

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

beside the Pradhâna), (the Sâmkhya system cannot be authoritative).

Even accepting the Pradhâna of the Sâmkhyas for argument's sake—for the Vedântins also recognize Mâyâ as the cause of the world, the difference between the two being that the Pradhâna according to the Sâmkhyas is an independent entity, whereas Mâyâ is a dependent entity, being a power of Brahman—yet there is no mention of the other categories of the Sâmkhyas anywhere in the Vedas. Hence the Sâmkhya philosophy cannot be authoritative.

Topic 2: Refutation of the Yoga philosophy.

एतेन योगः प्रत्युक्तः ॥ ३ ॥

एतेन By this योगः the Yoga philosophy प्रत्युक्तः is (also) refuted.

3. By this the Yoga philosophy is (also) refuted.

After the refutation of the Sâmkhyas, who recognize an independent entity called the Pradhâna as the cause of the world, this Sûtra refutes the Yoga Smṛti, which also recognizes a separate entity called the Pradhâna as the first Cause, though unlike the Sâmkhyas they recognize an Īśvara who directs this inert Pradhâna in its creative evolution. The Yoga system is spoken of in Upaniṣads like the Śvetâśvatara. It helps concentration of the mind, which is necessary for the full comprehension of Brahman, and as such it is a means to Knowledge. So this Smṛti, being based on the Śrutis

is authoritative. But it also recognizes the Pradhâna, which therefore is the first Cause—so says the opponent. This Sûtra says that the arguments given in the last Sûtra refute also the Yoga Smṛti, for it also speaks of a Pradhâna and its products which are not to be found in the Śrutis. Though the Smṛti is partly authoritative, yet it cannot be so with respect to that part which contradicts the Śrutis. There is room only for those portions of the Smṛti as do not contradict the Śrutis.

Topic 3: Brahman, though of a different nature from the world, can yet be its cause.

न विलक्षणत्वादस्य, तथात्वं च शब्दात् ॥ ४ ॥

न Not विलक्षणत्वात् because of the contrary nature अस्य of this तथात्वं its being so च and शब्दात् from Śruti.

4. (Brahman is) not (the cause of the world) because this (world) is of a contrary nature (from Brahman); and its being so (i.e. different from Brahman) (is known) from the scriptures.

Brahman is intelligence, pure, etc. while the world is something material, impure, etc. and so is different from the nature of Brahman; as such, Brahman cannot be the cause of this world. The effect is nothing but the cause in another form; therefore the cause and effect cannot be altogether of a different nature. Intelligence cannot produce material effects and *vice versa*. That the world and Brahman differ entirely in their characteris-

tics is known from texts like "Brahman became intelligence as also non-intelligent" (Tai. 2.6), where "non-intelligent" stands for the world. So Brahman cannot be the first Cause of the material world, though the scriptures may say so.

अभिमानिव्यपदेशस्तु विशेषानुगतिभ्याम् ॥ ५ ॥

अभिमानिव्यपदेशः The reference (is) to the presiding deities तु but विशेष-अनुगतिभ्याम् because of the special characterization and the fact of being so presided.

5. But the reference is to the presiding deities (of the organs) on account of the special characterization (as 'deities') and also from the fact of a deity so presiding (over the function of an organ being approved by the Śruti in other texts).

The opponent, who says that the world and Brahman being different in nature—sentient and material respectively—cannot be related to each other as cause and effect, anticipates a plausible objection and answers it in this Sūtra. There is a text, "These organs quarrelling over their respective greatness," etc. (Br. 6.1.7), which shows that even the organs are not material but sentient. The opponent says that from this we are not to infer the sentiency of the world, since the reference is to the presiding deities of these organs. For the same topic occurs in the Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad, where they are expressly mentioned. "These deities (speech etc.) quarrelling over their respective greatness" (Kau. 2.14). Also because other texts show the existence of such presiding deities. "Fire becoming speech entered the

mouth" (Ai. Ā. 2.4.2.4). The same argument applies to texts of the Chândogya, (Ch. VI) where fires etc. are said to have thought and produced the next element in the series. The thought here spoken of is of the highest Deity, Brahman, which is connected with Its effects as a superintending principle. From all such texts we cannot infer the sentiency of the world, which is material and so different in nature from Brahman. Therefore Brahman cannot be the cause of the material world.

दृश्यते तु ॥ ६ ॥

दृश्यते Is seen तु but.

6. But it is seen.

'But' refutes the opponent's view expressed in the last Sūtra, viz that this world cannot have originated from Brahman because it is different in character. For it is seen that intelligent things like scorpions etc. are produced from non-intelligent cowdung etc. Again from a sentient spider there comes forth the thread for its web. So also do nails, hair, etc. come forth from a man, who is an intelligent being. Therefore it is quite possible that this material world could be produced by an intelligent Being, Brahman. It may be objected that a man's body is the cause of the hair and nails, and not the man; similarly the cowdung is the cause of the body of the worms. Even then it must be admitted that there is a difference between the cause and the effect since, in both the examples cited, one of them is the abode of something sentient while the other is not; they are not

similar in all respects. If they were, then there would be nothing like cause and effect, nor would they be called by different names. So we have to admit that the cause and its effects are not similar in every respect, but something in the cause, or some qualities of it, must be found in the effects also, as the clay in the lump is found in the pot also, though the shape etc. of the two differ. So we say that even in the case of Brahman and the world, some qualities of the cause, Brahman, such as existence and intelligence, are to be found in its effect, the world. Everything in the world exists, and this quality it gets from Brahman, which is existence itself. Again the intelligence of Brahman lights the whole universe. So these two qualities of Brahman are found in the world, which justify our relating them as cause and effect in spite of differences in other respect between them.

असदिति चेत्, न, प्रतिषेधमात्रत्वात् ॥ ७ ॥

असत् Non-existent इति चेत् if it be said न no प्रतिषेध-
मात्रत्वात् for it is merely a negation.

7. If it be said (that the world, the effect, would then be) non-existent (before creation), (we say) no, for it is merely a negation (without any basis).

If Brahman, which is intelligent, pure, and without qualities, is the cause of the world of an opposite character, it follows that before creation the world was non-existent, for Brahman was then the only existence. This means that something which was non-existing is brought into existence, which is not accepted by the

Vedântins. This argument of the opponent this Sûtra refutes by saying that this negation is a mere statement without any objective validity. The effect exists in the cause before its origination as well as after it. It can never exist independent of the cause either before or after creation. Therefore the world exists in Brahman even before creation and is not absolutely non-existent.

