

The *Mokṣopāyasaṅgraha*

JÜRGEN HANNEDER

During the course of editing the *Utpatti prakaraṇa* the present author investigated one paper manuscript written in Śāradā which is kept in the *Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek*, Göttingen, as Cod. Ms. Sanscr. Vish. 126. The beginning of the text is missing, the manuscript starts on folio 3r with:

uttamo mokṣa ucyate
brahmaṭsa eva vimalakramo jñānaprakāśakaḥ [= MU 1.2.8]

The text ends on folio 563r with verse 6.374.17 [= N_{Ed} 7.215.17], i.e. the last verse of the MU. Thereupon follow the colophon and the scribe's concluding verse on folio 563v:

iti śrīmahārāmāyaṇe mokṣopāyasaṅgrāhe nirvāṇaprakaraṇaṃ samāptam /
samāptaṃ cedaṃ mokṣopāyasaṅgraham /
śāke gate śivanandaividhau vikramabhūpateḥ /
itiṃ nītā gaṇeśena mokṣasāraṃ śivāyate /

The essence of [the way to] Liberation (=Mokṣopāya), completed (?) by Gaṇeśa in the year 1911 of the Vikrama era [i.e. 1854/55], becomes auspicious.

The interpretation of this verse assumes that *mokṣasāra* is brief for *mokṣopāyasāra*, although the name of the text according to the colophon is *mokṣopāyasaṅgraha*. We also have to read *nītam* and assume from the context that the phrase *itiṃ √nī* means "to complete".

When I first received copies of this manuscript during editing the *Utpatti prakaraṇa*, it looked at first sight very promising, because it seemed to transmit the text of the MU, merely lacking some of the doubtful and even problematic verses. For instance, the awkward set of verses that start this *Prakaraṇa* (3.1.1–4) is missing and the *Prakaraṇa* is, as would be expected, introduced by the *pratisandhiśloka*. Further comparison showed that the manuscript contained in the beginning of the *Utpatti prakaraṇa* an almost complete text and one was left wondering about its self-designation as *saṅgraha*.

Upon reading more it became clear why the name was in fact fully justified, but in an unexpected way: After reproducing a fairly complete beginning

of the third *Prakaraṇa*, we suddenly find that MU 3.13.54 is followed by 3.64.1 (fol. 120). The large part of the text omitted is the story of Līlā and it took only few more checks to arrive at the diagnosis that this “*Mokṣopāyasaṅgraha*” (*ŚSam*) was a version that was condensed in a unique way, namely through removing the *ākhyānas*!

One could surmise that someone interested in the “philosophy” of the work wanted to produce a version that contained just the philosophical parts without the *ākhyānas*. This approach would not only be unusual, but, especially in the light of the MU’s views about the use of “*yukti*”¹, a grave misunderstanding of the intention of the text. But as we shall see below, the method of abridgement used in the *Mokṣopāyasaṅgraha* is even more unexpected.

The *Mumukṣuvyavahāraprakaraṇa*

The second *Prakaraṇa* commences as in the MU: The first verse refers back to the *Vairāgyaprakaraṇa*; in vss. 2 and 3 Rāma is addressed by Viśvāmitra, who says that his insight into the futility of the world, which was expressed in the long poetical lamentations in the first *Prakaraṇa*, is fundamentally correct, but that he would still need to purify his mind. Verse 4 introduces the story of Śuka and Janaka, which depicts a person in a similar condition. The story, related in the MU from 2.1.4 up to 2.2.1, is carefully removed in the *Saṅgraha*. The last omitted verse marks the return to the main topic:

tasmāt prakṛtam evedam śṛṇu śravaṇabhūṣaṇam |
mayopadiśyamānaṃ tvaṃ jñānam ajñāndhyanāśanam (= MU 2.4.7)

Therefore listen [now] as I expound the main topic itself, an ornament for the ears, [namely] the knowledge that destroys the darkness of ignorance.

The next verse which continues the instruction is consequently contained in the *Saṅgraha*. Did the redactor of the summary think that the *prakṛta* could be separated from the *aprakṛta*, whereas in fact both are necessary for a *drṣṭānta*?

For investigating the character of the *ŚSam* and its method of abridgement a full list of verses in the *Mumukṣuvyavahāraprakaraṇa* follows. The verse num-

¹ See BRUNO LO TURCO’s article in this volume.

bers refer to the MU as edited,² no attempt was made to provide the Ś_{Sarm} with a verse numbering of its own.

