CHAPTER VI.

CONCLUSION

We thus see that the Sāmkhya of the Sage Kapila which is presented to us in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa, which is equated also with the Bhāgavata Dharma and which is known as the Vaiṣṇava Sāmkhya is the same as the one presented by the Epic MB. It is already amply explained previously that this Sāmkhya was the Vedic or Āraṇa Sāmkhya or Knowledge; and it is also clarified how this Sāmkhya which was inseparable from the Vedānta was purely Advaita or Monistic Philosophy. Western scholars like Keith and others have recognised the Epic Sāmkhya as distinct from the Classical Sāmkhya. It is also shown how the Indian thinkers like Radhakrishnan, Dasgupta, Aurobindo and others hold that this Early Sāmkhya materially differs from the Classical Sāmkhya which stands no comparison with the Pre-Classical Sāmkhya.

It is also shown that it is the Pre-Classical Sāmkhya that was promulgated by the Sage Kapila, that was popular in India as most authoritative and attained great fame, and that the Classical Sāmkhyas have attempted to link their atheistic Sāmkhya with the Early Pre-Classical Sāmkhya, with a view to earn or gain for their philosophy the previous Parampara, authority, popularity, and fame of the Early Sāmkhya. In the history of the Classical Sāmkhya, the Sāmkhya Kārikās of Is'varakṛṣṇa that are now available are the earliest documents.
on the basis of which authority we can take the origin of the Classical Samkhya to the third Century A.D. It is no doubt true that the Brahma Sutras have refuted the Classical atheistic Samkhya, and taking this factor into consideration, we can take the Classical Samkhya a little earlier to the Sutra period of the third century A.D.; but this will not matter much.

There are also some attempts made by certain scholars to take the Classical Samkhya, even still earlier than this period claiming that some of the principles of this Classical Samkhya are analogous to the principles of Buddhism. It has been shown that this is only a futile attempt, since there is no direct evidence to show that the Samkhya taught by the Sage Arada, the former teacher of Buddha as appearing in the Buddha Charita of As'vaghosa, was clearly atheistic like the Classical Samkhya, and thereby to trace an early history to the Classical Samkhya. There are, however, on the other hand indications to show that the Buddhistic principles preached by the Lord Buddha are based on the Upanisads or Upanisadic Jnana or Upanisadic Samkhya. It is also stated by Radhakrishnan and others that "when Buddhism offered a challenge to Realism the Samkhya accepted the challenge and argued on a purely rationalistic soil, and it (Classical Samkhya) was obliged to concede that there was no proof for the existence of God." This goes to show that the Classical Samkhya was a later development to meet the Buddhistic arguments.

There are also attempts made by some scholars to give an early date to the Classical Samkhya on the basis of reference
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to the Classical Sāmkhya principles in the Yoga Sūtras, but it has already been shown that the Classical Yoga in the Yoga Sūtras which is in line with the Classical Sāmkhya cannot be taken to the age of the grammarian Sage Patañjali and that the age of this Classical Yoga is to be taken to the fourth Century A.D.

The Sāmkhya works like Sāṣṭi Tantra, Abhiruddhnya Samhita, Charaka Samhita, etc refer only to the theistic or the Pre-Classical Sāmkhya. They cannot, therefore, be taken as helping to give an early date or age to the Classical Sāmkhya. These works accept the theistic Sāmkhya appearing in the Bhāgavata or the MB. We have shown on the basis of the various passages appearing in the Bhāgavata, the Epic MB, the Upaniṣads, as to how the Sāmkhya narrated by the Sage Kapila or Lord Kṛṣṇa in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa is the one that corresponds with the thoughts current in the Vedic or Upaniṣadic literature. Such an authoritative Sāmkhya, which has nothing to do with Classical Sāmkhya, cannot be passed over simply on the ground that it has only a traditional basis. Such a traditional account, in the absence of any direct evidence against it, will have to be also taken as authoritative. It is for this reason that Dasgupta seems to be urging correctly that "in the absence of any proof to the contrary, it may be urged that the account of Sāmkhya attributed to Kapila in the Bhāgavata may generally be believed to be true." By carefully excluding the various wrong approaches or the incorrect interpretations which are imposed upon the (traditional)Vedic or Upaniṣadic statements, by some of the Western scholars and with attempts made to understand the correct meanings of even some of
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the few Vedic or Upanisadic passages with the help of the explanations given in the Bhāgavata, MB and elsewhere, it is possible to find out that there has been much force or truth even in the traditional passages and that they are very meaningful. The allegorical meanings which are sometimes exaggerated will have to be correctly understood. It has been also shown that the Vedas, Brahmānas and the Upanisads are the backbone of the Kapila Sāṃkhya appearing in the Bhāgavata, for which reason the theistic Sāṃkhya is never 'A-Vaidik' as understood by some scholars. This theistic Kapila Sāṃkhya of Bhāgavata presents the Vedic or Upanisadic wisdom or Jñāna and has a consistent continuity with the Vedas, Brahmānas or Upanisads without any break. Bhāgavata has adopted many of the Vedic or Upanisadic statements verbatim and their ideas as well to explain its Sāṃkhya and to establish identity between the Sāṃkhya and the Bhāgavata Philosophy or Dharma. Keith while explaining the Sāṃkhya in the Epic has correctly put forth, "From the religious side of the epic, the Sāṃkhya system is strangely taken up into the Bhāgavata faith by the equation of the four Vyūhas of the Supreme spirit Viṣṇu to four of the principles of the Sāṃkhya Philosophy." This also applies to the Bhāgavata Purāṇa view of Sāṃkhya and is emphasised previously. The conception of the four Vyūhas in Bhāgavata Purāṇa correspond with the four components of the Antākṣaraṇa—Citta, Ahamkāra, Buddhi and Manas—which ensnare the Ātman and form a sort of barricade (Vyūha) preventing the cognition or knowledge of the Ātman.

