



KARYA-KĀRAṆA VĀDA AS THE PHILOSOPHICAL BASIS OF SAMPRAPTI: A CONTEMPORARY SCIENTIFIC APPRAISAL

1. *Dr. Bhawani Singh 2. Chandra Shekhar Pandey, 3. Rani Singh,

¹*Research Scholar Department of Siddhant Darshan, Faculty of Ayurveda, Institute of Medical Sciences, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, 221005, India. Email: bhawani@bhu.ac.in

ORCID: [0000-0002-6891-1367](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6891-1367)

²Professor Department of Siddhant Darshan Faculty of Ayurveda, Institute of Medical Sciences Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi 221005, India Email: cspandey@bhu.ac.in ORCID: [0000-0002-1938-7490](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1938-7490)

³Professor Department of Siddhant Darshan Faculty of Ayurveda, Institute of Medical Sciences Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi 221005, India Email: rani@bhu.ac.in ORCID: [0009-0000-8725-7391](https://orcid.org/0009-0000-8725-7391)

*Corresponding Author: Dr. Bhawani Singh

*Research Scholar Department of Siddhant Darshan, Faculty of Ayurveda, Institute of Medical Sciences, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi, 221005, India. Email: bhawani@bhu.ac.in

ORCID: [0000-0002-6891-1367](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6891-1367)

Abstract

Samprapti - the Āyurvedic doctrine of pathogenesis - is not a self-standing clinical schema but the **enacted clinical expression** of a deeper philosophical doctrine: Karya-Kāraṇa Vāda, the theory of cause and effect. The present paper argues that Karya-Kāraṇa Vāda, in its Satkāryavāda formulation, constitutes the irreducible philosophical basis upon which every structural feature of Samprapti is built - and that appraising this relationship against contemporary pathophysiology reveals not merely analogical resemblance but genuine ontological convergence. The five canonical arguments of Sāṃkhya-Satkāryavāda - *Asadakaraṇāt*, *Upādānagrahāt*, *Sarvabhāvāpatteh*, *Śaktasya Śakyakaraṇatā*, and *Kāraṇabhāvāt* - are shown to be structurally encoded within the six stages of Samprapti (Ṣaṭkriyākāla), such that each stage of pathogenesis is the clinical actualization of a specific philosophical proposition. This triangular argument - *Philosophical Doctrine* → *Samprapti Structure* → *Contemporary Biomedical Science* - is sustained through systematic comparison with molecular genetics, allostatic load theory, the multi-hit pathogenesis model, network medicine, and the disease-health continuum. The paper further elaborates how correctly identifying Karya-Kāraṇa Vāda as the philosophical foundation of Samprapti has direct and non-trivial consequences for the design of stage-specific treatment protocols, positioning Samprapti-Vighaṭana (disruption of the pathogenetic chain) as a philosophically coherent and scientifically grounded therapeutic imperative. It is concluded that Samprapti is comprehensible as a rational system only when its Karya-Kāraṇa basis is made explicit - and that making this basis explicit constitutes a genuine contribution to translational medicine.

Keywords: *Karya-Kāraṇa Vāda, Satkāryavāda, Samprapti, Ṣaṭkriyākāla, Pathogenesis, Chronic Disease Biology, Āyurveda*

1. Introduction: The Philosophical Foundation of Samprapti

Samprapti is conventionally introduced in Āyurvedic education as a clinical schema - a map of how disease unfolds from initial doṣa imbalance to manifest pathology. This introduction, while practically useful, obscures something philosophically fundamental: Samprapti does not merely *describe* a causal sequence - it *enacts* one. Every element of its architecture - the stages of doṣa transformation, the mechanism of organ localization, the principle of therapeutic reversal - presupposes a specific theory of what causation *is*. That theory is Karya-Kāraṇa Vāda.

Karya-Kāraṇa Vāda - the doctrine of cause (*kāraṇa*) and effect (*kārya*) - is the epistemological and ontological matrix within which Samprapti becomes intelligible. Without it, Samprapti is a descriptive sequence without explanatory depth. With it, Samprapti is revealed as the **systematic clinical elaboration of a rigorous causal philosophy**: specifically, of the Sāṃkhya doctrine of Satkāryavāda, which holds that the effect pre-exists in its material cause in latent form, and that causation is the progressive actualization - the *āvirbhāva* - of that latent potential.

The present paper sustains three interconnected theses. The **primary thesis** is that Karya-Kāraṇa Vāda, in its Satkāryavāda form, is the philosophical basis of Samprapti - not coincidentally related to it but *constitutively generative* of its structure, logic, and therapeutic implications. The **secondary thesis** is that the five canonical Satkāryavāda arguments are each structurally encoded within specific stages of the Ṣatkriyākāla, such that the philosophical doctrine and the clinical schema are internally unified. The **tertiary thesis** is that appraising this philosophical basis against contemporary pathophysiology reveals genuine ontological convergences that are not merely analogical but substantive - convergences that carry direct implications for integrative clinical practice and translational research.

This paper therefore proceeds not from clinical observation to philosophical reflection (the conventional Āyurvedic pedagogical order) but in the reverse direction: from philosophical foundation to clinical structure to contemporary scientific appraisal. This reversal is not merely rhetorical - it is the intellectually correct order for understanding why Samprapti is the kind of pathogenetic model it is.

