

Bhāskarakaṇṭha's

MOKṢOPĀYA-ĪTĪKĀ

A Commentary on

The Earliest Available Recension of the Yogavāsīṣṭha

I

Vairāgyaprakaraṇam

Revised Edition in Devanāgarī script

by Jürgen Haneder and Walter Slaje



Rāma and Viśvāmītra standing humbly before Daśaratha. Mughal painting illustrating an Indo-Persian version of the *Yogavāsīṣṭha*. Folio 19v of ms. 5 reproduced with kind permission by the Chester Beatty Library, Dublin, Ireland.

SHAKER VERLAG
AACHEN 2002

प्राक्कथनम्

मोक्षोपायान्बुजस्यान्ता रसचर्वणमोहितान् ।
 रात्रौ सहृदयभुङ्गान्पायाद्युष्मानरन्धती ॥
 संचित्य सर्वाल्लिपिगान्बहुहस्तलेखान्
 सत्पाठप्रापणमिच्छामिशास्त्रयुक्त्या ।
 येनापपाठनिवहो ऽस्मृतितां विवेका-
 दायाति लेखकनिशाचर औपशम्यम् ॥

योगवासिष्ठमहारामायणाह्वयं भारतीयवाङ्मयमहोदधेर्महोर्मित्वेन वर्तमान-
 महैतरसवाहि द्वात्रिंशत्सहस्रग्रन्थविस्तरं सर्वलोकप्रसिद्धवाङ्मयस्याङ्गभूतं मोक्ष-
 तात्पर्यं शास्त्रकाव्यं श्रीमता वाल्मीकिनामर्षिणा प्रोक्तं श्रीशङ्करभगवत्पूज्यपा-
 दप्रस्थापिताम्नायपरतन्त्रं चेत्येव प्रायो विज्ञायते ।

वस्तुतस्त्विदं वागीशेनानुपमप्रतिभावता कश्मीरवासिना केनचिन्महापुरुषे-
 ण स्वशास्त्रे “मोक्षोपायकृता ग्रन्थकारेण”^१ इति सूचितेन “अपि पौरुषेयमादेयं
 शास्त्रम्”^२ इति स्वस्मिन्नेव ग्रन्थे स्वकण्ठेनाभिहितं पौरुषं शास्त्रं “मोक्षोपा-
 य”^३ इति च नाम्ना ख्यातं “वासिष्ठं ब्रह्मदर्शनम्”^४ इति कश्मीरेषु प्रथां प्राप्तं
 प्रणीतम् । न चेदं मोक्षोपायशास्त्रमद्वैतवेदान्तानुरोधे^५ सर्वांगमप्रामाण्यानङ्गी-
 करणात् । नापि तत्र भक्तिमोक्षोपायत्वेनोपदिश्यते^६ ।

तेनैव चिदद्वैतोपदेशकेन मोक्षोपायग्रन्थकारेण प्रायेण द्वे प्रतिष्ठे मोक्षस्योपा-
 यत्वेनोक्तमित्ते । आख्यानरूपत्वेन निपुणमुपयुक्ता दृष्टान्तयुक्तिर्मुमुक्षुभिश्च स्व-
 पौरुषेणैव “बुद्ध्या विचारयेद्”^७ इत्याद्युक्तत्वाद्बुद्धिपूर्वमभिनिवर्तनीया विचार-
 युक्तिः । विचारश्चेह शास्त्रविचारनिमित्तः “को ऽहं स्याम्”^८ इत्यादिः स्ववि-

१ द्र० मो०उ० २.१८.६०

२ द्र० मो०उ० २.१८.२

३ द्र० मो०उ० २.१०.६

४ द्र० श्रीविरकृतायां जैनराजतरङ्गिण्याम् १.५.८०

५ द्र० मो०उ० ४.२१.२४-३३ । अत्र सर्वे कापिलवेदान्तविज्ञानवादाहंतादीनां शास्त्रदृष्टयः

६ द्र० मो०उ० ५.४३.२० । तत्रोक्तं “शास्त्रयत्नविचारयो मूर्खाणां प्रपलायिनाम् । कल्पिता

वैष्णवी भक्तिः प्रवृत्त्यर्थं शुभस्थिता ।”

