

Globethics Repository

The logo for Globethics, featuring the word "Globethics" in white, sans-serif font centered within a solid blue rectangular background.

God, The Soul And The Creatrix

This page was generated automatically upon download from the Globethics Repository. More information on Globethics see <https://www.globethics.net>. Data and content policy of Globethics Repository see <https://repository.globethics.net/pages/policy>.

Item Type	Article
Authors	Bossche, Frank Van Den
Publisher	University of London
Rights	Creative Commons Copyright (CC 2.5)
Download date	2026-07-02 20:07:02
Link to Item	http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12424/198125

GOD, THE SOUL AND THE CREATRIX
HARIBHADRA SŪRI ON NYĀYA AND SĀMĀKHYA

Frank Van Den Bossche

Unlike his *Ṣaḍḍarśanasamuccaya* (*ṢDS*) Haribhadra Sūri's¹ *Ṣāstravārtāsamuccaya* (*ṢVS*)² is not a compendium of philosophical systems (*darśana*) but a comprehensive account (*samuccaya*) of doctrinal (*śāstra*) expositions (*vār[ti]tā*) or simply doctrines (*vāda*). The *ṢVS* is subdivided into *stabakas*, chapters or sections: (1) *bhautika-vāda*, on the materialism of Cārvāka or Lokāyata; (2) *kāla-vāda*, *svabhāva-vāda*, *niyati-vāda* and *karma-vāda*, on the doctrines about the leading principle in the world: time, essence, faith or *karma*; (3) *īśvara-vāda*, on the doctrine of God of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika and *prakṛti-puruṣa-vāda*, on the doctrine of the Soul and Primal Nature of the Sāṃkhya or, as I will translate it, the 'Creatrix'; (4) *kṣaṇika-vāda*, on the doctrine of momentariness of the Sautrāntika Buddhists; (5) *viññānādvaita-vāda*, on the doctrine of consciousness-only (*viññāna-mātra*) of the Yogācāra Buddhists; (6) *sūnya-vāda*, on the doctrine of emptiness of the Mādhyamika Buddhists; (7) *nityānityatva-vāda*, on the doctrine of eternity-and-noneternity of the Jainas; (8) *brahmādvaita-vāda*, on the doctrine of the non-duality of Brahman of the Advaita Vedānta; (9) *mokṣa-vāda*, a discussion about the possibility or impossibility of Liberation; (10) *sarvajñatā-pratiṣedha-vāda*, on the doctrine of the negation of the possibility of omniscience of the Mīmāṃsā and an unidentified Buddhist sect (*bauddha ekadeśī mata*); and (11) *śabdārtha-saṃbandha-pratiṣedha-vāda*, on the doctrine of the negation of the word-meaning relation of the Sautrāntika Buddhists. Below I will present a translation and analysis of section 3 of the *ṢVS*, viz. the section on *īśvara-vāda* and *prakṛti-puruṣa-vāda*: Haribhadra Sūri's Sanskrit *ślokas* together with

¹ This Haribhadra, eight century, is the one called 'Yākinī-putra,' <spiritual> son of <the nun> Yākinī. This is clear from the colophon: *ācārya-haribhadreṇa śāstra-vārtā-samuccayam* in verse 699, and the use of the identity markers *kṛtvā prakaraṇam*, *yad avāptam*, *kuśalam*, and *viraha* in verse 700 (Williams 1965: 103).

² Dixit 2002. Dixit's Hindi translation is not literatim. It is in fact a paraphrase. I will refer to it as P. To some verses Dixit adds a comment (Ṭippaṇī). I will refer to it as Ṭ. The translation of some of the Hindi parts was checked by Prof. Dr. Vooshmalla Krishna of the University of Hyderabad.

Dixit's Hindi paraphrase and commentary.³ For the analysis I will focus on those aspects of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika and Sāṃkhya doctrines that are relevant for Haribhadra Sūri's presentation and criticism. As a Jaina Haribhadra Sūri is a non-theist and non-creationist.⁴ As such he criticizes the *īśvara* concept of the Nyāya system.⁵

³ This article is the first of a series wherein each *stabaka* of the ŚVS will be translated and commented upon, that is, Haribhadra's *ślokas* together with Dixit's Hindi paraphrase and commentary. It is important to note that Haribhadra Sūri treats the philosophical doctrines separately. He does not link the sections mutually. This gave me the opportunity to study the sections in an order I could choose. I started with the the most basic and universal philosophical question: How did the universe (*loka*, *jagat*) arise? Was it created? and, Who or what did eventually create it? To illustrate the primal nature of these questions I refer to the famous hymn 10.129 of the Ṛgveda as rendered by Macdonell n.d.: 19: "(...) 6. Who knows for certain? Who shall here declare it? Whence was it born, and whence came this creation? The gods were born after this world's creation: Then who can know from whence it has arisen? 7. None knoweth whence creation has arisen; And whether he has or has not produced it: He who surveys it in the highest heaven, He only knows, or haply he may know not." Haribhadra deals with the question of creation in *stabaka* 3, combining the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika and Sāṃkhya views in the same section.

⁴ As it is formulated by Hemacandra in his Yogaśāstra 5.105-6: *lokaḥ (...) niṣpādito na kenāpi na dhṛtaḥ kenacic ca saḥ; svayaṃ siddho nirādhāro gagane kiṃ tv avasthitaḥ* (Gopani & Bothara 1989: 122): "This world is created by no one and supported by no one. It is self-established, without base and contained in space."

⁵ The concept of *īśvara* as 'creator' or 'agent' (*karṭṛ*) appeared in India somewhere around the beginning of our era. The question of the origin of the world is of course older. We note the famous *nāsadīya-sūkta* of the Ṛgveda 10.129 and the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad 1.1 where as possible causes are considered: Time (*kāla*), Nature (*svabhāva*), Destiny (*niyati*), Fortuity (*yādṛcchā*), Primal Elements (*bhūtāni*) and Paramount Soul or (Puruṣa). The Mahābhārata mentions Karma, Fate (*daiva*) and Nature (*svabhāva*) as possible causes (Jacobi 1923: 38-39). The term *īśvara* for the supreme Puruṣa or Soul was first used in the Atharvaveda (Jackson 1986: 317). Maybe the first systematic refutation of the belief in a *īśvara* as the creator, ruler and destroyer of the world is found in the *Twelve Gate Treatise* of Nāgārjuna (c.150-c.250, Cheng 1976: 208). There is another small treatise ascribed to Nāgārjuna (though Jacobi (1923: 39) is skeptical about this), the *Īśvara-karṭṛtva-nirākṛtir Viṣṇor eka-karṭṛtva-nirākaraṇam* or 'Refutation of God as agent: Refutation of Viṣṇu as the Sole Agent' which exists in Sanskrit and Tibetan (Thomas 1903: 345-49). *Īśvara* is called a *karṭā* here, but it is not clear of what he is an agent or a creator. The text simply states: *yaḥ karoti sa karttā. yaḥ kriyāṃ karoti sa kartṭṛ-saṃjñō bhavati* or "Who acts is an actor. Who produces an action (der eine Handlung ausübt, Jacobi 1923: 39) is considered to be an actor." The idea that God is an agent or creator is specific for the Nyāya, Vaiśeṣika and Vedānta systems. Later Sāṃkhya and also Yoga became theistic but in these systems *īśvara* is not considered as the efficient or material cause of the world. In Pātañjala Yoga God is simply a kind of individual Soul (*puruṣa*). His role is purely practical. By abstract contemplation of God (*īśvara-praṇidhāna*, Yogasūtra 1.23, YS 2.1, YS 2.32 and YS 2.45 as found in Prasāda 2000: 40, 88, 159, and 168) who is untouched by afflictions, actions and fruition (YS 1.24, Prasāda 2000: 40), omniscient and unrestricted by time, the *yogin* reaches the state of *samādhi* or ecstasy, the eighth and last stage of yoga practice. In Vaiśeṣika the 'arrival' of God as the creator of the world through 'unseen' powers (*adṛṣṭa*) is rather late, at the latest with Praśastapāda (5th or 6th c. AD). See Bronkhorst 1996a: 281 and Potter 1977: 282ff.

ईश्वरवादखंडन

īśvara-vāda-khaṇḍana

ईश्वरः प्रेरकत्वेन कर्ता कैश्चिदिहेष्यते।

अचिन्त्यचिच्छक्तियुक्तोऽनादिशुद्धश्च सूरिभिः ॥ १९४ ॥

194. *īśvaraḥ prerakatvena kartā kaiścid iheṣyate;*
acintya-cic-chakti-yukto 'nādi-śuddhaś ca sūribhiḥ.

Some scholars here accept that God is a creator because He has the nature to incite <all activity of living beings> and <they accept> that He has an inconceivable power of intelligence and is pure without beginning.

P. Some scholars admit that God is an agent in the form of an inciter of all activity of living beings⁶ and that this God possesses inconceivable power of intelligence and that He is pure without beginning.

Ṭ. The intention to say about God that He 'possesses an inconceivable power of intelligence' is the following. It is a supernatural divine frolic to know all things in the world even without the aid of a body, senses, etc.⁷

The word *preraka* is found in the Nyāyasūtrabhāṣya 2:1:29 and 3:2:28, but not in the *īśvara* context.⁸ Guṇaratna Sūri uses *preraka* in the *īśvara* context in the *maṅgala* of his Tarkarahasyadīpikā (1412), that is, his commentary on Haribhadra Sūri's ṢḌS: "Theists think that everything is caused by the Lord of the world. God possesses the fourfold innate <capacities> of knowledge, desirelessness, virtue and masterfulness, and He is the inciter of heaven and hell for <all> living beings."⁹ In Nyāya the subject of *īśvara* is

⁶ P 56.5 प्राणियों के समूचे क्रियाकलाप का प्रेरक रूप से.

⁷ चित् = चैतन्य. Ṭ 56.6 शरीर, इन्द्रिय आदि की सहायता के बिना भी जगत् की सब वस्तुओं को जान लेना एक अद्भुत ईश्वरीय लीला है.

⁸ NSBh 2.1.29 and 3.2.28 (Śhastrī & Śukla 1942: 64 and 159).

⁹ *īśvara-vādinaś (...)* sarvaṃ jagad-īśvara-kṛtaṃ manyante. *īśvaraṃ ca saha-siddha-jñāna-vairāgya-dharma-aiśvarya-rūpa-catuṣṭayaṃ prāṇināṃ ca svarga-apavargayoḥ prerakam iti* (Jaina 2000: 17).

discussed under the head of the possible objects of knowledge (*prameya*). Early Nyāya does not consider God to be the creator of the world. Here God is only the agency (*kāritatva*) of human action (*puruṣa-karma*).¹⁰ The Nyāyabhāṣya of Vātsyāyana (or Pakṣilasvāmin, 425-500 A.D.) elaborates on this point but adds that God not only 'sets in motion' (*pravartayati*) the collections of *dharma* and *adharma* in each Soul but also the earth (*pṛthivī*), etc., The word *karṭṛ* or *kartā*, however, is not used in this context.¹¹ The Nyāyavārttika of Uddyotakara (first half of the 7th century) teaches that God 'supports' (*anugṛhṇāti*) human action which means that He unyokes the result of an action at the time of the working-out, and that He is the efficient cause of the world (*nimitta-kāraṇa*) of which earth, etc., is the material cause (*upādāna*).¹² The Nyāyavārttikatātparyāṭikā of

¹⁰ NS 4.1.19-21 (Jacobi 1923: 113ff.): *athā'para āha*: NS 4.1.19: *īśvaraḥ kāraṇam puruṣa-karmāphalya-darśanāt*. NS 4.1.20: *na, puruṣa-karmābhāve phalāniṣpatteḥ*. NS 4.1.21 *tat-kāritatvād ahetuḥ*: "Next, another <author> says: 'God is the cause because it is seen that human action <can be> without result.' <There is an objection: This is> not <true> since without human action no result is brought about. This is not an argument since <God has brought about> this <human action>."

¹¹ Nyāyabhāṣya (Jacobi 1923: 113ff.): *puruṣo 'yaṃ samīhamāno nā'vaśyaṃ samīhā-phalam prāpnoti tenā'numīyate: parādḥinām puruṣasya karma-phalārādhanam iti; yad-adhīnam, sa īśvaraḥ; tasmād īśvaraḥ kāraṇam iti. īśvarādḥinā cet phala-niṣpattiḥ syād, api tarhi puruṣasya samīhām antareṇa phalam niṣpadyete'pi. puruṣa-kāram īśvaro 'nugṛhṇāti (...)* *viśiṣṭam ātmāntaram īśvaraḥ. tasya ca dharmasamādhi-phalam aṇimādy-aṣṭa-vidham aiśvarya (...)* *pratyātma-vṛttin dharmādharma-saṃcayān pṛthivy-ādīni ca pravartayati (...)* *āpta-kalpaś cā'yam*: "The endeavoring man does not necessarily obtains the result of <his> endeavor. Therefore <we> conclude that the gratification of the result of <his> actions depends on someone else. From whom it depends is God. Therefore God is the cause. <Objection> If the occurrence of the result depends on God then the result would also be brought about without the endeavor of man. God supports human action. (...) God is a special other <kind of> Soul (...) As a result of <His> justice and enstacy He possesses lordship which is of eight kinds, the power of becoming as minute as an atom, etc., (...) He creates the collections of *dharma* and *adharma* occurring in each Soul and the earth, etc., (...) And He is someone who has done his duty (*āpta-kalpa*: 'einer, der gewissermaßen Alles erreicht hat,' Jacobi 1923: 76)."

