

## Doxographies - Why six *darśanas*? Which six?

2004 ASIAN STUDIES GRADUATE STUDENT COLLOQUIUM

Prem Pahlajrai  
Asian Languages and Literature  
University of Washington

These days it is commonly held that there are six *darśanas* or systems of orthodox or *āstika* Hindu philosophy. These are usually enumerated as three pairs: Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika, Sāṃkhya and Yoga, Mīmāṃsā and Vedānta. The heterodox or *nāstika* systems are typically enumerated separately: the Jaina, Buddhist and the Materialists (the Lokāyatās/Cārvākas). This paper explores why traditional doxographies are often preoccupied with enumerating only six systems and which systems they choose to enumerate.

According to Richard King, “the use of the term *darśana* to denote a ‘school of philosophy’ ... does not occur until the fifth century of the Common Era where it is used by the Buddhist Bhāvaviveka in his *Verses on the Heart of the Middle Way (Madhyamaka Hṛdaya Kārikā)*”.<sup>1</sup> Possibly through the association with the six *darśanas*, the term *darśana* by itself has also come to mean “philosophy” in contemporary Sanskrit. Through its derivation from the verbal root *drś*, “to see,” *darśana* in connection with these systems also implies “vision,” “view,” and even “insight” or “realization”. In the opening verse to the Jaina doxography, *Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccaya*, Haribhadra Sūri indicates two contrasting meanings of *darśana*: the true insight, *saḍdarśana* of the Jina Mahāvīra and all the other philosophical views, *sarva-darśana*.<sup>2</sup>

But there are other Sanskrit terms used to refer to philosophical systems. For example, in Śaṅkara’s works, the following are noted: *tantra*, *siddhānta*, *śāstra*, *pakṣa*, *mata*, *samaya*, *vāda*. But these tend to usually occur in compounds and/or in reference to the philosophical systems of others. Halbfass suggests that *darśana* without any qualifiers has the doxographic, neutral or sometimes even pejorative

---

<sup>1</sup> King (1999), pp.44-5

<sup>2</sup> Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccayaḥ 1: *saddarśanaṃ jinaṃ natvā vīraṃ syādvādadeśakam | sarvadarśanavācyo’rthaḥ saṃkṣepeṇa nigadyate ||*

sense of “(mere) view,” “theory,” or “speculation” as distinguished from “true insight” *samyagdarśana* or *tattvadarśana*. “The combination and merger of these two meanings, or the interpretation of the doxographic usage in the normative sense of ‘right vision,’ ‘realization,’ is a symptomatic innovation of Neo-Hinduism.”<sup>3</sup>

Among certain European and European-worldview-influenced scholars, “Indian” or “Eastern” philosophy is held to be an oxymoron, mainly due to the preoccupation of the Indian systems with liberation (and thus their “practical” motivations) and due to the inextricability of theology and tradition from these systems. Philosophy, according to such scholars, is supposed to be “pure” and uncoupled to theology and tradition, along the lines of what is found in the west. Halbfass suggests that in the Indian context, “the commitment to tradition is not a mere habitual continuation of past ways of thinking. It is something actively asserted and pursued, something questioned, justified and rationalized. ... [The] spirit of critical argumentation ... is also reflected in the idea of *ānvīkṣikī*.”<sup>4</sup> Scholars such as Hermann Jacobi proposed that this term *ānvīkṣikī*, “investigation through reasoning” better captured the association of the Indian systems with “pure” theory. However, *ānvīkṣikī*’s “significance as an indicator of rational and methodological attitudes and programs has been ambiguous and temporary. As far as its overall historical role is concerned, it can hardly be considered an equivalent to ‘philosophy’.”<sup>5</sup>

Both Halbfass and King argue that Indian philosophy does not reflect the European Enlightenment split between religion and philosophy because there was no equivalent antagonism towards religion in the culture. While *darśana* or *ānvīkṣikī* do not exactly correspond to European “philosophy,” this does not imply the absence of concern with metaphysics, epistemology, ontology and linguistic analysis. In fact there is found in these *darśanas* a level of sophistication comparable to that found in European thought and worthy of study.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Halbfass (1988), pp.265-6.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., p.281.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., p.285.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., pp.263-86; King (1999), pp.24-41.

