Archipel

Études interdisciplinaires sur le monde insulindien

100 | 2020

Varia

Śaivistic *Sāṃkhya*-Yoga: Revisiting the Eclectic Behaviour of the Balinese Hindu Textual Tradition

Sāṃkhya-Yoga sivaïte : revisiter le comportement éclectique de la tradition textuelle hindoue de Bali

W.A. Sindhu Gitananda, I Wayan Cika, I Nyoman Suarka and Ida Bagus Jelantik Sutanegara Pidada

Electronic version

URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/archipel/2088>

DOI: 10.4000/archipel.2088

ISSN: 2104-3655

Publisher

Association Archipel

Printed version

Date of publication: 15 December 2020

Number of pages: 91-112

ISBN: 978-2-910513-84-9

ISSN: 0044-8613

Electronic reference

W.A. Sindhu Gitananda, I Wayan Cika, I Nyoman Suarka and Ida Bagus Jelantik Sutanegara Pidada, « Śaivistic *Sāṃkhya*-Yoga: Revisiting the Eclectic Behaviour of the Balinese Hindu Textual Tradition », *Archipel* [Online], 100 | 2020, Online since 28 November 2020, connection on 04 December 2020. URL : <http://journals.openedition.org/archipel/2088> ; DOI : <https://doi.org/10.4000/archipel.2088>

AUTOUR DE BALI ET DU GRAND EST INDONÉSISIEN

W.A. SINDHU GITANANDA¹, I WAYAN CIKA², I NYOMAN SUARKA³
& IDA BAGUS JELANTIK SUTANEGARA PIDADA⁴

Śaivistic *Sāṃkhya*-Yoga: Revisiting the Eclectic Behaviour of the Balinese Hindu Textual Tradition⁵

Introduction

The Old Javanese (OJ) terms expounding the tenets of Śaivism found in Bali may be traced to those of Indian Śaivism. Most of those terms are found in OJ texts that have been traditionally handed down in Bali for generations. Many such religious texts show a hybrid character. This tradition of hybridization is still documented in a modern authoritative book of Śaivism in Balinese entitled *Aji Sangkya* (AS),⁶ compiled in 1947 by Ida Ketut Djelantik. In the

1. Faculty of Arts, Universitas Udayana, Denpasar, Bali; Faculty of Education Universitas Hindu Indonesia, Denpasar, Bali. sindhugitananda@gmail.com.

2. Faculty of Arts, Universitas Udayana, Denpasar, Bali. wyn_cika@unud.ac.id.

3. Faculty of Arts, Universitas Udayana, Denpasar, Bali. nyoman_suarka@unud.ac.id.

4. Faculty of Arts, Universitas Udayana, Denpasar, Bali. bgs_jelantik@unud.ac.id.

5. The transliteration system used in this article maintains, side-by-side, prevalent conventions used by modern scholars to render Balinese, Sanskrit, and Old Javanese (for the latter two we use the modified IAST/ISO15919 system advocated by Aciri and Griffiths 2014, which has the advantage of being consistent with the transliteration of Sanskrit). Meanwhile, as far as the *Aji Sangkya* is concerned, the spelling has been adapted to the reformed Indonesian version for the sake of clarity.

6. Aciri (2013:74) considers it as a modern textbook of Hinduism. It is inspired by several OJ and Indian texts mentioned in the AS, such as *Bhuvanakośa*, *Vrhaspatitattva*, *Tattvajñāna*, *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*, *Pañcaviṃśatitattva*, *Buku Yogasūtra*, *Nirmalajñāna*, *Śaṅ Hyaṅ Daśa Ātmā*, *Śārasamuccaya*, *lontar Samādhi*, *Catur Yuga Vidhi Śāstra*, *Sapta Bhuvana* (Djelantik, 1947:1; also mentioned in Aciri, 2013:75-6).

introduction, the author mentions *Igama Siwa*⁷ while promoting teachings about the existence of *Ida Sañ Hyañ Vidhi*⁸ and His bliss for creating the universe and everything within it, including humans (Djelantik, 1947:1). In this sense, Djelantik made an effort to attribute an equal position to both “traditional” Śaiva theology and reformed Hinduism within the frame of the Balinese religion.⁹ Meanwhile, by its very title, the AS¹⁰ is affirmatively related to *Sāṃkhya*, an ancient Indian dualistic philosophical school, as well as *Yoga*. The AS asserts explicitly both positions as the ultimate understanding of the true *Yoga* on the theoretical basis of the *Sāṃkhya* (Djelantik, 1947:14).

However, this position regarding the theology of Śaivism is not new. Śaivism reconciles the dualism of the *Sāṃkhya* and the monism (*advaita*) of the Vedānta (Bernard, 1999:130). Soebadio (1985:54; cf. Yasa and Sarjana, 2013:126) noted that in Indonesia, Śaivism (and Śaivasiddhānta in particular) has a very close relationship to both the monistic and dualistic schools of philosophy. Suamba (2016:300-1) affirms that it has undergone very dynamic

The AS is considered an authoritative modern exposition of Śaiva doctrine in Bali, and it has been translated into Dutch by Hooykaas (1950-51) as “*Çāṅkhya-leer van Bali*” in the *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*; into Indonesian by Gde Sandhi (1973), I Wayan Suka Yasa and Ida Bagus Jelantik (2008) with brief content analysis, Ida Komang Wisasmaya (2012), the grandson of Djelantik; into palm-leaf manuscript in *Tutur Aji Sangkya* found in the *Pusat Dokumentasi Dinas Kebudayaan Bali* (T/1/12 = K31, 60 folios); see more in Acri (2013:75). Recently, Ida Bagus Agastya (2015) has made a concise description of the AS with some intertextual notes.

7. The term “*igama*” is used to define religion in its philosophical sense, in this case of the Śaivism. Djelantik (1947:1) explains in Balinese as follows, “*Sahantukan Igama Siwa punika sané wenten iriki ring Bali miwah Lombok katahan nganggé Basa Kawi miwah Sanskrit, punika duaning titiang ngawangun Buku diastu alit sané ngambil papalihan paplajahan Igama Siwa keni nganggé Basa Bali kapara, mangda molah katampèn antuk sareng katah*” (‘Because the *Igama Siwa* found here in Bali and Lombok is mostly using *Basa Kawi* (OJ) and Sanskrit, that is why I compose this book even though (it is) very small (concise) while applying the pattern of the teaching of the *Igama Siwa* in *Basa Bali kapara* (the Balinese for all castes), in order to make people (reader) easier to understand’).”

8. *Ida Sañ Hyañ Vidhi* is the Balinese Hindu name for God.

9. Acri (2011b:156) states that Balinese religion appears to be a ‘localized’ form of Śaivism characterized by a monotheistic theology, viewing in Śiva the Paramount Lord and the all-encompassing Supreme Reality (*paramārtha*). In this case, Acri (2011b:159) argues that the concept of the devotion to a single deity – in modern Balinese case, the “neutral” Sañ Hyañ Widhi or Sañ Hyañ Tuṅgal – should not be interpreted as an “invention” following the influence of Monotheistic religions, but rather as a polarization of existing ideas, following the attempts by the reformers to align their religion with the dominant form of Hinduism in order to avoid the denomination of “sectarian” coined by colonial scholarship, and be recognized as a true “world religion.”

10. Acri (2013:74) translates the title as “*Textbook of the Sāṃkhya Philosophy*,” while Hooykaas (1951) freely rendered it as “*Çāṅkhya-leer van Bali*”.

processes of finding “the best” in order to fit the local tradition. The AS may thus be regarded as a text that is ontologically rather dualistic, yet monistic as well as Śaivistic at the same time. This textual eclectic attitude can be detected also in the new hybrid textual constructions by Balinese intellectuals, as well as in many aspects of Balinese culture and religion.¹¹ As Acri (2013:97) asserts, “most Balinese reformist authors never rejected altogether the fundamental tenets and deeply Śaiva persuasion of their traditional theology but simply sought to reconfigure and integrate it in order to ensure compliance with certain trends of neo-Hindu orthodoxy.” This means that the hybrid construction of the AS reflects the traditional character of Balinese Hinduism inherited from the OJ Śaivistic tradition of eclectic behaviour. Hence, it is rather difficult to reduce Balinese Hinduism to a specific strand in relation to Indian thought because it has a very dynamic inclusion of textual canons, which is complicated further if one observes Balinese religious praxis. This article analyses the eclectic attitude reflected by the AS, one of the authoritative books on Balinese Hinduism, in order to attain a hermeneutic interpretation.

