Zeitschrift: Asiatische Studien : Zeitschrift der Schweizerischen Asiengesellschaft = Études asiatiques : revue de la Société Suisse-Asie

Herausgeber: Schweizerische Asiengesellschaft

Band: 53 (1999)

Heft: 3

Artikel: What comes first (in the Mahbhrata) : Smkhya or Yoga?

Autor: Schreiner, Peter

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-147480

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: 22.11.2025

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

WHAT COMES FIRST (IN THE *MAHĀBHĀRATA*): SĀṂKHYA OR YOGA?

Peter Schreiner, Zürich

"What is the precise relationship between Sāṃkhya and Yoga?" was one of the questions put by the organisors of the Lausanne Conference on Sāṃkhya and Yoga; and I put the stress on *precise*. My title question aims at one aspect of this relationship, the analysis of the sequence (and in that sense 'priority') of passages ('texts') in the Mahābhārata (MBh) dealing with Sāṃkhya and texts dealing with Yoga. From observations about the redaction of the MBh this promises to lead to results about relative chronology.[1] The occurrence or non-occurrence of certain concepts (e.g. 'emanation doctrine') or a specific terminology (e.g. *guṇa*, *prakṛti*) do not identify 'Sāṃkhya', since they do not clearly distinguish Sāṃkhya from Yoga. However, is not the occurrence of the words *yoga* and *sāṃkhya* a rather obvious and possibly even precise criterion for identifying the passages the priority of which I want to determine?

The availability of the text of the Critical Edition of the MBh on computer makes it relatively easy to answer this question. And I do not wish to miss any opportunity to publicly thank our colleague Prof. Muneo Tokunaga for his effort and for the generosity with which he has made the fruits of his efforts available to the scholarly world.

The following table showing the frequency of *sāṃkhya* and *yoga* in the MBh answers my title question according to a first criterion of priority, which I would call *quantitative priority*: The word *yoga* occurs more frequently than *sāṃkhya* and thus comes first.[2]

1 The parenthetical phrase in the title emphasises the methodological restriction that statements about the relation of Sāṃkhya and Yoga are all based upon the study of texts; they can interpret observations about the relationship between texts in terms of a relationship between their contents, or they can interpret what the texts themselves say about relationships (between contents or between texts), or they draw conclusions from observations about the contents to the relationship between the texts.

2 In counting *yoga*, I have excluded all occurrences with prepositions (*prayoga*, *viyoga*, *saṃyoga*, etc.), a compound like *yogakṣema* will, however, be included. An evaluation of such a list cannot do without looking at each instance! I have done so for the occurrences of *sāṃkhya*, but not yet for all occurrences of *yoga*; cf. John

I wish to emphasize that these numbers represent 'counts' but not 'statistics'; I have done nothing to evaluate the frequency and distribution of these numbers with the skills and tools of the statistician.[3]

Frequency of *sāṃkhy-* and *yog-* in MBh

	Sāṃkhya	Yoga
MBh1	1	33
MBh2	-	7
MBh3	2	77
MBh4	-	2
MBh5	-	56
MBh6	7	131
MBh7	-	43
MBh8	1	22
MBh9	-	26
MBh10	-	7
MBh11	-	3
MBh12	99	329
MBh13	9	92
MBh14	-	28
MBh15	-	11
MBh16	-	6
MBh17	-	5
MBh18	1	6

All of the occurrences of *sāṃkhya* in MBh 6 are from the Bhagavadgītā (BhG); all except 2 from MBh 13 occur in chapters 14-18, which are a śivaitic insertion containing the *Śivasahasranāmastotra* (ch. 17). Upamanyu relates about a certain Taṇḍin whose stotras to Śiva are quoted; Śiva is

---

BROCKINGTON, 'Yoga in the Mahābhārata', in the proceedings of the conference on "Yoga: its place within the traditions and its formation today", ed. Ian WHICHER, Richmond: Curzon Press, forthcoming 1999. – My special thanks to John BROCKINGTON for his comments to the present paper and for checking my English!

3 Further I wish to voice a note of caution. The numerical evidence drawn from Tokunaga's input is not error-proof; needless to say that this observation hardly detracts from Tokunaga's merits! There happens to be a small section of the *Śāntiparvan*, the Nārāyaṇīya, where I can compare TOKUNAGA's input with my own (cf. *Nārāyaṇīya Studien*, ed. Peter SCHREINER, Wiesbaden 1997). The count of the word *sāṃkhya* results in a total differing by 2: TOKUNAGA's input omits the prose stotra in ch. 325 and has mistyped *sāṃkhya* once (in 336.76, where the h is missing). Such ideosyncracies must be allowed for in all cases! (Identically mistyped *sāṃkya* occurred four times in the *Śāntiparvan*.)

identified with the ultimate goal of Sāṃkhyayogas. I believe this quantitative criterion justifies us in concentrating on the *Śāntiparvan*, and more specifically on the *Mokṣadharmaparvan* when talking about "Sāṃkhya in the MBh", whereas a study of Yoga would have to cover most of the MBh.

The distribution of Sāṃkhya and Yoga as vocabulary item motivates me to mention at least in passing a second criterion of priority, which I would call *episodic priority*. There are instances of *yoga* as an element in the narrated events (plot) of the epic, e.g. Kṛṣṇa's or Droṇa's death (and these two are not the only instances of a motif which I have called the motif of "the death of the Yogin").[4] These events must be considered to be closer to the core of the MBh as an epic; the didactic passages (and all Sāṃkhya passages must probably be deemed didactic) are generally considered to be later. To that extent, Yoga comes first in the MBh, i.e. in the development of the epic.[5]

This leads to a third criterion, i.e. *redactional priority*. It relates to the question which topic is treated before or after which other topic. One may have to distinguish two levels here, a) the actual sequence of topics, b) explicit cross references in the text.

As an example of the second type I may recall that famous passage in BhG 2.39: "Listen about that awareness (*buddhi*), which was presented to you in the context of Sāṃkhya, also with regard to Yoga. Yoked (united) with that awareness you will leave behind the bondage of actions." Neither did the word *buddhi* occur in the BhG up to that point (apart from having called Dhṛtarāṣṭra *durbuddhi*), nor is the content of BhG 2.1-38 necessarily close to what one is used to call Sāṃkhya. I see two possibilities to explain this situation; either we have a case of "loose cross reference", i.e. a cross

4 Peter SCHREINER, "Yoga – Lebenshilfe oder Sterbetechnik?" In: *Umwelt & Gesundheit*, Köln 1988, Heft 3-4, 12-18. See also John BROCKINGTON, *The Sanskrit Epics*, Leiden 1998, 310.

