

Mādhava, An Early Unfaithful Exponent of the Sāṅkhya

By

V. RAGHAVAN, *Madras.*

Early Sāṅkhya was characterised by a large variety of doctrines, Paramārtha mentioning no less than eighteen schools of Sāṅkhya. Īśvarakṛṣṇa's work not only swallowed all the earlier literature but also codified the system into some homogeneity. The glimpses that we have of the early Sāṅkhya authorities, Kapila, Āsuri, Pāṇcaśkha, Vīṛṣaganya, Jaigīṣavya and Vindhyavāsin, as also the views in the Yoga-Sūtras, Aśvaghoṣa, Caraka and the Great Epic, show a considerable body of divergent views.¹ While, on one side, following a common law in the history of Sanskrit literature, the compendious *Kārikās* of Īśvarakṛṣṇa threw into oblivion all the earlier literature, the system itself was soon absorbed and rendered superfluous by both the theistically oriented epic version and the Vedānta. The reconstruction of the early history of Sāṅkhya and the views of its different exponents becomes thus a very interesting work. Mādhava, of whose contribution and its peculiar nature we shall speak here, is one of the little known celebrities of this early history of Sāṅkhya.

Umveka makes an interesting reference to him in his commentary on the *Śloka-vārttika*,² from which it appears that Mādhava is presupposed by Kumārila himself. The reference occurs under the *Codanā Sūtra* during the course of the discussion that the scriptural injunction or interdiction alone is authority for determining *dharma* and *adharma* and not any inference, such as the one based on the apparent good or injury relating from an act. According to Umveka, the subsection beginning from verse 231 under the *Codanā Sūtra* is directed against the Sāṅkhya who does not accept the scriptural authority and opposes Vedic sacrifices as being on a par with any mundane act of injury (*himsā*). After showing that neither benefit to another nor injury to him is criterion for *dharma* or *adharma*, but the injunction or interdiction of the Veda alone is, Kumārila considers the view of a clever opponent who said that it was not on the basis of any inference that he considered the Vedic sacrifice as *adharma*, that he considered the Vedic *vidhi-niśedha* as the competent authority in this respect and that as the Veda prohibited *himsā* and it could not draw a line between one kind of *himsā* and another or remove

1. See E. H. Johnston : *Early Sāṅkhya*, London.

2. Madras University Sanskrit Series, p. 112.

the injurious nature in one case by its *vidhi*, the Vedic sacrifice too should be considered to be *adharma*. Now, Umveka introduces this view as that of a *leader of Sāṅkhya thought* (Sāṅkhya-nāyaka), by name *Mādhava*.

सांख्यनायकमाधवस्त्वाह—विहायानुमानादीन् विधिप्रतिषेधनिबन्धनत्वमेव धर्माधर्मयो-
रवलम्ब्य अग्नीषोमीयादिष्वधर्मतामाह क्वचदिति श्लोकत्रयेण × × × हिंसा नाम तावदेका
व्यक्तिरत्रैलोक्यऽपि, तस्माच्च क्वचिल्लोके ब्रह्महत्यादिषु “न हिंस्यात्सर्वाणि भूतानि” इति प्रतिषेधादनिष्ट-
साधनत्वशक्तिरवगमिता; न च प्रतिहता इदानीम्; विधेयेष्वग्नीषोमीयादिषु हिंसाया अविशेषाच्चाप-
गच्छति × × × अतः सर्वशास्त्रानुसारादेव हिंसादीनामधर्मत्वं कल्प्यते न पुनरनुमानत इति
स्थितमग्नीषोमीयादिष्वधर्मत्वम् ।

