Abstract

The Sāṁkhya philosophy relating to Prakṛti and Puruṣa discusses the ultimate reality of the universe in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa. When the balanced state of Prakṛti is disturbed by Puruṣa, the process of evolution takes place in the universe. This article concentrates on the significance of Prakṛti and Puruṣa as the base of the Sāṁkhya philosophy. At the same time, it also deals with the impression of these two components of nature in this philosophy for the creation and maintenance of this universe. To analyze the Sāṁkhya philosophy relating to Prakṛti and Puruṣa, this study has been used as overall theoretical approach. It is important in order to present how the Bhāgavata reflects the use of Prakṛti and Puruṣa for the creation of the universe. The interpretive method is used for the exploration of Prakṛti and Puruṣa in the text. The findings of the investigation suggest that Prakṛti and Puruṣa are the bases of the Sāṁkhya philosophy and the readers should have knowledge about this philosophy of the very ancient time. The prime conclusion drawn from this research is that Prakṛti and Puruṣa are the main elements of Nature from which the creation and the existence of the universe are possible.

Keywords: sāṁkhya, prakṛti, puruṣa, panchatanmātrā, panchamahābhuta

Introduction

The Sāṁkhya philosophy, one of the ancient philosophies of the Hinduism, discusses the numbering system of Prakṛti and Puruṣa. With the support of this notion, James Fieser and Bradley Dowden define Sāṁkhya philosophy in Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy as:

Word Sāṁkhya is derived from the Sanskrit noun Sankhya (number) based on the verbal root khya (make known, name) with the proverb sam (together). Sāṁkhya thus denotes the system of enumeration. It belongs to number and calculation. (1)

Sāṁkhya is a representative philosophy of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa. This philosophy includes two sorts of entities i.e. Prakṛti (nature) and puruṣa (persons). These are the basic principles for the creation of the universe. “Puruṣa is a person or self or spirit and possesses intelligence and feelings, while Prakṛti is impersonal or jada or inert and devoid of both intelligence and feelings” (Roy 96). The researcher emphasizes on Prakṛti and puruṣa for the analysis of Sāṁkhya philosophy.
Seer Kapila, the son of Devahuti and Kardama Muni is the founder of Sāṁkhya philosophy (Roy 2). The seer instructs this philosophy to his loving mother Devahuti especially in the “Third and Eleventh Cantos” of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa. People call this Sāṁkhya philosophy as Kapilagita (Basel 24). The Bhāgavata Purāṇa traces dichotomy between the principles of Prakṛti and puruṣa. “The puruṣa is beginningless and attributeless, distinct from and superior to Prakṛti” (Tagare: 2075). The Puruṣa has association with Prakṛti and the divine being plays a part for the performance of his līlā (playful activities). There is the existence of Prakṛti from the equilibrium among sattva, rajas, and tama elements. The Bhāgavata Purāṇa includes the use of Sāṁkhya philosophy in different places through the text systematically. One can find a large section of Sāṁkhya philosophy in the Sixth Chapter of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa as Kapilagita (Basel 2). According to Basel, everybody views the systematic version of the Sāṁkhya philosophy at 2.5, 3.5, 3.7, 3.26 and throughout the Eleventh Canto of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa (30). One can see the reliability and validity in his notion relating to the Sāṁkhya philosophy.

Sāṁkhya philosophy is the creation from mahatattvas (budhi). This element creates ahamkāra (egoism) which is the production from manas. Ahamkāra causes the birth of sattva, rajas, and tama guṇas. Basel formulates a critical survey in it:

The Bhagavata refers to the Brahman not as the supreme principle as in Vedanta, but instead as the sum total of the evolutionary process of Prakṛti. The learned know Brahman as comprising of the effects of pradhana- a collection of 24 principles 5 tanmatra, 5 mahabhutas, 4 internal organs, 10 sense organs (5 cognitive and 5 conative organs). There are only five gross elements (mahabhutas). The precise order in which these twenty-four tattvas is as follows: mahat (also referred to as chitta) is produced from the unmanifest (avyakta) Prakṛti and then gives rise to the threefold guṇas is dominant; in vaikarika, taisya- ahamkāra rajas, and in tama-ahamkāra. From these, the remaining tattvas are produced. (25)

Tagare gives continuation in the survey of Sāṁkhya philosophy by arguing that “The vaikarika-ahamkāra produces manas” (2074). Similarly, taisya-ahamkāra is the production of buddhi, ten indrias and prāṇa. In the same case, tama-ahamkāra causes the production of five tanmatras and five mahabhutas in pairs.

