

Yoga-Mīmāṃsā

Vol. IX, No. 4, April, 1967. pp. 23-41,

Sāṃkhya and Yoga *

by

Dr. C. T. KENGHE

From very old times, the words Sāṃkhya and Yoga go hand in hand. The words can be found even in the Vedic Sāṃhitā texts. However, as they have been used in altogether different meanings — Sāṃkhya as the name of a Ṛṣi and Yoga in its etymological sense of 'connection' — we need not discuss these passages here. From the time of the Upaniṣads, however, we can see the technical usage of these words in philosophy. As the word Kapila, the name of the traditional founder of the Sāṃkhya system, has been mentioned even in the Ṛgveda and the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad, many scholars are led to believe that the Sāṃkhya and also Yoga systems of thought were founded even before the time of the metrical Upaniṣads. Let us, therefore, see first in brief whether Kapila mentioned in the Vedic literature can be identified with the founder of the Sāṃkhya system.

The word Kapila occurs in a stanza¹ in the tenth Maṇḍala of the Ṛgveda and also in a Vāḷakhilya² hymn. Śāyaṇācārya³ in his commentary seems to believe that Kapila mentioned in the Ṛgveda was identical with the great founder of the Sāṃkhya

* A paper read at a Seminar in Kaivalyadhama on 11-1-1964

The transliteration of the Sanskrit references is given at the end of the article.

1. दशानामेकं कपिलं समानं तं हिन्वन्ति ऋतवे पाययि ।
गर्भं माता सुधितं वक्षणास्ववेनन्तं तुषयन्ती बिभर्ति ॥ RV. X-XVII, 17
2. अगस्तिर्माध्वश्चैव मुचुकुन्दो महामुनिः ।
कपिलो मुनिरास्तीकः पञ्चैते सुखशायिनः ॥ Khila II, 1.7
3. कपिलम् एतन्नामानं तं प्रसिद्धमृषिम् सायण

system. Modern scholars have, however, suggested several other meanings.⁴ Looking to the context, the word Kapila in the tenth Maṇḍala can be better understood as the name of a Marut (Daśanāmekam). Śāyana's interpretation clearly involves anachronism, as there is no evidence in the Ṛgveda to show that the full-fledged Sāṃkhya system had evolved in that remote past. The reference in the Vāḥkilya hymn is quite vague, though the word Muni coming after it, suggests that it is the name of some sage. Even granted that it is a reference to the founder of the Sāṃkhya system, Kapila cannot be placed in the Vedic age as the very language and metre of the verse evidently show that it is an interpolation of a much later period. Amongst the various recensions of the Yajurveda Saṃhitā, one is named after Kapila.⁵ However, the subject-matter of the Yajurveda can hardly allow us to identify this Kapila with the reputed founder of the Sāṃkhya system. The word Kapila occurs at a few⁶ places in the Brāhmaṇas and the Upaniṣads as an adjective denoting 'tawny-coloured'. However, the most important reference to the word is one in the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad. Scholars like Garbe, Weber and Udayaviraṣastri seem to be quite convinced that Kapila in the Śvetāśvatara refers definitely to the founder of the Sāṃkhya philosophy. According to us, such a meaning is quite out of the context. These scholars seem to have been misled by the word Ṛṣi. But, as Geldner has pointed out the word Ṛṣi is also used in connection with Agni and other deities in the Vedic literature. The Īśāvāsya calls Puṣan, 'Ekarṣi'. The Śvetāśvatara itself calls Rudra, Maharṣi. The line in the Śvetāśvatara where the word Kapila occurs is as follows —

4. For instance R. Shamashastry has understood it as a total solar eclipse called Kapila.

5. कपिल आर्यावर्तदेशे Dr. Raghuvira, Journal of the Vedic Studies, Vol. I, Part II

6. S. B. XIV. 9.4.14; G. B. I. 1.25; T. A. I. 17.1.2 etc.

“ Who feeds the first-born sage Kapila with knowledge
and observed him being produced.”⁷

The context is the description of the Absolute as God. There is absolutely no reason why the Sāṃkhya sage Kapila should be mentioned in this connection. In his commentary on this verse, Śaṃkarācārya first understands the word Kapila to denote the tawny-golden-coloured being and thinks that by it, Hiranyagarbha Brahmā is indicated. This is also the view of the eminent scholars like Max Muller and Deussen and in view of the context and general philosophy of the Śvetāśvatara, it is no doubt the correct view. Śaṃkarācārya has also quoted two similar passages from the same Upaniṣad in support of this view, wherein Hiranyagarbha is mentioned in the place of Kapila in the same context. Śaṃkarācārya has, however, given another meaning of the word Kapila as the first-born sage Kapila and quoted a passage from a Purāṇa in support of it. Udayavira-sastri has tried to interpret it in his favour. Śaṃkarācārya has also discussed the meaning of this verse in his commentary on B. S. II, 1.1. There, he remarks that this reference may be to another Kapila Vāsudeva, who burnt the sons of Sagara. Pandit Udayavirashastri has tried to twist this sentence to read there his favourite view.⁸ – Any way, this passage cannot be taken as a sound proof for the existence of Kapila’s system before the time of the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad.⁹

