

## The Path to Liberation through Yogic Mindfulness in Early Āyurveda

*Dominik Wujastyk*

It can come as a surprise to discover that buried in one of the earliest medical treatises in Sanskrit is a short tract on the yogic path to liberation. This tract—a mere thirty-nine verses—occurs in the Chapter on the Embodied Person (*Śārīrasthāna*) in the *Compendium of Caraka* (*Carakasamhitā*). The *Compendium* is a medical encyclopedia and perhaps the earliest surviving complete treatise on classical Indian medicine. It is even more surprising to find that this yogic tract contains several references to Buddhist meditation and a previously unknown eightfold path leading to the recollection or mindfulness that is the key to liberation. Finally, Caraka's yoga tract almost certainly predates the famous classical yoga system of Patañjali. Let us explore these points in turn.

Classical Indian medicine, *āyurveda* (“the knowledge for long life”), is based on the body of medical theory and practice that was first collected and synthesized in several great medical encyclopedias, including especially the *The Compendium of Caraka* and *The Compendium of Suśruta* (*Suśrutasaṃhitā*). However, there are traces of the formation of this medical system to be found in earlier Sanskrit and Pāli literature. The first occurrence of the Sanskrit word *ayurveda* in Indian history is in the *Mahābhārata* epic. The epic also refers to medicine as having eight components, a term that is so standard in later literature that the science “with eight components” (*aṣṭāṅga*) becomes a synonym for medicine. These components include topics such as therapeutics, pediatrics, possession, surgery, and toxicology.

But the very earliest reference in Indian literature to a form of medicine that is unmistakably a forerunner of *āyurveda* is found in the teachings of the Buddha (probably fl. ca. 480–400 BCE, but these dates are still debated). As far as we know, it was not yet called *āyurveda*, but the basic concepts were the same as those that later formed the foundations of *āyurveda*. The Pāli

Buddhist Canon as we have it today probably dates from about 250 BCE, and records a fairly trustworthy account of what the Buddha said. In the collection of Buddhist sermons called the “Connected Sayings” (*Samyutta Nikāya*), there is a story that tells how the Buddha was approached by a monk called Sīvako who asked him whether disease is caused by bad actions performed in the past, in other words by bad karma. The Buddha said no, that bad karma is only part of the picture and that diseases may be caused by any of eight factors. The factors he listed were bile, phlegm, wind, and their pathological combination, changes of the seasons, the stress of unusual activities, external agency, as well as the ripening of bad karma. This is the first moment in documented Indian history that these medical categories and explanations are combined in a clearly systematic manner. The term “pathological combination” (Pāli *sannipāta*) is particularly telling: this is a technical term from āyurveda that is as specific as a modern establishment doctor saying something like “hemoglobin levels.” This term signals clearly that the Buddha’s list of disease-causes emanates from a milieu in which a body of systematic technical medical knowledge existed. And it is these very factors that later became the cornerstone of classical Indian medical theory, or āyurveda. The historical connection between the ascetic traditions—such as Buddhism and āyurveda—is an important one.

What is the date of the *Compendium of Caraka*? The chronology of this work is complex. The text already declares itself to be the work of three people. An early text by Agniveśa was edited (*pratisamskrta*) by Caraka. Caraka’s work was later completed by Dṛḍhabala. Jan Meulenbeld has surveyed the key historical issues with great care in his *History of Indian Medical Literature*. After assessing the Nyāya, Vaiśeṣika, and Buddhist materials that appear in Caraka’s *Compendium*, Meulenbeld concludes that, “Caraka cannot have lived later than about AD 150–200 and not much earlier than 100 BC.”

