

to all men, they cannot give adequate reason for that statement. The doctrine of Karma therefore appears to be more reasonable than the other two theories.

(2) The commentator has explained some general rules relating to the principle of Karma. The commentary can be better followed if those rules are clearly understood. They are :—

A. One Karmāśaya is not responsible for many births. If it were so, there would be no chance for the fruition of all Karmas. In every birth many Karmāśayas are accumulated, and it would then be difficult to find time for the fruition of all these. Therefore such statements as 'killing of one animal will involve millions of birth as animal' etc. are untenable.

B. For the same reason the proposition that one Karma brings about one birth cannot also be correct.

C. Many Karmas do not cause many births simultaneously, because many births at the same time is an impossibility.

D. That many Karmāśayas go to bring about one birth appears to be the correct rule. In fact it is seen that in one life the fruits of many actions are experienced. Therefore many Karmas would appear to be the cause of one birth.

E. The Karmāśayas responsible for a birth also determine its span of life, and the experience of pleasure and pain therein is also brought about by them.

F. Karmāśaya is Ekabhavika i.e. is mainly accumulated in one life. Take X=previous birth and Y=the subsequent birth. The Karmāśayas responsible for Y have been mainly collected in X. Therefore Karmāśaya is Ekabhavika or of one birth. This is the general rule. The exception to this will be mentioned later. How Karmāśaya gathered in one life causes a subsequent life can be seen in the commentary.

G. The outcome of Karmāśaya which will bear fruit in a future life is threefold viz. birth, duration of existence, and experience of pleasure and pain. But as the outcome of Karma which becomes operative in that very life does not entail another birth or species, and if all the experience is felt in that life,