

Graham Burns (245343)
Text and Context in Classical Hinduism (15PSRC007)
Essay 1
MA Religions
Year 1

Yoga: The Roots of an Orthodox Darśana
Classical Yoga in the Vedas and Principal Upaniṣads

Graham Burns
January 2009

Introduction

Yoga is one of the six generally accepted orthodox schools of Indian philosophy (*darśanas*, literally “ways of seeing”). In this context, “orthodox” is taken to imply acceptance of the revelatory (*śruti*) quality of the Vedas (King 1999:43) – in contra-distinction to the heterodox thinking of groups such as the Buddhists, Jains, Ājīvikas and Carvakas – and “yoga” to refer to the teachings set out in the Yoga Sūtras (YS), a text of 195 or 196 verses attributed to a sage called Patañjali¹. The purpose of this essay is to consider how “orthodox”, in this sense, the yoga of Patañjali in fact is. To do this, I propose first to summarise briefly the meaning of the term yoga and the key features of Patañjali’s teachings; secondly, to put the YS into their historical context; then, by reference to the texts and other sources, to consider the extent to which the teachings of the YS can be seen to be rooted in the Vedas² and the extent to which they appear to draw from non-Vedic influences³.

What is yoga?

If one were to ask 50 contemporary westerners to define “yoga”, the likelihood is that one would receive 50 different answers. Many respondents would acknowledge yoga’s Indian origins, but would probably emphasise yoga as a discipline of physical fitness and/or stress relief. Only more serious students would be likely to acknowledge it as a centuries old philosophical and spiritual discipline. It is beyond the scope of this essay to explore how yoga developed in the centuries after the YS, but what is clear is that “yoga” has developed a very broad range of meanings. Interestingly, though, probably the majority of those teaching yoga in the west today see the YS as the root text of what they are teaching – even when the actual content of their classes bears little relation to Patañjali’s underlying philosophy and teachings.

The word yoga is etymologically derived from the root yuj, meaning “to yoke” or “to unite”, and yuj is acknowledged by the Oxford English Dictionary as a root of

¹ See below for discussion of the author’s actual identity.

² Unless otherwise indicated, it should be assumed throughout this essay that references to the “Vedas” are to be interpreted as reference to the Vedic canon in its widest sense: including the *Brāhmaṇas*, *Āraṇyakas* and Principal *Upaniṣads*, and not just to the four Vedic *Samhitās*.

³ Unless otherwise indicated, in this essay quotations from the Yoga Sūtras are from Hariharānanda Āranya 1963; the *R̥g Veda* are from Doniger O’Flaherty 1981; the *Upaniṣads* (other than the *Maitrī*) from Olivelle 1996; and the *Maitrī Upaniṣad* from Roebuck 2000.

the English word “yoke”. This mundane meaning of the word presents, as we will see, its own problems for the student of the roots of yoga as a philosophical and spiritual discipline – especially one which traces those roots to predominantly pastoral and agricultural societies.

Over time, the word yoga has become a by-word for almost “any ascetic technique and any method of meditation” (Eliade 1969:4), whether actually or ostensibly acknowledging Vedic authority or not. As Larson says:

“Yoga may become any method of meditation for inhibiting heart disease, toning muscles, increasing concentration, fostering relaxation... the ecumenical possibilities are nearly endless.”⁴

Why has the word yoga been so widely used in this way, way beyond either its original, mundane, meaning or the meaning given to it either by Patañjali or by those on whose teachings Patañjali drew? As Joshi points out (1965:53) “The word “yoga” has great prestige value”. There are perhaps two main – and slightly conflicting - reasons for this. First, there is the common tendency to try to legitimise something by associating it with antiquity, perhaps especially an ancient and so-called “orthodox” spiritual discipline (a tendency reflected in the many contemporary advertisements for consumer products which depict people in supposed yoga postures, but for which there is also authority in ancient Indian times). Secondly, there is the “exotic” nature of yoga, which is harnessed to present yoga as something out of the ordinary, more than just an exercise or relaxation regime. Through the ages (and, again, even to the present day), yoga practitioners (yogins) have been seen as out of the ordinary, beyond the realm of the common person, perhaps even possessing extraordinary powers – quite simply, unorthodox. As Joshi says:

“It is customary to look at yoga as a curious ancient art which combines a set of religious beliefs with a strange and mysterious practical discipline. To the orthodox Hindu mind, it represents something very high, beyond the ken of the man on the street...”⁵

This apparent mixture of claimed orthodoxy and exalted unorthodoxy is, as we shall see, not a new phenomenon in the history of yoga.

For Patañjali, the description of yoga was straightforward:

⁴ Quoted in Whicher 1998:6.

⁵ 1965:53. See this article generally for a discussion of the various meanings of the word in a number of texts.

“Yoga is the cessation of the turnings of the mind: then the Seer abides in its own nature.”⁶

Numerous translations have been offered of these two verses, but their key elements can be seen to be:

- (a) some form of stilling or controlling (nirodha) of the turnings or movements (*vṛtti*) of the mind or consciousness (*citta*); and
- (b) the resulting position of the “Seer”.

The word usually translated as “Seer” – *draṣṭuḥ* – is interesting. Seen as referring to some form of ultimate individual consciousness or reality, or essential self, it is surprising in a supposedly orthodox text not to find the word *ātman*, a word which has great prominence in the Vedic Upaniṣads but appears nowhere in the YS. The explanation for this may lie in the associations between Patañjali’s yoga and the *Sāṃkhya* school of philosophy, but the YS frequently use the term *puruṣa* – a key term in *Sāṃkhya*. Might the use of *draṣṭuḥ* at the beginning of the text reflect a concern not to use a word which might have “negative” connotations to Buddhists and other heterodox schools?⁷

The goal and the path(s)

Clearly, stilling or restraining the turnings of the mind is not a goal in itself. If it were, YS 1.3 and much of what follows would be redundant. For Patañjali, the final goal of yoga is *kaivalya* – literally “aloneness”, a state defined using *Sāṃkhya* terms as:

“the state of permanent cessation of the *guṇas* which have no further service to render to *puruṣa*” (YS 4.34)

in other words, a state of isolation of spirit (*puruṣa*) from matter (*prakṛti*).

In order to achieve this end, the YS present the practitioner with several paths. In each case, however, it is made clear that *kaivalya* will not come about through

⁶ YS 1.2 and 1.3 – author’s own translation.

⁷ Bearing in mind that Buddhism specifically denies the existence of a single ultimate reality or self.

knowledge alone, but requires “practice... for a long time” (YS 1.14) pursued with “faith, energy, repeated recollection, concentration and real knowledge” (YS 1.20).

Pāda (book) 1 of the YS is generally considered as offering the “fast track” approach. Its paths are varied, but, with the exception of that in 1.34 (retention of exhalation), all revolve around some form of meditation. *Pāda* 2 sets out two further paths. The first, in *sūtra* 2.1, is described as the “yoga of action” (*kriyāyoga*) and consists of three limbs:

- *tapas* – in this context, usually defined as self-discipline, rather than austerity;
- *svādhyāya* – study of one’s own self or of scriptures; and
- *īśvarapranidhāna* – devotion or surrender to *īśvara* (god).

