CLASSICAL YOGA PHILOSOPHY AND THE LEGACY OF SĀṂKHYA

CLASSICAL YOGA PHILOSOPHY AND THE LEGACY OF SĀṂKHYA

Gerald James Larson

MOTILAL BANARSIDASS PUBLISHERS
PRIVATE LIMITED • DELHI

First Edition: Delhi, 2018

ISBN: 000-00-000-0000-0

MOTILAL BANARSIDASS
41 U.A. Bungalow Road, Jawahar Nagar, Delhi 110 007
8 Mahalaxmi Chamber, 22Bhulabhai Desai Road, Mumbai 400 026

Printed in India

Table of Contents

PREFACE

It was in the summer of 1964 when I had completed my first year in the doctoral program at Columbia University, New York City, the same year in which I had also completed my first full year of the study of classical Sanskrit, that an opportunity arose to do a summer reading course with a visiting professor of Sanskrit from India. He was only to be in the city for the summer, and a course in Sanskrit reading was hastily set up to accommodate his brief visit. One other doctoral student and I were available to take that brief reading course, and we decided to read a reasonably short Sanskrit text, namely, the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* of Īśvarakṛṣṇa. It was a welcome change from the tedium of Lanman's *Sanskrit Reader* (*Nala*, *Hitopadeśa*, *Kathāsaritsāgara*, and so forth), an opportunity for the first time to read a philosophical text, the sort of reading that had persuaded me to undertake the study of classical Sanskrit in the first place.

I was enrolled in the joint Ph.D. program in the study of religion at Union Theological Seminary and Columbia University, and my interests were primarily in philosophy of religion and the history of religions. I had studied Heidegger's *Being and Time* and Jean-Paul Sartre's *Being and Nothingness* (with John Macquarrie at Union Theological Seminary) and the general history of philosophy (with John Herman Randall at Columbia University). I had also begun serious reading in the intellectual history of India, including the principal Upaniṣads, the *Bhagavadgītā,* the commentaries of the great Advaitin, Śaṅkara, Nyāya logic, early Buddhist philosophizing, the work of Nāgārjuna and Vasubandhu, and, of course, the various Vedāntas. I was also reading the standard secondary work commonly studied at that time, that is, the work of Paul Deussen, Erich Frauwallner, T. R. V. Murti, A. C. Mukerji, J. N. Mohanty, B. K. Matilal, *et al*.

As we read the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* that summer, I recall two vivid intellectual reactions. First, here was a philosophy of India dramatically different from the other traditions of Indian philosophy, an eccentric dualist ontology (not unlike the eccentric dualist ontology I had recently encountered in the work of Jean-Paul Sartre) that affirmed the productive reality of the natural, material world along with a notion of self (and/or consciousness) as a pluralistic presence that was the antithesis of any sort of cosmic absolute (whether as Brahman, Ātman, God, Emptiness,

or whatever). Second, here also was a philosophy that had stimulated considerable intellectual interest among scholars in the early modern historiography of the field of Indology (both Indian and European) (in the work, for example, of R. Garbe, H. Oldenberg, Th. Stcherbatsky, A. B. Keith, S. N. Dasgupta, *et al*.) but was for the most part dismissed as a serious intellectual position, largely, it seemed to me, because of the negative critique of the Sāṃkhya philosophy in Śaṅkara's famous *Brahmasūtrabhāsya*, a critique that as far as I could tell, as a young scholar, had been uncritically cited by almost all interpreters but had never been properly critiqued itself. In other words, I had the sense that Śaṅkara's critique had come to be a standard "hit" piece vis-à-vis Sāṃkhya philosophy, not unlike what Hegel did in the nineteenth century to Indian philosophy in general. As Halbfass has commented regarding Hegel's influential critique of Indian philosophy:

> . . . Hegel's negative statements on India and the Orient in general, and his pronouncement that "real philosophy" begins only in Greece, found wide acceptance, and they were taken as a justification to dismiss Indian thought entirely from the historiography of philosophy, or to relegate it to a preliminary stage.[1]

It appeared to me that both critiques, that of Śaṅkara and Hegel, *mutatis mutandis*, were motivated to a significant degree by a perceived need to come down hard on philosophical views that could possibly prove to be important rivals to their own positions. In the case of Hegel, Indian philosophy, according to Hegel, was insufficiently grounded in historical consciousness and thus hopelessly limited to vacuous abstractions in a "night in which. . . all cows are black."[2] In the case of Śaṅkara, the Sāṃkhya assertions of the reality of the natural, material world (*pradhāna*) and the pluralization of consciousness (*puruṣa-bahutva*) radically called into question the fundamental intuitions upon which the

1. Wilhelm Halbfass, *India and Europe: An Essay in Understanding* (Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1988), p. 98.

2. See Hegel's comment in his famous Preface to *The Phenomenology of Mind*, well worth quoting again:
". . . yet in the Absolute, in the abstract identity A = A, there is no such thing at all, for everything is there all one. To pit this assertion, that "in the Absolute all is one", against the organized whole of determinate and complete knowledge, or of knowledge which at least aims at and demands complete development—to give out its Absolute as the night in which, as we say, all cows are black—that is the very *naïveté* of emptiness of knowledge." Cf. G. W. F. Hegel, *The Phenomenology of Mind*, trans., by J. B. Baillie, Second Edition (London: George Allen & Unwin LTD, 1931), p. 79

Advaita position was dependent, according to the revelations as found in the *mahāvākyas* of *śruti*. More to the point, both critiques in their respective historical contexts were remarkably influential in undercutting much if not all of subsequent philosophical hermeneutical interest, not only of Sāṃkhya in the context of Indian thought, but of Indian philosophy generally in the context of modern western philosophy. It was perhaps a ripe time, in my view, to reconsider these older views in traditional Indian philosophy and in modern western thought, both historically and philosophically.

Willy-nilly, those two vivid reactions to my first reading of the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* inclined me on a research trajectory, first, for my doctoral dissertation at Columbia in 1967; second, to the revision of that thesis into my first book, *Classical Sāṃkhya: An Interpretation of its History and Meaning* in 1969 (and the second revised edition in 1979, reprinted most recently in 2014); third, to years of working together with a distinguished pandit in India, Dr. Ram Shankar Bhattcharya, co-editing with him, in 1987, *Sāṃkhya: A Dualist Tradition in Indian Philosophy,* and eventually, in 2011, *Yoga: India's Philosophy of Meditation,* respectively volumes IV and XII of the *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies*, under the general editorship of Karl H. Potter. Apart from long introductory essays, the encyclopedia volumes include summaries of the contents of all Sanskrit published texts on Sāṃkhya and Yoga that we could find from ancient times to the twentieth century.

In the Epilogue to the first edition of my *Classical Sāṃkhya*, I attempted to compare and contrast the eccentric Sāṃkhya dualism of *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* with the equally eccentric but strikingly similar dualist ontology (the *pour-soi* and *en-soi*) of Jean-Paul Sartre in the hope of showing the salient difference of the Sāṃkhya dualism (as well as the Sartrian dualism) from the garden-variety Cartesian dualism of western thought as well as the standard dualistic versions of the Vedanttic philosophies in India. In the Epilogue to the second edition of my *Classical Sāṃkhya* in 1979, I attempted to offer what I think is the first serious critique of Śaṅkara's critique of the Sāṃkhya philosophy, highlighting the manner in which Śaṅkara clearly misunderstood the nature of the Sāṃkhya dualism and thereby set in motion a misunderstanding of the Sāṃkhya philosophy, which continues even now in some contemporary accounts of Sāṃkhya. In the two introductory essays to the encyclopedia volumes mentioned above, I have tried to argue that classical Sāṃkhya philosophy is a creative and original tradition of philosophical reflection, and far from being a curious piece of cosmological speculation, is in many ways one of the

truly important intellectual achievements in India's intellectual history. In a similar manner I have tried to argue that the philosophy of Yoga (as a *samāna-tantra* "common tradition", or a "*sāṃkhya-pravacana*," that is, an "interpretation or explanation of Sāṃkhya") is unintelligible philosophically apart from the Sāṃkhya dualist ontology and its eccentric notion of the "pluralization" of consciousness (*puruṣa-bahutva*).[3]

I have come to appreciate more and more, in other words, what the great Gopinath Kaviraj said to me nearly half a century ago, when as a young postdoc at Banaras Hindu University I told him that I was studying one of the systems of Indian philosophy, namely, the Sāṃkhya. He waved his arm to interrupt what I was saying, and commented, "Sāṃkhya is not **one** of the systems of Indian philosophy; Saṃkhya **is** the philosophy of India!" He had in mind, of course, the remarkable influence that the basic categories and notions of Sāṃkhya and/or Sāṃkhya-Yoga have had on almost all aspects of Indian culture and learning in philosophy, mythology, theology, law, medicine, the arts, aesthetics, and the various traditions of *tantra* in the classical period. The ubiquitous presence of the Sāṃkhya network of notions (especially *triguṇa, satkāryavāda* and the absolute differentiation, *kaivalya*, between *puruṣa* and *citta-sattva*) has functioned as an essential cultural "code" (to use a semiotics idiom) to which intellectuals in every phase of cultural life in India have felt a need to respond, not always in agreement, to be sure, but as a starting-point for their own conceptual constructions.

The Present Undertaking

These days I am retired from two professorships, first, in 1995, having become professor emeritus, religious studies, the University of California, Santa Barbara, and then second, in 2003, having become professor emeritus from the Rabindranath Tagore professorship of Indian Culture and Civilization and director of India Studies, at Indiana University, Bloomington. Because of the freedom for research that emeritus status provides from full-time teaching, I decided to take up a demanding task that I had set aside during my active years of teaching,

3. Through the years, I have returned on several occasions to offer further treatments of the manner in which the eccentric dualism and the equally eccentric notion of the pluralization of consciousness (*puruṣa-bahutva*) are distinctive notions for properly grasping the purport of the classical philosophies of Sāṃkhya and Yoga, or perhaps better, classical Sāṃkhyayoga. Cf., for example, Gerald J. Larson, "An Eccentric Ghost in the Machine: Formal and Quantitative Aspects of the Sāṃkhya-Yoga Dualism," *Philosophy East and West*, Vol. 33, No. 3, July (1983): 219-233; "K. C. Bhattacharyya on the Plurality of Puruṣas (*puruṣa-bahutva*) in Sāṃkhya," *Journal of the Indian Council for Philosophical Research*, Vol. X, No. 1 (1992): 93-104; and "Materialism, Dualism and the Philosophy of Yoga," *International Journal of Hindu Studies*, 17, 2 (2013) 183-221.

namely, the task of providing a new accessible English translation of Vācaspatimiśra's *Tattvavaiśāradī,* an important commentary (*Ṭīkā*) on the *Yogasūtra* of Patañjali together with the brief commentary (*Bhāṣya*), attributed to a certain Vedavyāsa.

Vācaspatimiśra, an erudite scholar of Indian philosophy who lived in the middle of the tenth century (ca. 950 CE) in north India, although personally himself an intellectual adherent of the Advaita Vedānta of Śaṅkara, composed a number of detailed commentaries on many of the other systems of Indian philosophy, including Sāṃkhya and Yoga. He composed a relatively short and elementary commentary on the *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, entitled *Sāṃkhyatattvakaumudī* ("Moonlight on the truth of Sāṃkhya"), followed thereafter by a major commentary (*Ṭīkā*) on the *Yogasūtra* and its *Bhāṣya*, attributed to the legendary Vedavyāsa, entitled *Tattvavaiśāradī* ("A Skilled Clarification of the Truth") (of Yoga). Vācaspatimiśra's *Tattvakaumudī* on the Sāṃkhyakārikā is a rather elementary commentary, offering little more than basic (although certainly useful) explanations of the words of the various *kārikā*-s. The verses of the *Sāṃkhyakārikā,* however, are fairly straightforward and reasonably intelligible in and of themselves. More than that, the verses of the *Kārikā* are explicitly characterized as a summary of a system of thought, referred to as "the system of sixty" ("Ṣaṣṭitantra"), an older and detailed formulation of an ancient account of Sāṃkhya, which provides a sort of template for constructing an interpretation of classical Sāṃkhya.

The *Yogasūtra-s*, to the contrary, are little more than laconic utterances that are largely unintelligible taken solely by themselves, and throughout require a commentary for their interpretation. Furthermore, the commentary that accompanies the *Yogasūtra*-s, the so-called *Bhāṣya*, attributed (incorrectly according to most scholars) to the legendary Vedavyāsa, is hardly a model of clarity. The *Bhāṣya*, of course, provides much background information, but also often provides little more than passing notations that have led some interpreters to think that the *Bhāṣya* is what is known as a *svopajña* composition, a self-composed set of notations on the *Yogasūtra*-s. Vācaspatimiśra's *Tattvavaiśāradī*, therefore, on the *Yogasūtra* and the *Bhāṣya*, attributed to Vedavyāsa, is a much more ambitious undertaking than his work in the *Tattvakaumudī*, and it is essential reading for understanding the classical Yoga of Patañjali (as found in the *sūtra*-s and its *Bhāṣya)*. It is a major and thorough discussion of the classical Yoga of Patañjali (and its Sāṃkhya philosophical environment) and has been profoundly influential in all subsequent commentaries on both Yoga and Sāṃkhya from the tenth century through the present day, including the discussions

of the *Yogasūtra-s* by Aniruddha, Vijñānabhikṣu, *et al*., in the later centuries (the sixteenth century and beyond). In my view, it is essential to read the *Yogasūtra*-s and its *Bhāṣya* with the *Tattvavaiśāradī* (along with the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* and its commentaries) as the core literature of classical Sāṃkhyayoga.

Vācaspatimiśra's massive comment was translated into English over a century ago, first, in a rather casual manner by Rāma Prasāda (in the Sacred Books of the Hindus series) in 1912 and then again in 1914, in a full scholarly treatment by James Haughton Woods entitled, *The Yoga System of Patañjali* (as volume XVII of the Harvard Oriental Series). As will be discussed in the Introduction, however, both translations (while, of course, useful) are now quite dated both in terms of English usage and in terms of characterizing Sanskrit technical notions in a systematic manner. At many points, both translations are nearly unintelligible when read with or without the Sanskrit. More than that, as will be discussed in the sequel, neither translation sufficiently addresses the classical Sāṃkhya philosophical framework with which these Yoga texts are intimately related.

