

Routledge South Asian Religion

YOGA IN MODERN HINDUISM

HARIHARĀNANDA ĀRAṆYA AND SĀṂKHYAYOGA

Knut A. Jacobsen



Yoga in Modern Hinduism

The Sāṃkhyayoga institution of Kāpil Maṭh is a religious organization with a small tradition of followers that emerged in the last decade of the nineteenth century and the first decades of the twentieth century in Bengal in India around the renunciant and yogin Hariharānanda Āraṇya. This tradition developed during the same period in which modern yoga was born and forms a chapter in the expansion of yoga traditions in modern Hinduism.

The book analyzes the yoga teaching of Hariharānanda Āraṇya (1869–1947) and the Kāpil Maṭh tradition, its origin, history and contemporary manifestations, and the tradition's connection to the expansion of yoga and the Yogasūtra in modern Hinduism. The Sāṃkhyayoga of the Kāpil Maṭh tradition is based on the Pātañjalayogaśāstra, on a number of texts in Sanskrit and Bengali written by their gurus, and on the lifestyle of the renunciant yogin living isolated in a cave. The book investigates Hariharānanda Āraṇya's connection to premodern yoga traditions and the impact of modern production and transmission of knowledge on his interpretations of yoga. The book connects the Kāpil Maṭh tradition to the nineteenth-century transformations of Bengali religious culture of the educated upper class that led to the production of a new type of yogin. The book analyses Sāṃkhyayoga as a living tradition, its current teachings and practices, and looks at what Sāṃkhyayogins do and what Sāṃkhyayoga is as a yoga practice.

A valuable contribution to recent and ongoing debates, this book will be of interest to academics in the fields of religious studies, anthropology, Asian studies, Indology, Indian philosophy, Hindu studies, and Yoga studies.

Knut A. Jacobsen is professor in the study of religions at the University of Bergen, Norway. His research focuses on Yoga, Sāṃkhya, and Hindu conceptions and rituals of space and time. He is the editor in chief of the six volumes *Brill's Encyclopedia of Hinduism* (2009–2015), and he is the editor of the *Routledge Handbook of Contemporary India* (2016).

Routledge South Asian Religion

1 Hindu Selves in a Modern World

Guru Faith in the Mata Amritanandamayi Mission
Maya Warriar

2 Parsis in India and the Diaspora

Edited by John R. Hinnells and Alan Williams

3 South Asian Religions on Display

Religious Processions in South Asia and in the Diaspora
Edited by Knut A. Jacobsen

4 Rethinking Religion in India

The Colonial Construction of Hinduism
Edited by Esther Bloch, Marianne Keppens and Rajaram Hegde

5 Health and Religious Rituals in South Asia

Disease, Possession and Healing
Edited by Fabrizio M. Ferrari

6 Time, History and the Religious Imaginary in South Asia

Edited by Anne Murphy

7 Cross-disciplinary Perspectives on a Contested Buddhist Site

Bodhgaya Jataka
Edited by David Geary, Matthew R. Sayers and Abhishek Singh Amar

8 Yoga in Modern Hinduism

Hariharānanda Āraṇya and Sāṃkhyayoga
Knut A. Jacobsen

Yoga in Modern Hinduism

Hariharānanda Āraṇya and Sāṃkhyayoga

Knut A. Jacobsen

First published 2018
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

*Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa
business*

© 2018 Knut A. Jacobsen

The right of Knut A. Jacobsen to be identified as author of this work
has been asserted by him in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the
Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or
utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now
known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in
any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing
from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or
registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation
without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A catalog record for this book has been requested

ISBN: 978-1-138-08059-1 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-315-11334-0 (ebk)

Typeset in Times
by Apex CoVantage, LLC

Contents

<i>List of figures</i>	vi
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	vii
Introduction	1
1 Sāṃkhya, Yoga, and Sāṃkhyayoga	11
2 Encounters with a living Sāṃkhyayoga tradition	23
3 Kapila as the originator of Yoga	36
4 The rebirth of Yoga and the emergence of the <i>bhadralok</i> yogin	52
5 Gurus, book printing, and the Sāṃkhyayoga lineage	69
6 The textual tradition of the Kāpil Maṭh institution	88
7 Sāṃkhyayoga meditation instructions of the Kāpil Maṭh tradition	124
8 Monastic life and recitation of Sanskrit <i>stotras</i>	155
9 The material religion of Sāṃkhyayoga	177
10 The Kāpil Maṭh tradition and modern scholarship on Yoga	189
Conclusion	202
<i>Appendix: Some publications of the Kāpil Maṭh tradition</i>	209
<i>Glossary</i>	214
<i>Bibliography</i>	217
<i>Index</i>	228

Figures

2.1	The main building at Kāpil Maṭh with the Kāpil Cave to the left and the Kāpil Mandir to the right	30
2.2	The opening in the cave during the period in which the guru is in solitude. Above the opening on top is a painting of Kapila and underneath a painting of Hariharānanda Āraṇya and Dharmamegha Āraṇya. The photo on the wall to the left of the opening is of Hariharānanda Āraṇya and to the right of Dharmamegha Āraṇya	31
3.1	Statue of Kapila in the garden of Kāpil Maṭh in Madhupur	38
7.1	A model of the Ṛddhi Mandir, in the garden of Kāpil Maṭh	140
7.2	Participants in Omprakāś Āraṇya's instructed Sāṃkhyayoga meditations in Varanasi	147
8.1	Bhāskara Āraṇya meeting devotees in the opening of the cave	158
9.1	Shrine at Kāpil Āśram in Kurseong. On the top is the symbol Om, next is a drawing of Īśvara and below a drawing of Kapila. Underneath are photos of Hariharānanda Āraṇya and Dharmamegha Āraṇya and their <i>samādhisthānas</i> . Below on the right side is Bhāskara Āraṇya and on the left Śaṅkarācārya	179
9.2	<i>Samādhisthāna</i> of Hariharānanda Āraṇya	181
9.3	Orange figure with a text written in Bengali on the front about the inevitability of death and the immortality of the self	182
9.4	The skull with a message about suffering and death and the unchangeable self that does not die	183

Acknowledgments

This book has been a long-term project. I want to recognize the support I have received from a number of persons of the Kāpil Maṭh institutions for the project over the years. The head of Kāpil Maṭh, Bhāskara Āraṇya, early on gave his support to the project, and I am thankful for his cooperation. I have always felt welcomed at the Maṭh. I want to express my thanks to the late Ram Shankar Bhattacharya, who was a disciple of the Kāpil Maṭh. I am also thankful for the assistance I have received from Adinath Chatterjee, Santanu Mukhopadhyay, Abhijit Mukhopadhyay, Asoke Chattopadhyay, Tarapada Roy Chowdhury, Deepti Dutta, Swati Ray, D. N. Banerjee, and all the other devotees of the Kāpil Maṭh in Madhupur. I would also like to thank the late Omprakāś Āraṇya, Abhai Singh, Sohmer Gautam, and the other devotees of Kāpil Sāmkhyayogāśram in Sarnath, as well as Banabir Bhattacharya and devotees of the Kāpil Āśram in Kurseong, for their cooperation and assistance. I want to acknowledge the assistance of Sagar Chowdhury in Puducherry, Ajay Pandey, and Krishna Mohan Mishra in Varanasi, and thank Gerald James Larson, professor emeritus at the University of California for his continuous support and encouragement, and, finally, I want to state my gratefulness to my partner Hanne Svendsen for her assistance during many of the visits over the years to Madhupur, Kurseong, Kolkata, Varanasi, Sarnath, and Ganga Sagar.



