

Indian Philosophy
Prof. Dr. Satya Sundar Sethy
Department of Humanities and Social Sciences
Indian Institute of Technology, Madras

Module No. # 03
Lecture No. # 06
The Samkhya Philosophy

Welcome viewers to this session. In this session, we will discuss on Samkhya Metaphysics where we will be discussing that how Samkhya prescribes its doctrine, the theory of causation known as Satkaryavada. Before doing that, to make you engage in this session, I would like to bring your notice what we have discussed in the last class on Samkhya where we have discussed a historical background of Samkhya Philosophy, also discussed about various components that we find in Samkhya Philosophy. How Samkhya Philosophy believes about the worldly affairs, why Samkhya Philosophy name a Samkhya, who has given the name Samkhya and who is the fore founder of Samkhya, what is means by Samkhya; all these things.

Just for your brief recapitulation. **Capitalize** the founder of Samkhya Philosophy. Samkhya Philosophy is dualistic realism; dualistic means it believes in two ultimate realities: one is purusha another is prakriti. Prakriti is understood as matter, purusha is understood as self. They also believe there is not only oneself, but also there are many selves; that means, there are many purushas. They also equally give emphasis on the existence of matter; that is non entities.

The entities are an object. Non entities having the soul or self. They have given the equally importance for the existence of self as well as the existence of matter. So, therefore, they are dualistic and also in the same time, they are realistic. Hence for we call them Samkhya Philosophy is a dualistic reality. Also we had discussed in the last class that, that Samkhya is a philosophy; people considers the term Samkhya derived from the word Samkhya; that means, number. Why they call?

Why they have considered that Samkhya Philosophy derives from the term Sankhya because for them, Samkhya deals with the existence of the objects in the world and they

know that, that there are different objects exist in this world and they have a different size, they have different steps.


So, therefore, they have given an opportunity to count to say that there are not only one, two, three, four, five objects are exist. What they are saying is that there are n number of objects exist and they are also equally real. So, this is the brief that we have discussed in the last class. This class we will say that whatever Samkhya is arguing or they are arguing based on a certain doctrine or principle or theory. The theory that they prescribe is known as Satkaryavada or theory of causation because the belief if everything is happening in this world, there is cause behind this.

And also they believe that every fact must have a cause and the effect pre-exist in the cause prior to its production. I repeat, when they prescribe the theory of Satkaryavada, they said that the effect exist in its cause prior to its production. That is the theory all about the Satkaryavada.

Now, in this session, we will be discussing that whatever the theory this Samkhya Philosophy is given for establishing the existence of various self or soles and also the different numbers or various objects in this world. And we will see also why other schools are not accepting this theory Satkaryavada. What is the problem lies in Satkaryavada and how Samkhya depends them by saying that that this theory has its own stamina for its argument therefore, this theory cannot be rejected.

In the later period, we will find that how really this theory helps Samkhya to establish which other dimensions of the evolution in this world. How that purusha and prakriti also established based on this doctrine, that prakriti and purusha we will be discussing next and next classes in the future class, but today only now we will be only focusing our discussion on the theory of Satkaryavada.

(Refer Slide Time: 04:53)




THEORY OF CAUSATION-
SATKĀRYAVĀDA

- The Sāṅkhya Philosophy advocates the ontological dualism of Prakṛti and Puruṣas (individual souls).
- The Sāṅkhya Philosophy is called as dualistic realism.
- An unconscious entity exists and equally real like conscious entities.
- Subscribe the principle- *satkāryavāda* (theory of causation)

Now, as I said, you can see the theory Satkaryavada that they prescribed which is known as theory causation.


I will repeat, by saying that they are the dualistic, they are the dualistic realistic philosophers because they believe there are two ultimate realities one is prakṛti and puruṣas and also when they say puruṣa, they say that there is not only one puruṣa. There is many puruṣas exist in this world like there are many objects exist in this world. Therefore, they said that the importance that we give for the existence of matter also equally follow in case of puruṣa or self. That means, when you say that a self is exist in the equally emphasis we can also give the existence of entities. Therefore, we can conclude by saying that they believe that the conscious or unconscious entity exists in this world and we can count them. Therefore, few of these scholars believe that the term Samkhya derived from the word Samkhya.

(Refer Slide Time: 06:07)



EXPLAINING SATKĀRYAVĀDA

- The expression 'satkāryavāda' encompasses three words: Sat (existed), Kārya (effect), vāda (doctrine)
- "The effect pre-exists in the material cause in an unmanifested form"- satkāryavāda
- It means the effect is not a new creation, it is found in its material cause.
- Satkāryavāda = Parināmavāda
- Satkāryavāda ≠ Asatkāryavāda
- Asatkāryavāda = Ārambhavāda
- The doctrine Ārambhavāda states that "effect does not exist in its material cause". It is the new phenomenon which is different from its cause.



They subscribe the principle Satkaryavada which is known as theory of causation. Now we will be discussing what is they really mean by Satkaryavada and why the prescribe this norms and what is the really issue behind this, what is the essence of this theory Satkaryavada. As you can see in my slide, that the expression Satkaryavada encompasses three words: one is sat, second one is karya, the third one is vada. I would like to remind you that when I say karya since it is a ka, the pronunciation is ka above the a, there is a lie with the same way it is a Sanskrit we have to pronounce and we have to write it.


