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Introduction

This article will look at how Yoga is conceptualized, practiced, and authorized within the contemporary style of Viniyoga, a technique that plays an important part in Modern Yoga,¹ one of the most influential and widespread examples of appropriating Indian religion in contemporary Western settings. Moreover, Viniyoga also represents an unprecedented amalgamation of meditative practices, physical curing and devotionalism. For several reasons this intermingling has shown to be quite attractive to many Westerners, which might come as a surprise to those who tend to think of Modern Yoga as being preoccupied exclusively with fitness and well-being. Viniyoga in fact combines more traditional religious sentiments and practices with fashionable healthist ideologies and New Age cosmologies.

Modern Yoga has often been approached in terms of its breaks with the more traditional elements of Hindu religions, especially in light of postcolonial complexities. This is certainly an important insight, the encounter between India and Europe (Halbfass 1990) having in many ways altered the course for Indic religions. Joseph Alter (2004), Sarah Strauss (1997), and Elizabeth de Michelis (2004) have recently conducted valuable studies on trends in the history of Modern Yoga, including the importance of medicalization, globalization, and secularization. In the following I will attempt to highlight instead some of the more “traditional” elements by taking a closer look at the views of one of the most important figures in the development of Modern Yoga, namely a Vaishnava Brahmin by the name of Krishnamachar-
ya. Late in life Krishnamacharya accentuated the importance of devotional practices and attitudes in his teachings of Yoga. These views are represented today primarily by Krishnamacharya’s son, T. K. V. Desikachar, and are often referred to as Viniyoga. The centre Krishnamacharya Yoga Mandiram (KYM) was founded by Desikachar in 1976 and has over the last decade published a series of books. With reference to these publications, supplemented by fieldwork, I will argue that Viniyoga includes a distinct and elaborate form of devotionalism that is shaped to a great extent by Krishnamacharya’s Sri Vaishnava background.

The Teacher of teachers

Tirumalai Krishnamacharya (1888–1989) laid the foundation for much of what is now popularly identified as Yoga, and he is often referred to as “the Teacher of teachers.” His disciples have played a huge role in popularizing Yoga in the West, the most famous being Pattabhi Jois (b. 1915), the teacher of Ashtanga-Vinyasa Yoga; B. K. S. Iyengar (b. 1918), who developed Iyengar Yoga; and T. K. V. Desikachar (b. 1938), teaching in the style of Viniyoga. Many other contemporary Yoga teachers have trained in the Iyengar, Ashtanga or Vinyoga styles before developing their own method, or have simply borrowed from them. Krishnamacharya’s influence can be seen, among other things, in the emphasis on and development of physical postures (ásana). He was no doubt a pioneer in sequencing postures as well as in ascribing them specific therapeutic values.

Krishnamacharya was born in Karnataka (South India) in a Vaishnava Brahmin family. He was purportedly initiated into Yoga at an early age by his father, who taught him the Yoga Sūtra and told him that their family had descended from Nāthamuni (ca. tenth century CE), the first teacher (ādītya) revered by Sri Vaishnavas. He is also supposed to have learnt a number of asanas at Sringeri Matha, traditionally an Advaitin center of learning. At age 16 he made a pilgrimage to Nāthamuni’s shrine at Alvar Tirunagari, where he is supposed to have encountered his legendary forefather during an extraordinary vision. In this vision, Nāthamuni sang verses to him from the Yogarahasya (“The Secret of Yoga”), a text that had been lost for centuries. Krishnamacharya claims that he memorized and later transcribed these verses, and that many elements of his teachings can be found in this text. It has been published by KYM (Desikachar 2003a) and plays an important part in legitimating Viniyoga practices and doctrines.

As a young man, Krishnamacharya studied Sanskrit and several of the orthodox philosophies (dāsāmī) extensively, primarily in Banaras and Mysore. One of his teachers at Queens College in Banaras, Ganganath Jha, is said to have advised him to seek out a master called Ramamohan Brahmacari, claimed to be one of the few remaining Ḍāka Yoga masters and living in a remote cave near Lake Manasarovar in the Tibetan Himalayas. By Krishnamacharya’s own account he spent seven years with his teacher, from 1916 onwards, memorizing the Yoga Sūtra, learning asana and prānāyama, and studying the therapeutic aspects of Yoga. In exchange for instruction, Brahmacari asked his student to return home to teach yoga and establish a household. Whether or not this is a true account, it certainly legitimates several of Krishnamacharya’s innovations, such as adapting Yoga to modern-day society, the therapeutic orientation, and so on.

In 1931 Krishnamacharya was invited to teach Yoga at the Sanskrit College in Mysore, supported by the ruling family of Mysore. For the next two decades, the Maharāja of Mysore helped Krishnamacharya promote Yoga throughout India, financing demonstrations and publications. Being a diabetic, the Maharāja felt especially drawn to the connection between Yoga and healing, and Krishnamacharya devoted much of his time to developing this link. During his teaching at the new school Krishnamacharya is said to have developed what is now known as Ashtanga Vinyasa Yoga (āṣṭānga-vinyāsa-yoga), later made world-famous by Pattabhi Jois. Krishnamacharya apparently drew on many disciplines to develop dynamically performed asana sequences aimed at building physical fitness. He also taught his brother-in-law B. K. S. Iyengar, who would come to play perhaps the most significant role of anyone in bringing Yoga to the West. Iyengar’s own contributions would include precisely detailed, systematic articulation of each asana and a multi-tiered, rigorous training system. However, Iyengar’s emphasis on asana did not always please his teacher, who at one point is reported to have suggested that it was time for Iyengar to focus more on meditation.

