whom he teaches English and who are aspiring to come to India for further study at the Institute. Besides his classes, he is busy compiling a book on integrated yoga at the introductory level in German.

Mr. Hans and Miss Brigette Vogel returned to Germany after completing their full yoga education course at the Institute. Miss Sirpa Virtanen is conducting two classes in Finland and soon one more with Mr. Timo Myllykangas at his centre.

Mr. Peter Klatt writes from Switzerland that many people are interested in Yoga and regularly attend the classes and find the residential camps at their farm midst natural surrounding very conducive to self-development.

Shri Hansraj Yadav and Mr. Alziro organized a poster exhibition at Juhu for the Jaycees. Shri Hansraj taught at the Jaina Dharmika Jnana Satra to 120 residential students.

The 21-day course for women at the Institute was conducted by Mrs. Natasha Sherman and Miss Amola Ghosh in the morning and Miss Pearl Drego in the evening. Shri Satya Prakash conducted a 21-day Better Living class at Malad and at Vile Parle, Mr. Nariman Marshall conducts classes at Trombay Housing Colony.

Miss Shainaz Merchant conducts yoga classes at Arya Yoga Kendra of Santa Cruz.

For the past four years, the Institute has been permitting free use of its Hall for free supply of stationary to over 200 poor and deserving students by Prabhat Colony Satsang Mandal.

“Mother” Sita Devi’s 64th. birthday on 1st June was celebrated by an educational programme on Better Living presented by the Sadhakas. An exhibition of beautiful crafts and a sale of work done by the Sadhakas was also held. Pt. Narendra Sharma, a noted Hindi poet was the chief guest. Shri Chattrabhuji Narsee gave a short talk. Prof. Narendra Sharma of Rajasthan composed a poem for the day and recited it. The Founder blessed the occasion.
ARE YOGANGAS TO BE PRACTISED SUCCESSIVELY?

by RAM SHANKAR BHATTACHARYA

On the sūtra, Yamaniyamāsanaprāṇyāma-pratyāhāra-
dhārāna-dhyāna-samādhāyavaṅgā” (2.29), the Vyāsa-
bhāṣya comments: “Yathākramam eteṣām anuṣṭhānam svā-
rūpaḥ ca vakṣyāmaḥ”.

Woods translates this passages as follows: “the following up of these (i.e. the eight aṅgas) must be performed in suc-
cession. And what they are we shall describe.” This transla-
tion as done by Woods shows that the eight aṅgas of yoga are to be practised one after the other. According to us the trans-
lation is wrong and the view expressed in the transla-
tion is not only faulty but also baseless. Our arguments are as follows:

Woods seems to connect the word yathākramam (not dis-
regarding the due order or succession) with the word anu-
ṣṭhāna (practice) and not with the word svarūpa (essential
nature) of the aṅgas of yoga. According to Woods the bhāṣya passage consists of two sentences, (i) yathākramam suṣṭhāṇam (वस्त्रुक्ष्यते)
and (ii) suṣṭhāṇam (वस्त्रुक्ष्यते) svāraḥ cakṣuṃ: Wodds means to say that one should practishe the niyamas after practising the yamas; similarly one should practise the āsanas only after practising the niyamas and so on.

According to us, it is wrong to accept the above method of practising the aṅgas and accordingly we understand that Woods is wrong in connecting the word yathākrama with anuṣṭhāna only. Yathākramam, according to us, is to be connected with both the expressions, namely अनुष्ठाननिः (वस्त्रुक्ष्यते) and स्वरूपम (वस्त्रुक्ष्यते). There is neither any grammati-
cal nor any logical grounds to connect yathākrama with anuṣṭhāna only. One can easily find that both the anu-
ṣṭhāna (practice) and the svarūpa (nature) of the aṅgas
have been stated in the Yogasūtra in the same order as is found
in the sūtra 2.29, which is technically called ‘an uddenā
sūtra’ (i.e. an enumerating proposition). Since the descrip-
tion of the aṅgas strictly follows the order stated in the sūtra 2.29, it cannot be denied that the expression yathākramam is to be connected with the expressions ‘svarūpam ca vaksyāmah (we shall describe their nature also).

A perusal of the bhāṣya passage in question does not support the view of Woods. Had the bhāṣya followed the view of Woods it would have used two separate sentences, namely (i) एतेषामुपेक्षाय यथाकर्म संचित (these aṅgas are practised one after the other) and (ii) एतेषां त्वरित्व वेद्याय: (I shall deal with the nature of these aṅgas in the sequel). The practice and nature of the aṅgas are so intrinsically and inseparably related that one cannot be properly discussed without the other. Thus it follows that the method of practice (anuṣṭhāna) as well as the description of the nature (svarūpa) of the aṅgas must follow the same order in which the aṅgas have been enumerated in the sūtra 2.29.