Now, coming to the issue that Satkaryavada encompasses the three terms is known as sat karya, vada; sat means existed, karya means effect, vada means doctrine. What they mean is that the effect exists in the cause prior to its production. I will give an example for your understanding. If I say there is clay or mud. So, that a artist can create, can produce a pot or a bowl from clay or from the mud. The mud is an material cause whereas, the pot is in its effect. Another example I will give. When you say milk turn into curd here curd is an effect whereas, milk is its cause you say material cause; that means, if curd is a is a effect which is produced from the milk, we can only say that, this curd can be produced from milk; that means, there is a cause and effect, the inherence relation it cannot be separated from each other. Wherever there is a curd it assume that it the root cause of curd will be milk or say that the material cause of the curd which is an effect will be the milk.

Another example, if thread is the material cause then cloth will be the effects. So, word Samkhya argues that if there is an effect, it must exist in its material cause prior to its production. Before the curds comes to the existence, it was there in the milk. If it is not there in the milk, how curd comes out.

Why curd cannot be bring from any other causes like mud, like thread, like stones, etcetera. So, therefore, for every fact there must have a cause and the effect inherently exist in the cause prior to its production. That is the theory that they prescribe by the Samkhya Philosophy.

They said that this is the philosophy, this is the doctrine that they adhere and based on that, they establish the existence of purusha, the existence of prakriti and also the existence of non-entities or entity in this world. Hence for further this doctrine is the one and only one principle through which we can establish the all existence in this world if in the earth will existence itself.

(Refer Slide Time: 06:07)



EXPLAINING SATKĀRYAVĀDA

- The expression 'satkāryavāda' encompasses three words: Sat (existed), Kārya (effect), vāda (doctrine)
- "The effect pre-exists in the material cause in an unmanifested form"- satkāryavāda
- It means the effect is not a new creation, it is found in its material cause.
- Satkāryavāda = Parināmavāda
- Satkāryavāda ≠ Asatkāryavāda
- Asatkāryavāda = Ārambhavāda
- The doctrine Ārambhavāda states that "effect does not exist in its material cause". It is the new phenomenon which is different from its cause.

You can see further what they mean is that the effect pre-exist in the material cause in an unmanifested form that is known as Satkaryavada; that means, when there is an effect, it is just manifested, but when it was not effect, then it was lies in its cause, it is a unmanifested form.

When there is a curd it is already manifested. The milk already manifested in the form of curd, but when it was not curd hides in the material cause not in milk. Further they said that the effect is not a new creation. If anything produced in the form of effect it is not a new creation, it is all found in its material cause. That is what I have given an example, if the cloth is an effect it is not a new creation. It is already exists in the material cause in the threads. So, in a combination of threads we find its cloth. So, hence cloth is not a new creation for according to Samkhya Philosophy what they subscribe that it is theory of Satkaryavada said that any effect that we find in the world in its exist in the material cause prior to its production.

Satkaryavada is also known as Parinamavada. People also consider Satkaryavada is a different name having Parinamavada. Satkaryavada is different from Asatkaryavada. Now we will be discussing what is Asatkaryavada.

Asatkaryavada is opposite to Satkaryavada. Satkaryavada is prescribed by Samkhya Philosophy whereas; Asatkaryavada is prescribed by Nyaya Vaisheshika and Buddhism.

While they saying that Asatkaryavada is opposite to Satkaryavada, they said that in Asatkaryavada, we find every fact has a new creation, it has its different existence then the cause. The cause and effects; these two are different. Every effect or any of this effect cannot exist in its material cause prior to its production. They say that if curd is exist in the milk, then why can you save a different name saying that curd. Why cannot you say that this is also milk, that is also milk. Why you saying that is a curd. So, they further say that effect and cause is a two different phenomenon and exists differently. We cannot claim that effect exist in its material cause prior to its production. This is the theory prescribes by Nyaya Vaisheshika and Buddhism; going against the theory Satkaryavada which is prescribed by Samkhya Philosophy.


The theory Asatkaryavada is also known as Arambhavada. What is Arambhavada? Arambhavada means something has a new beginning. If the cause now transfer into a different phenomenon or effect, then the effect is a new creation. It is a new arambha, it is a beginning. When there is a milk, it is a material cause, when there is a curd is an effect right. If the effect is that this a new creation, it is a new beginning. Therefore, they say that it is a Arambhavada. So, hence for your understanding, I must repeat by according to Samkhya, they said that Satkaryavada is a theory or doctrine for which we can establish that how entities or non-entities exist in this world; both conscious and unconscious entities that exist in the world, we can prove them by taking the theory known as Satkaryavada which is known as also Parinamavada.

On the other hand, Nyaya Vaisheshika and Buddhism, they said that we are going against the Samkhya theory because we have a strong argument when we are going against Samkhya theory that we are going to discuss. However, they said that we never prescribe the theory Satkaryavada and we cannot believe that and we cannot accept that because of the doctrine Satkaryavada, the whole world exists. The entity of the whole world the objects of the whole world exist.