The Bhāgavata Purāṇa uses the term Sāṁkhya for the sake of jnana-knowledge. This philosophy discusses dualism, realism, and also pluralism. This perspective of life and nature depict the dualistic relation between Prakṛti and Puruṣa. On the basis of this notion, Champak Deca further proves that “Sāṁkhya accepts twenty-four principles among which two (Prakṛti and Puruṣa) are the Ultimate Realities (37). Other 23 principles (mahat, ahammkara, pancha- janendriyas, pancha-mahabhutas, pancha-tanmatra) belong to Prakṛti due to their production from it. “When the equilibrium state of the three guṇas in Prakṛti is disturbed by puruṣa, then
the process of evolution starts” (Deca 37). The Sāṁkhya explains the reality for practice to end pains and for achieving gains. One gets liberation from the distinctive knowledge between Prakṛti and Puruṣa. The gateway of liberation is sure to gain by removing pains. According to the usage, Sāṁkhya philosophy depends on the relation between Prakṛti and Puruṣa.

Kapil’s teachings of Sāṁkhya philosophy comprises from twenty-five to thirty-three chapters of the Third Canto of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa. A large number of critics, philosophers, and scholars have expressed their different views in the Sāṁkhya philosophy. This philosophy relates the principles of the universe. In the same line of logic, Prabhupada links it with metaphysics: “Sāṁkhya is what Western scholars generally refer to as “metaphysics” (2). It deals with “matters” and ‘spirit” for the sake of Bhakti. In this regard, Kamala Subramaniam provides the similar ground for interpretation. The interpreter is apt to state the relationship between the three guṇas and mind: “When mind gets involved in the three guṇas: when there is an upset in the balance of the three guṇas, then, one of the guṇas becomes predominant and the Atman gets involved in the play of emotions” (71). This logic strengthens the idea that creatures are in need of consciousness either in conditioned or in the liberated states. The Sāṁkhya philosophy of life enhances the consciousness of humans.

The same point is further explored and explained by Swami Ranganathanda. The critical thinker has remarkable exposition in favor of spiritual life from Sāṁkhya philosophy: “God is to be worshipped not only in a temple, not only in the image, but also in the hearts of all” (917). The theological perspective of Sāṁkhya philosophy makes a union between God and heart. To respect creatures is no more than the respect of God. Dharma (responsibility) is the understanding of spiritual identity. Kapil’s philosophy of Sāṁkhya links between dharma and karma. Prabhupada supports this idea and the interpreter ventures to state that “Dharma is the order of the Supreme Being” (4). Twenty-five principles of Sāṁkhya philosophy of Kapila is the foundation stone of the universe as well as the dharma in the law of nature. Dharma and religion are different things because dharma is the special quality of things or creatures. For example, the main dharma of the sun is to give heat. Thus this philosophy deals with the dharma of 25 principles for the existence of everything in the universe.

Basel, an analyst of Kapil’s Sāṁkhya philosophy, has different interpretation from the perspective of Prabhupada and Ranganathananda. The critic puts forward other tradition to stress the philosophy of Sāṁkhya:

Besides the Sāṁkhya School proper, there are a number of other traditions that may use related Sāṁkhya concepts and arguments that in many ways resemble those of the Bhagavata; Principally the classical Yoga School and the panchatantra tradition. (19)
There is linkage of Sāṁkhya philosophy with the classical yoga and tanmātra. This philosophy gets support to flourish from the two classical principles. In the same line of argument, Gerard
James Larson and Ram Shankar Bhattacharya present similar concepts emphasizing on yoga sutra: “The yoga sutra actually refer to themselves as a Sāṁkhyaapravachana, or explanation of Samkhya” (23). It traces that the yoga sutra is the base for the clarification of Samkhya philosophy.