¹² Nyāyavārttika (Jacobi 1923: 113ff.): *īśvaro brahma īśanā-yogāt. cetanā-śaktiḥ kriyā-śaktiś ce'sanā. sā cā'sti brahmaṇī'ti brahme'śvaraḥ kāraṇam jagataḥ. (...)* *paramāṇūpādānasya jagataḥ puruṣa-karmāpekṣa īśvaro nimitta-kāraṇam, yac ca tenā'pekṣaṇīyaṃ puruṣa-karma, tad apī'svara-nimittakam eva. (...)* *prayojanaṃ vinā na prekṣāvātāṃ pravṛttiḥ; na ca prāpta-sakala-prāptavyasyā'sti prāpaṇīyaṃ kiṃcid īśvarasya. tasmāt kṛtam asya jagan-nirmāṇene'ty ata āha: āptakalpasye'ti*: "If man would be independent<ly> capable of enjoying the fruits of <his> actions, then no one's action would be fruitless, nor would any one feel sorrow. But both are observed <to exist>. Therefore God is the cause (...) <Objection> If God, who depends on the actions <of man>, would be the cause of the production of the world, then God cannot be God *vis-à-vis* action. (...) We do not say that God is the cause irrespective of <human> action, etc., but that God supports human action. What does 'supporting' mean? He unyokes <the result of an action> for someone <only> at the time of the working-out (...) <NS 4.1.21> '(...) since <God> has brought about this <human action>.' Speaking thus it agrees that God is the efficient cause. If God is the

Vācaspatimiśra, however, does not explicitly mention God as the supporter of human action, but stresses the point that God is the efficient cause of the world.¹³ From this follows that Nyāya entertained two, arguably consecutive, ideas about the agency (*karṭṛtva*) of God: (1) as an inciter of human activity and/or its results (*karma*), and (2) as the cause (*kāraṇa*) of the world and hence its creator. Haribhadra Sūri criticizes both conceptions of God independently and separately in two of his works, the Śāstravārtāsamuccaya and the Śaḍdarśanasamuccaya. First the ŚDS. Verse 13, on Nyāya philosophy, reads: "In the thought of Akṣapāda Śiva is the God who accomplishes the <periodic> creation and destruction, omnipresent, eternal, pre-eminent, omniscient, and seat of eternal Intellect."¹⁴ Here God is causing (*kr̥t*) the creation and destruction of the world. God is not described as an agent (*karṭṛ/kartā*) of the working-out of *karma* nor the controller of *dharma* and *adharma*. This contrasts with the definition of God as a *kartā* given in the ŚVS verse 194 (see below). There is no mention here of God as the creator of the world. In the Laghuvṛtti of Maṇibhadra (date unknown) on the ŚDS the concept of God as an agent in the context of *karma* is treated, but only marginally so: "And the Lord (...) being omniscient (...) without anyone's wish bestows the enjoyment of happiness and sorrow for all living beings in heaven or hell by inference from the self-acquired merit or demerit. And accordingly it is said that 'This ignorant <mortal> creature having no power over his own joy or sorrow goes to heaven or to hell, driven by God'.¹⁵

efficient cause of the world, what is said to be directly the material cause of the world? Earth, etc., the extremely subtle substance called atoms."

¹³ *nirapekṣaś cet puruṣaḥ karma-phala-bhoge samarthaḥ syāt, na kasyacid aphaḷā kriyā bhavet, na kaścid duḥkhaṃ kuryād iti. ubhayaṃ ca dr̥ṣṭam; tasmād īśvaraḥ kāraṇam iti. (...) evaṃ karma-sāpekṣaś ced īśvaro jagad-utpatti-kāraṇaṃ syāt, karmaṇī'śvaro ne'śvaraḥ syāt. (...) na brūmaḥ: karmādy-anapekṣa īśvaraḥ kāraṇam iti, api tu: puruṣa-karma īśvaro 'nugr̥hṇāti. ko 'nugrahārthaḥ? yad yathā bhūtaṃ yasya yadā vipāka-kālaḥ, tat tathā tadā viniyunkta iti. (...) "tat-kāritatvād" evaṃ bruvatā "nimitta-kāraṇam īśvara" iti upagatam bhavati. (...) īśvaraś cej jagato nimittam, jagataḥ sāksād upādāna-kāraṇaṃ kim uktam? pṛthivyādi parama-sūkṣmam paramāṇu-saṃjñitaṃ dravyam iti (Nyāyavārttika, Jacobi 1923: 76): "The Lord (or God, īśvara) is Brahman because He possesses 'lordship' (īśanā). The power to think and the power to act is 'lordship.' And because this is present in Brahman, Brahma-Īśvara is the cause of the world. (...) God, who is conditioned by human action, is the efficient cause of the world whereof atoms are the material cause. (...) <Objection> (...) without motive there is no activity of deliberate beings. For God, who has reached everything there is to be reached, there is nothing left to be reached. Therefore no need for Him to create the world. Accordingly <the author of the Bhāṣya> says: 'He is one who has done his duty.' (...)."*

¹⁴ *ākṣapāda-mate devaḥ sṛṣṭi-saṃhāra-kṛc chivaḥ; vibhur nityaika-sarvajñō nitya-buddhi-samāśrayaḥ (Damodara 1929: 11).*

ज्ञानमप्रतिघं यस्य वैराग्यं च जगत्पतेः ।

ऐश्वर्यं चैव धर्मश्च सहसिद्धं चतुष्टयम् ॥ १९५ ॥

195. *jñānam apratighaṃ yasya vairāgyaṃ ca jagat-pateḥ;*
aiśvaryaṃ caiva dharmas ca saha-siddham catuṣṭayam.

He is the Lord of the universe whose four <capacities of> knowledge, desirelessness, masterfulness and virtue are unimpeded <and> naturally acquired.

P. With reference to this God it is said that the knowledge of this Universal Lord, His renunciation, His glory and His justice are <all> four unimpeded¹⁶- meaning all-powerful - and naturally acquired.¹⁷

Ṭ. This description of God is made in the terminology¹⁸ of the Sāṃkhya system though the endorsement of theism is not found in Sāṃkhya works themselves. But the acknowledgement of the existence of God is found in the Yogasūtra and its Bhāṣya that <both> assume the ideas of the Sāṃkhya on other doctrinal questions on existence.¹⁹ In the Yogasūtra and Bhāṣya the existence of God is accepted and He is considered to be a kind of Soul or Self.²⁰ According to the Sāṃkhya system the knowledge (*jñāna*), renunciation (*vairāgya*), glory (*aiśvarya*) and justice (*dharma*) that are found in a common man are the result of the proper works²¹ of this man, and are more or less potent.²² According to the

¹⁵ *bhagavān (...)* sarva-jñāś ca san (...) *sakala-prāṇinām (...)* svārjita-puṇya-pāpānumānena ca svarganarakayoḥ sukha-duḥkhopabhogaṃ dadānaḥ keṣāṃ nābhimataḥ, tathā cōktam: īśvara-prerito gacchet svargaṃ vā śvabhram eva vā; anyo jantur anīśo 'yam ātmanaḥ sukha-duḥkhalayoḥ (Damodara 1929: 13). This is verbatim verse 197 of the ŚVS (see below).

¹⁶ P 56.14 अप्रतिघं = अप्रतिहत = सर्व-समर्थ.

¹⁷ P 56.15 सहसिद्धं = सहजसिद्ध.

¹⁸ Ṭ 56.16 शब्दावली.

¹⁹ Ṭ 56.18 सत्ता-शास्त्रीय प्रश्नों पर.

²⁰ Ṭ 56.19 पुरुषविशेष = आत्माविशेष.

²¹ Ṭ 56.22 कृतित्व.

Yogasūtrabhāṣya the knowledge, renunciation, glory and justice found in God are naturally acquired and omnipotent.²³ The meanings of the words 'knowledge' and 'renunciation' are clear. The meaning of the word 'glory' <consists of> the eight superhuman powers of minuteness, lightness, greatness, heaviness, etc.²⁴ that in the Yoga books are described as the supernatural powers <of God>.²⁵ The meaning of the word 'justice' <consists of> some specific good qualities of character.²⁶ Verse 195 is also found twice verbatim in Guṇaratna's Tarkarahasyadīpikā (c. 1412).²⁷ Here the four qualities ascribed to God are reminiscent of the Yoga definition of an illuminated mind (*rājasika citta*). The Yogasūtrabhāṣya states: "The same <essence of mind> shining forth everywhere, the veil of delusion vanished, associated with *rajas* only obtains virtue, knowledge, desirelessness and masterfulness."²⁸ The same qualities are also found in the Sāṃkhya system in the form of the four positive *sāttvika bhāvas* or 'fundamental strivings in the innermost core of human's nature': the predisposition toward meritorious behavior (*dharma*), towards knowledge (*jñāna*), towards non-attachment (*vairāgya*), and towards power (*aiśvarya*).²⁹

²² † 56.22 न्यूनाधिक, more or less, सामर्थ्यसम्पन्न rich in power.

²³ † 56.24 सर्वसामर्त्यसंपन्न.

²⁴ † 57.1,2 विभूति (= सिद्धि): अणिमा, लघिमा, महिमा, गरिमा आदि. The standard list is: *aṇiman*, the power of becoming as minute as an atom; *laghiman*, extreme lightness; *mahiman*, illimitable bulk; *prāpti*, attaining or reaching anything (e.g. the moon with the tip of the finger); *prākāmya*, irresistible will; *īśitā*, supreme dominion; *vaśitā*, subjugating by magic; and *kāmāvasāyitā*, the suppressing all desires. † adds गरिमा, Skt. *gariman*, heaviness (making Himself heavy at will).

²⁵ † 57.2 अलौकिक क्षमताएँ

²⁶ † 57.3 चरित्रगत कतिपय सद्गुणविशेष.

²⁷ Jaina 2000: 18 and 82.

²⁸ *tad eva <citta-sattvam> prakṣiṇa-mohāvaraṇaṃ sarvataḥ pradyotamānam anuviddhaṃ rajo-mātrayā dharma-jñāna-vairāgyaiśvaryaṃ bhavati* (Prasāda 2000: 5).

²⁹ See Īśvarakṛṣṇa's Sāṃkhyakārikā XXII & LXII, Larson (1998: 192) and Larson & Bhattacharya (1987: 53).

अज्ञो जन्तुरनीशोऽयमात्मनः सुखदुःखयोः।

ईश्वरप्रेरितो गच्छेत्स्वर्गं वा श्वभ्रमेव वा ॥ १९६ ॥

196. *ajño jantur anīso 'yam ātmanaḥ sukha-duḥkhayoḥ;*
īśvara-prerito gacchet svargaṃ vā śvabhram eva vā.

This ignorant <mortal> creature having no power over his own joy or sorrow goes to heaven or to hell, driven by God.³⁰

P. It is also said that the ignorant Soul is not the master of his own happiness and sorrow,³¹ but that he goes to heaven or to hell through the inducement of God.³²

This verse is almost verbatim verses 03,031.027a and 03,031.027c of the *Āraṇyakaparvan* of the *Mahābhārata*,³³ *Mātharācārya's* commentary on the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* verse 61,³⁴ and *Madhusūdana's* commentary on verse 5.15 of the *Bhagavadgītā*.³⁵ The same verse is found verbatim in *Vācaspatimiśra's* *Nyāyavārttikatātparyaṭīkā* with reference to the *Smṛti* literature³⁶ and also in *Udayana's* *Nyāyakusumāñjali*.³⁷

³⁰ Translated as "Blind and powerless with regard to his weal, man goes to heaven or hell as the Lord impels him" by Radhakrishnan 1929: 341, and "Unwissend ist die Kreatur, unfrei durch Leiden und Freuden; vom Herrn geführt kommt sie zum Himmel, der Herr treibt sie zur Hölle" by Schrader 1902: 61.

³¹ P 57.6 यह अज्ञानी जीव अपने सुख-दुःख का स्वामी स्वयं नहीं.

³² P 57.7 ईश्वर की प्रेरणा से.

³³ *ajño jantur anīso 'yam ātmanaḥ sukha-duḥkhayoḥ; īśvara-prerito gacchet svargaṃ narakam eva ca* (Sukthankar 1942: 97).

³⁴ Id., Sarma 1922: 75.

³⁵ Id., Paṇśīkar 1936: 127.

³⁶ Id., Dravid 1925: 604-605.

³⁷ See *Nyāyakusumāñjali* 5.22, ed. Viraraghavacharya 1941: 54.

अन्ये त्वभिदधत्यत्र वीतरागस्य भावतः।

इत्थं प्रयोजनाभावात्कर्तृत्वं युज्यते कथम् ॥ १९७ ॥

197. *anye tv abhidadhaty atra vīta-rāgasya bhāvataḥ;*
itthaṃ prayojanābhāvāt kartrtvam yujyate katham.

