



Correcting the Text of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*

Johannes Bronkhorst¹ 

Published online: 7 October 2020

© The Author(s) 2020

Abstract Attempts have been made to correct the text of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* on the basis of the texts that its author used—and sometimes refers to by name—while composing his work. This procedure is promising in texts like the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*, which makes abundant use of other works, and might in principle give results that are independent of, and prior to, the detailed study of its manuscripts. A closer investigation shows that this procedure is not without risks, and may occasionally give rise to unjustified “corrections”. The article shows that quotations in the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* deviate from their source-texts in numerous cases. It further illustrates that the archetype underlying the manuscripts used for the available editions on occasion demonstrably differs from what must have been the text’s autograph. Other cases demonstrate that already the autograph sometimes deviated from its source-texts. The article concludes that careless “correcting” of the text may have serious consequences and can stand in the way of its correct interpretation.

Keywords *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* · Edition · Correcting texts

The *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* is, at its title indicates, a “Compendium of all philosophies”. It was composed in the fourteenth century in the South Indian Vijayanagara Empire. Its colophons attribute it to Mādhava the son of Sāyaṇa, but there are good reasons to believe that its real author was Mādhava’s contemporary Cannibhaṭṭa (Bronkhorst forthcoming).

✉ Johannes Bronkhorst
johannes.bronkhorst@unil.ch

¹ University of Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland

There is no critical edition of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*. The *New Catalogus Catalogorum* (Dash 2015, p. 119) enumerates its surviving manuscripts, but it is not known whether any of these manuscripts were used in the existing editions. Of the existing editions, only three, as far as I can see, are based on manuscript evidence. All the other editions appear to be based on one or the other of these three editions.

These are the following:

- The Bibliotheca Indica edition, by Īśwarachandra Vidyāsāgara, Calcutta 1858
- The Ānandāśrama edition, by the Ānandāśrama Pandits, Poona 1906 and subsequent editions. (I have only had access to the third edition of 1950 and the fourth edition of 1977. The third edition appears to be an exact reprint of the second edition, but its relation to the original first edition is unknown to me. The fourth edition of 1977 has been reset and is not in all details identical with the third one. In what follows I use the third edition.)
- The Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute edition, by Vasudev Shastri Abhyankar, Poona 1924. (I have had access to the third edition of 1978, seen through the press by T. G. Mainkar, and have not so far seen reasons to believe that it is different from the first edition.)

There is no guarantee that readings that we find in all these three editions are identical with what the author of the text committed to writing more than six centuries ago. Strictly speaking, we do not know whether readings shared by all surviving manuscripts are identical with what the author wrote. That is to say, there is no guarantee that the archetype of all surviving manuscripts is identical with the author's autograph; the same is true, a fortiori, for the "archetype" of the existing editions (which I will henceforth refer to as "the archetype of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*"). What we do know is that the manuscripts used for the editions represent two stages in the development of the text: Most manuscripts contain only 15 chapters,¹ whereas some have an additional chapter on Śāṅkara's philosophy that does not, with the exception of some transitional remarks, refer back to earlier chapters (Bronkhorst forthcoming).

One way to obtain a text that is as reliable as possible would be to make a critical edition that takes all manuscript readings into account.² There is conceivably also another way, which does not replace the need for a critical edition but may in certain cases provide us with even better, i.e. more original, readings than a critical edition. The *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* makes extensive use of other texts, hereafter called its source-texts, from which it sometimes copies, with or without acknowledgment. In the best of circumstances, the identification of explicit or implicit source-texts may make it possible to correct the text of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*.

¹ The *New Catalogus Catalogorum* describes the contents of the manuscripts as a concise account of 15 philosophical systems, with the exception of Vedānta (Dash 2015, p. 119).

² It is yet useful to keep in mind Sheldon Pollock's (2018, 6 n. 4) reflection that critical editing may have reached a point of fetishization with dense mathematical analyses and bloated apparati critici reporting scores of manuscript readings to no purpose. On critical editions and the limits of their usefulness, see also Bronkhorst (2008).

As so often, circumstances are not always perfect. In principle, we can be sure that the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* quotes in cases where it explicitly mentions the source-text (or its author). There are numerous such instances, but many of those “literal” quotations deviate in minor or major ways from their source-texts. The following two examples will illustrate this.

Chapter 12—on Jaimini’s philosophy—claims to quote the following passage from Udayana’s *Kusumāñjali* (p. 285 l. 12.273–276):³

*atra kusumāñjalāv udayanena jhaṭ iti pracurapravṛtteḥ prāmānyaniścayādhi-
natvābhāvam āpādayatā pranyagādi/
pravṛttir hīcchām apekṣate/ tatprācuryaṃ cecchāprācuryam/ icchā ceṣṭasādha-
natājñānam/ tac ceṣṭajātīyatvaliṅgānubhavam/ so ‘pīndriyārthasamnikarṣam/
prāmānyagrahaṇam tu na kvacid upayujyata iti/*

Udayana has stated the following in his *Kusumāñjali*, while putting forward that much activity that takes place instantly does not depend on certain knowledge of authoritativeness:

“For activity requires desire. And abundance of activity requires abundance of desire. And desire requires knowledge that something is the means to attain the desired goal. And that knowledge requires an experience of an inferential sign (*liṅga*) that something is of the same kind as the desired goal. That experience, in its turn, requires contact (*samnikarṣa*) between sense organ and object. Grasping authoritativeness, however, plays no role anywhere.”

