

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE SASTITANTRAM

by G. Oberhammer

Ever since the historical investigation of the Sāṃkhya philosophy has thrown more light on the development of the system and its historical relation, a work that has been the fundamental text of the speculative Sāṃkhya school is becoming more and more important, namely, the *Śaṣṭitantram*. Unfortunately this principal Sāṃkhya work has not been preserved except for some fragments and a few references, and even as regards its author tradition is full of contradictions. Some authorities speak of Pañcaśikha as its author whereas from the historical consideration of the tradition we are inclined to assign its authorship to Vṛṣagaṇa¹⁾.

The material on which our study is based are the following²⁾: *Pañcaśikha*: a) References: *Mahābhāratam* XII, 218, 6 (7886) ff.; 219, 5 (7934) ff.; 320, 60 (11783); 321, 3 (11839) f.; 322, 24 (11875) ff.; — *Sāṃkhyakārikā* Kā. 70; — *Paramārtha's* commentary p. 1058, 1059 (cp. 1061); — *Yuktidīpikā* p. 31, 24; 61, 1; 175, 8 ff.; — *Gauda-*

¹⁾ In accordance with the Chinese tradition we shall call the head of the Sāṃkhya speculative school „Vṛṣagaṇa“ to distinguish him from his followers (*vārṣaganāh*) without, however, deciding whether the real name of the head of the school was Vṛṣagaṇa or Vārṣagaṇya, as he is sometimes called. cp. P. Chakravarti: *Origin and Development of the Sāṃkhya System of Thought*, p. 136 f.

²⁾ Editions consulted: *La Sāṃkhyakārikā* étudiée à la lumière de sa version chinoise par M. J. Takakusu (BEFEO vol. IV), Hanoi 1904. — *Yuktidīpikā*, crit. ed. by P. Chakravarti (C. S. S. Nr. 23), Calcutta 1938. — *Jayamaṅgalā*, ed. by H. Sarma (C. S. S. Nr. 19), Calcutta 1926. — *Mātharavṛttiḥ*, ed. by P. Vishnu Prasad Sarma (Ch. S. S. Nr. 296), Benares 1922. — *Sāṃkhyadarśanam maharṣīśrikapilla-praṇītaṃ vijñānabhikṣuviracitapravacanabhāṣyasahitam āsubodhavidyābhuṣanānityabodhavidyārātnābhyāṃ saṃskṛtaṃ prakāśitam*, Calcutta 1936. — *Vijñānabhikṣu: Brahmasūtrabhāṣyam* (Ch. S. S. Nr. 8), Benares 1901. — *Tattvasamāsasūtravṛttiḥ, Bhāvāganeśadīkṣita's Tattvayāthārthyadīpanam, Śimānandadīkṣita's Sāṃkhyatattvavivecanam and Sarvopakārinīṭikā* are quoted according to the *Sāṃkhyasamgraha* (Ch. S. S. Nr. 246 and 286), Benares 1918—1920. — *Bhartrhari: Vākyapadīyam*, ed. by Carudeva Sastri, Lahore 1934. — *Uddyotakara: Nyāyavārttikam* (K. S. S. Nr. 33), Benares 1916. — *Mallavādi: Dvādaśāranayacakram* with the commentary of Simhasūri is quoted according to the edition of Muni Jambuvijaya, to be brought out by the Jain Atmanand Sabha shortly. — *Vācaspati-mīśra: Nyāyavārttikatātparyāṭikā* (K. S. S. Nr. 24), Benares 1925. — *Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccayah* by Haribhadra, ed. by L. Suali (Bibl. Ind.), Calcutta 1905.

- padbhāṣyam on Kā. 1; (cp. Parisīṣṭī of the Atharvaveda 43, 3, 1—13; Matsyapurāṇam 102, 8; Padmapurāṇam VI, 257, 121 f.; Vayupurāṇam 23, 140; 101, 337); — Māharavṛtīḥ p. 83; — Jayamaṅgala p. 68; — Śāddarsanaśāstravṛtīḥ p. 96, 5; — Tattvasamāśāstravṛtīḥ p. 125 (cp. Tattvayāthārtthyadīpanam p. 51); — Tattvayāthārtthyadīpanam p. 61.
- b) Fragments: Sāṅkhyatattvakaumdi on Kā. 2; — Tattva-vaīśaradi on Su. 1, 4 (cp. Yuktīdīpikā p. 41, 25 f.); 1, 25; 1, 36; II, 5; II, 6; II, 13 (cp. Sāṅkhyatattvakaumdi on Kā. 2); III, 13 (cp. II, 15; Yuktīdīpikā p. 72, 5 f.); III, 41; — Sāṅkhyaprapācānasūtrāṇi V, 32—36; VI, 68; — Vijnānabhikṣu's Sāṅkhyaprapācānabhāṣyam on Su. 1, 127; — Vijnānabhikṣu's Vijnānāmṛtabhāṣyam p. 17 (cp. Tattva-samāśāstravṛtīḥ p. 138; Tattvayāthārtthyadīpanam p. 82; Sāṅkhyatattvavivēcanam p. 24); — Tattvayāthārtthyadīpanam p. 61 (cp. Paramārtha's commentary on Kā. 2; Gaudapādabhāṣyam on Kā. 2; Māiharavṛtīḥ on Kā. 22; Śāddarsanaśāstravṛtīḥ p. 96, 18 f.; Kamalāsīl's Pañjikā on Kā. 7; Tattvasamāśāstravṛtīḥ p. 124; Sāṅkhyatattvavivēcanam p. 11); p. 72 (cp. Tattvasamāśāstravṛtīḥ p. 129; Sāṅkhyatattvavivēcanam p. 16; Sāṅkhyasūtravivāraṇam p. 108).
- Vṛśāṅga*: a) References: Mahābhāratam XII, 320, 59 (11782); — La vie de Vasubandhu, BEFFO tome IV (1904), p. 40; — K'uei-K'is commentary on Vijnāpīmatāratāśiddhīḥ, BEFFO tome IV (1904), p. 38; — Yuktīdīpikā p. 175; — Dvādaśāranayacākram p. 324, 11.
- b) Fragments: Vasubandhu's Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam V, 63; — Yuktīdīpikā p. 39, 19 (cp. p. 4, 10; Nyāyavārtīkām p. 43, 10; Nyāyavārtīkātīparayīkā p. 155, 20); p. 67, 14—17; 95, 24; 108, 3 ff.; 130, 11—19; 132, 28; 133, 4 f.; 170, 27 f.; — Yogabhāṣyam on Su. III, 53; — Dvādaśāranayacākram p. 314—324 (vitas and avitas for the existence of the primal matter); for the epistemology of Viśāṅga reconstructed from the fragments cf. E. Frauwallner: Erkenntnislehre des klassischen Sāṅkhyasystems (Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostiens, Bd. II (1958), pp. 124—126; — Vacaspatimīra's Bhāmati on Su. II, 1, 3 (cp. Yogabhāṣyam on Su.

