

Zeitschrift:	Asiatische Studien : Zeitschrift der Schweizerischen Asiengesellschaft = Études asiatiques : revue de la Société Suisse-Asie
Herausgeber:	Schweizerische Asiengesellschaft
Band:	53 (1999)
Heft:	3
 Artikel:	On Sevara-Smkhya
Autor:	Hattori, Masaaki
DOI:	https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-147471

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 15.01.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

ON SEŚVARA-SĀMKHYA

Masaaki Hattori, Kyōto

In the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* of Mādhava, the followers of the Yogadarśana propounded by Patañjali are called the Seśvara-sāṃkhyas (theistic Sāṃkhyas) in contradistinction to the Nirīśvara-sāṃkhyas (atheistic Sāṃkhyas), which name is applied to the followers of Kapila. Mādhava introduces the view of the Seśvara-sāṃkhyas with the following words:

The same twenty-five principles (*tattva*), primordial matter (*pradhāna*) etc., mentioned previously [in the chapter dealing with the views of the followers of Kapila] are admitted [in this system, too]. But there is the twenty-sixth [principle], that is, *parameśvara* (supreme God). He is a *puruṣa*, not affected by defilements (*kleśa*), action (*karman*), its fruition (*vipāka*), and subliminal deposits [of actions] (*āśaya*). He assumes a transformation-body (*nirmāṇa-kāya*) at will and sets forth in motion the worldly and Vedic traditions (*sampradāya*). He is a giver of favours (*anugrāhaka*) to living beings who are suffering pains in the charcoal fires of transmigration.¹

In the section elucidating the ‘action-yoga’ (*kriyā-yoga*), which consists of *tapas* (austerity), *svādhyāya* (recitation of *mantras*) and *iśvarapranidhāna* (devotion to God), Mādhava states that *iśvarapranidhāna* is the consignment (*samarpana*) of all actions to the *iśvara* or the abandonment of [the desire for] fruits which actions may produce (*kriyāphalasamnyāsa*), and quotes the *Bhagavadgītā* II. 47, “On action alone be thy interest, never on its fruits; let not the fruits of action be thy motive, nor be thy attachment to inaction.”²

As is well known the *Yogasūtra* (YS) admits the existence of God (*iśvara*). He is a ‘special kind of *puruṣa*’ (*puruṣa-viśesa*), who is, as described by Mādhava, unaffected by defilements, etc. While an ordinary *yogin* is at first affected by defilements and later gets free from them through yogic practices, the *iśvara* is ever liberated from them, and in this respect he is a model of *yogins* who are seeking to attain *saṃādhi*. He is not a benevolent god, who bestows favours to living beings, assuming a transformation-body and giving his merciful hands to those who are

1 SDS 333.6-334.2

2 *Ibid.* 371.2-11. For the translation of the *Bhagavadgītā*, cf. EDGERTON 1952.

suffering pain and seeking for his help. Several times YS mentions *īśvarapranidhāna* as a means to attain *samādhi*. In his commentary on YS, Vyāsa takes the term *pranidhāna* as meaning a special kind of devotion (*bhakti-viśesa*), and explains that the *īśvara* who is inclined [to a *yogin*] because of his *pranidhāna* bestows favours to him.³ He further states that *īśvarapranidhāna* means the consignment of all actions to *paramaguru* (*sarvakriyāñām paramagurāv arpaṇam*), or the abandonment of [the desire for] fruits of actions (*tatphalasamnyāso vā*).⁴ Mādhava's characterization of *īśvara* as one who bestows favours to living beings and his interpretation of *īśvarapranidhāna* are obviously based on Vyāsa's commentary on YS.

That the *īśvara* plays only a minor role in the yoga system as presented in YS has been remarked by several scholars.⁵ In YS I. 2, the yoga is defined as the restraint of activities of the mind (*cittavṛttinirodha*). As the means to realize it YS propounds the doctrine of eight-membered yoga (*aṣṭāṅga-yoga*), which describes the eight stages of yogic practice. In the final stage called *samādhi* (concentration), the activities of the mind are completely restrained, and the mind, which is as if it were empty of itself as consciousness, shines forth in the form of the contemplated object.⁶ Besides the eight-membered yoga, some other means to attain *samādhi* or the restraint of activities of the mind are mentioned in YS, and it is supposed that Patañjali incorporated in YS different yoga traditions that existed in his time. Perhaps among those who worship the *īśvara*, the devotion to the *īśvara* was regarded as a means to attain the goal of yogic practice. After the explanation of the activities of the mind to be restrained, YS I. 12 mentions repeated practice (*abhyāsa*) and detachment (*vairāgya*) as the

