

Epic Smkhya : texts, teachers, terminology

Autor(en): **Brockington, John**

Objektyp: **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: **01.06.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-147463>

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.

EPIC SĀṂKHYA: TEXTS, TEACHERS, TERMINOLOGY

John Brockington, Edinburgh

The main passages on Sāṁkhya in the *Mahābhārata* are undoubtedly those occurring in the *Mokṣadharmaparvan* (Mbh. 12.168-353) but I shall also take into account certain other passages, including those in which Sāṁkhya is presented as the basis for Yoga.¹ Such passages outside the *Mokṣadharmaparvan* include not just the *Bhagavadgītā* (BhG. 6.23-40) and *Sanatsujātīya* (5.42-45) but also the *Brāhmaṇavyādhasaṁvāda* (3.198-206), which contains an exposition of the Sāṁkhya categories, the *Viduranīti*, which uses Sāṁkhya terminology extensively in its sententious proverbialising, and the *Anugītā* (14.16-50). My aim is to provide a survey of such passages, with some attention also to their linking with various teachers and the terminology employed.² To state my own position at the outset, Sāṁkhya is most probably an ancient trend of thought but it was not a developed system until the time of Īśvarakṛṣṇa. Certainly, a listing of Sāṁkhya and Yoga alongside the Vedas and the Pāñcarātra and Pāśupata systems (*sāṁkhyam yogam pañcarātram vedāḥ pāśupatam tathā*, 12.337.59ab,³ with the supreme sage Kapila as the propounder of Sāṁkhya in 60ab) reveals its lateness by its air of precision as much as by its occurrence within the *Nārāyaṇīya*. It is also worth emphasising in this context the prevalence in the *Mahābhārata* of other less well defined views, such as those which elevate *kāla*, *daiva*, *svabhāva* or the like to the status of supreme principle.

¹ This article develops my treatment of epic Sāṁkhya and Yoga in *The Sanskrit Epics*, Brill, Leiden, 1998, pp. 302-312. It owes much to Peter SCHREINER's comments and to the material of his article published in this issue.

² The passages selected for notice are those which employ terminology typical of classical Sāṁkhya or use the term Sāṁkhya of the views presented therein. The second criterion thus excludes such passages as the *Jāpakopākhyāna* (12.189-193), where *sāṁkhyayogakriyāvidhi* (189.4d) is implicitly contrasted with the practice of *japa*. In addition, the *Nārāyaṇīya* (though mentioning Sāṁkhya very frequently, as well as Yoga) is not separately studied, in view of its full discussion in *Nārāyaṇīya-Studien*, ed. Peter Schreiner, Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 1997.

³ This line also occurs at 1ab, where the second half of the line reads instead *vedāranyakam eva ca* but a substantial number of manuscripts have the same reading as 59b.

Erich FRAUWALLNER, by his inclusion of the *Mokṣadharmā* treatises in his study of the earliest forms of Sāṃkhya, clearly considers a form of Sāṃkhya to be present in the *Mahābhārata*.⁴ However, the precise meaning of the terms is crucial: often *sāṃkhya* and *yoga* mean little more than theory and practice. EDGERTON has rightly insisted that to assume the existence of the systems whenever the terms occur in the *Mokṣadharmā*, *Bhagavadgītā* and other early texts is to commit a fundamental error in historical judgement,⁵ since the terms refer not so much to philosophical positions as to spiritual methodologies: for example, Vasiṣṭha in his discourse to Karāla Janaka (12.291-296), after defining Yoga in terms of *ekāgratā* and *prāṇāyāma* (294.8), affirms that the basis of Sāṃkhya is discrimination and enumeration (294.41).⁶ Again, a mainly Yoga chapter of the *Śukānupraśna* (12.228) refers to the 25 *tattvas* as found in Yoga and Sāṃkhya equally (28), makes the contrast between *vyakta* and *avyakta* the same as between *sattva* and *kṣetrajñā* in terms that seem more Sāṃkhya than Yoga (31), but then talks of the goal for each in slightly different terms (32 and 37). On the other hand, statements distinguishing Sāṃkhya from Yoga (or *sāṃkhyayoga* from *karmayoga*, *dhyānayoga* and so on, such as *nāsti sāṃkhyasamam jñānam nāsti yogasamam balam*, 12.304.2ab, cf.

⁴ Erich FRAUWALLNER, “Untersuchungen zum Mokṣadharmā”, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 45, 1925, pp. 51-67, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 32, 1925, pp. 179-296 and *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 33, 1926, pp. 57-68; also his *Geschichte der indischen Philosophie*, Müller, Salzburg, 1953, vol. I, pp. 275-408. A useful survey of scholarship on epic Sāṃkhya is contained in Gerald LARSON’s *Classical Sāṃkhya: An Interpretation of its History and Meaning*, 2nd edn, Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi, 1979 (especially chapters 1-2).

⁵ Franklin EDGERTON, *The Beginnings of Indian Philosophy*, Allen & Unwin, London, 1965, pp. 35-48 and 255-334. Sāṃkhya and Yoga are commonly both mentioned within one verse – whether to link or to contrast them – especially within the *Nārāyaṇīya* (12.50.32c, 189.4d, 228.28c, 231.3c, 289.1a, 290.100cd, 293.29cd, 30c, 42b, 44c, 294.5c, 295.42acd, 298.8cd, 304.1ab, 2ab, 4ab, 306.12b, 55cd, 65ac, 69c, 76d, 98a, 325.468, 326.100c, 327.24b, 66ab, 328.9a, 334.17c, 335.34d, 74c, 81cd, 85a, 336.69a, 337.1a, 59a, 68a, 338.2b, 339.7cd, 21cd). It is clear that from outside often little difference was seen between them, as when Vaiśampāyana declares that the teachers of Sāṃkhya and Yoga deny the one *puruṣa* and accept many *puruṣas* (12.338.2).

⁶ However, Vasiṣṭha announces that he is moving on from *yogadarśana* to *sāṃkhyajñāna* (294.26) and his definition of Sāṃkhya includes *prakṛti* and the 24 *tattvas* (294.41d-42).

289.2-5) may be seen as part of the process of emergence of the developed schools.

