

as texts like "By which that which is not heard becomes heard" etc. (Ch. 6.1.3) say; for the effects are not different from the cause. The illustrations referred to are: "My dear, as by one lump of clay all that is made of clay is known" etc. (Ch. 6.1.4). These texts clearly show that Brahman is the material cause of the world; otherwise they would be meaningless. Again texts like "Brahman alone was at the beginning one without a second" show that It is also the efficient cause, for who else could be such a cause when there was nothing else?

अभिध्योपदेशाच्च ॥ २४ ॥

अभिध्योपदेशात् On account of the statement of will (to create) च also.

24. Also on account of the statement of will (to create on the part of the supreme Self, It is the material cause).

"It wished, 'May I be many, may I grow forth'" etc. (Ch. 6.2.3). In this text the desire shows that Brahman is the efficient cause, and next 'may I be many' intimates that Brahman Itself became many. Hence It is the material cause as well.

साक्षाच्चोभयाम्नात् ॥ २५ ॥

साक्षात् Direct च and उभयाम्नात् because the Śruti states both.

25. And because the Śruti states that both (the creation and the dissolution of the world) (have Brahman as) the direct (cause).

That from which a thing springs and into which it is re-absorbed is its material cause. "All these things spring from Ākāśa (Brahman) alone and return to Ākāśa" (Ch. 1.9.1), "That from which these things are produced, by which, when produced, they live, and into which they enter at their dissolution—try to know that. That is Brahman" (Tai. 3.1). These texts show that Brahman is the material cause also. A thing may be said to be produced from its efficient cause, but it cannot return to that at dissolution unless it is also the material cause.

आत्मकृतेः परिणामात् ॥ २६ ॥

आत्मकृतेः As It created Itself परिणामात् by undergoing modification.

26. (Brahman is the material cause of the world) because (the Śruti says that) It created Itself by undergoing modification.

"That Itself manifested Itself" (Tai. 2.7), which shows that Brahman alone created the world, out of Itself, which is possible only by undergoing modification. The word 'Itself' in the text shows that there was no other cause operating. The modification is apparent according to Śāṅkara and real according to Rāmānuja.

योनिश्च हि गीयते ॥ २७ ॥

योनिः Origin च and हि because गीयते is called.

27. And because (Brahman) is called the origin.

“That which the wise regard as the origin of all beings” (Mu. 1.1.6)—this shows that Brahman is the material cause of the world. Hence Its being the material cause is established.

Topic 8: The arguments which refute the Sâmkhyas refute also others.

एतेन सर्वे व्याख्याता व्याख्याताः ॥ २८ ॥

एतेन By this सर्वे all व्याख्याताः are explained.

28. By this all (doctrines with reference to the origin of the world contrary to the Vedânta texts) are explained.

By this identity of the material and the efficient cause of the world all doctrines that speak of two separate causes for it are refuted. That is, not only the Sâmkhyan, but also the atomic and other theories are refuted, as they are not based on scriptural authority and contradict many scriptural texts. The repetition of the verb in the aphorism only shows that the chapter ends here.

Those who hold the atomic theory, or who say that the first Cause is non-existence, or that it is Śūnya (Void)—as the Nihilists say—cite respectively the following texts as authority: “These seeds, almost infinitesimal” (Ch. 6.12.1); “This was indeed non-existent at the beginning” (Ch. 3.19.1); “Some learned men being deluded, speak of nature, and others of time, as the cause of everything” (Śv. 6.1). But the arguments put forward against the Sâmkhyas, viz. that contrary to the scriptures their first Cause is insentient, that the

proposition that through the knowledge of the one everything is known, will not be true, etc. will apply here also, and so these views cannot be held to be authoritative and based on the scriptures. The Śrutis quoted are explained thus:

The word ‘infinitesimal’ or ‘atomic’ refers to the Ātman, which can be so-called as it is very fine. The non-existence spoken of is only a fine causal condition of the world undeveloped into name and form as yet, and not absolute non-existence; and the fact of nature being the first Cause is mentioned as a Pûrvapakṣa by the Śruti, which itself refutes it further on in the succeeding texts. So Brahman alone is the first Cause, and nothing else.

CHAPTER II

SECTION I

In the first chapter it has been proved that all the Vedânta texts deal with Brahman as the first Cause, yet the arguments based on reasoning against this doctrine remain to be refuted. With this object in view this section is begun. In section IV of Chapter I it was shown that the Pradhâna of the Sâmkhyas, as also the atoms of the Vaiśeṣikas, are not based on scriptural authority. In this section arguments, claiming their authoritativeness from the Smṛtis, to establish the Pradhâna and the atoms etc. are refuted.

Topic 1: Refutation of Smṛtis that are not based on the Śrutis.

स्मृत्यनवकाशदोषप्रसङ्ग इति चेत्, न,
अन्यस्मृत्यनवकाशदोषप्रसङ्गात् ॥ १ ॥

स्मृति-अनवकाश-दोषप्रसङ्गः There would result the defect of leaving no scope for certain Smṛtis इति चेत्, if it be said न no अन्यस्मृति-अनवकाश-दोषप्रसङ्गात्, because there would result the defect of leaving no scope to some other Smṛtis.

1. If it be said that (from the doctrine of Brahman being the cause of the world) there

would result the defect of leaving no scope for certain Smṛtis, (we say) no; because (by the rejection of that doctrine) there would result the defect of leaving no scope for some other Smṛtis.

In the last chapter it has been shown that the Sâmkhyan view is not based on scriptural authority. Now its authority even as a Smṛti is denied and refuted.

If the doctrine of the Pradhâna is rejected, then the Sâmkhya Smṛti, propounded by a great seer like Kapila and acknowledged by other great thinkers, would cease to be authoritative; hence it is but reasonable that the Vedânta texts be so interpreted as to preserve the authoritativeness of this Smṛti and not contradict it *in toto*. So says the opponent. The Sûtra answers this by saying that if the doctrine of Brahman being the cause of the world be rejected to accommodate the Sâmkhya Smṛti, which goes counter to the Śrutis, then by that rejection many other Smṛtis like the Manu Smṛti, which are based on the Śrutis and therefore more authoritative, and, which also propound the doctrine of Brahman, an intelligent principle, being the cause of the world, would find no scope. So between the two it is desirable that the Smṛtis which go counter to the Vedas be rejected.

इतरेषां चानुपलब्धेः ॥ २ ॥

इतरेषां Of the others च and अनुपलब्धेः there being no mention.

2. And there being no mention (in the scriptures) of the other entities, (*i.e.* the categories