3 Ybh I. 23: *pranidhānād bhaktiviśesād āvarjita īśvaras tam anugṛhnāti* ... Cf. also I. 25.

4 Ybh II. 1. Cf. also II. 32: *īśvarapraṇidhānam tasmin paramagurau sarvakarmārpaṇam*; II. 45: *īśvarārpitasarvabhāvasya samādhisiddhir...*

5 J. W. HAUER, who propounds the view that the yoga has its origin in the tradition of Rudra-Śiva worship, disapproved of GARBE's remark that God was "nur lose" introduced into the "Yogasystem" (HAUER 1958, 293-294). However, several scholars do not attach much importance to the *īśvara* in YS, cf. ELIADE 1958, 74: "... īśvara's role is comparatively small.>"; FRAUWALLNER 1953, 425: "... so zeigt ..., wie äusserlich sie (viz., die Lehre von Gott) hier eingefügt ist.>"; OBERHAMMER 1977, 164: "Die theistische Form yogischer Meditation hat in den Yogasūtren eine untergeordnete Bedeutung."

6 YS III. 3: *tad (= dhyānam) evārthamātranirbhāsam svarūpaśūnyam iva samādhih.*

means to restrain them, and as an alternative to these two means, *īśvarapranidhāna* is introduced in YS I. 23: “Or [the restraint of activities of the mind is attained] through the devotion to God” (*īśvarapranidhānād vā*).⁷ In YS II. 1ff. the action-yoga, which includes *īśvarapranidhāna*, is described as the means for the realization of *samādhi* (*samādhibhāvana*) and the attenuation of defilements (*kleśatanūkarana*). The action-yoga is incorporated into the eight-membered yoga and forms part of *niyama* (observance), which constitutes, along with *yama* (abstention), the preliminary stage of the yogic practice. It is thus understood that *īśvarapranidhāna* is recognized as a subordinate means for the attainment of the restraint of activities of the mind in YS.

The meaning of the term *īśvarapranidhāna* is not quite clear. Vyāsa’s interpretation that it means the consignment of all actions to the *īśvara* or the complete submission to the benevolent God does not seem appropriate, because it does not match with the instruction for *prāṇāyāma*, etc., which are to be practiced by a *yogin* with a will for self-mastery. It seems likely that the *īśvara* was introduced into the yoga system of Patañjali from the religious circle worshipping Rudra-Śiva,⁸ but the term *pranidhāna* is not found in relevant literature.⁹ This term is often used in Buddhist literature in the sense of ‘fixation of mind’ or ‘taking a vow’.¹⁰ A *bodhisattva* takes a vow or declares his earnest wish before starting his practice for the attainment of enlightenment. Since many Buddhist technical terms are

7 For the interpretation of this *sūtra*, see HAUER 1958, 241; 465, n. 1; OBERHAMMER 1977, 162.

8 HAUER 1958, 294: “Sein Ursprung und seine ganze Entwicklung vor dem YS war ... aufs engste verknüpft mit dem Ur- und Grossgott Vāyu-Rudra-Śiva, der schon sehr früh den Titel *īśvara*, der Mächtige, Herr, Herrscher erhielt, ...” HARA 1961 clarifies that the name *Śvetāśvatara* and some technical terms in the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* VI-21 reflect the existence of a group of ascetics, who, neglecting the orthodox Brahmanical *āśrama* (*atyāśrama*), perform austerities (*tapas*), recite sacred formulae (*brahman* = *mantra*), and worship Śiva in accordance with Pāśupata rules. It is noteworthy that the three factors constituting the action-yoga, viz., austerity (*tapas*), recitation of *mantras* (*svādhyāya*) and devotion to God (*īśvarapranidhāna*) are included in this early Śaiva (Pāśupata) practice, cf. TAKAGI 1966, 443.

9 The expression ‘*pranidhāya kāyam*’ occurs in the *Bhagavadgītā* XI. 44: *tasmāt pranamya pranidhāya kāyam prasādye tvām aham īśam īdyam* (Therefore, bowing and prostrating my body, I beg grace of Thee, the Lord to be revered).