The Dualistic Ontology of the *Sāṃkhya* in Relation to the AS Paradigm

A discussion of the relationship between *puruṣa* and *prakṛti* in the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* (SK)¹² and *puruṣa* and *pradhāna* in the AS first requires a comparison of the concepts found in both texts. In the SK, the process of manifestation of the *prakṛti* or material principle plays an important role in its philosophy. First, a connection with the *puruṣa* is established so that the material becomes conscious, to the point of releasing the relationship of the material from the *puruṣa*, or vice versa (the liberation of the *puruṣa*, i.e. isolation or *kaivalya*). Next, the separation from the body (*śarīrabhede*) takes place, and the *prakṛti* as the root cause (*pradhāna*) ceases to operate, having accomplished the purpose of the *puruṣa*, and attains a form of liberation that is both completely absolute (*aikāntika*) and final or permanent (*ātyantika*) (SK 68 in Saraswati, 2008:118). The *prakṛti* does not evolve and is not created from anything (SK 3). It is the origin or root of all matters (*mūla*). In this view, the *prakṛti* is the uncaused first principle, and the cause of all. Similarly, the *puruṣa* is neither created nor creative; it is just there. The connection between the two is caused by the attractiveness of the *prakṛti* for the *puruṣa*.

¹¹ See Sumardjo (2002).

¹² One of the oldest extant texts of the *Sāṃkhya* philosophical system is Īśvarakṛṣṇa's *Sāṃkhyakārikā* (350 CE) (Larson and Bhattacharya, 1987:43). The SK text used in this article is that printed in Appendix II, “The Text of the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* as attested in the *Yuktidīpikā* within the commentary to the corresponding verse,” in Albrecht Wezler and Shujun Motegi's edition (1998) of the *Yuktidīpikā*, as well as the appendix subtitled “*Sāṃkhya Karika* of Ishvara Krishna Sanskrit Text, Transliteration, and Translation” of *Samkhya Darshan: Yogic Perspective on Theory of Realism* by Swami Niranjanananda Saraswati (2008).

SK 19 and 20 explain the passiveness of the *puruṣa* (*draṣṭṛtva*). The nature of the connection (*saṃyoga*) of both is that the *prakṛti* has no consciousness but possesses the natural tendency or qualities (*guṇa*) to attract the *puruṣa*. This is related to the explanation given in SK 21, which is more straightforwardly presupposing the *prakṛti* as *andha* (blindness) and the *puruṣa* as *paṅgu* (lameness).¹³ In the SK, the initiating discourse implies that interest in the nature of existence is triggered by misery (*duḥkha*) in which ordinary efforts, such as using drugs, are not enough to solve the basic questions of “being.” The discriminative knowledge (*viveka*), the manifest (*vyakta*), and the non-manifest (*avyakta*) may be the prerequisite to discover the answers to the questions. There are two more similar principles, namely *avikṛti* (neither developing nor evolutive principle) and *vikṛti* (developing principle). The *avyakta* is in one direction to the *avikṛti*, the *prakṛti* with its tendencies (*triguṇa*), whereas the *vyakta* and the *vikṛti* are the *tattva* (principles) from *buddhi* (“intellect”)¹⁴ downwards (Bhattacharyya, 2008:158-60). Additionally, the *prakṛti* manifests as the *buddhi* only through its connection with the *puruṣa*. In line with the three sources of misery, there are also three methods for searching knowledge (*pramāṇa*): *drṣṭa* or direct experience, *anumāna* or inference, and *āptavacana* or statements from experts or trusted sources. From this, it can be understood that the SK paradigm is built through a psychology of anxiety, which can only be diminished by the knowledge of truth.

Meanwhile, the dualistic principles, the *puruṣa* and the *pradhāna*, in the AS exist due to the meeting of Śiva and Māyā. Then, this relationship is assumed to be like the relationship of the soul with the body, which is multi-layered and boundless. The separation causes, on the one hand, the *puruṣa* to return to its pure origin, i.e. a condition of flawless purity, called Sañ Hyañ Paramaśiva, and, on the other, the *pradhāna* to return to its pure unconsciousness, the *Māyā-Tattva*. Therefore, the aim of the discourse in the AS makes Śiva the supreme principle to Whom all the principles return (Balinese: *mulih maring*); this is called *Parama Mokṣa*.

In the AS, the discourse is built through the two key terms *cetana* and *acetana*, denoting two opposing states. If these were separated, nothing would exist. The *cetana* is understood as being conscious (Balinese: *ménget*), and the *acetana* is understood as being unconscious (Balinese: *lupa*). Both come as the *Śiva-Tattva* and the *Māyā-Tattva*. This forms a discourse of Śaivistic theodicy

13. Jakubzak (2006:186) notes that in the *Upaniṣads* the seeing bird refers to the passive inner controller (*antaryāmin*) and actionless witness (*sākṣin*) who is beyond all misery and joy.

14. The Old Javanese dictionary by Zoetmulder (1982:266) glosses *buddhi* as the power of forming and retaining general notions, intelligence, reason, mind, discernment (in *Sāṃkhya* second of 25 *tattva*’s); opinions, notion, idea (cf. *hidēp*); character, nature disposition; intention, purpose (cf. *ambēk*). In other words, the *buddhi* indicates the innate intelligence or the primordial memory.

devoid of any reference towards *Māyā* as delusion; rather, this principle is referred to as the origin of worldly life. The AS is more focused on just the principle of *cetana* or the *Śiva-Tattva*, which manifests into three categories: *Paramaśiva*, *Sadāśiva*, and *Śivātmā*. The text's theological paradigm is the conviction that all things are coming and will return to Śiva rather than the promotion of the anxiety paradigm found in the SK.

According to the SK, the *buddhi* is manifested from the meeting of both ontological principles of *prakṛti* and *puruṣa*. As explained in verse 23 of the same text, according to Saraswati (2008:103), the *buddhi* is both intellect and intuition. Usually, the *buddhi* has similar meaning with *mahat* "cosmic intelligence." From it, *ahamkāra* emerges and brings forth the lower sixteen *tattvas*: *manas* (mind), five *jñānendriya* or *buddhīndriya* (senses or organs of perception), five *karmendriya* (organs of action), and five *tanmātra* (subtle elements). From the five *tanmātra* emerge the five *mahābhūta* (gross elements).

However, in the AS, the *buddhi* has a different sense (see e.g. 3.1). It is regarded as *citta* or "mind" that undergoes the degradation of consciousness, because the focus of the AS is on the consciousness. This structuring follows the structure found in the *Tattvajñāna* (TJ),¹⁵ which offers a schematic presentation of Javanese Śaivism.¹⁶ In fact, in the SK, the *citta* is never explicitly mentioned or included as one of the principles. In the philosophical system found in the SK and the YS, the *buddhi* is considered one category that actually forms the *citta*, along with the *ahamkāra* and the *manas*. In this sense, the *buddhi* is the in-between state, which is expressed by the Balinese words *bingung* (confuse) and *biapara* (confusion). When it comes to indecision, according to the AS, the *buddhi* then has various characteristics: *caturaiśvarya* (four powers), *aṣṭatuṣṭi* (eight contentments), *aṣṭasīdi* (eight perfections), *balikaning caturaiśvarya* (opposite of four powers), and *pañcawretaya*¹⁷ (five distress) (Djelantik, 1947:10). In line with the category of the *caturaiśvarya* found in the AS, SK 23 mentions it similarly within the frame of *sattva* called *sāttvikametadrūpa*, namely *dharma* (goodness), *jñāna* (knowledge), *virāga* (indifference), and *aiśvarya* (power or highest attainment and perfection). However, the AS has a more complicated layered explanation. Each item is categorised in a more detailed fashion, for instance *dharma*, which is further divided into *sīla* (Balinese *solah rahayu*: good behavior), *yajna* (Balinese *barés*: generous), *tapa* (Balinese *ngated utawi matunain indria*: discipline or reducing sensual pleasure), *virakta* (Balinese *medalem sayang*: having compassion), *tyāga* (Balinese *las utawi lagas*: consistent or brave), and *yoga* (concentration).

15. See Yasa and Sarjana (2013:39).

16. See Suamba (2016:16).

17. The term is rather confusing since the word *wretaya* is not found in Sanskrit. The author, perhaps, has found different term for *kleśa* (impurity) as found in the *Yogasūtra* (YS II.12) of Patañjali (See Karambelkar, no year:194-5; Sura and Yasa, 2011:42).