The same can be said about the Yoga system. Yoga as a practical discipline is, no doubt, very ancient. Even Indus Valley excavations give evidence for its existence. But this need not lead us to believe that it existed as an independent system

7. ऋषि प्रसूतं कपिलं यस्तमग्रे ज्ञानैर्बिभर्ति जायमानं च पश्येत् । S. U. V. 2

8. Cp. Pandit Udayavirashastri : *Sāṃkhya Darśanakā Itihāsa* pp. 12 to 16.

9. For further discussion of the passage Cp. R. D. Ranade : *Constructive Survey of the Upanisadic Philosophy* pp. 186, 187

in the Vedic age. As will be shown later, Yoga was systematized even before Patañjali, the traditional founder of the system who is usually placed in the second century B. C. But in the Upaniṣads, Yoga does not denote a particular system, but the spiritual practice in general leading to realisation. This will be clear from the following discussion.

The words Sāṃkhya and Yoga appear together for the first time in the Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad. The line where these words occur can be translated as follows —

“Knowing that Lord, the cause, that can be attained by Sāṃkhya-yoga, one is freed from all bondages.”¹⁰ Here, Sāṃkhya-yoga’ can be understood either as Sāṃkhya and Yoga or as the Yoga named Sāṃkhya. As this happens to be the solitary reference to the word in the Upaniṣad literature, it is very difficult to fix up its exact purport. However, this can in no way be taken to be a reference to the classical Sāṃkhya system. Unfortunately, the original Sāṃkhya work by Kapila is not extant to-day. From the available evidence especially of the Brahmasūtra, we can say that Kapila had based his system on the Upaniṣads and that the passages from the Śvetāśvatara were also interpreted by the Sāṃkhya teachers in their favour. Again, the word Sāṃkhya had much wider import than Kapila’s system, as can be seen especially from the Gītā and the Mokṣadharmā portions of the Mahābhārata. From these references, as will be shown shortly, we can say that the word Sāṃkhya has the same denotation as the word Vidyā¹¹ in the Kāṭha Upaniṣad.

The Bhagavadgītā is traditionally known as the essence of all the Upaniṣads and is itself called an ‘Upaniṣad’. It is said to be the Brahmanvidyā as well as the Yogaśāstra. Although,

10. तत्कारणं सांख्ययोगाधिगम्यं ज्ञात्वा देवं मुच्यते सर्वपाशैः । S. U. V. 13

11. विद्यामेतां योगविधिं च कृत्स्नम् Kāṭha VI. 18

Kapila's system was already founded in the age of the Gītā, it has still kept up the old wider significance of the word Sāṃkhya. The Sāṃkhya in the Gītā can be said to be the same as the Brahma-vidyā or Vidyā in the Kaṭha Upaniṣad. The influence of Kaṭha on the Gītā is evident from the very fact that over five verses from Kaṭha have been verbally adopted in the Gītā. The words Sāṃkhya and Yoga occur in the Gītā for the first time in the 39th verse of the second chapter. Here, it is said – “ This has been told to you the viewpoint in Sāṃkhya, listen this in Yoga, the viewpoint being connected with which you will abandon the bondage of actions.”¹² This reference to both these words is the most important one in so far as the viewpoints in Sāṃkhya and Yoga have been clearly specified here. It is evident from this verse that the meaning of the word Sāṃkhya must conform with what has been said before this verse and that of the word Yoga what has been said after this verse. A careful study of these verses can reveal that the Sāṃkhyabuddhi explains the why of the Karma problem as distinguished from the Yogabuddhi which expounds the how of the same. Over and again in the course of the Sāṃkhya Buddhi, we meet with the phrases like ‘ therefore, fight, Oh descendant of Bharata ’ or ‘ therefore, you should not grieve ’. Thus, it is evident that the Sāṃkhya Buddhi explains why Arjuna should not grieve and should fight. If we apply a little more scrutiny, we can easily find that the reasons given by the Lord are just the expansion of the three phrases which He had already used earlier, viz., ‘ Anārya-juṣṭa ’, never cherished by the worthy, ‘ Asvargya ’ – debarring from the heaven and ‘ Akīrtikara ’ causing infamy.¹³ Thus, stanzas 11 to

12. एषा तेऽभिहिता सांख्ये बुद्धिर्योगे त्विमां शृणु ।
बुद्ध्या युक्तो यया पार्थ कर्मबन्धं प्रहास्यसि ॥ B. G. II. 39

