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PREFACE.*

Two systems of philosophy, attributed, respectively, to Kapila and to Patanjali, are designated, by the Hindus, as Sánkhya;† a term which common usage restricts, however,

* Together with the addition of much new matter, I here offer a substitute for my preface to the Sánkhya-pravachana-bháshya. My edition of that book is now out of print; and I have no intention of publishing another. Since writing the pages which introduced it, my views touching the Sánkhya have, owing to further study, undergone a very great change.

† The first system is known as nírsl'wara; the second, as ses'wara. The following half-couplet, to this effect, is from the Sñād-dars'ana-samuchchaya:

बाहु करिवरा बैंत्रिक बैविद्यार्दभवता।

The Jainas claim to have their own Sánkhya, Mímánsá, &c. Mackenzie Collection, Vol. II., p. xxxvi.

As explanatory of the ensuing extracts, it should be mentioned, that Kapila has hitherto generally been considered as the author of the Sánkhya-pravachana, and that it has been the universal custom to render nírsl'wara by "atheistic."

"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 Kárikà, il reste que ce soient les Sútras 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.
to the former. Etymologically considered, sánkhya is imme-

indiens et Colebrooke.” M. Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire: Premier
Mémoire sur le Sánkhya, 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 conde-
scend, save unavoidably, 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 what have been taken for 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.” Miscellaneous

Alike in both the Sánkhyas, there is acknowledgment of a being
superior to the gods. He is made up of an immaterial part, purusha,
or “person,” and of an anta’karaṇa, or “internal organ.” His person
is unintelligent; and, for his internal organ, by virtue of which he is
intelligent, he is indebted to the promptuary of all matter, prakṛti.
Precisely such, it is taught, is the constitution of man, beasts, &c.
Thus far both the Sánkhyas concur. But, according to Patanjali’s,
the Yoga, the being above spoken of, whom it calls Is’vara, has the
attributes of omnipotence, omniscience, and eternalness; his material
genesis being in the way of eternal and periodically recurrent emana-
tion from prakṛti. The nisī’svara Sánkhya simply denies to any
being,—even to its Hiranyagarbha,—the last of the attributes just
enumerated. The reader is now prepared to decide, whether the
doctrine ascribed to Kapila differs from the Yoga in such a manner
as to justify the application to it of the epithet “atheistic;” and
whether the Yoga, on the strength of its Is’vara, is entitled to the
appellation of “theistic.”

In the Sánkhyas, purusha, “person,” and átman, “spirit,” are
synonymes. All that is not matter is spirit; and, as embodied, it is
found in whatever possesses life, vegetation included. Jīva, “soul,”
is any spirit, in its aspect of incorporation. The Is’vara of the Yoga
has no body, and is not a jīva. The Hiranyagarbha of the other
Sánkhya has a body, and therefore is a jīva.
diately allied to sankhyá;* a word bearing the acceptance of

"Person" and "soul," it will have been observed, are here used in senses of accommodation. And so one has to use, in general, the terminology of our metaphysics and theology, when applied to express Hindu conceptions.

On the subject of repudiating I's'wara, see the Sánkhyapa-ravachāna, I., 92-99; III., 56, 57; V., 2-12, and 46; and VI., 64.

Even a limited inspection of Indian commentators on the Sánkhyā 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 I's'wara. See a subsequent note.

* M. Saint-Hilaire, in the opening words of his analysis of the Sánkhyā, confounds the paronymes sankhyā and sánkhyā: "Le mot de Sánkhyā, qui est devenu le nom du système de Kapila, signifie nombre; et, pris adjectivement, numéral. Il signifie encore, dans une acceptation assez voisine: calcul, supputation, jugement, raisonnement." Premier Mémoire, &c., p. 19.

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

The word sánkhyā, as affording a variety of significations, is made the subject of a laborious pun, in the initial couplet of Bháskara Achárya's Bija-ganita.

Cháritrasinha Gání, a Jaina, in his gloss on Haribhadra Súrí's Shad-dars'ana-samuchchaya, makes a statement, with reference to the origin of the word sánkhyā, which, as being altogether novel, deserves to be produced. While acknowledging the connexion of Kapila with the Sánkhyā, he avers, that the followers of that doctrine receive their appellation from the first doctor of their school, Sankha, or S'ankha. His words are: सांक्यसिद्धांतमार्थितेनर्मन्त्रम्। खाद्यपुरुषनिमिथिमेव च। शब्दः इति पुरुषनिमिथिमेव च। शब्दः इति वा शब्दः। तात्त्वस्ववा वा वाक्यार्जुनमार्थितेन शब्दः।

S'ankha, the lawgiver, is classed, with Kapila, as tāmasa, in the Páshandotpatti chapter of the Padma-purána, latter section.

For an account of the Shad-dars'ana-samuchchaya, I would refer the reader to my Contribution towards an Index to the Bibliography of the Indian Philosophical Systems. In that volume many particu-
"number," and also that of "decision."* But the time has

* Colebrooke says: "A system of philosophy in which precision of reckoning is observed in the enumeration of its principles, is denominated Sánkhya; a term which has been understood to signify numeral, agreeably to the usual acceptation of sankhyá, number: and hence its analogy to the Pythagorean philosophy has been presumed. But the name may be taken to imply," &c. Miscellaneous 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, &c., 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, from his guarded and adversative mode of expression, is quite clear, delivers, in the preceding extract, neither his own opinions nor even opinions which, until the adduction of further evidence, he would be thought to accept. Professor Wilson—Oxford Sánkhya-káriká, 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 Sánkhya; 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: for 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 [son] of Brahmá, to whom Krišṇa compares himself in the Gîtá, but a sage of his name, who invented the Sánkhya, or Numeral philosophy; which Krišṇa himself appears to impugn, in his conversation with Arjuna; and which, as far as I can recollect it from a few
long passed by for ascertaining, beyond doubt, what was

original texts, resembled, in part, the metaphysics of Pythagoras,
and, in part, the theology of Zeno.” Sir William Jones’s Works,

Sir William, at an earlier date, had pushed his hypothetical
analogies much further than this. “Of the Philosophical Schools
it will be sufficient, here, to remark, that the first Nyāya seems
analogous to the Peripatetic; the second, sometimes called Vais'ē-
shika, to the Ionic; the two Mīmāṁsās, of which the second is often
distinguished by the name of Vedānta, to the Platonic; the first
Sāṅkhya, to the Italic; and the second, or Pātanjala, to the Stoic,
philosophy: so that Gautama [Gotama] corresponds with Aristotle;
Kapāda, with Thales; Jaimini, with Socrates; Vyāsa, with Plato;
Kapila, with Pythagoras; and Patanjali, with Zeno. But an ac-
curate comparison between the Grecian and Indian Schools would
require a considerable volume.” 

Ibid., Vol. I., pp. 360, 361.

Vijñāna Bhikshu, in the Sāṅkhya-pravachana-bhāshya, explains
sāṅkhya to signify “the setting forth of spirit as distinct from pra-
kṛiti:” सत्त्वसत्वविविधानां शरणमगुणसत्त्वविविधानां.

Raghunātha Tarkavāgis’a Bhātṛachārya makes it one with “consi-
deration:” परविवेकनां सत्त्वसत्त्वविविधानां विविधानां. समवेंकय रूपमें यथा: सत्त्व
मृत्तिकारविविधानां सत्त्वविविधानां. Sāṅkhya-tattwa-vilāsa.

Deva Tirtha Swāmin takes it to import “orderly enunciation:”
कण्ठसत्त्वसत्त्वविविधानां समवेंकय कण्ठसत्त्वसत्त्वविविधानां कण्ठसत्त्वविविधानां साध्वसत्त्वसत्त्वविविधानां.
Sāṅkhya-tarangā.

According to a sacred text, adduced by S’ankara Achārya, in his
commentary on the Vishnu-sahasra-nāman, sāṅkhya means “know-
ledge of the true nature of pure spirit.” We read:

सत्त्वसत्त्वविविधानां कपिळाचार्य: तात्त्विक सत्त्वः सद्रष्यते:।

सत्त्वसत्त्वविविधानां नाम सत्त्वसत्त्वविविधानां सत्त्वसत्त्वविविधानां कपिळाचार्य: सत्त्वसत्त्वविविधानां नाम सत्त्वसत्त्वविविधानां।

सत्त्वसत्त्वविविधानां कपिळाचार्य: सत्त्वसत्त्वविविधानां।

महामात्रविविधानां शास्त्रसत्त्वविविधानां।

रूपमें वाच्यसत्त्वः। सत्त्वसत्त्वविविधानां नाम सत्त्वसत्त्वविविधानां। विविधानां कपिळाचार्य: सत्त्वसत्त्वविविधानां।
originally intended by thus denominating the aforesaid schemes of speculation.

The *Mahābhārata*, XIII., 7006, is here annotated.

I had hoped to find in the legal institutes of Vyāsa the line cited above. Not being there, probably it is buried in some Purāṇa. S'ankara's own definition is in these words: “The reflecting, that the *gunas*—goodness, passion, and darkness,—are objects of my perception; and that I, distinct from them, am spectator of their operations, eternal, heterogeneous from the *gunas*, spirit.” शार्थरू साम सर्वकरमांसम् गुणां सत्यम् अधिक्षेरम्। तस्मान सुप्रभावार्थसवार्थस्यतः। नियो गुणविश्लेषणः तांतांति विचारः। *Gītā-bhāṣya*, XIII., 12.

How to translate *guna* here, I know not. On this term, I shall by and by remark.

The *Mahābhārata*, a higher authority than any as yet brought forward, associates *sāṅkhya*, very significantly, with *parisāṅkhya*, which seems to have the sense of “exhaustive enumeration”:

शार्थरूः प्रवक्ष्यां गृहान्तः परिष्कर्णान्तः।

XII., 11303.

Again:

शार्थरूः प्रवक्ष्यां गृहान्तः परिष्कर्णान्तः।

XII., 11409-10.

Part of this extract is quoted in the *Sāṅkhya-pravachana-bhāṣya*, but worded somewhat differently.

Adwaitānanda, in his *Brahma-vidyābhārana*, an expository work connected with the Aphorisms of the Vedānta, suggests, that the word *panchavins'ati*, adduced from the sacred writings as defining the number of the Sāṅkhya principles, may intend 20 × 5 instead of 20 + 5. This conceit might be abundantly disproved. See the stanza last given, and the *Mahābhārata*, XII., *passim*, but, particularly, chapters 307, 308, 309.

नन्दिकोऽया साङ्कु तत्तप्रमाणप्रकासवसामहतः। What can be the drift of this mysterious announcement? It occurs in Prithwidhara Achārya's *Ratna-kos'a*, near the end.
In the Upanishads, the Bhagavad-gītā, and other ancient Hindu books, we encounter, in combination, the doctrines which, after having been subjected to modifications that rendered them, as wholes, irreconcilable, were distinguished, at an uncertain period, into what have, for many ages, been styled the Sāṅkhya and the Vedānta.*

Though Kapila is held to have originated the distinctive tenets of the Sāṅkhya,† it is extremely questionable whether—

---

* It is, further, a great mistake to suppose, that the Sāṅkhya-yoga of the Bhagavad-gītā is a peculiar system of eclecticism, or of compromise, that had vogue contemporaneously with the Sāṅkhya and the Yoga as we now understand them. Quite unknown, in the twilight days of Krishṇa and Arjuna, were the distinctions which at present discriminate those systems. Krishṇa has much to say of Brahma: upon his predecessor, Kapila, in all probability the conception had not dawned. The idea, that Kapila denied Iṣ'warā, was, it is quite possible, merely inferred, long after his time, from the bare fact of his silence. Who can say that, when he lived, the notion of an Iṣ'warā had as yet been elaborated?

† In only a single text that I know of is the Sāṅkhya ascribed to Śiva. Mahābhārata, XII., 10388. At the same place, the Yoga also is said to have been originated by that divinity.

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 created it. The ensuing couplet, from the last section of the Padma-purāṇa, is to the same purpose:

चेतनंपश्चत्रालोकं सत्योपावस्यातो
विष्णु-व्युहाभेदावर्णना च
to Vishṇu-vyūha-bheda-varṇana chapter.

A Hindu would harmonize these discordant statements by assuming, that they point to passages in two several stages of the world's history.

A facile and potential solvent of all difficulties as to time, space, and individuals, is the transparently indolent dogma of cyclical renovations of cosmic events. These iterations admitting of an indefinite
even if he was an author,—the Sánkhya-pravachana, now current under his name, can be referred to him on tenable grounds. And, if this "Six Lectures," at least as we possess it, is not of his composition, most assuredly neither is the Tatwasa- 

* These works, it is observable, are nowhere cited

number of changes in particulars, anybody may, at last, be almost anybody else; and it thus becomes a very easy matter to make light, among other things, of ordinary chronological sequence.

Swapnes'wara, author of the Kaumudi-prabhá, acquainted as he was with the aphorisms of Panchas'ikha, attributes to him the "Sánkhya Aphorisms" also. He accounts for its bearing the title of Kápila, by the circumstance, that Kapila initiated the Sánkhya tradition as set forth therein. By way of illustration, he notes the notorious appropriation to Manu of the code of laws set forth by Bhrigu. His meaning is, that Kapila only propounded the matter of the Aphorisms, of which the present shape is due to Panchas'ikha. He may, then, be supposed to lay to the account of humility the absence from Panchas'ikha’s name, in the Sánkhya Aphorisms,—as the “Six Lectures” alone deserves to be called,—of the honorific title of Acharya. 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. Panchas'ikha, as we shall see, is spoken of in two places in the Sánkhya-pravachana; Kapila, not at all. Swapnes'wara, it should be added, gives what is here repeated, as nothing but rumour. His words are: प्रचार श्रवणार्थसु भावमन्धारितम्।

काण्डकलिति श्रवणार्थसु मनःविस्मयतात्रायामिच्चम् मनुष्यसार्थम्।

* Little as we can respect the allegations of Hindu writers on such a point as that before us, still it is curious to see what those allegations are.

The anonymous author of the Sarvapakárinti relates, as an ancient tradition, that Kapila the incarnation of Vishnu composed the Tatwasa-

* The same tradition makes the doctrines of other, unnamed, philosophical schools, besides the Sánkhya, no less than the Six Lectures, to have sprung
by S'ankara Acharya, by Vâchaspati Mis'ra, or by any other

from the Tattva-samâsa. चावानादिकलेक्षकमयागाणमुदितसिद्धान-
जातोनमयाधिप्य: दुर्मतम:। सनमयिन्दत्वः। सदात्भमेत्वान् कामयाना
द्विक्षितसत्रायुक्तवादि चतु स्थवरान् स्वरूपिति च यूक्तात्। तत् एवंः समासात-
कहार्या सकल्पैःतन्त्रायां। सुनियां संवत्। यत् चेवें सकलं शोभृवथीयमेभुतं
लोणात्माप्रिय चैत्यप्राप्तमानवेऽव। सूक्ष्मकाश्चे तु चैत्यात् रात्रसर्वत्रसाधवकोित-
स्सैित। तथयु सुदार्शितृतृति तस्था चंद्र चौत्ताति नारायणावरसर्वसंगी-
भवानापितप्रसिद्धिः।

Vijnâna Bhikshu says, in his Sâkhya-pravachana-bhâshya: तत्तवमाता-
सुसाचे: चतुसाचे: पधारायाय: पद्यान्त्रनामाति चतु सैंवं चतुर्विविकारकवेचामायर-पेयान्त्रः। अतः पधारायाय: पधारायाय: भोगास्ते नयन साधारणसमाह युक्तं। सर्वजनातात्यः च यत् चतुर्विविकारकवेचामायर नवाय: विवेकानामाति। विवेकानामाति चतु सैंवं चतुसाचे: नयन साधारणसमाह युक्तं सर्वमातात्यः चतुर्विविकारकवेचामायराय निःपरस्परसिद्धिः। विवेकानामाति चतु सैंवं चतुसाचे: नयन साधारणसमाह युक्तं सर्वमातात्यः चतुर्विविकारकवेचामायराय निःपरस्परसिद्धिः।

“If it be alleged, that the Tattva-samâsa aphorisms are simply iterated in the Six Lectures, the answer is, that it is not so : for there is no mere repetition between the two; inasmuch as they are, respectively, concise and expanded. Hence, the appellation of Sâkhya-pravachana is suitable to the Six Lectures, in like manner as it is to the Institute of the Yoga. The former embraces precisely a detailed exposition of the Tattva-samâsa, the shorter Sâkhya Institute. There is this difference, however; that the Six Lectures only expands the subject-matter of the Tattva-samâsa; whereas the Institute of the Yoga avoids their seeming deficiency, by expressly recognizing Is'wara, whom both the other works, by concession for sake of argument, deny.”

Our commentator, further on, grows more confident; passing from the language of assumption, as it were, to that of positive assertion:

चावानादिकलेक्षकमयागाणमुदितसिद्धानात।
शामकलेक्षकमयागाणमुदितसिद्धानात॥

“This Institute, equally with that of the Yoga, as being a development of the substance of the shorter Sâkhya Aphorisms, is designated Sâkhya-pravachana, or, ‘Explication of the Sâkhya’.”

I am aware, that this couplet is susceptible of another construction; but that here put upon it is unfounded, and, besides, accords with the sense of the passage from the Sarvopakârini. More than this, if the Sâkhya Aphorisms are called Sâkhya-pravachana, as being
writer of considerable antiquity, or even in the Sarva-dars'ana-
an expansion, it is reasonable to believe, that Vijnána designed to
explain why the Yoga Aphorisms also are so designated.

Colebrooke, having in view a portion, if not all, of the foregoing
extracts, writes as follows: “It appears, from the preface of the Kapila-
bháshya, that a more compendious tract, in the same form of sútras,
or aphorisms, bears the title of Tattva-samása, 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
Sánkhya-pravachana.

“If the authority of the scholiast of Kapila may be trusted, the
Tattva-samása is the proper text of the Sánkhya; and its doctrine
is more fully, but separately, set forth by the two ampler treatises
entitled Sánkhya-pravachana, which contain a fuller exposition of what
had been there succinctly delivered.” Miscellaneous Essays, Vol. I.,
pp. 231, 232.

Dr. Röer.—Journal of the Asiatic Society 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 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, to be sure, has made out Vijnána to be self-con-
tradictory. At the same time, the clause to which Dr. Röer excepts
is almost a literal translation of the scholiast’s own words.

M. Saint-Hilaire says, speaking of the Sánkhya Aphorisms: “Ce
traité, quoique assez court, a été abrégé, dit-on, par Kapila, sous le
titre de Tattva Samása, c’est-à-dire, réduction substantielle du Sán-
khya. 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, &c., p. 5

Whence did the writer learn, for certain, that Kapila abridged the
Sánkhya-pravachana? Again, the phrase “reduction substantielle”
sangraha, which is dated so late as the fourteenth century; and scarcely answers to Tattva-samāsa, and only on the theory of such an abridgment. Moreover, Colebrooke would be explored in vain for a single quotation from the smaller treatise.

Vijnāna plainly rests the validity of adjudging the title of Sāṅkhya-pravachana to the Six Lectures, on the ground, that it is an expansion of the Tattva-samāsa; this being the embryo of also another collection of aphorisms called Sāṅkhya-pravachana, that belonging to the Yoga. But this derivation of the Yoga Aphorisms is unestablished, save by Vijnāna's own word. It may be suspected, that his sole foundation of fact is, the common application of the term Sāṅkhya to the system called from Kapila and to that of the Yoga.

Colebrooke—Miscellaneous Essays, Vol. I., p. 292,—is disposed to think, that the title of Sāṅkhya-pravachana, in its application to the Sāṅkhya Aphorisms, is borrowed. For my part, I have little doubt, that one of the original borrowers was Vijnāna Bhikshu. Except in the writings of that author, and of his followers, I have nowhere met with the employment of Sāṅkhya-pravachana, otherwise than to name the Yoga Aphorisms, but in the postscript to Aniruddha's commentary, and in that to its abridgment 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 apparent exceptions may, very allowably, be neglected.

With regard to the meaning of the title Sāṅkhya-pravachana, M. Saint-Hilaire could not have done better than consult Vijnāna, whose explanation of it he seems, however, to be unacquainted with. At p. 5 of his Premier Mémoire, &c., he translates those words by “Préface ou Introduction au Sāṅkhya.” However speculative Vijnāna may be in what he says of the germinal character of the Tattva-samāsa, there is no ground to mistrust his etymological analysis of the word pravachana, as here used. In one place, as we have seen, he explains it by prakārṣṣhya nirvachana, “detailed exposition;” and, in another, by prapanchana, “development,” or “explication.” In the Pātanjala-bhāṣya-vārttika, he defines it, again as a member of Sāṅkhya-pravachana,—the proper name, according to Vyāsa, of the Yoga Aphorisms,—by words expressing “detailed statement:”
their style, moreover, exhibits scarcely a perceptible trace of archaism. Indeed, the larger collection of sentences derived to us as, putatively, Kapila's, whatever its more general source, may be suspected of occasional obligation to the Kārikās of Vś'warakṛṣiṇa.*

Bhaṭṭa, in his Pāñjala-sūtra-nyātti-bhāṣya-chchhāyā-ryākhya, silently transcribes Vijnāna's derivation: रत्नश्रवणिकत्वं सारणश्रवणिकत्वं प्रकर्षेऽवचनम्।

* I., 124, of the Sāmkhya-pravacana runs thus:

रत्नश्रवणिकत्वं सारणश्रवणिकत्वं प्रकर्षेऽवचनम्।

This, to a syllable, is the first half of the tenth Kārikā.

I., 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, are as follows: संवरहरणवियोऽवचनं चित्तविविषयवियोऽवचनं विड्यविनाक्षये जनविविषयवियोऽवचनं चित्तविविषयवियोऽवचनं चित्तविविषयवियोऽवचनं। The seventeenth Kārikā is read:

विद्विषयविविषयवियोऽवचनं चित्तविविषयवियोऽवचनं।

There is nothing to choose between मन्त्र and महा, "what is combined" and "combination." Aniruddha has प्रकर्षेऽवचनम्. Vijnāna exchanges it for प्रकर्षेऽवचनम्.

II., 18, further, is half a couplet:

प्रकर्षेऽवचनम् चक्रिय्यश्रवणिकत्वं चित्तविविषयवियोऽवचनं।

The twenty-fifth Kārikā differs only in exhibiting चक्रिय्य एकदमस्य; the sense remaining unaffected.

II., 31, once more, is metrical, and is the same as the last half of the twenty-ninth Kārikā:

चक्रिय्यश्रवणिकत्वं चित्तविविषयवियोऽवचनं।

III., 48, 49, 50, 47, are as follows: चक्रिय्यश्रवणिकत्वं समाविषयवियोऽवचनं। चक्रिय्यश्रवणिकत्वं समाविषयवियोऽवचनं। चक्रिय्यश्रवणिकत्वं समाविषयवियोऽवचनं। And the fifty-fourth Kārikā is

चक्रिय्यश्रवणिकत्वं समाविषयवियोऽवचनं।

Snatches of verse, and now and then whole verses, chequer, independently of design, the prose of Sanskrit writers, as of writers in most languages. But it should be borne in mind, that the Sāmkhya-pravacana is of very limited compass, and that the ārgya is a measure of no little complexity. Should it be argued, with respect to the
immetricalness of the tenth *Kārikā*, that *Is‘warakṛishṇa* there consented to a prosodical blemish, rather than deviate from the very words of an aphorism, one may answer, that, in several places where we can trace nothing like intimate dependence, on his part, upon the aphorisms which have come down to us, he is chargeable with the same sort of laxity. Instances may be seen in the fourth, seventh, ninth, twenty-sixth, and seventieth of the *Kārikās*.

