

THE YOGAVĀSIṢṬHA AND ITS KASHMIRIAN RECENSION,
THE MOKṢOPĀYA
Notes on their Textual Quality

*By Jürgen Hanneder**

INTRODUCTION

The Yogavāsiṣṭha (YV) has been the subject of quite a few studies¹ and despite the fact that much remains to be studied in this voluminous work it does not, at first sight, seem to be a text more problematic than others.

Present-day research on the YV is based on an edition in two volumes accompanied by the commentary of the Advaita Vedāntin Ānandabodhendra,² the primary text making up the so-called vulgate (N_{Ed}).³ Based on it MAINKAR has explicitly denied the need for a critical edition:

Is a critical edition of the Vāsiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa possible? Time and again it has been said that the problems connected with the Vāsiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa are more or less of the same nature as of those connected with the Mahābhārata. But so far the question of the critical edition is concerned the two materially differ. The Mahābhārata textual criticism has become a science and it has been possible to arrive at a critical edition of the Epic. The wealth of manuscript material available for study and the inter-

* I am grateful to Anne MacDonald, Karin Preisendanz, and Walter Slaje for their valuable comments on the present article.

¹ The most comprehensive bibliographies are to be found in SLAJE 1994 and LO TURCO 1998. A single-volume reprint of the most important studies by BHATTACHARYA, DIVANJI and RAGHAVAN is under preparation by W. Slaje and the present author.

² Ānandabodha's date is not settled; BHATTACHARYA gives the beginning of the 18th century, see SLAJE 1994: 65. For the edition, see below, p. 187f.

³ In the absence of attempts at reediting this version with the help of a substantial number of manuscripts, the sigla YV and N_{Ed} denote the same text. The two reeditions of Ākhyānas, of which I am aware, namely THOMI 1980 and KARMAKAR 1956, were produced with the help of manuscripts of the Yogavāsiṣṭha and Mokṣopāya. In the latter case ms. B, which corresponds to N₁₅, bears a large number of variants.

esting facts revealed by them have made such a study possible. With the Vāsiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa, however, the case is different. The manuscript material is scanty and is not likely to throw any light on the evaluation of the text. Further the present Nirṇaya Sāgara text in two volumes appears to have a certain unified character about it. The same excessively poetical style is to be met with in all the six *prakaraṇas*. Similarly the same diction saturated with the Bhagavadgītā and Gauḍapāda is to be met with throughout. Finally, the same metaphysical and ethical views are taught with a remarkable consistency. ... Thus, whatever may be the phases through which the text has passed, the text as it is now is a homogenous one and an attempt to have a critical edition of the same is not likely to give any satisfactory results.⁴

These remarks have suggested to many that a further study of the transmission of the text should be seen as marginal to the study of its philosophy, perhaps in view of a critique of the "philology" of Purāṇa-like works.⁵

New manuscript discoveries and SLAJE's pioneering analysis of the history of the text, however,⁶ are proving all of MAINKAR's arguments to be wrong. It can now be proved that the Kashmirian recension of the Yogavāsiṣṭha, the so-called Mokṣopāya (MU), is not only an older version of the text, but that the Yogavāsiṣṭha is the result of a deliberate reworking that deprived the text of many original features and doctrines. Some of the new features that were added in this process of revision have dominated the description of this text, i.e. its labelling as a work on Yoga,⁷ or as a Vedāntic work,⁸ notions that are quite contrary to the original doctrines of the MU.

Inspired by these discoveries, SLAJE decided to produce a critical edition of the MU as commented on by the Kashmirian author Bhāskaraṇṭha (18th century),⁹ which would be published in a series of editions. To date, the fragments of the first three chapters (*prakaraṇa*)

⁴ MAINKAR 1977: 247f.

⁵ The recent edition of the Skandapurāṇa (ed. R. ADRIAANSEN – H.T. BAKKER – H. ISAACSON. Groningen 1998) has proved that, provided that appropriate material is available, the establishing of a critical edition of a Purāṇa, contrary to the wide-spread notions about oral transmission, is a worthwhile endeavour.

⁶ See SLAJE 1994.

⁷ See SLAJE 1998: 111ff.

⁸ Most recently in CHENET 1998–1999: 12. The differing ascriptions to philosophical and religious systems are listed in SLAJE 1992.

⁹ See SLAJE 1997a.

have been published¹⁰ and the fragment of the fourth is in preparation. The text contained in these fragments is in itself far superior to the printed text of the Yogavāsiṣṭha and the edition of the only commentary on the Mokṣopāya version is the first indispensable step towards a critical edition of the *mūla* text.

An edition of the entire Utpatti prakaraṇa is currently being prepared by the present author in a project financed by the German Research Foundation (DFG) at the University of Halle. The following is a provisional summary of results and deals especially with the quality of the newly established text as compared to that of the vulgar edition.

In his well-known handbook on textual criticism, MARTIN WEST¹¹ poses one important question of every future editor: "Is your edition really necessary?" In the present case, namely of launching an editorial project comparable in scope to the critical edition of the Mahābhārata or Rāmāyaṇa, the first question could be changed to: "Do the results justify the enormous effort?" Having edited one ninth of one book of the text this question can, in my opinion, be answered in the positive. The present edition amounts to no less than the recovery of a text and its philosophy that has been up to now, as it were, hidden in a revised version.

Critics may argue that since we have a printed text of the Yogavāsiṣṭha and the revision has only partly been effective, we may still, in view of the length of this text, obtain a fairly correct picture of its philosophy. The thesis put forward in this paper is that only on the basis of the earliest version can we judge the literary quality and study the philosophy of the Yogavāsiṣṭha/Mokṣopāya in detail, because the distortion of philosophical ideas through the innumerable changes introduced into the YV version is not likely to be neutralized through parallels; these changes prevent a thorough grasp of its philosophical positions. Since this is a crucial issue we shall give examples that will demonstrate the significant differences in the *quality* of the original and the reworked text. But the *pūrvapakṣa* argument just stated has already been proven wrong by SLAJE, who was able to demonstrate that certain Buddhist traces have been altogether effaced from the revised text:¹² the edited text does not anywhere reveal that the work

¹⁰ The first two volumes (SLAJE 1993 and 1996) contain an almost complete text of book 1 and 2, while only 15 of approximately 120 *sargas* are contained in the fragments of the third *prakaraṇa* (SLAJE 1995).

¹¹ WEST 1973.

¹² See his "Observations on the making of the Yogavāsiṣṭha (*caitta*, *na-nārtha* and *vaḥ*)", in: Raniero Gnoli Felicitation volume. Rome: ISMEO (forthcoming).

originally contained the Buddhist term *caitta*. The edition will therefore confirm what a careful philologist like DE JONG articulated earlier: "It is obvious that the Nirṇaya-sāgar Press edition of the great Yoga-vāsiṣṭha is not a sound basis for further study of this important text"¹³.

It is difficult to gauge the impact that the establishment of the original text will have on our understanding of the philosophy of this work, especially for those who have received the text through the standard edition, assisted by the translation of MITRA,¹⁴ but who are not familiar with the philological intricacies of Indian philosophical texts. Furthermore, the implications of the newly discovered changes to the original text must remain abstract as long as we cannot gain a more vivid picture of the cultural background in which they were made. But we can imagine that it is only because of the cultural and temporal distance, and the domination of Advaita-Vedāntic thought in modern India, that the transformation of the Mokṣopāya into a Yogavāsiṣṭha is not perceived as what it is in a historical perspective: a spectacular appropriation of a heterodox philosophy contained in one of the largest works in Indian literary history, a work that, although not protected by a wide-spread philosophical tradition, has remained fascinating through its unique blend of philosophy and narrative. It is still difficult to determine whether these distortions should be interpreted as no more than a gradual change made in good faith, perhaps prompted by a corrupted, or badly transcribed *ādarśapustaka* that had to be corrected, or whether the changes also involved a planned revision of the text to bring it in line with the philosophy of the transmitters. The extent of change in readings, the attempts to restructure the work, visible in the division of the Nirvānaprakaraṇa and the additional frame story which forces the whole work into a certain perspective, and the consistency that can be observed in purging the text of specific terms, clearly points to the latter¹⁵.

The necessity for a critical edition of the Mokṣopāya should be, especially for those interested in the philosophy of the work, as obvious as, in more recent history, the earlier need for an edition of the works of Friedrich Nietzsche, fulfilled by COLLI and MONTINARI. Without doubt the vulgate version as well as the Laghuyogavāsiṣṭha will remain relevant for the history of later Advaita-Vedānta which drew upon both, but for studying the original philosophy of the work the vulgate has to be dismissed.

¹³ DE JONG 1981: 225. RAGHAVAN (1939b: 152), notes that "the N.S. Press text of the LYV, like that of YV of the same press, has many mistakes".

¹⁴ MITRA 1891–1899.

¹⁵ For a discussion of deliberate alterations of readings, see SLAJE 1994: 87–97.

TEXTUAL CRITICISM

The the edition of the MU that is being made by the present author takes into consideration the division of the manuscript transmission into two recensions, namely the “Nāgarī Recension” as commented upon by Ānandabodhendra, henceforth called Yogavāsiṣṭha (YV) or vulgate represented by the edition described above (N_{Ed}), and the Kashmirian recension, called Mokṣopāya (MU). This fundamental bi-partition is analysed in detail in SLAJE 1994¹⁶.

SLAJE’s research has demonstrated that the YV is the result of a mixture of unintentional as well as intentional changes on a microphilological level, and of a conscious redactionary effort, visible in the accretion of a further frame story, the division of the Nirvāṇaprakaraṇa into a Pūrva- and an Uttarārdha, and intermixture with the Laghuyogavāsiṣṭha (LYV).

