



Newsletter of the NGMCP, Number 6

Spring-Summer 2008

Editorial

The sixth issue of the *Newsletter of the NGMCP*, which it is my pleasure to present herewith, is an occasion to introduce new things and to look forward, but also, even more importantly, an occasion to look back. To begin with the new: with this issue we will be starting a changed schedule, appearing with increased regularity but at a slower pace. From now onwards a *Newsletter* will be released twice yearly: a Spring-Summer issue and an Autumn-Winter one, with a minimum page-count of 24 per issue.

New are also two of the contributors to this issue, both young scholars who already have remarkable experience in working with Sanskrit manuscripts. Kazuo Kano, an assistant professor at Koyasan University in Japan, joins forces with Kengo Harimoto, of the NGMCP in Hamburg, to present an early manuscript fragment of an otherwise unknown commentary on the *Tattvasaṅgraha* of Śāntarākṣita. Identified some twenty years by Prof. Kazunobu Matsuda, the well-known 'manuscript-hunter', this fragment has never before been studied in detail or published. Here Harimoto and Kano edit and translate the first of two surviving folios, with material which they show to be important for our understanding of the history of the Sāṃkhya system. A similar study of the second folio is forthcoming in a future *Newsletter* issue.

The second contributor whom we welcome for the first time in this issue is Péter-Dániel Szántó, who holds MA degrees in Tibetology and Indology from ELTE University, Budapest, and is at present a doctoral student in Oxford University. Szántó presents a pioneering study of a group of texts which deal with initiation into the *Catuspīṭha*, a major, but virtually unstudied, tantric Buddhist system. Szántó is able to clarify the relationships between a number of texts, and sheds much light on their complex history.

We have also, as is customary, a book notice in this issue. Kengo Harimoto introduces a publication which edits and translates, for the first time, an early and influential work on *hathayoga*. The author, James Mallinson, has used a large number of manuscripts, including no less than six which were filmed in Nepal by the NGMPP; unusual is that to elucidate the practices taught in the text he has conducted extensive fieldwork with living *hathayoga* practitioners.

I am proud of the fine and ground-breaking contributions which appear in this issue; they would suffice to make it a memorable one. It is, in my view, a landmark also for other reasons. Firstly, it marks the half-way point of the projected duration of the Nepalese-German Manuscript Cataloguing Project. Begun in 2002, the project is expected to be concluded in 2014. A retrospective of the first six years is planned for the next issue of the *Newsletter*. I do not take this as an occasion for self-congratulation; but I think it can be said that much has been done in the first six years of this project, and we are looking forward to increasing our activity in the coming years, and to doing even more towards uncovering, making available, and making scholarly use of the treasures of the manuscript collections of Nepal.

Finally—and I have saved what is for me personally the important as the last—I would like to note another anniversary: this Spring-Summer issue appears not long after the 70th birthday of Prof. Albrecht Wezler, the founder of the NGMCP and my predecessor as holder of the chair for classical Indology in Hamburg. Cause for congratulation and for celebration indeed! Without his foresight, the NGMCP would not have come into being, and as a result a very large number of important indological discoveries (some of the more recent of which have been introduced in the six issues to date of the *Newsletter of the NGMCP*) would not have been made. Sāṃkhya, which is central in the paper by Harimoto and Kano, has long been one of the main focuses of Prof. Wezler's scholarship; and the breadth of interest, extending to countless little-known areas, that has been so noticeable throughout his long and distinguished career will, I hope, lead him to peruse also the other contributions to this issue with attention and pleasure. To our founder, and our teacher, most respectfully *namah*; to all our readers: Happy reading with the *Newsletter of the NGMCP*!

Harunaga Isaacson

Fragments of a commentary on the Tattvaśāṅgraha, part 1

Kengo HARIMOTO and Kazuo KANO

Introduction

Some twenty years ago, Kazunobu Matsuda (1990, 119) identified two folios in the codex photographed as NGMPP A 39/13¹ (frames 32–34) as fragments of an unknown commentary on the Tattvaśāṅgraha (TS) of Śāntarakṣita.² This is part 1 of a report on those fragments. The folio we report on here, photographed in frames 34 (recto) and 33 bottom (verso), constitutes a part of the commentary on TS stanza 14.

The manuscript The folios are palm-leaf. The size of the manuscript is unknown. Yet it is probably not much different from the 49 × 5 cm reported as that of the bundle A 39/13. It is written in what is sometimes called transitional Gupta (the term adopted by the NGMPP/NGMCP), which covers various scripts in the north of South Asian sub-continent in around the 7th to the 10th centuries. Among the specimens of manuscripts written in this script found in Nepal, the script of the Skandapurāṇa manuscript dated 810 shares some features with our fragments. A notable feature in this respect is the distinction between the dental *sa* and palatal *śa* by means of their respectively open and closed top.³

Both the left and the right edges are broken off in both folios. It is, however, possible to estimate the approximate number of lost *akṣaras* due to surviving lines and the parallel text in the Tattvaśāṅgrahapañjikā (TSP). Five lines, except the recto of the second fragment (containing four lines), are written on each side.

The text Since the two folios, sharing physical and orthographical characteristics, are found together, and since parallel passages are found in the TSP in both folios, it is reasonable to suppose that they belong to the same text and that that is a commentary on the TS, as proposed by Matsuda. This should be mentioned here since, as discussed below, there are only slight indications that the first folio we report on here is a commentary on the TS. The second folio makes explicit references to portions of

¹This manuscript has the National Archives Kathmandu accession number 3-737. According to Matsuda (1997, n. 2; 2002, p. 264), this number is given to manuscripts seen by Bendall in 1898–99. The NGMCP title list records ten manuscripts that are given this accession number.

²Some folios photographed as A 39/13 belong to the Daśabhūmikasūtra and were published in Matsuda 1996. Among the rest, four folios belong to a Jyotiṣa work, the Sārāvalī of Kalyāṇavarman and the rest to the Dhāraṇī of Amitābha.

³See Adriaensen, et al. 1998, p. 33.

the TS, and shows much more clear signs of being a commentary on the TS.⁴

The text of the first folio, the subject of this report, constitutes a part of the commentary on stanza 14 of the TS:

सुखाद्यन्वितमेतच्च व्यक्तं व्यक्तं समीक्ष्यते।
प्रसादतापदैत्यादिकार्यस्येहोपलब्धितः॥

“This [universe] is apparently understood as the manifest, accompanied by pleasure, etc. For, here [in this world] we observe their effects, such as pureness, heat, depression, etc., [everywhere].”

This stanza essentially argues for the existence of the *pradhāna* of the Sāṃkhyas; the view is later refuted in the TS. In order to analyze the text of our fragment, it is necessary to consult the TSP, since our text follows a similar strategy. Indeed, about half the text in our first fragment is shared with the TSP. In the TSP, stanza 14 of the TS is explained as referring to an argument for the existence of *pradhāna* formulated in Sāṃkhyakārikā (SK) 15:

भेदानां परिमाणात्समन्वयाच्छक्तिः प्रवृत्तेश्च।
कारणकार्यविभागादविभागाद्वैश्वरूपस्य॥

Most commentaries⁵ on this stanza, as well as the TSP, divide it into five reasons: (1) *bhedānām parimāṇāt*; (2) (*bhedānām samanvayāt*); (3) *śaktiḥ pravṛtteḥ*; (4) *kāraṇakāryavibhāgāt*; (5) *avibhāgād vaiśvarūpyasya*, and then explain each reason. According to Kamalaśīla, stanza 14 of the TS refers to the second reason (*bhedānām samanvayāt*).⁶ Kamalaśīla makes this point after citing SK 15 and explaining it. His explanation of SK 15, being very similar to those of a group of commentaries on the SK—Mātharavṛtti, Gauḍapādabhāṣya, an anonymous Vṛtti, Jayamaṅgalā, and the Suvarṇa- (or Kanaka-)saptati, extent only in Chinese translation, which in turn are similar to each other—is probably an almost verbatim copy from a lost commentary on the SK.⁷

Our text is available only starting from the middle of the discussion on the reason *samanvayāt*, which is the second in SK 15 and, according to Kamalaśīla, the reason behind TS k. 14. Having explained *samanvayāt*, the

⁴We will discuss the nature of the text as a commentary on the TS in more detail, including its relationship with the TSP, in the second part of this report.

