



universität
wien

MASTERARBEIT / MASTER'S THESIS

Titel der Masterarbeit / Title of the Master's Thesis

“The Notion of the Three Kinds of Suffering (*ādhyātmika*,
ādhibhautika, *ādhidaivika*) in Classical and Medieval
Sanskrit Literature”

verfasst von / submitted by

Anja Vukadin, BA MA

angestrebter akademischer Grad / in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts (MA)

Wien, 2023 / Vienna, 2023

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt /
degree programme code as it appears on the
student record sheet:

UA 066 697

Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt /
degree programme as it appears on the
student record sheet:

Masterstudium Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens

Betreut von / Supervisor:

O. Univ. Prof. Dr. Karin Preisendanz

Acknowledgments

First of all, I would like to thank my supervisor, o. Univ. Prof. Dr. Preisendanz, for her guidance and support during my Master's studies. I am grateful for her accuracy, precision and patience that led me to this stage where I was able to write a Master's thesis on the topic of Sanskrit literature. Moreover, I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. Himal Trikha and (Prof.) Dr. Elisa Freschi for their inspiring and motivating lectures during my studies. Their teaching not only enriched my knowledge but also broadened my view of Sanskrit literature.

Furthermore, I would like to thank my colleagues Dr. Christian Ferstl, Dr. Dominik Haas, Ge Ge, M.A., and Dr. Vitus Angermeier for taking the time to read my thesis, discussing its topic with me, and providing me with helpful advice. Many special thanks go to Ge and Vitus for facilitating the process of writing this thesis and making it enjoyable with the Turkish coffee breaks at our Department.

I would like to extend my heartfelt gratitude to my parents, family, and partner Radheshyam Stepponat for their unwavering support and encouragement throughout my studies and the process of researching and writing this thesis. My special thanks also go to my brother Ognjen Vukadin, who has always supported my interests and supplied me with Sanskrit books.

Lastly, I wish to express my *praṇāma* to my spiritual teacher Paramahans Swami Maheshwarananda, without whom my love, interest and curiosity towards Sanskrit, Indian philosophy and culture might never have blossomed.

Abstract

This MA thesis deals with the classification and explanation of the three kinds of suffering, *ādhyātmika* (suffering relating to something belonging to the Self), *ādhibhautika* (suffering relating to something belonging to living beings) and *ādhidaivika* (suffering relating to something belonging to the gods or to heaven). The reference to these three kinds of suffering is very well known from the opening verse of the teaching of classical Sāṃkhya philosophy in the *Sāṃkhyakārikā*. Although the verse itself only uses the term *duḥkhatraya*, ‘triad of suffering’ or ‘three kinds of suffering,’ the commentators on the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* and other authors provide further information on the names of these three kinds of suffering, their definitions and sub-classification, and explain them, mainly by way of exemplification. However, it is not clear whether this classification of *duḥkha* originates from the Sāṃkhya philosophy. The same classification is also found in various other Sanskrit literatures, such as the classical Yoga philosophy and the Pāśupata tradition, in the Purāṇas, in Āyurveda, etc.

In this context, the present thesis addresses the question how the interpretation and description of the *duḥkhatraya* developed in classical and medieval Sanskrit literature. Therefore, translations of selected passages of the commentaries on *Sāṃkhyakārikā* 1, *Sāṃkhyasūtra* 1, of short commentaries and other works included in the *Sāṃkhyasaṃgraha*, of commentaries on *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* 1.31, and of the *Pañcārthabhāṣya*, *Brahmapurāṇa*, *Viṣṇupurāṇa* and *Suśrutasaṃhitā*, are included. The rich information contained in these selected passages is then presented in tabular form and subsequently evaluated from various points of view, such as the mutual relationship between the interpretations in the sources and their crucial differences, their inner logic and development, and the identification of peculiar features of them.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
1.1. The concept of suffering in Indian philosophical thought	3
1.2. The tree kinds of suffering	10
1.3. Method and Aim of This Study	14
2. Translations of selected passages	16
2.1. Sāṃkhya.....	16
2.1.1. Īśvarakṛṣṇa's <i>Sāṃkhyakārikā</i> 1 (SK 1).....	21
2.1.2. Commentaries on the <i>Sāṃkhyakārikā</i>	24
2.1.2.1. <i>Gauḍapādabhāṣya</i> (GBh)	26
2.1.2.2. <i>Māṭharavṛtti</i> (MV)	27
2.1.2.3. <i>Sāṃkhyasaptativṛtti</i> (V1)	28
2.1.2.4. <i>Sāṃkhyasaptatikāvṛtti</i> (V2).....	31
2.1.2.5. <i>Yuktidīpikā</i> (YD).....	33
2.1.2.6. <i>Jayamaṅgalā</i> (JM)	34
2.1.2.7. <i>Sāṃkhyatattvakaumudī</i> (STK).....	35
2.2. <i>Sāṃkhyasūtra</i> (SS).....	36
2.2.1. <i>Sāṃkhyasūtravṛtti</i> (SSV)	36
2.2.2. <i>Sāṃkhyapracāsanabhāṣya</i> (SPBh).....	37
2.3. <i>Sāṃkhyasaṃgraha</i>	38
2.3.1. <i>Sāṃkhyatattvavivecana</i> (STV).....	40
2.3.2. Śimānanda's summarizing verse commentary on <i>Tattvasamāśasūtra</i> 22: <i>trividhaṃ duḥkham</i>	42
2.3.3. <i>Sāṃkhyatattvayāthārthyadīpana</i> (STYD)	44
2.3.4. <i>Samāśasūtrasarvopakāriṇī Ṭīkā</i> (ST).....	44
2.3.5. <i>Tattvasamāśasūtravṛtti</i> (TSSV).....	45
2.3.6. <i>Sāṃkhyatattvapradīpa</i> (STP).....	47
2.3.7. <i>Tattvamīmāṃsā</i> (TM)	47
2.4. Classical Yoga	48
2.4.1. <i>Tattvavaiśārādī</i> (TV)	50
2.4.2. <i>Vivaraṇa</i> (Vi).....	50
2.4.3. <i>Yogavārttika</i> (YV)	51

2.5. The notion of <i>ādhyātmika</i> , <i>ādhibhautika</i> and <i>ādhidaivika</i> suffering in other Indian traditions	53
2.5.1. The Pāśupata tradition.....	53
2.5.1.1. <i>Kauṇḍinya's Pañcārthabhāṣya (PABh)</i>	54
2.5.2. Purāṇas.....	55
2.5.2.1. <i>Brahmapurāṇa (BP) and Viṣṇupurāṇa (VP)</i>	56
2.5.3. Classical Āyurveda	59
2.5.3.1. <i>Suśrutasamhitā Sūtrasthāna (SS Sū)</i>	60
3. Analysis and evaluation of relevant passages	65
3.1. Tables.....	65
3.1.1. Physical (<i>śārīra</i>) suffering as the first type of suffering relating to something belonging to the Self (<i>ādhyātmika</i>).....	68
3.1.2. Mental (<i>mānasa</i>) suffering as the second type of suffering relating to something belonging to the Self (<i>ādhyātmika</i>).....	73
3.1.3. Suffering relating to something belonging to living beings (<i>ādhibhautika</i>).....	77
3.1.4. Suffering relating to <i>daiva</i> (<i>ādhidaivika</i>).....	81
4. Conclusion	86
5. Bibliography	88
5.1. Primary literature	88
5.2. Secondary literature	90
6. Appendix	98
6.1. Glossary relating to suffering of the <i>ādhyātmika śārīra</i> type	98
6.2. Glossary relating to suffering of the <i>ādhyātmika mānasa</i>	99
6.3. Glossary relating to suffering of the <i>ādhibhautika</i>	99
6.4. Glossary relating to suffering of the <i>ādhidaivika</i>	100
6.5. Abstract: German	102

Abbreviations

BP	<i>Brahmapurāṇa</i> (ed. Schreiner & Söhnen 1989)
BhG	<i>Bhagavadgītā</i> (ed. Paṇīskar 1936)
ChUp	<i>Chāndogya Upaniṣad</i> (ed. Limaye & Vadekar 1958)
CS	<i>Carakasamhitā</i> (ed. Trikamji 1940)
GBh	<i>Gauḍapādabhāṣya</i> (ed. Esnoul 1964)
JM	<i>Jayamaṅgalā</i> (ed. Śarmā 1970)
MBh	<i>Mahābhārata</i> (ed. Suthankar 1951)
MS	<i>Manusmṛti</i> (ed. Dave 1972)
MSū	<i>Mīmāṃsāsūtra</i> (ed. Bhaṭṭācārya 1883)
MV	<i>Māṭharavṛtti</i> (ed. Śarmā 1970)
PABh	<i>Pāñcārthabhāṣya</i> (ed. Śastri 1940)
PYŚ	<i>Pātañjalayogaśāstra</i> (ed. Maas 2006, ed. Āgāśe 1904)
SK	<i>Sāṃkhyakārikā</i> (ed. Esnoul 1964)
SPBh	<i>Sāṃkhyapravacanabhāṣya</i> (ed. Garbe 1895)
SS	<i>Sāṃkhyasūtra</i> (ed. Garbe 1888)
SS Sū	<i>Suśrutasaṃhitā Sūtrasthāna</i> (ed. Ācārya Yādavaśarman and Ācārya Narayan Ram 2003)
SSV	<i>Sāṃkhyasūtravṛtti</i> (ed. Garbe 1888)
STK	<i>Sāṃkhyatattvakaumudī</i> (ed. Srinivasan 1967)
STP	<i>Sāṃkhyatattvapradīpa</i> (ed. Dvivedin 1920)
STV	<i>Sāṃkhyatattvavivecana</i> (ed. Dvivedin 1920)
SṬ	<i>Samāśasūtrasarvopakāriṇī Ṭīkā</i> (ed. Dvivedin 1920)
ŚvetUp	<i>Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad</i> (ed. Limaye & Vadekar 1958)
STYD	<i>Sāṃkhyatattvayāthārthyadīpana</i> (ed. Dvivedin 1920)
TM	<i>Tattvamīmāṃsā</i> (ed. Dvivedin 1920)
TSS	<i>Tattvasamāśasūtra</i> (ed. Dvivedin 1920)
TSSV	<i>Tattvasamāśasūtravṛtti</i> (ed. Dvivedin 1920)
TV	<i>Tattvavaiśārādī</i> (ed. Āgāśe 1904)
V1	<i>Sāṃkhyasaptatvīṛtti</i> (ed. Solomon 1973)

V2	<i>Sāṃkhyasaptatikāvr̥tti</i> (ed. Solomon 1973)
Vi	<i>Pātaṇḍjalayogaśāstravivarāṇa</i> (ed. Harimoto 1999)
VP	<i>Viṣṇupurāṇa</i> (ed. Pathak 1991)
YD	<i>Yuktidīpikā</i> (ed. Wezler & Motegi 1998)
YV	<i>Yogavārttika</i> (ed. Paṭavardhana, Rāmakṛṣṇaśāstrī and Keśavaśāstrī 1884)

1. Introduction

Suffering, known as *duḥkha* in Indian religious and philosophical thought, as an ubiquitous aspect of human experience has been and continues to be a central concern for individuals across various historical and cultural contexts. It is important to note that the forms and expressions of suffering may change over time, yet its fundamental presence endures (Sköld & Lund 2021, p. 2f). The introduction of this thesis aims to provide an overview of the concept of suffering and its understanding in Indian religious and philosophical thought.

The issue of suffering has been approached by multiple disciplines, including sociology, medicine, psychology, etc.,¹ each of which examines the topic with its own methodologies. Sociologists examine the social factors contributing to suffering, while medicine seeks to alleviate suffering through clinical intervention. Psychology, on the other hand, concentrates on the psychological aspects of suffering.² Despite many efforts to alleviate suffering, it remains a persistent feature of human existence that is subject to change and evolution over time. Some remedies may provide temporary relief, but the underlying causes of suffering persist, presenting ongoing difficulties towards the achievement of its complete understanding and resolution. The Indian philosophical traditions provide a response to the quest for complete liberation from suffering. One of the most well-known statements on suffering in Indian philosophical thought is the Buddha's declaration *sabbam dukkham* ('everything is suffering'). The phenomenon of suffering is not a recent development, but the types of suffering prevalent in ancient times differ from those experienced in the present. The modern Indian philosopher Rajendra Swaroop Bhatnagar reflects on whether suffering is a defining aspect of human life and existence (Raveh 2021, p. 191).³ According to him, since we are born and are sentient beings, we are bound to suffer (Raveh 2021, p. 190f).

¹ Sköld & Lund 2021 presents the issue on suffering, which brings together the contributions of scholars from the fields of philosophy, sociology, psychology, anthropology and cultural studies.

² For more information on suffering in modern discourse, see *Making Sense of Suffering: A collective Attempt*. This book presents contributions that address the issue of suffering in specific contexts, e.g., suffering in the context of nihilism, painful aspects of life, suffering in palliative care, individual suffering in the context of migration, etc.

³ Raveh's paper serves as a tribute to Bhatnagar who passed away in 2019. In this paper, Raveh initiates a conversation with Bhatnagar through one of his last essays titled "No Suffering if Human Beings Were Not Sensitive," which remained unfinished due to his death. Additionally, Raveh includes a few paragraphs from Bhatnagar's earlier papers. See Raveh 2021, p. 189.

Before discussing the solutions to the problem of suffering advanced in Indian philosophical thought, it is important to examine the Sanskrit term *duḥkha*, which is commonly translated as ‘suffering.’

The word *duḥkha* can be translated as ‘sorrow,’ ‘grief,’ ‘unhappiness,’ ‘pain,’ ‘agony.’ The word is derived from the prefix *dus*, ‘bad’ or ‘difficult,’ and the noun *kha*, referring to an aperture, empty space, hole and specifically the center bore of a wheel. A literal translation of *duḥkha*, a *bahuvrīhi* compound, would be ‘having a bad center bore’ referencing the implied unsteadiness of a chariot.⁴ This interpretation can be situated in the early Vedic period, as evidenced by the *R̥gveda*, where the term *duḥkha* does not appear but its counterpart, *sukha*, is used as an adjective relating to *ratha* (‘chariot’), meaning ‘a chariot that runs smoothly’ (Younger 1969, p. 9f). This does not suggest that the *R̥gvedic* period lacked a concept of suffering, but rather that other terms were used at the time to refer to the phenomenon in a development that eventually led to the idea of suffering connected with the term *duḥkha* (Younger 1969, p. 17).

Especially when it appears in works belonging to the Indian philosophical traditions, the term *duḥkha* is commonly translated as ‘suffering’ rather than ‘pain.’ Pain and suffering are multi-dimensional experiences that encompass physical, psychological, and socio-cultural aspects. However, it is important to note that pain can lead to suffering, but not the other way around. Suffering is not solely determined by observable biological or physical factors, such as the pain resulting from tissue damage, but it is a subjective embodied experience (Bueno-Gómez 2017, p. 2). It is important to note that the translation of *duḥkha* depends on the context in which the term is used. For example, *duḥkha* often appears in conjunction with the term *sukha*, where the two terms can be translated as ‘pain’ and ‘pleasure.’ However, when used in the context of liberation, *duḥkha* is most closely associated with the English term ‘suffering.’ Despite this, the word *duḥkha* has a broader meaning than the English word ‘suffering’ alone (Potter 1986, p. 11). According to Potter, *duḥkha* as a result of one’s actions is considered to be something that is deserved, whereas ‘suffering’ has the connotation of undeservedness. Bhatnagar highlights that in India there is no distinction between deserved or undeserved suffering, as the mere fact of being born entails the inevitability of suffering (Raveh 2021, p. 194). From the point of view of their etymology, *duḥkha* and ‘suffering’ also have distinct meanings, with ‘suffering’ originating from the Latin verb ‘sufferre,’ meaning ‘to bear,’ ‘endure.’ However, in

⁴ See Apte 1890, p. 569 and Younger 1969, p. 12.

this thesis, even though the term *duḥkha* carries a wider range of meanings, it will be translated as ‘suffering’ as it is appropriate within the relevant context of Indian philosophy.

In the Sanskrit literature selected as sources in this thesis, another term used to describe suffering is *tāpa*.⁵ This word is derived from the root √*tap*, meaning ‘to be hot/warm,’ ‘to suffer.’⁶ The neuter noun *tapas* refers to the ‘heat’ or energy produced by severe ascetic practice or religious abstinence, while the masculine noun *tāpa* means ‘heat,’ ‘torment,’ ‘pain,’ ‘affliction,’ ‘misery.’ When used in a compound with *traya*, meaning ‘triad,’ it refers to the same concept as the word *duḥkha* in *duḥkhatraya*. To differentiate between the two terms, *tāpatraya* is translated as ‘three kinds of misery.’

The meaning of the term *duḥkha* has evolved over time, transitioning from ‘having a bad center bore’ in the early Vedic period to meaning of ‘pain’ and ‘suffering’ current in the later language. A concept of the notion of *duḥkha* in Indian philosophy and religion will be provided in the following to illustrate the historical development of this concept.

1.1. The concept of suffering in Indian philosophical thought

The Sanskrit word *darśana* is the commonly used word in modern scholarly literature to refer to the various traditions of Indian philosophy and claimed to be an equivalent to ‘philosophy’ in the European tradition, especially in India. The word is derived from the root √*dṛś*, which means ‘to see,’ ‘realization.’ However, Western historians of Indian philosophy often do not accept that *darśana* refers to philosophy (Halbfass 1988, p. 263).⁷ One of the main reasons for linking *darśana* with ‘philosophy’ is that the term is frequently used in Indian doxographic literature. Many Indian doxographies use the term *darśana* in their titles. According to Halbfass, the Jains and Vedāntins use the word in a neutral sense, without any normative or idealizing implications (Halbfass 1988, p. 266). Halbfass suggests that *darśana* has the

⁵ See the translated passages of the *Brahmapurāṇa* and *Viṣṇupurāṇa*.

⁶ See Apte 1890, p. 530.

⁷ Halbfass 1988, Chapter 15, offers a discussion on the Sanskrit terminology for ‘philosophy.’ Halbfass explores the term *darśana*, which refers to ‘seeing’ or ‘view,’ and its relationship to the European notion of philosophy. He also examines the term *ānvīkṣikī*, which is used in the *Arthaśāstra* and actually means ‘investigation through reasoning,’ and its potential as a terminological equivalent to ‘philosophy.’ Halbfass notes that H. Jacobi suggested this term as an equivalent to ‘philosophy,’ but concludes that, in terms of its overall historical role, it can hardly be considered equivalent to it (Halbfass 1988, p. 285).

doxographic, neutral, and only sometimes pejorative meaning of ‘view’ or ‘theory’ (Halbfass 1988, p. 265f).

Indian literature lacks a historiographical presentation of Indian philosophical traditions. However, it is generally accepted that there are six *darśanas* or orthodox (*āstika*) ‘views’ or philosophies, namely Nyāya, Vaiśeṣika, Sāṃkhya, Yoga, Mīmāṃsā, and Vedānta. Non-orthodox (*nāstika*) traditions would be Jainism, Buddhism and materialism. Most titles of Indian doxographic works contain the Sanskrit word for ‘all’ (*sarva*) or, more specifically, ‘six’ (*ṣaṭ*). Examples are the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* by Mādhava Vidyāraṇya, *Sarvadarśanakaumudī* by Mādhava Sarasvatī, *Sarvamatasamgraha* by Rāghavānanda, *Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccaya* by Haribhadra, *Ṣaḍdarśananirṇaya* by Merutuṅga, etc. Many of these works were authored by Jainas and Advaita Vedāntins.⁸ It is noteworthy that Jaina doxographies lack a systematic order in presenting philosophies, while the Vedāntins have chosen a hierarchical order where Advaita Vedānta is always placed at the apex and the proponents of the materialist tradition, the Lokāyatas or Cārvākas, together with their tradition, are placed at the lowest position.⁹ This approach of doxographic presentation by Advaita Vedānta authors, with a strong hierarchical order and the culmination of other philosophies in their own, is called the ‘inclusivistic model’ by Halbfass (Halbfass 1988, p. 356). For example, in the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* by Mādhava Vidyāraṇya (ca. 1350 CE), sixteen teachings are presented,¹⁰ whereas a sixfold division of philosophies is not customary for Vedāntins. The hierarchy starts with the materialists and other non-orthodox (*nāstika*) teachings, and Advaita Vedānta is placed at the end, suggesting that it is the culmination of all other traditions. The

⁸ Haribhadra and Merutuṅga are Jainas, Mādhava Vidyāraṇya, Mādhava Sarasvatī and Rāghavānanda are Advaita Vedāntins. According to Qvarnström, the initial phase of the later developed historical accounts of Indian philosophies can mainly be traced back to the Jaina and Buddhist canons. These scriptures provide information about the contemporary religious and philosophical ideas prevalent during their time. Qvarnström refers to two authors of these scriptures, namely the *Sūtrakṛtāṅgasūtra* and *Dīghanikāya* (Qvarnström 1999, p. 171). Furthermore, Qvarnström observes that doxographic treatises are primarily found in the Mādhyamika tradition of Mahāyāna Buddhism, the Śvetāmbara tradition of Jainism, and the Advaita Vedānta tradition of Brāhmaṇism (Qvarnström 1999, p. 174).

⁹ Qvarnström proposes a categorization of doxographic works into three distinct types. The first two types aim to present an author’s doctrinal position in relation to that of his opponents. The first type involves a fictitious dialogue between the author and the respective opponent, whereas the second type presents the opponent’s teaching in the first part of a given chapter, referred to as *pūrvapakṣa*, followed by the author’s response or critique in the second part, called *uttarapakṣa*. The third type of doxographies, on the other hand, outlines one philosophical tradition after the other in separate chapters. Examples of these categories can be found in doxographic texts of the Mādhyamika tradition of Mahāyāna Buddhism, the Śvetāmbara tradition of Jainism, and the Advaita Vedānta tradition of Brāhmaṇism (Qvarnström 1999, p. 174).

¹⁰ They are called Cārvāka, Bauddha, Ārhata, Rāmānuja, Pūrṇaprajña, Nakulīśa-Pāśupata, Śaiva, Pratyabhijñā, Raseśvara, Vaiśeṣika, Nyāya, Jaiminiya, Pāṇinīya, Sāṃkhya, Yoga, and Advaita Vedānta.

Jain doxographies present six philosophical teachings, while Vedantic doxographies classify philosophical teachings into two groups: the Vedic or orthodox (*āstika*) and the non-Vedic or non-orthodox, i.e., heterodox (*nāstika*) (Halbfass 1988, p. 353). This classification determines the acceptance of the authority of the Vedas as a criterion to be considered orthodox, which excludes rivals such as the materialists, Buddhists, and Jainas. However, the *āstika*–*nāstika* distinction is not a fixed mode of classification and is used differently according to the context. For instance, Haribhadra distinguishes between *āstikas* and *nāstikas* in a different way when he emphasizes that he provides a summary of traditions that are all *āstikavādas* (‘positive teachings’), by which he refers to the traditions of those who believe in *karman* and rebirth (Qvarnström 1999, p. 181).

In the following, I will present an overview of the various interpretations of the term *duḥkha* across *āstika* and *nāstika* philosophical traditions.¹¹ The term can be traced back to the Vedic and Upaniṣadic periods, where some references can be found. However, the meaning of *duḥkha* in the Vedic period is not equivalent to the later understanding of it. During the Upaniṣadic period,¹² the term *duḥkha* was utilized with varying connotations, ranging from the use as a simple adjective or adverb meaning ‘difficult,’ to the enumeration as a noun in the characterization of emotions and experiences, among others. According to Younger, the manifold usage of the terms *sukha* and *duḥkha* in the early Upaniṣads highlights a creative period in Indian theology (Younger 1969, p. 68).¹³

Thus, it appears that before the emergence of rival religio-philosophical traditions to the orthodox-brahminical tradition, there were no specific connotations of the term *duḥkha* relating the notion of suffering to the concept of liberation. With the emergence of Ājīvikism, Buddhism and Jainism, the belief in rebirth and karmic retribution was emphasised in the non-

¹¹ The interpretation of *duḥkha* in the different traditions of Vedānta will not be considered here. The text of Bādarāyaṇa’s *Brahmasūtra* does not provide a precise elucidation of *duḥkha*. Nonetheless, a considerable amount of commentarial literature exists on it, but its examination is beyond the scope of this Master’s thesis.

¹² It is almost impossible to find an exact date of the older Upaniṣads. Possible factors in the determination of their dates are the relationship with early Buddhist literature, and references to kings and their courts; see Cohen 2018, p. 13. Olivelle places Bṛhadāraṇyaka and Chāndogya as the two earliest Upaniṣads in the seventh to sixth centuries BCE, and assigns Taittirīya, Aitareya and Kauṣītaki to the sixth to fifth centuries BCE. According to him, Katha, Īśa, Śvetāśvatara and Muṇḍaka were probably composed in the last few centuries BCE, Praśna and Māṇḍūkya at the beginning of the common era. See Olivelle 1998, pp. 12-13.

¹³ Because of the extent of early Upaniṣadic literature, a survey of the usages and interpretations of the term *duḥkha* is beyond the scope of this thesis. For more information, see Younger 1969, pp. 39-79.

orthodox-brahminical traditions and great importance was given to the role of suffering, with the widely used term *duḥkha*, in connection with it (Bronkhorst 2007, p. 15).

Ājīvikism

The development of the term *duḥkha* appears to have started in the pre-Buddhist and Buddhist period, specifically with the Ājīvikas (Younger 1969, p. 142). The founder of the Ājīvika tradition, Makkhali Gosāla, may have lived between the fourth and second century BCE (Balcerowicz 2022, p. 65f). However, determining the precise concept of *duḥkha* in Ājīvika thought is challenging as all available information on their beliefs comes from literature written by non-Ājīvika authors, mostly from Jaina and Buddhist works, fables and narrative literature (Balcerowicz 2022, p. 109).¹⁴ According to these rival sources, for the Ājīvikas suffering (*duḥkha*) was conceived as atom-like particles (Younger 1969, p. 142). In their interpretation, everything was predetermined by the universal principle of destiny (*niyati*), and suffering was also predetermined. In Ājīvika metaphysics, everything was composed of atoms, and qualities emerging from aggregates of atoms, and the aggregation and nature of these atoms predetermined by destiny (Balcerowicz 2022, p. 74f.).

Jainism

The founder of Jainism, called Jina or Mahāvīra, was born around 549 BCE (Frauwallner 1953, p. 251). According to the Jaina teachings, there is an infinite number of souls (*jīva*). As a consequence of all activity in thought, word and deed, fine matter flows into the soul and settles there. This matter is known as *karman* and causes the bondage of the soul. It determines the pleasure and suffering that are allotted to the individual. Through the experience of pleasure and suffering in new births, the retribution for the good and evil deeds that had been done earlier takes place, and the old *karman* is thereby erased, that is, the matter in which it consists is expelled from the soul (Frauwallner 1953, p. 252f.). Every activity in life causes *karman* and leads to renewed existence. Every new birth brings with it a new activity and *karman*, and so it goes on in an endless sequence. Hence, suffering is caused by the different *karmans* of the individual living beings. The remedy to end suffering would be a way to obstruct the production of *karman*. In Jainism, this is done by the practice of asceticism, abstaining from food and preparing for death in a position that is motionless as possible (Bronkhorst 2007, p. 18). This

¹⁴ For more on the Ājīvikas, see Basham 1951 and Bronkhorst 2007.

should effect the annihilation of former *karman* and the non-production of new *karman* through the performance of new actions.

Buddhism

Among these non-Brahmanical traditions, Buddhism is probably the best-known tradition when it comes to the notion of suffering, especially through the Buddha's famous statement 'everything is suffering.' However, this kind of "pessimism" is provisional and not final, as the Buddha also points out the path to the cessation of suffering that leads to the state of liberation, namely *nirvāṇa*.

The Buddhist canon or *Tripitaka* is an important early source that clearly presents the centrality of the theological concept of suffering (Younger 1969, p. 81). *Duḥkha* is a central motif of the Buddha's Four Noble Truths: 1) there is suffering, 2) there is a cause of suffering 3) there is the cessation of suffering, 4) there is a path leading to the cessation of suffering. The sites of suffering were disease, old age and death (Frauwallner 1953, p. 183). The cause of suffering is the "thirst" that eventually leads to rebirth. The cessation of suffering is the complete rejection and abolition of this thirst. It is believed that suffering arises from craving and attachment to things and can be overcome through the practice of the Eightfold Path.¹⁵ The term *duḥkha* refers to the inherent suffering that arises from being alive, as well as to the suffering that arises from attempts to hold on to things that are impermanent.

As has been sketched above, there are various concepts of suffering in the non-Brahmanical traditions, from having the shape of an atomic particle predetermined by destiny to being caused by different actions or birth itself. In the Brahmanical traditions, we come across further concepts and classifications of *duḥkha*.

Sāṃkhya and Yoga

The Sāṃkhya notion of suffering is not presented in the following, as the second part of this thesis is dedicated to it and the threefold classification of *duḥkha*. The Yoga tradition of the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* transmits the same classification of three kinds of suffering, which is also not explained here, but treated below. In the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* (PYŚ) itself, the author, commonly called Patañjali, refers to suffering in the second "quarter," the *Sādhana-pāda*. He

¹⁵ The eightfold path consists of right view, right thinking, right speaking, right acting, right livelihood, right effort, right mindfulness and right concentration; see Frauwallner 1953, p. 184. For more on suffering in Buddhism, see Kumar 2003 and Harvey 2012, Chapter 3, pp. 50-87.

begins with listing certain practices aimed at attaining *samādhi* and reducing afflictions (*kleśas*) in the *sūtras*, and then explains the five afflictions, one of which, aversion (*dveṣa*), he subsequently defines as “aversion is that which adheres to / closely follows [the experience of] suffering” (PYŚ 2.8: *duḥkhānuśayī dveṣaḥ*). Furthermore, in PYŚ 2.15 we find a further classification of suffering, which, like the abovementioned notion of the afflictions, clearly shows the close relationship of the PYŚ with the Buddhist tradition:

pariṇāmatāpasamṣkāraduḥkhair guṇavṛttivirodhāc ca duḥkham eva sarvaṃ vivekinaḥ.

Through the suffering of transformation, misery and dispositions, and because of the contrariety of the functions of the qualities (*guṇas*), everything is just suffering for the one who is characterized by discrimination.

