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EDITOR'S PREFACE.

The title which the Hindus apply to their atheistic* theory,

* "Cependant, il n'est guère supposable que Colebrooke se soit trompé en disant que Kapila nie l'idée de Dieu. Il n'a fait que reproduire les accusations directes que l'Inde elle-même a portées contre lui; et, comme ces accusations incontestables ne sont pas justifiées pleinement par les slokas de la Kârikâ, il reste que ce soient les Sûtras qui les justifient. Dans aucun de ceux que nous avons traduits, cette déplorable doctrine ne s'est montrée positivement à découvert, mais je crois pouvoir affirmer, dès à présent, qu'elle est en effet dans quelques autres, comme l'affirment les commentateurs indiens et Colebrooke." M. Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire: Premier Mémoire sur le Sâñkhya, pp 271, 272.

Again, of Colebrooke as entertaining the view that Kapila is atheistic: "Il l'avait empruntée lui-même aux commentateurs indiens." Id., ibid., p. 5.

This is scarcely exact. Colebrooke, the last of men to condescend, as a general thing, to statements in train, does much more than "simply reproduce" the charge of atheism against Kapila, "borrowing it from Indian commentators." He refers, by numbers, to several of Kapila's own aphorisms, as being implicitly atheistic; and he translates one of them—I., 92—by the words "there is no proof of God's existence." Miscell. Essays, Vol. I., pp. 251, 252. See, further, I., 92—99; III., 56—57; V., 2—12, and 46; VI., 64, of Kapila's Aphorisms.

A very cursory glance at Indian commentators, at least on the Sâñkhya, would have evinced to M. Saint-Hilaire, that they are, mostly, as delicate as he is himself, in respect of charging Kapila with the denial of God.

In the Padma-purâna, latter section, Pâshântotpatu chapter, Jaimini and Kapila are called sages of the tâmasa order, and their writings are termed mris'wara.
is that of Kapila’s Sánkhyá; * this epithet being variously understood, in accordance with the several acceptations of its immediate primitive, sankhyá. In the Mahábhárata, sánkhyá is allied to parisankhyána and parisankhyá, ‘exhaustive enumeration.’

The author of the Shad-dars’ana-samuchchaya, a Jaina compendium, corresponding to Mādhava A’chárya’s Sarva-dars’ana-sangraha, says, in the tone of one who retails a familiar fact:

* Sánkhyá is the denomination common to Kapila’s system and to Patanjali’s.


Dr. Röer also says: “The term Sánkhyá has two meanings, enumeration and investigation.” Lecture on the Sánkhyá Philosophy, p. 8.

The word Sánkhyá, as affording a variety of significations, is made the subject of a laborious pun, in the initial couplet of Bháskara A’chárya’s Býag-gopita.

† साङ्ख्यान्तः प्रवचनस्य परिष्कार्यानाद्विजनस् | XII., 11393.

Also: साङ्ख्यात्र श्रेणमेतावत परिष्कारः नादेवनस्।

Also: ग्रहणेऽवै प्रत्ययः प्रचः प्रचःचाचाचे॥

तत्तामिच च चतुर्विवेष्ठं परिष्कारः न च तत्तत:॥

साङ्ख्याः च प्रकाश्या तु निः च च: प विकः॥

Ibid., XII., 11409-10.

One of my MSS. reads, in the first of these two passages, parisankhyá-nidars’anam; and, in the second, parisankhyána-dars’anam. The same MS. has sankhyam prakurute in place of sánkhyáḥ prakurute. Vijnána Bhukshu, at p. 8, has sankhyám prakurvate, and tena sánkhyáḥ prakrititah instead of parisankhyáya tattvatat. But, be the best readings, among these, as they may, it is abundantly plain, from the context, that Vijnána errs in supposing that any allusion is here made to sankhyá, or any cognate word, in the sense of “ratiocination” or the like. Colebrooke, who neglected to pursue the scholast’s citation to the fountain-head, took it, on trust, as correct, and renders sankhyá by “judgment.” Miscell. Essays, Vol. I., p. 229.
Sānkhyā, as the proximate source of sānkhya, denotes, greeably to a contemporary speculator of some local celebrity, 'enun-

Nilakantha Chaturdhara, in his commentary on the Mahābhārata, the Bhārata-bhūva-dīpa, meffectually labours, with the aid of arbitrary constructions, to gloss away the palpable import of the passages given above. In short, his predilections as a Vedānti reduce his exegetical merit, wherever the system of Kapila is under discussion, to that of perverse ingenuity.

In citing the Mahābhārata, or in referring to it, I follow, for convenience, the notation, right or wrong, of the printed edition. But I everywhere verify, or correct, the text of this edition by three very good MSS. which I have consulted.

Colebrooke says: "A system of philosophy in which precision of reckoning is observed in the enumeration of its principles, is denominated Sānkhyā; a term which has been understood to signify numeral, agreeably to the usual acceptation of sānkhyā, number: and hence its analogy to the Pythagorean philosophy has been presumed. But the name may be taken to imply," &c. Miscell. Essays, Vol. I., p. 229.

Adverting to these words, M. Saint-Hilaire observes: "Colebrooke s'est laissé tromper par l’apparence et par une fausse analogie, en prononçant le nom de Pythagore à côté de celui de Kapila." Premier Mémoire sur le Sānkhyā, p. 19.

Again, ibid., p. 20: "Si Colebrooke a eu tort de rapprocher le nom de Pythagore de celui du philosophe indien," &c.

But Colebrooke, as is quite obvious from his guarded and adversative mode of expression, delivers, in the preceding extract, neither his own opinions nor even opinions which, pending the adduction of further evidence, he would be thought to accept. Professor Wilson—Sānkhyā-kārikā, Preface, p. xi.—cites, it is true, the words "and hence its analogy to the Pythagorean philosophy has been presumed," and without comment as to the paternity of the surmise. It may have escaped him that he had formerly written: "The first Indian School, the leading tenets of which are described by Mr. Colebrooke, is the Sānkhyā, a term which has been understood to signify ‘numeral,’ and which, therefore, perhaps suggested to Sir William Jones, his comparison of it to the Pythagorean doctrine." Quarterly Oriental Magazine, Vol. IV., pp. 11, 12: September, 1825.

Colebrooke alludes, without doubt, to the following passage: "On the present occasion, it will be sufficient to say that the oldest head of a sect whose entire work is preserved, was—according to some authors—Kapila; not [?] the divine personage, a reputed grandson [?] of Brahmá, to whom .
ciation pursuant to a stated order.’* Another writer holds that it bears the import of ‘consideration.’† Elsewhere, it is explained by ‘right knowledge;’‡ and the author of the commentary in the following pages, defines it by ‘representation of the real nature of spirit, on the basis of an accurate discriminative acquaintance with it, as contrasted with nature.’§ Consonantly to

Krishna compares himself in the Gita, but a sage of his name, who invented the Sankhya, or Numeral, philosophy; which Krishna himself appears to impugn in his conversation with Arjuna; and which, as far as I can recollect it from a few original texts, resembled, in part, the metaphysics of Pythagoras, and, in part, the theology of Zeno.” Sir William Jones’s Works, Vol. I., pp. 163, 164: 4to ed of 1799.

Sir William, at an earlier period, had pushed his hypothetical analogies much further than this. “Of the Philosophical Schools it will be sufficient, here, to remark that the first Nyaya seems analogous to the Peripatetic; the second, sometimes called Vaiseshika, to the Ionic; the two Mimamsa, of which the second is often distinguished by the name of Vedanta, to the Platonic; the first Sankhya, to the Italic, and the second, or Patanjala, to the Stoic, philosophy; so that Gautama [Gotama] corresponds with Aristotle; Kanada, with Thales; Jaimini, with Socrates; Vyasa, with Plato; Kapila, with Pythagoras; and Patanjali, with Zeno. But an accurate comparison between the Grecian and Indian Schools would require a considerable volume.” Ibid., Vol. I, pp. 360, 361.

* कामात्त राज्यं गत्युच्छे। सम्प्रति ऋषिपूर्वकं भानं न्ययं यथा राज्यं ज्ञात्व सिद्धिसम्यक्तेत् शा स। Deva Tirtha Swami: Sankhya-taranga, ad init.

† पद्यविशंतित्वानं स्थह्यं विचारं। तस्मिन् त्य तेऽपि: साधृपद्धवयनिः शालद्वृत्ते। Raghunatha Tarkavagis’a Bhattacharya: Sankhya-tattwa-vidisa, ad init.

‡ संह्यं सम्प्रग्रहाः। तस्मिन् प्रकाश्यमाक्षमात्तचं शास्त्रं। Sridhara Swami: Subodhini, on II., 39, of the Bhagavad-gita.

Surya Pandit, the astronomer, annotating, in his Paramartho-prapta, the same passage of the Gita, almost copies Sridhara: हि सम्य। चान स।

§ The original will be found near the top of p. 8. As for the italics noticeable in the text, I would remark, once for all, that I use them to distinguish ellipses. Sanskrit vocables, also, when transliterated, I give, as a rule, in the same style of type.
some sacred text, as cited, with approval, by S'ankara A'chárya,* sánkhyá imports ‘ascertainment of the truth concerning pure soul.’ S'ankara, again, and in like manner taking no account of the etymology of the word, interprets it, on his own authority, by ‘the conception that the qualities of purity, passion, and darkness, are perceptible by me; and that I, being distinct from them, am the spectator of their operations, eternal, hetero
genous from the qualities, soul.’†

* In his commentary on the Vishnu-sahasra-náma from the Mahábhárata, XIII., 7006 The definition to which S'ankara accedes, may be from some Purána. It is not to be found in the legal institutes of Vyúsa, where I had hoped to meet with it. The passage in which this definition occurs, together with the verse which the passage explains, here follow:

sánkhyá: píllácháryá: tásá svedindhipati:।

sánkhyá: kápiilácháryá: rúti pramāñé patsékon náma sáµkhyáçádádhipáti: súdrivá: jñáyá
vedásya durgánapá:। cháyá tu te dénvarántapá:। kápiilácháryá: sáµkhyá múdramá
jñáyánáryáçádádhipáti: kápiilácháryá:। súdrivá: kápiilácháryá: súdr-
vidápaçáryá:।

máyá tathvidágáñé máñá mítyábháöé:।

rúti jñáaptá:। pí pradánt kápi: dhánanáiptá: hánte:। dháma: t kápiíá
nirériti suáñé:।

† Sáµkhyá náma déśá: ré sámájí gúpta sm dnya cháte nêyou: sáµkhyápará

The repugnance of the Vedántis to the Sáµkhyá can easily be illustrated. The word súnkhyá, substantive or adjective, occurs, in the Bhagavád-gítá, in five several passages: II., 39; III., 3; V., 4, 5; XIII., 24; XVIII., 13. In three of these passages, the first, and the last two, the theory of Kapila is clearly intended. Yet the commentators, who hold, with few exceptions, to the Vedánta, are most averse, in the majority of these cases, from owning that even the existence of atheism is recognised by the poem. In the three instances above mentioned, they, accordingly, explain súnkhyá by átman, átma-tattwa, bhakít-sástra, Brahmá, para-pumánn; sánkhyá being defined, respectively, by tattwa-jnána, adhyátyama-sástra, bhakti, upanishad, upanishad. As renderings of the first, we also find dhyáñina, jnána, paramátmá-vastu-viveka, paramáärha-vastu-viveka, vedánta, and yathávasthita-vishayayá buddháma:nu-
sáñkita-nirnayák ‘a conclusion induced on the cognition of a reality.’
But, whatever may have been the sense originally intended, and perhaps now lost, of the term in question, it is not improbable that it carried a reference, more or less obscure, to the radical independence of scriptural authority, which may be affirmed of Kapila. In the comprehensive spirit of all Hinduism, it is true that he has frequent recourse to Vaidika vouchers* for subordinate articles of belief. Yet, in spite of this semblance of catholicity, it is obvious that the essentials of his system must be justified, if justified at all, rather by an appeal to reason than to revelation. The Sánkhya, indeed, with all its folly and fanaticism, may, for a Hindu school of doctrine,

Where Kapila’s tenets are, in all likelihood, not alluded to, sánkhya is said to mean bhagavat and sannyasa; sánkhyā corresponding to kirtanātmanā bhaktih and sanyog átma-mati. Additional synonyms of the former, similarly employed, are bhakta, bhakti, jñána-nishtha, jñána-nishtha, jñánin, nishpadpa-purusha, sannyásin, s’uddhānātakaraya, and s’uddha-chetas.

S’ankara A’chārya; Gítá-bhāṣyā · Rámánuja A’chārya; Gítá-bhāṣyā · Súrya Pandit; Paramártha-propá. S’rídhara Swámi; Subodhání Madhusúdana Saraswáti; Bhagavad-gítá-gúdhártha-dípiká. Kalyúpa Bhatta; Rásika-ranyáni. Jayaráma Tarkavágiśa; Bhagavad-gítá-sárártha-saṅgraha Sadánpanda Vyúsa; Bhagavad-gítá-bháva-prakásá · Pas’sácha-bháṣyā, by anon.: Kes’áva Bhaṭṭa; Gítá-tattwa-prakásiká Rámachandra Saraswáti; Gítá-tátparya-s’uddhi.

Of these writers, Rámánuja, Madhusúdana, Sádánpanda, and the anonymous author of the Pas’sácha-bháṣyá, refuse to hear of there being any allusion, in the Gítá, to the system of Kapila.

Adwaitánanda, in his Brahma-vidyábharaṇa, an expositorial work connected with the Aphorisms of the Vedánta, suggests that the word pancha-vins’nti, adduced from the sacred writings as demarking the number of the Sánkhya principles, may intend 20 × 5 instead of 20 + 5. In disproof of this conceit, see one of the Sanskrit extracts at p. 2, supra; and the Mahábhárata, XII., passim, but, particularly, chapters 307, 308, 309.

* These citations from the Vedas can hardly be referred to a politic affectation of orthodoxy; to the quieting, on easy terms, of the misgivings of the unwary. The Jainas, who go the length of openly denying the divine origin of the Vedas, and who repudiate their authority generally, yet admit it when reconcilable with their own tenets. As. Res., Vol. XVII , p. 248.
be allowed a fair share of circumspection. In its dogmatism it has restricted itself, for the most part, to the supersensuous, a phrase too frequently convertible with the indeterminate. It would, accordingly, often have been difficult to demonstrate that it was not in the right; and it has signified nothing that it was in the wrong: the Hindus never having been known to approve themselves, ethically, any worse for their atheism than for their theism. What is more, the scrupulous vagueness with which it touches on the subject of matter, is, surely, something in its favour. It may have gone widely astray in the cloud-land of metaphysics; but it offers few parallels to the puerile hylology of the Nyáya. It may contravene the spiritual intuitions of humanity; but it has rarely called down the gods from Olympus, to move the derision of modern science. Other praise of the Sáñkhya than this, would, however, scarcely consist with the exactions of just criticism. On the assumption that it has come down to us legitimately elucidated, it is next to impossible, notwithstanding its fantastic show of method, to trace, in it, a single vestige of consistency. As apprehended in the present day, correctly or incorrectly, it must, in short, be ranked, with every other, even the most perspicuous, scheme of atheism, as little better than a chaotic impertinence.*

* The notion that the existence of God is susceptible of dialectical demonstration, has been surrendered, in later times, by most Christian theologians of any credit: it now being, more ordinarily, maintained that our conviction of deity, on grounds apart from revelation, repose solely on original consciousness, antecedent to all proof. The idea of God must, indeed, necessarily be postulated as the basis of all human speculation. See Hagenbach's History of Doctrines, passim.

Kant declares that the various objective arguments for the establishment of theism, may be reduced to the teleological, the cosmological, and the ontological. All these, I am told, have been urged, by the Hindus, in combating the Baudháhas, the Mímánsákás, and the Sáñkhya. But further investigation would be requisite before I could produce these arguments, as employed by the Brahmans, with any approach to a complete exhibition.
Indistinct allusion seems to be made, by the author of the Sánkhya Aphorisms, to anterior* cultivators of the atheistic philosophy, and, in so many words, to 'venerable preceptors'† of the theory. Of the latter, Sanandana‡ alone is specified by name, and once only: but, equally with all the authorities less distinctly commemorated in company with him, his writings, if he ever wrote, have long been forgotten. Panchas'ikha, though, like Sanandana, expressly mentioned, is yet denied his honourable designation. On the first occasion‡ where his opinion is reported, it is noted with disapprobation; and, in the sole remaining instance|| where it is brought forward, it is dismissed.

No one of these arguments makes more directly against such atheism as that of the Sánkhya, than the cosmological proof, or, rather, paralogism; it having been shown to be built on a logical fiction. This argument is admirably put by Diodorus of Tarsus, who lived in the fourth century:

* * * eἰ δὲ τὸς ἀγένητον λέγοι αὐτῶν τὴν τροπὴν, τὸ πάντων ἄδυνατώτερον εἰσάγει· τροπὴ γὰρ πάθος ἐστὶν ἀρχόμενον, καὶ οὐκ ἂν τις εἰποί τροπὴν ἀναρχον καὶ συντόμως εἰπέν, τὸν στοιχεῖον καὶ τὸν ἐστὶν αὐτῶν ζωὰν τε καὶ σωμάτων ἤ πάνορφος τροπὴ, καὶ τῶν σχημάτων καὶ χρωμάτων καὶ τῶν ὀλλων ποιητήν τινες ἔκφρασεν, μόνον οὐχὶ φωνὴν ἀφέσευ, μήτε ἀγένητον μήτε αὐτόματον νομίζειν τὸν κόσμον, μήτε αὖ ἀπορονήσῃν, Θεόν δὲ, αὐτῶν καὶ τὸ εἶναι καὶ τὸ εὖ εἶναι παρασχόμενον, σαφῶς εἰδέναι καὶ ἀδυστάκτως ἐπιστασΘαι. Photi Bibliotheca, ed. Bekker., p. 209, b.