Basel provides the ground for Sāṁkhya philosophy by mentioning the panchatanmātrā literature. This literature is itself quite voluminous and has not been studied by modern scholars (23). Due to the linkage of this literature to ritual, the philosophers and scholars neglect this lens of Sāṁkhya philosophy. Jan Gonda extends the scope of Kapila’s philosophy by stressing Basel’s idea of panchatanmātrā. The critic puts forward the idea of three texts and argues:

For the tradition itself the three most important texts are the sattvata, pauskara, and jayakhya samhitas. Collectively these are known as the three gems (ratnatraya). These three are generally considered to be the oldest of the panchatanmātrā samhitas. (52)

The text of panchatanmātrā includes theological and philosophical materials such as Paramsamhitita and Laxmi Tantra.

Thus Sāṁkhya, one of the oldest philosophies of the Hindus, has its roots in the Vedas. It relates to numbers so that this philosophy provides appropriate knowledge about Nature and reality. It focuses its notions on the evolution of Prakṛti from the multiplicity of objects. Prakṛti incorporates the three guṇas, (qualities) namely sattva, (super ego) rajas, (ego) and tamas (id). When there is disequilibrium in the three guṇas, there is the birth of Nature. On the basis of this notion, Sāṁkhya philosophy has its own problems due to the lack of proper analysis and evaluation in Sanskrit literature. The pioneers of the Hindu philosophy have incomplete exploration of this philosophy. In the words of Anima Sen Gupta: "As a consequence, in recent years, there has been a growing desire to understand the development of the Sāṁkhya school of classical Indian philosophy" (2). Basing her argument on such idea, one can argue that this philosophy is one of the oldest ancient Hindu philosophies. The major focus of this study is to highlight how Sāṁkhya philosophy is exhibited in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa. For the specification of the problems, the researcher uses the following questions:

- What remarkable images of Sāṁkhya philosophy in relation to Prakṛti and Puruṣa can we find in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa?
- How are Prakṛti and Puruṣa dealt within the Sāṁkhya philosophy?

The major objective of the study is to explore the Sāṁkhya philosophy in the Bhāgavata and its connection to Prakṛti.

Sage Kapil's philosophy of Sāṁkhya has become the subject matter of discussion among readers, critics, scholars and academicians. Its subject matter, theme and importance have drawn attention of the diverse critics. Among them, the major philosophers, critics and the
men of intellects are R. Puligandla, Mikel Burley, Gerald James Larson, C. T. Kenghe, Jumli Nath, Vikram H. Zaveri and Pratima Chattopadhyay. Puligandla tries to clarify himself on Sāṁkhya with his argument: "Every object of our experience is dependent upon and caused by other objects" (116). Explaining this statement, one oscillates that different elements of Nature have reciprocal relation to each other. In the different line of thought, Mikel Burley links Sāṁkhya with Yoga referring that "Sāṁkhya and Yoga are among the oldest and most influential systems of classical Indian thought and religious practice" (1). The critic broadens the scope of Sāṁkhya philosophy with yoga.

Likewise, Gerald James Larson notes that Sāṁkhya becomes rationalism in the history of thought (21). This argument turns out to be valid in the creation of this world and makes conscious to the readers about its importance. To strengthen the argument, Jumli Nath expresses his view: "Sāṁkhya system doesn’t believe in the unreality of the phenomenal world. It solely deals with the evolution of the universe which is not based on just a mere hypothetical speculation" (44). On the base of this notion, we believe that there are real matters in relation to the evolution of the universe. In this context, it is necessary analyze the use of Sāṁkhya philosophy as one of the very ancient philosophies of the Hindus.

Unlike Puligandla, Burley, Gerald Larson, C. T. Kenghe argues that the references of Sāṁkhya are very old. In his notion: "Though Kapila mentioned in the Rgveda and the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad cannot be identified with the founder of Sāṁkhya system, it is quite obvious that Sāṁkhya was already recognized as an ancient system in the age of the Mahābharaṭa" (6). Elaborating this argument, one can portray that Sāṁkhya philosophy begins in the Rgveda and it flourishes in the Śvetāśvatara and other Upanishads. It gets its popularity in the Mahābharaṭa and Purāṇas. Jumli Nath supports this idea and the critic further explores: "Sāṁkhya flourishes on the strong foundation laid by the Upanishads regarding this concern" (45). Moving ahead in this line of logic, the readers opine that Sāṁkhya philosophy has become popular on the bases of the Vedic, Upanishadīc and Paurāṇic texts.