What they prescribe is known as the theory Asatkaryavada or Arambhavada. So, therefore, in one hand you find Samkhya which who prescribe Satkaryavada or known as Parinamavada. On the other hand you find Nyaya Vaisheshika and Buddhism those who did not accept Samkhya theory, but but they prescribed a different theory known as Asatkaryavada as well as Arambhavada. The Asatkaryavada is also known as or called as Arambhavada. There you can see that the doctrine Arambhavada states that effect

does not exist in its material cause, it is the new phenomenon which is different from its cause .

(Refer Slide Time: 13:52)




So, this is the way, this is the direction. So, which Samkhya theory prescribe their doctrine and Nyaya Vaisheshika going against Samkhya theory prescribes a different doctrine.

Now, the real question comes does an effect originally exist in the material cause prior to its production. I repeat, does an effect originally exist in the material cause prior to its production. In other word, can we say that if milk is the material cause and curd is the effect, curd exist in the milk prior to its production can we say. So, now on this issue there is an argument. Nyaya Vaisheshika argues that why we cannot say so. What is the real fault lies in the theory Satkaryavada. They have given few points, strong argument based on that they say that all the entity that exist in this world; both conscious and unconscious entity, we cannot prove them by considering the doctrine which prescribe a sankhya known as Satkaryavada.


Now, let us discuss why Nyaya Vaisheshika rejects Samkhya theory of Satkaryavada. Now there are four, five points where that Nyaya Vaisheshika find there are strong argument lies while rejecting the theory Satkaryavada.

(Refer Slide Time: 15:20)



DOES AN EFFECT ORIGINALLY EXIST IN THE MATERIAL CAUSE PRIOR TO ITS PRODUCTION?

- The Buddhas & Nyāya-Vaisesikas refute this claim.
- According to them, the effect can't exist in the material cause prior to its production.
- a. If it were, then why we call cause and effect.
- b. What is the use of efficient cause?
- c. Why can't we use the same name for both cause and effect (e.g., clay and pot)?
- d. Why can't cause and effect are used for same purpose?
- e. If Sāṃkhya says that the distinction between cause and effect is found only in 'form', then they adopt the doctrine *asatkāryavāda*.



Now, the first point is that they said that we cannot claim that the effect exists in the material cause prior to its production because if it you are so; that means, if the effect exists in the material cause prior to its production, then why at all we are calling. So, this is effect that is cause. Why you are saying, when we are saying that by identifying offing or we are saying that this is milk that is curd.

If it is so, if the effect exists in the material cause, then we cannot say that this is effect, this is cause; there are two different phenomenons when you say this is cause and that is effect.

If at all this effect exist in the material cause, we can say that this is cause and also that is cause or in other way you can say this is effect and also that is effect; that means, when pointing out the finger saying that milk, we can say that this is a cause and also pointing out the finger towards the curd, we can say also this is a curd. We cannot say so, because curd is different from milk and curd is a different form of a milk and hence for milk is different from curd and as well as we cannot say that effect exists in its cause priors to its production if curd exist in the milk, then what is the point where we can say that now it is a curd and earlier it was a milk.


If it is there, we cannot make a distinction between cause and effect. Now the second point clearly mention that if the effect exist in the material cause as prescribed by

Samkhya Philosophy, then what is the use of efficient cause? That means, when there is clay which is a material cause and when there is pot which is an effect.

They effects a pot and the material cause of if pot is say let us a clay, the clay automatically cannot be transform into a pot. There is a person, there is an artist with its technological tools creates a pot by the help of clay. So, that is a efficient cause also involved for transforming to a material cause to a to a particular object. The pot is created from the mud by someone who know that how to create a pot. So that means, the tools used while creating a pot or while producing a pot also the efficient cause involve.


Here Nyaya Vaisheshika argues that if the effect exists in the material cause, if the pot exist in the clay prior to its production, then what is the use of efficient cause? Why this efficient cause involved here? Why there is an artist involved here to create that pot?

(Refer Slide Time: 15:20)



DOES AN EFFECT ORIGINALLY EXIST IN THE MATERIAL CAUSE PRIOR TO ITS PRODUCTION?

- o The Buddhas & Nyāya-Vaisesikas refute this claim.
- o According to them, the effect can't exist in the material cause prior to its production.
- a.If it were, then why we call cause and effect.
- b.What is the use of efficient cause?
- c.Why can't we use the same name for both cause and effect (e.g., clay and pot)?
- d.Why can't cause and effect are used for same purpose?
- e.If Sāmkhya says that the distinction between cause and effect is found only in 'form', then they adopt the doctrine asatkāryavāda.



From clay we can create different things; why only pot, bowls, glass so on and so forth. Then can we claim that all the things are existed in the clay prior to its production. We cannot say because the purpose for this clay and the purpose of the glass who is totally different and the name that we have given clay and the name that we have given for a glass also different name. If everything the effect exist in the material cause, then we cannot say that effect is a different form and the material cause exist in a different form, we cannot say so.

