CHAPTER III

"THE UNIVERSE"
"THE whole history of philosophy may in a sense be regarded as the criticism of the category of Substance."¹ As far as Indian Philosophy is concerned this proposition is quite true of Nyāya-Vaiṣeṣika and Saṁkhya systems. But Vedānta, with special reference to Advaita, postulates something more. It does not only cognise that mere substance and its categories are not real but there is an underlying reality from which the external categories get evolved and nourished. "The real consists not in an unchangeable substance but in certain constant properties which persist in all becoming."² In Vedānta these 'Qualities' are nothing but the Supreme Self that constituted the existence, consciousness and bliss of all being.
This evolution of the physical world starts at the stage of Isvara who is the primary projection of appearance from the Kūtaṣṭha stage. The Avidyā which persists in all stages of evolution is called Maya at the stage of Isvara. All further projections of the Supreme Consciousness as the universe and its physical and psychical contents are caused by the Maya. The circle of non-realisation, consequent wrong realisation and realisation and so on is the domain and distinctive characteristic of Maya.3

In this connection, it is essential to draw a distinction between Avidyā, Maya and Ajñāna, these terms that are sometimes used in the same connotation in Advaita literature. It is also said that "The differentiation between Maya and Avidyā of much latter origin in the history of Advaita literature and does not find place in the works of the two great disciples of Sankara, namely Suresvara and Padapadācārya, who are credited with having enunciated and formulated two
different schools of Advaitism, known as Aḥasa Veda and Pratibimba Vada respectively and having left behind appreciable literature, which goes a great deal to supplement some of the most important links of the system. Accordingly Suresvara upholds the theory of equation between Maya ama Avidya and recognises Avidya to be one only. He criticises the view of the two fold classification of Avidya namely Agnihotra (i.e., non-conception) and Mithya-grahana (i.e., false conception) of Brahman, securing in the Brahma-siddhi.

A closer scrutiny of Suresvara's conception of Isvara will reveal that he does make a distinction between Avidya and Maya. Isvara is omniscient, omnipotent, inner soul of all, all pervasive, stable and source of creation, stability and destruction of the world. This Isvara is impersonal God too. He is the Brahman that is the source of all further creation (Param Brahman). This feature of causal Brahman extends till the projection of the personal soul. As well as the Jiva, his
further projection, are the witness of all but the difference between these two is that Isvara is in the next of delusion (Moha) eventhough not entangled therein and Jiva in that of its effects. How is this Isvara projected at all? Suresvara says that, the Supreme consciousness in the form of Kutastha gets projected through the primordial Avidya. This primary projection is called Isvara.

The Primordial Avidya that is already there due to absence of discrimination is the source of all further creations till the farthest limits of intellect when the projections of cidabhasa stop. This Avidya with the projection of the Supreme Consciousness through it, i.e., Kutastha, is called the causal Brahman or Isvara. This Avidya after the projection of the Kutastha is no more Anicarita Samsiddha which it was in the primordial stage. The Kutastha Avidya, if we may call it so, has become Anivacanīya and lower down resulting in even the Isvara Avidya or Maya imbibing "qualities" like Satva, Rajah and Tamas.
KEEPING this distinction and gradation in the modification of Avidyā, in view, Suresvara says "The single universal soul deludes the whole world and becomes one and many". He expressly used the word Maya in this context and the illustration given here is a pot becoming colourful by the proximity of gems of different colours. This indicates that the Maya, conceived in this context, is also capable of emanating different "qualities". Yet at another place Suresvara indicates that the projection of the whole Universe beginning from the first created being (Sūtrātma) to the last (physical body) is due to the predominance of qualities. Hence it is to be clarified that in the stage of Isvara too the Supreme consciousness has its predominence over the Avidyā and hence he is the Sākṣi and Antarāmāmin of the further projection. The Avidyā here is termed as Svābhāsa Avidyā—Avidyā with the reflection of Supreme Consciousness in it.
SUREŚVARA makes use of three different connotations of आदित्यो Avidyā in connection with the three different main stages of psychical creation. With regards to the pre-Iśvara stage, he uses the term Avidyā only and even here the primordial Avidyā that co-exists with the Kūṭastha Supreme consciousness is 'Avicārita Siddha.' And the same from the Iśvara stage has become Anirvacanīya. In this stage, the term Maya or Moha is used and in the Jīva stage the word is Atmavidyā. He also uses the terms Avidyā, Ajnāna and Tamas common to all stages as they are cause and effect in their order in the process of gemination of illusion.