* * * For change is an incident that has a beginning; and one would never speak of change as without a beginning. And, to be summary, the all-wise Change of the elements, and of the thence arising animate beings and bodies; and the intricate diversity of forms, and colours, and other properties; all but give forth an articulate voice, telling us not to think of the universe as unoriginated, or self-actuated, or, yet, without a Providence; but to know of a truth, and to be unhesitatingly assured, that there is a God, who endowed them with both being and excellent being.

* III, 41. † A'chárya: V., 31. ‡ VI., 69. § V., 32. || VI., 68. Vedántí Mahádeva, annotating V., 32, infers, simply from the name of Panchas'ikha being given in the singular number, that Kapila purposes to mark him as a separatist. The singular must, then, be
with an air of sufferance rather than of approval. Of Sanandana nothing is known further than that he is classed among the mind-engendered progeny of Brahmá.* Panchas'ikha is usually described in the same enigmatical terms:† but the Mahá-

bhárata‡ also speaks of him as having had a human mother, Kapilá; and it assigns him to the line of Parás'ara.§

The Sánkhyá philosophy is, nevertheless, ascribed, by indigenous tradition, to Kapila,|| the putative author of the atheistic sentences, the Sánkhyá-sútra¶ and Tattwa-samásá; though the

taken to indicate, as compared with the plural, an inferior degree of respect. But Sanandana, though dignified with the title of dchárya, is yet spoken of, by Kapila, in the singular number. Mahádeva's words are: प शि रूपे -

चन्दन परमसंतदिति स्वचायति | It may, however, be doubted whether the use, in Sanskrit, of the pluralis majestaticus be of any antiquity, notwithstanding Sáyana A'chárya's opinion to the contrary. See Professor Wilson's Translation of the Rig-veda, Vol. I., p. 201, foot-note.

* See note at p. 15, infra. † See the same note. ‡ XII., 7895. At XII., 7886, of the same work, it is said :

यससः पि 'साज्ञा विन्मितः प्राप्ति ।

य सन्ये तेन रूपे वि पायति वि य ष ॥

'I can imagine that he whom the Sánkhyas call Kapila, the mighty sage, the patriarch, is, in person, under this form, exciting our admiration.'

Such is the unmistakable sense of the couplet; and so thinks Nilakantha Chaturdhara: च पिक्षः। तेन प वि स्वेच । तस्मिन ख अतु तथुकालम्। Yet Professor Wilson understands the meaning to be, that Panchas'ikha is here “named .... Kapila.” Sánkhyá-káriká, p. 190. Dr. Weber repeats this mistake: “als auch Kapila heisst.” Indische Studien, Vol. I., p. 433.

§ Janaka, chieftain of Mithilá, and disciple of Panchas'ikha, says:

पराग्न गोवङ्कह द्वृत्त मद्या न ।

भिक्षे: प शि राइविध्य पर तः || XII., 11875.

|| In only a single text that I know of, is the Sánkhyá imputed to S'iva: Mahábhdrata, XII., 10388. At the same place, the Yoga also is said to have originated with this divinity.

¶ Swapnes'wara, acquainted as he was with the aphorisms of Panchas'ikha, attributes to him the Sánkhyá-sútra also. He accounts for its bearing the title of Kápila, by the circumstance that Kapila initiated the Sánkhyá tradition as set forth in these aphorisms. By way of illustration, he adduces the
accuracy of this assignment rests, it seems probable, on no better
evidence than the fact, that such treatises of atheism as existed
prior to those attributed to Kapila, being superseded by his own
more developed, or less incongruous, enunciations, were con-
signed, at an early period, to oblivion.

But it does not seem imperative to include, among these
ancient productions, the works of Panchas'ikha also.* Even
conceding that Panchas'ikha, conformably to the ordinary ac-
count of him, was a disciple of A'suri,† who is, in turn, said to
have studied under Kapila;‡ yet the measure of a scholastic

notorious appropriation to Manu, of the code of laws set forth by Bhrgu.
His meaning is, that Kapila only propounded the matter of the Sánkhya-
sutra, whose present shape is due to Panchas'ikha. He may, then, be sup-
pended to set to the account of humility, the absence from Panchas'ikha's
name, in the Sánkhya Aphorisms, of the honorific title of A'chárya.
Against this it might be argued, that a saint so lowly would be likely to
mention, at least a few times, the name of the leading rabbi of his
school. Yet, on the contrary, be refrains from all mention of Kapila,
while he twice speaks of himself. But, in justice to Swapnes'wara, it should
be added that he gives what is repeated above, as nothing but rumour. His
words are: पश्चिमः सभा राशिणिः: काव्या सुभिक्षु सम्ब-
्दायप्रकोः वर्गे संभवतामिति मनुसाहिष्य।
* Colebrooke judges otherwise. Speaking of the Sánkhya-sutra, he says :
"It is, avowedly, not the earliest treatise on this branch of philosopy :
since it contains references to former authorities, for particulars which are
but briefly hinted in the sutras; and it quotes some by name, and, among
them, Panchas'ikha, the disciple of the reputed author's pupil: an anachron-
† Mahábhárata, XII, 7890, 7895. Elsewhere, Panchas'ikha is spoken
of as having been instructed, with Jajgishaya, by Kapila himself. Kúrmu-
puráṇa, first section, chapter 9, s'loka 119. Sec, also, the note at the foot
of page 16, infra.
‡ Bhágavata-puráṇa, I, 3, 11. Also: शादविद्वान्निमित्यनिमिर्मिनिदमस्त्राय
कारणां भवान पर पिरातुरेश्व भिज्ञसाधनाय तन्न्द्राबाच। Vyása: Pi-
tanyala-bháshya, I, 25. Notice will be taken, in a subsequent page, of the
discrepant explanations of the term adi-mdwan, in this passage. But the
commentators are unanimous in understanding, by paramarska, Kapila.
descent has no essential correspondence to that of a natural generation. More especially, the position that Kapila takes account of his own literary successor at the second remove, may be granted to offer but little violence to probability, if we simply suppose that the sage originally disseminated his tenets orally, and that they had undergone modification at the hands of sectaries from his proper school, before he committed them to a written form.*

Panchas'ikha is known, by scanty fragments, as the author of a collection of philosophical aphorisms.† One other perform-

* As an ungrateful alternative to silence, I have thus attempted to reduce to harmony, materials, in themselves, at first appearance, rather intractable; but which present, it may be, a distorted reflex of historical verity.

As the first step in dealing rationally with the mind-born sons of Brahmá, we must consider them as brethren, not as brothers. But, rather than depart, in favour of common sense, from the strictest letter of the theogonies, I have found the pandits disposed to fall back on their grand solution of all difficulties as to time, space, and individuals, the transparently indolent dogma of cyclical renovations of mundane events. These iterations admitting of an indefinite number of changes as to particulars, any body may, at last, be every body; and it thus becomes a very easy matter to make light of ordinary chronological sequence.

† A single one of them is given, as such, in Vyása's Pátanjala-bháshya, I., 3: र देव दर्शनम् = निरर्थ दर्शनम्। Kshemánanda, in his notes on the Tattwa-samása, twice quotes this as a sútra; and Váchaspati Miśra, Vijnána Bhukshu, and Nágoji Bhaṭṭa, consent in assigning it to Panchas'ikha, in Vyása's Pátanjala-bháshya we find, at II., 13: सृजन: संकर: सप्रिधार: सप्रत्यवर्ज्ञ: कुशक्त: नापकर्षोपायम्। क ाऽ बु न हि बहुक्षण: वेचायसाधारणत: वेगुपकर्षसबजः रिपुति। Of this passage, which is uncharacterised, by Vyása, except as being by Panchas'ikha, the Sánkhyă-tattwa-kaumudi cites the words सृजन: संकर: सप्रिधार: सप्रत्यवर्ज्ञ:। Sāktyes'wara, in his annotations on the Kaumudi, still dissecting, says that the first three of these words form one aphorism, and the remaining word, another.

So much for Panchas'ikha's sútras; and it may be questioned whether
ance, if not two, is likewise imputed to him; and he, perhaps,

any more samples of them are forthcoming, notwithstanding Colebrooke’s assertion that they “are frequently cited, and by modern authors on the Sāṅkhya.” Miscell. Essays, Vol. I., p. 233.

The next work recorded as by Panchas’ikha, is metrical; unless, indeed, as is quite possible, the longer extracts, to be given after the following couplets, belong, with one or more of them, to a treatise mixed of prose and verse.

This couplet is quoted, by Vijnāna Blākhshu, in his Vijnānāmṛta, with the following introduction: चिच्छरं सांतं मेंाषाजत तजज्ञानासा भागेय श्री राम्याय! This is the best voucher I have for advancing that Panchas’ikha commented on the Tattva-samāsa, of which the words चिच्छरं सांतं do really constitute a topic. This couplet is again quoted, partially, by Vijnāna, in his Yoga-vārtika, as well as in Bhāvā Gaṇeś’a Yogānusāsana-sūtra-ṛitti; and in full, by Kshemānanda on the Tattva-samāsa, in the Sāṅkhya-krama-dōpikā, and by Bhāvā Gaṇeś’a in the Tattva-yātārthikā-dēpāna. Various readings of it are: ṣda for ṣtyas, ḥā for tu; vimokho for tu mokho; kṛtsa for kṛichchhara, and kshayāḥ for kshayāt.

Bhāvā Gaṇeś’a, in his Yogānusāsana-sūtra-ṛitti, refers the stanza just given, directly to Panchas’ikha; but the same author, in his Tattva-yātārthikā-dēpāna, introduces these verses, and the three couplets following, by expressions importing that they were borrowed, not from, but through Panchas’ikha.

variants: yatra-tatra for yatra-kutra; ratah for sthitah; and mundę ja s’khhī and s’khhī mundę jotī for jotī mundę s’khhī.

variants: prakritena cha for prakritena tu; and badh’ yam tu nigadyat badh’ añyena muchyate, and bandh’ yam cha nigadyate, for badd. jantur vivartate.

variants: chatwāri for tattwāni; swarūpa for swarūpāni; pāpo 1 papnd; and bhuvyate for yuvyate.
Theistic Sāṁkhya as well as on the atheistic.

The couplets and that preceding them, the first and the third quotations, are also found in the Sāṁkhya-krama-dīpikā. Cited both there and in the Sāṁkhya-sūtra-vivaraṇa. Spoken of above; and the second is in Kshemā-uttwa-samāsa, and in Gaudapāda on the Sāṁkhya-kārikā. Verifiable that Bhāva Ganesa does not quote a syllable as Panchas'ikha, that does not occur in the Sāṁkhya-krama-
, accordingly, a presumption that Bhāva Ganesa took these is work, and under the impression that it was by Pancha-
suspicion is strengthened by the second exordial stanza of tṛthya-dīpana, where its author clearly enough claims to and in such a manner, namely, with the title of dhārya, as to and in such a manner, namely, with the title of dhārya, as to

extracted below have, in every case, the guarantee of good
extracted below have, in every case, the guarantee of good

ier being by Panchas'ikha. They are given, in the first āsa, in his Pāṇṭanjala-bhāṣya, anonymously: but three of attators; Vāchaspati Mis'ra, in the Pāṇṭanjala-sūtra-bhāṣya-
na Bhikshu, in the Yoga-vārtaka; and Nāgojī Bhaṭṭa, in the-vṛitti-bhāṣya-chodhāya-vyākhyā; testify, one, or all, to their for the passage at II., 22, Vāchaspati merely says that it authoritative sage; but the two other scholiasts declare it as'ikha.

is quoted and expounded by Kshemānanda also, in the Nava-

is quoted and expounded by Kshemānanda also, in the Nava-

सा नाभिगिनीय त सम्प्रदानुवस्तु सम्पद्व वासाय न्यात्मव्याप्ति सचानि व यथार्थप्राप्तिबुद्ध रवेषा चतुष्टय भव्यविभा राज्य च मादश्च च सविपरिक्ष्य । II., 5.
By the prevalent suffrage of mythology, Kapila* is reputed

* The more ordinary mánasa, or mind-begotten, sons of Brahmá vary, as specified in different Puráñas, from seven to more than twice that number; “but,” as Prof. Wilson remarks, “the variations are of the nature of additions made to an apparently original enumeration of but seven, whose names generally recur.” Vishnu-púrśña, p. 48, note 2. One such group is made up of Maríchí, Atri, Angrás, Púlasťya, Puláha, Kratu and Vasishta; the well-known ‘seven Rishis.’ Mahábhárata, XII., 7570 and 13075. This list is modified, in the same book of the Mahábhárata, 7534-5, by the substitution of Daksha for Vasishta: and, at 13040, by the addition of Mánú; thus increasing the aggregate to eight. But, however eked out by Pauránika liberality, it is not this catalogue of Brahmá’s mind-born progeny that is to furnish us with Kapila.
been a son of Brahmá; but he is otherwise described as

Wilson once wrote as follows: “The founder of the Sánkhyá philo-
amed Kapila; who, as one of the seven great Rishis, is one of the
stháma. There are other accounts of his origin; but none more satis-
Quarterly Oriental Magazine for Sept., 1825; p. 12. That
anywhere styled “one of the seven great Rishis,” needs confirma-
tion. The emphasis with which other accounts of him are here discre-
ting of this is to be found in the Translation of the Vishnu-

\[\text{\textit{Miscellaneous Essays, Vol. I., p. 229,}}\]—refers to Gaudapáda,
of Kapila’s being ranked as “one of the seven great Rishis."
; the collocation of the words in the passage quoted by Gaudapáda,
e has turned subject into predicate. The citation runs thus:

\[\text{\textit{These seven sons of Brahmá were \textit{\textit{one of the seven great Rishis.}}}\]

\[\text{\textit{The founder of the Sánkhyá \textit{\textit{one of the seven great Rishis.}}}\]

\[\text{\textit{Kapila’s being ranked as \textit{\textit{one of the seven great Rishis.}}}\]

\[\text{\textit{the collocation of the words in the passage quoted by Gaudapáda,}}\]

group of kindred emanations likewise comprehends seven persons.
\[\text{\textit{they are said to be Sana, Sanat-suñjáta,}}\]
anandana, Sanat-kumára, Kapila, and Sanátana. In the passage
all likelihood from some Purána, near the commencement of Gauda-
dgmentary on the Sánkhyá-káríká, Kapila still appears, but as intro-
eral accredited Sánkhyá doctors, to the extrusion of as many of his
oclates: the list now standing thus: Sanaka, Sananda, Sanátana,
\[\text{\textit{Vodhu, and Panchaśikha. In the \textit{\textit{tarpaṇa, or propitiation-serv-}}\]

\[\text{\textit{least one school of the Veda, that of Mādhyandma, the same per-
invoked, and in the same order, except that the names of A’suri and}
\[\text{\textit{\textit{rdya, latter section, Vishnu-vyúha-bheda-varṇana chapter, 14, 15,}}\]
changes, Kapila himself makes way for another; the set now con-
\[\text{\textit{Sanaka, Sananda, Sanátana, Sanat-kumára, Játa, Vodhu, and Pancha-}
9, with additional alterations, reduces the seven to five; Sanaka,
Sanandana, Rúrú (Rudra?), and Sanat-kumára; whom it qualifies as}

\[\text{\textit{s. The first three and the last of these five hold, apparently, pecu-
ince in the family of Brahmá; since from them, according to Gauda-
the forty-third Káríká, originated, severally, virtue, knowledge, dis-
d irresistible will. The names of these four also occur, unaccomp-
if they were to be regarded as representative, at III., 12, 3, of the

\[\text{puráṇa.}\]
an incarnation of Vishnu.* He is also recounted to have been

Sananda and Sanandana are, doubtless, prosodial varieties of the same name; and Jata seems to be put, by metrical licence, for Sanat-sujata.

In the Kûrma-pûrâna, latter section, V., 18, parts of the two classes of Brahma's mental sons, several new characters being added to the first, are named together; thus: Sanat-kumâra, Sanaka, Bhrgu, Sanâtana, Sanandana, Rudra, Angiras, Vámadeva, Sûkra, Atri, Kapila, and Marîchi. But it is worthy of observation that this Purâna plainly distinguishes the second class, as to origin, from the first. What is evidently intended for the first class, is detailed, at VII., 35—39, of the former section, as made up of Daksha, Marîchi, Angiras, Bhrgu, Atri, Dharma, Sankalpa, Pulastya, Pulaha, Kratu, and Vasishtha; and the generation of these individuals, as there given, is very different from what it is in any of the accounts rendered by Prof. Wilson. See Vishnupûrâna, p. 50, note. For instance, the first and the last four are derived, respectively, from Brahma's prâna, udâna, vyâna, apâna, and samâna. See, for these terms, Colebrooke's Miscell. Essays, Vol. I., pp. 356 and 374; also the Sânkhya-kârikâ, p. 103. At X., 84, of the same section, the whole eleven are denominated Brahmas; and Brahma is stated to have created them by his power as a Yogi. See, also, Vishnupûrâna, p. 49.