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

Introduction

The religious institution explored in this book is a small tradition of followers of Sāṃkhyayoga, which emerged in the last decade of the nineteenth century and the first decades of the twentieth century in Bengal in India around the renunciant and yogin Hariharānanda Āraṇya. Hariharānanda Āraṇya was from Howrah in Bengal, on the west bank of the river Hooghly from Kolkata, and lived from 1869 to 1947. For most of those years, 1892 to 1947, he lived the life of a Sāṃkhyayoga *saṃnyāsin* (renunciant, ascetic) and authored many texts in Sanskrit and Bengali on the theory and practice of yoga. Āraṇya is an enigmatic figure of the early history of modern yoga. He promoted the ancient Sāṃkhyayoga teaching as a living religious tradition and attracted a small number of disciples who themselves also became Sāṃkhyayogins, a few monks, and a small number of laypeople. He spent many years in caves and in *āśramas*, which were named after the ancient sage Kapila: Kāpilāśrama (the hermitage following the teaching of Kapila) and Kāpila Maṭha/Kāpil Maṭh (the monastery following the teaching of Kapila). His most important work is considered to be the *Kāpilāśramīya Pātañjal Jogdarśan* (“The Yoga Philosophy of Patañjali of the Kāpilāśram”), a Bengali translation of the Sanskrit text *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* (*Yogasūtra* and its auto-commentary *Yogabhāṣya* or *Vyāsaḥāṣya*) with a detailed commentary on and an explanation of the text. Āraṇya became a *saṃnyāsin* in 1892 and studied the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* in solitude in a cave for several years during the period 1892 to 1898, and he attempted to practice and follow the Sāṃkhyayoga teaching of this text. *Kāpilāśramīya Pātañjal Jogdarśan* was written in Kāpilāśram in Triveni, north of Kolkata along the river Hooghly some years after that and published in 1911 (see H. Āraṇya 1981, 1997). The word *Kāpilāśramīya* in the title refers to the place where the text was written, the Kāpilāśram in Triveni. In 1924, Āraṇya settled in Kāpil Maṭh in Madhupur, where the main center of the Kāpil Maṭh institutions remains to this day. Madhupur was at that time in the Bengal District of Santal Parganas, but today it belongs to the Indian state of Jharkhand. Āraṇya had an excellent grasp of the Sanskrit language. He wrote a number of texts in Sanskrit and Bengali, not only philosophical and religious interpretations of the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* and the *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, but he also wrote instructions in Sāṃkhyayoga meditation and pieces of creative writing such

2 Introduction

as an autobiographical novel, as well as an allegorical narrative, and a number of poems written in the format of classical Sanskrit *stotras*.

Yoga has become a famous global phenomenon and perhaps the most important export product of India and has from 2015 even been celebrated by the United Nations annually in the International Day of Yoga.¹ Āraṇya, however, did not achieve fame. A general feature of many of the major gurus of modern yoga is that they failed to attain the ultimate goal they preached, but they attained a large transnational following that, paradoxically, became the measure of their success.² Hariharānanda Āraṇya is not among those gurus. He is not even mentioned in Benoy Gopal Ray's *Religious Movements in Modern Bengal*, published in 1965, which describes a large number of gurus and guru movements in Bengal of the preceding 150 years. Nor are the institutions of Kāpilāśram or Kāpil Maṭh mentioned in the book. However, in J. N. Farquahar's *An Outline of the Religious Literature of India*, the author notes that he met a Sāṃkhya *saṃnyāsin* in Kolkata: "Sāṅkhya sannyāsīs are now so rare that it is of interest to know that, *as late as 1912*, a learned Sāṅkhya yati named Svāmī Hariharānanda was alive and teaching in Calcutta" (Farquahar 1920: 289, italics added). By using the phrase "as late as 1912," Farquahar seems to indicate that Āraṇya came from a larger premodern tradition of Sāṃkhya that was on the verge of dying out and that Āraṇya was one of the few, or the last one, left. There was apparently no one left in the Yoga³ tradition, because Farquahar writes, "Yogis of this great old school have become very rare. I have never had the good fortune to meet one" (Farquahar 1920: 289). It is also telling that Farquahar was not able to recognize Āraṇya as a follower of the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* because he probably had certain expectations of what "yogis of this great old school" would be like, and, apparently, Yoga would be something different from Sāṃkhya. One of Āraṇya's realizations was that Sāṃkhya and Yoga were both schools of Sāṃkhya philosophy and that "yogis of this great old school" would indeed be Sāṃkhyayogins.

Āraṇya sought solitude, both in this life and as the salvific goal of Sāṃkhyayoga, acquiring a large following was not his primary concern. In spite of the absence of a large number of followers, Hariharānanda Āraṇya and the Sāṃkhyayoga institution he founded nevertheless constitute an important chapter in the history of yoga as well as in the history of the Hindu religious tradition.

Āraṇya was a contemporary of the famous Bengali Vivekānanda (1863–1902) who was from Kolkata, but Āraṇya had a much longer life. His life span paralleled another well-known yogin from Kolkata, Sri Aurobindo (1872–1950) and was almost exactly the same as that of Mahatma Gandhi (1869–1948). Hariharānanda Āraṇya does not mention any of them in his writings, and I have discovered hardly any mention of politics, politicians, or contemporary religious figures in his texts published by Kāpil Maṭh. There are only very few references to contemporary Indian intellectuals, mainly to a small number of scientists. Āraṇya did not engage in society, and he did not comment at length in any of his writings that I have read on any political events, even though he lived through one of the most dramatic historical periods of Bengal and India.⁴ In what I have read, Āraṇya does not write about any other topics

than renunciation, Sāṃkhya, and Sāṃkhyayoga. Āraṇya embodied what he and his disciples perceived to be the ancient Hindu model of the yogin – a yogin who was a renunciant and totally removed from society and its concerns. This also explains to some degree his avoidance of fame. Hariharānanda Āraṇya prohibited his disciples from writing his biography. This can be interpreted as a sign of humility, but is also a reflection of Āraṇya's insistence on traditional correctness and his idealistic interpretation of the institution of *saṃnyāsin*. The followers of Kāpil Maṭh have taken the prohibition to mean that, preferably, no information about his pre-*saṃnyāsin* years should be communicated to others or talked about among themselves. This is in line with the Hindu idea that a *saṃnyāsin* has completely relinquished his pre-*saṃnyāsin* life.⁵ It is often considered improper, according to the idealistic conception of the *saṃnyāsa*, to speak about the pre-*saṃnyāsin* life of monks except to praise the person for what he renounced in relation to wealth and so on.

