

Appendix no.1 to the Order No. 4.2024

Director of the Doctoral School

**UNIVERSITY
OF THE NATIONAL
EDUCATION COMMISSION, KRAKOW
DOCTORAL SCHOOL**

DISCIPLINE: PHILOSOPHY

MA. Susanta Bhattacharya, PhD. Candidate

Dissertation: “Exploring the Process of Reversal (*Pratiprasava*) and Its
Relation with Liberation (*Kaivalya*) in the *Yogasūtra*”

Supervisor: Dr. hab. Marzenna Jakubczak-Borge, prof. UJ
Associate Supervisor: Prof. Diwakar Acharya, University of Oxford

Kraków, 2026

Załącznik nr 1 do Zarządzenie nr 4.2024

Dyrektora Szkoły Doktorskiej

**UNIwersYTET KOMISJI EDUKACJI NARODOWEJ
W KRAKOWIE
SZKOŁA DOKTORSKA**

DYSCYPLINA: FILOZOFIA

MA. Susanta Bhattacharya, PhD. Candidate

**Tytuł Rozprawy: “Analiza procesu odwrócenia (*pratiprasava*) i jego związku z
wyzwoleniem (*kaivalya*) w Jogasūtrach”**

**Promotor: Dr. hab. Marzenna Jakubczak-Borge, prof. UJ
Promotor pomocniczy: Prof. Diwakar Acharya, University of Oxford**

Kraków, 2026

Susanta Bhattacharya

Kraków, dnia/date 14.04.2026

imię, nazwisko/ name

OŚWIADCZENIE/ DECLARATION

Świadomy/a odpowiedzialności oświadczam, że przedłożona rozprawa doktorska pt.:
Aware of my responsibility, I declare that the submitted dissertation entitled:

“Exploring the Process of Reversal (*Pratiprasava*) and Its Relation with Liberation (*Kaivalya*)
in the *Yogasūtra*”

jest mojego autorstwa.

is my own creation.

Jednocześnie oświadczam, że w/w rozprawa nie narusza praw autorskich w rozumieniu
Ustawy z dnia 4 lutego 1994 roku o prawie autorskim i prawach pokrewnych (Dz.U. z 2021 r.
poz. 1062 z późn. zmianami) oraz dóbr osobistych chronionych prawem cywilnym.

At the same time, I declare that the aforementioned dissertation does not infringe upon
copyrights within the meaning of the Act of 4 February 1994 on Copyright and Related
Rights (Journal of Laws of 2021, item 1062, as amended) and personal rights protected by
civil law.

Przedłożona praca nie zawiera danych empirycznych ani też informacji, które uzyskałem/am
w sposób niedozwolony.

The submitted work does not contain empirical data or information that I have obtained by
unauthorised means. Stwierdzam, iż przedstawiona praca w całości ani też w części nie była
wcześniej podstawą żadnej innej urzędowej procedury związanej z zakończeniem kształcenia
w szkole doktorskiej.

I certify that the submitted work, in whole or in part, has not previously formed the basis of
any other official procedure relating to the completion of training in doctoral school.

Susanta Bhattacharya

14.04.2026

.....
Data/date

Podpis doktoranta/ PhD student's signature

Appendix no.3 to the Order No. 4.2024

Director of the Doctoral School

Susanta Bhattacharya

Kraków, dnia/date 14.04.2026

.....
imię, nazwisko/ name

OŚWIADCZENIE / DECLARATION

o zgodności wersji elektronicznej z wydrukiem

on the conformity of the electronic version with the hard copy

Ja niżej podpisany/podpisana* oświadczam, że wersja elektroniczna jest zgodna z wersją papierową rozprawy doktorskiej.

I, the undersigned*, declare that the electronic version is compatible with the paper version of the dissertation.

Susanta Bhattacharya

14.04.2026

.....

Data/date

Podpis doktoranta/ PhD student's signature

Appendix no.4 to the Order No. 4.2024

Director of the Doctoral School

Susanta Btallacharya

Kraków, dnia/date 14.04.2026

.....
imię, nazwisko/ name

OŚWIADCZENIE / DECLARATION

Ja niżej podpisany/podpisana* wyrażam zgodę/nie wyrażam zgody* na udostępnianie mojej rozprawy doktorskiej w wersji papierowej i elektronicznej dla celów naukowych i dydaktycznych.

I, the undersigned, consent/do not consent* to my dissertation being made available in hard copy and electronic format for research and teaching purposes.

Susanta Btallacharya

14.04.2026.....

Data/date

.....

Podpis doktoranta/ PhD student's signature

Acknowledgements (ENG)

First and foremost, I wish to acknowledge with deep gratitude the guidance and inspiration of my first philosophy teacher and mentor, **Dr. Svāmī Medhānanda (also known as Ayon Mahārāj)**, a monk of the **Rāmakṛṣṇa Math and Mission of India**. During the early stages of my philosophical education and research at **Ramakrishna Mission Vivekananda University, Belur, Kolkata**, his teachings, encouragement, and intellectual guidance played a decisive role in shaping my philosophical interests.

I would also like to express my sincere gratitude to my two supervisors, **Dr. hab. Marzenna Jakubczak-Borge**, Philosophy Professor at **Jagiellonian University, Kraków, Poland**, and **Dr. Diwakar Acharya**, Spalding Professor of Eastern Religions and Ethics at the **University of Oxford**, for their constant guidance from the very beginning of my doctoral studies. Their insightful questions, constructive criticisms, and valuable suggestions have greatly enriched this dissertation and guided my research in many important ways.

I am deeply grateful to my parents, family members, and friends for their unwavering encouragement, patience, and support throughout the course of my studies. I would also like to acknowledge the support and assistance of the members of the **Doctoral School** of our university, who have helped me in various ways since the beginning of my doctoral journey as an international student.

Finally, I wish to thank the university for its generous financial support during the four years of my doctoral studies, including scholarships that enabled me to attend conferences, summer schools, and academic programs. I am particularly grateful for the opportunity to spend time as a **visiting scholar at the Oxford Centre for Hindu Studies, University of Oxford**. These visits and academic interactions have been invaluable, contributing significantly to both my academic growth and personal development.

At the end, I dedicate this work to my first philosophy teacher and mentored, revered Svāmī Medhānanda Mahārāj.

Podziękowania (PL)

Zunächst möchte ich mich mit tiefer Dankbarkeit für die Anleitung und Inspiration meines ersten Philosophielehrers und Mentors, Dr. Svāmī Medhānanda (auch bekannt als Ayon Mahārāj), einem Mönch des Rāmākṛṣṇa Math und der Mission of India, bedanken. In den frühen Phasen meiner philosophischen Ausbildung und Forschung an der Ramakrishna Mission Vivekananda University in Belur, Kalkutta, spielten seine Lehren, seine Ermutigung und seine intellektuelle Anleitung eine entscheidende Rolle bei der Prägung meiner philosophischen Interessen.

Ich möchte auch meinen beiden Betreuern, Dr. hab. Marzenna Jakubczak-Borge, Professorin für Philosophie an der Jagiellonen-Universität in Krakau, Polen, und Dr. Diwakar Acharya, Spalding-Professor für östliche Religionen und Ethik an der Universität Oxford, für ihre beständige Begleitung seit Beginn meiner Promotionsstudien. Ihre aufschlussreichen Fragen, konstruktive Kritik und wertvollen Anregungen haben diese Dissertation erheblich bereichert und meine Forschung in vielerlei Hinsicht maßgeblich geprägt.

Ich bin meinen Eltern, Familienangehörigen und Freunden zutiefst dankbar für ihre unerschütterliche Ermutigung, Geduld und Unterstützung während meines gesamten Studiums. Ich möchte auch die Unterstützung und Hilfe der Mitglieder der Doktorandenschule unserer Universität würdigen, die mir seit Beginn meiner Promotionszeit als internationaler Studierender auf vielfältige Weise geholfen haben.

Abschließend möchte ich der Universität für ihre großzügige finanzielle Unterstützung während meiner vierjährigen Promotion danken, einschließlich der Stipendien, die es mir ermöglichten, an Konferenzen, Sommerschulen und akademischen Programmen teilzunehmen. Besonders dankbar bin ich für die Gelegenheit, als Gastwissenschaftler am Oxford Centre for Hindu Studies der Universität Oxford tätig zu sein. Diese Aufenthalte und den akademischen Austausch waren von unschätzbarem Wert und haben wesentlich zu meiner wissenschaftlichen und persönlichen Entwicklung beigetragen.

Abschließend widme ich diese Arbeit meinem ersten Philosophielehrer und Mentor, dem verehrten Svāmī Medhānanda Mahārāj.

Table of Contents:

Abstract.....	14
Introduction.....	18
Aim and Objective of This Study.....	19
Notes on Methodology.....	20
Summary of the Chapters.....	21
Chapter 1: Historical and Doctrinal Foundations of the Yogasūtra.....	24
Introduction.....	24
On the Dating of Yogasūtra.....	25
Early Scholarship on the Dating.....	26
Modern Scholarship on the Dating.....	27
On the Relationship Between Yogasūtra and Vyāsabhāṣya.....	28
On the Structural Integrity of Yogasūtra.....	28
On the Relationship Between Yogasūtra and Sāṃkhya.....	29
On the Relation Between the Yogasūtra and Buddhism.....	33
Group 1: Common Indic Roots Thesis.....	34
Group 2: Direct Buddhist Influence Thesis.....	36
Group 3: Mutual Influence Thesis.....	38
Group 4: Declining Anti-Buddhist Polemics.....	38
Group 5: Buddhist Authorship Thesis.....	39
On the Relation Between the Yogasūtra and Jainism.....	39
Conclusion.....	40
Chapter 2: Introducing the Concept of Pratiprasava and Some of Its Related Concepts... 41	
Situating Pratiprasava in the Yogasūtra.....	41
Literal Meaning of Pratiprasava.....	43
Metaphysical Meaning of Pratiprasava.....	43
Exploring Similar Terms for Pratiprasava.....	45
Some Important Concepts and Their Relation with Pratiprasava.....	46
The Concept of Kleśa.....	46
Avidyā As the Breeding Ground of Other Four Kleśa-s.....	46
Definition of Avidyā.....	47
To Mistake Non-eternal for Eternal.....	47
To Mistake Impurity for Purity.....	47

To Mistake Suffering for Happiness.....	48
To Mistake Nature for Consciousness.....	48
Four Types of Kleśa-s Generated From Avidyā:.....	49
The Concept of Asmitā.....	49
The Concept of Rāga.....	49
The Concept of Dveṣa.....	50
The Concept of Abhiniveśa.....	50
Four Types of States/Conditions of Kleśa.....	51
Prasupta-Avasthā.....	52
Tanu-Avasthā.....	52
Vicchinna-Avasthā.....	53
Udāra- Avasthā.....	53
Concept of Guṇa.....	53
Nature of Guṇa-s.....	55
Function of Guṇa-s/ Prakṛti.....	55
Levels of Guṇa-s.....	57
Viśeṣa Parva (Particular Condition).....	57
Aviśeṣa Parva (Unparticular Condition).....	57
Liṅga Parva (Marked Condition).....	58
Aliṅga Parva (Unmarked Condition).....	58
Guṇa-s as the Source of Twenty Four Tattva-s.....	58
The Concept of Puruṣa.....	62
Nature of Puruṣa in Sāṃkhya Philosophy.....	62
Characteristics of Puruṣa.....	63
Arguments for Puruṣa's Existence.....	63
First Argument As Saṃghātaparārtha.....	64
Second Argument as Trigūṇādiviparyaya.....	64
Third Argument as Adhiṣṭhānā.....	64
Fourth Argument as Bhokṛṭbhāvāt.....	65
Fifth Argument as Kaivalyārthaṃ Pravṛtteśca.....	65
Plurality of Puruṣa.....	65
First Reason as Jananamaraṇakaraṇa.....	66
Second Reason as Ayugapatpravṛtteśca.....	66
Third Reason as Trigūṇyaviparyaya.....	66
The Yogasūtra's Alternate Words for Puruṣa.....	66
Patañjali's Delineation of Puruṣa.....	67
Vācaspatimiśra's Understanding of "Tadākārāpatti".....	69
Vijñānabhikṣu's Understanding of Tadākārāpatti.....	70
Relation Between Pratiprasava and Samādhi.....	71
Samprajñata-Samādhi.....	72
Samprajñata Samādhi with Vitarka State.....	73

Savitarka Samprajñata Samādhi.....	74
Nirvitarka Samprajñata Samādhi.....	74
Samprajñata Samādhi with Vicāra State.....	75
Savicāra Samprajñata Samādhi.....	75
Nirvicāra Samprajñata Samādhi.....	75
Samprajñata Samādhi with ānanda State.....	75
Samprajñata Samādhi with Asmitā State.....	76
Asamprajñata Samādhi.....	76
Relation Between Pratiprasava and Kaivalya.....	76
Relation Between Pratiprasava and Jīvanmukti.....	78
Mention of Pratiprasava in Sanskrit Grammar Texts.....	79
Role of Pratiprasava in Yoga Philosophy.....	79
Conclusion.....	81
Chapter 3: Different Conceptions of Pratiprasava in the Secondary Literature.....	83
Introduction.....	83
On the Historical Interpretations of Pratiprasava.....	84
Vyāsa's Ambiguous Interpretation of Pratiprasava in Sūtra 2.10.....	84
Dominance of Vyāsa's interpretation of Sūtra 2.10.....	86
Bhoja's Denial of Vyāsa's Interpretation of Sūtra 2.10.....	86
On the Nature of Subtle Kleśa-s.....	87
Different Views Regarding the Possibility of Recurrence of Kleśa-s.....	87
Subtle Kleśa-s and the Question of Yogic Agency.....	88
Dagdhabījakaḷpa as Fifth Kleśa.....	89
Different Views on the Meaning of Pratiprasava.....	90
Role of Knowledge in Destroying Kleśa-s.....	91
Pratiprasava as a Cosmological Process in Sūtra 2.2.....	92
Clarification of Vyāsa's Quasi-Cosmological Pratiprasava in Sūtra 2.2.....	94
Interpretations of Cosmological Pratiprasava in Sūtra 2.27.....	95
On the Impossibility of Regeneration of Guṇa-s after Pratiprasava.....	96
Guṇātīta and the Death of the Yogin.....	96
Interpretations of Cosmological Pratiprasava in Sūtra 3.50.....	97
Patañjali's Direct Mention of Pratiprasava and its Interpretations in Sūtra 4.34.....	98
Critique of Historical Interpretations of Pratiprasava.....	98
Contemporary Interpretations of Pratiprasava.....	99
Cosmological Pratiprasava in Some Bengali Commentaries.....	102
Cosmological Pratiprasava in Some English Commentaries.....	103
Epistemological Pratiprasava in the Secondary Literature.....	107
Ian Whicher's Epistemological Interpretation of Pratiprasava.....	107
Taimni's Epistemological Interpretation of Pratiprasava.....	109
Despande's Epistemological Interpretation of Pratiprasava.....	110
Nicolai Bachman's Epistemological Interpretation of Pratiprasava.....	112

Michael Beloved's Epistemological Interpretation of Pratiprasava.....	114
Jaganath Cerrera's Epistemological Interpretation of Pratiprasava.....	114
Pratiprasava as Both Psychological and Cosmological process.....	115
Kenneth Rose's Interpretation of Pratiprasava as Psychological and Cosmological Phenomenon.....	115
Karen O'Brien-Kop's Psychological and Cosmological Interpretation of Pratiprasava...	118
Mikel Burley's Phenomenological Interpretation of Pratiprasava.....	120
Critique of Contemporary Interpretations of Pratiprasava.....	121
Conclusion.....	121
Chapter 4: Exploring the Meaning of Kaivalya in the Yogasūtra.....	123
Introduction.....	123
1. Cittavṛttinirodha -Oriented Kaivalya:.....	123
On the Meaning of Atha:.....	124
On the Meaning of the Yoga as Samādhi:.....	126
On the Meaning of Anuśāsana.....	127
On the Meaning of Citta:.....	130
On the Meaning of Kṣipta-Citta.....	130
On the Meaning of Mūḍha-citta.....	131
On the Meaning of Ekāgra-citta.....	133
On the Meaning of Niruddha-citta.....	134
On the Conducive Mental States for Samādhi.....	134
On the Meaning of Vṛtti.....	137
Five Types of Vṛtti.....	138
On the Meaning of Pramāṇa-vṛtti.....	139
On the Meaning of Viparyaya (error) Vṛtti.....	140
On the Meaning of Vikalpa (imagination) Vṛtti.....	140
On the Meaning of Nidrā (sleep) Vṛtti.....	141
On the Meaning of Smṛti (memory) Vṛtti.....	142
On the Meaning of Nirodha.....	142
On the Meaning of Cittavṛttinirodha.....	143
Understanding the First Four Sūtras (Catuḥślokī) from the Theoretical Perspectives..	143
Understanding the First Four Sūtra-s (Catuḥślokī) from the Practical Perspectives..	146
Cittavṛttinirodha-Oriented Kaivalya in the Sūtra 1.2.....	151
2. Knowledge-Oriented Type of Kaivalya.....	151
On the Relationship Between Puruṣa and Buddhi.....	152
On the Need of Dṛśya.....	154
On the Cosmological Status of Dṛśya.....	155
On the Meaning of Saṃyoga.....	158
On the Cause of Saṃyoga.....	161
On the Absence of Saṃyoga as Kaivalya.....	163
On the Vivekakhyaṭi as Means of Getting Rid of Saṃyoga.....	165

Seven Types of Highest Revelations in Vivekakhyāti.....	173
First Type of Highest Revelation.....	174
Second Type of Highest Revelation.....	174
Third Type of Highest Revelation.....	175
Fourth Type of Highest Revelation.....	176
Fifth Type of Highest Revelation.....	177
Sixth Type of Highest Revelation.....	177
Seventh Type of Highest Revelation.....	178
On the Meaning of Vyāsa's Enigmatic Kuśala.....	178
Knowledge-Oriented Kaivalya in the Second chapter.....	183
3. Purity-Oriented Type of Kaivalya.....	185
Different Views Regarding the Meaning of Purity of Sattva.....	186
Different Views Regarding the Meaning of Purity of Puruṣa.....	189
Different Views Regarding the Meaning of Kaivalya in Sūtra 3.55.....	191
On the Relation of Siddhi with Kaivalya.....	193
Purity (śuddhi) as an Important Theme in Yoga Metaphysics.....	196
Meaning of Purity of Sattva and Puruṣa.....	197
Purity-Oriented Kaivalya in Sūtra 3.55.....	202
4. Pratiprasava-Oriented Type of Kaivalya.....	204
Vācaspati's Interpretation of Sūtra 4.35.....	206
Vijñāna Bhikṣu's Interpretation of Sūtra 4.35.....	207
Vivaraṇakāra's Interpretations of Sūtra 4.35.....	209
Pratiprasava-Oriented Kaivalya in Sūtra 4.35.....	211
Conclusion.....	211
Chapter 5: Interpreting Pratiprasava as an Empirical and Transcendent Process.....	213
Introduction.....	213
Exploring the Epistemological Meaning and Function of Pratiprasava in Sūtra 2.10:.....	214
The Standard Interpretation of Sūtra 2.10.....	215
Pratiprasava as a Yogic Practice.....	215
On the Meaning of Tapas in Sūtra 2.1.....	216
On the Meaning of Svādhyāya in Sūtra 2.1.....	217
On the Meaning of Īśvara-praṇidhāna in Sūtra 2.1.....	217
Kriyā-Yoga as a Yogic Practice of Attenuating Kleśa-s.....	218
Dhyāna As a Yogic Practice for Weakening the Kleśa.....	220
Pratiprasava As a Yogic Practice to Abandon the Sūkṣma- Kleśa.....	222
Is Death Mandatory for the Complete Dissolution of the Kleśa?.....	225
Vyāsa's Interpretation of Sūtra 2.13.....	230
Vācaspati's Interpretation of Sūtra 2.13.....	232
Critical Analysis of Sūtra 2.13.....	238
On the Possibility of Kleśa's Complete Eradication in the Yogasūtra.....	240
On the Use of the Term "Heya" with Epistemological Overtone in the Yogasūtra.....	243

Pratiprasava as a Cosmological Process in sūtra 4.34.....	246
Understanding the Meaning of Sūtra 4.34.....	247
Two Important Parts of Sūtra 4.34.....	247
On the Meaning of Svarūpapraṭiṣṭhā in Sūtra 4.34.....	249
On the Meaning of Praṭiṣṭhā in in Yogasūtra.....	251
Praṭiṣṭhā as Sthairya (stability).....	253
Understanding the Concept of Citiśakti in Sūtra 4.34.....	253
Meaning of Citiśakti in the Sanskrit Commentaries.....	254
The Meaning of Śakti in Yogasūtra.....	255
śakti as Real Power.....	257
On the Definition of Citiśakti.....	258
Two Functions of Citiśakti.....	258
Two Different Definitions of Kaivalya.....	260
Resolving the Conflict of Two Definitions of Kaivalya.....	262
Developmental Stages of Kaivalya.....	263
Stage of Kaivalya - I.....	263
Stage of Kaivalya - II.....	264
Stage of Kaivalya - III.....	264
Stage of Kaivalya - IV.....	265
Stage of Kaivalya - V.....	266
Kaivalya as a Journey.....	266
Emperico-Transcendent Pratiprasava in the Yogasūtra.....	266
Understanding Kāryavimukt and Cittavimukti.....	267
Successive Stages of Cittavimukti-Prajñās.....	268
Two Stages of Liberation.....	271
The Status of the Liberated Yogin's Body and Mind.....	271
The Liberated Body's Function in Kaivalya.....	272
The Refined Apparatus: Mind and Body in Liberation.....	273
The Yogi's Embodied Liberation and Nirmāṇa-Citta.....	274
On the Meaning of Nirmāṇa-citta.....	275
Different Conceptions of Nirmāṇa-Citta in Sanskrit Commentaries:.....	275
Critique of Sanskrit Commentators' View on Nirmāṇacitta.....	278
Nirmāṇa-Citta as Transformed-Citta.....	279
Asmitā as a Feeling of Existence in Mundane World.....	281
Role of Nirmāṇa-Citta.....	282
Two-Stage Process of Liberation in Yoga.....	283
Addressing Potential Objections.....	284
Conclusion.....	286
Appendix 1: Some Remarks on the Significance of this Study.....	287
Dual Nature of Pratiprasava.....	288
Empirical Pratiprasava.....	288

Transcendent Pratiprasava.....	288
Kaivalya as a Dynamic, Multi-stage journey.....	288
Reconciliation of Jīvanmukti and Videhamukti.....	288
Addressing Research Gaps and Unifying Interpretations.....	289
Appendix 2: Raising Questions for Further Study.....	289
1. Detailed Exploration of the Functional Stages of Pratiprasava.....	289
2. In-depth Analysis of Citiśakti and Svarūpapraṭiṣṭhā.....	290
3. Detailed Examination of Cittavimukti and its Mechanisms.....	290
4. Nature and Function of the Liberated Yogi's Body and Mind.....	290
5. Re-evaluation of Nirmāṇa-Citta.....	290
6. Further Nuances in the Purity-Oriented Kaivalya.....	291
Glossary of Key Sanskrit Terms (in English alphabetical order)	
.....	291
Bibliography	
.....	296

Abstract

This study offers a fresh interpretation of the terms *pratiprasava* and *kaivalya*, both of which are central in understanding the soteriological vision of Patañjali's *Yogasūtra*. It argues that any comprehensive understanding of *kaivalya*, the declared goal of classical yoga, necessarily depends on a proper interpretation of *pratiprasava*. Literally, *pratiprasava* denotes the antithesis of creation or birth, implying dissolution, annihilation, or destruction. Philosophically, it signifies the reversal of nature's creative activity, leading to the dissolution of afflictions (*kleśa-s*) in an empirical context (YS 2.10) and the reabsorption of the qualities (*guṇa-s*) in an ontological/cosmological context (YS 4.34). Scholarly interpretations of *pratiprasava* vary widely. They may be broadly grouped into (1) ontological/cosmological readings, which understand it as the dissolution of the physical body and mind, culminating in liberation after death or *videhamukti*; and (2) epistemological/psychological readings, which see it as the dissolution of misidentification of *puruṣa* with *prakṛti*, resulting in liberation while living (*jīvanmukti*). Some contemporary scholars understand *pratiprasava* as simultaneously a psychological and cosmological process. This study argues that *pratiprasava* has a dual nature, functioning as both an empirical (epistemological/psychological) process and a transcendent (ontological/cosmological) one. In YS 2.10, it appears as a yogic practice for the purification of the mind (*citta*) by eliminating subtle *kleśa-s*, whereas in YS 4.34, it refers to the cosmological dissolution of the three *guṇa-s*, culminating in the dissolution of both *citta* and the physical body. These two functions, rather than being contradictory, form successive stages in a single process of liberation. *Kaivalya* is considered the highest stage of a yogi's spiritual journey. Patañjali mentions *kaivalya* five times in the *Yogasūtra*, each context offering nuanced meanings. This study posits *kaivalya* not as a single, instantaneous state, but as a dynamic yogic journey of freedom, comprising distinct incremental stages. These stages may be outlined as follows: 1. *Cittavṛtti-nirodha*-oriented *kaivalya* (*kaivalya* I, YS 1.3): *puruṣa* abides in its original form once all mental modifications have ceased. 2. *Hāna*-oriented *kaivalya* (*kaivalya* II, YS 2.25): characterised by the removal of *avidyā* (ignorance) and the consequent disjunction of *buddhi* from *puruṣa*. 3. *Siddhi*-oriented *kaivalya* (*kaivalya* III, YS 3.50): associated with the absence of "seeds of faults" and supernatural attainments. 4. Purity-oriented *kaivalya* (*kaivalya* IV, YS 3.55): attained when *sattva* (purified *buddhi*) attains parity of purity with *puruṣa*, resulting in embodied liberation (*jīvan-mukti*). 5. *Pratiprasava*-oriented *kaivalya* (*kaivalya* V, YS 4.34): defined as the

reabsorption of the *guṇa-s* to their unmanifest state, culminating in disembodied liberation (*videhamukti*). The study concludes that *pratiprasava* and *kaivalya* are interconnected, and that the dual interpretations of *pratiprasava* provide a coherent framework for resolving apparent contradictions in the understanding of *kaivalya*. Empirical *pratiprasava* the purification of the mind—leads to embodied liberation (*jīvan-mukti*), enabling the yogin to remain in the world while remaining unaffected by *prakṛtic* effects. Transcendent *pratiprasava*, involving complete dissolution of mind and body, leads to disembodied liberation (*videhamukti*), wherein *puruṣa* becomes entirely disentangled from all *prakṛtic* manifestations. This study presents the journey of liberation as sequential—embodied liberation preceding disembodied liberation—without implying the superiority of either state..

.....

.....

STRESZCZENIE (PL)

Celem niniejszej rozprawy jest przedstawienie nowej interpretacji sanskryckich terminów pratiprasava i kaivalya, kluczowych dla zrozumienia soteriologicznego celu Jogasutr Patańdzalego. W dysertacji położony został nacisk na wszechstronne wyjaśnienie pojęcia wyzwolenia (kaivalya), wskazywanego jako cel klasycznej jogi, a także na jego związek z wykładnią pojęcia odwrócenia (pratiprasava). Pratiprasava dosłownie oznacza antytezę stworzenia lub narodzin i implikuje rozpuszczenie, unicestwienie lub zniszczenie. Na gruncie filozofii jogi odnosi się do odwrócenia twórczych działań natury, prowadząc do rozpuszczenia doświadczanych uciążliwości (kleśa; YS 2.10) oraz własności (guṇa) w kontekście ontologicznym (YS 4.34). Proponowane przez uczonych interpretacje pojęcia pratiprasava są zróżnicowane. Ogólnie dzielą się na ontologiczne (rozpad fizycznego ciała i umysłu, prowadzący do wyzwolenia po śmierci, czyli videhamukti) i epistemologiczne (rozpad błędnej tożsamości jaźni (puruṣa) z przyrodą (prakṛti), prowadzący do wyzwolenia za życia, czyli jīvanmukti). Niektórzy współcześni uczeni interpretują to pojęcia również jako proces zarazem psychologiczny, jak i kosmologiczny. W niniejszym opracowaniu dowodzi się, że pratiprasava posiada dwoistą naturę, funkcjonując zarówno jako proces empiryczny (epistemologiczno-psychologiczny), jak i transcendentny (ontologiczny/kosmologiczny). W YS 2.10 pratiprasava jest rozumiana jako praktyka jogiczna służąca oczyszczeniu umysłu (citta) poprzez eliminację subtelnych uciążliwości (kleśa), natomiast w YS 4.34 reprezentuje ona ontologiczne rozpuszczenie trzech guṇ, pociągające za sobą rozpuszczenie citta i ciała fizycznego. Twierdzę, że te dwie odrębne funkcje nie są sprzeczne, lecz reprezentują kolejne etapy procesu wyzwolenia. Kaivalya jest uważana za najwyższy etap duchowej podróży jogina. Patańdzali w Jogasutrach wspomina o kaivalyi pięć razy, a każdy kontekst oferuje nieco inne niuanse znaczeniowe. Niniejsze studium postuluje kaivalyę nie jako pojedynczy, natychmiastowy akt, lecz jako dynamiczną jogiczną podróż ku wolności, obejmującą odrębne, stopniowe etapy. Etapy te obejmują: 1. kaivalyę zorientowaną na powściągnięcie zjawisk świadomościowych (cittavṛttinirodha – kaivalya I, YS 1.3), gdzie puruṣa w swojej pierwotnej formie opiera się na ograniczeniu wszelkich aktywności mentalnych. 2. kaivalyę zorientowaną na porzucenie (hāna – kaivalya II, YS 2.25), definiowaną przez eliminację niewiedzy (avidya) i wynikające z tego oderwanie się intelektu / świadomości intuicyjnej (buddhi) od jaźni (puruṣa). 3. kaivalya zorientowana na jogiczne mocy (siddhi – kaivalya III, YS 3.50), związana z brakiem „nasion wad” i nadprzyrodzonymi osiągnięciami. 4. kaivalya zorientowana na czystość (kaivalya IV, YS 3.55), osiągniana, gdy sattva (tj. oczyszczony

intelekt) i jaźń (puruṣa) są równe pod względem czystości, co prowadzi do ucieleśnionego wyzwolenia (jīvanmukti). 5. kaivalya zorientowana na odwrócenie (pratiprasava - kaivalya V, YS 4.34), definiowana jako odwrócenie gun do ich

pierwotnego, nieujawnionego stanu, prowadzące do bezcielesnego wyzwolenia (videhamukti). Niniejsze studium dowodzi, że pratiprasava i kaivalya są ze sobą ściśle powiązane, a dwojaki interpretacje pratiprasava oferują spójną strukturę do rozwiązywania pozornych sprzeczności w rozumieniu kaivalya. Empiryczna pratiprasava, skupiająca się na oczyszczeniu umysłu, prowadzi do ucieleśnionego wyzwolenia (jīvanmukti), pozwalając joginowi pozostać w świecie, pozbawionym skutków prakṛti. Transcendentna pratiprasava, obejmująca całkowite rozpuszczenie umysłu i ciała, prowadzi do bezcielesnego wyzwolenia (videhamukti), gdzie puruṣa jest całkowicie uwolniony od wszelkich przejawów prakṛti. Ta stopniowa podróż w stronę wyzwolenia jest przedstawiana jako sekwencyjna, z ucieleśnionym wyzwoleniem poprzedzającym ostateczny stan bezcielesny, bez sugerowania hierarchicznej wyższości jednego nad drugim.

Introduction

Pratiprasava is “ the central nerve in Patañjali's system”

Kenneth Rose (2016)

“The word *pratiprasava* encapsulates the entire Yoga praxis and telos”

Christopher Key Chapple (2019)

This study undertakes a comprehensive analysis of these two pivotal concepts within Patañjali's *Yogasūtra*. The rationale for selecting this topic is primarily driven by significant gaps and inconsistencies identified within the existing interpretive literature, both traditional and modern, regarding the understanding of *pratiprasava* and *kaivalya*. Scholars have interpreted *pratiprasava* in varied and often conflicting ways. These interpretations are broadly categorized into cosmological (dissolution of the physical body and mind, leading to liberation after death or *videhamukti*) and epistemological (unmasking of misidentification of *puruṣa* with *prakṛti*, leading to liberation while living or *jīvanmukti*). Some scholars also suggest it as both a psychological and cosmological process, but often without adequate elaboration on how these aspects function coherently. This study aims to provide a unified framework, proposing that *pratiprasava* has a dual functionality as both an empirical (epistemological/psychological) and a transcendent (cosmological/cosmological) process, which are successive stages rather than contradictory ones. *Kaivalya* is considered the highest stage of a yogi's spiritual journey, yet its meaning appears to carry contradictions across different chapters of the *Yogasūtra* where it is mentioned. The study highlights the difficulty of finding a single coherent meaning of *kaivalya* within the entire text. This includes the tension between *jīvanmukti* and *videhamukti*, which traditional scholarship often presents as conflicting forms of liberation. This study aims to resolve these by positing *kaivalya* not as a single, instantaneous state, but as a dynamic, multi-stage journey of freedom. A central premise is that a comprehensive understanding of *kaivalya* is contingent on a proper interpretation of *pratiprasava*. The existing literature lacks a coherent explanation of how these two concepts are interconnected and how *pratiprasava* facilitates the attainment of *kaivalya* in its various manifestations. This study addresses this by using the dual interpretation of *pratiprasava* to provide a coherent framework for reconciling the apparent contradictions in understanding *kaivalya*. Commentators, both traditional and modern, often fail to adequately explain the specific meaning and function of critical terms like "*svarūpapraṭiṣṭhā*" and "*citiśakti*" in the final *sūtra* (YS 4.34), frequently treating them as

mere synonyms for *puruṣa* or *kaivalya* without exploring their unique contributions to Yoga metaphysics. This study seeks to fill this gap by providing a detailed analysis of these terms and their intended functions. This study highlights that commentators extensively describe yogic practices (*sādhana*) leading to *kāryavimukti* (liberation of action/effect), but "fail to adequately explain the means of *cittavimukti*" (liberation of the mind), despite *cittavimukti* being identified as the main reason for *kaivalya*. This study proposes that *pratiprasava* provides the complete and continuous mechanism to dismantle the very structure of the *citta* by eradicating its root afflictions, leading to the successive stages of *cittavimukti* that commentators struggle to fully explain. By addressing these research gaps, this study aims to offer a more unified, coherent, and integrated understanding of liberation within Patañjali's *Yogasūtra*, specifically by clarifying the intricate relationship and progressive stages implied by *pratiprasava* and *kaivalya*.

Aim and Objective of This Study

This study primarily aims to provide an insightful and comprehensive analysis of the concepts of *pratiprasava* and *kaivalya* as presented in Patañjali's *Yogasūtra*. Specifically, it aims to achieve a few specific goals. It offers a unified interpretation of *pratiprasava* by arguing that *pratiprasava* functions as both an empirical (epistemological/psychological) process and a transcendent (ontological/cosmological). It also demonstrates that these two distinct functions are not contradictory but represent successive stages of the liberation process. It also clarifies the empirical role of *pratiprasava* (YS 2.10) as a yogic practice for the purification of the mind (*citta*) by eliminating subtle *kleśa*-s. It elucidates the transcendent role of *pratiprasava* (YS 4.34) as the cosmological dissolution of the three *guṇas*, entailing the dissolution of the *citta* and the physical body. This study posits *kaivalya* not as a single, instantaneous state, but as a dynamic yogic journey of freedom comprising distinct, incremental stages. It identifies and analyzes five different types or stages of *kaivalya* based on their contextual meanings in the *Yogasūtra*. This study also attempts to provide a coherent framework using the dual interpretation of *pratiprasava* to resolve apparent contradictions in the understanding of *kaivalya*. The aim is to reconcile embodied liberation (*jīvanmukti*) with disembodied liberation (*videhamukti*) by presenting them as sequential stages of *kaivalya*, rather than mutually exclusive or hierarchically superior states. The objective of this study is also to address the lack of adequate explanation in traditional commentaries regarding key terms like "*svarūpapraṭiṣṭhā*" and "*citiśakti*" in YS 4.34, providing a detailed analysis of their meaning and function. The intention is also to provide a comprehensive explanation for the

means of *cittavimukti* (liberation of the mind), which commentators often struggle to adequately explain, by proposing *pratiprasava* as a continuous mechanism for dismantling the *citta*'s structure. The other intention is to clarify the philosophical rationale behind Patañjali's choice of specific terminology and to address inconsistencies, such as the varied interpretations of "*kuśala*" in Vyāsa's commentary. In essence, this study aims to construct a comprehensive and integrated framework for understanding the intricate relationship between *pratiprasava* and *kaivalya* in the *Yogasūtra*, unifying diverse interpretations into a coherent philosophy of progressive life.

Notes on Methodology

The objective is to employ a comprehensive interpretive and analytical approach which can mainly be identified as hermeneutical in style. This study also makes use of some philological and historical styles when necessary. This multifaceted approach is designed to rigorously examine and re-conceptualize the meanings of *pratiprasava* and *kaivalya* within Patañjali's *Yogasūtra*, specifically addressing ambiguities and perceived contradictions in existing. For explaining the methodology, four key components are highlighted.

Conceptual and Textual Exegesis:

This study involves a close and detailed textual analysis of Patañjali's *Yogasūtra*. This includes focusing on the *sūtra*-s where *pratiprasava* (YS 2.10, YS 4.34) and *kaivalya* (YS 1.2, 1.3, 2.25, 3.50, 3.55, 4.34) are explicitly mentioned or alluded to. It delves into the literal and philosophical meanings of core Sanskrit terms. For instance, it dissects "*pratiprasava*" by examining the prefix "*prati*" and "*prasava*" and explores similar terms like *nirodha*, *pratibandhi*, *pratipakṣa*, and *pratiśedha* to understand their functional overlaps. It also analyzes key concepts such as *kleśa*, *guṇa*, and *puruṣa* to establish their precise usage within the Yoga system.

Comparative Analysis of Interpretive Literature:

A significant part of the methodology involves a systematic review and critical evaluation of a vast array of both traditional Sanskrit commentaries (e.g., Vyāsa, Vācaspati Miśra, Bhoja, Vijñānabhikṣu, Hariharānanda Āraṇya, Vivaraṇakāra, Nārāyaṇatīrtha) and modern scholarly interpretations (e.g., Ian Whicher, Taimni, Deshpande, Nicolai Bachman, Michael Beloved, Jaganath Cerrera, Kenneth Rose, Karen O'Brien-Kop, Mikel Burley, Feuerstein, Edwin Bryant, Pradeep Gokhale). These interpretations are categorized based on their perspectives (e.g., cosmological, epistemological, psychological/cosmological, phenomenological) and their strengths and limitations are critically assessed.

Argumentation and Resolution of Contradictions:

The core of the methodology involves presenting an original argument for the dual nature of *Pratiprasava* (both as an empirical/epistemological and a transcendent/cosmological process). This study argues that the two functions of the concept of *pratiprasava* in two *sūtra*-s—as an epistemological or empirical process and as a transcendent or cosmological process—are actually the results of two sequential stages of *kaivalya*. This dual interpretation is then used as a coherent framework to resolve apparent contradictions in the understanding of *kaivalya*, which is presented as a "dynamic yogic journey of freedom" comprising distinct, incremental stages (*Kaivalya* I-V). The study actively addresses the long-standing debate on *jīvanmukti* (embodied liberation) and *videhamukti* (disembodied liberation), arguing that they represent sequential stages of liberation rather than mutually exclusive states.

Structured and Progressive Inquiry:

This study follows a structured and progressive unfolding of the arguments across its chapters. It systematically introduces concepts, reviews existing scholarship, critiques various positions, and then builds its own coherent framework. This study also analyze *sūtra*-s from both theoretical and the practical perspective of different yogic and spiritual practices undertaken by the yogin from his or her beginning of *sādhana* (e.g., the first four *sūtra*-s) to gain deeper insights into the practitioner's journey and the philosophical underpinnings.

From a philological perspective, this study have done a close textual and linguistic analysis of the original sources as well. This study also delve into close reading and meticulous textual analysis of specific *sūtra*-s from Patañjali's *Yogasūtra*. This study have performed a linguistic and etymological review of key Sanskrit terms such as *pratiṣṭhā*, *citiśakti*, *heya*, *anuśāsana*, *nirodha*, and *vṛtti* to understand their nuances and implications within the Yoga system. For instance, this study provide a detailed breakdown of the literal meaning of *pratiprasava* by examining the Sanskrit components "*prati*" and "*prasava*" and referencing traditional lexicons like Monier Williams and Vaman Apte. This study has also explored similar terms for *pratiprasava* to differentiate its functionality. Through this rigorous and multifaceted methodological approach, this study aims to provide a unified and more comprehensive understanding of these fundamental yogic concepts, thereby filling critical research gaps in the interpretation of Patañjali's *Yogasūtra*.

Summary of the Chapters

Chapter 1: Historical and Doctrinal Foundations of the *Yogasūtra*

The first chapter is an introduction to the historical and doctrinal foundations of the *Yogasūtra*, highlighting the intense academic debates surrounding its origin, dating, and authorship. While traditional accounts attribute the work to the grammarian Patañjali around 400 BCE, modern researchers suggest a wider range of dates and question whether the text is a unified composition or a "patchwork" of independent parts. A central focus is the complex relationship between Yoga and the philosophy of *Sāṃkhya*, specifically whether Yoga is an independent system or a practical application of the *Sāṃkhya* metaphysics. The source also explores the significant intertextual influence of Buddhism, with some experts arguing that more than half of the aphorisms possess Buddhist roots. Additionally, the text identifies shared ethical frameworks with Jainism, particularly regarding the "great vows" of conduct. Ultimately, the overview presents the *Yogasūtra* as a sophisticated synthesis of various Indian spiritual and philosophical traditions.

Chapter 2: Introducing the Concept of *Pratiprasava* and Some of its Related Concepts

The second chapter introduces *pratiprasava*, detailing its literal meaning as the antithesis of creation or dissolution, and its philosophical significance in Patañjali's *Yogasūtra*. It explores similar yogic terms like *Nirodha*, *Pratibandhi*, *Pratipakṣa*, and *Pratiṣedha*, highlighting their functional overlaps with *Pratiprasava*'s aspects of cessation and reversal. This chapter establishes the close relationship between *Pratiprasava* and various stages of *Samādhi*, viewing them as a progressive journey toward liberation. It also outlines the direct connection between *pratiprasava* and *kaivalya*, the ultimate goal of yoga, and its indirect link to *Jīvanmukti*. Furthermore, this foundational chapter discusses essential concepts for understanding *Pratiprasava* within Yoga philosophy, such as the *kleśa-s* (afflictions like *avidyā*, *asmitā*, *rāga*, *dveṣa*, and *abhiniveśa*) and their four states, the *guṇa-s* (the three constituents of *prakṛti*) and their various levels of manifestation, and the nature and characteristics of *puruṣa* (pure consciousness).

Chapter 3: Different Conceptions of *Pratiprasava* in the Interpretive Literature

Third chapter comprehensively analyzes the diverse interpretations of *pratiprasava* found in traditional Sanskrit commentaries and modern scholarly works. It categorizes these interpretations into several distinct perspectives: the cosmological view, which sees *pratiprasava* as the literal dissolution of the yogin's physical body and mind leading to *videhamukti* (liberation after death), as presented by Vyāsa, Vācaspati, Bhoja, Vijñānabhikṣu, and others; the epistemological view, which interprets *Pratiprasava* as the dissolution of *Puruṣa*'s misidentification with *Prakṛti* or a mental purification process leading to *jīvanmukti*

(liberation while living), as argued by Ian Whicher, Taimni, Deshpande, Nicolai Bachman, and Michael Beloved; and interpretations that view *Pratiprasava* as both a psychological and cosmological process, as discussed by Kenneth Rose and Karen O'Brien-Kop. The chapter also touches upon Mikel Burley's phenomenological interpretation. Through critical analysis, this chapter highlights the various strengths, limitations, and perceived contradictions within these diverse scholarly understandings of *Pratiprasava*.

Chapter 4: Exploring the Meaning of *Kaivalya* in the *Yogasūtra*

Fourth chapter meticulously explores the multifaceted meaning of *kaivalya* as it appears throughout Patañjali's *Yogasūtra*, arguing that it is not a single, static state but a dynamic journey of freedom. It identifies four key types of *Kaivalya*: 1. *Cittavṛttinirodha*-Oriented *Kaivalya* (YS 1.2-1.3): Defined as the *Puruṣa* that abides in its true nature upon the cessation of all mental modifications (*Cittavṛttinirodha*). 2. Knowledge-Oriented *Kaivalya* (YS 2.25): Characterized by the absence of *avidyā* (ignorance) and the consequent cessation of the false conjunction (*saṃyoga*) between *Puruṣa* and *buddhi*, achieved through *Vivekakhyāti* (discriminative discernment), often associated with *Jīvanmukti*. 3. Purity-Oriented *Kaivalya* (YS 3.55): Defined by the equality of purity (*śuddhisāmye*) between *Sattva* (purified intellect) and *puruṣa*, which is attained through the practice of *vairāgya* (dispassion) and results in a state of embodied liberation or a supreme *siddhi*. 4. *Pratiprasava*-Oriented *Kaivalya* (YS 4.34): Presented as the ultimate stage where the *guṇa*-s return to their original unmanifest state (*pratiprasava*), leading to the *Puruṣa*'s establishment in its pure conscious power (*Citiśakti*) and primarily associated with *videhamukti* (disembodied liberation). The chapter concludes that these distinct stages reflect the yogin's progressive achievements along the path to ultimate liberation.

Chapter 5: Interpreting *Pratiprasava* as an Empirical and Transcendent Process

The final chapter presents the dissertation's core argument: *pratiprasava* holds a dual meaning and function within the *Yogasūtra*, serving as both an empirical (epistemological) and a transcendent (cosmological) process. This dual interpretation aims to reconcile the apparent contradictions in the definitions of *kaivalya* as *jīvanmukti* (liberation while living) and *videhamukti* (liberation after death). This chapter first analyzes empirical *pratiprasava* in YS 2.10, where it is understood as a yogic practice for the highest level of purification of the *citta* by systematically removing subtle *kleśa*-s through practices such as *kriyā-yoga* and *dhyāna*. This process, it argues, enables *jīvanmukti* without requiring the cosmological destruction of the *citta* itself. Secondly, this chapter explores *transcendent pratiprasava* in YS

4.34, defining it as an cosmological process involving the complete dissolution of the three *guṇa-s* back into their unmanifest state. This ultimate dissolution entails the disembodiment of the *citta* and the physical body, leading to *videhamukti*, where the *Puruṣa* is established in its pure conscious power (*citiśakti*). By synthesizing these two distinct functionalities, the chapter proposes *kaivalya* as a dynamic, multi-stage journey of liberation, where embodied liberation precedes ultimate disembodied liberation. It also addresses concepts like *cittavimukti* (liberation of the mind) as successive stages caused by *Pratiprasava* and reinterprets *nirmāṇa-citta* as a transformed *citta*. The chapter concludes that this dual understanding of *pratiprasava* offers a comprehensive and coherent explanation for the unfolding of liberation in Yoga philosophy.

.....

Chapter 1: Historical and Doctrinal Foundations of the Yogasūtra

Introduction

The *Yogasūtra* stands as a profoundly influential text within the field of Indology, impacting diverse disciplines such as philosophy, history, grammar, and theology. To fully grasp its significance within the evolution of Indian religious and philosophical thought, it is vital to establish a general understanding of its composition period. However, determining a precise date for the text remains a central subject of scholarly debate, and no definitive consensus has yet emerged. Researchers typically employ various methodologies to investigate this, including linguistic analysis, cross-referencing with other texts, and comparative analysis of doctrines. This chapter provides a comprehensive overview of the historical and textual context of the *Yogasūtra* by examining several critical areas of inquiry regarding authorship and dating, structural integrity, the *Sāṃkhya* connection and the influence of Buddhism and Jainism. Early traditional accounts often identify the author, Patañjali, with the grammarian who wrote the *Mahābhāṣya*, suggesting a date as early as 400 BCE. Modern scholars, however, offer a wide range of dates, with some placing the text between the first and second centuries CE, while others, like Philip Maas, argue for a later compilation around 400 CE. A significant debate exists regarding whether the *Yogasūtra* is a unified work or a "patchwork" of originally independent components. While some scholars argue it consists of four distinct but coherent chapters, others suggest that certain sections, such as the fourth chapter (*kaivalya-pāda*), may be later additions. The relationship between Yoga and *Sāṃkhya* is complex. This chapter explores various theses, ranging from the view that they are a "single system" (where Yoga provides the practice for the *Sāṃkhya* theory) to

the idea that they are "separate systems" that began independently. Many scholars refer to Patañjali's system as *śeśvara-Sāṃkhya* because it adopts *Sāṃkhya* metaphysics while incorporating a theistic dimension. The text shows striking parallels with heterodox traditions. This discussion covers the "common Indic roots" shared by Yoga and Buddhism, as well as arguments for direct borrowing or mutual influence between the two. Furthermore, the chapter highlights shared ethical frameworks with Jainism, particularly the five *yamas* (ethical vows) and the concept of the *mahāvratā* (great vow). By synthesizing these diverse scholarly perspectives, this introduction aims to situate the *Yogasūtra* within its broader historical and intertextual framework, providing the necessary background for further critical evaluation of its philosophical contributions.

On the Dating of *Yogasūtra*

The *Yogasūtra* has been an influential text for scholars across diverse fields of Indology, including historians, philosophers, grammarians, and theologians. To understand the extent of its impact on the development of Indian philosophical traditions and religious thought, it is essential to establish a general sense of the period in which the *Yogasūtra* was composed. Consequently, the question of its dating has long been a subject of scholarly interest and debate among Indologists. From early studies to contemporary research, this issue remains central to situating the text within the historical evolution of Indian philosophy. Although numerous arguments and forms of evidence have been advanced to determine the time of its composition, no scholarly consensus has yet emerged on its precise date.

Given the large number of arguments and the wide range of evidence presented in both early and contemporary scholarship, a separate, dedicated study would be required to examine and critically evaluate these scholarly works in order to determine the probable date of the *Yogasūtra*. Therefore, here I intend to offer only a very brief and general overview of the major arguments and key studies, which will provide readers with the necessary background for situating my thesis within its broader historical context.

At the beginning, it can be noted that scholars of Indology have sought to illuminate the period of composition of the text by employing a variety of methodologies, often differing significantly in both approach and disciplinary orientation. For this general discussion, I briefly outline several of the principal methods that I have identified in my study of various scholarly works and upon which researchers commonly rely. These include: (1) a critical examination of the language of the *Yogasūtra*, which may be described as the 'linguistic analysis method'; (2) a critical study of references, citations, and doctrinal parallels—whether

explicit or implicit—in other Indian philosophical and religious texts, which may be termed the ‘cross-referencing method’; (3) a critical investigation of the manuscripts of the *Yogasūtra* itself, referred to as the ‘manuscriptural evidence method’; (4) a critical analysis of the various commentaries on the *Yogasūtra*, which constitutes the ‘commentarial evidence method’; and (5) a comparative philosophical analysis of the doctrines of *Sāṃkhya* and Buddhist texts in relation to the concepts and teachings of the *Yogasūtra*, which may be described as the ‘doctrinal comparative method’.

It should be noted that the methods outlined above are not employed in isolation as rigid or mutually exclusive approaches. Rather, in most cases, scholars integrate several of these methodologies within a single study. Depending on the nature of the inquiry, these methods may function in an interconnected and complementary manner, though in certain instances they may also operate independently. Therefore, rather than discussing these methods individually, I will provide a historical overview of the dates or periods proposed by different scholars in various time zones.

Early Scholarship on the Dating

Early traditional scholars believed that the *Yogasūtra* was likely composed by the same figure, Patañjali, who authored the commentary “*Mahābhāṣya*” on Pāṇini’s *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, the foundational work on Sanskrit grammar, and was also traditionally associated with a medical text. However, the date of Pāṇini himself remains a matter of scholarly debate. According to George Cardona (1997, p. 261), Pāṇini’s period should not be placed earlier than 400 BCE. On the basis of this traditional identification, it has therefore been generally assumed that the *Yogasūtra* may have been composed after 400 BCE. James Haughton Woods (1914, p. 14) suggested that it may be possible that the author of *Yogasūtra* and *Mahābhāṣya* is the same person and he also cited one verse which tells us that “with hands folded in reverence, I bow to Patañjali, the most excellent of sages, who removed the impurities of the mind through Yoga, of speech through grammar, and of the body through medicine”¹. It is interesting to note that even today’s traditional yoga scholars recite this verse before their classes or lectures to show that Patañjali of the *yoga*, *vyākaraṇa* and medicine is the same person.

¹ *yogena cittasya padena vācām, malaṃ śarīrasya ca vaidyakena,
yo ’pākarot taṃ pravaraṃ munīnām, patañjaliṃ prāñjalirānato ’smi.*

Surendranath Dasgupta (1922, p. 231) also supported the view of Woods by providing a few arguments². Many other scholars also supported the view that a single individual, Patañjali, is the author of these three treatises on yoga, grammar, and medicine. On the other hand, many scholars do not endorse this view, rather they claim that it is not possible to establish a unitary historicity of the author of these three works. Jacobi (1930, p. 25) suggested that *Yogasūtra* was composed as late as the fourth or fifth century CE. Jacobi (1930, p. 25) claims that “at any rate, Patañjali cannot be earlier than the third century A.D”. So, *Yogasūtra* was not composed before the third century A.D. Louis Renou (1940, p. 368–73) showed that *Yogasūtra* and *Mahābhāṣya* are very different in their language, grammar, and vocabulary, indicating that these two works are not the work of the same person³.

Modern Scholarship on the Dating

Even modern scholars cannot find a consensus among themselves on the precise dating of the *Yogasūtra*. Edwin Bryant (2009, p. 34) comments that “Patañjali’s date can only be inferred from the content of the text itself. Unfortunately, most classical Sanskrit texts from the ancient period tend to be impossible to date with accuracy, and there are always dissenters against whatever dates become standard in academic circles. Most scholars date the text shortly after the turn of the Common Era (circa the first to second century), but it has been placed as early as several centuries before that. Other than the fact that the *Yoga-sūtras* were written no later than the fifth century, the date cannot be determined with exactitude”. It is difficult to pinpoint the precise time of Patañjali and his text. Philip Maas is one of the most influential modern scholars who has done serious studies on this issue. Maas (2023, p. 143) claims that Patañjali “lived at some time around the year 400 CE, that is, during the Gupta era, possibly in the western region of present-day Madhya Pradesh. This region may cautiously be inferred as Patañjali’s possible home from two philosophical exemplifications in the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* (1.7, 36) presupposing familiarity and possible geographical vicinity of its author and his intended audience to the Vindhya range and to a great ocean”. According to Maas, *Yogasūtra* was compiled or codified by Patañjali around the 400 CE.

² For the detailed arguments and evidence, please see Dasgupta’s “A History of Indian Philosophy’ (vol 1) from page number”” 231-235

³ For the detail arguments, please see Louis Renou (1940). "On the Identity of the Two Patañjalis". In Narendranath Law (ed.). *Louis de La Vallée Poussin Memorial Volume*. Calcutta. pp. 368–73.

On the Relationship Between *Yogasūtra* and *Vyāsa*

Maas further argues that Patañjali was not only the author of the *Yogasūtra* but also the composer of the *Yogabhāṣya*, an important commentary traditionally attributed to Vyāsa. Maas has conducted extensive research on manuscripts and philology to examine the relationship between the *Yogasūtra* and its classical commentary, the *Vyāsa*, particularly with respect to their textual unity and historical development. The traditional and widely accepted view among scholars is that the *Yogasūtra* was codified or composed by Patañjali, while the *Yogabhāṣya*, a commentary on the *Yogasūtra*, was written by an individual known as Vyāsa or Vedavyāsa⁴. According to this interpretation, the two texts were composed by two different authors. However, there is no scholarly consensus on identifying Vyāsa with Vedavyāsa, the legendary figure traditionally credited with authorship of several important works, including the *Mahābhārata* and other foundational Sanskrit texts. The Sanskrit word “Vyāsa” literally means ‘arranger’ or ‘compiler’. Vyāsa may indicate to any compiler, not only the historical figure Vedavyāsa.

Vyāsa, as the commentator on the *Yogasūtra*, is a highly significant figure who played a crucial role in shaping and systematising the philosophy of yoga. However, Maas argues in a series of studies that Vyāsa is, in fact, identical to Patañjali. According to this view, Patañjali not only codified the *Yogasūtra* but also composed an auto-commentary, the *Yogabhāṣya* (Maas 2013, p. 69).⁵ These two works, attributed to the same author, together form a composite textual tradition of yoga philosophy, which Maas designates as the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra*. This view has received good scholarly appreciation and support in the modern yoga scholarship as an original contribution to the study of the textual history of the *Yogasūtra*⁶. Apart from the question of the authorship of the *Yogasūtra* and the *Yogabhāṣya*, another significant issue concerns whether the *Yogasūtra* constitutes a unified and coherent composite text.

On the Structural Integrity of *Yogasūtra*

There is considerable debate about the structural unity of the *Yogasūtra*. Although many scholars maintain that it is a coherent and unified work that consists of four distinct chapters comprising 195 *sūtra*-s (aphorisms), others argue, based on internal textual evidence,

⁴ See Maas (2013)’s footnote number 8 where he mentions many such scholars for example: Surendranath Dasgupta, Richard Garbe, Mysore Hiriyanna, Louis Renou, Jean Filliozat, Otto Strauss, Giuseppe Tucci, and Moriz Winternitz. There are also other scholars who hold the same view

⁵ See Maas (2006, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2013, 2017, 2018,)

⁶ Maas is the only and the first scholar who had done a critical edition of the first chapter of *Yogasūtra*. Before the Maas, there was no reliable critical edition of the *Yogasūtra*.

that it does not represent a single, unified composition. Many notable scholars, such as Max Müller (1899), Paul Deussen (1920), Richard Garbe (1897), J. W. Hauer (1958), Erich Frauwallner (1953) and Surendranath Dasgupta (1922), claimed that the text is a “patchwork” (Bryant 2007, p. 35). Paul Deussen argues that the text of the *Yogasūtra* comprises four or five originally independent works that were later assembled into a single compilation (Maas 2013, p. 54). Similarly, Johannes Bronkhorst suggests that a single compiler may have gathered several *sūtra*-s from earlier sources, composed additional *sūtra*-s independently, and subsequently combined them into one text (Maas 2013, p. 62). Surendranath Dasgupta maintains that the fourth chapter (*kaivalya-pāda*) of the *Yogasūtra* was a later addition, and that the original text consisted only of the first three chapters (Byant 653).

There are numerous arguments which are based on important observations and critical analyses which concern the structural unity of the *Yogasūtra*, although these positions have also been subject to substantial critique. A thorough evaluation of these claims would require a separate and dedicated study, which lies beyond the scope of this work. Therefore, this study intend to give a brief overview of these issues. The standard interpretation maintains that, despite certain observable internal inconsistencies within its structural framework, the *Yogasūtra* constitutes a coherent and complete work authored by a single figure, Patañjali.

At present, no critical edition of the complete text of the *Yogasūtra* is available, and there is no consensus among scholars regarding the issue of the structural unity of the *Yogasūtra*. Therefore, this study approachs the text as a composite work attributed to a single author, who likely drew upon earlier yogic teachings that existed before, or during, the time of Patañjali. It is possible that he selected certain *sūtra*-s from a larger body of existing material, modified them where necessary to achieve greater grammatical precision, and composed additional *sūtra*-s to clarify and maintain the congruity of the metaphysical notions and yogic practices taught by the yogic philosophy of the time of Patañjali. This interpretation remains purely conjectural, as it is not at all supported by any textual, analytical, or logical evidence. There is another important issue about the originality of the *Yogasūtra* as an independent philosophical school.

On the Relationship Between *Yogasūtra* and *Sāṃkhya*

These categories include, specifically, 1) “the single system thesis”, which holds the view that *Sāṃkhya* and yoga *Sāṃkhya* and Yoga have, from their beginnings, constituted not two distinct systems but, rather, two parts (or halves, aspects, poles, etc.) of a unified enterprise. One part (*Sāṃkhya*) gives primary emphasis to theoretical matters, and the other (Yoga) is

mainly practical in orientation, but both are harmonized within the compass of a theory–practice unity, directed towards a common spiritual goal”. 2) “the divergence thesis” which posits that *Sāṃkhya* and yoga both originated from a single system but had “diverged from one another at some point along a more or less complicated sequence of transmissions, which ‘sequence’ is perhaps better pictured as a bushy plant with multiple branches than as a chain of orderly links. From this view, then, the two classical systems are related to each other more as cousins than as twins” (Burley 2007, p. 39). 3) “the grafting-on thesis” proposes that “classical Yoga is a more artificial construction, amounting to little more than a collection of technical instructions plus a few ad hoc doctrines that have been attached, or ‘grafted on’, to an already existing (presumably preclassical) version of *Sāṃkhya*” (Burley 2007, p. 39). 4) “The separate systems thesis” claims that “*Sāṃkhya* and Yoga began as separate systems and remain so in their classical forms” (Burley 2007, p. 39).

Most of the arguments presented by the scholars probably fit into one of the categories within Burley's fourfold division. It is also possible for a single argument to encompass more than two categories or even all four categories at once. However, I will not linearly address these four categories; instead, I will discuss several key perspectives on the issue of the relationship in a more scattered approach. Many scholars claim that *Sāṃkhya* and Yoga are not distinct philosophical schools. The only difference between these two schools is that yoga accepts the doctrine of *Isvara* (God) while *Sāṃkhya* denies it. This view is supported by a good number of scholars, such as H. T. Colebrooke (1873, p. 2065), M. N. Dvivedi (1934, p. xviii), Garbe (1917, p. 148), Radhakrishnan (1951, p. 342), Eliade (1969, p. 7), and N. Smart (1968, p. 26).

Due to this view, Patañjali's yoga is sometimes referred to as *śeśvara Sāṃkhya*, indicating a belief in God. Some scholars argue that while *Sāṃkhya* and Yoga share fundamental metaphysical principles, they differ in their perspectives on certain philosophical concepts, ethical practices, and spiritual practices. This view is also supported by a good number of scholars, such as Dasgupta (1930, p. 2), F. Catalina (1968, p. 19), K. B. R. Rao (1966, p. 9), and G. Koelman (1970, p. 237). It appears from the above discussion that yoga does not have its own philosophical originality. That is to say, yoga borrowed the entire metaphysics of *Sāṃkhya*.

Dasgupta claims that it was the Patañjali “who not only collected the different forms of Yoga practices, and gleaned the diverse ideas which were or could be associated with the

Yoga, but grafted them all on the *Sāṃkhya* metaphysics, and gave them the form in which they have been handed down to us”. Following Dasgupta's interpretation, many scholars concur that *Sāṃkhya* serves as the complete metaphysical foundation for the yogic practices outlined in the *Yogasūtra*. Patañjali's *Yogasūtra* is completely theoretically dependent on the metaphysics of *Sāṃkhya*, which is why it is sometimes referred to as “Pātañjala-*Sāṃkhya*” (Larson 1987, p. 19)."

On the contrary, some scholars argue that Patañjali's yoga has its originality as a school of thought which cannot be “subsumed under the heading of *Sāṃkhya*” (Feuerstein 1980, p. 10). Feuerstein (1980, p. 10) comments that “Classical Yoga is exactly what its protagonists claim: anautonomous *darśana* with its own characteristic set of concepts and technical expressions. The popular scholarly impression according to which Classical Yoga is some kind of parasite, capitalising on the philosophical efforts of Classical *Sāṃkhya*, is shown to be in need of urgent and radical revision”.

What Feuerstein suggests is that yoga should not be entirely reduced to *Sāṃkhya*. Feuerstein's perspective may seem quite appealing; however, establishing yoga as a fully independent and original philosophy with its own metaphysical foundation without referencing *Sāṃkhya* materials is challenging. This is particularly true until we achieve a clear understanding of the historicity of the two classical texts: the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* and the *Yogasūtra*. Regarding the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* and *Yogasūtra* age, experts are still at odds. While some scholars think that the *Yogasūtra* is older than the *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, the majority of scholars argue that the *Sāṃkhya* philosophy (which is now available only via the earliest text in the form of *Sāṃkhyakārikā*) is older than the *Yogasūtra*. Whicher thinks that *Yogasūtra* (second-third century CE) is probably older than the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* (ca. 400 CE), while Larson believes that *Sāṃkhyakārikā* (ca. 350-450 CE) predates *Yogasūtra* (ca. 400-500 CE)⁷. Based on his assumption that yoga philosophy is a school of *Sāṃkhya*, Larson characterises *Yogasūtra* as Pātañjala-*Sāṃkhya*.

A further question arises: which of these traditions borrowed from the other? Although a definitive answer remains elusive, it might be possible to address this issue if the relative historical priority of the two texts could be firmly established. If the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* were shown to be earlier, one might argue that the *Yogasūtra* drew upon *Sāṃkhya* doctrines; conversely, if the *Yogasūtra* were demonstrably older, it could be suggested that *Sāṃkhya*

⁷ These datings are given by these two scholars themselves.

appropriated elements from the yogic tradition. However, the precise dating of these texts remains uncertain. Most scholars maintain that the *Yogasūtra* incorporates *Sāṃkhya* concepts, many of which are believed to predate the systematic formulation of *Sāṃkhya* philosophy in the *Sāṃkhyakārikā*. It is therefore often considered probable that the *Yogasūtra* represents a later development, or at least that the metaphysical doctrines associated with *Sāṃkhya*—codified in ancient India and now largely preserved only in later sources—are older than the *Yogasūtra*. This view is closely connected with the widespread scholarly assumption that *Sāṃkhya* represents one of the most ancient philosophical traditions of India.

Although it seems true that *Sāṃkhya* is arguably the oldest, it is not entirely clear whether this *Sāṃkhya* is Isvarakrishna's *Sāṃkhya* or the ancient *Sāṃkhya* that is now lost. From the methodological point of view, *Sāṃkhyakārikā* and *Yogasūtra* have different approaches. While *Sāṃkhyakārikā* is more focused on explaining the metaphysical theory of ultimate reality (*kaivalya*), yoga focuses on providing the description or guidance in the yogic and spiritual practices to reach that ultimate reality (*kaivalya*). This view has been convincingly supported by the majority of scholars. For example, Feuerstein (1980, p. 113) states that “whereas Classical *Sāṃkhya* relies heavily on the power of ratiocination and discernment, Classical Yoga, like any other yogic tradition, is founded on a philosophy which encourages personal experimentation and direct “mystical” verification”. In defense of his comment, Feuerstein quotes a popular verse from *Mahābhārata* which says that “the methods of Yoga are based on direct perception (*pratyakṣa*), whereas the *Sāṃkhya* systems are determined by scriptural authority (*śāstraviniścaya*). My dear Yudhishtira, I (Bhīṣma) consider both of these views to be established in truth”⁸ (*pratyakṣahetavo yogāḥ sāmkyāḥ śāstraviniścayāḥ, ubhe caite mate tattve mama tāta yudhiṣṭhira*). Whicher (1998, p. 53) also holds the view that *Sāṃkhya* stresses “a theoretical/intellectual analysis, whereas yoga “emphasises the necessity of personal experimentation and practical meditational techniques” in the pursuit of ultimate reality.

Even if it is acknowledged that the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* and the *Yogasūtra* share a common metaphysical framework and draw extensively upon earlier *Sāṃkhya* traditions in developing their philosophical systems, an important question still remains: why do they differ so markedly in their methodological approaches, and why does the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* adopt a non-theistic position, whereas the *Yogasūtra* incorporates a theistic dimension in its

⁸ *Mahābhārata* verse xii 289.7: (*pratyakṣahetavo yogāḥ sāmkyāḥ śāstraviniścayāḥ, ubhe caite mate tattve mama tāta yudhiṣṭhira*)

theological outlook? To put it another way, what was the source of inspiration that led Īśvarakṛṣṇa and Patañjali to articulate the same goal of *kaivalya* through two markedly different approaches? A plausible explanation is that their respective philosophical orientations were shaped by their own intellectual creativity, doctrinal commitments, and experiential insights. These factors may have contributed to the divergence in their methods and practices, enabling them to develop distinct philosophical perspectives, even while drawing upon the shared heritage of ancient *Sāṃkhya* teachings.

Another possibility is that the ancient *Sāṃkhya* teachings regarded both theoretical knowledge and practical knowledge as equally essential for the realization of ultimate reality, assigning them the same level of importance within a unified spiritual framework. That is why the early *Sāṃkhya* integrated both theoretical knowledge and experiential practice within a single philosophical framework, presenting them as complementary and valid paths to the attainment of the ultimate goal. Such an early form of *Sāṃkhya* may also have acknowledged the concept of God, though perhaps not in the sense of a deity endowed with omnipotent attributes such as creator, preserver, or destroyer of the world.

In this respect, ancient *Sāṃkhya* may have exhibited a flexible and holistic orientation. Over time, however, its followers may have come to privilege one of these approaches over the other, adopting and propagating it among their disciples as the preferred path. Through this process, two distinct schools of thought gradually emerged. While their later codified forms differ in significant respects, their common source, which is ancient *Sāṃkhya* may originally have embraced both approaches without hesitation as authentic means to spiritual realization. This is my pure speculation without any kind of textual or historical evidence. In addition to the complex relationship between *Sāṃkhyakārikā* and *Yogasūtra*, there is another important issue that has drawn the attention of scholars, namely the influence of Buddhism and *Yogasūtra* on each other.

On the Relation Between the *Yogasūtra* and Buddhism

A cursory comparative study of the *Yogasūtra* (in some cases, *Vyāsabhāṣya*) and selected Buddhist texts reveals certain similarities in terminology, doctrinal formulations, and metaphysical perspectives. These parallels have prompted numerous scholarly claims concerning the relationship between the *Yogasūtra* and Buddhism more broadly. For a very brief and general introduction to this issue and in examining a range of views from different

scholars, I organise these popular claims and arguments into distinct sections, grouping them by the specific focus of their analyses. These categories are outlined below:

Group 1: Common Indic Roots Thesis

Some scholars acknowledge that the *Yogasūtra* exhibits notable similarities with certain Buddhist terms, concepts, doctrines, and spiritual practices. However, they argue that these parallels do not necessarily indicate direct borrowing from Buddhism. Rather, such similarities are understood as arising from shared Indic religious, spiritual, and yogic traditions that developed within a broader pan-Indian cultural context. I refer to this position as the “common Indic roots thesis”. This view is directly or indirectly supported by many scholars, including Émile Senart, Hermann Oldenberg, Nathan Söderblom Heiler, Louis de La Vallée Poussin, Johannes Bronkhorst (later work), and Geoffrey Samuel.

Karen O’Brion Kop (2022, p. 2) comments that “Senart was one of the first Western scholars to write about Buddhist elements in the *Yogasūtra* (Senart 1900), asserting that Buddhism itself evolved out of a proto-yoga tradition (Senart 1900: 348)”. By “proto-yoga tradition” he indicates the original or ancient yogic tradition before the period of *Yogasūtra* and Buddhism. His main thesis is that the similar concepts, terms or practices which are found in both yoga and Buddhism are not the result of borrowing ideas of yoga from Buddhism, because even Buddhism itself is rooted in a common ancient Indian heritage of yogic philosophical practices. He provides many interesting textual and conceptual pieces of evidence for his claim, which cannot be analysed here in detail due to the paucity of space and scope of our present study.

Senart shows that yogic *yama* and *niyama* (yogic ethical rules) have conceptual similarities with the Buddhist concept of *śīla* (ethical conduct) (Karen O’Brion Kop 2022, p. 2). Senart shows that the *jhana*-s (four *dhyāna*-s/meditations) of Buddhism are similar in “structure to the two-fold division of the classical yoga system of *saṁādhi* into the respective domains of *saṁprajñāta* and *asaṁprajñāta*” (Stuart Ray Sarbacker 2005, p. 79). He also finds many similar terms (such as *sarvajñatva*, *citta*, *dharmamegha*, *karma*, *kleśa bhūmi* and *the brahmavihāra*-s (*maitrī*, *karuṇa*, *mudita*, *upekṣā*) which are commonly used in *Yoga* and Buddhism. He claims that the presence of supernatural powers (*siddhis*/rddhi) in *Yogasūtra* shows “common foundations of yogic practices in the ancient substratum of magical practices, the supernatural abilities of perception and action characteristic of the Buddha in

the Nikāya sources, similar to those attributed to the advanced yogin in the *Yogasūtra*” (Sarbacker 2005, p. 79). For Senart, classical Yoga and Buddhism both adopted the yogic meditative concepts and practices from the old Indian yogic tradition, and Buddhism is in fact a branch of yoga itself. Therefore, there are similarities in terminologies, concepts and meditative practices between these two classical traditions of *Yogasūtra* and Buddhism.

Oldenberg also follows Senart’s main thesis. Oldenberg believes that it is the pre-classical or ancient yoga described in *Upaniṣadic* time (and possibly the pre-*Upaniṣadic* period) which is the “foundation for the yogas of both Buddhism and classical yoga (*Yogasūtra*), though the features of the pre-classical yoga are best represented in classical yoga”. Similarly, Heiler claims that the Buddhist tradition has many yogic terms and doctrines such as *dhyāna*, *siddhi*-s, the *brahmavihāra*-s and other terms as well derived from the proto-yoga tradition, which shows that “both these two traditions developed from the same root” (Sarbacker 2005, p. 84). De La Vallée Poussin is another important scholar who identified the similarity between many terms or concepts of *Yogasūtra* and Buddhism, particularly “*Sarvāstivāda*, *sautrāntika*, *vaibhāṣika*, and *Yogācāra* sources” (Sarbacker 2005, p. 82). His focus was to identify the common terminology used by the *Yogasūtra* and Buddhism. Some of his identified terms are “*bīja*, *vāsanā*, *saṃskāra*, *ṛtaṃbharā*, *avidyā*, *mahāvratā*, *kaivalya*, *prajñā*, *janmakathamā*, *saṃtoṣa*, *siddhi*, *manojavitva*, and *dharmamegha*” (Sarbacker 2005, p. 82). He claims that not only do some terms or concepts of *Yogasūtra* share similarity with Buddhism, but also “the first three *pāda*-s of the *Yogasūtra* contain more than one hundred ‘Buddhist’ terms, fifty of which can be directly traced to Vasubandhu’s *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*” (O’Brion Kop 2022, p. 3).

According to De La Vallée Poussin, these Buddhist terms were derived from an earlier “pure yoga tradition” that was “free from metaphysics and called this ‘Buddhist yoga’”. Buddhist yoga is the result of the earlier proto-yoga tradition. He argues that it is through early Buddhism that the proto-yoga tradition can be understood. His main conclusion is that Buddhism was influenced by the proto-yoga tradition (O’Brion Kop 2022, p. 2). This proto-yoga tradition is also partially the source of classical yoga. Geoffrey Samuel and Bronkhorst claim that yogic practices are “most likely evolved from the common sramana background of asceticism” (O’Brion Kop 2022, p. 6). The common claim of these scholars is that *Buddhism* and classical yoga share a common Indic root which is older than the period of classical yoga and *Buddhism*. On the contrary, many scholars do not agree with this view of the common roots thesis because they believe that Buddhism, by itself, directly influenced the

Yogasūtra, although the *Yogasūtra*-s are of Brahminical origin. To put it differently, vedic *Yogasūtra* borrowed Buddhist materials directly and used them as yogic or *Sāṃkhya-yoga* concepts for the presentation of its yogic theory of liberation. On the other hand, some scholars claim that *Yogasūtra* was directly influenced by *Buddhism*, not by the proto-yoga tradition. These scholars can be grouped as the supporters of “the direct Buddhist influence thesis”

Group 2: Direct Buddhist Influence Thesis:

The central argument advanced by these scholars is that the *Yogasūtra*—and in some cases the *Yogabhāṣya* as well—was directly influenced by, or borrowed from, Buddhist terminology, concepts, meditative practices, and even metaphysical doctrines. This conclusion is based on critical and comparative analyses of the structural and conceptual features shared by the Buddhist traditions and the *Yogasūtra*. This group includes a good number of supporters such as Arthur Berriedale Keith, Paul Deussen, Jakob Wilhelm Hauer, Erich Frauwallner, Gerhard Oberhammer, Surendranath Dasgupta, Johannes Bronkhorst, Klaus Klostermaier, Lance Cousins, Albrecht Wezler, Kōji Yamashita, Stuart Sarbacker, Dominik Wujastyk, David Gordon White, Mark Singleton, James Mallinson and Pradeep Gokhale. It is not possible to discuss them all in our present study because it requires a separate study. Therefore, I will just briefly mention a few comments.

O’Brion Kop (2022, p. 3) comments that “Hauer (1958), Frauwallner (1973) and Oberhammer (1977) all classified the *aṣṭāṅga* section (YS 2.28–3.7) as closely related to Buddhist thought.⁷ The other section of the *Yogasūtra* identified as having Buddhist ‘origins’, in part or total, is the fourth *pāda*. Dasgupta, Keith, Deussen, Hauer and Frauwallner discuss this *pāda* (particularly YS 4.16–21) as responding to the consciousness-only (*cittamātra*) positions of *Yogācāra* thought”. So these scholars seem to argue directly for the direct Buddhist influences of a few concepts found in the *Yogasūtra*.

Wujastyk claims that *Pātañjalayoga-śāstra* is deeply rooted in early Buddhist thought. Therefore, a proper historical knowledge is important for a better understanding of *Yogasūtra*. By providing a thorough historical background to the technical terms *dharmamegha*, *asaṃpramoṣa*, and *anantasamāpatti* of *Yogasūtra*, Wujastyk (2018, p. 23) argues that “one cannot correctly or fully understand much of what Patañjali said in his *sūtra*-s and commentary, without understanding something about Buddhism, and especially the Buddhist

thought and terminology that evolved to discuss meditation and the path to liberation”. Emphasizing the extent of Buddhist influence on the *Yogasūtra*, Dominik Wujastyk argues that certain *sūtra*-s are difficult to interpret without recognizing their direct connections to Buddhist thought. According to his analysis, without familiarity with the relevant Buddhist concepts and terminology, there is a significant risk of misinterpreting these passages within the *Yogasūtra*. Wujastyk (2018, p. 24) claims that without “knowing the Buddhist background to what Patañjali said can lead one seriously astray, where one can fail to understand what Patañjali was talking about”. According to Dominik Wujastyk, Buddhism not only exerted influence on the *Yogasūtra*, but, in certain cases, is indispensable for understanding the nuanced discussions of specific yogic terms and concepts. Klostermaier also claims that the term *dharmamegha* should be understood in the context of Buddhism.

Yamashita (1994) finds the Buddhist roots of some of the terms, concepts and passages of *Yogasūtra* and *Yogabhāṣya*. He argues that parts or some passages of *Sarvāstivāda* school of Buddhism can be found in the *Yogabhāṣya*. By showing the similarity of the exact wording of *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* (3.50) and a passage in the *Yogasūtrabhāṣya* (3.13), he (1994, p. 65, 84) argues that Patañjali may have used the Buddhist *Sarvāstivāda* theory of change (*pariṇāma*) to develop his own theory. He also claims that some terms of *Yogasūtra* are originally Buddhist in nature. For example, he believes that the terms “*citta*” and *kliṣṭa* are basically Buddhist terms. Wezler argues that *Yogabhāṣya* uses in many places the *Sarvāstivāda* and *Yogācāra* terms and concepts.

Pradeep Gokhale is an important scholar who undertook a detailed comparative and rigorous exegetical study of the *Yogasūtra*, examining the text aphorism by aphorism within a Buddhist framework. To the best of my knowledge, his work represents one of the recent book-length comparative textual studies in English that analyzes the *Yogasūtra*—together with its commentary, the *Yogabhāṣya*—in relation to Buddhist thought. His views are thought-provoking as well as radical. He finds that Patañjali was more dependent on the Buddhist sources for his philosophical explanation of the *Yogasūtra* rather than the *Sāṃkhya*. Gokhale (2020, p. 12) claims that in his study, he “found that more than 50 per cent of the *Yogasūtra*’s aphorisms can be said to have a background in Buddhism, directly or indirectly. Less than 40 percent of the aphorisms can be said to have a background in Sāṃkhya or other orthodox [*āstika*, namely non-Buddhist and non-Jaina] sources, directly or indirectly”. Gokhale’s claim indicates a significant direct influence of Buddhism on the philosophy of the *Yogasūtra*. Conversely, another group of scholars maintains that the *Yogasūtra* was not solely

influenced by Buddhism; rather, they argue that Buddhist traditions were themselves influenced, at least in part, by the *Yogasūtra*. These scholars are the supporters of “mutual influence thesis”.

Group 3: Mutual Influence Thesis

According to some scholars, it is true that the *Yogasūtra* incorporates numerous Buddhist ideas and practices, but it does so in a unique way to explain its own metaphysics. The presence of some Buddhist ideas and practices in the *Yogasūtra* does not simply suggest that it borrows from Buddhist philosophy. Instead, it indicates that the *Yogasūtra* engages with Buddhism in a critical and creative manner. One such creative and critical way of *Yogasūtra*'s adoption of Buddhist concepts is shown by Philip Maas (2020) in his article “*Sarvāstivāda Buddhist Theories of Temporality and the Pātañjala Yoga Theory of Transformation (pariṇāma)*”. The central thesis of this paper is that Patañjali adopts the Buddhist concept of temporality and reuses this Buddhist concept to create a unique *Sāṃkhya-Yoga* theory of transformation “to win the philosophical debate about temporality against *Sarvāstivāda* Buddhism” (Maas 2020, p. 964). Therefore, it is not a mere borrowing of Buddhist concept, but rather a creative and strategic method which was adopted by Patañjali to establish the superiority of his philosophy to his audience. Larson (1989) believes that this kind of sharing of philosophical concepts between *Yogasūtra* and Buddhism was produced by the philosophical debates between the *Sāṃkhya* and Buddhism.

Group 4: Declining Anti-Buddhist Polemics

Mikel Burley (2007, p. 90) argues that *Kaivalya-Pāda* (particularly, a few specific *sūtra*-s) do not directly criticise or refute the *Vijñānavāda* theory of *Yogacāra* Buddhism. If there is any kind of refutation, it comes from the commentators, not from Patañjali himself. Burley claims that *kaivalyapada*-“*sūtras* themselves are not unambiguously realist, although a form of realism can be read into them if one assumes in advance that this is their author's position. As we have seen, traditional commentators such as Vyāsa and Vācaspati do make such an assumption, but the eagerness of these commentators to besmirch the *Vijñānavāda* and their general hostility to Buddhism (most explicit in the case of Vācaspati) ought to make us wary. It is likely that philosophical vendettas are being waged at the expense of accurate exegesis. In opposition to the traditional interpretations, I have proposed alternative readings

of the two key *sūtra*-s, which readings undermine the assumption that the *sūtra*-s are inherently realist”.

Group 5: Buddhist Authorship Thesis

On a striking departure from all the views presented above, two scholars believe that *Yogasūtra* is a work by a Buddhist. In an alternative sense, Patañjali himself was Buddhist. Regarding the French scholar Michel Angot’s work, O’Brion Kop, (2022, p. 6) states that “in the introduction to his 2012 French translation of the *Yogasūtra* and *Yogasūtrabhāṣya*, Angot argued that the *Yogasūtra* was mostly written by a Buddhist author and that the last pāda and the commentary was written by a Hindu named Vyāsa in the sixth–seventh century, as a Brahmanic appropriation of a Buddhist text (Angot 2012: 24–34)”⁹. Another scholar who almost aligns with Angot’s thesis is Italian scholar Federico Squarcini. O’Brion Kop (2022, p. 6) states that “Squarcini asserted that the *Yogasūtra* is a Buddhist work that has an ‘interdiscursive’ relationship with the Brahmanical tradition, albeit primarily polemical (Squarcini 2016: xlix). Squarcini’s translation of the *Yogasūtra* includes an index, which links words and phrases from the *Yogasūtra* to Buddhist texts (Squarcini 2016: 179–89)”¹⁰. While it is evident that certain terms and concepts are shared by the *Yogasūtra* and various Buddhist texts. Although it remains uncertain which tradition influenced the other—or whether direct borrowing occurred at all—it may reasonably be inferred that some form of intellectual relationship existed between these two Indian schools of thought. Another important Indian philosophical tradition, Jainism, may also be considered in relation to the development of the philosophy articulated in the *Yogasūtra*.

On the Relation Between the *Yogasūtra* and Jainism

It is generally believed that yoga was developed not only within the Brahmanical framework but also in the Sramana tradition, which encompasses Buddhism, Jainism, and other paths. Pradeep Gokhale argues that “Patañjali’s yoga contains elements in both orthodox and heterodox philosophical traditions, including *Sāṃkhya*, Jaina and Buddhist thought”. Jaina philosophy and practices may exhibit direct or indirect similarities to the teachings and practices found in the *Yogasūtra*. Therefore, it can be concluded that Jainism may serve as a

⁹ I do not know French and have not consulted any translation of Michel Angot’s work. Therefore, my understanding relies entirely on the account provided by O’Brion Kop.

¹⁰ I do not know Italian; therefore, my understanding relies entirely on the account provided by O’Brion Kop.

potential source of interaction, as well as both direct and indirect influences, between the *Yogasūtra* and Jaina philosophy. It is definitely an interesting area of research, but it is beyond the scope of our present study.

Therefore, I will provide a brief overview of certain Jain terms and concepts that may have been incorporated into the *Yogasūtra* and that, in some instances, are important for a fuller understanding of its teachings. One of the important concepts of *Yogasūtra* regarding the ethical behaviour of the *yogin* is the idea of *yama*-s (personal ethical vows), which are identical to the Jaina classification of *vrata* (vows). The five *yogic* *yamas* are *ahimsā* (non-violence), *satya* (truth), *asteya* (non-stealing), *brahmacarya* (celibacy) and *aparigraha* (non-possession). In a similar way, there are almost five identical vows in Jainism. They include *himsāvirati* (refraining from violence) *anṛtavirati* (refraining from truth), *steyavirati* (refraining from stealing), *abrahmavirati* (refraining from non-celibacy) and *parigrahavirati* (refraining from possession). It is noteworthy that the *Yogasūtra* accords primacy to the practice of *ahimsā*, placing it first among the five personal ethical vows (*yamas*) prescribed for the *yogin*. In Jaina philosophy and religion the concept of *ahimsā* is of utmost importance for the Jaina spiritual seeker. Another notable instance of shared terminology appears in *sūtra* 2.31 of the *Yogasūtra*, where Patañjali employs the term *mahāvratam*, literally meaning “great vow.” A closely related concept, *mahāvrata* (“great vow”), also occupies a central place in Jainism, where it denotes the highest form of ethical commitment undertaken by ascetics. Such parallels in terminology and ethical emphasis may be cited as evidence of similarity and possibly interaction, influence or parallels between the *yogic* and Jain traditions.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the *Yogasūtra* emerges as a complex, composite work that defies simple historical or philosophical categorization. While traditional accounts often view the text as a unified treatise by the grammarian Patañjali, modern scholarship reveals a more nuanced landscape characterized by ongoing debates regarding its authorship, structural integrity, and ideological origins. As discussed, the text's composition period remains contested, with proposals ranging from 400 BCE to 400 CE, reflecting the difficulty of dating classical Sanskrit texts with exactitude. The philosophical identity of the *Yogasūtra* is inextricably linked to its neighbors in the Indian intellectual tradition. This introduction has highlighted some important issues regarding *Sāṃkhya* Foundation, Buddhist Intertextuality and Jaina Parallels. The *Yogasūtra* is frequently characterized as *śeśvara Sāṃkhya* (theistic *Sāṃkhya*) or

Pātañjala-Sāṃkhya, with many scholars arguing it grafted yogic practices onto an existing *Sāṃkhya* metaphysical framework. However, others contend that Yoga maintains its own originality as an autonomous *darśana* with a distinct focus on personal experimentation and direct perception. The relationship with Buddhism is perhaps the most debated area, with theories spanning from a shared "common Indic root" to claims of direct borrowing or even Buddhist authorship of the original *sūtra*-s. The significant presence of Buddhist terminology—estimated by some to represent over 50 percent of the text's aphorisms—suggests that a deep understanding of Buddhist thought is indispensable for a full exegesis of Patañjali's work. The text further mirrors the *śramaṇa* tradition through its ethical framework, specifically the five *yamas* and the concept of the *mahāvratā* (great vow), which find nearly identical counterparts in Jainism. Ultimately, whether the *Yogasūtra* is viewed as a "patchwork" of earlier traditions or a coherent system authored by a single figure, it represents a masterful synthesis of the spiritual and philosophical currents of its time. Its ability to integrate diverse metaphysical theories with practical meditational techniques is what has secured its position as a foundational and influential text across centuries of Indian thought.

Chapter 2: Introducing the Concept of *Pratiprasava* and Some of Its Related Concepts

Situating *Pratiprasava* in the *Yogasūtra*

Patañjali has prescribed many important yogic practices in the *Yogasūtra* which will be instrumental in attaining *kaivalya* – the ultimate stage of liberation a yogi can achieve. The practice of *pratiprasava* is such an important technique which will bring liberation to the life a yogi. Patañjali uses the term “*pratiprasava*” in the second chapter of the *Yogasūtra* where *pratiprasava* has been recognized as a means of overcoming the five subtle afflictions. In *Yogasūtra* 2.10, Patañjali first introduces the word *pratiprasava* where *pratiprasava* has been projected as a process of reversal of functioning of the subtle afflictions (*kleśa*-s). In this *sūtra*, Patañjali declares that “These five *kleśa*-s which are in subtle form can be reversed back into its original matrix” (*te pratiprasava-heyāḥ sūkṣmāḥ*). In *sūtra* 4.34 again the concept of *pratiprasava* is brought back in connection with the nature and definition of *kaivalya*. In this *sūtra*, Patañjali states that “*kaivalya* is the involution of the *guṇa*-s because of the fulfilment of their purpose; or it is the restoration of the puruṣa to its natural form which is pure consciousness” (*puruṣārtha-sūnyānām guṇānām pratiprasavaḥ kaivalyaṁ svarūpa-pratiṣṭhā vā citi-śaktir iti*). Scholars have interpreted the term “*pratiprasava*” in different ways.

This chapter serves as a foundational introduction to the central theme of this dissertation: *pratiprasava* and its profound relationship with *kaivalya* in Patañjali's *Yogasūtra*. Patañjali emphasizes various yogic practices as instrumental in attaining *kaivalya*, which is deemed the ultimate stage of liberation for a yogi. Among these, the practice of *Pratiprasava* is identified as a crucial technique leading to the yogi's emancipation.

Patañjali introduces the term "*pratiprasava*" twice in the *Yogasūtra*. In the second chapter (YS 2.10), it is presented as a means of overcoming subtle afflictions (*kleśa-s*). Here, *pratiprasava* is described as a "process of reversal," where "these five *kleśa-s* which are in subtle form can be reversed back into its original matrix". Subsequently, in the fourth chapter (YS 4.34), *pratiprasava* is linked to the nature and definition of *kaivalya*, stating that "*kaivalya* is the involution of the *guṇa-s* because of the fulfilment of their purpose; or it is the restoration of the *puruṣa* to its natural form which is pure consciousness". Literally, "*pratiprasava*" is formed from the Sanskrit words "*prati*" (in opposition to, against) and "*prasava*" (creation, origination), essentially meaning the antithesis of creation or birth, signifying dissolution, annihilation, or a return to the original state. Philosophically, it refers to the reversal of nature's creative activities, leading to the yogins' emancipation.

Despite being explicitly used only twice, *pratiprasava* is considered one of the central themes that permeates the entire *Yogasūtra*, marking a continuous journey from initial spiritual practices (*sādhana*) to the ultimate state of liberation, *kaivalya*. Scholars have interpreted "*pratiprasava*" in diverse ways, often from cosmological and epistemological standpoints. The cosmological meaning of *pratiprasava* in this context refers to the dissolution of all entanglements of embodied *puruṣa* with *prakṛti*, including the physical body and mind, whereas epistemological *pratiprasava* denotes the dissolution of misidentification of *prakṛtic* manifestation with embodied *puruṣa*. Because of the complexity of the relationship between ontology and epistemology, cosmological *pratiprasava* should be regarded as cosmological *pratiprasava* and epistemological *pratiprasava* as psychological *pratiprasava*. Depending on the type of interpretation, a concept may be simultaneously cosmological and epistemological. For this reason, I will substitute the terms cosmological and psychological for cosmological and epistemological.

This chapter will systematically unfold by first delving into the literal and philosophical meanings of *pratiprasava*. It will then explore similar terms in the *Yogasūtra* that share functional connections with *pratiprasava*, such as *nirodha*, *pratibandhi*, *pratipakṣa*, and *pratiṣedha*. A significant focus will be on the relation between *pratiprasava* and *samādhi*,

detailing its stages from *samprajñāta samādhi* to *asamprajñāta Samādhi*, and how *pratiprasava* serves as a crucial tool in this process of returning to the real self. The chapter will also establish the direct relationship between *pratiprasava* and *kaivalya*, emphasizing that a proper understanding of *pratiprasava* is essential for understanding *kaivalya*. Its indirect relation to *Jīvanmukti* (liberation while living) will also be introduced.

Furthermore, to provide a complete understanding of *pratiprasava*'s role in Yoga philosophy, this chapter will introduce several important related concepts such as *kleśa* (afflictions), *guṇa* (three real and eternal elements of *nature*), *puruṣa* (pure consciousness). By systematically introducing these foundational elements, this chapter aims to build a theoretical framework for the subsequent detailed analysis and reinterpretation of *pratiprasava* and *kaivalya* within the *Yogasūtra*.

Literal Meaning of *Pratiprasava*

Some scholars interpret *pratiprasava* from the literal perspective. *Prati* is the prefix and *prasava* is the main word, which are combined to form the term "*pratiprasava*." The prefix "*prati*" denotes "in opposition to," "against," "counter," or "contrary," whereas "*prasava*" indicates "creation, origination, begetting, generation, procreation, birth, or production." *Pratiprasava*, then, essentially means the antithesis of creation or birth. *Pratiprasava*, then, signifies dissolution, annihilation, or destruction. Monier Williams (1899, p. 674) defines *pratiprasava* as "counter-order, suspension of a general prohibition in a particular case, an exception to an exception, and return to the original state". Vaman Apte (1965, p. 380) describes *pratiprasava* as "a counter exception, an exception to an exception (where in the general rule is shown to be applicable to cases falling under the exception), a contrary effect." For Bhagavan Das (2009, p. 195), *pratiprasava* means "retirement, involution, retreat, reduction, reabsorption, reemergence, immergence".

Metaphysical Meaning of *Pratiprasava*

In addition to its literal meaning and additional connotations found in various sources, the term "*pratiprasava*" has a metaphysical connotation that is especially prevalent in yoga philosophy. The term "*pratiprasava*" literally means "a process of destruction," but in a philosophical sense, it refers to the reversal of the entire yogic process of nature's exterior creative activities, which finally leads to the yogins' emancipation. "*Pratiprasava*" is more than just a phrase in yoga philosophy; it is a key yogic idea. One of the central concepts relating to the spiritual goal of yoga is *pratiprasava* (reversal) of material constituents (*guṇa-s*). Patañjali first introduces it in *sūtra* 2.10, where he states that "these subtle

[afflictions] are to be cast aside by a retrograding process of reversal?¹¹ Patañjali explains that *pratiprasava* is a personal method which needs to be adopted by the Yogin because as much as *pratiprasava* progresses or is achieved, only then these subtle afflictions are gone.

In this *sūtra* “*pratiprasavaheyāḥ*” is a compound word that functions in this context as an adjective and it is qualifying *kleśa-s* (afflictions). So, *pratiprasava* is a process of reversal of *kleśa-s* in the empirical context. Again, Patañjali mentions the concept of *pratiprasava* in *sūtra* 4.34, which states that “ultimate liberation takes place when the *guṇa-s*, having nothing to accomplish for the sake of *puruṣa*, reverse to their latent source; in other words, when the *puruṣa* itself as conscious force rests in its essential form.”¹² Here, *pratiprasava* is a process of reversal of *guṇa-s* in the cosmological context. In this *sūtra*, *pratiprasava* process can be personal or impersonal or both. According to Patañjali, the ultimate result of this process of *pratiprasava* is *kaivalya*. Here, the term *pratiprasava* is directly mentioned to explain the nature of *kaivalya*. So, the concept of *pratiprasava* is bound up with that of *kaivalya*.

As a yogic process *pratiprasava* denotes a reversal of actions which keep the yogi away from realizing his true self: that he is *puruṣa*, not the *prakṛti*. ‘*pratiprasava*’ concept indicates that the yogi has the capacity of mind to reverse the process of evolution by bringing back three *guṇa-s* to their original source (*prakṛti*). According to Yoga Philosophy, it is the play of three *guṇa-s* which is responsible for this creation of *prakṛti* – the primordial cause of creation. If we understand *pratiprasava* both as a psychological and cosmological process, then it becomes clear that its function is as a means and goal of yoga, which is *kaivalya*. When *pratiprasava* functions as process of dissolution of all afflictions, the three *guṇa-s* become ineffective to affect the yogin while living and when three *guṇa-s* as manifest real cosmological substances (*tattva*) return to its original unmanifest form (*avyakta-prakṛti*) to its source, yogi realizes he is the *puruṣa* separate from *prakṛti*, the sole purpose of *puruṣa* is dissociate herself from the existence altogether which indicates her death. This knowledge of separation is called *kaivalya* (liberation) in yoga philosophy.

Although the word “*pratiprasava*” has been used only two times in the entire yoga *sūtra* but it is one of the central themes that run through the whole *Yogasūtra*. If we minutely observe the use *pratiprasava* by Patañjali in the second chapter and fourth chapter it is clear to us that the yogic process of *pratiprasava* begins with *sādhana* (spiritual practices) and

¹¹ YS 2.10: *te pratiprasavaheyāḥ sūkṣmāḥ*.

¹² YS 4.34: *puruṣārtha-śūnyānām guṇānām pratiprasavaḥ kaivalyaṁ sva-rūpa-pratiṣṭhā vā citi-śaktir iti*.

culminates with *kaivalya*. So, the process of *pratiprasava* is a continuous course of action starting from yogic practices to the ultimate end of liberation.

Exploring Similar Terms for *Pratiprasava*

A thorough study of *Yogasūtra* reflects that there are many concepts in the yoga *sūtra* which has strong connections or are identical with the different functionalities of *pratiprasava*. In the second *sūtra* of the first chapter Patañjali mentions the goal of yoga as “*citta-vṛtti-nirodha*”¹³. In this *sūtra* Patañjali defines Yoga as the cessation of mental modifications. What *nirodha* (cessation) means here is that a process of counteraction. The *vṛttis* will rise and those rising *vṛttis* should be opposed or reversed and this reversal process is called *nirodha*, similar kind of functionality of *pratiprasava*. *Nirodha* seems to be similar in its functionality to the epistemological function of *pratiprasava*. The term *nirodha* is used seven times in the *Yogasūtra* with the same meaning as a process of restrain¹⁴.

Despite the fact that “*pratiprasava*” has multiple meanings, Patañjali employs a lot of closely related terms. In *sūtra* 1.50 the word “*pratibandhi*” is used to mean obstruction or cessation. Patañjali states that “The *saṃskāras* born out of that [truth-bearing wisdom] obstruct other *saṃskāras* [from emerging] (*taj-jah saṃskāro ’nya-saṃskārapratibandhī*).¹⁵ In *sūtra* 2.33¹⁶ and *sūtra* 2.34¹⁷, the word *pratipakṣa* is mentioned which means opposite or reversal. *Sūtra* 2.33 says that “Upon being harassed by negative thoughts, one should cultivate counteracting thoughts” (*vitarka-bādhane pratipakṣa-bhāvanam II.33*). *Sūtra* 2.34 tells us that “Negative thoughts are violence, etc. They may be[personally] performed, performed on one’s behalf by another, or authorized by oneself; they may be triggered by greed, anger, or delusion; and they may be slight, moderate, or extreme in intensity. One should cultivate counteracting thoughts, namely, that the end results [of negative thoughts] are ongoing suffering and ignorance (*vitarkā himsādayaḥ kṛta kārītānumoditā lobha krodhamoha pūrvakā mṛdu madhyādhi mātrā duḥkhājñānānantaphalā iti pratipakṣabhāvanam II.34*). The term “*pratiṣedha*” is also identical with “*pratiprasava*” in *sūtra* 1.32. This *sūtra* indicates that

¹³ YS 1.2 – (*yogaś cittavṛttinirodhaḥ*)

¹⁴ YS 1.12 – (*abhyāsavairāgyābhyāmtannirodhaḥ*), YS 1.51 – (*tasyāpi nirodhe sarvanirodhān nirbījaḥ samā dhiḥ*), YS 3.9 – (*vyutthānanirodhasaṃskārayor abhibhavapr ādurbhāvau nirodhakṣaṇacittānvayo nirodhapa riṇāmah*),

¹⁵ YS 1.50 - *tajjah saṃskāro+anyasaṃskārapratibandhī*

¹⁶ YS 2.33 - *vitarkabādhane pratipakṣabhāvanam*

¹⁷ YS 2.34 - *vitarkā himsādayaḥ kṛtakārītānumoditā lobhakrodhamohapūrvakā mṛdumadhyādhimātrā duḥkhājñānānantaphalā iti pratipakṣabhāva*

“practice [of fixing the mind] on one object [should be performed] in order to eliminate these disturbances” (*tat-pratiṣedhārtham eka-tattvābhyāsaḥ*).¹⁸

Some Important Concepts and Their Relation with *Pratiprasava*

The concept of *pratiprasava* has many important functions which are directly or indirectly connected with other important concepts in the *Yogasūtra*. *Pratiprasava* is a yogic process which includes both theoretical importance as well as practical importance for the yogins. As a yogic practice, it is connected to many yogic practices and as a concept it plays important role in understanding the metaphysics of the yoga philosophy. So, it is important to learn about some concepts which are directly mentioned when *pratiprasava* has been discussed in the text. Let us have an overview of all these important related concepts which are prerequisite to understand the theoretical and practical role of *pratiprasava* in the *Yogasūtra*.

The Concept of *Kleśa*

The first important concept is the concept of “*kleśa*”(afflictions or defilements). Patañjali directly mentions in *sūtra* 2.10 that *pratiprasava* is the only method of getting rid of the *kleśa-s* which are the main hurdles in attaining the liberation from suffering in yoga. I will discuss in detail in the later stage of our discussion. Now let us focus on understanding what *kleśa* is. Bhoja defines *kleśa* “as something which torments, troubles, causes pain” (*kliśnanānti kleśā*). According to Vyāsa, *kleśa* means cognitive error (*viparyayā*). These five *kleśa-s*, after being expressed in the form of mental modifications, strengthen the functions of the three natural elements. To put it simply, these *kleśa-s* engage the intellect, based on the three natural elements in such actions, which will strengthen the continuity of the enjoyment and liberation of the *puruṣa*. This is why they continue the flow of the three natural elements. *kleśa-s* increase the flow of cause and effect of three natural elements. These *kleśa-s* help each other among themselves to perform their actions, which will be the cause of the birth, death, and life-space of the people in the future.

Avidyā* As the Breeding Ground of Other Four *Kleśa-s

As the land serves as a breeding place for rice seeds, the field of the mind is also where seeds like *avidyā* are sprouting. According to the commentators, *avidyā* is the breeding-ground (*prasavabhūmi*) of other four *kleśa-s*, including *asmitā*.¹⁹ The existence of *avidyā* is the cause of these four *kleśa-s*. Aversion (*dveṣa*) loses its effectiveness in such a

¹⁸ YS 1.32 - *tat-pratiṣedhārtham eka-tattvābhyāsaḥ*

¹⁹ YS- 2.4: *avidyā kṣetram uttareṣāṃ prasuptatanuvicchinmodārāṇām*.

situation when attachment (*rāga*) is dominant, yet *avidyā* persists during the attachment stage. *Asmitā* and other *kleśa-s* vanish when *avidyā* is totally eradicated.²⁰ Therefore, other *kleśa-s* are present where *avidyā* is present, and vice versa with *avidyā* absent. The presence of *avidyā* is necessary for the existence of other *kleśa-s*. *Avidyā* is considered the breeding ground of the other *kleśa-s* since it is necessary for their existence.

Definition of *Avidyā*

Avidyā is generally the inability to understand the real nature of a thing. Patañjali describes that to know the non-eternal (*anitya*) as eternal (*nitya*), impurity (*aśuci*) as purity (*śuci*), suffering (*duḥkha*) as happiness (*sukha*), and *prakṛti* (*anātma*) as *puruṣa* (*ātma*) is *avidyā*.²¹

To Mistake Non-eternal for Eternal

According to Vijñānabhikṣu, Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa, and Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha, *anitya* (impermanent) is something that is destroyed by the passing of time.²² To put it another way, *anitya* is anything that does not transcend time or is time-bound. For instance, over time, the earth, the subtle and physical things, and *prapancha* are all susceptible to deterioration or destruction. They are referred to as *anitya* because of their temporal limitations. The ability to perceive these transient objects or elements as permanent is known as *avidyā*. For instance, *pañcabhūta* (five gross elements), *sūrya* (sun), *chandra* (moon), *tārā* (stars), *bhūloka* (earth), and heaven are all thought to be eternal. Because of this ignorance, people attempt to get, accomplish, or visit these things or places using various practices that suit their tastes. The process of dissolution into the *pañcabhūta* through specific practices is explained in texts such as *Tattva-vaiśārādī*.²³ In yoga, this endeavor and understanding of transforming transient things into permanent ones or accomplishments is referred to as *anitya-avidyā*.

To Mistake Impurity for Purity

To treat impure elements as pure elements is called *aśuci-avidyā*. To give an example of treating impure elements as pure elements commentators cite the example of the impure

²⁰ Vācaspatimiśra's commentary on *sūtra* 2.4: *tataś cāvidyāsamucchede teṣāṃ api samucchedo yukta iti bhāvaḥ*.

²¹ YS- 2.5: *anityāśuciduḥkhānātmasu nityaśucisukhātmakhyātir avidyā*.

²² Vijñānabhikṣu's commentary on *sūtra* 2.5: *anityatvamasattvaṃ kālaṇiṣṭhābhāvapratiyogitvamiti yāvat*.

²³ Vācaspatimiśra's commentary on *sūtra* 2.5 (*kecīt kila bhūtāni nityatvenābhimanyamānās tadrūpam abhīpsavas tāny evopāsate/ evaṃ dhūmādimārgān upāsate candrasūryatāarakādyulokān nityān abhimanyamānās tatprāptaye/ evaṃ divaukaso devān amṛtān abhimanyamānās tabhāvāya somam pibanti/ āmnāyate hi --- "apāma somam amṛtā 10 abhūma" taittirīyasamhitā 3.2.5.4 iti/ seyam anityeṣu nityakhyātir avidyā*)

physical body. There is no one who does not consider his physical body as impure and who does not strive to show the purity of impure body. Commentators explain physical body as an example of impure object through scriptural evidence. *Vyāsa* provides an example of an impure object from a text which states that there are six causes of impurity of body.²⁴ The text explains that human body is impure because the child is born from the mother's womb which is attached to a number of impure substances such a *mala* (feces) , “urine” (*mūtra*), *vīrya* (sperm) *māṃsa* (flesh) *rudhira* (blood) etc. Even after the death, a human body is prohibited to touch due to its impurity.

Commentators like *Vyāsa*, *Vācaspatimiśra*, *Vijñānabhikṣu*, *Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha*, *Nāgeśabhaṭṭa*, and *Hariharānanda* give an example of how many people mistake an impure body for being pure. One who desires a girl's physical body for sexual pleasure thinks that the girl is so charming, as if she is a new line in the face of the moon, as if she is born from the nectar of honey, as if she has appeared from the noon now simply breaking the wall of the moon. He imagines all kinds of such thoughts.²⁵ In this way, in the impure body of the girl, one finds purity due to inappropriate knowledge. This is known as *aśuci-avidyā*, the second type of *avidyā* among the four.

To Mistake Suffering for Happiness

One misinterprets what something's actual nature is. One thinks the exact opposite of what something's true nature is. For example, one views the elements that cause suffering as those that cause happiness. Pleasure derived from the worldly objects is the cause of suffering. In worldly objects there is no happiness at all. There is only suffering in the possession of, in the use of, in the collection of, and in the spending of worldly objects. There is no happiness in any part of the material things. This is the third type of *avidyā*.

