UNIT 3: SĀṂKHYA: THEORY OF CAUSATION

UNIT STRUCTURE

3.1 Learning objectives

3.2 Introduction

3.3 Definition of Causation

3.4 Theories of Causation in Indian philosophy

3.5 Satkāryavāda in Sāṁkhya philosophy

3.6 Identical nature of Cause and Effect

3.7 Criticism of Satkāryavāda

3.8 Prakṛti parināmavāda in Sāṁkhya philosophy

3.9 Let us sum up

3.10 Further readings

3.11 Answers to check your progress

3.12 Model Questions

3.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit you will be able to:

- discuss Sāṁkhya philosophy as an orthodox system of Indian philosophy,
- define causation,
- explain Satkāryavāda as a theory of causation,
- discuss Sāṁkhya theory of Satkāryavāda,
- describe Asatkāryavāda as a theory of causation,
- discuss the criticisms of Satkāryavāda as a theory of causation,
- discuss reflection on parināmavāda and vivartavāda,
- explain Prakṛti parināmavāda as different from Brahma vivartavāda.

3.2 INTRODUCTION

This Unit introduces to you a brief sketch of Sāṃkhya philosophy as one of the fundamental orthodox systems of Indian philosophy. Sāṁkhya philosophy is considered as one of the primordial system of Indian philosophy. It believes in the authority of the Upanishads and as such follows the characteristic of being orthodox system or āstika school of Indian philosophy. But interestingly enough Kapila, who is said to be the path finder of this system, has never admitted the existence of God. The reason for such conclusion follows because according to him God's existence cannot be proved. Following this particular sentiment of atheism the Sāṁkhya philosophy is sometimes known as the 'atheistic Sāṅkhya' or as 'nirisvara Sāṅkhya'. But this particular assertion on Sāṁkhya philosophy is only hypothetical and many a time runs the risk of controversy.

Traditionally, it is accepted that the sage Kapila made his first interpretation about Sāṃkhya philosophy in his sutra known as 'Sāṅkhya-sūtra'. This sūtra being a brief account on the system, again an elaborate work is further developed by the sage himself entitled as the 'Sāṅkhya-pravacana sūtra'. It is supposed that 'Sāṅkhya-pravacana sūtra' is composed in the 14th century. Oral evidence follows that later on there is another work authored by Kapila as 'Tattvasamasa'. To talk on the earliest available work on Sāṁkhya philosophy, we can cite to 'Sāṃkhyakārika of Isvarakṛsna' who is believed to be the disciple of Asuri. It is to be noted that Asuri follows the teaching of the sage Kapila. Gaudapada also wrote a commentary on Sāṃkhya-Kārika. You have to remember that the most scholarly work on Sāṃkhya philosophy is a commentary on Sāṃkhyakārika, known as 'Sāṃkhyatattvakaumuda'. 'Sāṃkhyatattvakaumuda' is accepted as the most authoritative work on Sāṃkhya philosophy. We find references to Sāṃkhya and its co-related and counter system Yoga, in the Upanishads like the 'Chhandogya, the Prashna, the Katha and most mention worthy in the Shvetashvatara. The epic of India, like Mahābhārata, following the Gitā have referred to Sāṃkhya-Yoga doctrines. The Smṛtis and the Purāna including

Badarayana who has in his credit a sūtra popularly known as the 'Vedānta-sūtra' have often included the references of Sāṃkhya-Yoga doctrines.

