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 Śaṣṭītantram. 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 Paṇḍasikha as its author whereas from the historical consideration of the tradition we are inclined to assign its authorship to Vṛṣaṇaṃ 1).

The material on which our study is based are the following 2):

_Śaṭasikha_: a) References: Mahābhāratam XII, 218, 6 (7886) ff.; 219, 5 (7934) ff.; 320, 60 (11783); 321, 3 (11839) f.; 322, 24 (11875) ff.;
—Sāṃkhyaśāstra Kā, 70; —Paramārtha’s commentary p. 1058, 1059 (ep. 1061); — Yuktidipikā 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 “Vṛṣaṇaṃ” to distinguish him from his followers (vārsaganāḥ) without, however, deciding whether the real name of the head of the school was Vṛṣaṇa or Vārsaganyā, as he is sometimes called, cp. P. Chakravarti: Origin and Development of the Sāṃkhya System of Thought, p. 136 f.

2) Ed it ion s c on sulted: La Sāṃkhyaśāstra étudiée à la lumière de sa version chinoise par M.J. Takakusui (BEFEO vol. IV), Hanoi 1904. — Yuktidipikā, crit. ed. by P. Chakravarti (C.S.S. Nr. 23), Calcutta 1938. — Jayamanagala, ed. by H. Sarma (C.S.S. Nr. 19), Calcutta 1926. — Mātharavṛttīḥ, ed. by P. Vishnu Prasad Sarma (C.S.S. Nr. 296), Benares 1922. — Sāṃkhyaśāstraṃ mahāsūriśrīkapila-pranītaṃ vijñānabhiṣuviracitapracanabhiṣayaḥhitam āśūbodhavidyābhūṣanana-

ityabodhavidyārātanābhiṣayaṃ saṃkṛtāṃ prakāśitam, Calcutta 1936. — Vijñāna-

bhikṣu: Brahmaśūrabhāṣyaṃ (Ch.S.S. Nr. 8), Benares 1901. — Tattvasamāsa-

sūtra-vṛttīḥ, Bhāvaganaśadikṣita’s Tattvayāthārthya-dipanam, Śimāṇandadikṣita’s Sāṃkhya-tatttvavivecañam and Sarvopakārinītiṅkā are quoted according to the Sāṃkhyaśāstraṃgraḥa (Ch.S.S. Nrs. 246 and 286), Benares 1918—1920. — Bhartṛhari: Vākyapadiyam, ed. by Carudeva Sastrī, Lahore 1934. — Uddyoṭakara: Nyāya-

vārttikā (K.S.S. Nrs. 33), Benares 1916. — Mallavādi: Dvādasāranyacakram with the commentary of Simhasūri is quoted according to the edition of Muni Jambuvijaya, to be brought out by the Jain Atmanānd Sabha shortly. — Vācaspati-

miśra: Nyāya-vārttikatātparyātyaṅkā (K.S.S. Nrs. 24), Benares 1925. — ŚaḍārśanaSA-

muccayaḥ by Haribhadra, ed. by L. Suali (Bibl. Ind.), Calcutta 1905.
IV, 13: Dignāga’s Pramāṇasamuccayaḥ V, 42; Dvādaśāranayacakraṃ p. 63, 25).

Ṣaṣṭītantram: References: Sāṃkhya-karikā Kā. 72; — Paramārtha’s commentary on Kā. 17 (cp. Gaudapādabhāṣyam on Kā. 12; Māṭhara-vṛttīḥ on Kā. 17); — Anuyogadvārasūtram 41; — Kalpasūtram 1. 10 (cp. Yaśovijaya’s commentary); — Yuktidīpikā p. 175, 23; — Jayamaṅgalā pp. 1, 7, 56, 68, 69; — Tattvavaiśāradī on Śū. IV, 13 (cp. Yogabhaṣyam on Śū. IV, 13); — Śaḍdarśanasamuccayaḥ p. 109, 14; — Vṛṣabhadeva’s commentary on Vākyapadiyam I, 8; — Bhāskara’s Brahmaskṛtrabhāṣyam on Śū. II, 1, 1; — Tattvasamāsāsūtravṛttiḥ p. 136; — Tattvāyathārthiyadīpanam p. 80 (cp. Tattvasamāsāsūtravṛttiḥ p. 135; — Sāṃkhya-tatttvavivecanam p. 22); — Sarvopakārinītīkā 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 Ṣaṣṭītantram 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 Ṣaṣṭītantram 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 polemies of the time as they have come down to us. This period comes to an end with the Sāṃkhya-karikā 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.
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According to the author it is written on the basis of another work, the Śaṭṭitantram. But, with the Kārikā the development of the Sāmkhya 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 Sāmkhyasūtras in the form we have got, and by the commentaries, among others, of Vijñānabhikṣu on the Sāmkhyasūtras and of his disciple on the Tattvasamāsātras. In this development of the Sāmkhya 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 Śaṭṭitantram or not.

