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Theory of Causation in the Vedānta Philosophy

Introduction:

Vedānta is originally the name given to Upaniṣads because they are the last division (anta) of the Veda because they impart the ultimate form (anta) of the vedic knowledge. Vedānto nama upaniṣat pramanam. The Upaniṣad, the Brahma-Sūtra, and the Bhāgavad Gītā are called ‘Prasthana-traya, or the three basic works of Vedānta. The views of the upaniṣads also constitute the final aim of the veda,’ or the essence of the Vedas. The Vedānta Sutra is called Brahma Sutra, because it is an exposition of the doctrine of Brahman, and also Sariraka Sūtra, because it deals with the embodiment of the unconditioned self.

The Upaniṣadic teachings are the original Vedānta teachings. Radha Krishnan refers to Saṅkara’s philosophy. But later on, Saṅkara was more prominent by his teaching and the word ‘Vedānta’ came to denote only the teachings of Saṅkara’s Vedānta. Saṅkara’s teachings form only the central portion of the vast literature which is known by the term Vedānta. There are several schools of the Vedānta. Saṅkara’s Vedānta is called Advaita-vāda. The other schools are visistadvaita-vāda of Rāmānuja, Dvaita-vāda of
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Mādhvācārya Dvaitadvaita-vāda of Nimbārka and Suddhadvaita-vāda of Vallabha.

In the Mundaka upanisad (ii. 2.10) it is found that Ānanda is the beginning and the end of the world, the cause as well as the effect, the root as well as the shoot of the universe. The efficient and the final causes are one. God is known as Prajñāna, or the eternally active self conscious reason. He is responsible for the whole realm of change. Brahman is the sole and the whole explanation of the world, its material and efficient cause. The entities of the world are knots in the rope of development, which beings with matter and ends in Ānanda. Some interpreters of the Upaniṣads also contend that the Upaniṣads support the doctrine of Māyā in the sense of the illusoriness of the world. According to Deussen, there are four different theories of creation occurring in the Upaniṣad.

1. That matter exists from eternity independently of God, which He fashions, but does not create.

2. That God creates the universe out of nothing, and the latter is independent of God, although it is His creation.

3. That God creates the universe by transforming Himself into it.

4. That God alone is real, and there is no creation at all.

The last, according to Deussan, is the fundamental view of the Upaniṣads. The world in space and time is an appearance, an illusion, a shadow of the God. The above view clearly explains the theory of unreal
trans-formation – vivarta- vāda, the theory of the Saṅkara school. But Deussen's view is based on some misconceptions which are shown and refuted by Radhakrishnan. Upanisadas nowhere mention the illusion theory. The only one reality is Brahman. But the world is the real transformation of Brahman.

All the Vedāntic systems hold that the sutra (1,1,2) 'Janmadyasya Yatah' (from whom proceeds the origin etc, (of this universe) defines Brahman. According to the commentators, Hiranyagarbha is the efficient cause of the universe. Ānanda Tīrtha and Vijnāna Bhiksu take this sutra to mean that Brahman is merely the efficient cause of the universe, while the other commentators hold that Brahman is both the material (upādāṇa) and the efficient (nimitta) cause. Bhāskara and Vallabha accept the view that, though Brahman is without parts, the cosmos is the transformation of Brahman. Hence, according to them, Brahman itself is the material cause of transformation, while Vijnāna Bhiksu holds that Prakṛti alone is transformed, though Brahman too, being the locus of Prakṛti, may be said to be the material cause. Śrīkantha, Śrikara and Rāmānuja are of the opinion that, even though Prakṛti alone is immediately transformed, Prakṛti and Brahman are inseparable, both being related as the body and its indweller (Prakṛti being
the body of Brahman) Hence they accept the view that Brahman is the material cause, since Brahman too is transformed together with Prakrti.

**Creation in the Upanisad:**

In the Brhadaranyaka and Mundaka Upanisad it is found that the origin of the world is traced to creation or emancipation. All creatures come out from the Atman or Brahman, as sparks come out from fire, as plants shoot forth on the earth, as hairs spring from a living body, or as threads come out from the body of a spider. The world emanates from the fulness of Brahman, and returns to it.4

The Mundaka Upanisad says that the material elements, ether, air, light, water and earth, - life and sense-organs and manas spring from Brahman, The river, seas mountains and plants spring from Him. Plants, vital forces and corms spring from Him. Gods, men, beasts and birds spring from Him. The Vedas R.K., Sama and Yajus spring from Him. The moral laws and duties spring from Him. Brahman is the source of the cosmic order and the moral order.5

The Svetasvatara Upanisad refers to the creation of the world by God out of Mayā or Prakṛti. God is the Lord of Prakṛti and individual souls. He is endowed with Mayā. Mayā is Prakṛti Brahman is the infinite and eternal consciousness devoid of Sattva, rajas and tamas, prakṛti, composed of the

---

3 TCHI, (Vol. - III), P. 189
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gunaś, It is the own power of Brahman which is known as Svasakti. He creates the world out of his own power or prakṛti. Prakṛti is the conscious power of God, which can create the multiform of the various objects.⁷

The subala upaniṣad gives an account of creation and dissolution of the world. There was neither being, nor non-being, nor being and non-being both. From this Tamas, bhūtadi, earth, water, air, fire, ether etc. are created. A Similar account of cosmic creation is found in the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇa. The Śāmkhya theory of evolution reassembles it.