According to the commentary,¹⁶ the first compound refers to three types of suffering: suffering related to transformation (*pariṇāmaduḥkha*), suffering related to misery (*tāpaduḥkha*), and suffering related to dispositions (*samṣkāraduḥkha*). The first type occurs when individuals seek pleasure from certain objects and become addicted to them, inasmuch as the thirst of their senses cannot be eliminated once desires continue to grow following the repeated experience of pleasure. Once addicted in this way and seeking further pleasure, they become submerged in a large swamp of even greater suffering, similar to someone who, afraid of scorpions, has been bitten by a much more poisonous snake. The second type of suffering arises when individuals strive towards means to obtain pleasure and in the course of their efforts support or harm others and thus heap up merit or demerit, caused by greed and delusion. The third type of suffering is explained as follows. An individual develops a disposition towards pleasure and pain that is the subtle consequence of one’s earlier experience of pleasure and pain. In this way, when one experiences the maturation of one’s earlier actions, be it in the form of pleasure or pain, further subtle consequences of one’s action are accumulated, which amounts to a beginningless stream of suffering. Additionally, suffering arises due to the contrariety of the function of the qualities (*guṇas*). The three qualities as found in its first evolute, called Intellect (*buddhi*), are of a different form and operate unsteadily in a different manner; therefore, the mind is said to be characterized by quick transformation. Consequently, they are in contradiction to each other as regards their form and functioning. At the same time, these

¹⁶ Āgāśe 1904, p. 75, l3 – p. 76, 8.

qualities are all of the same form inasmuch as they produce the concepts of pleasure, suffering, and delusion in mutual dependence on each other. Their difference, however, is due to their being principally the respective quality.

Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika

In the related Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika philosophical traditions, suffering is considered an essential part of the respective classificatory system. In the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* (VS), according to the tradition composed by Kaṇāda, suffering (*duḥkha*) is included among the seventeen qualities (*guṇas*),¹⁷ which constitute the second of six categories (*padārtha*)¹⁸ that comprises everything that can be cognized and named. Suffering is also mentioned as one of the marks of the Self (*ātman*).¹⁹ In chapter 5, which discusses motion, there is a characterization of *yoga* as the state in which a person, while still possessing a body, experiences neither pleasure nor suffering, a state that is achieved by the dwelling of the mind in or on the Self.²⁰

In the *Nyāyasūtra* (NS), in the first chapter suffering (*duḥkha*) is listed as one of the twelve *prameyas*, i.e., objects of valid knowledge, which constitute the second of the sixteen categories (*padārthas*).²¹ According to Nyāya, liberation is achieved when the respectively earlier one among suffering, embodied existence, activity, faults and false knowledge ceases, due to the cessation of what immediately follows it, respectively.²² As in Vaiśeṣika, suffering is listed as a mark of the Self (*ātman*).²³ In the same chapter, a characterization of suffering is provided, namely “suffering is that which has the defining characteristic of distress.”

¹⁷ VS 1.1.5 (Jambuvijaya 1961, p. 2): *rūparasagandhasparśāḥ samkhyāḥ parimāṇāni pṛthaktvaṃ samyogavibhāgau paratvāparatve buddhayaḥ sukhaduḥkhe icchādveṣau prayatnāś ca guṇāḥ*.

The qualities are color, taste, smell, touch/ temperature, numbers, dimensions, separateness, conjunction and disjunction, distance and proximity, cognitions, pleasure and suffering, desire and aversion, and effort.

¹⁸ Substance (*dravya*), quality (*guṇa*), motion (*karman*), commonality (*sāmānya*), particularity (*viśeṣa*) and inherence (*samavāya*).

¹⁹ VS 3.2.4 (Jambuvijaya 1961, p. 28): *prāṇāpānanimeṣonmeṣajīvanamanogatīndriyāntaravikārāḥ sukhaduḥkhe icchādveṣau prayatnāś cety ātmaliṅgāni*.

²⁰ See Preisendanz 2018b.

²¹ NS 1.1.9 (Thakur 1997, p. 15): *ātmaśarīrendriyārthabuddhimanahpravṛttidoṣapretyabhāvaphaladuḥkhāpavargās tu prameyam*.

The object of valid cognition [comprises] the Self, the body, the senses, the objects [of the senses], cognition, the mind, activity, the faults, transmigration, the result, suffering [and] liberation.

²² Ibid. p. 3: NS 1.1.2: *duḥkhajanmapravṛttidoṣamithyājñānānām uttarottarāpāye tadanantarāpāyād apavargah*.

²³ Ibid. p. 16: NS 1.1.10: *icchādveṣaprayatnasukhaduḥkhajñānāny ātmano liṅgam iti*.

Immediately afterwards it is stated that “liberation is the absolute freedom from that.”²⁴ In the fourth chapter of the *Nyāyasūtra*, the topic of *duḥkha* is addressed again: “The arising of embodied existence is nothing but suffering due to [its] connection with various kinds of distress.”²⁵ In a following *sūtra* this is defended: “And since there is the [erroneous] imagination of pleasure with respect to a [certain] variety of suffering [it is not correct to object that the above statement is not appropriate because in between also pleasure comes about].”²⁶ If we erroneously perceive the pleasure we may experience as actual pleasure, we will not be able to understand that suffering comes with physical existence and strive at attaining liberation.

Mīmāṃsā

Mīmāṃsā philosophy is based on the *Mīmāṃsāsūtra* (MSū) which is traditionally attributed to Jaimini. The oldest preserved commentary on it is Śabarasvāmin’s *Bhāṣya*, which is tentatively dated between the third and fifth CE (Freschi 2018, p. 149). A reference to suffering can be found in the commentary on MSū 3.8.9²⁷ where Śabara, as he is briefly called, explains that austerity is suffering (*duḥkha*), and suffering the result of demerit (*adharma*) which, for its part, is an obstacle to the desired result of performing the prescribed rituals, for in general it does no good. Because demerit can be removed by way of the experience of its result, austerity is prescribed inasmuch as the experience of the suffering produced by the performance of austerities actually annihilates the suffering that is the effect of demerit.

1.2. The tree kinds of suffering

As shown above, the term *duḥkha* refers to diverse concepts of suffering within the scope of Indian religious and philosophical thought, depending on the historical and textual context. One established and widely recognized classification of suffering is its division into three types, sometimes collectively referred to as *duḥkhatraya*. These three types are known as *ādhyātmika*, *ādhibhautika* and *ādhidaivika*.

²⁴ Ibid. p. 21: NS 1.1.21: *bāddhanālakṣaṇaṃ duḥkham*, and NS 1.1.22: *tadatyantavimokṣo ’pavargaḥ*.

²⁵ Ibid. p. 245: NS 4.1.55: *vividhabāddhanāyogād duḥkham eva janmotpattiḥ*.

²⁶ Ibid. p. 247: NS 4.1.58: *duḥkhavikalpe sukhābhimānāc ca*.

²⁷ Bhaṭṭācārya 1883, p. 453, 9-14: *duḥkham hi tapaḥ, duḥkham cādharmaphalam*.

The three adjectives *ādhyātmika*, *ādhibhautika* and *ādhidaivika* are derived from compounds with the preverb *adhi* as their first member. *adhi* has a range of meanings including ‘with reference to,’ ‘concerning’ and ‘belonging to,’ and in nominal composition can be compounded with any noun or adjective. The addition of the *taddhita* affix *-ka* occasions the *vrddhi* form of the initial vowels of both the first and second member of the underlying compound and refers to something that ‘pertains to’ or ‘relates to’ that which is referred to by the underlying compound. The adjective *ādhyātmika*, derived from *adhyātma*, ‘referring to,’ ‘concerning’ or ‘belonging to the Self (*ātman*),’ is therefore translated as ‘relating to something that belongs to the Self.’ As for *ādhibhautika*, the perfect passive participle *bhūta*, ‘has become,’ refers, as a noun, to what has become, that is, to a material being or element, or to a living being.’ However, from the literature surveyed in this thesis it is clear that in the present context *bhūta* refers to living beings. The adjective *ādhibhautika* is therefore translated as ‘relating to something that belongs to living beings.’ The case of *ādhidaivika* is ambiguous inasmuch as *daiva* could be a *vrddhi* form of an underlying *deva*, ‘god,’ or *div*, ‘heaven,’ and one could therefore understand *ādhidaivika* to mean ‘relating to something that belongs to the gods’ or ‘relating to something that belongs to heaven.’ What ‘belongs to the gods,’ however, is something ‘divine,’ and what ‘belongs to heaven’ is something ‘celestial,’ which are both meanings of the adjective *daiva*. This would amount to ‘relating to something divine’ or ‘relating to something celestial’ as the meaning of *ādhidaivika*. Alternatively, like in the case of *adhyātma*, with an initial *vrddhi* vowel of the second member of the compound which serves as the basis of the derivation *ādhyātmika*, the underlying compound could already have had the form *adhidaiva*, ‘belonging to something divine’ or ‘belonging to something celestial.’ In this case, the adjective *ādhidaivika* would mean ‘relating to something that belongs to the divine’ or ‘relating something that relates to the celestial.’ Due to this double ambiguity and because of the different interpretations found in the literature, especially the commentaries, studied in this thesis, I will leave the term *daiva* untranslated.

The origin of the three terms may eventually be traced to the Brāhmaṇas and early Upaniṣads. For example, the *Taittirīyopaniṣad* (1.7)²⁸ shows that the world can be analysed with reference

²⁸ Limaye 1958, p. 52: *prthivy antarikṣaṃ dyaus diśo 'vāntaradiśāḥ. agnir vāyur ādityaś candramā nakṣatrāṇi. āpa oṣadhayo vanaspataya ākāśa ātmā. ity adhibhūtam. athādhyātmam – prāṇo vyāno 'pāna udānaḥ samānaḥ. cakṣuḥ śrotraṃ mano vāk tvak. carma māṃsaṃ snāvāsthi majjā. etad adhividhāya ṛṣir avocat – paṃktaṃ vā idaṃ sarvaṃ. paṃktenaiva paṃktaṃ sprṇotīti.*

Earth, the space in between, heaven, the directions [and] the intermediate directions; fire, wind, the sun, the moon, [and] the stars; the waters, plants, trees, space [and] the [material] Self: [this is an analysis] with

to what has become, i.e., in this context, to materials beings or elements (*adhibhūta*), and with reference to oneself, i.e., in this context, to the material Self or body (*adhyātma*). In each case, a further distinction in fivefold groups can be made. Moreover, the triad *adhyātma*, *adhibhūta* and *adhidaivata* occurs in the *Mahābhārata* where the term *adhyātma* refers to 13 faculties as that which belongs to the Self, i.e., to the thirteenfold cognitive–sensory apparatus according to Sāṃkhya, the term *adhibhūta* is applied to the range of objects of their activity as that which belongs to the material elements, and the *adhidaivata* refers to the respective deities associated with them as that which belongs to the divine.²⁹ A similar exposition is found in Śimānanda’s *Sāṃkhyatattvavivecana* on *Tattvasamāsasūtra* 7 (*adhyātmam adhibhūtam adhidaivatam ca*):³⁰

Intellect, “I” consciousness, mind, the faculty of hearing [and] touch as well as sight, taste, smell, the faculties of motion, excretion and procreation are technically called “that which belongs to the Self.”³¹

That which belongs to the material elements is, in due order, that which is intelligible and certainly that which is contemplable, that which is imaginable, that which is audible, that which is touchable and certainly that which is visible, that which is tastable, that which is smellable, that which is approachable and that which is excretable, [and] that which is enjoyable. In this way that which belongs to the material elements has been proclaimed.³²

And that which belongs to the divine is Brahma, Rudra and Candra, Ether and certainly Vāyu, Sūrya, Varuṇa and Indra, Viṣṇu and Mitra as well. In precisely this

reference to the [material] elements. Now with reference to the [material] Self: vital air [that streams] forth, vital air diffused [throughout the whole body], vital air [that streams] downwards, vital air [that streams] upwards [and] vital air [that streams] together; the senses of sight, hearing, thinking, speech [and] touch; skin, flesh, sinew[s], bone[s] [and] marrow. The sage, having settled this in detail, declared that all this here (i.e., the whole world) is indeed fivefold [and] that one acquires the fivefold [world] precisely through what is fivefold.

²⁹ See *Mahābhārata* (crit. ed.), Vol.15: *Śāntiparvan* 301.1-13, and Steiner 2007, p. 515.

³⁰ p. 15, 15 – p. 16, 20: *buddhyāhaṅkāramanasī śrotram tvak cakṣuṣī tathā | jihvā ghrāṇam pādapāyūpastham adhyātmamajñitam || [...] adhibhūtam – yathākrameṇa boddhavyam abhimantavyam eva ca | saṅkalpitavyam śrotavyam spraṣṭavyam draṣṭavyam eva ca || rasayitavyam ghrātavyam gantavyam utsraṣṭavyam ca | ānandayitavyam ity evam adhibhūtam prakīrtitam || adhidaivatam ca – brahmā rudraś candramāś ca ākāśo vāyur eva ca || sūryo varuṇa indraś ca viṣṇur mitram tathaiḥ ca || anenaiva krameṇedaṃ samproktam adhidaivatam |* It has to be noted that some verses are metrically incorrect.

A similar classification and identification can be found in the *Sāṃkhyasūtravivaraṇa* p. 107, 10 – p. 198, 12.

³¹ In this list, reference to the faculties of grasping or doing (*hasta* or *pāṇi*) and of speech (*vāc*) have been left out; thus, only eleven items have been enumerated.

³² In this list, reference to what is graspable or doable and to what is speakable has been left out, in accordance with the preceding list of faculties.

order this here has been declared comprehensively, namely that which belongs to the divine.³³

In the adduced sources, the three terms *adhyātma*, *adhibhūta* and *adhidaivata* are related to creation and analysis of the created world rather than to suffering. Therefore, in this context *bhūta* in the term *adhibhūta* is better understood as relating to material beings or elements of the world than to living beings. *Sāṃkhyakārikā* (SK) 53³⁴ describes eight kinds of divine (*daiva*) creation, five kinds of animal (*tairyagyona*) creation and one kind of human (*mānuṣya*) creation. Together, these three kinds constitute the material world. Some commentaries on SK 53 explain the categories of divine and animal creation in partial correspondence with their explanations of the categories of *ādhidaivika* and *ādhibhautika* suffering. Specifically, the eight divine kinds of creation are associated with Brahma, Prajāpati, Soma (i.e., Candra or Candramas), Indra, the *gandharvas*, *yakṣas*, *rakṣases* and *piśācas*, while the five kinds of animal creation include domestic and wild animals, winged and crawling animals, and stationary beings.³⁵

In conclusion, it should be emphasized that the double *vṛddhi* formations, namely *ādhyātmika*, *ādhibhautika* and *ādhidaivika*, are used only in connection with the three types of suffering, whereas the underlying terms appear to pertain to expositions on the creation of the world and its analysis.

³³ This list consists of only ten items, that is, altogether three deities have been omitted. If one compares the list with the identification of the associated deities in the similar exposition in *Mahābhārata*, *Śāntiparvan* 301.1-13 and takes some justifiable modifications into consideration, it turns out that deities for the faculties of excretion, speech – which has been omitted in the first list – and smell are missing, whereas a deity for the faculty of grasping or doing, which has *not* been included in the first list, namely Indra, is mentioned.

³⁴ Esnoul 1964, p. 65, 9-12.

³⁵ This enumeration is presented in the *Gauḍapādabhāṣya*; see Esnoul 1964, p. 65, 12-17. The enumeration of divine creation in the *Yuktidīpikā* is slightly different: Brahma, Prajāpati, Indra, the Fathers (*pitṛ*), *gandharvas*, *nāgas*, *rakṣases* and *piśācas*; see Wezler & Motegi 1998, p. 256, 13-14. Māṭhara has a similar enumeration; instead of the *nāgas*, he enumerates the *yākṣas*; see Śarmā 1970, p. 52, 12-13. V1 presents the same enumeration as Māṭhara; see Solomon 1973, p. 67, line 21 – p. 68, line 1. In V2, the relevant leaves are missing; see Solomon 1973, p. 58. The *Jayamaṅgalā* enumerates Brahma, Prajāpati, Sūrya, *asuras*, *gandharvas*, *yakṣas*, *rakṣases* and *piśācas*; see Śarmā 1970, p. 109, 1-2. Vācaspatimiśra, in his *Sāṃkhyatattvakaumudī*, refers to Brahma, Prajāpati, Indra, the Fathers, *gandharvas*, *yakṣas*, *rakṣases* and *piśācas*; see Srinivasan 1967, p. 162, line 1. In the enumeration of causes of *ādhidaivika* suffering in Sāṃkhya sources, only *yakṣas* and *rākṣasas* occur, and in the selected Purāṇas *rākṣasas* and *piśācas* are listed as causes of *ādhibhautika* suffering; see Table 3, p. 73 and Table 4, p. 77.

1.3. Method and Aim of This Study

The aim of this Master's thesis is to analyze and discuss in detail the threefold classification of suffering and its explanation in various Sanskrit works. In selecting relevant passages for translation and treatment, next to the references to pertinent works provided in several colloquia for advanced students in the philosophies and religions of South Asia, and those found in the pertinent secondary literature, the Digital Corpus of Sanskrit, an online search machine, was utilized to locate relevant passages in further sources that refer to the three kinds of suffering. The eventual choice of sources was based on the wish to highlight the diversity of relevant genres and religio-philosophical backgrounds.

The *Sāṃkhyakārikā* (SK) of Īśvarakṛṣṇa, the most significant classical work of the Sāṃkhya tradition, has been selected as the primary text for this thesis, along with its commentaries. The reason for this is the opening verse SK 1, which emphasizes the necessity of the absolute elimination of the triad of suffering. Furthermore, the commentaries on the SK provide detailed explanations of this classification, in contrast to the other selected passages from Sāṃkhya works. Additionally, works of the classical Yoga philosophy, the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* and its commentaries, have been considered because Sāṃkhya and Yoga philosophy share many concepts. Furthermore, passages from Kauṇḍinya's commentary on the *Pāśupatasūtra* and the *Brahmapurāṇa* and *Viṣṇupurāṇa* were translated to identify similarities and differences in the explanations of the three kinds of suffering across different traditions, as was a passage from the *Suśrutasamhitā* inasmuch as classical Āyurveda shares some concepts with Sāṃkhya philosophy.

Following the translation of the selected passages, an analysis and evaluation of the relevant passages are presented in the form of tables. This tabular presentation offers a clear and concise representation of the classification and explication of the triad of suffering, allowing for an easy identification of similarities, parallels and differences between the relevant sources.

This thesis aims to contribute to a better understanding of the three kinds of suffering and to provide a clear overview of their interpretation and exemplification in various Sanskrit works. It is intended to facilitate further research on the topic of suffering, particularly with respect to its triple taxonomy. Next to general literature on Sāṃkhya where the topic is briefly treated, two scholarly papers specifically address it: "The Triple Suffering" (Rusza 1997) and "Das dreifache Leiden in Sāṃkhyakārikā 1" (Steiner 2007). By translating, analyzing and evaluating

selected passages from Sāṃkhya philosophy, the Pāśupata tradition, the tradition of the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra*, the *Brahmapurāṇa* and *Viṣṇupurāṇa*, and the tradition of Āyurveda, this thesis aims to present a comprehensive picture of the concept of triple suffering as it developed in the different traditions, and to identify similarities and differences among the selected sources.

2. Translations of selected passages

2.1. Sāṃkhya

The classical philosophical system of the Sāṃkhya tradition is known as the teaching described in the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* (SK) of Īśvarakṛṣṇa. Before the historical development of Sāṃkhya philosophy is discussed here, the meaning of the term *sāṃkhya* should be explained.

The term *sāṃkhya*, derives from the word *saṃkhyā*, a noun which means ‘number.’ *sāṃkhya* as an adjective means ‘relating to number,’ ‘calculating,’ ‘reasoning.’ As a neuter noun, it also refers to a particular philosophical tradition, and as a masculine noun, to someone who calculates, enumerates, etc., or to a follower of Sāṃkhya philosophy.³⁶ The verbal root *√khyā* means ‘to perceive,’ ‘to know’; with the prefix *sa-* meaning ‘complete’ the verb would have the meaning ‘to perceive comprehensively/completely.’³⁷ Since the classical Sāṃkhya philosophy is known for its enumeration of twenty-five *tattvas*,³⁸ it may have been called Sāṃkhya for this reason.

Sāṃkhya refers to the tradition of philosophers who were convinced that it is possible to comprehend the world as a system of interaction between two realms of being, namely *puruṣa* (pure consciousness) and *prakṛti* (primordial matter). Sāṃkhya is based on an ontological dualism, i.e., there are only two kinds of entities in the world: *puruṣa*, which is inactive and perceptive, and *prakṛti*, which is unconscious but active and productive. *Prakṛti* consists of three *guṇas* (qualities): *sattva* (lightweight and illuminating), *rajas* (stimulating and moving) and *tamas* (heavy and enveloping).³⁹ This ontological distinction, which explains the world as an interplay between these two different ontological realms, is one of the fundamental features of Sāṃkhya. *Puruṣa* and *prakṛti* are the two ultimate ontological principles and distinct from

³⁶ See Apte 1890, p. 1113, Edgerton 1924, p. 7, Chakravarti 1951, pp. 1ff., Larson & Bhattacharya 1987, p. 3.

³⁷ See Chakravarti 1951, p. 3.

³⁸ The 25 *tattvas* of classical Sāṃkhya are: *puruṣa*, *prakṛti*, a set of three *antaḥkaraṇas*, ‘inner instruments,’ i.e., *buddhi* (intellect) *ahaṃkāra* (I consciousness) and *manas* (mind), five *buddhīndriyas* (sense capacities), five *karmendriyas* (action capacities), five *tanmātras* (subtle elements) and five *mahābhūtas* (gross elements).

³⁹ More on the *guṇas*, see Larson & Bhattacharya 1987, p. 65f. The translation of the three terms is taken from Jacobsen’s 2018 entry on Sāṃkhya in *Brill’s Online Encyclopedia of Hinduism*.

each other. The separateness of *puruṣa* from *prakṛti* and the realization of their separateness by means of knowledge have remained the two central doctrines in Sāṃkhya.

Just as Īśvarakṛṣṇa's name became famous for his compilation of the SK, for the very foundation of the Sāṃkhya tradition, sage Kapila became an eminent personality. The figure by name of Kapila was recognized as divine by a part of the population of Greater Magadha. He was best known as the sage to whom the creation of the philosophical Sāṃkhya tradition is attributed (Bronkhorst 2007, p. 61f). A commentary on the SK, the *Māṭharavṛtti*, describes Kapila as follows:

For here [in this world], the venerable great sage, as the descending manifestation of the venerable Old Man which is endowed with innate merit, knowledge, absence of passion and mastery, with the desire to show favor to the world became the son of Prajāpati Kardama in Devahūti, the daughter of Svāyambhu Manu, called Kapila. He saw this world here drowning in deep darkness, with the desire to show [it] the other shore (i.e., limit) of what is without another shore (i.e., limitless) through this knowledge which has the form of the apprehension of the difference between the *guṇas* (the three constituents of primordial matter) and *puruṣa*, which is like a handle, inasmuch as he was endowed with the realization which is like a nectar jewel for the world that is intensively bitten by the snake which is Time, which is like a proper herb for the removal of the disease which is worldly being which is difficult to be healed, which is like a lamp that destroys the darkness which is ignorance, which is like an axe which cuts apart the thee which is delusion which obstructs of the path towards the liberation.⁴⁰

Other commentators describe Kapila as a person with a divine nature.⁴¹ Beside Kapila, two teachers are often referred to as important followers of Sāṃkhya, namely Āsuri and

⁴⁰ *Māṭharavṛtti*, Śarmā 1970, p. 1, 12-19: *iha hi bhagavān maharṣiḥ sāmśiddhikadharmajñānavairāgyaiśvāryasampanno bhagavataḥ purāṇapuruṣasyāvatāro jagadamujighrṛksayā prajāpateḥ kardamasya putraḥ svāyambhuvasya manor duhitari devahūtyām kapilo nāma babhūva. sa tena guṇapuruṣāntaro-palabdhirūpeṇa jñānenāpārapāraṃ didarśiṣayā hastāvalambeneva, kālāhidandaśyamānajaṅgataḥ sudhāmaṇineva, duścikitsyasya bhavavyādher apanayanāya samyagauśadheneva, avidyāndhakārapradhvaṃsanapradīpeneva, muktimārgavirodhimohavṛkṣavivraścanakuṭhāreṇevāmunāvabodhena sampanno 'ndhe tamasi majjaj jagad idam adrākṣīt.*

The metaphor “which is like a handle” suggests that the specified knowledge is a tool one can hold on to, that is, a means by which one can attain liberation.

⁴¹ For the description of Kapila by other Sāṃkhya commentators, see Larson & Bhattacharya 1987, pp. 107-112. and Bronkhorst 2007, p. 62. More about Kapila can also be found in the *Mahābhārata* and the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*; see the references in Chakravarti 1951, p. 111.

Pañcaśikha.⁴² Āsuri is the first disciple of Kapila who appeared three times to him to impart the knowledge of Sāṃkhya.⁴³ From Āsuri, Pañcaśikha obtained the knowledge of Sāṃkhya; he was probably the author of the Sāṃkhya work *Śaṣṭitantra* ('Treatise on the Sixty [Topics]').⁴⁴ However, while some authorities attribute the authorship of the *Śaṣṭitantra* to Pañcaśikha, based on the ascription made in the tradition itself, it is more likely that Vṛṣagaṇa was the actual author (Oberhammer 1960, p. 71). Unfortunately, only a small number of fragments of this work and references to it have survived. Frauwallner aimed to reconstruct the beginning of the *Śaṣṭitantra* in his study *Zur Erkenntnislehre des klassischen Sāṃkhya-Systems*,⁴⁵ by utilizing evidence from Jinendrabuddhi's *Pramāṇasamuccayaṭīkā* and Siṃhasūri's *Nyāyāgamānusāriṇī*. Frauwallner strategically reconstructed the name of the author of the *Śaṣṭitantra* as Vṛṣagaṇa, perhaps because his followers are commonly referred to as *vārṣagaṇāḥ* in the *Yuktidīpikā*.

Motegi's important article on Pañcaśikha asserts that the *Mahābhārata* (MBh) is the primary source of information on this figure, a type of ascetic (Motegi 1999, p. 514). Motegi observes that there is no discernible connection between the ideas ascribed to Pañcaśikha and the fundamental concepts of Sāṃkhya, which makes it challenging to place him in the history of Sāṃkhya philosophy.⁴⁶ Motegi also suspects that later efforts may have distorted the text (*Mokṣadharmā*) to depict Pañcaśikha as a Sāṃkhya thinker. In contrast, Vācaspatiśrī, in his *Tattvavaiśārādī*, regards Pañcaśikha as a Yoga teacher rather than a Sāṃkhya teacher, whereas the *Sāṃkhyasūtra* and its commentators reckon Pañcaśikha as a prominent Sāṃkhya teacher. This raises the possibility that a new conception of Pañcaśikha may have arisen concurrently with the revival of Sāṃkhya (Motegi 1999, p. 533). Oberhammer's conclusion, however, is that during the Sāṃkhya renaissance, the only remaining evidence of the old tradition was the epic depiction of Pañcaśikha (Oberhammer 1960, p. 90).

Consideration of the usage of the word *sāṃkhya* and its development in non-Sāṃkhya literature need not necessarily lead to the conclusion that what is known as the classical philosophical

⁴² See further Brockington 1999, p. 475.

⁴³ See Māthara's commentary on SK 1, p. 2.

⁴⁴ See Chakravarti 1951, p. 113f. Other Sāṃkhya teachers are also mentioned in the SK commentaries, such as Paurika, Vārṣagaṇa, Vindhyavāsin, etc. See Chakravarti 1951, pp. 111-155.

⁴⁵ See Frauwallner 1953, p. 320, Frauwallner 1958, pp. 84-139 and Steinkellner's paper on the *Śaṣṭitantra* in which he provides the fragments related to the topic of perception (Steinkellner 1999, pp. 667-677).

⁴⁶ See Motegi's examination of the relevant chapters in MBh on p. 515f.

system of Sāṃkhya is referred to by this word already at a very early time, but rather points at some early historical traces of the development of the later tradition. Larson & Bhattacharya summarize the development of the term *sāṃkhya* into three phases.⁴⁷

1. The first phase (from the Vedic period, ca. 1500 BCE, until the 4th and 3rd centuries BCE) documents the term *sāṃkhya* as referring to the enumeration of a particular content.⁴⁸
2. In the second phase (from the pre-Buddhist Upaniṣads, ca. 8th or 7th century BCE, until the first century CE, characterized by the ascetic traditions and Jaina and Buddhist movements) it seems that *sāṃkhya* was primarily regarded as a method of attaining liberation through knowledge, but did not imply a specific system of metaphysical truth. The term occurs very often together in a compound with the word *yoga*.⁴⁹ Here, *yoga* would stand for some method of discipline, whereas *sāṃkhya* would stand for reasoning (Larson & Bhattacharya 1987, p. 6), for example in the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad (ŚvetUp). According to Chakravarti (1951, p. 1), the term *sāṃkhya* first appears in the ŚvetUp, where it occurs together with *yoga* and refers to attaining ultimate reality through its knowledge.⁵⁰ This does not mean that this selected passage in the ŚvetUp. testifies to a stage in the development of classical Sāṃkhya, but rather bears a trace of influence of Sāṃkhya (Frauwallner 1953, p. 473f.). Moreover, the *Mokṣadharmā* chapter of the *Mahābhārata* is of great importance for sāṃkhyistic thought, namely, for the so-called proto-Sāṃkhya. Reference to various teachers associated with the Sāṃkhya

⁴⁷ See Larson & Bhattacharya 1987, pp. 3-14.

⁴⁸ E.g., the enumeration of elements of statecraft in the *Arthaśāstra*, and of principles of medicine in the *Carakasamhitā*; see Larson & Bhattacharya 1987, p. 3f. Larson & Bhattacharya thus include the *Arthaśāstra* and *Carakasamhitā* in this first phase. However, it should be noted that the *Carakasamhitā* is believed to have been composed between the first and the second century CE; see Wujastyk 2017, p. 39. Regarding the date of Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra*, Olivelle places it in the middle of the first century CE, whereas some of its sources may go back to the first century BCE see Olivelle 2020, p. 31. See also Trautmann 1971, pp. 4ff. and McClish 2019, Chapter 2.

⁴⁹ Schreiner (1999) examines the occurrences of *sāṃkhya* and *yoga* in the MBh. On pp. 761-763 he pays special attention to the compound *sāṃkhyayoga* and notes that there are two examples where it is clear that *sāṃkhya* and *yoga* are elements in an enumeration. However, when they appear together in longer compounds, it becomes difficult to determine their relationship.

⁵⁰ ŚvetUp 6.13: *nityo nityānāṃ cetanaś cetanānāṃ eko bahūnāṃ yo vidadhāti kāmān tat kāraṇaṃ sāṃkhyayogādhyagamyam jñātvā devaṃ mucyate sarvapāśaiḥ* ||6.13|| Having known God who – the eternal among the eternal ones, the conscious among the conscious ones, the one among the many – assigns the objects of desire, as that cause, which is attainable through Sāṃkhya and Yoga, one becomes liberated from all fetters.

