CHAPTER 3

HISTORY OF SĀṂKHYA-YOGA
The most of religious and philosophical thoughts of India had their origin in the hoary past. There is no evidence about the home and the period of the origin of the Indian philosophical thoughts. Hence a thorough description of origin and development of Indian philosophical system is practically impossible. Apart from this, none of the system stands for uniform doctrine throughout their history.

The Śāṃkhyā philosophy is considered to be the most ancient among the other schools of Indian thought. Yoga, which is generally considered as a branch of Śāṃkhyā, has its theoretical basis in Śāṃkhyā. Due to the non-availability of authentic evidences of Śāṃkhyā and Yoga in the early period, most of the scholarly speculations about the origin of these systems have led to vague hypothesis. It is already mentioned that there is a tendency among the scholars to trace the origin of any discipline to Veda-s or Vedic literature. Śāṃkhyā and Yoga are also not an exemption in this regard. Viśnunabhikṣu, who wrote the most extensive commentary on the Śāṃkhyapravacanasūtra, took great pains to show that Śāṃkhyā has its roots in the Vedas and also that Śāṃkhyā did not conflict with the Vedas. Many of the modern scholars, such as S. N. Dasgupta and A. B. Keith have traced the origin of Śāṃkhyā, in Vedic corpus. With respect to the origin of Śāṃkhyā, says Keith, the
Sāṁkhyā system is most naturally derived out of the speculation in the Veda-s, Brāhmaṇa-s and Upaniṣad-s.¹ We come across mention of the Sāṁkhyā terms such as kapila, pradhāna, guṇa, puruṣa, prakṛti etc., are in Veda-s and Upaniṣad-s.

Vedic Origin of Sāṁkhyā-Yoga

Here is a brief outline of Vedic and Upaniṣadic references wherein the roots of Sāṁkhyā-Yoga are said to be found.

The dualistic thought of Sāṁkhyā system can be found in the early Vedic hymns. For example, the distinction between consciousness and materiality is foreshadowed in the Nāsadīyasūkta of RV, where creation said to occur not through the intervention of some deity but through the arising desire (kāma) and the transforming process of tapas. Such formative influences can also be discerned in early dualistic cosmogonies such as integration of puruṣa and virāṭ in the Puruṣasūkta or in the Hiranyagarbha of RV.

Among the Upaniṣad-s the Chāndogya mentions the triguna-s which perhaps might have led to the development of Sāṁkhyā concepts.² The Kaṭhopaniṣad refers to categories of matter as it appears in Sāṁkhyā.

In the Kaṭha verse-
one finds *puruṣa* and immortality described in a way which resembles later *Sāmkhya* thoughts.

The *Śvetāśvatara* *Upaniṣad* refers to *Sāmkhya* and its founder figure Kapila by name.³ It also mentions a number of *Sāmkhya* terms such as *vyakta*, *avyakta*, *jīna*, *pradhāna*, *prakṛti* and *guna*.⁴ In addition to it, there are speculations on *ātman*. There the *puruṣa* and *ātman* are said to be identical. Some other *Upaniṣadic* passages describes *ātman* in a more philosophical way,⁵ such as description of the chariot in the *Kathopaniṣad* employs a number of *Sāmkhya* terms, is a description of the disciplined *yogin*.⁶

Almost all *Upaniṣad*-s deal with the theory and practice of *Yoga*, in some forms or other, without mentioning the direct word *Yoga*, however, a detailed description of *Yoga* appears in the *Kaṭha*, *Śvetāśvatara* and *Maitrīyaṇī* *Upaniṣad*-s. Among them the *Śvetāśvatara* *Upaniṣad* is regarded as the most authentic work on *Yoga*, as it mentions the essence of yogic practices and their philosophical underpinnings. But the concept of *Yoga* of these texts may be different from those mentioned in the *YS* of
Patañjali. Thus it seems that during the Vedic or Upaniṣadic period Sāṃkhyā and Yoga have not emerged as an independent cognizable system of philosophy.

Certainly, it is very difficult to conclude that the system Sāṃkhyā-Yoga was originated from the Vedic phase. Because what is significant is that all these references to Sāṃkhyā-like terms in the Veda-s and Upaniṣads were meant largely the metaphysical dialects or spiritual methodologies, but not a philosophical system named Sāṃkhyā and Yoga. But those references were employed by the scriptures in their own context, carrying their own interpretation and to suggest a group of practices and attitudes with emphasize on the importance of self discipline and meditation in order to attain liberation. 'However, [...] these passages contain some of the typical terminologies of Samkhya philosophy', says Chattopadhyaya, 'the real purpose of mentioning them in the Upanisads is for either rejecting them outright or proclaiming the superiority of the Upanisadic view over Samkhya'. It is also likely that such terms or thought of Sāṃkhyā and Yoga at a later stage, got assimilated into what is known later as Sāṃkhyā or Yoga systems. Apart from this, the Sāṃkhyā-Yoga system has a non-Vedic origin also which needs a serious attention.
Non-Vedic Origin of Śāmkhya-Yoga: Some Speculations

Some scholars, like H. Zimmer and John Marshall oppose the theory of Vedic origin of Śāmkhya-Yoga and they trace its origin to pre-Vedic times along with Tantrism and conclude that the classical Śāmkhya-Yoga is remarkably independent from orthodox brahmanical tradition. The discovery of the remnants of the Indus Valley Civilization that existed in India around 2500-1500 B.C. has proved a line of its transmission to Indian thoughts.

The agriculturally rooted concept of the productive union of Sky-God and the Earth-Goddess appears in Indus Valley culture, the connection between the immaterial and immobile fertiliser and the active powerful, material fertile principle of Indus cult may have represented the prakṛti and puruṣa concept of Śāmkhya system and Śiva and Śakti of Tantrism. The system of Yoga was also widespread even in the pre-Vedic times. It is evident from the seals of Śiva and seated in Yogic posture unearthed during the archaeological excavations of Mohenjo-Daro and Harappa. Some rudimentary forms of Yoga also existed even during this civilization. This suggests strongly that the Yoga tradition owes much to the pre-Vedic culture. Both the agrarian theology of Śiva and Śakti and Yoga do not appear in the Veda-s. Thus the classical Śāmkhya-Yoga
seems to have a different origin than that of orthodox brahmanical
tradition.