७ द्र० मो०उ० ७.३२.२२

८ द्र० मो०उ० ६.१८.३०

चारः । एवरूपाच्छास्त्रार्थानुरूपविचारान् “नान्यतः प्राप्यते ज्ञानं मोक्षोपाय-
विचारणाद्”^१ इति ज्ञानं जायते । तेनैव ज्ञानेन “निर्मिसम्”^२ इति बीभत्सा-
दिनिमित्तं विनोत्तमवैराग्यमुत्पाद्यते “उत्तमवैराग्यं विवेकादेव जायते”^३ इति ।
तस्मिन्नेवाकृत्रिमवैराग्ये मनोनाशमहंकारमूर्तिं संसारप्रतिबन्धकवासनात्यागं च
प्राप्य व्यवहारमनुभवशून्यः शीतलावस्थां समाध्यपरामिधामुपगच्छति चिद-
गुः । सैवावस्थात्मसंवेदोव न तु परज्ञेया जीवन्मुक्तस्थितिर्भवति । यथोक्तं बहुशो
“वासनात्यागं कृत्वा तिष्ठन्ति लीलाया जीवन्मुक्ता”^४ इति “मोक्षो हि चेतसो
धर्मश्चेतस्येव स तिष्ठति”^५ इति “मोक्षो हि न परज्ञेय”^६ इति “शिरःशु-
ङ्गादि तज्ज्ञस्य चिह्नं न विद्यते”^७ इति च । मोक्षोपायमतानुसारी जीवन्मुक्तो
गार्हस्थ्ये सामान्यजनवतिष्ठन्कर्मकारित्वेन प्रायेण प्रवृत्तिपक्षमेवाश्रयते । श्री-
शङ्कराचार्योपदिष्टनिवृत्तिलक्षणसंन्यासमार्गावश्यकता^८ तस्य कथञ्चिन्न भवति
यथोक्तं “निश्चयवान्यो ऽन्तः समव्यवहृतिर्बाहिः”^९ इति “लोकोपमो ऽपि तुसो
ऽन्तर्यः स मुक्त”^{१०} इति “व्यवहारी यथैवाज्ञस्तज्ज्ञो लोक”^{११} इति “सर्वकर्मपरा
नित्यं तज्ज्ञा एवाज्ञवत्स्थिता”^{१२} इति “रागद्वेषभयादीनामनु रूपं चरन्नपि यो
ऽन्तर्व्योमवदत्यच्छुः स जीवन्मुक्त उच्यते”^{१३} इत्याद्यनेकशः ।

मोक्षोपायकृतो ऽद्वैतवेदान्ताद्यान्वायस्वातन्त्र्यमन्येभ्यो ऽपि विशेषेभ्यः स्फु-
टीभवति तद्यथा “मोक्षोपायादृते नैतत्कृतश्चिञ्ज्ञायत”^{१४} इति “नाविद्यास्तीह
नो माया”^{१५} इति “नन्वविद्या योच्यते वस्तुतो विद्यते नैषा”^{१६} इत्यादि । अपि

- ^१ द्र० मो०उ० ६.२९.७.८
^२ द्र० मो०उ० २.११.२०
^३ द्र० मो०उ० २.११.२३
^४ द्र० मो०उ० ५.१६.१३
^५ द्र० मो०उ० ६.२८.२९
^६ द्र० मो०उ० ७.१२५.३३
^७ द्र० मो०उ० ६.१३०.१४
^८ द्र० भागवतीभाष्ये १८.३०
^९ द्र० मो०उ० ६.६३.१६
^{१०} द्र० मो०उ० ६.७२.५
^{११} द्र० मो०उ० ६.१३०.८
^{१२} द्र० मो०उ० ७.१९९.१३
^{१३} द्र० मो०उ० ३.९.८
^{१४} द्र० मो०उ० ७.१३९.९
^{१५} द्र० मो०उ० ६.१२५.१
^{१६} द्र० मो०उ० ७.५२.५

च मोक्षोपाये “दृश्यात्यन्ताभाव” इति “सर्वापह्वव” इति च “सर्वसिद्धान्तसि-
द्धान्त” इत्याद्या बह्व्यो ऽनन्याधीनशास्त्रनिष्ठाः लीलोपाख्यानादिमहाकथाद्-
ष्टान्ताश्च विद्वत्कौतूहलजनन्यो भवितुमर्हन्ति ।

एतस्मिन्मध्ये श्रीमदानन्दबोधेन्द्रविरचितया तात्पर्यप्रकाशनाभ्या टीकाया
सह निर्णयसागरमुद्रणालयेन द्वित्रिवारं प्रकाशिते ऽपि मूलपाठाः प्रतिश्लोकप्रायं
लेखकस्वतितैस्तच्छोधनप्रयासजनितार्थदोषैश्च कालसमीरणैरिव विकृता आ-
भान्ति यद्दशान्मूलग्रन्थो बहुषु स्थलेषु दुर्गमः सदर्थहीनश्च वरीवर्ति । सैवावस्था
वेङ्कटरामराघवनादिमहोदयैरन्वेषकैर्शङ्कितानि साधुतरपुस्तकाभावाद्दोषपरिमा-
णं न सम्यग्निर्धारितम् ।

प्रह्लादचन्द्रशेखरदिवान्जीमहोदयेन गाढविचारेण गौडामिनन्ददुब्यस्य संक्षे-
परूपस्य लघुयोगवासिष्ठस्य मूलं प्रचलितबृहद्योगवासिष्ठाद्भिन्नमिति समीची-
नमनुमितम्^{१७} । अनधीतपूर्वाणां हस्तलिखितपुस्तकानां साहाय्येन पाठनिव-
हविचारद्वारेण योगवासिष्ठस्य रूपद्वयमवधारितं वल्दरित्युपाह्वेन स्तान्ये कुल-
नाम्ना मोक्षोपाययोगवासिष्ठमहारामायणनिकायभेदस्थापकपरीक्षा शार्मण्यभा-
षाविरचित^{१८} प्रकाशित^{१९} । तयोः प्राचीनतरं रूपं प्रायेण शारदालिखितलि-
तपुस्तकेषूपलब्धं मोक्षोपायशास्त्रमिति प्रत्यपादि । पूर्वं प्रकाशितस्य योगवा-
सिष्ठस्यापपाठबाहुल्यमस्मिन्मोक्षोपाये न विद्यते न च तत्र योगवासिष्ठ इव
लघुयोगवासिष्ठपाठाक्षेपाः श्लोकाक्षेपा वा दृश्यन्त इत्यादिविशेषा विस्तरतः
स्तान्येकतायाः पूर्वोक्तपरीक्षाया^{२०} ऽवसेयाः ।