To Mistake Nature for Consciousness

Commentators like *Vācaspatimiśra* claim that to understand inanimate thing (nature) as animate (consciousness) is the fourth type of *avidyā*. For example, when *cittavṛtti* is reflected in *budhhi*, the functions of *budhhi* is considered as the functions of *puruṣa*. *Videhalīna* (lost in physical body) yogins mistakenly worship *bhūtendriya* (elements of the body) as *puruṣa*. *Prakṛtilaya* (absorbed in subtle elements) yogins continue their *sādhana* by mistakenly worshipping *prakṛti* as *puruṣa*. These are the four types of *avidyā* mentioned

²⁴ *Vyāsa's* commentary on *sūtra* 2.5 (*sthānād bījād upaṣṭambhān niḥsyandān nidhanād api / kāyam ādheyaśaucatvāt paṇḍitā hy aśuciṃ viduḥ*)

²⁵ *Vyāsa's* commentary on *sūtra* 2.5 (*naveva śaśāṅkalekhā kamanīyeyaṃ kanyā madhvamṛtāvayavanirmiteva candraṃ bhittvā niḥsṛteva jñāyate*)

above. These are the four feet of *avidyā*. A question arises: there can be many types of *avidyā*, then why there are only four types? In response to this question, Vācaspatimiśra states that there may be many types but the seed of *saṃsāra* (circle of birth and death) are fourfold (these main four types of *avidyā*).

Four Types of *Kleśa*-s Generated From *Avidyā*:

From *avidyā* there arise four types of *kleśa*-s.

The Concept of *Asmitā*

The power of seeing is the intellect, and the power of vision is the self. These two are said to be the same in nature, and this is called the defilement of egoism.²⁶ When the power of the enjoyer and the power of the object of enjoyment are completely distinct, completely unmixed, and as if they have not attained non-difference, then enjoyment is possible. But when the nature is attained, there is only isolation for them. How can there be enjoyment? And it is said thus. Having seen the Supreme Person, who is different from the intellect, by means of form, character, knowledge, etc., one should consider oneself as that, due to delusion. Bhoja says that “where, through introversion and reverse transformation (*pratilomapariṇāme*), in a mind absorbed in *prakṛti*, only the essence of being manifests that is *asmitā*”²⁷.

The Concept of *Rāga*

The desire, thirst, greed, or attachment that is preceded by the recollection of pleasure in one who is conscious of pleasure, or in one who is conscious of the means to pleasure, is passion.²⁸ This *rāga* means attraction or infatuation or passion. This *rāga* originates from the *saṃskāras* of the mind. Whatever actions were committed in the past life, they exist in the form of *saṃskāras* in our mind. And from those *saṃskāras* of past actions, *rāga* originates.²⁹ For example, suppose that someone loved to eat meat in his or her past life and he or she was addicted to meat-eating. Due to the influence of the addiction of meat-eating in the past life, *saṃskāras* of meat-eating arises in the mind of present life which is the cause of desire of eating meat. Bhoja explains that ““That which lies latent in happiness” is called “dwelling on pleasure” (*sukhānuśayī*). Desire (*rāga*), a defilement (*kleśa*), is a longing (*gardha*) in the form

²⁶ YS 2.6 - *dr̥gdarśanaśaktyor ekātmatevāsmītā*.

²⁷ Bhoja’s commentary on *sūtra* 1.17 – *yatrāntarmukhatayā pratilomapariṇāme prakṛtilīne cetasi sattāmātramavabhāti sāmī*.

²⁸ YS 2.7- *sukhānuśayī rāgaḥ*.

²⁹ *Iyāsa*’s commentary on YS 2.7: *sukhābhijñāsyā sukhānusr̥tipūrvāḥ sukhe tatsādhane vā yo gardhas tr̥ṣṇā lobhaḥ sa rā*.

of a thirst (*trṣṇā*) for the means of happiness, preceded by the experience of happiness, on the part of one who knows happiness (*sukhajñā*)”³⁰.

The Concept of *Dveṣa*

Hatred is the anger, resentment, desire to harm, and wrath that arises in one who has recognized suffering and who recollects suffering, or the means to suffering.³¹ As we have the *saṃskāras* of *rāga* and we act due to the influence of *rāga saṃskāras*. In the similar way, from the *saṃskāras* of *dveṣa* we involve ourselves in the *dveṣa* related activities from the influence of past *dveṣa saṃskāras*. From this aversion, we suffer. That is why *dveṣa* is regarded as one of the *kleśa*-s. Bhoja comments that “suffering is characterized by freedom. For one who is aware of that, and who, with prior recollection of that, does not desire its means (*anabhilaṣato*), the anger that is of the nature of censure is the affliction (*kleśa*) characterized by hatred (*dveṣa*)”³².

The Concept of *Abhiniveśa*

This is the eternal blessing of all living beings: "May I not be, may I become." And this hope for the self does not exist for one who has not experienced the nature of death.³³ And by this is known the experience of previous births. And this clinging is a passion, flowing from its own nature. It is not possible to prove by direct perception, inference, or scripture that a worm, as soon as it is born, is afraid of death. But it is inferred from the fear of death that it has experienced in previous lives. And as this affliction is seen in those who are utterly deluded, so also in the wise who have known the past and future. Why is it called “the suffering of change”? Because it is the experience of the suffering of death in the case of both the wholesome and the unwholesome. Bhoja explains that “due to the force of the impressions left by the experience of the pain of deaths suffered in previous lives, the "affliction" (*kleśa*) called "tenacity of mundane existence" (*abhiniveśa*) arises as fear in everyone, from the worm up to Brahmā, [as the thought] "May I not be separated from the body, sense objects, etc.," and continues daily without any immediate cause”³⁴.

³⁰ Bhoja’s commentary on YS 2.7: *sukhamanuṣeta iti sukhānuśayī| sukhajñasya sukhānubhūtipūrvakāḥ sukhāsādhaneṣu trṣṇārūpogardho rāgasamjñakāḥ kleśaḥ*.

³¹ YS 2. 8- *duḥkhānuśayī dveṣaḥ*.

³² Bhoja’s commentary on *sūtra* 2.8: *duḥkhamuktalakṣaṇam| tadabhijñasya tada nūsmṛtipūrvakam tatsādhaneṣvanabhilaṣato yo ayaṃ nindātmakāḥ krodhaḥ sa dveṣalakṣaṇaḥ kleśaḥ*.

³³ YS 2.9 - *svarasavāhī viduṣo+api tathā rūḍho+abhiniveśaḥ*.

³⁴ Bhoja’s commentary on *sūtra* 1.9: *pūrvajanmānubhūta amaraṇa duḥkhānubhavavāsanābalādbhayarūpaḥ samupajāyamānaḥ śarīraviṣayādibhirmama viyogo mā bhūdityanvahanubandharūpaḥ sarvasyaivā akṣmerbrahmaparyantaṃ nimittamantareṇa pravartamāno abhiniveśākhyāḥ kleśaḥ*.

Four Types of States/Conditions of *Kleśa*

The afflictions (*kleśa*) have ignorance as their root. Ignorance is the field for the subsequent ones, which are dormant, interrupted, and vast. What is that sleep (*prasupta*)? The one who asks has the intention that there is no means of valid knowledge for the existence of afflictions that do not perform the function that was stated. The mind is the superior. May they not perform their function, for the afflictions of those who have attained the nature of the body of the formless have become seeds? But they exist only by the power of the seed, like curd from milk. For there is no cause of the manifestation of discrimination other than that. Therefore, those who are devoid of the manifestation of discrimination and whose afflictions are dormant until they reach the time limit of the nature of *videha*. But when they have attained that, the defilements, having returned, confront them in this or that object. Those who are established by mere power are called that. This shows the power of origination and the state of being a seed is the capacity for an effect. But why do the defilements not lie dormant even in one who has the notion of seclusion? Therefore he says one who has attained the state of *prasaṃkhyānavata*. His last body will not be followed by another body, in relation to which this body would be the previous one. Not elsewhere, in the body and so on, is the meaning. But is not the self not absolutely destroyed? Why then by the power of the yoga of that (Lord), when the objects are present, the defilements do not awaken. Therefore it is said of the good. Let there be defilements, but they are burned by the fire of analysis, that is, their seed-nature is destroyed. The practice of the antidotes to the defilements is the practice of yoga. The cultivation of that is the practice of it. The bodies of those who are obstructed by that are Or, right knowledge is the antidote to ignorance, the view of difference is to the concept of “I am,” the middle way is to greed and hatred, the cessation of the notion of continuity is to clinging. He said the reason: “Yes.” They arise again and again, either by the predominance of any one of the defilements, or by the use of aphrodisiacs, or by the weakness of the one who is overcome. The repeated occurrence of the non-interruption of the vow and the practice is shown by the repetition of the word “again”. The difference from the previously mentioned “asleep” is stated. Or one who is acting under the influence of passion, anger is overcome by one of a different kind or by one of the same kind but operating in a different object. The passion for other objects is overcome by passion itself. Therefore it is said: by passion. The three courses of action are to be known as appropriate in the case of future events. He says: He is. He is one who is attached to the mere defilement of future existence, but not one who is attached to the pleasure of the heaven of the Caitraratha gods, because that is cut off. Udāra says: The object. But it is not so. The *sūtra* says: The man who

is not afflicted by the defilements is not afflicted by the defilements. All these are defilements. They do not go beyond the domain of the afflictions, they do not go beyond being expressed by the word "afflictions", even when they attain greatness. Therefore, they are to be abandoned. Thinking that they are one in the sense of being afflictions, he asks: Then what is it? Even though they are the same in being afflictions, there is a difference in the states as described, so he answers. It is said to be true. This may be said: The afflictions arise from ignorance. Even so, when ignorance is eliminated, why do they cease? The cloth does not cease when the bag ceases. Therefore he says: All. As if they were different, as long as they are not distinguished from each other. He asks: Why? The answer is: in all. He himself clarifies this: "That". It is to be applied. The rest is easy to understand. "The state of the yogis who have merged with the truth while sleeping, and the afflictions of those who cling to objects are like a severed stream. This is the summary

Prasupta-Avasthā

The word "*prasupta*" means sleeping.³⁵ The stage of *prasupta* is like the sleeping condition of human mind. It is to be noted that *prasupta* is a sleeping state, but not dead state. When the *kleśa-s* are awakened from their sleeping condition, it would be the *udāra* stage (presently actively functioning stage of *kleśa-s*). The sleeping stage of the *kleśa-s*, the *saṃskāras* do not get activated. As in our sleep, we cannot act. In the similar fashion, the *kleśa-s* in the *prasupta* stage exist in sleeping mode. So, in the sleeping mode *saṃskāras* do not hurt us, but when they are awakened from the sleep, they start hurting or affecting us. Bhoja says that "those afflictions that reside in the ground of the mind (*kleśāścittabhūmau sthitāḥ*) and do not begin their own function in the absence of an awakening cause (*prabodhakābhāve svakāryaṃ nārabhante*) are called "dormant" (*prasuptā*). Just as, in childhood, the *kleśa-s* [afflictions] of a child, though present in the form of latent predispositions (*vāsanā*), do not manifest due to the absence of conducive awakening factors"³⁶.

Tanu-Avasthā

After practicing *kriyā-yoga*, *kleśa-s* become weakened, but they do not completely get eradicated. When the power of *kleśa-s* are weakened, these *kleśa-s* cannot work or function effectively. So, they cannot hurt or affect the yogin by arousing the feeling of joy and sorrow.

³⁵ YS 2.4 - *avidyā kṣetram uttareṣāṃ prasuptatanu vicchinodārāṇām*.

³⁶ Bhoja's commentary on *sūtra* 1.10: *tatra ye kleśāścittabhūmau sthitāḥ prabodhakābhāve svakāryaṃ nārabhante te prasuptā ityucyante yathā bālāvasthāyāṃ bālasya hi vāsanārūpāḥ sthitā api kleśāḥ prabodhakasahakāryabhāve nābhivyaajyante*.

This ineffective state of *kleśa-s* are known as the stage of *tanu-avasthā*. Bhoja says that “those subtle *vāsanās* (latent impressions) which, through cultivation of their respective opposites (*svasvapratipakṣabhāvana*), have had their power to accomplish their effects weakened (*śītilīkṛtakāryasampādanaśaktayo*), remain in the *citta* (mind) as a residue, incapable of initiating their own effects without abundant contributory conditions (*svakāryamārabdhumakṣamā*), as in the case of a yogin who is devoted to practice (*abhyāsa*)”³⁷.

Vicchinna-Avasthā

In our mind, there is the *saṃskāras* of *kāma*, *krodha*, *lobha*, *moha*, *raga*, *dveṣa* etc. But no two *kleśa-s* appear at the same time in our mind. When one *kleśa* such as *rāga* is active, the other *kleśa-s* such as *dveṣa* is inactive or ineffective in our mind. This ineffective state of one *kleśa-s* while the other *kleśa-s* is active is called *vicchinna-avasthā* state of that ineffective *kleśa-s*. Bhoja comments that “Those [*vāsanās* (disturbing emotions)] are interrupted (*vicchinnā*), overcome in strength by some powerful disturbing emotion, and remain [latent], just as desire [remains latent] in a state of hatred, or hatred in a state of desire. For these two, being mutually contradictory, cannot possibly occur simultaneously”³⁸.

Udāra- Avasthā

Those *saṃskāras* which hurts or causes suffering at the present moment are called *udāra-avasthā* state of *kleśa-s*. Bhoja writes that “Those active (*udārā*) *saṃskāras* which have attained the presence of cooperating factors, accomplish their own respective tasks, just as always, those who obstruct yoga [do] in the state of distraction (*vyutthānadaśā*)”³⁹.

Concept of *Guṇa*

Another important concept with which *pratiprasava* is directly linked is the concept of *guṇa* (eternal three elements). In the last *sūtra* of the text, Patañjali tells us that the manifest three elements can only be dissolved by the process on *pratiprasava*. Without having an idea of the concept of *guṇa*, it is not possible to show the relation between *pratiprasava* and the

³⁷ Bhoja’s commentary on *sūtra* 1.10: *te tanavo ye svasvapratipakṣabhāvanayā śītilīkṛtakāryasampādanaśaktayo vāsanā avaśeṣatayā cetasyavasthitāḥ prabhūtāṃ sāmāgrīmantareṇa svakāryamārabdhumakṣamā yathā+abhyāsavato yoginaḥ*.

³⁸ Bhoja’s commentary on *sūtra* 1.10: *te vicchinnā ye kenacidbalavatā kleśenābhi bhūtaśaktayastiṣṭhanti yathā dveṣāvasthāyām rāgo rāgāvasthāyām vā dveṣaḥ| na hyanayoḥ parasparaviruddhayoryugapat sambhavo asti*.

³⁹ Bhoja’s commentary on *sūtra* 1.10: *te udārā ye prāptas ahakārisannidhayaḥ svaṃ svaṃ kāryamabhinirvartayanti yathā sadaiva yogaparipanthino vyutthānadaśāyām*.

process of dissolution of *guṇa* by the process of *pratiprasava*. Let us discuss the concept of *guṇa* now.

In many Sanskrit literary and philosophical works, the word "*guṇa*" has multiple meanings. But it is a crucial technical term in *Sāṃkhya -Yoga*. Yoga adheres to the *Sāṃkhya* notion of *guṇa*, which is commonly interpreted as the "ingredient element" or "cosmological reals" that produce this universe (*prakṛti*), which can simultaneously be the gross material world and the subtle material world. *Prakṛti* (matter) has an unmanifest form that still has the capacity to manifest in the future, but it also has a form of manifestation, which is this manifest mundane world. This prospective state of *prakṛti* is called *avyakta* (unmanifest) *prakṛti*, and this visible universe is called *vyakta* (manifest) *prakṛti*. The primary goal of yoga is to comprehend the *vyakta prakṛti*, or manifest reality, by learning how the *guṇa* functions and, in the end, to eliminate the pain that results from it. According to *Sāṃkhya -yoga* dualistic theory, there are two eternally separate entities: *puruṣa* (pure consciousness) and *prakṛti* (matter). The interaction of matter and consciousness creates the universe. Ramakrishna Rao (1963) asserts that *guṇa* is an cosmologically existent element and that it is both a "substance" and a "quality" in *sāṃkhya*, both of which are "inseparable from each other." In *Sāṃkhya -Yoga* philosophy, *guṇa* is the collective term for three types of elements: *sattva*, *raja*, and *tama*. Because of these three varieties, *guṇa* is often referred to as *triguṇa*.

"*Guṇa-s* are themselves *prakṛti*," remarks Rao. The point is, why introduce this new concept of *guṇa* if *guṇa-s* and *prakṛti* are the same? Rao responds to this query by stating that "*guṇa-s* are functional modes of *prakṛti*, the ways in which *prakṛti* takes to manifest itself," citing evidence from the *sāṃkhyakārikā* literature. *Guṇa-s* are the "functional and operational forms of *prakṛti* itself," according to Rao. It is evident that everything in this world, no matter how subtle or how gross, is composed of these three *guṇa-s* (*Vyāsa - guṇebhyo vyaktāvyaktadharmakebhyo*), apart from *puruṣa* (pure consciousness). Stated differently, the three *guṇa* (*sattva*, *raja*, and *tama*) have combined to create this natural and supernatural world. I will use *prakṛti* and *guṇa* interchangeably, with no distinction in meaning. Despite the fact that the *Yogasūtra* lacks a specific *sūtra* that explains or defines the concepts of *guṇa*⁴⁰ and *prakṛti*⁴¹, the phrases have been utilized in several *sūtra-s*. The nature of *guṇa* is

⁴⁰ YS 1.6: *tat paraṃ puruṣakhyāter guṇavairiṣṇyam*, YS 2.15: *pariṇāmatāpasamskāraduḥkhair guṇavrttivorodhāc ca duḥkham eva sarvaṃ vivekinaḥ*, YS 2.19: *viśeṣāviśeṣalingamātrālingāni guṇaparvāṇi*, YS 4.8: *tatas tadvipākānugūṇānām evābhivṛtyaktir vāsanānām*, YS 4.13: *te vyaktasūksmā guṇātmānaḥ*, YS 4.32: *tataḥ kṛtārthānām pariṇāmakramasamāptir guṇānām*, YS 4.34: *puruṣārthaśūnyānām guṇānām pratiprasavaḥ kaivalyaṃ svarūpapratīṣṭhā vā citiśaktir iti*.

⁴¹ YS 1.19 – *bhava-pratyayo videh-prakṛtīlayānām*, YS 4.2 – *jātyantarapariṇāmaḥ prakṛtyāpūrāt*, YS 4.3: *nimittam aprayojakam prakṛtīnām varanābhedaś tu tataḥ kṣetrikavat*.

explained by a variety of other terminology, including *prakṛti*, *sattva*, *buddhi*, *dṛśya*, and *darśanaśakti*.

Nature of *Guṇa*-s

It is to be noted that *guṇa*-s are real substances as well as qualities in yoga metaphysics. These three *guṇa*-s are responsible for all physical states, mental states, and supernatural states. To rephrase it, body and mind and anything beyond body-mind are *guṇa*-s or made up of *guṇa*-s or the effects of *guṇa*-s except pure consciousness. That substance, which has the nature of illumination or light (*āloka*)⁴², is called *sattva guṇa* (*prakāśaśīlaṃ sattvam*)⁴³. That substance, which has the nature of activity or motion or movement, is called *raja guṇa* (*kriyāśīlaṃ rajah*). That substance, which has the nature of inertia or stagnancy, is called *tama guṇa* (*sthitiśīlaṃ tama*). To put it another way, when the illumination of *sattva* and activity of *raja* cease, this state or condition is known as the inertia of *tama guṇa*. Viṇṇābhikṣu says that even if these *guṇa*-s are substances, they are called *guṇa*-s because, as a rope binds someone, in a similar way, *guṇa*-s also bind the *puruṣa*⁴⁴. There is no different entity as *prakṛti* in which these three *guṇa*-s can reside and these *guṇa*-s can be called the *guṇa*-s (characteristics or features) of *prakṛti*. In other words, these three *guṇa*-s are themselves *prakṛti*. It is to be remembered that *guṇa* is *prakṛti* and *prakṛti* is *guṇa*⁴⁵. These *guṇa*-s are in flux always. They are constantly interconnected to create this subtle and repulsive environment. They maintain their individual qualities despite their connection. When one of the *guṇa*-s is dominant and the other two operate as secondary assistants to carry out the tasks. In this sense, they are both similar and distinct from one another.

Function of *Guṇa*-s/ *Prakṛti*

Patañjali uses the term “*dṛśya*” as an alternative for *guṇa*-s in the YS. The word “*dṛśya*” generally means what we can see with our eyes open. But when it is indicated as *guṇa*-s, it means the manifest world (which is both the gross world and the subtle world). *Dṛśya* is basically the form of *vyakta prakṛti*. Patañjali clearly states that the purpose or function of this *dṛśya/guṇa* is to provide experience (*bhoga*) and liberation (*apavarga*) for the *puruṣa* (*bhogāpavargārthaṃ dṛśyam*). In *sūtra* 2.18, Patañjali states that “that which is knowable has the nature of illumination, activity, and inertia [*sattva*, *rajas*, and *tamas*]. It

⁴² Viṇṇābhikṣu commentary on *sūtra* 2.18: *prakāśo saubhāgyādivṛttirūpāloko bhautikālokaśca*.

⁴³ Vyāsa’s commentary on *sūtra* 2.18: *prakāśaśīlaṃ sattvam. kriyāśīlaṃ rajah sthitiśīlaṃ tama iti*.

⁴⁴ Viṇṇābhikṣu commentary on *sūtra* 2.18: *ityāśankya guṇā eva prakṛtiśabdavācyaḥ, na tu tadatiriktā prakṛtirastītyavadhārayati—ete guṇāḥ iti*.

⁴⁵ Bhasyati: *ete sattvādayo guṇāḥ puruṣasya bandhanarajjava ityarthah, sattvādīni dravyāṇi, na tāni dravyāśrayā guṇāḥ, tebhyo vyatiriktasya guṇino’bhāvaditi veditavyam*.

consists of the senses and the elements and exists for the purpose of [providing] either liberation or experience [to *puruṣa*]].⁴⁶ This *dṛśya* includes all kinds of gross and subtle elements, matter, or entities that are knowable by any means or methods. I will loosely use this *dṛśya* as a manifest world for clarity of expression in English terminology.

So, this *dṛśya* is this manifest world, which consists of a few gross sense elements such as *rūpa* (sight), *rasa* (taste), *śabda* (sound), *gandha* (smell), and *sparsa* (touch), along with the subtle sense elements such as *rūpa-tanmātra*, *rasa-tanmātra*, *śabda-tanmātra*, *gandha-tanmātra*, and *sparsa-tanmātra*. According to the yoga theory of *dṛśya*, human beings have experience of the gross external world through five *jñānendriyas*, whereas they have experience of the subtle internal world through internal organs (*antakaraṇa*). We encounter the exterior aspects of this manifest world through our gross sense organs, and the internal aspects of this manifest world—including non-physical elements or entities—through our subtle sense organs. Patañjali states unequivocally that *prakṛti* either exists or serves the purpose of liberation (*apavarga*), which keeps *puruṣa* away from all sense pleasure, or it serves the purpose of experience (*bhoga*) of pleasure and pain derived from sense organs, which keeps *puruṣa* in bondage.

Vyāsa describes “*bhoga*” by saying that when *puruṣa* is under the spell of ignorance (*avidyā*), *puruṣa* comes into contact with the *buddhi* (intellect) which is a product of *prakṛti*.⁴⁷ Due to the lack of discriminating power (*viveka*) *puruṣa* equates himself with the *buddhi*. Speaking simply, *puruṣa* thinks that *puruṣa* is *buddhi* himself. When conscious *puruṣa* thinks that the actions [*sukha* (happiness), *duḥkha* (suffering)] of unconscious *buddhi* are his own actions. Conscious *puruṣa* does not consider himself different from this manifest world. *Bhoga* is not to think that *puruṣa* is different from the elements of manifest world. In other words, when *puruṣa* enjoys the pleasures and pain of this manifest world as the pleasure and pain of himself. This identification of conscious *puruṣa* with the unconscious manifest world is called *bhoga*. Vyāsa defines *apavarga*⁴⁸ by saying that when *puruṣa* realizes that *puruṣa* is completely different from *prakṛti* or all kinds of *prakṛtic* manifestation including physical body and mind, *puruṣa* find its true form (*svarūpa*) which is pure consciousness. Finding this true self of *puruṣa* as pure consciousness is called “*apavarga*”. Vijñānabhikṣu defines

⁴⁶ Bryant’s translation

⁴⁷ Vyāsa comments on *sūtra* 1.18: *atreṣṭāṇiṣṭaḡaṇasvarūpādvadhāraṇam avibhāḡāpannam bhogo*.

⁴⁸ Vyāsa commentary on *sūtra* 1.18: *bhoktuḡ svarūpādvadhāraṇam apavarga iti*.

apavarga as “*apavṛjyate anenety apavargah*” which means that “when one is disassociated (*nivṛtti*) from *bhoga*, it is called “*apavarga*”⁴⁹.

Levels of *Guṇa-s*

There are four levels or stages. They are *viśeṣa*, *aviśeṣa*, *liṅgamātra*, *aliṅgā* (*viśeṣāviśeṣaliṅgamātrāliṅgāni guṇaparvāni*)

Viśeṣa Parva (Particular Condition)

In the *viśeṣa parva* includes sixteen *tattva* (evolutes) which are five *mahābhūtas* (great gross elements), five *jñānendriya* (organs of perception), five *karmēndriya* (organs of action) and mind. These sixteen *tattvas* gradually emerge from the six *aviśeṣa guṇa-s* which include five *tanmātras* (subtle elements) and *ahaṃkāra* (ego). *Śabda*, *sparśa*, *rūpa*, *rasa* and *gandha* are the five *tanmātras*. From these five *aviśeṣa-tanmātras*, five *mahābhūtas* emerge gradually as *viśeṣa pariṇāma* (change or transformation) which are *ākāśa*, *vāyu*, *Agni*, *jala* and *pṛthivī*.⁵⁰ These *tanmātras* such as *sparśa* remained connected with previous characteristics of other *tanmātras* and produce *bhūtas* like *vāyu*.⁵¹ This is why *bhūtas* such as *ākāśa* have gradually one, two, three, four or five characteristics each or in total.⁵² The *viśeṣa* eleven *indriyas* (senses) are the results of the *aviśeṣa ahaṃkāra*. Even out of these eleven *indriyas*, five *jñānendriya* are the result of *sattva guṇa* dominated *ahaṃkāra*. Five *karmēndriyas* are the result of *raja* *guṇa* dominated *ahaṃkāra* and mind is the result both *guṇa* (*sattva* and *raja*) dominance.⁵³ This is how *aviśeṣa guṇa parva* is transformed into *viśeṣa guṇa parva*.

Aviśeṣa Parva (Unparticular Condition)

This *aviśeṣa parva* includes six *tattvas* which are five *tanmātras* and *ahaṃkāra*. There is *kārya* (effect) - *kāraṇa* (cause) *saṃparka* (relation) between *viśeṣa* and *aviśeṣa parva* of the *guṇa-s*. The cause of the eleven *viśeṣa tattvas* is the six *aviśeṣa tattvas*.

⁴⁹ Vijnānabhikṣu comments on *sūtra* 1.18: *apavṛjyate+anenety apavargah*.

⁵⁰ *Iyāsa* comments on *sūtra* 1.19: *tatrākāśavāyuvagnyudakabhūmayo bhūtāni śabda sparśa rūpa rasa gandha tanmātrāṇām aviśeṣāṇām viśeṣāḥ*.

⁵¹ Vijnana bhikṣu commentary on *sūtra* 1.19: *tathā cottarottaratanmātreṣu pūrvapūrva tanmātrāṇām hetuvācchabdatanmātram śabdamanātradharmakam tatkāryatayā sparśatanmātram śabdasparsābhayadharmakam, evaṃ krameṇaikaikalakṣaṇadharmavṛddhirityarthah*.

⁵² Vācaspatimiśra's commentary on *sūtra* 1.19: *viśiṣṭam hy aparam pareṇeti gandha ātmanā pañcalakṣaṇo rasa ātmanā caturlakṣaṇo rūpam ātmanā trilakṣaṇam sparśa ātmanā dvilakṣaṇah śabdaḥ śabdalakṣaṇa eveti*.

⁵³ Vācaspatimiśra's commentary on *sūtra* 1.19: *asmitālakṣaṇasyāviśeṣasya sattvapradhānasya buddhīndriyāṇi viśeṣāḥ rājasasya karmendriyāṇi manas tūbhayātmakam ubhayapradhānasyeti mantavyam*.

Liṅga Parva (Marked Condition)

The third stage of the *guṇa-s* is known as *liṅga parva*. *liṅga parva* includes only one *tattva* which is *mahat-tattva*. *Mahat* is the cause of these six *viśeṣa tattvas*. Vijñānabhikṣu says that “that which is supreme, the great principle (*mahat-tattva*), a mere sign (*liṅga-mātra*) distinct from the undifferentiated elements (*aviśeṣebhyo*), in that great self, which is mere being (*sattā-mātre*), having remained, they experience the ultimate limit of growth (*vivṛddhi-kāṣṭhām anubhavanti*)”⁵⁴.

Aliṅga Parva (Unmarked Condition)

This stage of *guṇa-s* only one *tattva* that is *avyakta prakṛti* which has no sign and no characteristics. In this unmanifest form of *prakṛti* there is no movement of these three *guṇa-s*. In other words, in this stage of *aliṅga parva*, three *guṇa-s* remain inactive. Activity of *guṇa-s* entail the existence of the natural and supernatural world. So, where there is no activity or movement of *guṇa-s* there is no creation.

Guṇa-s as the Source of Twenty Four Tattva-s

Śabda-tanmātra, *sparśa-tanmātra*, *rūpa-tanmātra*, *rasa-tanmātra*, and *gandha-tanmātra* are the components of *aviśeṣa guṇa parva*. Five *viśeṣa guṇa parva* arise from these five *tanmātras*. *Ākāśa*, (space), *vāyu* (air), *Agni* (fire), *jala* (water), and *prthvī* (earth) are the five *viśeṣa guṇa parva-s*. Five *jñānendriyas*, five *karmēndriyas*, and mind are the five *asmitā guṇa parva-s*. *Śrotra* (ears), *tvak* (skin), *cakṣu* (eyes), *rasana* (taste), and *ghrāṇa* (smell) are these five *jñānendriyas*. *Vāk* (speech), *pāṇi* (hands), *pāda* (feet), *pāyū* (anus) and *upastha* (genitals), are the five *karmēndriyas*. They produce eleven *indriyas* from these six *aviśeṣas*. Thus, there are six *aviśeṣa guṇa parva* (five *tanmātra* and *asmitā*). Five *bhūtas*, five *jñānendriya*, five *karmēndriyas*, and the mind make up the sixteen *viśeṣa guṇa parva*. From *liṅgamātra mahat-tattva*, six *viśeṣa guṇa parva* are generated. The *liṅgamātra mahat tattva* gives rise to *aliṅga* or *avyakta prakṛti*. In *Sāṃkhya -yoga*, *prakṛti* is also known as *pradhāna*. Nothing or any *tattva* can create this *avyakta prakṛti*. It is an endless *avyakta prakṛti*. The subtlest kind of *prakṛti* is this one.

Guṇa-s stay in balance (*sāmyāvasthā*) during this phase of *avyakta prakṛti*. When the three *guṇa-s* are in equilibrium, there is no movement or activity. For this reason, it is impossible to perceive or feel the evolution of *prakṛti*. The 24 *tattvas* of *prakṛti* are composed

⁵⁴ Vijñānabhikṣu commentary on YS 2.19: *pratisaṃmrjyamānās ca tasminn eva sattā-mātre mahaty ātmany avasthāya yat, tan niḥsattā-sattaṃ niḥsadasan-nirasad-avyaktam aliṅgam pradhānam tat pratiyanīti*.

of six *aviśeṣa*, sixteen *viśeṣa*, one *liṅgamātra mahat*, and one *pradhāna*. All of these three *guṇa-s* are mixed in various ratios to make, change, or create these twenty-four *tattvas*. Every element that exists, no matter how subtle or gross, is composed of varying amounts of these three *guṇa-s* at various points in time, with the exception of the pure conscious *puruṣa*. One or two *guṇa-s* cannot generate anything, so keep that in mind. The existence of these three *guṇa-s* in various altered forms or structures is all that exists anywhere in the universe other than the pure conscious *puruṣa*.

Kārya (effect) is produced by *kāraṇa* (cause). The *kāraṇa* is *avyakta prakṛti*, and *mahat kārya* is produced by *avyakta kāraṇa*. *Mahat kāraṇa* is the source of *asmitā* as *kārya*. The *kāraṇa* yields eleven *indriya-s* as *kārya* and five *tanmātra-s*. Five *tanmātras* as *kāraṇa* are converted into five *pañca-bhūtas* as *kārya*. The final result of the *guṇa-s* is five *pañca-bhūtas*. All kinds of emergence of any further *tattvas* from the gross material universe ends with the five *pañca-bhūta* stage. No more organisms or evolutes have emerged from these five grotesque *tattvas*. Evolution from the unmanifest realm to the gross manifest *pañca-bhūtas* occurs in this manner. Involution also occurs from the five manifest gross *prakṛti* to unmanifest *prakṛti*, again in reverse order. *Pañca-bhūtas* return to the stage of *pañca-tanmātras*, *pañca-tanmātras* become *asmitā tattva*, *asmitā tattva* becomes *mahat-tattva*, and *mahat-tattva* becomes unmanifest *prakṛti* throughout the involution process. In yoga, this is the involution process.

The *kṣiti* (earth), *apa* (water), *teja* (fire), *vāyu* (air), and *vyoma* (ether) are the *pañca-bhūtas* (five gross elements). The components of *kṣiti* are wood, stone, and gross soil. Bones and flesh are components of *kṣiti* in our bodily bodies. A component of *APA* is water. Blood and other bodily fluids are components of *APA*. Agni is made up of warmth and energy. Agni includes our physical body's warmth or temperature. Our lungs and abdomen contain air, which is a component of *vāyu*. *Ākāśa* is *vyoma*. The components of *ākāśa* are the mouth and nose. We can infer from this debate that all of the elements in our cosmos, whether they are considered subtle or gross, are truly present in varied proportions and in different sections of our bodies. Our physical body uses *kṣiti* to make its bones and flesh. Accepting that bones and flesh are the result of *kṣiti* may seem odd, but yoga metaphysics holds that as they are composed of soil, they are *kṣiti*. After the physical body dies, they will once more turn into soil. For example, food grains are grown from soil. Thus, excellent grains are the soil's changed produce. In reality, these food grains are merely soil—soil in a different form.

Consuming food grains results in the production of body flesh. Therefore, food grains and flesh are made of the same substance. Therefore, good grain is simply turned into flesh.

No element or *tattva* created from three *guṇa-s* is completely destroyed, according to *Sāṃkhya* -yoga. Only the change of *guṇa-s* from one form to another occurs. Food grains become soil, then soil becomes food grains, then food grains become flesh, and finally soil becomes flesh again. One element can transform into another in this way. Therefore, no element is created or destroyed. Therefore, the only change that occurs is the *guṇa-s* from one element to another. Apart from the pure conscious *puruṣa*, which is constant, everything that appears to be distinct entities with varying attributes and amounts is actually a transition or alteration of these three *guṇa-s* in this cosmos. *Mahat-tattva* is the result of the dissolution of *asmitā tattva*. As a result, *asmitā* is not entirely destroyed. Since *asmitā* is not a distinct element from the *guṇa-s*, it lacks a separate existence phase and destruction phase. *Asmitā* herself becomes *mahat tattva*, or evolves into it. For now, only the *mahat* is real, but once more, the *mahat tattva* vanishes into *aliṅga* unmanifest *prakṛti*. Thus, *mahat* is likewise not a permanent and actual entity. Therefore, *avyakta prakṛti*, which is composed of three *guṇa-s*, is the only element that is genuine and true. In other other sense, *guṇa-s* are the only elements in *Sāṃkhya* -yoga philosophy that are true, real, and eternal.

We have two kinds of *karaṇa* (instrument) or *indriya-s* (senses): internal and external. *Karaṇa* is the instrument that we use to carry out any task⁵⁵. To put it another way, *karaṇa* is the tool used to carry out any task. Thus, *puruṣa* is not *indriyas*, but *karaṇa* is only *indriyas*. Therefore, when we experience "ego," it is the ego of *indriya* or *karaṇa* rather than the ego of *puruṣa*. We use *karaṇa* as an instrument. *Puruṣa* does not experience pleasure or pain; rather, *karaṇa* or *indriyas* do. Therefore, *puruṣa* is not these *indriyas*. These *indriyas* are not the *puruṣa*; rather, they are the instrument or tool of *puruṣa*. For instance, a carpenter uses a saw and chisel to build a wooden material. In order to create wooden objects, the carpenter uses tools called saws and chisels, or *karaṇa*. But rather than creating the wooden objects, the saw and chisel are the tools of creation. Likewise, the *indriyas* are not the true selves as *puruṣa*. Humans use *indriyas* as their instruments. Seeing organs (eyes) is how I view things. Eyes are termed *darśana-indriya* for this reason. I use my ear, or sound organ, to listen to sound. The ears are termed *śrāvaṇa-indriya* for this reason. Similar to this, we learn about taste, smell, and touch by touching, tasting, and smelling actual organs. Similarly, I use the five *karmēndriyas* for various activities. Gross and subtle *indriya-s* are the two categories of these

⁵⁵ YS 3.51: *sthānyupanimantraṇe saṅgasmayākaraṇaṃ punar aniṣṭaprasaṅga*.

indriya-s. Gross *indriya-s* stay with the physical body after death, whereas subtle *indriya-s* go from the physical body along with the *prāṇa* (vital air) for the subtle body. Gross *indriya-s* operate or act when the mind is in waking (*jāgrat*) stage, while subtle *indriya-s* operate or act when the mind is asleep (*svapna*). Both the subtle and gross *indriya-s* are inactive during the deep sleep stage (*suṣupti*) of the mind. Another subtle *indriya* is the mind. *Asmitā* is the source of these eleven *indriyas*, and *asmitā tattva* is also the source of the *tanmātras*.

Ego, I-ness, or I-sense are all forms of *mahat-tattva*. *Asmitā tattva* is also known as *abhimāna* or *ahaṁkāra*. When *draṣṭā* (seer) and *dṛśya* (seen or that which yogin sees) come together, *asmitā* is created⁵⁶. *Ahaṁkāra* does not exist if *draṣṭā* and *dṛśya* are not combined (*saṁyoga*)⁵⁷. It is true that *puruṣa* and *dṛśya* are separate entities. These two are very distinct things. However, *draṣṭā* believes that *draṣṭā* and *dṛśya* are similar. That is to say, he sees himself as the very *dṛśya*. The acts of *dṛśya* turn into the activities of *draṣṭā*, while *draṣṭā* is wrongly confused with *dṛśya*. In this way, *draṣṭā* imposes *dṛśya*'s actions on himself as his own. The ego is created from this incorrect imposition. The *puruṣa* experiences both pleasure and suffering because of his ego. True knowledge emerges when this sensation of pleasure and misery, which is generated from the *indriyas* by forcing the *dṛśya*'s ego upon *puruṣa*, stops. The knowledge that serves as a reminder to the *puruṣa* of the distinction between *draṣṭā* and *dṛśya* is this actual knowledge. They are distinct beings with various personalities.

The mistaken belief that *draṣṭā* and *dṛśya* are one and the same is the root cause of all actions and emotions, both positive and negative. The acts of *dṛśya* are therefore caused by the *ahaṁkāra*, or ego, which dissolves into *mahat-tattva*. Thus, *mahat-tattva* is essentially the awareness of *puruṣa*. It is a faint awareness of life. A sense of existence in the world is the first step of the mind's waking stage after the deep sleep stage. We refer to this sensation of egoity as *mahat-tattva*. There is a sense of existence following the deep sleep, followed by a sense of "I exist." Since it is the *asmitā* (ego), the sensation "I exist" is not pure. The two stages of ego are the *mahat* ego of existence and the *asmitā* ego of "I exist." *Mahat* is the source of *asmitā*. In *mahat*, *asmitā* dissolves. When a yogi gains the actual understanding of the twenty-four *tattvas* listed above. The yogin discovers its *draṣṭā*, or actual nature. That is why the yogin is instructed to acquire knowledge about the intricate functioning of the *tattva-s* by concentrating one particular *tattva* at a time from the very beginning of his yogic practice⁵⁸. By concentrating on the *tattva-s* the yogin learns that the *draṣṭā puruṣa* is not the

⁵⁶ YS 2.6: *dṛgdarśanaśaktyor ekātmatevāsmītā*.

⁵⁷ YS 2.17: *draṣṭṛdṛśyayoḥ saṁyogo heyahetuḥ*.

⁵⁸ YS 1.32: *tatpratiṣedhārtham ekatattvābhyāsaḥ*.

same as these twenty-four *tattva-s*. For this reason, the yogin ought to be well knowledgeable about the *tattvas*. Just as the yogin knows that his home is different from himself, so too may he know that he is separate from both his mind and body when *tattva-jñāna* (correct knowledge about the evolutes) is present.

The Concept of *Puruṣa*

The concept of *puruṣa* is directly connect with the concept of *pratiprasava* because it is the *pratiprasava* process by which *puruṣa* finds its own two form. To understand the phenomenon of *pratiprasava* the idea of *puruṣa* should be clear first. Let us discuss the concept of *puruṣa* now. From the time of the *Rigveda*' composition until the time of *Sāṃkhyakārikā*'s composition, Larson (1969) illustrates the evolution of the term “*puruṣa*” (self/spirit) and its usage in various texts with different meanings. There are various interpretations of the term “*puruṣa*,” including “mortal man” and “cosmic man” in the *Rigveda* and “atman” (individual conscious self) in the *Upaniṣad*. According to Larson, before the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* treatise was written, the term “*puruṣa*” was employed to denote self as a synonym for “atman,” “*jīva*,” “*bhūtātmanā*,” and “*kṣetrajña*”. Larson comments that the term “*puruṣa*” acquires a more complex and polished meaning as the self during the time of *Sāṃkhyakārikā*'s composition, turning it into a technical term. As a *Sāṃkhya* technical term *puruṣa* only means “pure conscious self”. In the *Yogasūtra*, Patañjali also uses the term “*puruṣa*” “with the same precise definition provided by *Sāṃkhya* philosophy. So, *Sāṃkhya*-yoga tradition postulates that *puruṣa* is the pure conscious eternal entity.

Nature of *Puruṣa* in *Sāṃkhya* Philosophy

Sāṃkhyakārikā 3 tells us that *puruṣa* (pure consciousness) is completely different from *prakṛti* (unmanifested form of three *guṇa-s*) and *vikṛti* (manifested form of three *guṇa-s*)⁵⁹. *Prakṛti* here means *mūlaprakṛti* which indicates the unmanifest root of eternal elements of nature which are *sattva*, *raja* and *tama*. These three elements remain in their potential but unmanifested form. They are the root cause of all kinds of manifestations, but not the effect of anything. *Vikṛti* means the modifications of those unmanifest *guṇa-s* into manifested gross and subtle world. These manifested form of *guṇa-s* such as *mahat* and *pañcatanmātra-s* are both the cause and effect of this manifested world of different entities. In other words, *prakṛti* or *mūlaprakṛti* is the root cause of all creation whereas *vikṛti* is the cause and effect of created different manifestations of this universe. So, *puruṣa* is different from

⁵⁹ *Sāṃkhyakārikā* 3: *mūlaprakṛtiravikṛtirmahadādyāḥ prakṛtīvikṛtayaḥ sapta, ṣoḍaśakastu vikāro na prakṛtirna vikṛtiḥ puruṣaḥ*.

nature and natural created world. To be specific, *puruṣa* is not connected with the nature and natural world. This view is again further explained in *Sāṃkhyakārikā* 11 which tells us that *puruṣa* is opposite from *vyakta-prakṛti* (*vikṛti*) and *avyakta-prakṛti* (*mūlaprakṛti*)⁶⁰. To put it another way, *puruṣa* is not made up of three *guṇa-s*. *Puruṣa* is a different entity from three *guṇa-s*. *Puruṣa* is discriminating, subjective, specific, conscious and non-productive. *Puruṣa* exists independently being untouched or unaffected by gross or subtle elements of nature which consist of the manifest and unmanifest world.

Characteristics of *Puruṣa*

Sāṃkhyakārikā 19 tells us about the characteristics of *puruṣa*. *Puruṣa* is a witness (*sākṣi*), free (*kaivalya*), indifferent (*mādhyaṣṭhya*), spectator or seer (*draṣṭṛtva*) and inactive or non-doer (*akartṛbhāva*)⁶¹. *Samkhyasūtra* 19 states that *puruṣa* is *nitya* (eternal), *śuddha* (pure), *Buddha* (conscious) and *mukta* (free)⁶². *Nitya* means something which has no birth and death. In other words, if *puruṣa* is *nitya*, it indicates that the *puruṣa* is never created or destroyed ever. *Puruṣa* is eternal. *Puruṣa* lives forever. *śuddha* means purity. If *puruṣa* is *śuddha*, it indicates that *puruṣa* has no impurity or *puruṣa* is untouched by impurity. *Buddhi* means consciousness. If *puruṣa* is *buddhi*, it indicates that *puruṣa* is a conscious entity, different from matter. *Mukta* means free or without any limitation. As *puruṣa* is always free, *puruṣa* does not need to seek freedom. So, *puruṣa* is actually inactive (*niṣkriya*). If *puruṣa* is inactive, then *puruṣa* has to be a non-doer (*akartā*).

Arguments for *Puruṣa*'s Existence

Sāṃkhyakārikā (18) provides five arguments for the existence of *puruṣa*⁶³. *Puruṣa* exists (1) because aggregation or combinations exist for another (*saṃghātaparārthatva*), (2) because this other must be apart or opposite from the three *guṇa-s*, etc. (*triguṇādiviparyaya*), (3) because this other must be a superintending power or control (*adhiṣṭhānāt*), (4) because of the existence or need of an enjoyer (*bhoktṛbhāva*), and (5) because there is functioning or activity for the sake of freedom or isolation (*kaivalyārtham pravṛtteśca*) (Larson).

⁶⁰ *Sāṃkhyakārikā* 11: *triguṇamaviveki viśayaḥ sāmānyamacetanam prasavadharmi, vyaktam tathā pradhānam, tadviparītastathā ca pumān.*

⁶¹ *Sāṃkhyakārikā* 19: *tasmācca viparyāsāt siddham sākṣitvamasya puruṣasya, kaivalyam mādhyaṣṭhyam draṣṭṛtvamakartṛbhāvaśca.*

⁶² *Sāṃkhya sūtra* 19: *na nityaśuddhabuddhamuktasvabhāvasya tadyogasthadyogādṛte.*

⁶³ *Samkhyakārikā* 18: *saṃghātaparārthatvāt triguṇādiviparyayādadhiṣṭhānāt, puruṣo'sti bhoktṛbhāvāt kaivalyārtham pravṛtteśca.*

First Argument As *Samghātaparārtha*

"*Samghāta*" refers to the element (*padārtha*) that collaborates with other elements in order to function, work, or act. Every element always operates or functions with the help of other elements. For this reason, "*saṃghāta*" refers to a collection of several components. "For the sake, purpose, or need of others" is what *parārtha* means. *Samghātaparārtha* indicates that *prakṛti*, which is the sum of the three *guṇa*-s, serves to satisfy another person's purpose. There are two eternal entities in *Sāṃkhya-Yoga*. *Prakṛti* is one, and *puruṣa* is the other. *Prakṛti* serves the other eternal entity, *puruṣa* (awareness), if it does not serve itself. When people work together, they usually do it to meet the goals of others. Masons, carpenters, and other workers collaborate to construct a house in a similar manner. However, the edifice that the workers produced together serves the needs of others rather than their own. No single employee can claim that they created this house entirely on their own. It is the result of several people working together. Thus, it can be inferred that *prakṛti* serves solely to satisfy the *puruṣa*'s demand or objective. *Prakṛti* must work for *puruṣa* if it doesn't work for itself. Thus, *prakṛti*'s activity will continue. Thus, it can be inferred that *prakṛti* serves solely to satisfy the *puruṣa*'s demand or objective. *Prakṛti* must work for *puruṣa* if it does not work for itself. Since *prakṛti*'s functionality or activity would be meaningless without it, the continuation of *prakṛti*'s activity thus demonstrates the existence of *puruṣa*.

Second Argument as *Triguṇādiviparyaya*

Raja, *tama*, and *sattva* are *triguṇa*-s. *Viparyaya* denotes "movement, friction, or activity". The three *guṇa*-s are always in motion, causing friction. *Guṇa*-s are, in other terms, constantly dynamic. The *guṇa*-s are in balance during the *avyakta* stage of *prakṛti*. This balance implies that the *guṇa*-s are not moving or acting in any way. *Guṇa*-s are dormant during the *avyakta* stage. *Guṇa*-s are constantly in conflict or engaged with one another in *vyakta-prakṛti*. The question now becomes, why, in the *vyakta-prakṛti*, when *prakṛti* is totally unconscious, is there always friction between the *guṇa*-s? In other words, what is the reason behind the activity of these *guṇa*-s that create this manifest world, or what causes them to be active? The response is that the *guṇa*-s' actions serve to satisfy the *puruṣa*'s objective. To put it another way, the three *guṇa*-s' actions are how *prakṛti* appears for the *puruṣa*.

Third Argument as *Adhiṣṭhānā*

The term "*adhiṣṭhāna*" signifies control or superintendence. When the conscious *puruṣa* and unconscious *prakṛti* are close, the *puruṣa* governs or motivates the *prakṛti*

elements. For instance, just as a chariot is pulled by horses that may bend, hop, and run under the guidance of a charioteer, so too is the activities of elements guided by the *puruṣa*.

Fourth Argument as *Bhokṭṛbhāvāt*

The attitude or sensation of experiencing is called “*bhokṭṛbhāva*”. In this universe, one experiences both *sukha* and *duḥkha*. Somebody or a subject has this sensation of *sukha* and *duḥkha*. No sensation of enjoyment can exist without the enjoyer. Since *prakṛti* constituents are inherently unconscious matter or elements, they are unable to experience *sukha* and *duḥkha*. Since *avyakta-prakṛti* is also inherently unconscious, *vyakta-prakṛti* is likewise unable to enjoy *vyakta-prakṛti*. There must be an enjoyer as a result. It can be assumed that the unconscious *puruṣa* is the one who experiences or relishes these sensations of *sukha* and *duḥkha* since the matter is incapable of experiencing them.

Fifth Argument as *Kaivalyārthaṃ Pravṛtteśca*

Kaivalyārthaṃ means "for the sake of *kaivalya* (liberation from *duḥkha*). *Pravṛtti* signifies will, desire, or deliberate endeavor. The meaning of the phrase “*kaivalyārthaṃ pravṛtteśca*” is "the will or desire to attain liberation from suffering". *Prakṛti*'s components are inherently the sources or causes of misery. The question now arises: who wants or wills to achieve emancipation, or the total eradication of suffering. Since *prakṛti* is endowed with suffering, it is unable to wish to purge itself. Therefore, the *puruṣa* must be the one who wants or wills to end suffering entirely. The existence of conscious *puruṣa* is demonstrated by the will or desire to free oneself.

Plurality of *Puruṣa*

Sāṃkhyakārikā (19) ⁶⁴ confirms the plurality of *puruṣa* by giving three reasons: the existence of many *puruṣa*-s can be confirmed (1) because of the diversity of births, deaths, and faculties (*jananamaraṇākaraṇānām*), (2) because of actions or functions (that take place) at different times (*pratiniyamādayugapatpravṛtteśca*), and (3) because of differences in the proportions of the three *guṇa*-s (in different entities) (*triguṇyaviparyayāccaiva*) (larson's translation). Gauḍapāda discusses these three reasons in detail.

⁶⁴*Sāṃkhyakārikā* 19: *jananamaraṇākaraṇānām pratiniyamādayugapatpravṛtteśca, puruṣabahutvaṃ siddhaṃ triguṇyaviparyayāccaiva*.

First Reason as *Jananamaraṇakaraṇa*

According to Gauḍapāda⁶⁵, *ātmā* (*puruṣa*) is many rather than one because if only one person were born, then all other people may have also been born at the same moment. If one person passed away, then everyone other might have passed away simultaneously with that one person. All other people may have become disabled at the same moment if one person has a disability (such as blindness, deafness, or muteness). But in reality, it doesn't happen. Because of these variations in birth, death, and human abilities in several individuals at the same time, it can be concluded that *puruṣa* is not one but rather many.

Second Reason as *Ayugapatpravṛtteśca*

Gauḍapāda⁶⁶ clarifies this statement by pointing out that not all human beings are simultaneously involved in morally upright endeavors. While others simultaneously engage in wicked actions, other people engage in virtuous ones. While one person is practicing vairagya, another is practicing jnana. Therefore, it can be demonstrated that *puruṣa* is not one but rather many because different people have varied wants for different activities.

Third Reason as *Triguṇyaviparyaya*

According to Gauḍapāda⁶⁷, it can be established that *puruṣa* are not one, but rather many because different persons are influenced differently by different *guṇa*-s, even if everyone is born with three *guṇa*-s. Every *puruṣa* has three *guṇa*-s at birth. However, it is evident that just one of these three *guṇa*-s influences or dominates a single individual. Some people are influenced by *sattva guṇa*, which makes them happy; others are influenced by *raja guṇa*, which makes them unhappy; yet others are influenced by *tama guṇa*, which makes them deluded.

The *Yogasūtra*'s Alternate Words for *Puruṣa*

In addition to accepting all of the attributes of *puruṣa* and the arguments for its existence put forth by *Sāṃkhya* philosophy to comprehend the concept of *puruṣa*, Patañjali also employs a few additional alternative terms for *puruṣa* to more vividly and clearly

⁶⁵Gauḍapāda's commentary on *Saṃkhyakārikā* 19: *janma ca maraṇam ca karaṇāni ca janmamaraṇakaraṇāni, teṣāṃ pratiniyamāt, pratyekaniyamādityarthah, yadyekam evātmā syāttata ekasya janmani sarva eva jāyeraṇ ekasya maraṇe sarve'pi mriyeraṇ, ekasya karaṇavaikalye bādhiryāndhatvamūkatvakūṇitvakhañjatvalakṣaṇe sarve'pi badhirāndhakūṇikhañjāḥ syuḥ, na caivam bhavati tasmājjanmamaraṇakaraṇānām pratiniyamāt puruṣabahutvam siddham.*

⁶⁶Gauḍapāda's commentary on *Saṃkhyakārikā* 19: *itaśca – ayugapatpravṛtteśca, yugapadekakālam, na yugapadayugapat pravartanam, yasmādyugapaddharmādiṣu pravṛttirdrśyate, eke dharme pravṛttāḥ, anye'dharme, vairāgye'nye, jñāne'nye pravṛttāḥ, tasmādayugapatpravṛtteśca bahava iti siddham.*

⁶⁷ Gauḍapāda's commentary on *Saṃkhyakārikā* 19: *kiṃ cānyat – traiguṇyaviparyayāccaiva, triguṇabhāvaviparyayācca puruṣabahutvam siddham, yathā sāmānye janmani ekaḥ sāttvikaḥ sukhī, anyo rājaso duḥkhī, anyastāmaso mohavān, evaṃ traiguṇyaviparyayādbahutvam siddhamiti.*

describe and explain the idea of *puruṣa*, which is also accepted by *Yogasūtra*. Several of Patañjali's *sūtra*-s utilize the term *puruṣa*⁶⁸, but they do not directly define or explain what *puruṣa* is. Patañjali employs many synonyms, including *draṣṭā* (seer)⁶⁹, *drkśakti* (power of seeing)⁷⁰, *dr̥ṣi* (seeing)⁷¹, and *citi* (consciousness)⁷², as substitutes for *puruṣa*.

Patañjali's Delineation of *Puruṣa*

Patañjali dedicates two *sūtra*-s (2.20,) to elucidate the nature of *puruṣa*. In *sūtra* 2.20, Patañjali tells us that “the seer is merely the power of seeing [however,] although pure, he witnesses the images of the mind” (Bryant’s translation). Patañjali explains that the seer (*drasta*) is the *puruṣa*. Despite being pure, being devoid of qualities and attributes, formless, and single, *puruṣa* sees the thoughts or ideas of the mind (*pratyayānupaśya*). *Pratya* means *vṛttis*, (thoughts, images, or ideas of the mind), and *anupaśya* means seeing or witnessing. The method by which *puruṣa*, who is always pure, perceives the impure actions of the *buddhi* as his own is known as *pratyayānupaśya*. Because of the absence of ignorance (*avidyā*) and discriminating power (*aviveka*), *puruṣa* connects himself with the impure processes of the mind, even though *puruṣa* is just a conscious entity with pure knowledge. This is reflected in the mirror of *buddhi*. *Puruṣa* recognizes that all of these activities are those of the *buddhi*, not of the *puruṣa*, when *vivekakhyāti* rises. *Puruṣa* discovers its own self—a mere seer rather than a doer—when this insight dawns.

⁶⁸ YS 1.16: *tat param puruṣakhyāter guṇavair̥ṣṇyam*, YS 1.24: *kleśakarmavipākāśayairaparāmṛṣṭahpuruṣaviśeṣa īśvaraḥ*, YS 3.35: *sattvapuruṣayor atyantāsaṃkīrṇayoḥ pratya yāviśeṣo bhogaḥ parārthāt svārthasaṃyamāt puruṣajñānam*, YS 3.49: *sattvapuruṣānyatākhyātimātrasya sarvabhāvādhiṣṭhārtvām sarvajñārtvām ca*, YS 3.55 – *(sattvapuruṣayoḥ śuddhisāmye kaivalyam iti*, YS 4.18: *sadājñātāś cittavṛttayas tatprabhoḥ puruṣasy āpariñāmitvāt*, YS 4.34: *puruṣārthasūnyānām guṇānām pratiprasavaḥ kaivalyam svarūpapratīṣṭhā vā citiśaktir iti*.

⁶⁹ YS 1.3: *tadādraṣṭuḥsvarūpe avasthānam*, YS 2.17: *draṣṭṛdr̥śyayoḥ saṃyogoheyahetuḥ*, YS 2.20: *draṣṭā dr̥śīmātrah śuddho+api pratyayānup aśyaḥ*, YS 4.23: *draṣṭṛdr̥śyoparaktaṃ cittamsarvārtham*.

⁷⁰ YS 2.6: *dr̥gdarśanaśaktyor ekātmatevāsmītā*.

⁷¹ YS 2.20: *draṣṭā dr̥śīmātrah śuddho api pratyayānupaśyaḥ*, YS 2.25: *tadabhāvāt saṃyogābhāvo hānam tad dr̥ṣeḥ kaivalyam*.

⁷² YS 4.22: *citer apratisaṃkramāyās tadākārāpattau sva buddhisamvedanam*, YS 4.34: *puruṣārthasūnyānām guṇānām pratiprasavaḥ kaivalyam svarūpapratīṣṭhā vā citiśaktir iti*.

*Vyāsa*⁷³ comments that "merely seeing" (*dr̥śimātra*) means that it is only the power of seeing (*dr̥kśakti*) that is untouched by specification (*viśeṣaṇāparāmṛṣṭety*), this is the meaning. That *puruṣa* is sensitive (*pratisaṃvedī*) to the intellect (*buddhi*). It is not entirely of the same form (*sarūpa*) as the *buddhi*, nor is it completely different (*virūpa*) in form. It is not, in fact, of the same form (*Na tāvat sarūpaḥ*). *Vyāsa* asks: why is it so? *Vyāsa* replies that because *buddhi* is subject to the known (*jñāta*) and the unknown (*ajñāta*), it is indeed transformative (*pariṇāminī*). And its objects (*viśaya*), such as cows and pots, being known (*jñāta*) and unknown (*ajñāta*), demonstrate its transformative nature (*pariṇāmitvaṃ*). But the fact that the object is always known (*sadājñātaviśayatvaṃ*) reveals (*paridīpayati*) the immutability (*pariṇāmitvaṃ*) of the *puruṣa*. *Vyāsa* asks: why is it so? *Vyāsa* responds that indeed, it is not the case that consciousness is an object of the *buddhi* that is both apprehended (*agr̥hītā*) and apprehended (*gr̥hītā*). Thus, it is established (*siddham*) that the *buddhi* always has objects that are known (*sadājñātaviśaya- yatvaṃ*), and therefore, is immutable (*pariṇāmitvaṃ*). And further, the intellect (*buddhi*) is for the sake of another (*parārthā*) because of acting in concert (*saṃhatyakāritvāt*); the self (*svārthaḥ*) is the *puruṣa*. Thus, because of its determination of all objects (*sarvārthādhy avasāyakatvāt*), the intellect (*buddhi*) is threefold (*triguṇa*); and because it is threefold, it is non-conscious (*acetana*). But the *puruṣa* (Self) is only the observer of the *guṇa*-s (qualities) (*guṇānām̐tūpadraṣṭā*), therefore it is not of the same form [as them] (*Na sarūpaḥ*).

Vyāsa says that very well, then let it be "opposite." *Vyāsa* asks: why is it not extremely opposite (*nātyantaṃ virūpaḥ*)? *Vyāsa* responds that because even though *puruṣa* is pure, *puruṣa* still observes images or conditions or ideas of mind and *buddhi* (*pratyayānupaśyo*). *Puruṣa* observes [in order] to understand the images or conditions or ideas (*pratyaya*) of mind and *buddhi*; observing that, although not of its nature (*atadātmā*), *puruṣa* appears to be of its nature (*tadātmaka*). In support of his view, *Vyāsa* quotes a passage which says that "the power of the enjoyer (*bhoktṛśakti*) is indeed immutable (*apratisaṃkramā*) and non-transferring

⁷³ *Vyāsa* commentary on *sūtra* 4.22: *dr̥śimātra iti dr̥kśaktir eva viśeṣaṇāparāmṛṣṭety arthaḥ. sa puruṣo bhuddheḥ pratisaṃvedī. sa buddher na sarūpo nātyantaṃ virūpa iti. na tāvat sarūpaḥ kasmāt. jñātājñāt aviśayatvāt pariṇāminī hi buddhiḥ. tasyās ca viśayo gavā dir ghaṭādir vājñātaścājñātaś ceti pariṇāmitvaṃdarśayati. sadājñātaviśayatvaṃ tu puruṣasyāpariṇāmitvaṃ paridīpayati kasmāt. na hi buddhiś ca nāma puruṣaviśayaś ca syād agr̥hītā gr̥hītā ceti siddham puruṣasya sadājñātaviśaya yatvaṃ tataś cāpariṇāmitvaṃ iti. kiṃ ca parārthā buddhiḥ saṃhatyakāritvāt, svārthaḥ puruṣa iti. tathā sarvārthādhy avasāyakatvāt triguṇā buddhis triguṇatvād acetaneti. guṇānām̐tūpadraṣṭā puruṣa ity ato na sarūpaḥ. astu tarhi virūpa iti. nātyantaṃ virūpaḥ kasmāt. śuddho+apy asau pratyayānupaśyo yataḥ. pratyayaṃ bauddham anupaśyati, tam anupaśyann atadātmāpi tadātmaka iva pratyavabhāṣate. tathā cōktam--- aparīṇāminī hi bhoktṛśaktir apratisaṃkramā ca pariṇāminy arthe pratisaṃkrānteḥ tadavṛttim anupatati, tasyās ca prāptacaitanyo pagraharūpāyā buddhivṛtter anukāramātratayā buddhivṛttivaiśiṣṭā hi jñānavṛttir ity ākhyāyate.*

(*apratisaṃkrānteva*). When the mutable object is seemingly transferred, it follows its activity. And because the activity of *buddhi*, which is of the nature of receiving consciousness, is merely an imitation, the activity of knowledge is said to be non-distinct from the activity of *buddhi*.

Patañjali explains the nature of *puruṣa* once again in *sūtra* 4.22. According to *Sāṃkhya-Yoga* philosophy, *puruṣa* is the enjoyer (*bhoktā*) and knower (*jñātā*) of the *citta* (mind). Since *puruṣa* is always static and inactive by default, there may now be a question regarding the possibility of being both a knower (*jñātā*) and an enjoyer (*bhokta*) of *citta* (mind) without a direct relationship of *puruṣa* with the *citta*. *Sūtra* 4.22 tells us that “although it is unchanging, consciousness becomes aware of its own intelligence by means of pervading the forms assumed by the intelligence”⁷⁴ (bryant’s translation). Citi-consciousness, according to Patañjali, is immutable (*apratisaṃkrama*). The word “*pratisaṃkrama*” refers to moving or penetrating something by dispersing any energy spell. *Puruṣa*, who is immutable by nature, becomes the knower of *buddhi* and assumes the form of *buddhi* changes. *Puruṣa* turns into the *bhoktā* of the *buddhi*’s activities in this way. Since *puruṣa* does not act to change into *buddhi* in the same way that *buddhi* changes into different sense organs or *puruṣa* combines with various objects of sense organs, the claim that *puruṣa* cannot be a *bhoktā* is not logically impossible. However, because *puruṣa* learns by identification (*tadākārāpatti*), *puruṣa* can be a knower of *buddhi*. “*Tadākārāpatti*” is the process in which *puruṣa* establishes a relationship (*āpattau*) by taking the form (*ākāra*) of *buddhi* which is constantly shifting mental states (*citta*). While *puruṣa* mistakenly associates himself with the mental modifications by establishing the relation between *puruṣa* and *citta*, *buddhi* modifies or transforms itself into various sorts of mental modifications. Regarding the process of “*tadākārāpatti*” Vācaspatimiśra and Vijñānabhikṣu have different perspectives.

Vācaspatimiśra’s Understanding of “*Tadākārāpatti*”

Vācaspatimiśra⁷⁵ says that when ‘*puruṣa*’s reflection falls in the mirror of *buddhi*, the inanimate *buddhi* is transformed into an animated *buddhi*, and the *buddhi* then becomes conscious of or knowledgeable of outside objects. “*Buddhi-vṛtti*” is the term for this understanding of the outside world. This is the understanding of the outside world that the *buddhi* obtained. *Puruṣa* is used to identify this knowledge of exterior items (e.g., I know the pots or cows, or I have knowledge of pot). The “*buddhi-pratisaṃvedanam*,” “*bhoga*,” or

⁷⁴ YS 4.22: *citer apratisaṃkramāyās tadākārāpattau sva buddhisamvedanam*.

⁷⁵ See the commentary of Vācaspatimiśra commentary on YS 4.22.

"knowledge of *citta*" (*cittajñātitva*) is this understanding of *puruṣa*. However, how is the evolution of *buddhi* infused into numerous things by changeless *puruṣa*? Vācaspatimiśra remarks that pure *puruṣa* does not imbibe or identify with the knower of the *buddhi*, but rather with the *buddhi*'s reflected form of *puruṣa*. The reflected form of *puruṣa* in the *buddhi* is known as "*asmitā*". As the *buddhi* transforms into various forms, the mirrored form of *puruṣa* will also undergo transformations by observing the *buddhi*'s actions. The reflected form of *puruṣa* reflects all forms of "*buddhi-vṛtti*". For instance, the moon appears to tremble when its reflection hits the clear yet rippling water. This is caused by the water's movement. Consequently, human beings perceive the moon as a reflection even if it is motionless. Similarly, the reflected form of *puruṣa* in the *buddhi* becomes the knower of the mind's own activities as his own, despite the fact that *puruṣa* is immutable. This is called "*buddhyākārāpatti*". *Puruṣa* derives his own pleasures from this "*buddhyākārāpatti*," or he learns about *citta*'s actions as if they were his own'.

Vijñānabhikṣu's Understanding of *Tadākārāpatti*

The reflected form of *puruṣa* that is a part of the *buddhi* does not become the knower or the one who enjoys the "*buddhi-vṛtti*," according to Vijñānabhikṣu. It would appear that the conscious *buddhi* that arises from the conscious reflection of *puruṣa* transforms into "*buddhi-vṛtti*" "through various sense organ actions. In pure *puruṣa*, this "*viśayakāra-buddhi*," or "*buddhi-vṛtti*," is always naturally reflected. The reflected form of *puruṣa* is the activity of *buddhi-vṛtti*, which is impacted by pure conscious things. Vijñāna Bhikṣu ⁷⁶ comments that even for consciousness (*citta*) that does not reflect, the perception of its own mental activity occurs only through assuming the form of that mental activity (*apratisañcārāyā api citeḥ svīya-buddhi-vṛtti-darśanam buddhi-vṛtty-ākāratāpattyaiva bhavatīty arthaḥ*). The meaning is this: the movement of the knower is not directly the cause of knowledge, but rather the assumption of the form of the object is the cause, through the gateway of contact. Otherwise, due to the absence of mental movement in dreams and the like, there would be no possibility of the appearance of objects.

Vijñānabhikṣu continues that therefore, due to pervasiveness alone, everywhere the movement of the self that is near is not expected. And the acceptance of misfortune is to prevent the truly real form of a *puruṣa*. Just as, even at the time of contact with objects, in a dream or the like, the mind inevitably takes on that form in order to manifest it. Transformation (*pariṇāma*) is not accepted in this way: even in the absence of mental activity,

⁷⁶See Vijñānabhikṣu's commentary on *sūtra* 4.22.

the manifestation of that [activity] occurs to the *puruṣa*, by which the form of the activity [appears] even in the *puruṣa*. Transformation (*pariṇāma*) is not desired; rather, like the redness of a rose (*japā*) reflected in a crystal, only a reflection of the mental activity (*citta-vṛtti*) is desired, due to its lightness (*lāghavāt*). Because to assume a transformation called *ākāra* in both cases is complex, and because the capacity of crystal, mirror, etc., to reveal objects reflected in themselves is established. Therefore, it is said by the author of the *sūtra* that this is only the reflection in the *vṛtti*, which is the assumption of the form of the *vṛtti*.

Vyāsa ⁷⁷ comments that indeed, the power of the enjoyer (*bhoktṛśakti*) is immutable (*apariṇāminī*) and non-transferable (*apratisaṃkramā*), yet it appears to follow the transformations (*vṛtti*) of the object (*arthe*) that is subject to change (*pariṇāminī*), as if it were transferred (*pratisaṃkrānteva*) into it. And the activity of knowledge (*jñānavṛtti*) is indeed described as being undifferentiated from the activity of the intellect (*buddhivṛtti*), since it is merely an imitation of the activity of the intellect (*buddhivṛtti*), which has the nature of receiving the influence of consciousness (*caitanya*). *Vyāsa* supports his view by quoting: “neither the nether world, nor the caves of mountains, nor even darkness, the bellies, nor the oceans. In the cave wherein is set the eternal Brahman, which poets know as the undifferentiated activity of the intellect”. So, *Yogasūtra* establishes that even if *puruṣa* is completely disconnected from *prakṛti*, still *puruṣa* becomes the enjoyer and knower of the mental activities by reflecting *puruṣa*’s consciousness on the mirror of *buddhi*.

Relation Between *Pratiprasava* and *Samādhi*

Another important concept which is closely connected with the theme of *pratiprasava* is the concept of *samādhi*. *Samādhi* is a yogic state where a yogi loses his personal self and get lost in the object of meditation. *Samādhi* is a process of returning or coming back to view the real self of a yogi beyond this psychosocial individuality and a process of realization that he is the *puruṣa*, not the *prakṛti*. *Samādhi* is another important tool involved in the process of return to origin (*pratiprasava*). The stages of *samādhi* are like crossing the hurdles of attaining liberation one after another and ultimately reaching the most coveted “*asamprajñata* – *samādhi*” stage which directly leads to *kaivalya* (liberation).

We need to understand what are the stages of *Samādhi* and how these are identical with the theme of *pratiprasava*. *Samādhi* is of two types – *samprajñata-samādhi* and *asamprajñata-samādhi*. These two types of *samādhi* have been accepted by all the yogis and

commentators as valid and real stages of liberation from this primordial essence of this physical world. *Samprajñata Samādhi* has four stages of development and *asamprajñata-samādhi* has two stages of development. It is here in these stages of development of *samprajñata-samādhi* and *asamprajñata-samādhi* where the commentators and yogis differ in their views regarding the total number of stages of *samādhi*.

Samprajñata-Samādhi

Vyāsa defines *samprajñata-yoga* by saying that “*samādhi* which, in the one-pointed state of mind (*ekāgre cetasi*), illuminates the true object (*sadbhūtam arthaṃ pradyotayati*), destroys the afflictions (*kṣiṇoti ca kleśān*), loosens the bonds of *karma* (*karmabandhanāni ślathayati*), and leads towards the state of restraint (*nirodham abhimukhaṃ karoti*), is called *saṃprajñāta yoga* (*sa saṃprajñāto yoga ity ākhyāyate*)”. *Bhoja* also defines *samprajñata-yoga* when comments that “that by which the form of what is to be cultivated is known perfectly (*prajñāyate*), being free from correct doubt (*saṃśaya*) and error, is the *saṃprajñātaḥ samādhi*, a special kind of cultivation (*bhāvanā*)” (*samyak saṃśayaviparyayarahitatvena prajñāyate prakarṣeṇa jñāyate bhāvyasya rūpaṃ yena sa saṃprajñātaḥ samādhirbhāvanāviśeṣaḥ*). But the question arises: why it is named as *saṃprajñāta yoga*? *Vyāsa* replies that because of the non-apprehension of all words, it is called *saṃprajñāta yoga* (*sarvaśabdāgrahaṇāt saṃprajñāto 'pi yoga ity ākhyāyate*). What does the term *saṃprajñāta* mean”? *Vijñānabhikṣu* replies that “because of the connection with reasoning (*vitarka*) etc., which are forms of direct realization (*sākṣātkāra-viśeṣa-rūpa*), the union (*yoga*) with correct wisdom (*samyak prajñāvattvena*) is called *saṃprajñāta*”⁷⁸. It is the first stage of *samādhi*⁷⁹. To see the face of a man in a mirror clearly the mirror needs to be untainted and clean. In the same manner, one must have a transparent mind in order to have the right knowledge of the subtle entities in this world. At the time when the mind is one-pointed (*ekāgra*) and the *rajas* (action), and *tamas* (inertia) are inactive the mind becomes crystal clear. When there is a larger preponderance of *sattva* quality in the mind the mind becomes capable of contemplating the object of experience more clearly.

It is in this stage of one-pointedness of mind that mind stops having mere knowledge of physical knowledge of things in this universe and in this stage of one-pointedness one gains the true knowledge of things devoid of doubt and misperception of things. So, the mind

⁷⁸ *Vijñānabhikṣu*’s commentary on *sūtra* 1.17: *sākṣātkāra-viśeṣa-rūpaḥ vitarkādibhir anugamād hetoḥ samyak prajñāvattvena yogaḥ saṃprajñāta-nāmā bhavati*.

⁷⁹ *Vācaspatimiśra*’s commentary on *sūtra* 1.17: *saṃprajñāta-pūrvakatvād asamprajñātasya prathamam saṃprajñātopavarṇanam*.

starts to have knowledge of subtle things beyond gross physical knowledge of things. With the consecutive development of meditation on the part of the individual, the mind becomes susceptible to experience the things which are beyond the reach of sense organs or sensations. In this manner, in the *samprajñata-samādhi* stage, the experience from gross matter to subtle matter gradually develops. For this progress from physical to subtle knowledge, the *Śruti* (statements of the old, but lost scripture)) are the proof. While teaching archery, the teacher asks the student to aim at the things which has physical existence. When the student becomes an adept in aiming gross things the teacher instructs the student the rules of aiming and piercing the subtle entities through his arrow. In the same way, one who practices *samprajñata-yoga* experience at first the five *mahābhūta* (gross elements) and then subtle elements. The word ‘*samprajñata*’ itself indicates that the experience of the object of experience occurs in a right way. In fact, at the state of *samprajñata yoga*, the wisdom of comprehending 25 elements by which this world is made of, is produced. When the stage of *Samprajñata-yoga* gets matured and produces wisdom, this produced wisdom turns into *viveka-khyāti* (discriminative knowledge).

Patañjali states that *samprajñata-samādhi* has four states – state of *vitarka* (absorption with “physical awareness,”), state of *vicāra* (absorption with “subtle awareness,”), state of *ānanda* (absorption with “bliss,”), and state of *asmitā* (absorption with “the sense of I-ness.”)⁸⁰. Vyāsa explains the meanings of these four terms one after another in his commentary. Vyāsa says that *vitarka* means “a coarse application of the mind on its object” (*vitarkaś cittasyāḷambane sthūla ābhogaḥ*). *Vicāra* means subtle sustained thought (*sūkṣmo vicāraḥ*). *Ānanda* means joy (*ānando hlādaḥ*). *Asmitā* means “ego-sense (*asmitā*) [which is] consciousness (*saṃvid*) [and] of one essence (*ekātmikā*)” (*ekātmikā saṃvid asmitā*).

Samprajñata Samādhi with Vitarka State

Vijñānabhikṣu comments that “the word *vitarka* means “contrary reasoning” (*vitarka-śabdo viparīta tarkaṇārthakaḥ*). The very first stage of *samprajñata-samādhi* is *vitarkānugata samprajñata samādhi* where one is absorbed with physical awareness or accompanied by deliberation. *vitarkānugata samprajñata yoga* has its object of support of any gross object. This stage of *samprajñata yoga* is again into two types – *savitarka samprajñata samādhi* and *nirvitarka samprajñata samādhi*.

⁸⁰ YS 1.17: *vitarkavicārānandāsmītārūpānugamāt samprajñātāḥ*.

Savitarka Samprajñata Samādhi

There is the presence of thought process in this type of *samādhi*. For example, if the object of support in this stage of *samādhi* is a cow, the mind becomes one with the cow, along with the idea that it is an animal, has special colour, has special shape and other information regarding the cow. So, there is still distinction between the object of *samādhi* and *samādhi* itself. On other words, *samādhi* has not freed itself from being deliberative to the object of meditation. This is the *savitarka* stage of *samādhi*. Rāmānandasarasvati describes *savitarka samādhi* when he comments that “when a yogi, with a concentrated mind, conceptually cognizes a gross object such as a cow, without differentiating between the word and the meaning, the direct realization arising from *samādhi* grasps only the conceptually constructed object. Similarly, that wisdom (*prajñā*) of *samādhi* is mixed with the conceptualizations of word, meaning, and knowledge, and is equivalent to them, because there is no distinction in being conceptual. That mixed [wisdom] is what is meant by discursive absorption (*savitarka-samāpatti*)”⁸¹.

Nirvitarka Samprajñata Samādhi

In this stage of *samādhi*, the mind becomes one with the object of meditation devoid the knowledge of its properties or qualities. For example, now the mind merges with the cow without the distinctive knowledge of its colour, shape, and other properties. Hariharānanda describes that “when, through the practice of meditation free from names and sentences, the actual object of meditation is known devoid of speech, then there is purification of the memory of word-convention (*śabdasaṅketasmṛtipariśuddhiḥ*). At that time, that direct cognition does not become mixed with conceptual knowledge connected with words, or with knowledge based on hearing (*śruta*) and inference (*anumāna*) Then, the object abides in the wisdom of concentration (*samādhi-prajñā*) solely through its non-conceptual (*nirvikalpa*) own-nature (*svarūpa*). It is delimited only by such own-nature. At that time, only the real (*vāstavaṃ*) form (*rūpamātra*) alone appears (*nirbhāsate*), and no unreal (*asat*) entity (*padārtha*) exists within it. This is indeed non-discursive (*nirvitarkā*) attainment (*samāpatti*)”

82.

⁸¹Rāmānandasarasvati’s commentary on *sūtra* 1.42: *śabdajñānābhyāmabhedena vikalpite sthūle gavādyarthe samāhitacittasya yoginaḥ samādhijanyasākṣatkāro yathā kalpitārthameva grhṇāti, tathā sāmādhiprajñā śabdārthajñānānām vikalpaiḥ saṅkīrṇā taiḥ tulyā bhavati, vikalpatvāviśeṣāt | sāmādhiprajñā savitarkā samāpattirityarthah.*

⁸² Hariharananda Aranya commentary on *sūtra* 1.43: *yadā nāmavākyaarahitadhyānābhyāsād vāstavo dhyeyaviśayo vāgviyukto jñāyate tadā śabdasaṅketasmṛtipariśuddhiḥ, na tadā tat pratyakṣam vijñānam śabdānuviddhe savikalpena śrutānumānajñānena salinaṃ bhavati, tadā'rthah samādhiprajñāyām nirvikalpena svarūpamātreṇāvatiṣṭhate, tādṛśa svarūpamātratayaivāvaccidhyate = vāstavaṃ*

Samprajñata Samādhi with Vicāra State

In this *samādhi* age of, one is absorbed with subtle awareness or accompanied by reflection. The mind focuses on subtle elements. In other sense, the object of support is any subtle object, beginning with *tanmātra* the subtle elements and ending with *prakṛti*. This stage of *samādhi* is further divided into two types – *savicāra* and *nirvicāra samprajñata-samādhi*.

Savicāra Samprajñata Samādhi

In this stage of *samprajñata-samādhi*, mind becomes with the subtle object as limited by time, space and causality. Simply speaking, the mind is still associated with the pleasure, pain and etc. Bhoja comments that “that [*samādhi*] in which a subtle object appears, qualified by place, time, dharma, etc., as having the characteristic of being the object of word and meaning, and as being accompanied by conceptualization of word and meaning, is *savicāra* (deliberative)”⁸³.

Nirvicāra Samprajñata Samādhi

In this stage of *samprajñata-samādhi*, mind becomes with the subtle object without any limitation of time, space and causality. Bhoja explains that “that [*samādhi*] in which subtle objects, consisting of the essence of the *tanmātras* and the sense organs, appear as the mere substrate, devoid of location, time, characteristic, etc., is *nirvicārā*”⁸⁴. Vijñānabhikṣu explains that “that *samāpatti* which arises in every way, with all aspects (*sarvathāsarvaiḥsarva*), in all forms (*rūpaiḥ*), without limitation by place, time, etc., in the peaceful, risen, and inexpressible *dharma-s* that are not limited by past, present, and future *dharmas*, and in the past, present, and subtle states, is *nirvicārā*”⁸⁵.

Samprajñata Samādhi with ānanda State

When one gains mastery in *vitarka* state and *vicāra* state he enters into *ānanda* state. If one gives up the gross and the subtle elements, if one fixes the indriyas (sense organs) in their respective places and if one gives up the gross and the subtle meditation, and if one meditates on the *sattvic* mind itself, it is known as *sānanda-samādhi*. This is called *grāhya-samāpatti*, cognition of the instrument of cognition.

rūpamātrameva tadā nirbhāṣate, na ca kaścidasatpadārthastadantargato varttate, sā hi nirvitarkā samāpattiḥ.

⁸³ Bhoja’s commentary on YS – 1.42: *śabdārthaviṣay- atvena śabdārthavikalpasahitātvena deśakāladharmādya vacchinnāḥ sūkṣmo+arthāḥ pratibhāti yasyāṃ sā savicārā.*

⁸⁴ Bhoja’s commentary on YS 1.42: *deśakāladharmādirahito dharmimātratayā sūkṣmārthastanmātrendriyarūpaḥ pratibhāti yasyāṃ sā nirvicārā.*

⁸⁵ Vijñānabhikṣu’s commentary on YS 1.44: *yā tu sarvathāsarvaiḥsarva-rūpaiḥ, sarvato deśa-kālādy-anavacchedataḥ samāpattiḥ śāntoditāvyapadeśaya-dharmānavacchinneṣv atīta-vartamāna bhaviṣyad-dharmair anavacchinneṣv atīta-vartamāna-bhūta-sūkṣmeṣu jāyate sā nirvicārā.*

Samprajñata Samādhi with Asmitā State

The *asmitā* in the context of *samādhi* is when the mind experiences an “I- am- ness” in the sense of the true subject of awareness, viz., “the source of my awareness is *puruṣa*.”

Asamprajñata Samādhi

It is the last stage of all *samādhi* journey where the personal I'ness doesn't remain, that is, the individuality is lost and the mind is free of analysis, reflection, sense of the world. So, from *samprajñata-samādhi* to *asamprajñata-samādhi*, it is actually process of reversal (*pratiprasava*) from entangled life to utmost freedom. For *Vyāsa*, in *asamprajñata* stage, there is cessation (*nirodha*) of all mental modification (*asaṃprajñāte tu sarvāsām eva nirodha ity arthaḥ*). *Vyāsa* and most Sanskrit commentators further describe that “when all activities have ceased, and only latent impressions remain, the cessation of mind is *asaṃprajñāta-samādhi* (non-cognitive concentration)⁸⁶ and the means of attaining this *samādhi* is detachment (*tasya paraṃ vairāgyam upāyaḥ*).

Relation Between *Pratiprasava* and *Kaivalya*

Without a proper understanding of the concept of *pratiprasava*, we cannot understand the idea of *kaivalya* in the *Yogasūtra* or *Pātañjalayogaśāstra*⁸⁷. According to YS 4.34, *pratiprasava* is necessary for the attainment of *kaivalya* but scholars have interpreted these two terms in two different ways: from an cosmological standpoint and from an epistemological standpoint. Traditional Sanskrit commentators and some modern scholars defend an cosmological interpretation, according to which *pratiprasava* means the literal dissolution of one's physical body and mind⁸⁸. So, *kaivalya* is achieved when the embodied *puruṣa* obliterates all its entanglements with *prakṛti*. cosmologically understood, *kaivalya* entails liberation after the death of the body (*videhamukti*). By contrast, a number of other scholars defend an epistemological interpretation, according to which *pratiprasava* means the dissolution of our misidentification of *puruṣa* with *prakṛti*, which is the result of ignorance

⁸⁶ *Vyāsa's* commentary on *sūtra* 1.18: *sarvavṛttipratyastamaye saṃskāraśeṣo nirodhaś cittasya samādhir asaṃprajñātaḥ*.

⁸⁷ Philip Maas has suggested that *Yogasūtra* and *Vyāsabhāṣya* were written by the same individual, Patañjali himself, based on his research of many yoga manuscripts where the colophons read *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* or *Pātañjala-Yoga-Śāstra Sāṃkhya Pravacana* instead of *Yogasūtra*. However, since there is currently no comprehensive critical edition of the entire text, I use the *Yogasūtra* and *Yoga-Bhāṣya* as distinct works by different authors in this paper. Only the first part the *Yogasūtra* was critically edited by Maas.

⁸⁸ *Vyāsa*, Bhoja and Vijñānabhikṣu, Dāsgupta, 1924; Eliade 1961; Feuerstein 1989; Rukmani 1997; Veda Bhāratī 2004; Bhattacharya 2008; Bryant 2007.

(*avidyā*)⁸⁹. It is the liberating knowledge of the distinction between the *puruṣa*'s original self and the psychophysical self. So, *kaivalya* is attained when the empirical *puruṣa* ceases to identify with *prakṛti*. Upon the attainment of *kaivalya*, the afflictions and impurities of the mind are dissolved, but not the mind itself. Epistemologically conceived, *kaivalya* entails liberation while living in this physical body (*jīvan-mukti*)⁹⁰.

The declared goal of classical yoga is to attain *kaivalya* (liberation) which is considered as the highest stage of spiritual journey of a yogi after which nothing remains to achieve for a yogi. Patañjali uses the term *pratiprasava* to explain the nature of *kaivalya*. So, the concept of *pratiprasava* is bound up with that of *kaivalya*. Without a proper understanding of the concept of *pratiprasava* we cannot understand the idea of *kaivalya* in the *Yogasūtra*. According to *sūtra* 4.34 *pratiprasava* is necessary for the attainment of *kaivalya*. Though there is disagreement among scholars about the nature of *kaivalya* but there is complete consensus among the scholars that *kaivalya* is the last stage of yogic practice where liberation is attained.

Patañjali explicitly mentions *kaivalya* five times in the *Yogasūtra* (YS 2.25, 3.51, 3.56, 4.26, 4.34). In these aphorisms, we get many meanings of *kaivalya*. Let us see how Patañjali explains *kaivalya* throughout the whole *Yogasūtra* in different places:

1. Only from the discernment of the difference between *sattva* and *puruṣa* can there be sovereignty over all states of being and knowledge of all (III:49).
2. From dispassion even toward this, in the destruction of the seed of this impediment, arises perfect aloneness (*kaivalya*) (III:50).
3. There is no cause for attachment and pride upon the invitation of those well-established, because of repeated association with the undesirable (III:51).
4. From *saṁyama* on the moment and its succession, there is knowledge born of discrimination (III:52).
5. Hence, there is the ascertainment of two things that are similar, due to their not being limited (made separate) by differences of birth, designation, and place (III:53).
6. The knowledge born of discrimination is said to be liberating, (inclusive of) all conditions and all times, and nonsuccessive (III:54).

⁸⁹ Taimni 1961; Larson 1999; Whicher 2009; Chapple 2008; Collins 2009; Foulks 2009; Michael Beloved 2007; Sarbacker 2005 ; Bachman 2011.

⁹⁰ The term "*jīvan-mukti*" is not mentioned in the *Yogasūtra* and Vyāsa's commentary. It is a popular term in the Advaita *Vedānta* tradition. Here, I am using this term *jīvan-mukti* to indicate liberation in the realm of *prakṛti*.

7. In the sameness of purity between the *sattva* and the *puruṣa*, there is perfect aloneness (*kaivalya*) (*sattva-puruṣayoḥ śuddhi-samye kaivalyam iti III:55*).⁹¹

In all these above-mentioned aphorisms there is no clear indication that *kaivalya* in Yoga means rejection of this physical world and a final severing of man from matter or acceptance of this phenomenal world by living harmoniously with physical body and mind . Again, in *sūtra* 4.34 tells us that when the *pratiprasava* of *guṇa-s* takes place *kaivalya* is attained. I will show later in chapter 3 in detail that Patañjali provides different characteristics of the nature of *kaivalya* in different which may appear contradictory at the surface level and I will show that this apparent contradictions can be harmonized with coherent meaning and process of the *kaivalya* if *pratiprasava* is not understood in a literal sense in which it means complete disassociation from this physical world and physical body. The question is how to best interpret the meaning of *pratiprasava* in the yogic metaphysics.

Relation Between *Pratiprasava* and *Jīvanmukti*

Though there is no direct mention of the term *jīvanmukta* or *jīvanmukti* in both *Sāṃkhyakārikā* of Īśvarakṛṣṇa and *Yogasūtra* of Patañjali the idea of *jīvanmukti* or *jīvanmukta* is implied with important metaphors. The notion of freedom from attachment while living exists in both *Sāṃkhya* and Yoga. Īśvarakṛṣṇa's *Sāṃkhyakārikā* describes liberation as the realization (which happens while embodied) that the pure, inactive and conscious witness (*puruṣa*) is not related to unconscious manifest nature (*prakṛti*). *Sāṃkhyakārikā* 67 further, explains this state of liberation through the image of potter's wheel. This *Kārikā* 67 states that through the attainment of perfect knowledge, virtue and rest become devoid of their causal efficacy; yet the spirit continues to live for a while invested with the body; just like a potter's wheel continuing to revolve (even when the potter ceases in his efforts at revolving the wheel) due to the momentum of the past impulse⁹². In similar way, *Yogasūtra* states that all afflicted action ceases for the master yogi who, then lives on without impurity in "cloud of *dharma*" (YS IV. 29-30)⁹³.

It is evident from the above discussion that *Sāṃkhya* and Yoga assure the possibility of being liberated while alive, but these two philosophies do not discuss anything about the nature and status and function of *Jīvanmukta* in this mundane world directly. While

⁹¹ YS 3.55 - *sattva-puruṣayoḥ śuddhi-samye kaivalyam iti*.

⁹² *Sāṃkhyakārikā* 67: *samyagjñānādhiḡgamād dharmādīnāmakāraṇaprāptau tiṣṭhati saṃskāravaśāccakrabhramavad dhr̥taśarīrah*.

⁹³ YS 4.29: *prasaṃkhyāne+apy akusīdasya sarvathā vivekakhyāter dharmameghaḥ samādhiḥ*. YS 4.30: *tataḥ kleśakarmanivṛttiḥ*.

Īśvarakṛṣṇa's *Sāṃkhya Kārikā* leaves no scope for any discussion of *Jīvanmukta* even indirectly Patañjali somehow makes room for the discussion of *Jīvanmukta* in a more rigorous way by employing the term *pratiprasava* in *Yogasūtra*. *Pratiprasava* is a very important concept in *Yogasūtra* and it plays an important role in whole yogic metaphysics.

Mention of *Pratiprasava* in Sanskrit Grammar Texts

In Sanskrit grammar, *pratiprasava* has been used as an exception rule. In *kāśikā* commentary of *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (name of Pāṇinī's grammatical work consisting of 8 chapters), the word *pratiprasava* has been used. It says that "by the previous [rule], compounding is already established; when a prohibition arises due to "*tasya kartari ca*," this statement is begun for the sake of counter-exception" (*pūrveṇa samāsaḥ siddha eva, tasya kartari ca iti pratiśedhe prāpte vacanamidamārabhyate pratiprasavārtham*). *Padamañjarī* commentary says that "and by those such as sacrificers, for the sake of counter-cessation (*pratiprasava*). Counter-cessation is the permission to resume an activity that has been stopped by something else (*yājakādibhiḥsa pratiprasavārthamiti, anyena nivartitasya punaḥ pravṛtyabhyanuñjānamupratiprasavaḥ*). In *Siddhāntakaumudī* (703) says that "with these, a word ending in the sixth case is compounded, this is a counter-example to the rule "with *tr* and *ka* in the agent" (*ebhiḥ ṣaṣṭhyantaṃ samasyate, trjakābhyāṃ kartari ityasya pratiprasavo'yam*).

Role of *Pratiprasava* in Yoga Philosophy

Understanding the importance of *pratiprasava* in the Yoga metaphysics, Kenneth Rose (2016:107) understands *pratiprasava* as the "central nerve of Patañjali's system" because Patañjali uses yogic *samādhi* to demonstrate how the universe of experience can be reabsorbed (*pratiprasava*) into primal *prakṛti*. , Rose interprets *pratiprasava* as "reabsorption" or "mental simplification." By "simplification," Rose (2016:149) indicates that the mind transcends or simplifies itself factor by factor". Rose (2016: 102) states that *pratiprasava* is an essential mechanism that describes the progressive levels of *saṃprajñāta-samādhi* ⁹⁴. According to Rose (2016:114), *pratiprasava* is a movement of simplification from one *saṃprajñāta-samādhi* stage to another ⁹⁵. Here, *pratiprasava* is a

⁹⁴ Rose comments that "the extended fixity and mental simplification (*pratiprasava*) that characterize the ascending degrees of (*saṃprajñāta*) *samādhi*". According to Rose, there are four levels which are *vitarka-samādhi* (concrete-reflection recollectedness), *vicāra-samādhi* (abstract-reflection recollectedness), *ānanda-samādhi* (delightful recollectedness), and *asmitā-samādhi* (mere self-awareness recollectedness). These are Rose's translations.

⁹⁵ Rose writes that "the whole preceding practice of Eight-Part Yoga was needed in order to arrive at the movement of simplification (*pratiprasava*) that was enacted in the move from *saṃvitarka-samādhi* to *nirvitarka-samādhi*"

psychological process. However, Rose (2016:107) also understands *pratiprasava* as a reversal of the eternal, cosmological process by which *prakṛti* gradually emerges from a primal, potential condition into so many elements that make up the creation. Based on the importance of the cosmological *pratiprasava* process, Rose (2016:108) says that “Patañjali’s Eight-Part Yoga can be seen as a procedure for reabsorbing these projected bits of differentiated *prakṛti* back into its pristine, stabilized, and potential form (*guṇānāṃ pratiprasavaḥ*, YS 4.34; see also 1.45) at which point *puruṣa* shines clearly in the purified mind (*‘sāttvic citta’*) of the perfected yogi (YS 1.47).”

But Rose (2016:122) unsatisfactorily accepts *kaivalya* as “the complete and final break with *prakṛtic*” ⁹⁶. When *pratiprasava* is a cosmological process, the potential form of *guṇa-s* indicates the returning to the unmanifest (*avyakta*) form of *prakṛti* from the manifest (*vyakta*) form. How is it possible to keep even a purified mind in the unmanifest condition of the *prakṛti* because there would be no physical body and mind in unmanifest (*avyakta*) form of *prakṛti*? It is to be noted that *Citta* is made from the *prakṛtic* elements of *guṇa-s* and *citta* does not have an independent cosmological existence from *prakṛtic*. The above-mentioned reference of *sūtra* 1.47 is about the purified mind in the *samādhi* stage, not in the *kaivalya* stage, because the *sūtra* tells us that “upon attaining the clarity of *nirvicāra-samādhi*, the inner self is lucid” ⁹⁷. The question arises: when and why must the same *pratiprasava* process be psychological and cosmological? Does psychological *pratiprasava* lead to cosmological *pratiprasava*? Do these two processes work simultaneously or one at a time? Rose does not elaborate on these issues.

Chapple (2019: 196) considers that “in many ways, the word *pratiprasava* encapsulates the entire Yoga praxis and telos” because the reduction of *kleśa-s* and *karma-s* through the process of *pratiprasava* involves the application of the entire yogic discipline rather than just one or a few specific yogic practices. In the words of Chapple (2019: 179), “*pratiprasava* requires the undoing of all karmas by tracing them back to their origins and effecting an incineration of karmic seeds.” According to Chapple, tracing back to the origins is the process of *pratiprasava*. Chapple (2019: 180) identifies this process as “a process of the reversal of directionality”—from the direction of activity (*pravṛtti*) towards the direction of cessation (*nivṛtti*). For Chapple (2019:180), *nivṛtti* is not the cessation of all activities of mind

⁹⁶ Rose comments that “It is therefore difficult to give final allegiance to a soteriology that implies complete indifference to the world that appears to us and that presents us with both hardships and delights”.

⁹⁷ YS 1.47: *nirvicāravaiśāradye+adhyātmapasādaḥ*.

rather it is the cessation of the “quelling of vitiated yearning” which “brings peace” to the yogin ⁹⁸. The question arises: how can a yogin achieve complete peace through the process of *pratiprasava* while residing in this world? According to Patañjali, for the discriminating yogin, to exist in this ordinary world is to suffer perpetually (*duḥkhameva sarvaṃ vivekinah*) ⁹⁹.

For Chapple (2019: 186), *pratiprasava* is exclusively an epistemological process because he comments that the *pratiprasava* process “signals a backing away from the spinning out or stitching or weaving the world”, not from the world itself. In another place, Chapple (2008: 107) says that *pratiprasava* is a mental process that purifies the *citta* ¹⁰⁰. Chapple (2008: 107) thinks that *pratiprasava* is also a process that causes liberation ¹⁰¹. Chapple (2008: 89) explains the *pratiprasava* liberating process by saying that “the aspiring yogi strives to lessen his or her attachment first to the gross world, then to the subliminal influences that shape perception of the gross, and finally enters a liberated state wherein all obscurations are burned away.” When *pratiprasava* is understood as an epistemic process, Chapple's interpretation of it is accurate. However, Patañjali seems to emphasize in the final *sūtra* that primordial matter (*guṇa-s*) returns to its original form, which is an unmanifested form; thus I disagree with Chapple's assertion that *pratiprasava* is only an epistemological process in the *Yogasūtra*. When *pratiprasava* is an cosmological process of dissolution, the return of primordial matter to its original source indicates the dissolution of all *prakṛtic* connections with *puruṣa*. The continuations of this formation of the everyday world are primal matter as it manifests. The absence of primordial matter indicates that a liberated *puruṣa* is ultimately totally cut off from the connection of the physical body and mind, which are byproducts of primordial matter.

Conclusion

This chapter has laid the essential groundwork for our main discussion by thoroughly introducing *pratiprasava* and a suite of foundational concepts critical to understanding Patañjali's *Yogasūtra*. This introductory chapter establishes *pratiprasava* not merely as a term,

⁹⁸ Chapple comments that “Cessation (*nivṛtti*) brings peace, not in the sense of an escape from a dreadful irredeemable state, but through the quelling of vitiated yearning. By returning to the origin point before the issuance of the world transpires, one retreats to a place of peace. The reversal of directionality indicated by the return to the origin (*pratiprasava*) stands at the center of the Yoga experience”.

⁹⁹ YS 2.15: *pariṇāma tāpa saṃskāra duḥkhairguṇāvṛttivirodhācca duḥkhameva sarvaṃ vivekinah*

¹⁰⁰ Chapple writes that “The path to liberation is also discussed by Patañjali in yet another way that emphasizes subtilization (*pratiprasava*) as the means but using a terminology focused more directly on mental processes”.

¹⁰¹ Chapple comments that “It is only through the suspension of all identification by the process of *pratiprasava* that *kaivalya* takes place”.

but as a "key yogic idea" and indeed the central nerve of Patañjali's system. This chapter explains the literal meaning of *pratiprasava* as the opposite of creation, signifying dissolution, annihilation, or a return to the original state. Philosophically, it has been presented as the reversal of nature's creative activities, ultimately leading to the emancipation of yogins. Despite its explicit mention only twice in the *Yogasūtra* (YS 2.10 and YS 4.34), this chapter confirms its pervasive presence as a central theme that runs through the entire text, marking a continuous journey from initial spiritual practices (*sādhana*) to the final state of liberation (*kaivalya*).

To provide a comprehensive understanding of *pratiprasava*, this chapter has investigated similar terms such as *nirodha*, *pratibandhi*, *pratipakṣa*, and *pratiśedha*, illustrating their shared functionalities of cessation, obstruction, or counteraction within the yogic framework. A detailed examination of the relation between *pratiprasava* and *samādhi*, particularly the progression through *samprajñāta samādhi*'s various states (*vitarka*, *vicāra*, *ananda*, *asmitā*) to *asamprajñāta samādhi*, reveals *pratiprasava* as the underlying process of reversal leading from entangled existence to ultimate freedom. Furthermore, the present chapter establishes the direct relationship between *pratiprasava* and *kaivalya*, emphasizing that a proper understanding of the latter, the declared goal of classical Yoga, is contingent upon a clear grasp of the former. The concept's indirect connection to *Jīvanmukti* (liberation while living) has also been introduced, setting the stage for later discussions on embodied liberation.

More importantly, this chapter meticulously has introduced and defined essential related concepts that are indispensable for navigating the theoretical and practical dimensions of *Pratiprasava*. The *kleśa-s* (afflictions) have been identified as the primary hurdles to liberation, with *avidyā* (ignorance) established as the "breeding ground" for the other four *kleśa-s* (*asmitā*, *rāga*, *dveṣa*, and *abhiniveśa*). Their four states (*prasupta*, *tanu*, *vicchinna*, *udāra*) were also outlined, providing a framework for understanding their varied manifestations and the methods required for their eradication. The *guṇa-s* are explained as the three fundamental constituents of *prakṛti*, whose interplay is responsible for creation, and whose ultimate reabsorption (*pratiprasava*) is central to liberation. The *puruṣa* is delineated as pure consciousness, eternally distinct from *prakṛti*, whose liberation from entanglement with matter is the ultimate goal of Yoga. Arguments for its existence and plurality were also presented.

Finally, this chapter has laid an important conceptual foundation, defining *pratiprasava* in its varied literal and philosophical contexts and illuminating its intricate relationships with *samādhi*, *kaivalya*, and other core tenets of Yoga philosophy. By introducing the fundamental concepts of *kleśa-s*, *guṇa-s*, and *puruṣa*, this chapter has provided the essential theoretical framework required for the subsequent, more in-depth analytical discussions. It has set the stage for a critical engagement with existing interpretations and for developing a novel, coherent understanding of *pratiprasava*'s dual nature and *kaivalya*'s multi-stage progression towards ultimate freedom.

Chapter 3: Different Conceptions of *Pratiprasava* in the Secondary Literature

Introduction

This chapter highlights *pratiprasava* as a pivotal concept within Patañjali's *Yogasūtra*, outlining its literal and philosophical meanings, its relationship with *samādhi* and *kaivalya*, and introducing other essential foundational terms like the *kleśa-s*, *guṇa-s*, and *puruṣa*. Having laid this crucial groundwork, this chapter will provide a comprehensive and critical analysis of how *pratiprasava* has been understood by various scholars across traditional Sanskrit commentaries and modern academic discourse. Scholars have approached the concept of *Pratiprasava* from diverse perspectives, leading to a complex and often conflicting array of interpretations. These varying viewpoints can be broadly categorized into several main groups.

The first group is concerned with cosmological interpretations. This group interprets *pratiprasava* as signifying the literal and complete dissolution or reabsorption of *prakṛtic* manifestations. This view, defended by numerous traditional Sanskrit commentators such as Vyāsa, Vācaspati, Bhoja, and Vijñānabhikṣu, along with modern scholars like Feuerstein, sees *pratiprasava* leading to disembodied liberation (*videhamukti*). The second group provides epistemological or psychological interpretations. This group of interpreters, including modern scholars like Ian Whicher, Taimni, Deshpande, Nicolai Bachman, Michael Beloved, and Jaganath Carrera, holds that *pratiprasava* should be understood as a mental purification process or a change in the yogin's perception. This often connects *pratiprasava* with embodied liberation (*jīvanmukti*). The third group combines psychological and cosmological processes. Some scholars, such as Kenneth Rose and Karen O'Brien-Kop, attempt to integrate both psychological and cosmological dimensions, viewing *Pratiprasava* as functioning across

both realms simultaneously or sequentially. The fourth group is concerned with phenomenological analysis. By the expression of “phenomenological analysis”, Mikel Burley (2007, p. 13) means “the analysis of experiential content”. He is the sole member of this group who offers a distinct phenomenological view, interpreting *pratiprasava* as a process of the dissolution of *prakṛti*'s experience rather than *prakṛti* itself.

This chapter will critically analyze these different views, dissecting their arguments, identifying their strengths, and highlighting their limitations and perceived contradictions. By meticulously examining the diverse conceptions of *pratiprasava*, this chapter aims to reveal the interpretive challenges that have historically surrounded this term, thereby establishing the crucial need for a more coherent and integrated understanding, which will be developed in the subsequent chapters of this dissertation. To proceed on the discussion, let us understand how *pratiprasava* has been understood by different commentators and scholars from different perspectives.

On the Historical Interpretations of *Pratiprasava*

Although the term “*pratiprasava*” appears only twice in the *Yogasūtra* (2.10 and 4.34) in two specific contexts, most Sanskrit commentators bring the concept of “*pratiprasava*” 4 times in their commentaries, and they seem to hold a linear argument that “*pratiprasava*” is a process of ontological or cosmological dissolution of the *citta* in the *Yogasūtra*. This cosmological dissolution indicates complete dissociation of the *puruṣa* from all connections of *prakṛti*, including the physical body and mind. Vyāsa is the first commentator who seems to hold the view that *pratiprasava* is a process of dissolution of the mind, and the later commentators mostly follow Vyāsa's line of interpretation.

Vyāsa's Ambiguous Interpretation of *Pratiprasava* in *Sūtra* 2.10

In *sūtra* 2.10, Patañjali tells us that *pratiprasava* is a process of abandoning the five subtle *kleśa*-s, while in *sūtra* 4.34, Patañjali identifies *pratiprasava* as a process of abandoning the three *guṇa*-s, which are the three real elements (*tattva*-s) that constitute this natural and supernatural world except the pure conscious *puruṣa*. While *pratiprasava* is mentioned in the context of getting rid of five *kleśa*-s in *sūtra* 2.10, Vyāsa explains the process of *pratiprasava* in a quasi-ontological manner. Vyāsa comments that “those subtle five *kleśa*-s, which have transformed into a state that is similar to a burnt-seed condition (*dagdhabījakaḥ*), dissolve

(*pralīna*) along with the *citta* when the *citta* has fulfilled all of its duties (*caritādhikāra*) (which include *bhoga* and *apavarga*).¹⁰²

Vyāsa highlights three important philosophical points regarding the nature of *kleśa*-s. The first point is that *kleśa*-s remain in a latent form in the *citta*. The second point is that their total dissolution is only possible when *citta* finishes all of its duties, and the third point is that liberation takes place when *citta* returns to its cause, which is unmanifest *prakṛti*. For Vyāsa, *pratiprasava* is that process through which the *citta* gets dissolved because the complete annihilation of all subtle *kleśas* requires the annihilation of the functionings of the *citta* by the process of *pratiprasava*. But it is important to note that Vyāsa does not explicitly define *pratiprasava* in this *sūtra* 2.10, in which the concept of *pratiprasava* is used for the first time in the text by Patañjali. Vyāsa also does not define *pratiprasava* in other three places where he mentions or discusses this concept in the his commentary.

One should note that even if Vyāsa hints at the dissolution of the *citta* through the process of *pratiprasava*, he seems to be ambiguous in his claim regarding the total dissolution of the *citta* for getting rid of the five subtle *kleśa*-s in *sūtra* 2.10 because he uses the phrase “*astam gacchanti*,” which serves as the metaphor of the setting sun. “*Astam gacchanti*” literally means the setting of the sun. From the surface meaning, “*astam gacchanti*” may indicate the permanent absence of the sun from the purview of the people.

