

In this respect (2) it is to be considered :—whether one action is responsible for one birth or one action brings about many births? The second point is :—do many actions bring about many births or do they bring about only one birth? Now, one action can never be the cause of one birth; because in that case, on account of the absence of regularity of succession in the fruition of present actions and of those that have been stored up from time without beginning—some of which still remain unfulfilled, people would lose confidence in the performance of actions. This is therefore untenable. Again, one action cannot also account for many births. Because in that case if one out of many actions brings about many births then there would be no time for the fruition of the remaining actions. This view, therefore, is also untenable. Many actions are also not responsible for many births; because the many births cannot take place at the same time, and if it is said that they take place gradually, then also the difficulty mentioned before arises. For these reasons the accumulation of diverse latencies of actions, whether of merit or demerit, done between birth and death, whether dominant or in a subordinate state, are brought into action through death and massed together in one effort which simultaneously effecting death and causes a single birth. That birth gets its span of life from the accumulated Karmāśaya and in that span the experiences are felt as a result of that Karmāśaya. Karmāśaya being the cause of birth, of the span of life and of affective experience, is called 'Trivipāka' or that which has three consequences. For the same reason Karmāśaya has been called 'Eka-Bhavika' or gathered in one birth (life) only.

When Karmāśaya becomes operative in the present life and is responsible for affective experience only it is