

CHAPTER : VI

FURTHER DISTINCTIVE FEATURES OF THE TEXT (PHILOSOPHICAL ASPECT)

1) RELEVANCE OF PHILOSOPHICAL EXPOSITION :

The last prakarana of the third adhyāya contains the exposition of philosophical topics, relating to the Sāṅkhya and Yoga philosophy. The elucidation of the theoretical & practical aspects of philosophy is also found in some other smṛtis like those of Manu (Ch. I & XII) Yājñavalkya (III.4) etc. The great epic - Mahābhārata also contains a separate section, in which mokṣa (the fourth human goal) is elaborately treated. The extensive digests like the Kṛtyakalpataru, the Vīramitrodaya etc. that deal with practically all aspects of human life, have a separate section, that expatiates the mokṣadharmā. Even Hemādri intended to deal with all the four human aims, as the very name of his extensive digest (caturvargacintāmani) suggests. Thus the writers on Dharmaśāstra have given great importance also to the philosophical discussion, as the mokṣa is also one of the four human goals. The treatment of philosophical topics is indispensable in a smṛti-work, that embodies the elucidation of the complete or entire rules of piety (dharma) of human beings. Yājñavalkya¹ (I.8) maintains that realization of self through the practice of Yoga is the supreme Dharma. He also prescribes² (I.101) the study of spiritual text etc. for the perfection of japayajña. Vasistha (I.1)³ points out that dharmajijñāsā (desire to know Dharma i.e. exposition of Dharma) is for the emancipation of purusa.

Especially, in the present text, the discussion of philosophical topics is quite relevant, as Devala (2201) expounds

the Dharma that consists of two fold purusārtha namely abhyudaya & nihsreyasa. According to him, the latter purusārtha can be attained by two fold path of Sāṅkhya & Yoga. Buddha (I)⁴ also, like Devala, mentions Dharma to be a means of sreyas & abhyudaya. Thus the elucidation of both Sāṅkhya & Yoga, that constitute the second purusārtha, is relevant & necessary.

2) THE TWOFOLD PURUSĀRTHA :

Devala (2201-2209) maintains that purusārtha i.e. end or aim of human life is of two kinds namely (1) abhyudaya - worldly prosperity, (2) nihsreyasa - spiritual uplift or final beatitude. The first human end, that of abhyudaya was explained by the author in the previous portion. This means that according to Devala, one can secure worldly prosperity by following Dharma, explained earlier. While the second purusārtha can be acquired by two ways namely by the path of Sāṅkhya & that of Yoga. The fruit or aim & end of both of them is the emancipation in the form of complete cessation of the cycle of birth, death and the consequent sufferings. Both these - Sāṅkhya & Yoga - are said to constitute the second purusārtha, namely nihsreyasa & hence both form the part of the entire Dharma of human beings.

But it is remarkable that some terms (e.g. atyantābhāva, apavarga, abhyudaya & nihsreyasa etc.) are more current in the Vaisesika system of philosophy. The division of purusārtha into abhyudaya & nihsreyasa naturally reminds the Vaisesika sūtra (I.I) - 'Yato 'bhyudayanisreyasasiddhiḥ sa dharmah' &

clearly indicates the influence of Vaiśeṣika-sūtra upon Devala, which may suggest posterity of Devala to the Vaiśeṣika-sūtras.

Generally, puruṣārtha is said to be of four kinds (1) Dharma - Duty or piety, (2) artha - wealth, (3) kāma - pleasure, (4) mokṣa - emancipation. Hemādri, by his title of the gigantic work and Visvanāna (Sāhityadarpaṇa pariccheda I) refer to this scheme of puruṣārthas. The Arthasastra of Kautilya⁵ (I/7/10-11) emphasizes the artha aspect & gives prominence to it. It makes the Dharma & Kāma, as subordinate to it. Manu⁶ (2/224) refers to the various views, regarding the prominence of one over the other of the first three puruṣārthas and declares that the triad of puruṣārthas, namely - Dharma, artha & kāma are aggregatively important. Yājñavalkya⁷ (I.115b) & Gautama (I.9.46) also seem to endorse the same view of trivarga.

But it is noteworthy that mokṣa is not at all mentioned or considered by Manu etc. in their treatment. Devala has not at all employed the above conventional terms like Dharma, artha, kāma & mokṣa in his exposition. He does not verbally agree with or subscribe to the view of trivarga. His approach to the concept of puruṣārtha is distinctive. But it seems that according Devala, both the puruṣārthas, namely abhyudaya & nihsreyasa can be acquired by Dharma & hence he included the exposition of nihsreyasa also in his smṛti-text. The Mahābhārata⁸ (svargā: 5/62) mentions the view of Dharma, being superior to artha & kāma, as through the practice of Dharma,

one can secure the other two also. Devala seems to indicate that even moksa can be obtained by Dharma. Saṅkarācārya (introduction to Bhagavadgīta) refers to two kinds of Dharma-pravṛttilakṣaṇa & nivṛttilakṣaṇa. Budha (I)¹⁰ also mentions the Dharma to be the means of sreyas & abhyudaya. While Vasistha¹¹ (I/1) holds that Dharma is conducive to emancipation of the purusa.

The concept of purusārtha is also very much current in the Sāṅkhya & Yoga systems. The Sāṅkhya-sūtra¹² (I.1) mentions the total destruction of the threefold sufferings, to be the ultimate purusārtha. The term purusārtha¹³ occurs at about five times in the Sāṅkhya-kārikā & has been interpreted as referring to bhoga (enjoyment) & apavarga (emancipation) by Vācaspati Misra in his commentary. Patañjali, in the Yogasūtra¹⁴ (II/10), also seems to endorse the same view.

There is great influence of Sāṅkhya theories upon Devala as he also believes in two-fold purusārtha. But the prominent distinction between the two is that Devala represents both of them as the aspects of Dharma only. Dharma is the ground or basis, upon which the two are dependent.

Devala further adds that beasts are not entitled for the two-fold purusārtha, as they are bereft of Dharma while human beings & gods only are qualified for the same.

3) THE SĀṅKHYA PHILOSOPHY :

(A) INTERPRETATION OF THE TERM 'SĀṅKHYA' :

The term Sāṅkhya, according to Devala (2206) means right

understanding of 25 principles. The knowledge of these

principles is very necessary for understanding the difference between the self & not-self & consequently for obtaining the final release or emancipation. There is a famous verse¹⁵, declaring that the knower of 25 principles, in whatever stages & conditions of life he may be, is liberated. The person, who has realized such a distinction between self & notself can understand the 24 principles as distinct from his self. Hence he is described as a Sāṅkhya (Sāṅkhyāyante - ganyantepadārthāḥ yena saḥ). Devala also regards such a person possessing discriminative realization or discerning faculty as a real Sāṅkhya (2441). The supreme reality, the goal of Yogins, the Brāhman is also described as Sāṅkhya by the author (2473).

The Yogasūtra (IV.29)¹⁶ & the commentator Vyāsa (on Yogasūtra I.15 & II.2) most probably seem to use the word prasaṅkhyāna in the sense of discriminative knowledge of 24 principles & the self like Devala. While the 'real knowledge of the pure nature of self' is also represented as Sāṅkhya in the quotation of Vyāsa¹⁷. Here there is no reference to the knowledge of 24 principles. The term Sāṅkhya in Śvetāsvatara Up. (6.12)¹⁸ is in the sense of knowledge of Vedic Reality, according to Śaṅkarācārya¹⁹ (Bh.S.2.1.3), while Bhāmatīkara²⁰ explains it as - Sāṅkhyā means proper vedic wisdom and those who follow it are called Sāṅkhyas. The Bhagavadgīta²¹ (2.39, 5.4, 5.5, 13.24, 18/13), also has employed the term in the sense of tattvajñāna (knowledge of reality) and also in the sense of a person, knowing the ultimate reality²² (3.3, 5.5).

Thus it is evident that Devala interprets the term in accordance with the standpoint of Sāṅkhya philosophy & hence includes the knowledge of 24 principles along with self to be necessary. While the vedāntins do not mention the knowledge of 24 principles to be so indispensable. The Sāṅkhyas strive to realize the self, in rational manner, through the gradual realization of the various principles (i.e. not-self), in the ascending order (ārohakrama). While the vedāntins, try to realize the self only, without any attempt to know the not-self. By the knowledge of one reality the Brahman, everything becomes known; nothing remains to be known. (ekenaiva vijñātena sarvam vijñātam bhavati).

(B) CONCEPT OF MŪLIKĀRTHAS :

The ten fundamental principles of Sāṅkhya philosophy are enumerated in a verse (2236) in upajāti metre. The verse is very important from the point of view of the Sāṅkhya philosophy. It can also throw some light upon the date of Devala.

ANTIQUITY OF THE CONCEPT :

The concept of mūlikārtha seems to be very ancient one, because Devala has borrowed it from some ancient works on Sāṅkhya & Yoga (2210). It is not found in the Sāṅkhyakārikā or the Sāṅkhyasūtra. Among the extant Sāṅkhya works, the Tattvasamāsa (18) alone refers to this concept, but the small work does not explain it. The work is of an uncertain date. Prof. Max Muller²³ thinks it to be an earliest work. While most of the scholars²⁴ (like Keith, Garbe, Sovani etc.) assign it to a later date. Dr. V.V. Sovani²⁵ believes it to be older than

7th century A.D. But the concept of mūlikārtha is even mentioned by paramārtha (546 A.D.) in his chinese translation. Vācaspati Misra (on Kā.72) quotes also anustubh verses, that enumerate mūlikārthas from some ancient work called Rajavārtika (a work, probably now lost). Moreover, the commentary Jayamaṅgalā (on Kā. 51) also quotes a verse of Saṅgrahakāra, similar to that in the present text. Thus it is clear that though this concept is neglected in the Sāṅkhya-kārikā & the Sāṅkhya-sūtra, it is one of the most ancient & fundamental concepts of Sāṅkhya philosophy.

COMPARISON :

The above verse, mentioned by Devala is also found in some commentaries of the Sāṅkhyakārikā & the Tattvasamāsa. The variant readings, from those works are noted below :

TABLE NO. 7

- 1) Mātharavṛtti on Kā.72 - (1) Parārthyam for Parārtham
(2) Viśeṣavṛtṭih for ca śeṣavṛtṭih
- 2) Jayamaṅgalā on Kā.51 - (1) Parārthyam for Parārtham
(2) Akartrbhāvaḥ for Atho nivṛtṭih
- 3) Sāṅkhyatattvavivecana - (1) Ekatvayathārthavatve for
com .on Tattvasamāsa Ekatvamathārthavatvam
(Sāṅkhyasaṅgraha. p.22) (2) Parārthyam for Parārtham
(3) Akartrkatvam for Atho-Nivṛtṭih
- 4) Tattvayāthārthyadīpana - (1) Akartrtā ca for Atho Nivṛtṭih
com.on Tattvasamāsa
(Sāṅkhyasaṅgraha, p.80)

- 5) Kramadīpikā - (1) Akartrtā ca for Atho nivṛtṭih
com. on Tattvasamāsa
(Sāṅkhyasaṅgraha, p.135)

It is evident that there is difference about the sixth fundamental principle. Most of the above commentaries read akartrtva for atho nivṛtṭih mentioned in the Reconstructed text.

A SIMILAR ENUMERATION FROM RAJAVĀRTIKA :

The ten fundamental principles of Sāṅkhya philosophy are also enumerated in the verses in anustubh metre. Vacaspati Misra²⁶ (com. on Sāṅ. Kā. 72) & the sarvopakārinī (com. on Tattvasamāsa) quote it from Rajavārtika. It is also found in the introductory verses of the Yuktidīpikā commentary (p.1) on the Sāṅkhyakārikā.

The difference between Devala & the above enumeration is as follows - (1) The above verse mentions akartrtva, which is not found in the text of Devala. (2) While 'atho nivṛtṭih' mentioned by Devala, is not found in the above enumeration. (3) The term 'anaikya' is used instead of the words 'bahavaḥ pumāṁsah' in the present text.

EXPLANATION :

The following ten fundamental principles are enumerated in the text. (1) Astitva (existence), (2) Ekatva (singularity), (3) Arthavattva (utility), (4) Parārtham (serving the purpose of other), (5) Anyatva (distinction), (6) Nivṛtṭih (desistence or separation, (7) Yoga & (8) Viyoga - (contact & discontact), (9) Bahavaḥ pumāṁsah - (plurality of selves),

(10) Sarīrasya sthitiḥ sesavṛttisca - (existence & subordination i.e. tendency towards dependence of body).

These are briefly explained below.

The commentators (Vācaspati-kā-72, ^{ma}Jayaṅgalā (Kā. 51) point out that ekatva, arthavattva & parārtha are applicable only to pradhāna, the anyatva, akartrtva, bahutva are related to puruṣa only, while the astitva, viyoga, & yoga are with reference to both prakṛti & puruṣa & the last is in connection with the gross & subtle bodies.

