Antecedents

The ancient speculations of Samkhya philosophy is full of darkness. Every new system is the constituent of all the diverse ideas and learnings. No subject is absolutely new in the history of thought. Integration of many concepts constitute the Samkhya. No definite thinking is projected out of any particular person's brain. The Samkhya is not just the Aryan influence but is more than that the Upanisads contain a changed mode of thought and rendering of these thoughts by Kapila makes this more significant. It will be found that most of the ideas which are co-related and systematised in Samkhya find mention throughout the Upanisads. In the latter Upanisads these views however became more eminent. As the Upanisadic thinking is the background of the whole of Indian Philosophy a critical appraisal of the Upanisadica thought in relation with various philosophical thoughts and concepts may be most worth-while from the standpoint of integrating character of Indian Philosophy. It cannot be contended that the Aryans invaded such area which had no culture. Diggings at Harappa, Mohanjodaro and other sites, the findings of the archaeologists

Indicate that a very high culture or least of all its fragments did exist. The research findings at Mohenjodaro clearly indicates that the civilization after surviving for the long time was on the fall when the Āryans came. Every time a community conquers a high culture, one of the reason there is of that, it appreciates and desire to grasp that culture and benefit by it. The savages conquered the people physically and began to grasp the benefits of their artifacts unknowingly. They assimilated the Philosophy of being the reality of the culture without realizing that an admixture and stratification has begun to come up from this assimilation and missing of the invaders and the people of the settled civilization. Some symbols and items of religious art and practices which are found in India of today resemble the articles of the ancient and Āryans cities found during the course of archeological diggings. Several proofs of continuity viz. the tools the art of domesticating elephants and ox carts are cited by Zimmer. There are many bathing places which can be compared to those found in Mohenjodaro. Zimmer in this context further states, "Conspicuous among the Indus Valley religious symbols is the phallus—to this day the most common object of worships in the sanctuaries of Hinduism where it represents the generative male energy of the universe and is symbolic of the great God Shiva. Further more, the complement to the male symbol in
Mohanjodaro as well as in Modern India is our goddess with the lotus in her hair.¹ He also asserts that in the Aryan literature the mother goddess of the world is not mentioned as such but is linked to the Rigveda as a late and apocryphal hymn.² Zimmer finds that it is extremely interesting to observe that among the few remains surviving to us from the Indus civilization coming down thrown a corridor of some six thousand years as echoes of a religiosity antedating the arrival of the Vedic Aryans an antique religiosity, old as the pyramids of the Nile - the two aspects of the God are already revealed.

Figure 42 shows a little faience plaque from Mohanjodaro on which is engraved a horned deity, seated like a yogi with his heels pressed close together, naked, having three faces and with phallus erect. The personage wears many bracelets on his arms and a great fan shaped head-dress perhaps the latter is the piled up, matted hair. He is seated on a little throne or altar and is surrounded by two antelopes, an elephant, a tiger, a rhinoceros and a buffalo. (The glyphs along the upper margin can not be deciphered). The figure resembles nothing so much as Shiva Pashupati"The lord of beasts." Another figure, a torso from Harappa because of the position of the base of the extremities, resembles the "Posture of dance".

1. Heinrich Zimmer, Myths and Symbols in Indian Art and Civilization, p.95.
2. Ibid., p.96.
In fact, there is every reason to believe that this archaic torso represents a dancer, not very different in form from those of the much later Nataraja type." We can trace the efforts of the Āryanas dominating the enslaved peoples in the literature of India historically. By and by however the earlier Indian form re-emerge. Apparently this absorption of the intruding culture by the so-called civilization which had come to an end is not new and is still evidently a phenomena of the present day. The amalgamation of the culture generally produces a new and a great culture.

In the history of the Roman conquest of the Greek who in turn conquered them culturally is a more recent example of amalgamation. Sāmkhya, as "The first of the six schools of Indian Philosophy represents in the opinion of the writer, the beginning of the Golden Age of Indian Philosophy". This does not mean that nothing was produced before this. In the Upanisads the Sāmkhya rudiments of any other philosophy is represented as the intellectual battle-field where the assailant and the assailed produced their cultural heritage. Having engaged in the conflict the conquered and the conqueror are both different from the original fighters. It is amply showed in so far as the content of literature of India and change in style is concerned. Awakening of curiosity in man's mind was simply

2. Ram Chandra Bose, Hindu Philosophy, p.96.
revealed but it had no capacity to lead to any depth of philosophical speculations.

The Āryan mind was introduced with the most outstanding concept of cycle of re-birth in man which had no end. Immortality for him became an object to be escaped and not an object to the sought after. The concept of immortality had nearly the same meaning as that of the Homeric Greeks. The inhabitants of the Vedic period were quite an energetic and took pleasures in life and work. They did not believe in pessimism. Life was a thing of pleasure and they did their best to enjoy the life in its true spirit.

The preaching in the Rigveda is that the pious man should not die premature death but should live for his full life. After death the man was received in abodes called heavens or hells. The system of Kapila developed at a stage when Vedic sacrifices were in full swing, and it was a popular belief that sacrifices if performed in a laid down way a berth in heaven was assured. Heaven was the summum-bonum of life of the followers of Vedas. The Samkhya however shows that heaven cannot be taken as such. It also points out the short comings in the Vedic sacrifices. In the Samkhya-Kārika, the couplet proves the contention. Wilson concluded these views as "The Vedas are inefficient from their inhumanity in prescribing the shedding of blood. The rewards which they propose are also
but temporary, as the gods themselves are finite beings, perishing in each periodical revolution. The immortality spoken of in the Vedas is merely a long duration, or until a dissolution of the existent forms of things. The Vedas also cause, instead of curing, pain, as the blessings they promise to one man over another are sources of envy and misery to those who do not possess them.¹ There is no conclusive evidence that this Kapila is the propounder of the Samkhya system, yet some scattered evidence is there which finds Kapila associated with the Vedas. To substantiate this point the verse in Rigveda ² is quoted. They however had no concept of Karma and Samsāra and did not wish to be released from the wheel of Samsāra. The ideal desired was the opposite. There are prayers seeking immortality in the oldest vedas there by aboding heavens with the gods. Riches and immortality is pleased in the hymn to Varuna in Rigveda. The wishes for immortality fades amalgamation proceeds further. Since the heavens and hells were also in the wheel of Samsāra. Immortality was no longer desired but was rather taken to be avoided. It became a chain binding them to wheel of Samsāra. Approaching the emerging philosophic system of Kapila, it is found that some premises have been accepted.

1. Colebrooke, S.H.
2. Rigveda X. 27.16.
On reaching India, the Aryans found an advanced civilization. After enslaving these people the Aryans adapted themselves to the use of the artifices, of those people. Artisans and household servants were contacted and this resulted in the indigenous philosophy being turned into their own thinking. It was thus by stages that the Rigvedic religion became Brahmanism. It is clear that the Vedic sacrificial system gave rise to brahmanical speculation and was produced by the priestly class. Aranyaka age is found to be the period in which free thinking crept into gradually shake off ritualism. To make the Upanisads the source of all philosophy that came into being in the world of Hindu thought, it was necessary for paving the way for the Upanisads, revival of germs of philosophy speculation in the Vedas in a befitting manner. The process of cultural integration is still going on. The thinking philosophy of the Aryans begin from the Rigveda. We find the seed form of philosophical thoughts from the Vedas. For example the Purusha-Sukta clears one of the main categories of the Samkhya School. "The Purusa is this all, that which was and which shall be. He is Lord of immortality, which he grows beyond through (Sacrificial) food. Such is his greatness, and still greater, than that is Purusa. One-fourth of him is all beings. The three-fourths of him are

the immortals in Heaven. Three-fourth on high rose the Purusa. One-fourth of him arose again here (on the earth). Thence in all directions he spread abroad as that which eats and that which eats not." The plurality of Purusa in Samkhya philosophy has in all probability been taken from it. The mystery as this Sūkta is the knowledge and aim of the life of Samkhya system which is that life should be made successful through valid knowledge.

The glimpse nature of Prakrti of Samkhya philosophy, we all find; in Rigveda of Purusha-Sūkta and the way amalgamation of Prakrti and Purusa the universe comes into being. On the same lines its importance is mightier of all. Through Prakrti Jīva is bound by the wheel of Samsāra and through knowledge of tattvajña is freed from birth and death and attains the supreme happiness of immortality. In various hymns of Rigveda it has been established as such. We find the explanation of three gunas of Samkhya in the Vedas. It is pertinent to keep in mind that Samkhya owes its origin not to anyone but to a variety of traditions. For later Samkhya cosmological speculations of the Vedas, Brāhmaṇas and oldest upaniṣads are one of the most obvious sources. Since most of the ancient speculation

1. Purusha-Sūkta, 2-3-4.
seen to move towards monistic tendency in early Indian thought, the opinion of most of the interpreters of the ancient traditions in this regard is of course true. The fact that other emphasis are present is also however true. While going through the ancient Indravrtra myth, there exists an interesting dualism between chaos and order. All the creative powers are held within himself by Vrtra and creation took place after Vrtra was slain by Indra. The principle of causation is found in the Vedas in a scattered forms. The Chetna element has been confined in other hymns of Rigveda. It accepts such element in the human body which is immortal, continues to be eternal which can be named as Jiva-Atman. Presumably its directive comes in the hymns of the Rigveda viz. manas, Atman, Asu and Jiva etc. As we have discussed above it would be safe to assume that the Samkhya Philosophy exists in the Vedas in an exhaustive

1. दरे यम वैद्वत्तं मनं बनाम दर्षये ।
   \[\text{Rigveda, 10.58.}\]

2. गुप्ता कुशर सुगुत्समा कस्यितु ।
   \[\text{Ibid., 1.64.4.}\]

3. \text{उदाहरणों जाते कुरुति बागावत} ।
   \[\text{Ibid., 1.113.16.}\]

4. \text{जावात मृतस्य चरति स्वाभिमि} ।
   \[\text{Ibid., 1.64.30.}\]
manner. The passage of the Rigveda speaks of the two birds having abode in the same tree. Though one tastes the sweet pippla of fruit while the other simply watches it, without eating. While explaining it the various commentators explain it in different ways. The explanations contain such ideas that as explicating the Śamkhya thought. In this verse the two birds referred to resemble the buddhi and the Purusa of Śamkhya. The buddhi of Śamkhya is like the third which tastes the pippla fruit and the Purusa is like the second bird because though it witnesses and being indifferent is not overcome by the action of the buddhi; though the achievement of buddhi is ascribed to it through delusion. The account of Paingirahasya Brähmana which is referred to by Śankara in his Bhāsya further corroborates the interpretation of the two birds referring to the Buddhi and Purusa of Śamkhya. While discussing the individual and the supreme this verse is referred to by Śankara in his support. The other opinion is otherwise as individual and the supreme self has been explained differently in Paingirahasya Brähmans. In the opinion of this text, the expression ‘Tasyārasya Pipplam Swadwatti’ signifies the Sattva and Anasnannanyobhe caksiti stands for the Jña (the Purusa).

1. द्व शूपणां सुप्पल सत्त्वा समानं कृप्तं परिप्रेक्ष्यते ।
   तयोर्वचः पिप्पलं स्वादुव्यक्तमार्थं निवारकीयति ॥

Rigveda, 1.164.20.

2. S.B.B.S., 1.2.12.
Sattva and Jña are buddhi and the Purusa of the Samkhya literature. The statement of Sankara that Sattva and Kṣetrajña refer to antahkarana and the individual self respectively, because those are referred to as such in the text, "Sattva is that which dreams and that which is the individual self—the knowers in the Kṣetrajña." It is thus found that there existed an early authority like the Paingirahasya Brähmana which was keen to establish the idea of the buddhi and the individual soul in the verse of Rigveda.

SAMKHYA LITERATURE

The literature of Samkhya is very exhaustive amongst the six systems of Indian philosophy. The theory of Samkhya finds mention in all spheres viz. Vedas, Upanisads, Purānas, Ramayana, Mahābhārata and Caraka etc. The age of Samkhya literature can not be defined because there are different points of view expressed by various scholars because in the Medieval age the literature of Samkhya had been wiped out. In the introduction of 'Samkhya-pravacana-bhasya' Vijnānabikṣu says that many works have been consumed by time (kālārkabhaksītam), whatever was collected was in a miniature form. According to Krishna Candra Bhattacharyya, much of Samkhya Literature appears to

have been lost and there seems to be no continuity of tradition from ancient times up to the age of the commentators. In such systematic works of speculative meta-physics, there is so much that is clothed in a poetic or mystic garb on which commentators do not help us much but which are suggestive enough to tempt us to construct requires a constructive effort; but while in the case of some systems where we have a large volume of literature and a continuity of tradition, the construction is mainly of the nature of translation of ideas into modern concepts, here in Śāmkhya the construction at many places involves supplying of missing links from one's imagination. It is a risky work, but unless one does it, one cannot be said to understand Śāmkhya as a philosophy. It is a task that one is obliged to undertake. It is a fascinating task because Śāmkhya is a bold constructive philosophy. Infact the traces of Śāmkhya literature are found in the Aryan civilization in the Vedas but all the scholars do not accept it in unionism, The Śāmkhya philosophy in its true form is accepted by Keith, Chakravarti, Dasgupta, Radhakrishnan, Hiryana, Larson etc. With reference to Upanisads as in Svetāsvatār Upanisad. Kapila has been referred to. It has again been explicitly stated in the epic that the system of Śāmkhya was a constituent of a literature which has no ending. We can therefore infer that the existence

1. Svetā., V.2.
of the Śāmkhya-literature had the awakening of the Epics. Special attention has to be given to the couplet Śāmkhyē Kṛtānte Prakṛtane. Established conclusion as held by Kṛtānta clearly indicates that even before the Gītā was composed the Śāmkhya was systematised.

We can obtain satisfactory result in an abundant form in the thirteenth chapter of the Gītā which is dealt with reference to Prakṛti, Puruṣa, Kṣetra and Kṣetrajña. Maharishi Kapila was the founder of this system. There are many speculative stories about him, but it is authoritative that Kapila was a historical personality. We will not be wrong if we place his time before the century of Buddha. There are two creations by Kapila, one 'Śāmkhya-pravacana Sutra' and other is 'Tattva-Samāsa' but we do not have any authority with reference to these subjects which has close proximity. The chief base of systematic exposition of Śāmkhya in this chapter is found in the Śāmkhya-kārika of Isvarakṛṣṇa, Śāmkhya-sūtra and the Yoga sūtra of Patanjali and their commentaries and sub-commentaries.