अपीतौ तद्वत्प्रसङ्गादसमञ्जसम् ॥ ८ ॥

अपीतौ At the time of dissolution तद्वत् like that
प्रसङ्गात् on account of the fact असमञ्जसम् is absurd.

8. On account of the fact that at the time of dissolution (the cause becomes) like that (i.e. like the effect) (the doctrine of Brahman being the cause of the world) is absurd.

Says the opponent: If Brahman is the cause of the world, then the world being dissolved in Brahman at the time of dissolution, its defects would affect Brahman, even as salt affects the water in which it is dissolved. Hence Brahman would become impure and would no more be the omniscient cause of the world, as the Upaniṣads maintain. Again at the time of dissolution all things having gone into a state of oneness with Brahman, there will be no special causes left for a new creation. If in spite of this we consider a new creation possible, then it would mean that there is a chance of even the liberated souls, who have become one with Brahman, reappearing in the world. Nor can it be said that the world remains separate from Brahman in the state of dissolution, for in that case it would be no

dissolution at all. So the Vedânta doctrine of Brahman being the cause of the world is objectionable, as it leads to all sorts of absurdities.

न तु दृष्टान्तभावात् ॥ ९ ॥

न Not तु but दृष्टान्त-भावात् on account of the existence of illustrations.

9. But not (so) on account of the existence of illustrations.

The objection is being answered: That the effect, when it gets dissolved in the cause, does not pollute the latter by its defects, is borne out by innumerable instances. A clay pot, for instance, when it is broken and reabsorbed into its original substance, *i.e.* clay, does not impart to it its special features. The very fact of absorption shows that all the qualities of the effect cannot abide, for in that case it would be no absorption at all. Moreover, we have to remember that the effect is of the nature of the cause and not *vice versa*. Hence the qualities of the effect cannot touch the cause. It may, however, be objected that since the effect is but the cause in a new condition, all the good and bad traits of the effect must have been in the cause. But we forget that the world is after all an illusion. Brahman has only apparently changed into the world and as such is never affected by it, even as a magician is not affected by the illusion produced by him.

The other incongruity shown, *viz* that since at the time of dissolution the world is resolved into Brahman and becomes one with It, there can be no further

creation, and if it takes place there will be the possibility of even free souls coming into bondage again, cannot stand, for there are parallel instances with respect to this also. In deep-sleep we do not perceive anything, there is no diversity, but on awakening we find the world of duality. A similar phenomenon can be expected to happen at the time of dissolution. In the former case it is the existence of ignorance (Avidyâ), which is not destroyed, that is responsible for the reappearance of the world. So also at dissolution the power of distinction remains in a potential state as Avidyâ or ignorance. But in the case of the liberated no ignorance being left, there is no chance of their being brought back into bondage from their state of oneness with Brahman.

स्वपक्षदोषाच्च ॥ १० ॥

स्वपक्ष-दोषात् Because of the objections to his own view च and.

10. And because of the objections (cited) (being applicable) to his own (Sâmkhyan) view (also).

The objections raised by the Sâmkhyas against Vedânta are equally true of their view of the first Cause, *viz* the Pradhâna. Form, taste, etc. are not to be found in the Pradhâna, yet we find these things in the world produced out of it. The objection as regards reabsorption at the time of Pralaya applies also in the case of the Sâmkhyan Pradhâna. Thus whatever objections are raised against Vedânta in this respect

are also true of the Sāṃkhyas. Hence they should be dropped. Of the two, however, Vedānta being based on the Śrutis is more authoritative. Moreover, the objections have all been answered from the Vedānta standpoint, whereas from the Sāṃkhyan standpoint it is not possible to answer them.

तर्कप्रतिष्ठानादपि, अन्यथानुमेयमिति चेत्, †

एवमप्यविमोक्षप्रसङ्गः ॥ ११ ॥

तर्क-अप्रतिष्ठानात् Because reasoning has no sure basis अपि also अन्यथा otherwise अनुमेयम् should be inferred or reasoned इति चेत् if it be said एवम् so अपि even अविमोक्ष-प्रसङ्गः there will result the contingency of non-release.

11. Also because reasoning has no sure basis (it cannot upset the conclusions of Vedānta). If it be said that it should be reasoned otherwise (so as to get over this defect), (we say) even so there will result the contingency of non-release (from this defect, with respect to the matter in question).

What one man establishes through reason can be refuted by another more intelligent than he. Even a sage like Kapila is refuted by other sages like Kaṇāda. Hence reasoning having no sure basis cannot upset the conclusions of Vedānta, which are based on the Śrutis. But, says the opponent, even this judgement about reasoning is arrived at through reasoning; so it is not true that reasoning has never a sure basis. Sometimes

it is perfectly sound. Only we must reason properly. The latter part of the Sūtra says that even though in some cases reasoning is infallible, yet with respect to the matter in hand it cannot transcend this defect. For the cause of the world (Brahman) is beyond the senses and has no characteristic signs. It cannot therefore be an object of perception, or of inference, which is based on perception. Or again if we take 'release' in the Sūtra to mean Liberation, it comes to this: True knowledge of a real thing depends on the thing itself, and therefore it is always uniform. Hence a conflict of views with respect to it is not possible. But the conclusions of reasoning can never be uniform. The Sāṃkhyas arrive through reasoning at the Pradhāna as the first Cause, while the Naiyāyikas (logicians) mention Paramāṇus (atoms) as that. Which to accept? So no conclusion can be arrived at through reasoning independent of the scriptures, and since the truth cannot be known through this means, there will be no Liberation. Therefore reasoning which goes against the scriptures is no proof of knowledge and cannot contradict the Śruti texts.

Topic 4: The line of reasoning against the Sāṃkhyas is valid also against others like the Atomists.

एतेन शिष्टापरिग्रहा अपि व्याख्याताः ॥ १२ ॥

एतेन By this शिष्टापरिग्रहाः not accepted by the wise अपि also व्याख्याताः are explained.

12. By this (i.e. by the arguments against the Sāṃkhyas) (those other views) also not accepted by the wise (like Manu and others) are explained.