Of the genuineness of the three final *Kārikās* I have grave doubt. From the seventy-second we gather nothing more than that the treatise attributed to *Is‘warakṛishṇa* summarizes, with some reservations, the substance of the sixty Sāṅkhya fundamentals. It seems not altogether unlikely, that *Is‘warakṛishṇa* may have digested into stanzas the material parts of an earlier set of Sāṅkhya aphorisms; that those aphorisms were long neglected, and parts of them got lost; and that the person who integrated the remnants, to make up the *Sāṅkhya-pravachana*, availed himself of *Is‘warakṛishṇa’s* performance.

* Professor Wilson, reviewing Colebrooke, once wrote as follows: “The founder of the *Sāṅkhya* philosophy is named Kapila; who, as one of the seven great Rishis, is one of the sons of Brahmá. There are other accounts of his origin; but none more satisfactory.” Quartely Oriental Magazine, for Sept., 1825; p. 12. That Kapila is any where styled “one of the seven great Rishis” needs confirmation, for all the emphasis with which other accounts of him are thus discredited. Nothing of this is to be found in the Translation of the *Vishṇu-purāṇa*. Colebrooke—Miscellaneous Essays, Vol. I., p. 229, refers, mistakingly, to Gauḍapāda, in proof of Kapila’s being ranked as “one of the seven great Rishis.” The citation runs thus:

चतुर्वधीरः पुराणः स्त्री प्राच्चर्मासूर्यनः ।

“These seven sons of Brahmá were called great Rishis.”

The more ordinary *mānasa*, or mind-born, sons of Brahmá vary, as specified in different Purāṇas, from seven to more than twice that number; “but,” as Professor Wilson remarks, “the variations are of the nature of additions made to an apparently original enumeration of but seven, whose names generally recur.” Translation of the *Vishṇu-purāṇa*, p. 48, note 2. One such group is made up of Marici, Atri, Angiras, Pulastya, Pulaha, Kratu and Vasishṭha: the
Sánkhyā is held to have been a son of the god Brahmā: well-known “seven Rishis.” *Mahâbhârata*, XII., 7570 and 13075. This list is modified, in the same book of the *Mahâbhârata*, 7534-5, by the substitution of Daksha for Vasishtha; and, at 13040, by the addition of Manu: the tale being thus increased to eight. But, however amplified by Paurâjika liberality, it is not this catalogue of Brahmā’s mind-born progeny that is to furnish us with Kapila.

Incidentally, the *manas*, or mind, is not located, in Hindu opinion, in the brain, as Mr. J. C. Thomson imagines. See his *Bhagavada-gîtâ*, p. 68, notes 4 and 7. It is thought to be in the *hridaya*, or breast;—not heart, as *hridaya* is commonly rendered.

Another company of kindred emanation likewise comprehends seven individuals. In the *Mahâbhârata*, XII., 13078-9, they are said to be Sana, Sanatsujâta, Sanaka, Sanandana, Sanatkumâra, Kapila, and Sanâtana. In the passage quoted, in all probability from some Purâna, near the commencement of Gauḍapâda’s commentary on the *Sánkhyâ-kârikâ*, Kapila still appears, but as introducing several accredited Sánkhyâ doctors, to the extrusion of as many of his former associates; the roll now standing thus: Sanaka, Sananda, Sanâtana, Åsuri, Kapila, Voḍhu, and Panchasîkha. In the *tarpana*, or satisfaction-service, of at least one school of the Veda, that of Mâdhyândina, the same persons are invoked, and in the same order, except that the name of Åsuri and Kapila are transposed. See Colebrooke’s *Miscellaneous Essays*, Vol. I., p. 144. In the *Padma-purâna*, latter section, *Vîshnu-ryûha-bheda-varnana* chapter, 14, 15, among other changes, Kapila himself makes way for another; the set now consisting of Sanaka, Sananda, Sanâtana, Sanatkumâra, Játa, Voḍhu, and Panchasîkha. See the * Asiatic Researches*, Vol. XI., p. 99. The *Kûrma-purâna*, prior section, VII., 18, 19, with additional alterations, reduces the seven to five: Sanaka, Sanâtana, Sanandana, Rûrû, (?) and Sanatkumâra; whom it characterizes as great Yogins. The first three and the last of these five hold, apparently, peculiar eminence in the family of Brahmā; since from them, according to Gauḍapâda on the forty-third *Kârikâ*, originated, severally, virtue, knowledge, dispassion, and irresistible will. The names of these four occur, also, unaccompanied, as if they were to be regarded as representative, at III., 12, 3, of the *Bhûgavata-purâna*. 
but he is likewise described, on several occasions, as an

Sananda and Sanandana are, doubtless, prosodical varieties of the same name; and Játa seems to be put, by metrical licence, for Sanatsujáta.

In the Kúrma-puráña, latter section, V., 18, parts of the two classes of Brahmá’s mental sons, several new members being added to the first, are named together, thus: Sanatkumára, Sanaka, Bhrigu, Sanátana, Sanandana, Rudra, Angiras, Vámadeva, S’ukra, Atri, Kapila, and Marichi. But it is worthy of observation, that this Puráña 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, Marichi, Angiras, Bhrigu, Atri, Dharma, Sankalpa, Pulastya, Pulaha, Kratu, and Vaisishtha; and the generation of these persons, as there given, is very different from what it is in any of the accounts rendered by Professor Wilson. See Translation of the Vishńu-puráña, p. 50, note. For instance, the first and the last four are derived, respectively, from Brahmá’s prána, udána, vyána, apána, and samána. See, for these terms, Colebrooke’s Miscellaneous Essays, Vol. I., pp. 356 and 374; also the Oxford Sánkhyá-káriká, p. 103. At X., 84, of the Kúrma-puráña, latter section, the whole eleven are denominated Bráhmas; and Brahmá is stated to have created them by his power as a Yogin. See, also, Translation of the Vishńu-puráña, p. 49.

Further particulars of interest occur at X., 122—125, of the latter section of the Kúrma-puráña. Sanatkumára is there said to have instructed Samvarta; and he, Satyavrata: Sanandana, Pulaha; and he, Gautama: Angiras, Bharadvája: Kapila, Jaigishava and Panchasíkha: Sanaka, Parás’ara; and he, Válmíki. This Puráña is stated, at its conclusion, to have been transmitted from Brahmá as follows: Brahmá communicated it to Sanaka and Sanatkumára; Sanaka, to Devala; Devala, to Panchasíkha; and Sanatkumára, to Vyása.

There is, clearly, no countenance, in the analogy of the Hindu hagiography, for the else plausible surmise, that a complete history of the mánasas sons of Brahmá might, if recoverable, possibly go to show, that the epithet by which they are known may originally have borne a less mysterious signification than that of mind-born. Its intention
incorporation of Vishnu.* Another account makes him to have been a son of Kardama;† still another gives him Dharma could never have been to discriminate the literate portion of the Brahmanidae from their less learned kinsmen.

As the mind, in the Puranas, is constituted of matter, mental offspring are not to be looked upon as ethereal. Such, at least, is the Hindu conclusion.

* Mahabharata, III., 1996 and 8880. Ramayana, I., 41, 2—4 and 25. At I., 41, 2—4, Kapila’s destruction of the sons of Sagara is predicted. Padma-purana, latter section, Vishnu-vyasa-bheda-varna chapter. Translation of the Vishnu-purana, p. 377. Bhagavata-purana, I., 3, 11; where Kapila stands fifth of the twenty-four incarnations of Vishnu. See, also, at p. 5 supra, the verse from the Mahabharata, XIII., 7006, with Sankara Acharya’s commentary. See, further, in a coming note on Asuri, a passage from Vyasa’s Patanjala-bhashya. The commentators on that work, as Vachaspati Misra, Vijayana Bhikshu, and Nagoji Bhatta, understand the word adi-vidwan, or “primeval sage,” to mean, there, Vishnu.

Schlegel, in his note on the Ramayana, I., 41, 3, remarks: “De hoc Vishnus cognomine et munere non habeo quod expromam. Vix opus est monere plane hinc alienum est Kapilum, philosophiae ratio- nalis (sankhya) autorem; quamvis et hunc discipuli nimis ambitiosi numinis plenum, imo ipsum in mortali corpore praesentem Vishnum fuisse iactaverint. Quam opinionem innuit auctor Bhagavad-gitas, Lect. X., 26.”

It must now appear, that the notion which Schlegel dismisses so peremptorily, is much better fortified by old report than he apprehended.

† Bhagavata-purana, II., 7, 3; and III., 33, 1. The birth of the sage, and of his nine sisters, is there said to have taken place in the house of Kardama, the husband of Devahuti, 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 thus 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 prajapati, or “patriarch.” Translation of the Vishnu-purana, p. 50, note.
and Hinsá for parents;* and, again, he is identified with one

Elsewhere, however, it is denied, that Kapila was son of Kardama by Devahúti; another and later wife of the patriarch, of unspecified name, being held for the sage's mother. As for Devahúti, she is represented as the daughter, not of Manu Syáyambhava,—as is ordinarily declared,—but of Triṇabindu. The original of these statements is expressed in the following words:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sarga</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is explained by the sage's mother:—

 PADMA-PURÁNA, PÁTÁLA-KHANDA, 97th chapter.


* According to the *Vámana-purána*, LVI., 69—73, Dharma and Hinsá had eight sons: Sanatkumára, Sanátana, Sanaka, Sanandana, Kapila, Voḍhu, Asuri, and Panchas’ikha. The first four were versed in the Yoga; and the rest were proficient in the Sáńkhya. The passage, as I have seen it, is evidently very corrupt. I give it without any suggestions of amendment:
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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</tr>
</tbody>
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<th>Verse</th>
</tr>
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<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sarga</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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<table>
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<tr>
<th>Sarga</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* As I have seen it, the text is corrupt. I give it without any suggestions of amendment.
of the Agnis, or Fires.* Lastly, it is affirmed, that there have been two Kapilas: the first, an embodiment of Vishnu; the

The first three of these stanzas are adduced in the S'abda-kalpa-
druma, pp. 1831—32; where they are erroneously said to be from the fiftieth chapter of the Vāmana-purāṇa.

* युक्तान्वित-पात्रान न विभविन्त क्तात्मण्यः।
खक्कार् खक्कार्णां कर्तस्त। भोधन्ति च छ। छ। छ।
कपिलं पथविषम् छ यं प्रक्षेपयं: सदृशः।
खस्थः स कपिलो नाम चातुर्यायमप्रसर्कहः।

Mahābhārata, III., 14196—7.

The last line of these verses is cited by Vijnana, near the conclusion of his Sānkhyā-pravachana-bhāshya. But he rejects, with indignation, the idea, that Kapila is therein identified with Fire. It is simply meant, he says, that Kapila was endowed with the potency of fire; and he supports his interpretation by the aid of analogy, with some ingenuity. Of there having been two Kapilas, he will hear nothing.

In his version of it, the line he quotes is so phrased, as to give Kapila the authorship of the Sānkhyā only, and not of the Yoga likewise:

Professor Wilson, writing of this text, of whose respectable origin he was uncertified, pronounces, touching the identity 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.” Oxford Sānkhyā-kārikā, p. 188. See, also, Colebrooke’s Miscellaneous Essays, Vol. I., p. 230. But it seems just as likely, that the notion owed its origin to the fabled combustion, by Kapila, of the sons of Sagara. Mahābhārata, III., 8881. Also see the Asiatic Researches, Vol. III., pp. 349, 350; and Vol. VI., p. 478.

For Colonel Wilford’s wild speculations, in which he makes Kapila one with Enoch, vide ibid., Vol. VI., pp. 473-4.
other, the igneous principle in corporeal disguise.* It must

* See the reference to the Sarvopakarini, in the foot-note at p. 8, supra.

S'ankara Acharya, in the S'arivaka-mimamsa-bhashya, I., 2, 1, also declares for two Kapilas. Implicitly following the RamaYaṇa, he considers the Sagaracide Kapila to be an incarnation of Vasudeva, or Vishnu; but he denies the origination, or revival, by him, of the Sankhya philosophy. It is in another Kapila, on whom he forbears to expatiate, that he recognizes its inventor. The Bhagavata-purana, IX., 8, 18, insists, that this Kapila could not, with his benevolent nature, have slain the Sagaricæ intentionally. Yet it makes no doubt, that they were destroyed by fire issuing from the body of the incensed ascetic, independently of his volition.

S'ankara Acharya, commenting on the word Kapila in the Sve-tasvatara-upanishad, V., 2, proposes two interpretations of it. By one of them it is violently made to denote, as a lame synonyme, Hiranyakarṇa. Otherwise, since primogeniture among created beings is found averred of both Kapila and Hiranyakarṇa, they are, to save scriptural consisstency, concluded to be one and the same. On the other interpretation, the person named in the Upanishad is Kapila of the Sankhya, a partial incarnation of Vishnu. For his character as such, some unnamed Purana is adduced. S'ankara adds, that the other Kapila is celebrated in the Mundaka-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 Purana above referred to. S'ankara avowedly cites it, not to corroborate the first identification of Kapila, but to elucidate the second. Neither, in that quotation, is Kapila, “to praise him,” “identified with Hiranyakarṇa.” See the Bibliotheca Indica, Vol. XV., p. 62.

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

Kapila, in the Mahadeva-sahasra-nama-stotra, Mahabharata, XIII., 1211, is an epithet of Siva, and expresses, as indicated by the context, “tawny.”
be acknowledged, in sum, that we know nothing satisfactory concerning our old-world sage; the meagre notices of him that are producible 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 is good ground for our receiving, as an historical fact, his alleged connexion with the Sáňkhya.

In an inscription translated by Colebrooke, there occurs the word kapilá, which, he observes, "probably is fire, personified as a female goddess." [sic] Miscellaneous 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 that place it bears, undoubtedly, the sense of "dun cow;" from circumambulating which sort of creature great merit is supposed to be acquired. "‘A red one:’ kapilá. When applied to a cow, this term signifies one of the colour of lao-dye, with black tail and white hoofs." Colebrooke’s Two Treatises on the Hindu Law of Inheritance, p. 181, 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 it." Miscellaneous Essays, Vol. I., p. 231. But the Mahábhárata, despite its plentiful alloy of fiction, sufficiently attests, it should seem, the reality of the sage; and the Sáňkhya-pravachana and Tattva-samása may be pseudonymous, without vacating the existence of Kapila, or his character of Sáňkhya proto-philosopher.

There is, I doubt not, much new matter about Kapila in Dr. Muir’s Sanskrit Texts; but, to my regret, the work is not, at this moment, accessible to me.

In the Padma-puráña, latter section, Gaurí-viváha-varñana subdivision of the Kumára-sambhava chapter, Kapila is said to have dwelt in the village of Indraprastha. Further particulars regarding this personage can, doubtless, be obtained, if the Kapila-upapuráña,
Among the ancients whose names are found in association with that of Kapila, are Åsuri, Panchas'ikha, Sanátana, and Sanandana. These five persons, with others, we have mytho-historical authority for classing as brothers. But accounts differ on the subject of their parentage. An option is allowed between regarding them as mind-born sons of Brahmá,* and as offspring, after the natural course, of Dharma and Hinsá.†

Åsuri, it is stated, had for teacher Kapila himself.‡ That he was an author, we have the evidence, such as it is, of a single couplet.§

which is named in the Kúrma-purána, and elsewhere, be still extant. For the Kapila-sanhitá, a colloquy concerned with the sacred localities of Orissa, see Dr. Aufrecht’s Catalogus Cod. Manuscript. Sanscrit, &c., p. 77. At p. 26 of the Sanskrit Catalogue of the library of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, occurs the name of Kápila-smriti, or Legal Institute of Kapila. A work on naval astrology, attributed to Kapila, has been found in the Peninsula. Mackenzie Collection, Vol. I., p. 262. A treatise on the Yoga, called Kápilagítá, has also fallen in my way. It professes to be extracted from the Padma-purána.

* See the note at p. 14, supra.
† See the note at p. 17, supra.
‡ Bhágavata-puráña, I, 3, 11. Panchas'ikha apud Vyása: Pátanjala-bháshya, I, 25: चालिविद्रात् निर्माणिताचिनमधिहत्रैं काष्ठाकाल भगवान् परस्यं सरस्वते निजामवात्य तन्म प्राय। The commentators are unanimous in understanding, by paramarshi, or “great Rishi,” Kapila.

Colebrooke—Miscellaneous Essays, Vol. I., p. 231,—speaks of this passage as being one of Panchas'ikha’s sútras. But it is not so discriminated by Vyása, or by Vyása’s commentators; though they name Panchas'ikha as its author. Colebrooke, it is clear, did not suspect, that reference was anywhere made to more than one work of Panchas'ikha.

§ वृतिविन्द वृक्षपरिणयों चूँकि पृथ्वी चक्रायुक्ते।
प्रतिविन्दाद्यं कश्चिद् यथा चक्रपल्पिणी॥

This I found in Cháritrasintha Gañi’s scholia on the Shad-darśana-
samuchchaya.
Panchasīkha is called a disciple of Asuri;* but he is also said to have been instructed by Kapila.† He is known, by scanty fragments, as an aphorist.‡ Of a second work of his we have indications,§ and, it may be, of a third. It is manifest,

* Mahābhadrata, XII., 7890, 7895.
† And to have been fellow-student of Jaigishavya. Kurma-purāṇa: Prior Section, IX., 119. See, further, the reference to the Kurma-purāṇa in the note at p. 15, supra.

If Colebrooke—Miscellaneous Essays, Vol. I., pp. 229, 230,—meant to intimate, that, in Gaudapāda’s commentary, Panchasīkha is spoken of as Kapila’s disciple, either directly, or through Asuri, he committed an oversight. That Asuri was Panchasīkha’s preceptor is declared in the seventieth Kārikā; but on that couplet Gaudapāda makes no remark.

‡ A single one of his aphorisms is given, as such, in Vyāsa’s Pāñjala-bhāṣya, I., 4: रक्षें दामें क्षात्रियें दामें। Kāhemānanda, in his notes on the Tattva-samāsa, twice quotes this as a sūtra; and Vāchaspati Mis’ra, Vijnāna Bhikṣu, and Nāgojī Bhaṭṭa, consent in assigning it to Panchasīkha.

In Vyāsa’s Pāñjala-bhāṣya we find, at II., 13: सच्च: सह्यः सपरिचारः सप्तवार्तमयः। कुशलम् नापेकशायंसः। कथिताद्रिष्ट्व: च न विक- न्यदेश्य: धनाध्यायाभवम्: यमः आपकर्षशमासः कारिणः। Of this passage,—which is uncharacterized, by Vyāsa, except as being by Panchasīkha,—the Sānkhya-tattva-kaumudi cites the words सच्च: सह्यः सपरि- चारः सप्तवार्तमः। So does Nārayaṇa Tīrtha, in his Bhakti-chandrikā. Swapneswara, 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 Panchasīkha’s sūtras; and it may be questioned whether any more samples of them are forthcoming, notwithstanding Colebrooke’s assertion, that they “are frequently cited, and by modern authors on the Sāṅkhya.” Miscellaneous Essays, Vol. I., p. 233.

§ This work is metrical; unless, indeed, the longer extracts, to be given after the ensuing couplets, belong, with one or more of them, to a treatise mixed of prose and verse.
that he wrote on the Sánkhyā; and it is not impossible, that

This couplet is quoted, by Vijnāna Bhikshu, in his *Brahma-sūtra-riju-vyākhyā*, with the following introduction: चिन्तिष्ठो नौक्षेप गव्यो नौक्षेप नौक्षेप। This is the best voucher we have for the opinion, that Panchas’ikha commented on the *Tattva-samāsa*, of which the words चिन्तिष्ठो नौक्षेप do really constitute a topic. This couplet is again quoted, partially, by Vijnāna, in his *Yoga-vārttika*, as well as in Bhāvāganesa’s *Yogānus’asana-sūtra-vritti*; and in full, by Kshemānanda on the *Tattwa-samāsa*, in the *Sánkhyā-krama-dīpikā*, and by Bhāvāganesa in the *Tattwa-yādthārthya-dipana*. Its various readings, and those of the stanzas following, are not of sufficient importance to call for particularization.

Bhāvāganesa’s, in his *Yogānus’asana-sūtra-vritti*, refers the stanza just given, directly to Panchas’ikha; but, in his *Tattwa-yādthārthya-dipana*, he introduces those verses, and the three couplets subjoined, by expressions importing, that they were borrowed, not from, but through, Panchas’ikha.

Now, these three couplets, and that preceding them, the first and the third as acknowledged quotations, are also found in the *Sánkhyā-krama-dīpikā*. The last two are cited both there and in the *Sánkhyā-sūtra-vivaraṇa*. The first has been spoken of above; and the second is in Kshemānanda on the *Tattwa-samāsa*, in Chārītrasinha Gaṇi on the *Shad-darsana-samuchchaya*, and is twice given in Gaudapāda on the *Sánkhyā-kārikā*. It is, besides, observable, that Bhāvāganesa does not quote a syllable as derived through Panchas’ikha, that does not occur in the *Sánkhyā-krama-dīpikā*. There is, accordingly, a presumption, that Bhāvāganesa took the passages from that work, and under the impression, that it was by Panchas’ikha; and
he was likewise an expounder of the dogmas of Patanjali.

this suspicion is strengthened by the second exordial stanza of the Tattva-yādharthya-dīpana, where its author clearly enough claims to have consulted Panchas'īkha on the Tattva-samāsa:

चमासुत्रनमान्य वाचाचं पत्तिकां यथा च।
भावाचारण: कृपये तत्त्वाचार्यादीपिका।

The attribution to Panchas'īkha of the Sānkhya-krama-dīpakā, if ever actually maintained, would at once be invalidated by indicating the fact, that mention of Panchas'īkha is made, in the work itself, supposed free from interpolation; and in such a manner, namely, with the title of āchārya, as to differentiate him from its author.

The passages extracted below have, in every case, the guarantee of good authority for their being by Panchas'īkha. They are given, in the first instance, by Vyāsa, in his Pātanjala-bhāšya, anonymously: but three of Vyāsa’s commentators, Vāchaspati Miśra, in the Pātanjala-sūtra-bhāṣya-व्याख्यā, Vijñāna Bhikshu, in the Vāg-वार्तिक, and Nāgoji Bhaṭṭa, in the Pātanjala-sūtra-vṛtti-bhāṣya-चक्रधक्याव्याख्याय, testify, one, or all, to their authorship. As for the passage at II., 22, Vāchaspati merely says, that it is by an āgāmin, or authoritative sage: the two other scholiasts declare it to be by Panchas'īkha.

The first of the annexed passages is quoted and elucidated by Kshemánanda, in the Nava-yoga-kallola. A few words from the passage at II., 29, are brought forward in the concluding chapter of the Sarva-darsāna-saṅgrahā.

तत्त्वाचार्याद्वारा वाचाचं विष्णुविज्ञानं नामस्तुष्टं चतुर्विकारं विज्ञानं च।
मोक्षश्रवणं विष्णुपरमार्थं विज्ञानं च।
विज्ञानं तत्त्वाचार्यादेशं विष्णुविज्ञानं च।
मोक्षार्थं विज्ञानं च।

II., 36.

