Zeitschrift: Asiatische Studien : Zeitschrift der Schweizerischen Asiengesellschaft =

Études asiatiques : revue de la Société Suisse-Asie

Herausgeber: Schweizerische Asiengesellschaft

Band: 53 (1999)

Heft: 3

Artikel: Smkhya as Smnyastra

Autor: Torella, Raffaele

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-147467

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Mehr erfahren

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. En savoir plus

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. Find out more

Download PDF: 23.11.2025

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, https://www.e-periodica.ch

SĀMKHYA AS SĀMĀNYAŚĀSTRA

Raffaele Torella, Roma

At the very outset of the Sāṃkhya volume in the *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies*, G. J. LARSON wrote:

Many years ago when I met the great Gopinath Kaviraj for the first time in Varanasi, he inquired about my work. I commented that I was working on one of the ancient systems of Indian philosophy, namely, the Sāṃkhya. He impatiently waved his hand to interrupt me. "Sāṃkhya" he said "is not one of the systems of Indian philosophy. Sāṃkhya *is* the philosophy of India.".

In its classical formulation, Sāmkhya is only one darśana among other darśanas, and, in a sense, even one of the most generally criticized. However, this conflicts with other aspects. First of all, no other darśana has ever exported its doctrines so far and to spheres of Indian civilization so varied, and for so long. It is Sāmkhya that is the source of paradigms such as, for example, spirit-consciousness-inactivity as opposed to matterunconsciousness-productivity, so widespread throughout Indian civilization; and, besides this doctrine, which is after all schematic and generic – and can be found in other cultures too –, there also are extremely specific doctrines, which, in spite of their specificity, imposed themselves and circulated to such an extent as to almost make us forget their origin, as in the case of the gunas. One might reply by saying that Sāmkhya represents the common sense, existence as commonly understood, and therefore it underlies (or lies side by side) all the bolder and more personal speculative efforts. But it is not so. Sāmkhya has never been the philosophy of common sense, of vyavahāra. On the contrary, one of its late interpreters, Vijnānabhiksu, explicitly denies this and attributes this qualification to Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika instead.1

Sāmkhyapravacanabhāṣya, p. 2 nanu nyāyavaiśeṣikābhyām apy eteṣv artheṣu nyāyaḥ pradarśita iti tābhyām asya gatārthatvaṃ, saguṇa-nirguṇatvādiviruddharūpair ātmasādhakatayā tadyuktibhir atratyayuktīnāṃ virodhenobhayor api durghaṭaṃ ca prāmāṇyam iti / maivam, vyāvahārika-pāramārthikarūpaviṣayabhedena gatārthatva-virodhayor abhāvāt. Cf. also Abhinavagupta's statement: naiyāyikakramasyaiva māyāpade pāramārthikatvam (Īśvarapratyabhijñāvimarśinī vol.I p. 25). Again, in

As we said, Sāmkhya has been the object of many critical remarks, for example, those by Śańkara, who proposes to demolish particularly one of its main doctrines, that of pradhāna, leaving, however, the impression that he does not want to deny the importance and coherence of a tradition as a whole but that he aims, through the criticism of it, at better defining his own position. In fact, after about two centuries, we see Vācaspati Miśra take up the issue again and try to integrate Sāmkhya into Vedānta, just as Vijñānabhikṣu is to do again some centuries later. Another meaningful characteristic, also deserving to be analysed, is the fact that old and new Sāmkhya texts continue being commented upon, even when, strictly speaking, Sāmkhya adepts - I mean followers of Sāmkhya as a school perhaps do not exist any longer. If the commentators are not Sāmkhyas proper, why should they take the trouble of commenting upon Sāṃkhya texts? The answer is quite obvious. In all traditions, the commentary literature mainly follows two lines. On the one hand, a commentary is written with a view to making explicit the teachings of a text and defending them against the criticism of adversary schools. On the other, a commentary is written with an aim at attracting towards one's own orbit a text that is deemed to be important but at the same time ideologically somewhat distant from one's own position; thus a commentary is a device aimed at attempting to appropriate the text. In the latter case, in other words, a prestigious work is mostly commented upon when one, at least prima facie, disagrees with it. But this generally obtains for texts belonging to the same tradition as the commentator's. Why, then, comment upon a Sāmkhya text, if one is outside the Sāmkhya tradition? We may answer by putting one more question, which is, after all, the main subject of this paper: Is it really possible to be outside, totally outside, Sāmkhya? I should like to conclude these preliminary remarks by pointing out that Sāmkhya, although so strongly criticized by the Vedantins, is yet assigned, by the Vedantin Mādhava in the Sarvadarśanasamgraha, one of the absolutely highest ranks in the hierarchy of philosophical systems.