13. कुतस्त्वा कश्मलमिदं विषमे समुपस्थितम् ।
अनार्यजुष्टमस्वर्ग्यमकीर्तिकरमर्जुन ॥ B. G. II. 2

30 explain how this Kāśmala or weakness of heart is not cherished by the worthy or wise, giving philosophical discussion regarding the nature of the Self and the Non-self. Verses 31 and 32 explain how this weakness is Asvargya or debarring from heaven and verses 33 to 36 explain how it is Akīrtikara or 'causing infamy'. The thirty-seventh stanza summarises the two preceding arguments in the form of a dilemma. Verse 38, however, can not be said to belong to the Sāṃkhya Buddhi proper in so far as it tells in a nut-shell the how of the Karma-problem which properly belongs to the Yogabuddhi. After praising the viewpoint in Yoga, the Lord expounds the attitude of equanimity as the key of performing the actions without incurring any bondage whatsoever. It seems that in the course of the discussion, the Lord put in a nutshell the Yogabuddhi also and then said that he had told the Sāṃkhya Buddhi and was going to expound the Yoga Buddhi. Thus, from this reference, we can safely conclude this much that the Sāṃkhya Buddhi explains the why of the Karma problem and the Yoga Buddhi deals with the how of the same. In other words, the Sāṃkhya contents are argumentative and theoretical while the Yoga contents are explanatory and practical. The word 'Tu' distinguishes the Yoga Buddhi from the Sāṃkhya Buddhi. However, it cannot be said that these two viewpoints or Buddhis are quite opposite to each other. In fact, the Sāṃkhya Buddhi tells that one should do one's duties without any grief or lamentation, but how one can work like that has been explained in the Yoga Buddhi. Thus, these two viewpoints are complementary and not contradictory. However, the commentators find themselves at sea while discussing the meanings of the words Sāṃkhya and Yoga in keeping with the contents of the Sāṃkhya Buddhi and the Yoga Buddhi respectively. The first thing that strikes one in this connection is that all old commentators are agreed in not

including the contents of verses 31 to 38 in the teachings of the Sāṃkhya Buddhi proper. Thus Śāṅkarācārya says ¹⁴ —

“Worldly considerations have been adduced (31 to 38) to dispel grief and confusion, but they do not form the main subject of teaching. On the other hand, it is the realization of the Supreme Reality that forms the main subject-matter of this portion (12 to 30) of the discourse; and this, which has been treated of already, is concluded in verse 39 with a view to exhibiting the division of the whole subject of the ‘Śāstra’.”

Almost all other commentators have followed Śāṅkara in this respect and none has clearly stated that even verses 31 to 38 should also be included in the Sāṃkhya Buddhi. Modern scholars, however, think that the words ‘this’ and ‘has been told’ in this stanza necessarily indicate that the viewpoint explained in the immediately preceding stanza or stanzas is to be understood by the phrase. In fact, all the verses from 11 to 38 are meant by the Lord to be included under the Sāṃkhya Buddhi. The problem is how to make the meaning of the word Sāṃkhya consistent with the contents of all these stanzas.

While fixing up the meaning of the word Sāṃkhya in the Gītā, we can easily eliminate Kapila’s system. Peculiar Sāṃkhya terminology is not at all found in these verses, although it is found elsewhere in the Gītā. Thus, we must accept ‘Philosophical knowledge’ or ‘Knowledge of the Self’, i. e., Brahma-vidyā of the Upaniṣads as the meaning of the word Sāṃkhya. Casually it may also be noted that many Upaniṣadic quotations occur during the course of the Sāṃkhya Buddhi. The ancient commentators have also understood the word in the same manner

14. शोकमोहापनयनाय लौकिको न्यायः ‘स्वधर्ममपि चावेक्ष्य’ (२-२१)
इत्याद्यैः श्लोकैरुक्तः, न तु तात्पर्येण । परमार्थदर्शनं त्विह प्रकृतम् ।
तच्चोक्तमुपसंह्रियते — एषा ते ऽभिहितेति, शास्त्रविषयविभागप्रदर्शनाय ।