वाचाचं विष्णुविज्ञानं तत्त्वाचार्यादेशं विज्ञानं च।
विज्ञानं तत्त्वाचार्यादेशं विष्णुविज्ञानं च।
विज्ञानं तत्त्वाचार्यादेशं विष्णुविज्ञानं च।
विज्ञानं तत्त्वाचार्यादेशं विष्णुविज्ञानं च।

II., 5.

उष्णत: परमपुर्वसंकारणं विष्णुविज्ञानं विज्ञानं च।
विज्ञानं तत्त्वाचार्यादेशं विष्णुविज्ञानं च।
विज्ञानं तत्त्वाचार्यादेशं विष्णुविज्ञानं च।
विज्ञानं तत्त्वाचार्यादेशं विष्णुविज्ञानं च।

II., 6.

सत्यसंपन्नत: विष्णुविज्ञानं च।
विज्ञानं तत्त्वाचार्यादेशं विष्णुविज्ञानं च।
विज्ञानं तत्त्वाचार्यादेशं विष्णुविज्ञानं च।
विज्ञानं तत्त्वाचार्यादेशं विष्णुविज्ञानं च।

II., 17.
Sanátana is reported to have busied himself with the Yoga; but none of his writings seem to have survived to the present day.*

Sanandana, at least in the acknowledgment of tradition, was a philosopher of high repute. Of his literary remains, if he left any, nothing, it is believed, has reached us.†

Except at sheer random, we can scarcely estimate the duration that divided Is'warakṛṣṇa from Kapila. The utmost that can, with any safety, be said of his time is, that he flourished before the ninth century. In the very abruptness with which he begins his compendium,‡ the manner of a compar-

---

* Rāyamukuta, in his *Pada-chandrikā*, cites from the *Yoga-s'atā-kākhyāna* of a Sanátana; and Sundara Deva, in his *Hātha-sankota-chandrikā*, a Yoga treatise, from the *Sanátana-siddhānta*.

† He is one of the two authorities referred to by name in the *Sánkhyā-pravachana*; where he enjoys, uniquely, the honour of being called an ṛchārya. It may be, that this notice of him is in an aphorism retained from the original *Sánkhyā-sūtra*.

‡ Its opening stanza is translated as follows by Colebrooke, Professor Lassen, Dr. C. J. H. Windischmann, and M. Saint-Hilaire.
atively early age is plainly perceptible: he invokes no divinity,

"The inquiry is into the means of precluding the three sorts of pain: for pain is embarrassment. Nor is the inquiry superfluous, because obvious means of alleviation exist; for absolute and final relief is not thereby accomplished."

"Etergeminorum dolorum impetu (oritur) desiderium cognoscendae rationis qua ii depellantur. Quod (cognoscendi desiderium) licet in visibilibus rebus infructuose versetur, non est (infructuosum) propter absentiam absoluti et omni aeo superstitis (remedii)."

"Wegen des Zudrangs der Dreifalt von Leiden entsteht das Bestreben nach Erkenntniss eines diese (Leiden) verdrängernden (radicalen) Heilmittels. Sagt man: Dieses Bestreben sey unnüz, da ein sichtbares (Mittel der Abwehr) vorhanden sey, so ist dies fälsch wegen des Nichtseyns eines vollständigen und dauernden (Mittels)."

"La philosophie consiste à guérir les trois espèces de douleurs. Si l'on prétend qu'il existe des moyens matériels de les guérir, et que, par conséquent, la philosophie est inutile, on se trompe; car il n'est pas un seul de ces moyens qui soit absolu ni définitif."

If the intended sense, in the first line, were "for pain is embarrassment," the formation of the sentence being considered, the Sanskrit should be दृष्टयामध्यांभिलालात्. Dr. Windischmann—Die Philosophie im Fortgang der Weltgeschichte, pp. 1812, 1813,—concurs with Professor Lassen on the point here controverted, but afterwards copies Colebrooke almost literally. Vâchaspâti Mis'ra explains the beginning of the couplet to concern "the disadvantageous connexion of the intelligent power, or soul, with threefold pain resident in the internal organ:"

The Kârikâ will then, run thus:

दृष्टयामध्यांभिलालात् सिद्धाया तद्धात्राके चैते।
हेतु सिद्धाया वेन नेत्रकास्मातनेवऽभावत्।

I would render it: "Because of the discomposure that comes from threefold pain, there arises a desire to learn the means of doing away therewith effectually. If it be objected, that, visible means to this end
and salutes no venerable preceptor, but enters at once upon his

*being available, such desire is needless, I demur; for that these
means do not, entirely and for ever, work immunity from discom-
posure."

Abhīghāta signifies "impact," "blow," "shock," "agitation." 
Apaghāta has the sense of "averting," "debarring," "removal," 
"elimination." Drīṣṭa, "visible," is for "worldly," or "physical." 
Colebrooke puts "obvious."

The French interpretation of the preliminary Kārikā is hardly an
inspiration of profound scholarship. Yet a critique of it may not be
amiss. In the first place, the relation of identity is never, as there
assumed, expressed, in Sanskrit, by the fifth case. More strangely
still, in manifest ignorance of the manner in which more than one set
of Hindu aphorisms commences, M. Saint-Hilaire understands jijnāsā
to denote "philosophy;" herein silently adopting Professor Lassen's
inference, based on the consideration of its etymology: Gymnosophista,
p. 18. But the mere "ambition to know" would be too vague and
indeterminate, by far, for the highest aspiration of the Hindu. Phi-
losophy, with him, is a concretion, a definite tattva-jijnāsā, or "desire
of apprehending first principles." It may be mentioned, parenthe-
sically, that Professor Wilson has misread Gauḍapāda, where he explains
विद्वान by the equivalent desiderative विविद्ध; as this does not imply
"by the wise," which would be विद्विद्ध,—or, rather, the plural; if,
in fact, such an adjective as विविद्ध, though not abnormal, be
ever used.

Another error, on the part of M. Saint-Hilaire, and equally impor-
tant with the one just disposed of, consists in the anachronism of
representing Iś'warakṛṣṇa as employing a style of phraseology
which would reduce him to the last century, and even transport him
to the fellowship of antichristian Parisians. With most people but
Frenchmen, the contrast to revelation is reason alone. So it is with
us; and the same is the case with the Brāhmans, whose word for
"reason" is yuktī, never jijnāsā. No more than the Vedānta itself
is the Sāṅkhya a school of naturalism. The Baudhās, the Chārvākas,
and a few other classes of Indian religionists, openly and unreservedly
disown the warrant of the Veda; but, on the other hand, as Colebrooke
has most justly observed, the Sāṅkhya's "endeavour to reconcile their
undertaking, without ceremony or circumlocution. Who he was,
document to the text of the Indian scripture, and refer to passages
which they interpret as countenancing their opinions. The *Mimánsá,*
which professedly follows the *Veda* implicitly, is, therefore, applied
in its controversy with these half-heretics, to the confutation of such
misinterpretations. It refutes an erroneous construction, rather than a
mistaken train of reasoning." Like the rest of the six great systems,
the Sánkhya, it is true, imposes some share of its dogmas upon
the Veda, and then claims to have extracted them from it: a course
which has had its precise parallel in procedures connected with our
own Holy Writ. Still, its free-handing is by no means overdone, if
we judge by the Indian standard.

M. Saint-Hilaire, in the course of his remarks on the first *Káriká,*
adduces the introductory sentence of those imputed to Kapila:
"L’objet définitif de l’esprit de l’homme, c’est la cessation définitive
de la triple douleur." On this, and the two aphorisms which succeed
it, he says: "La traduction de ces trois Soutras de Kapila nous
montre fort nettement quel a été le travail de l’auteur de la Káriká.
Il n’a rien changé à la pensée primitive, et il l’a suivie pas à pas:
seulement il l’a rendue plus précise; il l’a même abrégée."
Ainsi, dès le premier pas, la Káriká, comme les Soutras, établit l’objet
de la philosophie." This is very gratuitous. Where, in the first
three aphorisms, do we see anything about *jijnásá,* M. Saint-Hilaire’s
hypothetical "philosophie"? The complete cessation of threefold
pain is there enunciated to be the supreme purpose of the soul. On
M. Saint-Hilaire’s theory, that *I’swarakrishna* adheres undeviatingly
to the intent of the aphorist, "la philosophie," the contradistin-
guished from revelation, must have been substituted, by him, for
"l’objet définitif de l’esprit de l’homme."

Proceeding to the second *Káriká,* we find the expression दशस्वादनु-
ञविकाय, "the revealed mode is like the temporal one," as Colebrooke
has it. Yet all revelation is not here contemplated. The commen-
tators are of opinion, and rightly, that only the Vaidika ritual is
animadverted upon. What is inculcated is, that a man should not
restrict himself to sacrifice and like observances, the promised requital
whereof is confined to the inferior bliss of Elysium, and stops short
of ensuring a period to the grand evil of existence, metempsychosis,
and where he dwelt, are, however, questions that must, it seems, for ever go unanswered. One writer, to be sure, styles him disciple of Panchasākha;* and another will have it, that he and Kālidāsa were the same person;† but these statements though worthy of record, would require strong confirmation before they could challenge acceptance.

Those works which the Hindus style non-voluntary,—among which sacrifice is comprehended,—are, indeed, said to be attended with sin: nevertheless, whatever the sin of performing them, there would be greater sin in abstaining from them. Being prescribed, they must be done; and the consequences must be endured, and duly atoned for. The Sāṅkhya simply takes a flight beyond the legalistic Mīmāṃsā: and so does the Vedānta; no more than which does the Sāṅkhya cut itself away from the Veda, or lay a ban upon the rites and ceremonies which it is thought to enjoin. In a word, the Sāṅkhya would only dissuade from content with a lower grade of future happiness. M. Saint-Hilaire's phrase of "resto de respect pour l'écriture sainte," used of a Sāṅkhya, proceeds, then, from mis-apprehension; and equally so does his remark on the first two Kārikās: "L'autorite de la raison n'a jamais été plus nettement affirmée; sa suprématie n'a jamais été plus hautement proclamée."

* Nārāyaṇa Tirtha, in the Tattva-chandra, so describes him, and gives him the title of Muni.

† Swapnes'wara says, in the Kaumudi-prabhā: द्रवर्तक्ष्यः सार्याचार्यां साविन्येन तत्त: कारिकां। These words are continuous with the extract given in a foot-note to p. 8, supra. The only MSS. of the Kaumudi-prabhā that I have seen,—two in number,—are defective at the conclusion, where Swapnes'wara may, perhaps, have enlarged on the traditional identity which he reports.

Kavirāja Yati, author of the Sāṅkhya-tattva-pradīpa, calls Is'wara-kṛishṇa sāṅkhya-mūla-kāra, or "founder of the Sāṅkhya." This may have been intended as nothing more than a compliment. As such I have more than once heard the epithet applied, by the pandits, to the compiler of the Sāṅkhya-kārikā.

Colebrooke, prior to the date of his elaborate and fruitful researches on Hindu philosophy, wrote as follows: "The text of the Sāṅkhya
The next writer that here calls for notice is one of foremost importance. Of all extant treatises on the system of Kapila, by much the most valuable are those of Vijnána Bhikshu. While he unfolds the doctrines of the Sánkhya with a completeness such as leaves little to be supplemented, he has the merit, in his capacity of expositor, of being as cautious as he is copious. If none of his countrymen have added to him, neither has any one of them ventured to arraign his accuracy,* still less, to disallow his ability.

philosophy, from which the sect of Buddha seems to have borrowed its doctrines, is not the work of Kapila himself, though vulgarly ascribed to him; but it purports to be composed by Is'warakrishna.” Miscellaneous Essays, Vol. I., p. 108. Unquestionably, this sentence was penned while Colebrooke was as yet unacquainted with the so-called aphorisms of Kapila; and it must have escaped his eye, when he was recommitting his essays to the press.

* M. Saint-Hilaire, indeed has found fault with him; but the reader shall see how misapprehensively.

First of all, I subjoin the twenty-fifth Káriká, with Colebrooke’s translation, and the censurer’s:

चालिक एकाश्चार: प्रवर्तने समाराष्ट्रानां!
भुजदेर्शातः च नास्थकेः साधारणसः

“From consciousness, affected by goodness, proceeds the good elevenfold set: from it, as a dark origin of being, come elementary particles: both issue from that principle affected by foulness.”

“L’ensemble des onze principes donés 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.”

Now, the expression “origin of being” is, in this place, all but nugatory: and Professor Wilson’s assumption, that “origin of beings” is intended, does not at all mend the matter; since “beings,” in the only plausible sense of which the word is here susceptible, that of “creatures,” or “elemental creation,”—fifty-third Káriká,—are, out of the Purápas, produced from egoism only by the intermediate agency of the elementary particles.
His reputation as an author rests upon at least five works,

The mistake which Professor Wilson falls into, after his attempt to correct Colebrooke, can easily enough be accounted for. Gaudapáda says: भूतानामादिभूमि। तमोज्ञङ्गोभोजङ्गो च तास्य रति। This 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 आदिभूतक, but आदिभूतम. Being, however, an adjective, it refers to भूतानि, the second factor of which it justifies etymologically. This reference should have been evident from the gender of उक्ताः, सा, and तास्याः; and also from that of भूतालस, which 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 egoism. The passage cited above will, therefore, admit of no other translation than such as this: "It, origin of the elements, is originant, viz., of the elements: it is surcharged with darkness, and hence is called dark." To bear out Professor Wilson's English, the Sanskrit should have stood somewhat after this sort: भूतानामादिभूमि तस्मां नेम ज्ञेश्वरस्तति तस्य नास्यमिति।

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

In the विष्णु-पुराण, at 1, 12, 53, the term भूतानि "generative of the elements," epithetically employed in place of "dark egoism," 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 Bhāṣya, which presents a notion familiar to all ancient cosmogonies. Gaudapáda 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
all of them concerned with philosophy. Their titles, in the

Nullus adhuc mundo praebet lumina Titan,
Nee nova crescendo reparabat cornua Phoebe.
In the influence of the quality of foulness, or passion,—for the word *rajas* has both senses,—may be suspected an affinity to the doctrine of an active principle, the moving mind, the *eros*, that set inert matter into motion, and produced created things." Oxford *Sāṅkhya-kārikā*, p. 94.

Professor Lassen, who was the first to translate the whole of *Is'wara-krishna’s* treatise, has a right understanding of *bhūtādi*. "Caterva undenum essentialis proficiscitur e sui sensu essentiali; rudimentalis ex (sui sensu) elementorum generatore; haece caliginosa est. Ex impetuoso (sui sensu) utralibet oritur creatio." Twenty-fifth *Kārikā*, in *Gymnosophista*, p. 58.

Professor Wilson's remarks, incidentally bearing on the functions of *bhūtādi*, at p. 164 of the Oxford *Sāṅkhya-kārikā*, are unsubstantiated. The text on which those observations are founded is as follows:

एकभौतिकः सृष्टिः जिद्धाकर्षणः साक्षरः।
भूतसर्गः देवसामुप्लविश्वानाः द्वयेष प्राप्या:

"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." Instead of this, 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 सृष्टिः "elemental creation:" but its insertion, as an equivalent of the *भौतिकः* सृष्टिः of the fifty-third *Kārikā*, is quite immaterial. Moreover, I have corrected a grammatical inadverence.

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 successive correlation, 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
order, mainly, in which they were composed, here follow.

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 Sánkhya principles, as recited in the Vishnu-puráṇa, is strangely misrepresented by the translator. A single specimen will suffice.

भूतादिः बिमुक्ताः शब्दम्भारवीक्ष तत: ||
यस्मात् शब्दम्भारवायुक्तम् शब्दवेयुक्तम्।
शब्दार्थ तथाकारम् भूतादि: य वमाह्येऽन् ||

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." P. 16.

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

Almost the entire page from which the passage above touched 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 váyu—euphonically required for váyuḥ—is made accusative. Saintly liberties vastly more licentious than this are often taken, in the Purāṇas; but there is, in this instance, no temptation whatever to do violence to Pāṇini.

To return to M. Saint-Hilaire. Part of his comment on the twenty-fifth Kārikā is thus expressed: "Or Vidjñāna 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 on l'a vu, 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.

* * * * * * * * *

"Si l'on adopte l'explication de Vidjñāna, il faudrait traduire le vingt-cinquième sloka de la façon suivante: 'Le onzième principe doué
I. The Brahma-sūtra-rūja-vyākhyā, sometimes called Vijnānām-

de bonté émane du moi quand le moi est modifié également par la bonté ; du onzième principe, considéré comme élément primitif, viennent les éléments grossiers. Ce onzième principe est obscur ; et tous deux, ce principe et le moi, nagissent 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-deuxième, qui fait sortir directement du moi les seize principes, et qui fait sortir en particulier 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 le prouve le sūtra que nous avons cité. Nous devons donc nous en fier à l'explication de Gaoudapada plutôt qu'à celle de Vidyānā. Dans le système sāṁkhya bien interprété, les cinq éléments grossiers viennent des 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 Vidyānā Bhikshou ; et ce qui doit nous étonner encore davantage dans son erreur, c'est que, dans le sūtra immédiatement précédent, Kapila dit expressément, lecture deuxième, sūtra dix-septième : ' L'effet du moi, c'est l'ensemble des onze organes et des cinq éléments grossiers.' Quelque délicat qu'il soit de se prononcer dans des questions de ce genre, nous croyons pouvoir affirmer que Vidyānā Bhikshou s'est trompé, et qu'il n'y a point à tenir compte de son opinion." Premier Mémoire, &c., pp. 100—102.

The critic, misled by Professor Wilson's "first element," translates bhūtādi by "élément primitif." He also substitutes "éléments grossiers" for "éléments subtils," as an evolution from his "élément primitif," thus passing by the origin of the subtile elements, which, themselves directly derived from egoism, constitute the immediate source of the gross elements.

In order to adjust the twenty-fifth Kārikā after Vidyānā's conception of manas, M. Saint-Hilaire correctly premises, that this word, denoted by "the eleventh," must be substituted, in the couplet, for "eleven." But, professing to effect this substitution, while he once puts manas therefor, he puts it three times for "egoism." He also puts
rita; a commentary on the Vedānta Aphorisms of Bādarāyana.

egoism 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. Vijnāna was not the man to perpetrate such a solecism as the deducing any of the elements from mind. He expands the text of the Sāṅkhyā-pravachana, II., 17, in these words: "The eleven organs, and the five subtile elements, to-wit, sound, &c., are the products of egoism;" एकादशस्वरूपं ब्राह्मणार्थं पञ्चाश्चाङ्गोऽण्यं वाच्यमिये । How could this have escaped the critic's eye?

But Vijnāna has clearly enough set forth his view of the twenty-fifth Kārikā; as M. Saint-Hilaire would have seen, had he only mastered, even with the aid of Professor Wilson,—a little closely scrutinized,—the scholiast's understanding of the eighteenth Aphorism of the second Book. After alleging manus to mean the eleventh organ, Vijnāna explains "both" to refer to the intellectual organs and the organs of action: एकादशस्वरूपं पूर्णमेकाश्च राज्यमेकाश्च अयत्ते, अयत्ते । अयत्ते राज्यार्थं ज्ञातार्थं दश्यमेकाश्च अयत्ते, अयत्ते । The Kārikā will, then, run thus: "The eleventh organ, consisting of goodness, originates from modified egoism. From egoism, as the source of the elements, proceed the elementary particles; and this variety of egoism is imbued with darkness. From egoism affected by activity, arise both the intellectual organs and the organs of action."

Vijnāna is, therefore, peculiar, as compared with some others, in deriving from pure egoism but a single educt, 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 egoism; 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 manifestations of the self-conscious principle. Whether ekādāsat'akam, in the aphorism, stands for "eleven," or for "eleventh," is altogether uncertain. Aniruddha takes it to be for the former. That Vijnāna deals with the Kārikā unjustifiably, in respect of ubhayam, is not to be gainsaid. At the same time, the Aphorisms stand uncommitted to the doctrine clearly implied thereby. We here have an addition,
II. The Sānkhya-pravachana-bhāṣya, or Sānkhya-bhāṣya; a commentary already spoken of. III. The Pātanjala-bhāṣya-vārttika, or Yoga-vārttika; annotating Vyāsa’s commentary in the Kārikās, which ill comports with the theory, that they were derived, by abridgement, or otherwise, from the Sānkhya-pravachana as we now have it.

The productiveness of active egoism is the doctrine of the Purāṇas. For instance:

भत्तमत्तमवर्मांकिकाप्रवाहस्तं तु तास्रातः।
तेससिद्धयतः खुद्देव चैकारिका दम।।
एकादिस समवश्राण्ड देव चैकारिकाः। खुतः।।
Vishnu-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.” Professor Wilson’s Translation, pp. 17, 18.

In a foot-note to p. 16, the Professor repeats Gaudapāda’s account of the three sorts of egoism, 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. The first of these two passages is cited by Vijnāna on II., 18, of the Sānkhya-pravachana. Virarāghava, in his commentary, the Bhāgavata-chandrikā, wrests the word taivasā, in the fourth verse, into congruity with the dogmas of I’swarakrishna and his school, by explaining it to denote “with the aid of passionate egotism.”

Add: चैकारिकादः द्विद्वारात मभृतु चैकारिकाभवस।
प्रेमसामस्तिवधायी खुदेव चैकारिकादम।।
एकादिस समवश्राण्ड खुरणामामायाकस।
भत्तमत्तमवर्मांकिकाः खुतः।।

This is from the Kārma-purāṇa, Prior Section, IV. It will be found, probably quoted from memory, in the Sānkhya-sūtra, p. 17.

It were easy to enlarge on the peculiarities of these passages, and to point out many more cases of misapprehension in M. Saint-Hilaire’s observations on the twenty-fifth Kārikā.
on the Aphorisms of Patanjali. IV. The Sánkhya-sára, which awaits description. V. The Yoga-sára-sangraha, or Jnánaprada; a succinct exposition of the Yoga. Each of these works, from the last upwards, cites all that, as here disposed, precede it. But the Sánkhya-bháshya and the Yoga-várttika 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.

In all probability, Vijnána lived in the sixteenth or seventeenth century.* There is some slight ground, however, for carrying him back still further.† His nationality is unknown; and so is his civil appellation even: for Vijnána Bhikshu‡ is,

---

* According to an anecdote which I have heard from several pandits, Nágoji Bhaṭṭa, the epitomator of Vijnána’s Sánkhya-bháshya, synchronized with Jayasingha, Rájá of Jaypur. The time of that prince is fixed by the fact, that, under him the Jayasingha-kalpadruma, by Ratnakara Bhaṭṭa, son of Deva Bhaṭṭa, was composed in the Samvat year 1770, or A. D. 1713. So much for oral tradition.

† In the Prayoga-ratna, a work on the sixteen sacraments, by Nárayana Bhaṭṭa, son of Rámeśwara Bhaṭṭa, its author says, that he was assisted, in preparing it, by Ananta Dikshita, son of Vis’wanátha Dikshita. The father of one of Vijnána’s disciples, Bhávágaṇes’a Dikshita, was Bhávávis’wanátha Dikshita; and, if the latter was one with Vis’wanátha Dikshita, and if Bhávágaṇes’a Dikshita was brother of Ananta Dikshita, we are enabled to form a pretty correct estimate as to the time of Vijnána Bhikshu. For Nárayana Bhaṭṭa’s youngest brother’s second son, Raghunátha Bhaṭṭa, dates his Kálatattva-vivechana in Samvat 1677, or A. D. 1620. Vijnána may be placed fifty or sixty years earlier.