After Āraṇya discovered Sāṃkhyayoga and mastered its teachings, and explored and developed forms of Sāṃkhyayoga meditation, his main vision seems to have been to promote Sāṃkhyayoga as a living tradition by personally following the strict discipline of the *saṃnyāsin* and, in addition, undertaking long periods of silence (restraint of speech), completing a number of writing projects, and living for long periods in isolation in caves. He spent the last 20 years of his life enclosed in an artificial (man-made) "cave." The guru enclosed in a cave became one of the unique features of the Kāpil Maṭh tradition and has continued to the present day. It adds to the authority of the guru and also secrecy as his daily life and practices cannot be observed. This institution of cave dwelling came perhaps as a response to the general expectations of Hindu religion that ideally yogins should live alone and in mountain caves. Perhaps nineteenth-century India's search for proper yogins, who were supposed to be found in caves, also had an influence. Possibly, Āraṇya wished to demonstrate that proper yogins do indeed exist. However that may be, he had a strong personal inclination for solitude, and it illustrates that the Kāpil Maṭh tradition aspired to be a tradition of "proper" yoga – a living form of an ancient tradition in its pure form as conceived by them. Teachers of yoga in modern India, on the contrary, typically have favored involving themselves actively in the society, often referring to the teachings of the *Bhagavadgītā*, which, contrary to the teaching of stages of life (*āśramas*) in the *Dharmaśāstras*, taught that renunciation did not mean renouncing action but renouncing only the fruits of action. Āraṇya opposed such an interpretation, arguing that the *Bhagavadgītā* was written in a context when many persons became monks but had no real inclination for ascetic living, and thus the text encouraged them to return to society instead and do their social duty. Hence the situation mirrored his perception that ascetics and renunciants who had no real propensity for ascetic living dominated contemporary India. They were either dishonest with no inclination for ascetic living or, though honest, were more inclined to social engagement than the practice of solitude and therefore should not have been renunciants in the first place (H. Āraṇya 2003: 34). This contrast between proper and honest and improper and dishonest yogins constituted an important component of the discourse about yoga

4 Introduction

and yogins in Bengal in the nineteenth century. Romantic notions about India's past contrasted with descriptions and experiences of contemporary society.

Hariharānanda Āraṇya looked back to an ancient period in which a philosopher called Kapila had, he believed, discovered and realized for the first time in the current cycle of creation the possibility of salvific liberation (*mokṣa*, *kaivalya*) by means of Yoga. He believed Kapila taught this knowledge, the Sāṃkhya system of thought, to his disciple Āsuri and thus made salvific liberation possible for others to attain.⁶ He believed Kapila was the founder of Sāṃkhya and therefore also the founder of Yoga philosophy (*Pātañjalayogadarśana*) since this Yoga, Āraṇya had realized, was not only based on Sāṃkhya philosophy, but was also an integral part of it. Āraṇya promoted the lifestyle and teachings of this ancient sage. Readers acquainted with modern yoga may be surprised by the strong focus on Kapila and the minor role assigned to Patañjali in the Kāpil Maṭh tradition, as in modern yoga, Patañjali has become an immensely celebrated figure. In modern yoga, it is Patañjali who is most often thought of as the foundational figure of yoga, not Kapila. In the Kāpil Maṭh tradition, Patañjali is indeed recognized as the author of the *Yogasūtra*, but as we shall see in this book, since the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* (*Yogasūtra* and its auto-commentary *Yogabhāṣya* or *Vyāsbhāṣya*) is based on Sāṃkhya philosophy, it is based on the teachings of Kapila and his yoga, according to the Kāpil Maṭh tradition. In addition to the sage Kapila as the first to attain salvific knowledge of the unchangeable *puruṣa* principle, Āraṇya promoted *īśvara* as a *nirguṇa* ("without qualities") divinity and Hiranyagarbha as a *saguṇa* ("with qualities") divinity and world creator, but no significant role is assigned to Patañjali. Although Patañjali is considered to be the author of the *Yogasūtra*, he is not thought to be the originator of yoga. Āraṇya looked at Sāṃkhya and Yoga as one integrated tradition and both were based on the teachings of Kapila and both taught the ultimate separateness of the two ultimate principles of *puruṣa* and *prakṛti*, consciousness and matter. This Sāṃkhya dualism is also taught in the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra*, according to Āraṇya. Modern yoga, in contrast, has often separated the *Yogasūtra* from the dualism of Sāṃkhya, and from the rest of the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* as well, treating the *Yogasūtra* as an independent text, and has instead interpreted the *Yogasūtra* as a text that preaches various forms of union (union of body and mind, union of the self and the divine, etc.). One reason for this insistence on union as the message of the text is probably the dominance of the goal of oneness and union in many Indian religious traditions,⁷ and a similar tendency to emphasize union in modern yoga in India and in many New Age yoga environments as well. Another reason is that even though many consider the *Yogasūtra* to be the foundational text of yoga, the type of yoga they practice is in fact not based on this text. Because of the high status the *Yogasūtra* attained in modern yoga, many have often blended or identified their teachings, which have roots in other traditions of yoga than the Sāṃkhyayoga of the *Yogasūtra*, with the teachings of that text and have read their own teachings into the text.

Hariharānanda Āraṇya, Kāpil Maṭh, and its related institutions are part of the history of yoga in India and the history of Hindu religion in Bengal, and constitute a chapter in the history of modern Hinduism. This study of the Kāpil Maṭh

tradition is of interest for several reasons. First, Hariharānanda Āraṇya and Kāpil Maṭh represent one of the earliest manifestations of the “new” yoga – the advancement of the yoga philosophy of the *Yogasūtra* in the modern world. Hariharānanda Āraṇya’s endeavors to promote Sāṃkhyayoga occurred in Bengal where modern yoga is supposed to have originated around the same time. The publication in 1896 of Vivekānanda’s lectures to his American audience in the book *Rāja Yoga*, a translation of the *Yogasūtra* into English together with a non-traditional commentary is considered to be the culmination of a growing interest in yoga in the second half of the nineteenth century and is acclaimed as the origin of modern yoga (De Michelis 2004, 2008). The Sāṃkhyayoga of Hariharānanda Āraṇya and the Kāpil Maṭh tradition developed in the same period in which modern yoga is supposed to have emerged: the last decade of the nineteenth century and the first decades of the twentieth century (Alter 2004; De Michelis 2004; Singleton 2010; Sjomán 1999). Kāpil Maṭh’s tradition is therefore of interest for understanding the origin and history of modern yoga. At the same time (the winter of 1895/1896) that Vivekānanda was lecturing on the *Yogasūtra* in the United States, the founder of Kāpil Maṭh, Hariharānanda Āraṇya, studied the Sanskrit text of the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* with Vācaspatimīśra’s commentary the *Tattvavaiśārādī* in solitude in a cave in the Barabar Hills in Bihar, 24 km north of the town of Gaya. Why this interest in Sāṃkhyayoga and the *Yogasūtra* in late nineteenth-century Bengal when in the earlier decades of the century apparently hardly a single Hindu specialist (*paṇḍit*) in the *Yogasūtra* and its Sāṃkhyayoga philosophy could be found? Some of the questions dealt with in this book include the following: Was the Sāṃkhyayoga of Hariharānanda Āraṇya and the Kāpil Maṭh a direct continuation of a premodern yoga tradition, one of the few remaining of a classical tradition that was still alive, as Farquahar seems to have believed? Did Āraṇya encounter representatives of a living tradition of Sāṃkhyayoga? How did Āraṇya learn the yoga of Sāṃkhya? Who was his guru? And to what degree was his yoga impacted by or a product of modernity? And what kind of yoga is the Sāṃkhyayoga of Kāpil Maṭh? Is it ancient, old, traditional, purist, orthodox, or modern?