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

etatpavitramagryam munirāsuraye’nukampayā pradaṇau
āsurirapi pañcaśikhāya tena ca bahudhā kṛtam tantram //

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 this\(^2\)). Further information about Pañcaśikha’s historical position is presented by the commentaries on the Sāmkhya-kārikā giving more detailed lists of teachers and pupils\(^4\)). 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-

\(^1\) Sāmkhyakārikā Kā. 70.

\(^2\) See p. 82.

cient tradition or because Pañcaśikha really was Āsuri’s pupil. (Since all the commentaries show the same sequence in naming the first Sāṁkhya 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 Īśvaraṅkṛṣṇa 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 Sāṁkhyaśāstra 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 Īśvaraṅkṛṣṇa 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 Sāṁkhya schools understands the Sāṁkhyaśāstra’s vague expression bahudhā kṛtam tantram in the way that Pañcaśikha has taught the system to many pupils: tena ca bahudhā kṛtam tantram / bahubhyyo janakavāśīṭh-ūdibhyah samākhyaṁ⁹). 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 paramaśirāsuraye tathā āsuri ṛapi daśamūya kumārāya bhagavatpañcaśikāhāya / tena ca bahudhā kṛtam tantram / bahubhyyo janakavāśīṭhūdibhyah samākhyaṁ / asya tu śastrasya bhagavato'gre pravṛttavāt na śastrāntaravat vanśāḥ śakyoc varṣāṣatasaḥšasairapayākhyātum / samkṣepena tu dvāv .................. hārītabāddhalikairātapaūrkarbhēsvara- pañcāḥdikaraṇapatañjaliśvarasaganyakaunḍīnyamūkśikāda (?) śisyapramparamāyāgatam bhagavānśvarakṛṣṇaṁś ca sāhīyaṁ kām śastrām pūrvacāryasūtraprabandhe gurulāghavamanādiyamāṅgāḥ paurushhyāṁ vyākhyaṁvavya ......... na garbhhamati-pramādaṁ dadaṁi granthahūyasthamamupajāyate.
⁹) Yuktidīpikā, p. 175, 10. Cf. Mātharavṛttih on Kā. 70: Pañcaśikhenā tena bahudhākṛtam tantram / bahūnāṁ śisyānāṁ pradattam.
The analysis of this passage gives the following result: the transmission of the system is marked by four stages. The Maharṣi (Kapila) teaches the extensive Sāṃkhya to the priest Āsūri (the remark on the extent of Kapila's teaching is merely an expression of the respectful esteem for the knowledge of a rṣi). 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 Sāṃkhya-kārikā by leaving out polemics and similes. 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 Śaṣṭī-tantram 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) Sāṃkhya-kārikā Kā. 72:

saptatīyāṃ kīla ye'rthāste'rthāh kṛṣnasya šaṣṭītantrasya
ākhyāyikāvirahitāh paravādavivarjītiścāpi.
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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-ordination. The epic speaks of Pañcaśikha as one of the chief representatives of the Sāmkhya (Sāmkhyanukhah). To the scholars at King Janaka’s court in Mithila he appears as Kapila, well versed in the doctrine of final salvation, the highest bliss. According to the tradition the epic Pañcaśikha belongs to the old Parāśara-

12) Here we base ourselves on the material gathered by V. M. Bedekar, in: Studies in Sāmkhya: The Teachings of Pañcaśikha in the Mahābhāratam. 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 Mahābhāratam, Leipzig 1906.
14) Mahābhāratam XII, 218, 6 (7886) ff.

