

68

100

शतश्लोकी

[HUNDRED VERSES]

A NEW INTERPRETATION
OF
EMANCIPATION

*According to the School of Nyāya Philosophy
of Gotama*

By

Prof. BADARINATH SHUKLA

Senior Fellow

Indian Council of Philosophical Research

New Delhi

&

Ex. Vice-Chancellor

Sampurnanand Sanskrit University

Varanasi

शतश्लोकी

दुःखपङ्के जगद् दृष्ट्वा निमग्नं करुणार्णवः ।
तदुद्धर्तुं मनश्चक्रे गोतमो मुनिपुङ्गवः ॥१॥

Gotama, the great sage, an ocean of compassion, having seen the world plunged in the mud of suffering made his mind to uplift it from the same.

दृढं जग्रास चिन्तेयमक्षपादं महामुनिम् ।
प्राणिनामखिलं दुःखं कथं नाशमवाप्नुयात् ॥२॥

The anxiety, how the entire suffering of the living beings could be destroyed, engrossed the mind of the great sage Akṣapāda (so nick-named for having eyes on his feet).

अनुत्पन्नं हि यद् दुःखं न तन्नाशयितुं क्षमम् ।
यच्चोत्पन्नं विना यत्नं भोगादेव क्षयं व्रजेत् ॥३॥

(The sage thought that) the suffering, which is unborn, could not be destroyed (because it does not exist itself and that thing is destroyed which already exists). And the born one could be destroyed without any effort only by undergoing its suffering.

अभावादन्यदुःखस्य कस्य नाशोऽनुचिन्त्यताम् ।
कथं च प्राणिनः कार्या निर्दुःखा इत्यचिन्तयत् ॥४॥

As there is no other type of suffering, how could the possibility of its removal be imagined? Consequently the sage became anxious, how the living beings could be made free from suffering.

तदेष जटिलः प्रयतो दुःखनाशः कथं भवेत् ।

मुनेस्त्वपस्त्विद्वयस्य चिन्तादूनं मनोऽकरोत् ॥५॥

The complicated issue, how the suffering of the world could be annihilated, made the great sage anxious, who lived a life of highest kind of austerity and thus disturbed his mind.

विचिन्तयन्निसं प्रयतं पौनःपुन्येन सततम् ।

क्षणमेकं न विश्रामं लेभे क्वापि मुनिर्महान् ॥६॥

Thinking again and again in a continuous state over the issue of uprooting the suffering of the world the great sage could not rest even for a single moment.

अन्ते संचिन्तयामास न चिन्त्यो दुःखसंशयः ।

किन्तु चिन्त्यमिदं सम्यग् वायो दुःखोद्भवः कथम् ॥७॥

Ultimately he resolved that the cessation of suffering is not so much worth consideration as the final cessation of its very birth.

जातस्य हि ध्रुवं दुःखं ध्रुवं जन्म च कर्मिणः ।

कर्मणि न क्षमं छेतुं यावद् दोषोऽनुवर्तते ॥८॥

Suffering is certain for the one who is born. And the birth is also certain for the one who is involved in actions. And action cannot be stopped so long as fault exists.

रागो द्वेषस्तथा मोह एष दोषः सुदुर्जयः ।

यावद् विपर्ययो लोके निर्मूलो न विशीयते ॥९॥

Love, hate and delusion, these faults are most difficult to be conquered so long as the false knowledge in the world is not uprooted.

अयमेव महान् हेतुः प्राणिनां दुःखजन्मनः ।

स हि शक्यो न दोषछेतुं तत्त्वज्ञानोदयं विना ॥१०॥

This (false knowledge) is the root cause of suffering of living beings. It cannot be uprooted unless the true knowledge dawns.

विपर्ययस्य किं रूपं तत्त्वज्ञानं च कीदृशम् ।

न क्वापि मुनिना प्रोक्तं स्वकीये न्यायदर्शने ॥११॥

It is nowhere discussed by the sage in his Nyāya Philosophy as to what is the nature of false knowledge and of what type is the true knowledge.