deriving the word from another noun *Sāṃkhyā* meaning 'correct knowledge', 'intellect' or 'number'. Most of the commentators have also made it clear that this *Sāṃkhyā* has nothing to do with Kapila's system. As verses 31 to 38 speak of the worldly considerations according to them, they do not include them in the *Sāṃkhyā* *Buddhi* proper. To solve this difficulty, Dr. Belvalkar¹⁵ has suggested that the contents of stanzas 31 to 38 are equally a part of the philosophical knowledge, in so far as they deal with 'Svadharmā' the nature of human beings as the combination of soul and body and that it should equally form a part of philosophy as the discussion of the Self and the Non-self or Body which is contained in the earlier verses. It may, however, be noted here that stanzas 31 to 38 do not directly deal with Svadharmā. The argument in these stanzas explains, as we have already shown, how the weakness of heart is *Asvargya* and *Akīrtikara*. 'Svadharmā' is mentioned only to state that not doing it would debar Arjuna from heaven. Thus we find that the *Sāṃkhyā* *Buddhi* consists of the arguments explaining why Arjuna should not grieve and should fight. As Arjuna was not convinced by mere worldly considerations, the Lord was required to show how his dolour was not justifiable even from the highest philosophical point of view. Owing to these philosophical arguments, used to explain how his weakness was *Anāryajūṣṭa*, the Lord designated all the arguments by a general term *Sāṃkhyā* *Buddhi* according to the canon 'Prādhānyena hi nirdeśa bhavanti.'

A similar controversy can be noted as regards the *Yoga* *Buddhi* as well. Almost all the ancient commentators explain *Yoga* *Buddhi* or *Yoga* as the means of attaining the *Sāṃkhyā* *Buddhi* or *Sāṃkhyā*. Modern scholars – Lokamanya Tilak, Belvalkar and others – however, suppose that the *Sāṃkhyā* *Buddhi* and the *Yoga* *Buddhi* or the *Sāṃkhyā* and the *Yoga* are two altogether different and even opposite things. By 'Sāṃkhyā', they

15. Belvalkar : *The Bhagavadgita* (Introduction) p. XVIII

understand not mere philosophical knowledge, but also Saṃnyāsa or renunciation and contempt for the worldly pleasures, and by Yoga, the Karmayoga or performing one's duties without attachment. Lokamanya Tilak further adds that the Lord was required to explain the Yoga Buddhi as he found the Sāṃkhya Buddhi insufficient for his purpose. It is true that in some other places, as we shall shortly see, the word Sāṃkhya has been used in the sense of a Saṃnyāsīn or the follower of the path of knowledge and renunciation and that the word Yoga also means Karma Yoga in some places in the Bhagavadgītā itself. Here, however, there is not even a hint of any such meaning. There is nothing of Saṃnyāsa or renunciation in the contents of the Sāṃkhya Buddhi. On the contrary, it urges off and on – 'Therefore, fight, oh descendant of Bharata'. The word 'Tu' need not be taken to mean that the Yoga Buddhi is opposed to the Sāṃkhya Buddhi. By understanding the words in the traditional way, we can also understand the significance of the title 'Sāṃkhya Yoga' given to the second chapter. Thus, after having explained the Yoga Buddhi or the means of attaining the Sāṃkhya Buddhi in stanzas 38 to 53, the Lord proceeds to describe the person who has perfected himself through the Yoga Buddhi and reached the Sāṃkhya Buddhi. He has been designated Sthitaprajñā. If we correctly understand this relation of the Yoga Buddhi and the description of Sthitaprajñā with the Sāṃkhya Buddhi, then the title Sāṃkhyayoga becomes quite intelligible. If on the other hand, it is presumed that the Sāṃkhya Buddhi has been rejected in this chapter in preference to the Yoga Buddhi, the title becomes a misnomer. The oneness of the Sāṃkhya and Yoga stated in the fifth Adhyāya can also be better explained with this assumption.

The words Sāṃkhya and Yoga occur again in the third chapter of the Gītā. Here, the Lord says —

“In this world a twofold path was expounded by me in the past, O sinless one, that of Sāṃkhyas by devotion to knowledge and that of Yogins by devotion to actions.”¹⁶

Here, the main point of controversy is regarding the significance of the word ‘purā’ ‘in the past’. It is generally understood to refer to the Sāṃkhya Buddhi and the Yoga Buddhi mentioned in the second chapter. Such an explanation makes redundant, however, the words ‘in the past’ and ‘in this world’. The word ‘purā’¹⁷ is used in the Gītā elsewhere in the sense of a ‘distant past’ or the time of creation, and the tradition from the creation of the earth described in the fourth chapter justifies Śaṅkarācārya’s interpretation of the word as ‘at the beginning of creation’. Of course, it’s apart that Arjuna might not have understood this significance here. The word Sāṃkhya is used here in the derivative form to denote a person who follows the path of knowledge as distinguished from a Yogin, the follower of the path of actions. The path of knowledge includes renunciation or Saṃnyāsa. However, it should be remembered that Saṃnyāsa has nothing to do with the primary sense of the word. Lokamanya Tilak’s¹⁸ suggestion that the word Sāṃkhya must have been originally applied to Kāpila ascetics and later on might have been used in a general sense of an ascetic is not tenable in so far as the word Sāṃkhya is older than Kapila himself and in the Bhagavadgītā, the word Sāṃkhya does nowhere refer to Kapila’s system.