It appears that Bhikṣu takes the sentence यथाकर्मम् एतेषामुपेक्षाय as a bhāṣya-passage on sūtra 2.29 and understands the sentence त्वरित्व च वेद्याय: as the pātanikā (introductory remarks) on the sūtra 2.30. Even accepting the sentence त्वरित्व च वेद्याय: as a separate sentence connected with the sūtra 2.30 (and not with the sūtra 2.29) Bhikṣu is inclined to connect the expression yathākramam with this sentence also as is clear from his remarks: त्वरित्व: च यथाकर्ममेहेतमत: परं वेद्याय त्वरित्व:

The word yathākramam has been connected with this sentence either in accordance with the principle of anuvṛtti or in accordance with the nature of the entity (arthaśāmārthya).

Some editions of the bhāṣya read एतेषांम् (v.i. एतेषा) अनुष्ठानं त्वरित्व च यथाकर्मम् वेद्याय: This reading also shows that the word yathākrama is to be connected with both anuṣṭhāna and svarūpa.

Now we are going to justify our view that it is wrong to hold that the aṅgas are to be practised successively. Our first argument is that no authoritative text on yoga prescribes the process of practising the aṅgas in succession.

One can easily observe that the successive practice of the first five aṅgas is non-scientific, fruitless and illogical. To be explicit: the practice of the five niyamas is not dependent on the practice of the five yamas. Though the internal connection of these two groups cannot be denied yet there is no reason to hold that the practice of the niyamas must be taken up only after the practice of the five yamas. Both the yamas and the niyamas are capable of being practised simultaneously and the practitioners are always advised to practise both of these two groups simultaneously. It can easily be observed that the practice of one group enables the practitioner to practise the other group in a more successful or subtle way. It is basically wrong to think that at the time of practising the second aṅga i.e. the niyamas, one should disregard or leave the practice of the first aṅga, i.e. the yamas.

Similarly it is wrong to think that the practice of āsana cannot be taken up before the practice of the niyamas. The nature of the āsanas is not such as is incapable of being practised before practising the niyamas or the yamas. Sitting on a posture is invariably required from the very initial stage of the yoga-practice as is clearly stated in the yogic texts. As the practice of the yama-niyamas helps one to remain in a posture with mental tranquility, easiness and restfulness, so the correct practice of āsanas enables one to understand the subtle character of the yama-niyamas and to comprehend the principles underlying them, by creating development in the thinking faculty of the mind. That the mental power is greatly affected by the āsanas if practised in the proper way cannot be denied. Thus it stands to reason that the first three aṅgas must be practised simultaneously, if they are to be practised with a view to achieving yogic ends.

Similar is the case with prāṇāyāma also. If anybody wants to practise prāṇāyāma successfully with a view to acquiring results favourable to yoga, he must practise prāṇāyāma along with the practice of yama, etc. A practice of prāṇāyāma having no touch with yama, etc. is useless so far as the yogic goal is concerned, for such a prāṇāyāma cannot give rise to enlightenment of insight (jñāna-dīpti, 2.28), nay, such a prāṇāyāma is even unable to dwindle the
impurities (aśuddhiṣaṇya) which is said to be the direct result of the practice of the āṅgas (vide 2.28). Again, a mild practice of prāṇāyāma does not, as a precondition, require a firm practice of the yama, niyama and āsana; the highly developed stages of prāṇāyāma are however always dependent on a firm practice of āsana and the like. It is required that a competent person must practice a mild form of prāṇāyāma from the initial stage of yoga-practice.

It is to be noted in this connection that Patañjali used the expression तत्त्वेष्यां सति (=the āsanas having been perfected) while describing the process of prāṇāyāma in the sūtra 2.49. The bhāṣya endorses this view by using the expression सत्यास-स्थित विप्रत्वेष्यां (=after the mastery of the yogic posture). This, however, does not prohibit the practice of prāṇāyāma unless āsana, etc. are made perfect. The nature of prāṇāyāma has no expectancy for such a condition. It is the highly developed stages of prāṇāyāma that require appropriate āsanajaya.

We are aware of the fact that prāṇāyāma can be practised without paying any heed to any yogic posture. Sometimes the act of prāṇāyāma comes into existence in a natural way without the slightest effort for recaka, pūraka or kumbhaka. Generally speaking, one is required to practise prāṇāyāma sitting in a yogic posture. Mastery of āsana is not required for practising prāṇāyāma. As a matter of fact both āsana and prāṇāyāma help each other. A practice of prāṇāyāma makes the limbs highly capable of practising āsana by rendering them light, vigorous and thin (krṣa).

(To be contd.)