According to Qvarnström , Bhāvaviveka’s MHK<sup>7</sup> (fifth cent. CE) is “not only the earliest doxographical work which we possess, but also one of the most valuable sources for the study of the history of Indian philosophy”.<sup>8</sup> “There are moments when [Bhāvaviveka] gives the impression of being the Indian tradition’s earliest and most diligent collector of philosophical trivia.”<sup>9</sup> It covers six “schools” (in addition to its own Madhyamaka philosophy), two of which are Buddhist:

- |                            |            |
|----------------------------|------------|
| 1. Śrāvakayāna or Hīnayāna | 4. Sāṃkhya |
| 2. Yogācāra                | 5. Vedānta |
| 3. Vaiśeṣika               | 6. Mīmāṃsā |

The Tamil Buddhist verse epic by Cāttanār/Śāttanār, *Maṇimekhalai* from around 500A.D. also lists six systems:<sup>10</sup>

- |             |              |
|-------------|--------------|
| 1. Lokāyata | 4. Nyāya     |
| 2. Buddhism | 5. Vaiśeṣika |
| 3. Sāṃkhya  | 6. Mīmāṃsā   |

The Jaina Haribhadra Sūri (end of eight century CE) in his *Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccaya* reinforces the “six schools” idea and describes:<sup>11</sup>

- |              |              |
|--------------|--------------|
| 1. Buddhists | 4. Jaina     |
| 2. Nyāya     | 5. Vaiśeṣika |
| 3. Sāṃkhya   | 6. Mīmāṃsā   |

The Buddhists are represented by a single school and no mention is made of Yoga and Vedānta, which are presumably subsumed by Sāṃkhya and Mīmāṃsā respectively.

Other Jaina doxographies either typically indicate that they are a survey of six systems by including the number six in their title, as Merutuṅga’s *Ṣaḍdarśananirṇaya*,<sup>12</sup> or they claim to offer a

<sup>7</sup> *Madhyamaka-hṛdaya-kārikā*.

<sup>8</sup> Qvarnström (1989), p.15

<sup>9</sup> Eckel, p.3.

<sup>10</sup> von Glasenapp, p.140; Halbfass (1988), p.560, n.10,13.

<sup>11</sup> *Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccaya* 3: *bauddhaṃ naiyāyikaṃ sāmṅhyaṃ jainaṃ vaiśeṣikaṃ tathā | jaiminīyaṃ ca nāmāni darśanānām amūny aho ||*

<sup>12</sup> Halbfass (1988), pp.351-2.

survey of “all” systems but are approximately six, as in *Sarvasiddhāntapraveśaka* by “an anonymous Jain author,” which includes a seventh section on the Lokāyata or Materialist school.<sup>13</sup>

In the ninth century, the *naiyāyika* Jayanta Bhaṭṭa in his *Nyāyamañjarī* also discusses six schools. The list is similar to Haribhadra Sūri’s in that it also omits Yoga and Vedānta, but it swaps out Vaiśeṣika with the Cārvākas.<sup>14</sup>

*Ṣaḍdarśanāsiddhāntasaṃgraha* by Rāmabhadra Dīkṣita et. al. (seventeenth or eighteenth century CE),<sup>15</sup> a doxography aligned with Advaita Vedānta, describes the following schools:<sup>16</sup>

- |                                    |                    |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Nyāya                           | 4. Sāṃkhya         |
| 2. Vaiśeṣika                       | 5. Yoga            |
| 3. Mīmāṃsā (Kumārila & Prabhākara) | 6. Advaita Vedānta |

A closing chapter deals with *vyākaraṇa*, grammar, and no mention is made of any Buddhist system whatsoever.