⁵Vācaspati Mīśra's Tattvakaumudī is an exception.

⁶Cf. TSP (28,8): *tad atrācāryeṇa 'samanvayāt' ity ayam eva hetur uktaḥ...*

⁷It has long ago been noted that there are close similarities between the following commentaries on the SK: Mātharavṛtti, Gauḍapādabhāṣya, the anonymous Vṛtti, Jayamaṅgalā, and the Suvarṇa-saptati. It is thus natural to assume that a single commentary was the source of all of these. The *terminus ante quem* of that commentary is provided by the date of Paramārtha who translated the Suvarṇasaptati into Chinese in the sixth century.

author of our text moves on to discuss four other reasons mentioned in SK 15.⁸ Unlike the TSP, he does so without actually citing SK 15. Nonetheless the text of the commentary on the TS in effect appears as though it is a commentary on SK 15—to the point that it could have been mistaken as such, were it not for the order of explanations of the reasons.

The structure of the explanations of three reasons (*bhedānām parimāṇāt, śaktiṭaḥ pravṛtṭeḥ,* and *kāryakāraṇa-vibhāgāt*) is clear. For each reason, our author first introduces an explanation almost identical to that of the TSP; then, he adds further explanations with the expression *apī ca* or *kiṃ ca*. In the conclusion of the explanation of each reason, he has a similarly formulated text that starts with an archaic expression *te manyāmahe . . . iti*.⁹

We have not found exact parallel passages to these additional explanations. It is, however, possible to find brief expressions that may reflect the same reasoning in the Jayamaṅgalā on the same kārikā. Also, the Ṭikā on the Dvādaśāranayacakra (DDANCT), when the Sāṃkhya argument for *pradhāna* is presented, shares substantial text to the additional explanations in our text. Discussions in the Nyāyabhūṣaṇa (NBhū) may also reflect the same line of arguments.¹⁰ Interestingly, the portions in the NBhū and the DDANCT that have parallel passages also begin their exposition with the reason *anvitatvāt* (NBhū)/*samanvitatvāt* (DDANCT). They do not cite SK 15, either, nor do they have the same discussion as found in the TSP and other commentaries on the SK. Furthermore, in the Yuktidīpikā we find much more elaborate and sophisticated discussions in the same line of arguments. See our observations below (pp. 22 ff.) for more on these points.

Facsimile and Transcript

The facsimiles and transcripts are given in the pages 17–18. The following notations are employed:

- Line numbers are presented in bold typeface. They do not form part of the text on the folio.
- /// signifies where the folio breaks off. If this occurs at the beginning of a line, the text to the left of this sign is lost; when this sign is at the end of a line, the text that follows is lost.
- Text enclosed in parentheses () is hard to read. When only part of the akṣara is not clear, only that part is enclosed.

⁸This is merely an assumption, since the text is only available up to the middle of the explanation on the fourth reason *kāryakāraṇa-vibhāgāt*.

⁹This, too, is presumed, since one occurrence of *te manyāmahe* is reconstructed in our edition. For this expression, see note 52.

¹⁰In the edition and translation that follow, corresponding passages in these texts are reported in notes.

- ○ signifies the space created to clear the binding holes. In this folio, the lines above and below that are not directly affected by binding holes, too, have spaces, corresponding to the position of the binding holes. These spaces, too, are signified by the ○ symbol.
- . . . signify lost text whose length is unknown.
- + signifies lost akṣara whose numbers are relatively certain.
- The text enclosed in ` and ´ is a later addition.
- — represents a similar sign found at the beginning of the first line of the recto and the last line of the verso of this folio. The scribe indicates herewith that he left some space before he began the line, probably due to the curvature of the palm-leaf, which did not allow for a first/last line as long as the others.
- .. represent an akṣara we cannot decipher.
- . represents part of an akṣara we cannot decipher.
- * represents virāma.

Edition

In the following edition, the text enclosed in brackets (‘[’ and ‘]’) is our reconstruction of what was lost in the manuscript due to physical damage. The text enclosed in double brackets (‘[[’ and ‘]]’) found in the beginning and in the end of this edition is beyond the content of the folio, but nonetheless could be reconstructed on the basis of the content.

[[¹¹श्रोत्रत्वक्चक्षुर्जिह्वाघ्राणवाग्धस्तोपस्थपा]]¹²युपादबुद्धहंकारमनांसि त्रयोदश त्रयाणां सुखदुःखमोहानां सन्निवेशविशेषाः, त्रयोदशानां त्रयोदशानामेकार्क्यभावात्। सुखाः करणप्रकाशाः। तेषां त्रयोदशानां तदेव प्रसादादि कार्यम्। दुःखाः करणप्रवृत्¹³त्तयः। तेषां तदेव शोषादि कार्यम्। मूढाः करणनियमाः। तेषां तदेव वरणा¹⁴दि कार्यम्॥

एवं¹⁵ भेदानामेकजातिसमन्वयो दृष्टः। सामान्यपूर्वकाणां शकलकपालामत्रभूषणप्रभृतीनामेकजातिसमन्वयो दृष्टः। ते मन्यामहे—प्रा¹⁶—

¹¹For this paragraph, cf. DDANCT, vol. 1, p. 314, ll. 8–13: सामान्यपूर्वकाणां च भेदानामित्यादि एकजातिसमन्वयप्रदर्शनार्थसुखादित्रिगुणैकजातिसमन्वयं कार्यात्मकानां तत्सन्निवेशविशेषत्वं पक्षीकृत्य ‘एककार्यत्वात्’ इति हेतुमाह तथोत्तरत्रोपसंहारात्। पञ्चानां पञ्चानामित्यादिविषया व्याप्तिं दर्शयति। तथा करणात्मकानां नेयम्। प्रसादादिशोषादिवरणादिकार्यात्मकं दृष्टं गुणत्रयैकजातिसमन्वितम्। तैरारब्धान्याकाशादीनि भूतानि एकोत्तरगुणवृद्ध्या तत्कार्यत्वात् तत्समन्वयाच्च तत्पूर्वकाणि। तथा बाह्यानामपि तैर्यग्योनमानुषदैवानां तत्पूर्वकतेति।

¹²श्रोत्रत्वक्चक्षुर्जिह्वाघ्राणवाग्धस्तोपस्थपा° conj.] n/a MS

¹³दुःखाः करणप्रवृ° conj.] n/a MS. Cf. SK 12: प्रीत्यप्रीतिविषादात्मकाः प्रकाशप्रवृत्तिनियमार्थाः। अन्योन्याभिभवाश्रयजननमिथुनवृत्तयश्च गुणाः॥

¹⁴वरणा° em.] धरणा° MS. Cf. SK 13c: गुरु वरणकमेव तमः; JaMa on SK 13 (79,16): वरणापध्वंसनसादनगौरवदैन्यभीतयश्च; NBh 565,8–9: तथा तामसानां पञ्चानामेकं कार्यं दृष्टम्—वरणसादनापध्वंसवीभत्सदैन्यगौरवाणि।

¹⁵For this paragraph, cf. DDANCT, vol. 1, p. 314, ll. 13–14: तस्मात् त्रैगुण्यसमन्वितत्वाद्भेदाद्विगुणपूर्वकाश्चन्दनशकलादिवत्। शकलकपालामत्रभूषणप्रभृतीनामिति व्याप्तिदर्शनार्थं साधनस्य दृष्टान्तबाहुल्यम्।

¹⁶मन्यामहे—प्रा conj.] मन्याम. °T MS

ग्भेदा[त्सामान्यमभूदिति सर्वेषामेषां यत्सा]¹⁷मान्यमभूत्तत्रधानम्, तस्मादस्ति प्रधानमिति।

