The *saikāryavāda* of Sāṃkhya-Yoga implies that the effect is pre-figured in its material cause (and hence, it is non-different from its material cause). On the assumption that the effect is non-different from its material cause, we have two theories in respect of the processes involved in the production of an effect. According to one theory, production involves a real change of cause whereas according to the other theory, production involves merely an apparent change in the cause. The former view is that of the Sāṃkhya-Yoga called *'pariṇāmavāda'*— the doctrine which involves real change in the cause in the process of the production of an effect. The latter view is called *'vivartavāda'* and held by the Śaṅkara school of Advaita Vedānta, according to which production involves only an illusory change as when a rope appears like a snake.
8.1. **PARIṆĀMA**

*Pariṇāma*¹ stands for change. The *Yoga Bhāṣya*² defines *'pariṇāma'* as that change which involves the "disappearance of the previous aspect (dharma) and appearance of another aspect of a substance (dharmi), while the substance itself remains constant". The *Yukti Dipika*³ illustrates the process of *pariṇāma* as follows: just as a *palāsa* leaf under the impact of heat and such other efficient causes gives up its greenness and becomes yellow and yet does not lose its identity of *palāsa*-hood, an object undergoing *pariṇāma* does not lose its identity. *'Pariṇāma'* stands for that change wherein existing qualities in a substance disappear and a different set of qualities appear in their place. When we say that the existing qualities disappear, it does not mean that they vanish into nothing; it only means that they have gone out of our sight, they have lapsed into their unmanifest state. Similarly, when we claim that a different set of qualities appear, it does not mean that qualities that are alien to the substance originate in it. It only means that the qualities that hitherto remained unmanifest, and were not in our sight have become manifest and come into our sight. When, for instance, clay is changed into a pot, the "pot" is not something foreign to the clay. The pot is an aspect of the clay which remains unmanifest in it prior to its production and becomes manifest under the impact of causal operation by the potter with the help of the other auxiliary causes, namely, his wheel, staff etc.
Similarly, when a pot is destroyed i.e., rendered into pot-halves, it does not mean that the pot has totally vanished. It only means that the pot has lapsed into its causal state of pot-halves. *Pariṇāma*, therefore, does not permit the production of the totally new and the total destruction of the existing one.

We have to understand the *Prakṛti-pariṇāma* of the Sāṁkhya-Yoga in the light of its above position. The Sāṁkhya-Yoga, as we have seen, accepts two ultimate reals, namely, *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti*—the former, standing for the principle of consciousness and the latter, the principle of primordial matter. The former is neither the cause nor an effect, whereas the latter functions as the ultimate material cause of all products in the world.

3.1.1. PRAKṛTI AS THE PRIMORDIAL MATERIAL CAUSE

According to the Nikāyikas, the ultimate material cause⁴ is not one but many atoms (*paramāṇus*). They are of four kinds, namely, atoms of air, fire, water and earth. The Sāṁkhya-Yoga, committed as it is to the philosophy of unity, points to a single primordial material cause of the world, namely, *Prakṛti*.

The Sāṁkhya-Yoga philosophy never admits the causality of *Puruṣa*.⁵ *Puruṣa* is neither the material cause nor the efficient cause. Admission of the non-causal nature of *Puruṣa* alone would remain compatible with the
unchangeability of the spiritual principle. Further, according to the Sāṃkhya-Yoga, cause can never be aparināmi. In order to produce the effect, the cause must either undergo change or it must exert active influence to bring about the effect. Therefore, the cause ceases to be immutable. Puruṣa being immutable cannot be the cause of the world. The Sāṃkhya-Yoga is the first in the fold of orthodox systems to declare that immutability and causality cannot belong to one and the same tattva.

But, why should it be held that Prakṛti is the material cause of the world? Why should we not accept any finite or limited entity among the evolutes of Prakṛti as the ultimate material cause? The Sāṃkhya-Yoga replies that what is limited cannot be the material cause of all, as for example, threads cannot be the material cause of a pot. Finite things such as wood, gold, clay etc., can be the material causes of their respective effects which are also finite and none of them can function as the material cause of all products in the world. The Chāndogya Upaniṣad says that which is limited is perishable. On the other hand the Veda declares Pradhāna as the cause of the world. It is the root cause of the world, since it does not evolve from any other thing. Guided by the principle of economy, the Sāṃkhya-Yoga accepts one imperishable ultimate cause, namely, Prakṛti to account for all products in the world.
Since, the root has no root, it is root-less. Aniruddha says that there being no root, that is no cause; the Mūla-Prakṛti, the root evolvent, the cause which is root-less, is the root (of all). Viṣṇu Bhikṣu explains us, why Prakṛti must be the uncaused cause of everything and why it must be infinite and all-pervasive. The ultimate cause of everything cannot itself have a cause; otherwise, it cannot be the ultimate cause. For this reason, Prakṛti is called the primary (Pradēhāna), the root-cause. The root material cause of the twenty-three principles, that is, Pradhāna, is root-less because, further root cannot be possible and if it were to be, there would be an infinite regression.

3.1.2. DISTURBANCE OF THE EQUILIBRIUM OF PRAKṛTI

As the ultimate material cause of all things in the world, Prakṛti in its unevolved state is the equipoise of the three guṇas and evolution starts when there is a disturbance in the guṇa equilibrium. The question, therefore arises: What is it that causes the disturbance of the equilibrium? The Sāṁkhya ascribes this to the proximity of Puruṣa to Prakṛti. The relation between Puruṣa and Prakṛti is the crux of the Sāṁkhya philosophy. Prakṛti is active but unconscious. Puruṣa is conscious but inactive. Further there is no place for God in the Sāṁkhya. Evolution and dissolution being periodical processes, the Sāṁkhya finds it difficult to account for the starting of the evolutionary
process at a particular time. In the absence of an intelligent Supreme God, an unmoved mover, the Sāṃkhya has to rely on its philosophy of unconscious teleology. There is some inherent teleology (unconscious) in the guṇas as a result of which they produce this world. The inherent teleology manifests itself in the form of Prakṛti unknowingly serving the purpose of enjoyment and liberation of Puruṣa. The movement of Prakṛti for the production of the world is thus in a way controlled and influenced by the transcendental Puruṣa. Hence, this blind teleological force of nature is also said to be due to the transcendental influence of the spiritual principle (Puruṣa). "Just as the unintelligent milk flows from the udders of the cow for the nourishment of the calf, so also the unconscious Pradhāna functions to liberate Puruṣa from the sorrows and sufferings of this world". Thus, unconscious teleology is an important hypothesis on the ground of which the Sāṃkhya school seeks to explain the evolution of this well-ordered universe by an unconscious Prakṛti even in the absence of any active guidance from a conscious Puruṣa.

