Chapter IV

THE CONCEPT OF MAN IN THE SĀMKHYA-YOGA

The concept of man in the Sāmkhya system may be said to be initially pessimistic as it asserts that man desires to enquire about a means to remove misery which comes upon mankind from three different sources.¹ In other words it holds that man is affected by three different kinds of afflictions. These three-fold afflictions are called Ādhyātmika, Ādhibhautika and Ādidaivika. It further says that though there are certain well-known means to remove them, "these are not certain and they cannot remove affliction finally and once for all."²

Like Buddhism and some other systems of Indian philosophy, Sāmkhya philosophy is pessimistic. According to John Davies, Sāmkhya philosophy is founded on the gloomy view of human life which is generally accepted by Hindu writers. He says that the Hindu writers assert an absolute pessimism. He further asserts - "Our present life is not a blessing; it is only a wearisome burden, which is finally cast off when the soul has become free from all contact with matter."³

---

1. S.K. I
   *dūḥkha-traya-abhīghātā jjiṅgāsā
tadabhīghātakē hetāu/*

2. S.K. I
   *dṛiṣte sā’-pārthā cēnai-kāntā’
tyantatōbhāvāt//*

3. John Davies, Hindu Philosophy, p. 14
But what we should remember here is that pessimism in Indian philosophy is not final. Every man tries to get rid of pain and he can avoid it only when he keeps himself aloof from the hedonistic ideal of pleasure. In the sūtras attributed to Kapila it is declared that complete removal of these three types of afflictions is the highest good of man. It is due to ignorance that the self fails to discriminate itself from the not-self. Hence it is in bondage. With the removal of ignorance, the self becomes liberated. One can attain salvation by renouncing the material world.

Of all the miseries mentioned above, the present one will be destroyed in the very next moment, the past one is already destroyed. What poses a problem for man is the future misery. Hence it is renounceable. Vyāsa bhāṣya also says that the world is full of misery, hence it is renounceable. All the schools barring Cārvāka agree in holding that the world is a world of action and a man has to live a life of action as per the laws of duty if he wants to be a part of the world. According to the Cārvāka materialists the

4. S.S. 1.1
   atha tribhādādhyātyanta

S.P.B. 1.1
   nivrittirantyanta purusārthah.

5. YS. 2,16
   heyam dūkhamanāgatam.

6. YB.
   tatra dūkha vahutaḥṃ samsāro heyam.

7. P.T. Raju and S. Radhakrishnan (ed.), The Concept of Man, p. 279
world is constituted with the material elements of earth, water, fire and air. For them even intelligence is produced from these elements when transformed into the body, just as the inebriating power is developed from the mixing of certain ingredients. They further hold that intelligence perishes as soon as the elements from which it arose are dissolved. According to them the soul is none other than the body distinguished by the attribute of intelligence as no separate existence of the soul distinct from the body is perceived. They do not believe in rebirth nor in the consequences of actions. According to them only the fools believe in a world hereafter. They do not believe in God too. For the materialists enjoyment produced from the sensual pleasures is the sole end of life. They recognise only two values of life, viz., wealth and enjoyment. One character of the allegorical drama probodhachandra daya says that wealth and enjoyment are the objects of human existence. This drama with the help of the said character sums up the doctrine of the materialist school. Pleasure and pain are the only criteria for determining the rightness and wrongness of actions. Dr. Radhakrishnan

8. Sarva-Darsana-Samgraha translated by E.B. Cowell and A.E. Gongh, p. 3
9. Ibid., p. 3
10. Ibid., p. 3
11. Probodhachandrodaya, Act ii
says - "An unqualified hedonism is the ethical ideal of the materialist school."12 "Eat, drink and be merry" is their ethical maxim. Brihaspati the founder of this doctrine says -

While life remains let a man live happily,
let him feed on ghee even though he runs in debt;

When once the body becomes ashes, how can it ever return again?13

What is again important to note is that according to this system Nature has nothing to do with human merits or demerits. It is "absolutely dead to all human values. It is indifferent to good or evil."14 It makes no discrimination between good and evil. Its behaviour is uniform to all, no matter whether it is good or bad; righteous or unjust.