2. Karya-Kāraṇa Vāda: The Philosophical Foundation

2.1 The Ontological Stakes

The Indian philosophical tradition bequeathed to Āyurveda a formally developed debate about the nature of causality, principally between two positions: *Satkāryavāda* (the effect pre-exists in the cause, as championed by Sāṃkhya) and *Asatkāryavāda* (the effect is genuinely new, as held by Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika). This is not an academically idle controversy - the choice between these positions determines the entire conceptual architecture of disease ontology. If Satkāryavāda is correct, disease is the **actualization of latent potential** already present in the constitution of the individual: it was always *there*, suppressed (*tirobhāva*), waiting to be manifested (*āvirbhāva*). If Asatkāryavāda is correct, disease is a genuinely new entity that did not exist before its production - a position that would make preventive medicine philosophically incoherent, since there would be nothing to prevent. Āyurveda, drawing its metaphysical foundations from Sāṃkhya-Yoga, is unambiguously committed to Satkāryavāda. This commitment is not explicit in the clinical texts - it is *presupposed* by them. The Āyurvedic physician who traces a patient's disease back to its Sañcaya-stage accumulation is operating with a Satkāryavāda ontology: the disease was latently there before it was clinically manifest. The physician who prescribes a diet opposite in quality to the aggravated doṣa is applying Satkāryavāda's corollary - that suppressing the actualization of a potential (*tirobhāva*) is a coherent therapeutic goal. Understanding this makes Āyurvedic medicine comprehensible as a rational system rather than a collection of empirical observations.

2.2 The Three Kāraṇa Taxonomy and Its Role in Samprapti

Āyurveda's causal theory distinguishes three categories of cause like Vaiśeṣika. The significance of this taxonomy for Samprapti is that it establishes multi-level, multi-factorial causation as the norm - disease is never monocausal, and the Samprapti model reflects this precisely.

Type of Kāraṇa	Definition	Role in Samprapti	Biomedical Analogue
<i>Samavāyi Kāraṇa</i>	Inherent/material cause - inseparably present in the substrate	The doṣic constitution (Prakṛti) that pre-specifies the nature and site of pathological transformation	Germline genetic constitution; constitutive epigenetic landscape
<i>Asamavāyi Kāraṇa</i>	Non-inherent cause - a quality or conjunction within the material cause that mediates the effect	The doṣa dushya sammurchana that drive dhātu desiccation in a particular Samprapti	Post-translational modifications; micro-environmental factors within the tissue
<i>Nimitta Kāraṇa</i>	Efficient/instrumental cause - the external agent triggering the transformation	Prajñāparādha, seasonal extremes, or dietary insults that initiate doṣa vitiation and set Samprapti in motion	Environmental triggers; chronic psychological stress; toxin exposure; infectious agents

Table 1: The three Kāraṇa taxonomy and its structural role in Samprapti

This taxonomy makes a point of fundamental importance: the *Samavāyi Kāraṇa* - the material cause - must already contain the *śakti* (potential) for the pathological transformation. The *Nimitta Kāraṇa* does not *create* disease; it *triggers* what was latently possible in the material substrate. This is the Satkāryavāda principle at the heart of Samprapti's causal logic - and it is a principle, as we shall argue, that contemporary molecular medicine is independently rediscovering.

3. Satkāryavāda: The Five Arguments as the Philosophical Skeleton of Samprapti

The classical Sāṃkhya text *Sāṃkhyakārikā* (Kārikā 9, Īśvarakṛṣṇa) presents five formal arguments - *hetus* - establishing Satkāryavāda. The central claim of this paper is that these five arguments are not merely philosophically prior to Samprapti but are **structurally encoded within it**: each argument finds its clinical actualization in a specific stage or mechanism of the Ṣaṭkriyākāla. We demonstrate this encoding for each argument in sequence.

asadakaraṇāt upādānagrahaṇāt sarvaṃbhāvāpatteh śaktasya śakyakaraṇāt kāraṇabhāvācca sat kāryam - Sāṃkhyakārikā 9

"The effect is pre-existent in its cause because: non-existence cannot be produced; the material cause is specifically grasped; not everything arises from everything; only what is capable produces what is possible for it; the effect shares the nature of the cause."

3.1 Asadakaraṇāt - Non-Existence Cannot Become Existence

The Philosophical Argument

If the effect were truly non-existent before its production, no causal activity could bring it into being - for causation acts upon something, not upon nothing. The clay must already contain the potential to become a pot; the sesame seed must already contain the oil. Causation is therefore not creation but *manifestation*: the actualization of what was latently present (*āvirbhāva*) from a state of suppression (*tirobhāva*).

Encoding in Samprapti: Sañcaya Stage

The first stage of Samprapti - *Sañcaya* (accumulation) - is the direct clinical expression of *Asadakaraṇāt*. At this stage, the disease is not yet manifest - there are no diagnostic signs, no significant symptoms - yet the disease is **already ontologically present** in its latent form. Doṣas are accumulating in their primary seats; pathological potential is building silently. This is precisely *tirobhāva*: the disease exists, suppressed, waiting. The *Sañcaya* stage is not pre-disease - it is *latent disease*. Its clinical existence is the enacted proof that the effect (manifest disease) was not non-existent before its production.

