CHAPTER - II

PHILOSOPHICAL ASPECT OF YOGA
explain or understand. In everything that they do there is a want, something is left out, on account of which they feel a kind of misery. And here they enter into the field of philosophical analysis.

Philosophy is not a theory that just occurred to somebody's mind; it is not merely a view-point that can be called philosophy. Everyone has a philosophy in that sense. One's idea of the world is one's philosophy, but there is a genuine philosophy in the true sense of the term. Philosophy is the wisdom of life. Great philosophers who were genuine thinkers defined philosophy as the technique of wise living; more than the love of this wisdom, a practice of this wisdom. To understand life in its correct perspective would be true philosophy. One should understand life as it is, one should not have a wrong idea about it. When one goes to a place he must understand where he is staying, what kind of people are around him, and should not go just headlong like a fool, without knowing anything about the circumstances prevailing outside. 'Where is he, what is that country, what kind of people are living around him, what are the conditions in which he is going to be there?' All these are the thoughts that may occur to one's mind when one goes to a new land. While one is in life, living in this world, it should be his duty to understand what is that thing in which he is finding himself. What is that that he is seeing in front of him, how is he related to those things?
What is he to do with them? How is he going to deal with those things that he calls the world in front of him? Here commences philosophical analysis: the perception of the world and man's having something to do with it.

There is a mutual concord between the world and the individual, and here commences what is called life. Life is nothing but this relationship between the individual and the world. One's attitude in respect of the world is one's life. Life is not only breathing, that is life in the biological sense, but in the sense of a value, life is more than mere breathing. The methodology of harmonising one's relationship with the world is the practical business of life. Each one has his own methods, and many of these do not succeed in life, because they are unconnected with the facts of life. One's living should be connected with the facts of life. If one employs wrong techniques in life, wrong in the sense that there were no proper relations with the facts of life, then he gets a rebuff and a kick from Nature.

Just as in scientific and technological fields there is a theory behind every invention, a doctrine or a principle to be followed by every approach in life, the actions that the human being performs have a principle underlying them. One should not just act, there is a method in the working, there is a way in which one ought
to conduct oneself in life. This conduct of life, if it is going to be a success, should be based on a principle connected with the reality of life. If one's way of living is unconnected with realities of life, then his life becomes a failure, he is a grieved person cursing everything on earth. But Nature is not going to listen to his curses, he may go on cursing and screaming, what does it care? Because he does not know Nature, he did not understand its ways. It will be like an ignorant man complaining against the laws of his State. Ignorance of law is no excuse; one knows it very well.

The wisdom of life, which is philosophy, is an understanding of life's aim and methods. The Sanskrit word for philosophy is 'Darśana' which literally means 'vision or sight'. It means search after the ultimate truth of life in the world. Yoga-Darśana of Patañjali, known as Yoga-system or Yoga philosophy, is one of the Six Systems of Indian philosophy. Patañjali, in writing Yoga-Darśana or Yoga philosophy, assumed the fundamental tents of Sāmkhya philosophy, much as a writer on the treatment of a certain disease would assume the ordinary facts of anatomy and physiology. He did so, because his aim was to lay far greater emphasis upon the practical side of self-discipline.

Yoga philosophy, upon which is constructed the most beautiful edifice of its psychology and practice, commences by the observation of the fact that there is a conflict in nature, far deeper than the psychological conflict one is familiar with. This psychological conflict seems to be based on another conflict which modern psychologists do not know. The conflict of the ideal with the real, is due to another deeper conflict. There is a fundamental conflict between man and Nature, because these two are irreconcilable. That between man and society is but a small conflict; there is a larger conflict of irreconcilability between man and Nature in front of him.