How does this dating relate to the early history of classical yoga? Is the yoga tract in Caraka’s *Compendium* to be dated before or after the classical yoga of Patañjali? In his authoritative new edition of the “Samādhi” chapter of Patañjali’s work on yoga, Philipp Maas (2006) has provided a compelling reassessment of the authorship, title, and date of the texts commonly known as the *Yoga Sūtra* and the *Vyāsabhāṣya*, but which call themselves collectively the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra*, or *Patañjali’s Teaching on Yoga*. Based on careful arguments and evidence, Maas makes three main assertions:

1. The text of the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra*, i.e., the undivided *Sūtra* and its commentary the *Bhāṣya*, is a single composition that can be traced back to a single author.

2. That author can be called Patañjali.
3. This unified text can be plausibly dated to about 400 CE.

Maas shows that the earliest references to “Vedavyāsa” as the author of a *Bhāṣya* occur at the end of the first millennium, in the works of Vācaspatimiśra (fl. ca. 975–1000), in his *Tattvavaiśārādī*; and Kṣemarāja (fl. ca. 950–1050), in his *Svacchandatantrodyota*. From the eleventh century onward, authors such as Mādhava (fifteenth-century *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*) routinely refer to Patañjali’s *Yogasāstra*, his *Sāṃkhyapravacana* or his *Yoga Sūtra*, and to Vyāsa as the author of the *Bhāṣya*.

However, the earliest of these revisionist authors, Vācaspati, also refers elsewhere to Patañjali as the author of a part of the *Bhāṣya*. Vācaspati was apparently uncertain as to whether *sūtra* and *bhāṣya* were by the same author or not. In fact, this view was reasonably widespread amongst early authors such as Śrīdhara in his ca. 991 CE *Nyāyakandalī*, Abhinavagupta in his ca. 950 CE *Abhinavabhārati*, and many others. Maas also shows that the earliest form of the work’s title in manuscript chapter colophons was probably *Pātañjalayogasāstra-sāṃkhyapravacana*, “Patañjali’s Sāṃkhya Teaching that is the Treatise on Yoga.” Working from this as well as internal textual arguments, Maas concludes that Patañjali took materials about yoga from older sources, and added his own explanatory passages to create the unified work that, since about 1100 CE, has been considered the work of two people. The extracts were designated as *sūtras* and ascribed to Patañjali, while the explanations and additional remarks were regarded as a *bhāṣya* and ascribed to Vyāsa (meaning “the editor” in Sanskrit).

As for the all-important issue of the date of the *Pātañjalayogasāstra*, Maas notes that it is partly a matter of guesswork, but refers to the plausible citations by Māgha (in his 600–800 CE *Śiṣupālavadhā*), Vṛṣabhadeva (fl. ca. 650 CE), and Gauḍapāda (in his ca. 500 CE commentary on Īśvarakṛṣṇa’s *Sāṃkhyakārikās*). Maas therefore argues that the *Pātañjalayogasāstra* was, by the beginning of the sixth century, regarded as an authoritative representation of yoga philosophy. Such a reputation would have taken at least some time to become established. The earliest possible date for the *Pātañjalayogasāstra* is Patañjali’s apparent engagement with the Vijnānavāda teaching of Vasubandhu in the fourth century, as already proposed long ago by Woods (1914). Maas’s final opinion is that the composition of the *Pātañjalayogasāstra* can be placed in the period between 325 and 425 CE.

Whatever the nuances of the arguments, it is beyond reasonable doubt that the *Compendium* of Caraka precedes the *Pātañjalayogasāstra*, that the yoga tract in the *Compendium* is older than Patañjali’s yoga system, and that it pro-

pounds a yoga system that has closer links to Vaiśeṣika philosophy than to the Sāṅkhya of Patañjali's system.

### Caraka's Yoga Tract

In the yoga tract in his chapter on the origin and structure of the human being, the *Śārīrasthāna*, Caraka first frames yoga as both spiritual liberation and the means of attaining it. Verses 138–39 are a direct citation from the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra*. Caraka continues with a description of the supernatural powers that accrue to the practitioner of yoga as a result of his self-discipline and the power of his concentration. This is very much in line with Patañjali's teaching on *siddhis*, and indeed with common ideas of the result of yoga practice across Indian literature.