The only other commentary that provides comparable information on classical Sāṃkhya and Yoga is the recently translated (indeed, twice-translated) text entitled, *Pātañjalahyogaśāstra-vivaraṇa*, attributed to the great Advaitin, Śankara. I say "twice-translated", since there have been two complete translations which reach dramatically different conclusions about the *Vivaraṇa*. The first is that by Trevor Leggett entitled, *The Complete Commentary by Śaṅkara on the Yoga Sūtra-s* (published by Kegan Paul International, in 1990), arguing that the commentary is by the great Advaitin, Śaṅkara, deriving from the eighth century. The second is that of T. S. Rukmani, entitled, *Yogasūtrabhāṣyavivaraṇa of Śaṅkara* (published by Munshiram Manoharlal, in 2001), arguing, to the contrary, that the text is a much later commentary by a different Śaṅkara than the great Advaitin, but possibly a follower of the great Advaitin, and having been composed somewhere between the tenth and fourteenth century. There has been considerable debate on both sides by competent scholars, and it must be concluded that at the present time, no consensus has been reached. My own view is that the *Vivaraṇa* is somewhat later than Vācaspatimiśra's *Tattvavaiśāradī* but that the authors and works of both were unknown to each other. Further research hopefully will clarify the relation between the two texts. I hope also that my new English translation of the *Tattvavaiśāradī* will be helpful in clarifying the significance of Vācaspatimiśra's own views as well as his own misunderstanding of some aspects of the *sūtra*-s and

the *Bhāṣya*, including his misunderstanding of the name of the author of the *Bhāṣya*, which, in my view, is not the legendary Vedavyāsa but more likely the Sāṃkhya reformer, Vindhyavāsin.

In any case, in 2003, I began a line by line daily reading of the *Pātañjala-yogasūtra*, its *Bhāṣya*, and Vācaspatimiśra's *Tattvavaiśāradī*, utilizing primarily the Sanskrit text as constituted by Ram Shankar Bhattacharya, which is based for the most part on what is usually considered the "vulgate" edition of K. S. Āgāśe, *et al*., from 1904. There are still many passages in the text that appear unclear to me, both in the Sanskrit and the various English translations, even after twelve years of ongoing work, and I invite other Sanskrit scholars to offer suggestions and/or corrections based on their own reading. Overall, however, I hope that the translation that I am offering is an improvement of our understanding of these texts at this time in the still unfolding history of the philosophy of Sāṃkhya and Yoga.

Let me offer two final prefatory remarks. The title of this book is *Classical Yoga Philosophy and the Legacy of Sāṃkhya*. By this title I wish to underscore that the philosophy of classical Yoga as set forth in the *Yogasūtra*, attributed to Patañjali, is, as the colophons to the manuscripts to its basic *Bhāṣya* attest, a "*sāṃkhya-pravcana*," that is to say, "an interpretation and/or explanation of the philosophy of Sāṃkhya." I also wish to underscore my view that the attribution of the compilation of the *sūtra*-s to the famous grammarian, Patañjali, author of the *Mahābhāṣya*, may well warrant revisiting, insofar as the *sūtra*-s in the famous *yogāṅga*-portion of the text (YS II.28 ff.) may well be traced to an earlier time, as J. W. Hauer suggested many years ago. It is certainly the case, as will be discussed in the Introduction, that the name of the famous grammarian was commonly associated with classical Yoga by about the time of Vācaspatimiśra and Bhoja, that is, the middle of the tenth century or the early eleventh century, and probably much earlier. Moreover, my view that the author of the *Bhāṣya* is the Sāṃkhya reformer, Vindhyavāsin, which follows earlier discussions by Ashok Aklujkar, *et al*., and is supportive of the suggestion that there may possibly be a link (for example, *sphoṭa*-theory) between the philosophy of Yoga and the grammarian tradition in the intellectual history of India in these early centuries.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have been assisted through the years by many colleagues in various fields in the preparation of this work, and I would like to take this occasion to mention the names of at least a few of the most important. First and foremost, I would mention Dr. Ram Shankar Bhattacharya, with whom I read the texts of Sāṃkhya and Yoga, beginning in my post-doc year (1968-69) at Banaras Hindu University in Varanasi, India, and continuing many years thereafter from the late 1960s onwards to his untimely death in June of 1996. While critical methods of traditional pandits are often interestingly different from modern scholarly methods, there finally is no substitute for reading classical Sanskrit with a traditional pandit by way gaining a fuller access to the nuances of Sanskrit interpretation that go beyond the scholastic rules for understanding the meaning of a Sanskrit text.

Second, I decided to provide a complete text of the Sanskrit of the texts included in this volume, namely, the *Yogasūtra*, its *Bhāṣya*, and an important *Ṭīkā* on the *Bhāṣya*, entitled *Tattvavaiśāradī*, by the famous tenth-century polymath scholar of Indian philosophy, Vācaspatimiśra, and to do so in the Devanāgarī script so that the text would be easily accessible to both English readers as well as students and scholars in India. I have used the original text that is commonly used in printed editions from the Ānandāśramasaṃsktagranthāvali, volume 47, as found in Ram Shankar Bhattacharya's edition of this old "vulgate" edition (and see Select Bibliography for details). The texts have been re-typed by a young Sanskrit scholar in Nepal, Prabhakar Wagle, in consultation with me and with Sthaneshwar Timalsina, religious studies professor and Sanskritist, California State University, San Diego.

Third, I wish to acknowledge the technical computer assistance of James Aeby, software specialist, book designer and editorial consultant, of Iris Studio, Bakersfield, CA. Jim has worked tirelessly over many months in designing the format and presentation of the various components of this volume. Also, in regard to computer assistance, I would like to thank Dwayne Pack, director of computing of the School of Humanities of the University of California, Irvine. I have been in conversation with

Dwayne for several years in trying to work out possible online access for this volume and other publications of mine. Moreover, Dwayne has designed and maintains my website (www.geraldjameslarson.com) for which I am continuously grateful.

Fourth, many of my former doctoral students, now professors at institutions around the world, have read portions of this volume in various stages of its preparation. Two in particular deserve special mention, Professor Knut A. Jacobsen, history of religions, University of Bergen, Norway, and Professor Wade Dazey, professor of religious studies, University of Wisconsin, Whitewater. In addition, I wish to thank Professor Jonathan Edelmann, University of Florida, Gainsville, who spent hours reading significant portions of this volume and kindly provided many pages of helpful corrections and suggestions. Needless to say, of course, I bear full responsibility for all of the content of this volume.

Finally, I would like to mention that fifty years ago (in the fall of the 1968-69 academic year when I was a postdoc at BHU) I met Mr. N. P. Jain of Motilal Banarsidass at a conference in Patna in the State of Bihar, India. He asked me if he could read my recently revised doctoral dissertation from Columbia University, New York City. He then, in turn, introduced me to Sundarlal Jain, proprietor of Motilal Banarsidass, who offered to publish the manuscript that same academic year. That manuscript became my first book, *Classical Sāṃkhya: An Interpretation of its History and Meaning* (1969; second revised edition in 1979; and reprinted most recently in 2017). Through the years I have come to know N. P. Jain, J. P. Jain, R. P. Jain and most recently Rajeev Jain, and many of their associates at Motilal Banarsidass. The family will be amused when I say that they taught me that contrary to the old cliché, there is, indeed, such a thing as a free lunch! I have had many of them with the Jain family through these five decades of our association, and I am delighted that they will be publishing this final volume of mine in the 80th year of my current rebirth!

'asato mā sad gamaya,
tamaso mā jyotir gamaya,
mṛtyor mā 'mṛtaṃ gamaya!'
(Bṛhad. Up. I.3.28)

Oṃ śantiḥ śāntḥ śāntiḥ!

ABBREVIATIONS

(A) TEXTS, SERIES, AUTHORS

EIP	Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies
HOS	Harvard Oriental Series
PYSV	*Pātañjala-yoga-śāstra-vivaraṇa*
SBH	Sacred Books of the Hindus
SDT	*Sāṃkhya: A Dualist Tradition in Indian Philosophy*, IV
SK	*Sāṃkhya-kārikā*
TK	*Tattva-kaumudī* of Vācaspatimiśra
TV	*Tattvavaiśāradī* of Vācaspatimiśra
VB	Vyāsa *Bhāṣya*
VM	Vācaspatimiśra
YPM	*Yoga: India's Philosophy of Meditation*, XII
YD	*Yuktidīpikā*
YS	*Yogasūtra*-s

(B) JOURNALS

AJP	*American Journal of Philology*
ASES	*Asiatische Studien Études Asiatiques*
BSOAS	*Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*
IJHS	*International Journal of Hindu Studies*
JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society*
JIP	*Journal of Indian Philosophy*
JRAS	*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*
PE&W	*Philosophy East and West*

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this book is to present a systematic discussion of the philosophy of classical Yoga as an interpretation and further elucidation of the philosophy of classical Sāṃkhya, based upon new translations into English of the three most important texts of philosophical Yoga, namely, the *Yoga-sūtra*-s, attributed to a certain Patañjali and usually called the *Pātañjala-yoga-sūtra* or *Pātañjala-yoga-śāstra* (hereafter simply YS) (ca. CE 350-450); its basic commentary (the *Bhāṣya*) attributed to the legendary Vedavyāsa (hereafter the VB) (likewise ca. CE 350-450); and a long sub-commentary called a *Ṭīkā* (or *Vyākhyā*) entitled *Tattvavaiśāradī* (" A Skilled Clarification of the Truth") (of Yoga) (hereafter TV) composed by the well known scholar of Indian philosophy, Vācaspatimiśra (hereafter VM) (ca. CE 950).[1] The total complex of the translation includes the four sections (or Pāda-s) of the YS, inclusive of the "Samādhi Pāda," "the concentration section" (with 51 *sūtra*-s), the "Sādhana Pāda," "the meditative practice section" (with 55 *sūtra*-s), the "Vibhūti Pāda," "the extraordinary cognitive states section" (with 55 *sūtra*-s) and "Kaivalya Pāda," "the spiritual freedom section" (with 34 *sūtra*-s). The *sūtra*-s, taken together alone (without commentary), or what is known as the "*sūtrapāṭha,*" number 195. Taken together by themselves in this manner, the *sūtra*-s are for the most part nearly impossible to understand, making clear that there has probably been a long tradition of oral interpretation, traceable through a series of traditional teachers (*guru-paraṃparā*).[2] Written commentaries in the case of the YS probably began already with the *Bhāṣya* attributed to the legendary Vedavyāsa (or the VB). In this regard, the laconic nature of the VB almost appears at times to be a set of scholarly notations, suggesting perhaps that the VB is what is known as a "self-composed" (*svopajña*) commentary. The Ṭīkā (or Vyākhyā) of Vācaspatimiśra, on the other hand, is a much more elaborate and dense discussion of the *sūtrapāṭha* and the VB. Even with both commentaries, moreover, the full significance of the Pātañjala-yoga-sūtra-s (YS) remains elusive. The dates for all three texts are only approximate as is often the case for Sanskrit philosophical texts in the early centuries, especially for the YS and VB, which could easily be plausibly dated in a wider range of ca. CE 200-600.

I have used the so-called "vulgate" editions of these texts, since these editions are the only complete texts currently available for all four sections or Pāda-s of the YS, the VB and the TV. I have nevertheless also had the benefit of utilizing a new critical edition of a small portion section I (or Pāda I) (the Samādhi Pāda) of the VB in the recent work of Philipp André Maas in his edition, *Samādhipāda: The First Chapter of the Pātañjalayogaśāstra for the First Time Critically Edited*.[3] Maas also includes in Appendix I, in collaboration with Kengo Harimoto, a possible reconstruction of the text of Pāda I (the Samādhi Pāda) of the *Pātañjala-yoga-śāstra-vivaraṇa* (hereafter PYSV), ascribed, though with some considerable controversy, to the well-known Advaita Vedānta philosopher, Śaṅkara.[4]

Date and authorship of the PYSV remain problematic, but it may well turn out to be an older commentary on the YS, according to Maas. Although Maas's work is only, thus far, a critical edition of the first section of the YS and the VB (and not inclusive of the TV), it involves an exhaustive catalogue of the manuscripts and printed editions of the various relevant texts along with detailed variant readings. Maas is skeptical about determining an original version of the YS and VB because of a long history of errors in the transmission of manuscripts; he is, nevertheless, able to identify both a "Northern group" and a "Southern group" of texts in transmission.[5] Maas designates the "Northern group" as the basis for what he calls a "normative recension" or "vulgate" edition, widely used throughout India.[6] The "Southern group," to which Maas assigns the PYSV, is possibly older and may well represent an older version of the VB. These conclusions await, of course, completion of the critical edition of all four sections of the VB and resolution of the issues of date and authorship of the PYSV. The shortcoming of Maas's work, in my view, is that he does not proceed to translate or critically to analyze his proposed critical text for Pāda I, nor does he address the philosophical content of what he studies. He is solely interested in the philological study of the ancient manuscripts (and see Larson, 2009: 487-98). In the interim, of course, a new English translation of the TV will have to be based on one or the other 'vulgate' editions, and I have chosen to use the edition in the Ānandāśrama series (and see note 1), which is generally recognized as the most widely used printed edition in philosophical discussions of Yoga.

The Vyāsa *Bhāṣya* (VB) on the YS is identified in many if not all colophons of its manuscripts and in most published editions as an "explanation of Sāṃkhya" (*sāṃkhya-pravacana*), and, therefore, early classical Yoga philosophy is usually considered in published editions to

be a later articulation and extension of classical Sāṃkhya philosophy.[7] The two traditions of Sāṃkhya and Yoga, thus, are usually characterized as a "common tradition" (*samāna-tantra*) in the intellectual history of India. There are, however, important differences between Sāṃkhya and Yoga, but, as will be argued in this work, they clearly represent a single philosophical heritage and cannot be properly understood apart from each other.