16. लोकेऽस्मिन् द्विविधा निष्ठा पुरा प्रोक्ता मयाऽनघ ।

ज्ञानयोगेन सांख्यानं कर्मयोगेन योगिनाम् ॥ B. G. III. 3

17. सह्यजाः प्रजाः सृष्ट्वा पुरोवाच प्रजापतिः ॥

अनेन प्रसविष्यध्वमेष वोऽस्त्विष्टकामधुक् ॥ B. G. III. 10

18. Gītārahasya (English Translation) p. 207

The next reference to be considered occurs in the fifth chapter of the Bhagavadgītā. The word Sāṃkhya appears three times in the following two ¹⁹ stanzas.

“ Fools, not the wise, speak of Sāṃkhya and Yoga as distinct. He who is rightly devoted to even one obtains the fruit of both. ”

“ That state which is reached by Sāṃkhyas is reached by the Yogas as well. He sees, who sees Sāṃkhya and Yoga as one. ”

The stanzas propound the unity of the Sāṃkhya and the Yoga. Now, in what sense is this unity to be understood? The Gītā says that both the followers of the Sāṃkhya and those of the Yoga reach the same goal. Are these then two distinct paths leading to the same goal or different stages on the same path? Although the first contention may look likely, at the first sight, a little more thinking can reveal that the unity so emphatically asserted by the Bhagavadgītā cannot be said to rest on this much ground. Again, the very next stanza states that Sāṃkhya or Sāṃnyāsa, which is its equivalent here, is very hard to be attained except through Yoga. Thus, it can be said that Yoga is the practice, which enables the aspirant to understand the Sāṃkhya which is the theory of Reality. It is, therefore, that Mahābhārata declares off and on that whatever the Yogas directly perceive that is argued out by the Sāṃkhyas ²⁰.

The word Sāṃkhya occurs at two more places in the Bhagavadgītā. In the thirteenth chapter ²¹ it clearly denotes the path of

19. सांख्ययोगौ पृथग्वालाः प्रवदन्ति न पण्डिताः ।
एकमप्यास्थितः सम्यग्भयोर्विन्दते फलम् ॥
यत्सांख्यैः प्राप्यते स्थानं तद्योगैरपि गम्यते ।
एकं सांख्यं च योगं च यः पश्यति स पश्यति ॥ B. G. V. 4,5

20. यदेव योगाः पश्यन्ति सांख्यैस्तदनुमीयते । M. Bh. S. P.

21. B. G. XIII-24

knowledge. In the eighteenth chapter, however, a quotation is given from the Sāṃkhya kṛtānta.²² As the ideas mentioned in the quotation cannot be traced to Kapila's system, the Sāṃkhya Kṛtānta may be understood as Jñāna Siddhānta in general or it might be a reference to some obsolete Sāṃkhya theory.

The word Yoga has a very frequent occurrence in the Bhagavadgītā. It is derived from the root Yuj and primarily signifies the connexion or union of two things. Secondarily, however, it denotes the different practices which lead to the union. Let us fix up the primary meaning of the word by answering the question whose union the Yoga is. This can be done with the help of the definitions of Yoga, given by the Bhagavadgītā itself. Three sentences in the Gītā are generally considered to be the definitions of Yoga. But, the only one among them viz. "Samatvaṃ Yoga ucyate,"²³ is a clear-cut definition and the other two can be easily understood in its light. Thus, one of the other definitions viz. "Yogaḥ Karmasu Kauśalam,"²⁴ occurs just after two stanzas and hence, Kauśala in this verse can mean nothing but 'Samatva' spoken of in a previous stanza. The last definition gives the derivation of the word Yoga by resorting to what is known as Viparītalakṣaṇa. Yoga is here said to be the dissociation from the association with pain. This dissociation²⁵ can be achieved, evidently, through 'Samatva' or equanimity only. This becomes more clear from the question of Arjuna viz. 'Yoyam Yogastvayā Proktassāmyena Madhusūdana'²⁶. Hence, the word Yoga in the Gītā primarily signifies equanimity 'Samatva', for, as the Gītā says, in that state of mind alone, there is always the union with Brahman or 'the Supreme Self' (Nir-doṣm hi samam Brahman tasmād Brahmani te sthitāḥ²⁷). This union results

22. B. G. XVIII-13

23. B. G. II-48

24. B. G. II-50

25. तं विद्याद्दुःखसंयोगवियोगं योगसंज्ञितम् । B. G. VI-23

26. B. G. VI-33

27. B. G. V-19

into the highest knowledge of reality or realisation which is called by the term Sāṃkhya. The Gītā as stated in the colophon, is a Brahma-vidyā or the lore of Brahman as well as the Yoga-śāstra or the science of Yoga. Now, this lore of Brahman is just the same as the knowledge of Reality or Sāṃkhya intended by the Bhagavadgītā. Thus, it is true as Garbe says, that the Gītā is a Sāṃkhya-Yoga treatise, but Sāṃkhya and Yoga have much wider significance in the Bhagavadgītā and there is no need of resorting to the theory of interpolations.