10 Cf. EDGERTON, F., *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary*.

adopted in YS,¹¹ it may well be assumed that this term also was taken into YS from the Buddhist tradition. As a matter of fact, the existence of *īśvara* is not accepted in Buddhism. However, the *īśvara* has changed his character in YS. Unlike the God in theistic Hindu religions, the *īśvara* in YS is not a ruler of the world and has nothing to do with creation and destruction of the world. He is simply regarded as a means to attain *samādhi* by those who practice yoga. The attitude towards the *īśvara* of this nature is not to be characterized as devotion (*bhakti*). The Buddhist term *pranidhāna* may be more appropriate to express the *yogin*'s attitude towards the *īśvara*. A *yogin* takes a vow or declares his firm resolution for the perfection of his yogic practice. His vow is addressed to the *īśvara*, and the *īśvara* assists him by being the witness of his vow or by being the object on which he concentrates his mind. It seems inappropriate to apply the name *Seśvara-sāṃkhya* to the yoga system as presented in YS, in which the *īśvara* plays only a minor role and is not related to Sāṃkhya doctrine, excepting that he is called a special kind of *puruṣa*. The application of the name *Seśvara-sāṃkhya* to the yoga system of Patañjali is nowhere attested before SDS.

In his article titled “God in Sāṃkhya” (*Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 27), J. BRONKHORST proved with sufficient evidence that the Sāṃkhyas of the commentators of the *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, who are called *Nirīśvara-sāṃkhyas* in SDS, also admitted the existence of God, not a ruler of all the worlds but God as an aid to yogic practices. Why, then, are the followers of Pātañjala-yoga alone called *Seśvara-sāṃkhyas*, while the follower of Kapila are called *Nirīśvara-sāṃkhyas*? On this point BRONKHORST states that the names *Nirīśvara-* and *Seśvara-sāṃkhyas* originally meant respectively the Sāṃkhyas who denied the existence of ‘Creator God’ and those who accepted the existence of ‘Creator God’. His view is based on the following statement in the *Tattvasaṃgraha* (TS) of Śāntarakṣita and Kamalaśīla’s *pañjikā* on it (TSP), both dating from the 8th century, A.D. Śāntarakṣita states: “Out of the primordial matter alone, provided with all potencies, the several effects come forth; they are by their nature nothing but the primordial matter” (TS I: *Prakṛtiparikṣā*, k. 7: *aśeṣa-śaktipracitāt pradhānād eva kevalāt / kāryabhedāḥ pravartante tadrūpā eva bhāvataḥ //*). Kamalaśīla comments “The followers of Kapila [think] that ... these several effects, *mahat* etc., come forth out of the primordial matter. ... The word ‘alone’ (*kevala-*) is [used] to exclude God

11 Cf. LA VALLEE POUSSIN 1936-37.

who is assumed [to take part in the creation] in addition to [the *pradhāna*] by the Seśvara-sāmkhyas.”¹² We learn, BRONKHORST remarks, from this that those who think that the world comes forth out of *pradhāna* alone are not Seśvara-sāmkhyas irrespectively of their opinions regarding God’s existence.¹³

The distinction between Nirīśvara- and Seśvara-sāmkhyas is recorded in some Jaina texts. In the *Saddarśanasamuccaya* of Haribhadra (8th century) we read: “Some Sāmkhyas are *nirīśvaras*, while other Sāmkhyas have the *īśvara* as their deity” (*sāmkhyā nirīśvarāḥ kecit kecid īśvara-devatāḥ*).¹⁴ In his commentary Guṇaratna explains that “for those who are *nirīśvarāḥ*, Nārāyaṇa is their deity.”¹⁵ Here the difference between the two schools of Sāmkhyas is not whether they are theistic or atheistic, but whether their deity is the *īśvara* or someone else, i.e., Nārāyaṇa. As proponents of this view Guṇaratna mentions Kapila, Āsuri, Pañcaśikha, etc.¹⁶ As remarked by F. O. SCHRADER, a Jaina scholar Abhayadeva (10th century?) states in his commentary on *Aupapātika-sūtra* that the Kāpilas (*kāvilā*), viz., those who have Kapila as their deity, are Nirīśvara-sāmkhyas, while the Sāmkhya-yogas (*sāmkhā yogī*) admit primordial matter and *īśvara* as the causes of the world.¹⁷ It is thus understood that in the Jaina tradition the appellation Nirīśvara-sāmkhya is applied to the followers of Kapila, who is recognized by Guṇaratna as a proponent of the Nirīśvara-sāmkhya doctrine and by Abhayadeva as deity. The Seśvara-sāmkhyas as distinguished from them admit the existence of God, who, according to Abhayadeva, is a cause of the world.

