

Ann Mathie
MA Traditions of Yoga and Meditation SOAS University
Origins And Development of Yoga in Ancient India 2017-2018

**The Role of Ethics in the Psychology and Soteriology of Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali and
Sāṃkhya Metaphysics of Sāṃkhyakārikā**

Abstract

Sāṃkhya metaphysics has served as a framework for many Indian traditions in transcendence for as long as 2000 years (Larson, 1969). Its dualistic ontological framework is the foundation of thought in Yoga, Tantra, Vedanta, and the birth of Buddhism (Samuel 2008). Its systematic way of organising or enumerating the components of the mind and the universe provides an understanding of the intrinsic structures of the mind from subtle states of consciousness to the gross mechanisms of eye consciousness, hearing consciousness, speech consciousness etc. In the following study, I will examine the nature of *prakṛiti* to gain insight into the constructs of the self as well as the mechanics of consciousness. Using this framework, I will demonstrate the position of ethics as a gateway to *Samādhi* (*deep absorption*) in the soteriology and ontology of the Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali (YS) and *Sāṃkhya* of Sāṃkhyakārikā (SK).

The Sāṃkhyakārikā and the Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali present the doctrine of mind and matter being the same thing. This mind–matter construct is brought into manifestation through the dynamic nature of its qualities, the *guṇas*. These forces create our differentiated perceived reality as well as our illusory mental constructs which support the appearance of a separate self (Burley, 2007 and Larson, 2011). Through the analysis of the nature of the *guṇas*, we can examine the transformational qualities of ethical behaviour and how this can lead to the dissolution of the self and result in knowledge of the true nature of reality.

Key words: *guṇas, prakṛiti, puruṣa, Sāṃkhya system, tattva,*

Introduction to the Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali and Sāṃkhyakārikā

The etymology of the term *Sāṃkhya* means to count or enumerate, and we can see this term in a variety of different mundane contexts throughout Indian history. In the framework of Indian metaphysics, the term *Sāṃkhya* refers to a rational numeric enumeration of the twenty-five

tattvas or principal components of the self which constitute all mind and matter or *prakṛiti*, *Sāṃkhya*'s dual component to pure consciousness or *puruṣa*. The philosophy itself is one which emerged over time through the evolution of traditions and ideas in India's philosophical history. Larson (1969) divides the development of *Sāṃkhya* into four time periods starting with the early *Vedic* hymns through the 8th and 9th century B.C. until the rise of early Buddhism. The earliest expressions of *Sāṃkhya* are attributed to Kapila who is mentioned as early as the Rg Veda (X27.16). In this first development, we can see the frameworks of *Sāṃkhya* thought in the subtle relationship between Gods and priests and the order or *rta* of the universe. The second development moves through the 'middle' Upanishads from the 4th Century B.C. until the 1st century A.D. where we see the development of terms such as *Ahaṃkāra* (the reflexive I-maker or ego) used as a cosmic entity. During this period, we see proto-*Sāṃkhya* concepts in the Bhagavad-gītā where we see a discussion of the *guna* and the concept of salvation through knowledge. The third developmental stage is the era of the Yoga Sūtras and the Sāṃkhyakārikā from the 1st Century A.D. to the 11th Century A.D. The Sāṃkhyakārikā of Īśvarakṛṣṇa became a seminal text historically which we can probably attribute to its completeness (Bryant, 2015). These two texts secure the core themes and refined metaphysics of *Sāṃkhya*'s dual philosophy, and we can see its progeny echoed through later Tantric developments. Larson (ibid) groups the final development of *Sāṃkhya* between the 14th to the 17th Century A.D. which he refers to as the *Sāṃkhya* Renaissance. White (2009) refers to a text Sāṃkhyapravacana Sūtra as one of the most important *Sāṃkhya* texts after Sāṃkhyakārikā. The importance of a text is often depicted by the number of commentaries written by known philosophers. For the Sāṃkhyapravacana Sūtra, we see commentaries by Aniruddha, Vijñānabhikṣu, and Mahādeva who have proven to be heavy-weight philosophers in the realm of metaphysics.

For this study, I will focus my attention on the third developmental stage of *Sāṃkhya* where we see a ripening of ideas psychologically and metaphysically with the foundational text, Sāṃkhyakārikā (circa 350 and 450 CE) by Īśvarakṛṣṇa, Indian philosopher and sage (Burley 2007) and the Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali written by the sage Patañjali. Unfortunately, very little is known about Patañjali and there is much debate regarding the dating of the Yoga Sūtras but there is speculation that the text was compiled around the 4th Century CE (Maas, 2020). Bryant (2015) suggests that it was compiled as late as the 5th Century CE.

To maintain consistency throughout this study I have quoted Mikel Burley's 2007 translation of the Sāṃkhyakārikā in *Classical Sāṃkhya and Yoga, An Indian Metaphysics of Experience* and Edwin Bryant's 2015 *The Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali, A New Edition, Translation and Commentary*. I have used the translation of Trevor Leggett's (1990), *The Complete Commentary by Śaṅkara on the Yoga Sūtras, A Full Translation of the Newly Discovered Text* which contains the Yogabhāṣya (Vyasa's commentary on the sutras) as a further commentary of the text as well as a comparison of translation. Of all the classical commentaries of the Yoga Sūtras, Śaṅkara's is the most in-depth and complete when analysing the subtle nuances of materiality and dissolution of the self. His insights are respected by a wide range of modern-day philosophers as well as historical figures in Indian philosophical history (Larson, 1969). This is evident in his detailed rebuttal of other philosophies such as non-dual Buddhist thought and dharma theory.

***Sāṃkhya* and Yoga: Two Schools of Philosophical Thought**

Before we explore the relationship between *Sāṃkhya* and Yoga as a frame for ethics, I should point out that *Sāṃkhya* and Yoga exist as two distinct schools of orthodox Hindu systems of philosophy, yet their systems are closely knitted together (Perret, 2007). Each text, however, presents different positions concerning the path to salvation. Although these differences are not central to the theme of this study, I do believe it is important to discern the purpose and nature of the two texts to contextualise the position of ethics as a means to salvation.

Sāṃkhya is a philosophy which places importance on knowledge as path to liberation. By observing the constituent parts of mind and matter, a transformation takes place in the instruments of perception in the observer which results in the dissolution of all things perceived. The world ceases to exist and all that is left is consciousness. For *Sāṃkhya*, the disentanglement of *Puruṣa* and *Prakṛti* happens through *viññāna* (knowledge). Although the Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali is framed in the metaphysics of *Sāṃkhya*, their main purpose is to describe the *means* to witnessing nature as it is, without the illusory psychological frameworks which distort our perception of reality. The YS is a text which focuses on a variety of practices which lead to the dissolution of the self namely through meditation. The metaphysics of the Sāṃkhyakārikā and the techniques of yoga described in the Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali are inextricably linked through the metaphysical mechanisms within the human psyche. Vyāsa declares the YS as “Patañjali's Yoga treatise, an exposition on *Sāṃkhya*” in his *bhāṣya* (commentary) (Bryant, 2015). The structures of mind laid out in the SK provide

the ontological framework for the YS. It is because of the unfolding structures of the mind as presented in *Sāṃkhya* philosophy that the preliminary practices work as a graduated purification process of each layer of the self. This eight-limbed path of yoga starts with attention to the social physical spheres then graduates towards more subtle control of the breath and then the mind. The gradual detangling of consciousness from matter results in the stilling of the mind which allows the observer to witness reality as it is, resulting in liberation from one's causal bind to matter. It is only through the purification of the self through yoga that the individual can directly experience the nature of reality thus detangling *prakṛti* (all matter) from *puruṣa* (pure consciousness).

We can say that the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* presents a cosmogenic view of the psyche whereas the Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali present a psychogenetic involution of the cosmos (Pattni, 2016). The SK is interested in the mechanics behind our differentiated mind universe. It is not interested in the deification of the hierarchy of *tattvas*; however, it stipulates that by witnessing the causal nature of the unfolding *prakṛti* through *vijñāna* (knowledge) then liberation can be attained. This atheistic container makes *Sāṃkhya* metaphysics easily appropriated across traditions of salvation in the Indian continent. The YS, on the other hand, references devotion to *Īśvara* as a means to Yoga or union with *puruṣa*. The worship of *Īśvara* enables the development of worthy attitudes within the adept. This aspect of the YS appeals to the notion of faith as correct attitudes needed to cultivate humility and devotion to prepare the mind for deeper stages of concentration which enables *vijñāna* (true knowledge). Although the devotional aspect of the YS is a means to cultivating appropriate attitudes, I only brief this point to outline the differences between the schools. I will focus on the ontological position of ethical behaviour with the exclusion of devotion as this pertains to a theistic approach to salvation.

There is further evidence of this cosmogenic and psychogenetic difference between the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* and the Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali in the different emphasis on the cause of creation. The YS brings into focus the cause of creation from the human psychological perspective in that ignorance is the initial cause for rebirth and the manifestation of our instruments of perception. The SK on the other hand, emphasises the concept of *puruṣārtha* (for *puruṣas* sake) (Larson, 1969). In *Sāṃkhya*, *puruṣa* only exists through the eyes of *prakṛti*. It is important to note that *puruṣa* is often depicted as having agency in both texts; however, these philosophical perspectives are presented in such a way due to pedagogical

reasons. Both texts take into account that the perspectives of the nature of *prakṛti* and *puruṣa* change according to the ontological position of the observer. This point will be analysed in more detail later.

This dual framework of reality has been appropriated by many different traditions and developed further to incorporate non-dual states of being. We can see examples of this in the *Śaiva Siddhanta* who added a further 11 *tattvas*, or components of consciousness, to the already established 25 (Flood, 2006). We will explore the meaning of *tattvas* later in this study but as a simplistic explanation, we shall describe the *tattvas* as mind structures of *prakṛti* which have differentiated themselves into more complex mechanisms which bring about conscious awareness in the human being. According to Goodall (2015), we do not find a conclusive list of 36 *tattvas* until the *Nisvāsakārika-Diksottara*. The extended list of *tattvas* represents the extended range of phenomenological experiences of the *tantrika* into loftier nondual states of awareness. However, it is not the purpose of this study to analyse the nuanced differences between *kailvalya*, a state of aloneness, separate from *prakṛti* and the *Śaiva Siddhanta* non-dual phenomena. I only wish to position *Sāṃkhya* metaphysics in the larger scope of ontological philosophies.