The Śāmkhya-kārika as professed by Isvarakṛṣṇa is dated as back as 200 A.D. Isvarakṛṣṇa accepts himself to be the go between the tradition as professed by Asuri and Pancasikha.
There are seventy verses in the Śāmkhya-kārīka and because of this fact off and on, it is called 'Śāmkhya-saptati'.

According to Garbe the Śāmkhya-kārīka with its seventy-verses dates back to 300 A.D.

There are many commentaries which are full of knowledge in respect of Śāmkhya-kārīka but in all of them Mathara-vṛtti seems to be the oldest one. It can be asserted that Gaudapāda-bhāṣya is an ancient and authoritative work. Raja also wrote commentary. The period of Gaudapāda dates to round about seventh century. This is different in character from that of creator of Māṇḍukya-kārīka. This question has not been yet decided in its entirety to-date. Besides this other commentaries are the Chinese version of Paramartha, Jayamangala or Śāṅkara-charya, Candrika of Narayanatirtha and Yukti-dīpikā, Śāmkhya-pravacana sūtra which is taken to be the work of Kapila is divided in six chapters. It is accepted that the creation of this treatise took place in the fourteenth century. There was a great scholar named Vijnānabhikṣu who wrote a commentary. In the sixteenth century 'Śāmkhya-Pravacana bhāṣya' on Śāmkhya-Sūtra which is important of all. In the later part of 1521 A.D. Anirudhā wrote 'Śāmkhya-Sūtra-Vṛtti'. The first and foremost

creation of Vijnānabhikṣu was an Samkhya which is referred as 'Samkhya-sāra'. There are also other commentaries of Vijnānabhikṣu, viz. 'Yoga-varttika', 'Yoga-sāra-samgraha'. Besides these he wrote 'Vijnana-amrita' commentary on Brahmasutra. Vijnānabhikṣu has tried to narrow down the differences between the Samkhya and theistic Vedanta, because likewise he considers this type of Vedanta as the real Vedanta. In his opinion the Advaita-Vedanta is the modern mixture of the said Vedanta. But if the circumstances of the case are be considered, it is positive that our Sutras of the Samkhya philosophy are the constituents not only that of ancient but also are in the nature of most modern sutras. The preachings of Kapila, Asuri, Pancasikha and Varshaganya coupled with those of Isvarakrsna and even of Vijnanabhikṣu prove this point of view.

There is a work on Samkhya worth referring named as Tattva-samasa which like its name is very much obliged. Max-Muller has named this Samkhya as the oldest creation, but this fact is not generally accepted. In regard to Tattvasamasa, it

1. Max Muller, Six Systems of Indian Philosophy, p.242.
3. Ibid., p.147.
appears that there existed more Sutras then we have at present. When we consider the quotation from the Bhagavadajjuka this contention is proved to be some what correct. Manas which finds in the Bhagavadajjuka is not there in the text of Tattvasamasa. Manas which is an important category in the scheme of Padartha as recognised by the Samkhya and there should be no reason for its omission in the text. In the Bhagavadajjuka the word Atma is substituted the Sutra Purusa. There would be no exaggeration to conclude that the Tattvasamasa as it is at present is smaller than its original form, and at least one more Sutra must have been there. On this particular subject there is a popular commentary named as 'Samkhya-karika-Dipika'.

About Tattva-samasa at one place it is asserted that it was the appropriate text book of the Samkhya philosophy. Colebrooke was not able to lay hand on its copy through share accident. He writes that it is not certain that Tattva-samasa of Kapila to be extent like wise the sutra of Pancasikha. He further asserts that the preface of the Kapila-bhasya that Sutras or aphorisms which form the compendious tract is titled Tattva-samasa and it is linked to Kapila.

There are two other works on Samkhya i.e. 'Samkhya-tattva-Vivechana' of Semananda and 'Samkhya-tattvyatharya-dipan' of Bhavagnesha. These works are later works of Vijnanabhiksu.
The textbook of Yoga-philosophy is the Yoga-sūtra of Pāñjali. According to Jacobi, this dates back to the end of fifth century but if we accept this date then this traditional thinking that its creator was Pāñjali in second century B.C. is proved. There have been many explanatory books written on it which include that of Vyāsa five hundred A.D. and Rajabhoja one thousand A.D. The best commentary as the first has been written by Vacaspati and the other by Vijnānabhikṣu.

**FUNDAMENTALS OF SĀMKHYA**

After having discussed the antecedents and Sāmkhya literature it is now proposed to thrashout its main doctrines. All its elements are subtle. Its gross elements cannot be seen through our gross-sight. The tattvas which have been named as permanent in Nyāya, Vaiśeṣika and Mīmāṃsā and in which they cannot peep into them, those tattvas are gross in nature in the Sāmkhya Philosophy. The Sāmkhya philosophy can be taken to be the starting point while analysing human experience. It will not be correct to suggest that the fundamentals principles and categories were postulated dogmatically. It would rather be felt that it was only after analytical study of consciousness that they were discovered and accepted. In the Sāmkhya system the most important form is the epistemological aspect.

In the world of Sāmkhya there are twenty-five tattvas
and besides these twenty-five tattvas the foundation of Samkhya has no place. According to Samkhya Philosophy the true knowledge of tattvas are responsible for liberation from pains. Through the special knowledge of Vyakt, Avyakta and Jnā we achieve the supreme tattva. These three subtle elements are responsible for the day today working of the universe. Now we express ourselves on such via-media on the bases of which the dualism of Purusa and Prakṛti of Samkhya is the aim.

The classification of Samkhya's twenty-five elements are thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prakṛti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pradhāna, Avyakta Prakṛti.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vikṛtti</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Eleven senses and five Mahābhūtas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prakṛti Vikṛtti</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mahat, Ahamkāra &amp; five subtle elements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na Prakṛti Na Vikṛtti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Purusa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRAMĀNA

Isvarakṛṣṇa has rightly observed that the objects can

1. द्रुष्टवदानुल्लितं स हृदयिनिदिहितायतिसिंहयुक्तं।
   विषयरूपः केषवम् अवक्तव्यक्तविद्विज्ञानादृ।
   S.K. 2.
be apprehended through the source of cognition. We should therefore devote our attention to the epistemological conception of the system before we deal with the metaphysical side.

The number of pramanas differ from school to school. Perception, inference, analogy, reliable authority, non-perception or negative proof (anupalabdhi or abhavapratyaksa) and inference of circumstances or implication (arthapatti) are the six means accepted by Pūrvamimansa. The first four of the above are only accepted by Nyāya, while only three are accepted by Samkhya and Yoga. There are however still others who accept nine by adding three more to the six. Sambhava, sritya and cesta are generally the last three. The Samkhya philosophy accepts only three advocating that these three are enough to project the permaya.

The sources of knowledge are perception (paratyaśka), inference (anumana) and plausible authority (āptavacana). Perception is instrumental in determining varied objects by means of the senses. According to Samkhya-kārika 23 determination

1. दृष्ट्यपुनामानात्वत्वचं व, वैमायाणिसिद्धातः \।
   तिरित्वं पुनायाणिः , पुंममिस्तिः। पुणायाणिः \।
   S.K., 4.

2. प्रतितिष्यया ब्रम्हायो दृष्ट्य ।
   Ibid., 5.
is directly related to buddhi. Ahamkāra gives birth to five senses including the mind (manas) according to Sāmkhya-kārikā 26-27. The ahamkāra according to Kārikā 22 derives from Buddhi. It is therefore clear that perception is a process involving buddhi, ahamkāra, manas coupled with one or more of the senses which are in contact with the objects of the senses. It would perhaps be better that the significance of the above terms should be discussed in greater details before the first means of knowledge is discussed.

PERCEPTION

According to Varṣaganya is the functioning of the sense organs. This definition is rebutted by the Yukti-dīgikā because it does not cover only the mental intuitions but also the pre-science knowledge of the Yogins as simply by the functioning of the sense organs these entities cannot be perceived, Vacaspati however opines that perception is of two kinds i.e., indeterminate and determinate. The immediate cognition of an object pure and simple is indeterminate perception. Only a vague idea is presented by it as 'It is' and not like that is the same way as what belongs to the mind of an infant or a dumb. It does not undergo any representative process and is purely presentative in character; because the recollection of name class and such other properties of the object are involved in it. It is through law of similarity that past experience
is revived in the mind, plays an important role in determinate perception because the image brought about by the senses is discriminated by it. But on the contrary in indeterminate perception everything is linked with the sense organs and the mind does not at all interfere. Perception is defined by Vindhyavāsin refers only to indeterminate perception and not the determinate one. The sense organs according to him come into contact with their objects and take the form of the objects as they are after modification. This is what he means by perception which is free from imagination. A vague vision of the object to the mind is therefore presented.

The same view is also held by the Buddhists in whose opinion a non-erroneous cognition of the object free from imagination is 'Perception'.

**INFERERENCE**

The knowledge derived from the prior knowledge of the 'Characteristic mark' (Lingga) and that which is mark inheres (Līngī) is inference according to Sāṁkhya Karika. The smoke

1. श्रोतापूज्विचिकित्सकैति विज्ञानसंग्रहलक्षणाप्रज्ञानेव निर्स्वरः ।
   Sanmati-tarka-prakarana, p.533; and also referred to in the Nyāya-mañjari, p.100.

2. तत्किर्मृत्तिजीपूर्वकं, ।
   S.K., 5.
is the indication that fire exists and in this case smoke is the Linga and fire is the Lingi. Though there are three kinds of inference in accordance with the Karikā 5 yet their enumeration has not been given. The authors who have commented on these three inferences refer them as pūrvavat, sesvāt and sāmānyato drṣṭa, but while interpreting their significance they differ widely. Pūrvavat is interpreted with reference to prior perception i.e. rain, clouds are an indication of rain sesvāt is interpreted in terms of inference from a part to a whole. To illustrate this point we can say that one drop of water and about sāmānyatodrṣṭa is interpreted as inference by analogy. To illustrate this point as the moon and the stars change in location the motion is inferred. This is the view of the Gauda-pāda. The Chinese version interprets Pūrvavat as inference from the cause Sesvāt inference from the effect and sāmānyatodrṣṭa as inference by analogy.

In his commentary Vācaspatimisra has discussed the three in terms of a two-fold distinction i.e. Pūrvavat is Sāmānyatodrṣṭa is vita and is affirmative and sesvāt which is inclusive of avita as negative.

1. Parmartha's Chinese Version on Karikā, 5.
2. S.T.K. on Karikā - 5, compare also Y.D., pp.43-51.
The different interpretations as referred to above, only the version of Paramártha is the same as is found in the explanation of the three-fold inference of Vātsyāyana while commenting on the Nyāyásūtra is very well known. Syllogism forming the constitution of five members is admitted. The observation of the accompaniment attended with non-observation of the non-accompaniment is the result of generalisation. Vyāpti is not a separate principle because it is constant concomitance. It is not a thing in itself but is related to things. Inference include Arthāpatti and sambhava or subsumption.

VALID TESTIMONY

Āptavacana is the last sense knowledge in Samkhya darsana. Samkhya as a separate source of knowledge can be taken as a reliable authority. The Vedas and the Brāhmaṇas, Manu's religious codes and the things a person who is free from any defect utters, are all included in it and are valid revelations. The said source of knowledge has to recognise such entities as have their presence even beyond the reach of the inference.

3. सामाज्यजन्तु स्वास्थ्यजित्योग्यार्था प्रसिद्धिदीर्घानाशु ||
   तत्त्वादिपि चार्थिन्द्र परैशामार्पणामातु नित्यो ||
   S.K. 6.
At times it is contended that the Sruti is only self-evident validity. Perception and inference are not immune to error and also require subsumption. Workability is the text of reality. What we apprehend is the relation to our ahamkara or individual purpose. It is not possible that a disinterested knowledge of the world independent of us exists.

The Jiva is contained in itself in an isolated consciousness and therefore cannot come up to that stage so as to be able to grasp the knowledge of reality beyond it.

SATKARYAVADA

The theory of causation is known as Satkaryavada in the Samkhya Philosophy. The literal meaning of Satkarya is (existent effect) but it means more than this literal meaning in the classical Samkhya. Purusa referred to in Samkhya is always passive. It is never taken to be an agent. The three gunas constitute Prakrti. It is therefore pertinent that the different modes of the gunas are the cause and the effect. The doctrine of Samkhya explains causality as a distinct feature of this system. It is in Karika-nine the term Satkarya appears and to explain the Phenomena five reasons are given. The verse in question has elaborately been explained by various commentators.

The point is:

1. Samkhya-Pravacana-Sutra, 1.147,36,77,83,154,11.2,22, iii.15,80,iv.22.

2. असकरणापुपलानृपणातु सत्वस्मावात् ||
   सकतयस्तुसक्यकरणातु, कारणाभावाच सत्कार्यं ॥
   S.K. 9.
(1) The non-existent can never be an object having activity as the hare can never have a horn. Vacaspati while commenting in this connection asserts that 'blue can never be made yellow even by thousand artists'.

(2) For a specific effect to be brought about appropriate material is required. This goes to show that the cause and the effect are definitely related to each other. Such being the case it is only, when it is related the cause gives rise to the effect to be known existent, the cause would not be effected and the result would be that, there would be no reproduction.

(3) If it is held that the relation between the cause and its effect is not necessary, then anything can come out of any thing, but it is contrary to our common belief and experience.

(4) The above referred relations are not admitted by Mimamsakas. They advocate that by certain potency in the cause is responsible for a particular effect. But Samkhya differs here and asserts that even if it is accepted the potency in question will be able to produce that particular effect for which it is efficient, as otherwise water could be ground out from the sand. This is thus implicites that cause and effect are correlated

1. S.T.K., on Kārikā - 9.
and it will not be possible for the latter to come out from that unless it possess the required potency.

(5) The nature of effect and cause is the same. In its essence cloth does not differ from the threads. If the objects are different from one another the causal relation cannot subsist between them. All these assertions are an attempt to subsist the effect that the effect is not a new entity. It is always existent, it is hidden in its cause even before its production.

