Editorial

The sixth issue of the Newsletter of the NGMCP, which it is my pleasure to present herewith, is an occasion to introduce new things and to look forward, but also, even more importantly, an occasion to look back. To begin with the new: with this issue we will be starting a changed schedule, appearing with increased regularity but at a slower pace. From now onwards a Newsletter will be released twice yearly: a Spring-Summer issue and an Autumn-Winter one, with a minimum page-count of 24 per issue.

New are also two of the contributors to this issue, both young scholars who already have remarkable experience in working with Sanskrit manuscripts. Kazuo Kano, an assistant professor at Koyasan University in Japan, joins forces with Kengo Harimoto, of the NGMCP in Hamburg, to present an early manuscript fragment of an otherwise unknown commentary on the Tattvasaṅgraha of Sāntaraksitā. Identified some twenty years ago by Prof. Kazunobu Matsuda, the well-known ‘manuscript-hunter’, this fragment has never before been studied in detail or published. Here Harimoto and Kano edit and translate the first of two surviving folios, with material which they show to be important for our understanding of the history of the Sāmkhya system. A similar study of the second folio is forthcoming in a future Newsletter issue.

The second contributor whom we welcome for the first time in this issue is Péter-Dániel Szántó, who holds MA degrees in Tibetology and Indology from ELTE University, Budapest, and is at present a doctoral student in Oxford University. Szántó presents a pioneering study of a group of texts which deal with initiation into the Catuspātha, a major, but virtually unstudied, tantric Buddhist system. Szántó is able to clarify the relationships between a number of texts, and sheds much light on their complex history.

We have also, as is customary, a book notice in this issue. Kengo Harimoto introduces a publication which edits and translates, for the first time, an early and influential work on hathayoga. The author, James Mallinson, has used a large number of manuscripts, including no less than six which were filmed in Nepal by the NGMPP; unusual is that to elucidate the practices taught in the text he has conducted extensive fieldwork with living hathayoga practitioners.

I am proud of the fine and ground-breaking contributions which appear in this issue; they would suffice to make it a memorable one. It is, in my view, a landmark also for other reasons. Firstly, it marks the half-way point of the projected duration of the Nepalese-German Manuscript Cataloguing Project. Begun in 2002, the project is expected to be concluded in 2014. A retrospective of the first six years is planned for the next issue of the Newsletter. I do not take this as an occasion for self-congratulation; but I think it can be said that much has been done in the first six years of this project, and we are looking forward to increasing our activity in the coming years, and to doing even more towards uncovering, making available, and making scholarly use of the treasures of the manuscript collections of Nepal.

Finally—and I have saved what is for me personally the important as the last—I would like to note another anniversary: this Spring-Summer issue appears not long after the 70th birthday of Prof. Albrecht Wezler, the founder of the NGMCP and my predecessor as holder of the chair for classical Indology in Hamburg. Cause for congratulation and for celebration indeed! Without his foresight, the NGMCP would not have come into being, and as a result a very large number of important indological discoveries (some of the more recent of which have been introduced in the six issues to date of the Newsletter of the NGMCP) would not have been made. Sāmkhya, which is central in the paper by Harimoto and Kano, has long been one of the main focuses of Prof. Wezler’s scholarship; and the breadth of interest, extending to countless little-known areas, that has been so noticeable throughout his long and distinguished career will, I hope, lead him to peruse also the other contributions to this issue with attention and pleasure. To our founder, and our teacher, most respectfully namah; to all our readers: Happy reading with the Newsletter of the NGMCP!

Harunaga Isaacson
Antiquarian Enquiries into the Initiation Manuals of the Catuspūtha

Péter-Dániel Szántó

Introduction

The aim of this paper is not to deal extensively with the contents of the Catuspūtha initiation manuals. That is far too difficult a task to be undertaken at the moment, due to the paucity of material on one hand, and the ‘barbaric’ language peculiar to these works on the other. My aim is merely to present a certain corpus of manuscripts, mostly from the microfilm archives of the NGMPP, and try to clear up some points of confusion regarding them.

The Initiation Manuals

The maṇḍalopāyaṇa\(^{1}\) is a genre of works in Tantric Buddhist (Vajrāyāna/Maṇtranyāña/Maṇtramahāyānā) literature prescribing in greater or lesser detail the modus operandi for initiating a would-be member of a Tantric cult.

In the core part of the ceremony described in these works, the officiant (acārya) introduces the initiand (śisyā) to the schematically arranged pantheon (maṇḍala) of the cult, provides the desired consecrations (abhisēka), subjects the initiand to pledges (saṃaya) and vows (samvāra), and gives specific teachings (upadeśa) relating to the scriptural cycle that he is a master of. At the end of the ceremony the consecrated śisyā becomes an initiate with the right—and indeed, duty (adhikāra)—to undertake meditative visualization of the central deity and his/her retinue (devatābhāvāna), to perform the rites taught by the cult, and to confer initiation himself, provided that he\(^{2}\) had taken the Consecration of the Officiant (acāryabhisēka). The rest of the prescriptions in these manuals relate to a large number of auxiliary rites which may or may not require active participation on the initiand/initiate’s part. They are, nevertheless, considered essential.

The need for such manuals is quite evident: scriptures rarely provide clearly formulated and unambiguous prescriptions for initiation (or anything else for that matter). A tantra at best will usually provide the broad framework for the rite, leaving plenty of room for interpretation and detail.

Initiation into the Catuspūthatantra

The Catuspūthatantra (CAPṬA) is a typical example. The tantra teaches initiation explicitly only in IV.1. whilst saying next to nothing about essentials such as the number and the proper order of consecrations. The synoptical outline of CAPṬA IV.1. is as follows:

\(^{1}\) I wish to thank Prof. Harunaga Isaacson and Iain Sinclair for their corrections, comments, and constant support.

\(^{2}\) Lit. ‘method (upāya) for the maṇḍala[-rite]’. The affix -kā should perhaps be understood as qualifying ‘anthology (saṃhīta)’, ‘booklet (pustika)’, or ‘work (rucana)’. Sometimes maṇḍalopāyikā is also seen in the Sanskrit titles preserved (or back-translated) in the Tibetan Canon. Perhaps this should not be readily dismissed as a corruption. According to Pāṇini 5.3.80 (BÖHFLING 1887:259) this is a justified abbreviation in the view of the ‘Eastern’ grammarians. However, it should be noted that this rule applies to male names only (cf. 5.3.78 ibid).

\(^{3}\) Use the male pronoun here in accordance with the usage of our texts. Although there is some evidence that women could be and were initiated as well, the references to initiand/s are overwhelmingly male. The singular also follows the practice of the manuals, although there can be a number of initiands in the rite. In this case the most prominent of them will act on behalf of the others in the more crucial phases. Since this person can dispose of wealth, I tend to think that the paradigmatic initiand the authors had in mind was a well-to-do male householder. Beyond the laity monks and yogins are also in the foreground. However, the identification of the agents taking part in the ritual is and was controversial. The investigation of this matter is beyond the scope of this paper.

\(^{4}\) It is here that one of the most important commentators, Bhavabhāṭṭa, forces the text to include the series of consecrations up to the ‘Fourth’ (caturthabhisēka).
two Indian exegetes, Kalyāṇavarman and Durjayacandra, comment only up to the end of the third chapter (pīṭha).

Despite our lacking his commentary to the fourth chapter, it is quite evident that Kalyāṇavarman must have thought that the actual teaching of the initiation rite is hinted at in CAPITA II.3. At this point in the commentary he makes a huge digression comprising more than one third of his work to give the additional details of the ceremony. On the other hand Bhavabhaṭṭa and Durjayacandra understand this sub-chapter as teaching the meditative visualization of the deities that make up the mandala.

An Insertion in CAPITA Ms. A.

Kalyāṇavarman does not seem to have been the only one who thought that CAPITA II.3. did not provide enough information on the initiation rite. This was also the case with one of the scribes of one of the earliest CAPITA mss. to which I have assigned the siglum A.

From Śrūṭijñānakīrtī’s colophon to his translation of Kalyāṇavarman’s work we are informed that the commentary (i.e. the CAPITA) was never completed: “These [chapters of the commentary] to three pīṭhas were written by the practitioner Kalyāṇavarman who thought compassionately of sentient beings. It is said that when [he was writing] the introduction to this [last] pīṭha the dākini forbade [him to continue]. Or, it is said that just when he was about to begin the commentary [to the fourth pīṭha] he met the dākini’s face to face and thus achieving realization he disappeared. Hence [I], the Indian upādhyāya Śrūṭijñānakīrtī, have begun writing a commentary to the fourth pīṭha of the Catuspāṭha according to what I have heard from my consecrated masters.” Tōh. 1608. 43°

There were at least three scribes working on this manuscript. The first, up to fol. 37, is the most legible and orderly. Thence out of 44 folios.

The first scribe, who was responsible for copying the greatest part of the text, was apparently intended to replace the root-text up to and including II.3.54ab. The second, of 70 verses, is nested between II.3.81ab and II.3.81cd. The third and shortest, of 36 verses, starts after II.3.137. and ends before II.3.143. They are all in the same hand, that of the first scribe, who was responsible for copying the greatest part of the text.

All the passages mentioned above contain material typical of initiation rites. Thus, for example, the first batch of verses deals with such topics as the ritual takeover of the ground for drawing out the mandala (bhāmiparigraha or bhāmīyacāna), the ritual purification of the thread and the coloured powders that will be used for tracing out the mandala (sūtra-prakṛṣṣaṇa and rajah-prakṛṣṣaṇa respectively), the outlining of the mandala (sūtraprāṇa), ritually placing the vases for consecration in their proper place (kumbhasthāpana), and so forth. The second batch teaches amongst others the mudrās and mantras of a series of deities (Pokkāsi, Ghori, Ugrī, Kapāli and several worship-goddesses) and a host of brahmanical gods (Hari, Brahman, Rudra, Śākra, Indra, Kubera, Bhūtādhipati, Nāgādhīpati) along with the mantras of their consorts (Lakṣmī, Varāhi, Sarasvatī, Brahmanī, Māheśvarī, Gangā, Aiindrāṇī, Tilottamā, Śaci, Rambhā, Vasumati, Hārīti, Laṅkēśvarī, Raktapriyā, Bhogavati and Utpalapriyā). None of these deities are present in the original CAPITA. The third batch describes the assignation of deities to guard the doors of the mandala and three types of bāli-offering: one for devas, one for nāgas, and one for gāyas.

