The Śāṅkhya-Yoga acceptance of Prakṛti as the ultimate material cause and its theory of evolution (parināma) is rooted in its doctrine of pre-existent effects (satkāryavāda). In order to understand the central role played by the doctrine of satkārya in the Śāṅkhya-Yoga system in all its ramifications, we need to understand its two ultimate reals, namely, Prakṛti and Puruṣa and the relation between them.

A philosopher, being an interpreter of life, has always to keep himself in close contact with his experience. Otherwise, he will create a system of dead thoughts, devoid of any touch of life and reality. The Śāṅkhya-Yoga developed its philosophy on the basis of analysis of experience.

According to the Śāṅkhya, there are two fundamental principles lying
at the root of experience, namely, *Puruśa* the subject, the principle of consciousness and *Prakṛti* the object, the principle of matter¹. They are not mythical in nature but are at the very root of the possibility of knowledge or experience. Experience is not possible unless there are objects of experience. But these by themselves are not enough to bring about experience. Experience presupposes consciousness. Unless there is some principle of consciousness, which interprets our experience, objects by themselves are incapable of producing experience. Hence, the need for the principle of consciousness which the Sāṁkhya finds in *Puruśa*. Therefore, the Sāṁkhya-Yoga logically and experientially leads us to accept the fundamental principles of *Prakṛti* and *Puruśa*. The two principles are therefore, not dogmatically postulated, but are accepted on the basis of a thorough analysis of experience.

*Prakṛti* is unconscious, active, mutable and eternal whereas *Puruśa* is conscious, inactive, immutable and eternal. *Prakṛti* and its evolutes being insentient are objects of knowledge, while *Puruśa* being sentient is the subject of knowledge. *Puruśa* also shares some characteristics with *Prakṛti*. Like *Prakṛti*, *Puruśa* is without a cause, omnipresent, immobile, non-component, non-merging, impartite, independent and eternal². But, whereas *Prakṛti* is eternal and mutable (*pariṇāmānitya*), *Puruśa* is eternal and immutable (*kūṭasthānitya*).
Prakṣīti, the root cause of all material things in the universe, is called the unmanifest (avyakta) and the primordial principle (Pradhāna). Pradhāna is the term regularly used in the Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali. It is also used in the Maitrī Upaniṣad which specially teaches Yoga. The earliest occurrence of the term 'Prakṣīti' is in the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad, where 'Prakṣīti' evidently denominates Avyakta. The indisputable occurrences of the term are to be found in the Mahābhārata and in Vasiṣṭha's and Yājñavalkya's systems. The Bhagavad Gītā uses the word frequently. Kṛṣṇa, describes his eight-fold Apara-Prakṣīti, as consisting of buddhi, ahaṅkāra, manas and the great elements, while his Para-Prakṣīti is said to be jīvabhūta. The Mahābhārata refers to the eight Prakṣītis and terms them as 'Avyakta', 'Para-Prakṣīti'.

It may also be noted that the Nāsadīya Sūkta in the Rg Veda suggests the existence of undifferentiated original cause of the universe which resembles the Sāṁkhya-Yoga description of Prakṣīti. The Brahma Sūtras suggest that the followers of the Sāṁkhya-Yoga made an effort to find out reference to their concept of Prakṣīti in 'sat'. The Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad describes 'aja' which is more akin to the Sāṁkhya-Yoga concept of Prakṣīti. This Upaniṣad uses the terms Ākṣara, Avyakta and Pradhāna also.

The basis for the personal concept of Purusa is indicated in the
Puruṣa Śūkta of the Ṛg Veda²⁰. The unattached and invisible nature of souls as free from material qualities is indicated in the Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad²¹, Kaṭha Upaniṣad²², Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad²³ and Maitrey Upaniṣad²⁴.