2.1.1	2.9.26	2.11.29	2.13.10	2.14.28	2.18.19
2.1.2	2.9.27	2.11.36	2.13.11	2.14.41	2.18.23
2.1.3	2.9.28	2.11.39	2.13.15	2.14.46	2.18.25
2.2.13–28	2.9.29	2.11.40	2.13.16	2.14.53	2.18.26
2.3.1	2.9.43	2.11.42	2.13.19	2.14.54	2.18.28
2.4.8	2.10.1	2.11.43	2.13.20	2.15.1	2.18.29
2.4.11–18	2.10.2	2.11.44	2.13.21	2.15.6	2.18.30
2.5.4	2.10.6	2.11.47	2.13.22	2.15.8	2.18.31
2.5.9	2.10.7	2.11.48	2.13.24	2.15.9	2.18.35
2.5.11	2.10.8	2.11.50	2.13.28	2.15.10	2.18.42
2.5.12	2.10.9	2.11.51	2.13.31	2.15.16	2.18.43
2.5.14	2.10.10	2.11.53	2.13.32	2.15.17	2.18.44
2.5.15	2.10.11	2.11.54	2.13.34	(N _{Ed} 2.15.19)	2.18.45
2.5.18	2.10.12	2.11.55	2.13.35	2.15.19	2.18.46
2.5.19	2.10.13	2.11.57	2.13.36	2.16.1	2.18.47
2.5.20	2.10.14	2.11.58	2.13.37	2.16.3	2.18.50
2.5.25	2.10.16	2.11.59	2.13.38	2.16.5	2.18.51
2.6.29	2.10.17	2.11.60	2.13.40	2.16.7	2.18.52
2.6.31	2.10.18	2.11.67	2.13.41	2.16.8	2.18.54
2.6.36	2.10.19	2.11.68	2.13.43	2.16.10	2.18.55
2.6.38	2.10.20	2.11.69	2.13.45	2.16.12	2.18.56
2.7.2	2.10.23	2.11.72	2.13.46	2.16.15	2.18.58
2.7.4	2.10.24	2.12.1	2.13.48	2.16.16	2.18.61
2.7.22	2.10.27cd	2.12.2	2.13.50	2.16.17	2.19.2
2.7.32	2.10.28	2.12.7	2.13.55	2.16.19	2.19.9
2.8.1	2.10.29	2.12.8	2.13.56	2.16.20	2.19.10
2.8.5	2.10.30	2.12.10	2.13.57	2.16.21	2.19.11
2.8.17	2.10.32	2.12.11	2.13.58	2.16.27	2.19.13
2.9.1	2.10.33	2.12.12	2.13.59	2.16.31	2.19.14
2.9.6	2.10.34	2.12.13	2.13.61	2.16.32ad	2.19.16
2.9.8	2.10.35	2.12.14	2.13.70	2.16.33	2.19.17
2.9.10	2.10.36	2.12.16	2.13.72	2.16.34	2.19.19
2.9.11	2.10.37	2.12.17	2.13.74	2.16.35	2.19.20
2.9.12	2.10.38	2.12.18	2.13.80	2.17.1	2.19.23
2.9.13	2.10.39	2.12.19	2.13.82	2.17.3	2.19.24
2.9.14	2.10.40	2.12.20	2.14.1	2.17.4	2.19.35
2.9.16	2.10.41	2.12.21	2.14.2	2.17.6ab	2.20.10
2.9.17	2.10.42	2.13.1	2.14.4	2.17.8ab	2.20.11
2.9.21	2.11.1	2.13.2	2.14.7	2.17.9	2.20.12
2.9.18	2.11.2	2.13.3	2.14.10	2.18.1	2.20.13
2.9.32	2.11.22	2.13.6	2.14.14	2.18.5	
2.9.24	2.11.23	2.13.7	2.14.18	2.18.12	
2.9.25	2.11.27	2.13.8	2.14.22	2.18.15	
2.9.25	2.11.28	2.13.9	2.14.23	2.18.18	

The passages counted as 2.12.12–18 and 2.13.9 are in prose. With 2.15.19 a verse from N_{Ed} has slipped into the text, although this observation is, in the absence of a critical edition of the *mūla* text of the second *Prakarāṇa*, prelim-

² See SLAJE (1993).

inary. There is a *Sarga* colophon after 2.12.21: *tattvajñamāhātmyapratipādanam nāma sargaḥ*; other colophons were ignored and the concluding verses in non-*anuṣṭubh*-metres that are found at the end of each *Sarga* are more often than not omitted.

