

Moksadharma 187 and 239-241 reconsidered

Autor(en): **Bisschop, Peter / Bakker, Hans**

Objekttyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Asiatische Studien : Zeitschrift der Schweizerischen
Asiengesellschaft = Études asiatiques : revue de la Société
Suisse-Asie**

Band (Jahr): **53 (1999)**

Heft 3

PDF erstellt am: **26.04.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-147462>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

MOKṢADHARMA 187 AND 239-241 RECONSIDERED*

Hans Bakker & Peter Bisschop, Groningen

In his *Untersuchungen zum Mokṣadharma (Die sāmkhyaistischen Texte)* (1925) and in the chapter on Sāmkhya of his *Geschichte der indischen Philosophie* (1953) FRAUWALLNER has shown *Mokṣadharma* 187 and 239-241¹ to be of crucial importance for understanding the development of the Sāmkhya-system. The great Viennese scholar dealt with yet another chapter (MBh (B) 12.286), which however has been omitted in the critical edition, but is preserved in the critical apparatus to 187. Conceived as different versions of one and the same “Grundtext,” they must, FRAUWALLNER argued, have been held to be of great significance at the time and probably led an independent existence before they were included in the collection of doctrines of the *Mokṣadharma*. FRAUWALLNER attempted a reconstruction of this “Grundtext” by sorting out words and passages that were judged by him not to have belonged to this text originally. He succeeded in giving a clear description of a distinctive philosophy, which he denominated “die epische Urform des Sāmkhya.”² An important conclusion of his reconstruction is that the so called “evolution theory” had not yet been developed; according to FRAUWALLNER the evolution theory was adopted by the Sāmkhya later from circles that taught an evolution out of *Brahman*.³

VAN BUITENEN (1956) also stressed the importance of these texts, but contrary to FRAUWALLNER’s conclusions, he maintained that an evolution theory can be traced in them. Out of both texts he reconstructed a small tract, which somehow had come to be included in this text-group. He recovered this tract by isolating and arranging those verses in which the

* We thank our colleague David ATKINSON for correcting the English of this article.

1 FRAUWALLNER uses a different numbering, based on the Bombay edition: 194 and 247-249. MBh 12.239-241 is also transmitted as part of the *Brahmapurāṇa*: BrP 237.43-238.14.

2 FRAUWALLNER 1953, 288-299.

3 Two texts according to FRAUWALLNER have been a major influence upon the development of the evolution theory: MBh 12.224 and the first book of the *Manusmṛti* (FRAUWALLNER 1925a). Cf. HACKER 1961 and RÜPING 1977.

term *bhāva* has apparently an other meaning than it has in the rest of the texts.⁴ He emphasized the evolution process taught in this tract, which, as he put it, has a “horizontal pattern” in contrast to a “vertical pattern”:

not *buddhi* into *manas*, *manas* into senses etc., but *buddhi* into *manas*, *buddhi* into senses.⁵

BAKKER (1982) accepted VAN BUITENEN’s reconstruction as a “working-hypothesis,” but criticized the interpretations of some passages; moreover he questioned VAN BUITENEN’s claim to have discovered an authentic text. He drew attention to an agreement of the reconstructed tract with the teachings of *Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad* 3.⁶

From all these different interpretations we may infer that the chapters under discussion contain a diversity of ideas, which are not necessarily consistent with each other. In this paper we want to look at three themes central to both texts that are relevant to the question put forward by VAN BUITENEN, viz. whether or not we encounter an evolution theory in these chapters. It will be shown that this question is related to a difference between both texts with respect to their conception of *buddhi*. The three themes are the following:⁷

4 “When we read through the two versions we are struck by the fact that the term *bhāva* occurs in two altogether different situations: first in connection with such ‘sensations, qualities and conditions’ as *sukha/prīti*, *duḥkha/śoka*, *moha*, *praharṣa* etc., *atuṣṭi* etc., *aviveka* etc.; secondly in connection with a process by which the *buddhi* modifies itself into *manas* as its *bhāva*.” VAN BUITENEN 1956, 153.

5 VAN BUITENEN 1957a, 22.

6 “... the most striking agreement of the epic with the Upaniṣad appears from the fact that the act of consciousness itself, when it has actualized the senses, evolves the objects (epic: *artha* / KauU.: *bhūtamātra*) of the latter. Or rather, at the very moment *buddhi* (or *prajñā*) actualizes the senses it evolves (epic: *vikurute* / KauU.: *abhivisrjate*) the object that is apprehended.” BAKKER 1982, 144.