People do not know what this huge cosmos is, and inasmuch as they have not been able to answer this question of the relationship between them and the cosmos, they have not been able also to answer the simpler question of their relationship with human society. What people call human society is only a small fraction of the fact of the vast universe before them. Just as a finger is a part of the larger body of a person, this society which is apparently troubling them so much is only a part, a very small part of this vast creation. It is creation that is posing a problem, not this small human society, and the problem of society is a part of the problem of the world as a whole. People might not have had the occasion to raise this question because the small problems are
engaging their attention. The persons just beside them are causing so much annoyance that they have no time to think of the larger difficulties in life. Their neighbours themselves have become a problem to them, and where is the time to think of the vast world outside? But unless they go to the cause, the effect cannot be known. This is a great principle in philosophical analysis. Their neighbours, the persons near them, are only effects of a larger cause. They cannot do anything with the persons near them, because they are in the position of an effect. The persons near them are not the problem but their intelligible relationship with them. The relationship between them and the neighbours are so nebulous that it becomes a problem, and they cannot solve this question because it is an effect of a larger question which is the cause of problems. The whole situation can be summed up in a single question: what is one's relationship with the vast environment in which one is? What is the relationship between man and nature, the inner and the outer, the individual and the cosmos, the subject and the object? If this question can be answered, all questions in the world can also be answered. The small questions of the relation between the employer and the employed, the master and the servant, the husband and the wife, the parent and the child - all these are issues arising out of the bigger question of one's relation to one's environment in general.
This was an eternal question that was posed before man's mind: What can man do with this world that stares at him in his face? Astronomers, physicists, chemists, biologists, psychologists, have all tried their best to answer this question, but no one can be said to have answered it satisfactorily, because the approach of the methodological sciences appear to be something like the attempt of the blindmen of the fable to describe the body of the elephant. They touched different parts of the elephant, but could not touch the whole of it at any time. Not the astronomer, not the physicist, not the biologist, was in a position to touch the whole of Nature at one stroke.

The original approach of astronomy was one of an attitude of diversity of things, the external world, which was approached as it appeared to the physical senses, and this approach brought a knowledge which ended merely in a wonder. They took things as they appeared, each star and each planet cast far off from the earth away in space. Advancement in knowledge revealed by various methods that the stars and the planets are not hanging and are not suspended as they appear to be, but they are relatively attracting one another by a force, called gravitation. Knowledge advanced. The gravitational pull theory discovered was not the full explanation, because the necessity arose to find out what these bodies are made of. The substance of the cosmos became the subject of study.
The analytic mind of the scientist observed that the many things are made up of a few things only. The multitude in the variety of creation is explicable in terms of a few fundamental elements of which everything is made. They felt that everything is made up of five things: the earth-element, the water-element, the fire-element, the air-element and the ether-element. The ether, however, became an enigma to the scientist. The vast astronomical universe is made up of these five elements alone. But, what are these five elements, is another question. What is the earth made of? The earth is only a name that is given to something which appears hard to the touch. But what is earth? What is water? What is fire? What are the five elements. Why not go deeper and discover what these five objects or elements are made of? They became the object of further physical analysis. The physicists analysed the elements of the earth, water, fire and air. They could not know what ether was. It appeared to be a vacuum, and how can one analyse vacuum? So it was left out of the analysis and they took only the four elements,—earth, water, fire and air for the purpose of practical study. They went on dissecting these into bits and parts and minor particles visible only to a powerful microscope, and it was proclaimed as a great discovery that these elements are made of small chemical units. They held that there are about ninety-two of these
chemical molecules. Then the desire arose to dissect even the molecule and they broke it into pieces by electronic processes. Electronic subjection revealed behind the molecules minor particles, or atoms, which were of a simpler nature than the molecules, and the scientists thought that the earth-atom, the water-atom, the fire-atom and the air-atom differ from one another in that they are only of four kinds. Today modern people say, with a tremendous courage and confidence, that they are in a world of electric forces called electrons, protons, neutrons, etc. Everything is reducible to these fundamentals. But what these things are is not known, whether they are waves or particles.