IN Brahmasiddhi, Nandanasīra postulates two kinds of Avidyā specifically and also utilises this distinction in explaining the purpose of meditation in his scheme of attainment of the final liberation and realisation of Brahman and considers meditation necessary for completely removing the second variety of (Kārya) neiscence and for converting indirect knowledge
of Brahman (Parokṣa Jñāna) into the direct Brahman realisation (Aparokṣa-Brahma-Sākṣātkarana). Hence Mundana has to accept the 'two types in support of his Bhāvādvaita theory. Suresvara contradicts this proposition because of his difference in this fundamental namely he accepts the theory of monism. As there is no fundamental difference in the nature and object of various gradations of it, Avidyā must be essentially the same inspite of its outward variations depending upon its functions and those of the Ābhāsas circumscribed by it.

IT has been explained above that Suresvara proposes a number of graduations in Avidyā the former being the cause and the latter effect. He never denies the need for such gradations because otherwise the very possibility such of creation and illusory appearances through it does not occur. He also says that in case of the false and doubtful knowledge the Ajñāna or non-realisation is the underlying principles and source. These gradations shall not be
considered as consisting in different entities.\textsuperscript{30}

AT the stage of Maya starts the differentiation of psychical and physical universes. The Isvara knows his own Mayā because of the projection of the consciousness in it and this knowledge is the beginning of the further creation of the universe. Before\textsuperscript{31} he gets this knowledge, which is external, Isvara has an undifferentiated comprehensive knowledge of his own power which makes him competent to project himself further. This further projection is of two channels. The physical world is predominant in Avidyā and psychical in the consciousness.\textsuperscript{32} In such a creation, the intellectual impressions, and past actions of the to-be-born and the ignorance, the final effect of Avidyā as a delimiting factor, the personal sin—all these factors have a role.\textsuperscript{33}

IN Advaita literature, there are many and diverse opinions in the matter of causality of the Universe. An effect shall have a source or material cause
and an agent or an instrumental cause. Suresvara propounds his own interpretation of his preceptor's conception in this matter of causality. According to him, the Supreme consciousness is both the agent and instrumental cause. However, he clarifies at the same time that both these types of causalities are attributed to the Supreme consciousness due to the intrinsic Avidyā that is ever present in it. There is however this difference.\textsuperscript{34} In the matter of being an agent, the Supreme consciousness itself has the predominance over Avidyā and the stage of Īśvara in the process of evolution is the be all and end all. When the Brahman is considered as the material cause of the Universe, it is the Avidyā in form of Ajñāna that predominates and causes the effectuation.\textsuperscript{35} In other words in 'Agent' it is the Jñāna that predominates and in the material cause it is the Kriyā. As it has been already stated, it is at the stage of Īśvara that this duality starts and the starting point is technically termed as "Sūtratma"\textsuperscript{36}
BUT the off quoted verse of Suresvara, in support of his so-called view that Ajñāna or Avidyā is the material cause, reads "Brahma-ās said to be the source of this whole illusory duality since it resorts to the Ajnana which is its material cause." But this verse can also be interpreted another way. "Ajñāna is said to be the source of this whole illusory duality since it resorts to Brahman, the material cause." Perhaps this latter interpretation is more correct, because, and whole Advaita Ontology and epistemology accepts that it is the Ajnana that rests itself on the Supreme consciousness and not the other way. The subject of "Having resorted" (Upāsritya) hence can only be Ajnana and not Brahman. A closer examination of Ānandagiri's commentary also on this verse reveals that this interpretation is correct. After mentioning the traditional view that Ajnana is the material cause, as a way of indirect refutation of the same, the commentator says that truly without resorting to Ajñāna Brahman cannot "modify" itself and even the tradition
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Suresvara's Contribution to Advaita does not deny such a causality (i.e., by way of modification) to the Brahman.