Second, Kāpil Maṭh and its related institutions represent a late nineteenth-century, a twentieth-century, and even a contemporary Indian manifestation of the teachings of Sāṃkhyayoga. It is a living Sāṃkhyayoga religious tradition. Little is known about what ancient Sāṃkhyayogins did, or if there was ever a community of Sāṃkhyayogins. No description of large Sāṃkhyayoga communities is given in the main text of Sāṃkhyayoga, *Pātañjalayogaśāstra*, or commentaries on the text. The community of Kāpil Maṭh tells us something about what Sāṃkhyayogins did in the late nineteenth, twentieth, and early twenty-first centuries. This book about Āraṇya and the institutions of Kāpil Maṭh describes Sāṃkhyayoga as a living practice and as “lived religion” – that is, Sāṃkhyayoga at a particular time and in a particular cultural context. The book analyzes what Sāṃkhyayoga meditation is as a contemporary practice. How did Āraṇya perceive Sāṃkhyayoga as a yoga practice? What is Sāṃkhyayoga meditation in practice? What do Sāṃkhyayogins do? These are some of the questions that will be pondered in this book.

A note on methodology

The approach of the book is philological and ethnographic. The textual sources of the philological research are mostly the published texts of the Kāpil Maṭh. The first two gurus of the Kāpil Maṭh tradition, Hariharānanda Āraṇya and Dharmamegha Āraṇya, wrote the majority of the texts but some were written also by disciples of the Kāpil Maṭh tradition. Most of the original texts of the Kāpil Maṭh are in Sanskrit and Bengali, a few are in English, and translations of most of them have been published in English by the Maṭh and in Hindi by the Kāpil Sāṃkhyayogāśram in Sarnath – an institution related to Kāpil Maṭh. Since the translations of the texts into English and Hindi have been done completely and entirely by disciples of the Kāpil Maṭh tradition, and the translations have been supervised and reviewed carefully by one of the gurus before publication, these translations can be considered, in principle, as equally authentic expressions of the teachings of the Kāpil Maṭh tradition as their Bengali and Sanskrit editions. Any differences between the original editions and the translations, except for mistakes, are indications of conscious decisions of the Maṭh and could be interpreted as revisions and manifestations of changes in the tradition, or adaptations to an English-speaking audience. However, the translators often note in the prefaces that they have attempted to remain faithful to the original Bengali text as far as possible (see D. Āraṇya 2003b: x). During my field studies, I also asked several disciples to write about their memories of the gurus, and their narratives are part of the written material for this study as well. The ethnographic material are my own field observations of Kāpil Maṭh in Madhupur, mostly for short periods over many years, and related institutions in Kolkata, Sarnath, Kurseong, and Varanasi, and interviews with gurus and disciples of the Kāpil Maṭh institutions at these places, as well visits to the vacant Kāpil Maṭh institution Kāpilāśram in Triveni. In addition, I have over the last two decades produced photographic documentations of the places of the Kāpil Maṭh institutions and their traditions and practices.

Chapter summaries

The book has ten chapters and a conclusion. The first chapter discusses the meaning of the term Sāṃkhyayoga, gives a short introduction to the Sāṃkhya and Yoga systems of religious thought, and discusses their similarities and differences, and their textual traditions. Sāṃkhyayoga is a textual tradition connected to the *Pātañjalayogasāstra* (*Yogasūtra* and the *Bhāṣya*) and the historical development seems primarily to have been as a theoretical tradition. That no ancient monastic community of Sāṃkhyayogins has been identified, in contrast to the rich archeological remains of ancient Buddhist and Jain communities in India, seems to confirm this. In Chapter 2, I describe some of my initial encounters with the living Sāṃkhyayoga tradition of Kāpil Maṭh and introduce the reader to this Sāṃkhyayoga tradition, my encounters with a *paṇḍit* connected to the institution of Kāpil Maṭh, and my gradual discovery of the organization, its gurus, publications, devotees, and *āśramas*. Chapter 3 analyzes the role of some early

Orientalists and their ideas about Sāṃkhya, and its founder Kapila in the emergence of Sāṃkhyayoga in nineteenth-century Bengal, and it discusses its possible impact on the teachings of the Kāpil Maṭh tradition. In the chapter, I further look at a belief present in the nineteenth century that the Buddha's teachings were dependent on the teachings of Kapila and that Buddhism was a form of Sāṃkhya – a view explored by the early European Orientalists as well as Indian intellectuals. The chapter discusses the role of this belief for the rebirth of Sāṃkhyayoga in nineteenth-century Bengal. At this time, it was Kapila and not Patañjali who was celebrated among Orientalists and Hindu intellectuals in Bengal as the originator of the philosophy of Yoga, which was considered part of Sāṃkhya philosophy. The chapter suggests that Kāpil Maṭh has institutionalized this nineteenth-century view.

Nineteenth-century Bengal was the center of the intellectual encounter between India and the West, and the encounter triggered a remarkable amount of intellectual creativity, which influenced religion and caused the emergence of new forms of Hindu traditions as well as a revival or rebirth of some of the old traditions. These changes took place in particular among the Bengali *bhadralok* population (the educated upper class in Bengal during the colonial period). While Chapter 3 analyzes the emergence of Sāṃkhya in nineteenth-century Bengal, Chapter 4 examines the rebirth of the Yoga of the *Yogasūtra* in the same period and the emergence of a new type of *bhadralok* yogin, the educated upper caste yogin. This new *bhadralok* yogin emerged as a contrast to other types of yogins, whom India's elites often looked upon with suspicion. The ascetic puritanism of late nineteenth-century Bengal seems to have contributed to new yoga identities, which became important for the new phenomenon of modern yoga as a whole. The founder of the Kāpil Maṭh tradition of Sāṃkhyayoga, Hariharānanda Āraṇya, seems to be one of the earliest representatives of this new “*bhadralok* yogin.” Orientalists and Bengali intellectuals gave renewed attention to ancient texts and teachings, and these were also made available to new audiences. Hariharānanda Āraṇya became a Sāṃkhyayoga *saṃnyāsin* in the 1890s. His unique contribution was the attempt to make the Sāṃkhyayoga philosophy of the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* a living tradition by experimenting with the role of the Sāṃkhyayoga *saṃnyāsin*. In the next chapter, Chapter 5, I discuss the likelihood that Hariharānanda Āraṇya did meet a Sāṃkhyayoga ascetic who connected him to a living tradition of Sāṃkhyayoga teachers with ancient roots. As already mentioned, J. N. Farquahar appears to have understood Āraṇya as the last remaining example of an ancient tradition. Other scholars have also considered the possibility that Āraṇya's Sāṃkhyayoga was connected to a tradition of “isolated hermits living high in the Himalayas” (White 2012: 12). In the Yoga volume of the *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies*, Āraṇya is presented in one sentence that gives the impression he had a teacher. He was, the text says, “a disciple of Swāmī Trilokī Āraṇya, but nothing is known about this teacher” (Larson and Bhattacharya 2008: 367), implying that he had encountered a teacher who possibly taught him Sāṃkhyayoga. David White makes the claim that this teacher, Swāmī Trilokī Āraṇya, “belonged to a lineage extending back to Patanjali himself” (White 2014: 224). Is it possible

that Hariharānanda Āraṇya met one of these cave dwelling hermits who initiated him into the ancient Sāṃkhyayoga tradition going back to Patañjali? Was there a living Sāṃkhyayoga tradition in India throughout the nineteenth century and did Hariharānanda Āraṇya come into contact with such a tradition? Or is living Sāṃkhyayoga a form of “modern” yoga created in an environment that favored rationality and ethics and disfavored rituals and priestly power? In other words, is living Sāṃkhyayoga a new institutionalization of yoga that responded to the needs of the Bengali *bhadralok* for a religion based on reason and free from myths and rituals, or is it an old lineage of Sāṃkhyayoga transferred through centuries by an oral tradition? The chapter attempts to provide answers to these questions.

