PREFACE

1. Reasons for taking up the work.—It is not without misgiving that one ventures to render into English the texts of an intricate system which have never, with the exception of the sūtras, been translated in Europe or America. But the historical importance of those texts, as forming a bridge between the philosophy of ancient India and the fully developed Indian Buddhism and the religious thought of to-day in Eastern Asia, emboldens one to the attempt. For this system, together with the Nyāya and Vāiṣeṣika systems, when grafted upon the simple practical exhortations of primitive Buddhism, serves as an introduction to the logical and metaphysical masterpieces of the Mahāyāna.

2. Difficulties of comprehending the work.—Even after a dozen readings the import of some paragraphs is not quite clear, such for example as the first half of the Bhāṣya on iii. 14. Still more intractable are the single technical terms, even if the general significance of the word, superficially analysed, is clear. This irreducible residuum is unavoidable so long as one cannot feel at home in that type of emotional thinking which culminates in a supersensuous object of aesthetic contemplation.

3. Difficulties of style.—The Bhāṣya and, still more, the Tattva-vāiṣeṣikā are masterpieces of the philosophical style. They are far from being a loosely collected body of glosses. Their excessively abbreviated and disconnected order of words is intentional. The Mīmāṃsā discussed first the meaning of words (padārtha); then in a distinct section the meaning of the sentences (vākyārtha); and finally and most fully the implication (bhāvārtha) of the sentences as a whole. Wherever the sentence-form is lacking, I have introduced in brackets the words needed to make a declarative clause. Much more obscurity remains in the bhāvārtha section of the Bhāṣya. For here many extraneous technical terms are surreptitiously introduced under the guise of exegesis. Thus polemic with an opponent whose name is suppressed
creeps into the argument. The allusions are suggestive, but obviously elusive. The passage at iii. 14 might be quite simple if we had before us the text which it criticizes.

4. **Translation of technical terms.**—A system whose subtleties are not those of Western philosophers suffers disastrously when its characteristic concepts are compelled to masquerade under assumed names, fit enough for our linguistic habits, but threadbare even for us by reason of frequent transpositions. Each time that Puruṣa is rendered by the word “soul”, every psychologist and metaphysician is betrayed. No equivalent is found in our vocabulary. The rendering “Self” is less likely to cause misunderstanding. Similarly, and in accordance with the painstaking distinctions made at the end of ii. 5, it is most important to remember that the term a-vidyā, although negative in form, stands for an idea which is not negative, but positive. Bearing in mind the express instructions of the text, I have adopted “undifferentiated-consciousness” as the translation of avidyā. Another word, which Professor Garbe discussed more than twenty years ago (in his translation of the Sāmkhya-pravacana-bhāṣya, S. 70, Anm. 1), is guna. I prefer to translate this term by “aspect” rather than by “constituent”, because, in addition to the meanings “quality” and “substance”, it often seems to have the semantic value of “subordinate” as correlated to prādhāna. Three other words sattva and rajas and tamaś seem untranslatable, unless one is content with half-meaningless etymological parallels. In another case I have weakly consented to use “Elevation” as equivalent to prasaṃkhyāna; the original word denotes the culmination of a series of concentrations; the result is the merging of the Self in the object of contemplation.

5. **Punctuation.**—1. Quotations from the Sūtras are enclosed in single angular quotation-marks (〈〉). 2. Quotations from the Bhāṣya are enclosed in double angular quotation-marks (« »). 3. Quotations from authoritative texts are enclosed in ordinary double quotation-marks (“ ”). 4. Objections and questions by opponents, and quotations from unauthoritative texts, are enclosed in ordinary single quotation-marks (‘ ’). Hyphens have been used to indicate the resolution of compound words. A half-parenthesis on its side is used to show that two vowels are printed in violation of the rules of euphonic combination (Lanman’s Sanskrit Reader, p. 289).
6. Texts and Manuscripts.—The text of the sūtras of the Yoga system, like that of the sūtras of all the other five systems, except perhaps the Vaiṣeṣika, is well preserved; and there is an abundance of excellent printed editions. The most accessible and the most carefully elaborated of these books is the one published in the Ānandācārama Series and edited by Kācīnātha Shāstri Āgāče. Variants from twelve manuscripts, mostly southern, are printed at the foot of each page; and Bhojadeva's Vṛtti is appended; also the text of the sūtras by itself and an index thereto. Another edition, in the Bombay Sanskrit Series, by Rājarām Shāstri Bodas, is also an excellent piece of work. I have, however, made use of the edition by Svāmi Bālārāma (Calcutta, Saṁvat 1947, A.D. 1890; reprinted 1 in Benares A.D. 1908) because it is based on northern manuscripts and because of the valuable notes in the editor's tīrputa. Of manuscripts, I have collated, with the kind permission of the Mahārāja, during a charming week's visit at Jammu just below the glistening snows above the Pir Panjal, two of the oldest manuscripts in the library of the Raghunāth Temple. In Stein's Catalogue these are numbered 4375 and 4388 and the former is dated Saṁvat 1666. Two other manuscripts were lent me, one by the courtesy of the most learned Gaṅgādhara Shāstri, the other the very carefully written Bikāner manuscript, sent to me by the generosity of the Bikāner government, which proved to be extremely valuable for disputed readings in the Tattva-vaiśāradhī. This latter manuscript seemed to be about a hundred and fifty years old and is described in Rājendralāla Mitra's Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Library of His Highness the Mahārāja of Bikāner (Calcutta, 1880) under the number 569. An old Shāradā manuscript, which, by the kind mediation of Mukundārām Shāstri of Shrinagar, was put into my hands, proved, upon critical examination, to have been so badly corrupted as, on the whole, not to be worth recording.

7. Acknowledgements.—At the end of one's task comes the compensation of looking back to old scenes, and to the friends and helpers who have watched the progress of the book. First of all I remember the delightful

---

1 In the reprint, the pagination is unchanged, but the lines vary a little. Hence there are some small apparent inaccuracies in the references. The reprint may be had from Harrassowitz in Leipzig; it is catalogued there as Pītanjala-darpaṇasaṇya yoga-tattva.