वात्स्यायनो हि तन्नूनं निजे भाष्ये न्यरूपयत् ।

नैपुण्येन विना क्षोभं चिन्तनार्हं मनोषिणाम् ॥१२॥

Vātsyāyana indeed has explained it in his commentary on Nyāya-sūtra in a scholarly manner without any hesitation which is worth consideration by the scholars.

आत्मभिन्ने शरीरादावात्मतादास्पदिद्वयः ।

वस्तुं विपर्ययोऽभीष्टस्तस्येदं सम्प्रतीयते ॥१३॥

It seems, he intends to say, that the body, etc., are different from the self and the identification of it with them is false knowledge.

तस्यायमाशयो ज्ञेय आत्मा हर्तुं न शक्यते ।

किन्तु देहादिघातेन दुःखितां दधते ध्रुवम् ॥१४॥

His intention is obvious that the self cannot be hurt, nevertheless when body, etc., are hurt it feels hurt.

आत्मा चैव विजानीयाद् देहादिभ्यः स्वकैकताम् ।

कथं देहादिघातेन मन्येत स्वं निगोडितम् ॥१५॥

In case the self does not identify itself with body, etc., why should it feel hurt when body, etc., are hurt ?

यदि चैवं न मन्येत द्वेषवान् स्यादयं कथम् ।

नेभ्यो जनेभ्य एतद् ये ताडयन्ति यथा तथा ॥१६॥

If it is not accepted so, why should it become averse to those who beat it (body, etc.) in whatsoever way (they like) ?

स्थितिरेषैव विज्ञेया सुखादिविषये पुनः ।

आत्मा हि प्रीतिमान् नित्यं तेभ्येव ये जनाः सदा ॥१७॥

देहादेरानुकूल्येन व्याप्रियन्ते निरन्तरम् ।

सुखहेतौ यथा रागो द्वेषो दुःखकरे तथा ॥१८॥

The same logic is applicable again with regard to pleasure, etc., also. The self is always affectionate to only those who ever work in a friendly way with their body, etc. (It is a universal truth that) the man loves that which is pleasant to him and hates that which is painful to him.

रागद्वेषद्विचक्रेण महता मोहरथेन ना ।

विक्रुष्यते विभिन्नेषु कर्मकर्मविकर्मसु ॥१९॥

Man seated in the chariot of great delusion, having two wheels of love and hate, performs different actions which are virtuous, or impious, or neutral.

तदेवं कर्मबीजेन गुण्यपापमहादुर्मौ ।

संरोष्य लभते ताभ्यां सुखदुःखात्मके फले ॥२०॥

Thus, the seed of action germinates two big trees of merit and demerit which produce fruits of pleasure and pain to him.

तत्र दुःखमतिद्वेष्यं समग्रस्यैव देहितः ।

दुःखमूलं महामोहो देहाद्यात्मवैयर्थ्याच्च ॥२१॥

The suffering is most repulsive between them for the entire embodied beings. The firm belief in the identification of soul with body, etc., is the great delusion which is the root cause of suffering.

तमुन्मूलयितुं नित्यं योक्तव्यं तत्त्वबुद्धये ।

आत्मा देहादितो भिन्न इत्येषा तत्त्वधीमता ॥२२॥

In order to uproot it (false knowledge) one should always engage himself in the realisation of truth. The self is different from body, etc., this is the opinion of learned men (about truth).

एतस्या उदये सद्यो महामोहः प्रलीयते ।

प्रलीने च महामोहे कर्मबीजं विशुष्यति ॥२३॥

At its dawn the great delusion is immediately destroyed, and when the great delusion is destroyed the seed of action is dried up.

विशुष्के कर्मबीजे च गुण्यपापाङ्कुरः कथम् ।

अभावे च तयोर्नैव पुनर्जानसम्भवः ॥२४॥

When the seed of action is dried up, how can the sprout of merit and demerit emerge ? And when they are no more, rebirth is not possible.

