

- point, they give the examples of causes like the one about milk, etc.²³¹
- 9 From this point onwards we shall describe how Prakṛti and Puruṣa have similar and different essential properties (*dharma*).
 Both are without beginning and both are without end; both both are permanent;²³² both are unsurpassed, both are without characteristics (*linga*) and both are omnipresent.²³³
 But Prakṛti is single, unconscious, has three guṇas, is essentially a seed, is essentially creative and has the essential property of being in the middle.
 The Puruṣas, meanwhile, are multiple and have consciousness. They do not have the guṇas, they are not essentially seeds, they are not essentially creative, and do not have the essential property of being in the middle.
- 10 Thus, on the assumption that an effect corresponds to its cause, all these particulars (*viśeṣa*), consisting of sattva rajas and tamas, come into being.
 Some people argue that the Person actually consists of these particulars²³⁴ because he is manifested by them and made out of them.²³⁵

²³¹ I.e., the calf in the proximity of the cow causes the milk, in the same way that Prakṛti in the proximity of Puruṣa causes evolution. Ḏalhaṇa on 3.1.8 (Su 1938: 340) explained that the milk, even though it is unconscious (*ajñā*), comes forth (*pravartate*) (in the cow) for the purpose of nourishing a calf. Ḏalhaṇa also gave the example of a man's semen that is incognizant (*ajñā*) but is comes forth (*pravartate*) in the presence of erotic women, at a private party, for the purpose of the man's enjoyment. Pātañjalayogaśāstra 4.17 addressed the same issue with the simile of magnetism: the mind (*citta*) was likened to a piece of iron that is attracted by the magnet of sense objects (Āgāśe and Āpaṭe 1904: 193, et passim).

²³² This is an emended reading of the Nepalese witnesses, which both read अनित्यौ “impermanent.” It is inconsistent and contextually incorrect to assert that Puruṣa is impermanent. The vulgate reads “permanent.”

²³³ See discussion, p.88.

²³⁴ Ḏalhaṇa on 3.1.10 (Su 1938: 340) identifies these as the principles (*tattva*), beginning with महत्.

²³⁵ This opinion of “some people” represents a kind of materialist who thinks that the Person is also composed of prakṛti's components rather than being distinct and unitary. This is an outsider view as far as early Sāṅkhya is concerned.

On अज्ञन in the compound तदञ्जन “manifested by them,” Kuiper (1953) noted the inadequacy of dictionary entries for derivatives of roots अञ्ज/अञ्ज, and described the root of the present word under no. 3 “show, manifest, mark, adorn, honour.” See ibid., §12, pp. 76–82.

- 11 In the Vedic tradition, however,²³⁶ people with a wide perspective consider essential being (*svabhāva*), destiny, time, transformation (*parināma*), the Lord, and chance (*yadrcchā*) to be Prakṛti.²³⁷
- 12 One should teach that the elements (*bhūta*) that are born from her as specifically having her qualities.²³⁸ From those, the entire group of living beings (*bhūtagrāma*) is generated, having their characteristics (*lakṣaṇa*).²³⁹
- 13–14 Its applicability (*upayoga*) is stated always with regard to medicine.²⁴⁰ Therefore in therapeutics, no consideration is given beyond the elements. Because it is has been stated,
 [by saying ‘Puruṣa’] he has expressed that it originates from a collection of substances beginning with the elementss (*bhūta*).²⁴¹

²³⁶ The variant reading वैदिक्, in witness N, probably would refer to the Vedic tradition, as it does generally in Sanskrit literature (MW:1022). Witness H and the vulgate read वैद्यके “in the medical tradition.” The following statement listing different views about Prakṛti is not known elsewhere in medical literature, but is very close to the Śvetāśvataropaniṣad and Gauḍapādakārikā 1.8, 9 (Karmarkar 1953: 3–4, 62).

²³⁷ Dalhaṇa on 3.1.11 (Su 1938: 341–342) discussed whether these six entities were to be considered together or separately. Dalhaṇa seems to have accepted Jejjāṭa’s view that these are multiple philosophical views, but that physicians consider the ultimate cause to be Prakṛti. He also recorded Gayadāsa’s view that some thinkers believe that these causes cumulatively constitute Prakṛti. Cf. similar discussion in Śvetāśvataropaniṣad 1.1–2 (Olivelle 1998: 414–415).

²³⁸ ततो “from her” refers to Prakṛti. Note that this phrase differs from the vulgate text, but was known and accepted by Gayadāsa.

²³⁹ Dalhaṇa on 3.1.12 (Su 1938: 341) took “having their characteristics” as referring to the characteristics of the भूत “elements.”

²⁴⁰ Dalhaṇa on 3.1.14 (Su 1938: 341–342) explained that “its” refers to discussion of the group of living beings, which starts with the five great elements (*mahābhūta*) (पञ्चमहाभूतारब्द).

²⁴¹ I.e., the “person” is the physical subject of medical science, deriving fro the elements (*bhūta*), etc. The internal reference here is to Suśrutasaṃhitā 1.38 (Su 1938: 9). In this passage, the Suśrutasaṃhitā defined the human being (*puruṣa*) as a material creature made out of the five elements and the physical bodily parts and tissues.