In the *Mokṣadharmā* several teachers are quoted as giving instruction in some form of Sāṃkhya. Some of them can be traced back to the older Upaniṣads and many also appear in the later Purāṇic literature; however, the doctrines attributed to them vary and are not necessarily specific to Sāṃkhya – for example, Jaigīṣavya merely advocates equanimity of mind in his response to Asita Devala at 12.222 and Kapila expounds the desirability of renunciation at 12.261. Three of these teachers are often referred to later as important precursors of the developed Sāṃkhya system: Kapila, Āsuri and Pañcaśikha. These three are presented in that order at 12.211.1-16, where Pañcaśikha Kāpileya arrives at the court of Janaka of Mithilā and is described as looking like Prajāpati Kapila in form, as the first or foremost pupil of Āsuri, and as being born from Āsuri's wife, Kapilā (hence his being Kāpileya, *kāpileyatva*). On the other hand, the only other passage to give any kind of list of teachers – a much longer list – appears to give the names in a random order: Jaigīṣavya, Asita Devala, Parāśara, Vārṣaganya, *bhikṣu* Pañcaśikha, Kapila, Śuka, Gautama, Ārṣiṣeṇa, Garga, Nārada, Āsuri, wise Pulastya, Sanatkumāra, Śukra, father Kaśyapa and then Rudra (12.306.56-60); this cannot be interpreted as a *paramparā* either forwards or backwards.⁷

Āsuri's name occurs only in these two passages and Pañcaśikha's only in the slightly more extended compass of 12.211-212 and 306-8, although Kapila is more widely attested.⁸ Indeed, Asita Devala, under one or both of

⁷ The fact that this list occurs well through the *Mokṣadharmā* may indicate its relative lateness (and so loss of contact with an authentic tradition), if we accept the premise that earlier passages tend to be nearer the beginning and later ones nearer the end of this compilation, but there is no specific evidence to support this. Also, a couple of *adhyāyas* later, Pañcaśikha is described not only as *bhikṣu* but also as belonging to the Pārāśarya gotra (308.24 – and in the preceding verse as propounding the Vaiśeṣika), which raises the possibility that Parāśara in this list is a doublet.

⁸ Incidentally, 211.13 declares that Āsuri attained imperishable Brahman. Kapila occurs in the *Śāntiparvan* at 43.12b, 192.93c, 211.9a, 17a, 212.52d, 260.5c, 290.3d, 306.58b, 323.8c, 326.64c, 327.64c, 330.29b(iic), 30c, 337.60a, 338.6b(iic), Kapilā at 12.211.14c, Kāpila at 12.211.11b, 290.53c, 81b, and Kāpileya at 12.211.6b, 15c(°tva), 16bc(°tva), 18b(iic); the Kapila fire is identified with *kapilo nāma sāmṣhya-yogapravartakaḥ* at 3.211.21cd; see further on Kapila below.

those names, occurs more widely than either Āsuri or Pañcaśikha.⁹ In the *Nāradaśāstra* (12.267) he propounds a cosmological view in which the five *mahābhūtas* evolve out of *kāla* in a scheme which is otherwise similar to others in a Sāṃkhya context (but which has *citta*, *manas* and *buddhi* in ascending order with the functions of awareness, thinking and determining, 16-17), while elsewhere he is one of a group of named *maharṣis* who praise Viṣṇu with verses and gain success by his favour (12.281.14-17). Other names linked elsewhere in the *Mokṣadharmasūtra* with Sāṃkhya ideas include Bhṛgu, Yājñavalkya, Vasiṣṭha, Vyāsa (also termed *sāṃkhyayogavid* at 18.5.33b) and Janaka (indeed, the list just cited comes from the discourse by Yājñavalkya to Janaka), while at 12.327.64-66 the seven mind-born sons of Brahmā – Sana, Sanatsujāta, Sanaka, Sanandana, Sanatkumāra, Kapila and Sanātana – are collectively described as the foremost knowers of Yoga and knowers of the Sāṃkhya *dharma*; Sanatsujāta, of course, is the expounder of the *Sanatsujātīya* and Sanatkumāra is quite commonly mentioned in the *Mokṣadharmasūtra* (12.271.3c, 6a, 59c, 63b, 306.59c, 316.5c, 326.35c, 327.64c, 329.8⁵, 336.37ac).

The *Sanatsujātīya* is probably one of the earliest of the philosophical passages to be included in the *Mahābhārata*; its text shows a great deal of confusion – by no means eliminated even in the Critical Edition – and this may well be an indication of its relatively early date and its popularity. Certainly, its borrowings come from the older literature, especially in *adhyāya* 45, which contains reminiscences of *Atharvaveda* 11.4.20ab, *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* 5.1, *Kaṭha Upaniṣad* 6.9 and 17ab (the last two also found as *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* 4.20 and 3.13ab), as well as the simile of the well in a flood found also in the *Bhagavadgītā* (5.45.23 and BhG. 2.46). It contains little that can be directly linked with Sāṃkhya, although there is a definite Yoga element, and its overall outlook and emphasis on *nivṛtti* seems Vedāntin (as a result presumably of its final redaction); however, knowledge of Brahman is termed *avyaktavidyā* (5.44.2) and Brahman has no colour, does not reside in the five elements, the sun, moon,

⁹ Asita Devala occurs at 12.200.4a, 222.4d, 267.1d, 281.15a and 306.57ab, Devala alone at 12.1.4b, 222.8b, 11b, 267.2a, 306.19a, and Asita alone at 12.222.3d, 326.110b. As the distribution of the single names shows, in several instances they clearly refer to Asita Devala and there is no reason to suppose that they do not always do so.

stars and so forth, nor in the Vedas and the Vedic rituals, yet this whole world is established in it (5.44.19-24).

However, most epic descriptions of Sāṁkhya are not given by Sāṁkhya teachers but are reports of their views. Thus, although these epic passages are not primary sources for knowledge about early Sāṁkhya as such, they do include ideas current at their time. In addition, these passages of the *Mahābhārata*, as well as some later Upaniṣads, may well have been composed during the period when early Sāṁkhya schools were emerging. They may even have preserved some small texts used in the schools for instruction, as HACKER has argued,¹⁰ but their outlook is rather different.