अजातस्य कथं दुःखमित्यं कोऽपि न दुःखभाक् ।

परसेको महान् प्रश्नो जागर्त्यात्र दुरतरः ॥२५॥

For the unborn how could there be suffering, and thus nobody would suffer. But here arises an important question which cannot be easily replied.

समाधानं विना यस्य सर्वेषोक्तिर्नर्थिका ।

सर्वस्यैव प्रकृत्यैव यथा दुःखं जिह्मसितम् ॥२६॥

सुखं तथा प्रकृत्यैव सर्वस्यैवाभिकाङ्क्षितम् ।

भीतोऽपि दुःखतः कञ्चित् सुखं हातुं न वाञ्छति ॥२७॥

And without its solution all these statements become meaningless, just as all the living beings naturally desire the annihilation of suffering.

In the same way, by nature, all of them crave for pleasure. Nobody likes to leave pleasure even though he is frightened by suffering.

जन्महानिर्न सोढव्या तस्माद् दुःखस्य हानये ।

जन्महानौ यतो नूनं सुखस्यापि क्षयो भ्रुवः ॥२८॥

To get rid of suffering one cannot afford the loss of rebirth, because if there is no rebirth the loss of pleasure is also certain.

वास्त्यायनो ब्रवीत्यत्र समाधानं निशम्यतानम् ।

सर्वं सुखं यतो दुःखेनानुविद्धमतो विना ॥२९॥

Listen to its solution spoken here by Vātsyāyana that no pleasure is possible without coupling with pain.

दुःखं, सुखं न लभ्यं स्यादित्येतदवधीयताम् ।

दुःखतस्त्रस्यतस्तस्मात् सुखस्नेहेऽपि नोचितः ॥३०॥

So be attentive to it. No pleasure is obtainable unmixed with suffering. One who is horrified by suffering should not crave for pleasure too.

अतो दुःखाभितप्तस्य सुखत्यागो हि युज्यते ।

परमेतत्समाधानं नैव रम्यं मनीषिणाम् ॥३१॥

Therefore, one, who is terrified by suffering, it is desirable, should sacrifice pleasure also. But this solution is not somehow acceptable to the scholars.

विना दुःखं सुखं नाप्यमतो दुःखद्वहा मुदा ।

सुखद्वहोऽपि कर्त्तव्य इत्युक्तिर्नैव युज्यते ॥३२॥

Without undergoing suffering pleasure is not attainable, therefore, one who hates suffering should gladly hate pleasure too. But this statement is not tenable.

यतो वक्तुमिदं शक्यं सुखं यस्मान्न लभ्यते ।

विना दुःखमतो ग्राह्यं तदपि प्रीतिपूर्वकम् ॥३३॥

Because it could be said that as pleasure is not attainable without undergoing suffering, therefore, suffering too should be happily accepted (if one desires pleasure).

दुःखद्विषा सुखं त्याज्यं ग्राह्यं दुःखं सुखार्थिना ।

अनयोः पक्षयोरैकपोषकं नैव दृश्यते ॥३४॥

One who hates suffering should sacrifice pleasure and one who is crazy for pleasure should welcome suffering too. Out of these two alternatives there is none who could advocate for either of the two.

मिथ्याज्ञानमधिश्चित्य यद् भाष्येऽभाषि तत्पुनः ।

नैव संगच्छते किञ्चित्चिन्त्यमानं मुहुर्मुहुः ॥३५॥

What has been said in the commentary about the false knowledge could not somehow be established without flaw even if it is thought over again and again.

देहादावात्मतादास्यबुद्धौ मानं न लभ्यते ।

काश्यदिदेहधर्मिणां धीरात्सत्यन्यथा भवेत् ॥३६॥

There is no proof for the knowledge of identification of self with body, etc., because the attributes of body like thinness, etc., may be known otherwise also in the self.