परीक्षाविधानप्रसङ्गे स्तान्येमहोदयेन मोक्षोपायस्य केषुचिद्धस्तलेखेष्वाप्रका-
शितपूर्वायाः श्रीमद्भास्करकण्ठप्रणीतायाटीकायाः केचन भागा उपालभ्यन्त ।
श्रीभास्करकण्ठो ऽद्वैतशैवमतानुसारीति तस्य भास्करेणान्मया प्रत्यभिज्ञाकारि-
काविमर्शिणीटीकाया सुस्तुटम् । तथापि स मोक्षोपायशास्त्रं न शैवमतमवलम्ब-
मानः व्याख्याति । तस्य मोक्षोपायटीका स्वकुलपरम्परीणरीत्यनुजीविनीत्या-
भाति^{२१} तस्मान्मोक्षोपायावगतौ सा परमोपकृतिः ।

पश्चिमपृथिवीभागस्थानां भारतीयशास्त्रान्वेषकाणां मुदे मोक्षोपायशास्त्र-

^{१७} (Divanji, 1939); (Divanji, 1938-39)

^{१८} (Shaje, 1994).

^{१९} (Shaje, 1997a) इत्यत्र तत्संक्षेपः ।

^{२०} द्र० अत्र द्वितीयपृष्ठे टीकावतरणिकाया अष्टमे श्लोके ।

स्याद्यप्रकरणत्रितयस्य पुरा टीकालेशाः प्राकाशयन्त २१। अधुना तु मुमुक्षुणां पठितानामन्वेषकाणां च सर्वेषां गीर्वाणवाग्विदामर्थं वैराग्यप्रकरणस्य टीका देवनागरीलिपिविन्द्यस्ता प्रकाशयते । अचिराच्छिष्टाष्टीकालेशाः क्रमेण प्रकाशयिष्यन्ते ।

शैस्ताब्दः २००१
विमारनागार्याम्

यू० हनेद

Introduction *

The *Mokṣopāya*, or, as it was until recently known, the *Yogaśāstisūtra*, is perhaps the most voluminous philosophical didactic poem in world literature (VON GLASENAPP). With its approximately 32,000 verses it exceeds even the *Rāmāyaṇa*, and this by 8,000 verses. Inside the frame story which situates the philosophical exposition and discourse within one episode of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, it utilises a blend of theoretical expositions and parabolic narratives to impress upon the reader its philosophy which aims at effecting a non-ascetic 'liberation-in-life' (*jitānmukti*). Through its unique narratives it has fascinated the Indian mind and was in abridged versions translated into Indian vernaculars as well as into Persian, was disseminated all over India, and has thus exercised a lasting impact until today. Nevertheless it has not yet received an appropriate treatment in recent literary histories, presumably because neither the historiography of Indian literature nor that of Indian philosophy has yet succeeded in categorising it in a satisfying manner. Strictly speaking it is as yet impossible to do full justice to the work, because its original philosophical content, presented as theoretical explanations of the stories, but also in the form of independent expositions, has suffered considerable changes at the hands of Advaita-Vedāntic redactors who from a certain period lay their hands on it and started transmitting it, thus producing the version known at present as the *Yogaśāstisūtra*. Fortunately an older version that has escaped this peculiar redaction, the so-called *Mokṣopāya*, has survived in a manuscript recension that can be assigned to the region of Kashmir. In a series of publications we intend to make this text available through a critical edition of the *mūla* text, but also, as a preliminary step, an edition of Bhāskarakarāṇḍha's commentary, of which only fragments survive.

^{२१} (Slaṅge, 1933), (Slaṅge, 1995), (Slaṅge, 1996).

* We should like to thank all those who have contributed to this edition with their corrections and suggestions, namely Ashok Aklujkar, Divākara Ācārya, Hārunaga Isaacson, as also Jutta Valent, who had collaborated in the first edition.

The *Mokṣopāya* and the *Yogavāsīṣṭha*

On collecting manuscript material for the purpose of investigating the history of the text and its philology, a meticulous perusal disclosed a rather unexpected result, namely the existence of a particular strand of its textual transmission, completely independent of the printed text of the vulgate¹ and obviously preserving an early state of textual development. Since the evidence for this has already been provided elsewhere,² we shall deal here only briefly with its most outstanding and distinguishing features.

This hitherto unnoticed recension of the text is—in terms of textual history—closely connected with the region of Kashmir, where, as is obvious from geographical, botanical and climatic as well as by historical references, the text must either have been produced or must at least have received the earliest shape that can be recognised at present. The Kashmirian sources mention or quote the text by the title of *Mokṣopāya* (MU) or *Mokṣopāya-Śāstra*, and this title agrees with the one used in the oldest layers of the text itself. Due to textual developments the designation of *Mahānīlāyana* occurs in more recent layers, but the title of *Yogavāsīṣṭha* (YV) is nowhere to be found. This latter title, which is apparently a very late one testified to by the colophons of only a small number of manuscripts, has nonetheless become the name by which the work is generally known.