The Sāmkhya system accepted the Vedic instructions about duties and sacrifices. It is said that Kapila "proclaimed the authority of revelation as paramount to reasoning and

13. Sarva-darsāna-saṁgraha, p. 10
experience."¹⁵ But it does not appear to be the correct view. John Davies says that it is contrary to the main principle of his philosophy.¹⁶ According to Kapila's system of philosophy, the knowledge of philosophy is the only way of obtaining the deliverance of the soul from matter.¹⁷ Kapila considers the scriptural ways of removing misery as ineffective as it is linked with impurity. Its effect is neither lasting nor always the same for all.¹⁸ Kapila, of course, considered valid testimony as one of the methods of proof and so his Vedāntist expounders explained this to be the case of his recognition of divine origin and authority of the Vedas.¹⁹ But such interpretation is misleading because Kapila was an atheist. Śaṅkara the eminent commentator gives a correct estimate of the Śaṁkhya position with regard to the Vedas. He in his commentary on the Brahma-sūtra concludes thus - "Hence it is proved that Kapila's system is at variance with the Vedas and with the words of Manu, who follows the Vedas, not only in supposing an independent prakṛiti (Nature), but also in supposing a diversity of souls."²⁰

¹⁵. Quoted by John Davies, Hindu Philosophy, p. 7  
¹⁶. John Davies, op.cit., p. 7  
¹⁷. Ibid.  
¹⁸. S.K. ii  
¹⁹. John Davies, op.cit., p. 7  
²⁰. John Davies' translation is quoted from his book - Hindu Philosophy, pp. 7-8  
Śaṅkara's commentary on Brahma-sūtra, iii.190
The Sāmkhya system believes in the minor gods as parts of man's environment. For attaining liberation, we should give up everything and try to realize our inner spirits. What we are to give up is only the material world and in this respect the system is similar to the Nyāya and the Vaiśeṣika.

As regards the constitution of the world, the Sāmkhya system differs both from the Nyāya and the Vaiśeṣika. According to the latter two systems the world is a plurality of atoms in space and of time. But for the Sāmkhya system the world is not a plurality of such independent atoms. The Sāmkhya unifies all the phenomena and treats them as constituting one single unconscious principle which they call it by different names such as Prakṛti, Pradhāna etc. In the system matter and spirit are considered independent realities. Matter cannot transform itself into spirit, rather the spirit frees itself from matter and thereby it attains liberation.

There is no wide difference between the Sāmkhya and the Yoga philosophy. Rather the two systems are grouped together and are called Sāmkhya-yoga. The Yoga and Sāmkhya systems are so much alike that most of the affirmations made by the one are valid for the other.

---

As the system of Kapila did not recognise a supreme Being, his philosophy was called Nirlśwara or Atheistic. So also he sought only to guide and strengthen man by his unaided power. His philosophy was also not meant for all classes of people. His philosophy was particularly addressed to those more instructed and more intelligent classes who would be capable of understanding the highest truths. However, it did not leave even the lowest class of people wholly without hope. Probably there was no bar even for the Śūdras and women to listen to the instructions of the system and thus they could also derive some benefit by knowledge gained by listening to such instructions; though it was not primarily addressed to them. Moreover, there was no place for religious observances in this system and prayer became a superfluous act. For Kapila knowledge alone could accomplish more for the soul than these religious rites. And it is because of this fact that this system found no favour with the common people. Hence, in order to make this philosophy more popular among the common people this philosophy was supplemented by Patañjali, who agreeing with almost every doctrine of Kapila also introduced in his system the concept of a supreme spirit, who directed and presided over the workings of Nature.

22. John Davies, op.cit., pp. 115-16
Another modification brought by Patañjali in this system is the enjoining of Yoga which means concentration of the soul on the Supreme Being by meditation.

Briefly speaking the two systems differ only on two points.

(1) Sāṃkhya philosophy is atheistic whereas Yoga philosophy is theistic, since it postulates the existence of a Supreme God.

(2) Secondly, according to the Sāṃkhya philosophy the only means to liberation is the metaphysical knowledge, but Yoga philosophy over emphasizes the importance of techniques for obtaining liberation. In other words, Yoga is here considered a means to attaining liberation.

But really speaking, Patañjali is neither the creator of Yoga philosophy nor he is the inventor of Yogic techniques. He himself confesses that he has merely published and corrected the doctrinal and technical traditions of Yoga.\(^{23}\) It is a fact that Yogic practices were in vogue in India from time immemorial. The practice of Yoga was prevalent among the esoteric circles of Indian ascetics and mystics long before Patañjali.\(^{24}\) Even in providing theoretical framework and

\(^{23}\) N.S. i.1

\(^{24}\) Mircea Eliade, *Yoga: Immortality and Freedom*, p. 7
metaphysical foundation to these Yogic practices, Patanjali wholly relied on Sāmkhya philosophy. He had the least contribution in this regard. Mircea Eliade in this context says - "As to the theoretical framework and the metaphysical foundation that Patanjali provides for these practices, his personal contribution is of the smallest. He merely rehandles the Sāmkhya philosophy in its broad outlines, adapting it to a rather superficial theism in which he exalts the practical value of meditation." 25