The *Kusumāñjali* under verse 2.1 (p. 229) contains the passage that is here no doubt referred to:

*(yad api jhaṭ iti pracuratarasamarthapravṛtṭyanyathānupapattyā svataḥ
prāmānyam ucyate, tadapi nāsti/ anyathaivopapatteḥ/ jhaṭ iti pravṛttir hi jhaṭ
iti tatkāraṇopanipātam antareṇānupapadyamānā tam ākṣipet/ pracu-
rapravṛttir api svakāraṇaprācuryam /) icchā ca pravṛtteḥ kāraṇam/
tatkāraṇam apīṣṭābhyupāyatājñānam/ tad api tajiātīyatvaliṅgānubhavaprab-
havam/ so ‘pīndriyasannikarṣādījanmā/ na tu prāmānyagrahasya kvacid apy
upayogaḥ/*

It is impossible to believe that the author of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* believed that he quoted literally from the *Kusumāñjali*. And yet, he presents this as a quotation, thus confirming our conclusion that quotations in the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* must be treated with caution, and do not in all cases justify “corrections” in the light of the source-texts.

The second example occurs in chapter 15, on Sāṃkhya. The *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* here quotes from Śāṅkara (p. 340 ll. 15.69–72):

³ Unless otherwise indicated, all references to the text of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* are to Abhyankar’s edition.

athāto brahmajijñāsā ity atra tu brahmajijñāsāyā anadhikāryatvenādhikārā rthatvaṃ parityajya sādhanacatuṣṭayasamṣattiviśiṣṭādhikārisamarpaṇāya śamadamādivākyavihitāc chamāder ānantaryam athaśabdārtha iti śamkarācāryair niraṭaṅki

This is what the teacher (*ācārya*) Śāṅkara, rejecting the meaning “beginning” (*adhikāra*) for *atha* because desire to know Brahma cannot be begun, stated under *Brahmasūtra* 1.1.1 “Next the desire to know Brahma” (*athāto brahmajijñāsā*): The meaning of the word *atha* is consecutiveness after tranquillisation (*śama*) etc. — prescribed by the sentence beginning with *śamadama*... — so as to apply to a qualified person (*adhikārin*) who distinguishes himself by the acquisition of the four means (*sādhana*).

The quoted passage does indeed occur in Śāṅkara’s commentary on *Brahmasūtra* 1.1.1, but in an altogether different form (*Brahmasūtra-Śāṅkarabhāṣya*, pp. 27, 37):

tatrāthaśabda ānantaryārthaḥ pariḡrhyate nādhikārārthaḥ, brahmajijñāsāyā anadhikāryatvāt/ .../ tasmād athaśabdena yathoktasādhanasamṣattyanantaryam upadiśyate/

Once again, there can be no doubt that the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* here presents a free paraphrase of what Śāṅkara had said.

Before we proceed, it is necessary to take the following points into consideration:

- It is not always obvious that the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* quotes directly from the source-text. In certain cases it may quote through the intermediary of other texts. As already pointed out by de la Vallée Poussin (1902, p. 391), this seems particularly clear in the chapter on Buddhism, which appears to derive at least some of its Buddhist quotations from Vācaspati’s *Bhāmāṭī* and other Brahmanical texts. It is conceivable, but hard to prove, that the same happened in other chapters.
- We have no guarantee that the text of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* that we find in its editions (or even in its manuscripts) is identical with the text committed to writing by its author, i.e. with its autograph. We have no guarantee either that the existing editions (and indeed, the surviving manuscripts) of source-texts are in all details identical with *their* autographs. In comparing passages quoted in the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* with their source-texts, we compare two uncertain readings.⁴
- We have no guarantee that the author of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* intended in all cases to quote a passage from a source-text *verbatim*. This uncertainty is particularly pronounced in cases where the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* does not name the source-text or its author.

⁴ This means that there may be occasions where it is possible to correct the available source-text on the basis of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*. An example is the description of *kalā* in chapter 6 (l. 6.66–67; similarly in other editions, without variants): *cetanaparatantratve saty acetanā kalā*. The *Ratnaṭīkā*, presumably its source-text, has: *cetanānāśritatve satī niścetanā kalā*. Hara (1958, 23 n. 95) comments: Presumably *anāśritatve* in [the *Ratnaṭīkā*] is an error for *āśritatve*.

- Even in cases where the author of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* intended to quote a passage *verbatim*, we do not know what reading he found in the manuscript(s) of the source-text available to him.

An example that illustrates these uncertainties occurs in the chapter on Pratyabhijñā (ch. 8). We read here (ed. Abhyankar, p. 192 l. 8.27–31):

*tathopadiṣṭam śivadr̥ṣṭau paramagurubhir bhagavatsomānandanāthapādaiḥ —
ekavāraṃ pramāṇena śāstrād vā guruvākyataḥ/
jñāte śivatve sarvasthe pratipattiyā dr̥ḍhātmanā//
karaṇena nāsti kṛtyaṃ kvāpi bhāvanayāpi vā/
jñāne suvarṇe karaṇaṃ bhāvanāṃ vā parityajet// iti*⁵

The venerable Somānanda, the supreme guru, has taught this in his *Śivadr̥ṣṭi*: “Once it is known thanks to a means of knowledge (*pramāṇa*), with firm understanding (*pratipatti*), whether from books or from the words of a guru, that the Śiva-nature is present in all, nothing remains to be done by means of instruments of knowledge or even (*api*) mental cultivation (*bhāvanā*). When knowledge is gold, one should abandon instruments and mental cultivation.”

Three of the four quoted lines (i.e. *ekavāraṃ ... bhāvanayāpi vā*) do indeed occur in the edition of the *Śivadr̥ṣṭi*: seventh Āhnika, v. 5cd–6ab). The final line (*jñāne ... parityajet*), though clearly included in the quotation attributed to the *Śivadr̥ṣṭi*, does not occur in the available edition of that text, which has, at this place: *jñāte ‘pi tarubhūmyādīdārḍhyān na karaṇādīkam*. It is possible, though far from certain, that the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* here quotes an earlier version of the *Śivadr̥ṣṭi*. There is, to my knowledge, no way at present to resolve this issue.