These are no doubt intentional insertions. It can hardly have been the case that the scribe was copying a ms. with shuffled folios from the mūla and another text describing the initiation rite. For all insertions occur beginning with a new and complete verse, never in the middle of a pāda. Were it the case that the folios were shuffled, I find it unlikely that all the pages would have begun and ended neatly with complete verses. It is possible however that the scribe was copying a text in which the insertions were made to the root-text. Since nothing suggests that the foreign hands are making up lost portions in the text, I believe that all folios were penned in a short space of time, the scribes taking turns.

This ms. has been miscatalogued as a śāiva tantra and in lack of a better title, it has been named the Prakāraṇa-tantra, no doubt because of its colophons which usually end ‘iti prakāraṇa . . .’.

In contrast to all other ms. of the CAPITA and what the three commentators seem to have read, this ms. is unique as it contains three large batches of extra verses in CAPITA II.3. (i.e. the ‘mandala’-chapter). The first, of 222 verses (or rather ‘units’, as I count mantras, instructions, section closers as ‘verses’), which starts after II.3.7ab, was apparently intended to replace the root-text up to and including II.3.54ab. The second, of 70 verses, is nested between II.3.81ab and II.3.81cd. The third and shortest, of 36 verses, starts after II.3.137. and ends before II.3.143. They are all in the same hand, that of the first scribe, who was responsible for copying the greatest part of the text.

Since nothing suggests that the foreign hands are making up lost portions in the text, I believe that all folios were penned in a short space of time, the scribes taking turns.
already present. If one reads ms. A. of the CaPTa in the absence of other witnesses, one would have great difficulty identifying the insertions, for they emulate the grammatical (or rather, ungrammatical) style of the tantra. Since stylistically these verses do not stand out clearly, they would not have prompted a copyist to suspect contamination.

The inserted passages in ms. A. match closely with material found in two works from among the satellite texts of the CaPTa. As I will argue below, the insertions are more likely to have served as the ancestor of both these works than the other way around.

The CaPTa was often a little later if the dating is auctorial) together with the circulation by the last quarter of the eleventh century (or a little later if the dating is set in the thirteenth century) with the printing of the two works from among the satellite texts. Identifying the insertions, for they emulate the grammatical style of the tantra.

The earliest reference I am aware of for this author comes from the ŚaUMaU of Bhuvācarya, who mentions him twice. The only surviving and incomplete ms. of the CaPTa was

13 This ms. is described in DBGP1:140–142 with a useful list of the chapter colophons. Janardan Pandey mentions another fragment of this work in the National Archives (14 folios, 214cd) as no. 1, but it is not entirely certain what he means by this number. His report states that this additional ms. ends in the 15th chapter of the CaPTa. Probably the manuscript is NGMP A 142/10, A 1275/7, but this remains to be confirmed.

14 For the Tibetan translation of this work see Tōh. 1619. Ōta. 1460 vol. 10, p. 90.

15 The title is misread and the work is incorrectly catalogued as Sarodāyānā-māndapāyikā in Matsuñami 1965:160. This misreading is slightly corrected by Petech 1984:44 to Sarodāyānāmāndapāyikā (Note that Petech misreads the catalogue number: 454 instead of 450). The date is rather NS 174 than Matsuñami’s NS 178 and Petech’s NS 176. The folios of the ms. are shuffled at present. It should be kept in mind that when I quote from this codex below, I am referring to the restored pagination and my provisional verse numbering. The Tibetan translation is canonical (Tōh. 1538.). It is unsigned and of such a low quality that I am inclined to believe that it is no more than a rough first attempt which somehow found its way into the Canon.

16 His name was variously reconstructed as *Bhuvācarya (Bhu ba blo ida), *Madhyadeśikāmati (Dbus pa blo lha), *Ariṣṭādhiṃat (Dbus pa blo ida) or simply Dhumāt – no doubt because of an attribute in the colophon: śrīmad Ratanagiro sthitā śarvasāvatārātthaketenā| kṛteyam maṇḍapāyikā Bhuvācāryaṃ dhūmātā | v. 790. | SaUMaU 56°.

17 This is this most likely Vigrāhapāla III who ruled during the third quarter of the eleventh century and possibly a decade further. His copper plate grants (the Amgāchi grant from his 12th regnal year) and the Bangōn plate (from his 17th regnal year) show similar palaeographical features with these manuscripts. See Epigraphia Buddhistica 46 (1987) 48–64. This manuscript is not dated but it looks remarkably similar in measure and scribal hand to a manuscript in the National Archives of another work, the Yogāmarasādhana-pāyikā (YośAUK, NAK 3-366) of Amitavajra, which is dated to the 13th regnal year of Vigrāhapāla. Since the subject matter is related (Yogāmba is later considered the author of the cult propagated by the CaPTa) and the two ms. look significantly alike, it is probably not unreasonable to suspect that they formed part of the same collection.

The title is misread and the work is incorrectly catalogued as Sarodāyānā-māndapāyikā in Matsuñami 1965:160. This misreading is slightly corrected by Petech 1984:44 to Sarodāyānāmāndapāyikā (Note that Petech misreads the catalogue number: 454 instead of 450). The date is rather NS 174 than Matsuñami’s NS 178 and Petech’s NS 176. The folios of the ms. are shuffled at present. It should be kept in mind that when I quote from this codex below, I am referring to the restored pagination and my provisional verse numbering. The Tibetan translation is canonical (Tōh. 1538.). It is unsigned and of such a low quality that I am inclined to believe that it is no more than a rough first attempt which somehow found its way into the Canon.

There is a further, rather curious, interaction between this work, the SaUMaU, and the Sdom pa lha. It is now pointed out that this work independently translated into Tibetan with the authorship credited to Vigrāhapāla III is later considered the author of the cult propagated by the CaPTa and the two ms. look significantly alike, it is probably not unreasonable to suspect that they formed part of the same collection. Thus we may surmise that this work was already in circulation by the last quarter of the eleventh century (or a little later if the dating is set in the thirteenth century) with the printing of the two works from among the satellite texts of the CaPTa.

The earliest reference I am aware of for this author comes from the ŚaUMaU of Bhuvācarya, who mentions him twice. The only surviving and incomplete ms. of the CaPTa was

This manuscript is not dated but it looks remarkably similar in measure and scribal hand to a manuscript in the National Archives of another work, the Yogāmarasādhana-pāyikā (YośAUK, NAK 3-366) of Amitavajra, which is dated to the 13th regnal year of Vigrāhapāla. Since the subject matter is related (Yogāmba is later considered the author of the cult propagated by the CaPTa) and the two ms. look significantly alike, it is probably not unreasonable to suspect that they formed part of the same collection. Thus we may surmise that this work was already in circulation by the last quarter of the eleventh century (or a little later if the dating is set in the thirteenth century) with the printing of the two works from among the satellite texts of the CaPTa. The earliest reference I am aware of for this author comes from the ŚaUMaU of Bhuvācarya, who mentions him twice. The only surviving and incomplete ms. of the CaPTa was

The earliest reference I am aware of for this author comes from the ŚaUMaU of Bhuvācarya, who mentions him twice. The only surviving and incomplete ms. of the CaPTa was
copied in NS 174 = 1054 CE. The author could not have been much earlier than this date since he also mentions Dārǐkāpādā, who is credited with a work related to the Kālacakrā.

Some further indirect evidence may be gathered from the Capipa. In his commentary to Cāpitā I.2.30, Kālyānavarman directs the reader to the/a Māndalapāyika/māndalapāyika for the visualizing meditation of Vajrasattva. Such an instruction is indeed to be found in the CapimaU but of course we may not state with certainty that he is referring to either Cāryāvatārapādā’s Cāpitā or some other work with the same title or designation, such as that of Āryadeva’s, dealt with in the next section of this paper. For the time being I will assume that he does. Thus, since the ms. of the Capipa is dated 1012 CE, all circumstantial evidence seems to point to the late tenth century/early eleventh as the terminus ante quem for this author.

In order to ascertain Cāryāvatārapādā’s authorship, we need to make a longer digression and deal with the Tibetan carrier of his work. The canonical Tibetan translation and he reconstructed the title Śāricatūtipithatantra-rājaṣya māndalapāyikā vidhipaṇḍī[sic] sārasamucayā nāma from Rgyud kyi rgyal rgyal po dpal Gdan bzhi pa zhes bya


23Toh. 1355. Rgyud kyi rgyal rgyal po dpal Dus kyi ’khor lo’i dbang gi rab tu byed pa’i ’grel pa (“Śārikālacakratantra-rāja Śākaprakrātyāvṛtti”). Dārīkāpādā (if the two authors are one and the same person) thus probably does not predate the early eleventh century. There are references to several other siddhas and scriptures in this text which might help establish a relative chronology. Authors named include Jālandharaṇāpādā, Kacchapati, and Indrabhūthi. Scriptures mentioned include the Saṃcārā (i.e. the Yognisamčāra), the Hāvākkhaṇḍa, ‘samājikatantra’[sic! for səmājika] (i.e. scriptures related to the Guhyasamāja), the Vajrāṅra, and the Sarvaṅdubha (i.e. the Sarvaṅdubhadānasamajyākāśiṣyāśtanāvam). With the exception of the Yognisamčāra this list of tantras looks quite ancient, so it is possible that the argument related to Dārīkāpādā should be overruled with the hypothesis that there were two Dārīkāpādās (or, even more likely, someone adopted his name to write a Kālacakrā work).