Chattopadhyaya observes that the original Sāṃkhya is an
elaboration of the Tantric ideologies. He also claims the origin of
Sāṅkhya along with pre-class life of the agricultural matriarchal peoples.¹⁰
N. N. Bhattacharyya also traces the roots of Sāṃkhya into ancient
matriarchal society. He says:

In a female-dominated society there is always a problem
regarding the position of the male or the husband [. . .]. Ilere
the mother is the head and the only bond of union of the
family. The father has no kinship with his children, who refer
to him curtly as a begetter. The role of husband in a female-
dominated society perhaps finds its expression in the Sāṅkhya
philosophy. Just as in such a society the child has no real
kinship with the father, so also the world, in spite of its
production by the union of Puruṣa and Prakṛti, has no real
relation with the former.¹¹

Textual Evidences

Some internal evidences also show that Sāṃkhya-Yoga originated
from the non-Vedic concepts. There are some factors which distinguish
the Śāṁkhyā from Veda-s. Śāṁkhyā system, on the contrary to Vedic line of thoughts, refused to speculate on God and rejected the scriptures and rituals as means for fulfilment of human desires. Focusing this atheistic nature of Śāṁkhyā scholars labelled it as belonging to non-Vedic category. The very first two kārīka-s of Īśvarakṛṣṇa's SK shows that the rejection of Veda-s and their ritualistic tradition, Chattopadhyaya's observations are noteworthy in this regard. They are as follows:

1. The remedies for suffering suggested by Veda are no better than those actually observed in ordinary life, e.g. the remedies suggested by medical science.

2. The Vedic remedies are marked by three defects. They are (a) impure (b) merely temporary and (c) marked by excess.

3. The knowledge that Samkhya stands for is the very opposite of Vedic remedies. [...] because the text clearly says tat-viparitah [sic] (the opposite of that).\textsuperscript{13}

Another important point is that the effect in Śāṁkhyā, regarding the theory of satkāryavāda, is the real transformation of the cause.\textsuperscript{13} The primal cause in Śāṁkhyā is the prakṛti, the primordial matter. Hence whatever exists in the universe, according to Śāṁkhyā, is the result of the
transformation of the primal cause prakṛti. Sāṃkhya also used the term pradhāna as the synonym of prakṛti. It is recognized that in Sāṃkhya the prakṛti is more important than puruṣa. This concept is also alludes to the social condition of the pre-Vedic matriarchal society, where puruṣa achieved only a subordinate position.

Similarly, the prakṛti is also compared with a dancing girl in classical Sāṃkhya.

रस्खय दर्शित्या निवर्तते नर्तकीं यथा गुरुयात्
पुरुषय तथात्मानं प्रकाश्य विविधतं प्रेरितं।।

(SK. 59)

Pointing out this SK verse D. P. Chattopadhyaya says 'It might have had some ritual significance'.

Śaṅkarācārya also had strongly argued and proved that Sāṃkhya clearly shows the anti-Vedic trends, in his Brahmāsūtrabhāṣya. Among the sūtra-s of Brahmāsūtra, 60 directly and more than 30 indirectly point to non-Vedic nature of Sāṃkhya system. Śaṅkarācārya says that 'the Sāṃkhya views were not substantiated either by the Veda-s or by ordinary experiences'. According to Richard Garbe, 'Sāṃkhya-Yoga is a kṣatriya philosophy'. He cites some of the evidences for proving the origin of Sāṃkhya-Yoga in the kṣatriya circles. They are as follows:
(a) in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa* (III, XXI, 26) Kapila is to
descend from Rājarṣi;

(b) the Buddha refers to the doctrine of Sanatkumāra who is
connected in the tradition of the Kṣatriyas, on the one
hand, and Sāṃkhya-Yoga, on the other;

(c) a passage in the *Mokṣadharma* sets forth five traditions:

Vedic, Sāṃkhya, Yoga, Pāṇcarātra and Pāṣupata.\(^{16}\)

Traditionally the authorship of *Sāṃkhya* is attributed to Kapila.

There are a number of conflicting myths associated with Kapila. *RV*
refers to him as one of the ten Aṅgirasa-s. The Aṅgirasa-s, who were
associated with Yati-s, the ascetic preceptors of non-Aryan culture, are
also said to have practiced *yoga* and *dhyāna*.\(^{17}\) According to
*Bhāgavatapurāṇa*, his parents were Devahūti and Kardamamuni.\(^{18}\)

B. Bhattacharya opines that - 'This tradition of relating Kapila to Devahūti
and Kardama speaks of times much more ancient than the Aryan
immigration'.\(^{19}\) Heinrich Zimmer also states that, 'Sāṅkhya is said to have
been founded by a semi-mythical holy man, Kapila, who stands outside
the traditional assembly of the Vedic saints and sages, as an Enlightened
One in his own right'.\(^{20}\) 'Sāṅkhya', says H. Zimmer, 'is referred to in the
Buddhist Pāli Canon, and Buddhist legends mention Kapila as one of the predecessors of the Buddha.\textsuperscript{21}

Besides this, many scholars have admitted that Sāṃkhya shows marked tendencies of pre-Buddhist school. Heinrich Zimmer observes four marked features of Sāṃkhya which appears in Buddhism: 'an insistence that all life is, necessarily, suffering; an indifference to theism and to Vedic sacrificial ritualism; a denunciation of ascetic extravagances (as represented, for example, in Jainism); and a belief in \textit{parināma-nityatva}, "the constant becoming of the world".\textsuperscript{22}

The Buddhist writer Āśvaghosa, in his \textit{Buddhacarita}, speaks of Sāṃkhya taught as one of the influential teaching learned by Buddha on his way to enlightenment. This suggests that the Sāṃkhya was in existence prior to the time of Buddha. In addition to it, all the other systems of philosophies including Buddhism have arisen as an antagonistic movement against Sāṃkhya and the Sāṃkhya stands itself as not influenced by any other system.