अनया दिशावशिष्टेष्वपि वीतप्रयोगेष्वर्थविभागः सुजातः, तथापि दिङ्मात्रमुच्यते—

अस्ति¹⁸ प्रधानं भेदानां परिमाणात्। इह लोके यस्य कर्ता भवति तस्य परिमाणं दृष्टम्। [यथा]¹⁹ कुलालः [परिमितान्मृत्पिण्डात्परिमितं घटं]²⁰ करोति प्रस्थग्राहणमाढकग्राहणं वा। इदं च महदादि व्यक्तं परिमितं दृष्टम्—एका बुद्धिरेको ऽहंकारः पञ्च तन्मात्राण्येकादशेन्द्रियाणि पञ्च भूतानीति। अतो ऽनुमानेन साधयामो ऽस्ति प्रधानं यदिदं व्यक्तं परिमितमुत्पादयतीति। यदि प्रधानं न स्यात्,²¹ निःपरिमाणमिदं व्यक्तं स्यात्॥

अपि²² चास्ति प्रधानं भेदानां परिमाणात्। यस्मात्कार्यकरणत्मात्मकानां भेदानां परिमाणं दृष्टम्। सामान्यतस्त्रयः सुखदुःखमोहाः। कार्यकरण-विशेषतस्त्रयो²³विंशतिर्भेदाः²⁴। दशविधं कार्यं [बुद्धिकर्मेन्द्रियविषयाः। त्रयोदशविधं करणं]²⁵ पञ्च बुद्धीन्द्रियाणि पञ्च कर्मेन्द्रियाणि त्रिविधं चान्तःकरणं बुद्धिरहंकारो मनश्चेति। एवमादिना प्रकारेण भेदानां परिमाणं दृष्टम्।

संसर्गपूर्वकाणां²⁶ च लोके भेदानां परिमाणं दृष्टम्। तद्यथा व्रीहौ संसृष्टानां मूलाङ्कुर²⁷पर्णनालकाण्ड²⁸प्रसवशूकक्षी[रतण्डुलकणानां परिमाणम्। ते मन्यामहे—भेदात्]²⁹ प्रागभूत्संसर्ग इति यत्रैषां संसर्गो ऽभू-

¹⁷त्सामान्यं ... यत्सा° conj.] n/a MS

¹⁸For this paragraph cf. TSP 14 (26,19–24): इतश्चास्ति प्रधानम्, भेदानां परिमाणात्। इह लोके यस्य कर्ता भवति तस्य परिमाणं दृष्टम्। यथा कुलालः परिमितान्मृत्पिण्डात्परिमितं घटं करोति प्रस्थग्राहणमाढकग्राहणम्। इदं च महदादि व्यक्तं परिमितं दृष्टम्—एका बुद्धिः, एको ऽहंकारः, पञ्च तन्मात्राणि, एकादशेन्द्रियाणि, पञ्च भूतानि। अतो ऽनुमानेन साधयामः—अस्ति प्रधानं यत्परिमितं व्यक्तमुत्पादयतीति। यदि प्रधानं न स्यान्निष्परिमाणम् इदं व्यक्तं स्यात्; MāVr on SK 15: अस्ति प्रधानम्। कुतः? भेदानां परिमाणात्। लोके यत्र कर्तास्ति तस्य परिमाणं दृष्टम्। यथा कुलालः परिमितान्मृत्पिण्डात्परिमितमेव घटं कुरुते प्रस्थग्राहकम् आढकग्राहकं वा। एवं व्यक्तं परिमितम्। एका बुद्धिरेको ऽहंकारः पञ्च तन्मात्राण्येकादशेन्द्रियाणि पञ्च महाभूतानि इति त्रयोविंशतिकम्। एवमेतत्परिमितं व्यक्तं दृष्टानुमानेन साधयामो ऽस्त्यस्य कारणं प्रधानं यद्व्यक्तं परिमितमुत्पादयति [इति?]²¹। यदि च प्रधानं कारणं न स्यान्निष्परिमाणम् इदं व्यक्तं स्यात्। अस्ति चास्य परिमाणं तस्मादस्ति प्रधानम्; GauBh on SK 15: भेदानां परिमाणा[त्?]²²। लोके यत्र कर्तास्ति तस्य परिमाणं दृष्टम्। यथा कुलालः परिमितैर्मृत्पिण्डैः परिमितानेव घटान् करोति, एवं महदादि महदादिलिङ्गं परिमितं भेदतः प्रधानकार्यम्। एका बुद्धिरेको ऽहंकारः पञ्च तन्मात्राणि एकादशेन्द्रियाणि पञ्च महाभूतानीति। एवं भेदानां परिमाणादस्ति प्रधानं कारणं यद्व्यक्तं परिमितमुत्पादयति। यदि प्रधानं न स्यात्तदा निष्परिमाणमिदं व्यक्तमपि न स्यात्। परिमाणाच्च भेदानामस्ति प्रधानं यस्माद्व्यक्तमुत्पन्नम्।

¹⁹यथा conj.] n.l. MS

²⁰परिमितान्मृत्पिण्डात्परिमितं घटं conj.] n/a MS

²¹त्पादयतीति। यदि प्रधानं न स्यात्, conj.] n/a MS

²²For this paragraph, cf. DDANCT, vol. 1, p. 314, ll. 15–16: इतश्चास्ति प्रधानं भेदानां परिमाणात्। आध्यात्मिकानां कार्यकारणात्मकानां परिमाणं दृष्टम्। सामान्यतस्त्रयः सुखदुःखमोहाः, कार्यकरणविशेषतः षोडश भावाः

²³कार्यकरणविशेषतस्त्रयो° em.] कार्यं करणं विशेषास्त्रयो° MS

²⁴विंशतिर्भे° em.] विंशति। भे° MS

²⁵[बुद्धि... करणं] conj.] n/a MS. Cf. MāVr on SK 32: कार्यमिति शब्दस्पर्शरूपरसगन्धाः पञ्च, वचनादानविहरणोत्सर्गानन्दाः पञ्च। एते दश विषयाः कार्यमित्युच्यते; JaMa on SK 32 (94,23–25): तस्य करणस्य दशविधं कार्यम्। तत्र शब्दस्पर्शरूपरसगन्धाः पञ्च, वचनादानविहरणोत्सर्गानन्दाः पञ्चेति दशधा।

²⁶For this paragraph, cf. DDANCT, vol. 1, p. 318, ll. 4–5: तस्मात् परिमितत्वात् संसर्गपूर्वका भेदाः, व्रीहाविव संसृष्टा मूलाङ्कुरपर्णनालकाण्डप्रसवतुषशूक-पुष्पक्षीरतण्डुलकणभावाः यथा वा शुक्रशोणितसंसृष्टाः कललावृद्धमांसपेशिशरीरव्यूहबाल्य-कौमारयौवनस्थाविरा भावा इति।

²⁷मूलाङ्कुर° em.] मूलकुर° MS

²⁸काण्ड° em.] काण्डा° MS

²⁹रतण्डुल... भदात् conj.] n/a MS. Cf. YD on SK 15a (141,18–19): तद्यथा मूलाङ्कुरपर्णनालकाण्डप्रसवतुषशूकपुष्पक्षीरतण्डुलकणानाम्; JaMa on SK

तत्रधानम्, तस्मादस्ति प्रधानं कारणं यत् इदं व्यक्तमुत्पन्नमिति॥

इतश्च³⁰ प्रधानमस्तीति पश्यामः। शक्तितः प्रवृत्तेः। इह³¹ लोके यो यस्मिन्³²नर्थे प्रवर्तते स तत्र शक्तः, यथा तन्तुवायः पटकरणे शक्तः। [अतः साधयामः—प्रधानस्यास्ति शक्तिर्यथा]³³ व्यक्तमुत्पादयति, सा च शक्तिर्निराश्रया³⁴ न भवति, तस्मादस्ति प्रधानं यत्र शक्तिर्वर्तते इति॥