A second hand can be discerned in the beginning of the second *Prakaraṇa*, which is responsible for adding the abbreviated *Prakaraṇa* marks (“*mu pra*”) in the margin next to the folio number and the “*mo sā*”³ of the first hand. The second hand has also changed the first words of the second *Prakaraṇa* “*nāradeneti*” to “*iti nādena*”, which is the reading of *N_{Ed}*. Similarly, in 2.10.30 *dvijaḥ* is corrected to the *N_{Ed}*-reading *kila*. Apart from these few secondary influences of the *Nāgarī* recension, not untypical for Kashmirian manuscripts,⁴ the text version is that of the MU, and with very few scribal errors.

From the above list we see that the compiler has a tendency to adopt complete verses. The case of 2.17.6cd is an exception, because this half-verse⁵ indicates the total number of verses of the MU, which does not apply to the *Ś_{Sam}*. Similarly 2.17.10–51, which is a description of the contents of the MU and refers to the *ākhyānas*, is omitted, as also 2.18.62, which explains the function of the stories as *dr̥ṣṭāntas*. The above list suggests that the *Ś_{Sam}* is independent of the LYV, which has extracted only verse 2.5.4 of *Sarga* 5 and nothing of *Sarga* 6. The LYV has, with 180 verses, adopted a smaller number than the *Ś_{Sam}* with 250.

The story of *Līlā*

We have seen that the author of the *Ś_{Sam}* has systematically omitted passages that were unnecessary or even contradictory to his aim. For instance, the table of contents contained in 2.17 was carefully removed by joining 2.17.9 with 2.18.1. The numbers given in these verses and especially the characterization of the text as being equipped with *dr̥ṣṭāntas* would of course be inappropriate for the *Saṅgraha*’s presentation. A more radical example is that of the omission of one of the most voluminous stories in the MU, the *Līlopākhyāna*, alias *Maṇḍapākhyāna*. This story is introduced in the MU with verse 3.15.17 and ends with 3.60.1:

³ According to this hand the text seems to be rather a *Mokṣopāyasāra* as in the scribe’s verse quoted above, but there it may be due to the constraints of metre.

⁴ See also above, p. 53, for this type of contamination.

⁵ *mokṣopāyābhīdhāneyam saṃhitā sārasammitā | trīṃśad dve ca sahasrāṇi jñātā nirvāṇadāyini ||*

*atredaṃ maṇḍapākhyānaṃ śṛṇu śravaṇabhūṣaṇam
niḥsandeho yathaiṣo 'rthaś citte viśrāntim eṣyati (3.15.17)*

...

*etat te kathitaṃ rāma dr̥śyadoṣanivṛttaye
līlopākhyānam anagha ghanatām jagatas tyaja (3.60.1)*

The Ś_{Sam} reads the *Utpattiprakaraṇa* only up to 3.13.54 and then jumps ahead to 3.64.1, thereby omitting also the explanation of the story, as well as some prose passages.

The Nirvāṇaprakaraṇa

A reading of the last *Prakaraṇa* brought another surprise. Upon the concluding colophon of the *Upaśamaprakaraṇa* follows the *pratisandhiśloka* introducing the new *Prakaraṇa* (6.1.1),⁶ then the following verses:

6.2.19–32	6.5.8	6.11.37	6.11.84	6.11.123
6.2.35	6.5.11	6.11.39	6.11.85	6.11.124–129
6.2.37	6.5.12	6.11.40	6.11.86	6.12.1
6.2.40	6.5.13	6.11.44cd	6.11.87	6.12.2
6.2.41	6.5.14	6.11.45ab	6.11.90	6.12.13
6.2.42	6.5.15	6.11.46cd	6.11.65ab	6.12.14
6.2.44	6.6.1	6.11.47ab	6.11.66cd	6.12.15
6.2.46	6.11.1	6.11.48cd	6.11.67ab	6.12.16
6.2.47	6.11.2ab	6.11.49	6.11.67cd	6.12.17
6.2.48	6.11.2cd (=N _{Ed})	6.11.50cd	6.11.69ab	6.12.21
6.2.49	6.11.3cd (=N _{Ed})	6.11.51ab	6.11.69cd	6.12.22
6.2.52	6.11.2cd (MU)	6.11.51cd	6.11.94	6.12.24
6.2.53ab (=N _{Ed})	6.11.3–6ab	6.11.52ab	6.11.95	6.12.25
6.2.53cd	6.11.7cd	6.11.55cd	6.11.96	6.13.1
6.2.54	6.11.8ab	6.11.57	6.11.97	6.13.2
6.2.55	6.11.6cd	6.11.58	6.11.98	6.13.3
6.2.56	6.11.7ab	6.11.59ab	6.11.99	6.13.4
6.2.57	6.11.8cd	6.11.62cd	6.11.100	6.13.7
6.2.58ab	6.11.8ab	6.11.63	6.11.101	6.13.8
6.3.1	6.11.9	6.11.64ab	6.11.102	6.13.9
6.3.4	6.11.10ab	6.11.74	N _{Ed} 6.11.90ab	6.13.10abc
6.2.59	(2 pādas untra- ced)	6.11.75	6.11.104–114	6.13.11d
6.4.15		6.11.76	6.11.116	6.13.12
6.5.1	6.11.13ab	6.11.78	6.11.117	6.14.1
6.5.2	6.11.15cd–20	6.11.79	6.11.118	6.14.2
6.5.3	6.11.26–27	6.11.80	6.11.119	6.14.3
6.5.5	6.11.31	6.11.81	6.11.120	
6.5.6	6.11.32	6.11.82	6.11.121ab	
6.5.7	6.11.36	6.11.83	6.11.122cd	