Cosmogony may have been unrelated to Sāṁkhya originally, and as a category it is later richly developed in the Purāṇas, with their clear mythological and theistic emphasis. Certainly, Bhṛgu in the *Bhṛgu-bharadvājasamvāda* (12.175-185) provides an account of the cosmogonic process set within the mythological framework of Brahmā emerging from Viṣṇu's navel and based to a significant extent on early views about the primacy of *prāṇa*.¹¹ The beginningless and endless, unmanifest god (*anādinidhano devaḥ* 175.11c, *avyakta iti vikhyātaḥ* 12a) emitted first the mighty *ākāśa*, from *ākāśa* arose water, from water fire and wind, from fire and wind together arose the earth, *mahī* (13-14); only then is the lotus emitted by the self-born one (i.e. Viṣṇu) and from it arises Brahmā, known as *ahamkāra* and *sarvabhūtātmabhūtakṛt*, to undertake creation (15-16).¹² These ideas are then amplified in a basically materialistic manner in the next *adhyāyas* and the operation of the five winds in the body – *prāṇa*, *apāna*, *vyāna*, *udāna* and *samāna* – is described in some detail (177.24-25 and 178.2-27). The *jīva* is able to perceive only when the senses are joined with the *manas*, which is vital for perception (180.14-18, cf. 176.2 where

¹⁰ Paul HACKER, "The Sāṁkhyization of the Emanation Doctrine shown by a critical analysis of texts", *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens* 5, 1961, pp. 75-112.

¹¹ Whereas the titles of some passages, such as the *Sanatsujātīya* and the *Anugītā*, are attested at a late stage of the text of the *Mahābhārata* (in the *Parvasamgrahaparvan*, at 1.2.33-70), those of passages within the *Mokṣadharmā* occur – often in varying forms – only in the colophons of many manuscripts. However, their occurrence there is an indication that such groups of *adhyāyas* were traditionally regarded as a unit, which for the *saṁvādas* is in any case established by the references within the texts to their speakers at the beginning and end of such passages.

¹² Prajāpati and *ahamkāra* are identical at 12.291.20 and 300.12.

creation is termed *mānasa*); by contrast, *buddhi* and *ahaṃkāra* are hardly mentioned (both together along with *manas* at 178.4 – a probably intrusive verse – and *ahaṃkāra* also at 175.16a, noted above).

Again, in the *Manubrhaspatisaṃvāda* (12.194-199), Manu states that from the imperishable self (*akṣara*), *kha* is born, then in turn *vāyu*, *jyotiḥ*, *jala* and *jagatī* (195.1) and he continues that the embodied self came into contact with the five elements and the five senses depend respectively on the qualities of the five elements. At a subsequent point in the discourse, a hierarchy is given which places *manas* above the senses, *buddhi* higher again, *jñāna* above *buddhi* and the supreme beyond *jñāna* (197.10-11, cf. 19); although this now includes *buddhi*, though hardly in the classical form, there is only one reference to *ahaṃkāra* (198.16c).

Similarly, the *Vārṣṇeyādhyātma* (12.203-210), which is enclosed in a broadly theistic but quite possibly later framework, incorporates elements of an early cosmogony, but one which now includes *buddhi*, *ahaṃkāra* and *manas*. To his pupil's initial question about where they both had come from, its anonymous teacher replies that Vāsudeva Vārṣṇeya is everything and that he causes the emanation and dissolution of the universe, being the unmanifest, eternal Brahman (203.7-9). The sequence of evolution is then given as *avyakta*, *buddhi*, *ahaṃkāra*, *ākāśa*, *vāyu*, *tejas*, *āpas*, *vasudhā*, followed by five *jñānendriyas*, five *karmendriyas* and their five *viśayas*, with *manas* as the sixteenth (203.25-27, cf. 298.11-14). The *guṇas*, *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*, are listed at 206.12 (cf. also 205.29, whereas at 203.33ab *sattva* is equivalent to *buddhi*) and their action is described in the next few verses in a manner fairly close to the classical scheme, but at 209.16 *tamas* is opposed to *tapas* (which at 210.15 pervades the triple world). After indicating the usefulness of Yoga techniques and commenting on the similar status of *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* (210.6-12), the dialogue then emphasises the role of intuition in being freed from the mortal world and becoming Brahman, which is going to the blessed, unborn, divine Viṣṇu, who is called the unmanifest (210.28-30).

This passage incidentally preserves the older scheme of the eightfold *prakṛti*, which here (*mūlaprakṛtayo 'ṣṭau*, 203.26c), at 294.27-29 (along with sixteen modifications, within the discourse between Vasiṣṭha and Karāla Janaka, 12.291-6) and at 298.10-12 (within the dialogue between Yājñavalkya and Janaka, 12.298-306) comprise *avyakta*, *buddhi*, *ahaṃkāra* and the five gross elements, although variations are frequent (for example, the senses instead of the elements at 12.267.16 and the *manas* for *avyakta* at

BhG. 7.4), and in two passages within the late *Nārāyaṇīya* the eight *prakṛtis* are identified with Marīci, Aṅgiras, Atri, Pulastya, Pulaha, Kratu, Vasiṣṭha and Manu Svāyambhuva (12.322.27-28 and 327.29-30, with seven *prakṛtis* being distinct from Svāyambhuva as the eighth at 12.322.28ab) and the eleven Rudras are the *vikāras* (327.31).

An early form of Sāṁkhya is found in the *Adhyātmakathana* (12.187, repeated with some significant variations at 12.239-41). This passage exemplifies the first of FRAUWALLNER's three stages of development of Sāṁkhya before Īśvarakṛṣṇa, in which there is no evolutionary doctrine and analysis begins with the five gross elements.¹³ Also, in this early speculation (e.g. at 12.187.14), the *guṇas* are called *bhāvas* and are basically psychical qualities: *sattva* (goodness), *rajas* (passion) and *tamas* (dullness). In fact, in the varying usage of the terms *bhāva* and *guṇa*, there are traces of a synthesis between ancient cosmological speculations and yogic theories of evolution. The *bhūtātmā* (= *jīva*) creates the five *mahābhūtas* and withdraws them again like the tortoise drawing in its limbs (187.4-7);¹⁴ the senses and their objects and the organs of action are produced from the elements, but *manas* is the sixth *tattva*, *buddhi* the seventh and *kṣetrajña* the eighth as the *sākṣin* (8-12); the position of *buddhi* next to *kṣetrajña* suggests that its role is analogous to that of the later *prakṛti*. Later within this passage *sattva* and *kṣetrajña* are equal but distinct: one (*sattva*) emits the *guṇas* and one (*kṣetrajña*) does not (37, cf. 42-43) and the wise individual who realises this gains his *svabhāva* (47-48);

¹³ FRAUWALLNER, "Untersuchungen zum Mokṣadharmā", II. The Bombay edition contains three versions of this passage but its 12.286[5] is lacking in several manuscripts and its readings are given by the Critical Edition in App.II.1 as variants to 12.187. It is translated by EDGERTON, *The Beginnings of Indian Philosophy*, pp. 256-60, analysed by J. A. B. VAN BUITENEN, "Studies in Sāṁkhya (I)", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 76, 1956, pp. 153-157 (cf. also the sequels (II) and (III) in *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 77, 1957, pp. 15-25 and 88-107), and re-examined by Hans BAKKER, "On the Origin of the Sāṁkhya Psychology", *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 26, 1982, pp. 117-148. The latest study of 12.187 and 239-41 is that by Peter BISSCHOP elsewhere in this issue.