But in close reading, it is a bit elliptical because the sun-setting metaphor does not indicate the total dissolution of the sun; rather, it indicates a period of ineffectiveness of the sunlight, especially at night, because the next morning, the sun again rises up and spreads its light and heat. Therefore, “*astam gacchant*” can mean both the complete dissolution of the *citta* in which *kleśa*-s remain in a latent form and the complete suspension of all kinds of latent activities of the *kleśa*-s in the substratum of *citta*. This is why I identify Vyāsa’s interpretation of *pratiprasava* in the *sūtra* 2.10 as quasi-ontological or cosmological. It is important to note that in the other places where Vyāsa discusses the concept of *pratiprasava*, he explicitly explains it as an ontological or cosmological process of dissolution, which will be shown later. This is why I have grouped Vyāsa as the ontological or cosmological interpreter in his overall explanation of *pratiprasava* in the *Yogasūtra*.

¹⁰² Vyāsa on *sūtra* 2.10: *te pañca kleśā dagdhabījākalpā yoginaścaritādhikāre cetasi pralīne saha tenaivāstam gacchanti*.

Dominance of Vyāsa's interpretation of *Sūtra* 2.10

Most of the Sanskrit commentators seem to adopt Vyāsa's interpretation of *sūtra* 2.10, which states that for completely getting rid of the subtle *kleśa*-s, one needs to get rid of the *citta* itself, the substratum in which subtle *kleśa*-s lie dormant. But Bhoja interprets subtle *kleśas* in an epistemological way. Bhoja comments that "those subtle *kleśa*-s exist only in the form of latent impressions (*vāsanā*) in the mind, and those subtle *kleśa*-s as *vāsanā* in the form of *vr̥tti* do not further begin to appear as a kind of mental modification (*vr̥tti*) to the yogin. These ineffective subtle *kleśa*-s remaining in the *citta* as *vāsanā* are to be abandoned by *pratiprasava*, which means a process of reverse-transformation (*pratilomapariṇāma*). When *citta*, along with all of its *vāsanā*, fulfills all required actions, *citta* returns back to its source, which is *asmitā* (egoity), and *citta* dissolves in *asmitā*, and at that time of dissolution, the subtle *kleśa*-s, which have already become rootless (*nirmūlānām*), do not have the possibility of arising again in the mind."

Bhoja makes it clear that returning to the source of subtle *kleśa*-s suggests a return to the *asmitā*, not to the *avyakta prakṛti*. Therefore, in the *asmitā* stage of the yogin, there is no ontological dissolution of *citta* because *asmitā* suggests that the yogin is alive and possesses an active mind. According to Bhoja, to get rid of the subtle *kleśa*-s does not inevitably require the ontological or cosmological dissolution of the mind; rather, it is an epistemological process of freeing the yogin from the clutches of subtle *kleśa*-s through the process of reverse-transformation, the process of *pratiprasava*.

Bhoja's Denial of Vyāsa's Interpretation of *Sūtra* 2.10

Bhoja appears to be more logical in his interpretation of this *sūtra* 2.10 than Vyāsa because this *sūtra* focuses on identifying a process or practice of *pratiprasava* for freeing oneself even from the subtlest of afflictions, which disturb the process of attainment of liberation. It may be argued that Patañjali nowhere in the text explicitly identifies the process of *pratiprasava* as a cosmological or epistemological process exclusively. Therefore, if *pratiprasava* is an epistemological process in this *sūtra*, then through *pratiprasava*, *citta* cannot be dissolved; *citta* can only be purified. In the present *sūtra*, the subject of discussion is about getting rid of the afflictions of the mind, not the mind itself.

While Bhoja is right in identifying that subtle *kleśa*-s in the *citta* can be overcome by a process of reverse transformation, Bhoja does not explain how *asmitā*, which itself is one of the five *kleśa*-s, can dissolve or make all kinds of subtle *kleśa*-s barren. How logical it is to understand that one *kleśa* can destroy all other subtle *kleśa*-s. There is also another problem in

Bhoja's interpretation. That is, how can *asmitā kleśa* destroy *avidyā kleśa*, which is higher in capacity than *asmitā*? In fact, *avidyā* is the root cause of all other subsequent *kleśa*-s which includes *asmitā kleśa*. Therefore, it appears that the subtle *kleśa*-s can only be abandoned or made impotent when *avidyā* is destroyed. It is also to be noted that Bhoja accepts *praitprasava* as a process of *pratilomapariṇāma* which in its reverse order of functionality will ultimate stop when *pratiprasava* by its process of dissolution reaches its source of all manifestations which is the unmanifest *prakṛti*. Therefore, how *pratiprasava* as *pratilomapariṇāma* will stop at the level of *asmitā* by breaking its reverse order of journey of the process of involution. The answer is not given in the Bhoja's explanation. One can raise another important question to Bhoja's interpretation: why is *pratiprasava* understood as an epistemological process in *sūtra* 2.10? Because in *sūtra* 4.34, Patañjali seems to explain *pratiprasava* as a cosmological process of dissolution of the *guṇa*-s.

While most of the Sanskrit commentators accept Vyāsa's cosmological interpretation, they clarify a few things regarding the nature of *kleśa*-s and the meaning of *pratiprasava*, which are not discussed directly in Vyāsa's commentary. Let us critically analyze a few such issues discussed by the later commentators.

On the Nature of Subtle *Kleśa*-s

While Bhoja describes subtle *kleśa*-s as latent impressions (*vāsanā*), Vyāsa describes them as burned seeds. Bhoja's interpretation is psychological or epistemological, whereas Vyāsa's interpretation is cosmological or ontological. Vyāsa's metaphor of the burnt seed has been widely accepted by later commentators. He is the first to describe the condition of subtle *kleśa*-s, which remain latent in the mind, likened to a burned seed. This metaphor indicates the loss of the seed's causal power to sprout and germinate again. Vyāsa employs the term "*dagdhabījakaḥ*," which can be literally translated as the condition of a burnt seed. What Vyāsa intends to convey with this metaphor of a burnt seed is that the *kleśa*-s have lost their causal efficacy.

Different Views Regarding the Possibility of Recurrence of *Kleśa*-s

One important question arises: is it the case that these *kleśa*-s, which have lost their causal power at the present time, will arise again in the near future to affect the yogin? The standard interpretation is that once the *kleśa*-s have lost their capacity to produce any further activity, they will remain in the state of burnt seed, which is incapable of germinating again. There is no possibility of recurrence of *kleśa*-s. However, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha thinks that there is

still a possibility that these burnt *kleśa*-s may germinate in the future if the yogin wills to activate them. That is why Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha believes that it is not sufficient to only destroy the *kleśa*-s; rather, one should destroy the substratum of those *kleśa*-s, which is *citta* itself. Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha clarifies all doubts regarding the status of the mind when one gets rid of the subtle *kleśa*-s. Getting rid of the subtle *kleśa*-s completely ultimately results in getting rid of *citta* itself.

While Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha is explicitly clear regarding the status of the *citta*, his examples of “*bhraṣṭabīja*” do not sound logical. *Bhraṣṭabīja* seems to suggest a few seeds that deviate from the burnt seed condition to become a normal seed again, which are capable of germinating. But one can ask: is there actually any such seed (*bīja*) that can be called “fallen seed” (*bhraṣṭabīja*)? It may be the case that Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha borrows the idea of *yogabhraṣṭa* (lost in the path of attaining liberation) yogins to see the difference between *bhraṣṭabīja* and other burnt seeds. Even if he uses the same metaphor of *yogabhraṣṭa*, still the comparison is not logical because a *yogabhraṣṭa* yogin has yet not been able to make her subtle *kleśa*-s like the burnt seeds. *Kleśa*-s of *yogabhraṣṭa* yogin are still active, not completely burned; that is why she is under the spell of these *kleśa*-s, which have successfully distracted her from her ultimate goal, which is the attainment of *kaivalya*. While a *yogabhraṣṭa* yogin initially succeeded in a few steps towards the goal of reaching *kaivalya*, eventually he was distracted now due to the effects of *kleśa*-s and lost the path of liberation again. But *dagdhabīja* has lost all potential for any kind of germination for now and for the future as well. It is highly unlikely that this *dagdhabīja* can turn into *bhraṣṭabīja*.

Subtle *Kleśa*-s and the Question of Yogic Agency

There is another important question that arises in the discussion of the role of yogic efforts for the destruction of subtle *kleśa*-s. The question is, do the yogis need to put in effort to destroy these subtle *kleśas*? Vyāsa, in his commentary on *sūtra* 2.10, indirectly hints that there is no need for any kind of yogic efforts for the destruction of the subtle *kleśa*-s because these subtle *kleśa*-s are only possible to be destroyed when the mind itself is destroyed. According to Vyāsa, there seems to be no need for any kind of special yogic efforts for getting rid of subtle *kleshas*. Vācaspati explicitly clarifies Vyāsa’s view. Vācaspati says that the destruction of *kleśa*-s in their subtle conditions is beyond the reach of human effort (*prayatnagocara*). For Vācaspati, one cannot destroy these subtle *kleśa*-s by doing any

particular yogic practices. It is only possible by the process of *pratiprasava* in which the *citta* as *kārya* will dissolve in *asmitā* as *kāraṇa*.

But the question arises: if the *kleśa*-s are completely beyond the capacity of yogic efforts, then why should Patañjali bother to mention this issue of getting rid of the subtle *kleśa*-s to the yoga practitioners? Patañjali could have been silent on this issue. But rather, Patañjali chose to mention the issue of *kleśa*-s and also prescribes a way out from the negative effects of subtle *kleśa*-s by the practice of *pratiprasava*. One may object that *pratiprasava* is an ontological or cosmological process, so the phenomenon of *pratiprasava* is also not within the reach of human effort. Therefore, Vācaspati may be right in identifying the incapacity of the human efforts for the destruction of subtle *kleśas*.

The reply is that nowhere in the entire text has Patañjali exclusively identified *pratiprasava* as a cosmological process, and in regard to the *sūtra* of 2.10, it appears that Patañjali indirectly presents the concept of *pratiprasava* as more of an epistemological process of purification of all kinds of subtle *kleśa*-s, which are dormant in the *citta*, rather than a cosmological process of dissolution of *kleśa*-s along with the mind because it is not possible to identify subtle *kleśa*-s as ontological elements like the mind, which can be dissolved into the unmanifest *prakṛti*, which suggests the death of the physical body and mind of the yogin. To put it simply, the destruction of subtle *kleśa*-s does seem to suggest the destruction of the physical existing entity of the mind and body of the yogin.

Dagḍhabhījakalpa* as Fifth *Kleśa

It is also important to note that Vācaspati¹⁰³ identifies the metaphor of Vyāsa's *dagḍhabhījakalpa* state of *kleśa*-s as the fifth (*pañcamī*) functional stage of *kleśa*-s, while there are originally only four stages of *kleśa*-s, which are *prasupta* (dormant), *tanu* (attenuated), *vicchinna* (interrupted), and *udāra* (active), mentioned directly by Patañjali himself in *sūtra* 2.4.¹⁰⁴ Even from a surface reading of Vyāsa's commentary, it is clear that *dagḍhabhījakalpa* is not a different stage of *kleśa*-s; rather, it is a particular higher level of the *prasupta* stage of *kleśa*-s where dormant *kleśa*-s completely lose their causal efficacy. Therefore, it appears that Patañjali and Vyāsa do not accept any kind of independent fifth functional stage of the *kleśa*-s. It is Vācaspati's own imagination, which does not have any textual justification for his claim.

¹⁰³ Vācaspati on *sūtra* on 2.10: “*tad evaṃ kleśā lakṣitās teṣāṃ ca heyānāṃ prasuptatanuvicchinnodārārūpatayā catasro avasthā darśitāḥ/ kasmāt punaḥ pañcamī kleśāvasthā dagḍhabhījabhāvataḥ sūkṣmā na sūtrakāreṇa kathitety ata āha*”.

¹⁰⁴ *Yogasūtra* 2.4: *avidyā kṣetramuttareṣāṃ prasuptatanuvicchinnodārāṇām*.

Different Views on the Meaning of *Pratiprasava*.

It is clear from the *sūtra* 2.10 that subtle *kleśa*-s should be abandoned by the process or practice of *pratiprasava*. Vyāsa just uses the word "*pralīna*," which seems to have an ontological connotation. In this ontological connotation, it indirectly refers to the dissolution of the *citta* for the complete dissolution of the subtle fine *kleśa*-s. Although Vyāsa does not define the term "*pratiprasava*," later commentators explicitly define the term. Vyāsa's ontological or cosmological interpretations have been mostly accepted in the Sanskrit commentaries. Hariharānanda clearly defines the term "*pratiprasava*" as meaning the opposite (*viruddha*) of creation or giving birth (*prasava*), which indicates the dissolution or annihilation (*pralaya*). It is such a *pralaya* that will have no further or subsequent birth or creation (*punarutpattihīnalaya*)¹⁰⁵. What Hariharānanda means to say is that *pratiprasava* is the penultimate process of destruction, which is permanent dissolution without any kind of future possibility of rebirth of the subtle *kleśa*-s or *citta*.

Some commentators identify *pratiprasava* as a cosmological process of reverse evolution (*pratilomapariṇāma*). *Pratilomapariṇāma* is a compound word in which "*pratiloma*" means an opposite or reverse order and "*pariṇāma*" means a process of transformation or change or evolution. "*Pratilomapariṇāma*" as a compound means an opposite or contrary process of creation or evolution. Simply, it indicates an opposite order or chain of destruction or dissolution. What these commentators seem to indicate is that the source of creation begins from the unmanifest *prakṛti*, and this creation process reaches its highest stage of development in the mundane world of objects and senses. Through *pratiprasava* as a process of *pratilomapariṇāma*, the *citta*, along with its *kleśa*-s, returns back to its original source, which is unmanifest *prakṛti*. This returning suggests the dissolution or destruction of *citta* and all other manifest entities of *prakṛti* by which the embodied *puruṣa* was once associated. So, *pratiprasava* has been understood as a process of cosmological dissolution or destruction by these commentators. For them, *pratiprasava* is a cosmological process of disentangling all kinds of *prakṛtic* bonds, including the physical body and mind of the yogin.

¹⁰⁵ Hariharānanda on *sūtra* 2.10: "*pratiprasavaḥ prasavād viruddhaḥ pralayaḥ, punarutpattihīnalaya ityarthah*,"

Role of Knowledge in Destroying *Kleśa*-s

One may argue that *pratilomapariṇāma* is actually an epistemological or psychological process of going back to the source of creation of *kleśa*-s, which is *asmitā*, not a cosmological process of going back to unmanifest *prakṛti*. Therefore, being a psychological process, the final stage of *pratiprasava* as a process of *pratilomapariṇāma* is to reach the highest stage of *asmitā*, not the unmanifest *prakṛti*. Hariharānanda clarifies that knowledge in the form of *vivekakhyāti*, which was associated with *citta* (*vivekakhyātimaccitasyopādānarūpā*), has turned the *kleśa*-s impotent. As a result, the knowledge and desire, which are the functions of the *citta*, have ceased now by the effects of *viveka*. But for ultimately dissolving all these subtle *kleśa*-s along with *citta*, even the process of *vivekakhyāti* should be restricted (*nirodha*). This *nirodha* of *vivekakhyāti* can be accomplished by the higher level of dispassion (*para-vairāgya*). At that time of complete cessation of the *vivekakhyāti*, all kinds of *vṛtti*-s cease completely, and along with the permanent cessation of all *vṛtti*-s, permanent cessation of subtle *kleśa*-s takes place.¹⁰⁶ The metaphysical importance of this dissolution of that subtle *kleśa*-s is that dissolution of subtle *kleśa*-s requires the dissolution of all psycho-physical activities of the embodied yogin. In other words, the yogin becomes like a deadbody or dead.

It is to be remembered that *vivekakhyāti* is definitely a cognitive process of higher level of acquired knowledge in the process of yogic *sādhana* gained by the yogin which provides the yogins with a proper knowledge of distinction between the *puruṣa* and *prakṛti*. But ultimately this higher knowledge of *viveka* need to stop for felicitating the process of *para-vairāgya* for the complete dissolution of the subtle *kleśa*-s. What Hariharānanda makes clear is that even the higher knowledge is not enough to dissolve the subtle *kleśa*-s. Knowledge is instrumental in weakening the *kleśa*-s, but not capable of destroying the subtle *kleśa*-s permanently. So, if *pratilomapariṇāma* is reverse order of process of creation, then it has to destroy the *kleśa*-s permanently as a process of involution. But if knowledge is not capable of destroying the subtle *kleśa*-s permanently, then *pratilomapariṇāma* cannot be solely a cognitive process or psychological process because being a cognitive process of true *kleśa*-burning knowledge, *pratilomapariṇāma* will not be

¹⁰⁶ Hariharānanda on sūtra 2.10: “*sūkṣmābhūtā vivekakhyātimaccitasyopādānarūpā ityarthah | kleśā eva pratiprasavena heyāstyājyā iti sūtrārthah | ta iti | jñānecchādirūpam cittakāryam parisamāpyate vivekena | atastena samāptādhikārasya cittasya kleśā dagdhabījakaalpā bhavanti | tataḥ punaḥ pareṇa vairagyena vivekasyāpi nirodhaḥ kāryaḥ | tadātyantavṛttinirodhāt kleśānāmatyantaprahāṇam bhavatītyarthah*”.

able to destroy the subtle *kleśa*-s completely and permanently. Therefore, it can be argued that *pratīlomapariṇāma* is more a cosmological or ontological process of reversal than a psychological or epistemological process of reversal.

Pratīprasava as a Cosmological Process in *Sūtra* 2.2

This interpretation of *pratīprasava* as an ontological or cosmological process of *pratīlomapariṇāma* appears to be consistent across most discussions of *pratīprasava* by these Sanskrit commentators in various sections of their commentaries. Although the concept of *pratīprasava* is first introduced in *sūtra* 2.10 of the *Yogasūtra*, Vyāsa is the first commentator to address this idea in his commentary on *sūtra* 2.2. It is to be noted that some commentators (such as Bhoja and Anantadeva Paṇḍita) do not discuss the issue of *pratīprasava* in this *sūtra* 2.2, which is about the effects or results of practicing *kriyā*-yoga, while many Sanskrit commentators follow Vyāsa's example, either directly or indirectly discussing the concept of *pratīprasava* in their subsequent explanations of this *sūtra*.

Sūtra 2.2 tells us that for the mastering the practice of *samādhi* (*samādhībhāvanārthaḥ*) and for the attenuation of the *kleśa* (*kleśatanūkaraṇārtha*), practice of *kriyā*-yoga is recommended.¹⁰⁷ What this *sūtra* indicates is that the results of practicing *kriyā*-yoga are twofold. The first is the progression in the path of attaining *samādhi*, and the second is the weakening or reducing the effects of *kleśa*-s for the yogin. These two results are not separate phases or stages of the functioning of *kriyā*-yoga; rather, they represent interconnected outcomes of practicing *kriyā*-yoga. For instance, as the effects of *kleśa*-s diminish, the yogin experiences *samādhi* more frequently. Conversely, as the yogin encounters more *samādhi* experiences, the *kleśa*-s remain in a weakened state within the *citta* of the yogin. Therefore, as a result of *samādhi* practice, yogin remains for some time free from the negative effects of *kleśa*-s. Therefore, these results of *kriyā*-yoga are interconnected and sometimes complementary to each other.

According to Patañjali, *kriyā*-yoga is a combination of three particular yogic practices: “*tapas*” (austerity/discipline), “*svādhyāya*” (self-study/self-analysis), and “*īśvara-praṇidhāna*” (surrender to the Lord).¹⁰⁸ When the yogin masters this practice of *kriyā*-yoga, as a result of that mastery, she is able to encounter the experiences of *samādhi* and weakening the *kleśa*-s. Vyāsa explains that “when practiced properly (*āsevyamānaḥ*), *kriyā*-yoga paves the way for perfecting *samādhi* and attenuates the *kleśa*-s. Those *kleśa*-s

¹⁰⁷ *Sūtra* 2.2: “*samādhībhāvanārthaḥ kleśatanūkaraṇārthaśca*”.

¹⁰⁸ *Sūtra* 2.1: *tapasvādhyāyeśvarapraṇidhānāni kriyāyogaḥ*.

which have already been weakened (*pratanūkr̥tān*) by the fire (*agni*) of *prasaṃkhyāna* becomes similar to the state of burnt-seed (*dagdhabījakalpān*). Due to achieving the burnt-seed like condition, *kleśa*-s lose their capacity to arise again for further germination (*aprasavadharmināḥ*). After the weakening of the *kleśa*-s, the subtle wisdom (*sūkṣmā-prajñā*) which consists in the knowledge of discernment between the *sattva* and *puruṣa* (*sattvapuruṣānyatāmātrakhyātīḥ*) is no longer affected (*aparāmr̥ṣṭā*) by the negative affects of the *kleśa*-s. These subtle wisdom (*sūkṣmā-prajñā*) which has fulfilled all of its tasks (*samāptādhikārā*) will lead to dissolution (*pratiprasava*).¹⁰⁹

Vyāsa gives a sequential presentation of the *kleśa*-s from its weakened state to its dissolution. First *kriyā*-yoga weakens the *kleśa*-s, and as the effect of the weakened *kleśa*-s, knowledge in the form of *prasaṃkhyāna* arises. This arrival of *prasaṃkhyāna*-knowledge makes the *kleśa*-s infertile. When *kleśa*-s are in an infertile stage, a special kind of realization arises in the name of discriminative knowledge (*sattvapuruṣānyakhyātī*). This special *sattvapuruṣānyakhyātī*, which is completely devoid of the negative effects of *kleśa*-s, also dissolves through the process of *pratiprasava* when their purpose of existence is fulfilled. For Vyāsa, *pratiprasava* is indirectly a process of dissolution.

To be specific, it appears to be a cosmological or ontological dissolution because as long as the discriminative knowledge, such as *sattvapuruṣānyakhyātī*, remains in the mind, *pratiprasava* does not start its functions. *Pratiprasava* only can start its activities when the discriminative knowledge, as *sattvapuruṣānyakhyātī*, has nothing left to accomplish. In other words, *sattvapuruṣānyakhyātī* becomes redundant. The cessation of this *sattvapuruṣānyakhyātī* knowledge is only possible when the *citta* is completely and permanently dissolved. Therefore, *pratiprasava* is that dissolution process in which *sattvapuruṣānyakhyātī*-knowledge will dissolve permanently along with the permanent dissolution of the *citta*.

It is interesting to note that Vyāsa brings the concepts of *prasaṃkhyāna* and *sattvapuruṣānyakhyātī* as cognitive processes in differentiating the ontological or cosmological role of *pratiprasava* in the yoga metaphysics. Even as an intermediate stage between *kriyā*-yoga and *pratiprasava*, how and why and when do *prasaṃkhyāna* and *sattvapuruṣānyakhyātī* as a special kind of knowledge arise for the yogin? Why can

¹⁰⁹ Vyāsa on *sūtra* 2.2: “*sa hy āsevyamānaḥ samādhiṃ bhāvayati kleśāṃś ca pratanūkaroti. pratanūkr̥tān kleśān prasaṃkhyānāgninā dagdhabījakalpān aprasavadharmināḥ kariṣyatīti. teṣāṃ tanūkaraṇāt punaḥ kleśair aparāmr̥ṣṭā sattvapuruṣānyatāmātrakhyātīḥ sūkṣmā prajñā samāptādhikārā pratiprasavāya kalpiṣyata iti*”.

pratiprasava not do the job of *prasaṃkhyāna* as a cognitive process of dissolution of *kleśa*-s? These questions remain unanswered in Vyāsa's commentary.

Clarification of Vyāsa's Quasi-Cosmological *Pratiprasava* in *Sūtra* 2.2

Vyāsa's indirect cosmological interpretation of *pratiprasava* has been clarified by the later commentators as a clear cosmological process of dissolution. Vācaspati identifies *pratiprasava* as a process of "pravilaya," which can be translated as dissolution or destruction.¹¹⁰ In a similar way, Vijñānabhikṣu interprets *pratiprasava* as "pralaya," which means complete destruction or annihilation or dissolution.¹¹¹ Hariharānanda understands *pratiprasava* as a process of "*pralīna*," which can be translated as "dissolution".¹¹² It seems to be clear that these commentators interpret *pratiprasava* purely in an ontological sense.

One can argue that still this dissolution is just a metaphor and it does not directly indicate the dissolution of the psycho-physical self of the yogin; rather, it is the dissolution of the *kleśa*-s. This doubt also has been cleared by Vijñānabhikṣu while he explicitly connects *pratiprasava* with the concept of disembodied liberation (*videha-kaivalya*). Vijñānabhikṣu clearly says that at the highest level of *samādhi* (which seems to suggest "*asamprajñāta-samādhi*"), *citta* dissolves into its root cause, which is unmanifest prakṛti, through the process of *pratiprasava*, and this dissolution by *pratiprasava* indicates the state (*daśā*) of disembodied liberation for the yogin¹¹³. From Vijñānabhikṣu's explanation, it is clear that *pratiprasava* is a process of cosmological dissolution of the *citta* and the physical body of the yogin.

Besides Vijñānabhikṣu, Vācaspati and Hariharānanda explicitly clarify that *pratiprasava* is a cosmological process of dissolution. While Vyāsa comments that the subtle knowledge completes its task (*samāptādhikārā*), *pratiprasava* dissolves all *kleśa*-s, Vācaspati interprets *samāptādhikārā* as process of cessation of *guṇa*-s in the form of *kārya* and *kāraṇa*.¹¹⁴ The cessation of the *guṇa*-s means the dissolution of the all functionalities of the mind and physical body. Simply, it indicates the death of the yogin. For Vācaspati, *pratiprasava* is a process of cosmological dissolution as well. Hariharānanda gives a fire analogy to indicate that in the stage of *pratiprasava*, there seems to be no possibility of any cognitive activity. He states that knowledge burns *kleśa*-s and when this burning of *kleśa*-s is

¹¹⁰ Vācaspati on *sūtra* 2.2: "*sūkṣmā prajñā pratiprasavāya pravilayāya kalpiṣyate*".

¹¹¹ Vijñānabhikṣu on *sūtra* 2.2: "*pratiprasavāya pralayāya kalpiṣyate*".

¹¹² Hariharānanda on *sūtra* 2.2: "*pratiprasavāya kalpiṣyate pralīnā bhaviṣyatūtyarthah*".

¹¹³ Vijñānabhikṣu on *sūtra* 2.2: "*caramāsamprajñāte pratiprasavāya pralayāya kalpiṣyate videhakaivalyadaśāyāmiti*".

¹¹⁴ Vācaspati on *sūtra* 2.2: "*samāpto 'dhikārah kāryārambhaṇaṃ guṇānāṃ yayā hetubhūtayā*".

finished, knowledge terminates itself. The analogy suggests that as long as there is fuel, the fire continues to burn. Once the fuel is completely consumed, the fire ceases to exist. Similarly, knowledge persists until the *kleśa-s* are fully burned away, and when that process is complete, knowledge dissolves like the extinguished fire. Therefore, Hariharānanda indirectly confirms that through the process of *pratiprasava*, all forms of cognition, as well as their locus—*citta*—are dissolved. Thus, for Hariharānanda, *pratiprasava* ultimately seems to represent a process of cosmological dissolution. All these sanskrit commentators accept that *pratiprasava* is a cosmological process of dissolution in their interpretations in this *sūtra* 2.2

Interpretations of Cosmological *Pratiprasava* in *Sūtra* 2.27

This cosmological explanation of the *pratiprasava* is again brought up by the sanskrit commentators in the discussion of *sūtra* 2.27. This *sūtra* tells us that “that yogins (who has acquired the unfluctuating discriminative knowledge) will only have specific seven (*saptadhā*) types of highest revelations or highest cognitive states (*prāntabhūmi*) of realization (*prajñā*)”.¹¹⁵ Among these seven highest states of *prajñā*, at the last stage of *prajñā*, *pratiprasava* functions as process of dissolution of the *guṇa-s*, the constituents of this natural and supernatural worlds. Vyāsa gives analogy of fallen stones of how this *pratiprasava* functions as a means of cosmological dissolution of the *guṇa-s*. He comments that “*guṇa-s* are like fallen stones from the edge of a mountain peak (*giriśikharataṭacyutā*) that lack support (*niravasthānāḥ*) to hold them. They (*guṇa-s*) move toward dissolution (*pralayābhimukhāḥ*) into their own cause (*svakāraṇe*), (which is unmanifest *prakṛti*), and ultimately disappear along with it (*astam gacchanti*)”.¹¹⁶

What Vyāsa seems to indicate is that *pratiprasava* is a the re-absorption of the *guṇa-s* into their original cause. This re-absorption suggests that all prakṛtic entanglements of the yogin which include mind and the physical body will dissolve into the the unmanifest *prakṛti*. Vācaspati clearly states that in *pratiprasava* stage, the *guṇa-s* dissolve into *pradhāna* (which is just an alternative term for unmanifest *prakṛti*)¹¹⁷. According to Vācaspati, *pratiprasava* is a process of cosmological dissolution of the *guṇa-s*. Vivaraṇakāra also explicitly states that *pratiprasava* is a process of dissolution of *guṇa-s* into the *avyakta* (unmanifest *prakṛti*).¹¹⁸

¹¹⁵ *Sūtra* 2.27: “*tasya saptadhā prāntabhūmiḥ prajñā*”.

¹¹⁶ Vyāsa on *sūtra* 2.27: “*guṇā giriśikharataṭacyutā iva grāvāṇo niravasthānāḥ svakāraṇe pralayābhimukhāḥ saha tenāstam gacchanti*,”

¹¹⁷ Vācaspati on *sūtra* 2.27: “*pratiprasave pradhānalaye 'pi*”.

¹¹⁸ Vivaraṇakāra on *sūtra* 2.27: ““*svakāraṇe ahaṁkāre pralayābhimukhāḥ... svakāraṇamapyavyaktabhāvaṁ pratipadyate*”.

Vijñānabhikṣu clearly states that *guṇa*-s dissolves into the unmanifest *prakṛti* completely and permanently along with the *citta*.¹¹⁹ What Vijñānabhikṣu suggests is that *citta* of the yogin should dissolve as a result of the dissolution of the *guṇa*-s through the process of *pratiprasava*.

On the Impossibility of Regeneration of *Guṇa*-s after *Pratiprasava*

One question may arise: Is it possible for these *guṇa*-s, which have now dissolved into the unmanifest *prakṛti* by the process of *pratiprasava*, to arise again in the future? The standard reply by the commentators is no. Vyāsa explicitly says that once the *guṇa*-s, which have been dissolved, will never regenerate (*punarastyutpādaḥ*) again because they do not have any purpose (for their regeneration).¹²⁰ Vijñānabhikṣu¹²¹ and Bhoja¹²² also support Vyāsa's view that when the *guṇa*-s fulfill their purpose (which is to provide the *bhoga* and *apavarga* to the *puruṣa*), there is no further reason or cause for the re-generation or return of the *guṇa*-s for the yogin.

Guṇātīta and the Death of the Yogin

Now the question arises: what kind of *kaivalya* the yogin attains who has dissolved all *prakṛtic* bondages? Vyāsa says that yogin goes beyond the touch of *guṇa*-s (*guṇātīta*).¹²³ It is an indirect indication that the yogin dissociates herself from all manifestations of *prakṛti* meaning the dissociation of the physical body and mind of the yogin. Therefore, according to Vyāsa, yogin dies when *pratiprasava* takes place. This death of the yogin after *pratiprasava* stage has been understood as *videha-mukta* (disembodied liberation) stage of the yogin by Hariharānanda. Hariharānanda also clarifies that *guṇātīta* means the lack of any relation of the three *guṇa*-s (*triguṇasambandhābhāva*) with the yogin.¹²⁴ It is evident from this discussion that, through the cosmological process of dissolution known as *pratiprasava*, a yogin attains *kaivalya* after the physical body dies. To achieve *kaivalya*, a yogin must be entirely free from any connection to *prakṛtic* manifestations, including both the physical body and the mind. Here, *kaivalya* is disembodied liberation because *pratiprasava* is a cosmological process of dissolution of three *guṇa*-s.

¹¹⁹ Vijñānabhikṣu on *sūtra* 2.27: “*tena cittena sahātyantalayaṃ gacchanti*”.

¹²⁰ Vyāsa on *sūtra* 2.27: *na caiṣāṃ pravilīnānāṃ punarastyutpādaḥ prayojanābhāvāditi*”

¹²¹ Vijñānabhikṣu on *sūtra* 2.27: “*puruṣārthasamāptyā prayojanābhāvāt*”.

¹²² Bhoja *sūtra* 2.27: “*niṣprayojanatvāccāmiṣāṃ kutaḥ praroho bhavet*”.

¹²³ Vyāsa on *sūtra* 2.27: “*pratiprasave’pi cittasya muktaḥ kuśala ityeva bhavati guṇātītatvāditi*”.

¹²⁴ Hariharānanda on *sūtra* 2.27: “*cittasya pratiprasave punarutthānahīne pralaye muktaḥ kuśalaḥ videhamukto bhavati guṇātītatvāt triguṇasambandhābhāvāditi*”.

Interpretations of Cosmological *Pratiprasava* in *Sūtra* 3.50

Again, in the discussion of *sūtra* 3.50, the concept of *pratiprasava* has been mentioned by the Sanskrit commentators as a cosmological process of dissolution. *Sūtra* 3.50 says that when one is completely least interested (*vairāgya*) in enjoying the highest supernatural power of discriminative knowledge (which results in omniscience and omnipotence) and when the seeds (*bīja*) of the disturbing mental modifications (*doṣa*) are extinguished (*kṣaya*), *kaivalya* takes place.¹²⁵ The interpretations of the previous *sūtra*-s concerning the meaning and nature of *pratiprasava* are echoed in this current *sūtra*. Most Sanskrit commentators assert that *pratiprasava* represents a process of cosmological or ontological destruction of the manifested principles of *prakṛti*. This destruction pertains to the physical body, mind, and senses of the yogin with whom she is associated.

Vyāsa is explicit in his comment in the present *sūtra* that when the *guṇa*-s finish, all their tasks (*caritārtha*) are completely and permanently (*ātyantika*) separated from the embodied *puruṣa* by dissolving them into the unmanifest *prakṛti* through the cosmological process of *pratiprasava*. This complete separation of *puruṣa* from *prakṛtic guṇa*-s is known as *kaivalya*.¹²⁶ Vyāsa clearly shows that *pratiprasava* is a process of complete separation between *guṇa*-s and *puruṣa*. For this permanent separation between these two entities, the only possible way is when *guṇa*-s as cosmological constituents of manifest *prakṛti* dissolve into unmanifest *prakṛti*, which indicates the complete dissociation of the embodied *puruṣa* from its psycho-physical existence. Vyāsa clearly identifies *kaivalya* as disembodied liberation and *pratiprasava* as a means of ontological dissolution of the yogin's psycho-physical self. Dissociation of the psycho-physical self means that the yogin needs to die to attain *kaivalya*. To understand it from a different angle, a yogin will die when *kaivalya* is attained. Vyāsa's ontological interpretation of *pratiprasava* has been completely supported and accepted by many later commentators such as Vivaraṇakāra,¹²⁷ and Vijñānabhikṣu,¹²⁸. The analysis of the concept of *pratiprasava* in *sūtra* 3.50 by the Sanskrit commentators can be understood as a clear cosmological process of dissolution. *Pratiprasava* is finally discussed by these Sanskrit commentators in the last *sūtra* 4.34.

¹²⁵ *Sūtra* 3.50: ‘*tadvairāgyādapi doṣabījakṣaye kaivalyam*’.

¹²⁶ Vyāsa 3.50:

¹²⁷ Vivaraṇakāra on *sūtra* 3.50: “*tadeṣāṃ guṇānāṃ manasi kleśakarmavipākasvarūpeṇābhivyaktānāṃ caritārthānāṃ pratiprasave pralaye puruṣasyātyantiko guṇaviyogaḥ kaivalyam*”.

¹²⁸ Vijñānabhikṣu on *sūtra* 3.50: “*caritārthānāṃ samāptapuruṣārthānāṃ pratiprasave manasā saha laye sati, puruṣasyātyantiko guṇaviyogaḥ kaivalyākhyo bhavatītyarthaḥ*”.

Patañjali's Direct Mention of *Pratiprasava* and its Interpretations in *Sūtra* 4.34.

In *sūtra* 4.34, *pratiprasava* is directly mentioned by Patanjali himself in regard to the dissolution of the *guṇa*-s. This *sūtra* tells us that when *guṇa*-s completes its tasks for *puruṣa*, the *guṇa*-s dissolve (*pratiprasava*) and this dissolution is known as *kaivalya*. Otherwise, this *kaivalya* can be understood as *puruṣa*'s abiding in its true self or being *puruṣa* as a pure conscious-power.¹²⁹ This *sūtra* is highly meaningful and complex to understand, as it has three important announcements. First is the *guṇa*'s return through *pratiprasava* to its original source (which is unmanifest *prakṛti*). The second is the *puruṣa*'s settlement in its own true form, and the third is the *puruṣa*'s stability in manifesting itself as conscious power at the attainment of *kaivalya*. It may appear that these three descriptions of *kaivalya* are the same but I will show that actually they are not definitions of *kaivalya* rather they are the different nature of *kaivalya* stage for the yogin. I will critically analyse this *sūtra* in the fifth chapter in great detail.

I now discuss only the different interpretations of the concept of *pratiprasava* as mentioned in the Sanskrit commentaries. Vyāsa comments that “when *guṇa*-s complete their functions for the experiences and liberation of *puruṣa*, these *guṇa*-s, which consist in both causes and effects of manifest *prakṛti*, dissolve into their original root, which is *avyakta prakṛti*. This process of dissolution of the *guṇa*-s into the unmanifest *prakṛti* is called *pratiprasava*, and this state of dissolution is known as *kaivalya*”.¹³⁰ Vācaspati describes this whole process of dissolution very explicitly and clearly in a step-by-step manner. He comments that this process of dissolution starts from *saṃskāra*; *saṃskāra* dissolves into *manas* (mind-faculty), then *manas* dissolves into *asmitā* (ego), then *asmitā* dissolves into *līṅga* (subtle body), and *līṅga* dissolves into *alīṅga* (unmanifest).¹³¹ This process of cosmological dissolution has widely been accepted in the later commentaries directly or indirectly. Therefore, it has been seen that in *sūtra* 4.34, according to the most Sanskrit commentaries, *pratiprasava* is a process of ontological or cosmological dissolution.

Critique of Historical Interpretations of *Pratiprasava*

Most Sanskrit commentators appear to maintain a relatively consistent understanding of *pratiprasava* as a process of cosmological or ontological dissolution throughout their expositions. However, a closer reading of the *sūtra*-s in which this concept appears suggests

¹²⁹ *sūtra* 4.34: “*puruṣārthaśūnyānām guṇānām pratiprasavaḥ kaivalyaṃ svarūpapratīṣṭhā vā citīśaktiriti*”.

¹³⁰ Vyāsa on *sūtra* 4.34: “*kṛtabhoga-apavargānām puruṣārtha-śūnyānām kārya-kāraṇātmakānām guṇānām yaḥ pratiprasavaḥ, tat kaivalyaṃ*”

¹³¹ Vācaspati on *sūtra* 4.34: “*saṃskārāḥ manasi līyante, manaḥ asmitāyām, asmitā līṅge, līṅgaṃ alīṅge*”

that such an interpretation may, at times, be somewhat imposed upon the text. Notably, Patañjali refers to *pratiprasava* explicitly only in two *sūtra*-s (2.10 and 4.34). In *sūtra* 4.34, the term seems to be employed in a partial ontological or cosmological sense, whereas in *sūtra* 2.10 it appears within a more epistemological context.

It is also significant that, in their commentaries on these two *sūtra*-s, Sanskrit commentators do not always provide a detailed definition or sustained analysis of the nature and metaphysical implications of *pratiprasava*. A comparative examination of the commentarial tradition suggests that the concept is often treated as a pre-established notion, interpreted primarily as a cosmological process of dissolution, with relatively little attention paid to its possible contextual or practical significance as a yogic discipline.

This tendency appears to stem from the standard Sāṃkhya–Yoga metaphysical framework, within which liberation (*kaivalya*) is generally understood as a complete ontological separation between *puruṣa* and *prakṛti*. Within this framework, *pratiprasava* is assumed to be the mechanism by which such separation is effected. However, it is noteworthy that the commentators do not offer a systematic justification for restricting *pratiprasava* exclusively to a cosmological or ontological process. In fact, the term is explicitly applied to the *guṇas*—ontological constituents—only in *sūtra* 4.34, whereas in *sūtra* 2.10 it is used in relation to the *kleśas*, which pertain to the epistemic and psychological processes of the yogin's *citta*.

A further reason for the predominance of the cosmological interpretation may lie in its compatibility with the commentators' understanding of *kaivalya* as disembodied liberation (*videha-mukti*). By construing *pratiprasava* primarily as a process of ontological dissolution, they are able to reinforce and justify this particular soteriological model.

Having discussed the problems of the traditional cosmological interpretations by different commentators, I am now going to discuss the modern readings of *pratiprasava* in some hindi, bengali and english commentaries.

Contemporary Interpretations of *Pratiprasava*

In addition to the Sanskrit commentators, modern scholars also address the topic of *pratiprasava*, both directly and indirectly. In this section, I will mostly analyze the interpretations of a few scholars from some Hindi commentaries, Bengali commentaries, and English scholarly works on the concept of *pratiprasava* in the *Yogasūtra*. I will begin my discussion with the some hindi commentaries.

Cosmological *Pratiprasava* in Some Hindi Commentaries

In his hindi commentary, *Yogdarśanam*, Svāmī Satyapati Parivrājaka explains the concept of *pratiprasava* in *sūtra* 2.10. He says that in this *sūtra* Patañjali tells what this *pratiprasava* means. “The cause of origination of five *kleśa* is *prakṛti*. From this *prakṛti kleśa* take birth. When *bhoga* and *apavarga* are accomplished, there is no need of *citta* to function furthermore. Therefore, the *pratiprasava* of *citta* takes place which means *citta* along with its *kleśa* get dissolved into *avyakta-prakṛti*”¹³². In his commentary *bhāva-prākāśika*, Mahāprabhu Lāl Gosvāmī explains *sūtra* 2.10 by saying that ‘*kleśa* is the cause of the *saṃsāra*. The destruction of the *ajñāna-kleśa* is not possible. *Kleśa* exist in the form of *vāsanā*. *Kleśa* which has not yet started the functioning of the *vṛtti* actions, are to be abandoned with the destruction of the *citta*’¹³³.

In his commentary *Yogdarśanasamīkṣā*, Paṇḍita Kṛṣṇamaṇi Tripāṭhī states in *sūtra* 2.10 that “those *kleśa* which have become subtle should be dissolved in their cause of *citta* which is *prakṛti* by the *sādhana* of the yogin. What this process is all about. He explains by saying that the *prakṛtilin* yogis remain weakened, but they are not completely destroyed. These *kleśa* remain in the form of subtle seed. The way of the abandonment of those subtle *kleśa* is explained in this *sūtra*. What it means is that when from *vivekakhyāti*, true self knowledge is gained and there is the lack of *avidyā*, then *citta* gets dissolved. After the dissolution of the *citta* the *kleśa* which remained in subtle form are destroyed as well”¹³⁴.

Svāmī Jñānānanda states that “the subtle *kleśa* disappear along with the dissolution of *antaḥkaraṇa* by the practice of yoga which aims at the uprooting of the seed of *kleśa*. With the process of *pratiloma* of *kleśa*, the *antaḥkaraṇa* which is the cause of *kleśa*, ceases

¹³² *sūtra* meṃ ‘*pratiprasava*’ śabda parā hai, isako aisā samajhanā cāhiye, pāca kleśom kā utpādaka kāraṇa prakṛti hai, usī se kleśom kā prasava arthāt utpatti hotī hai, jaba citta ke dvārā bhoga aur apavarga siddha ho jāte haiṃ to usakī āvaśyakatā nahīṃ rahatī, ataḥ usakī pratiprasava ho jātā hai arthāt vaha apane upādāna kāraṇa meṃ līna ho jātā hai.

¹³³ janmāntar meṃ anubhūta maraṇa trāsa ke smaraṇa janya bhaya se yaha icchā hotī hai, kleśa hī saṃsāra ke kāraṇa hai, ajñāta kleśom kā nāśa sambhava nahīṃ hai, vāsanā rūpa se sthita haiṃ, ve jina vṛttirūpa pariṇāmoṃ kā ārambha nahīṃ kiyā hai, ve vyāḡane yoga sūkṣma kleśa citta ke pralaya ke dvārā sarvathā vinaśta ho jāte haiṃ, arthāt apane kāraṇa meṃ pratiprasava = pratiloma kramase jaba cittalīna ho jātā hai taba dharmoṃ ke abhāva meṃ nirmūla asmitā rūpa prakṛti meṃ līna citta hone se ve heya ho jāte haiṃ evaṃ jinakā kārya bhārabdha ho cukā hai aise kleśom kī jo sukhaduḥkhamohātmaka vṛttiyā hotī haiṃ, ve dhyāna ke dvārā nivṛtta ho jātī haiṃ.

¹³⁴ ve sūkṣmāvasthā ko prāpta kleśa citta ko āpane kāraṇa meṃ vilīna kara ke sāadhanom dvārā vinaśta karane yoga haiṃ, arthāt-prakṛtilīna yogī ke kleśa kṣīṇa rahate haiṃ, kintu unakā sarvathā nāśa nahīṃ hotā, ve sūkṣma bīja rūpa se bane rahate haiṃ, unḥīṃ ko tyāga karane kā upāya isa sūtra meṃ batāyā gayā hai, isakā tātparya yaha hai ki jaba viveka khyāti se yathārtha ātma jñāna ho jātā hai aur avidyā kā abhāva ho jātā hai taba citta kā laya ho jātā hai citta ke laya ho jāne para jo kleśa sūkṣma bījarūpa se rahate haiṃ unakā bhī nāśa ho jātā hai

functioning with the destruction of *kleśa*. These five *kleśa* are not *vr̥tti*, but the cause of *vr̥tti* which is the collection of subtle conditions of the *citta*. This is why as in the similar way as the *vr̥tti* cease, the *kleśa* cannot be ceased. When the dissolution of *antaḥkaraṇa* happens by the *samādhi*, then the *kleśa* completely dissolve along with the destruction of *antaḥkaraṇa*¹³⁵.

Svāmī Viṣṇutīrtha says that “the meaning of *pratiprasava* – the sequence of *karaṇa* to the origination *kārya* is called *prasava*. The opposite of this sequence which is *kārya*’s dissolution in the *karaṇa*, is called *pratiprasava*. The intention of this *sūtra* 2.10 is that “the subtle *kleśa* which are weakened by the *kriyā*-yoga should be abandoned by the sequence of *pratiprasava*. For example, the cause of *dveṣa* is *duḥkha*, the lack of *sukha* and competition of *sukha* is called *duḥkha*. The cause of *rāga* is *sukha*. The tussle between *sukha* and *duḥkha* is between each other. The desire of *sukha* itself is a kind of *duḥkha*”¹³⁶.

The Hindi commentaries indicate that *pratiprasava* is a cosmological process wherein the yogin's mind dissolves, ultimately leading to the complete destruction of afflictions. This

¹³⁵ *ve arthāt pūrvokta pāṇcom kleśa jinakā varṇana bhalībhāti ho cukā hai, samādhipāda meṃ jo vyādhi ādi cittake vikṣepa aura yogake vighna-samūhakā varṇana kiya gayā hai, una sabake mūlameṃ ye pāṇca prakāra ke kleśa haiṃ, isā kāraṇa maharṣi sūtrakāra pahale ina kleśomke lakṣaṇa varṇana karake aba unake nāśake upāya varṇana kara rahe haiṃ, yogābhilāṣīko prathama hī kleśomkā tyāga kara denā ucita hai, parantu vinā yathārtharūpake jāne kisī vastukā tyāga athavā prahaṇa nahīṃ kiya jā sakatā; isā kāraṇa pūrvasūtrammeṃ unake lakṣaṇa, uddeśya aura utpattisthānakā varṇana karake aba unake tyāgakā upāya varṇana kara rahe haiṃ, ina pāṇca prakāra ke kleśomko do avasthāom meṃ vibhaktā kara sakate haiṃ, yathā- eka sūkṣma avasthā aura dūsarī sthūla- avasthā, sūkṣma arthāt antaḥkaraṇa meṃ kāraṇarūpeṇa aura sthūla arthāt. viśṭitarūpeṇa, isā sūtrakā yahī tātparya hai ki sūkṣma avasthāpanna kleśa bījanāśake samāna yoga meṃ antaḥkaraṇa līna honese usahī ke saṃga asta ho jāte haiṃ aura sthita rahanepara bhī unakī puna: utpatti nahīṃ hotī, sthūla-kleśomke laya karaneḥ upāya parasūtra meṃ kahā jāyagā, parantu sūkṣmakleśomke viśaya meṃ itanā hī kahā gayā ki ve apāne kāraṇarūpa antaḥkaraṇameṃhī pratilobha vidhike anusāra antaḥkaraṇa ke nirodha karāne layako prāpta ho jāte haiṃ, ye pāṇcom kleśa vr̥tti nahīṃ hai kintu vr̥ttiyomke nidānarūpa cittagata sūkṣma- bhāvasamūha haiṃ, isā kāraṇa jisa prakāra se vr̥ttiyā laya hotī haiṃ u prakāra se inakā laya nahīṃ ho sakatā hai, jaba samādhikēdvārā antaḥkaraṇakā laya hotā hai taba antaḥkaraṇake sātha hī sātha ye . pañcakleśa bhī āmūla layako prāpta hojāte haiṃ*

¹³⁶ *pratiprasava kā artha- kāraṇa se kārya kī utpatti ke krama ko prasava kahate haiṃ, usakā ulaṭa krama arthāt kārya kā phāraṇa meṃ vilīnīkaraṇa pratiprasava kahalātā hai, isā prakāra sūtra kā abhiprāya yaha hai ki kriyā yoga dvārā tanu kiye huṭ pāṇcom kleśom ke sūkṣma rūpom ko pratiprasava krama se tyāgā jānā cāhiye, jaise dveṣa kā kāraṇa duḥkha hai, sukha ke prabhāva evaṃ pratidvandvī ko duḥkha kahate haiṃ, rāga kā kāraṇa sukha hai, sukha-duḥkha kā dvandva pārasparika hai, sukha kī icchā svayaṃ duḥkha rūpa hai, isaliye sukha kī icchā kā tyāga duḥkha sahana karane ke līṭ titikṣā ko unnata karegā | icchā kā kāraṇa asmitā hai, -- cāhe vaha sukha prāpti ke karegā, icchā kā kāraṇa asmitā hai, cāhe vaha sukha prāpti ke liye ho, cāhe sukhom ke bhogane ke yantra athavā sādhanarūpa deha kī rakṣā ke liye ho, jise yahāṃ śrabhiniveśa samjñā dī gayī hai, isaliye rāga, dveṣa aura abhiniveśa tīnom kā kāraṇa asmitā hai, asmitā kā kāraṇa dr̥k śakti kī darśana śakti se tādātmya honā hai, jo vāstava meṃ kabhī nahīṃ hotā, kevala hotā huā-sā pratīta hotā hai, jaisā ki tulasīdāsa jī ne rāma carita mānasa meṃ kahā hai ki 'jaḍa cetanaḥ granthi pari gayī, jadapi mṛṣā chūṭata kaṭhinayī,' ukta tādātmya kā kāraṇa śravidyā hai, jo jñāna dvārā dūra hotī hai, jñāna ko yahāṃ viveka khyāti yā puruṣa khyāti kahā gayā hai, jisakī prāpti ke viśaya meṃ aṣṭāṅga yoga sūtra 28 meṃ kahēṃge, isā dṛṣṭi se sūkṣma kleśom kā kāṭanā yoga kā sāṅgopāṅga sādhana hone ke kāraṇa śīghra sambhava nahīṃ, isaliye pahale una kleśom kī vr̥ttiyom kā tyāga karānā cāhiye.*

interpretation of pratiprasava as a process of dissolution is consistently reflected in all the Bengali commentaries discussed. Having covered the Hindi commentaries, I will now turn to the examination of several Bengali commentaries.

Cosmological *Pratiprasava* in Some Bengali Commentaries

Among many bengali yoga scholars, Kālīvara Vedāntavāgiśa is one of the important early scholar who explains this *sūtra* by commenting that ‘when these above mentioned five *kleśa* become subtle by the practice of *kriyā-yoga*, then those subtle *kleśa* have to be discarded by the *pratiloma-pariṇāma*. The intention of this *sūtra* is that although the *kleśa* are not completely uprooted by *tapasyā* and *īśvarapraṇidhānā*, but they are weakened, but this weakening is almost similar to destruction. What is this weakening state? It is the lifeless state of the *kleśa* after the destruction of the gross state. The continuous practice of *tapasyā* and *īśvarapraṇidhānā* remove all *kleśa* or *avidyā* - *doṣa* become subtle or lifeless serially. So, *kleśa* become powerless or lifeless like the *dagdhabīja*. As the *dagdhabīja* does not germinate, so the *dagdhabīja kleśa*, produced by *tapasyā* do not give birth to subtle *duḥkha* and enjoyment of ... so, whether these types of *kleśa* exist or do not exist do not affect the yogi at all. For the Yogi he do not need to do anything to remove these *kleśa*. When his *citta* will be burned by the fire of *samādhi*, the *kleśa* will be dissolved in its own cause which is *asmitā* and that time all his *kleśa* -*saṃskāra* themselves automatically will be eradicated’¹³⁷.

Caṇḍīcaraṇa Pāl in his book “Meyeder *Pātañjal*” explains this *sūtra* in detail. He says that ‘the *kleśa* of *citta* are born from the *saṃskāra* of *citta*. From this *saṃskāra* desire is born. As much as desire reduces, *saṃskāra* also reduces. When all the *saṃskāra* of *citta* are abraded, then the *citta* will be dissolved and at that time there will be *mukti*. For abrading desire vairagya has to be practiced. By continuous discriminating evaluation process the faults or problems of the material world is perceived for the vairagya in material world. Those who do not have this discriminating faculty enjoy the mundane world and they do not attain *vairāgya*. When one continues this discriminating activity of *citta* the desire gradually decreases in the body, *indriya*-s, *buddhi* and mind. *Citta* is the seat of *iṣṭadevatā*. When *citta*

¹³⁷ ukta pañcakleś jakhan kriāyoger dvārā sukṣa haiā āise, takhan tāhādigake pratiloma-pariṇāmer dvārā citta haite dūrīkṛta karite haive. abhiprāi ei je, tapasyā o īśvar praṇidhān dvārā kleśer mūlotpāṭan nā haileo tāhār sūkṣatā hai, parantu tāhā prāi vināśer e tulya. sūkṣatā ki? sthūla pariṇām nāstā haiā giyā nirjīva dāśa prāpta haiyā. tapasyā o īśvarapraṇidhānādi karite karite citter samasta kleś vā avidyādi doṣa sakal krame sūkṣma vā nirjīva haiyā āise; arthāt dagdhavijer nyāi nistej vā niśakti haiyā pade. dagdhabīja jeman aṅkur janmāi nā, tāpasyādi dagdha kleśao temani sukha duḥkhādirupā sthūla bhog vā paripuṣṭa bhoga janmāi nā. sutarām serūp kleś yogīr pakṣe thākā nā thākā samāna. se kleśa nivāraṇera janya yogīr konorūpa upāi avalambana karite hai nā. tānhāra citta jātkāle samādhi anale dagdha haive, svīya kārāṇe asmitāi līn haive, takhana tānhāra samasta kleś saṃskār āp nā haitei tirohita haive.

is cleansed the seat of the *iṣṭadevatā* is cleansed and the *iṣṭadevatā* sits on that clean seat. At that time we attain success in our *sādhana*. When God resides in *citta*, *citta* does not remain mere *citta*, rather *citta* is known as *sattva* in this condition. As long as the flow of desire function, it is the mere *citta* and when the flow of desire ceases *citta* becomes *sattva*¹³⁸.

Pūrṇacandra Vedānta Cuñcu explains *sūtra* 2.10. He says that “*sūtrakara* does not mention the fifth stage of the five *kleśa* which is *dagdhabhīja* state because this *dagdhabhīja* state cannot be eradicated by the efforts of the yogin. This is why this fifth stage of five *kleśa* cannot be advised to the yogins by the *sūtrakara* to eradicate because to get rid of this stage of *kleśa* is beyond the capacity of the yogic practices. So, it is not advisable to the yoga practitioners by the *sūtrakara* for something which is unattainable by efforts of the *puruṣa*. To completely uproot the five *kleśa* which exist in the form of subtle state in *citta* is not possible by the efforts of the *puruṣa*. The complete destruction of the *kleśa* take place when the *citta* itself gets dissolved in the *avyakta-prakṛti*¹³⁹.

Bengali commentaries appear to align completely with traditional Sanskrit and Hindi interpretations of *pratiprasava*, viewing it as a process of cosmological dissolution of *citta* along with its afflictions. After surveying several Bengali commentaries, I will now explore the various perspectives on *pratiprasava* presented in English scholarly works.

Cosmological *Pratiprasava* in Some English Commentaries

One of the most prominent cosmological interpreters is Feuerstein, who conceives *pratiprasava* and *nirodha* in an cosmological manner. While commenting on *Yogasūtra* 2.10, Feuerstein explains that “*pratiprasava* is the gradual involution of the yogin's personal cosmos, which ends in the flowing back of the primary-constituents (*guṇa*) into the primal cosmic matrix” (Feuerstein 1989: 65). Feuerstein argues that *kaivalya* is disembodied

¹³⁸ *ei sūkṣma kleśasakal ke pratiprasaver dvārā arthāt pratiloma-gamaner dvārā lai karite hai| citter saṁskār haitei cittera kleś utpanna hai| ei saṁskār haite āsakti utpanna hai| āsakti jata kamive, saṁskārao tata kamive. āsakti jata vardhita haive saṁskārao tata vṛddhi pāive. citter samuday saṁskār jakhan kṣaya haiā jāive, takhan citrer laya haive, takhan mukti haive| āsakti kṣaya karivāra janya vairāgya avalamvan karive. avirata vicāradvārā viśaya er doṣadarśan karite karite kramaśa viśaye vairāgya haya. jāhārā eirūp vicār nā kariyā viśaya bhog kare tāhāder vairāgya hainā | eirup vicār karite karite krame śarīre, indriye, mane o vuddhite āsakti kamiyā āsive. cittai iṣṭadever āsan. ei citta ke pariṣkāra karilei tāhār āsan parisakṛta hailo| āsan pariṣakṛta hailei, sekhāne iṣṭadevatār adhiṣṭhān hai| takhan āmāder sādhane saphalatā lābh hai. citte bhagavāner adhiṣṭhān haile citta ār citta thāke nā. takhan citta sattva nāme abhivṛtta hai. citte jataḥṣaṇa kāmānār srot cale tataḥṣaṇ tāhā citta, ār kāmānār srot nivṛta haiyā sthir hailei citta sattva hai.*

¹³⁹ *sūtrakāra dagdhavīja sadṛśa kleś pañcaker pañcamī avasthār ullekh karen nāi, kāraṇ, yāhā puruṣer prayatna dvārā dūrībhūta hai tāhāri upadeś deoyā kartavya. aśokya viśaye upadeś pradān nirarthak. kleś sakalke saṁskār rūpe sthitiṛūp sūkṣma avasthā haite samūle vināś karā puruṣer prayatnasādhya nahe, uhā cittavināśer saṅgei tirohita hai, tāi sūtrakār uhār ullekh karen nāi|*

liberation in yoga because as long as *puruṣa* is encased in a physical body, *puruṣa* cannot enjoy true freedom. The body is the obstacle in the path of attaining *kaivalya* because the body is associated with *prakṛti* and the goal of yoga is to completely dissociate *puruṣa* from *prakṛti*.

Feuerstein (1974, p. 47) comments that:

Vyāsa promoted view that deliverance is possible even when still alive. But this standpoint is not sanctioned by the *Yogasūtra*. Vyāsa, who was in any case not a follower of Pātañjalayoga, here introduced opinions alien to the radical dualism of this school of yoga which makes no allowance for a liberation while yet embodied. As long as the self has not cut all connections with *prakṛti*, it cannot be said to stand in its true form (*svarūpa*). What philosopher-yogins like Vaśiṣṭha or Śaṅkara taught as *jīvan-mukta* can, to the follower of classical yoga, only mean close proximity to final emancipation. For this, as for Rāmānuja, release follows upon death, when the body has fallen off (*vi-deha*), and whenever a liberated person takes on a body again, either composed of gross or subtle matter, he is no longer residing in freedom, but is again subject to the laws of governing the machinery of the universe. Even when residing in the highest and purest realms of nature, he remains subject to a thin veil of illusion (*māyā*), since *prakṛti* is *avidyā* or nescience.

So, for Feuerstein, *kaivalya* cannot be attained while living. Feuerstein also states that *jīvan-mukti*, strictly speaking, is not the stage of *kaivalya* but rather a stage approaching *kaivalya*. He explains that while a *jīvanmukta* may stay in the highest and purest realms of nature, the *jīvanmukta* “remains subject to a thin veil of illusion (*māyā*), since *prakṛti* is *avidyā* or nescience” (Feuerstein 1974: 47). For Feuerstein, as long as *puruṣa* remains entangled with the body, *puruṣa* is subject to ignorance. As all effects of ignorance are completely abrogated for *puruṣa*, Yoga can be considered a world-renouncing tradition based on the goal of completely dissociating *puruṣa* from all actions in this physical world, because action entails the existence of the physical body.

According to Svāmī Veda Bhārati, the terms *pratiprasava* and *pratisañcara* are equivalent in terms of the *Sāṅkhya* theory of causality because “the evolutes are dissolved by the yoga process in their respective causes in the reverse order, just as they arise from their respective causes in the chain of causation” (113). Bhārati links *pratiprasava* with *pratisañcara* based on how similar the process of disintegration appears to be. It is incorrect to interpret *pratiprasava* from an *Sāṅkhya* perspective because neither the words *pratiprasava*

nor *pratisañcara* can be found in *Sāṅkhyakārika* literature. The word "*pralaya*" has been used to refer to dissolution in *Sāṅkhya*. Only in the *Tattvasamāsa-Sūtra* does the word "*pratisañcara*" emerge, and it is there that it is described as a process of cosmological breakdown or destruction, whereas "*sañcara*" is described as a process of creation. If *sañcara* is a process of creation, *pratisañcara* is the process of disintegration or destruction, which is the antithesis of *sañcara*. However, it should be noted that whereas *pratiprasava* is the prerequisite for liberation in yoga, *pratisañcara* is not directly associated with the concept of liberation in *Sāṅkhya*. Unlike "*sañcara*," which is found in the *Tattvasamasasūtra*, the term "*prasava*" is not mentioned in the *Yogasūtra*. The idea that *pratisañcara* is the reverse of "*sañcara*" in yoga thus does not make sense.

According to Veda Bhārati, *pratiprasava* is an exact match for *Nirodha*. According to Veda Bharati, *nirodha* is a similar process to *pratiprasava* in which the *guṇa*-s dissolve. But why does Patañjali not utilize the *nirodha* notion again in *sūtra* 2.10 in place of *pratiprasava*? This begs the question of whether *pratiprasava* is *nirodha*. *Nirodha* is a word that is extremely difficult to translate or comprehend, but it is obvious that in yoga metaphysics it has been used to describe a method of stopping or restricting the modifications or fluctuations of the mind, because in *sūtra* 1.2 Patañjali states that yoga is "*cittavṛttinirodhaḥ*" (suppression of the states of mind). *Nirodha* is therefore categorically not a transcendental dissolution process, and it cannot be compared to *pratiprasava*. "The stopping of that (five *vṛttis*) by repeated practice and dispassion (*abhyāsavairāgyābhyāṃ tannirodhaḥ*)," says Patañjali in *sūtra* 1.12 of his work. *Abhyāsa* and *vairāgya* are the means by which this *nirodha* process operates, but *pratiprasava* itself is a useful yogic procedure that causes dissolution. As opposed to what Veda Bharati believed, these two phenomena can be regarded as being very different from one another.

In a similar fashion, Pradeep Gokhale compares the concept of *pratisarga*—which he believes to be an *Sāṅkhya* concept of backward creation—with the term *pratiprasava*. The word "*pratisarga*" does not occur in *Sāṅkhyakārika* or any commentary of this text. Only the creation-related word "*sarga*" is provided in *Sāṅkhyakārika* 21, 24, 52, 53, 54, and 66 (*puruṣasya darśanārthaṃ kaivalyārthaṃ tathā pradhānasya | paṅgvandhavadubhayorapi saṃyogāstatkṛtaḥ sargaḥ*, sk-21). According to Gokhale, *pratisarga* would be the antithesis of *sarga* if *sarga* meant creation. Therefore, "*pratisarga*" refers to a dissolution or destruction process. The *Sāṅkhya* literature where Gokhale discovers the term "*pratisarga*" is not mentioned by him. Gokhale may have been thinking of the idea of "*pratisarga*," one of the

Purāṇas' defining themes (*pañcalakṣaṇa*), which incorporates some *Sāṅkhya* principles into its philosophical framework. Creation (*sarga*), dissolution and recreation (*pratisarga*), genealogy of kings, sages, and gods (*vaṁśa*), world periods or Manu eras (*manvantara*), and narrative descriptions of kings, sages, and gods (*Vaṁśanucarita*) are the five qualities. *Pratiprasava* is a very complex and significant idea in yoga metaphysics; hence, I don't believe it is acceptable to compare it to *pratisarga*. It is an entirely yogic technical terminology with practical and spiritual importance. *Pratiprasava*, in my opinion, is interpreted in a transcendental sense because it has been compared to the *Sāṅkhya* concepts of *pratisaṅcara* and *pratisarga* because of their apparent similarity as a process of dissolution. This comparison highlights a superficial imposition (by interpreters) of concepts from the *Sāṅkhyakārikā* upon the *Yogasūtra* because this comparison ignores the empirical or epistemological functioning of the *pratiprasava*. Besides being a metaphysical concept, *pratiprasava* is also a yogic *sādhana* that yogin undertakes while *pratisarga* is just a metaphysical concept which does not have anything to do with practice.

Edwin Bryant also interprets *pratiprasava* in an cosmological sense. Bryant (2009: 290) says that “their total dissolution occurs only when the mind of the liberated yogin dissolves back into its original *prākṛtic* source upon the yogin’s death, “*pratiprasava*”. Bryant (2009, p. 458) states:

The yogī’s physical body and cognitive apparatus can now return to the elements through reverse involution, the *pratiprasava* mentioned in this *sūtra* (4.34) (and in 1,10).

For Bryant, *pratiprasava* is exclusively an cosmological process of dissolution in the *Yogasūtra*. According to Bryant (2009, p. 571), when the yogī’s mind has fulfilled its purpose (*nirbīja-samādhi*), it (mind) dissolves back into prakṛti. Bryant (2009, p. 469) writes that:

“One cannot deny that in the actual state of *nirbīja-samādhi*, the yogī is completely dysfunctional; he or she has, after all, withdrawn consciousness from all sensual activities, *pratyāhāra* (II.54-55), and completely stilled all *vṛttis* whatsoever, such that the entire psychophysical organism is absolutely closed down.”

For Bryant, *pratiprasava* is that cosmological process by which the entire psychophysical entity of the yogin dissolves. In other words, the yogin dies by shutting down all kinds of entanglements with the nature.

The interpretations of *pratiprasava* by these scholars in their English writings clearly indicate that *pratiprasava* is an ontological or cosmological process of dissolution, which indirectly supports the notion that liberation in Yoga philosophy is a form of disembodied liberation. After discussing the cosmological interpretations presented by these scholars, I will analyze some epistemological views found in various English scholarly works.

Epistemological *Pratiprasava* in the Secondary Literature

According to certain scholars, *pratiprasava* is not a dissolution of the *prakṛtic* elements but rather the yogin's incorrect understanding of *prakṛti*. This interpretation is epistemological. Put differently, they consider that *pratiprasava* is a process of purifying the yogin's mind or that it is a shift in the yogin's way of thinking. Let us discuss many justifications offered by various scholars for their epistemological interpretations of the idea of *pratiprasava*.

Ian Whicher's Epistemological Interpretation of *Pratiprasava*

Completely opposing the cosmological interpretation of *pratiprasava* as a cosmological process of dissolution of all connections with the *prakṛti* including the mind and body of the yogin, Ian Whicher (1998, p. 156) suggests that *pratiprasava* "denotes the process of "dissolution into the source" or "withdrawal from manifestation" of those forms relative to the personal, microcosmic level of the yogin who is about to attain freedom (*apavarga*).” In other words of Whicher, *pratiprasava* "means the eradication of misidentification of the incorrect world view born of *avidyā* or incapacity of the yogin to "see" from the yogic perspective of the seer (*draṣṭā*), our true identity as *puruṣa*.” For Whicher, *pratiprasava* is a psychological process of knowing the true self of the yogin as *puruṣa* by dissociating himself or herself from the grip of *avidyā*. Due to the effect of *avidyā*, *puruṣa* identifies himself or herself as *prakṛti*. When there is no *avidyā*, *puruṣa* comes to realize his or her original self as *puruṣa*. So according to Whicher, *pratiprasava* is an epistemological process of purification of perceptual knowledge of the yogin. Whicher(1998, p. 156) explains:

“Epistemologically, *pratiprasava* denotes a return to the source, withdrawal, or dissolution of the afflicted state of the *guṇa-s* that is, insofar as the constituents of matter/nature have been under the influence of *avidyā* (ignorance) and have fulfilled their purpose for *puruṣa* in the context of *saṃsārika* experience and liberation from the bondage of the afflictions, *karma-s*, and their fruition. *Puruṣa* is therefore "disjoined" or "disengaged" from the *guṇa-s* in the condition of *saṃyoga* implying here a state in which there is no longer misidentification with the mind and its

modifications as in the empirical mode of selfhood. Pratiprasava can be further understood as “withdrawal from the epistemological power of the *guṇa*-s over the yogin”.(Whicher1998, p. 156)

For Whicher, *pratiprasava* is a process of dissolution of the afflicted states of the *guṇa*-s which bind the *puruṣa* in the realm of *prakṛti*, not the dissolution of the *guṇa*-s themselves. According to Whicher, *pratiprasava* is a process of dissolution of the mistaken relationship of *puruṣa* with the *prakṛti*. In other words of Whicher, *pratiprasava* is "withdrawal from the epistemological power of the *guṇa*-s over the yogin." Whicher believes that *pratiprasava* as a process of dissolution does not mean the cosmological dissolution of all kinds of manifestations including the physical body and mind of the yogin rather he comments that “what actually "dissolves" or is ended in Yoga is the yogin's misidentification with *prakṛti*, a mistaken identity of self that contrary to our true identity as *puruṣa* can be nothing more than a product of the three *guṇa*-s under the influence of spiritual ignorance.” Whicher believes that *pratiprasava* is an epistemological process of dissolution of wrong identification of yogin with all the *prakṛtic* manifestations including the physical body and mind. Whicher (1998, p. 206) states:

“Patañjali informs us that the overcoming or abandonment of this self-centered mentality or thinking is like that of the afflictions, a process referred to as *pratiprasava* (YS II.10 and IV.34): the "return" to the state of equilibrium or non-afflicted identity. Just as the afflictions are reduced to the condition of "scorched seed" (i.e., are made obsolete) through unfaltering discriminative discernment, so the previous *saṃskāra*-s, having become "seeds" scorched by the fire of knowledge, can no longer generate attachment to ideas (4.34) or fixed notions of self-rooted in ignorance”. (Whicher 1998, p. 206)

For Whicher, Patañjali uses *pratiprasava* to bring a mental or perceptual change in the mind of the Yogin. Whicher interprets *pratiprasava* in the two above-mentioned *sūtra*-s in an epistemological sense. But Patañjali employs the concept of *pratiprasava* as a process of dissolution of subtle afflictions in *sūtra* 2.10 and as a process of dissolution of *guṇa*-s in the *sūtra* 4.34. Whicher’s interpretation does not completely support Patañjali’s explanation of *pratiprasava* in these two *sūtra*-s. While it is possible to interpret *pratiprasava* in *sūtra* 2.10 from an epistemological standpoint where *pratiprasava* is a process of getting rid of the *kleśa*-s, but it is to be remembered that *pratiprasava* is prescribed for subtle *kleśa*-s which are

not possible of getting rid of by mere psychological change in the mind of the yogin from selfish thinking to unselfish thinking.

Patañjali clearly states in *sūtra* 2.10 that subtle *kleśa*-s are to be dissolved by the process of *pratiprasava* which cannot be dissolved by any practice. Psychologically, *pratiprasava* in *sūtra* 2.10 is a process of dissolution of the subtle *kleśa*-s (deep internal diflements of mind whicche are beyond the control of individual sense of egoity as mind-body entity), not the dissolution of mere individualistic sense of ethical misbehaviour or immoral or selfish activities (which are controlled by a mere sense of individual ego as mind-body entitiy). In *sūtra* 4.34 *pratiprasava* means a return of the *guṇa*-s to its original source which indicates the dissolution of all relationship with *guṇa*-s including the physical body and mind.

Whicher rightly explains *pratiprasava* as “the "return" to the state of equilibrium” which means that *guṇa*-s return to a balanced state only in the state of *avyakta-prakṛti*, but he unconvincingly equates this cosmological state of equilibrium of the *guṇa*-s with the psychological state of the mind of the yogin as “non-afflicted identity” which is not meant in the *sūtra* itself. It is to be noted that at the state of equilibrium of the *prakṛti*, *puruṣa* is beyond any kind of identity, she is even beyond “non-afflicted identity” because “non-afflicted identity” itself is also an identity. At the time of equilibrium of three *guṇa*-s, all kinds of identities including the identity of body and mind are lost because the return of the manifest *prakṛti* to the unmanifest *prakṛti* requires the death of the yogin. If the yogin is death, there cannot be any kind of identiy whether is afflicted or non afflicted identity.

Taimni’s Epistemological Interpretation of *Pratiprasava*

Taimni (1961:140) states that “*pratiprasava* is the gradual involution of the yogin's personal cosmos, which ends in the flowing back of the primary-constituents (*guṇa*) into the primal cosmic matrix. Taimni explains:

“The phrase *pratiprasava* means involution or re-absorption of effect into cause or reversing the process of *prasava* or evolution. If a number of things are derived in a series from a primary thing by a process of evolution they can all be reduced to the original thing by a counter-process of involution and such a counter process is called *pratiprasava*”.

Taimni (1961:140) explains the process of *pratirpasava* by saying that:

“the five *kleśa*-s mentioned in II-3 are not independent of each other but form a series beginning with *avidyā* and ending with *abhiniveśa*. The process of the development of *avidyā* into its final expression *abhiniveśa* is a causal process, one stage naturally and

inevitably leading to the next one. It is therefore inevitable that if we want to remove the final element of this fivefold series we must reverse the process whereby each effect is absorbed in its immediate cause and the whole series disappears. It is a question of removing all or none. This means that *abhiniveśa* should be traced back to *rāga - dveṣa*, *rāga - dveṣa* to *asmitā*, *asmitā* to *avidyā*, and *avidyā* to Enlightenment. This tracing backward is not merely an intellectual recognition but a realization which nullifies the power of the *kleśa*-s to affect the mind of the Yogi. This realization can come to a certain extent on the physical plane but is attained in its fullness on the higher planes when the Yogi can rise in *samādhi* to those planes. It will, therefore, be seen from what has been said above that there is no short-cut to the attenuation and final destruction of the *kleśa*-s. It involves the whole technique of Yogic discipline”.

According to Taimni, *pratiprasava* is a psychological or epistemological process of negating the effect of *kleśa*-s in the mind. While epistemological process of *pratiprasava* could be arguably accepted in the description of the *sūtra* 2.10, it is not acceptable in the *sūtra* 4.34 which clearly indicates that *guṇa*-s must return to its original source which is unmanifest *prakṛti*. This return of *guṇa*-s entail disentanglements of all kinds of *prakṛtic* manifestation including physical body and mind.

Deshpande’s Epistemological Interpretation of *Pratiprasava*

Deshpande (1978: 86) translates *sūtra* 2.10 by saying that "they [tensions] have to be removed by means of counter-creativity [*pratiprasava*] because they are very subtle,” Deshpande defines *pratiprasava* as an "extraordinary energy that is 'pure seeing' and is capable of penetrating and reaching the very roots of everything that is observable or the 'seen'." For Deshpande, *pratiprasava* is an epistemological capacity of the yogin to see the core of all manifestations of *prakṛti*. Deshpande (1978: 86) explains this *sūtra* by saying that It is necessary to dismiss *kleśa*-s, which are extremely subtle, and the only method to do so is through *pratiprasava*. This term is composed of the prefix “*prati*” and the word “*prasava*.” 'Begetting, generation, procreation' is what *prasava* signifies. Furthermore, “*prati*” denotes “in opposition to,” “against,” or “counter.” Everything, including humans, is reproduced by nature (Deshpande, 1978: 86). Man is the result of nature's capacity for reproduction. However, the only living creature that can be aware of this natural ability to procreate is man (Deshpande, 1978: 86). This is the reason why the logic of evolution itself motivates contemporary anthropologists to characterize man as “evolution becomes conscious of itself.” Being so

cognizant or aware is what it means to be a "seer," someone who sees the entire objective world—the "seen"—as the result of nature. Man alone possesses this remarkable power of observation (Deshpande, 1978: 86). All natural objects possess this power or energy, which has neither a quality nor a quantity associated with it. 'Seer' can never be the 'seen', the object, the observed. The 'subject' cannot be the product of conditioning or possess particular traits. 'Pure seeing' is an incredible energy that can penetrate and reach the fundamental foundations of everything observable or 'seen' (Deshpande, 1978: 86)...

Deshpande (1978: 87) again states:

“The movement of *pratiprasava* is not a movement of time. It looks at everything which time has put together and sees through it down to its very roots. If time and nature are procreative (*prasavātmaka*), *pratiprasava* is also creative but runs counter to procreation. Hence 'counter-creative' - not a very happy rendering in English. It has to be understood in and through action that is Yoga (Kriya Yoga). If one does not move along with the action of pure perception, the phrase will remain devoid of any meaning” (Deshpande, 1978: 87).

Deshpande (1978: 87) states that in opposition to procreation, the creative movement known as *pratiprasava* explores the origins of time and nature. To comprehend and live out this idea, one must take action, such as *kriyā-yoga*, for without it, the term has no meaning. According to Deshpande, *pratiprasava* is an active yogic practice like the *kriyā-yoga* techniques and *pratiprasava* is an activity of the mind in which the perception or mentality of the yogin changes or transforms. Deshpande (1978: 93) states that it is “through *pratiprasava*, one arrives at a stage in which one's mind is free of tensions and one's perception is illuminated by the emergence of existential intelligence (*viveka*)” What does one see now? One sees clearly the existential nature of both the 'seen' and the 'seer’”.

Deshpande (1978: 90) explains that two fundamental facts about one's existence and way of life are brought to light by *pratiprasava*: (I) one either identifies with *vṛtti-s* (*vṛttisārupya*) and becomes entangled in a world of tensions from which no egocentric activity can free one; or (ii) one recognizes this fact and declines to follow this self-procreative and self-importance-perpetuating movement, a movement of *prasava*. A completely new movement known as *pratiprasava*, or counter-creativity, emerges if one chooses "no movement" after realizing that "all is sorrow."

Deshpande (1978: 109) thinks that *pratiprasava* is a process of psychological change in the mind. He comments that “Body and mind-stuff are the products of the evolutionary and

social and historical past. The gold of pure perception that gets mixed up with them through contact born of *avidyā*, has to be separated from the accumulated refuge of the past. The process of this separation starts, not at the physical but at the psychological and perceptive level. It is a process of *kriya- yoga*, *pratiprasava* and *vivekakhyāti*, expounded in Part 11”.

Deshpande (1978: 9) states that *pratiprasava* is the proper method for releasing oneself from all *kleśa*-s. This entails an investigation that goes backwards, from the surface tensions at the periphery to their underlying causes. This is how meditation is done. During meditation, one's mind stays still, allowing only pure perception to function at the impulses that arise from conditioned consciousness. The ability of this perception to probe and penetrate is so great that it allows impulses to be observed in all their egocentric reasons as they emerge. And because they are seen for what they truly are and the harm they can inflict is fully comprehended, they finally go, leaving the mind clear and unclouded (Deshpande, 1978: 9).

Deshpande (1978: 94) comments that “Man, therefore, must, in the interests of survival, subject his experiences to careful observation and critical scrutiny with a view to finding a way out of tension, confusion and chaos. Those who care to do so discover a way out, the way of *pratiprasava*, which leads to freedom from all tensions and tension-ridden conflict, confusion and chaos”. For Deshpande, *pratiprasava* is a psychological process of cleansing all kinds’ impurities in the mind of yogin.

Nicolai Bachman’s Epistemological Interpretation of *Pratiprasava*

Bachman (2011: 61) states that finding the causes of *samskāra*-s will put a stop to *samskāra*-s. We can comprehend how a pattern started and take action to lessen its impact on our future behavior by following it back to its source (*pratiprasava*). It takes work and a strong desire to better ourselves and our deeds to do these measures. For Bachman, *pratiprasava* is process of finding the causes of *samskāra*-s and dissolving them by going to the root causes of those *samskāra*-s. Bachman (2011: 101) again says that to truly eradicate these internal ailments, we need to comprehend their origins and production process (*pratiprasava*). Our experiences from previous lives have shaped our current mental and emotional makeup. We are the culmination of our experiences. Finding the root cause of a sickness is similar to tracking down the origin of a bad habitual behavior. After that has been identified, it can be eliminated. Bachman (2011: 102) comments that the *kleśa*-s can no longer sprout and trigger unconscious reactions when we apply *kriyā-yoga* to weaken and nullify

them and then *pratiprasava* to eradicate them. Our focus can shift to *kaivalya*, or permanent liberation, once our baggage no longer influences our behavior and our *citta* is clear.

Bachman (2011: 118) states that Yoga offers methods for reprogramming the heart-mind and curing emotional disorders like *dveṣa*. The best method for weakening and eventually getting rid of all *kleśa*-s is to follow the three *kriyā*-yoga practices. By first completely understanding (*svādhyāya*) which occurrences cause our aversion, we can weaken *dveṣa*. Tracing the negative reaction back (*pratiprasava*) to the incident or events that triggered this aversion is one way to do this self-examination. This process can be aided by speaking with a therapist or longtime friends. Then, whenever the circumstance recurs, consider an alternative, constructive, and positive course of action to take in place of the unintentional and harmful response (Bachman, 2011: 118).

Bachman (2011: 214) believes that understanding our inner selves and the reasons behind our actions is one aspect of yoga. When we immediately react to a stimuli, we let our deep triggers (*kleśa*-s), habitual patterns (*saṃskāra*-s), and mental tumult (*vṛtti*-s) dictate how we respond rather than taking a step back and acting deliberately. To avoid this, we can identify the cause of our reaction, trace it back to its origin (*pratiprasava*), and learn from the suffering it produces (*duḥkha*). What occurred to me in the past that caused me to behave in this manner? How can I better myself so that I behave in a way that makes me feel good and proud? He (2011: 215) again says that destroying the roots of negative and harmful reactions within ourselves is the only way to completely eradicate them, just as eliminating the cause of disease is the only way to do so: either emotional-mental disorders (*kleśa*-s) or powerful patterns of habit (*saṃskāra*-s). The practice of *kriyā*-yoga weakens *kleśa*-s, whereas *pratiprasava* dissolves them. When other positive *saṃskāra*-s grow powerful enough to overpower negative ones, the negative ones disappear.

Bachman (2011: 2015) says that we can stop a *kleśa* before it takes over our behavior if we recognize when it is appearing subtly and interpret it as a warning indication or symptom of something more serious. Let's take an example where you wrote a song that became a huge hit. You suddenly become well-known, and a lot of people are focusing on you. By practicing *īśvara-praṇidhāna*, you can transmit the credit through your heart-mind to something greater than yourself (*īśvara*) if you recognize that you (*svādhyāya*) are starting to feel better than others (*asmitā-kleśa*) and know where your feeling of superiority originated from. This reverses the rising *asmitā-kleśa* and puts it back into dormancy (*pratiprasava*). Self-conceit can be avoided if you are watchful enough. If not, *asmitā-kleśa* grows inside your

heart-mind like a noxious weed and will be more harder to get rid of as the ego absorbs and retains all that attention.

Bachman Bachman (2011: 2015) explains:

Pratiprasava is a powerful exercise and is necessary to end the kleśa-s and any remaining negative or positive *saṃskāra*-s, the final step before *kaivalya*. As our heart-mind clears and we are able to remember past events that left a strong imprint in our consciousness, our current behavior might start to make more sense. Replacing longstanding habitual patterns with new ones requires diligence, focus, and persistence over a long period of time (*abhyāsa*). Eventually, our heart and mind become purified and able to enjoy the sweet taste of our inner light of awareness (Bachman, 2011: 2015).

Bachman thinks that as the last stage before *kaivalya*, *pratiprasava* is a potent exercise that aids in ending kleśa-s and negative *saṃskāra*-s. Purification and inner awareness result from replacing old habits with new ones, which takes effort, concentration, and perseverance. For Bachman, *pratiprasava* is a process of cleansing or purifying the mind by ending kleśa-s and *saṃskāra*-s in this process of *pratiprasava* one can enjoy the pure awareness state of mind.

Michael Beloved's Epistemological Interpretation of *Pratiprasava*:

Beloved thinks that *pratiprasava* is synonymous with *pratyāhāra*. He comments:

This means the practice of *rāja* yoga or mystic actions which effectively curb and end off what is unwanted in the psyche and what deters the objectives of yoga. *Pratiprasava* is known otherwise as the fifth stage of yoga which is *pratyāhāra* (*prati-āhāra*) reverting the sensual expressions back into the psyche, so that they do not express themselves outwards. This causes conservation of valuable psychic energy through which one develops supernatural perception. There are many subtle motivations which are quite fit to be abandoned or left aside, to be made powerless so that they do not motivate the psyche of the yogi in a counterproductive way. However, one must develop the power to shut down or squelch such energies, otherwise one can say what he likes and believe whatever suits his fancy and he will still be motivated by these energies to his detriment”¹²².

Jaganath Cerrera's Epistemological Interpretation of *Pratiprasava*

Jaganath Carrera (206: 125) explains *sūtra* 2.10 by saying that “in their subtle form, these obstacles can be destroyed by resolving them back into their original cause (the ego)”. He describes this *sūtra* that the "dormant" and "feeble" stages of the challenges listed in *sūtra* 2.3 are the "subtle form" that is being discussed here (see *sūtra* 2.4). The terms "dormant" and

"feeble" describe the actions of the barriers that are too subtle for the intellect to detect or that function as *samskāra*-s on a subconscious level. The experience of self-realization, in which ignorance is eliminated and the mind is transcended, is referred to as resolving the barriers to their fundamental cause. The impediments cannot exist after ignorance is destroyed by the light of the Self because ignorance created and maintains them (Carrera, 206: 125). According to Carrera, *pratiprasava* is a process of going back to the ego, not the unmanifest *prakṛti*. For Carrera, *pratiprasava* is an epistemological process.

Carrera says that "*pratiprasava* is the end game of spirituality, the mind resolving back into its source, unmanifest matter. It is again described in *sūtra* 4.34, but in a more cosmic sense in which the entire universe—all of the *guṇa*-s—return to their origin, a state of equilibrium". He believes that "*pratiprasava* does not describe the end of the universe. Instead, it is a personal transcendent experience in which the mind, by ending its misidentification with *prakṛti*, is resolved or returns to its origin—unmanifest *prakṛti*". For Carrera, *pratiprasava* is the transcending of self-centered mentality.

***Pratiprasava* as Both Psychological and Cosmological process**

In the recent time, there are few scholars who try to interpret *pratiprasava* from the cosmological as well as epistemological standpoint. For them, *pratiprasava* is both a psychological and cosmological process in which mind is purified and dissolved. According to this group of scholars, *pratiprasava* is both a purifying method and a destroying method for mind.

Kenneth Rose's Interpretation of *Pratiprasava* as Psychological and Cosmological Phenomenon

Pratiprasava is translated as "reabsorption or simplification" by Kenneth Rose (2016: 107). Rose defines "simplification" as "mind simplifying itself factor by factor" (149). According to Rose, the process of simplification involves the "mind transcending itself factor by faction" (152). What causes this transcendence? According to Rose, the mind advances to the next higher stage of *saṃprajñāta-samādhi* after passing through a lower stage. Therefore, during the meditation process, there is a mental shift from a lower degree of concentration on gross aspects to a higher level of concentration on subtle elements. Thus, *pratiprasava* is a mental simplification process that "characterizes the ascending degrees of (*saṃprajñāta*) *samādhi*," according to Rose (2016:102). What are these successive ascendance stages? "The emergence of the higher levels of *saṃprajñāta-samādhi* through the sequential suppression of the four chief generating factors of *vitarka*, *vicāra*, *ānanda*, and *asmitā* is the expression of

the process of simplification," according to Rose (2016:153). The four stages of *saṃprajñāta-samādhi* are as follows: the *vitarka* stage is the first, and the *asmitā* stage is the last. *Samprajñāta-samādhi* occurs during the yogin's lifetime. For Rose, *pratiprasava* seems to be a psychological process. The psychological reabsorption of the mind's contaminated condition into its crystal-clear state is known as psychological *pratiprasava*. To put it another way, it is the process of gaining accurate understanding of this everyday reality through multiple phases of meditation, which leads to the mind's restoration from its condition of impurity towards purity.

Rose acknowledges *pratiprasava* as a cosmological process in addition to psychological reabsorption, stating that "the world of experience can be reabsorbed back into primordial *prakṛti* through yogic *samādhi*" (2016:107). Note that Rose does not specify that this *samādhi* is merely the *saṃprajñāta-samādhi* in this passage. In this context, *samādhi* denotes both *saṃprajñāta-samādhi* and *asaṃprajñāta-samādhi*. "This process of reabsorption of *pratiprasava* is not only a psychological process, but it is also a reversal of the eternal, cosmological process whereby *prakṛti* unfolds itself from a primordial, potential state in a stepwise manner that begins from the heights of *buddhi*, the pure intellect, and ends in the world of the *bhūta-s*, or the traditional physical elements of space, air, fire, water, and earth, along with the physical senses (*indriya-s*) and bodily reactions (YS 2.18)."

Rose clarifies this uncertainty. According to Rose (2016:107), *pratiprasava* is the process of returning to *avyakta-prakṛti*, the original source, from the manifest world of *prakṛti*. According to Rose, *pratiprasava* is a mental journey from the manifest stage of *prakṛti*, where *saṃprajñāta-samādhi* makes the mind pure or clear, to the unmanifest stage of *prakṛti*, where *asaṃprajñāta-samādhi* causes the mind to dissolve. It is commonly believed that in *saṃprajñāta-samādhi*, there is an active mind through which the yogin interacts, whereas in *asaṃprajñāta-samādhi*, there is no functional mind of the yogin. This reabsorption process encompasses both cosmological and psychological processes. Rose claims that *pratiprasava* is a cosmological or cosmological process in addition to a psychological one.

As a mental process of upward journey from the gross levels of *samādhi* to subtler levels of *samādhi*, Rose's innovative idea of linking *pratiprasava* with various gradual stages of *saṃprajñāta-samādhi* is not supported by any textual evidence in the *Yogasūtra*, and Rose does not provide any textual relation with his formulation of the psychological *pratiprasava*. Patañjali states that *pratiprasava* is only necessary to eliminate the subtle *kleśa-s*, but Rose does not address why it must be a psychological process. In the second chapter, Patañjali

describes *pratiprasava* as a method of removing the *kleśa*-s. *Kleśa*-s must also be psychological in origin if *pratiprasava* is a psychological process. However, Rose does not clarify the *kleśa*-s' cosmological standing.

By going back to the origin of *prakṛti*, *avyakta-prakṛti*, Rose also acknowledges that *pratiprasava* is a cosmological dissolution of the yogin's body and mind. It is necessary to disintegrate the mind rather than purify it if *pratiprasava* is a cosmological or cosmological process. But as a psychological process, by distancing the mind from its impact or effect in the various stages of *samprajñāta-samādhi*, the yogin learns more about how the *prakṛti* functions and its various expressions. Rose claims that *pratiprasava* is a "reversal of the eternal, cosmological process," thus if he recognizes it as a cosmological process, the mind must vanish. The *avyakta-prakṛti* is shown by the reversal of eternal *prakṛtic* constituents into their source. Thus, it is evident that *pratiprasava* is an cosmological process. The mind must be cleansed if Rose agrees that *pratiprasava* is a psychological procedure. How can the *Yogasūtra*'s *pratiprasava* be both cosmological and psychological in nature? The question of what *pratiprasava*'s dual role is and how it functions in the psychological and cosmological domains emerges if it is acknowledged that it is both a psychological and cosmological activity. Another question is how we interpret *pratiprasava* as psychological and cosmological, respectively.

For what reason does Patañjali employ the idea of *pratiprasava* as a cosmological and psychological process? In the *Yogasūtra*, what metaphysical function does *pratiprasava* serve? Rose's explanation of the idea of *pratiprasava* leaves these problems unanswered. I believe that there will be a conflict between the psychological and cosmological functions of the *pratiprasava* process if we adopt Rose's reading of it as a reversal of *prakṛti* because reversal of *prakṛti* entails dissolution of mind and body of the yogin. Since psychological *pratiprasava* and cosmological *pratiprasava* are two entirely distinct domains of functionality, these two cannot be combined at the same time because *pratiprasava* can only work at one domain at a time. How do we interpret the question of the context in which *pratiprasava* is psychological and in which context *pratiprasava* is cosmological? How are the two stages of *pratiprasava* related to one another, if there are two stages? In which stage of yogic journey cosmological *pratiprasava* starts and psychological *pratiprasava* finishes? I think that because *pratiprasava* functions in the opposite way, it cannot be both psychological and cosmological at the same time if we interpret *pratiprasava* exclusively as a process of returning to the origin of *avyakta-prakṛti*?

Another question is how we interpret *pratiprasava* as psychological and cosmological, respectively. For what reason does Patañjali employ the idea of *pratiprasava* as a cosmological and psychological process? In the *Yogasūtra*, what metaphysical function does *pratiprasava* serve? Rose's explanation of the idea of *pratiprasava* leaves these problems unanswered. I believe that there will be a conflict between the psychological and cosmological functions of the *pratiprasava* process if we adopt Rose's reading of it as a reversal of *prakṛti*. Since psychology and cosmology are two entirely distinct domains that cannot be combined at the same time, I believe that *pratiprasava* cannot be both psychological and cosmological at the same time due to the processes opposite functioning.

Karen O'Brien-Kop's Psychological and Cosmological Interpretation of *Pratiprasava*

Karen O'Brien-Kop (2023: 185) translates *pratiprasava* as “material dissolution.” She explains this dissolution process by saying that “*pratiprasava* means dissolution or involution, the inverse of the process of the emanation of material reality.”¹² What is this inversing process of materiality? She (2023: 164) states that it is a “reversal of the material process.” By “material” she indicates the *prakṛti*. So, *pratiprasava* is a process of the dissolution of *prakṛti* in a reverse order from creation to destruction. It seems that she interprets *pratiprasava* from the cosmological standpoint. According to O'Brien-Kop, *pratiprasava* is the process of cosmological dissolution of the *prakṛti*. She (2023: 12) believes that *pratiprasava* is a “means of realization.” Which is to say that *pratiprasava* is a process or way or method of attaining or realizing the ultimate goal—*kaivalya* (liberation). But interestingly, she also accepts the epistemological role of the process of *pratiprasava*. Besides the cosmological function of the process of *pratiprasava* as a means of liberation She claims (2023: 12) that

“In terms of individual practice, then, *pratiprasava* entails the gradual withdrawal of the senses from the everyday world during meditation to the point where the practitioner starts to dissociate from the conventions of material existence – the identification with the body, the social self, one's environment, even time and space. Only in this state of splendid isolation, *kaivalya*, can one begin to witness from the non-engaged standpoint of pure consciousness (*puruṣa*). It is here that one can rest, supremely aware that the true self is eternal and unchanging consciousness, and therefore ultimately unaffected by the vagaries of everyday life, mental afflictions and suffering itself”.

O'Brien-Kop believes that *pratiprasava* is also a psychological process of detaching oneself from the influence and effects of *prakṛtic* manifestations by withdrawing the senses which

were previously caught up in the play of *prakṛti*. In other words, *pratiprasava* is a psychological process of one's misidentification with all social, physical and existential connections experienced in the realm of *prakṛti*. With this dissociation from all kinds of effects of *prakṛtic* manifestation the yogin comes to realize his or her true self as *puruṣa* and this realization is similar to *kaivalya* or liberation. In this passage two things are clear that *pratiprasava* is an individual psychological process and through this psychological *pratiprasava*, *kaivalya* or liberation is attained. So, *kaivalya* is also a liberation of mind from the all kinds of *prakṛtic* attachments.

For O'Brien-Kop, *pratiprasava* is both a psychological (epistemological) process and an cosmological process. It is to be noted that even the cosmological *pratiprasava* is an individual process of dissolving subtle afflictions and the *guṇa-s* in the *Yogasūtra*. So how far is it correct to identify the psychological *pratiprasava* as exclusively an individual practice by O'Brien-Kop? *Sūtra* 2.10 clearly says that *pratiprasava* is an individual process of dissolution of the subtle afflictions. O'Brien-Kop (2023: 62) also accepts that while she explains this *sūtra* by saying that “‘when the performative function of the yogin's mind dissolves, by this alone is reversal achieved’ (PYŚ 2.10). The reversal here is the material process of dissolving back into primordial stasis (*mūlaprakṛti* = *pradhāna/aliṅga*).” 62. So, for O'Brien-Kop, *pratiprasava* is an cosmological process of dissolution of *vyakta-prakṛti* into *avyakta prakṛti*. In other words, *pratiprasava* results in the death of the yogin. But O'Brien-Kop (2023: 63) suggests that the result of *pratiprasava* may not be death but “a kind of extreme dispassion towards life.”

If *pratiprasava* is a process of dissolving the mind into *avyakta-prakṛti*, how could the same *pratiprasava* be a process of dissociation of the mind's relationship with things of *prakṛti*? If *pratiprasava* is understood as a process of dissolution of mind into *avyakta-prakṛti*, then *pratiprasava* is a process of cosmological dissolution of mind, not a detachment towards life. The question arises of how far it is plausible to interpret an cosmological process as a psychological or epistemological process when they seem contradictory in their actions. There seems to be a contradiction in O'Brien-Kop's understanding of the two processes of *pratiprasava* as psychological and as cosmological because the moment *pratiprasava* starts working, the mind will dissolve into unmanifest *prakṛti*, not detach from *prakṛti*, because *pratiprasava* has been understood as a process of material dissolution. In the metaphysics of *Yogasūtra*, mind is also a material, and the dissolution of material mind means dissolution from *vyakta-prakṛti* to *avyakta-prakṛti*. There

is no possibility of the existence of any kind of pure or detached mind because the individual mind must be destroyed.

Mikel Burley's Phenomenological Interpretation of Pratiprasava

Burley interprets *pratiprasava* from a phenomenological perspective. For Burley 134, *pratiprasava* is a process of retreat of the manifestations of *prakṛti* from the view of *puruṣa*. Burley 134 states that this retreat or “withdrawal is referred to as *pratiprasava* (YS 4.34), a ‘return to the original state’ (MW: 668) or ‘flowing back to the source’; or as *prakṛtilaya* (SK 45), the ‘dissolution of [or into] *prakṛti*’; neither of these terms suggests that the manifestations in fact continue more or less as they are, only without being ‘seen’ by *puruṣa*”. According to Burley, *pratiprasava* consists in the dissolution of experience and of the constitutive conditions of the possibility of experience. For Burley, *pratiprasava* is a phenomenological process.

Burley just fleetingly mentions the term *pratiprasava* and does not discuss or explain it in detail. But what is clear from his view is that in *sūtra* 4.34 *pratiprasava* is a phenomenological process. But I doubt whether this explanation is plausible because in *sūtra* 4.34 clearly says that *guṇa-s* return to their original source. The original source is the unmanifest *prakṛti*. This return seems to imply that the mind and body of the yogin should also return to their original state which is unmanifest *prakṛti*. *Pratiprasava* in *sūtra* 4.34 indicates the cosmological dissolution of all connections of *puruṣa* with *prakṛti*. In other words, final result of the process of *pratiprasava* is the death of the yogin. Burley thinks that *pratiprasava* and *prakṛtilaya* are similar process. Although, it may appear that these two processes are similar, they do have differences as well.

Prakṛtilaya is a state of the progressive yogins who live in their subtle bodies, but they are not liberated. *Prakṛti* is understood as a composite whole of three cosmological real substances which are *sattva*, *raja* and *tama*. *Prakṛtilaya* literally means lost in the *Prakṛti*. *Prakṛtilaya* is actually a state where the unliberated yogins remain in subtle body in the higher realm of *prakṛti* which is subtler in nature than the normal gross physical world and after enjoying the fruits of their good *karma*, they will have to take birth again and earn their liberation. *Pratiprasava* is a prerequisite of attaining *kaivalaya*. When the yogins fulfil all his or her duties of *bhoga* and *apavarga*, *pratiprasava* causes liberation to the yogin. So, *pratiprasava* is instrumental in attaining liberation or *pratiprasava* is a process which is the cause of liberation. But *prakṛtilaya* is generally understood as hindrance or obstacle in the

process of liberation. They are not similar in their functioning even if they seem to mean dissolution in *prakṛti* literally.

Critique of Contemporary Interpretations of *Pratiprasava*

The opinions and concepts of the traditional commentators appear to be fully adhered to by all of the commentators in Bengali and Hindi. As a result, I will not restate the points made in the part that criticized Pratiprasava's historical interpretations. I shall highlight a few objections to the ways that the idea of *pratiprasava* has been interpreted in English works. There appear to be two primary two groups of scholars.. While one group seems to support the idea that *kaivalya* is disembodied liberation, the other group believes that the *Yogasūtra* may offer embodied emancipation. They are interpreting *pratiprasava* according to their preconceived ideas of *kaivalya* in the *Yogasūtra*. *Pratiprasava* is seen as an ontological or cosmological process of dissolution by those who believe that *kaivalya* is disembodied liberation, and as an epistemological or psychological phenomenon by those who believe that *kaivalya* is embodied liberation.

My objection is that *pratiprasava* should not be understood based on the specific meaning of *kaivalya*; rather, it should be understood independently in the specific contexts in which Patañjali has used it. *Kaivalya* should be understood based on the contextual meaning of *pratiprasava* because Patanjali makes it clear in *sūtra* 4.34 that *pratiprasava* is a prerequisite to achieving *kaivalya*. There are also another problem in interpreting *kaivalya* with one definite meaning because Patanjali mainly mentions *kaivalya* in four *sūtra*-s which seem to add different dimension in the nature of *kaivalya* which sometimes may appear to be conflicting from the surface reading of the text. Therefore, it is also problematic to have on exclusive meaning *kaivalya* throughout the text.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have surveyed and critically analyzed the diverse interpretations of *pratiprasava* as presented across traditional Sanskrit commentaries and modern scholarly works. This comprehensive literature review reveals a complex and often conflicting interpretive landscape, highlighting the challenges in establishing a unified understanding of this pivotal concept within Patañjali's *Yogasūtra*. A significant number of traditional Sanskrit commentators (including Vyāsa, Vācaspati, Bhoja, Vijñānabhikṣu, Ananta Deva Pandita, Rāmānanda Sarasvatī, Bhāvagaṇeśa, Sadāśivendra Sarasvatī, Hariharānanda Āraṇya, Vivaraṇakāra, and Nārāyaṇatīrtha) alongside some modern scholars (such as Feuerstein,

Pradeep Gokhale, and Edwin Bryant) interpret *Pratiprasava* as an cosmological process. This view posits *pratiprasava* as the literal dissolution or reabsorption of *prakṛtic* manifestations, including the yogin's physical body and mind, back into their unmanifest source (*avyakta-prakṛti*). Consequently, this understanding directly links *pratiprasava* to *videhamukti*, or liberation after the death of the physical body.

In contrast, a group of modern scholars (including Ian Whicher, Taimni, Deshpande, Nicolai Bachman, Michael Beloved, and Jaganath Cerrera) advocate for an epistemological or psychological interpretation of *pratiprasava*. This perspective understands *pratiprasava* as a process of mental purification, a shift in the yogin's perception, or the eradication of the *puruṣa*'s misidentification with *prakṛti* due to ignorance (*avidyā*). This view often associates *pratiprasava* with *jīvanmukti*, or liberation while living.

Recent scholarship, notably by Kenneth Rose and Karen O'Brien-Kop, attempts to integrate both psychological and cosmological dimensions, viewing *pratiprasava* as functioning across both domains. Mikel Burley also offers a distinct phenomenological interpretation. The critical analysis within this chapter reveals several significant limitations and inconsistencies in these interpretations. Even within the cosmological camp, figures like Vyāsa appear to exhibit an internal "incoherence" by interpreting *pratiprasava* as leading to *videhamukti* while simultaneously making room for a *jīvanmukta* stage, often described as merely "approaching *kaivalya*" rather than true liberation. The chapter specifically highlights a research gap concerning Vyāsa's "contradiction in defining the term or the idea of *kuśala* as a paradigm for distinguishing between two distinct forms of liberation: *videhamukti* and *jīvanmukti*". While an epistemological interpretation of *pratiprasava* may seem plausible for YS 2.10 (which concerns overcoming subtle *kleśa-s*), it is not acceptable for YS 4.34, which clearly indicates the "return of *guṇa-s* to its original source" and the "disentanglements of all kinds of *prakṛtic* manifestation including physical body and mind". A purely mental change cannot account for this cosmological dissolution. Critiques of scholars like Kenneth Rose points out that they "does not elaborate on these issues" of how psychological and cosmological *pratiprasava* work simultaneously or sequentially, or clarify the cosmological status of the *kleśa-s*. Karen O'Brien-Kop's interpretation is questioned for the plausibility to interpret an cosmological process as a psychological or epistemological process when they seem contradictory in their actions".

In conclusion, this chapter demonstrates that despite extensive scholarly engagement, a unified and coherent interpretation of *Pratiprasava* remains elusive in the interpretive

literature. The identified inconsistencies, unresolved questions, and inherent tensions between cosmological and epistemological understandings, particularly concerning its role in different stages of liberation, highlight a critical need for a more comprehensive and nuanced framework. This critical assessment of existing interpretations thus establishes the rationale and sets the stage for the subsequent chapters of this dissertation, which aim to offer a novel and integrated understanding of *pratiprasava*'s profound role in the journey towards *kaivalya*. Now the question arises: what does *kaivalya* mean? The next chapter focuses in finding the answer to this question.

.....

Chapter 4: Exploring the Meaning of *Kaivalya* in the *Yogasūtra*

Introduction

This chapter examines how the term "*kaivalya*" has been used in different contexts that are mentioned in different chapters of the *Yogasūtra*. It would not be injustice to say that *kaivalya* does not have only one meaning in the *Yogasūtra*. It appears that *kaivalya* has different meaning depending on the context in which the term is used by Patañjali. Due to the different contextual meanings of *kaivalya* in the *Yogasūtra*, it becomes difficult to find out one coherent meaning of the concept of *kaivalya* in the entire text. Even a close study of the *sūtra*-s in which *kaivalya* is mentioned seem to appear to carry apparent contradiction between the meanings of *kaivalya* in one chapter with the meaning of *kaivalya* in another chapter. It can even be said that these contradictory definitions of *kaivalya* suggest the different nature of *kaivalya* in the *Yogasūtra* which sometimes appear to be irreconcilable for the readers. Let us discuss the different definitions of *kaivalya* in different chapters of the *Yogasūtra*.

1. *Cittavṛttinirodha* -Oriented *Kaivalya*:

Patañjali begins *Yogasūtra* by telling us that he is going to present the teachings of yoga (*atha yogānuśāsanam*). Vyāsa explains this *sūtra* by commenting that "now, this [word] "*atha*" is for the purpose of commencing (*adhikārārthaḥ*) the text. The institute for the exposition of Yoga is now commenced. The term 'yoga' stands for communion (*samādhi*). And that *samādhi* is a universal property of the mind (*citta*). The levels of mind (*citta*) are: wandering (*kṣipta*), dull (*mūḍha*), distracted (*vikṣipta*), one-pointed (*ekāgra*), and arrested (*niruddha*). Of these, in a distracted (*vikṣipta*) mind, concentration (*samādhi*) is subordinate to distraction, and does not belong to the category of yoga. But the concentration which, in the one-pointed state of mind (*ekāgre cetasi*), illuminates the true object (*sadbhūtam artham*

pradyotayati), destroys the afflictions (*kleśān kṣiṇoti*), loosens the bonds of karma (*karmabandhanāni ślathayati*), and leads towards the state of restraint (*nirodham abhimukhaṃ karoti*), is called *saṃprajñāta yoga*. And this (*sa*) is accompanied by deliberation (*vitarka*), accompanied by reflection (*vicāra*), accompanied by bliss (*ānanda*), accompanied by the sense of "I am" (*asmitā*). We will explain this further on (*ity upariṣṭān nivedayiṣyāmaḥ*). But with the cessation of all mental activity (*sarvavṛttinirodhe*), it is called *asaṃprajñāta samādhi*"¹⁴⁰.

