Part 1

Study of the First Chapter of
The Yogasiddhāntacandrīkā
CHAPTER 1

WORKS AND THE FLOURISHING PERIOD OF NĀRĀYAṆA TĪRTHA
To study a philosophical work, it is necessary to clarify the author’s field of philosophical interest and his flourishing period. Although many philosophical works are ascribed to Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha, titles and numbers of his works and his flourishing period have not been critically examined. As regards, for example, commentaries on YS, three commentaries by him, including the YSC, have been handed down to us. It is rare to find such a commentator like him who composed as many as three commentaries on YS. This fact signifies his keen interest in YS.

To focus attention on Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha as a commentator on the sutra, I would like to enumerate his commentaries on YS.

1. The Yogasiddhāntacandrikā or Gūḍhārthadyotikā.²

This is the largest among the three. The title Yogasiddhāntacandrikā is known from colophons.³ Another title, Gūḍhārthadyotikā, is found in the introductory verse 3 and colophons of mss. D1., D2., and T1.⁴

2. The Pātañjalasūtrakalaghuvṛtti or Yogacandrikā.

This text is not published. The often found expressions ‘anyatra vistaraḥ’ in the text may indicate that this commentary is a shortened version of YSC. Both titles are known from the colophons of chapter 1

---

² An early form of this chapter 1 appeared in chapter 2 of “Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s Definition of Yoga,” M.Phil. dissertation by Endo submitted to the University of Poona in 1990, and in Nagoya Studies in Indian Culture and Buddhism: Sambhasa, vol.14, 1993, pp.41-60.

³ As to the abbreviations of the manuscript and text, see the introduction to the part 2 of the present study.

⁴ Ch. ed., colophon of chapter 1 [p.48, ll.22-23], chapter 2 [p.104, ll.14-15] and chapter 3 [p.140, ll.26-27]; D1.ms, colophon of chapter 2 [95a, ll.9-10]; D2 ms, colophon of chapter 1 [18b, ll.11-12; Text, p.(187), note6], chapter 2 [31a, ll.14-15] and chapter 3 [40a, ll.9-10]; T1.ms, colophon of chapter 2 [195, l.17-196, l.2]. T1.ms, colophon of chapter 3 reads Yogacandrikā [135, ll.12-16].

⁵ Colophons of chapter 1, 2 and 3 of D2.ms. and colophon of chapter 2 of
of the manuscripts.\textsuperscript{5} In the present study, the work is called \textit{‘Laghuvṛtti.’}

3. The \textit{Sūtrārthabodhini}.

This is the shortest among the three. The text is published together with \textit{YSC}. This work was intended as a brief, not a detailed, exposition \textit{(saṅkṣepena na vistarāt)}.\textsuperscript{6} From the closing verse, it is known that this work was composed in Prayaṅga.\textsuperscript{7}

As will be clear in the part 2 of the present study, to refer to the manuscript of \textit{Laghuvṛtti} provides very important information to study the text of \textit{YSC}. In the same way, to define number and titles of Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s work as well as his flourishing period will help us to understand the background of his thought presented in \textit{YSC}.

In the following, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s works and flourishing period are studied through examinations of three problems: 1) Problem of the identification of two Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha-s, namely, the author of \textit{YSC} and the author of Sanskrit drama \textit{Kṛṣṇalilātarangaṇī}; 2) The number and titles of Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s works; 3) Flourishing period of Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha.

\textsuperscript{5} Colophon of chapter 1: Calcutta ms.: iti nārāyanatīrthaviracitāyāṁ pātaṁjalesūtralaghuvṛttau yogacāndrikāyāṁ samādhipādaḥ prathamaḥ samāptāḥ 1 [18a, ll.10-11]; Wai ms.: iti nārāyaṇatīrthaviracitāyāṁ pātaṁjalesūtralaghuvṛttau yogacāndrikāyāṁ samādhipādaḥ prathamaḥ samāptāḥ //1// //cha// //śrīrām// //cha// //cha// [19a, ll.9-10]. Calcutta ms. is a ms in possession of The Asiatic Society, Calcutta: No.8010 of \textit{A Descriptive Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Collections of The Asiatic Society, vol.XI: Philosophy}. Wai ms.is a ms. in possession of Prājña Pāṭhasālā Māṇḍala, Wai: No.6157, L.no.6-4/398 of \textit{Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts (Prājña Pāṭhasālā Māṇḍala Collection) pt.II}.

\textsuperscript{6} Sūtrārthabodhini, p.1.

\textsuperscript{7} Sūtrārthabodhini, p.6.
SECTION 1. TWO NARAYANA TIRTHA-S

1.1. TWO NARAYANA TIRTHA-S

Apart from the commentaries on YS, various philosophical works such as the Sāmkhya-candrikā on the Sāmkhya-karikā, and the Laghuvyākhyā on the Siddhāntabindu of Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, are ascribed to Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha. As will be clear in the later, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha composed more than one commentary on several philosophical texts. This is perhaps because he composed easier commentaries, for the use of beginners, i.e., his disciples, after composing an extensive commentary. Therefore, we can surmise he guided many disciples, teaching various philosophical texts.

On the other hand, the author of the Sanskrit dance-drama Kṛṣṇalilā-taraṅgini bears the name Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha. According to Natarajan, the drama is still very influential in the musical scene in south India, and the sage Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha is worshipped even today.8 Herein a question arises: Could the ascetic poet be the author of commentaries on various philosophical treatises, a person who guided many disciples’ study of śāstra-s, at the same time?

The life of the ascetic poet Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha has been studied by several scholars. B. Natarajan’s recent study in particular provides us with very useful information about the subject. The account of this ascetic poet’s life, however, seems not to fit with the author of YSC. Here, following the study of Natarajan, I would like to point out several problems regarding the identity of the two Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha-s.

---

8 Natarajan 1988, p.xiii.
1.2. Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s Life: Earlier Studies and Their Problems

Various scholars’ studies of the life of the ascetic poet Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha are summarized by B. Natarajan.9 According to Natarajan, several scholars suspect that the author of the Kṛṣṇalilātaraṅgini and the author of YSC are one and the same person.10 N. Subramanian Sastri also says that the author of YSC is different from that of KLT.11 Nevertheless, after examining the views of scholars who have studied the matter, Natarajan reached the conclusion that the saint poet Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha is the same person as the author of YSC that is, the two Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha-s are identical.12 This conclusion appears to reflect the tendency of scholars such as Sivasankara Sastri to identify the two Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha-s. The following points in Natarajan’s conclusion draw our attention with regard to his identification of the ascetic poet with the author of YSC:

1) Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s flourishing period is determined to be AD 1675-1745.
2) He is considered to have been a Telugu Brahmin born at Kaza in Guntur district.
3) He is considered to have been the son of Nilakaṇtha Śāstrī and Pārvatī Amma of Tallāvajjhala family, and was named Govinda Śāstrī.
4) He acquired proficiency in music and śātra-s early. He was devotee of Kṛṣṇa.
5) He was a disciple of Vāsudeva Paṇḍita.
6) Govinda Śāstrī was initiated into samnyāsa by Śivarāma Tīrtha at Kanchipuram. They are said to belong to the Vidyāraṇya school.

---

10 Natarajan 1988, p.163.
7) Later, he left for Kashi, Prayag, Mathura, Puri and other places. He attained samādhi at Tiruppunturutti, Tanjavur district, Tamil Nadu.

Several points with respect to the above must be reconsidered. First, I wish to examine the claim that his name as a householder was Govinda Śāstrī and the name of his father was Nilakaṇṭha Śāstrī. Among scholars whose studies were examined by Natarajan, Sivasankara Sastri, Vavilla Ramaswami Sastrulu, Nori Narasimhaśāstrī, Dhara Ramanandha Sastri and D.V.R.S. Chalapathi all seem to mention both names. V.R. Krishna-swamy, Swaminatha Atreya and Kudavayil Balasubramanian seem to mention the name Govinda. On what grounds is this conclusion based? I could not refer to the studies of these scholars in original, except that of Nori Narasimhaśāstrī. However, we find the names Govinda and Nilakaṇṭha in one of the works ascribed to Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha, i.e., in the colophon of the first chapter of the Bhāṭṭabhāṣāprakāśa published in 1900 A.D. Is not the conclusion that he was named Govinda and that he was the son of Nilakaṇṭha based on this colophon? All the studies of the above scholars, except those of D.V.R.S. Chalapathi and Swaminatha Atreya, whose dates are not mentioned by Natarajan, are published later than 1900 A.D. If the conclusion that Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s name as a householder was Govinda and his father’s name was Nilakaṇṭha is based on the colophon of the edition of the Bhāṭṭabhāṣāprakāśa alone, the conclusion must be reconsidered.

Because, with regard to the colophon, P.K. Gode has concluded on the basis of detailed examination that the father and son, Nilakaṇṭha and Govinda, are in fact Nilakaṇṭha Caturdhara, the famous commentator on MBh, who mentions Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha as his teacher of Mīmāṁsā, and his son Govinda

---

15 Bhāṭṭabhāṣāprakāśa, p.13, ll.4-5: iti nilakaṇṭhasūrisūnugovindaviracite bhāṭṭabhāṣāprakāśa prathamo 'dhyāyaḥ.
1.3. Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s Teachers

The most remarkable aspect of Natarajan’s conclusion is that Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s teachers were Śivarāma Tīrtha and Vāsudeva. The colophon of KLT in the first chapter (tarāṇga) presents the name of his teacher as Śivarāmānanda Tīrtha, and the name Śivarāma Tīrtha is also found in the eighth chapter. According to Natarajan, V.R. Krishnaswamy, Sivasankara Sastrī, D.V.R.S. Chalapathi, Nori Narasimhaśāṭrī, Dhara Ramanandha Sastrī and Kudavayil Balasubramanian mention the name Vāsudeva. As I mentioned above, I could not refer to most of their studies. Therefore, I cannot know on what grounds those scholars concluded the relation of the author of KLT with Vāsudeva. While we do

---

16 Gode 1988. About the colophon of chapter 1, Gode’s study is summarized as follows: Ms. no.4357 in Stein’s Catalogue, p.111, which is transcribed in AD 1773, has the colophon of chapter 1 that mentions the name of Nilakaṇṭhāśurisūngovinda; Ms. no.587 of 1884-87 in Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, transcribed in AD 1830 doesn’t have the colophon; Ms. no.376 of 1899-1915 in Bhandarkar Institute which doesn’t have the colophon in question is transcribed by Govinda Dikṣita Caturdhari whose son Śiva Dikṣita Caturdhari composed one work in AD 1747; This ms. no.376 of 1899-1915 is supposed to be copied in about 1700-1720 and, therefore, older than the ms. no.4357 in Stein’s Catalog; Thus, to regard the author of the work, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha, as Nilakaṇṭha’s son Govinda must be a mistake.


19 Sivasankara Sastrī seems to have concluded the name Vāsudeva on the basis of the introductory verse of the Bhaktyadhikaranamalāṭikā. Natarajan 1988, p.124, ll.21-27. See the next note. Nori Narasimhaśāṭrī doesn’t give any reason to regard Vasudeva as the teacher of the author of KLT. Nori Narasimhaśāṭrī 1969, p.2, ll.22-26. He says, “We can also surmise safely that whenever the writer refers to Sri Krishna as Vāsudeva, he was always reminded of his Guru, Vāsudeva, at whose feet he mastered the Six Sastras as a lay man.” Nori Narasimhaśāṭrī 1969, p.15, ll.22-25.
not find Vāsudeva in *KLT* as the author’s teacher, we find the name in the introductory verse of *SC* and other works ascribed to Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha.\textsuperscript{20} However, the same introductory verse of *SC* clearly mentions another teacher’s name as Rāmagovinda Tīrtha and not as Śivarāma Tīrtha. In addition, manuscripts of *YSC* tell us that Rāmagovinda Tīrtha is the author’s teacher.\textsuperscript{21} This fact prevents us from identifying the author of *YSC* with the author of *KLT*, where neither Vāsudeva nor Rāmagovinda Tīrtha are mentioned as author’s teacher.

1.4. Śivarāma and Rāmagovinda: Difficulty in Their Identification

Even Natarajan is aware of the difficulty regarding the names of the teachers, although he does not hesitate to identify the two Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha-s.\textsuperscript{22} His conclusion regarding the identification arises from another identification, i.e., that of Śivarāma Tīrtha with Rāmagovinda Tīrtha. According to Natarajan, Sivasankara Sastri identified Śivarāma Tīrtha with Rāmagovinda Tīrtha and B. Rajanikanti Rao follows the former.\textsuperscript{23} Nori

---

This statement seems to be based upon an assumption that the author of *KLT* is identical with the author of the *Bhāktiyadhikaraṇaṃalāṭikā*.\textsuperscript{20} The introductory verse 1 of *SC*: śrīrāmagovindaśātūrīhāpādakṛpaṇavaisēṣād upalabhyā bodham / śrīvāsudevād adhigavyā sarvaśāstraṇī vaktum kim api spṛṅhā naḥ // [p.1, ll.2-3]. In the *Bhāktiyadhikaraṇaṃalāṭikā* and the *Vedāntavibhaṇaṃaṭikā*, the same introductory verse is found. See notes 50 and 55.

\textsuperscript{21} Colophon of chapter 1 of D2.ms.: iti śrīparamaham[sa]parivrajaṃcārayaśrīgovindatūrīhāpādaśiṣyaśrīnārāyaṇatīrthāvācīcitayam pātāmkalasūtrāvṛttau...; Colophon of T1.ms.: iti śrīmaṭparamahamsaparivrajaṃcārayaśrīrāmagovindatūrīhāhagavatpūrṇaśiṣyaśrīnārāyaṇatīrthasvāmavācīcitayam pātāmkalasūtrāvṛttau...

\textsuperscript{22} Natarajan 1991, pp.345-356. Natarajan examines the two names of Nārāyaṇa Tīrta’s guru, Śivarāma and Rāmagovinda, in the second volume of his study while he did not attempt it in the first volume. In spite of the examination, he does not reach a different conclusion.

Narasimhaśāstrī says that Gauḍabrahmānanda Sarasvatī who is a disciple of the author of *YSC*,²⁴ studied śāstra-s under both Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha and Śivarāma Tīrtha.²⁵ This opinion of Nori Narasimhaśāstrī is based upon closing verses of Gauḍabrahmānanda’s *Laghucandrikā*, a commentary on Madhusūdana Sarasvatī’s *Advaitasiddhi*,²⁶ which reads as follows:

“mahānubhavadhauśvakābhārāmākhyavarṇinaḥ /
etadgranthasya kartāro lehkakāḥ kevalam vayam //
śrīnārāyaṇatīrthānāṁ sādāśtriḥprāramīyūṣām /
caranyaḥ saranikṛtya tīrṇah sārasvatārṇavah //
bhaje śrīparamāṇandasarasvatyaṁghripaṅkajam /
yat kṛpādṛśṭileśena tīrṇah saṁsārasāgarah //”²⁷

These verses clearly show that Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha and Paramāṇanda Sarasvatī, whose name Nori Narasimhaśāstrī does not even mention, were teachers of Gauḍabrahmānanda Sarasvatī, and that Śivarāma does not appear to have been his teacher. The first verse in the above quotation, where Gauḍabrahmānanda calls Śivarāma the author of the work and himself a mere

---
²⁴ Gauḍabrahmānanda Sarasvatī is a disciple of Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha, the author of the *Laghutikā* on *SB* of Madhusūdana Sarasvatī. Gauḍabrahmānanda salutes Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha in the closing verse of his commentary Nyāyaratnāvali on *SB* [p.462, ll.14-15]. According to Tryambakramśāstrī Bhaṭṭa [1928: 11, ll.27-30], the Nyāyaratnāvali presupposes the *Gurūtikā* which is Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s another commentary on the *SB*, and the name *Gurūtikā* is mentioned in the *Laghutikā* by Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha himself. This Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha is identified with the author of *YSC* because both are the disciples of Rāmagovinda Tīrtha. See note 58.
²⁵ Nori Narasimhaśāstrī 1969, p.5.
²⁶ Nori Narasimhaśāstrī says that the author of the *Advaitasiddhi* is “Brahmananda Saraswati(sic).” Nori Narasimhaśāstrī 1969, p.5, l.33-p.6, l.1. Nori Narasimhaśāstrī’s study appears faulty regarding bibliographical references. For example, he mentions “Kashmir Sadananda(sic)”, i.e. Sadānanda Kāśmiraka, who is also known as a disciple of Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha and Gauḍabrahmānanda Sarasvatī, as author of the *Vedāntasāra*. Nori Narasimhaśāstrī 1969, p.5, ll.26-27. But it is well known that this Sadānanda is the author of the *Advaitabrahmasiddhi* and is different from Sadānanda, the author of the *Vedāntasāra*.
copyist, has been noted by scholars. Tryambakramśastrī Bhaṭṭā has suggested three possibilities: 1) that the verse is later addition; 2) that Śivarāma’s authorship is merely a pretext (vyavahāramātra); 3) or that the author of the Gurucandrikā, on which the Laghucandrikā depends a great deal and which is generally ascribed to Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha, was Śivarāma. However, he refrains from offering a conclusion as to who this Śivarāma was.28 Sūrya Nārāyaṇa Sukla concludes that Śivarāma must have been the donor when Gauḍabrahmānanda engaged himself in writing the work.29 Natarajan’s description gives the impression that this verse gave Sivasankara Sastrī a basis for identifying Śivarāma Tīrtha with Rāmagovinda Tīrtha.30 Although Natarajan, who quotes Tryambakramśastrī Bhaṭṭa’s study,31 doesn’t give his own comment on this Śivarāma, he refers to another interesting opinion regarding the guru-śisya-paramparā of Gauḍabrahmānanda Sarasvatī found in an edition of Bālakṛṣṇānanda Sarasvatī’s Śārīrakamimāṃsābhāṣya-vārtika, edited in 1941 by Anantakrishna Sastrī and Ashoknath Bhattacharya in the Asutosh Sanskrit series.32 The hypothesis on the lineage of teachers and pupils is based upon the introductory verses of the text. Unfortunately, although I could not refer to the edition, I was able to see the same verses quoted by Anantakrishna Sastrī in “Bhūmikā” of his edition of the Nyāyāmṛta and the Advaitasiddhi.33 I would like to quote, with a slight modification, the chart of the lineage reproduced by Natarajan from the edition of the Śārīrakamimāṃsābhāṣyavārtika.34 The chart appears to be prepared from various materials such as the Ratnaprabhā of Rāmānanda.

28 Tryambakramśastrī Bhaṭṭa 1928, pp.11-12.
29 Sukla 1934, pp.(1)-(2).
30 Natarajan1988, p.125.
Sarasvati, the Siddhāntasiddhāñjana of Kṛṣṇānanda Sarasvati, apart from the Śārīrakamīmāṁsābhāsyavārtīka.35

In the chart, however, we cannot help but notice that the names Rāmagovinda Tirtha, Nārāyaṇa Tirtha, Paramānanda Sarasvati do not appear. In other words, this chart doesn't say anything about Gauḍabrahmānanda's teachers. Therefore, we cannot conclude anything about who the Śivarāma, whose name Gauḍabrahmānanda mentions in the Laghuṭīkā, was, nor

---

35 The Śārīrakamīmāṁsābhāsyavārtīka mentions the names of Pūrṇānanda [in the introductory verse 13], Puruṣottamānanda [v. 14,15], Śivarāma [v. 16], Gopālānanda [v. 17], Śvayamparākṣānanda [v.18, 23], Śrīdhara [v. 19], Brahmānanda [v. 20], Upadeva [v. 21], Vāsudeva [v. 22], Bālakṛṣṇānanda [v. 24, 31]. From the Ratnaprabhā, the lineage Śivarāma - Gopālānanda - Govinda - Rāmānanda is known. The Siddhāntasiddhāñjana tells us that the author Kṛṣṇānanda Sarasvati was a disciple of Vāsudeva and Rāmabhadrā, both of whom were disciples of Śvayamparākṣānanda, and that Kṛṣṇānanda was a teacher of Ramānanda Yati (fl. 1670) and Bhāskara Dīksita. See "Preface" and "Bhūmikā" of the Siddhāntasiddhāñjana. Ed. by Ś. Narayanāswamy Sastry and R. Rama Sastry. Mysore: Univ. of Mysore, 1965.
anything about the identity of Śivarāma with Rāmagovinda Tīrtha. Consequently, we must hesitate to recognize Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha, the author of YSC, as the author of KLT.

We have to note here that Nārāyaṇendra Sarasvatī (6 in the chart) must be different from Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha, the author of YSC. Another disciple of Govindānanda Sarasvatī (3 in the chart), Rāmānanda Sarasvatī (5 in the chart), is the author of the famous Ratnaprabhā on Vācaspatimisra’s Bhāmatī and the Yogamāniprabhā on YS. Here and there in YSC, sentences corresponding to those of MP are found. In addition, in 1.36 of the Laghuvyrtti, sentences of MP 1.36 are quoted. Nevertheless, MP’s influence on YSC is not great compared to that of YV. This is strange if the author of YSC is a brother disciple of the author of MP. This, adding to the fact that the guru’s name of Nārāyaṇendra Sarasvatī is different from that of Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha, prevents us from identifying Nārāyaṇendra Sarasvatī with the author of YSC.

The question of the identification of the two Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha-s is not easy to answer, due to the limitation of reference data. However, in so far as data which support the identification cannot be found, we must leave the question unanswered, or we should not identify Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha, disciple of Rāmagovinda Tīrtha, with another Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha, disciple of Śivarāma Tīrtha.

SECTION 2. NĀRĀYAṆA TĪRTHA’S WORKS

Having determined that the identification of the two Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha-s is unacceptable, various works bearing the name Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha as their

---

37 Calcutta.ms., 14b, ll.1-4, Wai.ms., 15a, ll.5-9.
author should be classified into two groups, i.e., the works of the author of YSC and those of the author of KLT. In the following, first I would like to enumerate the works ascribed to Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha from several bibliographies, and then attempt to classify them. The numbers put at the head of each title are given by the present writer for the convenience of the study.

2.1. Works ascribed to Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha

*New Catalogs Catalogorum*, vol.X, has four entries ‘Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha,’ and lists twentyone works in total under them as follows:\(^{38}\)

Nārāyaṇa (Tīrtha)\(^{39}\)

18th.cent. son of Nilakaṇṭhasūri of Vārāṇasi; known as Govinda-śāstrī as householder; initiated by Śivarāmatīrtha; disciple of Rāmagovindaṭīrtha and Vāsudevatīrtha; teacher of Brahmānanda Sarasvatī (author of commentary on the *Siddhāntabindu*).

1. *Bālabodhini*, a commentary on the *Ātmabodha* by Śaṅkarācārya
2. A commentary on the *Kusumāṇjaliārikā* by Udayana
3. A commentary on the *Tattvacintāmaṇidīdhiti*
4. *Prabhā*, a subcommentary on the *Tarkasamgraha* by Annapu-bhaṭṭa
5. A commentary on the *Dakṣināmūrtistotra*
6. A commentary (*ṭīkā*) on the *Brahmasūtra*
7. *Bhakticandrikā*, a commentary on the *Bhaktisūtra* of Śāṇḍilya
8. *Bhaktyadhikarana* and a commentary
9. *Bhāṭṭabhāṣāprakāśa*
10. *Nyāyacandrikā*, a commentary on the *Bhāṣāpariccheda* by Viśvanātha

---


\(^{39}\) *NCC* vol.X, pp.75-76.
11. Yogacandrikā
12. Sūtrārthabodhinī or Gūḍhārthadyotanikā, a commentary on the Yogasūtra of Patañjali
13. A commentary on the Vedastuti
14. Vedāntavibhāvanā and commentary
15. Sāṃkhyaścandrikā, a commentary on the Sāṃkhyaśāstra by Īśvarakṛṣṇa
16. Tattvacandrikā, a commentary on the Sāṃkhyaatattvakaumudi by Vācaspatimiśra
17. Guroṭikā, a commentary on the Siddhāntabindu
18. Laghuṭikā or Nāraṇaḥ, a commentary on the Siddhāntabindu

Nāraṇaḥ (Tīrtha)\(^{40}\)

Native of Andhra, settled at Varahūr, Tamilnād; propagator of Bhakti doctrine; disciple of Śivarāmānanda Tīrtha.

19. Kṛṣṇalīlātaraṅgini
9. Bhāṭabhāṣāprakāśikā

Nāraṇaḥ (Tīrtha)\(^{41}\)

20. Haribhaktisudhārṇava

Nāraṇaḥ (Tīrtha)\(^{42}\)

21. A commentary (vṛtti) on the Brahmasūtra

The Sūtrārthabodhinī and the Gūḍhārthadyotanikā (or -ṛdyotikā), both listed as no.12 in the above, must be different works as have been mentioned above. It is not clear whether the Yogacandrikā (no.11 in the list) is YSC or the Laghuvṛtti.

Apart from the works listed above, the following are ascribed to the author of KLT by V.S.V. Guruswamysastry\(^{43}\):

---

\(^{40}\) NCC vol.X, pp.75-76.
\(^{41}\) NCC vol.X, p.95.
\(^{42}\) NCC vol.X, p.297.
\(^{43}\) Guruswamysastry 1986, p.xxii.
22. Pañcikaraṇavārtikavivarana and Dīpikā, a commentary on it
23. Subodhini, a commentary on the Catuḥsūtri portion of the
   Brahmasūtra
24. Pārijātāpaharaṇa (in Telugu)
25. Pārijātāpaharaṇa (in Sanskrit)

Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies, vol. I, adds the following work44:
26. Tarkaratnākara

Thus, twenty-six works in total are ascribed to Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha. It is
indeed strange, as Natarajan points out,45 that NCC lists the Bhāṭṭabhaṣā-
prakāśikā or -prakāśa under two entries. This means that the editors of
NCC identified Śivarāma Tīrtha mentioned under the first entry and Śiva-
rāmānanda Tīrtha mentioned under the second. Why, then, the author of
YSC and the author of KLT should be mentioned under separate entries?
The name of their guru, Rāmagovinda Tīrtha, which is found neither in the
Bhāṭṭabhaṣāprakāśa nor in KLT, may be the reason they are distinguished
as two separate people.

Now, the works listed above are classified into three categories, i.e.,
1) works of the disciple of Rāmagovinda Tīrtha, 2) works of the disciple of
Śivarāma Tīrtha, 3) works not specified. The classification is based mainly
on published texts and catalogs of Sanskrit manuscripts, not on an exami-
nation of all the extant manuscripts. Therefore, the classification must be
considered as tentative, not conclusive.

44 Potter comp. 1983, p.42. In NCC vol.VIII, p.122, under the entry
Tarkaratnākara, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha is mentioned as the author.
45 Natarajan 1988, p.166.
1) Works of Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha, Disciple of Rāmagovinda Tīrtha

1. Kusumāṅjalikārikāvyākhya on the Kusumāṅjalikārikā by Udayana 46

2. Nyāyacandrikā on the Bhāṣāpariccheda generally ascribed to Viśvānātha 47

46 In the Kusumāṅjalikārikāvyākhya 5.1 [p.73, ll.3-7], the same sentences that are seen in YSC 1.23 [Text. p.(95), ll.2-7] and in BhC 2.1.29 [vol.2, p.134, ll.9-14] are found.

47 At present, I do not have the full conviction to attribute this work to the disciple of Rāmagovinda Tīrtha. However, the following evidence shows some grounds to attribute the work to him.

To deny the objection which regards upamāna as anumāna and to show upamāna as an independent means of valid knowledge, NC 80 says the following: [A] nāpi gavayo gavayapadavācyo gosadṛśatvāt vyatireke ghaṭavat [B] gavayapadaṁ gavayavācakam asati vyṛtyantare vrddhaiḥ pravuṣyamānātavāt [b]yathā gopadaṁ gavāṁ vācakam ityādy anumānasya phalam [p.118, ll.13-15, bracketed and marked with A, B, and b by the present writer].

In YSC 1.7, almost same sentences in which the author asserts that upamāna is nothing but anumāna are found: tatopamānasya [B] gavayapadaṁ gavayavācakam / asati vrtyantare vrddhais tatra prayuṣyamānātavāt / [b]yo 'satī vrtyantare vrddhais yatra prayuṣyate sa tadvācakam / ] yathā gosābbādiḥ / [A]gavayo gavayapadavācyo gosadṛśatvāt / vyatireke ghaṭavad] ityādy anumāne [Text p.(25), 1.7-p.(26), l.1, bracketed and marked with A, B, and b by the present writer].

SM 140, 141 also has similar sentences: evam gavavavyaktriprayakṣānāntaraṁ [B]gavayapadaṁ gavayatvaprabhātinnimitikam asati vrtyantare vrddhais tatra prayuṣyamānātavāt ] [b] asati ca vrtyantare vrddhais yatra yat prayuṣyate tatra tat pravṛttiinnimitikam yathā gotvaprabhātinnimitikam / ] yad vā gavayapadaṁ sapradhvātinnimitikam sādhupadatvād ity anumānena [bracketed and marked with B and b by the present writer].

It is obvious that each part bracketed and marked with A), B) and b) corresponds respectively, especially A) and B) of NC and YSC. From the above evidence, we can conclude that the author of NC is identical with that of YSC.

The model of these syllogistic sentences is seen in Vācaspatimīśra’s TK 5 [p.88, ll.1-3], and in Udayana’s Nyāyakusumāṅjali 3.11 [p.339, ll.5-7]. Shiv Kumar says Vācaspati intended to criticize the Nyāya theory of upamāna, not the view of the Mīmāṃśa-school. Shiv Kumar 1980, p.121. Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha, who is the author of the Kusumāṅjalikārikāvyākhya and is said to have written the Tatvavacandra on TK, knew these criticisms mentioned by Vācaspati and Udayana against the Nyāya theory of upamāna as a matter of course. Moreover, in all probability, he must have made the sentences of
3. Tarkaratnākara on the Bhāṣāpariccheda
4. Bhakticandrikā on the Bhaktisūtra of Śaṅḍilya
5. Bhaktyadhikarana or Bhaktyadhikaranāmālā based upon Śaṅḍilya’s Bhaktisūtra, and a commentary (ṭīkā)
6. Bhaktimīṁśābhāṣya on Śaṅḍilya’s Bhaktisūtra

YSM based upon SM. This means he knew the answer of the Nyāya-school when he criticized their theory of upamāna in YSC. His expression in NC, therefore, appears as if he answers the question posed by himself in YSC. However, this must not prevent us from attributing the authorship of the former to the author of the latter.

48 According to manuscripts catalog of Vangiya Sahitya Parishat, the work is a commentary on BP, and the introductory verses of the work run as follows:
nārāyaṇapadam amalaṁ natvā nārāyaṇākhyāyatih/ nyāyakārikānāṁ suvyā-khyānāṁ tanoti satprītyai //1// suksamāṛthadhāraṇāyāṁ budheḥ paṭutā na tarkamate/ bālāvabodhanakṛte saphalo bhavitāyam āyāṣāḥ //2// [p.xxxiv, ll.11-12, and note 93 in the same page].

The first verse is exactly the same as the introductory verse of NC. Moreover, in NC 139, the author mentions the work Sattkaranatnākara as his own work: adhikaṁ tv asmatkṛtasattkaranatnākare draṣṭāvyam // [p.174, l.14]. Therefore, it is clear that the Tarkaratnākara was written by the author of NC preceding NC.

49 The ending verses 2 and 3 of BhC run as follows: adhitya sarvaśāstrāṇi vāsudevadāyaṇidheḥ / tīrthaśrīrāmagovindakṛpayaisā kṛtir mama //2// rāmagovindatīrthānām gurūṇām anv aham mama / tīrthaśrīvāsudevānāṁ caraṇau ġaraṇām sadā //3// [vol.2, p.255, ll.5-8].

50 The introductory verse of the Bhaktyadhikaranamālāṭīkā runs as follows: śrīrāmagovinDasutīrthaśāpadvāpiśeṣād upalabhyā ādhaṁ / śrīvāsudevād adhigatya sarvaśāstrāṇi vaktuṁ kim api śṛṣṭa naḥ // [p.1, ll.6-7].

Bhaktyadhikaranamālā’s introductory verse 1 runs as follows: sūtra-nāyagrathināṁ bhaktyadhikaranākhyam uktānāṁ / sadrāṭībūśāṁ mālaṁ kurute nārāyaṇākhyāyatih // [p.1, l.5-p.2, l.1].