1.1. PRĀKR̥TI

1.1.1. NATURE OF PRĀKR̥TI

Prākr̥ti is one, root-less root of the Universe with the three attributes and evolving through these every kind of entity save the Puruṣa²⁵. (On the other hand the products or the evolutes of Prākr̥ti are caused, non-eternal, non-pervasive, mobile, manifold, dependent, mergent, conjunct and heterogeneous²⁶.) Prākr̥ti is uncaused (ahetumat) eternal (nityam), all-pervasive ( vyāpi), immobile (niṣkriyam), single ( ekam), independent (anāśriam), unmerged (aliṅgam), non-conjunctive (viyuktam) and homogeneous (sajātiya). The evolved is composed of the three constituents (gaṇas), non-discriminated (aviveki), objective (viṣayāk), general (sāmanyam), non-intelligent (acetonam) and productive (prasavadharmi); so is the unevolved (Prākr̥ti). The Puruṣa though similar, is (yet) the reverse of these²⁷. The Puruṣa is similar to 1) Prākr̥ti in its eternity and uncauscdness and to 2) the products of Prākr̥ti in its plurality. But, inspite of these similarities to Prākr̥ti and its products, it is essentially different from them in that it is conscious and it is not subject to changes.

While Prākr̥ti is one, the products of Prākr̥ti are many²⁸. While
Prakṛti is self-subsistent and independent, the individual effects are sub-ordinate to Prakṛti. Unlike Prakṛti, its products take their shelter in cause.

After explaining the dissimilarities between the manifest and the unmanifest,Īśvara Kṛṣṇa mentions the similarities between these two. The three guṇas of pleasure, pain and delusion are to be found in both the manifest and the unmanifest. The products are non-different from Pradhāna. In the view of Vaiśespati Miśra, the evolutes starting from the great principle (mahat) cannot be distinguished from Prakṛti, being connate with it. There is also another reason for holding the evolved and the unevolved as non-discriminated. None of the effects functions by itself. As given in the kārikā X of Īśvara Kṛṣṇa, all the evolved are dependent throughout on the unevolved (Prakṛti) for their sustenance and functioning. Thus, no evolute functions by itself. This is marked by the use of the word 'aviveki'. 'Aviveki' may stand for 'non-separableness', i.e. for the character of being co-operative; among the manifest things, there is none that is adequate by itself to produce its effect; it can do so only when in co-operation with other things; and hence, it is not possible for anything to be produced out of anything taken singly by itself.

With the above knowledge of the difference and similarity between Prakṛti and its products, the nature and the characteristics of Prakṛti can
be well-exemplified. Thus, it is known that Prakṛti is uncaused, eternal and all-pervading. In its equilibriated state (avyakta) motion and change also take place. Sattva changes into sattva, rajas into rajas and tamas into tamas. But they never change into something else. Prakṛti is one and is the unity of the three guṇas in a state of equilibrium. Being the cause of all, it supports all, but itself is not supported by anything else. It is also partless, since in this state, the production of different evolutes does not commence. It is independent, non-manifested and unconscious, and is also the objective ground of all cognitions. It is not limited to individual consciousness, but enters into the knowledge of all. The most important characteristic of Prakṛti is that it is productive of the manifold products of the world.

Does Prakṛti then stand for the theistic God? Or does it correspond to the Vedāntic māyā? Is it all these, or none other than these? It cannot be God, since it is said to be without intelligence (acetana). It resembles the Vedāntic māyā in as much as it is at the root of the manifold material objects in the universe.

1.1.2. PROOFS FOR THE EXISTENCE OF PRAKRITI

Prakṛti cannot be an object of perception because it is too subtle to be so. But it can be inferred from its effects. The sensory and the motor organs, and all the material objects around us are its effects. Committed
to the view that nothing can come out of nothing, the Sāṁkhya traces the diverse products of the world to Prakṛti, the primordial material cause of the world.

The Sāṁkhya offers the following five proofs in support of the existence of Prakṛti. Prakṛti exists,

1. because of the finite nature of specific objects (bhedaṁ parimaṇaṁtvāt),
2. because of the homogeneous nature (samanvayāt) of the effects,
3. because of its function (evolution) being due to the efficiency (energy) of the cause (saktitāḥ pravṛtites'ca),
4. because of the separation between cause and its product (kāraṇa-kārya-vibhāgāt).
5. and because of the merging of the whole world (of effects) (avibhaṅgād vaiśvarūpyasya).

1. In the first argument, 'parimaṇaṁtvāt' stands for 'parimitatvāt' meaning because of 'being measured', i.e. 'being finite'. The reasoning assumes an asyllogistic form. The products in the manifest world being finite are dependent on their causes in which they exist in an unmanifest condition. The limited objects ultimately must have a cause which is unlimited, independent, unconditional and infinite which the Sāṁkhya finds in an unmanifest Prakṛti. For instance,
objects like pots and other things are found to have clay for their cause, in which they exist in an unmanifest form. Clay and such other causes also being finite, they also depend on their material causes in which they are supposed to be present in an unmanifest state. In this way, we are logically led on to the acceptance of an infinite cause which will not depend on any other cause and in which all finite objects of the world exist in an unmanifest form. The Sāmkhya finds in Prakṛti this infinite, independent material cause which constitutes the ultimate material cause of everything in this world.