IV, 13; Dignāga's *Pramāṇasamuccayaḥ* V, 42; *Dvādaśāranayacakram* p. 63, 25).

Ṣaṣṭitantram: References: *Sāṃkhyakārikā* Kā. 72; — Paramārtha's commentary on Kā. 17 (cp. *Gaudapādabhāṣyam* on Kā. 12; *Mātharavṛttiḥ* on Kā. 17); — *Anuyogadvārasūtram* 41; — *Kalpasūtram* 1, 10 (cp. Yaśovijaya's commentary); — *Yuktidīpikā* p. 175, 23; — *Jayamaṅgalā* pp. 1, 7, 56, 68, 69; — *Tattvavaiśārādī* on Sū. IV, 13 (cp. *Yogabhāṣyam* on Sū. IV, 13); — *Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccayaḥ* p. 109, 14; — *Vṛṣabhadeva's* commentary on *Vākya-padīyam* I, 8; — *Bhāskara's* *Brahmasūtrabhāṣyam* on Sū. II, 1, 1; — *Tattvasamāsa-sūtravṛttiḥ* p. 136; — *Tattvayāthārthyadīpanam* p. 80 (cp. *Tattvasamāsa-sūtravṛttiḥ* p. 135; — *Sāṃkhyatattvavivecanam* p. 22); — *Sarvopakārinīṭikā* p. 93.

In order to proceed safely and methodically with the limited material at our disposal we have to examine it as to its positive testimonial value. Since quotations of different centuries have often been juxtaposed on an equal footing, the result with respect to the author of the *Ṣaṣṭitantram* has inevitably been indecisive. As to our interpretation we shall adhere, therefore, to the following rules: on principle contemporary testimonies have more weight than similar reports of a later period, and later attributions of fragments will be considered correct only if they can be confirmed by contemporary literature of the same school or of its adversaries.

As the historical development of the *Sāṃkhya* system is to be the framework into which we have to place the *Ṣaṣṭitantram* and its author, we think it necessary to give a short outline of it³). The most ancient period marked by the names of Kapila and Āsuri must be separated from the classical period of the system in which the names of the *Sāṃkhya*-teachers Patañjali, Vṛṣagaṇa, Pañcādhikaraṇa, Vindhyavāsin and others play a significant role in the polemics of the time as they have come down to us. This period comes to an end with the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* of Īśvarakṛṣṇa which scarcely contains any speculation of its own, but remains a mere manual of the system.

³) In this we mainly follow the exposition of E. Frauwallner. Cf. *Geschichte der indischen Philosophie*, Bd. I, pp. 281—287.

According to the author it is written on the basis of another work, the *Ṣaṣṭitantram*. But, with the *Kārikā* the development of the *Sāṃkhya* philosophy has come to stagnation. It is only treated and commented on by learned pandits as part of the general intellectual formation. Later on about the latter half of the Middle Ages we find a renaissance of the system marked by the redaction of the *Sāṃkhyasūtras* in the form we have got, and by the commentaries, among others, of *Vijñānabhikṣu* on the *Sāṃkhyasūtras* and of his disciple on the *Tattvasamāśasūtras*. In this development of the *Sāṃkhya* doctrine we have to fit in the figure of *Pañcaśikha* in order to be able to decide whether he can be spoken of as the author of the *Ṣaṣṭitantram* or not.

The oldest reference to *Pañcaśikha* in the tradition of the system is found in *Īśvarakṛṣṇa*'s short statement:

*etatpavitramagryam munirāsuraye'nukampayā pradadau /
āsurirapi pañcaśikhāya tena ca bahudhā kṛtam tantram //*⁴⁾

The meaning of the phrase *tena bahudhā kṛtam tantram* has been understood by subsequent commentators in different ways and we shall have to revert to this⁵⁾. Further information about *Pancasikha*'s historical position is presented by the commentaries on the *Sāṃkhya-kārikā* giving more detailed lists of teachers and pupils⁶⁾. Thus the oldest commentary that has come down to us, the one translated by *Paramārtha*, mentions, like all other commentaries, *Pañcaśikha* immediately after *Āsuri* and adds several more names of teachers after him. Therefore we can conclude that for the author whose work *Paramārtha* translated, the period of *Pañcaśikha* was so remote that he could cite him with *Āsuri* either because of defi-

⁴⁾ *Sāṃkhyakārikā* Kā. 70.

⁵⁾ See p. 82.

⁶⁾ *Paramārtha*'s commentary (BEFEO tom. IV, p. 1059): „Cette connaissance vint de Kapila à Āsuri, qui la transmit à Pañcaśikha. Pañcaśikha la donna à Hokia (Gārgia?), Hokia à Ulūka, Ulūka à Po-p'o-li, Po-p'o-li à Īśvarakṛṣṇa” — *Mātharavṛttiḥ* p. 83: *śiṣyaparamparayāgatamiti / kapilādāsurinā prāptam idaṃ jñānam / tataḥ pañcaśikhena, tasmād bhārgavolūkavālmūkihārītadevalaprabhṛtīnāgatam / tatatebhya Īśvarakṛṣṇena prāptam.* — *Jayamangala* p. 69: *śiṣyaparamparayā ityādi / munerāsureḥ pañcaśikhastathā gārgagautamaprabhṛtirāramatanagrayā (?) Īśvarakṛṣṇanāmānam parivrājakamityanayā śiṣyaparamparayā.*

cient tradition or because Pañcaśikha really was Āsuri's pupil. (Since all the commentaries show the same sequence in naming the first Sāṃkhya teachers we cannot suppose that Paramārtha's author was not sufficiently informed.) Moreover, we have to take into consideration the fact that between Pañcaśikha and Īśvarakṛṣṇa several teachers are mentioned, and this strengthens the impression that Pañcaśikha belonged to an earlier period.

This impression is further confirmed by the Yuktidīpikā⁷⁾. Belonging as it does to the old group of commentaries on the Sāṃkhyakārikā and being remarkably well-informed about the classical period of the system, this work places Pañcaśikha together with Kapila and Āsuri as definitely forming one group of teachers who are separated from Īśvarakṛṣṇa by a long line of teachers⁸⁾. As we partly know these teachers from contemporary polemics we can establish their relative period in the entire history of Indian philosophy.

Moreover, it is worth noting that the Yuktidīpikā which gives the most reliable and detailed information on the Sāṃkhya schools understands the Sāṃkhyakārikā's vague expression *bahudhā kṛtam tantram* in the way that Pañcaśikha has taught the system to many pupils: *tena ca bahudhā kṛtam tantram / bahubhyo janakavaśiṣṭhādibhyaḥ samākhyātam*⁹⁾. In this connection it is interesting to analyse the introductory verses of the Yuktidīpikā in which an attempt is made to give a short sketch of the development of the system:

⁷⁾ Yuktidīpikā, crit. ed. by P. Chakravarti (Calcutta Sanskrit Series, No. 23), Calcutta 1938.