TABLE NO. 8

Pradhāna	Both	Puruṣa
Ekatva	Astitva	Anyatva
Arthavatva	Yoga	Akartrtva
Parārtham	Viyoga	Bahutva

1) ASTITVA :

This is the first fundamental principle, meaning 'existence' applicable to both pradhāna & puruṣa. It means that the prakṛti & puruṣa are not imaginary principles, but are real & existent. Several arguments, containing the proofs for the existence of both are put forth in the Sāṅkhyakārikā (15 & 17) & the Sāṅkhya-sūtra (1/140-144).

2) EKATVA :

This is the second cardinal principle, meaning 'singularity or oneness', applicable only to the prakṛti. Prakṛti is one only.

There are no distinct prakrtis for numerous purusas. Though plurality of self is advocated as a reality, there is no assumption of plurality of prakrti. This explicit clarification about oneness of prakrti. This explicit clarification about oneness of prakrti is necessary, as there was also an ancient view, mentioned²⁷ by Gunaratna Sūri, that the ancient school, of Sāṅkhya believed in the plurality of prakrti. The Yuktidīpikā (com.on Sāṅkhyakārikā, p.141) mentions²⁸ that the Sāṅkhya teacher paurika had maintained the view of distinct prakrti for each purusa.

But according to the commentator Gaudapāda²⁹ not only prakrti, but even purusa also is in reality one. Thus this principle of oneness, would be applicable to both purusa & prakrti, according to his explanation.

3) ARTHAVATTVA :

This is the third fundamental principle, meaning 'utility', applicable only to prakrti, according to commentaries - Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudī & Jayamaṅgalā. But it can be said to be applicable to both purusa & prakrti. Both of them have some purpose or end (artha) to be served from each other. The prakrti is unconscious but active, while purusa is inactive but conscious. Hence they are mutually helpful & interdependent. They are not able to accomplish their objectives independently. The prakrti & purusa are said to be acting like the blind & the lame, that help each other to serve their purpose. Prakrti requires that it should be seen by the purusa, so that there would be the production of the whole world, when it is in contact with purusa

But the puruṣa cannot obtain liberation, without the discriminative knowledge of his distinction from prakṛti (cf. Sāñ.Kā.21, Sāñ.S.2/1).

It seems that Vācaspati & Jayamaṅgalā maintain that the two purposes are served by prakṛti only & hence they explain this principle to be applicable only to it.

(4) PARĀRTHA :

This is the fourth fundamental principle, meaning 'serving purpose of the other' applicable only to the prakṛti. This indicates that the activity of prakṛti is for serving the purpose of puruṣa. Prakṛti only expects that it should be seen by the puruṣa. It does not desire anything else from the puruṣa. Puruṣa is able to obtain both - bhoga-enjoyment & apavarga-emancipation due to prakṛti. It serves both these ends of puruṣa. It binds & also releases him from the bondage. Just as the dancer entertains the audience with her dance or milk of the cow flows naturally for her calf or a camel carries the burden for the sake of his master; similarly prakṛti exerts herself for the sake of puruṣa, as if for her own purpose. Just as a dancer returns from the stage, after entertaining the audience, the prakṛti also, having disclosed her nature to puruṣa, returns from him. Thus all her activities are meant for the sake of fulfilling the purposes of the puruṣa (cf. sāñ.kā.56-60; sāñ.s.3/58,6/40).

5) ANYATVA :

This is the fifth principle, meaning 'distinction' applicable only to puruṣa, according to Vācaspati & Jayamaṅgalā. Puruṣa

is a distinct entity, assumed by the Sāṅkhyas. Puruṣa & Prakṛti are two separate principles, quite dissimilar in their qualities. The Sāṅkhya kārīkā (11) has properly distinguished the two from point of view of their qualities. Hence puruṣa can be really described as 'distinct' (anya) from prakṛti (cf. Sāṅ.kā.11, Sāṅ.S. 1/139).

6) ATHO NIVṚTTIḤ :

This is the sixth principle, meaning desistance, not mentioned by some commentators, who read 'akartrtva' for it. This principle is applicable to puruṣa in the sense that he realizes his distinction from the prakṛti & obtains the discriminative knowledge & gets himself released from the bondage of prakṛti. This principle may also apply to prakṛti, as she discloses her real nature to the puruṣa, releases him from the bondage & departs or withdraws herself from him.

7) & 8) YOGA & VIYOGA :

These are 7th & 8th principles, meaning 'contact & discontact', applicable to both prakṛti & puruṣa. The Sāṅkhhyas assume that there is a contact between the two, result of which is the disappearance of the equilibrium of prakṛti & the production of the phenomenal world, in gradual stages. This assumption of Sāṅkhhyas has given rise to 'a number of puzzling problems'.

While the other principle is the opposite of the above. It is disconnection between the two. When the puruṣa has obtained

discerning knowledge regarding the distinction of himself from the prakṛti, he has no purpose left to be served by prakṛti. Prakṛti, itself withdraws from him & the result is the discontact, dissociation between or separation from the prakṛti.

9) BAHAVAH PUMĀMSĀH :

This is the ninth principle, meaning plurality of self, applicable only to the puruṣa. Though the Sāṅkhyas propound the theory of oneness of prakṛti, they maintain puruṣa to be infinite in number. Several arguments, in defence of this view, are advanced in the Sāṅkhyakārikā & the Sāṅkhyasūtra. (Sāṅ.Kā.18, Sāṅ.S.1/149,6/45).

10) ŚARĪRASYA STHITIH ŚEṢAVṚTTIŚCA :

This is the tenth principle, meaning 'existence & subordination of the body' applicable to the subtle & gross body. Both these kinds of bodies are under the influence of Karma. The presence or existence of these is dependent upon it. Eventhough the person may have obtained the supreme knowledge, that releases him from the bondage, the body continues for some period & experiences the good & bad effects of the earlier fructified actions (prārabdha karma). The wheel of the potter continues to revolve for sometime through inertia, though he has stopped moving it; In the same manner, the body continues, until the effects of the karmas (actions) are exhausted. (Sāṅ.Kā.67, Sāṅ.S.3/82,83).

(C) THE THREE KINDS OF BODIES :

There is a vivid & minute description of the real nature

of the body, which is of three kinds, namely that of gods, human beings & lower beings (2264-2267). These three bodies are quite different in their nature. The peculiar characteristics of each of them are properly described in the text. Such a description of the threefold body is not to be found in the extant works of Sāṅkhya. The mention of threefold creation, that of gods, human beings & lower beings is found in the Sāṅkhya-kārikā & the Sāṅkhya-sūtra (Sāṅ.Kā.53/54, Sāṅ.S.3/46-50). But it is quite different & cannot be compared with the detailed elucidation given by Devala. This point also suggests that Devala is not in any way indebted to the extant works of Sāṅkhya. His exposition is based upon some ancient lost works on Sāṅkhya, as is clear from his explicit statement to that effect.(2210).

(D) THE FOUR MATERNAL & FOUR PATERNAL SHEATHS :

Devala refers to the four maternal & four paternal sheaths. (2221). But such eight sheaths are not mentioned in the three extant primary works of Sāṅkhya system namely - the Sāṅkhyakārikā, the Sāṅkhyasūtra & the Tattvasamāsa. Devala has borrowed this concept also from the ancient works of Sāṅkhya, in which the discussion of such topic might be there.

The Sāṅkhyakārikā (39) refers to the gross bodies by the term 'mātapitrjāh'. While commenting upon the above kārikā, Vacaspati Misra³⁰ explains that they have six sheaths - three - hair, blood & flesh, from the maternal side & three - muscles, bones & marrow, from the paternal side. The verses³¹, quoted by Pandit Shivanarayana Shastri in his commentary on the above verse

& in his Introduction also refer to the same concept of six sheaths - three paternal & three maternal - that constitute the body. The Sāṅkhyasūtra (3/7)³² refers to the gross body as mostly the product of maternal & paternal elements, but does not mention the concept of sheaths.

The commentary Yuktidīpikā³³ (p.120) refers to the six sheaths, as explained previously. But it adds that some explain the sheaths to be eight. i.e. the six already mentioned & two that are formed by asita (whatever is eaten) & pīta (drunk). But it is not clear, why the latter two are also included under the term mātrja & pitrja sheaths.

The eight stages of realisation referred to in the Upanisadic literature are - (1) Annamaya, (2) Prāṇamaya, (3) Manomaya, (4) Vijñānamaya, (5) Jñānamaya, (6) Cinmaya, (7) Ānandamaya, & (8) Brahmamaya; The five of them are quite well-known as sheaths & are referred to in the Taittirīya Upanisad, while last five are referred to in the Ganesātharvasīrsa³⁴.

(E) THE FIVE PRĀNAS & THEIR FUNCTIONS :

Devala mentions five kinds of vital breaths (2222). The functions & locations of each of them in the body are also explained (2402-2406). The Sāṅkhyakārikā does not accept the view of the separate functioning of prānas. It only refers to the five kinds of vital airs & states³⁵ that it is the common function of organs (karṇas - 10 external + 3 internal). The Sāṅkhya-sūtra (2/31) also reiterates the same in identical

words. The Tattvasamāsa (12) alone clearly speaks of five kinds of vital airs, in an independent sūtra, which is similar to that of Devala. Thus Devala differs from the Sāṅkhyakārikā & the Sāṅkhyasūtra, regarding the theory of prānas. The Sāṅkhyayoga-Tantras, which Devala followed, might have had incorporated the theory of separate functioning of five prānas.

The Tarkasaṅgraha (p.38)³⁶ mentions that there is only one kind of vital air, but it is designated as prāna, apāna etc., only on account of the difference in the adjuncts of location & function. Thus according to this work, the breath is only of one kind. This is also opposed to the view of Devala, propounding separate functioning of each vital air.

The locations of five vital airs, mentioned in the text are somewhat different from those, referred to in the off-quoted verse³⁷. The difference between Devala & the above verse is as follows :

TABLE NO. 9

	<u>Devala</u>	<u>the offquoted verse</u>
1. Prānaḥ	Ūrdhvam nābhergataḥ	Hrdi
2. Apānaḥ	Adho nābheḥ	Gude
3. Vyānaḥ	Śakḥasambandhiskandhāvistāḥ	Sarvasarīragāḥ
4. Udānaḥ	Bāhūrigrivācaksupārs'vagataḥ	Kanṭhadesasthāḥ
5. Samānaḥ	Śrotrahrdayanābhigataḥ	Nābhisamsthitaḥ

Mm.P.V.Kane³⁸ refers to the controversy regarding the meaning of the term prāna & apāna. Prāna, according to Caland, Keith, Dumout & a few others means 'expiration' in ancient vedic



literature, & apāna means 'inspiration'. But this meaning underwent a change in the later days, according to these scholars. "On the other hand, almost all sanskrit commentators & writers & G.W. Brown, Edgerton & others hold the opposite view". Mm.P. V. Kane³⁹ is of the opinion that "Prāna meant & means inhalation or thoracic breath", while 'apāna' means 'abdominal breath'. While referring to the view of Devala & Śaṅkarācārya in support of his interpretation, he writes⁴⁰, "Not only Śaṅkarācārya but a much earlier authority viz. the Dharmasūtra of Devala (mentioned by Śaṅkarācārya.....) defines the working of prāna & apāna as done by Śaṅkarācārya in his phāsyā on Br.Up. I.5.3".

(F) THE TANMĀTRAS, KNOWN TO THE TANTRAS OF SĀṆKHYAYOGA :

Devala has mentioned five subtle elements, called tanmātras of sound, touch, colour, taste & smell (2214, 2039, 2240, 2253), (cf. Sāh. Kā. 38). They are said to be of the nature of mere existence i.e. generic essence, having no specific qualities.

The mention of the concept of tanmātra in the text, is very important for determining the antiquity of the theory of tanmātras & the chronological position of Devala. The term does not mostly occur in the principal Upanisads. "The Mahābhārata also in its exposition of the Sāṅkhya doctrine, does not generally speak of the tanmātras & mentions the five sense-objects in their place. This fact indicates that the tanmātra theory is a later modification of the Sāṅkhya system", writes⁴¹ Dr. Punimihari Cakravarti. The same scholar further points out that "Neither

Caraka nor Asvaghosa (in his Buddhacarita) mentions the tanmātras & both of them count the objects of senses as the tattvas". Dr. Anima Sengupta⁴³ also remarks that "the tanmātras are omitted in many accounts (in the epic, the Gītā, the Caraka-saṁhitā etc.) & in their places, some sort of subtle bhūtas (elements) are substituted". Prof. Surendranath Dasgupta⁴⁴ mentions that "Caraka does not mention the tanmātras at all".

But the theory of tanmātras is mentioned or indicated in the following references.