Contemporary Scientific Appraisal

The most rigorous contemporary parallel is the concept of **genetic predisposition and disease susceptibility loci**. Genome-wide association studies (GWAS) have identified hundreds of loci associated with complex diseases - Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus, coronary artery disease, rheumatoid arthritis - in individuals who show no clinical disease. These loci represent the *Asadakaraṇāt* principle in molecular terms: the disease is *not* non-existent before its manifestation; it pre-exists as organised genomic potential. Similarly, viral latency - the persistence of Herpes Zoster in dorsal root ganglia for decades before reactivation - is the precise biological enactment of *tirobhāva/āvirbhāva*: the pathogen (and therefore the disease potential) is ontologically present, suppressed by immunological competence, manifesting only when that suppression is lifted. The Warburg effect in oncology - the reactivation of an embryonic glycolytic program in malignant cells - provides a further illustration: the 'new' metabolic program of cancer was never absent; it was suppressed in differentiated somatic cells and reactivated by oncogenic transformation.

3.2 Upādānagrahāt - The Material Cause is Specifically Grasped

The Philosophical Argument

A specific effect requires a specific material cause. Sesame seeds yield oil; sand does not. This causal specificity is explicable only if the effect pre-exists in the specific material substrate that is its *upādāna kāraṇa* (material cause). The cause does not merely permit any effect - it *specifies* the range of possible effects by virtue of what it already contains.

Encoding in Samprapti: Sthānasamśraya Stage

Upādānagrahāt is most explicitly encoded in the fourth stage of Samprapti - *Sthānasamśraya* (site-localization), specifically in the mechanism of *Doṣa-Dūṣya Sammūrccana*: the amalgamation of vitiated doṣas with susceptible tissues (*dūṣyas*). The question of **why a specific doṣa amalgamates with a specific dhātu** - why aggravated Vāyu deposits in the colon rather than the liver, why vitiated Pitta affects the blood rather than bone - is answered by *Upādānagrahāt*: the doṣa grasps the dhātu that already contains the specific material receptivity for that doṣa. This material receptivity is the *Samavāyi Kāraṇa* - the constitutive vulnerability pre-specified by the individual's Prakṛti.

Contemporary Scientific Appraisal

Upādānagrahāt maps with precision onto **tissue tropism** in infectious pathology and **pharmacogenomics** in therapeutics. SARS-CoV-2 preferentially infects ACE2-expressing pneumocytes not by chance but because those cells carry the specific molecular receptivity for viral docking - the biological *upādāna* of that particular infection. Hepatitis B virus tropism for hepatocytes, HIV tropism for CD4+ T-lymphocytes, and *H. pylori* tropism for gastric mucosa all exemplify the same principle: the pathogen grasps the tissue that already contains its specific material cause. In pharmacogenomics, the same logic applies in the therapeutic direction: drug efficacy and toxicity are determined by the pre-existent constitutive genomic architecture of the individual - the *upādāna* of the drug response. This provides the strongest scientific rationale for Āyurveda's Prakṛti-based individualized pharmacotherapy.

3.3 Sarvabhāvāpatteh - Not Everything Arises from Everything

The Philosophical Argument

If effects did not pre-exist in their causes, there would be no principled limitation on what could produce what - mud could yield milk, fire could produce ice. The orderly specificity of natural causation - the fact that *this* cause reliably produces *this* effect and not others - is explicable only if the effect was already determined by the constitutive nature of the cause.

Encoding in Samprapti: Constitutional Specificity of Pathological Patterns

Sarvabhāvāpatteh is encoded in the foundational Āyurvedic observation that a *Vāta-pradhāna Prakṛti* individual, exposed to Vāta-aggravating factors, does not develop arbitrary disease - they develop diseases of the nervous system, colon, musculoskeletal system, and sensory apparatus. A *Pitta-pradhāna Prakṛti* individual under inflammatory provocation develops hepatic, dermal, or haematological pathology. The Samprapti of each individual is **constitutively specified** - not everything arises from everything; what arises is precisely what the constitutive material substrate was already capable of producing. This is *Sarvabhāvāpatteh* as clinical reality: the disease pattern of any given patient is the causal expression of their constitutive Prakṛti.

Contemporary Scientific Appraisal

In contemporary pathophysiology, *Sarvabhāvāpatteh* corresponds to the principle of **organ-specific constitutional vulnerability**. Prolonged oxidative stress in pancreatic beta cells does not produce hepatocellular carcinoma - it produces beta-cell dysfunction and insulin secretory failure, because the constitutive properties of beta cells (high metabolic rate, low antioxidant defense, limited regenerative capacity) pre-specify the range of possible pathological outcomes. The multi-hit model of carcinogenesis (Knudson, 1971) encodes this principle formally: the specific cancer type that arises from a given constitutional predisposition (first hit) combined with an environmental trigger (second hit) is determined by the constitutive vulnerabilities of the tissue - not arbitrarily but with causal specificity. *Sarvabhāvāpatteh* is the philosophical articulation of what modern oncology demonstrates empirically.

3.4 Śaktasya Śakyakaraṇatā - Only What is Capable Can Produce What is Possible for It The Philosophical Argument

This is the pivotal argument of Satkāryavāda. A cause can only produce effects that lie within its own *śakti* (potency/capacity). The effect is not imposed from without - it is drawn out of what the cause was already capable of producing. Causation is therefore the **actualization of potential**, not the creation of novelty. What cannot be done cannot be made to happen, regardless of how powerful the efficient cause; what can be done was always *latently possible* in the material cause.