सेनाजयो यथा राज्ञि सेनाभिन्नोऽपि मय्यते ।

तथा देहादिभिन्नोऽपि तत्र तद्धर्मधीर्भवेत् ॥३७॥

Just as the victory gained by the army is supposed to be the victory of king himself though he is different from the army; in the same way though the body, etc., are different from the self, yet their attributes are supposed to be of the self

धर्मसरोपेण नापेक्ष्यो धर्मतादास्यविभ्रमः ।

अन्यथाऽऽत्मनि नैव स्याद् विभिन्नोद्दिश्यधर्मधीः ॥३८॥

False knowledge of the identification of one subject with another is not needed by the superimposition of their attributes, otherwise, the knowledge of the attributes of different sense organs cannot be attributed in one and the same self.

एकदैव जनो वेत्ति स्वमन्वं बधिरं तथा ।

एकदेकत्र जायेत भिन्नानां धर्मधीः कथम् ॥३९॥

Man at the same time knows himself as blind and dumb both. It is worth consideration how could the knowledge of the attributes of different things occur in one and the same thing at one and the same time.

तदभिन्नादभिन्नस्य तदभेदो यथा मतः ।

ततोऽन्यस्मादभिन्नस्य ततोऽन्यत्वं तथोचितम् ॥४०॥

As a thing, which is non-different from the other, which itself is non-different from another, is identical with that another; in the same way, it is proper to say that a thing which is non-different from the other, which itself is different from another, is different from that another.

अतो जनो यदा वेत्ति चक्षुर्भिन्नश्चवात्मताम् ।

आत्मनो हि कथं वेत्तु तदा चक्षुरभिन्नताम् ॥४१॥

Therefore, when a man knows himself identical with the ears which are indeed different from the eyes, how could then he know himself identical with the eyes ?

यदि धर्मसमारोपो धर्मसरोपनिमित्तकः ।

तदा गुमान् कथं वेत्तु स्वमन्वं बधिरं तथा ॥४२॥

If the super-imposition of attributes is due to the super-imposition of one subject on the other, how could a man know himself as blind and dumb both at one and the same time ?

अत एवेदमादेयं यस्य रागो महान् भवेत् ।
यत्र तस्मिन् तदीयस्य धर्मस्यारोपधीभवेत् ॥४३॥

Therefore, this is to be realised that the attributes of only those things are super-imposed on a man who is passionately attached with them.

देहादयो यतः पुंसो रागातिशयभाजान्म् ।

अतस्तदीयधर्माणां तत्रारोपः सुसङ्गतः ॥४४॥

As body, etc., are the objects of great affection for the man, therefore, the super-imposition of their attributes on them is quite proper.

अतो नवतया चिन्त्यं मिथ्यातत्त्वाबोधयोः ।

स्वरूपं येन नैव स्यादुक्तदोषोद्भवः पुनः ॥४५॥

Therefore, the nature of false knowledge and true knowledge should be considered in a fresh manner so that the emergence of above-mentioned fault should not occur again.

अनुकूलं सुखं दुःखं प्रतिकूलमियं मतिः ।

मिथ्याज्ञानतया ग्राह्या बुधवृन्देन धीमता ॥४६॥

The knowledge that pleasure is desirable and suffering is repulsive, should be accepted as false knowledge by the band of learned scholars.

न चैवान्न भ्रमः कार्यः सुखं यस्मादतिप्रियम् ।

अतस्तदाऽऽनुकूल्यस्य धीः कथं विभ्रमो भवेत् ॥४७॥

Here there should be no misunderstanding at all that as pleasure is the most desirable, therefore, how could knowledge of its desirability be a false knowledge.

अत्यप्रियं यतो दुःखमतस्तत्प्रातिकूल्यधीः ।
विपर्ययसिः कथं ज्ञेयः सुधीभस्तत्त्वचिन्तकैः ॥४८॥

As the suffering is the most repulsive, how could knowledge of its repulsiveness be tenable as false knowledge by the wise metaphysicians ?

यस्य येन समुत्कर्षः तस्य तत्रानुकूलता ।

यस्य येनापकर्षश्च तस्य तत्र प्रतीपता ॥४९॥

A thing which upgrades one is desirable to him and a thing which degrades one is repulsive to him.