2. The second argument to prove the existence of Prakṛti is based on the homogeneous nature of effects (samanvayāt). All the effects (evolutes) like mahat, etc., are seen uniformly to be in possession of the three guṇas (samanvayāt), namely, sattva, rajas and tamas. It is the firm conviction of Sāmkhya that according to its theory of satkārya the effect cannot be different from its cause. If the effects (evolutes) like mahat etc. possess sattva, rajas and tamas, there must be a common source for the three guṇas. The Sāmkhya believes that this common source for the products manifesting sattva, rajas and tamas in the Universe is the same as Prakṛti, the composite of the three guṇas.

3. The third argument in defence of the existence of Prakṛti rests
on the principle of efficiency of the cause for the evolution of effects (sakitiṣaḥ pravṛttes' ca). It is a well-known feature of causation that the functioning of a cause is dependent on its potentiality. It produces only what it is capable of producing. The cause of the evolved must contain the potentiality of the unevolved. And this can only be Prakṛti. Mahat too is caused by that which has the unevolved potentiality of mahat, that is by the Pradhāna. Therefore, Vācaspati Miśra observes that energy refers to the effect existing in the cause which is substance-potentiality32. This logic leads us to the supposition of an ultimate cause which has the energy to produce everything which is the same as Prakṛti.

4,5. The fourth and fifth arguments in support of the existence of Prakṛti are based on the principle that the effects get separated (vibhāgāt) from their respective causes at the time of creation (sṛṣṭi) and again get resolved (avibhāgāt) into them at the time of dissolution (pralaya). This process of the manifestation of effect from cause and the resolution of effect into its cause is comparable to a tortoise extending and withdrawing its limbs33. The effect is not non-existent prior to causal operation, but only non-manifest like the limbs of a tortoise hidden in its shell.

It is therefore, clear that there is one primordial source for the material objects of the world in which they exist in an unmanifest form prior to
evolution and simply get stretched out from the primordial principle like the limbs of the tortoise (when it stretches them out) and again get resolved into it at the time of dissolution like the limbs of the tortoise (when it withdraws them into its shell). This primordial principle from which the effects get separated i.e., become manifest (vibhāgāt) and into which they get resolved i.e., become unmanifest (avibhāgāt) is the same as Prakṛti.

These arguments in defence of the existence of Prakṛti depend upon the acceptance of satkārya view of causality. Vācaspati Miśra also mentions this clearly in his commentary saying that in order to establish the existence of Prakṛti, first we must accept the existence of the effect in its cause even before its causal operation.

1.2. PURUŚA

1.2.1. NATURE OF PURUŚA

Puruṣa or the principle of consciousness is another ultimate reality accepted by the Śāṅkhya-Yoga in addition to Prakṛti. The term Puruṣa has been chosen by the Śāṅkhya-Yoga to refer to the self, the principle of immutable consciousness. Prakṛti, as we have seen already, stands for the principle of change. The Śāṅkhya-Yoga is of the view that change can never be intelligible unless it is viewed against the background of something permanent. The search of this background brings the Śāṅkhya-Yoga to the
conception of *Puruṣa*. According to it the self thus arrived at is absolutely different from all material things, gross and subtle. The Sāṅkhya-Yoga infers the unchanging character of *Puruṣa* from the fact of its being the uninterrupted knower.

In its nature *Puruṣa* is the opposite of *Prakṛti* and its evolutes. *Prakṛti* and its evolutes, being composed of the three *guṇas*, are designated as the non-sentient, objects of knowledge, while *Puruṣa* is the sentient subject of knowledge. *Puruṣa* resembles *Prakṛti* in being omnipresent (*vyāpi*), immobile (*nīskriya*), non-composite (*viyoga*) non-merging (*aṅgīm*), impartite (*avibhāja*) and eternal (*nitya*).