(1) The term 'Mātrā' in the sense of tanmātra is found in the prasna Upaniṣad (4/8)⁴⁵ & the term tanmātra is explicitly mentioned in the Maitrāyāni Upaniṣad (3/2)⁴⁶.

(2) The Ahīrbudhnyasaṁhitā⁴⁷ (12/23) gives a detailed account of the Ṣaṣṭitantra, wherein 'mātrātantra' is mentioned as one among them.

(3) It is incidently mentioned at some places in the Mahābhārata⁴⁸. In the Bhagavadgītā (2/14)⁴⁹, the term mātrā occurs & the five subtle elements are referred to in the verse (VII.4)⁵⁰.

(4) Though the term 'tanmātra' does not occur in the caraka & the Buddhacarita, there is mention of some sort of subtle elements, which take the place of these tanmātras. (Buddhacarita,⁵¹ Ch.12/18, Caraka sārīra, 1/62).

(5) The Manusmṛti⁵² (I.27) also mentions some sort of subtle elements called 'mātrā'.

(6) The Yogasūtra⁵³ of Patanjali refers to the theory of tanmātras by the term 'sūksma' in the sūtra 3/43, as interpreted by the commentator vyāsa.

(7) The most explicit mention of tanmātra is found⁵⁴ in the Yājñavalkyaśmṛti (3/179) & in the Sāṅkhyakārikā (38).

In sum, the subtle elements like tanmātrās were admitted in the period even before christian era. They are sometimes referred to as mātrā, while during the early centuries of christian era, they are categorically referred to as tanmātras.

But it can be maintained that the theory of tanmātra is an ancient one, for the following reasons also.

(1) It is evident that the concept of tanmātras found in the present text was borrowed by Devala from some ancient Tantra, works of Sāṅkhya (as he himself has admitted his indebtedness). Hence the theory of tanmātras must have^{been} definitely propounded in those Tantra works.

(2) The Sāṅkhyakārikā (38) mentions the theory of tanmātras. The exposition of Sāṅkhya in the Sāṅkhyakārikā was also based upon the Sastitantra & the knowledge that was handed down through the successive series of Sāṅkhya Teachers. This fact also clearly indicates that the concept of tanmātras is not a new concept of the Sāṅkhya kārikā, but was borrowed from the ancient works of Sāṅkhya.

(3) Thirdly, Śaṅkarācārya⁵⁵ (2/2/10) points out that the Sāṅkhyas, sometimes explain the origin of tanmātras from mahat, while at some other places, from ahankāra. Thus there was controversy in the Sāṅkhya works themselves, regarding the origin of tanmātras. This view must have been based upon the ancient Sāṅkhya works, which Śaṅkarācārya definitely had before him, because like Devala, he also alludes to the extensive Tantras of Sāṅkhya system. (cf. Smṛtisca tantrākhyā paramarsipranītā..... Bh.S.S.2/1/1 & tathā mahājanaparigrhitāni mahānti sāṅkhyāditantrāni Bh.S.S.2/2/1). Some quotations on Yoga, mentioned by Śaṅkarācārya also are not found in the extant works of Sāṅkhya & Yoga. This suggests that even Śaṅkarācārya had before him some ancient Tantra works of Sāṅkhya & Yoga, which are completely lost now. Like Śaṅkarācārya, Devala also had before him such ancient works, on the basis of which the entire exposition of Sāṅkhya & Yoga was erected by him. Hence the theory of tanmātras can be traced to those ancient works.

Thus the concept of tanmātras is an ancient one, being expounded in the ancient Tantra works of Sāṅkhyayoga, which were accessible to Devala, Sāṅkhyakārikā & even Śaṅkarācārya. Hence the mention of tanmātras by Devala supports the view of placing Devala, in the period, earlier to the Sāṅkhyakārikā.

(4) THE YOGA PHILOSOPHY :

(A) INTERPRETATION OF THE TERM YOGA :

The another way to obtain nihsreyasa is Yoga. Yoga is defined as fixing or establishing (i.e. concentration) of mind, upon the

intended (internal) entity, after having turned it away from the external objects (2207). The sense-objects are surrounding the senses & the tendency of mind & senses towards them . . . is quite natural & unavoidable. The withdrawing of mind from them & making it introverted requires much training & practice. The practical way, that aims at this objective is Yoga, which also leads one gradually to the same purpose of emancipation.

The term 'Yoga' can be derived from the root 'Yuj' which occurs in the follow^{ing} shades of meaning in three different conjugations⁵⁶.

- 1) Yuj - (4.Ā.) Samādhau - to concentrate the mind - Yujyate
- 2) Yuj - (7.U) Yoge - to unite, to put to, to appoint, to give to prepare etc. Yujjati-te
- 3) Yuj - (10.V.) - Samyamane - to join etc. Yojayati-te
- 4) Yuj - (10.Ā.) - to censure - Yojayate

Among these, the last one is not useful for the interpretation of the term Yoga. Yoga is thus, a process of concentrating, uniting or joining the mind with the internal entity namely the self.

Patañjali⁵⁷ (1-2) explains the term in a technical sense. Yoga is cessation of mental modifications. Devala is not indebted to Patañjali for his interpretation of Yoga. The commentator Vyāsa⁵⁸ (on Yogasūtra I/1) states that Yoga is spiritual absorption. He, thus, interprets the term from the root Yuj (Samādhau 4.Ā.) to concentrate.

The Yoga, as expounded by Devala is a true Yoga. It is not hathayoga. He speaks of properly turning away of mind from the objects. There is no suppression or forceful restraint of mind, nor does he speak of blindly controlling the senses. If there is blind control of senses, the mind, yet, may wonder among the sense-objects. Hence according Devala, there should be in reality, the turning away of mind from sense-objects (cf. Bhagavadgītā, 3/6-7).

(B) AUXILIARIES OF YOGA :

PRĀNĀYĀMA - (BREATH-CONTROL) :

Devala explains the breath-control to be of three kinds - kumbha, recana & pūrana (2395-2399). The extant Yogasūtra & the commentator Vyāsa do not mention these terms, while explaining the concept of prānāyāma. The terms svāsa, prāvāsa & gativiccheda are employed in the Yogasūtra⁵⁹ (2/49) & three kinds of prānāyāma is indicated in the phrase - bāhyābhyantarastambhavrttiḥ in the Yogasūtra⁶⁰ (2/50). The Yogasūtra⁶¹ (1/34) mentions the terms pracchardana & vidhāraṇa. The Sāṅkhyasūtra (3/33)⁶² also uses similar terms but the terms, kumbha, recana, pūrana etc. used by Devala are not found in the above works. Devala does not follow any of these works. He has borrowed these terms from the ancient but lost works of Sāṅkhya-Yoga. The Viṣṇu purāna⁶³ (V/10/14), the Brhadhyogiyājñavalkya smṛti (8/9-10 & 19-21) & Vācaspati (on Yogasūtra II.50) mention above three terms.

Further divisions of the prāṇāyāma into mrdu (soft or mild), manda (slow) & tīksna (swift) are mentioned by Devala, in accordance with the number of udvātas, (breaths) one, two & three respectively (2400). The Yogasūtra⁶⁴ (2/50) seems to indicate twofold division - dirgha (prolonged) & sūkṣma (short), based upon space, time & number. But Vyāsa⁶⁵ refers like Devala to the three varieties, based on number -viz. mrdu, madhya, & tīvra.

The term udvāta is found in the Devala-sūtra & it is also explained by the author (2400-2401). But in the com. of Vyāsa (Y.S.2/50) & the Rājamārtanda⁶⁶, the term udghāta is employed. Mm.P.V.Kane⁶⁶ suggests the reading 'Udghata' for the Devala-sūtra also. He also suggests the reading āhatya for āhrtya. The term 'udvāta' only is retained in the present reconstructed text, as it is the reading, that is found, in the Kṛtyakalpataru, one of the earliest authorities that might have had the original text of Devala. It can suggest the proper sense (Ud=upwards, vāta - breath) viz. the process in which the breath is taken upwards, upto the head. The term āhatya would suggest the sense of dashing against the head, while āhrtya can mean that breath is forcibly brought towards the head. It suggests the yogin's control upon the breath. It is presumable that Devala's reading can be traced to the ancient Sāṅkhya works.

The conditions under which the prāṇāyāma is not to be performed are enumerated in the text (2407). They are as follows - when one is, (1) tired, (2) desirous of knowing, (3) desirous of sleeping, (4) perturbed, (5) hungry, (6) suffering from disease,

(7) troubled by heat & cold, (8) having speedy impulse of excretion. Such circumstances are not found in the extant Yogasūtras or Sāṅkhyasūtras.

PRATYĀHĀRA :

The mind is atomic, restless, light & forceful & hence it is very difficult to control it. It may swerve or fail in the practice of Yoga. The pratyāhāra, according to Devala, is the repeated attempt of bringing back & establishing mind upon the intended object (namely the self) (2408). Here also Devala emphasizes upon the turning away & controlling of the mind. He does not refer to the control of senses from the sense-objects. The latter can naturally be achieved, when the mind has been properly restrained. Patañjali's explanation is different in this respect. When senses, not coming in contact with their respective sense-objects, follow or flow towards as it were the mind (citta) -that stage is known as pratyāhāra, according to Yogasūtra⁶⁷ (2/54). Devala does not employ the technical term 'citta' like Patañjali.

The term 'artha' in the text means 'ātman' as explained by Lakṣmīdhara (K.K.M.p.173). Pratyāhāra is an attempt of yoking mind to the self. The term 'artha' also occurs in the sūtra (2207), defining Yoga. The word 'ātman' is actually used in the sūtra (2409), explaining dhāraṇā. Thus Devala's procedure of Yoga is more akin to the Upanisadic concept than with that of the extant Yogasūtras.

While pointing out the peculiar qualities of the mind, Devala refers to the atomic nature of it. The Sāṅkhyasūtra⁶⁸ (3/14) also seems to endorse the same view. While the commentator Vyāsa (on Yogasūtra 4/10) points out the view of Ācāryas⁶⁹ (celebrated teachers of that school) that they believed in the pervasive nature of the citta. The Nyāya & Vaiśeṣika systems⁷⁰ believe in the atomic nature of mind while the Mīmāṃsakas⁷¹ maintain the view of all-pervading nature of mind. Devala might be influenced by the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika schools in this respect.

DHĀRANĀ :

Devala explains dhāraṇā as a process of holding body, senses, mind, intellect & the self (all directed towards one & one objective only) (2409). Aparārka (p.1025) explains the word Ātman as ahaṅkāra here. But it seems to be improper as (1) the author himself could have used the word ahaṅkāra in the text, instead of Ātman, (2) secondly, the mention of a ahaṅkāra after mind & intellect, would be improper.

DHYĀNA :

The nature & procedure of dhyāna are described elaborately in a long sūtra (2410). The definitions of dhyāna, found in the Yogasūtra⁷² (3/2) & the Sāṅkhyasūtras (3/30 & 6/25) refer merely to some aspect of it, while Devala's explanation is a more detailed one, dealing with all the practical aspects of it. Devala is evidently not influenced by the above sūtras.

The dhyāna is a process of contemplation upon 'That' (tat).

This 'tat' may be interpreted⁷³ as standing for the Upanisadic Brahman, which is sometimes indicated by the use of word 'that' (tat). This suggests the vedāntic influence on the text.

Devala clearly refers to the two kinds of postures, namely svastika & bhadraka. The extant Yogasūtra does not mention any kind of posture, technically known as āsana. Acc. to Yogasūtra (2/46)⁷⁴, āsana is that which is stable & comfortable. This indicates that any posture, which is of this nature, is to be followed for the practice of Yoga. This does not mean that the various āsanas (postures) were not prevalent in those days. because Devala has mentioned āsanas here, while explaining dhyāna, on the authority of ancient works of Sāṅkhya-yoga.

The commentators Vyāsa (Y.S.2/46) etc. mention many āsanas. Kālidāsa refers⁷⁵ to Vīrāsana in the Kumārasambhava (3/45 & 59) & Yājñavalkya⁷⁶ (I/278,280) to bhadrāsana. The Dakṣamṛti⁷⁷ (VIII.5) mentions padmāsana & Yājñavalkya (3/198)⁷⁸ also seems to refer to it. These references would definitely suggest that the āsanas were quite well-known in the early centuries of christian era & might be prevalent even before it, as the ancient Sāṅkhya-Yoga Tantras, from which Devala has borrowed his explanation of dhyāna, might be referring to the āsanas.

(C) CONCEPT OF TAPAS :

Devala defines the term tapas as mortification or heating of the body by means of the practice of vows, fasts & rules. (2378-2394 & 8). He, systematically enumerates various virtues

and activities, that constitute the vrata, upavāsa & niyamas. He also defines tapas as the practice of dharma (duty) as enjoined to him, in accordance with his caste & stage in life, Thus the explanation, of tapas is very practical and is in conformity with the dictates of Dharmasastra. He does not explain it from the philosophical standpoint.