Puruṣa and Prakṛiti; A dual philosophy

Sāṃkhya thought is based on the idea that our phenomenological reality consists of manifest principles of materiality-mentality or *prakṛiti*. This material-mental architecture is a structure that can be dissolved part by part when one becomes aware of the true nature of its reality.

The *Sāṃkhya* teachers stated that through careful observation of reality and the self, the nature of mind, matter and consciousness becomes apparent. The means to arrive at this awareness is demonstrated through the various systematic practices and devotion demonstrated in Yoga.

The systematic dissolution of each part of the self, results in bare awareness being the object and the subject of the witness, without the lens of the distorted and diffracted self. To see the nature of reality, one must undergo a psychological transformation that brings about permanent freedom from a divided mind (Burley, 2007; Feuerstein, 1989; Jacobson, 1999; Larson, 1969).

To understand the essence of *Sāṃkhya* philosophy let us look at the nature of *prakṛiti* and *puruṣa*, the two main principles in the dual *Sāṃkhya* system. According to *Sāṃkhya*, our consciousness begins with pure awareness or *puruṣa* which exists as a separate entity (SK 11).

*triguṇam aviveki visayaḥ sāmānyam acetanam prasavadharmi /
vyaktaṃ tathā pradhānam tad viparitas tathā ca pumān // 11 //*

The manifest, as well as *pradhana* (i.e., the unmanifest), are tripartite, indiscriminate, objectual, universal, non-conscious, productive; and human (i.e., *puruṣa*) is the opposite of these. *Sāṃkhyakārikā* 11 (Burley, 2007, 166)

Puruṣa cannot be described because it is empty of anything. It can only be reflected upon as what it is not as it has no volition or action. It has no movement nor manifestation other than presence itself. It is eternal and ever-present. Accompanying *puruṣa* there is *mūlaprakṛti* which is pure un-manifest potentiality, pregnant with creation and animation yet not manifest into movement or form. There is no cause for *mūlaprakṛti* but she is the cause of all of creation. All that becomes manifest already exists as potentiality. According to the SK, *puruṣa* is the witnessing principal and any manifestation of *prakṛiti* comes into existence only for and to be witnessed by *puruṣa*. The unmanifest *puruṣa* is pervading, omnipresent, eternal, and inactive; the manifest or *prakṛiti* is non-eternal and active (Kṛṣṇa, 1933).

*evaṃ tattvābhyāsān nāsmi na me nāham ity aparīśeṣam /
aviparyayād viśuddhaṃ kevalam utpadyate jñānam // 64*

Thus, from the assiduous practice of that-ness, the knowledge arises that ‘I am not,’ ‘not mine,’ ‘not I’; which [knowledge], being free of delusion, is complete, pure, and singular.

*tena nivṛttaprasavām arthavaśāt saptarūpavinivṛttām /
prakṛtiṃ paśyati puruṣaḥ prekṣakavad avasthitaḥ svacchaḥ // 65*

Then *puruṣa*, abiding [in itself] like a spectator, sees *prakṛiti*, who has returned to inactivity and retreated from the seven forms due to her purpose being complete. *Sāṃkhyakārikā* 64 and 65 (Burley, 2007, 177)

To understand the nature of the mind in *Sāṃkhya*, we must understand the theory of causation or *satkāryavād*. The mechanisms of human psychology are seen as the same mechanisms which manifest the cosmos within the tradition of *Sāṃkhya*. Bronkhorst (2000) states that all the surviving commentaries of the theory of *satkāryavāda* in the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* argue that the product (manifest materiality) is the same as the cause of manifestation. To understand

this concept, we must unpack the nature of *prakṛiti* or manifest material mentality. From the state of *mūlaprakṛiti*, which is pure un-manifest potentiality, arises a subtle volition, a movement in the primordial void. *Mūlaprakṛiti* has no cause itself but it is the original cause for all manifest creation. The cascading ripple effect of manifestation from the first emerging principle is *sāttva guṇa* which differentiates into *rajas guṇa* and *tamas guṇa* respectively (SK 16). The three *guṇas* or *triguṇas* are *prakṛiti* engaged in varying dynamic forces which carry *puruṣa* into form. The *guṇas* themselves are non-conscious, as we can see from SK 11 (see previous), yet they bind consciousness into form (Larson, 1969). It is the union of *prakṛiti* and *puruṣa* (*saṃyoga*) which brings creation into play (SK 21). It is through *sarga*, to ‘emit’ or ‘to pour out’, that *prakṛiti* emits the world through her dividing nature (Parrott, 1986). According to *Sāṃkhya*, the only way to liberation is to detangle these two principles. It is important to highlight that there is no reaction or response to *prakṛiti* from *puruṣa*, these two components exist as two separate phenomena. It is only their proximity which gives the illusion of their causal entanglement and consciousness in form.

*kāraṇam asty avyaktam pravartate triguṇataḥ samudayāc ca /
pariṇāmataḥ salilavat pratipratiguṇāśrayaviśeṣāt // 16 //*

– the unmanifest is the cause, productive due to the combination of the three *guṇa*, and transformable fluidly in accordance with the specific abode [character?] of each of the *guṇa*.

*puruṣasya darfanartham kaivalyārtham tathā pradhānasya /
pakgvandhavad ubhayor api saṃyogas tatkṛtaḥ sargaḥ // 21 //*

For the purpose of perceiving pradhana, and for the purpose of puruṣa’s aloneness, the two [come together] like the blind and the lame; that conjunction is creation and emergence. *Sāṃkhyakārikā* 16 and 21 (Burley, 2007, 167-168)

Larson (1969) describes the *guṇas* as having three meanings: a type of action, the nature of thought and the quality of an object. Jacobsen (1999) debates that *prakṛiti* is not a material principle as it does not occupy space, but it is a motivating force behind manifestation. Burley (2007) argues that *prakṛiti* is the material aspect of reality creating separate forms and simultaneously acting as the forces that create form.

According to SK 12 and SK13, we can see that each *guṇa* pertains to a particular nature which creates different qualities in any form. These three natures are *sāttva* (light and structure), *rajas* (energy and action) and *tamas* (inertia and density). When *sāttva guṇa* predominates there is purity, clarity, and structure in the form. When *raja guṇa* predominates

there is energy, dynamism, and action present. When *tamas guṇa* predominates there is inertia, stagnation, and heaviness. These three *guṇas* are active and in a constant state of creation, interacting and affecting the nature of materiality. Each manifestation is dependent on its previous manifestation. The characteristic of each subtle structure is determined by the specific combination of *guṇas*.

Burley (2007) argues that the attributes of the *guṇas* are the cause of our phenomenological experience of reality. As our instruments of perception are formed from the differentiated *guṇas*, it is our witnessing consciousness (*puruṣa*) that perceives experiential phenomena through the ever-changing lens of the *guṇas*. It is important to note here that the *guṇas* which manifest in the constitution of the individual are not objective states but change according to perception. For example, a farmer will be full of *sāttvic* gladness as they look upon the rain nourishing their crops; however, someone who has just hung their laundry out to dry may be tinged with an essence of *tamas* as they look at the rain soaking their washing (Larson, 2011). The rain is a construct of all the *guṇas* but it is the observer who determines which *guṇa* shines through.

*prītyapṛītivīsādatmakāḥ prakāśapravṛttinīyamārthāḥ /
anyonyābhibhavāśrayajanānamithunavṛttayaś ca guṇāḥ // 12 //*

Of the nature of gladness, perturbation and stupefaction; serving to illuminate, activate and restrain; the strands (*guṇas*) subjugate, support, generate and combine with one another.

*sattvaṃ laghu prakāśakam iṣṭam upaṣṭambhakam calaṃ ca rajaḥ /
guru varaṇakam eva tamaḥ pradīpavac cārthato vṛttiḥ // 13 //*

Sattva is light and illuminating; *rajas* is impelling and moving; *tamas* is heavy and delimiting; and their purpose is to function like a lamp.
Sāṅkhyakārikā 12 and 13 (Burley, 2007, 166)

Yoga Psychology: The *Tattvas* and Principal Components of the Self

Puruṣa is present alongside the dynamic interaction of *guṇas* bringing apparent consciousness to form. It is through this process of manifestation that the components (*tattvas*) which make the self are created. Every instrument of perception is a creation of the differentiating *guṇas*. To understand how the self comes into manifestation, i.e., how our instruments of perception discern our phenomenological reality, we must understand the relationship between the *tattvas* and the cause of cognition. Jacobsen (1999) describes the twenty-five *tattvas*, or

instruments of perception, as being synonymous with varying states of “disturbed *guṇas*”. The ripples of dynamism emerging from the primordial *mulaprakṛiti* create complexity in human perception of experience. The emergence of *prakṛiti* from *mūlaprakṛiti*, through the cause of *sāttva guṇa*, comes from *prakṛitis*’ innate desire to witness pure consciousness. It is only from the first manifestation of *prakṛiti* (*buddhi*) that *puruṣa* can be witnessed as a mere reflection. When *buddhi* stands alone, its *sāttvic* purity is the cause of its all-knowing nature, the centre of human will. As *puruṣa* illuminates *buddhi*, its faculties of discernment can observe and distinguish all of manifest existence and its composition (SK 36). Its ability to discern is the cause of the human instinct to differentiate all sense objects (Parrott, 1986). Of all the *tattvas*, *buddhi* (the third principle) or ‘the great’ is the only principle which possesses the ability to discern *puruṣa* (the first principle) from *prakṛiti* (the second principle) (SK 22).

*prakṛter mahāṃs tato ’haṅkāras tasmād gajāś ca sodaśakah /
tasmād api ṣodaśakāt pañcabhyaḥ pañca bhūtāni // 22 //*

From *prakṛiti* [comes] the great; from that, egoity; and from that, the group of sixteen; again, from five of those sixteen, [come] the five elements.