The text of the vulgate as commented upon by Ānandabodha has been edited several times. Not much is known about the three editions dating from the end of the 19th century;¹⁷ the text is received through the edition by PAṆŚĪKAR, of which the second and the third reprint are widely available.¹⁸ These two can be distinguished by their apparatus and Sanskrit introductions. The second edition (1918) reprinted by Munshiram Manoharlal in 1981, contains a preface by the editor, in which the following sources are given: *etacchodhanāvasare prācīnaha-stākṣaravilasitaṃ pāṅktam prāyaḥ śuddham pustakaṃ paṇḍitajyeṣṭhā-rāmamukundajīnām granthasaṃgrahālayān mahatā prayatnena tebhyaḥ saṃpāditam ekam, aparaṃ ca ga.kṛ. mudraṇālayānkitam ekam ity ubhayaḥ saṃyojanena yāvanmanīṣam akāryasya saṃskaraṇam*.¹⁹ It remains unclear which of the three previous editions is meant, since we do not have sufficient bibliographical data on them and no copy could be traced up to now.

There also exists a reprint of the third edition (1937) by Motilal Banarsidass, which contains a *trītiyasamskaraṇasya prastāvanā* by one Bhārgava Śāstrī in addition to the first preface by PAṆŚĪKAR. There it is merely stated that the edition was prepared “with the help of manuscripts”²⁰. The typeface is the same as in the second edition and the text differs from the previous only in details: some corrections were

¹⁶ An English summary is also contained in SLAJE 1997a.

¹⁷ Listed in SLAJE 1994: 301. Prof. Slaje is in possession of one early print of the Utpattiprakaraṇa with Ānandabodhendra’s commentary in *pothī* format (without title page) that, judging from the typeface, could be the 1880 Nirṇaya Sagar Press edition. It contains no variant readings.

¹⁸ See YV in the references.

¹⁹ Preface, p. 4.

²⁰ Preface, p. 8: “*ādarśapustakasāhāyya- ...*”.

made to the *mūla* text, the *pratīkas* in the commentary are, unlike in the second edition, in bold typeface, and there are new variant readings in the footnotes, in addition to those given in the second edition.

In other words, the second edition of the YV is based on one previous edition, the basis of which is unknown, and one manuscript,²¹ while the third edition adds readings from an unknown number of manuscripts. Since none of the few variant readings given in these editions are attributed to a specific source, further analysis of the textual history is impossible. Ideally a test collation of a portion of the text from a wide selection of sources should be made, but in view of the findings to be discussed below this is perhaps not an immediately pressing task.

THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE UTPATTIPRAKARAṆA OF THE MOKṢOPĀYA

All the manuscripts have already been described in SLAJE 1994: 31ff., and SLAJE 1997a. For reference brief descriptions are quoted here:

Siglum	Location
N ₁₀	NGMPP, Berlin / National Archives Nepal, Kathmandu. Ms. A95/12. 285 fol.
N ₁₂	Benares Hindu University Library, Varanasi. Ms. 328148
N ₁₃	Benares Hindu University Library, Varanasi. Ms. 331122
Ś ₁	Facsimile of a ms. reproduced in: Sanskrit Texts from Kashmir, vols 8/9, repr. by LOKESH CHANDRA. [Śata-Piṭaka-Series 334/335]. New Delhi 1984
Ś ₃	Sri Pratap Singh Library, Srinagar. Ms. 8771 – new (7629 old) [microfilm at the Indological Institute, Bonn]
Ś ₇	Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts, New Delhi. Uncatalogued, purchased in 1995 from a private collection, No. RAR/181.045/MOK
Ś ₉	Staatsbibliothek Berlin, Hs. or. 12511 (Janert collection KA 1511)

Abbreviations used in the apparatus

†	<i>textus illegibilis</i>
a.c.	<i>ante correctionem</i>
p.c.	<i>post correctionem</i>
v.l.	<i>varia lectio</i>

²¹ That this manuscript was kept in Kashmir is known from a remark by the editor on 4.21.30, where he says: *idaṃ ca kāśmīrasthapustake ṭippanīrūpeṇopalabdham*.

The Ś-manuscripts are written in Śāradā, the N-manuscripts in Devanāgarī; all mss. listed transmit the text of the MU, not that of the YV. N₁₂ and N₁₃ form the basis for the edition of the fragments of the Utpattiprakaraṇa made by SLAJE.²² A more detailed description of the manuscripts will be presented in the forthcoming edition of the Utpattiprakaraṇa, but a few remarks are relevant for our argument.

Ś₇ is the most interesting manuscript, because here the process of contamination of MU with YV can be observed: the text is clearly that of the Mokṣopāya version – it has all the additional verses found in the MU, it omits the verses that are transmitted only in N_{Ed} and in most cases the readings are those of the MU. The scribe occasionally gives us what are presumably his own lexical notes, mostly interlinear. But he furthermore adds parts of Ānandabodhendhra's commentary in the margin and sometimes adjusts the readings of his *mūla* text in accordance with the commentator's version, that is, the YV.²³ As a result a variety of constellations is met with: the text either agrees with N_{Ed}, or N_{Ed}'s reading is added in the margin²⁴ – perhaps after adding the commentary –, or the original reading as attested by the other mss. is altered to agree with N_{Ed}. The result is a mixture, not a reworked root text, since only excerpts of the commentary are given and only a fraction of the readings are adjusted to agree with the Nāgarī version.²⁵ As a result agreement of Ś₇ with N_{Ed} is often an indication of contamination.

THE CHARACTER OF THE YV AND THE CONSTITUTION OF THE TEXT OF THE MU

In a manuscript transmission that is at least partially contaminated the best criterion for producing a stemma would be agreement of significant scribal errors. In the first fourteen Sargas I have found hardly an instance of such agreement. The insertions and omissions also do not occur in regular patterns and are not sufficient to establish a stemmatical relationship.

²² SLAJE 1995. These two mss. have not been recollated by me, but their readings are quoted from SLAJE's edition. All the other mss. were available as microfilms and/or print-outs from microfilms; in the case of Ś₇ Prof. Raffaele Torella has kindly provided us with a xerox copy of the copy he has taken in Delhi.

²³ A second hand sometimes corrects readings that agree with N_{Ed} into those agreeing with the other Śāradā mss.: 8.16d: *na tūktam* N₁₀ N₁₃ Ś₁ Ś₃ Ś₇ p.c. Ś₉] *nanūktam* Ś₇ a.c. (= N_{Ed}). The same hand also provides word divisions.

²⁴ See, for instance 11.1d, where all MU mss. read *gacchati*, while Ś₇ add N_{Ed}'s *tiṣṭhati* in the margin.

²⁵ For instance in 8.13 Ānandabodhendhra's gloss on *bodhanyāpi* is reproduced even though the *mūla* reads *bālasnyāpi*.

From \dot{S}_7 we can conclude that readings of the vulgate have been reintroduced into the Kashmirian transmission of the text of the MU. If \dot{S}_7 had been copied, the result would be a text of the MU, recognizable through typical readings, which was intermixed with YV readings. The striking agreement of other manuscripts with N_{Ed} in certain passages is most probably the result of the same phenomenon.

In recent articles SLAJE has demonstrated that the YV is not merely the product of gradual change towards a more conservative version, but included, at a certain stage, a planned revision of the text.²⁶ The judging of the value of a given variant of the YV recension against MU is therefore problematic: (1) the variant could represent a change introduced by revisor(s) of the YV and therefore be irrelevant for editing the MU; (2) the variant could be the result of the process of conflation with other versions, most notably the LYV;²⁷ (3) it could be a surviving primary reading that was lost due to corruption in the transmission of the MU. In the first two cases we have to eliminate the reading as irrelevant, in the last case we have to accept the reading of the YV and postulate that none of the MU manuscripts has the original reading. From the experience gained so far the third scenario is hardly ever met with. The impression gained to this point is clearly that the MU is more coherent and that the percentage of readings where N_{Ed} presents us with a viable alternative is very low indeed. In many cases where the text of N_{Ed} seems preferable, a closer inquiry or a comparison with other passages often confirms the reading of MU and shows that N_{Ed} has a tendency to simplify problematic readings.

In the other typical case, namely, when some of the MU mss. agree with YV against the others, the decision for the correct reading remains open and must be arrived at by way of the methods devised to deal with contaminated recensions. Where \dot{S}_7 agrees with YV one will always suspect²⁸ a direct influence of YV on \dot{S}_7 for the reasons mentioned above. Since contamination of the MU with the YV readings cannot be ruled out, the readings that agree with YV should always be treated with some suspicion.

One important source for differing readings and even additional lines is the LYV. This text is a summary in which the author has arguably taken more liberty with single readings and especially in

²⁶ For instance the complete removal of the term *caitta* cannot be just accidental; see SLAJE's article quoted n. 12 above.

²⁷ That the Laghu-version was included in the process that led to the characteristic format of the YV, such as the division of the Nirvāṇaprakaraṇa, is clear from many instances.

²⁸ This, it must be emphasised, is not a principle to be adopted mechanically. There are cases where a reading shared by \dot{S}_7 and N_{Ed} against the others is preferable.

smoothing the gaps resulting from his redaction with his own compositions than a simple scribe would have done. In the process of producing the YV, readings or even verses of the LYV were sometimes adopted. The rationale behind this redaction is still unexplained; perhaps both texts of the MU and the LYV were considered authentic and the combination of the "scattered knowledge" appeared to be the best method.