आत्मा खलु विभूर्नित्यो निर्मलश्च निसर्गतः ।

अतस्तस्य सुखात् किञ्चिद् दुःखाद् वा नैव सप्रभवम् ॥५०॥

The self is indeed omnipresent, eternal and blottless by nature. Therefore, neither pleasure nor suffering could affect it.

अत्रेदं न वचो युक्तं सुखं नात्यस्य कारणात् ।

दुःखं वा नाप्यहेतुत्वात् प्रियं वाऽप्रियमात्मनः ॥५१॥

यतः सुखं स्वभावेन प्रियं सर्वस्य देहितः ।

दुःखं चापि प्रकृत्यैव विप्रियं प्राणिनां मतम् ॥५२॥

The statement is not tenable here that pleasure is not desirable, being the source of other desirable (things), and suffering also is not repulsive, being the source of other repulsive (things).

As pleasure, by nature, is desirable to all the embodied beings and suffering also is repulsive, by nature, to all the living beings.

तदेवं प्रियताबुद्धिः सुखे सत्यैव नान्यथा ।

दुःखे च ह्येताबुद्धिः यथायैव न बाधिता ॥५३॥

Thus, the idea of the desirability of pleasure is true and not otherwise, and the idea of repulsiveness of suffering is equally true and cannot be refuted.

युक्तिपूर्णाविचारेण वच एतन्न युज्यते ।

प्रियाप्रिये स्वयं नैव सुखदुःखे उभे यतः ॥५४॥

The above statement does not stand to reason when it is well thought over, because both pleasure and pain themselves are neither desirable, nor repulsive by nature.

सुखेन वपुस्तसाह इन्द्रियाणां च पादवम् ।

मनसः सम्प्रसादश्च जायतेऽतः सुखं प्रियम् ॥५५॥

Pleasure is desirable as it makes one's body vital, senses alert and mind all happy.

दुःखेन वपुसालस्यमिन्द्रियाणां च मनस्ता ।

मनसश्चावसादः स्यादतो दुःखं न हि प्रियम् ॥५६॥

Suffering is not desirable as it makes one's body lifeless, senses dull and mind unhappy.

आत्मा केनापि रूपेण प्रभाव्यो नैव विद्यते ।

सुखेन नैव दुःखेन नातस्ते तत्प्रियाप्रिये ॥५७॥

The self is in no way influenced either by pleasure or by suffering. Therefore, they are neither desirable nor repulsive to him.

अतो निःसंशयं बुद्धी उक्ते मिथ्यैव सम्मते ।

शक्यन्तो भवितुं नूनं गोतमस्य महामुनेः ॥५८॥

Therefore, according to the great sage Gotama, the above-mentioned idea of pleasure and suffering, both, is undoubtedly a false one.

मिथ्याज्ञानद्वयस्यास्य तत्त्वज्ञानान्निवर्तनम् ।

अभीष्टं सूत्रकारस्य नात्र काचिन्मतिः परा ॥५९॥

The removal of those two false knowledges is caused by the knowledge of truth. This is the cherished view of the Sūtrakāra. Here there can be no other opinion.

यदा पुमान् विजानीयात् तथा स वस्तुतो यथा ।

तदा तस्य निवर्तत सुखदुःखभ्रमो महान् ॥६०॥

When a man knows himself what really he is, then the great false knowledge about pleasure and suffering is uprooted.

मिथ्याविदो यथा लभ्यं विषयेन्द्रियजं सुखम् ।

तथा तत्त्वविदो लभ्यमात्मदर्शनजं सुखम् ॥६१॥

Just as a man having false knowledge enjoys the sensuous pleasure, in the same way one who knows the reality enjoys the bliss caused by realisation of self.

आगमापायिनोऽर्थस्य दृष्टिरेव सुखप्रदा ।

दृष्टिर्नित्यात्मनो नैव सैषा मूढस्य मान्यता ॥६२॥

The experience of transitory things only gives pleasure and the knowledge of eternal self does not produce pleasure--this is the view of the ignorant.