किं³⁵ च शक्तितः प्रवृत्तेः। कार्यकारणानामधिष्ठितानामधिष्ठितानां च लोके शक्तिस्त्रिष्वपि कालेष्ववतिष्ठते—प्राक्प्रवृत्तेः प्रवृत्तिकाले चो[र्ध्वकाले च। प्राक्प्रवृत्तेः शक्तिरवतिष्ठते, शक्ता]³⁶नां प्रवृत्त्युपपत्तेः। प्रवृत्तिकाले ऽप्यवतिष्ठते तस्मादपवर्गदर्शनात्। कार्यकाले³⁷ ऽपि, तद्व्यतिरेकाभावात्, पृथक्परिमाणदर्शनाभावाच्च। इदं व्यक्तमव्यक्तवत्। ते मन्यामहे प्रागस्य भेदादस्त्यसावव्यक्ते शक्ति³⁸रवस्थिता [या व्यक्त-भावमापद्यते,]³⁹ या च सा शक्तिस्तत्रधानमिति।

इतश्चास्ति⁴⁰ प्रधानं कार्यकारणवि⁴¹भागात्। इह लोके कार्यकारण-योर्विभागो दृष्टः। तद्यथा मृत्पिण्डः कारणं घटः कार्यं घटो मधूदकपयसां धारणसमर्थो न तु मृत्पिण्डः। एवमिदं व्यक्तं म[हदादि कार्यं दृष्ट्वा

15 (80,25–26): यथा मूलाङ्कुरपत्रकाण्डप्रसवपुष्पतण्डुलकणानां भेदानां व्रीहिः . . . ; NBh 562,21 ff.: यथा व्रीहौ संश्लिष्टानां मूलाङ्कुरपर्णनालकाण्डप्रसवशूक-तुषपुष्पक्षीरतण्डुलकणानां परिमाणं दृष्टम्. See also note 26 above.

³⁰For this paragraph, cf. TSP 14 (27,12–15) इतश्चास्ति प्रधानम्—शक्तितः प्रवृत्तेः। इह लोके यो यस्मिन्नर्थे प्रवर्तते स तत्र शक्तः, यथा तन्तुवायः पटकरणे। अतः साधयामः—प्रधानस्यास्ति शक्तिर्यथा व्यक्तमुत्पादयतीति। सा च शक्तिर्निराश्रया न सम्भवति, तस्मादस्ति प्रधानं यत्र शक्तिर्वर्तते इति; MāVr on SK 15 (19,22–26): इतश्चास्ति—शक्तितः प्रवृत्तेः। इह लोके यो यस्मिन्नर्थे शक्तः स तस्मिन्नेव प्रवर्तते। तद्यथा कुम्भकारो घटघटिकाशरावोदञ्चवादिकरणे शक्तः। अतः साधयामः प्रधानस्याप्यस्ति शक्तिर्यथा शक्त्या व्यक्तमुत्पादयति। सा च शक्तिर्निराश्रया न भवति। तस्मादस्ति प्रधानं यत्र शक्तिरवतिष्ठते; GauBh on SK 15 (80,19–21) तथा शक्तितः प्रवृत्तेः। इह लोके यो यस्मिन् शक्तः स तस्मिन्नेवार्थे प्रवर्तते यथा कुलालो घटस्य करणे समर्थो घटमेव करोति न पटं रथं वा।

³¹प्रवृत्तेः। इह em.] प्रवृत्ते इह MS

³²यो यस्मि° em.] यो यस्मि° MS

³³अतः ... शक्तिर्यथा conj.] n/a MS.

³⁴श्रया em.] श्रयो° MS

³⁵For this paragraph, cf. DDANCT, vol. 1, p. 319, ll. 7–11: इतश्चास्ति शक्तिमदवस्थात्मात्रत्वाच्छक्तीनाम्। कार्यकारणानामधिष्ठितानामधिष्ठितानां च स्वकार्यसमर्थस्त्रिषु कालेषु शक्तयो ऽवतिष्ठते। तद्यथा—प्राक् प्रवृत्तेः शक्त्यवस्थानमनुमीयते प्रवृत्त्युपलब्धेः, प्रवृत्तिकाले ऽवस्थानमपवर्गदर्शनात्, प्रवृत्त्युत्तरकालावस्थानं प्रवृत्त्यतिरेकेणावस्थानदर्शनात्। एवमाद्यन्तवद्व्यक्तमुपलभ्य व्यक्तशक्त्यवस्थास्ति, अवस्थितशक्तेराद्यवसानाभावात् खपुष्पवत्, अवस्थितशक्तेरेव तद्भावाद्युदः पिण्डादिभाववत्। तस्माद् व्यक्तशक्तिप्रवृत्त्युपलब्धेरस्ति प्रधानमिति।

³⁶र्ध्वकाले ... शक्ता° conj.] n/a MS. Cf. DDANCT, vol. 1, p. 319, ll. 8: प्राक् प्रवृत्तेः शक्त्यवस्थानमनुमीयते प्रवृत्त्युपलब्धेः.

³⁷कार्यकाले em.] कार्यप्रवृत्तिकाले MS

³⁸शक्ति° em.] शक्ती° MS

³⁹या व्यक्तभावमापद्यते conj.] n/a (partly visible) MS. Cf. JaMa on SK 15 (81,12–13): यासौ शक्तिः सैवा(व?)व्यक्तभावमापद्यते इति सामान्यतोदृष्टम्

⁴⁰For this paragraph, cf. TSP 14 (27,16–19) इतश्चास्ति प्रधानम्, कारणकार्यविभागात्। इह लोके कार्यकारणयोर्विभागो दृष्टः। तथा हि मृत्पिण्डः कारणम्, घटः कार्यम्, स च मृत्पिण्डाद्विभक्तस्वभावः। तथा हि घटो मधूदकपयसां धारणसमर्थः, न मृत्पिण्डः। एवमिदं महदादि कार्यं दृष्ट्वा साधयामः—अस्ति प्रधानं यस्मान्महदादि कार्यमुत्पन्नमिति; MāVr on SK 15 (19,28–20,4): इतश्चास्ति—कारणकार्यविभागात्। करोतीति कारणम्, क्रियत इति कार्यं तयोर्विभागस्तस्मात्। तद्यथा मृत्पिण्डः कारणं घटः कार्यम्। स एव हि मधूदकपयःप्रभृतीनां धारणे समर्थः, न तु मृत्पिण्डः। एवं व्यक्ताव्यक्तयोर्विभागः। अन्यद्व्यक्तं महदहङ्कारतन्मात्रेन्द्रियमहाभूतपर्यन्तं, तच्च कार्यम्। अन्यच्च अव्यक्तं प्रधानं विपरीतं कारणमिति। तस्मादस्ति प्रधानम्; GauBh on SK 15 (80,22–81,2): तथास्ति प्रधानं कारणं कुतः कारणकार्यविभागात्। करोतीति कारणम्। क्रियत इति कार्यम्। कारणस्य कार्यस्य च विभागो यथा घटो दधिमधूदकपयसां धारणे समर्थः, न तथा तत्कारणं मृत्पिण्डः। मृत्पिण्डो वा घटं निष्पादयति न चैवं घटो मृत्पिण्डम्। एवं महदादि लिङ्गं दृष्टानुमीयते—अस्ति विभक्तं तत्कारणं यस्य विभाग इदं व्यक्तमिति।

⁴¹कारणवि° em.] कारणवि° MS

साधयामः—अस्ति प्रधानम्, यस्मान्महदादि कार्यमुत्पन्नमिति। ...]

Translation

... The thirteen [faculties (*karaṇas*)], [hearing, touch, sight, taste, smell, speech, hand, genitals, a]nus, foot, intellect, self-awareness, and mind⁴² are specific combinations of pleasure, pain and confusion;⁴³ for, every one of the thirteen [faculties] participate in one effect. Pleasant [things]⁴⁴ illuminate [those thirteen] faculties.⁴⁵ The effect [of those pleasant things] is the same pureness, etc. throughout the thirteen faculties.⁴⁶ Unpleasant [things]

⁴²We have supplied *śrotatvakcaṣṣurjihvāghrāṇavāgghastopasthāpā(yu)*° to complete the thirteen *karaṇas* of Sāṃkhya. The order follows that of a similar compound in the Suśrutasaṃhitā Śarīra-sthāna 1.4 where *pāyu* is followed by *pāda*. A different reconstruction, however, is possible as long as all the thirteen *karaṇas* are listed. Also, any synonym of those *karaṇas* could have been used. Ten of them are listed in SK 26: *buddhīndriyāṇi caṣṣuḥ-śrotagrāṇarasanasparśanakāni | vākṣpāṇipādapāyūpasthān karmendriyāṇy āhuḥ ||*.

