



**HAL**  
open science

## Review of Mokṣopāya vol.s 1-2-3

Judit Törzsök

► **To cite this version:**

| Judit Törzsök. Review of Mokṣopāya vol.s 1-2-3. 2016. hal-01448005

**HAL Id: hal-01448005**

**<https://hal.science/hal-01448005>**

Preprint submitted on 27 Jan 2017

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

*Anonymus Casmiriensis Mokṣopāya*, Textedition Teil 1 Das Erste und Zweite Buch *Vairāgyaprakaraṇa*, *Mumukṣuvyavahāraprakaraṇa* Kritische Edition von Suzanne Krause-Stinner, Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden, 2011.

*Anonymus Casmiriensis Mokṣopāya*, Textedition Teil 2 Das Dritte Buch *Utpattiprakaraṇa* Kritische Edition von Jürgen Hanneder, Peter Stephan und Stanislav Jager, Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden, 2011.

*Anonymus Casmiriensis Mokṣopāya*, Textedition Teil 3 Das Vierte Buch *Sthitiprakaraṇa* Kritische Edition von Suzanne Krause-Stinner und Peter Stephan, Harrassowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden, 2012.\*

The three volumes of critical edition under review are among the major results of the *Mokṣopāya* project, supervised by Prof. Walter Slaje. The aim of the project is to make the Sanskrit text of the *Mokṣopāya* ('Means of final liberation', 10th century CE, from Kashmir) available in a critical edition, with a full (German) translation, a philological commentary and a dictionary of its special terminology. The three edited volumes contain the first four books (*prakaraṇa*) of the Sanskrit text out of six.

Most readers of this review will certainly know the project and the reasons for which it is important to have a critical edition of this monumental work of 30,000 verses. It would have been, however, useful if the editors had said a few words about the significance and the context of this philosophical-poetical *oeuvre*, so that Sanskritists uninitiated into the *Mokṣopāya*'s intricacies should have a better picture of its position in Sanskrit literature. Such basic information may seem superfluous for the editors, who are well acquainted with the subject; perhaps it would feel like stating the obvious. There are nevertheless at least three reasons for which a contextualizing introduction would be necessary, even if it is not a necessary part of a critical edition strictly speaking.

1. All philological work needs to put its object of study in a wider context, in particular 'in the current scholarly atmosphere that distrusts the use of philology for historical purposes'. This expression comes from Patrick Olivelle's review of Slaje's *Mokṣopāyaṭīkā* edition (*Journal of the American Oriental Society* 117.1:204.). Although the review was written in 1997, the distrust does not seem to have disappeared completely—and it may concern the use of philology for almost any purpose.

Such an unfavourable situation has also some advantages, since it may motivate an editor to try to uncover a wider context of a text from the very beginning of its study. At the same time, it is understandable that the editors of the *Mokṣopāya* volumes perhaps did not want to be involved in what they may consider unnecessary apologetics. Yet, providing some context would also make the edition more appetizing for a less well-informed Sanskritist reader, which would certainly be desirable.

2. Authors of critical editions are often faced with the accusation that they edit a completely obscure text or an obscure version of a text that never had any relevance or use for any segment of society, whether around the time of its composition or later. Such

---

\*The reviewer would like to apologize for submitting this review with an indecent and probably unprecedented delay. The fourth volume of the edition and much of the German translation have also been published in the meantime, but unfortunately they could not be considered in the present review.

criticism is not always explicit, but may be expressed when the text is called 'resurrected' (implying that it has been as good as dead). In order to reply to such arguments in advance, it would have been useful to point out the relevance of the *Mokṣopāya* and the way in which it is embedded in the Indian tradition. This could have been done easily, for participants in the project have published ample material on the subject.

It has been demonstrated, for instance, that the *Mokṣopāya* has an inclusivistic attitude encompassing various Hindu as well as Buddhist schools of thought (see e.g. Hanneder 2006), but only passing reference is made in vol. 1 p. xi of the edition to note that the text is aimed at a larger public. Another paper (Slaje 2001:780) mentions that the *Mokṣopāya*'s author may belong to a school of thought that is called the *abhāvabrahmavāda* (also, possibly *śāntabrahmavāda*?) in contemporary Kashmirian sources.