The real object of disturbance in the guṇa equilibrium and the evolution of the world is two-fold: (1) Prakṛti becomes the object of experience of Puruṣa and (2) Puruṣa attains release from the torments and tortures of life on perceiving its own distinction from Prakṛti. The Sāṃkhya Kārikā XXI runs thus: "For the sake of Puruṣa's perception of Prakṛti and for his release,
a union of the two takes place, which resembles a union of the lame and the blind. By that union, evolution of the world is effected". The Yoga Sūtra of Patañjali17 says: "The union between Puruṣa and Prakṛti takes place for the sake of knowing the essential nature of Puruṣa and Prakṛti".

The equilibrium of the guṇas gets disturbed by the proximity (sānnidhyā) of the Puruṣa. Just as the magnet attracts iron by its mere proximity, so Puruṣas move Prakṛti to evolution by their mere proximity. Just as the magnet is the unmoved mover of iron, so Puruṣa is the unmoved mover of Prakṛti18. The proximity of Puruṣa breaks up the original equilibrium of the guṇas whereupon they try to dominate one another. The question, what makes the originally pure Puruṣa associate itself with the undisturbed Prakṛti, remains an ultimate mystery, in this school. A few unsatisfactory explanations are given. Isavara Kṛṣṇa19 says that the seeming contact between the two disparate substances, Puruṣa and Prakṛti is effected by showing Prakṛti to Puruṣa, 'who could not have had any desire to see it', so that he will see it with all its evils and will then be without any desire to see it at all. Bringing them together is like burning the finger of a child so that in future it will not like to go near fire. It seems that the occasion for contact between Puruṣa and Prakṛti is adventitious, for there is no third ground to bring about the contact20. According to Vijnāna Bhikṣu21 the contact is beginningless
(anādi) and is of the nature of the relation between the proprietor and his propriety (svasvāmi-bhāva) and is strengthened by the life of action. According to Pañcasikha, it is beginningless and due to ignorance (avidya) Puruṣa is really different from Prakṛti. But all agree that the contact has no beginning. Consequently, the compulsions of the Sāṁkhya metaphysics drive us towards the eternality of the world as is held by the Mīmāṃsakas. But paradoxically, belief in the evolution and dissolution of the world gets caught in its own trap.

Though the Sāṁkhya cannot satisfactorily explain how the equilibrium of Prakṛti is disturbed and the evolution of Prakṛti begins, the Yoga covers this deficiency by grafting the concept of God who is supposed to disturb the equilibrium of Prakṛti and start its evolution. God directs the evolution of Prakṛti and dissolves the world into Prakṛti. The Sāṁkhya does not believe in God. It holds that some transcendental influence of Puruṣa disturbs the equilibrium of Prakṛti and starts its evolution. Puruṣa is the unmoved mover of Prakṛti even as Aristotle's God is the unmoved mover of matter and the efficient cause of evolution.

3.1.3. THE PURPOSE, MEANING AND ORDER OF EVOLUTION

The Sāṁkhya Kārikā XXI, attempts to explain the utility of the conjunction between Puruṣa and Prakṛti by the simile of the 'lame man and the blind
one'. The lame though capable of seeing the way cannot walk, while the blind though capable of walking cannot see the way. But the lame when placed on the shoulders of the blind can direct the latter to proceed ahead. Thus, it is seen that their joint activity can serve a common end which none of them can fulfill by himself, without the help of the other. Similarly, Puruṣa is inactive, but it is conscious, while Prakṛti is active, but it is unconscious. However, their mutual co-operation can bring about an end which either of them cannot achieve independently of the other. Now, what is this end (aim or purpose) for which evolution proceeds?

This end is the release of Puruṣa, isolation (kaivalya) of Puruṣa from Prakṛti. Puruṣa’s end is to free himself from the clasp of Prakṛti. Though he is without any attribute, yet he appropriates pleasure, pain and such other properties of Prakṛti to his own self, and thus becomes affected by them. Strictly speaking, he is not to be touched by these attributes. But due to his association with Prakṛti, he fails to discriminate his own self from that of Prakṛti. But, when this discriminative knowledge dawns, he differentiates himself from Prakṛti and thus regains his true nature. In this state, he realises that pain belongs to Prakṛti and thus withdraws himself forever from the province of Prakṛti. This is liberation called isolation (kaivalya) from the clutches of matter (Prakṛti).
Evolution (parināma) does not permit the emergence of the new, but only the manifestation of the unmanifest. The passage of evolution involves a transition from the potential to the actual (āvirbhāva), from the undifferentiated to the differentiated (sāmsṛṣṭāviveka), from the indeterminate or non-specific (aviṣeṣa) to the determinate or specific (linga)\textsuperscript{25}, from the homogeneous (sarūpa-parināma) to the heterogeneous (virūpa-parināma).

The Sāṅkhya-Yoga evolution involves the gradual development of the different categories of existence. Prakṛti is transformed into mahat or cosmic intellect (buddhi). Mahat is transformed into ahamkāra or cosmic egoism. Ahamkāra is transformed into the eleven sense organs, and the five tanmātras or subtle essences of sound, touch, colour, taste and smell. The five subtle essences are transformed into the five gross elements of ether, air, fire, water and earth. These are the twenty-four principles\textsuperscript{26}. Including Puruṣa, we have twenty-five principles (tattvas) in the Sāṅkhya-Yoga\textsuperscript{27}. But Puruṣa is neither the evolute nor the evolvent.