All these references show that it is very difficult to link the origin of Sāṃkhya-Yoga as it belongs to any specific tradition, i.e., Vedic or non-Vedic. Hence it is certain that Sāṃkhya is indebted in its origin to various philosophical speculations and it had its own course of
developments. 'What is much more likely is' as G. J. Larson says, 'that Śāṅkhya is a derivative and composite system, a product of a wide variety of speculations from a wide variety of contexts, both orthodox and heterodox'. If so, the system of Śāṅkhya-Yoga is precise rational and logical and hence it does not seem to have its origin in Vedic culture. Thus it can be said that the essential principles of Śāṅkhya-Yoga are much older than any other of Vedic ideologies. The ideals of Śāṅkhya-Yoga that appears in Veda-s or Vedic literature may be a result of the assimilation of the non-Vedic culture into the Vedic culture. Hence it is certain that Śāṅkhya-Yoga was not Vedic at least in its initial phase.

Śāṅkhya-Yoga literature

Śāṅkhya-Yoga has a rich textual tradition. So it would be better to have a discussion on classical works on Śāṅkhya-Yoga to have a clear understanding of the ancient history of the system.

1. Śāṅkhya Literature

Śāṅkhyasūtra of Kapila and Sk of Īśvarakṛṣṇa are the two most celebrated works on Śāṅkhya system. Besides these two works, their commentaries are also helpful to determine the nature and history of
Śāmkhya. Some of them are trying to fill the gap in the literary continuity of Śāmkhya from Pañcasikha to Īsvarakṛṣṇa.

Śāmkhyasūtra

Śāmkhyasūtra was not known until it was commented upon by Aniruddha in 15th century A.D. Mādhava (13th-14th century A.D.), the author of Sarvarāṣanasāṅgraha, and Guṇaratna (14th century A.D.), the commentator of Saḍdarśanasamuccaya, do not refer to it. Hence it seems that the treatise Śāmkhyasūtra was probably composed some time after the 14th century A.D.

Śāmkhyasūtra consists of six chapters and 526 or 527 sūtra-s. Certainly its sūtra-style points to an old tradition. The period from 2nd century A.D. is marked by the emergence of various philosophical literature in sūtra-style. But the first three books of Śāmkhyasūtra follow the order as well as the style of language of the SK. This probably suggests that the Śāmkhyasūtra is a mere recording of SK in sūtra-style. Besides these, many philosophical ideas of 1st and 5th book of Śāmkhyasūtra are also appear to be showing the characteristics of the later period. Hence it is more safe to conclude that these were collected from some earlier Śāmkhyasūtra which is now irrecoverably lost. All these references assign Śāmkhyasūtra to a very later period and usually
considered that SK is the most ancient systematic work on this system.

Some important commentaries are given in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commentaries</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aniruddhavṛtti or Śāṃkhyasūtravṛtti</td>
<td>Aniruddha</td>
<td>15th Cen. A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śāṃkhyapravacanabhaṣya</td>
<td>Vijñānabhikṣu</td>
<td>16th Cen. A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śāṃkhyavṛttisāra</td>
<td>Mahādevaśāstri</td>
<td>17th Cen. A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laghusāṃkhyasūtravṛtti</td>
<td>Nāgoji Bhaṭṭa</td>
<td>17th Cen. A.D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table-1.3.1)

Śāṃkhyakārikā

It is already mentioned that the first attempt of systematization of philosophy was presented in the form of śūtra-s. But on the contrary the SK, an earlier fundamental text on Śāṃkhyā system, was composed in the form of verses. Controversy exists regarding the date of Īśvarakṛṣṇa, the author of SK. From various discussions of the problem the resulting impression is that composition of SK of Īśvarakṛṣṇa could have taken place anytime between 2nd cen. to 5th century. A.D.25
The work SK comprises 72 kārika-s in āryā metre. The kārika has been transmitted with varying number of verses. The author himself refers to his work as Saptati, so it is presumed that the original SK had precisely seventy verses. The commentaries like Mātharavṛtti reads 73 verses, Gauḍapāda's commentary enumerates 72 verses and comments only the first 69 verses, and the other commentaries like Yuktidīpikā, Jayamaṅgalā and Sāṃkhyatattvakaumudi (STK) are found to have 72 verses. Foremost commentaries on SK are tabulated here.

**Commentaries on Sāṃkhyakārikā**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commentaries</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yuktidīpikā</td>
<td>Unknown authorship</td>
<td>5th-6th Cen. A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauḍapādabhāṣya</td>
<td>Gauḍapāda</td>
<td>7th-8th Cen. A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mātharavṛtti</td>
<td>Māthara</td>
<td>7th Cen. A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāṃkhyatattvakaumudi</td>
<td>Vācaspatimiśra</td>
<td>9th Cen. A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayamaṅgalā</td>
<td>Śaṅkarārya</td>
<td>14th Cen. A.D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table- I.3.2)

**Historical Review of Sāṃkhyā based on Sāṃkhyakārikā**

A question may be raised why SK is selected for tracing the history of Sāṃkhyā not Sāṃkhyasūtra. The sūtra-s, as observed by
Erich Frauwallner 'are the result of a long development and contain elements coming out of entirely different times. They, therefore, cannot be looked upon as testimony for a particular fixed stage of development.' In contrast, the kārīka-s 'could not be so easily changed and supplemented with additions, because the personal peculiarity or the style of the author could find expression in them to a certain degree.' Hence it is more reasonable to work out the history of Sāmkhya on the basis of SK. SK, is the most ancient codified treatises on Sāmkhya system, also represents the classical tradition of Sāmkhya.