Further particulars of interest occur at X., 122—125, of the latter section of the Kûrma-pûrâna. Sanat-kumâra is here said to have instructed Samvarta; and he, Satyavrata: Sanandana, Pulaha; and he, Gautama: Angiras, Bharadvâja: Kapila, Jâigishavya and Panchasîkha: Sanaka, Parisâra; and he, Vâlmiki. This Purâna is related, at its conclusion, to have been transmitted from Brahma as follows. Brahma communicated it to Sanaka and Sanat-kumâra; Sanaka, to Devala; Devala, to Panchasîkha; and Sanat-kumâra, to Vyasa.

There is, clearly, no countenance, in the analogy of the Hindu hagiogony, for the else plausible surmise, that a complete history of the mânasa sons of Brahma, might, if recoverable, possibly go to show that the term by which they are known, may originally have borne a less mystical signification than that of mind-born. Its intention could never have been to discriminate the literate portion of the Brahmanidae from their less learned kinsmen.

* Mahâbhârata, III., 1896 and 8880. Râmâyana, I., 41, 2—4 and 25. At I., 41, 2—4, Kapila's destruction of the sons of Sagara is predicted Padmapûrâna, latter section, Vishnu-vyûha-bheda-varnama chapter. Vishnupûrâna, p. 377. Bhágavata-pûrâna, I., 3, 11; where Kapila stands the fifth of the twenty-four incarnations of Vishnu. See also, at p. 6, supra, the verse from
born as the son of Devahúti;* and, again, is identified with one of the Agnis, or fires.† Lastly, it is affirmed that there have been two Kapilas: the first, an embodiment of Vishnu; the

the Mahabharata, XIII., 7006, with Sankara A’charyya’s commentary. See, further, the passage at p. 10, supra, quoted in Vyasa’s Patañjala-bhashya. The later commentators on this work, Vijnana Bhikshu and Nagoji Bhatta, understand the word ddi-cidwán, or ‘primeval sage,’ to mean, here, Vishnu. Vachaspati Mis’ra, though recognizing Kapila as an incarnation of Vishnu, considers ‘primeval sage’ to refer to the former, reappearing on earth after absorption into the divine essence. The remainder of Vachaspati’s remarks are not very intelligible; or else my MSS. are corrupt. Schlegel, in his note on the Rámýana, I., 41, 3, remarks: “De hoc Vishnu’s cognomine et munere non habeo quod expromam. Vix opus est monere plane hinc alienum est Kapilum, philosophiae rationalis (sánkhyén) auctore sem, quamvis et hunc discipulum numis ambitiosi nummis plenum, imo ipsum in mortalibus corpore praesentem Vishnum fuisse uactaverunt. Quam opum nonem unum autem Bhagavat-gita, Lect. X., 26.” It must now appear that the notion which Schlegel here dismisses so peremptorily, is much better fortified, by mythology, than he, to all appearance, apprehended.

*Bhadgava-purāṇa, II., 7, 3; and III., 33, 1. The birth of the sage, and of his nine sisters, is here said to have taken place in the house of Kardama, the husband of Devahúti, who is called Kapila’s mother. Kapila’s father, according to this account, must be Kardama; as there is no hint of anything like a miraculous conception. Kapila, as here described, is, nevertheless, regarded, by some, as having afterwards become an incarnation of Vishnu. Kardama, if not one of Brahma’s mind-born sons, was, at all events, a projépati, or “patriarch.” Vishnu-puráṇa, p 50, note.


† मृत्यु ब्रह्मप्रियः श्री विभारे त न न। कृष्णः क याण्डो सौ वेदार्थिन स: ||
पिल्ल अब्रविषय च य न्या यंतथ: दुः ||
यिः शु पिल्लो ना डूब्हयोगप्रवचः : ||

Mahabharata, III., 14196—7.

It is the last line of these couplets which, with the exchange of s’ástrá for yoga, is cited at p. 232 of the present work. The ‘self-styled Vedántí,’ by which epithet Vijnana there denounces some unnamed author, for holding
other, the igneous principle in human disguise.* It must be acknowledged, in short, that we know nothing satisfactory concerning Kapila; the meagre notices of him that are producible that the Sānkhya Kapila was an incarnation of fire, has hitherto eluded my quest.

Prof. Wilson, alluding to this text, of whose source he was unapprised pronounces, touching the identity which it authenticates, that "there does not appear to be any good authority for the notion;" and adds, immediately afterwards: "Kapila is a synonyme of fire, as it is of a brown, dusky, or tawny, colour; and this may have given rise to the idea of Agni and the sage being the same." Sānkhya-kārikā, p. 188 See, also, Colebrooke's Miscell. Essays, Vol. I, p. 230. But it seems just as likely that the conception owed its origin to the fabled combustion, by Kapila, of the sons of Sagara Mahābhārata, III., 8881. Also see As. Res., Vol. III. pp. 349, 350, and Vol VI, p 478.

For Wilford's wild speculations in which he identifies Kapila with Enoch, see As. Res., Vol. VI., pp. 473-4.

* I quote at length, as the following passage will, in a subsequent page, again come under consideration:

S'ankara A'chārya, in the S'vēttas'vattarutrapriśupānished, V., 2, proposes two interpretations of it. By one of them it is violently made to intend, as a lame synonyme, Hiranyagarbha. Otherwise,
being hopelessly involved in uncertainty, and inextricably embarrassed by fable. Yet it may be credited, with but little hesitation, that he was something more substantial than a myth;* and there seems to be tolerably good ground for receiving, as an historical fact, his alleged connection with the Sánkhyā.

since primogeniture among created beings is found averred of both Kapila and Hiranyagarbha, they are, to save scriptural consistency, concluded to be one and the same. On the other interpretation, the person named in the text is Kapila of the Sánkhyá, a partial incarnation of Vishnu. For the qualification of him as such, some unspecified Puráṇa is adduced. S'ankara adds that the other Kapila is celebrated in the Mulpáda-upanishad. This statement is, however, made inadvertently, since no mention of him occurs there. S'ankara probably quoted, after the ordinary reckless Indian fashion, from memory. Dr. Röer has somewhat misrepresented S'ankara, in making him cite suicidally the Puráṇa above referred to. It is vouched, and professedly so, not to corroborate the first identification of Kapila, but to elucidate the second. Neither, in this quotation, is Kapila, "to praise him," "identified with Hiranyagarbha." See Bib. Indica, Vol. XV., p 62.

It may be observed, generally, that, in conformity with Hindu usage, none but the figment of one's special idolatry, is glorified as a plenary incarnation.

Kapila, in the Mahádeva-sahasra-náma-stotra, Mahábhárata, XIII., 1211, is an epithet of S'íva; and expresses, as indicated by the context, 'tawny.'

In an inscription translated by Colebrooke, there occurs the word kapilá, which, he observes, "probably is fire, personified as a female goddess." [sic] Miscell. Essays, Vol. I., p. 300, last line; and p. 304, foot-note no. 21. It remains to be shown that the word ever means fire. In this place it bears, undoubtedly, the sense of 'a red cow;' from circumambulating which, great merit is supposed to be acquired "A red one] Kapila: When applied to a cow, this term signifies one of the colour of lac-dye, with black tail and white hoofs." Colebrooke's Two Treatises on the Hindu Law of Inheritance, p. 131, second foot-note. For kapilá in this acceptation, see the Mahábhárata, XIII., 2953, 3535, 3596, 3703-4, 3744, 3764; and, on the subject of circumambulating a cow, see the same poem, XIII., 3436 and 3794.

* Colebrooke comes to a different conclusion. "It may be questioned," he says, "whether Kapila be not altogether a mythological personage, to whom the true author of the doctrine, whoever he was, thought fit to ascribe
The larger of the works presumed to be by Kapila, is comprised in six books of *sūtras* or aphorisms, which, as ordinarily

...Miscell. Essays, Vol. I., p 231. But the *Mahābhārata*, in spite of its alloy of fiction, sufficiently attests. it would seem, the reality of the sage; and the *Sāṅkhya-sūtra* and *Tattva-samāsa* may be pseudonymous, without vacating the existence of Kapila, or his character of originator, or early promulgator, of hylolheistic doctrines.

In the *Padma-purāṇa*, latter section, *Gaurī-varnana* subdivision of the *Kumūra-sambhava* chapter, Kapila is said to have dwelt in the village of Kālāpā. Further particulars regarding this personage can, doubtless, be obtained, if the *Kapila-upapurāṇa*, which is named in the *Kūrma-purāṇa* and elsewhere, be still extant. The *Kapila-sanhīta* may be the same. See the Sanskrit Catalogue of the library of the As. Soc of Bengal, p 72. At p. 26 of this Catalogue occurs the name of *Kapila-smrīti*, or legal institutes of Kapila. A work descriptive of certain places of pious resort, and another on naval astrology, attributed to Kapila, have been found in the Peninsula. Mackenzie Collection, Vol. I., pp. 65 and 262.

* Colebrooke—Miscell. Essays, Vol. I., pp. 231, 232—unhesitatingly applies the title of *Sāṅkhya-pravacana* to these *sūtras*; but adds—ibid., p. 232—that it “seems to be a borrowed one. at least, it is common to several compositions. It appertains to Patanjali’s *Yoga-sūstra*.” Undoubtedly it is borrowed; and I am disposed to date its use in question only from Vijnāna Bhikshu. Apart from the writings of this author and of his followers, I have nowhere met with the employment of *Sāṅkhya-pravacana* in place of *Sāṅkhya-sūtra*, save in the postscript to Amruddha’s commentary, and in that to its abridgement by Vedānti Mahādeva. But the epigraphs to Indian manuscripts are known to be, so generally, the work of copyists, that the adverse evidence of these two seeming exceptions may, very allowable, be neglected.

With regard to the meaning of the term *Sāṅkhya-pravacana*, which forms part of the title of the present publication, M. Saint-Hilaire could not have done better than consult our commentator, whose explanation of it he seems, however, to be unacquainted with. At p. 5 of his Premier Mémoire sur le Sāṅkhya, he translates these words by “Préface ou Introduction au Sāṅkhya.” Sooth to say, this would be a strange sort of name for a complete dogmatic enunciation, by any philosopher, of his own theory; especially if, as happens with the Sāṅkhya, the theory leaves almost no room for legitimate evolution.
read, amount to five hundred and twenty-six.* Its fourth book is chiefly made up of proverbial sayings and brief hints of

Mistaken as Vijnana probably is, in arguing that the Tattwa-samasa not only preceded the Sankhya-sutra, but formed its germ, there is no ground to mistrust his etymological analysis of the word pravachana as here used. At p. 7 of the present work, he explains it by prakarshena pravachanam *detailed exposition;* and, at p 110, by prapancha *explication.* Its import is, therefore, interpretation.

Vijnana, in the Patanjala-bhadhya-vartika, 1st adhyaya, ad fin., again defines the term sankhya-pravachana—as the proper name, according to Vyasa, of the Yoga Aphorisms—by words expressing 'detailed exposition.'

Nagoji Bhatta, in his Patanjala-sutra-vritti-bhadsha-vchchhaya, silently transcribes Vijnana's derivation: रतयं वास्त्रश्रवचनं तु वास्त्रज्ञानेव प्रकर्ष्यः

Had M. Saint-Hilaire not permitted his dependence on Colebrooke to supersede reference to Vijnana, he would have found that, on the statement of the latter, the Sankhya-pravachana came after the Tattwa-samasa; and that neither of them is described as standing to the other in a relation similar to that of preface. Further on I shall take up this point again.

* That is to say, in the six books, 164, 47, 84, 32, 129, and 70, respectively. As for this enumeration, even if it had not the support, by express declaration, of annotators, yet the tenor of their scholia would, in general, authorize it with sufficient distinctness. But it is expressly supported, by notation, in all the copies of the pure text that I have consulted, and in most of the MSS. of Vijnana's commentary and of Nagoji Bhatta's abstract of it, that I have collated. Aniruddha, and his epitomist Mahadeva, of whose works such MSS. as I have examined likewise have the aphorisms numbered, concur, essentially, in the forementioned distribution and aggregate. The only difference which they discover, consists in halving the 121st aphorism of book V.; thus bringing out the sum total, 527. See p. 207 of the present publication, and p. 33 of its appendix.

M. Saint-Hilaire, precipitately accepting, without diplomatic verification, the Serampore edition of Vijnana's commentary, and unvisited by any the least suspicion of its faultlessness, computes the Sankhya aphorisms, in the six books, at 156, 46, 76, 30, 122, and 69; in all, 479. See Premier Memoire sur le Sankhya, p. 6. The consequence, to his essay, of this want of circumspection and research, is not very advantageous. Neither need one be sur-
legends, illustrative of Sānkhyā topics; and its fifth is polemic, being devoted to a formal defence of the atheistic scheme. In

prised that, leaning on the old edition of Vijnāna, he should write thus: "Isvara Krishna, imbui des opinions de son temps, aurait pu prêter à Kapila des pensées qui ne seraient pas les siennes." Ibid., p. 69. The result of the otiose confidence above animadverted on, may in part be gathered from the particulars about to be noted.

In the edition received by our essayist, I., 61 is lost in the commentary; and yet the 22d kārikā is, in good part, composed of it. With the same memorial couplet, VI., 32, also, is connected: but this aphorism, with most of the explanation of it, is omitted altogether.

I., 87, which is degraded to commentary, fixes the number of the proofs admitted by the Sānkhyā, as stated in the 4th kārikā.

I., 118, which is in the same predicament with the aphorism last named, forms part of the 9th kārikā.

I., 141, similarly circumstanced, may be found embodied in the 17th kārikā.

I., 162, which is given as commentary, upholds the 62d kārikā. M. Saint-Hilaire would have quoted II., 28, after the 28th kārikā, had it not been omitted—with nearly all its commentary.

He would, also, at p. 444, have cited III., 18 and 19, if they had not been printed as shreds of schola.

The 50th kārikā receives support from III., 43, which is, likewise, disguised by small type.

Commenting on the 54th kārikā, M. Saint-Hilaire employs language which significantly implies the entire and unquestioning reliance on the old edition of Vijnāna, which has above been alleged of him. His words are as follows:

"Lecture 3, sūtra 44 [48]: 'En haut, il y a prédominance de la bonté.'

"Kapila ne va pas plus loin; et après avoir indiqué, comme on l'a vu, l'existence des trois mondes en n' indiquant que le monde des dieux où règne la bonté, il ne dit point quelle qualité prédomine dans les mondes qui viennent après celui-là. Il est probable que la Kārikā, en faisant prédominer l'obscurité dans le monde inférieur, et le mal dans le monde du milieu, se conforme à une tradition dès longtemps reçue; mais, dans les axiomes du maître, ce complément à peu près indispensable de sa pensée n'apparaît pas, et il n'en a rien exprimé, pas même par une de ces réticences qui lui sont si habituelles. Il faut ajouter que le commentateur des Sūtras, Vidjnāna Bhikshou, ne s'est pas arrêté d'avantage à la doctrine que nous retrouvons
addition to its special section of controversy, it, also, here and there, prefers in direct terms, or else darkly points to, exceptions

dans la Kârîkâ, et qu’à la suite de Kapila il a omis de parler des deux autres mondes, placés au-dessous du monde supérieur. Il se borne à dire que par "en haut" Kapila comprend le monde qui est au-dessus de la terre habitée par les mortels." Premier Mémoire, &c., pp. 213, 214.

The restoration of III., 49 and 50, which, with the explanation of them, do not appear in the Serampore impression of Vijnâna, at once accounts for several items of the 54th kârikô, and completely frustrates the criticism, just quoted, which our essayist ventures.

III., 53, which is reduced to commentary, is repeated, mostly, in the 55th kârikô.

To illustrate the 68th kârikô, M. Saint-Hilaire cites, instead of III., 56, which is omitted, the explanatory expansion of it.

"Colebrooke a fait remarquer (Essays, tom. I., page 232) que les Souâtras attribués à Kapila mentionnaient le nom de Pantchasikha. Le fait est exact, et Colebrooke en tirait cette double conséquence: d’abord, que les Souâtras n’étaient pas de Kapila lui-même, car il n’aurait pas cité le nom de son disciple, et, en second lieu, qu’il y avait pour le Sândkhyâ des autorités antérieures aux Souâtras, puisqu’ils invoquaient eux-mêmes le témoignage d’un maître plus ancien qu’eux. J’admet les deux conséquences signalées par Colebrooke. Mais il aurait dû ajouter que la citation rapportée par lui se trouve dans l’avant-dermeît souâtra de tout le système. (Lecture 6, souâtra 68). A cette place, les interpolations ont été plus faciles certainement que dans le corps même de l’exposition, et il est fort possible qu’une main étrangère ait glissé celle-ci à la fin de l’ouvrage. Cette simple indication du nom de Pantchasikha ne nous apprend d’ailleurs absolument rien sur la vie de ce personnage, elle ne fait que consacrer le souvenir d’une de ses doctrines." Premier Mémoire, &c., pp 253, 254.

Now, in the first place, the suggestion broached by M. Saint-Hilaire, that VI., 68, as being the penultimate aphorism of the Sândkhyâ-sûtra, may, not improbably, be an interpolation, is weakened by the fact that it is followed by two aphorisms instead of one, and his objection now lies, by his line of argument, more directly against the text commemorating Sanandana,—VI., 69,—which, in his reading of Vijnâna, is consigned to the notes. Again, both he and Colebrooke failed to observe V., 32, which, likewise, in Vijnâna, as received by the former, is simply a scantling of commentary. The rest of M. Saint-Hilaire’s reasoning, the bulk of which is, with such a lofty air
objected by a fictitious postulant, or protagonist; appending, in antidote, the appointed solution of the difficulty suggested.