3.1.4. EVOLUTES OF PRAKṛTI

3.1.4.1. MAHAT

Mahat (the great one) is the first evolute of Mūla-Praṇa. The reason for calling it great (mahat) lies in the fact that it is great in space as well
as in time; for there is no other evolute which is so exhaustive and durable as Mahat. It is also referred to as ‘buddhi’ (intellect), ‘mati’ (understanding or thought or inclination), and prajña (insight or wisdom).

Mahat is the first principle which is manifest (vyakta). Since it is caused, it is finite, non-pervasive, plural, etc., like other evolutes. It is characterised by ascertainment or determination (adhyavasāya), virtue (dharma), wisdom (jñāna), non-attachment (vīrāga), possession of lordly powers (ātśvārya) which constitute its sāttvika form. Cultivation of sāttvika buddhi results in the formation of a virtuous character while the increase of tāmasika properties in the intellect brings a man down to the level of a lower animal. So, the river like citta flows in two currents, virtuous and vicious. In the Yoga Bhāṣya, it is described as an extensive transparent stuff like the bright sky.

Of the different sāttvika properties, virtue is that which leads to success in this world and also in the other. Wisdom is the discriminative knowledge of the Spirit. Non-attachment or dispassion helps one to get merged in Prakṛti. This Prakṛti-liṅa condition, is a condition of bondage. But, it is a higher level of bondage brought about by non-attachment to actions and their results. Non-attachment is of four levels. The lordly powers are of eight kinds.
The sattvika properties of mahat are capable of leading a person to a higher stage of detachment. But, it cannot help him to attain liberation. Liberation can be attained only by the acquisition of discriminative knowledge that Purusha is different from Prakriti. All the tamasika properties act as obstacles in the path of liberation and keep a man bound to the circle of birth and rebirth.

3.1.4.2. Ahamkara

From mahat evolves ahamkara. The term ‘ahamkara’ is difficult to translate. It is made up of the personal pronoun "I" (aham) and the practical ‘kara’, which means "making", "doing", "working", etc. It is usually translated as "ego", "individuation", etc. Van Buitenen, emphasising the cosmic significance of the term, understands it as the creative cry, "I". In the Sankhya Karika, the term is equated with abhimana, which implies such notions as "conceit", "pride", or "erroneous conception", etc., Conceit in the ego of the form "I exist", "I know", "I have this or that duty to perform or abstain from" etc., precedes determination. It is the ground on which determination is based.

Ahamkara is a determinate form of mahat. Its function is abhimana or self-assertion. It is only when ahamvritti is generated in the intelligised mahat that there arises real enjoyment of pleasures and suffering of pains.
It is the *ahaṁkāra* that induces *Puruṣa* to wrongly consider itself the agent of actions.

The Sāmkhya\textsuperscript{38} speaks of three-fold *ahaṁkāra* 1. *vaikṛta*, 2.*taijasa* and 3. *bhūtādi*. The first one abounds in *sattva*, the second in *rajas* and the third in *tamas*. This division has been planned with a view to explain the sixteen evolutes of *ahaṁkāra* which are bifurcated into two series, subjective and objective. The names, *vaikṛta*, *taijasa* and *bhūtādi* are suggestive. The first means the basis of evolutes, the second stands for the bright and fiery, the third refers to the evolution of the elements.

From *vaikṛta ahaṁkāra* or *sātvika ahaṁkāra* the subjective series comprising the eleven organs emanate. These are the mind (*manas*), the five sense organs (*jñānendriyas*) and the five organs of action (*karmendriyas*)\textsuperscript{39}. It is on this level of evolution that man is first in contact with the external or gross world.

Mind (*manas*) is an organ both of cognition and action as seen from its function. The *manas* is described as *saṁkalpaka*\textsuperscript{40}, i.e., it is constructive, reflective, analytic and explicative. The mind serves as a bridge between *mahat* and *ahaṁkāra* on the one hand, and the senses and organs of action on the other. Thus, it is also a bridge between the internal and external
world. Mind together with mahat and ahaṅkāra makes up the internal organ (antaḥkaraṇa). It is also characterised as an indriya. Mind is involved primarily in waking experience of man. It is also involved in the internal functioning of man in so far as it provides the distinct impressions, constructions, etc. Mind is non-atomic and can come into contact with several senses at a time.

The Sāṁkhya-Yoga speaks of ten indriyas which are brought into two groups. The indriyas are not formed of the gross elements (bhūtas). The senses (indriyas) are supra-sensuous and imperceptible powers located in the external physical and perceptible organs. However, they are wrongly identified with their substrata like the eye-ball, etc. Plurality of organs does not bring about chaos. Each organ has its own field of activity and does not encroach upon that of others. Eye, ear, skin, tongue and nose apprehend visual appearance, sound, touch, taste and smell respectively. Similarly, the organ of speech, hands, feet, the excretory organ and the organ of generation perform the function of speaking, grasping, motion, excretion and the sexual gratification respectively.

Intelect (mahat), individuation (ahaṅkāra) and the mind (manas) constitute the internal organs (antaḥ-karaṇa). On the other hand, the ten senses
(indriyas) are external organs. The circulation of vital airs, *pāṇa, apāna, udāna, samāna, vyāna* is a common function of the internal organs. The internal organs function in the past, present and future, whereas the external organs function only in the present time. The external organs are compared to gates, while the internal organs are called gate-keepers. This thirteen-fold instrument functions as a whole by seizing (*āharaṇa*), holding (*āhāraṇa*) and manifestation (*prakāśakara*).

3.1.4.3. TANMĀTRAS

The *bhūti*di form of *ahaṅkāra* (tāmasa ahaṅkāra) which dominates in *tamas* generates the five subtle elements (tanmātras) of sound, touch, colour, taste and smell. These are called 1. *śabda* tanmātra, 2. *sparśa* tanmātra, 3. *rūpa* tanmātra, 4. *rasa* tanmātra and 5. *gandha* tanmātra respectively. These *tanmātras* like *mahat* and *ahaṅkāra* are both creative (*Prakṛti*) and created (*viktī*). The term 'tanmātra' means "only so much or little", "rudimentary", or "trifle".