The second is the well known “eight limbed”, or *aṣṭāṅga*, path (YS 2.29), comprising:

- *yama* – behavioural norms (non-violence, truthfulness, non-stealing, continence and material non-possessiveness)
- *niyama* – personal observances (cleanliness, contentment, *tapas*, *svādhyāya* and *īśvarapranidhāna* – see above)
- *āsana* – bodily posture (literally “seat”, though later appropriated to refer to the well known physical postures of *hatha yoga*)
- *prāṇāyāma* – restraint of breath, or of *prāṇa*⁸
- *pratyāhāra* – withdrawal of the senses
- *dhāraṇā* – concentration
- *dhyāna* – meditation
- *samādhi* - absorption.

Points to note here are, first, the incorporation of the three limbs of the “second” (YS 2.1) path (which, YS 2.2 tells us, themselves lead to *samādhi*) as just three of the five *niyamas*; and, secondly, the idea of eight limbs, which some commentators have considered a reflection of the Buddha’s noble eight fold path⁹. Zigmund-Cerbu has suggested that the ethical qualities of the first two limbs may have their root in Patañjali’s “superficial” theism (1963:129, citing Eliade); an alternative explanation might be to see them relating back to developing ideas of

⁸ *Prāṇa* is a complex, but very important, term in yoga. Although often roughly equated with breath, it is generally seen as encompassing a more profound energy or “life force”. See further below.

⁹ E.g. Cope 2006:279; Stoler Miller 1998:109, n15

Buddhist morality and/or the developing importance of the doctrines of karma and rebirth.

In passing, it is also worth noting that pāda 3 of the YS sets out a number of siddhis (extraordinary powers) allegedly available to those who follow Patañjali's path(s) of yoga. While the YS themselves caution against the use of these powers for egotistical purposes, their inclusion in a text which in many respects can seem dry and analytical may be another nod towards the view of the yogin as "exotic" or "unorthodox".

The YS in chronological context

It is impossible to explore the historical origins of the YS without attempting to piece together some sort of chronology. There is much debate over the dating of the YS, as well as debate over (a) whether they form one integral text or a compilation and (b) whether they are the work of a single author; if so, whether he was named Patañjali, and, if so, whether he was the same Patañjali as the famous Sanskrit grammarian of that name, believed to have lived in the second century BCE. These latter debates are of less importance for present purposes, but are summarised briefly by Eliade (1958:370-2) and Connolly (2007:137-40). As to the actual dating of the YS, the best that we can come up with is a probable date between 200 BCE and 200-300 CE, with the weight of (at least western) scholarship leaning towards the later end of that range¹⁰. As Eliade points out (1958:9), the dating of the YS is, on one level, of marginal relevance if, as is generally accepted to be the case, they purport to restate and consolidate existing teachings; on another level, however, their dating may turn out to be significant when we consider the texts and teachings which may have influenced them.

Dating the ancient śruti texts of the Vedas presents its own difficulties. First, we are not looking to date written texts, for the Vedas were transmitted orally long before they were committed to writing. Secondly, as śruti, or revelation, for many "the question is irrelevant, since, in essence, at least, the whole of śruti literature is considered to be apauruṣeya, not of human origin, and of primordial antiquity"

¹⁰ See, e.g., King 1999:68 ("third to fourth century CE"); Flood 1996:96 ("between 100 BCE and 500 CE"; Whicher 1998:39 ("second to third century CE"). Cf. Iyengar (one of the most widely respected figures in contemporary yoga) at 1966:1 ("between 500 and 200 BC"). Neither Eliade nor Connolly, both of whom summarise the arguments, expresses a conclusion. Bechert, in the context of dating the life of the Buddha, points out that "the tendency to claim high antiquity for the founder of a tradition is common to all periods of Indian ... history" (1982:33)

(Roebuck 2000:xxiv). As Olivelle says in relation to the Principal Upaniṣads “...any dating of these documents that attempts a precision closer than a few centuries is as stable as a house of cards” (1996:xxxvi). However, fairly general consensus puts the Vedic *Samhitās*, beginning with the *Ṛg* Veda, somewhere between 1500 and 1200 BCE (or perhaps a little later in the case of the Atharva Veda)¹¹; and the Principal Upaniṣads¹² between about 700 and 200 BCE¹³.

The individual whose life, more than that of Patañjali, is relevant to this study is the Buddha. Traditionally, the Buddha has been thought to have lived from 566 to 486 BCE, but more recent scholarship¹⁴ tends to put him a century or so later – though whether this precision is more stable than Olivelle’s house of cards remains speculative. With the above caveats in mind, we can posit a tentative chronology for the texts and characters which particularly concern this investigation as follows:

Ṛg Veda – 1500 to 1200 BCE

Atharva Veda – 1200 to 1000 BCE

Bṛhadāraṇyaka, *Cāndogya* and *Taittirīya* Upaniṣads – 700 to 400 BCE¹⁵

Life of the Buddha – c 450 to 350 BCE

Kaṭha and *Śvetāśvatara* Upaniṣads – 400 to 200 BCE¹⁶

Yoga *Sūtras* – 200 BCE to 300 CE

One text which I have omitted from the above chronology is the *Maitrī* Upaniṣad. The dating of this text which, as we will see, is a key text in the exposition of yoga, is controversial. It is widely thought to be a late (i.e. post-Buddha)

¹¹ There are contrary views: the well-known yoga scholar David Frawley uses astrological and other evidence from the *Ṛg* Veda to support a theory that the *Ṛg* Veda predated the Indus Valley civilisation which flourished from about 2500 BCE and even goes so far as to suggest that “the Vedic people were probably in India by 6000 BC” (1991:39).

¹² I am using the term “Principal Upaniṣads” as shorthand for the 12 or 13 texts generally given this appellation. Although lists vary, the 13 widely included under this heading are those included in Roebuck’s translation: the *Īśā*, *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*, *Cāndogya*, *Taittirīya*, *Aitareya*, *Kauṣītaki*, *Kena*, *Kaṭha*, *Śvetāśvatara*, *Muṇḍaka*, *Praśna*, *Māṇḍūkya* and *Maitrī*.

¹³ Flood 1996:37; Roebuck 2000:xxvi.

¹⁴ E.g. Bechert 1982

¹⁵ Bronkhorst puts the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* as post-Buddha (1993:112-113)

¹⁶ Radhakrishnan (1953:22) puts the *Kaṭha* significantly earlier

Upaniṣad¹⁷ or, at least, to have come into its present form at a relatively late stage in the development of the Vedic canon, and chapter 6, which is of most relevance for our present purposes, is widely thought to be a late addition to the core text. Roebuck considers that the Maitrī “could have been put into its present form as late as the second or third century CE” (2000:xxvi).