According to both the AS and SK, after the *buddhi* comes the *ahamkāra*.¹⁸ In SK 24, it is explained as a statement of the self or “sense of ego.” This sense of ego is not a subjective substance, but an objective one (Bhattacharyya, 2008:222). It is composed of the personal pronoun *aham*, “I”, and the root *kr*, “to do, make or perform.” This sort of Individuating Principle produces new modes of being. In line with that, according to the *Sāṃkhya*, the function of the *ahamkāra* is to feel the sense of I-ness,¹⁹ which makes the self feeling that it is acting, wanting, and having. Acri (2011a:425) translates it, on the basis of its occurrences in the OJ text *Dharma Patañjala* (DP), as “self-identity.” Palguna (2014:179) defines it in the light of *Kakavin Dharma Śūnya* as ‘ego’ or “self.” Then, because it is influenced by the *sattvaguna*, the *ahamkāra* manifests into eleven *tattvas* and, when it is influenced by *taṃas*, it further evolves into the five subtle elements.

Further, the description of the *ahamkāra* in SK 25 is similar to that found in the AS. In both texts, there are three characteristics, namely *vaikṛta* for *sāttvika ahamkāra*, *taijasa* for the *ahamkāra* influenced by *rajas*, and *bhūtādi* for the *ahamkāra* influenced by *taṃas*. As a result of the influence of the *vaikṛta*, the *ahamkāra* manifests as the *manas* (mind) and the five *jñānendriya* (senses of perception) and five *karmendriya* (organs of action), and as a result of the *tāmasika ahamkāra*, the *bhūtādi* then manifests as the *pañca tanmātra* (subtle elements), which later becomes the *pañca mahābhūta* (gross elements). Both groups manifest because of the influence of the *rajas* on the *ahamkāra* (*taijasād ubhayam*). Furthermore, according to the explanation of the AS, the *ahamkāra* is still influenced by the *citta* and the *buddhi*, which carry the *triṣuṇa*. The *buddhīndriya* consists of *cakṣu* (sight), *śrotra* (hearing), *ghrāṇa* (smell), *rasa* (taste), and *tvak* (touch). Then, the *karmendriya* consists of the ability to speak (*vāk*), grasping (*pāṇi*), locomotion (*pada*), excretion (*pāyu*), and sexual procreation (*upastha*) (SK 26). However, the explanation of the *tāmasika ahamkāra* (*bhūtādi*) is not given according to its various constituents; it is only explained in broad outlines, as in SK 38. Meanwhile, in the AS, all the constituents mentioned in detail are very similar to those listed in the TJ and the *Vṛhaspatitattva* (VT). Interestingly, in the AS, the *ahamkāra taijasa* section is not explained. As found in the SK 25 and TJ IVc as well in the VT 33.26-7, the *taijasa* is helping the *vaikṛta* and the *bhūtādi* to make the *ekādaśendriya* and the *pañca tanmātra*, like a pendulum.

18. According to Zoetmulder (1982:28), the *ahamkāra* means conception of one’s individuality, the egoistic self (one of the stages in the evolution of the *prakṛti*); selfishness, pride, conceit, arrogance; selfish, proud etc.; (also in more favourable sense) self-confidence, confidence, and courageous.

19. Cf. Jakubzak (2006:188).

As seen in the description of the *ahamkāra* outlined above, from the *vaikṛta* comes the *manas*.²⁰ The definition given to the *manas* resembles that of the *buddhi*, as described earlier. SK 27 and 29 further explain the nature of the *manas* as a determinant of the nature of the evolution of the five *jñānendriya* and five *karmendriya*. The *manas* also provides a basis for consideration, deliberation, thought, and analysis (*saṃkalpa*). Additionally, together with the *mahat* or *buddhi* and the *ahamkāra*, the *manas* functions to support or maintain the vital breath (*prāṇa*) that preserves life. Thus, life is highly determined by these three principles.

The SK also explains the functioning of the three together (the *buddhi*, the *ahamkāra*, and the *manas*) with one of the senses simultaneously or subsequently in the process of responding to an object, or in cases where awareness of something arises not from something that is directly experienced (for example, conceptualisation, or logical inference). All three operate based on memory and imagination (SK 30). In SK 31, it is stressed once again that the motives for all the activities linked to the *tattvas* are fulfilling the aim of the *puruṣa* (*puruṣārtha*).²¹

In the AS, the *manas* is given a glorifying term as *rājendriya* or the king of the senses. It is in charge of perceiving everything. In fact, it is explained that its position is on the seeds of the brain, between the forehead, heart, navel, and between the genitals and navel. In all places, according to the AS, there may be the *manas*. Therefore, the *manas* in both texts refers to the mind. However, the positions or the locations of the *manas* in the human body are explained in the AS, whereas in the SK they are more generally referenced.

The Dualistic Epistemology of Yoga in the AS

The Śaiva Yoga and the Pātañjala Yoga described in OJ texts come to a similar climax, the union with the Supreme Being. However, Acri (2013:97) notes that the goal of *samādhi* in Pātañjala Yoga is that of striving after isolation of the spirit from the mind, and that OJ texts as well as the AS introduced a new theistic understanding of *samādhi*. In the AS, the word is understood as meaning oneness with God, Śiva. Besides the understanding of *samādhi* as the isolation of the spirit from the mind, the YS also states that by meditating on Īśvara (i.e. Śiva, God) comes *samādhi* (*saṃādhisiddhir īśvarapraṇidhānāt*) (YS II.45 in Vivekananda, 1976:213; Sura and Yasa, 2011:48). While in this passage of the YS Īśvara would appear to be conceived of as a means rather

20. According to Zoetmulder (1982:1096) *manah* (Skt *manas*, mind in the widest sense as applied to all mental powers) spirit, mind, heart, feelings. Monier-Williams (1999:783) defines the *manas* as mind; intellect, intelligence, understanding, perception, and feeling.

21. The *puruṣārtha* has four dimensions, namely *dharma*, *artha*, *kāma* and *mokṣa*, which are well-known in Balinese Hinduism.

than an aim, the Śaiva concept of liberation is clearly aimed at the union of the soul with Śiva, leading to a conscious experience by the soul of Śiva's bliss (Schomerus, 2000:363).

The word Īśvara could be understood as a theistic element in the YS. This understanding is also shown by the translation of the word Īśvara as "God" by Vivekananda (1976) and Swami Prabhavananda and Christopher Iserwood (1953). However, YS I.24 considers the equation between the words *puruṣa* and *īśvara*. There is also a comparison that gives the superior position to Īśvara over the *puruṣa*. In other words, the *puruṣa* is the adept; there is a distance caused by devotion. All the verses that use the word *īśvara* in the YS imply the union of the *puruṣa* with Īśvara through practice of *yoga*. This leads to a slightly different understanding of the divinity of Śiva in the AS. Śiva is considered equal to the *cetana*,²² which also means being intelligent, human being; soul, mind; and awareness, understanding, intelligence.

Then, in the AS, Śiva is understood as (Balinese) *ménget*²³ (having memory or consciousness). Then, it is divided into three categories according to Śaiva point of view of OJ texts: *Śivātmā*, *Sadāśiva*, and *Paramaśiva*. This distinction results from the different qualities of consciousness of Śiva. The lowest hierarchical Śiva is the *Śivātmā*, having a similar state of consciousness as the *puruṣa*; the middling consciousness is *Sadāśiva* or the worshipped Almighty God; and the highest is *Paramaśiva* or the transcending and pure consciousness. These different qualities result from the influence of the *acetana*, the unconsciousness. This means that Śiva has a state of transcendence and immanence at once.

This is certainly different from the understanding of Īśvara in the YS, which continuously resides in a transcendent position. At this point, it can be understood that the YS paradigm is Godliness, worship, and an emphasis on the transcendental. In other words, the relationship between the *puruṣa* and Īśvara in the YS is the bottom-up relationship of theology in one direction. If the SK builds a downward evolution doctrine – without Īśvara – of all manifestations, the YS builds an upward spiritual doctrine. Nevertheless, YS I.24 explains that Īśvara is a special *puruṣa*, untouched by misery and actions and their results and desires (Vivekananda, 1976:138). This makes His transcending state similar to Paramaśiva. Moreover, it is explained in YS I.27 that the manifestation word for Him is 'OM' (*praṇava*) (*ibid.*: 141). This

22. In Monier-Williams (1999:397) the word *cetana* is defined as being visible, clear, superior, excellent; percipient (able to capture precisely), conscious, able to see (hear and feel). Aciri (2013:76) translates it as Sentience (capacity to feel, perceive, or experience subjectively).