The *tanmātras* are inert, but possess quantum or mass which is due to preponderance of *tamas* element in them. Ordinary beings cannot perceive them, but they are open to the *yogins* and such other superior beings. These are stated as non-specific (*āviśéga*) because, the different aspects of *sattva,*
rajas and tamas in them cannot be distinctively experienced by us. The reason for calling them tanmātras lies in the fact that they do not reveal the specific (viśeṣa) characteristics of their inherent properties.

The tanmātras possess the following notable characteristics:

1) They have evolved from the bhūtādi or tāmasa ahaṅkāra.

2) They are non-specific subtle essences which produce the gross elements and their qualities.

3. They are infra-sensible and therefore, cannot be directly perceived by the powers of the senses of the ordinary human beings.

4. These tanmātras are not as undifferentiated and indeterminate as the mere mass or bhūtādi. There is some determination even in tanmātric stage as they are already called 'śabda tanmātra', 'sparśa tanmātra' etc.

3.1.4.4. MAHĀBHŪTAS

From the subtle elements (tanmātras) evolve the five gross elements (mahābhūtās) of ether, air, fire, water, and earth. Ether (ākāśa) has the characteristic of sound (śabdamayasatta), air (vāyu) has the characteristic of touch (sparśamayasatta), fire (tejas) has the characteristic of colour (rūpamaya-satta), water (āpah) has the characteristic of taste (rasamayasatta)
and the earth (prthivî) has the characteristic of smell (gandhamayasatta).
The gross elements (mahabhutas) are specific because, they are perceived as
distinct, being possessed of different qualities. The evolutes of the gross
elements are of two kinds.

1) Bodies gross and subtle born of parents belong to the first division.
These are proximate to intelligence and appearing like intelligence. Of these,
the gross bodies are endowed by father and mother. They are composed
of the six constituents or sheaths (kosas) of hair, blood, flesh, tendon, bone
and marrow. Bodies constituted of these perish and are reduced to dust or
ashes. The subtle body is constant throughout change.

2) The gross elements of ether, air, fire, water and earth and the
objects constituted by them belong to the second division.

The gross elements which are produced from the tanmätras constitute
the limit of Prâktyic evolution. After the production of the gross elements,
evolution in the sense that there is transition from the subtle to the gross
stops. From gross elements onwards, evolution is only a transition within
the gross elements; it is not marked by difference between the evolute and
the evolvent in respect of grossness.

According to Vâcaspati Miśra, ahamkâra, in its sâttvika aspect evolves
into *manas*, the five organs of knowledge (*jñānendriyas*) and the five organs of action (*karmendriyas*). *Ahaṁkāra*, in its *tāmasa* aspect evolves into the five subtle essences (*tanmātras*), namely, colour (*rūpa*), taste (*rasa*), smell (*gandha*), touch (*sparśa*) and audition (*śabda*).

Vijñāna Bhikṣu\(^57\) differs from the above view and gives a slightly different account of the evolution of the cosmos. According to him, *Prakṛti* gives rise to *mahat* which in turn gets modified into *ahaṁkāra*, and *ahaṁkāra* in its *sāttvika* aspect evolves into *manas*. The organs of sense and action emanate from the *rajas* aspect of *ahaṁkāra*. The subtle elements (*tanmātras*) evolve from the *tāmasa* aspect of *ahaṁkāra*.

Different opinions of the Sāṁkhya teachers regarding the evolution of senses and *tanmātras* are recorded in the *Yukti Dīpikā*\(^58\). Pañcādhikaraṇa is of the opinion that senses arise out of *mahābhūtas*. Vindhyavāsin holds that *tanmātras* along with *ahaṁkāra* emanate from *mahat*.

Patañjali\(^59\) says that *sattva* with its power of restraint, *rajas* with its power of action and *tamas* with its power of indifference are modified into the known universe consisting of subtle and gross elements of matter and the physical apparatus, the five organs of knowledge, the five organs of action, and the three internal organs, mind (*manas*), intellect (*buddhi*), and
egoism (ahaṁkāra), to realise the ends of the Puruṣas.

Vyāsa\textsuperscript{60} says that the subtle essence of sound has the quality of sound only; the subtle essence of touch has two qualities, sound and touch; the subtle essence of colour has three qualities, sound, touch and colour; the subtle essence of taste has four qualities, sound, touch, colour and taste and the subtle essence of smell has five qualities, sound, touch, colour, taste and smell. The subtle essences are called the five elements. The atoms of the five elements are generated from the subtle essences. Hence, atoms are not the ultimate indivisible parts of the gross elements in the Sāmkhya-Yoga but are the evolutes of the tanmātras only. The earth atom is generated from the five subtle essences of smell, taste, colour, touch and sound, of which smell is the chief. The water atom is generated from the four subtle essences of taste, colour, touch and sound, of which taste is the chief. The fire atom is generated from the three subtle essences of colour, touch and sound of which colour is the chief. The air atom is generated from the two subtle essences of touch and sound, of which touch is the chief. The ether atom is generated from the subtle essence of sound\textsuperscript{61}. Each of the subtle essences is the chief constituent of the specific kind of atom generated by it, though other subtle essences are combined with it\textsuperscript{62}. 

\textsuperscript{60} Vyāsa

\textsuperscript{61} Each of the subtle essences is the chief constituent of the specific kind of atom generated by it.

\textsuperscript{62} Though other subtle essences are combined with it.
The atoms of Sāmkhya-Yoga, therefore, are not the ultimate particles of matter as conceived by the Vaiṣeṣika. They are effects, since they are evolved from the tanmātras. However, the tanmātras of the Sāmkhya can be compared to a certain extent with the paramāṇus of the Nyāya-Vaiṣeṣika school. Just as the four kinds of paramāṇus are the subtle causes of the four gross elements, in the same manner, the tanmātras are the subtle causes of five gross elements. Both the tanmātras and paramāṇus are to be known by us through inference only. In both, the qualities of sound, touch etc., exist in a latent form because of the very subtle nature of these infra-sensible elements. Just as in the tanmātric stage, tanmātras could be differentiated at least as śabda tanmātra, sparśa tanmātra etc., in the same manner, the atoms also could be differentiated into four kinds. According to the Sāmkhya-Yoga, the qualities of the mahābhūtas are due to the qualities latent in these subtle causal substances.

