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CHAPTER TWO

Theory of Causation in Sāṁkhya and Yoga Philosophy

Sāṁkhya yoga schools are very allied systems of Indian philosophy with the same metaphysical background. Yoga is theistic while Sāṁkhya does not believe in the existence of God. The theory of causation of the two schools is basically the same. It is called Satkārya-Vāda or Parināma-Vāda. The origin of the Sāṁkhya system and the logical consistency of its teaching have, for a long time, been matters of controversy. But its importance in the history of Indian thought has never been questioned. Its characteristic ideas and the terminology in which it gives expression to them are met with in the religious and philosophical literature of India almost as commonly as those of the Upanisads. It undermines the foundations of super-natural religion by substituting evolution for creation. The world is not the act of a creator (God). Production is the interaction between the infinite number of spirits and the ever active Prakṛti or the potentiality of nature. Plato calls it. – “The receptacle and nurse of all generation.” Richard garbe who has made a special study of this school says; “In Kapila’s doctrine, for the first time in the history of the world, the complete independence and freedom of the human mind, its full confidence in its own powers, were exhibited.” It is “the most significant system of philosophy that Indian has produced.”

1 IP, (Vol.-II), PP. 248-249
The yoga adopts the Śāṅkhya metaphysics. It is called the theistic Śāṅkhya. The yoga recognizes the reality of Prakṛti and its evolutes, innumerable individual souls (Puruṣa) and God. Prakṛti is the material cause of the world and God is the efficient cause. The main exposition of the system of Śāṅkhya and Yoga has been based on the Śāṅkhya Kārikā, the Śāṅkhya-Sūtras, and the Yoga-Sūtras of Patanjali with their commentaries and sub-commentaries. The Śāṅkhya Kārikā is written by Isvarakṛṣṇa."

The Śāṅkhya system believes in the reality of twenty-five Principles. They are-Prakṛti, Mahat, Ahaṁkāra, Manas, ten external sense organs, five tanmātras, five gross elements, and souls. The yoga assumes the reality of these twenty-five principles and adds the principle of God to them. It recognizes the reality of twenty-six principles with slight modification. The system yoga lays emphasis upon the Practice of yoga as an indispensable means to discriminative knowledge. That is the special difference between the yoga and Śāṅkhya system.²

**The Śāṅkhya Theory of Causation:**

Every thoroughgoing system of Philosophy has to account for the occurrence of events and changes seen in the world. Every event must have a cause. There is an intimate relation between cause and effect. Theories of causation are a part of theory of creation whether creation is real or unreal has been discussed in Parināmavāda and Vivartavāda. Is world born out of

---

² OIP, P. 293
Brahman or Prakṛti. It is answered by Brahma Parināmavāda and Prakṛti Parināmavāda.

**Satkāryavāda:**

The Saṁkhya philosophy occupies a unique place in the Indian philosophical systems. Among the six orthodox systems of Indian philosophy, Saṁkhya system has particularly concentrated their interest upon the problem of creation. According to them that which does not exist cannot come into existence, and that which is existent cannot be absent. The effect is concealed in the cause before it is produced. Creation means the manifestation of that which is hidden. Destruction implies the concealment of that which manifests. Creation and destruction imply the rejection of one form or quality and acceptance of the other form or quality, only difference cause and effect is that in its quality.

According to Satkāryavāda, the effect exists in its cause prior to its production. The view of Saṁkhya yoga is called Prakṛti Parināma-vāda because this view holds that Prakṛti is the cause of this universe. According to the Satkārya-Vāda, the effect is concealed in the cause before it is produced. Creation means the manifestation of that which is hidden, and destruction implies the concealment of that which is manifested.

**Parināma-Vāda:**

The Saṁkhya theory of causation is called Parināma-vāda because the cause really changes into the effect. Clay turning into the pot is an example of
Parināma-vāda. But it is not accepted in the Advaita Vedānta because the transformation of cause as an effect is not real. This view is known as vivarta-vāda. This view holds that an effect is an unreal transformation of its cause. While the rope's appearance as a snake is an example of Vivarta-vāda. According to Sāṁkhya an effect is a real transformation (vikāra) of its cause. Sāṁkhya causation holds that the material cause to endure a real change in its shape, but it is concerned to its essence, actually it does not change, the essence continues to be the same through the whole cause effect relation. So an effect does not differ from the causal essentiality. A cloth is not different from its thread and pot is not different from the clay. So the Sāṁkhya philosophers emphasis upon the identity of cause and effect.

The Sāṁkhya philosophers believe in the theory of Parināma-vāda while Vedānta philosophers accept the theory of Vivartavāda. Rāmānuja, like the Sāṁkhya accepts Parināma Vāda. According to Rāmānuja, the universe is the result of Brahma, while According to the Sāṁkhya, the universe is the result of Prakṛti, Rāmānuja's view is called Brahma-Parināma Vāda and the Sāṁkhya view is called Prakṛti Parināma-Vāda.

**Arguments in Support of the Satkārvavāda**

Isvara Kṛṣna has stated five arguments to prove the theory of causality in the Sāṁkhya Kārikā. There is a verse in the Sāṁkhya Kārikā where the proofs for the existence of Prakṛti are stated –

---

3 Vedanta Sara, P. 8
Asadakāraṇad Upādāna-grahaṇat Sarva Sambhavabhavat,

Śaktasya Śākya Kāraṇat Kāraṇa bhāvacc sat kāryam.⁴

1. asatakaranat :

If the effect does not Pre-exist in its cause, then it becomes a mere non-entity like the hare’s horn or the sky-flower which can never create anything. Vacaspati Miśra, in his commentary on the Sāṅkhya-Kārikā, says that even a thousand artists can not turn blue into yellow.⁵ Every where, effect is existent before its production in a hidden state. After all what is non-existent is never seen to be produced.⁶

2. upādāna-grahaṇat :