Devala's concept can be compared with that of Gautama⁷⁹ (3/1/15) & Baudhāyana (III/10/14), as there are some common points among them. All of them enumerate some virtues & activities as constituting the tapas. The five rules, mentioned by Gautama are also found in Devala's explanation, while Baudhāyana has the 'service of preceptor', as the additional common factor, along with the above five in Gautama. Baudhāyana mentions 'wearing of one garment' (Ekavastratā) instead of 'wearing of wet-garment'. But there is also much difference. The non-violence and non-stealing, enumerated among the constituents of tapas by Baudhāyana are not found in the definition of Devala & Gautama. There is much similarity between Gautama & Baudhāyana. Devala is more systematic & exhaustive than both of them.

Thus though Devala's treatment of the concept of tapas may seem to be similar to Gautama & Baudhāyana in some respects, he is not indebted to any of them. His approach is novel, systematic & original.

(D) UPASARGAS (OBSTACLES IN THE PRACTICE OF YOGA) :

A person may be properly practising the several means of Yoga, but various obstacles come in his way of obtaining perfection & obstruct the further progress of the aspirant, in his practice of Yoga. The obstacles are of ten kinds, according to Devala (2411). (1) Aniṣṭābhava - over powering by something undesirable, (2) Nidrābādhā - impediment on account of sleep, (3) Bhāyanakotpati - emergence of something terrifying, (4) Jñānapīḍā - Annoyance due to knowledge, (5) Bhogātiśaya - excess of pleasures, (6) Kopanaipunya - quickness in anger, (7) Aiśvaryaśeṣa - specific supernatural powers, (8) Dharmamahattva - eminence due to Dharma (9) Vidyāsthānāni - abodes in the form of lores, (10) Yasodīptih - brilliance of success.

The Yogasūtra (1/30)⁸⁰ also enumerates nine antarāyas (obstacles) & in the sūtra (3/36)⁸⁰, adds that supernatural powers are upasargas (obstacles) to the spiritual absorption. Thus though the Yogasūtra mentions ten obstacles in all like Devala, but they are differently enumerated as antarāyas & upasargas. The term upasarga is only used for those obstacles, that arise due to the obtainment of supernatural powers, while all other kinds of impediments that distract the mind are called antarāyas. Devala does not make any such distinction.

Devala's treatment is quite different from that of the Yogasūtra. Several obstacles, mentioned by Devala, are not found in the Yogasūtra. This may suggest that Devala is not indebted to or influenced by the extant Yogasūtra. He follows

the ancient Sāṅkhyayoga works, as he has clearly admitted.

(E) THE EIGHT SUPERNATURAL POWERS :

The eight kinds of supernatural powers are developed in the Yogin, ardently practising Yoga. Devala properly points out that the first three (animā, mahimā, laghimā) are sārīra i.e. connected with body. While the remaining five (namely prāpti, prākāmya, īsitva vasitva, yatra kāmāvasāyitva) are aindriya i.e. sensory (2412-2436).

The Yogasūtra⁸¹ (3/44) merely refers to the divine powers like animā etc. but no explanation of them is found in the Yoga-sūtra. But the commentator Vyāsa explains all of them in his commentary. There is difference in the sequence or order of them. The laghimā is taken before mahimā & īsitva is explained after vasitva. Some⁸² omit the last one, 'yatra kāmāvasāyitva' & instead of it, add garimā, as one of the divine powers.

Devala has explained the term laghimā as quickness or swiftness in the movement of the body, while it is also sometimes explained as opposite of garinnā (not mentioned by Devala). The garimā is understood to be a power to make the body, very much heavy & is opposite of laghimā - the power to be able to make body light like the cotton. Devala's explanation is quite different. The powers, īsitva, vasitva & yatra kāmāvasāyitva are also differently explained by Devala & Vyāsa⁸³ (the commentator of Yogasūtra).

TABLE NO. 10

<u>Devala</u>	<u>Vyāsa</u>
1) <u>Īsitva</u> - The unrestrained power by which the <u>yogin</u> can surpass even the deities.	The power of creation, destruction & Amalgamation.
2) <u>Vasitva</u> -The power to control one's own self & thereby becomes controller of his own life & birth.	The power to control the physical elements & their products. The <u>Yogin</u> becomes uncontrollable.
3) <u>Yatra</u> - Of three kinds i.e. <u>kāmāvasā</u> entering the <u>-yitva</u> shadow, mind or body of some other person.	The unfailing will-power, by which all physical objects, become as he wishes.

(F) ARISTAS - SIGNS OF APPROACHING DEATH :

The Yogin can obtain the knowledge of the approach of death either by the concentration on the karma (the past actions, which are of two kinds, (1) sopakrama . those that have started giving fruit, (2) nirupakrama - which have not started giving fruit and hence are accumulated or stored) or by the signs indicative of death. (cf. Yogasūtra 3/21)⁸⁴. During the practice of Yoga, the yogin can get the prior knowledge of his forthcoming death, which is suggested by various portents, seen by him. As such signs are seen by him, during the practice of Yoga, they are dealt with by Devala, in this portion of treatment of Sāṅkhya

& Yoga philosophy. There is also another significance of these protents. The Yogin, having received the prior intimation of his death, can be ready for facing it, in the most adequate, manner, as described in next topic of utkrānti. These omens, not only suggest his forthcoming death, but even the period, when it is likely to take place (2448-2467).

The Svetāsvatara Upanisad⁸⁵ (2/11) seems to refer to some such aristās. "The sāntiparva of the Mahābhārata (ch.318-9-17) Devala quoted in the moksakānda of kalpataru (pp.248-250 about 20 verses), the Vāyupurāna (ch.19 verses 1-32), the Mārkandeya-purāna (43.1.33), (ch.40 verses 1-33 Veṅkatesvar press ed.), Līngapurāna (Pūrvārdha ch.91) & other Purānas contain the long lists of the signs of approaching death"⁸⁶. It would be interesting to make a comparative study of these accounts. But for reasons of space & time, the treatment thereof is withheld.

The works on Jyotiṣa (like the Aḍbhutasāgara etc.) contain chapter, dealing with aristās. But the aristās, mentioned by Devala are those seen by the Yogin, while practising Yoga (cf. Yathāvat yogakarmani - 2448, Yogī-2457, drstāristo yatisresthah 2472). Hence they have been arranged here in the portion of Sāṅkhya-yoga. There are - also some other verses, found in the works on Jyotiṣa like the Aḍbhutsāgara etc. They have been separately collected in the appendix on Jyotiṣa.

(5) PĀPADOSAS - TREATMENT OF THE THREEFOLD VICES :

Devala explains elaborately the twelve mental or psychological, four bodily & six verbal vices, called pāpadosas. (2284-2371). The nature, origin, varieties & the way of their elimination are discussed, while describing the psychological vices like moha etc. The bodily & verbal vices are also squarely dealt with. The treatment of this topic, with such a systematic elaboration is rarely to be found elsewhere.

The Bhagavadgītā⁸⁷ (16/20) speaks of three vices, desire, anger & greed as the doors of hell & Arjuna is exhorted to shun all of them. The Yogasūtra⁸⁸ (2/34) merely points out that evil actions like killing etc. are caused by three vices namely, greed, anger & delusion. Devala explains twelve kinds of psychological vices, while the Mahābhārata (Sānti.163 =Cr.ed.12/15) contains description of thirteen kinds of such vices (namely - kāma, krodha, soka, moha, vidhitsā, parāśutva, mada, lobha, mātsarya, īrsyā, kutsā, asūyā & krpā). The manner of their emergence & destruction is also briefly described. But Devala is not at all indebted to it in any way. There is not only difference in the number & enumeration of vices, but also in the exposition. Devala's exposition is more systematic, vivacious and refined than that of the Mahābhārata.

The elucidation of threefold vices is also found in Manu & Harita-smṛtis. Both of them speak of three kinds of vices those of bodily, psychological & verbal nature. Manu (XII/5)⁸⁹ enumerates the following three as mental evil actions - (1) think-

ing about wealth of others, (2) thinking evil of others & (3) having wrong notions. Manu (12/6)⁹⁰ enumerates only four kinds of verbal vices, while Devala enumerates & explains six kinds of them. The three vices, namely pārusya, anṛta & paisunya mentioned by Manu are also mentioned & explained by Devala, with addition of three more vices to them. The three sorts of bodily evil actions, mentioned by Manu⁹¹ (12/7) are similar to those found in the text of Devala. There is only verbal difference. But Devala has properly explained each of them & added arthadusanam as the fourth. To sum up, the exposition in the Manusmṛti is merely enumerative, while it is descriptive & exhaustive in nature in the text of Devala. However, in no way, Devala is indebted to the extant Manusmṛti for his exposition.

Hārīta⁹² (quoted in P.M. II, Pt. II, pp. 212-213) also enumerates eighteen evil actions, leading to hell, six of which are mental, four verbal and the rest are bodily sins. The five psychological (parābhīdroha, krodha, lobha, moha & ahaṅkāra), the three bodily (namely paradārābhigamaṇa, dravyāpaharāṇa, & prāṇihimsā) & the two vocal (pārusya & anṛta) vices mentioned by Hārīta are similar to those found in the text of Devala. But here also fundamental difference is that Devala's exposition is descriptive & explanatory, while that of Hārīta is only enumerative.

TABLE NO. 11

1) Psychological vices -

<u>Devala</u>	<u>Manu</u>	<u>Hārīta</u>	<u>Mahābhārata</u>
12	3	6	13
Moha, rāga, dveṣa, māna, lobha, mada, soka, mamatva, ahañ- kāra, bhaya, harṣa, moghacintāsceti.	Paradravyeṣva bhidhyānam manasāniṣṭa cintanam vitathābhini- vesasca.	Paropatāpanam, parābhidrohaḥ, krodho, lobho, mohaḥ, ahañ- kārah.	Kāmah, Krodhaḥ Sokaḥ, Mohaḥ vidhitsu, parāsutvam, madah, lobhah, mātsaryam, īrsyā, kutsā, asūyā, krpā.

2) Bodily vices -

<u>Devala</u>	<u>Manu</u>	<u>Hārīta</u>
4	3	8
Hiṃsā, apacārah, styeyam, arthadū- ṣanam.	Adattānāmupādānam, hiṃsā, paradānāpasevā.	Abhakṣyabhakṣanam, abhojyabhojanam, apeyapānam, agamyāga- manam, ayājyayājanam, asatpratigrahanam, paradarābhigamanam, dravyāpaharanam, prānihimsā.

3) Vocal vices -

<u>Devala</u>	<u>Manu</u>	<u>Hārīta</u>
6	4	4
Paruṣavacanam, apavādah, paisuṇyam, anṛtam, vr̥thālāpo, nisthūram.	Pārusyam, anṛtam, paisuṇyam, asambaddhapralāpah	Pārusyam, anṛtam, vivādah, sruṭivikrayah.

(6) CONCEPT OF BONDAGE & LIBERATION :THE THREEFOLD BONDAGE :

Devala mentions that the bondage is of three kinds & its causes are also of three kinds. The attachment for bondage is of two kinds. (2224-2226).

The three kinds of bondage is prakṛtibandha, vaikārika bandha, & dakṣiṇābandha. The first - prakṛtibandha - is a bondage by the eight principles namely avyakta, mahat, ahaṅkāra & five tanmātras. The second - vaikārikabandha is the bondage of senses with the sense-objects. While the third bondage - dakṣiṇābandha - is caused by merits, obtained through the performance of pious & charitable deeds. The author further adds that the gods are fettered by the first one, those belonging to the particular scheme of life (āsrāmī) are bound by the second, while all others are fastened by the third bondage. (2276-2282).

In the Sāṅkhyakārikā (44) & the Sāṅkhyasūtra (3/24), there is only mention of the term 'bandha' but there is no reference

to or elucidation of its nature, as found in the sūtras of Devala. The Tattvasamāsa⁹⁴ (21) specifically mentions the bondage to be of three kinds ; The sūtra is quite identical with the sūtra of Devala. But the small work - Tattvasamāsa - does not explain the threefold bondage.

The commentators - Vācaspati & Gaudapāda refer to three kinds of bondage, while commenting upon the above Sāṅkhyakārikā (44). Gaudapāda quotes a verse⁹⁵ that refers to the threefold bondage.

Vācaspati Misra (com.on Kā.44) & Bhāvāganesa (com.on Tattvasamāsa 21) have elucidated the nature of the threefold bondage in detail. The explanation of the above two commentators is compared below with that of Devala.