⁴³See NBhū, 564,22 ff. for a similar discussion: *nanūktam pramānam—śabdasparsārūparasagandhāḥ pañcāpi trayānām sukha-duḥkhamohānām sanniveśaviśeṣāḥ | kasmāt? pañcānām pañcānām ekakāryabhāvāt | sāttvikarājāsātamasapañcakatrayāvārodhārtham vipśābhīdhānam | ekakāryabhāvād ity atrāpi vipśā draṣṭavyā | tatra sāttvikānām pañcānām ekam kāryam dṛṣṭam—prasādālāghavaprasavābhīṣvaṅgoddharṣaprītayāḥ | tathā hi—putras te jāta itī śabdām śrutvāsya prasādāḥ svasthendriyam bhavati | dehasya laḡhutvaṃ lāghavam, tuṣṭasādhanaadātrtvaṃ prasavaḥ, tatraiṣā śaktir abhiṣvaṅgaḥ, romāñcanam uddharṣaḥ, prītiḥ sukham iti | evaṃ sparsādīṣv api yojyam || tathā rājasānām pañcānām ekam kāryam dṛṣṭam—śoṣatāpabhedastambhodvegāpadveṣāḥ | tatra putras te mṛta itī śabdām śrutvāsya śoṣo bhavaty udakaprārthanaparativam, tāpo duḥkham, bhedo 'śruprasvedāmedhyādyutsargaḥ, stambhaḥ—kiṃ karomīty upāyāparijñānam, aratir udvegāḥ, pratikūlakaraṇecchāpadveṣāḥ | evaṃ sparsādīṣv api yojyam || tathā tāmasānām pañcānām ekam kāryam dṛṣṭam—varaṇasādanāpadhvamsabībhatsadainyagauravāṇi | tatra putras te mṛta itī śabdām śrutvāsya varaṇam kriyāpratibandhaḥ, sādanaṃ viṣaṇnatā, apadhvamsanaṃ nistejastvaṃ pratyaayalopo vā, bibhatso vikṣatarūpatvam, dainyam yat kiṃcit prārthanaparativam, gauravaṃ svastādīnām apy utkṣepaṇādīdyasāmāthyam | evaṃ sparsādīṣv api yojyam | etaiś ca śabdādībhīr ārabdhāni pṛthivyādīni pañca mahābhūtāni, tasmāt tāny api sattvādīnām sanniveśaviśeṣamātram | tathā karaṇātmanām sukha-duḥkhamohānām trayodaśānām tad eva kāryam prasādādi | tathā devamanuṣyatiriyagonyātmakānām prakāśapravṛttinīyamānām tad eva kāryam prasādādi | tasmāt sarvaṃ jagat sukhādīnām sanniveśamātram iti ||*. See also the passage in the DDANCT cited in note 11. Cf. SK 36ab, *ete pradīpakalpāḥ parasparavilakṣaṇā guṇaviśeṣāḥ*, and commentaries thereon, especially the Jayamaṅgalā, which glosses *guṇaviśeṣāḥ* with *traya eva guṇā anyonyābhībhavadvāreṇa pariṇatāḥ śrotādivyapadeśabhāḥ ity arthaḥ*.

⁴⁴We assume behind the masculine adjective *sukhāḥ* (and *duḥkhāḥ* and *mūḍhāḥ* below), the noun *viśayāḥ* or *arthāḥ* is to be understood. In the parallel discussion in the NBhū cited in the previous note, it would be the *dvandva* compound *śabdasparsārūparasagandhāḥ* that has the masculine ending because of the final member of the compound *gandha* is a masculine word. In our text, however, such a compound is not mentioned, and the pleasant/unpleasant/stupifying [...] should include actions made by the motor faculties (*karmendriyas*).

⁴⁵For this sentence and the following, see SK 11–13.

⁴⁶Cf. TSP 27,4–5: *prasādālāghavābhīṣvaṅgoddharṣaprītayāḥ sattvasya kāryam | sukham iti ca sattvam evocāte |*

activate the [thirteen] faculties.⁴⁷ The effect [of those unpleasant things] is the same dryness, etc. throughout the [thirteen faculties].⁴⁸ Stupefying [things] restrain faculties.⁴⁹ The effect [of those stupefying things] is the same concealment, etc., throughout the [thirteen faculties].⁵⁰

Similarly, we observe the continuity of [being] the same kind in derivatives. We observe the continuity of [being] the same kind in potsherds, half-cup, drinking vessel [that are made of clay, and] ornaments [made of gold], etc., that are preceded by the same [material].⁵¹ Therefore,⁵² we postulate [the following]: before [things] derive, there was a universal; thus the universal that existed [before] all these [derivatives] is *pradhāna*. Therefore *pradhāna* exists.

By this direction, [viz., the argument from the viewpoint of continuation (*samanvaya*),] the difference in function in the remaining [four] positive inferences, too, becomes a matter of course; still, a brief exposition is given [below].⁵³

⁴⁷See SK 12ab (*prītyapṛitīviśādātmakāḥ prakāśapravṛttinīyamārthāḥ*) for the reconstruction, *duḥkhāḥ karaṇapravṛttitayāḥ*.

⁴⁸Cf. TSP 27,5–6: *tāpaśoṣabhedastambhodvegāpadveṣā* [em. ° *padvegā* in edition] *rajasāḥ kāryam | rajas ca duḥkham |*.

⁴⁹Cf. SK 12ab (cited in note 47).

⁵⁰We have emended the reading *tad eva dharaṇādī*° to *tad eva varaṇādī* on the basis of SK 13 and parallel passages. Note that *va* and *dha* are very similar to each other in our script. The manuscript could perhaps also be read as *tad eva varaṇādī*°. The TSP (27,6–7) has *dainyāvaraṇasādanādhvamsabībhatsagauravāṇi tamasāḥ kāryam | tamaś ca moḥaśabdenocyate |*. We note that the author of our text twice mentions the second item in the list of effects in the TSP (with regard to *duḥkha/rajas* and *mūḍha/tamas*). This is probably because Kamalaśīla placed the item used in TS 14 in the beginning of those *dvandva* compounds, while our author followed the traditional Sāṃkhya list. The three effects are found in the parallel in the DDANCT (*prasādādiśoṣādivaraṇādīkāryātmakam*). See note 11.

⁵¹The compound *śakalakapālāmātrabhūṣaṇādīnām* appears somewhat clumsy although the intention of the argument is more or less clear. The Māṭharavṛtti (19,19–20) has *asmād eva kāraṇāc śakalakapālāmātra[sic] samastasamanvayaḥ | bhūṣaṇādīn dṛṣṭvā tattvena darśayati |*. Also, the Jayamaṅgalā has *samanvayāt—bhedānām iti vartate | samanvayo 'nugamaḥ | ekajātyanugamād ity arthaḥ | ya ekajātyanugatā bhedās teṣām ekam eva tathābhūtam kāraṇam dṛṣṭam | yathā kaṭakakeyūrādīnām suvarṇapīṇḍaḥ* on SK 15 (81,5–7). It appears as though our text has entries from different series in one compound. However, exactly the same compound *śakalakapālāmātrabhūṣaṇaprabhṛtinām* is found in the parallel passage in the DDANCT (see note 15). It is also used in the commentary *Pa-dhati* on Vākyapadīya 1.1 (p. 6, l. 21). This compound, thus, was probably well-known among the Sāṃkhyas, and therefore there is no need to suspect the reading we have here is a corruption.