An examination of Suresvara's interpretation of "Pravesa Sruties" in both Brhadāraṇya and Taittirīya Upaniṣads and other relevant passages confirm this view of his.39

In support of such a conclusion, a verse from Manusāmruti to the effect that the supreme consciousness generated itself into the world is quoted by Suresvara.40

The basic unity of cause and effect, accepted by Advaita as well as Sānkhya school of philosophy also supports this view of Brahman being the material cause of the world. Suresvara holds that cause becomes effect without loosing its intrinsic nature and only the activity of becoming intervenes in this process. The latter is the experienced and fruitful result of the former.41
without the intervention of the activity in between there is no difference between the cause and effect as the latter does not arise at all and the former only continues to be. In the reverse order too, when the effect ceases to exist, there shall be a positive activity of destruction and the resultant aspect of this activity is the cause itself. As such the Avidyā through which the causality of Brahman is determined and the effect namely and Universe is projected, play the role of 'vyāñjaka' only, a manifestor. In the downward process of creation Avidyā projects only the illusory manifestations and is the upward process it acts as 'Pramāṇa', right cognition, and ceases to operate when the cause is displayed.

ALL the Advaitins hold that the aspects of existence, cognition and pleasure in the mundane world really belong to Prahma whose illusory manifestation Sureśvara does concur with this view and his theory of material causality of Brahman is perhaps the most feasible proposition that reflects the above view.
He says that even the nature of Miśra (let alone the earlier and primary stage) does not lose his nature even though he is the agent as well as material cause of the world. He becomes the material cause because of his own projections being entangled in the Avidyā. Even in the matter of projection and withdrawal of mundane intelligence, this supreme consciousness has its part to play and so all the aspects of causality and effects are based, as it were on this basic existence. If the universe is the modification of Avidyā above, without this basic projection of Brahman too with it, when it is not possible to consider the three aspects of Brahman, viz., Existence, Consciousness and Bliss to be co-existing with the non-self aspects of projected Universe.

THE two views on the causation of Brahman that are a letter attributed to Vivaraṇācārya and Vācaspati are that, it is Vivātopādāna and Abhinirmittopādāna cause of the world respectively. According to the
former view the basic Brahman does not get transformed into the Universe, but because the Maya that is based on it gets these changes, Brahma also is considered to be its material cause. Here the material causality is erroneously attributed to Brahman. The latter school, however expounds that Brahman too gets transformed into the Universe as the basic principle of avidya which of course is the main material cause. A corollary of this difference results in that the Vivaraṇa school holds that Švara is the material cause of the world and the Avacaheda School of Vacaspati the Jīva to be so.

"Suresvara, the exponent of the Var-tika School of Abhasa Veda holds the view that Švara and Jīva are to be differentiated as Abhasasas emanating from pure consciousness, the absolute reality, as appearing in avidya and mind respectively and it is the Švara who is both the witness and Upadanaṅkàraṇa of the Universe." This view attributed to Suresvara appears to be totally incorrect, primarily because even the Švara
Suresvara's contribution to Advaita are not direct projections of the absolute reality. Isvara is perhaps the primary projections, though not strictly speaking so in view of the earlier stage of Kutastha, for all practical purposes but Jīva is a further projection of this primary projection, and from this Jīva, who has two stages, further projections arise. Each projection is a mixture of the Abhasa and its delimiting factor, Avidya.