It will be interesting for you to know in this lesson that the word Sāṃkhya takes two meanings. Sometimes it assumes the reference of 'Sāṃkhya' and many a time as 'Sāṅkhya'. According to some thinkers, we find the word 'Sāṃkhya' and it refers to 'samyak khyati' or jñana. The word 'Sāṃkhya' also refers to 'knowledge of the nature of pure spirit'. Sāṃkhya system is believed to establish a careful and philosophical speculation regarding the reality of the pure spirit. Therefore, Sāṃkhya philosophy is often considered as a system advocating both theoretical and intellectual aspects. It teaches predominantly the right knowledge of separating the pure spirit i.e. the Purusa from the material root cause of the world i.e. the Prakriti. Again according to many thinkers the word 'Sāṃkhya' is derived from the word 'Sāṅkhya'. This word 'Sāṅkhya' often refers to the theory of number. It reflects to 'an analytical enumeration of the principles of the universe'. Here we find the information that 'Sāṅkhya' 'enumerates the metaphysical principle of reality'. This particular meaning of the word 'Sāṅkhya' referring to number is applied because it advocates 'right knowledge of reality by enumeration of the ultimate objects of knowledge.' Sāṃkhya philosophy propounds very thoroughly like many other systems of Indian philosophy that it is the right knowledge of reality which can make an individual to attain freedom from sufferings of life. Therefore Sāṃkhya-Yoga forebear the characteristic of Indian philosophy of being both theoretical and practical because it states that Yoga goes hand in hand with Sāṃkhya. Yoga means practice and finally makes us to know that it is possible for an individual to realize the metaphysical teachings of Sāṃkhya in actual practical life. In this regard we can remember another two systems of Indian philosophy. They are Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika system. These two systems also advocate that the practical right knowledge of reality can put an end to the sufferings of life. The metaphysical aspect of Sāṃkhya philosophy, therefore, teaches the practical knowledge of the self. Here we also find that Sāṁkhya philosophy acknowledges only two kinds of ultimate realities. These two ultimate realities are spirit (Puruṣa) and matter (Prakṛti). It is very interesting

to learn that Sāṃkhya metaphysics which supports Prakṛti as one of the two ultimate realities rests on its theory of causation. This theory of causation is known as Satkāryavāda.

3.3 DEFINITION OF CAUSATION

The dictionary meaning of causation is 'the relation between cause and effect, or the act of bringing about an effect, which may be an event, a state, or an object (say, a statue)'. We all know that the concept of causation has a long association with human query. It is also asserted that causation can be understood as the capacity of one variable to influence another. Regarding the theory of causation we always see that the first variable will bring the second variable into existence or may cause the incidence of the second variable to fluctuate.

Thus we can say that the following two features are inevitable when we look forward to know about causation:

a. The action of causing

b. The relation of cause to effect

Sāṅkhya theory of causation finds the two mentioned features in its own unique way while referring to its theory of causation. In view to the principle of causation which gives guidance to the transformations in the atomic stage for e.g. milk, changes into curd the Sāṃkhya says that "as the total energy remains the same while the world is constantly evolving, cause and effect are only more or less evolved forms of the same ultimate Energy. The sum of effects exists in the sum of causes in a potential form. The grouping or collection alone changes and this brings on the manifestation of the latent powers of the gunas, but without creation of anything new. What is called the (material) cause is only the power which is efficient in the production or rather the vehicle of the power. This power is the unmanifested (or potential) form of the Energy set free (udbhutavrtii) in the effect. But the concomitant conditions are necessary to call forth the so-called material cause into activity".

3.4 THEORIES OF CAUSATION IN INDIAN PHILOSOPHY

In Indian philosophy there are two theories of causation. They are Satkāryavāda and Asatkāryavāda. Satkāryavāda is one of the central problems of Sāṅkhya philosophy. The Sāṃkhya metaphysics analyzing on the doctrine of Prakṛti, is based on its theory of Satkāryavāda. According to this theory, the effect is not a new creation. Creation is only an explicit manifestation of what is implicitly contained in the cause. Sāṃkhya philosophy, therefore, advocates that a cause is an entity in which the effect subsists in a latent form. In other words we can say that the Sāṃkhya theory of causation maintains that the effect pre-exists in the cause in a potential condition. The effect is a modification (parinama) of the cause. The effect is only a manifestation. It is just a development, or redistribution of the cause.