Let us now try to go a bit deeper into the question by examining the role of Sāṃkhya within one specific tradition, the Tantric one (admitting that we are allowed to speak of Tantrism as of a unitary phenomenon).

commenting Tantrāloka XIII.346cd lokādhyātmātimārgādikarmayogavidhānataḥ, Jayaratha says: lokaḥ śrutismṛtyādiḥ, adhyātmaṃ vedāntādiḥ, atimārgo laukikamārgātītam sāmkhyapātañjalādi ...

Furthermore, speaking of Tantrism means speaking not of a marginal element but of an essential and strongly characterizing component of the entire civilization of the subcontinent, from the medieval age onwards – in the social, religious, philosophical, and artistic spheres. We find Sāṃkhya doctrines in the very core of the metaphysics, cosmology and psychology of Tantrism, and we are not talking of single details but of fully structured systems of beliefs – such as the *tattva* theory –, which are so perfectly integrated into the tantric speculation that, most likely, we would never have thought of a derivation, had we not been aware of the remote origin of Sāṃkhya. This is particularly true for the Śaiva side of Tantrism.

In addition to the doctrine of *tattvas*, or at least the first twenty-three or twenty-four in the Śaiva outlook, we find the doctrine of *bhāvas* and *pratyayas*, obviously that of the three *guṇas*, the opposition/complementarity of the male and female principles in the Absolute, and all this does not concern only the speculative plane but is also firmly grounded in ritual (see for example the role of *buddhi-bhāvas* in the mental construction of the Śiva throne,² or the five *mahābhūtas* as pervading the entire universe in the so-called *pañcatattvadīkṣā*,³ and so on). Neither the tantras nor the commentaries and secondary works ever acknowledge these elements as "deriving" from Sāṃkhya, to which, moreover, a somewhat ambiguous treatment is reserved: a certain basic respect, on the one hand,

- 2 Somaśambhupaddhati I (BRUNNER 1963) p. 158 ff.; Mṛgendrāgama, kriyāpāda, III.12 and Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha's Vṛṭṭi (cf. BRUNNER 1985: 46); Svacchandatantra II.61cd-62 and Kṣemarāja's Uddyota; Sārdhatriśati-kālottara V.2cd-3ab and Rāmakaṇṭha's Vṛṭṭi. But cf. Rāmakaṇṭha's remarks (Sārdhatriśati-kālottara-vṛṭṭi p. 49 dharmādayas tv ete 'nantasya sāmārthyaviśeṣāḥ yaiḥ sarvaṃ dhatte, jānāti, na kenacid anurajyate, sarveśvaraś ca bhavatīti / na tu buddhidharmā iti maurkhyād vyākhyeyam, teṣām atra pragamāsaṃbhavāt) and Kṣemarāja's (Svacchandatantra-uddyota vol.I p. 45 īśvaraśaktyadhisthāne eva etad esām ghatate).
- Mahābhārata XII.187.3-5 pṛthivī vāyur ākāśam āpo jyotiś ca pañcamam / mahābhūtāni bhūtānām sarveṣām prabhavāpyayau // tataḥ ṣṛṣṭāni tatraiva tāni yānti punaḥ punaḥ / mahābhūtāni bhūteṣu sāgarasyormayo yathā // prasārya ca yathāngāni kūrmaḥ saṃharate punaḥ / tadvad bhūtāni bhūtātmā sṛṣṭvā saṃharate punaḥ // mahābhūtāni pañcaiva sarvabhūteṣu bhūtakṛt / akarot teṣu vaiṣamyaṃ tat tu jīvo 'nu paśyati //. Sārdhatriśati-kālottara VIII.1-2 atha dīkṣāṃ pravakṣyāmi pañcatattvavyavasthitām / pṛthivy āpas tathā tejo vāyur ākāśam eva ca // pañcaitāni ca tattvāni yair vyāptam akhilaṃ jagat / sarvatattvāni tatraiva draṣṭavyāni tu sādhakaiḥ //. See also the kalādīkṣā, where the five kalās are related to the five mahābhūtas, Mṛgendrāgama, kriyāpāda, VIII.154cd-155; Svacchandatantra V.12cd-13.