The Sāṃkhya view of Puruṣa or Bhāgavān as presented by the Sage Kapila in Bhāgavata Purāṇa is the same monistic view of the
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Vedas and Upanisads about the Paramatman or Parabrahman, as against the Plurality of the Classical Sāmkhya. The Supreme Purusa of the Bhāgavata is not an object of cognition but the idealistic Pure subject to be intutionally felt (Parijnānāmayāḥ) and is the only one and one Reality, while all things other than Paramatman or Purusa are unreal. The Prakṛti or Pradhāna which also appear in the Vedas or Upanisads as Maya, Asat, Hiraṇya is taken as unreal or illusory in the Sāmkhya. These concepts of Maya, Avidyā etc. which are considered as a prominent part and parcel of the later traditional Vedānta, were equally predominant aspects in the Vedic or Upanisadic or Epic thoughts when Sāmkhya and Vedānta were one and the same. It can be seen from the foregoing Chapters as to how the Bhāgavata Sāmkhya explains these Tattvas, how the Supreme Absolute by accepting Maya and by becoming Saguna Brahman provides for the exposition or creation of the Universe, and how He, on account of this Maya only, stands plural as Jīvātman and thus gets entangled in the mundane world.

The attainment of the Kaivalya state of Supreme or Absolute Brahman or Purusa or Reality, after extinguishing all the unreal Maya or Non-Ātman categories is the main aim of the Kapila or Bhāgavata Sāmkhya. The Bhāgavata Purāṇa considers that all ways like Bhakti, Yoga or Jñāna which are helpful to realise this Supreme state ultimately reach the Bhagavān, they being the means to the end but not the end itself. The cults of Bhakti, Jñāna or Yoga which the Bhāgavata-Sāmkhya suggests as the only means for realisation of self differ from the respective paths which the Catholic followers of these paths are upholding. In this connection it deserves to be noted that the Bhāgavata has not the weakness of those emotional thinkers who while applauding or
upholding their own paths relegate or strongly undermine paths other than their own; but Bhāgavata, all the while, upholds the interdependence or harmony among all these paths and considers these paths as useful for sharpening or purifying the mind. Bhāgavata concentrates upon the end or Bhagavān and considers Him as the fundamental factor to be achieved and when the end is attained it pleads 'Tyaja Astram'. The catholic Philosophy of the Bhāgavata Dharma, for this spirit of creating inspiration to all classes of followers is therefore most popular. It is for this reason that Śrī Rāmakrishna Paramahāsa upholds the teachings of Lord Kṛṣṇa, preacher of Sāṁkhya in Bhāgavata Purāṇa, which are 'Sweet as cake fried in the butter of wisdom (Jñāna) and soaked in the honey of love (Bhakti).'. The wise do not give much importance to the ways, after they achieve the ends, since they consider that after this attainment, "Tasya kāryam na vidyate." They do not want, for their own sake, to revert back from the end after achieving the same, since the summum bonum of their achievement is 'Yadgatva no nivartante taddhāma paramām mama." With the help of this Bhāgavata Sāṁkhya or Dharma, one should reach or strive to reach this Reality or Kaivalya. This is the preaching of the Sāṁkhya in Bhāgavata Purāṇa which is the same as that of all S'rutis and Smṛtis. This is the Bhāgavata Sāṁkhya Aim and -
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