¹⁴ It is clear that the *bhūtātman* is here the individual self (EDGERTON's "elemental self"), the *jīva* of 7d, despite Anima SEN GUPTA's claim that it stands for the *buddhi* (*The Evolution of the Sāṁkhya School of Thought*, 2nd edn, Munshiram Manoharlal, New Delhi, 1986, p.68). However, at 12.200.8 (cf. verse 11), Viṣṇu, described as *bhūtātmā mahātmā puruṣottamaḥ*, creates the five elements (*vāyur jyotiḥ tathā cāpaḥ khaṁ gāṁ caivānvakalpayat*, 8cd).

svabhāva appears as the highest category also at 12.195.21d, 204.3c, 215.27a and 229.6d. It must be noted that *ahamkāra* is absent throughout; since this principle usually appears in enumerations of Sāṃkhya *tattvas* in the *Mokṣadharmā* and is found already in Aśvaghoṣa's treatment of Sāṃkhya, this argues for an early date for this text-group. In addition, as FRAUWALLNER has indicated, the fact that this text-group is textually so corrupt is another pointer to an early date.

In FRAUWALLNER's second stage the theory of evolution is introduced and the classical notion of *prakṛti* and the three *guṇas* is developed. He traces the doctrine of evolution to the speculations about the ages and periods of the world as they emerge from Brahmā, identifying the *Śukānupraśna* (12.224-247) as an example of such speculation, and assigning this stage to Pañcaśikha, whom he also credits with adding the notion of *ahamkāra* and standardising the *tattvas* at 25;¹⁵ however, a major obstacle to his interpretation is the absence of the term *ahamkāra* from any of the *Mahābhārata* passages associated in any way with Pañcaśikha.¹⁶ FRAUWALLNER's third stage sees the addition of various further doctrines and was probably spread over a long period. He sees the introduction of the sixty topics (which include the ten basic principles dealing with the nature of *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* and the fifty *bhāvas*, attributed to Vārṣaganya) as being of major significance for Sāṃkhya psychology.

The views attributed to Pañcaśikha in the *Mokṣadharmā* seem quite different from those that can be pieced together from the occasional quotations ascribed to him in later texts; this could be resolved by positing more than one Pañcaśikha but it seems better to assume that Pañcaśikha was simply a respected name from the past, to which therefore a variety of

¹⁵ It is not clear whether *Mahābhārata* passages giving different totals of *tattvas* derive from an earlier period or merely reflect the heterogeneity of the material. For example, seventeen are mentioned at 12.267.28 (also at 12.231.15) but twenty at 267.30, just two verses later.

¹⁶ Within the *Śāntiparvan*, *ahamkāra* occurs at 104.22b, 152.30c(*nir-*), 175.16a, 21a, 178.4c, 184.15a, 189.17a, 190.5a(iic), 198.16c, 203.25bc, 204.10b, 205.18d, 19d, 20c, 206.4cd, 12d, 15c, 215.4c, 29a(*nir-*), 218.38b(*an-*), 221.45c, 223.5d, 228.14d, 25a, 33a(*an-*), 261.48d(iic), 262.6b(*nir-*), 276.20a, 291.20c, 21c, 23ac, 294.28ac, 295.6ac, 36b(iic), 37b(iic), 298.11b, 17a, 18a, 299.7a, 9a, 300.12bc, 301.22c, 304.15ac, 306.103c, 312.10a, 326.39d, 58c(iic), 327.26e, 27c, 335.18c (also *ahamkārika* 301.12a and *āhamkārika* 298.18d, 306.103b). As the forms *anahamkāra* and *nirahamkāra* illustrate, its use is in any case often non-technical.

views could be ascribed. The main *Mokṣadharmā* passage is the *Pañcaśikhavākya* (12.211-212), with which may be compared the account of Sāṃkhya given in the *Carakasamhitā*, as well as a long dialogue between Kapila and Āsuri which has been relegated to App.I.29 in the Critical Edition.¹⁷ But another brief dialogue attributed to Pañcaśikha (12.307, *Pañcaśikhajanakasamvāda*) has no obvious relevance to Sāṃkhya, although in the next *adhyāya*, the *Sulabhājanakasamvāda*, Janaka declares that he is Pañcaśikha's pupil (terming him *sāṃkhyamukhya* at 308.27a).

The *Pañcaśikhavākya* first identifies Kapila, the mythical founder of Sāṃkhya, with Prajāpati at 12.211.9; this recalls *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* 5.2, where Kapila being born in the beginning is Hiranyagarbha (elsewhere in the Upaniṣad identified with Rudra); incidentally, Kapila himself, in addition to this identification with Prajāpati and his expounding of the desirability of renunciation at 12.261, is also mentioned by Vaiśampāyana as the promulgator of Sāṃkhya, as Hiranyagarbha is of Yoga, at 12.337.60 (cf. *kapilo nāma sāṃkhyayogapravartakaḥ* at 3.211.21cd), while Hiranyagarbha is also the first in the line of teachers at 12.296.44 and Rudra is the first teacher of Yoga at 12.304.5ab. Kapila is also accorded divine status elsewhere, since he is identified with Viṣṇu or Hari (3.45.25) and by Sāṃkhya teachers with Vāsudeva (12.326.64 and 330.30). In addition, he is one of the speakers in the *Kapilagosamvāda* (12.260-262), while the other is the sage Syūmarāśmi who has entered the body of a cow that Nahuṣa is about to slaughter for Tvaṣṭṛ; however, the subjects of their discourse are the tension between the performance of sacrifices and *ahimsā* and that between the *āśramas* of the householder and the renouncer – there is no mention of Sāṃkhya or Yoga and no real sign of distinctively Sāṃkhya terminology.