7 In addition to these three, there may be distinguished three more themes (in both texts): an introductory question concerning the self (*adhyātman*) which forms the beginning of both texts (MBh 12.187.1-3; 239.1-2), a teaching about the three *bhāvās* (“states of mind”) *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas* (MBh 12.187.14, 21-35; 239.16, 20-25; 240.6cd-8, 10-11) and a soteriology (MBh 12.187.44-47, 51-60; 240.13-15; 241.5-14). Many of these themes, or parts of them, have parallels in other chapters of the *Mokṣadharmā*; so, for example, part of the teaching about the three *bhāvās* is found also in MBh 12.212.25-31. Study of these parallels may throw light on the composition and transmission of the *Mokṣadharmā*, as, *mutatis mutandis*, the *Nārāyaṇīya-Studien* by Peter SCHREINER and others (1997) has recently demonstrated.

1. A teaching about the five elements and their respective differentiation into sense-organ, sense-faculty and sense-impression.⁸
2. A teaching about the intellect (*buddhi*) and its relation to the “knower of the field” (*kṣetrajña*), the mind (*manas*) and the senses (*indriyāṇi*).⁹
3. A teaching about the relationship between the *sattva* and the *kṣetrajña*.¹⁰

The first theme (the teaching about the elements) forms a coherent whole, which can be separated quite easily from the rest of the texts (187.4-10 and 239.3-12). The five elements are regarded as the (material) cause of all sentient beings. They evolve into three modifications (*guṇa*): a sense-organ, a sense-faculty and a sense-impression. So, for instance, the element *ākāśa* evolves into the ears, hearing and sound.¹¹ The characteristic feature of this treatment of the elements is the epistemological point of view, which entails that the essential qualities of the elements are characterized by their impression on the senses.¹²

In addition to the five elements as the material cause, this section speaks of the *bhūtakṛt* (“creator of beings”) as a kind of efficient cause (Appendix: A).¹³ The *bhūtakṛt* appears to cause the differentiation of the elements into the triple modification of sense-organ, sense-faculty and sense-impression (187.7; 239.6-7). The conclusion seems justified that in this section of both texts a consistent doctrine is presented, which considers the elements to be the material out of which sentient beings (*bhūta*) are made, a process set in motion by a *bhūtakṛt*. This section forms a teaching

8 MBh 12.187.4-10; 239.3-12.

9 MBh 12.187.11-20; 239.13-15, 17-19; 240.1-6ab, 9-10ab, 12.

10 MBh 12.187.37-43, 48-50; 240.19-22; 241.1-4.

11 MBh 12.187.8ab: *śabdaḥ śrotram tathā khāni trayam ākāśayonijam* /.

12 This epistemological perspective remains in classical Sāṃkhya, where the five elements are considered to originate from the so called “subtle elements” (*tanmātra*). These *tanmātrās*, in fact, are the sense-impressions: *śabda*, *sparsa*, *rūpa*, *rasa* and *gandha*.

13 The Appendix contains the text of some passages of the critical edition. It is meant to facilitate comparison: the left column contains a passage of MBh 12.187, the right column contains the parallel of MBh 12.239-241 and vice versa. A blank means there is no parallel for a passage.

of its own; this is evident also from the fact that none of the words playing a key role in the rest of the texts, such as *kṣetrajña*, *buddhi*, *manas*, *bhāva* and *sattva*, are used here.

The transition to the next theme can be illustrated by 187.10cd-11ab (Appendix: B). Whereas 10cd enumerates the five elements with the *manas* as sixth, the following verse 11ab enumerates the five senses and the *manas*; the *buddhi* and the *kṣetrajña* being respectively the seventh and the eighth (11cd).¹⁴ These verses indicate a transition in both texts: nothing is said about the elements any more, the senses are given and the teaching about their origin out of the elements seems to be forgotten. Whereas up to this point we had a description of material nature, after it both texts seem to be dealing with ideal nature only. Although the following teaching about the *buddhi* does not form such a clear section as the foregoing teaching about the elements, the verses which we consider to belong to this teaching all have one thing in common: they deal with a psychic or ideal principle distinct from the (material) elements.