In the prefatory verses of Vijnána’s Pátanjala-bháshya-várttika, according to one of the many MSS. of it which I have examined, reference is made to one Bhavadeva, as an authority on the Yoga. Bhavadeva Mis’ra, of Patna, author of the Pátanjaliyábhinava-bháshya, a commentary on the Yoga-sára, seems to be intended. But of his age I know nothing.

‡ Or Vijnána Yati, as he is called just as often.
without question, the style of a devotee. Literature has preserved to us the names of three of his disciples: * Bhávágaṇeśa Díksiṭa,† Prasádamádhuva Yogin,‡ and Divyasinha Mis’ra.§

The ignorance of our pandits very ordinarily confounds him with Vijñánes’wara, or Vijñána Yogin, author of the Mitákshará, the celebrated commentary on the Yájnavalkya-smriti. But there is no evidence whatever that they are identical. Vijñánes’wara, who bore the title of Bhaṭṭáraka, was son of Padmanábha Bhaṭṭa, of the stock of Bharadwája. His preceptor was Vis’warúpa A’chárya, likewise a scholiast of Yájnavalkya. Vis’warúpa A’chárya, it is said, was the same person as Sures’wara A’chárya, civilly called Maṇḍana Mis’ra; a disciple of S’ankara A’chárya.

* M. Saint-Hilaire says: “Un maître n’a généralement qu’un disciple; un gorou n’a qu’un brahmatchâri.” Premier Mémoire, §c., 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 cases no longer exist; and they must always have been exceptional.

† I have seen a MS., without date, of the Tantra-chūḍamani, or Dharma-mimánsá-sangraha, an elementary Mímánsá disquisition, by Krishnádeva, son of Ráma A’chárya, which professes to be in the hand-writing of that person. I incline to consider the age of the MS. to be, at the very least, a couple of centuries.

‡ Author of the S’áriña-káriká-bháṣya, or Kárikártha-viniśchaya, a dissertation on the following enigmatical couplet, which its elucidator claims to take from the Mahábhárata:

एक्या दे चिनितिहि चिनितं भिवं महाभारतम्

चष जिला चिलिला भर चष जिला चुँबी भर।

The dissertation is in four sections; one being allotted to each quarter of the distich.

§ Divyasinha Mis’ra has written a commentary, by name S’áriña-káriká-bháṣya-várttika, on the work mentioned in the last note. He styles himself fellow-student of Prasádamádhuva Yogin, under Vijñána Bhikṣu; and he eulogizes Prasádamádhuva as the most eminent of their master’s disciples.
The following is as complete a list as I am at present able to draw up, of works treating exclusively of the Sánkhya.

I. The Sánkhya-kárıká,* by Is'warakrishña. Commentaries on it are:

A. The Sánkhya-kárıká-bháshya, by Gaṇḍapáda, supposed to be one with the preceptor of Govinda, of whom S’ankara Khárya was disciple.†

* I return to this work for a moment. Coupling it with the Sánkhya-pravachana, Colebrooke says, that both “may be considered to be genuine and authoritative expositions of the doctrine; and, the more especially, as they do not, upon any material point, appear to disagree.” Miscellaneous Essays, Vol. I., p. 234.

On the subject of Is’wara, the Sánkhya-pravachana asserts, that there is no proof of his existence. May it not be, that Is’wara-krishña, since he avoids any such declaration, thought differently? Possibly he would have denied, that the Sánkhya, as he held it, even implicitly rejects Is’wara.

The original Sanskrit of the Sánkhya-kárıká, unaccompanied by any commentary, has been published by Professor Lassen: also, in Roman characters, by M. G. Pauthier. These verses have been translated into Latin, by Professor Lassen; into German, by Dr. C. J. H. Windischmann; into English, by Colebrooke; and into French, by MM. G. Pauthier and Barthélémy Saint-Hilaire.


The notion, that Gaṇḍapáda was pupil of S’uka, the son of Vyása, is generally received by the Bráhmans. See, for this association, Colebrooke’s reference to the S’ankara-digvijaya: Miscellaneous Essays, Vol. I., p. 104.

Gangádhara Saraswáti, author of the Dattátreya-charitra, a metrical composition in the Maráthi language, deduces his own discipular descent, through S’uka and Gaṇḍapáda, from S’íva, as follows: S’ankara, Vishnú, Brahmá, Vasishthá, S’akti, Parás’ara, Vyása, S’uka,
B. The Sánkhya-tattwa-kaumudi, or Sánkhya-kaumudi, by Váchaspati Mí's'ra, pupil of Mártaṇḍatilaka Svámin.* It has been annotated in
   a. The Tattwa-kaumudi-ryákhya, by Bháratí Yati, pupil of Bodha Áranya Yati.


The Mitákshará, a commentary on the Brahma-sútra, by Annam Bhaṭṭa, son of Tirimula, contains a list, identical, down to S’ankara Ačárya, with the foregoing; except that Vasishṭha is preceding by Brahma and Bháma.

Gauḍapáda, it appears credible, belonged to the very precinct of the age of fable.

Gauḍapáda’s scholia on the Sánkhya-káriká, including the memorial verses, were published, by Professor Wilson, at Oxford, in 1837. Prefixed to the originals is the Professor’s translation of the scholia, accompanying Colebrooke’s version of the text.

* The Sánkhya-kaumudi was published in Calcutta, in the Samvat year 1905, or A. D. 1848; pp. 49, small Svo.

Colebrooke—Miscellaneous Essays, Vol. I., p. 233,—seems to be of opinion, that the title of Tattwa-kaumudi is applied to Váchaspati’s work only by comparatively recent abbreviation. But the concluding distich of the book itself, if not spurious, contains the shorter form. It also occurs in the list of Váchaspati’s works, as detailed at the end of his Bhámatí-nibandha; and in Mádhava Ačárya’s Sarva-dars’ana-sangraha.

Váchaspati’s exact age has not yet been discovered. But he is mentioned, as are Udayana and Pras’astapáda, in the Nyáya-sára-vichára of Bhaṭṭa Rágghava, which was written in the S’aka year 1174, or A. D. 1252; and he quotes from Bhoja, who was reigning in A. D. 1042.
b. The Tattvārāṇava, or Tattvāṃrita-prakāśini, by Rāghava Ananda Saraswatī, disciple of Adwaya Ananda, disciple of Vis'vēswara.

c. The Tattwa-chandra,* by Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha, who studied under Vāsudeva Tīrtha and Rāmagovinda Tīrtha.

d. The Kaumudi-prabhā, by Swapnes'wara, son of Vāhinīs'ā.

e. The Sāṅkhya-tattwa-vilāsa, Sāṅkhya-vrīti-prakāśa, or Sāṅkhya-vārttha-sankhyāyika, by Raghunātha Tarkavāgīśa Bhaṭṭāchārya, son of S'ivarāma Chakravartin, son of Chandravandya, son of Kāśinātha, son of Balabhadra, son of Sarvānanda Mis'ra. This is little more than a jejune epitome of the Sāṅkhya-kauṭumūḍī, with a preface briefly explaining the Tattwa-samāsa, which it repeats.

f. The Sāṅkhya-tattwa-vibhākara.†

C. The Sāṅkhya-chandrikā, by Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha.

D. The Sāṅkhya-kaumūḍī, by Rāmakrishna Bhaṭṭāchārya, who is said to borrow freely from the author of the work last named.‡

II. The Tattwa-samāsa,§ expositions of which are:

---

* Of this work I have seen only a fragment of the beginning, going over Vāchaspati's elucidation of the first eight Kārikās.

Two couplets, which appear in the Sāṅkhya-pravachana-bhāṣya as if by its author, are cited by Nārāyaṇa. He may, then, have come after Vijnāna Bhikshu.

† This work I know only from the first volume of Dr. Albrecht Weber's 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.


§ Except for its having elicited comments that lay under contribution philosophical sources presumed to be no longer forthcom-
A. The *Sarvopakārini*, by a nameless writer.

ing, the *Tattwa-samāsa* is of slight importance. It is a mere index to the topics of the Sānkhya.

The articles that make it up are variously reckoned by different authorities. The *Sarvopakārini* counts but twenty-two; as follows:

- अष्टयः प्रत्ययः ॥ १ ॥ श्रेष्ठ विकारः ॥ २ ॥ पुवः ॥ ३ ॥ तेजसुवः ॥ ४ ॥ श्रवणम् ॥ ५ ॥ पञ्चसुवः ॥ ६ ॥ शुचिताचारणः ॥ ७ ॥ पञ्चसम्बन्धः ॥ ८ ॥ पञ्चसवर्तकः ॥ ९ ॥ पञ्चसारः ॥ १० ॥ पञ्चसवर्तकः ॥ ११ ॥ पञ्चसारः ॥ १२ ॥ पञ्चसवर्तकः ॥ १३ ॥ पञ्चसारः ॥ १४ ॥ पञ्चसवर्तकः ॥ १५ ॥ पञ्चसारः ॥ १६ ॥ पञ्चसवर्तकः ॥ १७ ॥ पञ्चसारः ॥ १८ ॥ पञ्चसवर्तकः ॥ १९ ॥ पञ्चसारः ॥ २० ॥ पञ्चसवर्तकः ॥ २१ ॥ पञ्चसारः ॥ २२ ॥ पञ्चसवर्तकः ॥

The topic *traiyunya-sanchara* is given as two, in all the other commentaries. It is only by this bisection, that the *Sānkhya-sūtra-vivaraṇa* differs from the *Sarvopakārini*; and thus exhibits twenty-three so-called *sūtras*.

The *Sānkhya-krama-dīpikā* recites, at its commencement, twenty-five topics, but clearly by error; as it reduces them to twenty-four, by foregoing all explication of the words *trividho dhātu-sargah*, which occur after the topic given above as the nineteenth. The MS. from which Dr. J. R. Ballantyne printed the work in question, seems to be peculiar in reading *trividho dhātu-sansaṅgaḥ*. In the preface to the *Sānkhya-tattva-viśāsa*, where the *Tattva-samāsa* is quoted, as if from the *Sānkhya-krama-dīpikā*, and briefly elucidated, the expression *trividho dhātu-sargah* is explained by the words *vāta-pitta-kapha-bhedāḥ trividhāḥ*, as intending the assemblage of wind, choler, and phlegm.

The *Sānkhya-krama-dīpikā* gives after No. 22 as above, the words *trividham duhkham*, as a topic.

The reading of the *Tattva-yāthārthya-dīpama* corresponds with that of the *Sānkhya-krama-dīpikā*, barring its rejection of *trividho*, &c., and its considering the words *etad yāthātathyam* as a topic; thus actually giving twenty-five as the total.

Kšemānanda, in his annotations on the *Tattva-samāsa*, states, that it contains twenty-five topics: but he enumerates only twenty-four; his text being, as far as the words *etad yāthātathyam*, identical with that of the *Tattva-yāthārthya-dīpama*. 
B. The *Sānkhyā-sūtra-vivarana*, also by an anonymous author.

The eighth topic is read, in the *Sānkhyā-sūtra-vivarana*, *adhidava-vam cha*; and *adhidivavatam cha*, in the *Sānkhyā-krama-dipika*, in the *Tattva-yāthārthya-dipana*, and in Kshemānanda on the *Tattva-samāsa*. The *Sarvopakārini*, in its seventeenth topic, is unique in preferring *daśa* to *daśa-adhā*.

The *Tattva-samāsa* is generally found appended to Vedānti Mahādeva’s *Sānkhyā-epititi-sūra*, and according to the reading of the *Sarvopakārini*. Mahādeva, however, perhaps for the sake of shortness, omits the two sentences by which the topics are usually followed.

Of the *Sānkhyā-krama-dipika* I have collated five MSS.

Another classification of the *Sānkhyā* topics, which computes them at sixty, is propounded in the commentaries on the *Tattva-samāsa*, and in the *Rāja-vārttika* as quoted in the *Sānkhyā-kaumudi* and *Sarvopakārini*. The passage from the *Rāja-vārttika* runs as follows:

\[
\text{स्थापनाः सिद्धम् सिद्धां ज्ञानं ज्ञानं च}
\]
\[
\text{परायण्यं च नस्यां कथितं शेषं व च स}
\]
\[
\text{स्रोतांसौभलम् सौभलिकान्तं सूतां दशं}
\]
\[
\text{विषयं: प्रस्तिष्ठत्वां नव तु वेष:}
\]
\[
\text{कर्मानाः सम्भवतीतिवेष: सत्तम्।}
\]
\[
\text{रुति श्रेष्ठ: त्र्योधनामयम: वेष शिविफिमः।}
\]

Professor Wilson—Oxford *Sānkhyā-kārikā*, pp. 191-2—completes, in some sort, the set of ten “radicals” here included; but only by copying Vāchaspati where he supplements the text, and by misunderstanding him there and elsewhere. Vāchaspati connects *adhitva* with both *purusha* and *prakṛti*; and yet in order to make but one category of the whole, Professor Wilson makes two: “existence of soul” and “existence of nature.” Again, Vāchaspati explains *sēhas-pritti*, by *sthiti*, which he refers to *sthūla* and *sūkṣma*. Professor Wilson, dividing, as before, gives two categories, “duration of subtile” and “that of gross.” *Viyoga* and *yoga* are left, by Vāchaspati, unexplained, as being too plain to demand elucidation. Prof. Wilson throws them out altogether.

In an anonymous marginal note to one of my MSS. of the *Sānkhyā-kārikā*, I have found the verses given above from the *Rāja-
C. The Sánkhya-krama-dípiká, Sánkhyaááánkára, or Sánkhya-sútra-prakshepika;* likewise of unknown paternity.

D. The Tattwa-yátháthya-dípana, by Bhávágáne’sa Díkshita, son of Bhávávis’wanátha Díkshita, and pupil of Vijnána Bhikshu.

E. An unnamed volume of annotations, by Kshemánanda Díkshita,† son of Rághunandana Díkshita.

III. The Sánkhya-provachana, on which but two regular commentaries have been ascertained as now extant:

A. The Aniruddha-vr̥tti, by Aniruddha.‡

várttika, with the following stanza in place of their first couplet and a half:

पुष्प: प्रकृतिबद्धिरचार्यः मणाधा:।
सङ्कोचसिद्ध: सूतसंस्कारां: खः तत् दश॥

The commentaries on the Tattwa-samáśa cite the ensuing couplet for an enumeration of the ten radicals:

शक्तिबलसमाधिवचः पाराश्रेष्ठस्मालसक्षेत्रः च।
शेषो विमूच्छो वचना पुष्करणीस्वत: प्रदेशाणि: प्रविष्ठ: च शेषप्रविष्ठ:॥

The term asitwa, here used, is explained, by the other commentators, as it is by Váchaspati. Vis’esha-vr̥ttiḥ is, in some MSS., substituted for cha s’esha-vr̥ttiḥ. Its import is represented as above. See, regarding it, the sixty-seventh Káriká of Is’warakrishna.

* This work was published and translated by Dr. J. R. Ballantyne, in 1850. 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 Sánkhya-tattwa-vilása imputes this work to Asuri; but he contested the credibility of the attribution, on the showing of the commentary itself. It does not positively appear, however, that the author of the Sánkhya-tattwa-vilása is speaking of the Sánkhya-krama-dípiká.

† The only copy I have inspected of Kshemánanda’s notes on the Tattwa-samáśa, is imperfect in its latter half.

‡ Vijnána Bhikshu refers to him; and he is named in Rághava Ananda’s Tattwárstava.
a. The Sāṅkhya-vṛtti-sāra, by Mahādeva Saraswatī,* more commonly called Vedánti Mahādeva, disciple of Swayamprabhasā Tīrtha, is an abridgment of Aniruddha, but contains many original remarks by the epitomist.

B. The Sāṅkhya-pravachana-bhāshya or Sāṅkhya-bhāshya, by Vijnāna Bhikshu.†

* The Gīrvāna-pada-manjari by Varadarāja Bhaṭṭa, takes notice of a gloss on a Sāṅkhya-bhāshya. In the opening couplets to many copies of the Laghu-kaumudi,—which was written in Samvat 1715, or A. D. 1658,—Varadarāja is called pupil of Bhaṭṭoṭi Dīkṣita, and, as such, preceded Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa by two generations. See Colebrooke's Miscellaneous Essays, Vol. II., pp. 12, 13. If, then, it be not Mahādeva's epitome which Varadarāja intends, he probably refers to some work now lost.

† It was published by the editor of this volume, in 1854-1856, and forms Nos. 94, 97, and 141 of the Bibliotheca Indica. The oldest MS. used for it was dated in Samvat 1711, or A. D. 1654.

Dr. J. R. Ballantyne, in 1852-1856, published the Sāṅkhya-pravachana, with portions of commentary, and an English translation of both, in three volumes. As, in the last two, he has simply reprinted the Sanskrit as edited by me, some acknowledgment of obligation would not, perhaps, have been more than my due.

The first edition of the Sāṅkhya-pravachana-bhāshya bears the imprint of Serampore, 1821: 8vo. 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 Captain Roebuck's Annals of the College of Fort William, p. 157. The faults of that impression need not now be made the subject of particularization. The editors of the volume had the advantage of a manuscript, or manuscripts, much superior to the use they made of their appliances.

The Sāṅkhya-pravachana contains 526 aphorisms, that is to say, in the six lectures, 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
a. The *Laṅgu-sūna ṣṭhā-vṛtti* or *Laṅgu-sūnaḥ-ya-vṛtti*, by Nāgoji Bhaṭṭa, or Nāgos'a Bhaṭṭa Upādhyāya, is an abstract of the last.

supported, by notation, in all the copies of the pure text that I have consulted, and in most of the MSS. of Vijnāna's commentary, and of Nāgoji Bhaṭṭa's abstract of it, that I have collated. Anirudha, and his epitomist Mahādeva, 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 Lecture V.; thus bringing out 527 as the sum total.

M. Saint-Hilaire—*Premier Mémoire sur le Sāṅkhya*, p. 6,—computes the Sāṅkhya aphorisms at 479; or 156, 46, 76, 30, 122, and 69. This came from his trusting, with a confidence not altogether scholarly, the uncritical Serampore volume, which, with other faults, frequently gives text as commentary, and sometimes gives commentary as text. The consequence, to his essay, of neglecting due circumspection and research, is sufficiently disadvantageous. I add a couple of specimens.

Commenting on the fifty-fourth *Kārikā*, M. Saint-Hilaire writes:

"Lecture 3, soṭṭra 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 résicences qui lui sont si habituelles. Il faut ajouter que le commentateur des Soṭṭras, Vidyānā Bhikshou, ne s’est pas arrêté d’avantage à la doctrine que nous retrouvons dans la Kārikā, 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.
C. The Sāṅkhya-taranga, by Vis'wes'waradatta Mis'ra, or Deva TIRTHA Swámin, but who was more generally known as

The restoration of III., 49 and 50, which, with the explanations of them, do not appear in the Serampore impression of Vijnána, at once accounts for several items of the fifty-fourth Káríká, and completely frustrates the criticism just quoted.

Again: “Colebrooke a fait remarquer (Essays, tom. I., page 232) que les Sūtras attribués à Kapila mentionnaient le nom de Panchasikha. Le fait est exact, et Colebrooke en tirait cette double conséquence: d'abord, que les Sūtras 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 Sāṅkhya des autorités antérieures aux Sūtras, puisqu'ils invoquaient eux-mêmes le témoignage d'un maître plus ancien qu'eux. J'admets les deux conséquences signalées par Colebrooke. Mais il aurait dû ajouter que la citation rapportée par lui se trouve dans l'avant-dernier sūtra de tout le système. (Lecture 6, sūtra 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 Panchasikha 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 Sāṅkhya-pravachana, 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, on his line of argument, more directly against the text commemorating Sanandana,—VI., 69,—which, in his reading of Vijnána, is consigned to the notes. Again, both he and Colebrooke failed to observe V., 32, which, likewise, in Vijnána, as received by the former, is simply a scantling of commentary.

The fact, that Panchas'ıkha is mentioned in the Sāṅkhya-pravacaha, fairly compels the alternative of rejecting all we read of his relation to Kapila, or of adopting the view, that Kapila was not the author of those sentences in their present shape. I cannot
Kāshṭhajihwa, goes over but a part of the Śāṅkhyā-pravachana. believe that he was. In point of style, for one thing, they have not, as I have before remarked, the slightest flavour of antiquity.

Vedānti Mahādeva, annotating V., 32, infers, simply from Panchasīkha’s name being given in the singular number, that the aphorist purposes to mark him as a separatist. The singular must, then, he taken to indicate, as compared with the plural, an inferior degree of respect. But Sanandana, though dignified with the title of Aṭhārya, is yet spoken of in the singular number. Mahādeva’s words are:

पश्चिम रसेःकान्तचेन परमसमस्तदिनि खलिकति।

In the Mahābhārata, XII., 11875, Panchasīkha is assigned to the family of Parāśara; and the same poem, XII., 7895, speaks of his mother, Kapilā.

At XII., 7886, of the Mahābhārata, it is said:

यसाः कपिल वासु: परसर्थ प्रजापतिः।
स समे तेन दशेष विन्द्रायपति विर्भयस्॥

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

Such is the unmistakable sense of the stanza; and so thinks Nilakantha Chaturdhara: च कपिलः। तेन पश्चिमकान्तः। ततःप्रविधिनात्तत्त्वासाः। Yet Professor Wilson understands the meaning to be, that Panchasīkha is there “named ... Kapila.” Oxford Sāṅkhya-kārikā, p. 190. Dr. Weber repeats this mistake: “als auch Kapila heisst.” Indische Studien, Vol. I., p. 433.

A Bangāli translation of the Sāṅkhya-pravachana-bhāṣya, entitled Sāṅkhya-bhāṣā-sangraha, was undertaken by Rāmajaya Tarkalankāra Bhaṭṭāchārya, son of Mrityunjaya. So, at least, the work itself sets forth: but the Friend of India 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.” Mrityunjaya, 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 the 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 163
It is a fanciful performance, of slight extent, and of little value.*

IV. The Rāja-vārttika, complimentarily ascribed to Bhoja, King of Dhārā,† is, probably, a complete body of Sāṅkhya doctrine.

V. The Sāṅkhya-sāra, by Vijnāna Bhikshu, lays out the whole of the Sāṅkhya system within a small compass, and yet perspicuously.

VI. The Sāṅkhya-tattva-pradīpa, by Kavirāja Yati, dis-

octavo pages, breaking off, abruptly, in the midst of the commentary on the eighty-ninth Aphorism of the first Lecture—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 inspected a manuscript translation, in the provincial dialect, of the Sāṅkhya-pravachana and of Vijnāna's exposition in abstract. The author was Ahitāgni Rakshapāla Dūbe; who also showed me Hindī versions, made by himself, on a like model, of the Yoga, Nyāya, Vaisēshika, Vedānta, and Mīmāṃsā Aphorisms, and of S'āndilya's Sentences on Devotion. Each of the translations was accompanied, like that of the Sāṅkhya-pravachana, by a Hindī gloss, abridged from the Sanskrit.

* Its author owed his epithet to his wearing a cleft stick on his tongue, during the latter years of his life, as a check on loquacity. Vis'wes'waradatta died at Benares about ten years ago. His preceptor was one Vidyā Aranya Tīrtha, a Sāraswata Brāhmaṇ. The Sāṅkhya-turanga belongs to a series of tracts called, collectively, S'rī-kāś't-rāja-sāgara. I have seen at least twelve or fifteen works by its author, who composed largely in Hindī and Marāthi, no less than in Sanskrit.