As to the social background, Slaje 2000:177, 191 argues that the *Mokṣopāya* is aimed at those who fulfill their social duties (*gr̥hasthas*) rather than at renunciates (*saṃnyāsins*), and that in this respect it is close to Abhinavagupta's attitude in his exegesis. Both Slaje 2000:177 and Hanneder 2006:119ff. reveal several clues that point to a *kṣatriya* background, and Hanneder 2006:132ff. also shows that the text was actually recited to royals throughout Indian history, and that its courtly context remained alive.

It may also be interesting to some readers that several of the stories related have female protagonists (in fact queens) who transmit the doctrine about *mokṣa* (see Hanneder 2006:135).

Presenting these features (without dwelling on the details) would have certainly helped the reader to better understand the relevance and interest of the text, and perhaps also to acquire a larger readership.

3. As is visible in the above paragraphs, one must carefully go through various studies published by the participants in the project to put the text into its context. Since the information is rather scattered in various places, the introduction to the first volume of the edition would have been a good occasion to gather together the material and give a brief but informative presentation of the nature of the text.

This being said, the introduction to the first volume of the edition gives a detailed and lucid account of the textual history of the *Mokṣopāya*, explaining that it represents the earlier, Kashmirian recension of the pan-Indian *Yogavāsiṣṭha*. The latter expands and rewrites the *Mokṣopāya* extensively, thus transforming most aspects of its original doctrine. Indeed, although both recensions focus on explaining how one can become liberated from the cycle of rebirths already in this very life (*jīvanmukta*), important transformations took place; most importantly, the *Mokṣopāya*'s extreme illusionism and focus on the man-in-the-world (*gr̥hastha*) was replaced by a more orthodox Advaita-Vedāntin standpoint, which rather promulgated asceticism.

As Krause-Stinner's excellent textual introduction elucidates, the *Mokṣopāya* itself consists of several layers of composition, while the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* also shows the influence of other texts and recensions, notably that of the short recension entitled *Laghuyogavāsiṣṭha*. The overview of the stratification of the *Mokṣopāya* on p. xiii is very helpful and enables the reader to follow the multiple frame stories easier.

After a detailed discussion of the various recensions, the editorial policies from p. xvii provide the reader with a complete and thorough description of the sources and the way in which they are used to produce the constituted text. There is one aspect of the manuscript tradition that could have been emphasized more clearly and in a more prominent place: that *none* of the *Mokṣopāya* manuscripts is free of contamination from the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* recension. This is an extremely important piece of information, but it is somewhat buried and hidden in the middle of the description of MSS Ś<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>11</sub>. Later on, it is again mentioned on p. xxv in the discussion of the basic editorial principles, but there the reimportation of the Nāgarī recension into Kashmir is said to be detected only in ‘almost’ all MSS.

The conclusion is then rightly drawn on the subsequent pages, namely that this fully contaminated transmission can only be edited if the primary reading, from which the others can be derived, is determined in each case in its own context, independently of the age of the MSS or of the number of MSS transmitting the reading. Indeed, one cannot but agree with the editors on refraining from drawing a stemma, which would necessarily be wrong.

Now the difficulty in such a situation is to determine some guiding lines that could help in establishing the primary reading. The most questionable here is the premise (xvi-xxvii) that the *Mokṣopāya* has an internal consistency of ideas and a poetic and structural coherence. While one may suppose a certain consistency in the same text, the edition—as is rightly said on p. xxvi—cannot attempt to go back to an ‘Urform,’ which itself may not have been a hundred percent consistent in every respect either. Moreover, some transmitters or scribes may attempt to introduce more coherence and better style into the text. Such upgrading of the original in the transmission has been observed not only in the case of epic and purāṇic material (where it may be considered an evident phenomenon to some extent), but in the transmission of *kāvya* too (Goodall 2001). Although the editor seems to be aware of all these problems and pitfalls (pp. xxvi-xxvii, incl. note 80), the premise of coherence itself remains somewhat vulnerable.

Three main guidelines are then determined in the choice of variants: (1) the *lectio difficilior*, whose mechanical application is immediately rejected (p. xxviii); (2) the use of parallels within the text and elsewhere to support a reading and (3) the principle of rejecting synonyms that agree with the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* recension and are therefore likely to come therefrom.

The editorial principles have thus been thoroughly established (probably on the basis of what the group of editors had agreed upon) in the first volume by Krause-Stinner. The subsequent volumes rely on these principles recalling only a few guidelines, such as the rejection of synonyms agreeing with the text of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* (Hanneder in vol. 2 p. ix), and refer to the first volume.