A reference to Nirīśvara- and Seśvara-sāmkhyas is made also by Rāmānuja (11-12th century) in his commentary on the *Brahmasūtra*, viz., the *Śrībhāṣya*. The *Brahmasūtra* I.4.1ff. are meant for the refutation of the

12 TSP 21.2-4: ... *pradhānam, tata evaite mahadādayah kāryabhedāḥ pravartante iti kāpilāḥ*. ... *kevalād iti vacanam seśvarasāmkhyopakalpīteśvaranirāśartham*.

13 BRONKHORST 1983, 158.

14 ŚaṭDS k. 34ab.

15 TRD 96.2: *ye ca nirīśvarāḥ teṣāṁ nārāyaṇo devah*.

16 *Ibid.* 96.3-4: *teṣāṁ matavaktārah kapilāsuripañcaśikhabhārgavolukādayah*.

17 SCHRADER 1914, 102, n. 1: *kapilo devatā yeṣām: sāmkhyā eva nirīśvarā* ity arthah. n. 3: ... *prakṛtīśvarayor jagatkāraṇatvam abhyupagatāḥ*. It is worthy of note that Vācaspatimiśra admits that Kapila is an *avatāra* of Viṣṇu, cf. *Tattvavaiśāradī*, I. 25: *kapilo nāma viṣṇor avatāraviśeṣah prasiddhah*.

Sāṃkhya view that *pradhāna* is the material cause of the world. In *Śrībhāṣya* I.4.23, Rāmānuja introduces the argument set forth by the Seśvara-sāṃkhyas against the Vedāntins that the omniscient God cannot create the world unless there is *pradhāna* as the material cause of the world. He states:

The Nirīśvara-sāṃkhyas being thus refuted [in I.4.1-22], the Seśvara-sāṃkhyas raise the following objection: –Although the Upaniṣads propound that the omniscient *īśvara* is the cause of the world on account of his association with attributes, such as *īkṣāṇa*,¹⁸ etc., still it is apprehended that by the same Upaniṣads *pradhāna* is propounded as the material cause (*upādāna*) of the world. Not indeed do the Upaniṣads teach that the *īśvara*, who is omniscient, not subject to transformation (*apariṇāmin*), and the supervisor (*adhiṣṭhātr*), is the cause of the world without *pradhāna*, which is the supervised (*adhiṣṭheyā*), non-sentient (*acetana*) and subject to transformation.¹⁹

Then he quotes some passages from the Upaniṣads as testimony of this Seśvara-sāṃkhya argument. From this information supplied by Rāmānuja it is known that the Seśvara-sāṃkhyas admitted the existence of ‘Creator God’.

In his introduction to TS III: *Ubhaya-parīkṣā*,²⁰ Kamalaśīla makes reference to the view held by some Sāṃkhyas:

On this point (= regarding the cause of the world) some Sāṃkhyas (*kecīt sāṃkhyāḥ*) assert as follows: These various effects do not come forth from *pradhāna* alone, because it (= *pradhāna*) is insentient (*acetana*). No insentient entity is found to produce its own effect without a controller (*adhiṣṭhāyaka*). And the *puruṣa* cannot be the controller, because at that time he is unconscious (*ajñā*). The *puruṣa* cognizes only that object which is apprehended by *buddhi*, and prior to the association with *buddhi*, he is absolutely unconscious: he cognizes nothing at all. Since no one can create anything that has not been known, he is not a creator (*kartṛ*). Therefore, the *īśvara*, only when he is in dependence on *pradhāna*, is the

18 Cf. *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* 6.2.1: *sad eva somyedam agra āśid, ekam evādvitīyam. tad aiksata bahu syām prajāyeyeti.*