In the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad, 11, 2, 10, it is found that “All shine after Him who shines. By His radiance is all this illumined.”⁸

The efficient and the final causes are one. For the Upaniṣads, both form and matter, the ever active consciousness and the passive non-consciousness are aspect of a single reality. Matter itself is a God. Its first forms of fire, water, and earth are looked upon as divine, since they are all informed by the one spirit. The Śāmkhya dualism is repugnant to the Upaniṣads. The transcendent reality is the ground of the struggle between spirit and matter. In the Taiteriya Upaniṣad it is said that God created it self by itself and in the Brḥ-Upaniṣad it is found that “He creates the world and then enters it.” The Upaniṣads are decisive about the Principle that Brahman

---

⁷ IP, (Vol-I), P. 30
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is the sole and source of life in all that lives, the single thread binding the whole plurality into a single unity.\(^9\)

The true cause is thus the unchangeable being which persists through all experiences, and the effect-phenomena are but impositions upon it of ajnana or avidya. The Satkāryavāda of the Vedānta, that the cause alone is true and ever existing, and phenomena in themselves are false. There is only this much truth in them, that all are imposed on the reality or being which alone is true. This appearance of the one cause the being, as the unreal many of the phenomena is what is called the vivartavada as distinguished from the Sāṁkhyayoga parināmavāda in which the effect is regarded as the real development of the cause in its potential state. When the effect has a different kind of being from the cause it is called vivarta but when the effect has the same kind of being as the cause it is called pariṇāma.\(^10\) In the upaniṣadic passages it is found that ‘taccubhram jyotisam jyotish’ and ‘tameva bhantam anubhati sarvam tasya bhasa sarvam idam vibhati’\(^11\)

Vedānta has as much to object against the Nyāya as against the pariṇāma theory of causation of the Sāṁkhya; for movement, development, form, potentiality, and actuality all these are indefinable and inconceivable in the light of reason; They can not explain causation but only restate things and phenomena as they appear in the world. In reality however, though
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9 IP, (Vol-I), PP. 182, 83
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11 Mund up, 11.2.10
phenomena are not identical with the cause, they can never be defined except in terms of the cause.\footnote{12}

Samkara tried to show that the Upaniṣads looked upon the cause as mere ground of change which though unchanged in itself in reality had only an appearance of suffering change. It is said that though there are many diversities of appearance that one is called the plate, the other the pot, and the other jug, yet there are only empty distinctions of name and form. Earth is only real thing among these name and form. So it is that the ultimate cause, the unchangeable Brahman, remain ever constant.\footnote{13}

In the Advaita-वāda, besides Śaṅkara there are many teachers, they are specially Adisesa, Vasistha and Gauda Pāda, They are Pre-Śaṅkara. On the other hand Suresvara, vidyaranyamuni, Appaya-Diksita, Prakasananda, Citsukha and Sriharsa etc are post Śaṅkara, Adisesa, the author of Paramarthaśa, does not discuss the theory of causation. Vasistha, the author of yoga vasistha, propounds the unreal nature of this world in detail and also gives reasons for the impossibility of God. The author of yoga vasistha, admits the existence of the world in Brahman is a potential state. “As the various colours of the tail of a peacock potentially exist within the liquid of its egg. So the plurality is potentially present in the sprit which is capable of manifesting it.”\footnote{14}

\footnote{12} tadābhedaṁ vinaiva tadyatiṅkeṣaṇa durvaśam kavyam vivartah. Ibid
\footnote{13} AHIP, (Vol-I) P. 53
\footnote{14} Via, 47,29
The manifestation of this world from God cannot be the same form as that of the seed into a tree or milk into curd. There is a way that causes convert into its effect but no way to return (effect to cause). But Brahman is known to be continuing as the same pure Brahman throughout the creation, existence and end of the world. Brahman does not undergo transformation as milk or seed. Brahman, therefore, does not undergo transformation as milk. The world exists in Brahman in the same way as a tree exists in its seed.

Brahman is the ultimate reality which evolves itself as this world. In the chāndogya upanishad, it is described as ‘Tajjalan’ as that (tat) from which the world arises (ja), into which it returns (la), and by which it is supported and it lives (an). In the Taittiriya, Brahman is defined as that from which all these beings are born, by which they live, and into which they are reabsorbed. The evolution of the elements is given in an order, from Brahman arises ether, from ether air, from air fire, from fire water and from water earth. But the real theory of evolution is given in the doctrine of the five sheaths (Kosas) in the Taittiriya. The lowest level is that of matter (annamaya) after that life (Prāñamaya); The vegetable life osadhayah emerges first. The third is Perceptual consciousness (manomaya). The fourth state of evolution is self consciousness reason (vijñānamaya). The fifth and the highest state of

15 tajjatvat tallatvat tadanatvacca, BSS, P. 228
bhasa yasya jagadvibhāti sahajanandojjvalam yan mahah, PC, VI.14
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evolution therefore, is the non-dual bliss (anandamaya) This non-dual bliss is the cause of this universe.\textsuperscript{16}

Gaudap\=ada, in his M\=an\=d\=ukya Karik\=a has discussed the problem of causation in detail and has shown that there is actually nothing like origination, it is mere illusion. This view is known as ajativ\=ada i, e the theory of non-origination or non-birth. According to gaudap\=ada “No Jiva is born; there is no cause for it; this is the supreme truth; nothing whatever is born”.\textsuperscript{17} gaudap\=ada says that the birth of a real entity is justified only through m\=ay\=a and not in reality,\textsuperscript{18} Reality is no origination. It always remain the same. It is the complete absence of misery. The immortal can never become mortal and the mortal can never become immortal ultimate nature can never change. The Lord through His power appears to be many. The unborn appears to be born as many. The unborn appears to be born through illusion. Ultimately nothing originates. The non-existent can never be born at all the son of a barren women can be born neither through illusion nor in reality. The doctrine of no origination, therefore, is the ultimate truth. From the ultimate standpoint there is neither death nor birth, neither disappearance or appearance neither destruction nor production, neither bondage nor liberation, there is none who works for freedom, none who desire salvation, and none who has been

\begin{footnotes}
\item[16] ACSP, PP. 24-25
\item[17] Mandukya-karika; III, 48; IV,71
\item[18] Ibid, III, 27
\end{footnotes}
liberated; there is neither the aspirant nor the emancipated, this is the highest truth.