24Aryan upadesāḥ: māndalapāyikakautkramena kṛtvavajrasattvaṃ gah vajrasattvādhaṃ aham pāṭheta vajrāttvato ‘ham iti kṛtyāṃkāro bhāvayet ity arthāḥ Capipā 9°–10°.

25Candramāṇaladānumāthān mintvajrasattvāttvāhācintāmant padmamāṃsanā śāmīnaḥ himak大地maṇḍapabhaṃ | [v. 2.14.]: dērhati yam sattvaparāyaḥkārtā putacakabhuddheśkharan | vṛyamīḥ hṛdayāyaṁ pānāvyaṁ vāmanāḥ vāmaṁyaḥ nyesas vyayaḥ | [v. 2.15.]: sarvābhavāravagātra tvā sūbhāvastra-vābhāṣṭān | rāmāṇyālānaḥ anekasā ca vajrasattvādhaṃ aham pāṭheta | [v. 2.16.]: CapimaU 2°.

26Toh. 1613. = Ṭoṅ. 2484. Translated by Gayadhara (or Gaṇgā-ḍārā?) and ‘Gos Khug pa lhas btsas, a duo otherwise responsible for translating a number of important works related to the Capitā. Toh. 1607. = Ṭoṅ. 2478, the longest known commentary to the tantra, i.e. the Capipīṇi of Bhāvabhāṣṭa; Toh. 1616. = Ṭoṅ. 2487, a sūdana by the same author; Toh. 1620. = Ṭoṅ. 2492, an auxiliary work on the four ‘realities’ by Jetārī).

ba’i dkyil ’khor bdi gyi cho ga Snying po mdor bsags pa’i most likely to be a later construction deriving from the closing verses of the CapimaU. There is no strong evidence inside the work for this title, such as its occurrence in chapter colophons. Furthermore, the practice of extracting and back-translation titles from works seems to have been fairly common in Tibet.

Another, more serious, problem is the attribution of this work to Āryadeva in the colophon. The attribution is seemingly strengthened by the second quarter of the obeisance verse, where the author salutes Nāgārjuna (Klu sgrub). For centuries to come Tibetans apparently were under the impression that this translation is indeed an initiation manual in the spirit of the Ārāya school of the Guhyasamāja exegesis.

This can be ascertained for example from the Collected Works of Bo dong phyogs las rnam rgyal who ‘wrote’ an initiation manual to the Cāpitā cycle. This work (ET vol. 108., pp. 11–117.) is in fact the same as the CapimaU from the second chapter onwards minus the final colophon. The title page and the introduction, however, make it clear that he too thought the work to be in the spirit of the Ārya school (‘Phags lugs).

Cāryāvatārapādā’s authorship was eventually restored by Si tu pa Bstan pa’i nyan byed (1609/1700–1774), but only in the colophon of his revised translation of the work. It did not seem necessary to him to have new carvings made for the colophon page of the Tibetan CapimaU. With the precision of a good scholar Si tu records how he came into the possession of this manuscript and the circumstances of his work on it:

dkyil ’khor sgrub pa’i thabs ’di ni dpal Spyod pa’i bṛtal zhugs zhabs kyi mdzad pa’o | [ṭar ṭar ṭar ṭar] gdan bzhi’i dkyil ’khor cho ga Snying po mdor

27Toh. 1613. 137°.

28De la dngos po tson mdas pa’i snying po mdor bsags zhes bya sde ston | Toh. 1613. 137° corresponding to tassyā sanggrahavastusti paṇḍa- sārasamucayam = [v. 28.28.]: CapimaU 30°.

29Slob dpon chen po Arja de ba mdzad pa’i rgyud kyi rgyal po dpal Gdan bzhi pa zhes bya ba’i dkyil ’khor bdi gyi cho ga Snying po mdor bsags pa’i zhes bya ba rdzogs so. Toh. 1613. 137°.

30Born in Ngam ring in Gtsang in 1375/6 and died in 1450/1. Also known as ‘Jigs med grags pa, and Cho kyi rgyal mtshan. Although by far the most prolific Tibetan author ever (ET numbers 137 volumes), he seems to have fallen in relative obscurity. Later dge lugs pa authorities confuse him with Jo nang Phyogs las rnam rgyal, and classify him as an adherent to the controversial, and even persecuted, gzhon stong doctrine. Cf. Smrta 2001:192.

31The title page has: Gdan bzhi’i dkyil chos ’Phags rtags bzhugs bsod so. The work begins unceremoniously with the following: da ni rgyud kyi rgyal po dpal Gdan bzhi pa zhes bya ba’i dkyil ’khor bdi gyi cho ga ’Phags rtags bsod par bya ste | jis skad du Snying po mdor bsags pa ba lugs so d... The rest is Cāryāvatārapādā’s work.

This means to accomplish the maṇḍala-initiation is the work of the venerable Cāryāvṛatī. Now, the Sanskrit manuscript of this maṇḍala-rite of the Catusūṭṭhāna called the ‘Condensed Essence’ was obtained from Nepal. ‘Brug pa rin po che Bka’ brgyud phrin las shing rta mchog permitted that it should be seen and examined by me, and [thus] sent it to Mdo Khams along with a support (rten). Due to [my] distracting engagements, for a few years it remained neglected. Then, in the year of Inexhaustibility I have compared it with the old translation (gyur rnying). As far as redacting (zhus dag) goes, although the Nepalese manuscript has many corruptions (ma dag pa), the old translation contained some lacunae (chad pa). These I saw quite necessary to restore. [All] this was well achieved in the year of the Male-Fire-Hound [= 1766 CE] in Thub bstan chos ’khor [through] the text of Si tu Bstan pa’i nyin byed (20).

It is interesting to note that Si tu pa did not make an issue out of this restoration, although I find it highly improbable that he was not aware of Āryadeva’s putative deity in the Tibetan opinion.

The parallels for the inserted passages in CAPTA ms. A. can be found in the CAPIMAU in the following locations:

ins. 1 CAPIPAU ms. A. 17°–25° = CAPIPAU 3°–11° [= vv. 4.2–10.23]
ins. 3 CAPIPAU ms. A. 30°–31° = CAPIPAU 18°–20° [= vv. 19.1–33]

The most striking difference between the two versions is that the name of Yogāmbara is missing from CAPTA ms. A whereas the CAPIPAU mentions him twice. Thus (the passages are given here in diplomatic transcription):

tato vajrasattvanayaḥ dehācāraḥ kṛtasyātmakam | (Ms. A 20°)
tato yogāmbaramaṇayaḥ dehācāraḥ kṛtam ātmakam | (CAPIMAU 6°)

“Then the officiant should visualize his own body as ...”

&

asya buddhamahāvajra dhyāpaya nādhyacetasāḥ | (Ms. A 21°)
asya yogāmbarībhuddhaḥ dhyāpayaḥ madhyacetasāḥ | (CAPIMAU 7°)

“He should meditate on this ... with an equipoised mind.”

It is quite evident that the text has been tampered with. The CAPTA does not mention Yogāmbara at all, and nor do the two earlier commentators, Bhavabhūtā and Kalyāṇavaranī. It is only in Durjyacyandra’s commentary that we find Yogāmbara as the main deity of the cult, but even this commentator does not find the name of the deity in the text.

On the other hand it is quite natural that if someone wanted to superimpose Yogāmbara, he would change not the text of the tantra, but rather that of the maṇḍalopāyīkā. Many ācāryas following and propagating the cult might never have read the basic text. They simply officiated at the rituals and gave the relevant teachings according to the orderly arranged manuals.

The Catusūṭṭha maṇḍalopāyīkā of Āryadeva

The material treated above can be met with in a hitherto unidentified fragment in ms. NAK 5-37 [= NGMPP A 138/10]. This paper ms. of 118 folios containing the CAPTA and two fragments, was once part of a composite codex together with NAK 5-38 [= NGMPP B 112/4], which contains in its present state an incomplete CAPIPAU. The two fragments of the NAK 5-38 are: a) 72°–73° a seemingly incomplete word by word commentary to the

34This is ‘Brug chen VII. 1718–1766, who, although his junior, is listed as Si tu pa’s teacher.
35This is most likely a reference to some accompanying gift, such as a statue.
36This monastery in Derge was Si tu’s main seat.
beginning of the tantra. The listing of pratikas and the terse commentary suggests that it was used as a teaching aid for exposing the tantra; and b) a fragment in the same linguistic style as the tantra discussing elements related to the initiation rite and other material.

Fragment b) begins abruptly in the middle of a pāda. We may surmise from this that the scribe of the composite codex had only a fragmentary manuscript at his disposal. The text is very corrupt.

There are several internal colophons (given here in diplomatic transcription):

1. iti pūrvasevābodhanapātala samāptāḥ || (fol. 4r/75v)
2. iti bhūmiparigraha dviyita paṭala samāptāḥ || (fol. 6r/77v)
3. iti maṇḍalapātalaś trītyaḥ || (fol. 30r/101v)
- iti paṇcapaṇaquakramanirdeśaḥ samāptāḥ || (fol. 37r/108v)
4. iti caturthapatāla samāptāḥ || (fol. 40r/111v)
- iti prajñāvajratāvātāmānoḥ samāptāḥ || (fol. 47r/118v)

The text ends on the same page, but there are some additional verses before the closing formula ye dhārṇā, etc. This second part of the manuscript is not dated.40

Up to the third chapter, i.e. what is described here as the maṇḍalapātala is by and large the same text as the CĀPMĀU. Thus, the pūrvasevābodhanapātala corresponds to CĀPMĀU 2.3b, second word (this is where the fragment starts) to the end of chapter 3; the second section of the fragment, i.e. the bhūmiparigraha, corresponds to CĀPMĀU ch. 4. The rest of the CĀPMĀU is closely parallel to the fragment’s third section, that of the maṇḍala: up to first half of ch. 8 in the CĀPMĀU the text is essentially the same; from here, up to ch. 16 in the CĀPMĀU the subject matter is similar, but the text is arranged differently; the parallel resumes with ch. 16 of the CĀPMĀU and from there on the two texts run closely parallel to each other once again.