TABLE NO. 12

1) Prākr̥tiko bandhah -

	<u>Adhikārī</u>	<u>Svarūpam</u>
A) Devala :	Devatāh	Avyaktādibhirasṭabhih
B) Vācaspati	Prakṛterupā- sakah	
C) Bhāvāganesa	-	Aṣṭaprakṛtiṣu abhimānarū- pah

2) Vaikāriko bandhah -

A) Devala	Anyeṣām	Indriyaih indriyārthesu
B) Vācaspati	Vikāropāsakah	Bhūtendriyāhankārabuddhīh puruṣabuddhya upāsate
C) Bhāvāganesa	Pravrajitānām	Śabdādiṣu manasaḥ saṅgaḥ

3) Dakṣiṇābandhah -

A) Devala	Āsraminām	Iṣṭapūrtādibhih
B) Vācaspati	Iṣṭapūrtakarī	Puruṣatattvānabhijño hiṣṭapūrtakarī kāmopamanāh bandhyate.
C) Bhāvāganesa	Grhasthādīnām	Kāmopahatacetasām dakṣiṇām dadatām.....

As mentioned above, the causes of bondage are said to be of three kinds & the attachment for bondage is of two kinds, according to Devala (2225 & 2226). The extant Sāṅkhya works (like the Sāṅkhyakārikā, the Sāṅkhyasūtra, the Tattvasamāsa) do not refer to both these concepts. But on Kārikā 63, the commentator Shivanarayana Shastri⁹⁶ following Vācaspati points out in clear terms that there are seven causes of bondage. viz. dharma, adharmā, ajñāna, vairāgya, avairāgya, aisvarya, anaisvarya. Out of them, dharma & ajñāna have been explicitly mentioned by Devala in his explanation (2283). While the addition of ādi in the text, suggested by the researcher would include 'adharmā' also as the third cause. It is evident that other causes, mentioned by the commentators are the offshoots or corollaries of the above three. The explanation of the sūtra 'dvau bandharāgau' (2226) is not found in the reconstructed text. It is also not explicable even on the basis of the extant Sāṅkhya works. It may be that due to ajñāna, the twofold attachment for bondage namely of dharma & adharmā arises.

The Bhagavadgītā (16/20) mentions kāma, krodha & lobha as the three doors leading to hell. These are in other words, three causes of bondage. Among them, kāma & lobha may be understood as the two causes that give rise to the attachment for bondage. The kāma is the attachment for sentiment substances, while lobha is the attachment for non-sentient substances.

APAVARGA :

Like the Bhagavadgītā (V.4), Devala points out that the ultimate aim of both, paths, namely the Sāṅkhya & Yoga, is the same i.e. the attainment of emancipation. The term apavarga is used here by Devala. It is very much current in the Nyāya-vaīśeṣika systems. It also occurs in the Sāṅkhya & Yoga systems, but the another term Kaivalya is more prevalent in these two systems.

The explanation of the term apavarga in the text of Devala (2209) is also similar to that found in the Nyāya-vaīśeṣika systems. According^{to} Devala, apavarga, is the absolute negation or non-existence of birth, death, & consequent sufferings. According to the Nyāyasūtra (1.1.22) as explained by Vātsyāyana, apavarga is the complete cessation of birth & consequent sufferings. (cf. also other Nyāyasūtras mentioned above). The dual form 'Janmamaranaduhkīyoh' suggests that only two words are intended & not all the three independent words. Hence the compound can be interpreted as Janma ca maranam ca - janmamarane tayoh dukkham' of pain of birth & death.'

The term 'atyantābhāva', used by Devala in sūtra (2209) also displays the influence of Nyāyavaīśeṣika philosophy in which it is a technical term, representing one kind of abhāva.

PURPOSE OF SPIRITUAL ACTIVITY :

According to Devala (2442), the purpose of the spiritual activity is the obtainment of liberation or emancipation of four kinds. (1) sāyujya - (absorption into the deity), (2) sālokya

(obtaining the world of the deity), (3) prakṛtilaya (absorption into the earth etc.), (4) mokṣa-cessation of the repeated births (2443-2447). The Sāṅkhya-kārikā (45) refers only to prakṛtilaya. The Sāṅkhya sūtra⁹⁸ (5/74, 5/76, 5/80, 5/83) also is not at all in favour of admitting sālokya & sayujya kinds of liberation, mentioned by Devala.

The liberated person is described as a Sāṅkhya & is not only free from qualities, bondage, birth, old age, death & sufferings, but also obtains the Highest Infinite bliss (2241). This is suggestive of vedāntic influence on Devala. The classical⁹⁹ Sāṅkhya believes that liberation is the complete & ultimate destruction of all kinds of sufferings. There is no obtainment of positive happiness bliss. The explanation of the term 'mokṣa' (2447) is also significant. It is the negation, absence or non-attainment of repeated births. It is not only cessation of sufferings, but also of future birth. This reminds the Vaisesika concept of liberation in the sūtra¹⁰⁰ (5/2/10).

UTKRĀNTI :

Devala also expatiates the procedure of Yogin's departure from this world, after he has seen the sign of his approaching death (2468-2474). Though the author has explained the Sāṅkhyayoga philosophy, he identifies the ultimate state to be reached by the Yogin with the Brahman. The Yogin obtains nirvāna (salvation) & reaches the Highest Brahman, after leaving his mortal body. It is described as the ultimate & infinite state, designated as Sāṅkhya, bereft of connection or contact with birth, death

& other calamities. This description is not at all in conformity with the classical Sāṅkhya.

But the above description is similar to that of the Sāṅkhya accounts, found in the Carakasāṃhitā¹⁰¹ (Sārīra I/155/156, V/21 & 33) & the Buddhacarita (XII.65). Even, while expounding the Sāṅkhya doctrine, both the above works describe like Devala, the Brahman to be the ultimate state to be reached by the Yogin. It is also described as nirvāṇa in the caraka. The exposition of Sāṅkhya doctrines in the Mahābhārata¹⁰² (Cf. Śānti.275/39) also contains references to the Brahman, not admitted by the classical Sāṅkhya.

Thus the exposition of Devala also reflects upon the priority of Devala to the Sāṅkhyakārikā. Devala has borrowed the Sāṅkhya & Yoga accounts from the ancient works of those systems, that admitted even the concept of Brahman.

REFERENCES

1. Ayam tu paramo dharmo yodyogenātmadarsanam /
- Yāj.S.(I.8b).
2. Japayajñaprasiddhyartham vidyām cādhyātmikīm japet /
- Yāj.S.(I.106b).
3. Athātaḥ puruṣaṇiḥśreyasārtham dharmajijnāsā /
- V.D.S.(I.1).
4. Śreyobhyudayasādhano dharmah /
- Budha D.S.(I).
5. Artha eva pradhāna iti kautilyah /
Arthamūlau hi dharmakāmāviti //
- Arth.S.(I/7/10-11).
6. Dharmārthāvucyate śreyah kāmārthau dharmā eva ca /
Artha eveha vā śreyastrivarga iti tu sthitih //
- Manu.S.(2/224).
7. Dharmārthakāmān sve kāle yathāsakti na hāpayet /
- Yāj.S.(I/115b).
Na purvāhna-madhyandināparāhñānaphalān kuryāt //
Yathāsaktidharmārthakāmebhyasteṣu ca dharmottarah syāt //
- G.D.S.(I/9/46).
8. Ūrdhvabāhurviraumyeṣa na ca kaścicchrunoti me /
dharmādarthaśca kāmāśca sa kimartham na sevyate //
- Mbh.(Svar.5/63)(Cr.ed.18/5/49).

9. Dvividho hi vedokto dharmah /
Pravṛttilakṣaṇo nivṛttilakṣaṇas'ca /
Jagataḥ sthitikāṇam, Prāṇinām sāksādabhyudayanis'reyasahetuḥ//
- Sāṅkarabhāṣya on Bh.G. (Intro.) p.1
10. Cf.n.4 above.
11. Cf. n.2 above.
12. Atha trividhaduḥkhātyantānivṛttiratyan-tapurūṣārthah /
- Sāṅ.S. (I.1).
13. I) Purūṣārtha eva hetuḥ - Sāṅ.Kā.31; (II) Kṛtsnam puruṣasyār-
tham - Sāṅ.Kā.36; (III) Saiva ca puruṣārtham prati - Sāṅ.Kā.63;
(IV) Puruṣārthahetukamidam - Sāṅ.Kā.42; (V) Puruṣārthajñāna-
midam - Sāṅ.Kā.69. Vācaspati Misra explains - Bhogāpavarga-
lakṣaṇaḥ puruṣārthah /
14. Prakāś'akriyāsthitisīlam bhūten'driyātmakam bhogāpavargārtham
drśyam //
- Y.S. (II/18).
15. Pañcaviṃśatitattvajñāḥ yatra tatrā'srame vaset /
jaṭī muṇḍī sikhī vāpi mucyate nātra saṃsayaḥ //
- Gaudapāda's com. on Sāṅ.Kā.1, p.35.
16. Prasāṅkhyāne 'pyakusīdasya sarvathā vivekakhyā^{te}rdharmameghah
samādhiḥ /
- Y.S. (IV/29).

Vyasa on Y.S. I/15 -prasāṅkhyānābalādabhogātmikā.....

-do- II/2 -prasāṅkhyānāgninā dagdhabīja-

kalpānaprasavadharmināḥ kariṣyatīti/

17. Śuddhātmatattvavijñānam sāṅkhyamityabhidhīyate /

- Quoted by Dr.Cakravarti punimbihāri-

Origin & Development of the Sāṅkhya

System of Thought, p.1

18. Tatkāraṇam sāṅkhyayogādhighamyam

- Sve.Up.6/13.

19.Vaidikameva tatra jñānam dhyānam ca sāṅkhyayoga
śabdābhyāmahilapyate /

- Bh.S.S.(2/1/3).

20. Sāṅkhyā samyagbuddhirvaidikī tayā vartanta iti sāṅkhyāḥ //

- Bhāmatī on Bh.S.2/1/3.

21. Eṣā te'bhīhitā sāṅkhye buddhiryoge tvimāṃ sṛṇu /

- Bh.G.2/39a.

Sāṅkhyayogau pṛthagbālāḥ pravādanti na paṇḍitāḥ /

- Bh.G.5/4a.

Yatsāṅkhyaiḥ prāpyate sthānam tadyogairāpi gamyate /

ekam sāṅkhyam ca yogam ca yāḥ paśyati sa paśyati /

- Bh.G.5/5.

Anye sāṅkhyena yogena karmayogena cāpare /

- Bh.G.13/24b.

Sāṅkhye kṛtānte prōktāni siddhaye sarvakarmanām //

- Bh.G.18/13b.

22. Jñāyogena sāṅkhyānām karmayogena yoginām /
- Bh.G.3/3b.
Cf.n.21 above for Bh.G.5/5.
23. Six systems of Indian Philosophy, pp.224-229.
24. Dr.Sovani V.V. - A Critical Study of Sāṅkhya System, p.9.
25. Ibid.
26. Pradhānastitvamekatvamarthavatvamathānyatā /
pārārthyam ca tathānaikyam viyogo yoga eva ca //
Seṣavṛttirakarṭṛtvam maulikyārthāḥ smṛtā daśa //
- Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudī (on Sāṅ.Kā.
72, p.505), & Sarvopakārinī (com.
Tattvasamāsa, Sāṅkhyasaṅgraha), p.100
27. Maulikyasāṅkhyā hyātmanamātmanam prati pṛthak pṛthak
pradhānam vadanti / Uttare tu sāṅkhyāḥ sarvātmasvapyekam
nityam pradhānamiti pratipannāḥ //
- Com.on Ṣaddarśanasamuccaya Ka.36,
p.145.
28. Pratipurusaṃmanyat pradhānam śarīrādyaṛtham karoti /
Teṣāṃ ca māhātmyaśarīrapradhānam yadā pravartate, tadetāra-
nyapi, tannivṛttau ca teṣāṃapi nivṛttiriti paurikaḥ sāṅkhyā-
cārya manyate /
- Yuktidīpika, p.141.
29. Anekam vyaktam, ekamavyaktam, tathā pumānapyekāḥ /
- Com.on Sāṅ.Kā., 11, p.70.

30) Mātāpitṛjāḥ śatkausikāḥ tatra mātrto lomalohitamāmsāni,
pitṛtaḥ snāyavasthimajjānaḥ iti śatko gaṇaḥ /
- Sāṅkhyatattvakaumudī on Sāṅ.Kā.

31) Etat śatkausikam sarīram trīṇi pitṛta-strīṇi mātrtaḥ /
asthisnāyumajjānaḥ pitṛtaḥ tvaṅmāmsarudhirāṇi mātrtaḥ'iti
garbhopeniṣacchrutau 'majjāsthisnāyavaḥ sukrādraktāt
tvaṅmāmsasonitam / Iti śatkausiko nāma deho bhavati dehinām//
- Com.Sārābōdhini of Shivnarayan
Shastri on Sāṅ.Kā. (39), p.392.

Lomalohitamāmsāni jāyante māturasya yat /
pitussnāyavasthimajjānastataḥ śatkausikam vapuh //
- Sāṅkhyakārikā, Introduction
(Sāṅkhyabhūmikā), p.40.