⁶ The numbers refer to Ś₁; for a rough concordance with N_{Ed}, see the appendix to my forthcoming *Studies on the Mokṣopāya*.

With this we enter the story of Bhusuṅḍa, which is given in the Ś_{Sam} in an only slightly shortened form. Also the explanation of this story in *Sarga* 6.29 is given fairly completely:

6.29.2	6.29.25cd	6.29.43cd	6.29.57	6.29.72cd
6.29.7	6.29.26	6.29.44	6.29.58ab	6.29.73ab
6.29.8–13	6.29.27ab	6.29.45	6.29.60cd	6.29.75ab
6.29.19	6.29.28cd	6.29.48	6.29.61	6.29.76ab
6.29.20ab	6.29.29	6.29.49ab	6.29.62ab	6.29.81cd
6.29.24cd	6.29.30ab	6.29.50cd	6.29.65cd	6.29.82ab
6.29.25ab	6.29.36cd	6.29.51	6.29.66	6.29.84
6.29.22cd	6.29.37	6.29.52ab	6.29.67	6.29.88–95
6.29.23ab	6.29.38ab	6.29.56cd	6.29.68ab	

Sarga 6.30 and 31 at the end of the story of Bhusuṅḍa are also summarized, then follows a condensed version of the Śivākhyāna (MU 6.31–46). The subsequent ākhyānas are partly excised, as for instance the Arjunākhyāna, others as the story of the mīthyāpuruṣa (6.116–117) and Bhr̥ṅgīśa appear in an abridged version. Before we try to understand the rationale behind this type of abridgement, we shall deal with a passage in the last *Prakaraṇa*, which is crucial for the later textual history of the MU literature.

The bipartite Nirvāṇaprakaraṇa

The most significant test for establishing the relationship between the Ś_{Sam}, the MU and the LYV, is a comparison of that passage in the Nirvāṇaprakaraṇa which has been lost in N_{Ed} at its juncture between the *pūrva*- and *uttarārdha*. As SLAJE has shown,⁷ N_{Ed} lacks MU 6.122–157 (more than 500 verses) and reads instead merely 70 verses taken from the LYV:

MU	N _{Ed}
6.120–121	6.116.1–12 (= LYV 6.13.1–12)
6.122–157	6.117–128 (= LYV 6.13.13–6.18.83)

If we can show that the Ś_{Sam} selects verses not contained in the LYV or the YV, its direct dependence on the MU is proven. On folio 456r the Ś_{Sam} reads MU 6.138.14, that is, the concluding verse of chapter 14, and its colophon. Then follow a number of verses from *Sarga* 153, one from *Sarga* 155, then the Ś_{Sam} jumps to 159. This passage is given below with a concordance to the YV, which is in this passage more or less identical with the LYV:

⁷ See SLAJE (1994), further details in HANNEDER (*2006).