When the Sâmkhya philosophy, parts of which are accepted by the wise as authoritative, has been refuted, there is no question as regards the non-authoritativeness of all doctrines based merely on reasoning like the atomic theory of Kaṇāda and non-existence as the first Cause propounded by the Buddhists, which are wholly rejected by the wise. They are also refuted by these very arguments against the Sâmkhyas, as the reasons on which the refutation is based are the same.

Topic 5: The distinctions like enjoyer and enjoyed do not contradict the truth which is oneness.

भोक्तापत्तेरविभागश्चेत्, स्याल्लोकवत् ॥ १३ ॥

भोक्तापत्तेः On account of turning into the enjoyer
अविभागः non-distinction चेत् if it be said स्यात् may exist
लोकवत् as is experienced in the world.

13. If it be said (that if Brahman be the cause then) on account of (the objects of enjoyment) turning into the enjoyer, non-distinction (between enjoyer and things enjoyed would result), (we say, such distinction) may exist (all the same), as is experienced commonly in the world.

A further objection is raised against Brahman being the cause. We perceive differences in the world. Now, perception as a means of knowledge is stronger than the Śruti. Hence what the Śrūtis say in contradiction to such an experience cannot stand. The idea is this: The distinction between the enjoyer (the Jîva) and the objects of enjoyment is well established by experience.

Brahman is the material cause, then the world, the effect, would be non-different from Brahman, and under the circumstances, the Jîva and Brahman being identical in Vedânta, the difference between the subject and object would be destroyed, since the old would pass over into the other. Hence Brahman cannot be held to be the material cause of the world as it contradicts perception.

The latter part of the Sûtra refutes this giving examples. It says that nevertheless there can be such differences in non-different things. For instance, waves, foam, etc. are non-different, being alike sea water; yet as waves and foam they are different from each other. As sea water, their cause, they are one, but as waves, foam, etc. they are different, and there is no contradiction here. Hence it is possible to have difference and non-difference in things simultaneously, owing to name and form. Therefore from the standpoint of Brahman the enjoyer and the enjoyed are not different, but as enjoyer and things enjoyed they are different; there is no contradiction in this.

The Sûtra can also be interpreted otherwise. If Brahman be the cause, then It would also be the enjoyer, the individual soul (Jîva), there being no difference between cause and effect. Consequently, there will be no such difference as the bondage of the individual soul and the freedom of Brahman. The Sûtra says that even as there is a distinction between the object, which is clear, and its image, which is disfigured in an unclean mirror, so also owing to the impurities of the Antaḥkaraṇa (mind) the ever-free Brahman may give rise to the image of the individual soul, which is bound.

तदनन्यत्वमारम्भणशब्दादिभ्यः ॥ १४ ॥

तदनन्यत्वम् Its non-difference आरम्भण-शब्दादिभ्यः from words like 'origin' etc.

14. Its (of the effect) non-difference (from the cause results) from words like 'origin' etc.

In the last Sûtra the objection against Brahman being the material cause, that it contradicts perception, was answered from the standpoint of Parinâmavâda or the theory of Brahman actually undergoing modification. Now the same objection is refuted from the standpoint of Vivartavâda or apparent modification, which is the standpoint of Advaita. The objection is: Texts like "There is no manifoldness whatever here (in Brahman)" (Ka. 2. 4. 11) contradict perception. Reason also says that among things which get transformed into each other there cannot be difference and non-difference at the same time. Hence the doubt. In a single moon we cannot see two moons. What was spoken of in the last Sûtra, viz that the difference between them is one of name and form, even that is unreal, for in a thing which is one without a second, which is non-duality, even the difference due to name and form is impossible. The example of the sea is not apt, for here both the sea and its modifications, waves and foam, are objects of the senses, but Brahman is not. It is realized only through the scriptures and in Samâdhi. What then is the truth? It is oneness, non-duality. As the effect is non-different from the cause, the latter alone is real. The Śruti also establishes this by the ex-

ample of clay etc. in the Chândogya Upaniṣad. "Just as, by the knowledge of on lump of earth, my dear, everything made of earth is known, the modification being only a name arising from speech, but the truth being that all is earth...thus, my dear, is that instruction" (Ch. 6. 1. 4-6). Here the Śruti by using the word 'modification' tries to prove that there is no separate reality of the pots etc. which are mere modifications of the lump of earth. They are not separate things but merely different conditions, just as the boyhood, youth, etc. of Devadatta are mere conditions, and not real. So by knowing the lump of earth the real nature of the pots etc. is known. It matters little that the various forms are not known, for they are not worth knowing, being unreal. Even though these pots etc. are objects of the senses, yet discrimination tells us that besides earth nothing real is found in these. They are merely names arising out of speech and nothing more. They are cognized through ignorance, hence they are unreal. The clay, on the other hand, is realized even apart from name and form and is therefore real. Similarly Brahman alone is real and this world is unreal. The world being non-different from its cause, Brahman, the truth is oneness, non-duality, Brahman, the one without a second. To people who through want of experience have not this insight into things, there will always be difference and non-difference, even as in the case of the sea and its waves, but in reality these differences are relative and not true.

भावे चोपलब्धेः ॥ १५ ॥

भावे On the existence च and उपलब्धेः is experienced

15. And (because) on the existence (of the cause) is (the effect) experienced.

The effect is not experienced in the absence of the cause, which shows that the effect is not different from the cause. The world phenomena appear only because Brahman exists and not without It. Hence the world is non-different from Brahman.

सत्त्वाच्चावरस्य ॥ १६ ॥

सत्त्वात् On account of (its) existing च and अवरस्य of the posterior.

16. And on account of the posterior (*i.e.* the effect, which comes into being after the cause) existing (as the cause before creation).

The Śruti says that before creation the world had its being in the cause, Brahman, as one with It: "Verily in the beginning this was Self, one only" (Ai. Ā. 2. 4. 1. 1); "In the beginning, my dear, this was only existence" (Ch. 6. 2. 1). Now since before creation it was non-different from the cause, it continues to be so even after creation.

असद्व्यपदेशान्नेति चेत्, न, धर्मान्तरेण

वाक्यशेषात् ॥ १७ ॥

असत्-व्यपदेशात् On account of its being described as non-existent न not इति चेत् if it be said न no धर्मान्तरेण by another characteristic वाक्यशेषात् from the latter part of the text.

17. If it be said that on account of (the effect) being described as non-existent (before creation) (the conclusion of the previous Sûtra is) not (true); (we say) not so, (it being described) by another characteristic (as is seen) from the latter part of the text.