In this case however other <scholars> ask how it can possibly correct in that manner that He is an agent. For, He has no motive since He is without passion.

P. Against this some other scholars³⁸ object that when it is not established that God - who is Himself without passion - has a motive in the form mentioned, viz. the bestowal of inducement,³⁹ how far is it rational to consider Him as the real creator of the activity of living beings?

नारकादिफले कांश्चित् कांश्चित् स्वर्गादिसाधने।

कर्मणि प्रेरयत्याशु स जन्तून् केन हेतुना? ॥ १९८ ॥

198. *nārakādi-phale kāmścīt kāmścīt svargādi-sādhane;*
karmaṇi prerayaty āśu sa jantūn kena hetunā?

Some creatures He moves promptly into action resulting in hell, etc., some He moves promptly into action leading to heaven, etc. <But> for what reason?

P. The question rises why God drives some living beings to such actions⁴⁰ that result in the acquisition of heaven and some to such actions that result in the acquisition of hell.

स्वयमेव प्रवर्तन्ते सत्त्वाश्चेत् चित्रकर्मणि।

निरर्थकमिहेशस्य कर्तृत्वं गीयते कथम्? ॥ १९९ ॥

³⁸ P 57.10 किन्हीं दूसरे वादियों.

³⁹ P 57.11 प्रेरणा-प्रदान से.

⁴⁰ कर्मणि प्रेरयति = P 57.15 काम करने की प्रेरणा देता है.

199. *svayam eva pravartante sattvās cet citra-karmaṇi;*
nirarthakam iheśasya katṛtvaṃ gīyate katham?

And if <all> beings act on their own account alone in a variety of actions, why proclaiming that the Lord is the creator here. For, this makes no sense.

P. If one argues that in <this> world living beings are engaged in different sorts of actions⁴¹ on their own accord⁴² the question rises why then this pointless pronouncement⁴³ that God is the creator of the activity of living beings?

फलं ददाति चेत् सर्वं तत् तेनेह प्रचोदितम्।

अफले पूर्वदोषः स्यात् सफले भक्तिमात्रता ॥ २०० ॥

200. *phalaṃ dadāti cet sarvaṃ tat teneha pracoditam;*
aphale pūrva-doṣaḥ syāt saphale bhakti-mātratā.

If He gives all results <of all actions> here, directed by Him, then, if <these actions> are ineffective <in producing their result on their own account> the previous flaw remains. If <they are> perchance effective <in producing their result on their own account, God is a matter of> faith only.

P. One can say that all actions of living beings are established as giving their respective results by the inducement of God. But our answer to this is, that if actions are ineffective⁴⁴ in producing their result on their own account,⁴⁵ our previous objection remains in position, viz. why does God induce <living beings> in the direction of actions that lead some living beings to heaven and some living beings in the direction of actions

⁴¹ P 57.20 अनेकानेक प्रकार की क्रियाओं में.

⁴² P 57.21 स्वेच्छा से, by their own will.

⁴³ P 57.21 बेकार ही यहू गीत.

⁴⁴ अफल = P 58.1 असमर्थ.

⁴⁵ P 58.1 स्वतः फल देने में.

that lead to hell. And if they are effective in producing the effect on their own account, the postulation⁴⁶ of God is a matter of faith alone. For, then it is established that He has no motive.

आदिसर्गेऽपि नो हेतुः कृतकृत्यस्य विद्यते।

प्रतिज्ञातविरोधित्वात् स्वभावोऽप्यप्रमाणकः ॥ २०१ ॥

201. *ādi-sarge 'pi no hetuḥ kṛta-kṛtyasya vidyate;*
pratijñāta-virodhitvāt svabhāvo 'py apramāṇakaḥ.

Someone who has already done all that has to be done, has no reason for a primal creation also. For, that would be contradictory with the <basic> postulate <that He has already accomplished everything>.⁴⁷ Also <to argue that all this> is God's essence is unwarranted.

P. Next, if the theist⁴⁸ postulates that God is a *kṛta-kṛtya*, a Soul that has accomplished all that has to be accomplished or, in other words, a Soul with no activity left,⁴⁹ there is no reason possible for Him to start a creation. For, if the theist accepts such a cause a conflict will arise with his basic postulate,⁵⁰ viz. with his postulate that God is a Soul that is *kṛta-kṛtya*. Moreover, to say that all this is decisively the essence of God is an unwarranted matter, that is, the existence of God is not validly established.⁵¹

⁴⁶ P 58.5 कल्पना.

⁴⁷ *kṛta-kṛtya*: "Parvient à ses fins krtakṛtya signifie littér. qui a fait ce qu'il devait faire, c'est-à-dire qui voit tous ses désirs accomplis" (Strehly 1893: 93 note).

⁴⁸ P 58.10 ईश्वरवादी.

⁴⁹ P 58.8 एक ऐसी आत्मा जिसे कोई काम करना शेष नहीं.

⁵⁰ P 58.10 मूल-मंतव्य.

⁵¹ P 58.13 वस्तुतः ईश्वर का अस्तित्व ही प्रमाण सिद्ध नहीं.

Kṛta-kṛtya is a term commonly used in ritual context but it is also used in other contexts,⁵² as i.e. in Yoga literature.⁵³ In the first context, it refers to someone who has done his rituals as prescribed. In the second it refers to a *yogin* who has attained *samādhi* and has become perfect. In common parlance it is also used to speak of a person who follows God's precepts.⁵⁴ So a *kṛta-kṛtya* is someone who has performed all his duties, who is completely realized and satisfied, and hence who has nothing to strive for anymore, as i.e. the creation of the world.

कर्मादेस्तत्स्वभावत्वे न किञ्चिद् बाध्यते विभोः।

विभोस्तु तत्स्वभावत्वे कृतकृत्यत्वबाधनम्॥ २०२ ॥

202. *karmādes tat-svabhāvatve na kiñcid bādhyate vibhoḥ;*
vibhos tu tat-svabhāvatve kṛta-kṛtyatva-bādhanam.

If action, etc., would have that essence <to produce its result without God's intervention> the Lord<'s existence> is nothing to be set aside. If, however, the Lord would have that essence <to instigate action and provide the result> this is annulled by <His> being someone who has accomplished everything he wants.

P. When one accepts that action, etc., has the essence mentioned, that is, if one accepts that it is effective in the production of its result without depending on God,⁵⁵ no difficulty of any sort arises in relation to the existence of God. However, in that case God is not the inducer of the actions of living beings. But if one accepts that God has the essence mentioned, that is, if He is the inducer of actions and the provider, etc., of the result of

⁵² "(...) *kṛtakṛtyo* 'ham tvayi prasanne. The translation 'puisque tu es bien disposé [a mon egard], c'est que j'ai fait ce que je devais faire' is unnecessarily cumbersome. Rather: 'if you are satisfied, so am I.' (...) *Kṛtakṛtya* is such a common term that I would hesitate to go as far as seeing in it the 'predominance du contexte rituel, idée d'un rituel devant être accompli'" (Rocher 2000, n. 59).

⁵³ "When the *yogin* has attained this *samādhi*, he has become perfect (*kṛtakṛtya*) and lives forever in the bliss of Brahman: he can then also be called a *jīvanmukta*" (Klostermaier 1986: 254).

⁵⁴ Personal communication Prof. Vooshmala Krishna, University of Hyderabad, 2009.

⁵⁵ P 58.16 ईश्वर पर निर्भर रहे बिना.

these actions,⁵⁶ then a difficulty arises in relation to this recognition, viz. that God is a Soul that is *kr̥ta-kr̥tya* and that He has achieved all there is to be achieved.

ततश्चेश्वरकर्तृत्ववादोऽयं युज्यते पारम्।

सम्यग् न्यायाविरोधेन यथाऽऽहुः शुद्धबुद्धयः ॥ २०३ ॥

203. *tataś ceśvara-karṭṛva-vādo 'yaṃ yujyate pāram;*
samyag nyāyāvirodhena yathā''huḥ śuddha-buddhayaḥ.

And accordingly wise men declare for instance that this doctrine of a God-creator is thoroughly justified and correct since it is logically not contradictory.

P. All this being said, we can say that the God-creator doctrine is, in a specific sense, appropriate and logical,⁵⁷ as it is for example⁵⁸ formulated by some pure minds.

ईश्वरः परमात्मैव तदुक्तव्रतसेवनात्।

यतो मुक्तिस्ततस्तस्याः कर्ता स्याद् गुणभावतः ॥ २०४ ॥

204. *īśvaraḥ paramātmaiva tad-ukta-vrata-sevanāt;*
yato muktis tatas tasyāḥ kartā syād guṇa-bhāvataḥ.

A Supreme Soul <can also be called a> god because <one can reach> Liberation by resorting to the manner of life proclaimed by him. Therefore, in a secondary meaning, he can be an agent of this <Liberation>.

P. God is also another name of a Supreme Soul, that is, an omniscient person standing at the threshold of Liberation.⁵⁹ Since a living being can attain Liberation by following the

⁵⁶ P 58.20 कामों का फल-दाता आदि.

⁵⁷ P 58.25 समुचित तथा तर्कसंगत.

⁵⁸ P 58.25 यथा = उदाहरण के लिए.

⁵⁹ P 59.3 मुक्ति के द्वार पर खड़े सर्वज्ञ मनुष्य.

way of life suggested by such a Supreme Soul,⁶⁰ therefore he can, in a subsidiary meaning,⁶¹ also be called an agent of this Liberation.

The equation of a fully liberated and hence Supreme Soul (not necessarily on the 'threshold' of Liberation) with God is also found in later monistic Vedānta in the context of *kṛta-kṛtya*.⁶² In Jaina context an Arhat like Mahāvīra is "a Lord of *yogins (jogiṇāhaṃ)*" and a *kṛta-kṛtya*, "one who has discharged one's obligation (who has done what was to be done)."⁶³

तदनासेवनादेव यत् संसारोऽपि तत्त्वतः।

तेन तस्यापि कर्तृत्वं कल्प्यमानं न दुष्यति ॥ २०५ ॥

205. *tad-anāsevanād eva yat saṃsāro 'pi tattvataḥ;*
tena tasyāpi kartṛtvaṃ kalpyamānaṃ na duṣyati.

By not resorting to this <manner of life proclaimed by a Supreme Soul> the result is in fact transmigration. For that reason it is not wrong to consider him also to be an agent <of the worldly cycle>.

P. Otherwise, for a living being not following the path suggested by a Supreme Soul mentioned⁶⁴ results in fact in the being caught in the worldly cycle or the cycle of rebirth. In such case it is not wrong also to assume that this Supreme Soul is an agent of this worldly cycle.⁶⁵

⁶⁰ तदुक्तव्रतसेवनात् = P 59.4 परमात्मा द्वारा सुझाए गए आचरण-मार्ग पर चलने से.

⁶¹ गुणभावतः = P 59.6 गौण अर्थ में.

⁶² "Once the Soul as pure, stainless and uncreated Intelligence is thus revealed (...) the I becomes serene and free and abides happily in the Soul which is supreme bliss itself (XV, 19,20). In this state the Soul becomes the Absolute to which such names as the essence of wisdom, *God* (italic mine) and transcendence are equally applicable (*kṛtakṛtya*, X, 18)" (Mukerjee 1997: 115).

⁶³ Singh 2001: 1167, 1169.

⁶⁴ P 59.13 उक्त परमात्मा द्वारा सुझाए गए मार्ग पर न चलने का ही फल.

⁶⁵ संसार = P 59.11 संसार-चक्र = पुनर्जन्मचक्र.

A Supreme Soul is an example to follow. If one follows it, one reaches Liberation, if not, one remains caught in the cycle of rebirth. In both cases this Supreme Soul is a cause or an 'agent' of Liberation or bondage.

कर्ताऽयमिति तद्वाक्यो यतः केषांचिदादरः।

अतस्तदानुगुण्येन तस्य कर्तृत्वदेशना ॥ २०६ ॥

206. *kartā'yam iti tad-vākya yataḥ keṣāṃcid ādaraḥ;*
atas tad-ānugūnyena tasya kartṛva-deśanā.

The statement that he is an agent follows from the respect some have <for the teachings of a Supreme Soul as mentioned>. Accordingly, for that reason, it is shown that he is an agent <of the bondage and Liberation of living beings>.

P. In some people's mind reverence for the teachings of the Supreme Soul as mentioned <earlier> eventually⁶⁶ engenders the understanding that this Supreme Soul is an agent of the bondage and Liberation of living beings.⁶⁷ This is the reason that authors of the Śāstras, keeping in mind the mental state of these people, have called a Supreme Soul an agent of bondage and Liberation of living beings.

परमैश्वर्ययुक्तत्वान्मत आत्मैव चेश्वरः।

स च कर्तेति निर्दोषः कर्तृवदो व्यवस्थितः ॥ २०७ ॥

207. *paramaiśvarya-yuktatvān mata ātmaiva ceśvaraḥ;*
sa ca karteti nirdoṣaḥ karṭṛ-vado vyavasthitaḥ.

If a Soul possesses supreme sovereignty it is considered to be a god and, to say that this <soul> is an agent is established as a faultless theory.