This is all interesting, so far as it goes, and very useful for knowledge. But modern scientists could not give answer of the question. The question is: "What is this essence or substance out of which Nature is made, and how man is going to be related to it?" If some says that Nature is made of electricity, it is all right, but it is as good as saying it is made of many bodies or the five elements. It matters little to people what name is given to that which is called Nature. Tell them what Nature means to man, and what man means to Nature, what is the relationship between them. Are they friends or enemies? Is there any relationship between them? This is the question which scientists have not answered and which, perhaps, they are not going to answer. In India, this question was taken up by another system of thinking called...
There is a school of philosophy, called the Sāmkhya System, which, literally, means 'a system of knowledge'. The enumeration of the categories of reality is Sāmkhya. This analysis discovered that the gulf between consciousness and its objects cannot be bridged ultimately. Nature is Nature, man is man, and they will be always what they are. Man looks at Nature and Nature may react to man, but there cannot be an ultimate resolution of this gap between man and Nature. Instead of saying 'man and Nature', the Sāmkhya says, 'Puruṣa and Prakṛti'. These are the Sanskrit epithets for man in essence and Nature in essence. There are only two things in the whole creation: Puruṣa and Prakṛti. What is man and what is Nature, what is relationship between them, this knowledge was the contribution of the Sāmkhya philosophy to the world. It is on the Sāmkhya that Yoga philosophy is based. Patañjali accepted with some limitations all the psychological terms of the Sāmkhyas almost in the Sāmkhya sense. It will be clear, by and by, that the terms used by Patañjali perfectly conform to his whole scheme. His scheme is, as has been told earlier, the conservation of one's mental energy and so putting it into a mould as one can become one's True-Self and so can get rid of all sufferings.
The manifest universe together with its unmanifest material cause is spoken of in Yoga philosophy as Drṣya which means 'that which can be seen'. This is in relation to the Puruṣa, which is called the Draṣṭā, that which sees. The Drṣya is supposed to come into existence through a hierarchy of subtler states. The duality of the Draṣṭā and the Drṣya is akin to the duality of the living and the non-living. It is found by common-sense experience that there is a vast qualitative difference between objects which are living and those which are inanimate. For example, it is seen that a log of dead wood or a stone does not move of its own accord, it does not manifest any growth, nor does it ever appear to reproduce or multiply itself, and it is never seen to consume any food, or show what is called pattern of behaviour under varying situations. These qualities, to be sure, are exhibited only by the living beings. It is these differences that have perhaps given rise to the belief that living beings as endowed with a special entity which is responsible for their life activity, and the material objects do never behave like living beings due to the absence of this peculiar entity in them. This entity is spoken of as Caitanya. It is thus assumed that there are two wholly different realms in the world— the Cetana and the Jāda. Thus it is clear that the Yoga view of looking at the world is a realistic view and one knows realism holds good for all practical purposes.
Yoga philosophy proceeds to explain all that comes under the category of the material or the Jāda on the basis of a trio of qualities, which are called the three Guṇas. The word Guṇa in Sāmskṛta means a quality. Everybody knows that every object that one can know or perceive can be described in terms of the various qualities it possesses, viz, its colour, size, shape, density, solidity or fluidity and so on. The three Guṇas are found invariably in all that exists, may it be gross or subtle. It is only the Puruṣa that is supposed to be devoid of all the three Guṇas; all else in the world, including the objects of experience, our bodies and senses and even the mental apparatus, is supposed to be constituted, in essence, by the three Guṇas. These are called respectively, Sattva, Rajas and Tamas. The first of these qualities represents all that is light, desirable, enlightening, and is supposed to make for knowledge, happiness, righteousness, peace etc. The second is looked upon as the principle of motion, and is supposed to represent tension, movement, action, etc, while the third of these Guṇas is taken to indicate inertia, heaviness, lack of knowledge and obstruction. None of these Guṇas can ever stand all by itself. They are to be found always together, and to work, as a rule, in co-operation with each other, although any one of them may predominate at any movement by suppressing the other two.
A detailed description of the working of the three Guṇas in the Mahābhārata, where it is said that whatever is found in this universe (excepting the Puruṣas) is nothing apart from the three Guṇas. When Sattva predominates in the working of an individual's mind, he exhibits such qualities as happiness, love, peace, satisfaction, piouness, and overcomes passions and cravings. Similarly, when Rajas manifests itself by suppressing Sattva and Tamas, the individual shows in his behaviour such qualities excitement, power, bravery, longing, competition, greed, quarrelsomeness, control through force, activity, and so on. Tamas, in the same fashion, represents ignorance and darkness, infatuation, sinfulness, hypocrisy, envy etc. These three Guṇas are thus supposed to form the foundation of all that exists. These three (along with Puruṣas) are looked upon as the fundamental realities from which all else is supposed to originate. Nothing in the world can exist apart from them.