Patronage ended for Krishnamacharya’s school when India gained its independence and the politicians who replaced the royal family of Mysore had little interest in Yoga. Krishnamacharya struggled to maintain the school, but in 1950 it closed. He eventually left Mysore, accepting a teaching position at Vivekananda College in Chennai (Madras). New students slowly appeared, including people from all walks of life and in varying states of health, and Krishnamacharya attempted new ways to teach them.
He now focused on adapting postures to each student’s capacity. As students progressed, Krishnamacharya began stressing what he referred to as the “spiritual aspects” of Yoga, maintaining that every āsana should be seen as an act of devotion and lead toward inner calm. He would also introduce what he referred to as “Vedic chanting.” During the years of tutoring his son T. K. V. Desikachar, Krishnamacharya continued to develop his teachings and the approach that he preferred to call “Viniyoga of Yoga.” He would also come to divide Yoga practice into three stages representing youth, middle, and old age: First, develop muscular power and flexibility; second, maintain health during the years of working and raising a family; finally, go beyond the physical practice to focus on God.\(^8\)

**The Devout Yogi**

The life of Krishnamacharya has reached a mythical status. He is often referred to as an outstanding example of what it means to be a “true Yogi,” heralded as a fountain of wisdom and representing a perfection that is virtually impossible to accomplish by any normal person. Among many Yoga teachers that I have met life story functions as an inspiration for their own views and practices, as guidelines for dealing with life in general and Yoga in particular. A central characteristic is undoubtedly the role played by Krishnamacharya’s devotion, whether to tradition, teacher or God. He is typically described as “a man with great faith” who nevertheless did not wish to impose his personal beliefs on his students. However, the question does arise as to what extent these “personal beliefs” de facto influence the views of those inspired by him. Indeed, practitioners are lead to believe that in order to be genuinely “Yogi,” in anything resembling Krishnamacharya himself, he or she must be deeply devoted and have great faith, whatever that may entail in its specifics.

However, this is an ideal which tends to clash against the wish of many Western students of Yoga to avoid religious dogmas.\(^9\) Such an ambivalence produces various conceptual layers and discursive fields often at odds with each other. Viniyoga is thus similar to other forms of Modern Yoga,\(^10\) which tend to limit themselves “to very basic and polyvalent suggestions concerning the religio-philosophical underpinnings” of their practices (De Michels 2004: 187), so that “practitioners are mostly left to make sense of the received theories and practices, and of how these should be fitted into their lives, on the basis of their own rationalization” (p. 188). The ideological framework of Modern Yoga is often deliberately flexible, involving teachings that may be adopted in many different ways according to the wishes of the practitioner. There is typically a lack of pressure to commit to any one teaching or practice, thus being “highly suitable to the demands of contemporary developed societies” (De Michels 2004: 260). These essentially polyphonic and polyvalent ideological frameworks nevertheless include both traditional religious concepts (God, transcendence, devotion, etc.) as well as “modern understandings of ‘spirituality’ as awareness of and participation in/attunement to a holistic and evolutionary universe” (De Michels 2004: 250-1). It is here that we find an important devotionalist layer, derived to a significant degree from Sri Vaishnavism. Compared to Iyengar and Ashtanga Vinyasa Yoga, this layer is more pronounced in Viniyoga. Indeed, the stress on postures is less significant in Viniyoga compared to Iyengar’s and Jois’s Yoga. Thus, for example, the use of chant and the study of various texts, especially the Yoga Sūtra, is emphasized.

There is no doubt that Krishnamacharya considered himself a lineage-holder of Sri Vaishnavism, “the heir to a great intellectual tradition embodied in the household god Hayagriva” (Desikachar 1998: 34). Although introducing many innovative views and practices, “he always said that the teachings were not his own, but belonged to the masters who preceded him” (Desikachar 2005: 169), ultimately going all the way back to Nāthamuni. The Sri Vaishnava tradition formed an important part of Krishnamacharya’s personal religious practice and studies. He preferred to dress traditionally as a Brahmin, with lotus-seed beads around his neck, and the Vaishnava marks (vertical white and yellow tilaka) on the forehead. His daily routine consisted of practicing two or three hours of āsana (“including difficult variations of the headstand”) and prānāyāma, as well as elaborate worship (pūjā). He was “scrupulous about observing every ritual . . . in every last detail” (Desikachar 1998: 141). Turning ninety-eight, he moved into a small house on the family’s property, where he “wished to devote himself solely to worship, to Narayana” (Desikachar 1998: 151). “He had entered that twilight of life when, in our tradition, one is granted the privilege of total devotion to God” (Desikachar 1998: 153-4). T. K. V. Desikachar reports that “Yoga was much more about reaching the highest, which for him was God. So for Krishnamacharya, yoga meant taking steps that would lead to God . . . ” (Desikachar 1995: 224).