and a strong criticism on specific points, on the other.⁴ The basic respect does not seem essentially different from that paid to other traditions, too. We may quote statements like this: "Sāmkhya, Yoga, Pāñcarātra and Vedas cannot be despised, for they originated from Siva; all of them bestow the fruit of liberation" (Svacchandatantra V.44cd-45ab). In the hierarchies of philosophical-religious systems and the levels of liberation they can attain, Sāmkhya mostly occupies an intermediate rank: its purusa, once liberated, is made to correspond approximately to the plane of vijnānākala "devoid of kalā because of knowledge" or vijānakevala "isolated because of knowledge" (cf. TORELLA 1994: 199-200), and it is added elsewhere that this plane can be fully reached only through the practice of the yoga (related to the Earth principle) according to the Siva doctrine (Tantrāloka X.170cd-171 dharātattvagatam yogam abhyasya śivavidyayā // na tu pāśavasāmkhyīyavaisnavādidvitādrśā / aprāptadhruvadhāmāno vijñānākalatājusah //). Sometimes, specific points are discussed, e. g. the theory of the single quality versus the theory of the accumulation of the qualities in the mahābhūtas (cf. *Īśvarapratyabhijñāvivrtivimarśinī* vol. III pp. 297-300).

- 4 See e.g. Mṛgendratantra, vidyāpāda, II.15 sāṃkhyajñāne 'pi mithyātvaṃ kārye kāraṇabuddhitaḥ / akartṛbhāvād bhoktuś ca svātantryād apy acittvataḥ //.
- 5 Cf. the Pāñcarātra's position on the matter as expounded in a passage cited by Yāmunācārya in the Āgamaprāmāṇya (pp. 61-62) purāṇaiś caiva vedaiś ca pañcarātrais tathaiva ca / dhyāyanti yogino nityaṃ kratubhiś ca yajanti tam // evam ekaṃ sāṅkhyayogaṃ vedāraṇyakam eva ca / parasparāṅgāny etāni pañcarātraṃ ca sattama //. After quoting and commenting upon the latter verse in the Śrībhāṣya (vol.II p. 561, on Brahmasūtra II.2.42), Rāmānuja refers to one more verse: sāṃkhyaṃ yogaḥ pañcarātraṃ vedāḥ pāśupataṃ tathā / ātmapramāṇāny etāni na hantavyāni hetubhih //.
- 6 See e. g. the passage quoted by Rāmakaṇṭha in his *Prakāśa* on Sadyojyotis's *Nareśvaraparīkṣā* (p. 207, on III.80) *yac chrūyate buddhitattve sthitā bauddhā guṇeṣu tv ārhatāḥ sthitāḥ / gunamūrdhni sthitāḥ sāṃkhyā avyakte pāñcarātrikāḥ / sthitā vedavidaḥ puṃsi*. A very similar passage (but omitting the reference to the Sāṃkhyas) is quoted in *Pratyabhijñāhṛdaya* p. 18, *Tantrālokavārttika* vol. IV p. 131, and in many other Śaiva texts.
- Cf. *Īśvarapratyabhijñākārikāvṛtti* p. 68 (on III.2.7) te ca sāṃkhyapuruṣaprāyā vijñānakevalā ity ucyante; Pratyabhijñāhṛdaya p. 18 sāṃkhyādayas tu vijñānākala-prāyāṃ bhūmim avalambante. The reason of this imperfect equivalence is thoroughly explained by Abhinavagupta in *Īśvarapratyabhijñāvivṛtivimarśinī* III p. 322, where he concludes his argumentation by saying, once again: tataḥ sāṃkhyaiḥ puruṣair yat sādṛśyaṃ, tad ātyantikaṃ tajjātīyatāparyantaṃ na bhavati iti prāyikaṃ sādṛśyaṃ yuktam.