⁸⁾ Yuktidīpikā p. 175, 8—16: *yathā ca paramaṣīrāsūraye tathā āsurirapi daśamāya kumārāya bhagavatpañcaśikhāya / tena ca bahudhā kṛtam tantram / bahubhyo janakavaśiṣṭhādibhyaḥ samākhyātam / asya tu śāstrasya bhagavato'gre pravṛttatvāt na śāstrāntaravat vaṃśaḥ śakyo varṣaśatasahasrairapyākhyātum / samkṣepeṇa tu dvāv hārītabād dhalikairātapaaurikarbheśvara- pañcādihikarānāpatañjalivṛṣaganyakaunḍīnyamūkādika (?) śiṣyaparamparayā- gatam bhagavānīśvarakṛṣṇaśca sāhāyakam śāstram pūrvācāryasūtraprabandhe gurulāghavamanādrīyamāṇaḥ paurasthyāt vyākhyātavyā na garbhmatī- pramādam dadatīti granthabhūyasthvamupajāyate.*

⁹⁾ Yuktidīpikā, p. 175, 10. Cf. Mātharavṛttīḥ on Kā. 70: *pañcaśikhena tena bahudhākṛtam tantram * bahūnām śiṣyānām pradattam.*

tattvaṃ jñāsamānāya viprāyāsuraye munih /
yaduvāca mahattantram duḥkhatrayanivṛttaye || 3 ||
na tasyādhigamaḥ śakyah kartuṃ varṣasatairapi /
bhūyastvāditi sañcintya munibhiḥ sūkṣmabuddhibhiḥ || 4 ||
granthenālpena saṃkṣipyā tadārśamanuṣāsanam /
nibaddhamamalaprajñāih śiṣyāṇāṃ hitakāmyayā || 5 ||
pratipakṣāḥ punastasya puruṣeṣāṇuvādinah /
vaināśikāḥ prākṛtikā vikārapuruṣāstathā || 6 ||
teṣāmicchāvighātārthamācāryāih sūkṣmabuddhibhiḥ /
racitāḥ sveṣu tantreṣu viśamāstarkagahvarāḥ || 7 ||
śiṣyairduravagāhāste tattvārthabhrāntabuddhibhiḥ /
tasmādīśvarakṛṣṇena saṃkṣiptārthamidam kṛtam || 8 ||
saptatyākhyam prakaraṇam¹⁰⁾

The analysis of this passage gives the following result: the transmission of the system is marked by four stages. The Mahārṣi (Kapila) teaches the extensive Sāṃkhya to the priest Āsuri (the remark on the extent of Kapila's teaching is merely an expression of the respectful esteem for the knowledge of a ṛṣi). The Muni (this is the title usually given to Pañcaśikha) reduces the system to human dimensions and renders it accessible to the pupils. Only in the third stage of the transmission is the Muni's work enlarged by the Ācārya (the common expression for the teachers of the classical period in the Yuktidīpikā) into an extensive work by discussions on the tenets of the opponents. This work has again been abridged by Īśvarakṛṣṇa into his Sāṃkhyakārikā by leaving out polemics and similes¹¹⁾. As there is a clear statement that the Kārikā is based upon the former comprehensive description of the Sāṃkhya and since there is a further remark that it treats of the „sixty concepts“, it can be taken for certain that the work in question is the Ṣaṣṭitantram and that it cannot be a work of the Muni (Pañcaśikha). So much for the testimony of the old commentaries.

¹⁰⁾ Yuktidīpikā, p. 1, 6—18.

¹¹⁾ Sāṃkhyakārikā Kā. 72:

saptatyāṃ kila ye'rthāste'rthāḥ kṛtsnasya ṣaṣṭitantrasya /
ākhyāyikāviraḥitāḥ paravādavivarjitāścāpi.

The impression these commentaries give us is that, at the time when they were composed, namely even during the time of the Ācāryas and all the more so in the following period, Pañcaśikha was believed to belong to the remote past of the system's founder and his pupil Āsuri. We lack the necessary sources to establish firmly how near Pañcaśikha lies to Āsuri and Kapila, and must content ourselves with this general statement.

A further account on Pañcaśikha is presented by the Mahābhāratam, which, in spite of its not being reliable as a historical source due to its lack of a historically ascertainable structure, nevertheless enables us to make an approximate co-ordination¹²⁾. The epic speaks of Pañcaśikha as one of the chief representatives of the Sāṃkhya (*Sāṃkhyamukhaḥ*)¹³⁾. To the scholars at King Janaka's court in Mithila he appears as Kapila, well versed in the doctrine of final salvation, the highest bliss¹⁴⁾. According to the tradition of the epic Pañcaśikha belongs to the old Parāśara-

¹²⁾ Here we base ourselves on the material gathered by V. M. Bedekar, in: Studies in Sāṃkhya: The Teachings of Pañcaśikha in the Mahābhārata. We are also indebted to P. Chakravarti for his indications: op. cit. p. 80 and 113 f.

¹³⁾ Mahābhāratam XII, 325, 27. We give the references according to Paul Deussen: Vier philosophische Texte des Mahābhārata, Leipzig 1906.

¹⁴⁾ Mahābhāratam XII, 218, 6 (7886) ff.

In this connection a feature of the Sāṃkhya that is very predominant in the epic and still re-echoes in the introduction of the Sāṃkhyakārikā may be pointed out, namely Sāṃkhya as a doctrine of salvation, as *mokṣasāstram*. The primary and fundamental problem of the epic texts is salvation.

*nanu tvaya mokṣaḥ kṛtsnah pañcaśikhācchrutaḥ /
sopāyaḥ sopaniśadaḥ sopasaṅgūḥ sanīścayaḥ //* (Mahābhāratam XII, 165)

Strangely enough the only quotation which perhaps is taken from the work of Pañcaśikha *pañcaviṃśatitattvajña* is introduced in Paramārtha's commentary by the words: „voici ce qui est dit dans le mokṣa“ (op. cit. p. 982). We find the term *mokṣasāstram* used for the Sāṃkhya system also in the writings of Vijñāna-bhikṣu (Sāṃkhyapravacanabhāṣyam p. 7). If we consider at the same time that especially during this period the main authorities for argumentation were chosen from the Purāṇas and the epic (Mokṣadharmā) the influence of this literature can easily be perceived. That is how the knowledge about Pañcaśikha has entered into the consciousness of the philosophers. And thereby the psychological basis was given for the comparatively frequent attributions of anonymously transmitted fragments to Pañcaśikha.

gotram¹⁵). Certain assumptions can be made from this fact. Āśvaghōṣa makes the following remark in his *Buddhacaritam*:

*jaigīṣavyo'pi janakah vṛddhaścaiva parāśarah |
imām panthānamāsādyā muktā hyānye ca mokṣinah ||*¹⁶)

We find here the same expression as in the *Mahābhāratam*. Both these passages deal with an old Parāśara who is a follower of the Sāṃkhya; in both cases mention is made of a Janaka standing by his side. Moreover the *Yuktidīpikā* mentions a Janaka among Pañcaśikha's pupils¹⁷). Thus we can consider it as possible that Āśvaghōṣa here refers to Pañcaśikha and this could be a *terminus ad quem*. Even if we do not subscribe to this view the Pañcaśikha-Janaka episode gives us an approximate clue to the historical position of Pañcaśikha. Pañcaśikha must have been an important teacher (this is expressly mentioned in the epic) so that he could replace Yajñavalkya as teacher of Janaka (the fact that Yajñavalkya was the teacher of Janaka is mentioned in the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*) in the epic¹⁸). The tradition that has come down to us has kept an unbroken silence concerning this important position held by Pañcaśikha. Besides, Pañcaśikha's period must be sufficiently anterior so that historically he was sufficiently indeterminable for being introduced into an episode he was never connected with.