5 As an instance of an episodic occurrence of *sāṃkhya* see 12,39.23 (the first occurrence of *sāṃkhya* in the *Śāntiparvan*). The word occurs in the description of a demonic Cārvāka who poses as brahmin and mendicant (12,39.23: *sāṃkhyaḥ śikhī tridaṇḍī ca dhṛṣṭo vigatasādhvasaḥ*) and is introduced as Duryodhana's friend. He mingles with the brahmins who praise Yudhiṣṭhira but maligns him. *Sāṃkhya* as characterisation of an attitude which goes against the brahminical majority may be an indication of a non-vedic reputation of Sāṃkhya which would explain the insistence on accordance with *śruti* in many Sāṃkhya passages.

reference which points to nothing,[6] or to something outside of the text and which must be the result of carelessness on the part of a redactor; or those who wrote, redacted and transmitted the text were indeed convinced that Arjuna was told about an awareness according to Sāṃkhya.[7]

Examples of the first type of instances of redactional priority, the sequence of topics, are provided (in the *Mokṣadharmaparvan*) by chapters 187/188, 228, 231/232, 266/267, 289/290, 294/295, 298-303/304/306.

The following survey of the sections which constitute the *Mokṣadharmaparvan* identifies textual units by information from the colophons and/or by dialogue setting.[8] The right hand columns give the frequency of the words *yoga* and *sāṃkhya*. The underlined units emphasize those which provide examples for redactional juxtaposition of Yoga and Sāṃkhya texts.

6 cf. Peter SCHREINER: "Loose cross-references and vocatives: the case of the eschatological chapters in Viṣṇupurāṇa and Brahmapurāṇa." In: *Purāṇa* 30, 86-108.

7 Combined with the evidence about *sāṃkhya* and *yoga* as vocabulary items such use of Sāṃkhya leads to the observation that while the word *yoga* is used where the texts speak about Yoga (Yoga *is* the content of the passages in which the word occurs), Sāṃkhya on the other hand is a referential word which gives a name to the contents of passages which do not necessarily use the word *sāṃkhya*.

8 Such a synopsis of the *Mokṣadharmaparvan* confronts us with the additional difficulty of defining the border lines between texts or passages and by itself provokes a number of observations and questions:
– The criteria for delimiting units of text are not unambiguous. The division into chapters according to the Critical Edition (CE) has been accepted as fundamental, but even that is open to questioning when we take ms.-evidence into account. And further, the same criteria which allow us to group chapters (by distinguishing contents, dialogue situation etc.) would in some cases allow or require a division *within* sections (e.g. *Vyāsa-Śuka-saṃvāda*, 224-247).
– That the colophons were used to give titles to the listed sections accentuates the fundamentally 'synchronic' character of such a list; I use the colophons as convenient labels, fully aware of the fact that they most probably do not stem from the same time and source as the contents of the chapters and I can only globally point to the fact that there are many variants recorded for these colophons.
– The units listed are of widely differing size: single chapters or long sequences of up to 24 *adhyāyas*.

Survey of textual units in MBh 12

168:	Vipra-Senajit-saṃvāda		
169:	Pitā-Putra-saṃvāda		3Y
170:	śampāka-gītā		
171:	Bodhya-gītā/Maṅki-gītā		1Y
172:	Ajagara-Prahrāda-saṃvāda		
173:	Indra-Kaśyapa-Sṛgāla-saṃvāda		
174:	*kālamūli(a)ka*, (Karman-theory)		
175-185:	Bhṛgu-Bhāradvāja-saṃvāda		5Y
186:	*ācāravidhi*, rules of conduct.		
187:	*adhyātmakathanam*		
188:	*dhyānayogavidhi*		6Y
189-193:	Jāpaka-Upākhyāna	1S	6Y
194-199:	Manu-Bṛhaspati-saṃvāda		6Y
200:	*(sarva-)bhūtotpatti*		
201:	*diśāṃ svastikam*		
202:	Varāha-episode		7Y
203-210:	Vārṣṇeya-adhyātmam		10Y
211-212:	Janaka-Pañcaśikha-saṃvāda	2S	1Y[9]
213:	*dāntādhyāya, damastuti*		
214:	*amṛta-prāś(n)ika*		
215:	Indra-Prahrāda-saṃvāda		2Y
216-218:	Bali-Vāsava-saṃvāda		
219:	Indra-Namuci		
220:	Indra-Bali-, Bali-Namuci-saṃvāda		
221:	Śrī-Vāsava-saṃvāda		
222:	Jaigīṣavya-Asita-saṃvāda		
223:	Ugrasena-Kṛṣṇa-saṃvāda		
224-247:	Vyāsa-śuka-saṃvāda	5S	23Y
248-250:	Mṛtyu-Prajāpati-saṃvāda		
251:	*dharmalakṣaṇa*		
252-256:	Tulādhāra-Jājali-saṃvāda		
257:	Vicakhnu-gītā		
258:	Citrakārika-Upākhyāna		
259:	Dyumatsena-Satyavat-saṃvāda		
260-262:	Kapila-Go-saṃvāda		
263:	Kuṇḍadhāra-Upākhyāna		2Y
264:	*yajñanindā, hiṃsāvigarhā*		
265:	*catuḥpraśnika*		
266:	*yogācārānuvarṇanam*		3Y
267:	Nārada-Devala-saṃvāda	1S	

9 I omit these chapters in what follows as they are treated by another contribution to this volume; the word *yoga* occurs only once in the compound *tapoyoga*.

268:	Māṇḍavya-Janaka-saṃvāda		
269:	Hārīta-gītā		
270-271:	Vṛtra-gītā		1Y
272-273:	Vṛtra-vadha-upākhyāna		3Y
274:	*jvarotpatti*		2Y
275:	Samaṅga-Nārada-saṃvāda		1Y
276:	Nārada-Gālava-saṃvāda		1Y
277:	Sagara-Ariṣṭanemi-saṃvāda		
278:	Kāvya-Upākhyāna		12Y
279-287:	Parāśara-gītā		7Y
288:	Sādhya-Haṃsa-saṃvāda		
289:	*yogavidhi*	6S	38Y
290:	*sāṃkhya*	20S	8Y
291-296:	Karālajanaka-Vasiṣṭha-saṃvāda	22S	19Y
297:	*janakānuśāsanam*		
298-306:	Janaka-Yājñavalkya-saṃvāda	16S	25Y
307:	Pañcaśikha-Janaka-saṃvāda		
308:	Sulabhā-Janaka-saṃvāda	1S	13Y
309:	*pāvaka-adhyāya*		
310-320:	"life-story of Śuka"		21Y
321-339:	Nārāyaṇīya-Upākhyāna	22S	43Y
340-353:	Uñcha-vṛtty-upākhyāna		2Y