Among the earliest sources of the idea that supernatural powers result from meditation are the descriptions in the Buddhist canonical text, the *Sāmañña-phalasutta* of the *Dīgha Nikāya*, when characterizing the monk who has completed the four meditations (Pāli *jhāna*). The powers arise from being integrated (*samāhita*), and are as follows:

1. body-power (*kāyavasa*), or the power to self-multiply, vanish, fly through walls, even touch the sun or moon
2. knowledge from divine hearing (*dibbasotañāṇa*)
3. mind-reading (*cetopariyañāṇa*)
4. the recollection of past lives (*pubbenivāsānussatiñāṇa*)
5. divine seeing (*dibbacakkhu*)
6. knowledge of the destruction of the bad influences (*āsavakkhaya*)

Many of the key terms used in this list of six powers are the same as those used in Caraka's yoga tract when he describes the eight powers that yoga practice can produce.

Most interesting of all, Caraka frames a new eightfold practice leading to recollection (Skt. *smṛti*), and places recollection at the very center of yogic practice. For Caraka, it is recollection that leads to yoga, and yoga that leads to the acquisition of supernatural powers and to ultimate liberation.

The language and conceptualization of this passage in the medical literature places it squarely within the tradition of the Buddhist mindfulness meditation (Pāli *satipaṭṭhāna*), often practiced today under the name *vipassanā*. As Gyatso (1992) has shown, in the Buddhist tradition, the Pāli term *sati* (Sanskrit *smṛti*) can denote memory in two quite distinct senses. First, it denotes memory as the simple bringing-to-mind of events that happened at an earlier period in

time, the mental act required to answer such questions as, “what did I have for breakfast?” In a second sense, it means the deepening of one’s consciousness, of one’s experiential awareness of the present moment. This is the alert self-recollection that people experience at special or shocking moments in life, or as a result of deliberate forms of meditation practice. Sometimes, such moments of recollection or mindfulness generate long-term memories of the first type, which are referred to as “flashbulb memories.”

The Pāli compound word *sati-paṭṭhāna*, the meditational practice leading to recollection or mindfulness, corresponds to the Sanskrit *smṛti-upasthāna*. And in verse 146, Caraka’s text uses these very words to describe the one practice that leads to all the other moral and spiritual practices he has listed. They arise from “abiding in the memory of reality,” or in Sanskrit *tattva-smṛter upasthānāt*. In the following verse, 147, Caraka inverts the cause-effect relation: it is the practice of the virtues listed in 143–44 that leads to recollection. Finally, verse 147 also identifies the final goal of recollection with freedom from suffering, Sanskrit *duḥkha*, again the central doctrine of Buddhism. This theme of suffering and impermanence is picked up again in verses 152 and 153 in completely Buddhist terms. Caraka’s use of these keywords taken directly from the Buddhist meditational and doctrinal milieu shows unambiguously that his yoga tract is an adaptation of extremely old ascetic material known to us mainly from Buddhism.

Given all this, it is all the more surprising that the comment at the end of verse 149 identifies recollection with the ordinary-language meaning of memory, i.e., calling to mind previous experience. It is tempting to see this comment as an addition by an author who was not familiar with the Buddhist understanding of recollection or mindfulness that underlies this tract.

Since recollection is at the center of Caraka’s method of yoga, the eightfold path to recollection that he outlines in verses 148 and 149 is of special interest. This appears to be a very early “eightfold path” whose origins and detailed meaning are obscure and require further study. It bears no apparent relation to other early forms of yogic path, such as the sixfold path of the *Maitrāyaṇīya Upaniṣad*, or the eightfold path of Patañjali’s *Pātañjalayogaśāstra*. The first four of Caraka’s eight steps to mindfulness concern the deepening of perception and discrimination. The fifth step could mean an attachment to *sattva* in the sense of the Sāṃkhya *guṇa* of purity, although at the end of verse 141 the same word means, as it often does, “mind.” The sixth step, practice, could refer to practicing mindfulness, but it could also point to memorization in the ordinary sense. The seventh step, the yoga of knowledge, brings to mind the famous teachings of the *Bhagavadgītā* on this subject, where liberation is attainable through true gnosis. But Caraka’s *Compendium* elsewhere shows no

awareness of the *Gītā*. The last step, “what is heard again,” is syntactically a little odd, since it is not exactly a procedural step in a path. But it was clearly intended as the eighth “step.” It again suggests memorization, rather than mindfulness in the Buddhist sense.