One example for this is the first narrative in the Utpattiprakaraṇa, the story of Ākāśaja.²⁹ A comparison shows that the author of the LYV has omitted 2.20–2.29, a digression that is not necessary for understanding the narrative, and has thus elegantly joined the related 2.19 and 2.30, both of which deal with *sahakārikāraṇas*. Likewise 2.31–44 are omitted and the story resumes in LYV with 2.45ab, which contains the conclusion of the speaker's words and commences the return to the plot. But 2.45cd is omitted in the LYV and instead a new line is added which concludes the story. In the YV this new line is added in the same place, but there it seems prompted by the fact that, due to the omission of some half-verses produced by eyeskip rather than redactional activities, a single half-verse would have concluded the speech of Yama; adding the line from the LYV must have seemed the easiest way out. But this means that the revisors of the YV must have had both versions, the MU and LYV, before them and possibly picked readings and verses from either manuscript. Perhaps the copy of MU was decrepit and the only other manuscript that was available was one of the LYV. This is of course only the simplest solution; it is impossible to exclude that other versions as well as intermediate steps were involved of which we have no trace.

In any case there are, within the Nāgarī tradition, very problematic elements of conscious change, even of haphazard compilation, which need to be identified and excluded. The most obvious way to proceed was to use only MU manuscripts and exclude the YV version. This was considered before Ś₇ became available, a manuscript which shows that the Kashmirian scribes had access to the Nāgarī version and even used the commentary of Ānandabodha.³⁰ After the analysis of Ś₇, it was thought necessary to collate not only the mss. of MU, but also those of the YV, in order to be able to weigh and exclude the influence of this version on the MU manuscripts. The suspicion that none of the manuscripts have escaped the influence by the Yogavāsiṣṭha version severely complicates the textcritical relationship.

²⁹ A similar case, to which my colleague Jens Rosenmeyer has drawn my attention, is 3.121.27ab.

³⁰ Another indication of this is the beginning of Ś₁, which reproduces the introduction of Ānandabodha's commentary (SLAJE 1994: 39), but here the text itself is not so obviously affected.

Since contamination between the two recensions, i.e. MU and N_{Ed}, is assumed, the main criteria for arriving at the original reading must be: genetics of error, immediate context, coherence of the argumentation and consistency of the philosophy. In other words, one needs to employ the methods developed for contaminated recensions enhanced by what we know about the transmission of this text. If, and only if, these criteria fail, that is, when two equally possible readings remain, have I regarded the one that agrees with the Nāgarī recension as secondary, since contamination with N_{Ed} is the most likely case scenario.

PRINCIPLES FOR THE CONSTITUTION OF THE TEXT

1. Readings for which all mss. of the Śāradā recension agree are accepted as the critical text. Up to the present point in the edition there has occurred no instance where a reading of the vulgate would have to be preferred. Often the seemingly better readings turn out to be simplifications.
2. Within the Śāradā recension readings are weighed according to the principles of textual criticism as applicable to contaminated recensions.³¹
3. Since contamination of all manuscripts by the YV version must be assumed, an agreement of some readings of mss. of the MU with the vulgate is not unlikely to be the result of this process. This has, in cases where other criteria failed, as in the case of quasi-synonyms, been made the basis for the decision between readings, which means that the reading not shared by N_{Ed} is given preference.
4. Due to certain peculiarities in the language of the MU, to be described in the introduction to the forthcoming edition of the Utpat-tiprakaraṇa,³² we have chosen not to emend the text in those cases of textcritical problems where a possibly original, but non-standard feature of the author's language would thereby be lost.

THE QUALITY OF THE TEXT

It has been stated above that unless one is specifically interested in the later Vedāntic development of the ideas of the MU, the text of the vulgate cannot be used as a reliable source: the YV is not only a revised

³¹ See SRINIVASAN 1967.

³² Some of these peculiarities, as found in the printed YV, were discussed in the works of SATYA VRAT SHASTRI.

version, it is a version in which the consistency of thought and other indicators of the textual quality are significantly lower than in the MU. In order to prove this important point the following examples taken from the first fourteen Sargas of the forthcoming edition of the Utpatiprakaraṇa are briefly discussed.

The most amusing and obvious example of the enormous difference in quality between the MU and the YV is certainly 3.11.7. It occurs within a discussion of the non-existence of the world: the world does not *exist*, but it *appears*; like a dream it is perceived, but has no ontological reality in itself. Rāma, when insisting on its nature as perceptible and thereby according it at least some sort of existence, is rebuked in 11.7 by Vasiṣṭha with an elegant and slightly polemic rejoinder:³³

rāmaḥ

*vandhyāputro vyomavanam
naivāsti na bhaviṣyati /
kīdṛśī dṛśyatā tasya
kīdṛśī tasya nāstitā ||3||³⁴*

Rāma

[Granted that] the son of a barren woman [and] a forest in space do not exist, will not exist, what is the nature of their perceptibility and what the nature of their inexistence?

vasiṣṭhaḥ

*vandhyāputravvyomavane
yathā na staḥ kadācana /
jagadādy akhilam dṛśyam
tathā nāsti kadācana ||4||³⁵*

Vasiṣṭha

Everything perceptible like the world etc. never exists, just as the son of a barren woman and a forest in space never exist.

*na cotpannam na ca dhvaṃsi
yat kilādau na vidyate /
utpattiḥ kīdṛśī tasya
nāśasabdasya kā kathā ||5||³⁶*

That which is not already originated or destroyed [and] which does not exist in the beginning [of creation], how could its origination come about, how could we only mention its destruction?

³³ The variant readings of the MU mss. are given in the footnotes to every verse, followed by the variants of N₂₄ as against the constituted text.

³⁴ *vandhyāputro* N₁₀ N₁₃ Ś₂ Ś₇ (*vandhya* inserted) Ś₆] *vandhyāputra* Ś₁; *naivāsti*] repeated and deleted Ś₇; *tasya* N₁₀ N₁₃ Ś₁ Ś₂ Ś₆] *tatra* Ś₇.

³⁵ *putra* N₁₀ N₁₃ Ś₁ Ś₂ Ś₆] *putro* Ś₇.

³⁶ *utpattiḥ* N₁₀ N₁₃ Ś₂ Ś₇ Ś₆] *utpatti* Ś₁.

rāmaḥ

*vandhyāputranabhovrkṣa-
kalpanā tavad asti hi |
sā yathā nāśajanmāḍhyā
tathaivedaṁ na kiṁ bhavet ||6||³⁷*

Rāma

But a mental construction of the son of a barren woman and of a tree in space does nevertheless exist. Could it (the world) not be like it (i.e. the mental construction of something that does not exist), which [likewise] is born and destroyed?³⁸

vaśiṣṭhaḥ

*pullasyātulabhuh samyag
ālakaiḥ kuru kolanam |
niranvayā yathaivoktir
jagatsattā tathaiva hi ||7||³⁹*

Vaśiṣṭha

The existence of the world is as incoherent (*niranvaya*)⁴⁰ as the sentence: ...

The untranslatable pseudo-sentence in the last verse elegantly demonstrates Vaśiṣṭha's point that Rāma's argument is invalid, since it operates with non-existing entities, just as the sentence is made up of meaningless words. Moreover its effect is well-constructed: the reader remains puzzled while reading the first two Pādas and is only relieved with the occurrence of the word *niranvaya*.

While all the manuscripts of the MU produce this text with minor variations, N_{Ed} reads the first Pādas as:

tulyasyātuladuḥsthasya bhāvakaiḥ kila tolanam |

Here the line is "corrected" by small changes into a text that at least contains words that occur in the dictionary. Since nothing is too corrupt to be explained by a commentator, Ānandabodhendra tries to squeeze out some sense by assuming that *niranvaya* here means the

³⁷ *janmāḍhyā* N₁₃ Ś₇ Ś₉ | *janmādyā* Ś₁ Ś₃, *janmāyā* N₁₀.

³⁸ As a superficial analysis of a word check shows, *āḍhya* is used by our author very frequently (almost 100 occurrences were found) in poetic and also philosophical contexts. Due to limitation of space a discussion of these findings, for which the passages in question would have to be edited, cannot be accomplished, but there is no doubt that in philosophical passages the word is used in the more technical sense "being equipped with"; see Ānandabodhendra (*janmanāśādimattvena*) and Bhāskara (*nāśajanmayuktā*) on the verse.

³⁹ *pulla* Ś₁ N₁₀ | *phulla* Ś₁ Ś₇ Ś₉ N₁₃; *tulabhuh* N₁₀ N₁₃ Ś₃ p.c. (correction mark ambiguous) Ś₇ Ś₉ | *tulattas* Ś₁, *tulabhuh* Ś₃ a.c., † *tulabhuh* N₁₀; *ālakaiḥ* Ś₁ Ś₃ Ś₇ N₁₀ N₁₃ | *ālavaiḥ* Ś₉; *niranvayā* N₁₀ N₁₃ Ś₃ Ś₇ Ś₉ | *niranvāyā* Ś₁.

⁴⁰ In the sentence that follows there appears to be a grammatical/syntactical relation between the meaningless words (*anvaya*), but since these do not denote anything because they have no *artha*, there cannot be a "real" *anvaya*. For the commentator Bhāskara *niranvaya* therefore means *vyartha*.

ananvayālamkāra and that the first line explains this particular process of comparison (*upamā*).⁴¹

Although we find sentences fabricated from non-words in Sanskrit literature,⁴² the device is unusual, but inclusion of it is not atypical for a text that reflects such enormous creativity. Also the details of the “meaningless” sentence are noteworthy: the sentence contains pseudo-words in an apparent grammatical construction; it is meaningless in the sense that most of the words have no meaning, but there appears to be an intact syntactical relation between these meaningless words. It is thus in itself a *dṛṣṭānta* for this particular theory of non-origination and non-existence, that is, for a dream world that has its effects and interactions, but is ultimately unreal.

