

On the manuscript of the “*Sāṅkhya Vṛttih*”

Koki ARUGA

0. This short paper is a preliminary announcement of a manuscript preserved in the National Archives, New Delhi. The “*Sāṅkhya Vṛttih*”, which is so called in the list under the number 44, is quite different from the *Sāṅkhyavṛtti* and the *Sāṅkhyasaptativṛtti* published so far.¹⁾ According to the foreword to the list of the manuscripts section, the collection which includes this manuscript originally belonged to the Archeology and Research Department (Jammu&Kashmir Government, Srinagar).

In his book published in 1951,²⁾ P. Chakravarti refers to lack of sufficient materials for a detailed treatment of various schools of Sāṅkhya and states that further light may be obtained if some of the Sāṅkhya manuscripts that are listed in the different catalogues could be thoroughly examined. He makes reference to several such manuscripts. Since then, among those manuscripts, the *Sāṅkhyavṛtti* and the *Sāṅkhyasaptativṛtti* were published. However both these texts show, to a great extent, a common content that already appears in other commentaries, such as the *Suvarṇasaptati* (Paramārtha's Chinese translation), the *Gauḍapādabhāṣya*, and the *Mātharavṛtti*.

Chakravarti's statement apparently points to his contribution in editing the *Yuktidīpikā* for the first time. However, contrary to his expectations, no other important or new materials for the study of *Sāṅkhya* have since been reported. Only a new critical edition of the same *Yuktidīpikā*, in which "the Marginal Notes" is edited, has become available.³⁾

The purpose of the present paper is to make a first step toward the editing of a manuscript which, more or less, will be helpful to the study of the *Yuktidīpikā* and of *Sāṅkhya history*.

1. **Description of the Manuscript** The manuscript in question is written in Śāradā script on 22 sheets of paper, and measures about 26×18cm. It is apparent that it consisted of 11 folios and was separated into 22 for preservation. The condition of the paper is not good ; every sheet is covered with wax paper ; all sheets are bound like a book. Each page contains 24-28 lines. The manuscript is not complete, and contains the text of the com-

mentary on the *Sāṅkhya-kārikā* (SK) 1-64. However the following part of the commentary text, the name of the author and the date are not available. It is interesting that this commentary text is divided into at least seven *Āhnikas*.⁴⁾ The text of SK 35 is missing. Folios 1 and 11 are rather damaged. The title indication is written on the left margin at the bottom of each verso. The folio number, too, is written below each title indication. But the title indications are lost by damage on folios 1 and 11, and partly legible on folio 6. The folio numbers 1, 2, 6 and 11 are lost by damage, too. There are dots, which indicate that the original of this manuscript had problems such as lacunae, on 3 verso, 4 verso, 5 verso, 6 recto, 6 verso, 8 recto, 8 verso and 9 recto.

2. Title of the Text As is referred to above, the title of the text, according to the list of the collection, is “*Sāṅkhya Vṛttiḥ*”. However this is unlikely to have been the original title. The colophon of the whole text, in which a reliable description of the title may have been mentioned, is lost. At the end of several *Āhnikas*, we read the following :

1. *iti sāṅkhyasaptativṛttau tṛtīyam āhnikam* ;
2. *iti sāṅkhyasaptatikāvṛttau caturtham āhnikam* ;
3. *sāṅkhyavṛttau pañcamam āhnikam* ;
4. *iti sāṅkhyavṛttau ṣaṣṭham āhnikam*.

These *Āhnika* colophons give variants of the title. According to the former two, on the one hand, the text is called ‘*Sāṅkhyasaptativṛtti*’ or ‘*Sāṅkhyasaptatikāvṛtti*’, i.e. the commentary (*Vṛtti*) to the *Sāṅkhyakārikās* (*Sāṅkhyasaptati*). On the other hand, the latter two use the title ‘*Sāṅkhyavṛtti*’ to name the text. The title in the list seems to be based on at least one of these *Āhnika* colophons.

However there still remain some questions. Why is there no reference to the title of the text at the end of first two *Āhnikas*? Are all the names ‘*Sāṅkhyasaptativṛtti*’, ‘*Sāṅkhyasaptatikāvṛtti*’ and ‘*Sāṅkhyavṛtti*’ treated as equivalent by a compiler or commentator, or inserted by a scribe? Unfortunately it is not possible to answer these questions in the first place because no other manuscript is known. It may be supposed however that this is one of those typical cases in which colophons do not always supply correct titles.⁵⁾

Our most important clue to the title is found in the left margin at the bottom of this manuscript, where there is the title indication *sā° vī°*. This definitely makes us suspect the title in the list is a mistake.