With Chapter 6, I turn to the analysis of the Sāṃkhyayoga teachings of Hariharānanda Āraṇya and the Kāpil Maṭh tradition. Hariharānanda Āraṇya was a practitioner of the yoga of the Sāṃkhyayoga system of religious thought, but Āraṇya also remained oriented around books and textual knowledge and this shaped the institution of Kāpil Maṭh. The main part of the chapter gives a presentation of some of his Sāṃkhyayoga teachings based on an analysis of his books and written texts. It analyzes some of the main themes in his texts, such as the divinities Hiraṇyagarbha and Īśvara of Yoga; the meaning of *samādhi*; the theory of karma; the subject and the object; the ideal yogin; the understanding of *āsana*, *prāṇāyāma*, *saṃyama*, *jīvanmukti*; and the extraordinary powers, and references to Buddhist meditation. The main part of the chapter focuses on the *Kāpilāśramīya Pātañjal Jogdarśan*.

In Chapter 7, I turn to texts of Kāpil Maṭh that give detailed instructions in how to do yoga – i.e., instructions in Sāṃkhyayoga meditation. Āraṇya experimented with Sāṃkhyayoga ascetic practices and did give meditation instructions in his writings, which seem to be based on his own experiences. His fictional autobiography describes a number of meditation experiences of the yogin as he advanced on the Sāṃkhyayoga path toward salvific liberation (*kaivalya*). In this chapter, I analyze these texts as well as views of Dharmamegha Āraṇya and yoga instructions of Omprakāś Āraṇya, to further answer the question: What is the yoga of Sāṃkhyayoga?

Chapter 8 describes daily life in the Maṭh and the Sāṃkhyayoga ritual of *stotra* (Sanskrit verses) recitation. The melodious recitation of *stotras* composed by Hariharānanda Āraṇya is considered the most important daily practice of the devotees of the Kāpil Maṭh tradition. The living guru and the *samādhisthānas* of the dead gurus are honored, but there is no *pūjā* to statues of gods. This daily ritual is performed twice a day: in the morning and in the evening. When the Sāṃkhyayoga devotees gather at the *āśramas*, they recite the *stotras* together and the chapter argues that this ritual functions to construct and maintain a form of Sāṃkhyayoga community. The chapter analyzes the dominant themes in the *stotras* and offers a translation of some of them.

In Chapter 9, the material religion of Sāṃkhyayoga is analyzed. The devotees of Sāṃkhyayoga, and even the gurus, emphasize the complexity of the Sāṃkhyayoga teachings and how difficult it is to understand them from reading the texts. The textual tradition is looked upon as available only to the few.

Hariharānanda Āraṇya is admired for his scholarship and writings, and his grasp of Sāṃkhyayoga philosophy, but most Sāṃkhyayoga devotees do not claim to fully understand his texts and often state that they understand very little and have also read very little. The gurus, aware of this difficulty, have utilized the material dimension of the *āśramas* to teach Sāṃkhyayoga. The Sāṃkhyayoga *āśramas* are decorated with elements of the teachings for aesthetic and pedagogical purposes. The visual items found in the Sāṃkhyayoga monasteries such as paintings, statues, and inscriptions display the main doctrines and are a means of reminding the followers of the main teachings as well as maintaining a common identity. Sāṃkhyayoga is mainly a *nirguṇa* tradition, without the worship of statues. The monastic building with a guru inside and its surroundings become the most important part of the material religion. The chapter examines the material dimension of Kāpil Maṭh in Madhupur and Kāpil Sāṃkhyayogāśram in Sarnath, and in particular the art and the calligraphic (visual art related to writing) decorations. The calligraphic decorations display the main teachings. The chapter argues that they serve pedagogic and aesthetic purposes as well as make the monastery itself become the embodiment of the teachings.

In the last chapter, Chapter 10, I suggest several connections of Kāpil Maṭh with modern Indian scholarship on Sāṃkhya and Yoga. The gurus and some disciples of the Maṭh have been intellectuals and their writings are often based on textual studies of the Sāṃkhya and Sāṃkhyayoga traditions and have points of contact in academic scholarship. It is telling that a British Indologist, in a review of a book on Yoga written by a scholar who was a disciple of Kāpil Maṭh, published in 1933 (but republished in 1977), wrote that this book must be “the first book arguing the case for Yoga which reached an acceptable academic standard in handling its sources and over-all presentation” (Werner 1980: 100). That a renowned Indologist approved of the book and suggested that this was the correct way to write about yoga, is probably because the Kāpil Maṭh tradition at its origin had a connection to Indological textual material. The chapter discusses the role of the Kāpil Maṭh tradition in the emergence and development of modern scholarship on Sāṃkhya and Yoga in India. One problem for the study of ancient Indian philosophy, noted the Bengali historian of Indian philosophy Surendranath Dasgupta, was that those traditions had been lost almost for centuries as living traditions so that the study of Indian philosophy was basically philological. With the Kāpil Maṭh tradition, however, one of these old traditions of Indian philosophy, which was thought to have disappeared long ago, could, surprisingly, be encountered as a living tradition. This encounter meant that Sāṃkhya and Sāṃkhyayoga could not be treated only as historical facts and dead traditions. The living tradition had to become part of the scholarship, and the chapter suggests some ways the Kāpil Maṭh tradition has influenced scholarship in India.

The conclusion sums up several of the main findings and discusses the relationship between tradition and innovation in the case of Hariharānanda Āraṇya and the Kāpil Maṭh tradition. It discusses possible connections of Āraṇya with modern yoga and other yoga traditions, and suggests that Āraṇya, with access to ancient texts and influenced by Orientalists’ glorification of India’s ancient past and

renewed interest in yoga, set out to separate the Sāṃkhyayoga teachings of the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* from associations to contemporary renunciants and yogins and from other traditions of yoga and philosophy, with which the teachings of the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* had been united for several centuries. Āraṇya's project has a modern dimension to it in the sense that he attempted to purify a tradition and promoted its most ancient part as the one most relevant for the contemporary world.