The third point they also argued that by saying that why cannot we use the same name for both causes and effect. If you say that, the clay is an material cause of the effect pot, then why cannot we say that only one name for both cause and effect, why cannot we say by pointing out our finger by saying that this is clay and also that is clay by pointing out our finger to the pot. Why cannot we say. So, when we cannot say so, it simply implies that material cause and its effect are two different phenomenon and hence what to do different objects or entities exist in this world. We cannot say that the effect is a pot exist in the material cause. If you say sure then there is no point to give a different name for a different product; one product is clay another product is pot. Since hence we cannot say so. Therefore, we have to reject the theory prescribed by the Samkhya Philosophy known Satkaryavada.

The fourth point they argue that why cannot the cause effect are used for the same purpose. Here what they are saying is that that when there is a material cause clay is there and when there is a effect pot is there as for the Samkhya Philosophy this says that the effect pre-exist in the material cause priors to production here Nyaya Vaisheshika and Buddhism argues that. If this is so, in other words, the pot used for a different purpose, can you use the clay in the same purpose; the purpose for which we are using the pot which is an effect. We cannot do so.

Pot can be used for you know keeping waters keeping any oil things or any things inside that pot it can be same, but can you use the clay for the same purpose we cannot do. So, and hence for we cannot say that both are same entities. We cannot say that the pot is an effect exist in the material cause and also solving the same purpose we cannot say so. Hence we cannot say so, the cause and effect are two different entities and can be separated from each other.


And with these arguments Nyaya Vaisheshika claim and Buddhisit also claim that the theory that prescribe by the Samkhya Philosophy is not a valid one, not is strong one and further they say that, if at all Samkhya Philosophy convince by accepting that the cause and effect are two different phenomenon because they have a different forms, then Nyaya Vaisheshika and Buddhism are very happy to accept this because if at all Samkhya Philosophy accept this cause and effect are where is only in forms, then the Nyaya Vaisheshika and Buddhism saying that when they are two different form it simply

mean that two different object and hence for the effect never exist in the cause prior to its production.

That means whatever they argue is a theory Asatkaryavada it will sustain; however, the theory prescribed the Satkaryavada it will be declined or it will be rejected, but now we will see whether Samkhya accept this condition that given by Nyaya Vaisheshika and Buddhism or they have condemned all this allegations made against the theory Satkaryavada. Now we will see how Samkhya theory establishes the theory Satkaryavada.

For claiming that every effect exist in the material cause because every event has a cause and cause effect has a relation. We cannot separate effect from the cause. If you separate then we must believe that there should not be any inherence relation between cause and effect. Now we will see in the next slide how Samkhya theory establish their argument while rejecting the allegations made by Nyaya Vaisheshika and Buddhist theory.

(Refer Slide Time: 22:28)



Now, proofs of Satkaryavada. Now this sloka I will be reading out for your benefit that asadakaranad upadana grahanat sarvasambhava bhavat saktasya sakyakaranat karanabhavac ca satkaryam. I repeat further asadakaranad upadana grahanat sarvasambhavabhavat saktasya sakyakaranat karanabhavac ca satkaryam. This is a sloka inserted by Isvara Krishna is a commenter as you find in Samkhya karika.

What it means is that the effect subsists even prior to the operation of cause. What they mean is that, what that Isvara Krishna means is that, if you understand the Samkhya Philosophy in a true spirit in a proper spirit what Samkhya Philosophy prescribes is that though there is an efficient cause involved for transforming a material cause to the effect.

Prior to that efficient cause also, the effect exists in its material cause. This sloka divides into four parts and the last one is adding another part. So, therefore, five parts. First part is *asadakaranat*, this first part, the second part will be *upadana grahanat*, the third part will be *sarvasambhavabhavat*, the fourth part will be *saktasya sakyakaranat*, the fifth part will be *karanabhavac*. So, these are five claims made by Samkhya Philosophy for establishing for proving the doctrine that *Satkaryavada* that how effect exists in the material cause prior to its production.

Now, these are the five points we will be describing in the following slides. This is the Isvara Krishna when they inserted this sloka in the Samkhya *karika*, it clearly means is that the theory has its own stamina to establish the existence of the only phenomena.

The existence of both conscious entity and non-conscious entity in this earth. What he means even that, before the efficient cause comes to the existence the effect already lies in its material because if this is not so, then we cannot say that this effect comes from that cause. If the effect does not lie in that cause; that means, that particular effect can be produced by any other causes which is not the case. Giving an example, can we get curd from any of the causes let us say oil seeds sands or a water any from any of this material cause can we get curd we cannot get. Therefore, they say that the curd only can derive the curd only exist when there is a milk. So, therefore, if you do not believe that curd exists in the milk prior to its production; that means, it simply implies that curd can be derived from any of this material cause for example, seeds, trees, sands, water, kerosene etcetera which is not the case.

Now, we will see, what are the five arguments Samkhya given for establishing their theory *Satkaryavada*. Now Samkhya highlights five points.