Encoding in Samprapti: Prakopa Stage and the Threshold of Actualization

Śaktasya Śakyakaraṇatā is most explicitly encoded in the *Prakopa* (aggravation) stage - the second stage of Samprapti. Here, doṣas that have accumulated (Sañcaya) become *agitated and activated*: their *śakti* for pathological transformation crosses a threshold and they acquire the capacity to spread beyond their primary seats. The transition from Sañcaya to Prakopa is the transition from **latent potential to activated potential** - from *śakti* in repose to *śakti* in motion. This stage is also where the concept of *Ojaṣaya* (depletion of vital essence) becomes pathologically significant: as Oja diminishes, the body's *śakti* for maintaining *tirobhāva* (suppression of pathological potential) is withdrawn, allowing latent disease potential to actualize. The Prakopa stage is, in the most precise sense, *Śaktasya Śakyakaraṇatā* made clinically visible.

Contemporary Scientific Appraisal

The concept of **allostatic load** (McEwen & Stellar, 1993) provides the most direct biomedical translation. Allostatic load refers to the cumulative physiological cost of repeated adaptation to stressors - a progressive erosion of the body's regulatory reserves that leaves it increasingly vulnerable to pathological transformation. The body's capacity to maintain homeostasis is its *śakti for health*; disease emerges when allostatic load exceeds the system's compensatory capacity - precisely when the body's *śakti* for maintaining *tirobhāva* is exhausted. The immunosuppression-triggered reactivation of latent Herpes Zoster is a textbook instance of *Śaktasya Śakyakaraṇatā*: the virus always had the *śakti* for pathological replication, but the immune system's suppressive *śakti* exceeded it - until allostatic depletion reversed the balance. The *stress-diathesis model* in psychiatry (predisposition + stressor = illness) is the psychiatric equivalent: illness erupts when environmental

stress exceeds the individual's constitutional śakti for compensation - activating a latent pathological potential that was always present.

3.5 Kāraṇabhāvāt - The Effect is of the Nature of the Cause

The Philosophical Argument

The fifth argument is the most structurally profound: the effect shares the *essential nature (bhāva)* of its material cause. Curd shares the essential nature of milk. The effect is a *transformed expression* of the cause, not a categorically different entity. This grounds the Sāṃkhya claim that all manifest phenomena are transformations of a single underlying substrate (*Prakṛti*) - causation is transformation, not creation; differentiation, not discontinuity.

Encoding in Samprapti: The Continuum from Sañcaya to Bheda

Kāraṇabhāvāt is encoded in the most fundamental structural feature of Samprapti: its **continuity**. The six stages of the Ṣaṭkriyākāla are not categorically distinct entities - they are transformations of a single underlying causal process. The manifest disease of stage 5 (Vyakti) shares its essential nature with the latent accumulation of stage 1 (Sañcaya): it is the *same doṣic process*, more fully actualized. The complication of stage 6 (Bheda) shares its essential nature with stage 5: it is the *same pathology*, extended to structural tissue disruption. This ontological continuity is what makes *Samprapti-Vighaṭana* (disruption of pathogenesis) coherent as a therapeutic goal - one can reverse the causal chain because the chain is continuous; there is no categorical discontinuity that would make earlier stages irrelevant to later ones.

Contemporary Scientific Appraisal

Kāraṇabhāvāt finds its most exact contemporary parallel in the **disease-health continuum model** - the recognition that health and disease are not categorically distinct states but points on a quantitative continuum. The HbA1c-based staging of normoglycemia, pre-diabetes, and Type 2 Diabetes is the exemplary instance: there is no qualitative discontinuity between these states - they are the *same metabolic process* (progressive insulin resistance and beta-cell stress) at different degrees of actualization. The effect (manifest diabetes) shares the essential biochemical nature of its cause (pre-diabetic metabolic dysregulation) - it is that dysregulation, more completely actualized. The principle of *biochemical conservation* in molecular biology - the same proteins, lipids, and nucleic acids appear in health and disease, in altered configurations and concentrations but not as categorically new entities - is *Kāraṇabhāvāt* at the molecular level.

Satkāryavāda Argument	Core Philosophical Claim	Encoding in Samprapti Stage	Contemporary Biomedical Parallel
<i>Asadakaraṇāt</i>	Non-existence cannot produce existence; causation is manifestation of latent potential	Sañcaya - latent accumulation of doṣas; disease is already present, suppressed (tirobhāva)	Genetic susceptibility loci; viral latency; epigenetic silencing of oncogenes
<i>Upādānagrahāt</i>	Specific causes produce specific effects via material receptivity	Sthānasamśraya - Doṣa-Dūṣya Sammūrcchana; doṣas deposit in constitutively receptive dhātus	Tissue tropism; receptor-ligand specificity; pharmacogenomics
<i>Sarvabhāvāpatteh</i>	Causal specificity: not everything from everything; the cause specifies its effects	Constitutive Samprapti patterns - Prakṛti pre-specifies the disease type and organ of manifestation	Organ-specific vulnerability; multi-hit carcinogenesis model; constitutional disease predisposition