What follows in the present fragment (i.e. the ‘fourth paṭala’) is actually the text which in the Tibetan Bā’gyur is considered the first auxiliary tantra to the CĀPTA, the *Mantraṃsā (Sngags kyi cha) 41. However, it should be noted that the *Mantraṃsā stretches much further than what seems to be the erstwhile end of the work in this fragment.42

Although this fragment does not state anywhere that it was authored by Aryadeva, there is an important piece of evidence that suggests that it was considered to be so by at least one learned author. Incidentally, from this evidence it also follows that the Tibetan attribution of the CĀPMĀU to Aryadeva was not without basis.

This piece of evidence is an anonymous, short, and very knowledgeable commentary to the first 35 verses,43 taken from what is called the ‘fourth’ chapter (caturthapatāla). The long title of the work is: CĀPTIMĀUKAPAYAKA-yās ca caturthapatālaḥbāhūṣtamantradhiśārasaṃyakṣaṇāpya paṇijikā (henceforth CĀPMĀU MAIPA). It survives in a single, damaged palm-leaf ms. dated 1153 CE.44 There is a modern apograph of this ms. in left-slaying devanāgari under NAK 5-80 = NGMP A 141/17.45 After the maṇḍala-verse the author states in his pratiyāṇa:

*Cāptimaḥahātantrad uddhṛtya jñānasāgarat kṛtāṃ śrīDevapadence Manḍalopayakāṃtaram  
tasya caturthapatālasya mantradhirāsya laksanaṃ|  
gurpadprāsādavāṃ vijñātāṃ yan mayāḥ|ṣubham |  
 tad vicaksur āhāṃ śrutā kalyāṇasakhiḥśaṃyam.

40The full title is: Dpal gdan bzhad pa’i bshad pa’i rgyud kyi rgyal po snags kyi cha = Tōh. no. 429. Tr. by Gayadhara and Shakya ye shes. The other auxiliary tantra, which already has Yogāmbāra as its major figure, is the °Cāptiśūhayashvatatantrarāja° (Dpal gdan bzhad pa’i rnam par bshad pa’i rgyug kyi rgyal po) = Tōh. no. 430. Tr. by Smṛtiṅānakīrti and revised by Bu ston. The present reconstruction of the Sanskrit title is evidently a back-translation. I propose it should read -vāhyāktatantra- instead of -vkṣyatatantra-. In Bu ston’s long recension of the Rgyud sde sphyi’ rnam par bshag po (The Complete Works of Bu ston, Part 15 (Ba. Satapātaka Sēries, International Academy of Indian Culture, New Delhi, 1969. p. 462.) this latter tantra is called Rnal ’byor ma thams cad sgang ba (perhaps to be reconstructed as *Saravagānabhya/kas/).

41The text corresponds to Tōh. 429. 231b–244b3. The Tibetan text ends on 260a2.

42The lemmata in this commentary match the verses on fol. 30r/101v line 1–32/103v line 1 in NAK 5-37 (Tōh. 429. 231b–233a4 in the Tibetan translation).

43Note that it is miscatalogued as Cāptimaḥahālpadopayāgā in the NGMPP library card. The correct number of folios is 13, and not 12. The ms. is shuffled. The sequence of the microfilm frames is: 1°, 12°, 12°, 11°, 11°, 10°, 10°, 9°, 9°, 8°, 8°, 7°, 7°, 6°, 6°, 6° bis, 6°, 4°, 4°, 3°, 3°, 2°, 2°, 13°, 13°. The numeration, although old, seems to be wrong, I find that one folio is misplaced.

44The apograph is also miscatalogued as Cāptimaḥahālpadopayāgā. The fact that it is an apograph of NAK 1-1679 2/24 can be easily determined: the scribe wrote only the sūtra for each missing abhāva and the colophon states that the copy was made from an old Newari ms. (sty antalekhaput at(?) prac nanevakcharaiksar at pra- cinaṭadaprapustakaḥ udṛṭhaḥ 1987 vakranāvde lākṣitaṃ sūtram pustakam ).

45caturthapatāle conj.; caturthapatāla Ms.
46yan mayā conj.; padmayā Ms.
Glorious Āryadeva composed the nectar of immortality that is the manḍalopāyikā, having extracted it from that ocean of wisdom, the great tantra in Four Chapters. Through the grace of my master (guru) I have come to know an agreeable exposition of the 'raising of spells' [contained] in the fourth chapter of that [work]. If the blind one (vīcaksuḥ) [i.e. unable to understand it myself], after having heard the speech of my mentor (kalyāṇasakhi = kalyāṇamitra), shall proceed to [have it written down], in order to make my mind constantly firm.

I am not quite sure that I have interpreted every verse correctly. The essentials should suffice for the time being. What the author says is that: a) there was a manḍalopāyikā composed by Āryadeva; b) it is based on the CAPTCHA; c) it has at least four chapters; d) the fourth chapter partially deals with the extraction (lit. ‘raising’) of encoded mantras. This information tallies with the colophon we find in fragment b) of the second part of NAK 5-38 (but it does not agree with the chapter colophons in the CAPIMAU).

The fact that Āryadeva is here called Śrīdevapāda for purely metrical reasons becomes clear later on in the work (CaPMaUMaPa 5-38 (but it does not agree with the chapter colophons in the CAPIMAU)).

The subject here is the Bearer of Vajra, in the congregation of . . . [= gods] of a pure abode. Then Vajrapāṇi, having condensed [the long tantra] into the king of tantras in 12,000 [verses] in the glorious [land of] Oḍīyana, . . . (probodhya?) . . . by 80 crores of yogins and yoginis. From that [12,000 verse version], the glorious lord Nāgārjuna disseminated in the world the basic tantra in 1,200 verses after having gone there [i.e. to Odiyana] and after having heard [the 12,000 verse version] in great secret (mahaguptena?). Having heard this [1,200 verse tantra], the venerable Āryadeva composed a manḍalopāyikā for this king of tantras, and in the fourth chapter of that he taught (kṛta?) [procedures relating] to mantras such as their positioning [on the body]. With this the ‘connection’ (sambandha) is explained.

Conclusions

The CAPTCHA in its original form lacked detailed injunctions for the manḍala initiation ritual. For this reason, an author, emulating the un-grammatical style of the tantra, started to write supplementary verses which found their way into one ms. transmission of the basic text (witnessed here by ms. A). These verses form a kind of proto-manḍalopāyikā, one that still does not recognize Yogambara as the main deity of the cult.

At some point, most likely towards the end of the tenth century, a full manḍalopāyikā emerges. It is not only an initiation manual, but a wide-ranging anthology of many kinds of practices. This version incorporates the verses of the proto-manḍalopāyikā and tweaks the text to state that Yogambara is the presiding deity of the cult. There is also an effort to appropriate this ‘new Catuspīṭha’ into the *Ārya exegetical school of the Guhyasamāja. By the twelfth century the text is thought to have been authored by Āryadeva.

The CAPIMAU of Caryāvatāripāda is most likely to have been a separate reception of an extract from the work of Āryadeva, the one that deals strictly with the manḍala-initiation (i.e. what originally were but three chapters of the work). New chapter colophons are given to the text, making it consist of 27 chapters. This is not a unique occurrence. Another work attributed to Caryāvatāripāda has also been identified in this article as part of the SAUMAU of Bhūvācārya.

And in the same [verse] . . . . . . . the great king of tantras, the glorious Four Chapters in 180,000 [verses], which was uttered by the Lord, the Bearer of Vajra, in the congregation of . . . [= 56]
The CAPIMAU is translated into Tibetan with the not unfounded attribution to Āryadeva. This Tibetan conviction stretches on for at least six centuries. In the meantime the Caryāvratipāda CAPIMAU continues to circulate in Nepal as an independent work. A copy is retrieved from there in the 18th century and re-translated by the Tibetan scholar Si tu pa chen. He does not change the author in the edition of the Canon he supervised.

What remained of Āryadeva’s work after extracting the first three chapters and circulating it as an independent work, that is, chapter four and onwards, is separately translated into Tibetan as the *Mantrāṃśa, one of the two auxiliary tantras to the CaPTa. However, the Tibetan *Mantrāṃśa is twice the size of the surviving Āryadeva recension. The single surviving ms. of this work seems to end half-way through the text.

It is quite evident that the Tibetan translators encountered the Catuspītha tradition at a stage where it was still (or, yet again?) quite malleable.
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Today perhaps hundreds, if not thousands, of books are published each year, all over the world, having something to do with yoga. It is rare indeed, however, to find among them philological works that provide a solid ground for further research into yoga practices and their history. The Khecarīvidyā of Ādīnātha by James Mallinson, a revised version of his doctoral thesis presented to the University of Oxford, is a welcome addition to the meager collection of scholarly books on yoga. The text edited for the first time in the volume, Khecarīvidyā, is a text on hathayoga and it teaches one particular practice, khecarīmudrā. It is a relatively early work (before 1400 CE), and was, as Mallinson shows, influential, with portions of it being incorporated in various other works. It is ascribed to Ādīnātha, the first guru of the Nātha order, and consists of 284 verses divided into four patālas. The teaching is told in the form of a dialogue between Śiva and the Devī. The central practice taught is that of khecarīmudrā, which “involves the freeing and lengthening of the tongue of the yogīn in order that it might be turned back and inserted above the soft palate to break through the brahmāvāra, the door of Brahmā, so that the yogīn can drink the āmyta, the nectar of immortality, which is stored behind it.” (p. 4).

