

The Conception of Liberation in the Pātañjala Yoga – system

Dr. Krishnagopal Adhikari

Associate Professor,
Dept. of Sanskrit, Sitananda College
Purba Medinipur, West Bengal, India.
E-mail ID: krishnagopaladhikari64@gmail.com

Abstract:

It is a great pleasure to me that my article entitled “The Conception of Liberation in the Pātañjala Yoga-System” is ultimately published to keep pace with the present day dynamics. The subject-matter of my article is studied completely based upon the conception of liberation in the Pātañjala-Yoga System. I have tried utmost to dive deep into the theme of the subject of this article discussed most reasonably in the light of other Indian Philosophies.

The Sāṃkhya-Yoga Philosophy plays a vital role in Indian Philosophy. It has been recognized as the most ancient philosophy in the field of this discipline. Both the Sāṃkhya and Yoga Systems are co-related. Liberation or emancipation of salvation is the only goal of the Indian Philosophy. Liberation is impossible without the co-operation of the Yoga-systems of Patañjali and other systems of Indian Philosophy. Though the Advaita Vedānta Philosophy dismissed its necessity by the Brahma Sutra— “etena Yogaḥ pratyuktah”.

Though Patañjali is not the expounder of the yoga system, he collected different types of yogic practices in his lifetime and divided those into four Chapters. He is the path-finder of those who desire liberation or emancipation. It can never be violated by any other means. Hiranyagarvah is the founder of the yoga system as opined by the Sage Yājñavalkah.

Keywords: Pātañjala, Pātañjalayogasūtra, Kaivalya, Puruṣa, Avyakta.

It has been said in one of the aphorisms of Pātañjalayogasūtra, – ‘Sattvapuruṣayoh śuddhisā-mye kaivalyamiti’ (3/55). The meaning of this aphorism is as follows: Kaivalya is attained after equation of buddhisattva (Content of Intellect) and Puruṣa through purification (śuddhyā sāmyam = śuddhisāmyam, that is, equation through purification), even though knowledge due to viveka or separation by discrimination be attained or not.

Kaivalyasiddhi, attainment of union with the Absolute, is achieved when the content of Intellect and puruṣa are both so purified as to resemble each other, or appear to be equal or identical. This purification and resultant equality of Intellect and Puruṣa do not constitute Kaivalya on oneness with the Absolute by themselves, but they are the cause of Kaivalya. The purification and identification of the intellect had to its oneness with the Absolute,

which is ever pure. When the mind is established in the conscious knowledge of identity with the Puruṣa, or so to say, in the consciousness, - 'I am none but Puruṣa', the Intellect with its content of ego or I-ness seems to be equal to Puruṣa or the Absolute. So, in its purity and alone-ness the Intellect equals Him. This is what is meant by the purification of Intellect and its oneness with the Absolute. In this state the content of Intellect is freed from the impurities due to rajas and tamas and is completely purified, and what remains of it as a residue is absolutely pure sattva. Puruṣa is by nature absolutely pure when alone or in His original state; so His purification and equalisation are only attributed and not real; He is called pure as the Sun, coming out of the covering of a cloud, is called pure. Impurity is foreign to Puruṣa, it comes from contact of gross or material enjoyment. So long as He does not come in contact of gross sense objects or adventitious matter He may be described as pure in His pristine felicity. Disintegration of Puruṣa begins with His association or identification with intellection or mentation. When the process of intellection or mentation dissolves in Puruṣa and He remain in His pristine state His integration is complete.

When the Intellect takes after or resembles Puruṣa, its intellection ceases. It may be said that from a practical standpoint then Puruṣa looks like Intellect while He looks like Himself as well. That is the state of Kaivalya or oneness with the Absolute. Kaivalya thus means to remain 'Kevala' one alone in His integral state on the part of Puruṣa, in whom intellection ceases altogether. Hence in the state of Kaivalya Puruṣa does not undergo any transformation but in Him Intellect undergoes complete dissolution.

Now we shall discuss how the concept of mukti or liberation has been explained elsewhere in Vyāsa's commentary on Pātañjala Yogasūtra.

It has been stated in the fifth aphorism of Samādhipāda of Pātañjala Yogadarśana: *tadebambahūtam cittamavasitādhikā-ramatmakalpena vyāvatiṣṭhate pralayam vā gacchatīti*. The language of this part of the commentary is very obscure. The literal meaning of this part is as follows: that citta, whose domain of control, that is, (Puruṣa's) experience of earthly pleasures and liberation therefrom, has reached the end of inducement or attachment, exists like Ātmā (Ātmakalpa = as pure as Ātmā), or dissolves in Primordial matter or Prakṛti. The commentators have not attached much importance to the part, 'Ātmakalpena vyāvatiṣṭhate'. Vācaspati Miśra has said, 'tadevambahūtam cittam nirodhāvastham samkāraśeṣam bhūtvā Ātmakalpena avatisthate iti āpātataḥ pralayam vā gacchatīti paramārthataḥ', which means that citta, held under restraint, exists seemingly like Ātmā; in reality, however, it dissolves in its cause the Primordial Matter or Prakṛti. This division of one of the two concepts appearing spiritually like another is unreasonable, from sāṃkhya standpoint an instance of such division of two alternative concepts is rare. This is why Miśra was led to such a supposition. Other commentators excluding Vācaspati Miśra, have not attached any special significance to this part. Among recent scholars, renowned in philosophical circles, Pt. Hariharānanda Āranya is a front-rank expositor.