Notes

- 1 The initiative came from the Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi and was announced in a speech to the General Assembly of the United Nations on September 27, 2014 (see United Nations Information Centre for India and Bhutan [2014]).
- 2 See Singleton and Goldberg 2014 for an analysis of many of these gurus of modern yoga.
- 3 Yoga with a capitalized first letter refers to the Yoga system of religious thought, while the lower case yoga refers to spiritual practice and any other forms of yoga.
- 4 One of very few instances of a sentence commenting on political events can be found in a letter Āraṇya wrote in 1894, reprinted in H. Āraṇya 2003: 113–119, he describes experiences of extraordinary powers of knowledge, and when he returns to his normal state he reflects:

With it, past prejudices started coming back; e.g. I thought, do I return to earth empty handed, without doing anything worthwhile for the people? – Why not make India independent! The moment I thought of it, I had a sudden big drop from the exalted state. I felt bad that such a narrow selfish thought could creep into my mind after having seen so many universes. I realized it is difficult to get rid of narrow-mindedness (H. Āraṇya 2003: 118).

Unlike many other forms of modern yoga in India, Āraṇya's yoga does not seem to have been part of a nationalist project (for yoga and nationalist projects, see Alter 2004, 2007; De Michelis 2004; Jain 2014; Radice 1999; Rosselli 1980; Singleton 2008; Sjoman 1999; van der Veer 2001, 2014)

- 5 This has made it difficult to collect information about Hariharānanda Āraṇya from the followers of Kāpil Maṭh. I respect the opinion of the Kāpil Maṭh and this book does not give any information other than what is necessary to present the arguments. The book is not a biography of Hariharānanda Āraṇya but a contribution to the study of the emergence of yoga in modern Hinduism, Āraṇya's teaching, and the Sāṃkhyayoga of the Kāpil Maṭh tradition.
- 6 See Jacobsen 2008 for a monographic study of different traditions associated with Kapila.
- 7 Āraṇya would agree with many of these traditions that the purpose of yoga is to get rid of the "false sense of ego"; however, he disagreed with assertions of the self merging with or being absorbed into something else. On the contrary, he wrote: "The self cannot merge with anything . . . the self does not merge into anything. Generally, people think the self merges in Brahman or *something* like that. But in reality it is not so" (H. Āraṇya 2003: 103–104). According to the teaching of Sāṃkhya and Sāṃkhyayoga, when the experience of the object ceases for all time, the self attains isolation and does not unite with anything.

1 Sāṃkhya, Yoga, and Sāṃkhyayoga

Hariharānanda Āraṇya and the Kāpil Maṭh tradition refer to their teachings as Sāṃkhyayoga, Sāṃkhya, and Yoga. The honorary title given to Āraṇya by his disciples and devotees was Sāṃkhyayogācārya. Ācārya means a specialist in the field of one or more of the *śāstras* (Sanskrit textual traditions of knowledge). A learned guru may be called *ācārya* to emphasize his scholarly qualities (see Hara 1980; Jacobsen 2011b), and this was the case with Āraṇya. Sāṃkhyayogācārya denotes a specialist in Sāṃkhyayoga. The term Sāṃkhyayoga has a double meaning and often both meanings are implied when the term is used. First, Sāṃkhyayoga means the “yoga tradition of Sāṃkhya” and a Sāṃkhyayogin is a follower of that tradition. Second, Sāṃkhyayoga may refer to the unified tradition of the Sāṃkhya and Yoga systems of religious thought, and a Sāṃkhyayogin is a follower of this unified tradition. The Yoga system of religious thought (Yoga with a capital Y) is now often referred to in the research literature as Pātañjalayoga, but in the Kāpil Maṭh tradition, it is called Sāṃkhyayoga and simply Yoga. Sāṃkhya and Yoga (i.e., Pātañjalayoga, Sāṃkhyayoga) are two of the so-called six Brāhmaṇical systems of religious thought (*darśanas*). In the medieval philosophical digests (*nibandhas*), the concept of six *darśanas*, or six Brāhmaṇical systems of philosophy (Sāṃkhya, Yoga, Nyāya, Vaiśeṣika, Mīmāṃsā, and Vedānta) became widespread.¹ Each *darśana* was a philosophical system with a foundational text and a number of commentary texts. These six systems became conceived of as three pairs because of their similarities: Sāṃkhya-Yoga, Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika, and Pūrva and Uttara Mīmāṃsā. It is because of the similarity between the Sāṃkhya and Yoga systems of religious thought that they are often “simply referred to together as the tradition of Sāṃkhyayoga” (Larson 2008: 23). For the followers of Kāpil Maṭh, the Yoga system is the “yoga tradition of Sāṃkhya” and is therefore called Sāṃkhyayoga. The Sāṃkhya and Yoga systems of religious thought are considered a unified tradition and are thus also covered by the term Sāṃkhyayoga. The followers of Kāpil Maṭh regard Sāṃkhya as the theory part and Yoga as the practice part of a single tradition.

The terms sāmkhya and yoga

The terms “sāmkhya” and “yoga” are ancient Sanskrit words. The Sanskrit word sāmkhya relates to numbers and enumeration but its technical meaning also refers

to “reasoning,” “reasoning method,” and “the method of salvific knowledge” (Edgerton 1924). As the name of a philosophical system, the term *sāṃkhya* refers to the method of enumerating the contents of experience and the world (Jacobsen 2011b: 685; Larson 2008: 3).

The term “yoga” has a number of meanings and references in addition to being a name of one of the systems of religious thought, the Yoga *darśana*. The basic meaning of yoga is as a disciplined method for attaining a goal and refers to techniques of controlling the body and the mind, spiritual discipline. Yoga is used in combination with other words, for example *hathayoga*, *mantrayoga*, and *layayoga*, as well as *sāṃkhyayoga*, which refer to traditions specializing in particular techniques of yoga. Yoga can also be the name of the goal of yoga practice, such as in the statements “yoga means union” or “yoga means concentration (*samādhi*)” or “yoga means the cessation of the transformation of awareness.” In Indian history, yoga has been one of the main forms of spiritual practice,² and it has been linked with a great variety of theologies and philosophies.

The terms *sāṃkhya* and *yoga* were found in ancient Indian texts long before they became names of the systems. In the most ancient texts, there was neither a *Sāṃkhya* nor a Yoga system of religious thought (Edgerton 1924: 1–46). In the *Mahābhārata*, which is the most important text for understanding the early use of the terms, the words *sāṃkhya* and *yoga* mostly refer to methods of salvation rather than systems of religious thought, and even as late as in the *Bhagavadgītā* chapters of the text, *sāṃkhya* and *yoga* most probably do not yet refer to systems but to ways of acquiring salvation. *Sāṃkhya* referred to “salvation by knowing,” which implies renunciation of action, whereas one of the meanings of yoga was salvation by performing disciplined unselfish activities (Edgerton 1924: 4). While this is the view of Indological scholarship, the Kāpil Maṭh tradition takes the terms *sāṃkhya* and *yoga* in the *Mahābhārata* and the *Bhagavadgītā* to sometimes refer to the *Sāṃkhya* and Yoga systems of religious thought.