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

\[ \text{nānu tvaya mokṣah kṛtsnah pañcaśikhacchṛutah} \\
\text{sopāyah sopaniśadah sopasaṅgah saniścayah} \]

(Mahābhāratam XII, 165)

Strangely enough the only quotation which perhaps is taken from the work of Pañcaśikha pañcavinśatitattvajña 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 mokṣaśāstram used for the Sāmghya system also in the writings of Vījñānabhikṣu (Sāmkhyapravacanabhāṣyam 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 (Mokṣadharma) 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.
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gotram). Certain assumptions can be made from this fact. Aśvaghoṣa makes the following remark in his Buddhacaritam:

\[ jaigīṣavyo'pi janakah vṛddhaścaiva parāśrāḥ \\
\text{imāṁ panthānāmāsādya muktā hyanye ca mokṣinaḥ } \]^{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 pupils. Thus we can consider it as possible that Aśvaghoṣa 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 epic.\(^{18}\) 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 Aśvaghoṣa 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 Sāmkhyakārikā quotes a verse that is recited during the Ṛṣitarpaṇa ceremony:

Sanakaśca Sanandanaśca trītyaśca sanātanaḥ |
Āsurīḥ Kapilāścaiva vodhuh paṅcaśikhastathā //
ityete brahmanah putrāḥ sapta proktā maharṣayah // ¹⁰)

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

manusyaṁstarpayedbhaktyā brahmaputrān rśimstathā |
sanakaśca sanandaśca trītyaśca sanātanaḥ //
kapilāścaūrṇiścaiva vodhuh paṅcaśikhastathā |
sarve te trपितमायान्त 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 Tarpanavidhiḥ of the Atharvavedaparīśiṣṭa:

Yajnopavitam grīvāyāṃ avalambya sanakādimanusyāms tarpayati //
sanakaḥ trpyatu // sanandanaḥ trpyatu // sanātanaḥ trpyatu //
kapilas trpyatu // vodhus trpyatu // āsuris trpyatu // paṅcaśikhas trpyatu // ... ²¹) Hence we are justified in concluding that

¹⁰) 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:

utra pūrvaṅgatūṣeṣu kumūrā brahmunāḥ sutāḥ |
sanakaśca sanandaśca trītyaśca sanātanaḥ //
vodhuṣca kapilaśeṣamāsuriśca mahāyaŉāḥ /
muniḥ paṅcaśikhāṣcaiva ye cāntyerṣeyamādayāḥ //

²¹) Atharvavedaparīśiṣṭa 43, 3, 1—7.
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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 Rṣīfarpana 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 Yuktidīpikā\(^{22}\) 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 Yogabhāṣya 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 Yogabhāṣya, 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 darsanam

\(^{22}\) Yuktidīpikā, p. 31, 24: iha bhavatām pañcaśikhānām pañcavimśatattvāni and p. 61, 1: asmatpaksēpi turhi bhagavatpañcaśikhādinām pratvākṣatvat satkāryamabhyyapagantavyam.
khyātireva darśanam to Pañcaśikha, the Yuktidīpikā mentions it as taken from the Śāstram, a work which is cited in several places in the same text. Further the quotation rūpātiśayā . . . . pravartante in the Yogabhāṣyam is also attributed to Pañcaśikha-by Vācaspati, whereas the Yuktidīpikā attributes it to Vṛṣagana, 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 Vṛṣagana’s. The fragment in the Yogabhāṣyam on III, 53: mūrtivyavadhijatibhedābhāvānāsti mūlapṛthaktvam is attributed to Vṛṣagana by the Bhāsyam itself. The fragment in the Yogabhāṣyam on III, 13 is the above-discussed, which is mentioned once more in the Bhāsyam on II, 15, and is verified as Vṛṣagana’s by the Yuktidīpikā. The fragment in the Bhāsyam on IV, 13: gunānāṁ paramam rūpam . . . . ruttucchakam is attributed to Vṛṣagana by Vācaspati, which he (Vācaspati) himself states in another place to be a doctrine of the Śaśṭitantram. Finally the fragment in the Yogabhāṣyam on III, 14: jalabhūmyoh . . . . abhvivyaktir is ascertained as Vṛṣagana’s through Śīnhasūri’s commentary on the Nayacakram. From what we have seen we can conclude that Vṛṣagana is one of the chief authorities for the Yogabhāṣyam on the speculative problems of the Sāṁkhya 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) Tattvavaiśāradī on Y. S. I, 4.
24) Yuktidīpikā, p. 41, 25 f.
26) Yuktidīpikā, p. 72, 5 f.: tathā ca bhagavān vārsaganyah paṭhati rūpātiśayā nṛtyattayasyāca viruddhyante, sāmānyāṁi tvatiśayāḥ saha vartante.
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 Śaṣṭītantram. The commentary translated by Paramārtha into Chinese ca. 550 A.D. speaks of a work of Pañcaśikha containing 60,000 verses. The same commentary tells us in another passage that the Sixty Categories — generally known as the subject-matter of the Śaṣṭītantram — had been the subject of this work of 60,000 verses. How was such a thing possible? To begin with, Paramārtha’s author had wrongly interpreted Īśvarakṛṣṇa’s remark *tena bahuḍhā 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 Śaṣṭītantram could denote a definite work as well as the Sāṃkhya system of the classical period itself the relationship between Pañcaśikha and Śaṣṭītantram becomes easily understandable. In other words, Paramārtha’s informant transferred the idea he had about the classical Sāṃkhya system, namely the Śaṣṭītantram, 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 Śaṣṭītantram. 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 Sāṃkhya-kārikā, the Jayamaṅgalā, the author of the Śaṣṭītantram is in fact identified with Pañcaśikha. Obviously that commentary


