its coexistence, all this co-parcenary and conventional Reality and passes itself sometimes as the only reality. Though this Maya or Prakrti is not the essential truth or the Brahma, it has the phenomenal or counterfeit truth or reality. It is only wanting in Satyatva of the Brahma. It would not have certainly its existence, if the
Reality were not there at the background for its support or stand. Even the mirage which we see, cannot exist without a basis like the refraction of ray and the atmosphere. This Maya receives sometimes some impressions or some shadow or some phantoms from the Reality and with that much activity, it becomes or converts itself into the counterfeit reality and stages the whole world of conventional Reality. This explanation given by the Bhagavata to the Maya or Prakriti theory is in line with the Upanisadic statements. Maya or Prakriti, here having the conventional reality, acts as subordinate to the Ultimate and functions under the superintendence of the Saguna Brahman. The metaphysics of the Classical Sāmkhya which propagates the Prakriti as eternal and as independent stands no comparison with the Bhagavata Sāmkhya.

Greatness of Maya or Prakriti and its subordination or Adhisthāna:

Maya or Prakriti is all the while described in the Upanisads and the Bhagavata as possessing double characteristics of Sat and Asat. Prakriti, as Sat, is explained as the manifested (Vyakta) one and Prakriti, as Asat, is explained as the unmanifested (Avyakta) one and Avyakta or the Mula-Prakriti, which is the same as Apat, Apat, Tamas, Narā, Maya, Avidyā, Ajñāna etc, as explained previously. Sat is also explained as reality and Asat is explained as unreality. Maya is Asat or unreality when seen from the ultimate point of view and 'Sat' when viewed from the conventional or worldly point of view.

We see that the universe is the mother of wonders and its greatness is unfathomable even to the greatest scientists. Maya or Prakriti which is responsible for the appearance of the
universe is obviously greater and still more mystical than the universe. Bhāgavata states that the greatest self realisers Pāra-dāś 'anāh like Lord Śiva, Lord Kārṇa Brahmān, the sages Sanat-Kumāras, the Sage Kapila, Veda-Vyāsa; Asita-Devala and Āsura, etc. do not know the Māyā and its limitations, being still overcome by the same. Māyā gets its glories because of the entrance of the Savikalpaka Brahmān in it, who is obviously greater than this Māyā. The unlimited Nirvikalpaka is apparently far beyond the limited or Savikalpaka Lord. The CU which explains the Rg. Vedic Purusa Sukta states, "This is the greatness of the glories (Mahima) of the Virat-Purusa. Still greater than this (Tato) is the Absolute Purusa." Bhāgavata also states, "Who in three worlds (earth, upper region and lower region) can penetrate into thy Māyā (Utpi)? How, when and to what extent can one understand thy Māyā? Thou alone dost master over it and sport it by spreading it over all!" All this illusory character of the Māyā brings out the reality and greatness of the Ultimate, who being unapproachable by mind and speech, is to be explained only after negating all the unrealities of the Māyā.

The Māyā or Prakṛti of Bhāgavata is more powerful than the Prakṛti of the Classical Sāmkhya. It is not only creative or evolvable but also deceptive. It is also cosmic (Samaśti) as well as individual (Vyaṣṭi). It is supra-logical (Anirvācanīya) and therefore, the reasons as to how Māyā first appeared, how

1) अर्थात् समकथा नात्तो भवानन्द ! कौँ विभूति ते सर्वशक्ति ध्वजा / कौँ विभूति १७| ।
2) अर्थात् समकथा नात्तो भवानन्द ! कौँ विभूति ते सर्वशक्ति ध्वजा / कौँ विभूति १७| ।
3) अर्थात् समकथा नात्तो भवानन्द ! कौँ विभूति ते सर्वशक्ति ध्वजा / कौँ विभूति १७| ।
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she came under the purview of the Lord and how she became manifest powerful etc, cannot be logically explained. Bhāgavata states, "How that Bhagavān who is all powerful (Is'vara) and Absolute (Vimukta) came, (after becoming individual souls) under the influence of Karpanya (miseries) and subjected to attachments (Bandhanas) is all due to Māyā which is supralogical."

This supralogical aspect or the Anirvacänīyatva of Māyā is brought out even in the Nasadīya Sūkta of the RV. which states, "Who really knows? Who can here declare it whence was it born and whence came this creation? The Devas are later than this world's creation. Then who knows from where it came into being?"

The Bhāgavata also states: through the mouth of the Devas; "O! Supreme Protector! Thou art the Lord of the Māyā (Tisraṃś). How can we who are recent to creation conceive of Thy Supreme State?" It is this Anirvacänīyatva that is put forth by the Advaitins while explaining the origin of duality or Māyā.