"Non-existent indeed this was in the beginning" (Ch. 3. 19. 1). The word "non-existent" does not mean absolute non-existence, but that the world did not exist in a differentiated condition. It was undifferentiated—had not yet developed name and form—in which sense the word "non-existence" is also used in common parlance. It was in a fine condition, and after creation it became gross, developing name and form. This sense is shown by the immediately succeeding portion of the text, "It became existent, it grew." Hence the conclusion of the last Sûtra is all right.

युक्तेः शब्दान्तराच्च ॥ १८ ॥

युक्तेः From reasoning शब्दान्तरात् from another Śruti text च and.

18. From reasoning and another Śruti text (this relation between cause and effect is established).

From reasoning also we find that the effect is non-different from the cause and exists before its origination. Otherwise everything could have been produced from anything. Particular causes producing particular effects only shows this relationship between cause and effect. Before creation the effect exists in the cause as un-

manifest. Otherwise something new being created anything could have been created from all things. The fact is, it gets manifested on creation, that is all. That which is absolutely non-existent like the horns of a hare can never come into existence. So the cause cannot produce altogether a new thing which was not existing in it already. Moreover, that the effect exists even before creation we find from such Śruti texts as "In the beginning, my dear, this was only existence, one without a second" (Ch. 6.2.1).

पटवच्च ॥ १९ ॥

पटवत् Like cloth च and.

19. And like a piece of cloth,

Even as is cloth folded and spread out, so is the world before and after creation. In the folded state one cannot make out whether it is a cloth or anything else, which is clearly discernible when it is spread out. In the state of Pralaya (dissolution), i.e. before creation, the world exists in a fine potential state in Brahman and after creation takes the gross form.

यथा च प्राणादि ॥ २० ॥

यथा As च and प्राणादि in the case of Prāṇas.

20. And as in the case of the different Prāṇas.

When the five different Prāṇas (vital forces) are controlled by Prāṇâyāma, they merge and exist as the

chief Prāṇa (which regulates respiration) merely maintaining life. From this we find that the effects, the various Prāṇas are not different from their cause, the chief Prāṇa. So also with all effects; they are not different from their cause. Therefore it is established that the effect, the world, is identical with its cause, Brahman. Hence by knowing It everything is known.

Topic 7: Refutation of the objection that if Brahman were the cause of the world, then It and the Jīva being really one, Brahman would be responsible for creating evil.

इतरव्यपदेशाद्विताकरणादिदोषप्रसक्तिः ॥ २१ ॥

इतर-व्यपदेशात् On account of the other being stated (as non-different from Brahman) हित-अकरणादि-दोष-प्रसक्तिः defects of not doing what is beneficial and the like would arise.

21. On account of the other (the individual soul) being stated (as non-different from Brahman) there would arise (in Brahman) the defects of not doing what is beneficial and the like.

In the previous topic the oneness of the world with its cause, Brahman, has been established. But the Sûtra also states the identity of the individual soul and Brahman, and if Brahman at the same time were the cause of the world. It would be open to the charge of not doing what is good for Itself. Being omniscient, It would not have ordained anything which would do the individual soul harm, or abstained from doing that

which would be beneficial to it; for nobody is seen to do so with respect to oneself. Rather It would have created a world where everything would have been pleasant for the individual soul, without the least trace of misery. Since that is not a fact, Brahman is not the cause of the world, as Vedānta holds.

अधिकं तु, भेदनिर्देशात् ॥ २२ ॥

अधिकं Something more तु but भेद-निर्देशात् on account of the statement of difference.

22. But on account of the statement (in the Śrutis) of difference (between the individual soul and Brahman) (Brahman the Creator is) something more (than the individual soul).

'But' refutes the objection of the last Sūtra.

The Creator of the world is omniscient and omnipotent. As such He knows the unreality of the Jīvahood and the world, and also His own non-attachment to them, being a mere witness. He has neither good nor evil. So His creating a world of good and evil is not objectionable. For the individual soul, however, there is good and evil so long as it is in ignorance. The Śrutis clearly point out the difference between the individual soul and the Creator in texts like "The Ātman is to be realized" etc. (Br. 2. 4. 5). All these differences, however, are based on imaginary distinctions due to ignorance. It is only when Knowledge dawns that the individual soul realizes its identity with Brahman. Then all plurality vanishes, and there is neither the individual soul nor the Creator. Thus the individual

soul not being the creator of the world, the objection raised does not hold good.

अश्मादिवच्च तदनुपपत्तिः ॥ २३ ॥

अश्मादिवत् Like stones etc. च and तदनुपपत्तिः its untenability.

23. And because the case is similar to that of stones (produced from the same earth) etc. the objection is untenable.

An objection may be raised that Brahman, which is Knowledge, Bliss, and unchangeable, cannot be the cause of a world of diversity, of good and evil. This Sūtra refutes that. The objection is untenable, for we see that from the same material, earth, stones of different values like the precious jewels as also useless stones are produced. So also from Brahman, which is Bliss, a world of good and evil can be created.

Topic 8: Brahman though destitute of material and instruments is yet the cause of the world.

उपसंहारदर्शनान्नेति चेत्, न, क्षीरवद्धि ॥ २४ ॥

उपसंहार-दर्शनात् Because collection of accessories is seen न not इतिचेत् if it be said न no क्षीरवत् like milk हि since.

24. If it be said (that Brahman without extraneous aids) cannot (be the cause of the world)

because (an agent) is seen to collect materials (for any construction), (we say) no, since (it is) like milk (turning into curds).

A fresh objection is raised against Brahman being the cause of the world. There is nothing extraneous to Brahman to help in the work of creation, for there is nothing besides Brahman. Brahman is one without a second and so free from all differentiations internal or external. It is ordinarily seen that one who creates something, the potter, for example, uses extraneous aids like the wheel, clay, etc. But Brahman, being one without a second, has not these accessories and so is not the Creator. The Sûtra refutes this objection by showing that such a thing is possible even as milk turns into curds without the help of any extraneous thing. If it be urged that even in this case heat or some such thing starts curdling, we say it only accelerates the process but the curdling takes place through the inherent capacity of the milk. One cannot turn water into curds by the application of heat! But Brahman being infinite, no such aid is necessary for It to produce this world. That It is of infinite power is testified by such Śrutis as the following: "There is no effect and no instrument known of Him, no one is seen like unto Him or better. His high power is revealed as manifold and inherent, acting as force and knowledge" (Śv. 6.8).