The next critic of Sāṁkhya philosophy is Vikram H. Zaveri. In his article, he admits that the Sāṁkhya philosophy relates to the creation of this universe (2). The critic posits his argument relating to this philosophy about the creation of the universe. The humans of the present world believe in the creation of the universe. In this context, it is necessary to analyze the Sāṁkhya philosophy as the basis of knowledge. In this line of thought Richard Garbe broadens the area of the Sāṁkhya philosophy. He points out that "In Kapila's doctrine, for the first time in the history of the world, the complete independence and freedom of the human mind, its full confidence in its own powers, were exhibited" (Chattopadhyay 8). This notion is connected with the views of the other critics and philosophers relation to the Sāṁkhya philosophy. He has analyzed the human minds on the base of this philosophy.
The above discussed critics and their critical writings on Sāṁkhya philosophy basically deal with how the notions of Sāṁkhya relate to the creation of the universe. This philosophy has been created and flourished in Sanskrit literature. No one has explored the use of the Sāṁkhya philosophy relating to Prakṛti and Puruṣa in the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa. Thus, the following discussion concentrates on the use of this philosophy on the base of Prakṛti and Puruṣa in the Bhāgavata. For this regard, the exploration of Prakṛti and Puruṣa is necessary to throw light on the connection to display Sāṁkhya philosophy in the selected text.

Methodology

This library-based research work is inspired by Prakṛti and Puruṣa in Sāṁkhya philosophy and it implies elective and qualitative methodology. Sāṁkhya philosophy is the main theoretical modality that shall be applied in the preparation of this article. The researcher applies the Sāṁkhya philosophy of sage Kapila to analyze the primary text for this article. For this, Sāṁkhya philosophy relating to Prakṛti and Puruṣa is based for the analysis of the Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa compiled by Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana Vyāsa and translated into English by A.C. Bhaktivedanta Swāmī Prabhupāda. Sāṁkhya philosophy is used as the theoretical research tool for the completion of this article. This philosophy relating to Prakṛti and Puruṣa is cited and highlighted for the analysis. Basically, it is based on the library research so that the selected text forms the primary source for the study.

Besides, different Eastern and the Western critics’ opinions on the text’s philosophy and basically perceptions of Prakṛti and Puruṣa are observed. For this, the research questions are answered with the use of interpretive methodology. For the transliteration, the researcher uses A. C. Bhaktivedanta Swami Prabhupāda's the Śrīmad Bhāgavatam. In this connection, K. N. Upadhyaya further argues: "Sāṁkhya thought would be well advised to make close perusal of it" (342). The extension of this logic can be found in the relation between Prakṛti and Purusha in the text. The secondary sources will be taken from Sanskrit and English languages. But those sources will be used in terms of free translation. Both electronic and print forms of the sources will be used to collect the secondary data. Moreover, the Vedas and other classical Sanskrit literatures like Upanishad, Manusmriti will be dealt with to strengthen the research. This study will also attempt to read other classical religious texts to reframe its teaching on Prakṛti to Purusha. In the course of critical reading, the study will seek to take help of various modern theories to strengthen the Sāṁkhya philosophy. The collected data will be selected, evaluated, interpreted and presented.

Discussion

This article shows that Sāṁkhya philosophy relating to Prakṛti and Puruṣa traces that it is useful to study the conservation of Nature. This philosophy is necessary to highlight the value of this Vedic science at present. The study proves that the humans of the modern period
should have knowledge of this philosophy to be sensitive about the creation and conservation of this universe. *Prakṛti* is the source of everything and it is active consisting of the three human qualities conscious, subconscious and unconscious (superego, ego and id). On the basis of this relation, all the objects of the universe are related to *Prakṛti* which is active and *jada* - object. Humans and other creatures perform their activities on the base of *Prakṛti*. But *Purusha* feature is conscious, passive and free from the three *guṇas* (qualities) of *Prakṛti*. In this regard, *Sāṁkhya* philosophy has proved the equal importance of matter and consciousness in the evolution of the universe.