<i>Śaktasya Śakyakaraṇatā</i>	Only what is capable can produce what is possible for it; causation is actualization of śakti	Prakopa - activated doṣic śakti; Ojakṣaya withdraws suppressive potential; threshold crossing	Allostatic load; stress-diathesis model; immunosuppression-triggered reactivation
<i>Kāraṇabhāvāt</i>	Effect shares the essential nature of its cause; causation is transformation, not creation	Continuity of Śatkriyākāla - all six stages are the same process progressively actualized	Disease-health continuum; biochemical conservation; spectrum disease models

Table 2: The five Satkāryavāda arguments, their encoding in Samprapti, and contemporary biomedical parallels

4. Samprapti as the Clinical Elaboration of Karya-Kāraṇa Vāda

4.1 Samprapti as Enacted Philosophy

Having established that the five Satkāryavāda arguments are structurally encoded within Samprapti, we can now appreciate Samprapti in its full intellectual significance: it is not merely a clinical staging schema but the **clinical elaboration of a philosophical doctrine**. Every feature of its architecture - the continuity of its stages, the constitutional specificity of its pathological patterns, the threshold logic of its transitions, the causal chain of its progression - is the enacted expression of Karya-Kāraṇa Vāda in a living biological system. Understanding Samprapti without its Karya-Kāraṇa philosophical basis is like understanding thermodynamics without the concept of energy: the observations remain, but their explanatory depth is lost.

4.2 The Śatkriyākāla: Philosophical Doctrine Made Pathogenetically Explicit

The six stages of Samprapti - collectively called the *Śatkriyākāla* - represent the complete temporal unfolding of Karya-Kāraṇa Vāda from philosophical proposition to clinical reality. At each transition, a preceding karya becomes the kāraṇa of the succeeding stage - a cascading causal chain in which Satkāryavāda is operative throughout: each succeeding stage was latently present in its predecessor.

Stage	Sanskrit Term	Karya-Kāraṇa Role	Satkāryavāda Principle Enacted	Contemporary Pathophysiological Parallel
1	<i>Sañcaya</i>	Kārya of constitutional predisposition; Kāraṇa of aggravation	<i>Asadakaraṇāt - latent disease exists, suppressed; tirobhāva</i>	Silent metabolic dysfunction: elevated fasting insulin, sub-clinical hs-CRP elevation, impaired fasting glucose; detectable only by sensitive biomarker panels
2	<i>Prakopa</i>	Kārya of accumulation; Kāraṇa of systemic spread	<i>Śaktasya Śakyakaraṇatā - doṣic śakti crosses activation threshold; Ojakṣaya begins</i>	Early organ stress response: NF-κB activation, HbA1c borderline elevation (5.7–6.4%), microalbuminuria, impaired glucose tolerance
3	<i>Prasara</i>	Kārya of aggravation; Kāraṇa of localization	<i>Sarvabhāvāpatteh - spread is directionally specified by constitutive Prakṛti</i>	Systemic dissemination: circulating IL-6, TNF-α; gut dysbiosis with LPS translocation; circulating tumor cells in early malignancy
4	<i>Sthānasamśraya</i>	Kārya of spread; Kāraṇa of manifest disease	<i>Upādānagrahāt - Doṣa-Dūṣya Sammūrcchana; doṣa grasps the</i>	Organ-specific pathology: hepatic steatosis, atherosclerotic plaque, glomerular immune-complex

			<i>constitutively receptive dhātu</i>	deposition, pre-neoplastic lesions
5	<i>Vyakti</i>	Kārya of localization; Kāraṇa of complication	<i>Kāraṇabhāvāt - manifest disease shares essential nature with all preceding stages; āvirbhāva complete</i>	Clinically manifest disease: T2DM, CAD with angina, CKD Stage 3, clinical hepatitis - fulfilling standard diagnostic criteria
6	<i>Bheda</i>	Kārya of manifestation; structural consolidation of pathological kārya	<i>Kāraṇabhāvāt - ultimate transformation; same process, now structurally irreversible</i>	Advanced complications: diabetic nephropathy, retinopathy, neuropathy; cirrhosis; invasive malignancy; end-organ failure

Table 3: Śaṭkriyākāla - the six stages of Samprapti as the clinical elaboration of Karya-Kāraṇa Vāda, mapped to contemporary pathophysiology

4.3 The Satkāryavāda Logic of Samprapti's Continuity

The most clinically and philosophically significant feature of Samprapti, when viewed through the Karya-Kāraṇa lens, is its **ontological continuity**. At no stage does something genuinely new appear. The manifest disease of stage 5 (Vyakti) was ontologically present in stage 1 (Sañcaya): the intervening stages are its progressive actualization, not its creation. This Satkāryavāda continuity has a profound therapeutic corollary - **intervention is meaningful at every stage**, because at every stage the pathological potential that has actualized can, in principle, be returned to *tirobhāva* (suppression). The earlier the intervention, the less actualized the pathological potential and therefore the easier its suppression. This is the philosophical foundation of Āyurveda's unparalleled emphasis on preventive medicine - an emphasis that is not merely pragmatic but derives directly from the Karya-Kāraṇa ontology of Samprapti.

