

JOHANNES BRONKHORST

God's arrival in the Vaiśeṣika system*

(*Journal of Indian Philosophy* 24(3), 1996, 281-294)

God is not mentioned in the surviving versions of the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra.¹ He is mentioned in Praśastapāda's Padārthadharmasaṅgraha, in a passage which is very similar to a sūtra. The sūtra concerned occurs only in the version commented upon by Śāṅkara Miśra; there it is VS 1.1.4, and reads:

*dharmaviśeṣaprasūtād dravyaguṇakarmasāmānyaviśeṣasamavāyānām
padārthānām sādharmyavaidharmyābhyām tattvajñānān niḥśreyasam/*

The similar passage in the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha reads (Ki p. 4; Ny p. 23-26; Vy I p. 14-15; WI p. 1):

*dravyaguṇakarmasāmānyaviśeṣasamavāyānām śaṅṅām² padārthānām
sādharmyavaidharmyatattvajñānam³ niḥśreyasahetuḥ/ tac
ceśvaracodanābhivyaktā⁴ dharmād eva/*

Clearly the expression 'special dharma' (*dharmaviśeṣa*) in the sūtra corresponds to 'dharma manifested by God's injunctions' (*īśvaracodanābhivyakta dharma*) in the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha. What is more, the latter looks very much like a special interpretation of the former.⁵

However this may be, it seems safe to assume that God did not always play a role in the Vaiśeṣika system of philosophy. In other words, he must have found his way into it at some time or other, at the latest at the time of Praśastapāda. The author of the Yuktidīpikā claims that the belief in God as cause of the world among the followers of Kaṇāda, i.e. among the Vaiśeṣikas, was invented by the Pāśupatas / a Pāśupata.⁶ The fact that the memory of God's arrival in Vaiśeṣika was still alive in the days of the Yuktidīpikā confirms our impression of its relatively late date.

* I thank George Chemparathy for having made copies of his articles available to me.

¹ See Chemparathy, 1967. Already the Yuktidīpikā (p. 73 l. 6-7) observes about the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra: *śāstrapradeśe cāyam īśvaro na kasmimścid apy ācāryeṇa saṃkīrtitaḥ* "In no passage of (your) Śāstram is this Īśvara spoken of by the Ācārya" (tr. Chemparathy, 1965: 146).

² Some editions omit *śaṅṅām*.

³ Some editions read *sādharmyavaidharmyābhyām tattvajñānām*.

⁴ Some editions read °*nodanā*° for °*codanā*°.

⁵ Some authors (Bodas, 1918: xxxvii f.; Narain, 1976: 119 f.; Frauwallner, 1984: 35 f.) take the opposite position, according to which the sūtra would be later than Praśastapāda.

⁶ YD p. 73 l. 8-9: *kāṇādānām īśvaro 'stīti pāśupatopajñam etat*. Cp. Chemparathy, 1965.

God figures most prominently in the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha in its account of the destruction and subsequent renewal of the world (Ki p. 60-64; Ny p. 134-139; Vy I p. 95-96; WI p. 9-11). This account begins with the statement that the mode of creation and destruction of the four gross elements will be described (*ihedānīm⁷ caturnām* [282] *mahābhūtānām sṛṣṭisamhāraavidhir ucyate*). Their destruction takes place in the order: earth, water, fire, wind. The contacts between the atoms that constitute the gross elements come to an end, so that only isolated atoms remain. This process is triggered by the fact that the 'unseens' (*adrṣṭa*) — i.e. dharmas and adharmas — that reside in the souls and are responsible for the existence of bodies, sense organs, and gross (i.e., composite) elements, cease to function. This itself is simultaneous with God's desire to destroy the world (*maheśvarasya sañjihīrṣāsamakālam*).⁸ The subsequent renewal of the gross elements takes place in the order: wind, water, earth, fire. Here contacts are again established between the isolated atoms. This process is triggered by the 'unseens' residing in the souls; these 'unseens' have come into action again. This renewed action of the 'unseens' is itself preceded by God's desire to create (*maheśvarasisṛkṣānantaram*).⁹ The further development of the process of creation takes clearly mythological overtones, which we will consider below.

Here it is important to observe that the account so far considered is not symmetrical. The order in which the gross elements come into existence should be expected to be the exact reverse of the order of their destruction. Since they are destroyed in the order earth, water, fire, wind, their recreation should take the order wind, fire, water, earth. But according to the account in the Padhārthadharmasaṅgraha the order of creation is wind, water, earth, fire. Moreover, the bodies and sense organs which are mentioned in connection with the destruction of the world, do not recur in the description of creation.

With this in mind it is interesting to see that Śāṅkara's Brahmasūtrabhāṣya (on sūtra 2.2.12) refers to a Vaiśeṣika position concerning the creation of the world which is closely similar to the above one, but which does not refer to God. The passage concerned reads:¹⁰ "Then, at the time of creation, a movement dependent on the unseen

⁷ Some editions omit *ihedānīm*.