In this procedure it is nowise singular among compositions of its order. Neither is it the only sample, in Indian literature, of an aphoristic treatise that possesses but slight pretensions to method. It abounds, moreover, in repetition. As compared with the aphorisms of the other philosophical schools, to those of the Sāṇkhya may, however, with all their elliptical obscurity, be conceded no inconsiderable credit for the degree in which they define their own tenor. In this respect they present, indeed, an observable contrast to the sūtras of the Vedānta, to go no further; and the rationale of this contrast appears to be of no arduous discovery. As the creed purporting to represent the Vedas constituted the established faith, a compendium of its dogmas could securely count on a dispensation from that punctual scrutiny which would inevitably attend the symbol of a schism.* To the first would be wanting certain inducements

of patronage, avowedly adopted from Colebrooke, has been dealt with alreadv. See above, pp. 10, 11.

Once more, our essayist would, in expounding the 57th kārikā, have cited VI., 40, had it not, in the old edition of Vijnāna, been accounted expositorial; a part of the introduction to it being, there, put in its place.

* Nilakantha Chaturdharā, in his Shat-tantri-sūtra, enumerates, as āstika or orthodox systems of philosophy, the Mīmāṁsā, Tarka, and Vedānta; and, as nāstika or heterodox, the Chārvāka, Saugata, and Āraka. The Tarka, of the first class, he subdivides into the Sāṇkhya, Pāтанjala, Vaiseshika, and Nyāya; and the Saugata, of the second class, into the Sautrāntika, Vaiśhāshika, Yogāchāra, and Mādhyamika.

Proceeding to particulars, this writer gives some account of a singular theory, additional to those above named, by one Mis'ra. As never having been alluded to by any European writer, it may be thought not undeserving of a summary note.

The most remarkable characteristic of this theory consists in the exotic innovation of doing away with the ultimate resolution into the primal cause, of matter and all subaltern forms of intelligence. The diverse allotment, to different mortals, of mundane fruition, in the case of original appearances
to precision, which could scarcely fail to weigh gravely with the other; and, if acceptable in the gross, it might easily be entrusted to the casual care of expositors, for the redress of its laxities. As for the second, on the other hand, as anticipating every species of opposition, its compiler would industriously labour to diminish the chances of conflict, by, first of all, studying to avoid ambiguity; and, further, the proselyte to a new belief would naturally be solicitous for a precise enunciation of the tenets he had received in return for those he had discarded. Accordingly, though the aphorisms of the Vedánta may have been posterior to those of the Sánkhya, there seems good reason why the first should not have striven so strenuously as the other, against the hazard of misconstruction. That the latter is by no means so capable of various interpretation as the former, is incontestable. That it would prove to be so, might, perhaps, even be argued from the consideration that the Sánkhya has never, within historical knowledge, lapsed from unity; whereas

on the stage of life, is referred, by it, to the influence of the face of the horoscope at conception and birth. The preeminently devout are, at death, translated to a place of bliss, and are thenceforth exempt from earthly vicissitudes. Ignorant evil-doers are consigned, by divine messengers, to a region which is vaguely said to be inferior to paradise; and their resurrection in this world, or other subsequent change of state, appears to be unprovided for. Conscious transgressors are tormented in the flames of Tartarus, till the beginning of a new cycle; and are then recued with their former bodies. With these persons, the deeds of the past life have, declaredly, a retributive efficacy. Such as presumptuously pretend to oneness with the Deity,—by whom the Vedántas are plainly signified,—suffer, in their subtle frames, the döners of perdition, till the end of the current day of Brähma; and are then ejected from their gross corporeal investments. This last expression is unintelligible; and the text is, here, very likely, adulterated.

Mis'ra, on the representation of his critic, lays claim to one or more Upanishads, a Purána, and the Udás'aróva-bráhmana, as lending colour to his sentiments. Two branches from his proper school are hinted at; their deviation from the heresiarch being intimated to hinge on the nature of the godhead. Nilakaññha truculently retaliates the severity of Mis'ra to-
the Vedánta has notoriously ratified into several distinct and irreconcilable denominations.*

As already remarked, besides the book of aphorisms just dis-

- wards Vedántás, by denying to him and to his followers, every prospect of reaching the sphere of Brahma. He refuses them fellowship with the Hindu communion; and reviles them, under the epithet of 'brutes of the Lord,' for impiously maintaining that celestial blessedness is attended with a sense of selfhood.

The bare title of Mis'ra is usually appropriated, I learn, to Váchaspati Mis'ra the jurist. Here, however, it may, possibly, designate the elder writer of the same name, the pneumatologist. As conducing to sustain this conjecture, I may mention a rumour, prevalent among the learned Hindus of Central India, that this writer, late in life, put forth a disquisition, believed to have perished, on incognizable matters generally; in which, no doubt scandalizing the conservatism of his age, he evinced a marked disposition to think, within limits, for himself. At all events, the origination, on Indian soil, of a system that strikes at the very root of pantheism, is a phenomenon well worthy of remark. It may, indeed, almost be taken to imply an acquaintance with some religion of the West; though, in teaching that creation, sentient and inert, proceeds from the Deity as a seed, it is evident that Mis'ra had not risen to the Christian and Muhammadan dogma of genesis without a material cause. His implied restriction to the human species, of a future life, is, also, a striking reduction of the range accorded, by most oriental nations, to the economy of metempsychosis.

Of Nilakantha's Shat-tantrī-sātra I have been able to procure only the fourth and last chapter, and but a single copy of this fragment. The treatise is in verse, with a prose paraphrase and a commentary; the whole by the same author. It is said to have been written within the last century and a half.

* Notwithstanding their fundamental disparity, a general similitude pervades the Sánkhya and the Yoga. In some of the earliest authorities they are, also, repeatedly mentioned in combination. Their interdependence, likewise, is incontrovertible. That the Yoga implies the existence of the Sánkhya, does not require to be proved; and a reference to the Sánkhya-sātra equally discovers that it contemplates not a few of the fanatical notions and practices detailed in the aphorisms of the Yoga. It may, therefore, not unreasonably be concluded that the Sánkhya and the Yoga, whatever their era, or the age of their supposed earliest text-books, were of nearly contemporaneous origin.
missed, a scanty index* to the topics of the Sānkhya, entitled *Tattwa-samāsa*, is referred to Kapila. The articles that make

* The distribution of the Sānkhya system into twenty-five cardinal principles,—namely, eight producers, sixteen productions, and spirit,—is as old as the *Mahābhārata*. See foot-notes to pp. 2 and 6, supra. The crazy digest of these principles, laid down in the *Bhāgavata-purāṇa*, III., 26, 10 seqq., argues forcibly the recent origin of this crude farrago.

The topics of the Sānkhya, as diversely exhibited in the several editions of the *Tattwa-samāsa*, will receive full attention presently. But another classification of these topics, which computes them at sixty, is propounded in the commentaries on the *Tattwa-samāsa*, and in the *Rāja-vārtika* as quoted in the *Sānkhya-kaumudi* and *Sarvopakārini*. The passage from the *Rāja-vārtika* runs as follows:

प्राणानि वसेक मर्यादाच्ययान्यता।
पारायण व तथावे विशेषा शोभ एव च।
शेषानि निरक्तं वैदिकाञ्च उत्सा दश।
विशेषं पञ्चविशेषं स नव तुष्य।
करणानास्मात्मस्य विशेषित्य सत्तम।
दृष्टि च चति: पदराधानांस्थानां संन्य स्विधिभ।

Fifty of these topics, the ‘intellectual creation,’ offer no difficulty, at least in the immediate subdivisions of this aggregate. These are: the five species of obstruction, the nine of acquiescence, the twenty-eight of disability in the organs, and the eight of perfection. The remaining ten are: (1) the existence, (2) the simplicity, (3) the objectiveness, and (4) the subservience, of nature; (5) the distinctness, (6) the multity, and (7) the passiveness, of spirit; (8) the disjunction of nature from spirit, (9) the conjunction of nature with spirit; and (10) the continuance of the body after the acquisition of saving knowledge.

Prof. Wilson—*Sānkhya-kārīkā*, pp. 191-2—completes, in some sort, this set of ten ‘radical facts;’ but only by copying Vāchaspati where he supplements the text, and by misunderstanding him both there and elsewhere. Vāchaspati connects ‘existence’ with both ‘spirit’ and ‘nature;’ and yet in order to make but one category of the whole, namely, ‘the existence of spirit and nature.’ Prof. Wilson makes two: “existence of soul” and “existence of nature.” Again, Vāchaspati explains *s'ēsha-vritti*, by *sthūla* and *sūkhma*. Prof. Wilson, dividing, as before, gives two categories, “duration of subtle” and “that of gross.” *Viyoga* and *yoga* are left, by Vāchaspati, unexplained, as being too obvious to demand elucidation. Prof. Wilson throws them out altogether.
up this jejune catalogue, are misnamed *sūtras*;* and their
number, as fixed by different commentators, ranges from twenty-
two to twenty-five. On the strength of internal evidence, their
posteriority to the larger aphoristic treatise is scarcely matter

The commentaries on the *Tattva-saṃsaṅga* cite the ensuing couplet for an
enumeration of the ten radical facts:

अष्टिनिष्ठकतापराञ्ज्यांकेवल पाराञ्ज्यस्मककृतं च।
शेषं वियोगः वचः यूअः शितिः श्रीरः श्रेष्ठिः॥

The term *astitwa* ‘existence,’ here used, is explained by the other
commentators as it is by Vāchaspati. *Ves'esa-vrttiḥ* is, in some MSS.,
substituted for *cha s'esa-vrtitah*. Its import is represented as above. See,
regarding it, the sixty-seventh kārikā of I's'wara Krishna.

In an anonymous marginal note to one of my MSS. of the *Sāṅkhya-
kārikā*, I have found the verses given above from the *Rāja-vārtika*, with
the following stanza in place of their first couplet and a half:

पुनःप्र तिबिछिदिरज्जारिगुणः यः॥
त अष्टिनिष्ठकवृण्य मैलिकात्मा भवता दृष्ट॥

Here the fundamental categories are: (1) spirit, (2) nature, (3) intelli-
gence, (4) egotism, (5-7) the three qualities, (8) the subtle elements, (9)
the organs, (10) the gross elements. See, also, the *Sāṅkhya-kārikā*, p. 192.

* The *Sarvopallāni* commentary counts but twenty-two; as follows:

 deducted: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

The topic *traigunya-saṅchara* is given as two, in all the other com-
mentaries. It is only by this bisection that the *Sāṅkhya-sūtra-vīvarana* differs
from the *Sarvopallāni*; and thus exhibits twenty-three so-called *sūtras*.

The *Sāṅkhya-krama-dīpikā* rectifies, at its commencement, twenty-five
topics; but by obvious error; as it reduces them to twenty-four, by foregoing
all exposition of the words *trividho dhātu-sargah*, which occur after the topic
given above as the nineteenth. The MS. from which Dr. Ballantyne printed
the work in question, seems to be peculiar in reading *trividho dhātu-san-
of uncertainty;* and they add nothing to our knowledge of Kapila's system, except in having elicited annotations which lay

sargah. In the preface to the Sāňkhya-tattwa-vilása, where the Tattwa-samása is quoted, as if from the Sāňkhya-krama-dípaká, and briefly explained, the expression triviďho dhátu-sargah is explained by the words víta-píta-kapha-bhedát triviďhaḥ, as intending the assemblage of wind, choler, and phlegm. Colebrooke, by the way, translating from Jagannátha Tarkapanchánána, mistakes in construing the term dhátu-vaśkamya by "pernicious power of mineral drugs." Digest of Hindu Law, &c., Vol. III., p. 304 : 8vo. ed. Cf. Colebrooke's Two Treatises on the Hindu Law of Inheritance, p. 361, para. 2. The exact equivalent is, in our antique medical nomenclature, 'distemper of the humours.' The Hindu physiology reckons the humours at three only.

The Sāňkhya-krama-dípaká gives, after no. 22 as above, the words trividhaṁ dákham, as a topic.

The reading of the Tattwa-yáthárthya-dípana corresponds to that of the Sāňkhya-krama-dípaká, barring its rejection of trividho, &c., and its considering the words etad yáthátathyam as a topic, thus actually giving twenty-five as the total.

Kshemáñanda, in his annotations on the Tattwa-samása, states that it contains twenty-five topics: but he enumerates only twenty-four, his text being, as far as the words etad yáthátathyam, identical with that of the Tattwa-yáthárthya-dípána.

The Tattwa-samása is generally found appended to Vedánti Mahádeva's Sāňkhya-vritti-sára, and according to the reading of the Sarvopakáriṇí. Mahádeva, however, perhaps for the sake of shortness, omits the two sentences by which the topics are usually followed.

The eighth topic is read, in the Sāňkhya-sútra-vivarāṇa, adhidarñam cha; and adhidarvatam cha, in the Sāňkhya-krama-dípaká, in the Tattwa-yáthárthya-dípána, and in Kshemáñanda on the Tattwa-samása. The Sarvopakáriṇí, in its seventeenth topic, is unique in preferring das'a to das'adhá.

Of the Sāňkhya-krama-dípaká I have collated five MSS.

* The anonymous author of the Sarvopakáriṇí relates, as an ancient tradition, that Kapila the incarnation of Vishnu composed the Tattwa-samása, and that, in aftertimes, another Kapila, a manifestation of the divinity of fire, put forth the larger Sāňkhya Aphorisms, of which the 'Compendium of Principles' is the rudiment. The same tradition makes the doctrines of other, unnamed, philosophical schools, besides the Sāňkhya, no less than the 'Collection of Six Books,' to have sprung from the Tattwa-
under contribution sources presumed to be, in their integrity, no longer forthcoming.

samāsa. These observations will be found, in the Sanskrit, in a foot-note to p. 13, supra.

Vijñāna Bhikshu says: 'If it be alleged that the Tattwa-samāsa aphorisms are simply recited in the Collection of Six Books, the answer is, that it is not so. There is no mere repetition among them; inasmuch as they are, respectively, concise and expanded. Hence, the appellation of Sānkhyā-pravacanā is appropriate for the Collection of Six Books, in like manner as it is for the Institute of the Yoga. The former embraces precisely a detailed exposition of the Tattwa-samāsa, the shorter Sānkhya Institute. There is this difference, however, that the Collection of Six Books only expands the subject-matter of the Tattwa-samāsa; whereas the Institute of the Yoga avoids their seeming deficiency, by expressly propounding God, whom both the other works, by concession for sake of argument, deny.' For the original of this extract, see page 7 of the present work.

Our commentator, at p. 110, grows more confident; passing from the language of assumption, as it were, to that of positive assertion: 'This Institute, equally with that of the Yoga, as being a development of the substance of the shorter Sānkhya Aphorisms, is designated Sānkhya-pravacana, or, Exposition of the Sānkhya.'

Colebrooke, having in view a portion, if not all, of these remarks, writes as follows: "It appears, from the preface of the Kapila-bhāshya, that a more compendious tract, in the same form of sūtras or aphorisms, bears the title of Tattwa-samāsa, and is ascribed to the same author, Kapila. The scholiast intimates that both are of equal authority, and in no respect discordant: one being a summary of the greater work, or else this an amplification of the conciser one. The latter was probably the case; for there is much repetition in the Sānkhya-pravacana.

"If the authority of the scholiast of Kapila may be trusted, the Tattwa-samāsa is the proper text of the Sānkhya; and its doctrine is more fully, but separately, set forth by the two ampler treatises entitled Sānkhya-pravacana, which contain a fuller exposition of what had been there succinctly delivered." Miscell. Essays, Vol. I., pp. 231, 232.

Dr. Roer,—Journal of the As. Soc. of Bengal for 1851, p. 402, note,—after citing the latter of the paragraphs given above, unaccountably adds: "but this is a misapprehension: the scholiast does only say: 'they are of equal authority, one being a summary of the greater work, or else this an
The commentaries on the *Sānkhya-sūtra* are as follows:

I. The *Aniruddha-vṛtti*, by Aniruddha.* Of this author’s history I know nothing.

II. The *Sānkhya-vṛtti-sāra*, by Mahādeva Sarasvati,† more amplification of the conciser one.*” On the contrary, as will have been seen, the scholiast allows no such alternative, and is responsible for only the second member of it. Colebrooke would seem to have misunderstood the word *ubhayoh*; and he has, besides, made out Vijnāna to be self-contradictory. At the same time, the clause to which Dr. Roer excepts, is almost a literal translation of Vijnāna’s own words.

M Saint-Hilaire says, speaking of the Sānkhya Aphorisms: “Ce traité, quoique assez court, a été abrégé, dit-on, par Kapla, sous le titre de Tattva-Samāsa, c’est-à-dire, réduction substantielle du Sānkhya. Nous ne connaissons ce dernier ouvrage que par les citations qu’en ont faites les commentateurs, et qu’a répétées Colebrooke d’après eux (Essays, tome I., p. 231).” Premier Mémoire sur le Sānkhya, p. 5.

Here, again, Colebrooke is implicitly followed as translator of Vijnāna; at what cost, will already have appeared. Moreover, the phrase “réduction substantielle” scarcely answers to *Tattwa-samāsa*; and Colebrooke would be explored in vain for a single quotation from the smaller treatise.

Vijnāna plainly rests the validity of adjudging the title of *Sānkhya-pravachana* to the *Sānkhya-sūtra*, on the ground that these aphorisms are an expansion of the *Tattwa-samāsa*; the *Tattwa-samāsa* being, again, the embryo of another collection of aphorisms called *Sānkhya-pravachana*,—those of the Yoga. But this derivation of the *Yoga-sūtra* falls, in the first place, to be established; and, even if established, Vijnāna would still require a fact or two more to help him fairly to his conclusion. It may be suspected that his sole foundation of fact, in the passage given at the outset of this note, is the common application of the term *Sānkhya* to the system called from Kapla and to that of the Yoga.