The theory of the Guṇas appears to be consistent with the theory of fundamental particles like electrons, for if the electrons are really the ultimate foundation of all that exists, then they also seem to exhibit three qualities similar to those indicated by the three Guṇas. If it is true that an electron can be adequately defined by its mass, its motion, and the electric charge that it carries, then wonderfully enough, it is these very qualities

that are said to be indicated by the three Guṇas; Tamas indicating the mass, Rajas, the motion, and Sattva, the energy aspect.

It will be now seen how on the Yoga view, the world of the objects of experience evolves from the three Guṇas enumerated above. There are four stages recognised by Yoga in which the Guṇas manifest themselves. These are termed respectively Aliṅga, Liṅgamātra, Aviśeṣa and Viśeṣa. The first of these is also described by words like Prakṛti, Pradhāṇa, Avyakta etc. This state is characterized by a complete equipoise and balance in the working of the three Guṇas, that is to say, the three Guṇas are so evenly mixed up with each other at this stage that none of them does dominate others in the slightest manner. They are said to merge into each other completely, giving rise to a homogeneous and harmonious state. The harmony is, however, not a product of the cessation of their working; it is, on the other hand, very dynamic in nature. "When in a state of equilibrium they cannot serve the purpose of the Puruṣa, so that state of the Guṇas is not for the sake of the Puruṣa; it is its own independent eternal state. All the other three stages of evolution, viz. the Liṅga, aviśeṣa and Viśeṣa have been caused for the sake of the Puruṣa." The word "Aliṅga" denotes that this stage

5. Yoga as Philosophy and Religion P.7.
does not ultimately merge into anything else. It is the opposite of the word "Läṅga", which is applied to all that comes under the other three stages excepting the Alīṅga, because everything else is supposed to originate from its cause, which is subtler than it. Yoga Philosophy believes in a two-way process of evolution and involution. According to this belief, in the beginning there is only the alīṅga from which, through the other stages, namely, Lingamātra, Aviśeṣa and Viśeṣa, the world of the objects come into being in that order. In the end, the objects merge into their finer and still finer causes and the process of involution becomes complete when all else ultimately merge into the Alīṅga. The Alīṅga does not itself merge into any finer cause, it exists in its own right and there is no other state whatever from which it may be supposed to originate. The Alīṅga co-exists eternally along with the Puruṣas. The process of evolution starts from the Alīṅga when, from it, the next stage manifests itself. In a reverse fashion the process of involution ends in the Alīṅga. "This involution takes place only in man and not in the Universe. It is brought about consciously by Yogic practice". The Alīṅga is also called Prakṛti, which denotes that it is the mother of all else, and that in itself it does not come out as an effect of anything else. It is called Pradhāna because it comes first of all, and is the ultimate cause of the material world.

6. The Four Yogas, P. 125.
It is evidently the chief and all-involving state in which everything material ultimately finds its refuse. It is also called Avyakta, i.e. unmanifest, to indicate the fact that it is the finest stage which lies as the ultimate basis of all that is gross or manifest. Out of these names of the eternal reality, Prakṛti is the most common in use in philosophical literature. Prakṛti is thus the first and the ultimate state from which the world originates. It is composed of the three Guṇas which exist in that state, as has been said, in a perfectly balanced and harmonious condition. Prakṛti is thus characterized by complexity although it does not actually manifest any multiplicity. The multiplicity of the three Guṇas is here looked upon as giving rise to a single effect which is homogeneous and without any manifest differentiation. Prakṛti is thus nothing apart from the three Guṇas; it is only the three Guṇas themselves balancing each other in such a fashion that the net result does not show any discard or difference, thus giving rise to the complex but single Prakṛti.