Oberlies 1998, p. 118: “Wer den Gott, der, als Ewige der (/unter den) Ewigen, als der Geistige der (/unter den) Geistigen, als der eine der (/unter den) vielen Wünsche zuteilt (= erfüllt), als diese Ursache, erreichbar durch (die Pfade des) Sāṃkhya und Yoga, erkennt, wird von allen Fesseln befreit.”

philosophical tradition, such as Kapila, Āsuri, etc. (Larson & Bhattacharya 1987, p. 7), can be found there, references to evolution theory, etc.⁵¹

3. In the third phase (last century BCE through the first several centuries CE), the term *sāṃkhya* started to refer technically to the philosophical tradition. Although it is accepted that the classical philosophical system of Sāṃkhya begins with Īśvarakṛṣṇa's *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, there are a few sources, such as the fragments of the *Śaṣṭitantra* and fragments found in the *Yuktidīpikā*, that indicate that Sāṃkhya as a philosophical system existed prior.

⁵¹ Details about the evolution theory of Sāṃkhya in the *Mahābhārata* are elaborated in Frauwallner's article "Untersuchung zum Mokṣadharmā," 1925, pp. 51-67. In addition, Bisschop & Bakker discuss and analyze three topics the classical Sāṃkhya teaching occurring in *Mahābhārata*, namely the teaching on the five elements and their distinction, the teaching on *buddhi* and its relation to *kṣetrajñā*, *manas* and *indriyāṇi*, and the teaching on the relation between *sattva* and *kṣetrajñā*; see Bisschop & Bakker 1999, pp. 459-472. Additionally, Brockington analyzes the *Mahābhārata* passages that depict Sāṃkhya as the basis of yoga. According to this evidence, these considerations appear to have been distinct and experimental, and have to be regarded as beginnings rather than notions that may be categorized as those of a concrete established school of thought. See Brockington 1999, pp. 473-490.

2.1.1. Īśvarakṛṣṇa's *Sāṃkhyakārikā* 1 (SK 1)

The classical Sāṃkhya text, the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* of Īśvarakṛṣṇa, introduces its teaching with the following verse:

duḥkhatrayābhigātāj jijñāsā tadabhighātake hetau |

dr̥ṣṭe sāpārthā cen naikāntātyantato 'bhāvāt ||1||

Because of the attack by the three kinds of suffering there is a desire to know a cause that attacks them. If one objects that this (i.e., the desire to know) is useless when [such cause that attacks the three kinds of suffering] is observed, [we say that this is] not [so], because there is no [such observable cause that acts] in an invariable and absolute manner.

This first *kārikā* of the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* (SK 1) introduces the reason for Sāṃkhya's inquiry, namely "the attack by the three kinds of suffering." To summarize this verse, there are three kinds of suffering, a desire for remedies to them, and the claim that observable remedies are not reliable and do not work completely and perpetually.⁵² This leads to further questions:

1. What are these three kinds of suffering? The three kinds of suffering are *ādhyātmika* (suffering relating to something belonging to the Self), *ādhibhautika* (suffering relating to something belonging to living beings) and *ādhidaivika* (suffering relating to the *daiva*).⁵³
2. What is the observable remedy? In the case of *ādhyātmika* suffering, which may be physical or mental, the observable remedies are various kinds of medicine, the conjunction with the things that are dear to one and the avoidance of things that are unpleasant, the obtainment of objects of enjoyment, such as women, dress, food, etc. In the case of *ādhibhautika* and *ādhidaivika* suffering, a remedy is observed in the form of different kinds of protective measures. For example, Vācaspatimiśra explains the remedy for *ādhibhautika*

⁵² Gauḍapāda elaborates on *ekāntātyantato 'bhāvāt* as follows (Esnoul 1964, p. 3, 11-13): *yata ekāntato 'vaśyam atyantato nityaṃ dr̥ṣṭena hetunābhighāto na bhavati*. Because the attack [of the three kinds of suffering] by an observable cause does not happen invariably, i.e., necessarily, [and] absolutely, i.e., perpetually.

⁵³ The translation of these three terms is based on my understanding. However, some commentators provide their own explanation of them, which may differ from my translation. These will be reflected below in the translation part where the categorization of *duḥkhatraya* will be elaborated. The word *daiva* ('divine,' 'heavenly') will remain untranslated.

suffering as proficiency in the practice of the rules provided by the traditional body of expert knowledge on proper and efficient conduct, residence in safe places, etc. The remedy for *ādhidaivika* suffering, for its part, would consist in the employment of gems and formulas (*mantras*).

The *Gauḍapādabhāṣya* explains the remedies as follows:⁵⁴

Among these, for [the suffering] relating to something belonging to the Self, which for its part is twofold, a means [to attack it] which relates [itself] to something belonging to the Self is indeed observed by means of the practical application of the traditional body of expert knowledge that is the knowledge about the [full] lifespan, [namely] by means of the union with what is pleasant, getting rid of what is unpleasant, pungent, bitter, astringent, etc., decoctions, etc. The attack of [the suffering] relating to something belonging to living beings, is seen [to be effected] by means of protective amulets, etc.

Māṭharavṛtti:⁵⁵

The counter-action of the pain relating to something belonging to the Self that is [of the] mental [kind] is (i.e., results) from the conjunction with things that are pleasant and avoidance from afar of what is unpleasant. For [the suffering] relating to something belonging to living beings, however, it is appropriate to get rid [of it] by means of the construction of villages, cities, etc., for [the suffering] relating to the *daiva* by means of going to a windless place, an upper garment, a cover/screen, etc.

⁵⁴ *Gauḍapādabhāṣya*, Esnoul 1964, p. 3, 5-9: *tatrādhyātmikasya dvividhasyāpy āyurvedaśāstrakriyayā priyasamāgamāpriyaparihārakaṭutiktakaṣāyādikvādhādibhir dṛṣṭa evādhyātmikopāyaḥ. ādhibhautikasya rakṣādinābhigāto dṛṣṭaḥ.*

It seems that here a mistake has occurred in the transmission of the text, as the third type of suffering is not mentioned at all, and the methods described would be more appropriate for addressing the *ādhidaivika* type of suffering.

⁵⁵ *Māṭharavṛtti*, Śarmā 1970, p. 3, 23-26: *mānasasyādhyātmikatāpasya pratīkāraḥ priyavastusaṃyogād apriyasya dūrataḥ pariharaṇāc ca. ādhibhautikasya tu grāmanagarādikalpanayā prahāṇopapattiḥ, ādhidaivikasyābhivātayātaprāvaraṇāvaraṇādibhiḥ.*

In V1, p. 5, 1, *nivāta* occurs instead of *abhivāta*, which makes sense in this context, since *nivāta* means 'sheltered from the wind.'

And there are a hundred easily accomplished means for counter-acting physical suffering that have been taught by excellent physicians. For counter-acting mental pain, too, [there is] a means, easily accomplished, that is the attainment of objects, such as lovely women, the enjoyment of drink and food, ointments, clothes, ornaments, etc. In the same way, there is a cause for counter-acting the suffering relating to something belonging to living beings that is easily accomplished, that is, such as proficiency in the practical application of the traditional body of expert knowledge of proper efficient conduct, settling in places without danger, etc. In the same manner, there is an easily feasible means for counter-acting the suffering relating to the *daiva*, that is the application of gems, formulas, etc.

However, all these remedies are not invariably and perpetually effective, because the fever and dysentery may return, as Māṭhara phrases it, “like spring, etc., even though they have gone away, come back.”⁵⁷

3. What then would be the invariable and perpetual cause that would eliminate the three kinds of suffering? For Īśvarakṛṣṇa, all the remedies mentioned above will not lead to invariable and perpetual relief from suffering. Therefore, in the following verse (SK 2) Īśvarakṛṣṇa explains the solution, namely the removal of suffering by means of the discriminative knowledge of the manifest (*vyakta*), the unmanifest (*avyakta*) and the knower

⁵⁶ *Sāṃkhyatattvakaumudī*, Srinivasan 1967, p. 70, 8-13: *santi copāyāḥ śataṃ śārīraduḥkhapratīkārāyeṣatkarā bhiṣajāṃ varair upadiṣṭāḥ. mānasasyāpi tāpasyapratīkārāya manoḥjñāstrīpānānnabhojanavilepana-vastrālaṅkāraḍi viṣayasamprāptir upāya īṣatkarāḥ. evaṃ ādhibhautikasya duḥkhasya nīti-śāstrābhyāsakuśalatāniratyayasthānādhyāsanādiḥ pratīkārāhetur īṣatkarāḥ. tathādhidaivikasya duḥkhasya maṇimantrādy upayogaḥ sukarāḥ pratīkārōpāya iti.*

⁵⁷ Māṭhara’s commentary on *kārikā* 1, Śarmā 1970, p. 4, 2-6: *aparam, atyantato 'pi nāsau pratīkārāḥ, agadena nīrujīkṛtānām api jvarādīnām punaḥ katipayadivasair utpattidarśanāt. ataḥ sarvathātyantiko 'pi na dṛṣṭaḥ pratīkārā ādhyātmikaduḥkhāpanayane samarthāḥ, vasantādīnām apagatānām api punar āgamanavat.*

Moreover, this is also not an absolute (i.e., perpetual) remedy, because one sees the arising of fever, etc., again within some days even for those who have been made free from sickness by means of a medicine. Therefore, also a remedy that is absolute by all means is not observed, which is capable with regard to the removal of suffering relating to something belonging to the Self, like the return of spring, etc., even though they have gone away.

(*jñā*).⁵⁸ Sāṃkhya's means to attain complete freedom from suffering is knowledge; however, this knowledge alone is not enough, as is made clear in SK 68:

prāpte śarīrabhede caritārthatvāt pradhānavinivṛtau

aikāntikam ātyantikam ubhayaṃ kaivalyam āpnoti ||68||

When separation from the body has been obtained [and] the primordial matter has ceased activity because its purpose has been fulfilled, then it (i.e., the *puruṣa*) attains isolation that is both invariable and absolute.

Discriminative knowledge, cessation of the activity of *pradhāna* and the separation from the body lead to isolation (*kaivalya*), which is the final elimination of suffering.

2.1.2. Commentaries on the *Sāṃkhyakārikā*

There are eight available *Sāṃkhyakārikā* commentaries. Among these, a commentary transmitted together with the *kārikās* under the name **Suvarṇasaptatiśāstra* is available only in a Chinese translation by Paramārtha. Only the seven commentaries that have been preserved in Sanskrit have been selected here for the translation of their comments on the triple suffering in order to study this concept. The order of the translations is based on the probable chronology dating of these commentaries. First, the *Gauḍapādabhāṣya* is dated around 500 CE.⁵⁹ The *Māṇḍukya* seems to be of a later date, ca. 800 CE or later. Several assumptions have been made regarding the date and position of the MV. Chakravarti refers to Belvalkar whose opinion is that the *Māṇḍukya* is the original of Paramārtha's Chinese version of the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* together with a commentary (Chakravarti 1951, p. 159). Solomon suggests that the

⁵⁸ *dr̥ṣṭavad ānuśravikaḥ sa hy aviśuddhikṣayātīśayayuktaḥ | tadviparītaḥ śreyān vyaktāvyaktajñānavijñānāt ||2||*

[A cause that attacks the triad of suffering] derived from the revelation is like an observable [cause], for it is connected to impurity, decline [and] excess. What is different from them (i.e., observable causes and causes derived from the revelation) is a superior [kind of cause, coming] from the discriminating knowledge of the manifest, the unmanifest and the knower.

⁵⁹ See Larson & Bhattacharya 1987, p. 209. Gauḍapāda is sometimes identified with the Vedāntin Gauḍapāda, the author of the *Māṇḍukya*. However, there is no reliable evidence for this.

Sāṃkhyasaptatīrti (V1) and *Sāṃkhyasaptatikāvṛtti* (V2) follow the MV.⁶⁰ According to Solomon, V1 may be the earliest commentary on the SK, possibly written by Īśvarakṛṣṇa himself (Larson & Bhattacharya 2016, p. 179), whereas V2 has much in common with the MV.⁶¹ However, all of this is not certain and therefore V1 and V2 inasmuch as they are similar to the MV, are translated after it. Furthermore, the *Yuktidīpikā* (YD) is one of the most important commentaries on the SK, due to the preservation of much information on the various teachings of classical Sāṃkhya that is known only from this source (Larson & Bhattacharya, 2016, p. 227). Again, the date and even the name of the author of the YD are uncertain. Regarding the date, there are various suggestions, extending from the middle of the sixth century to the early eighth century.⁶² Also, the issue of the date and author of the author of the *Jayamaṅgalā* (JM) remains an open question. According to Chakravarti, the JM precedes the *Sāṃkhyatattvakaumudī* (STK) and comes after the YD.⁶³ Among these seven commentaries, only the date of the *Sāṃkhyatattvakaumudī* by Vācaspatiśra is reliable, namely, this work must have been composed in the ninth or tenth century.⁶⁴

⁶⁰ See Solomon 1974, p. 1. These two works have been edited by Solomon and were published by the Gujarat University, Ahmedabad. These editions are based on single palm-leaf manuscripts preserved in the Jaisalmer Jaina Grantha Bhandara.

⁶¹ See Solomon V2, p. 7 and V1, p. 8.

⁶² See Larson & Bhattacharya 1987, p. 228, Wezler 1998, p. xxvif.

⁶³ See Chakravarti 1951, p. 164f.; see also Larson & Bhattacharya 1987, p. 271.

⁶⁴ See Frauwallner 1953, p. 287 and Larson & Bhattacharya 1987, p. 16. Slaje attempts to determine the dates of the Nyāya philosophers, among whom Vācaspatiśra also plays an important role. He argues that Vācaspatiśra must have lived around the middle of the 10th century; see Slaje 1986, p. 274.

2.1.2.1. Gauḍapādhābhāṣya (GBh)⁶⁵

tad idam āhuḥ: duḥkhatrayābhighātāj jijñāseti. tatra duḥkhatrayam ādhyātmikam ādhibhautikam ādhidaivikam ceti.

Therefore, they say the following: *Because of the attack by the three kinds of suffering there is a desire to know.*⁶⁶ There, the three kinds of suffering are [the suffering] relating to something belonging to the Self, [the suffering] relating to something belonging to living beings and [the suffering] relating to the *daiva*.

tatrādhyātmikam dvividham śārīram mānasam ceti. śārīram vātapittasleṣmaviparyayaḥ jvarātisārādi. mānasam priyaviyogāpriyasamyogādi.

Among these, [the suffering] relating to something belonging to the Self is twofold, physical and mental. Physical [suffering] is effected by perversions of wind, bile and phlegm, such as fever, dysentery, etc. Mental [suffering] is the disjunction from that which is pleasant to one, the conjunction with that which is unpleasant to one, etc.

ādhibhautikam caturvidhabhūtagrāmanimittam manuṣyapaśuṃṛgapakṣisarīṣpadamaśaśakayūkāmatkuṇamatsyamakaragrāhasthāvarebhyo jarāyujāṇḍajasvedajodbhijebhyaḥ sakāśād upajāyate.

[The suffering] relating to something belonging to living beings, inasmuch as it is caused by the fourfold community of living beings, arises from the presence of ⁶⁷ humans, domestic animals, wild animals, winged animals, crawling animals, gadflies, gnats, lice, bugs, fish, crocodiles, sharks and stationary beings, [i.e.,] chorion-born, egg-born, moisture-born and sprout-born [creatures].

ādhidaivikam – devānām idam daivam, divaḥ prabhavatīti vā daivam, tad adhikṛtya yad upajāyate śītoṣṇavātavarṣāśanipātādikam.

⁶⁵ Esnoul 1964, p. 2, 10-22.

⁶⁶ Italics indicate a quotation from the *sūtra*.

⁶⁷ The adverb *sakāśāt*, according to the Böhrling's and Roth's *Wörterbuch*, can exceptionally be contrued with the ablative instead of the genitive; see Böhrling & Roth 1875, p. 507.

[The suffering] relating to the *daiva* [is explained as follows]: *daiva* [means that] this here is of the gods (i.e., refers to something belonging to the gods), or *daiva* [means] that [something] comes forth from the sky/heaven. That which arises with reference to this is cold, heat, wind, rain, the fall of Indra's thunderbolt,⁶⁸ etc.

2.1.2.2. *Māṭharavṛtti* (MV)⁶⁹

kiṃ punas tad duḥkhatrayaṃ? tad āha – ādhyātmikam, ādhibhautikam, ādhidaivikam.

What again are this three kinds of suffering? This, he (i.e., Kapila⁷⁰) says: [The suffering] relating to the Self, [the suffering] relating to living beings and [the suffering] relating to the *daiva*.⁷¹

tatra prathamam dvividham: śārīraṃ mānaṣaṃ ca. tatra śārīraṃ vātapittaśleṣmaṇām dehadhātūnām vaiṣamyād yad duḥkham ātmānaṃ deham adhikṛtya jvarātīsārādi pravartate. mānaṣaṃ priyaviyogād apriyasamyogāc ca dvividham. etad ādhyātmikam duḥkham abhihitam.

Among these, the first [kind of suffering] is twofold: physical and mental. Among these, physical [suffering] is the suffering that occurs with reference to the Self, [that is,] the body, such as fever, dysentery, etc., because of the imbalance of wind, bile and phlegm, the constituents of the body (i.e., the humors).

Mental [suffering] is twofold, because of the disjunction from that which is pleasant to one and the conjunction with that which is unpleasant to one.

This [suffering, as stated,] has been called the suffering relating to the Self.

ādhibhautikam tu bhūtāny adhikṛtya yat pravartate mānuṣapaśupakṣisarīrpa-sthāvaranimittam.

⁶⁸ See Apte 1890, p. 200. An alternative translation could be 'flash of lightning.'

⁶⁹ Śarmā 1970, p. 2, 25-32.

⁷⁰ From earlier on in the commentary, it is clear that Kapila is the speaker in this context and is addressing Āsuri.

⁷¹ In this case, the technical terms referring to the three kinds of suffering are translated differently, because of Maṭhara's different interpretation of these terms.

[The suffering] relating to living beings, however, is the one that occurs with reference to living beings, [that is, the one] caused by humans, domestic animals, winged animals, crawling animals, and stationary beings.

ādhidaivikaṃ tu divam adhikṛtya yat pravartate śītoṣṇavātavarṣādikaṃ.

[The suffering] relating to the *daiva*, however, is the one that occurs with reference to heaven, such as cold, heat, wind, rain, etc.

2.1.2.3. *Sāṃkhyasaptatvṛtti* (V1)⁷²

tatrādhyātmikaṃ dvividhaṃ śārīraṃ mānasaṃ ca. tatra śārīraṃ tāvad vātapittaśleṣmaṇāṃ vaiṣamyanimittena yad duḥkham utpadyate tad ādhyātmikaṃ vaidyā bruvate.

Among these, [the suffering] relating to something belonging to the Self is twofold, physical and mental. Among these, the doctors call physical suffering, to begin with, is that suffering which arises due to the cause which is an imbalance of wind, bile and phlegm, [the suffering] relating to something belonging to the Self.

ā nābher vātasthānam, ā hṛdayāt pittasthānam, ā mūrdhanaḥ śleṣmasthānam iti trayāṇāṃ trīṇi sthānāni.

The place of wind is up to the navel, the place of bile up to the heart, the place of phlegm up to the head. Hence there are three places of the three (i.e., *vāta*, *pitta* and *śleṣman*).⁷³

tatra kadācid vāta utkaṭo bhūtvā pittaśleṣmāṇāv abhibhavati tadā vātanimittā doṣāḥ, kadācit pittam utkaṭaṃ bhūtvā vātaśleṣmāṇāv abhibhavati tadā pittanimittā

⁷² Solomon 1973, p. 2, 15 - 3, 12. Lines 6 – 9 on p. 3 are not translated here. In the following, and also when quoting the text of V1 elsewhere, I am silently accepting the emendations and conjectures made by Solomon whenever they seem obvious.

⁷³ The preposition *ā*, constructed with an ablative, may be translated as ‘from,’ ‘away from,’ ‘out of,’ or ‘till.’ ‘until,’ ‘up to’; see Apte 1890, p. 220. Here it is used to refer to the places of the three basic bodily constituents or humors (*dhātus*) *vāta*, *pitta* and *śleṣman*. The same allocation of places to the *dhātus*, which are called *doṣas* (‘disturbing factors’) when they are not in balance, is found in Vāgbhaṭa’s *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasaṃhitā*; see Jolly 1951, p. 59: “*vāta* has its chief place below the navel, *pitta* between the heart and navel and *kapha* above the heart.” This deviates from Caraka’s and Suśruta’s placing of the *dhātus*; see Kutumbiah 1962, p. 67.

doṣāḥ, kadācic chleṣmotkaṣo bhūtvā vātapitte abhibhavati tadā śleṣmanimittā doṣā iti. eteṣāṃ vaiṣamyād jvarabhramātīsārāpasmāramadamūrcchāyāśāsīro-ro-gākṣirogapārśvaśūlakāśaśvāsahṛdrogabhagandarādyā vyādhaya utpadyante. etac charīraparyāyeṇādhyātmikam ucyate.

With regard to this, sometimes the wind, having become excessive, prevails over bile and phlegm, then there are disturbing factors that are caused by the wind. Sometimes when the bile having become excessive, prevails over wind and phlegm; then [the humors become] disturbing factors that are caused by bile. Sometimes phlegm, having become excessive, prevails over wind and bile; then [the humors become] disturbing factors that are caused by phlegm. Because of the imbalance of them (i.e., the three humors), illnesses such as fever, dizziness, dysentery, epilepsy, intoxication,⁷⁴ fainting, fatigue, diseases of the head, eye diseases, sharp pain in the side, cough, hard breathing, heart diseases, anorectal fistulas, etc. arise. This is said to be [the suffering] relating to something belonging to the Self by way of a [special] synonym [used] for the body.⁷⁵

mānasam vakṣyāmaḥ – priyaviprayogād apriyasamprayogād īpsitasyālābhān mānasam utpadyate duḥkham. yathā kaścīd devadattaḥ priyeṇa viprayuktaḥ, tasya tam anusmarato mānasam utpadyate duḥkham. athāpriyasamprayogaṃ ca vakṣyāmaḥ – yathā kaścīd devadattaḥ samgrāme śatrubhir baddhaḥ saṃkalpayati – kim asmākam amī kariṣyanti mānasam utpadyate duḥkham. īpsitasyālābhān vakṣyāmaḥ – yathā kasyacid devadattasya sarvakāmasamṛddhir āsīd, bhāgyavaśāt tasya bhāgyavedhitasya pūrvasukhānyabhidhyāyata īpsitaprāptir na bhavati, tasyepsitālābhān mānasam utpadyate duḥkham. yat prāgabhihitam śārīraṃ duḥkham vātādīnāṃ vaiṣamyeneti tad uktam.

⁷⁴ The term *mada*, refers here in V1 to an illness, as one kind of the physical form of *ādhyātmika* suffering. However, the *Tattvasamāsasūtravṛtti* (TSSV) categorizes it under the mental form of *ādhyātmika* suffering. Regarding the translation of the term *mada*, Meulenbeld translates it as ‘intoxication.’ In his work *Indian Medical Literature*, he refers to three types of *mada* in CS *Sūtrasthāna*, caused by alcoholic drinks, poison and blood, respectively; see Meulenbeld 1999, IA, p. 22. Moreover, in SS, *Uttaratantra* Chapter 62 on *unmāda*, ‘insanity,’ *mada* is one of the six types of *unmāda*. These six types may occur due to one of the three *doṣas* alone, all *doṣas* together, mental imbalance and poison. An early, not yet advanced stage of *unmāda* is also called *mada*; see Meulenbeld 1999, IA, p. 330. It is not clear whether *mada* in the V1 and in the TSSV share the same meaning. However, since they occur in different categorizations, I translate *mada* in the TSSV as ‘madness’ in order to make a distinction.

⁷⁵ Already in early usage, the word *ātman* may sometimes refer to the body. Alternatively, one should maybe read *śārīraparyayeṇa* here, i.e., ‘due to a perversion of the body.’

We shall [now] explain mental [suffering] – mental suffering arises from disjunction from that which is pleasant to one, from conjunction with that which is unpleasant to one, and from not getting something one desires to obtain. [This is] like [when] a certain Devadatta is disjoined from that which is pleasant to him, [and] mental suffering arises for him inasmuch as he regretfully recollects that (i.e., the thing which is dear to him). Now, we will also explain the conjunction with that which is unpleasant to one – [this is] like [when] a certain Devadatta, inasmuch as he has been bound by enemies in a battle, imagines:⁷⁶ “What will they do to me?” [and], the mental suffering arises [for him in this way].

We shall [now] explain not getting something one desires to obtain – [it is] like [when] for a certain Devadatta there was an abundance of all objects of desire (i.e., he had everything he wished for), [then,] by force of fate, obtaining what he desires to obtain no [longer] happens for him who – hit (literally: pierced) by fate⁷⁷ – is pondering longingly over past pleasures, [and] mental suffering arises for him because of not obtaining what he desires to obtain. The physical suffering which has been mentioned before [on the other hand] has been said [to be] due to an imbalance of wind, etc.

ādhībhautikaṃ vakṣyāmaḥ – mānuṣapaśuṃrgapakṣisarīṣpasthāvaranimittam.

[...]

We shall [now] explain [the suffering] relating to something belonging to living beings – [it is suffering] caused by humans, domestic animals, wild animals, winged animals, crawling animals and stationary beings. [...]

ādhidaivikaṃ vakṣyāmaḥ – ativr̥ṣṭyanāvṛṣṭigrahapīḍātapātyayaprabhṛti yad aṣṭa-devayonibhyaḥ sakāśād utpadyate duḥkhaṃ tad ādhidaivikaṃ.

We shall [now] explain [the suffering] relating to the *daiva*. The suffering, beginning with excessive rain, lack of rain, oppression by a planet, and the end of

⁷⁶ Maybe one should read *saṃkalpayataḥ* here and construe a single sentence: [It is] like [when] a certain Devadatta has been bound by enemies in a battle [and] mental suffering arises for him when he is imagining ...

⁷⁷ *bhāgyavedhitasya* is a conjecture by Solomon. The uncorrected text probably reads *bhāgyavaśāt tasya bhāgyatasya*. Solomon suggests *bhāgyavaśāt tasya vaiśamyam tasya* as an alternative conjecture, i.e., [then,] by force of fate, some imbalance (i.e., difficulty) occurs for him, obtaining what he desires to obtain no [longer] happens for him who is longingly pondering over past pleasures, [and] mental suffering arises for him ...

the hot season and beginning of the rainy season, that arises from the presence of the eight [kinds of] divine beings,⁷⁸ is [the suffering] relating the *daiva*.

2.1.2.4. *Sāṃkhyasaptatikāvṛtti* (V2)⁷⁹

tatrādhyātmikam dvividham śārīraṃ mānasam ceti. tatra śārīraṃ nāma vātapittaśleṣmaṇām vaiṣamyanimittena yad duḥkham utpadyate tad ādhyātmikam ity abhidhīyate. ā nābher vātasya, ā hṛdayāt pittasya, ūrdhvaṃ śleṣmaṇa iti trayāṇām trīṇi sthānāni bhavanti. tatra kadācid vāyur utkaṭībhūtvā pittaśleṣmāṇāv abhibhavati, tadā vāyunimittā doṣā utpadyante tadyathā śīrorogākṣīrogamukharogabhagandaragudāvartajalodaraplihavātagulmakāsaśvāsātīsāraprabhṛtyo vyādhaya utpadyante. yadā pittam utkaṭībhūtvā vātaṃ śleṣmaṇam cābhibhavati tadā pittanimittā doṣā utpadyante. yadā śleṣmā utkaṭī bhūtvā vātaṃ pittam cābhibhavati tadā śleṣmanimittā doṣā utpadyante. etac chārīram ity ucyate.

Among these, [the suffering] relating to something belonging to the Self is twofold, physical and mental. Among these, the suffering which is named physical [suffering] that arises due to the cause which is the imbalance of wind, bile and phlegm, is called [the suffering] relating to something belonging to the Self. [The place] of wind is up to the navel, [the place] of bile is up to the heart, [the place] of phlegm is above [the heart]. Hence there result three places for the three (i.e., *vāta*, *pitta* and *śleṣman*). With regard to this, sometimes wind, having become excessive, prevails over bile and phlegm; then disturbing factors that are caused by wind arise, that is to say, diseases beginning with head diseases, eye diseases, diseases of the oral cavity, anorectal fistulas, constipation, enlargement of the abdomen caused by

⁷⁸ Eight kinds of a divine place of origin are listed in V1 on SK 44. They are: *brāhma*, *prājāpatya*, *aindra*, *pitrya* (em. for *citra*), *gāndharva*, *yākṣa*, *rākṣasa* and *paiśāca* (p. 59, 10-12). They are again mentioned under SK 53 as the divine creation of eight varieties (*aṣṭavikalpo daivaḥ sargaḥ*), with the variant *paitra* for (em.) *pitrya* (Solomon 1973, p. 67, 20-21).

⁷⁹ Solomon 1973, p. 2, 7-22.

water,⁸⁰ enlargement of the spleen, visceral swelling caused by wind,⁸¹ cough, hard breathing, dysentery, etc. When bile, having become excessive, prevails over wind and phlegm, then disturbing factors that are caused by bile arise. When phlegm, having become excessive, prevails over wind and bile, then disturbing factors that are caused by phlegm arise. This is called “physical [suffering].”

mānasaduḥkham vyākhyāsyāmaḥ. tat trividham – priyaviprayogaḥ, apriya-samprayoga īpsitasya cālābhaḥ. samkalpayataḥ mānasam duḥkham utpadyate.

evam eva dvividham ādhyātmikam śārīram (?) duḥkham vyākhyātam.

We will [now] explain mental suffering. That one is threefold – disjunction from that which is pleasant to one, conjunction with that which is unpleasant to one, and not getting something that one desires to obtain. Mental suffering arises for him who imagines [such things].

In precisely this way, the twofold suffering relating to something belonging to the Self, has been explained.⁸²

ādhibhautikam vyākhyāsyāmaḥ. mānuṣapaśumrgapakṣisarīrpasthāvaranimittam yad duḥkham utpadyate tad ādhibhautikam ity abhidhīyate.

We will [now] explain [the suffering] relating to something belonging to living beings. The suffering that arises caused by humans, domestic animals, wild animals, winged animals, crawling animals and stationary beings, called “[suffering] relating to something belonging to living beings.”⁸³

ādhideivikam yathā – śītoṣṇavātavarṣāśanyavaśyāyāveśanimittam yad duḥkham utpadyate tad ādhideivikam ity abhidhīyate.

⁸⁰ *Udara* refers to a disorder resulting in enlargement of the abdomen; see Meulenbeld 1999, IA, p. 433. There are eight kinds of *udara*, the eighth kind is *jalodara*. According to Jolly 1951, p. 118, “[t]his is caused by untimely drinking of cold water. The belly is severely pushed as if filled with water so that it is felt and heard as a filled water-leatherbag.”