23. The Balinese word *ménget* is composed of {*ma-*} "suffix meaning to have" + {*inget*} "remember," "having memory," "being aware," and "conscious." In short, the word *ménget* in Balinese language has the same meaning with the word *cetana* in Sanskrit, 'having consciousness' (cf. Partami et al., 2016:507).

similar position of Paramaśiva and Īśvara is clearly stated in VT 7-10²⁴ as well as practiced in everyday Hindu prayers in Bali.

In the AS as well as in OJ texts, Śiva and Śivātmā have a historical relationship. It is explained that “*Ida Sañ hyaṅ Śivātmā tattva*” has been much disoriented, His disoriented state becomes confusion, (that then He) has will to produce all principles’ (Balinese) *Ida Sanghiang Siwatmatatwa, sampun kahanan bingung, kabingungan Idané punika sané manados biapara, makayun ngawijilang sarwa tatwa* (Djelantik, 1947:36). The Balinese phrase *sarwa tatwa* is used to mean the 25 principles of the SK. This means that there is a traditional relationship: the relationship between the universal and the particular (Gadamer, 2004:375). The particular, the *puruṣa*, adheres to the universal or Śiva because He is the source, the father (*Aji*).

The immanence of Śiva into Śivātmā occurs as the *puruṣa* is produced by the influence of Māyā. As explained in Schomerus (2000:44; 381), Śaiva doctrine (for instance, monistic Śaiva Siddhānta) in India understands Śiva as *Sat*, existing as a true reality. According to non-dualistic schools, everything comes from this reality, Śiva. At this level, Śiva is understood in the sense of monism. Moreover, in the theology of monistic Śaiva Siddhānta, God is also *Cit* (pure intelligence) and *Ānanda* (joy and the basis for the blessedness of souls) (Schomerus, 2000:48). Thus, the basis of *puruṣa* is happiness, according to the sense of Śiva as *Ānanda*. The entity mentioned in the AS after the Śivatattva is the *Māyātattva*. The discussion about the *Māyātattva* replaces the term *acetana*. On the other hand, when examined intertextually, the use of the word *māyā* is found in early *Siddhāntatantras*, as Goodall (2004:xxvii; quoting Sanderson, 1992) explains, to mention the material cause (*upādāna-kāraṇam*), while Śiva is only the efficient cause (*nimitta-kāraṇam*) of the universe. This conforms to a dualist idea of causality, which was prevalent in “orthodox” Śaiva Siddhānta,²⁵ which has greatly influenced the conceptual relation of Śiva and Māyā.

The term *māyā* is also found in the OJ tradition of Śaivism. The presence of this principle is closely related to the understanding of Śiva as *Sadāśiva*. It is explained that in the process of creating the world, *Śivatattva* (for example, the *Sadāśivatattva*) splits into two: *cetana* (*Śivatattva*) and *acetana* (*Māyātattva*) (Suamba, 2016:20-9). Yasa and Sarjana (2009:41-2), on the basis of the TJ and in line with the AS, explain that the *acetana* is called the *Māyātattva*,

24. See Sudarshana Devi (1957:38,76).

25. According to the historical investigation by Goodall (2004:xxvi), “Early non-dualist works of the school could have gone missing, but it appears likely that the Śaiva Siddhānta was a broadly dualist school which only after the twelfth century felt the influence of non-dualist Vedānta. The early Siddhāntatantras are not only not influenced by non-dualist Vedānta, they seem in fact to ignore it. It is only among the tantras that cannot be demonstrated to be early that we find works which either teach or appear to presuppose a Vedānta-influenced non-dualism.”

the principle of unconscious reality. The understanding of the *Māyātattva* mentioned in the AS can be traced to the TJ. It holds a position below the *Śivatattva*, vertically. Acri (2013:81), in his explanation of the evolution of universal principles found in the VT, emphasizes the horizontal dualism reflected by the Ātman's position between the *cetana* (Śiva) and the *acetana* (Māyāsīras or Māyā).

The term *māyā* generally means delusion according to the Vedāntins. The same term can also be found in the doctrines of non-dual Kashmir Śaivism. Māyā is considered not a separate reality, but the gross power of consciousness. It is the single, eternal, and an unconscious source of the worlds and everything in them, including the bodies and faculties of each soul (Sanderson, 1992; quoted by Goodall, 2004:xxvii-xxviii). It is referred to as Māyā Śakti (Bernard, 1999:139). In the sense of delusion related to monism, *māyā* has been regarded as a negative force that must be avoided. Bhattacharyya (2008:93) explains that *māyā* is the conceptual formulation of the feeling of the vanity of life just as another doctrine is of the demand for absolute certitude (*Brahman*). This is like existence without any essence. Therefore, in relation to Śaivism, this term is often replaced by the term *śakti*, referring to the potentiality of the power of the soul itself. In addition to the VT and the TJ, the terms *māyā* and *śakti* also appear in the AS. It seems that the use of both is not only intended to assert the authenticity of Śiva in the doctrine of monism but also to initiate a dualistic understanding (*cetana-acetana*) to facilitate the process of understanding Śiva as the consciousness and Māyā as the unconsciousness. From the two principles, as explained in the AS, the *puruṣa* emerges, as does the *pradhānatattva*. The *puruṣatattva* and the *pradhānatattva* are the result of the meeting between Śiva and Māyā (the father and mother of both) (Djelantik, 1947:7).

In YS I.3, the *puruṣa* is no longer explained because it has direct reference to the SK. However, it is identified with the *draṣṭā* “seer” (Vivekananda, 1976:20). The realization of the *puruṣa* is the key to the whole set of practices in the YS as releasing the *puruṣa* from its object, the *prakṛti*. This is the highest goal of the yoga discourse contained in the YS. The dualism in the YS is understood by the knowledge of the subject, the *puruṣa*, which is aimed at knowing everything that has *triguṇa* (*sattva*, *rajas*, and *tamas*), the *prakṛti*. The *puruṣa* comes to the *prakṛti* to form a duality; the subject comes to the object. In this context, the SK illustrates that the *puruṣa* comes after the *prakṛti*. In YS I.19, IV.2, and IV.3, the *prakṛti* has the same position as described in the SK. It is the cause of experience, as suggested by the terms *pratyaya* “experience” and *nimitta(m)* “cause.” Moreover, the word *prakṛti* itself also means cause, something present before another thing (Bernard, 1999:72). The more radical understanding of the dualism of the *puruṣa* and the *prakṛti* in the YS is the view that the paramount aim of yoga is to free man forever from the three types of pain (*duḥkhatraya*) (Bernard, 1999:87). These three kinds of pain occur as a result of the attachment

to the cause of experience that is avoided through the discriminative knowledge (*viveka*) of the *puruṣa* and the *prakṛti*. In other words, that goal is achieved by negating the *prakṛti*, the object of knowledge.

In the AS, the word *prakṛti* is not used, but the word *pradhāna* means the unconsciousness of the Māyā. This meaning tends to be positive and to have a complementary position with the *puruṣa*. Herein lies the difference between the AS and the two canonical texts of dualism. The *puruṣa* and the *pradhāna* are intended to complete each other and form a duality or hermeneutic intersubjectivity. In some parts of the AS, the relationship of *puruṣa-pradhāna* can turn into *pradhāna-puruṣa*. When referring to the YS, the *prakṛti* is the objective entity of knowledge determined by the subject of knowledge, the *puruṣa*; thus, one is allowed to leave the other after knowledge is discovered. On the contrary, in the AS, the relationship between the two has dialectically made them exist together with reciprocal positioning and mutual understanding of the objective experience. This is in line with the view of Gadamer that knowledge is entirely dialectical (Gadamer, 2004:439). The last sentence of the first paragraph of page 8 confirms the position of both principles in the AS, (Balinese) *Nénten wénten punapa punapi iriki ring jagaté sané tan madaging Predana-Puruṣa, apan mawiwit Predana-Puruṣa, mawinan sami awaking Predana-Puruṣa* (“There is nothing here in the universe that does not contain *Pradhāna-Puruṣa*, because all come from *Pradhāna-Puruṣa*, and all manifest from *Pradhāna-Puruṣa*”) (Djelantik, 1947:8). This gives a clear understanding of the different position of the YS, which tends to make the *puruṣa* the subject. However, according to the SK, the *prakṛti* is positioned as the Husserlian phenomenological object,²⁶ which comes first before the subject. Therefore, the YS never leave the subject-object dichotomy. Nonetheless, in the AS, the relations between the two entities are dialogically built; both are subjects stylistically implied by the use of the Balinese verbs *ngwrediang* (issuing; developing) and *mangelimbakang* (spreading) to mention the activities of the *puruṣa* and the *pradhāna*. Therefore, it can be understood that the AS develops the Gadamerian intersubjective philosophical discourse,²⁷ whereas the YS remains in the position of subject-object determined by the intentionality of both relationships like the SK.

