On Vācaspatimiśra's Explanation of the Cause of *saṃyoga*

Koki ARUGA

Vyāsa refers to eight kinds of interpretation of *adarśana* in his *Yogabhāṣya* (YB).¹⁾ They are worth examining from the viewpoint of Sāṃkhya studies. I shall focus on two of them and discuss the cause of *saṃyoga* in Sāṃkhya and Yoga texts with special reference to Vācaspatimiśra's explanation of *adarśana* in his *Tattvavaiśārādī* (TV). The two are as follows: 1) *guṇānām adhikārah* 2) *arthavattā guṇānām*.

The *Yogasūtra* (YS) says that *avidyā* is the cause of *saṃyoga*.²⁾ *Samyoga* is, on the one hand, described as the cause of unfavorable things (*duḥkha*).³⁾ However, on the other hand, YS 2.23 tells us that *saṃyoga* which is caused by *avidyā* brings the perception of capabilities (*śaktis*) of *puruṣa* and *prakṛti*. This perception seems favorable to humans. Vyāsa interprets the perception of objects and of the Seer as *bhoga* (experience) and *apavarga* (liberation) respectively.⁴⁾ But he carefully tells us, in commenting on YS 2.23, that *saṃyoga* is not the cause of *mokṣa*. He explains that *darśana*, which is the opposite of *adarśana*, is the cause of separation between *puruṣa* and *prakṛti*, and he asserts *adarśana* to be the cause of *saṃyoga*. His comment makes it clear that *adarśana* is, in his mind, functionally equivalent to *avidyā*.

Nevertheless, when we consider this idea, we cannot but feel unsettled in the explanation of the relation of *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* in the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* (SK), for we cannot find that either *adarśana* or *avidyā* play any important role in it.⁵⁾ When he explains the cause of *saṃyoga*, Īśvarakṛṣṇa only states: *puruṣaya darśanārthaṃ kaivalyārthaṃ tathā pradhānasya*.⁶⁾ The commentators primarily follow the view that *saṃyoga* is for the sake of *puruṣa*'s seeing primordial matter as well as his absolute isolation. What is to be noticed is that their commentaries introduce the idea of *upacāra* (metaphor) in explaining

the relation of *puruṣa* and *prakṛti*.⁷⁾ In this idea, the conjunction (*saṃyoga*) of *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* is a metaphorical expression and there is no real 'conjunction' of the two.

The author of the *Yuktidīpikā* (YD) tries to make the idea of *upacāra* understandable. He declares that the relation of *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* is proximity (*sannidhi*).⁸⁾ According to him, *saṃyoga* is possible where any *saṃyogas* enumerated by his opponent do not exist.⁹⁾ He states as follows: *anyas tu śāstrīyaḥ saṃyogo'rthanimittaḥ* (While another '*saṃyoga*' which is scriptural is that which is occasioned by purpose).¹⁰⁾ The adjective '*śāstrīya*' in his statement cannot be overlooked. Although it is clearly meant that the *saṃyoga* in the *kārikā* is '*śāstrīya*' and is understood as '*arthanimitta*', it is not clear whether '*śāstrīya*' is used so as to refer directly to Īśvarakṛṣṇa's *kārikā* or rather merely to imply a certain authoritative source.

Explanatory descriptions of the real relation between *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* are often given using the concept of *yogyatā*.¹¹⁾ However, there may arise the problem: if *yogyatā* belonged to *puruṣa*, could *puruṣa* really be liberated? Or can *puruṣa* intrinsically be isolated, as SK says? Even if *saṃyoga* is *yogyatā*, the result is the same. In fact, we find the view that *saṃyoga* is *yogyatā* in the *Tattvakaumudī*. It is offered as the objection by Vācaspatimiśra to introduce SK66¹²⁾, which only says that no further creation takes place in spite of *saṃyoga* because there is no motive for it. In addition, the author of YD refers to *saṃyoga* which is characterized by *yogyatā* as one of the *saṃyogas* enumerated by the opponent.¹³⁾ Therefore, it should be noted that *yogyatā* cannot be *saṃyoga* in itself. Thus, the *saṃyoga* which is construed as *yogyatā* is not necessarily favorable to the Sāṃkhya philosophy. The contexts in which *yogyatā* is employed are considered to require the conditions of metaphorical expression.¹⁴⁾

Furthermore, YD refers to certain *ācāryas*' view of bondage. According to this, the *ācāryas* call *saṃyoga* '*adhikārabandha*'.¹⁵⁾ P. Chakravarti pointed out that *adhikārabandha* was refuted by Kumārila in his *Śloka-vārttika*.¹⁶⁾ Neither of these texts give us enough information about who the *ācāryas* are. However, it can be said that *adhikāra*, in the view of some Sāṃkhya teachers,

is of great importance in explaining the relation between *puruṣa* and *pradhāna*.

It is possible to ask if the *adhikāra* and the *arthavattva* of *guṇas* in YB share the same sources with the references made by the author of the YD and Kumārila. However our materials are not sufficient to draw a conclusion. For instance, while '*adhikāra*' is explained as '*yogyatva*' in the *Ślokaavārttika*, the author of YD does not refer to '*yogyatva* (*tā*)' when he discusses the *ācāryas*' view of *adhikārabandha*. What we can say is that there still is the fact that *adhikāra* and *arthavattva* seem to be ideas held by Sāṃkhya teachers.