We have dwelt upon the Sāṃkhya and Yoga in the Gītā at a greater length as they throw good light upon the original meanings of the words in Indian Philosophy. It is regrettable that not understanding these meanings correctly, after studying fully the Sāṃkhya and Yoga in the Mokṣadharmapāṇḍita portion, scholars like Jayadeva Yogendra have found Garbe's theory as the only resort.²⁸ No doubt, Kapila had founded his system and Yoga also was systematised even before the age of the Gītā and the Mahābhārata, but these systems had some fundamental differences from the systems that are known from Īśvarakṛṣṇa's Sāṃkhyakārikā or Patañjali's Yogasūtra. Both these systems have undergone a very long course of development.

From the available data, the date of Kapila can be roughly fixed up between 1000 B. C. to 800 B. C. In the age of the Buddha, the Sāṃkhya Yoga ideas were already in the air and most probably the birth place of Buddha is known after Kapila, the founder of the Sāṃkhya system. Arāḍa Kālāma, one of the early teachers of Buddha was a follower of this system. Yāska's Nirukta²⁹ clearly refers to the Sāṃkhya Yoga system. The Maitri Upaniṣad and the Jaina works quote from the early

28. Cp. *Samkhya and Yoga in the Mokṣadharmapāṇḍita of the Mahābhārata* by Yogendra Jayadeva.

29. सांख्य योगं समभ्यस्येत् पुरुषं वा पञ्चविंशकम् Nir. XIV-6

Sāṃkhya works.³⁰ The Bhagavadgītā also refers to Kapila Muni as the foremost amongst the Siddhas.³¹ It may be noted that in the Sāṃkhya tradition also Kapila is known as Ādisiddha and Muni. The Bhagavadgītā calls the Sāṃkhya system by the name Guṇasāṃkhyāna.³² In the Śāntiparvan the Sāṃkhya is also called Parisāṃkhyana darśana.

Here, I specially want to stress two fundamental differences of Kapila's system from that of Īśvarakṛṣṇa for bringing out the relation between the original Sāṃkhya and the original Yoga. Firstly, Kapila's Sāṃkhya believed in Īśvara as one Viśva Puruṣa even while accepting many Puruṣas. In the Śāntiparvan, the views of the Sāṃkhya and the Yoga have been many times discussed. At times, the Puruṣa, as individual Puruṣa, is referred to as the twenty-fifth principle and at times the twenty-sixth Puruṣa has been referred to as the cosmic Puruṣa. But nowhere has this been said to be the differentia of Yoga.³³ While declaring the unity of the Sāṃkhya and the Yoga, in the fashion of the Gītā, the Śāntiparvan many times mentions that whatever the Yogas see that is argued out by the Sāṃkhyas or that the Yogas rely on the direct perception whereas the Sāṃkhyas rely on the śāstra.³⁴ Thus, the apparent difference between the Sāṃkhya and Yoga is only this much that the Sāṃkhya represents the theoretical aspect and the Yoga, the practical aspect of the same Vedic philosophy. However, Īśvara or Puruṣa was not accepted as the

30. The problem of the original Sāṃkhya has been fully discussed by the author in his thesis '*Sāṃkhya of the Bhagavadgītā and the System of Īśvarakṛṣṇa*'.

31. B. G. X-26

32. B. G. XVII-19

33. In this respect I should like to invite special attention to Prof. Bedekar's article '*Theism is no Differentia of Yoga*' – *Oriental Thought* Vol. V, No. 1 pp. 12 to 25.

34. प्रत्यक्षहेतवो योगाः सांख्याः शास्त्रविनिश्चयाः Mbb. S. P. 289-7

cause or active creator of the universe in the Sāṃkhya Yoga system. As can be seen from the Brahmasūtra,³⁵ the main objections of the Sāṃkhya and Yoga for this contention were that Puruṣa or Brahman cannot be the cause—because the universe is different in nature from Brahman or Puruṣa and if Īśvara is accepted as the active creator, He becomes subject to cruelty and partiality. The second important difference of Kapila's system lies in the acceptance of separate individual Prakṛti for each Puruṣa, together with one Cosmic Prakṛti. The Yogasūtra³⁶ IV-3 clearly refers to the individual Prakṛtis in plural, Īśvarakṛpā, however, mentions only one Cosmic Prakṛti. In this connection, special attention may be invited towards the following passage from the Yuktidīpaka³⁷ – 'For each Puruṣa a separate Pradhāna serves the purpose of body etc., and in their case when the original Pradhāna, of the body of the great soul, starts functioning then start others as well and when it ceases others also cease—thus thinks Sāṃkhyācārya Paurika'. It may be noted that it is in the same context of serving the purpose of individual body etc., that many Prakṛtis have been mentioned in the Yogasūtra. That this was the view of the original Sāṃkhya becomes clear from the following passage from the Śaṅkara's Samuccaya³⁸ – 'The original Sāṃkhyas speak of a separate Pradhāna for each individual soul, the later Sāṃkhyas, however, contend that there is one eternal Pradhāna among all individual souls.' It may further be mentioned that though the original Sāṃkhya