The one hundred and ninety-five *sūtra*-s (or 'mnemonic aphorisms') of the YS and the *Bhāṣya* (VB) in four sections (Pāda-s) have been translated many times in English and other European, Asian and Indian vernacular languages, but the long *Ṭīkā* of VM (together with the YS and VB) has had only two complete English translations, that is, the rendering of James Haughton Woods in *The Yoga-System of Patañjali* (Volume Seventeen of the Harvard Oriental Series, 1914) and the rendering of Rāma Prasāda in *Patañjali's Yoga Sūtras* (Volume Four, The Sacred Books of the Hindus, 1910), and neither with the full Sanskrit of Vācaspatimiśra's text.[8] Both translations, though ground breaking in their time and still well worth consulting, are nevertheless over a century old and in need of updating, especially the TV of VM because of its historical importance in the tradition.

The TV of VM needs updating, first of all, if for no other reason than that there has been new philological and philosophical work since the early twentieth century that needs to be taken into account. The J. H. Woods translation, to cite just one obvious example, hardly mentions the Sāṃkhya intellectual background that is essential for understanding Yoga, and, thus, fails to provide a rounded picture of the full Yoga system. Second, since it is a much fuller explication of the meaning of the YS and the VB, VM's TV will become clearer when the technical terminology in the text is revised from the older English of a century ago into a more contemporary and systematic English usage. Although the VB is an essential text on the YS, frequently, as mentioned just above, it gives the impression of being primarily laconic notations that call for much more elaborate treatment. VM's TV fills in many of the gaps in a way that appears to be faithful for the most part to the VB's original intent, although admittedly much continues to be opaque. An updated English rendering of that elaboration will hopefully allow VM's text to become more easily accessible to modern readers. Third, VM's commentarial work, not only on classical Yoga but also on the classical Sāmkhya, has been profoundly influential in subsequent Sanskrit commentary work.[9] VM's TV has been the main influence on almost all commentary work on Yoga after the tenth century CE, for example, the *Maṇiprabhā* of

Rāmānanda Sarasvatī, the *Yogavārttika* of Vijñānabhikṣu, and many other works, in the medieval and/or pre-modern period.[10] Likewise his commentary work on Sāṃkhya, entitled, the *Tattvakaumudī* ("Moonlight on the Truth") (of Sāṃkhya), a commentary on the core text of Sāṃkhya entitled, "Verses on Sāṃkhya" (the *Sāṃkhyakārikā*) (ca. CE 350-450), has been the basis for almost all of the commentaries on Sāṃkhya from the tenth century down to the present day.[11] Even the eleventh century commentary of Bhoja, the *Rājamārtaṇḍa,* which claims to be an independent work apart from earlier commentaries, is, in fact, dependent throughout on the VB and TV.[12]

VM, of course, was himself a follower of the Advaita Vedānta philosophy of Śaṇkara, and it might be thought that his interpretation of Yoga would have a Vedānta bias. For the most part, such appears not to be the case, however. VM composed extensive commentaries on most of the systems of Indian philosophy and is generally recognized among scholars as having been a reliable commentator on traditions other than his own. VM's TV, thus, fully deserves inclusion for establishing an essential textual base for the interpretation of classical Yoga philosophy. In fact, it is probably no exaggeration to say that VM's *Tattvavaiśāradī* is a major textual source for understanding the classical formulation of Yoga philosophy in the intellectual history of India.

One other major commentary on the YS and VB, already mentioned briefly above, that ranks in equal importance with VM's TV is the PYSV (*Pātañjala-yoga-śāstra-vivaraṇa*) ("An explanation of the Yoga Śāstra of Patañjali"), purportedly composed, according to its colophon, by the well known exponent of Advaita Vedānta, Śaṅkara-bhagavatpāda in the eighth century CE. Supposedly Śaṅkara may have been an exponent of Yoga as a young man but then converted to Advaita monism later in his career. The authorship and date of this commentary, however, continue to be controversial. Some have argued, for example, Paul Hacker,[13] Hajime Nakamura,[14] Sengaku Mayeda[15] and Trevor Leggett[16] and to some degree but with considerable skepticism Albrecht Wezler,[17] Wilhelm Halbfass,[18] and Philipp André Maas,[19] that it is possibly an original commentary of the great Śaṅkarācārya, or at least an earlier commentary from ca. CE 700, thus making the *Pātañjala-yoga-śāstra-vivaraṇa* (PYSV) possibly an older commentary on the YS and the VB than VM's TV. Whatever its date or authorship, however, the PYSV contains readings of the YS and VB that differ from the readings found in VM, and these differences continue to be discussed and collated in contemporary philological research, especially in the many articles of Albrecht Wezler, although even now, a complete list of the variants has

not been published.[20] Overall, regarding those who argue that the PYSV is an early commentary on the YS and VB by Śaṇkara generally tend to see extensive Vedānta influence in the PYSV.

Others, M. Ramakrishna Kavi,[21] T.S. Rukmani,[22] Tuvia Gelblum,[23] Usharbudh Arya,[24] *et al*., argue that the PYSV is probably considerably later, composed by one of the later followers of Śaṅkara from as late as the eleventh century CE and later.[25] They argue for the most part that the style of the PYSV is clearly different from the usually accepted works of Śaṅkarācārya and that the notion of a conversion of Śaṅkara from dualism to monism is ludicrous and lacking in any evidence beyond the mention of the name, "Śrī-Śaṅkara-bhagavataḥ kṛtau. . .", in the colophon of the manuscript.[26] My own inclination at the present time is tentatively to accept a later date, but for a quite different reason from others. I am struck by the discussion of theism in the PYSV that is not, in my view, typical of Yoga works, up to the time of VM, that is, ca. 950, but is typical of the elaborate theological discussions that occur in Sanskrit philosophical work from the time of Udayana (975-1050) and onwards.[27] I am also inclined to think that the author of the PYSV was roughly contemporary with VM but that the two worked separately and did not know each other's work. VM's discussion of theology is muted and hardly goes beyond the sort of mild devotionalism typical of earlier texts such as the *Bhagavadgītā.* There is, of course, good reason for Vācaspatimiśra to tread lightly on the theistic issue given the unrelenting dualism of the Sāṃkhya system that allows only for an exceedingly eccentric theology, if any serious theology at all worth the name. Since "consciouness" (*puruṣa*) is not involved in the cause-effect (*satkāryavāda*) *traiguṇya* realm of the natural material world (*mūlaprakṛti*), the only role that God could possibly have would be as an exemplar of what the Yogin seeks to achieve, namely, a condition of radical freedom beyond or transcendent of the cause and effect realm. Put another way, God as a particular *puruṣa* ("*puruṣa-viśeṣa*") can never be "personal" in the sense of ordinary awareness (*citta*), nor can God be a creator in any plausible sense.

In any case, in whatever direction the evidence finally tips the balance in the debate one way or another, the PYSV will continue to be important. Should it turn out that the PYSV is an early commentary, it will clearly be an important text for correcting some of the readings of the VB and the TV, and for understanding the "classical" philosophy of Yoga along with the TV. Should it prove to be a later text, however, it will still be important but more along the lines of understanding what can be called the medieval or "pre-modern" traditions of Yoga philosophy, that

is, what happens to Yoga when the theistic traditions à la Vijñānabhikṣu, Bhāvāgaṇeśa, *et al*., and the later Vedāntas become prominent.

The Relevant Time Frame

Before proceeding further, it may be useful to offer a comment about the time frame for the following discussion of Sāṃkhya and Yoga in the present volume by way of setting the historical boundaries for the discussion in the sequel. In this regard, this is hardly the context in which to discuss yet again the history of Sāṃkhya in its pre-classical or earlier formations. I have already done this at some length in my first book, *Classical Sāṃkhya: An Interpretation of its History and Meaning*, published nearly half a century ago and widely available now in its second revised edition, reprinted as recently as 2014.[28] Moreover, I have extended my historical observations as well as my philosophical interpretation regarding Sāṃkhya and Yoga considerably further and discussed the entire textual history of the tradition in collaboration with Dr. Ram Shankar Bhattacharya in the two volumes of the *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosop*hies, under the general editorship of Karl H. Potter, namely, Volume IV, entitled, *Sāṃkhya: A Dualist Tradition in Indian Philosophy* (hereafter SDT), and Volume XII, entitled, *Yoga: India's Philosophy of Meditation* (hereafter YPM).[29]

That which is relevant in terms of time frame for the present volume is the period in North and Northwest South Asia from the time of the Kuṣāṇa invasion in the first century CE and the reign of Kaniṣka (ca., CE 78-101). The period closely follows the turbulence of the Greco-Bactrian and Scythian presence in the eastern and western Gandharan regions, in which there was a mixed but vigorously interactive heritage of a variety of traditions: continuing Vedic and Upaniṣadic influences, Central Asian traditions, epic traditions soon to become what we now know as the *Mahābhārata* (inclusive of the *Bhagavadgītā*), the *Rāmāyaṇa*, early Purāṇic traditions, and early Sthaviravāda as well as early Mahāyāna Buddhist traditions. This is also the period, that is, the first centuries CE, in the North and Northeastern region, primarily in the Gangetic plane area. Older *śramaṇa* and *yati* ascetic traditions have developed into identifiable normative Buddhist and possibly already institutionalized Jain traditions that are interacting vigorously with the brahmanical ascetic traditions growing out of the earlier and middle Upaniṣadic traditions.[30]

This period is then succeeded by what Stanley Wolpert in his, *A New History of India*, has called "The Classical Age" (ca. CE 320 – ca. 700), identifying the "classical" period from the time of the unification

of the Gupta Imperial dynasty in the fourth century CE through the period of Harsha Vardhana (606-47) and somewhat beyond to the breakup of imperial formations in the direction of more localized political formations and continuing until the appearance of Islam from about the eighth century.[31] I am even inclined to extend what I consider to be the relevant period in North Indian intellectual history up through the tenth and eleventh centuries, and specifically to the time of the Arab occupations of Sind, the Ghaznavid invasions and the time of al-Biruni (ca CE 973-1050).[32]

This time frame, therefore, is the first millennium from 100 CE through approximately the early eleventh century CE. In terms of Sāmkhya, the earliest systematic form of classical Sāṃkhya philosophy is what is known as the "Ṣaṣṭitantra" ("The System of Sixty"), a somewhat mysterious collocation attributed to so many different possible authors (Kapila, Pañcaśikha, Vārṣagaṇya, *et al*.) that it may possibly have not been a text at all, but simply an old name of an oral tradition of the Sāṃkhya that had a variety of interpretations. The name most commonly associated with "The System of Sixty," however, is the name(s) Vārṣagaṇya (ca. CE 100 or slightly before) and the followers of Vārṣagaṇya (the "*vārṣagaṇāḥ*"). What we do know with some certainty is that the "System of Sixty" was given what has become in subsequent centuries an authoritative summary of the system known as the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* ("Verses on the Sāṃkhya") (ca. CE 350-450) and accompanied over the next several centuries by a group of commentaries, the *Suvarṇasaptati* (ca, 500) the *Sāṃkhyavṛtt*i (ca. 500), the *Sāṃkhyasaptativṛtti* (ca. 550), the *Bhāṣya* of Gauḍapāda (ca. 550), the *Yuktidīpikā* (ca. 680-720), the *Jayamaṅgalā* (ca. 700), the *Māṭharavṛtti* (ca. 800), and the *Tattvakaumudī* of Vācaspatilmiśra (ca. 950).[33] Beginning in the eleventh century, the medieval period of increased concern with theistic notions and the varieties of Vedānta speculation are becoming prominent, and the first period of classical Sāṃkhya has clearly declined.[34]

Prior to CE 100, the methodological comment of J.A.B. van Buitenen is fundamental in regard to any attempt to find a systematic Sāṃkhya philosophy based on snippets and/or fragments in the older literature.

> There must have existed scores and scores of more or less isolated little centers where parallel doctrines were being evolved out of a common source. Occasional meetings at pilgrimages and festivals, reports from other and remote *āśrama*-s brought by wandering ascetics, polemic encounters with other preachers must have resulted in a laborious process of partial renovation and conservation, more precise definitions of doctrines and eclecticism, adjustments of terminology, etc. At this stage to credit these little centres with the name "schools" is to do them

> too much, or too little honor. . . .
> Most of the process must elude us necessarily, but we stand a better chance of recovering the little that is left by allowing for the greatest diversity, rather than the greatest uniformity of doctrine.[35]

The point, of course, is that most research on Sāṃkhya prior to the first century CE, has little historical validity and is largely speculative.

In terms of Yoga, the historical development is roughly comparable, which is hardly surprising, since Sāṃkhya and Yoga are traditionally recognized as a "common tradition" (*samāna-tantra*). Prior to the first century CE the situation with "Yoga" is even more diffuse than is the case with "Sāṃkhya." As Franklin Edgerton pointed out years ago in his now classic essay in the *American Journal of Philology*, "Nowhere is there a suggestion that it (Sāṃkhya)—or Yoga either—means any particular system of metaphysical truth."[36] He continues,

> In the Gītā Sāṃkhya and Yoga are not metaphysical, speculative systems, not what we should call philosophies at all, but ways of gaining salvation; that and nothing else. Moreover, that and nothing else is what they are in all Indian literature until a late time—until far down into the Christian era.[37]

The latter part of Edgerton's comment, that is, ". . . far down into the Christian era" is perhaps to assert too much, since more recent work suggests that systematic Sāṃkhya and Yoga work is beginning to appear in the first centuries CE, as I have argued above. Even in the *Bhagavadgītā* and in Śāntiparvan references in the *Mahābhārata*, there are passages that clearly suggest that Sāṃkhya and Yoga traditions are slowly coalescing into a systematic formulation that will become one of South Asia's first philosophical traditions.[38]

The compilation of the YS by a certain Patañjali takes place probably shortly after or possibly around the same time as the *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, and possibly, as A. B. Keith suggested many years ago, in response to the appearance of the *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, by way of providing a compilation of meditation practices designed to accompany the rigorous dualist ontology and epistemology of the Sāṃkhya theoretical framework.[39] Tradition suggests that the Patañjali of the YS is the same person as the famous grammarian Patañjali, author of the *Mahābhāṣya*, and tradition also links the same Patañjali with medical traditions. This sort of traditional linkage is for the most part, at least with respect to the name Patañjali, much later in the intellectual history of the subcontinent, that

is, the eleventh century and later, but there is also the much older verse in Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadīya* (ca. CE 450) that could well have marked the beginning of such a linkage.