P. On the other hand, if he is perfect by reason of his supreme sovereignty a Soul can be considered to be a god because the agent of various actions to be done by a living being is

⁶⁶ P 59.17 फलस्वरूप ही.

⁶⁷ P 59.17 प्राणियों के बन्ध-मोक्ष का कर्ता.

the Soul of this living being.⁶⁸ Therefore the doctrine of a God-Agent is established as a faultless theory.

T. According to the Jaina doctrine a Soul is omnipotent⁶⁹ by nature. But its capacity remains disproportionally disconcert⁷⁰ as a consequence of the accumulation of *karma*. With this idea in mind Haribhadra says that a Soul "possesses supreme sovereignty."

शास्त्रकारा महात्मानः प्रायो वीतस्पृहा भवे।

सत्त्वार्थसंप्रवृत्ताश्च कथं तेऽयुक्तभाषिणः ॥ २०८ ॥

208. *śāstra-kārā mahātmānaḥ prāyo vīta-sprhā bhave;*
sattvārtha-sampravṛttāś ca katham te 'yukta-bhāṣiṇaḥ.

The authors of the Śāstras, exceedingly wise, were mostly free from desire in this worldly existence. Devoted <as they are> to the welfare of beings, why would they say unreasonable things?

P. Actually, the great men that composed the Śāstras were mostly liberated from worldly ambitions and they did everything purely out of philanthropy.⁷¹ Why then would they say such a thing if this was not reasonably established?⁷²

T. The reasoning of Haribhadra is as follows. Since the great men that composed the Śāstras were telling the truth⁷³ and since the doctrine of a God-Creator is in a strict

⁶⁸ P 59.23 एक प्राणी द्वारा की जाने वाली उन उन क्रियाओं का कर्ता.

⁶⁹ T 59.26 सर्वसामर्थ्यसंपन्न.

⁷⁰ T 59.27 न्यूनाधिक कुण्ठित.

⁷¹ सत्त्वार्थ = P 60.6 परोपकार.

⁷² P 60.7 जो युक्तिसंगत न हो.

⁷³ T 60.9 सत्यवक्ता.

specific sense⁷⁴ reasonably established, wherever in the Śāstras the doctrine of a God-Creator is advocated, it must suit this specific sense only.⁷⁵

अभिप्रायस्तत्तेषां सम्यग् मृग्यो हितैषिणा।

न्यायशास्त्राविरोधेन यथाऽऽह मनुरप्यदः ॥ २०९ ॥

209. *abhiprāyas tatas teṣāṃ samyag mṛgyo hitaiṣiṇā;*
nyāya-śāstrāvirodhena yathā''ha manur apy adaḥ.

Someone who desires <his> welfare should investigate the intention of these <authors of the Śāstras> thoroughly so that no contradiction arises with the science of logic. A wise man expresses himself accordingly.

P. For a person desiring his own benefit⁷⁶ it is necessary that he investigates the intention of the authors of the Śāstras thoroughly⁷⁷ in such manner that no contradiction between the logic of the intention expressed and the statements in the Śāstras arises.

T. In relation to the statements of the Śāstras one must emphasize that there should be no contradiction between their intention and the statements in the Śāstras. The implication is precisely this, that some ambiguous⁷⁸ Śāstra statements should not be given such a meaning that their contradiction would befall some <other> unambiguous Śāstra statements.

आर्षं च धर्मशास्त्रं च वेदशास्त्राविरोधिना।

यस्तर्केणानुसंधत्ते स धर्म वेद नेतरः ॥ २१० ॥

⁷⁴ T 60.9 एक अर्थविशेष में ही.

⁷⁵ T 60.11 उसे यही अर्थविशेष पहनाना चाहिए.

⁷⁶ हितैषिणा = P 60.14 अपना हित चाहने वाले व्यक्ति को.

⁷⁷ सम्यक् = P 60.15 भली प्रकार से.

⁷⁸ T 60.20 संदिग्धार्थक.

210. *ārṣaṃ ca dharma-śāstraṃ ca⁷⁹ veda-śāstrāvirodhinā;*
yas tarkeṇānusamdhatte sa dharmam veda netaraḥ.

One who explores the Veda and the Dharmaśāstra with a logic that is not contradictory with the Veda and Śāstras knows the *dharma*, no other.

P. A person who investigates the books given by the Seers, the Vedas, etc., the Dharmaśāstra books and the Purāṇas, etc., with the help of a logic that does not go against the teachings of the Vedas and the Dharmaśāstras, knows the *dharma*, no one else.

प्रकृतिपुरुषवादखण्डन

prakṛti-puruṣa-vāda-khaṇḍana

Refutation of the Doctrine of the Creatrix and the Soul⁸⁰

प्रधानोद्भवमन्ये तु मन्यन्ते सर्वमेव हि।

महदादिक्रमेणेह कार्यजातं विपश्चितः ॥ २११ ॥

211. *pradhānodbhavam anye tu manyante sarvam eva hi.*
mahad-ādi-krameṇeha kārya-jātaṃ vipaścitaḥ.

Other wise men, however, think that all originates from the First Principle <and> that here <out of this First Principle> by degrees the Intellect, etc., is produced as an effect <of that>.

P. Other learned men say that all worldly activity originates from a principle that is called the 'First Principle' from where a chain of production <of evolutes> moves on, the Intellect, etc., amidst.⁸¹

⁷⁹ Ṭ informs that in lieu of 'आर्षं च धर्मशास्त्रं च' the Sūcanānusāra of Yaśovijaya reads 'आर्षं धर्मोपदेशं च.'

⁸⁰ All translations of the Sāṃkhya *puruṣa* (lit. the 'Man'), Soul, Soul or Spirit, are ultimately unsatisfactory.

⁸¹ P 61.8 बीच में डालता हुआ. It is unclear why Dixit restricts the list of the Sāṃkhya principles (*tattva*) to twenty evolutes. In P. on 212 he enumerates the classical twenty-four evolutes, locking out the *Puruṣa*.

प्रधानाद् महतो भावोऽहंकारस्य ततोऽपि च।

अक्षतन्मात्रवर्गस्य तन्मात्राद् भूतसंहतेः ॥ २१२ ॥

212. *pradhānād mahato bhāvo 'haṃkārasya tato 'pi ca;*
akṣa-tan-mātra-vargasya tan-mātrād bhūta-saṃhateḥ.

From the First Principle the Intellect arises and from that Egoity, the class of the senses,⁸² the rudimentary elements, and the collection of <gross> elements.

P. These are the successive stages: From the First Principle the Intellect arises, from the Intellect Egoity, from Egoity the eleven senses and the five rudimentary or subtle elements,⁸³ from the rudimentary elements the great or gross elements.⁸⁴

The Puruṣa, the Universal Soul, which is uncreated *and* non-creative, is the first of the twenty-five principles (*tattva*) of classical Sāṃkhya. The other twenty-four principles are: the Creatrix (*prakṛti*, *pradhāna*) in its manifest (*vyakta*) form: the principles of the Intellect (*buddhi*) also called the 'Great One' (*mahat*), Egoity (*ahaṃkāra*), the internal organ of sense (*manas*), the five subtle elements (*tan-mātra*),⁸⁵ the five organs of sense (*buddhīndriya*),⁸⁶ the five organs of action (*karmendriya*),⁸⁷ and the five gross elements (*mahā-bhūta*).⁸⁸ With the 'class of the senses' (*akṣa*) or the 'eleven senses' (*indriya*) are meant: *manas*, the five *buddhīndriyas* and the five *karmendriyas*.⁸⁹

⁸² P 61.12 अक्ष = इन्द्रिय.

⁸³ P 61.13 तन्मात्रो = सुक्ष्म भूतो.

⁸⁴ P 61.13 महाभूतो = स्थूल भूतो.

⁸⁵ Sound (*śabda*), touch or contact (*sparsa*), form (*rūpa*), taste (*rasa*), and smell (*gandha*) (Larson & Bhattacharya 1987: 49).

⁸⁶ That is, the senses of seeing (*cakṣus*), hearing (*śrotra*), smelling (*ghrāṇa*), touching (*tvac*), and tasting (*jihvā*) (Larson & Bhattacharya 1987: 49). See SK 26/1: *buddhīndriyāṇi cakṣuḥ-śrotra-ghrāṇa-rasana-tvag-ākhyāni* (Sharma 2009: 32).

⁸⁷ Hand (*pāṇi*), foot (*pāda*), larynx (*vāc*), organ of generation (*upastha*), and excretion (*pāyu*) (Larson & Bhattacharya 1987: 49). See SK 26/2: *vāk-pāṇi-pāda-pāyūpasthān karmendriyāny āhuḥ* (Sharma 2009: 32).

घटाद्यपि पृथिव्यादिपरिणामसमुद्भवम्।

नात्मव्यापारजं किञ्चित् तेषां लोकेऽपि विद्यते ॥ २१३ ॥

213. *ghaṭādy api pṛthivy-ādi-pariṇāma-samudbhavam;*
nātma-vyāpāra-jaṃ kiñcit teṣāṃ loke 'pi vidyate.

A jar, etc., is produced from the transformation of earth, etc. According to these <Sāṃkhya scholars> nothing in this world exists that is caused by an operation of the Soul.

P. The question is up to what extent a jar, etc., is produced. According to the <Sāṃkhya> scholars mentioned its cause is the transformation⁹⁰ of earth, etc., *only*. This is because according to these scholars no action of the Soul <can be> the cause of the production of any object in the world.

According to Sāṃkhya the phenomenal world is ruled by processes of continuous change or transformation (*pariṇāma*) of the *guṇa* ratios. Every product is a transformation of one state into another as in case of a jar produced from a lump of clay.⁹¹ The Sāṃkhya *puruṣa* is intrinsically inactive. It is a non-agent (*akartṛ*) and cannot be involved in any process of causation or production in contrast to the *jīva*, the Soul of the Jainas which is fully an agent (*kartr*).

अन्ये तु ब्रुवते हेतत् प्रक्रियामात्रवर्णनम्।

अविचार्यैव तद् युक्त्या श्रद्धया गम्यते परम् ॥ २१४ ॥

214. *anye tu bruvate hy etat prakriyā-mātra-varṇanam;*
avicāryaiva tad yuktyā śraddhayā gamyate param.

⁸⁸ Space or ether (*ākāśa*), wind or air (*vāyu*), fire (*tejas*), water (*ap*), and earth (*pṛthivī*) (Larson & Bhattacharya 1987: 49, see also Larson 1998: 8ff.).

⁸⁹ " (...) the Sankhya recognizes eleven senses, five of which are called Cognitive senses, five, Active senses, and the remaining one, *Manah* or the internal sense" (Majumdar 1925: 65).

⁹⁰ परिणम = P 61.17 रूपान्तर-प्राप्ति.

⁹¹ Larson (1975: 31; 1998: 166).

Others, however, declare that this description of pure production is made without reasonable reflection⁹² <and that> it is no more than a matter of faith.

P. But some other scholars say that all descriptions given above are only imagination coined by the mind⁹³ so that if persons allege these descriptions they are doing so succumbing to faith⁹⁴ in such a manner that they do not reason rationally.

Arguably the word *prakriyā* is used here in the sense of *pariṇāma* (transformation).⁹⁵ Sāṃkhya is generally identified with a theory of 'transformation' (*pariṇāma-vāda*) that is associated with a theory of causality called *sat-kārya-vāda*.⁹⁶ The development of all other *tattvas* from the Creatrix is ruled by one mechanism only, the "tripartite process"⁹⁷ of the three *guṇas* or evolutes that constitute all psycho-material substance: *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*. These terms cover a variety of meanings but can be roughly translated as purity or goodness, energy or passion, and dullness or ignorance. This Sāṃkhyan tripartite process that can be called *traiguṇya-pariṇāma*⁹⁸ is in fact primordial

⁹² अविचार्य + युक्त्या.

⁹³ P 61.22 एक मनगढन्त कल्पना मात्रा.

⁹⁴ P 61.24 श्रद्धा के वशीभूत होकर.

⁹⁵ "The word *prakriyā* has a well-established sense of *derivation, bringing constituents together in such a way that a final product emerges*" (Aklujkar 2001: 462, italics mine).

⁹⁶ "The earliest critique of the notion of cause is to be found in the *satkāryavāda* doctrine of the Sāṃkhya school, which was historically the earliest of Indian philosophic systems. The doctrine means that the so-called effect preexists in its cause, causation being merely a change or transformation from one state to another while the original 'thing' (...) remains constant and unchanging. An effect means a change in only the attributes or characteristics of the thing, a new state of affairs means manifestation of what was *potentially* present (...) in the early state of affairs, that is, in its so-called cause" (Matilal 1975: 43). Bronkhorst 1996b: 2 explains *sat-kārya-vāda* concisely as: "(...) the fact that we say 'the jar comes into being' implies that the jar must be part of the situation described by that statement, and must consequently be there prior to its coming into being."

⁹⁷ Larson & Bhattacharya 1987: 66.