There are however, some important points of difference between the tanmātras of the Sāmkhya-Yoga and paramāṇus (atoms) of the Nyāya-Vaiṣeṣika. The paramāṇus are co-eternal with God and they constitute the ultimate material stuff of the universe. The tanmātras on the otherhand, are not eternal, being the products of Prakṛti. They do not also constitute the root cause of the universe. The Sāmkhya-Yoga does not hold substance and
quality as different, as held by the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika. On the other hand, this school admits identity (tādātmya) between the quality and the possessor of quality. Therefore, it does not matter in the least whether the tānmātras of the Śāṅkhyā are considered as substances or as qualities. Whereas in the Śāṅkhyā-Yoga, the tānmātras are the causes of the five gross elements as well as of their qualities, in the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika philosophy, the paramāṇus (being only substances) are the causes of the four mahābhūtas which are causes of their respective qualities. In spite of these differences, we may hold logically that as the basic principles of the physical world, the tānmātras occupy a place similar to that of the paramāṇus. They indeed, lay the corner-stone of this multi-coloured Universe, a Universe which is known and acted upon by the organs of sensation and action.

3.2. Kinds of pariṇāma

The claim that the Śāṅkhyā-Yoga subscribes to the doctrine of pariṇāma needs to be explained in the context of the evolution of Prakṛti into the manifold objects of the world through different stages. The concept of ‘pariṇāma’ as we have seen already does not permit the emergence of the new, but implies the manifestation of the unmanifest. Thus, when the Śāṅkhyā-Yoga contends that ‘mahat’ evolves from Prakṛti, the evolute ‘mahat’ is not foreign
to its evolvent 'Prakṛti'; it was there already in Prakṛti in an unmanifest form. What was unmanifest in its causal state becomes manifest in its effect state. Similarly, when mahat evolves into ahaṅkāra, the latter must be supposed to pre-figure in its cause in an unmanifest form. Following this logic, we have to assume that according to pariṇāmavāda, the evolute can never be different from its evolvent.

In the process of evolution of Prakṛti into the manifold objects of the world, we can distinguish between two kinds of pariṇāma, namely, 1. Sarūpa and Virūpa pariṇāma, 2. Tattva and Tattvāntara pariṇāma.

3.2.1. Sarūpa-Pariṇāma and Virūpa-Pariṇāma

We know that prakṛti is always dynamic and pulsating with activity. To say that it is dynamic is to accept that it is undergoing change. This change is of two kinds, namely, sarūpa and virūpa. The change within each guṇa as when sattva changes into sattva, rajas into rajas and tamas into tamas, without inter-mixing, is called sarūpa-pariṇāma (sadrśa-pariṇāma) i.e., the homogeneous change. In this state Prakṛti remains indeterminate, undifferentiated and in a state of equilibrium. But, when the guṇas begin to overpower one another, the equilibrium of Prakṛti gets disturbed and this leads to the manifestation of the heterogeneous phenomena of the world
starting from mahat. This change is called heterogeneous change, virūpa-parināma (visadṛśa-parināma).

But in both kinds of parināma there is no such thing as replacement of one substance by a totally different substance, but mere manifestation of the same substance in a different form. In sarūpa-parināma a single guṇa e.g., sattva manifests itself in different forms while producing its kind, whereas in virūpa-parināma the three guṇas jointly manifest themselves in different forms with the predominance of one over the other two.

Virūpa-parināma is of two kinds namely, 1. Tattvāntara-parināma and 2. Tattva-parināma.

3.2.2. TATTVĀNTARA-PARINĀMA AND TATTVA-PARINĀMA

The change wherein one tattva gives rise to another tattva, is called tattvāntara-parināma. It stands for the evolution of a different category of existence (tattvāntara) as that of the evolution of mahat from Prakṛti, ahaṁkāra from mahat, tanmātras and the senses (indriyas). from ahaṁkāra under the dominance of sattva on the one hand and the five gross elements from the five subtle elements on the other under the dominance of tāmas. In this kind of parināma the transition is from the subtle to the gross state. Accordingly, compared with the evolvent Prakṛti, its evolute, mahat is gross and the
grossness increases gradually as the evolution of Prakṛti progresses further. Vācaspati Miśra observes that the difference between one tattva and another consists in the degree of their subtlety or grossness. Though the tannātras are evolved from ahamkāra, the traces of ahamkāra are not easily discernible in the tannātras. They acquire properties which look different from those of ahamkāra. So, when the atoms are evolved from the tanmātras, they look different from the latter, since they acquire sensible properties which are not manifest in the tanmātras. Thus, the evolution of one tattva from another leading to the increase in its grossness is termed tattvāntara-parināma.

The change within the same category of existence (tattva) is called tattva-parināma. Unlike tattvāntara-parināma, in tattva-parināma, the evolvent and the evolute are the same with regard to their grossness or subtlety. In the process of evolution, at the stage of gross elements, namely, ether, air, fire, water and earth, each of them further evolves into its respective products. The gross element earth, for instance, changes into its products such as pots, saucers, cups etc., which are also of earthly nature. Here, the evolvent and the evolute belong to the same order of grossness. When pot is produced from clay, it cannot be taken that the clay is less gross and its evolutes, pot etc., are more gross. Both of them, the evolvent (clay) and its evolute (pot) belong to the same order of grossness. So, the evolution of clay into
earthen pots etc., is called *tattva-parināma* i.e., change within the same category of existence (*tattva*). Similarly, the elements water, fire and air giving rise to their respective evolutes is also called *tattva-parināma*, because they and their products belong to the same level as for as their grossness is concerned.