Another example occurs in the chapter on Yoga, which quotes *Yogasūtra* 2.5 in the following form (ed. Abhyankar, p. 361 l. 15.298–299):

*pariṇāmatāpasamskāraduḥkhair guṇavṛttyavirodhāc ca duḥkham eva sarvaṃ
vivekinaḥ*

This corresponds to the form the sūtra has in the critical edition of the *Yogaśāstra*, with the exception of the form *guṇavṛttyavirodhāc* which, in that critical edition, has *guṇavṛttivirodhāc*; this reading is confirmed in the *Yogabhāṣya* and in Vācaspati’s *Tattvavaiśārādī*. The negative form °vṛttyaviro° in the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* is apparently supported by all manuscripts used in the preparation of the Bhandarkar and Ānandāsrama editions; only the Bibliotheca Indica edition has *guṇavṛttinirodhāc*. It is tempting to conclude that the “incorrect” reading °avirodhāc was not part of the autograph and must be corrected. However, Vijñānabhikṣu’s comments on this sūtra defend the reading °avirodhāc, suggesting that this reading was current in at least certain manuscripts of the *Yogaśāstra*.

⁵ The Bibliotheca Indica edition has *bhāvanayā sakṛt* for *bhāvanayāpi vā* and *jñāte suvarṇe* for *jñāne suvarṇe*.

I will below present examples that illustrate the following:

- I. The archetype of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* is different from its autograph.
- II. Its archetype is identical with its autograph but different from the source-text.

I. Archetype different from autograph

Ia. A case where the editions of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* all go back to an erroneous reading occurs in the chapter on Vaiśeṣika (ch. 10: *Aulūkyadarśana*). In this chapter the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* often makes use of the *Padārthadharmasamgraha*, better known by the name *Praśastapādabhāṣya*. While discussing the kind of division born from division (*vibhāgajavibhāga*) that is called “born from a division between cause and non-cause” (*kāraṇākāraṇavibhāgaja*), the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* has the following line in all its editions (ed. Abhyankar p. 228, l. 10.137–138):

haste karmotpannam avayavāntarād vibhāgam kurvad ākāśādideśebhyo vibhāgān ārabhate/

An activity that has arisen in a hand, while **making** a division from another part of the body, brings about divisions from positions of ether etc.⁶

The corresponding line in the *Padārthadharmasamgraha* reads (WI § 189, p. 32):

yadā haste karmotpannam avayavāntarād vibhāgam akurvad ākāśādideśebhyo vibhāgān ārabhya

The reading *akurvad* is confirmed by all editions and commentaries of the *Padārthadharmasamgraha*, and this is not surprising: only this reading makes sense in the Vaiśeṣika scheme of things. When one moves one’s hand, no division between the hand and other parts of the body appears, whereas a division from positions of ether does.

Since it is hard to imagine that the author of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* introduced this change on purpose, we must conclude that a mistake entered the manuscript-tradition at an early date (unless we assume that the author’s mastery of Vaiśeṣika left to be desired, an option that cannot be totally discarded).

Ib. In its chapter on Pratyabhijñā (ch. 8) the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* quotes a verse from the conclusion (*upasaṃhāra*) of the chapter on action (*kriyādhikāra*) of Utpaladeva’s *Īśvarapratyabhijñārikā*, as follows (ed. Abhyankar, p. 197, l. 8.92–94; no variants in the different editions):

*upasaṃhāre ’pi —
itthaṃ tathā ghaṭapatādyākārajagadātmanā/
tiṣṭhāsor evam icchaiva hetukarṭṭkṛtā kriyā// iti/*

⁶ Cowell and Gough (1882, p. 156) translate: As action which arises in the hand, and causes a disjunction from that with which it was in contact, initiates a disjunction from the points of space in which the original conjunction took place. This does not do justice to the word *avayavāntarād*.

This verse is *Īśvarapratyabhijñākārikā* 2.4.21, which however reads somewhat differently in the critical edition (Torella 1994, p. 61):

*itthaṃ tathā ghaṭapatādyābhāsa jagadātmanā/
tiṣṭhāsor evaṃ icchaiva hetutā karṭrītā kriyā//*

The critical edition notes no variants, except *tadā* in one manuscript for *tathā*. Torella (1994, p. 187) translates:

Therefore causality, agency, action are nothing but the will of him who wishes to appear in the form of the universe, in the various manifestations of jar, cloth and so on.

The verse as quoted in the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* is harder to translate. Cowell and Gough (1882, p. 133) propose:

The mere will of God, when he wills to become the world under its forms of jar, of cloth, and other objects, is his activity worked out by motive and agent.

The translation “activity worked out by motive and agent” for *hetukarṭṛkṛtā kriyā* hardly makes sense, and we are justified in considering that the editions of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* do not preserve the original reading of this verse. And yet, it is hard to believe that the author of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* quoted a nonsensical verse. The conclusion must, once again, be that the archetype of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* differs at this place from its autograph.

Ic. Consider now the following lines from the chapter on Nyāya (ch. 11; l. 11.200–203):

*īśvarasya jagatsarjanam na yujyate/ tad uktam bhāṭṭācāryaiḥ —
prayojanam anuddiśya na mando ‘pi pravartate/
jagac ca srjatas tasya kiṃ nāma na kṛtam bhavet//*

It is not right to claim that God created the world. This has been stated by the teacher Bhaṭṭa:

“Not even a dim-witted person acts without a purpose.