⁸¹ There are five types of *gulma*, ‘visceral swelling,’ caused by *vāta*, *pitta*, *kapha*, all three *doṣas* together and blood; see Meulenbeld 1999, IA, p. 28. For more information on *gulma*, see Jolly 1951, p. 117.

⁸² The word *śārīram* does not seem to be right in what is obviously a conclusion of the explanation of *ādhyātmika* suffering unless one would add *mānasam*, or *mānasam ca*, to it.

⁸³ The correlative clause *tad ādhibhautikam ity abhidhīyate* is missing in the text and has been supplied by Solomon on the model of the conclusion of the sections on physical *ādhyātmika* suffering and *ādhideivika* suffering.

The suffering relating to the *daiva* is as [follows] – The suffering that arises caused by the influence of cold, heat, wind, rain, Indra’s thunderbolt (i.e., lightning) and hoar frost, is called “[suffering] relating to the *daiva*.”

2.1.2.5. *Yuktidīpikā* (YD)⁸⁴

*ādhyātmikam hi dvividham śārīram mānasam ca. śārīram tāvad vāta-pittaśleṣmaṇām vaiṣamyanimittam. tathā mānasam kāmakrodhalobhamoha-viśādhahayeryāratyāsūyāviśeṣadarśananimittam.*⁸⁵

As is well known, [the suffering] relating to something belonging to the Self is twofold, physical and mental. Physical [suffering], to begin with, is caused by the imbalance of wind, bile and phlegm. In that manner, mental [suffering] is caused by desire, anger, greed, delusion, depression, fear, jealousy, dissatisfaction, ill will and not seeing specifics.

ādhibhautikam ca manuṣyapaśumrgapakṣisarīrpasthāvaranimittam.

And [the suffering] relating to something belonging to living beings is caused by humans, domestic animals, wild animals, winged animals, crawling animals and stationary beings.

ādhidaivikam śītoṣṇavātavarṣāśanyavaśyāyāveśanimittam.

[The suffering] relating to the *daiva* is caused by the influence of cold, heat, wind, rain, Indra’s thunderbolt (i.e., lightning) and hoar frost.

⁸⁴ Wezler & Motegi 1998, p. 14, 13-19.

⁸⁵ This is an emendation by the editors. For the variant readings see Wezler and Motegi 1998, p. 14, 14-16. According to manuscripts K, P and D we have the reading *-viśādhahayeryāratyaviśeṣadarśana*. In this case, *asūyā* is not included. Moreover, we have two options here: either we can read *arati* which would result in *aviśeṣadarśana* as the next item, or *āratya* which would offer *viśeṣadarśana* as the next item. Manuscript A and the reading *kha* recorded in manuscript D have *-viśādhahayeryāsūyāratyaviśeṣadarśana*-. Here, *asūyā* is enumerated before *āratya/arati*. The reason why assume that the word should be *āratya* is because in the case of the enumeration in the *Pañcārthabhāṣya* (PABh) the reading *arati* result in an incorrect form of the following item with a long *ā*, i.e., *āviśeṣa*-. Regarding the reading of A and variant *kha* in D, *āratya* and *asūyā* would have exchanged their places in the compound as reconstructed by Wezler and Motegi, whereas in K, P and D *asūyā* would have been dropped.

2.1.2.6. Jayamaṅgalā (JM)⁸⁶

*duḥkhatrayābhigātāj jijñāsetyādi. duḥkhānāṃ trayam duḥkhatrayam –
ādhyātmikam ādhibhautikam ādhidaivikam ceti.*

Because of the attack by the three kinds of suffering, there is the desire to know,
etc. The three kinds of suffering are the triad of suffering – [the suffering] relating
to something belonging to the Self, [the suffering] relating to something belonging
to living beings and [the suffering] relating to the *daiva*.

ātmany adhyātmam, tatra yad bhavati tad ādhyātmikam – śārīraṃ mānaśam ceti.
tatra vātapittaśleṣmaṇāṃ vaiśamyēṇa jvarādiduḥkham. tac charīre bhavatīti
śārīram. yat kāmakrodhaśokādibhir manasi duḥkham tan mānaśam.

Belonging to the Self [means] with regard to the Self; what occurs there is relating
to something belonging to the Self – relating to the body (i.e., physical) and relating
to the mind (i.e., mental). Among these, suffering, such as fever, etc., is due to the
imbalance of wind, bile and phlegm. That one occurs in the body, hence it is
physical [suffering]. The suffering that [occurs] in the mind due to desire, anger,
grief, etc., is mental [suffering].

*yan mānuṣapaśuṃrgapakṣisarīrpasthāvarāṇy adhikṛtya bhavati tad ādhi-
bhautikam.*

[The suffering] that occurs with reference to humans, domestic animals, wild
animals, winged animals, crawling animals and stationary beings (i.e., is caused by
their actions), is [the suffering] relating to something belonging to living beings.

yac charīre grahāveśādīni daivāṇy adhikṛtya bhavati tad ādhidaivikam iti. etad
duḥkhatrayam.

[The suffering] that occurs with reference to *daiva* [events], such as the influence
of *grahas*,⁸⁷ is [the suffering] relating to the *daiva*. This is the triad of suffering.

⁸⁶ Śarmā 1970, p. 65, 15 –20, p. 66, 1-2.

⁸⁷ For the meaning of the word *graha*, see section 3.1.4.

2.1.2.7. *Sāṃkhyatattvakaumudī* (STK)⁸⁸

*duḥkhānāṃ trayam duḥkhatrayam. tat khalv ādhyātmikam ādhibhautikam ādhidaivikam ca. tatrādhyātmikam dvividham śārīraṃ mānaṣam ca. śārīraṃ vātapittaśleṣmaṇāṃ vaiṣamyanimittam. mānaṣam kāmakrodhalobhamohabha-
yerśyāviṣayaviśeṣādarśananibandhanam. sarvaṃ caitad āntaropāyasādhyatvād
ādhyātmikam duḥkham.*

The three kinds of suffering are the triad of suffering. That one, one should know, is [the suffering] relating to something belonging to the Self, [the suffering] relating to something belonging to living beings and [the suffering] relating to the *daiva*. Among these [the suffering] relating to something belonging to the Self is twofold, physical and mental. Physical [suffering] is caused by the imbalance of wind, bile and phlegm. Mental [suffering] is based on desire, anger, greed, ignorance, fear, jealousy and not seeing specific objects.⁸⁹ And all this is suffering relating to something belonging to the Self because of being effected by internal means.

bāhyopāyasādhyam duḥkham dvedhā. ādhibhautikam ādhidaivikam ca. tatrādhibhautikam mānuṣapaśuṃrgapakṣisarīrpasthāvaranimittam.

Suffering that is effected by external means is twofold – [suffering] relating to something belonging to living beings and [suffering] relating to the *daiva*. Among these, [the suffering] relating to something belonging to living beings is caused by humans, domestic animals, wild animals, winged animals, crawling animals and stationary beings.

ādhidaivikam yakṣarākṣasavināyakagrahādyāveśanibandhanam.

[The suffering] relating to the *daiva* is based on the influence of *yakṣas*, *rākṣasas*, *vināyakas*, *grahas*, etc.⁹⁰

⁸⁸ Srinivasan 1967, p. 68, 17-26.

⁸⁹ One may also understand ‘not seeing differences among objects.’

⁹⁰ *Yakṣas*, *rākṣasas* and *vināyakas* are demonic beings whose characteristics are presented in section of 3.1.4.

2.2. *Sāṃkhyasūtra* (SS)

The *Sāṃkhyasūtra* (SS), a treatise on Sāṃkhya, can most probably be dated to the 15th century. Possibly, some *sūtras* do belong to a later period, but this not certain.⁹¹ Two commentaries on the SS have been selected for this thesis,⁹² namely, Aniruddha's *Sāṃkhyasūtravṛtti* (SSV) composed about 1500 CE and Vijñānabhikṣu's *Sāṃkhyaprapaṇcābhāṣya* (SPBh) that is dependent upon the SSV.⁹³

References to the triple suffering are found in the above mentioned commentaries on the very first *sūtra*.⁹⁴

atha trividhaduḥkhātīyantanivṛttir atyantapuruṣārthah ||1||

Now, the absolute aim of *puruṣa* is the absolute cessation of the threefold suffering.

2.2.1. *Sāṃkhyasūtravṛtti* (SSV)⁹⁵

*trividhaduḥkheti śārīramānasikayor ādhyātmikatvena saṃgrahaṇād ekatvam.
ādhibhautikaṃ paśupakṣyādijanitam, ādhidaivikaṃ grahabhūtādijanitam.*

“The threefold suffering”: physical and mental [suffering] are one because they are lumped together (lit.: grasped together) as [suffering] relating to something belonging to the Self. [The suffering] relating to something belonging to living beings is created by domestic animals, winged animals, etc, [the suffering] relating to the *daiva* is created by *grahas*, spirits, etc.

⁹¹ See Chakravarti 1951, p. 171, and Larson & Bhattacharya 1987, p. 35 and p. 327.

⁹² There are few further, late commentaries, the *Vṛttisāra* of Mahādeva Vedāntin, the *Sāṃkhyasūtravṛtti* of Nāgoji Bhaṭṭa, etc.; for more information see Larson & Bhattacharya 2016, p. 35.

⁹³ See Larson & Bhattacharya 1987, p. 333.

⁹⁴ Garbe 1888, p. 2, 9.

⁹⁵ Ibid., p. 2, 15-17.

2.2.2. *Sāṃkhyapracāsanabhāṣya* (SPBh)⁹⁶

trividham ādhyātmikam ādhibhāutikam ādhidāivikam ca duḥkham. tatrātmānaṃ svasaṃghātam adhikṛtya pravṛttam ity ādhyātmikam: śārīram mānasaṃ ca. tatra śārīram vyādhyādyuttham, mānasaṃ kāmādyuttham. tathā bhūtāni prāṇino 'dhikṛtya pravṛttam ity ādhibhāutikam, vyāghracorādyuttham. devān agnivāyvādīn adhikṛtya pravṛttam ity ādhidāivikam, dāhasītādyuttham⁹⁷ iti vibhāgaḥ.

Suffering is threefold, relating to the Self, relating to living beings and relating to the *daiva*. Among these [the suffering] relating to the Self, [namely the suffering] that has occurred with reference to the Self, [i.e.,] to one's own aggregate (i.e., that which makes up the individual), is: physical and mental. Among these, physical [suffering] arises from diseases, etc., mental [suffering] arises from desire, etc. Similarly, [the suffering] relating to living beings, [that is, suffering] that has occurred with reference to living beings, [i.e.,] to living creatures, arises from tigers, thieves, etc. [The suffering] relating to the *daiva*, [that is, is the suffering] that has occurred with reference to gods such as Fire, Wind, etc., arises from burning, cold, etc. [This] is the division [of suffering].

yady api sarvam eva duḥkham mānasaṃ, tathāpi manomātrajanyatvājanyatvābhyaṃ mānasatvāmānasatvaviśeṣaḥ.

Although all suffering without exception is mental, nevertheless there is a distinction of being mental and non-mental because of arising merely from the mind and not arising (merely from the mind).⁹⁸

⁹⁶ Garbe 1895, p. 6, 6-15.

⁹⁷ In Garbe's edition, the text reads *citā* instead of *śīta*. However, the term *citā*, 'funeral pyre,' would not make sense in this context. Therefore, I assume that *citā* is a corruption for *śīta*, which would fit in this context.

⁹⁸ What exactly Vijñānabhikṣu wanted to say with this last sentence, is not fully clear. Possibly tried to explain that every suffering is actually mental suffering, but not every mental suffering has its cause in the mind, but rather somewhere else, such as *ādhibhāutika* suffering that would have its cause in other living beings. Vijñānabhikṣu elaborates more on this in his commentary on the *Yogavārttika*; see section 2.4.3. *Yogavārttika* (YV).

2.3. *Sāṃkhyasaṃgraha*

The *Sāṃkhyasaṃgraha*, edited by Vindhyeshvari Prasāda Dvivedin, contains a collection of nine works on the Sāṃkhya philosophy. These are:

1. *Sāṃkhyatattvavivecana*
2. *Sāṃkhyatattvayāthārthyadīpana*
3. *Samāśasūtrasarvopakāriṇī Ṭīkā*
4. *Sāṃkhyasūtravivaraṇa*
5. *Tattvasamāśasūtravṛtti*
6. *Sāṃkhyatattvapradīpikā*
7. *Sāṃkhyatattvapradīpa*
8. *Tattvamīmāṃsā*
9. *Sāṃkhyaparibhāṣā*

Out of these nine works, only three, namely, *Sāṃkhyasūtravivaraṇa*, *Sāṃkhyatattvapradīpikā*, and *Sāṃkhyaparibhāṣā*, do not refer to the categorization of the three kinds of suffering.

Most of these works⁹⁹ are commentaries on the *Tattvasamāśasūtra* (TSS). The TSS is dated after the 14th century. The reason for this dating is that it is not mentioned in the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* (dated to the 14th century)¹⁰⁰; however, there is also the assumption that this work is much older than the 14th century.¹⁰¹ The TSS contains 25 concise and simple *sūtras*. However, some of the selected commentarial works from the *Sāṃkhyasaṃgraha* do not contain all 25 *sūtras*, but only 23 or 22.¹⁰²

The commentaries on the TSS are late, apart from the *Tattvasamāśasūtravṛtti* (TSSV) around the 14th century (Larson & Bhattacharya 1987, p. 319f). This work contains a commentary on 23 *sūtras* and ends with *sūtra* no. 24, which refers to the three kinds of suffering.

⁹⁹ These are: *Sāṃkhyatattvavivecana*, *Sāṃkhyatattvayāthārthyadīpana*, *Samāśasūtrasarvopakāriṇī Ṭīkā*, *Sāṃkhyasūtravivaraṇa* and *Tattvasamāśasūtravṛtti*.

¹⁰⁰ “A Compendium of All Systems of Philosophy” by Mādhavāchārya.

¹⁰¹ See Larson & Bhattacharya 1987, p. 32f, Müller 1919, p. 242f.

¹⁰² These variations are noted next to each work.

The chronologically next dated work would be the *Sāṃkhyatattvayāthārthyadīpana* (STYD), written by Bhāvāgaṇeśa, dated to the late 16th century.¹⁰³ This work contains a commentary on 25 *sūtras*. The three kinds of suffering are referred to in the 24th *sūtra*.¹⁰⁴

The following two works are as well commentaries on the TSS and are both dated to approximately the 18th and 19th century.¹⁰⁵ The *Sāṃkhyatattvavivecana* (STV), a commentary on the TSS, was written by Śimānanda.¹⁰⁶ This work contains 25 *sūtras* and a commentary on them.¹⁰⁷ The *Samāsasūtrasarvopakāriṇī Ṭīkā* (ST), whose author is unknown, contains a commentary on 22 *sūtras*. This work does not provide a separate *sūtra* on the three kinds of suffering like the others do, but the commentary on *sūtras* no. 6 (*adhyātmam*), no. 7 (*adhibhūtam*) and no. 8 (*ādhidāivam*), which in other works are not related to suffering,¹⁰⁸ offers an explanation in the same manner as the other commentators explain the *sūtra* relating to the three kinds of suffering.

The last two works, the *Tattvamīmāṃsā* (TM) by Kṛṣṇamīśra, dated to approximately the 20th century,¹⁰⁹ and the *Sāṃkhyatattvapradīpaḥ* (STP) by Kavirāja Yati, dated to the 18th or 19th century,¹¹⁰ are not commentaries on the TSS, but rather independent works. They are written in prose and present brief summaries of the *Sāṃkhyakārikā*. The reference to the three kinds of suffering is found at the beginning of these works.

The order of the following translations of from these works is according to their order in the *Sāṃkhyasaṃgraha*.

¹⁰³ See Larson & Bhattacharya 1987, pp. 413ff.

¹⁰⁴ The difference in the number of *sūtra* is, due to the fact that in the TSSV the seventh *sūtra* lists the three types *adhyātmam adhibhūtam adhidāivatam* ca ||7||, whereas the STYD comments upon them as split into three separate *sūtras*, namely *adhyātmam* ||7|| *adhibhūtam* ||8|| *adhidāivam* ||9||. The last *sūtra* of the STYD, *etatparam yāthārthyam etaj jñātvā kṛtakṛtyaḥ syān na punastrividhaduḥkhenābhibhūyate* ||23||, is not a *sūtra* in the TSSV.

¹⁰⁵ See Larson & Bhattacharya 1987, pp. 443ff.

¹⁰⁶ More on this work see in the next section, 4.1. *Sāṃkhyatattvavivecana* (STV).

¹⁰⁷ The 25 *sūtras* are not arranged as in the STYD. STV reads *sūtra* seven as TSSV does. However, that what is *sūtra* 25 in the STYD, is divided into the three *sūtras* in the STV, namely: *etat paramparayā yāthātathyam* ||23|| *etat sarvaṃ jñātvā kṛtakṛtyaḥ syāt* ||24|| *na punas trividhena duḥkhenābhibhūyate* ||25||

¹⁰⁸ These three items are by other commentators explained that they refer to internal, external and celestial world.

¹⁰⁹ See *ibid.*, p. 617.

¹¹⁰ See Larson & Bhattacharya 1987, p. 449.

2.3.1. *Sāṃkhyatattvavivecana* (STV)

The *Sāṃkhyatattvavivecana* is ascribed to an author named Śimānanda. Śimānanda's name is mentioned in the first verse of this work:¹¹¹

raghunandanasutenedam iṣṭikāpuravāsinā |

kānyakubjadvijāgryeṇa śimānandena tanyate ||1||

This is spread out by Śimānanda, son of Raghunandana, inhabitant of Iṣṭakāpura, foremost among the twice born of Kānyakubja.

This verse provides information about Śimānanda's origin. He was a son of Raghunanda and lived in Iṣṭikāpura which is said to be present Etawah (Iṭāvā).¹¹² *Kānyakubja* was an ancient city of India, nowadays known as Kannauj. According to my understanding, *kānyakubjadvi* refers to a group of Brahmins to which Śimānanda belonged. There is uncertainty about both the name of the author and the title of the work. In the second edition of *Sāṃkhyasamgraha*, a footnote explains that the nickname, or pet name, of Kṣemendra was Śimānanda,¹¹³ which is also mentioned in the *bhūmika*.¹¹⁴ In the preface of this edition, it is further mentioned that Śimānanda wrote a *Nyāyaratnākara*. Moreover, in Potter's *Encyclopedia* the name Śimānanda stands for Kṣemānanda. Under the persons index we find Śimānanda (or Kṣemānanda), to whom is attributed the work *Sāṃkhyatattvavivecana*.¹¹⁵ In Aufrecht's *Catalogus Catalogorum*, we read under Kṣemānanda: son of Raghunandana of Iṣṭikāpura, *Tattvasamāsavyākhyā* and

¹¹¹ Dvivedin 1920, p. 1, 1-2.

¹¹² See Hall 1859, p. 4 and Vijayendra Kumar Mathur 1990, p. 78.

¹¹³ Dvivedin 1920, p. 1: *atra kṣemendrenety anumīyate. 'śimānanda' iti tu mātāpitror ullāpane nāmeti sarvajana prasiddhyartham tathaiva likhitam iti sambhāvyate.*

¹¹⁴ Ibid., p. 3.

¹¹⁵ See Potter 1970, no. 892; Kṣemānanda or Śimānanda (1450), wrote *Nyāyaratnākara* (Yoga) and 892.2 *Sāṃkhyatattvavivecana* (Kṣemānanda).

Nyāyaratnākara.¹¹⁶ The online catalogue of the National Mission for Manuscripts¹¹⁷ ascribes a work named *Pañcaviṃśatatattvajñāna* and the *Nyāyaratnākara* to Śimānanda.

If we take all this together, we get *Sāṃkhyatattvavivecana* and *Pañcaviṃśatatattvajñāna* as possible names of Sāṃkhya works composed by Kṣemānanda/Śimānanda/Kṣemendra. One could assume that the manuscripts on which the information in some of the sources referred to here was based did not contain the name of the work, and that therefore words from the beginning verses were taken and a title is reconstrued. In the second verse, the compound *pañcaviṃśatatattva* is used, and in the last one the verb *vivicyate*, from which the noun *vivecana* can be construed.¹¹⁸

Moreover, Udayvīr Śāstrī, in his book *Sāṃkhyadarśana kā itihāsa*, refers to a *Navanyāyaratnākara* or *Navakallola* written by Śimānanda. This may be identical with the mentioned *Nyāyaratnākara*. However, it seems that this work has not yet been published. According to Udayvīr Śāstrī, a manuscript is preserved at the Punjab University Library.¹¹⁹ At the beginning of this manuscript, it is revealed that Śimānanda's teacher was a certain Dinakara. On the last page of the manuscript, it is stated that Śimānanda wrote the *Navakallola* which is a part of the *Nyāyaratnākara*, and was a son of Dīkṣita Raghunandana, an inhabitant of Iṣṭikāpura and an ornament to the *kānyakubja* caste. The manuscript is dated to *Vikramasamvat* 1748, that means 1690 according to our time reckoning. According to Udayvīr Śāstrī, this date is not the date of the composition, but rather the date when the manuscript was written.

¹¹⁶ Aufrecht here refers to Hall; see Aufrecht 1891, p. 135. According to Hall, the author of the *Tattvasamāśayākhya* is Kṣemānanda, whose name has been corrupted to Kṣimānanda. His father was Raghunanda Dīkṣita, and he calls himself an inhabitant of Iṣṭikāpura which is present-day Etawa; see Hall 1859, p. 4. In the *New Catalogus Catalogorum*, the *Sāṃkhyatattvavivecana* is attributed to Kṣemendra Dīkṣita, also known as Śimānanda Dīkṣita; see p. 169.

¹¹⁷ See <https://www.bharatiyakritisampada.nic.in/advanceSearch>.

¹¹⁸ Dvivedin 1920, p. 1, 10-11: *sāṃkhyopajñā namas tubhyaṃ kapilāya mahātmane | pañcaviṃśatatattvānām tattvajñānapravartakaḥ ||2||* Oh original knower of Sāṃkhya! I bow to you, Kapila, the Great Soul, oh you who prompts (i.e., originated/authored) the knowledge of the true nature of the 25 principles.

¹¹⁹ See Śāstrī 1955, pp. 322ff. Prof. Karin Preisendanz kindly provided me with pictures of the first and last page of the manuscript, which were taken in the context of the FWF project “Die Sanskrit-Manuskripte der Woolner-Sammlung, Lahore.”

2.3.2. Śimānanda's summarizing verse commentary on *Tattvasamāśasūtra* 22:

*trividhaṃ duḥkhaṃ.*¹²⁰

duḥkhaṃ tu trividhaṃ proktaṃ adhyātmam adhibhūtakam |

ādhidaivam ca, tatrāpi prathamam dvividhaṃ smr̥tam ||

śārīraṃ mānaśaṃ ceti vātakāmādidōṣajam ||

bhūtebhyo mānuṣādibhyo jātaṃ syād ādhibhautikam ||

devebhyaḥ śītavātādibhavaṃ syād ādhidaivikam |

etat samāśataḥ proktā sūtravyākhyā yathāmati ||

Tattvasamāśasūtra 22: Suffering is threefold.

Suffering, however, has been proclaimed as threefold, [the suffering] relating to the Self, [the suffering] relating to living beings and [the suffering] relating to the *daiva*.¹²¹ Among these, for their part, the first [kind of suffering] is recollected as (i.e., traditionally said to be) twofold, [namely] physical and mental; [it] arises from disturbing factors such as [the perverted humour] wind, desire, etc. [The suffering] relating to something belonging to living beings should be that which has arisen from living beings, such as humans, etc. [The suffering] relating to something belonging to the gods should be that which comes about through cold, wind, etc., [coming] from the gods.

This is a commentary on the *sūtra* that has been pronounced in a nutshell, according to my understanding.

Following this, Śimānanda presents a more extensive commentary with a detailed treatment of Sāṃkhya.¹²²

¹²⁰ Dvivedin 1920, p. 25, 1-7.

¹²¹ In this case we have only long *ā* in *ādhidaivika*, which therefore has been translated slightly different than the terms for the other two kinds of suffering.

¹²² Dvivedin 1920, p. 31, 7-15.

*duḥkhaṃ trividhaṃ ādhyātmikādhībhautikādhidaivikabhedāt.*¹²³

tathā hi – tatrādhyātmikaṃ dvirūpaṃ śārīraṃ mānaśaṃ ceti. śārīraṃ tāvat vātapittaśleṣmaviparyayaḥ jvarātisārādi. mānaśaṃ tu priyaviyogāpriyasaṃyogādijam.

Suffering is threefold because of the division into that which is relating to something belonging to the Self, that which is relating to something belonging to living beings and that which is relating to the *daiva*.

To explain: Among these, [the suffering] that is relating to something belonging to the Self has two forms, physical and mental. Physical [suffering], to begin with, is effected by the perversion of wind, bile and phlegm, such as fever, dysentery, etc. Mental [suffering], on the other hand, arises from the disjunction from that which is pleasant to one, the conjunction with that which is unpleasant to one, etc.

ādhībhautikaṃ tu caturdhābhūtagrāmanimittaṃ paśupakṣimṛgamanuṣyasarīrapadaṃśayūkāmatakuṇasthāvarebhyo jarāyujāṇḍajasvedajodbhijebhyo jāyate.

[The suffering] relating to something belonging to living beings, however, inasmuch as it is caused by the fourfold community of living beings, arises from domestic animals, winged animals, wild animals, humans, crawling animals, gad flies, lice, bugs and stationary beings, [i.e.] chorion born, egg born, moisture born and sprout born [creatures].

divaḥ prabhavati tad daivam, tad adhikṛtya yaj jāyate tad adhidaivikaṃ śitoṣṇavātavarṣāśanipātajam.

That which comes forth from heaven is [called] the *daiva* (i.e., heavenly); that which arises with reference to it, is [the suffering] relating to the *daiva*, [that is, the suffering] that arises from cold, heat, wind, rain and the fall of Indra's thunderbolt (i.e., strokes of lightning).

¹²³ Here again Śimānanda uses the *vṛddhi* form for all three terms referring to the three kinds of suffering.

2.3.3. *Sāṃkhyatattvayāthārthyadīpana* (STYD)¹²⁴

ādhyātmikam ādhibhautikam ādhidaivikam ceti. tatrādhyātmikam dvividhaṃ śārīraṃ mānasaṃ ca. tatra śārīraṃ vātapittaśleṣmaṇāṃ vaiṣamyenotpannaṃ jvarātisārādi. kāmakrodhalobhādijanyaṃ mānasaṃ. mānuṣamṛgasarpādijanyaṃ ādhibhautikam. śtoṣṇavātavrṣṭijanyaṃ ādhidaivikam. anena trividhaduḥkhenābhibhūtasya tarati śokam ātmavid iti śrutvātmani jijñāsā jāyate, yathā tṛṣṭasya pānīyapipāsā.

[The suffering] relating to something belonging to the Self, [the suffering] relating to something belonging to living beings, and [the suffering] relating to the *daiva*. Among these, [the suffering] relating to something belonging to the Self is twofold, physical and mental. Among these, physical [suffering] has arisen from the imbalance of wind, bile and phlegm, such as fever, dysentery, etc. Mental [suffering] is arising from desire, anger, greed, etc. [The suffering] relating to something belonging to living beings is produced from humans, wild animals, crawling animals, etc. [The suffering] relating to something belonging to the *daiva* arising from cold, heat, wind and rain. For the one who is overwhelmed by this threefold suffering, having heard (i.e., learnt from the Śruti) that he who knows the Self, crosses over grief, the desire to know the Self arises, just like for the one who is thirsty the desire to drink water [arises].

2.3.4. *Samāśasūtrasarvopakāriṇī Tīkā* (ST)¹²⁵

adhyātmam ||6||

ātmānam adhikṛtyety adhyātmam, tad dvividhaṃ śārīraṃ mānasaṃ ceti. śārīraṃ vātapittaśleṣmavaiṣamyanimittam, mānasaṃ kāmakrodhalobhamoherṣyāviṣayaviśeṣadarśanādarśananimittam. etad ubhayaṃ apy āntaropāyasādhyatvād adhyātmam ity ucyate.

¹²⁴ Dvivedin 1920, p. 86, 15 - p. 87, 2.

¹²⁵ Dvivedin 1920, p. 96, 4-14.

adhibhūtam ||7||

mānuṣapaśupakṣisarīrpasthāvarādibhūtāny adhikṛtya tadadhibhūtam ity arthaḥ.

ādhidaivam ||8||

yakṣarākṣasavināyakagrahādyāveśanimittam etat. idaṃ dvayam api bāhyopāya-sādhyatvād bāhyam ity uktam.

That which belongs to the Self. ||6||

Belonging to the Self [means] “[occurring] with reference to the Self.” This [kind of pleasure, suffering, etc.] is twofold, physical and mental. The physical [kind] is caused by the imbalance of wind, bile and phlegm, the mental [kind] is caused by desire, anger, greed, delusion, jealousy, and aṇḍā. Both these two [kinds] are called “that which belongs to the Self” because of being effected by internal means.

That which belongs to living beings. ||7||

[What occurs] with reference to living beings, such as humans, domestic animals, winged animals, crawling animals, stationary beings, etc., that belongs to living beings. [This] is the meaning.

That which belongs to the *daiva* ||8||

This [kind] is caused by the influence of *yakṣas*, *rākṣasas*, *vināyakas*, *grahas*, etc. Both these two [kinds] are called “external” because of being effected by external means.

2.3.5. *Tattvasamāśasūtravṛtti* (TSSV)¹²⁶

trividhaṃ duḥkham ||23||

kiṃ trividhaṃ duḥkham ity atrocyate. ādhyātmikam ādhibhautikam ādhidaivikam iti. tatrādhyātmikam dvividhaṃ śārīraṃ mānasaṃ ceti. śārīre bhavaṃ śārīram

¹²⁶ Dvivedin 1920, p. 139, 16 - p. 140, 6.