One is likely to think that though in *tattva-parināma* there is appearance or disappearance of an aspect (*dharma*) in or from an enduring substance, in *tattvāntara-parināma* where one *tattva* such as *Prakṛti* gives rise to another *tattva*, namely, *mahat*, *mahat* is not a mere aspect (*dharma*) of *Prakṛti*, but a totally different existent. But Vyāsa’s account in his *Yoga Bhāṣya* steers clear off all such doubts. Vyāsa says that *tattvāntara-parināma* is on the same level as *tattva-parināma* so far as in both there is no creation of a new substance. He also says that the gross elements starting with ether (*ākāśa*) are the *dharmas* of their respective subtle elements (*tanmātras*). In the same way, *ahaṅkāra* is the *dharma* of its evolvent, *mahat*; and the sense organs and the subtle elements are the *dharmas* of *ahaṅkāra*. So, in both the kinds of *parināma*, one substance is not replaced by another substance which is totally distinct, although some properties disappear and some other properties appear in the primary substance which is enduring, namely, *Prakṛti*. Hiriyanna points out that it is just as in the game of dice; they are ever the same dice but as they fall in various ways, they mean to us different
The changes in *tattva* and *tattvāntara-parināma* are of three kinds, namely, *Dharma*, *Lakṣaṇa* and *Avasthā*.

### 3.2.3. Dharma, Lakṣaṇa and Avasthā Pariṇāma

We usually distinguish between the substance (*dharma*) of an object and its qualities or aspects (*dharmas*). The change wherein substance (*dharma*) remains the same while its qualities (*dharmas*) appear and disappear, as when a leaf remaining in essence (*dharma*) a leaf, changes its colour (*dharma*) from green to yellow, it is called *dharma-parināma*.

It is the persistence of the essence, *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas* amidst changes, that accounts for the identity of cause and effect. The three *guna* present themselves in the cause in a particular proportion and in the effect in another proportion. *Dharma-parināma*, therefore, stands for the appearance and the disappearance of qualities (*dharmas*) in or from a substance (*dharma*) that abides.

*Lakṣaṇa-parināma* refers to the change of an aspect (*dharma*) in a time-series. All the aspects (*dharmas*) that an object presents at different times may be viewed as existing in the object as latent, actual and sublatent form which may be termed respectively as past (āṭīta), present (vartamāna) and future (anāgata). So, the production or manifestation of a thing has
to be apprehended from the point of view of three stages—past, present and the future. Prior to its manifestation, an aspect (dharma) exists in the material cause in a sublatent or future (anāgata) form; after its production it exists in its actual or present (vartamāna) form and after its supposed destruction, it lapses into its latent or past (atīta) state. The Sāmkhya-Yoga is committed to the view that there is no production of the non-existent and destruction for the existent. Everything exists always in different states. Thus, an aspect (dharma) when it enters into its present (vartamāna) stage from its future (anāgata) state it undergoes a change. At that stage its present aspect only becomes prominent, while it is not altogether detached from its past (atīta) and future (anāgata) stages. The Bhāṣya illustrates it by the simile of a man when attached to a particular woman is not absolutely free from his passion for other women. The fact is that, his passion for a particular woman becomes prominent at that time, while it becomes latent towards other women for the time being.

Lakṣaṇa-parināma can be illustrated by the following example also. A stone has a statue already hidden in it and the sculptor only removes the outer parts of it to make it visible. In the same manner, the jar exists already in the lump of clay and it only becomes visible when the potter removes the superfluous parts from it. Therefore, according to the technicality
of this philosophy, the jar is said to exist in the clay in an anāgata (future) way i.e., the state of an object as not yet come into our view, before it becomes visible. On its being visible or coming into our view, it is said to be in the varīmāna (present) and when it is destroyed, it is said to be in the way called atīta (past).

Avasthā-pariṇāma is the change (pariṇāma) that an aspect (dharma) undergoes in every succeeding moment of its existence with reference to time. An aspect when it exists in its present stage is generally held to be new. But, its newness begins to diminish in every succeeding moment. Thus, what was brand new becomes new, from new it becomes old, from old it turns into older, and so on. Thus, everywhere the aspect remains the same, but it looks different with reference to time. It can be illustrated by the case of a woman who becomes a daughter in relation to her parents, mother in relation to her son and grand-mother in relation to her grand-children.

The author of the Yoga Bhāṣya states that ultimately there is only one change which is differently described under different circumstances. Thus, the earth material, when giving rise to a pot, is first of all, turned into a lump. From the lump, it assumes another shape, and then another. In this way it passes through different aspects till it is turned into a pot.
This is what is called the change of aspect (dharma-parināma). Then again, the pot changes showing comparative oldness and newness in every succeeding moment, and this is called the change of state (avasthā-parināma). All these changes do not change the original substance (dharmī) which remains constant throughout. According to Vācaspati Miśra, all these aspects (dharmas), marks (lakṣaṇas) and states (avasthās) may, in general, be called dharmas. So, the modification of the same substance may be said to be dharma-parināma, lakṣana-parināma and avasthā-parināma from different points of view.

Change according to the Sāṃkhya-Yoga is only the appearance and disappearance of qualities in or from an enduring substance. At no time change involves replacement of one substance by another. Change is only change of form, the substance remaining the same. The underlying substance that remains unaffected is called dharmī while its varying aspects are called dharmas. The dharmī is an abiding principle manifesting itself in and through the dharmas. So, the different kinds of pariñāma are nothing but the modification of the same substance viewed from different standpoints.

The Sāṃkhya-Yoga doctrine of pariñāma should not be confused with the Buddhistic doctrine of universal flux. According to the Buddhistic doctrine of universal flux, there are only dharmas that appear and disappear at every
moment and there is no dharmi in which they appear and disappear. Buddhism rejects the idea of a dharmi or abiding principle, apart from the dharmas that appear and disappear. Change, therefore, according to Buddhism is only replacement of one entity by another. "A thing is not the same at different moments or in different places. Every variation of time and place makes one thing 'another' thing. One element of reality does not change or grow into another, but gives rise to another. "The elements do not change, but disappear." Jainism, in conformity with its metaphysical presuppositions recognises the reality of both permanence and change. It believes that whereas the 'substance' remains the same, its modes change. Although, both Jainism and the Sāṁkhya-Yoga accept an abiding substance, they differ in respect of its nature, for Jainism with its belief in a permanent static substance is nearer to commonsense than the Sāṁkhya-Yoga.