The *Pañcaśikhavākya* then records that Pañcaśikha, the first or leading pupil of Āsuri, was celebrating a 1000-year sacrifice when the great doctrine of Kapila appeared before him in an aura of human form (*maṇḍalam puruṣāvastham*) and imparted to him *avyakta*, the highest truth,

¹⁷ Aśvaghoṣa's *Buddhacarita* 12.15-44 contains quite a systematic account of Sāṃkhya, which shows similarities to both of these. V. M. BEDEKAR rebuts the similarity with Caraka in "Studies in Sāṃkhya: Pañcaśikha and Caraka", *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 38, 1957, pp. 140-147 and analyses the *Mahābhārata* passage in "Studies in Sāṃkhya: the teachings of Pañcaśikha in the Mahābhārata", *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 38, 1957, pp. 233-44. The similarities seem to lie in the terminology rather than in the overall conceptualisation.

after which Pañcaśikha realised the distinction between *kṣetra* and *kṣetrājña* (12.211.10-12). Next Pañcaśikha expounds *nirveda* – a term absent from classical Sāṃkhya – as the means to release (211.19-21, n.b. *sāṃkhyam* in 19d) and this leads by stages into a refutation of views on rebirth which are not named but are clearly Buddhist (211.30-37). Despite FRAUWALLNER's arguments, both Pañcaśikha and Caraka accept 24 rather than 25 principles, although in 12.308 a system of thirty *tattvas* understood theistically is ascribed to Pañcaśikha. Janaka's questions to Pañcaśikha in 212.2-4 about the desirability of release are interesting, since they appear to suggest the inadequacy of *mokṣa* achieved through Sāṃkhya from a Vedāntin standpoint, which is echoed by Pañcaśikha himself (212.40-44), from which HOPKINS concluded that the whole passage is a "brahmaist" reworking of an older Sāṃkhya text.¹⁸ Certainly, in these verses Pañcaśikha declares that the *kṣetrājña* is eternal but loses its individuality on gaining *mokṣa*, just as rivers flow into the sea. At an earlier point in the passage, the emphasis seems also to be on the individual, when the five elements form the constituents of the body, joined and sundered by *svabhāva*, and the bodily principles (*dhātu* – another term absent from classical Sāṃkhya) are the senses and their objects, *svabhāva*, *cetanā*, *manas*, and the modifications *prāṇa* and *apāna* (12.212.6-9, contrast verse 34 where *citta* is the eleventh and *buddhi* the twelfth), while in the following verse *citta*, apparently a synonym for *manas*, precedes the *guṇas* (= *indriyas*). The usage of the term *guṇa* in this *adhyāya* is very varied.¹⁹

The first chapter of the *Śukānupraśna* or *Vyāsaśukasamvāda* (12.224-247) comprises a cosmogonic text which perhaps predates the Christian era, according to HACKER.²⁰ This served in his view as a model for the kind of teaching manual, composed at the latest in the 3rd century A.D., which expounded the evolution of the world according to a form of the Sāṃkhya system and is largely preserved in different versions in seven Purāṇas. A

¹⁸ E. W. HOPKINS, *Ethics of India*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1924, p. 151.

¹⁹ For further details see Shujun MOTEGI, "The teaching of Pañcaśikha in the Mokṣadharmā" elsewhere in this issue.

²⁰ Paul HACKER, "The Sāṃkhyization of the Emanation Doctrine shown by a critical analysis of texts", *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens* 5, 1961, pp. 75-112. It is worth noting that this *adhyāya* is over twice the average length at 75 verses, whereas the final *adhyāyas* of the *Śukānupraśna* (241-47) are much shorter than average. A modified version of these instructional tracts was incorporated into the opening *adhyāya* of the *Manusmṛti*.

tract on the divisions of time (224.12-21) precedes one on the qualities of the Yugas (22-27) and one on cosmogony (31-38). At the end of the world-night, Brahmā awakes, differentiates the unchanging (*akṣayya*, 224.31b – some Malayāḷam mss read *avyakta*) and emits *mahad bhūta*, from which comes *manas*, termed *vyaktātma* (so the text of 31d – HACKER regards the variant reading *vyaktāvyaktātma* as original, which would mean that *manas* is the *mahad bhūta*, not evolved from it); he then emits the seven *mānasas*; from *manas* in turn comes *ākāśa*, whose *guṇa* is sound, from ether comes *vāyu*, whose *guṇa* is touch, and so on (31-38),²¹ but each element also possesses the *guṇas* of the preceding elements (39). HACKER sums up its differences from the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* schema as follows: *avyakta*, the unevolved cause or primary matter, is distinct from *pradhāna*, the first product of its evolution; the evolution of the *tanmātras* is combined with that of the gross elements; the ten senses are the products of *taijasa* emanation; and *manas* seems not to have been mentioned in the oldest form of the text. It is worth noting that there is no mention here of *buddhi* and *ahaṃkāra* either, while the varying position – or none – assigned to *manas* here (where it is prominent) and in other passages is certainly some argument against its presence originally in the scheme. Klaus RÜPING has now identified the sources for the mention of seven *puruṣas* here (224.41) as *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* 2.1 (in which the five elements arise directly from the *ātman* and give rise to the *puruṣa*) and *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 6.1.1.2ff. (dealing with seven separate *puruṣas* which unite to form one *puruṣa*, the creator Prajāpati).²²

Later in the *Śukānupraśna* – which is decidedly heterogeneous – the elements are listed in ascending order: *indriyas*, *indriyārthas*, *manas*, *buddhi*, *mahān ātmā*, *avyakta*, *amṛta* (12.238.3-4, virtually identical apart from the naming of the highest entity as *amṛta* rather than *puruṣa* with *Kaṭha Upaniṣad* 1.3.10-11); here, then, *buddhi* is included in the scheme and is superior to *manas*, but *ahaṃkāra* is absent. This passage also includes the somewhat enigmatic prescription that the ascetic (*yati*) should make his

²¹ 12.224.32 recurs at 12.232.9, with the important difference of the reading *rasaḥ* for *jagat* in the second *pāda* (found as a variant in a substantial number of mss at 224.32b). In 12.231-2 Vyāsa expounds first the Sāṃkhya and then the Yoga method of realising Brahman.