MBh 12,187-188

I have included chapters 187-188 as the first example of consecutive chapters though they are not among those chapters within which Sāṃkhya and Yoga occur side by side. Ch. 187 is the chapter in which FRAUWALLNER saw the "beginning of that development which finally led to the creation of the first great philosophical system in India, the Sāṃkhya system." (*Philosophische Texte*, p. 78). If the doctrine or concept of *guṇa*s, and the terms *buddhi* and *kṣetrajña* are characteristics of Sāṃkhya, if a cosmogony in terms of emanation and the existence of a spiritual principle separate from all material worldly existence are among the factors which cumulatively constitute Sāṃkhya, then ch. 187 might after all have to be considered a Sāṃkhya text. There follows (without transition and without intermediate question by Yudhiṣṭhira) the announcement of an explanation of the fourfold *dhyānayoga*. Ch. 187 does not stand in close connection with what precedes it, nor is ch. 188 intrinsically linked with the questions

put by Yudhiṣṭhira at the beginning of ch. 189.[10] Thus, the question may be put whether a chapter on *dhyānayoga* was the motive for inserting a 'Sāṃkhya chapter' before it or whether the existence of a 'Sāṃkhya chapter' caused the addition of a succeeding Yoga chapter. Insofar as Sāṃkhya and Yoga are felt to belong together, the juxtaposition of these two chapters provides support for considering the content of 187 as 'Sāṃkhya'. In the text as it stands, Sāṃkhya comes first. In terms of a chronological priority the case can probably not be decided; it seems plausible to assume that those who wanted to insert something new in an established text would put it at the beginning or before the passage to be supplanted, but there are enough examples for the procedure which adds newer material at the end. Still, it needs to be stated as a first result *that* Sāṃkhya and Yoga appear as deliberately juxtaposed in the *Śāntiparvan*.

MBh 12,189-193; the compound *sāṃkhyayoga*

The beginning of chapter 189 (just referred to) is the first occurrence in the *Mokṣadharmaparvan* of Sāṃkhya *and* Yoga. Yudhiṣṭhira asks about the "complete rules concerning *japa*"; the next line raises great difficulties.[11] I

10 With backward references which let this chapter appear like the beginning of a *mokṣadharmaparvan*.

11 I cannot but add a general note of caution. The text of the *Mokṣadharmaparvan* as it stands in the CE is far from clear and unambiguous. It suffices to compare the translations of DEUSSEN and EDGERTON to realize that the tradition of the text was in the hands of people who were not at all unanimous about what the text should have meant, could have meant. The occasional excerpts from the commentaries given in the apparatus of the CE lead to the same conclusion. And since the editors of the CE did not translate their constituted text we cannot be sure about what they understood or how they wanted us to interpret certain concepts and phrases. In EDGERTON's translation we come across lacunae which are justified with remarks like "14-16 characterize the three 'strands' and other entities, in confused and inconsistent ways" (p. 296) or "18-22 analyse, in a confused way, various elements of the body and of the cosmos..." (p. 296, speaking about MBh 12,290). Need we settle for studying texts written by authors who were confused and inconsistent and which, thus, *cannot* make sense? I propose that this means rather concretely that the work of HOPKINS and DEUSSEN and FRAUWALLNER and even of EDGERTON and BEDEKAR (though they worked with the CE) needs to be reviewed ('vertieft') and expanded. I may have begun with this, but I am far from being able to solve the many problems posed on the philological level.

mention it not as an instance of redactional priority but in order to introduce a fourth type of priority, i.e. *logical or theoretical priority*.

DEUSSEN's translation of the phrase, "Ob unter dem Worte Gebetsmurmler etwa eine Vorschrift der Tätigkeit der Reflexion (*sāṅkhyam*) oder der Hingebung (*yoga*) zu verstehen ist", is literal enough but does not solve the problem why one should understand a type of *people* ("Gebetsmurmler") as a *rule* for an activity; and it opts for a translation of the prior members of the compound *sāṃkhyayogakriyāvidhiḥ* as a Dvandva which is certainly not the only possibility. The following table lists the occurrences of *sāṃkhyayoga* in the MBh:

293.44	*Sāṃkhyayoge* (sg.)
336.69	*Sāṃkhyayogena* (sg.)
(vgl. 6,35.24	*Sāṃkhyena yogena* vs. *karmayogena*)
295.42	*Sāṃkhyayogau* (du.)
6,27.4	*Sāṃkhyayogau* (du.)
306.69	*Sāṃkhyayogāḥ* (pl.)
13,16.25	*Sāṃkhyayogānām* (pl.) [*gatiḥ*]
306.12	*Sāṃkhyayogepsitaṃ* [*padam*] (compound)
326.100	*Sāṃkhyayogakṛtam* (compound)
327.24	*Sāṃkhyayogavido janāḥ* (compound)
334.17	*Sāṃkhyayogibhiḥ* (compound)
335.34	*Sāṃkhyayoganidhe* (voc., compound)
338.2	*Sāṃkhyayogavicāriṇām* (compound)
3,211.21	*Sāṃkhyayogapravartakaḥ* [*kapilaḥ*] (compound)
18,5.33	*Sāṃkhyayogavidā* [*vyāsena*] (compound)

There are certainly two instances of *sāṃkhyayoga* in the dual which clearly make Sāṃkhya and Yoga items in an enumeration. But there are also the cases in the plural speaking about people who are adherents of "Sāṃkhya and Yoga" or of "the Sāṃkhya (type of) Yoga" (if we assume a *karmadhāraya-tatpuruṣa* compound); there are two cases of the compound in the singular which clearly support the understanding of the compound as *karmadhāraya* in the sense of 6,35.24. In all cases where *sāṃkhyayoga* is prior member of a longer compound the grammatical structure does not help in deciding about the type of compound.[12]

Returning to the compound in 189.4 we note that the commentators (quoted in CE) are not unanimous about how to dissolve the compound.

12 Considering the firm connection of Kapila with Sāṃkhya I would opt for understanding Kapila as propagator of the "Sāṃkhya type of Yoga" in 3,211.21.

Nīlakaṇṭha seems to opt for a Dvandva with three members dependent on *–vidhi*; the fact that the next line speaks of *yajñavidhi* and that verse 7 speaks of only two paths leads me to assume that Yudhiṣṭhira wants to know whether *jāpaka* refers to "a rule or method of activity in the Sāṃkhya type of Yoga" or to a "rule concerning sacrifice".

As I said, this excursus into the use of the compound *sāṃkhyayoga* served to introduce the fourth type of priority, *logical or theoretical priority*. If Sāṃkhya is a special type of Yoga, then Yoga is the more general concept, the *Oberbegriff*; Sāṃkhya presupposes it if it is a specific, special case within the larger scope of Yoga. I believe the compound *yogasāṃkhya* does not exist in the MBh (though as a *dvandva* it would be as possible as *sāṃkhyayoga*). When the organisors of our conference in their comment on the third guiding question put forward the opinion that "the Yoga Sūtra and Yoga Bhāṣya accept a form of Sāṃkhya as theoretical background" (Workshop Proposal, p. 3) they postulate such a logical priority for Sāṃkhya over against Yoga. In the MBh it is the other way around.