We may thus recapitulate the findings of the epic: Pañcaśikha must have been an extraordinarily popular figure, highly esteemed and respected as a teacher. As the whole non-epic literature does not speak anything of this fact we can safely conclude that the epic has preserved a tradition that belonged to the early period of the

¹⁵) *Mahābhāratam* XII, 325, 24.

¹⁶) *Buddhacaritam* XII, 67.

¹⁷) See foot-note 8.

¹⁸) Cf. R. Garbe: *Sāṃkhya-Philosophie* p. 67. If the remarks of Āśvaghōṣa and of the *Yuktidīpikā* were not influenced by the epic, one could consider the tradition as genuine and accept that the similarity in name of a pupil of Pañcaśikha (or of a Sāṃkhya-teacher closely related to Pañcaśikha) and of Janaka, the king of Videha, might have been the reason for the origin of the identification of the two pairs, Pañcaśikha-Janaka and Yajñavalkya-Janaka.

system, but did not exist any longer during the classical period which alone is accessible to us.

This conclusion can be corroborated on the basis of another tradition that we come across in the Purāṇas. Gaudapāda at the beginning of his commentary on the Sāṃkhyakārikā quotes a verse that is recited during the Ṛṣitarpaṇa ceremony:

*Sanakaśca Sanandanaśca tṛtīyaśca sanātanah |
 Āsuriḥ Kapilaścaiva voḍhuḥ pañcaśikhastathā ||
 ityete brahmanah putrah sapta proktā maharṣayah ||¹⁹⁾*

This verse might be derived from the same source as Matsya-purāṇam 102, 18, if not directly originated from this latter passage:

*manuṣyāṃstarpayedbhaktyā brahmaputrān ṛṣīmstathā |
 sanakaśca sanandaśca tṛtīyaśca sanātanah ||
 kapilaścāsuriścaiva voḍhuḥ pañcaśikhastathā |
 sarve te tṛptimāyāntu maddattenāmbunā sadā ||²⁰⁾*

Naturally this passage presupposes the ceremony of sprinkling the water, and so we find the same names mentioned with the same functions also in the *Tarpaṇavidhiḥ* of the Atharvavedapaṭiśiṣṭa:

*Yajñopavītam grīvāyām avalambya sanakādīmanuṣyāṃs tarpayati ||
 sanakas tṛpyatu || sanandanas tṛpyatu || sanātanas tṛpyatu ||
 kapilas tṛpyatu || voḍhus tṛpyatu || āsuris tṛpyatu || pañcaśikhas
 tṛpyatu ||²¹⁾*. Hence we are justified in concluding that

¹⁹⁾ Gaudapādabhāṣyam on Kā. 1.

²⁰⁾ According to Garbe (op. cit. p. 64) this verse is recited daily during the Ṛṣitarpaṇa ceremony. — Cf. Vāyupurāṇa 101, 337—338:

*tatra pūrvagatāsteṣu kumārā brahmanah sutāḥ |
 sanakaśca sanandaśca tṛtīyaśca sanātanah ||
 voḍhuśca kapilasteṣāmāsuriśca mahāyaśāḥ |
 munih pañcaśikhaścaiva ye cānye'pyevamādayah ||*

Padmapurāṇa VI, 257, 121—122:

*sandarśanāya yogināṃ sanakādīmahātmanām |
 sanakaśca sanandanaśca tṛtīyaśca sanātanah ||
 sanatkumāro jātaśca voḍhuḥ pañcaśikhastathā |
 saptāite brahmanah putrā yoginah sumahaujasah ||*

²¹⁾ Atharvavedapaṭiśiṣṭa 43, 3, 1—7.

Pañcaśikha had been at that time already a respected authority of the past. Otherwise his name would not have found entrance into the mantram of the Ṛṣitarpaṇa ceremony. Thus our conclusion from the epic is strengthened. The classical tradition of the Sāṃkhya has placed Pañcaśikha deliberately on the same footing with Kapila and Āsuri, for he was at that time held to be among the great authorities of the school in an early, not more clearly definable, stage.

Now we come to the decisive argument: Pañcaśikha was nothing more than a name to them. With the exception of two passages in the Yuktidīpikā²²⁾ no mention whatever is made in any Sāṃkhya work of the classical period concerning his teachings. All the fragments that are usually associated with his name are not attributed to him till centuries later. That the silence of the school regarding Pañcaśikha is not accidental is shown by the fact that his name is never mentioned in the polemics that have come down to us; neither is he attacked nor discussed; he is no longer a Sāṃkhya teacher worthy of being taken into account since he has been surpassed long ago by the later philosophers of the system. All that remained was his name and fame.

But what about the fragments in the Yogabhāṣyam which are clearly ascribed to Pañcaśikha by Vācaspatimiśra? We shall first examine the value of the historical testimony given by Vācaspatimiśra concerning Pañcaśikha. If we fix ca. 500 A. D. for the Yogabhāṣyam, Vācaspati appears at least 300 years later, and the interval between Vācaspati and Pañcaśikha is several centuries more. So the testimony of Vācaspati on that question would have weight only if there are other cogent reasons to attribute these fragments to Pañcaśikha, but we lack such reasons. On the contrary, whenever an old source like the Yuktidīpikā preserves one of these fragments and mentions its author, we find that Vācaspati's attribution is not correct. If Vācaspati ascribes the quotation: *ekam eva darśanam*

²²⁾ Yuktidīpikā, p. 31, 24: *iha bhavatām pañcaśikhānām pañcavimsatitattvāni* and p. 61, 1: *asmatpakṣe'pi turhi bhagavatpañcaśikhādinām pratyakṣatvāt sūkāryamabhyupagantavyam.*

*khyātireva darśanam*²³⁾ to Pañcaśikha, the Yuktidīpikā mentions it as taken from the Śāstram²⁴⁾, a work which is cited in several places in the same text. Further the quotation *rūpātīśayā pravartante* in the Yogabhāṣyam is also attributed to Pañcaśikha by Vācaspati²⁵⁾, whereas the Yuktidīpikā attributes it to Vṛṣagaṇa²⁶⁾, who appears to be well known to this work even to the very details of his teachings. This fact makes this attribution absolutely authentic.