Thus Gaudapāda and Buddhists clarified that causality is therefore an impossibility. Origination is impossible because neither the existent nor the non-existent can be produced either by the existent or by the non-existent.\textsuperscript{19}

Sarṅkara agrees with Gaudapāda’s view of Ajāti. There is no real creation. God, therefore, is not a real creator. God alone is real; the creation is only an appearance of God Ajativāda (no-origination) is the fundamental doctrine of Gaudapāda. Negatively. It means that the world, being only an appearance, is in fact never created. Positively, it means that the absolute, being self-existent, is never created (aja) Gaudapāda agrees with Shūnyavāda in maintaining that origination, from the absolute standpoint, is an impossibility. Reality is no-origination. It always remain the same. In the Isha Upaniṣad, 12 it is declared that “those who are attached to creation or production or origination go to utter darkness. On the other hand, the shruti denies creation; and by declaring that ‘the unborn does not take birth again, who then, can indeed produce Him’. (Br – III, 9,28) the shruti denies the cause of creation.\textsuperscript{20}

The Vedānta philosophy looked at the constantly changing phenomena of the world appearance and sought to discover the root whence proceeded

\begin{footnotes}
\item[\textsuperscript{19}] ACSP, PP. 244-245
\item[\textsuperscript{20}] ACSIP, PP. 242-243
\end{footnotes}
the endless series of events and effects. The theory that effects were altogether new productions caused by the invariable unconditional and immediately preceding antecedents. A cause in that which must produce its effect is also equally indefinable, inexplicable and logically inconceivable, All the characteristics of the effects are indescribable and indefinable ajnana of Maya. The different follower of Samkara Vedanta in explaining the cause of the world appearance sometimes lay stress on the maya, ajnana or avidyā sometimes on the Brahman, and sometimes on them both. The writer of sanksepa sariraka (Śarvajnatmamuni) and his followers think that the pure Brahman should be regarded as the causal substance (upādāna) of the world-appearance. Prakasatman Akhandananda and Mādhava hold that Brahman in association with Māyā, Māyā reflected form of Brahman is known as Isvara and Isvara is regarded as the cause of the world-appearance. The world of duality is mere maya, the real thing being the non-dual.21 The world-appearance is an evolution or Pariṇāma of the Māyā as located in Isvara, whereas Isvara is the Vivarta causal matter. Both Brahman and Māyā are to be regarded as the cause, Brahman as the permanent causal matter, upādāna and māyā as the entity evolving in Pariṇāma. The Śvetasvatara clearly states that the origin (Prakṛti) of the world lies in the magical power Māyā of God.22 According to Vācaspati Miśra Brahman is the permanent cause of the world-

21 māyāmatram idam dvaitam advaitam paramarthātah, V.S., 11.17
22 māyāṃ tu prakṛtimaṇḍuṣṭhyā, māyaṁ tu mahēśvarāṇi vide svet. 4.10 and Saṁkara the thereon
appearance through Maya as associated with Jiva. Prakasananda in his Siddhanta Muktiivali holds that Brahman itself is pure and absolutely unaffected by illusory appearance and the causal matter of the world appearance.

The word maya was used in the Rg-veda in the sense of supernatural power and wonderful skill. The idea of an inherent mystery underlying, it was gradually emphasized in the Atharva veda and it began to be used in the sense of magic or illusion. In the Brhadaranyaka, Prasna, and Svetavatara Upoanisads the word means magic. In early pali Buddhist writings it occurs only in the sense of deceitful conduct. Buddhaghosa uses it in the sense of magical power. Nagarjuna and Lankavatara has acquired the sense of illusion. In Saṅkara the word maya is used in the sense of illusion, both as a principle of creation as a sakti (power) or accessory cause, and as the phenomenal creation itself, as the illusion of world- appearance. Gaudapāda compared the world-appearance with dream, and held that objects seen in the walking world are unreal, because they are capable of being seen like objects seen in a dream, which are false and unreal. Saṅkara expounded this doctrine in his commentaries on the upanisads and the Brahma-Sutra.23

In the Vedānta philosophy some philosophers regard that creation is the manifestation of God (vibhuti), while others regard it as of the nature of dream or illusion (Svapnamaya); and some others philosophers maintain that

23 AHIP, (Vol-I), PP. 469-470
it is the will of God, and others declare that everything proceeds from time
(Kāla) similarly creation is for the sake of enjoyment (bhoga) and sport
(Krida), Gaudapada, rejects all these views and says that it is the inherent
nature of the shining one. (devasyaisa Svabhāvo yam).

Gaudapāda uses the word māyā in the sense of wondrous power, it
becomes the Svabhāva or the nature of the Atman, “inseparable from the ever
luminous who is hidden by it.” Māyā is also said to be the beginningless
cosmic principle which hides reality from the vision of man, The world of
duality is mere māyā, the real being the non-dual.”24 Again in guadapada’s
philosophy māyā is not used with any strictness. It is used to indicate – (i)
The inexplicability of the relation between the Atman and the world, (2) The
nature or power of Isvara, (3) The apparent dreamlike character of the world.
Sāṅkarā’s philosophy is related with the first and indifferent to the last, and it
is similar to the samvrtisatya of the Madhyamikas rather than to the
Vyavaharikasatya.25

Gaudapāda denies the validity of causation and the impossibility of
change. “There is no destruction, no creation none in bondage, none
endeavouring (for release), none desirous of liberation, none liberated, this is
the Absolute truth.”26 The empirical world is traced to Avidya or in
Nāgārjuna’s phrase Samvṛti. “From a magical seed is born a magical sprout,