*Sāṁkhya* philosophy has depicted that *Prakṛti* and *Puruṣa* are two fundamental opposite realities which can eternally co-exist. *Prakṛti* accounts for whatever is physical, both mind and matter-cum energy. This study hints that the existence of creatures is an outcome of the consciousness matter relation. A proper understanding of this relation can help humans realize their position in the universe. *Jiva* (living being) is the state in which *Puruṣa* is connected to *Prakṛti* in some form. The universe is described by this school as one created by *Puruṣa*-*Prakṛti* entities infused with various combinations of variously enumerated elements, senses, feelings, activity and mind. Each sentient being or *Jiva* is a fusion of *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti*, whose soul/Puruṣa is limitless and unrestricted by its physical body. *Samsāra* or bondage arises when the *Puruṣa* does not have discriminating knowledge and so is misled as to its own identity, confusing itself with the Ego/ahamkāra, which is actually an attribute of *Prakṛti*. The spirit is liberated when the discriminating knowledge recognizes the difference between conscious *Puruṣa* and unconscious *Prakṛti* as realized by the *Puruṣa*.

**Reflectation of Prakṛti in the Bhāgavata**

The *Bhāgavata* elaborates the concept of *Prakṛti* and one believes that it is an original stuff from which there is the evolution of the material things. In this connection, the *Bhāgavata* notes that *Prakṛti* is the origin of the material world (Jumli Nath 131). In this line of thought, the text portrays that *Prakṛti* is the basic principle out of which there is the existence of the world. This standpoint justifies that the text explains the Nature of *Prakṛti* and her process of evolution in the light of *Sāṁkhya* philosophy. The *Bhāgavata* remarks that *Prakṛti* is the source of all specific objects and it is eternal imperceptible and indeterminate. There is the manifestation of *Prakṛti* in the three *guṇas* (qualities) *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*.

The flourish of *Prakṛti* in the material and transcendental worlds, gives shape to *Sāṁkhya* philosophy. In the expression of Kapila: "One should be situated in the transcendental position, beyond the stages of material consciousness, and should be aloof from all other conceptions of life. Thus realizing freedom from false ego, one should see his own self just as he sees the sun in the sky" (Prabhupāda 521). On the basis of this relation, consciousness is necessary to understand the value of *Prakṛti*. With the similar beliefs, Pushpendra Kumar opines that the three *guṇas*: *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas* reflects *Prakṛti* (225).
This dealing is based on the idea that the three qualities of Nature display Prakṛti. This notion traces that human qualities are reflected in Prakṛti. With this conditioning, the human qualities resemble the qualities of Nature.

Manas (minds), budhi (intelligence) and ahaṁkāra (egoism) are the elements for the evolution of Prakṛti. Devahuti writes in confirmation with her idea: "The eternal subtle senses are experienced as having four aspects, in the shape of mind, intelligence, ego and contaminated consciousness. Distinction between them can be made only by different functions, since they represent different characteristics" (3.26:14) Note. Appendix1. From this standpoint, readers come to know that Devhuti is curious to know about the Sāṁkhya philosophy from her son Kapila. Providing the ground for interpretation, Ganesh Vasudeo Tagare expresses his logic that the above three aspects (manas, budhi and ahaṁkāra) are the internal organs of humans (370). This analysis shows that our manas, budhi and ahaṁkāra are part and parcel of Prakṛti. In this regard, thoughts and activities of humans affect the condition of Prakṛti in the Bhāgavata.

Prakṛti has its relation to Lord Viṣṇu and this notion is forwarded by Kṛṣṇa to his friend and secretary Uddhava. According to Kṛṣṇa:

The material universe may be considered real, having nature as its original ingredient and final state. Lord Mahā-Viṣṇu is the resting place of nature, which becomes manifest by the power of time. Thus nature, the almighty Viṣṇu is the resting place of nature, which becomes manifest by the power of time. Thus nature, the almighty Viṣṇu and time are not different from Me, the Supreme Absolute Truth. (11. 24:19) Note. Appendix2

Explaining this statement, we clarify that Lord Mahā-Viṣṇu is the base and final condition of Prakṛti in the Bhāgavata. This argument turns to be valid from the link of Prakṛti to the Lord. In that line of thought, Bibek Debroy argues that the creation and the destruction of Prakṛti is related to the universal form of Viṣṇu (1317). Due to connection between Prakṛti and the Lord, readers are motivated to love both Prakṛti and the Lord.