* For evidence that Aniruddha was antecedent to Vijnāna Bhikshu, see the Appendix to this volume, pp. 3, 4, 8, 10, 11, 12.

† Mahādeva is likewise author of a Vedānta treatise, the *Tattvānusandhāna*. See my Catalogue of Sanskrit Books, &c., Vol. I., p. 97. He has also written a commentary on the *Amara-kos’A*, entitled *Budha-mano-hara*. Of this work I have one copy of the first two books, and another of the second only. The latest authority, of ascertained date, quoted in this fragment, is Rāya Mukuta, who was employed on his commentary in the
VI. The Rāja-vārtika, said to have been composed by, or for, Raṇaranga Malla, sovereign of Dhārā.*

Such commentaries on the Tattwa-samāsa as have been procured, will now be named.

I. The Survopakāriṇī, by a nameless writer.

II. The Sāṅkhya-sūtra-vivaraṇa, also by an anonymous author.

III. The Sāṅkhya-krama-dīpikā, Sāṅkhya-dalankāra, or Sāṅkhya-sūtra-prakshepiṇī;† likewise of unknown paternity.

lectively, Śrī-kāśi-rāja-sāgara. I have seen at least twelve or fifteen works by its author, who composed largely in Hindī and Marāhatti, no less than in Sanskrit.

* For this appropriation I am indebted to the learned Pandit Kāśinātha Śūtrī Ashṭaputra, of the Benares College. The Pandit is by far too well acquainted with Bhoja Rājā’s commentary on the Yoga-sūtra, to have mistaken it for the Rāja-vārtika. The latter treatise, he assures me, was in his possession several years, during which he constantly lectured on it to his pupils.

The only surviving extract from this work, generally known, is found in the couplets quoted, by Vāchaspati Mīśra, near the end of the Sāṅkhya-kaumudī; and in the Survopakāriṇī. They have been cited in the note at p. 27, supra.

† This work was published and translated by Dr. J. R. Ballantyne, in 1850; pp. 65, 8vo. Its titles were, at that time, unascertained.

Dr Röer—Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal for 1851, p. 405—states that the author of the Sāṅkhya-tattwa-vilāsa imputes this work to Aśuri; but he contests the credibility of this attribution, on the showing of the commentary itself. It does not positively appear, however, that the author of the Sāṅkhya-tattwa-vilāsa is speaking of the Sāṅkhya-krama-dīpikā.

For Panchas'ikha as scholiast of the Tattwa-samāsa, see p. 12, supra, foot-note.

To revert once more to Aśuri: since the first sheet of this preface was printed, a commentary on the Shaḍ-dars'una-samuchchaya has been procured, in which occurs the only passage attributed to this sage, that has yet offered itself to view. It is as follows:
IV. The *Tattwa-yāthārthya-dīpana*, by Bhāvā Gaṇeśa Dīkṣita,* son of Bhāvā Viśvanātha Dīkṣita, and pupil of Viṇāna Bhikshu.

V. An unnamed volume of annotations, by Kshemānanda,† son of Raghunandana Dīkṣita.

The *Sāṅkhya-kārikā*, by Īśwara Krishṇa,‡ ranks, in Hindu estimation, and deservedly, foremost among the Sāṅkhya com-

---

* He has also commented on the *Yoga-sūtra*, in the *Yogānus'āsana-sūtra-vṛtti*. Another of his works is the *Prabodha-chandrodaya-chīch-chandrikā*, or scholia on the *Prabodha-chandrodaya* drama.

† Author, also, of the *Nava-yoga-kālīla*, or *Nyāya-rānākara*; a concise treatise explanatory of the Yoga Aphorisms. He describes himself as belonging to a Kānyakubja family of Ishṭikāpura,—our barbarized Etawah, I am told. The only copy I have inspected of Kshemānanda’s notes on the *Tattwa-samāsa*, is imperfect in its latter half.

‡ The history of Īśwara Krishṇa is utterly unknown. Swapnetwara, in the *Kauṃudī-prabhā*, makes him one with Kāhādāsa: दूधर व्यासारामाकालिकाधारिण्य नामः कार्य I: I. These words are continuous with the extract given in a foot-note to p. 10, supra. The only two MSS. of the *Kauṃudī-prabhā* that I have seen, are defective at the conclusion, where Swapnetwara may, perhaps, have enlarged on the traditional identity which he reports.
II. The Sánkhyatattwa-kaumudi, or Sánkhyu-kaumudi; by Vácháspati Mis'ra,* pupil of Mártanda-tilaka Śvámí.

Gauḍapáda’s Bháṣya on the Sánkhyayókṛiká, including the Memorial Verses, was published, by Professor Wilson, at Oxford, in 1837. Prefixed to the originals is the Professor’s translation of the commentary, accompanying Colebrooke’s version of the text.

* There seem to have been two learned Hindus of the name of Vácháspati Mis'ra. Of the lawyer so called, Colebrooke says: “No more than ten or twelve generations have passed since he flourished at Semaul in Tirhút.” Digest of Hindu Law, &c., Preface, p. xix. 8vo. ed. of 1801. The same writer, after speaking of Vácháspati Mis’ra, the author of the Bhámati-nibandha, goes on to remark: “This is the same Vácháspati whose commentaries on the Sánkhyayókṛiká of Is’wara Chandra [Krishna], and on the text and gloss of Patanjala’s Yoga and Gotama’s Nyáya, were noticed in former essays. He is the author of other treatises on dialectics (Nyáya), and of one entitled Tattwa-bándhu, on the Púrva-nimánsá as it is expounded by Bhaṭṭa. All his works, in every department, are held in high and deserved estimation.” Miscell. Essays, Vol. L, pp. 332-3. It hence appears as if Colebrooke recognised this Vácháspati as distinct from some other,—from the jurist, in all probability. This distinction seems, in truth, to be indisputable; and yet I am unable to pronounce on the precise date that should be assigned to Vácháspati the lawyer; and materials fail me to verify the decision as to his age, cited above from Colebrooke. In the Dwaita-mánya, he mentions that he wrote that work at the instance of Jaya, consort of Bharava Rájú, and mother of Purushottama; but he enters into no further particulars. In another of his tracts, however, the Viváda-chintámaṇi, he alleges that, with a view to composing it, he had consulted, with other works, the Ratnákara. Now, the Ratnákara is known to have been prepared under the superintendence of Chandes’wara, minister of Harasinha Deva, son of Bhaves’a, princes of Mithila; and it specifies, as the time of its publication, the S’aka year 1236, or A. D. 1314. Beyond this point, Vácháspati the lawyer cannot, then, be carried into antiquity.

The elder Vácháspati Mis’ra is several times quoted in the Sarva-dárs’ana-ná- sansgrahá of Mádhava A’chárya; and his gloss on Vyása’s Yoga-bháṣhya, as likewise his Tattwa-kaumudi, is there mentioned in conjunction with his name. According to Colebrooke,—Miscell. Essays, Vol. I., p. 301,—
This treatise has, in turn, furnished occasion for several expositions. Such are:

"Madhava flourished towards the middle of the fourteenth century." The "no more than ten or twelve generations which Colebrooke reckons back from 1796 to Váchaspati the jurist, would be exhausted, even if Indian life averaged so many as three descents and a half to a century, long before we reached the time of Madhava Achárya. Moreover, I have seen a copy of part of the Bhámati-nibandha, which was transcribed in the Samvat year 1428, or A. D. 1372,—a date irreconcilable with Colebrooke's computation.

Váchaspati, in the brief enumeration, at the close of the Bhámati-nibandha, of his own compositions, eight in number, does not name, among them, a single one on jurisprudence. This list, as expanded in the Vedánta-kalpataru, embraces the following works: one on the Nyáya, the Nyáya-vártika-tátparya-tíká; one on the Sánkhya, the Tattwa-kauumudi; one on the Yoga, the Tattwa-s'áradá; one on the Mímsá, the Nyáya-kopsiká, a gloss on the Vedhí-voxeka; one on Bhaṭṭa's exposition of the Mímsá, the Tattwa-bindu; two on the Vedánta, the Tattwa-samíkshá, which is commentary on the Brahma-siddhi, and the Bhámati.

Váchaspati does not profess to confine himself, in this catalogue, to his writings of a certain class. Neither have we any hint that he was an author by proxy. These works must, of themselves, have cost good part of a life of study; and it is scarcely probable that, had the philosopher also become famous as a legal authority, his twofold character would not be celebrated, to this day, among the learned of India.

Several of these works are no longer known to exist. There is some uncertainty whether Tattwa-s'áradá be another name for the Pátanjalasútra-bháshya-nyákyá, but it seems, from the Vedánta-kalpataru, to be so. Colebrooke is, perhaps, incautious in saying that Váchaspati "is the author of other treatises on dialectics," besides the Nyáya-vártika-tátparya-tíká.

Váchaspati, in the Bhámati-nibandha, speaks of himself as living in the reign of one Nríga Rájá. Common fame makes him to have been a native of Tirhút; and his family name, Mis'ra, marks him as a native of Gangetic Hindustán.

Colebrooke—Miscell. Essays, Vol. I., p. 233—seems to be of opinion that the title Tattwa-kauumudi is applied to Váchaspati's Sánkhya work only by comparatively recent abbreviation. But the concluding distich of the book
a. The Tattwa-kaumudi-vyākhya, by Bhāratī Yati, pupil of Bodhāranya Yati.

b. The Tattwārṇava, or Tattwārṇita-prakāśini; by Rāghavānanda Saraswatī,* disciple of Adwayānanda or Adhwaryu Bhagavat-pāda, disciple of Vis‘wes’wara.

c. The Kaumudi-prabhā, by Swapnes’wara, son of Vāhinīs’ā.†

d. The Tattwa-chandra, by Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha Yati,‡ pupil of Vāsudeva Tīrtha, and disciple of Rāma-govinda Tīrtha.

e. The Sānkhya-tattwa-vilāsa, Sānkhya-vṛtti-prakāśa, or Sānkhyārtha-sankhyāyika; by Raghunātha Tarkavāgīśa Bhāttāchārya, son of Śiva-rāma Chakravartī, son of Chandravandya.

itself, if not spurious, contains the shorter form. It also occurs in the list of Vāchaspītī’s works, as lately detailed; and in Mādhava Achārya’s Sarva-dars’ana-sangraha.

The Sānkhya-kaumudi was published in Calcutta, in the Samvat year 1905, or A. D. 1848: pp. 49, small 8vo.

* To a writer or writers of this or similar name, Hindu literature is beholden for a number of volumes on the Vedānta and Mīmāṃsā. See my Catalogue, &c., Vol. I., pp. 70, 92, 139, and Appendix.

Rāghavānanda quotes Aniruddha, and was, consequently, posterior to him.

† Vāhinīs’ā had a brother surnamed Vidyāmāṇa; and this is the title of the father of Rudra Bhāttāchārya, the logician. A person called Swapnes’wara has contributed a series of annotations on the Aphorisms of Sāṅghīya, entitled S‘dvāyīya-s‘ata-sūtrī-bhāṣya.

* Of this work I have seen only a fragment of the beginning, going over Vāchaspītī’s notes on the first eight kārikās.

For several other works by Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha Yati, see my Catalogue, &c., Vol. I., pp. 88, 107, and Appendix. Colebrooke says, “He was author likewise of a gloss on the Yoga-sūtra, as appears from his own references to it.” Miscell. Essays, Vol. I., p 233. This statement has been substantially verified. There occurs, in his Sānkhya-chandrakā, a passage in which he speaks of his commentary on the Yoga-sūtra.

At p. 67 of this volume there are three couplets, introduced as if original. Two of them are cited by Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha Yati, who, therefore, perhaps came after Vijnāna Bhikshu.
son of Kāśīnātha, son of Balabhadra, son of Sarvavanda Misra. This is little more than a jejune epitome of the Sāṅkhya-kāimuḍī, with a preface briefly explaining the Tattwa-samāsa, which it repeats.

f. The Sāṅkhya-tattwa-vibhākara.*

III. The Sāṅkhya-chandrikā, by Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha Yati, author of the Tattwa-chandra, which has been spoken of above.

IV. The Sāṅkhya-kaumudī,† by Rāma-krishṇa Bhaṭṭāchārya, who is said to borrow freely from the author of the work last named.

The Sāṅkhya-sāra-viveka, or Sāṅkhya-sāra,‡ by Vijnāna Bhikṣu, consists of an expansion of the Sāṅkhya-kārikā, and an abridgement of the writer's own Sāṅkhya-pravachana-bhāṣya.

* This work I know only from the 1st Vol., by Dr. Weber, of Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der Königlichen Bibliothek. Berlin: 1853, p. 638. Dr. Weber is in doubt whether its author's name be, or be not, Vans'īdhara.

† Colebrooke’s Miscell. Essays, Vol. I, p 234. This work I have not seen. Lassen—Gymnosophista; Pref., p. ix.—makes it possible that it bears the second title of Sāṅkhya-sāra. Prof. Wilson leaves this point undiscussed. Sāṅkhya-kārikā, Preface, p. vii.


‡ In prose and verse; three chapters of the former, and six of the latter. The metrical portion consists of kārikās; and contains about 270 couplets, principally in the anushtubh measure. Colebrooke calls this work a “treatise on the attainment of beatitude in this life.” Miscell. Essays, Vol. I., p. 231. Its scope is, however, rather wider; comprehending salvation in general, as the meed of Sāṅkhya perfection.


Immediately succeeding the invocation of the Sāṅkhya-sāra-viveka, is the following passage:

Sāṅkhya Pariśkātha 'Neośāra' tathā vibhāṣitaḥ
dharmadīvīśeṇa vijñāna prapṇyate.
The *Sánkhya-tattwa-pradípa*, by Kavirája Yati or Bhikshu,* pupil of Vaikuṇṭha, is a brief exposition of the Sánkhya system.

The *Sánkhya-úrtha-tattwa-pradípipá*, by Bhatta Kes'ava, son of Sadánda, son of Bhaṭṭa Kes'ava, is a treatise resembling the last.†

Mr. Ward's version of these couplets runs thus: "The nature of spirit was examined by me briefly in the *Sánkhya-káriká*; according to my ability I now publish the *Sánkhya-sára-viveka*, in which I have collected the essence of the Sánkhya doctrines, which may all be found in the *káriká*.

The obvious rendering is, however, very different. 'The *Sánkhya-káriká* has discussed the nature of spirit but meagrely: Vijnána, in the *Sánkhya-sára-viveka*, therefore dilates on it. On the other hand, the processes of the Sánkhya have, in the *káriká* collection, been, for the most part, enunciated: accordingly, they are here set forth sparingly—so far only as they are there left unnoticed.'

Mr. Ward's text was, clearly, the same as my own, with the exception of a first case, in the second verse, instead of a seventh.

* Author of the *Tattwa-dípa* also. See my Catalogue, &c., Vol. I., p. 109.

† Colebrooke speaks of a Sánkhya work entitled *Sangraha*. I do not recall having met, in the course of my researches, with any reference to it. See Miscell. Essays, Vol. I., p. 234.

Ráya Mukuṭa, annotating the word *upalabdhi*, in his gloss on the *Amara-kos'á*, apparently quotes from a work called *Sánkhya-dars'ana*.

The *Sánkhya-muktávali*, by Voḍhù, is, further, a Sánkhya work possibly now, or once, in existence; if the bare word of a man who has declared to me that he once possessed and studied a copy of it, is to be received. But I strongly suspect that he fabricated the title of the treatise, for the occasion.

The Rev. Mr. Ward has published a list of Sánkhya compositions, in his work on the Hindus; Vol. II., p. 121: 8vo. ed. of 1822. This list is, however, one mass of errors, and errors almost too gross to deserve advertisement. It assigns the *Kapila-bhúshya* to Vías'wes'warí, perhaps instead of Vijnána Bhikshu, as one sometimes hears Vijnána Bhikshu incorrectly called; while it speaks of the *Sánkhya-pravachana-bhúshya* as a distinct composition, and neglects to name its author. Váchaspati Mís'ra's *Sánkhya-kaumúdá* is, in like manner, duplicated. Thus for a sample.
Of the history of our commentator, Vijnána Bhikshu, or Vijnána Yati, little has been discovered. We are even unacquainted with the civil appellation that he bore previously to commencing cenobite; and the period at which he flourished, if not wholly referrible to conjecture, can be determined only by approximation. He must have preceded Náges’á Bháttá, the epitomist of one of his works, who may have been living in the year 1713.* Three of his disciples† are known by name: Bhává Gáñés’a Díkshita, ‡ Prasáda Mádhava Yogi, § and Divya

The ignorance of our pandits very ordinarily confounds Vijnána Bhikshu with Vijnánes’wara, or Vijnána Yogi, author of the Múdikshárá, the celebrated commentary on the Yájnavalkya-smriti. But there is no evidence whatever that they are identical. Vijnánes’wara, who bore the title of Bhaṭṭáraka, was son of Padmanábha Bhaṭṭá, of the stock of Bharadvája. His preceptor was Vis’warúpa A’chárya, likewise a scholiast of Yájnavalkya. I shall not undertake to establish that this Vis’warúpa A’chárya was the same person as Sures’wána A’chárya, secularly known as Mandana Mí’sra, a disciple of S’ánkara A’chárya. See my Catalogue, &c., Vol. I., pp. 89, 91, 131.