31) Jayamaṅgalā on Ka. 70: *tena iti / pañcaśikhena muninā bahuḍhā kṛtam tantram / saṣṭītantrākhyam saṣṭikhandam kṛtam iti.*
still knows something from the Śaṣṭiṭantram, but no more from the original as is clear from the fact that, while enumerating the ten Mūlikārthas, a Saṅgrahakāra is mentioned as the source of information, and that the classification of the inference deviates from the original form in the Śaṣṭiṭantram. 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 Tattvakaumudi on Ka. 51, and so presupposes the former. Therefore he might really have been of the opinion that the Śaṣṭiṭantram and the tradition of the school connected with it originated from Paṅcaśikha. If we are in a position to show now that the fragments in the Yogabhāṣyam attributed to Paṅcaśikha by Vācaspati are really fragments of Vṛṣagana or of his school, our explanation of Vācaspati’s error would certainly carry weight when we shall prove that the Śaṣṭiṭantram was Vṛṣagana’s work. This proof holds good for part of the fragments.

First we shall consider the person of Vṛṣagana. Tradition regarding him begins with Vasubandhu who makes mention of the followers of Vṛṣagana. In Paramārtha’s „Life of Vasubandhu“ we meet with Vṛṣagana 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 Śāmkhya school35), a fact which is known to us also from the Yuktidipikā as Vṛṣagana’s followers are often mentioned there.

---
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 Fadi-cha (varṣa) ce qui signifie «pluie» parce qu’il était né pendant la saison des pluies. Ses compagnons étaient nommés les héritiques de la «troupe de la pluie» (vārṣaganyā).“ 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, Vṛṣaṇa is quoted by Vasubandhu in the Abhidharmakośa\(^{36}\), Dignāga attacks his teachings while he deals with the Sāmkhya\(^{37}\); Uddyotakara refutes his definition of perception\(^{38}\), and Śimhasūri also commenting on the Dvādaśāraṇayacakram considers Vṛṣaṇa as the representative of the system and tries to refute him\(^{39}\). All these facts show sufficiently that Vṛṣaṇa was the most important representative of the Sāmkhya from the fourth century up to the time when the Sāmkhyakārikā in its easily understandable form displaced the somewhat difficult and large work of Vṛṣaṇa, the only one to be dealt with by the opponents.

From Śimhasūri's commentary on Mallavādi's Dvādaśāraṇayacakram we are able to recover rather long fragments of this teacher, which give us an idea of his work\(^{40}\). The merit of having reconstructed Vṛṣaṇa's theory of cognition by means of these fragments and others goes to E. Frauwallner, thanks to whose work we can prove Vṛṣaṇa'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 Sāmkhyakārikā itself which, while proving the existence of the primal matter, enumerates the five proofs of Vṛṣaṇa\(^{43}\). But if we leave the classical period of the system and consider the later commentators, we observe that all that was known about Vṛṣaṇa'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. Tātparyatīkā, p. 155, 20 (K. S. S. No. 24) and Yuktidīpikā, p. 4, 10 and p. 39, 14.
\(^{40}\) Ibidem.
\(^{42}\) E. Frauwallner: Candramati loc. cit. p. 79 f.
\(^{43}\) Sāmkhyakārikā 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 Śāṃkhya, as a representative of the Yoga system and attributes genuine Vṛṣagāṇa-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 Śaṭṭītantram is already decided. But let us first examine the expression „Śaṭṭītantram“. Śaṭṭītantram means a „system of sixty concepts“. This expression occurs in the Śāṃkhyakārikā (§2), its commentaries and some passages of the Jaina (§3). This means that this expression is attested

[§4] Śāṃkhyakārikā Kā. 72.