The Kashmirian recension, which we shall refer to as the *Mokṣopāya* or as the Śāradaī version, is transmitted by a group of closely related, mostly Kashmirian manuscripts, a few of which contain fragments of a commentary by Bhāskarakanṭha. The other branch of transmission, which resembles the *Yogavāsīṣṭha* as edited, is to be found in a comparatively large group of manuscripts, sometimes accompanied by Anandabodhendrasarasvati's *Vasīṣṭhātīrthaparyaprakāśa*. This very version spread throughout India, at a time still to be determined, and, especially when printed with this commentary (N/Ed), came to be considered the standard text. With reference to the predominance of the pan-Indian script of these manuscripts it is here called the [Nāgarī] transmission, vulgate, or simply *Yogavāsīṣṭha*.

As to the formal differences, group N is characterised by an introductory frame-story unknown to group S, and by a bipartition of the Nirvāṇaprakaraṇa into a *pāṭava*- and *uttarārdha*. This division is the result of a contamination with an abbreviated and incomplete version of the

MU, the so-called *Laghuyogavāsīṣṭha* (LYV).³ Here again the S-group, which transmits the Nirvāṇaprakaraṇa as a single, undivided and—compared to the vulgate—complete book, demonstrably represents an earlier and more original version.

As regards the variant readings, we observe first of all again formal criteria that allow drawing a clear line of distinction between the two groups, such as common omissions, insertions from the LYV as well as an overwhelming mass of variants of various kinds that divide the two branches of transmission. Turning to the character⁴ of the variants of the vulgate, two major types of changes with reference to the Kashmir version can be discriminated: scribal and other non-intentional mistakes on the one hand and wilful modifications on the other. Among the vulgate's errors and mistakes of the non-intentional type, frequent misinterpretations of characters originally written in Śārada script and misinterpretations due to a scribe's or redactor's consideration of the very narrowest context only and their disregard for the larger context, the understanding of which could have been secured by a truly living tradition, are striking.

Among the more important wilful changes of the vulgate the following deserve enumeration: The accretion of multilayered frames with an 'orthodox' / brahmanical touch in the form of YV 1.1; the insertion of sar-gas stressing Rāma-bhakti (YV 6.127–8); contrary to the spirit of the original; attempts to reinterpret passages that were originally conceived of as anti-vedic and anti-ritualistic; the change or even complete deletion of Buddhist terms;⁵ changing of numerous plural-forms of nouns and verbs that would indicate a public 'sermon' of the originator of the *Mokṣopāya*. They all occur in the singular in the vulgate, obviously in order to adapt them to a younger and fictitiously created layer of the text, namely the dialogue between Vasīṣṭha and Rāma; finally, an attempt to 'vedānticize' the text, which—though it does teach monism (advaita)—has nothing in common with the particularities of Śaṅkara's Vedānta, more with Gaudapāda's Kārikās and peculiar traits of the Mahāyāna. Though changes of this kind are likely to have been introduced by several phases of deliberate redactions, many of them may also gradually have found their way into the vulgate in the course of the text transmission in the hands and mouths of pious Saṃnyāsins, who most probably were convinced of their interpretation as a correct understanding. Thus they might already have

¹ The *Yogavāsīṣṭha* of Vālmīki with the Commentary *Vasīṣṭhamahātīrthamāyānātīrthaparyaprakāśa*, ed. Vāsudeva Laxmināra Śāstri Panikar [sic], Bombay 1911, 2nd 1918, 3rd 1937.

² See SLAIE (1994), and, as a summary, SLAIE (1997).

³ *Laghuyogavāsīṣṭha*, ed. VĀSUDEVA ŚARMAṆ, Bombay: Nirṇaya Saagar Press 1937.

⁴ See HANNEDER (2000).

⁵ E.g. *caitta*, compare SLAIE (2001).

paved the way for Vidyāranya's peculiar presentation of what he calls the *Rāmavāsīṣṭhasaṃvāda*, i.e. the *Laghuयोगavāsīṣṭha*, in his *Itanumuktivivēka*.⁶ As far as can be judged at present, the very first deliberate inclusion of the 'Vāsīṣṭha-Rāma-Saṃvāda' into the corpus of systematic Advaita-Vedānta goes to his credit. By Vidyāranya's treatment the YV was thus made acceptable for the followers of Śaṅkara's 'orthodox' Advaita-Vedānta. It should be pointed out that the above-mentioned criteria of differentiation are absolutely characteristic of the respective strands, since they occur either all together in a manuscript or are all together absent.

As a result of contrastive investigations of the character of the variant readings that divide the two strands, it has become clear that the Kashmirian version as we have it now represents a particular state of development that, by application of recognised methods of textual criticism, can be determined as decidedly earlier and more faithful to the original author's thought and expression than that of the vulgate.

This state of affairs has considerable repercussion on the perception and study of the philosophy of the text. Almost all the studies now available are based on the vulgate edition⁷ and some of the features that are characteristic of the YV, but not of the MU, have dominated the scholarly perception of this text. It is, for instance, still labelled as a work on Yoga, or as a Vedāntic work; both notions are quite contrary to the original doctrines of the MU.