His explanation is as follows : from a customary point of view liberated citta may be guessed to have dissolved in its original cause, Avyakta that is, Prakṛti; and from the spiritual standpoint, that is, from the view-point of cessation of sorrows, when complete elimination of three kinds of sorrows occurs, there is no possibility of their further recurrence; so, citta appears to be dissolved or defunct. When, however, citta adheres to the three gunas the only thing that occurs is want of association between the seer and the objects seen, which are sources of sorrow. This exposition also is suppositional. In the original text there is no mention of such division into 'spiritual' and 'temporal' matters. The commentator is very sparing in his use of words. If one word be sufficient, he does not use of words for the sake of clarity, not to speak of a sentence.

Among the ancient commentaries Yoga commentary is said to be very brief. There is no other commentary, so brief but pregnant. The remark of Dr. Gopināth Kavirāja regarding its excellence is worth mentioning : "It is the most excellent among the few such specimens of world literature". The exposition of Hariharānanda Āraṇya follows Vacaspati Miśra upto a certain extent. Although it claims some originality in regard to significance, its conception in respect of 'spiritual' and 'temporal' divisions takes after Miśra's plan of supposition. Pūrṇacandra Vedāntacancu has stated in his book, "when the predominance of citta comes to an end as the result of domination over it by haste thought currents and notions, it is absolved of its usual functions and shines is its crystal like purity, existing as it does, like Ātma. At last it dissolves itself in Prakṛti and its function terminates". It is clearly seen that he has meant 'vā' in the sense of 'ca' and has sought to make us understand that citta's existence in the likeness of Ātma precedes its dissolution in Prakṛti; he has asserted this to be the real meaning of the text; he has not, however, taken recourse to any particular supposition. This is, no doubt, a merit of his exposition, but he has taken the liberty of meaning 'vā' as 'ca'. Of course, it is not rare to find 'vā', construed as 'ca', there are instances of such construction in sanskrit literature, where for the reason of no other alternatives such constructions occur. Here, too, he leaves us no occasion for thinking that there was any alternative. In that respect he may not be followed as an exemplar. Vijñānabhikṣu in his Yogo vārttika explained the line thus : 'Ātmakalpena' means Ātmabibhāgena i.e. without being separated from the Ātma and such type of Ātmā Vyuthāna-Prayaṇtam nirduhkhataye tiṣṭhati' i.e. stays without any sort of grief or, sorrows upto the reawakening state (Vyuthāna-paryantam). Vijñānabhikṣu also says that such type of Ātma gets videhakaivalyam destroying all the samskāras by dint of vigorous practice with utmost sincere effort. Thus according to Vijñānabhikṣu elevation from Nirodha-samādhi is but the liberation or Mukti to the Yogins. It may, however, be said with precision by a person, who has some acquaintance with the viewpoint of the commentator, that the remark, 'ātmakalpena vyābatiṣṭhati', is entirely meaningless from the standpoint of general Sāṃkhya. The operation of a thought-process has three

stages of development, - origin, duration, dissolution. Of these three, the time of dissolution is sure to follow in course of process the time of duration. The commentator may ask in reply, 'why'? Again, the use of the root 'sthā' in 'ātmakalpena vyābatiṣṭhate' is significant, and the prefix 'vi' used before it strengthens this significance all the more. Hence, it is naturally suggested that the commentator has purposefully used the word 'vyābatiṣṭhate'. It is usually assumed in the common viewpoint that citta dissolves in the long run and does not stay on. It is, as if, as a mark of protest against this common theory that the commentator avers, no citta stays on as an alternative to dissolution, it does not only stay on, it continues to stay on in a special way. If any body remarks that it is a mere wishful thinking of wild fancy, and as it raises a sectarian dispute, it is very unpalatable, too; it may be refuted by such rebuttal that this thought or fancy is not unfounded; the basis of such a fancy is clearly imbedded in the Sūtra-commentary. That is what is proposed to be discussed hereinafter.