Usually the fundamental question arises that does an effect in its original state exist in the material cause before to its production. The Nyāya-Vaiśeṣikas has given reply to this question negatively on the other hand Sāṁkhya has given reply to this question positively. According to the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣikas, the effect can never exist in the cause. Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika holds that the effect is really a new beginning (ārambha). Therefore, the effect is a new creation. Moreover the effect (karya) can never pre-exist (asat) in the material cause because if it is so then we cannot say that the effect is produced. This theory explains that the effect or kārya is asat or non-existent before its production. In response to this view, Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika argues that for e.g. if the pot already exists in the clay then where is the necessity of the potter to exert his efficiency in producing the pot out of the clay. If the pot already exists in the clay/mud then it is nonsense to talk on the production of the pot out of the clay. Nyāya-Vaiśeṣikas, Hinayāna Buddhism, Materialism and few followers of Mimāmsā believe in the theory of new creation. This theory of new creation of the effect is, therefore, called Ārambhavāda. It is often called as Asatkāryavāda.

To be more specific regarding the theory of Arambhavāda or Asatkāryavāda, the above mentioned systems have their own explanations and have accepted their unique arguments on the view that production is a new creation. So we find that Materialism believes in Svabhāvavāda. Again Hināyana Buddhism believes in Anitya-paramānuvada or Kṣanabhangavāda. Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika and few followers of Mimāmsā support Nitya-paramānu-kāranavāda.

On the contrary to Ārambhavāda or Asatkāryavāda, Sāṃkhya accepts that the effect is not a new beginning. The effect can never be non-existent in the cause. The effect exists (sat) in the cause before its manifestation. According to Satkāryavādins, the effect is only an explicit manifestation of that which was implicitly contained in the material cause. Thus Satkāryavāda holds that the effect already exists in the material cause before it is produced. Sāṃkhya refutes Ārambhavāda or Asatkāryavāda.



CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 1. What is Satkāryavāda?

……

Q 2. Mention one feature of Asatkāryavāda

……

Q 3. State whether statements are True or False

a) Buddhism believes in Satkāryavāda.

b) Samkhya refutes Ārambhavāda.

3.5 SATKĀRYAVĀDA IN SĀṂKHYA PHILOSOPHY

According to Sāṃkhya philosophy, every material effect is the modification (parināma) of Prakṛti. All effects pre-exist in the primordial bosom of Prakṛti. Every effect simply manifests itself only at the time of creation. Again at the time of dissolution the effect returns to Prakṛti. Satkāryavāda acknowledges the view that there cannot be new production

and even cannot be utter destruction. Production implies in Sāṃkhya system as manifestation (avirbhava). Production refers to development. On the other hand dissolution refers to envelopment. It also means dissolution (tirobhava). Hence in Sāṃkhya theory of causation destruction supports evolution and destruction supports involution.

Sāṃkhya puts forward several arguments to support Satkāryavāda as a theory of causation. The arguments are:

1. If the effect does not pre-exist or non-existent in its material cause, it becomes a mere non-entity like the hare's horn or the sky-flower. In this circumstance the effect can never be produced (asadakaranat); red cannot be turned into white even by a thousand artists. The effect is related to its cause. Otherwise any effort of an agent becomes just meaningless to bring the production into existence. The question here arises: can an agent bring out the thread out of water? The reply is negative. So Sāṃkhya argues that if a production has to be produced out of some material cause then the production must pre-exit in the cause. The production is possible or manifested only because of certain favorable conditions. For e.g. oil is produced by crushing or pressing the oil seeds. The activity of pressing or crushing the oil seed is the efficient cause of the agent and is necessary to manifest the oil. Here the production of the oil becomes possible because the oil is implicit in the oil seed. 'Effectuation is nothing but manifestation' (abhivyakti).
2. In Satkāryavāda we find an invariable relation between the effect and the cause. This invariable relation has made possible the effect to be manifest from its material cause (upadanagrahanat). 'This proves that the effects are pre-existent in their causes in a latent condition'. The jar is produced out of clay only. The material cause has the capacity to produce only that effect with which it is causally related. In other word the cause cannot produce that effect with which it is not causally related. Hence the effect must pre-exist in the cause before its prior production or it is actually produced.