19 Śrībh I.4.23: *evam nirīśvarasāṃkhye niraste seśvarasāṃkhyah pratyavatiṣṭhate. yady apīkṣāṇādiguṇayogāt sarvajñam īśvaram jagatkāraṇatvena vedāntāḥ pratipādayanti tathāpi vedāntair eva jagadupādānatayā pradhānam eva pratipādyata iti pratīyate. na hi vedāntāḥ sarvajñasyāpariṇāmino 'dhiṣṭhātur īśvarasyādhiṣṭheyenācetanena pariṇāminā pradhānenā vinā jagataḥ kāraṇatvam avagamayanti.*

20 *Ubhaya* means *prakṛti* and *īśvara* examined in the foregoing chapters.

creator of the various effect. Not indeed does someone, say Devadatta, give birth to a son by himself, nor does a potter alone make a pot.²¹

Here we find that the reason why they admitted the existence of 'Creator God' is clearly stated, and we may identify them with those whom Kamalaśīla called Seśvara-sāmkhyas in the first chapter of TSP.

Against the Seśvara-sāmkhyas, Śāntarakṣita raises the following objection. —The view that the *iśvara*, in cooperation with *pradhāna*, produce the various effects is to be accepted only under the assumption that (1) an eminent quality (*atiśaya*) is newly given to each of them, which by itself cannot produce the effects, or that (2) they jointly serve a common purpose (*ekārtha-kārin*). But there follows absurdity in both cases. (1) In the first case, the *iśvara* and the *pradhāna* would not be admitted to be eternal, since they undergo modification. (2) In the second case, all effects would be produced simultaneously, since the two causes are in constant conjunction as they both are eternal. In the answer given by the Seśvara-sāmkhyas to this objection, it is clearly noticed that the *iśvara* is closely related to the doctrine of the three *gunas*, which is characteristic of the Sāmkhya system of thought:

Even though these two causes, [*iśvara* and *pradhāna*,] are constantly present together, yet the various effects come forth only successively, because the three *gunas*, viz., *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*, of *pradhāna* are cooperators of the *iśvara*. Since these *gunas* function only successively, there is succession in the effects. When the *iśvara* is in conjunction with *rajas* of which the function is manifested (*udbhūta-vṛtti*) then he is the cause of the creation of the world, because *rajas* has procreation as its effect. When, on the other hand, the *iśvara* is in conjunction with *sattva* or *tamas*, then he is the cause of the duration or the destruction of the world.²²

21 TSP 74.12-18: *tatra kecit sāmkhyā āhuh – na pradhānād eva kevalād amī kāryabhedāḥ pravartante, tasyācetanatvāt. na hy acetano 'dhiṣṭāyakam antareṇa svakāryam ārabhamāno drṣṭah. na ca puruṣo 'dhiṣṭāyako yuktah, tasya tadānīm ajñatvāt. tathā hi – buddhyadhyavasitam evārtham puruṣas cetayate, buddhi-saṃsargāc ca pūrvam asāv ajña eva, na jātu kiṃcid arthaṃ vijānāti. na cāvijñātām arthaṃ śaktah kaścit kartum iti nāsau kartā. tasmād iśvara eva pradhānāpeksah kāryabhedānām kartā, na kevalah. na hi devadattādih kevalah putram janayati, nāpi kevalah kulālo ghaṭam karotīti.*

22 TSP 75.18-24 (ad TS kk. 97-100): *yady api kāraṇadvayam etan nityasaṃnihilitam tathāpi krameṇaivāmī kāryabhedāḥ pravartante, yata iśvarasya pradhānagatāś trayo gunāḥ sattvādayaḥ sahakāriṇaḥ, teṣām ca kramavṛttitvāt tatkāryeṣv api kramo bhavati. tathā hi – yadodbhūtavṛttinā rajasā yukto bhavati maheśvarah tada*

The source materials for the study of the Seśvara-sāṃkhya are unfortunately very limited. Although there are references to the Sāṃkhya ideas in Chinese translation of some Buddhist treatises, the Seśvara-sāṃkhya is nowhere mentioned. This is perhaps because the Seśvara-sāṃkhya doctrine was maintained by a minor group among the Sāṃkhyas. Since the Sāṃkhya system came to be represented by the *Śaṣṭitantra* and Īśvarakṛṣṇa's summary of its contents, viz., the *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, the Seśvara-sāṃkhya was scarcely referred to in opponents' literature.