देवादिवदपि लोके ॥ २५ ॥

देवादिवत् Like gods and others अपि even लोके in the world.

25. (The case of Brahman creating the world is) even like the gods and other beings in the world.

It may be objected that the example of milk turning into curds is not in point, since it is an inanimate substance. One never sees a conscious being, a potter, for instance, turning out things without the help of external aids.

This Sûtra refutes that objection by giving an example of creation by a conscious agent without any extraneous help. Even as gods, in the sacred books, are seen to create without extraneous means simply through their inherent power, so also the Lord through His infinite power of Mâyâ is able to create this world of diversity. The examples cited above show that it is not necessary that creation be limited by the conditions observed in the creation of pots. They are not universal.

Topic 9: Brahman though without parts is yet the material cause of the world.

कृत्स्नप्रसक्तिर्निरवयवत्वशब्दकोपो वा ॥ २६ ॥

कृत्स्न प्रसक्तिः Possibility of the entire (Brahman being modified) निरवयवत्वशब्द-कोपः violation of the scriptural statement that Brahman is without parts वा or.

26. (Brahman's being the cause of the world involves) either the possibility of the entire (Brahman being modified) or the violation of the scriptural statement that Brahman is without parts.

If Brahman is without parts and yet the material cause of the world, then we have to admit that the entire Brahman becomes changed into this multiform world. So there will be no Brahman left, but only the effect, the world. Moreover, it would contradict the scriptural text that Brahman is immutable. If on the other hand it is said that the whole of It does not undergo modification, but only a part, then we shall have to accept that Brahman is made up of parts, which is denied by scriptural texts. In either case it leads to dilemma, and so Brahman cannot be the cause of the world.

श्रुतेस्तु, शब्दमूलत्वात् ॥ २७ ॥

श्रुते: On account of scriptural texts तु but शब्दमूलत्वात् on account of being based on the scripture.

27. But (it cannot be like that) on account of scriptural texts (supporting both the apparently contradictory views) and on account of (Brahman) being based on the scripture only.

'But' refutes the view of the former Sûtra.

The entire Brahman does not undergo change, though the scriptures say that the world originates from Brahman. Witness such texts as, "One foot (quarter) of Him is all beings, and three feet are what is immortal in heaven" (Ch. 3. 12. 6). And as in matters supersensuous the Śrutis alone are authority, we have to accept that both these opposite views are true though it does not stand to reason. The thing is, the change in Brahman is only apparent and not real. Hence both the views expressed by the Śruti are true. It is on this basis

that the apparently contradictory texts become reconciled and not otherwise.

आत्मनि चैवं विचित्राश्च हि ॥ २८ ॥

आत्मनि In the individual soul च and एवं thus विचित्राः diverse च also हि because.

28. And because in the individual soul also (as in the case of magicians etc.) diverse (creation exists). Similarly (with Brahman).

This Sûtra establishes the view of the former by citing an example.

In the dream state there appears in the individual self, which is one and indivisible, diversity resembling the waking state (See Br 4. 3. 10), and yet the indivisible character of the self is not marred by it. We see also magicians, for instance, producing a multiple creation without any change in themselves. Similarly this diverse creation springs from Brahman through Its inscrutable power of Mâyâ, though Brahman Itself remains unchanged.

स्वपक्षदोषाच्च ॥ २९ ॥

स्वपक्ष-दोषात् On account of the opponent's view being subject to these very objections च and.

29. And on account of the opponent's own view being subject to these very objections.

If the Pradhâna is taken to be the first Cause, as the opponents of the Vedântic view (the Sâmkhyas) hold, in that case also, as the Pradhâna too is without parts, the Sâmkhyan view will be equally subject to the objections raised against Brahman as the first Cause. The Vedânta viewpoint has, however, answered all these objections, while the Sâmkhyas and Vaiśeṣikas cannot answer them, the change being real according to them.

Topic 10: Brahman's power of Mâyâ established.

सर्वोपेता च तद्दर्शनात् ॥ ३० ॥

सर्वोपेता Endowed with all च and तद्-दर्शनात् because it is seen.

30. And (Brahman is) endowed with all (powers), because it is seen (from the scriptures).

Generally we see that men endowed with a physical body possess such powers. But since Brahman has no body, it is not likely that It can possess such powers—so says the opponent.

This Sûtra gives proof of Brahman's being endowed with Mâyâ Śakti, the power of Nescience. Various scriptural texts declare that Brahman possesses all powers. "The great Lord is the Mâyin (the ruler of Mâyâ)" (Śv. 4. 10). See also Ch. 3. 14. 4 and 8. 7 1

विकरणत्वान्नेति चेत्, तदुक्तम् ॥ ३१ ॥

विकरणत्वात् Because devoid of organs न not इति चेत् if it be said तत् that उक्तम् has been explained

31. If it be said that because (Brahman) is devoid of organs (it is) not (able to create, though endowed with powers), (we say) this has (already) been explained.

As Brahman is devoid of organs, It cannot create. Moreover, It is described as "Not this, not this", which precludes all attributes; so how can It possess any powers? This Sûtra replies that it has already been explained in 2. 1. 4. and 2. 1. 25 that with respect to Brahman the scripture alone is authority and not reason. The scripture declares that Brahman, although devoid of organs, possesses all capacities. 'Grasping without hands, moving swiftly without feet' etc. (Śv. 3. 19). Though Brahman is without attributes, yet on account of Mâyâ or Nescience It can be taken to possess all powers.

Topic 11: Brahman's creation has no motive behind except a sportive impulse.

न प्रयोजनवत्त्वात् ॥ ३२ ॥

न Not प्रयोजनवत्त्वात् on account of having motive.

32. (Brahman is) not (the creator of the world) on account of (every activity) having a motive.

Granting that Brahman possesses all powers for creation, a further objection is raised against Its being the cause. Nobody engages himself in anything without a motive or purpose. Everything is undertaken by people to satisfy some desire. But Brahman is self-

sufficient, therefore It has nothing to gain by the creation; hence we cannot expect It to engage Itself in such a useless creation. Therefore Brahman cannot be the cause of the world.

लोकवत्, लीलाकैवल्यम् ॥ ३३ ॥

लोकवत् As is seen in the world तु but लीलाकैवल्यम् mere pastime.