Krishnamacharya’s Vaishnava devotionalism was also evident to his students. One student reports that, “Whenever we began a practice session, it
would always be with a prayer to Narayana. . . for any query of mine on absolutely any subject, he would give his point of view and recite a relevant śloka from various texts like the Bhagavad Gītā, Mahabharata and Gītā Govinda (Desikachar 2005: 211-2). Another student claims that Krishnamacharya “believed in leaving everything to Lord Narayana . . . Nothing was more important to him than devotion and dedication to God. This devotion was uppermost in all that he taught. When he taught me Pranayama he said, ‘When you inhale, remember that this breath was given to you by God, and when you exhale, remember that it goes back to him.’ . . . His teaching was suffused with bhakti.” (Desikachar 2005: 216). Yet another student sums up his impression of Krishnamacharya: “If I were to describe him in one word, I would choose the word, ‘Bhakta,’ or devotee, rather than a scholar, healer, or anything else. His faith in God was very deep and abiding” (Desikachar 2005: 229).

It seems that in the early days of his teaching Krishnamacharya would emphasize arduous physical training, coupled with a confronting and demanding teaching style. However, later in life his Sri Vaishnava devotionalist background seemed to increasingly take precedence and significantly influence the shaping of Viniyoga, to which we can now turn.

The basics of Viniyoga

Viniyoga consists of five basic constituents: physical training (āsana), breathing exercises (prānāyāma), chant, meditation (āhāmya), and ritual. Most often the novice will begin with the practice of individually prescribed āsana and prānāyāma, primarily aiming to improve mental and physical health. Breathing techniques are generally seen as an important aspect of physical postures. Over time, the practitioner will also be encouraged to practice prānāyāma together with mantras. For example, an integrated sequence might consist of a prostration-like flow of postures where the breath is aligned with movement and a mantra is chanted, instilling a devotional atmosphere.

Chanting and meditation are typically introduced only after some time, in exceptional cases right from the beginning.11 Reasons given for the inclusion of chant range from quasi-scientific and therapeutic explanations to more explicitly religious concerns. For example, chanting is practiced “partly for its healing effect on mind and body, and partly because it brings us spiritually into contact with something ancient and sacred” (Desikachar 1998: 22). Referred to as an instrument for improving the quality of experience (Desikachar 1998: 158), the power of chanting is frequently explained by referring to the force of the Sanskrit mantras in themselves, as well as to “the wisdom conveyed in the mantras,” thus linking the practitioner to tradition (Desikachar 1998: 160). Also the Yoga Sūtra (YS) is of central importance, being employed as a constant reference for practice and intellectual guidance, as well as being an object of contemplation through chant.12 Moreover, the YS is chanted using techniques of Vedic chant common in the South Indian environment, which considerably elevates the status of the YS vis-à-vis the Vedas.13

Turning to meditation, there are many different interpretations in use. Most often meditation is connected to struggles of the everyday in modern life, conceptualized in terms of stress (Desikachar 1998: 169; cf. Strauss 1997: 163–4 on the role of “stress” in Modern Yoga). At another level meditation is seen as a means of “opening our awareness both inward and outward beyond our usual mental limits” (Desikachar 1998: 22). Sometimes the deeper states of meditation, samādhi, is compared to the works of artists, manifesting “as creativity of the highest order, beyond what we think of as humanly possible” (Desikachar 1998: 173–4), the source of which is ascribed to “a higher force.” From yet another perspective, meditation is connected to the concept of dharma found in the Bhagavad Gītā, thus interpreting meditation as “the interaction with what is happening at the moment, our response to it, and our attitude about the response” (Desikachar 1998: 168). In this sense, meditation is about linking with Higher Being and deeper purpose. Thus, says Desikachar,

recognizing our responsibilities and intentions, and pursuing them with faith is the guide for linkage that takes us to ever higher levels of experience. But we still must be free of those two attitudes which . . . are the root causes of stress . . . ‘I am the doer,’ and ‘It is for me.’ This is progressively displaced by the attitudes: ‘Not by me,’ ‘Not for me.’ In both the Bhagavad Gītā and the Yoga Sūtras, the highest linkage is surrender to and union with Ishvara. (Desikachar 1998: 171)

The varying usages of “meditation” is a clear example of a polyvalent and polymorphic teaching style. Interpretations move between expansion of awareness, responsible social action, artistic creativity, worship to God, reaching towards the inner Self, dealing with stress, and so on. However, behind this variety lies a framework which ultimately values the importance
of devotion to God. Although different answers are given in different situations, it is clear that to Krishnamacharya the preferred object of meditation is indeed God. The goal of dhyāna is, ultimately, “to be with God” (Desikachar 1998: 163), an issue which we will return to later.

Ritual is referred to as an “instinctive and universal human act” (Desikachar 1998: 22) and is not dealt with systematically, its importance only being suggested. Descriptions of what ritual might entail are typically rather contradictory. For example, it is said that ritual necessarily involves innovation and adaptation, “however without neglecting fundamental requirements” (Desikachar 1998: 161). In any case, ritual is, at its best, something which gives rise to meditation.

To give an example of how all this might manifest in an actual teaching situation I will present a short description of a Viniyoga course that took place in Stockholm in April 2005. The whole family of Desikachar were teaching, and they started off with giving a collective “chanting concert,” which included various mantras directed to the sun, healing and peace chants, and a recitation of one of Krishnamacharya’s compositions, the Yogājītśara-nam. The course itself included basic practices of prānāyāma and āsana, often together with mantras. These practices were interspersed with chanting by the teachers on the podium. A significant amount of time was dedicated to the “philosophy of Yoga,” which meant explaining the two conceptual frameworks found in the YS, Kriyā-yoga and Āsāṅga-yoga.