Generally, preference is given to the latter, but mainly on the basis of the observation of Śaiva ritual, which mostly presupposes it. Sometimes, this is also accompanied by a certain annoyance at entering into the play of the rival positions within the Sāṃkhya schools (\bar{I} śvarapratyabhijñāvimarśinī vol.II pp. 213-214 tatraikaikaguṇam ākāśādi, ekaikavṛddhaguṇaṃ vā – iti darśanabhedaḥ – iti na vivecito 'nupayogāt).

In order to attempt an overall evaluation of the Śaiva position towards Sāṃkhya, I will focus on a specific point: the doctrine of *bhāvas* and *pratyayas*, i.e. the basic components of intellectual and psychological life of the individual. This doctrine, or perhaps two distinct doctrines belonging to distinct phases in the evolution of Sāṃkhya, ¹⁰ has been the object of different interpretations and formulations. ¹¹ The *Mrgendratantra* basically presents this doctrine in the terms in which it occurs in the *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, and the commentator Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha remains on the same lines. Only, they solve the question of the relationship between *bhāvas* and *pratyayas* – a question that the Sāṃkhya texts essentially leave unanswered – in terms of genetic connection: *bhāvas* are explicitly made to be the causes of *pratyayas* (*Mrgendrāgama*, *vidyāpāda*, X.25a *pratyayās tadupādānās*; *Vrtti*, KSTS ed., p. 220 ...utpattihetur yeṣām ...), or the latter the gross form, or actualization, of the former (Aghoraśiva's *Ṭīkā* on *Bhogakārikā* 60, p. 217, *ta eva* [*bhāvāḥ*] *prakarṣāvasthāṃ prāptāḥ sthūlena rūpeṇa bhogyadaśām*

- Iśvarapratyabhijñāvivṛtivimarśinī III p. 299 dīkṣākālena ca viśuddhaṃ pūrvaṃ tattvaṃ dharām apsu uttaratra yojanīyam iti [...] tatra kāraṇe kāryasya pravilayo yojanaṃ ca / 'yuktaḥ' iti sa eva ayaṃ bahutarāgamānugṛhītaḥ pakṣaḥ iti yāvat. Also the yoga practice named dhāraṇā in this case a practice shared both by Śaivas and Sāṃkhyas is in accordance with the accumulation theory (ibid. nanu kimarthaṃ śaivasāmkhyādaya ittham āhuh ...).
- 9 However, a fairly detailed discussion of the issue can be found in *Tantrāloka* IX and *Tantrasāra* VIII.
- 10 This is the opinion of FRAUWALLNER 1973: I, 268.
- We may start from the derogatory remarks of GARBE 1917: 341: "In der Beschreibung dieser Zustände zeigt sich die Klassifizierungssucht der Sāmkhya-Philosophie im hellsten Lichte; ihre Zahlenmanie nimmt geradezu den Charakter des Albernen an. Der ganze Gegenstand darf als die schwache Seite des Systems bezeichnet werden." On bhāvas see e.g. GARBE 1917: 339-340, VAN BUITENEN 1956: 153-157, LARSON-BHATTACHARYA 1987: 53-54; on pratyayas see, besides FRAUWALLNER 1973, GARBE 1917: 340-345, OBERHAMMER 1961, OBERHAMMER 1977: 17-57, LARSON-BHATTACHARYA 1987: 56-59, 631-634. A detailed treatment of the bhāva-pratyaya doctrine can be found in Yuktidīpikā pp. 230-253.