Vijñānabhikṣu in his commentary on the Brahma-sūtra which he wrote from the Sāmkhya point of view, had to reject the atheism of the Sāmkhya. He identified therein the prakṛti of Sāmkhya with the Śakti of Brahman, thereby he combined the theism of the Yoga, the dualism of Sāmkhya and monism of the Upaniṣads. 26 In contradistinction from the Sāmkhya system stand the three other doctrines, viz., the Mīmāṁsā of Jaimini, the Nyāya of Gautama and the Vaiśeṣika of Kāṇāḍa. These schools recognise the reality of qualitatively different atoms. These systems did not consider man's environment as constituting a single principle and here lies their difference from the Sāmkhya system. It is due to Karma of the souls that the atoms come together and thus form the

25. Ibid., p. 7
world. Of these three schools, the Mīmāṃsā at first did not accept God even for supervising the process of work; but subsequently it accepted God. The other two schools believed in the existence of God, who, according to them, did supervise the process of work. Of course, the Vaiśeṣika system accepted God with certain amount of hesitancy.

Atoms, time, space, etc. along with human Karma in its two forms, viz., the kinetic and the potential were the essential ingredients of both man and the world. The world of action constitutes man's environment. The Nyāya and the Vaiśeṣika were in favour of rising above the world of action but the Mīmāṃsā accepted the idea later.

Reality of the Ātman was admitted by all schools.

All the Vedāntic schools, arising as they do from the Upaniṣads, interpreted the Upaniṣads in the way a particular system understood them. The fact that the Upaniṣads were not very much consistent in interpreting certain doctrines especially the doctrine relating to the relation of the soul and the world to God, led to the formation of different Vedāntic schools. Each school interpreted the relation of the soul and the world to God in its own way. For these schools the environment for man was the Brahman Himself dwelling within every man and the world outside. All the
Vedāntic schools agree in holding that the material world constitutes a single principle called Prakṛti and these schools take prakṛti to be the part and parcel of the Brahman.

For Śaṅkara, the world has no distinct reality of its own. What is real, is the Brahman Itself. But the other Vedāntic schools give the world a distinct and some even a separate reality. In advaitic literature, it is termed as Māyā and it is said to be indefinable. In other words, it cannot be brought under the categories of thought. It cannot be described either as existent or as non-existent or as both or as neither. There are Vedāntic schools which conceive prakṛti as the form of the Śakti of Brahman and consider Māyā to be distinct from both prakṛti and Brahman. Māyā for them is a real form of Śakti of Brahman that evolves prakṛti.

Man's Karma, the material world, and God constitute man's environment. In other words man's environment is not only material but also spiritual and ethical. Thus man lives in a common world where they are bound either by human Karma, or by prakṛti, or by God or by any two or by all the three. For early Mīmāṁsā, it is Karma only, for the Sāmkhya, it is prakṛti only and for the other systems it is all three.  

27. Ibid., p. 281
Sāṁkhya system recognises Karma as well. But it is a fact that no system of philosophy minimizes the importance of Karma. For the Cārvākas, it is only the material particles which are solely responsible for creating both the world of matter and mind. They say matter even produces consciousness. Nothing imperceptible is real for them. The atoms being imperceptible are not accepted by them.

Evolution as explained in classical Indian thought is not exactly the same as understood and explained by science. If we can use the term evolution to mean emergence of the world out of some ultimate principle or principles, then only we can say there are some theories of the evolution of man in Indian thought.28

All the Vedāntic schools, with certain modifications, accepted the account of evolution as was explained in the Upaniṣads. Such modifications in their explanations of the theories of evolution were mainly due to the influence exerted on them by the pāṇḍūrata and the pāṇcarātra Āgamas. The pluralistic schools, viz., the Mīmāṃsā, the Nyāya and the Vaiśeṣika, hold that human Karmas which exist in the latent form even during the time of the dissolution of the world, were responsible for the creation of the world and man.

28. Ibid., p. 282
Human Karma brings together the atoms and it gives rise to the world of objects and man. Theistic schools hold that God's supervision over the workings of Karma is necessary for bringing the world into being but the non-theistic schools say that Karma by itself is capable of bringing the world into existence.

We propose to give a brief account of the Sāṁkhyā theory of evolution as it is incorporated in all the Vedāntic schools and also in the Yoga philosophy of Patañjali.

Sāṁkhyā philosophy recognises two distinct realities, viz., Puruṣa and Prakṛti. Both of them are independent of each other. According to the system everything comes out of prakṛti. Prakṛti which is constituted of three guṇas of sattva, rajas and tamas is the uncaused first cause of the world order. But puruṣa is neither the cause nor the effect of anything else. Yet it has indirect influence over prakṛti which brings forth the world into existence. According to the Sāṁkhyā, puruṣas are innumerable while prakṛti is one and hence it 'explains the commonness of the world to all men'. This dualism of the Sāṁkhyā system has striking similarity with the dualism of mind and matter of Descartes.