*Puruṣa* transcends causality. It is of the nature of pure consciousness. It is non-objective and sentient. Being untouched by the *guṇas* (*rajas*) of *Prakṛti*, it is inactive. But it appears to be active due to its contact with *buddhi*. Gauḍapāda and Māṭhara clarify the apparent activity of *Puruṣa* with the following example. As a *brāhmaṇa*, who is taken along by thieves with them, is suspected to be a thief; *Puruṣa* even though inactive by nature, is mistaken to be an agent on account of its contact with the agent.

How the originally isolated *Puruṣa* who is a mere witness comes to appear like the knower and experiencer, is a crucial problem in the Sāṅkhya-Yoga.
Puruṣa knows and experiences objects through the modifications of buddhi when he takes the activities of buddhi as his own just as a king takes the victory or defeat of soldiers to be his own.42

1.2.2. PROOFS FOR THE EXISTENCE OF PURUṢA

The Sāṅkhya offers the following proofs for the existence of Puruṣa.

The existence of Puruṣa as a distinct reality apart from matter has to be accepted because,

1) collocations serve the purpose of something other than themselves (saṅghātapaṁarāṭhatvāt),

2) the other must be the reverse of what is composed of the three constituents (triguṇādiviparyayāt),

3) there must be control of the collocations (adhiṣṭhānāt),

4) there must be an enjoyer (bhokṣṭhāvāt), and

5) there is activity for the purpose of release from the three-fold misery (kaivalyārtham pravṛttvāc).”

1) It is held that composite objects exist for the sake of Puruṣa. The body, the senses, the mind and the intellect are all means to realise the end of Puruṣa. Whatever is composite serves the purpose of some being other than itself, as for instance, a bed or a cot. The grouping is
purposive. The purpose is not that of the aggregate as such but of another i.e., other than the aggregate. This other is the same as Spirit. But one might contend that one collocation may serve the purpose of another collocation and hence, this other need not be a spiritual entity. But such a supposition leads to infinite regress, for that other collocation would itself serve the purpose of another, and so on endlessly. Hence, this 'other' must itself be other than the material aggregate and it is the same as the Spirit (Puruṣa).

2) The second proof for the existence of Puruṣa is as follows: The material objects are non-intelligent (acetana), non-discriminating (aviveki), objects of knowledge (viṣaya). Therefore, they presuppose something which is intelligent (sacetana), discriminating (viveka) and subject of knowledge (jñāty), devoid of the three guṇas. All objects composed of the three guṇas being the products of Prakṛti (which is devoid of intelligence), need an intelligent principle to guide them.

3) The third proof for the existence of Puruṣa is based on the ground that the intelligent Puruṣa is to be accepted as the controller of the non-intelligent collocations (adhiṣṭhāna) of Prakṛti. The products of Prakṛti being inert require to be controlled and directed by an intelligent agent just as the non-intelligent chariot moves under the guidance and control of an intelligent charioteer. Hence, the existence of an intelligent Puruṣa must be accepted.
4) The fourth argument seeks to prove the existence of Puruṣa on the basis of its bhokṛṭbhāvatva. According to the Sāmkhya, the different things in the world which are products of Prakṛti comprising the three guṇas, namely, sattva, rajas and tamas, present the agreeable and disagreeable features, namely, of pleasure, pain and delusion. But to whom are they agreeable or disagreeable? Who is to experience (bhogya)? Experience presupposes the subject of experience or experiencer (bhokṛś). The Sāmkhya insists that the experiencer or enjoyer cannot be buddhi or any other product of Prakṛti, since they themselves are of the nature of pleasure, pain and delusion. The point is that the ultimate experiencer or enjoyer must be other than that which comprises the three guṇas and this other is the same as Puruṣa.

5) The last argument for the existence of Puruṣa is based on the activity for the purpose of release of the Puruṣa (kaivalyārtham pravṛttis'ca). The term kaivalya, according to both Vācaspati Miśra and Viññāna Bhikṣu, means complete dissociation from pain. According to them, the attainment of kaivalya in this form is not possible for the evolutes of Prakṛti starting from buddhi and ending in gross matter like physical bodies. Freedom from pain for these evolutes means separation from their own nature, which is impossible. Hence, arises the necessity for some entity different from them. Had no such entity been recognised, it would have been meaningless for the sages to have striven for kaivalya. All śāstric injunctions for the effort
towards *kaivalya* would have been equally meaningless. This entity for the liberation for which the sages had striven is the same as *Puruṣa*. Hence, *Puruṣa* must be accepted to exist.