On the bases of all these authorities we come to the conclusion that potency of the cause exists before causation. This is the reason that in the opinion of Sāmkhya neither anything is born nor is destroyed. Keith accepts this assertion but suggests that these reasons can be reduced to three. There is no one opinion in the Indian Philosophies about Satkāryavāda. According to the principle of the Buddhists, the existent "Asat produces Sat" the existent is born out of non-existent." The theory of Uttara-Mīmāṃsā is "All is Sat". According to the theory of Nyāya's and Vaiśeshika's "Sat produces Asat". According to Sāmkhya Philosophy, "Sat produces Sat". In the Sāmkhya Kārika 9 the word 'grahanat' has been interpreted as 'Sambandhat'; by Vacaspati and Jayamangla, but it is taken in its literal sense of procuring by Gauda, Candrika and Mathara.
The Theory of Causation as professed by the *Sāmkhya* in this regard is to some extent similar with the view of Aristotle because he always believed in the maxim: 'Something can never come out of nothing' transition from the potential being to the actual being is in fact causation. Causation as a passage from implicit to the explicit is also depicted in the philosophy of the Hegel. Cause and effect are no doubt the potential and the actual form of the same matter and energy.

A non-entity cannot ever come into existence and an entity can not ever be annihilated has been expressed in explicit terms by the *Patanjali*. The problem of causality however has been tackled more scientifically by it. We can sum up its viewpoint that all manifestations have the primary *Prakṛti* as their base. The three gunas which constitute it are always functioning. They do not rest even a split of second causing any kind of modifications. The different collocations of the gunas are these modification of changes and do not differ them materially.

1. नास्त्यपूर्वः सम्प्रव: || न चाचिन्त चतौ विनाश हृति ||
   *Avatarna of Y.S. IV.11.*

2. कौन्तेयानात्यात्मापनार्थम्: शून्यं न तांतामपि गुणज्ञानविनिष्ठते,
   च-रू गुणज्ञान: ||
   *Ibid., iii.13.*

3. सर्वान्यं गुणानां सांवेदनशिष्यात्मात्मतः पर्याप्तिः गुणात्मानः ||
   *Ibid., iv.13.*
Efficient and material are the two kinds of causes distinguished by the Śāmkhya. The job of material cause is to enter into the effect and that of efficient cause is to exert from outside. The effect is imprisoned in the cause to liberate it from the causal state existence or something is necessary and of prime importance. If we need oil the seeds have to be grounded like-wise to get the grain the paddy has to be thrashed. This concomitant activity when not in existence, the effect has no meaning. The cause contains in itself potential effect but this potential property is not actualised all at once. To actualise the potential energy we require concomitant cause which is a hurdle in the way. Place (desa) time (kāla) and form and formulation of a thing (ākāra) according to Vyāsa are concomitant conditions. We cannot raise a plant from out of the stone. Any cause can produce any effect in accordance with the Śāmkhya philosophy because all things are modified forms of Prakṛti but this is possible only when the hurdles obstructing are removed in respect of that particular effect. This view has also been admitted by Vijnānabhikṣu because he asserts that if God's will prevail the particles in the stone are so arranged that the part forming a hurdle is removed, a plant can come up from a stone.

1. Y.B., IV.3.
We find two kinds of distinguishing effects. It is a case of simple manifestation when cream is taken out of the milk. It is a case of reproduction when jewel is made of gold. We call it a case of dharmaparināma, when a thing changes in quality, it is a case of laksanāparināma when the potential becomes factual and if there is a change, it is external in character. Avasthā-parināma is the change of state which is caused because of the fact that time has lapsed. Every moment and every where change is taking place.

Dualism is an exponent of Śāmkhya philosophy. In its view Prakṛti and Purusa are the different basic tattvas and with their relations between themselves, this universe comes into being. Prakṛti is of unconscious nature and one, but Purusa is active and are many. Like pārṣāṇa-vaśesika the existence of the world as independent entity is in consonance with the Śāmkhya Philosophy, but this can be asserted only if we keep aside the doctrine of plurality of Purusa. In the actuality of Śāmkhya where for the birth of this universe innumerable independent matter are required in conformity with the view of Nyāya-vaśeskhya. The Śāmkhya philosophy is the exponent of dualism because it believes in the Prakṛti Purusa dualism for the explanation of the universe. Both these basic matters

1. Y.B. iii. 13.
are Prakrti and Purusa. Therefore it can be inferred that the necessary and the all important work is to find the cause of the birth of this universe.

**GUNA**

Prakrti which is in itself a constituent of substance and they are three in number viz. Sattva, rajas and tamas. In the Sanskrit language by the word guna there are various meanings and due to this very reason this word has been translated differently. The word guna as referred to in the Sāmkhya philosophy 'force' in the closest one intended to be expressed by the Sāmkhya. In Vaiseshika philosophy forms, taste, smell etc., are called by the name of guna but according to Sāmkhya doctrine these three gunas are not gunas in this spirit, but are substances. According to Vijnanabhikṣu meaning of the guna is the rope or thread, therefore sattva etc. gunas are responsible for the bondage of the Purusa. Their processes like that of rajas and are called gunas, these are Prakrti in form and help the Purusa in attaining its selfish manner, and as is held by Vacaspatimisra, this view also terms them as guna. Their association and disassociation take place and they are characterized by buoyant, stimulating and moving etc. The reason that they are complete in themselves with regard to these characteristic, they are indeed substances. The three ultimate reals forming combination of all material and mental objects
are technically known as "Triguna". The Prakrti develops through its three constituent powers or gunas, which are necessarily to be assumed keeping in view the character of the Prakrti's effect. Prakrti can therefore be said to be a string constituting three strands. The properties of pleasure, suffering and getting bewildered are contained in buddhi which is an effect. The cause of buddhi is prakrti, should necessarily have the properties which can be answered. The gunas are infact inferred from their effects and they do not perceive. The gunas include two levels of meaning according to the Kārika, one is psychic i.e. Sattva defining pleasure, goodness etc. rajas referring to suffering, passion etc. and tamas for dullness and indifference. The second referring to circumstances responsible for the unmanifest and manifest universe is illumination, thought etc., has been linked to sattva activation energy, etc. Connected with rajas and heaviness etc. taken to be tamas. According to Kārika twelve there is interaction in these gunas, the different conditions of the manifest universe is dependent upon one or another of these factors which is dominating. Further they are related with the mūlaprakrti intimately and function for the sake of the Purusa (like a lamp).

1. कारणमस्त्यायकतम प्रवृत्ति विदुषात: अनुवयाच।
परिपापत: सत्त्ववश्चित्रितुपरास्तंत्रविशेषताम॥
S.K. 16.

2. सत्त्व लघु प्रत्यक्षमिण्तुपसुष्टपं कथं-चरणः।
पुनर्वर्णामेव ततः, प्रतीतवचा-वैलो वृद्धि॥
Ibid. 13.
The joint functions of the wick, oil and flame of a lamp which is instrumental in producing light, is interpreted by the Bhāṣya Sāṃkhya Tattva-Kaumudi, Yukti-dīpīka, jaya and Paramārtha's Chinese version; the production of light is the joint and co-operative effect of all the three even when each of them as a different structure. It is exactly the manipulation of wind, bile and phlegm in a proper manner so that the substance of the physical body is nourished.

The three gunas as responsible for pleasure pain and delusive cognitions have been accepted in uniguously and unanimously by the teachers of Sāṃkhya. We find that this is explained by the simile of lady, warrior and cloud by the commentators of early period. Though it is a pleasure afforded by a virtuous lady to her husband, yet this very action is the cause of pain to the co-wives. If a sensuous person fails to get her, he is deluded. From this it will be seen one and the same woman causes pleasure, suffering and bewilderment to different persons. If warrior and cloud are taken up we find that through his deeds a brave warrior is a source of pleasure to his master inflict injuries to the enemy and he who starts the treating quickly are deluded. Likewise the husband-man gets pleasure, the traveller is afflicted and the lady who is away from her

1. प्रीत्युपि - विषाणात्मका:  ----  1
S.K.12.
Jaya. & Y.D.
husband is deluded by the raining cloud. From all this it is abundantly clear that different persons having different bent of mind are effected by the same object in different ways. Likewise there three attributes are contained in all the manifested entities. The gunas are essentially the constituents of Prakṛti which is held ultimate cause of all unconscious entities. The properties of the fact exists even in the cause is a formal saying in the Śamkhya. Since the gunas possess the properties of lightness activity etc., they are not in the Vaisesika sense qualities. In the early Upanisads the gunas reflect psychic states which are responsible for the physical and mental evil but they are referred as types of reals by Vijnanabhiksu. In texture they are taken to be extremely fine and are always changing. They are changing into one another the continually even in the state of equilibrium. Since the gunas are the constituents of Prakṛti and its products, they are unconscious. They cannot discriminate between themselves and the Purusa because they have not the power to do so. Though Purusa alone is subject in the gunas are always objective.

PRAKṚTI

The Śamkhya philosophy is quite different from almost all

1. S.P.B. 1.61.

2. Sveta. & Maitra.
the orthodox system in so far as accepting reasoning as the main criterion of truth is concerned. It proceeds by asserting that some ultimate cause may be responsible for everything in the universe. What can be the ultimate cause for this nature for? For affirming ultimate cause nature, the gross world as it is observed by the self has been analysed by the Sāmkhya. The things in the world have been classified under two heads that is internal and external, in this analysis. The internal constituting the eleven organs and external constituting the five gross elements. These sixteen are recognised as effects. The eleven organs referred to (1) five organs of senses viz. ear, nose, eye, tongue and skin, (2) five organs of action viz. the speech, the hand, the foot, the excretion and that of generation (3) An internal organ which partakes nature of both. The Sāmkhya found only the five elements viz. ether, air, light, water and earth in the external universe. This analysis however is purely of metaphysical nature rather than that of physical nature or chemical. In the external world the scientists may witness a large number of elements but the external world is the constituent of the five organs of senses for a philosopher. The origin of the five gross elements as professed by Sāmkhya have to be the five qualities by which they

1. पूर्वप्रकृतिविद्वाच प्रकृतिविद्वाच सप्त।
चौद्वस्तु विकारः न प्रकृतिर्नित्वत्वः पुरुषः॥
S.K., 3.
are known. External universe is known as is represented by sense organs. Five subtle elements sound, touch, form, taste and smell are conceived by the Samkhya to be responsible for five gross elements. As a result these subtle elements have no existence as external. Despite all differences found by the Samkhya the eleven senses and the five subtle elements remain, though their proportion may be different with different things. The cause either organs or the subtle elements was determined as threefold ego. The cosmic intellect gave rise to this ego was the further thinking, but this cannot be designated as ultimate cause because its cause can also be conceived. The five subtle elements, ego and intellect, were designated as the causes and the effects by the Samkhya. In the causal sequence all these things are the gross and limited in nature and accordingly must have their origin connected with some ultimate cause. According to general principles of Satkāryavāda the ultimate cause should possess the three qualities which are found to be common to all effects.

The concept of Prakṛti, the ultimate cause as being a conglomeration of the three forces is arrived at by the Samkhya. It contains in a state of equilibrium with the essence of these three qualities. The kārikā's do not find mention

1. S.K., 3.
in these three forces in a state of equilibrium. All the commentators, however, have explained it so and this idea is found in the sutra. For the production of the effects this ultimate cause must be efficient to do so. In its three forces primordial matter has this efficiency. Again the distinction between cause and effect is seen which is in evidence of function. Prakṛti as a separate ultimate cause have also to be conceived for this reason. All the various manifestations in the universe have to merge in to the ultimate cause at last. Likewise it can be in the case of root matter. Advancing these arguments the Śāṅkhya refers the ultimate cause through different names that is avyakta, Prakṛti, Pradhāna, Aksara, Mahād, Brahma etc. This Prakṛti has been referred only as the cause and not as the effect of anything else. The Śāṅkhya does not accept Nīmittakaraṇa except that some agent is necessary to plan the world from the ultimate cause 'Prakṛti' on the contrary its thinking must naturally be by-product of the Prakṛti.

Many modern scholars by taking advantage of this similarity associate Śāṅkhya school to that of western materialism and take Śāṅkhya not root-matter or Prakṛti to be material. Colebrook in Alberuni's India identifies Prakṛti with matter. Radhakrishnan

1. सत्यरूपस्तम्भोऽस्मायावस्था, प्रकृति: ।

S.S. 1.61.
and some others have taken its meaning to be as nature. This seems to be erroneous appraisal of the Samkhya in the concept of Prakrti, like Vaishesika as Samkhya does not accept the ultimate cause of the universe to be related with the matter. There is nothing in the Samkhya series of evaluation as material except the five gross elements; Rather matter has been taken to be the manifestation of the intellect or the mind. According to the Samkhya doctrine Pradhāna has been taken to be the constituent of the three guṇas and can not be taken to be material as is professed by Western materialists. The opinion in this case is contradictory. While expressing the word prakṛti in English, it should be named Supraphysical substance because it is accepted that Prakṛti is far beyond the mind the intellect. Sense as is held by the Western materialist the conception of Prakṛti in the Samkhya is not material. It can be held to be material for its being non-spiritual. Prakṛti can be referred as matter. Though the Prakṛti is supra-physical but it is not consciousness pure and simple because it is the nature of Purusa and Prakṛti which is entirely different from him. To Purusa, Prakṛti plays the part of an organ and is responsible for this pleasure, pain and perplexion. The Samkhya while distinguishing Prakṛti from its effects prefer to its special qualities i.e. it is only a cause and not an effect, it is not perishable, it is all pervasive, it has no functions, it is the one not resorted to anything not inferative, impartile and self
dependent. Being the ultimate principle Prakrti has no other ultimate cause. If any cause is attributed to Prakrti would invite argument and infiniti. If we resort to pure reasoning no final cause can be conceived because Purusa remains unchanged and as such cannot be instrumental in producing anything. Taking in view this position, it infers the Prakrti is eternal and not perishable. Destruction as referred to in the Samkhya means merger into the cause. It is therefore no use to discuss root matter remaining in its own form for ever or its existence is through its effects. This point is raised by Shri Samkaracharya in his commentary. In any of the Samkhya treatises no satisfactory answer is forthcoming. A real change is accepted by the Samkhya school and that transformation of the cause is to the effect is attributed to it. Prakrti transforms itself into the effects when the equilibrium of the forces is disturbed but a part still remains. Finally we come to the conclusion that avyakta is completely transformed into the universe and its existence for all times to come in and through its effects. Since every thing originates from Prakrti cause and effect are entirely different from each other as has been held by the Samkhya. Prakrti is therefore all pervading and whole world takes shape from Prakrti.

1. तेतुमतित्वमत्वापि शक्यनमेकापर्ति विहुण्यः ।
साक्ष्यं परंत्वं व्यक्तं विपरीतमत्वात् ॥
S.K. 10.