⁸ WI p. 9 l. 12 - p. 10 l. 2: ... *maheśvarasya sañjihīrṣāsamakālam śarīrendriyamahābhūtopanibandhkānām* (one edition omits °mahā°) *sarvātmagatānām adrṣṭānām* (some editions read *sarvātmagatādrṣṭānām*) *vṛttinirodhe sati maheśvareccchātmānusamyogajakarmabhyah śarīrendriyakāraṇāṇuvibhāgebhyas* (one edition reads °vibhāgas tebhyas) *tatsamyoganivṛtau teṣām āparamānvanto vināśah/ tathā pṛthivyudakajvalanapavanānām api mahābhūtānām anenaiva krameṇottarasaminn uttarasmin* (some editions read *uttarasmiṃś ca*) *sati pūrvasya pūrvasya* (some editions read *pūrvapūrvasya*) *vināśah/ ...*

⁹ Some editions read *maheśvarasya sisṛkṣānantaram* or *parameśvarasya sisṛkṣānantaram*.

¹⁰ Shastri, 1980: 435: *tataḥ sargakāle ca vāyaviyeṣv aṇuṣv adrṣṭāpekṣam karmotpadyate/ tat karma svāśrayam aṇum anvantareṇa samyunakti/ tato dvyāṇukādikrameṇa vāyur utpadyate/ evam agnir evam āpa evam pṛthivī/ evam eva śarīram śendriyam iti*. On sūtra 2.2.11 (Shastri, 1980: 431), too, Śāṅkara describes the role of the unseen (or unseens): *te ca* (i.e. *paramānavah*) *paścād adrṣṭādīpuraḥsarāḥ samyogasacivāś ca santo dvyāṇukādikrameṇa kṛtsnam kāryajātam ārabhante*. Cp. Chemparathy, 1967: 113 f.

/ unseens (*adr̥ṣṭa*) arises in the atoms of wind. That movement connects the atom in which it resides with another atom. Then, in the order of the dyad (*dvyaṅuka*) etc., wind comes into being. In the same way fire, water, and earth." Śāṅkara ascribes this position explicitly to the followers of Kaṇāda (*kāṇāda*), i.e., to the Vaiśeṣikas, and criticizes it for not including a conscious initial instigator, responsible for the first movement which sets the process going. This means that Śāṅkara did not base his account on Praśastapāda's Padārthadharmasaṅgraha, which mentions Maheśvara, but on a similar account which did not mention God.

[283]

If we compare Śāṅkara's passage more closely with the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha, we find that the account of creation which Śāṅkara ascribes to the Vaiśeṣikas is, in certain details, closer to Praśastapāda's account of destruction than to his account of creation. For one thing, the order in which the elements are created in Śāṅkara's account differs from that of Praśastapāda; it is however the exact reverse of the order in which the elements are destroyed according to Praśastapāda. Then there is the fact that Śāṅkara's account includes bodies and sense organs, and is therefore, once again, closer to Praśastapāda's account of destruction.

It seems likely, in view of the above, that Śāṅkara used, for the account of destruction and creation which he ascribes to the Vaiśeṣikas, the same Vaiśeṣika text which was also Praśastapāda's source. But whereas Śāṅkara remained faithful to this source, with the intention of criticizing the views expressed in it, Praśastapāda maintained only the account of destruction, adjusting it to some extent by introducing God into it. With regard to the account of creation, Praśastapāda deviates more from his source, and borrows extensively from one or more other, rather more mythological, sources (see below). Praśastapāda's main Vaiśeṣika source, apart from the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra, appears to have been a now lost commentary on the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra named Kaṇandī, written, as it seems, by someone called Rāvaṇa. Praśastapāda himself wrote a Ṭīkā on this text, which, too, is now lost.¹¹ It would seem, then, that Śāṅkara had access to, and used, Rāvaṇa's Kaṇandī. This is confirmed by the commentator Govindānanda who cites the claim of an earlier commentary called Prakāṭārtha to the extent that the position ascribed by Śāṅkara to the Vaiśeṣikas is found in Rāvaṇa's Bhāṣya.¹² We can conclude that the Kaṇandī did not yet refer to God in its account of the destruction and creation of the world.

Śāṅkara refers again to a Vaiśeṣika doctrine under sūtra 2.2.17, in a passage which criticizes the relation of inherence (*samavāya*) that presumable exists between a

¹¹ Bronkhorst, 1993.