* See a foot-note to p. 32, supra. In the prefatory verses of Vijnána’s Pátanjalá-bháṣya-vártika, according to one of the many MSS. of it which I have examined, allusion is made to one Bhavadeva, as an authority on the Yoga. Bhavadeva Mí’sra of Patna, author of the Pátanjaliyábhikshavá-bháṣya, a commentary on the Yoga-sútra, seems to be intended. But of his age I know nothing.

† M. Saint-Hilaire says: “Un maître n’a généralement qu’un disciple; un gorou n’a qu’un brahmatchâr.” Premier Mémóire sur le Súkhya, p. 7. Again: “La science, ainsi que j’ai eu occasion de le dire au début de ce mémoire, se transmet, dans l’Inde, habituellement d’un seul maître à un seul disciple.” Ibid., p. 254. This is news in India. Such unnatural cases no longer exist, if, indeed, they ever existed.

‡ I have seen a MS., without date, of the Tantra-chuíśimani or Dharma-imánás-sangraha, an elementary Mímánsá disquisition, by Káishna Deva, son of Ráma A’chárya, which professes to be in the hand-writing of this person. I hardly incline to consider the age of this MS. to be a couple of centuries, at the most.

§ Author of the Sátra-káriká-bháṣya or Kárikártka-cínis’chaya, a dia-
Sinha Misra.* Vijñana is the author of at least five several works, all of which are concerned with philosophy. Their titles, in the order, mainly, in which they were composed, are as follows: the Vijñānāmṛita or Brahma-sātra-rijju-rynkhyi,† the Sānkhya-pravachana-bhāṣya or Sānkhya-bhāṣya,‡ the Pātanjala-bhāṣya-vārtika or Yoga-vārtika,§ the Sānkhya-sāra-rīvēka or Sānkhya-sāra, and the Yoga-sāra-sanyāsini or Jñāna-pradīpa.¶

I have not proposed, in this preface, to treat of the Sānkhya system otherwise than with reference to the subordinate subjects of biography and bibliography. A number of obvious occasions have, however, emerged for deviating from those rigid bounds. Yet, for thus trespassing beyond my limits, no apology may, perhaps, be expected; and none, certainly, will be requisite for a few sentences in defence of my proper charge, Vijñana Bhikshu.

Sērtatation on the following enigmatical couplet, which its expounder claims to derive from the Mahābhārata:

र्षया दे विनिशित्य वृंदन्तुभिन्नेशीमृस
प्रति वि च विनिशिता वस्त श्रिया ज्ञोनी सम

This dissertation is in four sections, one being allotted to each measure of the distich.

* Divya Sūtra Misra has written a commentary, by name Sātra-kārikā-bhāṣya-vārtika, on the work mentioned in the last note. He style himself fellow-student of Prasāda Mādhava Yogī, under Vijñana Bhikshu; and he subjoins Prasāda Mādhava as the most eminent of their master's disciples.

† Each of these works, from the last upwards, cites all that, as being dispersed, precede it. But the Sānkhya-bhāṣya and the Yoga-vārtika quote each other. Their author appears, accordingly, to have been engaged with both at the same time; unless he, or some one else, interpolated one or the other.

‡ A commentary on Bādarāyana's Aphorisms of the Vedānta; containing

§ A commentary on Bādarāyana's Aphorisms of the Vedānta; containing

¶ Embracing $l. 3400.

A commentary on the Pātanjala-bhāṣya of Vyāsa; $l. 6300.

A succinct exposition of the Yoga philosophy; $l. 830 successor.
In India, at least, Vijnana Bhikshu's ability as an expositor of the Sankhya philosophy stands unimpeached. It has, however, at last been disallowed by so considerable a scholar as M. Saint-Hilaire. But it will be easy to evince, after the ensuing extract, whether our scholiast's judgement, particularly as regards the specific point on which the European philosopher arraigns it, be as immature as has been represented.

M. Saint-Hilaire translates and descants on the twenty-fifth of Is'wara Krishna's memorial stanzas, as follows:

"VINGT-CINQUIÈME SLOKA DE LA KABIKA.

"L'ensemble des onze principes doués de bonté émane du moi quand il est modifié également par la bonté. Du moi considéré comme élément primitif viennent les éléments grossiers; il est alors obscur; et cette double émanation n'a lieu que par l'influence de l'activité."

"Lorsque dans le moi la bonté l'emporte sur l'obscurité et sur la méchanceté ou passion, le moi est essentiellement pur; et, dans le langage des anciens maîtres, le moi, à cet état, est appelé modifié. Sa véritable nature, c'est d'être affectée par la bonté; et quand il est ainsi affecté, la modification qu'il reçoit est celle qu'il doit véritablement recevoir; ce n'est pas en quelque sorte une modification pour lui, puisque son essence c'est d'être bon. C'est du moi dans cette disposition que sortent les onze principes, doués alors comme lui de bonté. On se rappelle que les onze principes sont les cinq organes de perception, les cinq organes d'action, et le manas, ou le cœur, placé au onzième rang. Quand au contraire le moi est affecté d'obscurité, on ne l'appelle plus Veikrita, le modifié; mais on l'appelle Bhou-tâdi, l'élément primitif, l'obscur; et c'est de lui que sortent les cinq éléments grossiers, les Bhoutâni. Mais pour produire l'une ou l'autre de ces créations, soit les onze organes doués de bonté, soit les cinq éléments grossiers, le moi a besoin de l'intervention de l'activité.* Par lui-même le moi

* The three guṇas are, it may be, still an unread riddle; and I decline the attempt of improving on the interpretations of them that have been ventured by my predecessors.

Prof. Wilson formerly wrote of them as follows: "The Hindu system arranges all the attributes of spirit in action, under three heads or qualities, the sattvā, rajās, and tamas. The first comprises the presence of all good, and absence of all evil; the last, the presence of all evil, and the absence of all good; and the middle one is a mixed quality, in which the operations..."
In India, at least, Vijnana Bhikshu’s ability as an expositor of the Sankhya philosophy stands unimpeached. It has, however, at last been disallowed by so considerable a scholar as M. Saint-Hilaire. But it will be easy to evince, after the ensuing extract, whether our scholiast’s judgement, particularly as regards the specific point on which the European philosopher arraigns it, be as immature as has been represented.

M. Saint-Hilaire translates and descants on the twenty-fifth of Y'swara Krishna’s memorial stanzas, as follows:

"VINGT-CINQUIEME SLOKA DE LA KABIA.

"L’ensemble des onze principes doués de bonté émane du moi quand il est modifié également par la bonté. Du moi considéré comme élément primitif viennent les éléments grossiers ; il est alors obscur ; et cette double émanation n’a lieu que par l’influence de l’activité.

"Lorsque dans le moi la bonté l'emporte sur l'obscurité et sur la mécanicité ou passion, le moi est essentiellement pur ; et, dans le langage des anciens maîtres, le moi, à cet état, est appelé modifié. Sa véritable nature, c’est d’être affecté par la bonté, et quand il est ainsi affecté, la modification qu’il reçoit est celle qu’il doit véritablement recevoir ; ce n’est pas en quelque sorte une modification pour lui, puisque son essence c’est d’être bon. C’est du moi dans cette disposition que sortent les onze principes, doués alors comme lui de bonté. On se rappelle que les onze principes sont les cinq organes de perception, les cinq organes d’action, et le manas, ou le cœur, placé au onzième rang. Quand au contraire le moi est affecté d’obscurité, on ne l’appelle plus Veikrma, le modifié ; mais on l’appelle Bhou-tâdi, l’élément primitif, l’obscur ; et c’est de lui que sortent les cinq éléments grossiers, les Bhoutân. Mais pour produire l’une ou l’autre de ces créations, sont les onze organes doués de bonté, soit les cinq éléments grossiers, le moi a besoin de l’intervention de l’activité." Par lui-même le moi

"The three gunas are, it may be, still an unread riddle; and I decline the attempt of improving on the interpretations of them that have been ventured by my predecessors.

Prof. Wilson formerly wrote of them as follows. "The Hindu system arranges all the attributes of spirit in action, under three heads or qualities; the sattva, rajas, and tamas. The first comprises the presence of all good, and absence of all evil; the last, the presence of all evil, and the absence of all good; and the middle one is a mixed quality, in which the operation..."
of the affections and passions is strongest, and gives occasional predominance to good and ill." Quarterly Oriental Magazine for March, 1826, p. 21. In the next page he adds: "Srddhara and Nilaanaitha, it is true, interpret sattwa by désire, firmness, fortitude: but they intend the same thing, in fact, with the sattwa quality, or the Mens Sola of the upright man who is unmoved by ignorance and passion. It appears to be the same as the Temperants or Tranquillitas of the Stoics, whilst the regias might be expressed by Perturbatio, and tames by Intemperautus."

Mr. J. Ellis unhesitatingly renders the names of the qualities by " pure unpassioned virtue," " passion," and " depravity inclining to evil;" and he believes the apocryphal Sanchoniathon to have had some inkling of these " ethicalines, and to have bungled them in his mystical theology. Notice of the Rédaïya, of Bodhâyana, in the Quarterly Oriental Magazine for September, 1826, pp. 8, 15, and 16.

Mr. Saint-Hilaire says: " Je crois qu'en résumé cette attribution des trois qualités à la nature cachée une idée des plus simples; elle signifie uniquement que les choses dans leur rapports avec nous, ce c'est à l'homme que tout se rapporte dans ce système idéalisme, ne peuvent être que de trois sortes, bonnes, mauvaises, ou indifférentes. J'ai vainement cherché un autre sens aux théories du Sánkhya; je ne puis leur trouver que celui-là. Dans le nombreux passages des commentateurs, des poèmes et des pourains où il est question des trois qualités, elles se présentent toujours sous cet aspect." Premier Mémoire sur le Sánkhya, p. 317.
autrement la pensée de Kapila. Je viens de dire que le Sout du autre est ici complètement identique, sauf un neutre en place d’un masculin, au vers de la Kārikā. Ainsi les deux commentateurs ont le même texte, et la différence d’interprétation ne repose pas sur une différence de mots. Or Viśṇuṇā ma comprend qu’il s’agit ici, non pas de l’ensemble des onze principes sortant du moi, mais du onzième principe, c’est-à-dire du manas, du cœur, qui, dans toutes les classifications, figure régulièrement, comme un le mam, au onzième rang, parce qu’il est tout à la fois organe de perception et organe d’action. Il faudrait donc faire ici un changement considérable, et substituer le manas aux onze organes. Je dois dire que la grammaire ne s’y oppose en rien, et que le texte, sort avec le neutre de Kapila, tout au masculin d’Isvara Krishna, se prête également bien à l’un et à l’autre sens.

“Si l’on adopte l’explication de Viśṇuṇā, il faudrait traduire le vingt-cinquième sloka de la façon suivante :

“Le principal principe, doué de bonté émane du moi qui est modifié également par la bonté ; du onzième principe, considéré comme un élément primitif, viennent les éléments grossiers. Ce onzième principe est obscur ; et tous deux, ce principe et le moi, n’agissent que sous l’influence de l’activité.”

“Mais on peut remarquer que cette explication est en contradiction formelle avec les slokas qui précèdent : d’abord avec le sloka vingt-deux : ce qui fait sortir directement du moi les seize principes, et qui fait sur trois particular les éléments grossiers des éléments subtils ; et ensuite, avec le sloka vingt-quatrième, qui reproduit la même doctrine. Il faut ajouter que cette doctrine que nous retrouvons dans la Kārikā vient de Kapila lui-même, comme la prouve le sûtra que nous avons cité. Nous devenons donc bien fier à l’explication de Gaudapada plutôt qu’à celle de Viṣṇuṇā. Dans le système sāṅkhya bien interprété, les cinq éléments grossiers viennent : les cinq éléments subtils, et les cinq éléments subtils avec les onze organes viennent du moi. Ce n’est pas le manas, le cœur, qui produit les éléments grossiers, comme le croit Viṣṇuṇā Bhumihou ; et ce qui est étranger encore davantage dans son erreur, c’est que, dans le sûtra immédiatement précédent, Kapila dit expressément, lecture deuxième, sûtra “[...].” : “L’effet du moi, c’est l’ensemble des onze organes et des cinq éléments grossiers.” Quelque défaut qu’il soit de se prononcer dans des questions de ce genre, nous croyons pouvoir affirmer que Viṣṇuṇā Bhumihou s’est trompé, et qu’il n’y a point à tenir compte de son opinion.”


M. Saint-Hilaire’s rendering of the memorial culprit calls, first of all, for attention.
In the preceding extract we read that it is of the essence of egotism to be good. Yet it is no more so than it is of its essence produced from egotism only by the intermediate agency of the elementary particles.

The mistake which Professor Wilson falls into, after his attempt to correct Colebrooke, can easily enough be accounted for. Gaudapāda says: भूसांवाचारिभूतं। ततोष कालेण। ष तास्व रूसिः। Thus the Professor translates thus: “The first element of the elements is darkness; therefore it is usually called the dark.” But the word here rendered by “first element” would, as masculine, mean ‘first being,’ if it were a substantive; ‘first element’ requiring, not दोभृताः, but दोभृताः. Being, however, an adjective, it refers to ब्रह्माण्ड, the second factor of which it justifies etymologically. This reference should have been evident from the gender of उक्तं, सा, and तानस; and also from that of बहुसं, which, with its present ending, and, moreover, as it stands in the sentence, could never be an adverb. It is not propounded that the elements originate from their like, from an element; and, while nothing is predicated of darkness, darkness is predicated as characterizing one of the varieties of egotism. The passage cited above will, therefore, admit of no other translation than such as this: ‘It, origin of the elements, is originary, v.i., of the elements; it is also surcharged with darkness; and hence is called dark.’ To bear out Professor Wilson’s English, the Sanskrit should have stood thus: भूसांवाचारिभूतं सम्बन्धम्। लेण व ब्रह्माण्ड तस्मां नामरूपित।

In giving the passage from Gaudapāda, I have supplied it with punctuation, and the only punctuation that it will abide.

In the Purāṇa-parāṇa, at I., 12, 53, the term ब्रह्माण्ड: ‘generative of the elements,’ euphemistically employed in place of ‘dark egotism,’ is again rendered, by Professor Wilson, “first element.” See his Translation, p. 93, line 12.

Professor Wilson, building on his oversight, indulges in the following comment, which may now be cancelled: “There is a remarkable expression in the Bhāṣyā, which presents a notion familiar to all ancient cosmogonies. Gaudapāda says, ‘the first of the elements was darkness.’ It is the first of the ‘elements,’ not the first of ‘things’; for it was preceded by unevolved nature, and intellect, and it is itself a modified form of individuality. It therefore harmonizes perfectly well with the prevailing ideas in the ancient world, of the state of things anterior to elementary or visible creation, when ‘chaos was, and night,’ and when
sense to be dark, or to be active. To the end that egotism may acquire the distinction of pure, it is not necessary that it should

Nullus adhuc mundo præbebat lumina Titau,
Nec nova crescendo reparabat cornua Phœbe.

In the influence of the quality of foulness, or passion,—for the word rajás has both senses,—may be suspected an affinity to the doctrine of an active principle, the moving mund, the eros, that set inert matter into motion, and produced created things.” Sánkhya-kárika, p. 94.

Lassen, who was the first to translate the whole of Is'wara Krishna's treatise, had a right understanding of bhútádi. “Caterva undenum essentialis proficiscitur e su sensu essentia]; rudimentalis ex (sui sensu) elementorum generatore; haec caliginosa est. Ex impetuoso (sui sensu) utralbet oritur creano.” Twenty-fifth kárika, in Gymnosophista, p. 58.


A revised version of the kárika in question is here submitted: “The class of eleven, consisting of purity, proceeds from egotism technically called modified. From egotism, as the source of the elements, the rudimental particles originate; and this form of egotism is imbued with darkness. But it is only from egotism when affected by activity that the one and the other, the class of eleven and the elementary particles, take their rise.”

It may be observed that, while Professor Wilson, at p. 94 of the Sánkhya-kárika, considers egotism, in one of its kinds, as “the first of the elements,” at p. 121 he places, by the side of the tan-mátras ‘subtle elements,’—which emanate from egotism, and give birth to the gross elements,—as speciously comparable, the στοιχεία στοιχείων of Empedocles. For the seeming parallel to these elemental ultimates, the Professor ought, in consistency, to have gone back to dark egotism. But it has previously been shown that the Sánkhya does not recognise as elementary anything antecedent to the particles so designated.

The Professor’s remarks, incidentally bearing on the functions of bhútádi, at p. 164 of the Sánkhya-kárika, are unsubstantiated. The text on which these mistaken observations are founded, is as follows: एवमान्तितकः चौग्री चिक्ष्यंभावसंग्रीभूतसंग्रीद्वेशान्तथेऽन्नाइत्येषप्रधानानि चांडशसमः।

“Thus, non-elemental creation, rudimental creation, conditional and elemental creation, in beings of divine, mortal, brutal, and (immovable) origin, are the sixteen sorts of creation effected by nature.” Such is Professor
consist wholly of purity; the mere preponderance of this qua-

Wilson's translation; instead of which we should certainly read: 'The non-elemental creation,—i.e., the rudimental creation and the conditional creation,—and the elemental creation, or the aggregate of beings of divine, mortal, and brutal, origin, are the sixteen sorts of creation proceeding mediately from nature.'

My MS. wants the word भूतपूर्ण एवं 'elemental creation'; but its insertion, as an equivalent of the शैतिक: यथः of the 53d kārikā, is quite im-material. Moreover, I have corrected a grammatical inadvertence.