2. 'स्तवण: दोषाचः' ॥
Brahma-Sutra, 2.1.29.
No special function like intellect etc. are performed by Prakṛti. Ascertaining is the special function of the intellect, pride is for ego, imagination is to the mind, but nothing can be referred to be special function of primeval matter and is therefore designated as having no functions. According to Akrīya, Prakṛti does everything and as such it is just the opposite opinion described above-Prakṛti does not differentiate from body to body and is one in character. There may be difference in so far as intellect, senses, mind etc. in concerned in different individuals. It is due to coming together of the three forces of Pradhāna, but all individuals Pradhāna is just the same. Accordingly it does not take the shape of gross body and is beyond everything Prakṛti having been considered the cause of every considered thing in, as such cannot be attributed to anything. Prakṛti can be inferred from intellect etc. The three forces sattva, rajas and tamas can in no case be taken to be the parts of Prakṛti as they are impertile, like Prakṛti, impertile objects can never form part of anything else. Since an effect depends on its cause and Prakṛti is the ultimate cause and not an effect of anything hence its being self-dependent is evident. Prakṛti has been attributed to three forces its being indiscriminate inanimate and productive according to the Samkhya distinguishing Prakṛti from Purusa. These attributes are found common in Prakṛti with its effects. Prakṛti is also

1. न्यायप्रणयनी विषयः सामान्यप्रणयनं प्रवर्त्तितम्।
   अब्रलं तत्र प्रधानं, तदक्षियतश्च पुन्नान्।

   S.K. II.
named as Triguna. It is the constituents of three gunas and are to be discussed in full elsewhere. The inanimate Prakrti through these forces make out the universe. The gunas are always restless and are not stagnant. The forces of harmony, passioning and obscuriting are Sattva, Rajas and tamas respectively. The state of equilibrium of these forces is associated with Prakrti and in this state the functions of these gunas are checked by one another and seemingly are steadily. On the disturbance of this equilibrium they start working on each other and start the process of transformation. In the causal sequence into the various principles Prakrti being triguna is aviveki, non-discriminate and its existence is not separate from these forces. There can be no discrimination between them. Further more the forces have to be separately observed. Prakrti is visaya the important object. The difference between the subject and the object strikes a philosophical mind at the very first instance. The object can never be the subject and Purusa being the subject, Prakrti is just opposite and different from it.

In Samkhya Prakrti moreover is common to all individuals. For creation it is inanimated aspects 'Sannidhi' of spiritual Purusa. The main function of creation is attributed to Prakrti alone, though the world is the result of the union of Prakrti and the Purusa. The very nature of Prakrti is productivity and it
needs no assistance to carve out the universe from itself. It has to be kept in mind that Purusa plays the role of an on-looker and does not act as an agent. This Prakrti is the master essentially of all qualities of the material physical and intellectual world. All such qualities are not there in the Purusa. Further more bondage and emancipation qualities which are taken to be associated with Purusa belong actually to Prakrti, seven physical forms that is righteousness and its contrast ignorance and its being devoid of passion and its contrast is divine power and its opposites are bound by it in itself. It helps in its liberation with one physical form named knowledge in so far as Purusa is concerned. The universe has thus been worked out by the Prakrti for enjoyment and liberating itself, enable it to serve the Purpose of Purusa. These qualities of enjoyment and liberation are at times referred to be associated with Purusa too. This can only be so when he is in union with Prakrti and in a secondarily form. Prakrti is the giver of several enjoyment to Purusa through buddhi

1. सृष्टिभिर्भूत व ब्याहात्मानपत्वना प्रकृतिः ।
   केवल पुनर्गतिः प्रति तिमीरख्येतेक है ||
   S.K. 63.

2. सर्व प्रत्युपायोऽयस्मात् पुनर्गति साध्यतः बुद्धिः ।
   केवल विशिष्टत्वं पुनः प्रधान पुनर्गतिः पूज्यम् ।
   Ibid. 37.
or mind and it is when it knows its real nature, it withdraws from the scene, as is the case of a dancing girl going back stage after her act is over. She never shows her face again to that particular Purusa.

Lastly it is through metaphysics and not from science that the Samkhya arrives at the conception. The real in fulhi has been defined as the unchanging subject and the Prakṛti and the changing object from the basis of the latter world coming into being.

**PURUSA**

Samkhya admits two independent entities, one is Prakṛti and the other is Purusa. These two tattvas have pivot position in the Samkhya school. Purusa has been described in Samkhya as pure consciousness in constitution. It is reflected as the soul of all living beings. Breathing of life into matter, account for by this principle. Intelligent for order of the manifestive entity and subjective aspect of reality are accounted for by it. It is pure, not reactive to cause, eternal, immutable,

1. शृङ्गस्य दृश्यमित्रा निन्द्ती न की यथा गृह्यसं।
पुरुषस्य तपात्तिष्ठतार्थ प्रकाशेऽविनियोजित्ते प्रकृति: ॥
S.K. 59.

2. प्रृथ्वि: सुकृतात् अभ्युतः शुचिस्युः सुचिरः ॥
Ibid., 61.
not active and has no part. It plays the part of a silent spectator of the doings of Prakṛti. It is expressed in a life full physical body. The nature of the physical body constituting its substratum is because of varying degree of expression. It is absent in the plants world. It is used in speculative contexts too and one which is of interest is that in Rigveda X.90. the meaning of the Purussa has been taken to be that of a cosmic man. In hymns of Atharva Veda X.2 and X.7 and few other speculative uses are there which are also of interest. The term has generally been used with reference to Ātman in the Upanisads. The Purussa of the Sāmkhya is not different to the one professed by Aristotle. Though in the beginning of the universe to give motion to the world a transcendent God is accepted by Aristotle, but he does not accept this fact that God has anything to say in the working of the universe. According to Aristotle, God is a power which is confined within Himself and as such he does not act for the world and also does not pay attention towards it. The motion of self comes up in quite a refined and unadulterated manner in the classical Sāmkhya. Puruss becomes a technical term as all of the older terms have been done with.

We come across in the phrase VyaktavyaktaViññānat in Karika No.2 as possible reference to the older Ksetrajña. By
Vyaktavyakta means Prakṛti or the older idea of Kṣetra and the Jna which refers to Purusa is in all probability the older Kṣetrajña. It would perhaps be better to bring together the main passages in the Kariki which refer to the term before the significance of Purusa in the classical Sāṃkhya is tried to be interpreted. Vedānta accepts the atman to be enjoyable but Sāṃkhya does not accept this theory but rather accepts it as consciousness. Comfort or enjoyment is the quality of Prakṛti, but this Purusa is different matter from that of Prakṛti. It cannot therefore be enjoyable. The Sāṃkhya accepts the knower as primordial matter.

Na Prakṛti na vikṛtiḥ Purusa appearing in Kariki III means that Purusa is neither Prakṛti nor Vikṛtiḥ. In this way it is inferred that Purusa is not to be taken to be connected organically with the other twenty-four tattvas. In Kariki XI this idea is further illustrated whereby Purusa is referred to be completely in opposition from vyakta and avyakta both. In other words Purusa is not accepted as the constituent of three gunas and has been taken to be discriminating subjective specific conscious and non-productive. Its existence is therefore distinctly separate from the manifest and unmanifest world and its reality is of different order completely. Further more in

1. Sīk., Paramārtha's Chinese Version etc., on Kariki II.
accordance with Karika, Purusa is distinctly separate to what constitutes the three guṇas. It has no relevance to the entire manifest and unmanifest universe. Its characteristics are: Saktītva, Kaivalya, Madhyastha, Druṣṭītva and Akaṛtrabhāva.

In accordance with the view the Purusa does not do anything or make any additions to the mūla-prakṛti and its manifestations. Its existence in the universe is of simple nature and that of a spectator to see the modifications of the world. The world cannot determinate, isolated or completely free. The reasons for postulating the existence of Purusa are as under:

1. Because accumulations exist for another.
2. Because it must be separate from the three guṇas.
3. Because Purusa must be controlling Power.
4. Because of the need of an enjoyer.
5. Because there is activity for the sake of isolation.

Like this Purusa exists, or remains present though it is neither a cause nor an effect. It is that light through which we see, that there exists a matter named Prakṛti. It is not dependent for illuminating object or anything else. Root matter and its products depend for their manifestation on the light

1. तत्सात् विश्वावात्तिर्द पुरुषस्य ।
 सैवलं पार्थस्य दुर्गृहस्मववाप्लव ।।

S.K. 19.

2. तत्सात्परात्तात् विश्वावात्तिर्द पुरुषस्य ।
 देवभवात्त सैवलं पार्थस्य दुर्गृहस्मववाप्लव ।।

Ibid., 17.

3. S.P.S., 1.61.
of Purusa and are not self manifested. It is not atomic size, because in that case it will be difficult to account for its cognition of all bodily states. It is not a participant in any activity. All qualities are denied by Sāmkhya to the Purusa because otherwise it will be capable of emancipation. Joyfulness and misery cannot belong to the soul, the nature of thing living inalienable.

PLURALITY OF PURUSA

When the soul is said to be an anasa or fragment of the Divine mind, it is to indicate that it is subsequent to the Divine mind as a reception of the Divine idea. The souls therefore serve as matter for the divine forms. This is the truth indicated in the Sāmkhya theory of the multiplicity of selves. According to the Vedānta there exists only one Atman in this universe but this view is not accepted by Sāmkhya. According to Sāmkhya every living being is separate atman Purusa. In the traditional nirisvara - sesvara the notion of self is narrated generally in cosmic terms. For example dominant-conception of the self is alike the old upaniṣadic notion of atman while going through the Moksadharma and Gītā. Purusa is taken to be plural however in classical Sāmkhya. This doctrine of plurality of Purusas has been set forth in eighteen Karika.

In this Karikā the diversity of births, deaths and faculties, actions or functions at different times differences in the proportion of the three guṇas has been viewed. The plurality of the purusas is established beyond reasonable doubt. This step of the Sāmkhya is a major one i.e. far away from the doctrines of a cosmic self.

Gunaratna-sūri in his Saddarsana-samuccaya states that the preachers of the original school of Sāmkhya asserted that there exists a separate Prakṛti for individual Puruṣas. An earlier school also maintains its plurality. We are further enlightened in this connection from the Yukti-dipīka where it has been stressed that this tattva of plurality of prakṛti was propounded by Paurika. According to this teacher the existence of a separate Prakṛti to each individual Puruṣa for the coming into being in the physical body and such other objects only for its empirical existence only one hand dualism of the system is tended to be underscored by the doctrine. To derive man and the world for a cosmic consciousness or spirit is not possible any longer. The existence of the world is that of real existence over the individual Puruṣa in the classical Sāmkhya. Although all the manifestations of the phenomenal

1. जन्मप्रणालिकानां प्रतिनिधिमानचुपप्रयुक्तदेव

2. पूर्वज बहुलम् सिद्ध एव अणुपविनियोगितानि}

— Sāka 18, cf. Bhāṣya,
STK, Paramārtha’s Chinese version etc

— मौलिकमूलया हृदयानस्माताः प्रति पुत्रं प्रशांतं वजलिनं उच्चे तु सांख्य:
सत्त्वस्त्रयाः नित्यं प्रावणमिति प्रपन्नाः।
world are dependent on the existence of Purusa yet origin and source have to be within the Mūlaprakṛti viz. vide apart from the Purusa. On the other hand the concreteness of the problem of salvation is tended to be underscored by the doctrine of plurality of purusas.

The suffering is the basic problem in classical Sāṃkhya. It is the concreteness of individual suffering and not the abstract suffering of a cosmic entity.

**THE EMPirical INDIVIDUAL**

The Purusa is individual but not personal. According to Vijnānabhiṣku Purusa is not in itself the Jīva but with abhāva and the Jīva. The reflected Purusa in buddhi appears as the ego, the cogniser of all our states including bliss and pains, while the pure-self remains beyond buddhi. When we do not know that ātman is apart from buddhi and is different character and knowledge, we accept ātman as buddhi. Each buddhi taking along with it senses and the like is an organism in an isolated form in accordance with the past karmas and avidyā is associated with it in a peculiar form. Free spirit and mechanism of Purusa and Prakṛti in a mixture form is the empirical self. The subtle body which is a product of Prakṛti which comes into being when

1. S.P.B., vi.63.
2. Y.S. ii.6.
3. S.P.B., ii.46.
Purusa and Prakrti are united, it becomes conscious though it is in itself non-conscious becomes conscious. It is effected through pleasure and pain action and its fruits and recycles in the course of rebirth. The Atman or the Purusa act in an indifferent manner in so far as world is concerned. Buddhi is taken to be responsible for activity which is a product of Prakrti. The Purusa appears as the performer in an indifferent manner when buddhi is united with Purusa. Antahkarana which Purusa lights is the actual agency. While passively observing the doings of Prakrti the Purusa forgets the true nature of Prakrti to which consciousness is attributed and makes it believe that it has the power to think feel and act. A particular finite form of existence, animal body is identified with it as a result thereof excluded the true life.

After having lost the eternity, peace, it enters the time of unrest. There is no movement in Purusa, but the body which contains Purusa is on the move from place to place. Purusa defines a name only because it is passive and is assumed to consent or withdrawal for the moving of Prakrti. The Purusa seems to be an agent though in reality it is not so. Proximity

1. S.P.B., 1.99.
of Prakrti to Purusa seems to be conscious. Experiencing of pain is only a reflected form which is of modified nature and the Upadhi. Its shadow falls on the purusa though it is in reality bounded with the citta.

Simple nature besides it consciousness of feelings etc., the terms transparent or translucent crop up in the mind. One is able to see the universe through the 'LIGHT' of Purusa and the existence of the world as a fact is responsible to make Purusa aware of itself. The two irreducible realities which are constantly interplyasing with one another are the fact of consciousness and the fact of the universe.