Mahā-Viṣṇu at the initial stage of creation manifests himself in māyā and thereby he prepares Prakṛti for the process of creation. The Bhāgavata insists that Prakṛti has manifold manifestation and she is an inseparable part of Puruṣa. In the general understanding, Puruṣa does not differentiate between māyā and Prakṛti (Nath 134). In the expression of king Parīkṣīt:

My Lord Viṣṇu and mother Lakṣmī, goddess of fortune, you are the proprietors of the entire creation. Indeed, you are the cause of the creation. Mother Lakṣmī is extremely difficult to understand because she is so powerful that the jurisdiction of her power is difficult to overcome. Mother Lakṣmī is represented in the material world as the
external energy, but actually she is always the internal energy of the Lord. (6.19:11)

Note. Appendix

Above mentioned example confirms that the creation of this universe is the effect of māyā. Brahmā creates Prakṛti with the help of māyā. Elaborating this argument, we state that māyā is one of the roots for the creation of Prakṛti in the Bhāgavata.

In the text, Prakṛti assumes the functions of both cause and effects at the beginning of creation. In this regard, Kapila notes his mother Devhuti: "The unmanifested eternal combination of the three modes in the cause of the manifest state and is called pradhāna. It is called Prakṛti when in the manifested stage of existence" (3.26:10) Note. Appendix. The examination of this notion traces that Prakṛti is the combination of the three modes of Nature. This discussion heads to the analysis of the development of Prakṛti. In this connection, Śridhara Swāmī writes ahead: "Prakṛti is the ground of the apparent manifestation of the world" (qtd. in Nath 138).In this regard, the doctrine of Prakṛti resembles the doctrine of Sāṁkhya. The above logical expression on the base of Prakṛti indicates that the supreme personality of Godhead is the guiding principle of Prakṛti. It is the cosmic principle of the creation. Thus, no one nullifies the functions of Prakṛti in the context of creation of the universe.

Reflection of Puruṣa in the Bhāgavata

Puruṣa is one of the philosophical discussions of Sāṁkhya system after Prakṛti in the Bhāgavata. The text reflects the concept of Puruṣa in detail in terms of its relation to Prakṛti. Supporting this argument, Nath argues that "The Bhāgavata Purāṇa holds Puruṣa as the self or soul which exists beyond Prakṛti" (124). The interpreter appreciates the fact that the literature of Bhāgavata manifests Prakṛti and Puruṣa as the prime factors of the creation of the universe. In this context, Sage Sūta states the Puruṣa incarnation of the Lord:

In the beginning of the creation, the Lord first expanded Himself in the universal form of the Puruṣa incarnation and manifested all the ingredients for the material creation. And thus at first there was the creation of the sixteen principles of material action. This was for the purpose of creating the material universe. (3.3:1) Note. Appendix

On the basis of this relation, one can argue that there are three Puruṣa features in the text: Kāraṇodakaśāyi Viṣṇu, Garbhodakaśāyi Viṣṇu and Kṣīrodakaśāyi Viṣṇu (Prabhupāda 142). These three Puruṣa features have different tasks. Kṣīrodakaśāyi Viṣṇu generates innumerable universes; Garbhodakaśāyi Viṣṇu enters in each and every universe and Kāraṇodakaśāyi Viṣṇu is observed in every material object (qtd. in Prabhupāda 144). Thus, these three Puruṣ features trace multiple functions.

The word Puruṣa is used in the Bhāgavata because he creates the puras (cities) in the bodies of animals, men, birds and celestial beings. Providing the ground for interpretation, Nārada Muni argues:
The Supreme Personality of Godhead had created many residential places like the bodies of human beings, animals, birds, saints and demigods. In all of these innumerable bodily forms, the Lord resides with the living being as Paramātmā. Thus He is known as the puruṣāvatāra. (7.14:37) Note. Appendix

To support the idea of Puruṣa, one can say that God is situated in the heart of all creatures so that the creatures are part and parcel of the divine being. This notion is supported by C. L. Gosvāmī and the critic remarks that the Puruṣa dwells in the bodies of all creatures (722). The Puruṣa feature of Kāraṇodakaśāyi Viṣṇu remains with the Jivas to enable them for the enjoyment of the material life.

The Puruṣa is the absolute consciousness and uniformly abiding as the inner self of the creatures. The Bhāgavata discusses Puruṣa as the attributeless entity which pervades in the heart of all beings. In the view of Brahmā, Puruṣa "is pure, being free from all contaminations of material tinges. He is the Absolute Truth and the embodiment of full and perfect knowledge. He is all-pervading, without beginning or end, and without rival" (2.6:40) Note. Appendix 7. This logical expression traces that the Puruṣa is the base for the existence of all creatures on this earth. Moving ahead in this line of thought, Debroy explores that the supreme Puruṣa is the protector of all flora and fauna in the Bhāgavata (108). This discussion has made considerable impact that the Puruṣa creates all other beings and remains silently in them for their existence.