Halbfass says that the number six “also serves as a guideline even when a greater number of systems are actually treated.”<sup>17</sup> For example, the *Sarvamatasāṅgraha*, written possibly by Rāghavānanda, sometime in the second millennium, “not very old,”<sup>18</sup> is also aligned with Advaita Vedānta. At first, it considers the systems in two groups of three (before expanding them further):

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| Heterodox <i>avaidka</i> , <i>nāstika</i> : | Orthodox, <i>vaidika</i> , <i>āstika</i> : |
| 1. Buddhists                                | 4. Tarka                                   |
| 2. Jaina                                    | 5. Sāṃkhya                                 |
| 3. Materialists                             | 6. Mīmāṃsā                                 |

Similarly, Mādhava Sarasvatī’s *Sarvadarśanakaumudī* (1500 CE<sup>19</sup>) has an initial bipartite grouping (which is subsequently elaborated):

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| Heterodox <i>avaidka</i> , <i>nāstika</i> : | Orthodox, <i>vaidika</i> , <i>āstika</i> : |
| 1. Buddhists                                | 4. Sāṃkhya                                 |
| 2. Jaina                                    | 5. Tarka                                   |
| 3. Materialists                             | 6. Tantra (Mīmāṃsā)                        |

<sup>13</sup> Halbfass (1988), pp.351-2.

<sup>14</sup> King (1999), p.45.

<sup>15</sup> Dasgupta, v.2, p.431.

<sup>16</sup> Halbfass (1988), p.352.  
<sup>17</sup> p.352.

<sup>18</sup> Halbfass (1988), p.350; Dasgupta, v.2, p.115.

<sup>19</sup> Dasgupta, v.2, p.225.

Both these doxographies further expand the heterodox schools to six by sub-dividing Buddhism into four schools. The orthodox schools similarly are made to constitute six by further sub-dividing Tarka into Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika, Sāṃkhya into Kapila’s Sāṃkhya and Pātañjali’s Yoga, and Mīmāṃsā into Pūrva- and Uttara-mīmāṃsā.<sup>20</sup>

The *Sarvasiddhāntasaṃgraha*, “falsely ascribed to Śaṅkara”<sup>21</sup> also has a similar organization:

<i>Avaidika</i> systems	<i>Vaidika</i> systems
1. Lokāyata	7. Vaiśeṣika
2. Jaina ( <i>arhata</i> )	8. Mīmāṃsā (Bhaṭṭa & Prabhākara)
3. Mādhyamika	9. Sāṃkhya
4. Yogācāra	10. Pātañjali Yoga
5. Sautrāntika	11. Mahābhārata (Vedavyāsa)
6. Vaibhāṣika	12. Vedānta

Instead of Nyāya here we have Vedavyāsa’s Mahābhārata treated as a separate system!

Interestingly, the *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha* of Mādhava-Vidyāraṇya (ca. 1350 CE) does not follow a six-fold division, or for that matter any other scheme that could be reduced to six. The sixteen *darśanas* treated therein are:

1. Cārvāka	9. Raseśvara Śaivism
2. Buddhist	10. Vaiśeṣika
3. Jaina	11. Nyāya
4. Rāmanuja’s Viśiṣṭādvaita	12. Jaiminīya Mīmāṃsā
5. Madhva’s Dvaita	13. Pāṇinīya Śabdādvaita/Śuddhādvaita
6. Nakulīśa’s Pāśupata	14. Sāṃkhya
7. Śaiva	15. Pātañjala Yoga
8. Pratyabhijñā ( <i>spanda</i> or <i>trika</i> Kāśmīra Śaiva)	16. Śaṅkara Vedānta

The systems are listed in hierarchical order, starting with the materialists and the other heterodox systems. Notice how Śaṅkara Vedānta is listed as the final system, implying that it the culmination of all the other systems.

<sup>20</sup> Halbfass (1988), pp.352-3.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., pp.350, 535 n.7.

Agrawal<sup>22</sup> organizes these *Sarvadarśanasanġraha* schools by category in the following manner:

- Nāstika, heterodox
  - Ādhyakṣika: 1. Cārvāka
  - Tārkika
    - Kṣanikavādin: 2. Bauddha
    - Syādvādin: 3. Jaina
- Āstika, orthodox
  - Saġuṇātmavādin
    - Tārkika
      - Pracchanna
        - Pracchanna-dvaita: 4. Rāmānujīya Viśiṣṭādvaita
        - Spaṣṭa-dvaita: 5. Madhva Dvaita
      - Spaṣṭa
        - Bhogasāadhanādrṣṭavādin
          - Videhamuktivādin
            - Ātmabhedavādin
              - Karmānapekṣeśvaravādin: 6. Nakulīśa-Pāśupata
              - Karmasāpekṣeśvaravādin: 7. Śaiva
            - Ātmaikyavādin: 8. Pratyabhijñādarśin
          - Jīvanmuktivādin 9. Raseśvara
        - Utpattisāadhanādrṣṭavādin
          - Śabdānaṅgīkāra: 10. Vaiśeṣika
          - Śabdāṅgīkāra: 11. Naiyāyika
    - Śrauta
      - Vākyārthavedin: 12. Mīmāṃsaka
      - Padarthavedin: 13. Vaiyākaraṇa
  - Nirṡuṇātmavādin
    - Tārkika
      - Nirīśvara: 14. Sāṃkhya
      - Seśvara: 15. Pātañjala Yoga
    - Śrauta: 16. Śāṅkara-Vedānta

As mentioned in the beginning, nowadays it is customary to group the six orthodox *vaidika, āstika* schools as schools of Hindu philosophy, paired as follows:

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. Nyāya, logic &                      | 2. Vaiśeṣika, atomism  |
| 3. Sāṃkhya, dualistic discrimination & | 4. Yoga, praxis based on the Sāṃkhya view                    |
| 5. Mīmāṃsā, Vedic exegesis &           | 6. Vedānta, based on the end of the Vedas,<br>the Upaniṣads. |

There is an hierarchy implied in the ordering of these systems, with Vedānta representing the apex in soteriological efficacy.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>22</sup> pp.xvi-xvii.

According to von Glasenapp, it is difficult to establish when it first came to be established that the “six *darśanas*” were all Hindu and Vedic. The expression *darśana-ṣaṭka* is first supported in fairly late brahmanical works (*Vetālapañcaviṃśatī* and *Kulārnavatantra*), according to the Petersburg dictionary. Since Vācaspatimiśrā had commented on the principal works of all these systems (with the exception of Vaiśeṣika) by 850 C.E., the view that these systems constitute a closely related whole had at least one supporter by then. In the eleventh century drama *Prabodhacandrodaya* by Kṛṣṇamiśra, one clearly encounters the opinion that ultimate ends of the six *darśanas* have a common foundation.<sup>24</sup> By the *advaitin* Rāmabhadra Dīkṣita’s time (seventeenth or eighteenth century CE) this Hindu-centric view seems fairly entrenched.

There is certainly a natural division between the *nāstika*, heterodox and *āstika*, orthodox systems. Halbfass suggests that Buddhism in particular has been “included, assimilated, superseded and at the same time excluded and disregarded by Hindu thought.”<sup>25</sup> The omission of the heterodox systems from the six *darśanas* can thus be considered a reflection of this tendency to focus on Hindu *darśanas*. The neo-Hinduism movement, beginning with Rammohan Roy in the early nineteenth century can be considered neo-Vedānta,<sup>26</sup> and thus inherits the inclusivist Vedic and Vedāntic view which subsumes the heterodox systems. For example, Vivekananda (1900) “desired to return the Indian world to its ‘pristine purity’” based on its Vedic origins.<sup>27</sup> He held Buddhism responsible for “the degeneration of Hinduism” and at the same time used Buddhism “to demonstrate the universal reach and inclusivist power of

---

<sup>23</sup> Halbfass (1988), p.368.

<sup>24</sup> von Glasenapp, p.141: “Wann die Theorie, daß diese sechs Lehren gleichberechtigte Ausdrucksformen der auf die vedische Offenbarung gegründeten Weisheit sind, zuerst ausgekommen ist, läßt sich schwer feststellen. Der Ausdruck „*darśana-ṣaṭka*“ ist in brahmanischen Schriften erst in ziemlich späten Werken belegt. [fn.20: “Das große Petersburger Wörterbuch führt Stellen aus der „*Vetāla-panca-vinśatī*“ und dem „*Kulārnavatantra*“ an.”]. Da Vācaspatimishra die Hauptwerke aller Systeme (mit Ausnahme desjenigen des Vaisheshika) um 850 n.Chr. kommentierte, hat die Auffassung, daß sie ein zusammengehöriges Ganzes bilden, damals jedenfalls schon in praxi einen Anhänger gehabt. In dem im 11. Jahrhundert geschriebenen Drama „*Der Mondaufgang der Erkenntnis*“ (*Prabodhacandrodaya*) von Krishnamishra tritt die Meinung, daß die sechs Darshanas letzten Endes eine gemeinsame Grundlage haben, schon deutlich hervor.”