CONJUNCTION AND INTERACTION OF PRAKRTI AND PURUSA

Coming back to the starting point, we take up the association and interaction of Prakrti and Purusa. The Karika does indicate as to the togetherness of Prakrti and Purusa, and that what happens when they come together but how the two come together has not been touched by the author of the karika is that he never asked that question. From the very beginning the assumption is that they are together and only a description

1. S.K., 20 & 22; Y.S., ii.17.
2. S.P.B., i.17.
of the mutual interaction of the principles along with a
description of the means for attainment of isolation or free-
dom are included in his analysis. The sattva element in Prakrti
is unconscious and through the reflection of the Purusa, it
is illuminated. The activity of the prakrti would not be
possible without this help of Purusa, because there would not
be any conscious regulation and adaptation. It would be nothing
but a blind force acting haphazardly. It is in this context,
all practical purposes that these two entities are dependent
on each other. There can be no doubt that there is polarity
in these two entities appearing consciousness and unconsciousness,
Mobility and immobility, productivity and non productivity etc.
The fact is that they are still interrelated. For serving its
own purpose one requires the help of the other. They have
the relation of the knowler and the known. To make it more clear,
their position is that of a spectator and characters in a
play. The philosophical significance of the smile of the lame
and the blind is brought out by the commentator. While the
former is able to see, he can not walk the latter can not see
the way, but is able to walk. Thus both are dependent on each
other. The position of unconscious prakrti is that of the blind.
Though it can move out of its own accord yet is not able to feel
the result of its activity. Thus if it remains on its own
would go on and on blindly and would never turn back. It can
achieve its goal through conscious reflection of the Purusa, so is the case of Purusa which is like the lame. Though a knowler but looks at activity of its own. Pleasurable and painful cognitions are experienced by it in its empirical existence. If there be no object of cognition, it will experience nothing. By realizing the true nature of the object of knowledge the mission of the knower will be fulfilled and that object ultimate is the Prakṛti. Sheer necessity is the reason for their union as both of these entities need each others service as provided in kārīka the relationship of prakṛti and purusa has been viewed only in terms of proximity or saṁśiddhi by the classical saṁkhya. According to it there is no bondage or release and accordingly there is no transmigration. It is prakṛti only which is bound and released and transmigrates in its various forms. A kind of interplay comes up between Pradhāna and Purusa in view of this saṁśiddhi. Transformation or modification starts in the mula-prakṛti and this transformation Purusa starts seem. Characteristics of each other seem to be taken up by these two principles. The unconscious one seems to be characterized by consciousness, because of the proximity, likewise the indifferent one appears as it characterized by

1. तस्मान् बिध्यते नापि पुच्छते नापि संसारति करिक्तः
   संसारति बिध्यते पुच्छते च नामात्मया प्रृक्ति: ।
   S.K. 62.
activity, because of the activities of the three gunas is how this interplay has been described in Sāmkhya-kārikā.

Darsanarthan has been taken with Pradhānāya and Kaivalyārtham with Purusāṣya by Vacaspati. The opinion of Gauḍa and Māṭhra is however otherwise. Since both processes start from the Pradhāna in the interest of Puruṣa, their interpretation is insignificant.

In his commentary Vacaspati illucidated the point by stating that it is not possible for the seed of the banyan tree to bring out at random a full grown tree with leaves so as to protect itself from the scorching rays of the sun. The tree takes the shape in a graded manner viz. root, stem, leaves and branches after the seed has come into contact with the earth, water and heat. So is the case with the evolutes. They follow a definite order of succession and do not appear suddenly. From the standpoint of the Sāmkhya the central conception of evolution lies in the expression 'Samsrīsthām-vivityatha' as pointed out above. To put it roughly it is gradual unfoldment of the differentiated within the integrated (Samaristhamviveka) has been illucidated very ably by B.N. Seal

1. तत्स्मातात्स्मात्स्मात्स्मात्स्मातं बैतालाविश्व वह्यम् ।
   गुणाङ्गुल्लो च तथा क्लेभ भवत्त्पुल्लोऽसीनः ॥
   S.K., 20.
in the following lines in so for as its significance is concerned:

"Evolution in its formal aspect is defined as differentiation in the integrated. In other words, the process of Evolution consists in the development of differentiated within the indifferentiated, of the determinate within the indeterminate, of the coherent within the incoherent."

MAHAT

The first product of the evolution of Prakrti is mahat, the cause of the whole universe. The intelligence of the individual is based on it. The cosmic aspect is brought out by the term Mahat. Psychological counterpart which is used as a synonym as buddhi. Psychological aspect of mahat is stressed upon in the Sāmkhya. Because of its being great in space as well as in time is the reason that it is called mahat. There is no other evolved principle such extensive and durable. The significance of the term is depicted in the Yukti-dīpāka. According to Kapila in Kārikā ascertaining and decision making is the special function of buddhi. Dharma jñāna, Viraga and

2. य न देयमुक्तयातु कालमहत्व्याय प्रत्येकम् सवियोजनश्वर्यमात्र योजकामुक्त्याय प्रतिष्ठितं 📖 Y.D.,p.108.
Aisvarya are its Sattvika forms Adharma, Aviraga and Anisvarya are its tamas forms. This principle as is existing in man as his special inner organ is responsible for decision making aspect. All intellectual processes of all individual selves, the whole universe is based on it. For buddhi the senses and the mind function, and for the good of the Purusa buddhi functions directly. Gaudapada refers in his bhasya the synonyms of buddhi are mahat, asuri, mati khyati, jñana and prajña. Knowledge has been termed as external and internal by Gauda. While the external knowledge is responsible for world pleasures, the internal is an instrumental in liberation. Mahat and asuri are some of these characteristics which are responsible for the suggestion that the original cosmic term has a significance, but in case of other characteristics they direct to the individual. In Gita a word in a slightly derived form is found which refers to buddhi. The term used there is Vyavasaya and is referred to the sense of one whose buddhi is in control. This passage in the Gita narrates that the opposite is one whose buddhi is avyavasaya or not controlled.

1. व्यवसायी बुद्धि: क्यों सा विश्लेषन्यायः ।
   गात्रस्यमेतद्वृत्तमपि, नामसाहित्यिरवैल्लाङ्कः ॥

2. Gauda. 23.

3. व्यवसायात्मिका बुद्धिरे हुयनत्तपन ।
   बुद्धाय हुयनत्तपन बुध्दोद्ववक्षयिनामः ॥

   Gita., II.41.
referred various uses of the term buddhi. In the context of classical Samkhya the most important of all are 'Awareness', 'General-mental attitude', 'Intelligence', 'Enlightenment', and 'Will'. Hume interprets it as the subtle body which includes from the intellect up to the separate elements. The assumption is that the buddhi is immediately connected with Purusa and with the rest indirectly keeping this view. In fact the opinion of Bhiksu is that while Purusa is the saksin of buddhi and through the aid of buddhi it is the beholder of others, when connected with buddhi the free and indifferent purusa becomes the saksin. Though buddhi is sattvika in itself, but due to the contaminating influences of its past life is rajasa or tamasa in an individual. The interaction of buddhi and the objective world with purusa as the spectator is responsible for the experiencing of pain or pleasure. True knowledge is possible when sattva is dominated or buddhi, the desire is through rajas and fast knowledge is attributed to tamas.

1. Edgerton, Beginnings of Indian Philosophy, pp.313-44.
4. सत्त्व व्याप्तिज्ञानेभु, रजो रागाभु - - - - - - - - - - -
Therefore buddhi is prakrti vikrtti. The dharma or elements of buddhi abode in the linga sarīra.

**AHAMKĀRA**

The presence of Purusa which is a second evolute is ahāmkāra. This principle emanates from buddhi directly and has been described ahāmkāra as abhimāna. From it a twofold creation emerges, the group of eleven and the five tanmātras. It is not possible to translate the term ahāmkāra. Personal pronoun, aham is the cause of it and by kāra is meant making, doing, working etc., In designating a letter or sound the particle is also used Omkāra, Ego is the term given to the ahāmkāra, "individualion", "Conception of one's individuality", While analysing this point this term has been taken to be creative by "I" by Van Buitenen Abhimana which reflects such notions as "Conceit", "Pride " or "Erroneous conception" is the conception of the Kārikā while equating this term. The fact of self awareness (ahāmkāra) is depicted besides functioning in the realm of mind, senses, etc. It can therefore be safely assumed that ordinarily experience is not associated with the general self-awareness. Without an object, it is a psychological factor that sense of selfhood is not possible. In the Samkhya theory

1. अभिमानोदकारस्त्वमाद दिविष्यः प्रवर्तकः करः ।
   एकादशक्र गणस्तमात्रः पञ्चस्वात् ॥
   S.K. 24.
of evolution through rise of ahamkāra proceeds the development of the objective. The possibility of the existence of a cosmic ahamkāra has to be admitted through which individual subjects and objects arise. Buddhi is more cognitive in function but ahamkāra seems to be more practical and as such is conceived as material. Abhimāna is psychologically the function of ahamkāra. Agency appertains to it, and not to the purusa. As is mahat to ahamkāra so is consciousness to self-consciousness. The former has to be accepted logically as a piece of position of the latter. The existence of ahamkāra from its effects have therefore to be inferred. Since if the material cause of other substances is taken to be a substance. It is through ahamkāra that the purusa identifies itself with the acts of Prakṛti. The sensations and suggestions of actions conveyed to it through manas are caused by it to the self. Formation of concepts and decisions are possible through it. The three-fold ahamkāra viz. Vaikārika, tajas and bhūtādi are referred by the sāmkhya authorities. The first one abounds in sattva, the second in rajas and the third in tamas. Planning of this division is to only analyse the sixteen evolutes of ahamkāra which are parted into two series that is subjective and objective. The eleven organs are the constituent of the former, and, which

1. S.P.S., VI.54.
2. Ibid., i.63.
constitute the former are the five organs of sense, the five of action, and the manas. Five subtle elements called tanmātras in Sāṃkhya literature are related to the latter. The subjective and objective aspects are not differentiated till Ahamkāra evolutes, and are in bondage in one principle. As the progress in evolution starts the oneness state of these two aspects require differentiation which is actualized in the evolutes of ahamkāra is responsible for the emanating of the objective series comprising of the five subtle elements and in consequence thereof these abound in tamas. No new evolute is given rise by taijasa exclusively by itself. Its main function is to excite the other two, the tamas or sattva are responsible for the differentiation in the evolute, this is so because the primary cause abounds in them. While explaining karika twenty-five the author of the yuktidīpika has dealt with this topic in a befitting manner. According to him eleven organs take birth from the vaikārikā which gets attracted to taijasa for excitement and for bringing out differentiation in its evolutes to the bhūtādi? As water mixed with water cannot be differentiated so is with the case of sattva, if it is left entirely to itself. The law of evolution necessitates differentiation of sattva element within the sattva element of Vaikārikā which is the next primary cause. Bhūtādi helps this differentiation in the organs. For excitement bhūtādi in turn looks to taijasa and for bringing out differentiation as in its evolutes to Vaikārikā. The tanmātras can not be
differentiated within the bhūtādi which is their immediate primary cause without the interference of Vaikārika. This view is also found in Śāmkhya-kārika and Tattva-Kaumudi of Vācaspati's Miśra. There is a difference of opinion in the view of Vijnānabhitṛṣṇu though insignificant. According to Sattvika ahāmkarika makes up the mind and for the coming into being of other sense organs rajas ahāmkarā or taijasa ahāmkarā. In so for the order of evolution is concerned, we find that some of the ancient teacher of Śāmkhya differ in the conception. Mahat produces Ahāmkarā as well as the five subtle elements in the view of Vindhyavāsin.

**Five Subtle and Five Gross Elements**

Through the tamaś element of ahāmkarā five tanmatras come into being. By the word tanmatra trifle or rudimentary is meant. These five tanmatras are sound, touch, form, taste and smell. To determine the meaning of the subtle elements is difficult. According to Śāmkhya-kārika they are taken to be non-specific but their by-products the gross elements are to be specific. They are extremely subtle "p-otentials"

1. महत: चहलिलेश्व: गुप्तन्ते       ↓
   Y.D. p.108/6-7.

2. क्षमात्वाण्यविलेशास्तः पुत्रानि पञ्च वाच्यः
   एते स्वतः विशेषत: बान्ता बोधार्यं फुधार्यं       ↓
   S.K., 38.
   also see - Bhasya on Karika 38.
which by coming together make out the five gross elements. There are various interpretations as to how gross elements are generated by the tanmātras. No light on this point has been thrown even by the Kārikā. What in this regard is provided in kārikā-thirty-eight is subtle elements produce gross elements. The subtle elements smell leads to the gross elements earth, taste to water, form to fire, touch to wind and sound to space is how Bhāṣya correlates the five tanmātras with the five gross elements. These five subtle elements do not find mention in the older listings of the twenty-five evolutes in the Gīta, the Moksadharma etc., while going through the older accounts of the tattvas it will be seen that the five gross elements perform the function of tanmātras remaining five tattvas being left out of the classical sāmkhya listing. This derivation is of interest to classical Sāmkhya in so far as individual analysis is concerned. In the classical scheme the tanmātras are taken to be evolutes of the ahamkāra and their place is parallel to that of the emergence of manas, the five senses and the five organs of action.

The opinion of Gaudapāda and Vacaspati in regard to gross elements is that they are the product through compounding of the

1. Edgerton, Beginnings of Indian Philosophy, pp.42-44.
fine elements by the process of accumulation. It is difficult
to grasp the ether view but for audibility, which can not
be a contrast to a gross element with the corresponding fine
element. According to Vasacspati the other essences produces the
ether atom, the two essences of sound and touch produce air atom,
the touch being the chief, the tanmatras of sound, touch and
form produce the light atom, form being the chief, four tan-
matras produce the water and the five tanmatras produce the
earth atom, taste and smell being the chief ones respectively.
A slightly different opinion is that of Vijnанabhiksu. The
other tanmatras with the help of bhutadi is responsible for
the production of ether atom. Though five mahabhutas of the
Samkhya are gross but they are subtle to those of Nyaya-vaisesika,
viz. they are the atoms of Nyaya-Vaisesika. According to
Nyaya-vaisesika the tanmatras take birth from Mahabhutas, but
according to Samkhya philosophy the five mahabhutas are produced
by the five tanmatras.

FIVE BUDDHINDRIYAS
Eye, Ear, Nose, Tongue and skin are called the sense organs,
in fact the sense is indirect power which is in a state of pratyaksa and grasps the matter. Therefore the sense in not an eye but is the power to see it. Accordingly the senses do not seem to be direct in their action, but are estimated through their dharms. The above referred five organs of perception are the function of sight, hearing, smell, taste, and touch. These all come into being for the Purusa and are the result of ahāmkāra.

**FIVE KARMENDRIYAS**

According to Śāmkhya philosophy the five organs of action viz. the voice, hands, feet, and the organs of excretion and generation are called karmendriyas. The function of the five is respectively speech, grasping, waking, excretion and organs. These ten senses (five buddhingriyas and five karmendriyas) are produced from sattvika ahāmkāra, and Purusa is their adhisthatha. The senses while living pratyakṣa remain apratyakṣa. That is why they are anumayā or assumed.