Yoga in the Vedic *Samhitās*

Having outlined the basic teachings of the YS, and attempted to put the YS into historical perspective, I return now to the question of the relationship between the YS and the Vedas.

As is well known, certain of the seals found by archaeologists excavating the Indus Valley sites depict individuals sitting cross-legged¹⁸. This has led to suggestions that these seals indicate that a form of yoga must have been practised in the Indus Valley. However, this sort of conclusion must be approached with considerable caution. There is little, if any, evidence of the actual practices undertaken by these individuals: indeed, little evidence that they were doing anything more than sitting cross-legged. As Samuel says about the most famous of these seals “The only reasonable conclusion is that we do not actually know how to interpret the figure” (2008, 4). In a similar way, Egyptian wall paintings of dancers have been found which appear to show the dancers performing yoga postures (Scaravelli 1991:16): while yoga postures may have been performed in Egypt centuries before they were first documented in India, we have no evidence about why the dancers’ bodies were in these particular shapes. In this latter case, there is at least as much logic in the argument that yoga postures drew on traditional dance movements than the other way round.

We should approach the question of yoga in the Vedic *Samhitās* with similar caution. The word “yoga” appears only a handful of times in the *R̥g* Veda, and then, ostensibly anyway, in its “mundane” context of joining, or yoking, one thing to another, with no concrete evidence of a deeper, symbolic, meaning. Again, that does not prove that the Vedic *ṛ̥sis* did not have meditative practice in mind, but, as with the Indus Valley seals, we cannot say this with any certainty. Despite this, writers have sought to find references to yoga in the *R̥g* Veda in a number of ways. Miller and Frawley, for example, both rely on references in *R̥g* Veda 5.81 to

¹⁷ Though Max Müller and van Buitenen argue otherwise: for a summary of the controversy see Cohen 2008:254-6

¹⁸ See, e.g., Samuel 2008:2-7; Eliade 1958:354-6

priests “harnessing their holy thoughts” (translation Griffith) as indicative of a practice of mind control¹⁹. Miller goes on to suggest that the Vedic sacrifice was itself a form of yoga: the chanting of the hymns and the ritual of the sacrifice serving as “aids to the process of internalisation”. In a broad sense, they may be right: but, again, do we have any evidence to support the argument that this verse and/or the sacrificial practices were forerunners of the more systematised yoga of the YS?

Two other verses of the *R̥g* Veda are often cited in support of the argument that yoga practice was, if not common, at least known. The comparison in 7.103 of Brahmins to frogs²⁰ has been used to suggest a reference to priests sitting cross-legged, or in padmāsana (lotus posture), with the perhaps inevitable conclusion that the Brahmins may (must?) have been practising yoga (Frawley 1991:220). The other often cited verse is 10.136²¹, which refers to long haired ascetics (keśins) apparently having some sort of drug fuelled out of body experiences with the deity Rudra, who, as Śiva, later came to be referred to as the “lord of yoga”. The use of this latter verse highlights another tendency among yoga historians: that of equating references to asceticism to yoga practice. Again, they may be right, but we have no evidence to support the idea that the long haired ascetics of *R̥g* Veda 10.136 were using yoga practices in the sense that that idea came to acquire. Certainly, there is again something of a contradiction in citing both the unorthodox long haired ascetics and the orthodox frog like Brahmins as early practitioners of yoga, unless yoga was more widespread in Vedic times than the textual evidence really supports²².

¹⁹ Miller 1974:50; Frawley 1991:210. Frawley even, rather tendentiously, translates as “yogically control their minds” the words which Griffith translates as “harness their holy thoughts”. However, it is worth noting that the word yoga does not appear in this verse.

²⁰ Doniger O’Flaherty 1981:232

²¹ Doniger O’Flaherty 1981:137

²² One important yogic concept which does have early references in the Vedic *Samhitās*, is the importance of the breath or, more specifically, of *prāṇa* in its wider context of life force or energy. We have seen that control of *prāṇa* (*prāṇāyāma*) is one of the limbs of the *aṣṭāṅga* yoga of the YS and, while the practice of postures (*āsana*) has come to dominate much contemporary yoga practice, Patañjali devotes significantly more of the YS to the practice of *prāṇāyāma* than he does to the practice of *āsana*. In *sūtra* 2.52 we are told that “by that” (i.e. *prāṇāyāma*) “the veil over manifestation of knowledge is thinned”. Much later yoga texts (e.g. the *Hatha Yoga Pradīpikā* and some of the Yoga Upaniṣads) also give *prāṇāyāma* a more exalted position than *āsana*. *Prāṇa* develops much greater significance in the *Bṛahmaṇas* and the Upaniṣads, but a foretaste of its developing importance is given in the Atharva Veda where book 11 hymn 4 lauds *prāṇa* as “the lord of all, on whom all is supported” and as that which “truly, is the lord of all

Yoga in the Principal Upaniṣads – an Introduction

While the main focus of religious practice at the time of the Vedic *Samhitās* was sacrifice, with the aims both of tangible earthly rewards (usually in the form of rain, cows or sons) and of achieving immortality, by the time of the Principal Upaniṣads more spiritual activities had “erupted into the open” (Werner 1977:108). While the idea that yoga had roots in the Vedic *Samhitās* (or earlier) has both proponents (e.g. Miller and Frawley) and opponents, or at least sceptics (e.g. Whicher and Pomedda), there is no real dispute that yoga has roots in the Principal Upaniṣads ²³.

It is customary to classify the Upaniṣads into an “early group” – including the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka*, *Cāndogya* and *Taittirīya* – and a “later group”, including the *Kātha*, *Śvetāśvatara* and *Maitrī*. While there are stylistic differences between the two groups, the intervening period between them is especially noteworthy as having seen the rise of a number of heterodox religious traditions, particularly those of the Buddhists, Jains, Ājīvikas and Carvakas, which did not accept the authority of the Vedic teachings or the soteriology of the Vedic sacrifice. While the Upaniṣads contain a wide range of teachings, a common theme is the subordination of ritual action to knowledge, particularly knowledge about the self (*ātman*). It is sometimes argued that this shift – described by Whicher as a “revolution” (1998:13) – coincided with a decline in the performance of the Vedic sacrifice. This may or not be true, but, if it is, it is surely more useful to consider the reasons behind its decline, and the reasons for the so-called “internalisation” of the sacrifice into the quest for knowledge and understanding. Certainly, the heterodox groups are likely to have enjoyed some cross-fertilisation with the orthodox Brahmanical traditions, even if they grew up in a geographical area which at the time may not have been fully “Brahmanised”²⁴, but, as Flood stresses (1996:83), the Upaniṣads define themselves as firmly within the Vedic canon as a reinterpretation and elucidation of Vedic practices, rather than a reaction against them, and show no explicit awareness of the heterodox traditions.

that breathes, and all that does not breathe” (translation Bloomfield). It is worth noting, however, that, at this stage, *prāṇa* seems to be something to be revered and honoured, rather than, as it later became, something to be controlled.