3. Everything cannot be produced out of everything. Our information always supports that only certain production is produced from certain material cause. This suggests that the effect pre-exists before its manifestation and therefore the effect is always in an implicit form in its material cause (sarvasambhavabhavat). For.eg. Cloth can be woven out of threads. It is possible because the cloth pre-exist in the threads. It is only because of this reason, the potter always takes clay to produce the pot or milk produces curd. So the effect is pre-existent in the cause. The cause therefore produces the effect only when it is related to the effect.

4. The effect must be potentially in the cause. Only an efficient cause can produce that for which it is potent. A potent cause has causal energy to produce a particular effect. The effect before its manifestation is potentially contained in the material cause. It is the potent power of the material cause that is definitely related to the effect. This results that the effect pre-exists in the material cause in an unmanifested form before its production. Thus production allows only actualization of the potential (shaktasya shakya-karanat). Hence the effect must be pre-existent in its potent cause only.

5. If the effect is non-existent in the cause then we have to conclude that the non-existent comes into existence from the cause. This is a hindrance in the law of causation as nothing can come out of nothing (ex nihilo nihil fit). The effect is identical with the material cause because it is the essence of its material cause. The cause is the implicit form and effect is the explicit form of the same process. Therefore we see always that the curd is contained in the milk, pot in the clay, oil in the oil seed etc. etc. The effect therefore pre-exists in its material cause (karanabhavat).

So, Sāṃkhya agrees to the view that production allows manifestation (avirbhava). On the other hand destruction means disappearance (tirobhava). The theory of causation in Sāṃkhya philosophy

advocates that production refers to only a transition from an implicit condition to an explicit condition. Again destruction refers to a transition from an explicit condition to an implicit condition. Therefore, production means an unfoldment (abhivyakti) and destruction means an enfoldment. Satkāryavāda concludes that production leads to evolution while destruction leads to dissolution. It can be cited, 'Thread is woven into cloth while cloth is again changed/hair-split into thread'. In the Bhāgavad Gitā we find that in essence the effect is identical with the cause. It says as thus: "There is no creation of the non-existent, there is no destruction of the existent". The effect is never a new creation of a non-existent entity. The effect is always a manifestation of a pre-existent latent effect.

3.6 IDENTICAL NATURE OF CAUSE AND EFFECT IN SATKĀRYAVĀDA

The following are the arguments through which Sāṃkhya proves the identical nature of cause and its effect.

Sāṃkhya observes that the effect is essentially identical with the cause in nature.

1. The effect cannot be different from its material cause. The effect is an inherent property of the cause. We see that the pot is not different from the clay which is its material cause. The pot is an inherent property of the clay. This concludes that essentially an object can never be different from its effect because production inheres in the causal object. A gold ornament is different from clay because gold ornament cannot inhere in clay. But a pot inheres in clay so a pot is not different from clay essentially.
2. The material cause and the effect producing from it, is causally related. This is the fundamental reason which asserts that both cause and effect are not different from each other in essence. We can cite an e.g. that there is no causal relation between gold ornament and pot because these are essentially different

from each other. But the causal relation is always found between the gold ornament and gold so they cannot be different from each other in essence.

3. The material cause can never be separated from the effect. When two objects are different from each other they cannot be co-joined. It is for e.g. the cat and the dog. In this case the cat and the dog can exist separately and in their own way. But there is no separate existence between the gold ornament and gold because gold constitute gold ornament. So the material cause is not different from the effect because cause subsists in the effect in essence.
4. The quantitative equality between the cause and the effect supports the identical nature between the two in essence. The gold ornament and gold are equal to each other in weight. The weight of gold is quantitatively equal with that of the gold ornament as gold is the cause which constitutes the effect i.e. the gold ornament. It is quantitative equivalence between the cause and the effect concludes essential identity between the gold and gold ornament.