32) Mātāpitṛjam sthūlam prāyasa itaranna tathā /
- Sāṅ.S. (3/7).

33) Tatraivāsitaḥ pītādhyāsādaḥtau (variant-tābhyām saḥāḥtau)
kosānapare vyācaksate /
- Yuktidīpikā, p.120.

34) Cf. Tvam jñānamayo vijñānamayo'si/.....Tvam vāṅmayastvam
cinmayah / Tvamānandamayastvam brahmamayah -
- Gaṇeśātharvaśirṣam.

35) Sāmānyakaraṇavṛttih prāṇādyā vāyavaḥ pañca //
- Sāṅ.Kā. 29.

36) Śarīrāntaḥsāncārī vāyuh prāṇah / Sa caiko'pyupādhibhedāt
prāṇapānādi samjñam labhate /

- Tarkasaṅgraha, p.38.

37) Hr̥di prāṇo gude'pāṇah samāno nābhisaṁsthitah /
Udānah kaṅṭhadesasthah vyānah sarvasarīragah //

-(Tarkasaṅgraha, footnote p.38,
Tarkabhāṣā-Notes p.195, Com. of
Bhāvāganeśa on Tattvasamāsa Sū.12).

38) Mm.Kane, P.V. - H.D.S., Vol.V, Pt.II, pp.1434-1435.

39) Ibid.

40) Ibid.

41) Dr.Cakravarti Punimbihari - Origin & Development of the Sāṅkhya
System of Thought - p.14.

42) Ibid, p.103.

43) Dr.Senagupta Anima - The Evolution of the Sāṅkhya School of
Thought, p.143.

44) Prof.Dasgupta Surendranath - A Hist. of Indian Philosophy,
Vol.I, p.214.

45) Pṛthivī ca pṛthivīmātrā cāpascāpomātrā ca tejaśca
tejomātrā ca vāyuśca vāyumātrā cākāśascākāśamātrā ca /

- Praśna Up. (4/8).

46) Pañcatanmātrā bhūtaśabdenocyante - Maitrāyaṇi Up. (3/2).

47) Kriyātantrāni pañcātha mātrātantrāni pañca ca /
bhūtatantrāni pañceti trimsad dve ca bhidāh imaḥ //

- Ahīrbudhnyā Saṁhita (XII-23), p.109.

48) Mbh.Anu.14/202 (Cr.ed.13/App.5/19), Mbh.Anu.96 (Cr.ed.13/
App.10/482), Mbh.Anu.145 (Cr.ed.13/App.15/4102-4103);
Mbh.Śānti.47 (Cr.ed.12/App.6/2), Mbh. (Cr.ed.12/App.26/30-50).

49) Mātrāsparaśāstu kaunteya śītośnasukhaduḥkhadāḥ /
- Bh.G.II/14a.

50) Bhūmirāpo'nalo vāyuh kham mano buddhireva ca /
- Bh.G.(VII /4).

Bhūmiriti pṛthivītanmātramucyate, na sthūlā /
'Bhinna prakṛtirastadheti vacanāt /
Tathā abādayo'pi tanmātrānyevocyante //

- Com.of Saṅkarācārya on Bh.G.(VII/4).

51) Khādīni buddhiravyaktamahānkārastathāstamah /
bhūtaprakṛtiruddiṣṭā vikārascaiva sōdāsa //
- Caraka (Śarīra-1/62)

Tatra tu prakṛtirnāma viddhi prakṛtikovida /
pañca bhūtānyahānkāram buddhiravyaktameva ca //

- Buddhā-carita (XII-18).

52) Anvyo mātrā vināśinyo daśārdhānām tu yāḥ smṛtāḥ /
tābhiḥ sardhamidam sarvam sambhavatyanupūrvasāḥ /

- Manu S.I/27.

53) Sthūlasvarūpasūksmānvayārthavātvasānyamād bhūtajayāḥ //

- Y.S.(3/43).

- Kimeṣāṃ sūksasvarūpam Tanmātram bhūtakāraṇam
ityevam sarvatannmātrānyetattṛtīyam /
- Vyāsa com. on Y.S.3/43.
- 54) Buddherutpattiravyaktāttato 'haṅkārasambhavaḥ /
tanmātrādīnyahaṅkāradekottaraguṇāni ca //
- Yāj.S.3/179.
Tanmātrānyavisesāḥ
- Sāṅ.Kā.(38).
- 55) Tathā kvacinmahatastanmātrasargamupadiśanti,
kvacidahaṅkārat /
- Bh.S.S.2/2/10.
- 56) Kale, M.R. - A Higher Sanskrit Grammar, Appendix pp.105-106.
- 57) Yogascittavṛttinirodhaḥ -
- Y.S.(I/2).
- 58) Yogah samādhiḥ
- Vyāsa's com. on Y.S.I/I.
- 59) Tasmin sati svāsprasvāsayorgativicchedaḥ prāṇāyāmaḥ /
- Y.S.2/49.
- 60) Bāhyābhyantarastambhavṛttirdesa-kālasaṅkhyābhiḥ paridrsto
dīrghasūksamaḥ /
- Y.S.2/50.
- 61) Pracchardanavidhāraṇābhyāṃ vā prāṇasya /
- Y.S.(1/34).

62. Nirodhaschardividhāranābhyām
- Sāñ.S.(3/33).
63. Prāṇāyāma ivāmbhobhiḥ sarasām kṛtapūrakaiḥ /
abhyasyate 'mudivasam recakākumbhakādibhiḥ //
- Vsn.P.V/10/15.
Pūrakaiḥ kumbhakas'caiva' recakastadanantaram /
prāṇāyāmastridhā jñeyah kaṇīyomadhyamottamah // etc.
- Cf. Brhadyogiyājñavalkya S.
(VIII/9-10 & 19-21).
64. Cf. note 60 above.
65. Evam mrdurevam madhya evam tīvro iti saṅkhyāparidrṣṭah /
- Vyāsa's com. on Y.S.2/50.
66. Mm.Kane, P.V.- H.D.S., Vol.V, Pt.II, p.1439, n.2363.
67. Svaviśayāsamprayoge cittasvarūpānukāra ivedriyānām pratyā-
hārah /
- Y.S.2/54.
68. Anuparimānam tatkr̥tisruteḥ /
- Sāñ.S.3/14.
69. Vṛttirevāsyā vibhunascittasyā saṅkocavikāsīnītyācāryāḥ /
- Com.of Vyāsa on Y.S.4/10.
70. Taccānuparimānam
- Tarkabhāṣā, p.75.
Tacca pratyātmanīyatatvādanantam paramānurūpam nityam ca /
- Tarkasaṅgraha, p.52.

71. Tarkabhāṣā-ed. by Gajendragadakar A.B. & Karmarkar, R.D.
- notes p.200.
72. Tatra prāyayaikatānata dhyānam /
- Y.S.(3/2).
Rāgopahatirdhyānam /
- Sāñ.S.(3/30).
Dhyānam nirviṣayam manah /
- Sāñ.S.(6/25).
73. Tattvamasi
- Chāndogya Up.6/8.
Tadbuddhayastadātmanastamniṣṭhāstatparāyanāḥ /
- Bh.G.5/17.
Cf.Com.of Śaṅkarācārya on Bh.G.5/17 & 2/16.
Tad iti sarvanāma sarvam ca brahma tasya nāma tad /
- Com.of Śaṅkarācārya on Bh.G.2/16.
- 74) Sthirasukhamāsanam /
- Y.S.(2/46), Sāñ.S.(3/34).
Sthirasukhamāsanamiti na niyamah /
- Sāñ.S.(6/24).
- 75) Paryāṅkabandhasthirapurvakāyam...../
- Kumārasmbhava (3/45).
.....Paryāṅkabandham nibidam bibheda //
- Kumārasmbhava (3/59).

76. Bhadrāsanopaviṣṭasya svastivācyā dvijāḥ śubhāḥ /Yāj.S.(I/278b)
Carmanyānaduḥe rakte sthāpyam bhadrāsanam tathā /
- Yāj.S.(I/280b).
77. Na ca padmāsanād yogo na nāsāgranirikṣaṇāt /
- Dakṣa S.(Ānandā ed.VII/5)
78. Ūrūsthottānacaranāḥ savye nyastetaram karam /
Uttānam kiñcidunnāmya mukham viṣṭabhya carasā /
- Yāj.S.(3/198).
79. Brahmācāryam satyavācanam savaneśūdakopasparśanamārdra-
vastratādhaḥśāyitānāsaka iti tapāṃsi/
- G.D.S.(III/1/15).
Ahimsā satyamastyainyam savaneśūdakopasparśanam gurusūsrūṣā
brahmācāryamadhāḥśāyamekavastratā'nāsaka iti tapāṃsi /
- B.D.S.(III/10/14).
80. Vyādhistyānasāṃśayapramādālasyāvīratibhrāntidarsānā-
labdhabhūmikatvānavasthitatvāni cittavikṣepāste'ntarāyāḥ //
-Y.S.1/30.
Tataḥ prātibhaśrāvanavedanādarsāsāvādavārtā jāyante /
- Y.S.3/35.
Te samādhāvupasargā vyutthāne siddhayaḥ
- Y.S.3/36.
81. Tatoḥimādiprādurbhāvāḥ kāyasampattaddharmanābhighātasca //
- Y.S.(3/44).
82. Kolhatkar, K.K. - Pātañjala Yogasūtra, p.441 on Y.S.3/45.

83. Vasitvam bhūtabautikesu vaśībhavatyavaśyaścānyeṣām /
 Īsitvam teṣām prabhavāpyayavyuḥanamiṣṭe /
 Yatra kāmavasāyitvam satyasankalpatā yathā sankalpastathā
 bhūtaprakṛtīnāmavasthānam /
 - Vyāsa's com. on Y.S.3/44.
84. Sopakramam nirupakramam ca karma, tatsamyamādaparāntajñāna-
 marīṣṭebhyo vā /
 - Y.S.(3/21).
85. Nīharadhūmārkānalānilānām khadyotavidyutsphatikasāśinām /
 etāni rūpāni puraḥsarāni brahmanyabhivyaktikarāni yoge //
 - Sve.Up.(2/11).
86. Mm.Kane, P.V. - H.D.S., Vol. IV, p.181.
87. Trividham narakasyedam dvāram nāśanamātmanah /
 kāmah krodhastathā lobhastasmādetattrayam tyajet //
 - Bh.G.(16/20).
88. Vitarkā himsādayahlobhakrodhamohapūrvakāh. . . .
 - Y.S.(2/34).
89. Paradravyeṣvabhidyānam manasāniṣṭacintanam /
 Vitathābhīniveśasca trividham karma mānasam //
 - Manu.S.(XII.5).
90. Pāruṣyamānṛtam caiva paisūmyam cāpi sarvaśah /
 asambaddhapralāpaśca vāñmayam syāccaturvidham //
 - Manu.S.(XII.6).

91. Adattānamupādānam hiṁsā caivā-vidhānataḥ /
paradāropasevā ca śārīram trividham smṛtam //'
- Manu.S. (XII/7).
92. Sarvābhakṣyabhakṣaṇamabhojyabhojanamapeyapānāgamyāgamanama-
yājyayājanamasatpratigrahaṇam paradārābhigamanam dravyā-
-paharaṇam prāṇihīṁsā ceti śārīrāṇi / Pāruṣyamaṇṛtam
vivādah śrutivikrayāśceti vā-cikāṇi / Paropatāpanam parābhi-
drohaḥ krodho lobho moho 'haṅkāraśceti mānasāṇi / Tadeṭānya-
-stādasanaireyāṇi karmāṇi /
- Harita quot. in P.M. Vol. II, Pt. II,
pp.212-213.
93. Jñānena cāpavargo viparyayādiṣyate bandhaḥ /
- Sāñ.Kā. (44b)
94. Trividho bandhaḥ
- Tattvasamāsa sūtra, 21.
Bandho Viparyayāt - Sāñ.S. (3/24)
95. Prakṛtena ca bandhena tathā vaikārikena ca /
dākṣiṇena tṛtīyena baddho nānyena mucyate /
- Com.of Gauḍapāda on Sāñ.Kā. 44.
96. Dharmādharmajñānajñānavairāgyāvairāgyāisvaryaṇaisvaryaṇi
aṣṭabhāvāḥ pūrvamuktāḥ, tatra, jñānam varjayitvā anyāṇi
sapta prakṛtirūpāṇi bandhahetavaḥ /
- Sārābodhini on Sāñ.Kā. 63.

97. Tadatyantavimokṣo 'pavargah

- Nya.S.I/I/22.

Tena duḥkhena janmanā atyantam vimuktirapavargah

- Vātsyāyana's com. on Nya.S.I/I/22.