51 Although NC, vol.X, p.75, regards this work to be identical with BhC, this work appears to be different from it. Manuscripts catalog of Tanjore, vol.XIV, p.6372, no.8226, describes some portions of the work. Among the description, the sentences reproducing the beginning of the manuscript [l.11-18 in the catalog] seem to be a commentary on the Śaṅḍilya-Bhaktisūtra 2.1.21. However, these are not found in BhC 2.1.21. The end of the manuscript is also reproduced in the catalog [p.6372, l.20-p.6373, l.9]. There, the portion of the word ‘āvir iti’ [p.6372, l.20] up to the word ‘vā’ [p.6373, l.6] corresponds to the sentences in BhC, p.252, l.21-p.253, l.5. From the word ‘ityādi’ [p.6373, l.6] to the word ‘vistarāḥ’ [p.6373, l.9] also correspond to p.254, ll.19-21 of BhC. However, BhC has sentences in
7. Yogasiddhāntacandrikā or Guḍhārthaḥdyotikā on the Yogasūtra

8. Yogacandrikā or Pātañjalaśūtralaghuvṛtti on the Yogasūtra

9. Śūtrārthabodhini on the Yogasūtra

10. Vedāntavibhāvanā and commentary (ṭīkā)

11. Sāṃkhyacandrikā on the Sāṃkhya-śārikā

12. Tattvacandrikā or -candra on the Sāṃkhya-śātattva-kumādi by Vācaspatimiśra

13. Laghuvyākhyā on the Siddhāntabindu by Madhusūdana Sarasvatī

14. Guruṭikā on the Siddhāntabindu

---

about 35 lines between the two portions, while the ms. of the Bhaktimīmāṁsābhāṣya has only one word ‘atiprasaktar’ between the two words ‘vā’ and ‘itiyādi’ [p.6373, l.6], which runs as “vā ṭiprasaktar ityādi anyatra vastaraḥ / etat sarvam kathanam kāra...”. For the above reason, the Bhaktimīmāṁsābhāṣya and BhC must be different works but written by the same author.

52 See note 21 of this chapter.

53 Colophon of Calcutta ms.: iti śrīrāmagovindatīrthaśīśyanārayanatīrthakṛtā yogasūtravṛttiḥ govimdagirīlim samvat 1878 śake 1743 śuklapakṣe tithi aşṭamyaṁ raviyāre. Colophon of Wai ms.: // iti śrīrāmagovindatīrthaśīśya-nārayanatīrthakṛtā yogasūtravṛtticaturthapāḍah samāṭaḥ // govimdāpanam astu śivārpanaṁ ca // cha// //cha// //śrīrām///

54 The colophon of the printed edition: iti śrīrāmagovindatīrthaśīśyaśrīnāra- yanatīrthaviracitā pātañjalaśūtravṛtyākyāyā samāṭa //4/ [p.61,li.24-25].

55 Perterson’s manuscripts catalog describes this work in p.48, Extract 134. According to the catalog, introductory verse 1 of theṭīkā runs as follows: śrīrāmagovindasutīrthapāḍakpāviśeśād upalabhya bodham / śrivāsudevād adhigamya sarvaśāstrāṇi vaktum kim api śphā nah //1//.

Verse 222 of the Vedāntavibhāvanā: natvā śrīpuruṣottamākhyacarāṇau dāmodarasvāmīnām tau govimdakpāṇidheṣ ca carāṇaḥ śrīrāmapūrvasya ca // vidyākaraṇavāsudevavatīnāmtau pūrṇatām āgataḥ sadvedāṃṭavibhāvanā hariyam pronāt tena svayam //222//.

56 See note 20 of this chapter.

57 See Hall 1979, p.38, 1.8.

58 Colophon of the printed text: iti śrīmatparamahamsaparivrājakācāryaśrī- rāmagovindatīrtha śīśya[tathā]vāsudevatīrthavidyāśīśyaśrīnārayanatīrthaviracitā siddhāntabindulaghuvyākhyā sampūrṇā / [p.156, li.4-6 in (1).ed., p.462, li.28-30 in (2).ed.].

59 See Tryambakramāstrī Bhāṭṭa 1928, p.11.
2) Works of Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha, Disciple of Śivarāma Tīrtha

1. Kṛṣṇalilātaraṅgini

2. Haribhaktisudhārṇava

3. Pārijātāpaharana, Kāvyā in Telugu

4. Pārijātāpaharana in Sanskrit

5. Subodhini on the Brahmasūtraśaṅkarabhāṣya 1.1.1-4

6. Paṅcikaraṇavārtikavivarana on Sureśvara’s Paṅcikaraṇavārttika, and commentary Dīpikā

7. Bhāṭṭabhāṣāprakāśikā or -prakāśa

---

Colophon of the first taraṅga: iti śivarāmānandatīrthapādaśākāśirāraṇatīrthaviracitāyām śrīkṛṣṇalilātaraṅginyām śrīkṛṣṇapradurbhāvaśvarṇām-nāmrappathamas taraṅgas samāptah / [p.311, ll.5-7].

Guruswamyasatra 1986, p.xxiii.


I could not refer to the edition which is said to be published from the Advaita Sabha, Kumbakonam in 1954. Guruswamyasatra quotes a portion from this work in roman transliteration without diacritical marks. Guruswamyasatra 1986, p.xxii-xxii. Natarajan, summarizing Guruswamyasatra’s study, a different study from the one mentioned above, also shows the same portion as follows: advaitaṁ śivam ity atas śivapadaṁ samśāntabhadma tu yat yasmin rāmapade cidātmā sukhe śiddhā ramante 'niṣam / tattīrtham paramārthatas suviditaṁ tīrthāgraniversevitam taṁ seva śivarāmatīrtham atulam kaivalyam asmad āśaṁ // Natarajan 1988, p.105. Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies, vol 1, attributes this work to Śivanārāyaṇa Ananda-ārtha, who flourished about AD 1550. Potter (comp.) 1983, p.360. The grounds for AD 1550 are not known. Śivanārāyaṇanandatīrtha is one of the names used by the author of KLT. See Natarajan 1988,p.190-191.

Colophon of Dīpikā: iti śrīśivarāmatīrthapūjyapādaśisyāśrīnāraṇāraṇatīrthaviracitāyām vārtikāvīvaranadīpikāyām jivanmuktinirūpaṇāmnāma caturtham prakaraṇam samāptam / [p.76, ll.5-7].

The closing verse and colophon: bhagavachivarāmatīrthaśisyo muni-nāraṇatīrthanāmaḍhyeyah vyā(a)tanod adhikāśi bhāṭṭabhāṣāgrathanam bhāṭṭanayapraśvesahetoḥ // iti śrīparamahamsaparivrājakācāryabhagavac-χivarāmatīrthapūjyapādaśisyāśrīnāraṇatīrthamuniviracito bhāṭṭabhāṣā- prakāśo 'yaṁ samāptim agamat // [p.61, ll.11-15].
8. Prabhā on the Tarkasamgrahadipikā by Annambhāṭṭa

3) WORKS NOT SPECIFIED

The authors of the following works are not specified because teacher's name is not found in the manuscripts I could refer to or because the date in catalogues are not sufficient for the purpose.

1. Bālabobhinī on the Ātmabodha

2. Tattvacintāmanididhitivyākhyā on the Tattvacintāmanididhitī by Raghunātha Śiromaṇī

3. A commentary (ṭīkā) on the Brahmasūtra

4. A commentary (vyrtti) on the Brahmasūtra

5. A commentary on the Daksinamūrtistotra

6. A commentary (ṭīkā) on the Vedastuti

SECTION 3. THE FLOURISHING PERIOD OF NĀRĀYĀṆA TĪRTHA

As I have argued in the previous discussion, we do not have at present

---

67 Madras-Triennial manuscripts catalog, vol.II, pt.1, lists one manuscript, R.no. 1044 [pp.1371-1372]. The catalog describes the colophon of the manuscript as follows: iti śrīmatparamahamsaparivrājakācāryaśrīśivarāma-tīrthabha(śa)vatpujyapādasīsyena śrīnārāyaṇatīrthathena (thena) kṛtā tarka(sam-graha)dīpikāprabhā samāptā //.
68 See manuscripts catalog of BORI, vol.IX, pt.1, p.186; No.145-no.555/1886-92. The manuscript has a date of transcription as Samvat 1742 = AD 1685 or 1686.
69 See Stein's manuscripts catalog, p.144; No.1431,1463 The name of the author is Nārāyaṇatīrthayatīvaryaḥ.
71 See manuscripts catalog of Wai, p.826; serial no.6516.
72 According to NCC, vol.X, p.76, the work is mentioned in Fascicle XXII of Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts existing in Oudh, compiled by Pandit Devi-prasada. I could not consult the catalog.
73 See manuscripts catalog of North-West, p.492 ; No.144.
any firm evidence to identify the author of *KLT* with the author of *YSC*. Therefore, here, concerning the flourishing period of the author of *KLT*, disciple of Śivarāma Tīrtha, I shall confine myself only to pointing out several problems found in Natarajan’s study on the matter. Secondly, I shall examine the flourishing period of *YSC*’s author.

### 3.1. Flourishing Period of the Author of *KLT*: Earlier Study and Its Problems

Natarajan gives Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s active period as 1675-1745 A.D.\(^74\) The date of Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s death, 1745 A.D., is based on the study of Kurukanti Sitarama Bhattacharya.\(^75\) Natarajan clearly mentions that further study is needed, because of the lack of identification of the reference works utilized by scholars including Nori Narasimhaśāstrī.\(^76\) According to Nori Narasimhaśāstrī, Kurukanti Sitarama Bhattacharya gave the death date as “1745 on Thursday, the eighth day of the bright half of the Phalguna lunar month”; in addition, the date was given “by Tamil writers as the eighth day of the bright half of Masi month, Krittika star, Thursday.”\(^77\) The dates correspond to February 28th and January 30th respectively.\(^78\) However, the grounds for these opinions are not known. Unless we know the basis of the conclusion, we cannot be convinced, for there is another opinion

---

\(^74\) Natarajan 1988, p.160.


\(^76\) Natarajan says he could not find the mention to Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha in ‘Kuruganti’ Sitarama Bhattacharya’s study, “Tanjapura Andhra Nayaka Raja Charitram (written in Telugu)”, No.17 of Andhra Grantha Mala, Tanjavur: Sarasvati Mahal Library, 1932. Natarajan 1988, p.514.

\(^77\) Nori Narasimhaśāstrī 1969, pp.13-14.

\(^78\) Swamikannu Pillai 1922, p.292.
based upon somewhat firmer grounds, which is also reported in Natarajan’s study.

Natarajan says that Kudavayil Balasubramanian fixed the date as February 28th, 1645, Sunday; *Mrgaśīrṣa* star, eighth day of bright half and twenty-third day of the *Māśi* month in the year of *Tāraṇa*.³⁹ Natarajan cites the following verse on which the opinion is based:⁴⁰

\[ \text{śrīmattāraṇāvatvatsare subhadine śuklāṣṭamīsamyute} \\
\text{naksatre mrgaśirṣake navadine śrīmāghamāse kalau} \\
\text{kristvādau śatāśodaśānvitacatupaṇcaśatābde mahān} \\
\text{śrīnārāyaṇaţīrthhasadguruvarto jīvatsamādhiṁ yayau} // \]

Natarajan says that the source of this verse is not known.⁴¹ However, this verse gives us the following data: *Tāraṇa* year, *Māgha* month, eighth day of bright half, *Mrgaśīrṣa naksatra*, 1645 A.D. The meaning of ‘*navadine*’ is not clear. According to *Indian Ephemeris*, vol.VI, the eighth day of bright half of the *Māgha* month in the year of *Tāraṇa* (1645 A.D.) corresponds to January 25th, Saturday.⁴² Since I could not refer to the study of Kudavayil Balasubramanian directly and I also do not have any knowledge of ephemeris, I cannot know the reason why Kudavayil Balasubramanian fixed the date as twenty-third⁴³ of the month of (*Kumbha*)māśī, which does not correspond to days of the *Māgha* month but corresponds to days of the *Phālgunā* month. These problems must be solved before fixing the death date.

---

⁴² Swamikannu Pillai 1922, p.92.
⁴³ ‘Subhadina’ can be read as the 23rd day. However, according to *An Indian Ephemeris*, Vol.VI, Feb. 28th, 1645 is not the 23rd day of the *Kumbhamāśī* month. The 23rd of the month is 18th, Feb., and is the 2nd of bright half of the *Phālgunā* month. On the contrary, the 23rd, Feb., which is the 28th of the *Kumbhamāśī* month, is the 8th of bright half of the *Phālgunā* month. See Swamikannu Pillai 1922, p.92.
Further, P.K. Gode suggested the active period of Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha, the author of the Bhāṭabhāṣāprakāṣikā and the disciple of Śivarāma Tīrtha, as about 1650 A.D.\textsuperscript{84} If we identify this Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha with the author of KLT, the flourishing period given above, 1675-1745 A.D., must be reconsidered.

3.2. FLOURISHING PERIOD OF THE AUTHOR OF YSC: 1600-1690 A.D.

I would like to argue that the flourishing period of Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha, the disciple of Rāmagovinda Tīrtha, can be determined in the following way. Among the works to which he wrote a commentary, BP, generally attributed to Viśvanātha, is the latest. Therefore, BP’s date is the upper limit of Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s flourishing period. From the closing verses of Viśvanātha’s NSV,\textsuperscript{85} we know Viśvanātha flourished around 1634 A.D., and we can surmise BP to have been written around 1634 A.D. In the case that we cannot consider Viśvanātha the author of BP, and rather regard Kṛṣṇadāsa Sārvabhauma as its author\textsuperscript{86}, the upper limit of Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s flourishing period becomes approximately 1600 A.D.\textsuperscript{87}

\textsuperscript{84} Gode 1938, p.70b.
\textsuperscript{85} The closing verse 2 of NSV runs as follows: rasabāṇatithau śakendrakāle bahule kāmatithau śucau sithe / akaron munisūtravṛttim etām nana vṛndāvipine sa viśvanāthah // [p.1201, II.20-23]. ‘Rasabāṇatithi (1556)’ of the Śaka era corresponds to AD 1634.
\textsuperscript{86} Viśvanātha’s authorship of BP and commentary SM was denied and both works were ascribed to Kṛṣṇadāsa Sārvabhauma (16th century) by D.C. Bhattacharya and Umesh Mishra. Umesh Mishra 1966,p.422; Matilal 1977, p.109. However, scholars generally have not accepted this opinion. Matilal 1977, p.110; Potter (comp.) 1983, p.411.
\textsuperscript{87} Several correspondences between Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s works and NSV, however, may suggest that Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha utilized the latter. The explanation of three kinds of anumāna in YSC 1.7 [Text p.(27), l.6-p.(28), l.4] corresponds to the sentences found in NSV 1.1.5 very much [p.147, ll.27-29; cf. SM 142, 143]. The interpretation of the three kinds of inference,
The lower limit of his period can be fixed in the following way. As we have seen previously, Gauḍabrāhmaṇanda Sarasvatī is known as a disciple of Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha, the disciple of Rāmagovinda Tīrtha. According to P.K. Gode, one manuscript of Gauḍabrāhmaṇanda Sarasvatī's Nyāyaratnāvalī, a commentary on SB of Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, was transcribed in 1687 A.D. (Vikrama 1743). Further, both Gopinath Kaviraj and Umesha Mishra say Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha's NC was written before 1701 A.D., the date of a manuscript of the Muktāvalīprakāśa of Dinakara. In view of the above, the lower limit of Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha's flourishing period can be argued approximately 1690 A.D.

Thus, I would like to suggest that the flourishing period of Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha, disciple of Rāmagovinda Tīrtha, is 1600-1690 A.D. rather than 1675-1745 A.D.

viz., pūrvavat, śesavat and sāmānyatodṛṣṭa, mentioned in NS 1.1.5, as kevalānvayin, kevalavyatirekin and anvayavyatirekin is seen in various works of the Nyāya-school, and the syllogistic sentences used as illustrations in both YSC and NSC are often found in other works of the Navya-Nyāya-school. While explaining the three kinds of anumāna in SC 5, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha does not use the terms kevalānvayin, kevalavyatirekin and anvayavyatirekin. Therefore, in YSC he must have followed some of the Nyāya-school's text. Moreover, the resemblance in detail between YSC and NSV is striking. Another example of the correspondence between Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha's sentences and NSV is found in the explanation of the fivefold classification of tarka. The explanation of tarka in the Kusumāñjali-kārikāvyākhyā 3.7 [p.39, ll.4-15] resembles that in NSV 1.1.40 [p.325, l.25-p.327, l.25]. These two examples of correspondence between Viśvanātha and Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha may not be firm evidence to prove the posteriority of the latter. Here, I confine my remarks to pointing out the possibility.


89 See Kaviraj 1982 (rpt.), pp.109-110 and Umesha Mishra 1966, p.472. Kaviraj and Mishra hold that the manuscript was possessed by Dinakara himself. Though the manuscript is said to be preserved in 'Sarasvati Bhavana Sanskrit Library', I could not find it in A Descriptive Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts of Sanskrit University Library (Sarasvati Bhavana), Varanasi.
CHAPTER 2

NARAYANA TIRTHA'S UNDERSTANDING OF PATAÑJALA-YOGA
SECTION 1. INVOCATION VERSES (maṅgala)

As a starting point to clarify the significant characteristics of YSC, we will begin to examine Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s aim to compose YSC, that is, why he intends to compose a new commentary to YS. As to this question, the invocation (maṅgala), or the opening verses of YSC, give us important information. In this chapter, we will inquire into the invocation to understand Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s evaluation of the Yoga expounded in YS and his aim of composing a new commentary.

The invocation verses reads as translated in the following.

“That is described in the Vedas as “the Brahman that is truth, knowledge, infinite and unique happiness.” Those holding various theories consider it in various forms such as Viṣṇu or Śiva. That is not subjected to any [worldly] means of knowledge but realized always through real and blissful union [with it] caused by compassion of [itself in the form of] the spiritual teacher. That Lord Kṛṣṇa, the spiritual teacher of the universe, we always worship him in our heart. (1)’’

“Lord Brahmā [himself] taught Yoga. Then illustrious Patañjali (śeṣa) himself [taught Yoga] with the excellent sūtra-s. Further, omniscient Vyāsa [taught] the supreme [Yoga] in its complete through the pretext of [his] commentary [on the sūtra-s]. Intelligent Vācaspatimiśra explained the commentary, and so did Vijñānabhikṣu. However, the hidden and secret meaning [of the sūtra-s] is very difficult to understand for the persons of mediocre intelligence. (2)”

---

1 Cf. Tai 2.1.1.
2 Piṭāmahā means Lord Brahmā. Traditionally, Hiranyagarbha, i.e. Brahmā is regarded as the founder of Yoga. cf. BYY 12.5 : sāmkhyasya kartā kapilāḥ paramārthaḥ sa ucyate / hiranyagarbhō yogasya vaktā nānyāḥ purātanaḥ.
3 Šeṣa or Ahīṣa, the lord of serpents, is identified with Patañjali. See Bhattacharya 1985, pp.90-93. The lord of serpents also means Śiva.
“Therefore, Nārāyaṇa Bhikṣu composes another commentary named ‘Gūḍhārthadyotikā or the illuminator of the secret import’ on the sūtra-s to satisfy Hari\(^4\). (3)”

“Vyāsa refuted the prosperity of independent reality of the primordial matter (pradhāna) as well as the dogma of plurality of the self (cīdbheda)\(^5\) through the statement of oneness [of the individual self and the absolute Self] in the Brahmasūtra composed by himself. However, he did not refute the Yoga that is meditation (bhāvanā). (4)”

“Moreover, the intelligent sage [Vyāsa] explained the Yoga that confers the knowledge of the self in the Yogabhāṣya and in other literature. Therefore, great teachers gave consideration on that [Yoga] also. (5)”

“In the Bhagavadgītā, Yoga was regarded superior to other [means of liberation] by the Lord.\(^6\) [Yoga] was practiced by Śuka\(^7\) and others. Therefore, high respects are being given to this [Yoga] by the saints. (6)”\(^8\)

\(^4\) Hari can mean various deities. Here, hari seems to mean Krṣṇa, because Nārāyaṇa Tirtha expresses his devotion to Krṣṇa in the first verse.

\(^5\) Although the meaning of ‘cīdbheda’ seems ambiguous, I gave the translation interpreting it as ‘plurality of the self (ātmabheda).’ Cf. BS Bh 2.1.1: kapilo hi na sarvātmavadarśanam anumanyate, ātmabhedābhyupagamat [p.350, ll.5-6]. It may be interpreted as ‘not conscious (acetana).’ Cf. BS Bh 2.1.1: tāsū hy acetanaṁ pradhānāṁ svatantram jagataṁ kāraṇaṁ upanibadhyate [p.346, l.3].

\(^6\) Cf. BhG 5.2, 5.6, 6.46. In BhG, the term ‘Yoga’ means training or practice in general. If it is allowed to say roughly, all practices expanded in BhG can be understood as ‘Yoga.’

\(^7\) Śuka is, according to Indian mythology, a son of Vyāsa. In BhP, he is described as a great Yogin. BhP 1.4.4: tasya putro mahāyogi samadri nirvikalpakah / ekāntamātir unnidro gudho mūḍha ivedyate //.

\(^8\) YSC maṅgala: satyaṁ jñānam anantaṁ advayasukhaṁ brahmeti vedeṣu yat prakṛtaṁ viṣṇuśvādibhīḥ ca bahubhi rūpāṁ matam vādibhīḥ / yan māṇaviśayaḥ sādā guruṇpāsati premayogena sal labhyam tam samupaśmahe hṛdi sadā krṣṇam jagaddeśikam // 1 // yogam prāha pitāmaho 'tha bhagavān śeṣaṁ svayaṁ sūttamaiḥ sūtraiḥ bhāṣyamāṇa sarvavidito vyāsah samastaiṁ param / tadbhāṣyaṁ viśādīcakāra matimāṁ miśro 'tha bhikṣus
SECTION 2. NĀRĀYĀNA TĪRTHA’S UNDERSTANDING OF YOGA

2.1. YOGA IN YSC

The first verse of the maṅgala that expresses Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s invocation to Kṛṣṇa shows us his fundamental understanding about Yoga. He understands that Yoga is the only means to perceive the absolute Self, Brahman, advocated in the Upaniṣad-s. The Brahman is not perceived with worldly means of knowledge, although various forms and names are employed to express it. The Yoga, he says, is real and blissful union with the Absolute brought about by compassion of the Absolute personified as the ultimate preceptor (guru).¹⁹

It must be noted here that the beginning part of the verse “satyaṁ jñānam anantam advayasyaḥ brahma” is almost identical with the sentence of Tai 2.1.1 “satyaṁ jñānam anantam brahma.” This sentence of Tai 2.1.1 is regarded in the tradition of the Advaitavedānta as a secondary sentence (avāntaravākyā) that imparts a knowledge on the Brahman signified by the word ‘tat’ of the principal sentence (mahāvākyā) “tat tvam asi (Chāṇ 6.8.7, etc.).”¹⁰ Of course Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha who composed works

---

¹⁹ Cf. YS 1.26

¹⁰ See SB: tataś ca ‘yato vā imāni bhūtāni jāyante, yena jātāni jīvanti’ ityādyāḥ srstya-dīśrutayas tatpadavācyārthasya samarpikāḥ ‘satyaṁ jñānam anantam’ ityādayas tu laksyārthasya / . . . tena prathamam avāntara-vākyebhyo ‘nubhūtayoḥ śuddhayor jīvabrahmanos tat tvam asy ādīvākye mukhyārthānvayānapapattyā laksanaṁya smaranopapattīḥ / [(1) p.8, l.13-p.9, l.32; (2) p.26, l.1-p.34, l.1].
of Advaita also is well aware of it. Therefore, it is clear that Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha tries to introduce philosophy of Advaitavedānta, instead of the metaphysics of Sāṃkhya on which YBh depends, into Pātañjala-yoga from the beginning of his commentary. However, as mentioned above, he tells that Yoga is the only means to perceive the Brahman. In this respect of Yoga, YSC differs from the opinion of Advaitins who regards the mahāvākyas as the only means to realize the Brahman. This question is taken up in the next chapter.

The first verse of the maṅgala gives us one further important information about Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s understanding of Yoga. It is his emphasis on the compassion of God as an important element for the Yoga to realize the Absolute. This emphasis on the devotion to God is reflected in the long discussion about Bhakti-yoga and īśvara found in YSC 1.23-29 and 1.32. In other word, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha tries to incorporate developed theory of Bhakti-yoga into the system of Pātañjala-yoga. Further, YSC tries to incorporate not only Bhakti-yoga, but also various Yoga-s such as Haṭṭha-yoga, Mantra-yoga, etc., into the Yoga of YS. We shall examine this subject later in chapter 4.

2.2. NĀRĀYAṆA TĪRTHA’S APPROACH IN INTERPRETING YS

From the first verse of the invocation, we come to know Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s two significant approaches in interpreting YS: 1) He tries to illustrate Yoga’s authenticity as being originated from the orthodox teachings of the Upaniṣad-s; 2) He tries to incorporate Bhakti-yoga and other various Yoga-s into the system of Pātañjala-yoga. As will be clear in the text part of the

---

11 See Laghuvyākhya on SB quoted in the above note: evaṁ pramite viśiṣte grhītaśaktikena tatpadena lakṣanayā śuddhopasthitau kāraṇībhūtānubhava- janakaṁ vākyam āha satyam iti / ‘satyam jñānam anantaṁ brahma ... ityādyāḥ śrutaya ityarthāḥ / lakṣyasya tatpadalaksyasya lakṣanayā tatpada-bodhyasyeti yāvat / pramāpikā iti śeṣaḥ / [(1) p.8, ll.29-32; (2) p.27, l.26- p.28, l.14].
present study, a large number of quotations from Upaniṣad-s and from other works on various Yoga-s are found in the text of YSC. Those quotations explain well the two characteristics of his approach. Thus, we come to understand Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s intention to compose YSC from the characteristics in his interpretation of YS: Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha composed YSC with the intention to establish the authenticity of Yoga as the teachings of the Upaniṣad-s, that is, Vedānta and to incorporate various Yoga-s known in his time into Pātañjala-yoga.

2.3. RECONCILIATION WITH VEDĀNTA

The other invocation verses also give us very interesting information regarding Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s understanding of the relation between the Pātañjala-yoga and Vedānta.

In those verses also, we find Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s intention to establish the authenticity of Yoga and YS as not contradicting to the teaching of Vedānta. In the fourth and the fifth verse, he illustrates the authenticity by means of the tradition that Vyāsa, the author of YBh, is identical with the author of BS. The fourth verse’s reference that BS did not criticize meditation although it refuted the Sāṃkhya theories of self-dependence of pradhāna and plurality of puruṣa shows his effort to justify the study and practice of Yoga with excluding the Sāṃkhya-metaphysics.¹²

Generally, BS 1.1.5-11, 1.4.1-28, 2.1.1-11, and 2.2.1-10 are regarded as criticisms directed against Sāṃkhya, though different interpretations are

¹² BS admits, according to Śaṅkara, that Yogan-s see the Self in meditation. See BS 3.2.24: api ca samrādhane pratyakṣanumānbhāyām; BS Bh 3.2.24: api cainam atmānāṃ nirastasamastaprapaṇacam avyaktam samrādhana-kāle paśyanti yogaṅaḥ / samrādhanaṃ ca bhaktidhyānapraṇidhāṇyāduṣṭā- nam / [p.657, ll.14-16]. In addition, BS 4.1.7-12 are interpreted as instructions on meditation (upaśana).
found at the hands of various commentators.\textsuperscript{13} In Śaṅkara’s commentary on BS, Sāṃkhya-school was one of the main opponents to Vedānta-school. Advaita-school cannot accept the Sāṃkhya theory of the independent pradhāna as the material cause of the universe and the their theory of the plurality of individual selves. Because for Advaitin, Brahman alone is the both material cause and instrumental cause (abhinnanimittopādānākāraṇa) of the universe, and each individual selves are identical with the unrivaled Brahman.\textsuperscript{14} According to Śaṅkara, the same criticism applies to the metaphysics of traditional texts of Yoga.\textsuperscript{15} However, practice of Yoga as a means to obtain true knowledge is not rejected because it agrees to the teachings of Veda-s.\textsuperscript{16}

Thus, it seems reasonable also to suppose that Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s statement in the fourth invocation verse is derived from Śaṅkara’s interpretation of BS.\textsuperscript{17} Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha does not regard the Sāṃkhya metaphysics of

\textsuperscript{13} Ghate 1981, pp.59-61, pp.70-77, pp.84-85.

\textsuperscript{14} BS\textit{bh} 2.1.3: etena sāṃkhyaśastrīpratyākhyāyānena yogasṁtīr api praty-ākhyātā draśṭavyet atiśiṣati / tatrāpi śrutivrodhena pradhānam svatantram eva kāraṇam mahadādīni ca kāryān alokavedaprasiddhāni kalpyate [p.352, ll.4-5]; śrutir hi vaidikād ātmikatvavijñānād anyaniḥreyasādhanam vārayatī tam eva viditvätimṛtyum eti nānyāḥ panthā vidyate 'yanāya iti / dvaitino hi te sāṃkhya yogāś ca nātmikatvadārśīnaḥ / [p.354, ll.1-3]. See also Larson 1979, p.215. Other Vedāntin-s, such as Viśiṣṭādvaita, Dvaitādvaita and Dvaita had, agree to Sāṃkhya as to the plurality of the individual self. See Ghate 1981, p.27, p.29, p.33.

\textsuperscript{15} See BS\textit{bh} 2.1.3 quoted in the above note.

\textsuperscript{16} BS\textit{bh} 2.1.3: samyagdarśanābhyupāyo hi yogo vede vihitā... [p.352, l.7]; yat tu darśanam uktam tatkāraṇam sāṃkhya-yogābhiṇannam iti, vaidikam eva tatra jñānam dhyānam ca sāṃkhya-yogāsabdābhyām abhilaṣyate pratyāsatter ity avagantavyam / yena tv aṃśena na virudhyate teneṣṭam eva sāṃkhya-yogasṁtīrtyoḥ sāvakāśatvam / [p.354, ll.3-6].

\textsuperscript{17} In the commentary on BS ascribed to Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha, the following discussion is found, although we do not have firm evidence to ascribe this work to the author of YSC: BS criticizes only some section of Yoga texts which expounds metaphysics of Sāṃkhya, but not the sections devoted to the teaching of practicing Yoga. Because even though the Yoga texts is valid in suggesting means for the highest end of life, it is not valid in its metaphysical aspect of pradhāna, for it does not intend to expounding
pradhāna and puruṣa expounded in YBh as the metaphysics really intended by Vyāsa. The verse shows his effort to reconcile Pātañjala-yoga with Advaitavedānta. However, as the entire text of YSC, especially the text of the fourth chapter, is not available to us at present, the question whether his attempt to exclude Sāṃkhya metaphysics from the system of the Pātañjala-yoga is successful or not remains to be considered.

2.4. CONCLUSION OF THIS CHAPTER

From what has been said above, we come to the following conclusion regarding Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s understanding of the Pātañjala-yoga and his aim of writing YSC: Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha wrote YSC with the intention to interpret Pātañjala-yoga in reconciliation to the philosophy of Advaitavedānta, and to incorporate various mediaeval Yoga-s under its system.

It seems that the intended subject is what he calls the hidden and secret meaning of YS that neither Vācaspatimiśra nor Viśnunabhiṣṭa revealed in their commentaries.\textsuperscript{18}

---

\textsuperscript{18} Among other commentaries on the YS, as far as I could refer to, only \textit{NCh} of Nagojībhaṭṭa mentions \textit{BS}’s refutation of Yoga-school. Quoting Śaṅkara’s \textit{Bhāsyā} and \textit{Bhāmatī} of Vācaspatimiśra, \textit{NCh} 1.1 also says that \textit{BS} refutes only Sāṃkhya-like theories of pradhāna in Yoga-texts, but not Yoga-practices. \textit{NCh} p.219, ll.5-20.
CHAPTER 3

YOGA AND ADVAITA VEDĀNTA
SECTION 1. ADVAITIC INTERPRETATION FOUND IN YSC 1.1

It was observed in the preceding section that the invocation of YSC shows the characteristics of Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s interpretation of YS: 1) Reconciliation to the philosophy of Advaitavedānta; 2) Incorporation of various mediaeval Yoga-s. So far as the Vedāntic interpretation is concerned, YSC is not the only work that tries to reconcile the Pātañjala-yoga with Vedānta. Vijñāna-bhikṣu, for example, already attempted to synthesize Sāmkhya, Yoga and Vedānta in his Yogavārttika. In all the systems of Vedānta, meditation plays important roll. Therefore, it is not surprising that YS attracted an attention of many Vedāntin. The question is how YS was interpreted in accordance with the philosophy of Vedānta. Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s particular way to reconcile Pātañjala-yoga to Advaitavedānta is clearly expressed in the beginning of YSC 1.1. Here we would like to see how he reconcile Yoga to Advaitavedānta.