HENCE it is to be surmised that as far as the first projection i.e., the stage of Isvara is considered, the evolution is Vivarta and Brahman is Vivartopādaṇa. There is no mutilation, so to say, of the Absolute Reality up to this stage and hence the view that Isvara has full control over Maya is justified and the projector, the Avidya, is said to retain its pure Satvic nature. "Vivarta or illusory manifestation is the production of an effect which has not the same kind of existence as its material cause" and Isvara being the nearest entity to the Absolute Reality in all its aspects Sat, cit and Ananda, it is Avidya that is the
PARINAMA or modification is the product of an effect which has the same kind of existence as its material cause.\(^5\) In the secondary and further projections from the stage of Īśvara, the primary Cidābhāsa, i.e., Īśvara projects itself in its constituent Avidyā and consequently the resultant entity will comprise all the aspects of this Cidābhāsa i.e., the Absolute Reality as well as the neiscence. Hence in the further projections both these are to be considered as material causes.

At the same time, it is necessary to note, the material causality of Brahman is wrought out due to its association with preceding Cidābhāsa and also neiscence and it also continues to be the Agent, the prompter of Avidyā and its creation. Hence it stands as "Abhinna Mīmāṃsādānā Karana."

COMMENTING on the analogy of the projection of the Universe to the web coming out of spider and sparks out of fire,\(^5\) Śrī Sahāra upholds only the
Vivaratopādānta of Brahman, at the stage of Jīva also.

"We notice in life that sparks of fire may be considered identical with fire. Similarly a part may be considered identical with fire. Similarly a part may be considered identical with the whole. Such being the case, words signifying a modification or part of the supreme self, as applied to individual self are meant to convey its identity with it. That this is so appears also from the introduction and conclusion."52 And again Sankara says in the same context "We know that a part is one with fire before it is departed. Therefore the example of gold, iron and sparks of fire are only meant to strengthen one's idea of oneness of the individual self and Brahman and not to establish the multiplicity caused by the origin etc., of the Universe."53

SUCŚŚVARA, as a true disciple and commentator supports this view of Vivartopādānta in his Vārtika tool. He says that from the angle of Absolute Reality the creation etc., of the Universe are mere fancies,
OF COURSE, of the self, and as such there is no fixed order too for these external modifications. Continuing further he however says that this Brahman itself attained the nature of self in intellect, physical body, senses etc., due to non-realisation. The Absolute Reality is qualified by itself, with non-self entities of the Universe and thus becomes non-immediate. Inspite of the context wherein the original commentator sticks to pure Vivarta doctrine, Vārttikākāra introduces his own version of the secondary causality. In an earlier passage of the same context he expressly states that the supreme self gave birth (Jayā) to universe just as ether is delimited by the pot etc., and the self takes the forms (apabhak) of various entities of Mundane Universe which also are termed real (Satymityabhīyate) for all practical purposes.

TWO different stand points are given in the matter of Absolute Reality being considered as the material cause of the Universe. It consists in being the substrate in which, the world is erroneously surmised, or in being the substrate of Maya which gets materially modified.
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and becomes the world. Suresvara's views on world causality are based on the first definition as far as Isvarya stage and the second one, with regards to the further projection. Only such a view of two fold relationship of of Absolute Reality and Universe, in the matter causality, is sound and makes the Abhasa theory plausible.

In the contemporary Western philosophy the conception of God and evolution of the Universe tally almost with this theory of Suresvara, that Isvara alone is the immediate and material cause. Dr. Radhakrishnan says, "An essence becomes an existence, an object, an event, only by confirming to the laws of actual Universe. An actual event is the meeting point of a world of actualities on the one side and the world of ideal possibilities on the other. Eternal objects in their interaction with creative passagie issue in actuality, reckoning with space-time limitation, casual push or drag of the past and that ultimate irreducibility which we may call God. It is God who envisages the realm of possibilities and the world of settled
facts so as to focus them on each occasion for the creation of something new. It is he that determines the ideal plans of events by the imposition of his nature. Without such divine control, sheer unlimited activity taken with infinite world of ideal forms would be unable to achieve anything specific.