Thus three quotations in the Yogabhāṣyam have already been verified as being Vṛṣagaṇa's. The fragment in the Yogabhāṣyam on III, 53: *mūrtivyavadhijātibhedābhāvānnāsti mūlaprthaktvam* is attributed to Vṛṣagaṇa by the Bhāṣyam itself. The fragment in the Yogabhāṣyam on III, 13 is the above-discussed, which is mentioned once more in the Bhāṣyam on II, 15, and is verified as Vṛṣagaṇa's by the Yuktidīpikā. The fragment in the Bhāṣyam on IV, 13: *gunānām paramam rūpam sutucchakam* is attributed to Vṛṣagaṇa by Vācaspati, which he (Vācaspati) himself states in another place to be a doctrine of the Śaṣṭitantram²⁷⁾. Finally the fragment in the Yogabhāṣyam on III, 14: *jalabhūmyoh abhiviyaktir* is ascertained as Vṛṣagaṇa's through Siṃhasūri's commentary on the Nayacakram²⁸⁾. From what we have seen we can conclude that Vṛṣagaṇa is one of the chief authorities for the Yogabhāṣyam on the speculative problems of the Sāṃkhya metaphysics. These findings are based on sources older than Vācaspati and are therefore historically more reliable. It is quite the opposite with regard to the Pañcaśikha-fragments which are nothing but anonymous quotations attributed to Pañcaśikha by Vācaspati alone several hundred years later and so cannot be accepted as really such.

²³⁾ Tattvavaiśaradī on Y. S. I, 4.

²⁴⁾ Yuktidīpikā, p. 41, 25 f.

²⁵⁾ Tattvavaiśaradī on Y. S. III, 13.

²⁶⁾ Yuktidīpikā, p. 72, 5 f.: *tathā ca bhagavān vārṣaganyah pathati rūpātīśayā vṛtyatīśayāśca viruddhyante. sāmānyāni tvatīśayāḥ saha vartante.*

²⁷⁾ Tattvavaiśaradī on Y. S. IV, 13. Cf. Bhāmati on Br. S. II, 1, 3: *ata eva yoga-śāstram vyutpādayitā āha sma bhagavān vārṣaganyah.*

²⁸⁾ Dvādaśāranayacakram, p. 320, 2—4. Cf. Yuktidīpikā, p. 81, 21 f.

But how could it happen that a scholar of Vācaspatimiśra's standing attributed anonymous quotations to Pañcaśikha? The answer is simple. He was convinced that they were fragments of Pañcaśikha's work. We shall understand this if we examine the origin of the assertion that Pañcaśikha was the author of the Śaṣṭitantram. The commentary translated by Paramārtha into Chinese ca. 550 A. D. speaks of a work of Pañcaśikha containing 60.000 verses²⁹). The same commentary tells us in another passage that the Sixty Categories — generally known as the subject-matter of the Śaṣṭitantram — had been the subject of this work of 60.000 verses³⁰). How was such a thing possible? To begin with, Paramārtha's author had wrongly interpreted Īśvarakṛṣṇa's remark *tena bahudhā kṛtam tantram*, as he understood it to mean that Pañcaśikha had written a large work. Besides, he must have known Pañcaśikha as he is portrayed in the epic, so that he could consider him as the important representative of the Sāṃkhya system. If we now recall to mind the fact that the name Śaṣṭitantram could denote a definite work as well as the Sāṃkhya system of the classical period itself the relationship between Pañcaśikha and Śaṣṭitantram becomes easily understandable. In other words, Paramārtha's informant transferred the idea he had about the classical Sāṃkhya system, namely the Śaṣṭitantram, to Pañcaśikha's supposedly voluminous work of which he could now say that it dealt with the Sixty Concepts. On the basis of this fact a later period attributed to Pañcaśikha also the special work called Śaṣṭitantram. This attribution became all the more possible since the knowledge about its real author was steadily fading while the name of Pañcaśikha was kept alive through the centuries, thanks to the epic and its tradition. But the historical truth has been thereby distorted. In a later commentary on the Sāṃkhyakārikā, the Jayamaṅgalā, the author of the Śaṣṭitantram is in fact identified with Pañcaśikha³¹). Obviously that commentary

²⁹) Paramārtha's commentary: loc. cit. p. 1059.

³⁰) Loc. cit. p. 1061.

³¹) Jayamaṅgalā on Kā. 70: *tena iti / pañcaśikhenā muninā bahudhā kṛtam tantram / ṣaṣṭitantrākhyam ṣaṣṭikhaṅdam kṛtam iti.*

still knows something from the Śaṣṭitantram, but no more from the original as is clear from the fact that, while enumerating the ten Mūlikārthas, a Saṃgrahakāra is mentioned as the source of information, and that the classification of the inference deviates from the original form in the Śaṣṭitantram. The above-mentioned identification has been possible because of this fact.

As has already been correctly pointed out by Hara Datta Sarma³²⁾, Vācaspati refers very probably to an opinion of the Jayamaṅgalā in his Tattvakaumudī on Kā. 51, and so presupposes the former. Therefore he might really have been of the opinion that the Śaṣṭitantram and the tradition of the school connected with it originated from Pañcaśikha. If we are in a position to show now that the fragments in the Yogabhāṣyam attributed to Pañcaśikha by Vācaspati are really fragments of Vṛṣagaṇa or of his school, our explanation of Vācaspati's error would certainly carry weight when we shall prove that the Śaṣṭitantram was Vṛṣagaṇa's work. This proof holds good for part of the fragments.

First we shall consider the person of Vṛṣagaṇa. Tradition regarding him begins with Vasubandhu who makes mention of the followers of Vṛṣagaṇa. In Paramārtha's „Life of Vasubandhu“ we meet with Vṛṣagaṇa having a mythical form as the teacher of Vindhyavāsin³³⁾ and therefore he must have lived about one and a half generations before the junior Vasubandhu³⁴⁾. Moreover we learn through K'uei-Ki's commentary on the Vijñāptimātratāsiddhiḥ that he was the head of a Sāṃkhya school³⁵⁾, a fact which is known to us also from the Yuktidīpikā as Vṛṣagaṇa's followers are often mentioned there.

³²⁾ Haradatta Sarma: Jayamaṅgalā and the other Commentaries on Sāṃkhya Saptatī, p. 428 f. (IHQ Vol IV, Calcutta 1928).

³³⁾ BEFEO tom IV, p. 40 f.

³⁴⁾ In reckoning the period of the junior Vasubandhu we follow E. Frauwallner: On the Date of the Buddhist Master of Law Vasubandhu (Serie Orientale Roma, vol. III), Roma 1951, p. 55 f.