On commencing the commentary on YS 1.1, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha quotes several sentences of Upaniṣad-s which advocate the realization of the Brahman, or the absolute Self. As the means for realization of the Self, he introduces profound meditation (nididhyāsana). Further, nididhyāsana is identified with concentration (samādhi).¹ This samādhi is, according to Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha, a subordinate synonym of Rāja-yoga. I would like to present the portion in question in translation.

""The one who knows the Brahman attains the supreme (Tai 2.1. 1)."" ""He who knows the Brahman becomes the Brahman itself (Mūnd 3.2.9)."" ""After knowing only that, he attains immortality. There is no

¹ The translations of the word ‘samādhi’ and ‘nirvicāra’ that will appear later in this study, I followed Woods (tr.) 1972. As to the translations of the words ‘samprajñāta’ and ‘asamprajñāta,’ also appearing later, I followed Woods, but I gave the words ‘conscious’ and ‘non-conscious’ instead of Woods’ translations, namely, ‘conscious of objects’ and ‘not conscious of objects’ for the purpose of simplicity.
other way to attain it (Śvet 3.8 or 6.15).” “One who knows the Self overcomes grief (Chāṇ 7.1.3).” These sacred texts determine that the direct perception of the Self is the means to attain the highest purpose of human beings (puruṣārtha). As the means (sādhana) [of the direct perception], hearing (śravaṇa), thinking (manana) and profound meditation (nididhyāśana), and so on, are taught in [the sacred texts] such as “indeed, the Self must be perceived, heard of, thought of and meditated upon (Br 2.4.5 or 4.5.6).”

Among those [three], the profound meditation is the supreme. Because the mind (manas) can possess supernatural and uncontradicted valid knowledge of the Self only through the cooperation of that [meditation] (tatsahakṛtād eva). Moreover, because the result of it, [i.e., the valid knowledge of the Self,] such as omniscience, is told.²

The profound meditation, further, is concentration (samādhi) [of the mind] characterized as the focus on one point (ekatānatā), and the like, which is a subordinate synonym (aparaparyāya) of the Rāja-yoga.”³

The above translated portion tells how Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha reconciles Yoga with the system of Vedānta. What has to be noticed is his expression of the profound meditation (nididhyāśana). He says nididhyāśana is the most important among śravaṇa (hearing) manana (thinking) and nididhyāśana (profound meditation) expounded in Br as the means to realize the Self.

The discussion about the three is found here and there in various works of Vedānta. However, opinion varies among Vedāntin-s as to which of the three

---

² Cf. NC on BP 66 ab.
³ YSC 1.1 :brahmavid āpnoti param / brahma veda brahmaiva bhavati / tam eva viditvā 'timrtym eti nānyaḥ panthā vidyate 'yanāya / tarati śokam ātmavid / ityādīśrutsbr̥tasādhanatākātmamasākṣātkāraśādhanatayā śravaṇamananandīdhyāsanādhīnī ātmā vāre draṣṭavayo śrotasyo mantavyo nididhyāsitavya ityādināmvātani / tatra nididhyāsanam pradaḥanām / tatsahakṛtād eva manasā 'laukidādhitātmagocaramāsāṃsvāt sarvavijñānādirūpapataphalasamvaddāc ca / nididhyāśanaḥ caikatānanādirūpāh rājayogāparaparyāyaḥ samāduḥḥ / [Text p.(2),l.10-p.(3),l.9].
is the most principal means. Even in the tradition of the Advaitin alone, several views are found. Before examining Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s view, we must look briefly several discussions regarding the profound meditation (nīdīdhyāsana) and the realization of the Self among Advaitin-s

SECTION 2. PROBLEM OF NĪDĪDHYĀSANA

2.1. QUESTION OF THE CHIEF CAUSE FOR THE REALIZATION OF THE SELF IN ADVAITAVEDĀNTA

For the Advaitin-s, question regarding śravaṇa, manana and nīdīdhyāsana is a question regarding the relation of action to the realization of the Self. To define principal-subordinate relation among the three, especially to define the position of nīdīdhyāsana, is to define how important role action plays for attaining the realization.⁴

Śaṅkara denied the decisive role of action in Upad.⁵ As to the relation of śravaṇa, manana and nīdīdhyāsana, however, he says in his commentary on Br that the totality of the three forms the means of the perception (darśana) of the Self.⁶

---

⁴ Advaitins’ views on the principal-subordinate relation among the śravaṇa, manana and nīdīdhyāsana are briefly summarized by Hino. See Hino 1982, pp.24-25.
⁵ Upad 1.1.11-12: tathā dhruvapalā vidyā karma nityam apekṣate / ity evam kecid icchanti na karma pratiṅlatah // 11 // vidyāyāh pratikūlam hi karma syat sābhīmānataḥ / nirvikārātmabuddhiḥ ca vidyētiha prakīrtīta // 12 // [p.72, l.21-p.73, l.4] ; Upad 1.18.219: tvampadārthavivekāya sam-nyāsaḥ sarvakarmanām / sādhanatvaṃ vrajaye eva śanto dāntādiśasanāt // 219 // [p.182, l.9-12].
⁶ Brhadāraṇyakopaniṣadbhāṣya 2.4.5 : tasmād vai ātmā are draṣṭavyo darśanārtho, darśanaviṣayam āpādayitavyaḥ / śrotavyaḥ pūrvam ācāryata āgamataḥ ca / paścān mantavyas tarkataḥ / tato nīdīdhyāsitavyo nyācayena dhyātavyaḥ / evam hy asau drṣṭo bhavati śravaṇamanananidīdhyāsanair nirvartyaiḥ / yadaikatvam etasy upagatāni tadā samyagdarsanam brahmaikatvaviṣayāṃ prasīdatī, nānyathā śravaṇamātreṇa / [p.760, l.17-
Sureśvara holds that “śravaṇa and manana are co-existent and nididhyāsana is their culmination and the precedent of the knowledge of the Brahman.” 7 Sureśvara’s interpretation of nididhyāsana as the “culmination of śravaṇa and manana,” not as action of meditation, is to avoid his view to fall into the Jñānakarmasamuccayavāda, or the view that admits the combination of action and knowledge as necessary for achieving the liberation. 8

Jñānakarmasamuccayavāda is the view maintained by scholars such as Maṇḍana Miśra 9. Maṇḍana Miśra holds that knowledge arises from Upaniṣadic text is indirect (parokṣa). To obtain direct realization, meditation (upāsanā) is required. 10

21]. Hino points out that Ānandagiri comments śravaṇa is the principal. Hino 1982, p.24.


9 As to the Jñānakarmasamuccayavāda of Maṇḍana Miśra, see S. Kuppuswami Sastri 1984, pp.xxxiii-xxxvi.

10 Maṇḍana Miśra’s view on meditation and the realization of the Self is summarized by S. Kuppuswami Sastri as follows: according to Maṇḍana Miśra, “the knowledge which arises from such texts [i.e., Upaniṣadic texts such as ‘tat tvam asi’] … is indirect and mediate(parokṣa). … Maṇḍana maintains that such indirect knowledge of Brahman should pass through the furnace of meditation (Upāsanā) before … mediacy could be removed from it, and before it could be refined into the pure, efficient and direct realisation of the Absolute Real (Brahmavidyā or Brahmasāksātikāra). It is only this direct realisation which springs from meditation based upon the indirect knowledge arising from the Upaniṣadic texts, that is capable of bringing about liberation (mukti).” Kuppuswami Sastri 1984, p.xxxviii, l.28-p.xxix, l.5. See also Murty 1973, pp.104-105. As the suports for his interpretation, Kuppuswami Sastri indicates the following portions of the Brahmasiddhi: niṣcīte ‘pi pramāṇat tattvate sarvatra mithyāvabhāśā nivartante, hetu-viśeṣād anuvartante ‘pi … tannirvittaye ’sty anyad apekṣyam, tac ca tattvadarsanābhāṣyo lokasiddhāḥ [p.35, ll.1-5]; tasmāt tannirvittaye viñciṭa-brahmātmabhāvāṇiṣiśādhanāṇy apekṣyāṇi [p.35, l.25]; parokṣarūpaṁ śabdajñām, … nityaś cāttmatattvapraṇāsah, tatra na punar viparyāyāvakaśo ’sti; śabdāṁ tu pramāṇadhīnāṁ kṣaṇikāṁ jñānam, tatra punar api viparya-
Maṇḍana’s view obviously conflicts with Śaṅkara’s view that the only way to the liberation is the knowledge of Brahman obtained only from the passages of Upaniṣad-s. The followers of Śaṅkara, beginning with Sureśavara, tried to include meditation in their system of Advaita avoiding to fall into the Jñānakarmasamuccayavāda at the same time. This resulted in their various interpretations about the nature of nididhyāsana, its relation to śravaṇa and manana.

The principal question in this argument for the position of meditation is a question about the direct or chief cause (karana) for realization of the Self. While Maṇḍana holds that meditation (prasmākhyaṇa) is the chief cause,

yāvakāsaḥ; drṣṭam hi pramāṇānanusandhāne punah sarpabhṛntyā rajor bhayam / aṭhāṛapi sāṃtataṃ śabdāṃ jñānam anuṣamadhitā, kim anyad upāsanam asmāt? tasmād bandhahetucchedo ’pi vidyāiva, na tayā sādhyāḥ / [p.134, ll.3-14]; yadi matam prayakṣādīny api pravrṭtyangāṇy eva, pramite ’ṛthe hānopādāṇidilakṣaṇāyāḥ pravrṭites tanmūlatvāt, idrśāṃ pravrṭtyangātavam ātṛapy araty eva, śabdāt pramite brahmaṇi sāksātkarāṇaya pravrṭter iṣṭatvād iti / [p.159, ll.10-13].

Śaṅkara criticizes, in BSBh 3 adhyāya 4 pāda, the view that knowledge is subordinate to actions prescribed in Veda-s, and, especially in BSBh 3.4.11, the view that action cooperates with knowledge for the achievement of the aimed result. BSBh 3.4.11: yady arop uktaṃ — ‘tam vidyākarman samanvārambhete’ īty etat samanvārambhavacanam āsvātantrye vidyāyā liṅgam īti tat pratyucaye / vibhāgo ’tra draṣṭavayo vidyāyam puruṣam anvārabhate karmāṇyam iti / [p.786, ll.19-21]. Śaṅkara admits only the obligatory actions (nitya-karman) prescribed in Veda-s help to acquire the knowledge through their effect of destroying the evils obstructing the realization of Brahman. BSBh 4.1.18: tasmād vidyāṣamyuktaṃ nityam agnihotrādi vidyāvihīnām cobhayam api mumukṣā moksaprayojana-ddeśeneha janmani janmāṇtare ca prāg jñānotpatteḥ kṛtaḥ yat tad yathā-sāmarthya brahmādhipamapratibhandhakāraṇopātaduritākṣayaḥ etuva dvāreṇa brahmādhipamakāraṇatvam pratipadyamānām śravaṇamananānaśraddhātātparyāyantararaṅgakāraṇāpeśam brahmādhipayā sahākakāryaṃ bhavati iti siddham / [p.853, l.20–p.854, l.1]. For Śaṅkara, upāsana and nididhyāsana are actions (kriyā, karman) in their nature. BSBh 4.1.1: api copāsanaṃ nididhyāsanaṃ cetī antarāntāvṛttigungaiva kriyābhidhyāte / [p.826, ll.9-10]; BSBh 4.1.6: svayam evopāsasayā karmavat phalavat tvopapatteḥ / [p.840, ll.1-2]. About Śaṅkara’s thought on action and knowledge, criticism against the Jñānakarmasamuccayavāda, see Mayeda 1979, p.84-94.

Śaṅkara and his followers, such as Sureśvara, Vivaraṇa-school, Madhusūdanasarasvatī, hold the principal sentence of the Upaniṣad-s (mahāvākya) is the chief cause.¹³

On this question, Vācaspatimīśra in his Bhāmati gives a different answer: mind (manas or antaḥkaraṇa) is the karaṇa for realization of the Self. This view of Vācaspatimīśra offers a key to understand Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s effort to reconcile Pātañjala-yoga to Advaitavedānta in YSC. Therefore, I would like to describe briefly the view of Bhāmati here.

2.2. BHĀMATI-SCHOOL’S VIEW

According to Bhāmati, the realization or the direct perception (sāksātkāra) of Brahman arises from the instrument for perceptual knowledge (pratyakṣa), not from that for verbal knowledge (śabdapramāṇa), because it is a perception. Since the perception is a particular activity of the mind (antaḥkaraṇavṛttibhedā), the mind is the direct cause for the realization. Moreover, this particular activity of the mind arises in the state resulted from the meditation on the doubtless meaning of the principal sentence (nirvicikitsāvākyārthabhāvanāparipāka). The knowledge of Brahman, which is produced from the scriptures and is mediate (parokṣa) is different from the immediate realization of Brahman.¹⁴

¹⁴ Bhāmati 1.1.1: na cāsaḥ anupāditarahmānubhāvā taducchēdāya paryāptā, sāksātkārarūpo hi vipāryāṣaḥ sāksātkārarūpaṇaiva tattvajñānenocchidyate, na tu parokṣāvabhasena, diṁmohilātacakratalavṛksamarunārici-saṁlaiśivraṣmeyā pparaokṣāvabhaśiṣu aparokṣāvabhasibhir eva digāditattvapatravyair nivṛtviddarśanāt / no khalv āptaçañāningādivinisīcitadigāditattvāñām digmahādayo nivartante / tasmāt tvāmpadārthasya tatpadārthatvena sāksātkāra esitavyah / etāvatā hi tvāmpadārthasya duḥkhiśokhitvādiśaṁsātkāraśājīnītthā nānyathā / nacaiśa sāksātkāro māmāṁśāsaḥitaśyāpi śabdapramaṁsasya phalam, api tu pratyakṣasya, tasyaiva tatphalavatvaniyām / anyathā katajabījad api vatāṅkurotṛtipprasāngāt / tasmān nirvicikitsāvākyārthabhāvanāparipākasahitam antaḥkaraṇaṁ tvāmpadārthasyāparokṣasya
that is the particular activity of the mind (antaḥkaraṇa-vṛttibheda) is produced with the help of the latent impression (sāṃskāra) accumulated by meditation preceded by śravaṇa and manana.\textsuperscript{15}

Although Vācaspati does not regard meditation as the direct cause for the realization, he is in the same point of view with Maṇḍana Miśra in regarding the knowledge produced from Upaniṣad as indirect. This point of view is traditionally called as śabdaparokṣaprasthāna. On the other hand, the view that regards the knowledge acquired by the scriptures is direct, which is held bySUREśvara, Padmapāda and the Vivaraṇa-school, is called śabdāparokṣa-
prasthāna.\textsuperscript{16} The two different theories of Vivaraṇa-school and Bhāmati-
school are well described in the Vedāntaparibhāṣā.\textsuperscript{17} It introduces the two
different views as follows, of which the later is the view of the Bhāmati-
school:

\begin{quote}
"tac cāparokṣajñānaṁ tat tvam asy ādīvākyād iti kecit /
manananidhyāsanaṃ saṃskṛtāntaḥkaraṇaḥ evety apare //"
\end{quote} \textsuperscript{18}

\textsuperscript{15} Bhāmati 1.1.4 : nāpi vidyodayah, tasyāpi śravanamananapūrvakopāsanā-
janitasamskārasacīvād eva cetaso bhāvāt / [p.70, ll.21-22]; tasmād brahmabhūyasāvidyāpīdhānāpanayamātreṇāvirbhāvāt, avidyāpanayasya ca vedāntārthavijñānād avagatiṇaryantād eva saṃbhavāt, upāsanaṅgṛt saṃskāra-
hetubhāvasya saṃskārasya ca sāksātkāropajanane maṇaḥsācivyasya ca
mānāntarasiddhāt, ‘ātmety evopāsita’ iti na vidhiḥ, api tu vidhisarūpo
’yam / [p.70, l.28-p.71, l.26]; satyaṁ, na brahmajñānamatram sāṃsāri-
kadharmanivṛttikāraṇam api tu sāksātkāraparyantam / brahmāsāksāt-kāraś
cāntaḥkaraṇavṛttibhedāḥ śravanamananādijanitasamskārasacīvamanojanmā
śadjaδibhedaśāksātkāra iva gandravasāstraśravanābhāyāsamskrtamano-
yonih / [p.94, ll.25-26]; 2.2.10 : yadu tu ‘tat tvam asi’ iti vākyaśravana-
mananadhyānābhāyāsparipakaparakṣaparyantarajyo ‘syā sāksātkāra upjāyate
tadā jīvaḥ sūdbuddhatattvasvabhāvam ātmano ’nubhavan nirmṛṣṭa-
nikhilasāvāsanakleśajālayah kevalah svastho bhavati [p.429, ll.19-21].

\textsuperscript{16} Shīma 1986, p.111, ll.5-16.
\textsuperscript{17} Vedāntaparibhāṣā p.206, l.6 - p.209, l.7.
\textsuperscript{18} Vedāntaparibhāṣā p.206, ll.7-8.
SECTION 3. RECONCILIATION WITH ADVATAVEDĀNTA

3.1. RECONCILIATION WITH THE MEDITATION THEORY OF BHĀMATĪ-SCHOOL

Let us now return to the above quoted portion of YSC 1.1. There, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha said: "Among those [three, i.e., śravaṇa, manana and nididhāyāsana], the profound meditation is the supreme. Because the mind (manas) can possess supernatural and uncontradicted valid knowledge of the Self only through the cooperation of that [meditation] (tatsahakṛtād eva)."

Here we find the similarity of YSC with the view of Bhāmatī-school: The mind possesses valid knowledge of the Self through the cooperation of nididhāyāsana. Therefore, it seems reasonable to suppose that Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s idea is closely related to the opinion of Vācaspatimiśra and the Bhāmatī-school.

This similarity of YSC with Bhāmatī-school and dissimilarity with Vivaraṇa-school regarding the role of meditation for the realization of the Self is well expressed in YSC 1.49 where problem about the realization of the Self and the means for it is discussed.

The discussion can be summarized as follows: YS 1.49 tells the truce bearing insight (rtambharā-prajñā) arising in super-reflective concentration (nirvicāra-samādhi) has, unlike the verbal cognition and inference, ‘a particular (viśeṣa)’ as its object; Interpreting this sūtra, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha says that verbal cognition and inference can not produce indeterminate (nirvikalpa) knowledge on an unqualified object, further, he applies this idea to the cognition of the Self; Against this view, Vedāntin rises objection that the principal sentences, such as “tat tvam asi” can causes valid perceptual knowledge on the referents of the words ‘tat’ and ‘tvam’; Further, Vedāntin gives meditation the role of removing obstacles to the cognition of the Self;

19 YS 1.49: śrutānumānaprajñābhyām anyaviśayā viśeṣārthatvāt.
Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha rejects this objection saying that the valid knowledge about
the non-difference (abhedā) of the individual self and the absolute Self can
arise only through the mind (manas) cooperated with meditation because
only organs (indriya) can produce direct knowledge.

To understand the discussion clearly, I would like to quote YSC 1.49 in
translation in the following:

20 YSC 1.49: ata eva tasyāḥ klīptābhyaḥ visayato viṣeṣam āha // śrutānumā
neti // śrutānumānaprajñābhyaḥ anyavisayā viṣeṣārthatvāt // sā tu samā
dhijā praṇāḥ śrutānumānaprajñābhyaṁ śrutam śravaṇam śabdabodhaḥ
anumāṇam mananam yauktikajñānaṁ tadāpraprajñābhyaṁ anyavisayā
atiriktavisayā / kutāḥ / viṣeṣārthatvāt / viṣeṣo nirvikalpo 'jñāto visayo
yasyāḥ sā tathātvāt / śabdānumānayoḥ padārthatavacchedakavyāpakaṭāv
vacchedakapurūṣākāreṇaiva dhijanakatvaniyamena tadvrāhānayoga
viṣeṣayāmatārvayakatvād iti yāvat // vedāntinaṁ tu / śabdasya śaktyā padā
rthatavacchedakapurūṣākāreṇaiva dhijanakatvaniyam na tu laksanāyāpi /
ato laksanāyā kevalasya brahmaṇaḥ śabdagramatve 'pi na kṣatīḥ / tathā
cā mahāvākyārthaprajakābhūtanubhāvajānāvānāntaravākyasthapada
janāyamārtikāraniḥbhūtanubhāvajānakatvam asamprajñātayogasya svajana-
dharmadvāreti na ko 'pi virodho na vā mahāvākyārthabodhānupapattīr
aptū bhāva iti prāhuḥ // idaṁ tu bodhyam / yady api tam tv aupaniṣadām
puruṣam prchāmi / ityādiśrituṁ upaṃsūnaṁśtrāgamayam evātmatattvam
daśamas tvam asītyādvikāye daśamādisākṣātkārārāśanāt tat tvam asī
ādvikāyair api aparokṣapramā ca sambhavati / yogapadārthānirūpita-
tvampadārthābhādparasādabtvādina śabdasya aparokṣadhijanakatve 'upra-
saṅgābhāvd ṣaḍgābhāvāḥ yogādvikāyāṁ tvampadārthābhādparatvābhāvāt / dhāmi-
kas tvam asītyādvikāyaṁ tu yogapadārthānirūpitatvampadārthābhādpa-
ratvābhāvāt tasmā tāṁti viṣeṣājānādhijanakatvāna parokṣajānājana-
kāṇi / tat tvam asītyādvikāye tvam niruktarūpeṇa aparokṣadhijanakam eva /
tato jātāyāṁ api aparokṣapramāyāṁ viparītabhāvanādīrūpadośasattve phalam
na sambhavatī piṭhādhanirāśaya nididhyāśanādikam api āvasyakam
iti piṭhādhanirvṛttiphalakatvam eva vaktum ucitaṁ na jñānaphala-
tvam bhāvanāyāḥ pramanāntaratvāpātāt / kāminīṁ bhāvāyato vyavhitā-
kāminīsākṣātkāreyeva bhāvanājānayatvenātmasākṣātkāreyāpramātvapra-
saṅgāc ca / mūlibhūtanubhvasu tvam suṣupter moṣād vā sambhavaty etevi
na sarvathā jñāne bhāvanāvāsāraṇaṁ ścṛtāśanāpekṣā / tathāpi daśame
vākyasahakṛtena manasaḥ caṇkṣaḥ vāparokṣapramājananena drṣṭāntās-
siddheḥ niruktarūpeṇa śabdasya aparokṣajānājanaṅkatve mānābhāvād
indriyajāpyājānasyaviṣayāparokṣatvapratipatte manasaśvānuṇḍrastavyam
iti śruteś ca śrutiḥ prāk tvampadatatpadavācyatvādina pramitayor jiva-
paramātanair avinābhāvādirūpabhādasya ca manasaiva bhāvanāsahā-
kāreṇaparokṣapramā bhavatīti bhāvanāsamādhe jñānaphalakatvathā-
nam evaitammatānusāreṇa yuktam etevi dik / na vā bhāvanājanyatve 'py
[TRANSLATION OF YSC 1.49]

"From the very reason that [the truce-bearing insight (ṛtambhara-prajñā) exists in the clarity of the super-reflective concentration (nirvicāra-samādhi)], the insight is different from the other insight in its object. [The author of the sūtra] tells it in the sūtra "from [insights] based upon hearing and inference."

The truce-bearing insight has an object different from that of the insights arising from hearing and inference, for it has 'a particular' as its object (YS 1.49).

The insight arising from the [super-reflective] concentration [has an object different] "from that of the insights arising from hearing and inference." "That arising from hearing (śruta)" means hearing (śravaṇa), verbal cognition (śābdabodha). "That arising from inference (anumāna)" means thinking (manana), cognition resulted from reasoning (yauktikajñāna). Comparing to these two insights, [the insight arising from the super-reflective concentration (nirvicāra-samādhi)] "has a different object," i.e., superior object (atirikta-visaya). Why?

"For it has 'a particular' as its object." "A particular" is an indeterminate (nirvikalpa) and previously not known (ajñāta) object. The insight which has such an object is that which has 'a particular' as its object. [In the cognition of the Self,] language and inference can only produce the knowledge [of the Self] in the form of the Self [qualified by] the delimiter of the referent [in the case of language] and the delimiter of the pervaderness [in the case of inference] (padārthatā-vacchedakavyāpakatāvacchedakapuruṣākāraṇa)."21 This [insight arising

ātmasākṣātyāprāmāṇyaṁ abādhitaviśayatvāt / uktaśākṣātyārasya tu bādhitārthaviśayatvād evāprāmāṇyaṁ na bhāvanājanyatvenetī bhāvaḥ
[Text p.(181),l.6-p.(185),l.4].

21 The compound "padārthatāvacchedakavyāpakatāvacchedakapuruṣākāreṇa" can be interpreted as "padārthatāvacchedakavyāpakatāvacchedaka-avacchinna-puruṣākāreṇa." Here, the delimiter (avacchedaka) in both
from the super-reflective concentration] has as its object only the object unsuitable for the cognition by both [language and reasoning]. This is the meaning [of the sūtra].

The followers of the Vedānta school, however, insist upon as follows. Although language invariably gives rise to the knowledge [of the Self] in the form of the Self [qualified by] the delimitor of the referentness through its denotative function (śakti), yet it does not [give rise to knowledge] through implication (lakṣanā). Therefore there is no harm if the unqualified Brahman alone [,i.e., not the Self qualified by the delimitor of the referentness] is understood through implication. In the same way [this is clear] : The secondary sentence (avāntaravākya) is that which gives rise to the knowledge that causes one to understand the meaning of the principal sentence (mahāvākya) indirectly. The non-conscious Yoga (asamprajñāta-yoga) produces knowledge that creates the memory on the words of the secondary sentence through the merit the Yoga produced. Therefore, not a single contradiction exists [in Vedāntin’s theory]. Further, there will not be a failure in realizing the meaning of the principal sentence.

the cases seems to be puruṣatva. Delimitor (avacchedaka) is one of the concepts employed by Navya-nyāya to analyze and explain relation. According to Wada, it is a property of a relatum that restricts the locus of the delimited as that of the delimitor, and lets one to recognize the relatum in a particular manner. Wada 1990, pp.83-84. Here, in the case of a verbal knowledge of the Self (puruṣa), the referent puruṣa has the property ‘referentness (padārthata)’ residing in it. The delimitor which restricts the locus of the referent-ness to be puruṣa and allows one to recognize the referent to be puruṣa is its property ‘puruṣatva.’ In the case of the inference of puruṣa, puruṣatva is the delimitor of the pervaderness (vyāpakata) in the same way. Delimiter also can mean a qualifier (viṣeṣana). Wada 1990, p.94, note 1. Therefor I rendered the term “-avacchinna-” in the presumed compound “padārthataavacchedaka-vyāpakaivatā-cchedaka-[puruṣatva-avacchinna ]puruṣākāren” as ‘qualified.’ I would like to express gratitude to Dr. Toshihiro Wada of the Nagoya University for his kind advice regarding the interpretation of the text.
However, we [Yoga school] should understand as follows.

[Vedāntin] may argue in the following way. From the reason [taught] in the sacred texts such as “I ask you the person expounded in the Upaniṣad-s (Br 3.9.26),” the reality of the Self is understood only through the Upaniṣad-s. Based upon the experience that the sentence such as “you are the tenth” gives rise to the direct knowledge of ‘the tenth,’ it becomes clear that the valid perceptual knowledge [of the Self] arises from the [Upaniṣadic] sentence, such as “thou art it (Chān 6.8.7, etc.).” Because, to establish that the word is the producer of the direct knowledge of the Self, we do not insist on any unwarrantable application of rule, such as, that the word functions as a different word having the same meaning with that which has the meaning of the word ‘tvam’ conditioned by the appropriate meaning of the word (yogyapaḍārthanirūpitaṭvampadaḍārthābhedaṇaḥaṣṭadatva). For, in a grammatically appropriate sentence [the word ‘tvam’] can not be a different word having the same meaning with that which has the meaning of the word ‘tvam.’ However, the sentences such as “you are religious (dharmaṇikas tvam asi),” producing knowledge not arising from their object, give rise to indirect knowledge because of the very reason that [the word ‘tvam’] does not have a function of a different word having the same meaning with that which has the meaning of the word ‘tvam’ conditioned by the appropriate meaning of the word (yogyapaḍārtha-nirūpitaṭvampadaḍārthābhedaṇaḥaṣṭadatva). On the contrary, the sentence such as “thou art it” certainly produces the direct knowledge in the form it describes. Even when the valid direct knowledge is appearing, the result does not arise if there exist defects such as in the form of the latent impression [created from the false identification of the body with the Self] that contradicts [to the knowledge] (vipaṛītabhāvanādi-
Therefore, the profound meditation [and other practices] also are necessary to remove the hindrance. Consequently, the profound meditation [and other practices] can be regarded as only what result the removal of the hindrance, but not as what result the knowledge, because the latent impression [created by meditation] would be counted as another means of valid knowledge, [if the profound meditation produced the knowledge]. Moreover, the contingency of the invalidity would result to the direct perception of the Self just as in the case of the cognition of a distant lover for a man who meditates upon the lover. Further, the knowledge [that is produced from the secondary sentence (avāntaravākya) and] that causes [the understanding of the meaning of the principal sentence (mahāvākya)] certainly arises from the deep dreamless sleep (suṣupti) or from the removing [the attribute such as ‘true’ from the ‘true Self’ understood by the secondary sentence “the Brahman that is truth, knowledge”] (moṣa). Therefore the knowledge does not always depend upon the profound meditation which is a special meditation (bhāvanāviśeṣarūpanidhiyāsanā).

Notwithstanding this [Vedāntin’s opinion, we, Pātañjala-yoga school, understand as follows]. As to the ‘tenth (daśama)’ [given by Vedāntin as an example of the direct knowledge arises from the sentence “you

---

22 See Laghuvyākhyā on the SB 8: pratibandhaś ca ... viparītabhāvanā ceti / ... anādikālātpravṛttadehātmajnājanījanitasāṃskārapracayaś cittaśoṣaḥ /.[(1) p.128, ll.6-10 ; (2) p.428, ll.15-21.
23 See SB : advitiyabrahmaciṣḍaṁ payasyā pravṛttānāṁ satyajñānādipadānāṁ upādhiśiṣṭacaitanye saktatve ’pi caityamātre tātparyena tatraiva tadamśe eva sāṃśākarodbadhayā ca / [(1) p.10, ll.1-3; (2) p.36, l.1-p.37, l.3] ; Laghuvyākhyā on it: satyādi padānāṁ — satyajñānāntavijñānamayādi- padānāṁ / upādhiśiṣṭacaitanye saktatve — pi padasvābhāvyādina satyavādīdarvādaviśiṣṭacaitanye kalpyamānaśaktitattve ’pi, caityamātre — anupahitacaitanye tātparyena, tadamśe eva — viśiṣṭasyāṁśe viśesye sūddha eva, sāṃśākarodbadhayā ca — sāṃśākarodbadhakatvāc ca / satyādipadānāṁ iti śeṣāḥ / satyavādīviśiṣṭavādyakāśaktyanubhavajanitasāṃskārasyaiva dharmāmśamoṣeṇa śuddhasmrītiḥetutvam kalpyate tātparyānugṛhitasyādipadājñānārūpodbadhayatvād ity yāvat / [(1) p.10, ll.26-31 ; (2) p.37, ll.21-28].
are the tenth’], valid direct knowledge occurs from the mind (manas) or the organ of vision assisted by the sentence. Therefore, it is not a valid example. Accordingly, there is no proof for word’s being the producer of the direct knowledge in the above insisted manner. Consequently, the knowledge produced from organ (indriya) is determined as the only direct knowledge. Moreover, a sacred text reads as “it should be realized only through the mind (Br 4.4.19).”

Thus, only through the mind cooperated with meditation (bhāvanā-sahakāra) the valid direct knowledge occurs about the non-difference (abheda) in the form of such as an inseparability (avīnābhāvādirūpa) between the individual self and the absolute Self which were known (pramita) as the object of the words ‘tvam’ and ‘tat’ before the sacred text [“tat tvam asi” was heard]. Hence, to admit the concentration in meditation (bhāvanāsamādhi) as being the producer of the knowledge is exclusively suitable in accordance with the theory of this school, [i.e.,Pātañjala-yoga] (etanmatānusārena). The perception of the Self is not invalid though it is produced from the meditation, for its object is not contradicted. The above-mentioned perception [of a distant lover for a man who meditates upon her] is invalid only because it has a contradicted thing as its object, not because its being produced from meditation.”