<sup>25</sup> Halbfass (1988), p.191.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, p.222.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.234-5.

Hinduism.”<sup>28</sup> It would only be natural that the exclusively orthodox *śaḍdarśana* enumeration gets reinforced by the proponents of neo-Hinduism.

In Buddhism too, we have the six heretical teachers whose arguments the Buddha refutes, for example in the *Śrāmaṇyaphala Sūtra*:

- |                          |                          |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Maskarī Gośālīputra   | 4. Ajīta Keśakambala     |
| 2. Nirgrantha Jñātiputra | 5. Kakuda Kātyāyana      |
| 3. Pūrāṇa Kāśyapa        | 6. Sañjayī Vairāṭṭīputra |

The number six has played a role since ancient times in the enumeration of metaphysical systems.

There are the six *vedāṅgas*, “limbs of the Veda,” grouped in pairs:<sup>29</sup>

- For correct recitation:
  1. *śikṣā*, the science of proper articulation, pronunciation and phonetics
  2. *chandas* or *chandoviciti*, metre and prosody
- For proper understanding:
  3. *vyākaraṇa*, linguistic analysis or grammar
  4. *nirukta*, explanation of difficult Vedic words
- For proper employment during sacrifices:
  5. *jyotiṣa*, astronomy pertaining to determining the most auspicious days for sacrifices
  6. *kalpa*, ceremonial or ritual code

Vedic “sciences” also occur in Kauṭilya’s list of “sciences” in his *Arthaśāstra* (I.1)<sup>30</sup> (c. 400 BCE):

- *ānvīkṣikī*, “investigative science”<sup>31</sup>
- *trayī*, the threefold science of the Vedas: reciting hymns, performing sacrifices, and chanting.<sup>32</sup>
- *vārttā*, science of trade and agriculture.
- *daṇḍanīti*, science of government and politics.

If one were to count the *trayī* as three separate sciences, once again that brings the count to six.

(Interestingly however, the three sciences of the *trayī* don’t directly correspond to the *vedāṅgas* unless

---

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., p.235.

<sup>29</sup> MW, s.v. *vedaṅga*.

<sup>30</sup> Halbfass (1988), p.274: *ānvīkṣikī trayī vārttā daṇḍanītiś ca-iti vidyāḥ*.

<sup>31</sup> This term has been considered equivalent to “philosophy,” as seen earlier in context of the discussion of what *darśana* means.

<sup>32</sup> MW, s.v. *traya*

one differentiates either the chanting or reciting of the *trayī* to involve the *vyākaraṇa* and *nirukta* of the *vedāṅgas*).

Madhusūdana Saraswati (early sixteenth century), in his *Prasthānabheda*, lists eighteen (six times three!) traditional “sciences,” *vidyā*:<sup>33</sup>

- the four Vedas,
- the six *vedāṅgas*,
- four “additional limbs,” *upāṅgas*:
  - *mīmāṃsā*
  - *nyāya*
  - *purāṇa*
  - *smṛti*
- four additional Vedas, *upavedas*:
  - *āyurveda*, the science of medicine,
  - *dhanurveda*, the science of archery,
  - *gāndhārvaveda*, the science of music,
  - either *śāstraśāstra*, the science of arms or *sthāpatyaveda*, the science of architecture and *śilpaśāstra*, the knowledge of arts.

Earlier, Bhāsarvajña (ca. 900 CE) had also proposed augmenting the list of fourteen *vidyās* (above list minus the *upavedas*) with medicine, *vaidyaśāstra* and the Śaivasiddhānta sectarian tradition for a total of sixteen.<sup>34</sup> By counting *śāstraśāstra*, *sthāpatyaveda* and *śilpaśāstra* individually instead of collectively, the list can be made to consist of eighteen members.