As stated previously, this Māyā is capable of deluding the Saguna Brahman like the Lord (Kārya) Brahman and the Lord Rudra. The Lord Brahman created Avidyā and Vidyā (also known as Sarasvatī or Citta). The Lord Brahman got enamoured of Sarasvatī, who stood to him in the relation of a daughter. The sages like Marīcis began to question Brahman about his integrity on the authority of Dharma. Lord Brahman, thereafter gave up his form or body (as the father) and began to sport with her by assuming

---
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another form. This allegory is meant to explain the greatness of the Absolute Brahman and His becoming Saguna Brahman for coming in contact with $\text{M}^\text{ay}a$ (or Sarasvati or Vidyä). Bhagavata also considers Lord Rudra or S'iva as Saguna Brahman and Lord Vishnu as Nirguna Brahman. It also states that the Lord S'iva became once enamoured of Mäati the Mäya of Lord Vishnu and that he later on explained this incident to his wife by stating:-

"The illusive energy is as if similar to the Absolute. Dost thou behold the Mäya of the great Puruṣa who is unborn. I am the Lord of all Kaläs (glories). Still I had been overpowered by Mäya; what to speak, then, of those persons who have no control?"

This great illusive power of Mäya is further described by the Bhagavata:- "Inscrutable is the Mäya! Even those knowers conversant with the path of Mäya are overpowered by the power of Mäya. The Saguna Brahman (Mäyin) himself does not know fully the ways of Mäya. What then of others to speak?" "Just as the limitless sky knows not its own limits, so also the God Himself does not know the limits of His Mäya, far less the other Gods."

This Mäya is therefore, described as deluding all the Jiva-tmans and the universe. The whole universe has been stupefied by the

There is an alternate reading for Anurupa as Aminadabhibhava in some editions of the Bhagavata Purâṇa. The latter reading will not be very appropriate, since Mäya is not considered as a portion (Amin's a) of the Lord. Mäya assumes the semblance of the Lord and hence the reading of Anurupa fits well and appears more correct and proper.

(3) अपि अपभ्रां क अस्य भावाः परस्य भुवनं परंतवत्त्वः ||
(4) अर्थां कार्यां भावं भयं भोजनं भोजनं भूतं भयं कृत्यादिकलयाः || $\text{BP} \text{IV}-12-43$
(5) अस्ति भ्रातिः भावाः भूतं भयं भोजनं भोजनं कृत्यादिकलयाः || $\text{BP} \text{VI}-6-35$
(6) $\text{BP} \text{VIII}-12-2$
energy of Yoga-Maya and its Guna-Yoga. Maya though very powerful, cannot overpower the Absolute. Bhagavata offers salutations unto the Paramesvara whom the Maya that is responsible for the creation of the universe, cannot approach. It treats the Maya (Aja) as insentient. It (or its constituents like intellect, mind, vac) cannot realise or understand the essence of the Lord. In the circumstances, how can Maya be part or Amsa of the Lord? It has its Adhishthana in Brahman only. Its constituent Gunas cannot function without disturbance by the Kala who is the Lord Absolute himself. The Bhagavata states, "Whatever (predominant) status of the Gunas may be, be they the Sattvika, Rajasa or Tamas, know thou, that they are all from me alone. I am not in them, they are in me (having adhishthana in me)". This clearly indicates that the Maya has the basis in the Absolute. It is not however that the Absolute has his adhishthana in Maya. In the case of Ghatakas'a, Ghaṭa which is a creation or Upadhi to Akās'a is placed in the Akās'a and Ghaṭa-Akās'a is formed. It should never be construed that Akās'a has gone and stayed in the Ghata, since the Akās'a which is all pervading, was there before the creation of Ghaṭa and it exists in its own form after creation of Ghaṭa and will be there even after the Ghaṭa is destroyed. Sri Uadhava states to the Lord that the Prakṛti and Purusa which are different in nature from each other are still interdependent on each other (and have adhishthana in each other) and there is no cause for

(1) अद्वितीयप्रथायोगादेशमुपभोगद्विभिः किष्ठं समस्तं || \(Bp\) \(s.13-45\)
(2) अस्तेऽपरं भागवतेन श्रुत्यं प्रक्ष्यकर्तम || न यथा भ्रूः तथा भ्रुत्य दलोमेव विकाल्प्यं \(BpX-28-6\)
(3) नेतृत विनं तेज्यां प्रक्ष्याकर्तम || अन्यायस्यित्वं भ्रुहां गृहितं \(BpX-40-3\)
(4) \(Rg\) \(viii-12.6\)
(5) \(Rg\) \(xiii-12.6\)

\(BpX-22-26\)
any Bheda in them. The Lord, in explaining the real aspects of Sāmkhya, replies to him that the Purusa and Prakṛti are quite distinct from each other. The creation starts from Prakṛti after disturbance of its guṇas and is always changing. But Purusa who is beyond Prakṛti and beyond changes, the witness of all distinctions or differences (in Prakṛti or Maya) is perfect among the perfects (or perfect-most), self-sufficient-most and illuminates the whole universe or Maya by his own illumination. The Absolute is thus limitless and the limited Prakṛti alone creates the differences. The sun is bigger than the piece of cloud appearing before it, but still the cloud appearing before the Sun, causes dullness or darkness. The Absolute who shines inside and outside is one; but the Maya or Prakṛti which appears in multitudinous forms (Urudhā) causes difference in the appearance of the Absolute, making it appear as if in multitudinous forms.