This YSC 1.49 clearly reflects the discussion between Vivaraṇa-school and Bhāmatī-school regarding the direct cause for the realization of Brahman. Here, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha, from Yoga-school’s point of view, criticizes Vivaraṇa-school’s view that the direct knowledge of the non-difference of the individual self and Brahman arises from the principal

---

24 Cf. Vedāntaparibhāṣā: brahmasākṣātkāre ’pi manananidhyāsana-saṃskṛtam mana eva karaṇam “manasaivāṇudraṣṭavyah” ityādīṣruteḥ / [p.208, ll.7-8].
sentences (māhāvākyā) of the Upaniṣad-s. He says that the direct knowledge about the non-difference of both occurs only from the mind cooperated with meditation. This view regarding the cause of the direct knowledge is as same as the view of the Bhāmatī-school. His expression that the individual self and the absolute Self were known as the object of the words ‘tvam’ and ‘tai’ before the sacred text “tai tvam asi” was heard signifies the necessity of the learning of the secondary sentences and the primary sentences as prerequisites for the meditation. In this way, he maintains the importance of the Upaniṣad-s in the system of Yoga.

However, when Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha says “to admit the concentration in meditation as being the producer of the knowledge is exclusively suitable in accordance with the theory of Pātañjala-yoga,” the question as to which of the two, mahāvākyā or manas, is the direct cause (karaṇa) for the realization is ignored. In his interpretation, the point of the question about the karaṇa for the realization is replaced with the question whether meditation can produce the direct knowledge of the Self or not. It is necessary for the system of Pātañjala-yoga to maintain meditation to be the most important cause for the realization of the Self. From the above examination, it seems reasonable to suppose that Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha regards the Vedānta of Bhāmatī-school more suitable to Pātañjala-Yoga’s system than Vivaraṇa-school, and he reconciles Pātañjala-yoga with Bhāmatī-school.

It should be noted, however, that Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha in the above quoted YSC 1.49 interprets the non-difference (abheda) of the individual self and the absolute Self as inseparability (avinābhāva). As will be mentioned later in section 1.8 of chapter 4, he interprets Advaita-yoga that is a form of Bhakti-yoga, or īsvara-pranidhāna, as a meditation on inseparable relation (avinābhāva) of the individual self and the absolute Self also.  

---

25 YSC 1.28: vastutas tu akāreṇemam ātmānam anviṣya makāreṇa brahmaṇānusandadhyād ukāreṇāvicikitsān ityādiśrutes tadarthasya
suggest that Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha understands the non-difference (abheda) of the individual self and the absolute Self in the system of Pāṭaṅjala-yoga is inseparable relation (avinābhāva), not the complete oneness (aikya) as insisted by Advaitin-s.

3.2. INCORPORATION OF ADVAITIC THEORY OF MEDITATION

We have seen how Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha reconciles Pāṭaṅjala-yoga with the Vedānta of Bhāmatī-school. However, this reconciliation does not mean that Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha abandoned independency of Pāṭaṅjala-yoga. Bhāmatī-school’s meditation theory does not replace the entire meditation theory of YS. It is incorporated into the system of Pāṭaṅjala-yoga as a component. Let us now examine how Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha incorporates the view of Bhāmatī-school in the system of Pāṭaṅjala-Yoga.

As expressed in the above quoted YSC 1.49, the system of Pāṭaṅjala-Yoga gives more important role to meditation (nididhyāsana) than to hearing (śravaṇa) and thinking (manana). The truce-bearing insight (ṛtambhara-prajñā), which is said to have a different object comparing to the insights produced from śravaṇa and manana, arises in the clarity of the super-reflective balanced state (nirvicāra-samāpatti).26 On this truce-bearing insight, YBh 1.48 quotes a verse that describes three kinds of means for the insight, namely, scripture (āgama), inference (anumāna) and practice of meditation (dhyānābhīyasaraṇa).27 Vācaspatimiśra and Vijñāna-bhikṣu in their commentary on YBh identify these three with śravaṇa, manana and nididhyāsana respectively. It is clear that YSC depends on the preceding

jīvaparamātmanor abhedasyaitanmate dravyagunayor ivāvinābhāvarūpasya bhāvanam cintanam ity arthaḥ / [Text p.(121), l.11-p.(122),l.4].
26 YS 1.47; 48.
27 YBh 1.48: āgamenānumānenā dhyānābhīyasarasena ca / tridhā prakalpa-yan prajñāṃ labhate yogam uttamam [p.51, ll.12-13].
commentaries in this respect. What has to be noticed is that this rtaṁbharā-
prajñā arises in the super-reflective balanced state (nirvicāra-samāpatti).
This state is counted as a state of conscious concentration (sampraṇāt-
samādhi) or concentration having seed (sabīja-samādhi) because even
this insight produces latent impressions (samskāra). When these latent
impressions are restrained by the latent impressions produced by subsequent
restraint, then the concentration becomes seedless (nirbhīja) which is
called non-conscious (asampraṇāta). Since the non-conscious concent-
tration is the higher state comparing to the conscious concentration,
nididhyāsana giving rise to the rtaṁbharā-prajñā is not the highest medi-
tation for Vācaspati and Vijñānabhinī as well as for Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha.

In YSC 1.1, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha says nididhyāsana is a subordinate synonym
(aparaparyāya) of the Rāja-yoga. According to him, Rāja-yoga is the
seedless concentration (nirbhīja-samādhi). Comparing to this seedless
concentration or the non-conscious concentration, nididhyāsana
being a form of the conscious concentration is a lower state. This seems to
be the reason why nididhyāsana is a subordinate synonym (aparaparyāya)
of the Rāja-yoga.

The seedless concentration or the non-conscious concentration arises from
superior detachment (para-vairāgya). In YSC, detachment is categorized

---

28 YS 1.46.
29 YS 1.50.
30 YS 1.51.
31 YBh 1.2 and 1.18.
32 Vijñānabhinī criticises Vedāntin’s opinion that the indeterminate knowl-
edge of the Self (nirvikalpa-ātmajñāna) arises in the asampraṇāta-
samādhi, and classifies the knowledge as that arising in the sampraṇāta
stage. See YV 1.2 [p.40, ll.14-19].
33 YSC 1.20: ayam eva ca rājyoga ity ucye / tad uktam smṛtau samādhis
tatra nirbhijjā rājyogah prakṛttatah / dipavrājate yasmād ātmā saccin-
mayah prabhuh // iti // [Text p.(68).ll.2-5].
34 YSC 1.18: viramanam virāmo vṛttinām abhāvah tasya pratyayah pratyeti
janayatiti kāraṇam paravairāgyam tasyābhyāsaḥ paunaḥpunyaṁ pūrva
into superior detachment and inferior detachment (apara-vairāgya) based upon YS 1.15 and 16. The inferior detachment is a stage called vaśikāra that arises for one who became free from greed towards worldly objects, such as women, food, or towards objects heard of in the Veda-s, such as heaven.\textsuperscript{35} The superior detachment is to be free from a greed towards guna-s (guna-vitrṣṇya) as a consequence of the discriminating knowledge of the Self from pradhāna (puruṣakhyāti).\textsuperscript{36} Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha says that the conscious concentration arises in the state of vaśikāra and it, further, produces the knowledge of the Self.\textsuperscript{37} Consequently, nididhyāsana that is a form of the conscious concentration and produces the knowledge of the Self is a lower state of the mind comparing to the non-conscious concentration that arises from superior detachment. This non-conscious concentration (asamprajñā-ta-samādhi) or the seedless concentration (nirbīja-samādhi) is Rāja-yoga.

Thus, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha includes the meditation theory of Bhāmatī-school under Pātañjala-yoga as a previous stage to non-conscious concentration.

3.3. VĀCASPATIMIŚRA’S VIEW: BACKGROUND OF NĀRĀYAṆA TĪRTHA’S INTERPRETATION

We have examined the incorporation of Bhāmatī school’s meditation theory into the system of Pātañjala-yoga by Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha. His interpretation, or the incorporation of Bhāmatī school’s meditation theory, seems to have its root in Bhāmatī itself.

\textsuperscript{35} YS 1.15: dṛṣṭānuṣrāvikavīṣayavitṛṣṇasya vaśikārasaṃjñā vairāgyam.
\textsuperscript{36} YS 1.16: tatparam puruṣakhyāte gunavitrṣṇyam.
\textsuperscript{37} YSC 1.16: tatra vaśikārasaṃjñē vairāgye jāte sati samprajñātaphrabhāvena puruṣasya yā khyātih pradhānād vivekena yaḥ sākṣātkāraḥ... [Text p.(59) l.13-14]; YSC 1.17: īdānim aparavairāgyasādhyāṃ samprajñātaṃ lakṣayati / vitarketi // [Text p.(62), l.4-5].
In Bhāmati 2.3.39, Vācaspatimiśra says that śravaṇa and manana correspond to dhāraṇā, nididhyāsana corresponds to dhyāna, darśana to samādhi, further, the whole of the quoted sentence of Br signifies samyama described in the eight-fold yoga of Patañjali.38 Samyama is defined as external aids or indirect aids (bahir-aṅga) for the seedless concentration.39 The seedless concentration is a higher stage than samyama. Consequently, it is certain that Vācaspatimiśra, in his interpretation of Advaitavedānta, admitted a stage higher than the perception of Brahman, that is, a stage that corresponds to the seedless concentration (nirbīja-samādhi) of Patañjala-yoga.

As have been pointed out by Shima,40 Vācaspati maintains latent impressions of ignorance (avidyāsaṃskāra) continue to exist even after the perception of the Brahman.41 He thinks removal of ignorance (avidyā) and appearance of the true nature of Brahman follow the perception of Brahman as a result of the perception.42 Therefore, the removal of ignorance and the appearance of the true nature of Brahman seem to correspond to the seedless concentration and kaivalya of Patañjala-yoga respectively.

Vācaspati already had interpreted that nididhyāsana is followed by higher stage. Thus, we may say that this Vācaspati’s interpretation made Nārāyaṇa Tirtha’s attempt to incorporate the meditation theory of Advaita under

38 Bhāmati 2.3.39: samādhir ity samyamam upalakṣayati / dhāraṇā-dhyānasamādhyayo hi samyamapadavedaniyāḥ / yathāhuḥ — ‘trayām ekatra samyamah’ iti / atra śrotavyo mantavya iti dhāraṇopadesaḥ / nididhyāsita-vya iti dhyānopadesaḥ / draṣṭavya iti samādher upadesaḥ / yathāhuḥ — ‘tad eva dhyānam arthamātraniḥbhāsaṃ svarēpaśūnyam iva samādhiḥ’ iti / [p.545, ll.28-31].
39 YS 3.8.
41 Bhāmati 1.1.1: na khalv ayam sarvathā manuṣyābhīmānaraḥitaḥ, kim tv avidyāsaṃskāra-avṛttiyāsa mātrayā tadabhimāno ’nuvartate / [p.32, ll.28-29].
42 Bhāmati 1.1.2: śrutītihāsapuruṣāsmṛtyayah pramāṇam / anubhavo ’ntah-karaṇavṛttibheda brahmasaksātākaras tasyāvidyāni-vṛttidvarena brahma-svarūpā-vir-bhāvaḥ pramāṇaphalam / [ p.51, l.31-p.52, l.16].
Pātañjala-yoga easy. Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha followed Vacaspati's way, although their interpretations of the quoted Upaniṣad differ in detail: while Vācaspati regards *nididhyāsana* as *dhyāna*, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha regards it as a form of the conscious concentration (*samprajñāta-samādhi*).⁴³

⁴³ Vijñānabhiṣṇu, in his *Vijñānāmṛtābhāṣya*, interprets the Upaniṣadic passage under consideration as follows: *śravaṇa*, *manana* and *nididhyāsana* mean scripture (*śāstra*), inference based upon the scripture (*tattvānubhāṣya-anumāna*) and yogic perception (*yogipratyakṣa*) respectively, further, these three are the means for the valid knowledge (*pramāṇa*) of Brahma. See *Vijñānāmṛtābhāṣya* 1.1.3 [p.37, ll.2-7].
CHAPTER 4

INCORPORATION OF VARIOUS YOGA-S
SECTION 1. NĀRĀYĀNA TĪRTHA ON VARIOUS YOGA-S

1.1. VARIOUS YOGA-S IN YSC

In the preceding section, we saw the first characteristic Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s interpretation of YS: reconciliation of Pātañjala-yoga with the philosophy of Advaitavedānta. In this section, we shall look into the second characteristic of Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s interpretation: incorporation of mediaeval Yoga-s under the system of Pātañjala-yoga.

As have been observed in the previous section, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha calls non-conscious concentration (asamprajñāta-samādhi) as Rāja-yoga in YSC 1.20. In YSC 1.1 nididhyāsana which is a form of conscious concentration (samprajñāta-samādhi) is said to be a subordinate synonym (aparaparyāya) of Rāja-yoga. Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha enumerates various names of Yoga-s, fifteen in total, as means for the conscious concentration in YSC 1.1. He says these Yoga-s are incorporated in the system of Pātañjala-yoga, as can be seen in the following quotation. I would like to quote the portion in question of YSC 1.1 in translation:

“However, the means to attain that [concentration] (tatsādhana) are Kriyā-yoga, Cāryā-yoga, Karma-yoga, Hāṭha-yoga, Mantra-yoga, Jñāna-yoga, Advaita-yoga, Laksya-yoga, Brahma-yoga, Śiva-yoga, Siddhi-yoga, Vāsanā-yoga, Laya-yoga, Dhyāna-yoga and Premabhakti-yoga. Therefore, with a view that all of them are included into the eightfold yoga (aṣṭāṅgayoga) either in their general or particular forms, lord Patañjali, while explaining the yoga consisting of eight parts along with its result through four chapters which deal respectively with concentration (samādhi), means (sādhana), supernatural power (vibhūti) and the isolation (kaivalya), makes the commencement of his text at the beginning [of the sūtra] saying “now [starts] teaching of yoga”, intending to suggest subject-matter (viṣaya), purpose (prayojana), person
authorized (adhipārin) [of his teaching] and relation (sam-bandha) [among these three], 1 so that the intelligent people may be inclined towards it.”

Here, the enumerated fifteen Yoga-s are: 1) Kriyā-yoga, 2) Caryā-yoga, 3) Karma-yoga, 4) Haṭha-yoga, 5) Mantra-yoga, 6) Jñāna-yoga, 7) Advaita-yoga, 8) Laksya-yoga, 9) Brahma-yoga, 10) Śiva-yoga, 11) Siddhi-yoga, 12) Vāsanā-yoga, 13) Laya-yoga, 14) Dhyāna-yoga and 15) Premabhati-yoga. All of them, according to Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha, are incorporated under the eight-fold Yoga of YS. It is important to note that these Yoga-s are means (sādhana) to attain the concentration (samādhi). This concentration is conscious concentration (samprajñāta-samādhi) judging from the portion of YSC that we have observed in the previous section. Therefore, all the above mentioned Yoga-s are subordinate to non-conscious concentration (asamprajñāta-samādhi) that is Rāja-yoga. Thus, he incorporates the

---

1 Subject-matter (viṣaya), purpose (prayojana), person authorized to study the teaching (adhipārin) and relation (sam-bandha) are kown as the four necessary elements (anubandhacatuṣṭaya). YSC 1.1 says: Yoga along with its means and result is the subject matter (abhidheya); isolation (kaivalya) through the Yoga is the result (phala), person who desires for the isolation is the person authorised; a relation of instigator and that instigated (prayojya-prayaøyakabhaʋa) exists between the text and the subject-matter, a relation of expounder and the expounded (pratipādyapratipādakabhaʋa) exists between the text and the subject-matter, a relation of the means and that to be achieved (sādhyasādhanabhāva) exists Yoga and the isolation. See Text p.(6), II.3-7: atra sasādhanāḥ saphalo yogaḥ pratipādyatayā śāstrasyābhidiheyaḥ / pratipādyayogadvārā kaivalyaṃ phalam / tatkāmaś cādhikāri / śāstraphalayoh prayojyaprayojakabhaʋaḥ / śāstrabhidheyaos tu pratipādyapratipādakabhaʋaḥ / abhidheyaṃsa yogasya kaivalyaṃca sādhyasaḍhanabhāvaḥ sambandhaḥ iti dik.

2 YSC 1.1: tastsādhanan tu kriyāyogas caryāyogah karmayogah hathayogah mantrayogah jñānayogah ’dvaitayogah laksya-yogah brahma-yogah śivayogah siddhiyogah vāsanāyogah layayogah dhyānayogah premabhatiyogas ca / tad etat sarvam sāmānyāvivaśeṣaḥvaiṣṇaṅgaṅgayaṅgona kavalikrtam iti manasi nidhāya sāṣṭāngam saphalam yogam sāmādhisādhanavibhūtikāvalyārthakaś caturbhīḥ pādair vyuttādyaiṣyaṃ prekṣāvatpravṛttaye viṣayapravojanādhi-kārisambandhān darsāyan prathamaṃ śāstrasyārabham pratiṉāṇite bhagavāṇ patañjaliḥ / athayogānu-sāsanam iti // [Text p.(3), I.9-p.(5),1.3]
various Yoga-s under Pātañjala-yoga that consists of eight parts (aṣṭāṅga-
yoga).³

In the above enumerated fifteen Yoga-s, not only the Yogas-s whose
names are familiar to us but also Yoga-s on which even dictionaries on Yoga
do not mention are included. Moreover, YSC gives unique interpretations to
some of the Yoga-s although whose names are familiar to us. Therefore, it is
difficult to mention briefly their individual nature before we directly exam-
ine YSC's interpretations. In the course of the examination, characteristics
of each Yoga-s and Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha's way of incorporation of them will
become clear.

Now we will examine how Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha includes them into the Yoga
of YS. First, we will examine the incorporation of the fifteen Yoga-s except
Prema-bhakti-yoga on which Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha puts special emphasis. Prema-
bhakti-yoga will be examined in the next subsection.

1.2. KRIYĀ-YOGA (YOGA OF RITUAL ACTION)

Kriyā-yoga is already defined in YS 2.1 as “tapahsvādhyāyesvaraprāṇi-
dhānāni kriyāyogah.”⁴ According to YSC 2.1, ascesis (tapas) is exhausting
body (kāyaśoṣana) by fasting and other means. Study of scriptures is re-
peated study of Upaniṣads and other texts. Devotion to God (īśvarapra-
ṇidhāna) is faithfulness (bhakti) originated from praise (stuti), worship
(pūjā) of the God. Praising is to speak of only the merits of the God.
Worship is offering of seat or water for washing the feet to the God. The
faithfulness, or the devotion to the God should be the complete offering of

3 The eight parts are: yama (abstention), niyama (observance), āsana (pos-
ture), prāṇāyāma (breath control), pratyāhāra (withdrawal of the senses),
dhāranā (fixed attention), dhyāna (meditation), samādhi (concentration).
YS 2.29: yamaniyamāsana-prāṇāyām-pratyāhāra-dhāraṇā-dhyāna-smādhi
ṣṭāṇgāni.

4 Translation: Ascesis, study of scriptures, devotion to God.
all the deeds to the supreme God who is the supreme teacher. The result of the offering should be abandoned. In this sense, this Yoga is similar to the Karma-yoga expounded in BhG. YSC says Kriyā-yoga is a cause for purification of mind (cittaśuddhi) which brings practice (abhyāsa) and detachment (vairāgya), both of which are the methods to restrain the activities of mind, it is also a cause for control of external organs (bāhye-ndriyanigraha) for Yogin drawing his mind inward. This Kriyā-yoga consists of bodily, verbal and mental actions (kāyavānanovyāpāra). Therefore, īśvarapraṇidhāna in this Yoga is distinguished from Bhakti-yoga that is a meditation (bhāvanā). We may say that here “kriyā” does not mean action in general, but particular actions favorable to Yoga. Kriyā-yoga brings about concentration (samādhi) and attenuation of affliction and karman.

Tapas, svādhyāya and īśvarapraṇidhāna are included in niyama (observance), one of the eight parts of the eightfold Yoga, by YS 2.32: “śaucasamatoṣatapaḥsvādhyāyevaśvarapraṇidhānāni niyamah.” According to Nārāyaṇa Tirtha, only tapas and svādhyāya in this YS 2.32 are Kriyā-yoga.

Īśvarapraṇidhāna in YS 2.32 is repeating the Mantra that brings to eman-
cipation and signifies God (mokṣamantrajapa), or meditation of the object of the Mantra (tadarthabhāvana), which is expounded in YS 1.28. This īśvaraprāṇidhāna is not simply a bodily action. Therefore, it is not Kriyā-yoga, but other Yoga, namely, Brahma-yoga, Śiva-yoga, Mantra-yoga, Jñāna-yoga, Advaita-yoga and Bhakti-yoga.¹⁰

1.3. CARYĀ-YOGA (YOGA OF CONDUCT)

According to Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha, Caryā-yoga is a method to destroy the impurity of mind.¹¹ YS 1.33 is the sutra that expounds Caryā-yoga: maitri-karunāmuditopekṣānāṁ sukhaduhkhapunyāpunyaviśayānāṁ bhāvanātas cittaprasādanam.¹² The meditation, such as the meditation of friendliness towards those who have happiness, produces attribute whose nature is sattva (sāttvika-dharma; śukla-dharma). The attribute in turn brings the clarity of mind and steadiness of mind. Since accomplishment of such meditation is possible to a person free from worldly attachment, detachment (vairāgya) is the main Caryā-yoga (mukhyacaryāyoga).¹³ The meditations are subordinate Caryā-yoga (gaṇacaryāyoga). The subordinate Caryā-yoga is

---

¹⁰ YSC 2.32: īśvaraprāṇidhānam samsāramocakasyeśvaraprasādasyānukūlo vyāpāro mokṣamantrajapataladarthabhāvanādiḥ / ato brahmayogaśivayogamantrayogajñānayogādvaitayogabhaktiyogānāṁ antarbhāvo 'tra mokṣa-sādhananīyame jñātavyah / [Ch.ed. p.76, ll.4-7].

¹¹ YSC 1.33: cittasyāsūyādimalavato yogāsambhavāṁ tānirāsopāyaṁ caryā-yogam āha [Text p.(138),ll.3-4] ; evaṁ caryāyogena cittamalanirāsakena [Text p.(139),ll.4-5].

¹² Translation: Clarity of mind occurs from meditation of friendliness, compassion, joy and indifference respectively towards those who have happiness, pain, virtue and vice.

¹³ YSC 1.33: tad evaṁ caryāyogena cittamalanirāsakena sukhyādiṣu yathā-kramam utkabhāvanārūpena sāttviko dharmo jayate / tena ca suklena dharmena cittam prasannam bhavati / prasāde ca sthithipadam labhate / etac ca puṣkalam viraktasyaiva sambhavatīti mukhyaṁ caryāyogo vairāgyam eveti saṁkṣepah // [Text p.(139), ll.4-9].
included under śauca (purity) and samtoṣa (contentment) in the niyama (observance) among the eight parts of Yoga.\textsuperscript{14}

1.4. KARMA-YOGA (YOGA OF ACTION)

In YSC, Karma-yoga is not “method of achieving salvation through disinterested action”\textsuperscript{15} expounded in BhG. As have been mentioned in the above, YSC calls such Yoga as Kriyā-yoga. In YSC \textsuperscript{16}, Karma-yoga is śaṭkarma, “the six purificatory processes”\textsuperscript{17} and mudrā, “pose, attitude,” “states midway between āsana and prāṇāyāma.”\textsuperscript{18} They are techniques of Haṭha-yoga. They are to prevent diseases which obstruct to acquire correct knowledge and concentration.\textsuperscript{19} Nārāyaṇa Tirtha says that although those techniques are implied by the sūtra 2.28,\textsuperscript{20} they are not included in the aṣṭāṅgayoga that is direct supports for Rāja-yoga, because those techniques

\textsuperscript{14} YSC 2.32: tatra śaucaṁ malanirāsanam / tac ca dvividham — bāhyam ābhyanțaram ca / tatra ... ābhyanțaram — maitrīdibhāvanābhiṣ cittamala-prakṣālanam / ... samtoṣo yāḍchālābharas tuṣṭīḥ / ...atra yatamāṇādivai-rāgyahetukasya mukhyavairāgyasādhanasya maitrīdibhāvanārūpasya gaṇacaryāyogasyāntarbhāvah [Ch.ed. p.75, ll.16-27].

\textsuperscript{15} Varenne 1989, p.234b, ll.24-26.

\textsuperscript{16} YSC 2.28

\textsuperscript{17} Yoga Kośa pt.I, p.138b, ll.25-26.

\textsuperscript{18} Yoga Kośa pt.I, p.111a, l.37-38.

\textsuperscript{19} YSC 2.28: atha vā yogāṅgānāṁ dhautivastityādiṣṭakarmamanāṁ mahā-mudrādīṁ ca anuṣṭhānād drūdhaḥbhīṣaj jñānadiśtyāḥ / jñāyate 'reneti jñānaṁ karānavargāḥ / tasya diśtyā rogādyanabhīṣajena ṭejasvīḥ drūdhatā ca, ā vivekakhyaṭeḥ vivekakhyātiparyantām bhavatīty arthāḥ / rogādīna jñānasya kṛuntībhāvas tu praśiddha eva / sa saiteṣv ṛṣīgeṣv anuṣṭhiteṣu rogapratibandhāna bhavatīty arthāḥ / tathā ca karanadārdhyadvārā *samādhidārdhyārtham karmayogo* / pi praṭhamato maṇuṣṭhaya rogabhiṣuneti bhāvāḥ / sa ca karmayogāḥ saṭkarmarūpo mudrārūpas ceto dvividhā nirūpita ākare [Ch.ed. p.68, ll.15-23]; ...* Read as cited here instead of the reading in Ch.ed.: samādhidārdhyārthārthakarmayogo.

\textsuperscript{20} YS 2.28: yogāṅgānuṣṭhānād aśuddhikṣaye jñānadiśtyāḥ ā vivekakhyāṭeḥ.
are only for the perfection of body.  

He enumerates six karman as dhauti, vasti, neti, nauli, trāṭaka, kapālabhāti and mudrā as mahāmudrā, mahābandha, mahāvegha, khecarī, śakticālana, mūlabandha, uḍātiyāna, jālandharabandha, viparitakarani. Further, he quotes verses from works on Haṭha-yoga to explain these techniques in YSC 2.28. It is not necessary for the purpose of this study to enter into a detailed discussion about these techniques of Haṭha-yoga.

1.5. HAṬHA-YOGA (YOGA OF STRENGTH)

Haṭha-yoga is included under āsana (posture) and prāṇāyāma (breath control) of the eightfold Yoga. As posture, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha enumerates in YSC 2.46 thirty-eight kinds of āsana-s, such as Padma-āsana, Siddha-āsana, Bhadra-āsana, Vīra-āsana, Svastika-āsana, Siṁha-āsana, and explains them with quotations from works on Haṭha-yoga. YS 2.50 is interpreted as expounding pūraka, recaka, and sahitakumbhaka of prāṇāyāma, and YS 2.51 as expounding kevala-kumbhaka. He explains these techniques of breath control with quotations of many verses from works on Haṭha-yoga or Purāṇa-s in YSC 2.49, 50, 51.

21 YSC 2.28: etac ca sarvaḥ, yogāṅgānuṣṭhānād iti sūtre sūtritam api haṭha-yogāṅgatvena dehasiddhimatrāphalatvenā sāksād rājyogāṅgatvāt kaṅṭharavena sūtrakṛtā noktam iti mantavyam iti [Ch.ed. p.73,II.1-3].
22 Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha quotes approximately more than fifty verses from, according to him, a work called Ākara. Two verses are quoted from a work called Skanda (Skandapurāṇa ?). Further, about five and a half verses by Dattātreya are quoted. To the verses quoted from Ākara, we find many corresponding verses from HP. HP’s corresponding verses to those from Ākara are : 2.22, 2.23ab, 3.6, 2.24?, 2.25?, 2.27, 2.28, 2.29, 2.30, 2.31, 2.32, 2.33, 2.34, 2.35, 2.36, 3.21, 3.25, 3.26, 3.27ab, 3.28, 3.29, 3.32, 3.33, 3.37, 3.41, 3.42, 3.59ab, 3.58cd. To some verses by Dattātreya, HP 3.78, 3.80, 3.77cd, 3.81, 3.79abc correspond.
23 YSC 2.46 and 2.47.
24 YS 2.50: bāhyābhhyantarastambhavṛttir desakālasaṁkhyaṁbhih paridṛṣto dirghasūkṣmaḥ.
25 YS 2.51: bāhyābhhyantaraviṣayākṣepī caturthaḥ.
In YSC 1.34, Hatha-yoga, especially prāṇāyāma, is interpreted as a method to stabilize mind. The ground for this interpretation seems to be Y Bh 1.34 that explains stability of mind (manasaḥ sthiti) is acquired from pracchardana (exhalation) and vidhāraṇa (retention) of breath. YSC explains that prāṇāyāma destroys all vice and stabilizes the mind concentrated on meditative object through the destruction of the vice. According to Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha, YS 1.34 expounds recitakumbhaka (retention of exhaling breath), one of the seven kumbhaka-s explained under YS 2.51.

1.6. MANTRA-YOGA

In YSC, Mantra-yoga is repeating (japa) the sacred syllable Om (praṇava). The sacred syllable Om signifies God (iśvara) or the absolute Self (paramātman). According to YSC 1.28, the repetition of praṇava and meditation on the referent of the syllable (tadarthabhaṇavā) expounded in YS 1.28 are two aspects of the devotion to God (iśvara-
prāṇidhāna) that is Bhakti-yoga.\textsuperscript{35} Mantra-yoga is included in Bhakti-yoga. Further, it is included under niyama among the eight parts of Yoga.\textsuperscript{36}

Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha says that Mantra-yoga, Jñāna-yoga and Advaita-yoga are forms of iśvarapraṇidhāna that is Bhakti-yoga. In YS\textsuperscript{C} 1.29, he gives detailed remarks on their characteristics and result. It will be examined later in section 1.8 of the present chapter.

1.7 JÑĀNA-YOGA

Jñāna-yoga is also included in iśvarapraṇidhāna expounded in YS\textsuperscript{S} 1.28.\textsuperscript{37} According to YS\textsuperscript{S} 1.28 and 1.29, it is a meditation on the referent of the sacred syllable Om. This meditation is the phenomenon of the absolute Self as being different from both the phenomenal world evolved from prakṛti and the individual self (puruṣa). It is a repeated meditation of the discriminative knowledge (vivekajñānābhyāsa).\textsuperscript{38} This Yoga also is included under niyama among the eight parts of Yoga.\textsuperscript{39}

\textsuperscript{35} YS\textsuperscript{C} 1.28: arthabhāvanarūpam prāṇidhānam āha // tajjapeti// [Text p.(120), II.2-3]; tad evam bhaktiyogenā bhagavadanugrahās tataḥ para-vairāgyaḥ asamprajñātāsamādhiḥāḥ [Text p.(122), II.8-9].

\textsuperscript{36} YS\textsuperscript{C} 2.32: iśvarapraṇidhānam samsāramocaksyāśvaraprasādasyāṃkūlo vyāpāro mokṣamantrajapadarthabhaṇānādiḥ / āto brahmayogasīvayogam-antrayogajñānāyogādvaitayogabhaktiyogānāṃ antarbhāvo 'tra mokṣa-sādhananiyame jñātavyāḥ / [Ch.ed. p.76, II.4-7].

\textsuperscript{37} YS\textsuperscript{C} 1.29: kiṁ ca japa ity anena mantrayogo 'rthabhāvanam ity anena vivekajñānābhyāsarūpo jñānayogo 'bhedabhāvanārūpo 'dvaitayogasya ca samgrhitāḥ [Text p.(122), I.11-p.(123),I.3].