ACTIVITY: 3.1

Explain five arguments to support Sāṃkhya theory of Satkāryavāda.

Ans. ……

……

Do you find any distinction between Satkāryavāda and Asatkāryavāda?

Discuss

Ans. ……

……

Explain the reasons for considering the identical nature of cause and effect in Satkāryavāda

Ans. ……

……

3.7 CRITICISM OF SATKĀRYAVĀDA BY THE BUDDHAS AND THE NYĀYA-VAIŚEṢIKAS

Satkāryavāda in Sāṃkhya philosophy concludes that the effect pre-exists in the cause. But the Buddhas and the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣikas systems of Indian philosophy have severely criticized Satkāryavāda as these systems have accepted Asatkāryavāda or Arambhavāda. Following are the arguments put forward against Satkāryavāda by these systems of Indian philosophy.

1. According to the Buddhas and the Nyaiyayikas, it is self-contradictory to accept that the effect arises from the cause and again the effect gets destroyed in the same cause itself. It is just next to impossibility to think that the same cause can be the place for two opposite actions. The same cause cannot support two self-contradictory actions like production and destruction.
2. Again it is also understood that the cause and the effect are two conditions of our understanding. We say that 'it is a piece of cloth' and we understand in a different way that 'these are threads'.
3. Cause refers to a particular usage of word while effect refers to a particular usage of word. We use the word cause referring to the threads in the cloth and the cloth is yet to be produced. Again we use the word effect referring to the cloth which is produced and never to threads from which the cloth is produced. So the

Nyaiyayikas hold that the effect does not pre-exist in the cause. According to both the Buddhas and the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣikas, the effect cannot be therefore accepted as exist before it is produced by the cause. The kārya or the effect is asat in Asatkāryavāda. The effect is therefore non-existent before its production. Arambhavada or Asatkaryavāda beholds the theory of beginning of the effect anew and never as the effect pre-exists in the cause in a potential cause. The effect is thus can never a modification (modification) of the cause. The effect cannot be a re-distribution of the cause.

4. According to the Buddhas and the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣikas the cause cannot serve the purpose of the effect. The threads producing the cloth cannot serve the purpose of the cloth produced from the threads. Threads are always woven into a piece of cloth. A piece of cloth can cover a body or can be used as a rapper but on the other hand threads before they are woven cannot cover the body.

   Thus it is concluded by the Buddhas and the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣikas that the cause and the effect are different from each other.

In reply to these criticisms forwarded by the Buddhas and the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣikas, the Sāṃkhya argues that the above mentioned arguments can never prove the fundamental difference between the cause and effect. According to Sāṃkhya philosophy, the difference between cause and effect is accidental and it is possible because of 'manifestation and non-manifestation in one and the same thing'. So it is our practical experience which determines the distinction between cause and effect. Cause and effect are considered as 'different states of one and the same substance'.



LET US KNOW

In response to the identical and real nature of cause and effect Samkhya agrees that the existence of Prakṛti can be inferred from the

world as the world is the effect of Prakṛti and therefore identical with Prakṛti. Prakṛti is eternal and all changing phenomena are of the nature of manifestation (avirbhava) or non-manifestation (tirobhava). The effects of Prakṛti are of the nature of evolution and envelopment of the three gunas i.e. sattva, rajas and tamas.



CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q.4: How do you define Sāṃkhya theory of causation?