24 māyāmātram idam dvaitam advaitam paramarthatah, V.S.. 11.17
25 IP, (Vol. II), PP. 460-461
26 na bandho’sti na moksa’sti niśbandho’sti na bandhanam
   aprabodhad idam duhkham prabodhāt pravilīyate. MK. i. 1
this sprout is neither permanent nor perishing, such are things and for the
same reason. The highest state beyond the distinctions of knowledge can not
be characterized by the predicates of existence, non-existence, both or
neither, Guadapāda and Nāgārjuna regard it as something which transcends
the phenomenal.27

In case of causality Saṅkara makes the causal nature the Svabhāva, or
the Īśamānya or the universal, while the effect is regarded as a condition
avastha or viśeṣa. "There are in the world many Śamānyas with their viśeṣas
both conscious and unconscious. All these Śamānyas in their graduated series
are included and comprehended in one great Śamānya, i.e. in Brahmān’s
nature as a mass of intelligence. Brahmān is reality is to say that it is different
from the phenomenal, the spatial, the temporal and the sensible Brahmān is
what is assumed as foundational, though it is in no sense substance.28

In the case of transformation the cause and the effect belong to the
same order of reality, while in that of appearance the effect is of a different
order of being from the cause. The world resides in Brahmān even as the
illusion of a snake is said to reside in the rope. There are other interpretations
of the doctrine of māyā to be met with in the Advaita treatises. Māyā can not
be different from Brahmān, which was no second. The universe is not due to
any addition to Brahmān from some other source of reality, for nothing can

27 sarvopalambhospaṃsah prapañcopaṃsah śivah
na kvacit kasyacit kaścid dharma buddhena desitaḥ prapañcopaṃsah, ii. 35. CP. MK. i. 1
28 Ibid, P. 534
be added to that which is already perfect. It is therefore due to non-being. The process of the world is due to a gradual deprivation of reality. Māyā is used as the name of the dividing force, the finitising principle, that which measures out the immeasurable and creates forms in the formless. This māyā is a feature of the central reality, neither identical with nor different from it.29

The evolution of the universe is an order. The whole world springs from Isvara, Ākasa being produced first, and later on the other elements in due succession. The gross matter of the world (Mālābhūtas) is made up of the varying combinations of these subtle rudiments (Suksmabhūtas). The gross substance Ākasa manifests sound, air manifests sound and pressure, fire these and in addition light and heat, Water has the qualities of taste in addition to the others, and earth has the qualities of other substances and its own special quality of smell, every object has the properties of sound, tangibility, form, taste, and smell. The gross elements give rise by modifications (Pariṇāma) to different kinds of things. Matter is constantly undergoing change of state. Changes may also be induced from without. Saṁkara speaks of a cosmic vibratory motion. All these elements are non-intelligent (acetana), and can not of themselves bring about their development. The immanence of God in them all is assumed. The order of creation is reversed in the case of dissolutions. At the time of dissolution the

29 IP, P. 570
earth becomes water again water; fire; fire air, air becomes Akasa re-enters Isvara.30

Advaita Vedānta maintains the theory of vivarta. Saṅkara maintains Satkāryavāda in the form of vivartavāda. The effect, according to him, is non-different from the cause. The pot is nothing else but earth, but the object and its material cause is invariably related. The effect can not exist without a cause. The pot can not be separated from the clay. It is an illusion to maintain that the effect is something new which was non-existent earlier and which has been newly born. It was always existent in its material cause. The creation of the reality from the unreal cannot be imagined. The substance can change one form for another. If the real could come out of the unreal, oil should be extracted from the sand. Due to the activity of the instrumental cause no new substance is born, only the form latent in the substance becomes manifest. Hence, the effect is non-different from the cause and exist in it. Causal relation is not a real change. The changing world is merely a reflection. This reflection is due to adhyasa. Adhyasa is due to Avidyā. Both Adhyasa and Avidyā are eternal, so the world also seems to be eternal.

Pratibimbavāda:

Advaita philosophy maintains the relation of reflection (Pratibimba) between the jiva and Brahman. The reflection of infinite consciousness in the mirror of Avidyā is jiva. In the commentary of the Brhadaranyaka upaniṣad, 30 IP, (Vol-II), P. 592-593
Saṅkara suggests the theory of reflection. The Absolute is the original (bimba) and the world is the reflection (Pratibimba) just as the moon causes many refection's in different pools of water and the reflections differ in their clarity according to the degree of cleanliness of the water refection it and just as they appear to be stable or moving if the water is stable or moving, similarly, due to the nature of Avidyā, the jivas who are the reflections of the infinite, appear to have different forms and types. From this analogy two things are clear. First it is one Brahman which is reflected differently in different Antahkaranas due to different Avidyā, and secondly, that the clearness of the reflection of the Brahman will be proportionate to the clearness of the Antahkaraṇa.  