33. But (Brahman's creative activity) is mere pastime, as is seen in the world.

Even as kings without any motive behind are seen to engage in acts for mere pastime, or even as men breathe without a purpose, for it is their very nature, or even as children play out of mere fun, so also Brahman without any purpose engages Itself in creating this world of diversity. This answers the objection raised in the previous Sûtra against Brahman's being the cause of the world.

Topic 12: Partiality and cruelty cannot be attributed to Brahman.

वैषम्यनैर्घृण्ये न, सापेक्षत्वात्,
तथा हि दर्शयति ॥ ३४ ॥

वैषम्यनैर्घृण्ये Partiality and cruelty न not सापेक्षत्वात् on account of Its taking into consideration (other reasons) तथा so हि because दर्शयति declares.

34. Partiality and cruelty cannot (be attrib-

uted to Brahman) on account of Its taking into consideration (other reasons in that matter), because (the scripture) declares (it to be) so.

Some are created poor, some rich; hence the Lord is partial to some. He is cruel, inasmuch as He makes people suffer. To such an objection this Sûtra replies that the Lord cannot be accused of partiality and cruelty, because He dispenses according to the merit and demerit of the individual soul. The scripture declares to that effect, "A man becomes good by good work, bad by bad work" (Br. 3. 2. 13). But this does not contradict the independence of the Lord, even as the king's status is not compromised by his giving presents to his servants according to their action. Just as rain helps different seeds to sprout, each according to its nature, so God is the general efficient cause in bringing the latent tendencies of each individual to fruition. Hence he is neither partial nor cruel.

न कर्माविभागादिति चेत्, न, अनादित्वात् ॥ ३५ ॥

न Not कर्माविभागात् for want of distinction in work इति चेत् if it be said न no अनादित्वात् because of (the world) being without a beginning.

35. If it be said (that is) not (possible) for want of any distinction in work (before creation), (we say) no, because of (the world) being without a beginning.

Since before the first creation the individual soul cannot possibly have had a previous existence, whence

comes the difference in the condition of beings in that first creation, unless the Lord has caused it out of His partiality? This objection is answered by the Sûtra, which says that creation is without a beginning and the question of first creation cannot arise. It is like a seed and its sprout. So the individual souls have always had a previous existence and done good or bad deeds in accordance with which their lot in a subsequent creation is ordained by the Lord.

उपपद्यते चाप्युपलभ्यते च ॥ ३६ ॥

उपपद्यते Is reasonable च and अपि and उपलभ्यते is seen च also.

36. And (that the world is without a beginning) is reasonable and is also seen (from the scriptures).

Reason tells us that creation must be without a beginning. For if the world did not exist in a potential state in the form of Samskâras (impressions), then an absolutely non-existing thing would be produced at creation. In that case even liberated souls might be reborn. Moreover people would be enjoying or suffering without having done anything to deserve it—an instance of an effect without a cause, which is absurd. It cannot be attributed to primeval ignorance, which, being one, requires the diversity of individual past work to produce varied results. The scriptures also posit the existence of the world in former cycles in texts like "The Lord devised the sun and moon as before" (Rg-Veda, 10. 190. 3).

So partiality and cruelty cannot be imputed to the Lord.

Topic 13: Brahman endowed with all attributes necessary for creation.

सर्वधर्मोपपत्तेश्च ॥ ३७ ॥

सर्व-धर्म-उपपत्तेः From the possibility of all attributes च and.

37. And because all attributes (required for the creation of the world) are possible (only in Brahman, It is the cause of the world).

This Sûtra answers the objection that because Brahman is attributeless It cannot be the material cause of the world.

Objection: Material cause is that which undergoes modification as the effect. Such a cause is generally seen to possess attributes in the world. Therefore an attributeless Brahman cannot be the material cause of the world, as it goes counter to our everyday experience.

Answer: Though the material cause undergoes change to produce the effect, yet this can take place in two ways. An actual modification, as when milk turns into curds, or an apparent modification due to ignorance, as when a rope is taken for a snake. Therefore though in the attributeless Brahman an actual change is impossible, yet an apparent modification is possible owing to Its power of Mâyâ. Because of this power all the attributes required in the cause for such a creation are possible only in Brahman. Therefore Brahman is the material cause of this world, not through actual modification, but through apparent modification, and It is also the efficient cause of the world. Therefore the fact that Brahman is the cause of the world is established.

CHAPTER II-

SECTION II

In the last section all arguments against Brahman being the first Cause have been answered. In this section all the doctrines of the other schools are taken up for refutation through reasoning alone without reference to the authority of the Vedas.

In the last Sûtra it has been shown that Brahman possesses all the attributes, though through Mâyâ, for equipping It to be the first Cause of the universe. Now the question is taken up whether the Sâmkhyan Pradhâna can satisfy all those conditions.

Topic 1: Refutation of the Sâmkhyan theory of the: Pradhâna as the first Cause.

रचनानुपपत्तेश्च नानुमानम् ॥ १ ॥

रचनानुपपत्तेः Because of the impossibility of design च and न not अनुमानम् that which is inferred.

1. And that which is inferred (*viz* the Pradhâna of the Sâmkhyas can) not (be the first Cause) because (in that case it is) not possible (to account for the) design (found in the creation).

In the preceding portion the Sâmkhyan doctrine has been refuted here and there on scriptural authority.

Sûtras 1-10 refute it through reasoning independent of the Vedânta texts.

The inert Pradhâna does not possess the intelligence that is required for creating such a diverse and well-designed world as this, and so it cannot be the first Cause.

प्रवृत्तेश्च ॥ २ ॥

प्रवृत्तेः Of a tendency च and.

2. And on account of (the impossibility of such) a tendency (to create).

Even granting that such a creation is possible for the Pradhâna, still there are other objections.

Inert Pradhâna cannot again be credited with the desire or tendency to create. Clay by itself is never seen to create a pot without the agency of an intelligent being. So the inert Pradhâna cannot be the cause, for in that case the activity necessary for the production of the world would be impossible. There must be some ruling intelligence for that purpose.

पयोऽम्बुवच्चेत् तत्रापि ॥ ३ ॥

पयोऽम्बुवत् Like milk and water चेत्, if it be said तत्र there अपि even.

3. If it be said (that the Pradhâna spontaneously undergoes modification) like (the flowing of) milk and water, (we say that) even there (it is due to intelligence).

