



---

# Concept Of God In Samkhya Philosophy

**Bhushan V Pandit** Gujarat University, Ahmedabad [panditbhushan.phd@gmail.com](mailto:panditbhushan.phd@gmail.com)

---

## Introduction

The original Samkhya philosophy is an atheistic philosophy. It is the oldest philosophy of India, whose basic basis is considered to be Shvetashvatara Upanishad. Sankhya believes in two elements, Prakriti and Purusha, one is the root, and the second, for the origin of the conscious world, it considers Prakriti as the main reason. Only by the presence of a man, anger arises in the nature and from that the 23 elements are manifested respectively. No substance called God is accepted by Samkhya as the creator. Two differences of Sankhya have been considered. Some scholars also consider Sankhya to be theistic; But the people of old statistics give many strategies against God.

Sanatana Samkhya followers against the existence of God Gives tips –

- 1) This world is a chain of action, so there must be a reason for it, there is no doubt about it, But that reason cannot be God, because God is considered to be eternally immutable non-resultant God and who is not the resultant 'changeable'. He cannot be the reason for anyone. That means there cannot be a promoter of any action. Hence the principle emerges that the root cause of the world is ever-changing. This is the eternally consequential nature.
- 2) It can be said here that nature is inert. Conscious power is necessary to represent and regulate its speed which creates the universe. The knowledge of living entities is limited, so the subtle matter of the world cannot control the cause. Therefore, there must be an infinite intelligent conscious entity who can operate nature. His name is God, but such logic is not expedient. In the opinion of theists, God does not do anything. He does not get involved in any action, but operating or regulating the nature is an action. Suppose God is the regulator of nature, then the question arises that why does God tend to create creation through the operation of nature? It cannot have any purpose of its own, because it is impossible to have incomplete desire or unsatisfied desire in the former God. If it is said that the purpose of God is to fulfill the purpose of other living beings, then doubt arises that without any selfishness, no one is ready for the success of others and in reality, this world is full of their sins and sufferings. Therefore, it seems inconsistent to say that God has created this universe for the welfare of the living beings.
- 3) If there is faith in God, then the freedom and immortality of the living beings gets obstructed, if the living beings are considered as a part of God, then there should be

divine power in them, which is not visible. On the contrary, if they are considered clear by God, then it is proved that they are mortal.

Late Shri Lokmanya Tilak has tried to save a small worker of Sankhyakarika. In the Gaunapadabhashya of the 71<sup>st</sup> Karika, there is mention of the views of many thinkers who consider the world to be the cause other than nature. There is no indication of these mentions anywhere in the 71<sup>st</sup> Karika. In this Karika it is said that some people attribute the cause of the universe to God, some to Purusha, others to Time or Svabhava cannot be the cause of the universe because of the manifestation of Time or Svabhava. In Sankhya opinion, these are the works of nature. Ishvara and Purusha are in fact nirguna, unconnected with the three gunas of Prakriti, hence the world cannot arise from them.

Many thinkers have expressed the opinion that different types of purposeful creations are found in the objects of the world. This creation indicates towards the conscious creator. In reply to this, Yuktidipika says that If it is believed that the world is the creation of the all-knowing God, then the question will arise that why is sorrow found here? In answer to this, the theists say that the cause of happiness and sorrow is the religion and unrighteousness of the living beings. Here the question arises that what can be the meaning of the presence of unrighteousness in the world created by God?

There is another school of Sankhya philosophy which we can call theistic Sankhya. Among the ancient Acharyas, the supporters of this opinion are Acharya Vigyanbhikshu, whose Sankhya discourse commentaries are famous. Dr. Umesh Mishra is of the opinion that the word 'knowledge' in Sankhyakarika "Vyaktyaktyagya Vigyanat" is 'eternal', 'all-pervading' trigunateet 'one' and 'passive'. There is no rajas element operating in it like nature. He has expressed surprise at the scholars supporting its existence in many ways. Mishra ji is of the opinion that apart from this carika there should be some other carika which should be in between the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> carika. Probably it has disappeared. They believe in two types of men, one bound and the other united. The Purusha Bahutva that has been rendered in Samkhya is actually for conditioned men. There is only one united man.

Scholars like Dr. Dasgupta are also of the opinion that theism has been denied in Sankhya, but Dr. Gupta has not given any proof in support of his opinion. In this regard, the statement of Prof. Max Müller seems to be authentic that Kapil does not give any argument against monotheism. In the view of Prof. Max Müller, Kapil has the same idea that he believes in the absence of logical proofs for God's achievement. In this direction, he is very close to the

western philosopher Kant. Prof. Max Müller says that Kapil has not given any evidence to refute God.

Therefore, the idea that God has been denied in Samkhya does not seem to be logically established. Dr. Radhakrishnan accepts the authority of an administrator God in Samkhya on the basis of “Ihaseshvarsiddhi: Siddha” (Sankhyasutra, 3.57). Which arranges for the orderly development of nature in the creation period. In Sankhya Darshana, although the power of God with the power of action is not found, but the description of God is definitely found in the form of the witness of the world. Just because of the presence of the witness God, nature gets involved in the business of the world in the same way as a magnet creates movement in iron just because of its presence.

From the above discussion, we come to the conclusion that in the original Samkhya philosophy neither theism nor atheism has been denied. Even in the Sankhya Sutras there is a glimpse of theism, which has been further developed in the commentary of Vigyanbhikshu, but it is so clear that the Sankhya does not accept God as the creator and controller of the world.

Reference:-