Vācaspatimiśra describes Vyāsa's eight kinds of interpretation of the word '*adarśana*' as Sāṃkhya tenets in TV on YB 2. 23.¹⁷⁾ However he does not refer to their sources. He mainly shows that these interpretations are derived from the negative prefix 'a-' in *adarśana*. It is well known that, according to one popular formation of the grammarians, the negative prefix 'a-' can give six different meanings. Which meaning it has is dependent upon what the negated compound denotes. And the functions of this negative prefix are called *prasajyapraṭiṣedha* and *pariyudāsa*. Vācaspatimiśra, when he comments on *adarśana* in YB 2. 23, introduces these terms. He means that six Sāṃkhya tenets concerning the interpretation of the word '*adarśana*' are explained by the two types of negation. But there is a difficulty in believing that the Sāṃkhya teachers regarded *adarśana*, the cause of *saṃyoga*, as to be interpreted in the meanings of *prasajyapraṭiṣedha* and *pariyudāsa* because there is no evidence offered for this. It is not even certain that the other commentators consider all of the interpretations of the the word '*adarśana*' to be those of Sāṃkhya teachers. Vyāsa only states that these interpretations are mentioned in the *śāstra*¹⁸⁾ and the *Yogaśāstravivaraṇa* explains that the *śāstras* are *darśanāntaras*.¹⁹⁾

In spite of the explanation in TV, there is no evidence that the six kinds of interpretation of *adarśana* are connected with *prasajyapraṭiṣedha* and *pariyudāsa* in other Sāṃkhya and Yoga texts. They do not completely match the meanings which the negative prefix 'a-' gives. Therefore it is difficult to suppose that all six of them are originally based on the prefix 'a-' in *adarśana*. It is rather possible that Vācaspatimiśra only followed Vyāsa and gave the

explanation.

Why did Vācaspatimiśra introduce *prasajyapratishedha* and *paryudāsa*? As we have seen above, *arthavattā* in Sāṃkhya is said to be of *puruṣa*, while in YB it is of *guṇas*. There is a similarity in employing it to explain the cause of *saṃyoga*, but differentiation is required by the consideration of its locus. Vācaspatimiśra rejected the *arthavattā* in YB.²⁰⁾ If he had intended to cover all of the Sāṃkhya views on the cause of *saṃyoga*, he should have referred to 'artha' in SK. However the *arthavattā* in YB is of *guṇas* only. By adopting *prasajyapratishedha* and *paryudāsa* in his comment on six of Vyāsa's eight kinds of interpretation of *adarśana*, he restricted his explanation of the cause of *saṃyoga* to the attributions of *guṇas*. In this way he could leave the *arthavattā* of *puruṣa* uninjured.

1) *The Yogasūtras of Patañjali with the Scholium of Vyāsa and the Commentary of Vācaspatimiśra*, ed. by R.S. Bodas, Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series XLVI, 1917, pp. 93-95. In this paper I make use of this edition of the *Yogasūtra*, the *Yogabhāṣya* and the *Tattvavaiśārādī*.

2) YS 2. 24.

3) YS 2. 17.

4) YB, p. 92.

5) Cf. P. Chakravarti, *Origin and Development of the Sāṃkhya System of Thought*, 1975², p. 140.

6) SK 21.

7) For instance, see *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō* No. 2137, *Sāṃkhyavṛtti* and *Sāṃkhya-saptativṛtti* on SK 20.

8) R.C. Pandeya, *Yuktidīpikā*, p. 89¹⁻². Here I use proximity for *sannidhi*. The author of YD grounds the usage of *sannidhi* on occupying the same spot which is figuratively expressed.

9) Similar enumerations of the *saṃyogas* are, as already pointed out, found in the *Māṭhara*, the *Sāṃkhyasaptativṛtti* and the *Jayamaṅgalā*. Cf. E.A. Solomon, *The Commentaries of the Sāṃkhya Kārikā—A Study*, p. 50. Here we have to pay attention to the enumeration in the Vaiśeṣika doctrine. Cf. *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* 7.2.10 (Here I follow the numbering in the text of G.O.S. 136.). In YD the opponent says: "*viññatam saṃyogadvayam*." What '*saṃyogadvayam*' indicates is not clear. However, if it indicates *karmaja* and *saṃyogaja*, it reminds us of the classification of *saṃyoga* in the *Prāśastapādabhāṣya*.)

(36) On Vācaspatimiśra's Explanation of the Cause of *saṃyoga* (K. ARUGA)

10) pp. 88-89.

11) Cf. M. Hulin, *Sāṃkhya Literature*, A History of Indian Literature Vol. VI, p. 147.

12) S.A. Srinivasan, *Vācaspatimiśras Tattvakaumudī*, Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 12, p. 172.

13) p. 88.

14) For instance, *puruṣa* and *pradhāna* are inevitably called *bhoktr* and *bhogya* respectively.

15) pp. 89-90.

16) P. Chakravarti, *op. cit.*, p. 233.

17) pp. 93-95. These can be presented as follows: a) *adhikāra* of the *guṇas* b) non production of primary mind c) *arthavattā* of the *guṇas* d) *avidyā* (nescience) or the seed of mind e) the manifestation of *saṃskāra* for production f) the cognitive faculty g) the characteristic of *puruṣa* and *pradhāna* h) the knowledge (of sounds, touches and so on) which is comprehension.

—relative to *guṇas*: h); a), c), d), e) and f) (These are explained in the meaning of *paryudāsa*.); b) (This is explained in the meaning of *prasajyaapratiṣedha*.)

—relative to *puruṣa* and *guṇas*: g)

Vācaspatimiśra mentions that only e) is accepted here because the diversity of experience of *puruṣas* cannot be explained in the rest.

18) p. 95.

19) Madras Government Oriental Series No. XCIV, p. 200. Cf. T.S. Rukmani, *Yogavārttika of Vijñānabhikṣu*, Vol. II, p. 163.

20) Cf. n. 17).

⟨Key Words⟩ *adarśana*, *saṃyoga*, *Yogabhāṣya*, *Tattvavaiśārādī*, Vācaspatimiśra

(Graduate Student, University of Tokyo)