35. Cp. B. S. II-14; II-1-34

36. निमित्तमप्रयोजकं प्रकृतीनां वरणभेदस्तु ततः क्षत्रिकवत् Y. S. IV-3

37. प्रतिपुरुषमन्यत्प्रधानं शरीराद्यर्थं करोति । तेषां च माहात्म्यशरीरप्रधानं यदा प्रवर्तते तदेतराण्यपि, तन्निवृत्तौ च तेषामपि निवृत्तिरिति पौरिकः सांख्याचार्यो मन्यते ।

38. मौलिक्यसांख्या ह्यात्मानमात्मानं प्रति पृथक् प्रधानं वदन्ति, उत्तरे तु सांख्याः सर्वात्मस्वप्येकं नित्यं प्रधानमिति प्रपन्नाः ।

also was mainly based on reason – Brahmasūtra calls the Sāṃkhya Prakṛti by the terms Aśabda, Anumāna, Ānumānika – even then it is evident from the Brahmasūtra that it had also tried to interpret several Vedic texts in its favour.

Thus, originally – even as the system – Sāṃkhya and Yoga were almost one. Unfortunately, we do not get any reliable information regarding the founder of the original Yoga – he is said to be Hiranyagarbha or Maheśvara. However, before Patañjali and Īśvarakṛṣṇa, several Yoga and Sāṃkhya teachers had expressed varied opinions on the subject, as can be seen from the Mahābhārata, Yuktidīpikā and other works.

It seems, in the age of Kautilya, already some rift had arisen between Sāṃkhya and Yoga; for, Kautilya³⁹ mentions Sāṃkhya and Yoga separately under Ānvīkṣikī. Several metaphysical differences between Sāṃkhya and Yoga have been mentioned by Vātsyāyana in his commentary on the Nyāyasūtra. Many scholars understand Yoga, here, in the sense of the Nyāya or Vaiśeṣika system. According to Jacobi, however, Vātsyāyana refers here to the original Yoga. Vātsyāyana⁴⁰ gives as the specific contentions of Sāṃkhya – ‘The Non-being does not come to exist, the Being does not cease to exist, there is no difference in the conscious beings, difference lies in body, senses, mind, subjects and their respective causes.’ This is quite in keeping with the current Sāṃkhya views. Regarding the Yoga view, however, he says – ‘The creation of elements is due to the actions etc., of the Puruṣas, the Doṣas and Pravṛtti are the

39. सांख्यं योगो लोकायतिकं चेत्यान्वीक्षिकी Arthasastra

40. यथा नासत आत्मलाभः न सत आत्महानं निरतिशयाश्चेतनाः देहेन्द्रियमनःसु विषयेषु तत्कारणेषु च विशेष इति सांख्यानाम् । पुरुषकर्मादिनिमित्तो भूत-सर्गः कर्महेतवो दोषाः प्रवृत्तिश्च, स्वगुणविशिष्टाश्चेतनाः असदुत्पद्यते उत्पन्नं निरुध्यते इति योगानाम् ।

वात्स्यायनभाष्य न्या. सू. I. 1-29

cause of actions, the conscious beings are distinct with their own qualities. Non-being is produced and the product is destroyed.' From among these specific contentions of Yoga mentioned by Vātsyāyana, at least the last one is not acceptable to Patañjali. In all probability, Vātsyāyana knew some earlier Yoga writings; for at another place ⁴¹ he mentions the Adhyātmavidhi consisting of Tapas, Prāṇāyāma, Pratyāhāra, Dhyāna and Dhāraṇā to be known from the Yogaśāstra. Thus, Vātsyāyana might be knowing some other Yogaśāstra. The significant point for us here is that the rift did arise between the system of Sāṃkhya and Yoga.

If we look to the cause of this rift, we can see, that perhaps while facing Buddhism, Sāṃkhya tended towards atheism and also dispensed with the authority of the Veda. From Yuktidīpikā we know that a long drawn out controversy did take place between Sāṃkhya teachers on the one hand and the Buddhistic teachers on the other. It seems that the teachers of Yoga being more reconciliatory in attitude, did not enter into any such controversies. It can further be seen that Patañjali and Vyāsa on the side of the Yoga and the author of the Sāṃkhyaśāradhī on the part of the Sāṃkhya tried to bridge this gulf. Thus, the two systems Sāṃkhya and Yoga are very closely related and their origin and development go hand in hand and the original Yoga did not owe much to Nyāya, Bauddha and Jaina systems as Jacobi ⁴² would believe it.