The teaching starts with an enumeration of eight principles: the five senses, the *manas*, the *buddhi* and the *kṣetrajña*. Their respective functions are given:

The eye is for seeing, the mind causes reflection, the intellect serves determination, the knower of the field is called the onlooker.¹⁵

While both texts agree on these functions they disagree about the relationship between the *buddhi* and the *kṣetrajña*. This disagreement can be deduced from a small, but important variation in the parallel passages 187.20 and 240.6 (Appendix: C). According to both passages the “invisible one” governs the senses, but whereas 187.20 uses the masculine *adrśyaḥ*, 240.6 uses the feminine *adrśyā*.¹⁶ Therefore in 187.20 the term “invisible one” refers to the *kṣetrajña*, whereas in 240.6 it refers to the *buddhi*. In the parallel passages 187.13 and 239.18 (Appendix: D) there is a similar variation. Both verses deal with the question who is the one that sees

14 That we are here concerned with a break is also evident from the parallel passage which omits 187.11ab, and instead of *mahābhūtāni pañcaiva* (MBh 187.10c) reads *indriyāṇi nare pañca* (MBh 239.14a).

15 MBh 12.239.15: *cakṣur ālocanāyaiva saṁśayaṁ kurute manah / buddhir adhyavasānāya sākṣī kṣetrajña ucyate //*.

16 Some manuscripts of 240.6 also read *adrśyaḥ*. No manuscript of 187.20 reads *adrśyā*.

everything that is above the soles of the feet and inhabits all this. 187.13 seems to teach that it is the *kṣetrajña*, as in the preceding verse the *kṣetrajña* is called the onlooker. 239.18 however explicitly states it is the *buddhir uttamā* (“supreme intellect”). These variations indicate a difference with respect to the relationship between the *buddhi* and the *kṣetrajña*. Whereas according to 187 the *buddhi* and the *kṣetrajña* are utterly distinct, in that the one is the active knowledge-principle responsible for the activity of the senses and the other an absolute, non-active onlooker or subject, in some parts of 239-241 the *buddhi* and the *kṣetrajña* seem to be two sides of one and the same principle.

The difference between the two texts can be illustrated by comparing those verses that explain the relation of the *buddhi* to the senses (appendix: E). In 187.18-19 the senses are characterized as instruments which the *buddhi* employs for apperception:

The eye is what it sees with, what it hears with is called the ear, the nose they say is what it smells with, with the tongue it experiences flavour and with the skin it feels touches.

In the parallel passage of 240.4-5, however, it is not the instrumental case (*yena paśyati*) that is used, but the active present participle together with the finite verb *bhavati*:

While hearing it becomes hearing, while touching it is called touch, while seeing it becomes sight, while tasting it becomes taste, while smelling it becomes smell.

The *buddhi* does not employ the senses as instruments, but it is or becomes itself the senses. The word *indriyāṇi* used in both text passages (187.20; 240.6) does not seem to have exactly the same meaning: in 240 it denotes the sense-faculties, whereas in 187 its connotation seems to encompass the sense-organs as well.¹⁷ In 240 a sense is not so much an instrument, as a

17 Although in classical Sāṃkhya the *indriyāṇi* as faculties are explicitly distinguished from the organs, which are called their “seats” (*adhiṣṭhānāni*) – e.g. in the *Yuktidīpikā* (YD ad SK 26cd, 197): *ucyate: adhiṣṭhānād indriyaprthaktvaṃ śaktiviśeṣopā-lambhāt / yathā śarīrāsambhavino viśayavyavasāyalakṣaṇasya śaktiviśeṣasyopā-lambhād arthāntaram buddhir anumīyata evam adhiṣṭhānāsambhavino viśaya-grahaṇalakṣaṇasya śaktiviśeṣasyopalambhād arthāntaram indriyam iti* / – the use of the term in these texts of the *Mokṣadharma* is not unambiguous. Thus in MBh 12.239.11cd the “complex of the senses” (*indriyagrāma*) is described as “derived

modification of the *buddhi*, viz. a state of mind characterized by sense-perception. In this way it is said that the *buddhi* evolves the complex of the senses, just as a tortoise sticks out its limbs (239.17).

However, despite this occasional ambiguity, the verses in this section do not deal with material nature, but with ideal nature. The *buddhi* is therefore not looked upon as a material entity as it is in classical Sāṃkhya. In this connection some remarks have to be made on FRAUWALLNER's observation – in the introduction to his translation of the reconstructed “Grundtext,” published in his *Nachgelassene Werke II* – to the effect that the *buddhi* in this text-group is ranked among material nature.