The effect is only a manifestation of its material cause because it is invariably connected with it. Only a particular material is taken for a certain effect to the brought about. A pot cannot be produced out of clay, cloth can not be produced out of thread. It implies that there is a inherent relation between cause and effect. When both cause and effect exist then this relation can exist.⁷ The Sāṅkhya-Sūtra states that there is the law of Material cause.⁸

3. sarvasambhavabhavat :

Everything cannot be produced out of everything. It implies that the effect, before its manifestation, is implicit in its material cause. “causes,

⁴ SK, K. 9
⁵ asaccet kāraṇa-vyāpānet purvaṁ kāryaṁ nāsyā satvaṁ kartum keṇāpi śākyam, na hi nilam silpisahasraṁ pitaṁ kartum śākyate, STK under SK, K. 9
⁶ asataḥ karaṇe tu na nidadasaṁ kīṇcidasti : Ibid.
⁷ etadukttam bhavati - kāryena sambaddham kāraṇam kāryasya janakam, sambandhasca kāryasyaṁ sato na sambhavati. Ibid.
⁸ Upādānanītyanīt.
being always related to existent things, can have no connection with non-existent for one who wishes to have an unrelated effect produced there would be no restriction at all.” In fact, there is an invariable relation between cause and effect. If there is no any relation between cause and effect then every effect would arises from every cause. In our every day life, everything is not possible everywhere.

4. śaktasya Śākṣya Karanaṁ:

Only a capable object can produce that for which it is potent. A cause produces only that effect which it has the potentiality to produce, and no other. If this were not true, one would get oil from sand. For this reason, the effect is present in unmanifested or potential form in its cause before it is produced. Production is only an actualization of the potential.

5. karaṇaṁbhāvāt:

An effect cannot take place without a cause. There is identity between cause and effect. The effect is the essence of its material cause and as such identical with it. When the obstacle is removed from the path of manifestation, the effect naturally flows out of its cause. The cause and the effect are the implicit and the explicit stages of the same process. The effect pre-exists in its material cause. i.e, the cloth is contained in the thread or curd in the milk. The effect pre-exists in its material cause (Karaṇaṁbhāvāt).

According to Śāṁkhya, everything has a cause. The cause and its effect.

9 STK-9
always co-exist even before the latter becomes known or visible. Nothing happens by change. Change, according to Sānkhya, is a meaningless word and it is covered by our own ignorance and we cannot ascertain the cause of a thing. In the Kārikā III, it is mentioned that the whole universe is a continuous process of change of cause into their effects.

There is an essential identity between cause and effect:

1. The last argument of Satkārya Vāda proves that cause and effect are not different. They are same in nature. Vacaspati Miśra Up-holds some arguments to prove the identity of cause and effect. He says that a pot is not different from the clay because it is the attribute of the clay. One object may differ from another by its essence. One object cannot be the attribute of the other. For example, a cow is not the attribute of a horse. But cloth is an attribute of the threads.¹⁰

2. Clay and pot are not different object because clay is the material cause of pot. So, there is a relation between constituent and constituted. The objects different in essence do not have such relation e.g., in case of a pot and cloth there is no such relation, this relation may be between cloth and thread, they are same objects.

3. Pot and clay are not different entities because there is no ‘conjunction’ and ‘Separation’ between them ‘conjunction’ between two objects

¹⁰ iha yad yato bhidyate tat tasya dharmo na bhavati yathā gauravasya-dharmaśca patastāntūnām-tasmānārthaṁtaram. Ibid. STK Under SK, K9
different from each other e.g. in the case of a pool and badara tree and ‘separation’ e.g. in the case of Himalayas and Vindhya mountains, But in case of clay and pot there is neither ‘conjunction’ not ‘separation’, so they are not different.11

4. An object may be different from its essence but always it has a weight different from that of the later. For example, the lowering of the balance caused by a bracelet weighting, two palas is more than that caused by the bracelet weighting a single pala. But in case of pot and clay we do not find that type of difference. It proves that pot not different from clay. An effect is not different in essence from its material cause.12

Nyāya objections to the identity theory:

Vācaspati Miśra raises some objections given by Nyāya against the identity theory and from the Sāṁkhya standpoint he rejects it. According to Nyāya, if cause and effect are not different then, it will create self contradictory actions i.e. when cloth is torn and reduced to threads, yet it would be the same object ‘cloth’ according to the identity theory. The identity of cloth and threads would mean that the same thing is being destroyed and produced at the same time.

11 STK under SK, K. 9
12 STK under SK, K. 9
From the useful purpose of a thing, cause is different from the effect. For example, cloth (effect) serves the useful purpose of man but threads cannot fulfill that purpose. There is an idea that affirmation of cause and effect related to the two members of the relationship, viz., cause and effect, is different.

According to Vācaspati Miśra, these arguments cannot prove the difference between cause and effect. He refutes the argument with the example of a tortoise.\(^{13}\) i.e. the limbs of a tortoise appear or disappear, it is folding or unfolding, it does not mean that the limbs are produced or destroyed by the tortoise. Similarly the posts and crowns are not different from clay or gold. It is not produced or destroyed. Actually no ‘Production’ of what is non-existent, nor destruction of what is existent. Tortoise is not different by its expanding or contracting limbs. Similarly, pots and crowns are not different from clay and gold.

Another objection is answered by Vācaspati Miśra which is raised by the Naiyāyikas. For example a forest consisting of Tilaka trees. We can speak of ‘Tilaka trees in the forest, Similarly, we can speak of ‘cloth in the threads’\(^{14}\) There is an invariable relation between tree and forest and cloth and threads, actually these are not different.

---

\(^{13}\) yatha hi kūrmasyāṅgani kūrmasarīre nivāsanānāni tirobhavanti nissaranāt cābhīr bhavanti na the kūmaṣṭaḍaṅgānyut padyante pradāvāmsate va. Ibid.