²³ In the remainder of this essay, it should be assumed that references to the *Upaniṣads* are references to the Principal *Upaniṣads*, as defined above. I am not going to discuss the Yoga *Upaniṣads* in this essay, as, on just about any analysis, they post-date the YS.

²⁴ A point emphasised by Prof. Johannes Bronkhorst in his 2008 Numata lecture series at SOAS.

Perhaps of more relevance is the significant change in Indian society which took place around the time of the Upaniṣads. Generally referred to as the “second urbanisation” (the Indus Valley civilisation having been the first), the first millennium BCE saw a shift from a predominantly pastoral society towards an agrarian society centred around increasingly developed towns, with the corresponding increase in trade and travel. As we see in contemporary society, urbanisation tends to provoke a greater emphasis on the individual over the extended family or social group, and, perhaps, greater exposure to, and willingness to explore, new ideas²⁵. Certainly, Thapar (following Staal) sees the rise of renunciate traditions as deriving, at least in part, from nostalgia for a disappearing nomadic life (2000a:822) or, as she also puts it, “the age of transcendence was not accidental” (2000b:882).

In the earliest Upaniṣads – the Bṛhadāraṇyaka and Cāndogya – there is still no real evidence of any systematic practice of mental control. Probably the most we can say is that ideas which assumed significance in later yoga teachings began to emerge as important. The most significant of these is *prāṇa*. We have seen that *prāṇa* was revered in the Atharva Veda, but it is the early Upaniṣads which begin to develop a more sophisticated theory of *prāṇa*, not least its division into five principal ways of flowing, the control and manipulation of which assumed great importance in the much later hatha yoga tradition²⁶. The idea that the state of an individual’s breath could influence his or her mental state, and the idea that the breath might be a useful focus for meditation (both of which are embraced to some extent by the YS²⁷ and become increasingly important in later yoga practice) can be seen in the Cāndogya Upaniṣad, in which Uddālaka Āruṇi teaches Śvetaketu:

“Take a bird that is tied with a string. It will fly off in every direction and, when it cannot find a resting place anywhere else, it will alight back upon the very thing to which it is tied. Similarly, son, the mind flies off in every direction and, when it cannot find a resting place anywhere else, it alights back upon the breath itself; for the mind, my son, is tied to the breath.”²⁸

²⁵ Kaelber 2004:386-8, summarises this well

²⁶ These flows are variously described in different Upaniṣads, but, broadly speaking, come to be associated with different areas of the physical body, different bodily functions and different energetic effects.

²⁷ E.g. 1.34

²⁸ Cāndogya Upaniṣad 6.8.2. Another early Upaniṣadic concept which became very significant in later yoga practice is the idea of the five kośas – sheaths or layers – surrounding the individual’s essential core (described here as bliss), deriving from chapter 2 of the Taittirīya Upaniṣad.

By the early Upaniṣads, the ultimate aim of religious observance had begun to switch from the gaining of material ends and the achievement of immortality to liberation from the cycle of death and rebirth. While Vedic sacrificial practices were rooted in the notion that action – in the sense of precise ritual performance – was inextricably linked to the results of that action, those results, as we have seen, were generally portrayed as material benefits in this life, the prolongation of this life, and, ultimately, immortality in some heavenly realm. The early Upaniṣads saw the development of the notion that all human actions were linked to the results of those actions (generally referred to as the law of karma); that actions in one lifetime determined the quality of the next life; and that the ultimate goal was freedom from a continuous round of rebirth in the human world (*saṃsāra*). The doctrine of karma became “of near universal pervasiveness” (Tull 2004:318) in Indian religious thought, both “orthodox” and “heterodox” – accepted, with some variations, by Hindus, Buddhists and Jains alike. The question which, therefore, began to come to the forefront was how, if not by ritual action alone, liberation from *saṃsāra* might be achieved.

Knowledge, practice and grace – yoga in the later Principal Upaniṣads

We have seen that, for Patañjali, achievement of kaivalya required “long, uninterrupted, alert practice” pursued with “faith, energy, repeated recollection, concentration and real knowledge”²⁹. We have also seen that one of the paths to kaivalya emphasised tapas (self-discipline), *svādhyāya* (study) and *īśvarapranidhāna* (devotion or surrender to *īśvara*)³⁰. While the “superficial theism” of the YS has already been noted³¹, contemporary yoga students often fall into the trap of seeing yoga as being primarily a path of action, or practice, and neglecting the importance of both faith (*śraddha*) and what Hariharānanda describes as “real knowledge” (*prajñā*). Contrast this with the final verse of the *Cāndogya Upaniṣad* in which the teaching of Brahma, said to lead one to the world from which one “does not return again”, also emphasises study (*svādhyāya*) and withdrawal of the senses, but (other than calling for regular Vedic recitation) lacks any requirement for faith³², and there is little suggestion at this stage of any systematic form of mental practice as a prerequisite to liberation.

²⁹ YS 1.14 and 1.20

³⁰ YS 2.1

³¹ See page 5

³² *Cāndogya Upaniṣad* 8.15

The earliest references to yoga as a system begin to appear in the later Upaniṣads, and three of these – the *Kaṭha*, *Śvetāśvatara* and *Maitrī* – are of particular significance. As already noted³³, these texts are generally considered post-Buddhist, but there is another significant connection between them, in that all are associated with the Black Yajur Veda recension. Cohen (2008:62) points out that the Yajur Veda is thought to have flourished in the area to which Bronkhorst refers as Greater Maghada, the geographical area in which Buddhism arose. While not necessarily suggesting the direct influence of the Yajur Veda *śākhā* in the early teachings of the Buddha, Cohen does posit the likelihood of cross-fertilisation of ideas between the two traditions. While her analysis tends to focus on apparent references to Yajur Veda Upaniṣads in Buddhist teachings, her argument must logically imply that those Yajur Veda Upaniṣads which post-dated the life of the Buddha may, in turn, have been influenced by Buddhist ideas emerging out of the same “cultural and spiritual milieu”³⁴.

The earliest of these three key Upaniṣads is generally accepted to be the *Kaṭha* (KU) and, as already noted³⁵, there is by no means unanimity that it is post-Buddhist. In the KU we find probably the first unambiguous use of the word yoga in a sense other than its mundane one in the third teaching given by Yama to Naciketas in chapter 3. In this well-known teaching about the nature of the self, Yama begins by emphasising the efficacy of “rites rightly performed” (3.1), before comparing the self (*ātman*) to a rider in a chariot, with the intellect (*buddhi*) as the charioteer and the mind (*manas*) as the reins. The senses are compared to the horses and the sense objects to the paths. 3.5 goes on to teach that the person whose mind is uncontrolled has no control over the senses, in the same way as unruly horses beyond the control of the charioteer. 3.6 explains that the senses of a person who has understanding (*vijñāna*) and whose mind is restrained obey him as obedient horses obey the charioteer. The one with uncontrolled mind and lack of understanding remains on the cycle of rebirth; he who has understanding and control over his mind (and who is “pure”) reaches the “final step from which he is not reborn again” (KU 3.8).

