INTRODUCTION
The Sāṁkhya and the Yoga are two important orthodox schools of Indian Philosophy. Their doctrines could be traced to the earliest available literary sources, the Vedas, which are not only repositories of ancient Indian wisdom, but also constitute a store-house of all orthodox schools of Indian Philosophy. The Sāṁkhya Pravacana Sūtra of Kapila is considered to be the oldest account of the Sāṁkhya philosophy. But its systematic presentation is to be found in the Sāṁkhya Kārikā of Īśvara Kṛṣṇa, which is known for its brevity, clarity and depth. Īśvara Kṛṣṇa himself gives the names of the persons who were responsible for the origin and development of this school of philosophy. From his account in his Sāṁkhya Kārikā LXX.,

\[
\text{etat pavitrām agryam munir āsuraye 'nukampaya pradadau} | \\
\text{āsurī api pāñcaśikāya, tena ca bahudhā kṛtam tantram} \| \\
\]
we learn that the tenets of this school were first passed on in compassion to his disciple Āsuri by the sage Kapila, the founder of the school, who was considered the first among the wise (ādividvān). Doubts have been expressed about the historicity of Kapila. He is considered more a mythological figure than an historical person (Pulilbihari Chakravarti, Origin and Development of the Sāṃkhya system of thought, p.112.). Āsuri is said to have passed on the doctrine of Sāṃkhya to Pāṇicaśikha, who elaborated it. Doubts have been current on the authenticity of the Sāṃkhya Sūtras. However, the earliest authentic systematic exposition available of the Classical Sāṃkhya is found in Īśvara Kṛṣṇa’s Sāṃkhya Kārikā, Vācaspati Miśra’s Tatvā Kaumudi, Aniruddha’s Sāṃkhya Pravacana Vṛtti and Vijñāna Bhikṣu’s Sāṃkhya Pravacana Bhāṣya. They constitute important and authentic works on the Sāṃkhya philosophy.

The Yoga as a systematic exposition of a school of philosophy is traced to the Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali. Vyāsa’s lucid and masterly commentary on the Yoga Sūtra’s known as Yoga Bhāṣya, is an authoritative work on the Yoga system. Vācaspati Miśra’s commentary on the Yoga Bhāṣya known as Tatvā Vaiśāradī is a masterpiece of philosophical exegesis and style. Vijñāna Bhikṣu’s Yoga Vṛttika is another important work of the Yoga tradition.

A unique feature of the Sāṃkhya-Yoga system is its rationalist temper, its reliance on reason in developing its doctrines. Only such things as cannot be accounted for by perception and inference are accepted on the strength
of Śruti.

For the purpose of the present study, the Sāṁkhya and the Yoga have been taken as allied systems inasmuch as their position on the doctrines of causation (satkāryavāda) and evolution (pariṇāmavāda) are the same. The fundamental points of difference between these two schools are indicated. For example, while the Yoga introduces the concept of God over and above the two ultimate principles, namely, Puruṣa and Prakṛti, the Sāṁkhya accepts these two only. Further, minor differences between the two schools in respect of the evolution of different categories are indicated at appropriate places. Although, there is no reference in the works of the Sāṁkhya tradition to the three forms of pariṇāma—dharma, tākṣaṇa and avasthā that figure in the Yoga Śūtra; they are not unacceptable to Sāṁkhya.

In line with the other systems of Indian philosophical tradition, the Sāṁkhya also originated in man's endeavour to redeem himself from suffering, from the cycle of birth and rebirth and to attain the ultimate ideal of life. This is evident in the following Sāṁkhya Kārikā I.

\[ \text{duḥkha-traya'-bhīghāṭāj jiḥṭāsā tadabhīghātakahetau } \]
\[ \text{drṣṭe sā 'pārthā cen nai 'kāntā'-tyantato'bhāvāī } \]

But this ideal cannot be achieved without the requisite philosophic wisdom. Knowledge and ethical perfection constitute the two wings for the soul in its spiritual flight. Knowledge comprises the insight into the Sāṁkhya-Yoga
categories and ethical perfection refers to the code of conduct that the aspirant has to adhere to in his day-to-day life.