† For this appropriation I am indebted to the learned Pandit Kās'ınātha S'āstrī Ashṭaputre, late of the Benares College. The Pandit is by far too well acquainted with Bhoja's commentary on the Yoga-sūtra, to have mistaken it for the Rāja-vārttika. The latter treatise, he assures me, was in his possession for several years, during which he constantly lectured on it to his pupils.
principle of Vaikuṇṭha, is a composition of similar scope, but of inferior value.

VII. The Sānkhyārtha-tattva-pradipikā, by Bhaṭṭa Kes'ava, son of Sadānanda, son of Bhaṭṭa Kes'ava, resembles the last, and is not a work of much account.*

In the Sānkhya-sāra we have the best known existing treatise in which to study the system ascribed to Kapila. This treatise consists of two sections, in prose and in verse, respectively. The first section is in three chapters, treating of emancipation as the fruit of discriminative apprehension, of the character of such apprehension, and of that from which spirit is to be discriminated.† The second section contains seven chapters, explanatory of the nature of spirit, of the

---

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

The Sānkhya-muktāvali, by Voḍhu, is the name of a Sānkhya work possibly now, or once, in existence; if the bare word of a man who has declared to me, that he once possessed and perused a copy of it, is to be received. But I strongly suspect that he fabricated the title of the treatise, for the occasion.

Mr. William Ward has published a list of Sānkhya compositions, in his work on the Hindus; Vol. II., p. 121: Svo. ed. of 1822. That list is, however, one mass of errors, and errors almost too gross to deserve advertence. It assigns the Kapila-bhāṣya to Vis'vēswa'ra, perhaps instead of Vijnānes'wara, as one sometimes hears Vijnāna Bhikshu incorrectly called; while it speaks of the Sānkhya-praṇa-bhāṣya as a distinct composition, and neglects to name its author. Vāchaspati Mis'ra's Sānkhya-kaumudi is, in like manner, duplicated. This for a sample.

† In that chapter, the third, there is much about the term guṇa. At p. 6, supra, a note on the subject has been promised; but, for the present, it must be postponed. In the meantime, the reader is referred to my translation of Pandit Nehemiah Nīlakaṇṭha’s Rational Refutation, &c., pp. 42, etc.
distinction between spirit and what is not spirit, of coercion of the mind, of emancipation in the body,* and of supreme emancipation.

But for my being on the point of leaving India, with no thought of returning, I should append to this preface a full translation of the Sánkhya-sára, accompanied by annotations.†

The following pages were printed from two undated manuscripts. One of them I procured at Benares; and the other belongs to the Asiatic Society of Bengal. For the readings of the latter, I have to thank Mr. Cowell, the Society’s Secretary. Though I spared no pains in the quest, no other manuscripts but those I have used were obtainable; and my text, I am well aware, is not immaculate.

Camp Tappá,
State of Gwalior,
March 15, 1862.

* Colebrooke represents the Sánkhya-sára as being a “treatise on the attainment of beatitude in this life.” Miscellaneous Essays, Vol. I., p. 231. That topic is one of two to which its concluding chapter only is devoted.

† Mr. Ward’s version of the Sánkhya-sára, with all its imperfections, is of some value. It will be found in his work on the Hindus, Vol. II., pp. 121-172 of the octavo edition printed in 1822.
साध्व्यसारः।

श्रीयुतेन फिल्स-एडवार्ड-हल्न नामकमहोदयेन

प्रकाशितः।

कलिकातानगरे

व्यापित-विश्वन-मले प्रयोजनस नृत्यकृति भृतः।
प्रकाशिता: १९०५। १०. १५०५।
साधुक्यसारः

पूर्वभागः

प्रार्थनः परिच्छेदः

महदार्शः स्वयम्बूर्वा जगद्धुर्व इत्यः
सर्वात्मनेन नमस्त्यै विषाणवे सर्वजिन्याश्वे ॥ १ ॥
साध्वकारिकः लेखार्धमः प्रतत्त्वं विशेषितमः
साध्वसारिकेको विचारणेन प्रपञ्चते ॥ २ ॥
प्राचः सहित्वा साध्वप्रक्ष्यणा कारिकागणः
सांतार्थं वच्चति लेखाम तदनुत्तांशमाचारः ॥ ३ ॥
साध्वभाष्येप्रक्तवादः स्वव्रं विक्तरानं मया ।
प्रेरत्तं तस्मातु तदन्त्वं स्वपेश्चायं वच्च्ये ॥ ४ ॥

ञ्ज्ञात्साध्वकारसाध्वात्तकारः कर्त्ताव्येक्षणासाध्वामानिन्वृत्त्या तत्त्वार्थर्गदेर्यमधीर्यमाध्ययुद्धानवर्णम् पूर्वोपवर्गकर्मणा
चाचार्रागादिसूचकारुपुष्पधार्येन विपाकानार्थकारे
त्वात् प्रारम्भसमाध्यायान्तरु पुनर्भवाभावेन चित्तेतुः खा-
व्यक्तिमृत्तिको बोधा। भवनीनिषुतिृत्तिविदिधम्। तत्र 
शुनयः। अथाकामयमानः थेःकामो निप्रामो न तस्म 
ग्राणः उत्कामनीतीविह समवलीयते।

श्राद्धानं चेतृ विज्ञानीयाध्यात्मको नृपहः।
विमीक्षना कस्य कामाय श्रीरमुनस्मुडः रेत॥
यदा सर्वं प्रसुमचने काम थेःक्ष दृष्टि श्रिता॥

अथ सर्वं प्रसुमचने कामाय थेःक्ष दृष्टि श्रिता॥

कामान् यः कामयते मन्यमानः
स कर्मभिज्ञते तत्र तत्।

पर्यास्कासर्म वर्तकर्तरस्मु
दृष्ट्वष सर्वेऽप्रतिभृत्यः कामः॥

दिशाया॥ शृणुनयः कृमिश्या॥ यथा कृमि॥

रागदेशाणां देशा सर्वं भानिनिवशना॥
कार्या चास्य भवेदृ देशाः पुष्पापुष्पमिति शुभी॥

नासानां सर्वेऽप्रवेषसमंजः॥

इति। मौशलमेच।

इन्द्रियाणीनिर्यायायो नेपासर्पन्तिनुणः।

कौन्तेय करणेदः स देवेन पुनरौति॥

तस्मात् नर्यात्मकात् रागाद्व बीजाज जायति जनव॥

इति। ननु रागाभावपि कैवलकमवेशान नरकातिप्रकाशः।

कथृ रागाय कर्मसाधिकारिनं वपिकारमधु उपपनम्। नर

कादिः विशेषेर रागाभावं समान्यते रागस्वताः।
নিষিদ্ধকারিণী স্তব্ধ করার্থে তপস্যামেয় আরে-স্মারকিন্ত্রিয়পরকাত্যে। যথাযোগ্যিক্ষিপ্রকারণভাবায় অত্যন্ত কর্মচারী জনপ্রিয়িকার্যকে কর্মণ্যাং সুচ-কার্য ভবনি।

নদেব সত্যঃ সুচ কর্মণি
বিন্ধে মনো যথ নিষিদ্ধকারম

dি যথাযোগ্যিক্ষিপ্রকারণভাবায় অত্যন্ত কর্মচারী জনপ্রিয়িকার্যকে কর্মণ্যাং সুচ-কার্য ভবনি।

যথ যথ মনো দৈহী ধারয়েন সকালঃ ধিযঃ
খচাট্টঃ দেশাদ্ব ভয়াদ্ব বাপি যানি নত্ত্বকা কাঁদনাম।

ল্যাট্রি স্বোচ্ছে। তথাচ ল্যাট্রি কর্মাধ্যম। সুতি মুল্লে নির্পাচকে। জাত্যায়ে মুখ। যথাযোগ্যিক্ষিপ্রকারণভাবায় অত্যন্ত কর্মচারী জনপ্রিয়িকার্যকে কর্মণ্যাং সুচ- কার্য ভবনি।

শীলন্তে চাঁদ্য কর্মণি তখনি ছঠে পরারে।
ল্যাট্রি স্বোচ্ছে। প্রাচীনকর্মণাস্তক্রমেরেচিং দ্বিতীয়ে কথ্যমিথ্যাং যথি চেন না।

বাদাগ্রিন্দ্রকর্মণাং তমাজ্জঃ পপিনার্গ কুঁদা।
ল্যাট্রি কার্কেদ্রাঙ্গ্যাপি অরেন্ত কাঠাবাদ্র দ্বারপ্রত্যক্ষে নাশার্থি গৌরিবিএপি কল্যাণেরচিয়ান। কর্মশ্চ দ্বিচ্ছ ক্ষেত্রায়।
सहकार्यन्वयन नैषधितम। कर्मकां नाशस्त्र प्रारम्भाभोगाने चित्रनाशादेव भविष्यति। जति लोकसिद्धान्तविद्यानाग्रे- नैव द्वारेषा कर्मफलानुपत्तिसङ्केतवान न ज्ञानन्य कर्म- नाशकल्व गौरवादित्यादिर्म योगवात्तिके प्रपच्छितमसाधिरिति दिक्। तस्माद विवेकसाधानकाराद्विद्यासिद्धारागादिकेनानिवृत्ता चित्रिषु शायनोरुचितिक्रियापरमपुष्पाधिः सिध्यांनिलपपल्लम। तथा च योगविज्ञानम। च्ययं दुःखमनं- गतम। चित्तवेक्ष्यातीरिविवश्व चानेपाय इति।

इति हृदिभविन्दुविग्रहित्विर शाक्षारोब्ज्ञानिलादादी।
विवेकस्मातिनित्यानुपरमपुष्पाधिः परिच्छिदः। || * ||
अथ द्वितीयः परिच्छेदः।

चर्याःस्वामानात्मविवेकक्रमानां किं सहुपं तदुच्छते। चात्मा
नावन् तुहुःखाद्वैतभिति सामायते। लेखकप्रसिद्धः चर-
नानामच्छ प्रक्रियादिर्ज्ञवर्गः तथोर्योगवैधव्याय जरीयमि-
ल्यापरिण्यमित्वादिप्रेण द्रष्टगुणयानस्तेन चेष्टापदेश्यतथा
पृथ्वीकृतः चानं विवेकक्रमम्। तथा च मृदिः। स एष नेता
नेयात्माशाम्रोहो न चि गृहि तेषुशर्या न चि शीर्षतें। सज्ज
चि सन्यतेसिद्धो न वयस्ते न रिघ्नीलोकभिः। मृदिः।

सर्वस्य प्राद्विन्यलक्ष्यां गुस्तदर्पणविभिः।
सुते॥ विकियं मृद्धायादाृत्त्वानम् मृदिः॥
चर्याःसैृ प्रक्रियानीचमिः चि कलुषालिम।
प्रवृद्धुक्तमभवाः कल्पित व्यभि नां विद्वन्न॥
एवं द्वेषे द्वारायिद्: प्रवृद्ध्वनास्त्तमि सूत्रे ।
निविशा सविकारायं ब्रज्यप्रायुणियचिचभवन॥
इति। चच्छच च। एवं तत्त्वाभ्यासानु नेति नेतीनित्यागाद्
विवेकसिद्धिति। तत्त्वाभ्यासः लक्षणः। च मान्येत् कर्मः।
चर्याःकाः विशेषाः विकारास्विकारसिंह्व वर्षिते।
चेतनाचेतनान्तर्ज्ञाने द्वानमुच्छते॥
इति। यथायण्योन्यमेव चानमेव विवेकक्रमान्त तथास्वात्मवित्
शेषेक्रमेव तथापृवकाराः भवति। चात्मा चात्रे द्रष्य
द्वादिशुद्धिभिः। नन्तनात्मयात्मबुद्धिः। यात्विथा
पान्चवादिपुष्टा तथा कथमात्मकविशेष्यकविवेकधारना-प्रयत्न प्रकारादिभेदादिर्ति चेन न। नाहाविद्या अनान्तविशेष्यकविवेकधारनादारोणाःतामित्वाविशेष्यकविवेकधारनायां-बादिति। यच्छै योगेन निर्विभूषकमात्मकानन्यां जाक्यते नरा-विवेकधारनारैव मोक्षकारणं भवति न तु साधारणविवेक-तन्त्रलाभावत्। अष्टं गौरं कर्ता चहौ लुहोत्वदिक्षानमेव द्वाविद्या संसारान्यंचेतुनया अनन्यसततविश्वासिश्वा नद्याख निर्वेक्ता नावेन गौरं इत्यादिहुप्या विभेकधारितिरीवेः भवति। समाने बिषयं गौर्यभावव्यक्तकरकर्या-हांभवनालावहै विन-रोपात। अनत्यं पुनःनिर्विभूषकभुगापि इदेः रजनेन्ति चानविरेतिधिवापने। किच्च यथोत्तत्त्रभावनाे गौर-विरेतिधिवाप्ययकत्या निर्विभूषककस्न्यः भर्मालवंतक-तलं न पुष्कं कल्यते गौर्वात। अर्थं चास्या अर्थं तेजेणे नेति नेति न च्योत्तता नेति नेति न्युनत: परत्तीलादिनुस्या विभेक-पदेश्यापेक्षायांमोचापदेशा नाग्तीतृतुचते।

शंकेष्यं त्रयोख्येण दस्यमनवं चानवचतुः।
भूतप्रकाश्यमेव च वे विदुर्वर्णिते परम॥
इति गौर्यभद्रवकेश्वर विभेकधारनेव मोक्षरेुपमुच्यते।
चतत्वा विभेकधारेव साधारणविवेकनिर्ववा मोक्षेतुः।
योगेन केवलात्मकानन्यारतु योग्यातृपित्विनिबन्धायु-धारान्तर्मध्यमाभावसुपात्यादिभेदं च गौर्यति तत्तवकवा-निर्वेक्तितिः। एततं सुव्युतवेद समसाधारणमात्मां गौर्वा-
पूर्वभाग दिविययित्वमेणः

तत्कलादिवीचारां च अर्निश्वाद्भोगिन्यमायं विवेकशानन्त्रैव प्रोष्टम् भूतं सत्वं द्रव्यतेऽमु मन्यतध्यम। ज्ञानान्तराणं साधारणमाना

निवर्तनक्यात। ब्रह्मस्मृतीसायं तथं विग्रहेऽवत् परमात्माना

विवेकप्रेषणम्। साध्‌ भाषालेत् सामान्यांविवेकप्रेषणविष्टिति

दिनः। ननु यथात्तरविवेकशास्त्रप्रलोकयनमविवोधयक्षेण। न

घटने। विवेकशास्त्रेऽविद्याप्रतिनिधिध्वजकालमात्रोऽहि विवेक

शास्त्रोत्तरं पुनःभिमानसम्प्रवास। प्रेक्षारज्जयविवेक

द्रष्टनापि कालान्त्रे प्रख्ति रजस्तम्भविदित। सःैवः

द्विवेकशास्त्रम्। प्रेक्षारज्जापि जातेषुपि साधाराक्षेरे दूरकार

द्विवेकशास्त्रप्रवर्तकरणां दूरकारादिवीचाराणां चैत्यन्ति

सम्बन्धेन पुनःभृमो युक्त। अनात्मन्यात्माभिमाने लना

दिवासनैव दृष्टं सर्वस्तिकस्त्राय जातमाच्यामिभिमाने दृष्ट

शान्तानुपलब्धे। सा भिक्षुभाष्यावस्मना यदा विवेकशास्त्र

प्रतिपरमश्रेयस्वावस्योमुखितात् तदैव विवेकशास्त्राकार

निधोच्यात। नयूषेऽवघः वासनायेश्वतो भिक्षुभाष्य कस्याद

शास्त्रमन्भावात् तत्स्य च विवेकशास्त्रनिरास्तां जाताया न

पुनःभिमानः सत्वति वासनार्थायाभावादिति तु सच्चति

वैभव्यम्। यद्यत् तु बुधिपुश्पयोग्यविनिविधानात्तिकम्

विवेककारां दृष्टं इत्यये तदा तु तत्वोऽवधित् विवेक

शास्त्राकारं चूतं दृष्टं न तत्स्य पुनःभृमो चतुतं फलविलेन

योगजभृतामाच्यामिभिमाने तत्स्य दृष्टलक्ष्यनासम्प्रवास।

विवेकशास्त्रनिष्ठा च मीतादिपिक्षेऽवि: ।
सादृशयसारस्त्र

प्रकाशं च प्रश्नितं च मौद्रेन च प्राण्डयं।
न देषी सम्भवुतानि न निवर्जनानि कार्जनि॥
उदासीनवदतीनि गुणैक्षारिणि न विचाल्यानि॥
सवा श्रेष्ठपरित्यार्गी गुणनीति: स उच्चाय॥

इति। गुणातीतस निवृत्तगुणाभिनामः। अधिकं तु ज्ञानव-चित्तमेव वच्यामः। नन्देवमणि विवेकप्रह्लयोगिपदार्थोऽनुमानन्येऽप्रारितिकर्मः। सर्वपदार्थस्य विवेकचयश्रवान् 
कथं विवेकश्चते मात्राशृङ्गेषु सत्त्वाति चेन् न। दग्धतपरिश्रमा-मिति। सभामानस्य संसारवनंवक्रमवनं भूतमाः। तत्त्वत् हि। द्वित्य स- 
काहाँश्च मायाया भिन्नः प्रकाशकलाहृः। यथा यथा प्रकाशक: च 
तन्त्रारूपैः स्वभावः। यथा घटानोको द्वितिप्रकाशाच च द्विती- 
रित्युनमाननात्। द्वारावनन्तरका भूतितित्वारहट्टं येहथा विवेकतेऽतुदेशि सिद्धाय। कर्मकार्यविरोधश्चाः कृष्णकर्मा। 
एतव आद्रि अविन्धकावरणाय साधारणम्। द्विती- 
हरार्जस्वम्: सहिष्णुवातः। नन्देवमणि वुद्धितित- 
मायावृत्ती विवेकः सिद्धतु। तत्स्य सह साधारामार्जस्वम् 
न विज्ञानादिराहम इति चेन् न। द्वितीयानं नास्तस्य विधाय 
विज्ञानस्य अनुसारः द्वारावनां भूतन्यायानुत्तम्यायें विभुक्तम्। द्वितीयानम् द्वारावन्तरस्य च अनुसारः 
विभुक्तेऽतु शून्यान्याननं अरुक्ताऔप्तानुत्तम्यायें विभिन्नता 
स्थित्तम्। यथा नै- 
न्यायान्यानां चिन्ति: सकर्का कार्यवादित्यानुमानेऽबाध्यात् 
कार्यकारनित्यन्यानांतरं। तत्स्य विभुत्तम् परिमितयान्यम् 
कल्युध्यादिकां च परिश्रमिभिन्नस्यनुत्तमताय वुद्धाय-
पूर्वभागी दिलीचपरिच्छेदः ।

तमानीघर्घश्रृःशं विवेकग्रंथे सति तदुच्छरानुमानेन परिणामितारिणालितसिद्धेऽपि: सामान्यनि प्रायावात्माविवेकक्यं घर्तं राणी। अत्रवर्त पातल्प्रे सत्वपुरुषान्यनाथानिर्वेको मेघेतेन रथस खच्च खच्च वायस्वाभ्ये रूपः। सत्वपुरुषाः न्यतानातिनिपाधसिद्धविवेकक्यं यथाक्षरे प्रकाशविवेकम्भऽहानृतः तत्र च सत्वश्रे बुद्धस्वत बुद्धस्वत्त्वमुखः।

एवं च प्रकाशवादप्रेषणं विशिश्वासानां भाव तदिवेक्षणानां घयते। अतेऽन दमदमविवेकादिविवेकान्त्रिनि निर्विश्राहसि प्राची प्रवाहऽपृप्तिः। किच्छवधमा प्रकाशितकारे भेजे भिन्नोपरिणामितालितामुनानेरपि सामान्येता दमदमदेको इत्यः सम्बन्धतया। यत लघुनिता बेदानितमव दमदमविद्वेदविद्वेद विद्वेदाभिता इत्यतः तः प्रकाशविवेचिताय ज्ञेयं त्राभविवेकं मन्यते।

घटटः घटटः सर्वेऽन धरे। यथा।

देवेन्द्रः तथा देवेन नाचेभुविद्वरद्रेष्टः ॥

तन्त न। चात्मा वारे द्रष्यं इत्यादिद्रुतारिणयमेव दमदमार्थानाि साचापुरुषलिपितमन्याम च प्रकाशवादेषरुप्तचान सकरणदारे नष्टस्थान। अत्रवम् ज्ञेयं च आयो व्रतम् भावमित्रत्वसम्वेदयते न नु प्रकाशवरुपलवुवायतम्। संयम्यकामस्वमहत्त्वम् चक्रावेचाविविद्वानात् नाप्राप्तवत्ता नाप्राप्ताविक्षचारितशान। अत्तरव्यक्त दमदम च प्रकाशवादेष तथा चात्मन नास्तिकसि तद्रप्तितुम्म। यथा चात्मित्तवन्भयात्मानेपुष्पर्यावरा चैत-
न्यास्स्फलव्यायों न भवतीनि भवदीस्च्यते तथैव सैवैर-पीयते सुखदुःखार्थदिमचेनादिपि बुद्धः स्प्रकाशतं चैतन्य-व्याया न भवतीनि। तथा चास्मनीव बुद्धाविपि दम्मवा-सिद्धा दम्मवेन रूपेण बुद्धविवेकोऽवनापेशितादि पि न सिध्यतीनि भावादिर्धु प्रधानान्येव दूःखानुस्तानानि दिक्क।

ननु संधववेद्व कस्मान्यतेपेष प्रवेक्षणः। तथादीपि सा-मायन्येव बख्नि सनि परिणामिल्लसंचर्यकारित्वकृ खुःखा-भावादमकल्पतुविश्वमीत्वत्वादीदीप्ति रूपविवेकयज्ञा-पाण्यो माच्छेत् न ननु ननु गमन्येव इति चेन् न। बोभिमानप्रति-वन्यकालनालेवानानुगमादिहि। अथवेच्छ नमान्यतेपेष प्रव-वेकस्यावं सर्वभिमाननिवर्तकं नानं देवं नेन्द्रियाणि-त्यादिप्रत्येकप्रवेकः चेन् तेन ननु ननु युतिस्तृतः चेन् न। भावानारविवेकानां सामान्यविवेकप्रस्थानादीनि॥

दृश्य श्रीविश्वासाभिषुविरूप्चते साधसारे माचेतुविवेक-श्रान्नखसक्सपरिच्छेदः॥ *॥
ध्रुव तृतीयः परिच्छेदः

ध्रुव केवले प्रकाश्यादृश्ये चेत्यः पुरुषोऽविशेषयो इत्युच्चते।
प्रकाशनिःस्रवः च कार्यः पात्रादेशः वहनिः।
भूतानि चेति सामान्याः चतुर्विशेषानि च।

एतेऽवै धर्मसर्वं भूतं गुणार्थसाधनाणाम्। तत्र
प्रधानिः सात्त्विकः परम्यराज्यार्थिविकारोपार्रान्तरं प्रधानः
कार्यः परिणामस्वरूपः इति कुप्पने। प्रधानः शक्तिर्रञ्जः
प्रधानमुव्यंत्रं नमो मायाविचार्यवादः प्रधानः पर्यावृत्य।

ब्रह्मार्थी विद्याधिवेशी मायेनि च प्रधानः परे।
प्रधानिः परा चेति वदन्ति परम्पर्यः।