\(^{14}\) evaṁ ca ‘iha tantusu pata’ iti vyapadesopī yathā ‘iha vane tilaka’ ityupapannah, Ibid.
From the standpoint of the useful purpose of a thing he says that through threads do not serve the purpose of covering or cold yet after combining the threads it takes a shape of a cloth and then they can serve the same purpose.\(^{15}\)

According to the Śāmkhya system, for the effect, according to a fundamental postulate of the system, must be essentially the same as the material cause. By a process of analysis, the essential characteristics of the physical universe are reduced to three-named Sattva, Rajas and Tamas and Prakṛti is conceived as constituted of them. The Guṇas are to be understood as the components of Prakṛti.\(^{16}\) They might be described as substances. The effect is identical with the cause in essence. Sāmkhya recognizes two kinds of causes, material cause and efficient cause. The material cause enters into the constitution of the effect and contains the potentiality of being reproduced in the form of the effect. The efficient cause exerts an extraneous influence on the effect, co-operates with the causal power inherent in the material cause and liberates it. All changes are due to the combination and separation of the Guṇas, which are always integrating and disintegrating. All effects are due to particular arrangements and collocations of the guṇas which are indestructible and eternal.\(^{17}\) Prakṛti is eternal. It is the ultimate reality behind changing phenomena which are of the nature of manifestation and non

---

15 STK., under SK, K. 9
16 sattvarajasam śānyāvastha prakṛtih. SS. 1/61
17 OIP, PP. 257-262
manifestation, evolution and envelopment of the Guṇas. Prakṛti is eternal, but its modifications are always changing. Prakṛti is eternal, though mutable.\footnote{SSV. Vi, 16; YBH, TV, IV, 13}

In the Sāṁkhya system, the first product of the evolution is called Mahat. It includes intellect ego, and mind. It is cosmic in its nature. It is also known as Buddhi or intellect. The senses, the mind and the ego function for Buddhi which functions directly for the Puruṣa. Its functions are said to be ascertainment and decision. It arises when sattva predominates. Its attributes are virtue (dharma) knowledge (jñāna) detachment (vairāgya) and power (aisvarya). If it is vitiated by Tamas, these attributes are replaced by their opposites. Memories and recollections are stored in buddhi.

There is a resemblance between Sāṁkhya theory of causation and the theory of creation in the Padma-Purāṇa. When the equilibrium state of the Guṇas are disturbed by the nearness of the Puruṣa then the creation process is started in the Sāṁkhya system. Similarly, according to the Padma Purāṇa at the time of creation because of the disturbances of the Guṇas the Lord assumed the form of Mahat which is of the three types-Sattvika, Rajasika and Tamasika. From Mahat Ahaṁkāra is born. This Ahaṁkāra resembles the principle of pradhāna and is enveloped by the seeds of three types, viz, vaikārika or sāttvika, Taijasa or Rājasika and Bhutādi or Tāmasika. From Ahaṁkāra arose five elements and ten cognitive and conative organs. Ākasa of the nature of sabda-tanmatra, i.e. subtle element of sound, was born from
Bhutadi or Tāmasika Ahaṁkāra. Bhūtadi then envelopes that Ākasa. Ākasa being thus productive created the subtle element of touch which is called vāyu. Vāyu is strong and has touch as its quality. Ākasa then covered vāyu as a result of which vāyu became effected and created the rudiment of form. In this way other two subtle elements were also produced. From Taijasa Ahaṁkāra the five sense organs and five motor organs are born. The ten presiding deities of the sense organs are born from the vaikārika Ahaṁkāra. Mind is the eleventh organ. The five elements of earth, water fire air and ether are called višeṣa or particular as they are endowed with the special characters of tranquility, violence, and stupidity. This description of the evolution of the rudimentary elements etc. is actually the same as that of the Visnu Purāṇa. The only difference is that here it is not mentioned how disturbance of the Guṇas is effected and what is the role of Puruṣa and Prakṛti in the process of Mahat etc.

Evolution is the play of these twenty four Principles which, together with the Puruṣa who is a mere spectator and outside the play of evolution, are the twenty five categories of Sāṁkhya. Out of these twenty five Principles, the Puruṣa is neither a cause nor an effect, Prakṛti is only the cause and not the effect. Mahat, Ahaṁkāra and the five subtle essences are both cause and effects. Only five sensory organs, five motor organs, and five gross elements
and manas are effects only.\textsuperscript{19} Prakṛti and its effects, constituted by the three gunas are said to be non discriminating (aviveki), object (visayah), common to many Puruṣas (śāmānyam), non intelligent (acetanam), and productive (prasavadharmi).\textsuperscript{20} Each evolute is finer than the one succeeding it and grosser than the one preceding it. The series from Prakṛti to the five gross elements numbers twenty-four, and Puruṣa is said to be the twenty-fifth Principle of the Sāṅkhya System. The twenty-three Principles derived from Prakṛti are effects, since they are different from Prakṛti and Puruṣa, are of limited magnitude, and possess the attributes of pradhāna, such as growth and assimilation, and serve as instruments of Puruṣa.\textsuperscript{21} All the things of the world are said to be the vikṛtis of Prakṛti. Prakṛti stands to vikṛtis in the relation of an original substance to its modifications.