[§5] Sometimes we come across passages in which the Śaṭṭītantram is attributed to Kapila. For instance, in Kalpanastra I, 10 we find the expression sattitaṇṭavisarne wich is commented on by Yaśovijaya as śaṭṭītantram kapilaśāstram, tatra viśāradāh paṇḍitaḥ; Bhaskara says in his Brahmasūtrabhāṣya on Br. S. II, 1, 1: yadi brahmaivopāddānakāraṇaṁ nimitakāraṇaṁ ca tatāḥ kapilamahāśirpiṇīta-śaṭṭītantrākhyasmiter anavakāśo nirvīśayavatam... To conclude on the basis of such and similar passages, as does Udayana Saṭṭī, that the Śaṭṭītantram is Kapila’s work is unjustifiable. Such passages are easily to be derived from the identification of the Śāṃkhya system with the Śaṭṭītantram, and they mean nothing more than that the Śāṃkhya system had been founded by Kapila.

The same is to be said of the question of the Śaṭṭītantram in the Aḥirbudhnyasaṁhitā that has been raised by Schrader and recently resumed by V. M. Bedekar. Bedekar says in his essay „The Development of the Śāṃkhya and the Problem of the Śaṭṭītantram“ that, in order to solve the problem of the Śaṭṭītantram in a satisfactory manner, the Śaṭṭītantram of the Aḥirbudhnyasaṁhitā must also be explained. To this we may say that we are talking of a Śaṭṭītantram meaning a definite text that is historically ascertainable. That text is, as far as we know, entirely different from the so-called Śaṭṭītantram of the Paṇcarātra work. Only in the first case is the name Śaṭṭītantram deduced logically and organically from the teachings of the school, namely from the system of the sixty concepts. In the Aḥirbudhnyasaṁhitā we find, in the contents of the Śāṃkhya 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, Vṛṣagana's work, which is attested as vṛṣaganyatantram 46). This must be identical with the Śaṭītantram the author of which can thereby be ascertained as Vṛṣagana.

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 Ahibudhnyasambhitā, therefore, cannot be used for an evaluation of the original work. Cf. E. Frauwallner: Geschichte der Indischen Philosophie, Bd. 1, p. 480, note 177. Further in this case the word Śaṭītantram 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: Śaṭītantrāṇyathāiṣhikikam esām nāṇāvidham mune (Ahibudhnyasambhitā XII, 30). Thus the Śaṭītantram of the Sāṃhitā has nothing to do with the Śaṭītantram, 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) Dvāḍaśāranayacakrā, p. 324, 11. Besides this general consideration, we can also bring forward a textual argument for the identification of Vṛṣaganyatantram with the Śaṭītantram. Thus we find that the five proofs for the existence of primal matter given by Simhasūri in his commentary on Dvāḍaśāranayacakram as Vṛṣagana’s are identical with those found in the Sāṃkhyaakārikā, Kā. 15. As Īśvarakṛṣṇa himself states that he gave an exact summary of the Śaṭītantram and since we do not find any evidence for the existence of an important work other than the Vṛṣaganyatantram, we can conclude that Īśvarakṛṣṇa reproduces in Kārikā 15 the five proofs from Vṛṣagana, and consequently the Vṛṣaganyatantram is identical with the Śaṭītantram.
a thing like this. Besides the epic tradition of the Mokṣadharma and
the Purāṇas in which Paṇcaśikha is mentioned as the chief Śaṅkhya
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 Paṇcaśikha is mentioned in two passages of the Śaṅkhyasūtras, the main text of the Śaṅkhya Renaissance47).