जातभावत्तभाक्त्वेऽपि कदाप्येतन्न नश्यति ।

नाशकस्यानुपस्थित्या सम्पयेत्तन्निभालयताम् ॥६३॥

Understand it very well that the bliss caused by the realisation of the self, though a positive effect, could never be destroyed due to absence of destroyer.

भावस्य जातमात्रत्वं न हि नाशप्रयोजकम् ।

क्षणवादप्रवेशो हि तदा दुर्वरतां व्रजेत् ॥६४॥

The very birth of a positive thing is not instrumental for its destruction. Otherwise the operation of the momentariness could not be checked.

जातभावस्य सम्प्राप्तिः नियता नाशकस्य नो ।

कर्माद्दृष्टजनित्वेन निगीर्णत्वाद्गुणधिता ॥६५॥

It is no rule that every positive effect has its own destroyer invariably. Because it is engulfed by extraneous adjunct, e.g., being caused by the unseen which is a total effect of the actions either approved or disapproved by scriptures.

यो विशेषगुणो योग्यो विभुद्रव्ये हि जायते ।

तस्य नाशो गुणेन स्यादौरीक्येनैकवर्तिना ॥६६॥

The special quality, which could be perceived and born in an omnipresent substance, is destroyed by the successive quality which is located there itself.

अत एतत्सुखस्यापि संयोगादिगुणेन हि ।

विनाशो दुर्निवारस्यात् तदाश्रयनिवासिना ॥६७॥

Therefore, the destruction of this bliss also is unavoidable due to the presence of the quality like conjunction, etc., in the same locus (self).

नैषाऽपि शोभना वाणी यतोऽप्योग्यो न नश्यति ।

गुणो विशेषरूपोऽपि पुंसोऽदृष्टादितामभाक् ॥६८॥

This statement is also not convincing, as the special quality of the self like unseen, etc., is not destroyed too by the means stated above.

सुखमात्मप्रमाजातं मनो द्रष्टुं न हि क्षमम् ।

लौकिकेनावचना योग्यं नैव सम्मन्यते बुधैः ॥६९॥

The bliss caused by the realisation of the self could not be perceived by mind in worldly manner. So, according to the learned scholars it is not perceivable.

अतस्तस्य न नाशस्यात् तेनैकत्र निषीदता ।

गुणेन तत्स्थितस्तस्मात् शाश्वतो नात्र संशयः ॥७०॥

Therefore, this particular bliss cannot be destroyed by the quality which is there itself. So, it is undoubtedly stayable for ever.

दुःखस्यात्यन्तिको नाशः केवलो नैव युज्यते ।

मोक्षो यत्रात्मचैतन्यमपि नश्यति निश्चितम् ॥७१॥

It is not proper to accept mere super-annihilation of suffering as emancipation where loss of the self-consciousness is certain.

सुखं चैव न यत्र स्यात् तन्न काम्यं सुखाश्चिनः ।

अतस्तस्मै न तस्य स्यान्निखिलाभीष्टमोक्षता ॥७२॥

The emancipation where there is no bliss is not desired by those who are crazy for pleasure. Therefore, such an emancipation is not for them, as it is desired by all.

सुखं मे सततं भूयात् दुःखं नैव कदाचन ।

इति द्वे सहजौ तूष्णे पुंसः सकलसम्भवे ॥७३॥

Pleasure be ever available to me and suffering should never occur to me—these two are, according to all, natural desires of man.

अतो मोक्षः स एव स्याद् यत्र तूष्णे उभे समम् ।

नश्यतां येन मुक्तः स्याद् गततूष्णो ह्यनाकुलः ॥७४॥

Therefore, emancipation is that in which both these desires are simultaneously destroyed, so that the emancipated may be free, desireless and unperplexed.

विशेष एष विज्ञेयो जनयोर्बद्धमुक्तयोः ।

बद्धः प्रयतते स्वस्य केवलस्यैव मुक्तये ॥७५॥

The difference between the bonded and the free is that the bonded tries for his own emancipation only.