There are two references to this Mādhava in Jinendrabuddhi's gloss *Viśālāmalavati* on the *Pramāṇasamuccaya* of Diṇnāga (ch. 1)³ from which it is seen that this Sāṅkhya writer was earlier than Diṇnāga himself who presupposes him. Here again, Mādhava is seen to hold a peculiar view. From verse 28 onwards, Diṇnāga proceeds to criticise the Sāṅkhya conception of *pratyakṣa* or sensory perception and the nature of sense and its object; in this context, the gloss of Jinendrabuddhi (on verse 31) says that, as against Kapila, Mādhava held that the nature of *sukhā* etc. differed in every case : कपिलादयो मन्यन्ते सुखादीनां स्वरूपं सर्वत्र एकमेव । माधवरतु तानि सर्वत्र भिद्यन्त इति । Jinendrabuddhi says again under verse 34 : माधवपक्षादस्य न्यूनदोषत्वादित्येवमुक्तमिति न दोषः ।

A third text where we have a very significant reference to Mādhava is Kārṇakagomin's gloss on Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇavārttika*;⁴ from Kārṇakagomin we learn that the reading in Umveka's gloss on Kumārila, *Sāṅkhya-nāyaka* is really corrupt and that Mādhava was really not a 'leader of Sāṅkhya thought, Sāṅkhya-nāyaka', but a *Sāṅkhya-nāśaka*, 'a destroyer of Sāṅkhya.' During his examination of the conception of verbal testimony such as of the Veda and of the conception of an 'āpta', the trustworthy person whose word (*śabda*) is an authority (*pramāṇa*), Dharmakīrti says that the view that the Veda or its interpretation has had the transmission from mouth to mouth in an unbroken manner rests solely on the conventional and customary belief within a group of persons, and it is quite possible that corrupters, out of self-importance, inner dislike or the vile satisfaction of vandalism, had misrepresented the tradition :

अपि च वेदस्तद्व्याख्यानं वा पुरुषेण पुरुषायोपदिश्यमानमनष्टसम्प्रदायमेवानुवर्तत इत्यत्रापि
समयः स(श?)रणम् । आगमभ्रंशकारिण्यामाहोपुरुषिकया तद्दर्शनविद्वेषेण वा तत्प्रतिपन्नखली-
करणाय धूर्तव्यसनेन अन्यतो वा कुतश्चित् कारणाद् अन्यथारचनासम्भवात् ।

When explaining the above, Kārṇakagomin says that for misrepresentation, there is the example of Mādhava who ruined the Sāṅkhya by expounding it in

3. Edn. H. R. R. Iyengar, Mysore, pp. 77, 80.

4. BORS edn. by Rahual Sankrityayana, p. 59.

an unfaithful manner : आगमभ्रंशकारिणामित्यादिना सम्प्रदायविच्छेदेन रचनान्तरसम्भवमेव समर्थयते । आगमभ्रंशकारिणां पुंसामन्यथा । पूर्वरचनावैपरीत्येन रचनादर्शनादिति सम्बन्धः । अन्यथा रचनायां कारणमाह । आहोपुरुषिकयेत्यादि । आहोपुरुषिकयेत्यहंमानित्वेन । यथा सांख्यनाशकमाधवेन सांख्यसिद्धान्तस्यान्यथा रचनं कृतम् । तददर्शनविद्वेषेण वान्यथा रचना-सम्भवात् । 'Sāṅkhya-nāśaka' is thus a badge of notriety gained by Mādhava for the *sāhya-sārathya* he did for the Sāṅkhya system.

Corroboration of the existence of an early Sāṅkhya writer of this name comes from Hieun-Tsiang who mentions in his Travels⁵ that in Magadha was a monastery dedicated to the Buddhist teacher Guṇamati, "who here vanquished in discussion the great Sāṅkhya Doctor Mādhava". It is significant to note in this connection that Guṇamati⁶ wrote what is called the *Lakṣaṇānuśāstra* which Paramārtha rendered into the Chinese about 560 A. D., a text which shows "an intimate acquaintance with the Sāṅkhya teachings".

5. T. Watters : *On Yuan Chevang's Travels in India*, London, Vol. II, pp. 108-9.

6. "One Sthiramati was a pupil of Guṇamati and lived before 425 A. D." Winternitz: *History of Indian Literature*, Calcutta University, Vol. II, p. 362, fn. 3.