In most instances to be analyzed for redactional priority, logical priority is one dimension of what the texts are all about. Yet, we need to distinguish this theoretical level from statements in the texts about which position is better. If Sāṃkhya is said to possess hierarchical priority as the better or more comprehensive or more successful view or method, it thereby still presupposes logically or theoretically Yoga or the *śruti* as the position with which it compares itself.

MBh 12,228-229

The next instance of juxtaposed passages is ch. 228 (part of the extensive Vyāsa-śuka-dialogue). Its beginning deals with Yoga. Verse 27 announces an exposition of the unmanifest and an enumeration (*saṃkhyā*!) of the manifest.[13] The next verse states that the 25 principles are the same on both sides, in Yoga and in Sāṃkhya (*ubhayataḥ ... yoge sāṃkhye 'pi ca tathā*) and demands the listener to hear about differences.

13 *tatrāvyaktamayīṃ vyākhyāṃ śṛṇu tvaṃ vistareṇa me* |
tathā vyaktamayīṃ caiva saṃkhyāṃ pūrvaṃ nibodha me. ||12,228.27|

Clearly Yoga and Sāṃkhya are juxtaposed redactionally as well as by explicit cross reference (and please note the sequence of the words "*yoge sāṃkhye*", which did not make a compound); both know 25 principles. Traditionally one has understood the 'differences' mentioned to refer to difference between Yoga and Sāṃkhya; however, what follows concerns rather the differences between some of these principles. Verses 32-36 then draw a picture of the ideal Sāṃkhya adherent (or rather practitioner):

> 32. The withdrawal from sense-objects is the mark of perfection for Sāṃkhya-followers. 33. Unselfish, without egotism, free from the pairs, having cut off doubts, he is not angry and does not hate, nor does he speak false words. 34. When reviled and beaten, because of his kindness he has no bad thought; he turns away from reprisal in word, action, and thought, all three. 35. Alike to all beings, he draws near to (the god) Brahmā. He neither desires, nor is he without desire; he limits himself to merely sustaining life. 36. Not covetous, unshaken, self-controlled; not active, yet not neglecting religious duty; his sense-organs are not drawn to many objects, his desires are not widely scattered; he is not harmful to any creature; such a Sāṃkhya-follower is released.
> (EDGERTON, *Beginnings*: 266)

I find it difficult to recognize a 'philosopher' in this description and we learn next to nothing about the theoretical views to which such a Sāṃkhya adheres; this Sāṃkhya adherent *is* a Yogin.[14]

14 EDGERTON uses this passage to illustrate that the knowledge which brings salvation ('Sāṃkhya') implies renunciation of action, quietism. He summarizes some of the characteristics of the adherent of Sāṃkhya who is thus released. "That knowledge is the method of Sānkhya is not definitely stated in these verses, but it is nevertheless implied, as HOPKINS says (114), and the following verses make it abundantly clear; they contain an elaborate glorification of knowledge, *jñāna* (see particularly 8688 [= 12,229.1] and 8696f. [= 12,229.9]." – EDGERTON's hypothesis thus depends on the claim that the two consecutive chapters stem from the same milieu and context. It may be noted that 12,229 speaks of *jñāna*, but does not use the term *sāṃkhya*; incidentally, *yoga* too is absent from 12,229, while it occurs 8 times in 12,228 (plus 3 times *sāṃkhya*).

The chapter ends with an announcement (of the means by which one is released by Yogas, stated in one line as "going beyond Yoga-lordship") and a conclusion (that *bhāvajā buddhiḥ* was spoken about). Brief as these redactional hints are, they let Sāṃkhya in this chapter appear as surrounded by Yoga or Sāṃkhya as an insertion in a Yoga text.

MBh 12,231-232

In the same dialogue, the introductory question to chapter 231 implies that Sāṃkhya and Yoga are alternative ways to attain *brahman*. The first verse of 232 states that the preceding chapter was a presentation "in the manner of Sāṃkhya" (*Sāṃkhyanyāyena*) and continues to announce as new a topic "what is to be done in Yoga" (*yogakṛtyam*). Clearly, the Sāṃkhya text precedes the Yoga text.

MBh 12,266-267

The sequence is the other way around in 12,266 and 12,267. Chapter 266 is a Yoga chapter while the concluding verse of 267 states that the knowledge which destroys meritorious and evil (deeds) is "Sāṃkhya knowledge" (*sāṃkhya* apparently used as adjective).[15]

MBh 12,289-290

Chapters 289-290 provide another explicit juxtaposition of Sāṃkhya and Yoga. With 38 occurrences of *yoga* plus 6 of *sāṃkyha* in ch. 289 against 8 of *yoga* plus 20 of *sāṃkhya* in ch. 290, the Yoga chapter here precedes the Sāṃkhya chapter. The Yoga chapter, however, contains an introduction which talks about Sāṃkhya. Consequently we have here a case where Sāṃkhya surrounds Yoga (or Yoga appears as an insertion in a Sāṃkhya context).
Chapter 290 contains a catalogue of things that form part of (enumerating) Sāṃkhya knowledge: If knowledge about, e.g., the realms of Yakṣas,

15 There are many details in this chapter which raise difficulties of understanding!

Rākṣasas, Gandharvas, ancestors, Maruts, various kinds of seers (vv. 7-9)[16] or about numerically decreasing aspects of the three *guṇa*s and other factors (14-16), the dependence of factors (in bottom-up sequence!, 18-23), about the postmortal fate of sinners, etc., exclusively defines Sāṃkhya knowledge, then this is the only Sāṃkhya passage in the MBh! Even if it is difficult to recognise any system in this enumeration, EDGERTON's verdict ("confused bits of knowledge" *Beginnings*: 296) is certainly also not an adequate description of what the text wants to convey. Which place are we going to assign to this type of knowledge in our traditional understanding of Sāṃkhya as philosophy, or in Sāṃkhya as path to salvation?