According to the system of Yoga philosophy Īśvara is also a particular Puruṣa; His difference from the Puruṣa in general is this that He is free from Kleśa (misery), Karma (acrimony), Karmavipāka (consequence of action) and Karmāśaya (stored up action). The Puruṣa in general is bound by these bonds since the beginning of time. Will He be Īśvara when freed from these bonds? No, that cannot be said, too. For, if these be many Īśvaras many difficulties will ensue in the matter of creation. Besides, if citta be defunct, from whom will aiśvarya flow or manifest itself? Aiśvarya of divine quality is a characteristic feature of gunas in action. But Īśvara is nirguṇa. If it be argued that Īśvara is endowed with illimitable power, yet such power being a characteristic feature of combined gunas, how can He be called free? So, such argument is irrational. In refutation of this argument the commentator Vyāsadeva says, "sa tu sadaiva muktaḥ, sadaiva Īśvara", i.e. He is always free and is always Īśvara. 'Sadaiva muktaḥ' means that His freedom is undisturbed by time, that is, He was never before in bondage, He is not in bondage now and He will never be in bondage in future. Similarly, His power, which is boundless, is also unaffected by the changes of time, He has been infinitely powerful since the dawn of creation and will ever remain so till the end of creation. Now a natural question arises, - if power be a characteristic feature of combined gunas will it not flow or issue from Prakṛti (i.e. Primordial Matter) or Prākṛita (i.e. a composite of Prakṛiti)? Citta is a component of Prakṛti or is a product of change taking place in Prakṛti owing to interaction of gunas. It is essentially a seat of guna-action. If Īśvara be supposed to possess it, how can He be called free? For, citta is devoid of the capacity to bring mokṣa or liberation. In refutation of this argument Vyāsadeva, the commentator, has had to say in clear language, "Prakriṣṭa sattvopādānāt Īśvarasya śāśvatika utkarsah", which means that perfect sattva or sattya-guṇa par excellence or citta endowed with verified sāttvika quality of that type being present in Īśvara, He possesses perennial omnipotence. The commentator has expressed a world of meaning by this

only one-expression, viz. 'prakṛiṣṭa sattopādānāt'. It has already been stated that the commentator is very reserved in speech; he has not elaborated this expression of 'prakṛiṣṭa sattva' anywhere else in so many words; but it should not be thought that there is no means to understand it clearly. The problem faced by us here is equally present in almost each and every mokṣaśāstra (holy books on liberation) of India. In the Śakta, Śaiva, Vaiṣṇava Āgamas there are ample instances of this problem. It is found in the itihāsa and purāṇas, such as, the Mahābhārata, the Bhāgavata etc., in almost all commentaries excepting the Śāṅkara's commentary on Vedātāsūtra, and especially in the works of the Gosvāmīs of the Chaitanya sect, where it has been described as 'aprākṛita śuddha sattva'; in the Śaiva and Śakta Āgamas it has been named as 'Bindu'. There is no scope for such extensive discussion here, neither there is any necessity for such detailed description at this place. Everywhere the same problem has been faced and it has been solved in the same manner. So, for the sake of felicity of understanding, some discussion of this 'viśuddha sttva' is necessary here. In the Mahāyāna Buddhism and especially in Vajrayāna this type of problem and its solution are seen; even among non-Indian religious sects, such as, the Christians, the Mohammedans etc. discussions of this problem are found. If we want to know to which solution the commentator lends his support in his statement, 'ātmakalpena vyabatiṣṭhate pralayam vā gacchati' in course of his Sūtra commentary, we must understand which citta will dissolve in Primeval Prakṛti and which will stay in Puruṣa Himself with crystal like purity like Ātma. Another alternative is to determine if there is any means to discriminate between these two types of citta or if there is any suggestion thereof in the commentary itself. It may be suggested in this connection that all cittas will dissolve themselves in their cause owing to extreme or acute Vairāgya, if there be no particular desire left in them, and that if anybody desire to attain liberation by achieving identity with Īśvara owing to desire for Bhakti or devotion he may attain that sort of liberation. There is no inconsistency in such suggestion. In order to avoid prolixity no discussion of the different philosophical streams is made here. Such discussion will find due place in course of the thesis.

We shall now discuss very briefly in the context of mukti or liberation, as approved by Pātañjala Yogadarśana, this subject in relation to other philosophical systems, particularly Advaita Vedānta. Hinayāna Bauddha and Gauḍiya Vaiṣṇava philosophy. Vyāsadeva has mentioned the words 'prakṛiṣṭa sattva' in his commentary on Pātañjala Yogasūtra (1/24), defining Īśvara, in the context of describing His eternal excellence. He means to suggest that the eternal excellence of Īśvara is owing to His being endowed with purest sattva. There is much consistency between this state and 'aprākṛita śuddha sattva' as mentioned by the Gauḍiya Vaiṣṇavas. Bhagavāna Śrīkṛṣṇa is possessed of this supernatural pristine form of sattva. The Īśvara, mentioned in Vyāsa's commentary, is Himself the very ingredient of super-excellent sattva and is also endowed with it. A deep study of these

two aforesaid terms is necessary in the context of comprehending the concept of mukti or liberation, as approved by Pātañjala Yogadarśana. The discussion that follows is needed to understand the real picture of a yogī or sādhaka, desirous of attaining Kaivalya, when it is depicted in the language used in common parlance.