……

Q.5: Mention two reasons for the Nyaiyayikas to accept Asatkāryavāda

……

Q.6: What do you mean by effect is actualization of the potential (shaktasya shakya-karanat)

……

3.7.1 Different Types of Causes

According to Sāṃkhya philosophy cause is of two kinds. They are material cause (upādānakārana) and efficient cause (nimittakārana). The material cause modifies itself into the production of the effect. The power or potentiality of being produced as an effect, subsist in the material cause itself. The efficient cause creates an influence on the effect. The efficient cause co-operates with the causal power which is present in the material cause and actualizes the capacity of material cause. In this state the causal power of the efficient cause ceases with the reproduction of the effect. For e.g. Gold is the material cause of an ornament. Here Gold enters into its production. Gold will continue to be in function so long as the ornament will be there into existence. But after the destruction of the ornament, gold will replace into the potential condition again. Here efficiency of goldsmith becomes the efficient cause of the

ornament. The efficiency of the goldsmith actualizes the causal energy which is present in the material cause and finally the ornament is produced. Here it is found that the causal power comes to an end with the production of the ornament.

3.7.2 Different Kinds of Effects

According to Sāṃkhya philosophy, effect is of two kinds. They are simple manifestation and reproduction. Simple manifestation refers to transformation. On the other hand reproduction refers to modification. For e.g. when milk is transformed into cream we find the effect as causation by simple manifestation. While when gold is modified into an ornament we find the effect as causation by reproduction.

3.8 PRAK- TI PARINĀMAVĀDA IN SĀṂKHYA PHILOSOPHY

Sāṃkhya philosophy advocates that there are two kinds of Satkāryavāda. They are parināmavāda and vivartavāda. Parināmavāda reflects that there is a real transformation (parinama) of the cause into the effect. Sāṃkhya philosophy in specification supports parināmavāda. In parināmavāda the effect is produced. But vivartavāda reflects that the change is only an apparent. In this reference Advaita Vedānta favors vivartavāda in specification. When we see a snake in a rope, the rope for e.g. appears to be a snake. It is never the rope which is changed into a snake. The rope only appears to be a snake. Therefore in Advaita Vedānta we always find that the Brahman is transformed into the world effect. This transformation of Brahman is only in vivarta. Therefore in Sāṃkhya we come to know about 'Prakṛti-Parināmavāda' while in Advaita Vedānta we know about 'Brahma-Vivartavāda'.



3.9 LET US SUMUP

- The sage Kapila made his first interpretation about Sāṃkhy a philosophy in his sutra known as 'Sāṅkhya-sūtra'. This sutra being a brief account

on the system, again an elaborate work is further developed by the sage himself entitled as the 'Sāṅkhya-pravacana sūtra'.

- In Indian philosophy there are two theories of causation. They are Satkāryavāda and Asatkāryavāda. Satkāryavāda is one of the central problems of Sāṅkhya philosophy.
- Sāṃkhya agrees to the view that production allows manifestation (avirbhava). On the other hand destruction means disappearance (tirobhava). The theory of causation in Sāṃkhya philosophy advocates that production refers to only a transition from an implicit condition to an explicit condition. Again destruction refers to a transition from an explicit condition to an implicit condition.
- Satkāryavāda concludes that production leads to evolution while destruction leads to dissolution.
- Sāṃkhya philosophy advocates that there are two kinds of Satkāryavāda. They are parināmavāda and vivartavāda. Parināmavāda reflects that there is a real transformation (parināma) of the cause into the effect.
- Satkāryavāda in Sāṃkhya philosophy concludes that the effect pre-exists in the cause. But the Buddhas and the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣikas systems of Indian philosophy have severely criticized Satkaryavada as these systems have accepted Asatkāryavāda or Arambhavāda.
- These two ultimate realities are spirit (Purusa) and matter (Prakṛti). It is very interesting to learn that Sāṃkhya metaphysics which supports Prakṛti as one of the two ultimate realities rests on its theory of causation.
- Sāṃkhya accepts 'Prakṛti-Parināmavāda' while Advaita Vedānta accepts 'Brahma-Vivartavāda'.