This teaching is interesting in several respects. First, it uses words with the root *yuj* (the same as the word *yoga*) when talking about controlling the mind. This is not a surprising choice in the context of the story (the yoking of horses to a chariot), and might be thought of as coincidence, were it not for verse 6.11 (see

³³ See page 7

³⁴ Cohen 2008:62. Werner 1977 is another who suggests that the Brahmanical tradition took on ascetic practices from Greater Maghada and adopted them into orthodox teaching with a view to claiming universality. Cf. Flood 1996:83 (see page 10).

³⁵ See note 16

below). Secondly, it emphasises the control of the mind, but without offering any tools for achieving that control, other than through “understanding”. In other words, it appears to suggest knowledge as the key to controlling the mind and, accordingly, to liberation. In this respect, it is perhaps following in the tradition of the earlier Upaniṣads. Thirdly, control of the mind is seen as leading to control of the senses. As we have seen, sense withdrawal (*pratyāhāra*) is one stage of Patañjali’s eight limbed path. Lastly, though perhaps peripherally, it teaches that liberation requires purity. This is hardly a new idea (cf. the preparation of the *yajamāna* before Vedic sacrifice) but its emphasis may perhaps be an early foreshadow of *yama* and *niyama*³⁶.

In KU 6.10 and 6.11, we learn that:

“When the five senses... together with the mind cease... and the intellect itself does not stir, that, they say, is the highest state. This, they consider to be yoga, the steady control of the senses. Then one becomes undistracted for yoga comes and goes.” (translation Radhakrishnan)

For the first time, we see a direct association of the word *yoga* with control of the mind and senses. Still, however, we have no guidance about how this control is brought about. The idea that *yoga* “comes and goes” is not a universal translation of the final part of 6.11: Olivelle, for example, translates it as “*yoga* is the coming-into-being, as well as the ceasing to be” (1996:246). However, the idea of *yoga* as something transient suggests that systematic practice may be important, an emphasis which is largely lacking from the remainder of the text.

For the writer of the KU, there is no doubt that the goal of *yoga* was liberation from *saṃsāra* and that that liberation was to be found primarily through knowledge – both the knowledge of the importance of controlling the mind and senses and the knowledge of Yama’s teachings about the self. The final verse (6.18) states that:

“... after Naciketas received this body of knowledge, and the entire set of yogic rules (*etām yogavidhim*) taught by Death, he attained Brahman; he became free of aging and death; so will others who know this teaching...”.

It is interesting to conjecture what might be meant by “and the entire set of yogic rules” with its inference that Yama gave Naciketas not just the “body of knowledge” but something more. Does this imply a systematic set of practices, the

³⁶ I acknowledge the danger here of falling into the trap of making more of the reference than is justified.

details of which are omitted from the *Upaniṣad*? Or does it simply refer to the control of the mind and senses? It is clear that the *Upaniṣad* emphasises knowledge as the primary means of liberation, but this reference to “rules” may be another suggestion that practice forms part of the path. What is missing, however, is any suggestion that renunciation or asceticism per se are required³⁷. Theistic influence is also generally lacking in the later part of the text. While we should bear in mind that the teaching was initially conveyed by the god of death, there is no obvious requirement for divine grace as part of the path to liberation. However, in 2.23 we find that the self “cannot be grasped by teachings or by intelligence, or even by great learning. Only the man he chooses can grasp him....”. If we are to read the text as any sort of coherent teaching, therefore, we have to conclude that, while knowledge is the key to liberation, that knowledge is not necessarily universally available³⁸.

Olivelle describes the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad* (SU) as “a somewhat late text composed under the influence of both the Sāṃkhya -Yoga tradition and the emerging theistic tendencies” (1996:252). It is not clear whether he is suggesting that it may post-date the YS, or simply alluding to the number of *Sāṃkhya* concepts and references to yoga in the text. Certainly, as we have seen in our outline chronology, most scholarship would date the SU before the most likely date of the YS³⁹.

The SU sets its theistic stall out early. In 1.3 it says that “those who follow the discipline of meditation have seen God”. So, not only is sight of God seen as desirable, but the route to this sight is through “the discipline of meditation”. The

³⁷ Unless it is assumed that control of the mind and senses would not be possible without renunciation.

³⁸ To Radhakrishnan, this is a clear teaching of the self “as personal God” and a “doctrine of divine grace” (1953:619)

³⁹ Dating the *Sāṃkhya* school of philosophy is more difficult, as the *Sāṃkhya Kārikā*, the key extant text of the *Sāṃkhya darśana*, is not the earliest attempt to systematise *Sāṃkhya* (King 1999:63). The word “*sāṃkhya*” means “enumeration”, and (again with the perhaps distorting effect of hindsight) we can see places in the *Upaniṣads*, and earlier texts, where lists are used to explain a hierarchy, often with the *ātman* or (as in orthodox *Sāṃkhya*) *puruṣa* at the top of the tree. Whether these are a form of “proto-*Sāṃkhya*” is unclear: certainly, the *Upaniṣads* generally do not reflect the fairly radical dualism of later *Sāṃkhya* philosophy. Cohen (2008:215) cites Bronkhorst’s suggestion that Kapilā, the accepted founder of the *Sāṃkhya* school, may originally have been a deity in the same Greater Maghada region as saw both the rise of Buddhism and the Yajur Veda *śākhā*. If that were the case, it would provide another link in the chain which may connect that region to the yoga of the YS.

word used for meditation here, *dhyāna*, is significant not just because of its later use as one of Patañjali's eight limbs, but also because of its importance in Buddhism. The first chapter also makes clear that Brahman – described as “the highest object of the teachings on hidden connections (*upaniṣad*)” – is “rooted in austerity” as well as in the knowledge of the self (SU 1.16). We see, therefore, up front in this *Upaniṣad* a greater emphasis on both practice (in the form of austerity) and grace as leading to the requisite knowledge of *ātman*.

Unlike the KU, Chapter 2 of the SU presents us with some of the first practical instruction on yoga. The chapter begins with the image of Savitr “yoking first his mind” before bringing fire (agni) out of the earth: quoting from, amongst other earlier texts, the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, probably as an attempt to give the teachings which follow greater authority by relating them back to the Vedic tradition, but also providing an intriguing reference back to possible early uses of the word yoga, or words related to it, in other than the mundane sense. SU 2.8 provides some of the earliest instruction on posture, indicating that when the body is kept upright, with chest, neck and head erect, and the senses drawn in, the wise man crosses “all the frightful rivers with the boat consisting of... Brahman”. 2.9 gives instruction on use of the breath, and we see for the first time a clear statement that *prāṇa* should be controlled, rather than venerated (as in the Atharva Veda). As in the KU, control of the mind is related to the control (or yoking) of unruly horses. In 2.10, we have instruction for the location of practice (“level and clean; free of gravel, fire and sand; near noiseless running waters and the like.... in such a spot one should engage in yogic practice”). After listing apparitions said to “pave the way” for “full manifestation of Brahman”, we are told that “that man, obtaining a body tempered by the fire of yoga, will no longer experience sickness, old age or suffering” (SU 2.11 and 2.12). We see here, therefore, a much stronger emphasis both on practice and on the physical body, the inference being that we must use yoga practice to build a healthy body to prepare ourselves for the results of our practice. Although not a major feature of Patañjali's teaching, centuries later this emphasis on purification of the physical body would form a key part of the teachings of hatha yoga.