Of the kārīka-s first two and the last four provide some clues on the nature and history of early Sāmkhya system. According to SK, the ancient phase of evolution and formulation of Sāmkhya system much indebted to three mythical personalities namely, Kapila, Āsuri and Pañcaśikha. Īśvarakṛṣṇa does not mention Kapila by name but refers to him as Paramarṣi and Muni. According to him, the system of Sāmkhya was believed to be the secret system of knowledge in ancient times and the sage Kapila duly expounded this secret knowledge to Āsuri out of compassion. Āsuri in turn, taught it to Pañcaśikha, by whom this doctrine was propounded extensively. It shows that besides these three scholars there were others but they would not leave their mark on this tradition.
Further he claims that this doctrine gained popularity through a ‘śisyaparamparā’. It also shows that there was a long tradition of Śāṁkhyā. But he does not give much detail about his teachers or others. He also makes a pointed reference to Śaśṭitantra and claims that he is privileged to have restored his ancient stream of Śāṁkhyā. In the last verse of SK, which is found in Mātharavritti, the author claims that his presentation is not defective in its meaning, because it is a mirror like reflection of Śaśṭitantra.

तस्मात्समासाबृह्तं शास्त्रामिदं नार्तमतः पतित्वीतम्

तन्त्रमेत् ब्रूहन्वृतमेव अनाम्नितम्बिम्बम् ॥

He also states that the subjects which are treated here are the very subjects mentioned in the Śaśṭitantra. Here the doubt arises whether the referred work is the original one or the redaction of Śaśṭitantra? Īśvarakṛṣṇa states that his work is a summary of siddhānta. Thus it is clear that he epitomizes the whole principles which are enunciated in the Śaśṭitantra in 72 verses. Again he states that he has avoided referring to the ākhyāyika-s and paravāda-s. This shows that there were different versions of Śāṁkhyā before Īśvarakṛṣṇa.
Shaṭitantra

Īṣvarakṛṣṇa refers to Shaṭitantra, which is found to be an earlier exposition of Sāṁkhya, as also a major source of SK. It is not certain whether the word Shaṭitantra refers to a work or it simply implies to the composition of sixty different topics. According to the Chinese translation of Paramārtha the Shaṭitantra is of sixty thousand verses, but Jayamaṅgalā states that it has only sixty chapters. Vācaspatimiśra, while quoting Rājavartika, enumerates the sixty topics in his STK, which is a commentary on SK. A different account of the content of Shaṭitantra is found in a Pāṉcarātra text named Ahirbuddhnyasaṁhitā which also enlists the sixty topics of Shaṭitantra. It means Shaṭitantra was not a small work but was a work of greater importance.

It is already pointed out that the authorship of the work is still a matter of controversy. According to SK, Kapila was the author of Shaṭitantra. Viṃānabhikṣu also explicitly stated that Sāṁkhya-pravacanasūtra or Shaṭitantra is the work of Kapila. The verse:

सांख्यरूपं संकल्पने बैष्णवः कपिलाद्योः
ढीतिव्यादृशः पूवे तादृशं श्रणू मेधसञ्जिलोः
शष्टिनां स्पृहल तनं सांख्यं नाम महापुरोः
of *Ahirbudhnyasamhitā* of *Pañcaratra* school also suggests that Kapila was the author of *Saṣṭitāntra*. But the *Jayamaṅgalā* commentary ascribed its authorship to Pañcaśikha\(^{38}\) and Vācaspatimīśra in his commentary on *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya*, holds the view that Vārṣagāṇya was the author of *Saṣṭitāntra*.\(^{39}\) In spite of these, *Māṭharavṛtti* and *Gauḍapādabhāṣya* quote a passage from *Saṣṭitāntra*,\(^{40}\) which is a prose whereas *Yogasūtrabhāṣya* (*Y.Bh*) also quote a *sāstra* but that is in metrical style.\(^{41}\) Vācaspatimīśra equates the *sāstra* with *Saṣṭitāntra*.\(^{42}\) Taking all the above clues into consideration 'it appears that' says Pulinbihari Chakravarti, 'the nucleus of Sāṃkhya was formulated by Kapila and it was Pañcaśikha who propagated the system into a huge treatise of verse. Later on, Vārṣagāṇya thought it necessary to re-write the text of Pañcaśikha and as a result of this, the original text of verse became an admixture of prose and verse.\(^{43}\)

Vācaspatimīśra classifies this work into the category of *Yoga*. In the *Y.Bh*, he explains the verse 'गुणानां परमं रूपं न दृष्टिप्रमुखति' and says that it is a verse from *Saṣṭitāntra*.\(^{44}\) The work *Saṣṭitāntra*, as per *Ahirbudhnyasamhitā*, contains two book *prāktamaṇḍala* and *vaikṛtamaṇḍala* of 32 and 28 chapters respectively.\(^{45}\) This sort of divergent accounts shows the possibility of having one more *Sāṃkhya*
work bearing the same title  Saśṭitantra. Dasgupta suggests the possibility that there were two Saśṭitantra-s.\textsuperscript{46} These references point to the possibility that there are two Saśṭitantra-s one atheistic and the other theistic in nature. The disparity between the two accounts of Saśṭitantra suggests that the original Saśṭitantra as referred to in the Ahirbudhnyasamhitā was consequently revised and changed. Later Guṇaratna speaks of Saśṭitantroddhāra, a revised version of Saśṭitantra, in his Tarkarahasyadīpikā.\textsuperscript{47} Concerning the theistic one, the details of which are lost but is kept in a modified form by Patañjala school of Sāmkhya. In other words there is a possibility that the earlier Saśṭitantra i.e., the atheistic one, was lost even before Vācaspatimisra's time. It can be concluded, as suggested by J. N. Sinha, that Saśṭitantra was a manual of the Sāmkhya-Yoga, and not the classical atheistic Sāmkhya system.\textsuperscript{48}