¹² Govindānanda's Ratnaprabhā on Śāṅkara on BS 2.2.11 (Shastri, 1980: 431): *prakaṭārthakārās tu yad dvābhyām dvyaṅukābhyām ārabdham kārye mahattvam dr̥śyate tasya hetuḥ pracayo nāma praśītilāvayavasāmyoga iti rāvaṇapraṇīte bhāṣye dr̥śyata iti cirantanavaiśeṣikadr̥ṣṭyedam bhāṣyam ity āhuḥ.*

material cause and its effect.¹³ Inherence is defined as the connection between things that are not established separately (*[a]yutasiddhayo[ḥ sambandhaḥ] samavāyah*). Śāṅkara first points out that a material cause can very well exist without its effect, so that that this definition is to be interpreted in the sense that only one of the two — the effect — cannot exist separate from the other. Since the effect cannot have a connection with the cause before it has been established — i.e., before it has come into being — it is suggested that, once established (*siddham bhūtvā*), it is connected with the cause. This, however, would lead to the consequence that the effect is established [284] before there is a connection with its cause. This in its turn would be in conflict with the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra (*yutasiddhyabhāvāt kāryakāraṇayoḥ saṃyogavibhāgau na vidyete*; no. 7.2.14 in the edition of Jambuvijaya) which states that effect and cause do not have contact or separation, because they are not established separately.

This passage is of particular interest in the present context, because some of the surviving fragments of the lost Kaṇḍī deal with precisely this problem. However, the Kaṇḍī does not represent the position according to which an effect is first established and subsequently connected with its cause. On the contrary, these two events are there stated to take place simultaneously.¹⁴ Praśastapāda's commentary on this passage, on the other hand, reinterprets it in such a way that the effect first establishes itself, then to be connected with its causes and with existence.¹⁵ Mallavādin, to whom we owe these fragments, emphasizes the opposition between the Kaṇḍī and Praśastapāda's commentary thereon once again in the following condensed statement:¹⁶ "It is the opinion of the Vākyakāra, who is followed therein by the Bhāṣyakāra, that [the connection with the causes and with existence take place] at the moment in which the thing comes into being itself. The opinion of Praśastamati (= Praśastapāda) is that the thing, once it is established (*siddha*), is connected with its causes and with its

¹³ Shastri, 1980: 445-46: *yutasiddhayoḥ sambandhaḥ saṃyogo 'yutasiddhayos tu samavāyah ity ayam abhyupagamo mṛṣaiva teṣām, prāk siddhasya kāryāt kāraṇasyāyutasiddhatvānupapattē/ athānyatarāpekṣa evāyam abhyupagamah syād ayutasiddhasya kāryasya kāraṇena sambandhaḥ samavāya iti, evam api prāg asiddhasyālabdhātmakasya kāryasya kāraṇena sambandho nopapadyate dvayāyattatvāt sambandhasya/ siddham bhūtvā sambadhyata iti cet, prāk kāraṇasambandhāt kāryasya siddhāv abhyupagamamānāyām *yutasiddhyabhāvāt kāryakāraṇayoḥ saṃyogavibhāgau na vidyete itīdam uktaṃ duruktaṃ syāt/*

*Several editions read *ayutasiddhyabhāvāt*. This is not likely to be right. Not only is it difficult to make sense of this reading; all known versions of the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra concerned have *yutasiddhyabhāvāt*.

¹⁴ The following passage from the Kaṇḍī has been preserved in Mallavādin's Dvādaśāranayacakra, itself reconstructed by Jambuvijaya (1976: 508-09) (cf. Halbfass, 1992: 179 f.; Bronkhorst, 1993: 145): *niṣṭhāsambandhayor ekakālatvāt/ niṣṭhā kāraṇasāmagryavyāpārakālah prāg asato vastubhāvah niṣṭhānam samāptih .../ sambandhaḥ svakāraṇasattāsamavāyah/ tayor ekakālatvam, svakāraṇasattāsambandha eva niṣṭhākālah, kutaḥ? samavāyasyaikatvāt, yasminn eva kāle pariniṣṭhām gacchat kāryam kāraṇaiḥ sambadhyate samavāyasambandhena ayutasiddhihetunā tasminn eva kāle sattādibhir api ...*

¹⁵ It is again Mallavādin who has quoted this passage from Praśastapāda's Tikā, observing that Praśastapāda explains the passage from the Kaṇḍī (Mallavādin speaks of *vākya* and *bhāṣya*) differently; cf. Jambuvijaya, 1976: 512-13; Bronkhorst, 1993: 145-46: *sambandhaś ca sambandhaś ca sambandhau, niṣṭhāvāḥ sambandhau niṣṭhāsambandhau, tayor ekakālatvāt/ niṣṭhitam niṣṭhā, kārakaparispandād vastubhāvam āpannam avyapadeśyādharām kāryam niṣṭhitam niṣṭhā ity ucyate, tasya svakāraṇaiḥ sattayā ca yugapat sambandhau bhavataḥ/ bhāṣyam api pariniṣṭhām gacchad gatam ity etam artham darśayati, vartamānasāmīpye vartamānavad vā (Pāṇini 3.3.131) iti/*