³⁵⁾ BEFEO tom. IV, p. 38: „Parmi ses disciples, les principaux formaient dix-huit groupes dont le chef était appelé Fa-li-cha (varṣa) ce qui signifie «pluie» parce qu'il était né pendant la saison des pluies. Ses compagnons étaient nommés les hérétiques de la «troupe de la pluie» (vārṣaganya).“ Cf. also Vasubandhu, Abhidharmakośaḥ V, 63 f.: „Vous n'avez plus qu'à joindre l'école des Vārṣaganyas...“

This testimony of Paramārtha is corroborated by other evidences. For instance, as we saw, Vṛṣagaṇa is quoted by Vasubandhu in the *Abhidharmakośa*³⁶), Dignāga attacks his teachings while he deals with the Sāṃkhya³⁷); Uddyotakara refutes his definition of perception³⁸), and Simhasūri also commenting on the *Dvādaśāranayacakram* considers Vṛṣagaṇa as the representative of the system and tries to refute him³⁹). All these facts show sufficiently that Vṛṣagaṇa was the most important representative of the Sāṃkhya from the fourth century upto the time when the Sāṃkhyakārikā in its easily understandable form displaced the somewhat difficult and large work of Vṛṣagaṇa, the only one to be dealt with by the opponents.

From Simhasūri's commentary on Mallavādi's *Dvādaśāranayacakram* we are able to recover rather long fragments of this teacher, which give us an idea of his work⁴⁰). The merit of having reconstructed Vṛṣagaṇa's theory of cognition by means of these fragments and others goes to E. Frauwallner, thanks to whose work we can prove Vṛṣagaṇa's influence on the later period — as for instance, on the *Vṛttikāra* in Śabara's *Bhāṣyam*⁴¹), on *Candramati*⁴²) and, as much as we can see from the fragments, on the Sāṃkhyakārikā itself which, while proving the existence of the primal matter, enumerates the five proofs of Vṛṣagaṇa⁴³). But if we leave the classical period of the system and consider the later commentators, we observe that all that was known about Vṛṣagaṇa's work and person gradually disappears. He is no longer cited, his doctrine is no longer

³⁶) See note 35.

³⁷) See note 39.

³⁸) *Nyāyavārttikam*, p. 43, 10 (K. S. S. No. 33); cf. *Tātparyatikā*, p. 155, 20 (K. S. S. No. 24) and *Yuktidīpikā*, p. 4, 10 and p. 39, 14.

³⁹) For some material on this point see E. Frauwallner: *Zur Erkenntnislehre des klassischen Sāṃkhya-Systems* (*Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens*, Bd. II, Wien 1958), p. 123—126.

⁴⁰) *Ibidem*.

⁴¹) Cf. E. Frauwallner: *Candramati und sein Daśapadārthasāstram* (*Studia Indologica*, Festschrift für Willibald Kirfel zur Vollendung seines 70. Lebensjahres, Bonn 1955), p. 78.

⁴²) E. Frauwallner: *Candramati* loc. cit. p. 79 f.

⁴³) *Sāṃkhyakārikā* Kā. 15.

dealt with in polemics and it is possible that a scholar of Vācaspati's rank knows only a few fragments of his work and considers him, who was once the most famous teacher of the Sāṃkhya, as a representative of the Yoga system and attributes genuine Vṛṣaṅga-fragments to Pañcaśikha.

If we now recapitulate the results we have arrived at, we get the portrait of a teacher who can be exactly fitted in historically and whose work has had a wide influence upon the development of the school and the philosophy of the time. This is a portrait quite contrary to the one resulting from our study of Pañcaśikha who is not known to the classical period through any fragment and who was too remote to be noted by the philosophy of the time. And thereby the question of the authorship of the Śaṣṭitantram is already decided. But let us first examine the expression „Śaṣṭitantram“. Śaṣṭitantram means a „system of sixty concepts“. This expression occurs in the Sāṃkhyakārikā⁴⁴), its commentaries and some passages of the Jainas⁴⁵). This means that this expression is attested

⁴⁴) Sāṃkhyakārikā Kā. 72.

⁴⁵) Sometimes we come across passages in which the Śaṣṭitantram is attributed to Kapila. For instance, in Kalpanasūtra I, 10 we find the expression *sattitanta-visarāe* which is commented on by Yaśovijaya as *ṣaṣṭitantram kapilāśāstram, tatra viśāradaḥ paṇḍitaḥ*; Bhaskara says in his Brahmasūtrabhāṣyam on Br. S. II, 1, 1: *yadi brahmaivopādānakāraṇam nimittakāraṇam ca tataḥ kapilamaharṣipraṇīta-ṣaṣṭitantrākhyasmṛter anavakāśo nirviśayatvam*... To conclude on the basis of such and similar passages, as does Udayana Sastri, that the Śaṣṭitantram is Kapila's work is unjustifiable. Such passages are easily to be derived from the identification of the Sāṃkhya system with the Śaṣṭitantram, and they mean nothing more than that the Sāṃkhya system had been founded by Kapila.

The same is to be said of the question of the Śaṣṭitantram in the Ahirbudhnyasamhitā that has been raised by Schrader and recently resumed by V. M. Bedekar. Bedekar says in his essay „The Development of the Sāṃkhya and the Problem of the Śaṣṭitantram“ that, in order to solve the problem of the Śaṣṭitantram in a satisfactory manner, the Śaṣṭitantram of the Ahirbudhnyasamhitā must also be explained. To this we may say that we are talking of a Śaṣṭitantram meaning a definite text that is historically ascertainable. That text is, as far as we know, entirely different from the so-called Śaṣṭitantram of the Pañcarātra work. Only in the first case is the name Śaṣṭitantram deduced logically and organically from the teachings of the school, namely from the system of the sixty concepts. In the Ahirbudhnyasamhitā we find, in the contents of the Sāṃkhya system, categories

for us concerning the classical period alone, and indeed clearly as the title of a definite work. Only when the work had become typical for the system could the name of the work be used for the Sāṃkhya system as such as it also had become a system of sixty concepts. And there is, as far as we can see from the sources, only one work in the classical period to represent the Sāṃkhya system, namely, Vṛṣagaṇa's work, which is attested as *vārṣagaṇyatantram*⁴⁶). This must be identical with the *Ṣaṣṭitantram* the author of which can thereby be ascertained as Vṛṣagaṇa.

Finally we want to touch upon a question that is only partly connected with the subject matter of our article. Surveying the Sāṃkhya literature we meet with the following peculiar fact: at the end of the Middle Ages, far more than a thousand years after Pañcaśikha, his name is connected all on a sudden with quotations that were handed down until that time anonymously. What is to be said of that?