⁹⁸ "In a Sāṃkhyan context, the *traiguṇya* issue is resolved by considering it an emanation or transformation (*pariṇāma*) from primordial materiality (*mūla-prakṛti*), radically separated and different from the principle of pure transcendental consciousness (*puruṣa*)" (Rigopoulos 1998: 165).

materiality.⁹⁹ So all psycho-material substances are Prakṛti *in* transformation. There is nothing but production (*prakriyā-mātra*).

युक्त्या तु बाध्यते यस्मात् प्रधानं नित्यमिष्यते।

तथात्वाप्रच्युतौ चास्य महदादि कथं भवेत्? ॥ २१५ ॥

215. *yuktyā tu bādhyate yasmāt pradhānaṃ nityam iṣyate;*
tathātvāpracyutau cāsyā mahad-ādi katham bhavet?

However this goes against reason since the First Principle is acknowledged to be eternal. Now, until it does not deviate from this state <of eternal stability>, how then can the Intellect arise <from it>.

P. This description is contrary to reason because the First Principle here is considered to be eternal. But until the First Principle does not give up its primal state,¹⁰⁰ how shall it give birth to the Intellect, etc.

तस्यैव तत्स्वभावत्वादिति चेत् किं न सर्वदा।

अत एवेति चेत् तस्य तथात्वे ननु तत् कुतः? ॥ २१६ ॥

216. *tasyaiva tat-svabhāvatvād iti cet kiṃ na sarvadā;*
ata eveti cet tasya tathātve nanu tat kutaḥ?

If one argues that this is the essence of that <First Principle to produce the Intellect, etc.>, why not always? If one argues: Because of that!, then how is this ever possible when this <First Principle remains> in such a <stable> condition?

⁹⁹ "(...) although three *guṇas* are mentioned, namely, *sattva*, *rajas*, and *tamas*, the basic Sāṃkhya conceptualization is that of one, continuous and unique process with three discernible "moments" or "constituents." There is one continuous process of transformation (*pariṇāma*), which is the inherent generativity of primordial materiality, but this one continuous process manifests itself in three inextricably related constituents that intensionally define the unique, continuous process" (Larson & Bhattacharya 1987: 66).

¹⁰⁰ P 62.1 मूल-स्वरूप.

P. One can say that the production of the Intellect is the very essence of the Creatrix. But then our question is: Why does the Creatrix not produce the Intellect every moment? The answer can be that it is also the essence of the Creatrix to produce the Intellect, etc., now and then <only>. But then our question is: How can the accidental production of the Intellect from the Creatrix be possible when this Creatrix abides in an unmoved existence in its primal state?¹⁰¹

According to the Sāṃkhya the Creatrix starts to produce its evolutes at a certain point in time after a *pralaya* or a period of universal dissolution. Then the unmanifest Creatrix starts to move as a result of the upsetting of the previous equilibrium of the *guṇas*¹⁰² and becomes a manifest Creatrix. Gradually it produces the Intellect up to the gross elements. The question is: If the unmanifest Creatrix has an unmoved and stable essence, why does it come into action at a certain moment, and why not always? Conversely, if it would have the inherent capacity to produce the evolutes, why not continuously <so>.

नानुपादानमन्यस्य भावेऽन्यजातुचिद् भवेत्।

तदुपादानतायां च न तस्यैकान्तनित्यता ॥ २१७ ॥

217. *nānupādānam anyasya bhāve 'nyaj jātucid bhavet;*
tad-upādānatāyām ca na tasyaikānta-nityatā.

The production of one thing from another without a material cause is not possible at all and, if this <first thing - the Creatrix> is the material cause of that <second thing - the Intellect, the first thing> is not absolutely eternal.

P. Even when one object - the Creatrix for instance - is present,¹⁰³ a second object - the Intellect for instance - cannot be produced as long as the material cause of this second object is not present also. If the first object mentioned would be the material cause of the

¹⁰¹ P 62.11 जब तक वह (अर्थात् प्रधान) अपने मूलस्वरूप में अविकृत भाव से वर्तमान है.

¹⁰² "In the Sāṃkhya-philosophy these Pralayas take place whenever the three Gunas of Prakriti recover their equipoise, while creation results from the upsetting of the equipoise between them" (Müller 1971: 110).

¹⁰³ P 62.14 उपस्थित रहने पर भी.

second object alluded to, this first object cannot be considered to be absolutely eternal, that is, eternal with an unchanged existence.¹⁰⁴

Sāṃkhya distinguishes between two forms of Prakṛti, the unmanifest Creatrix (*avyakta*) that is uncreated and the manifest Creatrix (*vyakta*) that is created. The last is caused (*hetumat*), finite (*anitya*), active (*sakriya*) and diverse (*aneka*). The last is the opposite of the first.¹⁰⁵ In order to explain the nature of this unmanifest Creatrix the Sāṃkhya commentators often use the simile of water which can - as a basic substrate - occur in a multiplicity of manifestations such as rain, juice, etc.¹⁰⁶ It is clear that Haribhadra Sūri endorses the idea of the eternity and unchangeability of a material or quasi-material substratum of the world that is active and productive. The unmanifest form of the Creatrix, the psycho-material substrate of the world, consisting of the three *guṇas*, first produces the Intellect. But, a material cause (*upādāna*) cannot produce an effect without changing itself in the process. This is illustrated in Sāṃkhya by means of the simile of the causal transformation (*pariṇāma*) of milk into curds¹⁰⁷ wherein milk is the *upādāna*, the material cause of curds. If, in this manner, the unmanifest Creatrix is the *upādāna* of the Intellect, it must itself change in the process and hence it cannot be eternal in the sense of *unchanging* (*avikṛta*).

घटाद्यपि कुलालादिसापेक्षं दृश्यते भवेत्।

अतो न तत् पृथिव्यादिपरिणामसमुद्भवम् ॥ २१८ ॥

218. *ghaṭādy api kulālādi-sāpekṣaṃ dṛśyate bhavet;*
ato na tat pṛthivy-ādi-pariṇāma-samudbhavam.

It is also seen that <the production of> a jar, etc., requires a potter, etc. Therefore it is not possible that it is produced from a transformation of earth, etc., <alone>.

¹⁰⁴ P 62.18 अविकृत भाव से.

¹⁰⁵ Larson 1998: 10.

¹⁰⁶ Larson 1975: 31.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.

P. Also we get a jar, etc., by producing it with the help of a potter, etc. So regarding these <products like a jar, etc.> one cannot say that the *sole cause*¹⁰⁸ of them is the transformation of earth, etc.

One of the offshoots of the Sāṃkhya theory of causality is that it restricts the concept of cause (*kāraṇa*) solely to the material cause (*upādāna*), considering all other causes as auxiliary appliances (*kāraṅkāṇi*) and granting them only a minor role. Matter is, in fact, the same in the cause and the effect. That is why causality is simply a process of transformation of the *guṇas* (*guṇa-pariṇāma*) inherent in the Creatrix.¹⁰⁹ What is the role of the efficient cause (*nimitta-kāraṇa*) or the agency in this matter (the weaver and the loom in case of a cloth, God (*īśvara*) in case of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika theory of creation)?¹¹⁰ The Puruṣa is not - not as a unity and not as a plurality - the efficient cause of the universe or of products in general. The Puruṣa is merely a 'spectator'¹¹¹ or a 'knower' (*jñā*).

तत्रापि देहः कर्ता चेन्नैवासावात्मनः पृथक्।

पृथगेवेति चेद् भोग आत्मनो युज्यते कथम्? ॥ २१९ ॥

219. *tatrāpi dehaḥ kartā cen naivāsāv ātmanaḥ pṛthak;*
pṛthag eveti ced bhoga ātmano yujyate katham?

If one argues that the body is also an agent in this case, this <body> is not at all separate from the Soul. If one argues that it is indeed separate, how can the Soul possibly have experience?

¹⁰⁸ P 62.22 एकमात्र कारण.

¹⁰⁹ "Man beschränkte den Begriff der Ursache (*kāraṇam*) ausschließlich auf die materielle Ursache. Allen andere Ursachen wies man als Hilfsmitteln (*kāraṅkāṇi*) eine bescheidene Nebenrolle zu. Die Materie ist aber in Ursache (*kāraṇam*) und Wirkung (*kāryam*) dieselbe. Und so kam man zu der Formel, daß die Wirkung nicht neu entsteht, sondern in der Ursache bereits vorhanden ist, und daß jedes scheinbare Werden und Vergehen nur in einer Umgestaltung oder Umwandlung (*pariṇāmah*) der vorhandenen Materie besteht" (Frauwallner 1953: 386).

¹¹⁰ King 1999: 208.

¹¹¹ Hulin 1978: 145 and Sharma 2003: 161ff.

P. One can also argue that the body of the potter, etc., is the creator of the jar, etc., not <his> Soul. Our answer to this is that the body is not separate from the Soul. That is why, according to the <Jaina> scholars in question, the Soul is completely pervading <the body>.¹¹² If one argues that the body is really separate from the Soul, our question will be: How can the Soul be an agent of experience?¹¹³ That is the reason why the Soul can become an agent of experience only with the help of a body.

If the individual *puruṣa* or *ātman* cannot be a cause because it is inactive, what then about the body? According to the Sāṃkhya each sentient being is linked to a *puruṣa* that is limitless and not restricted to the physical body. The Jaina objection is that the individual Soul cannot exceed the limits of the body. According to the Jainas the Soul (*jīva*) of non-liberated sentient beings has the same size as the body.¹¹⁴ Next, in Sāṃkhya the individual *puruṣa* possesses a 'witnesshood' (*puruṣasya sākṣitvam*);¹¹⁵ it witnesses the Intellect, etc. According to Sāṃkhya the *puruṣa* is also an experiencer (*bhoktr*).¹¹⁶ But this is incompatible with its being a non-agent (*akartṛ*). The Sāṃkhya also states that the body - or any matter that is made up of the three *guṇas* - and the Soul are absolutely different.¹¹⁷ How then can it be an 'experiencer'? Arguably, the Sāṃkhya means that the

¹¹² P 63.2 सर्वव्यापी.

¹¹³ P 63.3 भोगकर्ता.

¹¹⁴ Bronkhorst 2000: 9.

¹¹⁵ SK 19: *tasmāc ca viparyāsāt siddham sākṣitvam asya puruṣasya; kaivalyaṃ mādhyasthyaṃ draṣṭṛtvam akartṛ-bhāvaś ca*: "And from that contrast it follows that the Spirit is endowed with the characteristics of witnessing, isolation, indifference, perception and inactivity" (Sharma 1933: 22, 30).

¹¹⁶ SK 17: *saṃghāta-parārthatvāt tri-guṇādi-viparyayād adhiṣṭhānāt; puruṣo 'sti bhoktr-bhāvāt kaivalyārtham pravṛtteś ca*: "The Spirit exists, since composite (objects) are meant for another; since it is the reverse of that which has the three Attributes and the rest; since there must be control; *since there must be someone who enjoys*; and since there is activity for release" (Sharma 1933: 20, 27, italics mine). It is important to note that the Spirit is labeled an enjoyer or an experiencer (*bhoktr*).

¹¹⁷ "The Soul is perfectly indifferent and, therefore, also not the vehicle of moral responsibility. This office is assumed by the subtle or internal body, which is chiefly formed of the inner organs and the senses, and which surrounds the Soul. This internal body <*liṅga-śarīra*, the 'mark' body comprised of the *buddhi* up to the *tan-mātras*> accompanies the Soul from one existence into another, and is, therefore the real principle of metempsychosis. It is the object of the Sāṃkhya philosophy to teach people to know *the absolute*

Soul is a passive reflector of the experiences of the mind-body complex just as the unconscious mind is a reflector of the consciousness of the Soul.

देहभोगेन नैवास्य भावतो भोग इष्यते।

प्रतिबिम्बोदयात् किन्तु यथोक्तं पूर्वसूरिभिः ॥ २२० ॥

220. *deha-bhogena naivāsya bhāvato bhoga iṣyate;*
pratibimbodayāt kintu yathoktaṃ pūrva-sūribhiḥ.

Since it is the body that experiences, it is, consequently, not accepted that it is the <Soul> that experiences since it is only <like> the appearance of a reflection. Accordingly early sages have said: ...

P. The following answer can be given. Since it is the body that incites experience, the agency of experience does not really lie in the Soul but falls <on it> like a shade.¹¹⁸ Accordingly ancient sages have said: ...

"पुरुषोऽविकृतात्मैव स्वनिर्भासमचेतनम्।

मनः करोति सान्निध्यादुपाधिः स्फटिकं यथा ॥ २२१ ॥

221. "*puruṣo 'vikṛtātmaiva sva-nirbhāsam acetanam;*
manaḥ karoti sānnidhyād upādhiḥ sphaṭikaṃ yathā."

विभक्तेदृक्परिणतौ बुद्धौ भोगोऽस्य कथ्यते।

प्रतिबिम्बोदयः स्वच्छे यथा चन्द्रमसोऽम्भसि ॥ २२२ ॥

222. *vibhaktedṛk-pariṇatau buddhau bhogo 'sya kathyate;*
pratibimbodayaḥ svacche yathā candramaso 'mbhasi."

The Soul has a changeless essence. It causes the unconscious mind to reflect <the Soul's consciousness in the mind> by its <mere> presence. <This seeming consciousness of the

distinction between Soul and matter in its most subtle transformations, as it appears in the inner organs" (Garbe 1897: 11, italics mine).