ANALYSING further the philosophy of White Head, Dr. Radhakrishnan says "There is a progressive incorporation into the cosmic series of eternal order which God embraces in himself. The primordial nature of God, by which White Head means God beyond time and not before time is the conceptual consciousness or the possibilities or the capabilities capable of harmonious concurrent realisation;--- The view of forms as conceptually realized in God avoids the realisation of independent existence as well as subsistence. The being of these eternal objects is not a ghost like imitation of actuality, but consists in mere possibility. They are not metaphysical forces generating the world of existence, nor dynamic powers drawing men and things towards themselves."
Suresvara calls these possibilities as Samskaras. In fact all the Advaitins agree with this view that the generating force for creation consists in these remnants of past action that lie concealed in the Maya of Isvara. These Samskaras are divided into many types and "Bhavana," "Ajnana," and "Karma" are the three important among them. It is in the reverse order of these three, they operate generally in the stage of Isvara, before they cause the creation of Universe.

PROF. RADHAKRISHNAN, continuing further says: "White Head distinguishes (1) an Ultimate which he calls creativity, which is actual is virtue of its accidents and (2) God who is the primordial non-temporal accident. God is not the absolute, but only one of the actualisations of the absolute. It is difficult to conceive what this ultimate creativity which is said to be pure indetermination without any character of its own is. What is the source of limitation which turns this purely indeterminate creativity into a determinate freedom?"
God himself, being a consequent of this limitation of indeterminate activity, cannot become the entire source of further limitations, "God is an actual entity and so is the most trivial puff of existence in far-off empty space."  

**However,** Prof. Radhakrishnan comments, "But being also consequent, he (God) is the beginning and end. He is the principle of concretion by which its conceptional plan becomes realized in fact. 'The consequent nature of God is His judgement of the world.' The actual world process requires for its explanation, according to Whitehead, a three fold character of God; (1) God as wisdom, the primordial nature (2) God as love and (3) God as judgement, a conception strangely reminiscent of Hindu conception of God as Brahma, Visnu and Siva. 'The universe includes a three fold creative act composed of (i) the one infinite conceptional realisation (ii) the multiple solidarity of free physical realisation in the temporal world and (iii) Ultimate unity of the multiplicity of actual fact with the primordial conceptional
fact. God is the ground and goal of the whole evolutionary scheme.

The three stages in the evolution from Īśvara, emuncted by Suresvara viz., Sūtrātman, Hiranyagarbha and Virāt may correspond to the three phases of evolution described above. However Suresvara is credited with evolving a series of stage even prior to the evolution of Sūtrātman and after Īśvara. The said three phases of creation and also the intrinsic possibilities like Karma, Ajñāna, Bhāvanā etc., which according to Vedanta, constitute the forces that start the evolution from the indeterminate principle i.e., Māyā of Īśvara, also have their role to play in this intervening and unmanifest stage of creation.

There are nine stages in this process. The first three are (1) the emergence of omniscence (2) Universal compassion and (3) Disturbance in the Māyā. These three are actually the consequence of
the primordial Avidyā that continues. The omniscence of the supreme consciousness which is devoid any object is made delimited, as it were with reference to an universal object in the first stage. This objectified cognition presupposes an unmanifest intellect which in its turn identifies with the object in the process of cognition and this is the second stage. This results in motivation which is represented by the Avidyā, already actuated for the purpose of evolution of Isvara and his omniscence, is further disturbed so that it becomes attuned to cause the next projections and this stage is called Maya.

ALL these three stages can be put under the head of primordial Ajñāna or Avidyā which is one of the main factors (or possibilities according to White-head) that are associated with God or Isvara. The two aspects God as wisdom and God as Love are presented in the first phase.

THE next phase is called the 'Desire' or Kāma associated with Isvara in the process of evolution.
This is termed as Īksana or Tapas in Upanisads. It has three stages (1) The excogitation as to the fulfilment of the purpose of life (2) the decision that creation is the only way (3) and a search as to how this creation can be done. The first stage is caused by the ascentuation of Avidyā into Maya which veils the supreme reality and so there arises a sense of non-fulfilment and want. The second stage consequently at the end of which an erroneous decision is arrived at and the third stage leading to the implementation of this decision.