āpannāh samsārinām pratyāyanāt pratyayāh kathyante). The latter passage also contains an etymological explanation of the term pratyaya, derived from Nārāyaṇakaṇtha (Mrgendravrtti p. 220 te dharmādaya upādānam utpattihetur yesām te samsāryānoh pratyāyanāt pratyayā istāh), who also quotes *ibid*. an anonymous verse with an etymological explanation of *bhāva* (bhāvayanty ātmano lingam tena bhāvā iti smrtāh). 12 Neither of these two etymological explanations belongs to the Sāmkhya tradition.¹³ After following the Mrgendra and Nārāyankantha's discourse about the fifty pratyayas with no objection, the sub-commentator Aghorasiva rather unexpectedly remarks that this is not the final assessment of the question – both as regards the features and number of the pratyayas – which instead is to be found in the Saiva tradition and, particularly, in the Matangapārameśvaratantra (Mrgendravrtti-dīpikā p. 282 te ca siddhyādayaḥ pañcāśat pratyayāh sāmkhyasiddhā evātra darśitāh / natu siddhāntasiddhāh śrīmataṅgādāv anyathaiva tallaksanasya tatsamkhyāyāś cābhidhānāt). In fact, if we look into the vidvāpāda of this Āgama (patala XVII), we find a

- This still cryptic explanation (but cf. also Matangapārameśvaravṛtti, vidyāpāda, p. 389: bhāvayanti adhivāsayanti buddhim yato dharmādayo 'nusthitāh, tato bhāvāh kathyante) is partly elucidated by Aghorasiva in his Dīpikā on the Mrgendravrtti (p. 280 buddhau vāsanātvena sthitā dharmādayo 'stau bhāvā ity arthah / ete cetyādi / sāttvikaśuddhā [read sāttvikā śuddhā] matih pravrttā yasya pumsah tasya dharmādayaś catvāro bhāvā bhavantīti bhāvāh). I am very grateful to Professor Alexis SANDERSON for providing me with a copy of this rare text. The editor of the Dīpikā traces the verse explaning the term pratyaya to the Pauskarāgama. In fact, in patala VI of the vidyāpāda of the edited Pauskara we can find not only the same explanation of pratyaya (VI.124ab pratyāyayanti ksetrajñam tena te pratyayāḥ smrtāh) but also that of bhāva (VI.50cd-51a ete dharmādayaś cāstau bhāvayanti vatas tatah // lingabhāvāt [read lingam bhāvāh] samuddistā[h]). However, it seems very unlikely that such a late (and southern) compilation as the edited Pauskarāgama can represent the source of this old doctrine, and all the more so if we consider that this text shows at many points its endebtment to the Matanga, probably read in the light of Rāmakantha's vrtti. In the latter work (p. 389), both verses are quoted, while Rāmakantha comments upon vidyāpāda, XVII.26cd-27ab pratyayo 'kṣārthayogotthaḥ pumsah pratyayakrt sadā // bhāvanātah smrto bhāvo vāsyate yena pudgalah /.
- 13 See e.g. Yuktidīpikā p. 239 (on Sāṃkhyakārikā 46ab): pratyayasarga iti pratyayaḥ padārtho lakṣaṇam iti paryāyāḥ / [...] athavā pratyayo buddhiḥ niścayo 'dhyavasāya iti paryāyāḥ / tasya sargo 'yam, ataḥ pratyayasargaḥ pratyayakāryaṃ pratyayavyāpāra ity arthaḥ / athavā pratyayapūrvakaḥ sargaḥ pratyayasargaḥ / buddhipūrvaka ity uktaḥ.