Since we do not know nearly enough about the stages that led from the MU to the YV version, we can only surmise that this process involved a mixture of ignorance of the sense of the passage as well as half-knowledge in its restoration, unless the bad state of the manuscript that was the revisor’s source is responsible for it. In either case, the quality and fidelity of the text is far below that of the transmission of the MU manuscripts, where we find hardly significant variation. In Ś₃ the scribe wrote *-bhūh* first, perhaps automatically emending the meaningless *-bhuh*, which he, when reading on and realizing that in the second line the statement is expressly termed “meaningless”, changed back – if I interpret the correction mark correctly – to what must have been in his *ādarśapustaka*: the meaningless *-bhuh*. What is completely absent in the MU manuscripts is the attempt to change the wording.

The important question is: Is this a singular, or a typical case? As an answer the following instances from the first fourteen Sargas (668 verses) of the Utpattiprakaraṇa are briefly analysed, all of which are clear distortions of the sense of the original. There are of course many more cases where the text of the MU as constituted here reads differently than the YV.⁴³

⁴¹ He says *tulyasya = upamāṭum iṣṭasya* etc.

⁴² One instance, to which W. Slaje has drawn my attention, is in the *Mahābhāṣya*, where a string of non-words is given as an example for *anarthakāni vākyāni* (The *Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali, ed. F. KIELHORN. Bombay ³1892, vol. 1, p. 38, line 5).

⁴³ In the first fourteen Sargas of the Utpattiprakaraṇa there are 861 cases of changed text. This amounts to a ratio of 1.29 variants of N_{ed} against MU per verse and confirms SLAJE’s calculation of 1.25 (SLAJE 1994: 76) by a narrow margin.

MU 11.25

*atyantāsambhavo yāvad buddho drśyasya nākṣayaḥ /
tāvad draṣṭur adraṣṭvām na sambhavati mokṣadam* //44

As long as the permanent⁴⁵ absolute impossibility of the [existence of the] object of cognition is not known, the liberating absence of the subject of cognition⁴⁶ does not come about.

The verse is clear and in accord with the philosophy of the text. In the vulgate this appears as:

*atyantāsambhavo yāvad buddho drśyasya na kṣayaḥ /
tāvad draṣṭari drśyatvām na sambhavati mokṣadhīḥ* //11.23//

Ānandabodhendra explains the word *atyanta* as *mūlāvidyābādhenātyantika ity arthaḥ*, which is a Vedāntic overinterpretation, since there is no *mūlāvidyā* or even an *avidyā* in a Vedāntic sense in the MU. His other remarks that it is not possible to escape from objects and that therefore the idea of liberation does not occur⁴⁷ are not sufficient to reconstruct his exact understanding of the verse.

A tentative translation of N_{Ed} would run as follows:

Until the absolute impossibility of the [existence of the] object of cognition is known there is no destruction of the object[s], for that long the nature of the perceptible world remains in the perceiver [and] the idea of liberation does not occur.

The syntactical construction remains problematic, since *tāvat* has to be understood before *drśyasya* as well as before *draṣṭari*. But if we translate the first line as “as long as the absolute impossibility of the [existence of the] object[s] of cognition, [which is their] destruction (*kṣayaḥ*), is not known”, this would amount to a reconciliation of the concept of non-origination (*ajāti*)⁴⁸ held by the MU with a less strict position, according to which this knowledge of the non-origination of objects is equal to the destruction of them. But in fact the MU does not allow a weakening of its position in that respect and the verse immediately following in MU clearly contradicts such an interpretation.⁴⁹ But in this verse the first half in N_{Ed} has been altered in a way which agrees with such an interpretation, which, however, creates problems

⁴⁴ *buddho* N₁₀ N₁₃ Ś₃ Ś₇ Ś₉] *baddho* Ś₁; *adraṣṭvām* Ś₁ Ś₃ Ś₇ Ś₉ N₁₀] *adṛṣṭvām* N₁₃; N_{Ed}: *nākṣayaḥ*] *na kṣayaḥ*; *draṣṭur adraṣṭvām*] *draṣṭari drśyatvām*; *mokṣadam*] *mokṣadhīḥ*.

⁴⁵ Lit.: “indestructible”.

⁴⁶ Lit.: “the non-perceiverness of the perceiver”.

⁴⁷ *drśyatvām aparihāryam iti śeṣaḥ*] *ato mokṣadhīr na sambhavatīty arthaḥ* |.

⁴⁸ The chapter with which we are dealing, the Utpattiprakaraṇa, is, in fact, about the impossibility of origination.

⁴⁹ *drśyam cet sambhavaty ādau paścāt kṣayam upāgatam / tad drśyasmaraṇānartharūpo bandho na śāmyati* //11.26// (N_{Ed} reads *upālabhet* for *upāgatam*).

with the second half. The problem can be solved by enquiring into the motives for an alteration of readings. Whereas a motive for an alteration into an *ajātivāda* cannot be found, it is plausible to regard N_{Ed}'s version as a "purification" of the text of the strict position of the non-origination and inexistence of all things. In view of the changes already documented⁵⁰ it is, I think, inevitable that we regard this as a change introduced from the standpoint of (later) Advaita Vedānta. The result in N_{Ed} is a text in which these partly contradicting positions are mixed, and as a consequence the philosophical coherence suffers. Both translations are remarkably unaffected by these problems⁵¹.

MU 2.56

*cidvyoma kevalam anantam anādimadhyam
brahmeti bhāti nijacittavaśāt svayambhūh /
ākāravān iva rasād iha vastutas tu
vandhyātānūja iva nāsti tu tasya dehaḥ //⁵²*

The Absolute (*brahma*) which is the space of consciousness, alone, endless [and] without beginning or middle [i.e. present], spontaneously⁵³ appears here because of its own mental functions (*citta*) as the Self-existent (Brahmā) as if equipped with a form; but in reality [this Brahmā] is like the son of a barren woman, but its body does not exist.

The reading *rasād iha* stresses that this appearance is sudden, unprecedented and, as it is often stated, accidental. Only Ś₃ and N_{Ed} read *pumān iva*.

MU 5.21

*calatīdam anicchasya kāyāyo yasya sannidhau /
jaḍam paramaratnasya śāntam ātmani tiṣṭhataḥ //⁵⁴*

⁵⁰ See SLAJE 1994: 91–97 ("Vedāntisierung").

⁵¹ "It is entirely impossible to be so, as long as our notion of the view is not lost in our minds, for unless the view is vanished both from the vision of the eyes and mind, no one can even form an idea of liberation in his mind." (MITRA 1891–1899 a.l.) – "Aussi longtemps que la notion du monde visible n'est pas totalement annulée, le percipient et la perception perdurent, (si bien) que nul saurait même former l'idée de délivrance" (CHENET 1998–1999: 610).

⁵² *rasād iha* Ś₁ Ś₇ N₁₀] *pumān iva* Ś₃; *nāsti tu tasya* Ś₃ Ś₇ N₁₀] *tasya tu nāsti* Ś₁; N_{Ed}: *rasād iha*] *pumān iva*.

⁵³ *rasāt* could mean *abhilāṣāt* here (see Bhāskara on 1.20.32 in SLAJE 1996), but also "spontaneously" (HANNEDER 1998: 181).

⁵⁴ *kāyāyo* Ś₁ Ś₇ N₁₃] *kāyāye* Ś₁, *chāyāyo* N₁₀; N_{Ed}: *kāyāyo*] *kāyo yo*; *ratnasya*] *rakṭasya*.

In the proximity of the supreme (*parama*) [Absolute]⁵⁵ this inert body moves, like the ore [in the proximity] of a magnet (*ratna*), while it remains peaceful within itself and without volition ...

The comparison of the body with a magnet has disappeared in N_{Ed}, where the compound *kāyāyo* “body-ore”, which can easily lead to scribal misreadings or misunderstandings, was simplified to *kāyo yo*. Furthermore the unusual, but attested sense of *ratna* as “magnet” as well as its qualification as *parama* has barred the way back to the *lectio difficilior* preserved in the MU.

MU 6.22

*sacchāstrasatsaṅgamajair vivekaiś
tathā vinaśyanti balān malāni |
yathā jalānām katakānuṣaṅgād
yathā jaḍānām abhayopayogāt ||*⁵⁶

Through discrimination arising from good scriptures and contact with good people the impurities vanish by force [i.e. inevitably], like those of water through contact with the *kataka*[-nut]⁵⁷ [and that] of dumb [people] through granting security.⁵⁸

My interpretation of Pāda d follows Bhāskara, but the term *upayoga* could more specifically refer to a medical context, if it could be confirmed that the plant *abhayā* (= *haritakī*) was used medicinally to remove impurities acting as impediments to the optimal functioning of the mind.

In any case the reading of N_{Ed}, *yathā janānām matayo 'pi yogāt* “like the minds of people through Yoga” is the *lectio faciliior*. This change is comparable to the tendency in N_{Ed} to read *bodha* where a similar-sounding reading was unclear, as for instance *codyacañcuḥ* to *bodha-cañcuḥ*.⁵⁹ To the casual reader of this text which, as its title seemingly indicates, is on “Yoga”,⁶⁰ the reading must have seemed unobjectionable. The commentator Ānandabodha even introduces the concept of *yogābhyāsa* into the text⁶¹.