For obvious practical reasons, the constitution of the critical apparatus is described in each volume, so that the reader can have access to basic information, in particular the list of abbreviations, without needing to consult the first volume. What is slightly disconcerting here is that some details are not identical in the three volumes, although the formulation is mostly either the same as or closely synonymous with what we find in the first volume. Thus, in vol. 2, Hanneder appears to add the abbreviation *explicat* for

longer scribal explanations. For this, however, vol. 1 uses the abbreviation *explic.* (for *explicavit*), according to the list of abbreviations there, which, by the way, is also reproduced in vol. 2. So is there a difference between *explicat* and *explic.*? When one tries to check which is used in vol. 2, the passage referred to on p. xvi cannot be found in the edited text.

A more important novelty in the layout of vol. 2 is that verses whose authenticity is in doubt are printed in smaller typeface. It is unfortunately not explained here on what grounds the authenticity of these verses may be questionable, given that they can be found in all the MSS. More of such passages appear in vol. 3, which retains the convention of smaller typesetting. The introduction to vol. 3 p. xi then states that these passages appear to be inconsistent with the rest or do not have the same poetic quality. Here the reader may have some doubts as to what constitutes these inconsistencies or poor poetry, but unfortunately there is no philological commentary available for this volume.

While the longest and fullest introduction is given in the first volume, one cannot neglect the others either. Most importantly, the clearest explanation of the chronological development of the six books or *prakaraṇas* of the text can be found in the third volume (p. x) by Krause-Stinner and Stephan, mentioning also how the bipartite structure (*jāti* and *upaśānti*) was later imposed on the text. This should belong to the general introduction in vol 1. Since each introduction contains important bits of information, the reader is required to go through and make a synthesis of the whole. It is again understandable that the editors' view of the text evolves while going through the process of editing, but the reader would certainly appreciate more help. It is to be hoped that a synthesis will follow once the text has been edited in full.

The remaining part of the description of the apparatus does not differ substantially in the three volumes, except that there are different or sometimes more numerous examples given for typically ambiguous readings or for orthographic conventions in volumes 2 and 3.

Some particularities of the conventions may be useful to mention here. Firstly, all the abbreviations are in Latin. The only other option the editors deem worth considering is to use Sanskrit (see vol 2. p.xi by Hanneder), but they reject it since Sanskrit has not got the appropriate vocabulary for the purpose (which is true). Among the abbreviations, a useful one the edition introduces is *cett.* (= *ceteri*), which denotes all the other MSS when only one differs from them. This makes the apparatus less voluminous and is a welcome innovation (apparently, of the last minute, see vol. 2. p. xiv).

Secondly, the editors have retained some Kashmirian spelling conventions, most conspicuously the use of *jihvāmūliya* and *upadhmanīya* (represented by *ḥ*) and the use of final sibilants before initial sibilants rather than a Visarga. The adoption of Kashmirian scribal habits, which, let us remark, are not always consistent in the MSS themselves, may reflect the original form of the text. However, the *Mokṣopāya* was written in Sanskrit, which implies that it was potentially aimed at a pan-Indian readership. It is therefore questionable whether it was intended to be read with such local flavour (although one cannot exclude this possibility either).

Thirdly, and most importantly, no convention is used for text passages whose constitution is uncertain. While the above-mentioned conventions (using Latin abbreviations or Kashmirian spelling) are perfectly understandable and depend mainly on the editor's personal taste, signalling textual problems belong to the obligations of any editor.

It can reasonably be expected that two conventions for problematic readings should be used in any edition: one for text passages whose exact reading is uncertain for some reason or odd enough to warrant questioning; another—usually a crux mark—to signal segments that are certainly corrupt and/or meaningless, but for which the editor cannot propose a conjecture (or does not want to propose one, if several possibilities can be envisaged for instance). The lack of any such signs implies that the constitution of the text is fully secure and without any problems or ambiguities. This is rather unlikely to be true for the entire *Mokṣopāya*.

There is nevertheless a way in which the editors alert the reader of potential textual problems: in the running philological commentary called *Stellenkommentar*. This philological commentary has not been printed, but is available at [http://adwm.indologie.uni-halle.de/MU\\_PhilKomm.htm](http://adwm.indologie.uni-halle.de/MU_PhilKomm.htm) (accessed by the reviewer on the 15th of August, 2015) for volume 1, the first 59 chapters of volume 2 and for volume 4. The *Stellenkommentar* is an important part of the editorial work and is accordingly presented in a publishable form on the website; but unfortunately, it is not available for a large portion of the text. Moreover, whether there is a *Stellenkommentar* or not, it is not enough to signal more serious textual problems, which should be marked in the text itself.