What has not been made by Him who creates the world?”

The two half-verses here quoted have been taken from Kumāriḷa Bhaṭṭa’s *Ślokavārttika* (*Sambandhākṣepaparihāra* vv. 55ab and 54cd respectively), but the second line is rather different in the one edition of that text accessible to me, as we will see below.

But let us first look at the text as we find it in the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*. The lines are quoted to support the view that God did not create the world. The first quoted line does support this, for it could reasonably be argued that creating the world serves no purpose to Him all of whose desires are fulfilled. The second line, on the other hand, makes no sense in this context. This does not change if we accept the reading of the Bibliotheca Indica edition and supported by several manuscripts used for the Ānandāśrama edition:

jagac cāsrjatas tasya ...

... by Him who does not create the world?

The edition of the *Ślokavārttika* has a different reading for this line:

jagac cāsrjatas tasya kiṃ nāmeṣṭaṃ na sidhyati

What object of desire is not attained by Him even without creating the world?

and this makes perfect sense. Since it is hard to believe that the author of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* quoted a nonsensical line, there are good grounds to believe that he quoted it as we find it in the edition of the *Ślokavārttika*. Clearly the archetype of the editions of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* contained an error, supporting the view that this archetype was different from the autograph of this text.

These examples give us reasons to think that the readings provided by the editions of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* do not always coincide with the readings of its autograph and can in certain cases be corrected with the help of the source-texts. Some scholars have raised this possibility into a principle. Uma Shankar Sharma stated already in 1964 that “the text of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* is ... defective because the quotations of other works occurring in the present work sometimes present different readings when compared with the original text” (p. 22). Others have used this principle to correct the text.

Hélène Brunner, in her study of the chapter on the *Śaivadarśana* (1981), takes the position that in quoting verses from known source-texts, the author of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* did not wish to deviate from their original reading, so that we are entitled to correct the text in cases where the quoted verses differ from their source-texts. We are not, however, entitled to do so in the case of prose passages (Brunner 1981, p. 107):

Les śloka cités par [Mādhava] proviennent, à une exception près, de textes dont on possède des éditions, ou plusieurs mss.; et beaucoup d’entre eux sont couramment cités dans la littérature śivaïte. A part un ou deux détails que nous signalons, leur forme est bien assurée et on peut les corriger sans hésitation; il ne s’agit pas de suggérer pour eux des lectures nouvelles issues d’un cerveau imaginaire, mais de rétablir celles qui sont attestées partout. Il en va autrement pour la partie en prose, c’est-à-dire l’exposé de [Mādhava], dont la forme correcte ne peut être rétablie par simple comparaison avec les passages qui l’inspirent, puisque justement [Mādhava] modifie ceux-ci, peu ou prou.⁷

Raffaele Torella’s article “Due capitoli del *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*: *Śaivadarśana* e *Pratyabhijñādarśana*” (1980) follows by and large the same method. It proposes numerous emendations of the text of those two chapters, which it justifies with the observation that these chapters are largely based on a small number of known texts. Chapter six, on the philosophy of the followers of Śiva (*śaivadarśana*), Torella

⁷ Brunner (1981, 132 n. 155) goes to the extent of characterizing one prose passage as une systématisation fâcheuse, qui brouille le tableau au lieu de l’éclairer. Given such serious deviations from the sources, why not accept that the verses, too, were sometimes adjusted? We will see below that that is exactly what happened in certain cases.

(1980, p. 363) states, is like a *collage* of passages taken from two works: Aghoraśiva's commentary on Bhojarāja's *Tattvapraṅkāśa* and Nārāyaṅakaṅṭha's commentary on the *Mṛgendrāgama*, called *Mṛgendravṛtti*. Similarly, the seventh chapter, on the philosophy of recognition (*pratyabhijñādarśana*), makes extensive use of Abhinavagupta's *Īśvarapratyabhijñāvimarśinī*.⁸

The approach adopted by Brunner and Torella is understandable and no doubt justifiable in certain cases. However, there appear to be cases where their approach does not work.

II. Archetype is identical with autograph but different from source-text

IIa. The chapter on Śaiva philosophy contains a verse that begins with the words *prāvṛtīśo balaṃ* (ed. Abhyankar p. 188 l. 7.185). Brunner and Torella propose to emend this into *prāvṛtīśabale* on the basis on the reading in the text from which this verse was taken.⁹ Torella (1980, p. 379) translates this: “il velame (*prāvṛti*), la forza del Signore (*īśabala*)”. Brunner (1981, p. 136), similarly, translates: “L’*envelope*, la Force du Seigneur”. Both follow the commentators in looking upon *prāvṛti* and *īśabala* as constituents of this compound. However, the then following lines of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* show that its author considered *prāvṛtīśa* (“ruler of darkness”) and *bala* (“force”) two separate items, which are separately discussed in the following two passages:

(a1) *prāvṛṇoti prakarṣeṅcchādayaty ātmanah svābhāvikyau dṛkkriye iti
prāvṛtir aśucir malaḥ/*

(a2) *sa ca iṣṭe svātantryeṇeti īśaḥ/*

tad uktam —

eko hy anekāśaktir dṛkkriyayoś chādako malaḥ puṃsaḥ/

tuṣataṅḍulavaj jñeyas tāmṛāśritakālikāvad vā// iti/

(b) *balaṃ rodhaśaktiḥ.*

I translate:

⁸ Torella (1980, p. 364): Analogamente allo *Śaivadarśana*, l’opera dell’autore si esplica nella scelta e nella coordinazione di un certo numero di brani significativi tutti desunti dall’*Īśvarapratyabhijñāvimarśinī* di Abhinavagupta. Senza inserire nessun accenno ad una valutazione (lo stesso nello *Śaivadarśana*) egli si limita a riportare — talora integralmente, talora condensandole, talora semplificandole — le complesse argomentazioni di Abhinavagupta ...