\textsuperscript{38} YS\textsuperscript{S} 1.28: tadarthisa pranavārthasyācintyaisvaryaśaktiyuktasya paramātmano bhāvanām prakṛttitakāryapurusebhyo vivekanusandhānam /[Text p.(121), II.1-3]. See the previous note also. Viṣṇuśākṣṭikṣu in YV 1.24 expounds two kinds of meditation of pranava, of which Jñāna-yoga in YS\textsuperscript{S} is similar to the second. See YV 1.24: pranavārthaścānām ca mukhyo dvividham — tatraikam aṃśāṃśīkṣāyāraṇaśaktiśaktimadādāyabhedena taptāyahiṃḍavad avibhāgalaṃakaśaikbhaṅgad aham brahma sarvaḥ khalu brahmaḥadāraḥ pātivaiḥ... aparāṇa prakṛttitakāryapurusebhyo vivekena kevale brahmaṇātmāra atmavacchintanam... [p.161, II.3-24] ; anayoś cintayor madhye prathamacchintanam upāsanā, dvitiyoḥ tattvajñānānāṁ iti / [p.163, I.22]. Bhikṣu’s interpretation corresponds to his understanding of the
1.8. ADVAITA-YOGA

The meditation of the referent of the sacred syllable Om is interpreted as Advaita-yoga also. The sacred syllable signifies the absolute Self. To meditate repeatedly on the absolute Self as not different (abheda) from the individual self is Advaita-yoga. Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha interprets that this meditation is to meditate on the inseparable relation (aviniḥśāva) of the individual self and the absolute Self. This Yoga is also a form of īśvarapranidhāna that is Bhakti-yoga. This is included under niyama of the eight parts of Yoga.
Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha explains characteristics of īśvarapranidhāna in the forms of Mantra-yoga, Jñāna-yoga and Advaita-yoga as follows.

Īśvarapranidhāna in the forms of the three Yoga-s is a way to achieve the goals of human life (puruṣārtha) gradually, without depending on the method consisting of a series of causally related practices beginning with action suitable for the self and ending with concentration on the self.\textsuperscript{44} YS 1.29 expounds that īśvarapranidhāna in the forms of the three Yoga-s brings about realizations (sākṣātkāra) of the individual self and God.\textsuperscript{45} The realization of the individual self, which destroys ignornace of the self, is a direct cause for the isolation of the self (kaivalya).\textsuperscript{46} The realization of the God destroys ignorance of the God who in turn takes away his devotee’s ignorance of the individual self. Thus, the realization of the God is an indirect cause for kaivalya.\textsuperscript{47} However, the realization of the individual self

\textsuperscript{44} YSC 1.29: trividhasyāpy etasya pranidhānasya klptakāraṇatākascvocita-karmādisvasamādhyantāsadhanaṁ vināpy anupadam eva vakṣyamāṇarītyā sākṣāt paramparayā vā dharmārthakāmanamokṣārūpapuruṣārthacatuṣṭaya-sādhanatvam astīty [Text p.(123), l.3-6].

\textsuperscript{45} YS 1.29: tataḥ pratyagcetanādhigamāpy antarāyābhāvaḥ ca; YSC 1.29: tatatas trividhayogatāpi īśvarapranidhānāt pratyakcetanādhigamāḥ prati-pāṃ vipārītām arūcāti vijānātīti pratyag atra bhṛnto jivapadbhirhindheyah / cetano 'tra nityānāṃ cetanaś cetanaḥnām iti śrutipramita īśapadbhirhindheyah / tayor adhigamah sākṣātkāraḥ / [Text p.(123), l.10-p.(124), l.2].

\textsuperscript{46} YSC 1.29: sa ca tatra ākāraya svasya nāyam na me nāhām ityādyākāro drdhaḥ sākṣāt kaivalyaḥetuḥ / tam eva viditvātīṁtyum eti / ityādiśruteth / virodhīvīṣayakatvena svājñānocchedāsamatvāc ca / [Text p.123), l.2-5].

\textsuperscript{47} YSC 1.29: īśasya ca sarvakalyāṇaṣaṣṭrāṇām sarvaniyāntā prakṛtat-kāryatadabhimāṇiṣuṣebhyā bhinnā ity ākāraḥ parokṣo vāsudevaḥ sarvam ity ākāro vā yathāādhikāraṃ parokṣo 'parokṣo vā drdho bhaktānugraḥ-ṛatham abhivyaktasākṣātkāro 'parokṣo 'ṛjunamucundoprajāādādānāṃ śriksṛṣṇanarāśamharūppa vā yady api na sākṣāt kaivalyaḥetuḥ sambhavaty avirodhītvana tadaṣājananāno 'samarthavitāt tathāpi sa pratyagātmānaḥ svātmasākṣātkārādvvārā vastutas tadaṣājāṇād eva tadabhaṇānā jātathāttkopena svājñānadāhārābhīr vividhānacchadarsanat tadviṣayakājānām eva svājñānadvārā sarvānarthahetur iti tadaṣājānāpanayāna eva svājñānocchedadvārā vā kaivalyaḥetuḥ / [Text p.(123), l.6-p.(125), l.6].
and God is, in reality, a realization of the non-difference (abheda) between
the individual self and the absolute Self, which takes the form of non-differ-
ence of the referents of the words ‘tat’ and ‘tvam’ without any adjuncts
expressed in the Upaniṣadic sentence “tat tvam asi.” Or, it may take the
form as expounded by Viśiṣṭādvaitin-s that the referent of the word ‘tvam’
without any adjuncts is inseparable from the creator of the world that is the
referent of ‘tat.’

Īśvaraprāṇi-dhāna not only produces the realization of
the individual self and the God, but also removes obstacles to practice of
Yoga.

Thus, in YSC 1.29 Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha very clearly shows his Vedāntic inter-
pretation of YS again. His uniqueness consists in the interpretation of YS 1.29.
He interprets the word ‘pratyak-cetana’ in YS 1.29, tataḥ pratyakcetana-
dhigamao 'py antarāyabhāvaś ca, as ‘pratyak’ that means the individual
self (jīva) and ‘cetana’ that means the God (iṣṭa), although other com-
mentaries interpret the word ‘pratyak-cetana’ as only the individual self.

This unique interpretation makes it possible to conclude that īśvaraprāṇi-

---

48 YSC 1.29: vastutasa tayor adhigamas tat tvam asyādvākyabodhitabheda-
sākṣātkāras tat tvam padārthayoh sūddhayor na bheda ity ākāraḥ / sūddhas
tvampadārtho jagatkartratpadarthāvinābhūta ity ākāra vā viśiṣṭādvaitasam-
mataḥ / [Text p.(125),l.12-p.-(126),l.3].

49 YSC 1.29: tasya ca na kevalam moksarūpaṁ śrīmāṇaṁ sādhanatad-
ubhayasākṣātkāra eva phalam api tv aihikāsubhīkṣaṁ kṣaṇiṁ aṁśaṁ
sarvāntarāyānām abhāvādīr apiy aṁśa / apy antarāyā-
bhāvaś ceti // vakṣyamāṇāṁ antarāyāṇāṁ abhāvo vināśāḥ / [Text p.(127),
l.3-7].

50 YSC 1.29: tatas trividhayogāpyād īśvaraprāṇidhānāt pratyakcetanādhi-
gamah / pratipaṁ viparitam aṁciḥ apiy aṁśaṁ pratyag atra bhṛanto ābhāvā-
bhoodheyah / cetano 'tra nityāṁ cetaṁ cetanaṁ cetanānām iti śrutipramita
śrāpaṁ abhīdheyah / tayor adhigamaḥ sākṣātkāraḥ / [Text p.(123), I.10-
p.(124),l.2].

51 The commentaries referred to are YBh, TV, YV, Viv, RM, DP, MP, SDh,
NCh, NV, PD. Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha also says, in YSC 1.29, that preceding
scholars interpret the word as only the individual self: vṛddhāsa tu pratyak-
cetanapadam kevalajīvaparamaṁ nayantas tatsākṣātkārasaivyāvādṛśadvāra-
rthabhedanaparātvaṁ vighnaniṁvṛttesa japahalatvam samuditasya
samuditphalatvaṁ prāhuḥ [Text p.(129), l.2-4].
 dhāna produces the realization of the non-difference between the individual self and the absolute Self or the inseparable relation of the individual self and the creator of the world.

1.9. LAKŚYA-YOGA (YOGA ON INTERNAL OBJECT)

YS C says that Lakṣya-yoga is expounded in YS 1.35: viṣayavatī vā pravṛttir utpannā manasah sthitinibandhanī.\textsuperscript{52} YS C 1.35 explains Lakṣya-yoga as translated in the following:

“Lakṣya-yoga in the form of concentration (saṁyamarūpa) of mind on object such as the tip of nose causes direct perception of supernatural smell. This perceptual activity having object (viṣayavatī pravṛttiḥ) brings about confidence (viśvāsa) and causes mind to accomplish concentration on exceedingly subtle objects such as the almighty God (parameśvara). In the same way, when an excellent perception on doctrinal object (śāstriyānubhavaviśeṣa) arises, with belief [in the doctrine], Yogins remains concentrated in the meditation. This is Lakṣya-yoga.”\textsuperscript{53}

According to YS C, Lakṣya-yoga is a meditation on an object (lakṣya) that brings supernatural perception and makes mind concentrated on the object through confidence obtained from the supernatural perception. YBh already mentions about the supernatural perceptions by concentration, such as perception of supernatural smell by the concentration on the tip of nose. These perceptions, according to YBh, remove doubts and become introductions to

\textsuperscript{52} Translation: Or, perceptual activity which has object arises and makes mind concentrated.

\textsuperscript{53} YSC 1.35: nāsāgrādau cittasya saṁyamarūpād lakṣyayogād divyagandhā-disāksātkāro bhavati / seyaṁ viṣayavatī pravṛttir viśvāsam utpādyā para-meśvarādāv atisūksme manasah sthitim sampādayatity arthah / tathā ca śāstriyānubhavaviśeṣe jāte śraddhayā yogino dhyānādau sthirā bhavanty ayam lakṣyayogah / [ Text p.(143), ll.6-10]
obtain wisdom of concentration (samādhiprajñā). YBh, moreover, tells that although doctrinal objects known by śāstra, inference or teaching of masters are invisible, supernatural perception of those objects gives Yogin confidence about the teaching. Nārāyanā Tirtha interprets YS 1.35 on the basis of YBh. Further, he quotes a passage from a smṛti to explain why YS 1.35 expounds Lakṣya-yoga. The smṛti reads as follows:

“The perceptions on the places such as the tip of nose will appear firmly for the meditating people. [The perception] is that which is called Lakṣya-yoga. It excellently gives confidence in Yoga.”

This Yoga is included under dhāraṇā (fixed attention) of the eight parts of Yoga.

1.10. BRAHMA-YOGA

Brahma-yoga, according to YSC, is a meditation on Brahman as sound (nāda). The Yoga is expounded by YS 1.36: viśokā vā jyotismati. Viśokā is interpreted as being painless caused by efforts of many practices, the illumination (jyotis) is interpreted as consciousness and bliss existing in sound

---

54 YBh 1.35: nāsikāgre dhārayato 'syā yā divyagandhasaṃvītsā gandhapra-vṛttih / jihvāgre rasasaṃvit / ... jihvāmule śabdasaṃvid ity etā vṛttaya utpānnaś cittaṃ sthitau nibadhnejanti, saṃsāyam vidhamanti, samādhiprajñāyāṃ ca dvārī bhavantiti / [p.39, l.9-p.40, l.2].

55 YBh 1.35: yady api hi tattacchāstranumānācāryopadesaśair avagataṃ arhat-tattvaṃ sadbhūtam eva bhavati ... tathā 'pi yāvad ekadeśo 'pi kaścin na svakarṇasamvedyo bhavati tāvat sarvam paroksām ivāpavargādīśu sūkṣme-śv artheṣu na drdham buddhim utpādayati / tasmāc chāstranumānācāryopadesāṃ podbalanārtham evāvasya kaścidarthaviśeṣaḥ pratyaksākartyaḥ / tatra tadupadistārthākadeśa-pratyakṣatve sati sarvam sūkṣma-viśayaṃ api ā 'pavargāc chraḍḍhīyate / etadartham evedaṃ cittaṃ apadikārakaṃ nirādyate / [p.40, l.3-10].

56 YSC 1.35: yā hi nāśāideśeṣu drśtih pumśām sthirā bhavet / sa lakṣyayoga ākhyāto yoge śraddhākaraḥ paraḥ / [Text p.(143), l.11-12].

57 YSC 3.1: atraiva lakṣyayogasyāntarbhāvaḥ [Ch.ed. p.106, l.22-23].

58 Translation: Or painless [perception] of illumination [is the cause of the stability of mind].
Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha explains this Brahma-yoga as a meditation of Brahman in the form of sound existing in the eight-petaled lotus in the chest, and quotes a few works to illustrate it. The meditation on the lotus in the chest is already mentioned in YBh 1.36. TV 1.36 and YV 1.36 explain this meditation as meditation on the eight-petaled lotus in the chest, on the letters ‘a, u, m’ and a half syllable. YSC, clearly depending on these preceding commentaries, says as translated in the following:

"Eight-petaled lotus exists [in the chest] facing downwards from the heart. After meditating it as turning upwards with exhaling breath, one should meditate on it a circle of the sun consisting of twelve kalās, the letter ‘a’ that is the awaking state. [One should meditate] above the circle a circle of the moon consisting of sixteen kalā-s, the letter ‘u’ that is the dreaming state. [One should meditate] above that a circle of fire consisting of ten kalā-s, the letter ‘m’ that is the dream-

---

59 YSC 1.36: aṣṭadalādau nādākhye brahmaṇī manasāḥ saṃyogād viśokā bahutarasādhanādyāyāsakṛtaduḥkhaśunyā jyotismati jyotī visayā nādagatācandāndaviṣayā saṃvin manasāḥ sthitihetur ity arthaḥ / [Text p.(144), ll.5-8].

60 YBh 1.36: hṛdayapundarīke dhārayato yā buddhisamvit, buddhisattvān hi bhāsaram akāśakalpaṁ, tatra sthitivaśarādyat pravṛttiḥ sūryendugrahāmaniprabhārūpākāreṇa vikalpate / [p.40, l.15-p.41, l.3].

61 This lotus in the chest is not the Anāhata-cakra. This lotus seems to be what is called Ānanda-kanda in Tantric works. See Kālīcarāṇa’s Ślokārtha-pariṣkarinī on the Śatecaṇḍarāja 25: “madhye raktabijam” iti hṛt-padmasya karṇikādhideśe urdhvamukhakaraktavarnaṣṭadalapadmam ity arthaḥ / etatpadmopari mānasapūjā kāryā / [p.27, ll.14-15]. Avalon’s translation: “The red lotus in this quotation is one below the pericarp of the heart lotus; it has its head turned upwards, and has eight petals. It is in this lotus that mental worship (Mānas-pūjā) should be made [Arthur Avalon 1974, p.377, l.25-p.378, l].” See also Avalon 1974, p.378, note 1: “This is not one of the six Cakras, but a lotus known as Ananda-kanda where the Iṣṭadevata is meditated upon. See Ch.V, v.132, Mahānirvāṇa-Tantra.”

62 Kalā means a small part of a thing. Although kalā seems to be a measure of time, the exact meaning is not clear. TV and YV do not mention kalā-s of each circle.
less state. [One should meditate] further above that, Brahman called sound that is the fourth state. This is Brahma-yoga.”

This Yoga is included under niyama.

1.11. ŚIVA-YOGA

YS 1.36 is interpreted as expounding Śiva-yoga also. This Yoga is a meditation on the individual self in the form of illumination located in the middle of eyebrows while the external sight is fixed. In this case, the sūtra 1.36, “viśokā vā jyotīsmati,” is interpreted to mean “non-afflicted [perception] of the witness-Self in the form of illumination [is the cause of the stability of mind].” YSC 1.36 says this Yoga is the sāmbhavīmudrā, a technique of Hatha-yoga, and quotes a verse as same as HP 4.36 that expounds the sāmbhavīmudrā. This Yoga is also included under niyama.

---

63 YSC 1.36: hṛdayādhanām aṣṭaḍālaṁ kamālāṁ recakenaḥdha-mukham vibhāvya tatra sūryamanḍalaṁ dvādaśakaliṁmaṁ ṇāgaritaśthānam akāram tadupari candranandaṁ soḍaśakaliṁmaṁ svapnavahānam ukāraṁ tadupari vahnimandaṁ daśakaliṁmaṁ susuptihānam ma-kāram tadupari ſādākhyāṁ tuṣṭiyāṁ brahma vibhāvaved iti brahmayaṁgaḥ / [Text p.(144), II.8-13].
64 YSC 2.32: aṭo brahmayaṁgaśivayogamantryogajñānayogādvaitayogabhaktiyogānāṁ antarbhāvo ṛtra mokṣasādhanṣaṁyaṁ jñātavayāḥ / [Ch.ed. p.76, II.6-7].
65 YSC 1.36: aṭhavā bhrūmadhyādau jyotirūpe pratyagatmanī bahirdrṣṭiṁ bandhena manasaṁ samyaṁaṁ viśokā bhayayogādvā iṣayāsakrtakleśāraḥtiṁ jyotīsmatiṁ sāksivīṣayāḥ saṁvin manasaṁ sthairyaḥetur iti śivayogāḥ / [Text p.(147), II.1-4].
66 YSC 1.36: ayaṁ eva śambhāvīmudreṇy ucyate / tad uktam / antarākṣyaḥ bahirdṛṣṭ striṁ nimeṣonmeṣavarjitā / esā hi śambhāvī mudrā sarvatantreṣu gopitā / iti / sa ca yogāsaṅacāṅcaribhūcārkhécaryagocarinarvāṅgamudrābhiṁ sidhyati / [Text p.(147), 1.4-p.(148),l.3].
67 YSC 2.32: aṭo brahmayaṁgaśivayogamantryogajñānayogādvaitayogabhaktiyogānāṁ antarbhāvo ṛtra mokṣasādhanṣaṁyaṁ jñātavayāḥ / [Ch.ed. p.76, II.6-7].
1.12. SIDDHI-YOGA (YOGA OF SUPERNATURAL POWER)

YSC seems to interpret Siddhi-yoga as a practice that produces supernatural powers through concentration. YSC says that Siddhi-yoga is expounded by the sūtra 1.40: paramāṇuparamamahattvānto 'syā vaśikāraḥ.68 Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha explains that this mastery (vaśikāra) or the unobstructed state (apratibadhyatā) arises from concentration. It is a mark that tells success in stabilization of mind, and it is Siddhi-yoga.69 He quotes a verse that reads as translated in the following:

"The excellent firmness arises by means of methods based upon restraint of vibration of breath. Then, Siddhi-yoga will appear, the excellent Yoga that produces supernatural powers."70

YSC does not give a statement that includes this Yoga under some parts of the eightfold Yoga.

1.13. VĀSANĀ-YOGA (YOGA OF IMPRESSION)

Vāsanā-yoga is expounded in YS 1.37 and 38. YSC interprets YS 1.37, "vītarāgaviśayam vā cittam," as "or, mind without affection [should be the object of meditation]," and YS 1.38, "svapnanidrājñānālambanam vā," as "or, that which is known in dream and deep dreamless sleep [should be] the object [of meditation]." According to YSC, Vāsanā-yoga is a meditation on immaculate objects, such as purified mind, God appeared in dream or happiness in deep dreamless sleep. These objects are free from impure impres-

---

68 Translation: For this [Yogin whose mind obtained stability,] mastery over from the smallest thing to the biggest thing arises.
69 YSC 1.40: cittasthitijayasya jñāpakaṃ siddhiyogam samādhyanukūlam āha // [Text p.(171), l.4-5] ; asya sthiracittasya yoginaḥ paramamahattvāntāḥ ... vaśikāro 'pratighātaḥ kenāpy apratibadhyatā / saiva ksutpipāsā- dipiddipadvipadhadvăra samādhisādhikā cittajayasya ca jñāpiketi bhāvah / ayam eva siddhiyogah / [Text p.(171),l.9-p.(172),l.2]
70 YSC 1.40: prānaspadanirodhād yair upāyair drḍhatāparā / siddhiyogabhave atra yogah siddhikāraṇaḥ parah // [Text p.(172),ll.3-4].
sions and their nature is sattva. To meditate on these objects accumulates pure impressions in mind that drive away impure impressions, and helps to develop the will for emancipation.\textsuperscript{71}

This Yoga also seems not to be included under the eight parts of Yoga.

1.14. LAYA-YOGA (YOGA OF DISSOLUTION)

According to Avalon, Laya-yoga is meditation on cakra-s situated inside the body.\textsuperscript{72} YSC interprets Laya-yoga as the balanced state (samāpatti) that is a form of conscious concentration (samprajñāta-samādhi),\textsuperscript{73} on the basis of the verse quoted from a Yogagrantha in YSC 1.41:

"Dissolution of vital air, sense organs and mind into the nine cakra-s. This is called as Laya-yoga (Yoga of dissolution) based upon the Yoga of complete knowledge."\textsuperscript{74}

This Yoga is expounded in the sūtra 1.41 that defines the balanced state (samāpatti): kṣīṇavṛttter abhijātasyeva maṇer grahitgrahanagrāhyesu tatsthata dańjanatā samāpattiḥ. This sūtra is interpreted as follows: The

\textsuperscript{71} YSC 1.37: vītarāgām nirvāsanaṁ yat sanakādīnāṁ cittaṁ tadviśayam tadvibhāvanaparam kuryāt / nirvāsanaṁ sitam antaḥkaraṇaṁ kuryād iti yāvat / anenātra yogino mumukṣāmaṁtralābhena vāsanāyogadarsitaḥ / ... asyāpi cittaṁ svabhāvataḥ sattvapradhānam api tamasā pīdhā asti / tat sāttvikabhāvanayā tamovicame labdhaṁvṛttīkam bhavati tejāhpratibaddha-jalasaiṁyavad iti vinaiva sādhanāntaraṁ yogino mokṣasukhāṁśānambhavād āyaṁ śubha vāsanāyogaviruddhavāsanānīvarttaka iti // [Text p.(149), l.3-(150), l.2] / YSC 1.38: vāsanayógasyāvāntarabhedam aha / svapneti // ... atra jñānaśabdo jñeyaṇairah / svapne bhagavato yad rūpam priyam ārdhyam eva prabuddhah / evam nidrādaun aha sukham anubhuyate tadālabhanevad tadvibhāvanaparam cittaṁ kuryāt / pūrvvāsanaṁprāpta-sattvapradhānam evaṁtaḥkaraṇaṁ kuryād iti yāvat [Text p.(150), l.4-p. (151), l.1].

\textsuperscript{72} Avalon 1974, pp.222-223.

\textsuperscript{73} YSC 1.41: samprajñātasya viśayam pradarṣayan samprajñātāparaparyāyam layayogam aha // [Text p.(172), l.7-9] / samāpattiḥ samyagāpattir layaḥ samprajñātalakṣaṇo yogo bhavatī arthaḥ / [Text p.(173), l.6-7].

\textsuperscript{74} YSC 1.41: navasv eva ca cakreṣu marudaksamanolayaḥ / layayoga iti khyātaḥ samyakprajñānayogataḥ / [Text p.(174), l.11-12]
balanced state of mind is its taking the complete form (samyaktadākāratā) of the self or sense organs or object to be known by their influence (uparāga) on mind. According to YSC, samāpatti (balanced state) means to enter into the object completely (samyagāpatti), that is dissolution (laya).75 Thus, samāpatti expounded in YS 1.41 is understood to be Laya-yoga. Since conscious concentration is a subordinate synonym (apara-parāya) of non-conscious concentration,76 Laya-yoga seems to be included under samādhi (concentration) of the eight parts of Yoga.

1.15. DHYĀNA-YOGA

Dhyāna-yoga is expounded in YS 1.39: yathābhimatadhyānād vā.77 YSC 1.39 explains: One should meditate on any desired objects, such as the almighty God in the form of Hari, Rāma, or external light of sun or moon. The mind that obtained stability by this meditation becomes capable of concentration on the absolute Self without being assisted by other practice.78 Although any statement that includes this Yoga under some parts of the eight-fold Yoga is not found, this Yoga may be included under dhyāna (meditation).

75 YSC 1.41: abhyāsavairāgyābhyaṁ apagatavṛttyantarasya cittasya grahitragrahaṇagrāhyesu grahitā puruṣāḥ sthūlasūkṣmabhedena grahanam ghyaте 'ṛtho′ nenetiindriyam evam grāhyaṁ ca grahitṛgrahaṇagrāhyāni / teṣu yā tatsthatadañjanatā tatsthenoparāgena tadañjanatā tanmayatā samyaktad-ākāratā samāpattih samyagāpattir layah samprajñātalakṣaṇo yogo bhavatity arthaḥ / [Text p.(173), ll.1-7].
76 See section 3.2 of chapter 3.
77 Translation: Or, [mind obtains stability] by meditation on any desired object.
78 YSC 1.39: harirāmādirūpam pārameśvaram bāhyam candrasūryādiyotir vā yad evaṣṭam tad eva dhyāyet / tasmād api dhyānāḥ labdhasūṣṭikasya cittasya sādhanāntaram vināpi kevāle paramātmāni sthitiyogatā bhavatity arthaḥ / [Text p.(151), ll.6-9].
SECTION 2. YSC’S VIEW ON PREMABHAKTI-YOGA AND ĪŚVARA

2.1. PREMABHAKTI-YOGA

In YSC, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha puts special emphasis on Bhakti-yoga. As have been studied in the first chapter, he composed three works on Bhakti: commentary Bhakticandrikā on the Bhaktisūtra of Śaṅḍilya; Bhaktyadhikarana and tīkā; Bhaktivimāṇsābhāṣya on the Bhaktisūtra of Śaṅḍilya. Simply the number of works on Bhakti shows his great interest on Bhakti. Further, according to Ādya Prasād Mishra, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha, together with Madhusūdana Sarasvatī, is counted as one of the most important writer contributed to the later development of the Bhakti theory in the tradition of Advaita.79 Ādya Prasād Mishra points out that Madhusūdana Sarasvatī and Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha, “unlike the other exponents of Śaṅkara’s School, recognize not only the Jñānayoga but also the Bhaktiyoga as the path leading to the achievement of the highest goal of life” in the system of Advaita-vedānta.80 It is clear that his great interest in Bhakti is reflected in YSC.

As have been mentioned in the previous section, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha regards the devotion to God (īśvarapranidhāna) expounded in YS 1.23 as Bhaktiyoga. Īśvarapranidhāna consists of repetition of the sacred syllable Om, and meditation on its referent.81 Since YBh already explains that pranidhāna is special kind of worship (bhaktivīśa) that causes īśvara’s favor to the devotee,82 it is quite reasonable that Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha regards the sūtra expounding Bhakti-yoga. However, his interpretation of this Yoga, such as the interpretation of īśvarapranidhāna into Mantra-yoga, Jñāna-yoga and

80 Ādya Prasad Mishra 1967, p.237, ll.8-11.
81 YS 1.28: tajjapas tadarthabhāvanam.
82 YBh 1.23: pranidhānād bhaktivīśaḥ āvarjita īśvaras tam anugṛhṇāty abhidhyānamātreyā / [p.25, ll.9-10].
Advaita-yoga, is very unique. Let us examine YSC’s understanding of Ṣvarapraṇidhāna, or Bhakti-yoga in the following.

YSC says that Ṣvarapraṇidhāna is a love (preman) in the form of repeated consideration on God with wholeheartedness. It brings concentration (samādhi) most quickly and without effort. Because the concentration is brought about by favor of the God who responds to the wish of the devotee. Even though the object of this meditation is not the self, it results in the concentration of the self. Therefore, Bhakti-yoga is a method to obtain the concentration on the self without depending on the meditation of the self which has many constituents to be performed.

---

83 YSC 1.23: īśvare 'nupadam eva vākyamāṇalakṣaṇe praṇidhānāt praṇidhiya tadekaṁātraṁśtham manahkriyaṁ 'neneti punahpunaranusan-dhānārūpaprema tatsādhanāmanṭrajapārdhyatvajñānādirūpād vākyamāṇād bhaktiyogād anāyāsenāsanatamaḥ samādhiḥābo bhavatīty arthāḥ [Text p.(72), l.11-p.(73), l.1]

84 YSC 1.23: prākṛtastukṛtajāṭajād anugrahāṭ tatsambhave 'py āsannatama iha pranidhānajanmā sarvajñāṁ bhagavantaṁ bhāvayata āsannatame samādhiphale bhavetām itī tadichārūpāt tat tad anugrahā ṣ eva sadgurulābhāditv bhavatīti [Text p.(73), ll.2-5]. However, the concentration obtained by this Bhakti-yoga seems to be conscious concentration (samprajñātasaṁādhi). To acquire non-conscious concentration (asamprajñātasaṁādhi), superior detachment (paravairāgya) is required further. See YSC 1.28: tad evaṁ bhaktiyogena bhagavadanugrahās tataḥ paravairāgyaḥ asamprajñātasaṁādhiḥ [Text p.(122), ll.8-9].

85 YSC 1.23: sāṃsārārupavānarthahetusvājñānanāše virodhiṣayakatvena kṣamasya svāsākṣātkārasayo ṭaltattaye 'vaśāyāpeksitasvasamādhiṁ prati svagocarāraṇaṇāpasaḥ samānaviṣayatayā hetutvena mukhyatve 'pi satya-saṃkālpasya śvarasyecchāmāreṇa phaladasya yathā kathācaiḥ api praṇidhānaṁ tato 'pi mukhyam / tasya klīptatādṛśakāraṇaṇāpaṁ vināpi tatprāśadajanitatsākṣātkāraṇā整理vā ṣ vasamādhisādhanatvād mām eva ye prapadyante māyām etāṁ tarantie te / ityādiḥbhagavadavākhyaṁ māyātattkgṛtajñānataktṛa-bandhādiniḥṛtīpahalāśravanāc ca tato 'pi mukhyam iti jñāpayitum tasya tena saha vikalpo sūtrānte vāśābadnābhīhitā iti dik ///[Text p.(73), l.5-p.(74), l.2]; YSC 1.29: trividhāsyāpy etasya pranidhānasya klīptakāraṇatākavocita-karmādīsvasamādhyayatanāḥ samādhiḥābo bhavatīty abhipretvam abhipretva phalāntaram āha ///[Text p.(123), ll.3-7].
Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha emphasizes this simplicity, or easiness of Bhakti-yoga. He even expounds that a slight īśvarapraṇidhāna brings fulfillment of any wishes. On the basis of this simplicity, he regards Bhakti-yoga as a practice alternatively chosen instead of the meditation on the self.

Further, he classifies īśvarapraṇidhāna into four classes in YSC 1.32: para-mukhya, mukhya, mukhyajātiya and mukhyakalpa. The first is a love for the God that occurs as a continuous flow of an activity firmly taking the form of God in devotee’s mind enaptured from hearing his various virtues. It is a love as milkmaids’ love for Kṛṣṇa. Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha says that this is expounded in BṛH 12.8ab, and calls this as Premabhakti-yoga. The second is a repeated meditation on the God by withdrawing the mind inward, withdrawing from acting toward external objects. This meditation is expounded in BṛH 12.9 and is recommended to person who cannot achieve

---

86 YSC 1.23: idānim puruṣagocaratatsarvanairapekṣenāṇājasaiva jñānadvārā kaivalyāntaphalasādhanaṁ... ityādiśrutibhiḥ... ityādismṛtibhiṣ ca tathātveno-ktaṁ bhagavadbhajanaṁ upāyaṁ āha // īśvareti // [Text p.(71), 1.4-p.(72),1.9].

87 YSC 1.32 : kintu bhagavadbhajanasyaivaṁganvad apūṃsasyāpy asya ... bhagavatā mahāphalatvapratipādanāṁ ... tathā bhagavato yathākathācinām nāmoccarāṇādirūpām api pranidhānam ajāmilāder icca pāparāśim nāsāyata tena nāśeṇaivaṁdhikaṁ sampādyamānam śraddhādināṁ pūrṇam bhajaniyecchāsaḥakṛtāṁ sarvam evābhilasitām sādhayaṁ / tasmāt pranidhānam evāvasyakam // [Text p.(132), 1.10-p.(133), 1.6].

88 See YSC 1.23 quoted above in the note 86.

89 YSC 1.32 : tac ca caturvīdham / paramakukhyam mukhyam mukhyakalpaṁ ceti / [Text p.(133), ll.7-8].

the Premabhatki-yoga. This is called as *nididhyāsana*. The third is action (karma) such as utterance of God’s name, fasting, recommended to person who cannot practice the meditation, which is expounded in *BhG* 12. 10ab. The fourth is abandoning all the fruits of action and offering them to the God. This is recommended to the person who cannot perform even the above mentioned actions. This is expounded in *BhG* 12.11. *YSC* calls this also as *prāṇidhāna*.

Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha says that among the four *īśvaraprāṇidhāna*, the third and the fourth are not regarded as Bhakti-yoga, because they are simply bodily actions of devotees. They are included in Kriyā-yoga expounded in *YS* 2.1. Thus Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha counts Bhakti-yoga-s as *Nididhyāsana* and Premabhatki-yoga.