*ete pradīpakalpāḥ parasparavilakṣaṇā gujaviśeṣāḥ /
kṛtsnam puruṣasyārtham prakāśya buddhau prayacchanti // 36 //*

These specifications of the *guṇas*, distinct from one another, present the whole [world] to *buddhi*, illuminating it like a lamp for the sake of *puruṣa*.
Sāṅkhyakārikā 22 and 36 (Burley, 2007, 168 and 171)

Our fourth manifest principal is *ahaṅkāra*, the I maker or egoity; a force which gravitates towards itself forming the ego. The preceding *tattvas* to manifest are *manas* (mind), *buddhindriyas* (sense capacities), *karmendriyas* (action capacities), *tanmātra* (sensory content) and the *bhutas* (five elements) (Burley 2007). SK 24 and SK 63 suggest that seven main *tattvas* have manifested because of *prakṛitis*’ innate nature of binding herself to herself. The energetic activator of the differentiating *prakṛiti* is *rajas* (Larson 1969). The self-grasping power of *ahaṅkāra* turns *prakṛitis*’ self-multiplying complexity towards more *tamasic* manifestations; such is the phenomenological realness of solidity, heat, liquid and air and the space through which form manifests (*bhutas*).

*abhimāno ’haṅkaras tasmād dvividhaḥ pravartate sargaḥ /
ekādaśakaś ca gaṇas tanmātrapañcakaś caiva // 24 //*

The thought of self is egoity; from that, a twofold emergence proceeds, namely the group of eleven and the five *tanmātras*.

*rūpaiḥ saptabhir eva tu badhnāty ātmānam ātmanā prakṛtiḥ /
saiva ca puruṣārthaṃ prati vimocayaty ekarūpeṇa // 63 //*

Prakṛiti binds herself by herself with the use of seven forms; and, for the sake of each *puruṣa*, liberates herself by means of one form.
Sāṃkhyakārikā 24 and 63 (Burley, 2007, 169 and 177)

It is important to note that the *ahaṃkāra* is referred to as *asmitā* in Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali (YS 1.17) where the term is referred to as an act of absorption in the self. In the SK, *ahaṃkāra* is a term that refers to the ontological position as a fundamental structure of the mind/universe and *asmitā*, as mentioned in the YS, refers to a psychological function when referring to the human being.

1.17 vitarka-vicārānandāsmītā-rūpānugamāt samprajñātaḥ

vitarka, absorption with physical awareness; *vicāra*, absorption with subtle awareness; *ānanda*, absorption with bliss; *asmitā*, absorption with the sense of I-ness; *rūpa*, form; *anugamāt*, accompanied by; *samprajñātaḥ*, a type of *samādhi* state.

Samprajñāta [samādhi] consists of [the consecutive] mental stages of absorption with physical awareness, absorption with subtle awareness, absorption with bliss, and absorption with the sense of I-ness.
The Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali, 1.17 (Bryant, 2015, 126)

We see another reference to this in YS 2.3 where *asmitā* is referred to as an impediment to *Samādhi*.

2.3 avidyāsmītā-rāga-dveṣabhiniveśāḥ kleśāḥ

The impediments [to *samādhi*] are nescience, ego, desire, aversion, and clinging to life. The Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali, 1.17 (Bryant, 2015, 146)

YS 4.4 highlights this concept as the central theme to the soteriology of the Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali. It is the self-grasping nature of the ego (*asmitā*) that is the cause of suffering, and it is this cause that we must overcome to reach liberation (Bryant, 2015).

4.4 nirmāṇa-cittāny asmitā-mātrāt

Created minds are made from ego only. The Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali, 1.17 (Bryant, 2015, 486)

Of the *tattvas*, *buddhi* and *ahaṃkāra* pertain to the cosmic self when they stand as a pair and alone. When functioning with sense receptors, these two mechanisms are directed towards the human sensory experience and psychological processes due to the reflexive I-maker or *ahaṃkāra*. *Prakṛiti* continues to divide through the senses creating a more ‘solid’ illusory self, which amounts to human suffering. The human instruments of perception are preserved within a structure which lasts the lifetime of an individual (Larson, 1969). According to *Sāṃkhya*, the subtler parts of our inner instrument (*lingasarira* or subtle body including *buddhi*, *ahaṃkāra* and the 11 instruments of perception) transmigrate and the more gross aspects of our instruments decay and are shed at the time of death, SK 55 and SK 62. We are never really bound or liberated as our consciousness always exists in its unchanged form alongside the varying transmigrating states of *prakṛiti*.

*tatra jarāmarajakṛtaṃ duḥkhaṃ prāpnoti cetanaḥ puruṣaḥ /
lingasyāviniṣṭtes tasmād duḥkhaṃ svabhāvena // 55 //*

Puruṣa, consciousness, acquire there the suffering created by decay and death until its deliverance from the *linga*; hence one’s own nature is associated with distress.

*tasmān na badhyate ’ddhā na mucyate nāpi saṃsarati kaścit /
saṃsarati badhyate mucyate ca nānāśraya prakṛtiḥ // 62 //*

No one, then, is bound, nor released, nor wanders; it is *prakṛiti*, in its various abodes (*āśrayā*), that wanders and is bound and released.
Sāṃkhyakārikā 55 and 62 (Burley, 2007, 175 and 177)

The cessation of the transmigrating individual happens when the individual realises that *Prakṛiti* is not the self; however, the body continues to exist, due to the inert *tamasic* nature of physicality (SK67).

*samyajjñānādhiḡamād dharmādināmakārajaprāptau /
tiṣṭati saṃskāraśat cakrabhramivad dhṛtaśariraḥ // 67 //*

Due to the attainment of perfect knowledge, virtue (dharma) and the rest have no impelling cause; [nevertheless,] the endowed body persists owing to the momentum of impressions, like a potter’s wheel.
Sāṃkhyakārikā 67 (Burley, 2007, 178)

It is important to note that although the physical instruments of perception such as eyes, ears, skin etc., may be shed and decay, the sensory phenomena itself does not exist in physical form and transmigrates with the more subtle essences of the human. The Sāṃkhyakārikā suggests that the human ability to experience the sensate world exists without the need for physicality.

The manifestation of ears, eyes, skin etc is a result of the continually unfolding nature of ear-consciousness, eye-consciousness sense/touch-consciousness etc. The actual physical world has no distinguishing features at all; it is the *mind* that discerns its features through its higher, subtle faculties of discernment (*buddhi*) and sense organs (*buddhindriyas*). The only distinguishing feature is the elemental composition (*mahabhutas*) of the object of perception (SK 38).

*tanmātrāṅy aviśeṣaḥ tebhyo bhūtāni pañca pañcabhyaḥ /
ete smṛtā viśeṣāḥ śantā ghorāś ca muḍhās ca // 38 //*

The modes of sensory content (*tanmatras*) are non-specific; from these five [come] the five elements; these are regarded as specific, tranquil, disturbing, and delusive. Sāṃkhyakārikā 38 (Burley, 2007, 172)

To understand *prakṛiti* as our phenomenological experience we must state the ontological position from which we are defining it. Its metaphysical realness can only be defined from the position of sensory and cognitive experience yet when the individual's perception has transcended the senses, *prakṛiti* ceases to exist (Perrett, 2001). Metaphysical realism exists from the perspective of the individual through the sensory receptors, it does not exist from the perspective of the liberated individual. However, YS 2.22 states that materiality continues to exist for other *puruṣas*.

2.22 kṛtārtham prati naṣṭam apy anaṣṭam tad-anya-sādhāraṇatvāt

Although the seen ceases to exist for one whose purpose is accomplished [the liberated *puruṣa*], it has not ceased to exist altogether, since it is common to other [not-liberated] *puruṣas*.

The Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali, 2.22 (Bryant, 2015, 297)

The composition of the *guṇas* present in the sense receptors will affect the nature of the object being perceived; objective materiality does not exist (Jacobsen,1999). The nature of an object will always depend on the balance of *guṇa* in the observer (refer to Jacobsen's example of the farmer and laundry attendant). Due to the self-binding nature of *prakṛiti*, an increasingly *tamasic* formation of *guṇas* forms our instruments of sensory perception. Due to the *tamasic* elements of our sense receptors, the illusory world appears as though solid and permanent. *Samsara* or the illusion of solidity and realness of the self is caused by *puruṣa* shining through the *guṇas*; an arrangement of projections onto projections for the sake of *puruṣa* (SK 42 and

YS 4.22). This arrangement gives the illusion that it is conscious due to the light of *puruṣa* purveying it.

*puruṣārthahetukam idaṃ nimittanaimittikaprasaṅgena / prakṛter vibhutvayogān
naṭavad vyavatiṣṭhate liṅgam // 42 //*

This *liṅga*, motivated for the sake of *puruṣa*, by means of the association of causes and effects, and due to its connection with the manifestness of *prakṛti*, performs like a dancer. Sāṃkhyakārikā 42 (Burley, 2007, 172)

4.22 *citer apratisaṅkramāyās tad-ākārāpattau svabuddhi- saṃvedanam*

Although it is unchanging, consciousness becomes aware of its own intelligence by means of pervading the forms assumed by the intelligence.

The Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali, 4.22 (Bryant, 2015, 525)

Feuerstein's theory of deep structure *prakṛiti* and surface structure suggests that the mind exists in many dimensions at once. The deep structure is the latent or unmanifest potential aspects of material reality. One could say that they exist in a dimension without time. The surface structures are the projections of thought onto an object. He distinguishes these facets into four levels, *alinga* (the transcendental realm of mere potentiality), *linga-matra* (the first manifestation of the 'world ground'), *āviveśa* (the sensory potentials, that which are heard, felt, seen etc) and *viveśa* (the intellect, sense organs and material element), (Feuerstein 1989, 17).

Although Feuerstein has delineated four levels according to their behaviour and function within the individual consciousness, the Sāṃkhyakārikā suggest that there is a graduated evolution from one *tattva* to another as they are derived from the same source. It is for this reason that one *tattva* can dissolve back into its origin due to its causal nature. The very axle which connects *Sāṃkhya* ontology with yoga epistemology lies in the principle that the graduated structure of the universe is the very same graduated structure of the mind. The solid appearance of individuality is the ignorance that separates us from the transcendental mind which lies beyond the self-perpetuating ego. The mind is the manifest universe, the universe is the manifest mind. This is evident in our previous exploration of *prakṛiti* and the changing and manifesting nature of the *guṇas*.