In the text, we find the followings :⁶⁾

tad idānīm tāpasvarūpasya </> prabhe (da) kathanadvāreṇa prastūyate </> duḥkhatrayābhigṛhāṭā
[=]

++jñāse⁷tyādinā </> saptatyākhyena sāstreṇa ācāryeśvarakṛṣṇena hi </> saptatyāryābhiḥ ṣaṣṭi-
tantrārītaḥ [=]

++ darśitaḥ / tasyātisaṅkṣiptasya prakāṭikarāṇārtham idam api⁸ vivaraṇaṁ saṅkṣepeṇāra (bhyate)
+ [=],⁹

The subject of the *Ṣaṣṭitantra*, which is shown by the holy teacher Īśvarakṛṣṇa with the seventy verses in the *āryā* metre in the form of a Treatise called the *Saptati* which starts with "From the destruction [caused] by the triple misery [is born] the desire to know [the means to that destruction itself — i.e., SKlab] ", is introduced by the description of the divisions of the nature of sorrow. In order to make the quite concise (subject) clear, this *Vivaraṇa* is also begun concisely.

The word *vivaraṇa* is found once again :

yathāsmābhir uktam </> tathā sāṅkhyasamikṣāsāṅkṣepavivaraṇāt¹⁰ sampāditādvaitasiddheḥ </> [=]
bhavadbhir ākarmyam /,¹¹

What we have said should be heard by you from the *Vivaraṇa*, an abridged investigation of *Sāṅkhya*, of (the text) in which establishment of Non-duality is accomplished.¹³

It is not certain that the above sentences contain the correct title of the text. But it is possible we can extract a kind of hypothetical title **Sāṅkhya(samikṣā)(saṅkṣepa)vivaraṇa*. According to the title indication of the manuscript, namely *sā^o vi^o*, we can suppose that *Sāṅkhya-Vivaraṇa* is considered to be the correct title by the scribe. However there are no other decisive details available.

3. Features of the text There are, from the viewpoint of the study of *Skāṅkhya* history, interesting descriptions in the text. I will mention two of them below.¹⁴

3.1. *Kārikā* Text Various readings of the *kārikās* are found in the commentaries. Although transmissional differences of the SK among the commentaries are supposed, details of the transmissions by the commentators or the scribes are still to be clarified. In order to show only some of the characteristic readings in the *Kārikā* text of this manuscript, I will quote two *kārikās* in the following.

SK 26 reads as follows :

buddhīndriyā[=]ṇi karṇatvakcakṣūrasananāsikākhyāni /
vākpāṇipādapāyūpasthāḥ karmendriyāṇy āhuḥ //.

We can find the same reading only in the *Yuktidīpikā*.

And SK 27 is as follows :

saṅkalpakam atra manas ta[=]c cendriyam ubhayathā samākhyātām /
antas trikālavīṣayam tasmād ubhayapracāram¹⁵ tat //.

The words and the construction of this *kārikā* show similarity to the readings of SK27 in the *Yuktidīpikā* and the *Sāṃkhyavṛtti*.

There are other *kārikās* which contain readings different from those in the *Yuktidīpikā* but are same as or similar to the *kārikās* in other commentaries.¹⁶⁾ Since the commentary text does not give explanations word by word under many *kārikās*, it is difficult to confirm the readings of those *kārikās* in the text. However, so far as distinctive readings are concerned, we will have to pay attention to the origins or transmissions of such readings.

3.2. One Interesting Topic Regarding the content of the commentary text, there are interesting topics which lead us to suppose that the commentator knew the characteristic views in the *Yuktidīpikā* or had other sources of information on Sāṃkhya views. I will refer to one of them below.

When he discusses *pratyaya-sarga*, Chakravarti says in the *Origin and Development of the Sāṃkhya System of Thought* :

However, the author of the *Yuktidīpikā* is found to shed some important light here... These are :

— (1) form (*rūpa*), (2) undertaking of initiatives (*pravṛtti*), (3) the result to be obtained therefrom (*phala*).