(i) Puruṣa

(ii) Prakṛti- unmanifested) =manifested

3. Buddhi or intellect
(10) Manas

(4) Ahaṁkāra, or self-sense
(11-15) Five senses

(5-9) Five tanmātras of sound, touch, smell, form or colour
(16-20) Five organs of action

(21-25) Five gross elements of ether, air light, water and earth.\textsuperscript{22}

\textsuperscript{19} CSIP, PP. 161-162
\textsuperscript{20} S.K. II
\textsuperscript{21} SPS, i. 120-124. S.K., 15
\textsuperscript{22} na ca guṇā pradhānabhāvo vaisanyam viṁśat... iti mahadādibhavana pravṛttir dviniyā, STK, P. 305
Mahat, ahaṁkara and the five tanmātras are the effects of some and causes of others. The five gross elements and the eleven organs are only effects and not causes of others. While Prakṛti is only cause, the eleven products are simply effects. Seven of the products are both causes and effects. While the Puruṣa is neither cause nor effects.\textsuperscript{23}

These products of the evolution, which are capable of originating other products like themselves are said to be non-specialised (avisesa), while those which can not originate other existence like themselves are said to be completely specialized (visesa). Ahaṁkār gives rise to tanmātras, it is easily trace the presence of ahaṁkāra in the five elements. What is derived from ahaṁkāra seems to be different existence altogether and this transformation is a case of tanmātras Parināma. The senses and the gross elements can not give rise to an altogether different kind of existence. While ahaṁkāra is non-specialised (avisesa), the senses etc. are highly specialized (visesa).\textsuperscript{24}

The different principles of the Śaṅkhya system can not be logically deduced from Prakṛti, and they seem to be set down as its products. There is no deductive development of the products from the one prakṛti. Vijñānabhikṣu is aware of this defect and so asks us to accept the Śaṅkhya account of evolution on the authority of the scriptures.\textsuperscript{25}

\textsuperscript{23} SK, 3 
\textsuperscript{24} YB 11, 19 
\textsuperscript{25} IP, (Vol.-II), P. 274
Causation in Yoga System:

The yoga system advocates the theory of Satkāryavāda or Parināmavāda. There is neither production of a non-existent thing or destruction of an existent thing. A non-existent thing can not be produced; but what was existent in an unmanifest condition appears in a manifest condition. Production is manifestation, and destruction is envelopment. A present cause contains its effect in a latent condition. Milk is turned into curd which it contained in a potential condition. All effects are particular collocations of the Guṇas. Sattva, Rajas and Tamas.

The material cause possesses the power to produce a particular effect. Power exists in the causal substance to produce a specific effect. It is a quality that is inferred from the production of a particular effect. Clay can produce a jar, threads can produce a cloth. These causal powers are not perceived, but inferred from the production of different effects. They are of the nature of qualities, so they are not different from the causal substances in which they reside. They are latent conditions of their effects prior to their production. The potent cause can not be deprived of its causal power, since they are identical with each other.26

The causality in yoga system is very similar to Saṃkhya causation. Yoga accepts five aspects of causality viz.

1. The doctrine of Dharma and Dharmin (Substance)

26 YBH, II – 19, TV, III, 15
2. The doctrine of Parināma (Change).
3. The doctrine of Karma Niyama (Succession).
4. The limitations of effect (Upabandha).
5. The doctrine of Nimitta Kāraṇa. (efficient cause).

The doctrine of Dharma and Dharmin:

In the yoga causation, the substance is the background of all modifications and it remains un-changed, and it is called 'dharmin' and the changing modifications are called 'dharmas'. There is a relation between Dharmin and Dharma. Dharmin is the background of all dharmas. It is the basis of both general and particular and it is invariably connected with them.

According to yoga causation, Prakṛti is the basis of all modifications. It is constituted of three guṇas. Sattva, Rajas and Tamas. These guṇas are always functioning; they never rest for a single moment without giving rise to one or the other kind of modification.27 It is the real nature of guṇas which to persuade the tendency of transformation in guṇas.28 But all these modifications are nothing but the different collocations of the guṇas and materially do not differ from them.29 According to yoga, the relation between cause and effect is the relation of Dharmas and dharmin. The Dharmin is the background of all the dharmas it may be manifest or unmanifest form, it is the substratum of both general or particulars, so it is inerably connected with

---

27 YB, II, 13
28 Ibid
29 YB, IV 13
them.\textsuperscript{30} It is a real principle manifesting itself through the dharmas and the dharma is only an aspect of dharmin.\textsuperscript{31} According to the Bhāṣya dharma means - yogyatavacchina dharminah Saktir-eva dharmah.\textsuperscript{32} The material objects possess the power (Sakti) and this is the capacity of creating something.

The doctrine of parināma:

According to the Saṅkhya and yoga philosophy, the guṇas of the prakṛti are changing. When the guṇas are changing among themselves, it is called homogeneous change i.e. Sattva turns into Sattva, Rajas into Rajas, Tamas into Tamas. When they intermix and give rise to new effects, this type of change is called heterogeneous change. According to the yoga bhaṣya change (Parināma) means disappearance of the antecedent and appearance of another aspect (consequent) of a substance. But this substance itself remains constant.\textsuperscript{33}

Change means disappearance of the previous aspect and appearance of another aspect of substance, when the substance remains constant. Change means a change of qualities not the substance. According to Patanjali there are three types of changes –

1. Dharma - Parināma
2. Laksana - Parināma
3. Avasthā - Parināma

\textsuperscript{30} YB, III, 14
\textsuperscript{31} YB, III 13
\textsuperscript{32} YB, II, 14
\textsuperscript{33} YB, III, 13
The dharma-parināma or the change of aspect is the change that an element undergoes through its various manifestations. It is the change of aspects while the original substance remains constant. For example, clay turns into different shapes but itself remains the same. This change of appearance may be viewed from another aspect by virtue which is present or past and old or new, these are called the lakṣana parināma and Avastha Parināma. At every moment every object of the world is undergoing change. Change as past, present and future, as new, old or unborn. Any change is in a potential state, it is known as future, when manifested present, when it becomes sub-latent it is said to be past. Thus it is that the potential manifests and sub-latent changes of a thing are called future, present and past. According to Bhāṣya, actually there is only one change, these are differently explained under different situations. Vācaspatimiśra states that, all these aspects (dharma) marks (Lakṣana) and states (Avasthā) generally be called dhammas. So the same substance are going to modification into these three stages i.e. Dharma – Parināma Lakṣana Parināma, and Avathā Parināma.

