



# International Journal of Sanskrit Research

अनन्ता

ISSN: 2394-7519

IJSR 2021; 7(1): 207-209

© 2021 IJSR

[www.anantaajournal.com](http://www.anantaajournal.com)

Received: 09-11-2020

Accepted: 18-12-2020

SK Mohammad Sakim

Vill-Sahabagh, Harinkhola,  
Arambagh, Hooghly, West  
Bengal, India

## Indispensability of the commentary “Sāṃkhyatattvakaumūdī” for comprehending the text “Sāṃkhyakārikā”

SK Mohammad Sakim

### Introduction

Most of the fundamental Scriptures of Indian philosophies were written in Sanskrit language. But Sanskrit language has an attribute that Sanskrit words are ambiguous and hold various meanings. For example, the term “saindhava” in the sentence “सैन्धवम् आनय” has two meanings. One of them is salt and another is horse. But in the context of lunch or dinner it stands for salt. It stands for horse born in Sindhu at the preparation of war. Thus this is said that –

“अर्थात् प्रकरणाल्लिङ्गादौचित्यादेशकालतः I

शब्दार्थाश्च विभज्यन्ते न रूपादेव केवलम् II”

Arthāt prakaraṇāllinṅgādaucityādeśakālah I

Śabdārthāśca vibhajyante na rūpādeva kevalam II

Hence the main texts of Indian philosophy often are not comprehensible to us. In order to apprehend and simplify, the Sanskrit scriptures has been annotated by many commentators from various angles. So we may feel indispensability of Sanskrit commentaries written on main texts.

So we have taken here a commentary named “सांख्यतत्त्वकौमुदी” \*1 for showing its importance in comprehending the purport of the text “सांख्यकारिका” \*2. There are some points through which the indispensability of “सांख्यतत्त्वकौमुदी” in comprehending the main text “सांख्यकारिका” will be established. 1) Somewhere commentator makes purport out of the text by using simple and appropriate example. (2) Somewhere he makes the text understandable by wiping out confusion. 3) And somewhere he holds subtle logical discussion as the text becomes more understandable to the readers.

### 1) Using of simple and appropriate example for revealing the purport of the text.

There are similarities between the “पुरुष” \*3 and “प्रधान” \*4 like ceaselessness, eternity, etc., but there are also dissimilarities such as the absence of three attributes (गुणत्रय) \*5. The following sloka says what are the three attributes and what are their characteristics:

“प्रीत्यप्रीतिविषादात्मकाः प्रकाशप्रवृत्तिनियमार्थाः I

अन्योन्याभिभवाश्रयजननमिथुनवृत्तयश्च गुणाः” II \*6

(Pṛityapṛitivyāsadātmakah prakāśapṛavṛittinīyamārthah I

Anyonyābhibhavaśrayamithunavṛittayaśca guṇah II)

Characteristics of the three attributes (गुणत्रय) are being expounded in the following verse no 13.

सत्त्वं लघु प्रकाशकमिष्टमुपष्टम्भकं चलञ्च रजः I

गुरु वरणकमेव तमः प्रदीपवच्चार्थतो वृत्तिः” II \*7

(Sattvam laghu prakāśakamiṣṭamupaṣṭambhakam calañca rajah I

Guru Varāṇakameva tamah pradīpavaccarthato vṛittih II)

Corresponding Author:

SK Mohammad Sakim

Vill-Sahabagh, Harinkhola,  
Arambagh, Hooghly, West  
Bengal, India

The सत्त्वगुण is buoyant and illuminating; the रजोगुण is exciting and mobile; and the तमोगुण is sluggish and obscuring; their functioning is for a single purpose, like that of a lamp.

Now, these attributes are endowed with mutually contradicting properties. It is but natural that they would only destroy each other like 'Sunda and Upsunda' \*8. It has been said that their functioning is for a common purpose, like that lamp. It is matter of common observation that the wick and oil, though opposed to the action of fire, when brought together they operate to perform the task of giving light. In the same way, सत्त्व, रजः and तमः attributes are also though contradictory to each other, cooperate and effect their single purpose of bringing the emancipation of the पुरुष (spirit).

Though in the main text of "सांख्यकारिका" we find the example of a lamp to establish their functioning for a common purpose, but one may arise a question that though the wick and oil are opposed to the action of fire but wick is not opposed to action of oil vis-vis the oil is not opposed to the action of the wick. But here these gunas are endowed with mutually contradictory property. Hence the example produced in the main text of "सांख्यकारिका" is not perfect. Therefore the commentator Vacaspati Mishra appends a supplementary instance. The three humours of the body, viz. wind, bile and phlegm though possessed of mutually opposite properties, cooperate with each other for the sole purpose of sustaining the body.