However, the most important practical difference between both versions is that, owing to severe textual corruptions, the YV can often not be interpreted in a satisfying manner. In almost all those cases the MU preserves a text that is not only intelligible—though often difficult—but also coherent and philosophically sound.⁸ Through investigations from different angles⁹ it has become plain that it is only through the Śārādā version that we can judge the literary quality and study the philosophy of the text in detail. All these investigations have confirmed what a careful philologist

⁶ See SLAJE (1998), SLAJE (1995–6) and SLAJE (2000a). One should also note that some "minor Upaniśads" are influenced by the YV. See JOACHIM FRIEDRICH SPROCKHOFF, *Samnyāsa. Quellenstudien zur Askese im Hinduismus I* [AKM 42.1] Wiesbaden 1976, p. 312–377.

⁷ There are the following exceptions: BRONKHORST (2000), BRONKHORST (2001), LO TURCO (1998), LO TURCO (2001) and ROSENMEYER (1998). Some scholars have reached by merely naming the text as MU, while continuing to use the vulgate edition CAKRAVARTI (2000).

⁸ The reader will be able to judge for himself in the forthcoming edition of the *Uṣṭhāprakarāna* by HANNEDER. A first elaboration of this point is to be found in HANNEDER (2000).

⁹ SLAJE (1994), HANNEDER (1998), SLAJE (2001), HANNEDER (2000).

like DE JONG has articulated long before: "It is obvious that the *Nirnaya-sagar* Press edition of the great *Yogavāsīṣṭha* is not a sound basis for further study of this important text."¹⁰

Here is an overview of the versions of the *Mokṣopāyā*/*Yogavāsīṣṭha*:

1. *Mokṣopāyā*. The earliest known version of the text composed probably in second half of the tenth century; only parts of a commentary by Bhāskarakantha on this text survive (see below). Up to date three volumes of this commentary are edited,¹¹ one is about to be published.¹² They contain almost the complete text of the *Vairāgya*- and *Mumukṣuprakaraṇa*, but merely a part of the *Uṣṭhāprakarāna* and approximately half of the *Sthitiprakaraṇa*. An edition of the *mūla*-text of the *Uṣṭhāprakarāna* is under preparation.
2. *Yogavāsīṣṭha*. The printed vulgate, which derives from the *Mokṣopāyā*, but is a deteriorated version of the text.
3. *Mokṣopāyāsaṃgraha*.¹³ A fairly voluminous abstract of the *Mokṣopāyā*, which clearly transmits readings peculiar to the Śārādā recension. The technique used for abbreviating the text differs from all other known shorter version in that the redactor has tried to eliminate all the *ākhyānas*, retaining only the philosophical discourses.
4. An abridged version of the text composed by Abhinanda with the probable original name *Mokṣopāyāśāra*, but now known under the name *Laghuयोगavāsīṣṭha*. Neither the identity of the author nor the date can be given with any certainty. The wide-spread edition¹⁴ rests only on thin mss. evidence¹⁵ and contains two complementing halves of two commentaries, of the *Vāsīṣṭhacandrīkā* of Āmasukha and the *Saṃsāratārāni* of Mummadiġeva.
5. *Nānaavāsīṣṭha*. Another abridged, probably South-Indian version of the LYV that remains, however, virtually unstudied.¹⁶

¹⁰ See DE JONG (1981), p. 225. RAGHAVAN (1939) (p. 152) also notes that "the N.S. Press text of the LYV, like that of YV of the same press, has many mistakes."

¹¹ SLAJE (1996), SLAJE (1993), SLAJE (1995).

¹² SLAJE (2002).

¹³ Only one known manuscript: Cod. Ms. Sanscr. Vash 126 of the *Niederösterreichische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Göttingen*.

¹⁴ See above fn. 3.

¹⁵ For an analysis, see SLAJE (1994), p. 125–134.

¹⁶ See SLAJE (1994), p. 41f.

6. *Yogavāsīṣṭhasāra*. A group of recent brief compilations, the most wide-spread being the one commented upon by Mahīdhara.¹⁷ One version published recently by THOMI¹⁸ contains even considerable portions of non-YV material.

Bhāskarakaṇṭha's *Mokṣopāyaṭīkā*

Bhāskarakaṇṭha's *Mokṣopāyaṭīkā* belongs to the most important textual testimonia, since he transmits the mūla-text also in the praṭīkas of his commentary. His *Ṭīkā* has been preserved almost completely only for the first two (Vairāgya- and Mumukṣu-)Prakaranas. For the third (Uṣpati), fourth (Sthiti) and sixth (Nirvāna) only fragments, though themselves of considerable size, are available, while the rest seems irretrievably lost. This tallies with the report by K. C. PANDEY, who says that in the 1930s, when he visited Kashmir, some of the *Ṭīkā*-manuscripts were still in the possession of Bhāskara's direct descendants.¹⁹ Because of the great importance of Bhāskara's exegesis for the editorial work on the complete text, the critical edition of Bhāskara's *Ṭīkā*, whose fidelity to traditional exegesis can be demonstrated, has to be tackled prior to an edition of the mūla-text.