Besondere Bedeutung kommt in ihm [viz. the “Grundtext”] der Psychologie zu. Weltseele und Materie sind nämlich nach ihm scharf getrennt. Dabei werden nicht nur die Sinnesorgane, sondern auch die psychischen Organe, Denken (*manah*) und Erkennen (*buddhiḥ*) der Materie zugerechnet.¹⁸

In our opinion this is certainly not true for some passages in *adhyāya* 240. This becomes evident when we consider MBh 240.3 (Appendix: F). After the progressive enumeration of the *indriyāṇi*, the *arthās*, the *manas*, the *buddhi* and the *ātman*, which we also encounter with some variations in the *Kaṭha Upaniṣad*,¹⁹ it is said that:

The intellect is the self of man; the intellect indeed is the essence of the self; when it produces a *bhāva* it is / becomes mind.²⁰

The *buddhi* is regarded as the essence of the self in this verse. In the preceding verse however the self is stated to be higher than the *buddhi*. Consequently the *buddhi* seems to exist in two ways: 1) as an absolute, non-intentional self, corresponding to the *kṣetrajñā*; 2) as an empirical, intentional activity, when it evolves through the *manas* into the senses. In the latter case the *buddhi* exists as a *bhāva*, i.e. in a “state of modification.” It is obvious that this doctrine differs materially from the one found in MBh 187, where the *buddhi* is treated as an hypostasis of empirical

from the five elements” (*pāñcabhautika*), thereby implying its material nature, whereas MBh 187.20 seems to conflate the *adhiṣṭhānāni* and the *indriyāṇi*.

18 FRAUWALLNER 1992, 78.

19 *Kaṭha Upaniṣad* III.10-11; VI.7-8a.

20 MBh 12.240.3: *buddhir ātmā manuṣyasya buddhir evātmano 'tmikā / yadā vikurute bhāvaṃ tadā bhavati sā manah //*.

intellect, fundamentally distinct from the transcendental subject, *kṣetrajñā*, as well as separated from the senses.²¹

The difference between the two texts can be illustrated further by comparing the passages that deal with the relationship between *sattva* and *kṣetrajñā* (Appendix: G). If we understand *sattva* here, not as referring to a material principle comparable to the *prakṛti*, but as referring to the *buddhi*,²² a remarkable agreement with the foregoing appears. According to both texts the *sattva* creates (*srjate*) the *guṇās*, whereas the *kṣetrajñā* is only their observer. The *guṇās* are to be interpreted here as the modifications of the *buddhi*, just as in the teaching about the elements the word *guṇa* denotes the modification of the elements. The difference between the two texts lies in the relationship of *kṣetrajñā* and *sattva* to the self (*ātman*). For, whereas 187.40cd states that the self is the one who observes the *guṇās* (i.e. is the *kṣetrajñā*) but wrongly thinks himself to be their creator, according to the parallel passage 240.19ab the self in reality (*yathātatham*) is both, the observer (*paridraṣṭr*) and the creator (*sraṣṭr*) of the *guṇās*. The doctrine underlying MBh 240 therefore seems to be that *kṣetrajñā* and *sattva* are two

- 21 This difference may also explain the parallel verses 187.23 and 240.8. According to 187.23 the essence of the *buddhi* consists of the three *bhāvās* (viz. *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*) and it never transcends them; according to 240.8 however it does transcend the three *bhāvās*, although its essence is said to consist in them (*bhāvātmikā*). In both chapters the passage at issue has variant readings – some manuscripts of 187.23 read *ativartate* instead of *nātivartate*, while some manuscripts of 240.8 read *nātivartate* instead of *ativartate* – yet this variance may be significant and point to an original difference of doctrine rather than being due to mere textual corruption. In 187.23 the *buddhi* does not transcend the three *bhāvās*, because only the “invisible one,” viz. the *kṣetrajñā*, transcends them. In 240.8 the *buddhi* does transcend them, since it is equated to the absolute self and as such is the transcendental “invisible one.”
- 22 FRAUWALLNER (1992) translates *sattva* in this part of the texts with “die Güte”; EDGERTON (1965) translates it with “essential (material) reality.” VAN BUITENEN (1957b, 95) distinguishes five meanings of the word *sattva* in the context of proto-Sāṃkhya: “1. *sattva* as the material counterpart of the *kṣetrajñā*; 2. as the *buddhi*; 3. as a *bhāva* of the *buddhi*; 4. as a state of well-being amounting to release; 5. as the first of the three *guṇās*.” Although VAN BUITENEN takes *sattva* here in the first meaning, he observes that there is no real difference between the first and the second meaning: “In these early forms of Sāṃkhya creation does not necessarily start from a higher principle than the *buddhi*, e.g., *avyakta*, *pradhāna* or *prakṛti*, but from the *buddhi* itself; nor has the *ahamkāra* yet taken over the evolutionary functions of the *buddhi*. As the *buddhisattva* is indeed creation and thus the ‘material’ counterpart of the unaffected *kṣetrajñā*” (1957b, 96-97). Cf. also JOHNSTON 1937, 50-51.