¹⁶ Jambuvijaya, 1976: 516-17; Bronkhorst, 1993: 147: *vastūtpattikāle eva iti tu vākyakārābhiprāyo 'nusrto bhāṣyakārāiḥ/ siddhasya vastunah svakāraṇaiḥ svasattayā ca sambandha iti prāśastamato 'bhiprāyah/*

existence." Since the Kaṇḍī appears to have consisted of *vākyas* and *bhāṣyas*, the Vākyakāra and the Bhāṣyakāra are the author(s) of the Kaṇḍī.¹⁷

It seems clear that Śāṅkara does not here follow the Kaṇḍī directly, but rather the Kaṇḍī as interpreted by Praśastapāda. Assuming that Mallavādin's account of the difference between Praśastapāda's Ṭikā and the text on which it commented is reliable, we have to conclude that Śāṅkara was acquainted with Praśastapāda's Ṭikā. If this is the case, how then do we explain that Śāṅkara attributes to the Vaiśeṣikas the position according to which God played no role in the creation of the world? Doesn't it seem reasonable to think that Praśastapāda, whose Padārthadharmasaṅgraha acknowledges God's role in creation, had referred to God's role in creation in his Ṭikā as well?

Here one might be tempted to conjecture that Praśastapāda in his Ṭikā kept certain ideas to himself, which he only expressed in his independent work, the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha. The Ṭikā being, according to this line of reasoning, just a commentary, it might not have contained new or deviating ideas. This conjecture, however, has *a priori* little to recommend itself. Indian commentators have always shown remarkable skill in reading new ideas into their basic texts. And we have just seen that Praśastapāda, too, did not hesitate to reinterpret the text on which [285] he commented. His reinterpretation of the phrase *niṣṭhāsambandhayor ekakālatvāt* was such that other Indian scholars of that time, such as Mallavādin, felt called upon to point out the difference between the commentary and the basic text. It therefore seems unlikely that Praśastapāda had not mentioned God's role in the creation of the world in his Ṭikā.

This conclusion is supported in another way as well. A number of fragments dealing with God are attributed to Praśastapāda in Kamalaśīla's Tattvasaṅgrahapañjikā. These fragments probably derive from Praśastapāda's lost Ṭikā. They have been studied by George Chemparathy (1969), who has argued that Praśastapāda in his Ṭikā "not only considered the Īśvara as the creator of the universe, but that he even brought forward formal proofs — at least one — to establish it" (p. 70).¹⁸ Another proof for the existence of God is based on his activity of teaching language to men at the beginning of creation.

What, then, should we conclude from Śāṅkara's discussion of Vaiśeṣika doctrines? The most plausible conclusion would seem to be that Śāṅkara was acquainted with both Praśastapāda's Ṭikā and with the text on which it commented, most probably the Kaṇḍī. He may not have known Praśastapāda's Padārthadharmasaṅgraha. However, in his discussion of Vaiśeṣika doctrines Śāṅkara was apparently somewhat eclectic. That is to say, he singled out for discussion the

¹⁷ See Bronkhorst, 1993: 147 f. for reasons to think that Vākyakāra and Bhāṣyakāra were one and the same person.

¹⁸ At least one fragment of Praśastapāda preserved in the Tattvasaṅgrahapañjikā deals with the proof of God's omniscience; see Chemparathy, 1969a.

passages that lent themselves most easily to his criticism. In practice this meant that he criticized Praśastapāda where the latter's position seemed to him particularly vulnerable, but he criticized the Kaṇḍī where that text presented a doubtful point of view. The Kaṇḍī's godlessness was criticized, even though Praśastapāda rejected it; and Praśastapāda's ideas about the link between an effect and its causes were singled out for attack, even though the position of the Kaṇḍī was not susceptible to this particular criticism.

This conclusion is supported by some other passages in Śaṅkara's Brahmasūtrabhāṣya, which refer to *some* Vaiśeṣikas, who do consider God the efficient cause of the world. Under sūtra 2.2.37 he states:¹⁹ "In the same way some Vaiśeṣikas etc., with some difficulty, following their own manner, explain that Īśvara is the efficient cause [of the universe]." It is hard not to recognize in these "some Vaiśeṣikas" Praśastapāda, the author of the Ṭīkā on the Kaṇḍī.

What does the preceding discussion teach us about God's arrival in the Vaiśeṣika system? It appears that Praśastapāda did not yet find God in the account of creation in the text which he commented upon, the Kaṇḍī. This does not necessarily mean that Praśastapāda was the first [286] Vaiśeṣika to attribute this function (and the function of name-giving) to God, but this possibility can certainly not be discarded. It seems in any case likely that among the major authors of Vaiśeṣika he may have been the first to reserve an important place for God.