(Refer Slide Time: 25:57)

SĀMKHYA HIGHLIGHTS FIVE POINTS

- what is non-existent cannot be brought into existence by the operation of cause
- A particular effect can be produced out of a particular material cause
- There is impossibility of all things coming out from all things
- Something can only produce what it is capable of producing. A potent cause has causal energy to produce a particular effect. The causal energy is to be inferred through its effect.
- The effect is not different from the cause. If it were, then we have to establish an identical relation between an entity and a non-entity, which will be a vague one.


First they said that what is non existence cannot be brought into existence by the operation of cause. I will read further, what is non existence cannot be brought into existence by the operation of cause. What is saying that, if something non existence somewhere, can you bring something out of that. What is that is what I just said that categorically that if something does not exist in a particular cause, can you bring that existence further.

If the pot does not exist in the material cause clay, can you bring the pot from any other material cause from like rock, like sands, like waters, like any other causes. Can you bring. So, we cannot bring. So, therefore, they saying that the pot already existed in the material cause clay hence for by the help of efficient cause, we are now getting a pot from the material cause clay.

If the pot does not exist in the material cause, then it simply implies that pot can be brought from various causes, may be causes like a from any other material cause like say gold, like ornaments, any other things which, but which is not the case therefore, the first argument that defense to the Nyaya Vaisheshika saying that which is non existence cannot be brought into existence. If the curd does not exist in the milk we cannot bring the curd from the milk. Therefore, first argument they reject thus the Nyaya Vaisheshika argument that only Asatkaryavada can help to existence of objects in this earth.

The second point is they are saying that a particular effect can be produced from a particular cause; that means, only this two things are inseparably related. A particular effect can be produce from a particular cause; that means, that particular effect cannot to be produced from any other causes. What they saying is that if you say that this is a pot you can produce only from clay, if this is a curd you can produce only from milk, it cannot be produced from any other sources. If this is not sure, then why we hesitant to accept that that the effect exist in the material cause prior to its production. In the first point when they say that nothing can be comes brings to the existence from the non existence.

(Refer Slide Time: 25:57)



What it means that, if any of the artists will come ,can that artist transform to the blue color to the red color or yellow color at any chance cannot be do. So, because the red color cannot be bring from the blue color. Henceforth whatever the efficient cause will be involved if the effect does not exist in the material cause cannot comes to the existence.

The second point is they are saying that, if a effect can be produced from different material cause, then why cannot we say that the curd can be produced from water, from kerosene, from sugar, from any of the material cause, but which is not the case; that means, we have to accept that that the effect exist in the material cause prior to its products.

Now, if you see the argument, a blue color cannot be transform to the red color or yellow color. That means, you cannot brought the red color or green color from the blue color by any of the artist; that means, whatever efficient cause you involved for transforming a material cause to the efficient cause, you cannot do that until unless the effect exist in the material cause.

Now, the third point they clearly state that there is impossibility of all things brings from all things. What they say that; that means, there is an inherence relation that you find between cause and effect. You cannot bring everything from everything; that means, you cannot bring a table from a glass, you cannot bring a glass from water, you cannot bring curd from let us say diesel. You cannot get diesel from any of this hard objects. That means, a particular effect must produce from a particular cause and a if this is not so, then we can get every object from any of this material cause, but which is not the case.

We can only get curd from the milk, we can only get clothes from the threads; here threads are the material cause and cloth is the effect. Henceforth if we accept this norm that all things cannot be produced from each and every things, then we have to adhere to the principle of Satkaryavada which states that every fact exist in its material cause prior to its production.

(Refer Slide Time: 25:57)

SĀMĀKHĪYA HIGHLIGHTS FIVE POINTS

- what is non-existent cannot be brought into existence by the operation of cause
- A particular effect can be produced out of a particular material cause
- There is impossibility of all things coming out from all things
- Something can only produce what it is capable of producing. A potent cause has causal energy to produce a particular effect. The causal energy is to be inferred through its effect.
- The effect is not different from the cause. If it were, then we have to establish an identical relation between an entity and a non-entity, which will be a vague one.

This is the third argument. The fourth argument they said that something can only be produced, what is capable of producing a potent cause has causal energy to produce a particular effect. What they mean is that, if a material cause does not have that causal energy to produce a particular effect; we cannot derive that effect at any cost. If the milk has not a causal energy to produce a curd, we cannot bring curd at any cost; whatever the efficient cause we involve, whoever the person will be try to even convert from milk to curd cannot be do that.

The question puts in this way. Can we bring curd by any of the human being or any of the person from water? Can a person get curd from the kerosene? We cannot do so. Because the milk has its energy the milk has its has its capable of producing curd; that means, if the milk has not capable of producing the curd, we cannot think that the curd only be produced from the milk. We can think in other alternatives also curd can be produced from any other liquids like water, kerosene, diesel etcetera etcetera, but which is not that, that means, a particular cause is capable of producing some particular effect.

In other hand, they said that milk cannot produce a iron rod. Milk cannot produce a plastic bucket. Milk only can produce a curd. Henceforth, they say that the whatever the efficient cause will be involved in between while transforming from the material cause to the to its effect, we find that the effect potentially like in its material cause otherwise the particular effect cannot be comes to the existence.