The Classical Sāmkhayas do not accept the cosmic Purusa, though they accept the cosmic (Samasti) Prakṛti and have thereby made the position of the Classical Sāmkhya metaphysics very slender. But the Bhāgavata Sāmkhya accepts the Supreme Purusa and makes Him the Adhisthāna for the Prakṛti. The Lord is immanent in the universe and the Prakṛti also. Bhāgavata never accepts the universe as an evolution from the Lord. It does not accept the Parināmavāda of the Classical Sāmkhya in this connection fully. The Lord here is neither the Nimitta Kāraṇa nor the Parināma (Upādāna) Kāraṇa. Bhāgavata by putting forth Mayaśāda like the Advaitin accepts the Vivarta-Upādāna.

1) ब्रह्माण्डः परमात्मा तया विद्युत्त्रिकर्ण्यको नरेशसिंहासिनी ।
५५ २२-२९
2) अन्तः अद्वैतस्वरूपायः यद्य अन्तः सत्त्वभावस्वरूपायः सेवितसि ॥
५५ २२-३१
3) तद्विन्द्र अन्तः वैशेषिक शास्त्रसे केवलाः किं भावायात कहासे अन्तः सत्त्वभावात् किं पूजास्तित ॥
५५ २२-३०.
Parana. The world is not completely different from Brahman (Ananya), nor independent of Brahman (Avyatirikta) as can be seen from the Upanisadic words like (Anupravista) and (Atmāśraya). The world, though it hangs on Brahman, does not cause any alteration in Brahman.

Radhakrishnan explains, "Brahman is that of which the Vivarta or perversion is the world of space etc. Vivarta signifies the appearance of the absolute Brahman as the relative world of space and time." He explains the world as a sort of translation and as the translation is made for us, the original does not depend for its existence on the translation. Bhāgavata explains:—"The universe is Bhagavān himself, who is still separate from it." The commentator Śrīdharsvāmin explains:—"The universe is not separate from Bhagavān, but Bhagavān is still different from it, since the origination, preservation and dissolution of this universe are attributed to Him." Bhagavān is in the world, but He is not the world itself. Though the Bhagavān is in the midst of it, He still transcends it. He subsists in the Māyā or the universe as its reality, but the Māyā does not subsist in Him as his part since He transcends it, being its Lord. If the reality were not behind the Māyā what can the insentient Māyā or Prakṛti do for the creation of the Universe? When the mundane universe in the embryo could not proceed, the Lord breathed (Ajīvayat) life or sentience (Jīva) in the insentient (Ajīva). All this view of the Bhāgavata is based on the CU stating "Sarvam khalu idam brahma."5

1) pp. II, p. 570 (2) इसके ही विषयं भगवानिनेत्रीय यतो अंतरस्थानलिखितं बादित्व यो-4-20
(3) इसके ही विषयं भगवानिनेत्रीय यतो अंतरस्थानलिखितं बादित्व यो-4-20
(4) नामस्य अविनेत्रीयं यतो अंतरस्थानलिखितं सूतक ३-३४.
(5) CU III-14-1.
Bhū also states 'All this is Brahman'; "This Atman is the support of all creatures." The other Upanisads all make similar statements. These explanations of the Upanisads tend to establish the oneness of the Atman and to indicate further that whatever appears as world is the vivarta or namesake diversity from the Brahman caused through 'Māyā.' This diversity is only a name depending on the Atman for its existence. Whatever reality appears as caused by this change of name is only Pratibhāsika Reality or Svāpni Reality, which will disappear, no sooner the so-called change disappears. This position is made clear by the Bhāgavata saying:—"Salutations unto Thee who by Māyā, has created this universe and set it into action, (Niyacchata) and due to whose Māyā this universe, though not a reality, shines or appears as if it is a Reality existing." Just as the clothes which have no scent acquire the fragrance of the scented box containing them, so also the Māyā and the universe attain a sort of some-what reality or name-sake or Pratibhāsika reality of the Brahman, because of the Brahman underlying the same. The reality of the universe is thus in appearance, since its creation out of Brahman, is only a vivarta through Avidyā or Māyā and is not an actual transformation. Bhāgavata explains:—"That which did not exist before its origination, which will not exist after destruction, will have no existence in the middle or during the interim period. Such existence or reality in the middle is name-sake only (Vyapades'a mātra)." This clearly shows that

1) भोभति तद् इ भू II-3-1. (2) महंता अति भर गृहोत्ति १५० १४-१६
(3) तत्त्वं कोकिंतर साधु वासिः समागमयं सुविदायते स्विनयते।
८३ नियाम्याद्विभ्यं भविष्यते च तथा विद्यान्दवताद् मानाते यथास्मात् विभू कृष्णमभावद् || ५४-७०-३८४
(4) न भवं सुमन्दा दुष्टं यथा पत्त्वो भयानं यथव तथावपूव्य। || ५४-२२-२१
the Reality of the universe which is there name-sake, is borrowed from the Brahman. Bhāgavata further explains that That thing which is at the beginning and at the end of a thing will exist in the middle also. The intervening nominal changes that appear in the middle are only for the sake of the phenomena like the metallic or earthen wares which appear in the middle having no reality, the Gold or the earth being the only reality for these articles. This is all on the analogy of the CU statement, of clay and clay products. The changes that are appearances like universe are only Vācārāmbhapa due to Maya, whereas the Absolute is the only Reality. Thus from the standpoint of the Bhāgavata-Sāmkhya, all this Prakṛti or Maya, all the Sāmkhya categories, both gross and subtle are all unreal as against the non-dual Reality of the Absolute. Siddhāvara Bhāṭṭācārya therefore rightly states that, "It is therefore hopeless to think the world of three gunas as real."