Īśvara Kṛṣṇa, announces in the very first kārikā of his treatise Sāṁkhya Kārikā his objective in undertaking to write a work of this kind. He says that he wants to show a way out of the three-fold pain that men are subject to in their mundane existence, by providing the discriminative knowledge that Puruṣa is different from Prakṛti. The Sāṁkhya Kārikā II runs thus,

\[ \text{dṛṣṭavād ānusravikāḥ, sa hy avisuddhi-kṣayā-ūtṣaya-yuktāḥ} \]
\[ \text{tadviparītaḥ sreyān vyaktā-\'vyakta-jīna-vijñānāt} \]

This discriminative knowledge (viveka-jñāna) is based on our knowledge of the Sāṁkhya-Yoga doctrines regarding the nature of Puruṣa, Prakṛti and their relation, God, theory of causation, evolution, categories of evolution and so on.

The present study centres round one of the important tenets of the Sāṁkhya-Yoga school, namely, its theory of causation. Although, the discussion of the various doctrines and problems of the Sāṁkhya-Yoga has to take place in the context of the realisation of the ultimate ideal, namely, kaivalya, every issue figuring in it has been analysed and discussed thoroughly. Among the various issues which have received a good deal of attention are its theory of causation which came to be known as the doctrine of pre-existent effects (satkāryavāda) and the theory of evolution (pariṇāmavāda). The entire
metaphysical structure of the Sāṃkhya-Yoga philosophy is rooted in these doctrines according to which there is no production of the non-existent and destruction of the existent.

Causation constitutes the central doctrine in the Indian philosophical systems. The issue over which the systems are sharply divided is, whether the effect is pre-figured in its material cause even before its production or whether it is a new entity that begins to be, having not existed before under the impact of the efficient causes. To put the same in a different form; whether the effect is different from its material cause or non-different from it. The followers of the Sāṃkhya-Yoga are firmly committed to the view that the effect is pre-figured in its material cause even before its production and hence, it is non-different from it; whereas the followers of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika hold a diametrically opposite view that there are no traces of the effects in their material (inherent) causes and hence, they are totally different from them. The two schools are sharply divided on this issue and they are so much convinced about their respective stands that they are never tired of adducing any number of arguments in defence of their respective positions. The reason for such rigid postures on their part is quite understandable, for any concession shown in this regard would not only mean a defeat, but giving up one's metaphysical standpoint altogether.

The Sāṃkhya-Yoga in conformity with its doctrine of pre-existent effects
traces everything material right from the subtle mahat to the gross physical objects to one primordial principle, namely, Prakṛti. It believes that all products are contained implicitly in the bosom of Prakṛti and production accordingly would mean merely a transition of an effect from its implicit to an explicit state (parināma). This is perfectly in tune with its doctrine of pre-existent effects (saṅkāryavāda). To give up saṅkāryavāda or to show any concession in this regard would mean giving up its metaphysical position and unconsciously walking into the traps of its opponent.

So is it with the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika, the followers of which in conformity with their doctrine of the origin of non-existent effects, believe that the ultimate building blocks of the world of matter are many and not one. They are the atoms of earth, water, fire and air. Experience discloses to us that the products of these atomic composition are different from the atoms which have produced them. Hence, the effects have to be construed as non-existent before their production and therefore are to be viewed as different from their respective material (inherent) causes. Production according to the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika is an instance of the many (atoms or parts) giving rise to the one (whole) and not the one Prakṛti becoming many as in the Sāṁkhya-Yoga. The one is not a development (parināma) of the many atoms but a creation (āraṁbhā) according to the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika. Impressed by the differences between cause and effect, the followers of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika have no alternative
except to adhere to the doctrine of non-existent effects (asatkāryavāda), whereas the followers of the Sāṁkhya-Yoga committed to the logic that we cannot account for non-existents are forced to accept the doctrine of pre-existent effects (satkāryavāda).