**MANAS**

The manas while working with the jñānendriyaṣ take the equal form of the senses and while working with the karmendriyas take the shape of action. It is therefore in this context that

---

1. वाप्पाणिपापवापापस्वानिर्भौनिन्द्राणयाँ: ॥

it is referred to be of a ubhayatmaka character. It helps both types of senses. For doing any work in manas, 'doing or not doing' Sankalpa or vikalpa which takes place is the dharma and the shape of manas. The important function of synthesising the sense-data in to percept is attributed to the organ manas which suggests that alternative ways of action and the will decrees are carried through the organs of action.

No distinction is made between the organs, its function in the matters of manas as is the case of the intellect and self-senses are taken to be the doors and the manas doorkeeper. Perception and action both require the co-operation of manas. In terms of different senses it assumes manifold forms. Manas is an instrument having the quality of movement and action and as such is not all pervading. Since it has connection with the

1. उपायत्तमत्र मनः संकल्पपिन्दिनम् च सापम्यां ह।
   गुणपरिणामपिनिह्यात्त्व मनस्तत्व वायुपेत्वाय॥
   S.K. 27.

4. Ibid., 11.27.
5. Ibid. V.69-70.
senses, it has to be made up of parts. Since there is an eternal subject possessing buddhi and the other organs, these are not eternal. "Among the two (the internal and the external organs) the principle is manas, as a head servant among servants."

LINGA SARĪRA

The constituent of three antḥ-karanam ten bahuymkaranam and five tanmātras is called the Sūksma sarīra. According to the principle of Śamkhya for the existence of the universe for every purusa one Sūksma sarīra is necessary. It is dependent on the five bhautika sthūla-sarīra but the gross body does not perish, it is taken over by another gross body which is a result of vāsnyayos of that gross body and in this context it remains static till pralaya. At the time of pralaya it merges in the Prakṛti and takes birth in a new form in the new world. Though the various ācharyas accept the subtle body to be the constituent of eighteen-tattvas, but it is an accepted fact that Gaudapāda accepts the subtle body to be the constituent of eight tattvas viz. mahat, ahamkāra, manas and five tanmātras. In so far

1. S.P.B. IV.127.
3. पूर्वोत्तप्तमनवक्त, नियतं, महावदि सुभमलयतः।
संसर्गति निरपयोगं भतीलिव्यावितं विजयम्।।
S.K. 40.
and Gauda. 40.
as transmigrating entity viz. the Linga is concerned causation of another kind occurs which explains the reasons of the transmigration of linga from life to life according to the classical Śāmkhya. The force of the bhāvas is responsible for the bringing about of the causation and is residing in the buddhi. The bhāvas of the fundamental strivings in the innermost core of nature of man. Śāmkhya admits two types of world, one is Pratyaya-sarga and the other is corporeal-creation.

PRATYA SARGA

IśvaraKṛṣṇa after marking out to the principle of bhāvas and consequences their of further introduces an aspect of psychical evolution which he names as 'Pratyaya-sarga'. This is comprised of erroneous view, contentment, achievements and infirmity of the organs. Fifty sub-divisions constitute it because of different in gunas. Of this four-fold Pratyaya-Sarga, five heads constitute erroneous views, twenty-eight constitute disability, nine constitutes contentment and eight constitutes achievement making up of a total fifty. The author of the

2. रच प्रत्ययसू निपर्वत-सततिन-तुष्टिन-विविधात्म्यः। गुणवैश म्याविद्वान्तत्स्य च मेदात्सु पंचाशस्त्र ॥
S.K. 46.
Yuktidipika however enlightens us here. He differs with the other commentators of the karika and states that pratayasa-sarga is the basis of the ultimate result brought out by the evolved called Vyakta. There are three aspects of the evolved according to him. The three aspects are the rupa and pravritti and the phala. While discussing vyakta or the evolved principle, he asserts that it manifests itself in three ways, i.e. through its form initiation and result. The form of vyakta of these in the constituent of buddhi, ahankara eleven organs the five subtle elements and the five gross elements pravrtti is synonymous with arambha. It refers initiative to work, endeavour, effort etc. It is generally taken up for the purpose of attainment of what is agreeable and aversion of what is disagreeable. In the Nyaya-system pravritti is prominently placed is an information of interest. There is a slight different when we compare this conception of pravrtti of the Nyaya system with that of the Yuktidipika. Pravrtti refers to merit and demerit according to the ancient teachers of Nyaya. But in accordance with Samkhya system the entire set of 'Bhavasarga' constituting not only merit and demerit, but all the eight aspects of buddhi and their consequences are meant by pravrtti. Coming towards the result of the evolved to know that according to the Yuktidipika, it is two two-fold, visible and invisible. The visible result being composition of achievement, contentment disability
and wrong motion is called pratyaya-sarga. During the cycle of rebirth reaping the harvest of karmen is the invisible result. Special attention has to be given to the relation of pravrtti and phala. Phala has been defined to be the outcome of initiatives meaning experiencing of happiness and misery in the Nyāya-system. More or less the same view is advocated by the Śamkhya authorities. Viewing the whole thing by them however is on the basis of their principle of causality. The constitution of result is not a new phenomenon in its entirety but its existence is already there in the Vyakta, pleasure, pain and delusion being its characteristics according to them. The efficient causes which have their origin to pravrtti helps the manifestation of the result which is already there in its dormant state in the vyakta. In a nutshell it is only bringing the latent result into its present state and that nothing new is generated. Similarly about merit, demerit and the like which means these are not produced but are already produced. A sequential order is followed by the manas and the result.

Siddhi is taken to be eight-fold comprising of reasoning, oral

_____________________

1. "पृष्ठिकोष जनिताकार्यः फलस्वः।"
   N.S. 1.20.

2. सत्त्व फलस्व निपित्व वक्तानोक्तरस्तोः ........
   ........ ।
   Y.B. IV.12.

3. फलं तु यमातित्वं यस्य प्रथमप्रभुत्तनय: कार्यस्य, न ह्यपुत्तनय:।
   Ibid., IV.11.
instruction from the preceptor, study of philosophical texts (4, 5 and 6) suppression of three-fold misery, acquisition of friends for guidance towards spiritual upliftments and purification to be attained by discriminative knowledge. Wisdom can only produce them. Those indulging in an erroneous views cannot attain it. Where Viparahya is in it the world being immobile Siddhi is not possible. Siddhi is also obstructed by the twenty eight disabilities. Four internal and five external tusties are also taken to be the bhāvas to the siddhis. The belief of the first four is that attainment of liberation is through the grace of Prakṛti. Renunciation of the sensations of colour taste, odour, touch and sound is dependent upon the external five.

Achievement of Siddhi automatically vanquishes the erroneous notions. No obstruction of this stage is possible by organic disabilities also. It is through intuition that the mind knows everything and hardly needs the help of the organs. Mokṣa is imminent at such a stage. Finding a channel to flow the siddhi dries up the other three currents of wrong notion, organic disability and contentment. In this state, then the individual moves about freely and is not effected by pleasures and pains.

CORPOREAL CREATION

Vācaspatimisra has accepted two types of bodies, subtle and gross. Vijnānabhikṣu has however accepted a third type
of body which is called adhisthanasarūra. This adhisthana body is the result of entry of the subtle body from one gross body to the other gross body. To sum up briefly the classification of entire biological universe has been made into fourteen heads of which eight are of divine order, one that of mankind and the other five that of inferior order. Any embodied being comes under one of these fourteen heads. In the Śāmkhya literature this is known as corporeal creation. So far as the Purusa is in association with the subtle body, he gets encaged in one of these heads of embodiments which is responsible for his misery arising out of decay and death, when he gets dissociated from the same he becomes free and does not ever re-enter the whirlpool of existence. Unlike the lingasarūra the bhautika-sarga, it comes into being and gets dissolved in the course of one life. According to the kārikā or Śāmkhya philosophy it is the body born of a father and mother.

MISERY AND ITS SOURCE

The aim of all the Indian philosophies is to help the man

1. ब्रजविलयो येवलक्षणम् योनिः प्रथमा प्रतिति ।
   मानसवैकविषयं समास्तो भौगोलिकः स्थः ॥
   S.K. 53.

2. तत्र बन्यवर्गक्रमं दूसरं प्राप्तोति केतनं पुनर्यथः ।
   जिसास्यां किंविन्यूत्स्यां दूसरं स्थापयिता ॥
   Ibid., 55.

3. चूत्य वाताविलब्धा: सदा प्रशस्तिप्रविष्टं निश्चित: स्यः
   चूत्यास्तेषां निश्चिताः, मातापिलब्धा निवर्तने ॥
   Ibid., 39.
in the attainment of nirvana by overcoming the pairs and pleasures of the world. It is in this context that in Sruti also it has been laid that the soul should be discovered. The Sāmkhya system starts from the man suffering from three types of pain of the world and it narrates the ways and means to attain freedom from these pains and sufferings of the universe. In view of the fact that this philosophy starts from sufferings, therefore some scholars name this philosophy as the philosophy of pessimism. Our life is full of pleasures and pains is a tradition. It is with the universe that pleasures and pains take birth. The aim of the Sāmkhya is to liberate man from his worldly existence. This pessimistic view of the world is not found in such a distinct manner except Buddhism. The aim of this system is to establish the fact that everything in the gunas is full of pain. While at the outset an object may appear to be pleasant, but after analysis, it will be found that it contains in its womb the seeds of misery. When an object is enjoyed what actually happens is that there is a desire to have more and when this desire is not full-filled, it leads to disappointment. There are three types of sufferings adhyatmika adhibhautika and adhidevika. By the term adhyatmika means

1. ॐ:मार्गिष्टात्मानं ज्ञात्व तद्भिष्टेऽहैतु ।
   दृष्टे वा पार्थ देशाकानात्यथान्यज्ञे भवाभ्य ॥

S.K. 1.
concerning atma. Here the word atma means the body. Therefore the sufferings concerning the manas and the body is called Adhyatmika. By adhi is meant mental suffering and anger etc. And Vyadhi means body ailments, injury etc. Their combined form is adhyatmika. Adhibhautika sufferings are the result of outer objects for example to biting of the snake, of the scorpion blow of a lathi etc., Adhiveika sufferings are the result of ghosts etc. All pain is manas, but on the ground of its separate cause is divided into three groups. Gauda while defining manas pain states it to the separated from the desire and associated with the undesire. In the Sāmkhya cessation of pain is not possible because guna constitute pain and eternal pain has to exist. Recurrence of pain is not possible because it can be suppressed only. This is so because the seeds of ignorance which is responsible for the pain are destroyed. Though Vacaspati has tried his best that it points to the concept of the three fold pain and not to the whole composition but from this point he has not gained anything. According to Vacaspati bhautika includes trees and stones and he has divided them into four classes (1) Born of placenta (2) Born from eggs, (3) Born from perspiration and (4) Born by bursting open the soil. Bhūta according to Nārāyana are harmful things to mankind and five gross materials is the thinking of the Gauda's.

1. Gauda, I.
In his karika the term avidya has not been used by Isvarakrsna anywhere. Viparyaya is responsible for the bondage in his opinion.

Fast conception of a thing whose real form is not corresponding to such conception is constituted by it. Five aspects are attributed to it and these fully correspond to those of avidya. It is therefore correct that ignorance is the cause of sufferings. "The final cessation of the three kinds of pain is the final object of soul. It is therefore in this context that is the Indian Philosophy moksa is possible through tattva-jña.

MOKSA

On earth the life is like a pendulum, sometimes moving to the pleasures and happiness and the other time towards pain and misery. In case it be possible to avoid pains and pleasures to resist decay and death is not possible for a man. Though everyone is eager to be free from all pain and misery but while remaining on the empirical level unmixed and pure pleasure cannot be enjoyed in so far as our life on earth

1. विपर्यायिष्ठले वन्धः ||
   S.K. 44.
2. विपर्ययो निःश्चांतिनतूरूपानुक्रिष्ठः ||
   Y.S. 1.8.
3. S.S. 1.1.
is concerned, this is the greatest truth. If one has to surpass the sorrowful existence, Concede that the pleasure leads to sorrow that nothing on earth can be helpful in the overcoming of sorrows of this empirical life. Neither science nor any religious practices can be helpful for removing all these evils of life.

Though these ordinary means have a value limited in character in making life happy on this earth is a tolerable situation. Now the question before us is as to how freedom from all pains and sufferings can be obtained. As is evident from the kārīka it would be seen that at the very outset this basic purpose has been set-forth. It is of interest that the question of salvation has been dealt with in kārīkās.

According to Isvākṛṣṇa exclusive means of release is attributed to wisdom. Thus according to him seven aspects bind Prakṛti and is released by the one. This is none other but wisdom. Through its continuing culture, there is a realization on the part of the Purusa that he is not the empirical individual. Further is distinct from prakṛti and nothing of the world of prakṛti belongs to him. Pure and absolute knowledge

2. तैन निद्रक्षमाणेर्मेयस्थात् सप्तात्मिनिष्ट्वात् ।
   प्रृतिः पश्यति पुराचः प्रेषाक्षरनिष्ट्वता स्वस्यः ॥
   S.K. 65.
3. एवं तत्वात्मास्वात्तामिलौ, न मे नात्मविनिभरितः ॥
   अतिस्वयमिदुदुः केवलापदाता जातः ॥
   S.K. 61.
is the result of discrimination. The particular individual who has attained such a stage. Creative activity of Prakrti ceases for all times to come. At this stage Purusa also becomes serene and tranquil. Purusa beholds her with indifference, because he knows that prakrti can not bind him further. Finding that she has been understood by the Purusa becomes disinterested for all times to come. The author of the kārīka defining her nature has termed prakrti to be a bashful maiden, which while having been seen by the Purusa does not expose herself to his sight. After the attainment of discriminative knowledge their union does not break up outrightly, yet further evolution is of no possibility. Now rising of discrimination does not mean that Prakrti frees from the Purusa outrightly; because on account of past habits for some little time its work continue and body only does not come in its way. Though no fresh karma accumulated, yet through the force of the prākṛabhākarma the body continues. Aviveka has no relevent to Jīvanmukta possessing a body is thrust upon him by his past Samskaras.

1. प्रक्ते: सुझावर्गे न विश्वस्तति मे मतिवैतति।
    यत् सकंदामनां नामः समस्कारः संबंधात् इति॥
    S.K. 61.