*Nididhyāsana* as Bhakti-yoga is that which consists of Mantra-yoga, Jñāna-yoga and Advaita-yoga expounded in *YS* 1.23, 1.28, 1.29. It is the

---

91 *YSC* 1.32: dvitiyām tadasāmarthye bahiḥpravṛttisvabhāvasya manasaḥ pratyāhāreṇa punah punar bhagavaty ātmāni nivesanarūpo 'bhyāso nididhyāsanākhyāḥ / atha cittām samādhūtaṃ na śaknoṣi mayi sthiram / abhyāsavyogena tato mām icchāptum dhanaṇājaya // ityādyuktam // [Text p.(134) II.3-9].

92 *YSC* 1.32: tritiyān tu tadasāmarthye 'pi tatprātiṣṭhānātamoṣcāraṇākaikī- ādaśyupavāśādirūpaṃ karma / abhyāse 'py asamartho 'si matkarmaparamo bhava / ityādīnoktaṃ / [Text p.(134), II.9-13].

93 *YSC* 1.32: caturthām tatrāpy asāmarthye svabhāvata eva kṛtānām api karmanām phalecchāṃ tyaktvā paramesvare paramagurāv arpaṇam / sādhu vāsādhū vā karma yad yad ācaritaṃ mayā / tat sarvam tvāi samnyastam tvatprayuktah karomy aham / iti saṃkalpaviśesarūpaṃ / athitad apy asAKTO 'si kartum madyogam āśritaḥ / sarvakarmaphalatyāgaṃ tataḥ kuru yat ātmavan // ityādīnoktaṃ bhagavagadītyādaśādhyāye / atra ca prāṇidhāna-sabdenoktaṃ / [Text p.(134),I.13-p.(135),I.9].

94 *YSC* 2.1: prāṇidhānam stutādijanitā bhaktiḥ / ... stutir atra guṇamatra-kathanam pūjā cāsanapādyādyarpāṇam / etābhir janitā bhakti śvara-pūjanam / tarc ca sarvakriyānām paramesvare paramagurāv arpaṇam / tatphalasamnāya vā / ... tattādaṃ, kāmato 'kāmato vā pi yat karomi śubhāśubham tatsarvam tvayi samnyastam tvatprayuktah karomy aham ityādi-smṛtbhir vyākhyātam / dvitiyām yu karmaphalānām bhoktā parameśvara iti cintanam /... etāni niruktārthabhāvanāviṣṭabhaktiyoobbhinatvāt kriyāyogah / vāgādivyāpāramātratvāt / [Ch.ed. p.49, II.11-21].
iśvarapraṇidhāṇa in the forms of repetition of the sacred syllable Om and meditation on its referent, as have been examined above and in the previous section. Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha says Premabhakti-yoga is expounded in YS 1.32, “tatpratīṣedārtham ekatattvābhyaśaḥ.”⁹⁵ He explains why Premabhakti-yoga is expounded particularly in this sūtra apart from the nididhyāsana as follows: Premabhakti-yoga causes excellent compassion of the God and destruction of obstacles to the practice of Yoga more easily without effort comparing to nididhyāsana although both have same object.⁹⁶

The sūtra 1.32 is interpreted in two ways. In the first, the word ‘ekatattvābhyaśa’ means to have the love appearing firmly taking the form of the God in mind that is melted from hearing virtues of the God. Here, ‘ekatattva’ is interpreted as ‘on the principal God (mukhye bhagavati)’.⁹⁷ In the second, ‘ekatattvābhyaśa’ means to have a flow of mind’s activity as focused on the unique (eka) real entity (tattva) without superimposition (anāropita) that is the undivided form of the Self (akhandārtha). In this meditation, the activity of the mind continues in the form that ‘that is unique, undecaying, immortal and fearless.’⁹⁸

According to Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha, the first meditation is determinate (savi-kalpa) continuous flow of mind’s activity having the form of the God with attribution (saguṇabhagavat) and the second is continuous flow of the

---

⁹⁵ Translation: To remove them [i.e., distractions (vikṣepa)], practice on one entity [must be performed].
⁹⁶ YSC 1.32: tatra nididhyāsanam samānaviṣayatayā sākṣātkārajanakatvasedhanam karmādiyogeḥ bhyaś ca cantaraigam ity abhipreyārthabhaṇavasabdena pūrvam ādṛtam yady api tathāpy api adṛṣṭadvārā kṛpātiṣayaphalakād antarāyabhāvaphalakāc ca tasmāt paramam mukhyam bhaktiyogam sarvopāyaphalabhūtan ayatnata eva tadbhayaphalakaṃ premākhyam abhyāsam āha // [Text p.(135),l.10-p.(136),l.3].
⁹⁷ YSC 1.32: ekasmin tattve mukhye bhagavaty abhyāsah gopinām iva tadguṇanaganaśravavāhān daśivibhūtasya cetaso bhūṣānāśiptraratatāṁrasyaeva drhhatadkāratārūpa-prema ... kārya āty arthah / [Text p.(136),ll.7-11]
⁹⁸ YŚČ 1.32: athavā ekasmin sajaśījyāvijñāyasyavagatabhedarahitaṃ tattvam anāropitam akhandārtha āty āvat / tasyābhyaśah tad ekam ajarāṃ amṛtaman abhayam āty vṛttipravāhaḥ kārya āty arthah / [Text p.(136),l.15-p.(137),l.2].
indeterminate (nirvikalpa) activity of mind acting towards the attributless Brahman (nirguna). Thus, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha introduces feature of medieval Bhakti-yoga in the sense of an intent love for the God, as maintained by Bhāgavata sect, and Vedāntic interpretation of Bhakti-yoga as meditations on the saguṇa and nirguna aspects of the absolute Self into the system of Pātañjala-yoga. As we have noted earlier, he is one of the most important writer contributed to the later development of the Bhakti theory in the tradition of Advaita following Madhusūdana Sarasvatī.

However, we must note that in YSC Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha does not regard Premabhakti-yoga itself as the highest goal of life (puruṣārtha) as insisted by Madhusūdana in BhRA. In the system of Pātañjala-yoga, Bhakti is a means to attain the highest goal.

---

99 YSC 1.32: tasmāt saguṇabhagavadākārākāradhārāvāhikavṛtivṛpravāh savikalpo nirgünagocaro dhārāvāhiko nirvikalpo va kāryo 'nāyāsena mokṣam icchateti yāvat // [Text p.(137), l.9-p.(138),l.1].

100 For the Advaitin-s who claim the true nature of attributeless (nirguna) Brahman is perceived only when the ignorance on the Self is destroyed by hearing the principal sentence (mahāvākyā), the love that is a cognition of the God with form (saguṇa) can not be a direct method to attain liberation. Madhusūdana Sarasvatī says in his BhRAtikā that Bhakti that is savikalpaka cognition and Brahavidyā that is nirvikalpaka cognition are different. BhRAtikā 1.1: svarūpasādhanaphalādhiḥkārīvailakṣaṇyād bhaktibrahma-vidyayoh / dravībhāvapūrvikā hi manaso bhagavadākāratāt savikalpakoṛṛupā bhaktih, dravībhāvāpūpetā 'dvitiyāttamātragocarā nirvikalpakamano- vṛttir brahmavidyā / bhagavadgunagarimagrathasthānārūgprahaṃpravānāb haktisādhanam, tat tvam asy adivedāntamahāvākyam brahmavidyāśādhanam / ... [p.26, l.9-p.27, l.4]. See also Ādya Prasād Mishra 1967, pp.237 - 238. Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha is also aware of this difficulty and, as have been examined in the previous subsection (under 3.1.7. Advaita-yoga), tries to avoid it by interpreting that the realization of the God by Bhakti destroys ignorance of the God who in turn takes away his devotee’s ignorance of the individual self. Still, it is not clear how he reconciles the difference between the saguṇa and the nirguna Brahman as the object of Premabhakti-yoga.

101 BhRAtikā 1.1: ... rasārūpatayāḥ 'bhivyakto bhagavadākārāturūpo ratyā-khyasthayibhāvah paramānandasākṣātmakah prādurbhavatī / sa eva bhakti-yoga iti tām paramaṁ niratiṣayam puruṣārtham vadanti rasajñāḥ / [p.10, l.7-p.11, l.1]; tasmāt puruṣārthacatuṣṭayāntagatāvena vā svātantryena vā bhaktiyogah puruṣārthaḥ paramānandarūpavād iti nirvivādam / [p.16, l.5-
2.2. Īśvara

The theory of Bhakti-yoga is closely related to the notion of the God (īśvara). Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha introduces the above discussed theory of Bhaktiyoga in the system on the basis of his understanding of īśvara of Pātānjala-yoga. We shall now examine his understanding of īśvara in the system.

In YS, īśvara is expounded in the sūtra-s 1.24-1.27. According to the sūtra-s, īśvara is a special puruṣa untouched by afflictions (kleśa), meritorious and demeritorious actions (karma), fruits (vipāka) of actions and latent impressions (āśaya) of the fruits.\(^{102}\) He is omniscient (sarvajña).\(^{103}\) He is the guru for all previous teachers, since he is not limited by time.\(^{104}\) He is denoted by the sacred syllable Om.\(^{105}\) YBh explains that īśvara is different from liberated self, since the later becomes liberated after breaking bondage but the former has never been, will never be touched by bondage. He is always liberated and always īśvara.\(^{106}\) He has eternal excellence due to his acquiring pure sattva (prakṛṣṭa-sattva).\(^{107}\) He is the unrivaled almighty.\(^{108}\) His designation is understood from the sacred text.\(^{109}\) He does not have self-

---

7]. See also Ādya Prasād Mishra 1967, pp.238-240. Mishra points out that Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha follows Madhusūdana on this point in BhC. [Mishra 1967, p.240].

102 YS 1.24: kleśakarmavipākāśayair aparāmṛṣṭah puruṣaviśeṣa īśvarah //.

103 YS 1.25: tatra niratīśayam sarvajñābijam // (cited according to the reading of Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha).

104 YS 1.26: sa pūrveśām api guruḥ kālenānavacchedāt // (cited according to the reading of Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha).

105 YS 1.27: tasya vācakaḥ pranavaḥ //.

106 YBh 1.24: kaivalyaṁ prāptas tarhi santi ca bahavaḥ kevalaṁ / te hi trīni bandhanāni echītva kaivalyaṁ prāpta īśvarasya ca tatsambandho na bhūto na bhavi /... sa tu sadaiva muktah sadaiveśvara iti / [p.26, II.6-10].

107 YBh 1.24: yo 'sau prakṛṣṭasattvopādānād īśvarasya sāśvatika utkarṣaḥ [p.27, I.1].

108 YBh 1.24: tasmād yasya sāmyātiśayair vinirnuktam aiśvaryaṁ sa evēśvarah [p.29, I.5].

109 YBh 1.25: tasya saṃjñādiveśapratipattir āgamataḥ paryanveśyā / [p.30, II.3-4].
gratification. His motive is gratification to living beings in the way he thinks, ‘I will relieve transmigrating puruṣa-s, at the periodic dissolution and at the great dissolution, by instruction of knowledge and right-living.’

Īśvarapraṇidhāna is special kind of worship (bhaktiviṣeṣa) that causes īśvara’s favor to fulfill wish of devotee.

We have seen that YSC’s Bhakti-yoga has two characteristics; 1) Vedāntic interpretation of Bhakti-yoga as meditation on saguṇa and nirguṇa Brahman and 2) medieval sense of Bhakti as an intent love for the God. To understand these characteristics, it is necessary to examine YSC’s thought on the relation between īśvara and individual self, and God’s characteristics as an object of devotion.

As will be observed clearly in the text part of the present study, YSC follows Vijñānabhikṣu’s explanation given to YBh 1.24 regarding the relation between īśvara and individual self. YSC says, in the same way as YV, that īśvara is a special puruṣa different from transmigrating puruṣa. In this sense, īśvara is considered to be a kind of puruṣa, but its limiting adjunct (upādhi) belongs to pradhāna. Further, YSC quotes YBh 1.24 and gives explanation that has great similarity with YV 1.24. However, at the end of YSC 1.24, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha says as follows.

“Since the excellence of īśvara is described [in YBh] based upon only [his] relation to pure sattva, individual self has the inferiority caused by impure sattva, not by its nature. Therefore, the secret, real intention of

110 YBh 1.25: tasya ’tmānugrahābhave ’pi bhūtānugrahah prayojanam / jñābadharmopadesena kalpa-pralayamahā-pralayesaṁ sāṁsāriṇāṁ puruṣān uddhariṣyāmi / [p.31, l.4-p.32, l.2].
111 YBh 1.23: pranidhānād bhaktivīṣeṣād āvarjita īśvaras tam anugṛhiṇāty abhidhyānamātrena / [p.25, ll.9-10].
112 YSC 1.24: puruṣāviṣeṣāḥ saṁsāri-puruṣāvilakṣaṇāḥ puruṣa evaśvārah / tathā ceśvarasya puruṣe ’ntarbhāvas tadupādheḥ ca pradhāne ’ntar-bhāvah / [Text p.(77),ll.1-3; YV 1.24: puruṣāviṣeṣa evaśvāra / tathā ceśvarasya puruṣe ’ntarbhāvas tadupādheḥ pradhāna iti bhāvah / [p.129, ll.13-14].
the author of Yogabhāṣya is that the distinction between individual self and īśvara occurs due to the difference of limiting adjuncts, but in their nature they are not at all different (abheda eva) as known from “tat tvam asi” and other [teachings].”

Here we come to know Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s idea about the relation of jīva and īśvara of Pātañjala-yoga. He thinks their difference arises from the difference between the limiting adjuncts (upādhi), namely, pure sattva for īśvara and impure sattva for jīva, even though they are not different (abheda) in their essence. He adds that this idea of the difference of upādhi is the real intention of the author of YBh.

Although Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s understanding of the non-difference (abheda) in Pātañjala-yoga is in the sense of inseparability (avinābhāva), as we have seen in the section 3.1 of chapter 3, still it is not difficult to see here his inclination to Advaitic interpretation. Because his interpretation is almost as same as the opinion of Advaita-vedāntin refuted by Vijnānabhikṣu in YV 1.24. Bhikṣu ascribes this opinion to the follower of avaccheda-vāda.

There, Advaitin says as follows: The excellence of the special puruṣa results only from his having pure sattva as limiting adjunct; It follows logically that the inferiority of individual self is resulted from its having impure sattva as its limiting adjunct; Then it is not necessary to regard īśvara as the special

---

113 YSC 1.24 : prakṛṣṭasattvasaṁbabdhād eveśvarasyotkarṣakathānāj jīvasya malinasattvakṛto 'pakaṛsu na svataḥ / itthāṅ copādhibhedāj jīveśvara-vibhāgaḥ svatas tv abheda eva tat tvam asyaṁdibodhita iti bhāṣyakārasya gūḍhābhīsamdhir ...[Text p.(90), ll.4-8].

114 Avacchedavāda, or the theory of limitation, is one of the two main theories in Advaitavedānta to illustrate and explain the identity between the absolute Self and individual self. According to this theory, the one absolute Self appears as many individual selves through the limitations (upādhi) of ignorance, just in the same way as space, which is only one in reality, appears as a space in a certain pot and space other than it by the limitation of the pot. Tradition ascribes this theory to Bhāmati-school. Another main theory is pratibimbavāda, the theory of reflection, traditionally ascribed to Vivaraṇa-school. According to it, individual self is a reflection of the absolute Self on avidyā. As to these theories, see Deutsch 1990, pp. 51-54.
purusa; Instead, because of simplicity as well as the teachings of sruti and smrati, it should be held that only one atman appears as isvara and jiva in accordance with the difference of limiting adjuncts as if a space is divided by different limitations such as a pot.115

It is obvious that Narayana Tirtha utilizes this opinion of Advaitin. As Bhiksu supposed, YBh’s explanation regarding the limiting adjunct of isvara may open the way to the interpretation like avacchedavada. Though such an interpretation is not acceptable for Bhiksu, it must be preferable for Narayana Tirtha who inclines to give Advaitic interpretation to Patanjala-yoga. His interpretation is almost same as the objection from Advaitin except that he does not mention both isvara and jiva are essentially one atman; he simply says they are not different (abheda).

The reason of his assertion that the avacchedavada-like interpretation fits to the real intention of the author of Yogabhasya appears to be his Advaitic inclination against the interpretation of Bhiksu. Because, for Narayana Tirtha, to interpret Patanjala-yoga in reconciliation to the philosophy of Advaitavedanta is to reveal the hidden and secret meaning of YS that neither Vacaspatimisra nor Vijñanabhiru revealed, as we have examined earlier in section 3.1. of chapter 3.

115 YV 1.24 reads the objection as follows: yadi prakrtasattvopadannad eva sasvatiko jivebhya utkasas cetanavisheasya tvayay ‘py abhyupagatas tatha jivanaam apy apakarso malinakaryasattvanimittika ity arthad agatah / tathaa ca srutir api — karyopadhir ayaam jivaah karanopadhir isvarah // iti / tarhi kim artham purusaviisha isvara evety ucyate ? ekasyaivatmana akasaayeyevo-padhibhedair jivevaradivibhagasambhavena laghavad aikatmyakalpsayayauvaucityat, tattvam asi, aham brahmastmi, akasaam ekam hi yathaa ghatadiisu prthag bhevet / tathatmaiko hy anekaas ca jaladharesy ivamsuman // ity-adisrutismrtisatair atmaikyasyaiva pratipaditatvaca / bhedabhedabhaya-srutismitmadhye bhedanindaya ’bhedadajnanasya mokshaphalakatvakathanena cabbhedavakyani evasvarthaparani, bhedavakyani tv anuvadamatraniti / [p.141, ll.19-29].
2.3. ASPECTS OF ĪŚVARA

We have seen that Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha introduces feature of medieval Bhakti-yoga in the sense of an intent love for the God when he interprets Prema-bhakti-yoga. As to the nature of īśvara being God with compassion, which YBh interprets as God who responses to his devotees for their gratification, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha in YSC 1.26 introduces theory regarding the aspects of God that resembles to the theory of Bhāgavata-sect. Let us now look at YSC’s explanation about the aspects of God briefly.

YSC says īśvara is regarded to appear in many forms for the gratification of his devotees. Although īśvara is in only one form when he is without attribution (nirguna), he appears in many forms, such as the inner controller (antaryāmin), outer controller (bahiryāmin), and others. YSC explains the aspects of īśvara as follows:

A) Antaryāmin (inner controller): Instigator residing inside body.
   A.1) Cidantaryāmin: That which resides inside sentient being.
   A.2) Acidantaryāmin: That which resides inside insentient being.
B) Bahiryāmin (outer controller): Ruler existing outside.
   B.1) Nityavibhūtinilaya (That which resides in eternal manifestation):
       Avatārin, the supreme God (parameśvara).
   B.2) Lilāvibhūtinilaya (That which resides in play-manifestation)

\[\text{\textsuperscript{116}}\text YSC 1.26: vastuto vicitrānekaśaktimattveneśvaratvāt sarvasamarthasya bhaktānugrahādinimittattadṛūpeṇa svecchayaiva mahadalpakārkapakr-
   tvam ity evoītam anyathā vicitrāantaśaktimattvādirūpeśvaratvānupapatteḥ /}
   [Text p.(99), ll.2-5].
\[\text{\textsuperscript{117}}\text YSC 1.26: yady apy ekam evādvitiyam / eko devāḥ sarvabhūteṣu
gūḍhāḥ sarvavyāpi sarvabhūtāntarātāmā / ityādiśrutibhir nirguna ekarūpa
eva tathāpy eko vaśi sarvabhūtāntarātāmā ekaṁ rūpam bahudhā yaḥ karoti /
   ajāyamāno bahudhā vijāyate / ityādiśrutibhir antaryāmibahiryāmibhēdena
dvividhāḥ / [Text p.(99), l.9 -p.(100), l.4].
\[\text{\textsuperscript{118}}\text YSC 1.26: antaryāmī antahsthitvā prerakah / [Text p.(100), ll.4-5].
\[\text{\textsuperscript{119}}\text YSC 1.26: bahiryāmī bahiḥsthitvā niyāmakāḥ / [Text p.(100), l.12].
B.2.i) Vyūha\textsuperscript{120} : That which is bestower of Veda, accomplisher of the beginning of creation, manifesting only two guṇa-s, having body; Brahmā, etc.\textsuperscript{121}

B.2.ii) Avatāra (descents) : That which has body manifested for the sake of others by his own will, has various merits such as

\textsuperscript{120} According to Gonda, the term \textit{vyūha} indicates that these figures termed as \textit{vyūha} “are regarded as representations an effective arrangement of the parts of coherent whole,” and “translation such as “expansion”, “emanation”, “conglomeration” etc. are inadequate.” Gonda 1977, p.60, ll.10-13 and note 25.

\textsuperscript{121} YSC 1.26: tatra vyūho vedādiṃdṛṣṭāṃ vyādharāṃ dvayaṃ dvaṣṭāṃjāvigravaṇā / sa eva brahmādṛṣṭaṃ sa sarvadeheṣu vyāpya sthitāḥ / sarasāṃsāla r̥ṣam brahma svayam bhavati / sādguṇaya-paripūrṇo 'sa vāsudevaḥ saññpanañ / tridhā kṛtvāmano r̥ṣam caturdhā kurute jagat / antaryāmītvam āpanṇah sargam samyak karoti hi / ityādi-smrteḥ / [Text p.(101),ll.3-10]. It is not clear what two guṇa-s are. So far as YSC quoted here is concerned, they seem to be two of the six attributes (śadguṇa) of the highest God maintained by Pāñcarātra-sect. They are, to borrow Gonda’s phrase, omniscience (jñāna), activity based on independent lordship (aiśvarya), potency or ability (śakti), force (bala), unaffectedness, virtue, virility (vīrya) and brilliant energy or self-sufficiency (tejas). Gonda 1977, p.60, ll.2-5. Bhāgavata-sect expounds that \textit{vyūha}-s are the first descents appear from Vāsudeva and each \textit{vyūha} holds the six guṇa-s, but only two of which manifest. See Schrader 1973, pp.40-41; Gonda 1977, p.60. However, unlike the \textit{vyūha}-s of Bhāgavata-sect, namely, Saṃkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna, Aniruddha and Vāsudeva, \textit{vyūha}-s in YSC seem to be Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva. See YSC 1.26: brahmaviṣṇu-rūḍhra dvividhāḥ śravaḥ pauranās ceti / tatra ye śrutaś te sākṣat parameśvarasyāvatārāḥ niravidhāvādīśravaṇāḥ / [Text p.(97), ll.3-5]. In BhC 2.1.29, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha says īsvara is endowed with three guṇa-s, not six, and the direct incarnations from him, Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva, have rajas, sattva and tamas respectively as upādhi, although he does not use the term \textit{vyūha} there. See BhC 2.1.29: sa eva triguṇamāyaviśīṣṭa īśvara iti procyate / māyinām tu maheśvaram iti śruteḥ / etasyāvatārā brahmaviṣṇu-rūḍhraḥ / atha yo ha khalu vā vā 'syā tāmaso 'mśo 'sau brahmacārito yo 'yam rudro 'tha yo ha khalu vā vā' syā rājaso 'mśo 'sau brahmacārito yo 'yam brahma 'tha yo ha khalu vā vā' syā sātviko 'mśo 'sau brahmacārito yo 'yam viṣṇuḥ sa vā eṣa ekas tridhābhūtaḥ iti maitrāyaṁyaśruteḥ / etc ca guṇamātropadhi-katvād guṇāvatārā apy āvīrdbhūtānekaśaktimattvāt pūrṇā evety ucyante / [p.135, ll.6-13].
love for the devotee.\textsuperscript{122}

B.2.ii.a) *Vibhava-avatāra* (descents in manifestation): That which has celestial body fitting for moving around and contacting to others.\textsuperscript{123}

B.2.ii.a.1) *Svarūpa-avatāra*: The supreme God stays in the form similar to others manifested from his non-natural form.\textsuperscript{124}

B.2.ii.a.1.a) *Manuja* (humankind): That which is in the form of human; Rāma, Kṛṣṇa, etc.

B.2.ii.a.1.b) *Amanuja* (non-humankind): That which is in the form of deity as Upendra, or animal like Matsya.

B.2.ii.a.2) *Āveśa-avatāra* (descents existing in others)

B.2.ii.a.2.a) *Svarūpāveśa-avatāra*: God staying in other’s mind descending with his own nature; Kapila, Ananta, Vyāsa, Paraśurāma, etc.\textsuperscript{125}

B.2.ii.a.2.b) *Śakyāveśa-avatāra*: God staying in other’s mind descending with the portion of his śakti; Pṛthu, Dhanvantari, etc.\textsuperscript{126}

B.2.ii.b) *Arcā-avatāra* (incarnation for worship): That which stays in the nature of being dependent on worshiper.\textsuperscript{127}

\textsuperscript{122 YSC 1.26: avatāras tu svasaṅkalpa-pūrvakaparādhinavyaktikṛtadeho bhaktavātsalya-yadyanekagunolbaṅaḥ / [Text p.(101), ll.10-11].}

\textsuperscript{123 YSC 1.26: tatra vibhāvavatāro gamanāgamanasaṃśa-viśa-viśayogyam yathā bhavati tathā divyaṃ dehaṃ prakaṭayaṃ sthitaḥ / [Text p.(102), ll.4-6].}

\textsuperscript{124 YSC 1.26: tatra svarūpāveśatāraḥ sarvesvarāḥ svīyāprākrta-rūpam itarasajātīyatyā prakaṭayaṃ sthitaḥ / [Text p.(102), ll.7-8].}

\textsuperscript{125 YSC 1.26: tatra svarūpāveśatāraḥ keśucic cetanēsu svena sannidhiḥ-bhūya sthitaḥ / [Text p.(103), ll.4-5]; tatrādyāḥ kapilānantavyāsaparāśura-rāmaprabhrīḥ / [Text p.(103), ll.6].}

\textsuperscript{126 YSC 1.26: śaktyāveśatāraḥ tathaiva śaktyā sannidhībhūya sthitaḥ / ... dvitīyāḥ prthudhanvantari-prabhrīḥ / [Text p.(103), ll.5-6].}

\textsuperscript{127 YSC 1.26: arcāvatāras tv arcakaparādhinātmasthitīḥ / [Text p.(104), ll.3-4].}
B.2.ii.b.1) *Grha-arca-avatara* (incarnation for worship in house): Statue consecrated by mantra and enshrined at temple in house.\textsuperscript{128}

B.2.ii.b.2) *Ayatana-arca-avatara* (incarnation for worship in some place): That which stays in places such as *sala-grama* stone by his own will\textsuperscript{129}

This classification of the aspects of God is accomplished obviously under the influence of the theory of Bhāgavata or Pāṇcarātra-sect. The terms such as *vyūha*, *vibhava*, *antaryāmin*, *arcā-avatāra* are originally used in the *avatāra* theory of Pāṇcarātra.\textsuperscript{130}

Although it is obvious that Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha followed the terminology of Pāṇcarātra, however, *YSC’s* description on the aspects of God differs in its essence from that of Pāṇcarātra’s. Take the concept of *vyūha*-s that plays very important roles in the creation for example. In the Pāṇcarātra theory of *vyūha*-s, they appear in the first phase of creation. *Vyūha*-s are Vāsudeva, Saṃkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna and Aniruddha, and they represent four combinations of the six *guna*-s of the highest God, *jñāna* (omniscience), *aiśvarya* (activity based on independent lordship), *sakti* (potency or ability), *bala* (force), *vīrya* (unaffectedness, virtue, virility) and *tejas* (brilliant energy or self-sufficiency)\textsuperscript{131}: Vāsudeva is the totality of the six *guna*-s; Saṃkarṣaṇa has *jñāna* and *bala* manifested; Pradyumna has *aiśvarya* and *vīrya* manifested; Aniruddha has *sakti* and *tejas* manifested. In their totality

\textsuperscript{128} *YSC* 1.26: tatra grhācāvatārā upāsakair grhadeva-vājyādau pūjyatvena sthāpitā mantrādisaṁskṛtā mūrtih / avatāratvam tu tasmin mantrādibala-śanidhibhūya bhagavato 'vasthānāt / [Text p.(104), II.5-7].

\textsuperscript{129} *YSC* 1.26: āyatanaarcaavatāras tu śalagṛāma-diṣu svasaṁkalpa-dīnā sannidhi-bhūya sthitaḥ / ata eva teṣām paramātmatvena pūjataḥ phalaḷabha ucyate śāstreśu / [Text p.(104), II.7-10].

\textsuperscript{130} As for the *avatāra* theory of Pāṇcatātra and the meaning of the terms see Shrader 1973, pp.33-69.

\textsuperscript{131} The meanings of the words are given following Gonda’s explanation in Gonda 1977, p.60, II.2-5.
or by the pairs, the six guṇa-s play roles of the material or instruments of the creation.\textsuperscript{132} Thus, Saṃkarśaṇa, Pradyumna and Aniruddha participate one by one gradually in the creation of the dual principles of puruṣa and prakṛti, further the cosmic egg (brahmāṇḍa).\textsuperscript{133} On the other hand, however, it seems that vyūha-s are Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva in YSC.\textsuperscript{134} Although Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha says vyūha-s have two guṇa-s manifesting\textsuperscript{135} and are accomplisher of the beginning of creation (srṣṭyādimātrasampādaka), YSC explains neither any details of the guṇa-s nor the role of vyūha-s in creation of the universe in the same way as Pāṇcarātra does. Thus, there exist essential difference between the Pāṇcarātra theory of vyūha-s and that of YSC regarding names and their role in the creation. Therefore, we may say that although Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha borrows the terms of Pāṇcarātra for the classification of the aspects of God, he does not use the theory of creation of the latter. For Pāṇcarātra, God’s various aspects are important elements to explain the creation and structure of the universe, whereas they are important as the objects of meditation, as the objects of Bhakti-yoga, in Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s interpretation of Pātañjala-yoga.

2.4. PRAṆAVA

The God as the object of Bhakti-yoga is signified by the sacred syllable Om. The sacred syllable Om (praṇava) is expounded in YS 1.27, “tasya vācakah praṇavah.”\textsuperscript{136} The interpretation of this sūtra is very important for YSC’s Bhakti-yoga because it throws light on the relation between the sacred

\textsuperscript{132} See Schrader 1973, p.39, ll.3-11.
\textsuperscript{133} For detail, see Schrader 1973, pp.42-44.
\textsuperscript{134} YSC 1.26: brahmaviṣṇurudrā dvividhāḥ śrautāḥ paurāṇāś ceti / tatra ye śrautāś te sāksāt parameśvarasyāvatārāḥ niravidyatvādiśravaṇāt / [Text p.(97), ll.3-5].
\textsuperscript{135} Cf. above note 121.
\textsuperscript{136} Translation: The denotative of it [i.e. īśvara] is the sacred syllable Oṃ.
syllable and its referent, the God. We have seen in the previous subsections that the God as the object of Premabhakti-yoga was interpreted into two ways, namely, the attributelss (nirguna) Brahman and the God with attribution (sagunabhagavat). We have seen also that Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha said the individual self and the God are essentially one ātman. The interpretation of the sacred syllable Om reflects these interpretations of the God. Moreover, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha applies here the theory of linguistic analysis to define the relations between the syllable Om and its referent, which shows his broad philosophical interest. The above cited sūtra is interpreted by Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha in three ways. Let us now examine YSC’s interpretations of the sūtra.

The first interpretation is that the undivided entire syllable Om is the denotative, or name (saṁjñā) of the God without attributes (upādhi) through conventional power (rūḍhi). Rūḍhi is denotative power of a word meaning of which is not directly connected with its derivation. In the case of this kind of word (rūḍha), meaning of the word is understood by the denotative power of the whole word independently of the meanings of the components of the word. Therefore, in this interpretation of YSC, the word Om is understood as referring, in its whole, to the God without any attributions, such as a form or a name of deities. This means that the word Om itself means the God.

The second is that the syllable Om consisting of three sounds, ‘a,’ ‘u,’ and ‘m’ refers to the God being his three descents, Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva, through denotative powers of the each component sound (pratyeka-śakti). In this case the word Om is interpreted as yaugika (derivative) word.