⁵²We keep the reading *te manyāmahe* in our text. The expression is frequently used in the Mahābhāṣya. The use of the third person pronoun, even when the subject is in another person, in the sense of 'as such,' 'thus,' etc. in the Vedic and even in the classical Sanskrit is known. See A. A. Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar for Students*, Oxford 1916, § 195B 3.b, pp. 294–5; J. S. Speijer, *Sanskrit Syntax*, Leyden 1886, § 445, pp. 344–5.

⁵³We understand that the purpose of this paragraph is to illustrate why only the reason *samanvayāt* is alluded in TSP 14. It also justifies why the other reasons are mentioned in this commentary. Cf. TSP (28,8): *tad atrācāryeṇa 'samanvayāt' ity ayam eva hetur*

Pradhāna exists since derivatives have a quantity.⁵⁴ In this daily life we observe that when something has a creator, it has a quantity. For example, a potter produces a pot that has a certain quantity from a lump of clay of a certain quantity—a pot that holds the volume of *prastha* or *ādhaka*. Also, we observe that the manifested (*vyakta*), which are *mahat*, etc., has a quantity—one thinking faculty; one self-awareness; five subtle elements; eleven faculties; [and] five elements. Accordingly, we establish, based on an inference, that there is *pradhāna* that produces this manifested that has a quantity. If there was no *pradhāna* then this manifested [universe] would have no [limited] quantity.

Also,⁵⁵ *pradhāna* exists since derivatives have a quantity. [To paraphrase,] for, we observe that derivatives, which are either effects or instruments, have a quantity. When seen collectively, [the derivatives are] three, i.e., pleasure, pain and confusion. In accordance to the division in the effects and instruments,⁵⁶ the derivatives are twenty-three: there are ten kinds of effects,⁵⁷ i.e., the objects of sense and motor faculties. Instruments are thirteen: five sense faculties, five motor faculties; and three kinds of internal faculties: thinking faculty, self-awareness, and mind. In this or other ways, we observe

uktah | pariśiṣṭānām upalakṣaṇārthaḥ | “Now, there [in the TS] the *ācārya* (Śāntarākṣita) mentions only this *hetu*. It represents the remaining [reasons (*hetus*)].” Interestingly, the two texts, the NBhū and the DDANCT, where we find parallel passages to the arguments not present in the TSP (at the same time lacking the arguments present in the TSP) also place the same reason *samanvayāt* first.

⁵⁴Now this commentary introduces the remaining four reasons mentioned in SK 15. This is contrary to the strategy taken by Kamalaśīla. He, when commenting TS k. 14, introduces SK 15 in the outset. He interprets each reason, presumably copying the text from a commentary on the SK at his disposal. (The text of the TSP on TS k. 14 shares much with the commentaries on SK 15 except the *Yuktidīpikā* and the *Tattvakaumudī*.) Then he gives the explanation of TS k. 14 at the end. Our author, although the beginning of the commentary on TS k. 14 is lost, probably has started explaining the stanza itself and went on to introduce the four other arguments of SK 15 without quoting it. This first paragraph on the reason *parimāṇāt* has close parallels with the TSP, MāVṛ, GauBhā. Reconstructions in the edition in this paragraph are based on the parallels, particularly the TSP.

⁵⁵Now our author introduces another interpretation of the reason *bhedānām parimāṇāt*. In his interpretations of the reasons listed in SK 15 he is consistent in first introducing the interpretation found in the TSP and many commentaries on the SK, and then introducing another with phrases such as *api ca* or *kiṃ ca*. Note that in the following, what are counted as twenty-three are not the usual Sāṃkhya’s twenty-five *tattvas* sans *puruṣa* and *prakṛti*. Dividing *vyakta* into the effect (*kārya*) and the instrument (*kaṛaṇa*), and the *kārya* into ten is attested in SK 32: *karaṇam trayodaśavidhaṃ tadāharaṇadhāraṇaprakāśakaram | kāryam ca tasya daśadhāhāryam dhāryam prakāśyam ca ||*

⁵⁶We have emended the reading *kāryam karaṇam viśeṣas* to *kāryakaraṇaviśeṣataḥ*. This is the reading found in the parallel passage in the DDANCT (see note 22), and is more intelligible.

⁵⁷See SK 32c: *kāryam ca tasya daśadhā*; MāVṛ on SK 32 (36,22–24): *kāryam iti śabdasparśarasarūpagandhāḥ pañca, vacanādānaviharaṇotsargānandāḥ pañca | ete daśa viśayāḥ kāryam ity ucyate |*

the quantity of derivatives.

Also,⁵⁸ we observe in daily life that derivatives that arise from a compound have a quantity. For example, [we observe] a [limited] quantity in the root, shoots, leaves, stalk, joints, flowers, awn, sap, paddy, and grain that are fused in a rice [grain]. Thus we think that a compound existed before [all these] derivatives [arose]; thus where the compound of [all] these [derivatives] existed, that is *pradhāna*; therefore, *pradhāna*, the cause, exists, from which this manifested [world] arose.

For the following reason, too, it is our opinion that *pradhāna* exists: for, [effects] take place according to [their] capabilities (*śakti*).⁵⁹ In our daily life [we observe] that if A acts on the object B, A is endowed with capability with regard to B; for example, a weaver is endowed with capability with regard to effecting clothes.⁶⁰ Therefore we

⁵⁸This paragraph constitutes yet another interpretation of the reason *bhedānām parimāṇāt*. The first sentence, up to the example of rice, has a close parallel in the DDANCT. (See note 26.) A parallel discussion, albeit much longer, is found in the YD on SK 15a: *yat parimitam tasya sata utpattir dr̥ṣṭā | tadyathā mūlāṅkuraparṇanāladanādbasatūṣaśūkapuṣpakṣīratāṅḍulakāṇānām | parimitās ca mahadahamkārendriyatanmātramaḥbhūtalakṣaṇabhedāḥ | tasmāt satkāraṇapūrvakāḥ | yad eṣām kāraṇam tad avyakam |* Cf. also NBhū 562,21 ff.: *kiṃ ca parimitatvān mūlādivat | yathā vr̥hau saṃśliṣṭānām mūlāṅkuraparṇanālakāṅḍa-prasavaśūkatuṣapūṣpakṣīratāṅḍulakāṇānām parimāṇam dr̥ṣṭam |*

⁵⁹This paragraph moves on to the commentary on the phrase *śaktiḥ pravṛtteḥ* of uncited SK 15. The first interpretation, just like the previous interpretation on *bhedānām parimāṇāt*, starts with a parallel paragraph to the ones found in the TSP and SK commentaries such as the MāVṛ, GauBhā. See note 30.

⁶⁰This interpretation of the reason *śaktiḥ* is probably an old one since almost the same text is found in parallel passages in the MāVṛ, GauBhā and the TSP. Despite that, the argument seems to contain several problems, including textual ones. One is that this example has a potential danger of annulling the argument, since the weaver may be seen analogous to *puruṣa*, rather than *pradhāna*. Thus the argument could be used to argue that *puruṣa* has *śakti*. Rather, in order to make the point that the potential/capability lies in the cause, it might have been more appropriate to state that the threads (*tantu*) have the potential. It is in fact possible to emend the text to read *yathā tantavaḥ paṭakarāṇe śaktāḥ* with minor corrections. Nonetheless, since this part is extant in our fragment, and because of the parallel passages, we do not emend the text here. Other commentaries on the SK that do not share the exact reading also support the reading *tantuvāyah*. In the Gauḍapādabhāṣya the example is not a weaver but a potter (*yathā kulālo ghaṭasya karaṇe samartho ghaṭam eva karoti na paṭam ratham vā*). There it is clearly intended that the one who has the potential/capability is a human creator. Another parallel in the Māṭharavṛtti where again a potter is mentioned in a similar formulation as ours (*tadyathā kumbhakāro ghaṭaghatikāśarāvodañcanādīkaraṇe śaktāḥ*) further suggests that the reading *tantuvāyah* is not an error in the transmission of our fragment. This potential danger might have been realized by the early Sāṃkhyas since the YD has only a remnant of this argument in the beginning of the commentary on the reason *śaktiḥ pravṛtteḥ* (See Wezler and Motegi 1998, p. 144, l. 32–145,3) and spends most effort in arguing from the point of view that *pradhāna* is *śakti*, the argument somewhat parallel to the second interpretation on the reason *śaktiḥ pravṛtteḥ* below. This line of argument might have arisen from the realization of the potential difficulty in the original interpretation. The use of the word *adhiṣṭhita* and *anadhiṣṭhita* below presupposes the role of an intelligent attendant

establish that *pradhāna* has *śakti* with which [it] produces the manifested (*vyakta*). And this *śakti* is not without a locus. Therefore *pradhāna* exists in which *śakti* resides.⁶¹