The chapter ends with an emphatic eulogy of Sāṃkhya knowledge as a "knowledge equal to which no other knowledge exists" (290.95). The Sāṃkhyas here claim uniqueness and superiority over against anybody who might claim to have another knowledge that leads to salvation. If the implied others include the Yogins, this is a passage which claims that Sāṃkhya stands higher than Yoga.[17] It is that knowledge which Yogins (*samyagyuktās yogāḥ*, 290.100) and Sāṃkhyas strive at. "That great knowledge, however, o king, in the Vedas, in the Sāṃkhyas ('enumerations'?) and in Yoga, which is seen to be manifold and ancient, that is included in Sāṃkhya (*sāṃkhyāgataṃ tan nikhilam*)." (290.103)

Sāṃkhya (sg.) is used here as a concept which covers Sāṃkhya (pl.), Yoga and Vedas; furthermore it is clearly stated that whatever existed in Vedas, Yoga and Sāṃkhyas ('classifications, categorizations'?) "has gone into Sāṃkhya".[18] If we take this at face value and (running the risk of

16 The realms of all kinds of beings includes the "lords of the Yogas" (290.9) and the "virtues in the Yoga of knowledge and the faults in (that) Yoga" (290.13) and "the various Yogas" (290.34). If Yoga counts among the realms to be known by Sāṃkhya (mentioned three times), then it is clearly presupposed and as such subsumed by Sāṃkhya; that Sāṃkhya itself is among the objects of Sāṃkhya knowledge (290.13 continues "as well as the faults in Sāṃkhya knowledge and the virtues") indicates that the emphasis is probably on "faults and virtues", i.e. on Sāṃkhya knowledge as a kind of meta-knowledge; possibly this is a case of *Systemzwang*. The enumeration of realms of knowledge remains (grammatically) open-ended, interrupted (never to be resumed) by a question concerning one of the details mentioned (the faults of the body).

17 Note that the statement that Sāṃkhya knowledge is the highest (in 290.96) seems to refer to an outside source or authority, expressed by *matam*; the author does not speak from his own experience but seeks support from those who share his opinion.

18 *jñānaṃ mahad yad dhi mahatsu rājan* |

overinterpreting) as a statement about a historical process, then the text identifies Vedic orthodoxy and Yoga as the two counterpositions which Sāṃkhya integrated into its own fold. Those who utter this claim are already convinced that Sāṃkhya has become Vedic and achieves what Yoga achieves. EDGERTON's translation "that (knowledge) in its entirety has come from Sāṃkhya" (*Beginnings* : 300) turns the logical and chronological priority around. The eulogy of Sāṃkhya as the meeting place of all kinds of traditions and as the most effective way to salvation is continued in the next verses. The fate of the *yogabhraṣṭa* (as taught in BhG 6.37-45) is here adopted for those who are reborn after a sojourn with the gods.[19] Another detail which may be important for any attempt to place this passage on a scale of relative chronology is the mention of Nārāyaṇa as the one who supports this knowledge, who is all and who performs the cosmic functions of creation and reabsorption.[20]

---

vedeṣu sāṃkhyeṣu tathaiva yoge |
yac cāpi dṛṣṭaṃ vividhaṃ purāṇaṃ |
sāṃkhyāgataṃ tan nikhilaṃ narendra ||12,290.103|

19 *viparyaye tasya hi pārtha devān* |
gacchanti sāṃkhyāḥ satataṃ sukhena |
tāṃś cānusaṃcārya tataḥ kṛtārthāḥ |
patanti vipreṣu yateṣu bhūyaḥ ||12,290.106|
hitvā ca dehaṃ praviśanti mokṣaṃ |
divaukaso dyām iva pārtha sāṃkhyāḥ |
tato 'dhikaṃ te 'bhiratā mahārhe |
sāṃkhye dvijāḥ pārthiva śiṣṭajuṣṭe ||12,290.107|
teṣāṃ na tiryaggamanaṃ hi dṛṣṭaṃ |
nāvāggatiḥ pāpakṛtāṃ nivāsaḥ |
na cābudhānām api te dvijātayo |
ye jñānam etan nṛpate 'nuraktāḥ ||12,290.108|

20 *sāṃkhyaṃ viśālaṃ paramaṃ purāṇaṃ* |
mahārṇavaṃ vimalam udārakāntam |
kṛtsnaṃ ca sāṃkhyaṃ nṛpate mahātmā |
nārāyaṇo dhārayate 'prameyam ||12,290.109|
etan mayoktaṃ naradeva tattvaṃ |
nārāyaṇo viśvam idaṃ purāṇam |
sa sargakāle ca karoti sargaṃ |
saṃhārakāle ca tad atti bhūyaḥ ||12,290.110|

MBh 12,291-296

The next dialogue (12,291-296: Karālajanaka-Vasiṣṭha) is characterized by the ways in which Sāṃkhya and Yoga are identified with each other. Emanation doctrine and guṇa terminology, the relation between puruṣa and prakṛti, such topics would allow us to consider chapters 291, 292 and the beginning of 293 as Sāṃkhya texts. The verses 12,293.29-30 are certainly among the most emphatic affirmations of the unity of Sāṃkhya and Yoga;[21] however, it makes sense to identify entities only if they are distinct, and distinct before they become one. And once made sensitive to how this unity is postulated and by whom, one can see in this passage a clear example of how someone from the Sāṃkhya standpoint affirms identity and equivalence with Yoga. The Sāṃkhyas are those who follow (sāṃkhyair anugamyate). How exactly the relation between puruṣa and prakṛti and the mediating guṇas is described and illustrated in this chapter is not very clear; twice the unanimity of Yogas and Sāṃkhyas is mentioned (v. 42 and 44). In v. 44 we have one of the occurrences of the compound sāṃkhyayoga in the singular; however, the reading is marked as doubtful and all alternative readings make it two words or plurals. The compound has the argument of lectio difficilior in its favour and would thus be the older reading.

Plurality is mentioned as one of the characteristics of the perishable, unity of the imperishable. These catchwords are taken up in Janaka's request for clarification, to which other pairs of concepts are added: imperishable and perishable, knowledge and ignorance, Sāṃkhya and Yoga[22] – "how they are separate and not separate" (Edgerton's translation, pṛthak caivāpṛthak ca ha).

Vasiṣṭha's answer (ch. 294) does not seem to concern these questions; he

21 *tasmāt tvaṃ śṛṇu rājendra yathaitad anudṛśyate* |
yāthātathyena sāṃkhyeṣu yogeṣu ca mahātmasu ||12,293.29|
yad eva yogāḥ paśyanti sāṃkhyais tad anugamyate |
ekaṃ sāṃkhyaṃ ca yogaṃ ca yaḥ paśyati sa buddhimān ||12,293.30|
"Therefore listen, o king, how this is seen as it really is among Sāṃkhyas and great-souled Yogas. That which Yogas see, is followed ('observed', EDGERTON) by Sāṃkhyas; Sāṃkhya and Yoga are one; he who sees (this) is endowed with 'awareness' ('is enlightened', EDGERTON: 305)."