> *kāya-vāg-buddhi-viṣayā ye malāḥ samavasthitāḥ,*
> *cikitsā-lakṣaṇa-adhyātma-śāstrais teṣāṃ viśuddhayaḥ.*
> What are the impuritiies whose objects relate to body,
> speech and intellect;
> the purifications of these are (dealt with) in the
> Śāstra-s of medicine, grammar and Self. (*Vākypadīya* I.147)

Thus, three of the emerging "therapeutic" Śāstra-s or learned traditions in the early centuries CE, the Śāstra of grammar (*śabda*) to deal with the impurities of language, the Śāstra of medicine (*cikitsā*) to deal with the impurities of the body, and the Śāstra pertaining to the Self (*adhyātma-vidyā* or *yoga*) to deal with the impurities of awareness, come to be associated with the name, Patañjali.[40] In this older reference, of course, the name, Patañjali, is not used, but it is reasonable to suggest that this could well be a much older textual base for the beginning of the linkage of the three Śāstras. In this regard, Ashok Aklujkar, in an interesting essay that looks at all of the other later references that seem to relate the name Patañjali to the three traditions of learning, comments as follows:

> First, we need to ask ourselves what probability is there that a relatively widespread pattern would reflect itself in Bhartṛhari's verse (even to the extent of having the words *kāya, vāc* and *mala* in common) and Patañjali, who is associated with that pattern, would still not be intended. The probability would seem to be very low. Secondly, in Bhartṛhari's works as well as in the VB [the *Bhāṣya* in all probability not correctly attributed to Vyāsa], which we can now think of as a pre-Bhartṛhari work [hence, earlier than ca. CE 450], there are signs of a rather special concern with pointing out the relatedness of grammar, Yoga, and medicine as branches of learning or text traditions.[41]

S. N. Dasgupta in his extensive writings on the history of Indian philosophy and in his many publications about Yoga philosophy accepts the identity of the grammarian with the author of the YS, although he clearly indicates that the name, Patañjali, as it relates to all three traditions is overall a late attribution and not altogether certain.[42]

Many, however, reject such an identity, mainly because of the obvious anachronism between the probable date of the compilation known as the YS (ca. CE 350-450) and the much earlier date of the grammarian in the

second century BCE, and for a number of other reasons as well.[43] A case can perhaps be made, however, as has been done by Jakob Wilhelm Hauer in *Der Yoga*, that the section of the YS known as the "eight-limbed Yoga" (YS II.28 through III.55), which focuses primarily on traditional meditation practices without much attention to systematic philosophical matters, may be traceable to an earlier period that may well coincide with the period of the grammarian.[44] This could possibly explain the use of the name, Patañjali, in a manner that permits a relation between the grammarian and later Yoga tradition. There may be no need, in other words, to posit a second "Patañjali," as many suggest, but simply to suggest that by including a section of the YS that reaches back possibly to the work of the grammarian, the author or compiler of the YS may be attempting to legitimate the emerging classical Yoga philosophy as an important part of the developing learned Śāstra-s in the first centuries CE, and to link the Yoga portion to the other two "therapeutic" Śāstras of grammar and medicine that are becoming vigorous traditions of learning in the period.

As will be discussed in the sequel, this is somewhat close to my own view, which is that the author or compiler of the *sūtrapāṭha*, and possibly as well of the VB, is a reformer of the classical Sāṃkhya whose name is Vindhyavāsin, a contemporary of the Buddhist thinker, Vasubandhu (ca. CE 350) and whose polemical interaction with whom, that is, with Vasubandhu and the Buddhists in the Ayodhyā region, was the basis for his reformist views of the philosophy of Sāṃkhya that eventually become what we now know as the YS and VB. In other words, I am inclined to think that the YS and the VB (ca. CE 350 or shortly thereafter) is a reformist re-casting of the classical Sāṃkhya of the "System of Sixty" (the "*Ṣaṣṭitantra*") in its final articulation by Vārṣagaṇya (in ca. the first century CE), and the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* (the summary of the "System of Sixty" ca. CE 350 or thereabout).[45]

To conclude this brief discussion of the name, Patañjali, and the author/compiler of the YS, Ram Shankar Bhattacharya has discussed all aspects of the identity of the various Patañjalis at some length, both pro and con; and while he himself rejects the identity of the grammarian and the author/compiler of the YS, suggesting that there may well be not only two, but perhaps even more than two Patañjalis linked to the Sāṃkhya and Yoga traditions, the issue is still debatable and unresolved.[46] He comments as follows: ". . . we want to inform our readers that we find no harm if the identity of the grammarian Patañjali and the Yogin Patañjali is proved undoubtedly. We simply assert that the aforesaid arguments are incapable of proving the identity of these two teachers."[47]

Finally, also, let me conclude my comments on the matter of the time frame of the present book. I have mentioned the major classical Sāṃkhya thinkers and texts and the major discussions about the identity of Patañjali and the author/compiler of the YS and the VB in the early centuries CE. Most of these figures and texts derive from the Kuṣāṇa through the Gupta imperial periods and extend through the period of Harṣa in the northern regions of the subcontinent, encompassing the regions from the Northwest to the Gangetic plane. The time frame must also be extended, obviously, through the tenth century CE to include Vācaspatimiśra (ca. CE 950) who composes his *Tattvakaumudī* (on the *Sāṃkhyakārikā*) and his *Tattvavaiśāradī* (on the YS and the VB). As already mentioned, he was an adherent of Advaita Vedānta, but he also composed highly respected commentaries and texts on other systems of Indian philosophy as well.[48]

Little is known about Vācaspatimiśra other than he is said to have been a Maithili Brahmin from Darbhanga district (in what is now Bihar) and can be placed now with some certainty after the time of the Nyāya philosopher, Jayantabhaṭṭa (ca. 875) and before the work of the well known Nyāya thinker, Udayana (975-1050), hence, roughly in the middle of the tenth century.[49]

Mid-tenth century (ca. 950) also makes VM a contemporary of the important Muslim thinker, al-Biruni, who works in Ghazni in roughly the same period (ca. 973-1050) and composes his work, *India*, which includes a translation of a text entitled *Kitāb Pātanjal* (the YS of Patañjali) and a work called *Sāṅkhya* (attributed to Kapila).[50] As has already been made clear, the work of Vācaspatimiśra is fundamental for understanding both classical Sāṃkhya and classical Yoga, and likewise it is reasonable to suggest that al-Biruni's work, especially on the YS, is important evidence that Yoga continues to be well known and sufficiently significant in that time frame for a figure as prominent as al-Biruni to translate the YS (together with a commentary) from Sanskrit into Arabic. The first millennium CE, therefore, ca. CE 100 – 1100, is the appropriate time frame for the early development and the eventual mature articulation of classical Sāṃkhya and classical Yoga and also, alas, as suggested earlier, its decline and waning influence by the end of this period.

Thereafter, in my view, perhaps beginning intellectually with the elaborate theologizing of Udayana, the growing importance of Vaiṣṇava and Śaiva theisms, the increasing prevalence of tantric (*śākta*) ritual theory and practice, the decline and assimilation of Buddhist traditions, and the emergence of a variety of Vedāntas, there is a cultural turn

away from the classical heritage that eventually will lead to a new but different Sāṃkhya and Yoga, what might be called a "renaissance" or even a 'Neo-Sāṃkhya' and Yoga, manifest in the extensive work of, first, Aniruddha (fifteenth century) Vijjñānabhikṣu (sixteenth century), Bhāvāgaṇeśa, *et al.*, the rise of Nātha and Haṭha Yoga of Gorakṣanātha and Matsyendranātha, . . ." the prevalence of Purāṇic traditions (such as the *Bhāgavata*), and other exuberant sectarian religiosity. It is hardly an accident, of course, that all of this runs parallel with the rise and maturation of both orthodox Sunni and Sufi Islamic traditions throughout the subcontinent during the Delhi Sultanates and the Mughal imperial period, a sort of "Arabic-cum-Persian cosmopolis", that interacts with what Sheldon Pollock has called the "Sanskrit cosmopolis," the interactions between which are well worth further study and analysis.[51]

Important Recent Bibliographical Resources

In addition to the basic texts already mentioned in the history of scholarly work on Sāṃkhya and Yoga, some salient new secondary work also deserves to be cited that has greatly improved the scope of material available for continuing research. First, of course, there is the work of Philipp André Maas and Kengo Harimoto in preparing a new critical edition of the first section or Samādhi Pāda. This is clearly a fundamental and important first step in completing the demanding task of a full critical edition of all four Pādas of the YS.[52]

Second, there are now two full translations available of the *Pātañjala-yoga-śāstra-vivaraṇa* (PYSV), Trevor Leggett's work, *The Complete Commentary by Śaṅkara on the Yoga Sūtras*, and T.S. Rukmani's work, *The Yogasūtrabhāṣyavivaraṇa* of Śaṅkara. What is interesting about the two translations is that the two translators take opposite positions regarding the date and authorship of PYSV.[53] Leggett argues persuasively in favor of the authorship of Śaṅkara thereby suggesting a date for the text, *ca*., eighth century CE, and see especially his "Technical Introduction.[54] Rukmani, on the other hand, argues for a later follower of Śaṅkara as the author, possibly as late as a certain Śaṅkara of the Payyur family in Kerala anywhere from the eleventh century or later.[55]

Yet another pioneering accomplishment in recent scholarship is Shlomo Pines and Tuvia Gelblum in their collaborative translation, "Al-BĪRŪNIĪ's Arabic Version of Patañjali's *Yogasūtra*," (in Four Chapters) (published over a period of many years in the *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* (BSOAS), 1966, 1977, 1983 and 1989.[56] The great value of Pines-Gelblum is the continuing detailed discussions

of the interaction between the Arabic and Sanskrit texts of Yoga in all four portions of their translation of the YS. These discussions are especially pertinent, in my view, for bridging the period from the work of VM into the subsequent medieval and/or pre-modern period in the Sāṃkhya and Yoga of Aniruddha, Vijñānabhikṣu, *et al*., and the much later *Sāṃkhya-sūtra*.[57]

Next, mention has to be made of the various philological studies of Albrecht Wezler regarding the *Pātañjala-yoga-śāstra-vivaraṇa* or PYSV.[58] While Wezler's studies have not reached hard conclusions either about date or authorship of the PYSV, his work has greatly clarified the issues that are yet to be resolved in determining the future of the discussion of that text's significance. He has made considerable progress in tracing variant readings of the VB as found in the PYSV that are 'better,' or at least, interestingly different, from the vulgate text of VM. Leggett has also taken note of some of the more important differing readings of the YS and VB in VM and PYSV.[59] These variants when assembled in their totality will provide much helpful data in completing the critical edition of the entire VB.

Finally, without doubt the most important bibliographical breakthrough, not only for the study of Sāṃkhya but for help in understanding Yoga as well, is the work of Albrecht Wezler in collaboration with Shujun Motegi in making available a critical edition of the commentary on the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* known as the *Yuktidīpikā*.[60] There were two earlier published editions of the text, the earliest by Pulinbehari Chakravarti in 1938 and a more recent edition by R. C. Pandeya in 1967.[61] Especially valuable in the *Yuktidīpikā* are the references to the various competing interpretations of the developing Sāṃkhya system among Sāṃkhya teachers in the early centuries, indicating that Sāṃkhya philosophy was a vigorous intellectual tradition with internally diverse interpretations. As indicated above, especially the views of Vārṣagaṇya and his followers (the *vārṣagaṇāḥ*), and particularly the views reported about a certain Vindhyavāsin, provide, in my view, important evidence for both of the distinctive classical forms of Sāṃkhya and Yoga in the early centuries CE. The former, Vārṣagaṇya, appears to be clearly associated with the tradition known as the "Ṣaṣṭitantra" (a "System of Sixty") (either itself a text or groups of texts, or simply an enumerated list of a system for oral teaching), the "schoolbook" summary of which is known as the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* of Īśvarakṛṣṇa.[62] The latter, Vindhyavāsin, is said in the *Yuktidīpikā* to have some distinctive differences from Vārṣagaṇya that may well be what comes to be known as the *Yogasūtra*.

The Sāṃkhya and Yoga Conceptual Frameworks

K. C. Bhattacharyya comments as follows at the outset of his "Studies in Sāṃkhya Philosophy":

> Much of Sāṃkhya literature appears to have been lost, and there seems to be no continuity of tradition from ancient times up to the age of the commentaries. . . . The interpretation of all ancient systems requires a constructive effort; but while in the case of some systems where we have a large volume of literature and a continuity of tradition, the construction is mainly of the nature of translation of ideas into modern concepts, here in Sāṃkhya the construction at many places involves supplying of missing links from one's imagination. It is risky work, but unless one does it one cannot be said to understand Sāṃkhya as a philosophy. It is a task that one is obliged to undertake. It is a fascinating task because Sāṃkhya is a bold constructive philosophy. Sāṃkhya is not the avowed formulation of religious experience which Vedānta is primarily, nor analytical and critical like Nyāya but is based on speculative insight and demands imaginative-introspective effort at every stage on the part of the interpreter.[63]

Bhattacharyya's comment is not only true regarding the early Sāṃkhya materials. It is also true for understanding the philosophy of Yoga. It has often been suggested that the relation between Sāṃkhya and Yoga is largely a difference between the non-theistic (*nir-īśvara*) early "reason-method" of early Sāṃkhya and the later theistic (*seśvara*) "action-method" of Yoga. While this is certainly correct to some degree, a careful reading of the texts of the two traditions suggests a number of additional important differences that raise the possibility that these two traditions are, in fact, quite different from one another. The differences are so extensive that some have suggested that there is no such thing as a Yoga philosophy or system of thought. Yoga is simply a collection of meditation exercises that can be used by any sectarian group.[64] Others have suggested, for example, J. W. Hauer, that Yoga can stand by itself quite apart from its commentaries and that Sāṃkhya has been "foisted" on Yoga.[65]

Such views are no longer taken seriously in view of more recent research, but there remain two important questions. (1) First, how are the various differences to be explained historically between what Dasgupta calls the "Kapila Sāṃkhya and the Pātañjala Sāṃkhya"? (2) Second, why is it still legitimate to refer to Yoga philosophically as an "explanation or explication of Sāṃkhya" (*sāṃkhya-pravacana*)?