Then he quotes two passages. One of them is as follows :

*tatra rūpa-pravṛtti-phalalakṣaṇam vyaktam / rūpaṃ punar mahān ahamkāraḥ pañcātmanmātrāṇy
ekādaśendriyāṇi pañcabhūtāni / sāmānyataḥ pravṛttir dvidhā — hitakāmaprayojanā ca, ahita-
pratiśedhaprayojanā ca /viśeṣataḥ — pañcakarmayonayo dhṛtyādyāḥ prāṇādīdyās ca pañcāvayavaḥ /
phalaṃ dvividham — dṛṣṭam adṛṣṭaṃ ca /*

The commentator of our text also refers to the view of three aspects of the evolved :

*yadā ca rūpaṃ pravartate</> pravṛttaṃ ca phalaṃ eti</> tadā pravṛttiphalaparimāṇe vakṣyāmaḥ /
tatra pravṛ[=]*

*ttiḥ kriyāsankṣepeṇa hitakāmāhita<n>niśedhaprayojanabhāvāt </> dvidvidhā / viśeṣato dharmā[=]
rthakāma mokṣaprayojanatayā catuvārṇvṛtyādirūpeṇa pañcadhā prāṇādirūpenāpi pañca[=]
prakāraiveti / phalaṃ ca sankṣepato dvividham dharmādharmabhedāt /....¹⁸⁾*

I will take up further interesting issues in this commentary in future publication.

1) Esther A. Solomon edited two palm-leaf manuscripts preserved in the Jesalmere Grantha Bhaṇḍāra and published in 1973 from Ahmedabad. One is the *Sāṃkhyavṛtti* (V₂) and the other is the *Sāṃkhyasaptativṛtti* (V₁). There is another edition of the *Sāṃkhyavṛtti*, which was published by N. Nakada in 1978 from Tokyo. The same manuscript was used for both editions

of the *Sāṅkhyavṛtti*.

- 2) See his preface in the *Origin and Development of the Sāṅkhya System of Thought*, Calcutta, 1951; Second Edition, Delhi, 1975.
- 3) *Yuktidīpikā*, *The Most Significant Commentary on the Sāṅkhyakārikā* (*Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien* 44), critically edited by Albrecht Wezler and Shujun Motegi, vol. 1, Stuttgart, 1998.
- 4) Each of the first five *Āhnikās* except the fourth has a commentary text on ten *kārikās*.
- 5) Cf. *Catalogue of the Jaina Manuscripts at Strasbourg*, by Chandrabhāl Tripāṭhī, Leiden, 1975, p. 41.
- 6) Only to make the conditions and my readings of the manuscript clear, I employ the following brackets and signs in this paper :
 (a) < > for deletion ; (b) + for an damaged *akṣara* ; (c) [=] to mark the end of a line ; (d) () for supplements.
- 7) Cf. SK1 : *duḥkhatrayābhigātāḥ jijñāsā*.
- 8) Ms : *avi*
- 9) 1 verso.
- 10) Ms reads *sāṅkṣyasamīkṣāsāṅkṣepavivaraṇāt*.
- 11) 4 recto.
- 12) It is not certain that *sāṅkhyasamīkṣāsāṅkṣepavivaraṇa* is treated as a full title by the author. *Sāṅkhyasamīkṣā* is used with *śāstra* as follows :
yathā ca kāryāṇi kāraṇāṇi bāhyās ca [=] devādayaḥ parasparopakāreṇa (ms : *parasparokāreṇa*) *vartante tathā sāṅkhyasamīkṣāśāstrād vistareṇāvagantavyam* / (6 recto).
- 13) The word *advaita* is not found elsewhere in this manuscript. Consequently, it is not clear what *sampāditādvaitasiddheḥ* means.
- 14) I previously dealt with several other interesting points of the text in my report financially supported by Fuse Kikin (Fuse Academic Foundation), Department of Literature, Tokyo University, in 1993.
- 15) Ms : *ubhayapramāṇam*
- 16) SK 5,8,14,17,20,36,37,38,45,46,49,50,51 and 52 are, without regard to importance of the different readings, the examples. It seems that there are textual problems in SK 58 and 64, though I do not refer to them here.
- 17) p. 302.
- 18) 5 verso.

(This research was supported in part by a Grant-in-Aid for JSPS Fellows.)

〈Key Words〉 *vivaraṇa*, *Sāṅkhyavṛtti*, *Sāṅkhyasaptativṛtti*, *Yuktidīpikā*

(Research Fellow of the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science)