The doctrine of karma Niyama (Succession):

Succession is followed by the change of state. The idea of succession is based on incessant flow of moment and it recognized at a particular point in the series because at every moment a unit of change has entered into its final

---

34 YB, III. 13
35 TV on YB III, 13
limit. The new cloth gets older and older at every moment but its oldness is known at the point when the change does not remain unfelt. There are different types of successions for different types of changes. Diversity in change is due to the diversity in succession.\footnote{YS.III, 15}

The karma is a relative sequence between one aspect that is present and the other which is immediately contiguous to it.\footnote{YS, HI, 15}

**The limitations of effect (upabandha):**

The causal efficiency is regulated by the law of place, time, form and merit and demerit. Saffron grows in Kashmir, but not in Panchal, this is known as desapabandha. Its seeds germinate in a particular environment. Different crops grow in different seasons. This is known as Kalaupabandha or limitation of time. Dear can not give birth to a human being. This is the limitation of form, (ākarapabandha) curd can come out of milk, this is the limitation of causes, (nimittapabandha). A person endowed with demerit does not enjoy happiness, a person endowed with merit does not feel unhappiness. These are the limitations of merit and demerit. But all these limitations can be removed by the will of God.

**Doctrine of Nimitta Karana (Efficient cause):**

The causal energy of an effect is liberated by an efficient cause. It can not generate a non-existent effect, but it can only manifest a pre-existent

\footnotesize{\begin{itemize}
\item \footnote{YS, III, 15}
\item \footnote{YS, III, 15}
\end{itemize}}
latent effect in the material cause. Mustard is the material of oil, which exists in a latent condition in it, liberated by pressing which is its efficient cause.\textsuperscript{38}

Potential energy is stored up in a collocation of the guṇas, the sum of material causes, which is liberated by the action of the efficient cause, which removes the barriers, liberates the causal energy and produces the effect, which is fresh collocation of the guṇas. The efficient cause can only make the latent effect actual, but it can not produce a non-existent effect.\textsuperscript{39}

God is the Nimitta Kāraṇa of the world because He disturbs the equilibrium of Sattva, Rajas and Tamas, the three constituents of Prakṛti, and removes all the barriers to the production of particular effects out of them.\textsuperscript{40} Merit and demerits are the effect of the Guṇas. They are modifications of the mind which is an evolute of the Guṇas. Effect cannot move their causes to action.\textsuperscript{41}

So merits and demerits can not move the Guṇas to action and make them produce the manifold effects. But when they come into existence once by God’s breaking the barriers of Prakṛti, they themselves work as efficient causes; they also break the barriers, remove the counteracting forces and liberate the causal energy. When the counter acting forces are removed, the material causes themselves are modified into particular effects. The counter

\textsuperscript{38} SPB, I, 129
\textsuperscript{39} YBH, IV, 12
\textsuperscript{40} AHBP, (Vol. II) P. 115
\textsuperscript{41} YB, IV, 3
action of barriers consists in merit over powering demerit and demerit over
powering merit.\textsuperscript{42}

God not only disturbs the equilibrium of the Guṇas of Prakṛti, He also
removes obstacles to the evolution of Prakṛti to adjust it to the merit and
demerits of the individuals. Both God and merits and demerits, therefore,
liberate the causal power in the material cause.\textsuperscript{43}

Physical agents also work as Nimitta Kāraṇas and counteract the
manifestation of other effects. Thus mustard is the material cause of oil which
is liberated by pressing. The barriers are the opposing forces which cheek
Prakṛti to function in the particular direction. The function of Nimitta Kāraṇa
is, therefore, twofold; negatively it counteracts the opposing forces and
positively it liberates the energy in the direction of producing a particular
effect.

\textbf{Comparison with Nyāya – vaiśeṣika and Buddha :}

According to yoga a substance is identical with its generic and specific
qualities. It does not passes them. Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika also holds that qualities
do not inhere in itself. The fundamental difference is that satkāryavādins
support the identity between dharma and dharmin but asatkāryavādins
concludes that both are absolutely different.

\textsuperscript{42} AHIP, (Vol.-II), P. 115
\textsuperscript{43} AHIP, (Vol.-II), P. 15
Buddhists hold that there are only impermanent dharmas without any permanent dharmin (substance). Dharmas come into being and pass away without leaving any residue. The so-called substance does not exist as such, it is merely a mental construction of the aggregate of passing dharmas; there is nothing permanent in their background.

Vyāsa does not regard God as efficient cause of the evolution of Prakṛti, but vācaspati states that God is the efficient cause of the evolution of Prakṛti into various effects, whose function consists in the removal of barriers for the fruition of merits and demerits, which are the effects of Prakṛti.44 Effect cannot move their cause to action. Therefore merits can move Prakṛti to transform itself into various effects. They can not be the efficient cause of its evolution. They can merely remove obstacles in the shape of opposite demerits. Demerits also can merely remove obstacles the shape of opposite merits.45 The God of yoga is not the creator, preserver, or destroyer of this world. He does not reward or Punish the souls. He cannot grant liberation. He can only remove the obstacles in the upward progress of devotees, directly. He has nothing to do with the bondage and the liberation of the Puruṣas. Ignorance binds and discrimination between Prakṛti and Puruṣa liberates. The end of the human life is not the union with God, but only separation of Puruṣa from Prakṛti, such conception of God is certainly unsatisfactory.46

44 YS, I, 23
45 OIP, P. 297
46 ACSIP, P. 174
The *Chândogya upaniṣad* denies the asatkāryavāda and establishes satkāryavāda (Sadeva somyedamagra asi-deka-mevadviti yam) effect pre-exists in its material cause, for example, milk turns into curd. There is a real transformation (Parināma) between cause and effect. Fire water and earth appeared from the three gunas and these are the essential elements of all natural objects.\(^{47}\)

The *Svētasvatara upaniṣad* contains a more developed account of the Śāṅkhya Principles of the cosmos, the three gunas, though the Śāṅkhya elements are subordinated to its main doctrine of theism. It identifies Pradhāna and Māyā as well as Brahman and Puruṣa. The Maitrayani Upaniṣad, which seems to be a Post-Buddhist one, is familiar with a developed Śāṅkhya and refers to tanmātras, the three guṇas, and the distinction of spirit and nature.\(^{48}\) The Śāṅkhya accept two ultimate principles, Puruṣa (spirit) and Pradhāna or Prakṛti, Prakṛti is accepted by them as the ultimate cause of the material world.