Much of the remainder of the SU is taken up with teachings about the self and Brahman, here identified with Rudra. Rudra is seen as key to overcoming suffering – another suggestion of Buddhist influence, as earlier Vedic texts do not emphasise worldly existence as suffering in the same way as the Buddha's Four Noble Truths – and “the wise Śvetāśvatara” is portrayed as having come to know Brahman “by the power of his austerities and by the grace of God” (SU 6.21). The end point of yoga in the SU is therefore not overtly stated to be liberation from *saṃsāra*. As in earlier *Upaniṣads*, perception of the true nature of the self is seen

as key, but, rather than that perception explicitly leading to freedom from rebirth, the “embodied person... becomes solitary, his goal attained and free from sorrow”. When he sees the true nature of Brahman, “he has known God” (SU 2.14 and 2.15).

The SU, therefore, takes almost for granted the idea that yoga means control of the mind and senses, but, unlike the KU, provides both practical instruction and an indication of everyday results of practice, including such mundane things as brightness of complexion and a reduction in faeces and urine. Knowledge of *ātman*/Brahman remains key, but that knowledge is to be attained through meditation, austerity and the grace of God, and the final goal is couched more in *Sāṃkhya* terms of solitariness (cf. *kaivalya* in the YS) than in terms of freedom from *saṃsāra*.

I have already alluded to the difficulties of dating the *Maitrī Upaniṣad* (MtU)⁴⁰. Van Buitenen’s extensive 1962 analysis of the text identifies at least two distinct sources for it. Cohen 2008 broadly adopts van Buitenen’s conclusions, though considers his theory “unnecessarily complicated” (2008:256). Arguments for the relative lateness of the *Upaniṣad* include its frequent quotations of earlier *Upaniṣads*, its reference to the trimurti (Brahma, *Śiva* and *Viṣṇu*) and, again, possible references to Buddhist thought (Radhakrishnan 1953:793), and it is not always included in collections of the Principal Upaniṣads. It may well have been one of the first *Upaniṣads* to have been assembled in written form, rather than transmitted orally (Roebuck 2000:xxvii). Like the KU and SU, it is associated with the Black Yajur Veda. One point accepted by both van Buitenen and Cohen is that chapter 6 is most likely a later addition.

The MtU begins with a reference to the Vedic sacrifice, indicating that, after the sacrificial fires have been built, the *yajamāna* should “meditate on the self” so that the sacrifice should become complete⁴¹. Here, the self to be meditated on is said to be *prāṇa*. Chapter 3 draws a differentiation between the essential self (*ātman*) and the elemental self (*bhūtātman*) subjected to the three *guṇas*, not unlike the *Sāṃkhya* distinction between *puruṣa* and *prakṛti*⁴², and Chapter 4 begins with a request to the teacher (Maitri) to learn the means of dis-associating from the *bhūtātman* and uniting with the *ātman*. MtU 4.3 presents the remedy as a

⁴⁰ See pages 7 and 8. Also sometimes known as the Maitreya, *Maitrāyaṇa*, *Maitrāyaṇī* or *Maitrayāṇīya*.

⁴¹ Cf. Miller’s argument about the yogic nature of the Vedic sacrifice: see page 9.

⁴² Note that YS 4.34 sees the cessation of the action of the *guṇas* as a prerequisite to *kaivalya*.

combination of Vedic knowledge, the practice of one's own duty (dharma) and behaviour according to one's stage in life (*āśrama*), which may or may not include ascetic renunciation. However, according to 4.4, "Brahman is attained by knowledge, asceticism and contemplation. The one who, knowing this... worships Brahman goes beyond Brahma, and reaches godhead over the gods. He attains indestructible, measureless, flawless bliss.... He achieves union in the self." In Roebuck's translation, chapter 4 ends by ostensibly quoting verses from an unidentified earlier text extolling the virtues of the cessation of the movements (*vṛtti*) of the mind (*citta*) which, it is said, leads to a mind which is neither deluded nor attached to the objects of the senses. These particular verses sometimes appear at MtU 6.34 (as in Radhakrishnan's translation) and their similarity to the description of yoga in YS 1.2 will be apparent.

If Chapter 6 of the MtU is indeed a later addition to what is already considered a "late" Upaniṣad, there must be a possibility that chapter 6 might post-date the YS.⁴³ The importance of this for present purposes is the inclusion in 6.18 of a six limbed system of yoga, which is generally assumed⁴⁴ to be a precursor of the eight limbed system of the YS. The six limbs of yoga presented in MtU 6.18 are:-

- *prāṇāyāma*
- *pratyāhāra*
- *dhyāna*
- *dhāraṇā*
- *tarka*
- *samādhi*.

It will be immediately apparent that five of the six feature in the eight limbed path of the YS – the exception being *tarka*, translated by Radhakrishnan as "contemplative enquiry" (1953:830). The three "missing" limbs are *yama*, *niyama* and *āsana*: in other words, the first three of Patañjali's eight⁴⁵. As already noted⁴⁶,

⁴³ This certainly follows if we accept Roebuck's theory that the MtU in general belongs to the early years CE, and even more so if the YS were to fall early in their likely date range. Interestingly, few writers on yoga comment on the potential significance of this. Cohen 2008:261; Whicher 1998:21; Zigmund-Cerbu 1963 and Flood 1996:95 all seem to pre-suppose that chapter 6 of the MtU pre-dated the YS. Eliade 1958:125 is alert to the possibility that chapter 6 might post-date the YS, though rather glosses over the potential significance of this by pointing out (correctly) that the dating of the texts does not, of itself, provide a chronology for the ideas expressed in them.

⁴⁴ See the sources referred to in note 43.

⁴⁵ It is also worth noting that, in the MtU, *dhyāna* and *dhāraṇā* are placed in the opposite order to the YS.

it has been suggested that the compilers of the YS were keen to give their path eight limbs, in order to reflect the noble eight fold path propounded by the Buddha. Certainly, going forward from the YS, we find both eight limbed and six limbed yoga paths in texts such as the Yoga *Upaniṣads* and in the tantric traditions in both India and Tibet⁴⁷.