*manasi bhavaṃ mānaṣaṃ ceti. tatra śārīraṃ nāma vātapittaśleṣmaṇāṃ vaiṣamyād
yad duḥkham utpadyate jvarātisāravisūcikāmūrchādikaṃ tac chārīraṃ ucyate.
kāmakrodhalobhamohamadersyādikaṃ priyaviyogādikaṃ tan mānaṣaṃ ity ucyate.
adhibhūtebhyo bhavaṃ ādhibhautikam. mānuṣapaśuṃrgasarīrpasthāvare-
bhyo yad duḥkham utpadyate tadādhibhautikam. adhidevebhyo jātam ādhidaivi-
kam. śītoṣṇavātavarṣāsannipātādinimittaṃ yad duḥkham utpadyate tad ādhidai-
vikam.*

Suffering is threefold ||23||

What is the threefold suffering? With regard to this [question] it is stated [as follows]: [The suffering] relating to something belonging to the Self, [the suffering] relating to something belonging to living beings and [the suffering] relating to the *daiva*. Among these, [the suffering] relating to something belonging to the Self is twofold, physical and mental. Physical [suffering] is that which comes about in the body, and mental [suffering] is that which comes about in the mind. Among these, the suffering named physical [suffering], which arises because of the imbalance of wind, bile and phlegm, such as fever, dysentery, cholera, fainting, etc., is called “physical [suffering].” [Suffering] such as desire, anger, greed, delusion, madness, jealousy, etc., [and suffering] such as disjunction from that which is pleasant to one, etc., are called “mental.”¹²⁷ [The suffering] relating to something belonging to living beings comes about from that which relates to living beings. The suffering that arises from humans, domestic animals, wild animals, crawling animals and stationary beings is [the one] relating to something belonging to living beings. [The suffering] relating to the *daiva* has arisen from [phenomena] that relate to the gods. The suffering that arises caused by cold, heat, wind, rain, the fall of Indra’s thunderbolt, etc., is [the suffering] relating to the *daiva*.

¹²⁷ One would expect ‘arising from,’ e.g., *kāma...ādijam* or *kāma...ādibhavam*.

2.3.6. *Sāṃkhyatattvapradīpa* (STP)¹²⁸

tatrādhyātmikam dvidhā śārīram mānasam ca. vātapittaśleṣmaṇām vaiṣamyanimittam śārīram, kāmakrodhalobhamoherṣyāviśādaviṣayaviśeṣādarśanākāraṇakam mānasam. āntaropāyasādhyatvād ādhyātmikam duḥkham iti vyapadiśyate. bāhyopāyasādhyam api duḥkham dvividham ādhibhautikam ādhidaivikam ca. tatrādhibhautikam mānuṣapakṣisarīrpasthāvaranibandhanam. ādhidaivikam yakṣarākṣasavināyakagrahādyāveśanimittam. sarvaṃ mānasapratyakṣam.

Among these, [the suffering] relating to something belonging to the Self is twofold, physical and mental. Physical [suffering] is caused by the imbalance of wind, bile and phlegm, mental [suffering] is caused by desire, anger, greed, delusion, jealousy, depression and not seeing specific objects. Because of being effected by internal means, [it] is designated as “the suffering relating to something belonging to the Self.” Also the suffering that is effected by external means is twofold, [the suffering] relating to something belonging to living beings and [the suffering] relating to the *daiva*. Among these, [the suffering] relating to something belonging to living beings is causally based on humans, winged animals, crawling animals and stationary beings. [The suffering] relating to the *daiva* is caused by the influence of *yakṣas*, *rākṣasas*, *vināyakas*, *grahas*, etc. All [suffering] is mentally perceptible.¹²⁹

2.3.7. *Tattvamīmāṃsā* (TM)¹³⁰

tatrādhyātmikam dvividham śārīram mānasam ca. śārīram vātapittaśleṣmaṇām vaiṣamyanimittam, mānasam kāmakrodhādinibandhanam. ādhibhautikam mānuṣapaśupakṣyādinimittam. ādhidaivikam yakṣarākṣasagrahādyāveśanibandhanam.

¹²⁸ Dvivedin 1920, p. 152, 4-11.

¹²⁹ This last sentence is similar to the concluding statement in the the SPBh of Vijñānabhikṣu.

¹³⁰ Dvivedin 1920, p. 179, 5-9.

Among these, [the suffering] relating to something belonging to the Self is twofold, physical and mental. Physical [suffering] is caused by the imbalance of wind, bile and phlegm, mental [suffering] is casually based on desire, anger, etc. [The suffering] relating to something belonging to living beings is caused by humans, domestic animals, winged animals, etc. [The suffering] relating to the *daiva* is causally based on the influence of *yakṣas*, *rākṣasas*, *grahas*, etc.

2.4. Classical Yoga

Classical Yoga philosophy is known through the *Yogasūtra* (YS) ascribed to Patañjali. The YS with its commentary, often designated as the *Vyāsaśāstra*, is known as the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* (PYŚ). Following Bronkhorst's hypothesis, Maas argues emphatically that one should consider the YS with its commentary as the work of a single author who must have lived between 325 and 425 CE (Maas 2006, p. xix).¹³¹ The PYŚ is similar to the classical system of Sāṃkhya in many respects, but also in some ways very different from it. The two traditions share similarities in their ontology. Classical Yoga philosophy, just as Sāṃkhya, is based on the theory of *puruṣa*, *prakṛti* and the three *guṇas*.¹³² According to Frauwallner, Yoga is an old school of the Sāṃkhya system.¹³³

In the manuscripts, the PYŚ is divided into four quarters (*pādas*): *Samādhipāda* (quarter on contemplation), *Sādhana-pāda* (quarter on the means of achievement), *Vibhūtipāda* (quarter on the supernatural powers) and *Kaivalyapāda* (quarter on the emancipatory isolation). Reference to the three kinds of suffering is found in the first quarter, the *Samādhipāda*, in *sūtra* 31. In *sūtra* 30, the author has enumerated various distractions, and in this *sūtra* he lists mental and physical states and processes that accompany them, with suffering (*duḥkha*) finding its place as the first one.¹³⁴ In the commentary, the author explains suffering by simply dividing it into

¹³¹ Maas has shown that there is no manuscript transmission of the YS without the commentary, and that the YS and commentary are syntactically connected. For more information on the author Patañjali and his date, see Maas 2006, pp. ix-xii.

¹³² See Maas 2020, *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* in *Brill's Encyclopedia of Hinduism Online*.

¹³³ See Frauwallner 1953, p. 409f.

¹³⁴ Maas 2006, p. 49: *duḥkhadaurmanasyāṅgamejayatvaśvāsapraśvāsā vikṣepasahabhuvah* || YS 1.31 || *duḥkham ādhyātmikam ādhibhautikam ādhidaivikam* ca. Suffering, mental discomfort, trembling of the limbs, [irregular] inhalation and exhalation are accompanying the distractions. ||1.31|| Suffering is relating to something belonging to the Self, relating to something belonging to living beings and relating to the *daiva*.

the three types, but does not elaborate on this, contrary to other commentators such as Vācaspatimiśra, the author of the *Vivaraṇa*, and Vijñānabhikṣu.

Vācaspatimiśra's *Tattvavaiśārādī* (TV) is an important commentary from around 950 CE. The most informative commentary, possibly the oldest, is the *Pātañjalayogaśāstravivaraṇa*, by an author called Śaṅkara. The question whether this Śaṅkara is identical with the famous Advaita Vedānta philosopher, is still unresolved. Vijñānabhikṣu composed a commentary in the latter half of the 16th century, named *Yogavārttika* (YV).

Regarding reference to the terms *ādhyātmika*, *ādhibhautika* and *ādhidaivika*, it is interesting to note that they appear in the PYŚ not only in the context of suffering, but also in the context of *ariṣṭas* (death omens) where *ariṣṭa* is described as having a threefold characteristic in the commentary on *Vibhūtipāda*, *sūtra* 22. This *sūtra* refers to a twofold distinction of *karma* ('action') and to the knowledge of one's close death which one can achieve through the control of concentration (*dhāraṇa*), meditation (*dhyāna*) and contemplation (*samādhi*).¹³⁵ To this, the author of the PYŚ adds an alternative, namely that one can also achieve the knowledge of one's approaching death by knowledge of signs of death or death omens. The commentary explains:

Death omens are threefold – relating to something belonging to the Self, relating to something belonging to living beings and relating to the *daiva*. Among these, an *ādhyātmika* [omen of death is like the following]: A person who has covered ears does not hear the noise in its own body, or a person does not see a light when his eye has been obstructed. Similarly, an *ādhibhautika* [omen of death is like the following]: A person sees servants of Yama, [or] he suddenly sees ancestors who have passed away. Similarly, an *ādhidaivika* [omen of death is like the following]: A person suddenly sees the heavenly world or perfected beings (*siddhas*), or everything perverted.¹³⁶

Thus, an *ādhyātmika* omen of death relates to something that belongs to oneself, namely one's body and senses. An *ādhibhautika* omen of death relates to certain living beings, namely the

¹³⁵ Āgāśe 1904, p. 147, 1-2. *sopakramaṃ nirupakramaṃ ca karma tatsaṃyamād aparāntajñānam ariṣṭebhyo vā ||3.22|| tatsaṃyama* is not explicitly defined in the commentary to this *sūtra*. However, the commentary on YS 3.4 explains the term *saṃyama*, which is related to these same terms.

¹³⁶ Āgāśe 1904, p. 147, 11-17. *trividham ariṣṭam – ādhyātmikam ādhibhautikam ādhidaivikam ceti. tatrādhyātmikam: ghoṣaṃ svadehe pihitakarṇo na śṛṇoti, jyotir vā netre 'vaṣṭabdhe na paśyati. tathādhibhautikam: yamapuruṣān paśyati, pitṛṇ atītān akasmāt paśyati. tathādhidaivikam: svargam akasmāt siddhān vā paśyati, viparītaṃ vā sarvaṃ iti.*

creepy servants of Yama, the god of death, who come to take the dying persons to Yama's dark realm, and to other non-human beings like one's ancestors who have already passed away. An *ādhidaivika* omen of death relates to something belonging to heaven / the gods, like the heavenly world or the *siddhas*, who are semi-divine beings. The explanation of the three terms characterizing the three kinds of death omens clearly shows a close similarity with the explanation of the same terms in the context of the three kinds of suffering.

2.4.1. *Tattvavaiśārādī* (TV)¹³⁷

na kevalaṃ navāntarāyāḥ duḥkhādayo 'py asya tatsahabhūvo bhavantīty āha – duḥkhetyādi. pratikūlavedanīyaṃ duḥkham. ādhyātmikaṃ śārīraṃ vyādhivaśān mānasaṃ ca kāmādivaśāt. ādhibhautikaṃ vyāghrādijanitam. ādhidaivikaṃ graha-pīḍādijanitam.

Not only the nine obstacles,¹³⁸ [but] also suffering, etc., occur for him (i.e., the yogi) as something that accompanies them. Therefore he (i.e., the author) says – “Suffering,” etc. Suffering is that which is being experienced as unpleasant. [The suffering] relating to something belonging to the Self is physical on account of disease, and mental on account of desire, etc. [The suffering] relating to something belonging to living beings is created by tigers, etc. [The suffering] relating to the *daiva* is created by oppression by a planet, etc.¹³⁹

2.4.2. *Vivaraṇa* (Vi)¹⁴⁰

ādhyātmikam – adhy ātmanīty adhyātmam, tatra bhavam ādhyātmikam. tac ca śārīraṃ mānasaṃ ca. śārīraṃ dhātuvaiśamyādinimittam. mānasam iṣṭavighātādi-

¹³⁷ Āgāśe 1904, p. 35, 18-24.

¹³⁸ These nine obstacles are listed in the previous *sūtra*.

¹³⁹ On the meaning of *grahapīḍā*, see section 3.1.4.

¹⁴⁰ Harimoto 1999, p. 285, 3-7, p. 286, 1.

hetukam. ādhibhautikam – adhi bhūteṣv ity adhibhūtam, tatra bhavam ādhibhautikam. tac ca paśumṛgādyupanipatitam. ādhidaivikam iti. adhi deveṣv ity adhidaivam, tatra bhavam ādhidaivikam. tac cāpi vātavarṣādinimittam.

ādhyātmikam –belonging to the Self [means] “[occurring] with reference to the Self”; what comes about there is [the suffering] relating to something belonging to the Self. And this [kind of suffering] is physical and mental. Physical [suffering] is caused by the imbalance of the constituents of the body (i.e., the three humors), etc. Mental [suffering] is caused by the impediment of that which is desired, etc.

ādhibhautikam – belonging to living beings [means] “[occurring] with reference to living beings”; what comes about there is [the suffering] relating to something belonging to living beings. And this [kind of suffering] takes place on account of domestic animals, wild animals, etc.

ādhidaivikam – belonging to gods [means] “[occurring] with reference to the gods”; what comes about there is [the suffering] relating to something belonging to the gods. And this, for its part, is caused by wind, rain, etc.

2.4.3. *Yogavārttika* (YV)¹⁴¹

ātmānaṃ svasaṅghātam adhikṛtya vartata ity ādhyātmikam, tac ca dvividhaṃ śārīraṃ mānaṣaṃ ca. śārīraṃ vyādhyādijanitam mānaṣaṃ kāmādiṣaṃ.

[The suffering] relating to something belonging to the Self [means] “[the suffering] that occurs with reference to the Self, [i.e.] one’s own aggregate (i.e., that which makes up the individual).” And this [kind of suffering] is twofold, physical and mental. Physical [suffering] is produced by disease, etc., mental [suffering] arises from desire, etc.

bhūtāni prāṇino vyāghrādīn lakṣikṛtya jāyata ity ādhibhautikaṃ vyāghrādyuttham. devān adhikṛtya jāyata ity ādhidaivikaṃ śītoṣṇādyuttham ity arthaḥ.

¹⁴¹ Paṭavardhana, Rāmakṛṣṇasāstrī and Keśavaśāstrī 1884, p. 59, line 26 – p. 60, line 1-4.

[The suffering] relating to living beings, [that is, the suffering] that arises with reference to living beings, [i.e.] living creatures, arises from tigers, etc. [The suffering] relating to the *daiva*, [that is, the suffering] that arises with reference to the gods, arises from heat, cold, etc. [This] is the meaning.

yady api sarvam eva vipakṣodbhavaṃ duḥkhaṃ mānaśaṃ tathāpi prādhānyena manovikārajanīyatvājanīyatvābhyāṃ mānaśatvāmānaśatvavibhāgaḥ. viśayagata-duḥkheṣu cittavikṣepāṇām ahetutvād duḥkhasāmānyasya trividhā vibhāgo na ghaṭate ghaṭapaṭādiduḥkhānām asaṃgrahāt. evam anyatrāpi.

Even though all suffering without exception, which comes about through adverse factors, is mental, nevertheless there is a division of being mental and non-mental because of arising from negative mental modifications and not arising [from such modifications]. Because the distractions of the mind are not causes with regard to suffering that belongs to objects, a threefold division of the universal of suffering (i.e., suffering in general) does not take place (i.e., does not work out), because there is no inclusion of the suffering from a pot, cloth, etc. In this way it is also elsewhere.

2.5. The notion of *ādhyātmika*, *ādhibhautika* and *ādhidaivika* suffering in other Indian traditions

As has already been mentioned in the introduction, references to the three kinds of suffering can be found in various genres of Sanskrit literature apart from the philosophical traditions of Sāṃkhya and Yoga. This section presents the occurrence of the taxonomy of *ādhyātmika*, *ādhibhautika* and *ādhidaivika* suffering in the Pāśupata tradition, some Purāṇas and Āyurveda.

2.5.1. The Pāśupata tradition

The Pāśupata tradition belongs to the religious stream of Śaivism. Śaivism is a tradition that focuses on the worship of the deity Śiva. Within Śaivism, there are further differentiations: the Atimārga (“Higher Path”) which prescribes strict ascetic practices that lead directly to liberation, and the Mantramārga (“Path of Mantras”) which leads to liberation through the attainment of supernatural powers and experience of pleasure (Flood 1996, p. 158). Flood broadly distinguishes between Purāṇic and Non-Purāṇic Śaivism. Non-Purāṇic Śaivism comprises two divisions, the *atimārga* and *mantramārga*, whereas Purāṇic Śaivism developed as a major strand of Hindu religiosity.¹⁴² Moreover, there is a distinction between lay devotion to Śiva, in which domain certain Purāṇas belong, and initiatory Śaivism, which requires an initiation by a teacher.¹⁴³ The Pāśupata tradition, probably the oldest Śaiva sect, belongs to the Atimārga (Flood 1996, p. 155). The foundational text of the Pāśupata tradition is the *Pañcārtha* or *Pāśupatasūtra*, dated to the second century CE, with Kauṇḍinya’s commentary *Pañcārthabhāṣya* (PABh), dated between 400 and 550 CE (Sanderson 2012-2013, p. 8). Regarding the content of the PABh, it seems that Kauṇḍinya has adopted some teachings from Sāṃkhya and Yoga for the formation of his own teaching (Hara 2002, p. 18).¹⁴⁴ The teaching of the PABh deals with five topics: cause (*kāraṇa*), effect (*kārya*), observance (*vidhi*), union (*yoga*) and end of suffering (*duḥkhānta*).¹⁴⁵ Since the complete removal of suffering is thus one

¹⁴² For more information, see Flood 1996, pp. 152ff.

¹⁴³ See Sanderson 2014, p. 4.

¹⁴⁴ For more information on similarities with Yoga and Sāṃkhya see Hara 2002, Chapter 1: *Pāśupata and Sāṃkhya Yoga* in *Pāśupata Studies*, pp. 17-33.

¹⁴⁵ The translation of these terms has been taken from Sanderson 2014, p. 10.

of the main topics in the PABh as well as in Sāṃkhya, the classification of *duḥkha* is mentioned several times in the PABh. Among the various classifications of *duḥkha* mentioned in the PABh,¹⁴⁶ in this thesis only the triad of suffering that corresponds to the Sāṃkhya notion will be presented.

2.5.1.1. Kauṇḍinya's *Pañcārthabhāṣya* (PABh)¹⁴⁷

duḥkhānām iti. atra prasiddhāni duḥkhāny ādhyātmikādhībhautikādhidaivikāni. tatrādhyātmikaṃ dvividhaṃ duḥkhaṃ śārīraṃ mānasaṃ ca. tatra manasi bhavaṃ mānasaṃ.

krodhalobhamohabhayaaviśādersyāsūyādvēṣamadamānamātsaryāratyādyaviśeṣad arśanādinimittaṃ tad duḥkham. tathā śārīraṃ api śīrorogadantaro-gākṣīrogajvarapratimatsyātisārakāśaśvāsodarāmayādinimittotpannaṃ duḥkham.

“Of suffering”: Here the [three] well-known [kinds of] suffering are relating to something belonging to the Self, relating to something belonging to living beings, and relating to the *daiva*. Among these, the two-fold suffering relating to something belonging to the Self is physical and mental. Among these, mental [suffering] is that which comes about in the mind. This [kind of suffering] is caused by anger, greed, delusion, fear, depression, jealousy, ill-will, dislike, madness, pride, malice, dissatisfaction, etc., and by not seeing specifics, etc. Similarly, physical [suffering], for its part, is suffering that has arisen from causes such as diseases of the head, dental diseases, eye diseases, fever, *pratimatsya* (?),¹⁴⁸ dysentery, cough, hard breathing, stomach sickness, etc.

¹⁴⁶ Hara also presents another fivefold classification of *duḥkha*, with five key terms, namely, *garbha* (suffering in the womb), *janman* (suffering at birth), *ajñāna* (the suffering of ignorance), *jarā* (the suffering of old age) and *maraṇa* (the suffering of death).

¹⁴⁷ PABh on *Pāśupatasūtra* 5.40, Śastri 1940, p. 141, 10-15.

¹⁴⁸ *pratimatsya* must be a corruption of the text. Hara also places a question mark next to this untranslated word in his transliteration. See Hara 2002, p. 79.

tathānyad api pañcavidham duḥkham bhavati. tadyathā – ihalokabhayaṃ paralokabhayaṃ ahitasamprayogo hitaviprayoga icchāvyāghātaś ceti. tathānyad api trividham duḥkham bhavati: ādhyātmikam ajñānam puruṣe, ādhibhautikam viṣayitvam, ādhidaivikam ca paśutvam trividham aparaṃ¹⁴⁹ prāhuḥ.¹⁵⁰

Likewise, there is also another fivefold suffering. To elaborate – fear concerning this world, fear concerning the other world, conjunction with something that is not beneficial, disjunction from something that is beneficial, and obstruction of one’s wishes. Likewise, there is also another threefold suffering: Others proclaim [suffering] to be threefold: relating to something belonging to the Self, [namely] ignorance with regard to the person, relating to something belonging to living beings, [namely, the individual’s] being characterized by the objects of the senses (i.e., sensuality), and relating to the *daiva*, [namely] being “cattle” (i.e., a soul to be released by the grace of the Lord).

2.5.2. Purāṇas

The Purāṇas, ‘ancient tales,’ are an extensive corpus of texts that is traditionally categorised into 18 Mahāpurāṇas (major) and 18 Upapurāṇas (minor).¹⁵¹ The date of the Purāṇas is very uncertain and it seems that not all parts of a specific Purāṇa were written in one period, but rather some parts written later, some earlier. The central topics of the Purāṇas are cosmic creation, stories of various Gods and sages, creation of the earth, the cosmic cycles, etc.¹⁵²

The *Viṣṇupurāṇa* (VP) and *Brahmapurāṇa* (BP) belong to the category of Mahāpurāṇa. According to some scholars, the VP is one of the most important Purāṇas because of its representation of the Pāñcarātra tradition.¹⁵³ The date of the VP is speculative, with suggested

¹⁴⁹ Probably one has to read *apare* here.

¹⁵⁰ Śastri 1940, p. 143, 10-13.

¹⁵¹ See Rocher 1986, pp. 31ff., Bishop 1973, p. 1. The Purāṇic corpus contains a varying number of works, and its classification is much more complex.

¹⁵² For more on the topics of the Purāṇas, see the *pañcalakṣaṇa* characterisation in Bailey 2011, pp. 319-337 and Bailey 2018.

¹⁵³ This is a tradition that worships Viṣṇu as the supreme God. For more, see Rastelli 2018.

dates from the 700 BCE to ca. 1045 CE.¹⁵⁴ It is one of the shorter Purāṇas, composed of six *aṃśas* (parts), with a total of one hundred and twenty-six chapters. The reference to three kinds of affliction, *ādhyātmika*, *ādhibhautika* and *ādhidaiivika*, is found in the sixth *aṃśa* narrated by Parāśara¹⁵⁵ to Maitreya.¹⁵⁶

In most lists of Mahāpurāṇas, the BP is listed at the very beginning. It is an extensive work consisting of 245 chapters.¹⁵⁷ The date of the BP is still uncertain; according to Schreiner, the BP appears to be a text that was edited in north-eastern India using older sources with the intention of creating a Purāṇa.¹⁵⁸ The reference to the three kinds of affliction is found in chapter 234, narrated by Vyāsa.

As for the concept of the three kinds of suffering, the VP and the BP do not refer to *duḥkhatraya*, but to *tāpatraya*. The word *tāpa*, a masculine noun, means ‘heat,’ ‘torment,’ ‘pain,’ ‘affliction,’ ‘misery.’ It is derived from the root $\sqrt{tap}$ which means ‘to be hot/warm,’ ‘to suffer.’¹⁵⁹ The neuter noun *tapas* refers to severe penance. In order to distinguish between *duḥkhatraya* and *tāpatraya*, the latter term is translated as ‘three kinds of misery.’

2.5.2.1. *Brahmapurāṇa* (BP) and *Viṣṇupurāṇa* (VP)¹⁶⁰

vyāsa uvāca

ādhyātmikādi bho viprā¹⁶¹ jñātvā tāpatrayaṃ budhaḥ |

utpannajñānavairāgyaḥ prāpnoty ātyantikaṃ layam ||BP 234.1||

¹⁵⁴ See Rocher 1986, p. 249, Hazra 1940, p. 19.

¹⁵⁵ More on Parāśara, see Vettam Mani 1975, p. 569; more on Maitreya, see Vettam Mani 1975, p. 469.

¹⁵⁶ *parāśara uvāca: ādhyātmikādi maitreya jñātvā tāpatrayaṃ budhaḥ | utpannajñānavairāgyaḥ prāpnoty ātyantikaṃ layam || VP 6,5.1||* Parāśara said: O Maitreya! Having known the three kinds of misery, beginning with [the misery] that belongs to something relating to the Self, a learned man for whom knowledge and passionlessness have arisen, obtains the absolute dissolution.

¹⁵⁷ See Rocher 1986, pp. 154-156.

¹⁵⁸ Schreiner 1989, pp. 410-419.

¹⁵⁹ See Apte 1890, p. 530.

¹⁶⁰ Because of the similarity between Brahma- and Viṣṇupurāṇa, only the translation of the passages in the former is presented here.

¹⁶¹ In the VP instead of *bho viprā*, the text has *maitreya*; see VP 6.5.1.

Vyāsa said:

O wise ones! Having known the three kinds of misery, beginning with the one relating to something belonging to the Self, a learned one for whom knowledge and passionlessness have arisen, obtains the absolute dissolution.

ādhyātmiko 'pi¹⁶² dvividhaḥ śārīro mānasas tathā |

śārīro bahubhir bhedair bhidyate śrūyatām ca saḥ ||BP 234.2||

The [misery] that relates to something belonging to the Self, for its part, is twofold, physical and mental. Physical [misery] is divided by numerous divisions (i.e., into numerous kinds), and this one should be heard (i.e., learnt about) [now].

śīrorogapraṭiśyāyajvaraśūlabhagaṃdaraiḥ |

gulmārśaḥśvayathuśvāsacchardyaḍibhir anekadhā ||

tathākṣirogātīsārakuṣṭhāṅgāmayasaṃjñakaiḥ |

bhidyate dehajas tāpo mānasam śrotum arhatha¹⁶³ ||BP 234.3-4||

The misery born from the body is divided manyfold, by diseases of the head, cold, fever, sharp pain, anorectal fistulas, by visceral swelling, hemorrhoids, swelling, hard breathing, vomiting, etc.,

likewise by eye diseases, dysentery, skin diseases and what is called diseases of the limbs. [Now] you should hear (i.e., learn about) mental [misery].

kāmakrodhabhayadveṣalobhamohaviṣāḍajaḥ |

śokāsūyāvamānerṣyāmātsaryābhibhavas¹⁶⁴ tathā ||

¹⁶² In the VP *vai* occurs instead of *api*; see VP 6.5.2.

¹⁶³ Instead of *arhatha*, the VP has *arhasi*; see VP 6.5.4.

¹⁶⁴ One should probably read *ādibhavas* here.

mānaso 'pi dvijaśreṣṭhās tāpo bhavati naikadhā |

ity evamādibhir bhedaḥ tāpo hy ādhyātmikaḥ smṛtaḥ || BP 234.5-6||

Born from desire, anger, fear, dislike, greed, delusion and depression, likewise coming about through grief, ill-will, disrespect, jealousy and malice, mental misery, for its part, O best of Brahmins! does not occur in one way [only]. With these and like divisions (i.e., kinds), misery is recollected (i.e., traditionally known) as relating to something belonging to the Self.

mṛgapakṣimanuṣyādyaiḥ piśācoragarākṣasaiḥ |

sarīṣṛpādyaiś ca nṛṇāṃ janyate cādhibhautikaḥ ||BP 234.7||

And [misery] relating to something belonging to living beings is produced for humans by wild animals, winged animals and humans, etc., by *piśācas*, snakes and *rākṣasas*, and by crawling animals, etc.

śītoṣṇavātavarṣāmbuvaidyutādisamudbhavaḥ |

tāpo dvijavaraśreṣṭhāḥ kathyate cādhibaivikaḥ ||BP 234.8||

O best of the Brahmins! And the misery relating to something belonging to the *daiva* is explained as a production of cold, heat, wind, rain, water, lightening, etc.

garbhajanmajarājñānamṛtyunārakajaṃ tathā |

duḥkhaṃ sahasraśo bhedaḥ bhidyate munisattamāḥ ||BP 234.9||

Likewise, the suffering that is born from the womb, birth, old age, ignorance, death and hell, is divided thousandfold by [its] divisions, O most excellent sages!

2.5.3. Classical Āyurveda

The most important and well-known work of the textual corpus of classical Āyurveda is the Compendium of Caraka, the *Carakasamhitā* (CS). It has been composed probably in the first or second century CE. Another important Āyurvedic text is the Compendium of Suśruta, the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* (SS), which is probably to be dated one or two centuries after the CS (Wujastyk 2017, p. 39). These two works are not at all identical; they differ from each other in their classifications, therapies, and theories. This applies also to the classification of suffering. The classification of suffering into *ādhyātmika*, *ādhibhautika* and *ādhidaivika* is found only in the SS. The CS, on the other hand, distinguishes three types of disease, namely *nija* (indigenous), *āgantū* (exogenous) and *mānasa* (mental). Indigenous diseases arise from the disturbing bodily factors, exogenous diseases from spirits, poison, wind, fire, conflict, etc., and mental diseases from not getting what one wishes or from getting what one does not wish.¹⁶⁵ Hence, when one compares the threefold classification of disease in the CS and the classification of suffering in the SS, there are indeed some similarities. The *nija* and *mānasa* types of disease would match the *ādhyātmika* type of suffering, and the *āgantū* type of disease partially the *ādhibhautika* type of suffering and partially its *ādhidaivika* type.¹⁶⁶

The reference to *ādhyātmika*, *ādhibhautika* and *ādhidaivika* suffering is found in *Suśrutasaṃhitā*, *Sūtrasthāna* 24.3. In this section of the text, a classification similar to the one adopted in Sāṃkhya is followed. According to Rusza, the original source of the notion of triple suffering is probably the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* inasmuch the identification of suffering with a pathological state would seem justifiable for him (Rusza 1997, p. 4). Steiner, on the contrary, argues that this classification would not fit into the medical context, because Indian medicine has its own systematic classifications of disease which would fit much better than the

¹⁶⁵ CS 1.11.45: *trayo rogā iti – nijāgantūmānasāḥ. tatra nijāḥ śārīradoṣasamutthāḥ, āgantur bhūtaviṣavāyavagnisamprahārādisamutthāḥ, mānasāḥ punar iṣṭasya lābhāl lābhāc cāniṣṭasyopajāyate*. See Trikamji 1940, p. 76.

¹⁶⁶ The *Sāṃkhyatattvakaumudī* classifies *ādhibhautika* and *ādhidaivika* suffering as suffering effected by external (*bāhya*) mean, and *ādhyātmika* suffering as effected by internal (*āntara*) means (see above, p. 32). Moreover, Caraka reiterates on the *āgantū* type of disease in CS 1.7.51: *ye bhūtaviṣavāyavagnisamprahārādisambhāvāḥ nṛṇām āgantavo rogāḥ [...]* The exogenous diseases of humans which arise from spirits, poison, wind, fire, assault, etc. [...].

The causal factor *bhūta*, in the sense of a spirit, and thus referring to a kind of demonic possession, is enumerated in the SSV under the causes of *ādhidaivika* suffering (see above, p. 36).

classification of the threefold suffering.¹⁶⁷ Therefore he suggests that a notion of the Sāṃkhya tradition was incorporated here into medical lore.