इति स्वतेऽ। सा च साम्यावश्योपल्बन्तिः सच्चार्द्विध्यं
यम्। कार्यसच्चार्द्विध्यायोपल्बन्तिः। साम्यावश्या च
न्यूनादिकविलासंसंगतिनांवश्या चाकार्यार्थिं यावन। म-
चतुर्विशेषं तु कार्यसच्चार्द्विधिः न कदाचप्राकार्यावश्यं भवतीनि
तत्तावश्यं। वैष्णवीैष्णायमपि प्रकाशित्वसिद्धं उपल्लितिं
भक्तम। अकार्यायमिति द्वपंस्तिनात्तथं निम्बूयाय। सच्चा-
दिःगुणवत्वी सच्चार्थिनिर्देशः प्रकाशितिः न गुणीयम्। स-
चार्द्विध्यानन्दमयं तद्रव्यविहित्ति साधारणस्य सच्चार्द्विधिः
प्रकाशित्वसिद्धं वै निम्बूयाति न वै विध्यमानम्। सच्चार्द्विधि
नामार्थमपि गुणार्थिनेत्र प्रकाशित्वच चै। गुणेभु एव
कार्याभ्यस्ता नदन्यप्राङ्कित्यनावैयथर्थाच च। प्रक्षेतरुणा
इत्वादिवक्तः तु वनस्पती दृष्टा इत्यद्वृत्तो नाथस।

तत्र च वैवमाय सजालीयः सबलनेन गुणानार्यः उत्कः
तत्र च वैवमाय सजालीयः सबलनेन गुणानार्यः उत्कः
एतेनाः श्रविन्तज्ञत्वकोः पुष्पपादिते मन्तम्।

रथाय तम एवेन ग्रास तवरेणिन विषमलं
प्रवृत्तेन्द्रू वै रजसो छुं के प्रवृत्तेन्द्रू वै
संवेदनां चुल्लेकं गुणानार्यः उत्कः
सहित्यादिते।

इत्यकाय भागात् इत्यकाय भागात्
संत्वादेहासिन्तु रमायासितु नार्यात्यात्तु
पाददलिन्। च द्वजाणुपुष्पोपकारणान्तः पुष्पवन्धु
कलाचे च गुणशमिनोच्छते।

मनसः सहानुभद्रे।

तत्र च खुशप्रसादप्रकाशनेनेकर्मसंकः
प्राधान्यमलु खुशास्मक्षुचच्छते। एवं रजेन्द्रपुखङ्कः
प्रवृत्यादिनेनेकर्मसंकः प्राधान्यमलु दुःखास्मक्षुचच्छते।

तथा नामस्वरलोकं नार्यानिनेनेकर्मसंकः
प्राधान्यमलु माचार्यास्मक्षुचच्छते। तत्र च नामस्वरलोकं
विशेषानि खुशास्मक्षुचच्छते।

सतः भावः सत्युक्तेमलिनते बुद्धच्छ।
चि धर्मप्राधान्योत्तरम पुरुषोपकरण सत्त्वशव्द्रायि। सधारम च रजःश्रव्द्धि रागशोकाम। चधारम च नमःश्रव्द्धि। चधारमवर्णयोगात। ताति च सत्त्वादिनि प्रविधकसंस्काराय। जात्वादिनेरमनसंवायसाधतं वैधस्थ्यं च गुणानामिति साध्यश्चाचाराः। चत्रः चि नवव लघुवादिना वहनाः सत्त्वानां साधतं तेनेवं रजस्मभोभ्यं वैधस्थ्यम्। एवं चलवादिना गुलदवादिना च बहनां रजस्मां बहनां च तत्तमां नदृभयमुक्तामिति। किच्च यद्य सत्त्वादिनेरमक्षेत्रायतिकृतैर्व स्थानं न च च्यं विभेयं वहनाम्।
एकदानेनक्रमशं पुरुषोपकरणाय इति। तथा च कार्यानमननवैचित्र्यं न घटते। न च संयोगवैचित्र्यं वैचित्र्यं स्यादितिवाचाम्। विभवं च च्याणं गुणानां स्यं। संयोगवैचित्र्यं व्यासभावात्। ड्रव्यान्तरस्य चाव्यं च क्रिकिरित्याभावादिनि।
तस्मात् सत्त्वादिनेरमक्ष्यात्यत्तिकाक्रमाय इत्याशायि। तेषु चित्वचनं तु सत्त्वादिनेरभविनमाजकोपाध्यायेः। वैभविकाराः नं। ड्रव्यचनविदितं सिद्धम्। ताति च सत्त्वादिनि यथायोगमणुप्रभुविनन्दकालकानि। अन्यथा रजस्मशुलश्वभवलवचनविदेशदान। च्याखामारणात्त्वं च विभुतोचितायात्। सर्वां च प्रारणद्वारां विभूते चायाणं परिक्षित्यानुसरतेऽस्य।
नन्यं वैभविकारामाजकोपाध्यायोविदितं प्रभुवित्तिर्तिकारायणमिति चेन्न। गन्धादिर्गुणमुयृत्वेन कारणद्वेष्यु प्रभुवित्तियावलयेन साक्तनिवेशात्।

अव्यत्तं कारणं यतं नतं प्रधानाम्।
प्राच्ये प्राच्ये सूक्ष्म निन्यं सदस्याद्याकम् ॥
शब्दायांशिविशीरी नन्दौ रूपादिभिरसंयुनम् ॥
चिघुयं तयज जगधोनिनादिमथ्याययम् ॥

इत्यादिना।

वैशेषिकाणां कारणाश्च्यु गम्बामन्तुधु न भावेच्छाप्यिनरालकम्।
मधैनामप्रश्यथर्युविभुविषयारणसत्त्वाहावनेनकान्तित्वपले परिक्ष्यञ्जलेकाम्ब्यन्तिमन्तरिति सैवम्।
कारणाश्च्युत्रप्रकाशिनिनिवेनावपरिक्ष्यञ्जलवचनात्।
गम्बायन गम्बायनं गृहवीयायामकालं।
आकाशिग्रहयज्ञनीयो विहृतनेन विद्युतिकान्तिबिभवलस्तोप्ययोग्यर्थेषु।
तथा पुष्पभग्नं सर्धैर्मेव प्रकाशितिसत्यस्तत्वानुपपर्यथेषु।
आज्ञामकामिति शुनि

तत्तथावघमान।
चयाच्युतवयायभिमानादिक्याराज्यिकेव
क्षेत्रिक्यांक्षार्थविकालं।
अन्यथा श्रुतिप्रद्वूतसय प्रक्तिचरो
भक्तानुपपरिन्ति।
प्रक्तिविगुतायास्वरूपेः विग्रहो भौति इत्यादि।
प्रक्तिकालसय चेतस्म।
चुहुः समाचाराह्वाममर्मदिकाः मन्त्रावहिकाः सुख

dुः समाचाराह्वाममर्मदिकाः चुहुः समाचाराह्वाममर्मदिकाः
वस्त्रार्थे प्रक्तिविक्षेपरं।
शुनिलीचां चां चाभुवाचकसकः।
एवव

सामान्यतेः सुनिलमिताः।
प्रक्ताविष्णुः शास्त्र यथाचच चायत-गन्तव्याः।
संमानाय तत् समानाय विधयकालाः।
नवनारेव

सुखादिकमुलपथः बाध्यस्वल्पु सुखादि तै सः प्रमाणां येन ह

dहाँसन न्यायती।
उच्चारे।
चालन् कारणश्च सुखादि हेतुत्तस्या
विषेषे पुः सुखादिकं सिन्धुिन।

dूपादिर्गतो च तमादिकमेव।
सत्कारकृतायां नियामकम्। उत्तमवतिकालिकपलो नौकल- 
पीतवालिना जातिसाधृष्टिपत्रसः। कामादिस्मृतिरेखया एव 
रूपवतीः सुखदः लोकार्जुनलाच। च। खतः सुखादिमच्छेयमो- 
नमादिकम्। किंच घरहृपमति प्रवत्यवन्योक्ति सन्धि 
सन्तुखमित्यादिप्रत्यायादिपि विषये सुखादुचिम्। अधिकं तु 
भास्ये द्रष्ट्यम्। तदेव प्रकाशिरनिष्पिता। मच्छत्यं निर्धृष्ट्ये। 
प्रक्षणे: सकाशादृ बुधार्खः मच्छलं जायने। तत्त्र धर्मादिक- 
रूपकायुगवैयोगानान् मच्छसंख्या तदेव च बच्चाम्। मच्छान् 
बुधः: प्रखच्यादयथ तस्य पर्यायः। तथा चात्तमनुगीतायाम्। 

c्यानात्माम मनिनिविष्णूर्जिंशुः: सामयस्व वीरच्छन्। 
बुधः: प्रकाशिकामिद्रथ तथा बन्धा धृति: सृतिः॥ 
पर्यायस्यामकृतमेकाथानात्मा निग्रहायने। 

c्विन्न: ऋणिपार्थत्य सवर्तनासिस्मीररुपाः॥ 

c्विन्न: युद्धिनां लोकेः सवं व्याप्य स निन्धति। 

c्विन्न: विष्णुमान वचना विष्णुर्विनिर्वाकः। 

c्विन्न: नानीप्राप्तां ज्ञानां ज्ञात्वनयम्॥ 

c्विन्न: सर्वं एवते मच्छत्यमुपयायः। 

c्विन्न: सर्वोच्चवर्धिदृश्यां चतुर्म्भूमन्तिः प्रभुः॥ 

c्विन्न: च सत्तकारवाचकं मध्ये। दृष्टवत्येयपाधिकान् 

c्विन्न: सचिका राजस्वव नामस्व निधा मच्छान्। 

c्विन्न: माल्येः।
साहुसारस्य

सविकारान् प्रधानान् तु महत्तत्त्वमाज्यतेऽ
महानन्ति यतः ख्यातिनिःकानां जाते सदा इ
गुणेः चेतायमाणेव्यख्यवे देवा विजन्ति
एका मूर्तिस्य देवा ब्रह्मबिष्णुमहेश्वरा: इ
इति। ऋणमेवादिभावनिदेशः धर्मधम्मवेदान्। ब्रह्मश्रावरणं
पेप्स्यायाप्यात्रा विष्णुवेत्ते वेदव्याहीतवीति। चेतायमाणेव्यख्यवे
नात्मन्त्रम्। इद्भोऽवन महत्तत्त्वमाज्यते। च पञ्चमोऽश्मोऽदेशः। 
नन्ति। महत्तत्त्वमाज्यते। महत्तत्त्वमाज्यते। नासाधारपनेन चायमवसति
इति। महत्तत्त्वमाज्यते। महत्तत्त्वमाज्यते। नासाधारपनेन चायमवसति
इति। महत्तत्त्वमाज्यते। महत्तत्त्वमाज्यते। महत्तत्त्वमाज्यते। 
च च प्रज्ञा

नमोऽभिस्वरोऽश्मेपतिम्। न तु ख्यातिनिःकानां जाते सदा इ
सब्धविष्णुमहेश्वराः। सब्धविष्णुमहेश्वराः। 

नमोऽभिस्वरोऽश्मेपतिम्। न तु ख्यातिनिःकानां जाते सदा इ

नराम च पर्यायः। कैर्म प्रज्ञा:।

नराम च पर्यायः। कैर्म प्रज्ञा:।
इति। स चालहारलिविवधतया चिन्विवकार्यं। तदुत्ते कैम।
वैकारिकसौजन्यस्य भोजनादिस्वै नामसः।
चिन्विवधायमचारो भवत्। समवचव च।
तैत्तिकादिविणाति संहृिवा वैकारिकाः दशम।
एकादशं मनवात खगुणेनाध्यात्मकः।
भूतत्त्वाच गर्भस्य भूतादैर्भवं प्रजा।
इति। वैकारिकः सात्तिकः। तैत्तिकः राजसः। खगुणेन-निश्चित्वविधिः साचाः। चिन्विवकार्यात्मकः।
उभयात्मकं चानकमी-भयेन्द्राद्धमकः। चन्द्रमना चन्द्रवं नाढ़ाचित्तादिशुत्त्वाः
मनसः चानकमहेन्द्रियसंचकारिलसिद्धिरति। एकादशेन-निश्चित्वदेवात्स।
दिनवात्ताक्षज्ञे चिन्विवकारिन्द्रप्रेक्षस्मित्चकः।
चन्द्रय
इति। चालहारो निश्चितः। इन्द्रायदीर्मणि निश्चितः।
चालहारादा देव जन उत्थाते।
श्रवणाग्राहचाहस्य जायते भावितात्मनः।
रूपागाः तथा चचुर्ईणं गम्यजित्तृत्वाः।
इद्वादि वैचारकाधिकाधिकारियादीनां नान्दकारिग्रामिकारियावनात।
तत्त्वादशस्त्रादानं संहृत्यपूर्वं दशिन्द्र-विणाति प्रचन्नसत्ताति चेिवनते।
इन्द्रयस्यवाचयायस्य कार्य-कारणभासाभावान् कमलियमः नासित। तचत्त्रिक्षेपे ना-
साधुसारख

सत्यानत्त्वार्थोऽकारणभावः प्रभावाभावान्। नमस्वाच्यु लक्ष्मि।

च यथा। प्रकटत्वाभावार्थः केवलस्माघकोषेण सार्गर्गात्रेण
प्रकटत्वाभावार्थः केवलस्माघकोषेण क्रमेणोक्षेत्रायुक्तम्। परत्वार्थाय
प्रकटत्वाभावार्थः उत्तमते प्रत्येकाभावे नमस्वाच्यु क्रमेणो-
केवलस्माघकोषेत्रायुक्तम्। तत्सत्य प्रकटत्वार्थायः पच्चभूतानि
जायन्ते। तच्चाभावार्थः प्रकटत्वार्थाय तद्वराभूतानि
चाच्यु क्रमः कुमारिकिल्लादिपुराणिः। यथा कृमि।

भुजादिः करूपः परत्वार्थाय संसर्गम् ह।

आकाशः दुपिरः तस्मात्तपम्ब शाब्दल्लोचनम्।

आकाशः विकृत्वाणि। सर्वभूतानि संसर्गम् ह।

वायुः तत्सत्य तस्मात् तस्मान गुणे गुणे मतः।

इत्यादिकमेवैत। नवेचमाकाशद्विनिर्देशतुष्ट्वयास्पदः। न-
न्यात्त्वार्थशिवकलेव मधुकंचनं भार्तिविनिर्देशतुष्ट्वयास्पदः
धारणं चेनः। आकाशदेवीं सप्तमदेविभिः क्रोधारातो-
प्रकटत्वार्थाय कारणात्स्व। पुराणपूवकल्लादिः। तदेवं चे-
विमानिकत्वानामभिन्नतिः। तक परमात्मानि वर्जितलाभात
च चुंडोऽपि प्रवेशं सर्वदशं निजश्रीररस्मिः भवति व-
क्रोधारात्स्वभिमानिकत्वानामभिन्नतिः। तक च सर्वपुष्पाणि
संगीताधातुः स्राकन्तप्रज्ञायणयमां नित्याः। तेनैव चेनः
च चेन्द्रकोषेः परमात्माः संसर्गाः जीवानां भवति। चाराणि
बुद्धरेव दृष्टिभेद इत्यते। न निजश्रीरीरायं दृष्टिभेद निर्दिष्टमे।
तत्सत्य निजश्रीरस्मि पुण्यार्थेष्व चारुदिवाताथयं विना
परमहंस्य लोकान्तरगमनासम्भवान। इतं च विष्णुरामादात्रै स्वयंभु उपाधिमभूतमकं जायते। तस्यैव विरा- डाक्षावच्छमाणं सूच्यकरोवन। ततस्य व्यष्ठिस्वामनामुपाधि- भूतानि व्यष्ठिलिङ्गकरोरापि नरंभुस्तानि ततो विभज्यन्ति। पितुरिङ्गकरोरापि पुनःविलिङ्गकरोवन। नदुत्तां छत्रकारेण। व्यक्तिभेदः कर्मविषेषयादिनि। मनुनास्युत्तमः।

तेषां लक्ष्यवान् छल्ल्यान् पश्चाम्यभिष्टीताजसाम।
सचिवालयः समाचाराः सुर्ख्यतानि निर्माणेऽव।

इति। पश्चाम्यभिष्टीतविष्ठियं समस्तलिङ्गकरोरापचकः।
तथा च स्त्र्यां। स्त्र्यां करोरापचकः स्त्र्याण्य आप्रवमणाः स्त्र्याः समाचाराः स्त्र्याचेतनेऽथु संयोज्य स्त्र्यां प्रणाणिः सस्त्र्याः।
विष्णुकरोरेँ निहितम। खूलकरोरावत्तीष्टये। द्रवगुणितां तमच्छावच्छमाणेः।
हारावस्था। खापि द्रवगुणितां मध्ये योग ब्राह्मोक्ति। द्रवगुणितां मध्ये बारुंश्वरोक्ति। द्रवगुणितां मध्ये तेजः।

tेजसाद्वृत्तिः द्रवगुणितां मध्ये जलं जल- खापि द्रवगुणितां मध्ये पुष्पिक चन्द्रयमहते। सैव प्राचिनः

tस्त्र्याः।

तस्यैव च प्राचिनः। ब्रह्मणंकर्षणं परी- श्रीरामै।

तस्यापि द्रवगुणितमाणस्यस्त्र्यास्य प्रकृतिशवारणणस्य मध्ये चतुर्दशुभवानास्य इ।

नदुत्तां मनुना स्वयंभुवं प्रकायः।

सैवभिष्टीताजसां छल्ल्याः सिद्धचारविधि। प्रज्ञः।
चाप एव सर्जायस्त्री नातु बीजमवास्त्रजनम्
तदर्जशवप्रेमाय मुख्यायोगसभाजनम्
तस्मिन जन्म स्वयं ब्रह्मा सर्वत्राकामिनामस्य
स वै शरीरी प्रथमः स वै पूर्वः उच्यते।
चार्क्कार्तै स भूतानां ब्रह्मायेः सम्बन्धितम्
आपो नारा इति प्रात्मा आपो वै नर्धनवः।
ता यद्यन्तिग्नमं पूर्वं तेन नारायणं भूतः।

dhvādānena iti. na tvā cātām samastihumāntaḥ sāddhāpratapaṇāḥ vibhāga-
drām te c caṅkāt adhyātmaḥ ca chākācāte samucchatāyaḥ śamucchātya
vikṛtyate. cañchna nāvabhāparatvaḥ nārāyana eva samakullana-
mañāyaḥ śamucchātaśāraśāra iti. tvakṣya b nārāyaṇo vārā-
sharerīṁ saṁnāmākārakāṇīkaśākṣāniyasya bhūmenaradāpi cha tuṁ-
kaśākaśākṣamātaḥ ca yātād vārāyanaśāpi vibhīṣāḥ śak-
ratnaṁ kṛttvayet.

tathāś rasaṃkūte: kāryāṁ kāryaṁ sārcha.

chayāna: samjayaṁ gātābhucchya dhimānā.

itä. tvatu śrīpamānyo nārāyanaṁ nābhikmālaśātrachak-
rādīśvairutuṣṣumgāssvibhāvaḥ sṛṣṭate tvatu dānandīnamsaṁyabā
eklaśaśte maññastam. dānandīnasmāyaṁ ch tu nārāyaṇaṁ shrerīṁ
dandīkārūkṣṭhaḥ duṣṭānaṁ dānānaṁ cha tuṁkaśākārakaṁśaṁgāssvibhāva:
śrīpamānyaṁ sākṣātrgam ghatate na vādirgaya. dānandīnasmāyaṁ
एवं योगिविधिभक्षण प्रयाणांदिनि। तद्वां सुभेपतन्ततुविशिष्टतः नामालेकेश्वरादिक्षितः। तत्त्व प्रयोजनं चातुर्मास। तत यदृच्छिक जायते तथा तद्वारूपणेनेक्षितं नतस्य संचारिष्येण नत्तुष्म स्वप्नां प्रविलोकितं।

यदृच्छिक जायते तत्त्वं तन्त्र महायान भवति॥

तीनमे प्रतिलोमायि जायने च चातुरोत्तरम।

इति भारतादिभ्यं इति। एतेऽथ चुड़िस्तिसंधिः। खूच्चा एव परिधांतूरुविशिष्टतित्वाती कुटुंबपुरुषविवेकाय प्रद-शिष्यः। खूच्चा ज्ञाने प्रतिच्छणपरिणामां एते पंचस्य तथाते।

निवद्या च ज्ञातवधिति भवति न भवति च।

कालेनातूलच्छेदेन बलसाल तन्त्र न दृष्टये॥

इति। अन्तथ चवं जडवयु परमार्थं सुरूवैविशेषु।

तत्त्व तद्वादृश्च विरञ्जायसेवेपरमार्थसबो दुर्खबीमिबिल्ले-झ्रूः। तदुत्तमनुगीतायाम।

अयज्ञातज्ञातप्रभावो वुद्वस्वर्नमयो महान।

महामहायातिन इन्द्रियाहुरकाटे।

महाभूतात्माक्षुर विशेषाक्षुरस्वामि।

सदापर्यं सदापुर्यं ग्रामभाषमायोगे।

चाजीवं सर्वभुतानं बद्धब्रजं। सर्वभुतानं।

पतज्ञा च तत्त्वं ज्ञानेन परमार्थिन।

किंतर्चातुरार्ण मित्र ज्ञाति धनुजनानी।

इति श्रीविष्णुभिचविविक्षिते बाध्यार्थे। विवेकार्थनिषयो-गिनियां चतुर्दशीयां। सुरूवपरिच्छेदः॥ ५ ॥