(1) Regarding the first question, based upon comments found in the *Yuktidīpikā*, there were a variety of proponents of the Sāṃkhya in the

first centuries CE, including such names as Paurika, Pañcādhikaraṇa, Patañjali (a different teacher from the Patañjali of Yoga), Vārṣgaṇya, the "followers of Vārṣagaṇya (the "*vārṣagaṇāḥ*"), Vindhyavāsin, *et al*.[66] The latter figures, Vārṣagaṇya (and his "followers") and Vindhyavāsin, seem to have been especially important, the former, Vārṣagaṇya, since he was central in pulling together some sort of final version of the "System of Sixty" (*ṣaṣṭitantra*), and the latter, Vindhyavāsin, who apparently deviates somewhat from the standard view of Sāṃkhya largely because of his having been in polemical exchange with the Buddhists in Ayodhyā. Īśvarakṛṣṇa's *Sāṃkhyakārikā* is the only extant text of the Sāṃkhya school from this early period and was composed probably, as already indicated, some time in the fourth century (ca. 300-350). It is evidently nothing more than what it claims to be, a simple in-house or schoolbook summary of the "System of Sixty" in its Vārṣagaṇya form. This "system of sixty" is cited in several commentaries on the *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, for example, the *Māṭharavṛtti*, the *Jayamaṅgala*, the *Yuktidīpikā,* the *Tattvakaumudī*, and so forth. The *Yuktidīpikā* cites the "system of sixty" in some of its opening verses as follows:

> (9) *pradhānāstitvam ekatvaṃ arthavattvam athānyatā;*
> *pārārthyam ca tathānaikyaṃ viyogo yoga eva ca;*
> (10) *śeṣavṛttir akartṛtvaṃ cūlikārthāḥ smṛtāḥ daśa;*
> *viparyayaḥ pañcavidhas tathoktā nava tuṣṭayaḥ*;
> (11) *karaṇānām asāmarthyam aṣṭāviṃśatidhā matam;*
> *iti ṣaṣṭiḥ padārthānām aṣṭābhiḥ saha siddhibhiḥ.* (YD, p. 2) [67]

A reasonable interpretive translation would be the following:

> (9-10) The existence of primordial materiality (*pradhāna* = *traiguṇya* = the interactions of *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*); its oneness (*ekatva* = *satkāryavāda*); its objectivity (non-sentience or *jaḍa*) (*arthavattva*); its difference (*anyatā*); its relation with or alongside another (*pārārthya*); so also, the other, the not one or plural (*anaikya*) *(= puruṣa-bahutva*); separation (of one from the other) (*viyoga*); linkage (*yoga*) of one with the other; its (that is, the *puruṣa*-s) non-agency (*akartṛtva*); and continuous functioning (of awareness, *citta* or *buddhi*) for a time after the realization of the distinction between *pradhāna* and *puruṣa* occurs (*śeṣa-vṛtti* = *jīvan-mukta*); these are the 10 topmost or principal (notions) to be taught (*cūlikārthāḥ smṛtāḥ daśa*)—
> (10-11) The 5 incorrect forms of knowledge (*viparyayaḥ pañcavidhas*) (ignorance, egoity, attachment, enmity and clinging to conventional life); likewise the 28 varieties (*aṣṭāviṃśatidhā*) of dysfunctional life due to the weakness of the eleven capacitiies (*karaṇa*-s), (five of sense, five of motor and one mental capacity together with an additional nine

> dysfunctions that are negations of the nine contentments together with a further eight dysfunctions that are the negations of the eight extraordinary cognitive perfections); the 9 contentments (*tuṣṭi*-s) (of monastic life prior to attaining final spiritual freedom); and the 8 extraordinary cognitive perfections (*siddh*i-s) (that bring about the realization of spiritual freedom (*kaivalya*), including rational reflection, oral instruction, study, collegial interaction, purity, and the successive overcoming of the discomfort pertaining to self-understanding, the discomfort pertaining to social interaction, and the discomfort pertaining to celestial becoming. (These 50 components make up the "pratyaya-sarga" or the "realm of ordinary awareness" of everyday life.)
> The 10 principal catgories (*padārtha*-s) together with the 50 categories descriptive of everyday ordinary life make up the "system of sixty" (the "Ṣaṣṭitantra').

Īśvarakṛṣṇa then proceeds to compose the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* as a convenient summation of what would obviously be a much more elaborate discussion of the conceptual framework of the "system of sixty", leaving out, as he says in verse seventy-two of the *Sāṃkyakārikā*, the illustrative examples, that is, possibly the sorts of examples that accompany technical inferences, and the polemical interactions with opponents that usually accompany philosophical texts. Given the various disagreements that are discussed in passing in the *Yuktidīpikā*, I am inclined to think that the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* may well have been prepared as a final definitive summation for the views of Vārṣagaṇya and his "followers" (the *vārṣagaṇāḥ*-s).

Nothing more needs to be said about the classical Sāṃkhya of Īśvarakṛṣṇa for purposes of this Introduction, since this first phase of the in-house classical form of the school is reasonably well understood as I have made available both in my *Classical Sāṃkhya: An Interpretation of its History and Meaning* as well as in volume IV of the Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies, *Sāṃkhya: A Dualist Tradition in Indian Philosophy*, co-edited by me in collaboration with my distinguished co-editor, Ram Shankar Bhattacharya.[68]

In answer to our first question, therefore, the evidence suggests that there were a variety of interpretations of Sāṃkhya and Yoga in the early classical period, the most important being probably the differences between the Sāṃkhya of the SK (traceable perhaps to Vārṣagaṇya and his followers) and the " Sāṃkhya-pravacana" of the VB on the YS (traceable to the reformist views of Vindhyavāsin).

(2) The second question mentioned earlier, however, that is, why is it still legitimate to refer to Yoga philosophically as an "explanation or explication of Sāṃkhya" (*sāṃkhya-pravacana*), given what appear

to be a number of major differences between early Sāṃkhya and the Yoga philosophy of Patañjali? Again, the *Yuktidīpikā* is helpful by way of getting started. In his passing references to the various Sāṃkhya teachers, the author of the Yuktidīpikā offers the following intriguing comments.

> (a) *mahataḥ ṣaḍ aviśeṣāḥ sṛjyante pañca tanmātrāṇy ahaṃkāraś ceti vindhyavāsimatam. . . .*
> (b) *Indriyāṇi. . . vibhūnīti vindhyavāsimatam. . . .*
> (c) *adhikaraṇam api kecit trayodaśavidham āhuḥ, ekādaśakam iti vindhyavāsī. . . .*
> (d) *tathānyeṣāṃ mahati sarvārthopalabdhiḥ, manasi vindhyavāsinaḥ. . . .*
> (e) *saṃkalpābhimānādhyavasāyanānātvam anyeṣām, ekatvaṃ vindhyavāsinaḥ.* (YD, p. 187.)

Five ideas are mentioned here that are distinct to Vindhyavāsin:

(a) Unlike other Sāṃkhya teachers who derived the subtle elements from egoity, Vindhyavāsin argued that the five subtle elements and egoity together derive directly from the *mahat* (*citta* and/or *buddhi*).
(b) Unlike other teachers who said that sense capacities are pervasive but limited, Vindhyavāsin argued that sense capacities are all-pervasive (*vibhu*).
(c) Unlike other teachers who thought that there is a thirteenfold (*trayodaśa*) internal organ (*antaḥkaraṇa*), Vindhyavāsin accepts only an elevenfold (*ekādaśaka*) instrument.
(d) Unlike other teachers who think that ascertainment finally takes place on the level of the *mahat* or *buddhi*, Vindhyavāsin takes the view that experience occurs in the mind (*manas*).
(e) Unlike other teachers who argue that intention (*saṃkalpa*), self-awareness or egoity (*abhimāna*) and ascertainment (*adhyavasāya*) are all separate functions, Vindhyavāsin argues that they should be taken together as a single function.
And In addition, (f) there is a sixth important notion not only in the *Yuktidīpikā* but elsewhere as well, for example, in Medhātithi's commentary on *Manusmṛti* I.55, that Vindhyavāsin did not accept the notion of a transmigrating subtle body, primarily because the capacities (including the *citta*) are all-pervasive and thus it is not necessary to posit a subtle body.[69]

These views of Vindhyavāsin are all similar with the views of the YS and VB. Moreover, and even more important, there are important

references to some documented interactions between the followers of Sāṃkhya and Buddhist traditions (Sarvāstivāda, Sautrāntika, and Vijñānavāda) in the early centuries CE; and it is the case that many Buddhist terms are to be found in the YS and the VB. Especially the *sūtra*-s in Book Four have often been cited as being under heavy Buddhist influence, responding largely, it has been thought, to Vijñānavāda Buddhist thought. Beginning already in the work of S. N. Dasgupta and coming down to Frauwallner, many scholars have therefore dismissed Book Four of the YS as a later appendage or interpolation. The problem of Buddhist terminology, however, cannot be so easily swept away, since Louis de la Vallée Poussin demonstrated years ago, the presence of Buddhist terminology in the YS and the VB not only in Book Four but extensively in the first three Books as well. La Vallée Poussin has collected well over a hundred terms that appear to be common to both the YS and Buddhist philosophy. Some fifty of these La Vallée Poussin traces to discussions in the *Abhidharmakośa* and *Bhāṣya*, that is, to Sarvāstivāda, Sautrāntika and early Yogācāra contexts.[70] La Vallée Poussin is cautious about the significance of this terminology in terms of understanding the relations between the YS and Abhidharma Buddhist thought. He sees his listing as adding "some new pieces of information" ("*quelques renseignements nouveaux"*) to the continuing effort to construct a more adequate intellectual history of Sāṃkhya, Yoga and Buddhist traditions.

It is striking that this terminology from Buddhist texts for the most part is not found in the purely classical Sāṃkhya of the "system of sixty" and its presentation in the *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, but is clearly present in the YS and the VB. More than that, the views regarding the Sāṃkhya philosophy that clearly differ from the standard classical Sāṃkhya appear to be strikingly similar to the views of Vindhyavāsin mentioned just above. Furthermore, there is the interesting reference to polemical interaction between Buddhists in Ayodhyā, especially the critical response of the famous Buddhist thinker, Vasubandhu, to the Sāṃkhya views of Vindhyavāsin as reported in Paramartha's "Life of Vasubandhu". Stefan Anacker paraphrases this interaction in the following.[71]

> The year 376 brings Candragupta II, Vikramāditya, to the throne of the Gupta Empire. As famous for his liberal patronage of learning and the arts, as for his successful maintenance of the Empire, his reign marks one of the high points in the classical Indian period. And Ayodhyā, where Vasubandhu again took up his abode, became for a while the Emperor's capital-in-residence. It may have been shortly after this date

> that a great debate occurred, which was to stick in the minds of the Buddhist biographers.
>
> Philosophical debating was in classical India often a spectator-sport . . . . The King himself was often the judge at these debates, and loss to an opponent could have serious consequences . . . . One of the most stirring descriptions of such a debate is found in the account of Paramārtha, where he describes how the Sāṃkhya philosopher Vindhyavāsin challenged the Buddhist masters of Ayodhyā, in the presence of Emperor Candragupta II himself. At that time both Vasubandhu and Manoratha were absent from Ayodhyā . . . and only the old Buddhamitra was left to defend the Dharma. Buddhamitra was defeated, and had to undergo the humiliating and painful punishment of being beaten on the back by the Sāṃkhya master in front of the assembly. When Vasubandhu later returned, he was enraged when he heard of the incident. He subsequently succeeded in trouncing the Sāṃkhyas, both in debate and in a treatise . . . Candragupta II rewarded him with 300,000 pieces of gold for his victory over the Sāṃkhyas.[72]

Given these references to Vindhyavāsin in the Yuktidīpikā together with the extensive presence of the critique of Buddhist ideas throughout all Four Books of the YS and the VB, and given what appears to be a reasonably reliable report of Vindhyavāsin in polemical interaction with Vasubandhu and other Buddhists in Ayodhyā, it is hard to avoid the possibility, even probability, that the philosophical interpretation of Sāṃkhya that is found in the YS and the VB reflects a reinterpretation of Sāṃkhya philosophy that is to be traced to the work of Vindhyavāsin. Either Vindhyavāsin himself may have been the compiler of the YS and VB that is now extant, or, the YS and VB may have been compiled by one of Vindhyavāsin's followers. I am inclined to think that Vindhyavāsin is the actual compiler. Ashok Aklujkar is also so inclined. He refers to the second dedicatory verse of VM's TV (*Tattvavaiśāradī*):

> *natvā patañjalim ṛṣiṃ vedavyāsena bhāṣite,*
> *saṃkṣiptaspaṣṭabahvarthā bhāṣye vyākhyā vidhīyate.*
> Having paid homage to the Ṛsi Patañjali, a commentary or explanation (*vyākhyā*) which is brief, clear and substantive is being set forth in regard to the commentary composed by [or attributed to] Vedavyāsa.

It is recognized by most scholars that the legendary Vedavyāsa (or Vyāsa) is obviously not the compiler of the YS and its *Bhāṣya*. It is more likely, says Aklujkar, that the verse should read "vindhyavāsena" (or "vindhyavāsinā") instead of "*vedavyāsena*" and may well represent a simple transmission error in manuscripts after the time of VM. There probably was a simple shift of the letter, "y" in the *devanāgarī* script,

back one syllable, which could have turned "vindhyavāsena" into "vedavyāsena".[73] Be that as it may, it appears likely, in my view, that the views of Vindhyavāsin are central in the authorship or compilation of the YS and VB, with Vindhyavāsin himself having been the compiler or possibly one of his followers. Should it have been a follower or student of Vindhyavāsin, such a student could have had the name Patañjali; or, as was suggested earlier, the compiler of the YS and VB may have used the name of the famous grammarian as a way of legitimating the newer version of the Śāstra. All of this admittedly is highly speculative and will have to await a final critical edition. The linkage between Vindhyavāsin, the Sāṃkhya teacher, however, with the views of the YS and VB seems reasonably solid.