The elemental creation has fourteen divisions; and the two branches of the non-elemental count, each, as unity. The sum of sixteen is thus completed. There is, then, no such respective reference, in the above passage, as may have led the Professor to supply the word 'immovable,' and which induced him to make the following comment: "Apparently, each of the four classes of beings proceeds from four modifications of nature, or, from the invisible principles, from the subtile rudiments, from the conditions or dispositions of intellect, and from the gross elements."

The evolution of the Sāňkhya principles as recited in the Vishnu-purāṇa, is strangely misrepresented by the translator. A single sample will suffice.

\[ \text{भूतपूर्ण विकृताम्:} \text{शब्दतन्त्राचिन्तं यत्:} \]
\[ \text{सन्तवं शब्दतन्त्राचाराकश्म:} \text{शब्दजच्छन्ति:} \]
\[ \text{शब्द एवं त} \text{इकाकाख्य पूर्ण:} \text{च चासांशोत्} \]

I., 2, 37-8.

"Elementary Egotism then becoming productive, as the rudiment of sound, produced from it Ether, of which sound is the characteristic, investing it with its rudiment of sound" Translation, p. 16.

The correct rendering is, however: 'The element-engendering egotism, being modified, then produced the rudiment of sound; and, from the rudiment of sound, the ether, whose characteristic is sound; and this element-engendering egotism, similarly to agents in processes before mentioned, invested the ether, which consists of sound.'

Almost the entire page from which the passage above animadverted on is taken, is disfigured by the style of misapprehension just pointed out. In one place, in fact, in order to force the construction desired, the nominative singular vāyu—euphonically required for vāyuḥ—is made accusative. Santa\(\text{l\text{}}}y liberties vastly more licentious than this, are often taken, in the Purā\(\text{n}\text{s}, but there is, in this instance, no temptation whatever to do vio-


cence to Pāṇini.
lity being held sufficient for the purpose.* Further, the term *manas* is said to mean ‘heart.’ At p. 30, it is called “l’esprit vital.” At p. 106, a choice is allowed out of “le cœur;” “l’esprit,” and, “pour prendre une expression plus juste et assez souvent employée dans notre langage philosophique, le sensorium commune.”† The *manas* is defined, by Śāṅkhya authorities, to be one of the soul’s three internal organs, without which there is no experience of joy or grief; in the same way as, for instance, but for the eye, one of the soul’s external organs, sight is impossible.

In order to adjust the twenty-fifth *kārikā* after Vijnāna’s conception of *manas*, M. Saint-Hilaire correctly premises that this word must be substituted, in the couplet, for the eleven organs. But, professing to effect this substitution, while he once puts *manas* for the eleven organs, he puts it three times for egotism. He also puts egotism for subtile elements, or, rather, gross elements; for he foists this blunder of his own, as well as his borrowed primitive element, on the injured commentator. Again, purposing to censure Vijnāna, he remarks rightly, at first, that, ‘in the Śāṅkhya system, accurately expounded, the five gross elements issue from the five subtile elements; and the five subtile elements, and the eleven organs, from egotism.’ Yet, in

* Indeed, in the twenty-fifth *kārikā* itself we have the word *vukrita* ‘modified’ as a synonyme of *sāttvika* ‘pure.’ Elsewhere, *vaikárika* ‘modification’ occurs as its substitutes.

† Professor Wilson had already explained *manas* to be “an internal sense, a *sensorium.*” Śāṅkhya-kārikā, p. 100. Colebrooke calls it a “sensitive, maternal organ,” and likens it to the *θυμός* of Pythagoras. Miscell Essays, Vol. I., p. 418.

The word *manas* has often been compared to the Greek *μένος*; but, whether as used in the Śāṅkhya system, or elsewhere, it bears very little similarity to this term, which “seems most commonly to answer to the Latin word *impetus*, and implies rather a physical, than mental, energy. Homer places it, at different times, in the knees, the *θυμός*, the *στήθος*, and the *φρήν*.” Mitchell’s Wasps of Aristophanes, p. 103.
translating and annotating the twenty-fifth karikā, we have seen that it is the gross elements which he derives immediately from egotism.

But Vijnāna has clearly enough set forth his view of the twenty-fifth karikā, as M. Saint-Hilaire would have seen, had he read, even with the aid of Professor Wilson, the scholiast's interpretation of the eighteenth Aphorism of the second Book.* After alleging manas to mean the eleventh organ, Vijnāna explains 'both' to refer to the intellectual organs and the organs of action. The karikā will, then, run thus: 'The eleventh organ, consisting of purity, originates from modified egotism. From egotism, as the source of the elements, proceed the rudimental particles; and this variety of egotism is imbued with darkness. From egotism affected by activity, arise both the intellectual organs and the organs of action.'

Vijnāna is, therefore, peculiar, as compared with some others, in deducing, from pure egotism, but a single product, mind, instead of eleven, viz., mind and the ten organs of intellection and action: the latter being referred, by him, to the active species of egotism; which is held, on the adverse interpretation, to be, independently, inoperative, but yet an indispensable condition of energy on the part of the other two modifications of the self-conscious principle. To defend, textually, his exegesis of the latter part of the twenty-fifth karikā, Vijnāna must be supposed to contemplate the twenty-sixth karikā; inasmuch as the organs of understanding and action are there mentioned for the first time in the treatise: and this anticipation is clearly impracticable, save by the dislocation of all syntax. Nevertheless, the import which Vijnāna contends for, is far from being a peculiarity

---

* Sāṅkhya-karikā, p. 94. Professor Wilson here, too, however, requires to be set right. Forgetting the order in which he has just enumerated the modifications of egotism, he writes "the other ten, from the second kind; and the elements, from the third." The words 'second' and 'third' must be transposed.
personal to himself only. Both the sets of Aphorisms attributed to Kapila are silent on the topic under discussion; and so is the Mahābhārata. Arguing, however, from the Hindu point of view,—such as it is,—our commentator is supported by the divine testimony of the Purāṇas, against the mere human authority of Iśwara Kṛṣṇa and his successors.* At all events, the ex-

* The productiveness of active egotism is the doctrine of the Purāṇas. The Mahābhārata, after XII., 11395, where it would be expected to pound either this view, or else one that would preclude it, is suggestively mute. Can it be that this tenet is a development dating subsequently to Iśwara Kṛṣṇa’s time; having been, since then, grafted on the Purāṇas? I quote, below, from these works.

भूतनामाभरणम्।यस्माचर्च्चाराणुि सामसात।
तै समेतालिकाय देवा वेदारिका दश।
एकादश मनस्तत्त देवा वेदारिकाः वृत्ता।

Vishṇu-purāṇa, I., 1, 46-7.

"This is the elemental creation, proceeding from the principle of egotism affected by the property of darkness. The organs of sense are said to be the passionate products of the same principle, affected by foulness; and the ten divinities proceed from egotism affected by the principle of goodness; as does mind, which is the eleventh." Prof. Wilson’s Translation, pp. 17, 18

In a foot-note to p. 16, Prof. Wilson repeats Gaudāpāda’s account of the three sorts of egotism, but without directing attention to its contradiction of his text.

For a passage to the same effect with the verses given above, see the Bhāgavata purāṇa, III., 5, 29 seqq.: also III., 26, 27 seqq. It is the first of these two passages that is cited, by Viṣṇā, at p. 118. Vīrāghava, in his commentary, the Bhāgavata-chandrikā, wrests the word taijasat, in the fourth verse, into congruity with the dogmas of Iśwara Kṛṣṇa and his school, by explaining it to denote "with the aid of passional egotism."

Add: वेदारिकाद्वाणुाद्वाणु स्वासा वेदारिकाभवत्।
तै सातात्रियाली श्रीवेदारिकादश।
एकादश मनस्तत्त खगोलभय कम्।
भूतनामाभरणम् भूतादेवभवस्त।

Kūrma-purāṇa, prior section, 4th chapter.
pression of amazement ventured by M. Saint-Hilaire, is altogether gratuitous; and it would have been well had he foregone the temerity of impeaching, with headlong disparagement, the adjudication, by so acute and learned a writer as Vijnána, of a nice philosophical punctuality. Vijnána, so far from the preposterous solecism of deducing any of the elements from mind, expands the seventeenth Aphorism of the second Book in these words: 'The eleven organs, and the five subtile elements, i.e., sound, &c., are the products of egotism.'

Gross from subtile

Pure egotism, here, again, is made to generate the ten superintending deities, who, according to the Sankhya system as ordinarily enunciated, except in the Puránas, must form part of the world of animation, which emanates from the subtile elements. The names of these deities occur in the Bhágavata-puráña, II., 5, 30. M. Burnouf, in his translation of this work, Vol. I., p. 122, renders the appellation of one of them, Dis', by "les points cardinaux." The directions are variously computed, by the Hindus, at four, eight, and ten. Professor Wilson arbitrarily expresses Dis' by "space." Vishnu-puráña, p. 17, 28th foot-note.

An eleventh deity is recognised by some of the Puránas,—the moon, whose presidency is over mind.

In the verses quoted above, from the Kárma-puráña, mind is strangely said to partake of the two qualities of activity and purity.

The Sarva-darśana-sangraha considers the ten organs and mind to be effluences from pure egotism, and silently ignores any hypothesis of their originating otherwise.

It is a curious circumstance that this work nowhere mentions the Sánkhyā Aphorisms; its authority on hylotheistic matters, wherever a text is to be cited, being the Kárikā of Iś'wara Krishna.

An examination of S'ankara Kehúrya's Sarva-siddhánā-sangraha, which I have not been able to procure, would, very probably, throw light on the Sánkhyā as received in the eighth century. The ninth chapter of this treatise is occupied with the doctrine of Kapila. See Zeitschrift der Deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Vol. I., p 200.

* See, at p. 45, supra, M. Saint-Hilaire's incorrect translation of the passage which I render thus. The essayist's heedlessness is, here, unaccountable.
follows of necessity.* As to the rest, his predilections, alike in the present instance and elsewhere, are for the doctrines of the original Sentences, as altered and amplified by Paurāṇika innovation.

The Sāṇkhya system assumes, in practice, the form of the adoration of nature,† or, rather, of a sublimated ideal essence of

* In the Sāṇkhya Aphorisms, the coordinate emanation, from the subtile elements, of the gross elements, is expressly indicated as early as I., 61,—which M. Saint-Hilaire passes by, as has previously been shown:—and Vijnāna, in his notes, is nowise eccentric in his paraphrase of this text.

† Mālā-prakṛti, the primum agent, whose analogues, in the several Hindu schools of philosophy, are too notorious to call for repetition. The late Rev. Dr. W. H. Mill has likened it to the ēnuo of Gnosticism, "in which, as in the Sāṇkhya, νῶς, or intellect, buddhi,—otherwise called mahat,—is the first-born offspring; and then all separate individual essences."

Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal for 1835, p. 386. Such was the dream of Valentine, as we learn from Irenæus: Λέγουσι γάρ τινα εἶναι ἐν ἀδράτοις καὶ ἀκατονομάστοις ὑψώμασι τέλειον Αἴωνα προόντα τούτον δὲ καὶ * * * * Προπάτορα καὶ Βυθὸν καλοῦσιν. * * * * 'Ὑπάρχοντα δ' αὐτῶν ἄχώρητον καὶ ἄδρατον, αἴδιον τε καὶ ἀγέννητον ἐν ἑσυχίᾳ καὶ ἠρεμίᾳ πολλῇ γεγονέναι ἐν ἀπείροις αἰῶνι χρόνων. Συνυπάρχειν δ' αὐτῷ καὶ 'Εννοια, ἢν δὴ καὶ Χάριν καὶ Σεγην ὄνομαζοντες. Καὶ ἐννοηθήναι ποτε ἄφ' ἄντον προβαλέσθαι τὸν Βυθὸν τούτον ἄρχην τῶν πάντων, καὶ καθάπερ στέρμα τὴν προβαλλὴν ταύτην (ἤν προβαλέσθαι ἐνενοθή) καὶ καταθέσθαι, ὃς ἐν μήτρῃ τῇ συνυπαρχοῦσῃ ἑαυτῷ Σεγην. Ταύτην δὲ ὑποδεξαμένην τὸ στέρμα τούτο καὶ ἐγκύμωνα γενομένην ἀποκυψάι Νοῦν ὅμοιον τε καὶ ἰσον τῷ προβαλώστα καὶ μόνον χρωτίντα τὸ μέγεθος τοῦ Πατρὸς. Τὸν δὲ Νοῦν τούτον καὶ Μανογενή καλοῦσι, Πατέρα καὶ 'Αρχὴν τῶν πάντων. Συμπροβεβλήσθαι δὲ αὐτῷ 'Αλήθειαν. Καὶ εἶναι ταύτην πρώτην καὶ ἀρχέγονον Πνεαγορικήν Τερακτίων, ἢ τὴν ἤ πρὶς τῶν πάντων καλοῦσιν. 'Εστι γὰρ Βυθὸς καὶ Σεγην, ἐπειτα Νοῦς καὶ Ἀλήθεια. Irenæi Opera, ed. Stierer: Lipsiae, 1853: Tom I., pp. 10 seqq. Cyril, of Jerusalem, gives Valentine's genealogy of the Aëons very differently: 'Ὁ Βυθὸς ἐγέννησε Σεγην, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Σεγηῆς ἐτεκνοποίει Λόγον, κ. τ. λ. Catech. VI.

In the Refutation of all Heresies, by Hippolytus, Irenæus's disciple, it is shown, however, that Simon, the Samaritan sorcerer, a precursor
the material world, for which the European languages, nowise to their discredit, want a name. That this scheme of speculation

of Valentine, had quite a different cosmogony,—and not in nomenclature only: Δύο εἰσι παραφύαδες τῶν ὄλων αἰώνων, μὴ τε ἁρχὴν μὴ τέρας ἡκουσαί, ἀπὸ μᾶς φέρεις, ἢ τις ἐστὶ δύναμις, Συγγ ἀόρατος, ἀκατάληπτος, ὁν ἢ μία φανεται ἀναθεν, ἢ τις ἐστὶ μεγάλη δύναμις, Νοῦς τῶν ὄλων, διέσων τὰ πάντα, ἄρσην Ἡ δὲ ἐτέρα, κατοθεν, Ἐπίνοια μεγάλη, θήλεα, γεννώσα τὰ πάντα. Simon's Απόφασις Μεγάλη. Vide Origem [lege Hippolyti] Philosophumena, sive Omnium Haresium Refutatio, ed. Emmanuel Miller; p. 173. Though Gregory of Nazianzus—supported by his commentators, Elias of Crete and Nicetas Serron—declares that Simon talked of both Βυθός and Συγγ, yet the evidence of what are, presumably, the sorcerer's own words, is opposed to this assertion. Theodoret describes Simon's nonsense similarly, as far as regards this pair of powers; only, like Irenæus, he puts Ἐννοια for Συγγ. And yet he brings in Ἐννοια a second time, as springing, with Φωνή, from Νοῦς and Ἐπίνοια. For this second Ἐννοια we must read Ὄνομα.

Simon's Ἐπίνοια thus appears to become, with Valentine, Ἐννοια; only the latter is, now, mother of Νοῦς, instead of mate. Ἐννοια has, here, however, another name, Συγγ; which is, with Simon, the appellation of the source of Ἐπίνοια. But Simon's Συγγ—otherwise called Πῆρ—has no obvious partner, to serve as prototype to the paramour Βυθός. In other words, Simon starts with a monad, while Valentine sets out with a duad. Valentine's theory, in producing the world, at the outset, by generation, is, therefore, in one respect, nearer the Sānkhya than is that of Simon; who, to every appearance, maintains a twofold effluence, prior to any process of procreation. The Sānkhya first begets, and then introduces evolution.

For Simon Magus's μεγάλη δύναμις, see the Acts of the Apostles, VIII, 10. In the homilies ascribed to Clement of Rome, the expression "great power of God," as applied, by Simon, to himself, receives the following turn: Σύμων, δροστερά τού Θεού δύναμις ὁν, καὶ τῶν τῶν Θεού οὐκ εἰδότων ἐπὶ κακοποίησε τὴν ἐξουσίαν ἔχων. Clementis Romani quae feruntur Homiliae Vigniti, ed. Dressel: Gottingae, 1853: p. 174. Simon's δύναμις cannot but remind the Sanskrit scholar of the Hindu s'akti. But the former term was applied to either sex, whereas the other is restricted to females.

Dr. Mill, in connection with the remark lately cited, puts forward a statement touching one of the fundamentals of Hinduism, which, as coming
A‘charya’s controversial adventures,—a romance which unquestioning credulity has affiliated on Ananda Giri,—the great Vedántic doctor is represented as having been confronted, in the course of his rambles, by only a single Sánkhyā, one Lakshmana. Though the heretic would, of course, eventually succumb, it yet cost his doughty opponent, in this instance, but few words to boast a new pervert.*

In preparing the present publication for the press, I employed, for the body of the work, three manuscripts, which agreed among themselves to such a degree as to occasion little doubt or dif-

* Nor was S‘ankara here constrained, in order to enforce his creed, to appeal to the argument of his disciples’ staves and sandals: a mode of propagandism to which, on the word of his biographer, he was, at all times, sufficiently prone to have recourse.

The author of the S‘ankara-dig-vijaya, unscrupulous fabler as he was, has yet described the Sánkhyā theory with sufficient accuracy. It is difficult to say whether he is equally exact in his account of the ascendency which it had acquired, in his day, among its professors.