$\acute{S}Sam$	YV 6.153.1 (N _{Ed} 6.126.58) 6.153.2 (N _{Ed} 6.126.59) 6.153.3 (N _{Ed} 6.126.60) 6.153.8ab (N _{Ed} 6.126.61ab)
6.153.10–14 6.153.15 6.153.18–20 6.153.22–26 6.153.28 6.153.30–31 6.153.45	
	6.154.1 (N _{Ed} 6.126.61cd) 6.154.2 (N _{Ed} 6.126.62cd–63ab) 6.154.7 (N _{Ed} 6.126.63cd–64ab) 6.154.20 (N _{Ed} 6.126.64cd–65ab) 6.155.1 (N _{Ed} 6.126.65cd–66ab) 6.155.2 (N _{Ed} 6.126.66cd–67ab) 6.155.3ab/4cd (N _{Ed} 6.126.67cd–68ab) 6.155.25 (N _{Ed} 6.126.68cd–69a)
6.155.32	
	6.155.34ab (N _{Ed} 6.126.69cd) (N _{Ed} 6.126.70ab untraced) 6.156.2cd/3ab (N _{Ed} 6.126.70cd) 6.156.3ab (N _{Ed} 6.126.71ab) 6.156.4 (N _{Ed} 6.126.71cd–72ab) 6.156.6 (N _{Ed} 6.126.72cd–73ab) 6.156.14 (N _{Ed} 6.126.73cd–74ab) 6.157.1–6 (N _{Ed} 6.126.74cd–80ab) (N _{Ed} 6.126.80cd–81 untraced) 6.157.14cd (N _{Ed} 6.126.82ab) 6.157.15–17 (N _{Ed} 6.126.82cd–85ab) 6.157.19 (N _{Ed} 6.126.85cd–86ab) 6.157.22 (N _{Ed} 6.126.86cd–87ab) 6.157.27ab (N _{Ed} 6.126.87cd) 6.157.23 (N _{Ed} 6.126.88) 6.157.24ab (N _{Ed} 6.126.89ab) 6.157.27cd (N _{Ed} 6.126.89cd) (N _{Ed} 6.126.90–91ab untraced) 6.158.3cd (N _{Ed} 6.126.91cd) 6.158.4 (N _{Ed} 6.126.92)

Here follow several verses from 6.158 in N_{Ed}, whereas the $\acute{S}Sam$ continues with 6.159.6. We see from the list that there is not even a single overlap between the $\acute{S}Sam$ and the YV/LYV, which proves beyond any doubt that the $\acute{S}Sam$ and the LYV are independent. Further proof of this is that while the LYV breaks off after this passage, the $\acute{S}Sam$ continues its summary until the end of the *Nirvāṇaprakaraṇa*. The $\acute{S}Sam$ is therefore a direct extract from the MU.

In the second half of the *Nirvāṇaprakaraṇa* most *ākhyānas* have again been omitted, as for instance the Vidyādhara story; later the text leaps from

Sarga 205 to 255, thereby omitting the voluminous *Pāṣāṅkhyāna*, then from 263.32 to 330.1, cutting out the *Vipaścit-* and *Śavākhyāna*. It is not necessary for the sake of this preliminary analysis of the \dot{S}_{Sam} to complete the list. In any case the impression that larger *ākhyānas* are removed and only very few small *ākhyānas* are retained is certainly confirmed.

The method of abridgement

We have seen that the compiler of the \dot{S}_{Sam} has in some places excised *ākhyānas*, references to the size of the text and has even removed doubtful passages in a way that suggests that the abbreviation was not executed haphazardly, but methodically. Since not all *ākhyānas* were removed this plan cannot have meant a lopsided assemblage of the philosophical discourses. The question is rather: what could have distinguished the stories that appear in the *Nirvāṇaprakaraṇa*, especially the *Bhusuṇḍa-* and the *Śivākhyāna*, to merit their inclusion. And why would the author retain two succeeding *ākhyānas*, thereby shifting the balance in this part of his text from philosophy to narrative.

If we rule out accident the most likely reason for this is the internal structure of the MU. In brief,⁸ the turning point in the text, as far as the development of Rāma is concerned, is of course his awakening to the truth. The instructions given after this passage, which lies in the middle of the whole work are apparently on a different didactic level than those that lie before this incident. Vasiṣṭha once explicitly refuses to answer a question and asks Rāma to ask again during the time of the *siddhānta*.

Now Rāma's enlightenment takes place between the *Bhusuṇḍa-* and the *Śivākhyāna* and the author's singling out of these stories among all emphasizes this crucial passage in the whole work. Of course there can be no definite proof that the compiler of the \dot{S}_{Sam} had this larger structure in mind, but we should add that the cross-referential passages are contained in the \dot{S}_{Sam} , as is another important passage where Vasiṣṭha gives the ultimate answer to a question of Rāma by remaining silent.

If this impression of a careful and thoughtful redaction, which seems, quite unlike many other abbreviated versions, guided by the original spirit of the work is not shaken by contradicting findings, we have in the \dot{S}_{Sam} – as in Bhāskarakaṇṭha's commentary on the MU – instances of an understanding of the MU that is far removed from its wide-spread Vedāntic reinterpretation.

⁸ Compare above, p.18; for details, see HANNEDER (2003).