29. S.K. iii

na prakṛtīṁ na vikṛtīṁ puruṣaṁ.
It is the belief of the Śāṁkhya system that prior to the creation of the world, prakṛti or the primeval matter remains in an equilibrium state. It is also their belief that a process of creation and dissolution (pralaya) is going on in the universe. But the question here is - Why does evolution take place? How or why the Śāmyāvasthā (equilibrium) of prakṛti is disturbed? It is said that prakṛti begins to evolve as soon as it comes into contact with puruṣa or it may be said that it is due to the transcendental influence of puruṣa that the equilibrium of prakṛti gets disturbed. It should be remembered that neither puruṣa by itself nor prakṛti by herself can produce the world of objects. Evolution of the world takes place only when puruṣa and prakṛti somehow are related. According to the Śāṁkhya system puruṣa is inactive but intelligent or conscious; prakṛti is active but non-intelligent. Hence the activity of prakṛti is to be guided by the intelligence of puruṣa. Hence their mutual co-operation is a must for bringing the world into existence.

Before describing the course of evolution according to the system, we want to make one point more clear. As regards the question why evolution takes place in prakṛti the

30. S.K. XXI
31. S.K. XIX
Sāṃkhya gives the answer thus. There is an inherent teleology or blind purpose in lifeless prakṛti. Evolution in prakṛti or all its transformations take place only with a view to serving the diverse puruṣas in their enjoyment of pleasure or sufferance of pains through experience, and this finally leads the puruṣas to absolute freedom or mukti.32.

Prakṛti or the sum-total of the guṇas has such connections with puruṣas that it serves the purposes of the puruṣas. Similar is the case with pralaya. Prakṛti returns to its quiescent state or the state of pralaya when all the Karmas of puruṣas collectively demand temporary cessation of all experience. The guṇa compounds at such a moment are broken and they are gradually reduced to their elementary disintegrated state of equilibrium. Even the state of pralaya is not a passive state, it is one of utmost tension. Pralaya also does not mean suspension of the teleology. It is a state of intense activity; but here the activity does not lead to any production of new things and qualities. Being unable to produce anything, the activity here repeats the same state of equilibrium. Thus the state of pralaya does not mean suspension of the teleology of the guṇas.

32. S.K. XXI
Another answer given by Sāṃkhya in respect of the question - 'Why is prakṛti disturbed?' is that it is due to the transcendental influence of Puruṣa. Of course this influence also does not mean anything other than the teleology that is inherent in the guṇas of Prakṛti. All the movements and modifications of guṇas will take place only with a view to serving the purposes of Puruṣas.

Yet another question remains unanswered. It has already been shown that the creation of the world of objects is possible only when there is co-operation between puruṣa and prakṛti.

Now the question is - What makes them co-operate with each other to make their contact possible? The Sāṃkhya gives the answer thus - Their co-operation is similar to the co-operation seen between a blind man and a lame man who want to come out of a forest. Non-intelligent prakṛti requires the help of intelligent puruṣa to guide her activity. Each one requires the help of the other.

Prakṛti requires the presence of puruṣa in order that prakṛti is known or appreciated by someone while puruṣa requires the help of prakṛti in order that it can discriminate itself...

33. S.K. XXI

Paṇḍa-andhavad ubhayorapi
Śāmyogas-tatkrītāh sargah.
from prakṛti and thereby it can attain liberation.  

The course of evolution according to the Śāmkhya system is as follows:

Prakṛti's equilibrium is first disturbed by the very presence of Puruṣa. Rajas being the active element, prakṛti is disturbed first, then through rajas the other two elements, viz., sattva and tamas also begin to vibrate and this produces a tumultuous commotion in the infinite bosom of prakṛti. Then a process of unequal aggregation of the guṇa reals in varying proportions takes place and in the process each of the guṇas tries to preponderate over the other two.

There is gradual differentiation as well as integration of the three guṇas of prakṛti in varying proportions which leads to the formation of the different objects of the world. Thus the incoherent prakṛti begins to evolve and becomes more and more determinate, differentiated homogeneous and co-herent.

In the process the manifold

34. S.K. XXI

Puruṣasya darśanārtham
taiva pradhānasya.

35. Śāmkhya-pravacana-sūtra with the commentary of Aniruddha and the Bhāṣya of Vijñānabhinavikshu.