Although *prakṛiti* covers the luminescent nature of *puruṣa*, SK 56 to 59 states that *prakṛiti* exists to be seen by *puruṣa* and *puruṣa* exists for its aloneness. Under this premise, the

creation of the self is designed purely so that it can realise its true nature. Śāṅkara (Leggett, 1990) describes *prakṛiti* as being bound to *puruṣa* through its first manifestation *buddhi*, a mirrored version of itself with the factors of discernment through which all of creation is seen and judged. When *puruṣa* is hidden behind the discerning factors of *buddhi*, then ignorance is born. This is otherwise referred to as the “cause of the disjunction of *pradhāna* and *puruṣa*”, *pradhāna* being the original cause of all materiality when all three *guṇas* are in their balanced non-active state (Leggett, 1990). When the components of the self are witnessed for what they are as separate components of manifestation through causality, they cease to exist for the observer. The pure light of *puruṣa* shines through and the ‘dancer’ stops dancing (SK 56 and 57). When there is discrimination of a seer then there is release (YS 2.23).

*ity eṣa prakṛtikṛto mahadādiviśeṣabhūtaparyantaḥ / prati puruṣavimokṣārtham
svārtha iva parārtha ārambhaḥ // 56 //*

This *prakṛti*-creation, from the great down to the specific elements, is for the sake of the liberation of each, for the other’s benefit as though for its own.

*vatsavivṛddhinimittam kṣirasya yathā pravṛttir ajñasya / puruṣavimokṣanimittam
tathā pravṛttiḥ pradhānasya // 57 //*

Just as the profusion of unknowing (*ajñā*) milk brings about the nourishment of the calf, so the profusion of *pradhāna* brings about the liberation of *puruṣa*.

*autsukyanivṛttyartham yathā kriyasu pravartate lokaḥ / puruṣasya vimokṣārtham
pravartate tadvad avyaktam // 58 //*

Just as [in] the world actions are performed for the purpose of removing [i.e., fulfilling] a desire, so does the unmanifest perform for the purpose of the liberation of *puruṣa*.

*raṅgasya darḥayitvā nivartate nartaki yathā nrtyāt / puruṣasya tathātmānam
prakāśya vinivartate prakṛtiḥ // 59 //*

Just as having displayed herself before the gaze of the audience, the dancer desists from dancing, so *prakṛti* desists, having manifested herself to *puruṣa*.
Sāṅkhyakārikā 56-59 (Burley, 2007, 175-176)

2.23 *sva-svāmi-śaktyoḥ svarūpopalabdhi-hetuḥ saṁyogaḥ*

cause; *saṁyogaḥ*, conjunction, contact, association
[The notion of] conjunction is the means of understanding the real nature of the powers of the possessed and of the possessor. The Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali, 2.23 (Bryant, 2015, 30)

The I-maker or *ahaṁkāra* is a reactive response to *prakṛiti*; it misidentifies *puruṣa* as a part of itself due to *puruṣa*’s proximity (SK 19 and 20, see above). *Buddhi* discerns the difference

between *prakṛiti* and *puruṣa*, whereas the *ahaṃkāra* is absorbed in its own self. It is the *ahaṃkāra* which channels *prakṛiti* into creating the further evolutes which form the self.

Sāttva being light and having structure allows *buddhi* to exist as a subtle but separate principal, a perfect reflection of *puruṣa*. When it is bound to *ahaṃkāra*'s downward flow of *prakṛiti*, the *tamasic* aspects of the further evolutes influence the perpetual creation of mind (SK 23). When *ahaṃkāra* is absorbed towards spiritual evolution then the *guṇas* move towards stillness' thus, working with *buddhi* to reflect the presence of *puruṣa* (Bryant, 2015 et al).

*adhyavasāyo buddhir dharmo jñānaṃ virāga aiśvaryam /
sāttvikam etad rāpaṃ tāmasam asmād viparyastam // 23 //*

Buddhi is discernment, its lucid (*sāttvika*) form [comprising] dharma, knowledge, non-attachment, [and] masterfulness, and its darkened (*tamasa*) form [comprising] the opposite. Sāṃkhyakārikā 23 (Burley, 2007, 169)

Yoga Psychology: The Mind Processes

An evolute of *ahaṃkāra* which brings awareness to the manifest sense object world is *manas*. It is the movement of the *guṇas* towards its sense objects as well as the translator of sensory experience and is the mechanism which joins the 'external' and 'internal' world. *Manas* brings the sensory world to *ahaṃkāra* where identification of sensory experience can take place (SK 26 and 27). It is the mechanism which possesses the function of feeling and responds to sensory experiences with craving or aversion (Bryant, 2015).

*buddhīndriyāṇi cakṣuḥ śrotraḡhrāṇarasanaṡvagākhyāni / vākpāṇipādapāyupasthān
karmendriyāṇyāhu // 26 //*

Sense-capacities is the term for seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting and touching; voice, hand, foot, anus and underparts are called action-capacities.

*ubhayātmakam atra manaḡ sakkalpakam indriyaṃ ca sādharmaṡt /
guṇapariṇāmaṡiśesaṡn nānāṡvaṡm bāhyabhedāś ca // 27 //*

In this regard, the essence of both is mind (*manas*), which is synthesis and is, due to its similarity, a capacity. Variousness and external differences are due to the specific modifications of the *gunas*.
Sāṃkhyakārikā 26 and 27 (Burley, 2007, 169)

The higher faculties, *buddhis*, translate this identification and transform the individual through its discriminatory powers. In the YS, the function of *manas* is pivotal in the stages of sensory withdrawal from the sensory world to awareness itself (*pratyāhāra*) (YS 2.54). When *manas*

withdraws its classification of sensory objects, it can turn its energies towards discerning *prakṛiti* and *puruṣa*.

2.54 *svaviṣayāsamprayoge cittasya svarūpānukāra ivendriyāṇām pratyāhārah*

Pratyāhāra, withdrawal from sense objects, occurs when the senses do not come into contact with their respective sense objects. It corresponds, as it were, to the nature of the mind [when it is withdrawn from the sense objects].
The Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali, 2.54 (Bryant, 2015, 371)

The Yoga Sūtras refer to the overall combination of *buddhi*, *ahaṃkāra* and *manas* as functioning together to create *citta*; a movement of the mind which causes the production of defilements. *Citta* can be loosely translated as the term ‘mind’ if we are to refer to the mind as the entire conscious and unconscious experience of the individual (Feuerstein, 1989). Larson (1979, 224) highlights Śāṅkara’s commentary that ‘*Sāṃkhya* wants to argue that "consciousness" (*cetana*) must be distinguished from "awareness" (*antaḥkarana-vṛtti* or *citta-vṛtti*)’. *Citta-vṛtti* is the product of the interaction between the *tattvas*, in other words, the product of the cognitive processes.

When the *guṇas* are influenced by *ahaṃkāra*’s self-making forces, the sensory experience of the human dominates the mind. It is the combination of these three components which results in the grasping nature of the mind towards sense objects (Pattni, 2016). It is the sense faculties which grasp the elements and translate them into a sensory experience. The five elements are potential experiences, but they have no life of their own.

In *Sāṃkhya*, *citta* is often comparable with the *antaḥkaraṇa* which is comprised of the *manas* (sense mind), *buddhi* (intellect), and *ahaṃkāra* (ego maker or ‘I-ness) according to Burley (2007). Larson (1979) on the other hand translates the ‘inner three’ as *buddhi*, *ahaṃkāra* and the senses (SK 33). If we are to embrace Burley’s interpretation of *antaḥkaraṇa* comprising of *manas* (sense mind), *buddhi* (intellect), and *ahaṃkāra* (ego maker or ‘I-ness) then the SK denotes these components as transcending time and space which is reflective of memory and anticipation of the future whereas the senses are only capable of experiencing the present moment. This concept is relevant when we analyse the processes of agency which we will later unpack.

*antaḥkaraṇam trividham daśadha bāhyaṃ trayasya viṣayākhyam /
sāmpratakālam bāhyaṃ trikālam ābhiantaram karaṇam // 33 //*

The inner instrument (*antahkaraṇam*) is threefold, the outer is tenfold [and] is held to be the domain of the three; the outer [operates in] the present moment [alone], the [inner] instrument in all three times.
Sāṃkhyakārikā 33 (Burley, 2007, 171)

Yoga Psychology: The Processes of Thought as Conditionality

Bakker (1982) discussed the idea that the interaction between the sense organs and the sense objects creates subtle thought forms or *bhūtamātras*. The *bhūtamātras* are composed of varying *guṇas* which Bakker refers to as mental defilements. When we view the world through the lens of defilements, we are subject to clinging or aversion. It is the nature of *prakṛiti* to continually differentiate herself due to the constantly moving *guṇa*; therefore, continually creating defilements of the mind. The behaviour of these projections or *vṛtti*, as they are referred to in the YS, can be known by its root verb *rt* to “turn” or to “proceed” suggesting that thought is in a state of perpetual change or motion. The impressions left on the mind-body by the *vṛtti* are *saṃskāra*. These *saṃskāra* act as tendencies of the personality. *Saṃskāras* come together to form personality traits or *vāsanā*. Bryant (2015) describes *vāsanā* as the latent tendencies collected from past lives which lie dormant in the mind field and are triggered when the correct conditions arise (YS 4.8). The continual arousal of these latent impressions or defilements will continue to advert the *buddhi* away from *puruṣa*. The relationship between *vṛtti*, *saṃskāra* and *vāsanā* create the qualities and conditions for one’s future experiences or *karma* which we will look at in more detail later.

As we are *prakṛiti* our tendency is to be attracted to the dividing nature of things thus we become attached to the material plane. YS 2.9 suggests that the flow of *prakṛiti* towards attachment to life (and its objects) cannot be avoided. The material realm sustains itself through the exchange of procreation or consumption. This exchange causes suffering in one form or another creating a reaction of an increasingly *tamasic* nature (YS 2.15). It is due to this nature that consciousness transmigrates from one life to another (SK45) unless we master self-control. As our physicality collapses and decays due to the natural accumulation of *tamas*, consciousness and its more subtle components continue without physicality. To acknowledge this nature is to have discernment.

2.9 svarasa-vāhī viduṣo ‘pi tathārūḍho ‘bhiniveśaḥ

[The tendency of] clinging to life affects even the wise; it is an inherent tendency.