conception that is essentially new with respect to Sāmkhya.¹⁴ Not only does this scripture view the pratyayas as the direct outcome of the eight bhāvas, as also the Mrgendra does, but also amplifies their number and in many a case modifies their meanings and functions. Without going into details, we can limit ourselves to saying that 5 yamas and 5 niyamas derive from dharma; 8 siddhis, multiplied by 10 different philosophical viewpoints, derive from jñāna; 10 tustis, also multiplied by 10 different philosophical viewpoints, derive from vairāgya; 10 aiśvaryas (the usual list animādi) multiplied by 8 different ways of existence derive from aiśvarya, 10 opposites to yamas and nivamas derive from adharma, 5 viparyayas (i.e. the usual Sāmkhya list: tamas, moha, etc.) derive from ajñāna; 10 atustis derive from avairāgya; and 21 aśaktis derive from anaiśvarya. 15 Thus the number of pratyayas raises to three hundred. But the Saiva elaboration of the bhāva-pratyaya doctrine does not stop here. In the Pauskarāgama, mentioned above, the pratvavas are further multiplied: now they are six hundred twelve (vidyāpāda, VI.127ab sambhūya vrttayo buddheh sat śatam dvādaśādhikam).

This handling of Sāmkhya concepts and doctrines by Śaiva tantras as they were their own, that is, tantric Śaiva doctrines – particularly in the case of a doctrine so typically Sāmkhya, with all the peculiarity of its often abstruse and archaic terminology – the familiarity that these tantras and their commentators show in modifying and integrate them, all this suggests a tentative conclusion. There is not one Sāmkhya but, as it were, two Sāmkhyas. One is a relatively coherent complex of doctrines and beliefs which has become, subliminally as it were, an integral part of Indian

- As is often the case in Tantrism (cf. the attitude of most of tantric literature towards vedic śruti), the relationship between the two conceptions is assumed to be that of sāmānya/viśeṣa (see Mṛgendravṛttidīpikā p. 291, on XI.1, aṣṭau navetyādinā saṃkṣepeṇa sāṃkhyāśritapañcāśatpratyayasaṃkhyāyā darśitatvāt siddhyādīnāṃ svarūpalakṣaṇam api tad uktam eveti [...] viśeṣalakṣaṇam asmābhiḥ pūrvaprakaraṇa eva darśitam).
- 15 A couple of verses by Rāmakaṇṭha himself aptly summarize the entire doctrine (Mataṅgapārameśvaravṛtti, vidyāpāda, p. 417, ad XVII.157cd): dharmādaya eva bhāvāḥ krameṇa pratyayarūpatāṃ prāptā iti / evaṃ śatatrayasaṃkhyātra darśitā / na tu sāṃkhyair iva pañcāśad ity uktam anyatra dharmo daśabhir bhedair jñānam aśītyā śatena vairāgyam / aiśvaryaṃ catuṣṣaṣṭyā daśabhir adharmas tadardhato 'jñānam // daśabhir avairāgyaṃ cānaiśvaryaṃ bhinnam ekaviṃśatyā / bhāva-pratyayabhedah samksepoktah śatatrayenāyam //.

tradition, ¹⁶ impelled by its intrinsic power and prestige deriving above all from its being the first bold and consistent systemization of the scattered patrimony of upaniṣadic speculations. The other is the Sāṃkhya as a darśana trying to put in order or develop, in some way or other, these doctrines, which are perceived as a timeless legacy even by those that are not their direct upholders. One wonders whether this could be an acceptable explanation of the sentence, apparently so incongruous, pronounced by Aghoraśiva in the *Mṛgendravṛttidīpikā*: Also the followers of Sāṃkhya ["also", that is, in addition to us Śaivas] admit of 24 *tattvas* ... ¹⁷

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abhinavagupta, *İśvarapratyabhijñāvivṛtivimarśinī*, edited by Madhusudan Kaul SHASTRI, vols. I-III, KSTS LX LXII LXV, Bombay 1938-43.