An somewhat similar, older list of seventeen *vidyās* was enumerated in Chāndogya Up. 7.1.2 (sixth to fifth cent. BCE).<sup>35</sup>

- 1-4. the four Vedas,
5. *itihāsapurāna*, the corpus of histories and ancient tales,
5. *pitrya*, ancestral rites,
7. *rāsi*, mathematics,
8. *daivam*, soothsaying,
9. *nidhi*, the art of locating treasures,
10. *vākovākya*, dialogue,
11. *ekāyana*, monologues,<sup>36</sup>
12. *devavidyā*, the science of the gods,
13. *brahmavidyā*, the science of ritual,

<sup>33</sup> Halbfass (1988), pp.353-4.

<sup>34</sup> Halbfass (1991), pp.54-5.

<sup>35</sup> Olivelle, pp.258-9.

<sup>36</sup> Or possibly worldly wisdom per MW, s.v.

14. *bhūtavidyā*, the science of spirits,
15. *kṣatrayidyā*, the science of government (or military order per MW),
16. *nakṣatrayidyā*, the science of heavenly bodies (astronomy)
17. *sarpadevajānavidyā*, the science of serpent beings

One could possibly make this enumeration conform to our expectations of some multiple of six by breaking up *itihāsapurāṇa* into two separate *vidyās* but it would be hard to defend the existence of a field of purāṇic study in the early upaniṣadic times. But one of the other sciences could be subdivided to make the count of eighteen, for example *kṣatrayidyā* into *dhanurveda* and *nītīsāstra* or the like. These last two examples merely serve to illustrate that when working with numbers, it is easy to tweak these towards where one can come up with a “neater” pattern. (More on this towards the end of this paper).

Does the Ṛg Veda hold any clues to the significance of the number six? An inspection of the occurrence of *ṣaṣ*, *ṣaṭ* and other variations in a word-index to the RV<sup>37</sup> shows mention of the six seasons,<sup>38</sup> the six directions,<sup>39</sup> six burdens,<sup>40</sup> a six-spoked wheel,<sup>41</sup> Indra’s six horses,<sup>42</sup> etc. There is nothing that can be directly linked with the occurrence of the number “six” in connection with *darśanas* in later times. However, we do find in RV 1.164.46 the significant utterance, *ekaṃ sad viprā bahudā vadanti*, which is cited by the proponents of orthodoxy to justify the inclusion of the heterodox systems.

While it is not possible to draw any definite conclusions regarding the significance of the prevalence of the number six (or multiples of six) in various enumerations, certain observations can be made:

1. When six systems are considered, their makeup varies and is not always exclusive to Hindu *darśanas*. e.g. Buddhist Bhāvaviveka’s MHK naturally includes Śrāvākayāna and Yogācāra, Mīmāṃsā and Vedānta are counted separately; Cāttanār’s *Mañimekhalai* counts Lokāyata and Buddhism among the six systems considered, Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika are counted separately; the Jaina

---

<sup>37</sup> Shastri (1963).

<sup>38</sup> RV 1.23.15.

<sup>39</sup> RV 1.164.6, 2.13.10, 6.47.3, 10.14.16, 10.128.5.

<sup>40</sup> *bhāra*, RV 3.56.2.

<sup>41</sup> RV 1.164.12.

Haribhadra Sūri's *Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccaya* also treats Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika separately, in addition to the Buddhist and the Jaina systems. Further, Yoga and Vedānta are often considered to be part of the Sāṃkhya and Mīmāṃsā systems respectively, for example in Cāttanār's *Maṇimekhalai*, Haribhadra's *Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccaya* and Jayanta Bhaṭṭa's *Nyāyamañjarī*.