Perhaps somewhat more surprisingly, the philosophical section of the course also included extended discussions of Varnāśrama-dharma and “the four goals of life,” i.e., dharma, artha, kāma, and mokṣa. Dharma was presented as something to be “done according to conscience, not the mind or the intellect.” A contemplation on dharma was also taught, which consisted of chanting “nāmo dharma, dharma yamā namaḥ” and simultaneously performing prostration-like postures. This practice was said to provide a possibility for reflecting on what is “correct dharma.” Suggestions were also given as to what this might include, at the very least: dayā (compassion), dānam (generosity, “to please the Lord, if there is belief in God, or society, if there is not”), and dānam (discipline of the senses). Artha was presented as the importance of providing for the basic necessities of life, which included returning favors to the teacher and fulfilling “certain things,” such as motherhood. A certain amount of kāma, or “desire,” was considered acceptable, but dharma and artha must under all circumstances be prioritized. Finally, mokṣa was only cursorily dealt with, and described as emotional, mental, or spiritual freedom, on the one hand, and as a releasing of guilt on the other. (Again we witness the flexibility of interpretations offered to the practitioners.) Didactic stories from the Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyaṇa were used throughout for illustration and explanation. A lengthy discussion was also held regarding the “miraculous power” of ritual.

It is clear from this description that a lot more is involved than simply healthy exercise. Not least important are normative discussions on how life should be lived according to “Yogic principles” that are in fact derived from more or less Neo-Vedāntic interpretations of classical Hinduism. Moreover, devotionalist themes were introduced throughout, although always with a reservation that allowed for “personal choice.” Nevertheless, several teachings openly encouraged the practitioner to be inspired by various themes taken primarily from scriptures important in Vaishnava traditions.

In KVM publications, Yoga is consistently presented as “an accessible, practical approach to an enduring state of happiness,” offered to individuals of all beliefs (Desikachar 1998: 197). At the same time, and somewhat contradictorily, it is also said that “Faith is at the heart of yoga” (Desikachar 2005: 169). Ultimately, it is claimed, “all healing comes from God” (Desikachar 1998: 123), and “If happiness is our goal, there can be only one direction for the mind and that is toward God” (Desikachar 1998: 201).

This is not easy for all Western students to accept. Accordingly, devotion is interpreted variously as having faith in the tradition, in the teacher or in God, or humbly accepting our duty to society. Devotionalist emotions may also be evoked using mantras directed to nature, particularly the sun, or some other “higher force” (cf. Desikachar 2005: 98). Alternating between such different interpretations of devotion is an effective rhetorical strategy. If surrendering to Nārāyaṇa is “culturally inaccessible,” then any God is an alternative; if the notion of God is too much for the student to accept then guru-bhakti will do; if not that then perhaps the sun. Even being devoted to “society” is an alternative. Devotion is said to be both a support for Yoga as well as a possibility, because “without a clear mind you cannot have devotion.” Indeed, “Yoga prepares for bhakti” or “for whatever you want to do” (Desikachar, interview 2005-04-20).

In this way, Yoga is separated from devotion and religion. Yoga is simply a tool that can be used for any purpose. It is presented as a “neutral” practice that can be combined with any number of “personal beliefs.” These choices are claimed not to be inherently connected to Yoga practice as such. Yet there is no doubt what Krishnamacharya and Desikachar them-
selves think are the best choices. It is to these that we can now turn, the Sri Vaishnava-inspired interpretation of Yoga.

**Sri Vaishnavism and Yoga**

The singularly most authoritative source for Vinyoga is the Yogaratna, claimed to be composed by Nāthamuni and revealed to Krishnamacharya. This text is published by the KVM as a "translation" by T. K. V. Desikachar (2003b). It emphasizes the theme of bhakti and was, together with YS, of utmost importance to Krishnamacharya (Desikachar 1995: 226). It authorizes and defines many of the innovations introduced by, or through, Krishnamacharya. Most importantly, for our purposes, is that the Yogaratna expounds upon Patañjali’s Yoga being equivalent to Bhakti-yoga: 15

(1.4) At the highest level, yoga is of two types—Bhakti and Prapatti. Through these, one will always get what he desires, based on his individual ability. (1.5) The fruits of yoga practice (whether Bhakti or Prapatti yoga) can be material (bhuksa) or freedom from suffering (muktik). Those who are devotees of the Lord, praise Hari for the purpose of mukti. Others seek material benefit, which is not approved of by the sāstras. (1.6) The yoga of eight limbs (Patañjali’s Āstānga-yoga) is proclaimed as Bhakti yoga. The yoga of six limbs Sadāṅga yoga, is spoken of as Prapatti yoga. (Desikachar 2003a: 1022)

In order to understand what is meant by this we need to take a look at how Bhakti-yoga and Āstānga-yoga have been approached within Śrī Vaishnavism. Within the sources of Śrī Vaishnavism, the word “Yoga” is used in many different ways, and it does not seem to play an important part at all with the Āyāms. Its meanings range from “practice in general” to “a specific practice” (with any number of añgaras, typically ranging from three to eight), or even a “state of meditation.” A cursory look at the Patañjara texts reveals that an eight-limbed Yoga is mentioned in the Agastya, the Nāradya and the Parna Śāhātās (Smith 1958: 91). However, it is the Aśāthājñya Śāhātā that expands the most on an eight-limbed yoga, “described at some length and not without some originality” (Schrader 1916: 124). In this text, Āstānga-yoga is understood in a devotional context which seems somewhat alien to the YS. Yoga, it is said, “is the counterpart of the ‘external sacrifice’ (bhāya-yāga), is ‘worship of the heart’ (ḥṛdaya-śradhanā) or the self-sacrifice (ātmanhāvis) offered to God by giving Him one’s own soul separated from matter, that is, in its original purity” (Schrader 1916: 123). In summary, an eight-limbed Yoga only superficially similar to that found in the YS seems to have been present in the Patañjara, appropriated within a context that differs somewhat from Patañjali’s. Nevertheless, yogic powers seem to have been regarded as conducive to liberation. 17