S‘ankara’s argumentation with Lakshmana can readily be imagined; but Lakshmana’s confession of faith, being brief, shall be adduced. It purports to be borrowed, and is as follows:

गुणसाध्य प्रधान द्वि सचचलादिकारणम्।
वचनम् ब भावच गच्छेद परातः परस्॥ इति॥

तदुपादनसाधः मुद्दि सर्वदिविष्ठा स्वाभास।
कपिलसादिभिराचायायादं शेषमुच्चस।॥ इति॥

‘The chief one—or primeval nature—is the equilibrium of the three qualities; the source of the great principle, or intelligence, and of the rest of the derivative material principles; undiscernible, as cause; also discernible, in its products; singular in the world, superior to what—viz., intelligence—is itself superior, in a descending series.

‘Through the mere worship thereof do men attain salvation, and Kapila and other teachers engaged in the most exalted contemplation.’

The latter couplet, if not a forgery, is scarcely in accord with M. Samb-Hilare’s assertion: ‘Le Bouddhisme est devenu une religion; et c’est un but que n’a jamais poursuivi l’école du Sánkhyā.’ Premier Mémoire sur le Sánkhyā, p. 4.
ficulty. None of them had a date; and they all wore a modern appearance. For correctness they were respectable. As the last pages of the sixth Book were passing through the printer’s hands, two other manuscripts were obtained. One was undated; the other was transcribed in the Samvat year 1711, or A. D. 1654. They discovered few blemishes; but, while presenting, throughout, a great similarity to one another, they differed, in many respects, from my earlier materials. Full particulars of these discrepancies will be found in the Appendix. This, for the benefit of Hindu students, I have given in Sanskrit; but in a style so simple that no European who has passed his novitiate in the classical language of India, will have reason to complain that it was not written in English. In this Appendix I have, also, frequently referred to Anuruddha’s and Mahádeva’s readings of the aphorisms. Of these sentences, unaccompanied by commentary, I had two excellent manuscripts. To ascertain the sentences the more completely, I likewise collated three very accurate copies of Náges’a Bhātta’s abstract of my author’s text. Náges’a cites the aphorisms at length.*

For the tedious array of emendations which deform the con-

* The first edition of the Sánkhyaprávachana-bháshya bears the imprint of Serampore, 1821: Svo. pp. 220. This seems to be the publication announced as having been projected by “Mr. Carey and his assistants,” under the auspices of the Council of Fort William, and the Asiatic Society of Bengal. See Roebuck’s Annals of the College of Fort William, p. 157. The faults of that impression need not now be made the subject of minute recital A characteristic sample of them may be seen in the foot-note at the bottom of pp. 21—24 supra. The editors of the volume had the advantage of a manuscript, or manuscripts, much superior to the use they made of their appliances Several of the longer additional passages which I derived from my codices last procured, and which will be found in the Appendix, occur in the Serampore edition also

In 1852, Dr. Ballantyne published the first fasciculus of “The Aphorisms of the Sánkhya Philosophy of Kapila, with Illustrative Extracts from the Commentaries.” It was followed, in 1854, by a second fasciculus, completing the fourth Book.
clusion of the volume, I plead my distance from the press, and the brittleness of Anglo-Indian type-etal.*

A Bangali translation of the Sánkhya-pravachana-bhāshya, entitled Sánkhya-bhāshā-sangraha, was undertaken by Rámajaya Tarkalankára Bhaṭṭāchārya, son of Mrtyunjaya. So, at least, the work itself sets forth: but the Friend of India Magazine for 1823, No. VIII., p. 567. makes them to be joint translators; and adds that they were, the last-named in succession to the other, "chief pandits in the Supreme Court." Mrtyunjaya, surnamed Vidyālankāra, had previously been head pandit in the College of Fort William. This version conforms very closely to the Serampore edition of the original, from which, while still unpublished, it appears to have been prepared. How much of this translation was executed, or how much of it was printed, I am unable to say. All that I have seen of it is a fragment of 168 octavo pages, breaking off, abruptly, in the midst of the commentary on the eighty-ninth Aphorism of the first Book—according to my numbering. The volume was published at Serampore, in 1818. It opens with a short preface in Sanskrit; and it gives the sūtras in the original language, and in large characters.

At Benares I have seen, in manuscript, a prose translation, in the provincial dialect, of the Sánkhya-sūtra and of Vijnāna's exposition in abstract. The author was Ahitāgmi Rakshapāla Dūbe; who also showed me Hindi versions, made by himself, on a like model, of the Yoga, Nyāya, Vais'eshika, Vedānta, and Mīmāṃsā, Aphorisms, and of S'āndilya's Sentences on Devotion. Each of these translations was accompanied, like the Sánkhya-sūtra, by a Hindi gloss, abridged from the Sanskrit.

* A more thorough search for defects than that which resulted in the list of errata at the end of the volume, has yielded the following additional ones:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P.</th>
<th>1. For</th>
<th>read</th>
<th>P.</th>
<th>1. For</th>
<th>read</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>कायोणा</td>
<td>र्योणां</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>त्यत्</td>
<td>र्यु स्</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>श्लोकारे</td>
<td>श्लोकारे</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>द्विविधशः</td>
<td>द्वि द्विविध:</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>नद्यका-</td>
<td>नद्यि</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>25</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>नला-</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>पतिः-</th>
<th>परिः-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>नले-</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>चति</td>
<td>चारि</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>रस-</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>झाण्य-</td>
<td>झाचे</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In bringing out this work, I have received assistance, in various ways, from Pandits Kāśinātha Sāstrī Ashtaputre Pūnekar, Bechan Tiwāri, Bālakrishṇa Sāstrī Khandakar, and Viṭṭhala Sāstrī Josī Ambuvekar. To each and to all I offer my grateful acknowledgements.

Ajmere, Rajputana; the 10th of September, 1855.

ADDITIONS AND EMENDATIONS.

P. 1, notes, last line. For “niriswara” read “niris’wara.” The passage here intended will be found at the sixth page of the present work.

P. 2, notes, l. 1. For “corresponding” read “corresponding, in some measure.”

P. 2, notes, l. 4. For “saṅgṛha” read “saṅgṛha.”

P. 2, notes, ll. 20 and 26. For “saṅgṛha” and “sāṅkhya” read “saṅgṛha” and “sāṅkhya.”

P. 9, notes, l. 7. Add references to the English translation of the Rigveda, Vol. I., p. 235, foot-note; and Vol. II., pp. 36 and 90, foot-notes. Also see, for a view adverse to that hastily expressed by the writer, the Nirukta, Daivata-kāṇḍa, 6, 7: p. 171 of Roth’s edition.


P. 9, notes, l. 24. In the Bhāgavata-purāṇa, I., 3, 11, Kapila is spoken of as having only revived the Sāṅkhya. From the same work, IX., 8, 14, it appears, however, to be asserted that he originated it. The ensuing couplet, from the last section of the Padma-purāṇa, is to the same effect:

在这方面，Vishnu-mukha-bheda-varṇana chapter.

A Hindu would harmonize these discordant assertions by assuming that they point to events of two several stages of the world’s history.

P. 10, notes, l. 22. If Colebrooke—Miscellaneous Essays, Vol I., pp. 230, 231—means to intimate that, in Gaudapāda’s commentary, Panchas‘ikha is said to be Kapila’s disciple, either directly, or through Aśuri, the assertion is an oversight. That Aśuri was Panchas‘ikha’s preceptor is de-
clared in the seventieth kārīka; but on this couplet Gauḍapāda makes no remark.

P. 11, notes, l. 14 For “3” read “4.”

P. 12, notes, l. 3. Colebrooke—Miscellaneous Essays, Vol. I., p. 231—speaks of the passage given at the bottom of p. 10 supra, and referred to at p. 17 infra, as being one of Panchas’ikha’s sūtras. But it is not so discriminated by Vyāsa, nor by Vyāsa’s commentators, though they name Panchas’ikha as its author. Colebrooke, it is evident, did not suspect that reference was anywhere made to more than one work of this ancient writer.

P. 12, notes, l. 25. Gauḍapāda cites this couplet twice. On one occasion he reads “vaset” for “sthitah.” The same distich is quoted by Chāntra Sinha Gauḍ, in his commentary on the Śad-dārs’ana-samuchchaya.

P. 12, notes, last line. For “pāṃḍ” read “pāṃḍā.”

P. 14, notes, l. 8. Of this passage the words चयरिषाशिििती अल्पग: are adduced as Panchas’ikha’s, in the concluding chapter of the Sarva-dārs’ana-saṅgṛaha.

P. 15, notes, l. 22. For “propitiation-service” read “satisfaction-service.” The former term rather translates sāṇti, a very common office of religion, among the Hindus.

P. 15, notes, l. 31. In place of “Rudra” there are preferable grounds for conjecturing “Ribhu.” See the Translation of the Viṣṇu-purāṇa, p. 38.

P. 17, notes, l. 24. Elsewhere, however, it is denied that Kapila was son of Kardama, by Devahūti; another and later wife of the patriarch, of unspecified name, being the sage’s mother. As to Devahūti, she is represented as the daughter, not of Manu Śyāyambhūva,—as is ordinarily declared,—but of Trūṇabindu. The original of these statements is expressed in the following words:

भोजे जवाचः ।
जयमव विजयशैव विष्णुश्रावः ॥ स ॐ बुङ्भः ॥
किंति सत्यं पुरा चोरेः य तस समुपदारिणो ॥ १ ॥
मशावचन्तुः ।
दर्जनिष्ठाः कर्तिः ्कम्बिः सुपर्वायं पुराण डिक्षिणः ॥ २ ॥
कर्मसंसक्तं तु कर्मसंसक्तं चाम समसभवतः ॥ २ ॥
केष(े) जयः कलिहसामुद्रः वि यथेतन्यामतः ।
व्यासमसभवत् सम्बासं कपिलस्य गोमथवित् ॥ ९ ॥

Padma-purāṇa, Pātāla-khanda, 97th chapter.

P. 20, notes, l. 6. For “Gauri-varṇana” read “Gauri-virāha-varṇana.”

P. 20, notes, l. 8. For “Kalāpa”—which should have been “Kalpa”—read “Indraprastha.”
The Kaptta-ffid, in a detached form, has also been found. It professes to be a part of the Padma-purāṇa, and is concerned with the practices of the yoga, or theocracy.

According to Colebrooke, the Pāśupatas—like the followers of Mis'ra—maintain "the distinct and separate existence of the efficient and material causes of the universe." Miscell. Essays, Vol. I., pp. 407, 409, and 412.

Govinda Dikshita—the Govinda above mentioned, or some other, but of the Chaturūhara family—was father of Śiva Dikshita, author of the Dharmma-tattwa-prakās'ā, the date of which is S'aka 1668, or A. D. 1746.

Jayadeva, the author of the Gīta-govinda, is said to have been the same person as Pakshadhara Mis'ra, the dialectician. Report has it that his custom was to attend his Nyūya teacher no oftener than once a fortnight, and that he owed to this fact his title of Pakshadhara. Quite possibly this is mere fiction; and it may have had its origin, partially, in the circumstance that there was a logician Jayadeva, who is spoken of as having been likewise a poet. See my Catalogue, &c., Vol. I., p. 51, l. 5; and its Appendix, p. 161.
Professor Lassen—*Gita-govinda*, Prolegomena, p. v.—, for want of an opportunity to examine the *Chandrâloka*, is in doubt whether the Jayadeva to whom it is attributed be identifiable with the lyric poet of the same name. The question is one of no difficult decision.

The Jayadeva of the *Chandrâloka* was, by his own showing, son of Mahâdeva, surnamed Yâjñika, and of Sumitrâ. Jayadeva, the author of the *Prasanâ-nârâghava* drama, particularizes the same persons as his parents, and further states that his family was denominated Kaundinya. Whether the *Chandrâloka*, a dry technical treatise, was the production of the writer of the *Gita-govinda*, could scarcely be ascertained by comparing the necessarily different styles of the two compositions. The *Prasanna-râghava* is, however, every way inferior, in respect of language and general execution, to the elegant Lays of Govinda; and there is no ground on which the position may be controverted, that the rhetorician and the play-wright were the same individual.

Internal evidence even is quite sufficient to determine the point under consideration, independently of the discrepancy offered in the accounts given, severally, of their extraction, by the rhetorician and dramatist, and by the author of the *Gita-govinda*. Moreover, if, following Lassen, we account as spurious the stanza with which this collection of poems, according to many manuscripts, terminates, we are left without any notice whatever, by its author, of his parentage. And why, if the *Chandrâloka* and *Prasanna-râghava* were also his, should he have consigned to them a specification which he has denied to his foremost performance?

The couplet above mentioned, which Professor Lassen presumes to be forged, is objected to, by him, on the assumption that the Bhojadeva whom Jayadeva is made, by it, to name as his father, must be the sovereign of Dhârâ. But Bhojadeva or Bhojaraja is by no means an appellation of unique incidence. More than one chief has certainly known to have borne it; and it has not yet been shown that, among persons so called, the grammarian, for instance, has any claim to be regarded as a royal patron rather than as an actual maker of books. In a word, it is not imperative to take such a termination as deva or râja to be indicative of rank. It may be part of a name; as in Varadarâja, Govindarâja, Jayadeva, and Harshadeva.

The name of Jayadeva's mother is written, by Lassen, Râmâdevî. My own manuscripts have Vâmadevi. Jayadeva's father is called Bhojadeva, by the Brâhman Râychaud, in his metrical Hindî translation of the *Gita-govinda*, the *Gita-govindâdârâ*.

It remains to speak of the *Râmâ-gita-govinda*, a poem on the incongruity of whose title Lassen justly animadverts. *Gita-govinda*, Prolegomena, p. VI. This wretched affair purports to have, for its author, one Jayadeva,
of Janakapura. So much the poetaster himself tells us; and I know not on what authority Professor Wilson—Mackenzie Collection, Vol. I., p. 103—concludes him to be one with the poet of Rádhá and Kúshá. The subject of the Ráma-gíta-govinda is that of the Rámdyáya. Its extent is 360 couplets; divided into six cantos, which bear the designations of Sámdanda-raghuvañdána, Vyáta-parásáríma, Jagannánta-právása, Hamvmad-ágamaña, Lánká-víjaya, and Ráma-rájábhishéka.

P. 35, notes, l. 31. Sámkara, it should seem, has wildly been assigned to the eighth century before the Christian era. See Mr. B H. Hodgson's Illustrations of the Literature and Religion of the Buddhists, p. 18, footnote.

P. 35, notes, 1 34. The notion that Gáudápáda was pupil of Súka, the son of Výása, is generally received by the Bráhmans. See, for this association, Colebrooke's reference to the Sámkara-víjaya: Miscellaneous Essays, Vol. I., p. 104.


The Mitákhshára, a commentary on the Bráhma-sútra, by Annám Bhattá, son of Tirumalá, contains a list, identical, down to Sámkara Ačhárya, with the foregoing; except that Vásishtha is preceded by Brahmá and Brahmá.

Gáudápáda, it appears credible, belongs to the very precinct of the age of fable.

P. 36, notes, 1 9. Bhnánt Bhatta, in the Dúwata-nírñaya-siddhánta-sangraka, speaks of the author of a treatise having the name of Dúwata-nírñaya, as being his paternal grandfather. But his own work, which cites it, proves that he does not mean the Dúwata-nírñaya of Váchaspati Mis'rá. Bhánánt Bhatta's parents were Nílakantha Bhatta and Gándhé. The title of Bhatta is borne by Mímánsákás.

P. 36, notes, l. 29 The Ratnákara, compiled under the patronage of Chandéswára, embraces at least seven sections, entitled Krítya, Dana, Víja-váhara, S'úddhi, Péliá, Vivída, and Grjáhashtá. Of these, Váchaspati
he was assisted, in preparing it, by Ananta Dikshita, son of Vis'wanátha Dikshita. The father of Bhává Gánes'a Dikshita was Bhává Vis'wanátha Dikshita; and, if the latter be one with Vis'wanátha Dikshita, and if Bhává Gánes'a Dikshita be brother of Ananta Dikshita, we are enabled to form a pretty correct estimate as to the time of Vijnána Bhikshu. For Náráyaṇa Bhatta's youngest brother's second son, Raghunátha Bháta, dates his Kálatáttwa-wvechana in Samvat 1677, or A. D. 1620. Vijnána may be placed fifty or sixty years earlier.

P 48, I. 1. Cancel the sentence "To the end," &c.

P. 50, notes, I. 1. Substitute as follows: The words vikríta 'modified' and vaisárika 'modificational,' as synonyms of sáttwika 'pure,' must be taken to denote, by eminence, the highest of the three egotistic transmutations of nature; these being held to result from that disturbance in the equipoise of its ingredients, by virtue of which it becomes eductive. Misapprehending the retrospective reference of the term vikríta, in the twenty-fifth káriká, M. Saint Hilaire describes 'pure' egotism as almost being at once a modification and not a modification.

Egotism, at the very instant of its emanation, assumes three distinct shapes. It would, accordingly, preclude doubt, if the particular sort of egotism had in contemplation were always characterized by its special epithet. Of egotism divested of qualifications the Sánkhya teaches us nothing.

There is no such thing in the scheme.

P. 55, notes, I. 21. A passage in Hippolytus which runs counter to this statement, escaped my notice. Having premised the names of Valentine, Heracleon, and Ptolemaeus, Hippolytus proceeds in these words: Kaí γάρ τούτων ἐστιν ἀρχὴ τῶν πάντων μονᾶς ἀγέννητος, ἀφθαρτός, ἀκατάληπτος, ἀπερινότος, γόνιμος, καὶ πάντων τῆς γενέσεως αἰτία τῶν γενομένων. Omnim Hæresum Refutatio, ed. Miller, p. 185.
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