⁹ Torella (1980, pp. 388–389): In luogo di *prāvṛtīśo balaṃ* (BORI) e di *prāvṛtīśau balaṃ* (ASS) leggo *prāvṛtīśabale*, come risulta dal testo edito del [*Mṛgendrāgama*] e dal relativo commento di Nārāyaṅakaṅṭha da cui è tratto questo passo del [*Sarvadarśanasamgraha*]; la lezione giusta è anche attestata nei mss. K e C.

(a) Darkness (*prāvṛti*) is thus called because it covers (*prāvṛṇoti*), i.e. conceals well (*pra*), its own natural vision (*drś*) and action (*kriyā*); it is an impurity (*mala*), and as such it is impure (*aśuci*). Its ruler (*īśa*) is thus called because he rules (*īṣṭe*) independently. ...¹⁰

(b) Force (*bala*) is the power of obstruction (*rodhaśakti*).

Clearly the text of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* as we find it in the existing editions does not support the interpretation proposed by Brunner and Torella. Torella therefore suggests another modification of the text, which now becomes:

(A) *prāvṛṇoti prakarṣeṇācchādayaty ātmanaḥ svābhāvikyau drḥkriye iti prāvṛtir aśucir malaḥ/*

tad uktam —

eko hy anekāśaktir drḥkriyayoś chādako malaḥ puṃsaḥ/

tuṣaṭaṇḍulavaj jñeyas tāmṛāśritakālikāvad vā// iti/

(B1) *īṣṭe svātantryeṇeti īśaḥ/*

(B1) *taḍīyaṃ balaṃ rodhaśaktiḥ.*

I translate:

(A) Darkness (*prāvṛti*) is thus called because it covers (*prāvṛṇoti*), i.e. conceals well (*pra*), its own natural vision (*drś*) and action (*kriyā*); it is an impurity (*mala*), and as such it is impure (*aśuci*).

...

(B1) A ruler (*īśa*) is thus called because he rules (*īṣṭe*) independently.

(B2) His force (*bala*) is the power of obstruction (*rodhaśakti*).

Torella does not reject the hypothesis that the author of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* himself changed the wording of this passage,¹¹ but prefers to ascribe the changes to a copyist or to a corruption in the text of the *Mṛgendravṛtti* used by the author of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*.¹² According to Brunner (1981, 136 n. 178), “il n’est guère probable que [Mādhava] lui-même ait commis cette erreur de lecture (ou accepté cette distortion)”; she therefore rejects this hypothesis (1981, 136 n. 175): “La mauvaise lecture du SDS a été source d’une série d’interprétations aberrantes chez

¹⁰ I do not translate the verse because it plays no role in my argument apart from showing to what extent Torella has modified the text.

¹¹ Torella (1980, p. 389): Non mi sen[t]i[re]i (?) tuttavia di scaratare del tutto l’ipotesi che la modificazione del testo della *MṛV* possa essere fatta risalire all’autore stesso del *SDS*: egli avrebbe diviso erroneamente il composto *prāvṛtīśabale* (in *prāvṛtīśa* + *bala*) e avrebbe adattato conseguentemente il commento di Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha che accompagnava il suo testo del *MṛA*.

¹² Torella (1980, p. 389): Mi sembra però più probabile che ciò sia da imputare all’intervento successivo di un copista (il compilatore del ms. capostipite di quelli che ci sono pervenuti), il quale, trovandosi davanti al composto ormai corrotto in *pr[ā]v[r]tīśo balaṃ* (così effettivamente è riportato nel ms. Kh), abbia ritenuto, pensando che corrotto fosse il commento, di dover adeguare quest’ultimo a quello. Altra ipotesi è che corrotto in questo senso fosse già il testo della *MṛV* cui l’autore del *SDS* attingeva.

les traducteurs et le commentateur moderne. Et c'est elle qui est à l'origine de la fâcheuse transposition d'une ligne un peu plus loin."

In this case, then, we can only "correct" the wording of a quoted verse on condition that we change the following prose as well. Such a correction can only be justified by evoking various actors (presumably copyists) who actively and knowingly interfered with the text. This activity must then have taken place before the archetype of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* editions, and presumably at a time close to the composition of this text.¹³ But obviously, Occam's razor prefers Torella's less preferred hypothesis, viz. that the author of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* himself changed the wording of this verse, or that the text of the *Mṛgendravṛtti* used by him contained this corruption. Either way, a translation of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* must translate, or try to translate, what its author wrote, not what he should have written according to modern scholars.

In this particular case, Torella, unlike Brunner, is willing to consider that a "corruption" goes back all the way to the author of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*. He does so again on p. 388, where he observes that the word *māyā* (l. 7.181) should be *mahāmāyā*, then adds that the author of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* himself may have introduced the change out of ignorance.¹⁴ Brunner (p. 135) is less tolerant, and replaces "incorrect" *māyā* with "correct" *mahāmāyā*, without further comments.

Ib. Consider next the following verse, which the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* attributes to Bṛhaspati (ed. Abhyankar p. 177 l. 7.44–45):

*iha bhogyabhogasādhanatadupādānādi yo vijānāti/
tam ṛte bhaven na hīdam puṃskarmāśayavipākajñam// iti/*

Brunner changes the beginning of this verse, and explains this as follows (Brunner 1981, 117 n. 66)

Nous corrigeons *iha bhogya-* du SDS ... en *bhavabhokṛ* donné par les deux [éditions] du [*Mṛgendrāgama*].