On the Meaning of *Atha*:

Bhoja states that "the word "*atha*" indicates a new beginning and also has an auspicious meaning (*maṅgalārthaka*)"¹⁴¹. Nārāyaṇatīrtha says that "Now, the word *atha* serves to mark the commencement of the text and is auspicious simply upon being heard, and it does not signify immediate sequence, such as in a question, etc. Indeed, according to the maxim that a verbal expectancy (*ākāṅkṣā*) is fulfilled only by a word, it is inappropriate for it to signify immediate sequence when the word [denoting sequence] is not present. Moreover, since a student's question, a teacher's command, faith (*śraddhā*), etc., are all equally causes for investigation, it is impossible to ascertain whose immediate sequence is intended"¹⁴². Rāmānanda Sarasvatī says that *atha* means *ārambhārthaḥ*. Bhāvagaṇeśa says that "now, the word "*atha*" here is auspicious in nature merely by its utterance and indicates commencement"¹⁴³. Nāgojībhāṭṭa says that "Now, the word "*atha*" is auspicious in its own form, like yogurt and so forth, and also indicates the commencement of a new topic"¹⁴⁴. Sadāśivendra Sarasvatī says that "here, the word "*atha*" signifies commencement, and by implication, auspiciousness (*maṅgalārtha*)"¹⁴⁵. Anantadevapaṇḍita says that "the word "*atha*" indicates commencement"¹⁴⁶. Hariharānanda says that "the word "*atha*" means "to begin" =

¹⁴⁰ *athety ayam adhikārārthaḥ. yogānuśāsanam śāstram adhikṛtaṃ veditavyam. yogaḥ samādhiḥ. sa ca sārvaabhaumaś cittasya dharmah. kṣiptam mūḍham vikṣiptam ekāgraṃ niruddham iti citta bhūmayah. Tatra vikṣipte cetasi vikṣepopasarjanībhūtaḥ samādhir na yogapakṣe vartate yas tv ekāgre cetasi sadbhūtam artham pradyotayati kṣiṇoti ca kleśān karmabandhanāni ślathayati nirodhamabhimukhaṃ karoti sa saṃprajñāto yoga ity ākhyāyate. Sa ca vitarkānugato vicārānugata ānandānugato 'smitānugata ity upariṣṭān nivedayiṣyāmaḥ. sarvavṛttinirodhe tv asaṃprajñātaḥ samādhiḥ*

¹⁴¹ *Athaśabdo adhikāradyotako maṅgalārthakaśca*

¹⁴² *atha śabdaḥ ārambhārthaḥ śrutimātreṇa maṅgalārthaśca, na praśnādyānantaryārthaḥ, śābdī hi ākāṅkṣā śābdenaiva pūryate iti nyāyena śābdānupasthitānantaryārthakatvānaucityāt, śiṣyapraśnagurvājñāśraddhādīnāmaviśeṣeṇa vicāraprayojakatayā kasyānantarye tātparyamityavadhārayitumaśakyattvācca*

¹⁴³ *athaśabdo'tra uccāraṇamātreṇa maṅgalarūpo'dhikāravācakaḥ.*

¹⁴⁴ *athaśabdaḥ svarūpeṇa maṅgalaṃ dadhyādivat, adhikāradyotakaśca.*

¹⁴⁵ *atra athaśabdaḥ ārambhārthaḥ, arthānmaṅgalārthaśca.*

¹⁴⁶ *athaśabdo'dhikāravācī.*

"to commence"¹⁴⁷. Vijñāna Bhikṣu says that "the word *adhikāra* is primarily used in the sense of "commencement" due to its conventional meaning, hence the scripture's being the object of commencement is indeed primary. And where the object's being the object of commencement is stated, as in "Now, this is the light," etc., there it is secondary, due to being the topic of the scripture that is the object of commencement—this is the idea. By this, the objection that the scripture is not the object of commencement because it is not determinable is refuted, because it contradicts the present commentary. To dispel the doubt that the word "*atha*" does not have the meaning of "question," etc., anywhere, it was said, "This."¹⁴⁸

Vivaraṇakāra¹⁴⁹ says that "*adhikāra* is commencement, *ārambhaḥ* is introduction, *prastāvaḥ*, its meaning (*arthaḥ*) is what is to be expressed (*abhidheyo'sya*); because of the authority (*prāmāṇyāt*) of the *śiṣṭa smṛti* (the tradition of the learned). Objection: But the learned remember the word *atha* to mean "immediately after" (*ānantaryārthasya*). And thus, it is said: "It is seen in the context of procedure (*prakriyārthe*) as immediately following what has occurred (*vṛttāt anantarasya*)." Reply: No, because it means "commencement" (*ārambhārthatvāt*) in all cases, and "immediately after" (*ānantaryasya*) is implied (*gamyamānatvāt*), just as when "son" (*putraḥ*) is said, "father" (*pitā*) is understood (*gamyate*), but "father" is not the meaning (*arthaḥ*) of the word "son." Likewise, here also, only "commencement" (*ārambha eva*) is expressed (*abhidhīyate*), but "immediately after" (*ānantaryam tu*) is understood (*pratīyate*). And for this very reason, it is said, "It is seen in the context of procedure as immediately following what has occurred." And if it had the meaning of "immediately after," then it would have said, "In the meaning of immediately after what has occurred, for the procedure." And "of what is immediately after" (*anantarasya iti*) is the expression (*abhidhānam*) of what is immediately to come (*anantarabhāvina eva*). Moreover, thus is the *smṛti*: "Some indeclinables (*avyaya*) are predominated by the meaning of case endings (*vibhaktyartha-pradhānam*), some are predominated by action (*kriyā-pradhānam*); *ucaiḥ* (high), *nīcaiḥ* (low), etc., are predominated by the meaning of case endings; *hiruk*, *pṛthak*, *ila*, etc., are predominated by action." And there is no meaning (*arthaḥ*) of indeclinables apart from this distinction (*vyatirekeṇa*). Therefore, if the

¹⁴⁷ *atheti śabdo'dhikārārthaḥ = ārambhaṇārthaḥ*.

¹⁴⁸ *adhikāraśabdo yogarūḍhatayā ārambhāna eva mukhya iti śāstrasyādhikāryatvaṁ mukhyamevāsti. yatra cārthasyādhikāryatvaṁ ucyate yathā athaiśa jyotirityādau tatrādhikāryaśāstraviśayatayā gauṇam tadityāśayaḥ. etena śāstrasyānadhikāryatvamanirūpyatvādityapāstaṁ prakṛtabhāṣyavirodhāditi. praśnādyarthakatvaṁ athaśabdasya kim kutrāpi nāstītyāśaṅkānirāsāyoktamayamiti.*

¹⁴⁹ I am using this name to indicate the writer of the Vivaraṇa, which is a commentary on Vyāsa's commentary. This writer carries the name of *Śaṅkara* but there are doubts among the scholars whether this *Śaṅkara* is the same person as *Ādiśaṅkara*, the writer of *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya*.

word *atha* has the meaning of "immediately after," then the hearing of case endings (*vibhakti-śravaṇam*) is inappropriate (*ayuktam*), because it is predominated by substance (*sattva-pradhānatvāt*); but if it has the meaning of "commencement of action" (*ārambha-kriyārthatve tu*), then the hearing of case endings is not inappropriate, because it is predominated by non-substance (*asattva-pradhānatvāt*). Therefore, it is correct that the word *atha* is indeed in the sense of introduction (*prastāvārthe eva*), and *atha* is in the sense of commencement (*adhikārārthe iti*). The word *iti* is for clarifying its own form (*svarūpāvadyotanārthaḥ*), just as one says, "*gauḥ* (cow)," thus he says. Even though the meaning of the word *atha* is well-known, it is mentioned for the purpose of settling the student's mind (*śiṣya-buddhi-samādhānārtha*) in the subject being commenced (*adhikriyamāṇa-viśaye*). For this principle is established in the *śruti*: "I will explain to you, but you should meditate on me as I explain." }¹⁵⁰.

On the Meaning of the Yoga as *Samādhi*:

Vijñāna Bhikṣu says that "yoga, well-known from the teaching "yoga is *samādhi*," is *samādhi*, the cessation of the fluctuations of mind (*cittavṛtti-nirodhaḥ*)"¹⁵¹. Hariharānanda says that "Yoga is *samādhi* (concentration). And this *yoga* does not have the meaning of "connection" etc. The grammarians say "*yuja* – in *samādhi*." And for them, *samādhi* means "concentration of the mind." And it is not that technical *samādhi* defined by the *artha-mātra* and other *sūtras*. For the grammarians, *samādhāna* is simply correct placement. This word *yoga* is derived from the root *yuj*. And that *yoga* is *samādhāna* (concentration)"¹⁵². Vivaraṇakāra says that "Because of the

¹⁵⁰ *adhikāra ārambhaḥ prastāvaḥ, artho 'bhidheyo 'sya ; śiṣṭasmṛtiprāmāṇyāt, nanu cānantaryārthasyāthaśabdasya smaranti śiṣṭāḥ, tathā cāha- "vṛttādanantarasya prakriyārthe dṛṣṭaḥ" iti, na-sarvatrārambhārthatvāt, ānantaryasya ca gamyamānatvāt, yathā putra ityukte pitā gamyate, na ca putrasābdasyārthaḥ pitā, tatthehāpyārambha evābhidhīyate, ānantaryam tu pratīyate. ata eva ca 'vṛttādanantarasya prakriyārtho dṛṣṭaḥ' ityucyate, yadi cānantaryārtho 'bhaviṣyattadā 'vṛttādanantarye'rthe prakriyāyāḥ' ityavadiṣyat, anantaryasyeti cānantarabhāvina evābhidhānam, api caivaṁ hi smṛtiḥ- "kiñcidavyam vibhaktyarthapradhānam kiñcitkriyāpradhānam, ucainīcārityādi vibhaktyarthapradhānam, hiruk prthagilyādi kriyāpradhānam' [iti], na caitadvyatirekeṇāvyayānāmarthom vidyate, tatrāthaśabdasyānantaryārthatve sati vibhaktya(kti)śravaṇamayuktam, sattvapradhānatvāt, ārambhakriyārthatve tu na vibhaktyārtha)śravaṇamayuktam, asattvapradhānatvāditi. tasmādathaśabdaḥ prastāvārthe eveti yuktamathelyadhikārārthe iti, svarūpāvadyotanārtha itisābdaḥ, yathā gaurityāheti, prasiddho 'pyathaśabdārtho 'dhikriyamāṇaviśaye śiṣyabuddhisamādhānārtha kīrtiyate, siddhe hyayam nyāyah śrutau 'vyākhyāsyāmi te vyācakṣāṇasya tu me nididhyāsasva' iti.*

¹⁵¹ *yuja samādhāvityanuśāsanataḥ prasiddho yogaḥ samādhīḥ cittavṛttinirodhaḥ.*

¹⁵² *yogaḥ = samādhīḥ, na ca saṁyo 'gādyarthako 'yam yogaḥ "yuja – samādhau" iti śābdikāḥ, teṣāṅca samādhīścittasamādhānārthakaḥ, na ca tadevārthamātrādisūtralakṣitaḥ pāribhāṣikāḥ samādhīḥ, samyagādhānameva śābdikānām samādhānametad, yujdhātuniṣpanno 'yam yogaśabdaḥ, sa ca yogaḥ = samādhānam.*

acceptance of *samādhi*, the root *yujiyoge* is excluded, and *yuja samādhau* is accepted. *Yoga* means concentration (*samādhāna*)”¹⁵³. Vācaspati Miśra says that “The meaning of *samādhi* is derived from “*yuja samādhau*,” not from “*yujir yoge*,” which means connection”¹⁵⁴. *Anantadevapaṇḍita* says that “Yoga is concentration”¹⁵⁵. Sadāśivendra Sarasvatī says that ““*yuja samādhau*’ is the verbal root from which the word *yogaḥ samādhiḥ*, union or concentration, is derived.”¹⁵⁶. Nārāyaṇatīrtha yoga is *samādhi*. Sadāśivendra Sarasvatī reminds us that (*samādhi*) is twofold: with conceptualization (*saṃprajñāta*) and without conceptualization (*asaṃprajñāta*). And that is the nature of mind (*cittasya dharmah*). Vyāsa explains that Yoga is *samādhi* and *samādhi* is the universal (*sārvabhauma*) quality (*dharma*) of the *citta*”¹⁵⁷. “*Sārvabhauma*” means something which is common to all conditions or situations. Vijñāna Bhikṣu comments that “*samādhi*” is all-pervasive (*sārvabhaumah*), a common attribute (*sādhāraṇah*) of the mind (*citta*) in all the states (*bhūmaya*) to be described—scattered (*kṣipta*) and so forth. It is a natural characteristic (*svābhāvikaḥ dharmah*) of the mind (*citta*), like the fluidity of water, because even in the scattered and other states, there is some cessation of fluctuations”¹⁵⁸. There are five states or level of *citta* which will be discussed later.

On the Meaning of *Anuśāsana*

Vivaraṇakāra says that “Just as a student is instructed by means of specific rules of engagement and disengagement, so too, because of the mere similarity of specific means and ends and their components, the instruction of a disciple is called the *yogānuśāsana*, like instruction in yoga. *Anuśiṣṭi* is *anuśāsana*; the *yogānuśāsana* scripture is that by which or in which one is instructed in yoga”¹⁵⁹. Vijñāna Bhikṣu says that ““*anuśāsana*” means the teaching (*śāsana*) of an instructor (*śiṣṭa*); thus, the *sūtrakāra* (author of the aphorisms) has shown the authority of the *śāstra* (treatise) as rooted in the guru (teacher), because *Yogiyājñavalkya*, by stating “*Hiraṇyagarbha* is the speaker of yoga, no other is more ancient,”

¹⁵³ *samādhigrahaṇāt 'yujiyoge' iti nivartya, 'yuja samādhau' ityayaṃ grhītaḥ, yogaḥ samādhānam.*

¹⁵⁴ “*yuja samādhau*” ityasmādvutpannaḥ samādhyaṛtho na tu “*yujir yoge*” ityasmātsamyogārtha ityārthaḥ.

¹⁵⁵ *yogo nāma samādhānam.*

¹⁵⁶ “*yuja samādhau*’ iti dhātoryogaḥ samādhiḥ.

¹⁵⁷ *yogaḥ samādhiḥ. sa ca sārvabhaumaś cittasya dharmah.*

¹⁵⁸ *samādhiḥ cittavṛttinirodhaḥ sa ca sārvabhaumah sarvāsu vakṣyamāṇāsu kṣiptādyavasthāsu sādharmaścittasya dharmah svābhāvikaḥ jalasya dravatvavat, kṣiptādyavasthāyāmapī hi yatkiñcidvṛttinirodho'styeveti, tathā cālakṣyaśvavasthāsu tallakṣaṇamativyāptamiti śeṣah, kāstāḥ sarvāḥ cittabhūmaya ityākāṅkṣyāmāha.*

¹⁵⁹ *yathā-śiṣyo 'nuśiṣyate viśiṣṭapravṛttinivṛttiniyamadvareṇa, tathā viśiṣṭasādhyasādhanaṭadanāṅganiyamamātrasādrśyādantevāsyānuśāsanavadyogānuśāsanamityucyate, anuśiṣṭiranuśāsanam, yoge 'nuśiṣyate 'nenāsminniti vā yogānuśāsanam śāstram.*

indicates that Hiraṇyagarbha is the original guru”¹⁶⁰. Hariharānanda says that “*anuśāsana* is the teaching and repeated teaching of the disciplined”¹⁶¹. “*Yogānuśāsana*, called the *yogaśāstra*, means that through it, there is also *yoga*”¹⁶².

Vācaspati Miśra says that “because *śāstra* is instruction, according to the etymology, “that by which one is instructed.”¹⁶³. *Anantadevapaṇḍita* says that *anuśāsana* means “that by which one is instructed and explained”¹⁶⁴. Sadāśivendra Sarasvatī says that “its instruction, following the *śāstra* of Hiraṇyagarbha, is taught and explained. Because the *samādhi* is accomplished and fruitful through it, the instruction is the *śāstra*. And so, the literal meaning [of the text] is that the *śāstra* that teaches the practice of yoga is begun for the sake of someone who desires *kaivalya*”¹⁶⁵. Nāgojībhāṭṭa says that “Yoga is being taught. “That by which [yoga] is taught and clearly understood” is the *yogānuśāsana*, the authoritative text. This means that it should be understood that this is merely a clear teaching of the yoga that was taught by Hiraṇyagarbha and others”¹⁶⁶.

Nārāyaṇatīrtha says that “*anuśāsana* means that which is taught or explained to students afterwards, according to the teachings of Hiraṇyagarbha, by means of characteristics, distinctions, results, and instruments; therefore it is *anuśāsana*. *Yogānuśāsana* means the exposition on Yoga. In other words, the treatise that explains Yoga is being commenced. Yoga, with its excellent instruments and results, is the subject matter to be explained in the treatise. Through the Yoga that is being explained, the result is *kaivalya* (supreme absorption). And one who desires that is qualified. The relationship between the treatise and the result is that of the instigator and the instigated. However, the relationship between the treatise and the subject matter is that of the explainer and the explained. The relationship between Yoga, which is the subject matter, and *kaivalya* is that of the means and the end. This is the direction [of the treatise]”¹⁶⁷.

¹⁶⁰ *śiṣṭasya śāsanamanuśāsanam tena śāstrasya gurumūlakatayā sūtrakāreṇa prāmāṇyaṃ darśitaṃ*
“*hiranyagarbho yogasya vaktā nānyaḥ purātana*” *iti yogiyājñavalkyena*
hiranyagarbhasyādigurutvabodhanādi.

¹⁶¹ *śiṣṭasya śāsanamanuśāsanam*.

¹⁶² *yogānuśāsanam nāma yogaśāstram tadadvārā yogo ’pītyarthaḥ*.

¹⁶³ *anuśāsanamiti hi śāstramāhānuśiṣyate ’neneti vyutpattyā*.

¹⁶⁴ *anuśiṣyate vyākhyāyate yena tat*.

¹⁶⁵ *tasyānuśāsanam hairanyagarbhe śāstramanuśritya śiṣyate vyākhyāyate sasādhanaḥ saphalaḥ*
samādhiranenetyānuśāsanam śāstram, tathā ca kasmaicitkaivalyakāmāya
pratipādyayogapratipādakam śāstramārabhyata ityakṣarārthaḥ.

¹⁶⁶ *yogo ’nuśiṣyate vivicya bodhyate ’neneti yogānuśāsanam śāstramadhikṛtam boddhavyamityarthaḥ,*
hiranyagarbhādyupadiṣṭasyaiva yogasya vivicya bodhanamatreti bodhyam.

¹⁶⁷ *anuśāsanam hiranyagarbhokteranu paścācchiṣyate vyutpādyate*
lakṣaṇabhedaphalasāadhanairnenetyānuśāsanam, yogasyānuśāsanam yogānuśāsanam,

Bhāvagaṇeśa says that “because the compassion for beings, the disciple's question, the guru's command, and so forth, are equally the cause for the composition of the treatise, it is impossible to ascertain the intention in the immediate sequence of which. *Anuśāsana* or *śāstra* is the teaching of the learned one, such as Hiranyagarbha. From the derivation, “that by which one is instructed.” And thus, the *śāstra* of yoga, instructed by gurus such as Hiranyagarbha, is the subject matter. It means, it has been begun”¹⁶⁸. Rāmānanda Sarasvatī says that “Although the *śāstra* was created by Hiranyagarbha, thinking that it was extensive, he indicates that a *śāstra* was started following that, namely, *anuśāsanam*. Here, in the *sūtra*, *yoga* is stated as what is taught in the *śāstra*, meaning that one who desires to know that is qualified. The result (*phala*) of *yoga*, however, is isolation (*kaivalyam*). The four connections (*anubandha-catuṣṭaya*) should be seen in relation to them as appropriate (*yathāyogaṃ teṣāṃ sambandha*)”¹⁶⁹.

Bhoja says that “That by which Yoga is taught and explained through distinctions of characteristics, means, and results is instruction (*anuśāsana*). *Yoga-anuśāsana* is the instruction of Yoga. Then, it should be understood that [the student] is qualified for the completion of the treatise. There, Yoga, with its means and its fruit, is the object to be expressed by the treatise, as being that which is produced by it. And the production of that is the fruit. The fruit of Yoga, when produced, is *kaivalya* (isolation). The relationship between the treatise and what is to be expressed is characterized by the nature of the producer and the thing to be produced. The relationship between Yoga, which is to be expressed, and its fruit, *kaivalya*, is that of means and end. This is what is said: the means of Yoga, which is to be produced, are shown by the treatise; Yoga, accomplished by those means, produces the fruit called *kaivalya*”¹⁷⁰.

yogapratipādakam śāstramārabhyate ityarthah, susādhanah saphalah yogah partipādyatayā śāstrasyābhidheyah, pratipādyayogadvārā kaivalyam phalam, tatkāmaścādhikārī, śāstraphalayoḥ prayojyaprayojakabhāvaḥ, śāstrābhidheyayostu pratipādyapratipādakabhāvaḥ, abhidheyasya yogasya kaivalyasya ca sādhyasāadhanabhāvaḥ sambandhaḥ iti dik.

¹⁶⁸ *śiṣyapraśnagurvājñālokanukampādīnāmaviśeṣeṇa śāstraracanāprayojakatayā kasyānantarye tātparyamityavadhārayitumaśakyatvāt, hiraṇyagarbhādinā śiṣṭasya śāsanamanuśāsanam śāstram, śasyate aneneti vyutpatteḥ, tathāca hiraṇyagarbhādigurūpadiṣṭasya yogasya śāstramadhikṛtaṃ, ārabdhamityarthah.*

¹⁶⁹ *yadyapi hiraṇyagarbhena śāstram kṛtaṃ tathāspi tadvisṛtaṃ iti matvā tadanuṣṛtaṃ śāstramārabhyata iti dhyotayati- anuśāsanam iti, atra sūtre yogah śāstrapratipādyā uktaḥ, arthātājijñāsuraadhikārī, phalam tu yogasya kaivalyam, yathāyogaṃ teṣāṃ sambandha ityanubandhacatuṣṭayaṃ draṣṭavyam.*

¹⁷⁰ *anuśiṣyate vyākhyāyate lakṣaṇabhedopāyaphalairyena tadanuśāsanam, yogasyānuśāsanam yogānuśāsanam, tadā śāstraparisamāpteraadhikṛtaṃ boddhavyamityarthah, tatra śāstrasya vyutpādyatayā yogah sasādhanah saphalo'bhidheyah, tadavyutpādanaḥ phalam, vyutpāditasya yogasya kaivalyam phalam, śāstrābhidheyayoḥ pratipādyapratipādakabhāvalakṣaṇah sambandhaḥ, abhidheyasya yogasya tatphalasya ca kaivalyasya sādhyasāadhanabhāvaḥ, etaduktaṃ bhavati*

On the Meaning of *Citta*:

Citta is one of the most important technical terms in the *Yogasūtra*, but Patañjali did not define it. Scholars translate *citta* as "mind," "mind-stuff," "mind complex," "consciousness,"²⁴ "awareness" "psyche," "psychic nature," "thinking principle," and "internal organ". All these translations indicate one or other actions of the *citta* definitely, but not the whole meaning of *citta*. It is generally translated as mind. But this mind (*citta*) is not a single entity, rather a combination of three elements – *manaś*, *buddhi* and *ahaṃkāra*. This combination is otherwise known as *antaḥkaraṇa* (internal instruments). Vācaspati Miśra says that “ the word *citta* indicates the internal organ, the intellect (*buddhi*)”¹⁷¹. It is to be remembered that whenever *citta* is used in the *Yogasūtra*, it means this whole combination of three elements. S. Dasgupta states that the *citta* stands for "all that is psychical in man."³¹ Koelman asserts that *citta* is "surely not a separate *prakṛtic* evolute,"³² meaning that it is not distinguishable from its component factors, those being *buddhi*, *ahaṃkāra*, and *manas*, whose emergence from primordial *prakṛti* is the theme of the *Sāṃkhya* cosmological scheme. Feuerstein calls *citta* "an umbrella term comprising all the functionings of the mind."³³ These mental functionings are generally divided into five levels or states of *citta*. According to Vyāsa , the five levels or states of mind (*cittabhūmayah*) are scattered (*kṣipta*), dull (*mūḍha*), distracted (*vikṣipta*), one-pointed (*ekāgra*), and suppressed (*niruddha*)¹⁷².

On the Meaning of *Kṣipta-Citta*

Scattered (*kṣipta*) state of mind (*citta*) is that mental condition in which mind is unstable and wavering always. Mind is not fixed in any particular object or thought. Mind is always jumping from one object or place or thought to another without any halt. Mind cannot concentrate or focus, it always remains agitated all the times. Hariharānanda explains that when the mind, which has the characteristic of *saṃskāra* and *pratyaya* (cause), is devoid of the desire for *tattva-samādhāna* (absorption in reality) and always wanders unsteadily, then its state is *kṣiptā*¹⁷³. Vijñāna Bhikṣu remarks that “*kṣipta* (scattered) has activity only in objects of the senses due to *rajas* [passion]”¹⁷⁴. Vivaraṇakāra states that *kṣipta* (scattered) is a past participle in the active sense, as in "the granary is broken by itself." "*kṣipta*" means dulled by

vyutpādyasya yogasya sādhanāni śāstreṇa pradarśyante tatsādhanasiddho yogaḥ kaivalyākhyam phalamutpādayati.

¹⁷¹ *cittaśabdenāntaḥkaraṇam buddhim upalakṣayati.*

¹⁷² *kṣiptam mūḍham vikṣiptam ekāgramniruddham iticittabhūmayah.*

¹⁷³ *yadā saṃskārapratyayadharmakam cittam tattvasamādhānacikīrṣāhīnam sadaivāsthiraṃ bhramati tadā'sya kṣiptā bhūmiḥ.*

¹⁷⁴ *kṣiptam rajasā viṣayeṣveva vṛttimat.*

clinging to undesirable objects ¹⁷⁵. Vācaspati Miśra mentions that *kṣipta* is that state of mind which is always being thrown by *rajas* (passion) onto this and that object, and is extremely unstable ¹⁷⁶. Rāmānanda Sarasvatī believes that the mind of the *daityas* (demons) is extremely *kṣipta* (scattered) due to *rajas* (passion) ¹⁷⁷. Bhoja claims that the scattered (*kṣipta*) state, due to the excess of *rajas*, is unstable, turned outwards, agitated by *rajas* towards discriminated objects such as pleasure and pain, whether they are remote, mediate, or immediate. This state is always that of the *daityas*, *dānavas*, and disputants ¹⁷⁸. Rāghavānanda Sarasvatī comments that “*kṣiptatva*” (scatteredness) is having objects other than the intended object ¹⁷⁹. Sadāśivendra Sarasvatī opines that which is scattered among objects by *rajas* is *kṣipta* (scattered) ¹⁸⁰.

One the Meaning of *Mūḍha-citta*

Dull (*mūḍha*) state of mind (*citta*) is that mental condition in which mind loses the sense of righteous duties and gets lost in the labyrinth of desires and engrossed in sleep and lethargy. In this state, mind is not attracted in discussing and acquiring salvific knowledge. Hariharānanda states that that *mūḍhā* state of the mind, which is under the control of intense *rāga* (attachment), etc., and *moha* (delusion), is the *mūḍhā bhūmi* ¹⁸¹. Vijñāna Bhikṣu thinks that *mūḍha* [dull] has activity such as sleep due to *tamas* [ignorance] ¹⁸². Vivaraṇakāra says that “*mūḍha*” means undiscriminating ¹⁸³. Vācaspati Miśra says *mūḍha*, on the other hand, is characterized by sleepiness due to an excess of *tamas* (ignorance) ¹⁸⁴. Rāmānanda Sarasvatī says that that of the *rākṣasa-s* (ogres) is *mūḍha* (dull), full of sleep etc., due to *tama* (ignorance) ¹⁸⁵. Bhoja says that the dull (*mūḍha*) state, due to the excess of *tamas*, without distinguishing between what should and should not be done, is controlled only by anger and other emotions towards actions that are contrary to dharma. This state is always that

¹⁷⁵ *kṣiptamiti karmakartari niṣṭhā, yathā bhinnah kusūlah svayameveti, kṣiptamaniṣṭaviṣayāsañjanena stimitam.*

¹⁷⁶ *kṣiptam sadaiva rajasā teṣu teṣu viṣayeṣu kṣipyamāṇamatyantamasthiram.*

¹⁷⁷ *rajasā atyantam cittam kṣiptam daityānām.*

¹⁷⁸ *kṣiptam rajasa udrekādashthiram bahirmukhatayā sukhaduḥkhādiviṣayeṣu vikalpiteṣu vyavahiteṣu samñihiteṣu vā rajasā preritam, tacca sadaiva daityadānavavādīnām.*

¹⁷⁹ *kṣiptatvam = uddiṣṭaviṣayātiriktaviṣayatvam,*

¹⁸⁰ *rajasā viṣayeṣu kṣipyamāṇam kṣiptam.*

¹⁸¹ *tādrśasyāpi ca prabalarāgādīmohavaśasya cittasya yā mūḍhā vasthā sā mūḍhā bhūmih.*

¹⁸² *mūḍham tamasā nidrādivṛttimat.*

¹⁸³ *mūḍham nirvivekam.*

¹⁸⁴ *mūḍham tu tamaḥsamudrekānnidrāvṛttimat.*

¹⁸⁵ *tamasā nidrādimanmūḍham rakṣasām.*

of the *raṁsas*, *piśācas*, and others. Rāghavānanda Sarasvatī says that *mūḁhatva* (dullness) is grasping only the object, even when, it is understood, the mind is in its domain ¹⁸⁶. Sadāśivendra Sarasvatī says that which is dulled by *tamas*, possessing the activity of sleep, laziness, etc., is *mūḁha* (stupefied) ¹⁸⁷.

On the Meaning of *Vikṣipta-citta*

While in *kṣipta-citta* state, mind is always jumping like a monkey from one branch to another branch of a tree from one moment to another moment, in *vikṣipta-citta* state, mind remains fixed or focused on one thought for a very short period of time. Even if the mind is unstable, still it becomes stable in one place for sometimes occasionally for a very short period of time. Hariharānanda states that the *vikṣiptabhūmikaṁ cittam* (mind in a distracted state) is distinct from the *kṣipta* (agitated state). There, occasional mental absorption, the desire for absorption, and absorption in the knowledge of reality are seen ¹⁸⁸. Vijñāna Bhikṣu thinks that *vikṣipta* [distracted] is distinguished from *kṣipta*: although the mind is concentrated due to the abundance of *sattva* [goodness], it has activity towards other objects from time to time due to a mere trace of *rajas* ¹⁸⁹. Vivaraṇakāra says that "*vikṣipta*" [distracted] means variously scattered, again in the active sense, and incapable of discrimination precisely because of being distracted ¹⁹⁰. Vācaspati Miśra says *Vikṣipta* is distinguished from *kṣipta*; the distinction is that it has occasional stability despite being mostly unstable. And this instability is either naturally occurring (*sāmsiddhikī*) or caused by the obstacles such as illness (*vyādhī*) and mental torpor (*styāna*) that will be described later¹⁹¹. Rāmānanda Sarasvatī says that *vikṣipta* (distracted) is superior to *kṣipta* (scattered), [and is the mind] of the *devas* (gods) etc.; the speciality [of *vikṣipta*] is the occasional steadiness of an extremely unsteady mind ¹⁹². Bhoja says that the distracted (*vikṣipta*) state, however, due to the excess of *sattva*, having specifically avoided the means of suffering, is engaged only in the means of pleasure, such as sound and so forth. This state is always that of the gods (*devas*) ¹⁹³. Sadāśivendra Sarasvatī

¹⁸⁶ *mūḁhatvaṁ* = *viśayamātragrāhakatvaṁ*.

¹⁸⁷ *tamasā nidrālasyaḁdivṛttimanmūḁham*.

¹⁸⁸ *kṣiptādvīṣiṣṭaṁ vikṣiptabhūmikaṁ cittam, tatra kāḁcitkaṁ cittasamādhānaṁ, samādhānacikīrṣā ca tattvajñānasamādhānaṁ ca drṣyate*.

¹⁸⁹ *kṣiptādvīṣiṣṭaṁ vikṣiptaṁ sattvādhikyena samādadhadapi cittam rajomātrayāntarāntarā viśayāntaravṛttimat*.

¹⁹⁰ *vikṣiptaṁ nānāḁkṣiptam, karmakartaryeva, vivekāḁsamaṁ ca vikṣiptatvādeva*

¹⁹¹ *kṣiptādvīṣiṣṭaṁ vikṣiptam, viśeṣo 'sthemabahulasya kāḁcitkaḁ sthemā, sā cāsyāsthemabahulatā sāmsiddhikī vā vakṣyamāṇavyādhistyānādyantarāyajanitā vā*.

¹⁹² *kṣiptādvīṣiṣṭaṁ vikṣiptaṁ devāḁdīnāṁ ; atyantacalacittasya kāḁcitkaṁ sthiraṁ viśeṣaḁ*.

¹⁹³ *mūḁham tamasa udrekākṛtyākṛtya vibhāgamantareṇa krodhāḁdibhiḁ viruddhakṛtyeṣeva niyamitaṁ tacca sadaiva rakṣaḁ piśācāḁdīnāṁ*.

says that which is slightly touched by *rajas* and *tamas*, possessing occasional meditation, is *vikṣipta* (distracted), more distinguished than *kṣipta* ¹⁹⁴.

On the Meaning of *Ekāgra-citta*

one-pointed (*ekāgra*) citta state is that mental state in which the mind is fixed and focused upon a particular object or thought or area for a longer period of time without disturbing the flow of the concentration. Hariharānanda states that the state of mind that is always inclined to stay in the desired object is the *ekāgrabhūmi* (one-pointed state) ¹⁹⁵. Vijñāna Bhikṣu thinks that *Ekāgra* [one-pointed] means that the tip or flame of the lamp of the mind is on one single object, because of pure *sattva*, it is unwavering on one single object for a period of time that will be specified later, like a lamp in a windless place. Thus, even though the three, *kṣipta* etc., have some one-pointedness, there is no over-application there ¹⁹⁶. Vivaraṇakāra says that "*ekāgra*" (one-pointed) means a stream of similar cognitions ¹⁹⁷. Vācaspati Miśra says *ekāgra* is one-pointedness ¹⁹⁸. Rāmānanda Sarasvatī says that in the *ekāgra* (one-pointed) *citta* (mind), which is dominated by *sattva* (purity) and fixed on one object, there is suppression of the activities of *rajas* (passion) and *tamas* (ignorance), and a special *sāttvika* (pure) activity, *samprajñāta-yoga* (cognitive *yoga*) occurs; by that, an object known indirectly through *śabda* (testimony) and *anumāna* (inference) is directly realized; from direct realization comes the destruction of *avidyā* (ignorance) and other *kleśa-s* (afflictions); then comes the burning of meritorious and demeritorious actions ¹⁹⁹. Bhoja says that in the one-pointed (*ekāgra*) state, there is the cessation of external activity ²⁰⁰. Sadāśivendra Sarasvatī says that which is one-pointed and continuous with pure *sattva*, the impurity of *rajas* and *tamas* having been shaken off, is *ekāgra* (one-pointed) ²⁰¹.

¹⁹⁴ *īṣadrajastamaḥsaṃsprṣṭena sattvena kādācitkadhyānayuktayā kṣiptādviśiṣṭaṃ vikṣiptam.*

¹⁹⁵ *abhīṣṭaviṣaye sadaiva sthitiśīlā cittāvasthā ekāgrabhūmiḥ*

¹⁹⁶ *ekasminneva viṣaye agraṃ śikhā yasya cittadīpasetyekāgraṃ viśuddhasattvatayaikāsmineva viṣaye vakṣyamāṇādvadhīkṛtakālaparyantamacāñcalaṃ nivāstathadīpavat, tathā ca kṣiptādītrayo'pi kiñcidaikāgryasattve'pi tatra nātiprasaṅgaḥ.*

¹⁹⁷ *ekāgraṃ tulyapratyayappravāham.*

¹⁹⁸ *ekāgramekatānam.*

¹⁹⁹ *niruddhasakalavṛttikaṃ saṃskāramātraśeṣaṃ cittaṃ niruddham, ekāgre tu sattvapradhāne ekaviṣayasthite citte rajastamovṛttinirodhaḥ sātvikavṛttiviśeṣaḥ samprajñātayogo bhavati, tena śabdānumānābhyāṃ parokṣatvena jñātārthaḥ sāksāt kriyate, sāksātkārādaavidyādikleśakṣayaḥ tataḥ puṇyapāpakarmaṇāṃ dāhaḥ tataḥ asaṃprajñāto yogaḥ.*

²⁰⁰ *ekāgre bahirvṛttinirodhaḥ.*

²⁰¹ *vidhūtarajastamomalena śuddhasattvenaikāgramekatānam.*

On the Meaning of *Niruddha-citta*

Suppressed (*niruddha*) state of *citta* is that mental state in which the mind is engrossed in itself. There is no subject and object division. All mental movements ceases. Mind is stable and focused. Hariharānanda states that the state of mind that is mostly the cessation of all *vṛttis* (fluctuations) is the *niruddhabhūmi* (restrained state) ²⁰². Vijñāna Bhikṣu thinks that *niruddha* [inhibited] means that all activities are inhibited, with only impressions remaining. Because the quality of *rajas*, such as attachment, is counteracted, the quality of *tamas* of people, such as depression, is seen ²⁰³.

Vivaraṇakāra says that *niruddha*" means a mind devoid of cognitions. But if what is intended to be discussed are the qualities in the stages [of mind]²⁰⁴. Vācaspati Miśra says *niruddha* is that [state of mind] where all mental activity has ceased, leaving only impressions (*saṃskāra*) ²⁰⁵. Rāmānanda Sarasvatī says that *asamprajñāta-yoga* (non-cognitive *yoga*), which is the suppression of even the *sāttvika* (pure) activity, and occurs in the *niruddha* (suppressed) *citta* (mind), when only *saṃskāras* (latent impressions) remain²⁰⁶. Bhoja says that in the arrested (*niruddha*) state, there is the dissolution of all activities and impressions (*saṃskāra-s*) ²⁰⁷. Sadāśivendra Sarasvatī says that in which all activities have subsided, leaving only residual impressions (*saṃskāra*), is *niruddha* (suppressed) ²⁰⁸.

On the Conducive Mental States for *Samādhi*

Hariharānanda says that *citta-samādhāna* (mental absorption) is indeed *yoga* (union). Because it is universal, the possibility of *yoga* exists in all five states. There, due to the force of intense *lobha* (greed), *moha*, etc., sometimes a little mental absorption occurs in the *kṣipta* and *mūḍha* states, but that does not lead to *kaivalya* (liberation), as in the case of Jayadratha, who was under the control of intense hatred. But the distraction that arises in the *vikṣipta* (distracted) mind, which is situated in the *vikṣiptabhūmi* (distracted state), becomes secondary, in the form of latent *saṃskāras* that have arisen in a subordinate manner, where the *vikṣepa-saṃskāra* (the mental impression of distraction) remains undestroyed. The *samādhi* (absorption) of such a mind in the *vikṣiptabhūmi* (distracted state) does not

²⁰² *sarvavṛttinirodhaprāyā cittāvasthā niruddhabhūmiḥ.*

²⁰³ *niruddham ca niruddhasakalavṛttikaṃ saṃskāramātraśeṣamityarthaḥ, rajodharmasya rāgādeḥ pratighātādeva lokānāṃ tamodharmo viśādādirdrśyata.*

²⁰⁴ *niruddhamiti pratyayaśūnyaṃ cittam, nanu ca bhūmiṣu dharmeṣu vivakṣiteṣu.*

²⁰⁵ *niruddhasakalavṛttikaṃ saṃskāramātraśeṣam cittam niruddham.*

²⁰⁶ *sāttvikavṛtterapi nirodhaḥ saṃskāramātraśeṣe niruddhe citte bhavati.*

²⁰⁷ *niruddhe ca sarvavṛttināṃ saṃskārānāṃ ca pravilaya.*

²⁰⁸ *praśāntasakalavṛttikaṃ saṃskāraśeṣam niruddham.*

properly belong to the side of *yoga* or *kaivalya*. The *samādhāna* (absorption) of one in the *vikṣiptabhūmi* (distracted state) is accompanied by disturbances. Therefore, when such a *sādhaka* (practitioner) is overcome by distraction, he behaves like an ordinary person who is negligent and devoid of the knowledge of reality”²⁰⁹.

Vācaspati Miśra says that in the case of *kṣipta* and *mūḍha*, even if there is cessation of mental activity due to mutual dependence, they are excluded from the category of *yoga* because they do not lead to liberation (*niḥśreyasa*) even indirectly, and because they are detrimental to it. However, in the case of *vikṣipta*, which possesses occasional stability focused on a real object, it might be considered *yoga*. Therefore, [the author] negates [this possibility]: in a *vikṣipta* mind, *samādhi*, the stability of the mind focused on a real object, does not belong to the category of *yoga*. Why? Because it is subordinate to distraction (*vikṣepa*), which is its opponent (*vipakṣa*). For something that belongs to the category of opponents, its very existence is rare, let alone its ability to accomplish anything. Indeed, a seed placed within a fire, even if it remains there for three or four moments, is not capable of sprouting. This is the idea”²¹⁰.

Bhoja comments that the two states, one-pointed (*ekāgra*) and arrested (*niruddha*), due to the excellence of *sattva*, are situated in the subsequent [states] and are conducive to *samādhi*. Regarding the reversal of the order of *sattva* and so on, the intention is this: although both *rajas* and *tamas* are to be completely abandoned, *rajas* is mentioned first for this reason: unless activity is shown, cessation cannot be shown. Therefore, the two are shown in reverse order. *Sattva*, however, is shown later for this reason: the two subsequent levels are useful for *yoga* due to its excellence. Among these two levels, one-pointed (*ekāgra*) and arrested (*niruddha*), the transformation of the mind that is the nature of one-pointedness is said to be *yoga*. In the one-pointed (*ekāgra*) state, there is the cessation of external activity. In

²⁰⁹ *cittasamādhānameva yogah, tasya sārvaabhaumatvāt pañcasvapi bhūmiṣu yogasambhavaḥ syāt tatra prabalalobhamohādīvaśāt kadā cit kṣiptamūḍhayorbhūmyoḥ kiyaccittasamādhānaṁ bhavati, na ca tat kaivalyāya bhavati, yathā – jayadrathasya prabaladveśādhīnasya, yastu vikṣipte vikṣiptabhūmiṣṭhe cetasi jāto vikṣepopasarjanībhūta upasarjanabhāvena = gaunabhāvenoditvarasamskārārūpeṇa yatrānaṣṭo vikṣepasamskārah sthitaḥ; tādrśasya cittasya vikṣiptabhūmikasya samādhirapi na samyag yogapakṣe = kaivalyapakṣe vartate, vikṣiptabhūmikasya samādhānaṁ sopaplavaṁ, tataśca tādrśaḥ sādḥako yadā vikṣepābhībhūto bhavati tadā pramattastattvajñānāhīnaḥ pṛthagjana ivācārati.*

²¹⁰ *kṣiptamūḍhayoḥ satyapi parasparāpekṣayā vṛttinirodhe pāramparyeṇāpi niḥśreyasahetubhāvābhāvāttadupaghātakatvācca yogapakṣāddūrotsāritatvamiti na tayoryogatvaṁ niṣiddham, vikṣiptasya tu kādācitkasadbhūtavīṣayasthemāśālināḥ saṁbhāvyeta yogatvamiti niṣedhati, tatra vikṣipte cetasi samādhiḥ kādācitkasadbhūtavīṣayasya cittasya sthemā na yogapakṣe vartate, kasmāt, yatastadvipakṣavikṣepopasarjanībhūtaḥ, vipakṣavargāntargatasya hi svarūpameva durlabhaṁ prāgeva kāryakaraṇaṁ na khalu dahanāntargataṁ bījaṁ tricaturakṣaṇāvasthitamuptamapyāṅkurāya kalpata ita bhāvaḥ.*

the arrested (*niruddha*) state, there is the dissolution of all activities and impressions (*saṃskāras*). Therefore, yoga is possible only in these two levels”²¹¹.

Vivaraṇakāra says that “there, the mind is explained as threefold (*triṣṭa*), because of its nature of manifestation (*prakhyā*), activity (*pravṛtti*), and stability (*sthiti*). Manifestation (*prakhyā*) is illumination (*prakāśana*), for that is the quality (*dharma*) of the *sattva* quality (*sattva*guṇa). Activity (*pravṛtti*) is instigation (*pravartana*), operation (*vyāpāra*), for that is the quality (*rajodharma*) of *rajas*. Stability (*sthiti*) is location (*sthāna*), obstruction (*varaṇa*), resistance (*pratibandha*), and that is the quality (*tamodharma*) of *tamas*. Indeed, the *sattva* and other qualities (*guṇa-s*) have such natures (*śīla*), and the mind has the nature of manifestation (*prakhyādi*), therefore the mind must be a transformation (*pariṇāma*) of the three qualities (*guṇa-s*)”²¹². Hariharānanda says that ““Mind” means – *prakhyāḥ* = all cognitions that are luminous in nature and pre-eminently illuminating; that is the sign of the *sattva*guṇa (quality of goodness). *Pravṛttiḥ* = all activities such as desire; that is the sign of *rajas* (quality of passion) which is characterized by activity. *Sthitiḥ* = all impressions whose nature is obscured; that is the specific characteristic of *tamas* (quality of ignorance) which is characterized by inertia. Because mind possesses these three kinds of qualities, mind is *triṣṭa* (of three qualities)”²¹³. Viññāna Bhikṣu says that “manifestation (*prakhyā*) is knowledge of reality (*tattvajñāna*); by this, all *sāttvika* qualities are indicated. Activity (*pravṛtti*) is action (*karma*); by this, all *rājasā* qualities are grasped. Stability (*sthiti*) is the absence of movement called activity (*vr̥tṭyākhyagatisūnyatā*), as long as it is sleep (*nidreti yāvat*); by this, all *tāmasā* qualities are grasped. These, in order, are the characteristics of substances called *sattva*, *rajas*, and *tamas*. Because they depend on something else, like form (*rūpa*) and so on, they are called qualities (*guṇa*). But the substances that are their basis, like the threads that begin a rope, are called qualities. And so, because the mind (*citta*) has the

²¹¹ *ekāgraniruddharūpe dve ca sattvotkarṣādyathottaramavasthitatvāt samādhāvupayogaṃ bhajete, sattvādikramavyutkrame tu ayamabhiprāyaḥ dvayorapi rajastamasoratyantaheyatve'pyetadarthaṃ rajasah prathamamupādānaṃ yāvanna pravṛttirdarśitā tāvannivṛttirnaṃ śakyate darśayitumiti dvayorvyatyayena pradarśanam, sattvasya tvetadarthaṃ paścātpadarśanam yattasyotkarṣeṇottare dve bhūmī yogopayoginyāviti, anayordvayorekāgraniruddhayorbhūmyoryaścittasyaikāgratārūpaḥ pariṇāmaḥ sa yoga ityuktaḥ bhavati, ekāgre bahirvr̥ttinirodhaḥ, niruddhe ca sarvāvr̥ttināṃ saṃskārānāṃ ca pravilaya ityanayoreva bhūmyoryogasya sambhavaḥ.*

²¹² *tatra cittam triṣṭamiti vyākhyāyate, prakhyāpravṛttisthitiśīlavādiḥ hetuḥ, prakhyā prakhyānam prakāśanam, sa hi, sattvaṅṇasya dharmah, pravṛttiḥ pravartanam vyāpārah, sa hi rajodharmah, sthitiḥ sthānam varaṇam pratibandha iti, sa ca tamodharmah, evaṃśīlāḥ hi sattvādayo guṇāḥ, cittam ca prakhyādiśīlam, tasmāt trayānāṃ guṇānāṃ pariṇāmaścittam bhavitumarhati.*

²¹³ *cittamiti – prakhyāḥ = prakāśasvabhāvāḥ prakāśādhikāḥ sarve bodhāḥ, sā sattvaṅṇasya liṅgam, pravṛttiḥ = icchā'dayaḥ sarvāśceṣṭāḥ, sā ca kriyāśīlasya rajas liṅgam, sthitiḥ = āvṛtasvarūpāḥ sarve saṃskārāḥ, sā hi sthitiśīlasya tamasaḥ svālakṣaṇam, citta eteṣāṃ trividhaguṇadharmānāṃ lābhāccittam triṣṭam.*

nature of manifestation (*prakhyādi*), it is threefold (*triguṇa*), made of the three qualities of *sattva* and so on, like a rope—this is the meaning”²¹⁴. Vācaspati Miśra says that “due to the quality of manifestation, there is the *sattva guṇa*. Due to the quality of activity, there is the *rajo guṇa*. Due to the quality of inertia, there is the *tama guṇa*. The mention of manifestation is illustrative. By that, other *sāttvika* qualities such as serenity, lightness, joy, and so forth are indicated. And by activity, *rājasic* qualities such as torment, sorrow, and so forth [are indicated]. Inertia, which is the attribute of *tamas*, is opposed to activity. From the mention of inertia, heaviness, obstruction, misery, and so forth are illustrated. This is what is said: even though the mind is one, because it is pervaded by the three *guṇa-s*, and because of the unevenness of the *guṇa-s*, due to the variety of mutual friction, it is reasonable that it has diverse transformations and exists in many states”²¹⁵.

On the Meaning of *Vṛtti*

Vṛtti is one of the most important technical terms in the *Yogasūtra*. Patañjali does not define or explain it explicitly. The word *vṛtti* has been derived from the root “*vṛt*” which means to turn, revolve, roll, proceed.²¹⁶ According to Monier-Williams (1800: 1010), *Vṛtti* can be understood as : "mode of life or conduct," "behavior (esp. moral conduct)," "mode of being," "disposition," "activity," "function," "livelihood," "mood (of the mind)," "nature," "character," "addition to," and "occupation with". Regarding understanding the meaning of *Yogasūtra* I.2 (*yogas cittavṛttinirodhah*), *vṛtti* has been interpreted as” modifications,²¹⁷ fluctuations,²¹⁸ “acts and 'functions’”²¹⁹ transformations,²²⁰ activities,²²¹ processes,²²² and mode²²³. There is no exactly synonym of *vṛtti* in English lexicon. So, I will adopt the

²¹⁴ *prakhyā tattvajñānāmanena sarve sāttvikā guṇā upalakṣitāḥ, pravṛttiḥ karma, anena sarve rājasā guṇā grāhyāḥ, sthīrtirvṛtyākhyagatiśūnyatā nidreti yāvat, anena sarve tāmasā guṇā grāhyāḥ, ete kramātsattvarajastamākhyānām dravyānām dharmāḥ parāśritatvāt rūpādivadguṇā ityucyante tadāśrayāstu sattvādidravyāṇi rajjvārambhakatantuvadeva guṇā ityucyante, tathā ca prakhyādisvabhāvakatvāt cittam triguṇam sattvādiguṇatrayanirmitam rajjuvadityarthah.*

²¹⁵ *prakhyāśīlatvātsattvagūṇam, pravṛttiśīlatvādrajogūṇam, sthitiśīlatvāttamogūṇam, prakhyāgrahaṇamupalakṣaṇārtham, tenānye'pi sāttvikāḥ prasādalāghavaprītyādayaḥ sūcyante, pravṛtyā ca paritāpaśokādayo rājasāḥ, pravṛttivirodhī tamovṛttidharmaḥ sthitiḥ, sthiti-grahaṇādgaṇavāvaraṇadainyādaya upalakṣyante, etaduktam bhavati – ekamapi cittam triguṇanirbhitatayā guṇānām ca vaiśamyēṇa parasparavimardavaicitryādvicitrapariṇāmaṇ sadanekāvasthamupapadyata iti.*

²¹⁶ See Monier-Williams (1899: 1009)

²¹⁷ See Taimni (1961: 6), Aranya (1963: 7), and Prasada (1912: 5)

²¹⁸ See Woods (1914: 8), Koelman (1970: 86), Feuerstein (1979a: 26), Chapple and Kelly (1990: 33); see also Halbfass (1991), Tradition and Reflection: Explorations in Indian Thought, p. 227.

²¹⁹ See Müller (1899: 337).

²²⁰ See Larson (1993: 377), who also identifies "functions" as an correct translation for *vṛtti*.

²²¹ See Purohit Swami (1973: 25).

²²² See Tola and Dragonetti (1987: 3).

²²³ See Hirianna (1949).

translation “modifications” to indicate *vṛtti* afterwards. *Vṛttis* are the different transformed conditions or forms of *citta* in a particular stage or time when *citta* is engaged with different stimulus. In other words, when *citta* equates itself with the form of objects (internal and external) or thoughts (*viśaya*), this equating results in *vṛtti* in the *citta*. Due to this equation or relationship of the *citta* with the internal organs or external world, mind takes different forms in different times on different internal and external objects. This transformation of mind into different forms and conditions can be called as *vṛttis*. Bhoja comments that the *vṛttis* are specific (*viśeṣāḥ*) transformations (*pariṇāma*) of the mind (*citta*)²²⁴.

Five Types of *Vṛtti*

These specific *vṛttis* are innumerable in number. But these *vṛttis* are generally divided into five groups and again all these uncountable *vṛttis* in the five groups can be divided into two broad categories as harmful (*kliṣṭa*) and beneficial (*akliṣṭā*) due to their effects in the practice of yogin’s *samādhi* (*vṛttayaḥ pañcatayyaḥ kliṣṭākliṣṭāḥ*). Vyāsa comments that *vṛttis* which are produced from the *kleśa* - *saṃskāras* and which become the ground for accumulating the *karmāśaya saṃskāras* are known as *kliṣṭa vṛttis*²²⁵. *Vṛttis* which awake the knowledge of distinction between *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* and which oppose the activities of *guṇa*-s are known as *akliṣṭā vṛttis*²²⁶. Hariharānanda explains that those *vṛttis* that torment the mind with distorted cognitions are afflictions (*kleśa*-s). The activities (*vṛttis*) that are composed of them and rooted in them are afflicted (*kliṣṭāḥ*). And those afflicted activities become the field for the accumulation of the traces of actions (*karmasaṃskāra*). Opposite to those are the unafflicted activities (*akliṣṭāvṛttayo*) whose object is discriminative discernment (*vivekakhyāti*). Through discernment, there is cessation of the mind. Therefore, such activities are opposed to the power of the *guṇa*-s, for the very activity of the *guṇa*-s is affliction (*kleśa*). Therefore, the activities (*vṛttayo*) that effect the *guṇa*-s and whose object is discernment are unafflicted (*akliṣṭāḥ*). The primary *akliṣṭa* (unafflicted) activities have discernment as their object. Other *akliṣṭa* activities also bring about discernment. And those activities, falling into the stream of *kliṣṭa* (afflicted states), occur as follows: when the stream of *kleśa*-s (defilements) is interrupted by practice and dispassion, activities with ultimate reality as their object arise. Similarly, even in the gaps of *akliṣṭa* states, *kliṣṭa* activities arise,

²²⁴ *vṛttayaścittapariṇāmaviśeṣāḥ | vṛttisamudāyalakṣaṇasyā avayavinoyā avayavabhūtā vṛttayastadapekṣayā tayapratyayaḥ.*

²²⁵ *kleśahetukāḥ karmāśayapracaye kṣetrībhūtāḥ kliṣṭāḥ.*

²²⁶ *khyātiviśayā guṇādhikāravirodhinyo 'kliṣṭāḥ.*

as it is said: "In those gaps, other conditions arise from latent predispositions ²²⁷. The five *vṛttis* are *pramāṇa* (epistemology, source of right knowledge), *viparyaya* (error), *vikalpa* (imagination, fancy), *nidrā* (sleep), *smṛtayaḥ* (memory) ²²⁸.

On the Meaning of *Pramāṇa-vṛtti*

Pramāṇa is a source of knowledge in which the true forms or true knowledge of something is rightly realized by different means or methods. There are three types of *pramāṇa-vṛtti* which are *pratyakṣa* (direct sense perception), *anumāna* (inference) and *āgama* (holy scripture). *Pratyakṣa* is that *pramāṇa-vṛtti* in which we have direct perception of different things through our mind, buddhi and sense-organs and there is no doubt about the knowledge of those things perceived. Vyāsa explains that direct perception (*pratyakṣam pramāṇam*) is the activity (*vṛttiḥ*) of the mind (*cittasya*) that is predominated by the determination of the particular (*viśeṣādvadhāraṇa-pradhānā*), having as its object (*tadviśayā*) an object (*arthasya*) whose nature is both general and specific (*sāmānyaviśeṣātmano*), due to the mind's being colored by external objects (*bāhyavastūparāgāt*) through the channel of the senses (*indriyapraṇālikayā*)²²⁹. Depending on the logic and information of the knowledge of different things acquired through *pratyakṣa-pramāṇa*, when the existence of anything (*padārtha*) is known, it is called *anumāna-pramāṇa*. Vyāsa elaborates that inference (*anumāna*) is a mental activity (*vṛtti*) whose main characteristic is the ascertainment of a generality, and whose object is a relation that is present in similar classes (*tulyajātīya*) and absent from dissimilar classes (*bhinnajātīya*) with respect to what is to be inferred (*anumeya*). For example, like Caitra, the moon and stars have motion because they attain another place; and the Vindhya [mountain range] has no attainment, hence no motion ²³⁰. *Āgama* is holy scripture and teachings of holy people through which knowledge of metaphysical things is gained. Vyāsa describes that an object that has been seen or inferred by a reliable person

²²⁷ *kleśahetukāḥ kleśāḥ = avidyā'dayaḥ, ye viparyastapratyayāḥ kliśnanti te kleśāḥ, tanmayāstanmūlāśca vṛttayaḥ kliṣṭāḥ, tāśca karmasaṃskārasaṃcayasya kṣetrībhūtāstadviparītā akliṣṭāvṛttayo vivekakhyātiviśayāḥ, vivekena cittasya nivṛttistatastādṛśā vṛttayo guṇādhikāravirodhinyo guṇapravṛttereve kleśāḥ, ato guṇanirvarttikāḥ khyātiviśayā vṛttayo'kliṣṭāḥ, vivekaviśayā mukhyā akliṣṭā vṛttayaḥ, vivekasya nirvarttikā anyāṃ api vṛttayo'kliṣṭāḥ, tāśca kliṣṭapravāhapatitāḥ, abhyāsavairāgyābhyāṃ vicchinne kleśapravāhe paramārthaviśayā vṛttayo jāyanta ityārthaḥ, tathā'kliṣṭacchidreṣvapi kliṣṭā vṛttya utpadyante, yathoktaṃ – "tacchidreṣu pratyayāntarāṇi saṃskārebhya" iti.*

²²⁸ *pramāṇaviparyayavikalpanidrāsmṛtayaḥ.*

²²⁹ *indriyapraṇālikayā cittasya bāhyavastūparāgāt tadviśayā sāmānyaviśeṣātmano 'rthasya viśeṣādvadhāraṇapradhānā vṛttiḥ pratyakṣaṃ pramāṇam.*

²³⁰ *anumeyasya tulyajātīyeṣv anuvṛtto bhinnajātīyebhyovyāvṛttaḥ saṃbandho yas tadviśayā sāmānyādvadhāraṇapradhānā vṛttir anumānam. yathā deśāntaraprāpter gatimac candratārakaṃ caitravat, vindhyaś cāprāptir agatiḥ.*

(*āpta*) is taught through words to another in order to transfer his own understanding; from the word, the activity of the hearer regarding that object is tradition (*āgama*). That tradition whose speaker has an incredible meaning and has not seen or inferred the meaning is unsteady. But in the case of the original speaker, if the meaning has been seen or inferred, it would be unwavering ²³¹.

On the Meaning of *Viparyaya* (error) *Vṛtti*

Patañjali states that “error is false knowledge stemming from the incorrect apprehension of something” (Bryant’s translation) ²³². *Viparyaya* means wrong knowledge. It is to have a knowledge of a thing which is not the true knowledge of that thing. In other words, *Viparyaya* is to accept the wrong state of something as true while in reality it is not the true state of that thing. Vyāsa explains that why is that not a valid cognition (*pramāṇa*)? Because it is contradicted by valid cognition (*pramāṇa*). Because valid cognition (*pramāṇa*) has a real object as its scope. There, the contradiction of non-valid cognition by valid cognition is observed. For example, the seeing of two moons is contradicted by the seeing of one moon, which has a real object. This ignorance (*avidyā*) is fivefold. Ignorance (*avidyā*), egoism (*asmitā*), attachment (*rāga*), aversion (*dveṣa*), clinging to life (*abhiniveśa*) are the afflictions (*kleśa-s*). These very afflictions, by their own designations, are darkness (*tamas*), delusion (*moha*), great delusion (*mahāmoha*), darkness (*tāmisra*), and blinding darkness (*andhatāmisra*). These will be discussed in connection with the defilements of the mind (*citta-mala*) ²³³.

On the Meaning of *Vikalpa* (imagination) *Vṛtti*

Patañjali tells us that “imagination consists of the usage of words that are devoid of an actual object” (Bryant’s translation) ²³⁴. When there is knowledge gained on the basis of the meanings of words, but those words do not indicate anything which actually exists in reality, this is called *vikalpa-vṛtti*. Vyāsa explains that it does not accord with valid cognition

²³¹ *āptena dr̥ṣṭo 'numito vārthaḥ paratra svabodhasaṃkrāntaye śabdenopadiśyate, śabdāt tadarthaviśayā vṛttiḥ śrotur āgamaḥ. yasyāśraddheyārtho vaktā na dr̥ṣṭānumitārthaḥ sa āgamaḥ plavate. mūlavaktari tu dr̥ṣṭānumitārthe nirviplavaḥ syāt.*

²³² *Sūtra 1.8: viparyayo mithyājñānamatadrūpapratiṣṭham.*

²³³ *sa kasmān na pramāṇam. yataḥ pramāṇena bādhyate. bhūtārthaviśayatvāt pramāṇasya. tatra pramāṇena bādhanaṃ pramāṇasya dr̥ṣṭam. tadyathā dvicandradarśanaṃ sadviśayeṇaikaandradarśanena bādhyata iti. seyaṃ pañcaparvā bhavaty avidyā. avidyāsmītārāgadveṣābhiniveśāḥkleśā iti. eta eva svasaṃjñābhis tamo mohomahāmohastāmisro 'ndhatāmisra iti. ete cittamalaprasaṅgenābhidhāsyante.*

²³⁴ *Sūtra 1.9: śabdajñānānupātī vastuśūnyo vikalpaḥ.*

(*pramāṇa*). Nor does it accord with misapprehension (*viparyaya*). Even when the object is empty, *vyavahāra* is seen, which is based on the power of verbal cognition (*śabdajñāna-māhātmya*). For example, "Consciousness (*caitanya*) is the very nature (*svarūpa*) of the *puruṣa* (Self)." When consciousness (*citi*) itself is the *puruṣa*, then what here is designated by what? And designation (*vyapadeśa*) occurs in usage (*ṛtti*). Just as "Caitra's cow." Likewise, the *puruṣa*, whose attribute of being an object is negated, is inactive (*niṣkriya*), [as in the sentences] "The arrow remains, will remain, has remained." When motion ceases, only the meaning of the verbal root (*dhātv-artha-mātra*) is understood. Likewise, [in the statement] "The *puruṣa* has the characteristic of non-origination (*anutpatti-dharmā*)," only the absence of the characteristic of origination (*utpatti-dharmasya-abhāva-mātram*) is understood, not an attribute inherent in the *puruṣa*. Therefore, that attribute is imagined (*vikalpitaḥ*), and *vyavahāra* exists because of it ²³⁵.

On the Meaning of *Nidrā* (sleep) *Ṛtti*

Patañjali says that "deep sleep is that state of mind which is based on an absence [of any content]" (Bryant's translation) ²³⁶. Vyāsa elaborates that and that, upon awakening, is a specific cognition (*pratyayaviśeṣaḥ*) arising from introspection (*pratyavamarśāt*). For example: "I slept well (*sukham aham asvāpsam*)." "My mind (*manaḥ*) is clear (*prasannaṃ*)." "Sleep makes my wisdom (*prajñāṃ*) sharp (*viśāradīkaroti*)." "I slept badly (*duḥkhamahamasvāpsam*)." "My mind (*manaḥ*) is dull (*styānaṃ*), wanders (*bhramaty*), is unstable (*anavasthitam*), I slept deeply (*gāḍhaṃ*), foolishly (*mūḍho*). "My limbs (*gātrāṇi*) are heavy (*gurūṇi*). "My mind (*cittam*) is weary (*klāntaṃ*). "My mind remains lazy (*alasaṃ*), as if robbed (*muṣitam iva*). "Indeed, this recollection (*pratyavamarśo*) of one who has awakened would not occur if there were no experience (*anubhave*) of the cognition (*pratyaya*); and the memories (*smṛtayaś*) based on that and concerning that would be lost. Therefore, sleep (*nidrā*) is a specific cognition (*pratyayaviśeṣo*). And that (*sā ca*), like other cognitions (*itarapratyayavan*), should be stopped (*niroddhavyeti*) in meditative concentration (*samādhau*) ²³⁷.

²³⁵ *sa na pramāṇopārohī. na viparyayopārohī ca. vastuśūnyatve api śabdajñānamāhātmyanibandhanō vyavahārodrśyate. tad yathācaitanyaṃpuruṣasyasvarūpamiti. yadā citir eva puruṣas tadā kim atra kena vyapadiśyate. bhavati ca vyapadeśe ṛttiḥ. yathā caitrasya gaur iti. tathā pratiśiddhavastudharmo niṣkriyaḥ puruṣaḥ, tiṣṭhatibāṇaḥ sthāsyati sthita iti. gatinivṛttau dhātvarthamātram gamyate. tathānutpattidharmā puruṣa iti, utpattidharmasyābhāvamātram avagamya na puruṣānvayī dharmāḥ. tasmād vikalpitaḥ sa dharmas tena cāsti vyavahāra iti.*

²³⁶ *Sūtra 1.10: abhāvaprāyayālambanā ṛttirnidrā.*

²³⁷ *sā ca samprabodhe pratyavamarśāt pratyayaviśeṣaḥ. katham, sukham aham asvāpsam. prasannaṃ me manaḥ. prajñāṃmeviśāradīkaroti. duḥkhamahamasvāpsam.styānaṃ me mano bhramaty anavasthitam gāḍhaṃ mūḍho 'ham asvāpsam. gurūṇi me gātrāṇi. klāntaṃ me cittam. alasaṃ muṣitam*

On the Meaning of *Smṛti* (memory) *Vṛtti*

Patañjali comments that “memory is the retention of [images of] sense objects that have been experienced” (Bryant’s translation) ²³⁸. Memory is the process by which an individual's experiences, whether they be physical or metaphysical, resurface in their mind in a manner that is comparable to how they were at the time of the encounter. Vyāsa states that does the mind remember the thought (*pratyaya*) or the object (*viṣaya*)? The thought (*pratyaya*) tinged by the object (*grāhya*), manifesting as the dual nature of object and perception, initiates a disposition (*saṃskāra*) of the same kind. That disposition (*saṃskāra*), colored by its own expression, generates a memory (*smṛti*) that is exactly of that form, consisting of object, perception, and both. Mindfulness (*smṛti*) is preceded by the aspect of the object to be grasped (*grāhyākāra*). And that [mindfulness] is twofold: mindfulness of what has been cultivated (*bhāvitasmartavyā*) and mindfulness of what has not been cultivated (*abhāvitasmartavyā*). In dreams, it is mindfulness of what has been cultivated. But in the waking state, it is mindfulness of what has not been cultivated. All mindfulnesses (*smṛtayaḥ*) arise from the experience of valid cognition (*pramāṇa*), error (*viparyaya*), conceptualization (*vikalpa*), sleep (*nidrā*), and mindfulness (*smṛti*). And all these states are of the nature of pleasure (*sukha*), pain (*duḥkha*), and delusion (*moha*). Pleasure, pain, and delusion should be explained in relation to the afflictions (*kleśeṣu*). Attachment (*rāga*) dwells on pleasure (*sukhānuśayī*). Aversion (*dveṣa*) dwells on pain (*duḥkhānuśayī*). Delusion (*moha*), again, is ignorance (*avidyā*) ²³⁹.

On the Meaning of *Nirodha*

Nirodha is another important technical terminology of *Yogasūtra* which is difficult to understand and translate. Etymologically *nirodha* is derived from *ni* (down, into) and *rudh*: “to obstruct, arrest, stop, restrain, prevent”. Scholars have translated *nirodha* as cessation, ²⁴⁰

iva tiṣṭhatīti. sa khalv ayaṃ prabuddhasya pratyavamarśo na syād asati pratyayānubhave tadāśritāḥ smṛtayaḥ catadviṣayā nasyuḥ. tasmātpatyayaviśeṣonidrā. sā ca samādhāv itarapratyayavan niroddhavyeti.

²³⁸ *Sūtra 1.11: anubhūtavaiṣayāsaṃpramoṣaḥ smṛtiḥ.*

²³⁹ *kiṃ pratyayasya cittam smaraty āhosvid viṣayasyeti. grāhyoparaktāḥ pratyayo grāhyagrahaṇobhayākāranirbhāsaḥ tajjātīyakam saṃskāram ārabhate. sa saṃskāraḥ svavyaṅgakāñjanas tadākārām eva grāhyagrahaṇobhayātmikāmsmṛtiṃ janayati.*

²⁴⁰ For instance, see J. Varenne (1976: 87) and G. Larson (1987: 28); in a more contemporary book (1993: 377), Larson interprets *nirodha* as “cessation” or “restraint.”

suppression,²⁴¹ "inhibition,²⁴² restriction,²⁴³ control,²⁴⁴ restraint,²⁴⁵. Sanskrit commentators interpret *nirodha* in many ways. Nārāyaṇatīrtha says that “cessation (*nirodhaḥ*) is appeasement (*upaśamaḥ*), like a fire without fuel (*nirindhanāgnivat*), which is the dissolution (*layaḥ*) into its own cause (*svakāraṇe*)”²⁴⁶. This view is supported by almost all the commentators.

On the Meaning of *Cittavṛttinirodha*

All the commentators believe that *cittavṛttinirodha* means the complete dissolution of all the modifications of the mind. *Anantadevapaṇḍita* states that the cessation (*nirodha*) of those activities (*vṛtti*) of the mind (*citta*), which are of the nature of the transformation of being (*sattva*), is the dissolution (*laya*) with a cause through inward-directedness (*antarmukhatayā*), due to the cessation of outward-directedness (*bahirmukhatā*)²⁴⁷. *Cittavṛttinirodha* process suggests that it is a complete stoppage of all kinds of modifications of the mind.

Understanding the First Four *Sūtras* (*Catuḥślokī*) from the Theoretical Perspectives

The first four *sūtra*-s are traditionally known as *catuḥślokī* or *catuḥśloka*. In the first *sūtra*, Patañjali tells us that the topic of discussion is the discipline of yoga²⁴⁸. In the second *sūtra*, Patañjali defines yoga. He explains that yoga is the cessation of the modifications of the mind²⁴⁹. What happens when the cessation of the modification of mind takes place? Patañjali replies in the third *sūtra* that at that time (*tadā*) of cessation, the seer (*draṣṭu*) settles down in his true form (*svarūpe'vasthānam*)²⁵⁰. In this *sūtra*, “*draṣṭu*” indicates the *puruṣa* who sees. The phrase “*svarūpe'vasthānam*” consists of *svarūpa* and *avasthāna*. *Svarūpa* can mean one's own form or shape or condition; character or nature. In the present context, *svarūpa* means the true form or true nature of the *puruṣa*. *Avasthāna* can mean standing; taking up one's place; situation; condition; residing; abiding; dwelling; stability. In the present

²⁴¹ See, for example, G. Jha (1907: 3), M. N. Dvivedi (1930: 2), H. Aranya (1963: 1), M. Eliade (1969: 36).

²⁴² See, for example, I. K. Taimni (1961: 6), T. Leggett (1990: 60)

²⁴³ See, for example, J. H. Woods (1914: 8), G. Koelman (1970: 237), G. Feuerstein (1979: 26), T. S. Rukmani (1981: 31)

²⁴⁴ Ranganathan (2008: 49), U. Arya (1986: 93). See also Purohit (1973), who interprets *nirodha* as "controlling."

²⁴⁵ See, for example, Tola and Dragonetti (1987: 5), Chapple and Kelly (1990: 33)

²⁴⁶ *nirodhaḥ upaśamo nirindhanāgnivat svakāraṇe layaḥ.*

²⁴⁷ *sattvaparināmarūpasya cittasya yā vṛttayaḥ tāsāṃ nirodho bahirmukhatāvicchedādantarmukhatayā sakāraṇe layaḥ.*

²⁴⁸ *Sūtra 1.1: atha yogānuśāsanam.*

²⁴⁹ *Sūtra 1.2: yogaścittavṛttinirodhaḥ.*

²⁵⁰ *Sūtra 1.3: tadā draṣṭuḥ svarūpe'vasthānam.*

context, *avasthāna* means to be staying in a particular state. The phrase “*svārūpe ’vasthānam*” seems to indicate being in a particular state which is the natural and original form of the *puruṣa*. It is to be noted that being in the true form of the seer (*puruṣa*) indicates the attainment of the highest result of the yoga-*sādhana* which is *kaivalya*. It can be arguably claimed that “*svārūpe ’vasthānam*” is the definition of *kaivalya* or the alternative phrase for *kaivalya*.

The word “*tadā*” “in this *sūtra*” indicates a time or state or condition. The question arises: When is that time or what is that time which is referred to as “*tadā*”? Vācaspati Miśra states that *tadā* refers to a state of complete cessation of mental modifications (*nirodhāvasthā*) which is against the active state of mental activities (*vyutthānāvasthā*)²⁵¹. One may ask? Then is it the case that at other times except the time of *nirodhāvasthā*, there is some kind of change in the real nature of *puruṣa*. Vācaspati Miśra clarifies that *puruṣa* as pure consciousness is eternally unchanging (*kūṭasthanitya*), never deviates from its own essential nature²⁵².

For Vijñānabhikṣu, “*tadā*” refers to the time or state of pure meditative absorption (*aśaṃprajñāta-yogakāla*). What is that *aśaṃprajñāta-yogakāla*? He replies that it is a state of *puruṣa* when only pure conscious absorption of the mind of the yogin remains without the existence of any object in the mind (*nirviśayacaitanyamātre ’vasthānam*)²⁵³. He connects this particular state with the state of liberation. He comments that “gradually, through the exhaustion (*kṣaya*) of all *saṃskāra*-s in the final stage of pure meditation absorption (*caramāśaṃprajñāte*), there is a permanent (*ātyantika*) abiding in one's true nature (*svārūpāvasthā*), which is called liberation (*mokṣa*)²⁵⁴.

According to Bhoja, “*tadā*” indicates a time when *puruṣa* remains in the state of pure consciousness (*cinmātratāyāmavasthānam*)²⁵⁵. This state of pure consciousness is gained when “*vivekakhyāti*” (discriminative knowledge) arises. What does *vivekakhyāti* mean? For

²⁵¹ “*ayamevārtho bhāṣyakṛtā dyotyate – svārūpapraṭiṣṭheti, tadānīm nirodhāvasthāyām na vyutthānāvasthāyāmi bhāvaḥ.*”

²⁵² “*na jātu kūṭasthanityā citiśaktiḥ svārūpāccyavate.*”

²⁵³ “*tadā ’saṃprajñāta-yogakāle draṣṭuḥ citiśakteḥ puruṣasya svārūpe nirviśayacaitanyamātre ’vasthānam,*”

²⁵⁴ “*krameṇa caramāśaṃprajñāte ’śeṣasaṃskārakṣayāt... ātyantikam svārūpāvasthānam mokṣākhyam,*”

²⁵⁵ “*draṣṭuḥ puruṣasya tasminkāle svārūpe cinmātratāyāmavasthānam sthitirbhavati,*”

Bhoja, *vivekakhyāti*-state indicates to a particular state or time when embodied *puruṣa* loses the sense of agency or doership (*karṭṛtvābhimānanivṛtti*)²⁵⁶.

In other sense, when embodied *puruṣa* does not equate herself with the activities of the mind, the embodied *puruṣa* finds its true Self (*svarūpa*). What does the *svarūpa* mean? Vācaspati Miśra says that the word *svarūpa* indicates negation of all the mental qualities such as *śānta* (calm), *ghora* (agitated) and *mūḍha* (deluded), which have been falsely superimposed (*āropita*) on the *puruṣa*²⁵⁷. What Vācaspati means is that the true nature (*svarūpa*) of *puruṣa* is that *puruṣa* is pure consciousness, not mental activities in the forms of modifications (*vṛtti*). Vācaspati further clarifies that the essential nature of the *puruṣa* is consciousness (*caitanya*), which is intrinsic and independent of external conditions; it is not, however, the cognition of the intellect (*buddhibodha*)²⁵⁸. Vācaspati explains that “just as a crystal is naturally transparent and white, its redness is an extrinsic condition arising from the proximity of a hibiscus flower. The intended meaning is that when the condition is removed, the property it imposed does not result in the destruction of the underlying substrate itself; otherwise, an absurd over-extension would occur. Furthermore, although the essential nature of the thing is undifferentiated, the relationship of a locus and its content is expressed by conceptually superimposing a distinction upon it”²⁵⁹.

The majority of the commentators agree that “*svarūpe’vasthānam*” indicates a particular state of *puruṣa* when all kinds of mental modification ceases to function. Vijñāna Bhikṣu clarifies that at the time of the dissolution of the modifications of the mind in the state of *asamprajñāta-samādhi*, *puruṣa* abides in its true form as pure-consciousness only. In this state of dissolution of modification of the mind, the mind also dissolves at the end of stoppage of all modifications which brings *kaivalya*. So, *kaivalya* in this *sūtra* is *videhamukti* which is attained after the dissolution of the mind and the body. Now the question arises: if someone has not attained the cessation of the modifications, what happens to her? Patañjali replies that she remains in bondage. *Sūtra* 1.4 tells us that the *puruṣa* remains engrossed with activities of the mind as his own at other times (when *puruṣa* is not in *nirodha-samādhi*) (*vṛttisārupyamitaratra*). What Patañjali seems to indicate is that when *puruṣa* does not remain

²⁵⁶ “*utpannavivekakhyāteścitsaṃkramābhāvāt karṭṛtvābhimānanivṛttau...*”

²⁵⁷ “*svarūpa ityāropitaṃ śāntaghoramūḍhasvarūpaṃ nivartayati,*”

²⁵⁸ “*puruṣasya hi caitanyaṃ svarūpamanaupādhikaṃ na tu buddhibodhaḥ,*”

²⁵⁹ *sphaṭikasyeva svabhāvasvacchadhavalasya japākusumasamnidhānopādhiraruṇimā na copādhinivṛttāvupahitanivṛttiratiprasaṅgāditi bhāvaḥ, svarūpasya cābhede’pi bhedaṃ vikalpyādhikaraṇabhāva ukta iti*

settled in its true form (*svarūpe* 'vasthānam'), *puruṣa* identifies with the mental states or mental activities forgetting that *puruṣa* is different from the mental states or mental activities. In other words, the actions of mind become the actions of *puruṣa* because *puruṣa* thinks that *puruṣa* is the mind itself.

Vyāsa explains this *sūtra* by commenting that even in the state of emergence (*vyutthāna*), the *puruṣa* has a mode of activity that is not distinct from the modes of activity of the mind (*citta*). And so the *sūtra* [says]: “There is only one kind of seeing: seeing is discernment (*khyāti*).” The *puruṣa*, as the master, has the mind as its own, like a magnet or a crystal that merely benefits from proximity. Therefore, the beginningless connection of the *puruṣa* is the cause for the understanding of the activities of the mind²⁶⁰.

Every commentator agrees that the various mental states and acts of *buddhi* are the reason for any relationship between the *prakṛtic* manifestation and the *puruṣa*. *Puruṣa* erroneously believes that it is *buddhi* and that his own actions are the same as those of *buddhi*. *Puruṣa* stays in bondage in this way. It is evident from the discussion of these first four *sūtra*-s that *kaivalya* is caused by the complete *cittavṛttinirodha*. Since *puruṣa* is totally divorced from all relationship to the *prakṛti* in this level of *kaivalya*, the yogin must die in order to achieve *kaivalya*. When we read these *sūtra*-s sequentially from top to bottom, we can conclude that *kaivalya* is total dissociation from *prakṛti* by confirming the yogin's death. This conclusion is based on a theoretical perspective as a philosophical book. One should keep in mind that the *Yogasūtra* is a practical manual guide in addition to a theoretical one. It seems that *cittavṛttinirodha*, a process of cosmological destruction of the yogin's being, may be the final stage of *kaivalya* if we interpret these first four *sūtra*-s from the perspective of the practitioner.

Understanding the First Four *Sūtra*-s (*Catuḥśloki*) from the Practical Perspectives

The yoga practitioner begins his yoga journey when she is in the state of “*vṛttisārūpya*” in which she is not aware of her original form as *puruṣa* by identifying herself with the actions or functions of the mind and senses. From the perspective of a practitioner, we have to begin our discussion from the fourth *sūtra*. We need to study and analyse these *sūtra* in the reverse order from fourth to first. The fourth *sūtra* seems to indicate that human beings are always driven and controlled by the activities of the mind. They equate their existence with

²⁶⁰ *vyutthāne yāścittavṛttayastadaviśiṣṭavṛttiḥ puruṣaḥ, tathā ca sūtram – “ekameva darśanam khyātireva darśanam” iti, cittamayaskāntamaṇikalpaṃ saṃnidhimātropakāri drśyatvena svaṃ bhavati puruṣasya svāmīnaḥ, tasmācittavṛttibodhe puruṣasyānādiḥ saṃbandho hetuḥ*

the existence of the mind. In other words, the embodied *puruṣa* thinks that she is the *buddhi*. The embodied *puruṣa* mistakenly imposes all the actions and qualities and effects of *buddhi* upon herself as her own due to the ignorance (*avidyā*). The question arises: how do we get rid off the *avidyā*? Patañjali instructs us to practice the eight limbs of yoga. When we start practice of yoga, the effects of *avidyā* gradually start reducing and provides us the insight that there is a kind of difference between the *puruṣa* -self of the yogin and *buddhi*-self of the yogin. One might ask: if all the activities by yogin are the activities of *buddhi*, then yoga practice is a function of *buddhi*. The reply is that the practice of eight limbs yoga is definitely the results of *vṛttis*, but these *vṛttis* are positive or good (*akliṣṭa*) for reducing the harmful effects of *avidyā* to the yogin.

In *sūtra* 1.5, Patañjali tells us that there are five kinds of changing states of the mind, and they are either detrimental or nondetrimental [to the practice of yoga] (*vṛttayaḥ pañcatayyaḥ kliṣṭākliṣṭāḥ*). According to Patañjali, all the *vṛttis* which are generally categorised into five types carry either detrimental (*kliṣṭa*) results or nondetrimental (*akliṣṭa*) results for reaching the goal of yoga which is *kaivalya*. How do one identify these *kliṣṭa-vṛtti* and *akliṣṭa-vṛtti*? Nāgojībhaṭṭa states that *kliṣṭa-vṛttis* are those things that result in merit, demerit, growth, form, afflictions and *akliṣṭa-vṛttis* are distinction, knowledge, means, objects, fame, awareness, which are in the form of distinction (*khyāti*) between sattva and puruṣa ²⁶¹. Nārāyaṇatīrtha mentions that *kliṣṭa-vṛttis* are those of various kinds, connected with latent impressions (*vāsanā*) regarding diverse objects, resulting in defilements (*kleśa*) called suffering (*duḥkha*) due to being caused by attachment (*rāga*) and so forth (*ādi*); [these mental activities] are of the nature of objects, and are *rājasya* and *tāmasasya*. Through them, by way of thirst (*trṣṇā*) and so forth (*ādi*), and through favoring and disfavoring others, there arises religious merit (*dharma*) and demerit (*adharma*), and thus there is experience only of what sustains suffering (*duḥkhadharā*). *Akliṣṭa-vṛttis* are those connected with discriminative knowledge (*vivekakhyāti*) and its means, which are opposed to the activities that result in defilements (*kleśa*), and are *sātvikya*”²⁶².

In explaining *sūtra* 1.5, Vyāsa comments that “afflictions (*kleśa*-s) are the causes (*hetuka*) that become like fields (*kṣetrībhūtāḥ*) in the accumulation (*pracaye*) of the

²⁶¹ *dharmādharmavṛddhirūpakleśaphalikāḥkliṣṭāḥ, sattvapuruṣānyatārūpa vivekajñāna sādhanaviṣayaḥ khyātisaṃjñā akliṣṭāḥ.*

²⁶² *kliṣṭā vividhānekaviṣayavāsanānibandhanā rāgādihetutayā duḥkhākhyakleśaphalikā viṣayākāravṛttayo rājasyastāmasasyaśca, tābhistrṣṇādidvārā parānugrahanigrahābhyām dharmādharmayorutpatyā duḥkhadharāyā evānubhavāt, akliṣṭā vivekakhyāti tatsādhana sambandhāḥ kleśaphalakavṛttivirodhinyāḥ sātvikyaḥ.*

storehouse of actions (*karmāśaya*), [these are] afflicted (*kliṣṭāḥ*). Those that have *khyāti* (the knowledge of differentiation between *puruṣa* and *buddhi*) as their object (*viṣayāḥ*) and oppose (*virodhinyah*) the superiority (*adhikāra*) of the qualities (*guṇa*) are un-afflicted (*akliṣṭāḥ*). Even when fallen (*patitāḥ*) into a stream (*pravāha*) of afflictions (*kliṣṭa*), they are un-afflicted (*akliṣṭāḥ*). Even in the gaps (*chidreṣu*) of afflictions (*kliṣṭa*), they are un-afflicted (*akliṣṭāḥ*) they become (*bhavanti*); in the gaps (*chidreṣu*) of the un-afflicted (*akliṣṭa*) are the afflicted (*kliṣṭāḥ*), thus (*iti*). *Samskāras* of the same kind (*tathājātīyakāḥ*) are made (*kriyante*) only (*eva*) by the activities/fluctuations (*vṛttibhiḥ*), and the activities/fluctuations (*vṛttayah*) [are made] by the *samskāras* (*samskāraiḥ*), thus (*iti*). In this way (*evam*), the cycle (*cakram*) of activities/fluctuations (*vṛtti*) and *samskāras* revolves (*āvartate*) constantly (*anīṣam*). That (*tad*), such (*evambhūtaṃ*) mind/consciousness (*cittam*), having determined (*avasita*) its authority (*adhikāram*) remains (*vyavatiṣṭhate*) in a semblance (*kalpena*) of itself (*ātma*), or (*va*) goes (*gacchati*) to dissolution (*pralayaṃ*), thus. Those afflicted (*kliṣṭāḥ*) and un-afflicted (*akliṣṭāḥ*) are the fivefold (*pañcadhā*) activities/fluctuations (*vṛttayah*)”²⁶³.

Vācaspati further elaborates Vyāsa’s comments. Vācaspati states that “it may be said that indeed, a person can be instructed, but the cessation of the activities of the mind (*vṛtti*) is not possible without understanding those activities. Nor can anyone enumerate them, even with a thousand lifetimes, for they are countless. Thinking thus, and introducing a *sūtra* that aims to explain their number and nature, [he says]: “But those (activities of the mind), when the mind (*citta*) is manifold, must be stopped”—the activities (*vṛtti*) are fivefold: afflicted (*kliṣṭa*) and non-afflicted (*akliṣṭa*). The activities (*vṛtti*) themselves are a single whole, of which valid cognition (*pramāṇa*) and the like are the five parts. Therefore, that activity (*vṛtti*), with its five aspects, becomes fivefold, possessing five parts. And those activities are many due to the differences in the minds of Caitra, Maitra, and others; thus, the plural form is appropriate.

This is what is said: Whether it is Caitra, Maitra, or someone else, all of them have only five kinds of activities (*vṛtti*), no more. And the singular “of the mind” (*cittasya*) is used with the intention of referring to the genus. But “of the minds” (*cittānām*) should be understood. He shows the distinction between them that is useful for practice—afflicted

²⁶³ *kleśahetukāḥ karmāśayapracaye kṣetrībhūtāḥ kliṣṭāḥ, khyātiviṣayā guṇādhikāra virodhinyo’kliṣṭāḥ, kliṣṭapravāhapatiā apyakliṣṭāḥ, kliṣṭacchidreṣvapyakliṣṭā bhavanti, akliṣṭacchidreṣu kliṣṭā iti, tathājātīyakāḥ samskāra vṛttibhireva kriyante, samskāraiśca vṛttaya iti, evaṃ vṛttisamskāracakramanīṣamāvartate, tadevambhūtaṃ cittam avasitādhikāramātmakalpena vyavatiṣṭhate pralayaṃ vā gacchatīti, tāḥ kliṣṭāścākliṣṭāśca pañcadhā vṛttayah.*

(*kliṣṭa*) and non-afflicted (*akliṣṭa*). Taking up the non-afflicted ones, the afflicted ones must be stopped, and those too, by supreme dispassion (*vairāgya*).

Its explanation is: "Having *kleśa* as their cause." The *kleśa*-s, such as egoity (*asmitā*), are the causes, the reason for the activity of those activities (*vr̥tti*); thus, they are spoken of in that way. Or, the activity of the activities (*vr̥tti*) consisting of *rajas* and *tamas*, which are dominated by the purpose of the *puruṣa*, leads only to *kleśa* by being the cause of *kleśa*. *Kleśa* is afflicted (*kliṣṭa*); therefore, those that have *kleśa* are afflicted. Since the activity of these [activities] is for the purpose of acquiring *kleśa*, therefore, they become the field for the accumulation of the residue of actions (*karmāśaya*). Indeed, this experiencer (*pratipadattṛ*) determines an object (*artha*) through valid cognition (*pramāṇa*) and the like, and being attached or repulsed there, accumulates the residue of actions (*karmāśaya*). Thus, the activities (*vr̥tti*) become the ground for the birth of the accumulation of merit (*dharma*) and demerit (*adharma*); therefore, the activities are afflicted (*kliṣṭa*).

He explains the non-afflicted (*akliṣṭa*): "Having manifestation (*khyāti*) as their object." The clarity of intellect (*buddhisattva*) from which *rajas* and *tamas* have been dispelled, flowing peacefully, is manifestation (*khyāti*). By that, which has an object, it indicates the distinction between *sattva* and *puruṣa*, which is its object. Therefore, since it has the distinction between *sattva* and *puruṣa* as its object, it is opposed to the authority of the *guṇa*-s. Indeed, the authority of the *guṇa*-s is the beginning of the effect, and its culmination is the discernment-manifestation (*vivekakhyāti*); therefore, they obstruct the authority of the *guṇa*-s, which have fulfilled their purpose. Therefore, those non-afflicted (*akliṣṭa*) activities (*vr̥tti*), beginning with valid cognition (*pramāṇa*), are such.

It may be said that all living beings are indeed only of afflicted (*kliṣṭa*) activities, since the birth of those devoid of passion (*vītarāga*) is not seen. And non-afflicted (*akliṣṭa*) activities cannot exist in a stream of afflicted (*kliṣṭa*) activities, nor is there any causality in their presence, due to being interspersed with opposing factors. Therefore, the cessation of the afflicted by the non-afflicted, and of those by supreme dispassion (*vairāgya*), is merely a wish. Therefore, he says: "Stream of afflicted (*kliṣṭa*)." The practice (*abhyāsa*) and dispassion (*vairāgya*) that are born from the repeated examination of scripture (*āgama*), inference (*anumāna*), and the instruction of a teacher (*ācāryopadeśa*) [cause non-afflicted states]. Although fallen into the stream of the afflicted, they are themselves non-afflicted, having fallen into the gaps of the afflicted. Indeed, a *brāhmaṇa* living in Śālagrāma, crowded with

hundreds of *kirātas*, does not become a *kirāta*. "In the gaps of the non-afflicted" is an example. And being within the afflicted but not overcome by the afflicted, they are non-afflicted. He says that the afflicted ones themselves overcome [the non-afflicted] in due course of the maturation of their own predispositions (*saṃskāra*): "Of the same kind." The predispositions (*saṃskāra*) are non-afflicted by the non-afflicted activities (*vr̥tti*); this is the meaning. Therefore, this cycle of activities (*vr̥tti*) and predispositions (*saṃskāra*) revolves constantly until the attainment of the *nirodha-samādhi*.

Having become such, that mind (*citta*) in the state of cessation (*nirodhāvastha*), with the residue of predispositions (*saṃskāraśeṣa*), abides in its own form, or it goes to dissolution (*pralaya*); this is the ultimate truth (*paramārthataḥ*). Having condensed it, he speaks the meaning of the *sūtra*: "Those," that is, "in five ways" is merely a statement of meaning, not an explanation of the activity of words (*śabdavṛtti*), due to the non-remembrance of the *tayapaḥ* mode"²⁶⁴.

The practice of *akliṣṭa-vṛttis* are highly recommended for the *yoga-sādhaka* which will help in the process of reducing the effects of *avidyā* and ultimately *avidyā* will be destroyed by *vivekakhyāti* which will bring *kaivalya*. With the help of *akliṣṭa-vṛttis*, the *yoga-sādhaka* comes to realize that the yogin is not the same as *buddhi* or *citta*. If there is no *vr̥ttisārūpya*, at that time (*tadā*) the yogin as seer (*draṣṭā*) gets settled in her true form (*svarūpe'vasthāna*) which is *puruṣa*²⁶⁵. In other words, when the yogin do not identify herself with the *vr̥ttis*, the yogin attains *kaivalya*. When the yogin is not in *vr̥ttisārūpya*, the yogin is in *samādhi* stage. Not being in *vr̥ttisārūpya* condition indicates a kind of *nirodha* state or *nirodha-samādhi*. Is this *nirodha-samādhi* the end of the yogin's existence? Does this attainment of *nirodha-samādhi* indicate the complete dissolution of *citta* and the body and mind of the yogin? It seems that not in *vr̥ttisārūpya* state seems to be an epistemological process, not an cosmological process because the yogin is still alive in the *nirodha-samādhi* stage where she has the conscious knowledge that she is completely different from *vr̥ttis*.

When there is no *vr̥ttisārūpya* stage, there is *kaivalya*. After the attainment of *kaivalya*, there takes place the complete dissolution of the mind and body of the yogin (*cittavṛttinirodha*). What I am suggesting is that from the practical perspective by reading the *sūtra-s* in the reverse order, it appears that *kaivalya* takes place first and then *cittavṛttinirodha*

²⁶⁴ See the commentary of Vacāpati Miśra on *sūtra* 1.5

²⁶⁵ *Sūtra* 1.3: *tadā draṣṭuḥ svarūpe'vasthānam*

takes place. Now the question arises: how do we understand *cittavṛttinirodha*? Is it not the case that *cittavṛttinirodha* is the prerequisite for the attainment of *kaivalya*?

***Cittavṛttinirodha*-Oriented *Kaivalya* in the *Sūtra* 1.2**

Cittavṛttinirodha is the only way of attaining liberation in Yoga. When we understand and analyse the process of *cittavṛttinirodha* from metaphysical perspective, it appears that *cittavṛttinirodha* indicates the complete cessation of the functioning of *vṛtti*-s and the *citta* which is necessary for the attainment of *kaivalya*, the ultimate goal of yoga. When we understand and analyse the process of *cittavṛttinirodha* from the practical perspective, it seems that *cittavṛttinirodha* does not indicate a complete dissolution of the *citta* because the yogin is in *nirodha-samādhi* in which he has physical body and mind. Is it a contradiction? Is Patañjali inconsistent in his teaching? Patañjali seems to leave room open for two stages of functioning of the process of *cittavṛttinirodha*. The first stage of *kaivalya* as “*svarūpe’vasthāna*” takes place when the yogin is not in *vṛttisārupya* condition in which *cittavṛttinirodha* is an epistemological process and the second stage of *kaivalya* as “*svarūpe’vasthāna*” takes place when the yogin is in “*vṛtti-viyoga*” stage in which *cittavṛttinirodha* is an cosmological process which entails the disembodiment. One may ask: are there two types of *kaivalya* and *cittavṛttinirodha*? *Kaivalya* is one single process, but it involves two stages. In these two stages, *cittavṛttinirodha* process functions in two sequential activities. The first activity of *cittavṛttinirodha* is epistemological whereas the last activity is cosmological in their nature. *Cittavṛttinirodha* is the prerequisite for the attaining *kaivalya*. In this context, it can be said that in *sūtra* 1.2, it is *cittavṛttinirodha*-oriented type of *kaivalya*.

2. Knowledge-Oriented Type of *Kaivalya*

In the *Sāṃkhya* -yoga cosmogony, creation takes place due to the close proximity between *prakṛti* and *puruṣa*. In other words, for creation, *prakṛti* and *puruṣa* are the essential two entities. *Prakṛti* is always procreative. In other words, *prakṛti* is the material cause (*upādānakāraṇa*) of this physical and metaphysical world. This mundane world which is seen by people is called *dṛśya* in Yoga. It is to be noted that *dṛśya* includes everything of this world which is made from three *guṇa*-s or which are the effects of these *guṇa*-s. Where there is *dṛśya*, there must be a *draṣṭā*. *Prakṛti* is *jada*. So, *prakṛti* cannot see. In other words, *prakṛti* cannot be the seer due to its unconscious nature. It is the conscious *puruṣa* who is the seer. This *puruṣa* is always pure, formless, detached and unchangeable. This *puruṣa* is not the *bhoktā* and *kartā*. *Puruṣa* is not the material cause (*upādānakāraṇa*) of this world, but it is the

efficient cause (*nimittakāraṇa*). The presence of *puruṣa* for the creation of *prakṛtic* world is mandatory. Other activities of this world are the activities of *prakṛti*. This *puruṣa* is only *draṣṭā* but due to the relation with the *prakṛti* this *puruṣa* equates himself with the activities of *buddhi*. In other words. *Puruṣa* considers the activities of *prakṛti* as its own activities due to *avidyā*. In *sūtra* 2.20, Patañjali explains the nature of *draṣṭā*. Patañjali tells us that “the seer is merely the power of seeing; [however,] although pure, he witnesses the images of the mind”²⁶⁶.

On the Relationship Between *Puruṣa* and *Buddhi*

Vyāsa explains that “*dṛśīmātra*” means that it is simply the power of vision, untouched by any qualification. That *puruṣa* is aware of the *buddhi*. It is neither identical to nor entirely different from the *buddhi*. It is not identical because the *buddhi* is subject to change due to its being related to known and unknown objects. The object of the *buddhi* is a cow or a pot, etc., which are known or unknown, and this shows its changeability. But the *puruṣa* is always related to unknown objects, which reveals its immutability. Because *buddhi* cannot be both related and unrelated to the *puruṣa*, it is established that the *puruṣa* is always related to unknown objects and therefore immutable. Moreover, the *buddhi* is for the sake of another because it acts in combination, while the *puruṣa* is for its own sake. Also, because the *buddhi* ascertains all objects, it is composed of the three *guṇa*-s, and because it is composed of the three *guṇa*-s, it is non-conscious. But the *puruṣa* is the observer of the *guṇa*-s, and therefore not identical. Then is it different? No, it is not entirely different. Because even though pure, it appears to observe the contents (*pratyaya*). It observes the intellectual content, and though not identical to it, it appears to be identical. And so it is said: “The power of the enjoyer is indeed immutable and non-transferring. It seems to transfer to an object that is changing and follows its activity. The activity of consciousness (*jñānavṛtti*) is said to be indistinguishable from the activity of *buddhi*, as it merely imitates the *buddhi*, which has attained the form of the support of consciousness”²⁶⁷.

Vyāsa asserts that the term “*dṛśīmātra*” in *sūtra* 2.20 signifies that *puruṣa* is the conscious and unattached being, perpetually transcending any association or relation with attributes or qualifications. The *puruṣa* -*tattva* possesses awareness (*pratisamvedī*) of *buddhi*. How can the pure *puruṣa*, devoid of any qualifications, possess awareness of the operations of the *buddhi*? Why is *puruṣa* referred to as the enjoyer (*bhokta*)? In response to this inquiry, it

²⁶⁶ *Sūtra* 2.20: *draṣṭā dṛśīmātraḥ śuddho 'pi pratyayānupaśyaḥ*.

²⁶⁷ See the commentary of Vyāsa on *sūtra* 2.20.

can be asserted that while being disconnected from all forms of relationships or attributes, *puruṣa* perceives himself as the *buddhi* due to the descent of *puruṣa*'s reflection within the *buddhi*. It resembles the reflection of the *Japā* blossom in the crystal. When the crystal is struck by the reflection, it changes from its natural color to red, which is the color of the *Japā* blossom. The *pratisaṃvedī*, *bhoga*, or understanding of the *puruṣa*, is this reddening of the white crystal.

A question now comes up. Should we consider *puruṣa* and *buddhi* to be one and the same if *puruṣa* is *pratisaṃvedī* and *buddhi* is *saṃvedakakarini*? Vyāsa responds to this query by saying that *puruṣa* and *buddhi* have both essential distinctions and certain parallels. *Buddhi* and *puruṣa* are not the same thing, nor are they different. *Puruṣa* and *buddhi* are not the same because, while *buddhi* may occasionally be conscious of *ghata* and *pata*, he may not always be. The *buddhi* is aware of *ghata* when he concentrates on it. *Buddhi* does not have knowledge of *ghata* when it is not focused on it. Similarly, when the *buddhi* concentrates on words (*śabda*), the *buddhi* becomes conscious of the words; at other times, the *buddhi* is not conscious of the words. When *buddhi* focuses on several things in a similar way, he occasionally becomes aware of something and other times he is unaware of the thing he previously focused on. This indicates that *buddhi* occasionally shifts its consciousness. *Buddhi* is hence by nature malleable (*pariṇāminī*). *Puruṣa*, however, is constantly conscious of *buddhi*. Put otherwise, the *puruṣa*'s consciousness in *buddhi* cannot be altered. It is untrue to say that *puruṣa* is occasionally cognizant of *buddhi* and at other times is not. The fact that *puruṣa*'s consciousness of *buddhi* remains unalterable indicates that *puruṣa* is unchanging (*apariṇāminī*).

Another distinction between *puruṣa* and *buddhi* is discussed by Vyāsa. *Buddhi* meets other people's goal (*parārtha*). *Puruṣa*'s needs are met by *buddhi*, which is connected to *kleśa*, *karma*, and *vāsanā*. *Puruṣa* is the reason that *buddhi* exists. *Puruṣa*, however, does not exist to fulfill any entity's needs. *Puruṣa* is there for its own sake. *Buddhi* takes on the shapes of *śānta*, *ghora*, and *mūḍha*; it becomes cognizant of these forms and identifies itself with these forms or stages of mental activity (*vr̥tti-s*), which is another distinction between *puruṣa* and *prakṛti*. The fact that the *buddhi* is composed of three *guṇa-s* is thus proven. Since *guṇa-s* are the essence of *buddhi*, *buddhi* is unconscious (*jada*). However, *puruṣa* does not identify himself with the *guṇa-s* or their activity; rather, he is merely an observer (*upadraṣṭā*) of the *guṇa-s*. Like a reflection in a mirror, *puruṣa* just becomes aware of or familiar with *buddhi*. Put differently, *puruṣa* does not actually participate in the actions of the *guṇa-s*. It is merely

seeing how the *buddhi* reflects the actions of the *guṇa-s*. *Puruṣa* is known as "*upadraṣṭā*" for this reason. *Puruṣa* is neither *guṇa-s* nor unconscious (*jada*), as this discussion demonstrates.

One might ask: *puruṣa* must be different from *buddhi* if it is not identical to him. Since the *puruṣa*, which is disengaged, pristine, and detached, nevertheless watches the *buddhi*'s activities, Vyāsa responds that *puruṣa* and *buddhi* are not entirely distinct. *Puruṣa* gains awareness of the *buddhi*'s activities through introspection. Due to the fact that the *buddhi* reflects *puruṣa*'s consciousness, when *puruṣa* learns of the *buddhi*'s acts, he identifies himself with them as his own. Vyāsa cites Pañcaśikhā on the potential similarities and differences between *puruṣa* and *buddhi*. According to the quotation, *bhoktṛśakti*, which is unchanging or unchangeable (*apariṇāmini*) and immovable or un-spreading (*apratisaṃkramā*), becomes mindful of the *buddhi*'s activities and perceives them in a reflexive conscientious state. *Puruṣa* seems to think that the actions of *buddhi* are the actions of the *puruṣa* in this reflexive phase. Put differently, the actions of the *buddhi* seem to be those of *puruṣa*.

On the Need of *Dṛśya*

Patañjali declares that "the essential nature of that which is seen is exclusively for the sake of the seer" (Bryant's translation)²⁶⁸. In other terms, *dṛśya* is *prakṛti*. *Dṛśya*'s (*prakṛti*) existence and activities are solely intended to serve the goal of *draṣṭā-puruṣa*. The *puruṣa* receives the experience from *dṛśya*, which either frees or ties the *puruṣa*. When *vidyā* drives *puruṣa*, *dṛśya* becomes the cause of liberation; when *avidyā* drives *puruṣa*, *dṛśya* becomes the cause of bondage. *Dṛśya* provides both bondage and liberty to *draṣṭā-puruṣa*. *Dṛśya* is unconscious by nature. So, *dṛśya* is unable to pursue freedom or servitude because of its consciousness. Thus, *puruṣa* requires the unconscious *dṛśya* to fulfill these two goals of *puruṣa*—liberation and bondage.

Hariharānanda explains this *sūtra* by saying that apart from serving the purposes of experience (*bhoga*) and liberation (*apavarga*) for the *puruṣa*, the visible world (*dṛśya*) has no other immediately arising form in its effects. Therefore, the purpose of the *puruṣa* is indeed the essence or inherent nature (*ātma = svarūpam*) of the visible world—this is the meaning of the *sūtra*. Or, the *guṇa-s* become visible in the form of experience (*bhoga*). As for "*dṛśi*," it means the state of being the object, the state of being experience and liberation. As for "*tat*," it means that the essence of that, the essence of the visible world, is the intellect (*buddhi*) in the form of experience and liberation. The intellect has attained its essence through the essence of

²⁶⁸ *Sūtra 2.17: draṣṭṛdṛśyayoḥ saṃyogo heyahetuḥ.*

the other (*para*), through the essence of the knower (*vijñātṛ*); it has gained existence. This is what is said: the awareness of pleasure and pain—"I am happy," "I am suffering," etc.—is experienced by the seer (*draṣṭā*) as residing in the intellect (*ātma buddhi gata*). And from that experience (*pratisamvedanā*), their (*teṣāṃ*) knowledge or existence arises; therefore, they have gained existence through the essence of the other, or they are known (*vijñātāva*). With the cessation (*nirodhāt*) of the mind-states (*cittavṛttinām*) whose function (*carite*) is to serve experience and liberation, the states (*vṛttyaḥ*) in the form of experience and liberation, illuminated by the reflection of the *puruṣa* (*pauṣabhāsā*), no longer exist. If one asks, "then what happens to those existing states (*vṛttinām*)? Is there utter destruction (*atyantanāśa*)?" The answer to this is given: by the abandonment of their own form (*svarūpahānād*), by the destruction of their own form, namely, the groups of pleasure, pain, etc. (*sukhaduḥkhādigramāṇām*), and the great principle, etc. (*mahadādi*), they perish (*naśyanti*), yet they do not utterly perish (*Na vinaśyanti*); there is no utter destruction (*atyantanāśa*) for them. And then, they exist in the form of the *guṇa*-s (*guṇasvarūpeṇa tiṣṭhanti*), and are seen by other *puruṣa*-s who have not fulfilled their purpose (*akṛtārthapuruṣair dṛśyanta iti*)²⁶⁹. Now the question arises: why does not *dṛśya* dissolve after providing liberation to *puruṣa*?