Māyā, Avidyā and Vidyā:

Bhāgavata does not make much difference between Māyā and the Avidyā. It also considers that the bondage and salvation are the aspects pertaining to the Gunas of Māyā and not to the Atman. Atman, being Nirguna, is in fact never bound nor liberated. The bondage and salvation which are felt in the phenomenal world are only superimpositions of Māyā on the Jīvātman. It has been explained previously that the conditions of waking, dreams, and dreamless sleep pertain to the Buddhi or Mind

1. The notes and citations in the text are not part of the main content and are not transcribed.
and have nothing to do with the Jīvatman. So also, grief and enticement, happiness and misery, birth and death accrue through Māyā or Avidyā only and are not real. The Jīvatman who is eternal truth, never gets born nor dies, nor does he suffer or enjoy. Such aspects are the manifestations of Avidyā, Māyā or Avidyā, from the standpoint of the Bhāgavata Sāmkhya, are unreal, as explained in the foregoing. Its manifestations are, therefore, unreal. By explaining that these aspects of 'bondage' or 'Salvation' are unreal from the standpoint of the Ultimate Reality, Bhāgavata further states that the bondage is caused by Avidyā and salvation results through Vidyā. Avidyā and Vidyā are both traced to Māyā and are explained as having their basis or substratum (Tanu) on the Absolute. Just as the body cannot survive without the Ātman, so also Vidyā and Avidyā cannot survive without the Absolute. The body or 'Tanu' here in this S'loka conveys the sense of unreal coverings or superimpositions. The words 'Na tu vāstave' used in the previous S'loka makes this position clear.

One may feel embarrassed or depressed at the explanation of the aspect of 'Salvation' also as pertaining to Māyā, since it may also impart the sense of 'Unreality' to Salvation. If Salvation were to be unreal, why all these efforts to be made to achieve such an unreal Salvation? To such questions, the reply is that there is no need for any exasperation since the salvation will be unreal to those who have no cause for bondage and who feel the bondage as unreal. To those who are not in the

(1) समवे यथाभाषा वर्णयो स्वयं विवेच्यते मात्र स्वविवेच्यात् भवति गृहीताम् ॥ ६॥
(2) विद्वेषने तया तु विद्वेषने शाश्वसन्नीति कालादृश्यताम् स्वविवेच्येति ॥ ६॥
the clutches of Avidya and its bondage, there is no salvation to be achieved. The Atman—Supreme or Jivatman—in the ultimate sense is the only one Reality and, whatever else than this is unreal, as has been emphasised previously. Any connection or bindings or limitations imposed upon this Reality from all external operations are obviously unreal and from this standpoint, it is explained that such bindings or limitations are unreal and appear only in the case of the Jivatman who is limited by the Avidya. To him there is the necessity of Salvation.

The Mayā concept has been traced in the foregoing to the RV. Bhāgavata traces the Avidya and Vidya also to the Puruṣa Sūkta of RV, by explaining the terms Anas'ana and Sas'ana appearing in the fourth mantra of this Sūkta, as Vidya and Avidya. This mantra means:—"The (Supreme) Puruṣa in his real essence, (Three-fourths), ascended (and stands as the Nirvis'esika); the individual Ketrajña (fourth part) Puruṣa (Vidya) who is here again and again stands transcending both Sas'ana and Anas'ana (Avidya and Vidya)." Bhāgavata explains this mantra:—"The Ketrajña Puruṣa transcends both Sas'ana and Anas'ana, Avidya and Vidya, for both of which he is the substratum." This explanation of the Bhāgavata, tracing to Rg. Vedic period the Vidya and Avidya concepts has not been stressed so far, by the modern Bhāgavata Sāṃkhya thinkers, as it seems to have escaped their notice. The Vedic Sāṃkhya thinkers who were the supporters of monism, were not in favour of attributing any independent position to Vidya and Avidya as the eternal truths, since the Puruṣa stands transcending them. This

(1) एकस्य कमण्डक्य अविश्वेष भवं भूमि। अन्धकारस्य द्वाराक्षास्त्यथात्तद्धाई विश्वहर्ष्यस्तरतेऽः

(2) समुद्धे अश्रुपर वद्याय प्राणो न कस्य नन्दनां वृक्षे।

(3) पुरोप पर विभेदः श्रत्राय सत्तानमात्रां वै पुरुषस्य कामशुष्ये तत्प्रवतः कस्यः (प्रम्पुरे 6.20,