स खल्वेव यदा मुक्तः कृपया परयावृतः ।

नाशाय सर्वदुःखानां सर्वलोकस्य वेष्टते ॥७६॥

But when the same man is emancipated he becomes most compassionate and engages himself in the annihilation of all types of suffering of all the people.

अनेके ऋषयो जाता अस्मिन् भरतभूतले ।

न च तैः वाञ्छिता मुक्तिः देहसम्बन्धवर्जिता ॥७७॥

There have been a number of sages in this land of Bharat, i. e., Bharatavarṣa. But they never desired disembodied emancipation.

पुनर्जन्मनि विज्ञेय एष भेदस्तयोर्बुधैः ।

बद्धः स्वादृष्टजन्यः स्यान्मुक्तोऽन्यादृष्टजो भवेत् ॥७८॥

The difference between the rebirth of those (bonded and free) should be known by the scholars thus—the bonded is born by his own unseen and the emancipated is born by the unseen of others.

यथेह्वरो वपुर्धत्ते परादृष्टवशात् स्वयम् ।

विमुक्तोऽपि तथा धत्ते परादृष्टवशाद् वपुः ॥७९॥

Just as the Lord embodies Himself on the unseen of others, in the same way the emancipated also embodies himself on the unseen of others.

अत एव बुधैश्चैव वच एतदनुच्यते ।

अत्यन्तं मुक्तकण्ठेन हृष्यत्स्वान्तेन सन्ततम् ॥८०॥

Therefore, on account of the above reason band of scholars repeatedly pronounces the following statement most freely and gladly.

न चाहं कामये राज्यं न स्वर्गं नापुनर्भवंम् ।

कामये दुःखतप्तानां प्राणिनामर्तिनाशनम् ॥८१॥

I desire neither kingdom, nor heaven, nor even no rebirth. I desire only the annihilation of suffering of the creatures who are most troubled by it.

अथवादो महाप्राज्ञो निःश्रेयसमसूत्रयत् ।

पुनस्तेन न चाभाषि तत्र कुत्रापि किञ्चन ॥८२॥

Akṣapāda, who had the highest wisdom, formulated Nihśreyasa—the summum bonum (in the first aphorism of his Nyāya Philosophy). But he further nowhere explained it in his Sūtras.

अपवर्गस्तदत्यन्तविमोक्षो यो निरूपितः ।
निःश्रेयसं स एव स्यादित्येतदपि नेरितम् ॥८३॥

Emancipation (Apavarga) which has been elucidated as super-annihilation of suffering is itself the summum bonum. But it is not stated by him that it is Nihśreyasa.

तस्य भागद्वयं ज्ञेयं तर्कशोधितबुद्धिभिः ।

सर्वोत्कृष्टं सुखं यत् स्याद् यश्च दुःखात्तिमशयः ॥८४॥

Logicians should know that it (Nihśreyasa) has two parts. First is the highest bliss and the second is the final annihilation of suffering.

दुःखानां केवलो नाज्ञो यदि मोक्षो मनो भवेत् ।

सुखहीनस्तदा तस्मै सुखार्थी स्पृहयेत् कथम् ॥८५॥

If mere annihilation of suffering is taken to be emancipation in which there is no bliss, why should one, crazy for pleasure, have desire for it ?

स चापि स्यात् पुनर्जन्माभावे सत्येव चेद् यदि ।

चैतन्यस्यापि लोपः स्यात् कस्य काम्यस्तदा भवेत् ॥८६॥

If that too is possible at the loss of rebirth, then consciousness also should be lost. If so, how would it be desired by anyone ?

यतो दुःखं महद् द्वेषमतस्तद्विनिवृत्तये ।

सर्वमेव विसोढय्यमित्यपि नोचितं वचः ॥८७॥

All is bearable for the annihilation of suffering as it is most repulsive—even this statement is not proper.

एष भावो यतस्तुल्य आत्मघातेन विद्यते ।

कश्चिन्नैवात्मघातो स्याद् यो नरः खलु बुद्धिमान् ॥८८॥

This idea is equivalent to suicide and no wise man would like to be self-destroyer.