The *Sāṃkhya* system of religious thought

The *Sāṃkhya* system of religious thought is a Sanskrit textual tradition, which has the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* (“Verses on *Sāṃkhya*”) of Īśvarakṛṣṇa (c. 350–400) as its authoritative foundational text and a tradition of commentaries on that text. Two other important *Sāṃkhya* texts are the *Tattvasāmasa* and the *Sāṃkhyasūtra*, and commentaries on them.³ Most likely one or more *Sāṃkhya* texts preceded the *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, but none have survived. The *Sāṃkhya* system of religious thought is associated with a series of key concepts in the Hindu tradition, such as *puruṣa*, *prakṛti*, *guṇa*, *sattva*, *rajas*, *tamas*, *buddhi*, *tattva*, *pariṇāma*, *tanmātra*, and *kaivalya*. The *Sāṃkhya* system of religious thought is based on a fundamental dualism between matter (*prakṛti*) and contentless consciousness (*puruṣa*). *Prakṛti* and *puruṣa* are, in reality, independent principles. *Puruṣa* is the observer (*draṣṭṛ*), the witness consciousness and *prakṛti* the observed content (*dṛśya*). Because of an imbalance in *prakṛti*, the observer and the content, subject and object appear as if interdependent, as if one. We therefore identify with the content (the mind, body,

and external world) displayed to *puruṣa* as if it were part of us, when in reality it is not, but part of *prakṛti* and not our self. The Sāṃkhya system provides a method for analyzing the world, and this analysis leads ultimately to the realization of the separateness of *prakṛti* and *puruṣa*. The realization of their separateness leads to *kaivalya*, salvific liberation and the end of suffering (*duḥkha*), according to the doctrines of Sāṃkhya. The world is analyzed in terms of 25 *tattvas* (principles). These are the five gross elements (*mahābhūtas*), the five subtle elements (*tanmātras*), the five action capacities (*karmendriyas*), the five sense capacities (*jñānendriyas*), the mind (*manas*), the ego (*ahaṃkāra*), the intellect (*buddhi*), the material principle (*prakṛti*), and the consciousness principle (*puruṣa*). The main purpose of the enumeration in Sāṃkhya seems to be to provide guidance for the attainment of salvific knowledge. In the enumeration of the principles, *prakṛti* and *puruṣa* are not the first principles but the last. They are sometimes referred to as *caturviṃśati tattva* (twenty-fourth principle) and *pañcaviṃśati tattva* (twenty-fifth principle). This seems to indicate that it is their realization for the purpose of *kaivalya* that is central and not a mapping of a cosmogony. Sāṃkhya is a teaching that deals with salvific liberation (*mokṣa*), and the purpose is a practical one: the realization of ultimate reality – that is, the realization of the principle that is beyond change. Matter is made up of three constituents, *sattva*, *rajas*, and *tamas*,⁴ but they are in imbalance, and it is this imbalance that causes perpetual change and suffering. Because of the similarity of consciousness and the purest part of matter called intellect (*buddhi*), which is the part made up mostly of *sattva*, we mistakenly identify ourselves with matter – i.e., with body and mind – which undergoes change. This incorrect identification is the ultimate cause of the experience of suffering (*duḥkha*), according to Sāṃkhya. Sāṃkhya tells us that the mind and body are objects for the witness consciousness. This witness consciousness (*sākṣin*) is unchanging and contentless, and the absolute subject which can never become an object. By means of the correct knowledge of the *tattvas*, the separation of consciousness from the objects of consciousness is attained and the unchangeable contentless *puruṣa* principle is realized, and the manifestations of *prakṛti* are dissolved. *Prakṛti* is singular, as it is the material foundation of the objects of the *puruṣas*, and it is consciousness that is plural according to Sāṃkhya.

The Yoga system of religious thought

Yoga is the name of the system that has the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* (“the authoritative text on yoga authored by Patañjali”) as its foundational text. Its author, Patañjali, is thought to have lived around 325–425 CE. The *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* consists of the *Yogasūtra* and an auto-commentary called the *Yogabhāṣya* or the *Īyāsbhāṣya*. The Yoga system is mostly in agreement with the dualist teaching of Sāṃkhya, but provides a meditation vocabulary that describes methods for purifying the mind so that it becomes more and more *sāttvika* (dominance by *sattva guṇa* [lightness]), which ultimately leads to *vivekakyāti*, discernment between *puruṣa* and *prakṛti*. In the *Yogasūtra*, Patañjali describes this state as “the cessation of the transformation of awareness” (*yogaś cittavṛttinirodhaḥ*;

Yogasūtra 1.2), which is a state in which “the seer abides in itself” (*tadā dṛṣṭuḥ svarūpe ’vasthānam*; *Yogasūtra* 1.3). Attainment of this state is the goal of Yoga. *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* – that is, *Vyāsabhāṣya* – on *Yogasūtra* 1.1 seems to define yoga as *samādhi* (*yogaḥ samādhiḥ*). *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* distinguishes between *samprajñātasamādhi* (concentration with content) and *asamprajñātasamādhi* (concentration without content), but both are considered yoga. The goal of meditation practice is the realization of the *puruṣa* principle as separate from *prakṛti* – that is, separating the non-self from the self and dissolving the manifestations of *prakṛti* into *prakṛti*, which is attained in *asamprajñātasamādhi*, a state when all changes of awareness have ceased (*cittavṛttinirodhaḥ*). Once attained, the period of cessation can gradually be prolonged. According to the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* traditions, when the transformation of awareness ceases, the real identity of the human being is realized. The goal is, similar to Sāṃkhya, the realization of the contentlessness of the principle of consciousness, *puruṣa*, and its total separateness from the material principle, *prakṛti*. As in Sāṃkhya, *prakṛti* is singular and is the object of the experiences of all non-liberated *puruṣas*. It is consciousness that is plural. In spite of the similarities between Sāṃkhya and Yoga, one major difference between the Sāṃkhya system and the Yoga system is the difference in the vocabulary of the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* and the *Sāṃkhyakārikā*. The Yoga system of religious thought is associated with a series of key concepts of the South Asian meditation traditions, primarily from the Buddhist traditions, which are absent in the Sāṃkhya texts.

Fundamental concepts of Yoga include the five activities of normal awareness (*cittavṛttis*) and the five stages of awareness (*bhūmi*). The five *vṛttis* are knowledge (*pramāṇa*), error (*viparyaya*), verbal construction (*vikalpa*), sleep (*nidrā*), and memory (*smṛti*), and the cessation of all these needs to be attained through practice (*abhyāsa*) and dispassion (*vairāgya*). The stages of awareness are distracted (*kṣipta*), sluggish (*mūḍha*), partially distracted (*vikṣipta*), one-pointed (*ekāgra*), and suppressed (*niruddha*). One-pointed awareness (*ekāgra*) is called concentration with content (*samprajñātasamādhi*). Suppressed awareness (*niruddha*) is concentration without content (*asamprajñātasamādhi*). It destroys afflictions (*kleśas*), provides release from karma, and is the goal of yoga. The Yoga system of religious thought for the first time merged Buddhist meditation terminology, such as *dhāraṇā* (fixation), *dhyāna* (meditation), *samādhi* (concentration), *nirodha* (cessation), *samāpatti* (engrossment), *āśaya* (trace), *smṛti* (memory), *vāsanā* (imprint), *avasthā* (condition), *dharmamegha* (a final stage of *samādhi*), *ṛtambharā* (“truth bearing,” a stage in *samādhi*), *bhūmi* (stage of awareness), *samāpatti* (engrossment of the mind on the object of meditation), and so on, with the Brāhmanical tradition (see Larson 1999; Poussin 1936–37). The author of the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* created a synthesis of Buddhist meditation terminology with the Sāṃkhya teaching of the *tattvas* and the discernment of the distinction between *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* (Larson 1999; Larson 2008). This vocabulary might have been common to several philosophies of meditation in ancient India and entered the Brāhmanical tradition in that way, but the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* probably points more directly to a Buddhist influence.