Abhinavagupta, *İśvarapratyabhijñāvimarśinī*, edited by Mukund Rām SHASTRI, vols. I-II, KSTS XXII XXXIII, Bombay 1918-1921.

Abhinavagupta, *Tantrasāra*, edited by Mukunda Ram SHASTRI, KSTS, XVII, Srinagar 1918.

Abhinavagupta, *Tantrāloka with Commentary by Rājānaka Jayaratha*, edited with notes by Madhusudan Kaul SHASTRI, vols. I-XII, KSTS XXIII, XXVIII, XXX, XXXVI, XXXV, XXIX, XLI, XLVII, LIX,, LII, LVII, LVIII, Allahbad-Srinagar-Bombay 1918-1938.

Aghoraśiva, *Bhogakārikā-tīkā* (see *Astaprakaranam*)

Aghoraśiva, Mrgendravrttidīpikā (see Śrīmrgendram ...)

Astaprakaranam, edited by Vrajavallabha DVIVEDī, Yogatantra-Granthamālā 12, Varanasi 1988.

- For example, it even seems that Sāṃkhya was one of the subjects taught in Buddhist universities. Hsuan-Tsang's report refers to Nālanda: "The priests, belonging to the convent, or strangers (residing therein) always reach the number of 10,000, who all study the Great Vehicle, and also (works belonging to) the eighteen sects, and not only so, but even ordinary works, such as the Vedas and other books, the Hetuvidyā, Śabdavidyā, Chikitsāvidyā, the works on Magic (Atharvaveda), the Sāṃkhya;" (BEAL 1911: 112)
- 17 P. 276 sāṃkhyair apy uktaṃ "prakṛter mahāṃs tato 'haṃkāras tasmād guṇaś [read gaṇaś] ca ṣoḍaśakaḥ / tasmāt ṣoḍaśakāt pañcabhyaḥ pañcabhūtāni [Sāṃkhyakārikā 22]"; see also p. 237 sāmkhyair api gaunam caturvimśatitattvātmakam isyate, etc.

Kṣemarāja, *Pratyabhijñāhṛdayam*, edited by Mukunda Ram SHASTRI, KSTS III, Srinagar 1918.

Matangapārameśvarāgama (Vidyāpāda), avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha, édition critique par N.R. BHATT, Publications de l'Institut Français d'Indologie No.56, Pondichéry 1977.

Mṛgendratantra (vidyāpāda and yogapāda) with commentary of Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha, edited by Madhusudan Kaul SHASTRI, KSTS L, Bombay 1930.

Mṛgendrāgama, Kriyāpāda et Caryāpāda, avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha, édition critique par N.R. BHATT, Publications de l'Institut Français d'Indologie No.23, Pondichéry 1962.

Śrīmrgendram, kāmikopāgamam, vidyāyogapādadvayamīlitam śrībhaṭṭanārāyaṇakaṇṭha-viracitayā vṛṭtyā tadvyākhyayāghoraśivācāryaviracitayā dīpikayā cālaṅkṛtam, [...] nā. kṛṣṇaśāstriṇā [...] ke. em. subrahmaṇyaśāstriṇā ca [...] saṃśodhya, Śivāgamasiddhānta-paripālansaṃghaprakāśyasaṃkhyā 12, Devakoṭṭai 1928.

Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha, Mṛgendravṛtti (see Mṛgendratantra)

Pauskarāgama, edited by K. Ramachandra SARMA, Advar Library Bulletin, 58, 1994.

Rāmānuja, Śrībhāṣyam, with the commentary Bhāṣyārthadarpaṇa by [...] Śrī Uttamur T. Viraraghavacharya, 2 parts, Ubhaya Vedanta Granthamala, Madras 1964.