One can also remark that the *Stellenkommentar* is fairly detailed in the beginning of vol. 2 but becomes more sporadic later on. As for explaining textual difficulties, sometimes it disappointingly fails to treat the actual questions. Let us see the following two examples.

1. At 1.11.23 (*śūnyamanmukhavṛttīs tu śuṣkarodananīrasāḥ / viveka eva hr̥tsam̐stho mamaikānteṣu paśyati*), there are two variants in *pāda* a, *manmukha* and *sanmukha*. The editorial choice of *manmukha* (read in MSS Ś<sub>1</sub> Ś<sub>3</sub> and Ś<sub>9</sub>) against *sanmukha* (transmitted by Ś<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>11</sub> and clearly supported by Bhāskarakaṇṭha's eighteenth century Ṭikā from Kashmir) seems not so easy to argue for. Note that it is not possible to distinguish between the two *akṣaras* *ma* and *sa* here in the oldest MS Ś<sub>14</sub> according to the apparatus.

*Sanmukha* in the sense of 'favourable, auspicious' could be at least as appropriate in meaning *asmanmukha* 'my mouth/face' (or 'turning towards me') to qualify acts or deeds (*vṛtti*), especially because *mama* is already there in the sentence. Let us note that this meaning is recorded for *saṃmukha* in Apte's Dictionary, but *sanmukha* and *saṃmukha* are practically homographs, which is clearly visible in numerous occurrences of *sanmukhain* MSS and even in editions in the sense of 'facing' (opp. of *parāṇmukha*), when clearly *saṃmukha* is intended. In fact, it is possible, even probable, that the meaning 'favourable, auspicious' belongs to *sanmukha* originally rather than *to saṃmukha*.

In any case, one would like to see arguments to support the editor's choice of *manmukha* in the *Stellenkommentar*, but all one gets is the remark that *ma* and *sa* can easily be confused in Śāradā, a confusion that is very well known to anybody who has ever read this script.

The *Stellenkommentar* also gives two other passages as parallels to support the editorial choice in question. The problem with these parallels is that in both cases, there is no ambiguity and there are no variants. The only reading is *manmukha* in one case (meaning 'my mouth' in 4.30.38) and *sanmukha* in the other (in 2.2.11). Their contexts seem also rather different. The alleged parallels appear therefore irrelevant to decide the present case. Thus, even if the editor may well be right in her choice, in the absence of any appropriate arguments the reader remains in doubt.

2. In volume 2, at 3.13.21d, one finds the conjecture *arthabhāvitāt* for *arthabhāvitvāt*. This may improve on the text, but the verse remains difficult (the commentary has been lost *ad loc.*) and one would like to see why the editors felt the need to change the transmitted text here and what the result of this intervention is. Unfortunately, the *Stellenkommentar* is very brief again, stating only that the text is *unklar*. But which text? Before or after the conjecture? If it is unclear, why does it remain without any sign that would alert the reader to the problem? Is it a good conjecture then if the text still remains unclear? Or should one conjecture something else (too)? Unfortunately, the answers to these questions also remain unclear.

In spite of such occasional queries, the constituted text runs mostly very smoothly and provides an enjoyable reading, with editorial choices that agree with the established principles and with a very clear and thorough record of the variants.

The *Stellenkommentar* often provides the reader with very useful explanations. At 3.4.12c (edited by Hanneder) the constituted text reads *ityākārṇyaivam astūktvā*. The majority of the MSS (Ś<sub>3</sub> Ś<sub>7</sub> Ś<sub>9</sub> and Ś<sub>14</sub>) support the reading with *evam*, but Ś<sub>1</sub> N<sub>13</sub> and the Ṭikā read *eva* instead. This implies that the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* recension probably had *eva*, which tips the scale towards *evam* for the *Mokṣopāya* recension. However, one may have the impression that the *evam* reading attempts to improve upon a hiatus produced by *eva*, therefore *evam* appears secondary. Indeed, one can observe the secondary hiatus-filling *-m-* appearing elsewhere in the transmission, as in 3.11.21c. Now, looking at the *Stellenkommentar*, there is an important detail mentioned there: that *evam* has been accepted on the basis of the idiomatic expression *evam astu*. Indeed, understood with *astu* rather than *ākārṇya*, the adverb makes much better sense. And even if some may object saying that *astu* could well stand alone as *bhavatu* or *yātu*, the argument provides very strong support for accepting *evam*.