This contrasts significantly with the dominant biomedical paradigm, which - despite decades of rhetoric about prevention - remains structurally oriented toward intervention at the Vyakti stage. The reasons for this are not merely institutional but epistemological: a biomedical framework that lacks an explicit theory of disease latency (the *Asadakaraṇāt* principle) and disease continuity (*Kāraṇabhāvāt*) will struggle to develop tools and protocols for intervening at the Sañcaya and Prakopa stages. This is precisely where Karya-Kāraṇa Vāda, as the philosophical basis of Samprapti, offers a framework that contemporary medicine needs but currently lacks.

5. Therapeutic Implications: Samprapti-Vighaṭana as Karya-Kāraṇa Vāda

5.1 The Philosophical Rationale of Samprapti-Vighaṭana

If Samprapti is the progressive actualization of pathological potential (Karya-Kāraṇa Vāda forward in time), then rational therapy must operate by **reversing** this causal chain - driving actualized pathological states back toward *tirobhāva*. *Samprapti-Vighaṭana* (disruption of pathogenesis) is coherent as a therapeutic goal **only because** Karya-Kāraṇa Vāda is true: if disease were not the actualization of latent potential but the creation of a genuinely new entity, there would be no causal chain to disrupt, no prior state to restore. The philosophical basis of Samprapti is simultaneously the philosophical justification of the therapeutic principle.

The specific therapeutic target at each stage is determined by which Satkāryavāda principle is dominant at that stage - and therefore which causal mechanism requires disruption:

Samprapti Stage	Dominant Kāraṇa Principle	Therapeutic Goal	Āyurvedic Intervention	Contemporary Parallel
<i>Sañcaya</i>	<i>Asadakaraṇāt - maintain</i>	Keep latent doṣic potential suppressed;	Rtucharya; Dinacharya; dietary regulation specific to	Primordial prevention; epigenetic reprogramming

	<i>tirobhāva; prevent actualization</i>	prevent threshold crossing	Prakṛti; Rasāyana as constitutional śakti support	through lifestyle; genomic surveillance in high-risk individuals
<i>Prakopa</i>	<i>Śaktasya Śakyakaraṇatā - deactivate accumulated śakti; restore suppression</i>	Pacify aggravated doṣas; withdraw their śakti for spread; reinforce Oja	Shamana (pacification) therapy; Prajñāparādha correction; specific Āhāra modifications; early Oja-building Rasāyana	Primary prevention; pharmacological intervention in pre-disease (metformin in pre-diabetes); lipid-lowering therapy; stress reduction protocols
<i>Prasara</i>	<i>Sarvabhāvāpatteh - arrest constitutively-specified spread pathways</i>	Block srota channels; prevent systemic dissemination of vitiated doṣas	Srotorodha-targeted therapy; Dīpana-Pācana; gut microbiome restoration via specific Āhāra; Pañcakarma preparation (Pūrvakarma)	Anti-inflammatory therapy targeting circulating mediators; gut barrier restoration; anti-metastatic therapy in early oncology
<i>Sthānasamśraya</i>	<i>Upādānagrahāt - disrupt Doṣa-Dūṣya Sammūrccana; remove doṣas from dhātu</i>	Dislodge deposited doṣas from susceptible dhātus; prevent structural consolidation	Pañcakarma (Vamana, Virechana, Basti, Nasya, Raktamokṣana) - each targeting specific Doṣa-Dūṣya depositions	Organ-directed targeted therapy; plaque stabilization; NASH-directed hepatic therapy; immunosuppression for immune-complex disease
<i>Vyakti</i>	<i>Kāraṇabhāvāt - disease shares nature of cause; full Samprapti reversal required</i>	Palliate manifest symptoms; restore doṣic equilibrium; prevent further actualization	Disease-specific Shamana and Shodhana; targeted classical formulations addressing the specific Samprapti	Standard evidence-based disease management: antidiabetics, antihypertensives, DMARDs, corticosteroids
<i>Bheda</i>	<i>Kāraṇabhāvāt - irreversible structural transformation; partial reversal possible</i>	Prevent further deterioration; nourish depleted dhātus; manage complications; salvage reversible components	Bṛmhaṇa (nourishing therapies); Rasāyana for tissue regeneration; complication-specific protocols; palliative care integration	Tertiary prevention; organ protection; complication management; regenerative medicine approaches

Table 4: Stage-specific therapeutic intervention grounded in the Karya-Kāraṇa philosophical basis of Samprapti

5.2 Samānya-Viśeṣa: The Therapeutic Corollary of Satkāryavāda

The Āyurvedic therapeutic law of **Samānya-Viśeṣa** - that similars increase (*saṁānya vṛddhikaraṇam*) and dissimilars decrease (*viśeṣa vyayakaraṇam*) - is the direct therapeutic corollary of Satkāryavāda. A substance similar in guṇa (quality) to a doṣa *actualizes* the doṣa's latent potential (augmentation); a substance dissimilar in guṇa *suppresses* that potential (pacification). The entire therapeutic logic maps precisely onto modern pharmacological **agonism** (Samānya - similar action potentiates) and **antagonism** (Viśeṣa - opposite action suppresses). The philosophical foundation of receptor pharmacology's most fundamental principle is Satkāryavāda.