By way of highlighting the main differences between the earlier classical Sāṃkhya (of the Ṣaṣṭitantra and the *Sāṃkhyakārikā*) and the Sāṃkhya as found in the YS and the VB, at least seven differences are worth mentioning as follows:

(1) First and foremost, the notion of "*citta*," (YS I.2) which I translate simply as "ordinary awareness" takes the place of the threefold "internal organ" (buddhi, ahaṃkāra, manas) (*antaḥkaraṇa*) of the older Sāṃkhya, and the "thirteenfold instrument" (*trayodaśa-karaṇa*) of the older Sāṃkhya (made up of intellect, ego, mind, the five sense capacities and the five motor capacities) becomes then for Yoga only an elevenfold instrument. Instead of three separate structures, *buddhi* (or *mahat*), *ahaṃkāra* and *manas*, classical Yoga combines the three into a single "awareness," and the notion of "awareness," therefore, becomes a much more complex operation that is inclusive of rational discernment, individual self-awareness and the everyday functioning of ordinary experience. The term "*citta*," of course, appears variously in the ancient texts, both Brahmanical and Buddhist, but it is difficult to avoid the parallels with "*citta*" in Sautrāntika and Vijñānavāda contexts in particular. The Yoga view, however, as in Sāṃkhya generally, stresses the objectivity or non-sentience (*jaḍa*) of *citta*, bringing it close to becoming a synonym for *prakṛti* or *pradhāna* or *mūlaprakrti* (primordial materiality). The term "Yoga" (YS I.2), which can be translated simply as "disciplined meditation," is said to be that which will bring about the "cessation of the functions of ordinary awareness" (*citta-vṛtti-nirodha*). When that cessation occurs (YS I.3), the witness or "seer" (*draṣṭṛ*) (*citi-śakti = puruṣa* = consciousness), or that whose presence makes ordinary awareness (*citta*) possible, will become apparent as that which is totally distinct from the "functioning of ordinary awareness" (*citta-vṛtti*-s). In other

words, there is a radical dualism between a non-sentient, physicalist "ordinary awareness" *citta*, on the one hand, and the presence also of an ontologically separate consciousness (*puruṣa*) whose simple catalytic presence allows experience to become possible, on the other. So long as that radically dualist separation (*vi-yoga*) occurs, just to that extent the essential nature (*svarūpa*) of consciousness shows itself (YS I.3). When that separation is not the case, that is to say, when the functions of ordinary awareness (*citta*) are operating in their beginningless conventional manner, the presence of the witnessing consciousness, though always present, is covered over by the functioning of ordinary awareness and is mistakenly experienced as ordinary awareness (YS I.4). The two distinct realities, ordinary awareness (*citta* = prakṛti) and consciousness (*citi-śakti* = *puruṣa*) are both all-pervasive and under all circumstances present to one another. There is no relation between them other than their simple presence to one another.

(2) Second, the older Sāṃkhya speaks of a thirteenfold instrument (intellect, ego, mind, the five sense capacities and the five motor capacities) together with five subtle elements as making up an eighteenfold subtle body (*sūkṣma-śarīra*) that transmigrates at death to a new rebirth body. The Yoga view asserts that ordinary awareness (*citta*) as *prakṛti* is all-pervasive as *citta-sattva*; hence, there is no need for a subtle body somehow moving from rebirth to rebirth (YS IV.3-4 and YS IV.10). The parallel with the Buddhist (and Jain) discussions in the classical period is obvious. Theravādins (and classical Jain thought) like the Yoga philosophy argue that there is no need for a subtle body (*ātivāhika*). Sarvāstivāda and other Buddhist schools argue for some sort of subtle body. It should be noted on this point that the *Abhidharmakośa* discussion comes out closer to the old Sāṃkhya view of a need for a subtle body in contrast to the Yoga view. It should also be noted here that the early *sūtra*-s in Book Four of the YS (YS 2-5 and 7-11), as Hauer and Feuerstein have correctly argued, in my view, have little to do with Yogins creating artificial minds. These *sūtra*-s intend instead to account for the manner in which individual *citta-s (nirmāṇa-cittāni*) emerge from an all-pervasive *citta-sattva* and become individualized at the level of *asmitā* or egoity (and see YS IV.4). The term "*nirmāṇa*" here is unlikely to refer to Yogins "constructing minds" but, rather, has reference to the manner in which *citta*-s become particularized. Says Feuerstein, following J. W. Hauer's reinterpretation of *sūtra*-s IV. 2-5:

> Thus *nirmāṇa-citta* denotes nothing else but the individualized consciousness complex as it appears in the terrestrial world. The one

citta from which many individualized *citta*s are said to derive (see YS IV.5) reminds one of the 'mind only' conceptualization in the idealist schools of Mahāyāna Buddhism.[74]

Throughout this section of Book Four (YS IV.12-22), of course, Yoga clearly attacks the 'mind-only' views of the Buddhists, holding fast throughout to maintaining a clear distinction between the "*dharma*," the changing or mutating forms of *sattva, rajas* and *tamas* and the substantive base (*dharmin*) of the *pradhāna* or *mūlaprakṛti*.

(3) Third, Yoga greatly simplifies the description of phenomenal existence in terms of the functions (*vṛtti*-s) of awareness (*citta*) in the fivefold framework of *pramāṇa* (correct knowing by way of perception, inference and reliable testimony), *viparyaya* (incorrect awareness-es), *vikalpa* (verbal discourse), *nidrā* (sleep) and *smṛti* (memory) (YS I.5-11). The Yoga idiom is a significant theoretical improvement over the *pratyayasarga* idiom of the older Sāṃkhya. The discussion in the YS and VB closely mirrors the more sophisticated philosophical accounts of *pramāṇa*-theory, theory of error, theory of language and meaning, theory of states of awareness, and theory of memory that are to be found in Buddhist, Nyāya, philosophy of language, and so forth.

(4) Fourth, the older Sāṁkhya deals with the issue of time and transformation in terms of the theory of *guṇa-pariṇāma*. Yoga philosophy offers a more specified account of time and transformation in terms of momentariness (YS IV.33) and a theory of the three perspectives on change and transformation (YS III.13-14), namely change in *dharma*, change in *lakṣaṇa*, and change in *avasthā* (YS III.13).

Change in *dharma* is the change in empirical characteristic (a lump of clay becoming a pot), change in *lakṣaṇa* is change in temporal mode from future, to present and finally past; and change in condition from new to old. The Buddhists (Sarvāstivādins, Sautrāntikas and Vijñānavādins) all debated the problem of change in precisely these terms. Yoga philosophy accepts all three explanatory modes with a primary focus on *dharma* and secondarily on temporal mode and condition and relating all three to the underlying *dharmin* or substance, again in direct criticism of Buddhist views.

(5) Fifth, the older Sāṃkhya soteriology emphasized the "discernment" (*viveka-khyāti*) of the difference between *puruṣa* and *prakṛti (vyakta-avyakta-jña-vijñānāt)* (*Sāṃkhyakārikā* II), arguing for its ultimate principles on the basis of inferences of the *sāmānyato-dṛṣṭa* type (the attainment of what is imperceptible in principle on the basis of certain general and necessary features of what is perceptible). In

contrast Yoga looks at the matter of discernment based on the careful analysis of *samādhi*-s (altered states of awareness) or one-pointed concentrations (*ekāgrata-samādhi*-s) on the perceptions of the empirical, the rational, the aesthetic and self-referential (*vitarka, vicāra, ānanda* and *asmitā*) (YS I.41-51) in order to attain "being itself" as an object (*sattā-mātra*), including among those intentional awarenesses even that exemplar as symbolically portrayed, Īśvara (YS I.23). Here again the influences from or interactions with Buddhist traditions are obvious but also modified to maintain the radical dualism of *dṛś* and *dṛśya* or *puruṣa* and *sattva* (YS II.17-27 and YS III.55). Finally, the concentrations reach their ultimate level beyond which the voluntaristic striving of a Yogin can no longer go, and it is recognized that there can be no cause and effect relationship between *citta* and *puruṣa* (*citi-śakti*). Obviously if the striving for discernment could cause enlightenment, that would be to drag enlightenment back into the causal system, and this has tended to be one of the basic misunderstandings of the radical nature of the Sāṃkhyayoga dualism, for example, in the work of Stephen H. Phillips, *et al*.[75] Hence, it is only when "cessation of the *citta-vṛtti*-s" occurs, that is, only when the cause-effect realm is transcended in the seedless (*nir-bīja*) or "objectless *samādhi*" (*a-saṃprajñāta-samādhi*), beyond the *triguṇa* realm of *pradhāna*, then and only then ". . . there is . . . the presence of the power of pure consciousness in its own inherent form" (". . . *svarūpa-pratiṣṭhā . . . citiśaktir* iti"). To think otherwise is to miss the point of the radical Yoga dualism (YS I.3, I.16, YS I.51, YS III.55 and YS IV.34).

(6) Sixth, Book Three, the Vibhūti Pāda should, of course, also be mentioned by way of pointing out material in the YS and the VB that is hardly mentioned in the older Sāṃkhya of the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* and its commentaries. In addition to the extraordinary cognitive capacities (*siddhi*-s), about which Book Three is clearly ambivalent (cf., of course, YS III.37 and YS III.51) there are, however, some important discussions related to the theory of time (in YS III.13-14), and of much greater significance the theory of language in YS III.17. Much has been written about all of these matters in the work of K. Kunjunni Raja, *Indian Theories of Meaning*, Tuvia Gelblum's seminal review article on time, in his article "Notes on an English Translation of the *Yogasūtrabhāṣyavivaraṇa*," and, as has been mentioned earlier at several points, the important draft essay of Ashok Aklujkar, "Yoga, Vyākaraṇa and the Chronology and Works of Some Early Śāstra Authors."[76] Suffice it to say at this point that the problem of time in the YS and VB appears somewhat muddled in YS III.13-14 but may have been resolved in Gelblum's corrected reading of

the VB (both for the PYSV and for the TV), suggesting the juxtaposition of "past" (*atīta*) with "present" (*vartamāna*) making clear that the proper Yoga view that the movement of time is from future to present and finally to past, and not the conventional view that time is to be understood in terms of the sequence past-present-future. The problem with the issue of "*sphoṭa*" in III.17 is difficult, since the term "*sphoṭa*," although often claimed to be an important idea in the YS and VB is, in fact, nowhere mentioned either in the *sūtra* or the VB. Some ideas very much like "*sphoṭa*" are certainly hinted at in the VB but not directly identified. It is only in the later TV of VM from the tenth century CE that the term "*sphoṭa*" is actually used. Aklujkar suggests that the author/compiler of the YS and VB, whom Aklujkar considers to be Vindhyavāsin, was somewhat earlier than Bhartṛhari (ca. CE 450) and was possibly an important influence on Bhartṛhari and later discussions of the notion of *sphoṭa*.

(7) Finally, of great interest and admittedly difficult to understand is Yoga's eccentric theology (YS I.23-32).[77] The older Sāṃkhya had not even mentioned God, since the theory of *guṇa-pariṇāma* as the continuing transmutation of an unfolding *mūlapraṛti* rendered the notion of a creator God superfluous (*nirīśvara*). Yoga, however, introduces a notion of 'devotion to God' (*īśvarapraṇidhāna*) but almost in a manner that initially appears to be tongue-in-cheek. From the time of Garbe, Keith and Dasgupta to the time of Frauwallner, Yoga theology either has been dismissed as an add-on in response to popular sentiment, or as an opportunity to move Yoga into one or another of the sectarian theologies (Vaiṣṇava, Śaiva, and so forth). The Yoga view, however, is more than a popular add-on but much less than a coherent theism. "God (YS I.24) is a particular *puruṣa* among the plurality of *puruṣa*-s, untouched by afflictions, karmic tendencies, karmic fruits, and long-term karmic predisposiitions" ("*kleśa-karma-vipāka-āśayair a-parāmṛṣṭaḥ puruṣa-viśeṣa īśvaraḥ"*). God is neither personal nor a creator, and has no causal role whatever to play in the transactions or mutations of primordial materiality (*pradhāna*). The notion of God is to be understood within the framework of the "pluralization of consciousncess" or the "plurality of *puruṣa*-s" (*puruṣa-bahutva*), and to be clearly distinguished from the cause-and-effect realm of the continuing transformations (*guṇa-pariṇāma* or *traiguṇya*) of primordial materiality (mūlaprakṛti or *pradhāna*). To use a metaphor from contemporary science, consciousness (*puruṣa*) or spirit in Sāṃkhya and Yoga is "quantized" or thought of in terms of discrete packets on analogy with the comparably odd notion of the pluralization of energy into discrete packets on the quantum level of the physical

world. There is, then, an intelligible natural and/or material world ". . . from Brahmā down to a blade of grass" (". . . *brahmādistambaparyantaḥ*) (*Sāṃkhyakārikā* LIV, and YS and VB at III.26-27), and it is a single, uniform (*ekatva*), rational macrocosmic-cum-microcosmic One. This single and intelligible world is only possible, however, because of the presence of a sort of "quantized" or "pluralized" consciousness or spirit (*puruṣa*), a consciousness or spirit that accompanies, makes possible and phenomenalizes the community of sentient beings (*nirmāṇa-cittāni*). Consciousness or spirit, therefore, in Sāṃkhya and Yoga, is not one but, rather, Many, and the traditional distinction between the One and the Many is turned on its head, or, if you will, attains its mirror reversal. "Devotion to God" (*īśvara-praṇidhāna*), therefore, becomes what the VB identifies as "particular kind of *bhakti*" (VB on YS I.23), a natural longing or inclination for transcendence, a transcendence that is always immediately and mysteriously present to any and each sentient being as its simple presence to itself.

What I have tried to show in the preceding discussion is that the many innovations that may be found in the YS, the VB and TV are very much in keeping with the overall classical Sāṃkhya framework of the early centuries CE. Or, put somewhat differently, although classical Yoga has a number of features over and above the older classical Sāṃkhya, probably due to polemical interaction with Mahāyāna Buddhist traditions, classical Yoga continues to be very much an "interpretation" or "explanation" of Sāṃkhya (that is, a "*sāṃkhya pravacana*"). Those who would pull the Yoga orientation in the direction of a sectarian theology, or to interpret Yoga simply as a possibly useful set of meditation practices, or most commonly, to seek to reduce the Sāṃkhya and Yoga dualism to one or another form of Vedānta, are, in my view, mistaken. To be sure, it is perfectly reasonable to make use of Sāṃkhya and Yoga notions in other contexts as has clearly happened throughout the intellectual history of India in all sorts of areas such as law, poetry, drama, art, philosophy and theology. Very much the same sort of thing has happened to Platonism in the history of western thought. There is, nevertheless, an identifiable way of thinking that is distinctively unique to Sāṃkhya and Yoga, specifying a unique contribution to South Asia's intellectual heritage and legacy, and deserving to be understood on its own terms.