As mentioned above, one of the valid reasons established by the editors for rejecting a variant is that it agrees with the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* or Nāgarī recension's variant against other Kashmirian sources. It is therefore important for the reader to know the variant of the Nāgarī recension in particular places. It turns out that initially, a separate register was going to be reserved for variants of the Nāgarī recension (vol. II p. x by Hanneder). This register was, however, discarded on the grounds that readings of the Nāgarī recension are irrelevant for the constitution of the *Mokṣopāya*'s text, except for a few instances. This is a clear case of self-contradiction, for how can one propose to reject a reading that agrees with what is not recorded? And the edition testifies to it: for while chapters 1-59 of volume 2 edited by J. Hanneder hardly refer to N<sub>ed</sub> (N<sub>ed</sub> representing, by and large, the Nāgarī recension in a published form), the subsequent chapters edited by P. Stephan often include the information as to which variants agree with those of N<sub>ed</sub>, by adding (=N<sub>ed</sub>) in parentheses after the variant. Indeed, this solution seems satisfactory. A

separate register for all the variants of the Devanāgarī recension would overburden the apparatus, but it is useful, and even necessary, to have N<sub>ed</sub>'s reading whenever it may influence editorial choices.

In some cases, omitting N<sub>ed</sub> becomes really problematic. In 3.7.25 the editor conjectures *rūḍhir alam* for *rūḍhibalam*. This is rather ingenious; but we learn from the *Stellenkommetar* that this is in fact N<sub>ed</sub>'s learned conjecture, which the editor has found very suitable. While the honesty of the *Stellenkommetar* deserves praise, it would have been important to signal in the edition that this is in fact N<sub>ed</sub>'s variant, or rather, conjecture.

There is an additional problem in the above-mentioned passage: the lack of reporting the Ṭikā's variant (*rūḍhibalam*). While the first volume of the edition by Krause-Stinner seems to refer regularly to the Ṭikā's variants, the second volume does so very occasionally. One reason is certainly that the Ṭikā does not survive intact for the whole of the third book; but it is not reported even where it is available, such as in the above mentioned verse 3.7.25.

This inconsistent reporting of the Ṭikā's reading leads us to the question of how the Ṭikā's testimony should be evaluated. Bhāskaraṅṅtha's eighteenth century commentary seems an important testimony for two reasons. First, as pointed out by Slaje (1993:11 ff.) too, its author is from Kashmir, using the Kashmirian *Mokṣopāya* recension and not the pan-Indian Devanāgarī recension. Second, since the author is from the eighteenth century, his sources for the text are several centuries closer to the original than what we have, even if the oldest manuscript used for the critical edition comes from before Bhāskara's time. Bhāskara himself may also have had access to old manuscripts which could have gone back earlier than ours. Therefore, the commentary warrants serious consideration both because of its provenance and its date. Moreover, the tradition of interpretation Bhāskara follows does not seem to be affected by the vedāntic reinterpretation of the text (Slaje 1993:13). Bhāskara's interpretations must, however, be read with caution, as pointed out by Hanneder (e.g. 2006:167). For being a Kashmirian *śaiva* (who also wrote a commentary on Abhinavagupta's *Īśvarapratyabhiñjāvivṛtivismarśinī*), he is likely to understand many philosophical passages in his own *śaivawayor* simply anachronistically (Hanneder 2006:166). Bhāskara's commentary has been critically edited in four volumes by Slaje (1993, 1995, 1996 and 2002).

Unfortunately, I have found no in-depth discussion of the way in which Bhāskara's commentary can contribute to the constitution of the critical text (apart from a few lines in Krause-Stinner's preface p.xxi citing Slaje 1993:7, although I may have overlooked something, given the somewhat labyrinthine nature of the publications on the subject). What Bhāskara read has been of course edited by Slaje, in his edition of the commentary. Slaje rightly emphasizes that his edition is not a critical edition of the *mūla*, although it does constitute a first step toward such an edition (Slaje 1993:10-13 and 17). It therefore reproduces the *Mokṣopāya* as read by the commentator, wherever his reading can be established (Slaje 1993:17). This is indeed what Slaje does apart from a few minor glitches or typos, as in 2.14.27b, where the commentary seems to read *kalanā* as Hanneder's edition also confirms, but Slaje's *mūla* *haskalpanā*, agreeing, somewhat surprisingly, with the critical edition and the majority of the MSS of the *Mokṣopāya* itself.