3.10 FURTHER READINGS

1) Sharma, Chandradhar. (1997). *A Critical Survey of Indian Philosophy*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers

2) Hiriyana, M. (1993). *Outlines of Indian Philosophy*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers

3) Chatterjee, Satischandra & Datta, Dhirendra Mohan, 1964. *An Introduction to Indian Philosophy.* Calcutta: University Press

4) Sinha, J, Indian Philosophy, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi



3.11 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Ans to Q No 1: Satkāryavāda holds that the material effect is the modification (parinama) of Prakṛti. Sāṃkhya accepts that effect pre-exist in the cause. The effect is not a new beginning. The effect is only an explicit manifestation of that which was implicitly contained in the material cause. Satkāryavāda advocates that there cannot be new production. It never allows total destruction.

Ans to Q No 2: One feature of Asatkāryavāda is that the effect can never exist in the cause. The effect is a new beginning (arambha). Asatkāryavāda explains that the effect or kārya is asat or non-existent before its production.

Ans to Q No 3: a) False b) True

Ans to Q No 4: Sāṃkhya theory of causation is defined as Satkāryavāda. It holds that a cause is an entity in which the effect subsists in a latent form.

Ans to Q No 5: According to the Nyāyayikas, it is self-contradictory to accept Satkāryavāda. While refuting Satkāryavāda, the Nyāyayikas have forwarded two reasons for accepting Asatkāryavāda. They are:

1) The Nyāyayikas hold that it is self-contradictory to accept that the effect arises from the cause. It is also self-contradictory to accept that the effect gets destroyed in the same cause. The same cause cannot support two sekf-contradictory actions like production and destruction.

2) The Nyāyayikas hold that the effect doesnot pre-exist in the cause. The Buddhas and the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣikas hold that the kārya or the effect is asat in Asatkāryavāda. The effect is a new and thus can never a modification of the cause. The effect for e.g. ‘curd’ is not a re-disttribution of the cause for e.g. ‘milk’.

Ans to Q No 6: Ans.: Satkāryavāda advocates that the effect is potentially in the cause. An efficient cause can produce for which it is potent. The effect before its manifestation is potentially contained in the material cause. Therefore in Satkāryavāda, production i.e. 'effect allows only actualization of the potential' (shaktasya shakya-karanat).



3.12 MODEL QUESTIONS

A) Very Short Questions

Q 1: Who is known as the path-finder of Sāṃkhya philosophy?

Q 2: Who is the author 'Sāṃkhya-sūtra'?

Q 3: What is the root cause of the world, according to Sāṅkhya philosophy?

Q 4: What is satkāryavāda?

Q 5: What are the two ultimate realities, according to Sāṃkhya?

Q 6: What is the other name of Sāṃkhya-theory of causation?

Q 7: What are the two theories of causation found in Indian philosophy?

Q 8: Define a) Satkārya vāda b) Asatkārya vāda

B) Short questions (Answer in about 150-200 words)

Q 1: Write a brief note on Sāṅkhya theory of causation.

Q 2: Distinguish between Satkāryavāda and Asatkāryavāda.

Q 3: Explain briefly the concept of Satkāryavāda.

Q 5: What are criticisms of Satkāryavāda forwarded by Buddha and the Nyāya- Vaiśeṣikas? Briefly explain

Q 6: What are the two causes, according to Sāṅkhya philosophy? Briefly explain

Q 7: Explain briefly the concept of prakriti-parināmavāda

C) Long Questions (Answer in about 300-500 words)

Q 1: Explain the Sāṅkhya theory of causation

Q 2: Define Satkāryavāda. Mention the features of Satkāryavāda

Q 3: Explain the grounds on which the Nyāyas have refuted Satkāryavāda.

Q 5: Discuss the concept of prakriti-parināmavāda.

Q 6: Discuss the concept of Satkāryavāda in Sāṅkhya philosophy.

Q 7: Explain the criticisms of Satkāryavāda forwarded by Buddha and the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣikas.

*****