

bodies; *sambhavanti*, are born; *sarva-yonisu*, from all wombs—from the wombs of gods, manes, humans, cattle, beasts, etc.; *tāsām*, of them, of those forms; *mahat brahma*, the great-sustainer, which exists as all the (various) forms; is the *yonih*, womb, source. *Aham*, I, Bhagavān; am the *pitā*, father; *bīja-pradah*, who deposits the seed, the agent of impregnation.

(Now) is being stated which are the qualities and how they bind:

सत्त्वं रजस्तम इति गुणाः प्रकृतिसम्भवाः ।
निबध्नन्ति महाबाहो देहे देहिनमव्ययम् ॥ ५ ॥

5. O mighty-armed one, the qualities, viz. *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*, born of Nature, being the immutable embodied being to the body.

O mighty-armed one—who are possessed of hands which are great and mighty, and extend up to the knees, *gunāh*, the qualities are named *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*. And they, *prakṛti-sambhavāh*, born of Nature, born of Māyā which belongs to Bhagavān; *nibadhnanti*, bind, as it were; the *avyayam*, immutable—the immutability has been spoken of in the verse, ‘Being without beginning...,’ etc. (13.31); *dehinam*, embodied being; *dehe*, to the body.

The word *guna* is a technical term, and is not a quality like colour etc. which inhere in some substance. Nor is it meant here that quality and substance are different. Therefore they are ever dependent on the Knower of the field, just as qualities are dependent (on some substance). Being of the nature of ignorance, they bind the Knower of the field, as it were. They come into being, making That (Knower) their sustainer. In this sense it is said that they bind.

Objection: Was it not said that the embodied one does not become defiled (see 13.31–2)? So, why is it contrarily said here that ‘they bind’?

Reply: We have rebutted this objection by using the word *iva* (as it were) in ‘they bind, as it were’.