36. S.N. Dasgupta, A History of Indian Philosophy, vol. I, p. 245

37. Kaumudī, 13-16; Tattvavaisāradī, 11-20
The course of evolution according to the system, however, follows a definite order. Out of the contact between puruṣa and prakṛti the equilibrium is disturbed leading to a tumultuous commotion in the infinite bosom of prakṛti and it gives rise to Mahat or Buddhi. In other words, the first product of prakṛti is Mahat. From prakṛti comes out the Mahat or Buddhi; from Buddhi the Ahamkāra or ego. From Ahamkāra follows the aggregate of the sixteen principles (viz., 11 sense-organs including the mind and the 5 Tanmātras) and from the five of the sixteen (viz., from the 5 Tanmātras) issue forth the five gross elements.

Mahat in its cosmic aspect is the great germ of this vast world of objects and hence it is called Mahat or the great one and in its psychological aspect, it is called Buddhi.

In the system of Kapila, Buddhi is defined as adhyavasāya which according to Amarkosha is a synonym of utsāha. Adhyavasāya also means strenuous effort. Professor

38. S.S. I.71
39. S.K. XXII

Prakṛter-mahāms-tato-'hamkāras-tasmād- gaṇas-ca  śroḍāsakah.
tasmād-api śroḍāsakāt pañcabhyah
paśca bhūtām

40. S.K. XXIII
Lassens translates it by "intentio" and Colebrooke by "ascertainment". St. Hillaire's interpretation of the word agrees with the comment made by Gaudapāda. It is that through which we make judgements like 'This is a jar', this is cloth, etc. The word may be used to mean determination or resolve. According to John Davies it is its secondary meaning. For him it primarily means a defining or distinguishing act. John Davies explains intellect thus - "Intellect (buddhi) is then, in the system of Kapila, the faculty or organ by which outward objects are presented to the view of the soul in their proper and definite form." 41

Some of the commentators suppose buddhi to be the seat of volitions which, however, is not the case. Kapila did not attribute volition to any form of matter. Though Kapila did not attribute volition to intellect or buddhi, he assigns to it some other properties which are equally strange as attributes of matter. 42 When Kapila says that the soul is inactive, he is bound to assign qualities or states which are connected with our active life to buddhi. Intellect when it is under the influence of sattva element is also indentified with virtue (dharma), knowledge (jñāna), detachment (vairāgya),

41. John Davies, op.cit., p. 56
42. Ibid.
and excellence (aśvāryya); but when it is under the influence of tāmas or darkness it is identified with vice (adharma), ignorance (ajñāna), attachment (āsakti or avairāgya) and imperfection (āsakti or anāśvāryya). Intellect being the product of prakṛti is entirely different from puruṣa or the self which transcends all physical things and qualities. But intellect, no doubt, "is the basis of all intellectual processes in all individual beings." 

Radha Nath Phukan giving a note on the Kārikā no. 23 states that intellect, Śāṁskāra and līnga - these three terms imply the same thing. He further states that buddhi is nothing more than the store house of thoughts. He points out that Sāṁkhyā philosophy classifies these thoughts into eight categories as stated in the said Kārikā. Thus according to this system of philosophy what we can know is that thoughts not only determine the quality of our actions and our future transmigrations but they also give us the power to act. Man is here like an animal tied up with a tether in the pole or post of Śāṁskāra or buddhi. Along with the lengthening of the...

43. S.K. XXIII

adhyāvasāyo buddhir-dharma
jñānam virāga aśvāryam/
sāttvikām etad-rūpam
tāmasam-asmd-viparyastam/

44. D.M. Datta and S. Chatterjee, An Introduction to Indian Philosophy, p. 269
rope with which it is tied up, i.e., with the brightening of one's sāṃskāra there is scope of improving the quality of one's acts. Not only that he is also capable of acquiring more and more freedom of movement, his power to do super human work also increases.\(^\text{45}\) His freedom from the seven kinds of thoughts means the release of his soul.

Here we can notice a distinction between the Sāmkhya and the Gītā. While according to the Sāmkhya thoughts are of eight kinds, for the Gītā thoughts are only of three kinds. In other words the Gītā classifies thoughts into three categories, viz., Sāttvika, Rājasika and Tāmasika. We have shown in our preceding chapter that the qualities of our actions and character are determined by these thoughts. It is also the case that our actions, our food, our temper and everything else have also been classified into the same three divisions. A man with Sāttvika nature is prone to do only sāttvika actions; he can take only sāttvika food and so forth. Conversely when a man is seen doing sāttvika work, taking sāttvika food, we may be sure that his thoughts are of sāttvika type.