Let us now consider the continuation of the account of creation presented in the Padārthadharmaśāstra. It is here described how, on the basis of the four gross elements, the world comes into being. The passage concerned reads (Ki p. 64; Ny p. 139; Vy I p. 96; WI p. 11):

*evam samutpanneṣu caturṣu mahābhūteṣu maheśvarasyābhidhānamātrāt
tājasebhyo 'ṇubhyāḥ pāṛthivaparamāṇusahitebhyo²⁰ mahad aṇḍam ārabhyate²¹/
tasmimś caturvadanakamalaṃ sarvalokapitāmahaṃ²² brahmāṇam
sakalābhuvanasahitam utpādyā prajāśarge viniyunkte²³ / sa cā maheśvareṇa
viniyukto²⁴ brahmā 'tisāyajñānavairāgyaiśvaryasampannaḥ prāṇināṇ²⁵
karmavipākaṃ viditvā karmānurūpajñānabhogāyusaḥ sutān prajāpatīn mānasān*

¹⁹ Shastri, 1980: 488: *tathā vaiśeṣikādayo 'pi kecit kathañcit svaprakriyānusāreṇa nimittakāraṇam īśvara itī varṇayanti* (tr. Chemparathy, 1967: 115)

²⁰ Variants: *pāṛthivādiparamāṇusahitebhyo*, *pāṛthivāṇusahitebhyo*.

²¹ Some editions read *utpadyate*.

²² Variant: *caturvadanakamalasakalalokapitāmahaṃ*.

²³ Variant: *niyunkte*.

²⁴ Variant: *niyukto*.

²⁵ Variant: *sarvaprāṇināṇ*.

*manudevarsipitṛgaṇān*²⁶ *mukhabāhūrupādātāś caturo varṇān anyāni coccāvacāni bhūtāni*²⁷ *sṛṣtvā, āśayānurūpair dharmajñānavairāgyaiśvaryaīḥ saṃyojayatīti/* "When in this way the four composite elements have come into existence, a great egg (*mahad aṇḍam*) is formed, caused solely by God's (*maheśvara*) meditation/ volition (*abhidhyāna*), out of atoms of fire with an admixture of atoms of earth.²⁸ In it [God] creates Brahmā, with four faces like so many lotuses, the grandfather of all worlds (*sarvalokapitāmahaṃ brahmāṇam*), and all worlds; he then enjoins him with the duty of creating living things. That Brahmā, thus enjoined by God, and endowed with abundant knowledge, complete absence of passion and absolute power, knows the effects of the deeds of living beings; he creates the Prajāpatis, his mind-created (*mānasa*) sons, with knowledge, experience and span of life in accordance with their [past] deeds; [he also creates] the Manus, Devas, Ṛṣis and groups of Pitṛs (*pitṛgaṇa*), the four *varṇas* out of his mouth, arms, thighs and feet (*mukhabāhūrupādātāḥ*) [respectively], and the other living beings, high and low (*uccāvacāni bhūtāni*); he then connects them with Dharma, knowledge, absence of passion and power in accordance with their residue of past deeds."

[287]

This passage is far more 'mythological' in character than the ones that precede it. It is also to a far lesser extent determined by Vaiśeṣika doctrines.²⁹ Similar accounts of creation are found elsewhere, and we will consider some of these.

First of all there is the *Manu Smṛti*, or *Mānava Dharmaśāstra*. It contains an account of the creation of the world in the first part of its first chapter, which is very similar to that of *Praśastapāda*, even in its use of words. In the *Manu Smṛti* it is *Svayambhū* who desires to create the world (*sisṛkṣu*; 1.6, 8), and does so through meditation / volition (*abhidhyāna*; 1.8). As a result a golden egg (*aṇḍam hainam*; 1.9) comes into existence. In this egg Brahmā is born, the grandfather of all worlds (*brahmā sarvalokapitāmahaḥ*; 1.9). In the subsequent creation the four *varṇas* are produced out of his mouth, arms, thighs and feet respectively (*mukhabāhūrupādātāḥ*; 1.31). Among the other created beings are mentioned the Prajāpatis and Great Ṛṣis (*patīn prajānām, maharṣīn*; 1.34, 36), the Manus and Devas (1.36), and the groups of Pitṛs (*pitṛṇām ... gaṇān*; 1.37).

The similarities between these two accounts of creation are great, greater than might be explained by coincidence. But before we conclude anything from these similarities, it will be necessary to draw some other texts into the picture. A similar account is found in the following Purāṇas: *Agni Purāṇa* 17.6-16; *Brahma Purāṇa* 1.37-56; *Harivaṃśa* 1.23-40; *Śiva Purāṇa*, *Dharma Saṃhitā* 51.3-28. These purāṇic accounts

²⁶ Variant: *manūn deva*°.

²⁷ Variants: *bhūtāni ca, anyāni coccāvacāni ca sṛṣtvā*.

²⁸ Atoms of fire with an admixture of atoms of earth constitute, in Vaiśeṣika, gold.