2. Some doxographies such as Rāghavānanda's *Sarvamataśaṅgraha*, Mādhava Sarasvatī's *Sarvadarśanakaumudī* and pseudo-Śaṅkara's *Sarvasiddhāntaśaṅgraha* treat more than six systems, first dividing them into heterodox and orthodox groups each containing three systems, and then expanding each sub-group to six systems.
3. One notable exception to multiple-of-six rule is Mādhava-Vidyāraṇya's *Sarvadarśanaśaṅgraha* which covers sixteen systems, treating Buddhism as a single system which is one of the usual three heterodox systems. The usual six orthodox systems are also present, but besides Advaita Vedānta, the variants Viśiṣṭādvaita, Dvaita and Śabdādvaita are also covered. In addition four Saivite systems, Pāśupata, Śaiva, Kāśmīra and Raseśvara are also included.
4. The authors of the doxographies are predominantly either Jain (Haribhadra, Merutuṅga) or Advaitin (Mādhava-Vidyāraṇya, Mādhava Sarasvati, pseudo-Śaṅkara, Rāmabhadra Dīkṣita, Rāghavānanda). We have two Buddhist compilations, Bhāvaviveka's MHK and Cāttanār's *Maṇimekhalai* in Tamil.<sup>43</sup> "Whereas the Jaina doxographies do not follow any recognizable schema in their presentation of the six systems, the Advaita Vedānta doxographic texts are usually based upon a hierarchical classification at whose apex stands the Vedānta" and at the nadir is either materialism (Cārvāka/Lokāyata) or, when only orthodox *vaidika* teachings are considered, the

<sup>42</sup> RV 2.18.4.

<sup>43</sup> There is also Śāntarakṣita's *Tattvasaṅgraha* with a commentary, *Pañjikā* by Kamalaśīla, both eight century CE. *Tattvasaṅgraha* "is a series of 26 critiques of the 'realities', i.e. supposed ultimate realities, first causes, categories and the like as variously conceived by practically all the schools of philosophy, leaving unscathed only conditioned origination as understood by Nāgārjuna, along with Dharmakīrti's epistemology." (Warder, p.205). This text contains a "richness of doxographic information" (Halbfass, 1988, p.355).

Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika.<sup>44</sup> “The hierarchical arrangement of the systems implies a soteriological gradation which assigns the followers of the lower (i.e. heterodox) doctrines an ethically and socially inferior status.”<sup>45</sup> Halbfass says that “it is no accident that the doxographic literature developed within Jainism and Advaita Vedānta. ... The two traditions claim to include and fulfill other doctrines – as a perspectivistic or hierarchically subsuming inclusivism [respectively].”<sup>46</sup> The Jaina doxologies, however, typically do not present their own system last – in Haribhadra’s *Ṣaḍḍarśanasamuccaya*, Jainism is the fourth of the six systems treated. Only Merutuṅga in his *Ṣaḍḍarśananirṇaya* closes with his own system, Jainism.<sup>47</sup>

5. As seen earlier, certainly by the eighteenth century, *ṣaḍḍarśana* comes to be associated exclusively with Hindu orthodox systems. The tradition of inclusivism or perspectivism (seen even in the Buddhist context)<sup>48</sup> is widely prevalent in Hinduism. In fact the purpose of the Advaita Vedānta doxographies is to demonstrate how its view encompasses and transcends the teachings of the other, lesser systems. The neo-Hinduism movement from the early nineteenth century onwards further reinforces the focus on Hindu systems to the exclusion of the heterodox systems since it conveniently supports the “modern nationalist assumptions about the underlying unity of Indian history”.<sup>49</sup>
6. As to the significance of the number six, while it is tempting to see a recurring pattern in its frequent occurrence or of its multiple in various enumerations, one should desist from doing so. This present examination, while no means comprehensive,<sup>50</sup> can only prove to be a self-fulfilling one – when one is only looking at enumerations comprising of six members (or multiples thereof) it is very tempting to numerically “fudge” the data to make other lists neatly fit this pattern (as I demonstrated above in

---

<sup>44</sup> Halbfass (1988), p.351.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid., p.368.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., p.356.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid., p.352.

<sup>48</sup> The three “turnings of the wheel” by the Buddha to explain and reconcile Hīnayāna, Madhyamaka and Yogācāra; Bhāvaviveka’s comment in the MHK 4.56, *vedānte ca hi yat sūktam tat sarvam Buddhabhāṣitam | dṛṣṭāntanyūnatā tasmāt sandigdham vā parikṣyatām* || (Gokhale, p.271).