On the Cosmological Status of *Dṛśya*

Patañjali answers that "although the seen ceases to exist for one whose purpose is accomplished [the liberated *puruṣa*], it has not ceased to exist altogether, since it is common to other [not-liberated] *puruṣa*-s" (Bryant's translation)²⁷⁰. According to Patañjali, this *dṛśya-prakṛti* offers *draṣṭā* a freedom. *Dṛśya - prakṛti* has nothing left to offer the liberated *puruṣa* s after the unliberated *puruṣa* s have achieved release. The freed *puruṣa* finds *dṛśya - prakṛti* to be totally ineffective and unappealing. However, because *dṛśya - prakṛti* is eternal and ever-living by nature, it does not completely cease to exist. For the unliberated *puruṣa* s, this ever-living *dṛśya-prakṛti* nevertheless offers its experiences and liberating actions. It should be mentioned that *Sāṃkhya* -yoga adheres to realism, which maintains that no aspect

²⁶⁹ *puruṣasya bhogāpavargarūpārthamantareṇa nāsti dṛśyasyānyat sāksājñāyamānaṃ rūpaṃ kārye vā tasmāt puruṣārtha eva dṛśyasyātmā = svarūpamiti sūtrārthaḥ, bhogarūpeṇa vā guṇā dṛśyā bhavantītyārthaḥ, dṛṣṭi, karmarūpatām bhogāpavargarūpatām, taditi, tatsvarūpaṃ dṛśyasvarūpaṃ bhogāpavargarūpā buddhiritiārthaḥ, parasvarūpeṇa vijñātrīsvarūpeṇa pratilabdhatmakam labdhasattākam, etaduktam bhavati sukhaduḥkhābodhaḥ, ahaṃ sukhī-āhaṃ duḥkhītyādyākāreṇātmabuddhigatena draṣṭraivapratisamvedyate, tatpratisamvedanācca teṣāṃ jñānam sattā vā tataste pararūpeṇa labdhasattākā vijñātāvā, carite bhogāpavargārthe cittavṛttinām nirodhānna bhogāpavargarūpā vṛttyaḥ pauṣabhāsā prakāśitā bhavanti, nanu tadā satīnām vṛttinām kimatyantanāśā ityetasyottaramāha - svarūpahānād sukhaduḥkhādigramāṇādīmahadādisvarupanāśāt te naśyanti na ca vinaśyanti na teṣāmatyantanāśaḥ, te ca tadā guṇasvarūpeṇa tiṣṭhanti, anyairakṛtārthapuruṣairdṛśyanta iti.*

²⁷⁰ *Sūtra 2.22: kṛtārtham prati naṣṭamapyanaṣṭam tadanyasādhāraṇatvāt.*

of the *dr̥śya - prakṛti* is ever annihilated. *Dr̥śya - prakṛti* solely undergoes form alterations. Here, Patañjali makes two distinct announcements. *Dr̥śya - prakṛti*'s cosmological reality is one of the announcements. Another announcement is that there are multiple *puruṣa* s but only one *dr̥śya - prakṛti*. One *puruṣa*'s emancipation does not imply that other *puruṣa* s will be freed. In a same manner, a single *dr̥śya - prakṛti* serves numerous *puruṣa* s concurrently. Vyāsa comments that even though a visible object may be destroyed or cease to exist for one fulfilled person, it is not destroyed because it is common to other persons. Although a wholesome thing may cease to exist for a wholesome person, it is not fulfilled with respect to unwholesome persons; therefore, it becomes the object of their sight and certainly attains its own form in another form. Thus, since the power of seeing and the act of seeing are eternal, their beginningless association is explained. And so it is said: "Due to the beginningless association of those who possess, there is also a beginningless association of the elements of dharma (*dharma-mātrā*)²⁷¹."

Vijñāna Bhikṣu elaborates Vyāsa's commentary by saying that he (Vyāsa) asks, "it is accomplished," meaning, the object having been accomplished that was created by his intellect, that is accomplished; in relation to a certain emancipated person, because of the non-origination of usefulness, the quality etc. is destroyed; it is not generally destroyed, like a king's kingdom, even when destroyed, because it is common to that accomplished one and another person, this is the meaning. The aphorism is applied, and its purport is explained, beginning with "skillful" and ending with "form," skillful means auspicious, and *akṛtārtham* means one by whom the object has not been accomplished, the rest is almost explained. So this is the meaning of the aphorism, also favored by scripture, as in: "One unborn (*ajā*) is red, white, black, creating manifold offspring similar to herself. One unborn (*aja*) lies besides her, loving her; another unborn (*aja*) abandons her, she who has been enjoyed. "Therefore, by this aphorism, the eternality of *prakṛti* (primordial nature) and the multiplicity of *puruṣa* (selves) are established, as well as the unity of *prakṛti* in the form that there is no multiplicity of *prakṛti* due to the difference of *puruṣa*-s, in order to refute the proponents of *vijñānavāda* (consciousness-only school) and others. Now, if it is so, wouldn't the unity of all *ātman*-s (selves), as stated in hundreds of *śruti* (scripture) and *smṛti* (tradition), like "just as the space enclosed in a pot, a water jar, and a begging bowl is one but appears different in

²⁷¹ *kṛtārthamekaṃ puruṣaṃ prati dr̥śyaṃ naṣṭamapi nāśaṃ prāptamapyanaṣṭam tadanyapuruṣasādhāraṇatvāt, kuśalaṃ puruṣaṃ prati nāśaṃ prāptamapyakuśalānpuruṣāṇprati na kṛtārthamiti teṣāṃ dr̥śeḥ karmaviṣayatāmāpannaṃ labhata eva pararūpeṇā'tmarūpamiti, ataśca dṛgdarśanaśaktyornityatvādanādiḥ saṃyogo vyākhyāta iti, tathā coktam –rdhamiṇāmanādisaṃyogāddharmamātrāṇāmapyanādiḥ saṃyoga iti.*

many ways; so, Subāhu, Kāśīpa, I, and others [are one in different bodies," be contradicted? No, because such statements, due to the difference in context, sometimes assert non-difference characterized by the absence of opposing qualities.

Emancipation is attained merely by the knowledge of the non-difference of all *ātman*-s, through the cessation of identification with the intellect and so on, due to its unchanging nature. Sometimes, it asserts non-difference characterized by non-distinction, and thus the principal selfhood of the one *paramātmān* (supreme self) is established. All of this has been elaborated by us in the commentary on the *Brahma Mīmāṃsā* (Investigation of Brahman), the commentaries on the scriptures, and so on. But such statements cannot possibly have the ultimate import of the non-duality of *jīvātman* (individual self) and *paramātmān* (supreme self), because of the opposition from hundreds of strong *śruti* and *smṛti* texts that establish difference, supported by sound reasoning in the form of the untenability of bondage and liberation. Furthermore, because of the perception of difference, "because of the designation of a part as diverse" (*aṃśo nānāvyapadeśāt*), beginning with the *Brahma Mīmāṃsā* and through all the aphorisms of all schools, the ascertainment is very clear that difference alone is the meaning of the scriptures due to the establishment of the difference of *ātman*s. Moreover, the cessation of the illusion of *saṃsāra* (cycle of rebirth) is not possible merely from the knowledge of the unity of all *ātman*-s, because in one space, there can be sound and its absence due to the difference in limitations; similarly, in one *ātman*, *saṃsāra* and absence of *saṃsāra* can exist due to the difference in limitations. And if discrimination is required, then the cessation of illusion would be from that alone, and the knowledge of unity would not be the cause of liberation through a seen effect; nor is the worship of all *ātman*-s as Brahman possible from the knowledge of the unity of *ātman*-s, because there would be the undesirable consequence of the very condemnation of Brahman in the direct perception of doghood and so on. Since the worship based on non-distinction characterized by non-difference is necessarily assumed in the classes of insentient objects, it is appropriate in the classes of sentient beings as well. Therefore, because of the absence of purpose, *śruti* and *smṛti* do not have the purport of establishing the non-duality of *ātman*.

Furthermore, we have established [this] in the *Brahma Mīmāṃsā* at the time of refuting the opinion of modern pseudo-Vedantins, this is the direction. Thus, with the group of aphorisms beginning with "distinct and non-distinct," since the power of seeing of the seer,

the *puruṣa*, is established by itself, and since the intellect is eternal in the form of cause, the connection between the two is beginningless in the form of a stream, this is proper as explained in the scriptures, he says, therefore. Even if qualities in the form of effects are destructible, their beginninglessness would not be possible, and thus the intellect, and thus the connection of intellect and *puruṣa*, this is the idea. Regarding the beginninglessness of the connection of intellect and *puruṣa* in the form of a stream, he mentions the consensus of the teacher *Pañcasikhā*, thus it is said, "because of the beginningless connection of the qualities with the substrate, the qualities with the *puruṣa*-s," without the eternality of the qualities, the beginninglessness of the connections of the common attributes of objects of knowledge such as intellect etc. would not be possible, this is shown to establish [that]. Thus, with the aphorisms beginning with "manifestation, activity," the twenty-five *tattva*-s (principles) have been stated here concisely with discrimination, but the elaboration must be seen in the *Sāṃkhya* school, because the discrimination of *prakṛti* and *puruṣa* is mainly established there, this is just like Yoga ²⁷².

On the Meaning of *Samyoga*

The association or conjunction between *drśya* and *draṣṭā* is known as *saṃyoga*. Patañjali tells us that "[The notion of] conjunction is the means of understanding the real nature of the powers of the possessed and of the possessor" (Bryant's translation)²⁷³. *Samyoga* causes the knowledge of *drśya* - *prakṛti* and *draṣṭā* - *puruṣa*. What is the nature of this *saṃyoga*? Vyāsa explains that the *puruṣa* who is the master, is joined with his own *drśya* for the sake of seeing; from that union comes the experience of the *adrśya*, which is *bhoga*. But that which is the realization of the *draṣṭu*'s own nature is *apavarga*. This union concludes with the act of seeing; thus, seeing is said to be the cause of separation (*viyoga*). Seeing is the opposite of *adarśana*, thus *adarśana* is said to be the cause of union. Here, seeing is not the cause of liberation (*mokṣa*); rather, liberation is the absence of bondage due to the absence of *adarśana*. Because, in the presence of seeing, there is destruction of *adarśana*, which is the cause of bondage, therefore seeing, which is knowledge (*jñāna*), is said to be the cause of aloneness (*kaivalya*). But what is this *adarśana*? Is it the authority of the *guṇa*-s, or is it the non-origination of the *pradhāna* mind, which is of the nature of seeing, belonging to the master who has the object shown to him, that is, the absence of seeing when the *drśya* is present in oneself? What is the purposefulness (*arthavattā*) of the *guṇa*-s? Or

²⁷² See the commentary of Vijñāna Bhikṣu on sūtra 2.22.

²⁷³ Sūtra 2.17: *draṣṭṛdrśyayoḥ saṃyogo heyahetuḥ*.

is *avidyā* suppressed along with one's own mind, being the seed for the origination of one's own mind? Or is it the manifestation of the movement-impression (*gatisaṃskāra*) when the stability-impression (*sthitisaṃskāra*) is destroyed? For it has been said that the *pradhāna*, existing only in stability (*sthiti*), would be non-*pradhāna* due to the non-doing of change (*vikāra*). Likewise, existing only in movement (*gati*), it would be non-*pradhāna* due to the eternality of change. And in both ways its activity attains the status of *pradhāna*; not otherwise. Even in other imagined causes, the discussion is the same. Some say that the power of seeing (*darśanaśakti*) itself is *adarśana*, according to the *śruti* "The activity of the *pradhāna* is for the sake of self-manifestation (*ātmakhyāpanārtha*)". Before activity, the *puruṣa*, capable of all knowing and not knowing, does not see; then the *dṛśya*, capable of all action and instrument, is not seen. Some say that *adarśana* is the property of both. There, this seeing, even though it is the very self of the *dṛśya*, occurs as a property of the *dṛśya* because it depends on the *puruṣa*'s perception. Likewise, *adarśana*, even though it is not the self of the *puruṣa*, appears only as a property of the *puruṣa* because it depends on the *dṛśya*'s perception. Some say that seeing it, that is knowledge (*jñāna*), is *adarśana*. These are the scriptural alternatives (*śāstragata vikalpāḥ*). There, this multiplicity of alternatives concerns the common object in the union of the *guṇa*-s of all *puruṣa*-s²⁷⁴.

Let us discuss Vyāsa's commentary. According to Vyāsa, *puruṣa* is the master of *buddhi*. The word "sva" indicates *buddhi*, with which *puruṣa* is joined. From this *saṃyoga*, the nature of *buddhi* is felt or realized (*upalabdhi*). This experience or comprehension is called *bhoga*. This *saṃyoga* should not be understood as a physical or mental connection. This *saṃyoga* is only the sannidhi-lakṣaṇa of *yogyata*. When the nature of *draṣṭā* is recognized, it is called *apavarga*. Here, *puruṣa-khyāti* in reference to different *kārya* and *kāraṇa* of *viveka-khyāti* is called *apavarga*. In this way, the nature of *buddhi* and *puruṣa* is to be understood properly by using the method of *saṃyoga*. That is why it is confirmed that this *saṃyoga* is transferred into these two-fold *darśana* - *kārya* (*darśana* of *dṛśya* and *draṣṭā*). There is the existence of *saṃyoga*, when the two-fold *darśana*-s take place. The separation of *puruṣa* and *buddhi* takes place. The cause of this separation is the feeling of *adarśana* of *darśana*. *Adarśana* is the opposite of *darśana*. This is why *adarśana* is the cause of the union between *puruṣa* and *prakṛti*. So, from *avidyā*, *saṃyoga* arises. From *saṃyoga*, *darśana* arises, and from *adarśana*, *kaivalya* arises.

²⁷⁴ See the commentary of Vyāsa on sūtra 2.17.

If it is accepted that from *darśana*, liberation takes place, *mokṣa* should be taken as *kārya* and *darśana* should be taken as *kāraṇa*. If we accept this logic, then *mokṣa* should be *anitya* due to *kāraṇa*, and *mukta-puruṣa* again may become bounded in the future. To clear this doubt, it is confirmed that *mokṣa* is not the cause (*kāraṇa*) of *kārya* (actions). *Darśana*, which is the feeling of being seen and seen is not the cause of *mokṣa*. It is the *adarśana*, which is the cessation of *avidyā*, which is the cause of bondage. When *avidyā* is dispelled, the *saṃyoga* is broken, and this break with *saṃyoga* is called *kaivalya*. It is to be noted that there does not arise any new state that can be called a liberated state. It is the absence of *saṃyoga* (which is the cause of bondage) that results in liberation. When there is the true knowledge of the *puruṣa*'s own true self, there is the cessation of the connection of *saṃyoga*. This cessation of *saṃyoga* is otherwise known as *kaivalya*.

Now the question arises: what is this *adarśana*, and what is the nature of *adarśana*? Vyāsa says that many people have tried to understand the meaning of *adarśana*, which is *avidyā*, from different perspectives. Vyāsa presents eight types of probable meaning of *avidyā*. (1) When *guṇa-s* are engaged to provide *bhoga* and *apavarga*, is this engagement called *adarśana*? (2) When there is no *pradhāna citta* that sees the *puruṣa*, is this lack of *citta* called *adarśana*? In other words, by that *citta* which produces the sense of knowledge of *puruṣa* and *prakṛti*, is this lack of origination of sensation of knowledge of *citta* called *avidyā* or *adarśana*? (3) Is it *adarśana* when the *guṇa-s* are required for the purpose of *bhoga* and *apavarga*? (4) *Avidyā* dissolves along with the dissolution of the *citta*, and again that dissolved *avidyā* becomes the cause of the production of *citta* again. Is this phenomenon of the re-creation of *citta* called *avidyā* or *adarśana*? (5) Is it called *adarśana* when there is the dissolution period going on, but there still exists the creation-state period? *Prakṛti* has two conditions or states. One condition is the condition of equilibrium of three *guṇa-s*, which is the state of dissolution, and the other condition is the condition of disequilibrium of the three *guṇa-s*, which is the state of creation or the created world. Due to the existence of these two states of *prakṛti*, *prakṛti* is considered the material cause of this mundane world. (6) Some people think that *darśana-śakti* is *avidyā*. *Prakṛti* exists to show its existence to the *puruṣa*. Without the existence of *prakṛti*, the true nature of *puruṣa* cannot be realized. Is this creation of knowledge of *prakṛti* called *avidyā*? (7) Many people believe that the nature of *prakṛti* and *puruṣa* is *avidyā*. (8) Many people believe that the knowledge of the existence of three *guṇa-s* is called *adarśana*. Vyāsa states that among these eight possible meanings of *avidyā* or *adarśana*, the fourth number point is the right explanation of *avidyā* / *adarśana*. Now the question arises what is the relation between *saṃyoga* and *avidyā*?

On the Cause of *Samyoga*

Patañjali states that the cause of *saṃyoga* (the association of *buddhi* and *puruṣa*) is *avidyā*. Bhāvaṅgaśa states that here, by the word ignorance (*avidyā*), the latent impression (*vāsanā*) of false knowledge (*mithyājñāna*), which is the intellect (*buddhi*) of self (*ātman*) in what is not self (*anātman*), is to be grasped²⁷⁵. Nāgojībhāṭṭa comments that here, by the word "ignorance" (*avidyā*), is meant the latent impression of false knowledge (*mithyājñāna-vāsanā*) in the form of a thought of self in what is not self, since that itself is possible at the time prior to birth²⁷⁶. Rāmānanda Sarasvatī says that the connection of the impression of erroneous knowledge is the cause, this is the meaning. The notion of non-difference between the seer and the seen, such as "I," is error. That mind, perfumed by that impression, dissolved in dissolution, having attained the state of the primary matter, at the time of creation, towards the *puruṣa*, is born (only through *sattva*). Through that connection, bondage is for the non-discriminating, and liberation is for the discriminating; indeed, it is equal to *avidyā* which is a beginningless impression variegated, abiding in the mind. Then, like a fish caught in a net, the human animal, afflicted by its own actions, abandoning pain that has been taken, taking up what has been abandoned, in what should be abandoned, egoism and possessiveness follow, being born and being born, external, internal, and both-caused, the three kinds of suffering flow over²⁷⁷.

Vyāsa explains that it means that the *buddhi* does not achieve the finality of its function, which is the revelation of *puruṣa*, because it is infused with the residue of mistaken knowledge. As long as it still has a function, it returns. But when it achieves the finality of its function, which culminates in the revelation of *puruṣa*, its function is fulfilled and it ceases to have the cause of non-perception (*adarśana*). Because there is no cause of bondage, it does not return again. Here, someone explains [this] with the story of a eunuch: He is told by his foolish wife, "Eunuch, noble sir, my sister has children. Why not me?" He tells her, "I am dead. How will I produce children?" Likewise, existing knowledge does not bring about the

²⁷⁵ *avidyāśabdenātrānātmanyātmabuddhirūpamithyājñānavāsanā grāhyā.*

²⁷⁶ *avidyāśabdenātrānātmanyātmabuddhirūpamithyājñānavāsanā tasyā eva janmaprākkāle sambhavāt.*

²⁷⁷ *bhrāntijñānavāsanā saṃyogasya kāraṇamityarthah, ahamiti dṛgdrśyayorabheda(pratyayaḥ) bhrāntiḥ, tadvāsanāvāsitaṃ cittaṃ pralaye līnaṃ pradhānabhāvamupagataṃ sargakāle puruṣaṃ prati (sattvainaiḥ) jāyate, tena saṃyogenāvivekino bandhaḥ vivekino mokṣaśca bhavati etayā hyanādivāsanāvicitrāyā cittavartinyā avidyā yā samah, tato matsyajālenevānuviddhaṃ puruṣapaśuṃ svakarmopahitaṃ duḥkhamupāttaṃ tyajantaṃ, tyaktamupādādānaṃ, hātavya evānātmanyahankāramakārānupātinaṃ jātaṃ jātaṃ bāhyādhyātmikobhayanimitāḥ tripurvāṇastāpā anuplavante.*

cessation of the mind (*citta*); what hope is there that destroyed knowledge will do so? There, someone like a teacher says: Indeed, the cessation of the *buddhi* itself is liberation. Because there is no cause of non-perception (*adarśana*), there is the cessation of the *buddhi*. And that non-perception (*adarśana*) is the cause of bondage. It ceases through perception (*darśana*). Therefore, the cessation of the *citta* itself is liberation. Why is his delusion in an improper place²⁷⁸?

Vyāsa clarifies the significance and meaning of the concept of *avidyā*. According to Vyāsa, the *vāsanā* of *mithyājñāna* in *buddhi* is *avidyā*. Since the *buddhi* is impure when it has *vāsanā* of *mithyājñāna*, it is unable to achieve its purpose of seeing the true form of *puruṣa*. The actual understanding of *puruṣa* is impossible due to the existence of *saṃskāras* in *buddhi*. Vyāsa uses a story to further clarify the relationship between the dissolution of the *buddhi* and the achievement of *mokṣa*. When her sister has children, a foolish woman asks her eunuch husband why she doesn't have any. In response to this query, the Eunuch husband states that he will produce children after his death. Similarly, when *vivekakhyāti* - *jñāna* is there, *cittavṛtti* is not destroyed, and when *viveka-khyāti* is destroyed, *cittavṛtti* is likewise destroyed along with *vivekakhyāti*. Is there any evidence to support the claim that *cittavṛtti* is destroyed along with *vivekakhyāti* - *jñāna*? Vyāsa responds that since the cessation of *buddhi* itself is freedom, a typical *Sāṃkhya-Yoga* instructor can provide this affirmation in this context. *Buddhi* does not exist when *avidyā* is absent. There is freedom where there is no *buddhi*. *Avidyā* is dispelled by *vivekakhyāti*. *Buddhi* is dispelled by *avidyā*. Liberation results from this rejection of *buddhi*. It should be mentioned that emancipation is not brought about by *puruṣa khyāti-jñāna*. *Cittavṛtti* is not a result of emancipation. *Samyoga* between *buddhi* and *puruṣa* ceasing to exist is liberation in and of itself. Therefore, the question of how *buddhi* dissolving itself might result in liberation does not come up. Liberation occurs when the relationship between *buddhi* and *puruṣa* is terminated. To put it another way, freedom exists wherever there is *adarśana* of *buddhi*. Because of this, there is no space left for the *buddhi* to continue working after it dissolves. Vyāsa affirms that the connection between emancipation and *buddhi* is undeniable. *Buddhi* and *mokṣa* do not have a *kārya* - *kāraṇa* relationship. The *kārya*

²⁷⁸ *viparyaya-jñānavāsanānyarthah, viparyaya-jñānavāsanāvāsītā ca na kāryaniṣṭhām puruṣakhyātiṃ buddhiḥ prāpnoti sādhanikārā punarāvartate, sā tu puruṣakhyātiparyavasānām kāryaniṣṭhām prāpnoti, caritādhikārā nivr̥ttādarśanā bandhakāraṇābhāvānna punarāvartate, atra kaścītpaṇḍakopākhyānenoddhātayati - mugdhayā bhāryayā 'bhidhīyate - paṇḍakā' 'ryaputra, apatyavati me bhaginī kimarthaṃ nāma nāhamiti, sa tāmāha mṛtaste 'hamapatyamutpādayiṣyāmīti, tathedaṃ vidyamānaṃ jñānaṃ cittanivr̥ttiṃ na karoti, vinaṣṭaṃ kariṣyati kī pratyāśā, tatrā' 'cāryadeśīyo vakti - nanu buddhinivr̥ttireva mokṣo 'darśanakāraṇābhāvādbuddhinivr̥ttiḥ, taccādarśanaṃ bandhakāraṇaṃ darśanānnivartate, tatra cittanivr̥ttireva mokṣaḥ, kimarthamasthāna evāsya mativibhraḥ.*

- *kāraṇa* relationship might have existed if the *buddhi*'s cessation had occurred earlier, prior to the period of liberation. How the already destroyed *buddhi* could have been able to liberate the *puruṣa* would have been a reasonable inquiry. There is no dispute that *buddhi* causes *mokṣa* when the cessation of *buddhi* itself is merely another word for emancipation.

This *buddhi* keeps returning in this *saṃsāra* because it is unable to achieve its ultimate objective, which is liberation. This indicates that even after *pralaya* and *prakṛtilaya*, *buddhi* is still associated with the *puruṣa*. For this reason, *saṃyoga* is said to be caused by *avidyā*, which is the *vāsanā* of *mithyājñāna*. However, the duty of *buddhi* is performed or full when he discovers the true nature of the *puruṣa*. The cause of bondage, *adarśana*, does not exist after achieving its objective of understanding the actual nature of *puruṣa*, and the *buddhi* does not reappear to establish an association with *puruṣa*. This is how bondage is broken. Liberation is this breaking of bondage. It has been noted that *buddhi* serves two purposes: *apavarga* and *bhoga*. *Bhoga* persists between these two purposes until *puruṣa-khyāti* is reached. The aim of *buddhi* will not be achieved until *puruṣa-khyāti* is reached. The *apavarga* is reached when *puruṣa khyāti* occurs since the *buddhi* has no unfinished business. When *adarśana* stops, so does the relationship (*saṃyoga*) between *puruṣa* and the *buddhi*. Liberation is the state in which *saṃyoga* or *adarśana* stops. In other words, when the combination between *buddhi* and *puruṣa* ceases, *mokṣa* occurs spontaneously.

On the Absence of *Samyoga* as *Kaivalya*

This separation of *buddhi* and *puruṣa* is also known as *hāna*. Patañjali confirms that “by the removal of ignorance, conjunction is removed. This is the absolute freedom of the seer” (Bryant’s translation)²⁷⁹. Vyāsa explains that because of the absence of that non-seeing, the cessation of bondage is absolute, due to the absence of conjunction between intellect and the *Puruṣa*; this is *hānam* (cessation). That is the *kaivalya* (isolation) of *dr̥ṣi* (the power of seeing), the non-connection of the *puruṣa*, again, the non-conjunction with the *guṇa*-s; this is the meaning. In the cessation of the cause of suffering, the cessation of suffering is *hānam* (cessation). Then, the *puruṣa* is said to be established in its own nature²⁸⁰. Vyāsa makes it clear that the link between *buddhi* and *puruṣa* disappears when *avidyā* stops working. Vyāsa attests that this absence or separation is *atyantika*, or total detachment. Stated differently, this lack of *saṃyoga* affirms that any relationship's permanent ending is for the now and for all

²⁷⁹ Sūtra 2.25: *tadabhāvātśaṃyogābhāvo hānam taddr̥śeḥ kaivalyam*.

²⁸⁰ *tasyādarśanasyābhāvādbuddhipuruṣasaṃyogābhāva ātyantiko bandhanoparama ityarthah, etaddhānam, taddr̥śeḥ kaivalyam puruṣasyāmiśrībhāvaḥ punarasaṃyogo guṇairityarthah, duḥkhakāraṇanivṛtau duḥkhoparamo hānam, tadā svarūpapratīṣṭhaḥ puruṣa ityuktam*.

eternity to come. All afflictions that the yogin is experiencing now or may experience in the future must end in order for *saṃyoga* to be achieved. In actuality, *hānam* refers to this cessation of *avidyā*, which includes the cessation of *saṃyoga*. Another name for this *hānam* is *kaivalya*. By stating that the whole separation of *buddhi* and *puruṣa* will never be disjoined again, Vyāsa goes on to clarify the nature of *kaivalya*. Complete alleviation from suffering is a necessary component of this ongoing and total dissociation. Another name for this total cessation of suffering is *kaivalya* or *hānam*. *Puruṣa* becomes established in its initial form during the *kaivalya* stage.

Vivaraṇakāra further elaborates that four arrangements (*vyūhas*) have been discussed. Of these, it has been said, "suffering (*duḥkha*) is to be avoided, and future suffering is to be avoided." It is said that one arrangement, analogous to a disease, has been explained. And the cause of what is to be avoided, called "conjunction" (*saṃyoga*), along with its causes, has been spoken of. The second arrangement, analogous to the cause of disease, is the cause of what is to be avoided, namely, the conjunction of *pradhāna* (primordial matter) and *puruṣa* (consciousness), along with its cause, ignorance (*avidyā*), has been described. The subsequent description, along with a reasoned statement, is for the purpose of eliminating the desire for further explanation regarding that topic. After this, liberation (*hānam*), analogous to health, is to be spoken of as the purpose of the *mokṣasāstra* (treatise on liberation). And the subsequent description is for the sake of focusing the minds of the listeners. Because of its absence, the absence of conjunction is liberation; that is the isolation of the *dṛśi* (seer, consciousness). "That" is a retrospective reference to the previously discussed ignorance (*avidyā*). Because of the absence of that non-seeing (*adarśana*) or ignorance, the absence of the conjunction of *buddhi* (intellect) and *puruṣa*, which is the cause of suffering, is the complete cessation of bondage. This liberation is analogous to health. That isolation of the *dṛśi* is that very liberation, the complete cessation of bondage, the isolation of the *dṛśi*, the *puruṣa*. Its explanation is that the *puruṣa* is unmixed, that is, there is no further conjunction with the *guṇa*-s (qualities of *prakṛti*). Having explained the meaning of the words, he now shows the meaning of the sentence: the cessation of suffering, with the cessation of the cause of suffering, is liberation. Then the *puruṣa* is established in its own form, as it has been said, "*citiśakti* (the power of consciousness) is established in its own form." (*svarūpapraṭiṣṭhā vā citiśaktiḥ*). But how can there be liberation when *karma* (action) whose *vipāka* (ripening, result) is unfixed exists? Again, by *karma* whose *vipāka* is unfixed, there is a beginning of the body. No—because a counter-argument has been stated. It has been said that, due to right vision (*saṃyagdarśana*), the seed of affliction (*kleśa*) is burned,

and *karmas* become incapable of producing results, as illustrated by the example of grains of rice whose husk and awn have been removed and whose seeds are burned. Therefore, for the wise, there is no beginning of the body because of the absence of causes²⁸¹.

On the *Vivekakhyāti* as Means of Getting Rid of *Samyoga*

What is the means or process or method of “*hāna*”? Patañjali answers that “the means to liberation is uninterrupted discriminative discernment” (Bryant's translation)²⁸². *Aviplava* means nondisturbance or non-interruption. *Vivekakhyāti* is the knowledge that *prakṛti* and *puruṣa* are completely different. Vācaspati Miśra comments that “now, to explain the characteristic of the means of cessation, to describe the fourth *vyūha*, he introduces the *sūtra* - *atha*: “Unwavering discriminative discernment is the means of cessation (*hānopāyaḥ*).” Discriminative discernment (*vivekakhyāti*) also arises from scripture (*āgama*) and inference (*anumāna*), but it does not eliminate distraction (*vyutthāna*) or its impressions (*saṃskāra*), because these persist even in one possessing such discernment. Therefore, the term “unwavering” (*aviplavā*) is used to negate that. “Wavering” (*viplava*) means false knowledge (*mithyājñāna*); that which is devoid of it is unwavering. This is what is being said: Having grasped discrimination (*viveka*) through knowledge based on learning (*śrutamaya jñāna*), and having established it through reasoning (*yuktipayena*), a discriminative discernment that has reached the peak of excellence through cultivation (*bhāvanā*) practiced for a long time, uninterruptedly, and with reverence (*dīrghakālanairantaryasatkārāsevitā*), a discernment possessing direct realization (*sākṣātkāravatī*), that has eliminated false knowledge along with its latent impressions (*nivartitasavāsanamithyājñānā*), is unwavering and is the means of cessation (*hānopāya*)²⁸³.

Vijñāna Bhikṣu further elaborates that Vijñāna Bhikṣu says that “The specification “*aviplava*” is used to achieve the state of being firmly established in direct realization (*sākṣātkāra-niṣṭhā-rūpatva*). If one asks, “How is this achieved from the word *aviplava*?” [The answer] is: *plavate* means “it is overwhelmed by false knowledge (*mithyājñāna*) again and again due to the force of latent impressions (*saṃskāra*)”. When, in the state of direct realization (*sākṣātkāra-daśā*), subtle false knowledge (*sūkṣma-mithyājñāna*) is in a future

²⁸¹ See the commentary of Vivaraṇakāra on *sūtra* 2.25.

²⁸² *Sūtra* 2.26: *vivekakhyātiraviplavā hānopāyaḥ*.

²⁸³ *hānopāyalakṣaṇaṃ caturthaṃ vyūhamākhyātuṃ sūtramavatārayati - atheti, vivekakhyātiraviplavā hānopāyaḥ, āgamānumānābhyāmapī vivekakhyātirastī, na cāsau vyutthānaṃ tatsaṃskāraṃ vā nivartayati tadvato’pi tadanuvṛtteriṭi tannivṛttyarthamaviplaveti, viplavo mithyājñānaṃ tadrāhitā, etaduktaṃ bhavati - śrutamayena jñānena vivekaṃ gahītvā yuktipayena ca vyavasthāpya dīrghakālanairantaryasatkārāsevitāyā bhāvanāyāḥ prakarṣaparyantaṃ samādhigatā sākṣātkāravatī vivekakhyātirnivartitasavāsanamithyājñānā nirviplavā hānopāya iti, śeṣaṃ sugamaṃ bhāṣyam.*

state (*anāgatāvastha*), a state comparable to a burnt seed (*dagdhabījatyāvastha*), and its manifestation (*vivaraṇa*) is barren (*bandhya-prasava*), [meaning] it has the potential for barren manifestation (*bandhya-prasava-sāmarthyā*), then the flow of discriminative discernment (*vivekakhyāti-pravāha*) of the intellect (*buddhisattva*) whose dirt called afflictions (*kleśa*) has been shaken off (*vidhūta-kleśa*), becomes pure and unperturbed by false knowledge. This is due to the supreme purity (*paravaiśāradya*). Furthermore, its manifestation is present in the supreme state of mastery (*parasyāṃ vaśīkārasaṃjñāyām*), which is free from obstruction of desire (*icchā'pratighātarūpāyām*), described in the *sūtra* as "mastery extends from the smallest atom to the greatest magnitude" (*'paparamāṇuparamamahattvānto 'syavaśīkāra'*). Therefore, that discriminative discernment (*vivekakhyāti*) is called *aviplava*. That which is in the form of supreme direct realization (*paramasākṣātkārarūpiṇī*) is the means of abandonment (*hānopāya*). If one asks, "Through what means is it the means of abandonment (*hānopāya*)?" [the answer] is: because of that discriminative discernment (*vivekakhyāteḥ kāraṇāt*), the subtle form (*sūkṣmarūpasya*) of false knowledge (*mithyājñānasya*) attains the state of a burnt seed (*dagdhabījātāprāptiḥ*), and therefore there is no further manifestation (*punaraprasava*). Thus, this path to liberation (*mokṣasya paṇthāḥ*), which is in the form of discriminative discernment (*vivekakhyāti-rūpaḥ*) and the cessation of mind (*cittanivṛtti-ādi-rūpaḥ*), its manifestation, is the means of abandonment (*hānopāya*)²⁸⁴.

Vivaraṇakāra states that "In the third *vyūha*, it was stated that *hāna* (abandonment) is analogous to health. Now, intending to explain the fourth *vyūha*, which is analogous to medicine, [the text] asks: "What is the means of attaining abandonment (*hāna*)?" Indeed, how can there be a means of attaining abandonment? To the extent that *hāna* is not attainable because it is not a substance (*avastu*). For, *hāna* is merely the cessation of bondage. This is not a fault, because the removal of ignorance (*avidyā*) can be achieved through effort, like breaking a chain. When there is correct understanding, there is a cessation of ignorance. Thus, even though *hāna* is not a substance, it is conventionally treated as attainable. Discriminating

²⁸⁴ *sākṣātkāraṇiṣṭhārūpatvalābhāyāviplaveti viśeṣaṇam, tatrāviplavaśabdāt kathametallabhyate ityākāṅkṣāyāmāha, plavate, mithyājñānena saṃskāravaśāt mithyājñānenāntarāntarābhībhūyate ityarthah, yadeti, yadā tu sākṣātkāradaśāyām sūkṣmamithyājñānamanāgatāvasthaṃ dagdhabījatyāvasthaṃ tasya vivaraṇaṃ bandhyaprasavaṃ bandhyaprasavasāmarthyāṃ bhavati tadā vidhūtakleśākhadhūlerbuddhisattvasyāta eva paravaiśāradye vailakṣaṇye asyaiva vivaraṇaṃ parasyāṃ vaśīkārasaṃjñāyām 'paparamāṇuparamamahattvānto 'syavaśīkāra' iti sūtroktāyāmicchā'pratighātarūpāyām varittamānasya vivekakhyātipravāho nirmalo mithyājñānākulaṣito bhavati ataḥ sā vivekakhyātiraviplavocyate, sā paramasākṣātkārarūpiṇī hānopāya ityarthah, kena dvāreṇa hānopāya ityākāṅkṣāyāmāha, tata iti, tato vivekakhyāteḥ kāraṇāt mithyājñānasya sūkṣmarūpasya dagdhabījātāprāptiḥ, tataśca punaraprasava iti kṛtvā eṣa vivekakhyātirūpaścittanivṛtyādirūpamokṣasya paṇthāḥ asya vivaraṇaṃ hānopāya ityarthah.*

discernment (*vivekakhyāti*) that is unwavering (*aviplavā*) is the means to abandonment. What is discriminating discernment? It is the realization of the difference between *sattva* (mind-essence) and *puruṣa* (pure consciousness), the understanding of the true nature of *sattva* and *puruṣa* through their similarities and dissimilarities. However, that discriminating discernment, if not accompanied by the cessation of false knowledge (*mithyājñāna*), is unstable, does not become firm, and is not fit for accomplishing its purpose. Thus it is said: “Just as gold that is not properly refined does not shine, so too, knowledge of one whose impurities are not mature does not illuminate.” Similarly, “Knowledge of one seized by sensual craving is not a raft for him.” But when false knowledge reaches the state of a burnt seed, infertile because it is a burnt seed, incapable of initiating any activity, then the *sattva* whose impurities of afflictions (*kleśa*) have been dispelled—the *kleśa*-s themselves are the impurities, which have been dispelled—that *sattva*, which has been defiled by impurities such as passion (*rāga*) and so forth, existing in the highest state of renunciation (*vaśīkārasamjñā*), existing only in the clarity of knowledge (*jñānaprasāda*), that itself confirms: the flow of discriminating cognition (*vivekapratyayappravāha*), the uninterrupted state of discriminating knowledge (*vivekajñāna*), becomes pure (*nirmala*). Such discriminating discernment, being of this nature, becomes unwavering (*aviplavā*). When there is such unwavering discriminating discernment, then false knowledge takes on the state of a burnt seed because of its contradiction [with discriminating discernment], and again there is no further production [of false knowledge] due to false knowledge’s assumption of the state of a burnt seed. Thus it is said: “Just as seeds scorched by fire do not sprout again, so too, the self is not reborn through afflictions burned by knowledge.” That same kind of discriminating discernment is the path to liberation (*mokṣa*), the means to abandonment (*hāna*) that is the meaning²⁸⁵.

²⁸⁵ *uktastrīṭye vyūhaḥ – ārogyasthānīyo hānam nāma, adhunā caturthaṁ vyūhaṁ bhaiṣajyasthānīyamupācikyāsannāha – hānasya kaḥ prāptyupāyaḥ? iti. nanu ca katham hānasya prāpyupāya iti? yāvataḥ naiva hānamavastutvāt prāpyam, bandhanoparama eva hi hānam, naiṣa doṣaḥ, yatnasādhyatvādividyānivṛtteḥ yathā nigalabhedaḥ, samyakūkhyātau satyāmavidyānivṛtiriti hānamavastvapi prāpyamityupacaryete. vivekakhyātiraviplavā hānopāyaḥ, kā punarvivekakhyātiriti yāha – sattvapuruṣānyatāpratyayaḥ sattvapuruṣayoḥ sādharṇyayaivaidhamyayīyāthātmyāvabodha ityārthaḥ, sā tu vivekakhyātiḥ anivṛttamithyājñānā vipluvatte na sthīrībhavati, na kāryekṣameti. tathā cōktam--‘yathā hemāvipakvaṁ na virājate, tathā’pakvakaṣāyasya vijñānam na prakāśate. tathā “kāmagrāhagrāhītasya jñānamapyasya na plavaḥ”, iti. yadā tu mithyājñānam dagdhabījabhāvaṁ dagdhabījatvādeva vandhyaprasavaṁ kāryārambhākṣamaṁ sampadyate, tadā vidhūtakeśarajasā kleśā eva rajaḥ vidhūtaṁ yasya tadvidhūtakeśarajaḥ tasya sattvasya rāgādimalākalanīkitasya pararayāṁ vaśīkārasamjñāyām vartamānasya jñānaprasādamātre vartamānasya, tadevānuvadati – vivekapratyayappravāhaḥ vivekajñānanirantarabhāvaḥ nirmalo bhavati. sā vivekakhyātiḥ ittham bhūtā satī aviplavā bhavati, yadaivamaviplavā vivakakhyātiḥ tato mithyājñānasya dagdhabījabhāvopagamo viruddhatvāt, punaścāprasavaḥ mithyājñānasya dagdhabījabhāvopagamādeva, tathā cōktam –*

Bhoja says that “the discrimination (*viveka*) consisting of the understanding that “the *guṇa*-s are distinct, and the *puruṣa* is distinct,” the realization (*khyāti*) or clear understanding (*prakhyā*) of this, is the means or cause (*kāraṇa*) for his abandonment (*hāna*), the relinquishing of the pain (*duḥkha*) associated with the objective world (*drśya*). What kind of discrimination? Unwavering (*aviplavā*); that in which there is no wavering (*viplava*), interruption (*viccheda*), or intermittent rising up (*vyutthānarūpa*). The intent (*tātparyam*) here is this: through the power (*balāt*) of cultivating the opposing factors (*pratipakṣabhāvanā*), when ignorance (*avidyā*) dissolves, the internal (*antarmukhā*) transference (*saṃkrāntiḥ*) of the reflection of consciousness (*cicchāyā*) in the intellect (*buddher*) that is unoverwhelmed (*anabhibhṛtāyāḥ*) by the impurities (*malāna*) of *rajas* and *tamas*, and for which the pride (*abhimānāyāḥ*) in being a knower (*jñātṛtva*) and a doer has ceased (*vinivṛtta*), that is called discriminative discernment (*vivekakhyāti*). And when that is continuously (*saṃtatatvena*) present (*pravṛttāyām satyām*), the cessation of the purpose (*adhikāranivṛttiḥ*) of the objective world (*drśyasya*) certainly (*eva*) occurs, resulting in isolation (*kaivalyam*)²⁸⁶.

Rāmānanda Sarasvatī says that “discernment is the distinction between the seer (*dṛg*) and the seen (*drśya*); its knowledge is discrimination (*khyāti*); confusion (*viplava*) is false knowledge (*mithyājñāna*). Initially, a general discrimination (*vivekakhyāti*) arises from scripture (*āgama*), but it does not destroy ignorance (*avidyā*) such as the dewlap, etc., because it is indirect (*parokṣatvāt*). When that, being established by reflection (*manana*), is constantly practiced with the mind (*citta*) turned away from everything (*viraktena*) and facing the *puruṣa*, then, born at the culmination of the excellence of meditation (*dhyāna*), resembling a reflection of consciousness (*citpratibimbavatī*), taking the form of direct realization (*sākṣātkārarūpā*), destroying false knowledge along with its latent impressions (*savāsanamithyājñānaṃ nihantī*), being non-erroneous (*aviplavā satī*), (at the end) through cessation preceded by supreme detachment (*paravairāgyapūrvakanirodhena*), when the remaining impressions (*saṃskāraśeṣasya*) (of the mind) have accomplished their purpose (*kṛtakṛtyasya*), at the end of the karma that has begun to bear fruit (*prārabdhāvasāne*),

“bījānyagnyupadagdhāni na rohanti yathā punaḥ, jñānadagdhāistathā kleśairnātmā sampadyate punaḥ. ” iti, sā ca tādrśī vivekakhyātīr mokṣasya mārgo hānasyopāya ityarthah. 26.

²⁸⁶ anye guṇā anyāḥ puruṣa ityevaṃvidhasya vivekasya yā khyātiḥ prakhyā sā'sya hānasya drśyaduḥkha parityāgasyopāyaḥ kāraṇam, kīdrśī aviplavā na vidyate viplavo vicchedo'ntarā'ntarā vyutthānarūpo yasyāḥ sā'viplavā, idamatra tātparyam pratipakṣabhāvanābalādaavidyāpravilaye vinivṛttajñātṛtvakartṛtvābhimānāyāḥ rajastamomalānabhibhṛtāyā buddherantarmukhā yā cicchāyāsaṃkrāntiḥ sā vivekakhyātīrucyate, tasyām ca saṃtatatvena pravṛttāyām satyām drśyasyādhikāranivṛttirbhavatyeva kaivalyam,

through the door of absolute cessation (*ātyantikanivṛttidvārā*), it is the means of abolishing future suffering (i.e., liberation (*mokṣa*)) (*bhāviduḥkha hānasya mokṣasyopāya*), this is the meaning²⁸⁷.

Nārāyaṇatīrtha says that “the distinction between the seer (*dr̥g*) and the seen (*dr̥śya*) is discrimination (*viveka*), the manifestation (*khyātiḥ*) of that – the knowledge (*jñānam*) in the form of “the *guṇa*-s are different, and the *puruṣa* is different.” What is that like? It is unwavering (*aviplavā*), in which there is no disturbance (*viplava*), no inner suppression by impressions (*vāsanā*) born of false knowledge (*mithyājñāna*); it is of the nature of direct realization (*sākṣātkārarūpā*), and is the means to abandonment (*hānopāyaḥ*), the path (*panthā*) to liberation (*mokṣa*) which is the cessation of ultimate suffering (*ātyantikaduḥkhanivṛtti*), this is the meaning. The statement that this is the cause (*kāraṇam*) and the means (*upāya*) is because of the direct opposition between knowledge (*jñāna*) and ignorance (*ajñāna*). First, from knowledge comes the destruction of ignorance; then comes the cessation of the function (*adhikāranivṛttiḥ*) of *pradhāna*; then the dissolution (*laya*) of the mind (*citta*); then the destruction (*nāśaḥ*) of union (*saṃyoga*); then the non-origination (*anutpāda*) of suffering (*duḥkha*) – this is to make known the order (*krama*), this is the summary (*saṃkṣepaḥ*)²⁸⁸.

Bhāvagaṇeśa believes that “by means of the latent impression (*vāsanā*) of false knowledge (*mithyājñāna*), the internal overcoming is confusion (*viplava*); freedom from that, through discrimination (*vivekataḥ*), is the direct realization (*sākṣātkāra*) of *puruṣa*, which is the means to liberation (*mokṣopāyaḥ*) by way of uprooting ignorance (*avidyā*) along with its latent impressions (*savāsanā*)—this is the meaning. If it is argued that, in that case, there would be a deficiency (*vaikalyam*) of *asamprajñāta-yoga*, given the statement that liberation (*mokṣa*) arises from knowledge (*jñānāt*) alone, it is not so, because the intention is that *asamprajñāta* is included within knowledge (*jñāna*), by way of knowledge being the means

²⁸⁷ *dr̥gdr̥śyayorbhedo vivekastasya jñānam khyātiḥ, viplavo mithyājñānam, ādau khalvāgamātsāmānyato vivekakhyātirudeti, sāsñādyavidyāṃ na hanti paroḥsatvāt, yadā sā mananena sthāpitā satī sarvato viraktena puruṣābhīmukhena cittena nīrantaramabhyasyate tadā dhyānaprakaśaparyantajā citpratibimbavatī sākṣātkārarūpā savāsanamithyājñānam nīhantī aviplavā satī (ante) paravairāgyapūrvakanirodhena saṃskāraśeṣasya (cittasya) kṛtakṛtyasya prārabdhāvasāne ātyantikanivṛttidvārā bhāviduḥkha (hānasya mokṣasyopāya) (hānopāya) ityārthaḥ.*

²⁸⁸ *dr̥gdr̥śyayorbhedo vivekastasya khyātiḥ – anye guṇāḥ, anyāḥ puruṣa ityākāraṇam jñānam, sā kīdr̥śī, aviplavā, na vidyate viplavo mithyājñānanyavāsanābhirantarābhibhavo yasyāḥ sā sākṣātkārarūpā hānopāyaḥ, ātyantikaduḥkhanivṛttirūpamokṣasya panthā ityārthaḥ, kāraṇamiyī viḥāyopāya iti kathanam tu jñānājñānāyoreva sākṣādvirodhāt prathamato jñānādajñānānāśaḥ, paścāt pradhānasyādhikāranivṛttiḥ, tataścittasya layaḥ, tataḥ saṃyoganāśaḥ, tato duḥkhasyānutpāda iti kramajñāpanāyeti saṃkṣepaḥ.*

(*dvāratayā*)²⁸⁹. Nāgojībhāṭṭa thinks that “by the impression of false knowledge, there is a disturbance consisting of the suppression of internal [peace]; the discriminative discernment free from that is the means to liberation, [specifically] the realization of *puruṣa* (Self) arising from the discrimination of *prakṛti* (primordial nature), through the eradication of ignorance along with its impressions. If it is argued that in this way, the *śruti* (scripture) regarding liberation from knowledge alone would render *asamprajñāta* (*samādhi* devoid of cognitive content) fruitless, we reply no, because it is intended that it is included within knowledge as a means of knowledge”²⁹⁰.

Sadāśivendra Sarasvatī says that “unwavering discriminative discernment (*anyatākhyāti*) between *sattva* and *puruṣa*, which opposes ignorance (*avidyā*), is the cause of cessation (*hāna*) and liberation (*kaivalya*). This is the intended meaning of these two *sūtras*. Through the practice of the eight limbs (*aṣṭāṅga*) consisting of observances (*yama*) and disciplines (*niyama*) pursued with zeal (*ādhara*), continuously (*nairantarya*), and for a long time (*dīrghakāla*), when unwavering discriminative discernment between *sattva* and *puruṣa* arises, the five afflictions (*kleśa-s*) beginning with ignorance (*avidyā*), and the connection caused by them, are completely eradicated. The accumulations of wholesome and unwholesome actions (*kuśalākuśalakarmāśayā*) and their results (*vipāka*) are destroyed at their root. Then, with the cessation of discriminative discernment through supreme dispassion (*paravairāgya*) and with the mind turned back through the practice of *nirodhasamādhi*, liberation (*kaivalya*) arises for the unattached *puruṣa* in the form of abiding in its own nature (*svarūpapraṭiṣṭhā*)²⁹¹. Anantadevapaṇḍita says that “discernment (*viveka*): The unwavering (*aviplavā*) fame (*khyātiḥ*) or distinct knowledge (*prakhyā*) of the distinction between *puruṣa* and the *guṇa-s*, that is, that which is free from disturbance (*vigato'gatarā*), where disturbance (*viplavaḥ*) is of the nature of rising up (*vyutthānarūpaḥ*), is

²⁸⁹ *mithyājñānavāsanayā'ntarābhibhavo viplavastadrahito vivekataḥ puruṣasākṣātkāro mokṣopāyaḥ savāsanāvidyonmūlanadvāretyarthaḥ, nanvevaṃ jñānādeva mokṣa iti vacanādasamprajñātayogavaikalyamiti cenna, jñānadvāratayā jñānamadhya evāsamprajñātāntarbhāva ityāśayāditi.*

²⁹⁰ *mithyājñānavāsanayāntarābhibhavo viplavastadrahitā vivekakhyātiḥ prakṛtivyavekataḥ puruṣasākṣātkāro mokṣopāyaḥ savāsanāvidyonmūlanadvāretyarthaḥ, nanvevaṃ jñānādeva mokṣaśruterāsamprajñāto niṣphala iti cenna, jñānadvāratayā jñānamadhye tadantarbhāva ityāśayāt..*

²⁹¹ *aviplavā avidyāvirodhinī sattvapuruṣayoranyatākhyātirhānasya kaivalyasya heturityarthaḥ – ayam sūtradvayasyābhisandhyarthah – ādaranairantaryadīrghakālānubandhiyamaniyamādyaṣṭāṅgānuṣṭhānena sattvapuruṣānyatā-khyātākhyātāvaviplavāyām jātāyāmavidyādayaḥ pañca kleśāstatkṛtasamyogaśca samūlakāṣaṃ kaṣiṭā bhavanti, kuśalākuśalakarmāśayāstadvipākāśca samūlaghātāṃ hatā bhavanti, tataśca paravairāgyeṇānyatākhyātinivṛttau nirodhasamādhyabhyāsena citte nivartite sati puruṣasya nirlepasya svarūpapraṭiṣṭhārūpaṃ kaivalyaṃ bhavātīti.*

the means (*upāyah*) to cessation (*hānasya*) through the abandonment of what is to be seen (*dr̥śyaparityāgasya*)²⁹².

Vyāsa tells us that “discrimination (*vivekakhyāti*) arises from the realization of the difference between *sattva* and *puruṣa*. However, as long as mistaken knowledge (*mithyājñāna*) is not eliminated, it fluctuates. When false knowledge is reduced to the state of a burnt seed, incapable of sprouting, then, for the *sattva* that has shaken off the dust of afflictions (*kleśarajas*) and abides in supreme purity (*vaiśāradya*) and the ultimate state of mastery (*vaśīkārasamjñā*), the flow of discriminative awareness becomes stainless. This unwavering discriminative discernment (*vivekakhyāti*) is the means of release (*hānopāya*). From this comes the state of burnt seed for false knowledge and consequently, no further arising. This is the path to liberation (*mokṣa*), the means of release (*hānasyopāya*)²⁹³. Hariharānanda explains Vyāsa’s commentary further by saying that “Now, then, he states the means of abandonment: “*sattva*,” that is, having ascertained the intellect-*sattva* as merely the notion of “I am,” and then, separate from that, the experience of merely the *puruṣa* as the witness of even that is discriminative discernment (*vivekakhyāti*); because of the mind’s being absorbed in that, at that time, the manifestation of that discrimination, that manifestation, however, is unceasing due to false knowledge, meaning from inverted cognitions in the form of the “I-thought” (*aḥambuddhi*), the “mine-thought” (*mamattvabuddhi*), and the “I am”-thought (*asmītibuddhi*), it “floats.” When, through the exhaustion of the impressions of reversal, false knowledge becomes barren, meaning it no longer produces inverted cognitions, and thus, in the consciousness of supreme control, in the supreme state of desirelessness characterized by control, at that time the discriminative discernment of the present yogi becomes undisturbed; that is the means of attaining the abandonment of suffering; the rest is clear²⁹⁴.

²⁹² *viveketi, puruṣaguṇabhedaivivekasya yā khyātiḥ prakhyā aviṣlavā vigato’gatarā vyutthānarūpo viṣlavō yasyāḥ sā hānasya dr̥śyaparityāgasyopāyaḥ.*

²⁹³ *sattvapuruṣānyatāpratyayo vivekakhyātiḥ, sā tvanivṛttamithyājñānā plavate, yadā mithyājñānam dagdhabījābhāvaṁ vandhyaprasavaṁ sampadyate tadā vidhūtakleśarajasāḥ sattvasya pare vaiśāradye parasyām vaśīkārasamjñāyām vartamānasya vivekapratyayapravāho nirmalo bhavati, sā vivekakhyātiraviṣlavā hānopāyaḥ, tato mithyājñānasya dagdhabījābhāvopagamaḥ punaścāprasava ityeṣa mokṣasya mārgo hānasyopāya iti.*

²⁹⁴ *atheti hānopāyamāha sattveti, asmītipratyayamātram buddhisattvamadhigamya tato’nyatastasyāpi sākṣī puruṣa ityetanmātrānubhūtirvivekakhyātiḥ, tanmayattvāttadā tadvivekasya cetastanmayatvāt, tadā tadvivekasya prakhyātiḥ sā tu khyātiranivṛtta mithyājñānā aḥambuddhimamattvabuddhyasmītibuddhirūpebhyo viparyastapratyayebhya ityarthāḥ, plavate, yadā viparyayasamskāraḥ parasyām mithyājñānam vandhyaprasavaṁ bhavati viparyayapratyayān na prasūta ityarthāḥ, tathā ca paravaśīkārasamjñāyām vaśīkāravairāgyasya parāvasthāyāmityarthāḥ,*

There are two key words in this *sūtra*. An example of this is "*aviplava*," which means "devoid of *mithyājñāna* and *aviveka*." The other term is *vivekakhyāti*, which refers to a specific mental state in which *mithyājñāna* is absent and knowledge is entirely pure and true. Knowledge flows freely in this *vivekakhyāti* condition, with no interruptions or halts of any type. This condition is characterized by the absence of knowledge divisions and a continuous flow of knowledge. This pure, undisturbed, and uninterrupted flow of knowledge is comparable to the continuous flow of oil from one pot to another, where there is no interruption to the oil's flow. This continuous flow of the knowledge is called *aviplava*. *Vivekakhyāti* is the primary method of eradicating or erasing *avidyā*. *Dr̥śya* - *śakti* and *dṛg* - *śakti* are both autonomous and entirely distinct from one another. *Prakṛti* is totally detached from *puruṣa*. The primordial self of *puruṣa* is not manifested in the body, sense organs, mind, or egoism. The presence of pure consciousness of *puruṣa*, which is detached, pure, and solely awareness-existence, is the foundation for the original self of *puruṣa*'s pure conscious identity. The *puruṣa* understands that the *prakṛti* is not the source of the experience of I-ness, but rather the *puruṣa*'s pure consciousness-self. *Khyāti* is the term for this insight or understanding. The germ of *sukha* and *duḥkha*, which is *avidyā*, is eradicated when this *khyāti* (knowledge derived from the understanding of the difference between the genuine self of *puruṣa* and *prakṛti*) emerges.

So, the yogin no longer has a sense of *sukha* and *duḥkha* following the eradication of *avidyā*. The question now arises: how is this *vivekaja-prajñā* or *khyāti* attained? The study of sacred texts (*śāstra*) or the guidance or instruction of the guru are the initial sources of *vivekakhyāti*. The yogin then attempts to comprehend this arousing knowledge of *vivekakhyāti* by critically analyzing and reflecting on it using his mental logic and reasoning. The yogin's understanding of *vivekakhyāti* is strengthened and clarified compared to former periods following the application of critical contemplation on the subject. Following that, the understanding of *vivekakhyāti* is further developed and solidified via the practice of the eight limbs of yoga. By strengthening and purifying the knowledge of *vivekakhyāti*, the yogin achieves *saṃprajñāta-samādhi*. The *mithyājñāna* that was brought on by *avidyā* does not reappear when *saṃprajñāta-samādhi* occurs. All kinds of seeds are destroyed. There is no desire of any type (*viśaya-śakti*) when the germ of *mithyājñāna* is eliminated. There is no sign of the flow of desires in *citta* once all desires have been annihilated. To put it another way,

vartamānasya yoginastadā vivekakhyātiraviplavā bhavati, sā tu duḥkhaḥānasya prāptyupāyaḥ, śeṣamatirohitam.

citta becomes absolutely pure. The understanding of the truth of *vivekakhyāti* is generated in this absolutely pure *citta*. *Vivekakhyāti* is the name given to this genuine, unadulterated knowledge. The seed of *mithyājñāna* is totally destroyed when the awareness of *vivekakhyāti* emerges. *Aviplava- vivekakhyāti* is the name given to this *mithyājñāna* state that resembles roasted seeds. *Hāna* is brought on by this *aviplava- vivekakhyāti*, and *kaivalya* is brought on by this *hāna*.

Seven Types of Highest Revelations in *Vivekakhyāti*

Patañjali tells us that the yogin who has attained *vivekakhyāti* has seven types of highest realizations. According to *sūtra* 2.27, “the yogin’s true insight has seven ultimate stages” (Bryant’s translation)²⁹⁵. The seven unique revelations that the yogin experiences during the stage of *vivekakhyāti* are not mentioned by Patañjali. The names and specifics of these seven insights were likely well-known or prevalent at the time of Patañjali, which could be one explanation for why they were not included. The requirement that these unique insights be studied and applied under the supervision of a qualified guru could be another likely explanation. But, Vyāsa elaborates on these seven types of insights. Vyāsa comments on this *sūtra* by saying that “because of the removal of impurities, obstructions, and defilements, when no other perception arises in the mind, the *prajñā* (wisdom) of the *vivekin* (discriminating person) is sevenfold. (1) That is, *heya* (what is to be abandoned) has been fully known, and there is no further *parijñeya* (to be fully known) for him. (2) The causes of what is to be abandoned are exhausted, there is no further need to weaken them. (3) Cessation (*hānam*) has been directly realized through *nirodhasamādhi* (the *samādhi* of cessation), (4) the means of abandonment has been cultivated in the form of discernment. This fourfold (state) is the function of the *vimukti* (liberation) of *prajñā* (wisdom); the *cittavimukti* (liberation of mind), however, is threefold (*trayī*), with the *buddhi* (intellect) having fulfilled its purpose. Like stones falling from the mountain peak, the *guṇa-s* (qualities) are unstable, facing destruction in their own cause, they go to rest together with it. And there is no further arising of these dissolved ones, because there is no purpose. In this state, the *puruṣa* (Self) is beyond the connection of the *guṇa-s* (qualities), is pure light of its own nature, and is *kevalī* (alone). Seeing this sevenfold *prāntabhūbhiprajñā* (wisdom at the edge of the last stage), the *puruṣa* (Self) is called *kuśala* (skillful). Even in *pratiprasava* (involution) of the *citta* (mind), the liberated one is indeed *kuśala* (skillful) because he is beyond the *guṇa-s* (qualities)”²⁹⁶.

²⁹⁵ *Sūtra* 2.27: *tasya saptadhā prāntabhūmiḥ prajñā* .

²⁹⁶ *aśuddhyāvarāṇāmalāpagamāccittasya pratyayāntarānūtpāde sati saptaprakāraiva prajñā vivekino bhavati, tadyathā – parijñātaṃ heyam nāsyā punaḥ parijñeyamasti, kṣīṇā heyahetavo na punareteṣāṃ*

In this commentary Vyāsa explains these seven types of revelations. Vyāsa states that the word “*tasya*” in this *sūtra* indicates the particular yogin who has attained the *vivekakhyāti* stage of *sādhana*. These seven types of revelations appear before the yogin when there is no impurity in the form of *avidyā* which exists in the *citta*. These seven types of revelations are as follows:

First Type of Highest Revelation

According to Vyāsa, the first revelation which the yogin experiences is that the yogin has come to perfectly know what is to be abandoned (*heyam*). *Heyam* can mean both *duḥkha* and *samsāra* (which is full of suffering or which causes suffering). For the yogin, there is nothing else to be known when the yogin realizes that suffering is the main problem which is to be got rid off. Now the question arises that why is this a special revelation of the yogin because even those who have not attained *vivekakhyāti* also experience different types of suffering which can be physical, mental and spiritual. The answer is that it is special revelation because the yogin with *vivekakhyāti* sees every experiences of *sukha* and *duḥkha* as nothing but suffering. Yogin has realized that what seems to be *sukha* is actually the reason of suffering. In other words, *sukha* causes suffering whether it is in present time or in future. This realization is only for the yogin who has attained *vivekakhyāti*, not for other yogins. This is why it is said that all that is suffering which are to be got rid of has been completely understood.

Second Type of Highest Revelation

The *hetu* of *heya* (*heyahetava*) is *avidyā*. *Avidyā* has become much weakened (*kṣīṇā*). What Vyāsa means is that the cause of suffering which is *avidyā* has been perfectly weakened. There is no remaining portion of *avidyā* which needs to be weakened. It is mandatory to know the cause of suffering. Otherwise there is no way of escaping from suffering. Vivaraṇakāra explains Vyāsa’s commentary further that because of the plural usage, “*kṣīṇā heyahetava*” refers to both afflictions (*kleśa*) and actions (*karma*), the causes to be eliminated. However, even a small amount of these afflictions and actions should not be conceived of as remaining, because the fire of right seeing (*samyagdarśana*) has burned their seeds. This also indicates the ultimate state. Thus, since the correct understanding is present and the afflictions are exhausted, nothing remains to be destroyed. The understanding arises: “I have done what

kṣetavyamasti, sāksātkṛtaṃ nirodhasamādhinā hānam, bhāvito vivekakhyātirūpo hānopāya iti, eṣā catusṭayī kāryā vimuktiḥ prajñāyāḥ, cittavimuktistu trayī caritādhikārā buddhiḥ, guṇā giriśikharataṭacyutā iva grāvāṇo niravasthānāḥ svakāraṇe pralayābhimukhāḥ saha tenāstaṃ gacchanti, na caiṣāṃ pravilīnāṃ punarastyutpādaḥ prayojanābhāvāditi, etasyāṃavasthāyām guṇasambandhātītaḥ svarūpamātrajyotīramalaḥ kevalī puruṣa iti, etāṃ saptaavidhāṃ prāntabhūhiprajñāmanuṣyaṇpuruṣaḥ kuśala ityākhyāyate, pratiprasave’pi cittasya muktaḥ kuśala ityeva bhavati guṇātītatvāditi.

needed to be done," which is a sign of the maturation of right seeing. Just as when the cause of disease is destroyed in a sick person, the understanding arises: "I am healthy; there is no further need for medicine," so it is. Thus, the second aspect of wisdom has been described²⁹⁷.

Third Type of Highest Revelation

Vyāsa states that by the practice of *nirodha-samādhi*, the yogin has been able to experience the state of "*hāna*" which is equal to *kaivalya*. Vācaspati Miśra elaborates Vyāsa's commentary by saying that the yogin has the feeling: "I have directly realized and ascertained through direct perception in the state of *saṃprajñāta* that abandonment is achieved through *nirodha-samādhi*; there is nothing further to ascertain beyond this²⁹⁸". Vivaraṇakāra explains that because of its proximity to cessation (*hāna-pratyāsannatvāt*) and because its form is similar to cessation (*hāna-tulyarūpatvāt*), *nirodha-samādhi* itself is called cessation (*hānamityākhyāyate*), and that is directly experienced (*sākṣātkṛtam*), brought into the state of being an object of experience (*anubhavaviśayatāmānītam*), and that is concluded in *kaivalya*, and it is understood (*prajñāyate*) that *kaivalya* is to be accomplished. This too is a kind (*prakāraḥ*) of wisdom (*prajñā*) on the final stage (*prāntabhūmi*); the third has been explained (*trītiya ākhyātaḥ*)²⁹⁹.

Vijñāna Bhikṣu comments that the meaning is: "the causes of what is to be abandoned, such as ignorance (*avidyā*), desire (*Kama*), action (*karma*), etc., are exhausted by my discriminative discernment (*vivekasākṣātkāra*)."³⁰⁰ He states the third way: "realized (*sākṣātkṛtam*)."³⁰¹ And thus, the future liberation (*bhāvimokṣa*) in the form of the cessation of suffering (*duḥkhaḥāna*), caused by the *nirodha-samādhi* arising from the destruction of ignorance (*avidyā*) etc., is realized by me at the time of emergence (*vyutthāna*). "After the fall of the body, such will be my liberation (*mokṣa*)."³⁰² The realization of something similar is familiar in the destruction of the realization of another similar thing, as in the example of *asaṃprajñāta*yoga, liberation (*kaivalya*) is also practically seen. This is the resulting meaning. As it is heard, in *nirodhasamādhi*, the realization of cessation is not possible due to

²⁹⁷ *kṣīṇā heyahetava iti bahuvacanaprayogāt kleśāḥ karmāṇi ca abhidhīyante, na punareṣāṃ kleśakarmanāmalpamapi samyagdarśanapāvakādagdhabhijābhāvāt kṣe(dutprekṣi)tavyamasti, etenāpi prāntabhūmitvamevoktam, itthaṃ ca pratyupasthitasamīcīnapratyayasya kṣīṇakleśatvāt na kṣetavyamasti, kṛtakaraṇīyo'hamiti ca samyagdarśanaparipākalingapratyaya upāvartate, yathā rogāturasya rogaheṭuḥsaye nīrogo'haṃ na punarbhaisajyamastīti pratyayaḥ, evameva [śa] dvitīyaḥ prajñāprakāra uktāḥ.*

²⁹⁸ *sākṣātkṛtam pratyakṣeṇa niścitam mayā saṃprajñātavasthāyām eva nirodhasamādhisādhyam hānam, na punar asyāḥ param niścetavyam astīti.*

²⁹⁹ *hānapratyāsannatvāt hānatulyarūpatvācca nirodhasamādhireva hānamityākhyāyate, tacca sākṣātkṛtam anubhavaviśayatāmānītam, tadidaṃ kaivalye paryavasitam kaivalyaṃ kartavyamiti ca prajñāyate, eṣo'pi prāntabhūmiprajñāprakāraḥ trītiya ākhyātaḥ.*

the absence of mental activity (*vyrtti*). And the absence of suffering (*duḥkhābhāva*) at the time of *asamprajñāta* is directly experienced in the state of emergence (*vyutthāna*) through appropriate non-perception (*yogyānupalabdhi*). For if there were suffering (*duḥkha*) even in *asamprajñāta*, then it would be experienced, and then it would be remembered in the state of emergence (*vyutthāna*), just like waking up from sleep. Or, the cessation (*hāna*) that is accomplished by *nirodhasamādhi*, liberation (*mokṣa*), is directly perceived by *samprajñāta* which has cessation (*hāna*) as its object. This is the meaning³⁰⁰.

Fourth Type of Highest Revelation

Vyāsa states that the yogin has mastered the practice of *vivekakhyāti* which is the means of *kaivalya*. So, there is no other practice which needs to be mastered by the yogin. Vācaspati Miśra comments that the discrimination has been cultivated, accomplished; its form is discriminative discernment; it is the means of abandonment. Nothing further needs to be cultivated by it³⁰¹. Vivaraṇakāra explains that when discrimination (*viveka-khyāti*) is repeatedly practiced as the means of cessation (*hānopāyaḥ*), and the wisdom (*prajñā*) of the discriminating person ascertains that right seeing (*samyagdarśanam*) is present as it should be (*yathāvadupasthitamiti*), this is the fourth kind of wisdom (*caturthaḥ prajñāprakāraḥ*)³⁰².

According to Vyāsa, these four types of highest revelations are known as *kāryā-vimukti-prajñā*. Vyāsa does not explain what is meant by this phrase. *Kāryā* generally means actions. *Vimukti* means freedom or liberation. *Prajñā* means wisdom. From the literal meaning of these words, it seems that this phrase *kāryā-vimukti-prajñā* seems to suggest freedom or liberation from actions of *prajñā* or freedom attained thorough the actions of *prajñā*. Bhoja explains that such wisdom is called the pure knowledge that relates to the sphere of action and liberation from action³⁰³. What Bhoja means is that these four types of pure knowledge are the main function or action of the *prajñā* and during this time of arousal of four pure states or actions of *prajñā* in the *citta*, there does not exist any other impure types

³⁰⁰ *tataśca heyahetavo vidyākāmakarmādayo vivekasākṣātkāreṇa mama kṣīṇā ityādirarthaḥ, tṛtīyaṃ prakāramāha, sākṣātkṛtamiti, tataścāvidyādikṣayādutpannena nirodhasamādhinā hetunā vyutthānakāle duḥkhaḥānarūpo bhāvimokṣo mayā sākṣātkṛtaḥ dehapātānantarametādṛṣo me mokṣo bhaviteti sajātīyasākṣātkāra eva sajātīyāntarasākṣātkāravinaṣe paricitaḥ, asamprajñāta-yoga-dṛṣṭāntena kaivalyamapi dṛṣṭaprāyamiti phalitārthaḥ, yathāśrute nirodhasamādhau hānasākṣātkārānupapattirvyrttyabhāvāditi asamprajñātakālīnaśca duḥkhābhāvo yogyānupalabdhyā vyutthāne sākṣātkriyate, yadi hyasamprajñāte pi duḥkham syāt tadānubhūyeta tataśca suptothāna iva vyutthāne smaryeteti, athavā nirodhasamādhinā nispādyam hānam mokṣo hānagocarasamprajñātena sākṣātsatamityarthaḥ.*

³⁰¹ *bhāvito nispādito vivekakhyātirūpo hānopāyo nāsyāḥ paraṃ bhāvanīyam.*

³⁰² *samyagabhyastatarāḥ vivekakhyātirūpo hānopāyaḥ, samyagdarśanam yathāvadupasthitamiti niścītā cetprajñā vivekino jāyate sa eṣa caturthaḥ prajñāprakāraḥ.*

³⁰³ *īdṛśī prajñā kāryaviśayaṃ nirmalaṃ jñānam kāryavimuktirityucyate.*

of actions or functions of *prajñā* in the *citta* except these above mentioned four actions of the *prajñā* in the stage of *vivekakhyāti*. That is why these four revelations are called *kāryā-vimukti-prajñā* through which the yogin frees herself from all other impure actions of *prajñā* of the *citta*. According to Hariharānanda, this *kāryā-vimukti-prajñā* is obtained by the efforts (*prayatna*) of the yogin³⁰⁴. For Hariharānanda, *kāryā-vimukti-prajñā* is the results of the prescribed yogic *sādhana-s* for the yogin. After the description of the *kāryā-vimukti-prajñā*, Vyāsa tells us that there arises other three types of *prajñā* which are collectively called as *citta-vimukti-prajñā* which literally means the freedom or liberation from *citta* through *prajñā*. Last three types of revelations are as follows.

Fifth Type of Highest Revelation

Vyāsa states that yogin realizes that *buddhi* has fulfilled its purpose or function which is to offer *bhoga* (enjoyment) or *apavarga* (liberation). The cessation of *bhoga* is *apavarga*. *Buddhi* has brought the cessation of *bhoga*. I think what Vyāsa means is that the yogin has realized the extreme level of functioning of *buddhi* which has given an extreme level of experience to the yogin. After this extreme level of experience of the functioning of the *buddhi*, yogin is now not affected or driven or illusioned by the effects of *buddhi*. It is the effect of the *buddhi* which made the yogin realize that yogin is either in happy state or in suffering state. When the effect of the *buddhi* upon the yogin is over, there is no sense of *sukha* and *duḥkha*. Therefore, the purpose of *buddhi* which was to overwhelm the yogin by different levels of experiences of *sukha* and *duḥkha* is over. This revelation of the ineffectivity of *buddhi* is the first stage of *citta-vimukti-prajñā*.

Sixth Type of Highest Revelation

The yogin perceives that the three *guṇa-s*, the source of *buddhi*, are approaching the dissolution process during this level of enlightenment. Vyāsa compares it to the stones falling from the summit of a mountain. There is no support to prevent the stones from falling until they hit the earth after they fall from the mountain's summit. Similar to this, these three *guṇa-s* begin to shift from their manifested form to their unmanifest form due to the fulfilment of function of *buddhi*, which will finally cause the yogin's body and mind to dissolve. This revelation is the second stage of *citta-vimukti-prajñā*.

³⁰⁴ *eṣā catuṣṭayī kāryā prayatnaniṣpādyā vimuktiḥ, kāryavimuktiriti pāṭhe tu kāryāt prayatnāt vimuktirityarthaḥ.*

Seventh Type of Highest Revelation

Vyāsa informs us that in this state of movement of three *guṇa-s* towards unmanifest form, the yogin becomes detached from the *guṇa-s* (*guṇasambandhātīta*). This detachment from the *guṇa-s* results in the outburst of the shining light of the real nature of the yogin as a free lonely *puruṣa* -self. Vyāsa comments that these abovementioned seven types of highest revelations are observed by the *puruṣa* who is called *kuśala* (skillful yogin). Even at the time of involution (*pratiprasava*) of the *citta* into the unmanifest *prakṛti* the *puruṣa* remains *mukta* (liberated) and *kuśala* (skillful) due to the disconnection with the *guṇa-s*.

On the Meaning of Vyāsa's Enigmatic *Kuśala*

Here, Vyāsa discusses two types of *kuśala-s*. First type of *kuśala* seems to indicate the yogin who sees the highest seven types of revelation. These revelations are felt by the yogin who has attained the stage of *viviekakhyāti sādhana*. *Viviekakhyāti* is practiced by the yogin who has an active *citta* which means that the yogin is alive and mentally active. *Kuśala* is just an adjective of the expert or advanced yogi. In other words, *kuśala* is just an alternative term for the living yogin whose *prajñā* has reached a highest place of purity. Now question arises: is this yogin with pure *prajñā* liberated or not? It seems that Vyāsa is not clear in his answer while Patañjali seems to be clear that in this stage of pure *prajñā*, liberation is possible. Vācaspati Miśra explains this first type of *kuśala* of Vyāsa by saying that "In this state (of attainment of all revelations), a yogin, even while living, is called skilled and liberated, because it is his last body (*caramadehatvād*); thus the text says, "This." Vyāsa speaks of liberation in a non-figurative sense (*anaupacārikam*)³⁰⁵. Vācaspati Miśra does not give any kind of textual and logical justification for equating the first type of Vyāsa's *kuśala* with *jīvanmukta*. Vācaspati Miśra just quotes from Vyāsa's commentary of *sūtra* 4.3 in which Vyāsa tells us that "when the afflictions and actions cease, the wise man becomes liberated even while living"³⁰⁶. Vācaspati Miśra seems to hold the view that the first type of *kuśala* of Vyāsa is *jīvanmukta*, but here *jīvanmukta* does not mean attainment of *kaivalya* while living. It is the *jīvanmukti* stage because this is the last body of the yogin who will not take birth again. So, now the question arises: what does *mukti* mean in Yoga? The answer is that *mukti* is *kaivalya* in the *Yogasūtra*. Vācaspati Miśra clearly does not tell us that *jīvanmukta* has attained *kaivalya*. Following Vācaspati Miśra's line of interpretation, almost all the later Sanskrit commentators accept that the first type of *kuśala* is *jīvanmukti* stage, but lower than

³⁰⁵ *etasyām avasthāyām jīvann eva puruṣaḥ kuśalo mukta ity ucyate caramadehatvād ity āha--- etām iti. anaupacārikam muktam āha.*

³⁰⁶ *kleśakarmanivṛttau jīvann eva vidvān vimukto bhavati.*

the *kaivalya* stage. In other words, *jīvanmukta* does not attain *kaivalya*. From Vyāsa's commentary it is clear that the first type of *kuśala* is a living advanced yogin. It appears that first type of *kuśala* is not liberated. To be more specific, this *kuśala* is not completely liberated because *pratiprasava* (dissolution) is the prerequisite for attaining liberation.

According to Vyāsa, *pratiprasava* is the reverse of creation (*prasava*) and is an cosmological process of destruction. According to Vyāsa, in the instance of the second sort of *kuśala*, the *citta* of the yogin dissolves (*pratiprasava*) in the unmanifest *prakṛti*. The yogin transcends *guṇa*-s by this breakdown of the *citta*. In other words, when the physical body and mind dissolve, the yogin also dies. The disembodied yogin is fully freed in this moment of disintegration. According to Vyāsa, the yogin can also be referred to as a *kuśala* in this disembodied state. Specifically, the yogin becomes emancipated (*mukta*) *kuśala* for Vyāsa. The second kind of *kuśala* is this one. The description of the second type of *kuśala* raises the question of whether or not it is an cosmological dissolution process. Since *pratiprasava* in this context refers to *pradhanalaya*, which literally means the dissolution (*laya*) of all the constituents of three *guṇa*-s (*pradhāna*) into the unmanifest state of *avyakta-prakṛti*, Vācaspati Miśra affirms that the second type of *kuśala* must die in order to achieve *kaivalya*. By describing this liberation of the second type of *kuśala* as *videhamukti*, or freedom after the death of the physical body and mind, Hariharānanda endorses the viewpoint of Vācaspati Miśra. Hariharānanda states that upon the reabsorption (*pratiprasava*) of the mind (*citta*), in dissolution (*pralaya*) devoid of renewed arising, the liberated one (*mukta*) is skilled (*kuśala*), liberated from the body (*videhamukta*), because he has transcended the attributes (*guṇātītatvāt*), due to the absence of connection with the three attributes (*triguṇasambandhābhāvāditi*)³⁰⁷. Many scholars have supported the idea that *kaivalya* is *videhamukti*.

Surprisingly, however, the majority of scholars have not called attention to the Vyāsa's contradiction in defining the term or the idea of *kuśala* as a paradigm for distinguishing between two distinct forms of liberation: *videhamukti* and *jīvanmukti*. The first kind of *kuśala* seems to be comparable to *jīvanmukta kuśala*, who has achieved liberation in the domain of manifest *prakṛti*, according to Vyāsa's understanding. The second kind of *kuśala* according to Vyāsa is obviously *videhamukta*, who has achieved *kaivalya* in the domain of *avyakta-prakṛti*. The question then is now: how can these two kinds of *kuśala*-s be the same entity even if they operate in diametrically opposed and entirely separate domains? One possible response is that

³⁰⁷ *cittasya pratiprasave punarutthānahīne pralaye muktaḥ kuśalaḥ videhamukto bhavati guṇātītatvāt triguṇasambandhābhāvāditi.*

Vyāsa simply substitutes the term “*kuśala*” for *puruṣa*. Thus, the *puruṣa* is the one who attains *videhamukta* and *jīvanmukta*. Even if *kuśala* is thought of as a synonym for *puruṣa*, it is nevertheless difficult to comprehend why the same *kuśala* has two very different functioning domains. Because the first type of *kuśala* achieves liberation in the realm of manifest *prakṛti*, where he is connected to three *guṇa*-s because he is alive, and the second type achieves liberation in the realm of unmanifest *prakṛti*, where he is completely disconnected from manifest *prakṛti* because he is dead, it should be noted that the nature of these two types of *kuśala* liberation is entirely different and irreconcilable. Thus, even though Vyāsa employs the term *kuśala* as an alternative term for *puruṣa*, it seems that these two types of *kuśala*-s of Vyāsa cannot be the same being because they act in two totally different realms. In Vyāsa’s comments, the idea of *kuśala* being both *jīvanmukta* and *videhamukta* appears to be difficult and ambiguous.

Vijñāna Bhikṣu, on the other hand, attempts to explain how the same *kuśala* could be liberated in two different ways. Vijñāna Bhikṣu states that “instead of saying “one possessing wisdom (*prajñāvān*),” it is said, “seeing wisdom (*prajñām anupaśyan*),” to convey absence of pride (*nirabhimānatā*). The idea is that a *jīvanmukta* (liberated-while-living) sees the activity of the intellect (*buddhivṛtti*)—wisdom (*prajñā*)—merely as a witness, but does not identify with it. “Skilled (*kuśalaḥ*)” means auspicious (*kalyāṇaḥ*), because he has abandoned the intellect and its inauspicious partner (*akalyāṇabuddhipatnīparityāgāt*). The characteristics of a *jñānī* (one possessing knowledge), a *jīvanmukta*, have been stated in the *sūtra*. Now, incidentally, he states the distinction between that and one who is completely liberated (*paramamuktasya*): “*pratiprasava iti*”: even in the complete dissolution of the mind (*cittasya ātyāntaṃ laye API*), he remains skilled (*kuśalaḥ*), meaning he is completely separated from the qualities of *sattva*, etc. (*sattvādibhiḥ kuśalaguṇaiḥ atyantaviyogāt*). The “*Eva*” (indeed) emphasizes that even in the state of *jīvanmukta*, the opposed *akuśala* (unskillful) remains. Therefore, by “*ākhyāyata*”, it is explained that in the state of *jīvanmukta*, the skillfulness (*kuśalatvaṃ*) is secondary (*gauṇaṃ*), while here it is said that the skillfulness (*kuśalatvaṃ*) is primary (*mukhyaṃ*). But, in the *Gītā*, where it is said that “one who has renounced all undertakings is called beyond the *guṇa*-s,” this transcendence of the *guṇa*-s even for the knower refers only to being devoid of identification with the *guṇa*-s, just as the Supreme Lord is without qualities (*nirguṇatva*)³⁰⁸.

³⁰⁸ *prajñāvānityanuktvā prajñāmanupaśyanniti nirabhimānatāpratipādanāyoktaṃ, vuddhivṛttim prajñām sākṣibhāvenaiva jīvanmuktaḥ paśyati na tvabhimanyata ityāśayaḥ, kuśalaḥ kalyāṇo’kalyāṇabuddhipatnīparityāgāditi, jñānino jīvanmuktasya lakṣaṇaṃ sūtrenoktaṃ tatprasāṅgāt svayaṃ paramamuktasya tato viśeṣamāha, pratiprasava iti, cittasyātyāntaṃ layepi kuśala ityeva*

According to this interpretation, *kuśala* is *kalyāṇa*, which implies auspicious, according to Vijñāna Bhikṣu. According to Vijñāna Bhikṣu, a yogin's *kuśala* is a positive auspicious quality. It is evident that Vyāsa employs the phrase as an alternate appellation to denote the status of the accomplished or skilled yogin who has achieved or is on the path to *kaivalya*, rather than as a quality of the yogin. Vyāsa asserts that *kuśala* refers to the yogin himself rather than the yogin's virtues. Since the freed yogin has no qualities after the *videhamukti*, it is therefore impossible to distinguish between these two forms of liberations based on secondary or primary *kuśalatvaṃ*. Therefore, we are not at all benefited in understanding the meaning of *kuśala* as supplied by Vyāsa by the interpretation of Vijñāna Bhikṣu. When it comes to identifying two gradations between two liberated states (*jīvanmukta* as incomplete *mukta* and *videhamukta* as complete *mukta* (*paramamukta*), Vijñāna Bhikṣu does not provide any textual evidence from the *Yogasūtra* or logical reasoning from the yoga metaphysics.

It should be mentioned that, in Vyāsa's view, *kuśala* refers to the yogin himself rather than to the yogin's virtues. Since the freed yogi has no qualities after the *videhamukti*, it is therefore impossible to distinguish between these two forms of liberations based on secondary or primary *kuśalatvaṃ*. Therefore, we are not at all assisted in understanding the meaning of *kuśala* as supplied by the interpretation of Vijñāna Bhikṣu. When it comes to identifying two gradations between two liberated states (*jīvanmukta* as incomplete *mukta* and *videhamukta* as complete *mukta* (*paramamukta*), Vijñāna Bhikṣu does not provide any textual evidence from the *Yogasūtra* or logical reasoning from the yoga metaphysics. Vyāsa's intents and reasoning for using the term "*kuśala*" and its two distinct categories of freed situations are not explained in any way by Vijñāna Bhikṣu. There are numerous questions that Vijñāna Bhikṣu has yet to address.

What does the phrase "*kuśala*" signify, one might wonder? What makes Vyāsa add the entirely new word "*kuśala*" to his vocabulary? What is the unique function of the *kuśala* notion that other concepts cannot fulfill? Given that the goal of *vivekakhyāti* with varying degrees of ultimate insights is to eradicate *avidyā* rather than the *citta*, why does Vyāsa interpret *kaivalya* as having two types? In his commentary, Vyāsa does not provide a precise

bhavati, satvādibhiḥ sattvādibhiḥsa kuśalaguṇairatyantaviyogādityarthaḥ, evakāreṇa jīvanmuktadaśāyāmapī bādhitamakuśalam tiṣṭhatītyuktam, ata eva cākhyāyata ityanena jīvanmuktāvasthāyām gauṇam kuśalatvaṃ vyākhyāyātra bhavatītyanena mukhyaṃ kuśalatvamucyata iti, yattu gītāyām " sarvārambhavaritāgī guṇātītaḥ sa ucya " iti jñānino 'pi guṇātītatvamuktaṃ tad guṇābhimānaśūnyatāmātram parameśvarasya nirguṇatvavaditi.

definition or description of the term *kuśala*. For the first time in his commentary, Vyāsa uses the term *kuśala* in the context of the yogin's weakening states of the *kleśa* in *sūtra* 2.4. Vyāsa states that the seed of the *kleśa* is burnt by discernment (*prasamkhyāna*), it does not arise again even when the object is present. How can a burnt seed sprout? Therefore, one whose defilements (*kleśa*) are exhausted (*kṣīṇa*) is called *kuśala* and is in their final body (*caramadeha*)³⁰⁹. According to Vyāsa, *kuśala* is just a name or designation for the yogin who has successfully lessened the impact of the *kleśa*. There will be no further births from this *kuśala*. This *kuśala* yogin will achieve emancipation in her current existence, to put it another way.

This final birth is often referred to as the state of *jīvanmukta*. It is unclear from Vyāsa's commentary whether the *kuśala* yogin achieves *kaivalya* before to or following the death of the physical body if *jīvanmukta* refers to achieving *kaivalya* while living in the *Yogasūtra*. There is little doubt that *kuśala* denotes the skilled living yogin who has successfully counteracted the effects of deadening *kleśa*. *Kuśala*, according to Vyāsa, has nothing to do with *puruṣa* or liberated yogin. Instead, it shows how progressed the yogin's *sādhana* is. Remarkably, Vyāsa claims in the commentary of *sūtra* 2.27 that the yogin should be regarded as *mukta* and *kuśala* even after the dissolution of the *citta*, which denotes the yogin's death after he has gained liberation. It appears from our explanation of the idea of *kuśala* that opinions on what the term means are contradictory. While in *sūtra* 2.27 *kuśala* represents the liberated yogin as *puruṣa*, in *sūtra* 2.4 *kuśala* implies the highly evolved yogin who is not liberated. It is impossible for either liberated or unliberated yogin to be *kuśala* since their natures are so unlike and incompatible. I believe that the best way to reconcile this paradox is to comprehend *kuśala* as the liberated state of the living yogin. Therefore, a yogin who experiences *kaivalya* whether alive or dead might be referred to as *kuśala*. It should be mentioned that the yogin in *jīvanmukta* condition might be referred to as *kuśala* if we believe that *kaivalya* can be experienced in the world of *prakṛti*. The yogin can also be referred to as *kuśala* when *kaivalya* is experienced in the state of *videhamukti*, or unmanifest *prakṛti*. Thus, the idea of *kuśala* can be used as a bridge between *videhamukti* and *jīvanmukti*. But we have to keep in mind that Vyāsa must acknowledge that liberation in the *Yogasūtra* is both embodied and disembodied in order to comprehend *kuśala* as both *jīvanmukti* and *videhamukti*. Vyāsa's definition of *kaivalya*, which is uncompromisingly disembodied

³⁰⁹ *prasamkhyānavato dagdhakleśabījasya sammukhībhūte apy ālambane nāsau punar asti, dagdhabījasya kutaḥ praroha iti. ataḥ kṣīṇakleśaḥ kuśalaś caramadeha ity ucyate.*

emancipation, makes it challenging to deduce this answer. Nonetheless, this understanding of *kuśala* is possible in Patañjali's explanation of *kaivalya* in this chapter.

Knowledge-Oriented *Kaivalya* in the Second chapter

Although Vyāsa is reluctant to acknowledge this liberation as genuine liberation, Patañjali appears to allow for the possibility of liberation while living in *sūtra* 2.27. According to Vyāsa, emancipation must be *videhamukti* in the yoga metaphysics that is based upon the foundation of *Sāṃkhya* philosophy. For this reason, Vyāsa uses the idea of *kuśala* to demonstrate how Patañjali accepts a liberating condition while he is still alive, which is known as *kuśala* yogin. However, this yogin would finally be fully freed (*mukta kuśala*) once the yogin passes away. *Sūtra* 2.27, which appears to merely state that liberation is conceivable at the greatest degree of *vivekhyāti* stage, does not contain Vyāsa's conception of the two sorts of liberation. As Vyāsa interprets *sūtra* 2.27, it does not appear to be saying that the yogin's *citta* must be dissolved. I believe Patañjali is suggesting in *sūtra* 2.27 that *citta* is still functioning even after *kaivalya* is reached because *prajñā* takes place in the realm of *prakṛti*. So, it is possible that *kuśala* yogin attains *kaivalya* even while the *kuśala* yogin remains physically and mentally present in this world.

In order to comprehend Patañjali's message, let's examine *sūtra* 2.27. According to *sūtra* 2.27, the yogin undergoes seven different forms of utmost revelation (*prāntabhūmiḥ prajñā*) when they reach the stage of *vivekakhyāti*. The last stage of knowledge is an approximate translation of the phrase "*prāntabhūmiḥ prajñā*." The term "*prānta*" can refer to a verge, edge, border, end, extremity, or point. The term "*bhūmi*" can refer to state, condition, and situation. *Prajñā* can indicate judgment, discernment, wisdom, intelligence, and knowledge. "*Prāntabhūmiḥ prajñā*" seems to denote an individual whose level of knowledge has reached the extreme. According to Patañjali, there are seven stages in this advanced state of yogin wisdom.

The question now is: how can the yogin have seven more intense levels to traverse after achieving the highest level of knowledge? The explanation is that the yogin has no more knowledge to acquire after attaining the extreme level of awareness than by experiencing or sensing these seven distinct insights that arise during this time of being in the greatest state of knowing (*vivekakhyāti*). In this case, *prajñā* appears to have more to do with gaining the seven sorts of experiential feelings that constitute the yogin's greatest level of personal *sādhana* than it does with learning new information regarding anything in the world.

When Yogin is in the condition of *vivekakhyāti*, her *citta* experiences these seven different kinds of feelings. The highest degree of knowledge that a *yogin* can achieve is called *vivekakhyāti*.

One may now wonder why Patañjali makes the effort to bring up these human feelings. The likely explanation is that the person who is interested in yoga wants to learn what experiences people have during the *vivekakhyāti* stage. This *sūtra* clarifies that the yogin in the *vivekakhyāti* stage experiences these seven distinct feelings. These feelings are likewise experienced at the final level of *vivekakhyāti*'s development, according to this *sūtra*. As the primary prerequisite for achieving *vivekakhyāti*, the yogin also learns whether or not *kleśa-s* have turned into a burnt seed. It indicates that the yogin has successfully created a burnt-like stage of the *kleśa-s* if they experience these particular seven feelings. It indicates that the yogin's *kleśa-s* have not reached the *dagdhabīja* state if they experience different feelings in addition to these seven distinct ones. These seven categories of particular discoveries serve to validate the advancement of the yogic path of the *vivekakhyāti* stage, which culminates in *kaivalya*.

Now question is: what is *kaivalya*? In this chapter, Patañjali says that when there is the absence (*abhāva*) of connection (*saṁyoga*) between the *buddhi* and *prakṛti*, it should be understood as *kaivalya*³¹⁰. What causes this absence of *saṁyoga*? The absence of *avidyā* (corrupted knowledge) is the cause of this absence of *saṁyoga*. In other words, it is the *avidyā* which causes *saṁyoga* and this *saṁyoga* causes bondage. So, the aim of the yogin is to get rid of *avidyā* to free himself which is the attainment of *kaivalya*. The way or means of getting rid of *avidyā* is *vivekakhyāti*. To be more specific, it is the *aviplava-vivekakhyāti* which destroys *avidyā*. *Avidyā* is knowledge which is corrupted, not pure or truth revealing. In other words, *avidyā* is a wrong perception or knowledge in which *puruṣa* equates herself as *prakṛti*. *Puruṣa* thinks that all the activities of *prakṛti* are the activities of *prakṛti*. *Puruṣa* forgets that *puruṣa* is completely different from *prakṛti*. Due to this forgetfulness of the true identity of *puruṣa*, *saṁyoga* takes place. *Samyoga* causes bondage. Root cause of bondage is *avidyā*. *Avidyā* is destroyed by *vivekakhyāti* which is a realization of the yogin that she is different from the physical body, mind and *indriya-s* which make up our individual self. Whatever is seen (*dṛśya*) in external world and internal world of the yogin is *prakṛti*. The internal world of the yogin consists of Individual body (both *sthūla* and *sūkṣma*), mind and sense-organs. The

³¹⁰ *tadabhāvātsaṁyogābhāvo hānaṁ taddṛśeḥ kaivalyam.*

yogin is the *puruṣa* himself who is completely disconnected from all kinds of *prakṛti* manifestations including his physical body and mind.

Now the question arises: is this disconnection an cosmological or epistemological process of disconnection. In our present context, Patañjali indicates that this process of disconnection is an epistemological or psychological process because *vivekakhyāti* by which *kaivalya* is attained is an epistemological process. *Vivekakhyāti* happens to the living yoga practitioner, not to the dead person. *Vivekakhyāti* is a higher level of liberative knowledge which is acquired through *citta*. So, for possession of *vivekakhyāti*, *citta* is necessary. Existence of *citta* confirms that the yogin is living and yet the yogin has destroyed the *avidyā*. So, it is the attainment of *kaivalya* by the yogin while still living with physical body and mind. Patañjali clearly states that even in *vivekakhyāti* stage the yogin has seven specific types of *prajñā* which will eventually result in *kaivalya*. It must be reminded that *prajñā* is a function of *buddhi* in the yoga metaphysics. Existence of *buddhi* indicates that the liberated yogin is still in connection with *prakṛti* because *buddhi* is a manifestation of *prakṛti*. So, in this second chapter of the *Yogasūtra*, Patañjali seems to be saying that *kaivalya* is possible while living. In this chapter, Patañjali explicitly explains *kaivalya* in terms of acquiring true knowledge about the true nature of the yogin which is *puruṣa*. In our present context of attaining *kaivalya* through *vivekakhyāti*, *kaivalya* is *jīvanmukta*. So, it can be concluded that in this chapter, liberation is knowledge-oriented *kaivalya*. One may ask: is the *jīvanmukta* the last stage of *sādhana*? Patañjali does not discuss it but it appears that *jīvanmukta* still continues the flow of the practice of the *vivekhyāti*-knowledge in her life even after the attainment of *kaivalya*.

3. Purity-Oriented Type of *Kaivalya*

Patañjali again defines *kaivalya* in the third chapter which mainly focuses on the description of different supernatural power (*vibhūti*) which the yogin acquires during the developmental journey of his yogic *sādhana*. Patañjali says in *sūtra* 3.55 that “when *sattva* and *puruṣa* are equal in terms of purity (*śuddhisāmye*), it should be understood as *kaivalya*”³¹¹. Most of the commentators explain that in this particular *sūtra* 3.55, the term “*sattva*” refers to *buddhi*. They use the term *buddhi-sattva* to indicate the meaning of *sattva*³¹².

³¹¹ *sūtra* 3.55 *sattvapuruṣayoḥ śuddhisāmye kaivalyamiti*.

³¹² Vyāsa: “*nirdhūtarajastamomalaṃ buddhisattvaṃ...*”

Vācaspati:

Vivaraṇakāra: “*yadā nirdhūtarajastamomalaṃ... buddhisattvaṃ bhavati...*”

Vijñānabhikṣu: “*nirdhūto rajastamodravyarūpo malo yasya tattathā...*”

Śuddhi has been interpreted as purification. *Sāmya* literally means similarity or evenness or equality. Vyāsa understands *Sāmya* as *sārūpya* which can mean resemblance or sameness or similarity. The phrase “*śuddhisāmye*” indicates the equality or similarity in respect of the level of purity between *sattva* and *puruṣa*. Now the question arises: What does it mean by the purity of *sattva* and *puruṣa*? How do they become equal or similar in terms of purity (*śuddhisāmya*)?

Different Views Regarding the Meaning of Purity of *Sattva*

Most of the Sanskrit commentators agree that the purity of *sattva* (*sattva-śuddhi*) suggests the removal of the impurities of *raja* and *tama guṇa-s*. Vyasa explains that “when the quality of the intellect (*buddhisattva*) has its impurities (*mala*) of passion (*rajas*) and ignorance (*tamas*) washed away (*nirdhūta*), and when the function of *buddhi* is restricted solely to the realization of the distinction of the self (*puruṣa*), when the seeds of the afflictions (*kleśa*) are burnt away, then *buddhi* attains a state of purity which is equal to that of the *puruṣa*³¹³. According to Vyāsa, the purity of *sattva* or *buddhisattva* involves three activities of *buddhi*. However, it is unclear whether these activities occur sequentially or simultaneously. The first activity involves the *buddhi*’s dissociation from the impurities of *rajas* and *tamas*. During this dissociation, the *buddhi* appears to have a singular focus: to gain the knowledge that *puruṣa* is distinct from *prakṛti*. When this understanding of the difference between *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* emerges, the seeds of afflictions are incinerated. As these seeds are burned away, *sattva*, or *buddhi-sattva*, achieves purity. Following Vyāsa’s line of interpretation, Vivaraṇakāra,³¹⁴ Vijñānabhikṣu,³¹⁵ Sadāśivendra Sarasvatī,³¹⁶ and Rāmānanda Sarasvatī³¹⁷ opine that purity of *sattva* suggests the elimination of the impurities of *rajas* and *tamas*. Vivaraṇakāra³¹⁸ and Hariharānanda³¹⁹ think that the purity of *sattva* also indicates the burning the seeds of afflictions. Another shared meaning of the purity of *sattva* suggested by

Rāmānanda Sarasvatī: “*nirastasamastarajomālasya buddhisattvasya...*”

Sadāśivendra Sarasvatī: “*nirastasamastarajastamomālasya buddhisattvasya vivekakhyātyā*”

³¹³ Vyāsa Comments: “*yadā nirdhūtarajastamomalaṃ buddhisattvaṃ puruṣasyānyatāpratītimātrādhikāraṃ dagdhakleśabījaṃ bhavati tadā puruṣasya śuddhisārūpyamivāpannaṃ bhavati.*”

³¹⁴ Vivaraṇakāra: “*yadā nirdhūtarajastamomalaṃ... buddhisattvaṃ bhavati...*”

³¹⁵ Vijñānabhikṣu: “*nirdhūto rajastamodravayarūpo malo yasya tattathā*”

³¹⁶ Rāmānanda Sarasvatī: *nirastasamastarajomālasya buddhisattvasya.*

³¹⁷ Sadāśivendra Sarasvatī: *nirastasamastarajastamomālasya buddhisattvasya vivekakhyātyā.*

³¹⁸ Vivaraṇakāra: *dagdhakleśabījaṃ vinivṛttāvidyāpratyaavāsanārūpaṃ buddhisattvaṃ bhavati.*

³¹⁹ Hariharānanda: *vivekenādhikṛtaṃ dagdhakleśabījaṃ buddhisattvaṃ.*

Vācaspati³²⁰, Rāmānanda Sarasvatī³²¹ and Sadāśivendra Sarasvatī³²² is that the purified state of *buddhi* is the locus of *vivekakhyāti*.

It seems clear from the above discussion that Vyāsa's interpretation becomes a standard interpretation mostly to the other Sanskrit commentators. To clarify the functioning of this purified *buddhi*, Vācaspati provides an analogy of a mirror. He states that "through the elimination (*nivṛtti*) of *rajas* and *tamas*, *buddhi-sattva* attains a state of purity that makes *buddhi* fit for discriminative discernment (*vivekakhyāti*). At that moment, this *buddhi*, like a stainless (*nirmala*) mirror (*darpaṇa*), becomes capable of receiving the reflection (*pratibimbagrāhaka*) of the pure conscious *puruṣa*"³²³. For Vācaspati, the purity of *buddhi* is the epistemic ability of *buddhi-sattva* to gain *vivekakhyāti* and a glimpse of the true reflection of the true nature of *puruṣa* in the mind of the yogin. Vyāsa and Vācaspati seem to convey that purity of *buddhi* suggests the purified state of *buddhi* in the mind of the living yogin.

It is to be noted that *buddhi* itself is a product of *prakṛti* which is by default impure in its nature. Even if the commentators say that the impurities of *rajas* and *tamas* are washed away from the field of *buddhi-sattva*, is it actually possible to remove them completely because *citta* is made of three *guṇa*-s and they are alway in contact with each other unless or until the *citta* dissolves into unmanifest *prakṛti*? Therefore, how is it possible for *buddhi-sattva* to attain such an undisturbed purified state or condition of *citta* (mind) which will give the *citta* a direct access to such a level of purity which is similar to the *puruṣa*? Anticipating this question, Bhoja and Ananta Deva Paṇḍita seem to suggest a slightly different understanding of the purity of *sattva*. Bhoja and Ananta Deva Paṇḍita³²⁴ state that the purity of *sattva* means the removal of agency or doership and this state of purity of *sattva* can be reached when the *buddhi* returns to its original cause of *avyakta prakṛti*. Bhoja comments that "purification is the absorption of the *buddhi* into its own cause (*svakāraṇe'nupraveśa*) through the cessation of the conceit of being the universal agent (*sarvakartṛtvābhimānanivṛtṭyā*)"³²⁵. For Bhoja and Ananta Deva Paṇḍita, this purity of *sattva*

³²⁰Vācaspati: "sattvapuruṣānyatājñānaṃ sākṣātkaivalyasādhanaṃ,"

³²¹ Rāmānanda Sarasvatī: *nirastasamastarajomalasya buddhisattvasya vivekakhyātyā saṃskāraśeṣasya sarvavṛttiśūnyatvaṃ śuddhiḥ*.

³²² Sadāśivendra Sarasvatī: *nirastasamastarajastamomalasya buddhisattvasya vivekakhyātyā saṃskāraśeṣasya sarvavṛttiśūnyatvaṃ śuddhiḥ*.

³²³ Vācaspati comments: *rajastamonivṛtṭyā vivekakhyātiyogyam buddhisattvaṃ śuddhimāpadyate, tadā hi sattvaṃ nirmaladarpaṇavat puruṣapratibimbagrāhakaṃ bhavati*.

³²⁴ Ananta Deva Paṇḍita: *kartṛtvānivṛtṭyā svakāraṇe layaḥ*.

³²⁵ Bhoja comments: *sattvasya sarvakartṛtvābhimānanivṛtṭyā svakāraṇe'nupraveśaḥ śuddhiḥ*.

is related to the cosmological dimension of purity of the *buddhi*. In other word, *buddhi* can possibly be pure when *buddhi* dissolves into unmanifest *prakṛti*.

Some commentators hold the view that the purity of *sattva* indicates the cessation of all mental modifications (*vṛtti*). Rāmānanda Sarasvatī states that “purity of *sattva* means the emptiness of all activities (*sarvavṛttiśūnyatvaṃ*) regarding the remaining formative forces (*saṃskāraśeṣa*)”³²⁶. Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha comments that “purity of *sattva* indicates the absence of all mental fluctuations (*sarvavṛttirāhitya*) due to the fact that the mind's governing influence has been brought to an end (*samāptādhikāratvena*)”³²⁷. Another different interpretation is that the purity of *sattva* denotes the removal of egoism (*abhimāna*). Nāgojī Bhaṭṭa believes that “when the *citta* also becomes free from ego (*nirabhimāna*), then *citta* consists only in the discernment of the difference between the fundamental quality of *sattva* and the pure conscious *puruṣa* (*tat sattvapuruṣānyatākhyāti mātrādhikāra*)”³²⁸. Bhavagaṇeśa comments that “Just as a witness (*sākṣī*) is free from ego (*nirabhimāna*), in the same way, the *citta* becomes devoid of ego through its devotion to discernment (*vivekaniṣṭhā*)”³²⁹. Vācaspati reminds that this purity of *sattva* is helpful for gaining knowledge rather than direct liberation itself. He comments that “through the gateway of the purification of *sattva-buddhi* (*sattvaśuddhi*), the sovereignty (*aiśvarya*) and primordial wisdom (*jñāna*) born from this meditative absorption (*samādhi*) have been introduced”³³⁰.

Although there are some disagreements among the Sanskrit commentators, they accept a common doctrinal framework regarding the concept of the purity of *sattva*. Sometimes, they emphasize a different dimension of this purification of *sattva* in some places. Besides the meaning of purity of *sattva*, there is another important concept of purity of *puruṣa* which needs our attention. While there are mostly agreements among the general understanding of the meaning of the purity of *puruṣa*, there are also some nuanced interpretations of the concept of purity of *puruṣa*.

³²⁶ Rāmānanda Sarasvatī: *saṃskāraśeṣasya sarvavṛttiśūnyatvaṃ śuddhiḥ*.

³²⁷ Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha: *sattvasya samāptādhikāratvena sarvavṛttirāhityaṃ śuddhiḥ*.

³²⁸ Nāgojī Bhaṭṭa: *cittamapi yadā nirabhimānaṃ bhavati tadā tatsattvapuruṣānyatākhyātimātrādhikāraṃ*.

³²⁹ Bhavagaṇeśa: *yathā sākṣī nirabhimāna evaṃ cittaṃ nirabhimānaṃ bhavati vivekaniṣṭhayā*.

³³⁰ Vācaspati: *sattvaśuddhidvāreṇaitatsamādhijamaiśvaryaṃ jñānaṃ copakrāntam*.

Different Views Regarding the Meaning of Purity of *Puruṣa*

Most of the Sanskrit commentators seem to agree that purity of *puruṣa* suggests the absence of attributed or superimposed or metaphorical (*upacarita*) experience or enjoyment (*bhoga*). Vyāsa explains that “the purity of *puruṣa* indicates when the falsely attributed (*upacarita*) experience or enjoyment disappears”³³¹. Several later commentators such as Bhoja,³³² Ananta Deva Paṇḍita,³³³ seem to adopt this explanation of Vyāsa as a standard interpretation for the meaning of purity of *puruṣa*. Following this line of standard interpretation, Nāgojī Bhaṭṭa comments that “For the *puruṣa*, purification is the absence of experienced objects of enjoyment, achieved through the relinquishment of the ego's identification with such experiences”³³⁴.

Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha adds that for the purification of the *puruṣa*, both the absence of enjoyership and the absence of enjoyment are necessary. He states that “the purity of the *puruṣa* consists in its being devoid of the state of being an experiencer (*tadbhokṛtvādirāhitya*) and other such qualities”³³⁵. The question may arise: does this imply that the *puruṣa* experiences or enjoys life in a manner similar to that of the embodied *puruṣa*? Vijñānabhikṣu clarifies that “the purity of the *puruṣa* consists in the absence of the experience known as a specific cognition (*pratyayaviśeṣa*), which is merely attributed (*upacaritamātra*) to the *puruṣa*”³³⁶. Vijñānabhikṣu clearly explains that this enjoyment of *puruṣa* is only figurative. In a similar way, another group of scholars such as Rāmānanda Sarasvatī and Sadāśivendra Sarasvatī understand that the purity of *puruṣa* indicates the absence of imagined (*kalpita*) experience. Rāmānanda Sarasvatī³³⁷ and Sadāśivendra Sarasvatī³³⁸ comment that “even for the individual *puruṣa*, who is eternally pure (*nityaśuddha*), then, purity is the state of being free from constructed or imagined enjoyment or experience (*kalpitabhogaśūnyatva*)”.

³³¹ Vyāsa: *puruṣasyopacaritabhogābhāvaḥ śuddhiḥ*.

³³² Bhoja: *puruṣasya śuddhirupacaritabhogābhāva iti*.

³³³ Ananta Deva Paṇḍita: *puruṣasyopacaritabhoganivṛttyā kaivalyaṃ mokṣo bhavati*.

³³⁴ Nāgojī Bhaṭṭa: *puruṣasyopacaritābhimānatyāgenopacaritabhogābhāvaḥ śuddhiḥ*.

³³⁵ Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha: *puruṣasya tadbhokṛtvādirāhityaṃ śuddhiḥ*.

³³⁶ Vijñānabhikṣu: *buddhidharmatvāt puruṣa upacaritamātrasya pratyaya viśeṣākhyabhogasyābhāvaḥ puruṣasya śuddhiḥ*.

³³⁷ Rāmānanda Sarasvatī: *puruṣasyāpi nityaśuddhasya tadā kalpitabhogaśūnyatvaṃ śuddhiḥ*.

³³⁸ Sadāśivendra Sarasvatī: *puruṣasyāpi nityaśuddhasya tadā kalpitabhogaśūnyatvaṃ śuddhiḥ*.

On the other hand, there are also some unique or different interpretations regarding the meaning of purity of *puruṣa*. For example, Bhavagaṇeśa suggests that the purity of *puruṣa* means the absence of egoistic identification. He explains that “the purity of *puruṣa* indicates the absence of egotism (*nirabhimānatva*)”³³⁹. Bhavagaṇeśa seems to point out that this absence of ego is actually not the complete cessation of experience of the external world by the embodied *puruṣa*, but rather a psychological detachment from the experiences that affect the embodied *puruṣa*. For Hariharānanda, purity of *puruṣa* is the embodied *puruṣa*’s dissociation of mental modifications (*vṛtti*). Hariharānanda comments that “the secondary (*gauṇa*) purity of a pure *puruṣa* consists in the absence of transgressions (*apacārahīnatā*) and the non-perception of any similarity to the conduct [of the impure]”³⁴⁰. What Hariharānanda intends to indicate that purity of *puruṣa* is the realization that embodied *puruṣa* is different from the *vṛttis*. In other words, it is a cognition that I am not the *vṛttis*.

However, one may object to Hariharānanda’s argument by asking that is it not the case that cognition is an act of *buddhi* which is a manifestation of the *prakṛti*? Then how could we attribute that activity of *buddhi* to the *puruṣa* itself? Most of the commentators do not pay heed to the fundamental problem of the idea of *puruṣa*’s purity. If it is believed that *puruṣa* is intrinsically pure, then, why does Patañjali’s talk about the purity of *puruṣa* again?. Many commentators answer this question by saying that this purity concept about the *puruṣa* has been used metaphorically or figuratively. Even if we accept this argument, then another question arises: what is the purpose of this specific metaphor used in this *sūtra*? Commentators do not explain this purpose. Other commentators who assert that the purity of *puruṣa* signifies a lack of egotism, enjoyment, or enjoyership do not clarify how *puruṣa* could possess egotism, given that *puruṣa* transcends any form of agency or agentship. Patañjali does not define or explain the concept of purity of *puruṣa* and purity of *sattva* explicitly. But he explicitly mentions that when there is an equality in the level of purity between the *puruṣa* and *sattva*, this equality of purity (*śuddhisāmye*) should be understood as *kaivalya*. Therefore, the purity of *puruṣa* and *sattva* is directly connected to the concept of *kaivalya* in *sūtra* 3.55. *Kaivalya* has been interpreted in different ways by the different commentators.

³³⁹ Bhavagaṇeśa: *nirabhimānatvaṃ puruṣasyātra śuddhiḥ*.

³⁴⁰ Hariharānanda: *puruṣasya śuddhasya gauṇī śuddhirapacārahīnatā vṛttisārūpyāpratītiḥ*.

Different Views Regarding the Meaning of *Kaivalya* in *Sūtra* 3.55

All commentators agree that in this *sūtra* 3.55, *kaivalya* has been explained as a particular state which arises from the equality of *buddhi-sattva* and *puruṣa*. But they seem to have some different views regarding the nature of *kaivalya*. Vyāsa says that when purity of *sattva* and purity of *puruṣa* is in equal state, “in this state (*etasyāṃavasthāyām*), absolute liberation (*kaivalya*) occurs”³⁴¹. Most of the commentators such as Bhoja³⁴², Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha³⁴³, Vācaspati³⁴⁴, Vijñānabhikṣu³⁴⁵ completely follow Vyāsa’s interpretation. One may ask, is it the actual liberation (*mokṣa*) that is referred to as *kaivalya* in this *sūtra*? Is it a higher and special yogic state that is different from *mokṣa*? All the commentators explicitly declare that the *kaivalya* mentioned in this *sūtra* refers to the ultimate goal of spiritual liberation of the *Yogasūtra*, which is *kaivalya*, which is otherwise known as *mokṣa* in other Indic philosophies. Many commentators such as Bhoja,³⁴⁶ Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha,³⁴⁷ Ananta Deva Paṇḍita,³⁴⁸ and Bhavagaṇeśa³⁴⁹ directly use the term “*mokṣa*” to indicate the attainment of highest spiritual goal which is referred to as *kaivalya* in the *Yogasūtra*.

Regarding the nature of *kaivalya*, Vyāsa states that “because of the absence of defilements, there is an absence of the ripening of *karma* (*kleśābhāvātkarmavipākābhāva*), since the *guṇa*-s have fulfilled their purpose, they no longer present (*upatiṣṭhante*) themselves as objects of perception or experience (*dṛśyatvena*) to the conscious *puruṣa*; that is the isolation of the *puruṣa*, and at that time, the *puruṣa* becomes solitary, a pure light consisting of its own essential nature. That is the absolute liberation of the *puruṣa*; then the *puruṣa*, free from impurity (*amala*) and being the light of its own essence alone (*svarūpamātraḥ*), becomes isolated (*kevalī*)”³⁵⁰. Vyāsa makes it clear that in the state of *kaivalya*, the *puruṣa* becomes lonely because the *guṇa*-s withdraw themselves from the purview of *puruṣa*. In other words, *guṇa*-s cease their functionalities for the embodied *puruṣa* which seems to suggest the ontological dissolution of all *prakṛtic* entanglements of the

³⁴¹ Vyāsa: *etasyāṃavasthāyām kaivalyaṃ bhavati*.

³⁴² Bhoja: *dvayoḥ samānāyām śuddhau puruṣasya kaivalyamutpadyate*.

³⁴³ Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha: *evam samānāyām śuddhau puruṣasya kaivalyaṃ mokṣo bhavati*.

³⁴⁴ Vācaspati: *sattvapuruṣayoḥ śuddhisāmye kaivalyamiti*.

³⁴⁵ Vijñānabhikṣu: *yadā śuddhirvakṣyamāṇārūpā vivekāśātkārādbhavati tadaiva mokṣo*.

³⁴⁶ Bhoja: *kaivalyamutpadyate mokṣo bhavatītyarthaḥ*.

³⁴⁷ Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha: *kaivalyaṃ mokṣo bhavati*.

³⁴⁸ Ananta Deva Paṇḍita: *kaivalyaṃ mokṣo bhavatītyarthaḥ*.

³⁴⁹ Bhavagaṇeśa: *tadaiva mokṣo bhavati*.

³⁵⁰ Vyāsa: *kleśābhāvātkarmavipākābhāvaḥ. caritādhikārāścaittasyāṃavasthāyām guṇā na puruṣasya punardṛśyatvenopatiṣṭhante, tatpuruṣasya kaivalyaṃ, tadā puruṣaḥ svarūpamātraḥ kevalī bhavati*.

puruṣa. This dissolution indicates the dissolution of the *citta* and physical body of the embodied *puruṣa*. What Vyāsa seems to imply is that *kaivalya* in this *sūtra* 3.55 is disembodied liberation (*videhamukti*). Vyāsa interprets *kaivalya* in this *sūtra* in an ontological sense. Many of the commentators agree with this ontological interpretation of Vyāsa. For example, Vivaraṇakāra also states that *guṇa*-s do not present themselves before the *puruṣa* when *kaivalya* is attained³⁵¹.

From a slightly different perspective, Hariharānanda explains that “the seer (*draṣṭṛ*) remains in a state of absolute solitude (*kevalāvasthāna*) once the objects of perception (*dr̥śya*) have dissolved (*vilaya*)”³⁵². For Hariharānanda, *kaivalya* is the isolation of the seer from the seen. He seems to interpret *kaivalya* in a phenomenological way. According to Hariharānanda, *kaivalya* is not directly the ontological dissolution of the *guṇa*-s, but rather the phenomenological dissolution of the *prakṛtic* objects of perception for the *puruṣa*. However, Rāmānanda Sarasvatī gives a completely different definition of *kaivalya*. He comments that “*kaivalya* indicates the “non-arising of future suffering (*anāgataduḥkhānutpādarūpa*) when ignorance ceases (*avidyānivṛtti*) through the mere direct realization of the Self as distinct from the intellect (*buddhivilakṣaṇapuruṣasākṣātkāramātra*)”³⁵³. For Rāmānanda Sarasvatī, *kaivalya* means the permanent relief from the upcoming sufferings in this *sūtra*. He seems to interpret *kaivalya* in an epistemological way.

It is interesting to note that while the Sanskrit commentators explain the different nature of *kaivalya* in this *sūtra* 3.55, they also discuss the relation between *kaivalya* and *siddhi* (supernatural ability). It should be noted that this *sūtra* does not directly mention the term “*siddhi*.” The question arises: why do the commentators suddenly bring up the topic of *siddhi* in the explanation of this *sūtra*? Vijñānabhikṣu clarifies this doubt by commenting that “Patañjali mentions “by means of the purification of *sattva* (*sattvasuddhivāreṇeti*). The purification of the *sattva* refers to the purification of the *buddhi-sattva*, such as dispassion and so on; the remaining thought is that [this is mentioned] because of its utility for liberation through that [purification]. Sovereignty is the power of action, such as the ability to become minute (*aṇimā*); knowledge up to discriminative discernment has been declared through the collection of aphorisms; however, in the highest sense, absolute liberation occurs through a

³⁵¹ Vivaraṇakāra: *caritādhikārācāitasyāmavasthāyām guṇāḥ, na puruṣasya punarddaśyatvenātiṣṭhante, tat puruṣasya kaivalyam*.

³⁵² Hariharānanda: *dr̥śyānām vilayād draṣṭuḥ kevalāvasthānam*.

³⁵³ Rāmānanda Sarasvatī: *kaivalyam tu buddhivilakṣaṇapuruṣasākṣātkāramātrāt avidyānivṛtttau anāgataduḥkhānutpādarūpaṃ siddhyatītyarthaḥ*.

visible process such as the cessation of ignorance and so on, resulting specifically from the knowledge of the distinction between the *puruṣa* and the *sattva*”³⁵⁴. One may ask: what is the relation between *kaivalya* and *siddhi*? One possible reply could be that this chapter is titled as “*vibhūti-pāda*” (chapter on supernatural ability). So, it could be a clarification from the commentators that *kaivalya* should not be understood as *siddhi/vibhūti*. Another clarification may be that *siddhi* do not cause *kaivalya*. While most of the Sanskrit commentators agree that *siddhi-s* are not necessary for the attainment of *kaivalya*, they highlight differences in their relationship.

On the Relation of *Siddhi* with *Kaivalya*

Most Sanskrit commentators explicitly state that *kaivalya* is not dependent on *siddhis*. Vācaspati remarks that for the attainment of *kaivalya*, “there is no dependence (*apekṣā*) whatsoever upon supernatural powers (*vibhūti*)”³⁵⁵. In a similar way, Nāgojī Bhaṭṭa confirms that it does not matter whether one has gained *siddhi-s* or not, liberation certainly (*avaśyaṃ*) takes place³⁵⁶. Most commentators such as Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha,³⁵⁷ Vijñānabhikṣu,³⁵⁸ and Bhavagaṇeśa³⁵⁹ clearly accept the view that *siddhi-s* are not prerequisite for the attainment of *kaivalya*. While there is complete consensus among the commentators that *siddhi-s* are not directly the reason or cause of liberation, there is disagreement among the Sanskrit commentators regarding the indirect or secondary role of *siddhi-s* in the attainment of *kaivalya*.

The question arises: is *siddhi* entirely irrelevant in the process of attainment of *kaivalya*. In other words, is there any kind of role of *siddhi* to play in the attainment of highest goal of yogic journey namely *kaivalya*? Some commentators explicitly mention that *siddhi* is completely irrelevant for the attainment of *kaivalya*. Nāgojī Bhaṭṭa comments that “one might object that for someone practicing yoga, the attainment of spiritual powers (*siddhi*) will certainly occur; however, this is not so, because dispassion (*vairāgya*) toward those *siddhi-s* acts as an obstacle (*pratibandhaka*), preventing their arising (*anutpāda*). Someone else might also argue that the failure of these *siddhi-s* to arise is due to the obstruction caused by past

³⁵⁴ Vijñānabhikṣu: *sattvasuddhidvāreṇeti, sattvasya buddhisattvasya śuddhirvairāgyādi tadvāreṇa mokṣopayogitayeti śeṣaḥ, aiśvaryaṃ kriyāśaktirañimādi, jñānaṃ vivekajñānāntaṃ proktaṃ sūtrajātena, paramārthatastu sattapuruṣānyatājñānādevājñānādinivṛttyādirṣṭadvārā kaivalyamityarthaḥ.*

³⁵⁵ Vācaspati: *na vibhūtiṣu kācidapekṣā ’sti.*

³⁵⁶ Nāgojī Bhaṭṭa: *prāptasiddhervā ’prāptasiddhervā avaśyaṃ mokṣo bhavati.*

³⁵⁷ Rāmānanda Sarasvatī: *na tatra siddhyapekṣetyarthaḥ.*

³⁵⁸ Vijñānabhikṣu: *mokṣo na tatra siddhyapekṣetyarthaḥ.*

³⁵⁹ Bhavagaṇeśa: *na tatra siddhyādyapekṣetyarthaḥ.*

sins (*tatpratibandhakapāpa*)”³⁶⁰. Nāgojī Bhaṭṭa clarifies that *siddhi*-s are not at all important for the attainment of *kaivalya* because even *kaivalya* can be attained without the arousal of any *siddhi*. He presents two reasons for preventing the rise of *siddhi*-s: one is the practice of *vairāgya* and other is the bad deeds of past life or lives. These two reasons may even be responsible for unproductivity of any kind of *siddhi* in the process of attainment of *kaivalya*. Therefore, *siddhi*-s are completely irrelevant and serve no function at all for the attainment of *kaivalya*. On the contrary, some commentators seem to argue that *siddhi*-s are not completely useless. Vācaspati states that “the *siddhi*-s are not entirely without a cause in regards to liberation, yet they are not the direct cause”³⁶¹. Vijñānabhikṣu also thinks that *siddhi*-s are indirectly useful as a process of purification.

Besides the usefulness of the *siddhi*-s in attaining *kaivalya*, another important question arises: Can a yogin prevent the arousal of *siddhi*-s? Vivaraṇakāra answers that *siddhi*-s arise naturally and are consequential or incidental (*ānuṣaṅgika*). In contrast, Nāgojī Bhaṭṭa argues that *siddhi*-s are not inherent results, as they can be prevented from arising through the practice of *vairāgya*, which serves as an obstacle to their emergence. The commentators appear to be divided into two distinct groups. One group contends that *siddhi*-s are natural byproducts of practice, while the other group asserts that *siddhi*-s do not always arise naturally.

Another important question arises: what might be the possible reasons for the emergence of these *siddhi*-s? Rāmānanda Sarasvatī tells us that *siddhi*-s are presented solely to foster faith (*śraddhotpādanārtha*)³⁶². However, he does not clarify what he means by "faith." He may be referring to faith in the validity of the yogic path. Alternatively, he might mean faith in the progressive development of the yogin. In other words, the emergence of *siddhi*-s serves as a form of assurance that the yogin is advancing in her spiritual journey from lower stages of perfection to higher ones.

Even though these commentators clarified a few important points about the meaning of this *sūtra*, many doubts and questions still need to be addressed. Every commentator agrees that the word "*sattva*" in this *sūtra* refers to *buddhi-sattva*, and that "*sattva*'s" purity (*sattva-śuddhi*) indicates that *sattva* is free from the link between the *raja* and *tama* *guṇa*

³⁶⁰ Nāgojī Bhaṭṭa: *nanu yogamabhyasyataḥ siddhiravaśyaṃ bhaviṣyatyeveticenna siddhiṃ prati vairāgyasya pratibandhakatvena tadanutpādāt, tatpratibandhakapāpāttadanutpattirityapi kaścit.*

³⁶¹ Vācaspati: *nātyantamahetavaḥ kaivalye vibhūṭayaḥ kiṃtu na sāksāt.*

³⁶² Rāmānanda Sarasvatī: *tattadvibhūṭayastu śraddhotpādanārthamupanyastāḥ.*

impurities. The fact that no commentators clarify why this *sattva* should be interpreted as *buddhi-sattva* is significant. Even if *buddhi-sattva* is interpreted as *buddhi* that is controlled by *sattva-guṇa*, *buddhi* cannot always be controlled by *sattva-guṇa* since, if the *sattva-guṇa* loses control over the functionality of *buddhi*, *rajas* and *tamas* will once more control *buddhi*. The concept of *kaivalya*, in which there is no chance of *sattva* changing, is used to describe this "*sattva*" state. Since *buddhi* is a byproduct of *prakṛti*, where change is the sole constant state, *buddhi-sattva* cannot be a stable condition of *buddhi*. As a byproduct of the malleable *prakṛti*, *buddhi-sattva* cannot be immutable in the current situation. Every *prakṛtic* manifestation has three *guṇa-s* in varying amounts, and at any one time, the yogin is dominated by one of these three *guṇa-s*. To keep *prakṛti* functioning, these three *guṇa-s* constantly interact with one another. It is important to remember that *guṇa-s* are fluid and constantly changing by nature, and that no single *guṇa*—regardless of its specific qualities—can ever fully control *buddhi*. There is a possibility that this *sattva*-state could transform from *buddhi-sattva* to *buddhi-raja* or *buddhi-tama* if *sattva* is seen as *buddhi-sattva*. One could respond that in this context, *buddhi-sattva* is merely a *kaivalya*-experienced psychological state that may not change. The first response is that, within the framework of this *sūtra*, "*sattva*" refers to both an cosmological real condition of *prakṛti* in which the yogin remains alive and active, as well as a psychological state. It is challenging to read *sattva* in this *sūtra* as *buddhi-sattva*.

Explaining the purity of *buddhi-sattva* is another challenge. Every commentator appears to agree that the dissolution of all impurities of the *raja-guṇa* and *tama-guṇa* is a necessary condition for the purity (*śuddhi*) of "*sattva*" or "*buddhi-sattva*". Since the other two elements (*raja* and *tama*) take up their cover of impurities from the purview of *sattva*, it seems that all commentators hold that *sattva*, one of the *prakṛtic* elements, is pure. It seems that *rajas* and *tamas* are necessary for *sattva* to be pure. By default, *prakṛti* itself is impure. Therefore, every element—or *prakṛtic* manifestation—must have some kind of impurity. Just like *tamas* and *rajas* have impurities, *sattva* should also have some sort of innate impurity. Therefore, there must be some kind of impurity in *sattva* that must be eliminated even if the impurities of *raja* and *tama* are eliminated. Therefore, removing the *raja* and *tama guṇa* impurities won't make *sattva* totally pure because *sattva* is inherently somewhat impure. The fact that *sattva* is entirely pure by nature and *raja* and *tama* are merely impure is never accepted in *Sāṃkhya-Yoga* metaphysics. Given its advantageous function in the yogin's *sādhana*, it is implied that *sattva* is purer than *rajas* and *tamas*. The question now arises: how

can we claim that *sattva* becomes as pure as the purity of *puruṣa* when the impurities of *raja* and *tama* dissolve if "*sattva*" is not by nature entirely pure?

Purity (*śuddhi*) as an Important Theme in Yoga Metaphysics

Another important question arises: what does this "*śuddhi*" mean in the present context where *kaivalya* is mentioned. Why is this concept of purity (*śuddhi*) brought in explaining the nature of *kaivalya* in this chapter? How does *śuddhi* cause *kaivalya*? In other words, how can this *śuddhi* be a method or way of attaining liberation? The word "*śuddhi*" literally can be translated as "cleansing", "purification", "purity", "holiness" and "freedom from defilement". In our present context of *sūtra* 3.55, *śuddhi* does not only mean cleansing but also a process of purification of *sattva* and *puruṣa*.

Let us discuss how Patañjali uses the concept of purity (*śuddhi*) in the *Yogasūtra*. Patañjali clearly declares that the purpose of practicing these whole eight limbs of yoga is to attain purity. *Sūtra* 2.28 tells us that "upon the destruction of impurities (*aśuddhikṣaye*) as a result of the practice of yoga, the lamp of knowledge arises. This culminates in discriminative discernment"³⁶³. Vyāsa explains that the eight limbs of yoga, through their practice, cause the decay, the destruction, of the five-knotted *viparyaya*, which is in the nature of impurity (*aśuddhi*); with its decay, there is manifestation of correct knowledge (*samyagjñāna*). As the means are practiced, impurity becomes attenuated; as it decays, the light (*dīpti*) of knowledge also increases in accordance with the order of decay. This increase (*vivṛddhi*) experiences excellence through discriminative discernment (*vivekakhyāti*), that is, from the knowledge of the distinct nature of *guṇa* and *puruṣa*. The practice of the limbs of yoga is the cause of separation from impurity, like an ax for something to be cut; but discriminative discernment is the cause of attainment, like *dharma* for happiness, and not otherwise³⁶⁴.

The impurities are the five afflictions which are to be separated from the *citta* of the yogin. Getting rid these five affliction is called purity (*śuddhi*). Patañjali seems to be saying that purity is an important accomplishment for the attainment of discriminative discernment which will ultimately result in the attainment of *kaivalya*. So, purity is an important theme in the Yoga. It is to be noted that through *śuddhi*, *kaivalya* cannot be directly attained as it is

³⁶³ 2. 28: *yogāṅgānuṣṭhānādaśuddhikṣaye jñānādīptirāvivekakhyāteḥ*.

³⁶⁴ *yogāṅgānyaṣṭāvabhīdhyāṣyamānāni, teṣāmanuṣṭhānātpañcaparvaṇo viparyayaśyāśuddhirūpasya kṣayo nāśaḥ, tatṣaye samyagjñānasyābhivyaktiḥ, yathā yathā ca sādhanānyanuṣṭhīyante tathā tathā tanutvamaśuddhirāpadyate, yathā yathā ca kṣīyate tathā tathā kṣayakramānurodhinī jñānasyāpi dīptirvivardhate, sā khalveṣā vivṛddhiḥ prakarṣamanubhavatyā vivekakhyāteḥ, āguṇapuruṣasvarūpavijñānādityarthāḥ, yogāṅgānuṣṭhānamaśuddherviyogakāraṇam, yathā paraśuśchedyasya, vivekakhyātestu prāptikāraṇam yathā dharmāḥ sukhasya nānyathā kāraṇam,*

stated in *sūtra* 2.28. The purpose of the practice of *śuddhi* is to help in the process of the attainment of *kaivalya*.

But surprisingly, in *sūtra* 3.55, Patañjali explicitly tells us that the attainment of *śuddhi* is equal to *kaivalya*³⁶⁵. In other words, the attainment of *śuddhi* should be understood as the attainment of *kaivalya*. One may ask: is there inconsistency in Patañjali's view regarding the concept of *śuddhi* because in *sūtra* 2.28, *śuddhi* is an auxiliary practice for the attainment of *kaivalya* whereas in *sūtra* 3.55, *śuddhi* itself is considered as equal to *kaivalya*³⁶⁶? The question arises: what does this *śuddhi* mean in this context of *sūtra* 3.55. The possible answer is that in *sūtra* 2.28, *śuddhi* is a cleansing activity or process which purifies the impurities of *prakṛti* whereas in *sūtra* 3.55, *śuddhi* is a purified state or condition of *prakṛti*. So, Patañjali seems to be using the concept of *śuddhi* in a much nuanced method as an active process and as an active condition which is well justified in the overall metaphysics of yoga. But now the question is: what is the meaning of *śuddhi* in *sūtra* 3.55?

It appears that anticipating this question, Patañjali gives the definition of *śuddhi* in *sūtra* 3.50 in which he uses the phrase “*doṣabījakṣaya*” which can be translated as the loss of the roots of impurities³⁶⁷. The word “*doṣa*” can generally mean fault, defect and vices. The word “*bīja*” can generally mean seed, root, source and origin. The word “*kṣaya*” may mean loss; waste; wane; diminution; destruction; decay; wasting or wearing away, removal; end and termination. The phrase “*doṣabījakṣaya*” seem to mean the purification of the roots of the defects. In the context of *sūtra* 3.50, this phrase means a state or condition in which the roots of all defects are purified and this purified state is equal to *kaivalya*. What causes this purification “*doṣabījakṣaya*” or “*śuddhi*”? Patañjali answers in the same *sūtra* that this purification is the result of “*vairāgya*” (dispassion). Patañjali asserts in *sūtra* 3.55 that this attainment of *śuddhi* is achieved by both the *prakṛti* (*sattva*) and *puruṣa*. Now, the question arises: what is the meaning of purity of *sattva* and *puruṣa*?

Meaning of Purity of *Sattva* and *Puruṣa*

All the commentators believe that purity of *sattva* (which they call *buddhi-sattva*) means that the impurities of *raja-guṇa* and *tama-guṇa* get separated from the *sattva-guṇa*. So, this separation of the impurities of *raja-guṇa* and *tama-guṇa* is the purity of *sattva*. But it is interesting to note that according to the commentators, this same removal of the impurities

³⁶⁵ *sattvapuruṣayoḥ śuddhisāmye kaivalyamiti.*

³⁶⁶ *sattvapuruṣayoḥ śuddhisāmye kaivalyamiti.*

³⁶⁷ *tadvairāgyādapi doṣabījakṣaye kaivalyam.*

of *raja- guṇa* and *tama- guṇa* which is taking place in the *kaivalya* like purity of *buddhi-sattva* also take place during the stage of “*sattvapuruṣānyatākhyāti*” (Discernment of the difference between *sattva* and *puruṣa*)³⁶⁸. The question arises: what is the result of the removal of the impurities of *raja- guṇa* and *tama- guṇa*? In reply to this question, the commentators seem to be saying that both purity of *buddhi-sattva* and *sattvapuruṣānyatākhyāti* are the result. But in *sattvapuruṣānyatākhyāti*, there is still impurities because *sattvapuruṣānyatākhyāti* is not the stage of *kaivalya* whereas in the stage of purity of *buddhi-sattva*, there is no trace of impurities because Patañjali clearly says that “*śuddhi*” means “*doṣabījakṣaya*”. So, there must be some kind of difference between these two types of removal of the impurities of *raja- guṇa* and *tama- guṇa* which are not clearly mentioned and explained by the commentators.

Another important term which the commentators use to explain the purity of *buddhi-sattva* is “*dagdhakleśabīja*” which means the burnt seed like condition of the afflictions (*kleśa*). Vyāsa comments in *sūtra* 3.55 that “when the seed of affliction is burned, it is as if the *puruṣa* (Self) attains similarity to purity (*śuddhi-sārūpyam*)”³⁶⁹. Vyāsa’s view has been adopted by almost all the commentators. However, Vyāsa uses this analogy in different places to identify different developmental stages of the yogic *sādhana* which are not at all the *kaivalya* like purity stage. Vyāsa first brings this notion of “*dagdhakleśabīja*” when he explains *sūtra* 2.2 which tells us that *kriyā-yoga* gives birth to *samādhi* when the afflictions are weakened³⁷⁰. Vyāsa comments that “by cultivating this *samādhi* (concentration), one develops it and attenuates the *kleśa-s* (defilements). Having attenuated the defilements, one will make them like seeds burnt by the fire of discernment (*prasamkhyānāgni*), having the nature of being incapable of germination. From the attenuation of these, a subtle *prajñā* (wisdom) arises, consisting of the manifestation of the distinction between *sattva* and *puruṣa* (*sattvapuruṣānyatāmātrakhyāti*) consciousness and the individual self), untouched again by the *kleśa-s* (defilements), its purpose fulfilled, and it will be fit for reabsorption (*pratiprasava*)”³⁷¹. From Vyāsa’s commentary, it is clear that due to *samādhi*, *kleśa-s* are burned and these burnt *kleśa-s* are not as pure as *kaivalya*. Vyāsa again uses the

³⁶⁸ *sūtra* 3.49: *sattvapuruṣānyatākhyātimātrasya sarvabhāvādhiṣṭhātṛtvaṃ sarvajñātṛtvaṃ ca*.

³⁶⁹ *sūtra* 3.55 commentary: *dagdhakleśabījaṃ bhavati tadā puruṣasya śuddhisārūpyam ivāpannam bhavati*.

³⁷⁰ *sūtra* 2.2 - *samādhibhāvanārthaḥ kleśatanūkaraṇārthaś*.

³⁷¹ Vyāsa’s commentary *sūtra* 2.2: *sa hy āsevya mānaḥ samādhim bhāvayati kleśāṃś ca*

pratanūkaroti. pratanūkṛtān kleśān prasamkhyānāgninā. dagdhabījakalpān aprasavadharmināḥ kariṣyatīti. teṣāṃ tanūkaraṇāt punaḥ kleśair aparāmṛṣṭā sattvapuruṣānyatāmātrakhyātiḥ sūkṣmā prajñā samāptādhikārā pratiprasavāya kalpiṣyata iti.

same analogy of *dagdhakleśabīja* in his commentary on *sūtra* 2.4 in which he comments that ‘in the stage of *prasaṃkhyāna*, there also *kleśa-s* are burnt as well’³⁷². *Prasaṃkhyāna* is definitely not as pure as the *kaivalya* stage. Vyāsa’s use of “*dagdhakleśabīja*” seem to suggest an advanced stage of *sādhana*, not a complete pure state of *kaivalya*.

There is also no clarity in view of the commentators regarding the meaning of purity of *puruṣa*. For Vyāsa, the absence of figurative enjoyment for a *puruṣa* is purity (*puruṣasyopacaritabhogābhāvaḥ śuddhiḥ*). Vyāsa does not explain what he means by “figurative enjoyment” (*upacarita bhoga*). Vijñāna Bhikṣu tries to explain the intention of Vyāsa’s comment by saying that “because *buddhi* is its *dharma* (essential quality), the absence of enjoyment known as specific perception (*pratyayaviśeṣākhyabhogasyābhāvaḥ*), which is merely attributed to *puruṣa* (the self), is the purity of *puruṣa*. Even for *buddhi*, in the state of being liberated while alive, because of discrimination, such enjoyment does not exist; thus, it means similarity of purity. Here, to turn away enjoyment that is merely the nature of witnessing, it is said “attributed,” because enjoyment, which is the nature of non-distinction, is attributed to *puruṣa*, because non-discrimination is the *dharma* (essential quality) of *upādhi* (limiting adjunct)’³⁷³. Vijñāna Bhikṣu does not clearly explain what he means by specific perception (*pratyayaviśeṣa*).

The explanations by the commentators of the *sūtra* 3.55 are not clear and sometimes not logical. We again return to our fundamental questions regarding this *sūtra*. First question is: what is the meaning of purity of *sattva*? The second question is: what is the meaning of purity of *puruṣa*? The third question is: what is the meaning of the similarity of purity (*śuddhisāmye*) between *sattva* and *puruṣa*? The fourth question is: what causes this purity? In *sūtra* 3.55, I think that Patañjali suggests that this purity (*śuddhi*) of *sattva* is a special pure state of *sattva* (*viśeṣa-śuddha-sattva*) which is different from the fundamental *sattva-guṇa* which is always kinetic in nature and always interacting with *raja* and *tama-guṇa* to produce different *prakṛtic* manifestations in the form of *vṛttis*. This *śuddha-sattva* is specially *śuddha* because there is no *saṃskāra* left in the *citta* of the Yogin which are the causes of different uncontrolled activities or actions of the *citta* with all other *prakṛtic* manifestations which used to blur the purview of the *puruṣa*’s true self (*svarūpa*) from the vision of the yogin.

³⁷² Vyāsa’s commentary *sūtra* 2.24: *prasaṃkhyānavato dagdhakleśabījasya saṃmukhībhūte+apy ālambane nāsau punar asti*.

³⁷³ *buddhidharmatvāt puruṣa upacaritamātrasya pratyayaviśeṣākhyabhogasyābhāvaḥ puruṣasya śuddhiḥ buddherapi jīvanmuktadaśāyām vivekitvena tādrśo bhogo nāstīti śuddhisāmyamityarthaḥ, atra sākṣitāmātrarūpabhogavyāvartanāyopacaritetyuktaṃ puruṣasya pratyayaviśeṣarūpa eva hi bhoga upacarito ’vivekasyopādhidharmatvāt*.

Samskāras are the cause of impurities of the *citta*. The impurity of *citta* means the *citta*'s constant engagement with all kinds of *vṛtti*-s which are always popping up in the *citta*. When the *saṃskāra*-s are gone, there is no impurity of any kind. So, now one may ask: how is it possible that *citta* can be without *saṃskāra*-s because without *saṃskāra*-s there will be no *citta*. The answer may be that no *saṃskāra*-s means that the yogin will not be driven or guided or affected by any kind of *saṃskāra*-s whatsoever because the *citta* has reached to a state of *śuddha-sattva* which is static and unmoved due to the virtue of attainment of purity which is as pure as *puruṣa* herself. This static *śuddha-sattva* is the last possible stage of the mind before dissolution of the *citta* into the unmanifest *prakṛti* in which the *citta* can be completely pure and this pure *citta* can have access to pure nature of *puruṣa* even while living because *sattva* functions in the realm of *prakṛti*. It seems that Patañjali leaves room open for the possibility of special *śuddha-sattva* driven *citta* which can have access to the pure self of *puruṣa* even in the realm of *prakṛti* by virtue of the attainment of purity. This is the probable meaning of the purity of *sattva* in this *sūtra*.

One may ask: why does Patañjali need to mention the purity of *puruṣa* here because it is already known that *puruṣa* is always pure by its nature. I think Patañjali seems to suggest that the purity of *puruṣa* means the possible direct pure experience of the *puruṣa*'s true self by the *citta* of yogin. This purity of *puruṣa* is mentioned as the pure accessible state of *puruṣa* from the perspective of the yogin. It could also mean that even if the yogin has some sort of experience of *puruṣa* in the advanced stage of *samādhi*, it is not the pure experience of the *puruṣa* by the yogin. In other words, it may be the case that this *puruṣa* experience by the yogin was mediated by something in earlier time that is why this experience should be understood as impure. It is also to note that before the attainment of purity by the yogin, the *citta* was guided by the *saṃskāra*-s. Due to the presence of *saṃskāra*-s in the *citta*, the experience of *puruṣa*'s existence by the yogin was not pure. So, it can be said that the purity of *puruṣa* should be understood from the perspective of the *yoga-sādhaka*-s as the pure-experience of the true form of *puruṣa* by the yogin while living with physical body and mind.

In reply to our third question, it can be said that through the word “*śuddhisāmye*”, Patañjali hints that there is possibility of similarity between the levels of highest experiences of the pure states of *prakṛti* and *puruṣa* when the *citta* of the yogin is pure by the virtue of attainment of purity. It is the purity of *citta* which is the common ground in which there is similarity in the highest levels of purity of manifestation on the part of *prakṛti* and *puruṣa*. So,

why are the *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* similar in terms of purity? It is similar in respect of their highest available pure experiences received by the pure *citta*. Patañjali seems to be saying that if the yogin can attain this special “*śuddha-sattva-citta*” state of the mind, the yogin would be able to access the highest level of experiences of the manifestation of *prakṛti* and *puruṣa* which are their last possible pure states accessible in the realm of *prakṛti*. As both of them are highest in terms of manifestation due to purity, so, their levels of purity are also similar. That is why *prakṛti* and *puruṣa* can be pure and they can be similar in their levels of purity. Even if the *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* can be pure, what is the reason for their purity? In other words, what is the cause of purity which is equal to the level of *kaivalya*?

Cause of Purity

Most commentators believe that the cause of purity is either due to the separation of the impurities of *raja- guṇa* and *tama- guṇa* from *sattva- guṇa* or due to the burnt-seed like condition of the *kleśa-s*. These reasons are already mentioned for other different yogic attainments earlier such as for the attainment of *vivekakhyāti* or *sattvapuruṣānyatāmātrakhyāti*. In the present context of *sūtra* 3.55, Patañjali introduces a different method of attaining purity which is equal to *kaivalya*. In *sūtra* 3.55, Patañjali seems to hint that there is another method also available for the yogin which is *vairāgya* which can cause purity. In *sūtra* 3.50, Patañjali mentions that when the yogin has *vairāgya* from any kind of attainments of yogic powers, there is the possibility of purification of all kinds of defects of the yogin and this purification can bring *kaivalya*³⁷⁴. In other words, the cause or reason for the attainment of purity is *vairāgya* and the attainment of purity is the cause of *kaivalya*.

It is to be noted that *vairāgya* is a very important practice for the yogin in the *Yogasūtra*. In *sūtra* 1.12 of the very first chapter, Patañjali mentions that for the cessation of the *vṛttis*, *abhyāsa* and *vairāgya* are to be practiced by the yogin³⁷⁵. The cessation of the *vṛtti-s* indicate *kaivalya* and Patañjali seems to be saying that through the practice of *vairāgya*, *kaivalya* can be attained. Patañjali defines *vairāgya* by saying that “*vairāgya* (dispassion) is the controlled consciousness of one who is without craving for sense objects, whether these are actually perceived, or described [in scripture]”³⁷⁶. What Patañjali seems to suggest that *vairāgya* is a practice of keeping the mind indifferent to everything which does not lead to *kaivalya*? In other words, *vairāgya* is a mental state of indifference. In *sūtra* 3.50, *vairāgya* is

³⁷⁴ *tadvairāgyādapi doṣabījakṣaye kaivalyam.*

³⁷⁵ *abhyāsavairāgyābhyāṃ tannirodhaḥ.*

³⁷⁶ *dṛṣṭānuśravikaviṣayavitr̥ṣṇasyavaśīkārasaṃjñā vairāgyam.*

a practice of indifference towards even the highest yogic powers (*siddhi*). When the yogin is indifferent to all *siddhis*, then *siddhis* cannot attract and disturb the yogin's journey towards *kaivalya*. That is why Patañjali suggests in *sūtra* 3.55 that by practicing *vairāgya*, highest purity of *sattva* and *puruṣa* is attained and this achievement of purity is equal to *kaivalya*. So, the purpose of *vairāgya* is to purify all kinds of impurities which exist unless or until the *sattva* equals *puruṣa* in terms of the attainment of purity. When *sattva* and *puruṣa* are equal in terms of purity, Patañjali says that this equality of purity should be understood as *kaivalya*. One may ask: how is it possible that there can be a pure state of *prakṛti* and *puruṣa* when impurities always exist in the realm of *prakṛti*?

Purity-Oriented *Kaivalya* in *Sūtra* 3.55

In reply to this question, it can be said that Patañjali seems to leave room open for the possibility of being pure even in impure realm of *prakṛti* if we interpret purity as a *siddhi*. One may object by saying that is it not the case that Patañjali warns the yogin to stay away from *siddhi* because *siddhi* may hinder the process of *kaivalya*? So, how can *siddhi*, which is generally a *kaivalya*-disturbing phenomenon can be *kaivalya*-rendering phenomenon? It is to be remembered that *siddhi* is a byproduct of yogic *sādhana*. For some yogins, *siddhi* will definitely rise up in the process of yogic *sādhana* whether the yogin intends to achieve it or not. The experience of *siddhi* by the yogin is inevitable. *Siddhi* is not directly a hinder to the process of attainment of *kaivalya* because all advanced yogins seem to have to confront to some sort of *siddhi* during their *sādhana*. What Patañjali tells us in *sūtra* 3.50 is that one should not indulge or enjoy the fruits of the *siddhi* rather one should be indifferent to the fruits of *siddhi*'s achievement however powerful or enticing it may be. So, *siddhi* by nature is not detrimental to the attainment of *kaivalya* but engagement of the yogin with the *siddhi* to enjoy the fruits of that *siddhi* is detrimental to the attainment of *kaivalya*.

One may ask: why does Patañjali not mention purity as *siddhi* in the list of *siddhi* in the *Yogasūtra* if he understands purity as a *siddhi*? It is right that Patañjali does not explicitly mention purity as *siddhi* and no commentators also describe purity as a *siddhi*. But it is to be noted that purity and *kaivalya* are brought in the third chapter which is mainly concerned with the description of different *siddhi*-s and the different characteristics of *siddhis*. The question arises: why does Patañjali bring the concept of purity and *kaivalya* together in the last *sūtra* of this third chapter if the concept of purity and *kaivalya* has nothing to do with the concept of *siddhi*. So, it is logical to understand that there is some kind of message regarding the relation between *siddhi* and *kaivalya* which Patañjali seems to convey by introducing this concept of

purity in the last *sūtra* which is not covered in other *sūtra*-s in this third chapter. The question is: what is that message? In *sūtra* 3.55, Patañjali declares that *kaivalya* is attained when the *sattva* and *puruṣa* are equal in terms of purity. According to Patañjali, *sattva* is a part of *prakṛti* which is impure by nature. So, how can *sattva* which is by default impure be pure? According to Patañjali, *puruṣa* is always pure by nature. So, why does Patañjali say again that *puruṣa* becomes pure? *Puruṣa* and *prakṛti* are completely different entity by nature and how can they even be equal in terms of purity? When one contemplates on these abovementioned question, one gets an impression that there appears to be some kind of inconsistency or contradiction in Patañjali's teachings. I believe that if the concept of purity is understood properly in this *sūtra*, Patañjali's message would be easier to grasp.

For Patañjali, purity means the deactivation of all the impurities and its roots from the field of *citta* by mastering the art of practice of *vairagya* by the yogin. The removal of all impurities from the *citta* results in the possibility of yogin's pure available highest access to the true form of *prakṛti* and *puruṣa*. This highest pure available form of *prakṛti* and *puruṣa* by the pure *citta* is explained as the purity of the existence of *sattva* and *puruṣa* in the realm of *prakṛti* from the perspective of yogin's side. *Sattva* and *puruṣa* are similar in terms of purity because of the highest possible pure accessibility of *prakṛti* and *puruṣa* to the yogin's purified *citta*.

Now question is: how can *citta* remain in a completely purified state without being contaminated by the existing impurities of the *prakṛtic* manifestations? *Siddhi* is a special power which can be operative in the realm of *prakṛti* without directly being involved with the functions of *prakṛti* because due to the rise of utmost purity, the *citta* of yogin only operates in a pure *sattva*- *prakṛti* stage which is a new, purified and evolved portion of old impure *prakṛti* and this newly evolved portion of *prakṛti* can exist independently even without being affected by the impurities of the *prakṛti*. If this purity is understood as *siddhi*, then the yogin's *citta* can remain untouched by the innate impurities of the *prakṛti* by sheer power of *siddhi*.

It is to be noted that this *siddhi* as purity is the only kind of *siddhi* which is different from all other *siddhis* in the sense that all other *siddhis* were the product of the yogin's impure *citta* which were obstacles in the path of *kaivalya*. *Siddhi* as purity can be equated with the state of *kaivalya* because the yogin's purified *citta* can have direct access to the true form of *puruṣa* even while the yogin is living with the physical body and mind. Patañjali seems to indicate in *sūtra* 3.55 that *kaivalya* can be attained if the yogin can acquire the available highest level of purity of her *citta* in the mundane world which have access to pure form of

puruṣa and *prakṛti* by only practicing the highest level of *vairagya*. Purity as *siddhi* is the cause of *kaivalya* as well the result of *kaivalya*. So, it can be said that in *sūtra* 3.55, *kaivalya* is explained as a purity-oriented *kaivalya* because the purity is the central issue in understanding and achieving *kaivalya* for the yogin. From the perspective of *siddhi*, this purity-oriented *kaivalya* can be otherwise called as *siddhi-oriented kaivalya*.

4. *Pratiprasava-Oriented Type of Kaivalya*

The last *sūtra* of the fourth chapter gives a final definition of *kaivalya* which says that “ultimate liberation is when the *guṇa*-s, devoid of any purpose for the *puruṣa*, return to their original [latent] state; in other words, when the power of consciousness is situated in its own essential nature” (Bryant’s translation)³⁷⁷. *Guṇa*-s have two functions to serve for *puruṣa*. These two functions are *bhoga* (enjoyment) and *apavarga* (liberation). *Bhoga* and *apavarga* are together known as *puruṣārtha*. By *puruṣārthaśūnya*, Patañjali indicates that there are no *bhoga* and *apavarga* remaining for the *puruṣa*. *Bhoga* means the enjoyment of all the fruits of the manifestations of *prakṛti* which bind the yogin with the *prakṛti* and this enjoyment becomes the cause of bondage for the yogin. Vyāsa explains that “when the power of the enjoyer (*bhoktr*) and the object of enjoyment (*bhogya*) are extremely distinct (*atyantavibhakta*), extremely unmixed (*atyantāsaṃkīrṇa*), and yet seemingly attain non-distinction (*avibhāgaprāptau Iva satyām*), then enjoyment (*bhogaḥ*) is possible (*kalpate*)”³⁷⁸.

In this case, Vyāsa denotes *puruṣa* by the enjoyer (*bhoktr*) and *buddhi* by the object of enjoyment (*bhogya*). *Buddhi* is *prakṛti*, which is inherently unconscious, whereas *puruṣa* is consciousness. By default, *puruṣa* and *buddhi* are entirely different. While *buddhi* is changeable (*pariṇāminī*), *puruṣa* is unchangeable (*aparīṇāminī*). Even though *puruṣa* is naturally pure, its intimate touch with *prakṛti* causes it to become impure when *avidyā* is formed. Even while the *sattva-guṇa* typically dominates *buddhi*, it is always combined with *raja* and *tama*, rendering *buddhi* impure. Due to the influence of *avidyā*, *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* seem to be one entity despite their inherent differences. In reality, the *puruṣa* yogin sees himself as a synthesis of the mind, body, and sense organs that make up *prakṛti* in its entirety. The yogin himself experiences a variety of emotions and sentiments, including desire, anger, *sukha*, and *duḥkha*, as a result of this imposition of all the *prakṛtic* qualities. The yogin makes

³⁷⁷ *puruṣārthaśūnyānām guṇānām pratiprasavaḥ kaivalyaṃ svarūpapratīṣṭhā vā citiśaktiriti.*

³⁷⁸ *bhoktrbhogyaśaktyor atyantavibhaktayor atyantāsaṃkīrṇayor avibhāgaprāptāu iva satyām bhogaḥ kalpate.*

the mistake of assuming that all of these qualities of *prakṛti* are his own. The yogin refers these sensations of *duḥkha* and *sukha* by the yogin are called collectively "*bhoga*".

"*Apavarga*" is the opposite of "*bhoga*". In *bhoga*, yogin forgets her own true nature whereas in *apavarga*, the yogin finds out her own true nature. Vyāsa explains that when the yogin accurately determines its real form or nature (*svarūpāvadhāraṇam*), this action is known as "*apavarga*"³⁷⁹. Vācaspati Miśra states that "*apavarga*" is that by which one is released (*apavṛjyate anena*)³⁸⁰. Vivaraṇakāra comments that because there is no difference in the cessation that occurs after the nature of the experiencer is ascertained (*avadhāryamāñāt*), it is called liberation (*apavarga*), for then he is always established in his own nature³⁸¹. For Hariharānanda, "*apavarga*" is the state of liberation (*mucyate*), where the domain or authority (*adhikāra*) of the qualities (*guṇa*) is abandoned or relinquished (*tyajyate*)³⁸². Bhoja claims that *apavarga* is the cessation of *saṃsāra* (*saṃsāranivṛtti*) preceded by discriminating discernment (*vivekakhyātipūrvikā*)³⁸³. *Apavarga* is something that liberates the yogin while *bhoga* is something that binds the yogin. These two functions of binding and liberating are accomplished by the *guṇa-s* or *prakṛti*.

Patañjali tells us in this *sūtra* that when these actions of *bhoga* and *apavarga* have been successfully performed by the *guṇa-s*, the *guṇa-s* return (*pratiprasava*) to their original form which is unmanifest (*avyakta*) *prakṛti*. This return of the *guṇa-s* from their manifest (*vyakta*) *prakṛti* to *avyakta prakṛti* is called *kaivalya*. This return of the *guṇa-s* to their *avyakta prakṛti* can be otherwise called as the establishment of the *puruṣa* its own form (*svarūpapraṭiṣṭhā*) or the power of consciousness (*citiśakti*). Vyāsa explains this *sūtra* by saying that "that isolation (*kaivalya*) is the retraction (*pratiprasavaḥ*) of the *guṇa-s* that are of the nature of cause and effect (*kāryakāraṇātmakānām*) for those that have completed enjoyment and liberation (*kṛtabhogāpavargāñām*), those that are devoid of the aims of humans (*puruṣārthasūnyāñām*). Self-establishment (*svarūpapraṭiṣṭhā*) again, is the absolute (*kevalā*) power of consciousness (*citiśaktiḥ*) of the *puruṣa* due to the lack of connection with

³⁷⁹ *bhoktuḥ svarūpāvadhāraṇam apavarga iti.*

³⁸⁰ *apavṛjyate anenety apavargaḥ.*

³⁸¹ *bhokṛtsvarūpāvadavadhāryamāñāduttarakālamapyapavṛttasya viśeṣābhāvādapavarga ityucyate, sarvadā svarūpapraṭiṣṭho hi (tadā) sa iti.*

³⁸² *apavargaḥ apavṛjyate mucyate guṇādhikārastyajyate.*

³⁸³ *apavargo vivekakhyātipūrvikā saṃsāranivṛttiḥ.*

intellect and sattva (*buddhisattvānabhisambandhāt*). Its constant remaining in that way (*tathaivāvasthānam*) is isolation (*kaivalyam*)”³⁸⁴.

Vyāsa indicates in this commentary that *guṇa-s* are the cause and effect of this so-called mundane world which includes both physical and subtle forms of existence which are collectively called as *vyakta prakṛti*. *Buddhi*, *ahaṁkāra*, *indriya-s* and their *saṁskāra-s* which make up this world are the cause and effect of the *guṇa-s*. In this *vyakta prakṛti*, *guṇa-s* exist only to serve two purposes for the *puruṣa* which are *bhoga* and *apavarga*. When the purpose of *bhoga* and *apavarga* are accomplished by the *guṇa-s*, *guṇa-s* become jobless and purposeless. By default, manifesting *guṇa-s* cannot exist without these two purposes. When *guṇa-s* finish serving *puruṣa*, *guṇa-s* have to recede back (*pratiprasava*) to their original form which is *avyakta prakṛti*. For Vyāsa, *pratiprasava* is an cosmological process of dissolution from the *vyakta-prakṛti* to *avyakta-prakṛti*.

So, *pratiprasava* is a reversing order of the creation. In this reversing order of dissolution, *saṁskāra-s* dissolve in *manas*, *manas* dissolve in *asmitā*; *asmitā* dissolves in *buddhi* and *buddhi* dissolves in *avyakta prakṛti*. This state of dissolution is called *kaivalya* which is otherwise called as *videhamukti* which means liberation after death. *Guṇa-s* which were in proximity with the *puruṣa* in the form of *buddhi*, *ahaṁkāra* and all other elements associated with the yogin dissolve into *avyakta prakṛti*. So, it can be said that this dissolution is the *kaivalya* of the *guṇa-s*. From the perspective of *puruṣa*, the *puruṣa* which was unsettled due to the effects of *vyakta- prakṛti* settles down now in his own true form. This well-settled *puruṣa* stays in the form of *citiśakti* all alone by herself always. This lonely state of *puruṣa* is known as the *kaivalya* of *puruṣa*. It should not be mistaken as two types of liberations: *kaivalya* of *guṇa-s* and *kaivalya* of *puruṣa*. In reality, these two types of *kaivalya* indicate the only one phenomenon described from two perspectives. One phenomenon has two descriptions from two perspectives.

Vācaspati's Interpretation of *Sūtra* 4.35

Vācaspati Miśra says that “He states the secondary connection of the aphorism that focuses on ascertaining the nature of isolation (*kaivalya*), [saying], "In the supremacy of the qualities (*guṇādhikāreti*). The re-absorption of the qualities that are devoid of the aim of the Self (*puruṣārtha*) is isolation (*kaivalya*), or the establishment in one's own form (*svarūpapraṭiṣṭhā*), or the power of consciousness (*citiśakti*). Because of having done what

³⁸⁴ *kṛtabhogāpavargānām puruṣārthasūnyānām yāḥ pratiprasavaḥ kāryakāraṇātmakānām guṇānām tatkaivalyam, svarūpapraṭiṣṭhā punarbuddhisattvānabhisambandhātpuruṣasya citiśaktireva kevalā, tasyāḥ sadā tathaivāvasthānam kaivalyamiti.*

needs to be done, that re-absorption of those qualities that are devoid of the aim of the Self (*puruṣārtha*) is the dissolution (*laya*) in their own cause, the chief (*pradhāna*); the impressions (*saṃskārā*) of the emergence (*vyutthāna*), absorption in meditation (*samādhi*), and cessation (*nirodha*) of those qualities, which are of the nature of cause and effect (*kāryakāraṇātmakānām*), dissolve in the mind (*manasī*); the mind dissolves in egoity (*asmitā*); the egoity dissolves in the subtle essence (*liṅga*); the subtle essence dissolves in the unmanifest (*alīṅga*). That dissolution (*kaivalya*) is the isolation consisting of the retraction of the qualities that are of the nature of cause and effect. He says, "The establishment in one's own form," [explaining that] liberation (*mokṣa*) of the chief (*pradhānasya*) towards any particular Self (*puruṣaṃ prati*) is the establishment in one's own form (*svarūpapraṭiṣṭhā*) or the liberation (*mokṣa*) of the Self (*puruṣasya*). Indeed, even in the great dissolution (*mahāpralaye*), there is the establishment in one's own form (*svarūpapraṭiṣṭhā*), the power of consciousness (*citiśakti*); and that is not liberation (*mokṣa*). Therefore, he says, "Again." The word "iti" at the end of the treatise (śāstra)³⁸⁵.

Vijñāna Bhikṣu's Interpretation of Sūtra 4.35

Vijñāna Bhikṣu explains that "If a question is asked about the cessation of a person's cycle of rebirth, then the question is whether there is well-being or not. Having analyzed the sentence, the commentary introduces the subsequent aphorism with the *guṇādhikāra*. *Guṇādhikāraḥ* means that *kaivalya* is a particular transformation at the completion of that sequence. Then, according to the meaning of the aphorism beginning with "Having accomplished their purpose (*kṛtārthānām*)", it is said. This means that the nature of that isolation is to be ascertained. The re-absorption of the *guṇa*-s devoid of the purposes of the *puruṣa*. Isolation is the return to the origin, or the establishment in its own nature of the power of consciousness. Due to having accomplished what was to be done, the re-absorption of the *liṅga-śarīra* nature of the instruments of the *puruṣa* that are devoid of the purposes of the *puruṣa* is the complete dissolution into its cause; that is the isolation of the intellect. And this very isolation is spoken of in relation to the wise *puruṣa* even for the *pradhāna* due to the re-conjunction with that *puruṣa*. But that power of consciousness which is in its own nature due to the distinction between *dharma* and the possessor of *dharma* is the establishment in its own nature; that is

³⁸⁵ *kaivalyarūpādvadhāraṇaparasya sūtrasyāvāntarasamgatimāha - guṇādhikāreti, puruṣārthaśūnyānām guṇānām pratiprasavaḥ kaivalyaṃ svarūpapraṭiṣṭhā vā citiśaktiriti, kṛtakaraṇīyatayā puruṣārthaśūnyānām yaḥ pratiprasavaḥ svakāraṇe pradhāne layasteṣāṃ kāryakāraṇātmakānām guṇānām vyutthānasamādhinirodhasaṃskārā manasī līyante mano'smitāyāmasmitā liṅge liṅgamaliṅga iti, yo'yaṃ guṇānām kāryakāraṇātmakānām pratisargastarakaivalyaṃ, yaṃ kamcītpuruṣaṃ prati pradhānasya mokṣaḥ svarūpapraṭiṣṭhā vā puruṣasya mokṣa ityāha - svarūpeti, asti hi mahāpralaye'pi svarūpapraṭiṣṭhā citiśaktiḥ, na cāsau mokṣa ityāta āha - punariti, sautra itiśabdaḥ śāstraparisamāptau.*

like a crystal being established in its own form when the red color imparted by the *japā* flower has ceased. This means that it is the isolation of the *puruṣa*. Indeed, the pure singleness happens to both, the condition and the conditioned that are inseparable, and both of these are means for achieving the *puruṣārtha* called the cessation of suffering and enjoyment; thus, there are two isolations that are distinguished. Of those, the first isolation is said to be figuratively attributed to the *puruṣa* in the *Sāṅkhya-kārikā* - "Therefore, the *puruṣa* is not bound, not liberated, and does not transmigrate." *Prakṛti*, having many abodes, transmigrates, is bound, and is liberated. [Sā. Kā. 62] thus." But that isolation which is of the nature of establishment in its own form, or that *puruṣārtha* of the *puruṣa* which is the nature of the absolute cessation of suffering and enjoyments refuted there, because if liberation is solely dependent on something else, since it is not an end of the *puruṣa*, the activity for the sake of liberation would not be possible. For the activity of the *karaṇa-s* is for the purpose of the *puruṣa*. The word "iti" indicates the completion of the *śāstra*. In the *Bhāṣya*, "of those whose nature is cause and effect (*kāryakāraṇātmanām*)", means that "of those consisting of the *liṅga-śarīra* that extend from the *mahat* to the subtle elements, those who have attained the state of cause and effect". But here, the gross body is not meant; for even when it exists, there is the arising of isolation. Indeed, how can there be self-establishment of one's own self when self-establishment is impossible? Therefore, [the text] says - "Own nature (*svarūpeti*) of the *puruṣa*". Again, it means that the pure power of consciousness alone is establishment in its own nature because of the absence of connection with *buddhi* and *sattva*. That means "O Own nature". Remaining always in establishment is, again, the unwavering second isolation; thus, the remainder"³⁸⁶.

³⁸⁶ *yadi puruṣasya samsārocchedaḥ prcchyate, tadā kuśalasyāsti netarasyeti praśna vākyam vikalpaya prativacanam sambhavaṭiṭi uttara-sūtram avatārayati—guṇādhikāreti. guṇādhikārah pariṇāma-viśeṣas tat-krama-parisamāptau kaivalyam iti. tataḥ kṛtārthānām ity ādi-sūtreṇa tātparyataḥ proktam. tasya kaivalyasya svarūpam avadhāryata ity arthaḥ. puruṣārtha-śūnyānām guṇānām pratiprasavaḥ kaivalyam, svarūpa-pratiṣṭhā vā citi-śaktir iti. kṛta-karatavyatayā puruṣārtha-śūnyānām puruṣopakaraṇānām liṅga-śarīrātmakānām pratiprasavaḥ sva kāraṇ'ityanta-vilayaḥ, sa buddheḥ kaivalyam. etad eva ca pradhānasyāpi jñānipuruṣam prati kaivalyam ucyate. tena puruṣeṇa saha punar saṃyogāt. yā tu dharma-dharmy-bhedāc citi-śaktiḥ svarūpiṇī svarūpa-pratiṣṭhā buddhi-sattvopādhika-rūpa-śūnyatā-rūpā japāpāye sphaṭika-svarūpa-pratiṣṭhāvat sā puruṣasya kaivalyam ity arthaḥ. parasparāvīryogī hy upādhy-upādhimātor ubhayor eva kevalatā ekākitā bhavati, te cobha eva duḥkha-bhoga-nivṛtī-ākhyā-puruṣārtha-sādhane bhavata iti dve eva kaivalye lakṣite. tayoś cādyam kaivalyam puruṣasyopacaritam ity uktam sāṅkhya-kārikāyām - "tasmān na badhyate 'ddhā na mucyate nāpi saṃsarati puruṣaḥ |saṃsarati badhyate mucyate ca nānāśrayā prakṛtiḥ. [sā.kā. 62] iti". na tu svarūpa-pratiṣṭhā-rūpam kaivalyam duḥkha-bhogātyanta-nivṛtī-rūpo vā puruṣārthaḥ puruṣasya tatra nirākṛtaḥ, mokṣasyānya-mātra-niṣṭhatve 'puruṣārthatve mokṣārtham pravṛtī-nupapatteḥ, puruṣārtham hi karaṇānām pravṛtīr iti. iti-śabdāḥ śāstra-samāpti-sūcanārthaḥ. bhāṣye kārya-kāraṇātmanām iti. kārya-kāraṇa-bhāvāpannānām mahad-ādi-sūkṣma-bhūta-paryantānām liṅga-śarīra-ghaṭakānām ity arthaḥ. na tu kāryam atra sthūla-śarīram, tat-sattve 'pi kaivalyodayād iti. nanu svasya sva-pratiṣṭhātvanupapattiyā katham sva-pratiṣṭhatvam ? tatrāha—svarūpeti. puruṣasya*

Vivaraṇakāra's Interpretations of *Sūtra* 4.35

Vivaraṇakāra comments that “at the completion of the treatment of the *guṇa-s*, liberation (*kaivalya*) has been spoken of. Its nature is now being determined. Because of disagreement regarding liberation (*kaivalya*), some think the complete cessation of the stream of consciousness is liberation. Others, however, think the remaining of the *puruṣa* as a mere substance, devoid of consciousness, after the eradication of the nine qualities of the *ātman*, namely, intellect, desire, aversion, effort, pleasure, pain, merit, demerit and impressions, is liberation. Others think union with *Īśvara* is liberation. Still others think the attainment of qualities equal to *Īśvara*, such as omniscience, is liberation. Thus, opinions differ. Here also, to dispel disagreement, the nature of liberation (*kaivalya*) is being determined: the return and re-absorption of the *guṇa-s*, which are devoid of the purpose of the *puruṣa*, into their own cause is the meaning; for those transformed by their nature as cause and effect, that liberation is the isolation of the *puruṣa*, the state of being unmixed with the *guṇa-s*, this is the meaning. Or, the establishment in one's own form is the power of consciousness, it is said. The power of consciousness of the *puruṣa* that is not connected to the essence of the intellect, that is unmixed and absolute, the remaining of that always in the same way, the state of the absolute is liberation”³⁸⁷.

All commentators are right that in this *sūtra* Patañjali defines *kaivalya* as a state of the dissolution of the *guṇa-s* if the phrases “*guṇānāṃ pratiprasava*”, “*svarūpapraṭiṣṭhā*” and “*citiśakti*” carry the same meaning of *kaivalya*. But it appears that these three phrases which may seem the same in meaning are not exactly the same in their meanings. All the commentators and most modern scholars do not explain the meaning of these important terms and concepts such as “*svarūpapraṭiṣṭhā*” and “*citiśakti*” in this last *sūtra*. They just explain that *kaivalya* is explained in this *sūtra* from the perspectives of *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* by employing the word “*vā*” meaning “*or*”. According to these commentators, *kaivalya* is the dissolution of the *guṇa-s* (*guṇānāṃ pratiprasava*) from the perspective of *guṇa-s*. So, it is the *kaivalya* of the *guṇa-s*. This same phenomenon of the dissolution of *guṇa-s* can be said to be the *kaivalya* of the *puruṣa* because *puruṣa* alone settles down (*svarūpapraṭiṣṭhā*) in her true form as a power of consciousness (*citiśakti*) after the dissolution of the *guṇa-s*.

punar buddhi-sattvāsambandhāt kevalā citi-śaktir eva svarūpa-praṭiṣṭhety arthaḥ. tasya iti. svarūpa praṭiṣṭhāyāṃ sadaivāvasthānaṃ punar apracyavaḥ kaivalyaṃ dvitīyaṃ iti śeṣaḥ.

³⁸⁷ See the commentary of Vivaraṇakāra on *sūtra* 4.35

It appears that the first part of the *sūtra* ("*puruṣārthaśūnyānāṃ guṇānāṃ pratiprasavaḥ kaivalya*") is given more attention and priority by the commentators than the second part (*svārūpapraṭiṣṭhā vā citiśaktiriti*). While the commentators merely ignore the second part of the *sūtra*, they focus mostly on discussing the first part. The second part of the *sūtra* is entirely elliptical in meaning, although the first part is comparatively simple to understand. For example, Patañjali already discussed all of the phrases and concepts in the first section of the *sūtra* (such as *puruṣa*, *guṇa*, *pratiprasava*, and *kaivalya*) in various places in the *Yogasūtra*. However, in the second section of the *sūtra*, Patañjali introduces entirely new terms, such as *citiśakti* and *svārūpapraṭiṣṭhā*, which are not even mentioned once in the entire text. Regarding the subject of why Patañjali used this entirely novel phrase or concept in the final *sūtra*, the commentators say absolutely nothing. Do these phrases or concepts have any particular meanings or connotations that are not conveyed before the conclusion of Patañjali's teaching in the *Yogasūtra* by any other concepts? Stated differently, what particular functions do these novel ideas fulfill within the metaphysics of yoga? Commentators appear to respond that Patañjali's inclusion of new words or ideas in this final *sūtra* lacks any self-contained significance. According to them, they just serve as synonyms or different terms or ideas to convey the meaning of the *sūtra*'s first section. It is a widely recognized fact among the traditional scholars that every word, term, and idea in this type of *sūtra* -text writing is carefully picked and employed by the author to communicate or convey a significant message that the author wishes to transmit to the audience. Therefore, it makes sense to assume that these new terms or ideas, such as *citiśakti* and *svārūpapraṭiṣṭhā*, must have specific connotations in this text.

Now the question arises: what potential meaning or intentions might Patañjali have had in mind when he used these completely novel ideas or terminology in the last *sūtra* of this text? The answer to this question will be discussed in the fifth chapter. To understand the meaning of *kaivalya* in this *sūtra*, we will focus on the first part of the *sūtra* at present. I completely agree with the commentators that Patañjali clearly tells us that *kaivalya* takes place when the *guṇa*-s return to their original state which is the *avyakta* state in which the yogin will be completely disconnected from all kinds of *prakṛtic* manifestations including the physical body and mind of the yogin. In other words, *kaivalya* take place after the death of the yogin which is known as *videhamukti*.

Pratiprasava-Oriented Kaivalya in Sūtra 4.35

For attaining this *videhamukti*, *pratiprasava* is the central process which in this *sūtra* seems to be a cosmological process. According to Patañjali, when the *guṇa-s* have served two purposes of *bhoga* and *apavarga* for the *puruṣa*, *guṇa-s* have nothing left to offer to *puruṣa*. *Guṇa-s* only exist to serve the purpose of *puruṣa*. When the purpose of *guṇa-s* is complete, *guṇa-s* return to their original state of existence which is the *avyakta-prakṛti*. Returning of the *guṇa-s* seem to indicate that dissolution of all connection of *prakṛti* with the liberated yogin including the physical body and mind. This whole understanding of *kaivalya* as *videhamukti* completely depends on the cosmological interpretation of the concept of *pratiprasava* in this present *sūtra*. But it may be pointed out that the concept of *pratiprasava* is also brought by Patañjali in *sūtra* 2.10 which tells us that the five subtle afflictions are to be got rid of by the process of *pratiprasava* ³⁸⁸. In this *sūtra*, Patañjali seems to be saying that *pratiprasava* is a psychological or epistemological process through which the yogin can be free from the afflictions. In this *sūtra*, *pratiprasava* is an epistemological process.

So, if we understand *pratiprasava* as an epistemological as well as cosmological process in the *Yogasūtra*, then *guṇa-s* has two types of *pratiprasava*. First type is the epistemological type of dissolution of the effects of all the *guṇa-s* and second type is the cosmological dissolution of the *guṇa-s*. In this last *sūtra*, Patañjali seems to indicate the last stage of *kaivalya* as cosmological dissolution of the three elements of the *guṇa-s* which does not exclude the first stage of *kaivalya* which is *jīvanmukti*. In this last *sūtra*, Patañjali clearly advocates that at the last stage of yogic journey, *guṇa-s* have to return to their *avyakta*-stage in which the yogin has to disconnect from all kind of *prakṛtic* manifestations including the physical body and the mind. According to this *sūtra*, the last stage of *kaivalya* is *videhamukti* because Patañjali clearly tells us that *guṇa-s* must return to their original state (*guṇānāṃ pratiprasava*) which requires the dissolution of *puruṣa*'s connection of *prakṛti*. In this *kaivalya*, *pratiprasava* is the central process. So, it can be said that *kaivalya* in this *sūtra* 4.35 is *pratiprasava-oriented kaivalya*.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have meticulously explored the concept of *kaivalya* as presented across Patañjali's *Yogasūtra*, challenging the notion of it as a singular, static end-state. Instead,

³⁸⁸ *sūtra* 2.10: *te pratiprasavaheyāḥ sūkṣmāḥ*.

my analysis firmly establishes *kaivalya* as a dynamic, multi-stage journey of freedom, whose meaning and characteristics evolve depending on the specific context in which it is described. This chapter has identified and elucidated four distinct "types" or developmental stages of *kaivalya*, each offering a nuanced understanding of the yogin's progressive liberation.

Firstly, the Cittavṛttinirodha-Oriented *Kaivalya* (YS 1.2-1.3) defines liberation as the *puruṣa* abiding in its true nature upon the cessation of all mental modifications (*Cittavṛttinirodha*). While a theoretical reading might suggest total cosmological dissolution, a practical perspective, particularly by reading the *sūtra*-s in reverse order, indicates this initial stage as an epistemological process. Here, the yogin achieves a state of awareness (like *nirodha-samādhi*) where they realize their distinction from *vṛttis* while still embodied. This represents an initial liberation that is *epistemological*, not necessarily a complete physical dissolution.

Secondly, the Knowledge-Oriented *Kaivalya* (YS 2.25) describes liberation as the absence of *avidyā* (ignorance) and the consequent cessation of the false conjunction (*saṃyoga*) between *puruṣa* and *buddhi*, achieved through *Vivekakhyāti* (discriminative discernment). This is distinctly an epistemological form of liberation, aligning with *jīvanmukti* (liberation while living), as the existence of *citta* is necessary for *vivekakhyāti*. The yogin in this stage experiences "seven types of highest revelations" (*prāntabhūmiḥ prajñā*), indicating a profound, yet embodied, realization.

Thirdly, the Purity-Oriented *Kaivalya* (YS 3.55) emphasizes liberation attained when *sattva* (the purified intellect) achieves equality of purity (*śuddhisāmye*) with *puruṣa*. This stage is deeply connected to the practice of *vairāgya* (dispassion), particularly an indifference even towards *siddhis* (supernatural powers), suggesting purification as the supreme attainment within the *Vibhūti-pāda*. This also points towards an embodied form of liberation, where the yogin's *citta* becomes pure enough to access the true nature of *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* even while living.

Finally, the Pratiprasava-Oriented *Kaivalya* (YS 4.34) is presented as the ultimate stage where the *guṇa*-s return to their original unmanifest state (*pratiprasava*), leading to the *puruṣa*'s establishment in its pure conscious power (*citiśakti*). This description clearly aligns with an cosmological process of dissolution from *vyakta-prakṛti* (manifested nature) to *avyakta-prakṛti* (unmanifest nature), which necessitates the dissolution of the physical body and mind, thus signifying *videhamukti* (disembodied liberation). The chapter also highlights the strategic use of novel terms like "*svarūpapraṭiṣṭhā*" and "*citiśakti*" in this final *sūtra*,

suggesting *Patañjali*'s intent to convey highly specific, nuanced meanings about this ultimate state of *kaivalya*.

In conclusion, this chapter comprehensively demonstrates that *kaivalya* is far from a monolithic concept in the *Yogasūtra*. The diverse definitions across different *sūtra*-s highlight its "intricate and multi-faceted nature" and appear to present "contradictory definitions that suggest the different nature of *kaivalya*". These variations, from epistemological purification to cosmological dissolution, indicate a progressive journey of freedom. This systematic analysis of *kaivalya*'s distinct stages and the apparent inconsistencies between them (e.g., *jīvanmukti* vs. *videhamukti*) lays crucial groundwork. It underscores the necessity for a more integrated and coherent framework that can harmonize these diverse understandings of liberation, a task that the subsequent chapter aims to address by re-interpreting the concept of *Pratiprasava* in its empirical and transcendent dimensions.

Chapter 5: Interpreting *Pratiprasava* as an Empirical and Transcendent Process

Introduction

This is the final and most important chapter of this dissertation. Chapter 1 of this dissertation has shown the historical and doctrinal foundations of the *Yogasūtra*. Chapter 2 of this dissertation has established *pratiprasava* as a central concept within Patañjali's *Yogasūtra*, laying the groundwork by exploring its literal and philosophical meanings, and its fundamental connections to *samādhi* and *kaivalya*. Chapter 3 then revealed the complex and often conflicting interpretations of *pratiprasava* found in both traditional Sanskrit commentaries and modern scholarship, highlighting persistent ambiguities concerning its nature and function. Building upon this, Chapter 4 meticulously demonstrated that *kaivalya*, the ultimate goal of Yoga, is not a monolithic concept but a dynamic, multi-stage journey of freedom, whose varied descriptions across different *sūtra*-s appear to present contradictory definitions of liberation, ranging from epistemological purification to cosmological dissolution. Building upon these foundational analyses, Chapter 5 finally aims to resolve these identified inconsistencies and apparent contradictions by proposing a novel, unified framework for understanding *pratiprasava*. This chapter argues that *pratiprasava* possesses two distinct meanings and functions depending on the context in which the term has been used in the *Yogasūtra*.

Specifically, this chapter will show that in YS 2.10, located in the *Sādhana-pāda*, *pratiprasava* functions as an epistemological process and a yogic practice for the highest level

of purification of the *citta* by reversing subtle *kleśa-s*. It will be shown that this empirical *pratiprasava* leads to liberation while living (*jīvanmukti*), without entailing the complete cosmological dissolution of the mind itself. In YS 4.34, the concluding *sūtra* of the text, *pratiprasava* is an cosmological process involving the complete dissolution of the three *guṇa-s*. This ultimate dissolution subsequently entails the dissolution of the *citta* and the physical body of the yogin, thereby leading to disembodied liberation (*videhamukti*).

This final chapter contends that these two distinct meanings of *pratiprasava* are not contradictory; rather, they represent two sequential stages with two distinct functions within the overarching process of liberation. By interpreting *pratiprasava* in this dual manner, this chapter will provide a coherent framework to resolve the apparent contradictions regarding the two different natures of *kaivalya*, allowing for a comprehensive understanding of both embodied (*jīvanmukti*) and disembodied (*videhamukti*) liberation as integral and equally valid stages of the yogic journey. Furthermore, it will delve into the profound implications of terms like *svarūpapraṭiṣṭhā* and *citiśakti* in YS 4.34, which Patañjali strategically introduces to delineate the ultimate state of *kaivalya*, addressing the question of what particular functions these novel ideas fulfill within the metaphysics of Yoga.

Exploring the Epistemological Meaning and Function of *Pratiprasava* in *Sūtra* 2.10:

Patañjali introduces the concept of *pratiprasava* for the first time in *sūtra* 2.10 which tells us that “these (*te*) subtle (*sūkṣma*) [*kleśa-s*] are to be cast aside (*heya*) by a retrograding process of reversal (*pratiprasava*)”³⁸⁹. In other words, five *kleśa-s* which have been weakened (*sūkṣma*) by the practice of *kriyā-yoga* need to be set aside by the process of *pratiprasava*. Patañjali makes two important announcements. First one is that five *kleśa-s* which are *avidyā*, *asmitā*, *raga*, *dveṣa* and *abhiniveśa* which remain in the subtle form in yogin’s *citta*, need to be abandoned. Second one is that this abandonment of subtle five *kleśa-s* is only possible through the process of *pratiprasava*. *Pratiprasava* is a yogic practice which the yogin needs to use to get rid of the deadening *kleśa-s* which cause suffering and bondage for the yogin. The question arises: what is the result of this abandonment of these five subtle *kleśa-s* by practicing the process of *pratiprasava*? The result seems to be the attainment of *kaivalya*. One might ask: what is the nature of *kaivalya* in this *sūtra*? For knowing the answer of this question, we need to understand the meaning and function of this *sūtra* carefully. Let us discuss the how this *sūtra* has been understood in the interpretive literature.

³⁸⁹ *sūtra* 2.10: *te pratiprasavaheyāḥ sūkṣmāḥ*.

The Standard Interpretation of *Sūtra* 2.10

All Sanskrit commentators and most modern scholars believe that all the five *kleśa-s* which have already been weakened by the *kriyā*-yoga which includes the activities of *tapas*, *svādhyāya* and *īśvara-praṇidhāna*, are to be finally got rid of by the process of *pratiprasava* which results in the dissolution of the mind. So, the idea is that the subtle *kleśa-s* are in the *citta* and unless or until the *citta* is completely dissolved, subtle *kleśa-s* cannot be completely got rid of. The five *kleśa-s* are completely destroyed when the *citta* is destroyed completely. The process of the dissolution of the *citta* is known as the process of *pratiprasava*. This process of *pratiprasava* confirms that *vyakta* (manifest) *prakṛti* returns to its *avyakta* (unmanifest) state. So, *kaivalya* is attained when the *citta* dissolves which suggests the *videhamukti* of the yogin.

It may be tempting to accept this interpretation as correct in the discussion of the present *sūtra* because Patañjali seems to be saying that *pratiprasava* is a process of dissolution because in *sūtra* 4.34 Patañjali clearly says that after fulfilling their all functions *guṇa-s* recede back to their unmanifest state through the process of *pratiprasava*. The result of *pratiprasava* is *kaivalya*. So, *kaivalya* is *videhamukti*. I contend that it is not right to understand or interpret *sūtra* 2.10 on the basis of *sūtra* 4.34. *Pratiprasava* is much earlier mentioned in *sūtra* 2.10 than *sūtra* 4.34 which is the last *sūtra* of the text. In *sūtra* 4.34, *pratiprasava* is mentioned in the context of the process of reversal of *guṇa-s* which are cosmological reals whereas in *sūtra* 2.10 *pratiprasava* is mentioned as a yogic practice to avoid the *kleśa-s* which certainly are not cosmological reals. I think it is better to understand the concept of *pratiprasava* in the context in which this concept is used because Patañjali has not explicitly defined the term “*pratiprasava*” in the *Yogasūtra*. Now question arises: what is this contextual meaning of *pratiprasava* in this *sūtra* 2.10. Let us discuss the meaning of *pratiprasava* in this *sūtra*.

***Pratiprasava* as a Yogic Practice**

In discussing *sūtra* 2.10, it appears that all commentators and modern scholars understand *pratiprasava* as a process in which *kleśa-s* dissolve along with the dissolution of the *citta*. If we read carefully this *sūtra* independently, it appears that *pratiprasava* is a yogic practice which Patañjali prescribes for the yogin to undertake to avoid the subtle *kleśa-s*. It is to be noted that Patañjali brings the concept of *pratiprasava* for the first time in the *yogastura* as a practice of forsaking subtle *kleśa-s* in the second chapter. Second chapter is named as *sādhana-pāda* which indicates that this chapter describes and discusses many different yogic

practices and the result of those yogic practices. In this chapter, one of the main goals of yogic practices is to free oneself from the clutches of *kleśa-s*. The *kleśa-s* have different states or conditions like *sthūla*, *dagdhabhīja* and *sūkṣma*. The means or practices of getting rid of the different conditions of *kleśa-s* as prescribed by Patañjali are mainly *kriyā-yoga*, *dhyāna* and *pratiprasava*.

On the Meaning of *Tapas* in *Sūtra* 2.1

In *sūtra* 2.1, Patañjali states that *tapas* (austerity), *svādhyāya* (self-study), and *īśvara-praṇidhāna* (surrender to God) constitute *kriyā-yoga*³⁹⁰. It appears from this *sūtra* that for Patañjali, *kriyā-yoga* is a combination of three particular yogic practices. Patañjali does not define or explain these terms or concepts in the *Yogasūtra*. The word “*tapas*” can literally mean warmth; heat; pain; suffering; religious austerity; bodily mortification; penance; severe meditation; special observance. In explaining “*tapas*”, Vyāsa comments that “yoga is not attained by one who does not perform *tapas*, since the impurity consisting of a network of objects that appear, variegated by beginningless actions, afflictions, and latent impressions, is not removed without the mixture of *tapas*. Therefore, *tapas* is undertaken. *Tapas* is considered as that which brings about tranquility of mind, is unobstructive, and is not to be avoided”³⁹¹. Hariharānanda states that “*tapas*” is enduring afflictions (*kleśa*), relinquishing comforts (*sukha*), and bodily control (*kāyasaṃyama*), which bring about mental clarity (*cittaprasāda*) through postures (*āsana*), breath control (*prāṇāyāma*), fasting (*upoṣaṇa*), and other practices”³⁹². For Vivaraṇakāra, “*tapas*” refers to practices like *ṛcchra* (a particular kind of religious penance) and *cāndrāyaṇa* (a fast regulated by the moon), enduring the pairs of opposites such as heat and cold”³⁹³. Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha illustrates that *tapas* is the emaciation of the body by means of fasting and the like. In the *Īśvaragītā*, it is told that ascetics call the drying of the body by fasts, *parāka* penance, *ṛcchra* penance, *cāndrāyaṇa* penance, and the like, the best austerity³⁹⁴. It seems that the term “*tapas*” used by Patañjali includes all these activities mentioned by these commentators.

³⁹⁰ *sūtra* 2.1: *tapasvādhyāyeśvarapraṇidhānāni kriyāyogaḥ*.

³⁹¹ Vyāsa on *sūtra* 2.1: *nātapasvino yogaḥ sidhyati, anādikarmakleśavāsanācitrā pratyupasthitaviṣayajālā cāśuddhirmāntareṇa tapaḥ sambhedamāpadyata iti tapasa upādānam*.

³⁹² Hariharānanda on *sūtra* 2.1: *tapastu cittaprasādakarāṇāmāsanapraṇāyāmopoṣaṇādīnām kleśasahanaṃ sukhatyāgaśca kāyasaṃyamastapaḥ*.

³⁹³ Vivaraṇakāra on *sūtra* 2.1: *tapa iti ṛcchracāndrāyaṇādi, śītoṣṇādidvandvasahatvam*.

³⁹⁴ Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha on *sūtra* 2.1: *tapa upavāsādinā kāyaśeṣaṇam, uktamīśvaragītāyām, upavāsaparākādikṛcchracāndrāyaṇādibhiḥ śarīraśoṣaṇam prāhustāpasāstapa uttamamiti*.

On the Meaning of *Svādhyāya* in *Sūtra 2.1*

Svādhyāya is a compound word composed of *svā* + *adhyāya*. *Adhyāya* means "a lesson, lecture, chapter; reading". *Svā* means "own, one's own, self, the human soul". Therefore, *svādhyāya* literally means "one's own reading, lesson". In explaining the meaning of *svādhyāya*, Vyāsa comments that “*svādhyāya* is the recitation of purifying mantras such as *praṇava*, or the study of scriptures on liberation”³⁹⁵. According to Hariharānanda, “control of speech (*vāk-saṁyama*) is *svādhyaya*”³⁹⁶. For Vivaraṇakāra, “*svādhyāya* is the repetition (*japa*) of the sacred *praṇava* (*Om*) and *mokṣa* scriptures, including the *Upaniṣads*”³⁹⁷. Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha illustrates that *svādhyāya* is the repetition of the *Upaniṣads* and the like. In the *Īśvaragītā*, it is said that wise call the muttering of Vedānta, Śātarudrīya, *Praṇava*, and the like, the *svādhyāya* that purifies the essence of men³⁹⁸. *Svādhyāya* can be understood as any kind of mental activities as chanting of sacred mantras and remembering and contemplating on the meaning of the Holy Scriptures.

On the Meaning of *Īśvara-praṇidhāna* in *Sūtra 2.1*

Īśvara-praṇidhāna can be translated as dedication to the lord or surrender to the Lord. Vyāsa comments that *īśvara-praṇidhāna* is the offering of all actions to the supreme guru God, or the renunciation of their fruits”³⁹⁹. For Hariharānanda, “*Īśvara-praṇidhāna* is mental (*mānasa*) contemplation (*saṁyama*)”⁴⁰⁰. According to Vivaraṇakāra, *īśvara-praṇidhāna* means offering one's actions to the supreme teacher (*Īśvara*), or renouncing the fruits of those actions and dedicating them to the Supreme Lord (*Parameśvara*)⁴⁰¹. Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha illustrates that *praṇidhāna* is the devotion born of praise and the like. In the *Īśvaragītā*, it is mentioned that "devotion becomes unwavering through praises, remembrance, worship, and actions of speech, mind, and body; this is the worship of *Īśvara*". Here, praise is the mere narration of qualities, and worship is the offering of seat, water for washing the feet, and the like. Devotion born of these is the worship of *Īśvara*. And

³⁹⁵ Vyāsa on *sūtra 2.1*: *svādhyāyaḥ praṇavādīpavitrāṇāṁ japo mokṣasāstrādhyayanam vā*.

³⁹⁶ Hariharānanda on *sūtra 2.1*: *vāksaṁyamah svādhyayaḥ*.

³⁹⁷ Vivaraṇakāra on *sūtra 2.1*: *svādhyāyaḥ-praṇavasya mokṣasāstrāṇāṁ copaniṣatprabhṛtīnāṁ pavitrāṇāṁ japaḥ*.

³⁹⁸ Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha on *sūtra 2.1*: *svādhyāya upaniṣadādyāvṛttiḥ, uktā ca tatraiva, “vedāntaśātarudrīyapraṇavādījapam budhāḥ* satvaśuddhikaram pumsām svādhyāyam paricakṣate” iti*.

³⁹⁹ Vyāsa on *sūtra 2.1*: *īśvarapraṇidhānam sarvakriyāṇāṁ paramagurāvarpaṇam tatphalasamnyāso vā*.

⁴⁰⁰ Hariharānanda on *sūtra 2.1*: *īśvarapraṇidhānantu mānasaḥ saṁyama iti*.

⁴⁰¹ Vivaraṇakāra on *sūtra 2.1*: *īśvarapraṇidhānam-kriyāṇāṁ paramagurāvīśvare samarpaṇam, tāsām vā phalasanyāsa: parameśvare samnyasanam*.

that is the offering of all actions to the Supreme Lord, the Supreme Guru, or the renunciation of its fruit. Of these, the first is: Whatever good or bad I do knowingly or unknowingly, all that I renounce to you; impelled by you, I do," thus it is explained by the *Smṛtis* and the like. The second is: The enjoyer of the fruits of actions is the Supreme Lord," thus contemplating, "knowing me as the enjoyer of sacrifices and austerities, the great Lord of all the worlds, the friend of all beings, one attains peace," thus it is taught that these, being distinct from *bhakti-yoga*, which is qualified by the specific contemplation of the meaning explained, are *kriyā-yoga*, because they are merely activity of speech and the like. Because *kriyā-yoga* is indicated in the singular, it is taught that the accumulated activity of body, speech, and mind is indeed *kriyā-yoga*, which has a specific result⁴⁰². The question arises: what is that specific result of *kriyā-yoga*?

Kriyā-Yoga as a Yogic Practice of Attenuating Kleśa-s

In *sūtra* 2.2, Patañjali recommends the practice of *kriyā-yoga* for the purpose of attenuating (*tanūkaraṇa*) the *kleśa-s* (*kleśatanūkaraṇārthaśca*) and this attenuation gives rise to the cultivation of the practice of *samādhi* (*samādhibhāvanārthaḥ*)⁴⁰³. Bhoja states that the *tanūkaraṇa* (attenuation) of *kleśa-s* is the obstruction of their own effect and cause (*svakāryakāraṇapratibandhaḥ*). *Samādhi*, which has the characteristics that have been stated, its cultivation (*bhāvana*) is repeatedly placing it in the mind; that is the meaning, the purpose of which is such, it is said. Thus it is said that these practices such as *tapas*, when practiced, loosen (*śithilī*) the *kleśa-s* such as *avidyā* which are situated in the mind, and resort to the helpfulness (*upakāraka*) of *samādhi*; therefore, the yogin should primarily be intent on the application of skillful means of *kriyā-yoga*⁴⁰⁴. Vyāsa comments that for the yogin, being practiced (*āsevyamāna*), cultivates *samādhi*, and makes the *kleśa-s* very thin (*pratanū*). He

⁴⁰² Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha on *sūtra* 2.1: *praṇidhānaṃ stutyādijanitā bhaktiḥ, uktā tathā tatraiva, stutismaraṇapūjābhīrvānmanahkāryakarmabhiḥ suniścalā bhavedbhaktiretadīśvarapūjanamiti, stutiratna guṇamātrakathanāṃ pūjā cāsanapādyādyarpaṇam, etābhirjanitā bhaktirīśvarapūjanam, tacca sarvakriyāṇāṃ parameśvare paramagurāvarpaṇam, tatphalasanyāso vā, tatrādyam, kāmato'kāmato vā'pi yat karomi śubhāśubham tatsarvaṃ tvayi sanyastaṃ tvatprayuktaḥ karomyahamityādismṛtibhīrvyākhyātam, dvitīyaṃ tu karmaphalānāṃ bhoktā parameśvara iti cintanam, bhoktāraṃ yajñatapasāṃ sarvalokamaheśvaram* suhrdaṃ sarvabhūtānāṃ jñātvā mām śāntimṛcchatītyādinā bodhitam, etāni niruktārthabhāvanāviśiṣṭabhaktiyogabhinnatvāt kriyāyogaḥ, vāgādivyāpāramātratvāt, kriyāyoga ityekavacanānirdeśāt kāyavānmanovyāpāraḥ samuccita eva kriyāyogo viśiṣṭaphala iti jñāpitam*

⁴⁰³ *sūtra* 2.2: *samādhibhāvanārthaḥ kleśatanūkaraṇārthaśca*.

⁴⁰⁴ Bhoja on *sūtra* 2.2: *kleśā vakṣyamāṇasteṣāṃ tanūkaraṇaṃ svakāryakāraṇapratibandhaḥ, samādhiruktalakṣaṇastasya bhāvanā cetasi punaḥ punarniveśanaṃ so'rthaḥ prayojana yasya sa tathoktaḥ, etaduktaḥ bhavati ete tapaḥ prabhṛtayo'bhyasamānāścittagatānaviccādkleśāñchithilī kurvantaḥ samādherupakārakatāṃ bhajante, tasmātpṛathamataḥ kriyāyogavadhānapareṇa yoginā bhavitavyamityupadiṣṭam*

will make those *kleśa-s* that have been made very thin like burnt seeds (*dagdhabījakaalpān*) by the fire of perfect wisdom (*prasamkhyāna-agni*), incapable of producing sprouts (*aprasava-dharmin*). Because of making those thin, subtle wisdom (*sūkṣmā-prajñā*), which is not touched again by *kleśa-s*, whose function has ceased, and which is merely the distinct appearance of *sattva* and *puruṣa* (*sattvapuruṣānyatāmātrakhyāti*), will be fit for reverse evolution (*pratiprasavāya*)⁴⁰⁵.

Vācaspati further clarifies Vyāsa's commentary. Vācaspati states that "if *kriyāyoga* (the yoga of action) itself thins the *kleśa-s*, then what is the use of *prasamkhyāna* (analytical insight)? Therefore, he says, "*pratanūkr̥tāniti*": *kriyāyoga*'s activity is limited to thinning, but not to rendering the *kleśa-s* infertile, whereas *prasamkhyāna* (analytical insight) is for rendering them infertile, like seeds that have been burned. Thus, infertility is expressed through similarity to seeds whose sprouts have been burned. It may be that *prasamkhyāna* (analytical insight) itself will make the *kleśa-s* incapable of producing (further afflictions), so what is the use of thinning these? Therefore, he says, "*teṣāmiti*": For if the *kleśa-s* are not thinned, the knowledge of the difference between *sattva* (the pure essence) and *puruṣa* (the self), being overcome by a powerful opposing force, will not even dare to arise. But when the *kleśa-s* are weakened, having been attenuated, that which opposes them arises through the practice of *vairāgya* (detachment) and *abhyāsa* (practice). And having arisen, as long as it is not touched or overwhelmed by them, then, it is said, the subtle knowledge (*sūkṣmā-prajñā*) that is solely the knowledge of the difference between *sattva* and *puruṣa* (*sattvapuruṣānyatākhyāti*), because its object is subtle due to its being beyond the senses, that subtle knowledge will be capable of counter-resolution and dissolution. Why? Because its authority is completed. Since the authority is completed, the commencement of the functions of the *guṇa-s* (qualities) through which it has the nature of a cause, therefore it is said thus"⁴⁰⁶.

⁴⁰⁵ Vyāsa on sūtra 2.2: *sa hyāsevyamānaḥ samādhiṃ bhāvayati kleśāṃśca pratanū karoti, pratanūkr̥tāṅkleśānprasamkhyānāgninā dagdhabījakaalpānaprasavadharmināḥ kariṣyatīti, teṣāṃ tanūkaraṇātpunaḥ kleśairaparāmr̥ṣṭā sattvapuruṣānyatāmātrakhyātiḥ sūkṣmā prajñā samāptādhikārā pratiprasavāya kalpiṣyata iti.*

⁴⁰⁶ Vācaspati on sūtra 2.2: *nanu kriyāyoga eva cetkleśānpratanūkaroti kṛtaṃ tarhi prasamkhyānenetyata āha – pratanūkr̥tāniti, kriyāyogasya pratanūkaraṇamātre vyāpāro na tu vandhyatve kleśānāṃ prasamkhyānasya tu tadvandhyatve, dagdhabījakaalpāniti vandhyatvena dagdhakalamabījasārūpyamuktam, syādetat, prasamkhyānameva cetkleśānaprasavadharmināḥ kariṣyati, kṛtameṣāṃ pratanūkaraṇenetyata āha – teṣāmiti, kleśānāmatānave hi balavadvirodhigraṣṭā sattvapuruṣānyatākhyātirudetumeva notsahate, prāgeva tadvandhyabhāvaṃ kartuṃ praviralīkṛteṣu tu kleśeṣu durbaleṣu tadvirodhinyapi vairāgyābhyāsābhyāmupajāyate, upajātā ca tairaparāmr̥ṣṭā'nabhibhūtā naiva yāvatparāmr̥ṣyata iti, sattvapuruṣānyatāmātrakhyātiḥ sūkṣmā*

From the above discussion it can be said that *kriyā-yoga* is a mandatory practice for attenuating the *kleśa-s*. This attenuation of *kleśa-s* will help the yogin to engage in the practice of *samādhi*. This *kriyā-yoga* needs the effort and energy of the yogin to perform because it involves physical and mental activities of the yogin. So, *kriyā-yoga* is simply the first yogic practice for the yogin to attenuate the first stage (gross/ *sthūla*) of activities of the *kleśa-s*. For attenuating the second of stage (*sūkṣma*) of the activities of the *kleśa-s*, Patañjali teaches the practice of *dhyāna*.

Dhyāna As a Yogic Practice for Weakening the *Kleśa*

Patañjali tells us in *sūtra* 2.11 that those *ṛtti-s* (*tadvṛttayaḥ*) [which have been attenuated by the practice of *kriyā-yoga*] are to be abandoned (*heya*) by the practice of meditation (*dhyāna*)⁴⁰⁷. Patañjali clearly states that *dhyāna* is the second stage of the yogic *sādhana* which will be practice after the yogin gets mastery of the first stage of *sādhana* which is *kriyā-yoga*. First stage of weakening the *kleśa-s* by the practice of *kriyā-yoga* will reach the second stage of weakening the *kleśa-s* by the practice of *dhyāna*. The question may arise: is it the case that *kriyā-yoga* does not include any kind of meditation? *Kriyā-yoga* may include meditation but here Patañjali seems to be saying that *dhyāna* is a superior kind of independent yogic practice which is mastered after one achieves the goal of *kriyā-yoga* which is the weakening of the attenuated gross *ṛtti-s*. It is to be noted that the objects of meditation in *kriyā-yoga* are many while the object of *dhyāna-yoga* is only the *puruṣa*. The meditation practices in the *kriyā-yoga* stage are to be understood as very surface level concentrations with the focus of attaining the goal of *kriyā-yoga* whereas in *dhyāna-yoga* practice, meditation practices are very deep and stronger level of concentration with the focus of abandoning the result of *kriyā-yoga*. The purpose of *kriyā-yoga* practice is to prepare the road for the arrival of *dhyāna-yoga* practice. This practice of *dhyāna* will help the yogin to abandon the attenuated *kleśa-s*.

Vyāsa states that “those *kleśa-s* that are made gross (*sthūla*) by the practice of *kriyā-yoga*, should be abandoned through *prasamkhyāna*-meditation until they are made subtle (*sūkṣmīkṛtā*), until they are like burnt seeds (*dagdhabījakaalpā*). Just as the gross dirt of clothes is first shaken off (*nirdhūyate*), and then the subtle dirt is removed with effort and by skillful means (*yatnenopāyena*), so too, the *sthūla* activities of *kleśa-s* have little resistance

prajñā' tīndriyatayā sūkṣmo 'syā viṣaya iti sūkṣmā prajñā pratiprasavāya pravilayāya kalpiṣyate, kutaḥ, samāptādhikārā yataḥ samāpto 'dhikāraḥ kāryārambhaṇaṁ guṇānāṁ yayā hetubhūtayā sā tathokteti.

⁴⁰⁷ *sūtra* 2.11: *dhyānaheyaṣṭadvṛttayaḥ.*

(*svalpapratipakṣāḥ*), but the subtle ones have great resistance (*mahāpratipakṣā*)⁴⁰⁸. Vācaspati elaborates Vyāsa's commentary by saying that Now, what is the abandonment (*hāna*) through the effort of a person (*puruṣaprayatna*) that has as its object (*kiṃviśayāt*) the afflictions (*kleśānām*) thinned (*tanūkṛtānām*) by the practice of action yoga (*kriyā-yoga*)? He says – "However, it distinguishes (*vyavacchinatti*) those abiding (*sthitānām*) that have approached (*upagatānām*) the state of a seed (*bījabhāva*) from the barren (*vandhyebhyaḥ*)." He recites the *sūtra*: "Their (*tad*) activities (*vṛttayaḥ*) are to be abandoned (*heyāḥ*) by meditation (*dhyāna*)." He explains – "Of the afflictions (*kleśānām*)." Even those (*kriyāyogatanūkṛtā*) thinned by the practice of *kriyā-yoga* can indeed be cut off (*ucchettum*) through being the cause of counter-production (*pratiprasava*) both in effect and in their essence (*svarūpataḥ*); therefore they are called gross (*sthūlā*). He says the limit (*āvadhīm*) of the effort of a person (*puruṣaprayatnasya*) that has the discrimination (*prasamkhyāna*) as its scope (*gocarasya*) – "As far as (*yāvaditi*)..." He (*vivṛṇoti*) clarifies– "Burnt (*dagdhā*)..." (*Sūkṣmīkṛtā*). Right here he gives an example (*dr̥ṣṭāntam*) – "Just as of cloths (*vastrāṇām*)..." The similarity (*samba*) between the example (*dr̥ṣṭānta*) and its application (*dār̥ṣṭāntikayoḥ*) is merely in terms of grossness and fineness (*sthūlasūkṣma*), but not again in terms of removability through effort (*prayatnāpaneyatayā*) because that is impossible in cases where there is abandonment through counter-production (*pratiprasava heyēṣu*). Those for whom a small (*svalpaḥ*) counter-force (*pratipakṣa*) is the cause of destruction (*uccheda*) are thus called. Those for whom a great (*Mahan*) counter-force (*pratipakṣa*) is the cause of destruction (*uccheda*) are thus called. The smallness (*svalpatvam*) is said to be inferior (*avaratayā*) because the discrimination (*prasamkhyānam*) is below (*cādhasāt*) counter-production (*pratiprasavasya*)⁴⁰⁹.

Patañjali makes it clear that *dhyāna* is an important yogic practice which is effective in counteracting the subtle *kleśa-s*. It is also evident that *dhyāna* is superior type of yogic practice than *kriyā-yoga* because *dhyāna* eliminates the subtle *kleśa-s* which are more difficult to get rid of as they remain in the *citta* in a hidden state. Patañjali tells us that at the first stage of yogic *sādhana*, *kriyā-yoga* eliminates *sthūla-kleśa-s* while at the second stage of yogic *sādhana*, *dhyāna-yoga* eliminates *sūkṣma-kleśa-s*. But Patañjali does not explain the nature of *sthūla-kleśa-s* and nor does Vyāsa explain that. Vijñanabhikṣu states that *sthūla-kleśa-s* are

⁴⁰⁸ Vyāsa on *sūtra* 2.11: *kleśānām yā vṛttayaḥ sthūlāstāḥ kriyāyogena tatkr̥tāḥ satyaḥ prasamkhyānena dhyānena hātavyā yāvatsūkṣmīkṛtā yāvaddagdhābījakalpā iti, yathā vastrāṇām sthūlā malaḥ pūrvam nirdhūyate paścātsūkṣmo yatnenopāyena cāpanīyate tathā svalpapratipakṣāḥ sthūlā vṛttayaḥ kleśānām, sūkṣmāstu mahāpratipakṣā iti.*

⁴⁰⁹ Vācaspati Miśra on *sūtra* 2.11.

those *vr̥tti-s* which are in manifested states or conditions (*abhivyaktāvasthā*) [in this mundane world]⁴¹⁰. Now questions arises: how do we know that *sthūla- vr̥tti-s* are manifested? Bhoja seems to reply that these manifested (*abhivyakta*) *vr̥tti-s* can be felt by the yogins because these *vr̥tti-s* have already started (*ārabhdha*) giving a sensation or feeling of *sukha* (pleasure), *duḥkha* (pain) and *moha* (delusion)⁴¹¹. It seems that these different feelings of *vr̥tti-s* are directly derived from the external objects and felt by physical body and mind of the yogin in the surface level of existence. When the yogin starts practicing *kriyā-yoga*, these disturbing feelings of different sensations lose their power to agitate the yogin gradually and when the yogin finally masters the *kriyā-yoga* practice, all these different *vr̥tti-s* of different disturbing sensations are attenuated and weakened completely in their external effects. After mastering the art of *kriyā-yoga*, the yogin, then, enters into the *dhyāna*, at that time the yogin mostly feels these subtle different feelings of pleasure and pain through his mind in a more deep level of existence in their internal effects. The yogin continues the *dhyāna* until these subtle *vr̥tti-s* are made weaker further which is called the *sūkṣma*-state of the *kleśa-s*. These *sūkṣma*-state of the *kleśa-s* also need to be eliminated. For the elimination of these *sūkṣma*-state of the *kleśa-s*, Patañjali recommends the practice of *pratiprasava*.

Pratiprasava As a Yogic Practice to Abandon the Sūkṣma- Kleśa

According to Patañjali, *pratiprasava* is the most superior and the final practice the yogin should be engaged to for the complete relief from the *kleśa-s*. Patañjali tells us that *kleśa-s* which have been weakened respectively by *kriyā-yoga* and *dhyāna* are to be finally abandoned by the practice of *pratiprasava*. Patañjali states in *sūtra* 2.10 that “these subtle (*sūkṣmāḥ*) *kleśa-s* are to be cast aside (*heya*) by a retrograding process of reversal (*pratiprasava*). Patañjali tells us that *pratiprasava* is a yogic practice by which the subtle *kleśa-s* are to be forsaken by the yogin. The question arises: what does the *sūkṣma-kleśa* mean in this *sūtra*? In other words, what is the nature of these five *sūkṣma-kleśa-s*? According to Vyāsa, *sūkṣma-kleśa-s* are those which are like the condition of burnt-seeds (*dagdhabījakaalpā*). By the metaphor of “*dagdhabījakaalpā*”, Vyāsa seems to say that in the *sūkṣma* state of *kleśa-s*, the *kleśa-s* (which are not dissolved) lose their capability of producing any further effects on the yogin. Bhoja thinks that *sūkṣma-kleśa-s* are those which remain in the *citta* in the form of *vāsanā* (latent desire) and those which do not manifest activity as *vr̥tti*. In explaining *sūtra* 2.10, Bhoja comments that “those subtle afflictions

⁴¹⁰ Vijñāna Bhikṣu on *sūtra* 2.11: *yā vr̥ttayah sthūlā abhivyaktāvasthāḥ*.

⁴¹¹ Bhoja on *sūtra* 2.11: *teṣāṃ kleśānāmārabdhakāryāṇāṃ yāḥ sukhaduḥkhamohātmikā*.

(*kleśa*), which remain in the form of latent impressions (*vāsanā*) and do not initiate transformation into the form of active expression (*ṛttirūpaṃ pariṇāmam*), are to be abandoned (*heyāstyaktavyāḥ*) through involution (*pratiprasava*) or reverse transformation (*pratilomapariṇāma*). When the mind (*citta*), along with its latent impressions (*savāsanam*), having fulfilled its purpose (*kṛtārtham*) in its own cause, egoity (*svakāraṇāsmītāyām*), is absorbed, then how can there be an origin (*saṃbhavaḥ*) of those that are without root (*nirmūlānām*)?”⁴¹²

In his Bengali commentary, Hariharānanda states that “*pratiprasava* =opposed to *prasava* or production, i.e. . . Disappearance by resolving into the cause. Subtle *kleśa* implies *kleśa* which has become like parched seed through *prasaṃkhyāna* or discriminative knowledge. The cognition of 'I' in one's own body can be completely removed on the realization the principle which is beyond the body and the senses. From such realization comes the knowledge that 'I am neither the body nor the senses.' Then no disorder in the body or of the senses affects the yogin's mind. When the latency of such knowledge is always present in a habitually one-pointed mind then it is called discriminative knowledge opposed to *asmitā kleśa*. On account of its being established in the mind no false notion of identification of the body with the Self can rise therein and therefore *asmitā* becomes like parched seed incapable of sprouting. In other words there cannot then arise any spontaneous Cognition of the 'I' as the self-associated with the body and the senses and thereby produce any distraction in the mind. This sort of parched state is the subtle form of *asmitā - kleśa*.

As the thought of renunciation becomes steadfast an insight into the nature of true Self is acquired and attachment to worldly objects becomes thin or ineffective as a parched seed. So does aversion become ineffective when a person gains an insight into the purity of the mind free from malice or hatred? Likewise fear of death is attenuated. With the cessation of the sense of identifying oneself with the body. Thus by means of the latent impressions acquired through *saṃprajñāna* (*sūtra* I.50), *kleśa-s* are thinned. Though attenuated they are still manifest. Just as the idea 'I am the body' indicates a manifest condition of the mind, so the idea 'I am not the body' i.e. the knowledge that (*puruṣa* is the Seer of 'I') is also a form of manifest condition. There is further similarity with the parched seed. The parched seed looks like an ordinary seed but has no power of sprouting; similarly *kleśa* in a subtle state exists but produces no modification, i.e. no afflictive fluctuation arises in the mind wherein only perfect

⁴¹² Bhoja on *sūtra* 2.10: *te sūkṣmāḥ kleśā ye vāsanārūpeṇaiva sthitā na ṛttirūpaṃ pariṇāmamārabhante te pratiprasavena pratilomapariṇāmena heyāstyaktavyāḥ, svakāraṇāsmītāyām kṛtārtham savāsanam cittam yadā praviṣṭam bhavati tadā kutasteṣāṃ nirmūlānām saṃbhavaḥ.*

knowledge prevails. At the root of modification based on knowledge also there exists *asmitā - kleśa* in a subtle form. The *kleśa* so reduced disappears with the disappearance of the mind. When through *para-vairāgya* or supreme renunciation, the mind merges into its constituent cause, the subtle *kleśa-s* also disappear along with it. Pralaya or Vilaya implies disappearance without chance of re-emergence. In ordinary circumstances afflictive modifications taking place in the mind determine the birth, span of life and the experience of pleasure and pain. *Kleśa-s* are attenuated by *kriyā-yoga*. Although in *saṁprajñāta-yoga* relationship with the body no doubt continues, that relationship is based on such knowledge as 'I am not the body' etc. This is the subtle state of *kleśa*. It is needless to say that it stops birth, span of life and further experience. In *asaṁprajñāta -yoga* that subtle relationship with the body also ceases, i.e. the modifications being merged in their natural causes, *kleśa-s* are completely destroyed” (P N Mukherjee’s translation).