**Brahma Parināmavāda**

According to Rāmānuja Brahman is the creator, Sustainer and destroyer of the world. In the state of dissolution, the physical world is destroyed and both the conscious and the material elements exist in seed form in Brahman. This has been called Brahman as cause. After creation, Brahman is manifested in the form of bodied jivas. This is the Brahman as the effect. Thus Rāmānuja like Sāṅkhya believes that the effect is existent before it is manifested (Satkāryavāda) But he differs in accepting Brahman as the original cause (Brahma Parināmavāda and not Prakṛti as accepted by

---

31 aka eva hi bhūtātma bhūte bhūte vyavasthitah/
ekadāh bahudhā āśīvate drṣyate jala-candrabhūtah/, BBU, K. 12
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Śaṅkhyā in their doctrine of Prakṛti Parināmavāda (Creation and destruction are only relative and signify different states of the same causal substance, namely Brahman.) 33

Rāmānuja says that the souls are parts in the sense of vīsesanas, qualified forms or modes of Brahman. The essential nature of the soul does not alter. The change of state it undergoes relates to the contraction and expansion of intelligence, while the changes on which the production, e.g., of ether depend are changes of essential nature.34

According to vidyarnya, Ārambha and Parināma are possible only in the cases where the material causes is something having parts, while vivarta is possible in those cases also where the material cause is without parts e.g. in our imposition of surface and blue colour on sky.35

On the otherhand, vidyananya explains that effect is inexplicable. He says that Maya creates this world in the partless bliss by creating the illusion. This Maya is a power like the power of a magician.36

In the Pancadasi, we may get two types of illusion, one which is associated with an adjunct and the other which is not associated with any adjunct. The cases of rope and sanke and that of conch and silver are of the latter type and the cases of cause and effect e.g. that of clay and jar are of the former type. In the second illusion of perception is the unreal entity where

33 R.B.G. - xiii - 2; ix - 7.
34 Svarūpanyathābhāvalaksana, II.3.18, R.B.G. Cited from IP, Radhakrishnan, P. 693
35 Pancadasi - xiii, 7
36 Pancadasi - xiii, 10
knowledge is real. But in the first, ease perception is the unreal entity and it is known to be unreal. The image of a man in water which is appeared to be real but actually not real. Everybody knows that there is a difference between the image of a man and a real man who is standing on the bank of the river. Vidyaranya illustrates this illusion as the sopadhika illusion. According to vidyaranya, advaitavadins regard this type of knowledge to be the aim of man though the clay does not give up its own form, yet there is the unreal transformation (Vivarta) in the form of the jar. Vidyaranya shows a distinction between vivartavāda and pariṇāmavāda and admits the existence of both. Gold turning into ornaments and clay turning into jar, these are treated by Saṅkhya as real transformation (Pariṇāma) but Vidyarnya calls it unreal transformation. When milk turning into curd, it is a real transformation. According to vidyarnya, in pariṇāma the cause give up its own form. There is no way to return back- In the vivartavāda, the cause continues to be as it is e.g. clay and gold in their effects jar and ornaments. The author of Pancadasi ready to accept both Pariṇāmavāda and vivartavāda on the phenomenal ground but he is not ready to accept ārambhavāda, because, according to ārambhavādins, the form and qualities such as touch, etc, of cause and effect being different, the existence of the material cause, such as clay, should be doubled.

37 Pancadasi xiii- 48
38 Ibid, xiii, 49
39 Ibid, xiii, 52
Vidyaranya developed the doctrine of Mayā after Saṅkara. There is a distinction between Parināma and vivarta in vidyaranya’s Philosophy but in Saṅkara’s philosophy there is no distinction between Parināma and vivarta. For Saṅkara, both the cases of milk turning into curd and clay turning into jar are the cases of parināma on the phenomenal ground and in case of vivarta it is the ontological ground. In vidyaranyas philosophy the distinction between the two types of illusions are known as Sopadhika and Nirupadhika.40

In the 16th century, Appayadiksita discussed the theory of causation siddhānta lesasangraha. He defines both these forms of transformation (Parināma and vivarta) in three ways. The author of siddhantalesa sangraha admitted the three types of existences which is admitted by Advaita Vedānta. These are Paramārthica i.e. (the ultimately real) vyavahārika i.e. (the empirically real) and Pratibhāsika i.e. (the illusory). When gold is turned into ornaments. The existence of both the cause and the effect is phenomenal. This kind of transformation is ‘Parināma’ In case of rope appearing as a snake, the existence of rope is phenomenal but snake is illusory. Thus, the cause and effect have dissimilar existences and hence this type of transformation is vivarta. In the case of this world which is a superimposition

40 nirupadhikasatta, I, 1.2 CP. śrutapraśāsī kenāpi parinamavisesena tattadvasthasya sattasopādhikasatta, ato nirupadhikasatta nirvikaratvam, As quoted in IP (Vol.-II) P. 699
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on Brahman, the existence of the former is phenomenal and the latter ultimately real.\footnote{SLS, IP, P. 58}

Again Parināma is an effect, it is non-different from its cause. Vivarta is also an effect, though it is not non-different, yet it is non-different from the cause, so it is indescribable.\footnote{Ibid, I P. 60}

\textbf{Dvaitavada view of causation.}

Madhva is a dualistic philosopher. His philosophy is known as Dvaitavada. It is semiliar to the theory of Nyāya –Vaiśeṣika causation. Pramāṇa Candrika is the authentic treatise on Madhva logic written by Satarī-Sesacarya, which defines ‘cause as the unconditional invariable antecedent of effect and ‘effect as that which is the counter positive of negation prior to existence.\footnote{karjya-pragabhava-pratiyogi. Pramana Candrika, P-138}

Cause is antecedent and effect is consequent. In Madhva-Siddhānta-Sāra, Padmanābhasuri elaborately discussed that Madhva’s view on causation is a reproduction of the Nyāya theory. Nyāya asserts that even with regard to its substance an effect is absolutely non-existent in its cause. But if it is so, Padmanābhasuri the author of Madhva-siddhānta-sāra argues that the effect can be produced even out of the absolutely non-existent entities such as the lotus in the sky or horns of a hair.\footnote{MSS, PP. 93-94}
Sāṃkhya says that an effect always exists in its cause in a potential form, it is not logical because by adopting this standpoint anything can be conceived as capable of being produced from anything without any limitation, whatsoever, regarding its nature. The Madhva thinkers adopts the middle path and admits the virtues of both the above contradicting views and so reject it. According to Madhva, the effect is both existent and non-existent. Before to its Production, the effect is implicit in its cause. Cause is hidden and effect is manifest so, cause and effect are different aspects of the same thing, So, Madhva never accepts the Satkāyavāda or Astkāryavāda as valid but a combination of the two. According to Madhva, the relation between cause, and effect is that of ‘identity and difference’. Madhva and his followers regards two kinds of causes. According to them, Brahman is the instrumental cause and Prakrti is the material cause of the universe. But in Saṅkara school of Vedānta, Brahman, as both the material and the instrumental cause of the universe.45