²² Klaus RÜPING, “Zur Emanationslehre im Mokṣadharmā”, *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 3, 1977, pp. 3-10. Since 12.228 was commented on earlier, it is passed over at this point.

thought enter into *sattva*, since it is not clear whether *sattva* is being used to mean the *buddhi* or “goodness” (238.9-10; at 245.3-4 it clearly does mean the latter); incidentally, the term *yati* is applied to Sāṃkhya and Yoga followers elsewhere too (e.g. 12.335.85ab) and even to Kapila (at 12.290.3cd, where he is also *īśvara*). Yet another scheme, still further removed from the classical Sāṃkhya list, is given in the *Śukānupraśna* (at 12.244): the five elements, *bhāva* and *abhāva*, and *kāla* (along with the senses and organs relating to the elements, 2-8), with *manas* as the ninth, *buddhi* as the tenth and the *antarātmā* as the eleventh (10); *buddhi* is defined as having the nature of resolve or intention and *manas* that of discrimination (11). An interesting metaphor is elaborated at 246.9-14, where the body is compared to a city over which the *buddhi* rules, with *manas* as the executive (*arthacintaka*) and the senses as the citizens, and in which two dreadful diseases, *tamas* and *rajas*, are liable to destroy its stability.

The *Vasiṣṭhakarājanakasamvāda* (12.291-6) seems to have greater coherence, although it gives the impression of being a late theistic reshaping of older material.²³ One pointer to its lateness is the occurrence, noted above, of the rare technical terms *ekāgratā* and *prāṇāyāma*.²⁴ Another is the overall mythological framework where Śambhu creates Hiranyagarbha and *buddhi* as the first stage, and so on (291.15-28). Nevertheless, elsewhere – as part of teachings explicitly identified as Sāṃkhya – *avyakta* is termed *kṣetra*, *sattva* and *īśvara* whereas the twentyfifth *tattva* is *anīśvara* and *atattva* (294.40, and *nistattva* at 42d) or again *avyakta* is equated with *avidyā* and the twentyfifth with *vidyā* (295.1-3). Perhaps the most

²³ Teun GOUDRIAAN examines this passage in “The Stages of Awakening in the Svachchanda-Tantra”, *Ritual and Speculation in Early Tantrism: Studies in Honor of André Padoux*, ed. Teun Goudriaan, Albany N.Y., 1992, pp. 139-173 (especially pp. 140-147, also pp. 155-160). Interestingly, GOUDRIAAN suggests (p. 146) on the grounds of inconsistencies between the earlier and later parts of 12.296 that “at least the passage from 294,1 to 296,40 is an interpolation containing a restatement of the earlier exposition” and that “the positions taken in the latter part (294-296) seem to indicate a certain development or, perhaps better, a change of emphasis, with respect to the earlier chapters (291-293).”

²⁴ *ekāgratā* occurs only at 12.198.6c and 294.8a and *prāṇāyāma* only at 294.8bc and 304.9bc; *ekāgramanas* (not found in *adhyāya* 294) occurs more often at 12.20.2d, 35.9d, 56.28d, 322.29a, 323.32e (°tva) and 325.3a but half its occurrences are in a Pāñcarātrin context, as is exclusively the case with *ekāntin* (13 occurrences between 12.323 and 12.336).

interesting feature of the passage is the assertion that what comes from *prakṛti* is of three genders but that the *līṅgin* (i.e. *puruṣa*) is neither male nor non-male (293.36).

In the *Śāntiparvan* Sāṃkhya is typically *anīśvara*, unlike Yoga. The *Yogakathana* (12.289) clearly differentiates *sāṃkhyayoga* from other kinds of Yoga and states that Sāṃkhya is non-theistic, emphasises knowledge as the only means of salvation, and relies mainly on accepted teaching as a means of knowledge; Yoga, on the other hand, is theistic, emphasises the power and strength of bodily discipline, and relies mainly on immediate perception as a means of knowledge; the passage also declares at verse 9 that the “views”, *darśana*, are not the same in the two systems, although it is not made clear just what this means and the impression is given that the process of differentiation is still taking place. In the next *adhyāya* (*Sāṃkhyakathana* / *Sāṃkhyavarṇana*) Bhīṣma further elaborates on the significance of Sāṃkhya, which is the highest knowledge on which other views rely (12.290.103, cf. 95-6); the main interest of this passage is that *sattva* is described as *daśaguṇa* and so on down to one, in an almost palindromic list (*sattva, rajas, tamas, buddhi, nabhas, manas, buddhi, tamas, rajas, sattva*), and is presumably equivalent to *buddhi* (290.14-16).

Nevertheless, the *Mokṣadharma* also contains a theistic version of Sāṃkhya, since several passages propound Nārāyaṇa as the 26th *tattva*. Three schools are mentioned: those who admit 24 categories, those who admit 25, and those who correctly admit 26 – the last a supreme being, as Yājñavalkya makes clear when narrating to Janaka his replies to the twenty-four questions put by the Gandharva Viśvāvasu (12.306.27-55,²⁵ seen in more impersonal terms in Bhīṣma’s summary of Yājñavalkya’s views at the end of the chapter as *kṣetrajñavit... tattvam* at 107cd; cf. also 12.187.37-39, 240.19-21, 296.22-26 and 303.13-18). The distinction between *kṣetra* and *kṣetrajña* is explained in detail and this perceiving self is set over against the 24 categories of *prakṛti* constituting the sphere of empirical knowledge. This perceiving self is not the real doer and enjoyer but simply the pure witness-consciousness. But both it and *prakṛti*, though independent of each other, are dependent on a further principle, *puruṣottama*, which is the final abode of the whole creation. While there are various differences from the

²⁵ Phyllis GRANOFF, in her article in this issue, notes that Vidyānandin’s description of Sāṃkhya in his *Satyāśāsanaparīkṣā* is closer in this respect to Mbh. 12.306 than to the *Sāṃkhyakārikā*.

classical Sāṃkhya, the passage definitely says that all sufferings are due to false identification of *prakṛti* and *kṣetrajña* and that final liberation will be effected by recognising the distinction between spirit and matter.