विवेक. 6 विवेकेंद्रनाथ इष्टबंधनो विमल सुशोभितम् ज्ञान एवं विस्तारसत्ताकामशुष्ये)
The Bhāgavata saying is a sufficient authority to show that the Maya concept in the sense of Avidyā or illusion or unreality which involves beings in the empiric world was fully developed in the Vedic times also. The restricted meaning of 'magic' or 'power' attributed by some thinkers to the term 'Māyā' will not appear very consistent in view of these Bhāgavata explanations. There are also some thinkers who think that the conception of 'Mokṣa' was not known to the Vedic thinkers, but the 'Vidyā' concept which means Mokṣa, indicates that the Vedic thinkers were fully aware of and also conversant with this concept.

Vidyā and Avidyā which are explained as the 'Tanu', having their basis on the Supreme, are also considered as the 'Light' and 'Shade'. They are considered by the Bhāgavata as also the wings of the Suparna who is the Ātman himself, by stating: "I salute the Akśara Brahma who is all pervasive like ether and all-existing (Triyuga), where the Vidyā and Avidyā (Chāyā tapau) which are the wings of Gṛdhra (Suparna=Ātman) have no scope." We come across these terms Vidyā and Avidyā in the SB and in the Up also and these aspects or concepts have been fully explained in the first chapter. Thus the concepts of Vidyā and Avidyā have the greatest anteriority.

Avidyā:

The Avidyā concept has been sponsored by the Advaita to explain the unreality of the world and the superimposition of the unreal world and its aspects on the Soul. Very often objections are raised against this Avidyā theory of the Advaitins, asking

(1) SB I, pp 113 to 116
(2) अध्यात्मानं यजुर न गृध्रपश्च तमसारं स्यं चिन्तुण्ग क्रुद्धागतां I SB VIII 5-27
them as to whether Avidyā belongs to Brahman or otherwise. They urge that it cannot be attributed to Brahman as Brahman is Žñāna in his essence. If it cannot pertain to Brahman, it will have to be considered as an independent reality, which will amount to be accepting dualism. To all these objections, Bhāgavata replies that the Vidyā and Avidyā pertain to Māyā only being created by it and that the Lord is only the locus (Tanu) of both the Vidyā and Avidyā. They are not the qualities of the Lord and hence the question of the Lord owning or possessing them does not arise at all. Since Māyā or Avidyā has its substratum on the Lord, the question of independence of the former does not arise.

Avidyā is that which binds the Jīvātmata with the objective world. The existence of the phenomenal world, the plurality of the Jīvātmata and their engagements in their empiric world is attributed to Avidyā. The Classical Sāmkhyas and the Classical Yoga followers consider Avidyā as one of the five Viparyayas. Avidyā to the Classical Sāmkhyas is a sort of intellectual ignorance or error. But to the Vedic or Bhāgavata Sāmkhyas it is synonymous with Māyā, having no Satyatva, (Kṣaram tu Avidyā); but still it has the phenomenal reality and lasts so long as the knowledge of the reality does not arise. Avidyā to them is the function of the non-soul. MB also explains Avidyā as Atyakta or Prakṛti; and Purusa who is the twenty-fifth and who is free from origination and dissolution, is Vidyā. Vidyā seems to have been taken in the sense of Žñāna.

1) दिग्यानिस्य भ्रम तद्रूपां भव्यता दृविषयानि || 69 मण्डला 1-3
(2) पाभोपाध्यायेण पुरुषां पुरुषोऽभित्रेत्याः || 88 पुरुषोऽभित्रेत्याः
(3) ६७ ४७ ५००-४ ५०० ३०७-२
Vidyā:

Now coming to the problem of Vidyā, it may be noted that this is explained as an aspect of Maya. Vidyā is not the Jñānasvarūpa of the Ātman according to Bhāgavata. It is all the while explained in the Upaniṣads like MU that it is through Paśine Vidyā which is also called Brahma Vidyā that Brahman is attained. Their purport is to explain that Brahman is not attained by the mere vocabular or metaphysical knowledge which is called Apara Vidyā. The necessity of the latter is not however dispensed with, since Svādhyāya or the study of the Vedas which is also a part of Yogāṇa is essential for being qualified to attain Brahma Vidyā.

The Bhāgavata advises:— "With the axe of Vidyā, sharpened by whole-minded devotion acquired by the worship of a preceptor, do thou cut the subtle body which is the staying place of Jīvātman. Thereafter, attaining the state of Paramātman, cast away the weapon (of Vidyā also)". Bhāgavata not only here emphasises the Vidyā as the essential requirement for the attainment of Brahman, but it also requires the Vidyā to be combined with or accompanied by Eka-Bhakti or Upāsanā. Bhakti is here Ātyantika Tammayatā. Now, it will have to be found out as to what is actually Vidyā? It is so to say the Upāsanā way by which the Upāsaka passes from the Sabīja Samādhi state to the Nirbīja Samādhi state after destroying the sense of distinction. At this stage, the Upāsaka is to cut away the last link of his Citta or intelligence or Linga body which is responsible for all this binding or limitation of the Jīvātman with the objective.

