भाष्यम्—कुतश्चैतदन्याय्यम्--

वस्तुसाम्ये चित्तभेदात्तयोर्विभक्तः पन्थाः ॥ १५ ॥

बहुचित्तावलम्बनीभूतमेकं वस्तु साधारणं, तत्खलु नैकचित्तपरिकल्पितं नाप्यनेकचित्तपरिकल्पितं किन्तु स्वप्रतिष्ठम्। कथं, वस्तुसाम्ये चित्तभेदात् धर्मापेक्षं चित्तस्य वस्तुसाम्येऽपि सुखज्ञानं भवति, अधर्मापेक्षं तत एव दुःखज्ञानम्, अविद्यापेक्षं तत एव मूढ़ज्ञानं, सम्यग्दर्शनापेक्षं तत एव माध्यस्थ्यज्ञानमिति। कस्य तच्चित्तेन परिकल्पितं—न चान्यचित्तपरिकल्पितेनार्थेनान्यस्य चित्तोपरागो युक्तः, तस्माद् वस्तुज्ञानयोर्ग्राह्यग्रहणभेदभिन्नयोर्विभक्तः पन्थाः। नानयोः सङ्करगन्धोऽप्यस्ति इति। सांख्यपक्षे पुनर्वस्तु त्रिगुणं, चलं च गुणवृत्तमिति, धर्मादिनिमित्तापेक्षं चित्तैरभिसंबध्यते, निमित्तानुरूपस्य च प्रत्ययस्योत्पद्यमानस्य तेन तेनात्मना हेतुर्भवति ॥ १५ ॥

Why is that (the statement controverted in the preceding Sūtra) illogical ?

Inspite Of Sameness Of Object, On Account Of Separateness Of Mind They (The Object And Its Knowledge) Follow Different Paths, That Is Why They Are Entirely Different (1). 15.

There may be a common object which is the focus of many minds ; it is not figured by one mind, nor by many minds, but is grounded in itself. How does this happen ? The object being the same, on account of the difference of mind it gives a feeling of pleasure from a virtuous angle, a feeling of misery from a vicious standpoint, a feeling of delusion when the mind is full of nescience or it causes an attitude of indifference on account of perfect insight. (If you say that object is a creation of the mind) Then of which mind is the object a creation ? Again it is not probable that the creation of one mind would influence another mind. That is why the paths of object and knowledge are demarcated by difference in the shape of objectivity and receptivity, and there is no chance of