However, some of the passages asserting a 26th principle do not imply the later Yoga notion of a lord as a kind of super-soul, but rather mean the *puruṣa* or *kṣetrajña* in its enlightened state (e.g. 12.296, especially verse 11), and in several passages a non-theistic doctrine seems clearly implied: for example, in 12.241.1 the *kṣetrajña* is equated with the *īśvara*. But in the *Bhagavadgītā*, which probably represents a more developed position and certainly shows a clear theistic emphasis, the tendency is to relate the highest principle which is beyond the 25 to Kṛṣṇa. Its second chapter defines *sāṃkhyayoga* as a kind of Yoga distinct from *karmayoga*, *dhyānayoga*, and so on. The seventh chapter presents a clearly theistic account of *sāṃkhyayoga*, in which the eightfold *prakṛti* is called Kṛṣṇa's "lower nature" (7.4) and described as his *māyā*,²⁶ and the start of the thirteenth chapter provides yet another account, which seems considerably later and close to the classical scheme (significantly chapter 13 is the only one in which either *kṣetrajña* or *kṣetra* appears, apart from the opening verse of the whole text, where *kṣetra* is used in a rather different sense), while 14.5-21 presents the *guṇas* in the dual role of psychological qualities and constituents of *prakṛti*. In general, the *Bhagavadgītā* seems to view *sāṃkhya* and *yoga* as complementary techniques leading to the same goal: "mere children declare them to be distinct, not the wise" (5.4ab, cf. more generally 5.2-5 and 4.33+38).

Cosmological concepts which one readily associates with Sāṃkhya and their mirror image in the process of dissolution are both found within the *Yājñavalkyaśaṅkṣā* (12.298-306) but, while the passage as a whole seems relatively structured, the details of the various schemes differ. Yājñavalkya first lists the eight *prakṛtis* and their sixteen *vikāras* (where *ahamkāra* appears among the *prakṛtis* and *manas* among the *vikāras*, 298.10-15, but in 16-20 *manas* is above the elements, next to *ahamkāra*); he then expounds the nine stages of creation, followed (in 12.299) by an account of the length of time required by *avyakta*, *mahat* and *ahamkāra* to

²⁶ In its use elsewhere of *adhiṣṭhāna* to describe the relationship of the deity to the world the *Bhagavadgītā* seems to subscribe to the view that the world arises out of the being of the deity (*adhiṣṭhāna* occurs at BhG 3.40b and 18.14a, and *adhiṣṭhāya* at 4.6c and 15.9c; cf. BhG 9.8-10, also Mbh. 12.187.20a+21a, 203.23ab, 240.6b,9a, etc.).

produce their respective evolutes. Next he describes the reverse process at the *pralaya*, when the elements merge successively into each other, *ākāśa* into *manas*, *manas* into *ahamkāra*, *ahamkāra* into *mahān ātmā* and *mahān ātmā* into Śambhu Prajāpati (12.300.6-13, the last verse mentioning Śambhu being very similar to 12.291.15, within the *Vasiṣṭhakarāla-janakasaṃvāda*); as this précis shows, the sequence is not precisely the same. Yet another variant follows, in which the senses of perception and the organs of action, *manas*, *ahamkāra* and *buddhi*, located in the individual (*adhyātma*), are each assigned separate spheres of activity in the material world (*adhibhūta*) and deities in the celestial world (*adhidaivata*), in a heavily formulaic presentation (12.301.1-13); the later part of this *adhyāya* (20-27) then elaborates on the qualities associated with *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*, here obviously viewed in a manner similar to classical Sāṃkhya, whereas elsewhere *sattva* often stands rather alone, as VAN BUITENEN has argued.²⁷ The dialogue is not, however, solely concerned with material of broadly Sāṃkhya character and, for example, in 12.304, Yājñavalkya expounds Yoga concepts and affirms that the eightfold Yoga is found in the Vedas (7ab). There is, indeed, throughout the dialogue a definite pattern of invoking Vedic authority for the teachings given, including Yājñavalkya's account of how he came to compose the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* (12.306.9-25, cf. Kṛṣṇa's statement that he revealed Yoga to Vivasvat in the beginning, BhG 4.1), while Yājñavalkya continues on a theistic note, as indicated above, and Viśvāvasu appeals to a different form of authority through the list of seventeen teachers, mentioned earlier.

Despite its name the next *adhyāya*, the *Pañcaśikhajanakasamvāda* (12.307), provides nothing that can be linked to Pañcaśikha or even to Sāṃkhya in general; its function seems to be simply to provide a lead-in to the next *adhyāya*, the lengthy *Sulabhājanakasamvāda*, where Janaka declares that he is Pañcaśikha's pupil (12.308.24). However, the general orientation of Sāṃkhya towards liberation is underlined in this episode, where Sulabhā, a female teacher of Sāṃkhya, challenges Janaka and enters his mind to test his claims to detachment; she is here termed a *bhikṣukī*, established in *yogadharma* and she wanders the earth alone (thus showing the irrelevance of gender distinctions to *nivṛtti*). Within this comes a listing of the *guṇas* which follows the ten senses and *manas* with *buddhi* as the

²⁷ "Studies in Sāṃkhya III", pp. 95-100. For further detailed discussion of 12.298-306 see Peter SCHREINER's article in this issue.

twelfth, above which is *sattva* (“by which a person is measured as *mahāsattva* or *alpasattva*”), and the fourteenth is the *kṣetrajña* (12.308.103-5), the enumeration continuing up to 31 *kalās* (*ekaviṃśaś ca daśa ca kalāḥ saṃkhyānataḥ smṛtāḥ* 112ab), illustrating yet again the fluidity of the terminology.

Indeed, Sāṃkhya had not assumed its later distinctive shape even by the end of the epic period, where the nearest approach to the classical system is found in the very late *Anugītā* (at 14.40-42, cf. 49), which also incorporates significant Yoga elements. In the *Anugītā* the scheme of evolution, when condensed from its rather prolix enumeration, appears to be from *prakṛti* to *mahān ātmā* to *ahaṃkāra*, which gives rise to *karmendriyas*, *manas* and *prthivī*, *prthivī* then gives rise to *gandha*, *vāyu* and *ghrāṇa*, *vāṃyu* to *sparśa*, *ākāśa* and *tvac*, *ākāśa* to *śabda*, *āpas* and *śrotra*, *āpas* to *rasa*, *tejas* and *jihvā*, and *tejas* to *rūpa* and *cakṣuḥ*. Elsewhere (14.48.9), the *Anugītā* seems to contradict the assertion of the equality of *sattva* and *kṣetrajña* at 12.187.37 / 240.19-20, especially since it continues with the analogy of the gnat and the fig (12.187.38, 12.240.21, 14.48.11).²⁸

Probably also late is the *Brāhmaṇavyādhasaṃvāda* (3.198-206), on the evidence both of the numerous correspondences with other parts of the *Mahābhārata* (best explained as borrowings) and of the teachings incorporated in it.²⁹ Here the butcher answers Kauśika’s question about the five *mahābhūtas* and their *guṇas*, by declaring that they are earth, water, fire, wind and *ākāśa* and that earth has five properties, water four, fire three, wind two and ether one (202.1-7); what is created by the senses is the manifest and what is above the senses and definable as the *liṅga* is the unmanifest (202.11). After thus expounding the categories in a form that seems quite close to classical Sāṃkhya, the butcher then defines the entire Yoga method as control of the senses and elaborates the chariot metaphor

²⁸ I am indebted for this point to Peter BISSCHOP (cf. his article in this issue).