2.5.3.1. *Suśrutasamhitā Sūtrasthāna* (SS Sū)¹⁶⁸

asmin punaḥ śāstre sarvatantrasāmānyāt sarveṣāṃ vyādhīnāṃ yathāsthūlam avarodhaḥ kriyate. prāg abhihitam “tadduḥkhasaṃyogā vyādhayaḥ” iti. tac ca duḥkhaṃ trividham – ādhyātmikam ādhibhautikam ādhidaivikam iti. tat tu sapta-vidhe vyādhāv upanipatati.

Again, in this very body of expert knowledge,¹⁶⁹ all diseases are being included¹⁷⁰ roughly, because they are common to all specialized scientific treatises. It has been previously said¹⁷¹ that diseases are conjunctions of this¹⁷² and suffering. And this suffering is threefold, namely, [the suffering] relating to something belonging to the self (*ādhyātmika*), [the suffering] relating to something belonging to living beings (*ādhibhautika*) [and the suffering] relating to the *daiva* (*ādhidaivika*). This, however, falls into the sevenfold disease.

te punaḥ saptavidhā vyādhayastadyathā – ādibalapravṛttāḥ janmabalapravṛttāḥ doṣabalapravṛttāḥ saṃghātabalapravṛttāḥ kālabalapravṛttāḥ daivabalapravṛttāḥ svabhāvabalapravṛttāḥ iti. (24.4)

These, however, the sevenfold diseases, are as follows:

1. [diseases] that have occurred by force of the beginning (*ādibalapravṛtta*)

¹⁶⁷ See Steiner 1998, p. 516. For more references to the various classifications of disease in Āyurveda, see Wujastyk 2017, pp. 38-54.

¹⁶⁸ Ācārya Yādavaśarman and Ācārya Narayan Ram 2003, p. 24, 4-7.

¹⁶⁹ The commentator Ḍalhaṇa explains this as *śalyatantra*, i.e., ‘the scientific treatise on surgery.’ Ibid. p. 107.

¹⁷⁰ The word *avarodha* is explained by Ḍalhaṇa as *saṃgraha*, which in the present context can be translated as ‘comprehension.’ Ibid., p. 114.

¹⁷¹ This refers to SS Sū 1.23: The conjunctions of this [individual] and suffering is called disease (*tadduḥkhasaṃyogā vyādhaya ucyate*).

¹⁷² Ḍalhaṇa says on *tat* as the first word of the compound: *tad iti tayoh śarīraśarīriṇoh, śarīramanasor iti kecit*. The word *tad* refers to the body and to that which is embodied, namely to body and mind. Ibid., p. 107. However, *tat* in *tadduḥkhasaṃyoga* in SS Sū 1.23, referred to in Sū 24.4 and quoted here in the previous footnote, refers to *puruṣa*, i.e., the person or individual, in the preceding passage Sū 1.22.

2. [diseases] that have occurred by force of birth (*janmabalapravṛtta*)
3. [diseases] that have occurred by force of the three humors as disturbing factors (*doṣabalapravṛtta*)
4. [diseases] that have occurred by force of a clash (*saṃghātabalapravṛtta*)
5. [diseases] that have occurred by force of time (*kālabalapravṛtta*)
6. [diseases] that have occurred by force of the *daiva* (*daivabalapravṛtta*)
7. [diseases] that have occurred by force of own being (*svabhāvabalapravṛtta*).

tatrādibalapravṛttā ye śukraśoṇitadoṣānvayāḥ kuṣṭhārśaḥprabhṛtayaḥ. te 'pi dvi-vidhāḥ – mātṛjāḥ pitṛjāś ca.

Among these, the ones that have occurred by force of the beginning are consequences of faults of semen and blood, such as skin diseases, hemorrhoids, etc. These, for their part, are twofold – produced from the mother and produced from the father.

janmabalapravṛttā ye mātur apacārāt paṅgujātyandhabadhiramūkaminminavā-manaprabhṛtayo jāyante. te 'pi dvividhāḥ – rasakṛtā dauhṛdāpacārakṛtāś ca.

The ones that have occurred by force of birth arise from the mother's improper conduct, such as lameness, blindness, deafness [and] dumbness by birth, speaking through one's nose, dwarfism, etc. These, for their part, are twofold – effected by the nutritional fluid [conveyed from the mother's body to that of the child?] and effected by improper conduct [of the mother] due to cravings connected with pregnancy.

doṣabalapravṛttā ya ātaṅkasamutpannā mithyāhārācārakṛtāś ca. te 'pi dvividhāḥ – āmāśayasamutthāḥ pakvāśayasamutthāś ca. punaś ca dvividhāḥ – śārīrā māna-sāś ca.

ta eta ādhyātmikāḥ. (24.5)

The [diseases] that have occurred by force of the [humors as] disturbing factors are [diseases] that have arisen from sickness and are effected by wrong intake [of food and drink] and behaviour. These, for their part, are twofold – arising from the

stomach and arising from the intestines. And [these] are, again, twofold – physical and mental.

These are [the diseases] relating to something belonging to the Self.

saṃghātabalapravṛttā ya āgantavo durbalasya balavadvigrahāt. te 'pi dvividhāḥ – śastrakṛtā vyālakṛtāś ca.

eta ādhibhautikāḥ. (24.6)

The [diseases] that have occurred by force of a clash are exogenous [arising] from the struggle of a weak person with something strong. These, for their part, are twofold – effected by weapons and effected by beasts of prey.

These are [the diseases] relating to something belonging to living beings.

kālabalapravṛttā ye śītoṣṇavātavarṣāprabhṛtinimittāḥ. te 'pi dvividhāḥ – vyāpan-nartukṛtā avyāpannartukṛtāś ca.

The [diseases] that have occurred by force of time are [diseases] that are caused by cold, heat, wind, rain, etc. They, for their part, are twofold – effected by impaired seasons and not effected by impaired seasons.

daivabalapravṛttā ye devadrohād abhiśaptakā atharvaṇakṛtā upasargajāś ca. te 'pi dvividhāḥ – vidyudaśanikṛtāḥ piśācādikṛtāś ca. punaś ca dvividhāḥ – saṃsar-gajā ākasmikāś ca.

The [diseases] that have occurred by force of the *daiva* are [diseases] that result from a curse, are effected by something relating to the fire priests and arise from natural events foreboding evil because of an offense against the gods. These, for their part, are twofold – effected by lightning and thunderbolts, and effected by *piśācas*, etc. And [these] are, again, twofold – produced from an association and accidental.

svabhāvabalapravṛttā ye kṣutpipāsājarāmṛtyunidrāprabhṛtayaḥ. te 'pi dvividhāḥ – kālakṛtā akālakṛtāś ca. tatra parirakṣaṇakṛtāḥ kālakṛtāḥ, aparirakṣaṇakṛtā akālakṛtāḥ.

eta ādhidaivikāḥ.

atra sarvavyādhyavarodhaḥ. (24.7)

The [diseases] that have occurred by force of own being are [afflictions] such as hunger, thirst, ageing, death, sleepiness, etc. These, for their part, are twofold – effected by time and not effected by time. Among these, the ones effected by time are the ones effected in the case of protective measures; the ones not effected by time are the ones not effected in the case of protective measures.

These are [diseases] relating to the *daiva*.

Here (i.e., in this classification) all diseases are included.

According to the SS, the three kinds of suffering can be squared with the seven kinds of diseases. The *ādhyātmika* type of suffering encompasses the first three kinds of diseases (*ādibalapravṛtta*, *janmabalapravṛtta* and *doṣabalapravṛtta*). The *ādhibhautika* type of suffering is represented only by a single kind of disease (*saṃghātabalapravṛtta*), whereas the *ādhidaivika* type comprises the remaining three kinds of diseases (*kālabalapravṛtta*, *daivabalapravṛtta* and *svabhāvabalapravṛtta*). Each of the seven kinds of diseases has its own twofold sub-classification. However, in the case of the *doṣabalapravṛtta* kind of diseases that belongs to the *ādhyātmika* type of suffering, a second twofold classification is provided. This second classification is very well-known in Sāṃkhya, namely, the twofold classification of *ādhyātmika* suffering into physical (*śārīra*) and mental (*mānasa*) suffering. It seems that in the SS this twofold division relates specifically to the *doṣabalapravṛtta* diseases as part of the diseases classified as *ādhyātmika* suffering. If it would refer to the whole group of diseases correlated with the *ādhyātmika* type of suffering, which would correspond to the sub-classification of this type as seen in Sāṃkhya literatures, it would include the *ādibalapravṛtta*, *janmabalapravṛtta* and *doṣabalapravṛtta* kinds of diseases. On the other hand, if it indicates only an alternative division of *doṣabalapravṛtta* diseases, this would make good sense since in classical Sāṃkhya the physical (*śārīra*) sub-type of *ādhyātmika* suffering is explained as resulting from an imbalance or perversion of the humors (*dhātu*) which then become disturbing factors (*doṣavaiṣamyā*, *doṣaviparyaya*). Whatever interpretation one prefers, the examples for the mental (*mānasa*) type of suffering known from other literature examined here are not

mentioned; this type remains unspecified here. However, in SS 1.23-25, in a fourfold classification of *duḥkha*,¹⁷³ the *mānasa* type occurs as the third one and is elaborated as follows:

However, mental [types of suffering], such as anger, grief, fear, joy, depression, jealousy, ill will, wretchedness, malice, desire, greed, etc., come about through the division (i.e., different kinds) of wishes and dislikes.¹⁷⁴

With regard to the passage SS Sū, 24.4-7, I would suggest that Steiner's understanding is more justifiable than Rusza's interpretation, namely, that the passage in the SS incorporated Sāṃkhya's threefold classification, and not the other way around. The twofold division of *ādhyātmika* suffering into physical and mental suffering is very well known among the Sāṃkhya commentators and in the passage of the SS it may have been taken over without an elaborating of the mental kind. Furthermore, the scheme of the three kinds of suffering as presented in SS Sū 24.4-7 is not utilized practically in other contexts of the SS.¹⁷⁵

¹⁷³ These types of suffering are exogenous (*āgantū*), bodily (*śārīra*), mental (*mānasa*), and natural (*svābhāvika*) suffering.

¹⁷⁴ See SS Sū 1.24: *mānasās tu krodhaśokabhayaḥarṣaḥaviṣāderśyābhyasūyādāinīyamātsaryakāmalobha-prabhṛtaya icchādvēṣabhedair bhavanti*.

¹⁷⁵ See Steiner 1998, p. 516.

3. Analysis and evaluation of relevant passages

In order to summarize the content of the translated passages and to provide an overview of the diverse classifications and exemplifications of the three kinds of suffering, a table is provided for each kind (Table 1 to Table 4). The *ādhyātmika* suffering is presented in two tables (Table 1 and Table 2), one relating to the physical form of suffering and the other to the mental form of suffering.

3.1. Tables

The first column of each of the tables names the items that occur as exemplifications of the respective type of suffering in the various works used as sources in this thesis. The first row indicates the works in which these items occur. The works are identified with the following abbreviations, which are further distinguished according to the type of work:

- commentaries on SK 1, highlighted in light orange color:

GBh *Gauḍapādashāstra*

MV *Māṭharavṛtti*

V1 *Sāṃkhyasaptatīvṛtti*

V2 *Sāṃkhyasaptatikāṇḍavṛtti*

YD *Yuktidīpikā*

JM *Jayamaṅgalā*

STK *Sāṃkhyatattvakaumudī*

- commentaries on SS 1 highlighted in orange color:¹⁷⁶

SSV *Sāṃkhyasūtravṛtti*

SPBh *Sāṃkhyapravācanabhāṣya*

¹⁷⁶ These commentaries are not represented in Table 1 on suffering of the *ādhyātmika śārīra* type, because they do not give examples of this type.

- works included in the *Sāṃkhyasamgraha* highlighted in yellow color:

STV *Sāṃkhyatattvavivecana*

STYD *Sāṃkhyatattvayāthārthyadīpana*

ST *Samāśasūtrasarvopakāriṇī Tīkā*

TSSV *Tattvasamāśasūtravṛtti*

STP *Sāṃkhyatattvapradīpa*

TM *Tattvamīmāṃsā*

- commentaries on PYŚ 1.31 highlighted in green color:¹⁷⁷

TV *Tattvavaiśārādī*

Vi *Vivaraṇa*

YV *Yogavārttika*

- a commentary on the *Pāśupatasūtra* highlighted in light blue color:

PABh *Pāñcārthabhāṣya*

- Purāṇas highlighted in blue color:

BP *Brahmapurāṇa*

VP *Viṣṇupurāṇa*

The following signs and symbols are used:

The plus sign “+” marks the word *ādi*, ‘etc.’

The question mark “?” indicates a possibly corrupt reading.

The minus symbol “-” used in Table 1 (*ādhyātmika śārīra* suffering) in the columns for BP and VP relating to the item *pārśvasūla*, indicates that in these two sources only the word *sūla*, without *pārśva*, occurs.

¹⁷⁷ These commentaries are not represented in Table 1 on suffering of the *ādhyātmika śārīra* type, because they do not give examples of this type.

The exclamation mark “!” used in Table 2 (*mānasa śārīra* suffering) indicates that Māṭhara explicitly refers only to the twofold division of the *mānasa duḥkha*.

The numbers in the tables represent the position of a specific item in a list, that is, in the compounds as found in the Sanskrit texts. E.g., in Table 1 the item *śīroroga* occurs as the eighth item of the compound in V1, but in V2, PABh, BP and VP takes the first place of the respective compounds.

A subdivision that has not been considered in these tables, is the subdivision into suffering that is effected by internal (*āntara*) and external (*bāhya*) means. Among the selected works, only STK and ST refer to it. *Ādhyātmika* suffering is effected by internal means, while *ādhibhautika* and *ādhidaivika* suffering are effected by external means.

3.1.1. Physical (*śārīra*) suffering as the first type of suffering relating to something belonging to the Self (*ādhyātmika*)

Table 1: The physical (*śārīra*) form of suffering relating to something belonging to the Self (*ādhyātmika*)

		GBh	MV	V1	V2	YD	JM	STK	STV	STYD	ST	TSSV	STP	TM	PABh	BP	VP
<i>jvara</i>	(1)	1	1	1			1+		1	1		1			4	3	3
<i>bhrama</i>	(2)			2													
<i>atīsāra</i>	(3)	2+	2+	3	11				2+	2+		2			6	12	12
<i>apasmāra</i>	(4)			4													
<i>mada</i>	(5)			5													
<i>mūrcchā</i>	(6)			6								4+					
<i>āyāsa</i>	(7)			7													
<i>śīroroga</i>	(8)			8	1										1	1	1
<i>akṣiroga</i>	(9)			9	2										3	11	11
<i>pārśva śūla</i>	(10)			10												4 -	4 -
<i>kāsa</i>	(11)			11	9										7		
<i>śvāsa</i>	(12)			12	10										8	9	8
<i>hṛdroga</i>	(13)			13													
<i>bhagaṃdara</i>	(14)			14+	4											5	5
<i>viṣucikā</i>	(15)											3					
<i>mukharoga</i>	(16)				3												
<i>gudāvartta</i>	(17)				5												
<i>jalodara</i>	(18)				6												
<i>plīha</i>	(19)				7												
<i>vātagulma</i>	(20)				8+												
<i>dantaroga</i>	(21)														2		
<i>udarāmaya</i>	(22)														9+		
<i>pratiśyāya</i>	(23)														5?	2	2
<i>gulma</i>	(24)															6	6
<i>arśa</i>	(25)															7	7
<i>śvayathu</i>	(26)															8	9
<i>chardi</i>	(27)															10	10
<i>kuṣṭha</i>	(28)															13	13
<i>aṅgāmaya</i>	(29)															14+	14+

The type of suffering presented in Table 1 contains the largest number of items when compared to the lists depicted in the other three tables. For this table, V1 has been used as the guiding source because among the Sāṃkhya sources it contains the longest list of items.

Jvara, ‘fever’ (1), is the most frequently mentioned item among the examples for physical suffering. It occurs ten times, and it is listed seven times as the first item. In the *Carakasamhitā* (CS), in the *Niḍānasthāna*¹⁷⁸ section, the first chapter is devoted to fever because it was a somatic disease.¹⁷⁹ Mythologically, its origin is connected to Maheśvara’s anger and it is regarded as the king of all diseases (Jolly 1951, p. 104).¹⁸⁰ Given its importance, it is therefore meaningful that fever heads the list.

Atīsāra, ‘dysentery’ (3), is another very frequent item that occurs mostly immediately after *jvara* in a considerable number of sources, that is, five among the seven that start their exemplification with *jvara*. Jolly refers to a type of diarrhea that is accompanied by fever and called *jvarātīsāra* (Jolly 1951, p. 109). Therefore, the compound consisting of these two terms could be understood in two ways: either as a *dvandva* of two distinct terms, ‘fever and diarrhea,’ or as an elliptic *tatpuruṣa* compound and thus as one term referring to the type of diarrhea associated with fever. In the case of V1, the two items do not occur side by side, in the second place, after *jvara*, *bhrama*, ‘dizziness,’ is listed. Therefore, in the case of V1, *jvara* and *atīsāra* are clearly two distinct items. Furthermore, it would be unusual if a list of examples of cases of physical suffering would be headed by a term that refers to a very specific kind of fever, and not to fever as such. The prominent position of both *jvara* and *atīsāra*, as a pair, probably reflects the relevance of these diseases in daily life. This is underlined by the fact that the above mentioned five sources do not single out further cases of physical suffering. Although V2 is the second Sāṃkhya text with a long enumeration of examples of physical suffering and is mostly similar to V1, it refers neither to *jvara* nor to *atīsāra*.

Bhrama, ‘dizziness’ (2), is mentioned only by V1. Jolly categorises *āyurvedic* texts into four groups, namely 1. internal diseases, 2. external diseases, 3. diseases of the head, 4. nervous and

¹⁷⁸ The *Carakasamhitā* consists of eight books or chapters, i.e., *Sūtrasthāna*, *Niḍānasthāna*, *Vimānasthāna*, *Śārīrasthāna*, *Indriyasthāna*, *Cikitsāsthāna*, *Kalpasthāna* and *Siddhisthāna*. For more information see Wujastyk 1998, p. 41, and Preisendanz 2018a, pp. 159-220.

¹⁷⁹ There are eight types of fever; see Meulenbeld IA 1999, p. 27 and p. 533, and Jolly 1951, pp. 104ff.

¹⁸⁰ See Meulenbeld IA (1999) pp. 27ff. Jolly refers to the fire of the wrath of Śiva, which manifested itself in the demon Vīrabhadra who disturbed the sacrifice of Dakṣa and then afflicted the world in the form of fever (see Jolly 1951, p. 104). Wujastyk presents a translation of Vāgbhaṭa’s account of fever in Wujastyk 2017, p. 45f.

mental diseases, toxicology.¹⁸¹ In this case, *bhrama* belongs to the fourth category. *bhrama* is explained as follows: “If the body is felt as turning in a circle like a wheel and the patient falls continually on the ground...”¹⁸²

Apasmāra, ‘epilepsy’ (4), *mada*, ‘intoxication’ (5), and *mūrcchā*, ‘fainting’ (6), are the following items in V1 and fall into the same fourth category. The subsequent item *āyāsa*, ‘fatigue’ (7), is not mentioned by Jolly, yet it would also fit into this category. These four items, which one after the other in V1, together with *bhrama* which, however, occurs already in the second place there, would, according to Jolly’s categorization, form a logical sequence relating to nervous and mental diseases.

Śīroroga, ‘head disease’ (i.e., headache) (8), *akṣiroga* ‘eye disease’ (9), and *mukharoga*, ‘diseases of the oral cavity’ (16), the latter occurring only in V2, would build the next logical sequence of diseases related to the head. However, only the first two are listed next to each other in V1, with the third one missing there, whereas V2 lists the three consecutively and even starts its enumeration in this logical order according to their categorization. The passage in the PABh similarly starts with three head-related diseases; however, instead of *mukharoga* it mentions *dantaroga* ‘toothache’ (21), and places it right after *śīroroga*.

Śūla, ‘sharp pain’ (10), is not found as an independent disease in ancient pathology, but rather occurs together with other diseases or as a symptom, such as *pārśvaśūla* ‘sharp pain in the side,’ mentioned in V1 (Jolly 1951, p. 114). The selected Purāṇas refer only to *śūla* and probably to sharp pain in general.

Kāsa, ‘cough’ (11), and *śvāsa*, ‘hard breathing’ (12), are another pair of terms that occur together, just as *jvarātīsāra*.¹⁸³ Although they appear very often together as the symptom of a disease, they are indeed independent diseases (Jolly 1951, p. 131).

The list of items in V1 after *atīsāra* (3) thus forms a logical order. The items from *atīsāra* to *āyāsa* (7) belong to the category of nervous and mental diseases, and *śīroroga* (8) and *akṣiroga* (9) belong to the diseases of the head. *Pārśvaśūla* (10) to *hṛdroga*, ‘heart disease’ (13), are

¹⁸¹ In the original German version, the categorisation is as follows: Die inneren Krankheiten und ihre Behandlung, Äussere Krankheiten, Krankheiten des Kopfes und Nerven- und Geisteskrankheiten, Toxikologie; see Jolly 1901, p. 139.

¹⁸² See Jolly 1951, p. 177. In the original German version, *bhrama* is described as follows: “Wenn der Körper sich wie ein Rad im Kreise dreht und der Kranke stets auf den Boden fällt, so heißt dies Schwindel (*bhramaroga*)”; see Jolly 1901, p. 120.

¹⁸³ In Jolly (1951) *śvāsa* is translated as ‘dyspnea’ (p. 132).

internal diseases, and the last item, *bhagaṃdara*, ‘anorectal fistula’ (14), belongs to external diseases. In V2 the situation is similar: the three first items of its list belong to diseases of the head, the fourth item belongs to the category of external diseases, and the remaining seven items to internal diseases.

Among the Sāṃkhya works, only V1 and V2 offer a rather extensive list of items; the other work mention just *jvara* (1) and *atīsāra* (3), except for TSSV which lists two more, namely, *viṣūcikā* (15) and *mūrcchā* (6). *Viṣūcikā* (15) occurs only in the TSSV as the third item after *jvarātīsāra*. The term literally means ‘both ways,’ i.e., from the mouth and from the anus, and can be understood to refer to cholera (Jolly 1951, p. 111).

Bhagaṃdara, ‘anorectal fistulas’ (14), *arśa*, ‘hemorrhoids’ (25), *śvayathu*, ‘swelling’ (26), and *kuṣṭha*, ‘skin disease’ (28), are the few external diseases mentioned. Among these, *śvayathu* can be both internal and external.¹⁸⁴ *Bhagaṃdara* is mentioned by V1, V2 and the selected Purāṇas; it arises from similar causes as *arśa*.¹⁸⁵ The other three are only mentioned in the Purāṇas. Of these, *kuṣṭha* is often understood as referring to black leprosy, yet there are eighteen kinds of *kuṣṭha* that are to be distinguished, and leprosy is only one of them (Jolly 1951, p. 142).¹⁸⁶

The remaining further items found in V2, the PABh and the two selected Purāṇas belong to the class of internal diseases.

Gulma, ‘visceral swelling’ (24), described as a round swelling hardness in the viscera, is of five types.¹⁸⁷ One of these types is *vātagulma*, ‘visceral swelling caused by wind’ (20), which is enumerated as the last item in V2’s list and occurs only there.

¹⁸⁴ See Jolly 1951, p. 146: “The external causes are due to the contact with leaves, fruit, stinging insects, etc. and the internal causes are due to the improper use of medicine, injurious food and drink, etc.” See Jolly 1901, p. 99: “Die äussere Ursachen sind Verletzungen jeder Art, Berührung mit Blüten, Früchten, stachelige Insekten, oder giftige Pflanzen, etc. Innere Ursachen sind die unrichtige Anwendung von Arzneimitteln, schwere Formen von Brechanfällen.”

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., p. 159.

¹⁸⁶ For more information on *kuṣṭha*, see Gallagher 2014. In *śloka* 8 of this chapter, causes of *kuṣṭha* are enumerated. Especially interesting causes are disrespect towards *brahmins* and teachers, and committing sinful acts. See Gallagher 2014, p. 20.

¹⁸⁷ See Jolly 1951, p. 117.

Udarāmaya, ‘ailment of the belly’ (22), listed only in the PABh, is divided into eight types,¹⁸⁸ which include, among others, *plīhodara* ‘enlargement of the spleen caused by water,’ and *jalodara*, ‘enlargement of the abdomen caused by water’ (18), mentioned only in V2. Yet, V2 refers merely, and as the only source, to *plīhan*, ‘spleen’ or ‘disease of the spleen’ (19), not specifically to *plīhodara*.

Gudāvarṭta, ‘obstruction of the bowels’ (17), occurs only in V2. *Chardi*, ‘vomiting’¹⁸⁹ (27), and *aṅgāmaya*, ‘ailment of the limbs’ (29), occur only in the two selected Purāṇas as the last items of their lists.

Pratiśyāya, ‘cold, catarrh’ (23), occurs in the selected Purāṇas and in the PABh, and is categorized in Jolly’s work under nasal diseases, which is a subcategory of diseases of the head (Jolly 1951, p. 172).

Comparing the sources on the *ādhyātmika* type of suffering as such, all of them agree on its physical and mental dichotomy. As far as the explanation of the cause of the physical form of this type of suffering is concerned, there is a slight difference in terminology, namely the term *viparyayaḥ* is used in the GBh in opposition to *vaiṣamya* in the other sources. However, this difference does not change the meaning. The physical form of suffering is due to the imbalance, i.e., perversion of wind (*vāta*), bile (*pitta*) and phlegm (*śleṣman*). This triad, known as the three humors or disturbing bodily factors (*dhātu* or *doṣa*), serves as the central model to explain the arising of disease in Āyurveda.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 118.

¹⁸⁹ *Chardi* is related to *arocaka*, which refers to the loss of appetite; see Jolly 1951, p. 115.

3.1.2. Mental (*mānasa*) suffering as the second type of suffering relating to something belonging to the Self (*ādhyātmika*)

Table 2: The mental (*mānasa*) form of suffering relating to something belonging to the Self (*ādhyātmika*)

		GBh	MV	V1	V2	YD	JM	STK	SSV	SPBh	STV	STYD	ST	TSSV	STP	TM	TV	Vi	YV	PABh	BP	VP
<i>kāma</i>	(1)					1	1	1		1+		1	1	1	1	1	1+		1+		1	1
<i>krodha</i>	(2)					2	2	2				2	2	2	2	2+				1	2	2
<i>lobha</i>	(3)					3		3				3+	3	3	3					2	5	5
<i>moha</i>	(4)					4		4					4	4	4					3	6	6
<i>viṣāda</i>	(5)					5									6					5	7	7
<i>bhaya</i>	(6)					6		5												4	3	3
<i>īrṣyā</i>	(7)					7		6					5	6	5					6	11	11
<i>āratya</i>	(8)					8														12		
<i>asūyā</i>	(9)					9														7	9	9
<i>aviśeṣadarśana</i>	(10)					10														13+		
<i>viṣayaviśeṣadarśana</i>	(11)							7							7							
<i>viṣayaviśeṣadarśanādarśana</i>	(12)												6									
<i>mada</i>	(13)													5						9		
<i>śoka</i>	(14)						3+														8	8
<i>dveṣa</i>	(15)																			8	4	4
<i>māna</i>	(16)																			10		
<i>mātsarya</i>	(17)																			11	12	12
<i>avamāna</i>	(18)																				10	10
<i>iṣṭavighāta</i>	(19)																	1+				
<i>priyaviyoga</i>	(20)	1	1!	1	1						1			7+								
<i>apriyasamyoga</i>	(21)	2+	2!	2	2						2+											
<i>īpsitasyālābha</i>	(22)			3	3																	

The sources present two different kinds of enumeration of types of mental forms of suffering.

Priyaviyoga, ‘disjunction from that which is pleasant’ (20), **apriyasamyoga**, ‘conjunction with that which is unpleasant’ (21), and **īpsitasyālābha**, ‘not obtaining something that is desired’ (22), are forming one kind of enumeration of the mental form of suffering. The works that present this kind are GBh, MV, V1, V2, STV and Vi. While Māṭhara explicitly refers only to *priyaviyoga* and *apriyasamyoga*, V1 and V2 enumerate all three types. Gauḍapāda enumerates the first two and adds *-ādi*, ‘and so on,’ at the end of the compound which alludes to more than the named two types. The STV follows the enumeration of Gauḍapāda. Among the PYS commentaries, Vi refers to *iṣṭavighāta*, etc. This would be semantically equivalent to the term *priyaviyoga*. Thus, among the selected sources only six (GBh, MV, V1, V2, STV, TSSV, Vi) refer to this kind of enumeration of types of the mental form of suffering. In the other sources, one finds the other kind of enumeration, namely of various negative emotions and attitudes. They will be analysed in detail below.

Kāma, ‘desire’ (1), occurs in all of the works that list negative emotions and attitudes as the first item of a compound, except for the PABh where – quite unexpectedly – it is not mentioned at all.

Krodha, ‘anger’ (2), is the second most commonly listed emotion after *kāma*. It occurs as the second item of the compound, and in the PABh is the first item. The occurrence of *kāma* and *krodha* as a pair is very well known from other Sanskrit literature, e.g., the Manusmṛti (MS):

If he (i.e., the king) has subdued desire and anger and sees things according to *dharma*, the subjects follow him like the rivers [follow] the ocean.¹⁹⁰

The man who has laid down the three ‘sticks’ with regard to all living beings and subdued desire and anger, therefore attains perfection.¹⁹¹

Thus, *kāma* and *krodha* are strong emotions that the king must overcome in order to make his subjects follow him and respect him, and to attain perfection. Furthermore, according to the

¹⁹⁰ MS 8.175: *kāmakrodhau tu saṃyamya yo ’rthān dharmeṇa paśyati | prajāś tam anuvartante samudram iva sindhavaḥ* ||8.175|| (Vol. 4, p. 363, 23-24).

¹⁹¹ MS 12.11: *tridaṇḍam etan nikṣipyā sarvabhūteṣu mānavaḥ | kāmakrodhau tu saṃyamya tataḥ siddhiṃ niyacchati* || 12.11|| (Vol. 6, p. 244, 7-8). *tridaṇḍa* literally means ‘the aggregate of the three sticks’ and here refers to the use of speech, thought and body in order to harm others.

Bhagavadgītā (BhG), those who are bound by hundred fetters of expectation and absorbed in *kāma* and *krodha* strive in an inappropriate manner for the accumulation of things for the sake of the enjoyment of objects of desire.¹⁹²

Lobha, ‘greed’ (3), occurs in the BhG next to *kāma* and *krodha*, where these three are described as the threefold gate to hell (BhG 16.21):

Desire, anger, as well as greed – this is the threefold gate to hell which destroys the Self, therefore one shall abandon these three.¹⁹³

Moha, ‘delusion’ (4), is included by almost all sources (YD, STK, ST, TSSV and STP) immediately after the three items mentioned above. An exception is STYD, which lists only the three emotions mentioned above, but it has ‘etc.’ after *lobha* and may therefore also intend *moha* here. The two Purāṇas have this item at a different place.