Now is there any proof for the existence of Prakṛti? One actually never experiences it as such. What is it then that the truth of this notion is based upon? Yoga philosophy says that although direct first hand experience is the only ultimate criterion for the validity of any statement, for all practical purposes three criterions are to be

7. Yoga-Sūtras, 1.7.
accepted, namely perception, inference and authoritative declarations of those who really know. When one perceives an object through the senses, he does not has any doubt about its existence. For example, one perceives various colours through the organs of sight, sounds through organs of hearing, and so on. But if an object is such that it cannot be grasped by any of the senses, this non-perception as such does not prove the non-existence of that object. Several situations under which one does not actually perceive an existing object, are mentioned in the Samkhyakārikā. For example, one may not actually see an object in another town due to a long distance in between. Similarly, an object may not be perceived due to extreme proximity, like the collyrium in one's own eye. Due to impairment of the senses or distraction or inattention, even a given object may not be perceived. Or else, the object may be too minute like the atoms. Lastly the object may be imperceptible due to obstruction like a wall in between, or it may not stand out clearly from its background, or it may be suppressed by it like the stars at the day time. Under such situations, non-perception is not sufficient to lead to the conclusion that the object is non-existent.

Whenever a direct contact with an object is not established through perception, one may still obtain a

8. Samkhyakārikā, 7.
correct knowledge through inference. For example, when one sees smoke on a distant mountain, he can infer that there must be fire somewhere on the mountain. Similarly, by seeing that the ground has become wet all through, and the trees and houses etc. have been drenched, he can infer that it must have rained a little while ago. In such cases, valid knowledge is obtained about an unperceived object. The knowledge is based upon a relation of invariable concomitance that has been observed between the situation that perceived and the inferred fact which is not perceived. Inference is based on the principle of uniformity in nature. Thus by seeing that a few grains of rice are cooked and softened, one infers that the whole amount of rice in a pot is cooked, or by tasting a few drops of water in the ocean one can say that the water in the whole ocean is salty. Close examination reveals that inference ultimately depends on perception.

When perception and inference both fail to give knowledge of a situation, one can still obtain true knowledge by taking recourse to the authoritative opinion of an expert. For example, one never sees the electrons by his eyes, nor can he infer their existence from common knowledge, and yet he does believe in their existence, because scientists appear to vouch for them. Similarly the beliefs that the earth is round, that the sun is million times greater in mass than the moon, that our bodies originate from the union of two microscopic structures called the
sperm and the ovum, and so on. It is amazing to see how a vast amount of knowledge of people is based on what others have taught them to believe. But these beliefs are not wholly independent on perception. They do ultimately have a basis of perception; people do not have any doubt about them, because they believe also that the authorities in the various fields have either perceived them directly or inferred the facts on the basis of perception of some other facts.

The notion of the Prakṛti appears to be outcome of a reasoning based on observation through a special viewpoint of Yoga philosophy concerning origination. It is argued that whatever is non-existent cannot be brought into existence, and whatever is existent cannot be made totally non-existent. Whenever a thing arises out of another, the product is not something wholly new or completely non-existent before. The effect (Kārya) is here looked upon as only a manifestation of what existed already in a latent form in the cause (Kāraṇa). So too with the phenomenon of destruction; whenever a thing is destroyed, it does not become lost completely; what happens is only that its manifest content merges in its cause and remains there in an unmanifested form. For example, when one gets oil by pressing the seeds of safflower or sesamum, the product i.e. the oil, is already there in the seed. Similarly, when a candle burns out to the end, one
cannot say that it is destroyed completely; it does exist in the form of the products of the process of turning. This view is consistent with the facts brought out by Science. This view of Yoga concerning origination has come to be known as the doctrine of pre-existence of the effect (Satkārya-vāda). The Yoga view, according to which nothing wholly new can ever be produced, leads to the conclusion that the manifest qualities of the large variety of the objects of experience must be there eternally in a dormant or latent form in something that is the first cause of all that exists. This is the Prakṛti, the mother of everything, which contains in itself in the form of the Guṇas, the essence of the potentialities of all that comes into being in the process of evolution and again returns to it through the process of involution.

Now will be described the three further stages, namely Līnagātra, Avisesa and Viśesa, through which the Prakṛti is supposed to evolve to form the manifest world of experience.