And they say that while seeing the effect we can only infer to the cause; that means, the effect has to be seen and while the cause has to be inferred; that means, by seeing the curd we can infer that it is existed in the milk prior to its production it cannot be perceived because no one can claim that.

Now, it is the time when milk transform to the curd no one can see that. For example, no man can identify that when his or her hair growth or nail growth, but after sometime he or she realizes that the nail grows or the hair grows. In the same way no one can point out that this is the moment this is the time where the milk transform to the curd.

But; however, by seeing the curd by perceiving the curd can infer what its material cause is therefore, here Samkhya argues that if the milk does not have any potential cause to produce a curd, it cannot bring curd from the milk. Therefore, the curd is an effect exists

in its material cause prior to its production. And if this has to be only infer the material cause has to be infer. In this way cause and effect of inherence relation.

The fifth argument they say that what we can see is a effect that is a curd, but what we cannot see is the milk. When you see a curd you cannot see milk in it what you see is a different form it is not milk, but you can infer that it exists because the material cause will be milk. If you accept that, that means, in one hand you are saying that something is exist, but in another hand, you are saying that something does not exist.


Samkhya here, arguing against Nyaya Vaisheshika saying that if you adhere at all Asatkaryavada which says that effect is a new creation it has it does not exist in this material cause. If you say so; that means, as a curd as a affect you accept it and you never accept that it comes from a milk. That means, you claim that something existed and it derived from the nonexistence which is an observed phenomena can you derive an existence from the nonexistence. You cannot do so. Therefore, you cannot argue that Asatkaryavada principle is the valid principle or a valid doctrine for identifying, for creating all the objects in this world. Therefore, they say that based on this five arguments that we can adhere to, we can stick to the doctrine Satkaryavada and we can claim them effect existence material cause prior to its production and henceforth all the objects that we see, that exist in this world are infer, many of the objects that we infer and believe that they are exist in this world. It is because of the doctrine Satkaryavada.

If you do not believe on the Satkaryavada at some of the point, you can say that this object exist accidental where Satkaryavada or the Samkhya Philosophy hesitant to accept that something exist accidental which does not have a any cause. Therefore, they prescribe the principle by saying that every fact must have cause prior to its production.

If this is not so we cannot say that a particular effect produce from a particular cause. We cannot even say that a material cause has its own potential to produce a particular effect and if we have at all accepting the Nyaya Vaisheshika theory of Asatkaryavada or Arambhavada; that means, we have a possibility or we can easily claim that everything can be produce from everything or without having any potential cause of an matter, we can produce any of its effect.

That means, we need not to think of an effect what is the responsible of its cause. We can think that if there is an effect it can be produced from any of the causes or any of the material cause that exist in this earth which is not the case. Therefore, samkhya while establishing that theory Satkaryavada rejects the Nyaya Vaisheshika argument against the theory Satkaryavada.

(Refer Slide Time: 36:57)



FURTHER SĀMKHYA ARGUES

- Production is manifestation
- Destruction is disappearance, absorption into the cause
- Production is transition from an implicit to an explicit condition.
- Destruction is transition from explicit to an implicit condition.
- Production is unfoldment, destruction is enfoldment
- Production is development and destruction is envelopment
- Example: Gold is transformed into ornaments, ornaments are melted into gold.
- Thus, production is not a creation, but it is only manifested what was there in the cause.

NIPTTEL

Now we will be seeing now the Samkhya argument in a further form that how samkhya further strengthen this argument on Satkaryavada. They say that production; that means, the effect is the manifestation of the cause. It is a different form, we see and also said that the destruction is disappearance or absorption into the cause; that means, from the gold you produce an ornament, you create an ornament; here ornament is an effect and the material cause of that ornament is a gold, but again when that ornament will be melted at this all ornament transform to the material cause known as gold.

So, therefore, gold is the material cause when you will create an ornament, you take the help from the gold; that means, the effect already exist in the material cause and when you melted the ornaments, it will be now comes to existence of its own cause that is gold.


That means, the cause and effect have its own inherence relation. When the ornament get melted, then you will find gold which is it is material cause. In this way samkhya also

argues in a different way by saying that how Satkaryavada really exists in this earth and with the help of this doctrine, we can prove each and everything exist in this earth having different shape, different size and different color.

Now they also claim that, production is a transition from an implicit to an explicit condition. That means, when an ornament created from the gold it is a transformation from implicit to the explicit condition. When it is a gold it says implicit condition, the ornament existed in the in the gold in it implicit condition form.

When you already created by the efficient cause of ornament, it is an explicit form. It is a different manifestation of gold, but the material cause as it exist. Henceforth they say that the cause and effect if at all you saying that they are different only in form not in essence. Please remember please understand that Satkaryavada or Samkhya Philosophy Satkaryavada; they also ideas to the principle by saying that the effect and cause if at all they are different, they are different only in form, but not in essence.