²⁹ The parallels with the rest of the *Mahābhārata* are as follows: 3.198.63-64 cf. 12.39.10-11, 3.198.67 cf. 5.40.20 and 12.309.16, 3.200.7 etc. cf. 12.318.1 etc., 3.200.32-33 cf. 12.316.25-26, 3.200.35-38 cf. 12.316.54-58, 3.202.7-10 cf. 6.6.6c-10b, 3.202.11 cf. 12.182.15 = 12.316.49, 3.202.20 = 5.33.70, 3.202.21 cf. 5.34.57, 3.202.24 cf. 6.24.67, 3.203.39-40 cf. 12.182.9-10 etc., 3.203.43 cf. 12.182.11 and 6.26.19 (BhG), 3.203.44cd cf. 6.28.23ab (BhG), 3.203.45ab cf. 12.182.12ab, 154.27cd, 269.5ab and 316.18ab, 3.203.46-48 cf. 12.316.19-20+22 (47-48 cf. also 12.182.13-14), 3.203.50 cf. 12.317.17, 3.206.16-17 cf. 12.317.4+8.

(202.18-23, cf. 5.34.57 and 12.231.11-12), before explaining, at the request of the brāhman, *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas* (203.2-12, cf. also 31) and the role of the *prāṇas* (203.15-28).

Vidura's sententious moralising to Yudhiṣṭhira (the *Viduranīti*, 5.33-40, immediately preceding the more significant *Sanatsujātīya*, already discussed) contains little of intellectual value and so has been relatively neglected by scholars. Nevertheless, it is relevant in that it demonstrates the extent to which ideas and terminology that we associate with Sāṁkhya had already become part of the common currency of ideas by the time of its composition. Once again, the numerous correspondences with other parts of the *Mahābhārata* suggest its overall lateness.³⁰ These include the chariot metaphor, just noted (5.34.57, cf. 3.202.21). As far as terminology is concerned, it has frequent references to *indriya*, *guṇa*, *prāṇa*, *buddhi* and *bhāva*, occasional mentions of *apāna*, *tamas*, *yoga* and *sattva*, and single occurrences of *indriyārtha* (5.34.52a), *kṣetrajña* (5.33.81c) and *prakṛti* (5.37.45d), but no mention of *rajas* (or *rājasa*, or indeed *tāmasa* and *sāttvika*). That these terms are not always used in the same sense as in Sāṁkhya – for instance at 5.35.45a the eight *guṇas* are good qualities (cf. 5.37.25d) – merely underlines the point that what is visible here is the popularisation of the general ideas even before they had reached their classical form.

On the other hand, non-technical use – or rather a different technical use – of vocabulary occurs even in the *Mokṣadharma*: a particularly striking example is the occurrence of *guṇa*, “bowstring”, at 12.231.27d and 314.27d, especially when put alongside the frequency of *dviguṇa*, *triguṇa*, *caturguṇa* and so on to mean “twofold” and the like, whereas *traiguṇya* occurs only at 12.332.17a (and is, for example, completely absent from the *Āśvamedhikaparvan*). Again, *prāṇa* is as common in the *Rājadharmā* and *Āpaddharma parvans* (usually meaning “life”) as in the *Mokṣadharmaparvan*. Similarly, *pradhāna* is as frequent in the *Rājadharmā* and *Āpaddharma* as in the *Mokṣadharma* and even there only a minority of its

³⁰ These parallels are too numerous to list here; there are at least 36, varying in length from one line to three verses. The high proportion of parallels to other parts of the *Udyogaparvan* strongly suggests that it is a late part of that book, while the parallels with 1.87, 2.57, 3.202 and 12.288, among others, point to very late eclectic borrowing from the entire *Mahābhārata*. The passage also contains a large number of verses in common with the extant *Manusmṛti*.

occurrences are as a synonym or equivalent for *prakṛti*.³¹ Some of the more clearly technical terms of classical Sāṃkhya are less frequent than might be expected, for example *indriyagrāma*, *karmendriya* and *jñānendriya*, all less frequent than *mahān ātmā* with its echoes of Upaniṣadic concepts.³²

Finally, not so much a conclusion as a further comment. Occasional remarks on the relative chronology of various passages within the *Mokṣadharma* (as well as elsewhere in the *Mahābhārata*) might suggest that a line of development is being traced. However, it is probably a mistake to suppose that in our present state of knowledge we can place these texts in a neat developmental sequence, still less the incidental allusions. The available evidence points rather to a number of separate and tentative beginnings, some of which proved blind alleys and others of which led somewhere, but often only after interacting with other patterns of thought and being profoundly modified in the process. They are indeed “beginnings” rather than anything that could be termed a “school”, and it is probably misguided to associate them with particular teachers. While the various schemes given in the texts surveyed mostly give the impression of being in some degree precursors of the classical Sāṃkhya, they also suggest that the process was by no means one of simple linear evolution. Careful attention to the terminology may offer clues towards the process and, as our understanding of the textual history of the *Mahābhārata* increases, it may become possible to give greater definition to this process but a completely coherent scheme will probably always be a chimæra.

³¹ These are its occurrences at 285.28d, 34a, 302.1a, 306.69b, 325.3¹⁰, 327.25b, 335.16b, 40d and 82b. It occurs 44 times in all in the *Śāntiparvan* (but is absent from the *Sanatsujātīya* and the *Bhagavadgītā*, as well as from the dialogue of the brāhman and the butcher).

³² *mahān ātmā* occurs at 12.203.35c, 231.16d, 20c, 291.41a, 294.35c, 298.16a, 300.12c, 327.26b and 335.18b.