1) (1956) गुरुकेर्ष्ट्यमेवाक्षापम्या विध्वनकुजारणं किष्टेन श्वीरकं
विद्वृत्तश्च जीवाशययमात्रं शम्भवं व तात्मात्माः कर्ष्यते यज्ञस्वरूपम्
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dualistic world, or the Atman becoming the worldly Jīvātman.
The covering of Māyā or Avidyā which binds the Jīvātman and
brings him to the empiric world is to be removed only by the
Māyā-Vidyā which is also to be given up (Tyaja-Aśram) at the
Ultimate stage, when the Soul becomes one with the Brahman. When
all the duality is weeded out, when the Jīvātman becomes one
with the Paramātman and when there is the fundamental oneness
or the non-dual Advaita state, where is the scope for Māyā or
Moha or Vidyā to stay?

Bhāgavata defines, "Vidyā" as that by which the aspect
of distinction (Bhida) or duality (which is cast upon or
imposed upon the self) is cast off or annihilated.

Śrīdharsvāmin while commenting on this Sūloka states that
Vidyā is not mere knowledge or cognition (through Jñāna) (Na
Jñānamātram), but also conveys that aspect by which one destroys
the Bheda imposed upon the Atman by the Māyā. After getting
the Jīvātman free from all the ties of Māyā, the Jīvanmukta
will reside in the Brahman State or in his own native essence
(Sva-Svarūpa) (Paśravare) as the partless or non-dual Brahman
itself. (With the dispelling through Vidyā, the Avidyā will
disappear and consequently) all effects of Avidyā like Karma,
doubt, or error (Viparyaya) will also disappear. Vidyā is thus
to act for the waning of the Citta. Bhāgavata in the wake of
TU describes Vidyā, "The Preceptor is the lower Araṇī (firewood)
the disciple is that above, the Pravacana (of the preceptor) is the connection and Vidyā is the junction (Sandhi) leading to happiness (Mokṣa).] Vidyā, like fire, purifies the Citta from all impurities and purges or burns away all the Rājas and Tamasa Gunas. Thus this Citta which gets thus very highly purified, and which becomes subtly proficient (Vais'āradi) (on account of Vidyā) burns away, or destroys (Dhunoti) the Māyā which creates the Gunas. When the Ātman, thus after the destruction of the Māyā or Gunas, attains its own status, the intelligent Citta (with Vidyā) disappears, (when its source Māyā is destroyed) like fire disappearing (after its source fuel is burnt away). This Citta is the same as the Liṅga body and, being very close to the Jīvātman, it connects the latter with the objective world. It is the Jīva-Kos'a or the Vasudeva Vyūha. When this Citta comes in high contact with Vidyā and becomes Vais'āmi, (thereby proficient), the Citta will be also freed from all Vāsanaś or impurities which are adherent to it. The sage Kapila says, "The worshipper Yogi earns Bhakti towards Lord Hari (whom he contemplates and worships by conceiving Him in a mental form) and when this Bhakti grows in intensity (will attain Tammayatā), his heart will melt away, and his body will get horripilation due to joy arising thereby and tears will flow out due to his ardent attractions (Autsukya) and his mind will get fully absorbed in the God. At this stage of intense absorption or Tammayatā, the mental conception of the God's form along with the Citta in which it is formed will be also lost, like the earthworm tied to the fisherman's hook for catching the fish, and with the disappearance of the Citta along with the mental image conceived,
there will be oneness of the Atman (of the Bhakta) with the Absolute. When the Citta gets destroyed (Mukta As'raya), it will no longer be having any connection with the objective world (Mirviṣayam). Thus with this renunciation of the objects or duality by the mind (Mahan Viraktam), he will be having the Nirvāṇa stage, like a flame, flickering at the point of extinction, becoming fire itself. At this stage, the worshipper, having the train of qualities or Guṇas (of Māyā) dispelled, will be experiencing the Absolute self itself, free from the sense of meditator, and object of meditation (Avyavādhanam = Dhyātṛ Dhyeya Vibhāga Śūnyam).

It has been already explained that the Vīmaṇ Purāṇa presents a similar view by stating that all the objective world of Bhedas will persist to a being, so long as the Karma or Avidyā will be there with him. Such Bhedas or Aññāna will disappear only after Brāhma-Śūnya (which is caused by Vidyā). This Brāhma Śūnya can not be had, unless one contemplates on the Brāhma or Paramātman who is same as Vīmaṇ who has no form. In view of the Supreme being without a form and in view of one's inability to fix up his contemplation in the initial state on such formless Paramātman, one will have to conceive of the Paramātman in his gross-form by picturing Him mentally, worship or contemplate on Him (till the mind gets pure and gets trained to be fixed on the
Paramātman. By constant practice, the devotee will be able to do away with the mental form and to fix up his Citta on the formless Supreme Himself.