इति बाध्यार्थ शूर्वमनेन।
चतुष्टात्तरभागः ॥

प्रथमः परिच्छेदः ॥

चतुष्य सिंहीः सुखेन्द्र श्राद्धेतु प्रद्युमनः।
विशेकशास्त्रायुगायाम् पुरुषाख्यो निन्ध्याते ॥१॥
तत्र सामान्यः सिद्ध जानेवचमितिविचारः।
द्रष्टाता नित्यकिष्णो धर्मेऽव स साध्यते ॥२॥
भेति निवासदीर्घस्य तत्क्षन्त्या वादित्वतः।
मदरा दिवकाराणि सुर्वायमिश्रितः ॥३॥
चपि चाउदयसांस्काराधार्तारुः बीजायुः।
धीरवाच्चिरसः सिद्धा भेत्तुरादाति ॥४॥
स्मासरावानान्दित्यमस्मि भेतुरायुः।
स्माम्र दुर्लतिचित्तकारवचं स्वतं तु बुद्धिः ॥५॥
स्माम्र स्मिनसेरस्कारचेतुरुपमेश्वरोऽभावः।
समस्य घटने खलनाऽष्टौ कौक्षनमात्रः ॥६॥
भेतुरायुः नानाभावः विनाशो शेतसमभावः।
न नासो भेत्तुरार्ति स्माम्र नियो वि सिद्धति ॥७॥
जतेऽषा ज्ञानप्रकाशायं नियतं तु न सुखस्ते।
न च प्रकाशे कुट्टापि प्रकाशोत्यतितिच्चते ॥८॥
कार्यं प्रकाशायं गुणेऽवयवाना चि तदुष्णः।
कार्यं तेन नासिनः प्रकाशे नित्यस्वतः ॥९॥
उत्तरभागी प्रथमपरिच्छेदः ॥ २५ ॥
प्रकाशांशांसंयोगान् प्रकाशांशम् इस्मे ॥
व्यासर्धे चास्तुनेमेक्षात् प्रकाशोत्स्वचिविधम् ॥ १० ॥
तन्नान् नित्यांत्याना चारान् निरं वाच्यं नयं सन्ति ॥
लाघवाज् चारामेवाशत्मा निराधारः प्रकाशने ॥ ११ ॥
चन्द्रमा नयं तथा संयोगदेशं तन्न मतम् ॥
चतो चानैव श्रवणात्मा दुःखित्वां धुःक्ष्यानादिद्वपन: ॥ १२ ॥
पिपें धर्मीचि मूढानां धुःक्ष्यानादिद्वपन: ॥
संयोगान्त तथा पिपें तु धारावच्चमन: प्रमा ॥ १३ ॥
सन्तु वाण्यनान्त्याध्यायमनाशादिविधखः ॥
श्रीनाथै नभमोवर्त्यान्त्यारामकेः ॥ १४ ॥
तन्नान् कालवर्णकाण्या बाधकाभावतस्मात: ॥
सुयादिभिं नित्यामा चिद्रपेयैव निधिः ॥ १५ ॥
तज्ज्ञा ज्ञानं विभु नित्यालादु द्रुत्यार्पिनिधापिं च ॥
मधवेऽनामिता चि स्माधुपले भाषायदेशना ॥ १६ ॥
विभुविद्धि परमेश्वरनेव साधानः निरिच्छित्तः ॥
न सर्वेऽसदा सर्वभानं ज्ञाने प्रसङ्गे ॥ १७ ॥
ध्यानभानं विश्लेष्यत्यत्तिरियमा मनो बुधेऽ ॥
वृत्तिरेव चिना साधानः प्रतिबिष्ययोग्यता ॥ १८ ॥
वनवसुसुर्देश्यि कुटस्थायबनये विभवनि धुःक्षे ॥
वृत्ता वक्तस्माय भानस्माय भानस्माय मनसम् ॥ १९ ॥
अन्ययथ्यतिरियत्यां वृत्तिजनयन्यार्पिल: ॥
वृत्ताकारधिकरयेन कामादिभर्पु नास्त्यम्भं ॥ २० ॥
चनावनां सचिविकारणां सख्चुद्विध्वंसितेः।
कूटस्थे परं सर्वापि चिदभाषणम् समः। ॥ २१ ॥
नित्यङ्गुः नित्यङ्गुः नित्यङ्गुः नित्यङ्गुः नित्यङ्गुः।
स्मृतिकार्यो निराधारः प्रदीपः सर्वस्वयं ॥ २२ ॥
नन्देवेनकर्तृवायुः लाघवादात्मानं खवत्।
धीवेजः सुखदः चालिवर्त्त्यादिति चेतनः न तत्। ॥ २३ ॥
भोगाभोगालिवर्त्त्यादितीनकुपेपदिपि चिन्तिष्ये।
अतिनिःसुत्याशुक्तकोन मेदहिः परस्यर्म् ॥ २४ ॥
चालिवर्त्त्यादित्बः भोगोद्योगः न वचतः।
तथापयस्य चिन्तिष्य भावभावो ख्यातां चि मेदहिः। ॥ २५ ॥
चौपाधिको यथा विशारदास्य खातिकेष्वविः।
खातिकेष्वविः विधिमेवैध्यांसिद्धिनान्नवः। ॥ २६ ॥

इति श्रीदेविशालभिन्नविरुचिव च शास्त्रार्थं पुष्पस्वरूपः
परिषदेः ॥ * ॥
आय हितोयः परिच्छेदः ।

अयास्मानाद्भवत् गुण्देशांकं तयोः ।
वच्चो विलारनस्ति वेन विवेकातिस्तुष्टा मुखे ॥ १ ॥
सामान्यतः धनावार्णी साक्षिरोपिनश्चतत्त्वं ॥ २ ॥
जायते चैव नृत्ता भूवा भूयोऽस्य जगद्भक्तः ॥ ३ ॥
चिन्तुणाम्यकारणीयं परिणामेऽरत्नश्चिन्तः ॥ ४ ॥
अधारविध्या विक्षेपाद्यानमविकारतः ॥ ५ ॥
यथास्थान्तत्त्वा तेऽवं धर्मापाद्यानमिथ्यते ।
सह्यद्रिं विनयमत्रां ज्ञाते चिन्तेन ॥ ६ ॥
चन्द्रो जगद्भक्तं सम्प्रभुप्राद्यानमिथ्यते ।
वृहस्पति वर्णयते परमार्येषु सदा ॥ ७ ॥
स्वरूपानं स्वाभवेऽयं सिद्धवतं परमार्येषु ।
स्त: स्मिर्यते स्त: सिद्धा चाकृ: सत्तभीति च दीर्घति ॥ ८ ॥
प्रत्येकविचारेऽणे तैसैं कृप्यापपातः ।
प्रजारविद्वेतस्तु सर्वा जड़ेऽस्य तराश्चतः ॥ ९ ॥
यन्त तु कालान्तराण्यस्य नान्यस्य चामुखे ।
परिणामाद्यसम्भवानं तद्वस्थितं दिक्षुर्वते ॥ १० ॥
पराधीनस्थलवाच च परद्वारा च सिद्धतः ।
परतः सदृशस्वेत् तत्त्वापरत्वमातः ॥ ११ ॥
सन्तानशतिः तु नायस्य नास्तिक्ते सद्दत्वं कुलः ।
इति गणितत्थैः सदृशस्वत्वविक्षितः ॥ १२ ॥
चन्द्रे न सन्नायसिद्धं जगत् सदस्यदायकम्।
उँशुदिनवकल्पवृण्ट न तथा वीश्वाचिको थथमः। ॥ ११ ॥
जगदृशेऽख्य चैतन्यं सरोजसारसिद्धेनर्त।
प्रयम्बस्य खर्णशी चितिरिवावृक्षिकारः। ॥ १२ ॥
तदन्नदिनत्वं तुककमसारत्वाद्‌हीने।
नथायस्वतमसच् चात्पि तद्वेशस्विश्विरतन:। ॥ १३ ॥
एवंविद्वास्वस्यस्या अन्तस्तो च दशिना।
बासिष्ठदैव विसतरते यथा लेखात् नलुचये। ॥ १४ ॥
स्मृतं जायसमर्थूः स्मृतं जायसमर्थूः।
महतिजन्मस्रूपं महतैः जनमायस्वस्विमं। ॥ १५ ॥
जगन्नायो भाषितिरति न कदापि न विद्यते।
विद्यते न कदाचिच्छ च जलबुद्धव द्रव्यम्। ॥ १६ ॥
आद्विशार्यस्य परं सत्यं नान्यं: संसारदायकं।
प्रहृत्तिकार जतं चदाय यथा महत्मरुपिका। ॥ १७ ॥
चित्रं सर्वमांत्यं शालं परमात्मधवं च प्रभृति।
चित्रलद्यचित्रमचवपु: परमाहंसाश्रमतमं। ॥ १८ ॥
तत् सर्वं सर्वमांत्यं सवं सर्वांत्यं च समं।
यच यच यथोदेवं नथातस्ते तत्स्त तच वै। ॥ १९ ॥
आविभावपंतिरेभावमयालिखुवेदनमं:।
स्फुरन्तिते यस्मान मराविव मरिवयं। ॥ २० ॥
अस्वतेव सती नेयनेव लब्धे चल।
मायेन्द्रजाल्याश्रीजागती प्रभवतंस्ये। ॥ २१ ॥
उषर्भमे दिलीयपरिश्रेण: ॥

ब्रह्मणा तन्ये विष्णु मनसैत्र खयाभुवा ॥
मनोमयमतो विष्णु यन्न नाम परिविज्ञे ॥ २२ ॥
यो चतुरुपमतं छोटो न विन्पे पदे ॥
चतुर्वारसिद्ध तस्य जगद्ध्वस्तञ्ज सन। ॥ २३ ॥
चतुर्वारसिद्ध कन्ये कान्ये कठके यथा ॥
कठकन्येरवासिन्त मनासिपि हेमधि: ॥ २४ ॥
तथाचेन्द्र पुरागरापननोस्कारान ॥
इर्म हर्षद्वरास्वि न लव्य य परमायुक्त ॥ २५ ॥
इत्यादि दिवसिश्रणे नाशयलासयोतादिनः ॥
जगतोपवराकौर्च सत कार्य प्राङ्कतं मतम् ॥ २६ ॥
नामद्विन्मस्फुतं यशस्व सिनियए जगत् ॥
तमः प्राकृति कौन्ते मायर्मेक्षपे श्यामुन। ॥ २७ ॥
छुपुप्रवस्या चकमन्द्वरेका श्रीलोकारे ॥
यथा स्थिता चित्तं सत्ते यें जगद्वाचवी ॥ २८ ॥
प्रकृतिनिर्मितिक्षण्यि जाता ब्रह्मणसहस्रारु ॥
इत्यादिवाकः साध्वोसत्कार्यादुपवरेणात् ॥ २९ ॥

इति आविष्णमविविचिताम शाक्षार भावानामवान: ॥
वचनाश्वत्वविध्यथपरिच्छे ॥ ॥
व्रत तत्त्वः परिष्कर्दः ॥

नदेव मात्रेः सत्ता दशिनायत्रविम्वचारः ॥

व्रत चिद्रुपताः वच्चे बुद्ध्वता सिविलक्षणाम् ॥ १ ॥

अनुभृतिः निर्विन्धो वेदनं चेचते पुमान् ॥

वेद्य जरं तमोग्रामानं प्रधानादिकामुच्चते ॥ २ ॥

वेदनं वेदसम्बन्धादीवै वेदचित्तोति ॥

यथा प्रकाशसंबन्धात् प्रकाशप्रकारः प्रकाशकः ॥ ३ ॥

यथा वार्षिकपरामर्शम् भानमर्शस्य भास्यम् ॥

एवं वेदार्थपरः कुञ्जश्चामस्वाभारतांशीनिः ॥ ४ ॥

असुखायं चिन्ता वेदार्थार्थयं न भीविव ॥

किन्तु साधारं दारते वा चिन्ततद्विक्षिणम् ॥ ५ ॥

वाच्यः कुञ्जश्चारणांभावादनुपराभुतः ॥

चित्रनः विद्यार्थविन्दुस्य च सर्वते ॥ ६ ॥

तथा चिद्रुपः कुञ्जश्चारणांभावते अश्वन ॥

कारणं व्रत्याचारमेव निष्ठायज्ञानसत्यः ॥ ७ ॥

नदेव चिन्हन्निराकारः प्रकाशाकाशाप्रकारः ॥

विद्यालयलक्ष्मी च सोचादेऽव्रत्यभवः ॥ ८ ॥

बुद्ध्वताभिस्तु साधारा परिक्षिष्ठा च द्विवन ॥

अन्तः च सबद्व तदस्तः श्रमणभक्षा ॥ ९ ॥

जया च परमः चालिद घटदीपलिनं मनः ॥

व्रतोः प्रकाशता लघुकारतादृश्ययमेव चित्तः ॥ १० ॥

यथास्याकाररत्नाएवलादिदृश्यत्वादि क्रमः ॥

स्वाधीनकार्यायामेव सैवं सर्वप्रकाशिका ॥ ११ ॥
न पुनःविष्कृत्वत् चिन्तामणिस्थलम्।
वृत्तियतो गैरवें स्खार् दयोधातिलकवने॥ १२॥
बुद्धाकृत्व लन्त्वस्तु तह्यारा प्रतिविष्मितम्।
पश्चायनभ्या नास्तो ख्रिः वुधादिर्कोड़िलिष्टः॥ १३॥
इत्येवं बुद्धसुभिकाय् बैलचपणं चितोरितम्।
चिद्विच्छा चाक्षुरैं धर्मं देहाद्रमः स्फुटिल्लिदम्॥ १४॥
अन्तोऽन्तिप्रतिविष्मितम् सारस्याद्व बुद्धिबाध्ये।
वैभव्यवहारातिः श्राह्येः गमयचारवन्॥ १५॥
नेवास्यवुधादिस्वयं बिवेको बुद्धिबाध्ये।
तार्किका यच समृद्धाः साहित्याः श्रेयस्य यतः॥ १६॥
बिज्जापवादिन्यो बैहाः बुद्धिबाध्याथिवेकः।
चतात्मानशुनाः मृदा मेनिरे बाणीका चिन्म॥ १७॥
सत्यपुर्वसा बिवेकायं बुद्धिवमेधः प्रवेशः॥
नास्तोऽक्तः सुधिया यद्हेकसाना चोरनीयोः॥ १८॥
एवनदवरस संसारे मोहस्त्राचैव संक्षिप्तः।
यद् बुद्धिभ्यो बिवेकवन दहादस्थाप्वधारणम्॥ १९॥
सवाग्यानुभवं वेदः न कःैदृष्टि वेदनाम्।
बिवेकत्वमात्मासनिन् हि भासमानिनः प्रेच्छते॥ २०॥
आत्मा बिवेकः बाणायनः न ग्राको बुद्धिमिश्रणात।
चतात्माः बुद्धाः बिवेकाया बुद्ध्विबाध्यान्तः॥ २१॥
यथा बुद्धा बिवेकायो नास्तिमिः प्रभुवन्तः॥ २२॥
सैस्त्रे तु बिवेकायो काधेमृत्ययः स्फुर्तम्॥ २३॥
उत्तरभागे छवीययपरिष्रेदः

सतुणिरामनस्तुतं स्खपावस्त्रिनेवदा मतुक्ष्रो मायेको तु मृणास्वाप्नो धिता ॥ ८४ ॥
बुधः सतुणिरामसाधवसं नवविनायकाः
किनिते: सतुणिरामनस्तुतं स्खपावस्त्रि करणस्थिततु ॥ ८५ ॥
पूर्णां कृत्तिक्षित्वा स्खपावस्त्रिनीति दक.
वृत्तान्तः स्खपावस्त्रिनीति स्वर्णान् नेचते पुमान ॥ ८६ ॥
वृजीतदेशे यथा बोधलथा स्वर्ण स्वर्णदा ॥
वृशिवत लपने मृणास्वाप्नानुभावस्त्रिनास्वेदनः ॥ ८७ ॥
दुह्मोगमचारो रागिनिदानं देहगोचनी ॥
वृहिन्त वर्जने मृणास्वाप्नानुभावस्त्रिनास्वेदनः ॥ ८८ ॥
अनात्रबुध्गार्थिद्यनविक्षेप्यान्न न चेत ॥
न मेलो बाध्यमुस्यास्वादिविचारसु चाचुकः परम ॥ ८९ ॥
समस्विचारबुध्गार्थिद्यनविक्षेप्यान्न स्वर्णान् स्वर्णदान ॥
बुध्गार्थिविवेकेन स्वर्णान्तिभिदा मुषा ॥ ९० ॥
चिन्ताने निर्पुष्येन स्खाम्यारोपितवामस्तवेत्त्वनम्
स्खाम्यारोपितवेत्त्वनम्  वधते थोः  वहक्षमि ॥ ९१ ॥
साधवी तु थोः प्रत्य इवां म्यायात्यें तत्वरा
इवां नन्दमयो चारस्य पनिते च यथा ॥ ९२ ॥
नारं करं दुवः दुवः चिन्ताचारकाशुक्पकः
एव नारर्त चन्द्रयनी न प्रविष्ठस्यभेदः ॥ ९३ ॥
दति ओविक्षावभिजुबिविरपायते शास्त्रायामे शास्त्रायामेऽन्मायते चिन्ताचारकाशुक्पकः ॥ ॥
चाथ चतुर्थी: परिच्छेद: ॥

इत्यवाचान: प्रेतको बुझारिष्यो विलक्षण: ॥
चित्रप्रकाशोःधुनासनाद्रुप्ता वध्यने तथा ॥ १॥
दुःखं कामसुक्ष्मेषा सुखं दुःखसुखायमः ॥
इंति सृगते: सुखाधातं नित्यनिर्दं: हन्तासनमः ॥ २॥
परिभाषावलाद्: कुटिवाध: सर्वत्र सम्वताः ॥
अन्यथा परिभाषेः माणशाले महेश्वर द्रुप्ता ॥ ३॥
यदा परोचवादेन परमप्रियताः ये ॥
कृपिकात् तुखंगः: प्रसी विमुलयाः काहनद्वनदः ॥ ४॥
नासननं न निरानन्दमिक्षप्तिरीत्विनिभ: स्फुटमः ॥
आरम्भायनन्द्रुपवनिपुष्टाः श्रुतिसंक्षणात: ॥ ५॥
उपासार्थ्यप्रवृत्तिणानं नैति नैति ज्ञेत्यं यथा ॥
निष्ठवाकं वलवर्दी विबिधवाक्यादिति विभिन्नः: ॥ ६॥
निर्निरानन्दमिति च शोपाक्ष्यानन्दमेश्वराः ॥
स्माङिच्छिद्यपिणां वक्ता न निधन इतिविनः ॥ ७॥
प्रेयोवन्यासाच: च सर्वसादंदिति सुक्ता सुखास्तपिः
जत्ता आत्मा प्रियस्तस चुखवर्तिनिम्ने नाचिना ॥ ८॥
आरण्डादया: प्रधानस्य इति वेदाराच्छन: ॥
वेदाराच्छन: न सिद्धां अत्मान: सुखस्तुप्ता ॥ ९॥
विश्वाराच् ब्रह्मभासाद्विभायाभिः: परीचितमः ॥
चित्रसुखस्तुपलं रेमाव वाक्यालेक्षुनाः ॥ १०॥
मा न भवमर्मं श्रव्यं भुयासमनिधिपकं।
निनिमितोऽल्लोगरं स प्रेमं परमिन्नित ॥ १९ ॥
अन्यावेशेऽयं बुढः कृत्ति हुयं न चुवेछव्यपि।
चतः प्रियतमः कामान्योऽयता द्विधिकः प्रियः ॥ २० ॥
आद्रवनासः सर्वग्रीमेऽप्रेम मां चुखलादपेते।
चारं श्यामिनि चैते यस्मात्र सुखं श्यामिनि नैन्यन्।। ॥ २१ ॥
तथा च सुखनादः सामावेने तास्तमानापि च॥
प्रेरिण्य प्रयोजिता सिद्धा खत्तः प्रेमावत्तेतु ॥ २२ ॥
नक्षत्रं वसुन अरोग्य प्रियो ततपाधिकावत्।
शैलपाठिकोपरिनिरस्तिरवान्तु न तात्त्विकी। ॥ २३ ॥
प्रेमित्युन्म चालिताविवेकाचः सुखादिनु।
आद्रप्रेमित्व निलामात्त्वानिलामाणन्दः पुमानं मतः ॥ २४ ॥
आदन: प्रीतमां वृद्धिर्यूद्र प्रक्षत समाचिता।
सर्वान्तिमायथिनौ नैं चुखायैं किं न मक्नान। ॥ २५ ॥
प्रयद्वर्षान्ति बुढः सुखं चेत्वुपु द्वयते।
अन्तःनृमेयं परमप्रियत्वं परं सुखम् ॥ २६ ॥
आदालर्थलेन सर्वच प्रीतिरात्मा खत: प्रियः।
इति मुख्यक: पार्थ आदालर्थविरिमित्या ॥ २७ ॥
तन्तोऽपृयुपमं चेत्य प्रियार्थवचनं सुखम।
भूताने नतू सुखं घीरा जीवनमुक्ता मद्धाधियः। ॥ २८ ॥
चन्द्राक्षरः सूक्ष्मसंविष्णु दियो गिनम॥
अप्रश्नानु कन्यो वाल्लुकायं वच्चते जन: ॥ २९ ॥
साक्षारक

सुखाश्रया बिचं पश्यन् देशी चित्रियरग्रङ्कोऽः।
बानार नैर्जर्जीलाजन्तं सुखं वेदनि न वाभ्रटक॥ २२॥
दुःख द्वध्यान दुःखमयान परिणः मन्तिदुःख॥ २३॥
विष्णुवाच्यानु दुःखामासानु चित्र सातं सखरोद्धकान॥ २४॥

इति श्रीविष्णुनाथभूमिविरचिते शाक्षारे शाक्षानाध्याने:
प्रापितामिखवैधंध्यं परिच्छेदः ॥ ॥

चतुर्थ पञ्चमः परिच्छेदः।

परिच्छेदनयोतं सचिदानन्दद्वस्तम्।
गीतमानं श्रुत्या अतिलोकानानं लच्चन्यायम्॥ १॥
तद्विपरीत्तमाणं लच्चां चेइतं स्फूर्तम्।
आयां तु गुणोदाप्यानं विवेको देशं चतुर्थम परं॥ २॥
नैर्जर्जास्व पुण्यलाब्धिवेधं जायस्त्वराध्यं।
वात्वनि वस्ती रूपेनान् पुम्मान्तरं परम्॥ ३॥
धियोयशिवकारायुत्या जनिनवातु दुःखाद्यः।
सामानाधिकरण्येन कल्याणं नाघवाद्य धियाम॥ ४॥
मच्छदेवं चखेन तडातु यज्ञ अनः।
कार्यकारणसाजायं देस बिहके वि सार्वं॥ ५॥
च्छ चात्मा वोधमाच्यं विध्यनि नाघवान।
गुणा सर्वं प्रदस्तवेदबकाराश्चेत्रिवेदिकिः॥ ६॥
चात्मा तु निगुणस्तदतु कृपक्ष्य मनो वुष्ये।
चित्ते कृपक्षुरं च तु चिरवादं गरिकीवक्॥ ७॥
उत्तरभागी प्रचन्दपरिचये।

लेपेरुसरसबन्धे नहँपूरपुर्नता।
यथा विषयसम्बन्धू बुढ्री मतवत वासन।
भाषाद्रैं इवत्योगाच च सत्तुद्वुश्च वासन।
लेपेतुस्तथ समवेतः संजः समविध चास्मनन्म।
च्यो निरक्षने उम्महं निरचेप्याच्याय पुस्मान।

मन्त्रपक्षकाचादियत्रानं श्रस्यम्। परम्परमः।

विश्वास्रान्नमाण्यतैः पुस्मयवधनेरतः।
सत्यामित्रत्वं यथा विसम्बुह दृशुपुत्तम।

अंत् ईश्वरिदासैव जगत् सत्तिधान्तः।

मार्शवत् प्रेक्षलेन जडानमयसङ्गविव।

पुस्मानेव जगत्कार्ती जगान्तादिविलेष्यः।

क्षामर्थिक्ष्यस्थवनम् यस्राज जडवर्ते। प्रवर्तिन्य।

करणाविन च देवेन्युर राजायमिधिकारित।

भेल्लाजां मनोमलिन्यपर्यन्तिक्षमभवतः।

मीश्वरमहति युःस्मात्मान्माचेद यत्विधनिन्ति।

ईश्वापातिष्ण नदू भूलके राजेवास्तृक्षान्तिक्षिलेष्यः।

धनादेयरे देशेऽदेभीयमानविष्णु।

इन्द्रियोधिक्षरी वृद्धिहुरामेश्वरः परः।

कृतस्माप्रकारात्मको नामो व्रतम्।

ईश्वरास्वितिलेष्म द्रष्ट्वो वै परेश्वरः।

अन्नास्त्तस्तुकेश्वरे वज्जिक्षापरस्ततज्ञः।

विश्वास्रास्य निर्दीप्यमनाचैव्यथमात्त्वः।
साध्विकार्य

यथायतिर्भवनि च वाच्याः श्पर्दायमप्रवहनार्द्दवः।
संसारं नतिहसूनि च मायाभोगं देहया॥ १५॥
शर्माणिग्राभवे निद्रापमार्भर्निद्राविन्दमाश्च।
पशयो योगिनाः प्राणायनोऽव्यवास्यं हरायते॥ २०॥
वाच्याः संभोगाते देवी। देवर्यासंन्यक्षितम्॥
वुद्ध्रावेश्वरस्मिनेन्द्रियाणि च।
वुद्ध्रावेश्वरस्मिनेन्द्रियाणि च।