She provides more information in note 62:

Cf. la fin du comm. de [Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha] sur [*Mṛgendrāgama*], [*vidyāpāda*], 3, 6b-7a, passage qui conclut l'argumentation établissant Īśvara comme *karṛ*: *itthaṃ ca vicīratattatkarṃśayādhivāsītabhokṛ-bhoga-tatsādhana-tadupādānādi-viśeṣajñāḥ kartānumānāntarenānumīyata iti na kaścīd doṣaḥ/ tad idam uktaṃ tatrābhavadbr̥haspatipādaiḥ* — "*bhava-bhokṛ-bhoga-sādhana ...*" (suite comme dans le SDS).

¹³ The presence of the correct reading *prāvṛtīśabale* in one ms (*ca* in the ASS edition) can be easily explained by the fact that this reading was attested everywhere (Brunner, cited above).

¹⁴ Torella, p. 388: Non è però da escludere l'eventualità di una inopportuna semplificazione operata dall'autore stesso, ignaro forse della differenza che gli Śaiva fanno tra *māyā* e *mahāmāyā*.

However, “correcting” the verse obliges her also to change the preceding prose, which contains the compound *tattatkarmāśayavaśād*. Brunner “corrects” this (note 64) into *tat-tat-karmāśayādhivāsita-bhokṭr*, because “Le terme *bhokṭr* qui apparaît dans la version correcte du *śloka* suivant, doit nécessairement apparaître ici.” But the term *bhokṭr* does *not* occur in the verse as we find it in the editions of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*. We are once again in a situation where we must either accept that an early copyist did not just make a copying mistake but reworked the text, or we accept that the author of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* did so himself. As it is, the readings as we find them in the editions of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* make perfect sense. Occam’s razor obliges us, once again, to attribute those readings to its author.

Ic. The *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* cites a line from the *Kiraṇāgama*, as follows (ed. Abhyankar, p. 180 l. 7.80–81):

tad uktaṃ śrīmatkiraṇe:

śuddhe ’dhvani śivaḥ kartā prokto ’nanto ’hite prabhuḥ// iti/

This has been stated in the *Kiraṇāgama*, as follows: “Śiva has been stated to be the agent on the pure path, on the improper path it is Ananta.”

This corresponds to *Kiraṇāgama*, *vidyāpāda* 3.27cd (Vivanti 1975, p. 14), with this difference that the edition of the *Kiraṇāgama* has ‘*site* (‘black’) instead of ‘*hite* (‘improper’). Brunner (1981, p. 121) and Torella (1980, p. 387) “correct” the verse, but are then confronted with a difficulty in the immediately preceding sentence, which expresses essentially the same meaning, but has *kṛcchrādhvaviṣaye* “in the area of the evil path”, which supposedly corresponds to the “corrected” expression *asite ’dhvani* “on the black path”. They now feel free to “correct” this to *kṛṣṇādhvaviṣaye* “in the area of the black path”, even though they know that this modification is not, apparently, supported by any of the source-texts. This form *is* found in one of the manuscripts used by the editors of the Ānandāśrama edition, but even this manuscript had *ahite* rather than *asite* (as far as we can tell), which suggests that it is no more than a corruption inspired by the opposition with *śuddhādhvaviṣaye* “in the area of the pure path” earlier in the same sentence. Brunner and Torella’s “correction” would imply that a corruption from *asite* to *ahite* has subsequently motivated an early copyist to change *kṛṣṇa* into *kṛcchra*, because *kṛcchra* ‘evil’ and *ahita* ‘improper’ have overlapping meanings. This sequence of assumptions can be avoided if we accept that the author of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* consciously introduced both the words *ahita* and *kṛcchra*.

IId. The first chapter of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* contains two verses that are quoted twice over, but not in identical form.

On p. 5 ll. 1.50–51 it quotes the following proverb (*ābhāṇaka*):

agnihotraṃ trayo vedās tridaṇḍaṃ bhasmaguṇṭhanam/

buddhipauruṣahīnānām jīviketi bṛhaspatiḥ//

The Agnihotra sacrifice, the three Vedas, the triple stave of the religious ascetic, covering oneself in ashes, these constitute the livelihood of those devoid of intelligence and exertion. This is what Bṛhaspati says.

On p. 13 ll. 1.112–113 it quotes the same verse in this form:

*agnihotraṃ trayo vedās tridaṇḍaṃ bhasmaguṇṭhanam/
buddhipauruṣahīnānām jīvikā dhātṛnirmitā//*

The Agnihotra sacrifice, the three Vedas, the triple stave of the religious ascetic, covering oneself in ashes, these constitute the livelihood, made by the creator (*dhātṛnirmitā*), of those devoid of intelligence and exertion.

Bhattacharya (2011, pp. 207–211) argues that the reading ending in ... *jīviketi bṛhaspatiḥ* is original, while the ending ... *jīvikā dhātṛnirmitā* is a modification introduced by the author of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* in order to avoid mentioning Bṛhaspati twice over in short succession. Indeed, in all parallel instances (ten out of eleven) the reading is *jīviketi bṛhaspatiḥ* (p. 73)

The same chapter quotes another verse twice over, first on p. 2 ll. 1.17–18:

*yāvajjīvaṃ sukhaṃ jīven nāsti mṛtyor agocarah/
bhasmībhūtasya dehasya punar āgamaṇaṃ kutaḥ//¹⁵*

One should live happily as long as life lasts, for nothing is beyond the reach of death. Why should we believe that a body that has been reduced to ashes will come back into this world?

and then again on p. 14 ll. 1.122–123:

*yāvaj jīvet sukhaṃ jīved ṛṇaṃ kṛtvā ghr̥taṃ pibet/
bhasmībhūtasya dehasya punar āgamaṇaṃ kutaḥ//*

One should live happily as long as life lasts; having incurred a debt one should drink ghee. Why should we believe that a body that has been reduced to ashes will come back into this world?