\(^{45}\) Radha Nath Phukan, The Sāmkhya Kārika of Isvarakṛṣṇa, p. 104
If our actions and their qualities be determined not by the soul itself but by the rules of thoughts, we may say that man is pre-determined; he has no freedom. "It is these thoughts which make the man what he is." 46

Ahamkāra in the system is of three kinds. This classification of Ahamkāra is made on the basis of preponderance of one or other of the two guṇas. The three types of Ahamkāra are called Vaikārika or Śattvika, Taijasa or rājas and Bhūtādi or Tāmasa. From Śattvika Ahamkāra comes the five organs of perception, the five organs of action and the mind or manas. And Tāmasa Ahamkāra gives rise to five tanmātrās. Rājas Ahamkāra helps both the Śattvika and Tāmasa Ahamkāra by supplying them the needed energy in bringing out their products. The five tanmātras give rise to five gross elements.

The account of evolution given by Śāmkhya philosophy agrees in many respects with the account given of it in the Kaṭha Upaniṣad though the two accounts are not exactly the same. Unlike Śāmkhya philosophy, the Yoga philosophy believes in the reality of God. Yet it accepts exactly in the same form the Śāmkhya theory of evolution.

46. Ibid., p. 102
Though all the orthodox schools do not openly contradict the Vedic views, yet each of them explains the Vedic utterances in their own way. In explaining the constitution of man, the Yoga and the Vedānta schools accept the Sāmkhya interpretation of it. The Mīmāṃsā view of it is accepted by the Nyāya and the Vaiśeṣika. Even then each of them might differ from each other on certain points. We may notice similarities of the Mīmāṃsā view with that of the Vedānta.

According to the first group, 'man is a spiritual and psycho-physical individual'. But as regards the nature of the 'spirit', 'mind' and 'body' each school differs among themselves. According to the Sāmkhya system the ego or Ahamkāra is the centre of both man and the world; because both of them come out of the ego. The Kārikā no. 25 states that the Sāttvika elements (mind and the sense organs) emanate from the Vaikārika Ahamkāra; the five Tanmātras (the subtle elements) proceed from that form of Ahamkāra which is known as Bhūtādi; it is of the nature of Tamas (dark or heavy). Both these emanations are caused by the Taijasa Ahamkāra.47

The Tanmātras may be said to be the original states of the

47. S.X. XXV

sāttvika ekādāśakah
pravartate vaikr̥tāḥ-ahaṃkārāt/
bhūtādes-tanmātras, sa
tamasaḥ taijasād-ubhayam//
five bhūtas or matter. From these five Tanmātras proceed the
two Mahābhūtas, viz., earth, water, fire, air and ether or
ākāśa - thus giving rise to the world of objects. Hence we
may say that according to this system the ego or Ahamkāra is
the centre of both man and the world. The ego on the other
hand comes out of reason which in turn comes out of the
primeval matter prakṛti. For some Vedāntic schools, prakṛti
is the part and parcel of Brahman. According to the Viśiṣṭād-
vaita of Rāmānuja both unconscious matter (acit) and the
finite spirits (cit) are constituents of God or Brahman.
Contrariwise, God or Brahman who is omnipotent includes within
Itself both the unconscious matter and the finite spirits.
The unconscious matter being the source of all the material
objects is called prakṛti after the Śvetāsvatara Upaniṣad.
Prakṛti is here regarded, as in the Sāmkhya system, as the
uncreated (aja) eternal reality. But unlike the Sāmkhya
Rāmānuja believes prakṛti to be a part of God.

The Sāmkhya system differs from the Kaṭha Upaniṣad
in that it leaves the opposition between spirit and matter

48. S.K. XXXVIII
Tanmātrāmy-aviśeṣāh, 
-tebhyo bhūtām pañca pañcabhyah/

49. S.K. XXII

50. Sveta Up., 4.5
ajām ekām lohita-śukla-kṛṣṇaṁ 
vahvih prajāḥ srijamānāṁ sarūpāḥ.
unreconciled whereas the Katha Upanishad says that the world rests on Brahman the immortal. Other Vedantic systems following the Katha interpretation, reconciles the opposition between matter and spirit by holding the material principle to be a form of the energy aspect of Brahman.

The Sāmkhya and the Vedanta system differ from each other in another important point. According to the Sāmkhya system the five elements come out simultaneously whereas according to the Vedantic system they come out of one another. For example - earth comes out of water, water out of fire, fire out of air and air out of ether.