Duḥkhajanmapravṛttidosamithyājñānānamuttarottarāpāye tadanam-
tarāpāyādapavargah

- Nya.S.I/1/2.

Mokṣo 'pavargah / Sa caikavimsatiprabhedabhinnasya duḥkhasyā-
tyantikī nivṛttih /

- Tarkabhāṣā, p.96.

.....Duhkhāpavargāstu prameyam /

- Nya.S.I/I/9.

Jñānena cāpavargo.....

- Sāñ.Kā.44.

.....Bhogāpavargārtham dr̥syam.....

- Y.S.II/18.

.....Kaivalyārtham pravṛttesca /

- Sāñ.Kā.17.

.....Kaivalyārtham tathā pradhānasya /

- Sāñ.Kā.21.

.....Ubhayam kaivalyamāpnoti /

- Sāñ.Kā.68.

The fourth pāda of Y.S. is called kaivalyapāda.

Tadabhāvāt.....tadr̥seḥ kaivalyam /

- Y.S.II/25.

Tadvairāgyādapi.....kaivalyam /

- Y.S.III/49.

Sattvapuruṣayoh̄ sūddhisāmye kaivalyam /

- Y.S. III/49.

....Tadā vivekanimnam kaivalyaprāgbhāram cittam /

- Y.S. IV/26.

Puruṣārthasūnyānām....kaivalyam svarūpapratisthā vā
citisaktih

- Y.S. IV/34.

98. Nānandābhivyaktirmuktirnirdharmakatvāt //

- Sāñ.S. (5/74).

Na viśeṣagatirnikriyasya /

- Sāñ.S. (5/76).

Sāmyogāśca viyogāntā iti na deśādilābho'pi /

- Sāñ.S. (5/80).

Nendradīpadayogo'pi tadvat /

- Sāñ.S. (5/83).

99. Duḥkhatrayābhigāt.....

- Sāñ.Kā. 1

Nānandābhivyaktirmuktirnirdharmatvāt /

- Sāñ.S. (5/74).

100. Tadabhāve sāmyogābhāvo' prādurbhāvaḥ sa mokṣaḥ /

- Vaiśeṣika sūtra (5/2/20).

101. Atah param brahmabhūto bhūtātma nopalabhyate /

nisṛtaḥ sarvabhāvebhyascihnam yasya na vidyate //

Gatirbrahmavidām brahma taccākṣaramalakṣaṇam /

Jñānam brahmavidām cātra nājñastajjñānātumarhati //

- Caraka (Śārīra I/155-156).

Nivṛttirapavargastatparam prasāntam tadakṣaram tad brahma
sa mokṣah /

- Caraka (Śārīra V/21).

Vipāpam virajah śāntam paramakṣaramavyayam /

amṛtam brahmanirvāṇam paryāyair śāntirucyate //

- Caraka (Śārīra V/33).

Etat tat paramam brahma nirliṅgam dhruvamakṣaram /

Yanmokṣa iti tattvajñāḥ kathayanti manīṣiṇah //

- Buddhacarita (XII/65).

102. e.g. Cf. Puṇyapāpaksayārtham hi sāṅkhyajñānam vidhīyate /

tatksaye hyasya pasyanti brahmabhāve parām gatim //

- Mbh. Śānti. 275/39. (Cr. ed. 12/267/38).

SECTION : II

(A) DEVALA'S INDEBTEDNESS TO THE WORKS ON SĀṆKHYA & YOGA :

INTRODUCTORY :

The various tenets of Sāṅkhya & Yoga systems have been dealt with by Devala. Even Śāṅkarācārya, (Bh.S.1/4/28) explicitly mentions¹ that the Dharmasūtrakāras like Devala etc. accepted the pradhānakāranavāda (doctrine of prakṛti being the cause of the world) in their treatises. Several distinctive philosophical features, as found in the exposition of Sāṅkhya & Yoga by Devala, have been dealt with in the previous section. It is now necessary to study how far Devala is indebted to the extant Sāṅkhya & Yoga works. It is the most pertinent question, whether Devala has based his doctrines upon the extant Sāṅkhya & Yoga works or he is indebted to ancient works, prior to extant ones.

POINTS OF AGREEMENT :

Many ancient works on Sāṅkhya & Yoga philosophy have been completely lost. The sāṅkhyakārikā, the sāṅkhyasūtra & the Tattvasamāsa are the most important extant sāṅkhya works, that contain several points of agreement both verbal & doctrinal - with the sūtras of Devala. Such points of parity between Devala & the sāṅkhyakārikā, the sāṅkhyasūtra & the Tattvasamāsa sūtra are noted² here for the comparative study.

TABLE NO. 13

<u>Devala</u>	<u>Sāṅkhyakārikā</u>
(1)Ekā Mūlaprakṛtiḥ - 2211 Sarvapūrvikā prakṛtiḥ - 2258	Mūlaprakṛtiravikṛtiḥ - 3a
(2) Sapta prakṛtivilkṛtayaḥ - 2212 Mahadahaṅkārāu - 2213 Pañcatanmātrāni - 2214	Mahadādyāḥ prakṛtivilkṛtayaḥ Sapta - 3b -
(3) Ṣoḍāśa vikārāḥ - 2215	Ṣoḍa-śakastu vikārāḥ - 3c
(4) Trayodaśa Karanāni -2218	Karanam trayodaśavidham -32
(5) Tesām trīnyantaḥkaranāni - 2219	Antaḥkaranam trividham - 33
(6) Daśa bahiṣkaranāni -2220	Dāśadhā bāhyam - 33
(7) Pañca Vāyaviśeṣāḥ - 2222Vāyavaḥ Pañca - 29
(8) Trayo guṇāḥ -2223guṇāḥ /12-13
(9) Trīni pramānāni -2227	Trividham pramānam -4
(10) Trividham duḥkham -2228	Duḥkhatrayābhighātāt1
(11) Caturvidhaḥ pratyaḃava(sa)rgaḥ -2229	Eṣa pratyaḃava(sar)go Viparyayā- śaktituṣṭisiddhyākhyāḥ -46
(12) Tathā dvividhaḥ sargaḥ-2230Dvividhaḥ pravartate sargaḥ

Devala

- 19) Cakṣuḥśrotraḡhrāṇāḡjihvātvaco
buddhīndriyāṇi -2242
- 20) Vagpāṇipāda-pāyūpasthāḡ
Karmendriyāṇi -2244
- 21) Rūpaśabdagandharasasparśās-
teṣāmarthāḡ -2243
- 22) Bhāṣaṇam Kriyā gamanam utsarga
ānanda eṣāṃ Karmāṇi -2245
- 23) Vayvagnyabākāsaprthivyo
bhūtaviśeṣāḡ -2246
- 24) Adhyavasāyalakṣaṇo mahān2251
- 25) Abhimānalakṣaṇo'haṅkāraḡ2252
- 26) Sattāmātralakṣaṇāṇi
tanmātrāṇi -2253
- 27) Saṅkalpalakṣaṇam Manah/2256
- 28) Prakṛtermahānutpadyate/Mahato'haṅkāraḡ/
Ahaṅkārat tanmātrāṇīndriyāṇi ca/
Tanmātrebhyo Viśeṣā

Sāṅkhyakārikā

- Buddhīndriyāṇi cakṣuḥ śrotra -
ghrāṇarasanatvagākhāṇi -26
- Vagpāṇipādapāyūpasthāḡ
Karmendriyāṇyāḡhuh -26
- Śabdādīṣu pañcāṇām28
- Pañcaviśeṣāviśeṣaviśayāṇi ...34
- Vacanādānaviharaṇotsargānandā-śca
pañcāṇām -28
- Tanmātrāṇyaviśeṣāstebhyo
bhūtāṇi pañca pañcabhyaḡ -38
- Adhyavasāyo buddhiḡ23
- Abhimāno'haṅkāraḡ24
- Tanmātrāṇyavi'seṣāḡ38
- Ubhayātmakamatra Manah
Saṅkalpakam27
- Prakṛtermahāmstato'haṅkārastasmād
gaṇāśca ṣoḡāśakaḡ/
Tasmādapi ṣoḡā'sakāḡ pañcabhyaḡ .

REMARKS :

The comparative account about the similarity between Devalasūtras & the above three extant sāṅkhya works, would suggest at least the following two facts, (1) Devala may be indebted to the above extant sāṅkhya works or (2) Devala & all the above three sāṅkhya works may be indebted to some other ancient & prior but lost sāṅkhya works, which may be the source of all of them & thus the occurrence of identical matter can be explicable.

Of the above two facts, the first one is not acceptable, as (1) it has been previously emphasized that though there are several points of agreement between Devala & the extant sāṅkhya works, there are various points of disagreement also between the two, which definitely suggest that the later works are not the basis of Devala-sūtras. Moreover, Devala also like the sāṅkhyakārikā, explicitly mentions his indebtedness to the ancient, inscrutable & voluminous sāṅkhyayoga treatises (Tantras), (2210).

OPINION OF PANDITA UDAYAVIRA SHASTRI :

Pandita Udayavira Shastri³ has given great importance to some of the passages of Devala to solve the chronological problems, regarding the extant sāṅkhya works. He has pointed out that some of the sūtras of Devala are identical with those of the Tattva-samāsa & the sāṅkhyasūtra, while there are some other sūtras of Devala, which are very close to the sāṅkhyasūtra & the Tattvasamāsa though the words are slightly different.

On the basis of such resemblances, he advocates that Devala had before him the extant sāṅkhyasūtra work & is indebted to it. He is not ready to accept the view that the sāṅkhyasūtra work itself has taken those sūtras from the work of Devala. He is also not prepared to believe that Devala is indebted to some other ancient lost sāṅkhya works.

Devala explicitly mentions his indebtedness to the Tantra work of sāṅkhya and this work, Pandita Udayavira Shastri maintains, is the ṣaṣṭitantra only. This ṣaṣṭitantra is the extant sāṅkhya-sūtra, work in six adhyāyas. This is the most peculiar view of the above author, explained by him in his book.

The Sāṅkhyakārikā, which is generally accepted to be the most ancient extant sāṅkhya-work, is advocated to be a work, later than the extant sāṅkhyasūtra & hence he is not ready to accept the view of Devala's indebtedness to the Sāṅkhyakārikā, because he places Devala in a period much earlier than that of Īśvarakṛṣṇa.

He also argues that there is no passage of Devala, that has any kind of similarity with the Sāṅkhyakārikā, while such relation of resemblance is too close in case of the sāṅkhyasūtra & Tattvasamāsa, with the sūtras of Devala.

HIS CONCLUSION :

To sum pup, he tries to prove that Devala is earlier to the Sāṅkhyakārikā & is not indebted to it in any way & that Devala is very much indebted to the sāṅkhyasūtra & Tattvasamāsa,

which he had before him, while writing the said passages. But the Sāṅkhyasūtra alone is the earliest extant sāṅkhya work to which Devala is heavily indebted.

CRITICISM :

(1) The above view of the author mainly rests upon the presumption of the priority of the sāṅkhyasūtra to the Sāṅkhyakārikā. This view is not generally accepted by the scholars. Most of the Western & Indian scholars, maintain the Sāṅkhyakārikā to be the earliest extant sāṅkhya work. Prof. Dasgupta⁴ believes the sāṅkhya-sūtras to be "probably written sometimes after 14th century". Prof. V.V. Sovani remarks that the Tattvasamāsa is a work "older than 7th century A.D."

(2) The argument from parity is not a solid proof for proving the priority or posterity of any work. The similarity may be due to some common source. Similarly, there are also some distinct conflicting views, which may on the same standpoint, suggest that the other work is not the basis of it.

(3) The view of Pandita Udayavira Shastri that there is no passage of Devala, which can be shown to have any kind of resemblance with the Sāṅkhyakārikā is quite baseless. The comparative statement about Devala & the Sāṅkhyakārikā, mentioned previously (Table No.13) can disprove this view of his.

(4) It is improper to deny any independent earlier source, being the basis of the sūtras of Devala, the sāṅkhyasūtras & the

& the Tattvasamāsasūtras, because there is no proof to prove that Devala alone is basis of the Sāṅkhyasūtra & the Tattvasamāsa or the otherwise. Some ancient lost work, being the basis of all of them is quite presumable. Devala has admitted his indebtedness to the Tantras of Sāṅkhya-Yoga (2210).

(5) It was explained in the previous part, how some of the theories & doctrines of exposition of Devala, have no parallel in the extant works, while some tenets are quite distinct & conflicting with the extant Sāṅkhya works. Hence Devala cannot be said to be indebted to the extant Sāṅkhya works.

DEVALA'S INDEBTEDNESS :

In the last chapter, the author himself admits his indebtedness to the ancient, profound & extensive Sāṅkhyayoga Tantras for his exposition of Sāṅkhya & Yoga. This statement of Devala (2210) is very important from various points of view.