⁵⁵ The verse is part of the long syntactical unit from vs. 5.4–24. *yasya* in our verse is taken up with the very last words of this Sarga.

⁵⁶ *balān* Ś₁Ś₂Ś₃N₁₀N₁₃ | *balāt* Ś₇; *katakā* Ś₂Ś₇Ś₉N₁₀N₁₃Ś₁p.c. | *kataka* Ś₁a.c.; *abhayopa* Ś₁Ś₃Ś₇Ś₉N₁₃ | *matayopa* N₁₀a.c., *mayato pi* N₁₀p.c.; *yogāt* Ś₁Ś₇Ś₉N₁₀N₁₃ | *bhogāt* Ś₃; N_{Ed}: *balān malāni* | *balād avidyāḥ*; *jaḍānām* | *janānām*; *abhayopa* | *matayo 'pi*, *matayaś ca*.

⁵⁷ See the PW, s.v. *kataka*.

⁵⁸ Compare also 6.20.41d: *sakalabhayāpaharo hi sādhusaṅgaḥ*. Compare also Bhāskara's commentary on the verse.

⁵⁹ Described in SLAJE 1994 under the heading “Bodhaismus” (p. 84ff.).

⁶⁰ In fact the term *yoga* is used in the YV as a synonym for *jñāna*; see SLAJE 1997b: 397.

⁶¹ See SLAJE 1998: 111ff., on the actual status of Yoga in the MU.

MU 7.28 (= N_{Ed} 7.30)

*na cid apratibimbāsti drśyābhāvād rte kvacit |
kva vinā pratibimbena kilādarśo 'vatiṣṭhate* //⁶²

There is nowhere a consciousness free from the appearance (*pratibimba*) [of objects], except for [the knowledge of] the non-existence of the objects. Where is a mirror without appearance?⁶³

In other words there is no way to remove the world, according to the preliminary statement in 3.1.6ab,⁶⁴ except through the knowledge that it does not exist. It is even explicitly stated that we are to understand that the knowledge of non-existence is of the world as it is;⁶⁵ the goal is not to remove the perception of the world through this knowledge.

N_{Ed} reads *na vidāḥ pratibimbāsti* in Pāda a, which is meaningless in the context. It is not necessary to present Ānandabodhendhra's long-winded commentary here, but we may note that he did not read *kvacin nā-* as in N_{Ed}'s *mūla* text in Pāda c, but *kva vinā* as in our text!

MU 8.13

*ya idaṃ śrṇuyān nityaṃ tasyodāracamatkrteḥ |
bālasyaṅpi paraṃ bodhaṃ buddhir eti na saṃśayaḥ* //⁶⁶

He who regularly hears this [Śāstra], the mind of him, who is [thus] equipped with the supreme experience,⁶⁷ will undoubtedly attain supreme knowledge, even if he be uneducated.

bālasyaṅpi is appropriate for expressing the quality of the Śāstra, while *bodhasyaṅpi* is secondary according to SRINIVASAN's rule 1.4.5.11.⁶⁸

MU 9.10

*yaś conmeṣanimeṣābhyāṃ vidheḥ pralayasambhavau |
paśyet trilokyāḥ kṣasamaḥ sa jīvanmukta ucyate* //⁶⁹

⁶² *cid aprati* N₁₀ N₁₃ Ś₁ Ś₃ Ś₇ p.c. Ś₉ | *vidāḥ prati* Ś₇ a.c.; *vinā* N₁₃ Ś₁ Ś₃ Ś₇ Ś₉ | *cinā* N₁₀; N_{Ed}: *cid aprati* | *vidāḥ prati*; *vinā* | *cin nā*.

⁶³ The fact that a mirror reflects outer objects is not part of the comparison, since there are no objects external to consciousness. The common property (*upamādharmā*) is the spontaneous appearance of objects in both.

⁶⁴ *bandho 'yaṃ drśyasadbhāvo drśyābhāve na bandhanam*.

⁶⁵ *atyantābhāvasaṃpattau drśyasyāsya yathāsthiteḥ* (3.7.27ab).

⁶⁶ *idaṃ* N₁₀ N₁₃ Ś₃ Ś₇ Ś₉ | *imaṃ* Ś₁; N_{Ed}: *bālasyaṅpi* | *bodhasyaṅpi*.

⁶⁷ *camatkāra* may refer to an experience of *cit*, but also of the partly poetical Śāstra.

⁶⁸ For the tendency to insert *bodha* almost indiscriminately in N_{Ed}, see n. 59 above.

⁶⁹ *vidheḥ* N₁₃ Ś₇ a.c. Ś₉ | *veda* Ś₁, *vidāḥ* Ś₃ Ś₇ p.c., *vidhuḥ* N₁₀; *trilokyāḥ* N₁₀ N₁₃ Ś₃ Ś₇ Ś₉ | *trilokyāḥ* Ś₁; *kṣasamaḥ* N₁₀ N₁₃ Ś₇ Ś₉ | *kṣasamāḥ* Ś₁ Ś₃; N_{Ed}: *yaś con* | *yaśyon*; *nimeṣābhyāṃ* | *nimeṣārdhād*; *vidheḥ* | *vidāḥ*; *kṣasamaḥ* | *svasamaḥ*.

He, who perceives the creation and destruction of the triple world through the opening and closing of Brahma's eyes while being equal to space is called liberated while living.

The first Pāda in N_{Ed} is difficult to interpret⁷⁰ and, if we look at the well-known source of this verse, namely Spandakārikā 1.1,⁷¹ where the first line reads: *yasyonmeṣanimeṣābhyām jagato pralayodbhavau*, is hardly more than a failed attempt to rescue the text from a prior corruption, since no real motivation to change the text can be distinguished. We know from other adaptations of this verse in the Nirvāṇaprakaraṇa⁷² that the author of the MU takes liberty in modifying the wording; therefore the *yasya*, which agrees with Spandakārikā 1.1, but does not work in the verse, must be secondary.

We find more instances of such changes of a perfectly intelligible text (MU) into a problematic version (YV) without clear motive, a fact which is best explained as an attempt to restore a corrupt reading. If it could be shown that there is comparatively little variation of readings within the manuscripts of the YV version,⁷³ the hypothesis could be formed that the YV version derived from perhaps only a single, perhaps decrepit manuscript of the MU version, the state of which necessitated the use of the LYV (which would explain the conflation of both versions). If the result evolved or was transmitted in a Vedāntic environment, this could account at least for some of the features we see now.

MU 9.56 (≈ N_{Ed} 9.45)

*ardhonmūlitadṛgbhrūbhūmadhyatārakavaj jagat |
vyomātmaiva sadābhāsaṃ svarūpaṃ yo 'bhipaśyati ||*⁷⁴

One who⁷⁵ looks at the world [as an unreal appearance,] just as a star [that is perceived] in the middle of the forehead⁷⁶ [when]

⁷⁰ Despite Ānandabodhendra's comments I do not understand the point of *-ardhāt*, and the *yasya* makes the construction of the relative clause impossible.

⁷¹ The Spandakarikas of Vasugupta. With the Nirṇaya by Ksemarāja. Ed. [...] by MADHUSUDAN KAUL SHASTRI. [KSTS 42]. Srinagar 1925.

⁷² *yasyonmeṣanimeṣābhyām bhāvanāpralayodayau* (7.106.18); *cidunmeṣanimeṣābhyām khātmodety astam eti ca* (7.100.48); *cidunmeṣanimeṣau yau tāv eva pralayodayau* (7.208.9). Furthermore there is a whole passage based on this pattern: *cittonmeṣanimeṣābhyām saṃsārapralayodayau* [...] *prāṇonmeṣanimeṣābhyām saṃśrteḥ pralayodayau* [...] *maurkhyonmeṣanimeṣābhyām karmaṇām pralayodayau* (6.44.16–18). And finally one instance not found in the vulgate: *yasyonmeṣanimeṣābhyām jagatsattālayodayau* (6.135.48 [counting according to the Śāradā recension]). The context of these verses is beyond the scope of the present paper.

⁷³ This was Slaje's impression while working on the textual history of the first Prakaraṇa (oral communication).

⁷⁴ *dṛgbhrūbhū* Ś, Ś, Ś, N₁₀ N₁₃] *dṛṣṭibhrū* Ś₃; N_{Ed}: *dṛgbhrūbhū*] *dṛśyabhrū*.

⁷⁵ The correlative to *yaḥ* follows in a later verse.

⁷⁶ Lit.: "in the middle of the space [between] the brows".

one's eyes are half-closed, [the world that] really consists of empty space [but is perceived] as an entity (*svarūpa*) that appears as real (*sadābhāsa*) [...]