2.15 *pariṇāma-tāpa-saṃskāra-duḥkhair guṇa-vṛtti-virodhāc ca duḥkham eva sarvaṃ vivekinaḥ*

For one who has discrimination, everything is suffering on account of the suffering produced by the consequences [of action], by pain [itself], and by the saṃskāras, as well as on account of the suffering ensuing from the turmoil of the vṛttis due to the guṇas.

The Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali, 2.9 and 2.15 (Bryant, 2015, 162 and 275)

*vairāgyāt prakṛtilayaḥ saṃsāro bhavati rājasād rāgāt /
aiśvaryād avighāto viparyayāt tadviparyāsaḥ // 45 //*

Prakṛiti's dissolution occurs as a result of non-attachment, wandering is due to attachment, which is impulsive; removal of obstructions is due to master-fulness, the reverse of that is due to the opposite.

Sāṃkhyakārikā 45 (Burley, 2007, 173)

To witness the true nature of reality, the *vṛtti*, *saṃskāra* and *vāsanā*, the mind machine or *citta* must come to a stop. The term *citta* in the YS is referred to as a dynamic force which must be brought to a standstill if true Yoga is to be attained (YS 1.2).

1.2 yogaś citta-vṛtti-nirodha

Yoga is the stilling of the changing states of the mind.
The Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali, 1.2 (Bryant, 2015, 74)

To halt the dividing nature of the mind, careful action, thought and speech must be perfected to assist in the involution of the mind towards liberation.

Ignorance and Agency

As we have discussed, all mentality-materiality is made up of the ever-changing *guṇas*. Volition and intention, therefore, will affect our perception of reality as such drives are formed of the *guṇas*. Volition (the flow of *guṇas* decided by *buddhi* and the self-making *ahaṃkāra*), Intention (the direction of the flow of *guṇas* discerned by *buddhi*) are the central forces which determine the qualities of the mind that manifest as we can see from our previous explanation of the inner instruments of perception or *antaḥkaraṇa*.

In Gaudapādācārya's commentary of the Sāṃkhyakārikā, he asks what is it that decides to act with virtue if the *guṇas* are without intelligence (Sharma, 1933). SK 20 states that it is the spirit or *puruṣa* which has the capacity for contemplation and the *guṇas* have the capacity for action: like the lame leading the blind. Their interaction brings about creation (*sargaḥ*) and

consciousness to psychological mechanisms. To the unenlightened perceiver, the *guṇas* present themselves as conscious realities with agency (*karṭṛtva*) (SK 20).

*tasmāt tat saṃyogād acetanaṃ cetanāvad iva liṅgam /
guṇakarṭṛtve ca tathā karteḥ bhavaty udāsinaḥ // 20 //*

Due to the conjunction of those [two, i.e., *puruṣa* and *prakṛiti*] the non-conscious *liṅga* appears as though conscious, and similarly, owing to the activity of the *guṇas*, the non-engaged appears as though active.
Sāṃkhyakārikā 20 (Burley, 2007, 168)

Although suffering is a result of the dividing nature of *prakṛiti*, it is also the reason why *puruṣa* will incline towards its true nature due to its contemplative tendency towards self-realisation. The application of intention is decided through the function of *buddhi*'s discernment which is activated by the conjunction of *puruṣa* and *prakṛiti*. It is the discernment of *buddhi* that causes the individual to move towards salvation from one's *tamasic prakṛitic* bind. This is evident in the natural reflections of the average psychologically 'healthy' human regarding feelings of guilt and remorse towards actions which have caused harm to others, or the pain or pleasure experienced as a direct result of one's actions.

Due to the vertical hierarchical unfolding nature of manifest principals from *sāttvic* to *tamasic* (SK 54), the more involved the individual is towards 'outer or *lower*' manifestations of the mind the more attached one becomes to outer appearances. It is only when we start to contemplate the difference between *prakṛiti* (intellect and *tattvas*) and *puruṣa* (spirit) the mind starts to move towards loftier, *sāttvic* states.

*ūrdhvaṃ sattvaviśālas tamoviśālas ca mūlataḥ sargaḥ / madhye rajo viśālo
brahmādistambaparyantaḥ // 54 //*

The upper realm is pervaded by luminosity (*sāttva*), and the base is pervaded by opacity (*tamas*); the middle is pervaded by activity (*rajas*); [such is the case] from Brahma down to a blade of grass.
Sāṃkhyakārikā 54 (Burley, 2007, 175)

Echoed throughout the Sāṃkhyakārikā, the means to liberation is knowledge. Knowledge is not the acquisition of information but experiential insight into the hierarchical construct of the material-mental realm of manifestation. Ignorance of the twenty-five principles leads to further bondage. The clarity of the individual will depend on how shrouded in *tamasic*

ignorance the instruments of perception are (Sharma, 1933). Ignorance is not a lack of knowledge but a clouding of the senses due to the build-up of thought forms over our sense preceptors which are created by false identification with the self. Mind states predominantly in *tamas* are the gloomiest, contentment being predominant in *rajas* and attainment being predominant in *sāttva*. Pain and pleasure cause aversion and attachment, thus providing the conditions for continued ignorance (YS 2.4 and 2.5).

According to the YS, the *vr̥tti* that cause the most bondage to life are the *kleśas*; ‘nescience, ego, desire, aversion, and clinging to life’ (Bryant, 2015, 246). The *kleśas* are the five main causes of human suffering which perpetually weave us into a *samsaric* matrix of *vr̥tti*, *saṃskāra* and *vāsanā* (YS 2.3 and 2.4). The *kleśas* are the psychological cause of what is pleasurable and what is painful, which in turn creates further desire and aversion. It is the *kleśas* which cause the modifications of the mind to become afflicted or *kliṣṭa* (painful and distressing) or non-afflicted *akliṣṭa* (not painful or distressing). To attain the necessary clarity the individual must maximise the *sāttvic* quality of one’s thoughts and actions to alleviate the lens of *tamasic* ignorance.

2.3 avidyāsmītā-rāga-dveṣabhiniveśāḥ kleśāḥ

The impediments [to samādhi] are nescience, ego, desire, aversion, and clinging to life.

2.4 avidyā kṣetram uttareṣām prasupta-tanu-vicchinodārāṇām

Ignorance is the breeding ground of the other *kleśas*, whether they are in a dormant, weak, intermittent, or fully activated state.

2.5 anityāśuci-duḥkhānātmasu nitya-śuci-sukhātma-khyātir avidyā

Ignorance is the notion that takes the self, which is joyful, pure, and eternal, to be the nonself, which is painful, unclean, and temporary.

The Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali, 2.3 to 2.5 (Bryant, 2015, 246 to 250)

The *kleśas* listed above are the deepest *saṃskāra* the human must overcome to permanently turn the flow of *prakṛiti* towards *buddhi*. Within the stream of thought the mind contains both afflicted and non-afflicted *vr̥tti*. Vyasa describes the mind stream in response to YS 1.5:

1.5 The mental processes are of five kinds; they are tainted or pure

The tainted are caused by the five taints (kleśa); they become the seed-bed for the growth of the accumulated karma seed-stock. The others are pure and are the field

of Knowledge. They oppose involvement in the guṇa-s. They remain pure even if they occur in a stream of tainted ones. In gaps between tainted ones, there are pure ones; in gaps between pure ones, tainted ones. It is only by mental processes that saṃskāra-s corresponding to them are produced, and by saṃskāra-s are produced new mental processes. Thus the wheel of mental process and saṃskāra revolves. Such is the mind. But when it gives up its involvement, it abides in the likeness of self (ātman) or else dissolves.
(Leggett, 1990, 119)

This cycle reinforces an identification of the *antakarāṇa* with its separate evolutes thus perpetuating a downward flow of *prakṛiti* towards an increasingly *tamasic* nature. The discerning function of *buddhi* responds with an aversion to mental modifications which are afflicted and seek refuge from further suffering. Thus begins the search for freedom from bondage.

In the previous commentary on Burley's interpretation of *antaḥkaraṇa* comprising of *manas* (sense mind), *buddhi* (intellect), and *ahaṃkāra* (ego maker or 'I-ness) (SK33), it is the *antaḥkaraṇa* which has the capacity for memory and discernment when reflecting on past pleasant or unpleasant experiences thus determining future actions towards outcomes which involve less suffering. For consciousness to only exist in the sense organs does not allow for discernment of action; therefore, it is the memory of impressions and their pleasant, unpleasant or neutral experiences which is the directional force behind agency and volition.

It is not only the discernment of *buddhi* which plays an active role in the volition of the individual, but it is also one's *karma*. The karmic impressions which arise have a moral quality and dynamism of their own which was created by a wholesome (*sāttvic*) or unwholesome (*tamasic*) action. The fruit of one's *karma* is experienced as psychological pleasure or pain.

Ethical Action as A Path to Liberation

The way to reverse such *tamasic* manifestations within the mind is through the upward volitional force of virtue (*dharma*) towards more *sāttvic* clarity (SK 44 and 45). The waking dream is the attachment to a seemingly real *samsaric* matrix which deals with human interaction and social constructs. The constructs through which we exist are designed by human behaviour and it is only through our healthy social constructs that wholesome dharmic behaviour can arise. Virtuous intentions are born from *buddhis*' discernment that wholesome action leads to a clear mind thus reversing the flow of *prakṛiti* from bondage to freedom

(Perret, 2007). The attitudes that manifest from the *guṇa* (*bhāvas*) can be seen as moral forces when they are dominated by *sāttva guṇa*. Virtue pertains to the qualities of calm, patience, stability, and stillness. It is through virtue that the witnessing principles can observe *prakṛiti* without becoming attached or averse to it. (Sharma, 1933).

dharmeṇa gamanam ūrdhvaṃ gamanam adhastād bhavaty adharmeṇa / jñānena cāpavargo viparyayād iṣyate bandhaḥ // 44 //

By means of virtue (*dharma*) there is movement upwards, by means of non- virtue (*adharmā*) there is movement downwards; by means of knowledge liberation is attained, and bondage is due to the opposite.

vairāgyāt prakṛtilayaḥ saṃsāro bhavati rājasād rāgāt / aiśvaryaḥ avighāto viparyayāt tadviparyāsaḥ // 45 //

Prakṛti's dissolution occurs as a result of non-attachment, wandering is due to attachment, which is impulsive; removal of obstructions is due to masterfulness, and the reverse of that is due to the opposite.
Sāṃkhyakārikā 44 and 45 (Burley, 2007, 173)

When we discuss the metaphysics of ethics, we must transport ourselves to a field where behaviour is not good or bad but simply the cause and effect of nature. The essence of the YS is to still the mind fluctuations thus attaining the clear *sāttvic* vision necessary to see the nature of reality. To transcend the perception of labelled 'things', the senses must be purified towards a *sāttvic* state through yoga. Through *sāttvic* thought and vision, we gain clarity on the nature of the mind as if looking to the bottom of a still lake. As a result, the mind begins to witness its own nature rather than get entangled with it. The *sāttvic* behaviour creates a *sāttvic* mind (YS 1.33 and 2.41). *Sāttva* being translucent allows *vidya*, knowledge of the true nature of things.