aspects of one and the same principle, viz. the *buddhi*, which is defined as the Self of man (MBh 240.3ab).²³ If our analysis of these chapters is correct, it may explain a statement in the *Anugītā*.

Some wise men who are well established in knowledge declare the identity of the *kṣetrajñā* and the *sattva*, this is not correct.²⁴

This verse may be taken to refer to those passages of 239-241 that teach the unity of the *kṣetrajñā* and the *sattva* within the self. This unity appears as two aspects (dialectical moments) of the *buddhi*: on the one hand as the transcendental subject, styled “*kṣetrajñā*,” on the other hand as the phenomenality (intentionality) of consciousness, styled “*sattva*” (“being”), that is intellect (*buddhi*) as activity, which comprises *manas*, the senses and their objects.

We now return to the “evolution theory” that VAN BUITENEN found in his reconstructed tract. The verses VAN BUITENEN used for his tract are those that deal with the modification of the *buddhi*. However, he mixes passages from 187 and 239-241, thereby blurring the difference between them. FRAUWALLNER also conflates the texts, selecting material from all three dialogues and blending them into one “Grundtext.” The unacceptable consequences of this conflation can be seen when we look at the important difference between the *buddhi* using the sense-organs in 187 and the *buddhi* becoming the sense-faculties in 240, which difference is obliterated in the verses 18-19 of his “Grundtext.”

Wodurch es sieht, das ist das Auge. Hörend wird es Gehör genannt. Riechend wird es zum Geruch. Schmeckend ist es der Geschmack. Mit der Haut berührt es die

23 Although the expression *prthagbhūtau prakṛtyā tau* (187.39a; 240.20c) seems to suggest that the two are essentially different, the expression *paridraṣṭā guṇānām sa sraṣṭā caiva yathātatham* (240.19ab) contradicts this; hence our conclusion that the difference is one of appearance, not of essence. Cf. also the example in 240.22 which has no parallel in 187. Whereas the simile of the fish in the water (187.39cd; 240.21ab) and the gnat in the fig-tree (187.38ab; 240.21cd) suggest a difference in essence, the simile peculiar to 240 implies a unity instead: “Or as the blade inside the reed-stalk is both separate and yet associated, just so these two are associated and fixed in one another” (transl. EDGERTON 1956, 279).

24 MBh 14.48.9: *āhur eke ca vidvāṃso ye jñāne supraṭiṣṭhitāḥ / kṣetrajñāsattvayor aikyam ity etan nopapadyate //*.

Berührung. Vielfach wandelt sich das Erkennen. Wenn es etwas begehrt, dann wird es zum Denken.²⁵

However, FRAUWALLNER was right in his observation that the evolution theory of the Sāṃkhya is not attested in this text-group. FRAUWALLNER has given three features of the evolution theory:

die Vorstellung der Urmaterie (*prakṛti*), die Lehre von den drei Eigenschaften (*guṇās*) der Urmaterie und die Lehre von den 25 Wesenheiten.²⁶

We find none of them in these texts. What VAN BUITENEN has styled a “horizontal evolution theory” is different from what FRAUWALLNER called an “evolution theory.” We would prefer to call the former a “teaching about the modification of the *buddhi*.” This teaching does not have a cosmological but a psychological status: it explains how the *buddhi* evolves the *manas* as its *bhāva* and subsequently differentiates into the sense-faculties. The ontological implications of this teaching conflict with the teaching about the elements in the first part of both texts, where it is said that not only the sense-organs and the sense-impressions, but also the sense-faculties have their origin in the elements. These texts therefore do not contain a consistent philosophy, but display the same diversity as so much of the *Mokṣadharmā*.