Suresvara considers that two aspects of the supreme had to play their parts at this stage. One is Kama; he says that even though from the viewpoint of absolute reality no desire can be attributed, from the standpoint of creation there is need to do so. The second is Bhāvāna which stands as the important gateway in order of creation. Once it gets accentuated, it ejects the Karma from the Maya and results in the varied operations and on the other hand, when it is withdrawn it,
merely stands as an attribute of the self. Through such a Bhavanā the desire operates in a devided manner and produces the Ajñāna (not the primordial one that operates on Supreme consciousness and produces Maya and Isvara) through which the self acts in the Universe. The Kāma at this stage is a desire of Universal application and is quite different from, even though the source of, the Kamāna the individual requirements of various aspects of creation.

The third and last phase in this unmanifest creation is represented by the conception ‘Karma’ or ‘Vāsanās’ according to Śrīśvarā. The past actions of individual animates and inaniminates lie dormant in the Ajñāna at Susupti stage, and Maya in the stage of deluge and they are accentuated by the Bhavanā especially in its second aspect viz., search as to the way of creation. The rise of these dormant ‘possibilities’ is the answer for such a search of method. In the reverse order the Supreme Consciousness having been realised, this dormant Karma becomes still and Bhavanā too cools down.
THERE are three sub-stages in the process of the evolution of this Karma. (1) Emergence of desire with reference to individual aspects of creation (2) Slight manifestation of duality (3) Manifestation of subtle stage of creation. In fact the second and the third stages here really belong to the first two stages of subtle creation viz., a manifestation of suträtmän and then the Universal psychosis and physic (Hiranyagarbha and Virät). 81

THERE is a confused thinking at this stage among some of the Advaita scholars. Sütätmän is a stage where duality makes a beginning and on further projection this gives rise to two separate entities, Hiranyagarbha and Virät. But many a scholar confuse the Sütätmän stage itself to be the Hiranyagarbha stage. This confusion is also ascribed to Suresvara because of the two consecutive verses in his Vartika 82 which describe the emergence of Sutra in the first and that of Virät in the next. Hence it is presumably surmised that since there shall be Hiranyagarbha before Virät, Sütätmän himself is Hiranyagarbha.
ANANDAGIRI however clarifies this point in his commentary of the first of these two verses. He says that sutra comprises both the powers of consciousness and effectuation; the same with predominance of consciousness is called Hiranyagarbha and with that of effectuation is called prana (giving raise to virat). In the particular context of these two slokas Sureswara perhaps did not express any description of Hiranyagarbha, because the context deals with physical creation only.

In the other context where the omniscient character and sakshatva of Isvara was discussed, Sureswara states that the next stage in the process in Hiranyagarbha, delimited by the cosmic intellect. The commentator here ascribes 'sutratva' to this Hiranyagarbha, on the condition that the power of effectuation is added (since the power of consciousness is already there) and also 'viratva' in the capacity of an entity delimited by the manifest five subtle elements i.e., the power of effectuation only.

Hence contextually Hiranyagarbha is placed as centre of
discussion, and Śūtrātman is the prior stage to it and Virāt a corresponding and yet different stage.

In his other book 'Pāñcikārana Vārtika,' Suresvara gives a clear differentiation of these three stages. He equates the self in waking stage in Virāt, in dream to Hiranyagarbha and in sound sleep to Śūtrātman and in this context he also clarifies that the Śūtrātman is the source from which the other two stages spring up.

While Hiranyagarbha is the Supreme potency of knowledge, Virāt is the Supreme potency of action, i.e., Prāna. This Prāna which is evolved from Śūtrātman directly due to stress on its power of action is accentuated again by the underlying Supreme Reality to generate the Virāt, the material cosmos. The Virāt, comprises the five subtle elements with stress on action severally modified; so as to form the physical side of the Universe. The Hiranyagarbha too comprises the five
five subtle elements, with stress on consciousness, again severally modified and produces the psychical side of the creation like, intellect mind etc.,

THERE are two ways of modifications of these subtle elements into the gross, enunciated in the Advaita system. The Čāndogyopanisad advocates triplication (Tri-vrtkarana) which consists each gross element constituting half of its own nature and the other half being equally divided with the natures of the other two elements. But this process is limited to the three elements to Tejas, Āp and Prthivi.