137 YSC 1.27: tasya nirūpādhikasyeśvarasaya prañavo ‘khaṇḍoṁkāro vācako rūḍhyā bodhakaṁ nāma saṁjñārūpakaṁ / [Text p.(108), l.13-p.(109),l.1].
139 YSC 1.27: athava tasya svecchāyāṅgikrtavigrāhāvacchinnasya brahmādi-mūrtitrayātmakatvena śrutasyeśvarasaya / prañavo ’ś ca uś ca ma cetā
Yaugika word is a such word meaning of which is determined only by the meanings of its component parts.\textsuperscript{140} Therefore, in this interpretation, the single syllable Om is understood to be a word in dvandva compound that means the three deities by the three component sounds.\textsuperscript{141}

The third is that the syllable Om in its entire denotes the supreme Self being the undivided, that is, the non-difference between individual self and the supreme Self. In this case, the word is interpreted as yaugika the meaning of which is understood by the denotative powers of the three components (pratyeka-śakti). The sound ‘a’ denotes individual self, ‘u’ denotes Brahman and ‘u’ denotes non-difference.\textsuperscript{142} The syllable Om is interpreted as a word in karmadhāraya compound.\textsuperscript{143}

To reconcile the three interpretations, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha says the word Om is rūdhayaugika (derivative or conventional) word. Rūdhayaugika is the word whose meaning is ascertained either etymologically from its component parts’ meanings, or conventionally from usage by the whole word. Both the meanings are determined independently and understood separately.\textsuperscript{144} The sacred syllable Om denotes the God without attributes by its total denotative power. Or it denotes either the descents, Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva, or the non-difference by the denotative powers of each component part.\textsuperscript{145}

akārokāramakārātmā akhaṇḍomkārāḥ / ... vācakaḥ pratyekasaktyā bodhakam nāma yaugikam / [Text p.(109), l.8-p.(110),l.2].
\textsuperscript{140} Kunjunni Raja 1977, p.59, ll.17-26.
\textsuperscript{141} YSC 1.27: atra pratipāḍyasyeśvarasyaikatve 'pi padārthatāvachchakānāṃ bhedena dvandvah / tasyaiva pratibhāsikabhedena vā dvandvah / [Text p.(110), ll.6-7].
\textsuperscript{142} YSC 1.27: akhaṇḍarthaṇaśaś tu tasya jīvaparayor abhedarüpaśaṅga-ṛthasya paramātmanāḥ pranaśvā 'khaṇḍa evomkārāh vācakaḥ / akāraśa jive makāraśya brahmāṇy ukāraśyābheda iti pratyekaśaktyā bodhakam nāma yaugikam eva / [Text p.(110), l.12-p.(111),l.2].
\textsuperscript{143} YSC 1.27: asmin pakṣe ca aś cāśāv uṣ cetyādikarmadhāraya eva / abhedaśya pratipāḍayatisāvatvā / [Text p.(112), ll.7-8].
\textsuperscript{144} Kunjunni Raja 1977, p.62, ll.17-24.
\textsuperscript{145} YSC 1.27: tasmin maṇḍapādipada vād rūdhayaugikam / samudāyasaktyāvayavāsaktihyāṁ pratyekam eva rūḍhyarthāvavārthhayor bodhajananāt /
Thus, YSC interprets the meaning and the object of the sacred syllable Om in accordance to its peculiar interpretation of īśvara. However, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha states that to interpret the word Om as denoting the non-difference between individual self and the supreme Self is the best, because in that case the syllable brings the understanding of the non-difference expounded in the principal sentence (mahāvākyā) "tat tvam asi."\(^{146}\) Here again we can observe his tendency to give Vedāntic interpretation to YS.

Above, we have examined YSC’s linguistic analysis of the sacred syllable Om and its referents. As we have seen in the previous subsections, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha interprets īśvara that is the object of Premabhakti-yoga as being nirguṇa and saguṇa, moreover, he interprets Premabhakti-yoga as being the knowledge of the non-difference, as being essentially one ātman, between the individual self and the God. These interpretations are the result of his attempt to incorporate the theism, or Bhakti, of Bhāgavata sect and Advaitic interpretation into Bhakti-yoga of Pātañjala-yoga. Therefore, it is understood that the linguistic analysis of the sacred syllable Om was attempted to theoretically ensure the relation between the practice of Bhakti-yoga and the Bhakti-yoga’s conceptual aspects newly incorporated into Pātañjala-yoga by Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha.

\(^{146}\) YSC 1.27: sarveśāṁ paksānāṁ yuktattva 'py ayāṁ pakṣo yuktatamaḥ / tat tvam asityādīmāhāvākyabodhitābhedaṁ yābhāt /*Text p.(111), II.7-8*/.
CHAPTER 5

RĀJA-YOGA AND YSC’S DEFINITION OF YOGA


1 SECTION 1. RĀJA-YOGA

We have seen, in the previous chapter, that Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha interprets YS as expounding Rāja-yoga, or non-conconscious concentration (asamprajñātasamādhi), and he incorporates fifteen Yoga-s into YS as means to achieve Rāja-yoga. Therefore, for the study of Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s interpretation of YS, it is indispensable to understand the meaning of Rāja-yoga.

We find the term Rāja-yoga enumerated with Mantra-yoga, Laya-yoga and Haṭha-yoga in several works on Yoga.2 However, what Rāja-yoga means in general is not yet apparent. Although Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha calls Pātañjala-yoga as Rāja-yoga, this does not mean Pātañjala-yoga only is Rāja-yoga. For example, HP asserts that Haṭha-yoga is a means to attain Rāja-yoga.3 Since Haṭha-yoga’s philosophical foundation is rather Vedāntic monism, this assertion is very perplexing if Rāja-yoga means Pātañjala-yoga whose philosophical foundation is generally understood as rather Sāmkhya dualism. Keṅge points out that Rāja-yoga does not mean only Pātañjala-yoga because Rāja-yoga, in various works, means a concentration in which the oneness of the individual self and Brahman is realized.4 Varenne, in the glossary attached

---

1 An early form of this section first appeared in Endo 1995. I would like to express gratitude to Prof. Musashi Tachikawa of the National Museum of Ethnology, Osaka, Japan, for his valuable advice concerning to the interpretation of the nature of Hatha-yoga and Pātañjala-yoga.

2 YTU 19: yogo hi bahudhā brahman bhidyate vyavarātataḥ / mantrayogo layaś caiva haṭho ’sau rājayogakah //; YŚU 1.129cd-130ab: mantra layo haṭho rājayogāntā bhūmikāḥ kramāt // 129 // eka eva caturdhāyaṃ mahāyogo ’bhidhiyate /; AP 3: layayogo haṭhas caiva mamtrayogas trīyakah / caturtho rājayogaś ca dvidhābhavavivarjitaḥ //, ŚYD 1.4: mantra layo haṭho rāja ceti yogaś caturvidhāḥ / tān āhuḥ pūrvamunayaḥ siddhā śambhuprabodhitān //.

3 HP 1.1-3: śrīdīnāṭhāya namo ’stu tasmai yenopadiṣṭā hāthayogavidyā / vibhrajate pronnatarājayogam āroḍhum icchor adhirohinīva // 1 // pranamya śrīguruṃ nātham svātmārāmena yoginī / kevalam rājayogāya hāthavidypadiśyate // 2 // bhrāntyā bahumatadhvānte rājayogam ajānātām hāthapradīpikāṃ dhatte svātmārāmakhṛpākaraḥ // 3 //.

4 Keṅge 1989, pp.(3)-(9).
his instructive book on Yoga, explains Rāja-yoga as “Royal art; denotes yoga as such, as opposed to ancillary methods such as bhakti-yoga, etc.”

Then, in what sense is Rāja-yoga “royal art”? Before we examine YSC’s definition of Yoga, the general meaning of the term Rāja-yoga, which seems not to have been critically studied, should be examined to understand Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s interpretation of YS.

In the following we shall look into the meaning of Rāja-yoga although based upon limited material. It is to be noted that discussion about each technique of Haṭha-yoga or other Yoga-s lies outside of the scope of this study. Further, historical study is not attempted in the following for lack of materials whose dates are certain.

1.1. RĀJA-YOGA AS PRACTICE CONCERNING TO SPIRITUAL EXPERIENCE

Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha is not the only one who asserts Pātañjala-yoga to be Rāja-yoga. In published commentaries on YS, the word Rāja-yoga does not seem to appear except in YSC. However, we find in Vijñāna-bhikṣu’s Yogasāra-saṅgraha, a manual of Pātañjala-yoga, an account that YSS itself is a work on Rāja-yoga. It reads as follows:

“However, posture (āsana) is not explained in this work, because [this is] a work of Rāja-yoga (rājayogaprakaraṇatvāt). Posture, purification of channels (nādiśuddhi) and others, on the other hand, should be learned in their detail in works of Haṭha-yoga or other [Yoga].”

---

6 Yogasāra-saṅgraha: āsanasya prapaṇcas tv atra rājayogaprakaraṇatvān na kriyate / āsananādiśuddhayas tu haṭhayogādigrantheśv aśeṣato draṣṭavyāḥ / [p.40, ll.1-2].
This statement gives us the starting point to understand the meaning of Rāja-yoga. Vijñānabhiṣku’s remark that technique such as posture and purification of channels should be learned in works of Haṭha-yoga and not in works of Rāja-yoga leads us to know that Bhikṣu thinks Rāja-yoga is not concerning to physical aspect of Yoga practice. In YSC 2.28 and 29, Nārāyaṇa Tirtha also interprets purification of channels and other techniques of Haṭha-yoga as merely practice bringing about physical perfection (deha-siddhamātrapala) and not directly being parts of Rāja-yoga consisting of eight parts.⁷ We have already seen that YSC interprets a conscious concentration (samprajñāta-samādhi) that brings the knowledge of individual self and the absolute Self as a subordinate synonym (apara-parāya) of Rāja-yoga and non-conscious concentration (asamprajñāta-samādhi) as Rāja-yoga. From these statements by Vijñānabhiṣku and Nārāyaṇa Tirtha, it is clear that Rāja-yoga is regarded as a Yoga different from Haṭha-yoga that concerns to physical technique or experience. In other words, Rāja-yoga is a Yoga concerning to spiritual experience. Its being spiritual differentiates itself from Haṭha-yoga and places itself higher than Haṭha-yoga. Here, concerning to spiritual experience means concerning to the experience which is interpreted dogmatically, for Pātañjala-yoga as Rāja-yoga is a system of dogma as well as a system of practice.

The word Rāja-yoga is found in a work advocating Vedāntic thought also. Aparoksānubhūti, a short work ascribed to Śaṅkaracārya, expounds a Yoga consists of fifteen parts and says the Yoga is Rāja-yoga⁸ In this work,

⁷ YSC 2.28-29: etac ca sarvam, yogāṅgānuṣṭhānād iti sūtre sūtritam api hāṭhayogā’ṅgatvena dehasiddhmātrapalatvena sāksād rājayogā’ṅgatvāt kāṇṭharavena sūtrakrtā noktam iti mantavyam iti samkṣepah //28// kāṇi punās tāni sāksād rājayogasyāṅgāni yair asuddhiḥaye jñānasya diptis tatrāha — yamaniyamāsanaprāṇājayaṃpratyaḥāradhāraṇādhyānasamādhayoh ’śtāṅgāni // [Ch. ed. p.73,1-7].

⁸ AA 102-144: yamo hi niyamas tyāgo maunam deśa ca kālata / āsanaṃ mūlabandhaś ca dehasāmyam ca drkṣitiḥ // 102 // pṛṇasamamanaṃ ceva prayāhāraś ca dhāraṇā / ātmadhyānaṃ samādhiś ca prakṛtyā anāgāni
Vedāntic interpretations of terms of Haṭha-yoga are found. In the terminology of Haṭha-yoga, *siddhāsana* is a posture and *mūlabandha* is a technique related to posture. However, both of *siddhāsana* and *mūlabandha* are interpreted as Brahman in this work, according to Swami Vimuktaṇanda who translated *AA*. Recaka, *pūraka* and *kumbhaka*, all of which are technique of breath control in the terminology of Haṭha-yoga, are interpreted as negation of phenomenal world, thought of identity between the Self and Brahman and steadiness of the thought, respectively. The enumeration of fifteen parts of Yoga and interpretations of them in *AA* are almost as same as those found in the *Tejobindu-upaniṣad* 1.15-1.51. In both the works, we find the intention to form a higher Yoga, a Yoga to realize the identity of the self and Brahman, by interpreting the practice of Haṭha-yoga with the dogma of Vedānta. This Yoga is Rāja-yoga. Haṭha-yoga is placed in the former

vai kramat // 103 // ...ebhir aṅgair samāyukto rājayoga udāḥrtaḥ / kiṅcit-pakvakaśāyaṇām hathayogena samyutah // 143 // paripakvaṁ mano yeṣāṁ kevalo 'yaṁ ca siddhīdaḥ / gurudaivatabhaktānāṁ sarveṣāṁ sulabho jāvāt // 144 //.

9 *AA* 112-114: sukhenaiva bhaved yasminn ajasraṁ brahmacintanam / āsanam tad vijānīyān netarat sukhanāśanam // 112 // siddham yat sarvabhūtādi viśvadhiṣṭhānam avyayam / yasmin siddhāḥ samāviṣṭhās tad vai siddhāsanaṁ viduh // 113 // yan mūlaṁ sarvabhūtaṁ yan mūlaṁ citta-bandhanam / mūlabandhaḥ sadā sevyo yogyo 'sau rājayoginām // 114 //; Vimuktaṇanda’s note on *AA* 113: "Siddhāsana — This is the name of a particular Yogic posture, but here it only means the eternal Brahman. [Incidently two particular posture known to the Yogis are mentioned in this and the next verse, and explained with reference to Brahman.]" Vimuktaṇanda 1982, p.61, ll.20-24.

10 *AA* 119-120: nisedhanam prapañcasya recakākhyāḥ samīraṇaḥ / brahmaivāsmiśi yā vr̥tīḥ pūrako vāyur īrītaḥ // 119 // tatas tadvṛtīnaiś-calyaṁ kumbhakaḥ prānasamāyamah / ayam cāpi prabuddhānām ajñānāṁ ghrāṇātājanam // 120 //; Vimuktaṇanda’s translation: "The negation of the phenomenal world is known as Recaka (breathing out), the thought, "I am verily Brahman," is called Puraka (breathing in), and the steadiness of that thought thereafter is called Kumbhaka (restraining the breath). This is the real course of Prāṇāyāma for the enlightened, whereas the ignorant only torture the nose.” Vimuktaṇanda 1982, p.64, l.23-p.65, l.2.
stage of Rāja-yoga as a method to destroy desires and to purify mind.\textsuperscript{11}

Here again, Rāja-yoga is regarded as a Yoga concerning to spiritual experience and its dogmatic interpretation.

1.2. RĀJA-YOGA AS THE HIGHEST PRACTICE

In the above examined literature, Haṭha-yoga is regarded to be a Yoga to purify body or mind and it is different from Rāja-yoga. However, as have been mentioned already, \textit{HP} does not say Rāja-yoga is a different system from Haṭha-yoga. It proclaims Rāja-yoga is a perfection of Haṭha-yoga.\textsuperscript{12} Moreover, in many other works which refer to techniques of Haṭha-yoga, Rāja-yoga is regarded as the highest of the four Yoga-s, namely Mantra-yoga, Laya-yoga, Haṭha-yoga and Rāja-yoga, which constitute a course of stages of Yoga-s.\textsuperscript{13} Obviously Rāja-yoga in these works does not mean a different Yoga from Haṭha-yoga, but the highest state of Haṭha-yoga.

The interpretation of Rāja-yoga as the highest Yoga is clearly seen in an etymology found in passages of \textit{Rājayogabhāṣya}, a commentary on \textit{Maṇḍalabrāhmaṇa-upaniṣad}. It says that Rāja-yoga is “rājña upayukto yogāḥ (a Yoga suitable for king)” or “yogān̄m rājā (king of Yoga-s),”

\textsuperscript{11} \textit{AA} 143-144 quoted in the above note 8.
\textsuperscript{12} \textit{HP} 1.2-3 quoted in the above note 3.
comparing to Hatha-yoga.\textsuperscript{14} \textit{RYBh} appears to derive the superiority of Raja-yoga to other Yoga-s from Raja-yoga’s easiness in practice and simplicity in its component parts. However, we cannot miss here the Indian point of view that gives more worth to spiritual things or inner things than to material, physical or outer things. \textit{MBU} proclaims practice of Tāraka-yoga and

\textsuperscript{14} \textit{RYBh} [p.1,II.18-13]: rājayogo rājña upayukto yogas tathocyate / yogānāṁ rājeti vā rājayogāḥ / pūrvokta yogā dehaprayāsakarāḥ / ayaṁ tu nirāyāsenā mokṣārūpapuruṣārthapradāḥ / hathavad asyāpy aṣṭāṅgāni sānti / kīṁ tu tadd-aṅgataṁ vistṛtam haṭhe bhavati / sūkṣmāṅgataṁ sāṁkṣepad vāksye /...;

Translation: A Yoga suitable for king is called Rāja-yoga; Or, king of Yoga-s is Rāja-yoga; The Yoga-s expounded earlier are achieved by bodily efforts; This Yoga, on the contrary, causes the emancipation, the goal of human beings, without efforts; This Yoga also consists of s eight parts like Hatha-yoga; However, Hatha-yoga consists of outstretched parts; [Rāja-yoga’s] being composed of subtle parts will be explained.

The eight parts (aṣṭāṅga) composing this yoga are yama, nīyama, āsana-niyama, prāṇāyāma, pratyāhāra, dhyāna, dhāraṇā and samādhi pro-
 proclaimed in \textit{MBU} 1.4-11. Cf. \textit{ŚYD} 1.12 quoted in the note bellow.

To avoid misunderstanding, it is to be noted that the present writer does not quote the \textit{RYBh} as the etymology on the bases of which he concludes Rāja-yoga is the highest Yoga. Rāja-yoga’s being the highest Yoga is already obvious from the position of Rāja-yoga in the above quoted enumeration of four Yoga-s in \textit{YTU}, \textit{YSU}, \textit{AP}, \textit{ŚYD}, or \textit{HP}’s statement that \textit{HP} is com-
 posed to expound Rāja-yoga. The present writer is quoting the \textit{RYBh} as a good example which explains his understanding that Rāja-yoga is not a particular system of practice but a Yoga that is regarded as the highest. The particular system of practice in \textit{RYBh} is the Tāraka-Amanaska-Yoga, that in \textit{HP} is Hatha-yoga, and they are called Rāja-yoga. This becomes possible when these works regard their own Yoga as the highest Yoga. The quoted \textit{RYBh} explains this way of thinking well. Apart from the etymology of Rāja-yoga as “king of Yoga”, we find different etymologies on ‘rāja’ as “shining” or “union of rajas (and retas)”: tad uktam smṛtu “samādhīs tatra nirbijō rājayogāḥ prakṛttītaḥ / dipavad rājate yasmd ātmā saccinmayaḥ prabhūḥ // iti // [ \textit{YS C} 1.20: Text p.(68),II.3-6] ; rajaso retaso yogād rāja-
yoga iti smṛtaḥ //137// animāḍipadām prāpya rājate rājayogataḥ / [\textit{YSU} 1.137cd-138ab: p.417,II.10-11]. These examples, if etymology were the decisive factor to interpret Rāja-yoga as the highest Yoga, contravene to the interpretation. However, they do not contravene to it. These examples of etymologies, kinds of rhyming game, obviously presuppose the notion that Rāja-yoga means the king of Yoga, and therefore explain why the particular Yoga is the king of Yoga from the characteristics of philosophical or dogmat-
ic aspects of the Yoga.
Amanaska-yoga, both of which aim to attain, through Haṭha-yoga-like techniques, perception of a kind of light that results the realization of the individual self and Brahman. Amanaska-yoga is regarded superior to Tāraka-yoga, because it has more inner object of meditation than the later has. *RYBh* calls these Yoga-s as Rāja-yoga.

Tāraka-yoga and Amanaska-yoga are enumerated as Rāja-yoga-s together with Rāja-yoga of Sāṃkhya, that is, Pātañjala-yoga in *Śivayogadipikā.* In the passages of *ŚYD,* which is one of the few examples in which the Yoga of *YS* is called as Rāja-yoga, however, Pātañjala-yoga is refereed to as inferior to Tāraka and Amanaska-yoga. The highest among the Rāja-yoga-s is Amanaska-yoga. This remark seems to be a reflection of *ŚYD*’s philosophical position that considers Sāṃkhya as inferior to Vedānta.

We have seen that in *YSC, YSS* and *AA,* Rāja-yoga is regarded as a Yoga concerning to spiritual experience and its dogmatic interpretation. In the above examined works, namely, *HP, RYBh, ŚYD,* etc., Rāja-yoga is “king of Yoga” or “the highest Yoga.” Thus, judging from the above examinations, we may say as follows: Rāja-yoga does not mean a particular system of practice; Rāja-yoga means a practice or a system of practice that brings a spiritual experience interpreted as the best according to the philosophical foundation on which the practice depends on; Rāja-yoga, in some cases, means a spiritual or physical state interpreted as the final and the best.

---

\[ \text{n} \]
1.3. RĀJA-YOGA AS UNCONSCIOUS STATE OF MIND

How are those best experiences described? In YS, that is the isolation of the self (puruṣa-kaivalya) which is the best state according to the doctrine of Sāṅkhya. YTU, in which Rāja-yoga is mentioned to appear after the perfection of Hatha-yoga, says detachment resulted from the discrimination (vivekavairāgya) arises in Rāja-yoga. Several works which mention techniques of Haṭha-yoga expound a mental state that seems to be a kind of trance. This mental state is interpreted dogmatically.

In HP, Rāja-yoga is a state resulted from the awakening of kūṇḍalinī. This state is named in various ways: concentration (samādhi), trance (unmanī, manonmanī), non-perception (amanaska), unity (advaya), etc. HP interprets the state of concentration (samādhi) as “dvayor aikyaṁ jīvātmāparamātmanoḥ (the oneness of the individual self and the supreme Self).” In this state, Yogin does not have notion of subject and object of perception, and he is said to be the agent of creation and destruction of the universe as iśvara.

16 YS 1.3: tadā draṣṭuḥ svarūpe 'vasthānām; 3.55: sattvapuruṣayoḥ śuddhi-sāmye kaivalyam iti; YS 4.34: puruṣārthaśūnyānaṁ guṇānāṁ pratīprasavaḥ kaivalyam svarūpa-pratiṣṭhā va citisaktir iti.
17 YTU 130: tadā vivekavairāgyam jāyate yogino dhrumav / viṣṇur nāma mahāyogī mahā bhūto mahātapāḥ // 130 // [p.385, ll.21-22]
18 HP 2.74-76: saktāḥ kevalakumbhakena yatheṣṭāṁ vāyudhāraṇāt / rājayogapadām cāpi labhate nātra saṃśayāḥ // 74 // kumbhakāt kūṇḍalī-bodhaḥ kūṇḍalībodhato bhavet / anargalā susumnā ca haṭhasiddhiṣ ca jāyate // 75 // haṭham vinā rājayogo rājayogam vinā haṭhap / na Siddhyati tato yugmam anispatteḥ samabhyeset // 76 // [p.68, l.11-p.69, l.3]
19 HP 4.3-4: rājayogah samādhiṣ caunmanī ca manonmanī / amaratvam layas tatvam śūnyāśūnyāṁ paraḥ padam // 3 // amanaskāṁ tathādvaitam nirālambaṁ nirañjanaṁ / jīvanmuktīṣ ca sahañā turyā cety ekavācakāḥ //4// [p.128, ll.7-10].
20 HP 4.7: tatsamam ca dvayor aikyaṁ jīvātmāparamātmanoḥ / pranaṣṭa-sarvasaṅkalpaṁ samādhiḥ so 'bhidhiyate // [p.129, ll.13-14].
21 HP 4.74: ekībhūtaṁ tadā cittam rājayogābhidhānakanam / sṛṣṭisamhāra-kartāsau yogiśivarasaṃ bhavet // [p.160, ll.11-12]. The text of AP 53 reads the same.
In *Gherandasaṃhitā*, Rāja-yoga is a general term for six practices which bring six concentrations (samādhi) or mental experiences resulted from the practices.²² Most of these experiences are characterized as bliss or trance and they are interpreted in accordance with Vedānta philosophy: By śāmbhavi-mudrā, Yogin realizes the Self and becomes filled with eternal bliss (sadānanda)²³; By bhṛāmarī-kumbhaka, bliss characterized as “I am that (so 'ham')” arises²⁴; By yoni-mudrā, Yogin becomes filled with bliss and united with Brahman, and advaita-samādhi in the form of “I am Brahman (aham brahma)” arises for him²⁵; Bhakti-yoga brings about an

---

²² *GhS* 7.5-6: śāmbhavā caiva bhrāmaryā khecaryā yonimudrayā / dhyānaṁ nādām rasānandaṁ layasiddhis caturvidhā // 5 // pañcadhā bhaktiyogena manomūrccā ca śaḍvidhā / śaḍvidho 'yaṁ rājayogah pratyekam avadhārayet // 6 // [p.124, ll.9-14]; *GhS* 7.17: iti te kathitam candā samādhir muktilakṣanam / rājayogah samādhiṁ syād ekātmey eva sādhanam / unmanī sahajāvasthā sarve caikātmavācakāh // [p.128, ll.1-3]. Name of the each samādhi known from *GhS* 7.5-6 are 1) dhūrāṇa, 2) nādā, 3) rasānanda, 4) layasiddhi, 6) manomūrccā. The name of the fifth seems to be manomani. See *GhS* 7.15: ānandārupalakena daśābhāvaḥ prajayate / samādhiḥ sambhavet tena sambhavite ca manomani // [p.127, ll.10-11]. Name of the each practice known from *GhS* 7.5-6 are 1) śāmbbhavi, 2) bhṛāmarī, 3) khecari, 4) yoni-mudrā, 5) bhaktiyoga. The name of the sixth practice seems to be mūrccākumbhaka. See *GhS* 5.78: sukkhena kumbhakāṁ kṛtvā maṇaś ca bhruvov antaram / samātayāja viṣayān sarvān manomūrccāsuhkapradā / ātmanī manasā yogā ānando jāyate dhruvam // [p.110, ll.17-19]. See also *HP* 2.69: pūrakānte gādhataruṃ baddhvā jālandharam śanaḥ / recayen mūrccākhyeyam manomūrccā sukhaṃ / [p.65, ll.20-21]. The sentence in 7.6c “śaḍvidho 'yaṁ rāja-yogah” may be interpreted as “the sixth samādhi is Rāja-yoga,” but I followed the interpretation given in the Lonavala edition of *GhS* and *Yoga Kosa*, pt.II [p.116].

²³ *GhS* 7.8: khamadhya kuru cātmānaṁtātmamadhye ca khaṁ kuru / ātmanāṁ khamayaṁ dṛṣṭvā na kincid api budhyate / sadānandaṁbhūtvā samādhisthoh bheven naraḥ // [p.125, ll.7-9].

²⁴ *GhS* 7.10: antāḥ stham bhramarīnādaṁ śrutvā tatra mano nayet / samādhir jāyate tatra āṇandaḥ so 'ham ity atāḥ // [p.126, ll.1-2].

exalted condition of mind (*daśābhāva*) through tears of bliss and bristling of hairs and further brings a trance (*manonmanī*); Yogan, after his mind becomes unconscious (*manomūrcchā*) by *mūrcchā-kumbhaka*, unites his mind with the self and with Brahman. According to *Ghs*, these experiences, or *samādhi*-s, are Rāja-yoga, of which the state of mind called trance (*unmanī*) or original state (*sahajāvasthā*) are synonyms.

In other works also, Rāja-yoga is expounded as a kind of trance. Take *Amaraughaprabodha* ascribed to Gorakṣanātha, for example. *AP* tells Rāja-yoga is a Yoga in which the activities of mind do not exist (*cittavṛtti-rahita*). Since two kinds of Rāja-yoga-s, one is that arises from herb (*oṣadhya*) and the other is spiritual (*adhyātmika*), are enumerated in this work, Rāja-yoga clearly means a kind of trance in which consciousness is almost lost as the trance resulted from taking narcotic drugs in this work. This Rāja-yoga is what is called the stream of immortality (*amaraugha*).

It is the highest among the four Yoga-s of Mantra, Laya, Ḥaṭha and Rāja.

---

26 On the meaning of *daśābhāva*, I followed the translation given in the Lonavala edition: “One should meditate on the form of one’s tutelary Deity within one’s heart and complete with devotion and great joy; with tears of joys and thrills one gets exalted condition of mind (aśṭasātvika Bhāva) and there will ensure the state of Samādhi and Manonmani too will arise. [*Ghs* p.127, ll.14-18]” *Yoga Kośa*, pt.1, explains it as forgetting of oneself [*p.66*].


28 *Manomūrcchā* can be interpreted as “inactivity of mind.” See the English translation of *Haṭhapradipikā* 2.69 by Iyangar [*Iyangar 1972: 35,10-14*].

29 *Ghs* 7.16: manomūrcchāṃ samāsādya mana ātmanī yoja yet / parātmanāḥ samāyogāt samādhiṁ samavāpnuyāt // [*p.127*, ll.19-20].

30 *Ghs* 7.17: iti te kathitamp caṇḍa samādhīr muktilaksanam / rājayogaḥ samādhiḥ śyād ekātmyam eva sādhanam / unmanī sahaṇāvasthā sarve caikāṭmavācakāh // [*p.128*, ll.1-3].

31 *AP* 4cd: yaś cītavṛttirahitaḥ sa tu rājayoga // [*p.48*, l.13].

32 *AP* 5ab: oṣadhīyo ‘dhyātmikaḥ ceti rājayogō dvidhā kvacit / [*p.48*, l.14].

33 *AP* 17ab: eka evāmaraughi hi rājayogābhidhānakāḥ // [*p.50*, l.1].

34 *AP* 24: mrdave diyate mamtro madhyāya laya ucyate / adhimātre ḥaṭhāṃ dadyād amaraughi maheśvare // [*p.50*, ll.15-16]; *AP* 73 : śrīmad-
Just as have been mentioned in *HP 4.77*, Yogin does not have notion of subject and object of perception, and he is said to be the agent of creation and destruction of the universe as *īśvara* in this state. In *SYD*, in *RY Bh* and in *Yogatārāvalī* also, trances such as *unmaṇī*, *manonmaṇī*, are taught as the highest mental state attained by Rāja-yoga.

In those works in which techniques of Haṭṭha-yoga are found, the highest mental experience that is called Rāja-yoga appears to mean a kind of trance, or unconscious state of mind. The expression “Yoga in which the activities of mind do not exist (*cittavṛtti-rakahita*)” found in *AP* unquestionably presupposes *YS* 1.2 that defines Yoga as “restraint of the activities of mind (*cittavṛttinirodha*).” As have been discussed, *YSC* proclaims non-conscious concentration (*asamprajñāta-samādhi*) is Rāja-yoga that is the means to

---

gorakṣanāthena sadāmaraughavartinā / layamaṃtrahathāḥ proktāḥ rāja-yogāya kevalam // [p.55, II.3-4]

*AP 53*: ekībhūtam tādā cittāṃ rājayogābhidhānakam / śrṣṭisamhārakartā 'sau yogisvarasamo bhavet // [p.53, II.5-6]. *HP 4.77* reads the same as quoted in the previous note 21.

ndriyāṇāṃ cironigraheṇa svāsaprācāre śamite yamindrāḥ / nīvātādīpā iva niścalāṅgā manonmanimagnadhiyo bhavanti //18/ unmaṇyavasthādhi-gamāya vidvann upāyam ekam tava nirdhiśāmi / paśyann udāśinadrā prapaṇcaḥ sāṃkhalpam unmūlaya sāvadhānāḥ //19// [p.17, 1.9-p.21, 1.12].
realize the Self. Therefore, we may say that $AP$ identifies the restraint of the activities of mind, which is proclaimed in $YS$, with the unconscious trance attained by the techniques of Haṭha-yoga on the basis of unconsciousness common to the two states of mind.\(^{37}\)

1.4. GENERAL MEANING OF RĀJA-YOGA

In the above, we have examined the general meaning of Rāja-yoga, although based upon limited material. We may say the following as conclusion: Rāja-yoga is not a physical practice but a practice or a system of practice concerning spiritual experience and its dogmatic interpretation; Rāja-yoga means "king of practice, the highest Yoga," which is a practice or a system of practice that brings a spiritual experience interpreted as the best according to the philosophical foundation on which the practice depends on; Rāja-yoga, in some cases, means a spiritual or physical state interpreted as the final and the best; Rāja-yoga as the highest experience attained by techniques of Haṭha-yoga is a mental state of unconscious trance interpreted identically with the restraint of the activities of mind expounded in $YS$ on the basis of unconsciousness common to the two states.