A Concluding Reflection

Earlier I quoted K. C. Bhattacharyya to the effect that Sāṃkhya (or Sāṃkhyayoga) is a "bold, constructive philosophy," and let me close this

Introduction by relating the Sāṃkhya or Sāṃkhyayoga orientation to its major opponent in the history of philosophy in South Asia, Śaṅkara, the great proponent of Advaita. Śaṅkara himself understood only too well what I have just argued about Sāṃkhyayoga, namely, that it is a distinct and unique way of thinking. More than that, Śaṅkara was aware that the Sāṃkhya (and Yoga) was a great threat to his own Advaita. It was a great threat, Śaṅkara believed, primarily because of its focus on the reality of primordial materiality (*pradhāna*), and even more than that, on Sāṃkhya (and Yoga's) pluralization or "quantizing" of consciousness, which, of course, is a stark repudiation of Upaniṣadic thought and an unapologetic rejection of monism in favor of a rich pluralism.[78] In this brief concluding reflection, I shall limit my comments to what I have called the "mirror reversal" of Śaṅkara's understanding of the One and the Many, and to the differece between Sāṃkhya (and Yoga) and Śaṅkara's Advaita on the issue of identity and difference.

The One and the Many. In Śaṅkara's Advaita, consciousness (*ātman* and/or Brahman) is always One, whereas the multiplicity of the empirical world of becoming is a bewildering, highly suspect, non-rational Many (*Māyā, avidyā*). For Sāṃkhyayoga, the exact opposite or the mirror reversal is the case. Consciousness (*puruṣa*) reveals itself as Many (*puruṣa-bahutva*), whereas the multiplicity of the empirical and phenomenal world is a completely intelligible, rational One (*prakṛti* or *pradhāna* as *traiguṇya*). For Śaṅkara, a single cosmic consciousness disperses itself into a random and finally unintelligible multiplicity. For Sāṃkhyayoga, many aspects of consciousness reside in a single rational world, or, if you will, there is a pluralization or 'quantizing' of Consciousness. For Saṅkara, consciousness (*ātman*) can never be particular or individual; it can only be general or universal. For Sāṃkhya and Yoga, consciousness (*puruṣa*) can never be general or universal; it can only be particular or unique. Consciousness can only be referred to as "any," never as "all". For Śaṅkara, what truly is and what is truly intelligible and what is ultimately satisfying (that is, *sat*, *cit* and *ānanda*) can only be the sheer transparency of consciousness (*ātman* as *svayaṃ-prakāśa*); anything else is an unintelligible and mysterious otherness. For Sāṃkhyayoga, the material world is truly intelligible and rational; what is unintelligible and mysterious is my particular or unique presence in that totally real material world (*vastutva*).

Identity and Difference. A closely related difference between Sāṃkhyayoga, on the one hand, and the Advaita of Śaṅkara, on the other, relates to dramatically different interpretations of Identity and

Difference (or Uniqueness). Regarding this issue, the ontologist, Milton Munitz has commented as follows:

> The notion of unity, in general, contains at least two separate meanings. According to one of these meanings, to speak of "unity" is another way of referring to identity. We express this notion of unity by saying that what we might otherwise think are two distinct entities, are in fact identical: they are one and the same. . . . There is, however, another meaning of unity besides that of identity; Unity can also stand for uniqueness.[79]

Śaṅkara the Advaitin in his attempt to fashion a notion of consciousness followed the path of identity, thereby critiquing all relations with anything other than consciousness itself, ending finally in a cosmic oneness without any relations. One might well ask, then, as many other philosophers in India did, what precisely is the difference between consciousness and nothing? If there is a difference, then there is at least one exception (or relation) apart from the contentless One, which obviously undercuts the asserted Identify. If there is no difference, the One then becomes a trivial nothingness, an identity without any meaning (which, it should be noted at least parenthetically, was the Buddhist response to Śaṅkara and the Vedānta-s generally). Sāṃkhyayoga followed, rather, the path of difference and argued for a single, complex, ever-changing material and/or natural world in which consciousness is present but totally distinct or different (or unique) vis-à-vis the material or natural world. This, of course, also raises the issue of relation, as was the key issue for the Advaitin as well. Sāṃkhyayoga handles the issue of relation in a somewhat different, and admittedly, problematic manner. To allow consciousness to be related to the material or natural world in a real relation requires pulling consciousness into the cause-effect framework of the material world. Sāṃkhyayoga argues, instead, that, therefore, there is no relation between consciousness and the natural world. They are two distinct, separate, and all-pervasive realities without any relation beyond sheer presence to one another. There is a single material or natural world, and there is a plurality of quantized or unique particular manifestations of consciousness mutually present with that world but not causally interactive with that world in any sense beyond each or any catalytic presence.

Endnotes

1. The Sanskrit text used is Ram Shankar Bhattacharya, ed., *Pātañjala-yogadarśanam* (Varanasi: Bharatiya Vidya Prakasana, 1963), including the *Pātañjala-yoga-sūtra*-s, the Vyāsa *Bhāṣya* and the *Tattvavaiśāradī* (of Vācaspatimiśra), in comparison throughout with the 'Vulgate' edition as presented in *Ānandāśramasaṃskṛtagranthāvalī*, Volume 47 (Pune: Ānanda Āśrama Sanskrit Series 47, 1978), as well as the text in *Pātañjala-yoga-darśana*, edited by Śrī Nārāyaṇa Miśra (Varanasi: Bharatiya Vidya Prakashana, 1992).

2. Ram Shankar Bhattacharya, *An Introduction to the Yogasūtra*, see especially Chapter I, "Yoga and Yogic Tradition" (Varanasi: Bhāratīya Vidyā Prakāśana, 1985), pp. 3-28. This book generally, despite some unfortunate English limitations in the printing process, is an outstanding set of notations about the meaning and terminology of Yoga Śāstra—essential notations for anyone who seriously seeks to understand how traditional pandits interpret their traditions.

3. Philipp André Maas, ed., *Samādhipāda: The First Chapter of the Pātañjalayogaśāstra for the First Time Critically Edited*, Geisteskultur Indiens. Texte und Studien, Band 9 (Aachen: Shaker Verlag, 2006), pp. 1-87.

4. Cf. also Kengo Harimoto, ed., *A Critical Edition of the Pātañjala-yoga-śāstra-vivaraṇa. First Part. Samādhipāda.* A Dissertation in the Department of Asian and Middle Eastern Studies. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1999.

5. Maas, pp. 165-66.

6. Maas, p. 165.

7. Maas, pp. l and li.

8. James Haughton Woods, trans. *The Yoga-System of Patañjali* (or The Ancient Hindu Doctrine of Concentration of Mind), HOS, Volume Seventeen) (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1914; reprint Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1992); and Rāma Prasāda, trans., *Patañjali's Yoga Sutras*, Sacred Books of the Hindus, Volume 4 (Allahabad: Panini Office, 1912; 2nd edition, 1978).

9. For details of Sanskrit editions and available translations in English for the texts of Sāṃkhya and Yoga from the earliest texts to the present time, see Volume IV and Volume XII of the Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies, as follows:
Gerald James Larson and Ram Shankar Bhattacharya, eds. *Sāṃkhya: A Dualist Tradition in Indian Philosophy*, Volume IV, EIP, Karl H. Potter, General Editor (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987, and currently re-issued in the Princeton University Press Legacy Library; and Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass,

1987). Also, Gerald James Larson and Ram Shankar Bhattacarya, eds. *Yoga: India's Philosophy of Meditation*, Volume XII, EIP, Karl H. Potter, General Editor (Delhi: Motilal Banasidass, 2011). Hereafter the former is abbreviated as SDT, and the latter as YPM.

10. *Ibid*.

11. *Ibid*. Fortunately, a full critical edition of the *Tattvakaumudī* has been available now for some years. See S. A. Srinivasan, ed., *Vācaspatimiśras Tattvakaumudī*, Alt-und-Neu-Indische Studien, Vol. 12, Alt-und-Neu-Indische Studien (Hamburg: Cram, De Gruyter & Co., 1967. For an English translation of the *Tattvakaumudī*, see Ganganath Jha, *The Tattva-kaumudī*, Poona Oriental Series, No. 10 (Poona: Oriental Book Agency, 1965), pp. 1-174.

12. *Ibid*.

13. Paul Hacker, "Śaṅkara the Yogin and Śaṅkara the Advaitin: Some Observations," (originally published in Festschrift, E. Frauwallner, WZKSO, 1968), now in Wilhelm Halbfass, ed., *Philology and Confrontation*: *Paul Hacker on Traditional and Modern Vedānta* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995), pp. 101-34. Hacker is the source of the notion that Śaṅkara may originally have been an exponent of Yoga and later converted to Advaita.

14. Hajime Nakamura, *A History of Early Vedānta Philosophy*, Part Two, Appendix B (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Reprint, of Volumes III-IV Shoki No Vedānta Tetsugaku, 2004 English trans., H. Nakamura and T. Leggett), pp. 756-775. Nakamura's discussion examines the PYSV's Vedānta bias together with an excellent discussion of how Yoga undergoes fundamental changes in the centuries after CE 950.

15. Sengaku Mayeda, *A Thousand Teachings*: The *Upadeśasāhasrī* of Śaṅkara (Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 1979), pp. 4 and 6 but especially endnotes to Introduction, III, B, notes 31,32,33,34 and 35, pp. 61-62, again with reference to Vedānta bias in the PYSV.

16. Trevor Leggett, trans., *The Complete Commentary by Śaṅkara on the Yoga Sūtra-s: A Full Translation of the Newly Discovered Text* (London and New York: Kegan Paul International, 1990), see Technical Introduction, pp. 17-48.

17. Albrecht Wezler, "On the Quadruple Division of the Yogaśāstra, The Caturvyūhatva of the Cikitśāstra and the 'Four Noble Truths' of the Buddha (Studies in the Pātañjalayogaśāstravivaraṇa II)," in *Indologica Taurinensia* of the International Association of Sanskrit Studies, Volume XII, 1984, 289-337. See also, Albrecht Wezler, "Philological Observations on the So-Called *Pāta ñjalayogasūtrabhāṣyavivaraṇa* (Studies in the *Pātañjalayogaśāstravivaraṇa* I), *Indo-Iranian Journal* 25 (1983), 17-40. See also, Albrecht Wezler, "A Note on *Mahābhāṣya* II.366.26: *guṇasaṃdrāvo dravyam*, Studies in Mallavādin's *Dvādaśāranayacakra II*, Offprint from *Buddhism and Its Relations with Other Religions: Essays in Honour of Dr. Shozen Kumoi on His Seventieth Birthday*,

n.d.; see also, Albrecht Wezler, "Further References to the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* in the *Pātañjalayogaśāstravivaraṇa* III), in Amrtadhara, Professor R. N. Dandekar Felicitation Volume, S D Joshi, ed., (Delhi: Ajanta Books, 1984), pp. 457-72; and finally, see, Albrecht Wezler, "On the *varṇa* System as Conceived of the Author of the *Pātañjala-yoga-śastra-vivaraṇa*" (Studies in the *Pātañjalayogaśāstravivaraṇa* IV), in Dr. B. R. Sharma Felicitation Volume (Tirupati: Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha, Tirupati Series No. 46, 1986), pp. 172-88.

18. Wilhelm Halbfass, *Tradition and Reflection: Explorations in Indian Thought,* cf. Chapter 6, "Śaṅkara, the Yoga of Patañjali and the So-Called *Yogasūtrabhāṣyavivaraṇa*" (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991), pp. 205-242. Halbfass nicely summarizes the alternative to the Advaitin Śaṅkara's authorship (see pp. 206-07).

19. Philipp André Maas, see above, note 2.

20. See above, note 3.

21. Kavi, M. Ramakrishna, "Literary Gleanings," *Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society*, 2 (2) (1927): 130-145, 225-251. Cf. also "Materials for the Authorship Problem," in Appendix in Kengo Harimoto, *God, Reason and Yoga*, and see full citation below in note 27.

22. T. S. Rukmani, trans. *Yogasūtrabhāṣyavivaraṇa of Śaṅkara*, Two Volumes (Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd., 2001), see Introduction, pp. ix-xxxi. See also Kengo Harimoto, review of "*Yogasūtrabhāṣyavivaraṇa of Śaṅkara*" by T. S. Rukmani," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 124.1 (2004), 176-80.

23. Tuvia Gelblum, "Notes on an English Translation of the *Yogasūtrabhāṣyavivaraṇa*" (by Trevor Leggett and see above endnote 13) in *BSOAS*, Volume 55, part I (1992), 76-89.

24. Usharbudh Arya (a.k.a. Swami Veda Bharati, D. LItt), trans., *Yoga-sūtras of Patañjali with the exposition of Vyāsa: A Translation and Commentary*, Samādhi-pāda , Study Material: Not for Sale (Rishikesh, Uttarkhand, India, n.d.), p. 11.

25. See above, note 18.

26. Polakam Sri Rama Sastri and S. R. Krishnamurthi Sastri, eds., *Pātañjala-yoga-sūtra-bhāṣya-vivaraṇam* of Śaṅkara-bhagavatpāda, No. XCIV. Madras: Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, 1952.

27. A careful discussion in some detail of the issues regarding the differing views of the date and authorship of the PYSV may be found in an Appendix entitled "Materials for the Authorship Problem" in Kengo Harimoto's book, *God, Reason and Yoga*, Indian and Tibetan Studies I (Hamburg: Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, University of Hamburg, 2014), pp. 225-251.
In this regard, mention should also be made to Philipp André Maas's "A Concise Historiography of Classical Yoga Philosophy," [in E. Franco, ed., *Periodization*

and Historiography of Indian Philosophy, pp. 53-90, and see full entry in Select Bibliography], which provides a useful overview of the many debates about the date and authorship of the PYSV and other texts of Yoga, but, in my view, is too quick to criticize the views of Leggett and Rukmani largely because they differ from his own tenuous point of view regarding the PYSV.