22 There are repetitions in the passage; apart from the pairs mentioned there is also the triad of awakened, unawakened, and in the process of awakening.

announces an exposition about "what has to be done in Yoga, separately" (v. 6). He describes a process of meditative absorption which leads to a vision of the Self as fire and light (v. 20):

> 25. This I consider to be the Yoga of the Yogas (the union of Yogins), the distinctive characteristic of Yoga; thus they see what is to be seen, the highest, ageless Self. 26. So far I have spoken to you truly (tattvataḥ) about the vision of Yoga; I shall speak further about the knowledge of Sāṃkhya, the display of enumeration (parisaṃkhyānidarśanam).[23]

The Sāṃkhya here sketched is that of those who teach prakṛti (prakṛtivādinaḥ, cf. prakṛtiṃ ca pracakṣate, v. 41) and the emanation of principles; later on the origin of the elements from ego-consciousness is specified as taught by followers of Sāṃkhya. Further, it is the enumeration of principles which is called Sāṃkhya by the wise who are pleased with the path of Sāṃkhya and know the methods and procedures concerning Sāṃkhya.[24] That these teachings constitute Sāṃkhya is repeatedly stated at the end of this exposition (vv. 41-42); while earlier it was 'vision' which characterized Yoga, the same word is now applied to Sāṃkhya (sāṃkhyadarśanam); and in concluding Vasiṣṭha claims that he spoke about the correct view (samyagdarśanam, vv. 44 and 45). Such emphasis would appear superfluous without a counterposition that questions the claim or competes with it. Since it is Sāṃkhya which is presented with such emphatic claims (while they are missing in the presentation of Yoga) it seems plausible to assume that it is Sāṃkhya which vies with Yoga for being the correct view or leading to the correct vision.[25]

With regard to redactional sequence the passage on Yoga comes before that on Sāṃkhya; in that sense, too, Sāṃkhya 'follows' Yoga (cf. 12,293.30).

The backward reference at the beginning of the next chapter (12,295) seems to have forgotten the Yoga passage. "So far I have told you the

23 "which teaches calculation" (EDGERTON: 310)

24 3 occurrences in v. 30; 30ab is repeated with slight change of word-order in 41ab.

25 The use of *darśana, nidarśana* and *anudarśana* in this passage confirms my impression that 'right view' is derived from 'right vision', i.e., that systematization and abstraction follow upon practice and experience. cf. Peter SCHREINER, "Schau Gottes als Leitmotiv hinduistischer Religionsgeschichte?" In: *Nārāyaṇīya Studien*, 159-196.

Sāṃkhya view" (Edgerton: 313); the verse continues by announcing an explanation of "knowledge and ignorance", i.e. of another of the pairs mentioned in 12,294.1-5. Verses 2-9 give an answer concerning knowledge and ignorance, 11-40 concerning the perishable and the imperishable. The chapter concludes by juxtaposing Sāṃkhya and Yoga – this time (v. 42) the compound is in the dual – "according to the teaching of the two textbooks" (Edgerton: 316). This confirms that the author knew of two schools which both had authoritative texts from which one could quote. "The authoritative text called Sāṃkhya is itself a Yoga view."[26] I see in this formulation the same relation of Sāṃkhya and Yoga that is expressed by the compound in the singular, i.e. Sāṃkhya as a kind of Yoga.[27] The last verse seems to reintroduce a difference in the two views. If the doctrine of two principles ("in the process of awakening" and "awakened") is explicitly stated to be the Yoga view, then the doctrine of three principles ("awakened", "unawakened" and "in the process of awakening") is implicitly the Sāṃkhya view. This accords with the label prakṛtivāda for Sāṃkhya.

The fact that chapter 296 introduces a 26th principle confirms the impression that in this dialogue the additions are indeed added (and not interpolated). The whole dialogue is permeated by the awareness that Sāṃkhya and Yoga are two distinct traditions and that their sameness or equivalence is (or should be) the result of allowing Sāṃkhya to share the claims of Yoga.

MBh 12,298-306

The next group of chapters in which the words sāṃkhya and yoga occur next to each other with remarkable frequency (16 times sāṃkhya, 25 times yoga) constitute the dialogue between Janaka and Yājñavalkya (MBh 12,298-306). Yudhiṣṭhira asks about that which is beyond all worldly attributes; the dialogue which Bhīṣma introduces to answer this question begins by asking about the number of sense organs, the number of prakṛtis, about brahman, the highest unmanifest, and about that which is beyond it,

26 *yad eva śāstraṃ sāṃkhyoktam yogadarśanam eva tat* (12,295.42)

27 In EDGERTON's translation the relation appears to be the other way round, Yoga being the view that follows Sāṃkhya: "The same teaching (as to truth) that is stated in Sāṃkhya, that is just the view of Yoga." (p. 316)

about origin and disappearance, about the "number or counting of time(s)" (*kālasaṃkhyām*). Yājñavalkya introduces his answer by announcing an explication about "the highest knowledge of the Yogas and the Sāṃkhyas in particular" (12,298.8, *sāṃkhyānāṃ ca viśeṣataḥ*) – no doubt Yoga (pl.) constitutes the more general term, Sāṃkhya the narrower specification; and it is Yoga which is here clearly considered a path of knowledge.[28] What follows is an account of the emanation of 24 principles in "nine creations" (v. 25). The chapter ends by announcing *kālasaṃkhyā* (v. 26; "Zeitberechnung", DEUSSEN: 644), which in turn is concluded in the first verse of 12,300; the next topic announced is disappearance (*saṃhāra*). The next topic is an explication according to the three levels of self, elemental being and divinity (*adhyātmam, adhibhūtam, adhidaivam*, 12,300.17). Let us recall that according to the announcement of 12,298.8 all this constitutes the "knowledge of Yogas and of Sāṃkhya in particular". In the list of sense organs and their three levels the teaching of Sāṃkhya is mentioned only for the hands as source or authority (*yathāsāṃkhyanidarśanam*, 12,301.4), while for the generative organ the Yogas are referred to with the same phrase (*yathāyoganidarśanam*, 12,301.3).[29] The section is explicitly concluded (v. 14); there follows a characterization of the three *guṇa*s. What is beyond them is the *puruṣa* identified as the highest which Janaka had asked about (12,302.12). The rest of the chapter (13-18) is another series of questions put by Janaka: about the relation of *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* as conscious and unconscious respectively (*cetanāvat, acetana*), about the teaching concerning liberation (*mokṣadharma*), about the place of the soul after death, about "Sāṃkhya knowledge as well as, separately, Yoga" (12,302.17), and about omens. Here it is Sāṃkhya which is characterized as knowledge; Yoga is separate or is considered a topic that can be treated separately.

The answer consists of a characterization of the *puruṣa*, stressing the distinctness from everything affected by the *guṇa*s. The section is concluded by saying that "this highest Sāṃkhya-view has been recounted to

28 An analysis of the ways in which frame questions, introductory questions of quoted dialogues and announcements (in the context of frames and of dialogues) are linked or juxtaposed is clearly necessary and important to determine how Sāṃkhya and Yoga are perceived; however, it falls outside the scope of this paper.