Mallinson used 28 manuscripts to prepare the critical edition. Of those, six (i.e. more than twenty percent) are from Nepal. Their NGMPP reel numbers are: A 999/7, E 1145/12, A 1289/9 (see the next page for a sample of this manuscript), M 23/10, C 32/12 (retake of C 86/6), A 207/9. The number and distribution of the manuscripts attests to the broad popularity of the work in recent centuries.

The introduction to the book includes brief discussions of the date and place of composition of the text, the witnesses of the text, the question whether the Khecarīvidyā is part of a larger text or an independent work, and the characteristics of its language.

The introduction is followed by a chapter titled “The hathayogic khecarīmudrā” that traces the history of the technique. Mallinson finds forerunners of the hathayogic khecarīmudrā in the Pali canon, early Sanskrit texts, and in tantric texts. After a short excursus—which serves to introduce the hathayogic khecarīmudrā—on the name of the technique, the author discusses two distinct approaches to the technique among the hathayoga texts. He observes that the conflict between the two contradictory aims of khecarīmudrā, the one characterized as binduddhārana and the other amṛtapalavana, in hathayoga texts reflect the taking over of hathayoga from its tantric origin by (orthodox) Advaita Vedāntins. He proposes the hypothesis that the text Khecarīvidyā was “an attempt by a school of yogīns whose roots lay in Kaula tantrism at reclaiming the hathayogic khecarīmudrā from more orthodox binduddhārana-oriented schools of hathayoga.” (p. 30) Mallinson also observes that the attempt had little effect in overturning the trend of hathayoga departing from its tantric origin. The author then reports on the results of his field research on the khecarīmudrā practice among the modern practitioners of hathayoga in India. The chapter is concluded with observations on the historical position that the khecarīmudrā technique has held among Indian ascetics.

The critical text (preceded by detailed descriptions of the manuscripts used, as well as of the ‘Ethnographic sources’, i.e. the living practitioners who Mallinson met or heard accounts of), the translation, and notes to the translation occupy most of the book, the last occupying as many pages as the first two. Testifying to the complicated transmission of the text, the book contains two appendices where editions of text fragments are presented. Appendix A is an edition of Khecarīvidyā 3.55–69 in a distinct recension found in the Matsyendrasanhitā and one Khecarīvidyā manuscript (G), and Appendix B is the edition of 3 patālas (17, 18 and 27) of the Matsyendrasanhitā. The Matsyendrasanhitā is a curious text in which all the four patālas of the Khecarīvidyā are found incorporated.

This book should be interesting to anyone with a scholarly interest in yoga practice. It is a fine example of how philology and ethnological field work may be combined.

(Kengo Harimoto)
10 recto and 11 verso of a *Khecarīvidyā* MS (NGMPP A 1289-9/Mallinson’s K4)
Fragments of a commentary on the Tattvaśaṅgraha, part 1

Kengo Harimoto and Kazuo Kano

Introduction

Some twenty years ago, Kazunobu Matsuda (1990, 119) identified two folios in the codex photographed as NGMPP A 39/13 (frames 32–34) as fragments of an unknown commentary on the Tattvaśaṅgraha (TS) of Śāntarakṣita. This is part 1 of a report on those fragments. The folio we report on here, photographed in frames 34 (recto) and 33 bottom (verso), constitutes a part of the commentary on TS stanza 14.

The manuscript The folios are palm-leaf. The size of the manuscript is unknown. Yet it is probably not much different from the 49 x 5 cm reported as that of the bundle A 39/13. It is written in what is sometimes called transitional Gupta (the term adopted by the NGMPP/NGMCP), which covers various scripts in the north of South Asian sub-continent in around the 7th to the 10th centuries. Among the specimens of manuscripts written in this script found in Nepal, the script of the Skandapurāṇa manuscript dated 810 shares some features with our fragments. A notable feature in this respect is the distinction between the dental sā and palatal sā by means of their respectively open and closed top.

Both the left and the right edges are broken off in both folios. It is, however, possible to estimate the approximate number of lost aksaras due to surviving lines and the parallel text in the Tattvaśaṅgrahapuṣṭikā (TSP). Five lines, except the verso of the second fragment (containing four lines), are written on each side.

The text Since the two folios, sharing physical and orthographical characteristics, are found together, and since parallel passages are found in the TSP in both folios, it is reasonable to suppose that they belong to the same text and that that is a commentary on the TS, as proposed by Matsuda. This should be mentioned here since, as discussed below, there are only slight indications that the first folio we report on here is a commentary on the TS. The second folio makes explicit references to portions of the TS, and shows much more clear signs of being a commentary on the TS.

The text of the first folio, the subject of this report, constitutes a part of the commentary on stanza 14 of the TS:

This stanza essentially argues for the existence of the pradhāna of the Śāṅkhyas; the view is later refuted in the TS. In order to analyze the text of our fragment, it is necessary to consult the TSP, since our text follows a similar strategy. Indeed, about half the text in our first fragment is shared with the TSP. In the TSP, stanza 14 of the TS is explained as adhering to an argument for the existence of pradhāna formulated in Śāṅkhyakārikā (SK) 15:

Most commentaries on this stanza, as well as the TSP, divide it into five reasons: (1) bhedānām perimānāt; (2) (bhedānām) samanvayat; (3) saktitah praṇāteḥ; (4) avibhāgād vaiśvarāpyasya; and then explain each reason. According to Kamalaśīla, stanza 14 of the TS refers to the second reason (bhedānām) samanvayat. Kamalaśīla makes this point after citing SK 15 and explaining it. His explanation of SK 15, being very similar to those of a group of commentaries on the SK—Mātharavṛttī, Gauḍapādabhaṣya, an anonymous Vṛttī, Jayamaigalā, and the Suvarṇā- (or Kanakas)aptati, extent only in Chinese translation, which in turn are similar to each other—is probably an almost verbatim copy from a lost commentary on the SK.

Our text is available only starting from the middle of the discussion on the reason samanvayat, which is the second in SK 15 and, according to Kamalaśīla, the reason behind TS k. 14. Having explained samanvayat, the

---

1This manuscript has the National Archives Kathmandu accession number 3-737. According to Matsuda (1997, n. 2; 2002, p. 264), this number is given to manuscripts seen by Bendall in 1898–99. The NGMCP title list records ten manuscripts that are given this accession number.

2Some folios photographed as A 39/13 belong to the Daśabhūmi-kaśūtra and were published in Matsuda 1996. Among the rest, four folios belong to a Ćyotisā work, the Sāravāli of Kalyāṇavarman and the rest to the Ģhārāṇi of Aṃtabha.


4We will discuss the nature of the text as a commentary on the TS in more detail, including its relationship with the TSP, in the second part of this report.

5Vācaspati Miśra’s Tattvakumārid is an exception.

6Cf. TSP (28,8): tad atrācāryeṇa ‘samanvayat’ ity ayaṇ eva heter ūktaḥ...

7It has long ago been noted that there are close similarities between the following commentaries on the SK, Mātharavṛttī, Gauḍapādabhaṣya, the anonymous Vṛttī, Jayamaigalā, and the Suvarṇāsaptati. It is thus natural to assume that a single commentary was the source of all of these. The terminus ante quern of that commentary is provided by the date of Paramārtha who translated the Suvarṇasaptati into Chinese in the sixth century.
author of our text moves on to discuss four other reasons mentioned in SK 15. Unlike the TSP, he does so without actually citing SK 15. Nonetheless the text of the commentary on the TS in effect appears as though it is a commentary on SK 15—to the point that it could have been mistaken as such, were it not for the order of explanations of the reasons.

The structure of the explanation of three reasons (bhe-dānāṃ pari-māna-d, saktitāḥ pravṛtteḥ, and kāryakārya-vibhāgāt) is clear. For each reason, our author first introduces an explanation almost identical to that of the TSP; then, he adds further explanations with the expression api ca or kārya ca. In the conclusion of the explanation of each reason, he has a similarly formulated text that starts with an archaic expression te manyāmahet . . iti.

We have not found exact parallel passages to these additional explanations. It is, however, possible to find brief expressions that may reflect the same reasoning in the Jayamaṅgala on the same kāra-kā. Also, the Tīkā on the Dvādasārayanayacakra (DDANCT.), when the Sāṃkhya argument for pradhāna when, is presented, shares substantial text to the additional explanations in our text. Discussions in the Nyāyabuṣṭa (NBh u) may also reflect the same line of arguments. Interestingly, the portions in the NBh u and the DDANCT. that have parallel passages also begin their exposition with the reason aneitvateit (NBh u)/samaneitvateit (DDANCT.). They do not cite SK 15, either, nor do they have the same discussion as found in the TSP and other commentaries on the SK. Furthermore, in the Yuktīdīpikā we find much more elaborate and sophisticated discussions in the same line of arguments. See our observations below (pp. 22f.) for more on these points.

Facsimile and Transcript

The facsimiles and transcripts are given in the pages [17] 15. The following notations are employed:

- Line numbers are presented in bold face. They do not form part of the text on the folio.
- /// signifies where the folio breaks off. If this occurs at the beginning of a line, the text to the left of this sign is lost; when this sign is at the end of a line, the text that follows is lost.
- Text enclosed in parentheses () is hard to read. When only part of the akṣāra is not clear, only that part is enclosed.

○ signifies the space created to clear the binding holes. In this folio, the lines above and below that are not directly affected by binding holes, too, have spaces, corresponding to the position of the binding holes. These spaces, too, are signified by the ○ symbol.
- . . . signify lost text whose length is unknown.
- + signifies lost akṣaras whose numbers are relatively certain.
- The text enclosed in ‘ and ’ is a later addition.
- — represents a similar sign found at the beginning of the first line of the recto and the last line of the verso of this folio. The scribe indicates herewith that he left some space before he began the line, probably due to the curvature of the palm-leaf, which did not allow for a first/last line as long as the others.
- .. represent an akṣāra we cannot decipher.
- . represents part of an akṣāra we cannot decipher.
- * represents virama.