2. सम्पूर्ण ज्ञानविशिष्टम् स्वरूपाज्ञानानविभाज्यते।
    विशिष्टति संस्कारात्मकां ज्ञातमतां दृश्यार्थः इति॥
    Ibid., 67.

3. S.P.S. iii.82-3.
Since their determination causes relief from bondage and continuance of body are compatible with each other. Complete release or disembodied viśeṣa-kaivalya is possible only for jīvanmukta at death. Two kinds of mukti-jīvan-mukti and videhamukti are recognised by the sāṅkhya sūtram. Emancipation of a soul, while he is still living encaged in the mind-body is jīvanmukti. Videhamukti is attainment of liberated soul after death. This is the real form of relief, because separation of mind and body in a complete form is possible in this condition only and all physical and mental ills are destroyed is the opinion held by Vijnānabhikṣu. According to the description of advaitins this state is not a state of ananda. This is a state when the threefold misery of human life has been destroyed. According to this school of philosophy the total annihilation of misery and not the achievement of any blissful condition is the supreme goal, when thinking on the part of the purusā is that the evo-lutes of Prakṛti are its own produce are shattered completely and freedom from pain in an absolute form is attained fully. After the exhaustion of the previous stock of merit and demerit and there is no trace leaving to the buddhi, there is no necessity for retention of its existence by the physical body any more. The Purusā attains final and absolute release with the separation of the Physical body and does not ever return to the whirlpool of the existence.

2. S.P.B., iii.84.
RE-CAPITULATION

In this chapter we have analysed the twenty-five tattvas of Sāṃkhya system along with the beginnings of the Sāṃkhya, where its start with the three-fold sufferings in a summarised manner. A critical study of liberation is keeping in view the opinions of different probable thinkings. While interpreting classical Sāṃkhya fundamental dualism between individual consciousness on the one side and the mass of undifferentiated being on the other have been projected. In the emergence of the manifest universe importance of the fact of consciousness has been stressed upon. Emphasis has been laid on the interplay that evolves on the Purusa coming into sinnidhi with the Prakṛti. It is an attempt to show that classical Sāṃkhya is a thought based on this act, of consciousness. The existence of the world in a manifest form is due to this fact, though nothing is added that of a spectator and since this is his nature. The universe has been used by it as an instrument to meet its end. Neither consciousness gives birth to the world nor world gives birth to consciousness in classical Sāṃkhya. At the very heart of the reality there is a original dualism which is the original fact of existence. The authority of chatanya has been accepted in the form of Purusa, and manas and bhūtas are the constituent of Prakṛti in Sāṃkhya. This is responsible for the birth of mental direction bhautika materials. Hence Sāṃkhya
has accepted Purusa and Prakriti to be fundamental elements. Vaisesikas has merged substances in these two tattvas. But difference in the assumption is that atma is dependent on Chaitanya and Purusa is the form of Chaitanya. The eight substances of Vaisesikha have been accepted to be the constituent of Prakriti. The place of mana has been taken by Antthkāraṇa and the place of four-fold-atoms and ākāsa has been taken by five tanmātras. The Sāmkhya-acharyas do not accept time and space as being independent substances, but instead accept practical relation of Satyabhutavysaṅkārtha. This relationship is not different from related things. Accordingly Sāmkhya has reduced the nine substances of Vaisēsikha to two basic tattvas. The scholars have contradicted the tattvas of the Sāmkhya viz. the fundamental two tattvas, unconsciousness of prakṛti and its evolution their proximity and mokṣa etc., but their criticism has no basis in the eyes of the Sāmkhya.

The fact that empirical individual and not transcendental subjects exists is the argument of the Sāmkhya in so far as the existence of the Purusa is concerned holds good. This is more clearly established in the theory of Sāmkhya in so far as plurality of Purusa is concerned. At many places of Brahma-Sūtras Badhrayana has referred the tattvas of Sāmkhya. In his Sarrika bhasya Sankaracharya has declared Sāmkhya to be pradhāna malha and without contradicting the thinking of tattvas Vedānta cannot be victorious. The greatest of all the principles of Sāmkhya is the working of the mūlaprakṛti and plurality of Purusa.
There exists no individual harmonious in character in the world of Prakrti because one guna is always in the help of others. Tamas is there when sattva prevails may be it is in bondage to sattva. Domination or suppression of the one or the other is evolution. Suppression however does not mean suppression. Any guna cannot supercede the other. The state of existence of sattva, Rajas and Tamas in themselves having overcome the others can not be conceived. It is only in seeming that they seem to be in complete harmony in pralaya, because prakrti is stated to be tension state in pralaya. Since all the three constituting gunas are equally strong, there is no evolution. Evolution is possible when one of these gunas dominates others. Evolution continues when harmony is not prevalent. There is no state of perfection where the three gunas are in harmony according to Samkhya philosophy. The original state of Prakrti cannot be taken to be harmony. In fact it is a suspense state in which prakrti may be taken to be neither active nor inactive. According to Samkhya prakrti being undivided and independent is primordial with Purusa equally. To be accurate purusa and the Prakrti are antagonistic dependent mutually within the real. As a prerequisite for the creative evolution their presupposition is necessary. There can be no experience unless the womb of the eternal ground of Prakrti is not impregnated by the Purusa. For evolving its product the Prakrti must be attracted by the Purusa. It is through the influence of Purusa.
the evolution of Prakrti is traced. Realisation of the freedom of spirit is attributed to the development of Prakrti. The prakrti consciously designs and executes any plan is not accepted by the Sāṃkhya. But execution of a plan designed to meet the ends of spirits is due to the development of Prakrti Purusa and buddhi are akin and not utterly opposed according to the Sāṃkhya account. Buddhi has in itself the most ultimate point of contact between Purusa and Prakrti. The operation of cosmic energy is discriminated and co-ordinated by this and added by ahāmkāra defines the witnessing self with through sense and action activities. The discriminative knowledge is strived for by buddhi in its sattva aspects. Realising that identifying is a mistake and feels that all is upsetting of the equilibrium of the gunas, buddhi with tattvas from the fast show which was being supported by it.

From the cosmic dance Purusa disassociates itself and power to reflect herself in the purusa is last by prakrti, because the effects of ahamkāra are no more, indifferent is buddhi and the gunas fall into equilibrium. The wisdom which saves in Prakṛti is gift asserted by sāṃkhya. Description of their different relation taking their to be the different aspects of the single eternal energy of spirit makes Sāṃkhya philosophy praise worthy. Helping each other in a spectacular way, show how the opposers fall in a whole. There is some unity above
itself on which transparent duality rests. If there has to be supposition of all experience, it is a universal spirit on which rests both the tendency of purusa and prakrti because they do not confront and contradict each other. The contradiction is resolved on the coming into being of the universe. This goes to show that there is a fundamental identity on which the two things rest. Insistence on Purusa by the Samkhya while not in a confused state with Jiva is nothing except to recognize a pure and perfect presence non-divisible, not affected, stress and struggle of the cosmic manifestation, all without, while being superior to it all. The prakrti is taken to be dependent on the supreme reality by the Vedanta as also Purāṇas. The Samkhya philosophy becomes more compatible with such a view. For preparation of the base for an adequate philosophy the Samkhya analysis of experience plays an important part. Grasping of this ultimate translucent consciousness to overcome suffering and to find state of freedom and isolation which is consciousness in itself is the purpose of the classical Samkhya. Therefore we can say that the analysis of tattva of the Samkhya are far reaching and heart rendering. It has taken tattva Mimamsa to such a stage where from Vedanta has grasped it and completed

it in a complete form. The author of Sāmghya philosophy Maharishi Kapila is appreciated in all the philosophies because of his grasp on the Sāstras and sharp knowledge and it is because of this that in the world of philosophies he is accepted to be the most renowned ancient achārya.

1. कारणाय समस्ततः वेदान्तविलोक्ते काव्यि पर्ये ।
कारणातु सांस्कृतिक नौरिह विशिष्टात्तरणाय ॥

Mathara-Vṛtti.
A CHART OF THE TWENTY-FIVE PRINCIPLES (tattvas) OF CLASSICAL SAMKHYA

(1) purusa (consciousness)

(2) prakṛti (primal nature or materiality consisting of sattva, rajas, tamas)

avyskta (unmanifest)

vyakta (manifest)

(3) buddhi (intellect or will with bhāvas)

(4) ahamkāra (ego) (taijasa or rajas-mode)

ahamkāra as vaikṛta (sattva-mode)

ahamkāra as bhūtādi (tamas-mode)

(5) manas

(6-10) Five buddhi-nādiyas

(11-15) Five karmendriyas (action-capacities)

(16-20) Five tanmātrās (subtle elements)

(21-25) Five maha-bhūta (gross elements)

(5) manas

hearing ---- speaking ---- sound ---- space

feeling ---- grasping ---- touch ---- wind

seeing ---- walking ---- form ---- fire

tasting ---- excreting ---- taste ---- water

smelling ---- generating ---- smell ---- earth

(5) manas

(6-10) Five buddhi-nādiyas

(11-15) Five karmendriyas (action-capacities)

(16-20) Five tanmātrās (subtle elements)

(21-25) Five maha-bhūta (gross elements)
Kapila is taken to be the giver of scientific form to the Samkhya philosophy. It is stated that Samkhya sutra and Tattva-Samasa are the works of Kapila, but in this context there are many contradictions among Scholars. As in the case of Nyaya, Vaisesika, Yoga Mimamsa and Vedanta there are sutras, so is the case with the Samkhyadarshana, which is also basically based on Sutras and its creator was Kapila.

SAMKHYA-PRAVACANA-SUTRA

There are six chapters in the Samkhya Sutra which are attributed to Kapila. The first three chapters have been devoted to the exposition of the principles of Samkhya. Some illustrative stories are given in the fourth chapter. Rival views are refuted in the fifth chapter and a recapitulation in the sixth chapter is bound-up.
According to the scholars of the day, the present Samkhya sutra is not the creation of Kapila but are dated to ninth century A.D. The basis of this contention is that various references in these Sutras are the same which are referred to by other works citing an example in the fifth chapter forty or fifty one, which find mention about the sanctity of the Vedas is the influence only on Vedanta. Besides this the various sentences of Samkhya-karika are found prominently in these Sutras. Since Sarvadarsnasahha of Madhava does not refer to it and his account of the Samkhya is based on the Karika. This work is taken to be of fourteenth century A.D. The Sutra is agreeable in its attitude towards theistic monism a strict dualism is professed in Karika. Samkhya-vrittisara of Mahadeva is accepted to be the time of sixteenth century A.D. Samkhya-vritti of Anirudha is of the fifteenth century. Udaivir Sastri has tried to prove that these Sutras of Samkhya are the creation of Kapila in his work entitled 'Antiquity of the Samkhya Sutra'. According to him various Sutras were appended to the basic Samkhya-Sutra of Kapila and this probably confuses the philosophy of this work. To cite an example it will be seen that sutras twenty to fifty five of the first chapter had been appended, later on because nineteenth sutras refers to the same subject as the fifty-fifth. In the same chapter

1. न नित्यसुद्वयुक्तस्मात्मत्वस्य तथागस्तणोगद्वाते ।
   S.S. 1.19.
   तथागद्वात्यत्सिन्तेकान्त शमातत्स्य ।
   Ibid., 1.55.
Sutras 53rd and 54th are same as fifteenth and sixteenth. Likewise there are numerous Sutras which are definitely of a later time. Their time of appendation is also known through them. In some Sutras Sughan and Patliputra names have been referred. This goes to show that the appendation of these Sutras relate to the time when these citations were important in the whole of India. This time is between the fourth and fifth century A.D. According to Udaivir Sastri there are sixty-eight Sutras which can be said to have been appended and if they are sixty-eight Sutras which can be said to have been appended and if they are excluded Samkhya in its ancient form comes into being. While comparing Sāmkhyaśākārikā and Sāmkhya Sutras we come across many stages where both are very common. At some places the same verse is found. According to Udaivir Sastri the author of Sāmkhya-kārikā has taken them from the Samkhya Sutras, but other scholars opine that these sūtras have

1. सत्त्वत्तिष्ठत्वम् बालिकािपासयम् पारम्परिः प्रिीम्।
   S.S. 1.124.
   S.K. 10.

2. सामान्यकारण। प्राप्तेति बैक्ताद्विकारात्।
   Ibid., 2.31, S.K. 29.
been taken from Samkhya-kārika. Dr. Baldev Upadhyaya accepts Samkhya Sutras to be an old work. His opinion is that Madhavya mantri in the Tikka of Suta-samhita one sutra has been taken from this work and taking this fact into account it can be referred to be of fourteenth century. Anirudha was an oldest commentator or tikkaker of these Sutras and his time has been accepted to be around fifteenth century. On this basis the creation of Sutras are fixed between 1380-1450. In this context Macdonell writes:

"The Sāmkhya Sūtras long regarded as the oldest manual of the system and attributed to Kapila were probably not composed till 1400 A.D."

Vijñānabhikṣu has the most important work on the Sāmkhya Pravacana-sutra. He has laboured hard to minimise the distinction between the Sāmkhya and theistic Vedānta. The theistic Vedānta is regarded by him as the genuine Vedānta and refers Advaita Vedānta to be its modern copy. Additionally Sāmkhya-sarā Yogavartikka, Yogasarasamgraha and Vijnana-amrita, which is a commentary on the Brahma-sūtra have also been written by Vijnānabhikṣu.

Whatever be the case it will have to be accepted that the author of Sāmkhya-sūtra is Kapila. Whether it was available in a written form and during the intervening period it did not exist, yet in whatever form we find the Sāmkhya-sūtra in the Samkhya-karika of Isvarakrsna has to be accepted as its seed.
The work depicting twenty-five Sūtras of Śāmkhya principles is accepted to be the work of Kapila in its basic form. Vijnanabhikṣu however seems to accept one author for Śāmkhya Sūtra, Śāmkhya-sāṅsārika and Tattva-samāsa. The chronological order in which Śāmkhya tattvas existed Muller and Dasgupta feel that it is a very ancient and original work but timed it to be earlier to Śāmkhya-kārīka because where both analysis offer different subjects. Tattvasamāsa seems to be an ancient one. The opinion of Keith is however contrary to this. He holds that the very name of Tattvasamāsa proves that it is a work of later times, because earlier to that the principles of Śāmkhya have not been found to be a summarized form and is definitely defiant to that of Śāmkhya-kārīka, because the basic principles of Śāmkhya have not been represented in a correct manner. Doubt, about its ancient existence arise because these are neither found cited in Śāṅkara or Vācaspati, nor they have referred them in any form. There is evidence of the existence of following commentaries. They are Sarvopāśarini, Śāmkhya-sūtra-vivaraṇa, Śāmkhya-krama-dippika, Tattvartha-dīpan etc.