The Śāṅkhya try to get over the difficulty by saying that even as water flows in rivers spontaneously or milk from the udder to the calf, so also the inner Pradhāna may become active of its own accord and undergo modification into intellect, Ahamkāra etc. without the agency of any intelligence.

\(^{47}\) TK, PP. 5-6  
\(^{48}\) IP, (Vol-I), P. 250
The Śāmkhya holds that though the Puruṣa is itself inactive yet it can
direct the Pradhāna. The sūtra refutes it. According to the Śāmkhya, the
Pradhāna is independent, and so it is not in keeping with this to say that it
depends on the neanness of the Puruṣa for its activity, even as the iron filings
depend on the magnet for their motion. Moreover, the Puruṣa being always
near the Pradhāna, there would be permanency of creation. Again the case of
the lame and the blind is not an apt example, for the lame man can give
directions to the blind one and direct him. But since the Puruṣa is altogether
in-different according to the Śāmkhya, it can not do that with respect to the
Pradhāna.49

The three guṇas, Sattva, Rajas and Tamas, are independent of each
other and are in a state of equilibrium before creation. Creation begins when
this equilibrium is upset and one Guṇa becomes more predominant than the
other two. Equilibrium cannot be upset without any internal force, nor can the
Guṇas, which are absolutely independent in the state of pradhāna, take of
themselves a subsidiary position to another guṇa without losing their
independence. Hence creation would be impossible.50

The process of creation of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa is also similar to the
Śāmkhya system. But even this is somewhat different from the classical
account which we find in the Śāmkhya Kārikā. According to the Śāmkhya

49 BS, PP. 180-181
50 BS, P. 181
system. Puruṣa’s Proximity disturbs the equilibrium of the three guṇas and evolution take place. But in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa it is said that when Lord was desirous of becoming many He disturbed the equilibrium of the three guṇas through Kāla. Thus, Kāla or time is the disturber of the guṇas and not Puruṣa.

In the Gītā, Saṁkhya and yoga are sometimes distinguished from each other as two different paths, and sometimes they are identified. But though the Gītā is generally based on the doctrines of the guṇas, prakṛti and its derivatives, yet the word Saṁkhya is used in the sense of the path of knowledge or of philosophic wisdom. The Mahābhārata also refers to Saṁkhya and yoga in several places. But in almost all places Saṁkhya means either the traditional school of Kapila Saṁkhya or some other school of Saṁkhya, more or less similar to it; yoga also most often refers either to the yoga of Patanjali or some earlier forms of it.

According to some commentators the Saṁkhya is wrong in supposing that the effect (e.g. the Jug) was pre-exist in its cause (e.g., earth), for had it been so the causal operation would have been fruitless. The Saṁkhya may, however, say that the causal operation serves to manifest what was potentially existing in the cause the function of causal operation is thus manifestation and not production. This, however, is wrong, for manifestation (Vyānaga) and production (Kārya) are two different words having two different concepts. Manifestation can occur only in the operation of a
manifesting agent with the help of its accessories in making an object manifested with regard to a particular sense-organ in a particular place where the manifesting agent exists. It would be proved that the pre-existent effect is manifested and not produced; only then would it have been worth while to enquire into the conditions of the causal operation to see whether it satisfied the necessary conditions of a manifesting agent, but the Sāṁkhya can hardly succeed in showing that it is so.

If the effect in nothing more than the potential power in the cause, it is much better to say that the cause has such power by which it can produce the effect under certain conditions. Consider the destructive agents it is noticed that, are the destructible effects already present in the destructible agent? It can not be so, for they are entirely opposed to each other. If it were not so, it could not destroy it. Again if it were not so and yet if it would be destroyed by the destructive agent, then everything could be destroyed by everything. It for the manifestation of a manifestation causal operation is necessary, then that will lead to a vicious infinite. Moreover, if manifestation is itself regarded as an effect, then since it did not exist before, its coming into being would involve the sacrifice of sat-kārya-vāda.51

In commenting on the Brahma-Sūtra, II, 1, 1, 2, 3, Bhiksu says that Manu speaks of the original cause as being the Prakṛti, and so also does the Sāṁkhya, and both of them are regarded as authoritative. But since the

51 AHIP, (Vol.-II), PP. 265-267
Saṅkhya doctrine of Atheism is contradicted by the opinions of patanjali and parasara, the view of the Brahma-Sūtras can not be interpreted merely on the theistic suggestion of Saṅkhya. It has also be admitted that the atheistic portion of Saṅkhya has no authoritative support either in the Vedas or in the purāṇas and has therefore to be regarded as invalid.52

There are various contradictions in the Saṅkhya philosophy, as for example, sometimes the senses are said to be eleven and again they are said to be seven, again the tanmātras are said to be produced from Mahat in one place and in another place from Ahaṁkāra (Ego) and so on. Its differences with Śruti and Smriti are well known. Hence the doctrine of the pradhāna of the Saṅkhya can not be accepted.