Edition

In the following edition, the text enclosed in brackets (‘ and ‘) is our reconstruction of what was lost in the manuscript due to physical damage. The text enclosed in double brackets (‘ and ‘) found in the beginning and in the end of this edition is beyond the content of the folio, but nonetheless could be reconstructed on the basis of the content.

---

*This is merely an assumption, since the text is only available up to the middle of the explanation on the fourth reason kāryakāryavibhāgāt.
9This, too, is presumed, since one occurrence of te manyāmahet is reconstructed in our edition. For this expression, see note 9.
10In the edition and translation that follow, corresponding passages in these texts are reported in notes.
Figure 1: Unknown Tattvasaṅgraha commentary fragment A recto

Transcript

1 — yupādabuddhayaṁ kā oraṁanāṁsi trayodasāṁ sukha-duḥkha-mohanāṁ sanmivēśvīśeśāṁ trayodaśāṁ trayodaśāṁ ekakāryabhāṁ vāt* sukhaṁ kāraṇapraṇāśaṁ teṣaṁ trayodaśāṁ tad eva prasādādi kā(ṇyaṁ) u// +++++ +________

2 +++++ ++++++ /// ttāyas teṣāṁ tad e va šoḍādi kāraṇo n) jyāmaṁ teṣaṁ ○ tad eva dharaṇādi kāraṇo evaṁ bhedānāṁ ekajātisamanvayo dṛṣṭāṁ // sāmāna-pūrva-vakāṣṭaṁ śākala-prālāmaṇaṁ bhāṣaṇa-prabhitīṇāṁ ekajātisamanvayo dṛṣṭāṁ // te manyāna e ṣag bheda // +++++ +++++ +++++

3 +++++ ++++++ /// (mj)āyam abhi(t) t tat pradhānāṁ i t i na ayā diśāviṣaṭeṣv api vīta-prayogeṣv arthāvibhāgaḥ sujñātaḥ tathāpi dīmātraṁ ucitaṁ asti pradhānaṁ bhedānāṁ parimāṇaḥ oṁ iha loke yasya kartāh bhavati | tasyo parimāṇaṁ dṛṣṭaṁ kuḷāla(h)// +++++ +++++ +++++

4 +++++ ++++++ /// (karo)ti prasthagrāhaṁ adhānaṁ prāhaṁ ekā bdhiḥ eko haṁkāreṇa paṁca tanmātraṁ ekādaśendriyāṁ | paṁca bhūtāṁti a oṁ to numānena sādhayaṁ sti pradhānaṁ | yad idam vyaktaṁ parimāṇaṁ u(t)// +++++ +++++ +++++

5 +++++ ++++++ /// nīphaṁ prāhaṁ idam vyaktaṁ svāt* api cāst pradhānaṁ bhedānāṁ ○ parimāṇaḥ yasmat kā(ṛ)yakaraṇātmakānaḥ bhedānāṁ parimāṇaṁ dṛṣṭāṁ sāmānyatas trayāḥ sukha-duḥkha-moṁ hāḥ kāraṇo viśeśāṁ trayoviṁśati bheda daśāvīdaṁ kāraṇa// +++++ +++++ +++++ +++++
Transcript

1 ++ + + + + + // pada bhūdhīndriyāṇī pada karmendriyāṇī trividham cāntālakaraṇa. buddhir ahamāḥ ca evaṃ dinā prakāraṇa bhedānāṃ parimāṇaṃ dṛṣṭaṃ sansārgapūrvvākāṇāṃ ca loke bhedānāṃ parimāṇaṃ dṛṣṭaṃ ○ tadyathā vihih sansāṣṭānīṃ mūlaṃ karaṇaṃ śaṃkānāñālaṃdāpāṣāvoṣāukāśī // ++ + + ++ +  

2 + + + + + + + //////️ (prāgh abhiḥ) sansārga iti yatraśāmī sansārgo bhūt tat pradhānaṃ tasmād asti pradhānaṃ kāranyaṃ yata idaṃ vyaktam utpannam iti itaś ca pradhānām astīti psṛyāmaḥ || śaktitaḥ pravṛttte iha loke yo yam aśīṣmin arthe pravarttate sa tatra śakto yathā tantuvāyaḥ paṭaṭkaraṇe śaktah || // ++ + + + + +  

3 + + + ++ + /// vyaktam utpādayati sā ca śaktir nirāśrayāṇa bhavati tasmād asti ○ pradhānaṃ yatra śaktir svarttata iti kim ca śaktitaḥ pravṛttteh kārtyārāṇānam adhiśhtiḥtanāṃ anadhiśhtiḥtanāṃ ca loke śaktis triṣy api kāleśe avatiṣṭhate || prak* pravṛttteḥ pravṛtttikāle ca // ++ + + ++ + +  

4 + + + + + + + ++ // nām pravṛtttyupapatteḥ pravṛtttikāte py avatiṣṭhate | tasmād apiśāranyāntaḥ kāryapraavṛttikāle pi tadyatirekābhāvāt* pṛthvak* parimāṇadāśānābhāvāc cedam vyaktam avyaktaṇāvat|| te manyāmahē prāg asya bhedād asty asāv avyakte śaktir avasthitā (yā vyāktaḥ) bha[v || // ++ + + ++ +  

5 — yā ca sā śaktis tat pradhānaṃ iti | ○ itaś cāsti pradhānaṃ kāryakaṭāraṃśvābhāgāt* iha loke kāryakaṭārayor vābhāgo dṛṣṭas tadyathā | mūtpindaḥ ○ kāranyaṃ ghaṭaḥ kāryam ghaṭo madhūdakapayasyaṃ dhāraṇasamatho na tu mūtpindaḥ (evaṃ idaṃ vyaktam na)

*ya vyaktabhāva is partially visible in the fragment photographed with the recto side.
पेरिमतुवात् स trìसगषवका ľदाः, Ŧीहाeवव स trìसűा मƷलाÈकưरपणƨनालकाõडIJसवतƲषशƷक-दűम्। सामाĭयतźयः सƲखĉःखमोहाः, कायƨकरणeवūषतः षोडश भावाः

यeद IJधानƫ न ŵयाăदा eनŲपeरमाणिमदƫ Ũय¯तमeप न ŵयात्। पeरमाणाÙच ľदानामिŵत पeरिमतƤµमƼƨिüपõडƤः  पeरिमताĭमƼिüपõडƤः  पeरिमताīव  घटान्  करोeत, एवƫ  महदeप  महदाeदिलÈगƫ  पeरिमतƫ Ũय¯तƫ पeरिमतम्। एका बƲिĚŗको ऽहƫकारः पǠ तĭमाǮाõŏकादūिĭĔयािण पǠ महाभƷताeनेरमाणम्। ú मĭयामż—ľदात्

चाĭतःकरणƫ  बƲिĚरहƫकारो  मनǤƞeत।  एवमाeदना  IJकाŗण  ľदानƊ Ǯयोदशeवधƫ  करणƫ

ľदानƊ  पeरमाणƫ  दƼŰम्।  सामाĭयतźयः  सƲखĉःखमोहाः।  कायƨकरण-करणƫ eवūषाŹयो॰

For this paragraph, cf. DDANCT . , vol. 1, p. 319, ll. 7–11: इदतʤताजिﬀिगिसावधाताधत्ताजिﬀिगिसावधाताधत्ताजिﬀिगिसावधाताधत्ताजिﬀिगिसावधाताधत्ताजिﬀिगिसावधाताधत्ताजिﬀिगिसावधाताधत्ताजिﬀिगिसावधात। इदतʤताजिﬀिगिसावधाताधत्ताजिﬀिगिसावधाताधत्ताजिﬀिगिसावधाताधत्ताजिﬀिगिसावधात। इदतʤताजिﬀिगिसावधाताधत्ताजिﬀिगिसावधाताधत्ताजिﬀिगिसावधात।

For this paragraph, cf. DDANCT, vol. 1, p. 319, ll. 15–16: इदतʤताजिﬀिगिसावधाताधत्ताजिﬀिगिसावधाताधत्ताजिﬀिगिसावधात। इदतʤताजिﬀिगिसावधाताधत्ताजिﬀिगिसावधाताधत्ताजिﬀिगिसावधात। इदतʤताजिﬀिगिसावधाताधत्ताजिﬀिगिसावधात।

For this paragraph, cf. DDANCT, vol. 1, p. 318, ll. 4–5: तमाहा, इदतʤताजिﬀिगिसावधाताधत्ताजिﬀिगिसावधाताधत्ताजिﬀिगिसावधात।

For this paragraph, cf. DDANCT, vol. 1, p. 195, ll. 24–25: इदतʤताजिﬀिगिसावधाताधत्ताजिﬀिगिसावधात।

For this paragraph, cf. DDANCT, vol. 1, p. 318, ll. 4–5: तमाहा, इदतʤताजिﬀिगिसावधाताधत्ताजिﬀिगिसावधात।

For this paragraph, cf. DDANCT, vol. 1, p. 318, ll. 4–5: तमाहा, इदतʤताजिﬀिगिसावधात।

For this paragraph, cf. DDANCT, vol. 1, p. 318, ll. 4–5: तमाहा, इदतʤताजिﬀिगिसावधात।

For this paragraph, cf. DDANCT, vol. 1, p. 318, ll. 4–5: तमाहा, इदतʤताजिﬀिगिसावधात।

For this paragraph, cf. DDANCT, vol. 1, p. 318, ll. 4–5: तमाहा, इदतʤताजिﬀिगिसावधात।
Translation

... The thirteen [faculties (karaṇas)], [hearing, touch, sight, smell, speech, hand, genitals, ajnus, foot, intellect, self-awareness, and mind] are specific combinations of pleasure, pain and confusion, for, every one of the thirteen [faculties] participate in one effect. Pleasant [things] illuminate [those thirteen] faculties [sic]. The effect [of those pleasant things] is the same pureness, etc. throughout the thirteen faculties [sic]. Unpleasant [things] activate the [thirteen] faculties. [The effect] of those unpleasant things is the same dryness, etc. throughout the thirteen faculties. Stupefying [things] restrain faculties. The effect [of those stupefying things] is the same concealment, etc., throughout the thirteen faculties.