The last part of verse 151 raises new questions. The philosophers of the Sāṃkhya school have normally been presumed to be those who “count” or “reckon” (*saṃkhyā-*) the twenty-five *tattvas* or evolutes of the universe’s creation. However, in verse 151, Caraka has the Sāṃkhyas counting not *tattvas*, but *dharmas*. This strongly suggests the use of the word *dharma*, or Pāli *dhamma*, in the sense of “entity,” “fundamental phenomenon,” or even more neutrally “thing,” and might even suggest the enumerative and descriptive characteristics of the Buddhist Abhidharma literature. The connection with Sāṃkhya continues with verse 153, which is a direct parallel of *Sāṃkhyakārikā* 64.

Caraka’s yoga tract is an early and profoundly syncretic text about the path of yoga. Its citations from Vaiśeṣika and Sāṃkhya treatises show its willingness to synthesize across philosophical divides. But it is the Buddhist technical vocabulary and the text’s focus on mindfulness as the most important yogic practice leading to liberation that strikes us most strongly. This suggests that Caraka integrated into his medical treatise an archaic yoga method that owed its origins to Buddhist traditions of cultivating *smṛti*.

Caraka’s yoga tract did not go unnoticed within the Sanskrit literary tradition itself. In the fourth or fifth century it was copied by the author the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*, and from there again into yet another work, the *Viṣṇusmṛti*. In this way, its ideas gained a readership far beyond physicians.

The passage below is translated from the *Carakasamhitā*, Śārīrasthāna 1, verses 137–55. The Sanskrit edition used is the standard vulgate edition: Jadavji Trikamji Acarya, ed., *Maharṣiṇā Punarvasunopadiṣṭā, tacchīṣyeṇāgniveśena praṇītā, Caraka Dṛḍhabalābhyāṃ pratisaṃskṛtā Carakasamhitā, śrī Cakrapāṇidattavira-citayā āyurvedadīpikāvyaḥkhyayā saṃvalitā*, 3rd ed. (Bombay: Nirnaya Sagara Press, 1941). Earlier translations of this passage, none of which develop its wider significance, include Priya Vrat Sharma, *Caraka-Samhitā: Agniveśa’s Treatise Refined and Annotated by Caraka and Redacted by Dṛḍhabala (text with English translation)*, 4 vols. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Orientalia 1981–1994), vol. 1, pp. 409–11; and Ram Karan Sharma and Vaidya Bhagwan Dash, *Agniveśa’s Caraka Samhitā (Text with English Translation and Critical Exposition Based on Cakrapāṇi Datta’s Āyurveda Dīpikā)*, 7 vols. (Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1976–2002), vol. 2, pp. 345–50).