41. Vatsyayanabhasya. Ns. IV 2-46

42. Cp. *On the Original System of Yoga* by **Hermann Jacobi**, (Bonn), from *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften Phil-Historische Klasse* 1929, XXVI, English Translation (Unpublished) by **Prof. R. D. Vadekar**, summary published in *Y. M.* VIII. 4, a reply to it published in *Y. M.* IX. 2.

— Transliteration —

- (1) Daśānāmekam Kapilam Samānam Tam Hinvanti Krata-
ve Pāryāya, Garbham Mātā Sudhitam Vakṣapāsvave-
nantam Tuṣayanti Bibharti.
- (2) Agastirmādhavaścaiva Mucukundo Mahāmuniḥ,
Kapilo Munirāstīkaḥ Pañcaite Sukhaśāyinaḥ.
- (3) Kapilam Etannāmānam Tam Prasiddhamṣim . . . Sāyapa
- (5) Kapila Āryāvartadeśe —
- (7) Rṣim Prasūtam Kapilam Yastamagre
Jñānairbibharti Jāyamānam ca Paśyet,
- (10) Tatkāraṇam Sāṃkhyayogādhigamyam,
Jñātvā Devam Mucyate Sarvapāśaiḥ.
- (11) Vidyāmetam Yogavidhim ca Kṛtsnam —
- (12) Eṣa Tebhihitā Sāṃkhye Buddhiryoge Tvimam Śṛṇu,
Buddhyā Yukto Yayā Pārtha Karmabandham Prahāsyasi.
- (13) Kutastvā Kāśmalamidaṃ Viśame Samupasthitam,
Anāryajūṣṭamasvargyamakīrtikaramarjuna.
- (14) Śokamohāpanayanāya Laukiko Nyāyaḥ Svadharmama-
pi Cāvekṣya ' — (2-31) Ityādyaiḥ Ślokairuktaḥ, Na tu
Tātparyeṇa. Paramārthadarśanam Tviha Prakṛtam. Ta-
ccoktamupasamhriyate — Eṣa te bhihiteti, Śastraviśaya-
vibhāgapradarśanāya.
- (16) Lokesmin Dvividhā Niṣṭhā Purā Proktā Mayānagha,
Jñānayogena Sāṃkhyānām Karmayogena Yoginām.
- (17) Sahayajñāḥ Prajaḥ Sṛṣṭvā Purovāca Prajāpatiḥ,
Anena Prasaviṣyadhvameṣa Vostviṣṭakāmadhuk.
- (19) Sāṃkhyayogau Pṛthagbālāḥ Pravadanti Na Paṇḍitāḥ,
Ekamapyāsthitaḥ Samyagubhayorvindate Phalam.

-
- (20) Yadeva Yogaḥ Paśyanti Sāṃkhyaistadanumīyate,
 (25) Tam Vidyādduḥkhasaṃyogavīyogaṃ Yogasaṃjñitam,
 (29) Sāṃkhyam Yogaṃ Samabhyasyet Puruṣam vā Pañca-
 vimśakam.
 (34) Pratyakṣahetavo Yogaḥ Sāṃkhyāḥ Śāstraviniścayaḥ.
 (36) Nimittamaprayojakam Prakṛtīnam Varānbhedastu.
 Tataḥ Kṣetrikavat.
 (37) Pratipuruṣamanyatpradhānam Sarīrādyartham Karoti,
 Teṣam ca Māhātmyasārīrapradhānam Yadā Pravartate
 Tadetarāṇyapi, Tannivṛttau ca Teṣāmapi Nivṛttiriti Pau-
 rikaḥ Sāṃkhyācāryo Manyate.
 (38) Maulikyasāṃkhyā Hyātmānamātmānam Prati Pṛthak
 Pradhānam Vadanti, Uttare tu Sāṃkhyāḥ Sarvātmasvapye-
 kam Nityam Pradhānamiti Prapannāḥ.
 (39) Sāṃkhyam Yogo Lokāyatikam Cetyānvīkṣikī.
 (40) Yathā Nāsata Ātmalābhaḥ Na Sata Ātmahānam Nirati-
 śayaścetanāḥ Dehendriyamaṇaḥsu Viśayeṣu Tatkāraṇeṣu
 ca Viśeṣa Iti Sāṃkhyānām, Puruṣakarmādinimitto Bhūta-
 sargaḥ Karmahetavo Doṣāḥ Pravṛttiśca, svaguṇādiviśiṣṭa-
 ścetanāḥ Asadutpadyate, Utpannam Nirudhyata Iti
 Yogānām. — Vatsyāyanabhāṣya, N. S. I.– 1-29.
-