Hariharānanda understands *pratiprasava* as an cosmological process in which *kleśa-s* along with the *citta* dissolves into the *avyakta prakṛti*. While Patañjali says that through the practice of *pratiprasava*, *kleśa-s* are destroyed, Hariharanda believes that through the practice of *para-vairagya*, subtle *kleśa-s* are destroyed along with the *citta*. He seems to be identifying *para-vairagya* as a different practice which cannot be found in the *Yogasūtra*. Hariharānanda also believes that in *saṁprajñāta-yoga*, the awareness that the yogin is not the body is the subtle state of the *kleśa-s* and this subtle awareness of the yogin stops the cycle of birth and life-span and experiences of the yogin, but even subtle *kleśa-s* are still *kleśa-s* which need to be got rid of completely to stop the cycle of birth and span of life and the experiences. For Hariharānanda, in *asaṁprajñāta-yoga*, the yogin does not have any identification with the body. But it is difficult to accept that in *asaṁprajñāta-yoga*, yogin is not identified with his body because the yogin is alive and he must have some kind of identification with the body.

It appears that all the above mentioned commentators believe that complete freedom from *kleśa-s* is only possible when the yogin’s *citta* is dissolved. In other words, permanent relief from the *kleśa-s* indicates the death of the yogin. I argue that a close reading of *sūtra* 2.10 does not support these conclusions made by these commentators. I claim that this whole understanding of this *sūtra* 2.10 is the result of some presuppositions. First presupposition is that *pratiprasava* is only an cosmological process of dissolution or destruction. Second presupposition is that *kaivalya* is *videhamukti*. In other words, liberation is only possible after the dissolution of the physical body and mind of the yogin. To understand *sūtra* 2.10 in a more comprehensive manner, we need to understand the meaning and nature of *kleśa-s* and

their relation with the *citta* in the *Yogasūtra* because we need to answer this question of whether dissolution of the whole personality of the yogin is necessary to eradicate *kleśa-s* completely. This inquiry invites us to explore the depths of the mind and its afflictions, as well as the transformative potential inherent in yoga practice. By examining how *kleśa-s* interact with the *citta*, we can discern whether a complete dissolution is indeed essential for achieving true liberation and clarity.

Is Death Mandatory for the Complete Dissolution of the *Kleśa*?

Kleśa-s have three states of functioning and three ways of getting rid of those three states. The first method of getting rid of the gross *kleśa-s* is by *kriyā-yoga* and the second method of getting of the subtle *kleśa-s* is *dhyāna-yoga*. The third and the final method of getting rid of the subtlest *kleśa-s* is by *pratiprasava*. While the name of these three practices for gaining freedom from *kleśa-s* are directly mentioned by Patañjali, Patañjali only mentions two stages of *kleśa-s* as *sthūla* and *sūkṣma* and he does not mention the third state of the *kleśa-s* which is reached by practice of *pratiprasava*. The commentators could not identify or name the third state. The standard interpretation is that the third or the last stage of *kleśa-s* can only be got rid of when the *citta* is dissolved because *kleśa-s* remain in the *citta* in a very subtle form. It is to be noted that the dissolution of the *kleśa-s* in the *citta* does not result in the dissolution of *citta* because while *kleśa-s* are the roots of suffering, not the *citta*. In this *sūtra* 2.10. these subtle roots of suffering are to be destroyed by the practice of *pratiprasava*. In the present context, Patañjali does not seem to be saying that *pratiprasava* is a process of dissolution of the *citta*, rather the dissolution of all kinds of roots of *kleśa-s* even if those roots are somehow connected with *citta*.

Patañjali tells us in *sūtra* 2.12 that “the stock of *karma* has the *kleśa-s* as its root. It is experienced in present or future lives”⁴¹³ (*kleśamūlaḥ karmāsayodṛṣṭādrṣṭajanmavedanīyaḥ*). For Patañjali, *kleśa* is the main cause of accumulation of different *karma-s* which can be good and bad. There are five *kleśa-s* which are *avidyā*, *asmitā*, *rāga*, *dveṣa* and *abhiniveśa*. Now the question may arise: why they are called *kleśa-s*. Bhoja replied that “they are called *kleśa-s* because they torment (*kliśnanti*) beings”⁴¹⁴. How do these *kleśa-s* torment us? Hariharānanda states that these *kleśa-s* torment us in the form of knowledge characterized by inverted or erroneous cognitions (*viparyayajñānāni*) that produce suffering (*duḥkha*)⁴¹⁵. *Kleśa-s* are linked with *karma*. *Karma* means actions. According to Vyāsa, *karma* is of two

⁴¹³ Bryant's translation

⁴¹⁴ Bhoja on *sūtra* 1.24: *kliśnantīti kleśā avidyādayo vakṣyamāṇāḥ*.

⁴¹⁵ Hariharānanda on *sūtra* 1.24: *avidyā''dayaḥ pañca kleśāḥ = duḥkhakarāṇi viparyayajñānāni*.

types: one is *kuśala* which can mean good, proper; beneficial; suitable; good and well while other one is *akuśala* which can mean bad, improper, inauspicious and evil. *Kuśala-karma* is similar to *dharma* (righteous actions) and *akuśala karma* is similar to *adharma* (unrighteous actions). Bhoja believes that *karma* is of three types: *vihita* (which is prescribed), *pratiṣiddha* (which is prohibited) and *vyāmiśra* (which is mixture of prescribed and prohibited actions)⁴¹⁶. The results of *karma* and *kleśa* are known as “*vipāka*”. Bhoja defines that “those that ripen (*vipacyante*) are called *vipāka*”. Bhoja comments that “fruits of actions” (*vipāka*) are the experiences of birth in particular species (*jāti*), lifespan (*āyur*), and enjoyment (*bhoga*)⁴¹⁷. Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha states that the result of these three *vipāka* is happiness and suffering⁴¹⁸. Due to *vipāka*, the activities of different *kleśa* and *karma* leave imprints in the mind of the yogin which is known as “*āśaya*” (desire and a receptacle). For Vyāsa, *āśaya* is *vāsanā* (inclination)⁴¹⁹. According to Hariharānanda, *āśaya* is the inclination towards birth, the life, and pleasure and pain⁴²⁰. *Āśaya* is also technically understood as the *stock* or the balance of the fruits of previous actions in the *citta*. In *Yogasūtra*, *karmāśaya* is the store house of all the impressions of *kleśa-s* and *karma-s* in the mind of the yogin. That is why Patañjali says in *sūtra* 2.12 that *kleśa-s* is the main cause of *karmāśaya* and one has to experience the results of *kleśa-s* in this life or in future life⁴²¹.

Hariharānanda states that “the predispositions (*āśayāḥ*) are the formative forces (*saṃskārāḥ*) that are the cause (*hetavaḥ*) of birth (*jāti*), lifespan (*āyur*), and enjoyment (*bhoga*). *Karma* is the activity (*vyāpāraḥ*) of the mind (*citta*), senses (*indriya*), and vital energies (*prāṇānām*). Those formative forces (*saṃskārāḥ*) that arise from that experience (*tadanubhava-jātā*), remaining (*santaḥ*) undivided (*avibhaktāḥ*) again (*punar*), would generate (*janayeran*) activities (*ceṣṭā*) that are in accordance with themselves (*svānugūṇāḥ*). And thus they would manifest (*āvirbhāvayeyuḥ*) bodies (*śarīra*), senses (*indriya*), pleasures (*sukha*), pains (*duḥkha*), and so forth (*ādīni*) that are concomitant with activities (*ceṣṭāsahabhāvīni*). That (*sa eva*) is indeed the storehouse of *karma* (*karmāśayaḥ*)”⁴²².

⁴¹⁶ Bhoja on *sūtra* 1.24: *vihitapratīṣiddhavyāmiśrarūpāṇi karmāṇi*.

⁴¹⁷ Bhoja on *sūtra* 1.24: *vipacyanta iti vipākāḥ karmaphalāni jātyāyurbhogāḥ*.

⁴¹⁸ Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha on *sūtra* 1.24: *vipākastayoḥ phalaṃ sukhaduḥkhe*.

⁴¹⁹ Vyāsa on *sūtra* 1.24: *tadanugūṇā vāsanā āśayāḥ*.

⁴²⁰ Hariharānanda on *sūtra* 1.24: *vāsanāḥ = āśayāḥ, tad yathā -jātivāsanā -āyurvāsanā -sukhaduḥkhavāsanā*.

⁴²¹ *sūtra* 2.12: *kleśamūlaḥ karmāśayo dṛṣṭādrṣṭajanmavedanīyaḥ*.

⁴²² Hariharānanda on *sūtra* 2.12: *jātyāyurbhoga-hetavaḥ saṃskārāḥ āśayāḥ, karma cittendriyaprāṇānām vyāpāraḥ, tadanubhava-jātā ye saṃskārā punaravibhaktāḥ santaḥ svānugūṇāśceṣṭā janayeraṃstathā ca ceṣṭāsahabhāvīni śarīrendriyasukhaduḥkhādīnyāvirbhāvayeyuḥ sa eva karmāśayaḥ*.

In explaining *sūtra* 2.12, Vyāsa comments that “there, the accumulation of virtuous and non-virtuous karma (*puṇyāpuṇyakarmāśayaḥ*) arises from desire (*kāma*), greed (*lobha*), delusion (*moha*), and anger (*krodha*). It is experienced either in this very lifetime (*dr̥ṣṭajanmavedanīyaḥ*) or in a future lifetime (*adr̥ṣṭajanmavedanīyaḥ*). There, that accumulation of virtuous karma (*puṇyakarmāśayaḥ*) which is accomplished through intense agitation (*tīvrasaṃvegena*), *mantra*, asceticism (*tapas*), meditative absorption (*samādhībhīḥ*), or through the propitiation (*ārāadhanādvā*) of powerful gods (*īśvaradevatāmahaṛṣimahānubhāvānām*), once perfected (*pariṇiṣpannaḥ*), ripens immediately (*sadyaḥ paripacyate*). Likewise, that accumulation of non-virtuous karma (*pāpakarmāśayaḥ*), which is repeatedly committed (*kṛtaḥ punaḥ punarapakāraḥ*) with intense suffering (*tīvrakleśena*) towards those who are frightened (*bhīta*), sick (*vyādhita*), or wretched (*kṛpaṇeṣu*), or towards those who are trustworthy (*viśvāśopagateṣu*), powerful (*mahānubhāveṣu*), or ascetic (*tapasviṣu*), also ripens immediately (*sadya eva paripacyate*), just as Nandīśvara Kumāra, having abandoned (*hitvā*) his human condition (*manuṣyapariṇāmaṃ*), was transformed (*pariṇataḥ*) into a deity (*devatvena*), and likewise Nahuṣa, the king of the gods (*devānāmindraḥ*), having abandoned (*hitvā*) his own state (*svakaṃ pariṇāmaṃ*), was transformed (*pariṇataḥ*) into an animal (*tiryaktvena*). There, for the beings in hell (*nārakāṇām*), there is no accumulation of karma (*karmāśayaḥ*) that is experienced in this very lifetime (*dr̥ṣṭajanmavedanīyaḥ*), and for those whose afflictions are exhausted (*kṣīṇakleśānām*), there is no accumulation of karma (*karmāśayaḥ*) that is experienced in a future lifetime (*adr̥ṣṭajanmavedanīyaḥ*)”⁴²³.

Vācaspati further elaborates Vyāsa’s commentary. Vācaspati says that “it may be asked, are afflictions (*kleśa-s*) and the accumulation of *karma* (*karmāśaya*) the cause of birth, life, and enjoyment, and also torment people? But are ignorance (*avidyā*) and the like not also causes? How are ignorance and the like afflictions? To this Patañjali says: The accumulation of karma has its root in afflictions and is experienced in seen and unseen births. The afflictions are the root of its arising, and it is thus spoken of in its function as cause and effect. This means that the accumulation of *karma* has its root in ignorance and the like and is the

⁴²³ Vyāsa on *sūtra* 2.12: *tatra puṇyāpuṇyakarmāśayaḥ kāmalobhamohakrodhaprabhavaḥ, sa dr̥ṣṭajanmavedanīyaścādr̥ṣṭajanmavedanīyaśca, tatra tīvrasaṃvegena mantratapaḥsamādhībhīrṇirvartita īśvaradevatāmahaṛṣimahānubhāvānāmārāadhanādvā yaḥ pariṇiṣpannaḥ sa sadyaḥ paripacyate puṇyakarmāśayaḥ iti, tathā tīvrakleśena bhītavyādhitakṛpaṇeṣu viśvāśopagateṣu vā mahānubhāveṣu vā tapasviṣu kṛtaḥ punaḥ punarapakāraḥ sa cāpi pāpakarmāśayaḥ sadya eva paripacyate, yathā nandīśvaraḥ kumāro manuṣyapariṇāmaṃ hitvā devatvena pariṇataḥ, tathā nahuṣo’pi devānāmindraḥ svakaṃ pariṇāmaṃ hitvā tiryaktvena pariṇataḥ iti, tatra nārakāṇām nāsti dr̥ṣṭajanmavedanīyaḥ karmāśayaḥ, kṣīṇakleśānāmapi nāstyadr̥ṣṭajanmavedanīyaḥ karmāśayaḥ iti.*

cause of birth, life, and enjoyment; therefore ignorance and the like are also its cause and are thus afflictions. He explains: In that connection, the *āśaya* is that in which worldly beings repose. The *āśaya* of actions is virtue (*dharma*) and non-virtue (*adharma*). From desire, in engaging in actions motivated by desire, virtue becomes the cause of heaven and so forth. Similarly, from greed, non-virtue arises, such as stealing the property of others. From delusion (*moha*), even when acting with the intention of virtue in non-virtuous acts such as violence, it is still non-virtue. However, there is no virtue born of delusion. There is virtue born of anger, as in the case of Dhruva, whose anger arose from the insult of his father, and through the accumulation of meritorious karma motivated by the desire to conquer, he attained a higher position among the inhabitants of the intermediate realm. But non-virtue born of anger, such as killing a *brāhmaṇa*, is well-known among beings. He speaks of its twofold nature, saying, "It is experienced in a seen birth." He speaks of what is experienced in a seen birth: "Through intense agitation." He gives examples in order: "As in the case of Nandīśvara," and "There, among the hell beings," the different kinds of hells, such as Kumbhīpāka, are attained through the accumulation of *karma*. The hell beings who perform those actions do not have an accumulation of karma that is experienced in a seen birth. Indeed, such suffering, continuously experienced for thousands of years and more, is not possible with a human body or through its transformations"⁴²⁴.

Patañjali appears to be stating in *sūtra* 2.12 that *kaivalya* is impossible if the yogin does not engage in *kriyā-yoga*, *dhyāna* -yoga, and *pratiprasava* to eliminate the various functional states of *kleśa*. The *avidyā*, *lobha*, *moha*, *rāga*, *dveṣa*, and numerous other negative *kleśa*-s motivate or compel people to act in their daily lives. The repercussions of these several *kleśa*-s make it impossible to achieve *kaivalya* through *samādhi* -meditation. Therefore, the outcome of *samādhi* which is *kaivalya*, cannot be reaped until or until *samādhi* is attained.

For this reason, Patañjali makes it quite evident that *kleśa* is the primary source of the various behaviors that keep people trapped in the cycle of birth and death. The yogin will experience several *ṛtti*-s, including *Kama*, *krodha*, *lobha*, and *moha*, as well as other unpleasant *ṛtti*-s, as a result of the *kleśa*-s' impacts. One must experience *sukha* or *duḥkha* as the results of their acts when they are motivated or directed by these various *kleśa*-s. It is important to realize that although *kleśa*-s are the root cause of both good and negative deeds, these deeds in turn lead to more *kleśa*-s in the yogin's subsequent existence.

⁴²⁴ See the commentary of Vācaspati on *sūtra* 2.12.

Therefore, *duḥkha* is unavoidable when one is in control of *kleśa* and karma. If one is not freed, the *kleśa-s* and *karma* will be a never-ending circle of pain. *Karma* begets *kleśa*, and *kleśa* begets *karma*. *Karmāśaya* is the term for this collection of *kleśa* and *karma* imprints. *Samskāra* is another name for this *karmāśaya*. When someone does something that is influenced by *kleśa*, their body and mind are imprinted with *samskāra* related to that activity. These deeply rooted *samskāra* s will persist in the *citta* as a seed that eventually sprouts into a tree. *Karmaphala* is the term for the outcome of such seed germination.

An individual must experience the goodness or badness of the outcomes of various karmas during this incarnation or in a subsequent one. The *karmaphala* will be intense and quick to experience if one acts with maximum speed and intensity. The results of those *samskāra-s* and deeds are experienced in the current life when the *āśaya* or *karmaphala*, or *samskāra* is very powerful and effective; in the next lifetime, the results are realized when the *samskāra-s* are weak. *Karmaphala* will either be experienced now or in the future, depending on the severity and intensity of the *karmāśaya*. *Karmaphala* will be active in this life or the next, to put it another way.

For this reason, Patañjali says that *karmāśaya*, which is created by the *kleśa-s* by good or bad deeds, will be relived in this incarnation or the next. *Drṣṭājanmavedanīya* is the state in which the yogin's *karma* produces results in this body; *Adṛṣṭājanmavedanīya* is the state in which the karma's effects are felt in the next incarnation. It is also important to remember that excessive *pāpa-karma* or *puṇya-karma* will cause one to suffer the consequences of those deeds in this lifetime. Therefore, it is evident that in certain situations, deeds driven by excessive *pāpa* and *puṇya-karma* carried out in this incarnation will undoubtedly result in outcomes in this life rather than in a subsequent one.

According to Vyāsa, by intense austerity and devotion to the gods, a man by the name of Nandīśvara achieved the divine body of the god in this human body in ancient times. The curse of the *Ṛṣis* turned the good-hearted human Nasuḥa into a snake since Nahuṣa severely tormented and agitated the *Ṛṣis*. In this *sūtra*, Patañjali explains that in order to eradicate the five *kleśa-s* that are produced by *karma* and *karmāśaya*, *kriyā-yoga* should attenuate them, *dhyāna* -yoga should weaken them, and *pratiprasava* should dissolve them. The yogin will achieve *samādhi* and *kaivalya* after *kleśa-s* are gone. Lack of *kleśa-s* results in the absence of *Kama*, *krodha*, and *lobha* as well as *karmāśaya* and *karmaphala*. *Sukha* and *duḥkha* will not exist when *karmaphala* is absent. *Karmāśaya* will not exist if there is no sense of *sukha* and

duḥkha. Now the question arises: how the results of *karmāśaya* which are either pleasurable or painful are experienced?

In *sūtra* 2.13, Patañjali tells us that “as long as the root of the *kleśa*-s exists, it fructifies as type of birth, span of life, and life experience [of an individual]”⁴²⁵ (*sati mūle tadvipāko jātyāyurbhogāḥ*). Bhoja explains that “when the afflictions (*kleśa*), which have the characteristics of being rooted and liberated, are not overcome, the ripening (*vipāka*) of *karma* in the form of skillful and unskillful actions results in birth (*jāti*), lifespan (*āyur*), and experiences (*bhoga*). Birth (*jāti*) is, for example, being a human (*manuṣyatva*); lifespan (*āyus*) is a long-lasting connection to a single body (*śarīra*); experiences (*bhoga*) are objects (*viśaya*), senses (*indriyāṇi*), and the experience of pleasure (*sukhasamvid*) and pain (*duḥkhasamvid*). The word “experience” (*bhogaśabda*) is derived from the instrumental sense of the action of *karma*. The meaning here is that the *karmic* imprints (*karmavāsanā*) accumulated in the ground of the mind (*cittabhūmi*) since beginningless time (*anādikāla*), as they ripen (*pākam upayānti*), remain in a state of dominant and subordinate qualities (*guṇapradhānabhāvena sthitā*) and begin their own function characterized by birth (*jāti*), lifespan (*āyur*), and experiences (*bhoga*)”⁴²⁶.

Vyāsa’s Interpretation of *Sūtra* 2.13

Vyāsa states that “when the afflictions (*kleśa*) are present, the accumulation of *karma* (*karmāśaya*) is capable of producing a result (*vipāka*), but not when the root of affliction has been cut off. Just as rice grains covered with husk, possessing the potential of an unburnt seed, are capable of sprouting, but not when the husk has been removed or the seed has been burnt; similarly, the accumulation of *karma*, when bound by afflictions, is capable of sprouting a result, but not when the afflictions have been removed, nor when the seed of affliction has been burnt by *prasamkhyāna*. And that result (*vipāka*) is threefold: birth, lifespan, and enjoyment (*bhoga*).

Here, this is considered: Is one action the cause of one birth, or does one action project multiple births? A second consideration: Do multiple actions produce multiple births, or do multiple actions produce one birth? Certainly, one action is not the cause of one birth. Why?

⁴²⁵ Bryant’s translation

⁴²⁶ Bhoja on *sūtra* 2.13: *mūlamuktalakṣaṇāḥ kleśāḥ, teṣvanabhibhūteṣu satsu karmanām kuśalākuśalarūpāṇām vipākaḥ phalaṃ jātyāyurbhogā bhavanti, jātirmanuṣyatvādiḥ, āyuscirakālamekaśarīrasambandhaḥ, bhogā viśayā indriyāṇi sukhasamvidduḥkhasamvicca karmakaraṇabhāvasādhanaavyutpattiyā bhogaśabdasya, idamatra tātparyam cittabhūmāvanādikālasamcitāḥ karmavāsanā yathā yathā pākamupayānti tathā tathā guṇapradhānabhāvena sthitā jātyāyurbhogaalakṣaṇaṃ svakāryamārabhante.*

Because if the accumulation of countless actions from beginningless time, and the remaining actions, and the current actions, did not have a fixed order of fruition, there would be no certainty for beings, and that would be undesirable. Nor is one action the cause of multiple births. Why? Because if each single action among many actions were the cause of multiple births, then the absence of a time for the result of the remaining actions would occur, and that too is undesirable. Nor are multiple actions the cause of multiple births. Why? Because those multiple births cannot occur simultaneously; they must occur sequentially. And thus, there would be the consequence of the previous fault.

Therefore, in the interval between birth (*janma*) and death (*prāyaṇa*), the diverse accumulation of meritorious and non-meritorious karmic predispositions (*pun्यāpunyakarmāśayapracaya*), existing in a state of principal and subordinate, manifested at death, having accomplished death through a single connected series (*ekapraghaṭṭaka*), coalesced and produces only one birth (*janma*). And that birth obtains its lifespan (*āyuska*) from that very action, and in that lifespan, enjoyment (*bhoga*) is realized through that very action. Therefore, that karmic predisposition (*karmāśaya*) is called "threefold result" (*trivipāka*) because it is the cause of birth, lifespan, and enjoyment. Thus, it is said to be a karmic predisposition (*karmāśaya*) that ripens in a single lifetime (*ekabhavikaḥ karmāśayaḥ*).

However, that [*karma*] which is experienced as agreeable at birth, is of one type as it begins with one result due to being the cause of enjoyment, or is of two types as it begins with two results due to being the cause of life and enjoyment, like Nandīśvara or like Advuṣa. This *citta* (mind), however, has been variegated, as it were, by *vāsanās* (predispositions) brought about by the experience of afflictions (*kleśa*), actions (*karma*), and their results (*vipāka*). Like a fishing net, it is completely filled, as it were, with knots. These *vāsanās* have arisen from previous lifetimes. As it is said, "That accumulation of *karma* is of one lifetime." Those *saṃskāra-s* (traces) that are causes of memory are *vāsanās*, and they are without beginning.

That accumulation of *karma* which is of one lifetime is both determinate (*niyata*) in its result and indeterminate (*aniyata*) in its result. Of those, this is the rule for that which is experienced as agreeable at birth and is determinate in its result: this is not the rule for that which is not experienced as agreeable at birth and is indeterminate in its result. Why? Because for that which is not experienced as agreeable at birth and is indeterminate in its result, there are three possibilities: the destruction of the action which has been done but is not yet ripe; or

its entering into a principal action; or its lasting for a long time, having been overcome by a principal action that is determinate in its result.

There, the destruction of the action which has been done but is not yet ripe is like the destruction of a white action when a black action arises. In that regard, it has been said, "Two and two actions are to be known. One mass of evil-doing destroys the one who has done virtuous deeds. Therefore, desire to do good deeds, for here the wise know your actions."

[Or] it's entering into a principal action. In that regard, it has been said, "There may be a small admixture which is easy to remove and easy to reflect upon, which is not sufficient to diminish the merit of a virtuous person. Why? Because I have much other merit, and when this has entered into it, it will only slightly diminish the merit in heaven."

Or it's lasting for a long time, having been overcome by a principal action that is determinate in its result. How is that? It is said that death is the common manifesting cause of an action that is experienced as agreeable at birth and is determinate in its result, but not of one that is not experienced as agreeable at birth and is indeterminate in its result. However, that action which is not experienced as agreeable at birth and is indeterminate in its result may be destroyed, or may enter into another action, or may remain for a long time, having been overcome, until a common manifesting cause of action makes it not turn towards its result. Therefore, because the place, time, and cause of its result are not ascertained, this course of action is wondrous and difficult to know. And the cessation is not due to exceptions to the general rule, thus, the accumulation of karma is recognized as being of one lifetime ⁴²⁷.

Vācaspati's Interpretation of *Sūtra* 2.13

Vācaspati comments that "If it be argued that, since the *karmāśaya* (store of karmic traces) is rooted in *avidyā* (ignorance), upon the arising of *vidyā* (knowledge) and the destruction of *avidyā*, may no other *karmāśaya* arise. But, since it is impossible to exhaust through experience the countless *karmāśayas* of former existences accumulated in a beginningless succession of births, whose time of ripening is unfixed, *saṃsāra* would be impossible to uproot. Therefore, [the *sūtra*] says: "While the root exists, its ripening is *jāti* (birth), *āyus* (lifespan), and *bhoga* (experience)." This is what it means: The *karmāśaya*, whose fruit is pleasure and pain, produces birth and lifespan as necessarily connected with itself, in accordance with its purpose. And pleasure and pain are always attended by attachment and aversion and inseparable from them; without those [attachment and aversion], they [pleasure and pain] do not occur. Nor is there any possibility that one would be satisfied

⁴²⁷ See the commentary of Vyāsa on *sūtra* 2.12.

or agitated by that which is pleasure or pain. Therefore, this ground of the self, sprinkled with the water of *kleśa-s*, is the field for the production of the fruit of karma. Thus, even in the generation of fruit, the *kleśa-s* are cooperative causes of the *karmāśaya*. Hence, with the eradication of the *kleśa-s*, due to the absence of a cooperative cause, even though the time of ripening is nonexistent, endless, and unfixed, [the potential fruit] is like a seed destroyed by perfect discernment and is not fit to sprout. The *bhāṣya* (commentary) itself clarifies the stated meaning, saying: "While existing..." In this very context, it gives an example: "As with husks..." Even husked seeds, through sweat and the like, are like burnt seeds. It applies this to the example, saying: "Thus..."

Objection: *kleśa-s* are not able to be removed, because truly existent things cannot be removed. Therefore, [the *sūtra*] says: "No." [It means that there is] the state of the seed of *kleśa-s* burnt by perfect discernment. It speaks of the threefold nature of *vipāka* (ripening), saying: "That and..." *Vipāka* is that which is ripened, that which is accomplished by *karmas* (actions).

The first consideration is to establish the certainty of one karma, examining the possibilities of one or many births. The second, however, is to establish the certainty of many karmas, examining the possibilities of one or many births. Thus, there are four possibilities. Of these, the first possibility is refuted: one karma is not the cause of one birth. The question is asked: Why? The answer: Because for one karma remaining from the countless accumulations since beginningless time in each birth, and from the exhaustion in each birth, there arises a lack of confidence for people due to the irregularity of the order of fruition for the present karma. And that is undesirable.

This is what is said: Because the karmic residues are sparse due to the dwindling of karma and the abundance of its arising, and because they are mutually compressed, with continuous arising and without interruption, there is no confidence for the wise to determine the order of fruition as they await their own maturation, and so there arises a lack of confidence in performing meritorious deeds.

The second possibility is refuted: one karma is not the cause of many births. The question is asked: Why? The answer: Because if a single karma deposited in many births is the cause for the maturation characterized by many births, the absence of a time for the maturation of the remaining karma would arise. And that is also undesirable, because if karma is futile, there would be the consequence of not performing it. When there is a lack of confidence due to the irregularity of the order of fruition in a single karma to be eliminated in

one birth, what to say then of a single karma to be eliminated in many births? There, indeed, due to the absence of opportunity, there would only be the absence of a time for the maturation of the present karma. This is the idea.

The third faulty possibility is refuted: many karmas are not the cause of one birth. The reason is given there: that many births cannot occur simultaneously for those who are not yogis, and must be expressed sequentially. For if a thousand karmas were to simultaneously produce a thousand births, then, from the exhaustion of those very thousand karmas, there would be a time for the maturation and a regulation of the order of fruition for the remaining karma. But there is no simultaneity of births. Thus, the fault stated in the first position [*pakṣa*] is what is meant.

Thus, with the rejection of the three positions, the position remains, by process of elimination, that multiple *karmas* are the cause of a single birth. Therefore, he says, "*tasmājjanma iti*" - birth, and dying, *janmaprāyaṇe*, their *antaram*, the middle, in that, variegated by the offering of pleasure and pain as fruit (*vicitrasukhaduḥkḥaphalopahāreṇa vicitraḥ*), that which is extremely manifest, immediately gives fruit, that is *pradhāna* (principal); but that which is somewhat delayed, that is *upasarjana* (subordinate). *Prāyaṇa* is death. By that, made manifest, brought face to face with the commencement of its own effect (*svakāryārambhaṇābhimukhamupanīta*), simultaneously intensified by a single effort (*ekapraghaṭṭakena yugapatsammūrchito*), in an effect characterized by birth and so forth (*janmādilaṅkāṇe kārye kartavya*), having attained a state of oneness (*ekalolībhāvamāpanna*), it creates a single birth, not many, and that birth, the state of being a human and so forth (*manuṣyādibhāva*), through that very *karma*, having obtained its lifespan (*labdhāyuska*), by the difference of time (*kālabheda*), its life becomes fixed (*niyatajīvitam bhavati*).

In that lifespan (*āyusī*), through that very *karma*, enjoyment (*bhogaḥ*), the direct experience of pleasure and pain (*sukhaduḥkḥasākṣātkāraḥ*), comes into being through its own connection (*svasaṃbandhitayā saṃpadyata iti*). Therefore, that *karmāśaya*, because it is the cause of birth, lifespan, and enjoyment (*jātyāyurbhogahetutvāt*), is called *trivipāka* (having three kinds of result). He summarizes the general rule (*autsargikamupasaṃharati*) – "*ata ekabhavikaḥ karmāśaya ukta iti*" - therefore, the *karmāśaya* is said to be *ekabhavika* (related to one existence). *Eko bhava ekabhavaḥ* (one existence is one existence), the compound is formed by "*pūrvakāletyādīnā*". *Ekabhavo'syāstīti matvarthīyaṣṭhan* (one existence exists for it, in the sense of *matvarthīya*). Sometimes the reading is *aikabhavika iti*, there *eka* - from the

word *bhava* the affix “*thak*” is added in the sense of *bhava*, *ekajanmāvacchinnamasya bhavanamityarthaḥ* - it's becoming is limited to one birth, this is the meaning.

Thus, having stated that a generally applicable single-existence *karma* has a threefold result (*trivipāka*), it distinguishes the threefold result of *karma* experienced in the visible present life (*drṣṭajanmavedanīya*): Regarding the visible, Nandīśvara's exceptionally meritorious distinction (*puṇyabheda*), born from extremely intense agitation and superior means, in his human birth with a life span limited to eight years, is twofold (*dvipākam*) because it is the cause of both life span (*āyur*) and enjoyment (*bhoga*). However, in Nahuṣa's case, the distinction is the opposite of merit (*apūṇyabheda*), being merely the cause of enjoyment (*bhogamātrahetuḥ*) since his life span was determined by the action that was antagonistic to Agastya's striking with his heel, namely, the cause of attaining Indra's position.

Now, just as a single-existence karmic accumulation (*karmāśaya*) exists, are the habitual tendencies of afflictions (*kleśavāsanā*) and the habitual tendencies of experiencing the results of karma (*karmavipākānubhavavāsanā*) also favorable to enjoyment, and thus, wouldn't a human being who has fallen into an animal realm (*tiryagyonimāpanna*) enjoy what is appropriate to that species (*tajjātīyocitaṃ*)? To this he says, "Because of affliction (*kleśeti*), [it is] compacted (*saṃmūrchitaṃ*), having attained a state of oneness (*ekalolībhāvamāpannam*)." To distinguish the nature of habitual tendencies (*vāsanā*) from merit and demerit (*dharmādharmābhyaṃ*), he says, "Those formations (*saṃskārā ye*),”

It prepares the ground for occasionally making an exception to the general rule of having only one lifetime – that which is thus. But, by the word "but," it distinguishes from *asana*. This rule of having only one lifetime applies only to that which is experienced in this very life (*drṣṭajanmavedanīya*) and has a fixed result (*niyatavipāka*), not to that which is not experienced in this very life (*adrṣṭajanmavedanīya*) and is of what nature, having an unfixed result (*anīyatavipāka*)? It asks the reason – why? It states the reason – because. First, it speaks of one course – of what has been done (*kṛtasya*). Secondly, it speaks of – pre-eminence (*pradhāna*). Thirdly, it speaks of – fixedness (*niyata*).

Here, first, he distinguishes: "There, of what has been done," from the actions of renounces that are neither white nor black. There are only three other kinds of actions: black, black-white, and white-white. Therefore, here, the white *karmāśaya* (store of *karma*), which is accomplished by austerity, *svādhyāya* (study), and so forth, is said to be the destroyer of the black karma that has not yet given its fruit. And, due to the absence of distinction, even the variegated [karma] is [destroyed] because of its connection with the black aspect. Thus, it

must be understood. Here itself, the Blessed One cites a *āmnāya* (traditional saying): "Where this," is [said]. The connection is that two, two, indeed, actions, black and black-white, destroy. By repetition, abundance is indicated. Of whom? He says, "Of a sinful person." Which one destroys?

He says, "A single mass of meritorious deeds," of a group, because it is accomplished by a group. Therefore, by this, the third, the white *karmāśaya* is stated. This is what is said: This white *karmāśaya*, called such, which is accomplished by means devoid of harming others, and so forth, even though it is only one, destroys many *karmāśayas* that are intensely opposed, black ones and black-white ones. Therefore, desire that! Because of being in accordance with the *chandas* (Vedic meter), it is *ātmanepada* (middle voice). The rest is easily understood. And here, that is some greatness of the arising of white karma, because the absence of the others [arises], not from the suffering born of *svādhyāya* and so forth. Indeed, *adharma* (non-virtue) is opposed to suffering alone, but it is opposed to the suffering that is its own effect. And the suffering produced by *svādhyāya* and so forth is not its effect. If it were its effect, the injunctions of *svādhyāya* and so forth would be useless, because its arising is from its power alone. Or, in the absence of its arising, even *kumbhīpāka* and so forth would be enjoined. But in the absence of injunction, there is the absence of its arising. Thus, all is well-reasoned.

It distinguishes the second course: In a primary action like the *Jyotiṣṭoma* sacrifice, there is the insertion (*āvāpagamanam*) of something related to it, such as the injury of animals (*paśuhiṃsā*). Indeed, there are two effects of injury etc.: Since it is prescribed as subordinate to the primary act, it is helpful to it (*tadupakāraḥ*). However, because injury is prohibited by the injunction "one should not injure any beings" (*Na hiṃsyātsarvā bhūtāni*), it is also harmful (*anarthaśca*). Therefore, since it is performed as subordinate to the primary act, it is only secondary (*apradhānataiva*). Thus, it cannot immediately (*drāgityeva*), being independent of the primary act, produce its own harmful result. But, when the primary action has begun to ripen, it remains there rendering assistance to the primary act (*pradhāne sāhāyakamācarantī vyavatiṣṭhate*), and the remaining in its own function as a mere seed, rendering assistance to the main action, is the insertion into the primary action.

Where it has been said by Pañcaśikha: the slight commingling (*saṃkara*) arising from the *Jyotiṣṭoma* sacrifice etc., of the primary unseen (*pradhānāpūrvasya*), with the unseen caused by the injury of animals etc. (*paśuhiṃsādijanmanā'narthahetunā'pūrveṇa*), is indeed possible to be removed (*saparihāraḥ śakyo hi*) by what expiation (*kiyatā prāyaścittena*

parihartum). But if, through negligence, the expiation is not performed, and it should ripen at the time of the fruition of the primary action (*pradhānakarmavipākasamaye ca vipacyeta*), even then, to whatever extent that harm produces (*yāvantamasāvanartham prasūte*), to that extent, the wise, who are immersed in the great lake of the nectar of happiness (*sukhasudhāmāhāhrada*), brought about by a multitude of merits (*puṇyasabhāropanīta*), disregard it with reflection (*sapratyavamarṣo mṛśyante hi*), [as they would] a spark of the fire of suffering (*duḥkhavahnikaṇikām*) caused by a mere sin (*pāpamātropapāditām*). Therefore, it is not sufficient to diminish or destroy the very great merit of the wise one.

The objector asks – why? Answer is that – Indeed, I have much other merit (*kuśalam hi me bahvanyadasti*) that is established as ancillary to the primary action (*pradhānakarma parikaratayā vyavasthitam*), ending with the fees for initiation etc. (*dīkṣaṇīyādidakṣiṇāntam*), where this slight commingling (*svalpaḥ saṃkaraḥ*) in its result, even in heaven (*svarge'pyasya phale*), will cause a diminution (*apakarṣam*) from a heaven (*svargāt*) completely untouched by suffering (*sarvathā duḥkhenāparāmṛṣṭād*), [causing only] a mixing of a little, a very little suffering (*alpamalpaduḥkhasambhedam kariṣyatīti*), for one whose birth is obtained through mingled merits (*saṃkīrṇapuṇyalabdhajanmanah*).

It distinguishes the third course (*trītyām gatiṃ vibhajate*) - as fixed (*niyateti*), because here strength (*balīyastvena*) is considered primary (*prādhānyamabhimatam*), not as a mere accessory (*na tvaṅgitayā*), and strength is due to having a fixed result (*niyatavipākatvena*) because there is no opportunity at another time (*anyadā'navakāśatvāt*), while the weakness (*durbalatvam*) of that with unfixed results (*anīyatavipākasya tu*) is because there is opportunity at another time (*anyadā sāvakāśatvāt*), and long duration (*ciramavasthānam*) is merely as a seed (*bījabhāvamātreṇa*), not again (*na punaḥ*) as primarily beneficial (*pradhānopakāritayā*) because it is independent (*tasya svatantratvāt*).

Indeed, it has been said that by dying (*prāyaṇena*) the accumulation of *karma* (*karmāśayo*) is manifested (*abhivyajyata*) all at once (*aikadaiva*), and now long duration (*cirāvasthānam*) is being said, so how does the later not contradict (*virudhyata*) the former? One with this intention asks - How? The answer is - from unseen causes (*adr̥ṣṭeti*), the singular (*ekavacanam*) is with regard to the class (*jātyabhiprāyam*) that determines (*avadhārayati*) the stated course (*gatimuktām*) of the other (*taditarasya*) - because of the unseen (*yattvadr̥ṣṭeti*), the rest (*śeṣam*) is easily understood (*sugamam*)”⁴²⁸.

⁴²⁸ See the commentary of *Vācaspati* on *sūtra* 2.13.

Critical Analysis of *Sūtra* 2.13

Patañjali explains the connection between *kleśa-s* and their fruits in detail in *sūtra* 2.13. According to Patañjali, the fruits or outcomes of *karmāśaya* are experienced when the *kleśa-s* is present as the root. In what ways do we enjoy the benefits of the *karmāśaya*? In response, Patañjali says that it is experienced as in the form of *cittavṛtti* as *sukha* and *duḥkha* (*bhoga*). Since Patañjali specifies the outcome of *karmāśaya* (*vipāka*) as *hlāda* (pleasure) and *paritāpa* (pain) in the following *sūtra*, Vijñāna Bhikṣu argues that the term "*bhoga*" does not refer to the direct experience of *sukha* and *duḥkha* as a result of *karmāśaya*. Vijñāna Bhikṣu seems to suggest that when one feels (*bhoga*) *sukha* and *duḥkha* *vṛtti-s* of the *citta*, *vipāka* directly causes *hlāda* (joy) and *paritāpa* (pain).

This demonstrates that the current *sūtra*'s use of the term "*bhoga*" does not denote "*bhoga*" as *vipāka*. So, *bhoga* is the experience of different *cittavṛtti-s* as *sukha* and *duḥkha*, not the resulting experience of *cittavṛtti-s* as *sukha* and *duḥkha*. Patañjali initially says that *saṃskāra-s* are created from the imprints of karma in the mind when *kleśa-s* are present and karma is performed at that moment. We refer to these *saṃskāra-s* as *karmāśaya*. The results of acts are given by this *karmāśaya*. Patañjali gives us *sūtra* 2.13 for this reason. Patañjali seems to be saying in this *sūtra* that *karmaphala* can only be experienced if the *kleśa-s* are present.

Understanding the *Yogasūtra*'s *karma* theory requires a nuanced interpretation of this *sūtra*. If we interpret this *sūtra* literally, it might indicate that *karmāśaya* only produces outcomes (*vipāka*) when *kleśa*, the root of *karma*, is present; otherwise, *karmāśaya* produces no results. There will be a logical issue if we read this *sūtra* in this manner. The issue is that there will not be any outcomes for *prārabdha* - *karmāśaya* when the *kleśa-s* are abandoned by the practice of *vivekakhyaṭi*. However, the *prārabdha* continues to provide the yogin with *sukha* and *duḥkha* even after the *kleśa-s* have separated from the yogin. In order to resolve this logical dilemma, Vyāsa believes that one should not assume that *kleśa-s* will continue to exist as long as one experiences the fruits or outcomes of *karmāśaya* in the form of *sukha* and *duḥkha*.

Patañjali suggests that when the *karmāśaya* begins to deliver its fruits or effects to the yogin, *kleśa-s* must undoubtedly be there. After *karmāśaya* begins to function as a result of

experiencing *sukha* and *duḥkha*, it makes no difference to the yogin whether or not *kleśa-s* are there for the duration of feeling the impacts of the *kleśa-s* as *sukha* and *duḥkha*. According to Vyāsa's comment, "*satsu kleśeṣu karmāśayo vipākārambhī bhavati nocchinnakleśamūlah*," *kleśa-s* are simply required to initiate the process of *karmāśaya* working as *sukha* and *duḥkha*. However, this does not imply that *kleśa-s* must be present for the yogin for as long as *karmāśaya* is working as an experience of *sukha* and *duḥkha* for the yogin. To put it another way, even when the *kleśa-s* are gone, the yogin may experience *karmāśaya* as *sukha* and *duḥkha*. Amidst these experiences, the yogin will not produce any new karma- *saṃskāra*, and since there will be no new *karmāśaya* stored for the yogin, the yogin will not experience *karmaphala*.

Because the *kleśa-s* were present when the yogin was born, the *kleśa-s* have already started to function in the current birth as a result of *prārabdha - karmāśaya*. This is why the yogin only experiences the effects of *karmāśaya* after disengaging from them via the practice of *vivekakhyāti*. Whether or not *kleśa-s* are present, the *prārabdha - karmāśaya* will continue to deliver its effects as *duḥkha* and *duḥkha* till death after this incarnation begins. In other words, even if the yogin does not experience *kleśa* throughout his lifetime, he may still have the experience of *duḥkha* and *sukha*. The yogin eliminates the *kleśa-s* during their lifetime by engaging in *kriyā-yoga*, *dhyāna -yoga*, and *pratiprasava*, respectively.

As a result, there will not be any more *karmāśaya* or experiences of it in the future. After the *kleśa-s* dissolve, the yogin undergoes *prārabdha - karmāśaya*, which began with his birth and will conclude with his demise. The yogin is not under the power of *prārabdha - karmāśaya*. Therefore, Patañjali will not advise doing something that is outside of the yogin's control. Therefore, it can be inferred that Patañjali meant the destruction of all *kleśa-s* save the *prārabdha - karmāśaya* in *sūtra* 2.10, where he specifies that the subtle *kleśa-s* are to be discarded by the practice of *pratiprasava*. The yogin is alive with a physical body and mind if *prārabdha - kleśa-s* are present.

Therefore, it is not justifiable in the current context to say that *pratiprasava* in *sūtra* 2.10 is an cosmological process of dissolution of the *citta*. In other words, the *kleśa-s* can be fully eradicated without dying. Therefore, it can be said that *pratiprasava* is a yogic process of epistemic dissolution of the *kleśa-s* in *sūtra* 2.10 rather than a cosmological process. One may object by saying that this possibility of dissolution of *kleśa-s* seems to depend mostly on the interpretation of Vyāsa's rather than Patañjali's *sūtra* 2.10 and 2.13. I shall respond to this objection by citing *sūtra* 4.30 to support my conclusions.

On the Possibility of *Kleśa*’s Complete Eradication in the *Yogasūtra*

In *sūtra* 4.30, Patañjali explicitly tells us that it is possible for the yogin to get rid of the *kleśa* and *karma* when the yogin achieves the state of the *dharma-megha-samādhi*⁴²⁹. *Dharma-megha* is a special kind of higher *samādhi* state of the yogin. Patañjali states in *sūtra* 4.29 that “for one who has no interest even in [the fruits] of meditative wisdom on account of the highest degree of discriminative insight, the *samādhi* called *dharma-megha*, cloud of virtue, ensues” (Bryant’s translation) (*prasaṃkhyāne’pyakusīdasya sarvathā vivekakhyāterdharmameghaḥ samādhiḥ*). Patañjali does not provide a definition for *dharma-megha samādhi*, nor does Vyāsa. *Dharma-megha* literally means the cloud of *dharma*. Vivaraṇakāra states that it is called *dharmamegha* because it rains down (*varṣatīti*) the supreme *dharma* known as *kaivalya*⁴³⁰.

Rāmānanda Sarasvatī comments that “that *dharmamegha* (*dharmamegha saṃjñāḥ samādhiḥ*)-*samādhi*, which is essentially a continuous stream of discriminative discernment (*vivekakhyāti*), fully and completely (*sarvātmanā*) exists. And that (*SA ca*) indeed (*khalu*) sprinkles or moistens (*mehati- siñcati*) a neither-white-nor-black (*aśuklakṛṣṇam*) *dharma*, which has liberation (*kaivalya*) as its result (*kaivalyaphalam*), thus it is called (*ityucyate*) *dharmamegha*. This means (*it bhāvah*) that when detachment (*vairāgyāt*) arises in reflection (*prasaṃkhyāne*), and the *dharmamegha* is present (*dharmameghe sati*), cessation (*nirodho bhavati*) of reflection (*prasaṃkhyānasya*) occurs due to the arising (*udayāt*) of supreme detachment (*paravairāgya*)”⁴³¹.

Bhoja comments in *sūtra* 4.29 that “reflection (*prasaṃkhyānam*) upon the distinct individual natures (*parasparavilakṣaṇasvarūpavibhāvanam*) of the many principles (*yāvatām tattvānām*) that are arranged in due order (*yathākramam vyavasthitānām*), even when that exists, because of the absence of the rise of other notions (*pratyayāntarāṇāmanudayāt*) for one who is without gain (*akusīdasya*) and does not desire fruit (*phalamalipsoḥ*), from the complete discrimination of all kinds (*sarvaprakāravivekhyāteḥ*), there arises the *dharmamegha samādhi* due to the remainder. *Dharmamegha* is so-called because it showers (*mehati*) and sprinkles (*siñcati*) the excellent, neither white nor black, *dharma*, which

⁴²⁹ *sūtra* 4.30: *tataḥ kleśakarmanivṛttiḥ*.

⁴³⁰ Vivaraṇakāra on *sūtra* 4.29: *kaivalyākhyam param dharmam varṣatīti dharmameghaḥ iti saṃjñā*.

⁴³¹ Rāmānandasarasvatī on *sūtra* 4.29: *sarvātmanā vivekakhyātireva santatirūpaḥ dharmameghasaṃjñāḥ samādhiḥ bhavati, sa ca khalvaśuklakṛṣṇam dharmam kaivalyaphalam mehati-siñcatīti dharmamegha ityucyate, prasaṃkhyāne vairāgyāt dharmameghe sati paravairāgyodayāt prasaṃkhyānasya nirodho bhavatīti bhāvah*.

accomplishes the highest human purpose (*paramapuruṣārthasādhakam*). By this, it is established that only excellent *dharma* is the cause of knowledge (*jñānahetutvamityupapāditaṃ bhavati*)⁴³².

Vyāsa explains *sūtra* 4.29 that “when this *brāhmaṇa*, even in meditative wisdom (*prasaṃkhyāna*), is without desire (*akusīda*), and seeks nothing even from that, then, for one who is detached (*virakta*) even there, there is absolutely only discriminative discernment (*vivekakhyāti*). Thus, with the destruction (*kṣaya*) of the seed (*bīja*) of predispositions (*saṃskāra*), other unfavorable perceptions (*pratyayāntarāṇi*) do not arise. Then, for him, there is a *samādhi* called cloud of *dharma* (*dharmamegho nāma samādhiḥ*)⁴³³. Vācaspati comments that “thus, the author of the *sūtras*, having spoken of the means of cessation of distraction (*vyutthāna-nirodha-upāya-praṃsakhyānam*), speaks of the means of cessation of meditative wisdom (*prasaṃkhyāna-nirodha-upāyam*): In meditative wisdom (*prasaṃkhyāne*), even for one who is without gain (*akusīdasya*), *dharmameghaḥ samādhiḥ* (the cloud of *dharma samādhi*) is the all-encompassing discrimination (*sarvathā vivekakhyāter*). Then, from reflection (*prasaṃkhyānāt*), he does not desire anything such as the sovereignty over all beings (*sarvabhāvādhiṣṭhātrtvādi*).

On the contrary, even there, being disgusted with the fault of change (*pariṇāmitvadoṣada'nena viraktaḥ*), there is only all-encompassing discrimination (*sarvathā vivekakhyātireva bhavati*). This very thing he explains - even there, when there might be causes of distraction (*vyutthānapratyayā bhavayustadā*), then this Brahmin is not all-encompassing discrimination (*sarvathā vivekakhyātiryatastasya*), because for him there are no other causes (*Na pratyayāntarāṇi bhavanti*); therefore, there is all-encompassing discrimination (*tataḥ sarvathā vivekakhyātiriti*). Then *dharmamedhaḥ samādhiḥ* (the cloud of *dharma samādhi*) comes into being. This is said - being disgusted (*virakta*) with meditative wisdom (*prasaṃkhyāne*), desiring its cessation (*tannirodhamicchan*), he should cultivate (*upāsīta*) *dharmamegha-samādhi*, and in its cultivation, there is all-encompassing discrimination (*sarvathā vivekakhyātirbhavati*), and thus he is able to stop (*niroddha*) it⁴³⁴.

⁴³² Bhoja on *sūtra* 4.29: *prasaṃkhyānaṃ yāvatāṃ tattvānāṃ yathākramaṃ vyavasthitānāṃ parasparavilakṣaṇasvarūpavibhāvanam tasmīnsatyapyakusīdasya phalamalipsoḥ pratyayāntarāṇāmanudayātsarvaprakāravivekhyāteḥ pariśeṣāddharmameghaḥ samādhirbhavati, prakṛṣṭamaśuklakṛṣṇaṃ dharmam paramapuruṣārthasādhakam mehati siñcatīti dharmameghaḥ, anena prakṛṣṭadharmasyaiva jñānahetutvamityupapāditaṃ bhavati.*

⁴³³ Vyāsa on *sūtra* 4.29: *yadā'yaṃ brāhmaṇaḥ prasaṃkhyāne'pyakusīdastato'pi na kiṃcitprārthayate, tatrāpi viraktasya sarvathā vivekakhyātireva bhavatīti saṃskārabhijakṣayānnāspa pratyayāntarāṇyutpadyante, tadā'sya dharmamegho nāma samādhirbhavati.*

⁴³⁴ Vācaspati on *sūtra* 4.29: *tadevaṃ sūtrakāro vyutthānanirodhopāyapraṃsakhyānamuktivā prasaṃkhyānanirodhopāyamāha - prasaṃkhyāne'pyakusīdasya sarvathā vivekakhyāterdharmameghaḥ*

According to Patañjali, when the yogin achieves mastery of the *dharma-megha-samādhi*, *kleśa* and *karma* ceases (*nivṛtti*)⁴³⁵. Vyāsa explains that “from that gain (of *dharma-megha samādhi*), afflictions (*kleśa-s*) such as ignorance (*avidyā*) are completely uprooted and destroyed. Good (*kuśala*) and bad (*akuśala*) karmic imprints (*karmāśaya*) are completely struck down at the root (*samūlaghātaṃ*). When *kleśa* and *karma* cease, the wise person (*vidvān*), even while living, becomes liberated (*vimukti*). Why? It is because mistaken knowledge (*viparyaya*) [such as *avidyā*] is the cause of birth and indeed, no one whose mistaken knowledge is diminished is seen born again anywhere by anyone”⁴³⁶. Patañjali and Vyāsa make it clear that it is possible to get rid of *kleśa-s*. But it should be noted that it does not mean that Patañjali and Vyāsa are saying that *prārabdha - karmāśaya* would also be dissolved. In other words, What Patañjali and Vyāsa seem to indicate that cessation of *kleśa* and *karma* means dissolution of all types of *kleśa-s* and *karma* except the *prārabdha - karmāśaya* which has already begun its working and which only will end at the death of the yogin.

One may object that it appears in the *sūtra* and commentary that cessation of *kleśa* and *karma* means cessation of all *kleśa-s* including *prārabdha - karmāśaya*. It is to be remembered that as this cessation of *kleśa* and *karma* happens during the stage of *dharma-megha samādhi*, *prārabdha - karmāśaya* still exists because the yogin in the stage of *dharma-megha samādhi* is still alive which the effects of *prārabdha - karmāśaya* is. *Dharma-megha samādhi* is a higher level of meditative state in which yogin keeps his physical body and active mind and the yogin continues his *sādhana*. During this time of *dharma-megha samādhi*, the yogin gets rid of *kleśa* and *karma*. So, it can be concluded that cessation of *kleśa* and *karma* means cessation of all *kleśa - karma* except *prārabdha - karmāśaya* and cessation of *kleśa* and *karma* does not indicate the dissolution of the *citta* of the yogin. In other words, death of the mind and body of the yogin is not mandatory for

samādhiḥ, tataḥ prasamkhyānāna kiṃcitsarvabhāvādhiṣṭhātrtvādi prārthayate, pratyuta tatrāpi kliśnāti pariṇāmitvadoṣada'nena viraktaḥ sarvathā vivekakhyātireva bhavati, etadeva vivṛṇoti - tatrāpīti, yadā vyutthānapratyayā bhavayustadā nāyaṃ brāhmaṇaḥ sarvathā vivekakhyātiryatastasya na pratyayāntarāṇi bhavanti tataḥ sarvathā vivekakhyātiriti, tadā'sya dharmamedhaḥ samādhirbhavati, etaduktaṃ bhavati - prasamkhyāne viraktastannirodhamicchandharmameghaṃ samādhimupāsīta, tadupāsane ca sarvathā vivekakhyātirbhavati, tathā ca taṃ nirodhduṃ pārayatīti.

⁴³⁵ *sūtra* 4.30: *tataḥ kleśakarmanivṛttiḥ.*

⁴³⁶ Vyāsa on *sūtra* 4.30: *tallābhādavidyādayaḥ kleśāḥ samūlakāṣaṃ kaṣitā bhavanti, kuśalākuśalāśca karmāśayāḥ samūlaghātaṃ hatā bhavanti, kleśakarmanivṛttau jīvanneva vidvānvimukto bhavati, kasmāt, yasmādviparyayo bhavasya kāraṇam, na hi kṣiṇaviparyayaḥ kaścitenacitkvacijjāto dṛśyata iti.*

getting rid of the *kleśa-s* in the *Yogasūtra*. According to the abovementioned discussion, we can say that *pratiprasava* in *sūtra* 2.10 which is the finest yogic practice to get rid of the finest *kleśa-s* is not an cosmological process of dissolution of *citta* because Patañjali seems to suggest in *sūtra* 4.30 that to get rid of *kleśa-s* there is no dissolution or destruction of the *citta* necessary. Therefore, it can be argued that the practice of *pratiprasava* in *sūtra* 2.10 does not entail the dissolution of *citta* which ultimately results in the death of the yogin. So, it is better to understand *pratiprasava* in the *sūtra* 2.10 as an epistemic yogic practice rather than an cosmological process of dissolution of *citta*. Another evidence of the epistemological *pratiprasava* can be found in Patañjali's use of the term “*heya*” in *sūtra* 2.10 which seems to carry an epistemological overtone depending on which we can say that *pratiprasava* is more of an epistemic yogic practice rather than an cosmological practice.

On the Use of the Term “*Heya*” with Epistemological Overtone in the *Yogasūtra*

In the *sūtra* 2.10, Patañjali states that the subtle *kleśa-s* are to be cast aside (*heya*) by the retrograding process of reversal (*pratiprasava*)⁴³⁷. Along with *pratiprasava*, “*heya*” is an important word in this *sūtra* which demands our attention. The term “*heya*” has the Sanskrit root “*hā*,” which means to be left, quit, abandoned, rejected, or avoided. “*Heya*” can also be literally translated as “*tyāga*” (giving up). The term “*heya*” is the first division of four division (*caturvyūha*) of yoga metaphysics. Vācaspati states that “that of which the arrangement of its parts is condensed (or briefly stated) as the four *vyūhas*, is thus called “*caturvyūha*”⁴³⁸. The four divisions are *heya* (suffering or *duḥkha*), *heya-hetu* (cause of suffering), *hāna* (relief from suffering), and *hānopāya* (means or method of destroying suffering).

Vyāsa draws a comparison between this fourfold divisions of yoga with the fourfold division of the Indian medical science (*Āyurveda*). Vyāsa comments that “just as medical science of *Āyurveda* has a fourfold structure—(1) *roga* (disease), (2) *roga-hetu* (the cause of disease), (3) *ārogya* (relief from disease), and *bhaiṣajya* (the administering of medicinal plants as a means of curing disease)—so too, this science of yoga has a fourfold structure: (1) *saṃsāra* (the cycle of existence), (2) the cause of *saṃsāra*, (3) *mokṣa* (liberation), and (4) the means to *mokṣa*. Of these, *saṃsāra*, which is full of suffering (*duḥkha*), is to be abandoned (*heya*); the union (*saṃyoga*) of *pradhāna* and *puruṣa* is the cause (*heyahetuḥ*) of what is to be

⁴³⁷ *sūtra* 2.10: *te pratiprasavaheyāḥ sūkṣmāḥ*.

⁴³⁸ Vācaspati on *sūtra* 2.15: *catvāro vyūhāḥ saṃkṣiptāvayavaracanā yasya tattathoktam*.

abandoned; the absolute cessation (*nivṛtti*) of this union is abandonment (*hānam*); and the means (*hānopāya*) of abandonment is correct view (*samyagdarśanam*)⁴³⁹.

In this *sūtra* 2.10. “*Pratiprasava heyāḥ*” is a compound word functioning like an adjective and it is qualifying *kleśa-s*. In the context of the present *sūtra*, it can be said that *heya* is subtle *kleśa-s* and *avidyā* is the cause of this subtle *kleśa* and release from *avidyā* is the release from five *kleśa-s* and the means or way of abandoning these five *kleśa-s* is *pratiprasava*. Now the question arises: what does this phrase “*pratiprasava heyāḥ*” mean in the present *sūtra*? Is “*pratiprasava heyāḥ*” a process of cosmological dissolution or epistemological process of dissolution? If we employ Vyāsa’s comparison of the four division of *Āyurveda*, then it becomes easy to relate *kleśa* with disease. According to that comparison, “*heya*” can be regarded as *kleśa* and *kleśa* can be compared as disease. In this context of *sūtra* 2.10, “*pratiprasava heyāḥ*” is a process of getting rid of the disease in the form of subtle *kleśa-s*. So, it can be argued that getting rid of disease does not entail getting rid of the body in which the disease resides. In the similar way, getting rid of subtle *kleśa-s* by the process of *pratiprasava* do not entail getting rid of the *citta*.

Therefore, it can be confirmed that *pratiprasava* is not a process of cosmological dissolution of the *citta* rather the dissolution of the impurities associated with *citta* due to the presence of *kleśa-s* for the yogin. It can be concluded that *pratiprasava* in *sūtra* 2.10 is an epistemic yogic practice like other practices such as *kriyā-yoga* and *dhyāna -yoga* for dissolving the subtle *kleśa-s* for the yogin by a process of purification of *citta* in which *citta* will not store or give birth to new *karmāśaya* in the present time while the yogin is living or in the future time after the death. It is to be noted that *citta* can only function even after the dissolution of the *kleśa-s* because *citta* itself is the product of the *prārabdha - karmāśaya* which is not yet exhausted completely. The *citta* for the yogin remains active until *prārabdha - karmāśaya* is totally depleted, signifying the cosmological disintegration of the *citta* for the yogin.

It should be observed that the word “*heya*” appears to have an epistemological overtone rather than an cosmological one when it is used again in the next *sūtra* 2.11 as a compound word. Patañjali again uses the word “*heya*” in the phrase “*dhyānaheya*” as he did

⁴³⁹ Vyāsa on *sūtra* 2.15: *yathā cikitsāsāstraṃ caturvyūham – rogo rogaheturārogyaṃ bhaiṣajyamiti, evamidamapi śāstraṃ caturvyūhameva, tadyathā – saṃsāraḥ saṃsāraheturmokṣo mokṣopāya iti, tatra duḥkhabahulaḥ saṃsāro heyāḥ, pradhānapuruṣayoḥ saṃyogo heyahetuḥ, saṃyogasyā’tyantikī nivṛtirhānam, hānopāyaḥ samyagdarśanam.*

in the phrase “*pratiprasava heya*” in *sūtra* 2.10. In *sūtra* 2.11, Patañjali states that the yogin should practice *dhyāna* (meditation) to get rid of those weakened *vr̥tti*-s which are the results of the process of mastering *kriyā-yoga*⁴⁴⁰.

In other words, the practice of *dhyāna* is recommended to win over the gross *vr̥tti*-s in the form of *kleśa*-s which have been first weakened by the practice of *kriyā-yoga*. According to Patañjali, *dhyāna* is the means or method of abandoning (*heya*) of the weakened *kleśa*-s. Now the question arises: what how does *dhyāna* abandon (*heya*) the *kleśa*-s. *Dhyāna* is a psychological or epistemic process of higher level of concentration which needs yogin’s effort and practice. Through this concentration of mind, yogin abandons (*heya*) the effects of weakened *kleśa*-s, so that the weakened *kleśa*-s cannot further be an obstacle in his yogic journey which ultimately ends in the total abandonment of the *kleśa*-s.

So, it can be said that *dhyāna* is an epistemological process of reducing the effects of *kleśa*-s upon the yogin’s life. If *dhyāna* is a psychological or epistemological process and the abandonment (*heya*) of *kleśa*-s is also an epistemological or psychological process. So, it can be argued that the word “*heya*” in the phrase “*dhyānaheya*” seems to have an epistemological emphasis rather than cosmological emphasis because through the process of *dhyāna*, *citta* does not dissolve. *Dhyāna* is a process of purification of the *citta*. So the word “*heya*” seems to indicate the psychological abandonment of the weakened *kleśa*-s which helps to purify the *citta* of yogin by reducing the negative effects of weakened *kleśa*-s on the yogin.

So, in the present context, “*heya*” means reduction of the negative effects of *kleśa*-s, not dissolution of all *kleśa*-s. Depending on the use of the word “*heya*” in *sūtra* 2.11 by Patañjali, it can be said that “*pratiprasava heya*” in *sūtra* 2.10 seems to mean the reduction of effects of the subtle *kleśa*-s upon the yogin which indicate permanent relief from the present *kleśa*-s and future *kleśa*-s except the *prārabdha* - *karmāśaya*. Depending on the psychological or epistemological overtone of the word “*heya*”, it appears that *pratiprasava* is not an cosmological process of dissolution rather a psychological or epistemological of process of reduction of the effects of subtle *kleśa*-s.

Again, in *sūtra* 2.16, Patañjali uses the word “*heya*.” Patañjali states that future suffering is to be abandoned (*heya*)⁴⁴¹. Patañjali says that the suffering (*duḥkha*) that has not yet arrived (*anāgatam*) but will definitely arrive in future births to give results in the forms of *sukha*, *duḥkha*, and *moha* to the yogin should be abandoned by the practice of yoga. Patañjali

⁴⁴⁰ *sūtra* 2.11: *dhyānaheyāstadvṛttayaḥ*.

⁴⁴¹ *sūtra* 2.11: *heyam duḥkhamanāgatam*.

appears to guarantee that a yogin who begins practicing yoga in this life would be able to achieve *kaivalya* and end their future suffering. Through this *sūtra*, Patañjali clarifies that if one attains the highest stage of yogic *sādhana*, which culminates in the accomplishment of *kaivalya*, and this is the yogin's final birth, then one can be free from suffering even in the future.

The phrase "*duḥkhamanāgatam*" tends to refer to the *karmāśaya* or *vāsanā*, or *saṃskāra* that is hidden in the *citta* of the yogin's current incarnation as a seed but will come to fruition in the yogin's subsequent birth as a tree. This *sūtra* further affirms that even by practicing *kaivalya*, the highest level of yoga, and one cannot escape the current suffering that results from *prārabdha* - *karmāśaya*. Therefore, the *citta* of the yogin is not destroyed if *prārabdha* - *karmāśaya* is not depleted. The yogin is therefore alive. Because the yogin's current suffering continues even after all *kleśa*-s are abandoned, the word "*heya*" is not associated with the cosmological process of dissolution, even in this *sūtra* 2.16. One could argue that the Patañjali's usage of the term "*heya*" in *sūtra* 2.10 conveys an epistemological or psychological focus rather than a cosmological one, based on the meaning of the word in this *sūtra* 2.16.

It appears that Patañjali employs the word "*heya*" in a psychological or epistemological sense in other *sūtra* s besides *sūtra* 2.10. As a result, it might be argued that the word "*heya*" in *sūtra* 2.10 cannot imply something else without any explanation. Therefore, it can be said that the word "*heya*" in the phrase "*pratiprasava heya*" seems to suggest that *pratiprasava* is an empirical, psychological, or epistemological method of eliminating the *kleśa*-s from the yogin's *citta*. According to *sūtra* 2.10, *pratiprasava* is a process of psychological or epistemic purification of the *citta* rather than its cosmological disintegration.

***Pratiprasava* as a Cosmological Process in *sūtra* 4.34**

In the final *sūtra*, Patañjali again uses the term "*pratiprasava*" in explaining the nature of *kaivalya*. According to the final *sūtra* 4.34, "*kaivalya* occurs when *guṇa*-s, which have no more actions to do for the *puruṣa* (*puruṣārthaśūnya*), return to their original state (*pratiprasava*) or when *puruṣa* itself, as a conscious force (*citiśakti*), is established in its genuine form (*svarūpapraṭiṣṭhā*)"⁴⁴². The three *guṇa*-s (*sattva*, *raja* and *tama*) exist only for providing "*bhoga*" (experience of the mundane world) and *apavarga* (relief from the

⁴⁴² *sūtra* 4.34: *puruṣārthaśūnyānāṃ guṇānāṃ pratiprasavaḥ kaivalyaṃ svarūpapraṭiṣṭhā vā citiśaktiriti*.

experience of the mundane world) to the *puruṣa*. “*Bhoga*” is the cause of bondage and “*apavarga*” is the cause of liberation.

So, *guṇa-s* exists either to bind the yogin or to liberate the yogin. These two actions are performed by the *guṇa-s* only for the *puruṣa*. That is why “*bhoga*” and “*apavarga*” are technically known as *puruṣārtha* (which literally means “for the sake of *puruṣa*”) in the *Yogasūtra*. Therefore, *puruṣārthaśūnya* means that the *guṇa-s* have fulfilled the functions of *bhoga* and *apavarga* for the sake of *puruṣa* and there is nothing left to do for the *puruṣa*. When *guṇa-s* cease its functioning, *guṇa-s* return to their *avyakata prakṛti* state by a retrograding process of reversal (*pratiprasava*) and this process of reversal of the *guṇa-s* from *vyakta prakṛti* to *avyakta prakṛti* is known as *kaivalya*. Otherwise, *kaivalya* should be understood as the establishment of *puruṣa* in its true form (*svarūpapraṭiṣṭhā*) as conscious-force (*citiśakti*).

Understanding the Meaning of *Sūtra* 4.34

In *sūtra* 4.34, Patañjali presents three distinct statements. The first statement indicates that the *guṇa-s* dissolve into the unmanifest *prakṛti* through a retrogressive process of reversal termed “*pratiprasava*.” When *pratiprasava* occurs, *kaivalya* is attained. In other words, *pratiprasava* is essential for achieving *kaivalya*, which underscores the cosmological dissolution of all *prakṛtic* manifestations, including the physical body and mind of the yogin. The second statement is that it should be interpreted as *kaivalya* once *puruṣa* settles down in its own form. The third statement is that *citiśakti* is another way to think of *kaivalya*.

The question now arises: do these three statements represent three different meanings of *kaivalya*? Are the three definitions of *kaivalya* identical or distinct from one another, assuming there are any? These three statements, in my opinion, do not constitute three definitions of *kaivalya*. These are the three ways that *kaivalya's* nature can be described. The nature of *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* at the moment of achieving *kaivalya* is precisely described by these three statements. Instead of being distinct descriptions, the three explanations of the nature of *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* are linked and reliant on one another.

Two Important Parts of *Sūtra* 4.34

To explain the link among these three statements, I divide the *sūtra* into two parts: first part is *kaivalya* as “*guṇānāṃ pratiprasavaḥ*” and the second part is *kaivalya* as “*svarūpapraṭiṣṭhā vā citiśaktiriti*”. According to the first part of *sūtra*, *kaivalya* is attained when *guṇa-s* finish all its functions in the form of *bhoga* and *apavarga* for the sake of *puruṣa*, *guṇa-s* recede back to their original form which is *avyakta-prakṛti*. How does this receding

process function? Vācaspati comments that “the return to their own cause, the *pradhāna*, is the dissolution (*laya*) of those qualities (*guṇa*) consisting of cause and effect (*kāryakāraṇātmakānām*) that are empty of the purpose of the *puruṣa* because their function has been fulfilled. The impressions (*saṃskāra*) of rising (*vyutthāna*), concentration (*samādhi*), and cessation (*nirodha*) of these qualities dissolve in the mind (*manas*), the mind in *asmitā*, *asmitā* in the *liṅga*, the *liṅga* in the *alīṅga*. This dissolution (*pratisarga*) of the qualities consisting of cause and effect is liberating isolation (*tarakaivalyam*)⁴⁴³.

This receding process is the process of *pratiprasava* which clearly suggests the cosmological dissolution of all the connections of *prakṛti* including the physical body and mind of the yogin with the *puruṣa*. So, *pratiprasava* causes *kaivalya* or *pratiprasava* is method of attaining *kaivalya*. In respect to the discussion of the first part of *sūtra*, it appears that *pratiprasava* is a transcendent process which indicates the death of the yogin for attaining *kaivalya*. This interpretation of this *sūtra* is only correct if one understands *pratiprasava* exclusively as an cosmological process. But this understanding of *pratiprasava* in the context of *sūtra* 4.34 may appear correct but when we understand the nature and function of *pratiprasava* used in the *Yogasūtra*, it appears that *pratiprasava* as cosmological process is partially correct. It is to be noted that Patañjali has already used the concept of *pratiprasava* in *sūtra* 2.10 where it has been shown that *pratiprasava* is a yogic epistemological practice of forsaking the *kleśa-s*.

We find that *pratiprasava* is an cosmological, cosmological, or transcendent process in which the yogin is dead in *sūtra* 4.34, but it is an epistemological, psychological, or empirical process in *sūtra* 2.10. The *Yogasūtra* gives *pratiprasava* two distinct meanings, which may seem conflicting. However, it is not the case. It serves two distinct purposes rather than two distinct meanings. Because *pratiprasava* has been utilized in two distinct contexts, it serves two distinct functions. *Pratiprasava* is an epistemic practice that the yogin must master in order to get rid of the subtle deadening *kleśa-s* in the context of a yogic *sādhana*.

In contrast, *pratiprasava* is used in the context of a cosmological process in order to get rid of the cosmological real *guṇa-s*, which validates the total disassociation of *puruṣa* from *prakṛti*. Therefore, a more accurate interpretation of *sūtra* 4.34 is that “*guṇānām pratiprasava* ” seems to imply that *pratiprasava*, as an empirical process, dissolves the effects

⁴⁴³ Vācaspati on *sūtra* 4.34: *kṛtakaraṇīyatayā puruṣārthasūnyānām yaḥ pratiprasavaḥ svakāraṇe pradhāne layasteṣāṃ kāryakāraṇātmakānām guṇānām vyutthānasamādhinirodhasaṃskārā manasi līyante mano'smitāyāmasmitā liṅge liṅgamaliṅga iti, yo'yaṃ guṇānām kāryakāraṇātmakānām pratisargastarakaivalyam*.

of *guṇa-s* like *kleśa-s* in the first stage, while *pratiprasava*, as a transcendent process, dissolves the *guṇa-s* themselves in the last stage. Accordingly, *pratiprasava* in *sūtra* 4.34 encompasses both the cosmological and epistemic functions. When we discuss the second part of this *sūtra*, it will become clearer how best to interpret *pratiprasava*.

In the second part of *sūtra* 4.34, Patañjali seems to state that *kaivalya* should be understood as *svārūpapraṭiṣṭhā* or *citiśakti*. It is interesting to note that all the Sanskrit commentators and modern scholar seem to use these two words interchangeably and they connect these two words like a single phrase while Patañjali seems to state that *kaivalya* can be understood as the establishment of the *puruṣa*'s original state (*svārūpapraṭiṣṭhā*) or as a pure consciousness-force (*citiśakti*). Most of the Sanskrit commentators do not explain the meaning and nature of these concepts.

It may seem that Patañjali is using these two words or concepts interchangeably without any difference. But from the grammatical perspective, in this *sūtra*, *svārūpapraṭiṣṭhā* is an adjective qualifying *citiśakti*. If *citiśakti* is understood as an alternative term for *kaivalya*, then *svārūpapraṭiṣṭhā* seems to describe the nature of *kaivalya*. The question arises: what is *kaivalya*? *Kaivalya* is a particular state when *puruṣa* is established in its true form *svārūpapraṭiṣṭhā*. In other words, establishment of *puruṣa* in its real form is the nature of *kaivalya* in the *Yogasūtra*. One may ask: what does it mean to be established in its original nature? Let us discuss the meaning of *svārūpapraṭiṣṭhā*.

On the Meaning of *Svārūpapraṭiṣṭhā* in *Sūtra* 4.34

All Sanskrit commentator and most modern scholars tend to understand *svārūpapraṭiṣṭhā* in *sūtra* 4.34 as similar to “*svārūpe‘vasthānam*” in *sūtra* 1.3 because in terms of content, this *sūtra* is exactly the same as *sūtra* 1.3: *tadā draṣṭuḥ svārūpe vasthānam*." *svārūpe vasthānam*" is related to *svārūpapraṭiṣṭhā*, while *draṣṭuḥ* is related to *citiśaktiḥ*. In its purest form, *kaivalya* is *citiśakti*. In this *sūtra*, Patañjali logically connects *upakrama* (introduction) with *upasaṃhāra* (conclusion). The final step, *svārūpapraṭiṣṭhā*, has been attained by what was first described as *kaivalya* (*svārūpāvasthāna*). Nevertheless, Patañjali employs a number of related phrases for *puruṣa*, *prakṛti*, and *kaivalya* between the beginning and end of the text. On the one hand, Patañjali indicates *puruṣa* with *draṣṭṛ*, *dṛṣi*, *cetanā*. However, he indicates *prakṛti* with *dṛśya*, *dṛgśakti*, and *darśanaśakti*. He employs “*svārūpe ‘vasthānam*’, *svārūpapraṭiṣṭhā*, and *citiśaktiḥ* to denote *kaivalya*.

One could be tempted to assume that the *Yogasūtra* uses these many terms or ideas—"svārūpe 'vasthānam,' *svārūpapraṭiṣṭhā*, and *citiśakti* — interchangeably to refer to

the same *kaivalya* event. However, it should be mentioned that *kaivalya* was previously defined multiple times before to *sūtra* 4.34. The significance of these closely similar terms or notions that Patañjali utilizes to illustrate the idea of *kaivalya* in the final *sūtra* is now a matter of debate. I presume that Patañjali employed these new terminology, like *svārūpapraṭiṣṭhā* and *citiśakti*, to explain the nature of *kaivalya* rather than to define it. Put differently, Patañjali appears to allude to the specific state or condition of the *puruṣa* at the time of *kaivalya*. Therefore, *kaivalya* is the specific state of *puruṣa*'s re-establishment in its own form, according to Patañjali.

Prior to achieving *kaivalya*, *puruṣa* was connected to *buddhi* and was not in its own form because of the impacts of *buddhi* impurities. *Puruṣa* is re-established in its true form (*svārūpapraṭiṣṭhā*) when it is separated from *buddhi*. This re-establishment is known as *kaivalya*. According to the conventional view, this re-establishment (*svārūpapraṭiṣṭhā*) means precisely what Patañjali describes as "staying in its own self" (*svārūpe 'vasthānam'*) in *sūtra* 1.3. Consequently, the meaning of these two statements is the same. These two phrases, in my opinion, are similar but not the same. *Svārūpapraṭiṣṭhā* appears to imply a particular nature of *kaivalya*, whereas "*svārūpe 'vasthānam'*" indicates a general definition of *kaivalya*." The question of who established the *puruṣa* in its actual form arises if we comprehend that *svārūpapraṭiṣṭhā* refers to a specific state.

One could respond to this question by saying that at the time of *svārūpapraṭiṣṭhā* state of *kaivalya*, it is the *puruṣa* who establishes herself. But it is to be noted that *puruṣa* cannot do anything alone without the help of *buddhi*. If *svārūpapraṭiṣṭhā* state is understood as a type of *kaivalya* stage, *puruṣa* needs to be separated from *buddhi*. Therefore, it is not possible for *puruṣa* to establish herself alone. Another reply is that it is the *prakṛti* who establishes *puruṣa*. It is to be noted that *prakṛti* cannot actively establish *puruṣa* because it is an unconscious and inactive entity. Therefore, it can be said that the *puruṣa* is established by the union of *prakṛti* and *puruṣa*. However, *svārūpapraṭiṣṭhā* has been referred to as *kaivalya*, and *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* are totally separated in this stage. The re-establishment of the *puruṣa* in its original self cannot therefore be due to the combination of *prakṛti* and *puruṣa*.

If one believes that *puruṣa* establishes itself in its actual form, then *puruṣa* is a doer, even though it is not included in the *Sāṃkhya-Yoga* metaphysics. Accepting that *puruṣa* establishes itself would impose agency on *puruṣa*, who is by default non-doer (*akarta*) in Yoga philosophy. Question arises: what is this term "*svārūpapraṭiṣṭhā*" mean? *Svārūpapraṭiṣṭhā* is made of two words – *svārūpa* which means one's own nature or form and

pratiṣṭhā which means establishment. The meaning of *svarūpa* in this context is clear that it is the real form or nature of the *puruṣa* while the word “*pratiṣṭhā*” cannot be understood literally in the present context.

On the Meaning of *Pratiṣṭhā* in *Yogasūtra*

The word “*pratiṣṭhā*” literally means establishment or foundation. But in the present context, *pratiṣṭhā* could mean reaching the final settled-state. If we understand that all the practices mentioned in the *Yogasūtra* are meant to be finally knowing or reaching the true form (*svarūpa*) of the yogin which is *kaivalya*, then we can say that the yogin has been able to know and reach her true self as *puruṣa* several times through different practices such as *vekakhyāti* and *para-vairagya* because Patañjali describes *kaivalya* in different contexts with different nature. But in *svarūpapraṭiṣṭhā* state, the yogin has reached the final stage of the journey of discovering the true self of the yogin. This final stage indicates a static condition of firmness of this self-discovery journey. There is no further movement from *jīvanmukti* stage of liberation to *videhamukti* stage of liberation. It seems that by the word “*pratiṣṭhā*”, Patañjali intends to highlight the end-game of the journey of self-discovery of the yogin. It appears that *svarūpapraṭiṣṭhā* state is a specific state of “*svarūpe 'vasthānam'*”.

The term “*pratiṣṭhā*” may also refer to the greatest achievement of firmness or skill of remaining still or focused on something. In our current situation, being stable or focused on something could be seen as being focused firmly on the *puruṣa*’s actual self (*svarūpapraṭiṣṭhā*). In other *sūtras*, Patañjali employs the term “*pratiṣṭhā*,” which appears to denote the mastery of a specific yogic practice in which the yogin becomes permanently stable for a longer period of time without any further effort after performing that particular yogic *sādhana* multiple times in past.

In *sūtra* 35, Patañjali uses the word “*pratiṣṭhā*” when he states that “when yogin’s practice of “*ahiṃsā*” becomes firmly mastered (*pratiṣṭhāyām*), the feeling of enmity of others does not arise towards this yogin⁴⁴⁴. What Patañjali seems to suggest is that if a yogin’s mind is devoid of actions and thoughts of violence (*hiṃsā*) and the practice of *ahiṃsā* reaches the highest stage of *sādhana*, the other violent animals turn into non-violent when these violent animals appear before the yogin whose mind does not fluctuate a bit in its practice of *ahiṃsā*. When yogin’s mind does not fluctuate even for a moment in the practice of *ahiṃsā*, the state of *ahiṃsā* in the mind becomes stable or fixed.

⁴⁴⁴ *sūtra* 2.35: *ahiṃsāpratiṣṭhāyām tatsannidhā vairatyāgaḥ*.

Vijñānabhikṣu interprets the term *pratiṣṭhā* in the phrase “*ahiṃsāpratiṣṭhāyām*” as “*sthairya*” which can mean firmness, stability, fixity, and steadiness⁴⁴⁵. Many Sanskrit commentators such as Vivaraṇakāra,⁴⁴⁶ Bhāvagaṇeśa,⁴⁴⁷ Nāgojibhaṭṭa,⁴⁴⁸ Sadāśivendra Sarasvatī,⁴⁴⁹ follow Vijñānabhikṣu’s interpretation. In this *sūtra*, Patañjali seems to use the word “*pratiṣṭhā*” to indicate a stable state or condition of *ahiṃsā* in the mind of the yogin by mastering the highest practice of *ahiṃsā*. Even in the next three *sūtras*, we find that the word “*pratiṣṭhā*” is again and again used in different phrases to suggest a state of stability or immovability (*sthairya*) by mastering a yogic practice. In *sūtra* 2.36, Patañjali asserts that if the yogin achieves mastery of the practice of “*satya*,” the yogin’s experience of *satya* will become stable. In this stable state of “*satya*” (*satyapraṭiṣṭhāyām*), whatever actions the yogin takes, whether through speech or desire, will yield genuine results⁴⁵⁰. According to Vyāsa, a person will instantly become virtuous if the yogin intends for them to do so. The individual will instantly reach heaven if the yogin intends for them to do so. This yogin’s utterances will not be in vain (*amogha*) because he has achieved stability in his practice of *satya*. Whatever the yogin says will actually be true⁴⁵¹.

The *sūtra* 2.37 tells us that when the yogin gains mastery in the practice of “*asteya*” (non-stealing), in that stable state of being firmed in the practice of “*asteya*” (*asteyapraṭiṣṭhāyām*), all the jewels of the world appear before the yogin by his mere wish of having any jewel⁴⁵². According to *sūtra* 2.38, if a yogin’s practice of “*brahmacarya*” becomes stable (*brahmacaryapraṭiṣṭhāyām*), the yogin gains energy (*vīrya*)⁴⁵³. Vyāsa and Vācaspati interpret “*vīrya*” as “*sāmarthya*” (ability) while Vijñānabhikṣu understands “*vīrya*” as “*śakti*” which can be translated as power; ability; strength; capability⁴⁵⁴. Vyāsa explains *sūtra* 2.38 by saying that by the attainment of *vīrya*, one enhances unobstructed qualities, and

⁴⁴⁵ Vijñānabhikṣu on *sūtra* 2.35: *pratiṣṭhāyām sthairye uktavitarkairasaṃsparśa iti yāvat*.

⁴⁴⁶ Vivaraṇakāra on *sūtra* 2.35: *ahiṃsāsthiraṭve avitarkaprādurbhāve*.

⁴⁴⁷ Bhāvagaṇeśa on *sūtra* 2.35: *ahiṃsāsthairye sati tatsannidhisthānām mārjāramūṣakādīnāmanyonyavairatyāgo bhavati*.

⁴⁴⁸ Nāgojibhaṭṭa on *sūtra* 2.35: *ahiṃsāsthairye sati tatsannidhisthānām mārjāramūṣakādīnāmapyanyonyam vairatyāga ityarthah*.

⁴⁴⁹ Sadāśivendra Sarasvatī on *sūtra* 2.35: *satyahimsāsthairye, tasyāhimsakasya yogidhaureyasya saṃnidhau svabhāvaviruddhānām govyāghrādīnāmapi vairatyāgo bhavatītyarthah*.

⁴⁵⁰ *sūtra* 2.36: *satyapraṭiṣṭhāyām kriyāphalāśrayatvam*.

⁴⁵¹ Vyāsa on *sūtra* 2.36: *dhārmiko bhūyā iti bhavati dhārmikah, svargaṃ prāpnuhīti svargaṃ prāpnoti, amoghā’sya vāgbhavati*.

⁴⁵² *sūtra* 2.37: *asteyapraṭiṣṭhāyām sarvaratnopasthānam*.

⁴⁵³ *sūtra* 2.38: *brahmacaryapraṭiṣṭhāyām vīryalābhaḥ*.

⁴⁵⁴ Vijñānabhikṣu on *sūtra* 2.38: *śaktiviśeṣaṃ lakṣayati*.

becomes capable of implanting knowledge in accomplished disciples⁴⁵⁵. For Vyāsa, The emphasis is on the transformative power of *vīrya* for both personal spiritual development and the ability to guide others. So, the term “*pratiṣṭhā*” seems to indicate the mastery and stability of the yogin in the practice of “*brahmacarya*”.

***Pratiṣṭhā* as *Sthairya* (stability)**

If we follow Patañjali’s use of the term “*pratiṣṭhā*” with the meaning of stability (*sthairya*) by mastering a yogic process in the *Yogasūtra*, it appears that the establishment of the *puruṣa* in its own form (*svarūpapraṭiṣṭhā*) may refer to being stable in its real nature (*svarūpasthairya*) by mastering the highest practice of *kaivalya*. Therefore, *svarūpapraṭiṣṭhā* seems to indicate a particular stable state of stillness (*sthairya*) of *puruṣa* in which the yogin’s mind is not further affected by any kind of *vṛtti*. *Svarūpapraṭiṣṭhā* is neither an alternative term nor a definition of *kaivalya*; rather, it is a particular description of the nature of *kaivalya*. One might object that even if we interpret *svarūpapraṭiṣṭhā* as a particular stable state of stillness of *puruṣa*, it appears that this kind of stable stillness cannot be achieved by the yogin while living because even for being stable and still in its own form, *puruṣa* requires some kind of power to stick to its own self within the realm of *prakṛti*.

According to *Sāṃkhya-Yoga* metaphysics, *puruṣa* does not possess any power, and *puruṣa* is not a doer of any kind of action. Therefore, it seems that *svarūpapraṭiṣṭhā* indicates a complete liberation from the existence altogether in which *puruṣa* remains in its own form due to the dissolution of *vyakta-prakṛti*. This conclusion may be tempting to many people, but it is not completely right. While it is undoubtedly correct that *puruṣa* does not have any power to act on anything, it does not mean that a liberated living yogin cannot stick to its original self. The liberated yogin can stick to its own real form as pure *puruṣa* due to the power of “*citiśakti*”. Now the question arises: what does *citiśakti* mean?

Understanding the Concept of *Citiśakti* in *Sūtra* 4.34

The term “*citiśakti*” consists of two components: “*citi*,” which translates to “consciousness,” and “*śakti*,” which translates to “power” or “capacity”. So, “*citiśakti*” literally means the power of consciousness. In the present *sūtra*, the term “*citiśakti*” has been used to indicate the nature of *kaivalya*. *Citiśakti* has generally been understood as *kaivalya* or *puruṣa* himself. In other words, *citiśakti* is just an alternative term for *puruṣa* and *kaivalya*. But it is interesting to note that most of the Sanskrit commentators do not define or explain

⁴⁵⁵ Vyāsa on *sūtra* 2.38: *yasya lābhādapratighāṅguṇānutkarṣayati, siddhaśca vineyeṣu jñānamādhātum samartho bhavatīti*.

the meaning or nature of *citiśakti* at all. They seem to just equate *citiśakti* with *kaivalya* or *puruṣa* without any explanation. It is to be noted that the term “*citiśakti*” has been used only one time in the entire text by Patañjali and that too is the last word of the last *sūtra* of the text. It is interesting to note that Vyāsa uses the term *citiśakti* five times in his commentary, but he does not define it.

Meaning of *Citiśakti* in the Sanskrit Commentaries

Vyāsa first brings the concept of *citiśakti* into discussion when he explains *sūtra* 1.2. Vyāsa comments that “*citiśakti* is unchanging (*aparīṇāminī*), non-transmigrating (*apratisaṃkramā*), has manifested objects (*darśitaviṣayā*), is pure (*śuddhā*), and infinite (*anantā*). And the *vivekakhyāti* (discriminative discernment) which consists of the quality of *sattva* (*sattvagūṇātmikā*) is the opposite of that *citiśakti*”⁴⁵⁶. In this commentary, Vyāsa explains the nature of *citiśakti* and contrasts the nature of *citiśakti* with the nature of *vivekakhyāti*. Vyāsa asserts that *citiśakti* is beyond even the touch of *sattvagūṇa*. It appears that the essential characteristics of *puruṣa* in the form of *citiśakti* of embodied *puruṣa* cannot be accessed in the realm of *gūṇa-s*. It is also to be remembered that all these characteristics of *citiśakti* are also equally the characteristics of the *puruṣa* itself. In *sūtra* 1.3, Vyāsa states that *citiśakti* is established in its own nature (*svarūpapraṭiṣṭhā*) only in the state of *kaivalya* when *citta* is without *vṛtti*. At other times, when *citta* is involved with *vṛtti* (*vyutthānacitte*), *citiśakti* persists, but it is not in a pure state, as it remains in the condition of *kaivalya*⁴⁵⁷. So, *citiśakti* is a state beyond any kind of *cittavṛtti*.

Again in *sūtra* 3.50, Vyāsa says that when the *gūṇa-s* fulfil all its activities in the form of karma, *kleśa* and *vipāka* of *citta*, the *gūṇa-s* dissolve into the *avyakta-prakṛti*. This dissolution of *gūṇa-s* is the permanent separation between *puruṣa* and *prakṛti*. This state of permanent separation is *kaivalya*. At that time of *kaivalya*, *puruṣa* remains in its own form as *citiśakti*⁴⁵⁸. According to Vyāsa, the *citiśakti* stage may only be attained when manifest *prakṛti* dissolves into unmanifest *prakṛti*, so confirming the yogin's death. *Citiśakti* is a state of videhamukti. Vyāsa discusses the nature of *citiśakti* many times in his commentary, yet he never even attempts to define it. Rather, he used it to indicate *kaivalya*, *puruṣa*, or a particular

⁴⁵⁶ Vyāsa on *sūtra* 1.2: *citiśaktir aparīṇāminy apratisaṃkramā darśitaviṣayā śuddhā cānantā ca sattvagūṇātmikā ceyam ato viparītā vivekakhyātir iti*.

⁴⁵⁷ Vyāsa on *sūtra* 1.3: *svarūpapraṭiṣṭhā tadānīm citiśaktir yathā kaivalye. vyutthānacitte tu sati tathāpi bhavanti na tathā*.

⁴⁵⁸ Vyāsa on *sūtra* 3.50: *tad eteṣāṃ guṇānām manasi karmakleśavipāka svarūpeṇābhiviyaktānām caritārthānām pratiprasave puruṣasyātyantiko guṇaviyogaḥ kaivalyaṃ tadā svarūpapraṭiṣṭhā citiśaktir eva puruṣa iti*.

state of *kaivalya*. For Vyāsa, *citiśakti* has no independent meaning. Vyāsa seems to suggest that Patañjali just used the phrase as a synonym for *puruṣa* and *svarūpapratīṣṭhā*, *kaivalya*, without any specific meaning or inference. Vyāsa’s perspective has received support from all Sanskrit commentators and the majority of modern scholars, as they similarly refrain from defining or explaining the meaning of the term “*citiśakti*” or the rationale for its use at the end of the text.

One possible reason for equating *citiśakti* with *puruṣa* or *kaivalya* is due to Patañjali’s use of the word “*citi*” in the phrase “*citiśakti*”. *Citi* can be understood as *caitanya* (consciousness) which is the nature of *puruṣa* in the *Sāṃkhya-Yoga* metaphysics. In other words, *citi*, in an alternative sense, can denote *puruṣa*. But one can ask: what about the meaning of the word “*śakti*” in the phrase “*citiśakti*” which means power or force. The question arises: if Patañjali intends to mean *citi* as only *puruṣa* then why does he add the word “*śakti*” with the word “*citi*”? One can argue that the word “*śakti*” does not have any independent meaning in this phrase “*citiśakti*”. So, “*citiśakti*” is simply an alternative term for *puruṣa* or a state of *kaivalya*.

I argue that “*śakti*” is the crucial term in this phrase “*citiśakti*” which demands our attention and without understanding the proper meaning and role of “*śakti*”, one cannot have a comprehensive understanding of the concept of *citiśakti* in the *Yogasūtra*. If the meaning of *citiśakti* is not properly understood, then the nature of *kaivalya* in the *Yogasūtra* would also be not comprehensive for us. Although the word “*citi*” has never been used in the text but we find the word “*śakti*” in several *sūtra*-s in which *śakti* seems to suggest a sense of exertion of power or force. To be precise, “*śakti*” means power or force to engage with something in other words where it has been used in the text.

The Meaning of *Śakti* in *Yogasūtra*

In *sūtra* 2.6, Patañjali uses the concept of “*dṛkśakti*” which indicate the *puruṣa*’s power to see⁴⁵⁹. What does *śakti* mean in this phrase? Nārāyaṇatīrtha rightly states that the word *śakti* means the ability (*yogyatā*) of seeing the manifestation of *prakṛti*⁴⁶⁰. So, in this *sūtra*, the word “*śakti*” is used with the meaning of real power or ability to do something. We find the use of the word *śakti* again in *sūtra* 2.23 in which Patañjali describes *puruṣa*’s power as “*svāmīśakti*”. Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha explains the meaning of “*svāmīśakti*” by saying that the

⁴⁵⁹ *sūtra* 2.6: *dṛgdarśanaśaktiyorekātmakatvevāsmīti*.

⁴⁶⁰ Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha on *sūtra* 2.6: *śaktiśabdo yogyatārthakaḥ*.

master is *puruṣa* (the conscious self), and his power, being consciousness, has the intrinsic nature of being capable of experience/enjoyment (*bhokṛtyogyatā*)⁴⁶¹.

In this context, “*śakti*” means the real power or ability to do something. *Sūtra* 3.21 again uses the word “*grāhyaśakti*” which means the power of grasping. Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha explains this *sūtra* by saying that when the yogi practices *saṁyama* on that form of the body which causes its visibility, and thereby obstructs the body's comprehension power, which is its capacity to be perceived, and thus prevents its visibility—which is the ability to connect with another's eye—then, if there is a connection with light but no contact with the rays of another's eye, the yogi's body becomes invisible, as if it cannot be seen by anyone, like a day-blind person. Briefly, by this explanation, it should be understood that the inaudibility of one's own speech and other senses, achieved through *saṁyama*, is also proven”⁴⁶². In the present *sūtra*, *śakti* is also a real power or capacity to do something.

It appears that the word “*śakti*” used in the *Yogasūtra* seems to carry a meaning of real force or power to do something in different contexts. In the similar fashion, in the phrase “*citiśakti*”, *śakti* could mean a real power or force or capacity. So, “*citiśakti*” can indicate the power of doing something by the *puruṣa*. In a literal sense, many scholars think that “*citiśakti*” is the power of consciousness or *puruṣa*. Now the question arises: what does the power of *puruṣa* indicate in the present context? Daya Krishna interprets this power (*śakti*) as “*nirodha-śakti*,” which he defines as the power “to stop or extinguish the *vṛtti*-s”. This interpretation, however, raises a fundamental question: how can there be any effort involved in stopping the *vṛtti*-s (mental modifications) when one is already in a state of liberation?

Patañjali confirms that *citiśakti* itself represents a state of liberation. In this specific stage, often referred to as the *citiśakti* stage, *puruṣa* is understood to rest in its own true nature, having become entirely disengaged from all *vṛtti*-s. The dilemma arises when considering the implication of *puruṣa* possessing such a power—the capacity to actively do something with *vṛtti*-s. If *puruṣa* were to have this power, it would seemingly imply that *puruṣa* has the capacity to engage with the *guṇa*-s (the fundamental constituents of nature). If we accept *puruṣa*'s power of engaging with *prakṛti* actively, this view directly contradicts the

⁴⁶¹ Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha on *sūtra* 2.23: *svāmī puruṣastasya śaktiścetanatvena bhokṛtyogyatā, svarūpātmiakaiva*.

⁴⁶² Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha on *sūtra* 3.21: *kāyasya yadrūpaṁ cākṣuṣatvaprayojakamasti tasmin saṁyamāttarasya rupasya tadgrāhyaśaktistambhe paracakṣussaṁyogayogyatārūpasya dr̥ṣyatāśaktipratibandhe sati cakṣuprakāśasaṁyoge paracakṣukiraṇairasamprayoge 'ntardhānaṁ yogidehasyācākṣuṣatvaṁ yathāvakāśaṁ utpadyate, divāndheneva kenāpyasau na dr̥ṣyata ityarthah, etena svīyaśabdādisaṁyamācchotrādya 'grāhyatvasiddhiruktā viditavyeti saṅkṣepaḥ*.

established understanding of *puruṣa* within Yoga philosophy, where *puruṣa* is characterized as "*akartā*" (a non-doer), "*abhoktā*" (non-experiential), and "*akarma*" (inoperative), meaning it is without agency.

Therefore, the central question becomes: how can "*citi*", or consciousness, which is synonymous with *puruṣa*, possess the power to engage with the *guṇa*-s, given its intrinsically non-agentic and inoperative nature? Therefore, *citiśakti* cannot be understood as the power of *puruṣa* or *puruṣa*'s engaging power with the *prakṛti*. So, again we return back to our fundamental question: what does *śakti* mean in the context of *puruṣa*? How is it possible that *citi* (consciousness), which is *puruṣa*, can possess such power without undermining its fundamental nature in the Yoga system?

śakti as Real Power

Patañjali's understanding of "*śakti*" is much nuanced. For Patañjali, "*śakti*" is presented as more than just a metaphor; it represents a real power or force for action. It is not merely a potential form of action but rather a "manifesting form of action". *Yogasūtra* suggests that Patañjali generally uses "*śakti*" consistently, implying that its meaning should align across various contexts. Then the question arises: what is the plausible interpretation of "*citiśakti*"? *Yogasūtra* initially defines "*citiśakti*" as a "form of manifesting the power of the conscious *puruṣa*". This suggests a direct connection between consciousness (*citi*) and an active power. If we accept active power of *puruṣa*, then there is contradiction with the idea of "*puruṣa*" as "*akartā*". A significant point of analysis is the potential contradiction when "*citiśakti*" is interpreted as the power of "*citi*" (consciousness) for "doing action". This interpretation clashes with the understanding of "*puruṣa*" in yoga, which is defined as "*akartā*". "*Akartā*" implies that *puruṣa* is a non-doer, meaning it does not engage in action.

What is the true nature of "*puruṣa*"? The Yoga philosophy emphasizes that it would be incorrect to understand *puruṣa* (*citi*) as having the power to engage with "*prakṛti*". *Puruṣa* is fundamentally disengaged from *prakṛti* always. Therefore, attributing an active, engaging power to *puruṣa* directly contradicts its established nature as "*akartā*" and its perpetual disengagement from *prakṛti*. Therefore, understanding "*citiśakti*" as *puruṣa*'s power is problematic: The yoga philosophy clarifies that it is "wrong to think that *citiśakti* is the power of *citi* (consciousness or *puruṣa*)" because utilizing power necessitates *prakṛti*. In the state of "*kaivalya*" – a state of ultimate liberation in yoga – *puruṣa* is completely "beyond the touch of *prakṛti*". This reinforces the idea that *puruṣa*, especially in its liberated state, cannot be the direct wielder of a power that requires interaction with *prakṛti*. If we critically examine the

term "*citiśakti*," highlighting that while "*śakti*" generally denotes real power for Patañjali, interpreting "*citiśakti*" as the active power of "*puruṣa*" creates a fundamental philosophical inconsistency with the core tenets of Yoga, particularly the passive, non-engaging nature of "*puruṣa*" and its ultimate separation from "*prakṛti*" in "*kaivalya*".

On the Definition of *Citiśakti*

One can ask: what is the definition and nature of *citiśakti* then? I believe that Patañjali suggests that *citiśakti* is not the power of '*citi*', but rather the power itself. This implies that '*citi*' (consciousness or spirit) inherently is this power, rather than possessing it as a separate attribute. *Citiśakti* is described as a force and the innate capacity of *puruṣa* to engage with himself, not with *prakṛti*. This highlights its intrinsic connection to *puruṣa* and its role in self-interaction. Crucially, the existence of this *śakti* is not dependent on *prakṛti* (material nature). This establishes *citiśakti* as an inherent property of *puruṣa*, independent of the material realm. Accessibility and Functionality in *puruṣa's* states are important to grasp. When *puruṣa* is not liberated, *citiśakti* is inaccessible. This suggests a state of entanglement or ignorance where *puruṣa* cannot utilize its own intrinsic power. Conversely, when *puruṣa* is liberated, *puruṣa* gains complete access to *citiśakti*, and it begins to function for *puruṣa's* benefit. This implies that liberation unlocks this innate power, allowing *puruṣa* to express or experience itself fully.

Two Functions of *Citiśakti*

One might wonder how this *citiśakti* functions. The *citiśakti* power manifests in two distinct types of functionalities: manifesting power and potential power. Both are still *citiśakti* itself. *Citiśakti* as manifesting power occurs when *puruṣa* lives in a liberated state in the realm of *prakṛti*. In this state, *puruṣa* continues to express itself, implying an active engagement with the world while remaining liberated. This state can be understood as the "*śakti*' manifesting *puruṣa*" and represents a state of liberation in life. *Citiśakti* as potential power is present when *puruṣa* lives in a liberated state devoid of all *prakṛtic* manifestation. Here, *puruṣa* continues "unmanifesting itself," suggesting a state of pure potentiality, disengaged from the material world. This state is called "*śakti* potential *puruṣa*" and signifies a state of liberation after death. In summary, *citiśakti* is *puruṣa's* fundamental, independent power for self-engagement, initially inaccessible in an unliberated state, but fully available upon liberation. This liberated state can then manifest in two ways: as an active, "manifesting" power within *prakṛti* (liberation in life) or as a dormant, "potential" power completely withdrawn from *prakṛti* (liberation after death). Manifest in two ways: as an active,

"manifesting" power within *prakṛti* (liberation in life) or as a dormant, "potential" power completely withdrawn from *prakṛti* (liberation after death).

Patañjali defines *kaivalya* in the final *sūtra* as "the return of *guṇa*-s to their original unmanifested stage" (*guṇānāṃ pratiprasavaḥ kaivalyaṃ*). This definition implies that *kaivalya* is achieved when *puruṣa* (the conscious self) becomes completely disconnected from any *prakṛtic* (material) manifestation, including the yogin's physical body and mind. The contradiction arises if one accepts that *kaivalya* might involve "some stages of development" due to the continuous working of "*śakti*". This idea of developmental stages seems to clash with the notion of *kaivalya* as a singular, complete disconnection from *prakṛtic* elements. *Yogasūtra* suggests that this apparent contradiction can be resolved if *pratiprasava* is not understood "exclusively in a transcendent sense as a process of dissolution". Instead, if *pratiprasava*, as a yogic metaphysical and practical concept, is understood to mean "only a process of reversal," then the idea of "different stages of *kaivalya* in yoga metaphysics can be accommodated".

This broader understanding allows for a progression rather than an instantaneous and complete cessation. It can be observed that Patañjali had already introduced the concepts of *pratiprasava* and *kaivalya* in various contexts within the *Yogasūtra* (YS) before *sūtra* 4.34. Understanding these earlier contexts is crucial for grasping Patañjali's overall position or viewpoint regarding these concepts, which helps in resolving the perceived contradiction. In essence, I argue that by interpreting *pratiprasava* as a "process of reversal" that can encompass stages, rather than solely a complete, transcendent dissolution, it becomes possible to reconcile the idea of *kaivalya* having developmental stages with Patañjali's ultimate definition of *kaivalya* as the *guṇa*-s' return to their unmanifested state.

I emphasized the functional importance of the term "*pratiprasava*", noting that it can be understood in both an "empirical way and in a transcendental way". This immediately sets the stage for a discussion of nuanced interpretations within Patañjali's philosophy. The core of the analysis revolves around two diametrically opposed views of *kaivalya* found in interpretive literature: one is embodied liberation (*jīvan-mukti*) which suggests that liberation can be achieved while still living in a physical body. The other is disembodied liberation (*videha-mukti*) which posits that liberation occurs after the shedding of the physical body and mind. I believe that both of these opposite views are "partially correct," indicating that *kaivalya* might encompass aspects of both or transcend a simple binary definition.

Here, I focus on a specific *sūtra*, YS 2.25, located in the *sādhana-pada*. Here, Patañjali seems to imply that *kaivalya* is embodied liberation. YS 2.25 describes *kaivalya* in terms of a profound disengagement: when avidyā (ignorance) ceases to function, a crucial event occurs. There is a disconnection between the *buddhi* (intellect or discerning faculty) and *puruṣa* (pure consciousness or self). The knowledge of this disassociation of *puruṣa* from the *buddhi* is considered *kaivalya*. This description from YS 2.25 suggests that *kaivalya* is an experiential state—a realization of the fundamental separation of the true self (*puruṣa*) from the modifications of the mind (*buddhi*)—which can presumably be attained while one is still embodied, aligning with the concept of *jīvan-mukti*. The cessation of avidyā is the catalyst for this ultimate discerning knowledge, leading to the experience of *kaivalya*.

Sūtra 2.25 seems to suggest *kaivalya* as liberation through realization: At its core, *kaivalya* is achieved when *puruṣa* realizes its distinctness from *buddhi*. This realization signifies a profound psychological change within the embodied *puruṣa*, rather than a cosmological one. The text emphasizes that this understanding of *kaivalya* can be grasped in an epistemological sense, focusing on the nature of knowledge and how this realization comes about. In the context of attaining *kaivalya*, Patañjali introduces the concept of *pratiprasava*. This process is understood empirically as a reversal of the course of kleśa. Avidyā, or ignorance, is identified as one of the five *kleśa*-s, highlighting the role of overcoming ignorance in the path to liberation.

A crucial aspect of *kaivalya* is articulated in YS 3.55, which states that liberation ensues when the purity of the intellect becomes equal to that of the *puruṣa*. This highly purified state is referred to as the *citta-sattva* state, which fundamentally resides within the realm of *prakṛti*. The purification of the mind of the yogin is synonymous with achieving this purified *citta-sattva* state. Therefore, *kaivalya* is directly presented as the result of the mental purification of the yogin. I can be assumed that this *kaivalya*, resulting from mental purification, can also be understood in an empirical sense. In the context of the *Yogasūtra* (YS), *kaivalya* is described as liberation while living, or *jīvan-mukti*. This implies that the liberated state is not merely a post-mortem experience but can be realized and experienced during one's lifetime through dedicated practice and mental purification.