<sup>49</sup> King, p.46.

the cases of the Bhāsarvajña and Chāndogya Upaniṣad lists of *vidyās*). If one were to do the same for enumerations of lists comprising four or five or seven members, one will probably come up with equally large sets of data. In the context of the *darśanas*, one can speculate that perhaps at an earlier point, doxographers felt that covering six systems demonstrated a thoroughness, a certain breadth of perspective and familiarity with other views. But why not five or seven instead, one can't say. Perhaps doxographers could not resist a pun, intentionally taking advantage of the phonological similarity between *ṣad*, “six” and *sad*, “true”. We do see treatments such as the Buddhist MHK, the *Sarvasiddhāntapraveśaka* (by an anonymous Jain author) and Rāmabhadra Dīkṣita's *Ṣaḍdarśanīsiddhāntasaṃgraha* that effectively deal with seven systems,<sup>51</sup> and Mādhava-Vidyāraṇya's *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha* treats sixteen – if six is comprehensive, seven, twelve or sixteen is even more so! Over time perhaps this recurrence of six systems in the doxographical context takes on an aspect of historical convention, which isn't hurt by the (coincidental?) fact that both the heterodox and the orthodox systems can be further expanded out to six systems each.

Thus the *ṣaḍdarśana* classification can be thought of as a convenient starting point into the study of Indian philosophy, a picture painted as it were in very broad strokes. But one needs to be aware of its limitations and to pay attention to what is being included, what isn't and why. One must not assume that the *āstika ṣaḍdarśana* developed independent of the *nāstika* systems or that “Hindu” equals “Indian”.<sup>52</sup> To get a fuller picture, one has to fill in details pertaining to additional *darśanas* and relate them to what one started with. This, I suppose, is how books on Indian philosophy come to be written!

---

<sup>50</sup> For example, I could have also looked at the lists of six items in the Buddhist *saṅgīti suttas*, in the Bhagavad Gītā, in Purāṇic literature, etc.

<sup>51</sup> The seventh in MHK is Bhāvaviveka's own Madhyamaka system; in the *Sarvasiddhāntapraveśaka*, it is the *Lokāyata*; and in *Ṣaḍdarśanīsiddhāntasaṃgraha*, grammar or *vyākaraṇa*.

<sup>52</sup> King, p.33.

## Works Cited

- Agrawal, Madan Mohan (2002), *The Sarva-Darśana-Saṃgraha of Mādhavācārya with English Translation, Transliteration and Indices*. Delhi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishthan.
- Dasgupta, Surendranath (1922), *A History of Indian Philosophy*, v1-5. Reprinted 1997, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Eckel, Malcolm D. (1992), *To See the Buddha: A Philosopher's Quest for the Meaning of Emptiness*. Princeton University Press.
- Gokhale, V. V. (1962), "Masters of Buddhism adore the Brahman through Non-adoration (*Bhavya Madhyamakahrdaya*, III)" *Indo-Iranian Journal* 5:271-5.
- Halbfass, Wilhelm (1988), *India and Europe: An Essay in Understanding*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Halbfass, Wilhelm (1991), *Tradition and Reflection: Explorations in Indian Thought*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- King, Richard (1999), *Indian Philosophy: An Introduction to Hindu and Buddhist Thought*. Washington D.C: Georgetown University Press.
- Monier-Williams, M. (1899), *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Oxford University Press.
- Olivelle, Patrick (1998), *The Early Upaniṣads: Annotated Text and Translation*. Oxford University Press.
- Qvarnström, Olle (1989), *Hindu Philosophy in Buddhist Perspective: The Vedāntatattvaniścaya Chapter of Bhavya's Madhyamakahrdayakārikā*. (Lund Studies in African and Asian religions v. 4) Lund Plus Ultra.
- Śastrī, Goswāmī Dāmodara ed. (1957), *Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccayaḥ by Śrī Haribhadrasuri with the Laghuvṛtti Commentary by Śrī Maṇibhadra*. Banaras: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series.
- Shastri, Vishva Bandhu (1963), *Rgveda-vaiyakarana-padasuci – A Grammatical Word-index to Rgveda*. Hoshiarpur: Vishveshvaranand Vedic Research Institute.
- von Glasenapp, Helmuth (1958), *Die Philosophie der Inder: Eine Einführung in ihre Geschichte und ihre Lehren*. Stuttgart: Alfred Kroner Verlag.
- Warder, A. K. (1998), *A Course in Indian Philosophy*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.