2.41 *sattva-suddhi-saumanasyaikāgryendriya-jayātma-darśana- yogyatvāni ca*

Upon the purification of the mind, [one attains] cheerfulness, one-pointedness, sense control, and fitness to perceive the self.
The Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali, 2.41 (Bryant, 2015, 344)

Śaṅkara describes this sutra as the causal unfolding of self-perception born from sense control. Sense control begins with one-pointedness which arises with cheerfulness. Each attitude lays procession for the later more refined state leading to insight (Leggett, 1990). The *sāttvic* mind allows *prakṛiti* to flow through the system without being obscured by *saṃskāras* or *vāsanā* (YS 4.3). Without the obscuration of *vāsanā*, there is steadiness and clarity of perception. Vyāsa describes these actions as a meditation which produces pure *dharma*

leading to a still mind. *Śaṅkara* emphasises that all actions rooted in non-harm, are fundamental towards producing a clear mind or pure dharma (YS 1.33) (Leggett 1990, 147). The inherent stillness of the *sāttvic* mind causes the *guṇas* to stop differentiating; thus, ceasing to create more mental defilements.

4.3 *nimittam aprayojakam prakṛtīnām varaṇa-bhedas tu tataḥ kṣetrikavat*

The instrumental cause of creation is not its creative cause, but it pierces the covering from creation like a farmer [pierces the barriers between his fields]. The Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali, 4.3 (Bryant, 2015, 489)

1.33 *maitrī-karuṇā-muditopekṣāṇām sukha-duḥkha-puṇyāpuṇya- viṣayāṇām bhāvanātaś citta-prasādanam*

By cultivating an attitude of friendship toward those who are happy, compassion toward those in distress, joy toward those who are virtuous, and equanimity toward those who are nonvirtuous, lucidity arises in the mind. The Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali, 1.33 (Bryant, 2015, 196)

Through the development of peaceful *bhavana* or attitudes, the senses turn inward. The tranquil *sāttvic* nature of peaceful attitudes still the flow of *manas* towards sense objects; thus, reducing impressions drawn upon the mind. The positive memory of this *sāttvic* mind reinforces the withdrawal of the sensory world. From this ontological position, ethical practice is supported by the ability to see clearly and not act out of need; non-attachment becomes effortless and fewer defilements are created (YS 1.12 and SK 63 and 64). A feedback system is created whereby ethical behaviour cultivates stillness in the mind and stillness in the mind enables clarity to conduct oneself with peaceful attitudes, leading to further purification of the *tattvas*.

1.12 *abhyāsa-vairāgyābhyām tan-nirodhaḥ*

[The *vṛtti* states of mind] are stilled by practice and dispassion. The Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali, 1.12 (Bryant, 2015, 112)

Virtue is the foundational practice towards the dissolution of lower principles as it generates dispassion for things (Y.S 1.15 and 1.16). By becoming unattached to the gains and losses in the material realm we can weaken the grasp of the *kleśas*, thus, weakening the self-binding influence of *asmitā* on our instruments of perception (SK 45). By weakening the *kleśas*, we begin to unbind *puruṣa* from *prakṛiti*.

*1.15 dr̥ṣṭānuśravika-viṣaya-vitr̥ṣṇasya vaśīkāra-samjñā vairāgyam
dr̥ṣṭa,*

Dispassion is the controlled consciousness of one who is without craving for sense objects, whether these are actually perceived, or described [in scripture].

1.16 tat-param puruṣa-khyāter guṇa-vaitr̥ṣṇyam

Higher than renunciation is indifference to the *guṇas* [themselves]. This stems from perception of the *puruṣa*, soul.

The Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali, 1.15 and 1.16 (Bryant, 2015, 116 and 117)

SK 23 describes *buddhi* as steering the reflexive response towards *sāttvic* or *tamasic* tendencies or attitudes. When *buddhi* is entangled with the instruments of perception then it will maintain its association with sense objects and the perpetual creation of ignorance. When *sāttvic* attitudes take precedence, the *buddhi* can turn towards non-attachment. As we have previously discussed when *buddhi* and *ahankāra* stand alone without the pull of the sense objects, then they operate as mechanisms for liberation.

*adhyavasāyo buddhir dharmo jñānaṃ virāga aiśvaryaṃ /
sāttvikametadrūpaṃ tāmasamasmād viparyastam ||23||*

Buddhi is discernment, its lucid (*sāttvika*) form [comprising] *dharma*, knowledge, nonattachment, [and] masterfulness, and its darkened (*tāmasa*) form [comprising] the opposite. Sāṅkhyakārikā 23 (Burley, 2007, 169)

The Sāttvic Mind Through Sādhanā and the Nature of Karma

To attain a *sāttvic* mind we must choose actions (*sādhanā*) and thought that transform our attitudes (*bhavana*) into more *sāttvic* states, SK 23. The gradual lessening of *tamas* is the purpose of the eight-limbed path of yoga presented in the YS 2.28. Śaṅkara (Leggett, 1990) describes the restraints (control of moral behaviour) in sutra 2.29 as the foundation of *samādhi*. Without the restraints, one is unable to obtain a mind calm and pure enough to still the moving *guṇas* in the mind. It is only when this prerequisite is established that he can go on to practice postures.

*2.28 yogāṅgānuṣṭhānād aśuddhi-kṣaye jñāna-dīptir-āviveka-
khyāteḥ*

Upon the destruction of impurities as a result of the practice of yoga, the lamp of knowledge arises. This culminates in discriminative discernment.

2.29 *yama-niyamāsana-prāṇāyāma-pratyāhāra-dhāraṇā-dhyāna- samādhayo 'ṣṭāv aṅgāni*

The eight limbs are abstentions, observances, posture, breath control, disengagement of the senses, concentration, meditation, and absorption. The Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali, 2.28 and 2.29 (Bryant, 2015, 313 to 315)

By impurities, *Patañjali* is referring to the taints. Śaṅkara highlights that through the method of yoga, the taints are removed and as a result '*knowledge of the difference*' comes into view. The skilful progression of yogic disciplines (YS 2.29 to 2.52) is organised in a way to purify the grossest aspects of our being starting with behaviour and culminating in the subtle art of stilling the mind in a manner that allows absorption on the object of meditation without any projections from a divided mind (*saṁyama*) (YS 3.35).

3.35 *sattva-puruṣayor atyantāsaṅkīrṇayoḥ pratyayāviśeṣo bhogaḥ parārthatvāt svārtha-saṁyamāt puruṣa-jñānam*

Worldly experience consists of the notion that there is no distinction between the puruṣa self and pure intelligence, although these two are completely distinct. Worldly experience exists for another [i.e., for puruṣa]. [By *saṁyama*] on that which exists for itself [i.e., on puruṣa], comes knowledge of puruṣa. The Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali, 3.35 (Bryant, 2015, 442)

Śaṅkara (Leggett, 1990) argues that the yoga of action, i.e., moral observance, are the initial stages in thinning out the taints. It is the precursor to the right vision by *saṁyama*. The taints are all that is *tamasic* in the mind such as "Ignorance, *I-am-ness*, desire, hate, and instinctive self-preservation" (YS 2.3 Bryant, 2015, 246). The very cause for our existence is the taints starting with Ignorance. Through the lack of knowledge of the true nature of things the mind believes it is a self (*I-am-ness*) which leads to clinging and aversion affirming the notion of self-preservation such as selfishness and egoic desires. The taints behave like causal conditions towards the thickening of the veil of ignorance. These conditions are like deep-rooted seeds which continue to feed the stream of *saṁskāras* that are created so long as there is ignorance. The mind's inclination towards these deep-rooted tendencies is so habitual that the yoga of right action is the only means to initially avert this flow away from further ignorance. Vyāsa (Leggett, 1990, 260) extends sutra 2.22 thus '*Mental processes from the taints are in manifest form (sthūla) and are first thinned out by the yoga of action; then they are to be got rid of by contemplation (prasaṅkhyāna), by meditation (dhyāna), until having thereby been made subtle, they are then made like scorched seeds.*' The yoga of action takes precedence as the initial stages of 'scorching the seeds' as it is controlled thought and

behaviour which prevents the creation of further *tamasic* attitudes and behaviours that add to the stock of *karma* produced from the taints (*āśaya*) (YS 2.12). Every thought or action that is born from the stock of *karma* that arises from the taints, further compounds the already existing *saṃskāras* (YS 2.13).

2.13 sati mūle tad-vipāko jāty-āyur-bhogāḥ

As long as the root [of the *kleśas*] exists, it fructifies as type of birth, span of life, and life experience [of an individual].

The Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali, 2.13 (Bryant, 2015, 270)

Pattni (2016, 87) refers to *karma* as having three meanings: a) ‘volitional activity’ or the moral forces behind one’s behaviour b) the reservoir of accumulated action and c) *karmavipāka*, the fruit of one’s actions.

4.8 tatas tad-vipākānugūṇānām evābhivyaṅktir vāsanānām

From [these three types of *karma*] the activation of only those subliminal impressions that are ready for fruition [in the next life] occurs.

The Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali, 4.8 (Bryant, 2015, 498)

Śaṅkara (Leggett, 1990) describes how various actions lead to birth in different beings, either plant, animal, or human as well as those manifest on different planes of existence. Such causal conditions of birth would determine how difficult or easy it would be to attain the necessary stillness of mind to remove the taints and enter *Kaivalya*. When the fruits of *karma* ripen, cannot be determined as well as the size of the stock of *karma*, hence the urgency towards cultivating a mind that inclines towards *sāttvic* stillness. Śaṅkara describes that when a larger stock of *karma* arises, it can impact the entire lifespan of an individual, leaving the individual vulnerable to adding to this stock of *karma*.

Bryant translates *ātmakam* as ‘having the nature of’ *sāttva* which Śaṅkara describes as having a constant tendency towards *śīla* or moral conduct YS 2.18 (Leggett, 1990). Through *śīla* we create the conditions for a *sāttvic* mind to arise. These conditions are precious, and it is undetermined when such an opportunity will arise again.

2.18 prakāśa-kriyā-sthiti-śīlam bhūtendriyātmakam bhogāpavargārtham dṛśyam

That which is knowable has the nature of illumination, activity, and inertia [*sattva*, *rajas*, and *tamas*]. It consists of the senses and the elements and exists for the purpose of [providing] either liberation or experience [to *puruṣa*].

The Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali,
(Bryant, 2015, 288)

The conditionality of each stock of karma that arises brings with it the causal chain of *samskāras* from previous lives. Śāṅkara's commentary references several scriptures when disclosing that *karma* arises in pairs (good and bad, white and black), the good deed nourished cancels the bad *karma*. His breadth of references indicates that this is common knowledge amongst different traditions. The stock of negative karma associated with it is purified by seeking good actions.

On which it has been said: 'karma-s are to be known as in pairs; one block made by the good cancels one made by the bad. Seek then to do good actions. Here it is that the sages instruct you on your welfare.'
Śāṅkara (Leggett, 1990, 302)

Awareness of the negative karma will arise; however, contemplation of one's *karma* in the spirit of equanimity allows the individual to steer the course of one's future choices. It is through this type of contemplation that detrimental *samskaras* are permanently eradicated. The *yamas* or self-restraints function as the initial steps in the consequentialist theory of causation. Gaudapādācārya references the YS's *Yama, Niyama* of Patañjali as the foundation to the graduated path of lessening the *tamasic* influence of the mind (YS 2.30 and 2.31). It is only through sheer will and self-control that the aspirant can reverse the "downward flow" of *prakṛiti* and start one's involution towards the transformation of *buddhi* (Sharma, 1933). It is *ahimsā*, the first of the five *yama*, which stands as the very foundation of self-refinement before the purification of the body through *asana* commences. *Ahimsā* (non-violence) is given special attention in Vyāsa's commentary which reflects the importance of this foundational behaviour (Prasāda, 1998). The causal effect of *ahimsā* (non-violence) ripples through every other *yama* and *niyama*; purifying the intention of every action and thought. We must regard violence as referring to any kind of harm unto another being, whether through intention, thought, communication or action. Included in this *yama* is the withdrawal of any kind of excitement invoked at the thought of harm unto another. It is through the total disassociation of harmful thought, speech and action that a pure form of *ahimsā* arises. When *ahimsā* is perfected, 'enmity is abandoned', even vicious animals give up their aggression leaving way for peaceful concentration on the meditation object YS 2.35.

2.35 ahimsā-pratiṣṭhāyām tat-sannidhau vaira-tyāgaḥ

In the presence of one who is established in nonviolence, enmity is abandoned.
The Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali, 1.2 (Bryant, 2015, 335)

Satyā or truth, the second *yama* is an extension of this virtue. Words communicated must not carry the intention of harm to another. When we remove this mischief then words maintain a *sāttvic* essence. Vyāsa expands this sutra and details exactly what is meant by ‘*truth*’.

Truth-speaking is said to be speech and thought in conformity with what has been seen or inferred or heard on authority. The speech spoken to convey one’s own experience to others should be not deceitful, nor inaccurate, nor uninformative. It is that uttered for helping all beings. But that uttered to the harm of beings, even if it is what is called truth, when the ultimate aim is merely to injure beings, would not be truth. It would be a sin. (Leggett, 1990, pg 376)

When truth is perfect, power arises in the word. This power has a direct impact on the thought intention and actions of others to whom the words were directed even to the extent of attaining heaven, YS 2.36.

2.36 satya-pratiṣṭhāyām kriyā-phalāśrayatvam

When one is established in truthfulness, one ensures the fruition of actions.
The Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali, 2.36 (Bryant, 2015, 336)

The following restraint listed is theft (*asteya*) or taking what is not yours to take. Through this restraint, desire for the external world lessens one’s grasp which in turn lessens greed leading to suffering and ignorance.

In turn, Vyāsa describes continence or *brahmacaryā* as restraint of the “hidden power, the power of generation” or sexual desire (Prasāda, 1998). However, Vyāsa also refers to *brahmacaryā* as “restraint of the sex organ and other senses”, implying that control of every sense organ enables *pratyāhāra* and therefore the conditions for *samādhi* (Leggett, 1990, 378). In this context, restraint refers to control of any urge for external stimuli invoked by desire and craving. In the initial stages of practice, this unguarded outward flow of power or *prakṛiti* inevitably leads to the manifestation of *vṛtti*. By preserving this powerful energy for the purpose of pure awareness, more physical energy is attained (YS 2.38)

2.38 brahmacarya-pratiṣṭhāyām vīrya-lābhah

Upon the establishment of celibacy, power is attained.
The Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali, 2.38 (Bryant, 2015, 337)

Lastly, *āparigrahā* or renunciation of unnecessary possessions lessens one’s attachment to the acquisition of material or non-material things thus lessens the attachment overall. YS 2.39

states that the *siddhi* of insight into the conditions of birth is brought on through the resolve to not possess property. Śāṅkara clarifies that it is through the lack of attachment to outer possessions that natural insight into one's nature arises spontaneously.

2.30 ahimsā-satyāsteya-brahmacaryāparigrahā yamāḥ

The yamas are nonviolence, truthfulness, refrainment from stealing, celibacy, and renunciation of [unnecessary] possessions.

2.31 jāti-deśa-kāla-samayānavacchinnāḥ sārva-bhaumā mahā-vratam

[These yamas] are considered the great vow. They are not exempted by one's class, place, time, or circumstance. They are universal. The Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali (Bryant, 2015, 316 and 321)

The universality of the *yamas* (YS 2.31) indicates a path to salvation which exists in its own right and transcends doctrine. Vyāsa's and Śāṅkara's commentary of this sutra points to the Brahmanical practice of sacrifice as being not exempt from this *Great Vow*. One might say that this text is radical in its opposition to the status quo of the text's contemporary society norms (Leggett, 1990).

Sutra 2.34 presents a warning that any action caused by anger, greed and delusion only causes further pain and suffering. The detailed description of subdivisions of suffering caused by different types of delusional intentions is set out to demonstrate the active element of causality in one's own experience. The severity of harm done will result in the level of pain received either in a hell realm or in one's own body. The shadow caused by the affliction of pain unto another lingers for lifetimes, hindering one's happiness in future lives.

2.34 vitarkā himsādayaḥ kṛta-kāritānumoditā lobha-krodha-moha-pūrvakā mṛdu-madhyādhi-mātrā duḥkhājñānānanta-phalā iti pratipakṣabhāvanam

The opposite: *bhāvanam*, cultivation Negative thoughts are violence, *etc.* They may be [personally] performed, performed on one's behalf by another, or authorized by oneself; they may be triggered by greed, anger, or delusion; and they may be slight, moderate, or extreme in intensity. One should cultivate counteracting thoughts, namely, that the end results [of negative thoughts] are ongoing suffering and ignorance.

The Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali, 2.34 (Bryant, 2015, 441)

The Sāṅkhyakārikā does not stipulate paths of practice; however, ethics is imperative to self-realisation (Jacobson, 1999). This is reflected in Śāṅkara's objection to the common 6-limbed

yoga approach where the means to knowledge starts at *asana*. He states that a firm sitting posture will not lead to *samādhi* if the mind is disturbed; restraints and observances are the basic qualifications for higher realisation.

The qualification is not simply that one wants to do yoga, for the holy text says: 'But he who has not first turned away from his wickedness, who is not tranquil and subdued, or whose mind is not at rest, he can never obtain the Self (even) by knowledge' (*Kaṭha* 1.2.24). And in the Atharva text, 'It is in those who have tapas and *brahmacaryā*, in whom truth is established' (Praš. Up. I.15), and in the *Gītā*, 'Firm in their vow of *brahmacaryā*' (VI.14). So, the restraints and observances are methods of yoga. (Leggett, 1990, pg 387).

Perfection of the *yamas* brings about certain insights, powers, stamina and preparation for practices which further refine the breath and body. The translucent nature of *sāttva* over the instruments of perception allows readiness for meditation which is the ability to absorb oneself in a physical or subtle object. This is due to the lack of *vṛtti* (moving thought projections) disturbing the flow of consciousness onto an object (YS 1.12) (Burley, 2007). The *sattvic* inner world is emanated into the outer world; perception is purified. By withdrawing the senses from their sense objects, the *vṛtti* stop and *buddhi* shines through (YS 1.41 and 4.22). Consciousness starts to take the form of *buddhi*, not the illusion of the object it is drawn to. This type of connection with an object is *samādhi*; there are no *bhūtamātra*, *saṃskāras* or *vāsanā*, just an exchange of pure consciousness. This is correct knowledge.

1.41 *ksīṇa-vṛtter abhijātasyeva maṇer grahīṭṛ-grahaṇa-grāhyeṣu tat-stha-tad-añjanatā samāpattiḥ*

Samāpatti, complete absorption of the mind when it is free from its *vṛttis*, occurs when the mind becomes just like a transparent jewel, taking the form of whatever object is placed before it, whether the object is the knower, the instrument of knowledge, or the object of knowledge.

4.22 *citer apratisaṅkramāyās tad-ākārāpattau svabuddhi- samvedanam*

Although it is unchanging, consciousness becomes aware of its own intelligence by means of pervading the forms assumed by the intelligence.
The Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali, 1.44 and 4.22 (Bryant, 2015, 217 and 524)

Once *prakṛiti* has been witnessed by *puruṣa* her job is done and she ceases to exist (SK 66). Complete dissolution has happened and there is no more need for creation; creation has served its ultimate purpose. From a psychological perspective, there is no special happiness attained from this eschatology; however, one can attain the state of *jīvanmukti* where *puruṣa*

continues to be closely associated with *buddhi* until the physical life ceases and liberation is certain (SK 67 to 68).