²⁹ Chemparathy (1972: 146) speaks of "Praśastapāda who ... had tried to accommodate and assimilate mythological accounts of cosmogony with the philosophical speculation of his school". Similarly Chemparathy, 1969: 73

are so similar to each other, that they can be looked upon as versions of one text. Indeed, we may safely assume that they all go back to one archetype.³⁰

The purāṇic account is in some respects less similar to Praśastapāda's account than the Manu Smṛti. It does not mention the creator's use of (*abhi-*)*dhyāna*. It does not distinguish Brahmā from Svayambhū. It does not use the expressions *mukhabāhūrupādahaḥ* and *brahmā sarvalokapitāmahaḥ*. And it does not mention the creation of the four castes.

In some other respects, however, the purāṇic account is closer to Praśastapāda. It mentions the *uccāvacāni bhūtāni* and the *mānasas*. It does not raise Manu above the Prajāpatis as does the Manu Smṛti, which thus introduces an extra step between Brahmā and the Prajāpatis.

In this connection a further observation is to be made. The purāṇic account contains the following words:³¹

hiranyagarbho bhagavān uṣitvā parivatsaram/ tad aṇḍam akarot dvaidham ...
[288]

It introduces here the name Hiraṇyagarbha to refer to the creator god. The Manu Smṛti has a parallel verse (1.12), which does not however contain the name Hiraṇyagarbha:

tasminn aṇḍe sa bhagavān uṣitvā parivatsaram/ ... tad aṇḍam akarot dvidhā//

The presence of the name Hiraṇyagarbha in the purāṇic account, and its absence from the Manu Smṛti, is interesting for the following reason. Candrānanda,³² the author of the oldest surviving commentary on the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra, introduces Hiraṇyagarbha for no obvious reason in his comments on VS 1.1.3. This sūtra might be translated as "Sacred tradition (*āmnāya*) is authoritative, because it has been uttered by him" (*tadvacanād āmnāyaprāmāṇyam*).³³ Candrānanda comments: "The word 'him' refers to Hiraṇyagarbha. Lord Maheśvara is called thus, because 'his seed (*retas = garbha*) is golden (*hiranya*)'" (*tad iti hiraṇyagarbhaparāmarśaḥ/ hiraṇyaṃ reto 'syeti kṛtvā bhagavān maheśvara evocyate*). Harunaga Isaacson, who has studied (and reedited) this commentary in his recent unpublished doctoral dissertation (University of Leiden), makes the following remark: "This interpretation of the *tat* in the sūtra's *tadvacanāt* raises some interesting questions That Candrānanda should take it as referring to

³⁰ Kirfel, 1927: 2 f. A comparative study of this text and the beginning of the Manu Smṛti has been carried out by P. Hacker (1963).

³¹ Kirfel, 1927: 3. Only the Brahma Purāṇa has *hiranyavarṇa* instead of *hiranyagarbha*.

³² For Candrānanda's views on God, see Chemparathy, 1970.

³³ Cp. Nozawa, 1993: 98.

God, and that God for him should be Maheśvara, i.e. Śiva, is not surprising, but what lies behind the introduction of Hiraṇyagarbha — why doesn't Candrānanda simply say that *tat* refers to God?" Isaacson wonders whether Candrānanda was acquainted with some explanation of the sūtra which we no longer have access to; alternatively, Candrānanda may have accepted a tradition according to which Hiraṇyagarbha is the author of the Vedas. Isaacson's alternative solution would agree very well with the purāṇic account of creation, which indeed mentions the *ṛces*, *yajuses* and *sāmans* among the things created by the creator god.³⁴ Add to this that Candrānanda's commentary shows many signs of having been profoundly influenced by Praśastapāda's Padārthadharmasaṅgraha, and the temptation is great to conclude that Candrānanda was still acquainted with the text which Praśastapāda had used while writing his section on creation. This text, like the purāṇic account with which we are acquainted, may then have used the name Hiraṇyagarbha as a designation of the creator god.

Caution is however required here. It is equally possible that Candrānanda was acquainted, not with the text which Praśastapāda had used, but rather with one or more of the purāṇic accounts which we considered above. In these accounts Hiraṇyagarbha does not create Brahmā, he is rather born himself as Brahmā Svayambhū. Candrānanda [289] does not tell us what position he attributes to Brahmā in the process of creation: was Brahmā created by, or rather identical with the highest God?

In this connection it is interesting to consider Udayana's comments on the passage on creation in the Padārthadharmasaṅgraha. Where Praśastapāda speaks of the time when the present Brahmā reaches liberation,³⁵ Udayana cites a scriptural passage (*āgama*) to the extent that the Yatis who have performed activities for which they did not desire results and whose minds are pervaded by the service of (God) who has taken on a form (?), will be liberated after having reached the place of Hiraṇyagarbha.³⁶ This quotation does not explicitly mention Brahmā, which suggests that Udayana was no longer acquainted with a tradition in which Hiraṇyagarbha was different from, and hierarchically higher than Brahmā. What is more, the immediately following line of Udayana's commentary speaks of the point of view (*pakṣa*) according to which God (*īśvara*) himself assumes a body and takes the place of Brahmā etc.,³⁷ exactly as do the purāṇic passages considered above. It would seem, therefore, that Udayana had no longer access to the text or texts that Praśastapāda had based his account of the creation on.