The above analysis raises a number of questions, which – though, admittedly, they cannot all be answered – need to be addressed, if any progress into the early history of the Sāṃkhya philosophical tradition is to be made. These questions are closely connected with the source material from which we have to reconstruct that history; in this particular case: how do we conceive of the coming into being of the *Mahābhārata* text corpus, especially its largest book, the *Śāntiparvan*. FRAUWALLNER’s hypothesis of one “Grundtext” that had been transmitted independently for a long time, had consequently developed into three different recensions, before the latter were included in the text of the *Mokṣadharmā* by one or more redactors,

25 FRAUWALLNER 1992, 82-83. FRAUWALLNER’s eclectic translation finds some support in MBh (B) 12.286.19-20, since this text also seems to be a mixture of both theories: *yena paśyati tac cakṣuḥ śṛṇvati śrotam ucyate / jighratī bhavati ghrāṇam rasatī rasanā rasān // 19 // sparśanam sparśatī sparśān buddhir vikriyate ’sakṛt / yadā prārthayate kimcit tadā bhavati sā manaḥ // 20 //*. Cf. FRAUWALLNER 1992, 82, n. 34-36.

26 FRAUWALLNER 1953, 300.

only to be further mutilated in the course of transmission, that hypothesis proves untenable. As we have shown there are clearly different views underlying the dialogues of Yudhiṣṭhira and Bhīṣma (*adhyāya* 187) on the one hand, and that of Śuka and Vyāsa (*adhyāyas* 239-241) on the other. An irreconcilable discrepancy had also been VAN BUITENEN's starting point, but to explain it this scholar applied basically the same method as FRAUWALLNER, though in more textual detail, when he constructed a new, smaller text out of both dialogues: "simply a text legitimately restored on the basis of two incomplete and corrupt versions."²⁷

However, instead of postulating or "restoring" a "Grundtext," we may make another assumption, namely that the redactor(s) of the *Mokṣadharma* was acquainted with various guru-traditions which he aimed to represent in different dialogues. These philosophical lineages may have been closely related, enough to employ the same jargon, including technical terms, expressions, metaphors and even verses; but within them different techniques to obtain inner tranquillity (*yoga*) may have developed, and accordingly different views to account for these experiences.

A scenario opposite to the one proposed by FRAUWALLNER may be envisaged: in the course of composition, redaction, transmission, further revision, and fixation of the *Mokṣadharma* a tendency may have been at work to straighten out contradicting views. If this were the case, the starting point may not have been one "Grundtext" that degenerated into various distorted representations, but rather a plurality of theories and views that found textual expression and was amalgamated in a *parvan* or sub-*parvan*, which became gradually more homogeneous in a process of composition-in-transmission. This process may have been concomitant with the rise of the classical school of Sāṃkhya. In other words, rather than for an underlying unity we should search for diversity behind the apparent homogeneity. Paradoxically, greater philosophical homogeneity may have been accomplished at the cost of more textual inconsistencies. This genetic model would imply that, though the *Mokṣadharma* as we have it offers already a bewildering diversity of often contradicting views, the historical reality at the time of its first composition was still more complex – each ashram, so to speak, having its own competing version of proto-Sāṃkhya philosophy and being keen on having it canonized in the *Smṛti*.

27 VAN BUITENEN 1956, 156.

An original plurality may not only account for the essential differences between both dialogues, but also for unsolved philosophical problems within each. How does the theory of the five *mahābhūtas* and their differentiation within sensitive beings concord with the psychological or ideal world treated in the rest of both dialogues? We are here apparently concerned with a cosmological theory in which God, the *bhūtakṛt* mentioned in 187.7 and 239.6, plays a key role.²⁸ This same theory is found in other chapters of the *Mokṣadharma*, which by FRAUWALLNER are not styled “epische Urform des Sāṃkhya.”

This brings us to our final point. What justification, if any, is there to annex the two dialogues at issue to the Sāṃkhya tradition and not, for instance, the dialogue between Manu and Bṛhaspati? If the hallmark of Sāṃkhya is a rift between the material and ideal world, all three dialogues may be said to belong to the same multifarious stream from which classical Sāṃkhya emerged.

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND ABBREVIATIONS

BAKKER 1982: BAKKER, H. T., “On the Origin of the Sāṃkhya Psychology”, in: *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens* 26 (1982), 117-148.

BrP: *Brahmapurāṇa*, Sanskrit Indices and Text of the Brahmapurāṇa, by Peter SCHREINER and Renate SÖHNEN (Purāṇa Research Publications Tübingen vol.1), Wiesbaden 1987.