Of the two primary principles (Prakṛti and Purusa), one is quite insentient and inert but can be activated by a glance from the other which is itself thoroughly inactive and indifferent. It is however the conscious element. Even the indifferent and disinterested observation by this 'Neutral Purusa' starts the process of evolution
and 'Prakṛti' begins to unfold the hidden secrets. At this point, what is called a conscious individual soul is produced. Just as the nearness of two brilliant colours produces many intermediate shades of colours, so also the mere proximity of Prakṛti and Puruṣa produces a joint effect and that joint effect is the principle of intelligence i.e. the individual consciousness. By his 'Citta' Patanjali means this individual consciousness. This individual consciousness means the sense of separateness from the True-Self and this sense of detachment is the source of all further development both good and bad.

This is also the position of the modern scientists. The universe is nothing but a grand play of all sorts of electrical charges; all forms and differences have sprung up from it. The superformed man and his intelligent brain are also evolved from them. Consciousness is nothing but a form of electrical energy. By some hitherto unintelligible process, some portion of this electric energy comes to have the property of individual consciousness and becomes the cogniser of the remaining whole which is itself not yet definitely known to be conscious or otherwise. The Yoga also holds that somehow or other the conscious Puruṣa becomes the cogniser of the non-conscious element and he generates its detachment from the True-Self. This element is therefore made of two ingredients viz. Prakṛti and Puruṣa. This is the 'Buddhi' of the Sāṃkhya and the 'Citta' of Patanjali.
Patañjali's exact sense of 'Citta' and his classification of Vṛttis must be correctly understood, otherwise they are likely to appear to be unscientific to the modern psychologists. Many a time they are found to complain that no scientific principle is observed in the analysis. This wrong notion is due to a frequent use of the words "Citta", 'Manas', 'Vijñāna' etc. as synonyms in the Sanskrit language. The modern psychologists form some notion by the word 'Mind', and as 'Citta' is supposed to be a synonym of 'Manas', the same idea is conveyed to them by Patañjali's 'Citta' also. But it is not always correct.

Citta is also called Lingamātra, because there is only one finer stage namely the Prakṛti from which it evolves as an effect. From this stage is supposed to arise what is called Asmitā or Ahamkāra. From the Ahamkāra the process of evolution is supposed to proceed in two ways: on the one hand the eleven organs (including the Mana, the five cognitive senses and the five motor organs) and on the other, the five subtle forms of the elements, called the Tanmātras, originate from the entity of Asmitā. The Tanmātras in their turn give rise to the five gross elements (Pañca Mahābhūta), namely, earth, water, fire, air and Ākāsa.

Ahamkāra and the Tanmātras are together grouped under the category of Aviśeṣa, while the eleven organs and the five elements are said to be the Viśeṣa. The word
"Vi^esa" indicates that these sixteen entities do not give rise to any further modifications of themselves.

There are, in fact, twenty four Tattvas, as they are called, which form the framework of the scheme of evolution in which the single but complex Prakṛti evolves itself into the form of the world of experience. This scheme of evolution is based on the principle of modification known as the Parināmavāda, according to which, everything in this world is dynamic and undergoes change from moment to moment. Various types of change or modification are here recognized. For example, the balanced working of the three Guṇas in the Prakṛti, in which the product is the same as the cause in all respects, is called Sajātiyaparīnāma. The modification of the Prakṛti through the next three stages is characterized by a change from one element (Tattva) to another, in which the product is distinct from the cause. This change is named Tattvāntara-parīnāma.

The five elements of earth, fire etc., which are the lowest in the series of evolution, combine together and give rise to various objects of experience. This change is looked upon as being of three types. For example, when an object comes into existence from its material cause as in the case of a jar coming out of a clay, the change is called Dharma-parīnāma. With reference to the three stages of the object as unproduced, produced
and destroyed, the change is described as Laksana-parināma. The change that an object undergoes after its production till its destruction, are designated by the term Avasthā-parināma, viz., the stages of childhood, adolescence and old age in one's life.

Now here comes the fundamental question as to why at all does the initial equilibrium of the three Guṇas in the state of Prakṛti, get disturbed to bring the multi-form universe into a manifest form. As Patañjali has told, the Drsya or what is the same, the Prakṛti, by nature, ever works for the Puruṣas and never for itself. This is perhaps based on the observation that whenever several entities work together to produce a single effect, it is found that their work or effect is never for themselves; such collective work is always for the sake of something else which is superior to them. That is to say, whenever there is organized activity, such activity always implies the existence of someone for fulfilling whose purpose the activity may go on. For example, objects which are complex like buildings, buses, engines, machines, books, tables, chairs, etc., can never originate for themselves; they invariably indicate the existence, either in the past or in the present, of someone who must have enjoyed them.