According to the Saṅkhya system there are in all three categories of objects (Padartha), namely, Vyakta (Manifest), the Avyakta (Unmanifest) and the Puruṣa (the soul). The puruṣa is, however, included in the Avyakta. Hence, there are only two categories in the Saṅkhya system, namely the vyakta and the Avyakta. The vyakta comprises the universe everything contained in it, whether it is perceived or only inferred. The Avyakta in the Saṅkhya philosophy indicates the ultimate cause which itself has no cause, the cause causans. Saṅkhya’s Avyakta corresponds to Brahman of the Vedānta.

52 AHIP, (Vol. I), P. 479
Any effect always remains latent in its cause and in proper time it is revealed by the activity of the cosmic power. This separation of the effect from the cause in which it was latent is called creation (Sarga) in the Śāṅkhya philosophy. The cosmic power with its three modes of action which brings about this separation is called the Prakṛti. The activity of the guṇas, that is their transformation, has no respite. Just as a clock when set in motion goes on by itself, so also once the guṇas commence to act, they continue to do so immediately according to fixed laws until the final object is reached. In the Śāṅkhya philosophy, twenty-three separate stages of such transformation have been described, so that the process of the transformation may be properly understood. These stages are Mahat-tattva and Ahamkāra tattva.\textsuperscript{53}

The purāṇas say that energy in the form of Tānmatras evolved from the egosense of the Viññāṇa. The idea was taken from the cosmology of Śāṅkhya philosophy. According to Śāṅkhya, thoughts and emotion of the sense-world, and gross energy (Tānmatras) of the physical world, are in substance one and the same thing, having emanated from the same source. They are, therefore, mutually convertible. Thought convert into energy and energy into thought. Just as light convert into electricity. The Tānmatra derives its name from the fact that it is the smallest fraction of the Premordial energy of Prakṛti. (the guṇas collectively)\textsuperscript{54}

\textsuperscript{53} RPR, PP. 577-578
\textsuperscript{54} Ibid, P. 579
According to Samkhya, the universe is a vast organization of the Avyaka Brahman, in which every action, every event in space time including our birth, death and rebirth, is a continuous natural process carried on by Prakṛti with her three guṇas and Brahman only devised the organization once for all and did nothing more. Samkhya has made a clear conception that although the Avyakta Puruṣa has thus completely concealed himself from our view, his presence can easily be felt in the inevitable law and order that prevail all over the universe.

Sri Aurobindo says that “The idea of the three essential Modes of Nature is a creation of the ancient Indian thinkers and its truth is not at once obvious because it was the result of long psychological experiment and profound internal experience. These Modes are termed in Indian books qualities (guṇas) and were given the names – Sattva, Rajas and Tamas ordinarily used for psychological self analysis, these distinctions are valid also in physical Nature. 55

According to yoga, the physical body supplies the gross vestment of spirit and material comforts often pass for spiritual blessings. Then there is the belt of the external sense-organs. As contrasted with the organic sensations mediated by the gross body, these bring reports of external objects and fascinate the soul by the beauties of diversified Nature. The reaction to sensory knowledge is effected by means of the organs of actions, and this

55 EOG, 1st Series, P. 181
brings in more knowledge of the external world and more material pleasures. Then there is a group of internal principles (antahkarana) – mind (manas), ego (ahaṃkāra), and intelligence (buddhi) – which forms the last and the most insidious chain of bondage forged round the soul. 56

Vātsyayana refers to an earlier form of yoga which held the doctrine of the creation of the world by the karma of the spirit, which is also responsible for the evils of love and hatred and the impulse for activity and the coming into being of the non-existent and the passing aways of the existent. This yoga insists on the importance of human activity, and is more closely related to the Karma Mīmāṃsā than to the Śaṅkhya, which adopts the satkāryavāda, the ultimateness of soul and the rise of conscious occurrences on account of connection with the body, the senses, mind and material qualities. 57

According to Samkara the Śaṅkhya philosophers have failed to understand the real meaning of Satkāryavāda. According to them, in spite of the presence of the effect in the material cause, it is the real modification or Parināma of it, yet it assumes a new form. According to Samkara this means that what was unreal has become real. So the doctrine of satkāryavāda is negated. This change of the form is not a real modification.

Though Śaṅkhya and Yoga schools are very close, yet there is a little difference between cause and effect, Yoga accept God as efficient cause but

---

56 TCHOI, (Vol.-3), PP. 54-55
57 IP, (Vol.-II), P. 340
Sāṃkhya does not. According to yoga, God removes the barriers to the transformation of Prakṛti into various effects but He does not move it to action. In Sāṃkhya, Prakṛti is the material cause, merits and demerits of the souls are its efficient cause. In the evolutionary process Rajas Predominates over Sattva and Tamas and so lives are full of sufferings. Pain is a specific mode of Rajas. Persons acquire virtue and vice by action. Virtue brings them happiness and vice brings them misery.

Vedānta philosophy also accept this view. According to Vedānta, Brahman is Nirguṇa (Static). The universe evolved out of a thought of His and all subsequent events in space – time are the work of His Māyā (Prakṛti).

Thus Upaniṣad actually says that though, according to sages who know, the whole creation is an act of Nature, Yet its ultimate cause is Brahman.

Again it is said that Prakṛti has a wonder power to do all things by her vibhūti yoga. Actually, the vibhūti yoga of Prakṛti means that no “action” can be done without application of anergy and the same time there is nothing in the world which an intelligent man can not do with properly organized energy. This statement requires no verification because by means of properly organized energy, even human scientists are now about to break

58 RPR, P. 586
59 Svet up – vi, I
60 Karika K.L. II
earthly bonds and conquer space with their rockets. There is every prospect of their being able to do more.