Indian spiritual aspirants are mainly divided into two categories. Those, who follow the Vedic stream are being here called Sampradāyins. Nanaka, Kavira etc., who are called Panthīs, are excluded from this category. In the association of sādhus or ascetics the custom of describing those, who are adherents of the Vedas and adopt any one of the commentators of the Brahmasūtra, as Sampradāyins has been handed down till today. Besides these there are the Āgamikas. Among them there are the Śaiva ascetics divided into sub-sects. The Vaiṣṇavas are also Āgamikas in their origin or source, as they to base their conclusions in some form or other on “Pañcarātra”. Even some of the Āgamikas in accordance with the Āgamika tradition of Brahmasūtra treat one of its commentaries as their authority. Thus it is found that there is ordinarily no bar to considering all ascetic orders as owing allegiance to the Vedas. We say ‘ordinarily’, because in subtle considerations such divisions are irrelevant. There are such Āgamikas, who even think that Āgama is the final authority. The Vedas are the first ladder in the many flights of steps which are constituted by Āgama. Among the many scriptural codes of ceremonial rules in the gradation of Āgama tradition Vedācāra is the first in order Abhinavagupta, who is considered to be proficient in all the Āgamas, has lent considerate support to this opinion. In his judgement a votary of God shows respect to another scriptural authority or evinces interest in the performance of rites with allegiance to it so long as he has desires befitting a paśu (a primary attendant of Śiva, who has carnal desires still left in him). Let it as it may, this discussion is irrelevant here. For a contextual review this is sufficient. Let us now resume the original discussion of the two categories of rotaries among the Sampradāyins. On one side of them there is venerable Śaṅkara along with Hinayana Buddhas. On the other side there are principally the Vaiṣṇava devotees and the Śaiva-śakta sects of ascetics, who being opposed to Śaṅkara's doctrines lie in the same category with the Vaisnava devotees. Their difference from Ācārya Śaṅkara pertains mainly in relation to the determination of the Ultimate Reality. There is absolutely no difference of opinion in regard to the doctrine that the Ultimate Reality is citsvarūpa (essentially and spontaneously conscious self); all the difference lies in relation to the affinity of Śakti with this Essence. In the opinion of Ācārya Śaṅkara the Ultimate Reality is Nirviśeṣa Brahma; the Śakti, which is imagined to play her role in It, is ‘sadasadbhyāmanirvacanīya’, that is, neither real nor unreal and hence indescribable; so, he takes Śakti for something unreal like a dream. In accordance with all other sects Brahma-Śakti is inherent in Brahma, and since she is immanent she is as real as Brahma Itself; she is indivisibly one with Brahma, so she exists within and apart from It. Launching into disputes on

this issue is useless. Only the doctrinal statement in connection with the proposed discussion is made here.

It is obvious from the aforesaid arguments that each of the classes of votaries acknowledges Śakti as an identity. Their Bhagavāna (God endowed with six aiśvaryas) is in essence Existence Absolute, Consciousness Absolute and Bless Absolute. His Energy immanent in Him is indivisible from Him. In the Kāśmīrī Āgama this Śakti or Energy residing in Him has been described as entirely one with Him (Śiva). One Absolute Entity has been described as Śiva on account of predominance of spontaneous revelation in Him and Śakti, owing to predominance of conscious cogitation in Her. This difference owing to the plea of revelation and cogitation does not make any change in Reality; for revelation bereft of self-conscious cogitation is not worth the name; so, it is insensate. Self-consciousness is the very life-breath of revelation. The Gaudiya Vaiṣṇava sect, inaugurated by Mahāprabhu Śrīkṛṣṇa Caitanya, does not find any difference in this respect. They do not acknowledge any Reality devoid of Śakti of Energy. This Śakti, again, is in their opinion of three divisions: antarama, bahirama and tatastha (that is, inner, outer and marginal). They are respectively called Htādinī, Sandhinī Samvit. Of these the first being the innermost is the very essence of His power. Māyā being the outermost of His powers (bahirama) covers Reality and distracts the soul from His and Jīva comes within the jurisdiction of His marginal power and is called tatastha. In this perspective Jīva is essentially one with Absolute Reality. His relation to the Reality is that of estrangement and reunion. In apprehension of deficiency in argument this relation is described under cover of the term, 'acintyabhedābheda' (the inconceivable separation and union). According to the Gaudiya Vaiṣṇavas Śrīmadbhāgavata is considered to be the epitome of the Vedas and it is the Chief authority on the Ultimate Reality. That sloka of the Bhāgavata which is accepted as the basic source of their theological contention on the Ultimate Reality is: 'Vadanti tattvavidastattatt-vam yajñānamadvayam / Brahmeti paramātmeti Bhagavānīti śabdyate', that is, those who have philosophical and ontological knowledge of the Ultimate Reality describe it as The Supreme one, without a second, Its essence is knowledge Absolute; the same Reality manifests Itself under the three names of Brahma, Paramātmā and Bhagavāna. It should be taken for granted that the difference in manifestation is due to the difference in the taste and capacity of the votaries of Godhead. The Gaudiya Vaiṣṇavas believe in the theory of evolution through change and transformation and not in the theory of illusion of māyā. Kṛṣṇa's will acts as an incentive to His Sandhinī Śakti, which undergoes purification and transforms herself into citdhama and other pure accessory environments for the manifestation of His inner power or Svarūpaśakti. This sanctified pure energy is otherwise named 'Vasudeva'. Bhāgavata says on this point: "Sattvam Viśuddhaṁ Vasudeva Sajñitam", that is, the rectified pure entity goes by the name of Vasudeva. Beyond this supernormal entity there is an aura of effulgent rays encircling it. The Gaudiyas call it