Kapila

Kapila is known as founder of the Sāmkhya system of thought. Some references to Kapila are found in Veda-s as well as in other ancient Sanskrit works. He is first mentioned in Śvetāśvataropanisad which is an early text to deal with some Sāmkhya principles.\textsuperscript{49} While the first mention of Kapila as a founder of the Sāmkhya philosophy is to be found in the Mokṣadharmaparvan of Śāntiparvan of Mahābhārata.\textsuperscript{50} The traditional
Hindu scriptures add some additional attributes such as *Mānasaputra* of Brahma, incarnation of Viṣṇu, incarnation of īśā etc., to Kapila. He is also said to be belonging to the clan of Gautama ṛṣi. The *Bhagavadgītā* depicts him as a Siddha, who endowed with spiritual powers. 'सिद्धानां
कपिलो मुनि'।

Īśvarakṛṣṇa in his *SK* refers to Kapila as Paramarṣī. So it is obvious that he was held in the highest position and his philosophy was highly influential. But scholars have been arguing whether Kapila was really a mythical or historical figure. Says Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, 'While these accounts are mythical, it may be accepted that a historical individual of the name of Kapila was reasonable for the Sāṃkhya tendency of thought'.

Īśvarakṛṣṇa does not give such references to Kapila's works. Tradition ascribes the authorship of *Sāṃkhyaśūtra* or *Sāṃkhya-pravacanasūtra* and *Tattvasamāsā* to Kapila. On the basis of *SK* it seems that there is no such work in the name of Kapila rather he would have transmitted his ideas orally to Āsuri.

**Āsuri**

Āsuri is supposed to be the first ever known disciple of Kapila. According to *Māṭhavṛtā*, he was a household Brahmīn and the 'Āsuri' was his clan name. *SK* only mentions that Āsuri received the *Sāṃkhya* system from Kapila and passed it to Pañcaśikha. This would also suggest
that there is no evidence of any text composed by him. But 
Śaṅdarśanasamuccaya of Haribhadrasūri and Tarkarahasyadīpikā of 
Gaṇaratna quote the verse:

विविक्ते दृष्टिपरिणति बुद्धी भोगोप्रेय चतुष्टये ।
प्रितिबिम्बोदय: स्वच्छे वथा चन्द्रमस्तोऽक्षरसि ॥

under the name of Āsuri.

Pañcaśikha

According to SK, Pañcaśikha was the third in the lineage of the 
Śaṅkhya teachers. He marks the end of the period of proto-Śaṅkhya 
tradition. As in the case of Kapila and Āsuri, the history of Pañcaśikha is 
lost in antiquity. The ancient literature shows him as a revered teacher of 
both of the tradition of Śaṅkhya and Yoga. The Brhadāraṇyakopaniṣad 
enlists a Pañcaśikha as being one among the five great teachers - Upaveśi, 
Aruṇa, Uddālaka, Yājñavalkya, Āsuri and Pañcaśikha.54 However, 
Mahābhārata counts Pañcaśikha as a historical personage and also 
elaborately depicted his teachings on Śaṅkhya. In the Epic, he is often 
addressed as Kāpileya.55 It suggests that he came from the lineage of 
Kāpila. And the verse-

परासरगोरृख्य वृद्धस्य सम्बन्धम् ।
suggests that Parāśara is an ancestral name of Paṇcaśikha. Paṇcaśikha, according to SK, expanded the Sāṁkhya doctrines at a greater length. It is said 'तैन च बहुधा कृतं तन्त्रम्'.\(^5\) The commentary, Jayamaṅgalā reads it as 'पञ्चशिखानेन मूलिना बहुधा कृतं तन्त्रम्'. The word 'tantra' not only indicates Śaṣṭiśantra, as an early source of Sāṁkhya, but also the possibility of the name of the text of Paṇcaśikha, also known as Śaṣṭiśantra. And also he is considered to be the first one to systemize the Sāṁkhya as a philosophical system.

It is observed that Paṇcaśikha's teaching of Sāṁkhya is elaborately discussed in Mokṣadharmaparvan of Mahābhārata, which is similar to that of CS. Moreover Caraka's account of Sāṁkhya is also connected with the views of Arāḍa, particularly given in Buddhacarita.\(^5\) It becomes clear that the earliest and lengthy version of Sāṁkhya is seen scattered in Mahābhārata, Buddhacarita and also in CS. It is to be noted that they are not a systematic work on Sāṁkhya. Though the dates of these works are uncertain all of them are placed chronologically prior to SK.
2. **Yoga Literature**

Indian philosophies mainly focus on the removal of fundamental causes of human suffering. *Sāmkhya* thoroughly diagnosed the root cause of human misery and the *Yoga* emphasises on removing the root cause of sufferings and restoring the human consciousness by practical methods. 'Yoga is not exactly a philosophical system'; says Daya Krishna, 'rather it is an applied philosophy or a praxis rooted in a theoretical diagnostics of the human situation'. The *YS* of Patañjali is the only fundamental work of this system.

**Yogasūtra**

The first exposition of systematization of techniques and theories of *Yoga* can be found in *YS* of Patañjali. It forms a part of the corpus of *sūtra* literature. It deals with the previous and contemporary *Yoga* practices in 196 *sūtra*-s or aphorisms. The text is divided into four sections known as *pāda*-s, viz., 1. *Samādhipāda*, describes the stages, obstacles and the theory of *samādhi*; 2. *Sādhanāpāda*, narrates *Yoga* practices; 3. *Vibhūtipāda*, enumerates the benefits of *Yoga* practice; and 4. *Kāivalyapāda*, deals with the metaphysical aspects of *Yoga*. The first three sections dealing with *Yoga* elements while the last section levels criticism against the Buddhist tenets. Similarly the term 'śī', which
denotes the conclusion of a work, appears at the end of the third as well as the fourth pāda. Pointing out these evidences Dasgupta remarks: 'There is of course another "irr" at the end of the fourth chapter to denote the conclusion of the whole work. The most legitimate hypothesis seems to be that the last chapter is a subsequent addition by a hand other than that of Patañjali [. . .]'.\textsuperscript{55} This final chapter has been assigned to the 5th century A.D.\textsuperscript{66} Dasgupta and H. Zimmer hold that the date of first three pāda-s of YS to 2nd century A.D.\textsuperscript{81} Based on the available evidence at hand, Ian Whicher, arrived at a conclusion that the YS is a product of the 2nd or the 3rd century A.D.\textsuperscript{62} Some important commentaries on YS are given in the following table.