In spite of the identification based upon the unconsciousness in the two states, the restraint of the activities of mind ($cittavṛttinirodha$) attained through the clarity of the super-reflective concentration ($nirvicāravaiśāradya$), which is expounded in $YS$,\(^{38}\) and the trance ($manonmanī$) attained through tears of bliss and bristling of hairs ($ānandāśrupulaka$),

\(^{37}\) *Yoga Kośa*, pt.II says, under the entry of "$manonmanī$ 2," the condition of $manonmanī$ of $HP$ "is the same as Patañjali’s nirbījasamādhi and GS’s [= $GhS$’s] manomūrcchā" [p.105a, ll.46-47].

\(^{38}\) *YS* 1.47: nirvicāravaiśāradye ’dhyātmapasādaḥ.
which GhS expounds,\textsuperscript{39} can not be the same spiritual experience. Pātañjala-yoga belongs to the tradition of Yoga in which the ultimate goal is achieved through restraint of the activities of mind (nivruttimārga). However, Haṭha-yoga belongs to the tradition in which to make the activities of mind active plays important role (pravruttimārga).\textsuperscript{40} The above discussed identification seems to be a result of efforts to reconcile both the traditions.\textsuperscript{41}

It is not clear whether Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha is fully aware of the difference between the highest state of mind achieved by the Yoga of YS and that achieved though the techniques of Haṭha-yoga when he incorporate Haṭha-yoga in to YS. Haṭha-yoga, for him, is a Yoga that brings physical perfection (dehasiddhamātraphala)\textsuperscript{42} or stability of mind (manasaḥ sthitiḥ).\textsuperscript{43} At least we may say that Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha does not regard Haṭha-yoga as a Yoga that concerns to a spiritual experience interpretable dogmatically as the highest state of mind.

\textbf{Section 2. YSC's Definition of Yoga}

In the previous section, we have studied that the general meaning of the term Rāja-yoga is the highest Yoga which is a practice or a system of practice that brings a spiritual experience interpreted as the best according to the philosophical foundation on which the practice depends. Further, it means a spiritual or physical state interpreted as the final and the best, in some cases.

\textsuperscript{39} GhS 7.15: āṇandāśrūpulakena daśābhāvah praṇāvate / samādhiḥ sambhāvet tena sambhavet ca mononmani // [p.127, ll.10-11].
\textsuperscript{40} Tachikawa 1988, p.99; p.212; p.219.
\textsuperscript{41} Tachikawa points out there have been such efforts in the history of Yoga. See Tachikawa 1988, p.219.
\textsuperscript{42} YSC 2.28-29 quoted in the above note 7.
\textsuperscript{43} YSC 1.34: evam maitrāyādibhāvanayā prasannasya cittasya sthityupāyaṁ hathayogam āha // [Text p.(140),l.2-p.(141),l.1]. See section 1.5 of chapter 4.
Therefore, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s assertion that non-conscious concentration (asamprajñāta-samādhi) is Rāja-yoga expounded in YS becomes to mean that YS expounds a system of practice leading to the non-conscious concentration that is philosophically interpreted as the final stage. This final stage is described in the definition of Yoga. Now we turn our attention to YSC’s definition of Yoga.

Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha shows four definitions of Yoga in YSC 1.2-3. This juxtaposition of definitions shows his commentary’s uniqueness. According to Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha YS 1.2, “yogaś cittavṛttinirodhaḥ” and YS 1.3, “tadā draṣṭuḥ svarūpe ‘vasthānam’” form definition of Rāja-yoga that can be interpreted in two ways. In the case Yoga is interpreted to include conscious concentration (samprajñāta-samādhi) also, YS 1.2 is regarded as giving definition that also can be interpreted in two ways.

2.1. THE DEFINITIONS OF RĀJA-YOGA

The first definition of Yoga concerns to the Yoga in which the true nature of the self is realized. Although the sūtra-s 1.2 and 1.3 themselves are the definition, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha shows his own definition by paraphrasing the sūtra-s as follows: vṛttyantaranirodhapūrvakātmagocaradhārāvāhika-nirvikalpakavṛttir yoga iti (Yoga is the indeterminate activity of mind consisting of the flow having the Self as its object, conditioned by the restraint of other activities).45

In this state of the restraint of the activities of mind, the individual self delimited by internal organs which is the agent of cognition and which is the content of the notion ‘I,’ stays in its own nature that is the absolute con-

44 YS 1.2: yogaś cittavṛttinirodhaḥ; YS 1.3: tadā draṣṭuḥ svarūpe ‘vasthānam.
45 YSC 1.2-3: itthaṅ ca vṛttyantaranirodhapūrvakātmagocaradhārāvāhika-nirvikalpaka vṛttir yoga iti lakṣaṇam siddham / [Text p.(8), II.4-5].
sciousness, that is, in the form of the Self without being delimited by internal organs. The Self stays in the state of object-ness. This means the Self is cognized in this Yoga.\footnote{YS 1.2-3: tadā nirodhakāle draṣṭuḥ pramāturbh ahamarthasyāntahkaranāvachhinnasya svarūpe viśeṣye kevalacaitanya ātmandy avasthānām viśayatayāvasthitīr vidyāmānātety arthaḥ / [Text p.(7),l.12-p.(8),l.2].} Since cognition exists, all activities of mind are restrained in this state except the activity of mind that results the cognition of the Self. This activity of mind, however, is not cognized by Yognin, but the existence of which is inferred after the meditation.\footnote{YS 1.2-3: viṣayātā ca vyāpārānubandhīnī vyāpāraḥ ca vṛttir eva / yogi yām aham etāvantam kālām samāhito 'bhūvam iti smarāṇena vyutthāne 'numinoti / [Text p.(8), l.2-4].} On the basis of this interpretation, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha gives the above mentioned definition of Yoga.

Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha says the first half of his interpretation, “vṛttyantara-nirodhopūrvaka,” shows the restraint of activities of mind other than the cognition of the Self. The second half, “ātmagocaradhārāvahikanirmsvikalpakavrūti,” shows that Yoga is not conscious concentration (samprajñāta-samādhi) but non-conscious concentration (asaṃprajñāta-samādhi) that is an activity of mind which produces mental disposition (saṃskāra).\footnote{YS 1.2-3: atraupadesīkavrūtvārāṇāya viśeṣāṇam abhāvasya nirvīṣayatvena saṃskārājanakatvād yogasya ca saṃskārājanakatvāt tathaivāgre vākṣyāmānātviṣeyam / tatra samprajñātasādhāranyāya nirvikalpaketi / [Text p.(9), l.1-4]. Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha seems to pay attention to the mental disposition (saṃskāra) because YS 1.18 says mental disposition exists in non-conscious concentration. YS 1.18: virāmapratyābhivyāsapatvāḥ saṃskāraśeṣo 'nyah.} Thus, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha establishes his original definition of Yoga. The Yoga is non-conscious concentration in which the true nature of the Self is realized, that is, Rāja-yoga.

As the second definition, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha interprets that YS 1.2 and 1.3 express Abhāva-yoga and Mahā-yoga respectively. Abhāva-yoga is a concentration (samādhi) in which manifestation of object does not exist.
This Yoga is the means to achieve Mahā-yoga. Mahā-yoga is a Yoga in which object of concentration does not exist and the nature of Yogin’s Self manifests in the form of Śiva. These are the Yoga-s expounded in Kūrmapurāṇa. 49

Abhāva-yoga that is a samādhi must be non-conscious concentration because the definition is given to the Yoga that is non-conscious concentration. Consequently, Mahā-yoga is understood to be the result of the non-conscious concentration.

Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s real intention to incorporate these two Yoga-s expounded in Kūrmapurāṇa is not clear. In the idea that Yogin’s Self manifests in the form of Śiva, we find their theistic feature comparing to the above mentioned first Rāja-yoga. This theistic characteristic may have been one of the reason for the incorporation of these two Yoga-s into the system of Pātañjalayoga. It is also possible to suppose that Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha mentioned these Yoga-s keeping in his mind the Śaiva theory in which Yoga is interpreted in the sense of ‘unity’ expounded in the Dhātupātha 7.7 “yujīr yoge” and explained as the manifestation of Yogin’s own nature in the form of Śiva (śivalakṣaṇasvasvarūpaḥbhivyakti). 50

49 YSC 1.2-3: athavā śivalakṣaṇā svasvarūpābhivyaktir mahāyogā nir-ālambas tat-sādhanaṃ tv abhāvayogāḥ samādhipadābhidheyo nīrābhāsaḥ / tatra prathamasya laksanaṃ tadeti / dvitiyasya tu cintārūpamī / “yogas tu dvividho jñeyo hy abhāvah prathamo mataḥ / aparasa tu mahāyogah sarvatattvamottamamā // śūnyaṃ sarvaṃ nīrābhāsaṃ svarūpam yatra cintyate / abhāvayogāḥ sa proktō yenātmānaṃ prapaśyati // yatra paśyati cātmanān nītānandam nīrājaianaṃ / mayaikeṣa sa mahāyogah bhāṣitaḥ paramah svayam // (Kūrma 2.11.5-7)” ityādiśrutibhir api tathā jñāpanāti / [Text p.(9), I.8-p.(10), I.8].

50 D2 ms. shows a variant reading in YSC 1.1 that resembles to this Yoga of Kūrmapurāṇa, in which the term Yoga is interpreted as the manifestation of Yogin’s own nature in the form of Śiva (śivalakṣaṇasvasvarūpābhivyakti). This interpretation is given on the basis of the Dhātupātha 7.7 “yujīr yoge” and some āgama. Although the āgama is not identified, we fined very similar interpretation of Yoga in a Śaiva āgama, namely, the Mrgendratantra, or Mrgendrāgama, and its commentary. See note 5 in the Text part p.(6) : D2. athavā yujīr yoge ity anuśāsanā [sic.] tad ātmavad aṅto pi sandi-
the aim of the incorporation of these Yoga-s is to establish the authority of YS applicable to more wide variety of Yoga-s.

In the above examined YSC’s interpretation on the definitions of Rāja-yoga, YS 1.2 and 1.3 are regarded to form the definitions. YS 1.2 is not the only sūtra expounding the definition. YS 1.3 that expounds the characteristic of highest state of meditation is regarded as a part of the definition. Since Rāja-yoga is the highest Yoga that brings a spiritual experience philosophically interpreted as the best, YS 1.3 is the necessary part of the definition.

2.2. DEFINITIONS OF YOGA AS CONSCIOUS CONCENTRATION AND NON-CONSCIOUS CONCENTRATION

In Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s interpretation of the Pātañjala-yoga, Rāja-yoga primarily means non-conscious concentration.51 However, in Pātañjala-yoga’s traditional understanding, Yoga does not mean solely Rāja-yoga. According to YBh, Yoga means concentration (samādhi).52 Consequently, not only the non-conscious concentration but also the conscious concentration

51 That conscious concentration is not included in Rāja-yoga is understood from the following sentences of YSC 1.2-3: atra samprajñātaprāṇanirodhā-deḥ sādhanaśātvā eva nivesāt samprajñāte sāttvikaviśiṣṭavṛttiśattvam prāṇanirodha ity anūkāvapi ca na hānih / rājayogavijñāpayiśayaśā tvā laksanasūtraśpravrtteḥ // [Text p.(10), II.9-12]. See also YSC 1.2-3 quoted in the below note 52.

52 YBh 1.1: yogah samādhiḥ / [p.2, II.1-2]. See TV 1.1: ...yogah samādhir iti / “yuja samādha” ity asmād vyunpanaḥ samādhyartho na tu “yujir yoge” ity asmāt samyogārtha ity arthah / [p.2, II.17-19].
is regarded as Yoga. Hence, definition different from that of Rāja-yoga must be given to the Yoga that includes conscious concentration. In this case, YS 1.3 that expounds the highest state of meditation, that is, non-conscious concentration, does not fit for the definition. Therefore, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha regards only YS 1.2 as expounding Yoga that includes conscious concentration, and he interprets the sūtra in two ways. Let us call the two interpretations of Yoga that includes conscious concentration as the third and fourth definition of Yoga.

The third definition, “yogaś cittavr̥ttiordhah,” is interpreted as follows. Conscious concentration is a Yoga in which mind’s activities in the nature of rajas and tamas are restrained. In other word, the activities in the nature of sattva exist in conscious concentration. Non-conscious concentration is restraint of all activities. In this case, non-conscious concentration that is the restraint of all activities of mind is regarded to be the cause of the isolation (kaivalya) of puruṣa on the basis of its being a cause of the realization of the Self through unseen potency (adrṣṭa) produced by itself.

In this definition, non-conscious concentration is not interpreted as having an activity of mind. This interpretation seems to be given following YBh. As to the interpretation of conscious concentration that mind’s activities in

53 YBh 1.2: tasya lakṣaṇaḥ bhidhītsayedam sūtraṃ pravartate—yogaś cittavr̥ttinirdhah // (YS 2) // sarvaśabdāgraḥanāt samprajñāto 'pi yoga ity aākhhyāyate / [p.4, ll.4-6]. YSC 1.2-3: athavā samādhītvena samprajñātasyāpy agre vaksya-mānaṇavād rājayogavat samprajñāto 'pi pratijñāṣūtre yogasaabdābhidheyaḥ / tathā ca “yuja samādhīv (Drātiṣṭha 4.68)’ ityaniśasanād yogasyobhayavidhasamādheḥ svarūpasādhanabhedaphalapratipādakam śāstram ārabhyata iti pratijñāṣūtrārthah / [p.12, ll.4-8].
54 YSC 1.2-3: tadubhayasādhaṝaṇaṃ lakṣaṇaṃ āha / yogaś cittavr̥tti-nirdhah iti / [p.12, ll.8-9].
55 YSC 1.2-3: tatra cittasya rājasatāmasavṛttiṇāṃ nirodha upaśamaḥ samprajñātah / sarvavr̥ttiṇāṃ nirodho ‘samprajñātah / [p.12, ll.10-12].
56 YSC 1.2-3: sarvavr̥ttiṣūnyarūpāsamprajñātasya tu samādhyāṅgino yogasya .. maṇimaṇtrādīnīyayena kaivalyahetutvam svajanyādṛṣṭadvārātmasāksātkāraḥ hetutvam // [p.13, ll.10-13].
57 YBh 1.1: sarvavr̥ttiṇirodhe tv asamprajñātaḥ samādhiḥ // [p.4, ll.2-3].
the nature of rajas and tamas are restrained in the concentration, it seems
that Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha follows YBh.58 Therefore, we may say that Nārāyaṇa
Tīrtha shows YBh’s interpretation as the third definition.

As the fourth definition, YS 1.2 is interpreted in the following way. On
the basis of the etymological interpretation that “nirodha” means that in
which the activities of mind are restrained, the word “nirodha” means
“virodhivrttiparyavasāyin (that which destroys contradicting activities).”59
Therefore, Yoga is classified into conscious and non-conscious according to
the difference of their effect.60 Since these effects are to destroy the ig-
norance (ajñāna) directly through valid knowledge that arises in the mind
associated with meditation (bhāvanā), Yoga is not futile.61 Because real-
ization of true undivided nature of the Self (akhaṇḍārtha) is difficult to
obtain from sentence expounding it (vākyā) for the person whose mind is
acting toward outside world.62

In this fourth definition, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s interpretation of the word
‘nirodha’ seems to be influenced by Sarvadarśanaśaṅgraha’s interpretation
of YS 1.2. SDS also says YS 1.2 means that Yoga is the restraint of mind’s
activities opposing to it (pratipanthevrttinirodha) because the word
nirodha means that in which the activities are restrained.63

58 YBh 1.2: cittam hi prakhyāpravṛttisthitisīlatvat triguṇam / prakhyārūpaṃ
er cittasattvam ... tad eva rajoleśamalāpetam svarūpapratīṣṭham sattva-
purusāṅyatākhyātimātraṃ dharmameghadhyanopagaṃ bhavati / [p.4, l.6-
p.5, l.5].
59 YSC 1.2-3: athavā nirodhaś cittavrūtyo nirudhyante ’sminn iti vyutpattyaā
virodhivṛtttiparyavasāyī bodhyah / [Text p.(14), l.l.1-2].
60 YSC 1.2-3: ata vṛttviśeṣarūpābhīyam samprajñātāsamprajñātābhīyām
yogasya vibhajanan apy agre saṃgacchate / [Text p.(14), l.3-5].
61 YSC 1.2-3: ata eva na yogasya vaiyarthayam api / tādṛśavṛtter bhāvanā-
sahakṛtmanahpramāṇajñeyaṃ parokṣatayājñānacchedakṣamatvād ity
agre sphutibhaviṣyati / [Text p.(14), l.5-7].
62 YSC 1.2-3: bahirmukhānām vākyato ’khaṇḍārthabodhasyāpi durlabhād
iti samkṣepah // [Text p.(15), l.2-3].
63 SDS Pātañjaladarśana: sarjavṛttinirodhe tv asamprajñātah samādhīh /
nanu sarjavṛttinirodho yoga ityukte samprajñāte vyāptir na syāt / tatra
Although YSC’s interpretation of the word nirodha resembles to that of SDS, this does not mean YSC followed only SDS. Because the idea that the discriminative knowledge (vivekakhyāti) arising in conscious concentration destroys the indiscrimination between mind and the Self caused by ignorance (avidyā) is already expounded in YS 2.26. Further, the purport of YSC’s interpretation of the fourth definition agrees with the interpretations of YS 2.26 found in other commentaries, such as TV, YV, MP, on the following point: Indirect or unstable knowledge of the distinction between mind and the Self obtained from scripture or inference becomes direct and firm through Yoga, further, the direct knowledge destroys the indiscrimination caused by ignorance. This suggests that the fourth definition seems to be
given by Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha following those preceding commentaries and the etymology of nirodha found in SDS.

However, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha differs from other commentaries in his conspicuous emphasis on Yoga’s superior effectiveness comparing to the knowledge obtained from scriptures.66 Obviously he has in his mind the superiority of Yoga to mere hearing of Upaniṣadic sentence. In other words, he is trying to incorporate the śravana of Upaniṣadic sentence (vākyā) in the system of Pātañjala-yoga as a prerequisite for the realization on the true nature of the Self by Yoga. This idea of Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha is the same as that we have seen in the examination of his attempt to incorporate Bhāmati-school’s meditation theory in chapter 3 of the present study. Therefore, we may say the fourth definition fits to his Advaitic interpretation of Pātañjala-yoga.

2.3. EVALUATION OF THE JUXTAPOSITION OF THE DEFINITIONS

We have examined the four definitions of Yoga given in YSC. The juxta-position of the four definitions is the unique characteristic in Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s interpretation of the definition of Yoga. As a conclusion of this chapter, we may consider the purpose of this juxtaposition.

Among the four, the first and the second are the definitions of Rāja-yoga, or non-conscious concentration. For Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha, YS is the work expounding Rāja-yoga. Therefore, the definition of Yoga in YS should be pri-

---

66 See also YSC 2.27: nanu jñānād eva cten mokṣas tadā ’samprajñāta-yogānta*–prayāśāṇusaraṇam vyartham/ ātmataṭtvaśayaunapiṣadatvena śrutyaiva jñānasambhavād ity āśaṅkya, āgamāt parokṣaiva vivekakhyātir udeti nāparokṣā, kintu sā bhāvanāprakarsād eveti jñāpayisyāṁs tasyā vivekakhyāteḥ svarūpam āha [Ch.ed. p.67, II.1-4]; * The reading of Ch. ‘-yogāntaraprayāśāṇusaraṇam’ is corrected with D2.[23a, l.18].
marily given to Rāja-yoga. To regard YS 1.2 and 1.3 composing the defi-
nition is very peculiar to Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha. Since Rāja-yoga means, as we
have already examined, the highest Yoga that brings a spiritual experience
philosophically interpreted as the best, it must have been necessary for
Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha to regard YS 1.3 that expounds the highest state of medi-
tation as a part of the definition of Yoga.

Among the two, the first seems to be Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha's original definition
while the second is given following Kūrmapurāṇa. The first definition
concerns to the meditation in which the true nature of the Self is realized
directly. The second that concerns to the meditation in which the nature of
Yogin's Self manifests in the form of Śiva. This second definition seems to
have been given with the intention to incorporate a theistic Rāja-yoga or
Śaiva interpretation of Rāja-yoga. Comparing to the first that does not
contain any theistic characteristics, the second appears to be theistic. We can
surmise, therefore, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha intended to show atheistic and theistic
Rāja-yoga-s.

Although Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha interprets YS primarily expounds Rāja-yoga,
Yoga does not mean solely Rāja-yoga, or non-conscious concentration. YBh
regards conscious concentration also as Yoga. Therefore, the third and the
fourth definitions are given. These definitions are expounded solely by YS
1.2 that fits to conscious concentration as well as to non-conscious concen-
tration.

In the third definition, both conscious and non-conscious concentrations are
interpreted as the restraint of the activities of mind but the activities re-
strained are different according to the each concentration. Since this inter-
pretation is first found in YBh, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha seems to have given this
third definition to accommodate in YSC the traditional interpretation of YBh.

In the fourth definition, Yoga is understood to destroy the ignorance
directly through knowledge arising in the mind associated with meditation.
Here the emphasis is put on the superior efficiency of knowledge arising from Yoga comparing to knowledge obtained from Upaniṣadic sentence. This interpretation agrees with Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s Advaitic interpretation of Yoga by the incorporation of Bhāmatī-school’s theory of meditation.67

Thus, we have seen that Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha enumerated atheistic and theistic features of Rāja-yoga, YBh’s interpretation and Advaitic interpretation of Yoga. In this juxtaposition, he not only simply explains the traditional definition of Yoga but also tries to show new aspects, broad applicability to various Yoga-s, of YS’s definition. In other words, his juxtaposition of the definitions aims to accommodate various interpretations of Yoga and meditation theories into the system of Pātañjala-yoga. Therefore, his juxtaposition can be evaluated as an attempt to demonstrate the wide applicability of the simple aphorisms of YS. We may say that he tries to establish YS as a comprehensive authority of Yoga that expounds various Yoga-s with its simple sentences.

---

67 As to the incorporation of the Bhāmatī-school’s meditation theory, see chapter 3 of the present study.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUDING REMARKS
In the foregoing chapters, we have examined YSC’s unique characteristics following the study of the works and the flourishing period of Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha. In this chapter, let us consider YSC’s significance for the history of Pātañjala-yoga philosophy to conclude the first part of the present study.

YSC is a work composed with the intention to answer to the challenges to the Pātañjala-yoga from the new trend of religion and philosophy in the medieval India. YSC is evaluated as a work intending to reestablish YS as the authority of Yoga that fits to the philosophical situation of the Medieval Period through reconciliation with Advaitavedānta and incorporation of various kinds of Yoga-s.

We have studied that Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha flourished in the seventeenth century. From the examination of titles and number of his works, we understand that he had special interest on Pātañjala-yoga expounded in YS on which he composed three commentaries. Further, the number of the works on other philosophical schools, namely, two works on Sāṃkhya, three works on Advaitavedānta, three works on the philosophy of Bhakti and three works on Nyāya, shows us his broad field of philosophical interest. We may say that this broad philosophical interest prepared the foundation of YSC’s characteristics.

Comparing to his simple commentaries such as SC, YSC contains many new interpretations undertaken originally by him. His intention that brought about such new interpretations of YS is clearly known from the invocation of YSC. The invocation verses tell us that Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha composes YSC intending to establish Pātañjala-yoga’s authenticity following the teachings of Upaniṣad-s. Further, he tries to incorporate various medieval Yoga-s such as Bhakti-yoga into Pātañjala-yoga.

These two, namely, Vedāntic interpretation of YS and incorporation of various Yoga-s into the system of Pātañjala-yoga, are the most significant characteristics of YSC. They form the new perspective Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha
adopted to meet the challenge to Pātañjala-yoga from the new trend in the medieval Indian philosophical situation, namely, the flourishing of theistic Vedānta and various kinds of Yoga-s, such as Haṭha-yoga, etc.

In the seventeenth century, there were various flourishing schools of Vedānta, such as Viśiṣṭādvaita, Dvaita, Svābhāvikabhedābheda, Śuddhādvaita, Acintyabhedābheda, etc. Their common feature lies in the enthusiastic theism, or Bhakti, on which Advaitavedānta had been reluctant to put emphasis. However, the reconciliation between the philosophy of Advaita and Bhakti was established by Madhusūdana Sarasvatī. Even in the period of Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha, Advaitavedānta must have been the most orthodox school of Vedānta. We have studied that Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha composed the Lahuvyākhyā and the Gurusūkta on Madhusūdana Sarasvatī’s Siddhānta-bindu, moreover that he was very influenced by Madhusūdana’s philosophy of Bhakti. Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha had an intimate acquaintance with the philosophy of Advaita and Madhusūdana Sarasvatī’s works. Thus he attempted in YSC to show the interpretation of Pātañjala-yoga in reconciliation with this most orthodox Vedānta.

To be sure, YSC is not the first work that tries to interpret Pātañjala-yoga with Vedāntic thought. For example, Vijñānabhikṣu in his YV tries to synthesize Pātañjala-yoga with Bhedābhedavedānta and Sāṁkhya. Yet, YSC’s significance lies in its incorporation of theories of Advaitavedānta into the system of Pātañjala-yoga. Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha adopts the meditation theory of Bhāmatī-school of Advaitavedānta. Further, concerning to the interpretation of the relation between individual self and īśvara, he uses the avacchedavāda insisted by Vācaspatimīśra.

We have seen Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha declares at the beginning of YSC’s invocation that YS is the work that teaches the method to realize the Self expounded in Upaniṣad-s. However, most of the Advaitin-s maintain the chief cause for the realization of the Self is the hearing of the mahāvākyā. Medi-
tation takes only subsidiary role for the realization. If Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha follows such theory of Advaitin-s, Yoga would not be regarded as the principal method to realize the purport of Upaniṣad-s. Therefore, to achieve the Advaitic interpretation of YS, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha found a key to the interpretation in the meditation theory of Bhāmatī-school in which Vācaspatimisra puts more emphasis on meditation than the hearing of the mahāvākyā. Thus, he includes the meditation theory of Bhāmatī-school as a part of the system of Pātañjala-yoga.

Avaccheda-vāda insisted also by Vācaspatimisra is another peculiar Advaitic characteristic found in YSC. As to the relation between individual self and īśvara, YSC says they are essentially not different but the difference occurs according to the difference of limiting adjuncts (upādhi) to them. Interestingly, though this is the view severely criticized by Vijñānavahikṣu in his YV 1.24, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha who remarkably follows YV in YSC 1.24 adopts the view without criticizing Bhikṣu. This may show, in addition to the fact that the Advaitic theories he adopted were those of Vācaspatimisra, his great respect to Bhikṣu and Vācaspati as preceding commentators of YS.

Thus, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha tried to establish Yoga dogmatically as the most efficient method to realize the non-different (abheda) expounded in the mahāvākyā “tat tvam asi.” However, it is to be noted that although he adopted the theories expounded by Bhāmatī-school, namely, the meditation theory and avaccheda-vāda, this does not mean he identified Pātañjala-yoga with Advaita. As have been examined, he incorporated Bhāmatī-school’s meditation theory as a previous stage to non-conscious concentration, further, he says the individual self and the supreme Self are non-different (abheda) instead of identical (eka). Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha was fully aware of the independence of Pātañjala-yoga to Advaitavedānta.
Another significant characteristic of YSC, namely, the incorporation of various Yoga-s, is a clear reflection of the state of Yoga in the seventeenth century. We have seen that fifteen Yoga-s were incorporated into the system of YS. It is difficult to think that all the Yoga-s incorporated were truly existent as practicable Yoga in Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s time. Some of them may have been Yoga-s only the names of which were known from works on Yoga. However, some Yoga-s developed after the tenth century were surely practiced. In fact, there are various works of Haṭṭha-yoga, Lakṣya-yoga, etc., a few of which we utilized in the present study. Further, the influential movement of Bhakti made the theistic meditation as one of the most important Yoga. Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha composed YSC under the circumstance that various Yoga-s not expounded in YS were prevailing.

Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha regards YS as the work that teaches the Yoga to realize the Self expounded in the mahāvākyam “tat tvam asi.” In this sense, YS is the work expounding Rāja-yoga, or the highest Yoga. We have examined that Rāja-yoga means the system of practice that brings the experience philosophically interpreted as the best. Consequently, YS must be the most authentic work on Yoga. However, various kinds of Yoga-s different from the Yoga of YS, such as Haṭṭha-yoga, Bhakti-yoga, existed and practiced in the seventeenth century. Long quotation from the works on Haṭṭha-yoga found in the second chapter of YSC and Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s emphasis on Bhakti-yoga in the first chapter of YSC show how influential those Yoga-s were in his time. To establish YS as the most comprehensive work on Yoga and the authority of Yoga, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha attempted the incorporation of such various Yoga-s into the system of Pātañjala-yoga.

The incorporation was made possible with the interpretation of the various Yoga-s as subordinate parts for the highest Yoga. YS is interpreted as expounding primarily the Yoga that brings the realization of the Self by its
entire sūtra-s, moreover, secondly the subordinate Yoga-s at the same time by several sūtra-s.

Especially, as Bhakti-yoga on which Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha puts great emphasis, he incorporated the passionate meditation of the God and the modified Pāñcarātra theory on the various aspects of īśvara. Moreover, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha introduced linguistic analysis of the relation between the syllable Om and its referent, the God. However, YSC’s explanation about the aspects of the God does not include the creation theory that is very essential to Pāñcarātra. YSC simply adopted the theory to explain the various aspects God as the objects of meditation. In the same way, the linguistic analysis was given to explain clearly the theoretical aspect of Bhakti-yoga that, in the system of Pātañjala-yoga, is chiefly the recitation of the sacred syllable Om.

It is apparent that the incorporation of various Yoga-s, such as Haṭha-yoga, Pāñcarātra Bhakti-yoga, etc., was attempted to expand the perspective and applicability of YS to wider field of Yoga-s, but not as a result of an identification of Pātañjala-yoga with them. The incorporation of such meditations is an answer to the movement of theism and to the flourishing new Yoga-s in the Medieval Period.

His intention to expand the applicability of YS to wider range of Yoga-s and to Vedāntic philosophy is clearly signified also in the juxtaposition of the four definitions of Yoga. In YSC, Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’ own definition of Rāja-yoga, theistic Rāja-yoga found in Kūrmapurāṇa, YBh’s traditional interpretation of Yoga and the definition of Yoga that fits to the incorporated meditation theory of Bhāmatī-school are juxtaposed. This juxtaposition shows Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s effort to establish YS as the work of the Rāja-yoga that is the method to realize the purport of Upaniṣad-s and as the authority on various Yoga-s, without harming the Pātañjala-yoga’s traditional interpretation.

The above examined Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s interpretations of YS, namely, Vedāntic interpretation through the apparent adoption of Bhāmatī-school’s
theory, and the interpretation to establish \textit{YS} as the work that synthesizes various Yoga-s, have not been undertaken in any other commentaries of \textit{YS}. Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha calls his new commentary as ‘\textit{Gūḍhārthadyotika} (the illuminator of the secret import of \textit{YS}).’ We may say that \textit{YS}’s being the authority of Rāja-yoga that expounds the method to realize the purport of Upaniṣad-s and synthesizes the various Yoga-s is the secret import Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha wished to reveal.

Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s interpretation of \textit{YS} should be regarded as an attempt to expand Pātañjala-yoga’s applicability to Vedāntic philosophy and to various Yoga-s, both were flourishing in the Medieval Period. \textit{YSC} should be evaluated as an ambitious work that revives the Pātañjala-yoga succeeding the traditional interpretation given by \textit{YBh}, \textit{TV}, \textit{YY} one hand and incorporating other systems’ philosophical theories and Yoga-s on the other hand.

\textit{YSC} shows us one direction of Pātañjala-yoga’s answer to meet the challenges from theism, Vedāntic philosophy and various Yoga-s flourished in the Medieval Period. At the same time, \textit{YSC} presents us a good figure of the development of Advaitavedānta. It shows how Advaita, after reaching to the peak of its own development, influenced other philosophical system and developed within the frame of other system.

At present we do not have enough material to judge whether Nārāyaṇa Tīrtha’s attempt of reconciliation of Pātañjala-yoga with Advaita was successful or not because the fourth chapter of \textit{YSC} is still to be edited. Not only the edition of the fourth chapter but also the better, more critical text of the second and third chapters of \textit{YSC} should be prepared. Further, \textit{YSC}’s criticism against other philosophical systems, such as Advaitavedānta, Naiyāyika, etc., should be examined. We may say that the critical study of \textit{YSC} has just started. For the study, many problems to be solved and many subjects to be examined in the future are still remaining.