Two Different Definitions of *Kaivalya*

Patañjali's *Yogasūtra* (YS IV.34) explains that ultimate liberation occurs when the *guṇa*-s—the fundamental constituents of nature (*prakṛti*)—cease to have a purpose for the *puruṣa* (conscious force) and reverse to their latent source. This process, referred to as

"*guṇānāṃ pratiprasavaḥ*," signifies the reversal of the *guṇa-s* into unmanifest *prakṛti*. Essentially, it means the dissolution of all entanglements of *prakṛtic* manifestation, which includes the physical body and mind of the yogin. This dissolution is understood in a transcendental sense, leading to liberation after death (*videhamukti*). In this state, the *puruṣa* rests in its own essential form, free from the influence of the *guṇa-s*. An important clarification made in the Yogasūtra addresses whether the *guṇa-s* return to their original state for other individuals when one person attains *videhamukti*. Patañjali explicitly states that the answer is no.

I quote *sūtra* 2.22 which indicates that while the "seen" (the world of experience) ceases to exist for a liberated *puruṣa* whose purpose is accomplished, it does not cease to exist altogether. This is because the world is "common to other [not-liberated] *puruṣa-s*". This point highlights a crucial aspect of the Yoga tradition: its realist perspective. Unlike idealist perspectives that view the world as a mind-created entity, the Yoga tradition asserts that the world is objectively real. This means that even if an individual *puruṣa* achieves liberation and transcends the world of *guṇa-s*, the objective reality of the world persists for all other unliberated *puruṣa-s*. The liberation of one *puruṣa* does not dissolve the cosmos for everyone else; rather, it signifies that the liberated *puruṣa* no longer experiences or is affected by that objective reality.

Patañjali, as presented in the sources, articulates a profound and vehement declaration regarding the nature of the world for a yogin who has achieved *vivekajñāna* (true knowledge). For such an individual, this world is unequivocally seen as an abode of suffering. To continue living in this mundane realm is, in Patañjali's view, to perpetuate suffering for the *puruṣa*. The source elaborates on the multi-faceted nature of this suffering, stating that "For one who has discrimination, everything is suffering on account of the suffering produced by the consequences [of action], by pain [itself], and by the *saṃskāra-s*, as well as on account of the suffering ensuing from the turmoil of the *vr̥tti-s* due to the *guṇa-s*".

This comprehensive definition highlights that suffering is not merely physical pain but encompasses the karmic repercussions of actions, the latent impressions (*saṃskāra-s*), and the constant flux and disturbance of mental modifications (*vr̥tti-s*) driven by the fundamental qualities (*guṇa-s*) of nature. Given this pervasive suffering, Patañjali suggests a radical solution: the yogin "should depart from this physical world by dissolving her physical body and mind". This counsel stems from the inherent human aversion to pain and suffering, especially when an escape is available. This *sūtra* indirectly but strongly implies that the

ultimate goal, *kaivalya*, is not to be achieved within this *prakṛtic* (material) suffering world. Importantly, this *prakṛtic* world is understood to include the very physical body and mind of the yogin. Therefore, the path to *kaivalya* necessitates a detachment and transcendence of these worldly elements, leading to a state beyond the suffering inherent in existence as perceived by one with true knowledge. The dissolution of the body and mind is presented as the means to facilitate this escape from perpetual suffering and attain *kaivalya*.

Resolving the Conflict of Two Definitions of *Kaivalya*

The *Yogasūtra* elaborates on Patañjali's concept of *kaivalya*, highlighting its intricate and multi-faceted nature by presenting two seemingly contradictory definitions. Here I explain how these apparent differences can be reconciled by understanding *kaivalya* as a developmental process rather than a single, static state. The first definition of *kaivalya* is presented in an empirical sense, known as *jīvan-mukti*, or liberation while living. This understanding is derived from the phrase "*sattva-puruṣayoh śuddhi-sāmye kaivalyam*". In this context, *kaivalya* is possible within the empirical world of *sattva*, which is an ingredient of *prakṛti*. Consequently, this form of *kaivalya* does not entail a complete disassociation from *prakṛti*. In contrast, the second definition of *kaivalya* is presented in a transcendental sense, as *videhamukti*. This definition is encapsulated by the phrase "*guṇānāṃ pratiprasavaḥ kaivalyam*". This clearly signifies the involution of evolution, which means the complete untying of all connections with *prakṛtic* manifestation, including the physical body and the mind of the yogin.

I acknowledge that these two definitions appear to be divergent and incompatible. However, it reconciles these differences by proposing that they are not contradictions but rather distinct stages of an emancipated *puruṣa*. To grasp the "intricate nature of *kaivalya* ", it is crucial to understand these stages. A key concept for understanding this reconciliation is the *pratiprasava* process. Patañjali asserts that achieving *kaivalya* requires completing this process. *Pratiprasava* is described as a process that involves several developmental stages, ultimately culminating in the dissolution of the *guṇā-s*. The text explains that Patañjali defines *kaivalya* differently at various points because it is a progressive journey. As the yogin moves from earlier stages to further achievements in this process, a new definition of *kaivalya* is given to reflect that accomplishment. Essentially, *kaivalya* is not a static stage or an instant accomplishment. Instead, it is characterized as the yogin's personal project which consists of a multi-phase endeavor. The *pratiprasava* process reaches its complete culmination in *sūtra*

4.34, leading to the dissolution of all *prakṛtic* connections completely. This final *sūtra* marks the definitive end of the journey for the liberated yogin.

Developmental Stages of *Kaivalya*

It is to be noted that *kaivalya* has developmental stages in the *Yogasūtra*. These developmental stages can be inferred from the contextual meaning of *kaivalya* in different places. I introduce two distinct stages or types of *kaivalya*: one stage of liberation is identified as *kaivalya* I: *Cittavṛttinirodha*-oriented *kaivalya* (*sūtra* 1.3). Patañjali uses the word “*tadā*” in *sūtra* 1.3, which signifies a specific period of time or a stage of *sādhana* (spiritual practice). According to *sūtra* 1.2, *kaivalya* occurs "when all the *vṛtti*-s of mind are restricted". The term *vṛtti*-s refers to the fluctuations or modifications of the mind. This restriction of mental fluctuations is known as *cittavṛttinirodha*. The result of *cittavṛttinirodha* is that the *puruṣa* (the true self or consciousness) "rests in its own original form". Therefore, this type of *kaivalya* is dependent on the activity of *cittavṛttinirodha* and is described as "*cittavṛttinirodha*-oriented *kaivalya*". The sources designate this stage as “*kaivalya* I” because Patañjali introduces it in the first chapter of the text. Second stage is *kaivalya* as *hāna* (*Sūtra* 2.25).

Stage of *Kaivalya* - I

Patañjali describes *kaivalya* for a second time in the second chapter, specifically in *sūtra* 2.25. This type of *kaivalya* is defined by the "absence of that *avidyā*". *Avidyā* is referred to as "corrupted knowledge," which is explained in an earlier *sūtra*. The absence of *avidyā* leads to the "absence of false relation between the seer and the seen". This "false relation" is typically understood as the mistaken identification of the *puruṣa* with *prakṛti* (the material world) due to ignorance. This "absence of false relation" is known as *hāna*. Ultimately, this *hāna* is otherwise known as *kaivalya* of the *puruṣa*". I understand *kaivalya* as a journey with multiple stages of liberation. The first stage ("*kaivalya* I") is achieved through the stilling of mental activities (*cittavṛttinirodha*), allowing the *puruṣa* to realize its true nature by dissolving the effects of subtle *kleśa*-s. This can be achieved by the epistemological *pratiprasava*. The second stage is characterized by the eradication of *avidyā* (corrupted knowledge) which is the cause of *saṃyoga*, leading to the dissolution of the misidentification between the *puruṣa* (the seer) and the phenomenal world (the seen), a state identified as *hāna*.

Stage of *Kaivalya* - II

Samyoga has been defined as the experience or engagement of embodied *puruṣa* with *prakṛti*. This occurs when the embodied *puruṣa* experiences the manifestations of *prakṛti* through the mind, sense-organs, and body, and mistakenly believes that these components are part of *puruṣa*. Essentially, *saṃyoga* represents a "wrongly imposed relation" between *puruṣa* and *prakṛti*. This attributed relation, *saṃyoga*, is identified as the cause of *avidyā*, which is defined as "corrupted knowledge" or knowledge that is not true. A clear example of *avidyā* provided is the act of recognizing the physical body as the *puruṣa*, despite the physical body being *prakṛti* and distinct from *puruṣa*. Therefore, *avidyā* is fundamentally the cause of the false relation between *prakṛti* and *puruṣa*. This false relation between *prakṛti* and *puruṣa*, driven by *avidyā*, is the cause of bondage.

Consequently, the elimination of *avidyā* is presented as the direct means to eliminate bondage. Patañjali's instruction for eliminating *avidyā* is highlighted: it should be eradicated by gaining true knowledge. This process leads to *kaivalya*, which in this stage of the yogin's *sādhana*, is explained as knowledge-oriented liberation. However, it is crucial to understand that this specific stage of *kaivalya*, marked as "kaivalya II", is not the ultimate end of *sādhana*. Instead, it represents a phase of the journey of *kaivalya*, because the flow of the practice of true knowledge continues for the yogin. This signifies a continuous process of understanding and realization rather than a singular, final achievement.

Stage of *Kaivalya* - III

Patañjali again discusses *kaivalya* in *sūtra* 3.50. This *sūtra* states that "when there is no attachment even for *vivekakhyāti* practice... there is no seed of faults (which keeps the yogin in bondage)". The absence of this "seed of faults" is identified as *kaivalya*. There seems to be a connection to *viveka-khyāti* and supernatural attainments: The chapter where Patañjali mentions *kaivalya* (*sūtra* 3.50) primarily describes the supernatural attainments (*siddhis*) of a yogin. *Viveka-khyāti* practice itself is considered the cause of powerful supernatural attainments, such as omniscience and omnipotence. However, *kaivalya* is achieved specifically when there is no attachment even to *viveka-khyāti* practice. It could be the case that Patañjali introduces *kaivalya* in this chapter to convey that it is also an attainment for the yogin, but crucially, it is the supreme (*param*) attainment (*siddhi*). Patañjali emphasizes that one should not indulge in other attainments until *kaivalya*, the supreme *siddhi*, is achieved. The attainment of *kaivalya* can be identified as supreme *siddhi*-oriented liberation because

kaivalya is an attainment just like the attainment of other *siddhis* by employing many different yogic practices .

So, from the perspective of the practical yogic journey undertaken by a yogin, *kaivalya* is the highest achievement of the yogin. This highest attainment can be arguable identified as the supreme *siddhi* of the yogin and this attainment of supreme *siddhi* as *kaivalya* will be definitely sanctioned by Patañjali by a central aspect of *kaivalya* is the erosion or absence of the "seed of faults". These faults are what keep the yogin in bondage. When these seeds are absent, *kaivalya* is attained, leading to liberation. The *kaivalya* as the supreme *siddhi* can be identified as “*kaivalya* III”. An insightful detail is that even after a yogin attains *kaivalya* as the ultimate *siddhi*, they continue the practice of detachment for *viveka-khyāti*. This is because the yogin is still alive, and this practice remains part of their yogic *sādhana*. This highlights that attainment of *kaivalya* does not necessarily end all yogic discipline but rather shifts its focus or context.

Stage of *Kaivalya* - IV

Kaivalya is defined in *sūtra* 3.55, stating that it "ensues when the *sattva* is equal to *puruṣa* in terms of purity". This highlights that the liberation hinges on achieving a state where the purity of *sattva* matches that of *puruṣa*. Vyāsa clarifies that *sattva* refers to *buddhisattva* (*buddhisattvaṃ*). The purity of *buddhisattva* is achieved when *rajas* and *tamas* become ineffective in the *citta*. In this state, the *citta* becomes clean and pure. The sole purpose of this purified *buddhisattva* is to differentiate between the real nature of *puruṣa* and *prakṛti*. This differentiation process renders *avidyā* and other *kleśa-s* impotent, comparing them to "burnt seeds". Consequently, the *citta* achieves a state of purity and clarity.

Puruṣa achieves its pure state through detachment from *cittavṛttinirodha*. This implies a cessation of the modifications of the mind, allowing *puruṣa* to be no longer under the spell of mental activities that bind the embodied *puruṣa*. When the *citta-sattva* becomes pure and clear in the form of *vṛttis* , it is described as being "similar to the pure state of *puruṣa*". This congruence, where the pure state of *puruṣa* and *buddhisattva* converge, is identified as *kaivalya*. A significant aspect emphasized in the text is that *kaivalya* can be attained within the realm of *prakṛti*. In this specific stage of liberation, the yogin lives in the mundane world with a physical body and mind. Therefore, this form of *kaivalya* is explicitly termed "embodied liberation". It is also characterized as "purity-oriented liberation" due to its foundation in the purity of *sattva* and *puruṣa*. The text further marks this state, described as the most pure stage of *puruṣa* and *prakṛti*, as “*kaivalya* IV”.

Stage of *Kaivalya* - V

According to Patañjali, *kaivalya* is defined as the "reversal of the *guṇā-s* to its original state which is unmanifest *prakṛti*". This implies a profound transformation where the *guṇā-s*, which are the fundamental constituents of nature, return to their primordial, unmanifest state. This reversal process signifies a journey from *vyakta-prakṛti* (manifested *prakṛti*) to *avyakta-prakṛti* (unmanifested *prakṛti*). *Vyakta-prakṛti* refers to the manifest, observable aspects of nature, while *avyakta-prakṛti* is the unmanifest, primordial state. The transition from the manifest to the unmanifest is achieved through a specific process called *pratiprasava*. Therefore, the text emphasizes a strong connection between *kaivalya* and *pratiprasava*, stating that "*kaivalya* is *pratiprasava*-oriented liberation". This suggests that the process of *pratiprasava* is central and indispensable to achieving this type of liberation. In this final stage of *kaivalya*, the liberation described is explicitly referred to as "disembodied liberation". This indicates a state of freedom that transcends the physical body and its limitations. The text also assigns a specific identifier to this particular understanding of *kaivalya*, labeling it as "*kaivalya* -V".

***Kaivalya* as a Journey**

After analyzing these different stage or conditions of liberated yogin, *kaivalya* can be understood as a journey encompassing different incremental stages. These stages can be broadly categorized into two main groups based on their "place of occurrence". The first group, referred to as the first sequence, involves liberation in the realm of *prakṛti*. This is described as the empirical stage and is known as *jīvan-mukti*. The second group, termed the second sequence, entails liberation outside the realm of *prakṛti*. This represents the transcendental stage and is identified as *videhamukti*. It is important to understand that *jīvan-mukti* and *videhamukti* are presented as two sequential stages of true *kaivalya*. Despite being sequential, Patañjali seems to indicate that there is no hierarchy between them; no stage of liberation is superior or inferior. Both stages are considered equal in their salvific efficacy. This suggests that while they represent different phases or states of liberation, their ultimate value or power to grant salvation is the same.

Emperico-Transcendent *Pratiprasava* in the *Yogasūtra*

The concept of *pratiprasava* appears to be used in two different senses within Patañjali's text. In the chapter on practice, it is used in an empirical sense, while in the fourth chapter, it takes on a transcendental meaning. This raises several critical questions: Does Patañjali contradict himself in his views? Is the understanding of two distinct concepts of

“*pratiprasava* “a misinterpretation? Is “*pratiprasava* “a single yogic concept with two different functions? If it has two functional stages, why are these stages presented with different meanings and sequential stages? I claim that Patañjali is completely coherent in his views. This coherence is demonstrated through his established framework of *prajñā* leading to *kaivalya*, or liberation. The mechanism for achieving *kaivalya* is detailed as follows: Patañjali confirms that *avidyā* (Ignorance) is the root cause of suffering. In *sūtra* 2.24, Patañjali identifies *avidyā* as the fundamental cause of the conjunction, or entanglement, between *puruṣa* (the conscious self) and *prakṛti* (primal matter or nature)⁴⁶³. *Hāna* is understood as the cessation of conjunction. When *avidyā* is absent, there is no conjunction between *puruṣa* and *prakṛti*. This lack of conjunction is termed “*hāna*”⁴⁶⁴. This *hāna* directly signifies the *kaivalya*, or liberation, of the seer⁴⁶⁵. The method, or means, to achieve *hāna* is *vivekakhyāti* (discriminative discernment)⁴⁶⁶.

Understanding *Kāryavimukt* and *Cittavimukti*

A crucial aspect of achieving liberation is the development of knowledge. A *puruṣa* who attains *vivekakhyāti* progresses through seven consecutive ultimate states of knowledge, or *prajñā-s* (2.27)⁴⁶⁷. These seven *prajñā-s* are further categorized by Vyāsa⁴⁶⁸ into two distinct groups: first group is *kāryavimukti* Stage. This stage comprises the first four *prajñā-s*. These *prajñā-s* are specifically attained through the active efforts of the yogin. This suggests a phase of deliberate practice and exertion on the part of the practitioner. Second group is the *cittavimukti* Stage. This stage encompasses the last three *prajñā-s*. Significantly, these *prajñā-s* are automatically attained after the successful achievement of the *kāryavimukti-prajñā-s*. This indicates a more spontaneous, effortless progression once a certain level of realization has been established through initial efforts. I show that Patañjali’s apparent inconsistency in using “*pratiprasava*” is resolved by understanding his overarching

⁴⁶³ *sūtra* 2.24: *tasya heturavidyā*.

⁴⁶⁴ *sūtra* 2.25: *tadabhāvātsamyogābhāvo hānaṃ taddr̥śeḥ kaivalyam*.

⁴⁶⁵ *sūtra* 2.25: *tadabhāvātsamyogābhāvo hānaṃ taddr̥śeḥ kaivalyam*.

⁴⁶⁶ *sūtra* 2.26: *vivekakhyātiraviplavā hānopāyaḥ*.

⁴⁶⁷ *sūtra* 2.27: *tasya saptadhā prāntabhūmiḥ prajñā*.

⁴⁶⁸ Vyāsa on *sūtra* 2.27: *tasyeti pratyuditakhyāteḥ pratyāmnāyaḥ, saptadheti aśuddhyāvaraṇamalāpagamāccittasya pratyayāntarānutpāde sati saptaprakāraiva prajñā vivekino bhavati, tadyathā – pariñātāṃ heyam nāsyā punaḥ pariñāyamaṣṭi, kṣīṇā heyahetavo na punareteṣāṃ kṣetavyamasti, sāksātkṛtāṃ nirodhasamādhinā hānam, bhāvito vivekakhyātirūpo hānopāya iti, eṣā catuṣṭayī kāryā vimuktiḥ prajñāyāḥ, cittavimuktistu trayī caritādhikārā buddhiḥ, guṇā girīśikharatāṭyacutā iva grāvāṇo niravasthānāḥ svakāraṇe pralayābhīmukhāḥ saha tenāstaṃ gacchanti, na caiṣāṃ pravilīnāṃ punarastyutpādāḥ prayojanābhāvāditi, etasyānavasthāyāṃ guṇasambandhātītaḥ svarūpamātrajyotīramalaḥ kevalī puruṣa iti, etāṃ saptavidhāṃ prāntabhūbhiprajñāmanuṣāṇpuruṣaḥ kuśala ityākhyāyate, pratiprasave’pi cittasya muktaḥ kuśala ityeva bhavati guṇātītatvāditi*.

framework of liberation. I will confirm the coherence of his system through the progression from *avidyā* to *vivekakhyāti* and ultimately through the seven stages of *prajñā* leading to *kaivalya*. This structured path, with its stages of conscious effort (*kāryavimukti*) and automatic unfolding (*cittavimukti*), provides a context within which the different functional stages of "*pratiprasava*" could logically exist and contribute to the ultimate goal of liberation.

The central issue I highlight here is that while commentators extensively describe effort (yogic *sādhana*) as the means of *kāryavimukti*, they fail to adequately explain the means of *cittavimukti*. This is significant because *cittavimukti* is explicitly stated as the main reason for *kaivalya*. A key question arises from this observation: if *kāryavimukti* is achieved through effort, what then causes *cittavimukti*? I find that prominent commentators, such as Vyāsa, do not provide a direct answer to this question. The explanation often offered by these commentators, suggesting that *cittavimukti* automatically occurs after *kāryavimukti*, is deemed implausible. The reason for this skepticism is that *cittavimukti-prajñā* is not a singular event but rather comprises three successive stages. While the result of *kāryavimukti* might potentially contribute to or cause one of these stages of *cittavimukti*, it logically cannot be responsible for all successive *prajñā*-s.

Successive Stages of *Cittavimukti-Prajñās*

Therefore, I argue that there must be a distinct cause for these successive stages of *cittavimukti-prajñā*-s. I think that Patañjali has implicitly answered this question within his teachings. I believe that Patañjali seems to hint that *pratiprasava* is the direct cause of *cittavimukti*. The reasoning for this assertion is multi-faceted. *Pratiprasava* is presented as the only method by which a yogin can completely eliminate the five afflictions. These five afflictions are fundamental, acting as the building blocks of the *citta* itself (as referenced in 2.10). Furthermore, *pratiprasava* is described as a continuous process. This continuous process ultimately culminates in the dissolution of the *citta* itself (as referenced in 4.34). In essence, I propose that *pratiprasava* offers a complete and continuous mechanism to dismantle the very structure of the *citta* by eradicating its root afflictions, thereby leading to the successive stages of *cittavimukti* that commentators failed to fully explain.

There is a critical distinction between different types of yogic practices and their respective outcomes, particularly concerning the attainment of *cittavimukti* and *kāryavimukti*. One might ask: if *pratiprasava* is considered a yogic *sādhana* (practice) that necessitates the yogin's efforts, then *cittavimukti*—which is implicitly understood to be beyond or unachievable through mere effort—cannot be attained via *pratiprasava*. This objection is

based on the premise that "all efforts or *sādhana*-s end in the *kāryavimukti* stage", suggesting a limitation of effort-based practices to only the *kāryavimukti* stage. There is a crucial distinction between two categories of practices. *Kāryavimukti-sādhana* is characterized by external efforts of yogic practices. These efforts are explicitly described as those that can be seen by others or the yogin's external awareness of the mind itself. This implies practices that are observable, whether by an external observer or by the practitioner's conscious, external self-awareness. It suggests a more tangible, perhaps action-oriented or consciously monitored form of effort. In stark contrast, *pratiprasava* involves "internal practices". The defining characteristic of these practices is that they are not seen by others or the yogin's. This is the main distinction. While *kāryavimukti-sādhana* involves efforts that are either outwardly visible or internally acknowledged by the yogin's conscious awareness, *pratiprasava* delves into a realm of practice so internal that it transcends even the yogin's ordinary external self-awareness. This suggests a practice that operates at a deeper, possibly subconscious, pre-conscious, or trans-conscious level of the being.

Therefore, my interpretation resolves the initial objection by reframing the understanding of "yogic *sādhana*" and "efforts." It suggests that while all "external efforts" or *sādhana*-s visible to external awareness might indeed lead to *kāryavimukti*, *pratiprasava* represents a different class of "internal practices" that operate beyond this visible or externally conscious scope. This allows for the possibility that *cittavimukti*—the ultimate goal—is attainable through *pratiprasava* precisely because it is an "internal practice" that transcends the limitations of what is "seen by others or the yogin's external mind", unlike the external efforts leading to *kāryavimukti*. I argue that the path to *cittavimukti* via *pratiprasava* is not contradictory to the idea that "all efforts end in *kāryavimukti*," because *pratiprasava* involves a type of internal engagement that is qualitatively different from the external efforts associated with *kāryavimukti*. This distinction emphasizes the depth and subtlety required for the highest spiritual liberation, setting *pratiprasava* apart as a unique and profoundly internal mode of yogic *sādhana*.

The central focus of the interpretation revolves around understanding how *pratiprasava* functions in the process of *cittavimukti*, which refers to the liberation of the mind. This question arises due to the understanding that *pratiprasava* operates in two distinct stages: as an empirical phenomenon and as a transcendental phenomenon. Question may arise. In which stage of yogic *sādhana* (yogic practice or discipline) do empirical *pratiprasava* and transcendental *pratiprasava* begin to function? This question seeks to

clarify the timeline or developmental stage within a practitioner's journey where these specific aspects of *pratiprasava* become active or applicable. What specific role do these empirical and transcendental *pratiprasava* play in the overarching process of attaining liberation? This query aims to understand the contribution and significance of each stage of *pratiprasava* towards achieving the ultimate goal of yogic liberation. My discussion sets the stage for an in-depth exploration of *pratiprasava*, highlighting its unique subtlety and dual nature, while posing fundamental questions about its practical application and efficacy in achieving *cittavimukti* and liberation.

The first stage of *prajñā* involves the accomplishment of *bhoga* and *apavarga* with the assistance of intelligence. *Bhoga* refers to experience, while *apavarga* signifies liberation or release. A key principle in this stage is that *apavarga* is the cessation of *bhoga*, and as long as *bhoga* persists, *apavarga* cannot be attained. During this yogic *sādhana* (spiritual practice), all external experiences completely cease, though they do not dissolve. Crucially, in this state, there is a complete cessation of the *citta* (mind-stuff), and its inherent fluctuating nature is permanently destroyed. Vyāsa illustrates this transformation with an analogy: boulders losing their support and tumbling from the tops of mountains. This analogy, as interpreted by the text, signifies that once the *guṇa*-s (qualities of nature) detach from the *puruṣa* (consciousness or self), they lose their ability to re-affect the *puruṣa*. This implies a profound and irreversible disengagement.

In this ultimate stage, the *puruṣa* becomes completely detached from all kinds of *prakṛtic* effects. *Prakṛti* refers to the primordial matter or nature from which the world unfolds, and its effects are the experiences and modifications of the mind and senses. Upon achieving this detachment, the *puruṣa* transforms into the *kevalin*, meaning "the alone". This signifies a state of absolute isolation and independence from the material world. This is presented as the ultimate stage of *prajñā*, which is directly equated with *kaivalya*, or "kaivalya offering insight". *Kaivalya* is a central concept in Yoga philosophy, representing the absolute freedom and liberation of the *puruṣa* from the entanglement with *prakṛti*, leading to a state of pure, unconditioned consciousness. There is a potential misunderstanding: that in the final stage of *cittavimukti*, *puruṣa* is completely dissociated from *prakṛti*. I clarify that this is not the case. One of the main reasons for this is that *prajñā* itself is considered a part of *prakṛti*. Furthermore, complete dissociation of the *puruṣa* from *prakṛti* is not within the control of an embodied *puruṣa*. This is because an embodied *puruṣa* is bound by the law of karma. True liberation, therefore, cannot be achieved until all "fructifying karmas" are entirely exhausted.

Two Stages of Liberation

Given these constraints, I propose that liberation is better understood as occurring in successive stages. These stages are defined as two forms of *kaivalya*: the first stage of *kaivalya* (embodied liberation) in which the embodied *puruṣa* becomes completely devoid of all kinds of *prakṛtic* effects. This implies a state where the influence and impact of *prakṛti* on the *puruṣa* are nullified, even while the *puruṣa* remains embodied. I refer to this stage as "embodied liberation". It is achieved through a process called "empirical *pratiprasava*". There is the second stage of *kaivalya* (disembodied liberation) which is a more profound stage where the *puruṣa* is described as completely devoid of all kinds of *prakṛtic* manifestation. This comprehensive disassociation extends to include the physical body and mind. I call this stage "disembodied liberation". This ultimate liberation is made possible through the process of "transcendental *pratiprasava*". Here, I posit a two-tiered model of liberation, distinguishing between an initial state of freedom from *prakṛtic* effects while still embodied, and a final, complete disassociation from all *prakṛtic* manifestations, including the physical and mental structures, which is contingent upon the exhaustion of *karma*.

The Status of the Liberated Yogin's Body and Mind

We are faced with a fundamental question concerning a liberated yogin (*jīvan-mukta*): how their physical body and mind continue to function despite the attainment of *kaivalya* (liberation), especially when *prakṛti* is understood to cease its actions for the *puruṣa*. My analysis begins by acknowledging a potential challenge: if *kaivalya* implies a state devoid of *prakṛtic* effects, how can a *jīvan-mukta* live and operate using a body and mind that are themselves effects of *prakṛti*? Clarifications are given here regarding the nature of the body and mind: It is affirmed that the physical body and mind are indeed effects or parts of *prakṛti*. This establishes the initial dilemma. The existence of this physical body and mind is attributed to the yogin's previous karma. Crucially, the yogin has no control over this past karma, implying that the current physical form is a pre-existing consequence of actions taken before liberation. Consequently, the physical body and mind are predetermined by the law of karma. Their existence is not contingent upon the yogin's current spiritual status; they exist independently of whether the yogin is in a state of bondage or liberation.

This resolves the initial part of the dilemma by explaining why the body and mind are still present post-liberation—they are a residual effect of past actions. The more intricate question then arises: even if the body and mind exist independently, how do they continue to

function when *prakṛti* has ceased all its actions for the *puruṣa* upon liberation? The reply is that they do not work due to the effects of *prakṛti* anymore. This is a critical distinction, as the liberated *puruṣa* is no longer entangled with *prakṛti*'s operations. Instead, their continued functioning is attributed to the effects of *śakti*. More specifically, it is the manifesting *citiśakti* of *puruṣa* itself that enables the body and mind to operate. I suggest that the liberated yogin's body and mind, though products of *prakṛti* and predetermined by past karma, continue to exist regardless of the yogin's liberated state. However, their *modus operandi* shifts dramatically. While *prakṛti*'s influence ceases for the liberated *puruṣa*, the driving force behind the body and mind's function becomes the inherent, manifesting power (*citiśakti*) of the *puruṣa* itself, rather than the external workings of *prakṛti*. This highlights a profound transformation in the energetic source sustaining life post-liberation.

The Liberated Body's Function in *Kaivalya*

One faces a central philosophical question concerning *kaivalya*, or liberation, particularly how a *jīvan-mukta* (a liberated being) can continue to inhabit and operate a physical body and mind, given that these are effects of *prakṛti*, which is supposed to cease its actions upon liberation. The initial argument presented is that if the first stage of *kaivalya* signifies being "devoid of all kinds of *prakṛtic* effects," then a *jīvan-mukta* should logically be unable to live or function with a *prakṛtic* body and mind. This is because the physical body and mind are unequivocally considered "effects of *prakṛti*".

This sets up the core dilemma I aim to resolve. My interpretation addresses this by clarifying that while the physical body and mind are indeed parts of *prakṛti*, their current existence for a yogin is not contingent on their present state of liberation or bondage, but rather on their previous karma. The yogin, even when liberated, has no control over this previous karma. This implies a pre-deterministic aspect: the physical body and mind are predetermined by the law of karma. Therefore, their "existence does not depend upon the bondage or liberation of the yogin. This explains why the body persists, but not how it functions post-liberation. Even with the understanding that the body and mind exist due to past karma and are independent of the yogin's liberated status, the crucial question remains: how do these physical bodies and minds function?

My reply is that upon liberation, *prakṛti* ceases all its actions for the *puruṣa*. This means the inherent operational mechanisms of *prakṛti* no longer drive the individual. However, the body and mind still work. Crucially, their functioning is not due to the effects of *prakṛti* any longer. Instead, their continued operation is attributed to the effects of the *śakti*,

especially the manifesting *citiśakti* of *puruṣa* itself. This means that the driving force behind the body's and mind's activity shifts from an external, material principle (*prakṛti*) to an internal, conscious power (*citiśakti*) of the *puruṣa* (the conscious self) itself. Here, I resolve the paradox by distinguishing between the origin/existence of the body (due to past karma and *prakṛti*) and its functional agency post-liberation. While *prakṛti* creates the body and mind and dictates their initial function in a bound state, once liberation is achieved, *prakṛti's* influence on the *puruṣa* ceases. The body and mind, still present due to past karmic momentum, are then animated and sustained by the inherent "manifesting *citiśakti* of *puruṣa* itself," allowing the *jīvan-mukta* to continue living and interacting with the world without being bound by *prakṛti's* effects.

The Refined Apparatus: Mind and Body in Liberation

One can raise a question regarding the state of the human body and mind after liberation. The question is that whether these components (body and mind) remain the "same old, impure apparatus" that store *kleśa-s*, *pāpa*, and *punya*, even when a manifesting *citiśakti* is the driving force behind their operation. I reply that the mind and body are not the same as they were prior to liberation, despite any apparent similarities. This transformation is internal and profound. The core of this change lies in the dominance of the *guṇa-s*, which are fundamental qualities or constituents.

In the state of bondage, the human body and mind were characterized by the reliance on the dominance of one specific *guṇa* at a time among the three, implying a fluctuating and often impure state. During this stage, *sattva-guṇa* (often associated with purity, knowledge, and harmony) could not always dominate due to its impure nature, which was derived from *kleśa-s*. *Kleśa-s* are typically understood as mental afflictions or impurities that bind an individual. The apparatus in this state also concurrently stored *pāpa* (demeritorious actions) and *punya* (meritorious actions). In stark contrast, the first stage of liberation introduces a significant shift: the *sattva guṇa* constantly holds sway. Crucially, this is not the same *sattva-guṇa* as experienced in bondage. In the liberated stage, it is described as a "static, refined, and pure sattva".

This purified and unwavering *sattva* is the catalyst that "ensues *kaivalya* (3.55)", which refers to absolute independence, ultimate liberation, or freedom from worldly attachments and suffering. The consistent and pure dominance of *sattva* indicates that the impurities (*kleśa-s*) that once hindered it have been removed. Therefore, I conclude that the old body and mind are not merely superficially altered; rather, they become "internally changed and purified

apparatus" in the liberated stage. This signifies a fundamental shift from a state governed by fluctuating and impure qualities to one where a stable, refined, and pure sattva leads to the ultimate state of liberation.

The Yogi's Embodied Liberation and *Nirmāṇa-Citta*

There appears to be a fundamental paradox concerning the state of a liberated yogi: how they can continue to embody a body and mind, and functionally act, given that liberation in yoga is understood as the cessation (*nirodha*) of all *vṛtti-s* (modifications/activities) of *citta* (mind). In response, it can be said that a liberated yogi retains their body and mind due to "pure sattva" and manifesting *citiśakti*. However, any activity of the mind inherently involves the presence of *vṛtti-s*, and actions stemming from the mind lead to *karma-phala* (fruits of action). Therefore, if there are no *vṛtti-s*, there is no mind, which logically suggests the yogi should become "psycho-physically inactive".

This leads to critical questions regarding the nature of the liberated state: Does the yogi's body become inert, "like a cadaver (*mṛtavat/mṛtakavat*)"?⁴⁶⁹ Is this state akin to a "yogic death" or "deathly otherness", implying an actual renunciation of sensory experience?⁴⁷⁰ A liberated yogi can maintain psycho-physical activity without engaging in the *karma*-producing actions of an unliberated individual. In the liberated stage, all types of physical and mental activities that were the result of past impressions and five afflictions and ignorance cease. These are the actions driven by *vṛtti-s* and personal attachments that generate *karma*. When these motivated and influenced actions stop, *puruṣa* (the pure consciousness) manifests its *śakti* (power) through an "internally refined body".

Crucially, this manifestation also occurs through a "yogically manufactured mind (*nirmāṇa-citta*)". This *nirmāṇa-citta* then begins to produce new psycho-physical activities. The only purpose of these newly generated psycho-physical actions, facilitated by the *nirmāṇa-citta*, is to keep the human body and mind alive until the death of the liberated yogi. While the old mind, which was a source of *vṛtti-s* and *karma*, ceases to operate in a liberated yogi, a new, specially created mind (*nirmāṇa-citta*) takes over. This manufactured mind

⁴⁶⁹ Rocco Cestola (2024, p. 72) shows that this situation of the yogin who has attained liberation (in *asamprajñātasamādhi* stage) has been compared to a dead-body. Cestola writes that "Commenting on YBh/YS I.18, both Vijñānabhikṣu and Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa describe the yoga practitioner as being deeply absorbed in *asamprajñātasamādhi* and "remaining like a cadaver." The expressions used are *mṛtavat* in the PYV (Yogavārttika), and *mṛtakavat* in the YV (Pātañjalayogasūtravṛtti)".

⁴⁷⁰ Grinshpon (2002, p. 6) comments that ultimate goal of yoga is cessation of all psycho-physical actions. He comments that "Yoga is essential otherness," which suggests "[T]he creation of a yogic universe based on difficult and prolonged observances and practices culminating in actual sensory renunciation". He says that "The otherness of Yoga is expressed in terms of paranormal experiences (*siddhi*)".

allows the liberated yogi to maintain their physical existence and perform necessary functions, but these actions are not driven by personal desires, past impressions, or afflictions. Instead, they are purely for the sustenance of the physical vehicle until its natural end, demonstrating a state of active embodiment that is fundamentally different from the unliberated experience.

On the Meaning of *Nirmāṇa-citta*

Patañjali introduces the concept of *nirmāṇa-citta* in *sūtra* 4.4, which is a special type of new mind that a yogin possesses the ability to construct. Now the question arises: what does this new mind mean? In *sūtra* 4.4, Patañjali states that “from the mere egoity (*asmitāmātrāt*), *nirmāṇa-citta* arises”⁴⁷¹. Vyāsa does not elaborate on this important *sūtra* and important concept of *nirmāṇa-citta*. Vācaspati comments that “having prepared for the fulfillment of accomplishments (*siddhi*) with an abundance of nature (*prakṛti*), Patañjali deliberates on the unity or diversity of the *citta* residing in the various bodies created by the fulfillment of accomplishments. When it is said, "but when," there, if there were diverse minds (*manastva*) for the bodies, due to the difference in intention (*abhiprāya*) for each *citta*, there would not be compliance with a single intention (*ekābhiprāyānurodha*) or mutual connection (*parasparapratisaṁdhāna*), as with different persons (*puruṣāntaravat*).

Therefore, the opponent asserts that a single *citta*, like a lamp, pervades even many created bodies (*nirmāṇakāya*) by being diffused. [To this,] Patañjali replies: "*nirmāṇacitta*-s arise merely from egoism (*asmitāmātra*)." Since everybody that lasts for life (*yāvajjīvaccharīra*) is seen to be associated with a unique and distinct *citta*, just as the bodies of Caitra, Maitra, and others; therefore, it is established that created bodies (*nirmāṇakāya*) also have their own individual mind (*manas*). With this intention (*abhiprāyeṇa*), Patañjali says: "merely egoism (*asmitāmātra*)"⁴⁷².

Different Conceptions of *Nirmāṇa-Citta* in Sanskrit Commentaries:

There is no disagreement among the Sanskrit commentators regarding the origin of *nirmāṇacitta*. They believe that the primary cause of origination of *nirmāṇacitta* is the egoity (*asmitā* or *ahaṁkāra*). *Ahaṁkāra* is identified as "the I-maker" and the fundamental cause of

⁴⁷¹ *sūtra* 4.4: *nirmāṇacittānyasmitāmātrāt*.

⁴⁷² Vācaspati on *sūtra* 4.4: *prakṛtyāpūreṇa siddhīḥ samarthya siddhivīnirmītanānākāyavarticitatkatvanānātve vicārayati - yadā tvīti, tatra nānāmanastve kāyānām praticittamahiprāyabhedādekābhiprāyānurodhaśca parasparapratisaṁdhānam ca na syātām puruṣāntaravat, tasmādekameva cittam pradīpavadvisāritayā bahūnapi nirmāṇakāyānvyāpnotīti prāpta āha - nirmāṇacittānyasmitāmātrāt, yadyāvajjīvaccharīram tatsarvamekaikāsādhāraṇacittānvītam dṛṣṭam, tadyathā caitraṁmaitrādiśarīram, tathā ca nirmāṇakāyā iti siddham teṣāmapi prātisvikaṁ mana ityabhiprāyeṇa* 'ha - asmitāmātramīti.

mind. Most Sanskrit commentators (such as Vijñānabhikṣu⁴⁷³, Bhāvagaṇeśa⁴⁷⁴, Rāmānanda Sarasvatī⁴⁷⁵, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha⁴⁷⁶, Nāgojibhaṭṭa⁴⁷⁷, Sadāśivendra Sarasvatī⁴⁷⁸, Hariharānanda Āraṇya⁴⁷⁹) believe that *nirmāṇacitta* refers to those minds that are created by one's own intention or will (*saṅkalpa*). These *nirmāṇacitta*-s are fashioned by a yogi through their spiritual power and will, specifically to animate multiple created bodies (*nirmāṇakāya* or *nirmāṇadehasaṃghāta*)⁴⁸⁰. The word "mere (*mātra*)" in "*asmitāmātra*" is significant, as it excludes the mind (*manas*) itself, indicating that egoity is a more fundamental causal principle than the ordinary mind⁴⁸¹. Hariharānanda describes this egoity as a purified form, whose seed of afflictions is burnt and not dissolved⁴⁸². Hariharānanda explains it as "mere *asmitā* that is devoid of the function of the mind which is of the nature of non-discrimination," acting like a "burnt seed"⁴⁸³.

Some Sanskrit commentators⁴⁸⁴ state that *nirmāṇacitta* are produced "by the effects of yogic practices (*yogaprabhāvāt*). *Nirmāṇacitta*-s arise from the "abundance of nature (*prakṛti*)" that is subject to the intention (*saṅkalpa*) of the yogi. Hariharānanda comments that

⁴⁷³ Vijñānabhikṣu on *sūtra* 4.4: *svasaṅkalpena nirmīṭcittāni nirmāṇacittānyucyante*.

⁴⁷⁴ Bhāvagaṇeśa a on *sūtra* 4.4: *siddhau saṅkalpena nirmīṭtāni cittāni nirmāṇacittānyucyante, tāni bahūni nirmāṇadehasamasamkhyānyapi bhavanti, teṣāṃ kāraṇamāha asmitāmātrāditi, manaḥkāraṇādahāṅkāradityarthaḥ*.

⁴⁷⁵ Rāmānandasarasvatī on *sūtra* 4.4: *yogaprabhāvāt nirmīyanta iti nirmāṇāni cittāni yogisaṅkalpādhīnaprakṛtyāpūrāt kāyavat ahaṅkārat prakṛterjāyanta ityarthaḥ*.

⁴⁷⁶ Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha on *sūtra* 4.4: *yogaprabhāvānnirmīyanta iti nirmāṇāni cittāni yogisaṅkalpādhīnaprakṛtyāpūrāt kāyavadahāṅkārat prakṛterjāyanta itya'rthaḥ*.

⁴⁷⁷ Nāgojibhaṭṭa on *sūtra* 4.4: *asmitāmātramahaṃkārastasmātsiddhena saṅkalpena nirmīṭtāni cittāni nirmāṇacittāni tāni dehasamasamkhyāni bhavanti, ahaṃkāraṇakāraṇakānītyarthaḥ, anyathaikacittena viruddhānāṃ bhogasamādhyaḍḍhānāṃ nānādeheṣvekadā saṃbhavo na syāt*.

⁴⁷⁸ Sadāśivendra Sarasvatī on *sūtra* 4.4: *yogaprabhāvānnirmīyanta iti nirmāṇāni cittāni yogisaṅkalpādhīnaprakṛtyāpūrāt kāyavada-hāṅkāratvaparakṛterjāyanta ityarthaḥ*.

⁴⁷⁹ Hariharānanda on *sūtra* 4.4: *svecchayāsyotthānaṃ nirodhaśca tato na nirmāṇacittaṃ bandhahetuḥ*.

⁴⁸⁰ Vācaspati on *sūtra* 4.4: *tasmādekameva cittaṃ pradīpavadvisāritayā bahūnapi nirmāṇakāyānvyāpnotīti prāpta āha*.

Vijñānabhikṣu on *sūtra* 4.4: *tāni bahūni nirmāṇadehasamasamkhyāni bhavanti*.

Bhāvagaṇeśa a on *sūtra* 4.4: *siddhau saṅkalpena nirmīṭtāni cittāni nirmāṇacittānyucyante, tāni bahūni nirmāṇadehasamasamkhyānyapi bhavanti, teṣāṃ kāraṇamāha asmitāmātrāditi, manaḥkāraṇādahāṅkāradityarthaḥ*.

Rāmānanda Sarasvatī on *sūtra* 4.4: *yogaprabhāvāt nirmīyanta iti nirmāṇāni cittāni yogisaṅkalpādhīnaprakṛtyāpūrāt kāyavat ahaṅkārat prakṛterjāyanta ityarthaḥ*.

Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha on *sūtra* 4.4: *yogaprabhāvānnirmīyanta iti nirmāṇāni cittāni yogisaṅkalpādhīnaprakṛtyāpūrāt kāyavadahāṅkārat prakṛterjāyanta itya'rthaḥ*.

⁴⁸¹ Vijñānabhikṣu on *sūtra* 4.4: *mātraśabdena manovyāvṛttiḥ*.

⁴⁸² Hariharānanda on *sūtra* 4.4: *asmitāmātrāt apralīnasya dagdhakleśabījasya cetaso vikṣepasaṃskārapratyayaḥ cittaḥ kāryaṃ nyagbhūtaṃ bhavati*.

⁴⁸³ Hariharānanda on *sūtra* 4.4: *avivekarūpacittakāryahīnāyā evāsmītyā ityarthaḥ*.

⁴⁸⁴ See the the above cited commentaries of *sūtra* 4.4 by Rāmānandasarasvatī, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha, Sadāśivendra Sarasvatī.

the yogi, by their own will, takes this mere *asmitā* to create these *nirmāṇacitta-s*⁴⁸⁵. Vivaraṇakāra describe the nature and characteristics of *nirmāṇacitta* as “new, fashioned, thought-out, immaterial, and divinely piled up”⁴⁸⁶. Vivaraṇakāra says that the creation of *nirmāṇacitta* is not limited to minds; even the senses are said to arise from mere egoity, ensuring that the created bodies are functional and not like useless corpses⁴⁸⁷. Vijñānabhikṣu adds that many intellects (*buddhi*) and egoities (*ahaṅkāra*) can also arise from the abundance of intellect where the yogi's own nature is predominant⁴⁸⁸. It is firmly established by the commentators that for every created body (*nirmāṇakāya*), there is a unique and distinct *nirmāṇacitta*⁴⁸⁹.

Therefore, there is multiplicity of multiple bodies. This multiplicity is crucial to prevent contradictions: A single mind cannot simultaneously experience concentration (*samādhi*) and enjoyment (*bhoga*), or knowledge (*jñāna*) and ignorance (*ajñāna*), across different bodies⁴⁹⁰. Multiple minds allow for different intentions (*abhiprāya*) and activities (*pravṛttibheda*) in each created body, just as with different persons⁴⁹¹. To support these diverse activities and qualities, a "difference in instruments (*karaṇabheda*)" or internal organs (*antaḥkaraṇabheda*) is required for each body⁴⁹². Hariharānanda says that *nirmāṇacitta-s* are not a cause of future bondage (*bandhahetuḥ*) for the yogi. This is because their arising and cessation are entirely controlled by the yogi's own will. For Hariharananda, the purpose of

⁴⁸⁵ Hariharānanda on *sūtra* 4.4: *svecchayaikamanekaṃ vā cittaṃ kāyaṃ ca nirmimīte*.

⁴⁸⁶ Vivaraṇakāra on *sūtra* 4.4: *so'haṃkāraṃ cittakāraṇamupādāya nirmāṇacittāni nirmittāni cintāni aprākṛtānīśvaracittāni navāni karoti yogī*.

⁴⁸⁷ Vivaraṇakāra on *sūtra* 4.4: *cittagrahaṇamudāharaṇamātram, indriyāṇyapyasmitāmātrādeva, tataḥ te sacittāḥ sakāraṇāṃśca bhavanti. cittendriyābhāve ca mṛtadeśīyaḥ kāyo nirarthakaḥ syāt*.

⁴⁸⁸ Vijñānabhikṣu on *sūtra* 4.4: *buddhyahāṅkāra api aneke svaprakṛtipradhānabuddhyāpūrādbhavantīti pratyetavyaṃ yuktisāmyāditi*.

⁴⁸⁹ Vijñānabhikṣu on *sūtra* 4.4: *svasaṅkalpena nirmittacittāni nirmāṇacittānyucyante, tāni bahūni nirmāṇadehasamaśāṅkhyāni bhavanti*.

Vācaspati on *sūtra* 4.4: *tathā ca nirmāṇakāyā iti siddhaṃ teṣāmapi prāṭisvikaṃ mana ityabhiprāyeṇā'ha - asmitāmātramiti*.

⁴⁹⁰ Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha on *sūtra* 4.4: *anyathāikacittena viruddhānāṃ bhogasamādhyādīnāṃ nānādeheṣvekadā saṃbhavo na syāt*.

⁴⁹¹ Vācaspati on *sūtra* 4.4: *tatra nānāmanastve kāyānāṃ praticittamabhiprāyabhedādekābhiprāyānurodhaśca parasparapratisaṃdhānaṃ ca na syātāṃ puruṣāntaravat*.

Vivaraṇakāra on *sūtra* 4.4: *ekacittatve tu guṇapradhānabhāvaḥ pravṛttibhedeśca nopakalpate*

⁴⁹² Vivaraṇakāra on *sūtra* 4.4: *tatra vibhutvādekaṣṭatrajñāte'pi bahukāyārāmbhatvamupapadyate, guṇapradhānānekapravṛttibhedārthaṃ tu karaṇabheda eṣitavyaḥ*.

Vijñānabhikṣu on *sūtra* 4.4: *nanu nirmāṭcittasya ekasyaiva pradīpavadvisāritayā kāyavyūheṣu vṛttisambhavāt kimarthaṃ dehabhedenāntaḥkaraṇabhedo'bhyupagamyate*.

the of creating *nirmāṇacitta* and associated bodies by the yogin is to favor others (*parānugrahārthāya*)⁴⁹³.

Critique of Sanskrit Commentators' View on *Nirmāṇacitta*

As we can see from the discussion above, Sanskrit commentators describe the nature and function of *nirmāṇa-citta* rather than defining it. There are a lot of logical issues with their explanations as well. Commentators think that since there are numerous *nirmāṇakāya*, there must also be many *nirmāṇacitta*-s, which is how Patañjali intended to express *sūtra* 4.4. Stated differently, do these *nirmāṇakāya*-s have distinct *nirmāṇacitta*-s of their own? *Sūtra* 4.4 has been connected to this question in order to provide a solution. According to their response, the yogin can produce independent *nirmāṇacitta*-s and inject *nirmāṇacitta*-s into already formed *nirmāṇakāya*-s. So that there is always one *nirmāṇacitta* available for each produced body. If it is believed that many of the *nirmāṇakāya*-s that the yogin made can be implanted with *nirmāṇacitta*-s, then a logical difficulty occurs.

The issue is that how can those *nirmāṇakāya*-s survive without *puruṣa* if the yogin connects them with the *nirmāṇacitta*-s? Until there is a connection between the body and *puruṣa*, the body cannot be alive. The body cannot become alive and active alone by the presence of *citta*. The yogin cannot enter into multiple bodies at once, hence it is impossible to enter into other bodies. If someone replies that the yogin himself comes into the *nirmāṇakāya*-s as *puruṣa* in order to maintain the body alive, it is still problematic. In the metaphysics of *Sāṃkhya-Yoga*, *puruṣa* is a single entity for a single body. As a result, a *puruṣa* cannot simultaneously participate in so many *nirmāṇakāya*-s. Therefore, it is impossible for all of the *nirmāṇakāya*-s to be alive at the same moment in this scenario. The yogin's original body, which she was previously affiliated with, will be dead when she tries to enter the other *nirmāṇakāya*-s.

One could respond that the yogin returns to her actual body and brings it back to life after visiting the other body. Therefore, the question of how the yogin's old body survived without the *puruṣa*'s link emerges. The yogin's actual body would decay and transform into the various physical elements (*bhūta*). So, it can be said that it is difficult to justify yogin's possibility of entering into different bodies through *nirmāṇacitta* at the same time.

⁴⁹³ Hariharānanda on *sūtra* 4.4: *yogī tu parānugrahārthāya tadasmitāmātram dagdhabījakalpamupādāta sveccayaikamanekaṃ vā cittam kāyaṃ ca nirmimīte sugamaṃ bhāṣyam, svecchayāsyotthānaṃ nirodhaśca tato na nirmāṇacittam bandhahetuḥ.*

There is another problem with the cause of origination of *nirmāṇacitta*. It has been proposed by the Sanskrit commentators that *nirmāṇacitta* originates from the mere egoity (*asmitāmātrāt*). *Asmitā* has been interpreted as *ahaṃkāra* (ego). *Ahaṃkāra* is one the three elements which create *citta*. According to *Yogasūtra*, *citta* is a combination of three elements - *manas* (mind), *buddhi* (intellect) and *ahaṃkāra* (ego). Now the question arises: how can one element (such as *ahaṃkāra*) of *citta* can create an entire new *citta* which requires three elements to be produced. So, even if we say that this ego is mere (*mātra*) *ahaṃkāra*, still there is this logical problem because only *ahaṃkāra* also means that there is no chance of mixing with *buddhi* or *manas* of the yogin to create this *nirmāṇacitta*. It can be suggested that creating *nirmāṇacitta* from *ahaṃkāra* seems impossible.

Why do the commentators think that it is logical to have numerous created bodies and minds? All of these interpreters, I presume, consider *nirmāṇacitta* to be *siddhi* (supernatural powers). From the standpoint of ordinary human understanding, *siddhis* seem totally unattainable, but they are entirely feasible because of the unique aptitude that a yogin acquires via mastering various yogic practices. Therefore, *nirmāṇacitta* could be an extraordinary capacity even if it is difficult to logically prove the relation between many created-bodies and created-minds. However, it is still hard to understand why they consider *nirmāṇacitta* to be only a *siddhi*. It should be mentioned that Patañjali has already devoted an entire chapter to explaining the many kinds of *siddhis* and their fruits, which he appropriately calls *vibhūta-pada* (the chapter describing unusual powers of the yogin). Why does Patañjali not make reference to or allude to *nirmāṇacitta's* status as a *siddhi* in the *vibhūta-pada*, either explicitly or implicitly? In some cases, *nirmāṇacitta* could be more than only *siddhi*. Since *nirmāṇacitta* has been utilized in the *kaivalya-pada*, it is also probable that it is a yogic special skill related with the state of *kaivalya*.

Nirmāṇa-Citta as Transformed-Citta

There is another interpretive problem with the term “*nirmāṇa-citta*” itself. The word “*nirmāṇa*” could mean forming, making, creating, building, composition and transformation. *Nirmāṇa-citta* then indicate the creation or production of special *citta* in our present context. Now the question arises: what does it mean to create or produce a *citta* in our present context? The immediate reply would be that it is the creation or production of a special *citta* by *ahaṃkāra* or *asmitā*? But it is to be remembered that in the metaphysics of *Sāṃkhya-Yoga*, there is no independent creation except transformation because everything whatever exists except the *puruṣa* is a transformation of three *guṇa-s* into different entities or elements.

Therefore, in our present context, “*nirmāṇa*” should be understood as a transformational change of *citta*, not a creation of new and independent *citta*.

Even if we interpret *nirmāṇa* as transformational change, how do we understand transformational changes of many *citta*-s because in *sūtra* 4.4 *citta* has been used in plural form (*cittāni*) which suggests many *citta*-s? So, the literal meaning of the actual phrase “*nirmāṇacittāni*” in *sūtra* 4.4 seems to suggest transformation of many *citta*-s. As I have earlier shown that the theory of many *citta* is a problematic one, then what could be the plausible meaning of this phrase in our present context? I suggest that by the term “*cittāni*”, Patañjali indicates different layers or levels or stages of *citta* which the yogin takes up as she progresses in her yogic journey. Therefore, the phrase “*nirmāṇacittāni*” could possibly mean the transformational changes of different functional levels of *citta*. So, “*nirmāṇa-citta*” could be translated as transformed or metamorphosed state of *citta* from *citta*’s earlier version.

One may object that “*nirmāṇacittāni*” does not literally translate to different transformed layers of *citta*. The meaning of phrase “*nirmāṇa-citta*” cannot be understood properly from its literal perspective, rather “*nirmāṇa-citta*” should be understood as a metaphysical concept and yogic process because it is to be remembered that *nirmāṇa-citta* is a technical term in *Yogasūtra* which can have many shades of meanings. Even if we accept that transformed-*citta* is one of possible meanings of “*nirmāṇa-citta*”, the question arises: what does it mean to transform or change in *citta* because *citta* is always changing or transforming from one thought to another or one action to another action? Patañjali does not give any explicit answer of this question in the *Yogasūtra*, but one possible meaning can be derived from other related concepts and contexts.

I suggest that this transformation or change can mean transformation from lower level of impurity of *citta* to higher level of purity of *citta* by the yogin. Patañjali explicitly mentions that the purpose of practicing different limbs of yoga is to destroy the impurities (*aśuddhikṣaye*) of mind which will bring *vivekakhyāti* (discriminative knowledge) that will ultimately bring *kaivalya*. As purity is a central theme for Patañjali and it is connected with *kaivalya* also because Patañjali declares in *sūtra* 3.55 that when *sattva* and *puruṣa* are equal in terms of purity, it should be understood as *kaivalya*⁴⁹⁴.

⁴⁹⁴ *sūtra* 3.55: *sattvapuruṣayoḥ śuddhisāmye kaivalyamiti*.

***Asmitā* as a Feeling of Existence in Mundane World**

This “*nirmāṇa-citta*” (transformed-citta) is unique and distinct due to its specific origin and characteristics. The foundational element of the *nirmāṇa-citta* is its constitution. It is made from ego only (*asmitāmātrāt*). This *asmitā* has been understood as *ahaṃkāra* which I have shown as problematic interpretation. Then the question arises: what does this *asmitāmātrāt* mean in the present context? If we understand “*nirmāṇa-citta*” as purifying transformed state of *citta*, then *asmitā* does not seem to suggest that negative ego-centric feeling (*asmitā*) of one of the five *kleśa*-s. I suppose that it is crucial to understand that this *asmitā* is not to be conflated with the five afflictions that bind ordinary beings.

Instead, I suggest that *asmitāmātrāt* signifies a very specific kind of feeling of the existence of individuality: a sense of egoistic knowledge rooted purely in *sattva* (*śuddha-sattva*). This pure *sattvic* nature is what fundamentally differentiates the *nirmāṇa-citta* from all other *prakṛtic* manifestations, highlighting its exceptional status and purity. This sense of *asmitā* in *kaivalya* stage may be the result of embodying *citiśakti* which allows the liberated yogin to transcend all the *kleśa*-s and enjoy a pure state of higher purity which is equal stage of *kaivalya*. The primary purpose of this unique *asmitā* within the *nirmāṇa-citta* is to allow the embodied *puruṣa* to retain her sense of individuality as a liberated *puruṣa*. This function is vital because it enables the liberated *puruṣa* to interact with *prakṛti* through the *nirmāṇa-citta* while simultaneously maintaining her distinct identity. This individuality serves to differentiate her from all other unliberated *puruṣa*-s and other *prakṛtic* manifestations, ensuring that her liberated state is preserved even in engagement with the material world.

The acquisition of this extraordinary mind is achieved through advanced yogic practice, specifically *Samādhi* meditation (*dhyāna*)⁴⁹⁵. One of the most significant characteristics of the *nirmāṇa-citta* is that there is no storage of *saṃskāra* within it (*anāśaya*). This feature is paramount as it breaks the cycle of *karma*. Since *saṃskāra* – the imprints of past actions – are absent, the actions performed by the *nirmāṇa-citta* are not a consequence of the yogin's past bondage. More importantly, these actions will not bind the yogin in the future. This is based on the principle that without *saṃskāra*, there can be no *karma-phala* (fruits of action). Therefore, when a liberated yogin performs actions using this manufactured mind, she remains completely detached from their effects, ensuring her continued freedom and non-entanglement.

⁴⁹⁵ *sūtra* 4.6: *tatra dhyānajamanāśayam*.

Role of *Nirmāṇa-Citta*

Actions performed by the liberated yogin is generated by *nirmāṇa-citta*. These actions are distinctive because they are explicitly not the result of the effects of *prakṛti*. Instead, they are directly attributed to the effects of *puruṣa*'s self-illumination power, which is manifested as *citiśakti*. This distinction is crucial, as it separates these actions from those driven by material nature. The nature of *puruṣa* is described as self-illuminating (*svābhāsaṃ*)⁴⁹⁶. Patañjali emphasizes this inherent quality of *puruṣa* as *svābhāsaṃ*. The term *svābhāsaṃ* is a compound of “*sva*” (self) and “*ābhāsa*” (illumination), signifying that *puruṣa* does not require any external source or illuminator for its emanation of illumination. This highlights *puruṣa*'s intrinsic, independent radiance. Furthermore, *puruṣa* manifests or emanates its *śakti* (power) through the *nirmāṇa-citta*. This manifested power is identified as *citiśakti*.

It is the functioning of this manifesting *citiśakti* that enables a liberated yogin to perform all their activities within the mundane world. This implies that liberation does not necessarily lead to inactivity but rather to a different mode of action. It is to be noted that manifesting *citiśakti* is a special, self-emanating power of the *puruṣa*. This power is specifically what allows the yogin to continue performing actions even after achieving liberation. This is a significant point, as it defines a state where spiritual freedom does not negate engagement with the world but transforms its nature. Finally, the stage of the liberated yogin operating through this manifesting *citiśakti* can be equated with embodied liberation. This is because this form of liberation takes place specifically within the realm of *prakṛti*, indicating a state where a liberated being can continue to exist and act in a physical body and the material world, yet their actions are not bound by *prakṛti* but are rather expressions of *puruṣa*'s self-illuminated power (*svābhāsaṃ*).

But it is to be noted that in the stage of potential *citiśakti*, the yogin's body and mind cease to exist after all effects of fructifying *karma* have been exhausted. Consequently, there is no *nirmāṇa-citta* and no physical body. Crucially, at this stage, there is absolutely no connection to the *prakṛtic* manifestations. This means that the manifestation of *citiśakti* cannot be felt or exerted in *prakṛti*. From the perspective of *puruṣa*, *śakti* is an innate capacity. However, from the perspective of *prakṛti*, this *śakti* is described as the dormant power of *puruṣa*. Because of this inactivity of *puruṣa*'s power in *prakṛti*, it can be named as potential *citiśakti*. Potential *citiśakti* signifies that while *puruṣa* inherently possesses the ability to exert

⁴⁹⁶ *sūtra* 4.19: *na tatsvābhāsaṃ dṛśyatvāt*.

śakti, this ability cannot be known or articulated and exists only in its potential form due to the absence of any associated *prakṛtic* element.

The stage of *puruṣa* characterized by potential *citiśakti* can be equated with disembodied liberation. This is because disembodied liberation takes place beyond the realm of *prakṛti*, aligning with the state where there is no connection to *prakṛtic* manifestations. *Kaivalya* (liberation) in yoga is a journey for a liberated yogin from embodied liberation to disembodied liberation. This transition is made possible through two successive stages of *pratiprasava*. Embodied liberation is achieved as a result of empirical *pratiprasava*. This process involves reversing the functioning of the *kleśa*. Disembodied liberation is the outcome of transcendental *pratiprasava*. This higher stage of *pratiprasava* is defined as the process of reversing the functioning of the "guṇa-s" from the manifest world to the unmanifest world. There seems to be a profound spiritual state where the individual consciousness (*puruṣa*) is completely dissociated from material existence (*prakṛti*), reaching a potential state of power (*citiśakti*) that underlies disembodied liberation, a state achieved through specific cosmological reversals (*pratiprasava*) of karmic and material influences.

Two-Stage Process of Liberation in Yoga

Two functions of *pratiprasava* confirms a two-stage process of liberation in Yoga, signifying different states of freedom from the influence of *prakṛti* and its constituents, the *guṇa-s*. *Pratiprasava* should be initially understood in an empirical sense and should not be taken literally. Instead, it functions as a symbol for reversing a process described in the Yoga sūtras (YS). YS 2.10 indicates that subtle afflictions (*kleśa-s*) are to be eliminated through this retrograding process of reversal. The essence of *pratiprasava* is not the complete dissolution of the *kleśa-s* themselves, but rather the dissolution of their functional effect on the *puruṣa*. It signifies a reversal of how the *kleśa-s* operate.

The concept of *pratiprasava* indicates the two stages of liberation. The first stage is the *jīvan-mukti*. This *jīvan-mukti* stage can be characterized by a barrenness of the effects of tri-*guṇa-s* on the *puruṣa*. This means that while the *guṇa-s* and *kleśa-s* may still exist, their power to influence or bind the *puruṣa* is neutralized. At this stage, *pratiprasava* is perceived in an empirical way, focusing on the reversal of the functioning of *kleśa-s*. The *prarabdha*-generated *kleśa-s* themselves do not completely dissolve, but their ability to affect the *puruṣa* ceases. This leads to the state of *jīvan-mukti*, implying liberation while still embodied.

The second stage of liberation is *videhamukti*. This second stage represents a more profound dissolution, described as a barrenness in the functioning of *tri-guṇa-s*. This signifies a complete cessation of the *guṇa-s*' activity in relation to the *puruṣa*. This cessation leads to the dissolution of all connections with the *puruṣa*, including the physical body and mind. This complete separation results in the state of *videhamukti*, which means liberation from the body. YS 4.34 tells us that *kaivalya* is the turning back of the *guṇa-s* to their source, once (their work) for the sake of *puruṣa* is accomplished. This "turning back" (*pratiprasava*) of the *guṇa-s* to their original source signifies a return to a state where the *guṇa-s* no longer have any contact with the *puruṣa*. This state or condition can be identified as ultimate freedom.

This stage of ultimate freedom involves the complete dissolution of everything created by *prakṛti*, encompassing both the physical body and the mind. Alternatively, YS 4.34 also defines *kaivalya* as "the power of pure consciousness (*citi-śakti*) abiding in its own essence", highlighting the *puruṣa*'s return to its unconditioned, pure state. In essence, I have shown that a progressive path of liberation where the first stage (*jīvan-mukti*) focuses on neutralizing the effects of *prakṛti* on *puruṣa* while embodied, and the second stage (*videhamukti*) involves the complete disentanglement from *prakṛti* and its creations, leading to the ultimate state of *kaivalya* where the *puruṣa* rests in its pure consciousness.

Addressing Potential Objections

I have shown that the core concept introduced is *kaivalya*, which the YS defines not as a sudden, instantaneous state, but rather as a dynamic yogic journey of freedom. This journey is presented as a progression, beginning with liberation from epistemic bondage and culminating in freedom from cosmological bondage, achieved through ongoing spiritual practices. This dynamic perspective is crucial for understanding how different forms of liberation can coexist and be considered "full-blown". Here, I address a potential objection regarding how both embodied and disembodied liberation can be considered complete forms of freedom. I resolve this by explaining them (two types of *kaivalya*) as forms or sequentially developing stages of a dynamic liberation process. This indicates a progressive rather than a mutually exclusive or instantly achieved understanding of liberation.

Furthermore, I tackle the question of whether the YS implies that disembodied liberation is the "highest form" of liberation. I explicitly state that nowhere throughout the YS is it stated, either explicitly or implicitly, that disembodied emancipation is superior to embodied liberation. I believe that this is a significant clarification, as it challenges any potential hierarchical interpretation of these two states. Instead of a hierarchy, I describe their

placement within the YS narrative. Disembodied liberation is presented as the final step of the Yogin's dynamic liberation journey and is found in the final *sūtra* of the text. Embodied liberation is explained as *kaivalya* in the four *sūtras* immediately preceding the final *sūtra*. This textual arrangement suggests a sequential understanding, where embodied liberation, understood as *kaivalya*, precedes the ultimate disembodied state, rather than one being inherently superior to the other. The emphasis is on the journey and the progressive unfolding of freedom from different types of bondage.

Now, I address another potential objection regarding the concept of "*pratiprasava*" within the context of the YS. The objection is that *pratiprasava* cannot be comprehended in a single, coherent sense, despite an initial inclination to interpret it uniformly throughout the YS. I believe that the core reason for this complexity is the dual nature of "*pratiprasava*": it functions simultaneously in the fields of ontology and epistemology. My study shows that *pratiprasava* has dual functionality both as an empirical and a transcendent concept. Due to the distinct functional realms of ontology and epistemology, it would be challenging to grasp the YS's definition of "*pratiprasava*" from a singular perspective. I further explain that even if one attempts to interpret "*pratiprasava*" merely as a "process of reversal" throughout the YS, this understanding remains incomplete. This is because such a simple interpretation leaves ambiguity regarding what is being reversed and from what state.

To achieve a comprehensive understanding of "*pratiprasava*," I suggest reframing it to account for its distinct functionalities in the cosmological and epistemological domains. Specifically, Patañjali seems to propose that the first reversal of *pratiprasava* is epistemological reversal which refers to the reversal of mind impurities to their pure state. This aspect deals with the knowledge and understanding of the mind and its purification. The second reversal of *pratiprasava* is cosmological reversal which refers to the reversal of *guṇa-s* from their manifest existence to their unmanifest existence. This aspect pertains to the nature of reality and the transformation of fundamental constituents of existence (*guṇa-s*). Therefore, it can be said that *pratiprasava* is more accurately understood through two distinct forms of functionality: cosmological *pratiprasava* and epistemological *pratiprasava*. This dual interpretation is presented as necessary to fully grasp its meaning within the YS's metaphysics.

Conclusion

This study set out to resolve a longstanding tension within the interpretive history of Patañjali's *Yogasūtra*: the apparent inconsistency between the empirical and the cosmological meanings of *pratiprasava*, and the corollary problem of how to understand the diverse and sometimes conflicting descriptions of *kaivalya* found throughout the text. By undertaking a close reading of the Sanskrit *sūtras*, the classical commentaries, and modern scholarly interpretations, this dissertation has argued that these apparent contradictions arise not from incoherence within the *Yogasūtra*, but from insufficient attention to the contextual and functional specificity with which Patañjali deploys key technical terms.

At the heart of this inquiry lies the claim that *pratiprasava* possesses a **dual nature**, each aspect activated within a different textual and doctrinal setting. In YS 2.10, *pratiprasava* denotes a yogic, epistemological process by which the subtle *kleśa*-s—attenuated through *kriyāyoga* and further weakened through *dhyāna*—are finally reversed and dismantled through an inward, transformative discipline. This form of *pratiprasava* neither requires nor implies the dissolution of the physical body or the *citta*; instead, it describes the highest stage of mental purification within the realm of practice. As a result, it leads to *jīvanmukti*, embodied liberation, in which the yogin remains alive, free from all afflictive influences and incapable of generating further *karmāśaya*, even while continuing to inhabit a body shaped by *prārabdha-karma*.

By contrast, in YS 4.34, *pratiprasava* refers to the cosmological retraction of the *guṇa*-s into their unmanifest source. This process represents the final cessation of *prakṛti*'s functioning for the sake of *puruṣa*, culminating in the complete dissolution of body, mind, and all manifest structures. This is the domain of *videhamukti*, disembodied liberation. Rather than conflicting with the empirical sense of *pratiprasava* presented earlier in the text, this cosmological meaning constitutes its natural culmination. The dual senses of the term thus mark two successive and mutually dependent movements of liberation: the empirical reversal of the *kleśa*-s and the transcendent reversal of the *guṇa*-s.

This dual structure of *pratiprasava* provides the key to understanding the equally diverse formulations of *kaivalya* within the *Yogasūtra*. As this study has demonstrated, Patañjali does not present *kaivalya* as a monolithic or singular experience but as a **progressive, multistage journey**, marked by distinct thresholds of transformation. The varied definitions of *kaivalya*—as the cessation of mental fluctuations, as the disjunction of *puruṣa* and *buddhi*, as the supreme *siddhi*, as the equality of purity between *sattva* and *puruṣa*, and

finally as the cosmological *pratiprasava* of the *guṇa*-s—are not contradictory. Rather, they describe successive deepening degrees of freedom, each corresponding to a higher stage of yogic accomplishment.

Taken together, these findings advance a unified and coherent interpretation of liberation in the *Yogasūtra*. They show that Patañjali's system is philosophically more subtle than many commentators have assumed: liberation is neither exclusively embodied nor exclusively disembodied, but a **twotiered process** in which *jīvanmukti* and *videhamukti* are sequential, interdependent, and equally salvific stages of a single metaphysical arc. *Pratiprasava*—in its empirical and transcendental forms—constitutes the continuous mechanism by which this arc unfolds: first dismantling the internal architecture of affliction, then dissolving the cosmological architecture of manifestation itself.

This dissertation thus contributes a new perspective to the study of classical Yoga by demonstrating that the coherence of the *Yogasūtra* becomes fully visible only when its technical vocabulary is interpreted contextually, relationally, and developmentally. It clarifies the internal logic by which Patañjali moves from practice to metaphysics, from the psychology of affliction to the ontology of liberation, and from the lived experience of the yogin to the ultimate solitude of *puruṣa*. In doing so, it offers a more complete account of the yogic path—one that honours both the empirical disciplines of transformation and the transcendent horizon toward which they lead.

Appendix 1: Some Remarks on the Significance of this Study

This study has systematically re-interpreted two main concepts in Patañjali's *Yogasūtra*, offering a unified and coherent framework for understanding the yogic path to liberation. Through a philological, philosophical, and hermeneutical analysis, I have addressed long-standing ambiguities, perceived inconsistencies, and significant research gaps in both traditional commentaries and modern scholarship. The central thesis of this study is that *pratiprasava* possesses a dual nature, functioning as both an empirical (epistemological/psychological) process and a transcendent (cosmological/cosmological) process, which are successive stages of the liberation journey rather than contradictory ones. The key findings are as follows:

Dual Nature of *Pratiprasava*

Empirical *Pratiprasava*

As elucidated in YS 2.10, *pratiprasava* is an empirical, epistemological process focused on the reversal of the mind's impurities, specifically the subtle *kleśa*-s. This process does not entail the destruction of the mind itself but rather its thorough purification and the elimination of the functional effect of *kleśa*-s on the *puruṣa*. This leads to embodied liberation (*jīvan-mukti*). The study clarifies that *pratiprasava* here is a yogic practice, akin to *kriyā*-Yoga and *dhyāna*, requiring the yogin's effort to overcome *kleśa*-s without necessitating the dissolution of the *citta*.

Transcendent *Pratiprasava*

As presented in YS 4.34, *pratiprasava* is an cosmological process involving the complete reversal of the *guṇa*-s, leading to their return to the unmanifest *prakṛti*. This ultimately signifies the dissolution of the *citta* and the physical body of the yogin, resulting in disembodied liberation (*videhamukti*). This stage represents the absolute disentanglement of the *puruṣa* from all *prakṛtic* manifestations.

***Kaivalya* as a Dynamic, Multi-stage journey**

This dissertation fundamentally redefines *kaivalya* not as a single, instantaneous state, but as a dynamic yogic journey of freedom encompassing distinct, incremental stages. These stages, which mark the yogin's progressive achievements, include: *Kaivalya* I: *Cittavṛttinirodha*-oriented (YS 1.3), where *puruṣa* rests in its true form upon the cessation of mental fluctuations. *Kaivalya* II: Knowledge-oriented (YS 2.25), involving the cessation of *avidyā* and the realization of the *puruṣa*'s distinction from *Buddhi* through *Vivekakhyāti*. *Kaivalya* III: *Siddhi*-oriented (YS 3.50), where *kaivalya* is understood as the supreme attainment (*siddhi*) achieved through detachment even from *vivekakhyāti*. *Kaivalya* IV: Purity-oriented (YS 3.55), defined by the equality of purity between *Sattva* (purified intellect) and *puruṣa*, indicating a state of profound clarity and freedom. *Kaivalya* V: *Pratiprasava*-oriented (YS 4.34), the ultimate stage of disembodied liberation through the cosmological reversal of the *guṇa*-s.

Reconciliation of *Jīvanmukti* and *Videhamukti*

This study is a contribution to this long-standing debate regarding embodied liberation (*jīvanmukti*) and disembodied liberation (*videhamukti*). These are presented not as mutually exclusive or hierarchically superior states, but as sequential stages of liberation within the dynamic journey of *kaivalya*. Empirical *Pratiprasava* facilitates *jīvanmukti*, while

transcendent *Pratiprasava* culminates in *videhamukti*. The dissertation explicitly argues that nowhere in the *Yogasūtra* is one form of liberation deemed superior to the other.

Addressing Research Gaps and Unifying Interpretations

The study successfully fills critical gaps in existing scholarship:

- (1) It provides a unified interpretation of *Pratiprasava*, harmonizing cosmological and epistemological views into a coherent framework.
- (2) It clarifies the mechanisms of *cittavimukti* (liberation of the mind), which previous commentators often failed to adequately explain, by proposing *Pratiprasava* as the "complete and continuous mechanism" for dismantling the *citta*'s structure through eradicating root afflictions.
- (3) It offers a detailed analysis of novel terminology like "svarūpapraṭiṣṭhā" and "citiśakti" in YS 4.34, demonstrating their specific functions in delineating the ultimate state of *kaivalya*, rather than merely serving as synonyms.

In conclusion, this dissertation significantly enhances the understanding of Patañjali's philosophy of liberation. By presenting *Pratiprasava* as a dual, sequential process and *kaivalya* as a dynamic, multi-stage journey, it provides a comprehensive, integrated, and internally consistent interpretation of the *Yogasūtra*'s core tenets. This framework not only resolves long-standing paradoxes but also offers deeper insights into the profound spiritual insights central to Yoga philosophy.

Appendix 2: Raising Questions for Further Study

This dissertation, while offering a comprehensive re-interpretation of *pratiprasava* and *kaivalya*, also implicitly and explicitly opens several avenues for future study in the field of Yoga philosophy. These areas stem from the dissertation's identification of previously unresolved questions, its critiques of existing interpretations, and the implications of its own novel framework. The scope of future study on this topic includes:

1. Detailed Exploration of the Functional Stages of *Pratiprasava*

This study explicitly asks: "In which stage of yogic *sādhana* (yogic practice or discipline) do empirical *pratiprasava* and transcendental *pratiprasava* begin to function? This question seeks to clarify the timeline or developmental stage within a practitioner's journey where these specific aspects of *pratiprasava* become active or applicable." Further inquiry is needed into "What specific role do these empirical and transcendental *pratiprasava* play in the overarching process of attaining liberation?". While this study argues for a dual nature of

pratiprasava, it also highlights earlier unanswered questions by Kenneth Rose, such as "when and why must the same *pratiprasava* process be psychological and cosmological?" and "Do these two processes work simultaneously or one at a time?". Future studies could delve deeper into the philosophical and practical nuances of these two processes' interaction and sequence.

2. In-depth Analysis of *Citiśakti* and *Svarūpapraṭiṣṭhā*

This study notes that most Sanskrit commentators do not explain the meaning and nature of these concepts of *svārūpapraṭiṣṭhā* and *citiśakti* in YS 4.34, often treating them as mere synonyms for *kaivalya* or *puruṣa*. While this study offers its own interpretation, a dedicated, comprehensive investigation into the potential meaning or intentions Patañjali might have had in mind when he used these completely novel ideas or terminology in the last *sūtra* of this text could be fruitful. Further research could explore the implications of *Citiśakti* as an "innate capacity of *puruṣa* to engage with himself, not with *prakṛti*" and its inaccessibility in an unliberated state versus its manifestation in two ways (active/manifesting vs. dormant/potential) in liberation.

3. Detailed Examination of *Cittavimukti* and its Mechanisms

This study points out a significant gap where commentators "fail to adequately explain the means of *cittavimukti*", despite it being the "main reason for *kaivalya*" [637, Research Gaps]. While the dissertation proposes *pratiprasava* as a "complete and continuous mechanism", the intricate details of how this "internal practice" functions qualitatively differently from external efforts to achieve *cittavimukti* could be a rich area for further philosophical and phenomenological exploration.

4. Nature and Function of the Liberated Yogi's Body and Mind

This study raises specific questions about the state and function of the *jīvan-mukta*'s body and mind post-liberation: "Does the yogi's body become inert, 'like a cadaver (*mṛtavat/mṛtakavat*)'? Is this state akin to a 'yogic trance (*yoga-nidrā*)'?" This opens up research into the practical and philosophical implications of the liberated state in an embodied form, particularly how activities continue "due to 'pure *sattva*' and manifesting *citiśakti*".

5. Re-evaluation of *Nirmāṇa-Citta*

This study critiques the traditional interpretation of *nirmāṇa-citta* and suggests it be understood as "transformed-*citta*" rather than the creation of new minds, and as referring to "different layers or levels or stages" of *citta*. This alternative interpretation, alongside the idea that *nirmāṇa-citta* is a "technical term in *Yogasūtra* which can have many shades of

meanings", warrants dedicated investigation into its precise metaphysical and practical implications.

6. Further Nuances in the Purity-Oriented *Kaivalya*

Despite the current study's analysis of "Purity-Oriented *kaivalya*" (YS 3.55), it highlights numerous "doubts and questions still need to be addressed". These include: clarifying why *sattva* is interpreted as *buddhi-sattva* by commentators, how *buddhi-sattva* can be a stable condition, how *sattva* (inherently impure) can be as pure as *puruṣa*, and the apparent inconsistency of *śuddhi* being both an auxiliary practice and equal to *kaivalya*. These questions offer specific points for future research. By tackling these specific areas, future studies can build upon the foundational work of this dissertation, further refining and expanding the understanding of liberation in Yoga philosophy.

Glossary of Key Sanskrit Terms (in English alphabetical order)

.....
.....

abhiniveśa - clinging to existence or tenacity of worldly life

abhyāsa - repeated practice or spiritual exercise

adr̥ṣṭajanmavedanīya - karmic results to be experienced in a future, unseen birth

āgama - sacred tradition or authoritative scripture

ahiṃsā - harmlessness or non-injury

ahaṃkāra - the sense of self-identity or ego-maker

akartā - non-agent or the principle that does not act

akliṣṭa - not afflicted or untroubled mental states

aliṅgā - without distinctive marks or the undifferentiated state

anumāna - logical inference or deduction

anuśāsana - precept or instruction

antakaraṇa - the internal instrument comprising mind, intellect, and ego

anitya - impermanent or transient

apariṇāminī - immutable or not subject to transformation

apavarga - liberation from the cycle of rebirth

apratisaṃkramā - not moving or without transition

asamprajñāta-samādhi - the highest meditative absorption where distinction between subject and object ceases

asmitā - the sense of "I-am-ness" or pure egoity

atha - "now" or "then"

avasthāna - abiding or remaining in one's true nature

avidyā - spiritual ignorance or lack of true knowledge

aviśeṣa - without particularity or non-specific

aviplava - unwavering or undisturbed awareness

aviveka - lack of discrimination between the self and the non-self

avyakta - the unmanifested state of primordial nature

ānanda - spiritual bliss or joy

āśaya - the mental substratum where karmic latencies reside

āyurveda - the traditional Indian science of health and longevity

ātman - the true self or soul āyu - life-span or duration of life

āyu - life-span or duration of life

bhoga - karmic experience or enjoyment

bhūmi - a stage, level, or ground of spiritual progress

bhūta - an element or a living being

buddhi-sattva - the purity of the intellect or the essence of awareness

catuḥślokī - a work consisting of four verses

caturvyūha - a fourfold structure or manifestation

citiśakti - the inherent power of pure consciousness

citta - the individual mind or field of consciousness

cittavimukti - the liberation of the mind from obstructions

dagdhabīja - a seed that has been burnt, representing karmic latencies made sterile

darśanaśakti - the capacity for perception or the power of vision

dharma-megha-samādhi - the "Cloud of Dharma" concentration, the final stage of meditative absorption

dhyāna - profound meditation or sustained contemplation

drkśakti - the power of consciousness that sees

draṣṭā - the seer or the pure subject

dr̥ṣi - the faculty of seeing or pure vision

dr̥śya - the seen or the objective world

duḥkha - suffering, pain, or unsatisfactoriness

dveṣa - aversion or hatred

ekāgra - focused or concentrated on a single point

ghata - a vessel or jar, often used as an analogy for the body

ghora - terrible or vehement mental states
guṇa - the three qualities of nature: *sattva*, *raja*, and *tama*
hāna - the removal or cessation of suffering
hānopāya - the method or means to achieve cessation
heya - that which is to be avoided or relinquished
īśvara-praṇidhāna - surrender or dedication to the Supreme Being
jāti - birth or state of existence
jīvanmukti - liberation achieved while still in the physical body
kaivalya - final emancipation or the state of absolute independence
kāma - desire or worldly longing
karma - action or the law of causality
karmaphala - the result or fruit of one's actions
karmāśaya - the accumulation of karmic traces in the mind
kāraṇa - the cause or instrumental reason
kārya - the effect or that which is to be done
kāryavimukti - liberation resulting from the completion of effects
kevalin - one who has attained absolute isolation (liberation)
khyāti - discernment or spiritual knowledge
kleśa-s - the mental afflictions or poisons
kliṣṭa - afflicted or painful mental states
krodha - anger or wrath
kriyā-yoga - the yoga of action, consisting of austerity, study, and devotion
kuśala - wholesome, virtuous, or skilful
kṣipta - the distracted or scattered state of mind
liṅgamātra - the level of nature that is "only a mark" (intellect)
lobha - greed or covetousness
laya - dissolution or mental absorption/inactivity
manaś - the discursive mind or organ of thought
mithyājñāna - erroneous perception or false knowledge
moha - delusion or mental infatuation
mṛtakavat - behaving like a dead body
mṛtavat - as if dead
mukta - liberated or set free
mukti - release or spiritual liberation

mūḍha - the dull or stupefied state of mind

mūlaprakṛti - the root-nature or the primordial unmanifest cause

nirmāṇa-citta - a mind created by a yogi through transformation

nirmāṇakāya - the physical manifestation or emanation body

nirodha - the cessation of mental fluctuations or restraint

nivṛtti - the cessation of worldly activity or the path of return

nitya - eternal, perpetual, or constant

niruddha - the state of mind where all fluctuations are suppressed

pañcaśikhā - name of a great *Sāṃkhya* teacher

pāpa - sin or demerit

parva - a chapter, joint, or division of time

pata - fall or descend

pradhāna - the primary matter or chief principle

prajñā - insight or transcendent wisdom

prakṛtilaya - dissolution of the self into primordial nature

prakṛti - primordial nature or the creative matrix

pramāṇa - the means of valid knowledge or proof

prānta - the border, edge, or extremity

prārabdha - karma that has already begun to bear fruit

prasava - the act of begetting or manifestation

prasamkhyāna - the highest discriminatory meditation

prasupta - dormant or latent states of mental afflictions

pratibandhi - an obstacle or that which impedes

pratipakṣa - the opposing side or a remedial thought

pratiprasava - it is a technical term which means a process of reversal. Literally it means reabsorption into the cause or involution

pratisamkrama - the transition or impression of one thing on another

pratisamvedī - one who experiences or is conscious of

pratiśedha - negation or prohibition

pratiṣṭhā - foundation, establishment, or stability

pratisarga - secondary creation or dissolution

pratilomapariṇāma - transformation in reverse order (involution)

pravṛtti - outward activity or the path of manifestation

pratyakṣa - direct perception

pratyāhāra - sensory withdrawal, the fifth limb of yoga

puruṣārtha - the goal of human existence

puruṣa - the pure consciousness, the pure Self/Spirit

puṇya - virtue or religious merit

rāga - passion, or desire for pleasure

sādhana - spiritual practice or means to success

saṃskāra - subconscious mental impressions

saṃparka - contact or union

samprajñāta-samādhi - meditative absorption with awareness of objects

samāpatti - meditative attainment or balanced state

samādhi - concentration or total absorption

samādhībhāvanā - for the purpose of developing meditative concentration

saṃyama - the combined practice of dhāraṇā, dhyāna, and samādhi

saṃyoga - the conjunction between the seer and the seen

sañcara - evolution or the movement of nature

saṃsāra - the wheel of worldly existence and transmigration

samyagdarśana - perfect vision or right perception

sarga - creation or manifestation

sattva - the quality of light, purity, and harmony

sattvapuruṣānyatākhyāti - the knowledge of the difference between the mind-purity and the consciousness/Self

siddhi - spiritual extra-ordinary power or supernatural power

sthūla - gross or physical

styāna - mental rigidity or dullness

sukha - happiness or ease

sūkṣma - subtle or atomic

sūtra - an aphorism or thread of discourse

svarūpa - one's own true nature or form

svarūpapratiṣṭhā - abidance in one's own essential nature

svarūpe'vasthānam - resting in the true self

svādhyāya - self-study or recitation of sacred texts

śakti - ability, capacity power or energy

śānta - peaceful or pacified

śuci - pure or clean

śuddhi -purity or purification
tanūkarāṇa - thinning out the afflictions
tapā - austerity or disciplined effort
tattva - a principle or ultimate reality
triguṇa - composed of the three *guṇa*-s: *sattva*, *raja* and *tama*
udāra - actively manifesting state
vāsanā - the residual latencies or impressions in the mind
vicāra - subtle investigation or reflection
videhamukti - liberation without the physical body
vidyā - true knowledge or science
vikṣipta - the scattered or oscillating state of mind
vimukti - spiritual emancipation
viparyaya - error or false perception
viśeṣa - particularity or specific difference
vitarka - gross deliberation or thought
vivekajñāna - discriminative knowledge between self and nature
vṛtti - the modifications or fluctuations of the mind
vyādhī - physical disease or imbalance
vyakta - the manifest world
vyutthāna - the state of worldly consciousness following meditation
yoga-nidrā - yogic sleep or deep meditative rest

Bibliography

.....

Primary Text

Yogasūtra by Patañjali (3rd or 4th century)

Sanskrit Commentaries on *Yogasūtra*

Vyāsaśāstra (3rd to 4th century CE)

Tatvavaiśārādī of Vācaspati Miśra (9th or 10th century)

Vivaraṇa of Śaṅkara (13th Century -not settled with finality)

Yogavārtikam of Vijñānabhikṣu (15th century)

Bhāsvatī of Svāmī Hariharānanda Āraṇya (19th century)

Pātañjala-rahasya of Rāghavānanda-Sarasvatī (1550–1600 CE)

Rājamārtāṇḍa of Bhojadeva (1000 CE)

Yogamañiprabhā of Rāmānanda Sarasvatī (1550–1600 CE)

Pradīpikā of Bhāvagaṇeśa (1600–1700 CE)

Yogasiddhāntacandrikā of Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha (1700–1750 CE)

Sūtrārthabodhīnī of Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha (1700–1750 CE)

Yogasudhākara of Sadāśivendra Sarasvatī (1700–1800 CE)

Yogacandrikā of Anantadevapaṇḍita (1800–1900 CE)

Āgāṣe, K. (Ed.). (1904). *Vācaspatimiśra Viracita Tīkā Saṃvalita Vyāsabhāṣya Sametāni Pātañjalayogasūtrāṇi, Tathā Bhojadevaviracita Rājamārtaṇḍābhīdhavṛtti Sametāni Pātañjalayogasūtrāṇi, Sūtrapāṭhasūtravarṇānukramasūcībhyāṃ Ca Sanāthikṛtāni. Ānandāśrama.*

Tattvasamāsa (or *Tattvasamāsasūtra*, or *Sāṃkhyatattvasamāsa*). *Sāṃkhya-sangraha*. A collection of the works of *Sāṃkhya* philosophy (1920). Edited by V. P. Dvivedin (pp. 117–118). Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office.

Hindī Commentaries on *Yogasūtra*

Jñānānanda, S. (2018). *Yogadarśana*. Bhāratadharmamahāmaṇḍala.

Satyapati Parivrajaka, S. (2003). *Yogadarśanam* (Second). Darśan Yoga Mahāvidyālaya.

Tripāṭhī, Ś. (1997). *Yogdarśanasamīkṣā*. Kṛṣṇadāsa Academy.

Viṣṇutīrtha, S. (2018). *Pātañjala Yogadarśana*. Vijñāna Press.

Bengali Commentaries on *Yogasūtra*

Pāl, C. (1930). *Meyeder Pātañjal*. Jñānānanda Brahmacharyāśrama.

Vedāntacūcu, P. (1898). *Pātañjala Darśan*. Upendranāth Cakravartī.

Vedāntavāgīś, K. (1884). *Pātañjala Darśan o Yoga-Pariśiṣṭa*. Śrībhuvanamohan Ghoṣa.

Secondary Literature in English on *Pratiprasava* and *Kaivalaya on Yogasūtra*

Apte, V. (1965). *The Student's Sanskrit-English Dictionary: Containing Appendices on Sanskrit Prosody and Important Literary and Geographical Names in the Ancient History of India: For the use of schools and colleges*. Motilal Banarsidass.

Bachman, N. (2011). *The Path of the Yogasūtras: A Practical Guide to the Core of Yoga*. Sounds True.

Ballantyne, J. R. (1852). *The Aphorisms of the Sāṃkhya and Yoga Philosophy of the Hindus*. Trübner.

Beloved, M. (2010). *Yogasūtras of Patañjali*. Amazon Digital Services LLC - Kdp, 2010.

Bryant, E. F. (2009). *The Yogasūtras of Patañjali: A New Edition, Translation and Commentary with Insights from the Traditional Commentators*. North Point Press.

Burley, M. (2007). *Classical Sāṃkhya and Yoga: An Indian Metaphysics of Experience*. Routledge.

Cardona, G. (1997). *Pāṇini: A Survey of Research*. Motilal Banarsidass.

Carrera, J. (2012). *Inside the Yogasūtras*. Integral Yoga Publications.

Cestola, R. (2024). Fading into Death Through Pātañjalayoga: On the Apparent Dead-Like State of the Yoga Practitioner Absorbed into Contentless Samādhi. *Journal of Yoga Studies*, 5, 69–123. <https://doi.org/10.34000/JoYS.2024.V5.003>

Chapple, C. K. (2019). Activity, Cessation, and a Return to Origins in the Yoga Sūtra. In C. K. Chapple & A. Laura Funes Maderey (Eds.), *Thinking with the Yogasūtra of Patañjali: Translation and Interpretation*. Lexington Books.

Chapple, C. (2008). *Yoga and the Luminous: Patanjali's Spiritual Path to Freedom*. State university of New York press.

Chapple, C. K. (Ed.). (2009). *Yoga and Ecology: Dharma for the Earth: Proceedings of Two of the Sessions at the Fourth DANAM Conference, held on site at the American Academy of Religion, Washington, DC, 17-19 November 2006*. Deepak Heritage Books.

Chapple, C. K., & Viraj, Y. A (Kelly). (1990). *The Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali: An Analysis of the Sanskrit with Accompanying English Translation*. Sri Satguru Publications.

Collins, A. (2009). *Dharmamegha Samādhi* and the Two Sides of *Kaivalya*: Toward a Yogic Theory of Culture. In C. K. Chapple (Ed.), *Yoga and Ecology: Dharma for the Earth*. Deepak Heritage Books.

Das, B. (2009). *A Concordance-Dictionary to the Yoga-Sūtras of Patañjali and the Bhāṣya of Vyāsa*. Bhāratiya Vidyā Saṁsthān.

Dasgupta, S. (1930). *Yoga Philosophy in Relation to Other Systems of Indian Thought*. Calcutta: University of Calcutta.

Dasgupta, S. (1995). *Yoga as Philosophy and Religion* (1. ed., repr). Motilal Banarsidass.

De Michelis, E. (2004). *A History of Modern Yoga: Patañjali and Western Esotericism*. London & New York: Continuum.

De La Vallée Poussin, L. (1937). Le Bouddhisme et le Yoga de Patañjali. *Mélanges Chinois et Bouddhiques*, 5, 223–242.

Deśapāṇḍe, P. Y. (1978). *The Authentic Yoga: A Fresh Look at Patanjali's Yogasūtras with a New Translation, Notes and Comments*. Rider.

Desikachar, T. K. V. (1998). *The Heart of Yoga: Developing a Personal Practice*. Inner Traditions.

Deussen, P. (1914). *Allgemeine geschichte der philosophie i, 3: Die nachvedische philosophie der inder*. F.A. Brockhaus.

Dvivedi, M. N. (Ed. & Trans.). (1930). *The Yoga-Sūtras of Patañjali*. Theosophical Publishing House.

Eliade, M. (1969). *Yoga: Immortality and Freedom* (2nd ed., W. R. Trask, Trans.). Princeton University Press.

Feuerstein, G. (1979). *The Yoga-Sūtra of Patañjali: A New Translation and Commentary*. Dawson.

Foulks, B. (2009). Super *Samskāras*: Soteriological Subliminal Impressions in Patañjali's Yoga Sūtra. In C. K. Chapple (Ed.), *Yoga and Ecology: Dharma for the Earth*. Deepak Heritage Books.

Frauwallner, E. (1973). *History of Indian Philosophy*. Delhi: Motilal banarsidass. motilal Banarsidass.

Gokhale, P. (2020). *The Yogasūtra of Patañjali: A New Introduction to the Buddhist Roots of the Yoga System*. Routledge.

Grinshpon, Y. (2002). *Silence Unheard: Deathly Otherness in Pātañjala-Yoga*. State University of New York Press.

Halbfass, W. (1991). *Tradition and Reflection: Explorations in Indian Thought*. State University of New York Press.

Hariharānandārāyaṇa, S. (1983). *Yoga Philosophy of Patañjali: Containing His Yoga Aphorisms with Vyāsa's Commentary in Sanskrit and a Translation with Annotations Including Many Suggestions for the Practice of Yoga*. State University of New York Press.

Hartranft, C. (2003). *The Yoga-Sūtra of Patañjali: A New Translation with Commentary*. Shambhala.

Heiler, F. (1922). *Die Buddhistische Versenkung: Eine Religionsgeschichtliche Versuchung*. Gyan Books.

Hiriyanna, M. (1932). *Outlines of Indian Philosophy*. London: Allen & Unwin.

Hiriyanna, M. (1949). *The Essentials of Indian Philosophy*. George Allen & Unwin.

Īśvarakṛṣṇa. (2014). *Sāṃkhyakārikā and the Bhāṣya or the Commentary of Gauḍapāda* (H. T. Colebrooke & H. H. Wilson, Trans.; Illustrated). Literary Licensing, LLC. (Original work published 1887).

Iyengar, B. K. S. (1993). *Light on the Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali*. HarperCollins.

Jacobi, H. (1930). *Über Das Ursprüngliche Yoga System: Nachträge Und Indices*. De Gruyter.

Jha, G. (1907). *The Yoga-Darśana: The Sūtras of Patañjali with the Bhāṣya of Vyāsa*. Tattva-Vivecaka Press.

- Keith, A. B. (1932). *Some Problems of Indian Philosophy*. 8, 154–180.
- Klostermaier, K. (1986). Dharmamegha Samādhi: Comments on Yogasūtra IV.29. *Philosophy East and West*, 36(3), 253–262.
- Koelman, G. M. (1970). *Pātañjala Yoga: From Related Ego to Absolute Self*. Papal Athenaeum.
- Leggett, T. (1990). *The Complete Commentary by Śaṅkara on the Yoga Sūtras: A Full Translation of the Newly Discovered Text*. Kegan Paul International.
- Larson, G. J. (1969). *Classical Sāṃkhya : An interpretation of its history and meaning*. Motilal Banarsidass.
- Larson, G. J., & Bhattacharya, R. S. (Eds.). (1970). *Yoga: India's Philosophy of Meditation* (Vol. 12). Motilal Banarsidass .
- Larson, G. J. (1993). The Trimurti of Smṛti in Classical Indian Thought. *Philosophy East and West*, 43(3), 373–388.
- Le yoga-sutra de patanjali: Le yoga-bhasya de vyasa avec des extraits du yoga-varttika de vijnana-bhikṣu* (M. Angot, Trans.). (2012). Les Belles Lettres.
- Maas, P. A. (2006). *Samādhipāda: Das Erste Kapitel des Pātañjalayogaśāstra zum Ersten Mal Kritisches Editiert*. Aachen: Shaker Verlag.
- Maas, P. A. (2007). A Concise Historiography of Classical Yoga Philosophy. In E. Franco (Ed.), *Periodization and Historiography of Indian Philosophy* (pp. 53–90). Vienna: Sammlung de Nobili.
- Maas, P. A. (2008). “Descent with Modification”: The Opening of the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra*. In W. Slaje (Ed.), *Śāstrārambha: Inquiries into the Preamble in Sanskrit* (pp. 97–119). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Maas, P. A. (2009). The So-Called Yoga of Suppression in the *Pātañjala Yogaśāstra*. In E. Franco & D. Eigner (Eds.), *Yogic Perception, Meditation, and Altered States of Consciousness* (pp. 263–282). Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Maas, P. A. (2010). On the Written Transmission of the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra*. In J. Bronkhorst & K. Preisendanz (Eds.), *From Vasubandhu to Caitanya: Studies in Indian Philosophy and Its Textual History* (pp. 157–172). New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Maas, P. A. (2017). From Theory to Poetry: The Reuse of Patañjali's *Yogaśāstra* in Māgha's *Śiśupālavadha*. In E. Freschi & P. A. Maas (Eds.), *Adaptive Reuse: Aspects of Creativity in South Asian Cultural History* (pp. 29–62). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

Maas, P. A. (2018). *Sthirasukham Āsanam*: Posture and Performance in Classical Yoga and Beyond. In K. Baier, P. A. Maas, & K. Preisendanz (Eds.), *Yoga in Transformation: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives* (pp. 49–100). Vienna: Vienna University Press.

Maas, P. A., & Verdon, N. (2018). On al-Bīrūnī's *Kitāb Pātangal* and the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra*. In K. Baier, P. A. Maas, & K. Preisendanz (Eds.), *Yoga in Transformation: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives* (pp. 283–334). Vienna: Vienna University Press.

Maas, P. A. (2020). *Sarvāstivāda* Buddhist Theories of Temporality and the Pātañjala Yoga Theory of Transformation (*Pariṇāma*). *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 48(5), 963–1003. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10781-020-09450-1>

Maas, P. A. (2023). *Pātañjalayogaśāstra*. In H. Basu, A. Malinar, & V. Narayanan (Eds.), *Brill's Encyclopedia of Hinduism* (Vol. 7: Supplement; K. A. Jacobsen, Chief Ed., pp. 143–150). Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Maehle, G. (2011). *Yoga Meditation: Through the Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali*. New World Library.

Miller, B. S. (1990). *Yoga: Discipline of Freedom*. University of California Press.

Mitra, R. (1883). *The Yoga Aphorisms of Patañjali with the Commentary of Bhoja Rāja*. Asiatic Society.

Monier-Williams, M. (1899). *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary, Etymologically and Philologically Arranged*. Clarendon Press.

Müller, M. (1899). *The Six Systems of Indian Philosophy*. Longmans, Green and Co.

O'Brien-Kop, K. (2022). *Rethinking "classical yoga" and Buddhism: Meditation, Metaphors and Materiality*. Bloomsbury Academic.

Oldenberg, H. (1923). *Die lehre der upanishaden und die anfänge des buddhismus*. vandenhoeck & ruprecht.

Patañjali. (2012). *Le yoga-sutra de Patanjali: Le Yoga-Bhasya de Vyasa avec des Extraits du Yoga-Varttika de Vijnana-Bhiksu* (M. Angot, Trans.). les Belles lettres.

Pflueger, Lloyd. W. (2003). Dueling with Dualism: Revisioning the Paradox of *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti*. In D. Carpenter & I. Whicher (Eds.), *Yoga: The Indian Tradition*. Routledge.

Prabhavananda, S., & Isherwood, C. (1953). *How to Know God: The Yoga Aphorisms of Patañjali*. Vedanta Press.

Prasada, R. (1912). *Patañjali's Yoga Sūtras with the Commentary of Vyāsa and the Gloss of Vācaspatiśra*. Panini Office.

Purohit, S. (1973). *Aphorisms of Yoga*. Faber and Faber.

Ranganathan, S. (2018). *Patañjali's Yoga Sūtra*. Penguin.

Rao, K. B. R. (1963). The *Guṇas* of *Prakṛti* According to the *Sāṃkhya* Philosophy. *Philosophy East and West*, 13(1), 61. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1396786>

Rao, K. B. R. (1966). *Theism of Pre-Classical Sāṃkhya*. Prasaraṅga, University of Mysore.

Raveh, D. (2011). *Exploring the Yogasūtra: Philosophy and Translation*. Continuum.

Ravindra, R. (1996). *The Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali*. Morning Light Press.

Renou, L. (1940). On the Identity of the Two Patañjalis. In N. N. Law (Ed.), *Louis de La Vallée Poussin memorial volume* (pp. 368–373).

Renou, L., & Filliozat, J. (1953). *L'Inde Classique: Manuel des Études Indiennes* (Tome 2). Paris: Payot. (Bibliothèque de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient, 3).

- Rose, K. (2016). *Yoga, Meditation, and Mysticism: Contemplative Universals and Meditative Landmarks*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Rukmani, T. S. (1997). *Tension Between Vyutthāna and Nirodha in the Yogasūtras*. 25(6), 613–628.
- Samuel, G. (2008). *The Origins of Yoga and Tantra: Indic Religions to the Thirteenth Century*. Cambridge University press.
- Śāṅkara, Rukmani, T. S., Patañjali, Vyāsa, & Patañjali. (2001). *Yogasūtrabhāṣyavivarāṇa of Śāṅkara: Vivaraṇa text with English translation, and critical notes along with text and English translation of Patañjali's Yogasūtras and Vyāsabhāṣya*. Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd.
- Sarbacker, S. R. (2005). *Samādhi: The Numinous and Cessative in Indo-Tibetan Yoga*. State University of New York Press.
- Sarbacker, S. R. (2021). *Tracing the Path of Yoga: The History and Philosophy of Indian Mind-Body Discipline*. State University of New York Press.
- Satchidananda, S. (1978). *The Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali*. Integral Yoga Publications.
- Satyananda Saraswati, S. (1966). *Four Chapters on Freedom: Commentary on the Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali*. Bihar School of Yoga.
- Senart, É. (1900). *Bouddhisme et yoga*. 42.
- Shearer, A. (2005). *The Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali*. Bell Tower.
- Singleton, M., & Mallinson, J. (2017). *Roots of Yoga*. London: Penguin.
- Squarcini, F. (2016). *Patañjali Yogasūtra: A cura di federico squarcini*. Giulio Einaudi.

- Strauss, O. (1925). *Indische Philosophie*. München & Basel: Ernst Reinhardt Verlag. (Geschichte der Philosophie in Einzeldarstellungen, 2.1: *Das Weltbild der Primitiven und die Philosophie des Morgenlandes*).
- Taimni, I. K. (1961). *The Science of Yoga*. Quest Books.
- Tola, F., & Dragonetti, C. (1987). *The Yogasūtras of Patañjali: On Concentration of Mind* (K. D. Prithipaul, Trans.). Motilal Banarsidass.
- Tucci, G. (1957). *Storia della Filosofia Indiana*. Bari: Laterza. (Biblioteca di Cultura Moderna, 523).
- Varenne, J. (1976). *Yoga and the Hindu Tradition*. University of Chicago Press.
- Vedabhāratī, S. (1986). *Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali: With the Exposition of Vyāsa; A Translation and Commentary: I Samādhīpāda*. Himalayan International Institute of Yoga Science and Philosophy of the U.S.A.
- Vedabhāratī, S. (2001). *Yogasūtras of Patañjali: With the Exposition of Vyāsa; a Translation and Commentary: II Sādhānapāda*. Motilal Banarsidass.
- Vivekānanda, S. (1998). *Rāja Yoga or Conquering the Internal Nature*. Vedanta Press.
- Woods, J. H. (1914). *The Yoga-System of Patañjali; Or, The Ancient Hindu Doctrine of Concentration of Mind: Embracing the Mnemonic Rules Called Yoga-Sūtras of Patañjali and the Comment Called Yoga-Bhāṣya Attributed to Veda-Vyāsa, and the Explanation Called Tattva-Vaiśārādī of Vācaspatiśrī*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (Harvard Oriental Series, 17). Repr. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1992.
- Whicher, I. (1998). *The Integrity of the Yoga Darśana: A Reconsideration of Classical Yoga*. State University of New York Press.
- White, D. G. (2014). *The Yoga Sūtra of Patañjali: A Biography*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. (Lives of Great Religious Books).
- Winternitz, M. (1922). *Geschichte der Indischen Litteratur* (Bd. 3: *Die Kunstdichtung, Die Wissenschaftliche Litteratur, Neuindische Litteratur, Nachträge zu Allen Drei Bänden*). Leipzig: Amelang. (Die Litteraturen des Ostens in Einzeldarstellungen, 9).

Wujastyk, D. (2018). Some Problematic Yoga *Sūtras* and their Buddhist Background. In K. Baier, P. A. Maas, & K. Preisendanz (Eds.), *Yoga in Transformation: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*. V&R Unipress.

.....