RESEARCH

by ROBERT SHERMAN

I BELIEVE that the way in which we conceptualize something will determine what we ultimately come to know about it. I believe that the history of scientific research as well as our general approach to knowledge confirms this view. Our understanding of the universe has undergone drastic changes and each new understanding brings new “facts” and realities. In essence, each major scientific breakthrough has led not only to a totally new conception of the universe but also to a re-evaluation and understanding of the past. All of this has been termed progress and it cannot be denied that in certain areas man’s capacities to control his environment have increased. But it is these very “advances” and new conceptions that are my concern. The scientific establishment has now totally won its battle for acceptance as the only valid procedure for the attainment of new knowledge. With this view necessarily comes the view that our present understanding is far superior to any previous understanding and we are also in a better position to understand all previous conceptions. This is why we have “new” history books written all the time. I view this whole process to be nothing else than self-deception. Our views today are different but are they necessarily any better?

But what has all this to do with Yoga? The major problem for modern man with respect to Yoga is to define for himself exactly what Yoga is. This is a very crucial question for the definition or limits that one puts on Yoga will ultimately determine the experience that one has with Yoga. This is true for the researcher as well as the practitioner. So, in my view, the first crucial variable is the definition of Yoga and I will return to this point shortly.

There is a second crucial factor and that is our current approach to experimentation itself. At this point our materialistic approach to knowledge only accepts physically measurable phenomena as the stuff upon which our knowledge is built. Subjective experience is gone. If the modern researcher can’t measure something it doesn’t exist. This
1. Yogayana, Bombay.
2. School of Classic Yoga, New Delhi
3. Yoga Education Centre, Sevapur

All teachers of Yoga, trained at The Yoga Institute, during the past two decades, are requested to enlist their membership with the National Yoga Council by remitting an amount of Rupees fifteen for the year beginning August 1976. The membership includes a free supply of the Journal of The Yoga Institute and the Yoga Teachers Year Book. The Council aims at unifying and promoting activities of classic Yoga in India. It is expected that all those who have passed from The Yoga Institute must consider their membership as a duty they owe to the subject. Please correspond with the Secretary, National Yoga Council, Yoga Bhavan, Bombay 400 055.

RENEWAL OF SUBSCRIPTION

This Journal, under the present conditions, is published at a loss because of the enormous rise of cost of paper, printing and other incidental services. Your subscription ends with this issue. No further copies will be sent. You are therefore requested to remit in advance your annual subscription which is fixed for Volume XXII (1976-77) at Rs. 12/- for India, £1.25 for Europe and $3.00 for U.S.A.
ARE YOGANGAS TO BE PRACTISED SUCCESSIVELY?

by RAM SHANKAR BHATTACHARYA

Similarly it is wrong to hold that pratyāhāra is to be practised only after the practice of prānāyāma. Pratyāhāra can be practised successfully to a considerable degree without the help of prānāyāma. It cannot, however, be denied that prānāyāma is extremely helpful in practising pratyāhāra for control of the senses because one can acquire mastery over the organs in a more easy way with the help of prānāyāma. However, prānāyāma is helpful for pratyāhāra, yet it would be wrong to hold that pratyāhāra cannot be practised before the practice of prānāyāma.

There is no doubt that dhāraṇā is transformed into dhyāna, which again is transformed into samādhi. Thus it is quite reasonable to hold that the practice of samādhi is dependent on dhyāna, which again is dependent on dhāraṇā. Dhāraṇā however is not absolutely dependent on pratyāhāra and the rest. A gross form of dhāraṇā is practised even at the initial stage of Yoga. Dhāraṇā is a superior kind of ekāgratā in which the element of fixity is predominant.

Ekāgratā (one-pointedness) lies at the root of all yoga-practices. Without ekāgratā the practice of the yamas and the like becomes mechanical and it hardly produces any result favourable to Yoga. The element of ekāgratā is essential for practising āsana and prānāyāma. Without ekāgratā the practice of āsana and prānāyāma cannot come under the province of Yoga. Prānāyāma, if practised without ekāgratā, gives rise to some particular kinds of diseases. All this shows that a gross form of dhāraṇā is essentially required for practising yamas etc. This is why a yoga student is asked to practise a gross form of dhāraṇā (sometimes called bhāvanā) at the time of practising the āṅgas, namely yamas, etc.

The foregoing discussion shows that it is logically wrong to suppose that the eight limbs of yoga should be practised one after the other.

3. Vide Śāntiparvan, 316 - 10 (यदेव उत्तमव्यवहारात् कालान्तरगत प्रत्येको ज्ञातस्य भवति। विभेदसा भवेत् तत्समागमातृत्वं ॥) Some yogic texts require that one should fix one's mind in the śūnyāleha before practising prānāyāma. This śūnyāleha is a positive feeling as is known to our tradition. It is to be taken as an ākāśa (supporting object). Now-a-days a large number of persons are found to practise prānāyāma without following the aforesaid principles. The rise of various kinds of diseases and organic defects or disorders in these persons proves the validity of the view expressed in the above quoted Śānti-parva verse.