1. As we said above, the situation at that time was propitious for

which are absolutely foreign to it. Hence we can conclude that this name has found entrance into the sectarian text only in a secondary sense. The passage in the *Ahīrbudhnyasamhitā*, therefore, cannot be used for an evaluation of the original work. Cf. E. Frauwallner: *Geschichte der Indischen Philosophie*, Bd. I, p. 480, note 177. Further in this case the word *Ṣaṣṭitantram* does not seem to us to mean a definite work, but only one of those various forms of Sāṃkhya philosophy which were closely connected with the Purāṇa literature, since there is a plurality of such systems expressly mentioned: *Ṣaṣṭitantrānyathaikaikam eṣāṃ nānāvīdhaṃ mune* (*Ahīrbudhnyasamhitā* XII, 30). Thus the *Ṣaṣṭitantram* of the *Samhitā* has nothing to do with the *Ṣaṣṭitantram*, the most important text of the classical period, although it would have to be considered, of course, in a description of the whole history of the Sāṃkhya philosophy.

⁴⁶) *Dvādaśāranayacakram*, p. 324, 11. Besides this general consideration, we can also bring forward a textual argument for the identification of *Vārṣagaṇyatantram* with the *Ṣaṣṭitantram*. Thus we find that the five proofs for the existence of primal matter given by Simhasūri in his commentary on *Dvādaśāranayacakram* as Vṛṣagaṇa's are identical with those found in the *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, Kā. 15. As Īśvarakṛṣṇa himself states that he gave an exact summary of the *Ṣaṣṭitantram* and since we do not find any evidence for the existence of an important work other than the *Vārṣagaṇyatantram*, we can conclude that Īśvarakṛṣṇa reproduces in *Kārikā* 15 the five proofs from Vṛṣagaṇa, and consequently the *Vārṣagaṇyatantram* is identical with the *Ṣaṣṭitantram*.

a thing like this. Besides the epic tradition of the Mokṣadharmā and the Purāṇas in which Pañcaśikha is mentioned as the chief Sāṃkhya teacher, we have no other tradition whatever of him. At the same time hardly anything but the names of the old teachers of the classic time were known. To this could be added the fact that the name of a Pañcaśikha is mentioned in two passages of the Sāṃkhya-sūtras, the main text of the Sāṃkhya Renaissance⁴⁷⁾.

2. R. Garbe⁴⁸⁾ and F. Hall⁴⁹⁾ before him have called our attention to the fact that the fragments ascribed to Pañcaśikha in the Tattvayāthārthyadīpanam of Bhāvāganeśa are all to be found in the Tattvasamāśasūtravṛttiḥ⁵⁰⁾. According to Garbe this work was attributed to Pañcaśikha in all the manuscripts known to him⁵¹⁾. As Bhāvāganeśa himself states in the introduction to his work:

*samāśasūtrānyālambya vyākhyāṃ pañcaśikhasya ca |
bhāvāganeśaḥ kurute tattvayāthārthyadīpanam ||*⁵²⁾

F. Hall and later more decidedly R. Garbe had concluded that the fragments in question have been ascribed by mistake to Pañcaśikha by Bhāvāganeśa, for he had thought that the Tattvasamāśasūtravṛttiḥ was a work of Pañcaśikha.

Although Garbe was right in saying that the attribution of these fragments by Bhāvāganeśa to Pañcaśikha was wrong, yet his argument is not fully convincing. First of all Garbe considered, upon the authority of Vācaspati, the fragments in the Yogabhāṣyam as

⁴⁷⁾ Sāṃkhyasūtras V, 32 ff. and VI, 68.

⁴⁸⁾ R. Garbe: Sāṃkhya-Philosophie, 2nd edit. p. 68, footnote 2. The argument of Garbe against the śloka *ādyaś tu mokṣo* etc. holds good also for all the other Pañcaśikha-fragments in Bhāvāganeśa's work.

⁴⁹⁾ Sāṃkhya-Sāra, a Treatise of Sāṃkhya Philosophy by Vijñānabhikṣu, ed. by F. Hall, Calcutta 1862, p. 23 f.

⁵⁰⁾ Tattvasamāśasūtravṛttiḥ (Sāṃkhyasaṃgraha, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, No. 286, Benares 1920, p. 117—140). This work is identical with the work edited by Ballantyne under the title „Kramadīpikā: A Lecture on the Sāṃkhya Philosophy, embracing the text of the Tattvasamāśa“, printed for the use of the Benares College, Mirzapore 1850.

⁵¹⁾ loc. cit.

⁵²⁾ Bhāvāganeśa Dikṣita: Tattvayāthārthyadīpanam (Sāṃkhyasaṃgraha, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series No. 246, Benares 1918), p. 51.

genuine fragments of Pañcaśikha. Therefore he was of the opinion that Pañcaśikha's work had been written in prose, so that the metrical fragments later ascribed to him were suspicious to him as a matter of course. Today we know that Pañcaśikha's work cannot be said to be written either in prose or in verse, since we have no fragment which we can with certainty ascribe to him.

Furthermore it is possible to prove that Bhāvāganeśa depended on the Tattvasamāśasūtravṛttiḥ to a greater extent than Garbe supposed it to be⁵³). But now the question arises why Bhāvāganeśa did not cite also the much longer quotations from the Vṛttiḥ under the name of Pañcaśikha. Why does he connect with this name only passages that are given in the Vṛttiḥ itself as quotations?⁵⁴) On the basis of Garbe's argument one would expect that the quotations appearing as Pañcaśikha-fragments in the Tattvayāthārthyadīpanam should not be considered by Bhāvāganeśa as Pañcaśikha's, and that those cited anonymously should appear as Pañcaśikha's. Further it is hard to believe that Bhāvāganeśa considered the Tattvasamāśasūtravṛttiḥ as a work of Pañcaśikha, he (Pañcaśikha) himself being quoted there⁵⁵). Bhāvāganeśa could not have failed to observe this fact, for he cites this special passage word for word with the name of Pañcaśikha⁵⁶). Summing up, we have to say that Garbe's explanation of the appearance of Pañcaśikha-fragments in the work of Bhāvāganeśa seems to be only partially correct.

3. Even if we accept this explanation there are still three passages of Pañcaśikha-fragments left unexplained:

a) The quotation as given by Vijñānabhikṣu in his Bhāṣyam on

⁵³) Bhāvāganeśa makes excerpts from the Tattvasamāśasūtravṛttiḥ word for word on pp. 61, 63, 71 f., 74, 75, 80, 81 without, however, mentioning the source.

⁵⁴) The fragment *pañcavimsatitattvajña* etc. is found in the writings of Paramārtha on Kā. 2 and in those of other authors. The fragment *ādau tu mokṣo* etc. is introduced by the words *uktam ca* in the Vṛttiḥ, as is also the case with the fragment *prakṛtena tu bandhena* etc. The fragment *tattvāni yo vedayati* etc. is cited as well by the Sāṃkhyatattvavivecanam (Sāṃkhyasamgraha, p. 16) and Sāṃkhyasūtravivaraṇam (Sāṃkhyasamgraha, p. 108), though in a slightly modified form.