Here is a list of the manuscripts of the *Ṭīkā*:²⁰

Siglum	Extent	Descr.
Ś4	Ṭīkā: Vairāgya	Banaras Hindu University Varanasi (SLAJE 1994, p.34ff).
N11	Ṭīkā: Vairāgya	Banaras Hindu University Library, Library, Varanasi (SLAJE 1994, p.40f).
N12	Ṭīkā: Mumukṣu, Uṣpati	Banaras Hindu University Library, Varanasi (SLAJE 1994, p.36ff).
N13	Ṭīkā: Uṣpati	Banaras Hindu University Library, Varanasi (SLAJE 1994, p.38).
N17	Ṭīkā: Sthiti 1-33	Staatsbibliothek Berlin (Janert collection Hs. or 11221).
Ś6	Ṭīkā: Sthiti 1-5	Staatsbibliothek Berlin (Janert Collection Hs. or 12704).
N26	Ṭīkā: Nirvāna 195.2 [= N/Ed 7.38f] - 271 [= N/Ed 7.114]	BORI, Poona (Viśrāma 1/623), 208 foll. Kashmir-Devanagari. (See DIVANJI (1938-39))

A few remarks must suffice about the two manuscripts that are used here to establish the text for those passages where Bhāskarakaṇṭha's commentary is missing: Ś1 is a complete manuscript of the mūla text, which was published as a facsimile edition by LOKESH CHANDRA (New Delhi 1984). It consists of a collection of parts of originally different manuscripts

¹⁷ See SLAJE (1994), p. 50, fn. 2.

¹⁸ Vāsīṣṭha-Grantha-Māla: Yogavāsīṣṭhasāra "Die Quintessenz des Yoga-vāsīṣṭha, ed. by PETER THOMI, Wiesbaden 1999.

¹⁹ See below.

²⁰ Complete lists of all the known MÜ-mss. are contained in SLAJE (2000b), for detailed descriptions, see SLAJE (1994).

copied by several scribes, one day put together as a 'complete' text. Ś₃ is also complete and located in the Sri Pratap Singh Library in Srinagar. It is dated Laukikasamvat 43 and Samvat 1924 [= AD 1867] and was copied by Rāmācandra Bhaṭṭāraka.

Bhāskarakanṭha

The author of the *Mokṣopāyātikā*, the Kashmirian philosopher Bhāskarakanṭha, is best known for his *Bhāskari*,²¹ a commentary on Abhinavagupta's *Īśvarpratyabhijñānīmānirī*, in which the author mentions that he has produced a *Mokṣopāyātikā* of enormous size.²² Until recently not much was known except what was stated by K. C. PANDEY: "Commentary on Yoga Vāsisṭha. It consisted of one lac and ten thousand verses, according to his own statement in his introduction to the Bhāskari. But only a few fragments of it are now left with his present descendants. This presents a Śaivaite interpretation of the text."²³

His other known works are a Sanskrit translation of the Kashmirian verses of the poetess Lallā called the Lallāvākyaṇi, the *Harṣeśvarastava* and an independent philosophical treatise, the *Cittinubodhaśāstra*. Other details about the author are given by SUŚAMĀ PĀNDEVA in the preface to her edition of the *Cittinubodhaśāstra*.²⁴ His ancestry is given by himself as follows: Mādhavakanṭha (great grandfather), Vaidūryakanṭha (grandfather), Avatārakanṭha (father); his teachers were Narottamakaula and Ratnakanṭha, a disciple of his grandfather Vaidūryakanṭha. His date rests on the information provided by K. C. PANDEY, who writes: "He does not say anything about the time of his life or that of the composition of his works. On enquiry, however, from the living descendants, it has been found that he was six generations removed from the present. We can, therefore, safely say that he belonged to the latter half of the 18th century A.D."²⁵ It is at present impossible to prove or disprove this dating and for doing full

²¹ *Īśvara-pratyabhijñā-vimarsīni* of Abhinavagupta. Sanskrit Text with the Commentary Bhāskari. Ed. by K.A. Subramania Iyer and K[ranthi] Chandra[nd] Pandey. General Editor: R.C. Divedi. 3 Vols., Delhi 1986. [Reprint of: Princess of Wales Saraswati Bhavana Texts No. 70/83/84, Allahabad [...]: 1938-1954].

²² *dāśasūhrotharalāksaṁsthāyākaśītrīnokṣopāyātikākarṇava*, vol. 1, p. 3, line 5ff. This refers probably to *granthas*, i.e. for a prose work, units of 32 syllables.

²³ PANDEY (1963), p. 265.

²⁴ Rāṭhānaka Bhāskarakanṭha's *Cittanubodhaśāstram*, ed. by Sushama Pandey, Varanasi: Tara Book Agency 1990.

²⁵ PANDEY (1963), p. 264f.

justice to the author a study of his complete works would be a prerequisite.

The *Mokṣopāyātikā* is the only known commentary on the Kashmirian recension, and not only preserves the mūla text, but also gives valuable explanations. He makes it very clear that he considers the author of the *Mokṣopāyā* to be human: the Śāstra is thus, quite contrary to the frame story, of human origin (*pauroṣeyam*²⁶). As the source for his interpretations the author quotes his family tradition, and in some places he also refers to some of the doctrines as being "secret", which is of course a well-known pattern of the esoteric Śaiva religion, in which Bhāskarakanṭha is placed through his most well-known work, the *Bhāskari*. Nevertheless PANDEY's supposition that the *Ṭikā* is a Śaiva interpretation of this text is unfounded. Even though Bhāskarakanṭha occasionally uses Śaivaite terminology that is not found in the mūla text, he is far from forcing a fixed philosophical position upon it and is therefore markedly different in this respect from Ānandabodhendra, who misses no opportunity for employing Vedāntic patterns of interpretation. It is also interesting to note that Bhāskara's treatment of *daiva* in the *Ṭikā* (2.5-9) differs from that in his independent work, the *Cittinubodhaśāstra*.²⁷ This could indicate that he was trying to adhere to what he perceived to be the correct or traditional interpretation of this work. Whether he had access through his family to an older Kashmirian exegetical tradition, or whether his father, according to Bhāskara a *śatāhsiddha*,²⁸ claimed authority for interpreting this text for himself, is in the absence of other evidence unclear.