**Commentaries on Yogasūtra**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commentaries</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vyāsabhāṣya</td>
<td>Vyāsa</td>
<td>4\textsuperscript{th} Cen. A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tattvavaiśāradī</td>
<td>Vācaspatimāśra</td>
<td>9\textsuperscript{th} Cen. A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājamārtanda</td>
<td>Bhoja</td>
<td>10\textsuperscript{th} Cen. A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yogavārtika &amp; Yogasārasaṅgraha</td>
<td>Vijñānabhikṣu</td>
<td>16\textsuperscript{th} Cen. A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yogasūtravṛtti</td>
<td>Nāgoji Bhaṭṭa</td>
<td>17\textsuperscript{th} Cen. A.D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table- I.3.3)
Patañjali: the Author of Yogasūtra

According to the Indian tradition the authorship of YS and the great grammatical composition Mahābhāṣya are attributed to Patañjali. But the scholars have been unable to ascertain whether both Patañjalis are identical or different. An identical remark of Patañjali of YS with the Patañjali of Mahābhāṣya was first made by Bhoja in the introductory stanza of his commentary work Rājamārtanda.

शच्चानुशासन विद्वक्ता पातालजल कुवृता
बृह्ति राजमुगाकसंस्कारदिपि व्यालन्तविता रङ्गरक।
वाक्यानवपुष्पां मलं फणिश्वतां पञ्चव प्रोकोस्वतः
सतस्य श्रीरणरसंगमल्लण्यतोच्चो जयवन्ते।।

Victory is to be the luminous words of what illustrious sovereign Raṇarāṇīgamalla, who by creating his grammar, by writing his commentary on the Patañjala (text on YS) and by producing a work on medicine called Rājamṛgāṅka, has like Patañjali removed defilement from speech, mind and body.

But there is no reference in Mahābhāṣya to the authorship of YS. Similarly YS also does not mention about the authorship of Mahābhāṣya. In Mahābhārata, Vyāsa states that Hiraṇyagarbha was the founder of this
Yoga system. Gaudapada in his commentary on SK quotes YS and states that Patañjali as the author. The Rājamārtanda verse also hints one of the other fields of Patañjali that is medicine. Another reference to Patañjali as he was the author of three treatises is found in the Ayu, Dī commentary of Cakrapāṇīn on CS:

पातालमहायात्मकसंस्कारंसमासंस्कृते |
मनो वाक्यायदेवाय सहस्रप्रतिनिधिनां समावेशाय नाम: ||

(Intro. 4)

Tradition also believes that Patañjali is the incarnation of Śeṣa. On the other hand Bhāvamītra, the author of Bhāvaprakāśa, opines that Caraka was an incarnation of Śeṣa. The central idea of revival and development of Yoga appears to be in the direction of its exploitation as a health science. Such references lead to the conclusion among the scholars that Caraka and Patañjali were the same. Certainly Caraka and Patañjali are not one and the same person. Because medical preceptor Patañjali is to be considered as an alchemist. But Caraka referred to alchemy only once in CS. Similarly several aspects of Yoga that described in Mahābhārata are found in CS. But it has no similarity with the YS of Patañjali. Hence it is more safe to say that both Patañjali and Caraka were authors of treatises on Yoga, Grammar and Medicine.
Moreover, the word 'amūśāsana' in the first sûtra of YS also shows that the tradition of Yoga existed before Patañjali. Ian Whicher explains the term thus: 'amūśāsana means to teach that which has been taught before within an existing tradition, not claiming that anything new has been created by the author'.\(^{67}\) Hence it should be clear that Patañjali merely codified the system in his YS. Vācaspatimisra and Vijñānabhikṣu also admit the view that he is not an inventor of Yoga system but a compiler of what was best in the Yoga practice and knowledge of his period. S. N. Dasgupta is of the opinion that Patañjali has given the argument relating to Yoga in the sûtra form in the work YS. According to him, Patañjali is 'an editor'.\(^{58}\) Dasgupta again states that the YS of Patañjali 'do not show any original attempt, but a masterly and systematic compilation which was also supplemented by fitting contributions'.\(^{59}\) Thus Patañjali is only the author of the text YS not the founder of Yoga system.

Yuktidīpikā, the commentary on SK, suggests that Patañjali was among the early Sāmkhya teachers.\(^{70}\) The system of Patañjali is also known as Pātañjalasāmkhya and Sāmkhyapravacana. It shows his contribution to Sāmkhya system. Thus it can be concluded that Patañjali systematized the concepts of Yoga and set them forth on the background of the metaphysics of Sāmkhya.
All these references give strong indication that the Yoga system was codified at the early phase of Buddhism and its elements are to be found in the non-philosophical works like Mahābhārata, Buddhacarita and CS, where the Yoga is not identified as an independent philosophical system.

**Early Speculation of Sāṃkhya-Yoga**

From the above critical analysis, in accordance with the classical works of Sāṃkhya and Yoga it is understood that some speculations of Sāṃkhya-Yoga are also found in Mokṣadharma-parvan of Mahābhārata, Buddhacarita and the CS.