Siddhadhāma, Brahmadhāma or Brahma. It is formless and the paravyoma referred to above is with form. By way of instance the Gaudiyas say: “Garmacakṣe dekhe yaiche sūrya nirviṣeṣa/Jñān-mārgे laite nāre tāhāra viṣeṣa”.

Round about the dhāma referred to above they imagine a river, full of cit water; this river is called Virajā. Its other name is Kāraṇarnava, beyond which lies the kingdom of Prakṛti. There is no difference between this Prakṛti and the Prakṛti of the Sāṃkhya System; infinite crores of Brahmāṇḍas of Māyic ingredients lie within the womb of this Prakṛti. This is the result of evolution of Śrīkṛṣṇa’s Māyā śakti. Diversity is seen in place of unity owing to the effect of Māyā śakti. From time immemorial in spite of being the tatatha śakti of Śrīkṛṣṇa, Jīva is bound in the kingdom of Māyā owing to his averseness to Kṛṣṇa. It is his essential and inherent quality to attain his true nature and form through obedience to Godhead. Hence a day must come when through association with saintly souls his desire to return to God, who is his true home, will reawaken him from this sleep, and then himself or with the help of a spiritual perceptor or with the help of Scriptures he will come by the mode of worship, work of meditative practices for the purpose of returning to God, which is his real home. It is necessary for him to realise with particular attention this mode of return journey, which is in a reverse process.

The bondage from which Jīva suffers is due to his dislodgment or fall from his original state, his loss of freedom enjoyed in that state. His real and original state is beyond time and space; hence his fall should not mean that it is circumscribed by time and space, rather it means want of consciousness regarding his real self. How does it ensue in time? Though different causes have been assigned in the three prasthānas (branches of spiritual and Gītā), they are unanimous in one respect that this fall from real self dates from beyond time. Right from the beginning of this dislodgment his real self has been covered or enveloped with encrustations due to Māyā and knowledge of Vikalpas, that is, alternative concepts of self have taken hold of him. This knowledge of alternative concepts of self is termed as bandha (i.e. bondage), which may be described in ordinary judgment, without entering into subtle discussions about it, as envelopment by three crusts or bodies, namely, kāraṇa, sūkṣma and sthūla (causal, subtle and coarse), which have barred his knowledge of real self when the self sheds its coarse, mortal frame it resides in its super-conscious state, which is called ‘turiya caitanya’ in philosophical language and is not different from Brahma Caitanya, i.e. Brahma-Consciousness. This state has been termed in Śaṅkara philosophy as the state of release from worldly bondage. It is natural for Jīva to separate his real self by discriminatory knowledge of pañca koṣas (Viz. annamaya, prāṇamaya, monomaya, vijñānamaya, ānandamaya, respectively the mortal, vital-mental, supra-mental, blissful sheaths), in order to attain this state of release. But those, who do not consider Jīva other than Brahma or do not consider it desirable to attain the state of Brahma, look