Śrī ŚANKARA gives three explanations for omitting the first two elements, Ākāśa and Vāyu in this process of modification. They are (1) it is possible to presume the emergence of Ākāśa and Vāyu even before the generation of Tejas or (2) The context, which deals only with the oneness of cause and effect, does not require the mentioning of all effects and these three are mentioned as examples or (3) since only the three elements are dealt with, triplication is described.
BUT the whole problem rotates round the fact of sanction of scriptures. The triplication is expressedly mentioned in the Chandogya and the quintuplication which is described by Sāṅkara in Taittiriya Bhaṣya at length (and followed by all latter authors) does not find this sanction in any scripture. Ṭanandagiri answers this question in his own way that the triplication is only an indication to quintuplication. This argument has an indirect approval of Sāṅkara whose argument are also enunciated in his Brahmasutra Bhaṣya.

In a similar context in Pancikaranavartika, Ṭanandagiri in his commentary lays his argument on the fact that the triplication or quintuplication are mere modes of modifications of subtle elements into the gross and since Ākāsa and Vāyu also, being objects of perceptual cognition, are gross, quintuplication has to be accepted by all thinkers. Hence the triplication is only an indication to the quintuplication. This argument is based on Sāṅkara's conception of grossness as enunciated in his Brahmasutra Bhaṣya.
WHAT is the view of Suresvara on this issue? Does he accept the proposition of his preceptor or does he reject it on the ground that it has no expressive sanction of scripture? In one of the two places when he comes across this problem he obediently and truly narrates the process of quintuplication and ends it with "wo to say the knowers of truth." In the other place he does not describe the quintuplication in so many words but accepts it in principle concluding the same with the statement that the whole world in Brahman. Further the simile he applies in this context indicates his lack of faith in this process which he states, is to explain the presence of the subtle quality of each element in the next, in the order of their evolution. A closer examination of this verse reveals his view that he does not believe in all these permutations and combinations just to achieve the grossness and objectivity of perceptual cognition. However he does not deny the generation of the five gross elements each from the other in the respective order.
and also inheritance by each of the qualities of all the earlier ones, as a consequence of such a generation. But even here he denies the reality of this generation to the elements as such except in their residual form of Brahman.

THUS at least by indication Suresvara differs from his predecessor. About the triplication we do not have any idea of Suresvara's views. However there is a school of Advaitins who deny the reason in quintuplication and accept only the process of triplication. Their arguments are (1) if the elemental qualities of prthvi and ap are considered to be existing in akāśa and vāyu, they too shall acquire the form and volume, the qualities of the latter, just as the prthvi acquires the qualities of sound and touch on account of its association with akāśa and vāyu; but in experience this is not so. In the absence of such practical utility, it is quite useless to go contrary to the expressive statement of Chandogya. Vacaspati Miśra is considered to be leader of this opinion, and it may not be too much to expect that given a chance to
comment on Chanḍogya Bhāṣya and Brahmaṣṭra Bhāṣya, Suresvara would have shown the way to him.

IN this connection the following point needs clarification. In the process of quintuplication it is the subtle qualities (Tattvātra) of the elements that take part in permutations and combinations and so the resultant gross elements are said to possess these subtle qualities only and not the corresponding/gross elements as such. Hence there appears to be no need for assumption of forms and volume for Ākāsa due to the association of the Prthvi because it is adequate if the subtle qualities of Prthvi i.e., small is available in the gross Ākāsa. But when once this subtle quality is present, the corresponding grossness i.e., form and volume too has to emerge as an automatic evolution and hence Suresvara considers that even the assumption of this subtle quality, which is a resultant of quintuplication, is illusory.

BUT in the process of tripllication it is only that the three gross elements that enter into
the permutations and combinations. As a result of this they not only possess the corresponding qualities of grossness but those of subtle elements also. There exist the casual and effectual aspects of the corresponding constituent elements. Hence this process seems to be more reasonable, if at all any such process involving permutations and combinations is need for creation.