⁵⁵) Tattvasamāśasūtravṛttiḥ, p. 125.

⁵⁶) Tattvayāthārthyadīpanam, p. 61.

S. S. I, 127 differs so much from the text of the *Tattvasamāśasūtravṛttiḥ* that, in order to derive it from the *Vṛttiḥ*, one must consider it as a paraphrase.

b) The *Pañcaśikha* fragment in S. S. V, 32 ff. is not derivable from it at all — a fact which made Garbe consider it as a genuine fragment of *Pañcaśikha*.

c) The *Pañcaśikha*-fragment in S. S. VI, 68, likewise, is not to be found in the *Tattvasamāśasūtravṛttiḥ*.

This shows that the name of a *Pañcaśikha* appeared in the *Sāṃkhya* Renaissance even independently of the *Tattvasamāśasūtravṛttiḥ*, allegedly attributed to *Pañcaśikha*. Yet we shall consider more closely the *Pañcaśikha*-fragment in S. S. V, 32. It deals with a problem that arose from the elaboration of the theory of inference, namely, the problem of *vyāptiḥ*. With the words *ādheyaśaktiyoga iti Pañcaśikhaḥ*, the definition of *vyāpti* of a *Pañcaśikha* is given. The problem of *vyāptiḥ* is, however, a fresh one. In its oldest form it can be traced back to *Vṛṣagaṇa*'s question about the nature of the *sambandhaḥ*⁵⁷). But that seems to be much more archaic than the theory of the *Pañcaśikha* of the *Sāṃkhyasūtras*, and it presupposes a much higher level of abstraction in the posing of the problem than *Vṛṣagaṇa*'s. Further it must be observed that, since we can survey roughly the development of the theory of inference, a doctrine of *vyāptiḥ* such as we find it in *Pañcaśikha*'s fragment cannot be historically fitted into the period of the old *Pañcaśikha*. Thus we can conclude that the teacher who defined *vyāptiḥ* as *ādheyaśaktiyogaḥ* is to be dated later than *Vṛṣagaṇa* and cannot possibly be identified with the old *Pañcaśikha*. As to whether the hypothesis of a younger *Pañcaśikha* is to be accepted on these grounds cannot yet be decided on the material available at the moment. In addition to this, two other sections of the *Sāṃkhya* tradition will also have to be examined: the *Tattvasamāśasūtras* and the *Sāṃkhyasūtras*.

⁵⁷) E. Frauwallner: Zur Erkenntnislehre des klassischen *Sāṃkhyasystems*, WZKS Bd. II, p. 123. Cf. *Jayamaṅgalā*, pp. 8, 9—15 and *Nyāyavārttikatātparyātikā*, p. 165, 2 (K. S. S. No. 24).

We have now come to the end of our study of the author of the *Ṣaṣṭitantram*, and we can thus sum up the results of our research:

1. All the traditions point to Pañcaśikha as a Sāṃkhya authority of the early period of the system.

2. During the classical period of the system in which we have to place the *Ṣaṣṭitantram* hardly anything more than the name of Pañcaśikha is known whereas Vṛṣagaṇa is clearly verified to belong to the period in question. He is the author of the fundamental work of the school of the time. This work can be reconstructed to a great extent by means of fragments, and it is identical with the *Ṣaṣṭitantram*.

3. The authority of Vācaspati concerning the attribution of the anonymous quotations in the *Yogabhāṣyam* to Pañcaśikha is entirely insufficient. On the contrary, we can show in four cases that Vṛṣagaṇa is the Sāṃkhya-authority for the *Bhāṣyakāra*.

4. Due to the fading knowledge about Vṛṣagaṇa during the post-classical period the knowledge about Pañcaśikha as a predominant Sāṃkhya-teacher, kept alive in the epic and the *Purāṇas*, comes to the foreground, until at last, supported by the incorrect interpretation of Īśvarakṛṣṇa's testimony, Pañcaśikha takes Vṛṣagaṇa's place as the author of the *Ṣaṣṭitantram*. The mistake of Vācaspati is to be attributed to this circumstance.

5. At the time of the Sāṃkhya Renaissance the epic portrait of Pañcaśikha is practically the only trace which remained of the old tradition. Besides, at the same time we come across the doctrine of a Pañcaśikha concerning the problem of the *vyāptih* so that now the name of the old teacher of the same name revived.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(We give here only the literature not mentioned by Garbe in his „Die Sāṃkhya-Philosophie“)

- V. M. Bedekar: *Studies in Sāṃkhya: Pañcaśikha and Cāraka* (ABORI, vol. 38, pp. 140—147), Poona 1958.
V. M. Bedekar: *Studies in Sāṃkhya: The Teachings of Pañcaśikha in the Mahābhārata* (ABORI, vol. 38, pp. 233—244), Poona 1958.

- V. M. Bedekar: The Development of the Sāṃkhya and the Problem of the Śaṣṭitantra (Journal of the University of Poona, Humanities Section, No. 11, pp. 37—49), Poona 1959.
- P. B. Cakravarti: Origin and Development of the Sāṃkhya system of Thought (Calcutta Sanskrit Series, No. 30), Calcutta 1951.
- S. N. Dasgupta: History of Indian Philosophy, vol. I, Cambridge 1951.
- E. Frauwallner: Geschichte der Indischen Philosophie, Bd. I, Salzburg 1953.
- E. Frauwallner: Zur Erkenntnislehre des klassischen Sāṃkhya-Systems (Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens, Bd. II, pp. 84—139), Wien 1958.
- R. Garbe: Die Sāṃkhya-Philosophie, eine Darstellung des Indischen Rationalismus, Leipzig 1917.
- M. Hiriyanna: Śaṣṭitantra and Vṛṣagana (JORM vol. III, pp. 107—112), Madras 1929.
- G. Kaviraj: Introduction to the Jayamaṅgalā ed. by H. Sarma (Calcutta Oriental Series No. 19), Calcutta 1926.
- F. M. Novotny: Die Sāṃkhya-Philosophie auf Grund der Yuktidīpikā und der Fragmente der Werke alter Sāṃkhya-Lehrer, Dissertation, Wien 1941.
- H. D. Sarma: The Sāṃkhya Teachers (Festschrift Winternitz, pp. 225—231), Leipzig 1933.
- F. O. Schrader: Das Śaṣṭitantra (ZDMG Bd. 68, pp. 101—110).
- Udaya Vira Sastri: Antiquity of the Sāṃkhya Sutras (Fifth India Oriental Conference, Proceedings and Transactions, vol. 2, pp. 855 ff.), Lahore 1930.
- Udaya Vira Sastri: Sāṃkhyadarśan kā Itihās, Jvalapur 1950.
- Udaya Vira Sastri: Kapila aor Śaṣṭitantra (Visvajyoti, April 1958, pp. 12—15), Hoshiarpur 1958.