29 This is surrounded by *yathātattvanidarśanam* (in vv. 2, 8, cf. 12) and a refrain-like *yathāśrutinidarśanam* (vv. 5-13, with variants).

you; for, having thus recounted, the Sāṃkhyas have gone to separateness; those others, however, experienced in the principles, have the same (the following?) view; from now onwards I shall also speak about the view of the Yogas." (12,303.20-21)[30] – It is tempting to make an etymological connection between *sāṃkhya* and the activity called *parisaṃkhyā*. However that may be, in the light of this conclusion plus announcement we must consider what precedes as concerning Sāṃkhya, what follows as concerning Yoga. The redactor of this passage put Sāṃkhya first. This is confirmed by the beginning of the next chapter (12,304):

> The Sāṃkhya knowledge I have spoken about; pay attention now to the Yoga knowledge, as heard about (or revealed), as seen (experienced) truly.[31] There is no knowledge equal to Sāṃkhya, there is no power equal to Yoga; both of them are the same path, both are remembered (*smṛtau*) to be deathless. Men content with little awareness see them as separate. We, however, o king, see decidedly that they are the same. What the Yogas see, the same is seen by the Sāṃkhyas. Sāṃkhya and Yoga are one; who sees this (is) a knower of the principles (of truth). (12,304.1-4)[32]

The rest of this and the next chapter do not mention Sāṃkhya again; chapter 304 speaks about Yoga, about eight perfections, about the *saguṇa* and the *nirguṇa* aspect of Yoga, about breath control, meditation on *puruṣa*, and it ends with an emphatic description of Yogic absorption and one-

30 *sāṃkhyadarśanam etat te parisaṃkhyātam uttamam* |
evaṃ hi parisaṃkhyāya sāṃkhyāḥ kevalatāṃ gatāḥ ||12,303.20|
ye tv anye tattvakuśalās teṣām etan nidarśanam |
ataḥ paraṃ pravakṣyāmi yogānām api darśanam ||12,303.21|

31 For EDGERTON who will not admit that Yoga has anything to do with knowledge, "Yoga knowledge" means that "the word 'knowledge' is mechanically carried over from the compound *Sāṃkhya-jñānam*, just before, to the parallel *Yoga-jñānam*; the proper term would be 'Yoga-power' (*-balam*) as in vs. 2, or 'Yoga-activity' (*-kṛtyam*) as in vs. 8." (EDGERTON: 325fn1)

32 *sāṃkhyajñānaṃ mayā proktaṃ yogajñānaṃ nibodha me* |
yathāśrutaṃ yathādṛṣṭaṃ tattvena nṛpasattama ||12,304.1|
nāsti Sāṃkhyasamaṃ jñānaṃ nāsti yogasamaṃ balam |
tāv ubhāv ekacaryau tu ubhāv anidhanau smṛtau ||12,304.2|
pṛthak pṛthak tu paśyanti ye 'lpabuddhiratā narāḥ |
vayaṃ tu rājan paśyāma ekam eva tu niścayāt ||12,304.3|
yad eva yogāḥ paśyanti tat sāṃkhyair api dṛśyate |
ekaṃ sāṃkhyaṃ ca yogaṃ ca yaḥ paśyati sa tattvavit ||12,304.4|

pointedness (standard comparisons, mostly, which recur at different places in the MBh).

The next chapter (12,305) teaches about the departure of the soul from the body and correlates parts of the body with divinities to whom the soul proceeds if it leaves by that part. The ultimate purpose is to defeat or conquer death: "Knowing the retention connected with Sāṃkhya ('enumeration', *sasāṃkhyadhāraṇam*) one conquers death by Yoga through the inner Self exclusively directed towards that." (v. 20)[33] I am not at all sure how to translate this verse idiomatically and thematically correctly. About the relation between Yoga and Sāṃkhya, however, it is evident that the means to conquer death is Yoga, that the yogic practice to achieve this goal is *dhāraṇa*[34] and that this practice is to be connected with (*sa-*) Sāṃkhya. It seems scarcely plausible to understand *sāṃkhya* here as mention of a philosophic system; what the context requires would rather be a specific activity which can be combined with 'retention', i.e. 'calculation, enumeration, numbering'? This *sāṃkhya* is connected with Yoga as the more general practice and concept; in that sense Yoga can here claim priority.

The last chapter of this dialogue is a kind of excursus in which Yājñavalkya tells about his biography; the sun prophesies that he will reach that position or status which is "desired by Sāṃkhya and Yoga" (306.12, *sāṃkhyayogepsitaṃ padam*) or by "Sāṃkhyayoga" (in the sense of a yogic practice connected with or specified by *sāṃkhya* in the sense of 305.20, above). Clearly juxtaposed are Sāṃkhyas and Yogas (both plural) in 306.55 in concluding a passage which teaches about the 26th principle as the highest. Yājñavalkya's dialogue partner flatters Yājñavalkya by attributing to him the complete Sāṃkhya knowledge as well as the Yoga knowledge (306.65). "Sāṃkhyayogas" (pl.) feature again in 306.69, where Yājñavalkya mentions that they call primordial matter '*pradhāna*' due to or in accordance with the teaching of *śruti*. Sāṃkhyas and Yogas (plurals) are again juxtaposed in v. 76, both intently looking for or at the 26th principle,

33 *sasāṃkhyadhāraṇaṃ caiva viditvā manujarṣabha* |
jayec ca mṛtyuṃ yogena tatpareṇāntarātmanā ||12,305.20|

34 *Dhāraṇa* and *dhāraṇā* occur in the *Śāntiparvan*. For *dhāraṇa* cf. 12,184.13b (ifc), 304.9d, 305.20a (ifc); *prāṇadhāraṇa* at 12,139.36d .55b. 58d, 185.3 .13, 330.20b; for *dhāraṇā* cf. 12,159.32d .36b, 210.24e .27d (iic), 228.13a, 289.30b .37b .54c .55a .56b, 304.9a. (Thanks to John BROCKINGTON for these references!)

similarly in v. 86 as both sharing with other people who desire liberation "this vision seen by knowledge" (*etad darśanaṃ jñānadṛṣṭam*, "all of them have this view, which is perceived by knowledge" EDGERTON: 329). Sāṃkhya knowledge and the authoritative text of Yoga are studied by the king who renounces his kingship (v. 95), and both (juxtaposed as each endowed with characteristics created by their authoritative texts, *svaśāstrakṛtalakṣaṇāḥ*) share a view (v. 98; "das sehen die Sâṅkhya's und die Yoga's ein und schöpfen die Beweise dafür aus ihren Lehrbüchern." DEUSSEN: 670).