The Sâmkhyas try to get over the difficulty by saying that even as water flows in rivers spontaneously or milk from the udder to the calf, so also the inert Pradhâna may become active of its own accord and undergo modification into intellect, Ahankâra, etc. without the agency of any intelligence. The latter part of the Sûtra refutes this and says that even the flowing of water and milk is directed by the Supreme Lord. The scriptures also say: "Under the mighty rule of this Immutable, O Gârgi, some rivers flow to the east" etc. (Br. 3. 8. 9); "He who inhabits water, but is within it, ... who controls water from within" (Br. 3. 7. 4). The Lord is behind everything directing the material world.

व्यतिरेकानवस्थितेश्चानपेक्षत्वात् ॥ ४ ॥

व्यतिरेकानवस्थिते: There being no extraneous agency besides it च and अनपेक्षत्वात् because it is not dependent.

4. And because (the Prâdhana) is not dependent (on anything), there being no extraneous agency besides it (its activity and nonactivity cannot be explained).

The Pradhâna of the Sâmkhyas being inert, it cannot of itself start to be active, or when once set in motion, cease to be active of itself. So in the absence of an intelligent guiding principle it is impossible for the Sâmkhyas to explain creation and dissolution at the beginning and end of a cycle, which they admit. The only other principle besides the Pradhâna that they admit is the Puruṣa or soul, but according to them it is not an agent, for it is indifferent. All other principles

which they admit including even Karma are but products of the Pradhâna and as such cannot have any determining effect on it. Hence their position launches them into a contradiction.

अन्यत्राभावाच्च न तृणादिवत् ॥ ५ ॥

अन्यत्र Elsewhere अभावात् because of its absence च and न not तृणादिवत् even as grass etc.

5. And (it can) not (be said that the Pradhâna undergoes modification spontaneously) even as grass etc. (turn into milk); because of its absence elsewhere (than in the female mammals).

Nor is the spontaneous modification of the Pradhâna possible. If you cite grass as an instance, we say it is not changed into milk spontaneously but only when eaten by female mammals. Otherwise it would be converted into milk independently of them. Since the analogy itself does not stand, we cannot accept the Pradhâna's undergoing modification of itself.

अभ्युपगमेऽप्यर्थाभावात् ॥ ६ ॥

अभ्युपगमे Accepting अपि even अर्थाभावात् because of the absence of any purpose.

6. Even accepting (the Sâmkhyan position with regard to the spontaneous modification of the Pradhâna, it cannot be the first Cause) because of the absence of any purpose.

Granting the spontaneity of the Pradhâna, it will lead to a contradiction in their philosophy. If the Pradhâna is active spontaneously, then this activity cannot have any purpose, which would contradict the Sâmkhyan view that the modification of the Pradhâna is for the experience and Liberation of the soul. Moreover, the soul being perfect, it is already free and nothing can be added to or taken away from it. Hence, the Pradhâna cannot be the first Cause.

पुरुषाश्मवदिति चेत्, तथापि ॥ ७ ॥

पुरुष-अश्म-वत् Even as a person or a magnet इति चेत् if it be said तथापि even then.

7. If it be said (that the Puruṣa can direct the Pradhâna) even as a (crippled) person (can direct a blind man), or a magnet (the iron filings), even then (the difficulty cannot be surmounted).

The Sâmkhyas hold that though the Puruṣa is itself inactive yet it can direct the Pradhâna; the Sûtra refutes it. According to the Sâmkhyas, the Pradhâna is independent, and so it is not in keeping with this to say that it depends on the nearness of the Puruṣa for its activity, even as the iron filings depend on the magnet for their motion. Moreover, the Puruṣa being always near the Pradhâna, there would be permanency of creation. Again, the case of the lame and the blind is not an apt example, for the lame man can give directions to the blind one and direct him; but since the Puruṣa is altogether indifferent according to the Sâmkhyas, it cannot do that with respect to the

Pradhâna. In Vedânta, though Brahman is indifferent, yet through Mâyâ It is endowed with attributes and activity; so It becomes the Creator. Again the Puruṣa and the Pradhâna are altogether separate and independent; the one is intelligent and indifferent, the other inert and independent. Now if these two are to be connected, a third principle will be required, and since no such principle is recognized in the Sâmkhya philosophy, their connection is impossible.

अङ्गित्वानुपपत्तेश्च ॥ ८ ॥

अङ्गित्व-अनुपपत्तेः Owing to the impossibility of the relation of principal (and subordinate) च and.

8. And because the relation of principal (and subordinate) is impossible (among the Guṇas, the Pradhâna cannot be active).

The Pradhâna, according to the Sâmkhyas, consists of the three Guṇas (constituents), Sattva, Rajas, and Tamas, which are independent of each other and in a state of equilibrium before creation. Creation begins when this equilibrium is upset and one Guṇa becomes more predominant than the other two. Equilibrium cannot be upset without any external force, nor can the Guṇas, which are absolutely independent in the state of Pradhâna, take of themselves a subsidiary position to another Guṇa without losing their independence. Hence creation would be impossible.

अन्यथानुमितौ च ज्ञशक्तिवियोगात् ॥ ९ ॥

अन्यथा Otherwise अनुमितौ if it be inferred च even

ज्ञशक्ति-वियोगात् owing to the absence of the power of intelligence.

9. Even if it be inferred otherwise, owing to the absence of the power of intelligence (the other objections to the Pradhâna being the first Cause remain).

If it be inferred from the effects that the cause, the Pradhâna, consists of Guṇas which are not absolutely independent, but contain some characteristics inherent in them, like instability, owing to which they themselves enter into a state of inequality even while they are in a state of equilibrium, then also because of the want of intelligence the objections founded on design in the world and that it would lead to continuous creation, stand against accepting the Pradhâna as the first Cause. *Vide* Sûtras 1 and 4.

विप्रतिषेधाच्चासमञ्जसम् ॥ १० ॥

विप्रतिषेधात् Because of contradictions also च असमञ्जसम् inconsistent.

10. Also because of contradictions (the Sâmkhyan theory) is inconsistent.

There are various contradictions in the Sâmkhya philosophy, as, for example, sometimes the senses are said to be eleven and again they are said to be seven; again the Tanmâtras are said to be produced from Mahat in one place and in another place from Ahaṅ-kâra (Ego), and so on Its differences with Śruti and

Smṛti are well known. Hence the doctrine of the Pradhâna of the Sâmkhyas cannot be accepted.