I interpret the "star" as an unreal optical appearance. For this interpretation, compare Bhāskara's comments:

*saḥ ardhonmīlitaḍṛk | bhruvau eva bhūh sthānaṃ | tasya madhyam bhrūbhūmadhyam | ardhonmīlitaḍṛśāḥ bhrūbhūmadhye bhāsamānā yā tārakā | tadvat | ardhonmīlitānetraḥ puruṣaḥ svabhrūmadhye svadṛṣṭiraśmim eva tārakākārāṃ yathā paśyati | tathety arthaḥ |*⁷⁷

N_{Ed} reads *ardhonmīlitaḍṛśyabhrūmadhye tārakavat*, which would stretch the limits of stylistically acceptable *sāpekṣasamāsa* too far, since *ḍṛśya* would have to refer to *tāraka*. *ḍṛśya* is, by the way, ignored by Ānandabodha. He understands the comparison to refer to a yogi who, when practising the *khecarīmudrā*, perceives a star in the middle of his brows. This explanation is inappropriate in the context of explaining that the world is an unreal appearance that is nothing but empty space, which only appears as real. There is also no reason to assume that our text wishes to say that the *bindu* experienced by the yogi in the *khecarīmudrā* is unreal; this unreality of what appears is certainly part of the comparison. His solution to the problem is as follows:

yathā yoginaḥ khecaramudrāyām bhrūmadhye dṛṣṭiniveśe 'rdhonmīlitacakṣur ḍṛśyabhrūmadhye nivīṣṭaṃ kṛṣṇatārakam asphuṭa-tvāt sadābhāsaṃ svarūpaṃ paśyati so 'pi sa evety arthaḥ |

This solution, however, does not work, since the correlative for *yathā* follows much later. Therefore an example from everyday experience, as in Bhāskara's explanation, fits the purpose much better.

MU 10.30

*cetyāsaṃbhavatas tasmīn pade keva cidarthatā | āsvādakāsaṃbhavato marice keva tīkṣṇatā ||*⁷⁸

Because of the non-existence of objects of consciousness in this state [of the Absolute] there is no meaning to the [term] consciousness [with reference to it].⁷⁹ Just as there is no sharpness in pepper without a person to taste it.

⁷⁷ Another possibility would be to separate *ardhonmīlitaḍṛk* from the rest.

⁷⁸ *sambhavato* N₁₀ N₁₃ Ś₃ Ś₅ Ś₉ | *sambhavati* Ś₁; *keva* N₁₀ N₁₃ Ś₁ Ś₅ Ś₉ | *kaiva* Ś₇; N_{Ed}: *pade keva cidarthatā | yad ekā jagadarthatā, pade kā jagadarthatā* (reported as v.l. by Ānandabodha); *marice* | *marice* ; *keva* | *kaiva*.

⁷⁹ Lit.: "What is the meaning ...". Since consciousness implies an object to be cognized, the Absolute is in itself and in this sense only *acit*; compare: *tasmāc cid apy acidrūpā cetyariktatayātmani* (10.24ab).

The reading in N_{Ed} (*cetyāsam̐bhavatas tasmin yad ekā jagadarthatā*) is, as far as I can see, uninterpretable.

MU 10.31ab

satyeveyam asatyaiva cīteś cittoditā pare /⁸⁰

This existence of consciousness (*cittā*) arises in the Absolute, [although] in fact unreal, as if real.

I would like to interpret the text in the light of statements such as *citas cittvam ahaṅkāraḥ saiva rāghava kalpanā* (14.46ab, different in N_{Ed}) and *citā yathādaṁ kalitā svasattā sā tathoditā* (14.48ab), which imply that as soon as consciousness conceives its own nature, i.e. as being conscious of something to be cognized, this inevitably leads to the experience of and thus the existence of the world. In N_{Ed} this less obvious concept is lost.

MU 11.18ab (≈ N_{Ed} 11.16ab)

ajātam eva yad bhāti saṁvido bhānam eva tat /⁸¹

That which appears, [but] is in fact unoriginated, is actually an appearance of consciousness.

N_{Ed} reads *ajñānam eva*, but according to the MU ignorance does not appear as if being the substrate of appearance.

MU 13.3cd

tato 'haṁbhāvakalanam̐ cetyaikaparatāvaśāt //⁸²

Then there occurs a construction of the I-sense under the influence of a fixation on nothing but the objects of cognition.

N_{Ed} reads *tato 'sya māyākalanam̐* [...]. Ānandabodhendra very briefly comments on both variants, but prefers the reading *māyākalanam̐*. The term *māyā* occurs in the MU often in the compound *saṁsāramāyā* and similar comparisons, but not as a technical term as known from Advaita Vedānta.

MU 13.13ab

kharūpaṁ yad vikalpātma katham̐ tat satyatām iyāt /⁸³

⁸⁰ *satyeveyam* N₁₃ Ś₃ Ś₇] *satyaiveyam* Ś₁ Ś₉ N₁₀; *asatyaiva* N₁₀ N₁₃ Ś₃ Ś₇ Ś₉] *asatyeva* Ś₁; *cīteś cittoditā* N₁₀ N₁₃ Ś₇ Ś₉] *citas cittodyatā* Ś₁ Ś₃; N_{Ed}: *asatyaiva* (according to Ānandabodhendra)] *asatyeva* (mūla); *cīteś cittoditā*] *cittacetyā-ditā*.

⁸¹ *tat* N₁₀ N₁₃ Ś₃ Ś₇ Ś₉] *yat* Ś₁; N_{Ed}: *ajātam*] *ajñānam*; *saṁvido bhānam*] *saṁvidābhāsam*.

⁸² *kalanam̐* Ś₁ Ś₇ Ś₉] *kalanā* Ś₃, *kalpanam̐* N₁₀; N_{Ed}: *'haṁbhāva* (= v.l. in N_{Ed})] *'sya māyā*.

⁸³ *yad* Ś₁ Ś₃ Ś₇ N₁₀] *tad* Ś₉; N_{Ed}: *kharūpaṁ*] *svarūpaṁ*.

That which consists of empty space and is [merely] conceptualization, how can that become real?

N_{Ed} has *svarūpaṃ yad vikalpātma* [...]. For similar misreadings of *kha-* as *sva-* see 9.10c and 13.26a.

MU 13.26 (≈ N_{Ed} 13.27)

*kharūpatārakāntaḥstho jīvo yac cetati svayam /
tad etad buddhicittādi jñānasantānarūpakam* //⁸⁴

What the soul, which exists within a point of light⁸⁵ that consists of empty space, itself cognises, that, [like] *buddhi*, *citta*, etc., consists of a stream of cognition.

For Pāda d we find *jñānasattādirūpakam* in N_{Ed}, the reason for which is probably the Buddhist connotation of (*vi*)*jñānasantāna*. That such connotations were avoided in the YV is best demonstrated by the quotation of Gauḍapāḍakārikā 4.1 in YV 7.195.63, where, despite the position of the *kārikā*, the verse is modified on the lines of Śaṅkara's commentary on it⁸⁶.

THE DRṢṬISRṢṬIVĀDA⁸⁷

The cases discussed in the preceeding pages may alone not be sufficient to postulate the higher quality of the whole text of the MU as against the YV, and it must be emphasized that the evidence presented here was collected in the course of editing the first few Sargas of the Utpatti prakaraṇa and is therefore limited in scope. It is more important that this evidence confirms the diagnosis previously arrived at by SLAJE. But for those still unconvinced I shall briefly discuss a few passages that contain one philosophical doctrine for which the YV/MU is credited by a variety of authors, the *drṣṭisrṣṭivāda*:⁸⁸ Ātmasukha, when commenting on Laghuyogavāsiṣṭha 3.1.56 shows, in a fairly long passage, that *drṣṭir eva srṣṭiḥ* is the *vāsiṣṭhasiddhānta*. And also Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, discussing this *vāda* in his Advaitasiddhi, concludes by quoting YV 6.127.20, which he introduces with *vāsiṣṭha-*

⁸⁴ *kharūpa* Ś₁Ś₃Ś₇Ś₉ | *svarūpa* N₁₀; *āntaḥstho* Ś₁Ś₃Ś₉ | *āntastho* Ś₇; *yac* Ś₁Ś₃Ś₇Ś₉ | *yaṃ* N₁₀; *cetati* Ś₃Ś₇Ś₉N₁₀ | *cetasi* Ś₁Ś₉; *jñānasantāna* Ś₁Ś₃Ś₇Ś₉ | *jñānasattādi* N₁₀; N_{Ed}: *kharūpa* | *svarūpa*; *yac* | *yaṃ*; *jñānasantāna* | *jñānasattādi*.

⁸⁵ Lit.: "star".

⁸⁶ See SLAJE 1994: 94f.

⁸⁷ The following passages were encountered while discussing material from the MU with my colleague Sthaneswara Timalisina (Kathmandu) who is currently working in a research project at the University of Halle on the history of the *drṣṭisrṣṭivāda*.

⁸⁸ I am grateful to Walter Slaje for the following references.

vārttikāmṛtādāv ākare ca spaṣṭam evoktam.⁸⁹ Another piece of evidence is found in the Svānubhūtināṭaka, in which one character explains *drṣṭisrṣṭi*⁹⁰ and calls this the secret doctrine of Vedānta expounded by Vasiṣṭha and others⁹¹ and immediately afterwards turns to the *jñānabhūmikās* with a quotation from the YV⁹².

There are two very explicit references to this theory in the MU:

srṣṭayo drṣṭayo brāhmyo nānātāmananātmakāḥ /⁹³

[All] creations are [merely] the perceptions of the Absolute which consist of ideations of diversity.

In N_{Ed} 7.49.10ab we read instead:

srṣṭayo 'srṣṭayo brāhmyo nānātā ca na nāsatātḥ /

The sentence does not make good sense, and Ānandabodhendra's commentary is again a desperate attempt to rescue the text from meaninglessness: *yato nānātā nāsty atātḥ srṣṭayo na santi | yataś ca nāsatā na santy ato 'srṣṭayaḥ pralayaś ca na santi* |.