The Present Edition

The present edition is based on the first German edition by SLAJE,²⁹ which reports all the readings, contains more technical information on the establishment of the text and is printed in romanized transcription, but differs from it in a variety of ways. It is not intended to replace the first edition, but as a reading book for a wider audience, and therefore printed in Devanāgarī characters with normalised Sandhi.³⁰ For the same reason, the critical apparatus of the first edition is not repeated here. Furthermore,

²⁶ See *Mokṣopāyā* 2.18.2 in SLAJE (1993).

²⁷ 14.328, 333f; 15.234.

²⁸ *Mokṣopāyātikā*, introductory verse 8.

²⁹ SLAJE (1996).

³⁰ While in the critical edition the orthographical peculiarities of the mss. were preserved, here the Sandhi is restored with the exception of *prāthkas*, which are, wherever possible, *asandhitā*.

in order to present a complete text, we have supplied the *mūla* text for those passages that were missing in the first edition because of gaps in the manuscript of Bhāskarakanṭha's commentary.³¹ And finally, various corrections, some suggested by reviewers,³² have been taken into consideration.

The problem of providing Sanskrit prose with a consistent and helpful punctuation is solved by editors in a variety of ways and especially for the complex syntax of commentaries there are widely varying solutions. In a commentary on a verse that forms a single clause one could often view the whole commentarial passage as one phrase that would need no punctuation except at the end. It would often amount to a complete absence of *danḍas*, and this is exactly what we see in the manuscripts of Bhāskara's *Ṭkā*, who do not use *danḍas* in the commentary at all.

For an editor wishing to guide the reader through the text the better approach is to mark the natural units of a commentarial passage, i.e. the *prāṭikas* with their explanations.³³ The result is that there are many more *danḍas* in such a text as compared with normal narrative prose. Quite a few editions thus adopt a middle way between these extremes by using commas, where a *danḍa*, suggesting the end of a clause, would be too strong. We have refrained from imitating this practice, since the comma suggests that the conditions of its use in English apply, which is not the case. As a result the present edition has perhaps "too many *danḍas*" and we would request the readers to treat them more like a Śāradā "half-danḍa" rather than a "full stop".

The Vairāgyaprakaraṇa

In comparison with the other five Prakaraṇas, the Vairāgyaprakaraṇa appears as homogenous and well-planned and its contents tallies with its name: it deals with the story of Rāma's dejection and detachment. The frame stories contained in the first Sarga of the Nāgarī recension are missing here—a characteristic of the *Mokṣopāya*—and the 32 Sargas of this version thus correspond to Sargas 2–33 of the *NEA*. They can be divided into two segments: the first is a mythic description of the origin of the work, in

³¹ In those cases our sources are the mss. of the *Mokṣopāya* recension, which contain only the *mūla* text as documented in SLAJE (1994) (p. 38–41) or SLAIE (2000b). The variants of the text thus established are of course given in the footnotes. In the first Prakaraṇa there is only one brief gap (2.4–12), but there will be more in the forthcoming volumes.

³² See DE JONG (1998).

³³ This applies of course only to this particular commentarial style.

which a connection to the epic *Rāmāyana* is made [Sarga 1] and the setting for the instruction of Rāma is created [Sargas 2–10 and 31–32]. The second is a poetical tract on the reasons for Rāma's *vairāgya* [Sargas 11–30], where each Sarga treats of a distinct reason.

Bhāskarakanṭha's *Ṭkā*, of which the beginning is fortunately preserved, is of considerable importance for this Prakaraṇa: firstly it confirms one important characteristic of the *MU*, namely the absence of the outer frame of the vulgate. Furthermore there are a few unexpected, but important statements about this text: Bhāskara indicates with a remark (*itih param vairāgyaprakaraṇārambhaḥ*) and a separate maṅgalasloka that the Vairāgyaprakaraṇa itself starts only with Sarga 11. Finally, despite all fictions of a mythical or epic origin of this work, he quotes a tradition that preserves the secret (*rahasya*) of a human authorship of the *Mokṣopāya*.³⁴

Summary of Contents

Sarga 1 [Introduction of the *Ṭkā*.] Maṅgalasloka devoted to Śiva [1–3], to the author's grandfather Vaidūryakanṭha and father Avatārakanṭha [4–6]; programmatic verses on the qualification for studying the commentary [7], on the family tradition as the source for interpretation [8], on the exclusion of some people from studying the work [9]; introduction of the author and his lineage [10], request for being lenient with errors in his work [11], adoration of the goddess of speech and his teacher Narottama Kaula [12], the title of the work: *Mokṣopāyagrantha* [13]. In the prose introduction: remarks on the author of the *Mokṣopāya* as being a *vidhyatīkṛta*, who extracted instructions from a *Matāraṇīyana* thought to comprise the *Rāmāyana* and the *Mokṣopāya*.³⁵

[*Mūla*.] Maṅgalasloka [1]. Qualification for studying the work [2]. Origin of the work: the Vālmīki-Bharadvāja-myth: programmatic verse about liberation through studying the *kathopāya* (= *Rāmāyana*) and *Mokṣopāya* [3]. Vālmīki first composed the epic [4] and gave the work to his disciple Bharadvāja (5), who recited it to Brahmā [6] and received a boon from the god [7]. Bharadvāja wishes that all mankind should be freed from suffering [8]. As a consequence Vālmīki is requested by Brahmā to complete his *Rāmāyana* [9–16]. Repetition of this request by Bharadvāja and question about the life and liberation of Rāma. Vālmīki agrees [24]. Rāma and others are characterised as *jīvanmuktas* [29].