upon even this disembodies state as something trivial; yet they acknowledge the fact that this mortal body is a source of limitation to the self. In this respect there is practically no difference of opinion between Śamkara's Vedantic followers and followers of Sāṃkyā. Difference of opinion centres round the subject of singleness or plurality of souls. In case of other differences, if any, settlement is generally subject to subtle disputations. There is no scope for such discussions here. Other sects including the Vaiṣṇavas opine that during the state of sādhanā or votive austerities measures should be adopted in the māyika body so that with the fall of the mortal body the devotees attachment is transferred to his spiritual body and the experience of bondage does not persist even for a moment. Such measure is first adopted at the time of initiation, when the seed of this spiritual body is sown in the heart of the aspirant. The seed of this spiritual frame is carried from the soul of the preceptor to that of the disciple at the moment of dīkṣā or spiritual initiation. In course of time this body is nourished by spiritual practices and is enriched with siddhi or state of supernal bliss or release in mortal physique. The Vaiṣṇava devotees of mystical nature call this body 'the bhāva deha' or 'siddha deha'; the 'baindaba deha' of the Śaivas and the 'Bajradeha' of the Bajrayānī Bauddhas are more or less the same with it. It is not destroyed with the destruction of the three other bodies mentioned above. When the spiritual aspirant goes beyond the māyika world and desires to enter the paravyoma in the reverse process of sādhanā he crosses the boundary of the prākṛta world, then he must take a dip in virajā. No sooner than he touches the water of virajā his māyika deha falls off or dissolves. The sadhaka attains the disembodied state, and then being no body at the time, he experiences no problem of movement. He achieves the state of pure Consciousness and acquires a position in the region of formless luminousness, which is the ultimate result of his siddhi. But although he goes beyond Māyā, he does not experience any manifest independence in this state. So, the Vaiṣṇavas do not consider this state as their desideratum. This is the state of being Brahma, but it is bereft of Śakti, though it is identification with the Supreme Soul. The Gaudiyas consider it beneath their hankering. In their opinion constant and implicit obedience to the Divine will constitutes true purusārtha (attainment of the supreme object in life). From the standpoint of complete elimination of sorrows attainment of identification or unity with Brahma is, no doubt, final release. The Gaudiyas mean it as a kind of mukti, without doubt, but yet it is not so much desired by them as devotion to Godhead, which is deemed by them as 'parama purusārtha'. This is termed by them also as 'pañcama purusārtha'. Incidentally, it should be borne in mind that this doctrine of pañcama purusārtha is also a very old concept. In this connection the remark of Utpalācārya, the Kāshmīrī Saivādvaitabādin may be remembered: "mokṣat upari śambhavī bhaktih". The term 'prakṛṣṭa sattva' as was used by Vyāsadeva, the commentator of Pātañjala Yogasūtra (V.B.I. 24) has been termed in the esoteric language of other philosophical system as 'aprākṛta śuddha sattva'. We have stated it

explicitly in the foregone discussion. 'Prakṛṣṭa sattva' and 'sūddha sattva' are almost synonymous expressions. 'Aprākṛta' as an adjective is appropriately used here as elsewhere from the same discretionary standpoint, because by 'prakṛṣṭa sattva' we should mean Sattvaguṇa from which all traces of rajas and tamas have been expunged. The Sāṃkhya teachers have decided that none of the three gunas can operate without at least the slightest assistance of the other two gunas; in the absence of such assistance it becomes inoperative or dissolved in Avyakta. If that be the position, what special purpose will be served in manifesting the aiśvarya of Īśvara by such type of Sattvaguṇa? This is why such sattvaguṇa is described as 'aprākṛta' in other philosophical treatises. It has no kinship with prakṛta sattva. It is a special form of power exercised by Īśvara. When sattva, devoid of the slightest traces of rajas and tamas, without undergoing dissolution in Avyakta, is retained by Puruṣa as a distinctive attribute. It is, therefore, invariably presupposed that this sattva is not prakṛta sattva. It is viśuddha or pure in the superlative degree, as it is completely freed from the dross of rajas and tamas, and 'aprākṛta' because it does not dissolve in Avyakta, yet not in the least partaking of the nature of a usual human attribute.

It would appear from what has already been discussed that prakṛta citta, cultivating implicit obedience without any demur to the will of Godhead, is transformed into the veritable personification of true Consciousness and ultimately forms the aprākṛta deha of the spiritual aspirant in the nityadhāma (heavenly abode), if he can attain requisite spiritual help for the purpose and if it does not dissolve in Avyakta in the long run. It should be remembered that since this body is all-consciousness, in respect of Consciousness it is one with the Jīva, which too is all-conscious, so far as the essential nature of the two is concerned. The self is incorruptible Consciousness; the cinmaya deha is a sportive embodiment of the cit-śakti (conscious power or energy); the difference between the two is a difference of plea and hence nominal. We observe here that when Jīva has a devotional hankering, he can with an endowment of pure being obtain elevation to the paravyoma (the supreme height of the Absolute Being), and his citta, too, does not dissolve in Prakṛti. In similar manner in the Yoga commentary, too, we find that a devotee seeking release possesses two cittas, - one dissolves in Prakṛti (pralayam gacchati), the other 'ātmakalpena vyavatiṣṭhate', that is, becomes immaculately pure like Ātmā and stay on instead of dissolving. Here, again, we find that 'prakṛṣṭa sattva' or Īśvara endowed with a purified essence, inspite of being Īśvara is free from all bondage, 'sah sadaiva Īśvarah, sadaiva muktah'. In the Sūtra, it is again observed that there are two categories of mumukṣus, - one find release simply by virtue of perseverance in the practice of contemplation on the real nature of the self or Reality, without in the least meditating on Īśvara; the other finds release by complete self-surrendering to Īśvara, accepting Him as the supreme preceptor, and depending of His grace alone. It is quite natural that those, who find release by the grace of God, should obtain liberation like