In BhG 2.62-63 there is an indication of the chronological sequence of *kāma*, *krodha* and *moha*:

While contemplating the sense objects, an attachment to them arises for the person.

From the attachment desire comes forth, from desire anger arises.

From anger delusion occurs, from delusion occurs confusion of attentiveness, from the loss of attentiveness occurs ruin of the intellect, from the ruin of the intellect one completely perishes.¹⁹⁴

Furthermore, in Kauṭilya’s *Arthaśāstra*, in the book on the “Restraint of the Senses,” in chapter six called “Abandoning the Collection of the Six Enemies,” there is an enumeration of six enemies that should be conquered:

Restraint of the senses, which is the cause of knowledge and discipline, is to be effected through abandoning desire, anger, greed, pride, madness and joy.¹⁹⁵

¹⁹² BhG 16.12: *āśāpāśāśatair baddhāḥ kāmakrodhaparāyaṇāḥ | īhante kāmabhogārtham anyāyenārthasaṃcayān ||12||* (p. 642,3 – 643,1).

¹⁹³ BhG 16.21: *trividhaṃ narakasyedaṃ dvāraṃ nāśanam ātmanaḥ | kāmāḥ krodhas tathā lobhas tasmād etat trayam tyajet ||BhG 16.21||* (p. 648, 1-2).

¹⁹⁴ BhG 2.62-63: *dhyāyato viṣayān puṃsaḥ saṅgas teṣūpajāyate | saṅgāt saṃjāyate kāmāḥ kāmāt krodho 'bhijāyate ||62|| krodhād bhavati saṃmohaḥ saṃmohāt smṛtīvibhramaḥ | smṛtibhramśād buddhināśo buddhināśāt praṇaśyati ||63||* (p. 122, 1-4).

¹⁹⁵ *vidyāvinayaḥetur indriyajayaḥ kāmakrodhalobhamānamadaharṣatyāgāt kāryaḥ ||1.6.1||*

Śoka, ‘grief’ (14), occurs only in the JM and the two selected Purāṇas. However, in Āyurveda, in SS Sū 1.23-24, there is an enumeration of mental diseases in which grief (*śoka*) is also mentioned:

However, mental [types of diseases], such as anger, grief, fear, joy, depression, jealousy, ill-will (*abhyasūyā*), low-spiritedness (*dainya*), malice, desire, greed, etc., come about through the division (i.e., different kinds of) wishes and dislikes.¹⁹⁶

In this passage of the SS, all items, except *harṣa* and *dainya*, can be found in Table 2. The item *kāma*, which is mostly enumerated first place in the sources used in Table 2, is mentioned only as the second to the last item here, followed by *lobha* as the final item, which appears as the third item in almost all sources.

Aviśeṣadarśana, ‘not seeing specifics’ (10), *viśayaviśeṣādarśana*, ‘not seeing specific objects’ (11), and *viśayaviśeṣadarśanādarśana*, ‘seeing as well as not seeing specific objects’ (12), are mentioned in five works. The first item, *aviśeṣadarśana*, occurs in the YD and the PABh, and the second in the lists in the STK and the STP. The last variant is found only in the SṬ. The common characteristic to these three variants is that they occur as the last item in the respective list.

¹⁹⁶ SS Sū 1.23-34: *mānasās tu krodhaśokabhayaḥarṣaḥaviśeṣāderṣyābhyasūyādainyamātsaryakāmaloḥprabhṛtaya icchādvēṣabhedair bhavanti*.

3.1.3. Suffering relating to something belonging to living beings (*ādhībhautika*)

Table 3: The suffering relating to something belonging to living beings (*ādhībhautika*)

		GBh	MV	V1	V2	YD	JM	STK	SSV	SPBh	STV	STYD	ST	TSSV	STP	TM	TV	Vi	YV	PABh	BP	VP
<i>caturvidhā</i>		•									•											
<i>a manuṣya / b mānuṣa</i>	(1)	1a	1b	1b	1b	1a	1b	1b			4a	1b	1b	1b	1b	1b					3a	3a
<i>cora</i>	(2)									2+												
<i>piśāca</i>	(3)																				4	4
<i>uraga</i>	(4)																				5	5
<i>rākṣasa</i>	(5)																				6	6
<i>paśu</i>	(6)	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1		1		2	2		2		1				
<i>mrga</i>	(7)	3		3	3	3	3	3			3	2		3				2+			1	1
<i>vyāghra</i>	(8)									1							1+		1+			
<i>pakṣin</i>	(9)	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	2+		2		3		2	3+					2	2
<i>sarīrpa</i>	(10)	5	4	5	5	5	5	5			5		4	4	3						7+	7+
<i>sarpa</i>	(11)											3+										
<i>daṁśa</i>	(12)	6									6											
<i>maśaka</i>	(13)	7																				
<i>yūkā</i>	(14)	8									7											
<i>matkuṇa</i>	(15)	9									8											
<i>matsya</i>	(16)	10																				
<i>makara</i>	(17)	11																				
<i>grāha</i>	(18)	12																				
<i>sthāvara</i>	(19)	13	5	6	6	6	6	6			9		5+	5	4							

The passages on suffering relating to something belonging to living beings all provide lists of living beings. The terms in the first column set in bold refer to the main categorization of living beings in this context. Living beings are classified as *manuṣya* or *mānuṣa* (humans), *paśu* (domestic animals), *mṛga* (wild animals), *pakṣin* (winged animals), *sarīṣṛpa* (crawling animals) and *sthāvara* (stationary beings).¹⁹⁷ They are listed in the same order by all¹⁹⁸ commentators of SK 1. Regarding the SS commentaries, the SSV enumerates only two classes, *paśu* and *pakṣin*, yet adds ‘etc.’ at the end. The SPBh refers rather to an example for a specific class, e.g., it mentions *vyāghra*, ‘tiger,’ that would fit into the class of wild animals, and then lists *cora*, ‘thief,’ that fits into the class of humans, followed by ‘etc.’ *vyāghra* is also adduced, as the single example supplied with ‘etc.,’ in two commentaries on PYŚ, the TV and the YV. Among the living beings listed in Table 3, further subdivisions can be recognized.

Caturvidhā, ‘fourfold,’ refers to the fourfold community of living beings. This is found only in the GBh and the STV at the beginning of their explanations. Since these two works are the only ones that are referring to this fourfold division, they are presenting the longest list of living beings in comparison to other texts. The *caturvidhā* taxonomy is based on the mode of birth of living beings, namely those born from moisture (*svedaja*), from an egg (*aṇḍaja*), from the chorion (*jarāyuja*) and from a germ (*udbhijja*). This division of living beings seems to have been known already in ancient Sanskrit literature.¹⁹⁹ A similar division is found in the Chāndogya Upaniṣad (ChUp 6.3.1):

There are three seeds (i.e., origins) for these living beings, one should know, namely, birth from an egg, birth from [another] living being, [and] birth from a germ.²⁰⁰

Here, the missing item of the *caturvidhā* division is *svedaja*. The term *jarāyuja* is also not mentioned here; however, the ChUp refers to birth from another living being (*jīvajja*), which would semantically correspond to *jarāyuja*. Moreover, in the context of the question “Who is this one here whom we worship as the Self?”, the Aitreya Upaniṣad (AitUp) gives a list of

¹⁹⁷ The order of items in this list may depend on hierarchical considerations and perceived importance in relation to human life.

¹⁹⁸ The MV is an exception inasmuch as it does not mention *mṛga*.

¹⁹⁹ For various other classifications of living beings, such as the structure of their feet, their dental structure, etc., see Smith 1991.

²⁰⁰ See V.P. Limaye and R.D. Vadekar 1958, p. 137: *teṣāṃ khalv eṣāṃ bhūtānāṃ trīṇy eva bījāni bhavanti āṇḍajaṃ jīvajam udbhijjam iti ||6.3.1||*.

living being as an answer. Among these, “this one” is said to be living beings of various kinds, inter alia the ones born from an egg, the ones born from the chorion, the ones born from moisture and the ones born from a germ.²⁰¹ A more detailed explanation of the fourfold classification is found in MS 1.43-46.²⁰²

[Living beings] born from the chorion are domestic animals as well as wild animals, as well as beasts of pray, [and] animals having teeth in both jaws, *rākṣasas* as well as *piśācas* and humans. Those born from an egg are winged animals, snakes, crocodiles, fish and turtles, and [living beings] of such kind that are born on the ground and aquatic. [Living beings] born from moisture are gadflies, gnats, lice, flies and bugs, [living beings] that originate from vapour as well as whatever other similar [beings] there are. [Living beings] born from a germ are all stationary ones that are growing from seeds or cuttings. Plants are those that come to an end through the maturation of their fruit (i.e., are annual) and have many flowers and fruits. Those who bear fruit without flowers are called “lords of the forest,” those who bear flowers and bear fruit are called “trees” (*vrkṣa*). Various types of shrubs, stems as well as grasses, climbing plants and creepers are growing from seed or from stalk. These are covered in various forms of darkness due to the result of their acts. They have internal consciousness and are accompanied by pleasure and pain.

The extended list of causes of *ādhibhautika* suffering in the GBh begins with the chorion-born living beings, i.e., humans (*mānuṣya*), domestic animals (*paśu*) and wild animals (*mṛga*). They are followed by egg-born living beings, i.e., winged animals (*pakṣin*) and crawling animals (*sarīṣṭṛpa*), which may further be seen as a division into animals abiding in the sky and on the ground. Then, moisture-born animals are listed, namely, gadflies, gnat, lice and bugs, followed by animals abiding in the water which represent further egg-born living beings, namely fish,

²⁰¹ AitUp 3.1 and 3, p. 67: ko 'yam | ātmeti vayam upāśmahe [...]3.1|| ... āṇḍajāni ca jārujāni ca svedajāni codbhijjāni ca...||3.1.3||

²⁰² Dave, Jayantakrishna, Vol. 1, 1972, pp. 74-79: *paśavaś ca mṛgāś caiva vyālāś cobhayatodataḥ | rakṣāṃsi ca piśācāś ca manuṣyāś ca jarāyujāḥ* ||1.43|| *āṇḍajāḥ pakṣiṇaḥ sarpā nakrā matsyāś ca kacchapāḥ | yāni caivamprakārāṇi sthalajāny audakāni ca* ||1.44|| *svedajaṃ daṃśamaśakaṃ yūkāmakṣikamatkuṇaṃ | ūṣmaṇaś copajāyante yac cānyat kiṃ cid īdrṣaṃ* ||1.45|| *udbhijjāḥ sthāvarāḥ sarve bījakāṇḍapraroḥiṇaḥ | oṣadhyāḥ phalapākāntā bahupuṣpaphalopagāḥ* ||1.46|| *apuṣpāḥ phalavanto ye te vanaspatayaḥ smṛtāḥ | puṣpiṇaḥ phalinaś caiva vrkṣāś tūbhayataḥ smṛtāḥ* ||1.47|| *gucchagulmaṃ tu vividhaṃ tathaiva tṛṇajātayaḥ | bījakāṇḍaruhāṇy eva pratānā vallya eva ca* ||1.48|| *tamasā bahurūpeṇa veṣṭitāḥ karmahetunā | antaḥsaṃjñā bhavanty ete sukhaduḥkhasamanvitāḥ* ||1.49||

crocodiles and sharks. The list is concluded with the mention of the stationary beings (*sthāvara*).

According to the two selected Purāṇas, *piśācas* (3) and *rākṣasas* (5) belong to the causes of *ādhibhautika* suffering, whereas some of the other sources make reference to *rākṣasas* and other malevolent semi-divine beings in their lists explaining *ādhidaivika* suffering.²⁰³ The reason why the Purāṇas list these two items in the context of *ādhibhautika* suffering, is presumably their having a human shape. Therefore, I have listed them below *manuṣya/mānuṣa*, i.e., ‘humans,’ in Table 3.

Uraga, ‘snake’ (4), is another kind of semi-divine being listed in the two Purāṇas. *Uraga*, ‘moving on its breast,’ can only refer to a serpentine animal, but since the Purāṇas list *uraga* between *piśāca* and *rākṣasa* and later also refer to *sarīṣṛpa*, in this case the term should refer to semi-divine serpentine beings.²⁰⁴

Makara, ‘crocodile’ (17), is said to be ‘a kind of sea-animal,’ ‘a crocodile,’ ‘shark.’²⁰⁵ It is very uncertain what exactly *makara* refers to, yet it is clear that the word relates to an aquatic animal. The *makara* is well known as a vehicle of Varuṇa and various Yakṣas and Yakṣīs, appears on the banner of Kāmadeva, and is a vehicle of the river-goddess Gaṅgā. *Makara* corresponds to the Capricorn, represented in Mesopotamia as having the shape of a creature half goat, half fish (Parpola 2011, p. 18). In its iconographical presentation, the *makara* is portrayed as a creature with the head of a crocodile, with horns extending backwards from the end of its long snout, with sharp teeth, with four, and later two, legs of a lion or dog, and with a scaly body and tail that was initially conceived like that of a crocodile, later like that of a fish (Coomaraswamy 1931, p. 47f). The word *makara* is usually translated as ‘crocodile’; however, according to Parpola, the identification of the origin of the image of *makara* is unclear. In any case it is an aquatic monster, like a crocodile (Parpola 2011, p. 18).

Grāha, ‘shark’ (18), literally means ‘grabber’ and in this context, according to Parpola, refers to other beasts of prey than the *makara*, such as sharks and water-snakes (Parpola 2011, p. 20).

²⁰³ For more on *rākṣasas* and *piśācas*, see the following section on *ādhidaivika* suffering (3.1.4).

²⁰⁴ *Uragas* are sometimes identified with *nāgas*; see Hopkins 1915, p. 28.

²⁰⁵ See Apte 1890, p. 830.

3.1.4. Suffering relating to *daiva* (*ādhidaivika*)

Table 4: The suffering relating to *daiva* (*ādhidaivika*)

		GBh	MV	V1	V2	YD	JM	STK	SSV	SPBh	STV	STYD	SṬ	TSSV	STP	TM	TV	Vi	YV	PABh	BP	VP
<i>śīta</i>	(1)	1	1		1	1					1	1		1					1		1	1
<i>uṣṇa</i>	(2)	2	2		2	2					2	2		2					2+		2	2
<i>agni</i>	(3)									1												
<i>a vāta / b vāyu</i>	(4)	3a	3a		3a	3a				2b+	3a	3a		3a				1a			3a	3a
<i>a varṣa / b varṣāmbu / c vṛṣṭi</i>	(5)	4a	4a+		4a	4a					4a	4c		4a				2a+			4b	4b
<i>ativṛṣṭi</i>	(6)			1																		
<i>anāvṛṣṭi</i>	(7)			2																		
<i>a aśani / b aśanipāta / c vaidyuta</i>	(8)	5b+			5a	5a					5b			5a+							5c	5c
<i>avaśyāya</i>	(9)					6																
<i>tapātyaya</i>	(10)			4*																		
<i>grahapīḍā</i>	(11)			3													1+					
<i>yakṣa</i>	(12)							1					1		1	1						
<i>rākṣasa</i>	(13)							2					2		2	2						
<i>vināyaka</i>	(14)							3					3		3							
<i>bhūta</i>	(15)								2+													
<i>graha</i>	(16)						1+	4+	1				4+		4+	3+						

In the case of *ādhidaivika* suffering, two interpretations can be distinguished. The first determines this type of suffering as caused by celestial phenomena, such as cold, heat, thunder, etc., whereas the second determines the influence of semi-divine beings as the cause of this kind of suffering. The sources that indicate the causation by celestial phenomena clearly outweighs the sources that propagate the other kind of causation. The most common examples of celestial phenomena are highlighted, such as cold (*śīta*), heat (*uṣṇa*), wind (*vāta/vāyu*), rain (*varṣa*) and thunderbolt (*aśani/aśanipāta/vaidyuta*). V1 gives a series of examples of celestial phenomena that are not mentioned in any of the other works, such as excessive rain (*ativṛṣṭi*), lack of rain (*anāvṛṣṭi*), oppression by planets or an eclipse (*grahapīḍā*), the end of the hot season and beginning of the rainy season (*tapātyaya*), etc.

Graha, ‘grasper’ (16), as the last highlighted item, typically concludes the enumeration that characterizes the second interpretation. The term is set in bold because it occurs most frequently there. *Graha* literally means ‘seizer’ or ‘seizure’; however, in the astrological literature the word refers to the planets who are influencing the lives of humans and events on earth. There are nine planets.²⁰⁶ In the *Suśrutasamhitā*, *graha* refers to demons that cause mental diseases. There are nine such demons, each causing specific symptoms of possession (Wujastyk 1999, p. 4f). Although astrology plays a certain role in medical literature, the nine demons enumerated by Suśruta do not have any recognizable connection with the nine planets (Yano 2022, p. 388).²⁰⁷

In the enumeration of certain semi-divine beings in STK, ST and STP, *graha* occurs in the fourth and final place, and in the TM in the third and final place. In this case, one can assume that *graha* indeed refers to certain demons. In the SSV, the item precedes *bhūta*, which is supplemented by ‘etc.’ Here one can assume the same. However, in the case of the JM *graha* is the only item listed as an example of causes of *ādhidaivika duḥkha* and may therefore be understood either as pointing to the influence of planets, as celestial phenomena, or that of demons, as a kind of (semi-)divine beings.²⁰⁸

²⁰⁶ The nine planets are: Sun, Mars, Moon, Mercury, Jupiter, Venus, Saturn, Rāhu and Ketu. See Yano 2022, pp. 389ff.

²⁰⁷ For more information on the meaning of *graha* in traditional Indian astrological works, see Yano 2022. Yano outlines a process of semantic change of the concept of *graha* in Sanskrit literature.

²⁰⁸ In the *Śivadharmasāstra*, chapter six (*Śāntyadhyāya*), translated and edited by Bisschop, a reference to the appeasement of all gods and supernatural powers are found. In this context, *graha* does not refer to any specific seizers, like demons causing mental diseases or planets, but rather seizers of all kinds. The appeasement of the *grahas* is formulated as follows: “All the epilepsy-seizers, and all the fever-seizers, the foetus-seizers, and

Grahapīḍā, ‘oppression by planets’ (11), may refer either to oppression caused by *grahas* or, more specifically, to an eclipse mythologized as the oppression of a planet by another demonized celestial body.²⁰⁹ The word *pīḍā* means ‘molestation,’ ‘disturbance,’ ‘injury,’ ‘oppression’ or even, just by itself, ‘eclipse.’ The compound occurs only in V1 as the third item out of four and in this context seems to refer to a celestial phenomenon. In the TV on the PYŚ, it occurs as the first and only item referred to, with an added ‘etc.’ However, as Vācaspatimiśra presents a list of semi-divine beings concluded with *graha* in the STK, his commentary on the SK, it can be assumed that *grahapīḍā* refers to the oppression by demons here.

Besides *grahas* further beings belonging to the category of semi-divine beings, such as *yakṣas*, *rākṣasas*, *vināyakas* and *bhūtas*, characterize the second explanation of *ādhidaivika* suffering. To determine the exact nature of these semi-divine beings is not so simple. Indian literature is very rich in its various categorizations of semi-divine beings, such as *yakṣas*, *nāgas*, *bhūtas*, *pretas*, *piśācas*, *vetālas*, *asuras*, etc., and nowhere are explicit differences between the various species described (DeCaroli 2004, p. 10).²¹⁰ While some types of semi-divine beings are harmless creatures, in the case of the explanation of *ādhidaivika* suffering the mentioned beings must be fearsome demonic creatures.

The word ***rākṣasa*** (13) is etymologized as ‘guarding’ as well as ‘injuring.’ According to Hopkins, *rākṣasas* are understood as either protectors or, perhaps, injurers of enemies of the guarded person or object (Hopkins 1915, p. 38f). They are recognized for their aggressive behavior and for disturbing sacrificial rituals (Sutherland 1991, p. 54). In the cosmological mythology of the Purāṇas, various kinds of demonic beings are created by Brahmā. It is said that after having created gods, demons, ancestors and humans, Brahmā became hungry, and from his hunger *yakṣas* and *rākṣasas* arose which began to eat his body. Brahmā was upset about their behavior, and his hair fell out and became *nāgas*. This made him angry, and the creature born of his anger was a man-eating *piśāca*.²¹¹ In the creation of these beings, there is

those seizers of various diseases, the seizers in the sky, the best seizers in heaven, the seizers on earth and in the nether region, the seizers in all directions – may they always bestow peace on me, through the splendour of that god who has a dark-blue neck and who has a snake for an ornament.” (232-234), p. 185.

²⁰⁹ See Apte 1890, p. 701.

²¹⁰ DeCaroli provides examples for how the terms *rākṣasa* and *yakṣa* are interchangeably used to denote a fearsome demonic creature, and how *bhūta* and *preta* are both terms referring to ghost-like creatures. See DeCaroli 2004, pp. 10ff.

²¹¹ In the *Rāmāyaṇa*, a different story is told, namely, that at the time when Brahmā had to create a guardian of the cosmic waters, the beings who said *rakṣāmaḥ*, ‘we will guard,’ became *rākṣasas* and the ones who said *yakṣāmaḥ*, ‘we will sacrifice / be quick,’ became *yakṣas*. See DeCaroli 2004, p. 11.

a distinction among higher and lower demons. In the present cosmology, *rākṣasas* seem to be ranked higher than *piśācas*.²¹²

Piśācas are described as lesser demons that are often associated with *rākṣasas*.²¹³

***Yakṣas* (12)**, in comparison to other demons, seem to be the semi-divine beings that have been studied most by scholars.²¹⁴ *Yakṣas*, as ancient deities, are frequently referred to in Buddhist, Jains and Hindu scriptures and most frequently represented in the form of sculptures. Sutherland describes the portrayal of *yakṣas* beings, starting from their depiction as water deities to their representation as demons and finally as a symbol of eroticism and romantic love (Sutherland 1992, p. 5). *Yakṣas* show a wide spectrum of attributes documented in their representation in literature as well as iconography.²¹⁵ They are mostly benign creatures of nature or local deities who are living in rivers, forests, or mountains. Their female counterparts, the *yakṣīs*, are endowed with sensual appeal and possess an erotic character; they are depicted in art almost naked and with swelling breasts in seductive postures.²¹⁶ The word *yakṣa* is derived from the root *yakṣ*, ‘to honor,’ ‘worship,’ ‘to stir,’ ‘to move,’ and thus is not directly connected to any demonic attribute. Hence it seems that the demonic representation of *yakṣas* is a later concept (Mishra 1981, p. 1).²¹⁷ They share some habits with the *piśācas*, such as eating raw flesh and corpses (Mishra 1981, p. 4).

***Vināyakas* (14)** are malicious demons or evil spirits.²¹⁸ In Y. Krishan’s comparative study of *vināyakas* as *vighnakarṭṛs*, that is, causers of obstacles, in the *Mānavagṛhyasūtra* and *Yājñavalkyasmṛiti*, the *vināyakas* are depicted as evil spirits whose possession causes various

²¹² See the translation of the words *rākṣasa* and *piśāca* in O’Flaherty 1980, p. 52 and DeCaroli 2004, p. 11. In BhG 17.1, we also find a kind of hierarchy among semi-divine beings. It is said that *sattva*-type people worship gods, *rajas*-type people worship *yakṣas* and *rākṣasas*, and *tamas*-type people worship *pretas* and *bhūtas*.

²¹³ See Hopkins 1915, p. 44. Sutherland (1992, p. 59) translates *piśāca* as ‘flesh eater’ or ‘desirer of flesh.’

²¹⁴ See Ram Nath Mishra 1981, p. 1.: “there will not be found many deities who had such a diversity of functions and such spectacular ups and downs as the Yakshas.” For studies on *yakṣa* beings, see Ram Nath Mishra 1981, Härtel and Auboyer 1985, Coomaraswamy 1931, Sutherland 1992 and DeCaroli 2004.

²¹⁵ According to Mishra 1981, p. 2, sculptures of *yakṣas* are the earliest known Indian iconic representations. For iconographical representations of *yakṣas*, see the illustrations in Coomaraswamy 1931. Härtel and Auboyer (1985) point out that they are especially found among the earlier sculptures (p. 22).

²¹⁶ See Härtel and Auboyer 1985 p. 22.

²¹⁷ DeCaroli (2004) points out that references to possession found in the Ṛgveda are connected to *yakṣas* and that it is said there that *yakṣas* should not possess the body of worshipers. This suggests that already in the Vedic age possession by *yakṣas* was not desirable (p. 25).

²¹⁸ See Hopkins 1915, p. 207.

symptoms, such as depression, etc. In the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*, a *vināyaka* is appointed by Rudra and Brahmā as leader of *gaṇas*.²¹⁹

Bhūtas, ‘spirits’ (15), are mentioned only once in the selected sources, namely, in the SSV on the SS, where the term appears in the second place, after *graha* supplied with an ‘etc.’ The word *bhūta* derives from the verbal root *bhū* ‘to become,’ and has a large number of meanings. In the context of *ādhidaivika* suffering it refers to a spirit or ghost. In āyurvedic literature, among the eight branches of medicine one is named *bhūtavidyā*. This branch deals with the diseases caused by the possession by *bhūtas*, i.e., spirits (Meulenbeld 1991, p. 185). Smith translates *bhūta* as ‘existent being,’ referring to beings that are causing a certain mental illness (Smith 2006, p. 472). Ernst explains *bhūta* as referring to “böse, unheimliche Wesen, Gespenster, Kbolde oder ähnliches” (Ernst 1922, p. 167).²²⁰

Looking at the used sources, one can state that among the works included in the *Sāṃkhyasamgraha*, that is, ST, STP and TM, adopt the interpretation that *ādhidaivika* suffering is due to the influence of semi-divine beings. This is followed among the commentaries on the SK only by the STK, among the commentaries on the SS only by the SSV, and among the PYŚ commentaries presumably only by the TV.

²¹⁹ See Y. Krishan 1992, pp. 363-367. Krishan shows that there is a difference in the presentation of the *vināyakas* in the *Mānavagrhyasūtra*, which he assigns to the pre-Epic period, in comparison to the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*, which according to him belongs to the Epic period. In the latter, one finds only one main evil force, the *Vināyaka* with many manifestations. The designation and worship of Gaṇeśa as *Vināyaka* was gradually adopted in later literature. For more information on *Vināyaka* as Gaṇeśa, see Shanti Lal Nagar 1992.

²²⁰ For further references to the understanding of the term *bhūta*, see Crooke 1896, p. 234. According to Crooke, *bhūta* refers to a malignant evil spirit and is a general term which includes various species of evil spirits. He explains that a proper *bhūta* is a spirit emanating from a man who has died a violent death, either by accident, suicide, or capital punishment. Moreover, Walhouse explains that in South India three terms, *bhūta*, *preta* and *pisāca*, are used to designate malignant beings of human origin, where the first one, *bhūta*, applies to all three classes: see Walhouse 1876, p. 408.

4. Conclusion

This Master's thesis aimed to explore the characterization of the concept of three types of suffering (*duḥkhatraya*) across the Sanskrit literature and to assess how it differs in the course of time and among traditions. The analysis of the selected Sanskrit sources indicates that the notion of the triple suffering is a widely recognized concept in Sanskrit literature, and that the differences in its characterisation are minor ones.

In Sāṃkhya, the triple suffering is not characterized and explained in the *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, but the commentarial tradition agrees on its characterization as *ādhyātmika*, *ādhibhautika*, and *ādhidaiivika*. The *ādhyātmika* type of suffering is further classified into *śārīra* (physical) suffering and *mānasa* (mental) suffering. The former is due to an imbalance of the humors *vāta*, *pitta*, and *śleṣman*, a characterization that is followed consistently across the selected literature. However, the commentators differ in their description of *mānasa* suffering, with the result of two distinct characterizations.²²¹ The *ādhibhautika* type of suffering is characterized by way of an enumeration of various living beings, with slight variations among the commentaries. For example, in the selected Purāṇas the two kinds of creatures called *rākṣasa* and *piśāca* are associated with *ādhibhautika* suffering, whereas in other sources they are enumerated under *ādhidaiivika* suffering. In the case of the characterization of the *ādhidaiivika* type of suffering, various approaches can be distinguished: one based on celestial phenomena, the other based on the influences of *grahas* (planets) and semi-divine beings, and one also finds a characterization that includes both approaches.

While the Sāṃkhya tradition has been examined most extensively in this thesis, it is not necessarily the origin of the concept of triple suffering. The tradition of Āyurveda also presents a similar classification of suffering, albeit with distinct differences.²²² If we assume that the origin of the concept lies in Sāṃkhya tradition, this would align with Torella's thesis of Sāṃkhya as a *sāmānyaśāstra*, that is, Sāṃkhya as general scientific body of knowledge. Torella demonstrates that Sāṃkhya has spread its concepts to a greater variety of spheres within Indian civilization than any other philosophical tradition did (Torella 1999, p. 553f). However, regardless of its exact place of origin, the triple suffering was evidently a well-known concept.

²²¹ See Table 2, section 3.1.2.

²²² See section 2.5.3 *Classical Āyurveda*.

The origin of the terms *ādhyātmika*, *ādhibhautika* and *ādhidaivika* can be traced back to early Upaniṣadic sources, specifically the *Taittirīyopaniṣad*. However, there they do not refer to the concept of suffering, but rather to ideas about the creation of the world.²²³ The usage of these three terms as double *vṛddhi* formations occurs in the selected passages only in the context of suffering. An exception to this is the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra*, where the same terms are also used in the context of the classification of death omīna (*ariṣṭa*).²²⁴

The above findings may be expanded through the investigation of further Sanskrit literature where the triple suffering is mentioned, which would lead to a more comprehensive understanding of this concept. It would also be worthwhile to examine whether the three terms *ādhyātmika*, *ādhibhautika* and *ādhidaivika* are used only in the context of suffering or whether they may not be applied in other contexts beyond the already observed one of the omīna of death. Additionally, future studies could focus on the investigation of the means by which complete cessation of the triple suffering is achieved, as presented in the selected passages.

²²³ See section 1.2 *Three kinds of suffering*.

²²⁴ See section 2.4 *Classical Yoga*.