The Emergence of the term Citta as one of the Principles (tattva)

The dualistic relationship between the *puruṣa* and the *prakṛti* of the SK has made what is called in the YS as *citta* emerge. This reflects the way in which

26. Based on Husserl, the object is known due to the intentionality of the subject to it (Blackburn, 2013:418-20; 454).

27. The relation of two things is based on the horizon of both, without subject-object relation, but the objective knowledge is called hermeneutic experience, which is attained through a fusion of horizon (Gadamer, 2004:437; 449).

the AS frames the meeting of the *puruṣa* and the *pradhāna*. Unlike in the SK, in the YS, the word *citta* is the key to understanding all the yoga doctrines mentioned in chapter I *Samādhi Pāda*, chapter III *Vibhūti Pāda*, and chapter IV *Kaivalya Pāda*.²⁸ The word *citta* is often translated as “mind.” Thus, the central point or core of the yoga doctrine in the YS may be in the mind.²⁹

The states of mind are called *ṛtti*, and they have two divisions: *nivṛtti* (will not to will) and *pravṛtti* (will to will) (Bhattacharyya, 2008:284). YS IV.5 states, *Pravṛttibhede prayojakaṁ cittamekamanekēṣāṁ* (‘Though the activities of different created minds vary, the one original mind is the controller of them all’ [Vivekananda, 1976:252]). Bernard (1999:94) and Vivekananda (1976:116) propose another term frequently used for the mind as a whole, namely *antaḥkaraṇa* (the internal doer). Bernard (1999:94) states that the *citta* comes from the root *cit*, which means to “perceive, understand, know.” The term *cit* is related to the concept of the nature of Śiva in Śaivism, as explained by Schomerus (2000:147). It refers to knowing everything without learning. Similarly, according to Monier-Williams (1999:395), *cit* means “thinking; thought, intellect, spirit, and soul.” Thus, the word *citta* refers to something that knows.

In the AS, a vertical comparison is made by linking the *citta* to the *puruṣa*. In the VT (35, in Sudarshana Devi, 1957:36), it is stated, (OJ) *apan ivāḥ ikaṁ citta lavan ātmā bhedanya*, (“it is very difficult to understand the difference between the mind [*citta*] and soul [ātmā]”). Acri (2011a:485) has detected the similarity between the DP and the YS when they state that the perception of reality by the mind is mirrored in the soul’s perception of reality, which mistakenly identifies itself with the mind. In the TJ, there is also some difficulty in interpreting *citta*: (OJ) *Citta nāranya ganāl riṅ puruṣa, guṇa nāranya dadi niṅ Pradhānatattva, an kacetana deniṅ Puruṣa* (‘*Citta* is the gross form of the *Puruṣa*. *Guṇa* is the manifestation of *Pradhānatattva*, given the consciousness by the *Puruṣa*’). A similar explanation comparing the *citta* with the *triguṇa* is also found in the AS: (Balinese) *Kabiaparan cita punika kawastanin triguna, dagingipun triguna punika keanggén wisaya antuk cita* (‘The confusion of the *citta* is called *triguṇa*, meaning that *triguṇa* is used as contentment (*wisaya*) by the *citta*’).

In the AS, the position of the *citta* is obviously under the *puruṣa* as a result of its first meeting with the *pradhāna*. However, in the VT, the TJ, and the DP, one notes a position of interchangeability between the *citta* and the *puruṣa*, and yet identifying both as the same would be a mistake. Meanwhile, in YS

28. In chapter II, the term is not mentioned but categorized according to its activities (*ṛtti*) as the five troublesomes (*kleśa*) in attaining *samādhi*.

29. The term “mind” is closely related meaningfully to the term “*cogito*” or the Cartesian Doubt. In this sense there is a distinction between mind and body. In this view it is understood that the soul is different from the body. The mind is said to represent the soul similar to the understanding offered by VT (cf. Blackburn, 2013:562).

IV.20, the *citta* and the *buddhi* actually replace one another, *Cittāntaradṛśye buddhibudheratiprasaṅgaḥ smṛtisaṅkaraś ca* (“Another cognizing mind being assumed, there will be no end to such assumptions, and confusion of memory will be the result”) (Vivekananda, 1976:261; Sura and Yasa, 2011:65). In the YS, the position of *buddhi* is not explicitly mentioned, just like that of the *citta* in the SK. The *citta* can be exchanged with any of the following three mental principles: *buddhi*, *ahamkāra*, and *manas*. However, the AS actually gives a different position to the *citta*, above the *buddhi*, as explained earlier, (Balinese) *Budi punika sinah sesudan i cita sané sampun banget pakirang makta ménget...* (“The *buddhi* is clearly after the *citta*, in which it has lacked memory”). Thus, Djelantik seems to have introduced a new construction that is not attested in the VT or the TJ, the two authoritative *tattva* texts in OJ. Therefore, unlike the YS, which uses the word *citta* to refer to *buddhi*, *ahamkāra*, and *manas*, the AS actually construes *citta* as one separate *tattva*. The difference in the position of the *citta* may be the result of dynamics of the discourse of yoga in Bali during the author’s time, thus reflecting the eclectic attitude of the tradition. Although the AS explicitly refers to the YS, it retains a specific structure. Any discrepancies cannot be simply understood as misunderstandings; rather, as it is clear from the discussion of the term *citta*, it can be presumed that a new understanding did take place in relation to the dualistic philosophical discourse found in Sanskrit seminal sources and reelaborated in the AS. Therefore, the text documents a deconstruction, the creation of a new structure, or even a renewal of understanding of the tradition, even though that tradition is still firmly adhered to as AS still keeps its concordance with the YS.

The Emergence of Aṣṭāṅgayoga in the AS

The term *aṣṭāṅgayoga* has been interpreted as the eight limbs or, rather, ancillaries of yoga. These eight ancillaries are found in the YS of Patañjali and other later texts of the Indian tradition. The *Dharma Pātañjala* (DP), the text studied by Aciri (2011a:477), devotes almost one-third of its exposition to this type of yoga. Ensink (1974:198 in Aciri, 2011a:477) notes that the importance and uniqueness of the DP lie in the fact that it constitutes the only OJ source that expounds the yoga with eight ancillaries (*aṣṭāṅga*) – characterising the Pātañjala variety of yoga – instead of the yoga of the six ancillaries (*ṣaḍāṅga*), which characterises a variety of Tantric yoga described in the majority of Śaiva and Buddhist sources from both the Indonesian Archipelago and the Indian Subcontinent.³⁰ Aciri (2013:85) states that the most widespread form of yoga

³⁰ The adoption of the eight ancillaries of yoga by Djelantik was regarded by Bakker (1993:302, cited in Aciri, 2013:89) as a contribution of Indian thought to Balinese thought. Djelantik is seen as a reformer, as a member of modern Balinese religious elite, who refers directly to Indian sources.

in the Javano-Balinese literature, including Tuturs and Tattvas, is the (more or less markedly) Tantric variety of yoga of the six ancillaries (*ṣaḍaṅgayoga*). Further, Acri (2011a:477-8; 2013:86) states that over time, Patañjali came to be recognised as the ultimate authority on yoga in the mainstream Brahmanic traditions, and even in Śaiva sources (especially in South India). Thus, the YS assumed the contours of the ‘classical’ or ‘orthodox’ formulation of yoga in the Hindu episteme through the centuries. Surely enough, in line with these developments, and in harmony with both the YS and the DP, the *aṣṭāṅga* variety of yoga is found in the AS.