Sāṃkhya system holds that Prakṛti is both the material and efficient cause of the universe. It is active and ever-changing, but blind and unintelligent. How can such a blind principle evolve an orderly world and direct it towards any rational end? How again are we to explain the first disturbance in Prakṛti which is said to be originally in a state of equilibrium? On the other hand, the Sāṃkhya admits another ultimate Principle, Viz Puruṣa. The category of Puruṣa includes a plurality of selves, who are eternal. These selves are intelligent but inactive and unchanging. But how can the inactive and unchanging self at all come in contact with and influence Prakṛti? The Sāṃkhya holds that the nearness of Puruṣa is sufficient to move Prakṛti to act, although itself remains unmoved. In the Sāṃkhya system, there are so many questions and problems but these thinkers has tried to solved there problems by their reason and intelligent. From the speculative stand point there seem to be certain gaps in the Sāṃkhya philosophy, still we should not under estimate its value as a system of self-culture and its practical point of view, this system is as good as any other and enables the religious aspirant to realize the highest good of human life.

The aim of yoga is to explore the religion of genuine Super-physical experience and to reveal the reality of man and the world – “the real self, the
Atman as eternally pure, enlightened and free, as the only true, unchanging happiness.\textsuperscript{61}

According to the Śāṅkhya theory of causation, cause and effect both are two moments in a continuous process. Earlier is known as the cause and later is known as effect. To put it differently, the effect manifest cause and the cause is unmanifest in effect. The difference between them is one of degree and not of kind. Hence the distinction is only relative and not absolute. Every cause may be traced back to a previous one and every effect may become the cause of something yet to come. At this rate there would be no finality, no resting place. Even God can not be looked upon as the first cause because we are bound to ask for the cause of God. If God is caused by some other God, then who is the cause of that other God? This way lies infinite regress. If, to escape from this difficulty, we say that God is self-caused, cannot the same view be taken of the other effects? Cannot Mahat, Ahaṁkāra and other evolutes be also self-caused? In that case there would be no such thing as causal relation at all. Gaudapada refers to this point and says that “There is no example to show that, while the ultimate cause gives rise to other effects, it is itself uncaused; if, on the other hand, we suppose the so-called ultimate cause is also caused by something else, then there is infinite regress.” There is no parallel instance in our experience to render plausible the Śāṅkhya contention that the cause of the other evolutes may

\textsuperscript{61} TYAOP, P. 18
itself be uncaused. The causal chain admits of no exceptions. Nothing that is caught in this vortex can claim a privileged position for itself. The same rule applies to all cases. Just as Mahat and Ahaṁkāra are traced back to prakṛti, even so prakṛti must be traced to something higher. We cannot arbitrarily draw the line at Mahat and say that the causal nexus applies only up to that point and has no application beyond it, or we must be prepared to admit that just as Prakṛti exists in its own right, the other entities, Mahat, Ahaṁkāra and so forth, also exist in their own right and do not owe their existence to anything higher. The Saṁkhya view cannot have it both ways. This is the contradiction inherent in the Saṁkhya conception of causal relation. It seeks to show that the effect is non-different from the cause but it does not follow up this line of reasoning to its logical conclusion. Either Prakṛti has to be traced to something higher or it must cease to be looked upon as the cause of Mahat, Ahaṁkāra and so forth. In both cases there will be a surrender of the fundamental doctrine of the Saṁkhya.

The Saṁkhya holds that there is an invariable relation between cause and effect, i.e. Fire and smoke. Fire is the cause and smoke is the effect, but what is the exact relationship between them? If there is smoke in a place fire is bound to be present also in that place or in that neighbourhood. If there is no fire in a place it follows that there can be no smoke in that region. This is all that we can say for certain. We cannot go further and say that where there is no smoke there can be no fire or where there is fire, smoke also is bound to
be present. Fire can exist independently of smoke whereas smoke has no such independent existent. We can see red hot coals which are devoid of smoke, but do we come across smoke existing independently of fire? No, we do not. The truth of the matter is that the cause is superior to the effect. The latter has only a dependent existence while the former exists in its own right. That cause and effect are not exactly identical in all respects is the very assumption that gives meaning to the causal relationship. If they were identical there would be no movement from the one to the other and the phenomenon of change would remain unexplained. If they were completely different there would be no question of a transition from the one to the other. They are identical and yet they are different. The cause is the element of identity and the effect is the element of difference. The relationship between them is therefore one of identity in difference. But as the cause is superior in status it must be placed on a footing higher than that of the effect. Ontologically the cause is superior to the effect and hence the relationship is not exactly identity in difference but identity with the appearance of difference.

Śaṅkara refers to this superiority of cause in more than one context. He expresses the same idea in a slightly different way by saying that while the particular can come out of the general, the reverse can never happen. Pots,
Jugs and Saucers can be made of clay but clay can never be made of pots and jugs.\textsuperscript{62}

In his commentary on the Vedānta Sūtra II.I.14 Saṅkara has discussed the nature of the relationship between cause and effect at great length. He shows that the relation is such that the effect can be present only when the cause is present while the cause can be present even in the absence of the effect. In the absence of the cause the effect can not be present, whereas in the absence of the effect the cause may still be present. Since the effect has no existence independently of the cause it is said to be ananya or non-different from the cause. It is therefore just an appearance super imposed on the cause which is the reality.\textsuperscript{63}

They belong to different levels of reality and the whole trouble which the Saṅkhya has to face arises from treating them both as being equally real. They belong to different orders of reality. This is the upshot of Saṅkara’s elaborate discussion of the question in his commentary on Vedānta Sūtra II.I.14. Gaudapada also has explained the concept of cause in his Māndukya Kārikā and has come to the same conclusion. Nagārjuna, the author of Mula Madhyama Kārikā, has explained the concept in a very rigorous manner, strongly reminiscent of Bradley. But his criticism is simply destructive and does not show a way out of the difficulty.

\textsuperscript{62} atyantasarupye ca prakrtivikarbha eva praliyeta, SW, Vol. II, P. 294
\textsuperscript{63} ananyatvan adhisthānataḥ aropyasya niriksitam, SW, Vol. X. P - 82. St. 407