³⁴ Kirfel, 1927: 4.

³⁵ Ki p. 60; Ny 134; Vy I p. 95; WI 9: *vartamānasya brahmaṇo 'pavargakāle*.

³⁶ Ki p. 61 l. 17-19: *vartamānasya brahmaṇo 'pavargakāle mokṣakāle "ye hy asaṅkalpitaphalakarmakartārah sākāropāsanāparivāsitacetaso yatayo 'tas te hiraṇyagarbhāpadavīm anuprāpyāpavṛjyanta" ity āgamāt*.

³⁷ Ki p. 61 l. 19: *yadā tv īśvara eva kāryavaśād gṛhītadīvyadeho brahmādyavasthām āpadyata iti pakṣaḥ ...*; cp. p. 65 l. 10: *yadā tv īśvara eva kāryavaśād brahmādiśarīram ādatta iti pakṣas ...*; Chemparathy, 1972: 147.

However this may be, it appears that Praśastapāda (or the earlier Vaiśeṣika from whom he borrowed) drew upon an account of the creation of the world which shared a number of characteristics with the account in the beginning of the *Manu Smṛti* on the one hand, and with the purāṇic account specified above, on the other. Unless we assume that Praśastapāda used more than just one text in order to create his account, we are led to think that he was influenced by a predecessor of the *Manu Smṛti* which (still?) shared some features with the purāṇic versions, features that subsequently disappeared.

What more do we know about Praśastapāda's source? It is to be noted that Praśastapāda — unlike the accounts in the *Purāṇas* and *Manu Smṛti*, but like the commentator Candrānanda — calls the creator Maheśvara, a name often reserved for Śiva. Recall further that the *Yuktidīpikā* claims that the Pāśupatas, or a Pāśupata, invented the belief in God as cause of the world among the Vaiśeṣikas. This does not necessarily mean that Vaiśeṣika "was worked over by Pāśupatas and molded into the form Praśastapāda presents", as Potter (1977: 22) has it. It is at least as likely that Praśastapāda, or the predecessor whom he copies here, was a Pāśupata, and introduced the relatively few remarks about God into this text. Since the word *pāśupata* in the *Yuktidīpikā* is the first member of a compound, the reference may be to one single person.

[290]

Whatever the historical truth in this matter, it seems likely that the above passage from the *Padārthadharmasaṅgraha* was inspired by an older account that belonged to a Śaiva work. The same might then be true of the *Manu Smṛti* and perhaps of the archetype of the purāṇic account.

This last conjecture is somewhat problematic, for most of the texts mentioned above are not Śaivite. They do however all contain a feature which, if it is not exclusively Śaivite, belongs primarily to this god. The *Manu Smṛti* and most of the *Purāṇas* enumerated above — but not the *Padārthadharmasaṅgraha* — contain the following words:

dvidhā kṛtvātmano deham ardhena puruṣo 'bhavat/ ardhena nārī
 "He divided his own body into two and became a man with one half, a woman with the other half." (tr. Doniger and Smith, 1991: 7)

Only the Śiva *Purāṇa* has: *dvidhā kṛtvātmano dehaṃ strī caiva puruṣo 'bhavat*.

All these texts speak of an androgynous being, half man, half woman. The supreme Indian androgyne is, of course, Śiva (Doniger O'Flaherty, 1980: 310), who is known in that form from at least the second century onward (id., p. 312). It is perhaps not possible to prove that the original account of creation that influenced these versions was Śaivite; yet it may have been such that it could be thus interpreted.

[292]

References:

- Agni Purāṇa. Edited by Āchārya Baladeva Upādhyāya. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office. 1966. (Kashi Sanskrit Series, 174.)
- Bodas, Mahadev Rajaram (1918): "Introduction." In: Tarka-Saṅgraha of Annambhaṭṭa, ed. Yashawant Vasudev Athalye. second edition, revised and enlarged. Bombay. (Bombay Sanskrit Series, 55.)
- Brahma Purāṇa. Sanskrit indices and text. By Peter Schreiner and Renate Söhnen. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz. 1987. (Purāṇa Research Publications, Tübingen, vol. 1.)
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (1993): "The Vaiśeṣika vākya and bhāṣya." Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute 72-73, 1991 & 1992 [1993], 145-169.
- [293]
- Chemparathy, George (1965): "The testimony of the Yuktidīpikā concerning the Īśvara doctrine of the Pāśupatas and Vaiśeṣikas." Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens 9, 119-146.
- Chemparathy, George (1967): "Theism and early Vaiśeṣika." Kavirāja Abhinandana Grantha, ed. Bābūrāma Saksenā et al., Lucknow: Akhila Bhāratīya Saṃskṛta Paṛiṣad, pp. 109-125.
- Chemparathy, George (1969): "The Īśvara doctrine of Praśastapāda." Vishveshvaranand Indological Journal 6, 1968 [1969], 65-87.
- Chemparathy, George (1969a): "Two little-known fragments from early Vaiśeṣika literature on the omniscience of Īśvara." Adyar Library Bulletin 33, 117-134.
- Chemparathy, George (1970): "The Īśvara doctrine of the Vaiśeṣika commentator Candrānanda." Rtam 1(2), 47-52.
- Chemparathy, George (1972): An Indian Rational Theology. Introduction to Udayana's Nyāyakusumāñjali. Vienna. (Publications of the De Nobili Research Library, 1.)
- Doniger, Wendy, and Smith, Brian K. (tr.)(1991): The Laws of Manu. Penguin Books.
- Doniger O'Flaherty, Wendy (1980): Women, Androgynes, and Other Mythical Beasts. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Frauwallner, Erich (1984): Nachgelassene Werke, I: Aufsätze, Beiträge, Skizzen. Herausgegeben von Ernst Steinkellner. Wien. (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, 438. Band. Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens, Heft 19.)
- Hacker, Paul (1963): "Two accounts of cosmogony." Jñānamuktāvalī. Commemoration Volume in Honour of Johannes Nobel. Edited by Claus Vogel. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture. (Sarasvati-Vihara Series, 38). Pp. 77-91. Reprint: Kleine Schriften (Wiesbaden 1978) pp. 389-403.
- Halbfass, Wilhelm (1992): On Being and What There Is: Classical Vaiśeṣika and the history of Indian ontology. State University of New York Press.
- Harivaṃśa. Critically edited by Parashuram Lakshman Vaidya. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. 1969.
- Jambuvijaya (ed.)(1976): Dvādaśāraṃ Nayacakraṃ of Ācārya Śrī Mallavādi Kṣamāśramaṇa, with the commentary Nyāyāgamānusāriṇī of Śrī Simhasūri Gaṇi Vādi Kṣamāśramaṇa, Part II (5-8 Aras), edited with critical notes by Muni Jambūvijayajī. Bhāvnagar: Śrī Jain Ātmānand Sabhā. (Śrī Ātmānand Jain Granthamālā Serial No. 94.)
- Kirfel, Willibald (1927): Das Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa. Versuch einer Textgeschichte. Bonn: Kurt Schroeder.
- Manu Smṛti. Edited, with the commentary Manvarthamuktāvalī of Kullūka Bhaṭṭa, by J.L. Shastri. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. 1983.

- Narain, Harsh (1976): Evolution of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika Categoriology, Vol. I. Varanasi: Bharati Prakashan.
- Nozawa, Masanobu (1993): "The Vaiśeṣikasūtra with Candrānanda's commentary (1)." Numazu College of Technology Research Annual (Numazu Kōgyō Senmon Gakkō Kenkyū Hōkoku) 27, 1992 [1993], 97-116.
- Potter, Karl H. (1977): Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies, II. Indian Metaphysics and Epistemology: The tradition of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika up to Gaṅgeśa. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Praśastapāda: Praśastapādabhāṣya, alias Padārthadharmasaṅgraha. 1) Edited, with Udayana's Kiraṇāvalī, by Jitendra S. Jetly. Baroda: Oriental Institute. 1971. (Gaekwad's Oriental Series, 154.) 2) Edited under the title Nyāyakandalī, with Śrīdhara's Nyāyakandalī, by J.S. Jetly and Vasant G. Parikh. Vadodara: Oriental Institute. 1991. (Gaekwad's Oriental Series, 174.) 3) Edited, with Vyomaśiva's Vyomavatī, by Gaurinath Sastri. 2 vols. Varanasi: Sampurnanand Sanskrit Vishvavidyalaya. 1983-84. (Śivakumāraśāstri-Granthamālā, 6.) 4) Word Index to the Praśastapādabhāṣya: [294] A complete word index to the printed editions of the Praśastapādabhāṣya. By Johannes Bronkhorst and Yves Ramseier. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. 1994.
- Shastri, J.L. (1980): Brahmasūtra-Śāṅkarabhāṣyam, with the commentaries Bhāṣyaratnaprabhā of Govindānanda, Bhāmatī of Vācaspatimiśra, Nyāya-Nirṇaya of Ānandagiri. Delhi etc.: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Yuktidīpikā. Edited by Ram Chandra Pandeya. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. 1967.

Abbreviations:

- Ki Praśastapādabhāṣya, ed. Jetly
 Ny Praśastapādabhāṣya, ed. Jetly and Parikh
 Vy Praśastapādabhāṣya, ed. G. Sastri
 WI Praśastapādabhāṣya, ed. Bronkhorst and Ramseier