## 2) Wiping out the confusion for revealing the purport of the text

All the philosophers of Indian philosophical schools except Carvaka, hold the theory of causality known as कार्यकारणभाववाद. सत्कार्यवाद\*9, a kind of कार्यकारणवाद has been expounded by the philosophers of Samkhya system. Therefore Samkhins are regarded as सत्कार्यवादिनः. There are five arguments which has been illustrated in the सांख्यकारिका of Isvarkrishna. In order to establish the theory of सत्कार्यवाद. Thus, we find a most popular śloka in सांख्यकारिका-

“असदकरणादुपादानग्रहणात् सर्वसम्भवाभावात् I

शक्तस्य शक्यकरणात् कारणभावाच्च सत् कार्यम्” II \*10

(Asadakaraṇādūpadānagrahaṇāt sarvasambhāvābhāvāt I  
Śhaktasya śakyakaraṇāt karaṇābhāvācca sat kāryam I I)

Here the fifth linga or hetu is कारणभाव. Generally the term "भाव" is used for "धर्म" (quality) or क्रिया (action). From the विग्रहवाक्य "कारणस्य भावः कारणभावः" we come to know that कारणभाव means कारणधर्म or कारणक्रिया. The term 'भाव' is also used for indicating the meaning स्वभाव or तादात्म्य. So, what should we understand by the term "कारणभाव"? Does it indicate here any quality prevailing in the cause (कारण) or any action (क्रिया) prevailing in the cause or cause itself?

The answer is that the term 'कारणभाव' here stands for 'कारण' itself and it is discussed clearly in the commentary named 'सांख्यतत्त्वकौमुदी' of Vacaspatimishra. Though according to context we may understand that and we need no depend on the 'सांख्यतत्त्वकौमुदी' for understanding that but why is 'कार्य' identical with the 'कारण' is not discussed in the main text 'सांख्यकारिका'. Reason of identity between the 'कार्य' and 'कारण'

has been discoursed in 'सांख्यतत्त्वकौमुदी'. So we find these following reasons in 'सांख्यतत्त्वकौमुदी'. –

“कार्यस्य कारणाभेदसाधनाणि च प्रमाणानि – न पटस्तन्तुभ्यो भिद्यते तन्तुधर्मत्वात् I इह यद्यतो भिद्यते तत्तस्य धर्मो न भवति I यथा गौरश्चस्य धर्मश्च पटस्तन्तुनां तस्मान्नार्थान्तरम् I उपादानोपादेयभावाच्च नार्थान्तरत्वं तन्तुपटयोः, ययोरर्थान्तरत्वं न तयोरुपादानोपादेयभावः, यथा घटपटयोः I उपादानोपादेयभावश्च तन्तुपटयोः तस्मान्नार्थान्तरत्वम् इत्यस्य अर्थान्तरत्वं तन्तुपटयोः संयोगप्राप्त्यभावात्, अर्थान्तरत्वे हि संयोगो दृष्टो यथा कुण्डवदरयोः, अप्राप्तिर्वा यथा हिमवद्विन्ध्ययोः I न चेह संयोगप्राप्तौ तस्मान् न अर्थान्तरत्वमिति I ”\*11

The following are the proofs that establish the non-difference of the effect from the cause (1) The cloth is not different from the yarns (constituting it) because the cloth subsists in the yarns. A thing differing in its essence from another, cannot subsist in it, like a cow in a horse; but, here the cloth subsists in its yarns. From this it follows that the effect is not different from its cause. (2) The cloth and the yarn cannot be two different things because of the relationship between the material cause and the effect. Whenever two things are found to be different from each other, there the relationship between the constituent cause and effect is never found, eg in the case of the jar and the cloth. But the relationship between the constituent cause and the effect is found between the yarn and the cloth; thus the two are not different things. (3) For the following reason also cloth and yarn are not two different things: 'because there is neither conjunction nor disjunction between them. Conjunction is found to exist only between objects different from each other, as between the well and the jujube tree; the same with regard to separation also, as between the Himavan and the Vindhya. In case of the cloth and the yarns, there is no such conjunction or disjunction; hence, they are not two different things.

## 3) Holding subtle logical discussions for revealing the purport of the text.

In order to reveal the purport of "सांख्यकारिका" Vacaspatimishra, author of the commentary "सांख्यतत्त्वकौमुदी" is not engaged to explain the karika only, but he deals with solution of some more objectionable questions or anupapattis. For instance, we may take this verse -

“दृष्टवदानुश्रविकः स ह्यविशुद्धिक्षयातिशययुक्तः I

तद्विपरीतः श्रेयान् व्यक्ताव्यक्ताज्ञविज्ञानात्” II \*12

“Dṛṣṭavādānuśravikah sa hyaviśuddhikṣyātīśayayuktah I  
Tadviparītah Śreyān vyaktāvyaaktajñāvijñānāt II”

Here the authors intends to state that pain cannot be absolutely rooted out by the the "दृष्ट उपाय" \*13 as well as the Vedic path (अनुश्रविक) \*14. Because the Vedic means is attended with impurity, decay and excess.

What do we mean by the term 'अविशुद्धि' or impurity here? Author intends to state that it is impure because sacrifices like soma yajna etc. are performed by the sacrifice of animals and destruction of corn etc. Bhagavan Pancasikhaçarya\*15 says it is slightly mixed remediable and bearable svalpasamkara means the admixture of the slight sin, productive of evil, caused by the slaughter of animals etc. with the principal merit born of the performance of sacrifices like Yotistama etc. By Sāparihara is maid that the evil is removal by certain expiatory rites. But if due to inadvertence expiatory rites are not observed, then it also bears fruit at time of fruition of the