The Vedanta Sūtra states, "When one has been taught by the preceptor through the great saying or Mahāmantra (Tad 'Tvam Asi) that its meaning is the partless Ultimate (Supreme), after the 'Tad' entity and 'Tvam' have been clarified by adopting the method of superimposition and negation, there will arise (in the Upāsaka), after he gets fully qualified, the following state of consciousness (Citta-\textit{Vṛtti}) having for its content the partless Brahman 'Aham Brahāsmi' - 'I am Brahman whose nature is eternal, pure, intelligent, free, true, which is supreme bliss which is infinite without a second.' That (mental state) (\textit{Vṛtti}) inspired by the reflection of spirit (Cit), refers to the Supreme Brahman as not distinct from the Jīvātmā and removes only the ignorance obscuring it. Then, as when the threads constituting a piece of cloth are burnt, the cloth itself is burnt, so, since ignorance (Avidyā), the cause of all, is removed, all the effects arising from it will also disappear and the mental state (like Citta) as falling within that sphere (Avidyā) will also get destroyed automatically. Spirit as reflected in it, being unable to illumine the self-luminous Brahman, not distinct from the internal
self, will be overcome, as a lamp-flame for example is, by the sun's rays, being unable to overcome them. And it will lapse into Brahman itself, not distinct from the inmost self, as its condition viz, the mental state is no longer there - as the reflection of a (Raman's) face, on the mirror's disappearing, vanishes to become one with the face. Here, when the Upasakā is in deep contemplation of the Mahā-Vakya-Mantra, the Supreme Paramātman will reveal himself in the Citta Vṛtti in the form of 'Brahmāsmi'. This is what is called "Vṛtti-Saṅskārā," or the rising of the 'Vidyā'. This Vidyā burns away the Ajñāna or Maya or Avidyā (Ajñānam badhate), since the main function of Vidyā is to burn or obliterate the Avidyā or Bheda prevailing in the Jīvatman as stated by the Bhāgavata, along with the illumination of the Jnāna. This Vidyā, being also in the same process as Avidyā will also get destroyed, when its source is destroyed like the cloth getting destroyed when the threads are destroyed or the fire getting extinguished when the fuel is destroyed by fire. The purport of Vidyā is thus to liberate Jīvatman from the ties of Maya or Avidyā like the removal of the thorn in the flesh by the thorn only to throw it away later.

The explanations like 'Citta-bādis'a' 'Tyaja Astrām' which are given in the Sāmkhya of the sage Kapila or of Lord Kṛṣṇa and which underlie the Vidyā concept in the Bhāgavata, are the presentations of Advaita philosophy only, as can be seen from the foregoing. Bhāgavata in furtherance of this Advaita conception is pleading that Bondage and Liberation (which are caused by Avidyā and Vidyā) are attributed to the Ajñāna (Mayā) and therefore bear the appellation of Ajñāna (Ajñāna Saṃspādā) and are not present.
(Na Anayn) in the Paramatman who is identical with Truth (Rta) and knowledge (Jna). Just as there is no day and night in the case of Sun, there is no bondage or liberation, in the Paramatman, from the ultimate point of view. He being eternal consciousness (Ajasra Cit), Absolute (Kevala) and Supreme (Parā). It, therefore, solicits and desires the devotees to take up to Tapas and Vidya, meaning thereby that Vidya is fed by Tapas or Bhakti. Since Bhāgavata Śāmkhya is Vaiśnava Śāmkhya, the sword of Jñāna, Śāmkhya or Vidya of Bhāgavata is expected to be here sharpened or supported by Bhakti.

Gunas:

The Guna concept of the Bhāgavata is the same as that appearing in the BG and Mait U. These are the Guna-realms and not a Padārtha of the Vaiśeṣika theory. These constitute the Prakṛti or Māyā and are its power (Sakti) and for this reason the Māyā or Prakṛti is called Triguna. The Gunas cannot reach the Absolute. Hence He is called Nirguna or Aguna. Gunas form three categories Sattva, Rajas and Tamas. They are mentioned in the SU as Red, White and Black producing manifold offsprings similar in nature. Bhāgavata has used the same terminologies also in some of its contexts. The 'Guna' terminology is mentioned in the AV as explained in the first Chapter.

The nature and characteristics of each of these three Gunas vary divergently and produce different effects. When the Māyā is in Āvyakta state, prior to its manifestation, it is in a

1) अद्वैतस्वरूपे भवन्ति विद्यायः गृहो नाम्निः सत्य यत्र सभायोऽस्मात् ।
अद्वैतात्मानामेव केवल क्षणं तस्माद पार्थ सब्बायोऽस्मात् ।