Topic 2: Refutation of the objection from the Vaiśeṣika standpoint against Brahman being the first Cause.

महदीर्घवद्वा ह्रस्वपरिमण्डलाभ्याम् ॥ ११ ॥

महत्-दीर्घ-वत् Even as the great and long वा or ह्रस्व-परिमण्डलाभ्याम् from the short and the infinitesimal.

11. (The world may originate from Brahman) even as the great and long (triad etc.) originate from the short (and the minute dyad) or (this kind of dyad) from the infinitesimal (atom).

The Sâmkhyas having been refuted, the Vaiśeṣika philosophy is taken up in Sûtras 11-17 and refuted. First, the plausible objection against Brahman being the first Cause is answered from the standpoint of the Vaiśeṣikas in Sûtra 11. According to them the qualities of the cause produce similar qualities in the effects, even as the whiteness of the threads produce that of the cloth woven out of them. So if the world is created from Brahman, the quality of intelligence should abide in the world also; but as a matter of fact it does not. So Brahman cannot be the cause of the world. This argument is refuted on the ground that the same objection applies to the Vaiśeṣika view of creation also; hence it is no special objection against Vedânta. According to them the ultimate condition of the world is atomic, and all things in this world are but aggregates of the different kinds of atoms. The atoms are

eternal and the ultimate cause of the world. In the state of dissolution the world exists in the atomic state. At the time of creation the atoms of air are set in motion by Adṛṣṭa, the unseen principle, and two atoms combine to form a dyad. Again, three dyads combine to form a triad and four dyads form a tetrad, and in this way gross air is created. Similarly, the other elements are created from their respective atoms and dyads. An atom, according to this philosophy, is infinitesimal, a dyad is minute and short, and compounds from the triad upwards are great and long. Now, if two atoms which are spherical, produce a dyad which is minute and short, but in which the sphericity of the atom is not reproduced, or if four dyads, which are short and minute, produce a tetrad, which is great and long, but the minuteness and shortness of the dyad are not handed down, it is clear that all the qualities of the cause are not reproduced in the effect. So there can be no objection to an intelligent Brahman being the cause of the world, which is not intelligent. Brahman, which is Knowledge and Bliss, can produce a world which is inert and full of misery.

Topic 3: Refutation of the atomic theory of the Vaiśeṣikas.

Having answered the objection against the Vedāntic view, the author of the Sūtras now proceeds to refute the Vaiśeṣika philosophy.

उभयथापि न कर्मतिस्तदभावः ॥ १२ ॥

उभयथापि In either case न is not कर्म activity अतः therefore तत्-अभावः negation of that.

12. In either case (*viz* the Adṛṣṭa, the unseen principle, inhering either in the atoms or in the soul) the activity (of the atoms) is not (possible), therefore the negation of that (*viz* of creation through the combination of atoms).

If the world is created by the combination of atoms, the question is, what causes this combination? If it is a seen cause, it is not possible before the creation of the body. A seen cause can either be an endeavour, or an impact, or the like. Unless there is the connection of the soul with the mind, there can be no endeavour on the part of the soul, according to the Vaiśeṣika assumption. And since before creation there is no body and therefore no mind, endeavour cannot take place. Similarly with impact etc. If the cause is Adṛṣṭa (the unseen principle), does it inhere in the soul or in the atoms? In either case, it cannot be the cause of the first motion of the atoms; for this Adṛṣṭa is non-intelligent and so cannot act by itself. If it is inherent in the soul, the soul being then inert, there is no intelligence to guide this Adṛṣṭa. If it is inherent in the atoms, it being always present, a state of dissolution would be impossible, for the atoms will be always active. Again, the soul is without parts like the atoms, and so there is no possibility of any connection between the soul and the atoms. Consequently, if the Adṛṣṭa inheres in the soul, it cannot influence the motion of the atoms not connected with the soul. So in all cases original activity in the atoms is not possible, and in the absence of that there can be no combination of atoms, as the Vaiśeṣikas say. Consequently, the theory that the world is created by the combination of atoms is untenable.

समवायाभ्युपगमाच्च साम्यादनवस्थितेः ॥ १३ ॥

समवाय-अभ्युपगमात् Samavâya being admitted च also साम्यात् equality of reasoning अनवस्थितेः *regressus in infinitum* would result.

13. (The Vaiśeṣika theory is untenable) also (because it involves) a *regressus in infinitum* on similar reasoning, since it accepts Samavâya.

Samavâya or inseparable inherence is one of the seven categories of the Vaiśeṣikas. They say it is this that connects the dyad with its constituents, the two atoms, since the dyad and the atoms are of different qualities. In that case Samavâya (inherence) itself also being different from these dyads and atoms, which it connects, another Samavâya will be required to connect it with these, and that in its turn will require another Samavâya to connect it with the first Samavâya and so on without an end. Hence the argument would be defective, and consequently the atomic doctrine, which admits Samavâya for combination, is inadmissible.

नित्यमेव च भावात् ॥ १४ ॥

नित्यम् एव Permanently च and भावात् because existing.

14. And because of the permanent existence (of the tendency to act or otherwise of the atoms, the atomic theory is inadmissible).

The atomic theory involves another difficulty. If the atoms are by nature active, then creation would be permanent, for dissolution would mean a change in the nature of the atoms, which is impossible. If on the other hand, they are by nature inactive, then dissolution would be permanent, and there will be no creation for the same reason. Their nature cannot be both activity and inactivity, they being contradictory. If they are neither, their activity and inactivity would depend on an efficient cause, like Adṛṣṭa, which being always connected with the atoms, they will always be active, and creation would be permanent. If on the other hand, there is no efficient cause, there will be no activity of the atoms and hence no creation. Consequently the atomic theory is again inadmissible.

रूपादिमत्त्वाच्च विपर्ययो, दर्शनात् ॥ १५ ॥

रूपादिमत्त्वात् On account of possessing colour etc. च and विपर्ययः the opposite दर्शनात् because it is seen.

15. And on account of (the atoms) possessing colour etc., the opposite (of what the Vaiśeṣikas hold would be true), because it is seen.

The atoms are said to have colour etc., for otherwise the effects will not possess these qualities, since it is the qualities of the cause that are found in the effects. In that case the atoms would cease to be atomic and permanent. For whatever possesses colour etc. is found to be gross, not minute, and impermanent as compared with its cause. So the atoms also, which have colour etc., must be gross and impermanent, and this contra-