According to the *Yukti Dīpikā*⁴⁶, striving for *kaivalya* is an act on the part of *Pradhan*. Activity constitutes the nature of *Pradhan*, as it develops into forms, while *Puruṣa* does not evolve into forms. A striving for the cessation of all activities on the part of one whose very nature is activity, appears very strange and cannot be accounted for unless we accept something other than *Pradhan* for whose purpose this striving is made. The author of the *Yukti Dīpikā* observes that *Puruṣa* stands for this something outside *Pradhan*. *Puruṣa* constitutes the purpose behind *Pradhan*'s striving for *kaivalya*⁴⁷.

1.2.3. PLURALITY OF PURUṢAS

The plurality of *Puruṣas* is sought to be established on the basis of differences in the incidence of birth and death, differences in the endowment of the instruments of cognition and action and also the differences in the actions pursued by different persons.⁴⁸

*If there is only one Soul (*Puruṣa*), birth of one should lead to the birth of all and similarly of death which is not the case. Firstly, the fact that different persons are seen to born and die at different times shows that*
the *Puruṣa* cannot be one but many. Secondly, if *Puruṣa* is one, blindness or deafness of one will lead to the blindness or deafness of all. But the fact that different persons are endowed with different sense organs is an indication that *Puruṣa* is not one, but many. Thirdly, if there is only one *Puruṣa*, it follows that a certain action on the part of one (person) should lead to the same activity on the part of others which is not the case. The differences in action on the part of different persons lead us to the conclusion that *Puruṣas* are many.

1.3. God

The most conspicuous difference between Sāṁkhya and Yoga is the acceptance of God (*Iśvara*) as an independent reality by Yoga in addition to *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti*. Patañjali is supposed to have made Sāṁkhya theistic by grafting the concept of God. Madhavacārya describes Patañjali as the founder of the theistic Sāṁkhya (*viśvarasāṁkhya-pravartaka*). The *Sāṁkhya kārikā* does not mention God. Vācaspati Miśra, finds logical incongruity in the belief in the existence of God. The *Sāṁkhya Sūtra* criticises the existence of God (*Iśvara*). Vijñāna Bhiṣku thinks that the *Sāṁkhya Sūtra* does not disprove God (*Iśvara*) but negates the proof for His existence. However, he holds that *Iśvara* serves no purpose in the Sāṁkhya system. Patañjali accepts God (*Iśvara*) as an independent reality in addition to *Prakṛti* and *Puruṣa*. 
1.3.1. NATURE OF GOD

Patañjali describes God (Īśvara) as a unique self (Puruṣa-viśeṣa), untouched by afflictions, actions, fruits and dispositions\(^{55}\). He accepts God as an object of meditation (dhyāna) and as one who removes the obstacles coming in the way of concentration\(^{56}\). Vyāsa makes the Yoga God saguṇa (qualified) by introducing the idea of mercy for creatures\(^{57}\). God as accepted by Patañjali and supposed by Vyāsa is not the efficient cause of the evolution of Prakṛti. But Vācaspati Miśra\(^{58}\) holds that God disturbs the equilibrium of Prakṛti and enables it to evolve into the manifold objects of the Universe. But as an efficient cause, His role is not active. In this sense He does not move Prakṛti to evolve, but He eliminates the obstacles standing in the way of evolution of Prakṛti. His role in the evolution of Prakṛti resembles the role of a peasant who waters lower fields by removing the barriers from higher fields full of water. God removes obstacles to the transformation of Prakṛti into various modes without energising it into activity. God is therefore, considered as the inactive efficient cause of the evolution of Prakṛti\(^{59}\). Why does He remove obstacles and pave the way in the evolution of Prakṛti?

The answer is, for the enjoyment and release of the Puruṣas. Both, Vijñāna Bhikṣu and Vācaspati Miśra hold that Prakṛti is the material cause of the world and God is its efficient cause.

God is eternally free and transcends the law of karma. He is omniscient
and omnipotent and omnipresent. He is embodiment of perfection. He is the teacher of the saints (ṛṣis) and the teacher of the Veda.60 "aum" is His symbol.