The absence of any detailed discussion of Bhāskara's testimony suggests that it is not considered to be more important than any manuscript of the *Mokṣopāya*. Indeed, it appears so in some cases, when it goes off to a (wrong) direction of its own, such as in 3.10.52, where it has an idiosyncratic and inferior reading *ṣaṣṭhendriyātītam* for *ṣaṣṭhendriyonmuktam*. However, in many other cases it may deserve to be taken more seriously, as is done in 1.9.32b, for instance, where its reading of *saṃsthiti* is accepted against *saṃprāpti* found in all the MSS.

On a few occasions the editors reject the Ṭikā's reading perhaps slightly too hastily. In 1.1.14, the Ṭikā clearly reads *potenevātha* with MSS Ś<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>11</sub>, but *potenevāśu* is accepted, on the grounds that it is semantically better (and perhaps also in order to keep a reading that is not that of the Nāgarī recension). The Ṭikā even remarks (as is noted in the *Stellenkommentar*) that *atha* is a filler here. Indeed, it does seem to be a filler and it is difficult to explain how and why such a filler would be secondary, while *āśu* appears more likely to be introduced precisely because *atha* was felt to be a filler and *āśu*, in spite of the repetition of information already contained in *kṣipram*, was perceived as stylistically better. Note also that a similar case of intrusive *atha* can be found in 4.1.18a (*tathaivātha*).

Of course the above example is also a question of editorial taste. Yet, there is another problem with the way in which the Ṭikā's testimony is handled: namely that it is not systematically reported, and when it is reported, it is not always done in an unambiguous way. This creates a certain amount of uncertainty. In such situations one must actually look at the Ṭikā edition itself, for the edition of the *Mokṣopāya* does not provide the necessary information. Let us see some examples.

In 1.4.15d, the Ṭikā is not reported to agree with the lemma (*vikārayanti*), only the MSS containing the Ṭikā (MSS Ś<sub>4</sub> and N<sub>11</sub>) are reported to agree with it, while the Ṭikā appears to include the variant reading *vikāravanti*. Looking at the Ṭikā edition, it turns out that the first reading of the Ṭikā itself in fact does agree with the accepted *vikārayanti*, and it gives *vikāravanti* as a second (variant) reading. One can of course assume that this is the case, but it would be useful to have such information laid out in the critical edition, to avoid ambiguity.

In 1.6.15a the Ṭikā seems to have an unmetrical reading at first sight, for it is reported to have *tena* for *ca tena samāsādya*. This seems rather surprising, but if one checks the place in the Ṭikā edition, it is clear that the Ṭikā certainly had a metrical reading. Nevertheless, the commentary only supports the reading of the word *tena* and not the rest of the lemma, and this might be the reason for reporting it only for *tena*. But such way of reporting the Ṭikā is ambiguous, for it might be understood to have an unmetrical reading rather than a partial support. If unmetrical readings were otherwise signalled as such (which is unfortunately not the case), the reader would not have this doubt.

The reader of course can see on a large number of occasions that Bhāskara's readings may not always be trusted (see e.g. 4.1.11a), just as the MSS too sometimes present readings that need to be emended. In 3.20.35a, the conjectural emendation of *me* to *te* is absolutely necessary in the context of the dialogue, as is the case in 3.25.34c, where

the obviously wrong *acalanīkam* is emended to *acalānīkam* (unfortunately, no variant of the *codd.* is noted and, probably by oversight, the wrong reading *acalanīkam* has remained in the text). Similarly, in 3.64.13a *sarge* seems to be rightly conjectured for *sargo/mārgo/māрге*, and in 2.31.29d the emendation of *sthitis* to *sthitim* is required by the syntax.

The editors are cautious when conjecturing and it is rare that their proposal seems questionable. One such occasion may be 3.4.14c, where the conjecture *maunātmā* for *maunātma* is made, so that it should agree with the masculine *ātmā*. The *Stellenkommentar*, referring to Bhāskara's tendentious interpretation, fails to convince, for even if Bhāskara's understanding is not true to the spirit of the original, his reading may well be primary. The neuter reading *maunātma* seems to be an appropriate description of *manas*, which is also said to be sluggish or inactive (*manthara* in the sense of *jaḍa*, as rightly pointed out in the *Stellenkommentar*). *Manthara* and *maunātma* can both qualify *manas* in a somewhat *nirukti* type series of qualifications. This does not amount to say that the conjecture is implausible; but given that the reading of the MSS does not appear wrong, it is perhaps not necessary to emend the text.