9. Yoga-Sūtras, IX-21
Yoga philosophy, however, seems to be guided by the belief that Prakṛti being material and thus insentient, does not exist for itself, because it is complex and because it exhibits organized activity of the three Gunas. The other principle must here be capable of exerting an influence on the Gunas in such a way that they would be instigated to work for it. It must at the same time be sentient, for, otherwise, there would be no question of its imposing a purpose on the Gunas. Such a principle is found by Yoga philosophy in what are called the Draṣṭās or the Puruṣas. The goal which the Puruṣas are supposed to impose on the Prakṛti is their own bondage and liberation.

Now it will be seen what is the nature of the Puruṣas as understood by Yoga. Patañjali declares that Draṣṭā is ever devoid of any attributes or qualities. Everybody knows that the objects of experience can be described in terms of their attributes or qualities, i.e., an object is that which possesses the given qualities like colour, shape, size and so on. It is not so in the case of the Draṣṭā, which is looked upon as pure. Iśvara Karṇā describes the Puruṣa in the Sāṁkhya Karṇīka, in contrast to the Prakṛti and its evolutes, in the following way. He observes that the Prakṛti and all its evolutes are made by the three Gunas,

11. Sāṁkhya Karṇīka, II.
whereas the Purusa is wholly exclusive of them. Similarly, they are insentient; the Purusa is pure sentient. They are not for themselves, they exist for the sake of others, while a Purusa, unlike them, exists for itself. The Purusa does not give rise to anything, i.e. it never undergoes any modification or change. The Purusa on the Sāmkhya-Yoga view is wholly passive. It ever remains like an indifferent onlooker. According to the Yoga philosophy Purusas are many, and not one. Each Purusa is thus an independent ultimate reality remaining eternally independent of all else. Īśvarakṛṣṇa tries to prove the plurality of the Purusas by an argument. He says that the plurality of the Purusas is established by the fact that the phenomena of birth, death, working of the senses, behaviour and activity, are observed to happen independently in each individual. Had there been a single soul in all the beings, then all of them would be born or dead together. Similarly, one could not then see any variety in experiences of different individuals; some of them could not be happy while others were in distress.

The multitude of the Purusas is supposed to be divisible into two main classes: (1) Those which are more or less in relation with the evolutes of the Prakṛti, and (ii) those who have become completely free of any such relation. In addition to these two types, a third is also

Isvara in the Yoga system is that Purusa is distinguished from all others by the fact of his being untouched by the afflictions or the fruits of Karma. Other Purusas are also in reality untouched by the afflictions, but they, seemingly at least, have to undergo the afflictions and consequently birth and rebirth, etc., until they are again finally released; but Isvara, though he is a Purusa, yet does not suffer in any way any sort of bondage. He is always free and ever the Lord. He never had nor will have any relation to these bounds. He is also the teacher of the ancient teachers beyond the range of conditioning time. He is omniscient in the highest degree, for in him is the furthest limit of omniscience, beyond which there is nothing. His being is indicated by the word "Om". In Yoga system Isvara is the superintendent of Prakrti in the sense of the latter's remaining in him in an undifferentiated way, but is regarded as the superintendent of Dharma and Adharma, and his agency is active only in the removal of obstacles, thereby helping the evolutionary process of Prakrti. He does not release all persons, because he helps only so
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far as each deserves; He does not nullify the law of Karma, just as a king, though quite free to act in any way he likes, punishes or rewards people as they deserve. In the Yoga System God is the omniscient Guru and not the omnipotent and omnipresent Isvara. As Yoga philosophy is based on Śāṅkhya, so I want to clear one thing that Śāṅkhya-philosophy is not atheistic. Śāṅkhya, no doubt, is perfectly theistic, inasmuch as it perfectly satisfies the Hindu idea of theism. There are two notions in the idea: the idea of an Overlord of the Universe, though not the Creator, and the belief in the efficiency of the Vedas. According to Śāṅkhya there are souls who, though almost perfect, fall short of perfection and these, after merging into the Prakṛti for a time, reemanate as its masters. The God of the Vedas according to the Śāṅkhya is one of such free souls. But the Yogis do not agree with this. According to them, just as there is an individual soul witnessing a part of Nature, there must be a universal Soul witnessing the whole Nature always before Him.