Him, endowed as they are with a pure essence of being. So, according to the commentator one category of citta meets with dissolution and the other stays on without being dissolved. This statement of his is quite consistent. Except the Hinayāna Buddhists and the Śāmkara sect almost all others lend support to this conclusion. Practically speaking, these two streams have been continuing to exist side by side since hoary antiquity. The Ācāryas of the Alāmkāra group have stated: “Rasāsvādah Brahma-svādasahodarāḥ”, that is, enjoyment of rasa or aesthetic flavour is akin to enjoyment of spiritual bliss born out of realisation of Brahma. There, too, persons who are devoid of devotion are not competent to appreciate aesthetic pleasure. “Na jāyate tadāsvādo vināratyādivāsanām”, – statements like this and many other are found in works of Sanskrit poetics. The Gauḍiya Vaiṣṇava sect is among the most remarkable of their successors in this domain in a different sense. Reverend Rūpa Gosvāmī has referred to this group in his ‘Vidagdha mādhava’ as the Rasika sampradāya. The doctrine of ‘acintya bhedāvēda’, too, is basically a contribution of the Alāmkāra sampradāya. A little insight will enable all to understand this matter. The bhāvadeha, siddhadeha, pan-copaniṣanmantratanu etc. of the Vaiṣṇavas, Bairavadeha or Śaktadeha of Saiva Śakta sects, the bajradeha of Bajrayāni Buddhists, even the Kāya Kalpanā of the Mahāyāna Buddhists in general bear out the significance of similar nature. The seed of difference between the Hinayāna and Mahāyāna sects of the Buddhists is also imbedded here.

It is understood from the analysis of the literal significance of words used in the commentary on the fifth aphorism of the Samādhipāda and from that of the parallel illustrations quoted from different Sastras that in the attainment of Kaivalya by means of nirvīja Samādhi or to state more correctly, in the attainment of niḥsreyasa (cessation of birth) there are two different ways. Now it will be shown in the analysis of the Sūtra that of the two types of attainment the means to attainmet, too, have been stated as two. Of these two means or media one is ‘bhavapratyaya’ and the other, ‘upāyapratyaya’. The two aphorisms are as follows: “bhavapratyayo bidehaprakṛtilayānām” (1/19) and “Śraddhāvīryasmṛtisamādhi – Prajñāpūrvaka itaresām” (1/20). In this introduction to the foregoing aphorism the commentator Vyāsadeva has said, “sa khalvayam dvividhah, upayāpratyayah bhavapratyayaśca, tatra upayāpratyayo yoginām bhavati” (V.B. 1.18). Again, he has stated in respect of prakṛtilaya in the commentary, - “tatha prakṛtilayāḥ sādhikāre cetasi prakṛtilīne kaivalyapadami-vānubhavanti, yābanna punarāvartate adhikāravaśat cittamiti” (V.B. 1.19). This means that this nirvīja samādhi is of two kinds: ‘upāyapratyaya’ and ‘bhavapratyaya’; of these two ‘upāyapratyaya’ refers to the attainment of the yogins and those whose citta dissolves in prakṛti, experience something like Kaivalya until their citta reverts to its usual function owing to predisposition incidental to habitual predilection. We need not enter into any discussion here about those, who adopt ‘bhavapratyaya’, and are referred to as ‘Videhadevas’ in the aphorism and its commentary; for, our subject for dis-

cussion is prakṛtilaya. ‘Pratyaya’ means cause and ‘bhavapratyaya’ means that of which ‘bhava’ is the cause. Similarly, the cause of nirvīja samādhi, which is experienced in śraddhāviryasmṛti samādhi and prajñā, is called ‘upāyapratyaya’ or ‘asamprajñāta Samādhi’. ‘Bhava’ has been construed differently by different commentators; there is no unanimity on this point. Vācaspati Miśra means ‘bhava’ as avidyā. Bhojarāja and Vijñanabhikṣu construe it respectively as ‘Saṁsāra’ and ‘janma’. It should, however, be remembered that we are discussing here the two types of ‘asamprajñāta samādhi’ or ‘nirvīja samādhi’, which are known as ‘bhavapratyaya’ and ‘upāyapratyaya’. Whatever explanation be given by anybody he must make his interpretation bear consistently upon ‘asamprajñāta samādhi’. The point under discussion is very abstruse and the commentator, taking for granted that the meaning of the aphorism is clear or, may be, for any other reason, did not most probably think that it might arouse any doubt in the mind of anybody. So, he left the interpretation of these two types of ‘Asamprajñāta samādhi’ untouched.