**Mahābhārata**

Mokṣadharma-parvan of Mahābhārata, which comprises the chapters 168-353 of the Śāntiparvan, is mostly dealing with the Sāṃkhyā principles. It summarizes the teachings of Paṇcaśikha, who is regarded as the direct disciple of Āsurī. But several principles in Mokṣadharma portion are by no means identical with the SK which is a true representative of the classical Sāṃkhyā system. A. B. Keith also observes the Sāṃkhyā portion of Mokṣadharma is an exposition of early Sāṃkhyā.
He notes: 'there is no real evidence that the Sāṃkhya philosophy existed as a complete whole as early as the period of the epic [. . .].'^{71}

While tracing Mahābhārata verses, XII. 318, S. N. Dasgupta, points out that it mentions three schools of Sāṃkhya.\(^{72}\) First, those who accept twenty-four tattva-s. It bears similarity with the school of Caraka. Here according to Pañcaśikha, avyakta is puṇīṣāvasthā, i.e., the ultimate truth is one - the avyakta is the state of puruṣa. The second school accepts twenty-five tattva-s. It is regarded as the orthodox school of classical Sāṃkhya philosophy that advocates a strict dualism, i.e., puruṣa and prakṛti are two separate entities. This does not mean that classical Sāṃkhya developed after the formulation of Mokṣadharma-parvan. The third school believes in twenty-six tattva-s. Here Īśvara is also accepted in addition to puruṣa. This agrees with the view of orthodox Yoga system were the existence Īśvara is accepted. But this twenty-sixth principle is different from that of Īśvara in the YS. According to Lallanji Gopal, there were no such schools believing in twenty-four, twenty-five and twenty-six categories. He observes as: 'The passages actually refer to the twenty-fourth, twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth categories'.\(^{73}\) 'What they denounce is', says L. Gopal, 'the limited knowledge possessed by the twenty-fourth
and twenty-fifth categories, as contrasted with that by the twenty-sixth category.^

Various scholars do not accept the Mahābhārata as an authentic source to trace the origin of Śāṅkhyā-Yoga. F. H. Johnston says:

The teaching in the epic is of a semi popular character and is not given with the precision of statement which would be expected of a formal treatise on philosophy. Further it covers a considerable period to time and emanates from many different writers and from several schools; naturally therefore there is discordance between different passages. But frequent ambiguity and lack of consistency do not prove that these epic descriptions are not to be taken seriously.^

Pulinbihari Chakravarti also recognizes that the Epic Śāṅkhyā does not tally with Īśvarakṛṣṇa's account of Śāṅkhyā. He observes two similarities in them, viz., representing the atheistic view as devoid of the faith in god and describing the organs as material objects.^

He also opines that in Epic the Śāṅkhyā and Yoga together form Śāṅkhyā-Yoga complex.
Mokṣadhrmaparvan also refers to a collection of Sāmkhya literature and a long list of Sāmkhya teachers, such as Vasiṣṭha, Janaka, Yājñavalkya, Jaigīsavya, Asita-devala etc. They seem to be belonging to the period between Pañcaśikha and Īśvarakṛṣṇa. From the evidences furnished by Mahābhārata it is very difficult to find the chronological sequence of these teachers. But it is an accepted fact that the Mahābhārata is not a unified collection of a single authorship. Mokṣadhrmaparvan also might have been inserted into Mahābhārata in later date. This leads us to think that possibly the Sāmkhya teachings referred in the Epic may not be their original version.

Buddhacarita

An analysis of the Buddhacarita's account of Sāmkhya principles reveals that there had been a well-defined and systematic speculation of Sāmkhya-Yoga system. Āsvaghoṣa (1st-2nd century A.D.), the author, cullogises and enumerates the Sāmkhya philosophy through the mouth of a preceptor named Arāda, who belonged to the pre-Buddha period. Though the term Sāmkhya has not been mentioned in the book, the name Kapila is clearly mentioned. But any of the scholars like A. B. Keith and S. N. Dasgupta have not shown much interest to evaluate Sāmkhya accounts in Buddhacarita. F. H. Johnston and P. B. Chakravarti hold the
views that there are close similarities between Āsvaghoṣa, Caraka and Pañcaśikha. G. J. Larson finds some similarities between Buddhacarita and Mokṣadharmaparvan. And he says that 'Āsvaghoṣa's treatment probably represents a somewhat later version of the kinds of speculation found in Caraka-Pañcaśikha'. Although, the three versions are influenced by a common tradition, there are some differences. Larson noticed some differences among them: (i) the Caraka-Pañcaśikha complex is more monistic (with twenty-four principles) whereas the Buddhacarita is more clearly dualistic (with twenty-five principles). (ii) the Caraka-Pañcaśikha complex recognizes a doctrine of guṇa-s (as psychic qualities) whereas Āsvaghoṣa does not refer to the guṇa-s.

Carakasamhitā

There is no any authentic reference to CS as a Śāmkhya text. But the only reference available is that of Guṇaratna who mentions Ātreyatantra as a Śāmkhya text in his commentary on Saṅgarṣanāsāmnucayā. It is already noted that CS is a redaction of Ātreyatantra. Therefore it can be said that Caraka's work may be either a part of the whole of the lost Śāmkhya work the Ātreyatantra, S. N. Dasgupta, P. B. Chakravarti and G. J. Larson have taken great
pains to trace Sāṃkhya elements in CS for reconstructing the Sāṃkhya
history.

In CS the term Sāṃkhya indicate either as an epithet of a
knowledgeable teacher along with Yoga as the name for a philosophical
system. It is said that Sāṃkhya elements of CS resembles very much
Pañcaśikha's teaching of Sāṃkhya which is found in Mokṣadharmaparvan
of Mahābhārata. Several aspects of Yoga teaching of Mahābhārata also
found in CS but it is not similar to the system of Pātañjala yoga. It seems
that Caraka also belonged to the line of tradition to which Pañcaśikha,
Āsuri and Kapila belonged. P. B. Chakravarti tied Caraka and Aṣvaghoṣa
in one thread and suggests that both of them had received knowledge on
Sāṃkhya from a common source.87