¹¹⁸ P 63.8 परछाई पडने जैसा है.

mind> is <merely> a fill in like <the reflection of color in> a crystal. The Intellect is developed in such a way that it is different <from the Soul>. One says that it experiences <the Soul> like the reflection, etc., of the moon in clear water.

P. The Soul has an essence that is, by itself, changeless¹¹⁹ and mirrors itself as it were in the unconscious mind, that is, makes it as if conscious¹²⁰ in the same way as a colored object placed beside a crystal mirrors itself in the crystal, viz. as colored. When the Intellect or the mind,¹²¹ that is separate¹²² from the Soul, obtains another form in this manner we readily say that the Soul is the subject of that experience. To argue in this manner is the same as you would consider the reflection of the moon falling on clear water, or the actions of this reflection as the actions of the moon. To this we state the following: ...

According to Sāṃkhya there is a difference between consciousness and experience. Only 'the seat of thought and feeling' (*antaḥkāraṇa*, the inner mental apparatus, consisting of *manas*, *aḥamkāra*, and *buddhi*) is the device for experience, not the Soul.¹²³ The Soul is pure consciousness that reflects or mirrors itself in *buddhi* or *manas* and makes it appear as if it is a conscious receptor of experience.¹²⁴

¹¹⁹ P 63.14 स्वयं अविकारी स्वरूप.

¹²⁰ P 63.15 चेतन.

¹²¹ P 63.17 बुद्धि = मन.

¹²² विभक्त = P 63.17 पृथक् स्थित.

¹²³ "Human awareness functions through the 'inner instrumentality' (*antaḥkāraṇa*) comprised of the following three principles: 1. The mind-organ (*manas*) (...); 2. The "I-maker" (*aḥamkāra*) (...); and 3. The Intellect (*buddhi*) (...) *Puruṣa* provides the 'frame' for the above mental processes, and though omnipresent, *puruṣa* remains 'unseen' and transcendent of *prakṛti*'s activities" (Whicher 1998: 90).

¹²⁴ "(...) consciousness and awareness are distinct. Consciousness is passive, inert, *sākṣin* (witness), agentless (*puruṣa*). Awareness is active questioning of an agent (*prakṛti*). *Puruṣa* is pure consciousness; and, by its being in proximity to *buddhi*, *buddhi* appears as though it has consciousness when, in fact, all it has are awareness and the Intellect. *Sūtra* 99 in the *Sāṃkhyapravācanasūtra* clearly spells this out: "(Actual) superintendence is of the *Antaḥkāraṇa* [includes *manas*, *kāraṇa*, and *buddhi*], because it is lighted up by *Puruṣa*, as is the case with the iron" (Burke 1988: 22, also citing Sinha, *Sāṃkhyapravācanasūtram*, Book 1, *Sūtra* 99, 1915).

प्रतिबिम्बोदयोऽप्यस्य नामूर्तत्वेन युज्यते।

मुक्तैरतिप्रसंगाच्च न वै भोगः कदाचन ॥ २२३ ॥

223. *pratibimbodayo 'py asya nāmūrtatvena yujyate;*
muktair atiprasaṅgāc ca na vai bhogaḥ kadācana.

The appearance of the reflection of this <Soul in the Intellect> is also not correct because <the Soul> is immaterial and because this leads to an unwarrantable conclusion.

P. The matter of the falling of the reflection of the Soul on the Intellect is not reasonable. The reason is that the Soul is an immaterial and incorporeal principle,¹²⁵ whereas the capacity to throw its own reflection on a mirror¹²⁶ is possible only in case of a corporeal substance. Secondly, if the reflection of a worldly Soul can fall on the Intellect, it must likewise fall <on the Intellect in case> of liberated selves. The point of all this is that according to the <Sāṃkhya> scholars mentioned the <reflection of the> Soul can never become an experiencer. Otherwise it must stay an agent of experience in the state of Liberation also.

The Soul is immaterial and incorporeal. It is not an object.¹²⁷ So the comparison with an object reflecting itself in a mirror, in this case Buddhi or the Intellect, does not hold. The use of the simile of the reflection on a mirror is not fortuitous. Other examples are colored light reflected in a crystal, or the moon reflected in clear water. The purity or clearness of the Intellect is due to its high *sāttvic* character which is responsible for the capacity of the lucent reflection of the consciousness of the Puruṣa. There is a second objection. The Soul is not an 'active' agent of experience. It is only a reflector of experience. If it would be an active agent of experience in worldly souls it must remain so in case of liberated souls.

¹²⁵ P 63.25 अमूर्त्त = अभौतिक.

¹²⁶ P 63.25 प्रतिबिम्बपात्र, lit. an 'image-container.'

¹²⁷ "The Soul <puruṣa> is pure consciousness, not embodied consciousness nor consciousness of a content having the form of an object" (Bhattacharyya 1956: 192).

न च पूर्वस्वभावत्वात्स मुक्तानामसंगतः।

स्वभवान्तर-भावे च परिणामोऽनिवारितः ॥ २२४ ॥

224. *na ca pūrva-svabhāvatvāt sa muktānām asaṅgataḥ;*
svabhavāntara-bhāve ca pariṇāmo 'nivāritaḥ.

And this <objection> is not unreasonable because of the earlier state of liberated <Selves>. And when <the Soul> acquires another disposition, the change <of it> is inevitable.

P. Because according to the scholars mentioned liberated Selves possess a special disposition¹²⁸ in <their> worldly state so that their reflections are falling on the Intellect and, consequently, in this manner they are agents of experience. That is why our objection that according to these <Sāṃkhya scholars> the liberated Selves must possess this same special disposition in the state of Liberation is not unreasonable. So their reflection falls on the Intellect and they must, consequently, be agents of experience. If they argue that in liberated Selves such a new disposition arises that they did not have in <their> worldly state, the scholars mentioned are obliged to accept that the Soul is such a principle wherein workings of transformation of form are usually active.¹²⁹

देहात् पृथक्त्व एवास्य न च हिंसादयः क्वचित्।

तदभावेऽनिमित्तत्वात्कथं बन्धः शुभाशुभः ॥ २२५ ॥

225. *dehāt pṛthaktva evāsya na ca hiṃsādayaḥ kvacit;*
tad-abhāve 'nimittatvāt kathaṃ bandhaḥ śubhāśubhaḥ.

And if this <Sāṃkhyan Soul> is separate from the body, <it can>not <experience> injury, etc., at all. However, if this <injury, etc.> does not exist <as affecting the Soul>, how can there be bondage <of karma>, pure and impure. For, there is no material cause <involved>.

¹²⁸ P 64.7 स्वभावविशेष.

¹²⁹ परिणाम P 64.13 रूप-रूपान्तरण की प्रक्रिया.

P. If the Soul is strictly separate from the body, injury, etc., ought never to be possible because then one can say that injury, etc., are actions that affect the body, not the Soul. And if injury, etc., does not exist <for the Soul>, how then can the pure and impure bondage of *karma* <in the Soul> be possible since in that case the instrumental cause¹³⁰ of bondage of *karma* <injury, etc.> will not exist.

Ṭ. The intention of Haribhadra is <to say> that the instrumental causes of the bondage of *karma* are injury, etc.

According to the Sāṃkhya *karma* does not affect the Soul. It affects the subtle body (*sūkṣma-śarīra*) composed of the *antaḥkaraṇa*, the five *tanmātras*, the five organs of action, and the five organs of perception. It is this subtle body that transmigrates, not the Soul.¹³¹

बन्धादृते न संसारो मुक्तिर्वाऽस्योपपद्यते।

यमादि तदभावे च सर्वमेव ह्यपार्थकम् ॥ २२६ ॥

226. *bandhādrte na saṃsāro muktir vā'syopapadyate;*
yamādi tad-abhāve ca sarvam eva hy apārthakam.

When bondage is not acceded, neither the cycle of rebirth nor Liberation is justified, and when these do not exist, restraint, etc., <are> all senseless.

P. Without the bondage of *karma* it is impossible for a Soul to be absorbed in the cycle of rebirth,¹³² nor can Liberation be attained. And when there is no Liberation all good activities in conformity to that,¹³³ viz. restraint, etc. - that are supposed to lead to Liberation - will be poorly established.

¹³⁰ P 64.20 निमित्त कारण as opposed to उपादान कारण.

¹³¹ Burke 1988: 24.

¹³² P 64.26 पुनर्जन्मचक्र में भ्रमण करना.

¹³³ P 64.28 सद्गुणान्.

Ṭ. With the expression 'restraint, etc.' are meant the eight good activities in conformity to what the Sāṃkhya-Yoga tradition calls the 'constituents of *yoga*.'¹³⁴ The eight constituents of *yoga* are: restraint, limitation, posture, breath-control, withdrawal of the senses, concentration, meditation, and contemplation.¹³⁵

आत्मा न बध्यते नापि मुच्यतेऽसौ कदाचन।

बध्यते मुच्यते चापि प्रकृति स्वात्मनेति चेत् ॥ २२७ ॥

227. *ātmā na badhyate nāpi mucyate 'sau kadācana;*
badhyate mucyate cāpi prakṛti svātmaneti cet.

If one argues that it is the Creatrix itself that is bound and liberated, this Soul is never bound nor liberated.

P. One can argue that <in Sāṃkhya> there is neither bondage nor Liberation of the Soul, but that the Creatrix is sometimes spontaneously involved¹³⁶ in bondage, sometimes in Liberation. To this we answer the following: ...

In Sāṃkhya it is not the Soul that is bound or liberated. The Soul is eternally unbound. So it does not need to be liberated. It is the Creatrix in the form of the Intellect, Egoity, etc., that makes the Soul *appear* as bound.¹³⁷

¹³⁴ Ṭ 65.2 योगांग.

¹³⁵ Ṭ 65.4 यम (not यह as in the text), नियम, आसन, प्राणायाम, प्रत्याहार, धारणा, ध्यान, समाधि.

¹³⁶ P 65.9 प्रकृति ही अपने आप कभी बन्ध की भागी बनती.

¹³⁷ SK 62: *tasmān na badhyate nāpi mucyate nāpi saṃsarati kaścit, saṃsarati badhyate mucyate ca nānāśrayā prakṛtiḥ*: "Therefore no <Soul> transmigrates, is bound or liberated. <Only> the Creatrix in its various forms transmigrates, is bound and liberated." "Ignorance caused by nondiscrimination is what causes *prakṛti's* evolutes to *remain* in the transmigratory cycle, but the root cause of that cycle is *prakṛti's* 'willing' to manifest itself once in all its complicated glory to a *puruṣa*" (Burke 1988: 21).

एकान्तेनैकरूपाया नित्यायाश्च न सर्वथा।

तस्याः क्रियान्तराभावाद् बन्धमोक्षौ तु युक्तितः ॥ २२८ ॥

228. *ekāntenaika-rūpāyā nityāyāś ca na sarvathā;*
tasyāḥ kriyāntarābhāvād bandha-mokṣau tu yuktitaḥ.

Since this <Creatrix> is always absolutely uniform and eternal, the bondage and Liberation of it have no justification since it cannot act in any way.

P. When the Creatrix is always unchangeable and eternal, the causation of the one activity <viz. Liberation> in lieu of the second activity <viz. bondage> is not possible, and in this manner to talk about the Liberation and bondage of the Creatrix is not relevant at all.

मोक्षः प्रकृत्ययोगो यदतोऽस्याः स कथं भवेत्।

स्वरूपविगमापत्तेस्तथा तन्त्रविरोधतः ॥ २२९ ॥

229. *mokṣaḥ prakṛty-ayogo yad ato 'syāḥ sa katham bhavet;*
svarūpa-vigamāpattes tathā tantra-virodhataḥ.

Liberation is the isolation <of the Soul> from the Creatrix. How is this <Liberation> of this <Soul> from that <Creatrix> possible? For, <if this is possible> this leads to the destruction of the essence <of the Creatrix>. Besides, this stands in contradiction with <the Sāṃkhya> doctrine.

P. Again, in the theory of the <Sāṃkhya> scholars mentioned, Liberation is the name of the breaking of the link <between the Soul> and the Creatrix.¹³⁸ How can the Creatrix attain such a Liberation? For then the very essence of the Creatrix must be considered to be destroyed. Secondly, the hypothesis mentioned, viz. of the breaking of the bondage of the Creatrix from the Creatrix¹³⁹ is contradictory with the philosophy accepted by the scholars mentioned. In Classical Sāṃkhya the *liṅga* is the 'mark' of the transmigrating

¹³⁸ P 65.18 प्रकृति के संबन्धविच्छेद.

¹³⁹ P 65.21 'प्रकृति का प्रकृति से संबन्धविच्छेद' कल्पना.

entity. This *linga* is the Creatrix consisting of the twenty-five *tattvas* from eternal consciousness down to the five organs of sense, five of activity (*buddhīndriya* or *jñānendriya*, and *karmendriya* respectively) and the five subtle elements that are the objects of sense (*tan-mātras*).¹⁴⁰

पञ्चविंशतितत्त्वज्ञो यत्र तत्राश्रमे रतः।

जटी मुण्डी शिखी वाऽपि मुच्यते नात्र संशयः ॥ २३० ॥

230. *pañcaviṁśati-tattva-jñō yatra tatrāśrame rataḥ;*
jaṭī muṇḍī śikhī vā'pi mucyate nātra saṁśayaḥ.