*dr̥ṣṭā mayety upekṣaka eko dr̥ṣṭāhamity uparamaty anyā /
sati saṃyoge 'pi tayoh prayojanaṃ nāsti sargasya // 66 //*

'I have seen her,' says the spectating one; 'I have been seen,' says the other, desisting; although the two remain in conjunction, there is no initiation of [further] emergence.

*samyagjñānādhighamād dharmādināmakārajaprāptau /
tiṣṭati saṃskāravaśat cakrabhramivad dhṛtaśariraḥ // 67 //*

Due to the attainment of perfect knowledge, virtue (dharma) and the rest have no impelling cause; [nevertheless,] the endowed body persists owing to the momentum of impressions, like a potter's wheel.

*prāpte śarirabhede caritārthatvāt pradhānavinivṛttau / aikāntikam ātyantikam
ubhayaṃ kaivalyam āpnoti // 68 //*

Pradhana being inactive, her purpose having been fulfilled, [*purusa*], upon separating from the body, attains aloneness (*kaivalya*), which is both singular and conclusive. *Sāṃkhyakārikā* 66-68 (Burley, 2007, 177-178)

The state of *puruṣa* is no state at all, which to most individuals is not an appealing motivation. However, the fact that one is freed from suffering is reason enough to pursue liberation on its graduated path from bondage and ignorance to knowledge and freedom from suffering (Perret, 2007). According to the metaphysics of *Sāṃkhya* and *Yoga*, the nature of our lived experience eventually leads to suffering. However, according to causality through the cultivation of *sattva guṇa*, freedom from suffering is possible and the upward journey to final *kaivalya* is certainly a worthy aspiration.

Conclusion

The conditioned reality we perceive is illusory to the extent that the balance of *guṇas* influences the clarity of vision into the true nature of consciousness. Our mistaken identity to matter is the outcome of the dividing nature of *prakṛiti* and her tendency to cling to a concept of self, leading to thoughts, identities, and constructs of an increasingly *tamasic* nature. The balance of the *guṇas* is the key to the way out of psychological suffering and can be achieved in several ways. Given that all thought is *prakṛiti* and all *prakṛiti* is a varying combination of *guṇas*, then the nature of the thought directly affects the qualities of our perception. The key concept are thoughts of a more selfish nature dominate in *tamas* and those of a more generous

selfless nature dominate in *sāttva* as defined in the Sāṃkhyakārikā and Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali. Arguably, the most sustainable path towards a permanent liberation from the self is through adjusting attitudes towards more ethical motivations. The *sāttvic* perspective will always unveil the real relationship between consciousness and matter thus severing *prakṛiti*'s reactive response to *puruṣa*.

Our phenomenological experience from the most solid, most corporeal to the most subtle thought directly correlates to the hierarchical ladder of the cosmological architecture of the universe. This is to say that the witnessing tools within the individual are made from the same components as the manifest universe that unfolds 'outside' the individual. To understand the nature of each *guṇa* is to understand the nature of *prakṛiti*, thus understanding the nature of the mind and the universe.

The frameworks presented in the Yoga Sūtra model strike a remarkable resemblance to new research in the field of consciousness and psychology. Examples of these similarities appear in research into altered states of consciousness and the effects of insight in psychedelic research as well as neurobiology and discoveries of the Default Mode Network, a resting state of the non-active mind which maintains the identity of the individual. The function of the DMN pays striking resemblance to the function of the *antakarāṇa* which has proved to play a significant role in supporting the egoic identity of the individual. When the DMN is deactivated, transpersonal states can be accessed either through meditation or psychotropics. Although this study has not directly analysed the Western psychological view in comparison to the Yoga Sūtra and Sāṃkhyakārikā, the frameworks presented can provide a model for our newly developing psychological paradigms in the West which explore the transpersonal in conjunction with the personal. As the West embarks on new ways to traverse liminal spaces, the YS and the SK present a framework and a wholesome path which can support and steer the practitioner away from adverse psychological outcomes. With our current findings in altered states of consciousness, the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders can no longer provide appropriate, up to date and healthy paths out of suffering with our new understanding of the mind and the psychological benefits of transpersonal states.

Our current medical mental health programs examine the suffering mind as an illness that needs fixing. The pathologisation of human suffering can often cause stigmatisation and further suffering. Without looking at the whole human being, the root cause of suffering is

never treated i.e., the nature of the mind. These ideas are coming into the mainstream through practices such as mindfulness, yet we are still in the dark about how thought affects the mind-body phenomena in Western psychology. Texts such as *Sāṃkhyakārikā* and *Yoga Sūtras* of Patañjali provide more than just a theoretical framework but disclosure of experience from great masters who have managed to steer their minds towards psychological states free from suffering. The texts offer tried, and tested methods coupled with a framework to support the individual on the path towards insight into the nature of suffering and radical freedom from suffering. Suffering is defined as a natural outcome caused by natural processes. Through this framework, it is easier to accept that suffering is due to the nature of the mind rather than through the fault of the individual. The philosophical framework supports the process of detaching oneself from one's suffering, thus the soteriology and ontology work hand in hand.

The pleasure-seeking *Cārvāka* might argue that the cost of seeking liberation is too high considering the effort and sacrifice it takes. To attain freedom from bondage one must give up the things that make life worth living. A yogi would argue that the gradual lessening of attachment through cultivating contentment, the shared joy of exercising friendliness and the abandonment of fear through actioning kindness are worthy enough even without final *kaivalya*. The path is not suffering until freedom; it is a gradual lessening of *tammās* or suffering in the psyche.

Bibliography

- Bakker, H. (1982). 'On the Origin of Samkhya Psychology.'. *Vienna Journal of South Asian Studies and Archive of Indian Philosophy*, Volume 26, 117-148.
- Bronkhorst, J. (2000). The Last Reason for Satkaryavada. *Haranadalahari. Volume in Honour of Professor Hara on his Seventieth Birthday*, 53-62.
- Bryant, E. (2015). *THE YOGA SŪTRAS OF PATAÑJALI, A New Edition, Translation and Commentary*. New York: North Point Press .
- Burke, D. (n.d.). Transcendence in Classical Samkhya. *Philosophy East and West*, 38, 19-29.
- Burley, M. (2004, November). 'Aloneness' and the Problem of Realism in Classical Samkhya and Yoga. *Asian Philosophy*, 14, 223-238.
- Burley, M. (2007). *Classical Sāṃkhya and Yoga An Indian Metaphysics of Experience* . London and New York: Routledge.
- Eliade, M., Trask, W., & White, D. G. (2009). • *Mircea Eliade, Willard Ropes Trask and David Gordon White Yoga: Immortality and Freedom, Princeton University Press*,. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Feuerstein, G. (1989). *The Yoga-Sutra of Patanjali A New Translation and Commentary*. Vermont: Inner Traditions India.
- Flood, G. (2006). *The Tantric Body, The Secret Tradition of Hindu Religion*. London and New York: I.B Tauris & Co. Ltd.

- Geoffrey, S. (2008). *The Origins of Yoga and Tantra*, Cambridge University Press. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodall, D., & Harunaga, I. (2011). Tantric Traditions. In J. F. (ed.), *The Continuum Companion to Hindu Studies*. London and New York.
- Jacobson, K. A. (1999). *Prakṛiti in Sāṃkhya-Yoga Material Principle, Religious Experience, Ethical Implications*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Kṛṣṇa's, I. (1933). *Sāṃkhya Kārikā Śvara Kṛṣṇa's Memorable Verses on Samkhya Philosophy with the Commentary of Gaudapādācārya*. (D. H. Sharma, Ed.) Poona: Oriental Book Agency.
- Larson, G. (1969). *Classical Sāṃkhya An Interpretation of its History and Meaning*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Private Limited.
- Larson, J. (2011). *Classical Sāṃkhya: An Interpretation of Its History and Meaning*. Motilal Banarsidass.
- Larson, J. G. (1998). *Classical Sāṃkhya: An Interpretation of Its History and Meaning*. Motilal Banarasidass.
- Leggett, T. (1990). *The Complete Commentary by Sankara on the Yoga Sutra-s A Full Translation of the Newly Discovered Text*. London and New York: Kegan Paul International.
- Parrott, R. J. (1986). The Problem of the Samkhya Tattvas as Both Cosmic and Psychological Phenomena. *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 55-77.
- Pattni, R. (2016). A Psychological Understanding of the Yogasūtra of Patañjali (sūtra 1 to 6) with a Comparative Phenomenology of Samādhi and Flow. *A thesis submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Faculty of Theology, University of Oxford, Hilary Term, 2016*. Oxford.
- Perret, R. (2007). *Indian Ethics, Classical Traditions and Contemporary Challenges Volume I* (Vol. Volume 1). (P. Bilimoria, J. Prabhu, & R. Sharma, Eds.) London: Routledge.
- Perrett, R. W. (2001). *Indian Philosophy, A Collection of Readings. Epistemology*. (R. W. Perre, Ed.) New York, London: Routledge.
- Prasāda, R. (1997). *Nature's Finer Forces: The Science of Breath and the Philosophy of the Tattvas*. Kessinger.
- Prasāda, R. (1998). *Patañjali's Yoga Sūtras with the commentary of Vyāsa and the gloss of Vāchaspati Miśra*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt Ltd.
- Raveh, D. (2012). *Exploring the Yoga Sutras: Philosophy and Translation*. . New York: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Sharma, D. H. (1933). *Sāṃkhya Kārikā Śvara Kṛṣṇa's Memorable Verses on Sāṃkhya Philosophy with the Commentary of Gaudapādācārya*. Poona, India: Sacred Text Series.
- Van Buitenen, J. (1957, April-June). Studies in Samkhya. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 77, 88-107.
- Whicher, I. (2007). *Indian Ethics Classical Traditions and Contemporary Challenges Volume I* (Vol. 1). (P. Bilimoria, J. Prabhu, & R. Sharma, Eds.) London: Routledge.
- Woodroffe, S. (2003). *The Serpent Power*. Ganesh and Co. T Nagar.