The second instance is MU 4.31.33–34:

sarvaṃ sat tac ca niḥśūnyam na kiñcid iva saṃsthitam |
tatra vyomni vibhāntīmā nijā bhāso 'nga drṣṭayaḥ //33//
yathā taimirikākṣasya sahaajā eva drṣṭayaḥ |
keśoṇḍukādīva bhānti tathemās tatra srṣṭayaḥ //34//⁹⁴

Here N_{Ed} has almost effaced the main point by reading *srṣṭayaḥ* in 33d and *drṣṭayaḥ* in 34b and 34d. It is of course impossible to prove that

⁸⁹ Advaitasiddhi of Madhusūdana Sarasvatī with the Commentaries [...], ed. ANANTA KRISHNA SHASTRI. Delhi 1982, chapter *drṣṭisrṣṭyupapattiḥ*, p. 537. The compound *vāsiṣṭhavārttikāmṛta* can be interpreted as a *dvandva* and taken to refer to the YV and Suresvara's Vārttika on the Brhadāraṇyakopaniṣad. In another occurrence of *vāsiṣṭhavārttikāmṛtādau* in his Siddhāntabindu, in a passage where a tenfold gradation of the states of waking, dream and sleep is discussed, both references are appropriate, because Madhusūdana's list is similar to the YV's *jñānabhūmikās* as well as to Suresvara's treatment in Brhadāraṇyakopaniṣadbhāṣyavārttika 4.3.1054ff. Compare ABHYANKAR's remarks in his edition of the Siddhāntabindu: *atha brhadāraṇyake caturthādhyāye tṛtīye jyotirbrāhmaṇe vārttikakāraṇi sureśvarācāryair yad uktam tadanusāreṇa pakṣāntaram āha* (Siddhāntabindu by Madhusūdanasarasvatī. A Commentary on the Daśaśloki of Śaṅkarācārya, ed. VASUDEV SHASTRI ABHYANKAR. Poona 1928).

⁹⁰ Svānubhūti-Nāṭaka [...] composed by Ananta Pāṇḍita, ed. UMA S. DESHPANDE. [Bhandarkar Oriental Series 24]. Poona 1990, p. 98ff.

⁹¹ *pingalajataḥ: tat kiṃ drṣṭisrṣṭim anusṛto 'si? upaṇiṣadarthāgāraḥ: vedāntarahasyam tv idam eva tat kiṃ na vibhāvitās tvayā vāsiṣṭhādya granthā api* (op. cit. [n. 90], p. 93f.).

⁹² Op. cit. (n. 90), p. 104.

⁹³ Based as yet on Ś₁ and N₂₀; the latter is especially helpful, since it contains Bhāskara's commentary, which reads as Ś₁.

⁹⁴ Quoted from SLAJE's forthcoming edition. The whole issue will be discussed in detail by Timalisina in his forthcoming thesis.

these small changes were the result of a deliberate process rather than a misreading, but it is perhaps not important whether such changes were introduced in ignorance of the MU's philosophical position that amounted to a kind of *dr̥ṣṭisr̥ṣṭivāda*, or as an attempt to edit out all too explicit occurrences of it.

Additional evidence is provided by the occurrences of the reverse compound *sr̥ṣṭidr̥ṣṭi* in N_{Ed} (7.52.47 and 7.92.61). In those instances it may of course be understood as "perception of the world",⁹⁵ but there are sufficient doctrinal grounds to assume that the compound is rather to be understood as a *karmadhāraya*, that the creation (*sr̥ṣṭi*) is nothing but its perception (*dr̥ṣṭi*) and thus as expressing the same identifying relation as in *dr̥ṣṭisr̥ṣṭi*. Remarkably these compounds underwent no modification in N_{Ed}.

If further research confirms that the MU contains one of the earliest brahmanical philosophies to develop this doctrine and, furthermore, that it was perceived as such by a variety of Indian philosophers, then the removal of the most explicit references to this position in the text of the YV can hardly have been merely accidental.

POETICAL IMAGES

The higher quality of the MU is, by the way, not restricted to philosophical ideas; in poetical passages too we find problematic readings. For instance in 4.15 the members of the congregation forming the audience of Vasiṣṭha's talk rise and the "flat centers of their chests that appear like golden plates are struck by the multitude of necklaces" (*hārabhārāhataṣvarṇapattābhorastaśāntarā*)⁹⁶. In N_{Ed} this became *-ābhorustanāntarā*, which cannot be applied to the Munis, Ṛṣis and the other male participants who are referred to by this compound. If we would take *stana* in the attested sense of (male) "nipple" then the qualification *uru* is a hardly convincing reading. Ānandabodhendra attempts escape from this reading by extracting *ūru* and *stana*, but apparently does not notice that the subject *sabhā* is feminine only grammatically.

There are other cases that remain unsolved: For instance in 4.31 an unusual poetical image of "saffron rains" (*kuṅkumavṛṣṭayaḥ*), which are said to have been blown away by the "winds of day break", is used, the sense of which is admittedly not clear.

⁹⁵ Ānandabodha, who comments the compound as *sargadr̥ṣṭi*, would surely have analysed the compound this way.

⁹⁶ Lit.: "The center of their sloping chests ...".

In N_{Ed} the compound is changed to *kusumavrṣṭayaḥ*. But this does not really work, since the “rain of flowers” would have to be understood as “flowers that have fallen to the ground because of the rain”,⁹⁷ and for this *kusumavrṣṭi* is not a particularly convincing expression. In this exceptional case I would adduce SRINIVASAN’s rule 1.4.5.1 which states that a *lectio difficilior* can be preferred even when its interpretation is not (yet) secure. The main argument here would be that by applying the genetic principle we cannot account for a change from *kusuma* to *kuṅkuma*.

THE COMMENTARY ON N_{Ed}

One final observation: To some the very existence of a commentary on the YV would imply that the text was in an acceptable state. But a commentator wishing to explain that a text belongs, at least in some sense, to his tradition cannot admit that the text he is commenting upon does not make sense; as a remedy a host of exegetical devices are applied to produce some meaning, even if the resulting interpretation cannot possibly be imagined to have been intended by a writer. In the commentary of Ānandabodhendra we find many of these examples;⁹⁸ a few may demonstrate this point:

17.23 in N_{Ed} reads *māladeśasamākrānta*. Since a grammatical subject for *samākrānta* is required, Ānandabodha explains: *māladānām īśena rājñā*. MU reads *mālaveśasamākrānta* “conquered by the king of Mālava”.

17.26 in N_{Ed} reads *bandikolāhalollāsapraṭiśrudvanakuñjaram*. Ānandabodhendra explains: *bandikolāhalollāsasya praṭiśrutāḥ pratidhvanikarā vanakuñjarā yasya* (“[the king] whose⁹⁹ forest elephants echo [i.e. reply to?] the noise of the prisoners”). But *praṭiśrut* means “echo”, not “to produce an echo”. The commentator has silently inserted the verbal element (-*kara*) into an otherwise problematic phrase. MU reads *ghanakandaram* instead of *vanakuñjaram*: “[the king] whose caves (presumably where the prisoners were kept) are filled with the noise ...”.

⁹⁷ See Ānandabodhendra a.l.: *vrṣṭinipatitakusumānīvety atra tātparyam*.

⁹⁸ Ānandabodha’s unreliability is also noted by RAGHAVAN 1939a: 122, who says in the discussion of 7.197.17: “The text requires correction. Ānandabodha muddles with the wrong text before him”. Sometimes, however, one suspects, especially in the portions not commented upon, that the text available to Ānandabodha must have been better than the printed version.

⁹⁹ The compound occurs in a series of *bahuvrīhis* referring to the king.

17.27 N_{Ed} reads *hayahastirathārājirajomeghaghanāmbaram* which is problematic, because the long vowel in *rathā*, which makes no sense, is required for metrical reasons. Ānandabodhendra explains *hayādī-nām ā sarvato rājayo yatra*. MU reads *hayahastirathāvārirajomeghaghanāmbaram* “the sky is densely filled by a cloud of dust surrounding horses, elephants and chariots”. *āvāri* is an uncommon formation with the suffix *-in*, of which we have however other examples in our text, as for instance *ākārin* and *kāraṇin*¹⁰⁰.

One potential counterargument against our thesis can be derived from those instances where N_{Ed} alone appears to retain a convincing reading. In the first fifteen Sargas of the Utpattiprakaraṇa there was no instance of this, but reviewers of the edition of the fragments of the first three chapters with Bhāskara’s commentary have listed a few cases. Firstly, it is not *a priori* impossible that all the MU mss. have a wrong reading, while the vulgate retains the primary reading, but this is, from what we know about the vulgate, not very likely. Even where the vulgate reading seems preferable, we must first suspect that this is so because it is the *lectio faciliior*. One such instance is a passage in the Mumukṣuprakaraṇa where the reviewer of SLAJE’s edition¹⁰¹ has found the reading of N_{Ed} to be preferable to that of the MU. The passage is 2.11.35cd:

dehamuktāmahātantur vinā jñānaṃ na naśyati ||

N_{Ed} reads:

dehayukto mahājantur vinā jñānaṃ na paśyati ||

From 6.133.12–13 (MU transcribed from ms. Ś; the passage is not in N_{Ed}):

tantau muktāphalānīva prayānti samavāyitām |

ahaṅkṛtāv indriyāṇi sāmāntā iva rājani ||12||

ahaṅkāramahātantau chinne tv indriyavālakaḥ |

itaś cetaś ca gacchanti sāmāntā vinṛpā iva ||13||

we know that *mahātantu* is an image for the *ahaṅkāra*, on which the pearls of the senses are metaphorically “strung”. Here *dehamuktāmahātantur* should therefore mean “the great thread of the pearl [that are] the bodies”. Not all cases can be solved in this way, but perhaps a few more will come to our attention upon a complete collation and an analysis of all the available manuscripts. But even if we have to accept

¹⁰⁰ The following passages have been found: *brahmāṇḍākāriṇi bhrame* (3.13.39), *bījam ākāri* (7.54.21), *niṣpādākāriṇi* (7.81.23), and *ākāriṇaḥ* (7.106.39); also 7.119.23 and 7.149.33. For *kāraṇin*, see *kāraṇinā* (2.18.63) and *kāraṇibhiḥ* (2.19.5a).