Now we should attempt the interpretation of the term, ‘ātmakalpa’ (V.D.I. 5). In order to facilitate arrival at a conclusion the meaning of ‘Ātmakalpa’ mentioned in the Vyāsa Bhāṣya on the fifth aphorism of the Samādhipāda has been taken as “endowed with purity like the Ātmā or Self”. Rajas and tamas are the two sources of impurity, as the former cover the consciousness of self and the latter leads to deflection or deviation. These two are unfavourable to the attainment of liberation. On the other hand, sattva, possessing the quality of revelation, helps in the removal of bondage due to the attachment of citta, though it is of kindred nature like the other two gunas in the matter of colouring the mind and inducing pleasurable sensations. In the opinion of the Vedāntins, for example, although the Vedic scriptures belong to the category of pretentiously ceremonial works they help in the development of sāttvikarituals, which in the end lead to attainment of Brahma. In reality, rajas and tamas have been explicitly described as ‘aśuddyavaraṇamala’, that is, the impure stain that envelopes the image of the self, in the commentary on the aphorism: ‘nirvicāravaiśaradye adhyātmaprasādah’ (1/47). When citta is freed from the slightest traces of rajas and tamas and is inspired with pure sattvika propensities it becomes equal to Ātmā or self in purity. It then even such pure sattvika proclivities of citta are destroyed it dissolves in its cause, Prakṛti; or, Sattva, attaining more excellence is converted into the cit ṣakti of Puruṣa and appears like the upādhi of Puruṣa. Pātañjali has more faith in the probability of the latter. It has been seen that he has mentioned the purification of both sattva and Puruṣa and their quality resulting therefrom, while assigning reason for realising Kaivalya, which has been incidentally discussed at the beginning of this introduction. When citta dissolves in Prakṛti, Puruṣa attains Kaivalya, or so to say, ‘He’ becomes ‘Kevala’, i.e. alone or without a second. Such a description is natural. But the commentator does not say that. Rather he refers to the Pātañjala Yogasūtra: ‘sattvapuruṣayoh śuddhisāmye

kaivalyam (3/55), that is, citta-sattva and Puruṣa become equal owing to purification and then Kaivalya is accomplished. In reference to ‘śuddhisāmya’ the other proposition, ‘ātmakalpena vyavatiṣṭhate’, as mentioned in the Bhāṣya of the fifth aphorism, is consistently borne out as a probability on the part of Patañjali. In this connection meditation on Īśvara, as prescribed in Yogadarśana, is closely related.

In this context more relatives discussions will be made in the body of the thesis as pertinently as possible. All that has already been said suffices for the sake of introduction to the subject matter propounded by way of a prolegomenon.

Bibliography

- *A critical study of the Sāṃkhya System.* By V.V. Sovani. Poona Oriental Series No. 11. Oriental Book Agency, 1935.
- *A Critical survey of Indian Philosophy.* By Chandradhar Sharma. Motilal Benarasidas. Jainendara Press, Delhi, 1964.
- *A History of Indian Philosophy (vol. I).* By S.N. Dasgupta, Cambridge. At the University Press, 1922.
- *A study of the self-concept of Sāṃkya Yogo Philosophy.* Printed at the Shahdara Printing press, Delhi, Munshiram Manoharlal.
- *An Aspect of Indian thoughts.* By M.M. Dr. Gopinath Kabiraj, Burdwan University, 1966.
- *An Examination of śāṃkara’s Refutation of Sāṃkya Theory.* By M.G. Sastri. Ahmedabasd, Gujat printing press, 1925.
- *Citsukhi by citsukhācārya.* Nirnayasagar Press, Bombay, 1915.
- *Classical Sāṃkhya – A critical study.* By Dr. Anima Sengupta. The United Press Lmt. Patna, 1969.
- *Indian Philosophy.* By S. Radhakrishnan (Vol. II). The Mac Millan Company. Printed in Great Britain, By Unwin Brothers Ltd., Working 1930.
- *Pātañjala Darśanam with Vyāsa Bhāṣya and Yogavāttika* by vijñānabhikṣu, Edited by Jivānanda Vidyāsāgara Bhattacharyya. Siddheswara Press, Calcutta, 1897.
- *Pātañjala Darśanam with Vyāsabhāṣya and Vācaspati Miśra’s Tatvavaisārādi.* Edited by Durgacaraṇa Sāṃkhya Vedāntatirtha. Calcutta (Central Book Agency). 1360 B.S.
- *Teachings of the Upanisada.* By Hemchandra Sarkar. Printed in Brahmo Mission Press, Calcutta.
- *The Yoga Philosophy.* By Tookeram Tatya. Bombay, The Bombay Theological Publication Fund, 1885.
- *The Yoga Vāsiṣṭha and its philosophy.* By B.L. Atreya. Benaras. R. Pathak, 1939.

- *Vedāntasāra with commentary of Sadananda Yogindra*. Translated by U.N. Mukherjee. Basumati Sahitya Mandir, Calcutta.
- *Yoga and Western psychology*. By Geraldine Coaster. London. Oxford University Press, 1945.
- *Yoga Śāstra*. Translated by Upendranath Mukhopadhyay. Basumati Sahitya Mandir. Basumati Press. Calcutta, 1358 B.S.
- *Yoga: A Scientific Evaluation*, By Kovoor. T. Behanan, New York. The Macmillan Co. 1937.
- *Yoga: Immortality and Freedom*, By M.S. Eliade (Trans) williard R. Trask. Bollingen Series LXI, New York: Pantheon Books, 1958.