Dvaitadvaita Vāda –

Nimbārka was the principal commentators on the Brahma-sūtra of Badarayana and the first systematic propounder of the schools of the Vedānta. Nimbārka calls the highest reality Brahman. To Nimbārka, Brahman is a personal God. He is the sole cause of the entire universe. He alone creates, maintains, and destroys the world of souls and matter. Brahman

45 AOMP, P. 75
is thus both material (Upādāna) and the efficient (Nimitta) cause of the world. Ordinarily the material and efficient causes are different from each other e.g., the lump of clay is the material, and the potter with his instruments the efficient, cause of a clay jar. But in the case of world creation the two are one and the same viz, the one Brahman, the omnipresent. Being, In Vedāntaratna-Manjusa, Purusottama points out that Brahman is the material cause of the universe in the sense that creation means the manifestation of his subtle power of sentience (cit) and non-sentience (acit) in the form of gross effects. During dissolution (Pralaya) the entire universe of the sentient and the non-sentient returns to and remains in Him in a subtle state as His natural powers. Then, at the beginning of creation, Brahman manifests these powers (cit śakti and acit śakti) in the form of souls and prakṛti; and from this prakṛti, the primal matter, there is the gradual evolution of the entire material world.⁴⁶

In Dvaitadvaita-vāda of Nimbārka, nothing new about causation, already it has been said by visistadvaita-vāda. According to this view also, an effect is implicit in its cause and becomes explicit when it assumes the form of the effect. Cause and effect are partly different and partly non-different.⁴⁷

Nimbārka Vedānta holds that there are three kinds of inanimate objects namely-

---

⁴⁶ TCHI, (Vol.-III), PP. 333-334
⁴⁷ AHIP, (Vol.-II), P. 704
1. **Aprakṛta** which is immutable super-matter of which the divine body is made and which is like the shuddhasattva or Nytyavibhuti of Rāmānuja.

2. **Prakṛta** which is derived from Prakṛti with its three guṇas and

3. **Kāla** or time.

The eternal nature of isvara is to govern (niyantarātva). Nimbarka and Kesava refute the predicateless character of Brahman and attribute to the latter good and auspicious qualities.⁴⁸

God is the highest Brahman who by His very nature is free from all defects and is abode of all good qualities, who manifests Himself in the four vyuhas and in incarnations, who is the ruler of this universe, is identified with Kṛṣṇa. Radha is His consort. Soul and matter are his parts in the sense that they are His powers. He is both the efficient and the material cause of this universe.

There is a difference between Nimbarka and Rāmānuja. Rāmānuja believes in identity – in-and-through difference but Nimbarka believes that in identity and-difference. Rāmānuja holds that difference can not exist separately from identity which it qualifies and to which it belongs. Identity is primary for Rāmānuja. But for Nimbarka, both identity and difference are separately and equally real. Nimbarka rejects the view that matter and souls

---

⁴⁸ Kesava says: ‘napi nirūparakṣam brahma tasya jñānākriyādīnām svabhavikasaktīnām sastrasiddhātāt’ (i-I-5)

Again: ‘anandamayaśabdanirodista tūna brahmaśiva’. TP, 1.1.13, As quoted in IP (Vol.-II)
are the attributes of God. Again Nimbārka also rejects the distinction between the body and the soul of God and the view that matter and souls form the body of God. Nimbārka calls that matter and souls as the ‘parts’ or ‘powers’ of God. 49

Sudhādvaita view of causation –

Sri Vallabha’s philosophy of Brahman as the sole reality and the material as well as the instrumental cause of the manifestative evolution of cosmos with its name and form is the foundation of his logic that all creation, which is just another name of the revelation of ‘Substance’ as ‘name’ and form is a self-creation (ātmasrṣṭi). According to Vallabha, there are two types of creation.

1. The direct or the spontaneous creation (Saksat) and (2) The indirect or the successive creation (Paramparya). In the case of the former kind, the whole world-order, with its name and form, its elements and physical objects, is spontaneously manifested without involving the intervention of intermediary stages in which the prior stage serves as the cause of the posterior one. 50

In the Chandogya Upanisad, there is a description of the creation of fire (tejas) from being (Sat), water (apas) from fire and food (annam) from water, In the Taittiriya, however, the process of creation of elements is described in

49 ACSIP, PP. 376-377
50 Anubhasya, P. 678
Quoted in the philosophy of the Vallabha school of Vedanta, P. 333-336.
five stages. This upanisad describes; "from that Brahman, which is the self, was produced space. From space emerged air, From air was born fire. From fire was created water, from water sprang up earth". The narration of creation in the purusavidha-Brahmana of the Brhadaranyakopanisad as, "The self was indeed Brahman in the beginning. It knew only itself as "I am Brahman, therefore It becomes all. And whosoever among the gods knew it also become that; and the same with sages and men".51

Vallabha, the propounder of Suddhadvaita-Vāda, explain the doctrine of immutable transformation. (avikṛtaparīṁamavāda). According to this doctrine, a cause remains untouch and unchanged (Avikṛta) though it is modified into effect (Parīṁma). In production a cause is manifested as an effect. In destruction an effect is absorbed in its cause. But in production and destruction, the cause does not undergo modification in its essential nature which remains untouch. Vallabha holds that an effect pre-exist in its cause as a power and thus he says only satkāryavāda in the name of avikṛtaparīṁamavāda.52

Rāmaṇuja recognizes three things as ultimate and real. (Tattva-traya) These are matter (achit), Souls (Chit) and God (Ishvara) Though all are equally real, the first two are absolutely dependent on God. Though they are substances in themselves, yet in relation to God, they become His attribute.