VAN BUITENEN 1956: VAN BUITENEN, J. A. B., “Studies in Sāṃkhya I”, in: *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 76 (1956), 153-157 [= *Studies in Indian Literature and Philosophy*, Delhi 1988, 43-52].

VAN BUITENEN 1957a: VAN BUITENEN, J. A. B., “Studies in Sāṃkhya II”, in: *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 77 (1957), 15-25 [= *Studies in Indian Literature and Philosophy*, Delhi 1988, 53-74].

VAN BUITENEN 1957b: VAN BUITENEN, J. A. B., “Studies in Sāṃkhya III”, in: *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 77 (1957), 88-107 [= *Studies in Indian Literature and Philosophy*, Delhi 1988, 75-110].

EDGERTON 1965: EDGERTON, F., *The Beginnings of Indian Philosophy: selections from the Rig Veda, Atharva Veda, Upaniṣads, and Mahābhārata*, translated from the Sanskrit with an introduction, notes and glossarial index by Franklin EDGERTON, London 1965.

28 Cf. MBh 12.121.55, 12.175.16.

FRAUWALLNER 1925a: FRAUWALLNER, E., “Untersuchungen zum Mokṣadharmā (Die nicht-sāṃkhyistischen Texte)”, in: *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 45 (1925), 51-67 [= *Kleine Schriften*, Wiesbaden 1982, 38-54].

FRAUWALLNER 1925b: FRAUWALLNER, E., “Untersuchungen zum Mokṣadharmā (Die sāṃkhyistischen Texte)”, in: *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 32 (1925), 179-206 [= *Kleine Schriften*, Wiesbaden 1982, 55-82].

FRAUWALLNER 1953: FRAUWALLNER, E., *Geschichte der indischen Philosophie*, Band I, Salzburg 1953.

FRAUWALLNER 1992: FRAUWALLNER, E., *Philosophische Texte des Hinduismus*, Nachgelassene Werke II, herausgegeben von G. Oberhammer und C.H. Werba, Wien 1992.

HACKER 1961: HACKER, P., “The Sāṃkhyization of the Emanation Doctrine (Shown in a Critical Analysis of Texts)”, in: *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens* 5 (1961), 75-112 [= *Kleine Schriften* 1978, 167-204].

JOHNSTON 1937: JOHNSTON, E.H., *Early Sāṃkhya: An Essay on its Historical Development according to the Texts*, London 1937.

MBh: *Mahābhārata*, for the first time critically edited by S. K. BELVALKAR, 19 volumes, Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1949-1953.

MBh (B): *The Mahā-bhāratam: with the Bharata Bhawadeepa Commentary of Nīlkaṇṭha*, edited by Pandit R. KINJAWADEKAR, New Delhi 1979.

RÜPING 1977: RÜPING, K., “Zur Emanationslehre im Mokṣadharmā”, in: *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 3 (1977), 3-10.

SCHREINER 1997: SCHREINER, P., *Nārāyaṇīya-Studien*, herausgegeben von Peter Schreiner (Purāṇa research publications Tübingen vol.6), Wiesbaden 1997.

YD: *Yuktidīpikā*, the most significant commentary on the Sāṃkhyakārikā, critically edited by A. WEZLER and S. MOTEGI (Alt- und neu-indische Studien; 44), Stuttgart 1998.

APPENDIX

Some parallels of Mokṣadharmā 187 and 239-241

A

*mahābhūtāni pañcaiva
sarvabhūteṣu bhūtakṛt /
akarot teṣu vaiṣamyam*

*iti tanmayam evedaṃ
sarvaṃ sthāvarajaṅgamam /
sarge ca pralaye caiva
tasmān nirdiśyate tathā //239.5//
mahābhūtāni pañcaiva
sarvabhūteṣu bhūtakṛt /
akarot tāta vaiṣamyam*

tat tu jīvo 'nu paśyati //187.7//

B *ghreyam ghrāṇam śarīram ca
te tu bhūmiguṇās trayah /
mahābhūtāni pañcaiva
saṣṭham tu mana ucyate //187.10//
indriyāṇi manaś caiva
vijñānāny asya bhārata /
saptamī buddhir ity āhuḥ
kṣetrajñah punar aṣṭamah //187.11//*

C *adhiṣṭhānāni buddher hi
prthagarthāni pañcadhā /
pañcendriyāṇi yāny āhus
tāny adrśyo 'dhitiṣṭhati //187.20//*