The notion of change in the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika, as in Buddhism, implies only the production of something new and not the appearance or disappearance of qualities in an enduring substance. According to the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika, all effect-substances are wholes (avayavins) made out of parts (avayavas). A table is a whole made of wooden parts. An ornament such as a neck-lace is a whole made of parts of gold. Any addition or subtractions of a part to or from a particular object (table or neck-lace), change in the arrangement
of its parts or change in its qualities by way of disappearance of the existing qualities and origination of new qualities, leads to the destruction of existing entity (whole) and the origination of a new entity. Change involves either the destruction of the existing whole or the origination of a different whole. The conception of change as understood by the Sāmkhya-Yoga as the disappearance and appearance of qualities in an enduring substance is alien to the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika and Buddhism. But, unlike Buddhism which dispenses even with spatial change, the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika accepts change of place but rejects change of form. "Movement, according to Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika only means change of place and not change of form". Both the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika and Buddhism reject the notion of parināma (change) as understood by the Sāmkhya-Yoga and Jainism.

It is only the Sāmkhya-Yoga which offers the most intelligible theory of change. No other school accepts the phenomenon of change in its true sense. The Buddhist theory accommodates it only in a secondary sense. Nor has the conception of change any place in the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika. According to the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika, all cases of seeming change always imply the destruction of the previous substance and its replacement by a new one. The word 'change' thus stands banished from the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika system. So far as the Vedānta is concerned, it accepts only one immutable reality, namely,
Brahman; all change is only apparent and illusory. It is thus clear that among all the orthodox Indian philosophical schools, the conception of change belongs exclusively to the Śāmkhya-Yoga.\(^{84}\)

The Śāmkhya-Yoga is committed to the classical conception of change as explained by A.E. Taylor that "change by itself apart from a background of identity is impossible for the reason that where there is no underlying identity, there is nothing to change. All change must be change of ....... and in something".\(^{85}\)

3.3. EVALUATION

There are certain principal objections to the Śāmkhya that are directed against the possibility of the evolution of Prakṛti and the purpose which the evolution is said to serve. First of all, it is contended that the process of evolution could not have been started and even if started could not be maintained without the intervention and control of an intelligent agent (Puruṣa). The weakness of the Śāmkhya consists in the separation of Prakṛti and Puruṣa as absolute and independent entities. As a matter of fact, subject and object are two aspects of the same reality which holds them together and yet transcends them. If Prakṛti and Puruṣa are absolutely separate and independent entities, then they can never unite together, nor can there be
any third to unite them. And if they cannot unite, evolution cannot take place.

*Prakṛti* in the unevolved state is the equipoise of its constituents, the three guṇas. Evolution proceeds from a disturbance of the equilibrium of *Prakṛti*. But, what is it that causes the initial disturbance of equilibrium? *Puruṣa* cannot account for the disturbance, for He is Pure Spirit with no point of contact with *Prakṛti*. The Sāmkhya realises this difficulty and in order to avoid it says that there is no real contact between *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti* and there only the proximity of *Puruṣa*. The proximity of *Puruṣa* to *Prakṛti* (*Puruṣa-sannidhimaṭa*), is sufficient to disturb the equilibrium of the guṇas and cause evolution. But, here the Sāmkhya falls into another difficulty. *Puruṣa* being always proximate to *Prakṛti*, evolution should never stop. Evolution would then be beginningless and endless and the very conception of *Prakṛti* as the state of equilibrium of the three guṇas would be impossible. The Sāmkhya finds itself between these two horns of dilemma—either no contact and no evolution or else no equilibrium and hence, no *Prakṛti* and no evolution. It is the reflection of *Puruṣa* in *buddhi* which comes into contact with *Prakṛti* and not *Puruṣa* himself. But, if *buddhi* or *mahat* is regarded as the first evolute of *Prakṛti*, how can it arise before evolution to receive the reflection of *Puruṣa*? To avoid this difficulty it is said that
Puruṣa is reflected in Prakṛti itself. If so, then, liberation and dissolution would become impossible because Prakṛti being always there and it being the essential nature of Puruṣa to identify himself with his reflection in Prakṛti, he would never get liberated. Moreover, the reflection being always there, there would be no dissolution and so no equilibrium of the guṇas and hence no Prakṛti. Again, if the bare presence of Puruṣa suffices, then this presence obtains even in the so-called condition of release (Prakṛti not being destroyed with release) and the possibility of fresh bondage is ever present. If it be said that a semblance of contact is sufficient to disturb the equilibrium, then evolution itself becomes a semblance of evolution, an appearance (vivarta) only and no real transformation (parināma) of Prakṛti. The scheme of evolution propounded by the doctrine may appear attractive once its inception is made possible; but the inception of the process seems unintelligible on the Sāṁkhya hypothesis of two substances eternally diverse in nature, each having no point of active contact with the other.

It cannot be said that the process of evolution is intelligible in itself granting that it has started somehow. It is said to be guided by a purpose, that of the liberation of the Spirit. But we cannot ascribe 'purpose' to the non-intelligent Prakṛti. To say that it is guided by the goal of the Spirit is again meaningless, since the purpose of one being cannot guide another,
except in so far as the former controls and uses the latter or the latter unintelligently enters into and assimilates the purpose of the former. Neither possibility is granted, since Prakṛti is neither intelligent nor controlled by intelligence. There is also the more fundamental difficulty as to how Spirit, which is pure, unchanging, non-active, can have any purpose at all. The mutability of Prakṛti can, in the circumstances, account at best for some kind of changing world, not for an ordered Universe of the kind we perceive and reason about. We should, indeed, expect chaos and not cosmos. What order there is should be accidental and it is not reasonable to hope that such evolution will subserve any purpose, least of all the release of the Spirit.