Similarly, we observe the continuity of [being] the same kind in derivatives. We observe the continuity of [being] the same kind in potsherds, half-cup, drinking vessel [that are made of clay, and] ornaments [made of gold, etc.], that are preceded by the same [material]. Therefore, we postulate [the following]: before [things] derive, there was a universal; thus the universal that existed before all these [derivatives] is pradhanā. Therefore pradhanā exists.

By this direction, [viz., the argument from the viewpoint of continuation (samanvaya),] the difference in function in the remaining [four] positive inferences, too, becomes a matter of course; still, a brief exposition is given [below].

We have emended the reading tad eva dhanaṇḍā to that eva varunādī on the basis of SK 13 and parallel passages. That and dhā are very similar to each other in our script. The manuscript could perhaps also be read as tad eva varunādī. The TSP (7.6–7) has dhanarvanāsādānādhibhavakṣaṇābhāva vama kṣaṇa kṣaṇam tamaṇaṁ tamaṇaṁ tamaṇaṁ maḥāādānacaryocayte. We note that the author of our text twice mentions the second item in the list of effects in the TSP (with regard to dhūkha/raya and maṅkha/tamas). This is probably because Kamalālāśa placed the item used in TSP 14 in the beginning of those dvandva compounds, while our author followed the traditional Śaṅkhyā list. The three effects are found in the parallel in the DDANC (pravāsādifosāsvarūpākāryakṣaṇam). See note 11.

The compound śakalakapālaṇātrabhāṣāksaṇādīnāṁ appears somewhat clumsy although the intention of the argument is more or less clear. The Mahābhārata (19.19–20) has asasm eva kṣaṇaṃ śakalakapālāṭarṇi[ś]cāsamastasamanvayeḥ bhāyaṇādī dhvātra tattvena darsayati. Also, the Jayamāṇgalā has samanvayeḥ—bheśāṃtīt svartatā samanvayaḥ ‘nuyamāḥ ekajataṇyagamīyatātmakāḥ prakāśapravṛttīyatamāno eva eva kṣaṇaṃ pravāsādīnāṁ tamaṇaḥ tamaṇaḥ tamaṇaḥ tamaṇaḥ maḥāādānacaryocayitāḥ. We keep the reading to be understood. The manuscript probably well-known among the Śaṅkhyas, and therefore there is no need to suspect the reading we have here is a corruption. We have emended the reading from the viewpoint of continuation (samanvaya)–ṣaṇāyatanūnaḥ kṣaṇāt kṣaṇāt kṣaṇāt kṣaṇāt to that eva varunādī. The TSP (7.6–7) has dhanarvanāsādānādhibhavakṣaṇābhāva vama kṣaṇa kṣaṇaṁ tamaṇaṁ tamaṇaṁ tamaṇaṁ maḥāādānacaryocayte. We note that the author of our text twice mentions the second item in the list of effects in the TSP (with regard to dhūkha/raya and maṅkha/tamas). This is probably because Kamalālāśa placed the item used in TSP 14 in the beginning of those dvandva compounds, while our author followed the traditional Śaṅkhyā list. The three effects are found in the parallel in the DDANC (pravāsādifosāsvarūpākāryakṣaṇam). See note 11.
Pradhāna exists since derivatives have a quantity. In this daily life we observe that when something has a creator, it has a quantity. For example, a potter produces a pot that has a certain quantity from a lump of clay of a certain quantity—a pot that holds the volume of prasthā or ādhāra. Also, we observe that the manifested (vyaktā), which are mahat, etc., has a quantity—one thinking faculty; one self-awareness; five subtle elements; eleven faculties; [and] five elements. Accordingly, we establish, based on an inference, that there is pradhāna that produces this manifested that has a quantity. If there was no pradhāna then this manifested [universe] would have no [limited] quantity.

Also pradhāna exists since derivatives have a quantity. [To paraphrase:] for, we observe that derivatives, which are either effects or instruments, have a quantity. When seen collectively, [the derivatives are] three, i.e., pleasure, pain and confusion. In accordance to the division in the effects and instruments, the derivatives are twenty-three: there are ten kinds of effects, i.e., the objects of sense and motor faculties. Instruments are thirteen: five sense faculties, five motor faculties; and three kinds of internal faculties: thinking faculty, self-awareness, and mind. In this or other ways, we observe

54 Now this commentary introduces the remaining four reasons mentioned in SK 15. This is contrary to the strategy taken by Kamalalāla. He, when commenting TS k. 14, introduces SK 15 in the outset. He interprets each reason, presumably copying the text from a commentary on the SK at his disposal. (The text of the TSP on TS k. 14 shares much with the commentaries on SK 15 except the Yuktidīpikā and the Tattvakoṇḍa, where we find parallel passages to the arguments not present in the TSP (at the same time lacking the arguments present in the TSP) also place the same reason sananvayāt first.

55 This paragraph constitutes yet another interpretation of the reason bhedānāṃ pramāṇāt. The first sentence, up to the example of rice, has a close parallel in the DDANCT. (See note 29.) A parallel discussion, albeit much longer, is found in the YD on SK 15a: yat prathaṃ tasya sāva utpattī dhīṣaḥ | (tadyathā mahākārya-pramāṇānāvadānādavakṣayopakṣāpyotpādakāryamānāh)| pramāṇāt ca mahadānāṃkārya-pramāṇānāvadānādavakṣayopakṣāpyotpādakāryamānāh. (See note 29.) This is contrary to the strategy taken by the early Sāṃkhya since the YD has only a remnant of this argument. This potential danger might have been realized by our author, when commenting TS k. 14, and he might have added the stanza itself and on to introduce the four other arguments of SK 15 without quoting it. This first paragraph on the reason paścitaḥ has close parallels with the TSP, Māyr, and GauBhā. Reconstructions in the edition in this paragraph are based on the parallels, particularly the TSP.

56 This paragraph moves on to the commentary on the phrase śaktitāḥ pravṛttēḥ of unsected SK 15. The first interpretation, just like the previous interpretation on bhedānāṃ pramāṇāt, starts with a parallel paragraph to the ones found in the TSP and SK commentaries such as the Māyr, GauBhā. See note 29.

57 This interpretation of the reason śaktitāḥ is probably an old one since almost the same text is found in parallel passages in the Māyr, GauBhā and the TSP. Despite that, the argument seems to contain several problems, including textual ones. One is that this example has a potential danger of annulling the argument, since the weaver may be seen analogous to the potter, rather than pradhāna. This argument was used to argue that puruṣa has śakti. Rather, in order to make the point that the potential/capability lies in the cause, it might have been more appropriate to state that the threads (tanūs) have the potential. It is in fact possible to emend the text to read yatā tadāvāyā patakarāne śaktiḥ with minor corrections. Nonetheless, since this part is extant in our fragment, and because of the parallel passages, we do not emend the text here. Other commentaries on the SK behind the parallel passages, we do not emend the text.
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26 Pradhāna, as indicated above, has close parallels with the TSP, Māyr, GauBhā, and the DDANCT. Despite that, the argument seems to contain several problems, including textual ones. One is that this example has a potential danger of annulling the argument, since the weaver may be seen analogous to the potter, rather than pradhāna. This argument was used to argue that puruṣa has śakti. Rather, in order to make the point that the potential/capability lies in the cause, it might have been more appropriate to state that the threads (tanūs) have the potential. It is in fact possible to emend the text to read yatā tadāvāyā patakarāne śaktiḥ with minor corrections. Nonetheless, since this part is extant in our fragment, and because of the parallel passages, we do not emend the text here. Other commentaries on the SK that do not share the exact reading also support the reading tanūraṇāḥ. In the Gaṇapādābhāsya, the example is not a weaver but a potter (yathā kuśalā gaṇaṣṭya karane samartho ghateno eva karotā na paṭam rathān vā), which is clearly intended that the one who has the potential/capability is a human creator. Another parallel in the Mādhavāyāti where again a potter is mentioned in a similar formulation as ours (tadyathā kuśalā kuśala-gaṇaṣṭya samartho ghateno eva karotā na paṭam rathān vā). There it is clearly intended that the one who has the potential/capability is a human creator. Another parallel in the Mādhavāyāti where again a potter is mentioned in a similar formulation as ours (tadyathā kuśalā kuśala-gaṇaṣṭya samartho ghateno eva karotā na paṭam rathān vā). There it is clearly intended that the one who has the potential/capability is a human creator. Another parallel in the Mādhavāyāti where again a potter is mentioned in a similar formulation as ours (tadyathā kuśalā kuśala-gaṇaṣṭya samartho ghateno eva karotā na paṭam rathān vā). There it is clearly intended that the one who has the potential/capability is a human creator.

58 This paragraph constitutes yet another interpretation of the reason bhedānāṃ pramāṇāt. The first sentence, up to the example of rice, has a close parallel in the DDANCT. (See note 29.) A parallel discussion, albeit much longer, is found in the YD on SK 15a: yat pramaṇaṃ tasya sāva utpatti dhīṣaḥ | (tadyathā mahākārya-pramāṇānāvadānādavakṣayopakṣāpyotpādakāryamānāh)| pramāṇāt ca mahadānāṃkārya-pramāṇānāvadānādavakṣayopakṣāpyotpādakāryamānāh. (See note 29.) This is contrary to the strategy taken by the early Sāṃkhya since the YD has only a remnant of this argument. This potential danger might have been realized by our author, when commenting TS k. 14, and he might have added the stanza itself and on to introduce the four other arguments of SK 15 without quoting it. This first paragraph on the reason paścitaḥ has close parallels with the TSP, Māyr, GauBhā. Reconstructions in the edition in this paragraph are based on the parallels, particularly the TSP.