Furthermore, [*pradhāna* exists] since [events] take place according to capabilities.⁶² In our daily life [we observe that] the capability of effects and causes, whether or not being attended [by *puruṣa*], is consistent throughout three time periods—before an event, at the time of the event, and after the event. Prior to an event, the capability is established; for, it is reasonable that the capable [causes] take effect.⁶³ [The *śakti*] is stable at the time of an event, too[, i.e., it does not disappear when it has started to

in producing effects (cf. SK 17b).

⁶¹Again, as formulated, this argument appears circular. *Pradhāna* has already been mentioned as the locus of *śakti* two sentences earlier (*pradhānasyāsti śaktir yayā vyaktam utpādayati*); yet on the basis of that premise, it is argued that *pradhāna* exists in this sentence. We might again suspect a textual problem in the transmission of an early commentary on the SK. The sentence *ataḥ sādhyamaḥ pradhānasyāsti śaktir yayā vyaktam utpādayati* contains two difficulties. One is the use of the word *pradhāna* already in that sentence; and the other is the verb *utpādayati*—the subject is not clear. Even though the most of the sentence is conjectured on the basis of parallel passages in the TSP and MāVṛ, we do not attempt to emend the text. Again, it appears that the reading in the old commentary on the SK on which many commentaries were based was very close to what is found in the TSP. We doubt that the author of our text had access to a commentary on the SK that had a better reading.

⁶²As mentioned in note 60, this argument is refined compared to the preceding interpretation, probably the original interpretation of the reason *śaktitah pravṛtteḥ*. The terms *adhiṣṭhita* and *anadhiṣṭhita* alludes to the argument for *puruṣa*, *adhiṣṭhānāt*, in SK 17. A close parallel discussion is found in the DDANCT (see note 35). Also, somewhat similar discussions in wording to the discussion here are found in the NBhū (563,9 ff.): *śaktiśabdena cāvyaktarūpeṇāvasthitam kāryam evocyste | tasya vyaktabhāvāpatih pravṛtir ity ucyate | pravṛtteḥ praḅ apy asti śaktih, labdhātmakānām pravṛttidarśanāt | pravṛttikāle 'py asti, tirobhāvarśanāt | tadūrdhvam apy asti, punaḥ pravṛttidarśanāt | tad evaṃ yataḥ śakteḥ sarvaṃ vyaktaṃ pravartate, sā śaktih sadāvasthāyini pradhānam ity ucyate |* and the JaMa on SK 15 (81,10–13): *śaktitah pravṛtteḥ ceti | iha kulādisaktipūrvikā ghaṭādīnām pravṛtir drṣṭā nāsaktipūrvikā | eṣām avigāhyādhyātmikānām pravṛtir drṣṭate | tataś ca pravṛtter janitayā śaktiyā bhavitavyam | yāsau śaktih saivāvyaktabhāvam āpadyata iti sāmānyatodṛṣṭam |* Note the use of *avigāhyādhyātmikānām* (a variant *apī bhāyādhyātmikānām* is recorded) in the JaMa.

⁶³Note that most of this sentence translates a reconstructed text. Based on the parallel passage in the DDANCT, most of the reconstruction is relatively secure. The only difficulty is the genitive plural word at the end of the reconstruction. The DDANCT does not have an equivalent. We chose the reading *śaktānām*, for the phrase *... nām pravṛtityupapatteḥ* should presumably state something rather obvious. Even the reading *śaktīnām* might be possible, although it makes the phrase apparently tautological. The YD has discussions in the same line of thought (cf. note 60), though they are much more sophisticated. An interesting point is that unlike in the preceding discussion, where *pradhāna* was the locus of *śakti*, here (and in the YD) *pradhāna* is *śakti*. We think that the discussion should contain the following points: in order for any event to take place, there has to be *śakti*; events can take place without the presence of *puruṣa*; effects in turn become the cause for the next event (thus *śakti* is preserved).

cause an event]; for, we observe the disappearance [of the cause] from the [effect].⁶⁴ Also, at the time of effect,⁶⁵ [the capability is established]; for [the effect] is not without it (*śakti*), and since we do not observe [that the effect acquires] independent quantity [besides the sum of quantities of the causes, thus suggesting the acquisition of capability from elsewhere]. The manifest is like the unmanifest [in that it is a cause for the next effect].⁶⁶ Therefore, we postulate: prior to this [world's] becoming distinct, this *śakti*, which becomes manifest, stably exists in the unmanifest; and this *śakti* is *pradhāna*.⁶⁷

For the following reason, too, *pradhāna* exists: for, the effect and the cause are different. In our daily life we observe the distinction between the effect and the cause. For example, a lump of clay is a cause [while] a pot is an effect. A pot can hold wine, water or milk, but not a lump of clay [can hold them]. . . .

Observations

The most obvious significance of the fragment we have reported on here is that there was a commentary on the TS apart from the TSP. This is a testimony to the importance of the TS. Apart from that, there are a few more points one can make concerning the short text.

As noted in the introduction, our text could be seen as a commentary on SK 15, which in its commentarial tradition was held to present five reasons (*hetus*) to ar-

⁶⁴It is not completely clear what this reasoning means. A similar sentence in a similar discussion in the NBhū (the parallel in the DDANCT is not helpful since it also has the same enigmatic reading *apavargadarśanāt*), *pravṛttikāle 'py asti, tirobhāvarśanāt* (see note 62 above) appears clearer. It would be referring to the fact that the cause (gradually) disappears in a process, thus suggesting the transfer of *śakti* from the cause to the effect. Here we follow that interpretation. Still somewhat puzzling in our text is the use of the word *apavarga*, which is a technical term among the Sāṃkhyas to mean liberation (*mokṣa*). Coupled with the use of the term *adhiṣṭhitānadhīṣṭhita*, the discussion appears to have something to do with the doctrine of *puruṣa*.

⁶⁵We emend *kāryapravṛttikāle* to *kāryakāle*. This is where the third phase should be discussed. Not only is the compound *kāryapravṛttikāle* rare (if ever used), it also means essentially the same thing as *pravṛttikāle*. If that were the case, the author would mention this phase two times. That is unlikely. Possible cause for the corruption is the same °*kāle pi* in the previous sentence. Other possible, but less likely, emendations include *kāryapravṛtte kāle*, *kāryapravṛtter uttarakāle*, etc.

⁶⁶We are not certain if this understanding is correct. It would seem appropriate—if one wishes to argue for the presence of *śakti* in all three phases with regard to an effect (before, during and after)—to argue that an effect in turn becomes the cause for the next event since the cause for the previous event, too, was a manifest (*vyakta*) in the first place. Again, a similar sentence in the similar context in the NBhū, *tadūrdhvam apy asti, punaḥpravṛttidarśanāt*, is clearer.