28. Gerald James Larson, *Classical Sāṃkhya: An Interpretation of its History and Meaning*, (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2014; originally published in 1969; second revised edition, 1979, and reprinted up through 2014). 315pp.

29. See Endnote 9 above for full details of publication.

30. For a fresh and original discussion of this period of the first centuries CE in the Northwest of the subcontinent, see Christopher I. Beckwith, *Greek Buddha* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015), pp. 1-60. This is a fascinating fresh look at the Śaka and Scythian traditions and their interactions with Greek and Central Asian traditions in the Kuṣāna era.

31. Stanley Wolpert, *A New History of India* (New York: Oxford University Press, Fourth Edition, 1993), pp. 88-125.

32. I have discussed this time frame at much greater length and with much additional detail in my book, *India's Agony Over Religion* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995), pp. 65-119, and see above Endnote 28.

33. All of these commentaries have been discussed at length by me in my *Classical Sāṃkhya: An Interpretation of its History and Meaning*, pp. 134-53, and see above Endnote 28.

34. This sort of periodization is roughly comparable to that of Erich Frauwallner, *Geschichte der indischen Philosophie*, Volume I, (Salzburg: Otto Müller, 1953), pp. 275-408. Also, this would include the work of Gerhard Oberhammer, who follows Frauwallner closely, in his "The Authorship of the *Ṣaṣṭitantra*," WZKSO, vol. 4 (1960), 71-91; and in his "On the '*Śāstra*' Quotations of the *Yuktidīpikā*," *The Adyar Library Bulletin*," Vol. 25, pp. 131-72; and finally, his *Strukturen Yogischer Meditation (*Wien: Verlag Der-Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1977), pp. 18-55 for Sāṃkhya, and pp. 134-229 for Yoga, wherein he sets forth a fourfold typology for Yoga that is a re-working of Frauwallner's twofold typology of 'cognitive restrictive' vs. 'cognitive intensive' Yoga (and see Larson, "Classical Yoga as Neo-Sāṃkhya: A Chapter in the History of Indian Philosophy", in *Asiatische Studien Études Asiatiques* LIII, 3, 1999, 723-732). As Feuerstein has commented, Oberhammer's so-called fourfold typology is "bewildering" and totally without evidence (Feuerstein, G. *The Yoga Sūtra: An Exercise in the Methodology of Textual Analysis,* 1979, pp. 83-84).

35. J. A. B. van Buitenen, "Studies in Sāṁkhya (III)", *JAOS*, Volume 77, pp. 101-102.

36. Franklin Edgerton, "The Meaning of Sāṃkhya and Yoga", *AJP*, XLV, No. 177, 1924, pp. 1-46.

37. *Ibid*. p. 6.

38. In this regard, see John Brockington, *The Sanskrit Epics* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1999), pp. 473-90. Also, see Peter Schreiner, "What Comes First (in the *Mahābhārata*) : Sāṃkhya or Yoga?", *Asiatische Studien/Études Asiatique*, LIII.3 (1999), 755-77.

39. A. B. Keith, *The Sāṃkhya System* (Calcutta: YMCA Publishing House, second edition, 1949), p. 70.

40. Gerald James Larson, "Differentiating the Concepts of "yoga" and "tantra" in Sanskrit Literary History," in *JAOS*, 129.3 (2009), 487-98.

41. Ashok Aklujkar, "Yoga, Vyākaraṇa and the Chronology and Works of Some Early Śāstra Authors," a paper presented (in draft form) at an International Seminar in January 1995 entitled "Concepts of Knowledge: East and West," Calcutta, edited by Susan Walters and J.L. Shaw, p. 17; then later published in March 2000 under a new title (and shortened) as "The Epistemological Point of View of Bhartṛhari," in *Concepts of Knowledge: East and West* (Calcutta: Swami Prabhananda, Secretary, The Ramakrishna Mission Institute of Culture, 2000), pp. 1-19.

42. Surendranath Dasgupta, *History of Indian Philosophy*, Volume I (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), Chapter VII, "The Kapila and the Pātañjala Sāṃkhya (Yoga)," pp. 208-73; cf. also, S. N. Dasgupta, *Yoga Philosophy in Relation to Other Systems of Indian Thought* (Calcutta: Orient Books, 1930), *passim*.

43. For a full discussion of the various arguments on either side, see Larson and Bhattacharya, eds., YPM, pp. 54-62.

44. J. W. Hauer, *Der Yoga*: Ein indischer Weg zum Selbst (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer Verlag, 1958), pp. 238-58 (with special reference to what Hauer calls "Der *yogaāṅga*-Text—Kap. II.28-III.55). I would add that such an insertion from an older tradition dating from the second century BCE need only be II.28 through III.5.

45. See Larson-Bhattacharya, SDT, pp. 113-163; and YPM, pp. 30-70. See above, note 9 for details.

46. Ram Shankar Bhattacharya, *An Introduction to the Yogasūtra*, pp. 85-106.

47. *Ibid*. p. 94.

48. See notes 1, 9 and 11 above for bibliographical references to Vācaspatimiśra's work on Sāṃkhya and Yoga. Sometimes Vācaspatimiśra is confused with a later so-called Vācaspatimiśra II who flourished in the 15th century and was an exponent of Navya-nyāya. For a full discussion of Vācaspatimisra of the 10th century and his various works, cf. Larson-Bhattacharya, SDT, pp. 301-

312. For a full discussion of the various works of Vācaspatimiśra, see Larson-Bhattacharya, SDT, pp. 301-312.

49. Srinivasa Ayya Srinivasan, ed., *Vācaspatimiśras Tattvakaumudī*, cited above in note 11, and see pp. 62-65.

50. al-Biruni's work with Yoga and Sāṃkhya is already mentioned in Volume I of Surendranath Dasgupta's *History of Indian Philosophy*, and see note 42 above, pp. 233-36, as well as in his *Yoga Philosophy in Relation to Other Systems of Indian Thought*, and again see note 42, pp. 59-64.

51. See Gerald James Larson, *India's Agony Over Reliigon*, (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995), pp. 102-1119; and see Sheldon Pollock, *The Language of the Gods in the World of Men* (Berkely: University of California Press, 2006), pp. 18-19.

52. For Maas and Harimoto, see above notes 3 and 4.

53. For Leggett, see above note 16.

54. *Ibid*., pp. 17-48.

55. For Rukmani, see above note 22, and see her Introduction, Volume I, pp. ix-xxxi. In this regard, see also notes 18 and 27 above.

56. Shlomo Pines and Tuvia Gelblum, "AL-BIĪRUŪNĪ's Arabic Version of Patañjali's *Yogasūtra*" in Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Stuides (BSOAS), First Chapter, Vol. 29 (1966), 302-25; Second Chapter, Vol. 40 (1977), 522-49; Third Chapter, Vol. 46 (1983), 258-304; and Fourth Chapter, Vol. 52 (1989), 265-305.

57. Richard Garbe, ed. and trans., *The Sāṃkhya Sūtra Vṛtti* (Calcutta: J.W. Thomas, Baptist Mission Press, 1888); and Nandalal Sinha, trans., *The Sāṃkhya Philosophy* (including the *Sāṃkhya-pravacana-sūtra* with the *Vṛtti* of Aniruddha and the *Bhāṣya* of Vijjñānabhikṣu and Extracts from the *Vṛtti-sāra* of Mahādeva Vedāntin; the *Tattvasamāsa*, *Sāṃkhyakārikā* and the *Pañcaśikha-sūtra* (Allahabad: Panini Office, 1915; and Delhi: Oriental Reprint, 1979).

58. See above, note 17 for a listing of Wezler's principal articles on the PYSV.

59. Leggett, see above note 16, and section "Technical Introduction," pp. 21-31.

60. Albrect Wezler and Shujun Motegi, eds., YD [*Yuktidīpikā: The Most Significant Commenatry on the Sāṃkhyakārikā*], Institut für Kultur und Geschichte Indiens und Tibets an der Universität Hamburg, Alt-und Neu-Indische Studien, No. 44 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1993.

61. Pulinbehari Chakravarti, ed., *YD* (Calcutta: Calcutta Sanskrit Series No. 23, 1938). Ram Chandra Pandeya, ed. *Yuktidīpikā* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1967).

62. The expression simply a "schoolbook" (or "*nur das Schulbuch*") was a comment to me by Erich Frauwallner in a personal conversation while sipping peach brandy in his kitchen in Vienna in 1969. I thought that it was a nice characterization, that is, not much more than an in-house schoolbook summary of Sāṃkhya for students.

63. Krishnachandra Bhattacharyya, *Studies in Philosophy*, Volume I, "Studies in Sāṃkhya Philosophy", Gopinath Bhattacharyya, ed. (Calcutta: Progressive Publishers, 1956), p. 127.

64. Johannnes Bronkhorst, "Yoga and Śeśvara Sāṃkhya," in *JIP,* 9 (1981), 316-17.

65. Georg Feuerstein, *The Yoga Sūtra: An Exercise in the Methodology of Textual Analysis* (Delhi: Arnold-Heinemann Publishers, 1979), cites Hauer (on p. 25): "The commentaries subsequent to Vyāsa, even already Vyāsa himself, instead of presenting the genuine philosophy of Yoga often foist on Yoga the philosophy of Sāṃkhya." Hauer's German is even stronger: "Es ist doch vehr viel Yoga-Philosophie aus den Sūtren selbst zu entnehmen. Und die Kommentare nach Vyāsa, ja schon Vyāsa selbst haben vielfach, statt die echte Yoga-Philosophie zu bieten, die Sāṃkhya-Philosophie dem Yoga untergeschoben." "It is much more important to get the Yoga philosophy from the *sūtra*-s themselves. And the commentaries after Vyāsa, and even already in the Vyāsa itself, instead of looking for the pure Yoga philosophy, falsely attribute it to the Sāṃkhya philosophy." Cf. (and see above, note 44) Jakob Wilhelm Hauer, Der Yoga, p. 265.

66. Pulinbehari Chakravarti, *Origin and Development of the Sāṃkhya System of Thought*, Calcutta Sanskrit Series XXX (Calcutta: Metropolitan and Printing House Limited, 1951); Second Edition, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1975), pp. 111-171.

67. See above, note 59 for full citation. Hereafter *Yuktidīpikā* will be simply YD.

68. See above, notes 9 and 27, and especially Larson-Bhattacharya YPM, pp. 32-50.

69. For all of these references, see Larson-Bhattacharya SDT, pp. 143-45, and also YD, p. 187 and 230.

70. Louis de la Vallée Poussin, "Le Bouddhisme et le Yoga de Patañjali," *Mélanges Chinois et Bouddhique*, 5 (1936-37), pp. 223-242. Cf. also, Gerald James Larson, "An Old Problem Revisited: The Relation Between Sāṃkhya, Yoga and Buddhism," in *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik*, Heft 15 (1989), pp. 129-46, and see especially Appendix B in which I provide a detailed list of terms common to the YS and VB and the *Abhidharmakośa* and *Bhāṣya*, p. 138. Finally, also see Larson-Bhattacharya YPM, pp. 38-43.

71. Stefan Anacker, *Seven Works of Vasubandhu: The Buddhist Psychological Doctor*, Religions of Asia Series, No. 4 (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1984), p. 20.

72. Cf. also Paramārtha, "Life of Vasubandu," M. J. Takakusu, ed., and trans., *T'oung-Pao*, 5, 1904, 269-296, and cf. also, M. J. Takakusu, "A Study of Paramārtha's Life of Vasubandhu and the Date of Vasubandhu," *JRAS* (1905), 33-53.

73. Ashok Aklujkar, "Yoga, Vyākaraṇa and the Chronology and Works of Some Early Śāstra Authors," p. 5; and see above note 44 for full citation.

74. Georg Feuerstein, *The Yoga-Sūtra of Patañjali: An Exercise in the Methodology of Textual Analysis* (Delhi: Arnold-Heinemann, 1979), pp. 78-79. See also, of course, the discussion in Jakob Wilhelm Hauer, *Der Yoga*, pp. 230ff, and see above, note 43.

75. See Stephen H. Phillips, "The Conflict of Volutarism and Dualism in the Yogasūtra," in *JIP,* 13 (1985), 399-414. Phillips here clearly misses the point of the Yoga (and Sāṃkhya) "voluntarism," which is not to identify a causal path to enlightenment. The voluntarism of Yoga has to do with bringing about the "cessation of the functioning of ordinary awareness," which shows precisely that there is no causal path to spiritual freedom. In other words, the voluntarism only provides the realization that *puruṣa* has never, in fact, been bound and that there is, finally, no need to achieve what is already the case.

76. Cf., K. Kunjunni Raja*, Indian Theories of Meaning*, especially Chapter 3, "Sphoṭa: The Theory of Linguistic Symbols" (Madras: The Adyar Library and Research Centre, Vasanta Press, second edition, 1969), pp. 95-148; and cf., Tuvia Gelblum, "Notes on an English Translation of the *Yogasūtrabhāṣyavivaraṇa*," in (BSOAS), Volume 55, part I (1992), 76-89; and cf. Ashok Aklujkar, see above, notes 41 and 73, pp. 1-18.

77. For a full discussion of Yoga theism, cf. my essay, Gerald James Larson, "Yoga's Theism: A New Way of Understanding God," in *Classical and Contemporary Issues in Indian Studies: Essays in Honour of Trichur S. Rukmani*, P. Pratap Kumar and Jonathan Duquette, ed. (Delhi: D. K. Printworld, 2013), pp. 78-95. Cf. also Gerald James Larson, "Materialism, Dualism and the Philosophy of Yoga," in *International Journal of Hindu Studies* 17, 2: 181-219; and cf. also Gerald James Larson, "Classical Yoga as Neo-Sāṃkhya: A Chapter in the History of Indian Philosophy," in *Asiatische Studien Études Asiatiques*, LIII, 3 (1999), 723-32

78. For a detailed discussion of the relation between Śaṅkara's Advaita and Sāṃkhya, see Gerald James Larson, *Classical Sāṃkhya: An Interpretation of Its History and Meaning*, see Epilogue, see "Śaṅkara's Critiique of Sāṃkhya and the Sāṃkhya Response," pp. 209-35.

79. Milton Munitz, *Cosmic Understanding*: Philosophy and Science of the Universe (Prinecton: Princeton University Press, 1986), p. 207.