1.3.2. PROOFS FOR THE EXISTENCE OF GOD

The proofs advanced by Yoga for the existence of God are as follows:

1. The Veda tells us that God exists.61

2. The law of continuity leads us to accept that there must be the highest limit of knowledge and perfection which is God.62

3. God should be supposed to exist, for otherwise, we cannot account for the association and dissociation of Puruṣa and Prakṛti.63

4. As one who facilitates concentration of the mind by arresting its fluctuations and thereby liberation. God must be supposed to exist.64

1. The Vedas, pronounce the existence of God as the Supreme Self who is also the ultimate reality and the final goal of the world. The scriptures are authoritative (for being creations of God), they cannot deceive us. Vyasa, argues that there is a beginningless relation (anādi saṁbandha) between the Vedas and the pre-eminence of God.65

2. Vyāsa applies the law of continuity to Power (sakti) and lordship (aśvarya). The different degrees of Power and lordship point to the existence
of the Perfect Power and highest Lord. God is the embodiment of the
greatest Power, unequalled and unsurpassed (samyatiśayavinirmukta). If there
were a more powerful being than God, He would be the highest Lord. If
there were another equally powerful Lord, there will be conflict and clash
of desires and purposes between them, and a consequent chaos in the world.
So, there is only one Supreme God.

3. Evolution of the world is due to the association (samyoga) of
Puruṣa with Prakṛti, and its involution is due to the dissociation (viyoga)
of one from the other. Puruṣa and Prakṛti being two incompatible realities
cannot associate themselves with each other on their own. Nor are they
naturally dissociated, because it would make their relation inexplicable. So,
there must be an intelligent cause which effects their association and dissociation.

Their association and dissociation cannot be accounted for without the
will of God. Although, God has no end of His own to achieve compassion
for creatures (bhūtānugraha) is the end of evolution and involution which
depend upon association and dissociation of Prakṛti and Puruṣas God brings
about their association and dissociation.

4. Devotion to God is the sure means for effecting concentration of
the mind by arresting its fluctuations. Devotion to Lord eliminates obstacles
to Yoga and enables the mind to attain concentration (samādhi) and liberation
The grace of God is recognised. God, therefore, must exist, as an object of concentration. Hence, God must exist.

However, our concern with God in the Sāṃkhya-Yoga theory of causation is only in the context of the explanation of evolution and dissolution of Prakṛti. We have seen how the Sāṃkhya in the absence of God, failed to offer a satisfactory explanation in the starting of the evolution of Prakṛti. But as is obvious from the above analysis, Yoga by accepting God has overcome the difficulties of Sāṃkhya. From our point of view we are not concerned whether Yoga's conception of God is satisfactory or not, but we are convinced that Yoga does avoid the difficulties of Sāṃkhya and offers an intelligible explanation for the starting of evolution of Prakṛti.

1.4. GUNAS

Prakṛti is the name given to the three guṇas, namely, sativa, rajas and tamas in a state of equilibrium. The guṇa theory is the most distinguishing characteristic of the Sāṃkhya-Yoga system. According to this theory, all mental and material objects of this phenomenal world are combinations in different proportions of the three ultimate reals which are technically known as guṇas. The conception of these guṇas arose in the minds of thinkers, undoubtedly as a result of their analysis of phenomenal consciousness and its objects.

Our worldly experience discloses that everything in the Universe possesses
a three-fold aspect. The world presents the features of brightness or illumination, activity or change and inertia or enveloping nature. It must have derived these characteristics from its cause, because according to the Sāmkhya-Yoga we cannot conceive of anything in the effect which is not found in the cause. Therefore, the principles underlying our experience as bright, active and inert must be traced to an ultimate source, namely, Prakṛti.

These features which are of the nature of brightness, change or activity and inertness are derived through the presence of the principles known respectively as sattva, rajas and tamas in Prakṛti. They are the constitutive elements of Prakṛti. They are not parts of Prakṛti, but identical with it, since the Sāmkhya-Yoga holds that Prakṛti is opposite of anything constituted of parts. They are called guṇas (literally, subsidiary or secondary) because they serve the purpose of the other (Puruṣa) or because they are inter-twined like the three strands of a rope which binds Puruṣa to the world. Thus, sattva, rajas and tamas are the three guṇas which are responsible for all the experiences of Puruṣa. They are objective, ultimate and the irreducible elements of experience. The 'sattva' element makes objects intelligible, the rajas element enables objects to undergo changes, tamas enables the object to assume shape and resists its destruction through changes.