5.3 The Rasa-Vīrya-Vipāka-Prabhāva Chain as Karya-Kāraṇa Pharmacology

The Āyurvedic pharmacological sequence - Rasa → Vīrya → Vipāka → Prabhāva - describes a **hierarchical Karya-Kāraṇa chain** in which each stage is the kārya of the preceding and the kāraṇa of the succeeding:

- Rasa (taste at first contact) → initial sensory and enteroendocrine response; anticipatory reflex activation
- Vīrya (potency during systemic absorption) → primary pharmacological effect during biotransformation; maps to pharmacokinetic distribution phase
- Vipāka (post-digestive tissue-level effect) → long-term metabolic action; maps to active metabolite pharmacology (codeine → morphine; prodrug activation)
- Prabhāva (specific inexplicable action) → effects not predictable from the preceding chain; maps to novel or pleiotropic mechanisms of action identified empirically

This sequence is Karya-Kāraṇa Vāda applied to pharmacology: the therapeutic effect does not appear ex nihilo at the tissue level - it was specified at every prior stage of the causal chain. *Vipāka* is particularly noteworthy as a philosophical anticipation of **active metabolite pharmacology** - one of the central concepts of modern clinical pharmacokinetics.

5.4 Implications for Precision and Translational Medicine

The correct identification of Karya-Kāraṇa Vāda as the philosophical basis of Samprapti carries four specific implications for contemporary clinical science:

1. Prakṛti assessment as constitutive phenotyping: Emerging multi-omics research (Prasher et al., 2008; Rotti et al., 2015; Juyal et al., 2012) demonstrates that Āyurvedic Prakṛti types correlate with distinct genomic, transcriptomic, and metabolomic profiles - validating the Satkāryavāda premise that constitutive pathological potential is materially grounded in the individual's biological substrate (Samavāyi Kāraṇa). Prakṛti assessment is therefore not subjective categorization but the clinical assessment of the individual's upādāna kāraṇa for specific disease patterns.
2. Early-stage Samprapti detection through multi-omics: The Sañcaya and Prakopa stages - currently sub-clinical and therefore invisible to standard diagnostics - may be made detectable through metabolomics, proteomics, and microbiome profiling. This would enable Āyurveda's philosophically grounded imperative of early-stage intervention to be implemented within evidence-based clinical frameworks, addressing one of the most significant gaps in contemporary chronic disease medicine.
3. Pañcakarma as multi-level causal intervention: Bio-purification procedures (Pañcakarma) operate not by targeting a single molecular node but by intervening at multiple levels of the Samprapti causal chain simultaneously - disrupting Doṣa-Dūṣya Sammūrchana at the Sthānasaṃśraya level while restoring Oja at the constitutional level. This multi-target, multi-level philosophy is precisely what network pharmacology and systems therapeutics are converging on as the appropriate approach to complex chronic disease.
4. Upāśaya as therapeutic causal confirmation: The Āyurvedic diagnostic tool of Upāśaya (therapeutic trial) - whereby the correct identification of the underlying kāraṇa is confirmed by the regression of the kārya upon its removal - is logically grounded in Karya-Kāraṇa Vāda and is structurally equivalent to the N-of-1 trial design in evidence-based medicine. It provides a philosophically robust framework for individualized therapeutic testing that complements population-level randomized controlled trial evidence.

6. Critical Appraisal: Convergences, Divergences, and Research Imperatives

6.1 Genuine Ontological Convergences

The convergences documented in this paper between Satkāryavāda and contemporary biomedical science are substantial, specific, and non-trivial. They include: the pre-existence of disease potential in the genome and epigenome (*Asadakaraṇāt*); tissue-specific molecular receptivity (*Upādānagrahāt*); constitutional disease-pattern specificity (*Sarvabhāvāpatteh*); allostatic threshold logic (*Śaktasya Śakyakaraṇatā*); and the disease-health continuum (*Kāraṇabhāvāt*). These are not

superficial analogies - they reflect shared structural features of biological reality that were captured in philosophical language by Sāṃkhya and are being rediscovered in molecular language by contemporary science. The claim is not that the frameworks are identical - they operate in different epistemic registers - but that they are **tracking the same ontological features** of the causal structure of disease.

6.2 Points of Genuine Divergence

- Ontological vs. mechanistic explanation: Satkāryavāda makes an ontological claim (the effect pre-exists). Contemporary biology demonstrates disease predisposition mechanistically (specific genes, specific molecular pathways). These are not the same claim, and the structural homology does not require ontological identity.
- Teleology vs. mechanism: Āyurvedic causal models retain an implicit teleological dimension - the body tends toward health; disease is a deviation from inherent telos. Contemporary biomedicine avoids teleological explanation in favour of mechanistic description. This is a genuine epistemological difference that neither framework should paper over.
- Holism vs. reductionism: Samprapti is irreducibly holistic - the same doṣic process has different pathogenetic implications in different constitutional contexts (Prakṛtis). Contemporary medicine, despite advances in systems biology, remains predominantly reductionist in practice. Network medicine is beginning to bridge this gap but has not yet achieved the integrative depth that Samprapti embodies.
- Empirical validation gap: The structural homologies identified in this paper require systematic empirical validation. Philosophical convergence does not constitute empirical equivalence. The research imperatives are clear: validated biomarkers for each Śaṭkriyākāla stage, controlled clinical trials of stage-specific Āyurvedic interventions, and multi-omics validation of Prakṛti-based constitutional phenotyping.