Nāthamuni is claimed to have been a practitioner of Āśāṅga-yoga. Indeed, “he is remembered as the last great master of the ancient Indian tradition of Yoga” (Garman 1974: 24). As to what Nāthamuni’s Yoga practice actually consisted of, we do not know because his knowledge of Yoga was lost to the afterworld: Yāmuna is reported to have “missed the chance to learn the secret of Nāthamuni’s powerful Yoga when the disciple to whom Nāthamuni had entrusted the secret died just after Yāmuna had missed an appointment with him” (p. 25). After that, “worship of the Deity in the image form would increasingly displace spiritual disciplines of self-effort as the center of Śrī Vaishnava piety, and scholarship would be concerned with the theory and the practice of the worship of the Divine Person” (pp. 25-6). Although we do not know how Nāthamuni envisioned and practiced Āśāṅga-yoga, we can nevertheless be sure that it must have differed from the way it is practiced in Modern Yoga.

To Rāmānuja and Yāmuna, Bhakti-yoga is a particular kind of meditative discipline, born of love, and involving a knowledge of one’s dependence on the Lord. According to the view set forth in Yāmuna’s Gitārthaśāstra-graha, it is brought about by following one’s dharma, and by practicing Jñāna- and Karma-yoga:

(1) It is the doctrine expounded by the Bhagavadgītā that Nārāyaṇa, who is the Supreme Brahman, can only be attained by means of bhakti which is brought about by observance of dharma (yādharma), acquisition of knowledge (jñāna) and renunciation of passion (vairāgya). (Translation by Van Buitenen 1968: 181-2).

The views of Yāmuna are essentially followed by Rāmānuja. Through Jñāna- and Karma-yoga one may reach the exalted state of Yoga as “contemplation of the ātman” (ātmanālakṣaṇa), the recognition of ātman in oneself and all others. This is simultaneously also bhakti, i.e., “man’s participating of God, at once ‘intellectual’ and devotional. It is the constant remembrance of the ātman’s total subservience to God” (Van Buitenen 1968: 22). Ultimately, devotion (bhakti) and true knowledge of God (brahmanātman), being based in Vedāntic scriptures as well as developed through meditation (up-
āsana, dhyāna, nididhyāsana), are deeply interrelated. Devotion is a continuous meditation accompanied by love, a “steady and continuous remembrance” (dhṛtvānusmṛti), “uninterrupted like the flow of oil,” and with the character of “direct knowledge” (aparokṣa-jñāna) or “immediate presentation” (sākṣiśākara). This devotion is attained by following a strict discipline consisting of, among other things, correct diet; absence of attachment to desirable objects; virtuous conduct; freedom from excessive dejection and satisfaction; and chanting the divine names, seeking to worship and serve the Lord with joy. This activity is accompanied by meditation on the Lord that is filled with love and the realization that one is “owned” by the Lord, a vassel (śesa) as it were (Narayanan 1987: 80-1).

Although Rāmānuja did not schematize practice in terms of the YS, his Bhakti-yoga is to some extent compatible with practicing Aṣṭāṅga-yoga. However, āsana, prāṇāyāma, and pātyāhāra can only be preparations for a meditation focused on Brahman/Nārāyaṇa (being the only “pure object,” śubhāśraya). Moreover, this meditation must be accompanied by the unselfish performance of śāścī duties, as well as with the correct understanding of the nature of the self. This differs from the views presented in the YS. To this we must also add the emphasis on surrendering to God, since Bhakti-yoga involves total dedication of the self to the Lord. Litanies, worship, and salutations are not alternative to Bhakti-yoga but help in its formation. Surrender to God (saraṇāgati, prapattī) is thus ancillary to Bhakti-yoga, and anyone who practices Bhakti-yoga must also be a prapanna, i.e., “one who has surrendered” (Narayanan 1987: 623).

Whether or not Yāmuna and Rāmānuja actually did practice the discipline of Bhakti-yoga, as it is presented in their theologically oriented works (cf. Narayanan 1987: 1489), it is clear that post-Rāmānuja writers increasingly emphasized and focused on surrender (prapattī) instead (cf. Hardy 2001; Forsthoefel & Munme 1999). This is precisely where Krishnamacharya enters the picture. With reference to Nāthamuni himself, Krishnamacharya legitimates and authorizes a set of practices and doctrines that combines Patañjali’s YS with his version of Śrī Vaishnavism, as well as with various Hatha-yogic practices, healthistic ideologies and Neo-Vedāntic interpretations of classical Hinduism.

Krishnamacharya’s Bhakti-yoga

In the following I will take a closer look at how Krishnamacharya and Desikachar envision Yoga practice within a devotionalist framework. I will focus on five issues: 1. The schematization and conceptualization of Yoga practice; 2. The role played by God-orientation; 3. The nature and practice of meditation; 4. Reinterpretations of the YS; and 5. The role played by surrender.