There are some problems while reconstructing the history of
Sāṃkhya-Yoga on the basis of the analysis of those elements which are
found in CS.88 At first, it is basically an Āyurveda text and secondly it is
not a composition of a single author. It was originally composed by
Agniśa, a pupil of Ātreyya and then it was revised by Caraka and named
it as CS. After Caraka it was redacted by Drīḍhabala which is available
now. Hence it is very difficult to differentiate the ideas of Agniśa,
Caraka and Drīḍhabala. It says that, it was Caraka who introduced
philosophical elements in it to formulate the medical principles. But those chapters in which philosophical ideas are expounded also have the colophon saying that ‘अतिवेशकुले तन्म चरक प्रतिस्वरूपे’. Similarly, each and every chapter of ČS begins with the sentence ‘हत समाह भगवान आज्ञाक’. This does not mean that all the philosophical expositions of the text were originally taught by Ātreyā. One noticeable point is that the Bhālasamhitā, which is regarded as a representative treatise of the Ātreyā school, also containing several philosophical (Sāmkhya-Yoga) principles which are similar to ČS. But the Bhālasamhitā has little to say regarding philosophical aspects compared to ČS. Drḍhabala also added some lost portions, such as 17 chapters in Cikitsā and full chapters in both Kalpa and Siddhi sthānas are also closely connected with various philosophical elements. Hence certainly Agniveṣa, Caraka and Drḍhabala are also contributed their own philosophical views on it.

Ātreyā

Biographical and historical information concerning Ātreyā are very little. He is widely associated with Takṣaśilā, the ancient Buddhist University. But there is no reference to Takṣaśilā in Agniveṣatāntra. Buddhist scriptures mention him as the teacher of Jīvaka, the personal physician of Buddha. Bṛhadāranyakopaniṣad mentioned Ātreyā along
with other teachers. But no where there is a reference of Ātreya as a teacher of Ayurveda. One such reference to him is found in Mahābhārata.

गान्धर्वे नारदो च भरसनानो धनुशं हम्।
देवोधिरि स्वर्ण: कुष्कात्रेयस्य चिन्तितम्।

(XII. 210. 21)

i.e., the science of medicine was acquired by Ātreya, the dark complexioned son of Atri.

He is also referred to as Kṛṣṇātreya. This reference of his skin colour seems to have given to identify him as a non-Aryan. But N. V. K. Varier observes about it as- 'The terms Punarvasu and Kṛṣṇātreya have never been used together in any place; [in CS] so they must be different authors'.

Agniveśa

Agniveśa, the author of Agniveśatana, was the pupil of Punarvasu Ātreya. Brhadāraṇyakopaniṣad also mentions the name Agniveśa. It is not possible to ascertain a fixed date of Agniveśa. He can be placed somewhere around 8th-7th century B.C. Thus it is almost certain that Agniveśa was a historical person, because there is no proof for his assertion.
Caraka

Like Ātreya and Agniśeṣa the date of Caraka is also a subject of controversy. He is believed to be a court physician of Kaniṣka, who ruled North-West India in the 1st-2nd century A.D. The word 'caraka' itself is very conjectural. It is also related to the word 'cāraṇa' meaning 'wanderer'. Thus the word caraka suggests certain clan name of physicians who have the wandering nature. It also shows that there were lots of physicians bearing the same title 'Caraka'.⁹² Pointing this view Chattopadhyaya opines that CS might have a 'medical compilation of some sect of the ancient roving physicians'.⁹³ He also shows the possibility of a physician, who belonging to the sect of Caraka, was the court physician of the king Kaniṣka. 'However', says Chattopadhyaya, 'even admitting the connection of certain caraka with Kaniṣka, Kaniṣka's date cannot have much relevance for the dating of our medical compilation'.⁹⁴ Hence it would be safe to place Caraka between 1st century B.C. and the early phase of 2nd century A.D.

In brief it can be concluded that the Sāṃkhya-Yoga has gone through mainly five developmental stages. In the first stage one finds the possibility of existence of Sāṃkhya-Yoga as early as in the Indus culture. In its second stage the Veda-s and the Upaniṣad-s give foundation for
these philosophical thoughts in their period. In the third phase the existence of Śāṃkhyā-Yoga is clearly visible in the non-philosophical classical works like Mahābhārata (Mokṣadharmaparvan), Buddhacarita and CS. The fourth stage presents a full-fledged two independent systems - Śāṃkhyā and Yoga - through the views of Īśvarakṛṣṇa and Patañjali. And the final stage is marked by the emergence of various commentaries. It presents a well structured doctrine removing all the gap and ambiguity of the history of Śāṃkhyā - Yoga.

The aim of the present study is to analyse the Ayurveda texts, especially bhātrayī, from the view point of Śāṃkhyā-Yoga. While examining the historical developments of Śāṃkhyā-Yoga in this regard, the foregoing discussions strongly agree with the hypothesis. The supporting views are as follows:

i. There are evidences of existence of primordial thinking of Śāṃkhyā-Yoga along with the primitive medical thinking even at the time of the great civilization Mohenjo-Daro and Harappa.

ii. As a part of cultural transmigration or brahmanization the thoughts relating to Śāṃkhyā-Yoga is traced in the Vedic Saṃhitā-s, which represents the second stage of developments of philosophical thoughts. These Śāṃkhyā-Yoga elements are not a well-developed
system and as an early medical system it was not within the purview of Vedic complex.

iii. In the third stage of development the Sāṃkhya-Yoga thoughts became more prominent and it has influenced all the existing system of knowledge even the Ātreyatantra (later known as CS). Perhaps the Saṣṭiṇātra, which is believed to be composed either by Kapila or Pañcaśikha, may have become predominant by this time.

iv. Later, when they grew into two independent systems through Īśvarakṛṣṇa and Patañjali, its influence is further reflected in SS, which developed during that time.

It is in this background, an analysis of Sāṃkhya-Yoga elements in the classical texts of Āyurveda is attempted in the following chapters.
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35. तथा च रामायानिकम्:

प्रभोपरिवर्तियामध्याय: समस्यायाय: कथाबध्यायः।
पररथि च तत्त्वातः वियायाय योग एव च।।
शेषमाध्यायायाः भाषायार् सुन्दरः॥
विपक्षाया परमेश्वरदेवलोको नव नुस्तया॥
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