7. Conclusion

This paper has argued - and, we submit, demonstrated - that Karya-Kāraṇa Vāda is the philosophical basis of Samprapti in a precise, structural sense: not merely a philosophically consistent backdrop but the generative doctrine from which every feature of Samprapti's architecture derives its intelligibility. The five Satkāryavāda arguments of *Sāṃkhyakārikā* 9 are not external to Samprapti - they are **encoded within it**, structurally operative in each stage of the Śaṭkriyākāla, constitutively expressed in the principle of Doṣa-Dūṣya Sammūrchana, and therapeutically consequential in the logic of Samprapti-Vighaṭana.

The contemporary scientific appraisal of this philosophical basis reveals genuine and non-trivial convergences with molecular genetics, allostatic load theory, tissue tropism, the disease-health continuum, and pharmacogenomics. These convergences do not reduce Āyurvedic causal theory to a pre-scientific approximation of biomedicine - they reveal that Satkāryavāda captured structural features of biological reality that contemporary science is independently arriving at through molecular investigation. The philosophical precedence of Karya-Kāraṇa Vāda does not make it scientifically superior; it makes it **scientifically significant** - a contribution from a different epistemic tradition to a shared empirical reality.

The most important practical implication is the one least visible to contemporary medicine: the Sañcaya and Prakopa stages of Samprapti - the stages where latent disease potential is accumulating and activating, where *Asadakaraṇāt* and *Śaktasya Śakyakaraṇatā* are the operative philosophical principles - are precisely the stages where intervention is most effective and most philosophically coherent, and precisely the stages where contemporary medicine is most diagnostically and therapeutically silent. Recognizing Karya-Kāraṇa Vāda as the philosophical basis of Samprapti makes this silence visible as a gap - and makes filling it an urgent scientific imperative.

What is now required is rigorous translational research: validated multi-omic biomarkers for each Śaṭkriyākāla stage, controlled clinical trials of Samprapti-stage-specific Āyurvedic interventions, and systematic integration of Prakṛti-based constitutional assessment with genomic and metabolomic

profiling. Karya-Kāraṇa Vāda as the philosophical basis of Samprapti is not, ultimately, a historical thesis - it is a **research program**. Samprapti is intelligible as a rational system of pathogenesis *only* when its Karya-Kāraṇa basis is made explicit. Making that basis explicit, and subjecting it to the rigours of contemporary scientific appraisal, is what this paper has undertaken - and what the field of integrative medicine must continue.

References

1. Agniveśa. Charaka Saṃhitā with Āyurveda Dīpikā Commentary of Cakrapāṇidatta. Ed. Yadavji Trikamji Acharya. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishthan; 2015.
2. Suśruta. Suśruta Saṃhitā with Nibandha Saṃgraha Commentary of Ḍalhana. Ed. Yadavji Trikamji Acharya. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishthan; 2014.
3. Vāgbhaṭa. Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayam with Sarvāṅgasundara of Aruṇadatta. Ed. Hari Sāstrī Pāradakara. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Orientalia; 2012.
4. Madhavakara. Mādhavanidānam with Madhukosha Commentary. Ed. Yadavji Trikamji Acharya. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishthan; 2004.
5. Īśvarakṛṣṇa. Sāṃkhyakārikā with Gauḍapāda-Bhāṣya. Trans. T.G. Mainkar. Pune: Oriental Book Agency; 1964.
6. McEwen BS, Stellar E. Stress and the individual: mechanisms leading to disease. Arch Intern Med. 1993;153(18):2093–2101.
7. McEwen BS. Stress, adaptation, and disease: allostasis and allostatic load. Ann N Y Acad Sci. 1998;840:33–44.
8. Knudson AG Jr. Mutation and cancer: statistical study of retinoblastoma. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 1971;68(4):820–823.
9. Prasher B, Negi S, Aggarwal S, et al. Whole genome expression and biochemical correlates of extreme constitutional types defined in Ayurveda. J Transl Med. 2008;6:48.
10. Rotti H, Mallya S, Kabekkodu SP, et al. DNA methylation analysis of phenotype specific stratified Indian population. J Transl Med. 2015;13:151.
11. Juyal RC, Negi S, Wakhode P, Bhat S, Bhatt B, Thelma BK. Potential of Ayurgenomics approach in complex trait research: leads from a pilot study on rheumatoid arthritis. PLoS ONE. 2012;7(9):e45752.
12. Hanahan D, Weinberg RA. Hallmarks of cancer: the next generation. Cell. 2011;144(5):646–674.
13. Warburg O. On the origin of cancer cells. Science. 1956;123(3191):309–314.
14. Hopkins AL. Network pharmacology: the next paradigm in drug discovery. Nat Chem Biol. 2008;4(11):682–690.
15. Patwardhan B, Mutalik G, Tillu G. Integrative Approaches for Health: Biomedical Research, Ayurveda and Yoga. Academic Press; 2015.
16. Sharma PV. Dravyaguṇa-Vijñāna. 4 vols. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Bharati Academy; 2006.
17. Dash B, Sharma RK. Charaka Saṃhitā: Text with English Translation and Critical Exposition. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Series; 2002.
18. Narayanaswamy V. Origin and development of Ayurveda: a brief history. Anc Sci Life. 1981;1(1):1–7.
19. Lad V. Textbook of Ayurveda: Fundamental Principles. Albuquerque: Ayurvedic Press; 2002.
20. Patwardhan K. Human physiology in Ayurveda. Anc Sci Life. 2012;32(2):98–105.