(Refer Slide Time: 39:23)



FURTHER SĀMKHYA ARGUES

- Production is manifestation
- Destruction is disappearance, absorption into the cause
- Production is transition from an implicit to an explicit condition.
- Destruction is transition from explicit to an implicit condition.
- Production is unfoldment, destruction is enfoldment
- Production is development and destruction is envelopment
- Example: Gold is transformed into ornaments, ornaments are melted into gold.
- Thus, production is not a creation, but it is only manifested what was there in the cause.


The effect is the manifestation of the cause, but when the effect get dissolute or get destruction or get then it again transform to its cause. The cause which responsible for create that product or that effect.

Now, they said that production is the transition from an implicit to an explicit condition. On the other hand, destruction is the transition from explicit to an implicit condition.

That means, when destruction is an effect that is it when you melted the ornament it, it will transfer to the gold you can get the gold; that means, the explicit condition of that gold will be an ornament and the implicit condition will be the gold and henceforth when you melted the ornament, you find the gold which is a material cause.



Production is enfoldment; that means, is a manifestation of that material cause, but wherever when it's destroyed it is an enfoldment. It again gets its own position of material cause. Production is development and destruction is envelopment. For example, as I said gold is transformed into ornaments and also ornaments are melted into gold; that means, when once you melt the ornament, it will be getting its own shape of material cause gold. Thus production is not a new creation, but it is only manifested what was there in its cause.

(Refer Slide Time: 40:39)



CAUSE AND EFFECT ALTER ONLY IN FORM, NOT IN ESSENCE

- The effect is not different from its material cause because of its property. (e.g. cloth & thread)
- The causal relation is seen between cause and effect, hence they cannot detach from each other
- The material cause and effect can't be separated from each other because they are not different in their essence.
- The quantitative equality found between material cause and effect. They are identical with each other. (e.g. weightage of cloth and the threads used in it)
- Can we claim something comes out of nothing, or the non-existence comes into existence? This is absurd.


 

When they saying that the effect is not a new creation rather it is a manifestation of the cause, they reject they completely reject the argument given by Nyaya Vaisheshika and Buddhist. They further claim that cause and effect if they are interchange or if you find that effect is a different form and causes is a different form, they are having only manifestation. They appear differently because they were different form, but they are not different in essence.

This is the argument they prescribe, this is the argument they adhere to and also they have given some reason for that. They said that the effect is not different from its material cause because of its property. When you say that that cloth and thread given an example say cloth is an effect and its material cause is thread, they say that cloth and the thread they were different form, but the essence will be same.



The essence of thread and essence of the cloth remains as same. Hence for cause effect cannot be separate. Further they said that based on the quantity; that means, when the cloth is created or produced, the material cause will be thread. Here it is said that whatever the weight age of thread used for creating that cloth is same as the weight age of that cloth. That means, they said that the material cause and effect have the same quantitative equality; that means, they are identical with each other. The quantitative equality found between the material cause and its effect, they are identical with each other.

(Refer Slide Time: 40:39)



CAUSE AND EFFECT ALTER ONLY IN FORM, NOT IN ESSENCE

- The effect is not different from its material cause because of its property. (e.g. cloth & thread)
- The causal relation is seen between cause and effect, hence they cannot detach from each other
- The material cause and effect can't be separated from each other because they are not different in their essence.
- The quantitative equality found between material cause and effect. They are identical with each other. (e.g. weightage of cloth and the threads used in it)
- Can we claim something comes out of nothing, or the non-existence comes into existence? This is absurd.

The weight age of cloth and threads used in it are same. Henceforth, the cause and effect are not separated rather the effect exist in its material cause priors to its production. If it is not so, then the cloth cannot have the same weight age, the threads weight age that used in that producing that cloth. They say that the causal relation is seen between cause and effect hence it cannot be discharged from each other; that means, whenever there is a effect there is a cause; that means, whenever there is a let us say curd, you find that its


cause will be milk. And it is invariably associated in everywhere in this earth and hence forth we cannot separate neither separate nor conjoin between this two phenomenon: one is effect another is cause. What we can see why we call that object is a effect and this object is a cause because they appears differently, they have a different form, but they are essential they are one and the same.

The effect pre-exist in the material cause prior to its production. Further they said the material cause and effect cannot be separated from each other because they cannot differ from there essence. While they saying that, they said that is it the possibility for us we can differentiate the effect from the curd if you say so, then we have to accept that that particular effect can be produced from many of the causes.

A curd can be produced from various of its material causes let us say cause sand, cause water, cause kerosene; any of this liquid, but which is not the case. Therefore, they strongly advocates the principle of Satkaryavada and saying that it is because of the Satkaryavada the whole world exist, whole the objects of the whole world exist in a different form, different cell, different size and different color.

The last argument saying that can we claim something comes out of nothing or non existence comes into existence. If we accept that all the effect and we say that effect is a new creation which is not there in the causes. That means, we are accepting that or we are accepting that we are capable of bring something existent from the non existence which seems to be absurd which cannot be the case in this earthly life. Therefore the doctrine prescribes by Nyaya Vaisheshika is completely rejected.

(Refer Slide Time: 44:41)




Now after doing that, after rejecting the Nyaya Vaisheshika arguments against Satkaryavada, now Samkhya feels happy. By seeing all this counter argument to the Nayayikas Nyaya Vaisheshika and Buddhism, they further argued to the Samkhya doctrine. They are saying that if both causes and effect are different states of one and the same substance, then why these are not used for one purpose.