सुखीति प्रत्ययैः सिद्धं सुखत्वं सुखसंश्रितम् ।

स्वाश्रयोत्कृष्टवृत्तित्वात् स्वाश्रयानपकृष्टगम् ॥८९॥

Blissness is a genus located in bliss. It is established by the feelings like 'I am blissful'. It inheres in such a thing which is not inferior to its substratum, because it inheres in the superior to its substratum.

स्वाश्रयोत्कृष्टनिष्ठस्य स्वाश्रयानपकृष्टता-

नियमो विदितो लोके परिमाणत्वसंश्रितः ॥९०॥

The rule, that a thing, which inheres in the superior to its substratum, resides in such a thing also which is not inferior to its substratum, is well-known in the world in dimensionness which resides in the omnipresent substances like sky and in the dimension which indeed is superior to others of its own category.

अनेनैवानुमानेन सिद्धे हि सर्वतोऽधिके ।

सुखे शङ्का न जायेत मानमानविदां नृणाम् ॥९१॥

Thus, the highest bliss is established by above inference. So the persons who know the importance of the means of valid knowledge would have no doubt in such kind of bliss.

अरण्यं भवितावश्यमुच्छेदो दुःखसन्ततेः ।

यतः सन्ततिविच्छेदनियमो लोकसम्मतः ॥१२॥

Thus, the final annihilation of flux of suffering would certainly occur. Because it is a rule accepted by all that every stream ends without exception.

को न वेत्ति जनो लोके दीपज्वलितसन्ततेः ।

आत्यन्तिकं समुच्छेदं तैलादिविगमोद्भवम् ॥१३॥

Who does not know in the world that final extinction of the flow of flames of a lamp takes place after total consumption of its oil, etc.

कार्यं निवर्तते नूनं निवृत्ते मूलकारणे ।

अतो सिध्यधियोऽप्ये दुःखं नोदेतुमर्हति ॥१४॥

It is a universal rule that the effect is annihilated when its root cause is annihilated, therefore, when there is no false knowledge, suffering cannot emerge.

तदेवमनुमानेन सिद्धं हि सर्वतोऽधिकम् ।

सुखदुःखप्रहाणं च परमं गतसंशयम् ॥१५॥

Thus, the highest bliss and the final annihilation of suffering—both are indeed established by the above inference.

निःश्रेयसमतोऽवश्यं भागद्वयसम्वितम् ।

गोतमानमतं मान्यं यतो न तद्वचोऽप्यथा ॥१६॥

Thus, emancipation has certainly two parts as stated above and it is accepted by Gotama as such and nowhere it has been contradicted by him.

सुखं वैविध्यसंसृष्टं विषयेन्द्रिययोगजम् ।

भुञ्जानश्चिरकालेन मानवो नैव तृप्यति ॥१७॥

A man enjoying a variety of sensuous pleasures even for a long time is never satisfied at all.

समुच्छेदोऽपि दुःखस्य जायते प्रत्यहं पुनः ।

उत्पत्तेर्दुःखजातस्य मानवो नैव मुच्यते ॥१८॥

The destruction of suffering also takes place every day again and again, but the man never becomes free from the emergence of suffering.

अतस्तान्भ्यां विरक्तः सन् सोत्कण्ठो जायते नरः ।

उत्तस्य दुःखनाशस्य सुखस्याप्युपलब्धये ॥१९॥

Therefore, man being indifferent towards those both should be eager for the destruction of suffering and for obtaining bliss as stated above.

अत एवाक्षपादेन मुनिना मतिशालिना ।

रचना न्यायसूत्राणां विहिताऽस्यन्तयन्ततः ॥१००॥

Therefore, the learned sage Aksapāda formulated the aphorisms of Nyāya (Philosophy) with great effort.

बदरीनाथशुक्लेन काशीवासिमनीषिणा ।

रचितेयं शतश्लोकी प्रीतये प्रतिभाजुषाम् ॥१०१॥

Professor Badarinath Shukla, resident of Kāśī, composed this Śataśloki (comprising hundred verses) for the pleasure of scholars.