Sadyojyotis, *Nareśvaraparīkṣā with Commentary by Rāmakanṭha*, edited by Mukunda Ram SHASTRI, KSTS XLV, Srinagar 1926.

Sāṃkhyadarśanam, maharṣi-śrīkapila-praṇītam, vijñānabhikṣu-viracita-pravacanabhā-ṣya, [...] paṇḍita-śrīāśubodha-vidyābhūṣaṇa-paṇḍita-śrīnityabodha-vidyāratnābhyāṃ saṃs-krtam prakāśitañ ca, Calcutta 1936.

Sārdhatriśatikālottarāgama, avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha, édition critique par N.R. BHATT, Publications de l'Institut Français d'Indologie No.61, Pondichéry 1979.

Somaśambhupaddhati (see BRUNNER 1963-1977)

Svacchandatantra, with commentary "Uddyota" by Kṣemarājācārya, edited by V.V. DVIVEDI, Vols. I-II, Parimal Sanskrit Series No.16, Delhi 1985.

Vijñānabhikṣu, Sāṃkhyapravacanabhāṣya (see Sāṃkhyadarśanam)

Yāmuna, Āgamaprāmānya (see BUITENEN 1971)

Yuktidīpikā, critically edited by A. WEZLER and Sh. MOTEGI, vol.I, Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien herausgegeben vom Institut für Kultur und Geschichte Indiens und Tibets an der Universität Hamburg, 44, Stuttgart 1998.

TRANSLATIONS AND STUDIES

BEAL, S. (1911) *The Life of Hiuen-Tsiang by Shaman Hwui Li*, with an Introduction containing an Account of the Works of I-Tsing, with a Preface by L. Cranmer-Byng. London.

BRUNNER-LACHAUX, H. (1963-1977) *Somaśambhupaddhati, parties I-III.* Traduction, introduction et notes par ..., Publications de l'Institut Français d'Indologie No.25 I-III. Pondichéry.

BRUNNER-LACHAUX, H. (1985) Mṛgendrāgama. Section des rites et section du comportement, avec la vṛṭṭi de Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇakaṇṭha. Traduction, introduction et notes par ..., Publications de l'Institut Français d'Indologie No.69. Pondichéry.

VAN BUITENEN, J.A.B. (1956) "Studies in Sāṃkhya (I)", Journal of the American Oriental Society, 76.

VAN BUITENEN, J.A.B. (1971) Yāmuna's Āgama Prāmāṇyam or Treatise on the Validity of Pañcarātra, Sanskrit Text and English Translation by ..., Ramanuja Research Society. Madras.

FRAUWALLNER, E. (1973) History of Indian Philosophy, 2 vols. Delhi-Varanasi-Patna.

GARBE, R. (1917) Die Sāmkhya-Philosophie: Eine Darstellung des Indischen Rationalismus nach den Quellen, zweite umgearbeitete Auflage. Leipzig.

HULIN, M. (1980) Mṛgendrāgama: Sections de la Doctrine et du Yoga avec la Vṛtti de Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇakaṇṭha et la Dīpikā d'Aghoraśivācharya, Traduction, introduction et notes par ..., Publications de l'Institut Français d'Indologie No.63. Pondichéry.

LARSON, G. J. and BHATTACHARYA, R. Sh. (Eds.) (1987), Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies, vol. IV, Sāṃkhya: A Dualist Tradition in Indian Philosophy, Delhi.

OBERHAMMER, G. (1961) "On the 'śāstra' quotations in the Yuktidīpikā", Adyar Library Bulletin, 25.

OBERHAMMER, G. (1977) Strukturen yogischer Meditation, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens, Heft 13. Wien.

TORELLA, R. (1994) *The* İśvarapratyabhijñākārikā *of Utpaladeva with the Author's* Vṛtti. Critical Edition and Annotated Translation, Serie Orientale Roma LXXI, IsMEO. Roma.