1. Schematization and conceptualization of Yoga practice. In Krishnamacharya’s and Desikachar’s teachings, Karma-yoga and Jñāna-yoga are translated into the Kriyā-yoga and the Aṣṭāṅga-yoga of the YS. For example, unselfish action is discussed in terms of dispassion (veirāga) and faith in God or the Eternal Teacher (tīrtha-parānadi-sūrya). Correct diet and pursuing a healthy body-mind form the “ascetic” elements (tapas) and the first five limbs of Aṣṭāṅga-yoga. Chanting (adhyāyana, japī) is interpreted variously as “self-study” (svādhśśa), meditation (dhyāna) or breathing technique (prāṇāyāma), and involves both chanting the YS and Vedic mantras (as a form of śāścī duty) as well as chanting the names of God (including the pranava, or Om, and the tinimunāra, an eight-syllable stanzas of central importance to practicing Śrī Vaishnavas). Correct conduct (svadharma), on the other hand, is explained with reference to “one’s own conscience,” and is interpreted through a Neo-Vedāntic version of Vaiṣṇavism-dharma and the “four goals of life,” which in turn are aligned with the first two limbs of Aṣṭāṅga-yoga, i.e., yama and niyama. Finally, knowledge of ātman and Brahman is interpreted through the higher stages of Aṣṭāṅga-yoga (dhārāna, dhyāna, and samādhi), although only by reinterpreting the YS (see below). Moreover, the “inferior” goals of Yogic practice, i.e., Self-realization and worldly prosperity, are ultimately subsumed within the goal of devotion (bhakti), but nevertheless presented as options for the practitioner.

2. The role played by God-orientation. Although Yoga is said to serve various purposes, as the individual may choose for herself, there is no doubt as to what Krishnamacharya and Desikachar consider to be the correct one. The Yogaratnasāra clearly states that God-orientation is essential, on any path of Yoga. For example, it is said in (III.27) “Whether a sterile woman, a pregnant woman, a young girl or a boy, no one must attempt to question God” (Desikachar 2003a: 158). And Desikachar comments, “bhakti alone will ensure that the person is useful to society” (Desikachar 2003a: 38). Indeed, “a person who does not seek God is unworthy of being called a man. This is one of the qualities that distinguishes human beings from other living species” (p. 146). In verse 1.88 it is unequivocally stated that “All aspects of Yoga practice must be done as an offering to Lord Śrīman Nārāyaṇa, the Supreme being” (p. 83). Desikachar comments that “This is the ultimate mes-
sage in which the author [i.e., Krishnamacharya/ Nāthamuni] introduces the idea of doing one’s duty, leaving the results in God’s hands” (p. 83). Moreover, in verse 1.111 it is finally stated that “all the Upaniṣads-proclaim, that Nārāyaṇa is highest among the highest and is the Supreme one” (p. 94). This “ultimate message” of Yoga and meditation is consistent with the views of Rāmānuja, as mentioned earlier.

In the Yogāñjñālīśāram—a composition by Krishnamacharya that is presented as the essence of his teachings on Yoga—half of the verses deal with devotional themes such as worship, the Lord, and so on. There are some interesting quotes: “Those who do not chant the Vedas, nor offer worship to the sun, bring peril to this holy earth, by disrespecting dharma” (Krishnamacharya 2001b: 19); “...never forget the Lord with his consort, who resides in the Heart” (p. 37); “...with stable mind reflecting on Viṣṇu, here and now śānti is sure” (p. 47); “...always practice the right prāṇāyāma praying again and again at the feet of the Lord” (p. 63); “Regulate the breath, be happy, and link the mind with the Lord in your heart” (p. 65).

3. The nature of meditation. Krishnamacharya (2001a) composed the Dhyānamālā as a guide for meditation. In an interview with Krishnamacharya, published in the introduction, he clearly states that the dhyāya, or object of meditation, must be the antaryāmin or the paramātman. This is said to be consistent with the Vedic tradition (vādika sampradāya), thus avoiding cita nishkriyātā (”formless inactivity of the mind,” cf. the citramantrita of the YS!) (Krishnamacharya 2001a: xvi). Thus, he says, “What is suggested is to follow the example of the great yogis who meditated on subha ṛṣṭa devatas ... According to Patañjali, the dhyāya can only be the paramātman. We should surrender to Him.” (p. xvii), and “While in a state of dhyānam, it is desirable that the person praise the Lord’s greatness. This bhāvanā is essential” (pp. xvi-xviii).30 The ślokas are no less clear: “Since the focus of dhyānam should be something that can be trusted, Sat or īśvara should be the focus. It is not enough to just think of īśvara. Different activities must sustain this trust in Sat, such as visiting places that glorify it” (p. 3). “Focus of dhyānam and dhyānam should be in the Heart where the Lord resides” (p. 13). But, “The object of focus is not the same for everyone. Each individual fixes his mind on that form or symbol that appeals to him. Hence one can focus on Hayagriva, the Lord of Knowledge, or the Lord who sustains this earth or Kṛṣṇa, the playful Lord. The teacher’s guidance is required here” (p. 17). Although the individual is encouraged to choose meditation objects according to the teacher’s recommendations, it is in fact deities from the Vaishnava traditions that are suggested throughout the text for example Krishna, Rāma, Hayagriva, Narasimha, and Varādaśāla.

