Chapter-II

CAUSALITY AND ULTIMATE REALITIES

SATKĀRYAVĀDA

Nature and forms of Satkāryavāda

• satkārya
   The existence of an effect in its material cause prior to its causal operation is called satkārya in the systems of Ancient Indian philosophy. Some systems of Ancient Indian philosophy admit satkārya, while others oppose it.

• satkāryavāda
   The theory which attempts to establish satkārya is known as Satkāryavāda. Satkāryavāda, thus, does not seek to prove the existence of the effect as such, but it seeks to prove the existence of an effect in its material cause prior to its production.

• Two different forms of satkāryavāda
   The theory of causation named satkāryavāda has two different forms, namely parināmavāda and vivartavāda. According to parināmavāda, when an effect is produced, there is a real transformation (parināma) of the cause into the effect), e.g. the production of a pot from clay. Sāṃkhya is in favor of this view as a further specification of satkāryavāda.

• prakṛtiparīnāmavāda
   Thus Sāṃkhya the theory of causation is a type of satkāryavāda. It is usually called prakṛtiparīnāmavāda, because according to this theory the world of multiplicity is the parīnāma of prakṛti—specifically speaking, the manifestation of the ultimate material root cause—mūlaprakṛti, which is essentially identical with its evolutes. This prakṛtiparīnāmavāda of the Sāṃkhya system is different from
the *Brahmapariṇāma*avāda* of Viśiṣṭādvaita Vedānta, according to which theory the world of multiplicity is the *pariṇāma* or manifestation of the root cause *Brahman*, who is essentially non-different (*aprthaksiddhi*) from the evolutes.

- **vivartavāda**

  According to Advaita Vedānta the change of the cause into the effect is merely apparent. In the case of seeing a snake in a rope, it is not the case that the rope is really transformed into a snake; what happens is that the rope only appears as a snake. So also Brahman does not become really transformed into the world, but He remains identically the same, while out of ignorance we wrongly think that Brahman undergoes change in creating the world.⁸⁰ This kind of *Satkārayavāda* is called *vivartavāda*.

  **The base-principle of Sāṁkhya-supported satkārayavāda**

  Sāṁkhya admits *satkārya*, i.e. the existence of an effect in its material cause prior to its causal operation, and attempts to establish it by arguments. The chain of arguments provided by Sāṁkhya in support of *satkārya* constitutes a theory of causation, and hence, it is called *satkārayavāda*. *Satkārayavāda* of the Sāṁkhya system is primarily based on the principle that whatever is non-existent can not be brought into existence and whatever is existent can not be made non-existent. Thus, according to this theory, an effect is the transformed cause. That is to say, a cause is the potential form and an effect is the actual form of the same substance, and therefore, production is simply the transformation of a material substance from its potential state to the actual state. So, what we call production is simply the manifestation or development of a cause and what we call destruction is merely disappearance of an effect into its cause. Naturally, there is as such nothing like utter destruction or annihilation.

---

⁸⁰ Chatterjee, Satischandra & Dhirendramohan Datta. *An Introduction to Indian Philosophy*. University of Calcutta, 2008, PP-256-257
A few prominent objections against this theory

The opponents of the Sāṁkhya-supported Satkāryavāda raise many objections against this theory, some prominent ones are as follows:

- If the effects or evolutes are identical with the root cause—mūlaprakṛti, why should they be produced from the mūlaprakṛti? The evolutes themselves might rather be regarded as the root cause—mūlaprakṛti.

- The causal scheme of the Sāṁkhya, is also inadmissible for the following reasons:
  - If it is urged that causal transformation means the assumption of new qualities, it may be asked whether such qualities are different from the causal substance or not, and if they are so, then the occurrence of new qualities cannot entitle one to hold the view that the causal substance is undergoing transformations (pariṇāma).
  - On the contrary, if the changing qualities and the causal substance were identical, then the root cause—mūlaprakṛti and its evolutes would be non-different, making thereby the causal operation absolutely non-sense.
  - Again, if it is urged that the effect is potentially existent in the cause, and causal operation only actualize it, i.e. produces some specific characteristics in the cause, this would mean that what was non-existent can be produced. This interpretation goes against the satkāryavāda.

- Moreover, the arguments put forward by Sāṁkhya in favor of satkāryavāda are also inadmissible for the following reasons:
  - If satkāryavāda is accepted, then nothing ought to be capable of being definitely asserted, since according to the satkāryavāda even doubts and errors are always existent as modifications of citta.
  - Again, the application of all the Sāṁkhya arguments in favor of satkāryavāda might be regarded as futile, since such arguments are intended to arrive at decisive conclusions; but decisive conclusions, being effects, are pre-existent in such arguments.
• If, on the contrary, it is contended that decisive conclusions are not pre-existent, but are produced by the application of arguments, then we have to admit that there is production of what was non-existent, and thus this contention goes against the *satkāryavāda*.

• If, again as a third alternative, it is urged that though the decisive conclusion (*niścaya*) is already existent before the application of the argumentative premises, yet it may be regarded as being manifested by the application of those premises, the Sāṁkhya thinkers may be asked to explain what they mean by such manifestation (*abhivyakti*).  

**The Sāṁkhya arguments in favour of satkārya**

The term *satkārya* appears in *kāriki-I*\(^{*}2\), wherein it is said that *satkārya*, i.e. the pre-existence of an effect in its material cause is established for the following reasons:

1. The non-existent can never be made existent.

   [Blue cannot be made yellow, even by thousand artists.]

---

\(^{81}\) Source of these objections:

\(^{82}\) "asadakaranādāduṇādānagahanāt sarvasambhavābhāvāt,
śaktasya śakyakaraṇāt kāraṇabhāvāc ca satkāryam."—*kāriki-I*, Sāṁkhya-kāriki

**Meaning:**

The effect pre-exists in its material cause

(1) because of the non-productivity of non-being,

(2) because of the need for an (appropriate) material cause,

(3) because of the impossibility of all things coming from all things,

(4) because something can produce what it is capable of producing, and

(5) because of the natural of the cause (or, because the effect is non-different from its cause).  

2. The effect exists before it comes into being in the shape of the material, of which it is composed.
3. Anything can not come out of anything.
4. Causal efficiency belongs to that which has the necessary potency.
5. The effect is of the same nature as the cause.

[A piece of cloth is not different in essence from the threads of which it is made up or the curd is not different in essence from milk of which it is made up.] In essence

According to this karikā, that the effect remains existent (sātv) in a latent form in its material cause before its production; after production it remains existent (sātv) sometimes in manifest form and in course of time it again remains (sātv) in a latent form in its material cause when it is merged into its own material cause. So, the whole material world remains latently existent (sātv) in the mūprakṛti before its production, it remains existent (sātv) sometimes in manifest form during creation and in course of time it again remains (sātv) in a latent form in mūprakṛti when it is merged into its own material cause mūprakṛti. Hence, the Sāṁkhya notion of the nature and existence of prakṛti is founded on their satkāryavāda. Let us now discuss the said five arguments put forward by Īśvarakṛṣṇa:

The argument – I: asadakaraṇāt (satkāryam)

An effect pre-exists (sātv) in its own material cause, because if an effect were really non-existent in its own material cause before its production, no amount of effort on the effect part of any agent could bring it into existence, as no artist can turn blue into yellow; no one can turn sugar into salt and extract oil from sand. This is because yellow is not contained in blue, nor is oil contained in sand. This is because yellow is not contained in blue, nor is oil contained in sand. When an effect is produced from some material cause, we have to say that

83 “asaccet kāraṇavyapārāt pūrvarī kāryam nāsya sattvarī kenāpi karttvā śakyam. na hi nilam śilpishaśreṇāpi śakyam pitāṃ karttvā”—Sāṁkhyaṭattvakaumudi on kārikā-IX, Sāṁkhyaṭakārikā
the effect pre-exists in the cause and is only manifested by certain favorable conditions, as when oil is produced by pressing the seeds. The activity of efficient causes, like the potter and his tools, is necessary to manifest the effect (pot) that exists implicitly in the clay.

If it is admitted that an effect like earthen pot is non-existent before its production from that non-existent object an existent earthen pot is produced, then why can't a purely unreal object like the hare's horn be produced from nothing? Again, if an earthen pot can be produced from its pre-production non-existence (prāgabhāva), then the same earthen pot can be produced further from its post-destruction non-existence (dhvamsābhāva). But this never happens. Therefore, an effect is always existent (sāt) in its own material cause.

Again, the non-existence of an effect (e.g. an earthen pot) is an attribute (dharma) of that effect (dharma); how can then the attribute non-existence remain in the absence of the substratum (dharma)? If it is admitted that the effect does not pre-exist in the cause, then it must be accepted that at the pre-production state there is presence of the attribute (dharma) non-existence in its substratum (dharma). But, this is not possible. Therefore, an effect pre-exists (sāt) in its own material cause.

The argument - II: upādānagrahaṇāt (satkāryam)

An effect pre-exists (sāt) in its own material cause, because a particular effect is produced only from its appropriate material cause. upādāna means the material cause. There is invariable relation between a material cause and its effect. A material cause can produce only that effect with which it is related. For example, one who wishes to produce curd needs its appropriate material cause milk, not anything else. Curd (dadhī) remains latently in the milk (kṣīra). As curd

84 "sadasattve ghaṭasya dharmau iti cet, tathāpyasati dharminī na tasya dharma iti sattvam tadavasthameva. tathā ca nāsattvam" — Śāṅkhyaatattvakaumudi on kārikā-IX, Śāṅkhyakārikā

85 "iha loke yo yenarthi sa tadupādāna grahaṇāṃ karoti dodhyarthi kṣīrasya na tu jalasya. tasmāt satkāryam" — Gauḍapādabhāṣya on kārikā-IX, Śāṅkhyakārikā
is existent in the milk before its production, so a curd can be produced from milk. To produce curd one needs milk as its material cause. The cause, which is in no way related to its effect cannot produce the effect and it cannot be related to what does not exist. Hence, the effect must exist in the material cause before it is actually produced.

If the effect were non-existent in its material cause, then the process of production would be baseless, because that which is real can only be a root by nature. There is as such a pre-existent relation between a material cause and its effect. The material cause related to a pre-existent effect is the producer of that effect. If the effect were non-existent in its own material cause before its production, then there cannot be any relation between the effect and its own material cause. So, an effect is existent \((sa\̄)\) in its own material cause before its production.

The argument – III : \textit{sarvasambhavābhāvāt (satkāryām)}

An effect pre-exists \((sa\̄)\) in its own material cause, because otherwise anything could come out of anything else, which really does not happen in this world. We see that only certain effect can be produced from certain cause. Curd can be got only out of milk and a cloth only out of threads. This shows that the effect somehow exists in its cause.

That is to say, all the effects are not produced from all the causes, an effect is uniquely related to its own material cause; and such an unique relation between an effect and its material cause cannot be admitted in the absence of the related effect and cause. If an effect can be produced in the absence of this unique relation between the effect and its material cause, then any effect can be produced in the absence of its unique material cause.

---

86 “\textit{itaśca kāraṇavyāpārat prāk sadeva kāryamityāha upādānagranānāt......upādānaiḥ kāryasya samvandhāditi yāvat}”—\textit{Sāmkhyatattvakaumudi on kārikā-IX, Sāmkhyakārikā}

87 “\textit{kāryena sambandham kāraṇam kāryasya janakam. sambandhaśca kāryasāsato na sambhabati. tasmāt saditi}.”—\textit{Sāmkhyatattvakaumudi on kārikā-IX, Sāmkhyakārikā}

88 “\textit{sarvasya-sarvatra sarhbhav ah na asti suvarnas ya rajatādau trmapāṁśusikatāsu}.”—\textit{Gauḍapādadbhāśya on kārikā-IX, Sāmkhyakārikā}
produced from any cause, the potter would not have taken clay to produce pots, instead of taking milk or threads or any other thing, which does not really happen. Therefore, an effect exists (sat) in its own material cause before its production.

The argument — IV: saktasya sakyakarana (satkarya)

An effect pre-exists (sat) in its own material cause, because of the fact a potent cause can produce a desired effect goes to show that the cause possesses potency and power, just as milk can produce curd, since it possesses potency and power of producing curd.

The effect producing power (sakti) of a cause, for Vācaspati, is the non-manifested form of the effect itself in that cause, while a producible effect (sakya kārya) is one that which is capable of being produced from a material cause (sakta kāraṇa) having contained the power (sakti) of production. As sesamum oil is produced only from its capable material cause sesamum, but never from anything else like sand. An effect that possesses some power is definitely related to the effect. However, the power cannot to be related to the effect, if the latter does not exist in some form. This means that an effect must exist in its own material cause before its production.

The argument — V: kāraṇabhavat (satkarya)

An effect pre-exists (sat) in its own material cause, because of the fact that the effect does not differ essentially from its cause. There is a relation of identity in difference between a cause and its effect, not merely a relation of difference without identity.

89 “asamvaddhasya janyatve asamvaddhatvavisēṣaṇa sarvaṁ kāryajātaṁ sarvasmād bhavet, na caitadasti.—Sāmkhyatattvakaumudi on kārikā-IX, Sāmkhyakārikā
90 “saktasya ātma eva utpādayati”—Gaudapādabhāṣya on kārikā-IX, Sāmkhyakārikā
91 “saktisca kāraṇagata na kāryasyāvyaktataṁbhavati, na hi satkāryapakṣekāryasyāvyaktatayā anyasyāṁ śaktāvastī pramāṇam”—Sāmkhyatattvakaumudi on kārikā-IX, Sāmkhyakārikā
92 Following this argument Anima Sengupta explains the relation of identity in difference between a cause and its effect in her own way:
Rice is produced only from a paddy, not from anything else like barley-seeds. If an effect were different in essence from its material cause this would not have happened. As it so happens a cause and its effect are identical in essence, although different in forms, because relation of identity in difference cannot exist between an existent cause and its non-existent effect. 93

If, therefore, the cause exists, the effect also must exist. In fact, the effect and the cause are the explicit and implicit states of the same substance. A cloth is not different from threads, of which it is made; the weight of a cloth is the same as that of the threads used in it.

**The conclusion drawn by Sāṁkhya from all these arguments**

- The effect exists in the material cause even before its production or appearance.
- No new thing can be produced anywhere any time.
- Production of a thing in the sense of new creation is not possible. Production means the manifestation of a subtle object. The sesamum oil that remains in the sesamum in a subtle state manifests itself by thrust, just as rice remains in the paddy in a subtle state and manifests itself by thrust. 94 The manifestation of an object from its latent state is called *āvirbhāva* (appearance).

“Before actual production, the effect exists in the *guna* collocation in the form of potential energy on account of certain obstacles which prevents its actualisation; but as soon as the barriers are removed, the energy gets a free passage and produces the necessary transformation known as the effect.”


93 “*na hi kāraṇādbhinnāṁ kāryāṁ. kāraṇāṇca saditī kathāṁ tadabhinnaṁ kāryamasadbhavet*”—Sāṁkhyaśāstraumudrāṁ kārikā-IX, Sāṁkhyaśāstraumudrā

94 “*sataścābhivyakṣirupapanna. yathāpijanena taisutailasya, avaghātena dhānyaeṣu tandulānāṁ*”—Sāṁkhyaśāstraumudrāṁ kārikā-IX, Sāṁkhyaśāstraumudrā
• Destruction of a thing in the sense of complete annihilation is not possible. Destruction means the dissolution of an object in its latent state. The disappearance of an object in its latent state is called nāśa or abhibhava. ⁹⁵

• Cause and effect are the different forms of the same thing. The subtle state of the object in which all the particularities (viśeṣa-s) of its gross form remain latent and undifferentiated is called cause (kārana), ⁹⁶ and when a subtle state of the object obtains gross form, we call it effect (kārya). ⁹⁷

• But inspite of having no difference in essence a cause and its effect serve different purposes owing to their difference in form. For example, a cloth (effect) can cover something, but the threads (its cause) can not.

• There is a real transformation (parināma) of the cause into the effect (e.g. the production of a pot from clay).

**Satkāryavāda—the foundation of Sāmkhya metaphysics**

Satkāryavāda is the foundation of the Sāmkhya metaphysics, because the theory that causation means a real transformation of the material cause into the effect logically leads to its concept of mūlaprakṛti as the ultimate cause—the root cause of the world of multiple objects. Everything in this world, including our body, senses, mind, ego and intellect are limited and dependent things produced by the combination of certain elements. Hence, the world is a series of effects, which must have a root cause. What, then, is the root cause of the world? Can the root cause be consciousness (puruṣa)? No, since consciousness is neither a cause nor an effect of anything. The root cause of the world thus necessarily be different from consciousness. Can this not-self be the material elements or the material atoms? According to the Cārvāka-s—the Ancient Indian materialists, the

---

⁹⁵ “nāśah kāraṇalayaḥ”—Sāmkhyaapravacanasūtra, 1/121.

⁹⁶ “nivṛttaviśeṣānāmaḥbhagatmanāvasthānam kāraṇamityayam siddhāntaḥ”—Yuktidipikā on kārikā-III, Sāmkhyakārikā

⁹⁷ “sūkṣmānāṁ murttīlabhaḥ kāryant”—Yuktidipikā on kārikā-III, Sāmkhyakārikā
atoms of earth, water, light and air are the material causes of the objects of the world. The Sāṁkhyā objects to this on the ground that material atoms cannot explain the origine of the subtle products of nature, such as the senses, the mind, the ego and the intellect. So, we must seek for something, which can explain the gross objects of nature as well as its subtle states, because in the process of evolution the cause is subtler than the effect and the cause pervades the effect, as for example, a seed develops into a tree or a wish into a dream-object. Therefore, because of the above-stated five reasons, it is proved that the existent is produced and not the non-existent, and that the emergent mahat and the rest are produced from the root cause mūlāprakṛti.

Prakṛti

Characteristics of prakṛti

Generally ‘prakṛti’ is wrongly understood as the equipoise state of the three guṇa-s. But since, the equipoise state of the three guṇa-s is only the non-manifested form of prakṛti, which is called mūlāprakṛti, avyakta or pradhāna; whereas prakṛti has one more form—the manifested form as well, it can not be defined as the equipoise state of the three guṇa-s. Why then Vācaspati says “sattvarajastamasāṁ sāmyāvasthā prakṛti” in Sāṁkhyatattvakaumudi?

The answer to this question is that Vācaspati writes “sattvarajastamasāṁ sāmyāvasthā prakṛtiḥ” in order to interprete the phrase “mūlāprakṛtiravikṛti” inserted in the third kārīka, i.e. with a view to define only mūlāprakṛti, not prakṛti in general. A careful study reveals that “sattvarajastamasāṁ sāmyāvasthā

---

98 Chatterjee, Satischandra & Dhirendramohan Datta. An Introduction to Indian Philosophy. University of Calcutta. 2008, p-258


100 “mūlāprakṛtiravikṛtiḥ mahadādyāḥ prakṛtivikṛtayaḥ sapta
ṣodāśakastu vikāro na prakṛtima vikṛtiḥ purusaḥ”—kārīka-III
prakṛtīḥ" is only a part of what Vācaspati has stated in course of interpreting the third kārikā. The text of his full statement is as follows:

"...tatra kā prakṛtireva ityata utkāṃ mūlaprakṛtīḥ avikṛtiriti. prakarotīti prakṛtīḥ pradhānam sattvarajastamasāṁ sāmyāvasthā. sā avikṛtīḥ prakṛtīḥ eva ityṛthaḥ. kasmāt ityata utkāṃ mūla iti? mūlāṃcāsaṃ prakṛtisēti mūlaprakṛtīḥ. viśvasyā kāryasarāṃghātasya sā mūlam na tvasyā mūlāntaramasti anavasthāprasaṃgāt."

From this it is clear that the characterization “sattvarajastamasāṁ sāmyāvasthā” is bound to the context “prakarotīti prakṛtīḥ pradhānam”, that is to mean pradhānam (is) sattvarajastamasāṁ sāmyāvasthā—the non-manifested form of prakṛti is the equipoise state of sattva, rajas and tamas.

In fact Īśvarakṛṣṇa is found to use the word prakṛti in the under-mentioned three different senses in the Sāmkhyakārikā:

1. the non-manifested pure form of Matter (i.e. mūlaprakṛti/pradhōna/avyakta),
2. both the non-manifested and manifested elemental causal forms of Matter (i.e. mūlaprakṛti and prakṛtivikṛtī), and
3. the above-mentioned two forms of Matter as well as their respective transformations (i.e. mūlaprakṛti, prakṛtivikṛti, vikṛti and their non-elemental transformations).

What is common in these three different usages of the term prakṛti, at least in some kārikās, is that prakṛti is the opposite element of puruṣa.

According to Īśvarakṛṣṇa, prakṛti—the opposite element of puruṣa, i.e. materiality, has basically two different forms: non-manifested and manifested (i.e.

---

101 As in the eighth, twenty second and fifty sixth kārikās.
102 As in the third kārikā.
103 As in the forty second, fiftieth, fifty ninth, sixty first, sixty second, sixty third and sixty fifth kārikās.
avayakta) and pradhāna being simply the non-manifested form of prakṛti is the equipoise state of sattva, rajas and tamas.

It is thus unwise to equate prakṛti with pradhāna or mūlaprakṛti and define it as sattvarajastamasāṃ śāmyāvasthā. In fact, the definition “sattvarajastamasāṃ śāmyāvasthā prakṛtiḥ” has been given by Vācaspati in course of offering interpretation of the phrase mūlaprakṛtiravikṛti occurring in kārikā-III with a view to stating the nature of mūlaprakṛti only. Hence, sattvarajastamasāṃ śāmyāvasthā is the characteristic of only mūlaprakṛti, not other manifested elements. mūlaprakṛti is identical with avyakta and pradhāna, because it is the non-manifested form of prakṛti.

If prakṛti is defined as sattvarajastamasāṃ śāmyāvasthā, the definition will suffer from the fallacy of under-coverage (avyāpti doṣa), having excluded vyakta—the manifested forms of prakṛti. [By ‘vyakta’ Īśvarakṛṣṇa means the manifested form of matter, which includes prakṛti-vikṛti, vikāra and their non-elemental transformations (atattvapariṇāma).]

Although Īśvarakṛṣṇa himself does not give any explicit definition of prakṛti, the common characteristics of avyakta and vyakta stated by him in the eleventh kārikā may be regarded as the fundamental characteristics of prakṛti. It is found that the term prakṛti has been used in many senses in Sāmkhyakārikā, some of which as mentioned below:

- **The non-manifested pure form of Matter**

prakṛti has been stated as the non-manifested pure form of Matter in some kārikās like the eighth, twenty second and fifty sixth ones. Let us see how.

- In kārikā-VIII, which reads:

  "saukṣmyāttadapidomalabdhirnābhāvat kāryatastadupalabdheḥ,
  mahadādi tacca kāryam prakṛtisarūpam virūpaṇica".

In this kārikā the reason for non-perceptibility of prakṛti has been stated as subtlety, not non-existence and thereby mūlaprakṛti is indicated by the application
of the term prakṛti. Gauḍapāda clearly mentions that here ‘prakṛti’ stands for pradhāna (prakṛtiḥ pradhānam). Similar statements are available in Yuktidipikā, Māṭharavṛtti and Jayamaṅgalā. Tattvakaumudi also supports this position when it mentions that the pronoun tat inserted in the phrase “kāryatāstadupalabdheḥ” stands for pradhāna (tat iti pradhānam).

Likewise the word prakṛteḥ occurring in the under-quoted kārikā XXII :

"prakṛtermahāṃstato ānkhāratastād ganaśca sōdaśakaḥ tasmādāpi sōdaśakāt pañcabhyāḥ pañcabhūtāni."

signifies mūlaprakṛti, since it describes the process of evolution indicating prakṛti as the root-cause of all the twenty three effect-elements. Jayamaṅgalā states clearly that ‘prakṛti’ in this kārikā is synonymous with the terms pradhāna, kāraṇa, avyakta, guṇasāmya etc. Similar expressions are available in other commentaries like Yuktidipikā, Gauḍapādbhāṣya and Māṭharavṛtti also.

Again the fifty sixth Kārikā, which reads:

"ityeṣa prakṛtikṛto mahadādiviśesabhūtaparyantaḥ prati purusāvivāmokṣārtham svārtha iva parārtha ārāmbhāḥ."

states that prakṛti evolves itself into the different forms of elements, right from mahat down to the mahābhūta-s, for the benefit of each puruṣa. Naturally, in this kārikā the word prakṛti’ stands for mūlaprakṛti or pradhāna. Jayamaṅgalā

---

104 “pradhānena visadṛśaṃ sadṛśaṃ”—Yuktidipikā,

"pradhānādvisadṛśaṃ sadṛśaṇa”—Māṭharavṛtti

"tadvyaktam prakṛteḥ pradhānasya sadṛśasadṛśaṇicetyarthalī”—Jayamaṅgalā

105 “prakṛtiḥ pradhānam kāraṇamavyaktam guṇasāmyam tamobahulamavyākṛtamiti prakṛtiparyāyāḥ”.

106 “prakṛtermahāṇutpadyate”

107 “prakṛtiḥ pradhānam brahmāvyaktam bahudhātmakam māyeti paryāyāḥ”

108 “prakṛtiḥ pradhānamadhikurute. brahmāvyaktam bahudhātmakam māyeti paryāyāḥ”.
interprets the term prakṛti ̣ kṛta clearly as "created by pradhāna, not created by God.".\(^{109}\)

\* Non-manifested and manifested elemental causal forms of Matter

In the Kārikā-III\(^{110}\) of Sāmkhyakarikā, which reads:

\[ mūlaprakṛtiravikṛtīḥ mahadādyaḥ prakṛtvikṛtayāḥ sapta \]
\[ śoḍaśākastu vikāro na prakṛtima vikṛtiḥ purusāḥ\],

'prakṛti' has been stated as the elemental causal forms of Matter which includes both mūlaprakṛti (non-effect cause element) and the prakṛtvikṛti-s (effect-cause elements). In course of interpreting the phrase "mahadādyaḥ prakṛtvikṛtayāḥ sapta" of this kārikā, which denotes a list of seven types of cause-effect elements beginning with the element mahat Vācaspati defines prakṛtiva as "tattvāntaropādānataṁca prakṛtivām", which means an element may be called prakṛti, if it is capable of producing another element. By 'tattvāntara' Vācaspati means difference in respect of grossness and sensibility. For example, mahat tattvāntara of mūlaprakṛti, while a pot is not the tattvāntara of clay, since pot and clay are equally gross and sensible.\(^{111}\) Again, mahat, ahaṁkāra and pañcataṁmātra are 'element producing' (tattvāntaropādānataṁca-yukta) elements' (tattva), because each one of these is cause of some element and effect of some other element. In course of interpreting the kārikā Yuktidikā also states, "prakṛti is understood as an effect-producing element." For Yuktidikā the effect-producing root element is the mūlaprakṛtiravikṛti, while 'prakṛti' and 'vikṛti' are

\(^{109}\) "prakṛtikṛta iti prādhānakṛtaḥ neśvarādikṛta ityarthāḥ"

\(^{110}\) "mūlaprakṛtiravikṛtīḥ mahadādyaḥ prakṛtvikṛtayāḥ sapta \]
\[ śoḍaśākastu vikāro na prakṛtima vikṛtiḥ purusāḥ" – Kārikā- III

\(^{111}\) "sarveśām goghaṁ dināṁ sthūlatā indriyagāhyatā ca samā iti na tattvāntaratvam".

\(^{112}\) "prakaroti iti prakṛtih. mūlaprakṛtiravikṛtīḥ mūlaprakṛtiravikṛtīḥ. mūlaprakṛtih kasya mūla? mahadādānām, samijñā khaliyām pradhānasya mūlaprakṛtirīti, sā cāvikṛtiravikāraṁ nyautpādyet varthāḥ".
synonymous with ‘kāraṇa’ and ‘kārya’ respectively. Similar views can be found in other commentaries such as in Gauḍapāda-bhāṣya¹¹⁴, Māṭharavṛtti¹¹⁵ and Jayamahaṅalā¹¹⁶.

The pradhāna or mūlaprakṛtivikṛti is the Primal Nature, since it is the origin of all the evolutes. But it is the origin having no cause. mahat, intellect, ego and the five subtle elements are the seven effect-producing produced elements. From the Primal Nature intellect is produced, and therefore, intellect is a product. As the intellect itself produces the ego it is productive. The ego too, is produced from the intellect, and therefore, it is a product; but since it gives rise to the senses and the five subtle elements it is productive.

“Again, the subtle element of sound is produced from the ego, hence is a product, and from it is produced the ether and therefore is productive. Likewise the subtle element of touch is produced from the ego and so is a product, and since it gives rise to wind, is productive. The subtle element of form is produced from the ego and therefore is a product, but as it produces light, it is productive. The subtle element of taste being produced from the ego is a product, but as it produces water, is productive and productions.”¹¹⁷

“The group of sixteen is product. The five organs of sense, the five organs of action, the eleventh mind, and the five gross elements—this group of sixteen, is only a product. Vikṛti means a product. The spirit neither is a product nor is

¹¹³ “kāraṇāni kāryāni cetyarthah”

¹¹⁴ “mūlaprakṛtih pradhānam”, “mūlam ca sā prakṛtiśca mūlaprakṛtih”, “soddakṣa gano vikṛtireva” etc.

¹¹⁵ “mūlaprakṛtih pradhānam mūlabhūtatvāt mūlam saptanāṁ prakṛtivikṛtāṃmādīrityarthah”

¹¹⁶ “mūlaprakṛtih pradhānam”, “mūlam ca tatprakṛtiśceti mūlaprakṛtih”, “soddakṣa gano vikṛtireva”, “nāsmāt kiñciddutpadyata ityarthah”

¹¹⁷ Mainkar, T.G. Sāṃkhya Karikā of Īśvarakṛṣṇa with Gauḍapāda-bhāṣya, Oriental Book Agency Poona, 1972, p-45 & 46
productive. *Mahadādi sapta* are both *prakṛti* and *vikṛti* and this has explained as follows:

(a) *Buddhi* arises from *pradhāna* hence *vikṛti* and gives rise to *ahāṅkāra* and so *prakṛti* also,

(b) *Ahāṅkāra* arises from *buddhi* hence *vikṛti*, and gives rise to the *pañca tanmātṛāni*, so *prakṛti* also,

(c) *Sabda tanmātra* arises from *ahāṅkāra* hence *vikṛti*, and gives rise to ākāśa, hence *prakṛti* also,

(d) *Sparśa tanmātra* arises from *ahāṅkāra* hence *vikṛti* and gives rise to *vayu*, so *prakṛti* also,

(e) *Gandha tanmātra* arises from *ahāṅkāra* hence *vikṛti* and gives rise to *prthīvī*, so *prakṛti* also,

(f) *Rūpa tanmātra* arises from *ahāṅkāra* hence *vikṛti* and gives rise to *tejas*, so *prakṛti* also,

(g) *Rasa tanmātra* arises from *ahāṅkāra* hence *vikṛti* and gives rise to āpah, so that means *prakṛti* also.”

- Any material element and thing except *puruṣa*

Īśvarakṛṣṇa uses the term *prakṛti* to stand for *mūlaprakṛti*, *prakṛtvikṛti*, *vikāra* and their *atattvāntara pariṣāma* (non-elemental transformations) in the following *kārikā*-s:

> "puruṣārthahetukam idam nimittaimittikaprasangena,  
prakṛtervibhutvayogānattavadavyavatisthate liṅgam"—kārikā-XLII

Remark: The phrase *prakṛtervibhutvayogāt* inserted in this *kārikā* signifies, according to the commentaries like *Gaudapādabhaṣya*, *Mātharavṛtti* and

---

118 Mainkar, T.G. *Sāṁkhyaśāstra of Īśvarakṛṣṇa with Gaudapādabhaṣya*, Oriental Book Agency Poona, 1972, p-45 & 46
Jayamarigalā\textsuperscript{121}, expansion of the denotation of ‘prakṛti’ to any material thing and element of the universe other than puruṣa.

\begin{itemize}
  \item “ādhyātmikāscatasraḥ prakṛtyupādānakālabhāgyākhyāh
  bāhyā viṣayoparamāt paṇica nava tuṣṭayo ‘bhimatāḥ’.—kārikā- L
\end{itemize}

Remark : ‘prakṛti’, here includes all forms of matter—manifested and non-manifested.

\begin{itemize}
  \item “rangasya darśayitvā nivartate nartakī yathā nṛtyāt
  puruṣasya tathā ‘tmānaṁ prakāśya vinivartate prakṛtiḥ’.—kārikā- LIX
\end{itemize}

Remark : The kārikā states that like a lady dancer prakṛti refrains from manifesting herself further in multiple forms as soon as she has exposed herself as manifested to the puruṣa. Hence, ‘prakṛti’ here does not simply denote mūlaprakṛti; it includes all other elemental and non-elemental transformations.\textsuperscript{122}

\begin{itemize}
  \item “prakṛteḥ sukumāratarānā na kiṇḍicidastiti me matirbhavati
  yā drṣṭāsmi punarna dasānanupaiti puruṣasya”. —kārikā- LXI
\end{itemize}

Remark : In this kārikā ‘prakṛti’ denotes all the elemental and non-elemental transformations (tattvapariṇāma and atattvapariṇāma),\textsuperscript{123} because only in its fully

\textsuperscript{119} “yathā rajā svarāstre vibhutvāt yadyadīcchati tat tat karotī tathā prakṛteḥ sarvatra vibhutvayogaḥ .... īṅgasya vyāvasthāṁ karoti”.
\textsuperscript{120} “yathā kaścid rajā prabhutvayogena svarāstre yadyadīcchati tat tat karotī evaṁ pradhānaṁ api prabhutvayogena mānusyaṁ vā daivam vā tairagyonyam kurute ....”.
\textsuperscript{121} “prakṛteḥ pradhānaṁ. tasyā vibhutvam jagatkārtṛtvam.”
\textsuperscript{122} “yathā nartaki.......rangasya darśayitvā kṛtkāryā nṛtyānivaṁtate. evaṁ prakṛṭirmahadahāmārātrānātrendriyabhūtabhāvā evamānuṣatiryāgrūpāsya yonīṣu sukhaduḥkhamohākṛtiḥ sāntaghoramūdhavīsyā sāti ātmānam puruṣasya prakāśya nivartate”.—Māṭharavṛtti
\textsuperscript{123} “sā prakṛtviryaktatmanā ca drṣṭāhamaneneti na punardānanupaiti puruṣasya; drṣṭāvābhāvāt”.—Jayamarigalā
manifested form prakṛti can stop coming into the sight of puruṣa as soon as prakṛti realizes, "I have been seen by puruṣa".

> "tasmānna badhyate'ddhā na muceyate nāpi samsarati kaścit saṁsarati badhyate muceyate ca nānāśrayā prakṛtiḥ". — Kārikā LXXII

Remark: As prakṛti transmigrates from its non-manifested form to its manifested forms of all kinds and vice versa, according to this kārikā, so the term prakṛti, here, denotes any material things and elements of the universe.124

> "rūpāh saptabhireva tu badhnātyātmānātmanā prakṛṭih saiva ca puruṣārtham prati vimocayatye karupena". — Kārikā- LXXXIII

Remark: As the mechanism of bondage and release undertaken by prakṛti is described125 here as per kārikā-LXII, hence the term prakṛti denotes any material thing and element of the universe.

> "tena nivrśtraprasavāmarthaḥvaśāt saptapravinivrśtām prakṛtiṁ paśyati puruṣah preksakavadavasthitah svasthā". — Kārikā- LV

Remark: By narrating that being seen by puruṣa as an indifferent spectator prakṛti comes back to the non-manifested state from its manifested states this kārikā recognizes both the manifested and non-manifested forms of prakṛti as its own different states.

Defining characteristics (lakṣaṇa) of prakṛti

The common characteristics of vyakta and avyakta forms of prakṛti, described in kārikā-XI, may be treated as the defining characteristics (lakṣaṇa) of prakṛti. The kārikā is as follows:

"triguṇamaviveki viṣayaḥ sāmānyacetakanaṁ prasavadharmi."

124 "prakṛtirātmānām badhnāti, mocayati saṁsarati ca...nānāśrayā devamanuṣatiryag-śāriśrābhubhūtyrthaḥ." — Mātharavṛtti

125 "purusārtham prati bhogāpavargem prati ātmanātmanem ekarūpena tattvajñānena vivekakhyātyā vimocayati punaḥ bhogāpavargau na karotyarthāḥ."—Tattvakaumudī
vyaktam tathā pradhānam tadviparītastathā ca pumān.”

The characteristics of prakṛti mentioned in this kārikā are namely (i) trigunam, (i) avivekī, (i) viṣayāḥ, (i) sāmānyam, (i) acetanam and (i) prasavadharmi, the meaning and significance of which are as follows:

trigunam: trigunam means constituted of three guṇa-s. It is the most important characteristic, because according to kārikā-XIV 126 the significance of all the five other characteristics are depends on the presence of the three guṇa-s (triguna) in the vyakta and avyakta forms of prakṛti and on the absence of the guṇa-s in puruṣa. The three guṇa-s—sattva, rajas and tamas taken together are described as trigunam. These three guṇa-s constitute the essence of prakṛti. The guṇa-s dominate, support and activate one another and interact among themselves to create the world.127 The Vayū Purāṇa associates rajas with Brahmā, tamas with Agni and sattva with Viṣṇu.128

Nature of the guṇa-s:129

• sattva is pleasure (prīti), luminosity (prakāśa), buoyancy (laghutva),
• rajas is pain (apriti), motion (cala) and ability to act (upaśtambhaka), and
• tamas is indifference (viśāda), heaviness (guru), veiling (āvaraka).130

prīti (pleasure), apriti (pain) and viśāda (indifference) are the subjective forms of sattva, rajas and tamas respectively, while luminosity (prakāśa), proclivity (pravṛtti) and restraint or limit (niyama) are the objective forms of sattva, rajas and tamas respectively. In the avyakta state the guṇa-s remain in equipoise, but in the vyakta state one guṇa dominate over the other two. In course of interpreting kārikā-XI Vācaspatri equates sukha, duḥkha and moha as “guṇa-s”

126 “avivekyādeḥ siddhīḥ traigunyāḥ tatviparītayābhāvāḥ”

127 anyonyābhīhavāśraya jananamithunavṛtttyasyaśca— kārikā-XII


129 To be discussed in details later on.

130 kārikā-XII
with sattva, rajas and tamas by making the statement—“trayo guṇāḥ sukhaduḥkhahamohā asyeti triguṇam”. What Vācaspati meant by describing duḥkha as a modification of rajaguṇa (“rajaḥ parināmabheda”) is that essentially duḥkha being rajaguṇa it is not possible to eliminate duḥkha altogether, since the guṇa-s are eternal, yet duḥkha can be turned back to its latent position rajaguṇa. 131

Aviveki: viveki means ‘differentiated’ or ‘discriminated’ and hence aviveki means ‘non-differentiated’ or ‘non-discriminated’. prakṛti being non-discriminated from the three guṇa-s is called aviveki. For Vācaspati prakṛti is aviveki in two different senses.

1 Sense-I: pradhāna is not different from itself and mahat etc. are not essentially different from pradhāna, because, there is a relation of essential identity (tādātma) between vyakta and avyakta. 132 Following the fifth argument of satkāryavāda—”kāraṇabhāvācca satkāryan”-kārikā-IX Vācaspati says, anything that possesses happiness (sukha), sorrow (duḥkha) and bewilderment (moha) is called aviveki. 133 Since prakṛti (at any state) is non-different from happiness, sorrow and bewilderment, so prakṛti is aviveki.

2 Sense-II: Vācaspati says, aviveka means sambhūyakāritva also134. Only after combining with others (sambhūya) an individual (thing or being) can perform any action. 135 The guṇa-s also having combined with one another (mithuna vṛtti) perform any action and hence prakṛti, constituted of the three guṇa-s, is called aviveki.

131 “yadyapi na sannirudhyate duḥkham tathāpi tat abhibhava śakyah kartumit”

132 "aviveki yathā pradhānam na svato vivicayate, evam mahadādayaḥ api na pradhānāt vivicyante tadātmakatvat”- Sāmkhyaatattvakaumudi on kārikā-XI

133 Vācaspati also says, "yat yat sukhaduḥkhhamohātmakam tattadavivekitvādiyogi, yathedamanubhūyamānam vyaktam”- Sāmkhyaatattvakaumudi on kārikā-XIV

134 "atha vā sambhūyakāritvāvivekītā”- Sāmkhyaatattvakaumudi on kārikā-XI

135 "na hi kiśicdekaṁ paryāptam svakārye, api tu sambhūyā”- Sāmkhyaatattvakaumudi on kārikā-XI
viṣaya: The word viṣaya has been used in seven kārikās of Sāṁkhya-kārikā.136 viṣaya means object. Object of what and whose object is prakṛti? For Māthara137 both the vyakta and avyakta forms of prakṛti are the objects of enjoyment of kṣetrajña puruṣa, and puruṣa is the enjoyer of the kṣetra—prakṛti. In the opinion of Gauḍapāda138 both the vyakta and avyakta forms of prakṛti serve the purpose of puruṣa as the viṣaya-s or objects of enjoyment and liberation to puruṣa. In course of interpreting the phrase “triguṇam aviveki viṣayaḥ”, occurring in kārikā-XI, Vācaspati remarks, “viṣayo grāhyaḥ viṣiṇāt vahirītī yāvat” with a view to reject the Buddhist view that viṣiṇa by itself assumes different forms of sound, touch, colour, taste and smell to appear as happiness, sorrow or bewilderment.139 Vācaspati opines here that viṣaya exists independently of the knowing self or conciousness as knowable (jñeya). Therefore, prakṛti, being viṣaya, is knowable (jñeya).

puruṣa—the pure consciousness has the capacity to enjoy, while prakṛti—the pure matter is enjoyable by the puruṣa. So the former is viṣayānd the later is viṣaya. The capacities of the two are non-changable.140 Even at the liberated state avvakta remains the object of puruṣa, but there is no urge for creation,


137 “sukhāduḥkhamohatayā bhogyaṁ tat puruṣasya. sa hi tasya bhokta. tathā pradhānāmapi sarvapuruṣānāṁ kṣetrajñānāṁ bhogyaṁ”—Mātharavṛtti on kārikā-XI

138 “bhogyam itaryathāḥ. sarvapuruṣānāṁ viṣayabhūtatvāt” and “sarva puruṣānāṁ bhojyā” —Gauḍapādabhāṣya on kārikā-XI

139 “ye tu āhūṁ viṣiṇaṁ eva harṣaviṣādāmohasabdādāyākāraṁ na punorito anyastuddharmetī” tān pratyaḥ viṣaya iti. viṣaya grāhyaḥ viṣiṇaṁ vahirītī yāvat”—Sāṁkhya-tattvākumudī on kārikā-XI

140 “bhoktātyogayatā ca puruṣasya caitanyam. bhogyatātyogatā ca prakṛteḥ jaçatvāṁ viṣayatvānca. na ca etayoḥ asti niṣṭhīḥ” —Sāṁkhya-tattvākumudī on kārikā-LXV.
puruṣa then realizes complete and permanent isolation from prakṛti and hence there remains no evolute for the enjoyment of puruṣa. At that time avyakta form of prakṛti appears as the object for the isolated spectator puruṣa.141 On the other hand, during anuloma pariṇāma, prakṛti as the possessor of all evolutes, becomes viṣayi, but at the state of simultaneous liberation of all puruṣa-s the viṣayi prakṛti becomes viṣaya of the isolated spectator puruṣa. So, both the manifested and non-manifested forms of prakṛti are the viṣaya-s (objects) of puruṣa.

Of course, this is the restricted sense of the use of the word viṣaya. In the wider sense, not only vyakta and avyakta, but also jīna is the viṣaya (of discriminative knowledge) as per kārikā-II, which speaks of vyaktāvyaktajñavijñāna—discriminative knowledge of vyakta, avyakta and jīna. In this wider sense viṣaya can not be a defining mark of prakṛti alone. When used in a restricted sense in kārikā-XI as a defining mark of prakṛti the term viṣaya signifies objects of knowledge and enjoyment. In that sense, only the vyakta and avyakta forms of prakṛti can be viṣaya, jīna can not be a viṣaya; because jīna is only an object of knowledge, not that of enjoyment.

sāmānya : The commentators explains sāmānya as the object of non-subjective apprehension. That means the object, which can be apprehended by many persons simultaneously is sāmānya. Citing almost similar analogies the commentators try to explain the nature of sāmānya. For them like a lady dancer142 or a paid maid servant143 or a prostitute144 both the vyakta and avyakta forms of prakṛti can be apprehended or enjoyed by all puruṣa-s, and hence the vyakta and avyakta forms of prakṛti are called sāmānya.

141 “prakṛtim paśyati puruṣaṭ”—kārikā-LXV
142 “śāmānyam sādhāraṇam ghatādidadadanekeśaḥ puruṣaṁgriñhitamityarthaaḥ.....tathā ca nartakābhuralatabhāṅge ekasmin bahūnām prati sandhānāṁ yuktam.”—Sāmkhyatattvakaumudi on kārikā-XI
143 “mūlyadāśivat sarva sādhāraṇatvāt”—Gaudapādabhāṣya on kārikā-XI
144 “śāmānyam vyaktaṁ gaṇikāvat sarvapuruṣāṇām. tathā pradhānāmapiḥ—Mātharavṛtti on kārikā-XI

Etika
acetana: ‘acetana’ means unconscious. As prakṛti is jaḍa (matter) it lack consciousness and so it is unconscious (acetana).\(^{145}\) Naturally the vyakta and avyakta forms of prakṛti, as such, are different from puruṣa—the pure consciousness. In kārikā-LVII the activities of prakṛti has been compared with that of a cow. As milk of a cow flows spontaneously through her udder unconsciously for the nourishment of her calf,\(^{146}\) similarly, the unconscious prakṛti acts for the liberation of puruṣa.\(^{147}\) In spite of being constitutionally opposite in nature owing to the proximity (saṁyoga) of puruṣa, consciousness being reflected on prakṛti, the vyakta and avyakta forms of prakṛti appear to be conscious\(^{148}\) and fulfills the enjoyment of puruṣa.\(^{149}\) At that time buddhi accepts the form of consciousness.\(^{150}\)

prasavadharmi: ‘prasava’ here means transformation (pariñāma), and therefore, ‘prasavadharmi’ means ‘that which is of the nature of transformation’.\(^{151}\) Both the vyakta and avyakta forms of prakṛti are always pariñāmi. The nature of transformation (prasavadharma) is eternally there in the vyakta and avyakta forms of prakṛti.\(^{152}\) Transformation (prasavadharma) of prakṛti denotes the productivity (pariñāmaśilatā) of vyakta and avyakta. There are two types of pariñāma—svarūpa

\(^{145}\) “bhohyatvayogayā ca prakṛterjaḍatvair na caitayorasti nivṛttītī”—Sāmkhyatattvakaumudi on kārikā-LXV

\(^{146}\) “vatsavivṛddhinimittam kṣīrasya yathā pravṛttirajñasya”—Sāmkhyatattvakaumudi on kārikā-LVII

\(^{147}\) “evamprakṛtiracetanā’pi puruṣa vimokṣaṇāya pravartiṣyate”—Sāmkhyatattvakaumudi on kārikā-LII

\(^{148}\) “tasmāt tat saṁyogādacetanaṁ cetanāvadiva līṅgaṁ”—kārikā-XX.

\(^{149}\) “buddhir hi puruṣasannidhānāt tachchāyapatyā tadṛūpeva sarvaviṣayopahogāṁ puruṣasya sādhayati. sukhaduhkhānubhavo hi bhogāḥ.....”—Sāmkhyatattvakaumudi on kārikā-XXXVII

\(^{150}\) “cetanā’dhiṣṭhītā buddhiścetanave vibhāvyate”—Yuktidipika on kārikā-XX

\(^{151}\) “prasavadharmi prasavarūpo dharmaḥ yaḥ saḥ asya asti iti prasavadharmi”—Sāmkhyatattvakaumudi on kārikā-XI

\(^{152}\) “prasavadharmasya nityayogamākhyātum”—Sāmkhyatattvakaumudi on kārikā-XI
parināma and virūpa parināma. At the time of pralaya (dissolution) there occurs svarūpa parināma (homogeneous transformation) in the pradhāna. The guṇa-s then remain in equipoise state; but sattva transforms itself into sattva, rajas transforms itself into rajas and tamas transforms itself into tamas.\(^{153}\) At the beginning of creation, there occurs virūpa parināma (heterogeneous transformation) in pradhāna. The guṇa-s then change heterogeneously; one guṇa tries to achieve preponderance over the other two, and thereby, pradhāna gradually mutates itself into mahat, ahamkāra, eleven senses, five subtle elements and five gross elements.\(^{154}\) Therefore, all positive entities (bhāva padartha) including the manifests (vyakta-s), except puruṣa, always mutate (parināmaśila) themselves, as from buddhi originates ahamkāra and from ahamkāra originate eleven senses and five subtle elements, and from the subtle elements originate five gross elements.\(^{155}\)

**GUÑAS–THE CONSTITUENTS OF PRAKṛTI**

“Guṇa here means a constituent element or component and not an attribute or quality. Hence by the guṇas of sattva, rajas and tamas we are to understand the elements of the ultimate substance called prakṛti.”\(^{156}\) The three guṇa-s constitute prakṛti—they are the essence, not qualities of prakṛti.\(^{157}\) prakṛti can not also be regarded as a substratum containing three inter-opposing qualities, because no substratum can have two or more opposing qualities, which contradict one another. As such sattva, rajas and tamas, which are called as guṇa-s, jointly constitute the essence of the root cause of the world—prakṛti.

\(^{153}\) “tasmāt sattvam sattvarūpatayā, rajo rajorūpatayā, tamastamorūpatayō, pratisargavasthāyāmapi pravartate”—Sāmkhyatattvakaumudi on kārikā-XVI

\(^{154}\) kārikā-XXII

\(^{155}\) “prasavadharmi vyaktam. buddherahamkārastata indriyaṇi tanmātraṇi ca tebhyo bhūtāni jāyante. evam pradhānamapi buddhim prasūyate”—Māṭharavṛtti on kārikā-XI

\(^{156}\) Chatterjee, Satischandra & Dhirendramohan Datta. *An Introduction to Indian Philosophy*, University of Calcutta, 2008, p-259

\(^{157}\) “sattvādīnāṁ taddharmatvaṁ tadrūpatvāt”—Śāmkhyapracanasūtra, VI/39.
"The reason why they are called guñas is either their being subservient to the ends of the puruṣa which is other than themselves, or their being intertwined like the three strands of a rope which binds the soul to the world." 158 The word guṇa in Sanskrit also means strand of a rope. Usually three strands are used to make a rope. prakṛti being made of three constituents: sattva, rajas and tamas, the constituents are analogically called guṇa-s. In the Sāṃkhya-yoga system, sattva, rajas and tamas are analogically treated as guṇa-s, which constitute the prakṛti-rope159 to bind puruṣa -animal.

That is to say the guṇa-s "are the constitutive element of prakṛti. Guṇa-s are not parts of prakṛti, but identical with it.....They are called guṇa-s (literally, subsidiary or secondary), because they serve the purpose of the other (Puruṣa) or because they are inter-twined like the three strands of a rope which binds Puruṣa of the world."160 The unconscious guṇa-s serve the purposes (i.e. enjoyment and liberation) of the other one (para)—conscious puruṣa-s.161 Puruṣa is accepted as para, because being devoid of the guṇa-s (nirguṇa) it is by nature opposite of the three guṇa-s.

The three guṇa-s are "responsible for all the experiences of Puruṣa. They are objective, ultimate and the irreducible elements of experience. The sattva element makes objects intelligible, the rajas element enables objects to undergo changes, tamas enables the object to assume shape and resists its destruction through changes."162

158 Chatterjee, Satischandra & Dhirendramohan Datta. An Introduction to Indian Philosophy, University of Calcutta, 2008, p-259 & 260
159 "sattvādiddrayāni rajjārambhakatantuvadeva guṇā itucayante"—Yogavārttika on Yogasūtra I/2
160 Chenchulakshmi, Kolla. The Concept of Parianāma in Indian Philosoph: A Critical study with Reference to Sāṃkhya-Yoga, Sundeep Prakashan, New Delhi, 2005, p-16
161 "gunāḥ iti parārthāḥ"—Sāṃkhyaattvakaumudi on kārikā-XII
162 Chenchulakshmi, Kolla. The Concept of Parianāma in Indian Philosoph: A Critical study with Reference to Sāṃkhya-Yoga, Sundeep Prakashan, New Delhi, 2005, p-16
"The guṇas are not the so-called qualities of the Vaiśeṣika system because, they themselves possess the characteristics of lightness, movement and heaviness. One quality cannot be the substratum for another. So, these guṇas are substances (dravyas), since the quality of lightness etc. subsist in them."\(^{163}\)

"All objects of the world (both physical and mental) are the results of the different permutation and combinations of these three ultimate real. Our thoughts and ideas (which seem to possess a character different from that of the physic world) are not outside the realm of the guṇas. They are as much the effects or modifications of the ultimate real as physics things......In every citta-vṛtti, the indistinguishable union of guṇas is detectable. Our phenomenal consciousness as well as its objects are due to the functioning of these three guṇas which are the sole productive forces of this universe."\(^{164}\)

The nature, purpose and action of the three guṇa-s have been described by Īśvarakṛṣṇa in the under-quoted twelfth and thirteenth kārikā-s of Śāmkhyakārikā:

\[ \text{prityapritviśādātmakāḥ prakāśapraśrītiyamārthāḥ,} \]
\[ \text{anyonyābhibhavāśrayajananamithunavṛttayaśca gunāḥ— kārikā- XII} \]

\[ \text{sattvam laghu prakāśakamiṣtamupāṣṭambhakāṁ calaṇca rajāḥ,} \]
\[ \text{guru varaṇakameva tamaḥ pradīpavaccārthato vṛttih—kārikā- XIII} \]

**Nature of the three guṇa-s**

The nature of the three guṇa-s are described below following the above-quoted two kārikā-s:

**Nature of sattva guṇa**

Śāmkhyakārikā describes the nature of sattva guṇa as laghu and prakāśaka.\(^{165}\) 'laghu' means buoyant or light and 'prakāśaka' means luminous or

\[^{163}\] Chenchulakshmi, Kolla. The Concept of Pariṇāma in Indian Philosoph: A Critical study with Reference to Śāṅkhya-Yoga, Sundeep Prakashan, New Delhi, 2005, p-16

\[^{164}\] Ibid, p-17

\[^{165}\] "sattvam laghu prakāśakam"—kārikā-XIII
illuminating. Therefore, sattva is buoyant or light (laghū) and luminous or illuminating (prakāśaka). According to Yuktidīpikā lāghutva is the capability responsible for the origination of an effect\textsuperscript{166} and the effectuating capabilities of the senses.\textsuperscript{167} Buoyancy or lightness (lāghava dharma) is responsible for the upward motion of flames or blazing up of fire,\textsuperscript{168} the winding motion (tiryak gamana) of anything, as in case of wind\textsuperscript{169} and contact of the senses (indriya-s) with their respective objects. Prakāśa, for that commentary, means the illumination of sense objects by removing the darkness of shadow caused by the gross elements.\textsuperscript{170}

**Nature of rajoguṇa**

According to kārikā- XIII rajas is described as upaśambhaka (motivator) and cala (mobile). Therefore, rajas not only motivates the other guṇa-s—sattva and tamas—which are inactive (aksiya) by themselves, it itself is also mobile. To perform their respective actions, sattva and tamas depend upon the pravṛtti or prajatna (stimulator), which comes from the rajas, and hence, rajas motivates sattva and tamas to perform their respective activities giving up their fatiguiness.\textsuperscript{171} According to Yuktidīpika calatā (action) is of two types viz. ‘to transform’ (pariṇāmalakṣaṇa) and ‘to flourish’ (praspandālakṣaṇa). To transform is to deviate a dharma from its previous dharma’ with the aid of any associated

\textsuperscript{166} \textquoteleft \textquoteleft tatra kāryasya tāvadudgamanaheturdharmo lāghutvam\textquoteright\textquoteright—Yuktidīpikā on kārikā-XIII

\textsuperscript{167} \textquoteleft \textquoteleft karaṇasya vṛtti-patu-vahetul\textquoteright\textquoteright—Yuktidīpikā on kārikā-XIII

\textsuperscript{168} \textquoteleft \textquoteleft yato-hanegrūrddhajvalananāṃ bhavati, tadeva lāghavamī—Sāṁkhya-tattvakaumudi on kārikā-XIII

\textsuperscript{169} \textquoteleft \textquoteleft kasya cī tiryak-gamane hetuḥ yathā vāyoh—Sāṁkhya-tattvakaumedī on kārikā-XIII

\textsuperscript{170} \textquoteleft \textquoteleft prakāśāstau prthividharmasya chaśā lākṣaṇasya tamasastirśkāreṇa dravyāntaropraṇashanam. karaṇasyāpi grahanām saṁkalpābhimānādyavasāyaviśayasya yathāsvāṃ pravartanānām\textquoteright\textquoteright—Yuktidīpikā on kārikā-XIII

\textsuperscript{171} \textquoteleft \textquoteleft rajasopāsthyet evasādāt pracānya svakārye te utśāharī pravatnāṁ kārye	extquoteright\textquoteright—Sāṁkhya-tattvakaumudi on kārikā-XIII
Flourishing, again, is stated as the action of vital winds (prāṇādi vāyu), function of the senses of action (karmendriya) and the upward, downward and rotational movement of objects.\(^{173}\)

**Nature of tamoguṇa**

In the Sāmkhyakārikā tamas is described as heavy (guru) and veiling (āvaraka) in nature.\(^{174}\) For the influence of the hindrance caused by tamas on the other guṇa-s a control and harmony is observed in the world, since sattva stimulated by rajas is prevented from exercising its limitless function. As a result, the senses (indriyas) fail to contact objects of distant place and of different times, and the upward motion of the flames is prevented from reaching the remote sky. Moreover, the activities of rajas are controlled by the hindrance of the heavy (guru) and veiling (varanaka) nature of tamas.\(^{175}\) Being heavy (guru) and veiling (āvaraka) in nature tamas makes things appear as impure (aśuddha).\(^{176}\)

**Purpose or necessity of the three guṇa-s**

The purpose or necessities of the three guṇa-s: sattva, rajas and tamas have been described, by the phrase "prakāśa-pravṛttinyāmārthāḥ,"\(^{177}\) as illumination (prakāśa), proclivity (pravṛtti) and restraint (niyamana) respectively.

\(^{172}\) "sā ca dvividhā, pariṇāmalakṣaṇā praspandalakṣaṇā ca. tatra pariṇāmalakṣaṇāyā sahakāriḥbāvāntarānu-grhītasya dharmaḥ pūrva-dharmā-pracyutiḥ"—Yuktidipikā on kārikā-XIII

\(^{173}\) "praspada (prasyanda) lakṣaṇā praṇādayaḥ karmendriyavṛttayaśca vacanādyāḥ. vāhyānāṁ darvāyaṅmutpatanani-patañabhramaṇāṇāṁ"—Yuktidipikā on kārikā-XIII

\(^{174}\) "guruvarāṇakameva tamaḥ"—kārikā-XIII

\(^{175}\) "rajastu cālatayaḥ pariṣṭraśayugyāṁ cālayāt guruṇā āmvatā ca tamasā tatra tatra pravṛtti pratīvandhakena kvacideva pravartate iti"—Sāmkhyatattvakaumudī on kārikā-XIII

\(^{176}\) "tatra guruvarvāṁ kāryasyādho-gamanahetudharmaḥ karaṇasya vr̥ttimandataḥ. varaṇamapi kāryagatari ca dravyāntarātirodhānam. karaṇagatā cāśuddhīḥ prakāśa-pratidvandvibhūtā"—Yuktidipikā on kārikā-XIII

\(^{177}\) kārikā-XII
Necessity of *sattva guna* : The presence of *sattva guna* is necessary for the origination of an effect\(^\text{178}\) and the effectuating capabilities of the senses,\(^\text{179}\) the upward motion of flames or blazing up of fire,\(^\text{180}\) the winding motion (*tiryak gamana*) of anything,\(^\text{181}\) and contact of the senses (*indriya-s*) with their respective objects.

Necessity of *rajoguna* : The presence of *rajoguna* is necessary for the functioning of buoyance and illumination, which are the essential properties of *sattva guna*, and for that inertia and veiling, which are the essential properties of *tamoguna*.

Necessity of *tamoguna* : Likewise, the power of restraint of the *tamoguna* is required to restrain buoyancy and luminosity (the function of *sattva*), and inertia and veiling (the function of *tama*).

**Functions of the three *guna*-s**

The Sanskrit word *vṛtti* means function in English. Each *guna* has its own individual *vṛtti*. Such as:

- The *vṛtti* or function (*kriyā*) of *sattva* is tranquility (*sānta*). Owing to the influence of this *sānta vṛtti* there appears pleasure (*sukha*).
- The *vṛtti* or function (*kriyā*) of *rajas* is turbulence or violence (*ghora*). By the influence of this *ghora vṛtti* there appears pain (*duhkha*).

---

\(^{178}\) *"tatra kāryasya tāvadudgamanaheturdharmo laghutvam"*—*Yuktidīpikā* on *kārikā*-XIII

\(^{179}\) *"karaṇasya vṛttipatuvaḥetuf"*—*Yuktidīpikā* on *kārikā*-XIII

\(^{180}\) *"yatohagnerūrddhajvalanam bhavati, tadeva lāghavam..."*—*Sāmkhyatattvakaumudi* on *kārikā*-XIII

\(^{181}\) *"kasya cit tiryakgamane heturbhavatī yathā vāyoh"*—*Sāmkhyatattvakaumudi* on *kārikā*-XIII
• The vṛtti or function (kriyā) of tamas is stupidity (muḍha). The influence of muḍhā vṛtti causes bewilderment (moha).  

Besides these individual vṛtti-s (functions) four inter-effective vṛtti-s (functions) of the guṇa-s have been indicated in the phrase “anyonyābhibhavāśrayajananamithunavṛttayaścā” of the twelfth kārikā. The guṇa-s are (i) (anyonya) abhibhavṛtti, (ii) (anyonya) āśrayavṛtti, (iii) (anyonya) jananavṛtti and (iv) (anyonya) mithunavṛtti. That means the guṇa-s are inter-suppressive, inter-supporting, inter-productive, inter-consorting and co-existing.

**Inter-suppressive**: A guṇa either dominates over or assists the other guṇa-s to produce any effect. By the phrase anyonyābhibhavāṛtti (inter-suppression) the dominance of one guṇa over other is meant. Thus inter-suppressive means “overcoming one another and becoming manifest with the characteristics of pleasure, pain etc: just as when the sattva dominates, then at that time dominating over, suppressing the rajas and tamas, with its characteristics, it manifest itself as pleasure and illumination. When rajas dominate the sattva and tamas, then it does so with its characteristic of pain and activity. When tamas dominates the sattva and rajas, then it does so through its characteristic of delusion and fixture.”  

The respective necessities (artha) of the guṇa-s make each guṇa to dominate over the other two (at different occasions). As a result, when there is preponderance of one guṇa, the other two remain as dominated.  

According to Sāṁkhya-tattvākāumudī the function of mutual suppression of the guṇa-s is like the following:

---

182 “tathā hi sattvarā rajastamasi abhibhūya sāntāmātmano vṛttim pratilabhate evam rajaḥ sattvatamasi abhibhūya ghorāmevaṁ tamaḥ sattvarajasi abhibhūya muḍhāmiti”—Sāṁkhya-tattvākāumudī on kārikā-XII

183 Mainkar, T.G. Sāṁkhya-kārikā of Īśvarakṛṣṇa with Gauḍapādabhāṣya, Oriental Book Agency Poona, 1972, page 76

184 “eṣāmanyatamenārthavāṣādudbhūtenānāhyadabhibhūyatē”—Sāṁkhya-tattvākāumudī on kārikā-XII
The *vṛtti* or function (*kriyā*) of *sattva guṇa* being tranquility (*sāntā*), when *sattva* dominates over the other two *guṇa*-s, owing to the influence of the function of tranquility (*sānta vṛtti*) of *sattva guṇa* there appears pleasure (*sukha*).

The *vṛtti* or function (*kriyā*) of *rajagaṇa* being turbulence or violence (*ghora*), when *rajas* dominates over the other two *guṇa*-s, owing to the influence of the function of turbulence or violence (*ghora vṛtti*) on *sattva guṇa* there appears pain (*duhkha*).

The *vṛtti* or function (*kriyā*) of *tamagaṇa* being stupidity (*muđha*), when *tamas* dominates over the other two *guṇa*-s, owing to the dominance of the function of stupidity (*muđha vṛtti*) of *tamagaṇa* there appears bewilderment (*moha*).185

**Inter-supporting**: Here, inter-supporting signifies the function of interdependence, because the term *āśraya* is not used in the concerned phrase in the usual sense of locus (*ādhāra*); but in the sense of dependence (*sahakārita*), and hence “*anyonyāśrayavṛtti*” signifies the function of interdependence. Only during heterogeneous change—*ṣṛṣṭi*, the *guṇa*-s undergo heterogeneous change *visadrśa* or *virupa pariṇāma*, which follows from *sadrśa* or *svarūpa pariṇāma*. *anyonyāśrayavṛtti* occurs during *visadrśa* or *virupa pariṇāma*. As we have said *guṇa* either dominates over or assist the other *guṇa*-s to produce any effect. By the phrase “*anyonyāśrayavṛtti*” the inter-assistance of each *guṇa* provided for the effect-producing function of the remaining *guṇa*-s is meant.186 The *guṇa*-s assist one another to give rise to the diverse effects constituting the phenomenal world.

When the function of one *guṇa* depends, for its actuation, on the other two *guṇa*-s, the *guṇa* that depends on the other *guṇa*-s is called *āśrita*, while the *guṇa*-s upon which the *āśrita guṇa* depends is the *āśraya* of the other two. Hence,

185 “*tatha hi sattvam rajastamas abhibhuya sāntāmātmano vṛttirn pratiabhate evam rajaḥ sattvatamas abhibhuya ghorāmevaṁ tamaḥ sattvarajas abhibhuya muḍhāmiti*”—Sāṁkhya-tattvakaumudi on kārikā-XII

186 “*parināmatāḥ salilavit pratipratigunāśraya viśeṣāḥ*”—Sāṁkhya-tattvakaumudi on kārikā-XVI
when *sattva* depends on the other two *guna*-s *sattva* is called *āśrita* and the other two are its *āśraya*. Likewise, each *guna* becomes the *āśraya* of the other two. In this way, the *guna* become *anyonyāśraya*, i.e. interdependent. 187 Here interdependence implies interassistance, since each *guna* helps the other two as well; as *sattvaguna* helps the other two *guna*-s by illumination, *rajoguna* helps the other two by motivation, and *tamoguna* helps the other two *guna*-s by veiling and restraint. 188

**Inter-productive:** The *guna*-s are inter-productive, because each *guna* produces the other two *guna*-s. 189 That is the meaning of the term *anyonyajananavr̥tti*. But what does the word *janana* (production) mean here? For Vācaspāti, ‘*janana*’ here means *saddr̥ṣa parināma*, 190 which is also called *svaṛupa parināma*. During *pralaya* there occurs *saddr̥ṣa parināma*, when the *guna*-s undergo homogeneous change by the aid of one another. *visaddr̥ṣa* or *vīrupa parināma* follows from *saddr̥ṣa* or *svaṛupa parināma* and hence *visaddr̥ṣa* is *parināma* the root cause of the *visaddr̥ṣa parināma*. But the *guna*-s are eternal, since no *guna* can individually evolve into any element. 191 When the *guna*-s remain as *sakti* or potential energy even the great sages cannot perceive them because of their subtleness—these sages can perceive only the effects of the *guna*-s. 192

187 “*anyonyāśrayavṛttayaḥ, yadyāpi ādhiḥādheyabhāvena na āśrayārtho ghatate tathāpi yadapekṣyayaḥ yasya kriyā sa tasya āśroyah*”—Śāmkhyatattvakaumudi on kārikā-XII

188 “*sattvam pravṛttiniyamou āśritya rajastamasoh prakāṣena upkaroti, rajah prkāśaniyamau āśritya pravṛttīya itarayoḥ, tamāḥ prakāśa-pravṛttī āśritya nīyamena itarayoḥ iti*”—Śāmkhyatattvakaumudi on kārikā-XII

189 “*anyatamaḥ anyatamaṁ janayati*”—Śāmkhyatattvakaumudi on kārikā-XII

190 “*jananaṁca parināmaḥ, sa ca guṇānāṁ saddrūpāḥ parināmaḥ*”—Śāmkhyatattvakaumudi on kārikā-XII

191 “*ataeva na hetumattvam, tattvāntarasya hetorabhāvāt*”—Śāmkhyatattvakaumudi on kārikā-XII

192 “*paramarṣerapi guṇānāṁ kāryameva pratyakṣam na śaktimātrenāvasthānāṁ sarvvedyātvāt*”—Yuktidīpikā on kārikā-XIII
Inter-consorting and co-existing: The guna-s are inter-consorting. They are inter-associates and co-existant. Thus, the guna-s are called anyonyamithunavṛtti. That means the guna-s are companions of one another—anyonyasahacara. Here, anyonyasahacara means avinābhāvavṛtti—the function of inseparable existence. In fact, no guna can exist separately leaving aside the other two.\(^{193}\) Dissociation never occurs among the guna-s even when one guna preponderates over the other two. Neither samyoga (association) nor viyoga (dissociation) can be there among the guna-s. Because being inseparately existent the guna-s can not be occasionally associated and, hence, none of them can be detached or dissociated from the others. In Sāmkhya samyoga is understood as "aprāptipūrvikā prāpti". By "aprāptipūrvikā prāpti" Sāmkhya means coming in contact of those, which exist separately. Naturally samyoga can not occur among the guna-s, which are in essence anyaonyamithunavṛtti.

But here the opponents argue that the functions of the guna-s are not like a couple’s mating, because in that case the guna-s, being of opposite nature, will destroy themselves like the two hostile demons, named Sunda and Upasunda, who killed each other after being involved in a duel for achieving the then most beautiful woman in the world Tilottama. Hence, for the opponents nothing can be produced by the assimilation of the three guna-s.\(^{194}\) Naturally, they argue, how can the three guna-s: sattva, rajas and tamas, possessing opposite qualities like gaurava (heaviness), lāghava (lightness) etc., be anyaonyamithunavṛtti? In other words, if the guna-s are “mutually opposed and act according to their own individual objectives, how they can produce one common effect?

In reply it is said that just as (i) a lamp, which is composed of the opposites, a wick, oil and flame, so also the guna-s sattva, rajas and tamas, which are opposite in nature, combine together and assist one another to generate

\(^{193}\) "anyonyamithunavṛttayah. anyonyasahacarāh, avinābhāvavṛttaya iti yāvat."—Sāmkhyatattvakaumudī on kārikā-XII

\(^{194}\) "nanu ete paraśaravirodhāsilā gunāḥ sundopasundavat param param dhvanisante ityeva yuktāṁ prāgeva tesāmekkritāḥ kartātyāḥ"—Sāmkhyatattvakaumudī on kārikā-XIII
light; (ii) proportionate combination of vāyu, pitta and śleṣmā helps to retain the body healthy and (iii) mutual combination of some objects of opposite nature, like water and fire, makes the act of cooking successful, similarly, the three guṇa-s, inspite of having opposite nature, combine with one another to perform their functions. Moreover, a woman causes pleasure to her husband, pain to her co-wives and infatuation to her beloved.

Neither in the homogeneous state nor in the heterogeneous state of prakṛti there is any conflict among the three guṇa-s. Because, during heterogeneous state, owing to the presence of inequal quantity of potential energy among the three guṇa-s there is preponderance among them and as a result, the suppressed guṇa-s lack power to confront with the dominating guṇa-s. Again, during the homogeneous state, owing to the absence of any urge to dominate others, there is no conflict among the three guṇa-s, although during that state equal quantity of potential energy remains in the guṇa-s.

The guṇa-s have two bhāva-s (states), viz. mukhya (primary) and gauna (secondary). At the primary state (mukhya bhāva) the guṇa-s oppose one another. But during the secondary state (gauna bhāva) they appear to be beneficial to the pradhāna—when there remains no conflict among the guṇa-s.

195 “pradipavaccarthato vṛttih”—kārikā-XIII
196 “yathā ca vātapiśtāśleṣmānaḥ paraspararājodhīnaḥ sārirdhāraṇalakṣaṇa kāryakārīṇaḥ”—Sāṃkhyaatvatvakaumudi on kārikā-XIII
197 “tad yathā jalāgni pacanīyasvedaniyeśu kāryaeṣu...... evaṁ tat siddaḥ...... sattvarajastamasāṁ virodhe'pi sahabhāvat”—Yuktidipikā on kārikā-XIII
198 “sattvamapi spāñcagurabhātim spaspatirajajasāṁ svena rūpenāṅgabhāvarī maccham stasyopakārād duhkharī samapadyate. tamoso mohānt”—Yuktidipikā on kārikā-XIII
199 “rūpātiśayā vṛttatīṣayāśca virudhyaante. sāmāmyāni tvatiśāhi saha vartante”—Yuktidipikā on kārikā-XIII
200 “gunapradhānabhbāvāt. gunabhūto hi pratiyogī pradhānabhūtena tadupakārakatvānna viruddhyata”—Yuktidipikā on kārikā-XIII
"The Yuktidipika, raises the question whether this description of the guṇa-s, leads to a concept of sixfold guṇa-s. Each guṇa apparently having two varieties on account of its 'dharma-s', as mentioned in the kārikā, laksanaabhedat guṇānām saḍaṭvam, and also the problem whether a guṇa is of a mixed nature having something of the other two guṇa-s, sāmkinṣasvabhāva. The problem is posed like: eko guṇaḥ trīrūpah; sarve vā sarvarūpāḥ and the conclusion is reached that guṇa-s are 'anyonyajanananvattayaḥ na ca sāmkīṃṣasvabhāvāḥ'. It has established also, that the guṇa-s is not six fold."\(^{201}\)

When sattva, rajas and tamas remain in equipoise state there is no preponderance of one guṇa over one the other two, and for this reason, the each guṇa changes within itself, without disturbing the others. That is, sattva changes into sattva, rajas into rajas and tamas into tamas. Such transformation is called svarūpaparānāma or homogeneous change.\(^{202}\) No object of the world can arise unless the dominance of one guṇa over the others begins to take place. The equipoise state of the three guṇa-s: sattva, rajas and tamas, is defined as "sattvarajastamasāṁ sāmyāvasthā' (equipoise state of the guṇa-s). The guṇa-s remain in the equipoise state in the mūlaprakṛti and they reveal interaction in the manifest state of prakṛti. Hence, Vijnanabhikṣu says, "akāryāvasthopalaksitam gunasāmānyam prakṛtiḥ"\(^{203}\). By various arguments, he tries to establish that prakṛti does not simply denote "equipoise state of the guṇa-s". The attribute "equipoise state of the guṇa-s" is applicable only to mūlaprakṛti. So, it is the lakṣana of mūlaprakṛti and upalakṣana or tatastha lakṣaṇa (secondary characteristic) of prakṛti.

\(^{201}\) Mainkar, T.G. Sāmkhyakārikā of iśvarakṛṣṇa with Gaudapādabhāṣya, Oriental Book Agency Poona, 1972, p-80

\(^{202}\) "parināma svabhāva hi guṇa.....tasmāt sattvaṁ sattvarūpatayā, rajah rajarūpatayā, tamastamorūpatayā pratisargavasthāyām api pravarttate"—Sāṁkhyaṭatvavakaumudī on kārikā- XVI

\(^{203}\) Sāṁkhyaśravacanaṁbhāṣya on Sāṁkhyaśūtra I/61
Number of prakṛti

The term prakṛti, in the broad sense, means material cause. Īśvarakṛṣṇa applies the term prakṛti in the third kārika to mean cause-element (kāraṇatattva). Hence, in that kārika the term prakṛti signifies both mūlaprakṛti (the non-manifested cause-element) and the prakṛtvikṛti-s (the manifested cause-elements). Since the mūlaprakṛti (avyakta) is considered as “avikṛti”, while buddhi, ahaṃkāra and five tanmātra-s are considered as “seven prakṛtvikṛti-s”, it is regarded that there are eight kinds of prakṛti (“āṣṭa prakṛti”), which are the modifications of one and the same prakṛti—the fundamental matter-element. So, as a single combination of different forms of matter prakṛti is one and only one, although the manifested forms of prakṛti are plural in number. But there is still a question: whether the non-manifested form of prakṛti—called avyakta or pradhāṇa is plural in number? According to Paurika, an ancient Sāṁkhya thinker, a separate pradhāṇa attached to each puruṣa produces the physical body and other objects of empirical existence. Hence, unlike the contention of kārika-X, which declares pradhāṇa or avyakta as single, not plural in number, Paurika admits plurality of prakṛti. But Paurika’s doctrine of plurality of prakṛti is not supported by any ancient Sāṁkhya thinker including Vārṣāgaṇya. In support of the denial of the doctrine of plurality of pradhāṇa Yuktidīpikā argues that the plurality of pradhāṇa cannot be established by any pramāṇa, because (i) owing to extreme subtleness of pradhāṇa, perception can not establish the plurality of pradhāṇa, (ii) for the non-existence of undisputed hetu or līṅga inference of the plurality of pradhāṇa is

204 "mūlaprakṛtvikṛtih mahadādyāḥ prakṛtvikṛtayaḥ sapta soḍaśaśakastu viśāro na prakṛtirna vikṛtih puruṣah" – Kārikā- III

205 "pratipuruṣamanyat pradhānaṁ saṅrādyartham karoti”—Yuktidīpikā on kārikā-LVI

206 “na tāvatpratyakṣa eva tachakaṁ niścetum. pradhānāṇāmatindṛtyatvāt”—Yuktidīpikā on kārikā-LVI
not possible at all and (iii) since authentic persons like Kapila consider pradhāna as single, so testimony also does not support the plurality of pradhāna.

But even if no pramāṇa does support the plurality of pradhāna or avyakta Īśvarakṛṣṇa has presented proofs for the existence of pradhāna or avyakta in kārikā-XIV and kārikā-XV.

**PROOFS FOR THE EXISTENCE OF AVYAKTA**

According to Śāṁkhyā-admitted satkāryavāda, any effect pre-exists in its material cause. The entire material world is an effect, and therefore, the material world must have a cause—although it is non-perceptible for being unmanifested and too subtle. This unmanifested and too subtle non-perceptible root cause of the material world is called avyakta or pradhāna or mūlaprakṛti in Śāṁkhyā. The root cause of the material world can not have any further root; because the root, by definition or by nature, can not permit any further root.

It is said in kārikā-VIII that non-perception of the elements like avyakta occurs owing to their too subtleness, not for their non-existence. However, the subtle elements like avyakta can be known, according to Śāṁkhyā, through the through sāmānnotadṛṣṭa type of inference (inference based on the observation of generality), because any supersensible element can be inferred by such type of inference. Yuktidipikā maintains that during the absolute equipoise state all effects latently remain in the avyakta. So, the existence of the equipoise state of prakṛti can not be denied as fictitious like the existence of a hare’s horn and there is no subtler state than the avyakta, as it is the root cause of all effects.

---

207 “līrin gām cāha sandīgdharh nāsti”— Yuktidipikā on kārikā-LVI

208 “āptāścā no nābhidhahurato manyāmahe naitadevamiti”— Yuktidipikā on kārikā-LVI

209 “mūle mūlābhāvādālamām mūlān”—Śāṁkhyaṭattvakaumudi on kārikā-III

210 “saukṣmyāt tadanupaladbhirnābāhāvat”.

211 “sāmānyatastau drṣṭādatindriyānām pratitiṁumānāt”—kārikā-VI
The proof given in *kārikā*-XIV in support of the existence of *avyakta*:

- Form the fact that all the effects such as *mahat* etc. are constituted of the three *guna*-s, it is proved that the material root cause of these effects must be admitted to be constituted of the three *guna*-s, because the effects possess the same nature of their respective causes.\(^{212}\)

Example: A cloth possesses the same attributes as that are possessed by the threads of which it is made.\(^{213}\)

During the absolute equipoise state the three *guna*-s latently remain in the *avyakta* and during heterogeneous transformation they manifest themselves in numerous ways and for this reason, there is diversity in the whole world.

Example: The rain water with single taste gets diversely modified into various fluids of numerous tastes, such as sweet (*madhura*), sour (*amla*), salty (*lavana*) and bitter (*tikta*) in accordance with diverse combinations, when it falls down on the earth. Likewise, the manifest world originating from *avyakta* has different manifestations.\(^{214}\)

Proofs given in *kārikā*-XV in support of the existence of *avyakta*

(1) "*bhedañām parimāṇāt* (*avyaktamastī*): The word *bhedañām* denotes manifested things and elements, while the term *parimāṇāt* means the spatio-temporal limitation. The period of duration of any effect like the manifested things and elements is limited in space and time (*paricchinnā* or *parimita*). The existence of a limited object is dependent on its cause, because that limited object is produced from its cause. All the manifested things and...

\(^{212}\) *kāraṇaṅgatmakatvāt kāryasya avyaktamapi siddham*—*kārikā*-IV

\(^{213}\) "kāryam hi kāraṇaṅgatmakāṁ drṣṭāṁ yathā tattvādi guṇatmakāṁ paṭādi"—Sāṁkhyaśatattvakaumudī on *kārikā*-XIV

\(^{214}\) "yathā hi vāridavimuktāṁ udakāṁ ekāraṇaṁ api tattat bhūmivikārānāsādyā nārikela-tīlalavivaciravilvatindukāmalakapācīnāmalakakapithaphalarasataya parināmāṁ madhura-mlalavatātiktakaṣāyātayāvikalpante...."—Sāṁkhyaśatattvakaumudī on *kārikā*-XVI
elements of the world being limited in space and time (paricchhipna or parimita), they require a final non-manifested root, which is infinite—i.e. beyond the spatio-temporal limitation, for their finitude. Can puruṣa be the root cause of all the effects—i.e. manifested things and elements of the world? In reply it is said that puruṣa can not be the root cause of the manifested things and elements of the world, because by nature puruṣa is neither cause nor effect.215

(2) "samanvayāt (avyakta ma): The term parimānat216 means 'because of the common quality of all objects'. As the common quality of all objects of the entire finite world indicates the essential homogeneity of all the objects of the entire finite world, so there must be a common source—the root cause of all the finite things and beings of the world and that root cause is avyakta. The existence of avyakta can thus be proved by samanvaya also. Pleasure, pain and bewilderment are the common characteristic of all evolutes (effects) and objects of the finite world. For Śāmkhya pleasure, pain and bewilderment are respectively identical with sattva, rajas and tamas. So, the ultimate unmanifest cause of all manifest effects must contain the three guṇa-s. Because, the nature of an effect is similar with that of its cause.217

(3) "saktitaḥ pravṛtteḥ (avyakta ma): Productions occur in the world as there is power, potency or urge in every cause to produce its effect; so evolution of the world points to the presence of power or potency of the infinite root cause and thereby the existence of the root cause. To explain further—

a. an effect is produced from the potency of its cause;218 not from anything lacking potency to produce that effect,219

215 "na prakṛtiḥ na vikṛtiḥ puruṣaḥ"-kārikā-III

216 "bhinnānāṁ samānarūpatā samanvayāḥ"—Śāmkhyaattvakaumudi on kārikā-XV

217 "yao yajjatiyakaḥ sa tasya vikāra iti"—Yuktidīpikā on kārikā-XV

218 "yo yasmin saktāḥ sa tasmin eva arthe pravartate"—Gaudapādabhaṣya on kārikā-XV
b. because, potency (śakti)—the implicit state of the effect (kārya)—remains only in the cause,220 and nothing other than the implicit state of the effect does exist in the cause,221

c. hence, avyakta exists as the cause of the manifest world order on the ground that an effect is produced by the potency (śakti) inherent in the cause.222

Example: The potency of sesamum-oil remains latently in the sesamum seed, not in the sand, otherwise sesamum-oil could be produced from sand in stead of sesamum seed.

(4) "kāraṇakāryavibhāgāt' (avyaktamasti): The effects have difference and non-difference with their respective causes.223 The material world being the effect of the infinite root cause—avyakta the difference between infinite cause and its effects points to the existence of the infinite root cause—avyakta. Because, all the effects of the world order are directly or indirectly related with the avyakta and have differentiation with the avyakta.224 According to Jayamarigala and Yuktidipikā there is differentiation of all the effects of the world as upakārya and their infinite root cause avyakta as upakāraka.225 Being

219 "asaṅktā karaṇāt kāryānupatīteḥ"—Śāṁkhyaṭattvakaumudi on kārikā-XV
220 "śaktiśca karaṇagataḥ na kāryasya avyaktaḥvāt anyaḥ"—Śāṁkhyaṭattvakaumudi on kārikā-XV
221 "na hi satkārayapakṣe kāryasya avyaktaḥ śaktyāḥ anyasyāṁ śakty ayast iti prāmāṇaṁ"—Śāṁkhyaṭattvakaumudi on kārikā-XV
222 "itaśca avyaktaraś asti iti aha śaktītaḥ prāvṛttiścāḥ"—Śāṁkhyaṭattvakaumudi on kārikā-XV
223 "karaṇaṃkāryavibhāgadavibhāgādviśvarūpyasyāḥ"—kārikā-XV
224 "so'yaṁ karaṇāt paramavyaktaḥ sāksāt pāramaryājīrynītāsyā viśvasya kāryasa vibhāgah"—Śāṁkhyaṭattvakaumudi on kārikā-XV
225 "karaṇam ca kāryam ca karaṇaṃkārye tayonibhāgah karaṇaṃkāryavibhāgah"—Yuktidipikā on kārikā-XV
the root (mūla) cause of the world order, avyakta is not dependent on anything else.

Analogy: An earthen pot, a gold ring and a gold crown, which latentlly remain in soil and gold respectively, appear subsequently from soil and gold differentiating themselves as effects.\textsuperscript{226} Likewise,

- the five gross elements (mahābhutas) appear and differentiate themselves from the five subtle elements (tānmātras),\textsuperscript{227}
- the five subtle elements (pañcatanmātra) and eleven senses appear and differentiate themselves from the ahamkāra\textsuperscript{228},
- the ahamkāra appear and differentiate itself from the mahat\textsuperscript{229} and finally
- the mahat appear and differentiate itself from the avyakta\textsuperscript{230}

(5) "avibhāgād vaisvarūpyasya" (avyakyamasti): For Gaudapāda and Vācaspāti 'avibhāga here means dissolution or merger, and the term viśva means various (nānā). So, the phrase avibhāgād vaisvarūpyasya means the various manifest forms getting merged into mūlaprakṛti attain the state of non-difference with the root cause avyakta. During dissolution, any effect merges in its cause, as an earthen pot merges in clay,\textsuperscript{231} and thereby the effect becomes non-different from its cause.

\textsuperscript{226} "evam kāraṇāt mṛtṇḍāt hemapindāt vā kāryāni ghatakundalmukūṭādīni santyevarbhavantivrhaīyante"—Sāmkhyatattvakaumudi on kārikā- XV

\textsuperscript{227} "santyeva ca prthivyādīnī kāraṇāt tanmātrāt āvirbhavantī vibhajyante"—Sāmkhyatattvakaumudī on kārikā- XV

\textsuperscript{228} "santyeva ca tanmātrāi ahamkārāt kāraṇāt"—Sāmkhyatattvakaumudi on kārikā- XV

\textsuperscript{229} "sannevaḥahamkāraḥ karaṇat mahatāḥ"—Sāmkhyatattvakaumudi on kārikā- XV

\textsuperscript{230} sanneva ca mahān paramāvyaaktādītī—Sāmkhyatattvakaumudi on kārikā- XV

\textsuperscript{231} "pratisarge tu mṛtṇḍān hemapindānī vā ghatakundalmukūṭādayo viṣānto’vyaktī bhavanti"—Sāmkhyatattvakaumudi on kārikā- XV
As the entire world of the manifested things and elements remain merged in the non-manifested root cause—avyakta during the equipoise state, and because there is no essential difference between any effect and its cause, the existence of the non-manifested root cause of the material world—avyakta is proved.

How a cause-element reveals as avyakta in respect of its effect-element is shown by the following chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The element(s)</th>
<th>Having dissolved in the element(s)</th>
<th>Reveal(s) the element(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mahābhūta-s</td>
<td>tanmātra-s</td>
<td>tanmātra-s as avyakta²³²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tanmātra-s and the eleven senses</td>
<td>ahamkāra</td>
<td>ahamkāra as avyakta²³³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ahamkāra</td>
<td>mahat (buddhi)</td>
<td>mahat as avyakta²³⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mahat</td>
<td>mūlapakṛti</td>
<td>mūlapakṛti as avyakta²³⁵</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mūlapakṛti is the parama avyakta. Therefore, during dissolution there is non-differentiation of all the effects (evolutes) with the mūlapakṛti.²³⁶

²³² “evam prthivyādayāḥ tanmātrāṇi viśantaḥ svāpekṣaya tanmātrāṇi avyaktyaṇti”—Sāṁkhyaṭattvakaumudi on kārikā-XV
²³³ “evam tanmātrāṇi ahamkāraṁ viśanti ahamkāramavyaktanyanti”—Sāṁkhyaṭattvakaumudi on kārikā-XV
²³⁴ “evam ahamkāro mahāntamāviśan mahāntamavyaktayati”—Sāṁkhyaṭattvakaumudi on kārikā-XV
²³⁵ “mahān prakṛtir svakāraṇar mviṣan prakṛtirimonyaktayati”—Sāṁkhyaṭattvakaumudi on kārikā-XV
²³⁶ “pralayakāle prakṛtāv avibhāgam gacchanti”—Gaudapādabhāṣya on kārikā-XV
PURUṢA

One of the two ultimate realities, other than prakṛti, admitted by the Sāṁkhya, is puruṣa. Generally it is considered as the self. Everybody asserts that he or she exists. No one can consistently deny the existence of one’s own self. There is thus almost a general agreement regarding the existence of self, at least because its non-existence cannot be proved in any way (asti hyātma nāstītvasādhanābhāvād). But in spite of the fact that there is general agreement with regard to the existence of the self, there is a wide divergence of opinion about its nature.

- Carvaka view: Some Carvaka-s identify the self with life (prāṇātmavādī), some with the mind (manātmavādī), some with the senses (indriyātmavādī), while some others with the gross body (dehātmavādī).

- Buddhists view: Some Buddhists regard the self as identical with the stream of consciousness.

- Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika and Prabhākara-Mimāṁsaka view: The Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika and the Prabhākara-Mimāṁsaka-s maintain that the self is an unconscious substance, which can acquire consciousness—an attribute, under certain conditions.

- Bhatta Mimāṁsaka view: For the Bhatta Mīmāṁsaka-s self is a conscious entity partially hidden by ignorance, but it can reveal its true form at the rise of perfect knowledge that men can have of their own selves.

- Advaita Vedānta view: The Advaita Vedānta holds that the self, by nature, is a pure, eternal existence-consciousness-bliss as-such (satcitananda svārūpa), which is one in all bodies, and is eternally free and self-revealing.

- Sāṁkhya view: According to Sāṁkhya, the self is pure consciousness as such. It is different from the body, senses, manas and intellect (buddhi). It is different from the world of material objects. The self is not the brain, nor the nervous system, nor an aggregate of conscious states. It is not a substance.
with the quality of consciousness. Consciousness is its very essence, not a mere quality of it. The self is the subject of knowledge and can never be the object of any knowledge, except of its own being.

As we are concerned specifically with the Sāmkhya view let us now explain this view.

**Defining characteristics (lakṣaṇa) of puruṣa**

In Sāmkhya the self is called *puruṣa*. It is not a existence-consciousness-bliss as-such, as the Advaita Vedanta-s think. According to Sāmkhya bliss and consciousness cannot be the essence of the same reality as these are essentially different.

"The self is the transcendent subject whose essence is pure consciousness.........The self is above all change and activity. It is an uncaused, eternal and all-pervading reality, which is free from all attachment and unaffected by all objects. All change and activity, all pleasure and pains belong really to matter and its products like the body, mind, and intellect. It is sheer ignorance to think that the self is the body or the senses or the mind or the intellect." 237

In karika-XI, quoted earlier, having described the common characteristics of *vyakta* and *avyakta* forms of *prakṛti* it is said that *puruṣa* possesses the opposite characteristics in addition to some other attributes. Hence the opposite characteristics of *vyakta* and *avyakta* in addition to some other attributes may be treated as the defining characteristics (lakṣaṇa) of *puruṣa*.

The characteristics of *prakṛti* mentioned in karika-XI being (i) *triguna*, (ii) *avivekī*, (iii) *viṣaya*, (iv) *sāmānya*, (v) *acetana* and (vi) *prasavadharmi*, the opposite characteristics of these would be (i) *atriguna*, (ii) *vivekī*, (iii) *aviṣaya*, (iv) *asāmānya*, (v) *cetana* and (vi) *aprasavadharmi*. The meaning and significance of which would naturally be the opposite of the respective characteristics of *prakṛti*.

---

237 Chatterjee, Satischandra & Dhirendramohan Datta. *An Introduction to Indian Philosophy*, University of Calcutta, 2008, p-264
Besides these in kārikā-XIX some more characteristics of puruṣa have been indicated, viz. (vii) sākṣitva, (viii) draṣṭṛtvā, (ix) kaivalya, (x) mādhyastha and (xi) akartrbhāva. In addition to these puruṣa is also ahetumat, nitya, vyāpi, askriya, anāśritam, aliriga, sāvayava, svatantra.

All these are the defining characteristics (lakṣaṇa) of puruṣa. These may be stated briefly below:

atraigūṇa: triguṇam means constituted of three guṇa-s and so atraigūṇam means not constituted of three guṇa-s. The three guṇa-s—sattva, rajas and tamas taken together are described as triguṇam and so puruṣa is beyond these three guṇa-s. (i) sattva being pleasure (priti), luminosity (prakāśa), buoyancy (laghutva); (ii) rajas being pain (apriti), motion (cala) and ability to act (upāstambhaka), and (iii) tamas being indifference (vīṣāda), heaviness (guru), veiling (āvaraka) puruṣa is beyond all these attributes. So, the conscious element, different from pleasure, pain and indifference must be different from these three guṇa-s, and this conscious element is puruṣa.239

viveki and mādhyastha: viveki means ‘differentiated’ or ‘discriminated’ and here ‘differentiated’ or ‘discriminated’ signifies free from the three guṇa-s. Those who are moved by pleasure and pain can not be treated as neutral (madhyastha).240 Whoever is free from pleasure, pain and indifference can be neutral (madhyastha).241 puruṣa is free from the three guṇa-s and thus from pleasure, pain and indifference. Therefore, puruṣa is called as having the status of mādhyastha or neutrality. Being viveki and pleasure, pain and indifference

---

238 kārikā-XII

239 "tasmāt ca viparyāsāt siddham"—kārikā-XIX

240 "sukhi hi sukhena trpyan duḥkhī hi duḥkhar dhviṣan na mādhyastho bhavati"—Sāṃkhya-tattva-kaumudi on kārikā-XIX

241 tadubhayarahitastu mādhyastha iti udāśīna iti cākhyāyate"—Sāṃkhya-tattva-kaumudi on kārikā-XIX
mādhyastha puruṣa is unable to combine with others and therefore can not be transformed (aprasavadharm).

asambhūyakāri and akartā : As puruṣa ca not perform any act with or without the help of any thing else, it is called asambhūyakāri. Naturally, akartābhāva (non-doership) is the nature of puruṣa.

aviśaya : For Māṭhara both the vyakta and avyakta forms of prakṛti are the objects of enjoyment of kṣetrajña puruṣa, and puruṣa is the enjoyer of the kṣetra—prakṛti. So, puruṣa is not viśaya, it is aviśaya. prakṛti serves the purpose of puruṣa as the viṣaya-s or objects of enjoyment and liberation to puruṣa. viṣaya exists independently of the knowing self or conciousness as knowable (jñeya), while puruṣa is the knower (jña). Therefore, prakṛti, being viṣaya, is knowable (jñeya). puruṣa—the pure consciousness has the capacity to enjoy, while prakṛti—the pure matter is enjoyable by the puruṣa. So the former is viṣayā and the later is viṣaya.

As buddhi reveals the difference between prakṛti and puruṣa, so it seems that puruṣa is the object (viṣaya) of the buddhi. But this is simply the consciousness reflected in the buddhi (i.e. vaddha puruṣa). Pure consciousness (mukta or śuddha puruṣa) is not the object (viṣaya) of buddhi, rather it is the subject (viṣayā) of prakṛti. It is thus described in kārikā-III as jña (knower), which knows itself as distinguished from prakṛti.

242 "vivektvādprasavadharmitaścā karteti siddham"—Sāmkhyatattvakaumudī on kārikā-XIX

243 "sukhaduhkhamohatayā bhogyan tat puruṣasya. sa hi tasya bhoktā. tathā pradhānāmapi sarvapurusānāṁ kṣetrajñānāṁ bhogyam"—Māṭhavrūti on kārikā-XI

244 "saiva ca viśinaṣṭi punāḥ pradhāna puruṣantaraṁ sukṣman"- Sāmkhyatattvakaumudī on kārikā-XXXVI
draṣṭa and sākṣi: Being conscious (cetana) and non-object (aviṣaya) puruṣa is seer (draṣṭa) and witness (sākṣi).245 All the enjoyments of puruṣa are performed by the buddhi.246 From this, it can be said that puruṣa is the subject (viṣayi) of the vyakta-s.247

asāmānya (non-general): According to Sāṁkhyya that which universally knowable248 is called sāmānya. As puruṣa is the knower of prakṛti and not vice versa it is not sāmānya—it is asāmānya (non-general).249

cetana (conscious): Both vyakta and avyakta are unconscious (acetana). So, puruṣa being the opposite of vyakta and avyakta is conscious (cetana). Moreover, no unconscious element can be a seer (draṣṭa) and hence puruṣa being a seer, is conscious.250

aprasavadharmi (non-productive): By nature puruṣa is non-productive (aprasavadharmi). Everything goes under transformation every moment, except consciousness (puruṣa)251 No transformation (pariṇāma) like death, birth and proclivity does occur in case of pure consciousness, as it is non-productive.252

245 "ca itanyāt aviṣayatvāt ca bhavati sākṣi ataeva draṣṭāpi bhavati"-Sāṁkhyaṭatattvakaumudi on kārikā-XIX
246 "sarvam pratuyapabhogam yasmāt puruṣasya sādhayati buddhiḥ"-Sāṁkhyaṭatattvakaumudi on kārikā-XXXVII
247 "buddhī hi puruṣasannidhānāt tātchāyāpāyā tadrūpeva sarvaviṣayopabhogam puruṣasya sādhayati"-Sāṁkhyaṭatattvakaumudi on kārikā-XXXVII
248 anekapuruṣālaḥ grhitam
249 "tad viparita tathā ca pumān"-kārikā-XI
250 "cetano hi draṣṭā bhavati, nācetanālī"- Sāṁkhyaṭatattvakaumudi on kārikā-XIX
251 "pratikṣaṇa-pariṇāmino hi sarva eva bhāvah, rte citisakteḥ"- Sāṁkhyaṭatattvakaumudi on kārikā-V
252 "na tu puruṣasya pariṇāmaḥ tasya aparīṇāmitvāḥ"- Sāṁkhyaṭatattvakaumudi on kārikā-XVIII
kaivalya (isolation): “ātyantiko duhkhatrayābhāvah kaivalyam”\(^{253}\)—this is how Vācaspati describes kaivalya. So, kaivalya denotes absolutely dissociated from three types of sorrow. It also denotes absolute dissociation from pleasure pain and indifference (sukhaduhkhamoharāhittva). As puruṣa is opposite of the three guṇa-s,\(^ {254}\) it does not require the favour of any contact with the guṇa-s and hence it does not experience pleasure, pain etc.\(^ {255}\) Therefore, kaivalya is the natural attribute of puruṣa.

ahetumat (cause-less): puruṣa (pure consciousness) by nature is non-caused (ahetumat) non-effect. vaddha puruṣa (consciousness reflected in the buddhi) may be hetumat having birth and death as referred to in kārikā-XVIII, but śuddha puruṣa is ahetumat.

nitya (eternal): “na prakṛti vikṛtīḥ puruṣaḥ”—this is how puruṣa is described in the third kārikā, which means puruṣa is neither caused, nor cause. That means being neither caused, nor cause, is puruṣa beyond any change. Being beyond any change, puruṣa is an eternal element (nitya tattva). Even during dissolution, puruṣa continues to witness prakṛti.\(^ {256}\)

vyāpi (pervasive): As puruṣa is the sākṣī (mere spectator), so its pervasiveness must be accepted to witness everything. According to Yuktidipikā, both prakṛti and puruṣa are all-pervasive.\(^ {257}\)

asakriya (inactive): Pure consciousness (śuddha puruṣa) is asakriya (inactive), because it is beyond transmigration, although consciousness reflected in the

\(^{253}\) Sāṁkhyaatattvakāumudi on kārikā-XIX

\(^{254}\) “atraiguñyācchāhasya kaivalyam” — Sāṁkhyaatattvakāumudi on kārikā-XIX

\(^{255}\) “yasmād guṇāstupakārjanirapekṣāḥ pravartante tasmādsāvapi tatsaṁsargam nā'hubhavati”— Yuktidipikā on kārikā-XIX

\(^{256}\) “prakṛtiṁ paśyati puruṣaḥ”— Sāṁkhyaatattvakāumudi on kārikā-LXV

\(^{257}\) “vibhu ca pradhānapuruṣau”— Yuktidipikā on kārikā-XV
buddhi is sakriya (active), because it transmigrates through the subtle body (śūksmaśarīra) from one gross body (sthūlaśarīra) to another.

anāśrita (non-supported): puruṣa is described as “na prakṛtiḥ na viyṛtih”. That means, puruṣa is not dependent on any thing for its origination, nor does it produce anything. So, puruṣa is non-supported (anāśrita), because an effect is supported (āśrita) by its cause and puruṣa does not have any cause.

aliṅga (neither logical mark nor mergent): ‘aliṅga’ means logical mark or mergent. So, ‘aliṅga’ means neither logical mark nor mergent. A vyakta is called liṅga in two senses:
- avyakta can be inferred depending on the vyakta-s as logical marks, and
- the vyakta-s merge in their respective causes during dissolution.

puruṣa can not be inferred depending on the vyakta-s as logical marks nor are they merge in anything, so it is aliṅga.

niravayava (devoid of parts): puruṣa is not a saṁghaṭa. A saṁghaṭa is that which is made of parts and serves the purpose of some other (para). puruṣa is neither made of parts nor does it serve the purpose of some other (para). So, it is niravayava.

svatantra (independent): puruṣa is not dependent on any cause for its existence. So, it is svatantra (independent).

**Different expressions to designate multiple aspects of self**

In different kārikā-s of the Sāṁkhyakārikā Īśvarakṛṣṇa has used expressions like jñā, puruṣah, pumān, purāṣaḥ and dhṛtaśarīra to designate Consciousness or self. But Īśvarakṛṣṇa used these expressions in many senses. The following chart shows in which kārikā-s he used which expression in what sense:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expression</th>
<th>Used in the kārikā (s)</th>
<th>In the sense of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jñā, pumān and purāṣa</td>
<td>second, eleventh and sixtieth respectively</td>
<td>Śuddha caitanya absolutely dissociated from prakṛti (puruṣa in kaivalya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puruṣa</td>
<td>three and sixty five</td>
<td>puruṣa in kaivalya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puruṣa</td>
<td>Seventeen, Nineteen, Twenty, Twenty one, Thirty one, Thirty seven, Forty two, Fifty nine, Sixty one, Sixty three and Sixty nine</td>
<td>puruṣa in kaivalya and śuddha caitanya in association with prakṛti (baddha and/or mukta puruṣa with gross and/or subtle bodies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puruṣa</td>
<td>Eighteen, Thirty six, Fifty five, Fifty six, Fifty seven, Fifty eight</td>
<td>baddha and/or mukta puruṣa with gross and/or subtle bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puruṣa</td>
<td>sixty</td>
<td>baddha and/or mukta puruṣa with gross and/or subtle bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dhṛtaśarīra</td>
<td>Sixty seven</td>
<td>mukta puruṣa with gross and subtle bodies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanation:**

- **puruṣa in kaivalya**: Pure Consciousness completely dissociated from prakṛti, i.e. transcendental self
- **baddha puruṣa**: Consciousness in association with prakṛti
- **baddha puruṣa with gross and subtle bodies**: Consciousness in association with gross and subtle bodies before attainment of discriminative knowledge, i.e. embodied empirical bound self.
- **baddha puruṣa with subtle bodies**: Consciousness in association with subtle bodies before attainment of discriminative knowledge, disembodied empirical bound self.
- **mukta puruṣa with gross and subtle bodies**: Consciousness in association with gross and subtle bodies after attainment of discriminative knowledge, i.e. embodied empirical liberated self.
• **mukta puruṣa with subtle bodies**: Consciousness in association with subtle bodies after attainment of discriminative knowledge, i.e. disembodied empirical liberated self.

• **baddha puruṣa and/or mukta puruṣa with gross and/or subtle bodies**: Embodied or disembodied bound or liberated empirical self.

• **sthūla śāriṇa or gross body**: The body constituted of the gross elements

• **sūkṣma śāriṇa or subtle body**: The body constituted of one or more of the subtle elements.

**Proofs for the existence of puruṣa**

The Sāṁkhya proves the existence of the self—puruṣa as the transcendent subject of experience by several arguments, some of which are given in the under-quoted seventeenth kārikā of the Sāṁkhya-kārikā.

“samghataparārthatvāṃ trīguṇādiparyādadihiṣṭhaṇāt.
puṇḍroṣṭi bhoktṛbhāvāḥ kaivalyārtham pravṛttēṣca.”

The arguments contained in the kārikā are as follows:

(i) **samghataparārthatvāṃ (puṇḍroṣṭi)**: All "objects of the world like tables, chairs, etc. which are composed of parts are means to the ends of others beings. These beings whose purpose the things of the world serve must be quite different and distinct from them all. That is, they cannot be said to be unconscious things, made up of parts like physical objects, for that would make them means to the ends of others ...."^258

In fact, all the manifests and the non-manifest material things and elements are composed of many parts or samghāta-s, just as a bed (śaṭyā), a seat (āśana), a body. A human body (śāriṇa) constituted of different limbs like hand, mouth, foot, eye and ear, for example, is used for the enjoyment of

---

^258: Chatterjee, Satischandra & Dhirendramohan Datta. _An Introduction to Indian Philosophy_. University of Calcutta. 2008. P-264
the non-composite element—the *para* entity—consciousness, which is called *puruṣa* in Sāṁkhya,. So, the existence of consciousness must be admitted.  

(ii) *trigunādīviparyayāt (puruṣo'śti)*: "All objects of the world are of the nature of pleasure, pain and indifference. However, pleasure and pain have meaning only as they are experienced by some conscious experience. Hence, there must be some conscious subjects or selves who enjoy and suffer pleasure and pain respectively." As the *puruṣa* is not composite in nature, so it is not constituted of the three *guna*-s. According to kārikā-XI prakṛti is *triguna* and *puruṣa* as its opposite, that means *atriguna*—not constituted of the three *guna*-s. So, *puruṣa* exists as an independent entity.

(iii) *adhiśṭānāt (puruṣo'śti)*: "All material objects including the mind and intellect, must be controlled, and directed by some intelligent principle. In order that they can achieve anything or realize any end. A machine or a car does its work when put under the guidance of some person. Therefore, there must be some selves who guide the operations of prakṛti and all her products." As prakṛti—constituted of the three *guna*-s—is *jaḍa* (matter), so it is unable to be act by itself. Without any control or superintendence (*adhiśṭāna*) of *puruṣa*, no transformation (*parināma*) is possible. Although *puruṣa* is not an active agent (*karaṅa*) of the transformation (*parināma*) of prakṛti, mere proximity (*sān nidhya* or *samvandha*) of *puruṣa* with prakṛti is the actual reason for the transformation (*parināma*) of prakṛti. Following

---

259 "*iha sanghātāḥ paraṁ prārthāḥ drṣṭāḥ. tad yathā śayanāsanarathacaraṇādayah. asti cāyaṁ śariralaḥkaṇāḥ saṁghātāḥ. tasmādānena'pi pararthena bhavitabyam. yo asau paraḥ sa puruṣāḥ. tasmādāsti puruṣāḥ"—Yuktidipīka on kārikā-XVII

260 Chatterjee, Satischandra & Dhirendramohan Datta. *An Introduction to Indian Philosophy*, University of Calcutta, 2008, p-265

261 "*trigunādīviparyayāditi vadata'saṁhataḥ para vivakṣitaḥ, sa cātmeti siddham"—Sāṁkhyaatattvakaumudi on kārikā-XVII

262 Chatterjee, Satischandra & Dhirendramohan Datta. *An Introduction to Indian Philosophy*, University of Calcutta, 2008, p-265
$\text{Sa}\text{ṣ\textit{t}itantra} \text{ Mā\textit{ṭ}hara thinks that the control of } \text{puru\textit{ṣ}a} \text{ over the } \text{prakṛ\textit{ti}} \text{ (pradhā\textit{ṇ}a) makes } \text{prakṛ\textit{ti}} \text{ to evolve. But it is not the agency of } \text{puru\textit{ṣ}a}, \text{ but mere proximity (} \text{sannidhi} \text{) of } \text{puru\textit{ṣ}a} \text{ that enables } \text{prakṛ\textit{ti}} \text{ to create this world.}^{263} \text{ Therefore, the existence of } \text{puru\textit{ṣ}a} \text{ is proved.}$

(iv) $\text{bhok\textit{ṭ}b\textit{hāvāt} (puru\textit{ṣ}o\textit{ṣ}ti)}$: All the things of the world—both $\text{vyakta}$ and $\text{avyakta}$—are of the nature of pleasure, pain and indifference. These are unconscious, and hence are unable to enjoy themselves or one another because, an enjoyer ($\text{kartā}$) must be different from the object of enjoyment ($\text{karma}$). Only $\text{puru\textit{ṣ}a}$—the pure consciousness, which is different from pleasure, pain and indifference can be the enjoyer of these three and become the ultimate experier of the world. $^{264}$ For this reason, the existence of $\text{puru\textit{ṣ}a}$ must be admitted as the enjoyer of the pleasure ($\text{sukha}$), pain ($\text{duḥ\textit{k}hā}$) and indifference ($\text{moha}$). $^{265}$

It should be remembered that pure matter and pure consciousness both are unable to enjoy anything. So, $\text{puru\textit{ṣ}a}$, who is not connected with $\text{prakṛ\textit{ti}}$, being pure, neutral and indifferent, is unable to enjoy any kind of experience. $^{266}$ However, enjoyment and indifference can occur in the same entity at the same time as an embodied $\text{puru\textit{ṣ}a}$ ($\text{jivanmukta puru\textit{ṣ}a}$) has no attraction to pleasure and pain, but due to the effect of previous act ($\text{prārabdha karma}$), he passes the courses of pleasure and pain.

(v) $\text{ka\textit{ī}valyārtham pravṛt\textit{tē}ḥ (puru\textit{ṣ}o\textit{ṣ}ti)}$: "Some persons at least of this world make a sincere endeavor to attain final release from all suffering. This

263 Chatterjee, Satischandra & Dhirendramohan Datta. *An Introduction to Indian Philosophy*, University of Calcutta, 2008, p-265
264 "bhogyey hi sukhaduḥkhe anukūlapratikūlavedaniye prayātmanubhūyete"—Sāṃkhyaśāstra-kaumudi on kārikā-XVII
265 "teṣāṁ sukhaduḥkha-dyātmakatvena svātmani vṛttivirodhāti"—Sāṃkhyaśāstra-kaumudi on kārikā-XVII
is not possible for anything of the physical world, for by its very nature, the physical world causes suffering rather than relieve it. So there must be some immaterial substances or selves transcending the physical order. Otherwise, the concept of liberation or salvation and the will to liberate or to be liberated as found in saints and the saviors of humankind would be meaningless."\textsuperscript{267}

The argument "\textit{kaivalyārtham pravṛtteścā}" denotes also that the scriptures and great sages speak about and act for the attainment of \textit{kaivalya} or isolation, i.e. seperation from \textit{prakṛti}. Unless we admit the existence of \textit{puruṣa}, the statements made in the scriptures and the activities of great sages will be meaningless. For this reason, the existence of \textit{puruṣa} must be admitted.\textsuperscript{268}

\textit{kaivalya} (isolation) means seperation from \textit{prakṛti}, and seperation from \textit{prakṛti} implies freedom from pain. \textit{kaivalya} can not be attained by \textit{prakṛti} and its evolutes, because these are of the nature of pleasure, pain and indifference, since these are \textit{trigunātmaka}. So, to explain the significance of the urge for \textit{kaivalya} in the minds of the sages and the presence of the scripture-based (\textit{sāstrika}) statements for the attainment of isolation (\textit{kaivalya}) the existence of \textit{puruṣa} must be admitted. For \textit{Yuktidipīkā} and \textit{Jayamarīgalā pradhāna} has an urge for isolation (\textit{kaivalya}) and this urge for isolation becomes meaningful only by the presence of \textit{puruṣa}.\textsuperscript{269}

\textsuperscript{267} Chatterjee, Satishchandra & Dhirendramohan Datta. An Introduction to Indian Philosophy, University of Calcutta, 2008, p-265

\textsuperscript{268} "\textit{tasmāt kaivalyārtham pravṛttegaṃānām mahādhiyām cāsti buddhyādvīptiikta ātmeti siddham}"—Sāṃkhya-tattvavācumudī on \textit{kārikā-XVII}

\textsuperscript{269} "\textit{tasmādyasya kaivalyām pradhānapravṛttihetuḥ sa puruṣaḥ}"—\textit{Yuktidipīkā} on \textit{kārikā-XVII}
Plurality of puruṣa

The plurality of puruṣa is established in the following karikā of the Sāṃkhya karikā:

"jananamaraṇakaranaṇāṁ pratīniyamādayugapatraṅgāpravṛttteśca
puruṣabahutvaṁ siddham traṅguṇavyiparītyācava."—karikā-XVII

There are three arguments in this karikā, which are as follows:

(i) jananamaraṇakaranaṇāṁ pratīniyamāt (puruṣabahutvaṁ siddham): The diversity of birth (janana or janma), death (maraṇa) and senses (karaṇa) noticeable in different individuals proves the plurality of puruṣa. However, in different commentaries janana, maraṇa and karaṇa have been interpreted, not in the ordinary sense, but in some technical senses. Because, being eternally non-changeable puruṣa is free from birth, death and activity or senses.

Sāṃkhya-tattvakaumudi and Jayamargalā²⁷⁰ thus explain the terms janana, maraṇa and karaṇa in the following way:

- ‘janana’ means the proximity (abhisamvandha) of puruṣa with an apūrva (new) nikāya. ['nikāya here means a combination of gross body with senses, mind, ego, intellect and awareness to serve a common purpose].
- ‘maraṇa’ means the dissociation (parityāga) of the proximity (abhisamvandha) of puruṣa with a nikāya, not the annihilation of puruṣa.²⁷¹
- ‘karaṇa’ means the three internal and ten external senses.²⁷²

For Yuktidipika birth (janma) is the contact of a subtle body with a gross body,²⁷³ death (maraṇa) is the dissociation subtle body from the

²⁷⁰ on karikā-XVIII
²⁷¹ "teśāmeva ca dehādīnāmupāttānāṁ parityāga maraṇāṁ na tu ātmano vīnaśah, tasya kūṭasthanityatvāt"—Sāṃkhya-tattvakaumudī on karikā-XVIII
²⁷² "karaṇāni buddhyādīnī trayodaśa"—Sāṃkhya-tattvakaumudī on karikā-XVIII
gross body,\textsuperscript{274} while \textit{karana}-s are thirteen in kind, viz. \textit{buddhi}, \textit{ahaṁkāra}, 
\textit{manas} and ten senses.\textsuperscript{275} So, \textit{puruṣa} being somehow related to \textit{janma}, 
\textit{maranā} and \textit{karana}, in accordance with the multiplicity of \textit{janma}, \textit{maranā} and 
\textit{karana} many \textit{puruṣa}-s exist.\textsuperscript{276}

(ii) \textit{ayugapatpravṛtteḥ (puruṣabahutvam siddham)}: The non-
simultaneous (\textit{ayugapaḥ}) occurrence of proclivity (\textit{pravṛtti}) noticeable in 
different individuals at different times proves the plurality of \textit{puruṣa}. Virtue 
(\textit{dharma}), vice (\textit{adharma}) etc. are the eight kinds of proclivity, which occur 
in the \textit{pradhāna}. If \textit{puruṣa} were one, then the \textit{pradhāna} would remain 
confined to that single \textit{puruṣa}.\textsuperscript{277} As a result all the bodies would be 
originated and destroyed at the same time in a single changing reality.\textsuperscript{278}
But the simultaneous proclivity in all the bodies is never observed.\textsuperscript{279} So, 
\textit{puruṣa} must be many. There are rather numerous subtle bodies 
(\textit{sūkṣmaśarīra}), and corresponding to each \textit{puruṣa} there is one subtle 
body. So \textit{puruṣa} is many.\textsuperscript{280}

\textsuperscript{273} “janmeti mahadādeḥ sukṣmaśaṁraśrītasya liṅgasya yathā sarīnkarāṁ bāhyena sarīrena sambandhaḥ.”—Yuktidipikā on kārikā-XVIII

\textsuperscript{274} “maraṁmiti pūrvakṛtasya karmanah phalabhogaparimāptēḥ sāmpratasya ca phalabhogasya pratyupasthāne liṅgasya pūrvaśarīrātyāgaḥ”—Yuktidipikā on kārikā-XVIII

\textsuperscript{275} “karaṁṁ trayośāśivanidhamiti”—Yuktidipikā on kārikā-XVIII

\textsuperscript{276} “etasmāllingadātmano bahutvamavasīyate.”—Yuktidipikā on kārikā-XVIII

\textsuperscript{277} “yadyeke ātmā syāttenaikapuruṣādhikāraṇaṁ pradhānam”—Yuktidipikā on kārikā-XVIII

\textsuperscript{278} “śaṅkaścāsaḥ yugapadnekāni sarīrāṁ upabhoktumityato yāvadbhīḥ sarīraśrāpachitāsū kālamātrāśvasminbhaparipartvā bhavityaṁ sarveśamuppatiṁ prati yugapat pravarteta”—Yuktidipikā on kārikā-XVIII

\textsuperscript{279} “dṛṣṭā tu pradhānasayaḥ yugapacccharārthaṁ bhāvena pravṛttiḥ”—Yuktidipikā on kārikā-XVIII

\textsuperscript{280} “pradhānenādirṣe pratipuruṣamekakamutpāditam”—Sāṁkhyaśāstra vaśvadāna on kārikā-XVIII
(iii) \textit{traiguṇyaviparyayāṭ (puruṣabahutvān siddham)}: The difference of the proportions of the three \textit{guna-s} (\textit{traiguṇyaviparyaya}) noticeable in different entities and individuals proves the plurality of \textit{puruṣa}. That there is diversity of the three \textit{guna-s} in different bodies and individuals can be noticed by observing the presence of preponderance of \textit{sattva}, \textit{rajas} and \textit{tamas} are respectively in (a) deities and \textit{saints}, (b) human beings and (c) beasts. Moreover, it is also said that the diverse effects, like pleasure, pain and indifference, caused by the \textit{guna-s} lead to the admitance of the plurality of \textit{puruṣa}.\textsuperscript{281} Even by admitance of diversities of internal organs the multiple activities of individuals can not be explained. So, the diversity of \textit{puruṣa-s} must be accepted. The fifty sixth \textit{kārikā} supports of the plurality of \textit{puruṣa} on the ground that there is proclicivity in \textit{prakṛti} for the liberation of each \textit{puruṣa} ("\textit{prati puruṣa vimokṣārtham}"). If \textit{puruṣa} were single—some of them could not liberated, while others were not. So, there are many \textit{puruṣa-s}. Moreover, \textit{prakṛti} withdraws her activities only from that \textit{puruṣa}, who has already seen her, although she continues her activities to other \textit{puruṣa-s}. This also proves the plurality of \textit{puruṣa}.

\textbf{Actual meaning of the plurality of \textit{puruṣa}: A few ancient and modern interpretations}

- **Ancient interpretations**: The table shows how most of the \textit{Sāmkhya} texts and commentators interprete the plurality of \textit{puruṣa}:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commentator(s) and Text</th>
<th>Argue(s) in favour of plurality of \textit{puruṣa}</th>
<th>Argue(s) in favour of singularity of \textit{puruṣa}</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

\textsuperscript{281} \textit{yathā sāmānye janmani ekaḥ sāttvikaḥ sukhi anyo rājoaso duḥkhi anyastāmaso mohavān. evam traiguṇyaviparyayādvahutvān siddham.}—\textit{Gauḍapādhāśya on kārikā-XVIII}
Māṭhara, Gauḍapāda, the author of *Jayamīgala* and some others in course of interpreting the three proofs given in karikā-XVIII favour the plurality of puruṣa. In course of interpreting karikā-XI argue that vyakta is plural, avyakta is single and so also puruṣa, i.e. puruṣa is single. But they fail to reconcile the apparent conflict between karikā-XI and karikā-XVIII.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sāṁkhya-pravacana-śūtra</th>
<th>puruṣa is plural as a species or individual</th>
<th>puruṣa is single as a genus</th>
<th>There is no contradiction between the Sāṁkhya conception of plurality of puruṣa and the scripture statements regarding the singularity of the self.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **Modern interpretations/comments**: The followings are some of the important views or interpretations or comments on this issue:

  > "If each puruṣa has the same features of consciousness, all-pervadingness, if there is not the slightest difference between one puruṣa and other, since they are free from all variety, then there is nothing to lead us to assume a plurality of puruṣas. Multiplicity without distinction is impossible."  

  282 "...vyaktādi visadṛśāṁ pradhānaṁ tathā... purusaḥ...ahetumannitya vyāpi niṣkriya eko'nāśrito'ligo niravayayaḥ svatantra iti."—Māṭhara

  "anekaṁ vyaktaṁ ekamavyaktaṁ tathā puruṣāpyekeḥ"—Gauḍapāda

  283 "nādvaitaśrutivirodho jātiparātvāt."—Sāṁkhya-pravacana-śūtra, I/154

“The plurality of Puruṣas, therefore, means the plurality of Linga-Puruṣas and does not mean the plurality of the transcendent Jīna.” 285

“it is evident that verse 18 indirectly establishes the unity or oneness of puruṣa and thus confirms what is affirmed in verses 10 and 11 with regard to his oneness”. 286

“The ‘oneness’ of pradhāna is numerical and it is the totality or the prime source of ‘vyakta’. Similarly ‘purusa is one’ numerically and may be regarded as the ‘prime source’ of individual purusas’. 287

**prakṛti-puruṣa-saṁyoga**

The most perplexing point of the Sāṁkhya School is prakṛti-puruṣa-saṁyoga—the relation between prakṛti and puruṣa. The Sāṁkhya-kārikā does not tell explicitly how the two basic elements—prakṛti and puruṣa—come in association together, although the text does tell us that they are together and what happens when they come together. With respect to the problem of how they come together, one can only suggest that from the beginning-less time they are together, and at the end the puruṣa will attain isolation or freedom. Here again, of course, it is necessary to keep in mind the purpose of the text. The task is thus not to explain how prakṛti and puruṣa came together for the first time. The task, rather, is to describe the nature of human existence and suffering. Unless it is assumed that prakṛti and puruṣa are together from the beginning-less time, it is not possible to explain the nature of human existence and suffering. In the Sāṁkhya-pravacanasūtra it is stated that the association of prakṛti and puruṣa has no beginning, but can have an end. We learn from kārikā-LXII 288 that the

---

285 Mukerji, J. N. *Sāṁkhya or The theory of Reality*, S. N. Mukherjee, Calcutta, P-61

286 Majumdar, A. K. *The Sāṁkhya Conception of Personality*, 1st edn., Calcutta University Press, 1930, P-27

287 Kumar, Shiv : *Sāṁkhya Thought in Brahmanical Systems of Indian philosophy*, 1st edn., Eastern Book Linkers, Delhi, 1983, P-207

288 "tasmān na badhyate'ddā na mucyate nāpi sarīsarati kaścit,"
relationship of prakṛti and puruṣa is only proximity or association. In fact, no one (except prakṛti) is bound or released, nor does one transmigrate—only prakṛti in its various forms transmigrates, gets bound and subsequently released. The puruṣa, by nature, is never bound to the world. It only appears to be bound owing to lack of discrimination. Hence, although prakṛti and puruṣa are always only in proximity to one another, they are never in actual contact. Because of the proximity a kind of interplay occurs between prakṛti and puruṣa—each of the two elements appears to take on the characteristics of the other. In kārikā XX\textsuperscript{289} this interplay is described thus: "Because of the proximity of the two—i.e., prakṛti and puruṣa, the unconscious one appears as characterized by consciousness, and likewise, the indifferent one appears as characterized by activity because of the activities of the three guṇa-s." The purpose of this interaction, according to kārikā XXI, is to bring about the release of puruṣa. It is stated in this kārikā that "the proximity of the two, like that of a blind man and a lame man, is for the purpose of seeing the pradhāna and for the purpose of the isolation of the puruṣa."\textsuperscript{290} When the discriminative is achieved, prakṛti is no longer appears as consciousness. The creation, brought about by prakṛti from mahat down to the specific gross elements function for the sake of the release of each puruṣa; this function is done for the sake of the other, i.e. puruṣa, as if it were for her own.\textsuperscript{291} puruṣa—the consciousness, then appears as what it is not—i.e., as part of the manifest world of suffering and thus attains the suffering caused by decay and death, until deliverance of the subtle body; therefore, suffering is of the nature (svabhāva) of the material things.\textsuperscript{292} Hence, in this sense, the emergence of the

\begin{quote}
**sāṁsara**

samāyate mucyate ca nānāśrayā prakṛtih."
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{289} "tasmāt tatasmiyogād acetanaṁ cetanāvad iva liṅgam,
guṇakartṛte'pi tathā karteva bhavaty udāsinaḥ."

\textsuperscript{290} "puṇṛṣasya darśanārthāṁ kaivalyārthāṁ tathā pradhānasya,
pāṅgvandhavat ubhayan api saṁyogas tatkṛtāh sargah."

\textsuperscript{291} "ityeva prakṛtiḥto mahadādiviśeṣabhūtaparyantah,
pratipuruvavimokṣārthāṁ svārtha iva parārtha āraṁbhaḥ."—kārikā LVI

\textsuperscript{292} "tatra jāraṁaraṇakṛtam duḥkhāṁ prāṇāṁ cetanaḥ puruṣāḥ,"
manifest world out of *mūlaprakṛti* is for the sake of *puruṣa* (*puruṣārtha*). Īśvarakṛṣṇa explains that like a dancer, who after having exhibited her performances on the stage in dramatic representation desists from acting when her part is finished, similarly *prakṛti* also having exhibited herself to the *puruṣa*, in the various manifest forms of intellect, ego, senses, subtle elements and gross elements, i.e. after the rise of the discriminative knowledge, desists from acting.

"Nature is compared here to a good woman servant serving faithfully a master who is ungrateful and devoid of good qualities. Nature does not gain in any way by the process of evolution. Vācaśpati rightly describes *prakṛti* as *tapasvinī*. The soul having no constituents cannot act and, therefore, cannot give anything in return. He is *upakāra-asamartha*. According to Vācaśpati and Candrikā, the *kārikā* points out the selflessness of *prakṛti*, while Gauḍapāda and Māṭhara think that it gives the cause of cessation of her activity."^{293}

"Next is explained what she does after having desisted. There is nothing in this world more soft, gentle, and modest than the nature....., because ..... , the nature says to herself, 'I have been seen by this spirit', thinking so she does not present herself to the view of the spirit.....Since the nature is the cause of everything, producer, maker of everything, it must be the cause of time also......The nature, therefore, is the cause and it has no other cause, does not come again within the view of the spirit. Therefore,.....there is no cause gentler, more enjoyable, than the nature, such as Īśvara and the rest."^{294}

"Old age, death, rebirth, all are of the body, not of the spirit. As Vacaśpati explains, just as the success or defeats of the army are attributed to the King, so these experiences are attributed to the spirit; *svāmini upacaryate*.^{295}

"*liṅgasya vinivṛtteh tasmād duḥkhariḥ svabhāvena. "—kārikā-LV

---

293 Mainkar, T.G. *Sāmkhyakārīka of Īśvarakṛṣṇa with Gauḍapādabhāṣya*, Oriental Book Agency Poona, 1972, p-189
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"What does the spirit do after the rise of this knowledge? As a result of this pure and absolute knowledge, the spirit perceives the nature, prekṣakavat; i.e. like a spectator seated well-composed, as a spectator of a play perceives a dancing damsel from his own seat......The spirit perceives the nature as free from the seven forms......of virtue and the rest, with which nature binds herself. Nature does not cease to exist, though the evolution does cease, as enjoyment and liberation have been achieved. The nature continues to be perceived through the intellect that is sāttvika. Thus, the perception of the nature is reconciled with the purity and inactivity of the puruṣa."\textsuperscript{296}

In the Yuktīpīkā the prakṛti-puruṣa-saṁyoga is called the āstriya saṁyoga—the scripture-stated relation, because it is such a kind of relation, which is beyond the spatio-temporal phenomena. It can neither be understood, nor be proved and explained in terms of ordinary experience and inference. But, since Sāṁkhya admits authority as pramāṇa there is no harm in accepting the Sāṁkhya-stated prakṛti-puruṣa-saṁyoga as a kind of āstriya saṁyoga.

\textsuperscript{296} Mainkar, T.G. Sāṁkhyaśāstra of isvarakṛṣṇa with Gauḍapādabhāṣya, Oriental Book Agency Poona, 1972, pp-198-199