## Suggestions for Further Reading

The formation and early history of the Ayurvedic medical system outlined above is discussed in more detail by Kenneth G. Zysk, *Asceticism and Healing in Ancient India: Medicine in the Buddhist Monastery* (New York and Bombay: Oxford University Press, 1991; reprinted Delhi 1998, 2000); and by Dominik Wujastyk, “Indian Medicine,” in W. F. Bynum and Roy Porter (eds.), *Companion Encyclopedia of the History of Medicine*, 2 vols. (London: Routledge, 1993), vol. 1, pp. 755–78; Dominik Wujastyk, “The Science of Medicine,” in Gavin Flood (ed.), *The Blackwell Companion to Hinduism* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), pp. 393–409; and Dominik Wujastyk, *The Roots of Āyurveda: Selections from Sanskrit Medical Writings*, 3rd ed. (London and New York: Penguin, 2003). The most authoritative discussion of the dates of Ayurvedic texts is Gerrit Jan Meulenbeld, *A History of Indian Medical Literature*, 5 vols. (Groningen: E. Forsten, 1999–2002), Meulenbeld’s discussion of the *Carakasamhitā*’s date is in vol. IA, pp. 105–15. The original Pāli text of the *Samyuttanikāya* discussed above appears in Leon Feer (ed.), *Samyutta-Nikāya. Part IV: Saḷāyatana-Vagga*, 3rd ed. (London: Pali Text Society, 1973), pp. 230–31. It has been translated by Bhikkhu Bodhi, *The Connected Discourses of the Buddha: A Translation from the Pāli* (Somerville, MA: Wisdom Publications, 2000), pp. 1278–79.

The question of whether the Buddhist Canon records the direct teaching of the Buddha or is a later construction by the monastic community is much debated. The topic is surveyed by Alexander Wynn, “The Historical Authenticity of Early Buddhist Literature: A Critical Evaluation,” *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 49 (2005): 35–70, who defends a conservative view of the authenticity of the Canon as a record of the Buddha’s words. A discussion of how recent manuscript discoveries affect our view of the *Samyuttanikāya*’s formation can be found in Andrew Glass and Mark Allon, *Four Gāndhārī Saṃyuktāgama sūtras: Senior Kharoṣṭhī fragment 5* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2007).

I have translated the Sanskrit word *smṛti* as “memory,” “mindfulness,” and “recollection” according to context. It has been called “one of the most difficult words . . . in the whole Buddhist system ethical psychology to translate” (Davids 1890–1894). Even in the early literature of the Veda, words from the verbal root *smṛ-* can denote memory of past events as well as the present awareness of objects of consciousness, as was noted by Konrad Klaus, “On the Meaning of the Root *smṛ* in Vedic Literature,” *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens*, 36 (Supplementband) (1993): 77–86. Several relevant papers

on the concept of memory in Buddhism are gathered in Janet Gyatso (ed.), *In the Mirror of Memory: Reflections on Mindfulness and Remembrance in Indian and Tibetan Buddhism*, SUNY Series in Buddhist Studies (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992). The following important study stays very close to the original sources: Tse-fu Kuan, *Mindfulness in Early Buddhism: New Approaches Through Psychology and Textual Analysis of Pali, Chinese, and Sanskrit Sources* (London and New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis, 2008). The issues of memory, Buddhism, and the *Carakasambhitā* are briefly touched upon by Johannes Bronkhorst, "A Note on the Caraka Samhitā and Buddhism," in *Early Buddhism and Abhidharma Thought: In Honor of Doctor Hajime Sakurabe on His Seventy-seventh Birthday, 2002.20. May* (Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 2002), pp. 115–21. Gerhard Oberhammer, *Strukturen yogischer Meditation* (Vienna: Verl. d. Österr. Akad. d. Wiss., 1977), discusses mindfulness in the context of the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* and with reference to the parallels in the *Questions of King Milinda* (Pali *Milindapañha*). See Thomas William Rhys Davids, *The Questions of King Milinda*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1890–1894), vol. 1, pp. 58–59; and more recently Thera Nyanaponika and Bhikkhu Nyanatiloka, *Milindapañha: ein historisches Gipfeltreffen im religiösen Weltgespräch* (Bern: O.W. Barth [bei] Scherz, 1998), pp. 62–63.