⁶⁷The reconstruction of this sentence is mainly based on the similar sentence in the JaMa, *yāsau śaktih saivā(va?)vyaktabhāvam āpadyata iti sāmānyatodṛṣṭam* (see note 62). Note that most of the sentence is partly visible in the small fragment of the folio photographed with the recto side.

gue for the existence of *pradhāna*. In our text the explanation of each *hetu* consists of two or more alternative interpretations. The first part is always parallel to the interpretation in the TSP, and further parallels are found in commentaries, such as the MāVṛ, GauBhā, JaMa, etc., on the SK itself.⁶⁸

We do not find close parallels to the remaining alternative interpretations (apart from what appear to be remnants) in commentaries on the SK, but parallels are found in the NBhū and in the DDANCT.⁶⁹ Interestingly, the parallels in the NBhū and the DDANCT start the Sāṃkhya argument for the existence of *pradhāna* with the reason (*sam*)*anvayāt*.⁷⁰ Also, they only offer interpretations of five *hetus* of SK 15 that are not found in the TSP or in commentaries on the SK. In this connection, it should also be noted that the TS in the first place refers to that reason (see page 15). Based on these observations, we may postulate the existence of a commentarial tradition on the SK which is separate from the one to which the Māṭharavṛtti, etc., belong.⁷¹ That commentarial tradition probably considered the reason *samanvitatvāt* in SK 15 as the main reason and the rest subsidiary,⁷² and offered different explanations for them. Although it is conceivable that there was a commentary on the SK that combined two strands of commentarial traditions, offering both the traditional (as in the Māṭharavṛtti, etc.) as well as the other (as reflected in the NBhū and the DDANCT) explanations, and that our text borrowed from this postulated commentary, it seems to us more plausible that the author of our text combined two different traditions—having first borrowed the interpretation from the TSP and then from another commentary on the SK. This scenario may be supported by the fact that among the similar interpretations of SK 15 in the TSP and commentaries on the SK, the TSP nonetheless offers the closest parallel to our text when it gives the first explanation of each *hetu*.

Text and Abbreviations

Anonymous Vṛtti An anonymous Vṛtti on the *Sāṃkhyakārikā*. See Nakada 1978.

DDANCT The *Ṭikā* on the *Dvādaśāranayacakra*. See Jambūvijaya 1966.

GauBhā The *Gauḍapādabhāṣya*, a commentary on the SK, ascribed to Gauḍapāda. See Wilson 1887.

⁶⁸See notes 18, 30, 40, 54, and 60.

⁶⁹See notes 11, 15, 22, 26, 35, 36, 43, 44, 50, 51, 53, 56, 58, 62, 63, 64, 66.

⁷⁰See page 16.

⁷¹See note 7.

⁷²Cf. *anayā diśāvāsiṣṭeṣv api vītaprayogeṣv arthavibhāgaḥ sujñānaḥ, tathāpi dīnmātram ucyate* in our text after the explanation of the *hetu samanvitatvāt*; *tad atrācāryeṇa 'samanvayāt' ity ayam eva hetur uktaḥ, pariśiṣṭānām upalakṣaṇārthaḥ* in the TSP after explaining all the *hetus* in SK 15, referring to TS k. 14.

JaMa The *Jayamaṅgalā*, a commentary on the SK, ascribed to Śāṅkarabhagavatpāda. See Śarmā & Vaṅgīya 1970.

MāVṛ The *Māṭharavṛtti*, a commentary on the SK. See Śarmā & Vaṅgīya 1970.

NBhū The *Nyāyabhūṣaṇa* of Bhāsarvajña. See Yogīndrānanda 1974.

SK The *Sāṃkhyakārikā* of Īśvarakṛṣṇa. See Wezler & Motegi 1998.

TS/TSP *Tattvasaṅgraha* of Śāntarakṣita/*Tattvasaṅgrahapañjikā* of Kamalaśīla. See S. D. Shastri 1969.

YD The *Yuktīdīpikā*, a commentary on the SK. See Wezler & Motegi 1998.

Bibliography

- Adriaensen, R., H. Bakker and H. Isaacson. 1998. *The Skandapurāṇa*. Volume I. *Adhyāyas* 1–25. Critically Edited with Prolegomena and English Synopsis. Supplement to Groningen Oriental Studies. Groningen 1998.
- Bendall, C. 1903. “Fragment of a Buddhist Ordination-Ritual in Sanskrit.” in *Album Kern*. Brill. Leiden 1903. Pp. 373–376.
- Jambūvijaya, Muni. 1966. *Dvādaśāraṇaḥ Nayacakraṃ of Ācārya Śrī Mallavādi Kṣamāśramaṇa, with the Commentary Nyāyāgamānusāriṇī of Śrī Siṃhasiri Gaṇi Vādi Kṣamāśramaṇa, Part I (1–4 Aras)*. Published by Sri Jain Atmanand Sabh, Bhavnagar 1996.
- Matsuda, K. 1990. “Newly Identified Buddhist Sanskrit Fragments in the National Archives Collection Nepal.” (in Japanese.) *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 389–386.
- . 1996. *Two Sanskrit Manuscripts of the Daśabhūmikāsūtra, Preserved at the National Archives, Kathmandu*. Bibliotheca Codicum Asiaticorum 10. The Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies for Unesco, The Toyo Bunko, Tokyo 1996.
- . 1997. “A Vinaya Fragment of the Mūlasarvāstivādin from ‘Bendall’s Puka’ in the National Archives, Kathmandu.” in *Bauddhavidyāsudhākaraḥ: Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday (Indica et Tibetica 30)*. Swisttal-Odendorf 1997. Pp. 431–437.
- . 2002. “A Brief Survey of the Bendall Manuscripts in the National Archives, Kathmandu.” in *Buddhist and Indian Studies in Honour of Professor Sodo Mori*. Kokusai Bukkyoto Kyokai (International Buddhist Association). Hamamatsu 2002. Pp. 259–265.
- Nakada, N. 1978. *Sāṃkhyavṛttih Edited by Naomichi Nakada under the Guidance of Prof. Dr. V. V. Gokhale*. The Hokuseido Press. Tokyo 1978.

- Śarmā, S. P. V. P. and S. Ś. Vaṅgīya. 1970. *Sāṃkhyakārikā of Śrīmad Īśvarakṛṣṇa with the Māṭharavṛtti of Māṭharācārya Edited by Sāhityācārya Pt. Viṣṇu Prasād Śarmā and the Jayamaṅgalā of Śrī Śaṅkara Critically Edited with an Introduction by Śrī Satkāriśarmā Vaṅgīya*. The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series No. 256. Varanasi 1970.
- S. D. Shastri 1969. *Tattvasaṅgraha of Ācārya Shāntaraḥṣita with the Commentary 'Pañjikā' of Shri Kamalashīla*. Vols. 1 and 2. Bauddha Bharati Series 1. Bauddha Bharati, Varanasi 1968.
- Steinkellner, E. 2007. *Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇaviniścaya, Chapters 1 and 2, Critically Edited*. Austrian Academy of Science, Vienna and China Tibetology Research Center, Beijing. Beijing 2007.
- Wezler, A. and Sh. Motegi. 1998. *Yuktidīpikā: The Most Significant Commentary on the Sāṃkhyakārikā*. Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 44. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart 1998.
- Wilson, H. H. 1887. *The Bha'shya, or Commentary of Gaudapāda Translated, and Illustrated by an Original Comment by Horace Hayman Wilson, M.A.F.R.S. Published by Mr. Tookaram Tatya*. Bombay 1887.
- Yogīndrānanda, Svāmī. 1974. *Nyāyabhūṣaṇam. Śaḍdarśana Prakāśana Granthamālā, 1. Śaḍdarśana Prakāśana Pratiṣṭhāna, Vārāṇasī* 1974.

The Newsletter of the NGMCP (ISSN 1865-164X) is a publication of the NGMCP, available as downloadable PDF file from the website of the NGMCP: <http://www.uni-hamburg.de/ngmcp>.

Edited by Harunaga Isaacson.

Typesetting: Kengo Harimoto.

The copyright of individual contributions remains with the authors.

The NGMCP is a project funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (German Research Foundation).

For correspondence:
NGMCP

Abteilung für Kultur und Geschichte Indiens und Tibets

Asien-Afrika-Institut

Universität Hamburg

Edmund-Siemers-Allee 1 (Hauptgebäude)

D-20146 Hamburg

Germany

E-mail: ngmcp@uni-hamburg.de

Telephone: +49 40 42838-6269