59 This interpretation of the reason śaktitāḥ is probably an old one since almost the same text is found in parallel passages in the Māyr, GauBhā and the TSP. Despite that, the argument seems to contain several problems, including textual ones. One is that this example has a potential danger of annulling the argument, since the weaver may be seen analogous to the potter, rather than pradhāna. This argument was used to argue that puruṣa has śakti. Rather, in order to make the point that the potential/capability lies in the cause, it might have been more appropriate to state that the threads (tanūs) have the potential. It is in fact possible to emend the text to read yatā tadāvāyā patakarāne śaktiḥ with minor corrections. Nonetheless, since this part is extant in our fragment, and because of the parallel passages, we do not emend the text here. Other commentaries on the SK that do not share the exact reading also support the reading tanūraṇāḥ. In the Gaṇapādābhāsya, the example is not a weaver but a potter (yathā kuśalā gaṇaṣṭya karane samartho ghateno eva karotā na paṭam rathān vā), which is clearly intended that the one who has the potential/capability is a human creator. Another parallel in the Mādhavāyāti where again a potter is mentioned in a similar formulation as ours (tadyathā kuśalā kuśala-gaṇaṣṭya samartho ghateno eva karotā na paṭam rathān vā). There it is clearly intended that the one who has the potential/capability is a human creator. Another parallel in the Mādhavāyāti where again a potter is mentioned in a similar formulation as ours (tadyathā kuśalā kuśala-gaṇaṣṭya samartho ghateno eva karotā na paṭam rathān vā). There it is clearly intended that the one who has the potential/capability is a human creator. Another parallel in the Mādhavāyāti where again a potter is mentioned in a similar formulation as ours (tadyathā kuśalā kuśala-gaṇaṣṭya samartho ghateno eva karotā na paṭam rathān vā). There it is clearly intended that the one who has the potential/capability is a human creator. Another parallel in the Mādhavāyāti where again a potter is mentioned in a similar formulation as ours (tadyathā kuśalā kuśala-gaṇaṣṭya samartho ghateno eva karotā na paṭam rathān vā). There it is clearly intended that the one who has the potential/capability is a human creator. Another parallel in the Mādhavāyāti where again a potter is mentioned in a similar formulation as ours (tadyathā kuśalā kuśala-gaṇaṣṭya samartho ghateno eva karotā na paṭam rathān vā). There it is clearly intended that the one who has the potential/capability is a human creator. Another parallel in the Mādhavāyāti where again a potter is mentioned in a similar formulation as ours (tadyathā kuśalā kuśala-gaṇaṣṭya samartho ghateno eva karotā na paṭam rathān vā). There it is clearly intended that the one who has the potential/capability is a human creator.
establish that pradhāna has sakti with which [it] produces the manifested (vyakta). And this sakti is not without a locus. Therefore pradhāna exists in which sakti resides.

Furthermore, [pradhāna exists] since [events] take place according to capabilities. In our daily life [we observe that] the capability of effects and causes, whether or not being attended [by purusha], is consistent throughout three time periods—before an event, at the time of the event, and after the event. Prior to an event, the capability is established; for, it is reasonable that the capable [causes] take effect. [The sakti] is stable at the time of an event, too; i.e., it does not disappear when it has started to

in producing effects (cf. SK 17b).

As mentioned in note 61, this argument appears circular. Pradhāna has already been mentioned as the locus of sakti two sentences earlier (pradhānāyah saktir yagyā vyaktaṃ utpādayati); yet on the basis of that premise, it is argued that pradhāna exists in this sentence. We might again suspect a textual problem in the transmission of an early commentary on the SK. The sentence abhāḥ sādhārayāḥ pradhānāyaḥ saktir yagyā vyaktaṃ utpādayati contains two difficulties. One is the use of the word pradhāna already in that sentence; and the other is the verb utpādayati—the subject is not clear. Even though the most of the sentence is conjectured on the basis of parallel passages in the TSP and Mārv, we do not attempt to emend the text. Again, it appears that the reading in the old commentary on the SK on which many commentaries were based was very close to what is found in the TSP. We doubt that the author of our text had access to a commentary on the SK that had a better reading.

But as mentioned in note 62, this argument is refined compared to the preceding interpretation, probably the original interpretation of the reason sāktaḥ sātvattvyāḥ. The terms adhīṣṭhita and anadhīṣṭhita alludes to the argument for purusa, adhīṣṭhānat, in SK 17. A close parallel discussion is found in the DDANCT. (see note 63). Also, somewhat similar discussions in wording to the discussion here are found in the NBbh (563,9 ff.): saktiśabdena cāvyakārtāryāṃvasthitām kāryam evocaye| tasya vyaktahābhāvatītya| pravṛttir trāg apy asiti saktik, labdhaṁ ṛṇakāmyāḥ pravṛttidurśaṁ| pravṛttikāle ‘py asiti, tirolbhāvardārśaṁ| tad adhīṣṭhav asyāt, puruṣaḥ pravṛttidurśaṁ| tad evan yahāḥ saktēḥ sarvāḥ vyaktaṃ pravṛttate, sūḥ saktēḥ sadāvadhūyanti pravṛttāṅgām asyaḥ| kārya pravṛttē caḥ| sahābhūtāsvātipivākāḥ ghaiṭavināṃ pravṛttē dyā|māhāsvātipivrūkṣām| esām avayavāyāhyātmakānyāḥ pravṛttē drīḍyāt| tataḥ ca pravṛttē janoṭayāḥ saktēḥ bhavastanām| yāsau saktēḥ savyayoḥbhāvavāṃś āpadyaḥ ti sāmānyadūtrāyaṁ. Note the use of avyayavāyāhyātmakaṁ (a variant api bāhvyāyāhyātmakaṁ is recorded) in the JāMa.

As noted in the introduction, our text could be seen as a commentary on SK 15, which in its commentarial tradition was held to present five reasons (hetu) to argue that the word apavarga, which is a technical term among the Śūnyākṣaras to mean liberation (mokṣa). Coupled with the use of the term ādīṣṭhānādihīṣṭhita, the discussion appears to have something to do with the doctrine of purusa.

We emend kārpaṇātivṛttikāle to kārpaṇākāle. This is where the third phase should be discussed. Not only is the compound kārpaṇātivṛttikāle is rare (if ever used), it also means essentially the same thing as pravṛttikāle. If that were the case, the author would mention this phase two times. That is unlikely. Possible cause for the corruption is the same śākta in the previous sentence. Other possible, but less likely, emendations kārpaṇātivṛttē kāle, kārpaṇātivṛttē utharākale, etc.

We are not certain if this understanding is correct. It would seem appropriate—if one wishes to argue for the presence of sakti in all three phases with regard to an effect (before, during and after)—to argue that an effect in turn becomes the cause for the next event since the cause for the previous event, too, was a manifest (vyakta) in the first place. Again, a similar sentence in the similar context in the NBbh, tādārthavām apy asiti, puruṣaprayṛttīdūrśaṁ, is clearer.

The reconstruction of this sentence is mainly based on the similar sentence in the JāMa, yāsau saktēḥ savvāt(?) vyaktabhāvām āpadyaḥ ti sāmānyadūtrāyaṁ. Note that most of the sentence is partly visible in the small fragment of the folio photographed with the recto side.

Observations

The most obvious significance of the fragment of the text we have reported on here is that there was a commentary on the TS apart from the TSP. This is a testimony to the importance of the TS. Apart from that, there are a few more points one can make concerning the short text.

As noted in the introduction, our text could be seen as a commentary on SK 15, which in its commentarial tradition was held to present five reasons (hetu) to argue that...
We do not find close parallels to the remaining alternative interpretations (apart from what appear to be remnants) in commentaries on the SK, but parallels are found in the NBhū and in the DDANCT. Interestingly, the parallels in the NBhū and the DDANCT start the Śaṃkhya argument for the existence of pradhāna with the reason (sam) anavajñā. Also, they only offer interpretations of five hetu of SK 15 that are not found in the TSP or in commentaries on the SK. In this connection, it should also be noted that the TS in the first place refers to that reason (see page 13). Based on these observations, we may postulate the existence of a commentarial tradition on the SK which is separate from the one to which the Mātharavṛtti, etc., belong. That commentarial tradition probably considered the reason saṃvāyata in SK 15 as the main reason and the rest subsidiary, and offered different explanations for them. Although it is conceivable that there was a commentary on the SK that combined two strands of commentarial traditions, offering both the traditional (as in the Mātharavṛtti, etc.) as well as the other (as reflected in the NBhū and the DDANCT) explanations, and that our text borrowed from this postulated commentary, it seems to us more plausible that the author of our text combined two different traditions—having first borrowed the interpretation from the TSP and then from another commentary on the SK. This scenario may be supported by the fact that among the similar interpretations of SK 15 in the TSP and commentaries on the SK, the TSP nonetheless offers the closest parallel to our text when it gives the first explanation of each hetu.

Text and Abbreviations


GauBhū The Gaṇḍapādabhāṣya, a commentary on the SK, ascribed to Gauḍapāda. See Wilson 1887.

Jama The Jayamaṇgalā, a commentary on the SK, ascribed to Śaṅkarabhagavatpāda. See Sārma & Vaṅgiya 1970.

MāVṛ The Mātharavṛtti, a commentary on the SK. See Śaṅkarabhagavatpāda. See Sārma & Vaṅgiya 1970.
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