There are some important points of Yoga philosophy which should be kept in mind while going through Yoga Psychology and yoga practice. The process of evolution has no beginning in time; that it is beginningless (Anādi). Avidyā is also beginningless and is contained neither in the Puruṣa nor in the Prakṛti, but it is associated with the

reflection of the Puruṣa in the Citta which is the first evolution of the Prakṛti. Just as the Prakṛti and Puruṣas are beginningless, so too is their togetherness (Samyoga). Patanjali seems to believe that togetherness of the Puruṣa and the Prakṛti has a purpose, that of getting these two realms ultimately to abide simply in themselves. He looks upon their togetherness simply as a fact that is merely apparent and not real. It is a product, as he says, of a mistaken identity (Avidyā), and when the false identity between the two is cancelled by the practice of Yoga, the two realms may abide wholly in themselves without any relation whatever, with each other.

If one wants to read the Yoga-Draṣṭāna of Patanjali correctly, one should always keep this point in mind that Patanjali uses the term Citta in the specific sense of Biddhi of Sāmkhyas, but, for all practical purposes, it corresponds to the Jīva of the Vedāntins. He did not use term Lingaśarīra (subtle body) in his Yoga-Sūtras, because Citta serves the purpose of Lingaśarīra. So says C.Kunhan Rajā * there is the phenomenal spirit (a rather incomprehensible combination of terms) which is the spirit with the element of function adopted from the nature of the Matter (Prakṛti), when the matter itself, in itself insentient, adopted the sentience element from the spirit.

There arises out of this combination what is termed the Linga-sarīra (subtle body). And this is nothing but Citta of Patañjali.

The Yoga system maintains the Vedic spirit of realism and rationalism. But the system has to take note of the change in time and the change in the beliefs of the people. If it had ignored such a change, there would have been a break up to their spirit of realism. If what is real in the environment is ignored, that will be ignoring the nature of the world also. In the Vedic times, there had been no notion of the world being the seat of suffering. A belief in the nature of the world being suffering is the later ingredient in the thoughts of India. If there is suffering, there must be an end to suffering and there must be some method for bringing about such an end. The end of the suffering is what is called Kaivalya (to become one's True-Self). The Sāmkhya and Yoga speak about Kaivalya as the goal. According to them the Kaivalya or the final goal is something positive. The word mean "state of being Kevala or just by oneself or to become one's True-Self". This must be the realisation of a fact as it is, without being intermixed with other facts, either in constitution or in quality or in function. This Kaivalya or becoming one's True-Self is meant for the Purusa, the Spirit, while there
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is also the Prakṛti or Matter in this Universe. Puruṣa or the spirit is "vision" and Prakṛti or Matter is "function". There is some kind of mutual exchange or barter of their respective natures between the two. Puruṣa, the Spirit, that is only a Vision, becomes a functionary through a nature received from Matter, and Prakṛti or Matter that is only a functionary becomes also a knowing entity through a nature taken from the Spirit. The world is the "confusion" of Spirit and Matter. The goal is their separation so that the Puruṣa (Spirit) becomes itself, without a notion of function which is extraneous to it and retaining the whole vision, which has been partly taken over by Prakṛti (Matter). This is Kaivalya, the state of being just oneself.

Yoga philosophy is a realistic philosophy. Its analysis discovered that the gulf between consciousness and its objects cannot be bridged ultimately. Nature is Nature, man is man. They are irreconcilable. The root cause of suffering is conflict between man and Nature (Puruṣa and Prakṛti), and this conflict is the fundamental cause of all other conflicts. If one wants to get rid of all sufferings, one will have to become one's True-Self. And this can be done only through Yoga practices. So this is Yoga philosophy on which Yoga psychology and Yoga practice are based. Now the psychological aspect of Yoga will be dealt with in the next chapter.