In YS II:28, the *aṣṭāṅgayoga* is called *yogāṅgā*. The text explains in advance about *viveka*, which means (right) discrimination achieved by practicing the eight ancillaries of yoga. Then, the following *sūtras* explain the ancillaries one by one in detail. It is interesting to compare the *yama* and the *niyama* in the YS, the AS, and earlier OJ texts. The VT expounds a similar list of *yama* and *niyama*, in *śloka* 60 and 61.³¹ Moreover, before the verses about the *yama* and the *niyama*, it is stated: (OJ) *Nahan yaṅ ṣaḍaṅgayoga naranya, pinakajñāna saṅ paṇḍita, mataṇyan kapaṅgiḥ Saṅ Hyaṅ Viśéṣa, ika ta kayogīśvaran maṅkana, ya teka karakṣanriṅ daśaśīla* (“These six ancillaries of *yoga* form the knowledge of the *paṇḍita* [priest]. That is why one attains *viśéṣa*. This kind of *yogīśvara*-hood is to be guarded by the ten virtues [*daśaśīla*]”)³². This means that the five *yama* and the five *niyama* can be added to the *ṣaḍaṅgayoga*. Similar to the exposition in the VT, the term *daśaśīla* is also found in the *Vratīśāsana*.

The description of the *yama* in the AS is more similar to that in the YS, whereas the description of the *niyama* tends to be closer to that in the VT, as shown in Table 1. However, no 1 to 1 correspondence can be detected. In the *yama* section of the YS, there is a difference in terminology between *aparigraha* (non-receiving) vs. *avyavahārika* (non-litigation) of the VT. The word *aparigraha* is definitively closer to (Balinese) “*tan loba makadi mamangan manginum jantos mamunyah* (not greedy like eating and drinking until getting drunk)” of the AS. This means that the AS here tends to concord the YS rather than the VT.

31. See Sudarshana Devi (1957:66;106).

32. Adapted from the translation by Sudarshana Devi (1957:106).

Table 1 – Comparison of the *Yama* and the *Niyama* (YS, AS, VT) with Adjustments to the Order of the YS

	YS	AS (Balinese)	VT
y a m a	<i>ahimsa</i> (non-killing)	<i>tan mamati-mati miwah nyakitin</i> (non-killing and non-injury)	<i>ahimsa</i> (idem)
	<i>satya</i> (truthfulness)	<i>tan linyok</i> (non-prevaricating)	<i>satya</i> (idem)
	<i>asteya</i> (non-stealing)	<i>tan mamaling</i> (non-stealing)	<i>astainya</i> (idem)
	<i>brahmacarya</i> (chastity)	(<i>tan</i>) <i>marosih kalih paradara</i> (not in courtship and not having sexual intercourse)	<i>brahmacarya</i> (idem)
	<i>aparigraha</i> (non-receiving)	<i>tan loba makadi mamangan manginum jantos mamunyah</i> (not greedy like eating and drinking until getting drunk)	<i>avyavahārika</i> (not litigate)
n i y a m a	<i>śauca</i> (purification)	<i>keni apik ring raga-sarira</i> (knowing how to clean self-body)	<i>śauca</i> (idem)
	<i>samtosa</i> (contentment)	<i>tan ngulurin pangan kinum</i> (not to follow desire for food and drink)	<i>āhārālāghava</i> (not to eat heavily)
	<i>tapa</i> (mortification)	<i>tan kroda</i> (not being angry)	<i>akrodha</i> (not being angry)
	<i>svādhyāya</i> (self-study)	<i>mangda teher baktine ring guru</i> (having to be obedient to the teachers)	<i>guruśuśrūṣā</i> (devotion to teachers/elders)
	<i>īśvarapraṇidhāna</i> (worship of God)	<i>anteng tetep bakti ring Batara luih mamuja japa-astawa</i> (being diligent and keeping the devotion to <i>Batara</i> (God) with good worshipping)	<i>apramāda</i> (not being careless)

In the *niyama* section, the tension between the YS and the VT in the AS becomes increasingly apparent. For example, in the AS, we find the Balinese clause *mangda teher baktine ring guru* (“having to be obedient to the teachers”), whose meaning is closer to *guruśuśrūṣā* (devotion to the teachers/elders) than to *svādhyāya* (self-study). Likewise, the meaning of (Balinese) *tan kroda* is similar to the word ‘*akrodha*’ in the VT, which refers to “not being angry,” as opposed to the item *tapa* (“mortification”) in the YS. An interesting point is the expression, (Balinese) *anteng tetep bakti ring Batara luih mamuja japa-*

astawa (being diligent and keeping the devotion to *Batara* [God] through good worshipping [*japa-astawa*]), which is closer to “*īśvarapraṇidhāna*” (worship of God) in the YS. Therefore, insofar as the *yama* and *niyama* are concerned, it can be concluded that the AS contains a combination or even coalition of the YS and the VT.

Unsurprisingly, the term *tarka*³³ is not mentioned as one of the eight ancillaries of yoga in the AS, since this item is only found in *śaḍaṅgayoga*. In YS I.17, there is an item referred to as *vitarka* (reasoning), but it does not belong to the *aṅgas*. *Tarka* has become one of the *aṣṭasiddhi* (eight supernatural powers) found in the VT³⁴ – comparable to the term *viveka* in the SK and YS. *Tarka* usually features as the fifth *aṅga* before *samādhi* in the texts of Śaivism in both Sanskrit and Old Javanese (including VT and TJ).³⁵ According to VT 58, the word *tarka* or *tarkayoga* means continually reflecting on Him (God) as ethereal and representing continuity and stability and as a being devoid of sound (Sudarshana Devi, 1957:105). The God reflected in the VT is called *Paramārtha* (the Highest Truth). This term shows the distinction between the *śaḍaṅgayoga* and the *aṣṭāṅgayoga*.

The *śaḍaṅgayoga* does not contain *āsana* (posture). It is not found in the VT but is found in the TJ instead. Interestingly, the TJ presents a hybrid list of seven ancillaries middling between *śaḍaṅgayoga* and *aṣṭāṅgayoga*: *āsana*, *prāṇāyāma*, *pratyāhāra*, *dhāraṇā*, *dhyāna*, *tarka*, and *samādhi*. The term used for the ancillaries is *prayogasandhi*. Thus, there have been dynamics of change in OJ texts related to the number and position of the ancillaries. It is, therefore, not surprising that the *aṣṭāṅgayoga* (with the sequence of *aṅgas* as in the YS rather than in the OJ texts) is found in the AS instead of the *śaḍaṅgayoga*. This fact positions the AS – in spite of its composition in the modern period – as one of the key texts of the *tattva* genre, giving it an eclectic flavour within the dynamics of the yoga discourses. It can be stated that there has been a fusion of these discourses on yoga ancillaries, even though the term *aṣṭāṅgayoga* is not explicitly mentioned in the AS.

An interesting point is the explanation of *dhāraṇā*,³⁶ *dhyāna*, and *samādhi*. In YS III.1, *dhāraṇā* refers to the mind when it holds on to some object, similarly in the AS, it refers to focusing on a single object, which becomes the true aim. Then, *dhyāna* refers to keeping the mind in a state of holding onto

33. In Monier-Williams (1999:439) *tarka* is glossed as conjecture; reasoning, speculation, inquiry; philosophical system; logic, and confutation. Similar to this, according to the OJ dictionary, the definition of *tarka* is conjecture, guess, opinion; reasoning, inference (Zoetmulder, 1982:1954).

34. Compare VT 33.4, “*tarka* means deliberative knowledge” (OJ) *tarka naranin jñāna mangūha* (Sudarshana Devi, 1957:33,87).

35. See Table 2: The Ancillaries of Yoga in Aciri (2013:87).

36. All the explanations are based on Vivekananda (1976:218-219).

the object for some time, and to the unification of the mind with its object: like a mixture of freshwater and seawater, its taste becomes salty, as explained in the AS. This may be regarded as the commitment of the author of the AS to the yoga tradition of Pātañjali (as per the YS) rather than to that of OJ texts. In the OJ tradition of yoga, *dhāraṇā* and *dhyāna* are not in sequential position, while in the AS the sequence appears exactly as per the YS. Then, *dhāraṇā* is understood as the state when “Oṅkāra which is the nature of Śiva should be placed in the heart absorbed in *tattvas*.” Because Oṅkāra is held continuously, hence it is known as *dhāraṇā*’ (VT 57 translated by Sudharsana Devi, 1957:105). Meanwhile, the understanding of *dhyāna* is characterized by a peaceful mind state. Herein lies as well the difference between the Śaiva Yoga and the Pātañjala Yoga; the Śaiva consistently suggests Śiva in the manifestation of Oṅkāra (“OM,” *praṇava*) as the object of meditation on *dhāraṇā*, without continuation on *dhyāna*, whereas the Pātañjala does not mention any specific object. The AS follows the latter: (Balinese) *ring asiki sane mawit tatujon sujati*³⁷ (“a single object, which becomes the true aim”).