The critical reassessment of the yoga teaching of Patañjali is that of Philipp André Maas, *Samādhipāda: das erste Kapitel des Pātañjalayogaśāstra zum ersten Mal kritisch ediert = The First Chapter of the Pātañjalayogaśāstra for the first time critically edited* (Aachen: Shaker, 2006). His key conclusions about the unified nature of the *sūtra* and *bhāṣya* are on p. xiv, and his arguments about the date of the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* are on pp. xv–xvi. The evidence for Patañjali's knowledge of Vasubandhu's works was given by James Haughton Woods, *The Yoga-system of Patañjali: or, the ancient Hindu doctrine of Concentration of Mind Embracing the Mnemonic Rules, called Yoga-sūtras, of Patañjali and the Comment, called Yoga-bhāṣya, attributed to Veda-Vyāsa and the Explanation, called Tattvavaiśāradī, of Vāchaspati-miśra*, *Harvard Oriental Series*, vol. 17 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914), pp. xvii–xviii.

Amongst the earliest descriptions of a structured path of yoga, having a series of *aṅgas* or "components" is that of the sixth *prapāṭhaka* of the relatively late *Maitrāyaṇīya Upaniṣad*. For the Sanskrit text, see V. P. Limaye and R. D. Vadekar (eds.), *Eighteen principal Upaniṣads: Upaniṣadic text with parallels from extant Vedic literature, exegetical and grammatical notes* (Poona: Vaidika Sam-sodhana Mandala, 1958), pp. 325–57. The *Maitrāyaṇīya*'s six-component yoga and some of its successors were usefully discussed by Anton Zigmund-Cerbu,

“The Śadaṅgayoga,” *History of Religions* 3:1 (1963): 128–34. Van Buitenen characterized the text as containing some interpolations: J.A.B. van Buitenen, *The Maitrāyaṇīya Upaniṣad. A Critical Essay, With Text, Translation and Commentary, Disputationes Rheno-Trajectinae*, vol. 6 (The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1962), pp. 84–87. This point was taken up by Somadeva Vasudeva, *The Yoga of the Malinivijayottaratantra, Critical edition, Translation and Notes*, (Pondicherry: IFP-EFEO, 2004), p. 375, note 18, where it is asserted that this section of the *Maitrāyaṇīya*’s text may be an interpolation later than *Jayākhyasamhitā* and other early Śaiva sources.

Tsutomu Yamashita, “On the Nature of the Medical Passages in the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*,” *Zinbun*, 36:2 (2001/2002): 87–129, establishes that the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti*’s “ātman treatise” is later than Caraka’s *Compendium* and that it derived almost all of its concepts in this section from the *Carakasamhitā*. For the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* passage parallel to verse 146 in Caraka’s yoga tract, see Samarao Narasimha Naraharayya and Rai Bahadur Srisa Chandra Vasu, *The Sacred Laws of The Aryas as Taught in the School of Yajnavalkya and Explained by Vijnanesvara in his Well-known Commentary Named the Mitaksara Vol. III: The Prayaschitta Adhyaya* (Allahabad: The Pāṇini Office, 1913), p. 148. The text edition is Narayan Ram Acharya (ed.), *Yājñavalkyasmṛti of Yogīśvara Yajñavalkya with the Commentary Mitākṣarā of Vijnāneśvara, Notes, Variant Readings, etc.* (Bombay: Nirnayasagara Press, 1949), p. 390, verse 3.160.

Verse 137 of the translation talks about “pains.” The Sanskrit term *vedanā*, sometimes translated as “feelings,” is one of the key terms in the Buddhist philosophy of dependent origination (Pāli *paṭiccasamuppāda*) and one of the five *khandhas* or experiential aggregates of Buddhist theory. These Buddhist concepts are discussed especially insightfully by Sue Hamilton, *Identity and Experience: the Constitution of the Human Being According to Early Buddhism* (London: Luzac Oriental, 1996).