5. Bibliography

5.1. Primary literature

- Ācārya 1938 Yādavaśarman Trivikrama Ācārya and Narayan Ram Acharya (ed.), *The Suśrutasaṃhitā of Suśruta with the Nibandhasaṅgraha Commentary of Śrī Ḍalhaṇāchārya and the Nyāyacandrikā Pañjikā of Śrī Gayadāsāchārya on Nīdanasthāna*. Bombay: Nirṇayasāgar Press [reprint Varanasi: Chaukhamba Surbharati Prakashan 2003].
- Āgāṣe 1904 K.Ś. Āgāṣe (ed.), *Vācaspatimiśraviracitaṭīkāsaṃvalita Vyāsabhāṣyasametāni Pātañjalayogasūtrāṇi. Tathā Bhojadevaviracita-Rājamārtanḍābhīdhavṛttisametāni Pātañjalayogasūtrāṇi*. Puṇyākhyapattana [= Pune].
- Bhaṭṭācārya 1883 J.V. Bhaṭṭācārya (ed.), *Mīmāṃsādarśanam. Śrī Śabarasaṃvāṃkṛtena bhāṣyeṇa sahitam*. Calcutta: Calcutta University.
- Dave 1972 Jayantakrishna Harikrishna Dave (ed.), *Manusmṛti with the Commentaries of Medhātithi, Sarvajñanārāyaṇa, Kullūka, Rāghavānanda, Nandana, Rāmacandra, Mañirāma, Govindarāja and Bhāruci*. Vol. 1. Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan.
- Dave 1984 Jayantakrishna Harikrishna Dave (ed.), *Manusmṛti with the commentaries of Medhātithi, Sarvajñanārāyaṇa, Kullūka, Rāghavānanda, Nandana, Rāmacandra, Mañirāma, Govindarāja and Bhāruci*. Vol. 6. Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan.
- Dave 1990 Jayantakrishna Harikrishna Dave (ed.), *Manusmṛti with the Commentaries of Medhātithi, Sarvajñanārāyaṇa, Kullūka, Rāghavānanda, Nandana, Rāmacandra, Mañirāma, Govindarāja and Bhāruci*. Vol. 4. Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan.
- Dvivedin 1920 Vindhyeśvarī Prasāda Dvivedin (ed.), *Sāṃkhyasaṃgraha, a Collection of the Works of Sāṃkhya Philosophy*. Benares: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office.

- Esnoul 1964 Anne-Marie Esnoul (ed. and tr. into French), *Les Strophes de Sāṃkhya (Sāṃkhya-kārika). Avec le commentaire de Gauḍapāda*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Garbe 1888 Richard Garbe (ed.), *The Sāṃkhya Sūtra Vṛtti. Or Aniruddha's Commentary and the Original Parts of Vedāntin Mahādeva's Commentary to the Sāṃkhya Sūtras*. Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press.
- Garbe 1895 Richard Garbe (ed.), *The Sāṃkhya-Pravacana-Bhāṣya or Commentary on the Exposition of the Sāṃkhya Philosophy by Vijñānabhikṣu*. Cambridge: Harvard University.
- Jambuvijaya 1961 Muni Śrī Jambuvijaya, *Vaiśeṣikasūtra of Kaṇāda. With the Commentary of Candrānanda*. Baroda: Oriental Institute.
- Kangle 1960 R.P. Kangle (ed.), *The Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra. Part I. A Critical Edition with a Glossary*. Bombay: University of Bombay.
- Limaye & Vadekar 1958 V.P. Limaye and R.D. Vadekar (ed.), *Eighteen Principal Upanishads. Vol.1. Poona: Vaidika Saṃśodhana Maṇḍala*.
- Maas 2006 Philipp Andre Maas, *Samādhipāda. Das erste Kapitel des Pātañjalayogaśāstra zum ersten Mal kritisch ediert*. Aachen: Shaker Verlag.
- Paṇṣīkar 1936 Wāsudev Laxmaṇ Shāstrī Paṇṣīkar (ed.), *Śrīmadbhāgavadgītā with the commentaries Śrīmat-Śāṅkarabhāṣya with Ānandagiri; Nīlakaṇṭhī; Bhāṣyotkarṣadīpikā of Dhanapati; Śrīdhari; Gītārthasaṅgraha of Abhinavaguptāchārya and Gūḍhārthadīpikā of Madhusūdana with Gūḍhārthattattvāloka of Śrīdharmadattaśarmā*. 2nd ed. Bombay: Nirṇayasāgar Press.
- Pathak 1991 M.M. Pathak (ed.), *The Critical Edition of Viṣṇupurāṇam. Vol. 2 (Aṃśas IV-VI & Pāda-Index)*. Vadodara: Oriental Institute.
- Śarmā 1970 Viṣṇu Prasād Śarmā (ed.), *Sāṃkhyakārikā of Śrīmad Īśvarakṛṣṇa with the Māṭharavṛtti of Māṭharācārya and the Jayamaṅgalā of Śrī Śāṅkara*. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office.
- Śastri 1940 Ananthakrishna Śastri (ed.), *Pāśupatasūtra with Kauṇḍinya's Pañcārthabhāṣya*. Trivandrum: University of Travancore.
- Sastri & Sastri 1952 Rama Sri Polakam Sastri & S.R. Krishnamurthi Sastri (ed.), *Pātañjala-Yogasūtra-Bhāṣya-Vivaraṇa of Śāṅkara-Bhagavat-pāda. Critically edited with introduction by [...] P. Sri Rama Sastri [...] and S.R. Krishnamurthi Sastri [...]*. Madras: Government Orient Manuscripts Library.

- Solomon 1973 Esther A. Solomon (ed.), *Sāṃkhya-Saptati-Vṛtti* (V1). Ahmedabad: Gujarat University.
- 1973 Esther A. Solomon (ed.), *Sāṃkhya-Vṛtti* (V2). Ahmedabad: Gujarat University.
- Srinivasan 1967 Ayya Srinivasa Srinivasan (ed.), *Vācaspatimiśras Tattvakaumudī. Ein Beitrag zur Textkritik bei kontaminierter Überlieferung*. Hamburg: Cram, de Gruyter & Co.
- Sukthankar 1951 V.S. Sukthankar, *The Mahābhārata*. Vol. 15: *Śāntiparvan. Mokṣadharmā for the First Time Critically Edited* [...]. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Thakur 1997 A. Thakur, *Gautamīyanyāyadarśana with Bhāṣya of Vātsyāyana*. New Delhi: Indian Council of Philosophical Research.
- Trikamji 1940 Jādvaji Trikamji, *The Carakasamhitā by Agnivesa revised by Charaka and Dṛdhabala. With the Āyurveda-Dīpikā commentary of Chakrapāṇidatta*. Bombay: Nirṇaya Sāgar Press.
- Wezler & Motegi 1998 A. Wezler and S. Motegi (ed.), *Yuktidīpikā. The Most Significant Commentary on the Sāṃkhyakārikā*. Critically edited [...]. Vol. I. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

5.2. Secondary literature

- Apte 1890 V.S. Apte. *The Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Poona: Shiralkar.
- Arbman 1922 Ernst Arbman, *Rudra. Untersuchungen zum altindischen Glauben und Kultus. Inauguraldissertation zur Erlangung der Doktorwürde*. Uppsala: Appelbergs Boktryckeri Aktiebolag.
- Aufrecht 1891 Theodor Aufrecht, *Catalogus Catalogorum. An Alphabetical Register of Sanskrit Works and Authors*. Vol.1. Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus.
- Bailey 2018 Greg Bailey, *Purāṇas*. In: *Brill's Encyclopedia of Hinduism Online*, ed. Knut A. Jacobsen, Helene Basu, Angelika Malinar and Vasudha Narayanan. Consulted online on 08 August 2023 http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2212-5019_BEH_COM_2020070.
- 2011 Greg Bailey, *Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa as Genealogy and Jātipurāṇa*. *Religions of South Asia* 5, pp. 319-337.

- Basham 1951 A. L. Basham, *History and Doctrines of the Ājīvikas. A Vanished Indian Religion*. London: Luzac and Co. Ltd. [reprint Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass 1981].
- Bisschop 2016 Peter C. Bisschop, India and the Making of Hinduism. The Contribution of the Purāṇas. In: *Religion and Orientalism in Asian Studies*, ed. Kiri Paramore, pp. 39-51. London/Oxford, etc.: Bloomsbury Academic.
- 2018 Peter C. Bisschop, *Universal Śaivism. The Appeasement of All Gods and Powers in the Śāntiyadhyāya of the Śīvadharmaśāstra*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Bisschop & Bakker 1999 P. Bisschop and H. Bakker, Mokṣadharma 187 and 239-241 Reconsidered. *Asiatische Studien* 53 (3), pp. 459-472.
- Böhtlingk & Roth 1875 Otto Böhtlingk und Rudolph Roth, *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*. St. Petersburg: Egger.
- Brockington 1999 John Brockington, Epic Sāṃkhya. Texts, Teachers, Terminology. *Asiatische Studien* 53 (3), pp. 473-490.
- Bronkhorst 1984 Johannes Bronkhorst, Patañjali and the Yoga Sūtras. *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 10, pp. 191-212.
- 2007 Johannes Bronkhorst, *Greater Magadha. Studies in the Culture of Early India*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Bueno-Gómez 2017 Noelia Bueno-Gómez, Conceptualizing Suffering and Pain. *Philosophy, Ethics, and Humanities in Medicine* 12 (7), pp. 1-11.
- Chakravarti 1952 Pulinbihari Chakravarti, *Origin and Development of the Sāṃkhya System of Thought*. Calcutta: Metropolitan Printing and Publishing House Limited.
- Coomaraswamy 1931 A.K. Coomaraswamy, *Yakṣas*. Part II. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.
- Crooke 1896 W. Crooke, *The Tribes and Castes of the North-Western Provinces and Oudh*. Vol. 1. Calcutta: Office of the Superintendent of Government Printing.
- Dasgupta 1922 Surendranath Dasgupta, *A History of Indian Philosophy*. Vol. 1. Cambridge: University Press.
- 1924 Surendranath Dasgupta, *Yoga as Philosophy and Religion*. London: The Mayflower Press/Plymouth: William Brendon & Son Ltd.

- DeCaroli 2004 Robert DeCaroli, *Haunting the Buddha. Indian Popular Religions and the Formation of Buddhism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Drautzborg & Oldfield 2013 Anja A. Drautzborg and Jackson Oldfield. *Making Sense of Suffering. A Collective Attempt*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Dimmitt & Van Buiten 1978 Cornelia Dimmitt & J.A.B. van Buiten, *Classical Hindu Mythology. A Reader in the Sanskrit Purāṇas*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Edgerton 1924 Franklin Edgerton, The Meaning of Sāṃkhya and Yoga. *The American Journal of Philology* 45 (1), pp. 1-46.
- Flood 1996 Gavin Flood, *An Introduction to Hinduism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Frauwallner 1925 E. Frauwallner, Untersuchung zum Mokṣadharma. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 45, pp. 51-67.
- 1953 E. Frauwallner, *Geschichte der indischen Philosophie*. 1. Band: *Die Philosophie des Veda und des Epos. Der Buddha und der Jina. Das Sāṃkhya und das klassische Yoga-System*. Salzburg: Otto Müller Verlag.
- 1958 E. Frauwallner, Zur Erkenntnislehre des klassischen Sāṃkhya-Systems. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens und Archiv für indische Philosophie* 2, pp. 84-139 (= *Kleine Schriften*, ed. G. Oberhammer and E. Steinkellner, Wiesbaden: Steiner 1982, pp. 223-278).
- Freschi 2018 E. Freschi, Mīmāṃsā. In: *History of Indian Philosophy*, ed. Purushottama Bilimoria, Vol. 1, pp. 148-156. London/New York: Routledge.
- Gallagher 2014 R.J. Gallagher, *An Annotated Translation of Chapter 7 of the Carakasamhitā Cikitsāsthāna. Leprosy and Other Skin Disorders*. Partial Fulfillment for the degree of Master of Arts at the University of Texas at Austin.
- Jacobi 1931 Hermann Jacobi, Über das Alter des Yogaśāstra. *Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik* 8, pp. 80-88.
- Halbfass 1988 Wilhelm Halbfass, *India and Europe: An Essay in Understanding*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Hall 1859 F. Hall, *A Controbution Towards an Index to the Bibliography of the Indian Philosophical Systems*. Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press.

- Hara 2002 Minoru Hara, *Pāśupata Studies*. Ed. Jun Takashima. Publications of the De Nobili Research Library 30. Vienna: Sammlung De Nobili, Inst. für Südasien-, Tibet- u. Buddhismuskunde.
- Harvey 2012 Peter Harvey, *Introduction to Buddhism. Teachings, History and Practices*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Härtel & Auboyer 1985 H. Härtel and J. Auboyer, *Indien und Südostasien*. Propyläen Kunstgeschichte 21. Berlin: Propyläen Verlag.
- Hopkins 1915 W. Hopkins, *Epic Hindu Mythology*. Strassburg: Verlag von Karl J. Trübner.
- Jha 2004 Ganganath Jha, *The Sāṃkhya-tattva-kaumudī, Vācaspati Miśra's commentary on the Sāṃkhya-kārikā*. With an Introduction and Critical Notes by Har Dutt Sharma, Revised and re-edited by M.M. Patkar. The Vrajajivan Indological Studies 35. Delhi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishthan.
- Jolly 1901 J. Jolly, *Medicin*. Strassburg: Verlag von Karl J. Trübner.
- 1951 J. Jolly, *Indian Medicine*. Translated from German and Supplemented with Notes by C.G. Kashikar. Poona: Vaidika Samśodhana Maṇḍala.
- Jacobsen 2018 Knut Jacobsen, Sāṃkhya. In: *Brill's Encyclopedia of Hinduism Online*, ed. Knut A. Jacobsen, Helene Basu, Angelika Malinar and Vasudha Narayanan. Consulted online on 08 August 2023 http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2212-5019_BEH_COM_9000000076.
- Krishan 1992 Y. Krishan, Vināyaka as Vighnakartā (Causer of Obstacles) in the Mānavagr̥hyasūtra and Yājñavalkyasmṛti: A Comparative Study. *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 72-73 (= *Amṛtamahotsava (1917-1992) Volume*), pp. 363-367.
- Kumar 2003 Ratnam R. Kumar, *Dukkha. Suffering in Early Buddhism*. New Delhi: Discovery Publishing House.
- Kutumbiah 1962 P. Kutumbiah, *Ancient Indian Medicine*. Bombay/Calcutta, etc.: Orient Longmans.
- Larson & Bhattacharya 1987 G.J. Larson and R.S. Bhattacharya, *The Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies*. Vol. 4: *Sāṃkhya. A Dualist Tradition in Indian Philosophy*. Ed. Karl H. Potter. Princeton: Princeton University Press. [reprint Princenton: Princenton University Press 2014]

- Larson 1999 G.J. Larson, Classical Yoga as Neo-Sāṃkhya: A Chapter in the History of Indian Philosophy. *Asiatische Studien* 53 (3), pp. 723-732.
- Maas 2013 Philipp André Maas, A Concise Historiography of Classical Yoga Philosophy. In: *Periodization and Historiography of Indian Philosophy*, ed. Eli Franco, pp. 53-90. Vienna: Sammlung de Nobili.
- Mani 1975 Vettam Mani, *Pūṛaṇic Encyclopedia. A Comprehensive Dictionary with Special Reference to the Epic and Purāṇic Literature*. Delhi/Patna, etc.: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Mathur 1990 V.K. Mathur, *Aitihāsik Sthānāvalī*. Jaipur: Rajasthan Hindi Granth Akadami.
- McClish 2019 M. McClish, *The History of the Arthaśāstra. Sovereignty and Sacred Law in Ancient India*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Meulenbeld 1997 Gerrit Jan Meulenbeld, Aspects of Indian Psychiatry. In: *History of Psychiatric Diagnoses. Proceedings of the 16th International Symposium on the Comparative History of Medicine—East and West September 1–8, 1991, Susono-Shi, Shizuoka, Japan*, ed. Yosio Kawakita, Shizu Sakai and Yasuo Otsuka, pp. 183-237. Tokyo: Ishiyaku Euro America.
- 1999 G.J. Meulenbeld, *A History of Indian Literature*. Vol. 1A. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.
- Misra 1981 R.N. Misra, *Yaksha Cult and Iconography*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.
- Motegi 1999 Shujun Motegi, The Teachings of Pañcaśikha in the Mokṣadharma. *Asiatische Studien* 53 (3), pp. 513-535.
- Müller 1919 M. Müller, *The Six Systems of Indian Philosophy*. London: Longmans Green and Co.
- Nagar 1992 Shanti Lal Nagar, *The Cult of Vinayaka*. New Delhi: Intellectual Publishing House.
- Oberhammer 1960 G. Oberhammer, The Authorship of the Śaṣṭitantram. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Suedasiens und Archiv für indische Philosophie* 4, pp.71-91.
- Oberlies 1998 T. Oberlies, Die Śvetāśvatara-Upaniṣad. Edition und Übersetzung von Adhyāya IV-VI (Studien zu den „mittleren“ Upaniṣads II – 3. Teil). *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens und Archiv für indische Philosophie* 42, pp. 77-138.

- O’Flaherty 1980 W. D. O’Flaherty, *The Origins of Evil in Hindu Mythology*. Berkely: University of California Press.
- Olivelle 1998 P. Olivelle, *The Early Upaniṣads. Annotated Text and Translation*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 2020 P. Olivelle, *Long-Distance Trade in Ancient India: Evidence from Kauṭilya’s Arthaśāstra*. *The Indian Economic & Social History Review* 57 (1), pp. 31-47.
- Parpola 2011 Asko Parpola, Crocodile in the Indus Civilization and Later South Asia Tradition. In: *Linguistics, Archeology and the Human Past*, ed. T. Osada and H. Endo, pp. 1-57. Kyoto: Indus Project, Research Institute for Humanity and nature.
- Parrot 1990 Rodney J. Parrot, The Worth of the World in Classical Sāṃkhya. *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 71, pp. 83-108.
- Potter 1970 Karl H. Potter, *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies*. Vol. 1: *Bibliography of Indian Philosophies*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Preisendanz 2018a Karin Preisendanz, Text Segmentation, Chapter Naming and the Transmission of Embedded Texts in South Asia, with Special Reference to the Medical and Philosophical Traditions as Exemplified by the Carakasamhitā and the Nyāyasūtra. In: *Pieces and Parts in Scientific Texts*, ed. Florence Bretelle-Establet and Stéphane Schmitt, pp. 159-220. *Why the Sciences of the Ancient World Matter* 1. Cham: Springer.
- 2018b Karin Preisendanz, Vaiśeṣika. In: *Brill’s Encyclopedia of Hinduism Online*, ed. Knut A. Jacobsen, Helene Basu, Angelika Malinar and Vasudha Narayanan. Consulted online on 08 August 2023: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2212-5019_BEH_COM_9000000077.
- Qvarnström 1999 Olle Qvarnström, Haribhadra and the Beginnings of Doxography in India. In: *Approaches to Jaina Studies: Philosophy, Logic, Rituals and Symbols*, ed. O. Qvarnström and N. K. Wagle, pp. 169-210. South Asian Studies Papers 11. Toronto: University of Toronto, Centre for South Asian Studies.
- Raghavan 1969 V. Raghavan, *New Catalogus Catalogorum: An Alphabetical Register of Sanskrit and Allied Works and Authors*. Vol. 5. Madras: University of Madras.
- Rastelli 2018 Marion Rastelli, Pāñcarātra. In: *Brill’s Encyclopedia of Hinduism Online*, ed. Knut A. Jacobsen, Helene Basu, Angelika

Malinar and Vasudha Narayanan. Consulted online 08 August 2023: http://dx-doi-org.uaccess.univie.ac.at/10.1163/2212-5019_BEH_COM_9000000055.

- Raveh 2021 Daniel Raveh, On Suffering: A Dialogue with Rajendra Swaroop Bhatnagar. *Journal of World Philosophies* 5, pp. 186-199.
- Rocher 1986 Ludo Rocher, *The Purāṇas*. A History of Indian Literature II, 3, ed. Jan Gonda. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Rukmani 1999 T.S. Rukmani, Sāṃkhya and Yoga: Where They Do otSpeak in One Voice. *Asiatische Studien* 53 (3), pp. 733-753.
- Rusza 1997 F. Rusza, *The Triple Suffering. A Note on the Sāṃkhyakārikā*. Presentation held at the Xth World Sanskrit Conference (Bangalore, 1997); Intended publication to be included in the Proceedings of the Conference. (Summary in: *English Abstracts*, Xth World Sanskrit Conference, New Delhi 1997, p. 261f.).
- Sanderson 2014 Alexis Sanderson, The Śaiva Literature. *Journal of Indological Studies* 24-25, pp. 1-113.
- Schreiner 1989 Peter Schreiner, Zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Brahmapurāṇa. In: *XXIII. Deutscher Orientalistentag, Würzburg: Ausgewählte Vorträge*, ed. Einar von Schuler, pp. 410-419.
- 1999 Peter Schreiner, What Comes First (in the Mahābhārata): Sāṃkhya or Yoga? *Asiatische Studien* 53 (3), pp. 755-777.
- Schreiner & Söhnen 1989 Peter Schreiner & Renate Söhnen (ed.), *Brahmapurāṇa: summary of contents, with index of names and motifs*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 1989.
- Sköld & Lund 2021 A. Sköld und P. Lund, Suffering in Contemporary Society. *Qualitative Studies* 6 (1), pp. 1-10.
- Slaje 1986 W. Slaje, Untersuchung zur Chronologie einiger Nyāya-Philosophen. *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 11-12, pp. 245-278.
- Smith 1991 Brian K. Smith, Classifying Animals and Humans in Ancient India. *Man*, New Series 26 (3), pp. 527-548.
- Smith 2006 Frederick Smith, *The Self Possessed: Deity and Spirit Possession in South Asian Literature and Civilization*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Solomon 1974 Esther A. Solomon, *The Commentaries of the Sāṃkhya Kārikā – A Study*. Ahmedabad: Gujarat University.

- Steiner 1998 Steiner Roland, Das „dreifache Leiden“ in Sāṃkhyakārikā 1. In: *Indica et Tibetica*, ed. Konrad Klaus and Jens-Uwe Hartmann, pp. 507-521. Wien: Arbeitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien Universität Wien.
- Steinkellner 1999 E. Steinkellner, The Śaṣṭitantra on Perception: A Collection of Fragments. *Asiatische Studien* 53 (3), pp. 667-677.
- Sutherland 1992 G.H. Sutherland, *Yakṣa in Hinduism and Buddhism: The Disguises of the Demon*. New Delhi: Manohar.
- Torella 1999 Raffaele Torella, Sāṃkhya as Sāmānyaśāstra. *Asiatische Studien* 53 (3), pp. 554-562.
- Trautmann 1971 Thomas R. Trautmann, *Kauṭilya and the Arthaśāstra: A Statistical Investigation of the Authorship and Evolution of the Text*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Walhouse 1876 M.J. Walhouse, On the Belief in Bhūtas. Devil and Ghost Worship in Western India. *Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland* 5, pp. 408-425.
- Woods 1914 James Haughton Woods, *The Yoga-System of Patañjali*. Harvard Oriental Series 17. Cambridge/Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Wujastyk 1998 Dominik Wujastyk, *The Roots of Āyurveda*. New Delhi: Penguin Books India.
- 1999 Dominik Wujastyk, Miscarriages of Justice. Demonic Vengeance in Classical Indian Medicine. In: *Religion, Health and Suffering*. London: Kegan Paul International. pp. 256-275.
- 2017 Dominik Wujastyk, *Models of Disease in Ayurvedic Medicine*. In: *The Routledge History of Disease*, ed. Mark Jackson, pp. 38-53. London/New York: Routledge.
- Yano 2003 Michio Yano, Calendar, Astrology, and Astronomy. In: *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Hinduism*, ed. Gavin Flood, pp. 384-399, Hoboken: Wiley Blackwell.
- Younger 1969 Paul Younger, The Concept of Duḥkha and the Indian Religious Tradition. *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 37 (2), pp. 141-152.

6. Appendix

6.1. Glossary relating to suffering of the *ādhyātmika śārīra* type

<i>akṣiroga</i>	eye disease
<i>aṅgāmaya</i>	disease of the limbs
<i>apasmāra</i>	epilepsy
<i>atīsāra</i>	dysentery
<i>arśa</i>	hemorrhoids
<i>āyāsa</i>	fatigue
<i>bhagaṃdara</i>	anorectal fistulas
<i>bhrama</i>	dizziness
<i>chardi</i>	vomitting
<i>dantaroga</i>	dental disease
<i>gudāvartta</i>	constipation
<i>gulma</i>	visceral swelling
<i>hṛdroga</i>	heart diseases
<i>jalodara</i>	enlargement of the abdomen caused by water
<i>jvara</i>	fever
<i>kāsa</i>	caugh
<i>kuṣṭha</i>	skin disease
<i>mada</i>	intoxication
<i>mukharoga</i>	diseases of oral cavity
<i>mūrcchā</i>	fainting
<i>pārśvaśūla</i>	a sharp pain in the side
<i>plīha</i>	spleen
<i>pratiśyāya</i>	cold
<i>śīroroga</i>	disease of the head
<i>śvayathu</i>	swelling
<i>śvāsa</i>	hard breathing
<i>udarāmaya</i>	stomach sickness

<i>vātagulma</i>	visceral swelling caused by wind
<i>viṣūcikā</i>	cholera

6.2. Glossary relating to suffering of the *ādhyātmika mānasa*

<i>apriyasamyoga</i>	conjunction with that which is unpleasant
<i>āratya</i>	dissatisfaction
<i>asūya</i>	ill will
<i>avamāna</i>	contempt
<i>aviśeṣadarśana</i>	not seeing specifics
<i>bhaya</i>	fear
<i>dveṣa</i>	dislike
<i>īpsitasyālābha</i>	not getting something one desires to obtain
<i>īrṣyā</i>	jealousy
<i>iṣṭavighāta</i>	removal of that what is desired
<i>kāma</i>	desire
<i>krodha</i>	anger
<i>lobha</i>	greed
<i>mada</i>	madness
<i>māna</i>	pride
<i>mātsarya</i>	malice
<i>moha</i>	delusion
<i>priyaviyoga</i>	disjunction from that which is pleasant
<i>śoka</i>	grief
<i>viṣāda</i>	depression
<i>viṣayaviśeṣadarśana</i>	not seeing specific objects
<i>viṣayaviśeṣadarśanādarśana</i>	seeing as well as not seeing specific objects

6.3. Glossary relating to suffering of the *ādhibhautika*

<i>aṇḍaja</i>	born from an egg
---------------	------------------

<i>daṃśa</i>	gadfly
<i>grāha</i>	shark
<i>jarāyuja</i>	born from the chorion
<i>makara</i>	crocodile
<i>manuṣya/mānuṣa</i>	human
<i>matkuṇa</i>	bug
<i>matsya</i>	fish
<i>maśaka</i>	gnat
<i>mṛga</i>	wild animal
<i>pakṣin</i>	winged animal
<i>paśu</i>	domestic animal
<i>piśāca</i>	demonic being, flesh-eater
<i>rākṣasa</i>	demonic being
<i>sarīrpa</i>	crawling animal
<i>sarpa</i>	crawling animal
<i>sthāvara</i>	stationary being
<i>svedaja</i>	born from moisture
<i>udbhija</i>	born from a germ
<i>uraga</i>	semi-divine being in a form of snake
<i>vyāghra</i>	tiger
<i>yūkā</i>	louse

6.4. Glossary relating to suffering of the *ādhidaivika*

<i>agni</i>	fire
<i>anāvṛṣṭi</i>	lack of rain
<i>aśāni</i>	thunderbolt
<i>aśānipāta</i>	fall of Indra's thunderbolt
<i>ativṛṣṭi</i>	excessive rain
<i>avaśyāya</i>	hoar frost
<i>bhūta</i>	spirit, ghost

<i>graha</i>	grasper, demonic being, planet
<i>grahapīḍā</i>	oppression by a planet, eclipse
<i>rākṣasa</i>	semi-divine being
<i>śīta</i>	cold
<i>tapātyaya</i>	end of the hot season
<i>uṣṇa</i>	hot
<i>vaidyuta</i>	lightening
<i>varṣa</i>	rain
<i>varṣāmbu</i>	rain, water
<i>vāta</i>	wind
<i>vāyu</i>	wind
<i>vināyaka</i>	semi-divine being
<i>vr̥ṣṭi</i>	rain
<i>yakṣa</i>	semi-divine being

6.5. Abstract: German

Diese Masterarbeit befasst sich mit der Klassifizierung und Erklärung des Konzepts von drei Arten von Leiden (*duḥkha*): Leiden in Bezug auf etwas, das zum Selbst gehört (*ādhyātmika*), Leiden in Bezug auf etwas, das zu einem lebenden Wesen gehört (*ādhibhautika*) und Leiden in Bezug auf etwas, das göttlich ist / zu den Göttern gehört oder zum Himmel gehört (*ādhibhautika*). Der Bezug auf diese drei Arten von Leiden ist aus dem Eröffnungsvers der Lehre der klassischen Sāṃkhya-Philosophie gemäß der *Sāṃkhyakārikā* sehr gut bekannt. Obwohl der Vers selbst nur den Begriff *duḥkhatraya* („drei [Arten des] Leiden[s]“) verwendet, geben die Kommentatoren der *Sāṃkhyakārikā* und andere Autoren weitere Informationen über die Bezeichnungen dieser drei Arten des Leidens, ihre Definitionen und Unterklassifizierungen, und erklären sie weiter, hauptsächlich in Form von in Listen angeführten Beispielen. Es ist jedoch nicht klar, ob diese Klassifizierung des Leidens ursprünglich aus der Sāṃkhya-Philosophie stammt. Die gleiche Einteilung findet sich auch in Werken in verschiedenen anderen Genres der Sanskrit-Literatur, wie in der klassischen Yoga-Philosophie und der śivaitischen Pāśupata-Tradition, in den Purāṇas, im Āyurveda usw.

In diesem Zusammenhang geht die vorliegende Arbeit der Frage nach, wie sich die Klassifikation, Interpretation und Beschreibung des dreifachen Leidens in der klassischen und mittelalterlichen Sanskrit-Literatur entwickelt hat. Dazu werden Übersetzungen ausgewählter Passagen aus den Kommentaren zu *Sāṃkhyakārikā* 1, *Sāṃkhyasūtra* 1, aus Kurzkomentaren und anderen Werken, die im unter dem Titel *Sāṃkhyasaṃgraha* veröffentlichten Konvolut von kurzen Sāṃkhya-Werken enthalten sind, aus Kommentaren zu *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* 1.31 sowie aus dem *Pañcārthabhāṣya*, dem *Brahmapurāṇa* und *Viṣṇupurāṇa* und der *Suśrutasamhitā* herangezogen. Die reichhaltigen Informationen, die in diesen ausgewählten Passagen enthalten sind, werden übersichtlich in tabellarischer Form dargestellt und anschließend unter verschiedenen Gesichtspunkten ausgewertet, wie z. B. aus Sicht der gegenseitigen Beziehung zwischen den Interpretationen in den Quellen und ihren entscheidenden Unterschieden, ihrer inneren Logik und Entwicklung und der Identifizierung und näheren Bestimmung von besonderen Merkmalen.