2. R. Garbe48) and F. Hall49) before him have called our attention
to the fact that the fragments ascribed to Paṇcaśikha in the
Tattvayāthārthhyadīpanam of Bhāvāgāneśa are all to be found in
the Tattvasamāsūtravrūttiti50). According to Garbe this work was
attributed to Paṇcaśikha in all the manuscripts known to him51). As Bhāvāgāneśa himself states in the introduction to his work:

\[
\text{samāsūtrānyālambya vyākhyām paṇcaśikhasya ca} / \\
bhāvāganeśaḥ kurute tattvavyāthārthhyadīpanam ///52
\]

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

Although Garbe was right in saying that the attribution of these
fragments by Bhāvāgāneśa to Paṇcaśikha was wrong, yet his argu-
ment is not fully convincing. First of all Garbe considered, upon
the authority of Vācaspati, the fragments in the Yogabhāṣyam as

47) Śaṃkhyasūtras V, 32 ff. and VI, 68.
48) R. Garbe: Śaṃkhya-Philosophie, 2nd edit. p. 68, footnote 2. The argument of Garbe against the śloka ādyas tu mokṣo etc. holds good also for all the other Paṇcaśikha-frgments in Bhāvāgāneśa’s work.
49) Śaṃkhyā-Sāra, a Treatise of Śaṃkhya Philosophy by Viśṇuabhikṣu, ed.
by F. Hall, Calcutta 1862, p. 23 f.
50) Tattvasamāsūtravrūttiti (Śaṃkhyasamgraha, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series
No. 286, Benares 1920, p. 117—140). This work is identical with the work edited
by Ballantyne under the title „Krāmadipīkā: A Lecture on the Śaṃkhya Philo-
sophy, embracing the text of the Tattvasamāsa“, printed for the use of the Benares
College, Mirzapore 1850.
51) loc. cit.
52) Bhāvāgāneśa Diksita: Tattvavāthārthhyadīpanam (Śaṃkhyasamgraha, Chow-
khamba 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 Tattvasamāsāsūtra-vṛttiḥ to a greater extent than Garbe supposed it to be 53). 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 Tattvayāthārthhyadipanam 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 Tattvasamāsāsūtra-vṛttiḥ as a work of Pañcaśikha, he (Pañcaśikha) himself being quoted there 55). Bhāvāganeśa could not have failed to observe this fact, for he cites this special passage word for word with the name of Pañcaśikha 56). 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 Vijñānabhiṣkuṣu in his Bhāṣyam on

---

53) Bhāvāganeśa makes excerpts from the Tattvasamāsāsūtra-vṛttiḥ word for word on pp. 61, 63, 71 f., 74, 75, 80, 81 without, however, mentioning the source.
54) The fragment pañcavimśatattvajña 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 uktaṃ ca in the Vṛttiḥ, as is also the case with the fragment prakṛtena tu bandhena etc. The fragment tattvāṇi yo veda-yatī etc. is cited as well by the Sāmkhyatattvavivecanam (Sāmkhyasamgraha, p. 16) and Sāmkhyasūtra-vivecanam (Sāmkhyasamgraha, p. 108), though in a slightly modified form.
55) Tattvasamāsāsūtra-vṛttiḥ, p. 125.
56) Tattvayāthārthhyadipanam, p. 61.
S. S. I, 127 differs so much from the text of the Tattvasamāsāsūtra-vṛttīḥ that, in order to derive it from the Vṛttīḥ, 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 Tattvasamāsāsūtra-vṛttīḥ.

This shows that the name of a Pañcaśikha appeared in the Sāṃkhya Renaissance even independently of the Tattvasamāsāsūtra-vṛttīḥ, allegedly attributed to Pañcaśikhā. 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 ādheyāśaktiyoga iti Pañcaśikhāḥ, 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 Vṛṣagana's question about the nature of the sambandhaḥ. But that seems to be much more archaic than the theory of the Pañcaśikha of the Sāṃkhya-sūtras, and it presupposes a much higher level of abstraction in the posing of the problem than Vṛṣagana'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 ādheyāśaktiyogah is to be dated later than Vṛṣagana 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 Tattvasamāsāsūtras and the Sāṃkhya-sūtras.

---

We have now come to the end of our study of the author of the Śaṣṭītantram, 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 Śaṣṭītantram 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 Śaṣṭītantram.

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 Bhāsyakāra.

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 Śaṣṭītantram. 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 vyāptīḥ so that now the name of the old teacher of the same name revived.
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