According to Bhattacharya (2011, p. 73), the reading *ṛṇaṃ kṛtvā ghr̥taṃ pibet* is spurious. It occurs only once (viz., in the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*) in the fourteen instances he found in the literature in which the verse is wholly or partly quoted or adapted.

In these two cases, then, we have reason to think that, on purpose or out of carelessness, verses were quoted in two different forms by the author of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*.

IIe. The chapter on Yoga (*pātāñjaladarśana*) of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* explains a number of Yogasūtras, staying in general close to the *Yogabhāṣya*. However, when discussing the postures (*āsana*), it states (in all editions)

¹⁵ *Viṣṇudharmottara Purāṇa* 1.108.18–19; see further Bhattacharya (2011, p. 84).

that there are ten of them, which it enumerates: *sthirasukham āsanam padmāsanabhadraśānavīrāśanasvastikāsanadaṇḍakāśanasopāśrayaparyāṅkakrauñcani śadanoṣṭraṇiśadanasamasamsthānabhedād daśavidham* (p. 376, ll. 15.463–464). It appears that the author of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* skipped one, the *hastiniśadana*, which is yet included in all surviving editions and manuscripts of the *Yogaśāstra* under sūtra 2.46 (Maas 2018). The mistake is easily understood, since the *Yogabhāṣya* does not explicitly state that there are eleven postures, even though it enumerates eleven of them. It seems reasonable to conclude that we are here confronted with a simple mistake by the author of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*.

IIf. Chapter 6—on the philosophy of the Pāśupatas who follow Nakulīśa—quotes a line that it attributes to Haradattācārya (pp. 162–163, l. 6.17–18):

*tad āha haradattācāryaḥ —
jñānam tapo 'tha nityatvaṃ sthitiḥ śuddhiś ca pañcamam// iti*

As stated by Haradattācārya:

Knowledge, asceticism, permanence, stability and purity as fifth.

The quoted line is *Gaṇakārikā* 6ab,¹⁶ which however has *siddhiś* instead of *śuddhiś*. Hara (1958, pp. 14–15) therefore “corrects” the text of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*. However, the reading *śuddhi* is shared by all editions of this text and was therefore presumably part of its archetype. One might conjecture that it is the result of a simple scribal error, but this cannot be the case, for the immediately preceding line reads (p. 162, l. 6.16–17):

jñānatapodevanityatvasthitiśuddhibhedāt pañcavidhaḥ

once again with *śuddhi*. If the autograph had *siddhi*, a conscious scribal modification must be held responsible for the text as we have it. It is less cumbersome to assume that *śuddhi* was already part of the autograph, which the author of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* found in his source-text or introduced himself.

* * *

The examples just considered should discourage us from “correcting” the text of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* too hastily. They suggest that its author did not always blindly copy the source-texts, either willingly or because the manuscripts he used were not identical with those used for their modern editions (or indeed out of carelessness). Either way, it makes sense to understand, and translate, even the quoted passages in the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* as we find them in its editions, on condition that those readings are intelligible and make sense. Proceeding otherwise may expose us to serious misunderstandings, as I will now show.

The chapter on the *Pratyabhijñādarśana* contains, in all editions, the following description of one form of causal efficiency (*arthakriyā*):

¹⁶ Hara (1958, p. 10–11) argues that Haradattācārya (rather than Bhāsarvajña) is the author of the *Gaṇakārikā*.

(1) *ihāpy aham īśvara ity evaṃbhūtacamatkārasārā parāparasiddhilakṣaṇajīvātmaikatvaśaktivibhūtirūpārthakriy[ā]*¹⁷

Torella (1980, p. 409) considers the compound °*lakṣaṇajīvātmaikatvaśaktivibhūtirūpā* corrupt, and proposes a different reading, which he finds in the *Īśvarapratyabhijñāvimarśinī* of Abhinavagupta: °*lakṣaṇā jīvanmuktivibhūtiyogarūpā*. The whole passage now becomes:

(2) *ihāpy aham īśvara ity evaṃbhūtacamatkārasārā parāparasiddhilakṣaṇā jīvanmuktivibhūtiyogarūpārthakriyā*

Torella (1980, p. 400) translates this:

(2) Quella che ha per essenza la presa-di-coscienza-meravigliantesi (*ca-matkāra*), ‘il Signore sono io!’, produce la perfezione assoluta o perfezioni parziali determinando l’ottenimento della **liberazione in vita** o dei poteri sovrannormali.¹⁸

However, passage (1) makes perfect sense:

(1) Causal efficiency (*arthakriyā*) has as essence the miraculous realization “I am the Lord” and has the form of supernatural power (*vibhūti*) that is the power related to the identity of *jīva* and *ātman*, characterized by the highest or partial perfection.

This, as pointed out above, is sufficient reason to stick to the reading of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* editions. However, there is more. Torella’s emendation contains the word *jīvanmukti* “liberation while alive”. This word is nowhere found in the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*,¹⁹ and there are reasons to think that it was avoided on purpose. Claiming liberation while alive for certain members of a school or sect has political implications. It means that that school or sect is superior to others, since it obviously teaches the right path. It seems probable that the author of the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* wanted to avoid such issues—in spite of the fact that his uncle (or at any rate someone close to him) had composed the *Jīvanmuktiviveka*, a text that does not eschew such a claim. Since I have dealt with this issue elsewhere (Bronkhorst forthcoming), I will say no more about it. Let it be sufficient here to state that if we “correct” the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* in the light of a source-text we run the risk of introducing a notion that its author had taken care to avoid.