The guṇas are not the so-called qualities of the Vaiṣeṣika system
because, they themselves possess the characteristics of lightness, movement and heaviness. One quality cannot be the substratum for another. So, these guṇas are substances (dravyas), since the qualities of lightness etc., subsist in them. All objects of the world (both physical and mental) are the results of the different permutations and combinations of these three ultimate reals. Our thoughts and ideas (which seem to possess a character different from that of the physical world) are not outside the realm of the guṇas. They are as much the effects or modifications of the ultimate reals as the physical things. The only difference lies in the fact that in the mental sphere, the element of sativa predominates, whereas in the sphere of the physical universe, tamoguṇa becomes the dominating element. Tamoguṇa is present in all our ideas of objects. Otherwise, these mental products could not assume the forms of their objects in order to make the experience of an individual possible. In every citta-vṛtti, the indistinguishable union of guṇas is detectable. Our phenomenal consciousness as well as its objects are due to the functioning of these three guṇas, which are the sole productive forces of this Universe.

However, our experience includes not only a cognitive aspect but also a feeling aspect. From the point of view of knowledge, these three guṇas, namely, sativa, rajas and tamas are known as bright, mobile and inert, whereas from the point of view of feeling, they appear as pleasure, pain and delusion. The co-existence of these three constituents is observed even in everyday
experience. This can be exemplified by a well-known illustration adduced by the Śāmkhya-Yoga\textsuperscript{78}. A's wife is beautiful, young and well-endowed with all the qualities of head and heart that are requisite in an ideal wife. These constitute the sāttva element in her. Because of this, she causes A, her husband, to rejoice. But she is the cause of jealousy in her co-wives B and C, and despair in her neighbour D who could not have the good fortune to be married to her. Jealousy is rājas and despair is tāmasa. These are due to the elements of rajas and tamas in A's wife. They become active only in respect of the co-wives or the neighbour. A lovely woman is not merely an assemblage of ideas in some minds (as is held by the idealistic philosophers). Nor is she absolutely different from thoughts or feelings (as is ordinarily held by the realistic philosophers). Thus, the correspondence between the inner world and the outer world has been satisfactorily explained by the Śāmkhya-Yoga philosophers on the hypothesis that they represent two allied lines of development from a common source (i.e., the three guṇas).

The guṇas are related to one another in a peculiar manner. They are mutually subjugative, supporting, productive and co-operative\textsuperscript{79}. Dominance of sāttva, rajas and tamas results in the dominance of virtue, vice and ignorance respectively as it is observed in the case of Gods, men and beasts which abound in sāttva, rajas and tamas respectively\textsuperscript{80}. Each guṇa suppresses
the other two to become manifest with its own characteristics or to perform its specific standing with the support of each other.

Though the gunas possess contradictory characteristics, yet they act in co-operation with each other to accomplish a single purpose, i.e. the emancipation of Puruṣa, just as a wick and oil, opposed to fire by nature, co-operate when in contact with the single purpose of giving light, just as wind, bile and phlegm, though possessing contradictory properties, co-operate for the single purpose of sustaining the body.

The Śāmkhya-Yoga Prakṛti with its three gunas, its theory of evolution of the gross objects of the world from the primordial Prakṛti are so designed as to be in conformity with the principle of conservation of energy. According to this principle the total energy of any body or a system of bodies can only be transformed from one state to another and can never be increased or decreased or made to disappear. The total energy of the universe remains the same in all its states of change.

When for instance, the primordial cause, namely, Prakṛti evolves into the gross objects of the world through a series of intermediary changes; Prakṛti merely changes from its subtle to gross state, there is neither destruction of Prakṛti nor increase, nor decrease in it in terms of quantity. It merely changes from one state to another leading to increase in its grossness. Similarly
at the time of dissolution (*pralaya*) when all the gross objects of the world merge into the primordial *Prakṛti* through the intermediary stages, there is no destruction of the gross bodies; they merely lapse into their state of subtlety from their state of grossness. It is on this principle that the Sāṅkhya-Yoga assumption of *Prakṛti* as the ultimate material cause is based. It is for this reason that the Sāṅkhya-Yoga accepts the doctrine of *sakārya* according to which there is no origination for the non-existent and destruction for the existent. Causation is merely a transition of an entity from its unmanifest to the manifest state, from its subtle to its gross state. Similarly, destruction is not annihilation, but only a transition from its manifest to its unmanifest state. This theory (*parināma*) is based on the Sāṅkhya-Yoga doctrine of *sakārya*. We shall discuss this in the next chapter.
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