चतुर्यात्मास्वेच्छानि परमाद्वाच्यानि च।
तथावन्नकं जीव इत्यानि च।
चतुर्यात्मास्वेच्छानि परमाद्वाच्यानि च।

यथेष यथौ व्यापकं तथौ यथौ व्यापकं तथौ धर्मादिकम्॥

प्रत्ययं भवेदुव्रह्म सखायाध्यायेऽपि।
सेवश्रवी साध्विवादेश्यापि चितःरेवजाननमन्यते॥ २४॥
परे वा परमात्माधिकं तु न जेठं काचित्।

वाच्यायापकलाभ्यं परं ब्रह्मा तु चेलन:॥ २५॥

वाच्यायापकलाभ्यं परं ब्रह्मा तु चेलन:॥ २५॥

वाच्यायापकलाभ्यं परं ब्रह्मा तु चेलन:॥ २५॥

नभोगाभवतः सा च कूटश्रेयाइतिगीत्वं २८॥

गोष्टिप्रतिविधकाघोगोष्टिवं तु भोजनुम्।
साध्विवादेश्यापि च वुद्धिस्वायत्वाय।

साध्विवादेश्यापि च वुद्धिस्वायत्वाय।
विना विकारं त्रृट्तलान साली तत्तोड़खिलक्षः ॥
चैवोपरागागास्तान सातिना यक्षवा चिनः ॥ ३० ॥
उपलितमेवेदमपि वाच्यं जातान ॥
चतु: पुमाननिर्देश्योपयुक्तं खड्महं कथ्यते ॥ ३१ ॥
विना ध्यामद्यालात्यत्त्वोपाचने च ॥
ञ्जश्या दश्याते राज्येश्वरितेन बधकृतुः ॥ ३२ ॥
ञ्जश्या चास्मादमित्रमु चिनि तथा सप्तुग्रिंधु ॥
चिनि विशाध सत्येकु विश्व भासंत सब्रेदा ॥ ३३ ॥
विशाधाराजपत: प्रूयमिनि चिंधोते खवत ॥
दयराजपत: मन्मोहविहिर्द्वारोपाय निर्मले ॥ ३४ ॥
आदर्श मलवधु योऽनि द्वापद्धता तु नयते ॥
वस्तुभिति नास्त्येव मलो धम्माणित: सदा ॥ ३५ ॥
आदर्श निर्मल: स्तंभो निर्देश्यचतने पुमान ।
सजातियपुवैधर्मश्च नास्ति यहु् भिदा ॥ ३६ ॥
आदर्श आत्मा समः प्राक्त एकहं च सर्वेदा ॥
देशाध्यचतना हेतो पुर्वभियक्तिः पुमान ॥ ३७ ॥
पकान्तिवादं दिति: केवलेभेच्याने तु सः ॥
विच्छेद्यप्रतिवच्छन रूपं च नास्ति: पुमान ॥ ३८ ॥
सर्वसहित्यन्याः चाभमगचेतनः चेतनेद्वात ॥
हृदरोवर्धीपद्वधाम्यम् लीलया ॥ ३९ ॥
चर्याभासानमदनमाननं भुव्यानें चं दुष उच्यते ॥
महारेण वचियिनि सुकारेण विश्नु पुन: ॥ ४० ॥
प्राणेत्यानय चाकू प्राण्यतमा चंस उच्चने।
श्रीरागरिव्ष्वङ्ग मुद्धाय बुद्धिमार्यम्॥ ४२॥
व्याय्यानक्तया सार्थं स्पर्शिव गुदाग्रामः।
चिगुणामयकमायं सं सांकुचिधान परिषामनन्॥ ४३॥
मायोनि कथ्यने चासुमा तन्मनाच्यनवेशवर्धृक्।
खालोकादश्च सत् तन्मानि पवेतनमि तु प्रेष्य॥ ४४॥
धुंसः कलाश्च चतन्तु निरंशवातो स निपककः।
ध्रुवंस्तुः स्वामिवाच्य सामी साजी तु चेतसः॥ ४५॥
श्रेयस्य सत्यस्य श्रव्येन चित्वार्य प्राप्ते बुधे।
सर्वाया: सर्वज्ञात्सं बृहत्त्वं ।
सामान्यादुहने यद्वस् राजा सर्वनाशिपुः।
चार्मुदयनम् ब्रह्मचार्य हन्मात्रात्मनवर्णनान्॥ ४६॥
प्रजये हि विज्ञानीयेनसन्तु ग्यानमात्रानाम।
सप्ताविन्निकवधम् नित्यमुहुः चित्तम्॥ ४७॥
नित्यमुक्तancies नित्य्यनुद्रः खलवान पुमानः मतः।
इत्यदिगुर्ग्रहेत्तर्गतिम सङ्कुचनं च॥ ४८॥
वैध्यावतिदत्तनात्मामवेकः कियत्या बुधे।
परिभ्रेष्टचलिकम पुम्रज्योः स्वित्सरान।
"धन्यस्य उत्क्रायं ह्यायिनामात्म मुक्तिः॥ ४९॥
दत्ति श्रीविज्ञामितिविरक्तिविरितिभस्याश्रावेष श्राविधम्
गणपरिच्छेदः॥ * ॥
खण्ड: परिभेदः।
विवेकंव गद्यक्या मतवा तद्नुभयते।
राजयोगं वशा कृत्याय समासेन तदुत्थते॥ १॥
अशुकीया राजयोगस्य हट्योगस्य भिक्षार्पान्।
बासिष्ठे च वनस्त्राय मुषुपपन्नेवमीरितम्॥ २॥
चानान्त्री राजयोगेच्छ आणानासाने हटे।
मुखे वैमायुक्तयाय तथे श्राध्वनुसारः॥ ३॥
विष्णुकुणात्मक दिये दुरिन्दितसमीरिता।
त चार्दै परिदृश्याय शिष्याय चेनिके।॥ ४॥
कामबोधायनन्तानि समर्चन्ति यथृदि।
तत्तानुविने व चानपुषपस्यं न वर्धते॥ ५॥
द्वार्षक्षरस्यस्मद्धरे कामकोजे तु चेनिके।
गुरुशास्त्रतन्त्रेछ ऋषी रुपवन्ते॥ ६॥
सार्वविचारस्य प्रचुरं तथा रस्मेवर्ज्जनाम।
सुखशुद्धिं प्रचुरः दुःखं प्रयनं धीरो विरज्जते॥ ७॥
ब्रह्महृदयोपदिः परशुरामोवामस्यपरिक्रियः।
गुज्जस्य वाणिज्येन वेदगुणात्मिक पुरुषयुक्त॥ ८॥
तत्त्वज्ञानी मुतत्वं यत्ते ज्ञातीर्षिमि॥
चतवा चायें समासेन लोकः सब्यादितपुरुषयुक्त॥ ८॥
इति मे भादि ना भादित्वीय्यं धिषित मनः।
स्वभावान्त तेन विक्रेयं दुःखं चिन्तनं चुक्ति॥ १०॥
साधुसंहारसे सब मात्र किये निजमें बोलनाहार।
सुदूर समाहरण किये पूजन तथा भांध्यों।
नवांगन नामांक्षानी रोगी रूपाणिया लक्षावगृह।
यदृश्य रोगी वातावायु वायु नामांक्षानी निकृष्ट।
इति नानानांतरस्च गारस्य मानवे।
माक्षाविद्या रूपमाचार चिन्तन वस्तु रहे।
मादुर नारिनि निर्देशिष्ट मुख्यापि न भक्त।
वदामीनाच्या विश्वास्या थाम्यं थाम्यं प्रकाशते।
हृदि वातावरणाची बुद्धिसांती बुद्धि परे विक्ष।
वुद्धिसांती चित्रान्तं इत्यात्यां नुस्तिं चतुर्वेदिः॥
हृदि नारिनि च चन्द्रमामि नामवन्याया इत्यते।
वसूली वसूली धर्म धर्म पूर्णा धर्म सदवशयं।
अन्न्ययों हृदय लघु स्वभाव नुभूति विस्तारित।
तैमौल: बहुमुखी आयुः साचान तदीयांता द्रुतकार॥
कर्म-नेत्रिराधां च भुज्या वुद्धिप्रकाशी।
वुद्धिप्रकाशीसमवेते च गौरवादिति निधितम॥
कर्म-नेत्रिराधां च भुज्या वुद्धिप्रकाशी।
हृदि बुद्धिमानकापिः चित्रान्तं इत्यादिः॥
धर्मार्थसंगम सम्पूर्णा बुद्धिमानी तु से।
नामां दृश्यार्थिव भास्करां च रोगिः॥
तां सर्वार्थां शास्त्रां परमार्थचनां मूलच।
प्रारंभाच्या विश्वात्माचन्मे विश्वार्पणमचन्म॥
निरभ्र निराधारं निर्गुणं निष्प्रद्रधम्।
निर्विशेषं जनातिवानं समस्तार्थवाभासकम्।
भूतविपुलं हृद्ग्रहं स्वारामाण्यं बैननं।
व्यवधिमात्रकं भूमाश्चर्चानुरंगिण्येत्।
अत्यन्तं च पुरुषं समविग्नं रूपिणः।
चर्चा आद्यकेष्व वस्त्वसमविग्नितं तुमनिषु गौतमे।
इति पश्चान्ति खेमास्य द्वोषविषयं प्रमुखं।
व्याधायां वापी यं विषयं श्रुतुः साज्ञयोगिनाम्।
सर्वभूतसंसाराणं सर्वभूतानि चास्तविनः।
एवं मनुस्यात्माजी स्वाराज्यविधिगतिः।
तास्मादं भयत्रदानेन खेमास्यार्चनेन च।
सम्मानवेन श्रुतात्मात्मानममनुर्जितः।
हृद्ग्रहं श्रीवाणातिदीनां भेगी रागश्र दीयते।
तेषोऽसा समस्मद्वायानं साम्यं देवीं विचिन्तयेत्।
उद्धृत ती लक्षणे चैव सर्वविषयशु सर्वदा।
सर्वविकुलकर्म कृत्रागादिकं क्षुद्रं।
चित्तवादेवा महैर्यं भुज्जः ना च यापि नानाधिकः।
तद्भवतोषोषु तद्भव्यायं विचिन्तयेत्।
गुणकार्यदिवं फिचिन्न निरिच्छायं विचिन्तयेत्।
तद्भवतोषोषु तद्भव्यायं च भूमिपार्ष्दविषय।
तथा न्यूनं न पश्चातं मेंदृतीकमः।
देवा दैवजयायेव यनिष्ये तत्जयायाय ।
चर्या यथा तत्वावर्ग्ये आत्रा श्रो नारका जन ॥ २३ ॥
दहावी स्वाज्ञानः प्रेममः पिन्दभावसुनार्दितवः
क दैवश ईशिनायो वा कं आङ्गः कांधधमालगः वा ॥ २४ ॥
चमिथीरे मेत्तस्त्था खानु स्मदेमभयमिति स्नुन ।
चिंधामलखक्रुपपु ईशानीशादिरुपकः ॥ २५ ॥
रुपभेदते द्वारसन सर्वा स्फटिके रुपभेददत्त ।
थियारं रुपं पुण्यनिके बक्रुपक इवेयते ॥ २६ ॥
वुकर्मादिरुपादिरूपाच्यीव बक्रुपपृष्ट ।
मामाभिन्न निराकारं विविधाकारायारिषो ॥ २७ ॥
मायैवेका चि चतुर्यं माहत्यविन्या धियः ।
पुंसा मेदे वुदभेदादमुदेश्ठाव पदार्थाणां यथा रवेः ॥ २८ ॥
व्याम्ब्रश कक्क्रुपेण मेदे कुरादिभेदतः ।
ओऽ तुष्टां दोही दर्हसुरकं सर्वेऽत् सर्वगोऽस्यः ॥ २९ ॥
चह्रमंदे शत तद्राधोऽश्रुरभिचिक्रितं ।
ब्रह्मणोऽद्राविन्ने सर्वभुतस्य तथा ॥ ४० ॥
उत्तमाधभमध्यभंगा माताय नपशा।
निगुणात्मकायायास्वलिङ्गाधात्मनोऽस्य चि ॥ ४१ ॥
उत्तमाधभमध्यचेतिध्य नैव द्वे धान ।
यथा दैवे तथाधन्यं चिन्तकायागयमायः ॥ ४२ ॥
वित्तमायातनाथाचैभेदे द्वारानरवाच्याः ।
एवमनोऽस्य पुरुष वहमुक्तामिषष्टः ॥ ४३ ॥
उत्तराभि सद्यपरिकेत्रं।

दृश्यानीशाशिवेश्याच च पुरुषांश्च न मेंसूयने।
मन्त्रायुते अति दुःखोदेशचरा प्रिया॥ ४४॥
चित्रीया मुद्दचित्तानामसाधवी धीमात्यायाम।
चिद्रादीं मथि धिया यदयी प्रतिविन्यानम॥ ४५॥
नन्तःनो नैव द्विपाय तथापिष्ठ वार्ज्जेव तत॥
स्वामादम्य चैयरं स्वानुभुत्या चि सिध्यति॥ ४६॥
यथा कैश्चिपि परस्तापि वै दुःखं न ह्याधिताति।
स्वामिन्याराध्यास्वादेयाध्यानं साधीयमनन्तनं॥ ४७॥
निद्रांश्च स्वामिनं ह्य्यम्य निद्राणं स्वानं परिध्यत।
तवस्वस्य रूपमेंद्रेवेयक्रमपक्षस्य सर्वंद्र॥ ४८॥
भुज्ञानं वायुभुज्ञानश्च मद्याम्यन्यग्राम।
यथैकरुपपतिराध्यायागायादुष्क्षाख्च॥ ४५॥
चारादश्चात्मकं चित्रभेदपरिणाम में।
हस्यमब्रह्माता दैशेपो जालस्त तद्वद्वीरे प्रभो॥ ५०॥
न स्वन्त मथि मोहच्या भाकरे भाग्यःपक्तवह।
दृष्टारेण चात्मानं वायञ्च मद्याभावमाग्न।
पूरे॥
मुख्ये मुख्यमें धीमें मे सा न वधूनम।
कृतक्षासुक्ष्मुच्चिलग्न्यं धीमुखप्रतिविन्यानम॥ ५२॥
नेत्रस्य नाहम भाग्रहुः सेव्ये पिर चिद्यर्षैः क्षं।
गृहयाच्छिद्रा व्यावस्यास्थाती ताशिव्याज्जित।
पत्त्वे मुखवत॥ यथा मथि बाङ्गे न तात्त्विकम्॥ ५४॥
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मयि वाण्यत्र वा पुणि केवलानुभवे विभूः पृ४४।
भाति यत् तद्वरस्ता धीर्द्विविष्यावत्कलनः।
पुष्करा रजतवत् विच्यतेऽ मयि न द्वापकति। पृ४५।
मरीचि तौययत् तद्वा क्वामादै नगरादिवलः।
कालवेष्येष्पि नागसखे विय विनं सनातने पृ४६।
ग्याचार्यस्थायि मातसु वुज्ज्वादै मम तेन किम।
मयि सर्वं यथा योग्यं सवर्चारइं यथा नमः पृ४७।
न सर्वं मयि सर्वं नाः सर्वं चाचित्यत: खवन्।
भावन एवातिष्ठानं क्षं चाहेसीचो चस्ये। पृ४८।
छानात्मकामिं विषं गायनं परम्पर्यः।
जगन् मम मद्यत्वान् मक्करीरसुखायदिवन्। पृ४९।
यथा मम तथायमयिः तीताय धियो भमः।
वस्तुतस्तु न काष्ठापि किमपि व्यभिचारः। पृ४१।
स्मालकऽसि श्रुतवेन पान्यास्सवास्यज्ञवन्।
एकः चिन्मात्रमस्तीतः प्रेणां प्रूः निरञ्जनम्। पृ४२।
क्षणात् भक्तसरं नतः न जगन् न जगलिया।
प्रस्फोते सबर्णश्यामः सम्भुब्रह्मिपरम्परा। पृ४३।
चिन्मपलमहादृश्यं प्रतिविश्वमुपागत।
कार्यद्वित्य वाच्यां काब्जन बल्हः सवर्चन निमः। पृ४४।
यथा नथ चिदाकां ग्न्यायेन ग्न्यायः। पृ४५।
चिदाकारामयं विस्त्य यतातुऽ धीरित्सकः।
भर्मणी तत्र तत्तैव भासन्तुवर्ग घटादिवत्।
धर्मार्थेना जन्ममात्राय शुभदुःखादिस्वतिष्ठितम्॥ ५५॥
जायदपि स्माय स्माय इत्यादिकं मम॥ ५६॥
हस्यमयान्योगिन्यां चित्ता जन्मविनाशिष्ठ॥ ५७॥
भृत्यतन्त्रभिविष्ठलोकां श्रावनस्य यथा॥
महापुष्पन्न भवजन्मस्तुः
कुमाराणाः जन्मभृत्ताः स्वायः॥ ५८॥
प्यायाभृत तामिरजित्स्तुः
घनास्पेतैविशिष्टे रथः किम्॥ ५९॥
इतीवं सततं ध्यायेनेन्नामनस्य सुधीः॥
साक्षात्कर रोयालयास्तं वागमोचररूपात्॥ ६०॥
कृष्णं निर्भरं श्रावनं मनं तत्त्वजन्ति चेत चणाम्।
तदृशः हस्यसंमक्षार्शयान्त सुझुम्पोहनन्याम॥ ६१॥
उत्त्यतायुक्तार्यास्त इत्यायारीः पुनः पुनः॥
विवेकेनैव तद्भवं सम्यादिन्द्रो गिरिनिवान॥ ६२॥
इति श्रीविज्ञानाभिविष्ठिते वास्त्वारे राजयोगप्रकारः
परिच्छेदः॥ * ||
एवमात्रानुभविनी जीवनमुक्तस्य लच्छमाः।
ख्यातं वच्चे भवेदं येन ज्ञातस्य ज्ञातकरणम।
एवं जनस्य मुननाः कालस्य अन्याय्यांना जतिताः।
कुर्यादेव गुरुमविद्यांस स्मार्य चाचन्याः चाभिमान्याः।
नेन्ध्र्यात्सर्वसमात्मकं च ज्ञातस्य लच्छम।
तद्नेतरं स्या केवलं योगभावो चतुर्विदितम।
श्रीत्वकारात्तानि वाक्याः चातन्विने मात्राभगिनः।
ज्ञातकारोऽवलंबिते विश्वासात्विनिकर्यायं वै।
यत्सर्वं सर्वाधिकारं भुजनं चात्मैव अवज्ञन।
तत्र को मोक्षं कः श्रोतं एकलब्धनुपश्यन।
यं सर्वाधिकारं भुजनं तत्र प्राप्तं प्रेमाधिकाऩम।
नायनेनन्दनं न दृष्टं तस्य प्राप्ता प्रतिभितं।
न विश्वारतं सर्वं स्या सतंगोग गतिः।
न विस्मारतं निर्धेयं चिन्मारं प्राणाङ्गीत्तथा।
नेत्रमार्त्यं नायस्मायायं दुःखे दुःखे मुक्त्रभा।
यथापूर्वस्थिनिः स जीवनमुक्तं उच्चते।
यथा जागरविस्ति सुपरस्यो यस्य ज्ञानं न विद्यते।
यस्य निवासनेन वानः स जीवनमुक्तं उच्चते।
रागदीशभवानानव्यस्तं चरर्जञपि।
यथात्त्वेयमवद्यक्षं स जीवनमुक्तं उच्चते।
यस्य नायनेनरथो भावे बुद्धिं खं लिघते।
कुर्बन्तानः कलिवते वास्किप स जीवनसुक्तेः उच्चने। ११।।
चैपि श्रीमहाचार्ये खतुपेश्वरणुमण्डलेः।
अय्याधः प्रसवावस्थौ जीवनसुक्तो न चाहन्याधी। १२।।
चिन्तामणि इत्य नित्यमन्दुसुवनीच श्रक्षाय।
इत्यात्सार्यश्रया जाकेपु नासन्युद्धिति कुट्टलम। १३।।
पर्वतसिन्नो नारो व्यायापी युक्तकर्माणि।
नद्रवास्काद्यत्वातन्तरसङ्ग्रहसायनम। १४।।
एवं तत्त्वे परे पुद्दे धीरे विश्वासनिमागत।
नद्रवास्काद्यत्वातन्तरबिष्येवदरचैपि। १५।।
येव नित्यमध्यात्म्येनालिन मन्त्यन्तमुखः सुखः।
गम्भीरस्य प्रसन्नव गिराविव मधावः। १६।।
पराण्नदद्रवास्नुभो रमने खासास्काणज्ञ।
सर्पक्कमपरिवारी निद्यद्वेयो निरामयः। १७।।
न पुष्पे न पापे नेतरेशादिपि लिप्यने।
थेन केन चिदाक्ष्ट्रो थेन केन चिदाष्ट्रित। १८।।
यत्रा कचन शाश्वे च स समाधिव राजने।
वार्षिकमाध्यमालारशस्त्रमन्नयेश्यतिः। १९।।
निर्गच्छति जगमालात पद्माराधिव केसरी।
वाचमीतरविषेः विषयशास्त्रेश्चित। २०।।
कामयुगानं गोभिर्शरदीव नमस्तुलम।
निश्चोचि निर्माणंकारं प्रूच्युपाजाविणत। २१।।
संयुतः वा वियुतः वा सदाचारनयकः।
एनावदेव खलु निजामलिङ्गमत्तः
संश्चान्नसंघनिर्मित्यामनिर्मित्याः।

नज्ञाय यज्ञद्वागविवाहे लोमे
मध्यपान्वमनुदिनं निपुणं तनुलम्॥ २२॥

तुर्यविशालूक्तस्य ज्ञात्स्य गुर्तितोपप्त्म भवार्षवत्।

न ज्ञाते ज्ञाते ज्ञाते न ज्ञुस्मानिविच्छे॥ २३॥

नर्येन्न व्यजतु वा निर्येन स्वपच्च गृहे श्रयाः।

च्छासम्मानिसम्ये सुन्त: एवामलाभायः॥ २४॥

न मोहो नभसः पुष्टे न पानाले न भवनले।

सर्वशास्त्राये चेतायायो मोह इन्द्रु श्रुते॥ २५॥

जीवकुलपं ज्ञात्स्य ख्यादे कालसानक्ते।

विश्वयदेवसुविकार्य पवनाक्यदनवामिव॥ २६॥

अनाशुमिर्ज्ञातादिप्रतिविचि च यादर्शी॥

सादृ दर्पणे दर्पणाते कैवलास्यस्यप्रतिष्ठी॥ २७॥

चर्चलं जगदिल्यादौ प्रशान्ते दशसमठे।

स्तान नादर्शी कैवलया स्थिते दशस्यवीति॥ २८॥

चिन्मानं चेतायदितमनत्समाज्यणम्।

अनादिमध्यनिष्ठ्यं दुनाधि निरापयम्॥ २९॥

न पवनं नापि चासकारं न दश्यं न च दश्रजम्।

अनाशमनमिविष्ठं तत् किशचिदविशिष्यन्॥ ३०॥

इति श्रीविश्वनिष्पद्विवर्चितं साधुसारसो जीवमुक्तिणिरस्मकोऽ

परिच्छेदः॥ ३१॥

इति साधुसारसेवेचरभागः। साधुसारसाङ्क्रयो दमासम्।