Another, possibly important, testimony that appears to be referred to in an inconsistent way, at least at first sight, is the *Mokṣopāyasamgraha* (Ś<sub>sam</sub>). Its readings are often reported in the first volume of the edition, but nowhere in the first half of the second volume. In this case, however, there is a reason: as Hanneder (2006: 10) points out, this work is actually not a summary, contrarily to what its title suggests, but a work that contains all the philosophical passages of the original, while omitting the narrative ones. Since the first part of the *Utpattiprakaraṇa* consists of *ākhyānas*, the *Samgraha* (as the informed reader can assume) completely omits them. Unfortunately, one is not reminded here of this fact, and those who have not read the different publications concerning the *Mokṣopāya* (see also Hanneder 2005 for the *Samgraha*) may remain perplexed.

Another, not particularly user-friendly aspect of the publication is that no indices have been included. This would not be a problem if the text was available in an electronic form, but it is not the case and no plan for an electronic publication appears to be mentioned either. Let us hope that at least the constituted Sanskrit text will be made available online once the project is finished.

Given the complexity of the work and the large amount of text edited, there seem to be very few typos or misprints. In addition to those mentioned above, one may be easily noticed in vol. 2. p. viii, where *Mokṣopāya* is probably intended as a subtitle and was meant to be set in bold and larger typeface, but is written in a smaller type and a visibly different font. In the same volume, p. xii note 12 has 'Siehe Bidez and Drachman...' for 'Siehe Bidez und Drachman'. In the edition, 2.7.21d has 'Nthirteen' in the apparatus (I assume the backslash was omitted in the TeX command); and the reading *gāminīs* is given as of 2.60.55c instead of 2.60.55d.

The task of editing the *Mokṣopāya* may be called a truly heroic exploit in philology, a task comparable to editing the *Rāmāyaṇa*, for the *Mokṣopāya* even surpasses the epic in length. As Goethe's words chosen by the editors for a motto show, one may sometimes feel that it cannot be accomplished without divine grace. All the editors and the project

supervisor, Prof. Walter Slaje, must therefore be congratulated upon accomplishing a major part of this enormous task with scholarly rigour. Although the edition is not user-friendly in every respect and often requires the reader to consult several additional volumes, the online *Stellenkommentar* and various papers by the editors, it presents all the data necessary for the reader to judge the available evidence for any particular passage. It also successfully reconstructs a text that is arguably the closest possible version to what the Kashmirian *Mokṣopāya* was in the tenth century. This all sounds very simple, yet preparing such a critical edition requires not only thorough, but also thoughtful and resourceful philological work, in which the editors have demonstrated their proficiency. The readers can be grateful to them for making available this original and fascinating text for further study, which will enhance our knowledge of medieval Kashmir as well as of Indian philosophy in general.

Judit Törzsök

## References

Goodall, D. 2001. "Bhūte 'āha' iti pramādāt: Firm Evidence for the Direction of Change Where Certain Verses of the Raghuvamśa Are Various Transmitted" *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 151/1:103-114.

Hanneder, J. 2005. "The Mokṣopāyasamgraha". In: J. Hanneder (ed.) *The Mokṣopāya, Yogavāsiṣṭha and Related Texts*. Aachen: Shaker (Indologica Halensis. Geisteskultur Indiens 7), pp. 105–112.

Hanneder, J. 2006. *Studies on the Mokṣopāya*. Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.

Slaje, W. 1993. *Bhāskarakaṇṭhas Mokṣopāyaṭīkā. 2. (Mumukṣavyavahāra)*. Graz: Leykam.

Slaje, W. 2000. "Liberation from intentionality and involvement: On the concept of *jīvanmukti* according to the *Mokṣopāya*" *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 28:171–194.

Slaje, W. 2001. "Observations on the making of the Yogavāsiṣṭha (*caitta*, *nañārtha* and *vaḥ*)". In: *Le Parole e i marmi*. Rome: Istituto Italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente (Serie Orientale Roma CXII, 1/2), pp. 771–796.