D *cakṣur ālokanāyaiva
saṁśayam kurute manah /
buddhir adhyavasāya
kṣetrajñah sākṣivat sthitaḥ //187.12//*

*ūrdhvaṁ pādatalābhyāṁ yad
arvāg ūrdhvaṁ ca paśyati /
etena sarvam evedaṁ
viddhy abhivyāptam antaram //187.13//*

E *yena paśyati tac cakṣuḥ
śṛṇoti śrotram ucyate /
jighrati ghrāṇam ity āha
rasaṁ jānāti jihvayā //187.18//*

yasmin yad anupaśyati //239.6//

*Śuka uvāca
akarod yac charīreṣu
katham tad upalakṣayet /
indriyāṇi guṇāḥ kecit
katham tāt upalakṣayet //239.7//*

*ghreyam ghrāṇam śarīram ca
bhūmer ete guṇās trayah //239.11ab//
indriyāṇi nare pañca
saṣṭham tu mana ucyate /
saptamīm buddhim evāhuḥ
kṣetrajñam punar aṣṭamam //239.14//*

*adhiṣṭhānāni vai buddhyā
prthag etāni saṁsmaret //240.9cd//
indriyāṇīti tāny āhus
teṣv adrśyādhiṣṭhati //240.6ab//*

*cakṣur ālokanāyaiva
saṁśayam kurute manah /
buddhir adhyavasānāya
sākṣi kṣetrajña ucyate //239.15//
yathā kūrma ihāṅgāni
prasārya viniyacchati /
evam evendriyagrāmam
buddhiḥ sṛṣṭvā niyacchati //239.17//
yad ūrdhvaṁ pādatalayor
avān mūrdhnaś ca paśyati /
etasminn eva kṛtye vai
vartate buddhir uttamā //239.18//*

*śṛṇvatī bhavati śrotram
sprśatī sparśa ucyate //240.4cd//
paśyantī bhavate drṣṭī
rasatī rasanam bhavet /*

tvacā spr̥ṣati ca sparśān
 buddhir vikriyate 'sakṛt /
 yena saṃkalpayaty arthaṃ
 kimcid bhavati tan manaḥ //187.19//

jighratī bhavati ghrāṇaṃ
 buddhir vikriyate pr̥thak //240.5//
 yadā prārthayate kimcit
 tadā bhavati sā manaḥ //240.9ab//

F

indriyebhyaḥ parā hy arthā
 arthebhyaḥ paramaṃ manaḥ /
 manasas tu parā buddhir
 buddher ātmā paro mataḥ //240.2//
 buddhir ātmā manuṣyasya
 buddhir evātmāno 'tmikā /
 yadā vikurute bhāvaṃ
 tadā bhavati sā manaḥ //240.3//
 indriyānāṃ pr̥thag bhāvād
 buddhir vikriyate hy aṇu //240.4ab//

G sattvakṣetrajñayor etad
 antaraṃ paśya sūkṣmayoḥ /
 sr̥jate tu guṇān eka
 eko na sr̥jate guṇān //187.37//
 maśakodumbarau cāpi
 saṃprayuktau yathā sadā /

sattvakṣetrajñayor etad
 antaraṃ viddhi sūkṣmayoḥ //240.19cd//
 sr̥jate tu guṇān eka
 eko na sr̥jate guṇān //240.20ab//
 maśakodumbarau cāpi
 saṃprayuktau yathā saha //240.21cd//
 iṣikā vā yathā muñje
 pr̥thak ca saha caiva ca /
 tathaiva sahitāv etāv
 anyonyasmin pratiṣṭhitau //240.22//

anyonyam anyau ca yathā
 saṃprayogas tathā tayoh //187.38//
 pr̥thagbhūtau prakṛtyā tau
 saṃprayuktau ca sarvadā /
 yathā matsyo jalaṃ caiva
 saṃprayuktau tathaiva tau //187.39//
 na guṇā vidur ātmānaṃ
 sa guṇān vetti sarvaśaḥ /
 paridraṣṭā guṇānāṃ ca
 saṃsraṣṭā manyate sadā //187.40//

pr̥thagbhūtau prakṛtyā tau
 saṃprayuktau ca sarvadā //240.20cd//
 yathā matsyo 'dbhir anyāḥ san
 saṃprayuktau tathaiva tau //240.21ab//
 na guṇā vidur ātmānaṃ
 guṇān veda sa sarvadā //240.18cd//
 paridraṣṭā guṇānāṃ sa
 sraṣṭā caiva yathātatham //240.19ab//