MBh 12,321-339 (*Nārāyaṇīyam*)

About the occurrences in the Nārāyaṇīya let me just observe that the juxtaposition of Sāṃkhya and Yoga seems to have become the standard way of speaking. 8 times the two terms are connected in a compound, 10 times the two terms occur in the same line, which together with the three references to Kapila as authority of or on Sāṃkhya leaves one occurrence of Sāṃkhyas associated with 'Bhāgavatas' (332.16). This reading is marked as uncertain (wavy line) since most Southern manuscripts substitute Yogas for Bhāgavatas.

The fact that Sāṃkhya terminology appears as integrated in a type of theology and cosmology associated with 'Pāñcarātra' tends to confirm that Sāṃkhya must have been well established and recognized as theory at that stage of MBh redaction history. This confirms the impression that the Nārāyaṇīya is a late addition to the *Śāntiparvan* and it indicates the direction in which the Sāṃkhya passages in the *Śāntiparvan* might be ordered chronologically: juxtaposition — comparison or competition — identification — utilisation.[35]

Conclusion

In terms of the *Textgeschichte* and *Redaktionsgeschichte* of the MBh it is evident that 'Yoga' is closer to the raw material out of which the epic has

35 These catchwords cannot do more than raise the question about the relative chronology of the Sāṃkhya passages, a topic which is not dealt with in this paper.

been formed (vocabulary item, episodic occurrences, distribution across the text). 'Sāṃkhya' has certain characteristics of a 'metatext' term. Where it is explicitly presented this happens mostly in parallel, vicinity or comparison to Yoga.[36] Sāṃkhya passages enclose or precede, but also succeed Yoga passages. Thus, the criterion of redactional priority has not yielded unambiguous results and needs more detailed analysis. Nevertheless, when seen in the light of the other criteria, I venture to hypothetically interpret the redactional position of the Sāṃkhya passages as indicative of the fact that Sāṃkhya was the newcomer in the epic compendium; the redactors wanted to convey authority and orthodoxy to that newcomer by putting it on a par with Yoga as the better known and more generally accepted paradigm of a *mokṣadharma*, a doctrine and method to reach salvific liberation.

To summarize – without unduly glossing over the obvious differences between these dialogues and texts – I would like to begin with the observation that the questions to which the texts claim or pretend to answer concern liberation, concern the conquering of death, concern the access to a rank above the realm of change and decay. The path which leads there is a path to ever more transcendent levels of existence which are accessible by meditative reduction of bodily and sensory functions and by merging ('uniting', √yuj) with ever more undifferentiated modes of consciousness. One may *know* about this path and these levels, one may *practice* such reduction, – both, practice and knowledge, constitute Yoga. The specifically Sāṃkhya aspect of this Yoga concerns a more detailed knowledge about the material realm that is to be left behind. The 'bottom-up' approach of Yoga is thus supplemented with a 'top-down' view of the same reality and the same levels. The Yogin will probably not be bothered to classify the details and processes of emanation which he is in any event striving to leave behind; the Sāṃkhya seems to claim that such knowledge is a condition or a help for turning away and for advancing towards the goal of isolated worldlessness, unworldly isolation. This argument belongs to what I have called the 'logical' priority of Yoga. The desire for salvation, the practical efforts to attain liberation come first; speculations about how this could work, reports about what one experiences, regulations and prescriptions about how to proceed come afterwards.

36 In the *Śāntiparvan* there is only one chapter (267) with *sāṃkhya* in which *yoga* does not also occur.

In the light of the observation that the introduction of Sāṃkhya (if not in the MBh at large, at least in the *Mokṣadharmaparvan*) has the air of a certain scholasticism and intellectualism, it would seem that those redactors who wanted the MBh to speak also about Sāṃkhya were neither epic bards nor great poets and probably not even practising Yogins, but rather (perhaps) meticulous scholars, scribes with archival ambitions, thinkers with a liking for numbers and classifications (but afraid of the 'existential' commitment to a path of Yoga which would lead to death and through dying, literally or spiritually). They may well have been *yogabhraṣṭa* (cf. BhG 6.37-45), Yogins who did not quite make it but who were close enough to the practice and the experiences of Yoga to be able to speak about it and to intellectualize it.[37] The *yogabhraṣṭa*, one who did not reach the goal of no return, is probably the best candidate for becoming a Sāṃkhya philosopher. But he would have been a Yogin first.[38]

If the corpus of the MBh at large is the oldest text to speak of Sāṃkhya, we must adjust our way of speaking about Sāṃkhya and Yoga in the history of Indian philosophies to the epic evidence. We need not call 'Sāṃkhya' what is not called so in our sources; and we need not speak of 'philosophy' where certain metaphysical assumptions are part of a way to salvation. Further, things may be different at a period *after* the establishment of philosophical systems; and that part of the history of Yoga which explains why Yogins who want to conquer death by reaching a status of no return through and after death should write books about philosophy, that part of the history of Yoga needs yet to be written. For the MBh as our earliest source, I believe, we can be positive: by all counts and on all accounts, Yoga comes first.

37 In that sense one can agree with FRAUWALLNER who would not include 'Yoga' under philosophy; if my perspective is correct, Sāṃkhya would be Yoga turned into philosophy. I claim that such a turn must have come later and presupposes the existence of that which is turned into something else.

38 Since it is the claim of this Sāṃkhya knowledge to be in accordance with revelation, one may speculate whether the increased importance of 'knowledge' on a path which will leave all knowledge behind may not betray the effort to include *veda*, i.e., 'knowledge' in a salvific path that would otherwise have nothing to do with any revealed knowledge.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BROCKINGTON, John: *The Sanskrit Epics*. Leiden 1998

DEUSSEN, Paul: *Vier philosophische Texte des Mahābhāratam*. Leipzig 1906

EDGERTON, Franklin: *The beginnings of Indian philosophy : Selections from the Rig Veda, Atharva Veda, Upaniṣads, and Mahābhārata*. London 1965

FRAUWALLNER, Erich: *Philosophische Texte des Hinduismus*. ed. Gerhard Oberhammer; Chlodwig H. Werba. Wien 1992

GRÜNENDAHL, Reinhold; MALINAR, Angelika; OBERLIES, Thomas; SCHREINER, Peter: *Nārāyaṇīya Studien*. Ed. Peter Schreiner. Wiesbaden 1997. (Purāṇa Research Publications Tübingen, vol. 6)

The Śāntiparvan, ed. Shripad Krishna BELVALKAR. Poona 1954-1966. (The Mahābhārata for the first time critically edited, vols 13-16)

SCHREINER, Peter: "Yoga – Lebenshilfe oder Sterbetechnik?" In: *Umwelt & Gesundheit*, Köln 1988, Heft 3-4, 12-18

SCHREINER, Peter: "Loose cross-references and vocatives: the case of the eschatological chapters in Viṣṇupurāṇa and Brahmapurāṇa." In: *Purāṇa* 30, 86-108