There can be many explanations offered for the omission of yama, niyama and āsana. Probably the most likely is that they were thought to be simply preparatory practices for the control of the mind, especially if āsana is given its literal meaning of “seat”⁴⁸ (though the MtU’s compilers clearly did not see *prāṇāyāma* in the same way). Zigmund-Cerbu suggests that yama and niyama, with their ethical components, reflected the more theistic approach of the YS, however superficial⁴⁹, but this argument ignores the theistic elements of yoga which appear in the SU and the MtU. It is submitted that the importance of ethics in Buddhism (and perhaps in the dharma *śāstras*) is likely to be more influential in the inclusion of yama and niyama than Patañjali’s “superficial theism”. The absence of yama, niyama and āsana certainly cannot, of itself, be seen as evidence that the YS came later than chapter 6 of the MtU. Indeed, each of 6.19 to 6.28 of the MtU, some of which develop the yogic theme begun in 6.18, begins with the word “*athanyatrapyuktam*” – “it has been said elsewhere”, indicating at least an attempt to imbue the teachings with the legitimacy of antiquity, if not a reference back to specific earlier teachings.

In MtU 6.20 to 29, amidst a number of references to controlling the breath, we find early references to the *suṣumna nāḍī* and to the technique of touching the tip of the tongue to the palate, both of which assume importance in later hatha yoga. We also find a reference (6.22) to closing the ears to listen to the “sound of the space within the heart”, which again foreshadows the later practice of *nāḍa* yoga, and of particular interest, references to meditation on the syllable OM, or *praṇava*, a technique which the YS⁵⁰ puts forward as a way of realising the inner self (*pratyakcetana*) and removing the obstacles to yoga⁵¹.

⁴⁶ See note 9

⁴⁷ See Zigmund-Cerbu 1963 for a discussion of this

⁴⁸ Rather than the wider idea of yoga postures, which probably only arose later. Cf. SU 2.8

⁴⁹ “One may therefore consider the first two members of Patanjali’s Yoga, Yama and Niyama, if not added to the traditional sixfold Yoga, at least to be connected with this theistically oriented Yoga whose first editor was Patanjali”. (1963:129)

⁵⁰ 1.27 and 28

⁵¹ The sacred syllable OM features regularly in the *Upaniṣads*, though earlier texts generally focus on its meaning and symbolism rather than prescribing meditation on it.

The perhaps composite nature of chapter 6 – at least in its continual purported reference back to earlier sources – is reflected in the different descriptions which it gives of the result of yoga practices. In 6.18, the sixfold path is said to lead to knowledge of Brahman; 6.20 and 6.25 talk of the rather Buddhist goals of becoming “selfless” and “the abandonment of all conditions of existence”; 6.22 of becoming “without separate nature” through reaching Brahman. Of most interest for our purposes, 6.21 states:

“By turning back the tongue-tip against the palate and harnessing the senses... one reaches selflessness. Because one is selfless, one no longer experiences joy and sorrow: one reaches absoluteness.” (translation Radhakrishnan)

The necessity of the mind ceasing to be affected by opposite emotions is, according to the YS, a key feature of stilling the mind’s turnings⁵², and the word which Radhakrishnan and Roebuck both translate as “absoluteness” is kevalatva, a word more literally meaning “aloneness” and deriving from the same root as kaivalya.

Unlike the KU, with its emphasis on knowledge as a way to liberation, and the overtly theistic SU, the yogic path propounded in chapter 6 of the MtU, while not ignoring either knowledge or divine grace, is very much focussed on practice. It contains several ideas which feature both in the YS and later tantric and hatha yoga and there are strong reasons to suggest either that it influenced the YS or vice versa. What is of at least as much interest for students of the yoga tradition post-Patañjali is the extent to which the MtU appears to foreshadow yoga practices which only come to prominence some considerable time later.

Buddhism in the Yoga Sūtras

It is well known that the Buddha practised both meditation and austerities prior to reaching enlightenment⁵³, and the term “yoga” later assumes great importance in Buddhism, especially in the Mahāyāna and Vajrāyāna traditions. However, according to Bronkhorst, there is no record of the term yoga being applied to the Buddha’s own meditative and/or ascetic practices⁵⁴, which means that we cannot say that any systematic form of yoga existed in early Buddhism which may have

⁵² E.g. YS 2.48

⁵³ See, e.g. Gethin 1998:21-22

⁵⁴ Prof Johannes Bronkhorst: lecture entitled Buddhism Sanskritised, Buddhism Brahminised delivered at SOAS 5 December 2008.

influenced the later *Upaniṣads* or the yoga of the YS. What we can, however, say is that the YS contain a number of instances of apparent Buddhist influence⁵⁵. Particular correlations noted are:

- the use of the term *nirodha* in YS 1.2: an important term in the Buddha's Four Noble Truths;
- the reference in YS 1.20 to the four *upāyas* ("faith, energy, repeated recollection, concentration and real knowledge");
- in YS 1.33 a direct reference to cultivation of the qualities of friendliness (*maitrī*), compassion (*karuṇā*), joy (*muditā*) and equanimity (*upekṣaṇa*) known to Buddhists as the *brahmavihāras*;
- the importance in the YS of the *kleśas* or obstacles to yoga, especially ignorance (*avidyā*);
- the inclusion of the *yamas* and *niyamas*, reflecting the Buddhist emphasis on ethics;
- the suggestion (YS 2.15) that all worldly objects cause suffering (*duḥkha*): another key idea from the Four Noble Truths;
- the inclusion in the YS of four stages of *samādhi*, analogous to the four *dhyānas* in Buddhism⁵⁶.

La Vallée Poussin 1936/7, Stoler Miller 1998 and Bronkhorst⁵⁷, amongst others, see these correlations as reflecting a definite Buddhist influence in the YS, and it is hard to disagree with their conclusion.

Conclusions

So how "orthodox" is the yoga of the YS? We have seen that the evidence of yogic ideas and practices in the Vedic *Samhitās* (or earlier) is at best circumstantial. The evidence for yoga in the Indus Valley civilisation relies on interpretation of archaeological artefacts which are open to a number of conclusions: we have no evidence of what the Indus Valley people believed, thought or practised. While verses in the *R̥g* Veda and the Atharva Veda point to some forms of established ascetic traditions, we again have no surviving evidence of the practices of those traditions and efforts to see those ascetics as the

⁵⁵ I have already noted the use of the word *draṣṭuḥ* in YS 1.3, when, in an orthodox text, one might have expected to find *ātman* or *puruṣa*.

⁵⁶ See La Vallée Poussin 1936/7 for a more detailed analysis of these correlations

⁵⁷ Lecture entitled Buddhism Sanskritised, Buddhism Brahminised delivered at SOAS 5 December 2008

forerunners of later yogins tend to fall into the trap of equating asceticism with yoga, when it is only in later texts that we see clear references to ascetics practising yoga techniques⁵⁸.