51 Chandogya Upanisad montra (Vi, 2, 1 to 4) quoted in the philosophy of the vallabha scheme) of Vedanta. P. 337
52 AHIP, (Vol.-II), P. 704
They are the body of God who their soul. God is the soul of nature but in relation to God, they become His body and he is their soul. The Brhadaranyaka describes Him as the running thread (Sutra) which binds together all the worlds and all the souls.\textsuperscript{53}

The identity meant by Tat-tvam asi, according to the explanation of the term visistadvaita. According to Rāmānuja’s visistadvaita conception, whatever serves as the substratum of change is a drāvyā. It means that Rāmānuja accepts the Pariṇāma-vāda of satkāryavāda. But it is the attributive elements (Viśesana) alone that change, for which reason the complex whole (Visista) is also spoken of as undergoing modifications. The substantive element (Visesya) in itself is changeless. God viewed as the viṣesya is changeless and the soul also is so. The relation between qualities and its transformation i.e. clay and jar and the lump of clay, former is known as Aprthak-siddhi, and latte is known as the material cause of the jar. The relation between them is stated to be identity (ananyatva or non-difference)\textsuperscript{54}

Prakasarānta was probably the first who tried to explain Vedānta from a purely sensationalistic view-point of idealism and denied the objective existence of any stuff. The existence of objects is noting more than their perception (drṣṭi). He says that the attribution of causality to Brahman can not be regarded as strictly correct; for ordinarily causality implies the dual

\textsuperscript{53} ACIP, P. 346
\textsuperscript{54} OIP, PP. 402-403
relation of cause and effect; since there is nothing else but Brahman, it
cannot, under the circumstances, be called a cause. Nescience (avidyā), again
cannot be called a cause of the world. Causality is based upon the false notion
of duality, which is itself the outcome of nescience. The theory of cause and
effect thus lies outside the scope of the Vedānta.55

According to vidyaranya, Māyā is the cause of the obscuration. It is
described as the power by which can be produced the manifold world
appearance. This power is known as sakti, and it can not be regarded either as
absolutely real or as unreal. It is associated only with a part of Brahman and
not with the whole of it. It is only in association with a part of Brahman that it
transforms itself into the various elements and their modifications. All objects
of the world are a complex of Brahman and māya.56

According to the school of Bengal Vaisnivism of chitanya is known as
Achintyabhedabheda or Identity in difference, the nature of which is
essentially indescribable and unthinkable due to the unthinkable power of
God. Brahman or Shri Kṛṣṇa is essentially Saccidānanda and is the auspicious
abode of infinite good qualities and powers. The attributes are identical with
the substance, though they also appear differently. The concept of Viśeṣa is
borrowed from Madhava to explain the unity which appears as different. The
concept of unthinkable is accepted to reconcile the apparent contradictions

55 AHIP, (Vol-II), PP. 221-222
56 AHIP, (Vol-II), P. 215
in the nature of Brahman. God is free from all differences homogenous, heterogeneous and internal. He manifests Himself as the world and the souls through His powers which are identical and yet different from Him. In Himself He is the efficient cause of the universe, while in association with his powers, He is the material cause. God’s inner power forms His essence as called Antaranga Svarupa Shakti and manifests itself as threefold powers as Sandhini which is sat or existence as Samvit which is chit or knowledge, and as Hladini which is Ananda or bliss. The power through which He manifests Himself in the form of the atomic Souls is called Tatastha Shakti or Jiva Shakti. The power through which He manifests Himself as the material world is called Mayā Shakti and it is said to be His external power. The world is the manifestation of His external power.57

Sri Aurobindo’s philosophy also under the schools of Vedānta. His famous book.

“The life Divine” is inspired by the creative vision of the seers of the Vedas and the sages of the upanisads. ‘The life Divine’ is a challenge to the false notion that philosophy in Indian died after the sixteenth century.

According to Sri Aurobindo, Brahman is the Supreme Reality in the world. It is absolutely indeterminate, indefinable and free. It can not be described either positively or negatively. The Saccidānanda through his consciousness – Force manifests Himself as this world out of sheer bliss.

57 ACSIP, P. 380
Bliss gives us the ‘why’ of creation. According to Taittiriya upanishad, out of bliss all things arise. Aurobindo says that the world existence is the ecstatic dance of Shiva which multiplies the body of the God numberlessly to the view, it leaves that white existence precisely where and what it was, ever it and ever will be; its sole absolute object is the joy of the dancing.\(^{58}\)

The Supermind or the Divine manifests himself in this world. It is with the Supermind that the process of self limitation and self individualization starts in Brahman. Brahman is the material and efficient cause of this world.