The adherence of the author of the AS to the tradition of Patañjali is somewhat less apparent in his explanation of the word *samādhi*: in the YS, the state of *samādhi* is like unexpressed meaning in any form, whereas in the AS, it is explained as “the state of selflessness (I-lessness)³⁸” (Balinese) *tan kantun éling ring rage*. Prabhavananda and Iserwood (1953:171) refer to it as absorption. Bernard (1999:190) defines it as the individual who becomes one with the object of meditation. Pott (1966:6) argues that in the state of *samādhi*, “Human consciousness has gone (*śūnya*), and one is no longer subject to relativity. It is a condition which cannot be described in words, one of great bliss and transcending any conception of time and place.” It can be concluded that *samādhi* is the state of the intersubjectivity or interconnectedness of the one who meditates with the meditated, undifferentiated state of subject-object.

Aciri (2013:97) regards *samādhi* (which he translates as absorption, as per the YS) in the context of the Śaiva yoga expounded in Sanskrit sources as well as in the DP as union with God. Another understanding is expounded in the VT: “*Samādhi* (concentration) is to think of Him continuously as absolute, unconceptual, without desire, calm, unchanging and without characteristics (Sudharsana Devi, 1957:105).” According to *Jñānasiddhānta* (JS), *samādhi* refers to concentration – when the mind is unworried, it has no concepts, it has no possessions, there are no desires in it, it has no objects, and it is clear without obstructions (Soebadio, 1971:187; 213). Even so, the term *samādhi* is complementarily used to refer to the term yoga.³⁹ In both traditions of yoga,

37. See Djelantik (1947:17).

38. The term is related to the Gadamerian hermeneutics that I-lessness is the state when speaking to someone is indeed speaking to our inner self (Regan, 2012:289).

39. See Bhattacharyya (2008:293) as well as Aciri (2011a:483).

Śaiva and Pātañjala, *samādhi* is the highest attainment, however, once more, different object of both determines different state of it, between Śiva and unspecified object.

Besides, in the AS, *dhāraṇā*, *dhyāna*, and *samādhi* are each attributed different time frames (10 minutes for *dhāraṇā*, 20 minutes for *dhyāna*, and 30 minutes for *samādhi*). No mention of these time frames can be detected in any OJ text known to us. Mentioning durations of each of the three ancillaries enables the reader to understand the implementation of the three terms in the yoga practice in a more contextual chronology. The practice of these three ancillaries is called *saṃyama* in the YS as well as in the AS, though the description shows slight differences. This term is also found in the JS (*dhyānādītraye samyamah śloka*, chapter 19.7)), where it has been glossed in the Old Javanese commentary as consisting in *prāṇāyāma*, *dhāraṇā*, and *samādhi* (Soebadio, 1971: 201–211; see discussion in Aciri 2011c:561), whereas the VT identifies the standard three items of *dhāraṇā*, *dhyāna*, and *samādhi* with the word (OJ) *sinanyama*. This means that the AS is in concordance with the YS as well as the VT.

With respect to the terms of yoga discussed above, it can be said that the AS documents a renewal of Śaivism in Bali in concordance with both Indian sources and Old Javanese texts. Therefore, since the premodern period, the discourses of yoga as well as Śaivism have been eclectically constructed. Aciri (2013:97) regards Djelantik, the author of the AS, as merely paying lip service to Pātañjali's system by adopting external means such as the ancillaries while maintaining the internals of Śaiva *yoga*. Our investigation suggests that the AS is in concordance with the YS as the authoritative text of yoga in the frame of the Balinese Śaivistic philosophical discourse. Indeed, the YS also appears to be a hybrid formulation derived from the 'tradition text' of the old *Sāṃkhya* philosophy and the early "tradition text" of Buddhist philosophising (Larson, 1999:724-5). This means that the AS follows such tradition of textual formulation.

Related to this eclectic construction, Djelantik had constructed a breakthrough before the issue of state religion in Indonesia was forcing the Balinese people to adhere to one of the religions recognized by the state. As pointed out by Picard (2011:124), the struggle for state recognition firstly took place from 1950, three years after the AS was published, when the Minister of Religion came to Bali for this task. Following those events, Balinese Hinduism finally found the best formulation for recognition. In relation to this, with the publication of the AS, Djelantik had predicted, so to speak, the political pressure of the central government towards the Parisada to universalize the Balinese belief system. Moreover, Djelantik wrote that the AS was compiled using the *Bali Kapara*,⁴⁰ which is not actually the lowest level of Balinese,

40. The word *Kapara* is derived from prefix {*ka-*} + {*para*} meaning general, all, without mentioning any caste in Balinese social system (See Partami et al., 2016:299).

but a kind of “everyday” or “general” Balinese used for both honorific and deprecatory levels of the language (Balinese: *mungguh tedun*).⁴¹ Djelantik (1947:1) confirms that the language of the text was chosen in order “to enable the common people to understand more easily” (Balinese) *mangda molah katampén antuk sareng katah*. This means, on the one hand, that Djelantik had broken the restrictions on the access to the sacred knowledge that the traditional palm-leaf manuscripts (*lontar*) contained, as asserted by Picard (2011:122). A very common term for this in Bali is *ajawéra* or *haywa werah* “do not divulge.” Regarding this restriction, Djelantik tries to be the hermeneutic agent for the renewal of Balinese Hinduism through his eclecticism. As explained by Gadamer (2004:22), the hermeneutic understanding is for the sake of reaching the common sense or *sensus communis*, and a humanistic idea of fluency.

On the other hand, Djelantik convinced the Balinese people that Śaivism is not only the religion of the elites, but of all Balinese (including the lay people) who follow the traditional beliefs that Aciri (2011b:156) call “localized ancestor-cults.” Djelantik elaborated a coalition of Indian dualism and OJ Śaivistic texts to enable his fellow Balinese to have similar *sadrassa* or tastes of the *Adiluhung* “high culture” of the OJ and Sanskrit. Therefore, we would argue that Djelantik’s authorial agenda reflects the eclectic textual strategy characterising the literary history of the Indonesian Archipelago, as originally noted by Gonda (see Soebadio, 1971:54; Sedyawati, 2009:33). Therefore, the AS may be regarded as a new eclectic construction of Śaivism that is in harmony with Indian texts on dualistic philosophy (*sāṃkhya*) and yoga.

Conclusion

The AS provides a relatively simple construction of key theological and doctrinal tenets of three schools of Indian religious thought: Sāṃkhya, Yoga, and Śaivism. Since its earliest textual records, Indian Śaivism has dealt with the doctrine of dualism and monism, as has Śaivism in Indonesia. The relationship (and, perhaps, synthesis) between dualism and monism has contributed to shape the archetype of Śaivistic orthodoxy in Indonesia since the premodern period. The legacy of this relationship has been inherited in Bali, arguably because it is the best formulation that fits some key values of Balinese culture. However, the texts of Old Javanese Śaivism were not totally similar to one another: every text had a different structure and doctrinal variations that indicated the forms of Śaivism adhered to by their anonymous authors. Therefore, we have described

41. Definitions of the levels and registers of Balinese vary. For instance, the Dinas Pengajaran Daerah Provinsi Bali in 1971 distinguished three levels, from lowest to highest: Basa Kapara (*lumrah*), Basa Mada, and Basa Singgih (Suwendi, 2014:4), while other official bodies and authors proposed different arrangements. Apparently following the (to our mind imprecise) division mentioned above, Aciri (2013:75) states that the AS was composed in ‘low-level Balinese’ (*bahasa Bali kapara*).

the AS as a new type of eclectic textbook that provides a formulation of dualistic-monistic Śaivism in Bali, yet in concordance with the Sāṃkhya and the Yoga schools of philosophy. This affirmative construction does not only concord with Indian dualistic thought, but is also the result of the development of Śaivism in Indonesia. The AS introduced an element of doctrinal renewal or innovation via a specific understanding of some key Old Javanese Śaivistic texts preserved in palm-leaf manuscripts from Bali. This agenda of innovation was already shaped by the hermeneutic understandings of the authors of several texts that came before the AS was composed. Thus, the AS may be regarded as a dualistic-monistic text in the tradition of the Old Javanese Śaivistic texts from the premodern period.