Again, according to the Taittirīya Upanishad ether comes out of the ātman, but for the Sāmkhya system all the elements come out of the ego the fact which we have explained before. Internal organs, according to the system, are of three kinds. Buddha, Ahamkāra and Manas - the three together

51. No one can go beyond Ĝit. This is the very Ātman whom Naciketa was enquiring after.

\[
\text{tasmīlolkāh śrītāḥsarve}
\]
\[
\text{tadunātyeti kaścan}
\]
\[
\text{atadvai tat.} \quad \text{(Katha Up., II.3.1)}
\]

52. Taitt. Up., ii.1.3

\[
\text{tasmādvā etasmādātman}
\]
\[
\text{ākāśaḥ sambhūtaḥ.}
\]

53. S.K. XXXIII

\[
\text{antāḥ karaṇāṃ trividhām.}
\]
constitute antaḥkaraṇa in the system. The three internal organs have their specific functions\textsuperscript{54}—their specific function distinguishes one from the other and it is not common to the three internal organs. But the function common to all these organs is the production of the five vital airs, breathing and the rest. Buddhi or intellect has the function of both ascertainment and determination. The function of Ahamkāra is self-consciousness and it has also the function of appropriating experiences as its own. The mind has the function of analysing and synthesising the internal and external perceptions. The mind partakes the nature of both the organs of perception and action.\textsuperscript{55}

The function of the four (the three internal organs and one external organ) with regard to a visible object is declared to be either simultaneous or successive; the function of the three internal organs with regard to an invisible object is preceded by that of the fourth.\textsuperscript{56} "Since the Buddhi with the other (two) internal organs determines finally all

\textsuperscript{54} S.K. XXIX

\begin{center}
svālakṣaṇyam vṛttis-trāyasya
sai-sā bhavaty asāmānyā/
sāmānya-karana-vṛttih
prāṇādyā vāyavah pānca/
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{55} S.K. XXVII

\textsuperscript{56} S.K. XXX
truths and knowledge about the objects of the sense-organs, the three internal organs stand to the sense organs in the relation of the door-keeper and the door."

As regards the function of the antah karaṇa we like to add one more point. The internal organs can function (i.e., think) not only in the present, but also in the past and the future. But the external organs through the medium of which alone the internal organs can have knowledge about objects are not so capable; these can function only in the present.

Another peculiar feature of the Śāmkhya doctrine of antahkaraṇa is that it has the potency of both merit and demerit. We have already pointed out that Buddhi in its Sāttvika form is identical with virtue, knowledge, detachment and excellence or supernatural power (aśvarya) and in its tāmasika form it is identical with vice, ignorance, attachment and imperfection or weakness. Thus it has the potency of both merit and demerit.

---

57. S.K. XXXV

sāntaḥkaraṇā buddhiḥ sarvāṁ
dvāri dvārāṇi sesāṁ/

58. S.K. XXXIII

59. S.K. XXIII
The commentators having Vedāntic leaning explain virtue as including humanity, benevolence, act of restraint (yama) and of obligation (Niyama).\textsuperscript{60} By act of restraint Gauḍapāda means abstinence from cruelty, falsehood, dishonesty, incontinence and avarice and by acts of obligation he means purification, contentment, religious austerities, sacred study and divine worship. But this interpretation of Gauḍapāda refers only to the pātañjala or theistic branch of the Sāmkhya school. According to Gauḍapāda knowledge is of two kinds, viz., external and internal. External knowledge is the knowledge of the Vedas and the six other branches of study connected with them - such as recitation, ritual, grammar, interpretation of words, prosody and astronomy. External knowledge also means knowledge of the purāṇas, Logic, theology and Law. Internal knowledge means the knowledge of prakṛti and the soul or it is the knowledge which enables one to distinguish between matter and soul. Liberation is obtained by internal knowledge while worldly distinction or admiration is obtained by external knowledge.

Though Kapila did not altogether discard Vedic knowledge, yet he had a very low estimation of it. John Davies explains Kapila's attitude towards Vedic knowledge thus -

\textsuperscript{60} John Davies, op.cit., p. 57
"Kapila, however, placed a knowledge of the Vedas at a very low point, if he did not discard it altogether. Religious austerities and divine worship found no place in his system. The soul of man is the highest existence which his philosophy contemplates, recognising as Comtism, only the supremacy of humanity, but rising above M. Comte in admitting the soul to be its only true representative." 61

Non-attachment is of two kinds. One kind of non-attachment means indifference to all external objects. This indifference may take place either because the objects are defective or there may be trouble in acquiring them or because of their injurious nature. The other kind of indifference means seeking of deliverance or separation from matter.

Aisvarya or excellence means supernatural power. A devotee obtaining with the help of knowledge complete separation from what is external to himself can do anything he likes. Aisvarya is a kind of thought which enables a man to do some miraculous deeds. Such thoughts are divided into eight kinds, such as - (1) Apimā, (2) Laghimā, (3) Garimā, (4) Mahimā, (5) Ṫisītva, (6) Vaisītva, (7) Prāpti, (8) Prākāmya.