In the *Mokṣadharma-parvan* of the *Mahābhārata*, Book XII, there are many sections in which the Sāṃkhya ideas are expressed. In some of them, mention is made of the twenty-sixth principle (*tattva*) besides the twenty-five that are enumerated in the classical Sāṃkhya system. In the Upaniṣads, the Sāṃkhya ideas first appear in those which were composed in the second period among the old Upaniṣads, and some of them are tinged with theistic colour.

It is known that there existed many branches of the Sāṃkhyas, maintaining different doctrines. Among them a certain group admitted the existence of the *īśvara* as the creator of the world, and formed the theory that explains the process of creation and destruction of the world by the cooperation of the *īśvara* with the three *guṇas* of *pradhāna*. They were called the Seśvara-sāṃkhyas. In the course of time, the Sāṃkhya came to be represented by the *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, and the doctrines maintained by the Seśvara-sāṃkhya, which were known to Śāntarakṣita and Kamalaśīla in the eighth century, were gradually forgotten. In the Sāṃkhyadarśana maintained by the followers of Kapila, the *īśvara*, who played not so important role from the beginning, came to be neglected, while in the Yogadarśana maintained by the followers of Patañjali, the *īśvara* is clearly mentioned in several *sūtras*, and moreover, the religious attitude towards God in *bhakti*-religion was introduced into the system. Thus by the time of Mādhava the appellation Seśvara-sāṃkhya came to be applied to the Yogadarśana.

sargahetuḥ prajānāṁ bhavati, prasavakāryatvād rajasah. yadā tu sattvam samudbhūtavṛtti samśrayate tadā lokānāṁ sthitikāraṇāṁ bhavati, sattvasya sthitihetutvāt. yadā tu tamasodbhūtaśaktinā samāyukto bhavati tadā pralayam nāśam sarvajagataḥ karoti, tamasah pralaya (Text: *pratyaya*) *hetutvāt.*

ABBREVIATIONS

TRD: *Tarkarahasyadīpikā*. See ṢaḍDS.

TS: *Tattvasaṃgraha* of Śāntarakṣita. Bauddha Bharati Ser. 1. Vārāṇasī 1968.

TSP: *Tattvasaṃgrahapañjikā* of Kamalaśīla. Bauddha Bharati Ser. 1. Vārāṇasī 1968.

YS: *Yogasūtra* of Patañjali. Ānandāśrama Skt. Ser., 47. Poona 1932.

Ybh: *Yogabhāṣya* of Vyāsa. Ānandāśrama Skt. Ser., 47. Poona 1932.

Śrībh: *Śrībhāṣya* of Rāmānuja. Ubhaya Vedānta Granthamālā. Madras 1963.

ṢaḍDS: *Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccaya* of Haribhadra, with *Tarkarahasyadīpikā* of Guṇaratna. Bibliotheca Indica. Calcutta 1905-1914.

SDS: *Sarvadarśanasaṃgraha* of Sāyaṇa-Mādhaba. Ed. by V. S. ABHYANKAR. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Inst., 1951 (2nd ed.).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BRONKHORST, Johannes 1983: "God in Sāṃkhya." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens*, XXVII, 147-164.

EDGERTON, Franklin 1952: *The Bhagavad Gītā, translated and interpreted*. Pt. 1: Text and Translation. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (HOS 38).

ELIADE, Mircea 1958: *Yoga. Immortality and Freedom*. Translated from the French by W. R. Trask. New York: Pantheon Books (Bollingen Ser. LVI).

FRAUWALLNER, Erich 1953: *Geschichte der indischen Philosophie*. I. Band. Salzburg: Otto Müller Verlag.

HARA, Minoru 1961: "Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad VI-21." *Shūkyō Kenkyū* (Journal of Religious Studies), 35-1 (No. 168), 98-74.

HAUER, J. W. 1958: *Der Yoga. Ein indischer Weg zum Selbst*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag.

LA VALLEE POUSSIN, Louis de 1936-37: "Le Bouddhisme et le Yoga de Patañjali." *Mélanges Chinois et Bouddhiques*, 5 (1936-37), 223-242.

OBERHAMMER, Gerhard 1977: *Strukturen Yogischer Meditation*. Wien: Der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens, Heft 13).

SCHRADER, F. Otto 1914: "Das Ṣaṣṭitantra." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 68, 101-110.

TAKAGI, Shingen 1966: "On the *Kriyā-yoga* in the *Yoga-sūtra*." *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*, XV-1, 442-451.