Evolution according to the Sāṅkhya is teleological. But all teleology is conscious and intelligent. Unconscious teleology is a contradiction in terms. Teleology or purpose implies foresight. Purposive action stands for the execution of a pre-conceived purpose. If Prakṛti acts to realise the purpose of Puruṣa, it must be intelligent and conscious of its purpose. Or, it must be an instrument of the Absolute Spirit or God, who is conscious of the purpose of Puruṣa, and guides its activities to realise them, so that the intelligent and purposive acts of God move the seemingly unconscious purposive action of Prakṛti. Mechanical causation in the world is subservient
to spiritual causation of God. Natural causation is the vehicle of moral causation. The seemingly mechanical causation of Prakṛti is adopted to the moral deserts of the individual souls by God who is the inner controller of the realm of nature and the realm of Spirits. The Śāṁkhya dualism of Prakṛti and Puruṣa cannot account for the adoption of the activities of Prakṛti to the end of Puruṣa. Its logical consequence is theism.

The possibility of orderly evolution of the non-intelligent Prakṛti is sought to be established by the Śāṁkhya on the ground of various analogies. But none of them is satisfactory. The Śāṁkhya seeks to show that just as unconscious milk flows from the udders of a conscious cow, the unconscious Prakṛti evolves for the sake of conscious Puruṣa for its liberation. But the flow of milk in the cow for the nourishment of the calf, a process which goes on only so long as there is a need for it (in the calf), is hardly a sufficient analogy. It is not a suitable illustration to explain the inherent unconscious teleology of Prakṛti. Grass changes into milk only when it is eaten by a milch cow and not when it is eaten by a bull. Moreover, the cow’s instinctive love for her calf helps the flow of milk out of her udders. The calf consciously draws milk from its mother’s udders to satisfy its hunger. This argument would make Puruṣa active and Prakṛti intelligent. This analogy is a false one, since it is a matter of proof that
the cow is a non-intelligent being. Nor is it of much use to appeal to the transformation of grass into milk in the body of the cow, for the transformation does not take place in the body of a dead cow or where grass is eaten by a bull. This would seem to indicate the necessity for some entity other than the material conditions of transformation, an entity that starts, directs and controls the process.

The Sāṁkhya attempts to justify its unconscious teleology on the analogy of the magnet affecting the iron within its vicinity. But this analogy does not help, for the magnet acts, not wherever it may be, but only in the presence of iron, and the proximity is, more often than not, intentionally brought about by an intelligent agent.

The Sāṁkhya contends that just as a lame man guides a blind man, so also the intelligent Puruṣa in spite of being inactive, guides the unconscious Prakṛti. But the analogy of the lame man and the blind man is wholly inappropriate. The lame man is not inactive. He communicates his ideas through words to the blind man, and thus acts upon him and guides his movements. The blind man is not non-intelligent. He understands his orders and carries them out. It is seen that their joint activity, i.e., their mutual co-operation, can bring about an end which one of them cannot achieve
independent of the other. Each of these (the blind man and the lame one) has a definite purpose of his own (though the purpose may happen to be identical or the same), while none of them definitely controls the other. It is not clear in the Sāmkhya teaching whether Prakṛti has any purpose of her own. The initiation and direction of evolution by a purely non-intelligent material principle would thus seem to be unacceptable and without any legitimate analogue in practice.

Puruṣa by itself or Prakṛti by itself, is incapable of producing this world, a creation which is beneficial to both of them. The lame man cannot come out of the forest independently, nor can the blind man, himself perform this function. It is only when the two act together, that they can reach their goal. Pure consciousness is immutable and as such is incapable of producing anything by itself. Prakṛti is unconscious and as such is incapable of creating independently this meaningful world. The two must unite. Prakṛti must be vitalised by consciousness so as to be able to evolve this multi-coloured world.

Even if evolution could somehow start and maintain itself, it would serve no purpose. If it serves to release the Puruṣa, one wonders how the Puruṣa came to be bound at all. Puruṣa and Prakṛti would seem to have
nothing in common except in respect of being un-originated. How then is it possible for the one to identify itself with the other? If it is the Puruṣa's essential nature so as to identify itself, it can find no release except through its own destruction. If the identification is adventitious, the cause of the super-imposition should be sought, if either Prakṛti or the presence of Puruṣa to Prakṛti be the cause, then, since these conditions persist at all times, even in release, there can be no assurance of its finality. The statement that Puruṣa having seen Prakṛti and Prakṛti having been seen by Puruṣa, they happen to live together, if at all, without mutual intercourse like a blase couple, is of no use except as a charming literary fancy. The essential nature of Puruṣa is not such as to call for a necessary completion by the sight or enjoyment of Prakṛti and the enjoyment when it comes is, for aught we know, accidental. And there is no knowing when such accidents will recur; one may predict on the basis of knowledge, not of ignorance. Bondage is inexplicable. Assuming that it has come about somehow, release is still more inexplicable.

There is still an unsolved mystery in the process of Prakṛti, in its evolution and involution. It is said that as soon as a Puruṣa realises his separateness (kaivalya), Prakṛti withdraws from him and withdraws its own evolutes into itself. But if it is an unconscious entity, how can it manifest
its evolutes to some Puruṣas and not manifest them to others at one and the same time? Has it a mysterious power and a sense of discrimination? If it has them how can it be called unconscious? The Sāṁkhya, resorts to the simile of a dancing girl who withdraws from such men as are not interested in her blandishments. But how can Prakṛti which is unconscious and material and works in fixed ways, be as delicate, sensitive, and prudent as a self-conscious dancing girl? The only reasonable way in which we can understand this view of the Sāṁkhya is that Puruṣa himself withdraws from Prakṛti like a bored spectator from all that takes place. But, does he withdraw his reflection? He has not thrown himself into Prakṛti and the reflection is not he himself. Then, why should he bother about withdrawing his reflection? The sun is not worried about the vicissitudes of his reflections in water.

These are some of the difficulties which we witness in the Sāṁkhya theory of evolution (pariṇāma). The followers of the Sāṁkhya have taken pains to overcome them, but they continue to baffle and worry the thinking minds. The Yoga accepting God as an intelligent director of the process of evolution and involution overcomes the difficulties to a certain extent that the Sāṁkhya is beset with.
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