2) भूयस्यतः तथा आदित्येऽविद्यायः वैवेक अद्वैतस्यमेव ।

3) न च भूत स्य तच्च रजस्त्वमेव न विद्यायो न भूतस्य प्रात्मायामेव ।

4) अद्वैतस्यां प्रतिष्ठितेऽक्षणं बली प्रभा अजनास्यं सर्वं ।
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state of equilibrium and hence no guna comes into predominance.
The suppression of the activity (Rajas aspect) and making it non-active is the characteristic of Tamas Guna. Hence Avyakta may be also taken as having Tamas Guna only (inactive). It can be seen that there is an allegorical story of the Lord Viṣṇu, as God Varāha lifting the earth from the cosmic waters (Māyā), when it was hidden there by the Asura Hiranyakṣa, who is nothing but the demon Tamas. God Varāha may be taken as the Kāla element who is Lord Viṣṇu and who disturbed the equilibrium of the Gunas of Māyā or Prakṛti. Hiranyakṣa is mentioned in the Bhāgavata as owning various Māyas under his control, which he used against Lord Varāha and it is also expressed that the Lord Varāha destroyed this 'Māya' or 'Tamas' by his Sudarsana cakra which represents Kāla (Time). The Mahat or earth was thus made manifest by the Lord Varāha or Kāla. Such manifestation of the Vyakta from the Avyakta is no wonder to the Lord. There is also another story of Lord 'Śiva' drinking the Kāla-Śūta poison. This poison can be allegorically taken to mean as 'Tamo-guna' which had covered up the other two Gunas. Lord Śiva drank the Tamas poison and brought to predominance the Sattva or Rajas Gunas.

There is also another allegorical story of the knowledge (Sattva) being hidden by the two demons (Madhu and Kaitabha who represent Tamas and Rajas Gunas) and of the Lord Hayagrīva destroying the two demons and restoring the Sattva. All these mythological stories have the allegorical explanations bearing on them.

1) आद्य-कृत्तत्वं भक्तसमासुरं महिंसेति तु दुःस्मिन्तं भगवान् आद्य-कृत्तां हि श्रीकृष्णं || १२-२२.
2. As the Sun (Viṣṇu) is the great divider of time, it is no wonder that the Bhāgavata would conceive a year, a fragment of time in terms of a wheel on the analogy of the Solar disc. The beautiful wheel in one of the hands of Viṣṇu (Sudarsana-Cakra) thus symbolises God's association with time. (Ph.B.I,p.257.)
The three gunas are always delusive. Even the Sattva Guna is delusive according to the BG and binds a being by attachment to happiness and by attachment to verbal knowledge, and when one carefully avoids such attachments of Sattva-guna, he will be able to conquer the gunas of Rajas and Tamas through Sattva. One can pass over the Sattva-Guna-delusions only through Sattva Guna. According to the Bhāgavata all things which become Pratyakṣa to human cognition or perception (Drṣṭam), which are revealed through S'rutis, which are inferred through Buddhi, all these things which depend upon the Purusa or Prakṛti for support or Adhisthāna - all these are permeated by the Gunas. On account of or due to these Gunas, there are differences or distinctions between beings and beings. The distinctions which are thus noticed, are caused through the Gunas of the Māyā and its evolutes. The Jīvātman, in his essence, is free from the Gunas, and there is, therefore, no distinction caused among the Jīvātman's. Such distinctions are only in the Citta, Buddhi, Ānākāra and mind elements which are superimposed upon the Jīvātman's, and due to whose commitments to the Gunas, the Jīvātman's also appear as if varying from each other. There is also no difference between the Individual Self and the Parameswara in the native state and whatever difference appears between the two is on account of the Gunas of the Māyā.

The Bhāgavata Sāmkhya accepts Kāla Tattva concept which is accepted by the Atharva Veda. Even the SU has also recognised this concept. Kāla is sometimes called the twenty-fifth element and Purusa as the twenty-sixth.

1) Bhāg. XI.14-6
2) Ka. XVI.13
3) Ādi Pur. 25-31
The Bhagavata also weaves round Puruṣa or Paramatman the mythology of Viṣṇu, and round Māyā or Prakṛti, the mythology of Lakṣmi and eulogises the two by praying:— "Thou art the Lord of the Universe, the prime cause of the Universe. This one is the Prakṛti who is the subtle and insurmountable (illusory) power, Māyā itself. Thou art the stay of the Māyā (Adhīśvāra) and Thou art the Supreme Puruṣa thyself. Thou art all sacrifices and this one is the offering (Iśya) in the sacrifice. Thou dost appropriate the fruits of sacrifices and this one constitutes the acts performed in the sacrifices. This is the Goddess in whom the Guṇas are manifest. Verily Thou art the Soul of embodied beings and she constitutes the subtle and gross bodies of the beings. This Goddess brings forth thy names and forms; thou underliest behind them as the Revealer." This mythological description of the Puruṣa and Prakṛti epitomizes the whole of Śāmkhya theme by expressing it in the Religo-Philosophical terms. The purport of this mythological conception is also to establish the unreality of Māyā whose Adhīśvāra or Adhīsthāna is the Lord Viṣṇu, the Supreme Reality and to convey thereby the theistic Vaishnavya characteristics of the Bhagavata Śāmkhya, as against the Classical Śāmkhya which has made Prakṛti as an independent element in its theory.

Other Tattvas:

The other Śāmkhya Tattvas are dealt in detail in Chapter II, and no further remarks are considered necessary here.