पुरुषस्योदिता मुक्तिरिति तन्त्रे चिरन्तनैः।

इत्थं न घटते चेयमिति सर्वमयुक्तिमत् ॥ २३१ ॥

231. *puruṣasyoditā muktir iti tantrē cirantanaiḥ;*
itthaṁ na ghaṭate ceyam iti sarvam ayuktimat.

The one who knows the twenty-five principles is liberated - no doubt about that! - abiding wherever <he wants>, in an *āśrama*, as an ascetic, a shaven-headed <renouncer> or a Brahmin. In <their> works the ancients have said that Liberation is produced for the Soul. In this manner this <Liberation> cannot take place <in the Sāṁkhya system>. So all <this> is unreasonable.

P. The ancient teachers recognized by the <Sāṁkhya> scholars mentioned have said in their texts: "The one who has knowledge of the twenty-five principles attains Liberation; there is no doubt about that. And, if desired, this person can live in a *āśrama*, if desired as an ascetic,¹⁴¹ if desired as a shaven-headed <renouncer>,¹⁴² and, if desired, as a

¹⁴⁰ The SK says: "The subtle body (*linga*), previously arisen, unconfined, constant, inclusive of the great one (*mahat*) etc, through the subtle elements, not having enjoyment, transmigrates, (because of) being endowed with *bhavas* ('conditions' or 'dispositions'). As a picture (does) not (exist) without a support, or as a shadow (does) not (exist) without a post and so forth; so too the instrument (*linga* or *karana*) does not exist without that which is specific (i.e. a subtle body)" (Larson 1998: 268).

¹⁴¹ जटिन् = P 66.4 जटाघारी, wearing the hair twisted together.

Brahmin."¹⁴³ In this manner these teachers were convinced that it was the Soul only that attained Liberation. But when the argumentation of the <Sāṃkhya> scholars mentioned is accepted, the attainment of Liberation of the Soul seems impossible. Hence it is established that everything these <Sāṃkhya scholars> have said in this connection is unreasonable.

Ṭ. The twenty-five principles indicated were already enumerated earlier in the Kārikā mentioned <before> and they are as follows: (1) the Creatrix, (2) the Intellect, (3) Egoity, (4-14) the eleven senses, (15-19) the five subtle elements, (20-24) the five gross elements, and (25) the Soul.

अत्रापि पुरुषस्यान्ये मुक्तिमिच्छन्ति वादिनः।

प्रकृतिं चापि सन्न्यायात् कर्मप्रकृतिमेव च॥ २३२॥

232. *atrāpi puruṣasyānye muktīm icchanti vādinaḥ;*
prakṛtiṃ cāpi sannyaṣyāt karma-prakṛtiṃ eva ca.

In this connection also other <viz. Jaina> scholars accept that <it is> the Soul <that attains> Liberation, and also that according to sound logic the Creatrix is identical to karmic matter.

P. Also in this connection some other <Jaina> scholars think that it is the Soul that attains Liberation and, reasoning correctly,¹⁴⁴ they argue that the Creatrix is another name for karmic matter.

Ṭ. The scholars indicated in the Kārikā mentioned are Jaina philosophers because they accept such a principle under the name of *karmic matter* or <simply> *karma* that is the root cause¹⁴⁵ of the bondage of the Soul. In equal manner the Creatrix of the Sāṃkhya philosophers is such a principle that is the root cause of the bondage of the Soul. But

¹⁴² मुण्डिन् = P 66.4 मुण्डित मस्तक.

¹⁴³ शिखिन् = P 66.4 शिखाधारी, wearing a tuft of hair on the crown of the head.

¹⁴⁴ P 66.16 समुचित युक्तिमार्ग का अनुसरण करते हुए.

¹⁴⁵ Ṭ 66.20 जड (...) आत्मा के बंध के लिए उत्तरदायी.

there is also a major difference between the karmic matter of the Jaina philosophers and the Creatrix of the Sāṃkhya philosophers that should be kept in mind. As we have already seen, according to the Sāṃkhya system the whole inanimate world, the twenty-three principles starting from the Intellect up to the five gross elements, is only a transformation¹⁴⁶ of the Creatrix. Contrary to that, the karmic matter¹⁴⁷ of the Jaina system is only a part of the inanimate or material world,¹⁴⁸ which means that according to the Jaina system one cannot say that the whole inanimate world is but a transformation of karmic matter.

तस्याश्चानेकरूपत्वात् परिणामित्वयोगतः।

आत्मनो बन्धनत्वाच्च नोक्तदोषसमुद्भवम् ॥ २३३ ॥

233. *tasyāś cāneka-rūpatvāt pariṇāmitva-yogataḥ;*
ātmano bandhanatvāc ca nokta-doṣa-samudbhavam.

Since this <karmic matter> is multiform, since it has the nature to transform <itself>, and since it has the nature to bind the Soul, the flaws mentioned <above> do not arise.

P. Since this karmic matter is of numerous sorts,¹⁴⁹ since therein the process of transformation is active, since the binding of the Soul by that <karmic matter> is possible, therefore in the <Jaina> thought brought forward <here> there is no scope for the flaws that were pointed out in the <Sāṃkhya> thought described earlier.

नामूर्तं मुर्ततां याति मूर्तं न यात्यमूर्तताम्।

यतो बन्धाद्यतो न्यायादात्मनोऽसंगतं तथा ॥ २३४ ॥

234. *nāmūrtaṃ murtatāṃ yāti mūrtaṃ na yāty amūrtatām;*
yato bandhād yato nyāyād ātmano 'saṃgataṃ tayā.

¹⁴⁶ T 66.26 रूपान्तरण.

¹⁴⁷ T 66.26 कर्मप्रकृति = कर्म-पुद्गल.

¹⁴⁸ T 66.27 जड-जगत = पुद्गल-जगत.

¹⁴⁹ For the 148 kinds of karma in Jainism, see Glasenapp 1964: 157ff.

<According to the Sāṃkhya> something incorporeal does not turn into something corporeal, something corporeal does not turn into something incorporeal. For this reason <according to the Sāṃkhya> it is irrational <to say> that the Soul is bound by this <karmic matter>.

P. <The Sāṃkhya> might object that since a material object cannot become immaterial and since an immaterial object cannot become material, it is not reasonable <for the Jainas> to say that the binding, etc., of the Soul is realized by karmic matter. To this our answer is: ...

देहस्पर्शादिसंवित्त्वा न यात्येवेत्ययुक्तिमतः।

अन्योन्यव्याप्तिजा चेयमिति बन्धादि संगतम्॥ २३५॥

235. *deha-sparśādi-saṃvittiyā na yāty evety ayuktimat.*¹⁵⁰
anyonya-vyāpti-jā ceyam iti bandhādi saṅgatam.

Because the body has the feeling of touch, etc., it is not reasonable to say that <something material> does not merge <with immateriality>. And this <feeling> is produced by the mutual concomitance <of the Soul and the body>. Hence the binding, etc., <of karmic matter with the Soul> is justified.

P. The presence in the Soul of the eventual experience¹⁵¹ of touch, etc., of the body is established in such a manner that to say that a corporeal object cannot become material is unreasonable. The cause of the experience mentioned is the close mutual relationship¹⁵² of the Soul and the body. Therefore it is also established that the binding, etc., of the Soul with karmic matter is a theory that is in accordance with reason.

Ṭ. The intention of Haribhadra is <to say> that, when the body touches objects of different sorts the Soul situated in this body starts to have experiences of different sorts, consisting of pleasure or pain. The following consequence is drawn from this, viz. that

¹⁵⁰ Not अत्युक्तिमत, see P 67.16 अ-युक्तिसंगत.

¹⁵¹ संवित्ति = P 67.15 अनुभूति.

¹⁵² अन्योन्यव्याप्ति = P 67.17 परस्पर घनिष्ठ संबन्ध.

there is a close relationship between the body and the Soul contained in that body. With the help of this example relating to experience Haribhadra wants to establish that such a close relationship between a conscious Soul and inanimate *karma*¹⁵³ can exist that the Soul can be thrown into the bondage of the cycle of rebirth.

मूर्तयाऽप्यात्मनो योगो घटते नभसो यथा।

उपघातादिभावश्च ज्ञानस्येव सुरादिना ॥ २३६ ॥

236. *mūrtayā'py ātmano yogo ghaṭate nabhaso yathā;*
upaghātādi-bhāvaś ca jñānasyeva surādinā.

The connection between the Soul and material <karmic matter> is also possible <just as it is in case> of the atmosphere, and also <in case> of the weakening, etc., of consciousness by liquor.

P. The connection of the immaterial Soul with matter, viz. karmic matter, is also possible in this manner, viz. just as it is of immaterial space¹⁵⁴ with a material jar. And in this manner the weakening,¹⁵⁵ etc., in the Soul as a result of the binding of karmic matter is possible just as drinking liquor, etc., weakens consciousness.

T. In order to establish the possibility of the connection between the Soul and *karma*, Haribhadra places two different examples before us in the verse in question, the example of the connection between a material jar and immaterial space¹⁵⁶ and the second, the example of the weakening of consciousness resulting from the subtle mental processes that follow from gross corporeal processes <like> the drinking of liquor. Among them the first example will make us understand that - as Haribhadra sees it - a jar is a material substance while space an immaterial substance in the same manner that according to him *karma* is a material substance while the Soul is an immaterial substance. And the second

¹⁵³ T 67.25 चेतन आत्मा का जड़ 'कर्मों' के साथ.

¹⁵⁴ नभस् = P 68.2 आकाश.

¹⁵⁵ P 68.3 शक्तिक्षय.

¹⁵⁶ T 68.7 एक मूर्त घट तथा अमूर्त आकाश.

example brought forward will mainly make us understand in that manner the example of the 'experience of the Soul produced by contact with the body' of that the latter verse.

एवं प्रकृतिवादोऽपि विज्ञेयः सत्य एव हि।

कपिलोक्तत्वतश्चैव दिव्यो हि स महामुनिः ॥ २३७ ॥

237. *evaṃ prakṛti-vādo 'pi vijñeyaḥ satya eva hi;*
kapiloktatvataś caiva divyo hi sa mahā-muniḥ.

Thus also the doctrine of the Creatrix should be considered to be true indeed and <also> because it is taught by Kapila <since> he is really a divine great sage.

P. For these reasons the doctrine of the Creatrix should also be considered a legitimate doctrine, also because Kapila - a great and divine sage - proposed this doctrine.

In order to understand Haribhadra Sūri's appraisal of the Sāṃkhya doctrines we can point to the parallels between the Sāṃkhya and Jaina systems. Both teach a multiplex dualism: they postulate two distinct realities and, besides, a radical difference between a plurality of Selves, the *puruṣas* and *jīvas*. In both systems the Selves acquire karmic bodies¹⁵⁷ and they strive for ultimate *kaivalya* or *kevala*, Perfect Isolation or Liberation. Moreover, the Jainas also use of the word *prakṛti* for *karma*.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁷ "In sūtra 6.67 of the Sāṃkhyapravacana it is said that karma is the cause (*nimitta*) of the relationship between Prakṛti and Puruṣa (...) Accumulated karma forms the *karmāśaya*, the recipient that envelops the *jīva*, that is, *the Intellect or consciousness evolved due to the interaction of Prakṛti and Puruṣa*" (Krishan 1997: 141f., italics mine).

¹⁵⁸ "In Jainism *prakṛti* is used to denote matter in the form of *karma*. In Jainism *karma* is material stuff (*pudgala*) that binds and produces changes in the Soul. (...) Before it enters the Soul the *karma* stuff is undifferentiated. Various natures or types (*prakṛti*) of karma are molded from this karma matter after interaction with the Soul has begun. The Jainas explain that bondage of the Soul can be understood from four points of view, one of which is *prakṛti*. The specific nature (*prakṛti*) assumed by the previously undifferentiated *karma* matter is determined by the type of activity performed. The nature of karmic matter is first divided into eight kinds (*mūlaprakṛti-s*) (knowledge obscuring, perception obscuring, energy obstructing, belief and conduct obstructing, duration of life determining, body type determining, family type determining, and pain and pleasure producing), and these eight kinds are subdivided into 148 main classes called the 148 *prakṛti-s*" (Jacobsen 1996: 68).

Synopsis

Basic tenets of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika as regards God (Īśvara) and objections:

1 God is an agent/creator (*kartā*),

1.1 because He incites all activity of living being with His

1.1.1 inconceivable power of intelligence, and

1.1.2 eternal purity.

2 God is the Lord of the universe with His unimpeded and naturally acquired

2.1 desirelessness,

2.2 masterfulness, and

2.3 virtue.

3 The ignorant mortal has no control over his destiny; God drives mortals toward heaven or hell.

<4 God is the agent of creation of the world> (Implied in *Objection 3*, verse 201)

Objection 1: If all beings act on their own accord, why 1.1 <and 3>?

Objection 2: Actions of living beings are effective as well as ineffective.