Radha Nath Phukan explains these thoughts thus -

61. Ibid., p. 58
(1) Anima - the power to enter into all things.

(2) Laghima - i.e., Lightness - the power to rise up to the sky.

(3) Garimā - which enables the yogin to make his body extremely heavy.

(4) Mahimā - Extensive Magnitude.

(5) Isitva - power to lord over anything.

(6) Vasitva - subjugation of all elements.

(7) Prapti - That sort of thought which enables a man to get whatever he desires.

(8) Prakāmya - infallibility of purpose.

Again Reason in the Sāmkhya system is said to be both theoretical and practical. Reason is here equivalent to consciousness and conscience which these two terms usually imply.

The Sāmkhya conception of the vital principle is not the same as that explained in the Upaniṣads. According to the Upaniṣads the vital principle is said to be different from the mind.

For both Upaniṣads and the Sāmkhya philosophy, it is of five kinds, but the Sāmkhya points out that the vital principle is the result of the three inner instruments (antaḥ
karaṇa) working together. Each of them has its own function, yet they together perform the function of biological activity.

According to the Yoga of Patañjali, it is in and through reason, we get the following - knowledge, illusion, objectless verbal knowledge, sleep and memory. Sleep is also one of its functions. Though Citta is the common name used to mean the three constituents of inner instrument, this peculiarity of the function of reason has its own importance. The Sāmkhya regards the ātman as sat (existent) and cit (conscious). Unlike the Vedānta it does not hold that the ātman is blissful too. Bliss according to the system is a characteristic of reason which however, is the product of prakṛti. Hence bliss cannot be the characteristic of ātman. According to the Sāmkhya system reason being distinct from the ātman, the ātman is conscious even when it is separated from the reason (buddhi).

According to Yoga, the self is, in its own nature, pure consciousness, free from all limitations. But in its ignorance it confuses itself with citta. Although the self really suffers no change, yet, because of its reflection in the changing states of citta, the self appears to be subject to change and modification. There are as many cittas as there are puruṣas, since each puruṣa has a citta connected with it.

62. S.K. XXIX
S.N. Dasgupta observes, "Mahattatva is but the collective aspect of this chitta material, though the citta should be distinguished from the mahat in this that fresh citta materials are always being evolved in it from the prakṛti, which are always in a state of transformation into the tāmātras and the atoms. The mahat is thus the general name as upholding the mind-stuff and the matter-stuff. This citta in its all pervasive character is called Kāraṇa citta." The concept of Kāraṇa citta (the causal mind) is very significant for the Yoga system. In connection with different bodies the all-pervading Kāraṇa citta manifests itself as the Kāryacitta (the individual mind). Every individual being shares this Kāraṇa citta through the process of individuation. The Kārya citta is only the modification of the Kāraṇa citta and works in different bodies according to its nature undergoing incessant transformation. It seems to be liable to contraction and expansion according to the nature of the body it occupies. But the Kāraṇa citta remains the same, retaining its all-pervasive character. It "expresses itself under the limitations of the body through which it is destined to play its role as destined by its Karma; it is the greater psychical store of which only a part is revealed in each individual experience as

63. S.N. Dasgupta, Yoga Philosophy : In relation to other Systems of Indian Thought, pp. 260-61
The Kāraṇa citta remains constant in all births and deaths that an individual undergoes. It keeps the memory of the experiences of thousands of lives in the form of Sāṁskāras or potencies. These potential impressions in the citta are revived in course of fructification of Karma in different reincarnations. As the Kāraṇa citta is essentially ubiquitous (Vibhu), the aim of Yogic practices is to recover this potential ubiquity in any individual case. The Sāṁkhya, however, denies the absolute ubiquity of the Kāraṇa citta and admits only its relative expansiveness in different types of bodies. Yoga seeks to gain complete mastery over the mind and its modifications. When the waves of Kārya citta die down and leave the citta in all-pervasive placidity (Kāraṇa citta), the Yogin acquires omniscience. "And the moment this quieting is accomplished", observes Zimmer, "the inner man, the life-monad, stands revealed - like a jewel at the bottom of a quieted pond." It is aptly remarked by Haridas Bhattacharyya, "Thus the Yoga philosophy reiterates the main Upaniṣaditic conclusion that the soul must not be identified either with the

64. Ibid., p. 287
65. S.N. Dasgupta, Yoga as Philosophy and Religion, pp. 93-4
body or with the senses or with the mind or even with the ego and the intelligence-principle, and that one must penetrate into the inner spiritual core after ripping open the 'sheaths' (Kośas) of materiality. "67