What they are saying that, if at all you are trying to convince that cause and effect are two different form in a different manifestation, they are only differ in their manifestation, but essentially they are same. Can you used the cause and effect for one purpose only? Can we use the clay in one hand and pot in other hand for a one particular purpose? We cannot do so because the pot is used in a different purpose whereas the clay cannot be used for the same purposes.

In this argument, Samkhya did not have any reply to Nyaya Vaisheshika. However they said that we accept two forms of Satkaryavada: one is parinamavada, another is vivartavada. What is parinamavada if the real transformation of the cause in to the effect. That means, the real transformation means you can see that the transformation the clay it looks in a different when it will transform the pot or bowl it is a different. This kind of transformation is known as parinamavada which is also prescribes by Samkhya or also you can known as Satkaryavada. This is a parinamavada.

Samkhya gives this name or this kind of transformation is known as prakriti parinamavada. In other kind of forms also Samkhya accepts because Samkhya believes that there are two types of Satkaryavada: one is parinamavada that that I have discussed now. This is a completely transformation from cause to effect. Another is vivartavada, the transformation of cause to the effect is an apparent it is a kind of superficial; where this is advocates or this is prescribes by advaita vedantins.


(Refer Side Time: 46:46)



According to them, the whole world is created, the objects are created and the responsible for creation of all those objects in this cosmos or everything happen in the cosmic order. Its responsible is Brahman; that means, Brahman is fine in some more other form in all the entities both conscious and non conscious entity. Therefore, vivartavada say that the change of cause into effect is nearly an apparent or superficial. That they say that how to understand this concept, they say that we see a snake in a rope; that means, the rope will be lie in the road in the such a manner that we confuse by stating that it may be a snake, but which is not the case.

We see a snake in a rope because the rope takes the shapes of snakes. The difference of rope and snakes are only is a superficial, its appears only apparent, but it is not the true case. This two are two totally different phenomenon hence for cause and effect are two totally different, but sometimes they appears as same.

(Refer Slide Time: 46:46)



SATKĀRYAVĀDA HAS TWO FORMS

- Parināmavāda: the real transformation of the cause in to the effect (e.g.; pot & clay, cud & milk, etc.)
- Parināmavāda = satkāryavāda (Sāmkhya Philosophy)
- Vivartavāda: the change of cause into effect is merely apparent/superficial. (e.g. we see a snake in a rope)
- Vivartavāda is advocated by *Advaita Vedāntins*
- Sāmkhya calls the Vivartavāda as-- Prakriti Parināmavāda
- Rāmānuja-- Brahma parināmavāda (the world is only transformation of Brahman)
- Sankara--- Brahma Vivartavāda

This is said by advaita vedantins. Now this is the vivartavada prescribed by advaita vedantins. Samkhya cause this vivartavada as a prakriti parinamavada because for Samkhya, it is because of the prakriti which is the responsible for the whole creation of this world and different objects in the world. In the next session, we will discuss what is the theory that what is the ideas that Samkhya Philosophy describes prakriti and how prakriti really responsible for creating the whole universe and objects of the world.

What they said is that, the vivartavada if at all they are claiming as one of the version of Satkaryavada, it is known as prakriti parinamavada by Samkhya Philosophy. Another philosopher known as Ramanuja, they say that Brahma parinamavada; that means, for him, the world is only transformation of Brahman because if the world you find everything, every objects exist is a just because of Brahman. So, therefore, it is a Brahma parinamavada; that means, it is a real transformation you find. Brahman is a different one and objects of the world is a different one; however, the Brahman in a some more other form find in all the observes of the world which is known as Brahman parinamavada prescribed by Ramanuja.

On the other hand, Sankara who believes in advaita vedantins who is a part of advaita vedantins, he prescribes that Brahman vivartavada; that means, Brahman is the soul reality and everything that we find is all about Maya or because of our ignorance, we say that there is a discrimination we say that these are the objects and Brahman which far

away from that. On the other hand, they said that Brahman creates everything and because of our illusionary mind or Maya, everything appears to us different; however, Brahman is the only and only one soul reality.

So, this is all about the theory of causation prescribed by Samkhya. For a brief recapitulation, I say that Satkaryavada is different from Asatkaryavada. Satkaryavada prescribes by Samkhya Philosophy which is known as Parinamavada. Asatkaryavada which is also known as Arambhavada prescribes by Nyaya Vaisheshika philosophy.

Now, their argument from each other you can see that how Nyaya Vaisheshika counter onwards Samkhya theory and how Samkhya also gives the responses to their arguments and further we said that Satkaryavada are of two different forms: one is vivartavada another is parinamavada and how vivartavada considered by advaita vedantins, Sankara Ramanuja and Samkhya Philosophy. On the other hand, how Samkhya Philosophy also consider this Satkaryavada in a different form that we are all discussed. In the next class we will be describing how really prakriti responsible for creating all cosmos of in this universe. Thank you so much.