By the time of the early *Upaniṣads*, we begin to see a move towards some of the key ideas that underlie yoga practice, notably the emphasis on the self and the increasing emphasis on knowledge as a key part of the path to liberation, as well as the beginnings of an exploration of *prāṇa* as something to be worked with rather than revered. However at this stage, we have little evidence of any systematic forms of practice, and, other than some possible analogies (the idea of “yoking” the senses), no real evidence of the use of the word yoga to signify any sort of system. It is only in the later *Upaniṣads* – notably the *Kaṭha*, *Śvetāśvatara* and *Maitrī* – that we begin to see the unambiguous use of the word “yoga” to refer to mental discipline and, later, to a more defined system of practice. There are still substantial differences within these *Upaniṣads* as to what the practice of yoga actually is, where it is said to lead, and whether those goals are achieved through knowledge, ascetic or other practice, divine grace or a combination, but the constant is a mental discipline in which the stilling (or “yoking”) of the mind and senses is seen as key to liberation – whether that liberation is described in terms of knowledge of Brahman or *ātman*, *kaivalya*/*kevalatva* or otherwise.

We have also seen that these three *Upaniṣads* almost certainly post-dated the life of the Buddha and the rise of other heterodox traditions, as well as the increasing urbanisation of Indian society. It remains an unanswered question whether what Lubin calls “the austere charms of the heterodox movements” (2005:91) directly influenced these later *Upaniṣads*, but the facts that all three fall within the *śākhā* of the Black Yajur Veda⁵⁹, and that the development of that particular *śākhā* was located geographically within the area in which Buddhism developed, is circumstantial evidence of cross-fertilisation, so that the possibility that the Brahmanical tradition adopted heterodox practices and ideas and sought to give them Vedic legitimacy can, while not capable of proof, certainly not be ruled out. Finally, we have seen that the evidence for Buddhist influence in the YS themselves is strong.

Where we appear to end up, therefore, is with a hybrid of fairly questionable “orthodoxy”, a system which grew from roots in the early *Upaniṣads*, but which,

⁵⁸ See Eliade 1958:138-40.

⁵⁹ It is worth noting here that the earlier *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad*, which, while not setting out any systematic yoga path, contains references to breathing practices, falls within the *śākhā* of the White Yajur Veda.

as a system with any form of coherence, can only be traced with any authority to those *Upaniṣads* which post-date the Buddha, and with other, strong, roots outside the fold of Vedic orthodoxy, perhaps in what might be called “Brahmanical asceticism” but more clearly in non-Vedic practices. It should be stressed, however, that any conclusion about “what influenced what” is at best tentative. As Eliade says:

“It cannot be too often repeated that the composition of Indian philosophic and religious texts never corresponds chronologically with the “invention” of their theoretic content.” (1958:125)

For Eliade, the development of yoga was one of “the greatest of Indian spiritual syntheses” (1958:101-2) and this should probably be our conclusion – that, rather than dogmatically looking for the roots of yoga in the orthodox Brahmanical or heterodox Buddhist and Jain traditions, we should see elements of both traditions “yoking” to form a system which has, throughout its long history, continued to exploit its “ecumenical possibilities” by propounding a variety of practices and positing a variety of final goals.

Graham Burns
January 2009

Bibliography

Bechert, H. ‘The Date of the Buddha Reconsidered’ in *Indologica Taurinensia*, 10 (1982) 29-36

Black, Brian 2007 *The Character of the Self in Ancient India* Albany: State University of New York Press

Bloomfield, Maurice Hymns of the Atharva Veda www.kessinger.net

Brockington, J.L. 1981 *The Sacred Thread* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

Bronkhorst, Johannes 1993 *The Two Traditions of Meditation in Ancient India* Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas

Bronkhorst, Johannes 1998 *The Two Sources of Indian Asceticism* Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas

Cohen, Signe 2008 *Text and Authority in the Older Upaniṣads* Leiden: Brill.

Connolly, Peter 2007 *A Student's Guide to the History and Philosophy of Yoga* London: Equinox Publishing Limited

Cope, Stephen 2006 *The Wisdom of Yoga* New York: Bantam Books

Doniger O'Flaherty, Wendy 1981 *The Rig Veda* London: Penguin Books

Eliade, Mircea 1958 *Yoga: Immortality and Freedom* Princeton: Princeton University Press

Flood, Gavin 1996 *An Introduction to Hinduism* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Frawley, David 1991 *Gods, Sages and Kings* Salt Lake City: Passage Press.

Gethin, Rupert 1998 *The Foundations of Buddhism* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Griffith, Ralph *The Rig Veda* www.kessinger.net

Hariharānanda Āranya, Swāmi 1963 *Yoga Philosophy of Patañjali* Albany: State University of New York Press

Iyengar, B.K.S. 1966 *Light on the Yoga Sūtras of Patañjali* London: Thorsons

Joshi, K.S. “On the Meaning of Yoga” in *Philosophy East and West* (1965) 15.1: 53-64

Kaelber, Walter. O. 2004 “Āśrama” in *The Hindu World* (ed. Mittal and Thursby). Abingdon: Routledge

King, Richard 1999 *Indian Philosophy: An Introduction to Hindu and Buddhist Thought* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press

La Vallée Poussin, Louis de 1936/7 “Le Bouddhisme et le Yoga de Patañjali” in *Mélanges Chinois et Bouddhiques* 5, 223-242

Lubin, Timothy 2005 “The Transmission, Patronage and Prestige of Brahmanical Piety from the Mauryas to the Guptas” in *Boundaries, Dynamics and Construction of Traditions in South Asia* (ed. Squarcini) Florence: Florence University Press

Miller, Jeanine 1974 *The Vedas: Harmony, Meditation and Fulfilment* London: Rider & Company

Olivelle, Patrick 1996 *Upaniṣads* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Pomeda, Carlos 2005 *The Wisdom of Yoga*, vol.1 Berkeley: YogaKula (DVD)

Radhakrishnan, S. 1953 *The Principal Upaniṣads* Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press

Roebuck, Valerie J. 2003 *The Upaniṣads* London: Penguin Books

Samuel, Geoffrey 2008 *The Origins of Yoga and Tantra* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Scaravelli, Vanda 1991 *Awakening the Spine* San Francisco: Harper Collins

Stoler Miller, Barbara 1998 *Yoga; Discipline of Freedom: The Yoga Sūtra Attributed to Patañjali* New York: Bantam Books

Thapar, Romila, 2000a “Sacrifice, Surplus and the Soul” in *Cultural Pasts*.
Oxford: Oxford University Press

Thapar, Romila, 2000b “Renunciation: The Making of a Counter-culture?” in
Cultural Pasts Oxford: Oxford University Press

Tull, Herman W. 2004 “Karma” in *The Hindu World* (ed. Mittal and Thursby).
Abingdon: Routledge

Van Buitenen, J.A.B. 1962 *The Maitrāyaṇīya Upaniṣad: a critical essay, with text, translation and commentary* s’Gravenhage: Mouton

Werner, Karel 1977 *Yoga and Indian Philosophy* Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass

Whicher, Ian 1998 *The Integrity of the Yoga Darśana* Albany: State University of
New York Press

Zigmund-Cerbu, Anton 1963 “The Sadangayoga” in *History of Religions* 3, 128-
134.