IMPLICATIONS :

It follows from the statement of Devala that - (1) Devala had before him many (not one, or two, but plural indicates many) Tantras, treating both Sāṅkhya & Yoga philosophy. They were written by ancient scholars & sages. They were voluminous, inscrutable & based upon logic & convention. They were probably containing treatment of both Sāṅkhya & Yoga, without any distinct discrimination. Devala also followed the same pattern. The Tantras were very extensive, hence Devala has abridged & briefly mentioned them in his treatise.

(2) None of the extant Sāṅkhya works (viz. the Sāṅkhyakārikā, the Sāṅkhyasūtra & the Tattvasamāsa) have been traditionally accepted to be the Tantra works of Sāṅkhya. On the other hand, there are some evidences⁶ to believe that there were voluminous & instrutable treatises on Sāṅkhyayoga (as Devala, Sāṅkhyakārikā, Sāṅkarācārya etc. mention), which were called Tantras. It can also be maintained that even Devala, Īśvarakṛṣṇa & Sāṅkarācārya etc. had access to such ancient works.

(3) Devala does not intend to refer to the extant Sāṅkhya works. These cannot be described to be 'Viśālāni gambhīrāni tantrāni' (R.F.Sr.2210).

The exposition of Yoga is also not in accordance with the extant Yogasūtra. There is no sūtra of Devala that is identical with that of the Yogasūtra. The definitions & explanations of various yogic terms are not in conformity with the extant Yogasūtra. This was explained elaborately in the previous section.

CONCLUSION :

Devala is not all indebted to the extant works on Sāṅkhya & Yoga. His exposition is based upon the ancient, voluminous & instrutable treatises (known as Tantras) of Sāṅkhya-yoga (as he himself has explicitly admitted (2210)).

REFERENCES

1. Sa ca devalādibhiḥ kaisciddharmasūtrakāraih svagranthesvāsritah/
tena tatpratishedhe yano'tīva kṛto nānvādikāraṇavādapratishedhe //
- Bh.S.S. (I/4/28).
2. Cf. Table No.13.
3. Cf. Sāṅkhya Darśanakā Itihāsa, p.209.
4. A Hist.of Indian Philosophy, Vol.I, p.222.
5. The Critical Study of Sāṅkhya System, p.9.
6. I. Brhaccaivamidam sāstramityāhurviduṣo janāḥ /
- Mbh.Sānti.307/46 (Cr.ed.12/295/44)
Sāṅkhyam viśālam paramam purānam /
301/114
- Mbh.Sānti (Cr.ed.12/290/109)
Sāṅkhyam ca yogam ca sanātane dve /
- Mbh.Sānti.349/73 (Cr.ed.12/337/68)
II. Saṣṭitantrānyathaikaikamesām nānāvidham mune /
- Ahīrbudhnya Saṁ.XII/30.
Viṣṇusaṅkalparūpam ca mahadyogaṇusāsanam /
- Ahīrbudhnya Saṁ.XII/31-38.
III. Etatpavitramagryam munirāsuraye'nukampayā pradadam /
āsūrirapi pañcasikhāya tena ca bahudhā kṛtam tantram /
'Sīsyaparamparayā"gatamiśvarakṛṣṇena caitadāryābhiḥ /
Sāṅksiptamāryamatinaḥ samyag viśṇūyā siddhāntam //

Saptatyām kila ye 'rthāste 'rthāḥ kṛtsnasya śaṣṭitantrasya /
ākhyāyikā virahitāḥ paravādavivarjitāścāpi //

- Sān.Kā.70-72.

IV. Tantrasya ca br̥hanmūrterdarpanasāṅkrāntamiva bimbam /

- Sān.Kā.Last additional verse

read by Māthara.

V. Pañcasikhena muninā bahudhā kṛtam tantram - śaṣṭitantrākhyam
śaṣṭikhāṇḍam kṛtamiti / Tatraiva hi śaṣṭīrarthāḥ vyākhyātāḥ/

- Jayamaṅgalā on Sān.Kā.70.

VI. Tattvam jijnāsamanāya viprāyāsurye munih /
Yadvāca mahattantram dukhatrayanivṛttaye /
na tasyādhigamaḥ śakyah kartum varśaṣṭairapi //

- Yuktidīpikā, p.1.

VII. Tathā cōktam / Ādividvānnirmānacittamadhīṣṭhāya
Kārunyād bhagavān paramarsīrāsurye jijnāsamanāya
tantram provāca /

- Vyāsa's com. on Y.S.I/25.

VIII. Smṛtisca tantrākhyā paramarsīpranītā śiṣṭaparigrhītā

- Bh.S.S.(II/1/1).

.....Mahājanaparigrhītāni mahānti sāṅkhyāditantrāni
samayagdarsanāpadesena pravṛttānyupalabhya.....

- Bh.S.S.(II/2/1).

(B) DEVALA - A BRAHMAVĀDĪ SĀṆKHYA : (A HAPPY BLENDING OF SĀṆKHYA AND VEDĀNTA) :

DEVALA - A SĀṆKHYA :

From the foregoing discussion, it would be clear that Devala was an expounder of Sāṅkhya & Yoga philosophy, In the chapter II-II (of part I, sect.I) of the present thesis, several references from the Mahābhārata & other works have been mentioned, which corroborate the above view of Devala, being the propounder of Sāṅkhya doctrine. Thus both external & internal evidences would prove the fact that Devala was a thinker of Sāṅkhya philosophy.

DEVALA - A BRAHMAVĀDĪ SĀṆKHYA :

But it was also previously clarified that Devala's exposition does not completely agree with the classical & orthodox Sāṅkhya tenets. There are, no doubt, points of parity or resemblance between them. But there are also numerous other facts, that do not corroborate with the extant works of classical Sāṅkhya system. This point was also emphasized in the previous discussions. The classical Sāṅkhya, maintains dualism, with the admittance of two fundamental principles of prakṛti & puruṣa; while Devala admits the third principle, namely the Brahman, also (2473). This is the fundamental difference between Devala & the classical Sāṅkhya view.

The Sāṅkhya philosophy as expounded in the Sāṅkhyakārikā, represents the extreme form of dualism. But the pre-kārikā-sāṅkhya was different. The Sāṅkhya accounts, found in the Mahābhārata,

Caraka, Buddhacarita etc., do not contribute to the extreme dualistic position of Sāṅkhya. But they admit¹ in their exposition the third principle of Brahman. Thus the pre-kārikā-sāṅkhya as expounded in the above works, was somewhat theist & non-dualistic & the same kind of philosophical doctrine is propounded by the author in the present text.

Moreover, it seems from the statement of Devala (2204-2210) that even the two systems, Sāṅkhya & Yoga, were also not completely separate from each other & were expounded as two paths, leading to the identical goal, in those ancient treatises called Tantras.

To sum up, like the pre-kārikā early Sāṅkhya philosophy, Devala was also a Sāṅkhya thinker, believing in the doctrine of Brahman. In other words, Devala was a Brahmavādī-Sāṅkhya.

DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE PHILOSOPHY OF DEVALA & ŚĀṆKARĀCĀRYA :

Śāṅkarācārya has explicitly referred to Devala in the commentary on Brahmasutras² (I/4/28). He might have had access to the lost text of Devala, that expounded the Sāṅkhya doctrine, but the statement of Śāṅkarācārya seems to indicate his dissent towards the treatment of Sāṅkhya by Devala. He was genuinely a Dharmasūtrakāra & hence his main aim was to propound Dharma. Moreover, he was also śiṣṭa, the follower of vedic religion & yet he followed the realistic Sāṅkhya doctrine, that propounded the prakṛti to be the cause of the world. This attitude of Devala is quite improper. The Sāṅkhya philosophy was the pradhānamalla for

Śaṅkarācārya & even the followers of vedic religion like Devala etc. should follow it, is a discouraging fact.

But from the point of belief in the doctrine Brahman, Devala is quite close to Śaṅkarācārya. Moreover, Śaṅkarācārya³, himself admits that the sāṅkhya philosophy is quite close to the vedic darsana (which he was expounding) & was, therefore, even admitted by some śiṣṭas like Devala etc. But yet there is a fundamental difference between Śaṅkarācārya & the classical sāṅkhya. The classical sāṅkhya philosophy is dualistic. It admits two separate principles namely prakṛti & puruṣa. The pre-kārikā sāṅkhya, (expounded in Mahābhārata, Caraka, Buddhacarita etc.) maintains the separate existence of two principles of prakṛti & puruṣa, though it admits the doctrine of Brahman. While Śaṅkarācārya admits only one principle namely Brahman from the transcendental point of view. The Brahman is the only principle from which the creation, maintenance & destruction of the entire world follows. The Brahman is not only the efficient but also material cause of the world⁴. Here Devala differs from Śaṅkarācārya. Though admitting the doctrine of Brahman, he does not maintain it to be source or material cause of the world. Prakṛti is admitted to be material cause of the world. Śaṅkarācārya has intentionally rebuked particularly this aspect of Devala's exposition that he believed in the pradhānakāranavāda.

Another difference, which is a corollary of the above fundamental disagreement, is the admittance of doctrine of puruṣārthavāda. Devala, like the sāṅkhyas, believes in two separate principles

of puruṣa & prakṛti & hence there can be relation of enjoyer & the thing, enjoyed (bhogya & bhoktā). The sāṅkhyas maintain the puruṣārtha to be of two kinds. (1) bhoga (enjoyment) & (2) apavarga (emancipation from the prakṛti). Devala, influenced by these theories propounds the Dharma to be constituting of twofold puruṣārtha, namely - abhyudaya & niḥsreyasa. But from the standpoint of Śaṅkarācārya, there is only one principle in reality & hence there can be no such relation of bhogya & bhoktā from the transcendental point of view. He maintains⁵ that there is no relation of artha & arthī, which suggests that there is no scope for the puruṣārthavāda in reality.

From the practical, pragmatic standpoint, the practice of Dharma, sacrifices⁶ etc. is quite necessary for the purification of mind & can gradually lead to the salvation, according to Śaṅkarācārya. Sacrifices are nitya or compulsory & not kāmya (intentional). While acc. to Devala, the sacrifices are kāmya or (intentional) & hence are optional. He seems to follow sāṅkhya doctrine that sacrifices cannot lead to salvation. Thus Śaṅkarācārya has upheld the vedic religion in high esteem, by assigning proper scope to sacrifices, in his philosophy, while Devala, following the Sāṅkhyas seems to have minimized the importance of sacrificial ritual.

According to the followers of Sāṅkhya doctrine, there are only two alternatives from the practical point of view - (1) Enjoy the world - (i.e. bhoga, or abhyudaya etc. according to Devala) & (2) leave it for ever - (i.e. apavarga or niḥsreyasa acc. to Devala). But the difficulty regarding Devala's philosophical

standpoint is that - he neither fully agrees with the Sāṅkhya doctrine nor entirely with vedic religion, as expounded by Sāṅkarācārya. On one hand, he admits the Sāṅkhya dualism, from the philosophical standpoint - with addition of Brahman as ultimate reality - but is genuinely an expounder of Dharma, derived from the vedic authority.

CONCLUSION :

In short, Devala, the follower of vedic religion, expounded also the ancient Sāṅkhya Yoga philosophy, that admitted even the doctrine of Brahman.

REFERENCES

1. Cf. Chakravarti, Punimbihari - Origin & Development of the Sāṅkhya system of Thought, p.26.
2. Sa ca kāryakāraṇānanyatvābhyupagamātpṛatyāsanno vedāntavādasya/
Devalaprabhrtibhisca kaisciddharmasūtrakāraih svāgranthe-
svāsritah, tena tatpṛatiseḍhe yatno'tīva kṛto nānvādikāraṇa-
vādapṛatiseḍhe //
- Bh.S.S. (I/4/28).

Vaidikasya darśanasya pṛatyāsannavādgurutaratarkabalopetatvād
vedānusāribhisca kaiscicchistaiḥ kenacidāmsena parigrhītavāt
pradhānakāraṇavādam.....sistairmanuvyāsaprabhrtibhiḥ kenacida-
msena parigrhītā ye 'nvādikāraṇavādāste'pi....
- Bh.S.S. (II/1/12).
3. Ibid.
4. Prakṛtisca pṛatijñādr̥ṣṭāntānuparodhāt /
- Bh.S. (I/4/23).

Prakṛtisca upādānakāraṇam ca brahmābhyupagantavyam,
nimittakāraṇam ca /
- Bh.S.S. (I/4/23).
5. Arthī cārthascānyonyabhinnau lakṣyete /
.....Aprāpte hyarthe'rthino'rthitvam syāditi /.....
tasmād bhinnāvetāvārthārthināu /....Atrocyate-na,
ekatvādeva tapyatāpakabhāvanupapatteh/
- Bh.S.S. (II/2/10).

6. Cf. Agnihotrādi tu tatkāryāyaiva taddarsanāt /

- Bh.S. . (IV/1/16) & Śaṅkarācārya's
com. on it.