In the Vedanta philosophy, there is a refutation of subjectivism. Sankara does not believe that the perception of a chair or a table is the perception of a mental state, for that would be to fly in the face of all evidence and dissolve the material universe into an unsubstantial dream. “We are compelled to admit objects outside our knowledge. The mental activity of perception is not the explanation of the object, but the nature of the object is the cause of the mental activity. Pure consciousness neither gives nor receives.\(^{59}\)

There is an inadequacy of empirical knowledge. Empirical knowledge revels in the distinctions of knower, knowledge, and the known, while the real is free from all these distinctions. If the real excludes relations, then relational thought is imperfect.\(^{60}\)

\(^{58}\) TLV, (Vol.-I), P. 119
\(^{59}\) IP, (Vol.-II), P. 497
\(^{60}\) IP, (Vol.-II), P. 502
There is an integral experience or anubhava in Vedānta philosophy. The absolute knowledge or the Ātaman as eternal knowledge (nityajñāna) who shines everything. This absolute knowledge is at the sometime, knowledge of the absolute. The word ‘Jñāna’ is rather unfortunate on account of its empirical associations. Causal explanation can not be complete. There is an indefinite number of terms before and after any given number of the series. Every event points back to the conditions out of which it has arisen. To say that A is the cause of B is not to explain B. “The use of causal relation in a law is a confession of in complete knowledge”. Saṁkara approves gaudapāda’s arguments about causal relation and holds that since cause and effects are identical, change and causation are only appearances. Since cause is rooted in the very organization of our intellect, we are obliged to use the causal category of the determination of events by antecedent ones. “The reason for assuming the non-difference of cause and effect is the fact that the understanding is affected by cause and effect jointly.”

Ānandagiri comments on it and assumes that the ground of cause and effect not merely on the ground of the actual existence of the thing depending on that of another, but on the additional ground of the mental existence, the consciousness of the one not being possible without the consciousness of another.

61 ‘Jneyabhave Jnānasyapy abhāvad. – Br. H. UP, S.B.H. P. 460
62 S. B, ii, I, 15, and Anandagiri on it
The Vedānta is directly opposed to the Nyāya. Most of the powerful criticism is directed against it. Saṃkara himself shows some contradictious and inconsistencies in Nyāya conceptions, such as the theory of causation, conception of the atom, the relation of Samavāya, the conception of Jāti, etc. The relation of Vedānta with Sāṁkhya and yoga seems to be very close. Vedānta had accepted all the special means of self-purification, meditation etc. that were advocated by yoga. The main difference between Vedānta and sāṁkhya was that sāñkhya believed the stuff of which the world consisted was a reality side by side with the Puruṣas. Vedānta had compromised so far with Sāñkhya that it also sometimes described maya as being made up of Sattva, Rajas and Tamas. Vedānta also held that according to these three characteristics were formed diverse modifications of māyā.63

It is seems that there is a charge against Saṁkara by vijnāna bhikṣu and others that Saṁkara was a hidden Buddhist himself. Saṁkara’s Philosophy is largely a compound of Vijnāna vāda and Śūnyavāda Buddhism with the Upaniṣad notion of the permanence of self superadded.64

According to Saṁkara the relation between Brahman and the world is of a very peculiar kind. The world is not a certain or even a manifestation of Brahman. Advaita stands for uncompromising monism and admits no continuity of the one with the many, of Brahman with the world. They are

63 AHIP, (Vol-I), P. 492
64 AHIP, (Vol- I), P. 494
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altogether on two different levels of reality and there is no question of relating them as cause and effect in the usual sense of the term. Saṅkara accepts parināmavāda in the empirical sphere but rejects it in the trans-empirical sphere. The world is not an effect or parināma of Brahman. Bhartrprapanca strongly advocated Brahma pariṅāmavāda and Saṅkara has criticized that view in no uncertain terms. Saṅkara’s view is Brahmavivartavāda, and not Brahmapariṅāmavāda. Brahman does not undergo the least change and yet projects the appearance of the world. Maintaining its integrity all the time it produces the impression of the world of diversity and change. Brahman therefore is not an identity in the midst of difference but an identity with the appearance of difference. It is not pariṅāmi nitya but kutastha nitya.

The difference between pariṅāma and vivarta is that in the former the effect is a real production from the cause and hence quite as well as the cause; in the latter, the effect belongs to a lower order and hence a mere appearance.  

To elucidate the conception of vivarta the example that is usually given is that of the rope which appears as a snake to the belated traveller. This illustration is to be found in Gaudapāda also. Without undergoing the least change and remaining a rope all the time, it still produces the appearance of

---
65 Parināmo nāma samsattakāryā pattih vivarto nāmo viśamasattaka kārya pattih.
66 SW, (Vol. I). P. 239, na tvahibuddhikāle tadapagamakāle ca vastunāḥ kaścit viśesah syāt
the snake in the mind of the passer-by. It is not like clay undergoing real change of form when it becomes a pot. The rope maintains its character intact and yet appears as something quite different. From the common experience the rope is not the cause of the snake since there is no relation between the two. And yet the presence of the rope is quite necessary for the snake-illusion to arise. In the absence of the rope the snake illusion is not likely to arise. The rope is therefore the substrate (adhisthāna) on which the snake illusion arises. When we examine the place with the help of a lamp, the snake will disappear and only the rope will remain. True knowledge affects the predicate or 'whatness'.

According to Saṅkara the relation between Brahman and the world is of a very peculiar kind. The world is not a certain or even a manifestation of Brahman. Advaita stands for uncompromising monism and admits no continuity of the one with the many, of Brahman with the world. They are altogether on two different levels of reality and there is no question of relating them as cause and effect in the usual sense of the term. Saṅkara accepts pariṇāṇavāda in the empirical sphere but rejects it in the trans-empirical sphere. The world is not an effect or pariṇāma of Brahman. Bhartrprapana strongly advocated Brahma pariṇāṇavāda and Saṅkara has criticized that view in no uncertain terms. Saṅkara's view is Brahmavivartavāda, and not Brahmapariṇāṇavāda. Brahman does not undergo the least change and yet projects the appearance of the world.
Maintaining its integrity all the time it produces the impression of the world of diversity and change. Brahman therefore is not an identity in the midst of difference but an identity with the appearance of difference. It is not parināmi nitya but kutastha nitya.