The author of the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* seems to have had a favorable view of some aspects of Buddhist meditation. Mallinson and Singleton, pondering the influence of Buddhism on the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra*, assert directly that, “the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* represents a Brāhmanical attempt to appropriate yoga from the Śramaṇa tradition” (Mallinson and Singleton 2017: xvii). That the author borrows from Buddhism without referring to it in the first parts of the text, and does not acknowledge the influence of Buddhism in the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* itself, probably supports the idea of appropriation. However, this may have happened, either as religious appropriation or perhaps as the result of someone switching his religious interests from Buddhism to Sāṃkhya, Patañjali produced a theory of meditation that explained how to realize the Sāṃkhya *tattvas* by using Buddhist meditation vocabulary. The Yoga system blended the Sāṃkhya philosophy, with its belief in an eternal unchangeable and contentless self, with theories of meditation preserved and promoted in the Buddhist traditions. The relationship between Sāṃkhyayoga and Buddhism was of great importance to Hariharānanda Ārya and the Kāpil Maṭh tradition, which will be discussed in Chapter 3.

Sāṃkhya and Yoga have a common core. Knowledge is of fundamental importance for attaining the goal, and they both accept three means of valid knowledge (*pramāṇas*): perception (*pratyakṣa*), inference (*anumāna*), and reliable testimony (*āgama*). They accept the *tattvas* and the *guṇas* as the basic elements for analyzing reality, the ultimate separateness of *prakṛti* and *puruṣa*, the idea of *puruṣa* as the passive witness, the fundamental character of everything as suffering (*duḥkham eva sarvam*, *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* 2.15; *duḥkhatrayābhīghātāt*, *Sāṃkhyakārikā* 1), and the idea of *mokṣa* (*kaivalya*) as the realization of the separateness of *puruṣa*. *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* differs in many of its descriptions from *Sāṃkhyakārikā* because *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* is a philosophy of meditation for the attainment of *nirodha*, cessation, while *Sāṃkhyakārikā*’s focus is on inferential reasoning (*anumāna*) and discernment (*jñāna*) by the intellect (*buddhi*) of the separateness of *puruṣa* and *prakṛti*. The most important differences between the Sāṃkhya and Yoga systems are the following. First, in the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* 53, the divine world is stated to be eightfold, but the *kārikā* mentions only Brahmā and does not specify which other divine beings are included. The commentaries usually take this divine world to refer to a number of divinities of ancient Brāhmanical cosmology. *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* 3.26 refers to a cosmology of divinities, which is comparable to Buddhist teachings about correspondences between cosmic divinities and degrees of mastery of meditation. However, in addition to these cosmological gods, there is mention in the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* of a god *īśvara*, which is a particular *puruṣa* (*puruṣaviśeṣa*), but is not an additional principle (*tattva*). Devotion to this *īśvara* (*īśvarapraṇidhāna*) is one of the methods of concentration that leads to salvific liberation.

A second difference is that in the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra*, the mind as a unity is called *citta*, and this concept is not used in the *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, which speaks about intellect (*buddhi*), ego (*ahaṃkāra*), and mind (*manas*). Third, in Sāṃkhya there is a subtle body (*liṅgaśarīra*) that transmigrates at death, while in Yoga *citta* is all-pervasive and immediately takes a new body at the moment of death (Larson

2008: 47). Fourth, in Sāṃkhya, the phenomenology of experience is analyzed into 50 components of the intellectual creation (*pratyayasarga*), whereas Yoga simplifies it into the five *cittavṛttis* (Larson 2008: 47). Fifth, Yoga offers a sophisticated theory of time in terms of moments (*kṣaṇas*) and three perspectives of change (*dharma*, *lakṣaṇa*, and *avasthā*), which it then analyzes in terms of *dharmin* (substratum) – the transformations of *prakṛti*. Sixth, and finally, while the soteriology of Sāṃkhya is based on the reflective discernment of the separateness of *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* (*vijñāna*), “Yoga’s principal concern is with the purposeful strategies, both physical and psychological, to be employed in order to achieve the requisite reflective discernment” (Larson 2008: 50). Yoga seems mostly to accept the Sāṃkhya doctrines, but it elaborates on some aspects of the Sāṃkhya system and especially on a more “sophisticated and detailed theory of awareness based upon ‘altered states of awareness’” (Larson 2008: 51).

At what point in time the terms Sāṃkhya and Yoga came to refer to systems of religious thought is not entirely clear. The *Sāṃkhyakārikā* (350–400 CE) became the foundational text of the system of religious thought called Sāṃkhya,⁵ and in the following centuries, several commentary texts were written on it, but it is noteworthy that the idea of a Yoga system of religious thought separate from Sāṃkhya probably arose very many centuries later. It is indicative that in the eighth-century CE Haribhadra Sūri did not name Yoga as a separate system in his *Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccaya* (Compendium of Six Philosophies). The six systems included were Buddhism, Nyāya, Sāṃkhya, Jainism, Vaiśeṣika, and Mīmāṃsā, enumerated in *śloka* 3 of the text: *bauddham naiyāyikam sāmkyam jainam vaiśeṣikam, jaiminīyam ca nāmāni darśanānāṃ amūnyāho* (*Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccaya* 3, p. 4). Other compendiums that also do not mention Yoga as a separate system of philosophy include Bhavya’s *Madhyamakahr̥daya*, the *Prapañcahr̥daya*, and Śāntaraksita’s *Tattvasaṃgraha* (Bronkhorst 1985). Johannes Bronkhorst has argued that Śāṅkara’s *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* 2.1.3 possibly contained the first recorded use of the term “Yoga” as a name of a philosophical system to refer to Pātañjalayoga (Bronkhorst 1981). Previously, the word *yoga* was perhaps sometimes used to refer to Nyāya. The word *yoga* was used in the *Arthaśāstra* 1.2.10 to mean “logic – the science of reasoning (*yukti*)” (Matilal 1977: 77). *Arthaśāstra* 1.2.10 reads, *sāmkyam yogo lokāyatam ceti ānvīkṣikī*. The terms *sāmkhya*, *yoga* and *lokāyata*⁶ here probably do not refer to systems of philosophy, but to methods. A possible translation of the statement is “enumeration, reasoning and disputation constitute philosophy.”⁷ It was apparently only around the twelfth century CE that Yoga – i.e., Sāṃkhyayoga – was for the first time listed as one of the *darśanas* (Mallinson and Singleton 2017: xxxvi). Before that, Sāṃkhyayoga was most likely so closely identified with Sāṃkhya that it was not considered to constitute a separate system. Both *Sāṃkhyakārikā* and *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* were probably thought to be texts of Sāṃkhya philosophy. In other words, what we today call Pātañjalayoga (or Sāṃkhyayoga or Yoga) seems, for many hundreds of years after the composition of the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra*, to have been known as a cohesive part of Sāṃkhya. We shall see that, according to the Kāpil Math