The Bhāgavata states that Puruṣa is not subjected to change and he identifies himself with Prakṛti. It is crucial to remember that Jivas are appended to the guṇas of Prakṛti and the Puruṣa is the doer. According to sage Kapila:

Material consciousness is the cause of one's conditional life, in which conditions are enforced upon the living entity by the material energy. Although the spirit soul does not do anything and is transcendental to such activities, he is thus affected by conditional life. (3.26:7) Note. Appendix 8

Concerning such argument, modern readers contradict this notion in relation to the Puruṣa feature of the conditional existence of the living entity. In the theistic mode, the readers come to know that the Bhāgavata points out this unborn Puruṣa creates, protects and destroys the entire universe (Nath 128). On the basis of this relation, primordial Puruṣa is identical with God.

The Puruṣa has pure nature and it is regarded as absolutely formless with pure consciousness. In this regard, the expression of Hiraṇyakaśipu is meaningful:

Let me offer my respectful obeisance unto the Supreme, who in his unlimited, unmanifested form has expanded the cosmic manifestation, the form of the totality of the universe. He possesses external and internal energies and the mixed energy called the marginal potency, which consists of all the living entities. (7.3:34) Note. Appendix 9
Keeping the same idea in mind, the researcher focuses that the \textit{Puruṣa} is endowed with unlimited potencies. His external potency manifests the material world; the internal potency manifests the spiritual world and the marginal potency reflects the living entities (Prabhupāda 164). In this connection, the \textit{Puruṣa} has both material and the spiritual energies.

Above mentioned discussion confirms that the \textit{Puruṣa} is all-pervading and the principal cause of the world. The ultimate teaching of the \textit{Bhāgavata} is that the \textit{Puruṣa} is reflected in all individual selves. On the base of this notion, one points out that the \textit{Puruṣa} is the ultimate illuminator, and he has reflection in the diverse bodies in different ways as the qualities of the \textit{guṇas}. It can be concluded that the \textit{Puruṣa} has multiple forms and names as the need of time and situation in the \textit{Bhāgavata}. Thus, the \textit{Puruṣa} is soul, consciousness and free from the three \textit{guṇas}.

\textbf{Conclusion}

The base of analysis relating to \textit{Prakṛti} and \textit{Puruṣa} in the \textit{Bhāgavata} is the \textit{Sāṁkhya} philosophy. The above discussion heads to the analysis of \textit{Sāṁkhya} as a dualistic system which advocates the dualism of \textit{Prakṛti} with \textit{Puruṣa}. \textit{Prakṛti} is the ultimate ground out of which there is the evolution of the world. The \textit{Sāṁkhya} philosophy intensifies that the world has been explained by the reference of \textit{Prakṛti} and \textit{Puruṣa}. These two components are the basis of the cosmic evolution. The text agrees that ignorance is the cause of bondage whereas knowledge is the cause of liberation. \textit{Prakṛti} becomes active from the observation of \textit{Puruṣa} and \textit{Puruṣa} is released by the knowledge of self.
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Appendix

1. मनोबुद्धिरहङ्कारधिविद्वत्तान्तःसमसंन्यातः || (3.26:14)

2. एपमाक्ष्यविषयःप्रोक्तःसंधिवन्दितःसमायः || (11.24:19)

3. युवात्तुंतिवःचक्रविभूजःताकःस्मातः || (6.19:11)

4. यतिनितिपुष्करंनितिसंसाददातः || (3.26:10)

5. ततःसाङ्गस्धापुरस्यस्मिनिस्तिरेकांतिवर्णान्तः || (3.3:1)

6. पुराणानांनृद्धत्वंसंविश्वनृद्धत्वं || (7.14:37)

7. स्थिरोदिष्टिवन्दितःप्रात्यातिस्थिरतिवन्दितः || (2.6:40)

8. सर्वभूतसंविदववेदेवा || (3.26:7)

9. अनन्तायायायायायायायायामिम सस्पेदे || (7.3:34)