If non-effective, why 1.1 < and 3>?

If effective and unconfined, the belief in God is a matter of faith only, but nothing to be set aside (Verse 202).

Objection 3: If God is a being that has accomplished everything (*kṛta-kṛtya*) and has no desires (cf. 2.1), why 4?

Objection 4: If 3, God cannot be a being that has accomplished everything.

God as an agent defined otherwise:

1 A Supreme Soul, a person 'standing at the threshold of Final Emancipation,' can be called a God.

2 This Supreme Soul is an agent of bondage, of the cycle of rebirth and of Final Emancipation as well, in the sense that He is a model that incites other living beings to follow his path.

Basic tenets of Sāṃkhya and objections:

1 All originates from the Creatrix (*prakṛti*) by degrees, as effects: the Intellect, Egoity, the senses the rudimentary elements, and the collection of gross elements.

2 Every object is produced from the transformation of earth, etc. only.

Objection: Some say that this is a matter of faith only.

3 Nothing is produced by the Soul (*puruṣa*).

4 The <original and unmanifest> Creatrix is eternal.

Objection: If the <unmanifest> Creatrix is eternal (meaning, having an unchangeable essence), then no evolution is possible.

5 It is the essence of the <unmanifest> Creatrix to produce the evolutes.

Objection: Then why does it not produce the evolutes always and only now and then.

Answer: It is the essence of the <unmanifest> Creatrix to produce the evolutes only accidentally.

Objection: In that case the <original> Creatrix does not have a stable essence.

6 *Objection:* Production presumes a material cause. A material cause is not eternal. The <unmanifest> Creatrix is the material cause of the evolutes. Hence the Creatrix cannot be absolutely eternal.

7 *Objection:* The production of ordinary objects requires an efficient cause. So, the production of things cannot simply be a transformation of state (see 2).

8 The body is the efficient cause, not the Soul which is essentially a non-agent.

Objection: The body is not separate from the Soul. If it would, the soul cannot be an agent of experience.

9 The <mind> body <complex> is the agent of experience. Its experience falls on the inactive Soul as a reflection.

10 On the other hand, the Soul's consciousness reflects itself in the mind, the Intellect, etc.

Objection: The argument of the Soul reflecting itself in the Intellect, etc., is not correct because the Soul is immaterial.

11 The Soul is separate from the body.

Objection: In that case the Soul cannot suffer. If the soul cannot suffer, no bondage of karma is possible. Then neither the cycle of rebirth nor final emancipation are possible. In that case all activities related to both are senseless.

12 It is the Creatrix in the form of the Intellect, Egoity, etc., that is bound and liberated, not the Soul.

Objection: The <original> Creatrix is said to be uniform and eternal, meaning unchangeable. In that case neither bondage nor liberation is possible.

13 Liberation is the isolation of the Soul from the Creatrix.

Objection: In that case the essence of the Creatrix would be destroyed. The ancients have declared that it is the Soul that is liberated. This is impossible in Sāṃkhya and hence unreasonable.

Objection: The Jains argue that it is the soul that attains Liberation and that the Creatrix is karma. Karma is multiform, transforms and binds the soul.

14 Something corporeal cannot turn into something incorporeal, and vice versa. So, one cannot say that the Soul is bound by karmic matter.

Objection: The body has <immaterial> feelings. This is the result of the interaction between the Soul and the body. In the same way the Soul acquires karma.

15 The Sāṃkhya doctrine of the Creatrix is true <if interpreted as karma>.

Abbreviations

Ṭ	Ṭippanī by Dixit on the Śāstravārtāsamuccaya
NS	Nyāyasūtra
NSBh	Nyāyasūtrabhāṣya
P	Paraphrase of Dixit of the Śāstravārtāsamuccaya
YS	Yogasūtra
ŚVS	Śāstravārtāsamuccaya
ṢDS	Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccaya
SK	Sāṃkhyakārikā
YŚ	Yogaśāstra

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary sources

Gūḍhārthadīpikā of Madhusūdana. See Paṇṣīkar 1936.

Tarkarahasyadīpikā of Guṇaratna. See Jaina 2000.

Nyāyakusumāñjali of Udayana. See Viraraghava 1941.

Nyāyavārtikatātparyāṭikā of Vācasparimiśra. See Dravid 1925.

Nyāyasūtrabhāṣya of Vātsyāyana. See Śāstri, Padmaprasād & Śukla Harirām 1942.

Mahābhārata; Āraṇyaka-parvan. See Sukthankar 1942.

Śāstravārtāsamuccaya of Haribhadra Sūri. See Dixit 2002.

Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccaya of Haribhadra Sūri. See Damodara 1929.

Sāṃkhyakārikā with commentary by Māṭhara. See Sarma 1922.

Secondary sources

Aklujkar, Ashok. "The Word Is the World: Nondualism in Indian Philosophy of Language." *Philosophy East & West* 51, 4 (2001) 452-473.

Bhattacharyya, Krishna Chandra. *Studies in Philosophy*, Vol. 1. Calcutta: Progressive Publishers, 1956.

Bronkhorst, Johannes. "God's Arrival in the Vaiśeṣika System." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 24 (1996a) 281-294.

Bronkhorst, Johannes. "The Correspondence Principle and its Impact on Indian Philosophy." *Studies in the History of Indian Thought* (Kyoto) 8 (1996b) 2-39.

Bronkhorst, Johannes. "Abhidharma and Jainism." *Abhidharma and Indian Thought. Essays in Honor of Professor Doctor Junsho Kato on his Sixtieth Birthday*. Ed. Committee for the Felicitation of Professor Doctor Junsho Kato's Sixtieth Birthday, Nagoya, 598-581 [13-30]. Tokyo: Shuju-sha 2000.

Burke, B. David. "Transcendence in Classical Sāṃkhya." *Philosophy East & West* 38, 1 (1988) 19-29.

Cheng, Hsueh-Li. "Nāgārjuna's Approach to the Problem of the Existence of God." *Religious Studies* 12 (1976) 207-216.

Damodara, Shastri, Goswami. *Shaddarshanasamuchchaya by Shree Haribhadrasoori with the Laghuvritti Commentary by Manibhadra*. Benares: Vidya Vilas Press, 1929.

Dixit, Krishna Kumara. *Ācārya Haribhadra Sūri's Śāstravārtāsamuccaya (With Hindi Translation, Notes and Introduction)*. Ahmedabad: L.D. Institute of Indology, (1969) 2002 (L.D. Series 128, 22).

Dravid, Nayaoharya Pandit Sri Rajeshwara Sastri (ed.). *Nyayavartik-tatparya Tika by Sri Vachaspati Mishra 1st Adhyaya*. Vol. I. Benares, 1925.

Frauwallner, Erich. *Geschichte der indischen Philosophie, I.* Salzburg: Otto Müller Verlag, 1953.

Garbe, Richard. *The Philosophy in India.* Chicago. The Open Court Publishing Company, 1897.

Glaserapp, Helmuth von. *Der Jainismus. Eine indische Erlösungsreligion.* Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, (1925) 1964.

Gopani, Amritlal (tr.) & Surendra Bothara (ed.). *The Yoga Shastra of Hemachandracharya (A 12th Century Guide to Jaina Yoga).* Jaipur: Prakrit Bharti Academy, 1989.

Hulin, Michel. *Sāṃkhya Literature.* A History of Indian Literature Series VI, Fasc. 3. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1978.

Jackson, Roger. "Dharmakīrti's Refutation of Theism." *Philosophy East & West* 36, 4, (1986) 315-334.

Jacobi, Hermann. *Die Entwicklung der Gottesidee bei den Indern, und deren Beweise für das Dasein Gottes, Original und Übersetzung.* Bonn und Leipzig: Kurt Schroeder Verlag, 1923.

Jacobsen, Knut. "The Female Pole of the Godhead in Tantrism and the Prakṛti of Sāṃkhya." *Numen* 43, 1 (1996) 56-81.

Jaina, Mahendra Kumara (ed.). *Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccaya of Haribhadra Sūri. [With the Commentaries of Tarkarahasyadīpikā of Guṇaratnasūri and Laghuvṛtti of Somatilaka Sūri and an Avacūrṇi].* Calcutta: Bharatīya Jnānapīṭha, Mūrtidevī Jaina Granthamālā, Sanskrit Grantha 36, 2000.

Jaina, Padmanabh Shrivarma. *The Jaina Path of Purification.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979.

King, Richard. *Indian Philosophy: An Introduction to Hindu and Buddhist Thought.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1999.

Klostermaier, Klaus. "Dharmamegha Samādhi: Comments on Yogasūtra IV, 29." *Philosophy East & West* 36, 3 (1986) 253-262.

Krishan, Yuvraj. *The Doctrine of Karma*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1997.

Larson, Gerald James. "The Notion of Satkārya in Sāṃkhya: Towards a Philosophical Reconstruction." *Philosophy East & West* 25, 1 (1975) 31-40.

Larson, Gerald James. *Classical Sāṃkhya: An Interpretation of its History and Meaning*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1998.

Larson, Gerald James & Ram Shankar Bhattacharya (eds.). *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies: Sāṃkhya, A Dualist Tradition in Indian Philosophy*. General Editor: Karl Potter. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1987.

Macdonell, Arthur Anthony. *Hymns from the Rigveda*. London: Oxford University Press, n.d.

Majumdar, A. K. "The Doctrine of Evolution in the Sankhya Philosophy." *The Philosophical Review* 34, 1 (1925) 51-69. Duke University Press on Behalf of Philosophical Review.

Matilal, Bimal Krishna. "Causality in the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika School." *Philosophy East & West* 25, 1 (The Problems of Causation: East and West) (1975) 41-48.

Mukerjee, Radhakamal. *Aṣṭavakraḡṭā (The Song of the Soul Supreme)*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 2000.

Müller, Max. *The Six Systems of Indian Philosophy*. Varanasi: The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, (1899) 1971.

Potter, Karl. *Indian Metaphysics and Epistemology: The Tradition of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika up to Gaṅgeśa*. New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, (1977) 1995.

Paṅśīkar, Wāsudev Laxmaṅ Shāstrī (ed.). *Śrīmadbhagavadgītā with the Commentaries Śrīmat-Śāṅkarabhāṣya with Ānandagiri; Nīlakāṅṭhī; Bhāṣyokarṣadīpikā of Dhanapati; Śrīdhari; Gītārthasaṅgraha of Abhinavaguptācārya; and Gūḍhārthadīpikā of Madhusūdana with Śrīdharmadattaśarmā (Bachchāśarmā)*. Bombay: Pāndurang Jāwajī, 1936.

Prasāda, Rāma. *Pātañjali's Yoga Sūtras. With the Commentary of Vyāsa and the Gloss of Vāchaspati Miśra*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers, (1912) 2000.

Radhakrishnan, Sarvepalli. *An Idealist View of Life*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1929.

Rigopoulos, Antonio. *Dattātreya, the Immortal Guru, Yogin, and Avatāra: A Study of the Transformative and Inclusive Character of a Multi-Faceted Hindu Deity*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998.

Rocher, Ludo. "Review: Marcelle Saindon. Le Pitṛkalpa d' Harivaṃśa: Traduction, analyse, interpretation. Sainte-Foy, Québec 1998." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 120, 3 (2000) 457-459.

Sarma, Vishnu Prasad (ed.). *Sāṅkhya Karika, With a commentary of Mathara Charya*. Benares: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series 296, 1922.

Śāstri, Padmaprasād & Śukla Harirām. *The Nyāyadarśana of Gotam Muni. With the Bhāṣya of Vātsyāyana*. Benares: Jayakrishna Dās Hari Dās Gupta (Kāshi Sanskrit series 43), 1942.

Schrader, Otto. *Über den Stand der indischen Philosophie zur Zeit Mahāvīras und Buddhas*. Leipzig: G. Kreysing, 1902.

Sharma, Chandradhar. *A Critical Survey of Indian Philosophy*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, (1960) 2003.

Sharma, Har Dut. *The Sāṅkhya-Kārikā; Īśvara Kṛṣṇa's Memorable Verses on Sāṅkhya Philosophy with the Commentary of Gauḍapādācārya*. Poona, 1933.

- Singh, Narendra. *Encyclopedia of Jainism*. New Delhi: Anmol Publications, 2001.
- Strehly, Georges. *Mānava Dharma Çāstra, Traduites du Sanskrit*. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1893.
- Sukthankar, Vishnu S. (ed). *The Mahābhārata; Āraṇyaka-parvan, Being the Third Book of the Mahābhārata, The Great Epic of India*. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Institute, 1942.
- Thomas, Frederick William. "Notes from the Tanjur." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1903) 345-354.
- Viraraghavacharya, Siromani (ed.). *Nyayakusumanjali, with Commentary of Kusumanjalivistara by Tarkarava Panditaratna*. Tirupati: Tirupati Vāṇīmudraṇālaya, 1941.
- Whicher, Ian. "The Mind (*Citta*): Its Nature, Structure, and Functioning." *The Integrity of the Yoga Darśana: A Reconsideration of Classical Yoga*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998, pp. 89-143.
- Williams, Robert. "Haribhadra." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 28, 1 (1965) 101-111.