The Sāṁkhya-Yoga pariṇāmavāda is an inevitable outcome of its doctrine of pre-existent effects (satkāryavāda). Pariṇāma as understood by the Sāṁkhya-Yoga means different things. Firstly, it stands for ‘change’, the dynamic nature of Prakṛti which pulsates with activity as against the static nature of atoms as conceived by the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika. Secondly, it stands for the change within the primordial Prakṛti in its state of equilibrium as when sattva changes into sattva, rajas into rajas and tamas into tamas. This is the same as sarūpa-pariṇāma. Thirdly, it stands for the change of a thing from its subtle state to its gross state as when Prakṛti changes into mahat, mahat into ahaṁkāra and so on till the evolution of the five gross elements. This is the same as virūpa-pariṇāma which is marked by the increase in the grossness of the evolutes compared with the evolvents. Fourthly, it stands for the change of a thing from one state to another as when a leaf undergoes a change of its colour from green to yellow or when clay changes from its state of lump into that of a jar or a pot. There is one thing common for all these forms of change, namely, they do not bring about anything new. Pariṇāmavāda of the Sāṁkhya-Yoga therefore, does not permit the origin or
production of anything new. It is totally opposed to the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika doctrine of the production of the new (āraṁbhavāda). There are schools which do subscribe to the doctrine of pariṇāma such as the Viśiṣṭādvaita of Rāmānuja and the Jainism. But the Sāṅkhya-Yoga doctrine of pariṇāma differs from their's; for whereas the Viśiṣṭādvaita and the Jainism understand pariṇāma as involving a change wherein the substance remains the same, but its form to be different (i.e. they believe that the form is not pre-figured in its material cause and hence new). The Sāṅkhya-Yoga believes that the form is also not new, since it is also pre-figured in its material cause.

The doctrines of satkārya and pariṇāma have generated a lot of controversy among the different schools of Indian Philosophy and there is a need to throw light on these issues.

This thesis is organised as a five-chapter exercise.

The first chapter entitled 'Sāṅkhya-Yoga Metaphysics', gives an account of the dualism of Puruṣa and Prakṛti. An attempt is made to expound the Sāṅkhya account of the nature of Prakṛti and Puruṣa and the arguments that have been advanced by the system in support of their existence. The Yoga view of God and His role in evolution is also discussed. The role of sattva, rajas and tamas, the constitutive aspects of Prakṛti, is also discussed.

The second chapter captioned 'Satkāryavāda' undertakes to explain the Sāṅkhya-Yoga theory of satkārya and the arguments of Īśvara Kṛṣṇa in
defence of the theory. This is followed by a presentation of the Nyāya objections to satkāryavāda and the Sāmkhya refutation of these objections. This chapter on the whole is a study in comparison of the two contesting theories of causation, namely, satkāryavāda and asatkāryavāda.

The third chapter entitled ‘Pariṇāmavāda’ deals with the Sāmkhya-Yoga account of pariṇāma and the different kinds of pariṇāma. It is shown that the Sāmkhya-Yoga theory of evolution is a necessary offshoot of its doctrine of pre-existent effects (satkāryavāda). Prakṛti is the primordial material cause of the universe. In and by itself Prakṛti is absolutely unconscious. Opposed to it is the Puruṣa, the other ultimate principle which by nature is pure consciousness. On account of its proximity to Prakṛti, Puruṣa becomes agitated. This agitation disturbs Prakṛti’s equilibrium and this leads to the evolution of heterogeneous categories. Evolution is nothing but the transition of the unmanifest into the manifest, the implicit into the explicit. The second half of the present chapter attempts to give a vivid account of the different kinds of pariṇāma as conceived by the allied system Yoga.

The fourth chapter, ‘Pariṇāmavāda and Vivartavāda’, presents a comparative picture of pariṇāmavāda in the light of the contention of the Śaṅkara school of Advaita Vedānta that satkāryavāda is not compatible with pariṇāmavāda but it is only with vivartavāda. The concepts of pariṇāma and vivartavāda are analysed and their differences shown. Then, a thoroughgoing
analysis is undertaken to show how satkāryavāda is not compatible with pariṇāma-vāda and how it logically culminates in vivartavāda.

The fifth chapter presents a critical evaluation of the main results of the thesis.

The methodology adopted in the preparation of the present thesis is analytical and comparative. Since a host of interpreters have already analysed the doctrines of the Sāṅkhya and the Yoga schools, a lot of attention is paid in this study to the history of research on the subject together and a critical evaluation of the findings and interpretations is attempted. The present work is also comparative in that the Sāṅkhya-Yoga philosophy of change can never be understood in its totality without reference to the contending theories of evolution emanating from the rival schools of philosophy—Indian and Western.