4. Reinterpretations of the YS. Although, as we have seen, Rāmānuja’s Bhakti-yoga is to some extent compatible with Patañjali’s YS, Rāmānuja nevertheless rejects the view of the nature of, and relation between, puruṣa and īśvara as it is presented in the YS. What concerns Rāmānuja is the relations between the world, the self, and God (the tattva-parayu). In this regard, the YS is not compatible with Rāmānuja’s Viśiṣṭādvaita because in the YS, God is not approached as a Creator, nor explicitly referred to as the supplier of muktī. In Rāmānuja’s Srihāṣṭīya it is clearly stated that those parts of Yoga that do not conflict with Vedānta can be accepted (2.2.43, in Thibaut 1962: 530-1). Thus, as long as Nārāyaṇa, the highest Brahman, is seen as constituting the Self of the YS (puruṣa)—refuting the view of the Lord being a mere instrumental cause—Yoga may be accepted.31 In any case, Rāmānuja is not explicitly interested in using the framework for practice as presented in the YS. Instead, he uses Yoga primarily to refer to practice (āhāryās) in general or to a subtle state of contemplation (ātmāvākṣaṇa). In the latter sense, correct meditation on Brahman is equivalent to loving devotion and true knowledge of God, they cannot be separated (cf. Gansten 2002; Forschofel & Mumme 1999). By contrast, Krishnamacharya and Desikachar consistently use Yoga to refer to the Kriya-yoga and Āstāṅga-yoga of the YS. Moreover, in their interpretation, bhakti is detached from Yoga. The YS is presented as a “neutral” practice, which ideally culminates in devotion. As it is stated in the Dhyānamālā, “...the ultimate goal of yoga is to develop bhakti. If bhakti is not nurtured, then the practice of yoga will only lead to short-lived happiness” (Krishnamacharya 2001a: v).

Ultimately, however, Krishnamacharya and Desikachar must deny the goal of the YS (i.e. kātipāya) yet simultaneously claim its schematization to be the experiential foundation of Bhakti-yoga. In the final analysis, the goals of the YS are denied by a Viśiṣṭādvaitic view, but the “lower” goals of kātipāya and superhuman powers (śiddhi, āśīvāra) are retained by Krishnamacharya and Desikachar as options for “those without faith.” This is only possible by reinterpreting the YS in an inclusivist manner, thus subsuming the YS within a Viśiṣṭādvaitic interpretation. The crucial distinction is between Yoga as simple practice, on the one hand, and the ultimate message of Yoga, which to Krishnamacharya and Desikachar is really devotion to Nārāyaṇa. Yoga provides for the “experience” of Brahman (i.e., brahmacīnā). Thus Yoga makes it possible to experience God, to reveal by experi-
ence what is otherwise only given in terms (Desikachar interview 2005-04-20). In other words, Yoga and Vedānta are seen as complementary, nevertheless it is devotion that is the preferred purpose and the ultimate goal of Yoga.

Rāmānuja certainly does not devalue yogic experience in itself. However, the ultimate aim must be to attain God rather than a transcendent state, or only knowledge of the self. As one could expect, Sri Vaishnava-inspired Modern Yoga is thus typically “rather conservative towards ‘enlightenment’ and altered states of consciousness, especially when compared with overall New Age attitudes towards such phenomena” (De Michelis 2004: 243). Rāmānuja’s Yoga differs from the samādhi-oriented message of the YS, in which bhakti as a goal in itself is conspicuously missing. Therefore Krishnamacharya and Desikachar must necessarily reinterpret certain features of the YS to make it compatible with their Sri Vaishnava frame of reference.

A look at Desikachar’s rendering of the Yoga Sūtra (Desikachar 2003b) will validate these claims. Most important of the YS is the highest state of Yoga, mentioned as “restraint” (nīrodha). It is obvious that Desikachar is not interested in discussing nīrodha as it is used in the YS. Rather, he emphasizes “one-pointed focus” (ekārthata) and sees nīrodha as a somewhat “deeper” version of concentration. He thus renders nīrodha as a form of comprehension where what is to be restrained are “preconceptions and products of the imagination that can prevent or distort understanding” (2003b: 19), not mental-affective activity or perception in toto (attvātpratītānīrodha), which seems to be the message of the YS.29 According to Desikachar, the chief goal of Yoga is to understand or comprehend an object fully and correctly (sometimes he uses the word “transparently”). By contrast, the YS and its commentaries seem to emphasize the need for absence of any objects whatsoever in order for release to occur. Such an altogether transcendent state, which leads to realization of total identification with purusa, is not utilized by Desikachar because it would deny the foundations of Bhakti-yoga,30 according to which attainment of God must always preserve some form of individuality (i.e., difference-cum-non-difference, or bhedābheda).

As a result, Desikachar also ignores the highest stage of focused meditation (saṃprajñāta samādhi), namely the state which is devoid of “bliss” (ānanda) but accompanied by pure “Sam-ness” (asmiṣṭā). He thus makes samādhi more compatible with a Vedāntic account of ānanda being intrinsic to ātman, as the most subtle form of Self-comprehension. Desikachar emphasizes that the process of samādhi is a form of comprehension which only seems to abolish individual identity (Desikachar 2003b: 79), rather than actually abolishing it. Again, this is consistent with Rāmānuja’s philosophy (Viśiṣṭādvaita), in which individual identity (asmiṣṭā) can never be fully abolished. Desikachar thus avoids dealing with the emphasis in the YS of actually transcending all individuality (asmiṣṭā). Because he does not explicitly differentiate between saṃta and purusa, the disinterest even of pure Iam-ness is not acknowledged by Desikachar. Desikachar avoids mentioning the transcendence of both ānanda and asmiṣṭā through asaṃprajñāta samādhi, instead viewing ānanda as the highest stage. As he must, because a fully objectless consciousness (asaṃprajñāta) or total lack of individuality (beyond asmiṣṭā) is unacceptable within a Viśiṣṭādvaita understanding.