³⁴ *Ṭkā* on 1.1.1 (introduction), 1.3.3, 2.18.2a and 3.8.8.

³⁵ See SLAJE (1994), p. 168–171.

Sarga 2 The question about how Rāma attained the state of a *jīvanmukta* [1] is answered with a brief summary of the philosophy of the work [2–15], characterised by Bhāskara as a “general instruction” (*sāmantīyopadeśa*). Start of the narration about how Rāma acquired liberation in life [16–17]: Some time after completing his studentship [18–19] Rāma asks his father for permission for a pilgrimage [20–24]. He departs [25–30], a brief description of the pilgrimage follows [31–41] and he returns [42].

Sarga 3 Reception [1–5] and subsequent life at the court [6–12].

Sarga 4 After the pilgrimage Rāma falls in a state of depression [1–9]. His father asks for the cause [10–11], but Rāma does not respond [12]. Vasiṣṭha, when asked by the king, states that there is a reason, but no cause for sorrow [13–15].

Sarga 5 The king and his wives are concerned and closely observe Rāma [1–2]. At the same time Viśvāmitra comes to Ayodhyā for help, since his sacrifice has been disturbed by demons [3–6]. The sage is received [7–37] and politely addressed by Daśaratha [39–54], who promises to fulfill all his wishes [52–54].

Sarga 6 Viśvāmitra asks for help in subduing the demons [1–10], and specifically for permission to take Rāma with him [11–28]. The king is dumbfounded [27].

Sarga 7 Daśaratha is not willing to comply [1–2], because Rāma is still very young, and himself wants to accompany Viśvāmitra [3–5]. Additional arguments that Rāma is inexperienced in battle etc. [6–38.]

Sarga 8 Viśvāmitra is angry and accuses the king of breaching his promise [1–5]. Vasiṣṭha steps in and admonishes Daśaratha to keep his word and act according to the Dharma [6–12].

Sarga 9 Daśaratha calls for Rāma [1–3], who does not appear. The servant tells him that Rāma, despite saying that he would come in a second, remained alone in a depressed state and pondering [4–5]. The king enquires about Rāma’s state and the servant now relates in detail that Rāma was depressed since returning from his pilgrimage [9], that he only through their sustained effort fulfils his daily duties, but does not even eat enough [11]. He does not enjoy the pleasures of royal life [12–23], but remains in the lotus posture with an empty mind [24]. Daily he becomes thinner, pale, and detached, withers like a tree in autumn [25]. If asked, he says: “it is nothing” and remains silent [29]. He instructs others not to cling to enjoyments, which are only pleasant at first sight [30–31]. When asked to behave like a king, he laughs; he does not seem to care for the outer world or himself [33–38], does not pay respect to others, even his teacher [42], and so forth.

Sarga 10 Viśvāmitra wishes to see Rāma immediately, since he thinks that his state is not caused by misfortune, but is a sign of an enlightened state produced through detachment (*vairāgya*) by discernment (*viveka*) [1–2]. With the delusion (*moha*) removed through *yukti* (which in this work means the didactic use of *drśāntas*), he will experience tranquility (*viśrānti*) [3–4] and with this experience he will regain his physical and mental health [5] and be able to fulfil his duties [6] while retaining his inner freedom [7]. The king now summons Rāma, who appears and is consoled by Daśaratha [28–30] and Vasiṣṭha [31–32]. Viśvāmitra asks for the reasons of Rāma’s state.

Sarga 11–30 With a sigh Rāma starts his answer [1]. According to Bhāskara the Vairāgyaprakaraṇa proper begins with verse two, i.e. with Rāma’s long answer. In Sarga 11 he summarizes his state.

Thereupon follows a group of Sargas, each devoted to one of the objects from which Rāma feels now detached. They are in the form of poetical “*vināśas*” of: *śrī* [Sarga 12], *jitā* [13], *āhankāra* [14], *citta* [15], *trṣṇā* [16], *śarīra* [17], *bāhya* [18], *yaucana* [19], *śrī* [20], *jarā* [21], *kāla* [22–23], *dāra* [24–25], *samsāra* [26], and *antīyānā* [27].

Then follow descriptions of the state of *vairāgya* [Sargas 28–29] as well as the question for the means to end suffering [Sarga 30].

Sarga 31 Rāma’s speech has evoked astonishment and admiration of all present in the congregation and of heavenly beings. A rain of flowers occurs and the Siddhas state that this has been new (*apūrvā*) and enlightening.

Sarga 32 The Siddhas decide to invite all seems to listen to the answer to Rāma’s question [1–3]. Munis flock to the congregation [4–15], are greeted [16–25] and Rāma is extolled for his words [30–43].