AS *Aji Sangkya*
 DP *Dharma Pātañjala*
 JS *Jñānasiddhānta*
 OJ Old-Javanese
 TJ *Tattvajñāna*
 SK *Sāṃkhyakārikā*
 VT *Vṛhaspatitattva*
 YS *Yogasūtra*

References

- Aciri, Andrea, 2011a, *Dharma Pātañjala: A Śaiva Scripture from Ancient Java Studied in the Light of Related Old Javanese and Sanskrit Texts*. Groningen: Egbert Forsten Publishing.
- Aciri, Andrea, 2011b, "A New Perspective for 'Balinese Hinduism' in the Light of the Pre-Modern Religious Discourse: A Textual-Historical Approach," in Michel Picard and Rémy Madinier (eds.), *The Politics of Religion in Indonesia: Syncretism, Orthodoxy, and Religious Contention in Java and Bali*, pp. 143-167. New York: Routledge.
- Aciri, Andrea, 2011c, "Re-configuration of Divinity in Old Javanese Śaiva texts from the Indonesian Archipelago (with special reference to *Jñānasiddhānta*, chapter 19)," *Travaux de Symposium International: Le Livre. La Roumanie. L'Europe. Troisième édition, Tome III*, pp. 546-65. Bucarest: Éd. Bibliothèque de Bucarest.
- Aciri, Andrea, 2013, "Modern Hindu Intellectuals and Ancient Texts: Reforming Śaiva Yoga in Bali," *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 169:68-103.
- Aciri, Andrea, and Arlo Griffiths, 2014, "The Romanization of Indic Script used in Ancient Indonesia," *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 170: 365-78.
- Agastya, IBG., 2015, "Membaca Aji Sangkya Karya Ida Ketut Jlantik," *Article* (printed as a book) distributed in the meeting of Dharmopadesa Pusat, March 28th, 2015, Desa Banjar, Singaraja. Denpasar: Yayasan Dharma Sastra.
- Bakker, F, 1993, *The Struggle of the Hindu Balinese Intellectuals; Developments in Modern Hindu Thinking in Independent Indonesia*. Amsterdam: VU University Press.
- Bhattacharyya, Krishnachandra, 2008, *Studies in Philosophy*, Third Revised and Enlarged Edition, edited by Gopinath Bhattacharyya. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Bernard, Theos, 1999, *Hindu Philosophy*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Private Limited.

- Blackburn, Simon, 2013, *Kamus Filsafat*, translated by Yudi Santoso. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Djelantik, Ida Ktoet, 1947, *Adji Sankya*. Banjar [no publisher].
- Djelantik, Ida Ktoet, 2008, *Aji Sangkya: Suntingan Teks, Terjemahan, dan Analisis Isi*, translated and analyzed by I Wayan Suka Yasa and Ida Bagus Jelantik. Denpasar: Widya Dharma.
- Djelantik, Ida Ketut, 1973, *Aji Sangkhya*, translated by Gde Sandhi. Direktur Jendral Bimbingan Masyarakat Hindu dan Buddha.
- Ensink, J, 1974, "Sutasoma's Teaching to Gajavaktra, the Snake and the Tigress (Tantular Sutasoma Kakavin38.1-42.4)," *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 130:195-226.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg, 2004, *Kebenaran dan Metode: Pengantar Filsafat Hermeneutika*, translated by Ahmad Sahidah. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Goodall, Dominic, 2004, *The Parāṅkhyatantra; A Scripture of the Śaiva Siddhānta; A Critical Edition and Annotated Translation*. Pondichéry: IFP/EFEO.
- Hooykaas, C., 1950-51, "Cāṅkya-leer van Bali (1947)," *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 84:434-84.
- Jakubzak, Marzenna, 2006, "Ego-Making Principle in Samkhya Metaphysics and Cosmology," in Anna-Teresa Tymieniecka (ed.), *Logos of Phenomenology and Phenomenology of the Logos. Book Two. Analecta Husserliana*, vol. 84. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Jelantik, Ida Ketut, 2012, *Kitab Aji Sangkya 1947*, edited by Ida Komang Wisasmaya. Surabaya: Paramita.
- Karambelkar, P.V., no year, *Pātañjala Yoga Sūtra; Sanskrta Sūtra with Transliteration, Translation & Commentary*. Lonavia: Kaivalyadhama.
- Larson, Gerald James, 1999, "Classical Yoga as neo-Sāṃkhya: A Chapter in the History of Indian Philosophy," *Asiatische Studien: Zeitschrift der Schweizerischen Asiengeesellschaft* 53:723-32. Germany: Walter de Gruyter.
- Larson, Gerald James and Ram Shankar Bhattacharya (1987). *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies, Volume IV: Sāṃkhya A Dualist Tradition in Indian Philosophy*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Monier-Williams, Sir Monier, 1999, *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Limited (first ed., 1899).
- Palguna, IBM. Dharma, 2014, *Dharma Śūnya: Memuja dan Meneliti Śiwa*. Mataram: Sadampatyaksara.
- Partami, Ni Luh, et al., 2016, *Kamus Bali-Indonesia*. Denpasar: Balai Bahasa Bali.
- Picard, Michel, 2011, "From Agama Hindu Bali to Agama Hindu and back: Toward a relocalization of the Balinese Religion?" in Michel Picard and Rémy Madinier (eds.) *Politics of Religion in Indonesia: Syncretism, Orthodoxy, and Religious Contention in Java and Bali*, pp. 117-141. New York: Routledge.
- Pott, P.H., 1966, *Yoga and Yantra: Their Interrelation and Their Significance for India Archaeology*, translated by Rodney Needham. The Hague, Nijhoff.
- Prabhavananda, Swami and Christopher Iserwood (transl. & com.), 1953, *How to Know God: The Yoga Aphorisms of Patanjali*. New York, Harper.
- Regan, Paul, 2012, "Hans-Georg Gadamer's Philosophical Hermeneutics: Concepts of Reading, Understanding, and Interpretation," *META: Research in Hermeneutics, Phenomenology, and Practical Philosophy*, Vol. IV, No.2/December 2012: 286-303. www.metajournal.org.

- Sanderson, Alexis, 1992, "The Doctrine of the Mālinīvijayottaratantra" in Teun Goudriaan (ed.), *Ritual and Speculation in Early Tantrism: Studies in Honor of André Padoux*, pp. 281-312. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Saraswati, Swami Niranjanananda, 2008, "Samkhya Karika of Ishvara Krishna Sanskrit Text, Transliteration and Translation," appendix of *Samkhya Dharsan: Yogic Perspective on Theories of Realism*, pp. 95-119. India: Yoga Publication Trust.
- Schomerus, H.W., 2000, *Śaiva Siddhānta: An Indian School of Mystical Thought*, translated by Mary Law. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Sedyawati, Edi, 2009, *Śaīwa dan Bauddha di Masa Jawa Kuna*, Denpasar: Widya Dharma.
- Soebadio, Haryati, 1971, *Jñānasiddhānta; Secret Lore of the Balinese Śaiva Priest*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Suamba, Ida Bagus Putu, 2016, *Jāvanese-Śaivism: A Philosophical Study of Tattva Texts*. Delhi: B.R. Publishing Corporation.
- Sudarshana Devi, 1957, *Wṛhaspati-Tattwa: An Old Javanese Philosophical Text*. Nagpur: Indian Academy of Indian Culture.
- Sumardjo, Jakob, 2002, *Arkeologi Budaya Indonesia: Pelacakan Hermeneutis-Historis terhadap Artefak-Artefak Kebudayaan Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: Qalam.
- Sura, I Gede dan I Wayan Suka Yasa, 2011, *Sāmkhya dan Yoga*. Denpasar: Lembaga Penelitian Universitas Hindu Indonesia.
- Suwendi, I Made, 2014, "Menuju Bahasa Bali yang Humanis (Reinterpretasi Sor-Singgih Bahasa Bali)," *Widyasrama, Majalah Ilmiah Universitas Dwijendra Denpasar*, December 2014: 1-9.
- Vivekananda, Swami, 1976, *Raja-Yoga or Conquering the Internal Nature*. Calcutta: Advaita Ashrama.
- Wezler, Albrecht and Shujun Motegi (eds.), 1998, "The Text of the Sāmkhyakārikā as attested in the Yuktidīpikā within the commentary to the corresponding verse," appendix II of *Yuktidīpikā The Most Significant Commentary on the Sāmkhyakārikā*, pp. 278-285. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Yasa, I Wayan Suka and I Putu Sarjana, 2013, *Brahmawidya; Teks Tattwa Jñāna*. Denpasar, Lembaga Penelitian in collaboration with Fakultas Ilmu Agama Universitas Hindu Indonesia.
- Zoetmulder, P.J., 1982, *Old Javanese-English Dictionary* (with the collaboration of S.O. Robson). 'S-Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff.