Chapter-I

INTRODUCTION

The Problem and Scope of the Research

The Source-Books of the Research

Sāṃkhya is one of the oldest systems of the Indian philosophy. Having its roots in the Veda-s, it has influenced almost all other Indian orthodox and heterodox schools. Thus, the basic tenets of the Sāṃkhya system can be traced in some form or other especially in the Yoga, Nyāya, Vaiśeṣika, and Vedānta systems; as well as in Jainism and Buddhism. A great sage named Kapila is considered to have founded the Sāṃkhya system of thought. It is generally held by some people that Kapila formulated the Sāṃkhya system in a work entitled Sāṃkhyaśūtra. But after a thorough research it is discovered that this book is of a late date.¹ In fact, two different readings of a presently extinct book is available now – of which the first reading, named Sāṃkhyaśūtra was presented by Aniruddha, while the second reading named Sāṃkhya-pravacanasūtra was presented by Vijñānabhinīkṣu. The name and form of the concerned original book is yet to be discovered.

It is a mystery whether Kapila had at all written any text or not. From the text Sāṃkhya-kārikā, composed by Īśvarakṛṣṇa, we come to know that Kapila is the first and best learned person (‘ādvīdvāna, ‘agrya muni’)², who, out of compassion to the suffering human beings, imparted the most sacred and perfect knowledge called Sāṃkhya to his disciple Āsuri, and thereafter, Āsuri passed this

¹ Prasad, Jwala: Indian Epistemology, Munshiram Manoharlal, New Delhi 2nd. Rev.ed, 1986, P-75
² “etat pavitram agryam munir āsurayeḥukampayā pradadau, Āsurir api pañcaśikhāya tena ca bahudhā kṛtam tantram”—kārikā-70
knowledge down to Pañcaśikha, who is considered to have written a book named śaṣṭhitāntra, which also is not available now. From Pañcaśikha this most sacred and perfect knowledge, called Sāmkhya, was extended in many forms to many learned persons. Following this tradition Īśvarakṛṣṇa was able to write a small but comprehensive text initially named Sāmkhyasaptati, which is now famous as Sāmkhyakārikā. At present Sāmkhyakārikā is claimed to contain all the essential principles, topics and elements, except stories and criticisms of opponent views discussed in details in the first authentic, but presently extinct, text named śaṣṭhitāntra. Hence Sāmkhyakārikā is treated as the presently available ancient-most authentic text.

In course of time, a great number of commentaries, interpretations and expositions of the said Sāmkhya texts appeared. Of these, the most important commentaries on Sāmkhyakārikā are namely:

- Tattvakaumudi (of Vācaśapati Miśra),
- Gaṇḍapādabhāṣya,
- Māṭharavṛtti,
- Yuktidīpikā (of unknown parentage), and
- Jayamangalā (of Śaṅkara).

Besides these, the commentaries written on the two different readings of the extinct unknown text, which deserve special mention, are namely

Sāmkhyasūtrakṛiti written by Anirudha on the reading of the said extinct unknown text named Sāmkhyasūtra and

- Sāmkhyapravacanabhāṣya written by Vijñānavāhanī on the reading of the said extinct unknown text named Sāmkhyapravacanasūtra.

The Sāmkhyakārikā and its commentaries provide the systematic classical presentation of the Sāmkhya of system. Hence, most of the modern Sāmkhya scholars call this kind of presentation Classical Sāmkhya. Whereas, for them, Sāmkhyasūtra and its commentary Sāmkhyasūtrakṛiti as well as Sāmkhyapravacanasūtra and its commentaries i.e. Sāmkhyapravacanabhāṣya constitute the letter Sāmkhya presentation. Besides these, many concepts,
technical words and phrases related to Śāṁkhyā thought are found scattered in many ancient texts and commentaries like Veda-s and Upaniṣad-s, Carvaka and Sutrutra Śaṁhitā-s, Mahābhārata and other Purāṇa-s etc. These are called Proto Śāṁkhyā or Early Śāṁkhyā.

The Problem and the Scope

There are controversies on many issues related to the Śāṁkhyā system of thought, especially its theory of evolution. For the sake of right understanding of the Śāṁkhyā system, attempts have been made both by the ancient and modern commentators to provide a true exposition of the issues depicted in the kārikā-s and/or sūtra-s. But these many-fold attempts have also created some confusions and misperceptions in understanding the Śāṁkhyā system as a chain of thought. Unless and until the Śāṁkhyā system can be shown as a chain of thought, founded on a systematic theory of evolution, the main purpose of the Śāṁkhyā system as a mokṣaśāstra cannot be served. The proto or early Śāṁkhyā and the later Śāṁkhyā, fail to provide any systematic presentation, and hence our study should mainly be based on the appropriate analysis and synthesis of the data available in the classical presentation of the Śāṁkhyā system.

Therefore, the scope of the research work will be confined to the analytical exposition of the Śāṁkhyā theory of evolution, especially based on Śāṁkhyakārikā of Īśvarakṛṣṇa and its commentaries, like Tattvakaumudī of Vācāśpati Miśra, Yuktidipikā of unknown parentage, Gaudapādabhāṣya, Mātharavṛttri and Jayamangalā of Saṅkara. The specific issues, which will be taken up for systematic study, are mainly the following:

(1) causality and the ultimate realities
   [i.e. satkārya, prakṛti and guṇa-s, puruṣa, relation between prakṛti and puruṣa],
(2) the process of the evolution of the world
[i.e. *tattvaparītāma* including (a) *sarūpaparītāma* and *virūpaparītāma*, (b) *anulomaparītāma* and *pratilomaparītāma*, as well as (c) *tanmātrasarga* and (d) *pratyasarga*], and

(3) the theory of evolution as the foundation of ethics.

But, for the sake of clarity of thought, wherever necessary, works other than *Sāṁkhya karīkā* of Īśvarakṛṣṇa and its commentaries will also be consulted.

### Meaning of the Term Sāṁkhya

The term Sāṁkhya appears, for first time, in the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad, with the usually associated word Yoga, indicating a metaphysical inquiry that leads the aspirant to the knowledge of the root cause of things and beings of the world. The meaning and purpose in which the word Sāṁkhya has been used in some Upaniṣad-s are somehow like the following:

In the *Chāndogya, Kaṭha, Śvetāśvatara* Upaniṣad-s, the word Sāṁkhya simply means the way of salvation by attaining perfect knowledge, not any system of metaphysical truth. Sāṁkhya as a methodology for attaining salvation by attaining perfect knowledge through various psychological analysis of experience that appears in such Upaniṣad-s and has later on become dominant spirit in the Jaina and Buddhist system of meditation. Controversies based on difference in perspectives and opinions regarding the different issues of the Sāṁkhya system including the major issue of the enumeration of elements as stated above appears

---

3 “*tatt kāraṇam sāṁkhya-yogādhiṃgam yā jñātvā devam mucayate sarvapāsaih*” – Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad, VI.13


5 Chandradhar Sharma: *A Critical Survey of Indian Philosophy*, Motilal Banarsidass Delhi-Varanasi Patna, 1964, P-149

6 Hiriyana: *The Essential of Indian Philosophy*, Motilal Banarsidass Publisher Private Limited, Delhi 2005, P-106
to be expanding from era to era. There is also a sharp difference of opinions and interpretations, regarding to the meaning of the word Śāṁkhya among thinkers or scholars.

- The knowledge of the separation of the puruṣa from the prakṛti is understood in Śāṁkhya as the true or right knowledge. Saṅkara thus uses the word Śāṁkhya in the senses of right knowledge. In his commentary on the Viṣṇusahasranāma he interprets the word Śāṁkhya in the sense of “knowledge of the true nature of the pure spirit”.

- The medieval philosopher as Radhakrishnan in his book Indian Philosophy (second edition) says that the word ‘Śāṁkhya’ has been derived from ‘saṁkhya’, which means number, and hence the name Śāṁkhya is justified as being appropriate to a system that gives an analytical enumeration of the principle of the cosmos. It is however a common tendency in all Hindu systems of thought, for him, to enumerate the elements.

- In some early texts the word Śāṁkhya has been used in the sense of philosophical reflection and not simply in the sense of numerical reckoning. In fact, having expounded by careful reflection on the nature of puruṣa and the other entities this system has acquired its significant title. Chandradhar Sharma, thus, tries to explain the word saṁkhya as having double meaning, e.g. ‘right knowledge’ as well as ‘number’. Having referred to the Śāṁkhya concept depicted in the Śrīmadbhagavatādī Chandradhar Sharma’s mentions word Śāṁkhya has been used in many senses in different

---

7 Mainkar T.G: Śāṁkhya-kārikā of Īśvarakṛṣṇa with Gauḍapādabhāṣya, Oriental Book Agency Poona, 1972, P-4
8 Ibid, P-3
9 S. Radhakrishnan: Indian Philosophy (second edition), Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2008, P-227
10 S. Radhakrishnan: Indian Philosophy (second edition), Oxford University Press, New Delhi, 2008, P-227
contexts it basically means *samyak khyāti* or *jñāna*, and therefore, it cannot be interpreted in any manner except "pursuit of true knowledge"\(^\text{11}\).

- According to Hiriyanna, the word Sāṁkhyā, which is derived from the Sanskrit word Sāṁkhyā meaning 'reflection', stands for the method of realizing the ultimate elements through knowledge\(^\text{12}\).

- Anima Sen Gupta observes that in certain contexts the word Sāṁkhyā has been used in the sense of the path of philosophic wisdom leading to the realization of the essential nature of the soul or *ātman*, and hence she thinks, the wise men follow of this path of knowledge for attaining liberation from the miseries of the world\(^\text{13}\).

- From all these explanations ultimately the word Sāṁkhyā appears to convey a systematic, precise, exhaustive and comprehensive metaphysical inquiry into the nature of the consciousness and the rest of the universe. This meaning, for T.G. Mainkar raises certain expectations that is amply fulfilled by the system\(^\text{14}\).

- Franklin Edgerton maintains, in his book *The Beginnings of Indian Philosophy*, that the derivative of Sāṁkhyā must be understood as the method based on reason. For him it is the rationalizing, reflective, speculative and philosophical method\(^\text{15}\).

---

\(^{11}\) Chandradhar Sharma: *A Critical Survey of Indian Philosophy*, Montilal Banarsidass Delhi-Varanasi Patna, 1964, P- 150

\(^{12}\) Hiriyana: *The Essential of Indian Philosophy*, Motilal Banarsidass Publisher Private Limited, New Delhi, 2005, P- 106

\(^{13}\) Anima Sen Gupta: *The Evolution of Sāṁkhyā School of Thought*, Munshiram Manoharlal, New Delhi 2nd. Rev.ed, 1986, P-75

\(^{14}\) Mainkar T.G: *Sāṁkhyakārikā of Īśvarakṛṣṇa with Gauḍapāḍabhāṣya*, Oriental Book Agency Poona, 1972, P-4

\(^{15}\) Gerald J. Larson, *Classical Sāṁkhyā: An Interpretation of its History and Meaning*, Ross/Erikson, Santa Barbara, New Delhi, 1979, P-2
According to Garbe, the term Sāṁkhya stands for that system, which emphasizes the enumeration of the fundamental elements and evolutes or emergent\textsuperscript{16}.

Jacobi has offered two interpretations of the word Sāṁkhya. For him, 'Sāṁkhya'
- on the one hand refers to those who define a concept by setting forth or enumerating its content and
- on the other hand, to those who investigate or analyze the various categories of existence\textsuperscript{17}.

Eliade suggests that the term Sāṁkhya, refers to those who seek the ultimate "discrimination" or "discernment" of the difference between prakṛti and puruṣa. He also understands the word in terms of the ultimate goal of salvation set forth in the system\textsuperscript{18}.

Giving importance to the usage of the term Sāṁkhya in the older texts Edgerton suggests that Sāṁkhya refers to the notion of reasoning. In the older texts, he says, the term Sāṁkhya is not a technical designation for a specific system of thought; rather it refers to those who seek salvation by knowledge. Although occasionally one finds the term used with reference to various mathematical meanings, it is not the central significance of the word for Edgerton. 'Sāṁkhya', he thinks, must be understood as a natural term to describe the method based on reason, more technically speaking—the rationalizing, reflective, speculative, philosophical method. It is the method of gaining salvation through knowledge.\textsuperscript{19}

Gerald J. Larson rightly observes that 'Sāṁkhya' was probably used and understood in a variety of ways by different writers and traditions, thus making

\textsuperscript{16} Gerald J. Larson, \textit{Classical Sāṁkhya: An Interpretation of its History and Meaning}, Ross/Erikson, Santa Barbara, New Delhi, 1979, P-3

\textsuperscript{17} Ibid

\textsuperscript{18} Ibid

\textsuperscript{19} Ibid.
it impossible to limit the term to any one technical meaning. Besides stating the reason behind the differences of opinion in understanding the meaning of the word Sāṁkhya Larson speaks of three dimensions of the meaning of the word Sāṁkhya in his book *Classical Sāṁkhya*.\(^\text{20}\) The term Sāṁkhya, for him, is derived from the root, _khyā_, together with the prefix, _sam_, meaning “reckoning, summing up, enumeration, calculation” etc. He agrees with Ram Shankar Bhattacharya on the point that the term Sāṁkhya is used both as an adjective and as a noun.\(^\text{21}\)

- As an adjective the term Sāṁkhya refers to any enumerated set or grouping that can presumably be used in any inquiry, in which enumeration or calculation is a prominent feature. For example, mathematics, grammar, prosody, psychology, medicine and so forth.\(^\text{22}\)

- As a **masculine** noun, the term refers to someone (person), who calculates, enumerates or discriminates properly.\(^\text{23}\)

- As a **neuter** noun, the term refers to the specific system of dualistic philosophy that proceeds by enumerating the contents of experience and the world for attaining complete and permanent liberation (_mokṣa_, _kaivalya_) from sorrow, frustration and rebirth.\(^\text{24}\)

Besides these dimensions, there is a historical development of the meaning of the word Sāṁkhya depending on the three identifiable phases of the development of Sāṁkhya,\(^\text{25}\) which can briefly be characterized as follows:

\(^\text{20}\) Gerald J. Larson & Bhattacharya: *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophy Vol. IV*, Motilal Barnasidass Publisher Private Limited, Delhi, 2006, P-3

\(^\text{21}\) Ibid

\(^\text{22}\) Ibid

\(^\text{23}\) Ibid

\(^\text{24}\) Ibid

\(^\text{25}\) Ibid
The first phase in the development of Sāṁkhya:

It begins from the Vedic period (about 1500 BC) and continues up to the sixth century B.C. Sāṁkhya then used to mean logical enumerations of the contents of a particular subject matter, as for example, the principles of medicine stated in the Carakasamhitā and Śrūtasaṁhitā, and the principles of statecraft narrated in Kautilya's Arthāśāstra, and so forth.  

The Second phase in the development of Sāṁkhya:

It begins from the period of pre-Buddhist Upaniṣad-s (eighth or seventh centuries B.C.). It can be traced through the speculative thinking one finds in the Mokṣadhramā and Bhagavadgītā portions of the Mahābhārata, when the cosmological descriptions have been linked to a methodology of reasoning resulting in spiritual knowledge (vidyā, jñāna, vīveka) associated with meditation that leads to liberation from the cycle of sorrow and rebirth.

In this ancient period there is only Proto-Sāṁkhya, when Sāṁkhya, owing to its association with tantra from the oldest period, is referred to as Kapila-Pañcaśikha-Tantra, or simply as Kapila-Tantra.

The third phase in the development of Sāṁkhya:

It begins from the last century B.C. through the first few centuries A.D. until recently Īśvarakṛṣṇa's Sāṁkhya-kārikā and its commentaries come into being.

Edgerton in 1924 claimed that Sāṁkhya as a technical philosophical system was not really in existence prior to Īśvarakṛṣṇa's Sāṁkhya-kārikā. But the gradual availability of three sources clearly indicate that Sāṁkhya as a technical system

---

26 Gerald J. Larson & Bhattacharya: Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophy Vol. IV, Motilal Barnasidass Publisher Private Limited, Delhi, 2006, P-3
27 Ibid, P-4
28 Ibid. P-5
29 Ibid
30 Ibid, P-9
existed prior to Īśvarakṛṣṇa, and that Īśvarakṛṣṇa’s own formulation comes at the end of normative period of formulation rather than at the beginning. These three sources are:

b) The reconstruction of a pre-Kārikā interpretation of Sāmkhya epistemology based on the quotations from older Sāmkhya text cited in opponent texts, like that of Dignāga and others.  
c) The reconstruction of an established Sāmkhya philosophical system from the earliest Purāṇa-s and the Mokṣadharma, by P. Hacker.

From the Yuktidipikā it becomes clear, that, there was a tradition of Sāmkhya as a philosophical system in the early centuries of the Common Era, which attempted:

I. to define classify and establish certain instruments of knowledge (pramāṇa-s),

II. to construct a sequence for making inferences made up of ten members (daśāvayavi nyāya),

III. to fix the number and order of the basic elements,

IV. to develop the notions of prakṛti, the three guṇa-s, the transformation of the guṇa-s (guṇapariniṇāma), and the pre-existence of effect in the cause (satkārya),

V. to accept, after much controversy, one primordial prakṛti but a plurality of puruṣa-s,

VI. to continue a rich fabric of internal debate involving such teachers as Paurika, Pañcādhikaraṇa, Patañjali, Vāraṇagāya and Īśvarakṛṣṇa,

31 Gerald J. Larson & Bhattacharya: Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophy Vol. IV, Motilal Barnasidass Publisher Private Limited, Delhi, 2006, P-9

32 Ibid, P-9

33 Ibid

34 Ibid
VII. to maintain a vigorous polemic of external debate with certain Buddhist philosophers and with the followers of early Vaiśeṣika,

VIII. to identify itself with a tradition initiated through śaṣṭitanka (a single text or multiple versions of a text bearing the same name), which apparently referred to a scheme of sixty topics made up of ten principal topics (maulikārtha), and finally,

IX. to receive its final normative and systematic formulation in Īśvarakṛṣṇa’s Śāṁkhyakārīka, which, though a brief text, nevertheless encompassed all of the important issues of the system in a concise and cogent fashion.35

Frauwallner speculates that an older Śāṁkhyā epistemology was developed from a revised version of Śaṣṭitanka at the beginning of the fourth century of the Common Era.36 From his reconstruction it becomes clear that a pre-kārikā philosophical Śāṁkhyā was dealing with a definition of perception like śrotraḍi-vrttiḥ and a definition of inference like sambandhād ekasmāt pratyakṣāt śeṣasiddhir anumānām.37

(c) Finally, from Hacker’s reconstruction it becomes clear that, there was an older Śāṁkhyā ontology-cosmology, which formed the bases for Īśvarakṛṣṇa’s normative conceptualization in the Śāṁkhyakārīka.38

Apparently, this philosophical tradition of Śāṁkhyā appears to coincide with the development of comparable conceptualizations within traditions of early Buddhist thought and early Vaiśeṣika.39 It is tempting to suggest that this Śāṁkhyā philosophical tradition is the oldest one among the technical schools of Indian philosophy (Hindu, Buddha and Jaina) and all the systems of Indian

35 Gerald J. Larson & Bhattacharya: Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophy Vol. IV, Motilal Barnasidass Publisher Private Limited, Delhi, 2006, P-10
36 Ibid
37 Ibid
38 Ibid
39 Ibid
philosophy have arisen out of an earlier Sāṃkhya philosophical environment.\textsuperscript{40} This claim may not, however, be accepted by all to be a legitimate one.

Although Yuktidipikā refers to a number of older Sāṃkhya philosophical teachers, it is difficult to ascertain even rough approximation of their dates.\textsuperscript{41}

- Paurika, a probable older teacher, has evidently accepted a plurality of prakṛti-s along with a plurality of puruṣa-s. His views have been finally rejected during the final stages of development.\textsuperscript{42}

- Pañcādhikaraṇa, another probable an older teacher, has accepted only ten organs instead of the normative thirteen. Moreover, he appears to have had a presently rejected somewhat eccentric view concerning the subtle body.\textsuperscript{43}

- Patañjali (a different figure than the compiler of the Yogasūtra and/or the grammarian) is another older teacher, whose unique views, such as the existence of a new subtle body for each rebirth and the non-existence of egoity as a separate basic principle apart from the intellect have been discounted in the final formulation of the Sāṃkhya system.\textsuperscript{44}

Up to this point, there has been no available Sāṃkhya textual tradition. The historical account stated above has been based on reconstructions and occasional references in the ancient literature. Still we have been able to identify at least heuristically three phases in the development of Sāṃkhya that roughly correspond to the three basic meanings of the term, namely: (1) Sāṃkhya as any enumerated set or grouping (tantra), (2) Sāṃkhya as a method properly employed by a discriminating person (Kapila-tantra), and (3) Sāṃkhya as an early tradition of dualist philosophizing (saṣṭitaṇṭra). This attains a normative formulation in the work of Īśvarakṛṣṇa, from where there

\textsuperscript{40} Gerald J. Larson & Bhattacharya: \textit{Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophy Vol. IV}, Motilal Barnasidass Publisher Private Limited, Delhi, 2006. P-11

\textsuperscript{41} Ibid

\textsuperscript{42} Ibid

\textsuperscript{43} Ibid

\textsuperscript{44} Ibid
is an identifiable textual tradition, and as a result the task of writing the history of Sāṃkhya easier basing the same on somewhat firmer ground.\textsuperscript{45}

Generally in the Sāṃkhya philosophical system there are three prominent sets of enumerations, namely—

1. the enumeration relating to the basic principles ($tattva$-s),
2. enumerations relating to the fundamental predispositions, and
3. enumerations relating to the phenomenal, empirical world of ordinary life ($pratyayasarga$ and $bhautikasarga$).\textsuperscript{46}

These are shown below:

- **The enumerations relating to the basic principles**

The enumerations relating to the basic principles are the set of twenty five elements that encompasses the basic principles of the system. The set of twenty five elements are as follows:

1. $puruṣa$ (pure consciousness) 
2. $mūlaprakṛti$ (primordial materiality) 
3. $mahat$ or $buddhi$ (intellect) 
4. $ahaṁkāra$ (egoity) 
5. $manas$ (sense of determination) 
6. $śrotra$ (sense of hearing) 
7. $tvac$ (sense of touching) 
8. $cakṣus$ (sense of seeing) 
9. $rasana$ (sense of tasting) 
10. $grhāṇa$ (sense of smelling)

\textsuperscript{45} Gerald J. Larson & Bhattacharya: *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophy* Vol. IV, Motilal Barnasidass Publisher Private Limited, Delhi, 2006, P-14

\textsuperscript{46} Ibid, P-48
11. vāc (sense of speaking)
12. pānī (sense of grasping/aprehending)
13. pāda (sense of walking/motion)
14. pāyu (sense of exciting)
15. upastha (sense of procreating)
16. śabda (sound)
17. sparsa (contact)
18. rūpa (form)
19. rasa (taste)
20. gandha (smell)
21. ākāśa ("space"/ether)
22. vayū (wind/air)
23. tejas (fire)
24. apaḥ (water)
25. prthivi (earth)

The five senses of action (karmendriya-s)
The five subtle elements (tanmātra-s)
The five gross elements (mahābhūta-s)

The enumerations relating to the fundamental predispositions

The enumerations relating to the fundamental predispositions (bhāva), inherent to the intellect in addition to its basic nature of reflective discerning, is a set of eight fundamental predispositions (bhāva). These are the tendencies that guide to a great extent the thinking, feeling and willing of a sentient being. The set of eight fundamental predispositions are as follows:

1. the predisposition toward meritorious behavior (dharma),
2. the predisposition toward knowledge (jñāna),
3. the predisposition toward nonattachment (vairāgya),
4. the predisposition toward power (aiśvarya),
5. the predisposition toward non-meritorious behavior (adharma),
6. the predisposition toward ignorance (*ajiñāna*),
7. the predisposition toward attachment (*avairāgya*), and
8. the predisposition toward impotence (*anaisvarya*).\(^{47}\)

These fundamental predispositions relating to reflective discerning represent the material dimension of *buddhi*. Therefore, these are called efficient causes (*nimitta*-s), which are correlated with the following eight resulting (*naimittika*) trajectories, namely:

1. the tendency to move upward in the cycle of transmigration (*ūrdhva*),
2. the tendency to move toward final release (*apavarga*),
3. the tendency to move toward merger in Primal Materiality (*prakṛtilaya*),
4. the tendency to move toward increasing control over life (*avighāta*),
5. the tendency to move downward in the cycle of transmigration (*adhostāt*),
6. the tendency to move toward increasing attachment and bondage (*bandha*),
7. the tendency to move toward further involvement in transmigration (*sāṃsāra*),
8. the tendency move upward declining control over life (*vighāta*).\(^{48}\)

The fundamental predispositions are innate or inherent (*sāmsiddhika* or *prākṛtika*), but these can be modified in terms of intensity or dominance of one (or more) over the other(s) through the cycle of continuing transmigration.

---

\(^{47}\) Gerald J. Larson & Bhattacharya: *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophy Vol. IV*, Motilal Barnasidass Publisher Private Limited, Delhi, 2006, P-49

\(^{48}\) Ibid. P-54
The enumeration relating to the phenomenal or empirical world of ordinary life

The enumeration relating to the phenomenal, empirical world of ordinary life is called pratyayasarga and bhautikasarga. This is the set of fifty categories. The set of twenty five basic principles interacting with the set of eight predispositions within the intellect generate what the phenomenal creation called pratyayasarga. It is made up of

- the set of five viparyaya-s (fundamental misconceptions),
- the set of twenty eight asakti-s (disfunctions),
- the set of nine tuṣṭi-s (contentments) and
- the set of eight siddhi-s (spiritual attainments). 49

Now, after discussing all these, it can be said that whatever be the differences of views or opinions among thinkers or scholars regarding the true meaning of the term Sāṁkhya, it may at least be safely said that Sāṁkhya stands for the philosophical system of thought propounded by the great sage Kapila. There are two different accounts regarding the origin of the name of the school as discussed above. According to one, Sāṁkhya derives its name from the world Sāṁkhya, which means number, and according to this account the school concerns itself with providing the right knowledge and understanding of reality by specifying the number and nature of the ultimate constituents of the universe. According to the other account, the term sāṁkhya means perfect knowledge. Since this philosophy is regarded by its followers as the system of perfect knowledge, they gave it the name Sāṁkhya.

Stages of the Development of Sāṁkhya System

In contemporary Indian culture, Sāṁkhya system is no longer a famous alive praxis. But as a very old system of Indian philosophy, it represents an

important tradition of Indian thought. Contents and traces of this thought can be found in a vast range of ancient Indian literature, which includes the Śrutis, Smṛtis, Upaniṣads, and Purāṇas. The origin and the course of development of Śāmkhya thought have been classified by different thinkers in different ways.

G. J. Larson’s view

In his book *Classical Śāmkhya* Larson classifies the development of Śāmkhya system of thought into four basic periods mentioned below:

1. **Ancient Śāmkhya speculations**

   This period begins from the eighth or ninth century B.C. It includes the speculative Vedic hymns and the prose Upaniṣads. Śāmkhya is not found in this period in the form of a very systematic philosophy. Śāmkhya thought in this ancient period is purely in a state of infancy.

2. **Proto-Śāmkhya speculations**

   This period extends from the fourth century B.C. to the first century A.D. It includes the ‘middle’ Upaniṣads, Carakasamhitā, Buddhacarita, the Bhagavadgītā, and mokṣadharma portion of the Mahābhārata. This period marks a time of amazing intellectual growth. During this period the religious quest has been given a rational and systematic foundation.

---
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\(\text{ Classical Sāṁkhya speculation}^{53}\)

This includes, for Larson, the \(\text{ Sāṁkhya-karikā, the Yogasūtra}\) and their commentaries. It ranges from the first century A.D. to the eleventh century A.D. A great variety of doctrines within the developing tradition can be found in this period. Īśvarakṛṣṇa's text \(\text{ Sāṁkhya-karikā}\) was composed in that period and it continued to remain as the authoritative interpretation of the system for many centuries.

\(\text{ Renaissance or later Sāṁkhya speculation}^{54}\)

It ranges from the sixteenth century A.D to the seventeenth century. It includes the readings of an extinct text provided by Aniruddha and Vijñānabhikṣu named \(\text{ sāṁkhya-sūtra}\) and \(\text{ sāṁkhya-pramāṇavacanasūtra}\) respectively and their corresponding commentaries Mahādeva's commentary together with the \(\text{ tattvasamāsasūtra}\) is also included in this period. According to Larson, it is a comparatively modern presentation of the system. These late texts "are markedly influenced by the Vedānta. For example, Vijñānabhikṣu devotes much energy to showing that Sāṁkhya can be reconciled in the orthodox point of view."\(^{55}\)

\textbf{Our observation}

For convenience, the developments of the Sāṁkhya thought should be distinguished in three different stages, namely

1. Early Sāṁkhya or the Pre-Karikā Sāṁkhya,
2. Classical Sāṁkhya and
3. Latter Sāṁkhya.

\(^{53}\) Ibid, P-134

\(^{54}\) Gerald J. Larson. \textit{Classical Sāṁkhya: An Interpretation History and Meaning}, Ross/Erikson, Santa Barbara, New Delhi, 1979, P-152

\(^{55}\) Ibid
- **Early Sāmkhya or the Pre-Kārikā Sāmkhya**

Sāmkhya thought available in a scattered form in the ancient literature of India, like the Veda-s, the Upaniṣad-s, the Purāṇa-s, the Caraka Saṃhitā, the Mahābhārata, the Gītā, the Buddacarita, the Yogasūtra of Patañjali and the Yogabhāṣya of Vyāsa may be called Early Sāmkhya.

- **Classical Sāmkhya**

The philosophical system based on the Sāmkhyakārikā of Īśvarakṛṣṇa and its commentaries may be called Classical Sāmkhya.

- **Latter Sāmkhya**

The late texts like sāmkhyapravacanasūtra or sāmkhyasūtra and the concerned commentaries, as stated by Larson, constitute the stage of Latter Sāmkhya. These late texts must be used with proper care to ensure that Sāmkhya concepts are not mixed with the Vedāntic ones and Sāmkhyakārikā is not interpreted from Vedāntic point of view.

The Sāmkhya thought has been shaped and reshaped through these three different stages of development. The systematic form of Sāmkhya has emerges for the first time in Īśvarakṛṣṇa’s Sāmkhyakārikā—the only presently available most authentic text that gives a precise, but comprehensive picture of this philosophical system. A number of commentaries have been written on this book to provide proper interpretation of this text, such as:

- the Tattvakaumudi of Vācaspāti Miśra,
- the bhāṣya of Gauḍapāda,
- the vṛtti of Maṭhara,
- the Yuktidīpikā of unknown parentage,
- Jayamaṇgalā of Saṅkara etc.

Besides these, another extinct text of late date, which is wrongly considered as the work of Kapila, is now available in two different readings, e.g. the reading of Vidyānabhistu entitled Sāmkhyapratvacanasūtra, and that of Aniruddha entitled Sāmkhyasūtra. Vidyānabhistu has written a bhāṣya on the
Sāmkhyapravacanasūtra and Aniruddha has written vṛtti on the Sāmkhyasūtra entitled Sāmkhyapravacanabhaṣya and Sāmkhyasutravṛtti respectively.56

The Sāmkhyakārikā and its commentaries refer to Kapila as the founder of the philosophical system, who out of compassion passed the great knowledge—Sāmkhya to Āsuri. Āsuri again passed this great knowledge to Pañcaśikha, from whom they said great knowledge has expanded to the learned persons.57

Unfortunately, all three teachers, mentioned above, are lost to antiquity. Pañcaśikha however, is referred to as the author of a massive treatise named Šaṭhitantra. The views attributed to Pañcaśikha in the Mokṣadharma suggests two alternative facts: one, that there was more than one Pañcaśikha, and two, that the name Pañcaśikha was a revered name in the tradition to which a variety of views were ascribed. Moreover, the claim that Pañcaśikha is the author of the Šaṭhitantra is contradicted by the counter-reference that the authorship of Šaṭhitantra goes to Vārṣaganya. It seems to be reasonable to support, however, that Pañcaśikha was a revered teacher of Sāmkhya and that Sāmkhya has not been a fixed philosophical system, but as a general methodology for attainment of salvation by reasoning and knowledge. It is also the reasonable to support that Sāmkhya represents an ancient chain of teachers (guruparamparā) beginning from the first learned (ādividvāna) and great sage (agrya munī) Kapila.58

56 Satischandra C & Direndramohan Datta: An Introduction to Indian Philosophy, University of Calcutta, 2008, PP-253-254

57 “etat pavitram agryam munī āsuraye’nukampayā pradadau, Āsurir api pañcaśikhāya tena ca bahudhā kṛtam tantram”—Kārikā LXX

A BRIEF SKETCH OF THE METAPHYSICS AVAILABLE IN SAMKHYAKĀRIKĀ

The metaphysics in Śāmkhyakārikā should be studied starting from the statement made in kārikā I, which mentions that reflection on human experience develops willingness to know the inner essence of human personality in order to grasp in a deeper and proper way the mystery of life and the valid means for getting rid of all sorrows permanently.

Kārikā I mentions that there are three kinds of sorrow, e.g. ādhyātmika (internal), ādhibhautika (external), and ādidaivika (divine). Sorrow of the ādhyātmika kind is twofold: śārīra (bodily) and mānasa (mental). Bodily sorrow arises from the disorder of wind, bile, or phlegm. Mental misery is separation from what is dear, union with that which is not liked and the rest. Sorrow of the ādhibhautika kind arises from the external causes, like things and beings of the world, such as fellow human beings, beasts, pet, flying animals, serpents, unmoving objects like trees, stones and the rest. Again, ādidaivika kind of sorrow arises from the supernatural agencies (devānāmidam or divāḥ prabhavat). On account of the affliction from this threefold sorrow, there arises inquiry concerning the means for the complete and permanent removal of threefold misery.

It is true that for the removal of the twofold internal misery, the internal means of the form of the treatment according to the medical science, union with the dear or desirable ones and preclusion of the undesirables, the pungent, bitter and astringent decoction and the like are readily available and are evident. Likewise, protection and the like are the evident means for the removal of the external misery. The Śāmkhya rationalism and their skepticism about the Vedic ritual are well reflected in the remarks of the Yuktidīpikā: 'tathā hi putrakāma iṣṭim nirūpya duhitaramapi na prāṇooti, arthakāmaśca karma kṛtvā māṣakamapi na labhate (since one is struck by the threefold misery, an inquiry into the means of terminating it is to be made. If is said that such an inquiry is superfluous in as

such as these mean do not secure absolute and final relief [kā I]). Hence, these evident means do not certainly and finally remove the misery.

One should have a jijñāsā (desire) for knowledge of those means, other than these evident means, which finally and completely remove the misery. To whom would the jijñāsā belong? To the puruṣa? No, for the puruṣa is atri-guna according to the Sāṁkhya. To the guṇa-s? No, for the guṇa-s are acetana. Still the Yuktidipika would attribute the jijñāsā to the guṇa-s, because of the rising of the jijñāsā in the buddhi, which is constituted of the three guṇa-s. Moreover, we experience the world as constituted of a manifold of objects. Therefore, it is expected that a good philosophy should seek to explain the significance of human life in relation to the whole universe by a thorough analysis of experience. A thorough analysis of human experience is thus the starting point of the Sāṁkhya Metaphysics.

In fact the basic human experiences of satisfaction, frustration, and indifference are traced back to their causal constituents (guṇa-s). This leads the Sāṁkhya thinkers, especially Īśvarakṛṣṇa, to the following valid logical decisions:

a. All individual experiences like pleasure, pain and indifference, as well as the material objects of the universe are constituted of three guṇa-s—sattva, rajas and tamas.

b. So, the material root cause of the universe is the guṇa-s—sattva, rajas and tamas taken together, i.e. prakṛti.

c. Besides this material root cause there is a fundamental experiencing non-material element—called puruṣa—the pure consciousness.

d. The proximity of prakṛti and puruṣa is the root of this world.

e. Non-understanding of this proximity is a beginning-less ignorance, which causes sorrow.
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f. Alleviation of all sorrows is the ultimate concern of all individuals.

g. But out of the many means for getting rid of sorrows, such as, popular practices (drṣṭa), performance of Vedic rituals, (ānuśravika) and discriminative knowledge of the matter-consciousness dichotomy (vyaktāvyaktājñā vijnāna), only the last one can cause alleviation of all sorrows.

As a system of philosophy Sāṁkhya is pluralistic dualism. It is realism and atheistic too. Sāṁkhya is pluralistic dualism, because it admits the reality of the world of multiplicity as the effect of the proximity of the two ultimate realities: prakṛti (primordial matter) and puruṣa (consciousness). It is atheistic, because Sāṁkhya does not require the existence and role of God for the evolution of the world of things and beings. Sāṁkhya is realism, since it holds that both matter and consciousness are equally real. The distinction between puruṣa and prakṛti is fundamentally a distinction between the subject and the object. The subject can never be the object, and vice versa. According to Kolla Chenchulakshmi, the two fundamental principles are lying at the root of experiences, namely, puruṣa and prakṛti. Puruṣa—the principle of consciousness is the subject and prakṛti—the principle of matter is the object of experience. These are not mythical in nature but are at the very root of the possibility of knowledge or experience. Experience is not possible unless there are objects of experience. But these by themselves are not enough to bring about experience. Experience presupposes consciousness. Unless there is some principle of consciousness, which interprets our experience, objects by themselves are incapable of producing experience. Therefore, Sāṁkhya logically and experimentally leads us to accept the fundamental principle of prakṛti and puruṣa. So, the dualistic metaphysics of Sāṁkhya is thus founded on the undeniably bipolar character.
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The metaphysical decisions are based on the Sāmkhya theory of causation, which is known as satkāryavāda. The essential question on which the Sāmkhya theory of causation is based is the following:

Does the effect pre-exist in its material cause?

Those who answer this question in the negative are called asatkāryavādin-s, while those who answer it in the affirmative are called satkāryavādin-s.

According to asatkāryavādin-s, the effect is a new creation; it is a real beginning. The effect does not pre-exist in the material cause. Had the effect pre-existed in its cause, there would be no sense in saying that it is produced or caused. While satkāryavādin-s, on the other hand, believe that the effect is not a new creation, it is only an explicit manifestation of that which was implicitly contained in its material cause.65

Another question comes: is the effect a real transformation or unreal appearance of its cause? Those who believe that the effect is a real transformation of its cause are called pariṇāmavādin-s. While those who believe the effect is an unreal appearance are called vivartavādin-s. Sāmkhya-Yoga and Rāmānuja believe in pariṇāmavāda, while Śaṅkara believe in vivartavāda. The view of Sāmkhya-Yoga is called prakṛtipariṇāmavāda, while that of Rāmānuja is called Brahmapariṇāmavāda.66

The theory that the effect really exists beforehand in its cause is one of the central features of the Sāmkhya system. The Sāmkhya defines cause as the entity in which the effect subsists in a latent form, and gives the following grounds in support of it67:
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A detailed study of satkāryavāda is given in Chapter-II
1. The non-existent can never be made existent. Blue cannot be made yellow, even by thousand artists.

2. The product exists before it comes into being in the shape of the material, of which it is composed.

3. If this is not admitted, then anything can come out of anything, which is impossible.

4. Causal efficiency belongs to that which has the necessary potency.

5. The effect is of the same nature as the cause. The cloth is not different from the threads or the curd is not different from milk in essence.

The causal relation cannot subsist between objects essentially different from one another. Development is the coming to light of what is latent and hidden.68 This view has also the support of scripture. According to this doctrine of satkāryavāda, the cause and the effect are the undeveloped and the developed states of one and the same substance. All production is development (udbhava), and all destruction is envelopment or disappearance (anudbhava or abhibhava) into the cause.69 Cause and effect are different states, and so are distinct from each other, though this distinction is based on our practical interests. The Sāmkhya theory of evolution (āvirbhāva) and involution (tirobhāva) are thus based on their satkāryavāda.70

Hence, satkāryavāda is the basis of the metaphysics in the Sāmkhya system. It is the theory of the relation of an effect (kārya) to its material cause. This theory logically leads to the concept of prakṛti as the ultimate cause of the world objects. All objects of the world, including our body and mind, the senses and the intellect, are limited and dependent things produced by the combination

68 As Aristotle would say; it is the transition from potential being to actual being, or in Hegel's words, it is the passage from the implicit to the explicit (Ref. Satischandra C & Dhirendramohan Datta: An Introduction to Indian Philosophy, University of Calcutta, 2008, P-266)
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of certain elements. Therefore, the world is a series of effects and that this series of effects must have a root cause.\textsuperscript{71}

What is the cause of the world? It cannot be the \textit{puruṣa} or consciousness, since the \textit{puruṣa} is neither a cause nor an effect of anything. So the cause of the world must be the not-self, i.e. some principle other than and different from consciousness.\textsuperscript{72} Can this not-self be the physical elements or the material atoms? According to the Carvāka-s or the materialists, the Jaina-s, the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika-s or Buddha-s, the atoms of earth, water, light and air etc. are the material causes of the objects of the world. The Sāṃkhya object to this on the ground, that, material atoms cannot explain the origin of the subtle products of nature, such as the mind, the intellect and the ego. So we must seek for something which can explain the gross objects of nature like earth and water, trees and seas, as well as its subtle products. Now it is found that in the evolution of things the cause is subtle than the effect and that it pervades the effect, as when a seed develops into a tree or a wish into a dream-object. Hence the ultimate cause of the world must be some unintelligent or unconsciousness principle which is uncaused, eternal and all pervading, very fine and always ready to produce the world of objects. This is the Prakṛti of the Sāṃkhya system. It is the first cause of all things and, therefore, has itself no cause. As the uncaused root-cause of all objects it is eternal and ubiquitous, because nothing that is limited and non-eternal can be the first cause of the world. Being the ground of such subtle products of nature as mind and the intellect, Prakṛti is a very subtle, mysterious and tremendous power which evolves and dissolves the world in a cyclic order.\textsuperscript{73}

Kārikā XX and XXI explain that evolution of the world has started from the association of \textit{prakṛti} and \textit{puruṣa}. The unconscious one (\textit{prakṛti}) appears as characterized by consciousness (\textit{puruṣa}). Similarly, the indifferent one appears as

\textsuperscript{71} Satischandra C & Dharendramohan Datta: \textit{An Introduction to Indian Philosophy}, University of Calcutta, 2008, P-257

\textsuperscript{72} Ibid,

\textsuperscript{73} Ibid, P-258
characterized by activity, because of the activities of the guṇa-s. The contact (sāmyyoga) between puruṣa and prakṛti does not; however mean any kind of ordinary conjunction like that between two finite material substances. It is a sort of effective relation through which prakṛti is influenced by the presence of puruṣa in the same way in which our body is sometimes moved by the presence of a thought. The association of two, as of the lame man and a blind man (the purpose of seeing the blind men and for the purpose of the walking of the lame man), is for contemplation by the Spirit of the Nature and for the release of Spirit and the creation proceeds from this union.\footnote{74}

The evolution of the world cannot be due to the self (alone), because puruṣa is inactive, and prakṛti is non-intelligent. The activity of prakṛti must be guided by the intelligence of puruṣa, if there is to be any evolution of the world, it is only when puruṣa and prakṛti co-operated, than there are the creation of a world of objects.\footnote{75}

The first product of the evolution of prakṛti is mahat or buddhi. Considered in its cosmic aspect, it is the great seed of this vast world of object and accordingly called mahat. In its psychological aspect this is as present in individual being, it is called buddhi or the intellect. The special functions of buddhi are as curtailment and decision. It is by means of the intellect that the distinction between the subject and other objects was understood and one makes decisions about things. Buddhi arises out of the preponderance of the element of sattva in prakṛti. It is a natural function of buddhi to manifest its self and other things. In its pure (sattvika) condition, therefore, it has such attributes as virtue (dharma), knowledge (jñāna), detachment (vairagya) and excellence (aisvaryya). But when vitiated by a tamas, it has such contrary attributes as vice (adharma), ignorance (ajñāna), attachment (āsakti or avairagya) and imperfection (asakti or anaisvaryya). Buddhi is different from puruṣa, which transcends all physical things.

\footnote{74 Satischandra C & Dhirendramohan Datta: An Introduction to Indian Philosophy, University of Calcutta, 2008 P-266}
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and qualities. However, it is the ground of all intellectual processes in all individual beings. It stands nearest to the self and reflects the consciousness of the self in such a way as to become apparently conscious and intelligent. While the senses and the mind function for buddhi or the intellect, the latter functions directly for the self and enables it to discriminate between purusa and prakrti.76

Aharîkâra is second product of prakrti, emerging which arises directly out of mahat, the first manifestation. Aharîkâra is said to be of three kinds, according to the predominance of one the guna-s. It is called vaikārika or sâttvika when the element of sattva predominates in it, tajasa or râjas when that rajas predominates, and bhûtâdi or tâmasa when tamas predominates. The function of aharîkâra is self-conceit or "I" and mine (abhimâna). From ahamkara, by access of element sattva emerge five knowledge senses (jñânendriya), five action senses (karmendriya), mind (manas) which at the same time as a senses of knowledge and activity (ubhayendriya). With the improvement tamas, ahamkara yield, on the other hand five subtle element (tanmatra) representing voice potency, touch, colour, feel and aroma. From five this subtle element emerge five gross elements, that is: akasa or ether, air, fire, irrigate and earth ground in the same formation. In Sâmkhya philosophical had twenty five principles (tattva) including purusa. From twenty-five the principle, prakrti represent the highest source or cause from all physical objects, including mind, substance and live.77

The five gross physical elements are arises from tanmatra-s described as such: (1) from the essence of sound (sabdatanmatra) is produced akasa with the quality of sound which is perceived by the ear, (2) from the essence of touch (sparsatanmatras) combined with that of sound, arises air with the attributes of sound and touch, (3) out of the essence of colour (rupatanmatra) as mixed with those of sound and touch, there arise light or fire with the properties of sound, touch and colour, (4) from the essence of taste (rasatanmatra) combined with
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those of sound, touch, colour is produced the element of water with the qualities of sound, touch, colour and taste, (5) the essence of smell (gandhatanmatra) combined with the other four gives rise to earth which has all the five qualities of sound, touch, colour, taste and smell.\(^{78}\)

The five physical elements of akasa, air, light, water, and earth have respectively the specific properties of sound, touch, colour, taste and smell. In the order in which they occur here, the succeeding element has the special qualities of the preceding ones added to its own, since their essences go on combining progressively. Prakṛti is the cause, but do not be caused from all objects. Mahat, aharḥkara, and five tanmatra have been because of certain effect, and they are effect from that certain cause. Eleven inderiya-s and five gross elements only the effect from certain cause and non cause themselves of an object which by substantial differ from them. Puruṣa nor caused (prakṛti), also non-effect (vṛkṛti) from an object. The state of prakṛti is the state of equilibrium of the three guna-s. When the equilibrium is disturbed due to some sort of contact with puruṣa the world of multiplicity comes into beings. The whole course of evolution from prakṛti to the gross physical element is distinguished into two stages, namely, the psychical (pratyayasarga or buddhisarga) and the physical (tanmatrasarga or bhautikasarga).\(^{79}\)

\(^{78}\) Satischandra C & Dhirendramohan Datta: *An Introduction to Indian Philosophy*, University of Calcutta, 2008. P-271

\(^{79}\) "prakṛtermahān tato‘hankāraḥ tasmād ganaśca śoḍaśkhaḥ, tasmādapi śoḍaśkāt pañcabhyah pañcabhūtāni"—kārikā-XXII