¹⁰¹ For the following, see DE JONG 1995: 191.

a small percentage – indeed the exact number remains to be determined – of readings of the vulgate as primary against the MU, this does not alter our general estimate of the textual quality of the vulgate and does not alleviate the fundamental problem ensuing from the character of the YV as being the product of unintentional change and planned revision.

It is therefore unfortunate that the most recent studies on the YV, as for instance by CHENET¹⁰² and FORT¹⁰³, are based only on the printed text of the vulgate, even though partial editions of the text with Bhāskarakāṇṭha's commentary¹⁰⁴ have appeared.¹⁰⁵ One would expect

¹⁰² For details, see my forthcoming review of CHENET 1998–1999 in IJ 2000.

¹⁰³ In FORT 1998 we find a brief treatment of the idea of *jīvanmukti* in the YV under the heading “Yogic Advaita” (p. 84–96), but the author does not explain why the YV's philosophy can be termed thus and we are left to speculate that it was the title of the work which suggested the heading. There are other minor oddities in his account: he consistently terms the *prakaraṇas* of the YV as “*khaṇḍas*”, the rules of word division in transcription are not adhered to, and, more importantly, his translation of 3.9.4–13 is so inadequate that using the text published by SLAJE in 1995 would perhaps not have made much of a difference. A few examples may suffice (the text is quoted from FORT's notes; see p. 84 and 209): *yathāsthitaṃ idaṃ yasya vyavahāravato 'pi ca | astam gataṃ sthitaṃ vyoma jīvanmuktaḥ sa ucyate ||*. He translates: “One who stands firm while doing everyday activity, Abiding like the empty sky: he is called liberated while living”. This is not merely a technical mistake of confusing cases and guessing at what could have been meant, for a crucial point in the YV/MU's concept of *jīvanmukti* has been missed: the *jīvanmukta* is a person “for whom, even while engaged in wordly activities, this [world] as it exists has disappeared and remains [empty] as space”. His translation of 3.9.10, a verse discussed above (see p. 199f.), runs as follows: “One who comprehends (cosmic) creation and destruction in the blink of an eye, // He sees the three worlds as his own self; he is called ...”.

¹⁰⁴ SLAJE 1993, SLAJE 1995, and SLAJE 1996. Unfortunately the doctoral thesis by Bruno Lo Turco (Lo TURCO 1998), an edition and translation of the *Līlopākhyāna* based on manuscripts of the MU version, remains unpublished.

¹⁰⁵ One other case is that of THOMI, who has apparently, but without new arguments, not accepted the priority of the MU and the textual history as reconstructed by SLAJE (see VON HINÜBER 1985: 221, on the inadequacy of his prior arguments). In his recent edition and translation of a brief *Yogavāsisṭhasāra* (*Vāsisṭha-Grantha-Mālā: Yogavāsisṭhasāra* “Die Quintessenz des Yoga-vāsisṭha”, ed. PETER THOMI. Wichtrach 1999), he claims that the readings of this *Sāra* reach back before all other sources now available (p. 8, n. 23). The passages he lists for this are however not in the least convincing. One instance is *Sāra* 1.13 (*N_{Ed}* 6.120.24c–25d). Here the text of the MU according to Ś₁ has: *sarvaiva hi kalā jantor anabhyāsenā naśyati | phaladāpi manojñāpi latevāsekavarjita || eṣā jñānakalā tv antaḥ sakṛj jātā dīne dīne | vṛddhim eti balād eva sattām (?) apy upaśālīvat ||*. In *N_{Ed}* one line was lost: *sarvaiva hi kalā jantor anabhyāsenā naśyati ||24|| eṣā jñānakalā tv antaḥ sakṛj jātā dīne dīne | vṛddhim eti balād eva sukṣetravyuptaśālīvat ||25||*. Finally the *Sāra* edited by THOMI

especially those with a historical interest in the philosophy of this text to be enthusiastic about the fact that the original is more coherent, more interesting and a much more impressive literary production than the version used until now.

REFERENCES

- CHENET 1998–1999 FRANCOIS CHENET, *Psychogenèse et Cosmogonie selon le Yoga-Vāsiṣṭha*. Vol. I–II. [PICI 67,1–2]. Paris: De Boccard, 1998–1999.
- DE JONG 1981 J.W. DE JONG, Review of THOMI 1980. IJ 23 (1981) 221–226.
- DE JONG 1995 Id., Review of SLAJE 1993. IJ 38 (1995) 191f.
- FORT 1998 ANDREW O. FORT, *Jīvanmukti in Transformation*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1998.
- HANNEDER 1998 JÜRGEN HANNEDER, *Abhinavagupta's Philosophy of Revelation*. An edition and annotated translation of *Mālinīśloka-vārttika* I, 1–399. [Groningen Oriental Studies XIV]. Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1998.
- HINÜBER 1985 OSKAR VON HINÜBER, Review of THOMI 1980. WZKS 29 (1985) 220f.
- KARMARKAR 1956 R.D. KARMARKAR (ed.), *Arjunopākhyāna*. [Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute Post-graduate and Research Department Series 2]. Poona: BORI, 1956.
- LO TURCO 1998 BRUNO LO TURCO, *Il Mokṣopāya; lo spazio della coscienza come principio assoluto. Dodici capitoli dal Līlo-pākhyāna*. Edizione critica e traduzione annotata. Ph.D. thesis, Univ. of Rome 1998.
- LYV *Laghuyogavāsiṣṭha*, ed. VASUDEVA ŚARMAN. Bombay: Nirṇaya Sāgar Press, 1937.
- MAINIKAR 1977 T.G. MAINIKAR, *The Vāsiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa*. A Study. New Delhi: Meharchand Lachmandas, 1955.
- MITRA 1891–1899 V.L. MITRA, *The Yoga-Vāsiṣṭha-Mahārāmāyaṇa of Vālmiki translated from the original Sanskrit*. I–IV. Calcutta 1891–1899 (repr. Varanasi 1976–1978).
- MU *Mokṣopāya*. Partial editions in SLAJE 1993, SLAJE 1995, and SLAJE 1996.
- RAGHAVAN 1939a V. RAGHAVAN, *The Date of the Yogavāsiṣṭha*. Journal of Oriental Research 13 (1939) 110–128.

reads: *sarvā eva kalā jantor anabhyāsena naśyati / iyaṃ jñānakalā tv antaḥ sakrj jātābhivardhate* // . It seems that the Sāra has abbreviated the three lines into two and merely changed two readings without altering the sense. Why this should be a proof for the priority of its readings remains as opaque here as in the other instances that I could check with the manuscripts available to me.

- RAGHAVAN 1939b Id., The Yogavasistha Quotations in the Jivanmuktiviveka of Vidyaranya. Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society 12 (1939) 149–156.
- SLAJE 1992 WALTER SLAJE, Sarvasiddhāntasiddhānta. On 'Tolerance' and 'Syncretism' in the Yogavāsistha. WZKS 36 (1992) 307–322.
- SLAJE 1993 Id., Bhāskarakaṇṭhas Mokṣopāyaṭīkā. 2. (Mumukṣu-vyavahāra-)Prakaraṇa. Graz: Leykam, 1993.
- SLAJE 1994 Id., Vom Mokṣopāya-Śāstra zum Yogavāsistha-Mahārāmāyaṇa. [Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens 27]. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1994.
- SLAJE 1995 Id., Bhāskarakaṇṭhas Mokṣopāya-Ṭīkā. Die Fragmente des 3. (Utpatti-)Prakaraṇa. Graz: EWS Fachverlag, 1995.
- SLAJE 1996 Id., Bhāskarakaṇṭhas Mokṣopāya-Ṭīkā. 1. (Vairāgya-)Prakaraṇa. Graz: EWS Fachverlag, 1996.
- SLAJE 1997a Id., The Mokṣopāya Project. ABORI 77 (1996[1997]) 209–221.
- SLAJE 1997b Id., Zur Traditionsgeschichte der Vorstellung von einer 'Erlösung im Leben' (*jīvanmukti*). BEI (1995–1996 [1997]) 387–413.
- SLAJE 1998 Id., On Changing Others' Ideas: The Case of Vidyāraṇya and the Yogavāsistha. IJ 41 (1998) 103–124.
- SRINIVASAN 1967 SRINIVASA AYYA SRINIVASAN, Vācaspatimīśras Tattva-kaumudī. Ein Beitrag zur Textkritik bei kontaminierter Überlieferung. [Alt- und Neuindische Studien 12]. Hamburg: De Gruyter & Co, 1967.
- THOMI 1980 PETER THOMI, Cūḍāla. Eine Episode aus dem Yogavāsistha [...]. Wichtrach: Institut für Indologie, 1980.
- WEST 1973 MARTIN WEST, Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique. Stuttgart: B.G. Teubner, 1973.
- YV The Yogavāsistha of Vālmīki with the Commentary Vāsisthamahārāmāyaṇatātparyaprakāśha, ed. WĀSUDEVA LAXMAṆA ŚĀSTRĪ PAṆSĪKAR [sic]. Bombay 1911 (repr. 1918 and 1937).