Verses 138–139 contain a passage parallel to *Vaiśeṣikasūtras* 5.2.16–17. These have been discussed by Antonella Comba, “Carakasamhitā, Śārīrasthāna I and Vaiśeṣika Philosophy,” in Gerrit Jan Meulenbeld and Dominik Wujastyk (eds.), *Studies on Indian Medical History* (Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1987), pp. 43–61; and by Masanobu Nozawa, “Concept of Yoga in *Vaiśeṣikasūtra*,” in *Indian Thought and Buddhist Culture. Essays in Honour of Professor Junkichi Imanishi on His Sixtieth Birthday* (Tokyo: Shunjū-Sha, 1996), pp. 17–30. The discussion by Albrecht Wezler, “Remarks on the Definition of ‘Yoga’ in the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra*,” in Luise A. Hercus et al. (eds.), *Indological and Buddhist Studies: Volume in Honour of Professor J. W. de Jong on his Sixtieth Birthday* (Canberra: Australian National University. Faculty of Asian Studies, 1982), is relevant, although it does not

mention the *Carakasamhitā* passage. Meulenbeld 1999–2002, vol. IB, p. 200, note 213, gives references for the dating of the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra*. The original *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* text in question can be found in the edition of Muni Jambuvijayaji (ed.), *Vaiśeṣikasūtra of Kaṇāda, with the commentary of Candrānanda*, *Gaekwad's Oriental Series*, vol. 136 (Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1961), p. 42.

### Translation of the *Carakasamhitā*, śārīrasthāna 1, verses 137–155

137

In yoga and liberation, all pains are transient. In liberation, the cessation is complete; yoga promotes liberation.

138–139

Happiness and pain result from the close proximity of the self, the senses, the mind, and their objects. By not commencing, while the mind is steady and focused on the self, that pair stops and an embodied person becomes powerful. Sages who understand yoga know that that is yoga.

140–141

Entering someone's mind, knowledge of objects, free action, vision, hearing, recollection, beauty, and invisibility at will: these are called the eightfold lordly power that yogins have. All that arises from meditation (*samādhāna*) with a purified mind.

142

Liberation comes from the absence of passion (*rajas*) and lethargy (*tamas*), due to the disappearance of potent karma. The disjunction from all conjunctions is called non-rebirth.

143–146

Constant attendance on good people, and the avoidance of those who are not good; performing vows and fasting as well as each of the separate restraints (*niyama*); steady concentration (*dhāraṇā*), knowledge (*viññāna*) of the teachings about dharma, a penchant for solitude, an aversion to the objects of sense, striving towards liberation, and supreme willpower. Not initiating deeds

(*karma*), destruction of past deeds, unworldliness, freedom from ego, seeing the danger in attachment, concentration (*samādhāna*) of mind and intellect, investigating the true state of things. All this develops from abiding in the mindfulness of reality (*tattvasmṛter upasthānāt*).

147

Attendance on good people, etc., through to willpower (i.e., vv. 143–44): these make mindfulness (*smṛti*) arise. After having become mindful of the essential nature of existing things, being mindful, one is released from suffering (*duḥkha*).

148–149

The eight causes that are said to bring mindfulness about are:

- (a) perception of the cause (*nimitta-grahaṇa*)
- (b) perception of the form (*rūpa-grahaṇa*)
- (c) similarity (*sādṛśya*)
- (d) contrast (*saviparyaya*)
- (e) attachment to *sattva* (*sattvānubandha*)
- (f) practice (*abhyāsa*)
- (g) the yoga of knowledge (*jñānayoga*), and
- (h) what is heard again (*punaḥśruta*)

Recollection is said to come from recollecting what has been seen, heard, and experienced.

150–151

The power of recollecting the truth (*tattva*) is the one path of liberation, the one that is revealed by liberated people. Those who have gone by it have not returned again. Yogins call this the way of yoga. Those sāmṅkhyas who have reckoned the dharmas and those who are liberated call it the way of liberation.

152–153

Everything that has a cause is pain, not the self, and impermanent. For that is not manufactured by the self. And in that arises ownership, as long as the true realization has not arisen by which the knower, having known “I am not this, this is not mine,” transcends everything.

154-155

When this final renunciation exists, all pains and their causes, with consciousness, knowledge, and understanding, stop completely. After that, the corporeal self that has become *brahman* is not perceived. Having departed from all conditions, not a sign can be found. But an ignorant person cannot know this knowledge of those who understand *brahman*.