According to pronouncement in the Śāmkhya-kārīka the original Śāmkhya philosophy work was known through the name of
'Sastitantra'. We find many references to this effect in the Jayamangala commentary. Hiranya has analysed it in his essay 'Sastitantra' and 'Vārganya'. According to him Sastitantra was the creation of Pancaśikha. The sixty tattvas of Samkhya has been explained in detail in its sixty parts. Jayamangala-kāra has clearly accepted this fact with reference to discussion in Samkhya-kārika to that Sastitantra was the work of Pancaśikha. We find many references of Sastitantra in the Yoga-bhasya. In his Tattvavesārdhī commentary on Brahmasūtra Sankarabhāṣya, he has referred to be the creation of Vārganya and has accepted it as a work of yogasāstra. Bhaskara has referred to Sastitantra to be the work of Kapila. Acharya Sankara in his Brahmasūtra-bhāṣya has described the 'tantra', which in all probability is Sasti-tantra. It is therefore difficult to suggest as to

2. तेन हति प्रज्ञितने मुनिना वेदाभ्यात तत्त्वः।
   चतुष्टीश्वाक्षरां चाक्षुषां शृङ्खलान्।
   तैर च चतुष्ठाव्यात्माताः।
   जयमांगलाः

3. गुणानां परम सृष्टि न दृष्टि-स्वाभाविकाः।
   यथा दृष्टिपयं वाच तत्त्वायेषम् सुरूक्ष्यम्।
   य.ब.

4. कत्वव योगाद्वृत्तेऽविद्याधितताम् स्म सतातु
   वाणवेयः। ---- गुणानां -- सुरूक्ष्ये।
   भामति-ब्राह्मसूत्र, 2.1.3.

5. कपिलोपिण्यितं चतुष्टीश्वाल्य्यस्मृते।
   ब्राह्मसूत्र, 2.1.1.
whose work is Sastitantra because those commentaries who have referred them cannot be taken to be of any evidence. Since the references in Samkhya-karika and pronouncements made time and again by Jayamangalakara, normally the scholars have started accepting Sastitantra to be the work of Pancasikha. The principle which has been explained to be Varsagnya of the Buddha scriptural Abhidharma is simply Satkaryavada.

**Samkhya Karika**

Samkhya Karika of Isvarakrsna is a popular work and basic work of the Samkhya system. Between 557 and 569 A.D., Paramartha at the time of the end of his literary activity translated the Karika along with a commentary into Chinese. Though there is little evidence about the character of Isvarakrsna, the author of the Karika, he has been referred to be a member of Kausika family in the Chinese version. In all probability he was from amongst the followers of Varsaganya. No precise date can be determined but discussion about Samkhya teachers, the general claim about Isvarakrsna carrying on his activity under the Gupta dynasty is supported. The Gupta period was a great literary and cultural activity period in India and it can naturally be assumed that in this era the classical Samkhya

1. B.S.S.B., 2.1.1.

2. Keith -- The Samkhya System, p.79.
achieved its normative articulation. According to Gaudapāda and Vacaspatimisra, there are seventy two verses in the Karika. Sixty-nine verses only have been commented upon by Gaudapāda. The oldest text Chinese version though comments on the final verses, but Karika sixty-three has been left out. Karika's 60-63, 65-66, have not been touched by the Yuktidīpikā. Beyond the seventy two verses as accepted by Gaudapāda, and Vacaspatimisra, the Matharvṛtī read an extra verse and there by making total of seventy-three verses. While going through Karika-seventy-two we find mention that there were only seventy verses in the original text. Despite vigorous attempts it has not been possible to define the original seventy. Since the additional verses have no concern with the system but are in the form of information in so far as authorship and transmission is concerned, does not have any impact on the basic Karika. In different commentaries some verses have been interpreted differently but they donot tend to change basic meaning. According to some European philosophers the Sāmkhya-Karika is the oldest work on Sāmkhya philosophy, but this opinion of the Western philosophers becomes absolute in the last karika of Isvarakrsna. In the end of his work he has referred to a work named Sastitantra and has written the karikas on the basis of that work :

"Saplayām hila ye'rītahas
terthah kṛtsnasya sastītantrasya,
ākhyayikavirahitah
paravādvirajitascapi."
In the above karika - Isvarakrsna has categorically accepted that the work Sāṃkhya-saptati is in all totality based on Sastitantra. The fact brought out by Isvarakrsna points out that an older work Sastitantra existed which besides having Sāṃkhya principles contained akhyayikas and paravadas.

Prominent writers of various schools of Sāṃkhya and their Biographical Sketches:

Kapila is the first and the foremost teacher of the Sāṃkhya Philosophy. But a veil of mistery and fable is thrown around Kapila, the traditional author of Sāṃkhya philosophy. The present period is predominantly of criticism. Each scholar tries to criticize the traditional thinking and in doing so he feels he is doing his duty. The Western Scholars are bent on proving the traditional acceptable principles of Indians and refer important people and prominent personalities to be an assumed stories. With this mentality some scholars have pronounced Kapila to be unhistoric and has referred him as an assumed person. Kapila has been referred as a fake personality first of all by MaxMuller and Colebrooke. The renowned Dr. Keith also opines that since he has been referred to be the form of Agni, Visnu and Shiva, his historical existence cannot be accepted.

This is also known as Hiranyagarbha. Gopinath has also given

this opinion in the introduction of Jayamaṅgalā. But the
famous scholar Garbe has criticised the view of Muller and
states that the traditional name of Kapila cannot be taken to
be an assumption. He is stated to be a son of Brahma and an
incarnation of Viṣṇu, though he was born to Viṭāha and Devahuti.
He has been taken to be endowed with knowledge, virtue and
supernatural power by birth. From inference it can be deduced
that he probably was a Brahman. Getting disgusted with the
beliefs and practices prevalent at that time, made out a system
through which he attempted to solve the mysteries connected by
spirit and matter by reasoning. Since the details of his life
or the time when he lived is not certain, his system has made
him memorable. In all probability he lived in the seventh century
B.C. Though no reliable evidence is available, he is stated
to have been born in Pushakara. To be more certain it would
be correct to suggest that he was born in Northern India, before
the birth of Buddha, the date of whose death has generally been

2. Gaudapāda's Commentary on the Kārikā.
3. पञ्चमे कपिलो नाम सिद्धेः कालविप्रज्ञप् ।
प्रोवपातापुर्वे वार्ष्य तत्वग्रामविनिर्णयः ॥
Bhāgavata Purāṇa, i.3,10.
4. Ibid., ii.7,3.
accepted to be 544 B.C. This assumption is based on the fact that in the Pali Dathavamsa, Buddha is stated to have been born in Kapilavastu, which had been built with the permission of Kapila by the sons of Ikshvaku. Further it was nearer to the Himalaya mountains. According to Prof. Dasgupta, it can safely be assumed that the attribution of the account of Sāmkhya in the Bhāgavata to Kapila is true. In the Sāmkhyakārīka of Ishvarakrsna however proclaims that Kapila taught classical Sāmkhya to Āsuri and to Pancasikha subsequently. He further states that with the exception of the fables, the account of Kārikā was in a summarised form of the Sastitantra. From the evidence available in the Mahābhārata, the Bhāgavata, the older Purānas and the Ahirbudhnya Sambhata, there can be a reasonable supposition to accept the original teaching of Kapila was theistic.

Āsuri was the disciple of Kapila. Pancasikha the disciple of Āsuri has stated in one Sutra that Vishnu through its power after the creation of the universe created a Chita and himself entered into it through an anṣa and came into being the form of Kapila. As Kapila becoming complete, gave sermons on the

2. S.N. Dasgupta, History of Indian Philosophy, Vol.IV,p.36.
tattvas of Samkhya philosophy to his dear disciple Asuri who had a desire for paramatattva. Though Keith, Garbe, the renounced scholars do not accept Asuri to be a historical personality, yet mentioning of Asuri in 'Satapatha-Brahmana' and Mahabharata, his historical existence is proved. According to these Epics Asuri learned adhyatamvidya from Kapila. Before grasping this initiation from Kapila, Asuri was a family man in all aspects. He was Varsasahastrajivi. There is no independent work by him available.

Pancasikha

Pancasikha was the follower of Asuri as has been referred in the Santiparva of Mahabharata. In this Epic he has also been referred to be a Bhiksu of Prasara-gautria, and with reference to his birth, it has been held that a child was brought up through breast feeding of a Brahmin lady named Kapila and as such he is called 'Kapilay'. This very personality was later on known by the name of Pancasikha. About him it has been said that he

1. परासाहस्य बुद्धस्य चुस्मात्मन: ||
   नित्य: पन्तिशिल्स्याः हिन्यः परस्मय: ||
   Mbh. XII.320.24.

2. ज्ञातराक्षा नाम काष्ठिवाशोऽवृत्तिनी ||
   तत्त्वः पुज्जगान्ध्र निच्छयः स निबिधि स्तनी ||
   तत: स कापिलेयत्वं कैये जुड़ि व परित्थितोऽपि
   स्तने भवनानाथ कापिलेयस्य सम्पवदु: ||
   Ibid., 218, 15-6.
studied Sastitantra of Kapila through his teacher Asuri and in turn taught it to various learners. He also wrote a detailed commentary on it. Some scholars take Pancasikha to be the author of Sastitantra but in this respect nothing concrete can be said because this work is not available. Pancasikha is quoted in the Vyasa's Yogasutra bhasya according to Vacaspatimisra. In Samkhya-pravacana-sutra also Pancasikha has been described. Pancasikha has been suggested to be associated with the Samkhya Yoga in Buddha-carita XII. The references referred to above point to a particular Pancasikha who was the preacher of the Yogic dimension of Samkhya Yoga. Pancasikha has been associated with the Sastitantra as an author according to the Chinese tradition. Here however Vacaspatimisra differs and according to him Sastitantra authorship is ascribed to Varsaganya. This is further supported by the fact that Yuktidipika commentary attributes quotation from the Yogasutra-bhasya to Varsaganya and not to Pancasikha. In the Moksadharmapancasikha doctrines are found and this is a confusing factor! A system of thirty tattvas in Mahabharata is ascribed to Pancasikha. To sum up, we can conclude that in all probability there were many Pancasikhas out of which one or more were Samkhya-Yoga teachers.

2. Mbh. (Santi-parva), 308.
While quoting a passage from a work by Varsaganya Yogasutra-bhasya wherein we find a criticism of the atomic theory of the Vaisesikas. Further quoting a verse by Vyasa in Yoga-Sutra-Bhasya which concerns the nature of gunas. Thus in accordance with Vacaspatimisra in his Bheshati on Vedantasutra II.1.2.3. is attributed to Varsaganya. Vacaspatimisra in his commentary Tattvakamudi on karika forty-seven, Varsaganya has been referred to be the teacher of the doctrine of five-fold ignorance. The doctrine found in Buddhacarita XII.33 suggests that Varsaganya is the teacher of Samkhya in Buddhacarita. Vacaspatimisra not only ascribes the quote in Yogasutrabhasya IV.13, but goes on further to state that the particular quote is from Sastitantra. Keith and Frawwulin were convinced of the authorship of the Sastitantra to Varsaganya, because of his reference coupled with the fact that Balrama another commentator also held the same view. This is a confusion in the Vacaspatimisra’s view in the context of Sastitantra because it is different from the one found in the Ahirbudhnya-samhita.

2. Ibid., p.317.
3. Jha (Trans.), STK, p.89.
For reconciling this confusion Chakravarti gives a suggestion that in fact the original Sastitantra was revised by Varsaganya. Since, for this no solid evidence is available the attempted reconciliation can be taken to be mere contemplation.

**Vindhyavasi**

The actual name of Vindhyavasi is not known, but in all probability he being the resident of Vindhyatavi was called Vindhyavasi. From the 'Tattva Samgrhapanjika' of Kamlashelha it infers that the actual name of Vindhyavasi was Rudrial. He has been named as the disciple of Varsaganya according to Paramartha. Paramartha was a knowledgeable Bodha scholar Bhikṣu, who wrote the life history of Vasubandhu. Paramartha in it refers to a vigorous discussion on the meanings of the sastras with Budhmitra in Ayodha and in which Budhmitra was defeated desperately. Because of this victory then the king of Ayodha awarded three lacs gold coins as a token of respect to Vindhyavasi. Later with the aim of avenging the defeat of his guru Vasubandhu reached Vindhyatavi but by the time Vindhyavasi was no more. There is no independent work related to Vindhyavasi, but in 'Slokavartika' Bhogavrtti and 'Maghatikhi-bhāṣya', we find reference to principles in respect of Sāmkhya. According to Dr. Vinkatashshbhattacharya the

Acharya Isvarakrsna has a great respect in the sphere of Samkhya philosophy. Though all description about him has become clear, yet with regard to the period in which he existed, there is a difference of opinion between historians. It is of course near established fact that after criticism of Samkhya philosophy by the Budhacharya Vasubandhu, Isvarakrsna edited Samkhya-karika to illuminate and forgiving respectability to the Samkhya-philosophy, which had become lean. If this fact is established then the period of Isvarakrsna is before that of Vasubandhu.

Paramartha Bhiksu while he was in China wrote the autobiography of Vasubandhu in 557-569 A.D. and he also translated the Samkhya-karika of Isvarakrsna as a name of 'Hiranyasaptati' or 'Suvarnasaptati' or 'Kankasaptati' in 570 A.D. Both these works are now available. Basing his estimate on these two works Dr. Takakusu has placed the time of Isvarakrsna around 450 A.D. Dr. Vincent Smith however is averse to this opinion and he places Isvarakrsna to be the time of about 240 A.D. and
that of Vasubandhu of the time of around 328-360 A.D. Further
after examining Anusūtis which are in a shape of protection
in Tibet works Dr. Vidyabhusan has proved that both Iśvarakṛṣṇa
and Vasubandhu were of the same period and they existed in 400
A.D. Saṃkhya-karika of Iśvarakṛṣṇa is a proved and full of know-
ledge of Saṃkhya Philosophy. The numerous commentaries written
on Saṃkhya-karika proves its mass popularity.

Bad English.