¹⁷ Ed. Abhyankar, p. 200 l. 8.130–131.

¹⁸ Cp. Torella (2011, p. 222): He whose essence is wondrous enjoyment—‘I am the Lord!’—produces supreme perfection or partial perfection [respectively] determining the attainment of liberation while alive, or supernatural powers.

¹⁹ With the exception of chapter 9, on the *Raseśvaradarśana*, where it is used in an altogether different sense.

Funding Open access funding provided by University of Lausanne

Compliance with Ethical Standards

Conflict of interest The author states that there is no conflict of interest.

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

References

- Bhattacharya, R. (1999). Jīvikā dhātṛnirmitā or jīviketi bṛhaspatiḥ? *Journal of the Indian Council for Philosophical Research*, 17(1), 171–176 (Reprint: Bhattacharya 2011, 207–211).
- Bhattacharya, R. (2011). *Studies on the Cārvāka / Lokāyata*. London: Anthem Press.
- Brahmasūtra-Śāṅkarabhāṣya*. Edited, with the commentaries *Bhāṣyaratnaprabhā* of Govindānanda, *Bhāmāṭī* of Vācaspati Miśra, and *Nyāyanirṇaya* of Ānandagiri, by J. L. Shastri. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. 1980 (reprint 1996).
- Bronkhorst, J. (2008). Advice for grammarians. *Asiatische Studien / Études Asiatiques*, 62(2), 475–484 (Reprint: *Future of Indology*, ed. Iwona Milewska, Kraków: Jagiellonian University, Institute of Oriental Philology, 2008 [2010] (Cracow Indological Studies, 10), pp. 217–229).
- Bronkhorst, J. (forthcoming). The *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*: One text or two? One author or two? Will appear in a *Felicitatio Volume*.
- Bronkhorst, J. (forthcoming a). The Vaiśeṣika path to liberation in context. In *Proceedings of the symposium Paths to Liberation in Non-Buddhist Traditions of South Asia*, Vienna, November 28–29, 2019.
- Bronkhorst, J., & Ramseier, Y. (1994). *Word Index to the Praśastapādabhāṣya. A complete word index to the printed editions of the Praśastapādabhāṣya*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Brunner, H. (1981). Un chapitre du Sarvadarśanasamgraha: le Śaivadarśana. *Mélanges Chinois et Bouddhiques 20 (Tantric and Taoist Studies in Honour of R. A. Stein, ed. Michael Strickmann, vol. I)* (pp. 96–140).
- Cowell, E. B., & Gough, A. E. (1882). *The Sarva-darśana-samgraha or review of the different systems of Hindu philosophy, by Madhava Āchārya*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.
- Dash, S. (2015). *New Catalogus Catalogorum* (Vol. XXXVIII). Madras: University of Madras.
- de la Vallée Poussin, L. (1901–1902). Le Bouddhisme d'après les sources brahmaniques, I: Sarvadarśanasamgraha, Chapitre II. *Le Muséon* n.s. 2 (1901), pp. 52–73, 171–207; n.s. 3 (1902), pp. 40–53, 391–401.
- Hara, M. (1958). Nakulīśa-pāśupata-darśanam. *Indo-Iranian Journal*, 2, 8–32.
- Maas, P. A. (2018). 'Sthirasukham Āsanam': Posture and performance in Classical Yoga and beyond. In K. Baier, P. A. Maas, & K. Preisendanz (Eds.), *Yoga in transformation: Historical and contemporary perspectives* (pp. 51–100). Vienna: Vienna University Press.
- Sarvadarśanasamgraha*. (1) Edited by Vasudev Shastri Abhyankar. (First published in 1924.) Third edition seen through the press by T. G. Mainkar. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. 1978. (Government Oriental Series, Class A, No. 1.) (2) Edited, with Madhusūdana Sarasvatī's Prasthānabheda, by B. A. Apte. Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series (Poona), 1950. (3) Edited by Īśwarachandra Vidyāsāgara, Calcutta, 1858.

- Sharma, U. S. (1964). *The Sarva-Darśana-Saṃgraha of Mādhavācārya*. Edited with an exhaustive Hindi commentary, copious appendices and Anglo-Hindi introductions. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Vidyabhawan.
- Śivadr̥ṣṭi of Somānanda, with the Vṛtti of Utpaladeva. Ed. Madhusudan Kaul Shāstri. Srinagar. 1934. (Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies, 54.)
- Ślokaavārttika of Kumārila Bhaṭṭa. Edited, with the commentary Nyāyaratnākara of Pārthasārathi Miśra, by Swāmī Dvārikādāsa Śāstrī. Varanasi: Ratna Publications. 1978.
- Torella, R. (1980). Due capitoli del Sarvadarśanasamgraha: Śaivadarśana e Pratyabhijñādarśana. *Rivista degli Studi Orientali*, 53(3/4), 361–410.
- Torella, R. (1994). *The Īśvarapratyabhijñārikā of Utpaladeva with the Author's Vṛtti*. Critical edition and annotated translation. Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.
- Torella, R. (2011). *The philosophical traditions of India. An appraisal*. Varanasi: Indica Books.
- Vivanti, M. P. (1975). Il “Kiraṇāgama”. *Testo e traduzione del “Vidyāpāda”*. Napoli: Istituto Orientale di Napoli. (Supplemento n. 3 agli ANNALI: vol. 35 (1975), fasc. 2.)

Abbreviation

WI = Bronkhorst & Ramseier 1994.

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.