The Dhyānānātha reiterates this view: “The experience of ānanda alone is nirguna. Or what some call asaṃprajñāta” (Krishnamacharya 2001a: 24). The view that this implies that reality is illusory is explicitly rejected (p. 26-27). The text overtly argues against the view that nirguna samādhi implies an experience devoid of everything. Instead, the text emphasizes that this form of samādhi is a state without distinction between mediation and the object, properly indescribable, yet nevertheless intended to deepen the link with the Lord (see pp. 24-32).

Another issue concerns how Desikachar interprets śraadāḥ and iśvarapraṇidhāna in the YS. He attempts to connect “faith” (śraadāḥ) with general discussions of devotion, belief in God’s power, and submission. However, in the YS, śraadāḥ appears to be more about assurance or trusting one’s practice. Similarly, iśvarapraṇidhāna is rendered by Desikachar as “actions done more in the spirit of service than for personal gain” (2003b: 64 cf. p. 70). Such a reinterpretation dispels more explicit references to God, thus making it possible to leave it up to the individual practitioner to “choose” whether it indeed means devotion to God or not. In any case, Patañjali’s treatment of iśvarapraṇidhāna seems to be more pragmatic. As Lester aptly puts it, in the YS, “Devotion to isvara is an aid to attaining samādhi, but not because of any power inherent in isvara Himself; rather, because the expression of devotion to a god is a psychological aid” (Lester 1976: xvii). And as Carpenter points out, “Patañjali’s own description of it in the YS focuses more on practice (abhyāsa) than on pictry” (2003: 35). By contrast, in the interpretations of Krishnamacharya and Desikachar, iśvarapraṇidhāna is used both as a legitimation for devotion to God (bhakti) as well as a possibility for the individual to choose a more pragmatic (or secularized) interpretation, for example faith in one’s teacher. Ultimately, this makes YS accessible to both atheists as well as to those who have faith in God:
In both the Bhagavad Gita and the Yoga Sutras, the highest linkage is surrender to and union with Ishvara. But there is a crucial difference. In the ‘divine song,’ Ishvara signifies Narayana, the supreme God; in Yoga, Ishvara is given to us as the supreme teacher, the all-knowing, beyond error. . . . Because of this distinction, Yoga is compatible with every religion and philosophy. Yoga is neutral, the threshold beyond which each individual chooses his own doorway to the highest power. Acceptance of this highest force, in Patanjali’s teaching, is called Isvarya pranidhāna—meditation upon, linkage with, and absorption into Ishvara. (Desikachar 1998: 171)

In other contexts, Isvarya pranidhāna is interpreted by Desikachar as having two different meanings, as faith in God, on the one hand, and as a quality of action, on the other. The latter is aligned with Karma-yoga, in which “we act but do not insist that we win,” recognizing that “we have done our best, the rest is up to God” (Desikachar, interview 2005-04-20). Here we see once more a variety of interpretations offered to the practitioner, several of which are only superficially compatible with the YS but more so with a Sri Vaishnava-inspired devotionalism.

5. The role played by surrender: One final issue remains, that is the role played by surrender (prapatti, śaṅkaraṇi) in Vinyoga. As we have seen, in the Yogarāhasya a six-limbed Yoga (śaṅkaraṇa) is declared to be equivalent to prapatti. However, this issue is not dealt with anywhere else in the text, nor is it taught by Vinyoga teachers. Perhaps the reference to a six-limbed Yoga is more a matter of aligning with tradition. However, it does seem that surrender serves an ancillary function within Krishnamacharya’s Yoga. For example, it is stated that Krishnamacharya

follow his path, but he did offer it as an option to those who were drawn to it (Desikachar 2005: 87; also cf. Desikachar 1995: 221).

There is no doubt that disciplined practice, in the form of Patañjali’s Astānga-yoga and Kriyā-yoga, are consistently emphasized over and against prapatti. But surrender is there nevertheless. One example is that surrender is encouraged as an option for the culmination of life, in the last stage (āśrama) called sannyāsa. The concept of sannyāsa is also reintroduced, in other contexts, by viewing it as a matter of giving oneself “to a higher power, to God,” and thus making it compatible even with a householder life (Desikachar 1995: 226-7).

One could also surrender to one’s dharma. At the course in Stockholm a practice was taught that involved a proscription-like sequence of āsanas and chanting “dharma śaṅkaraṇa gacchām,” which means “I take refuge in dharma” (a phrase probably inspired from Buddhist practice). Yet another example is surrender in the form of devotion to one’s teacher (guru or učārya-bhakti). Consistently the importance of a knowledgeable and genuine teacher is emphasized by Desikachar and Krishnamacharya. There are many references to Krishnamacharya’s devotion to his own teacher, Ramamohan Brahmacari, whose sandals he kept as a treasure throughout his life. He “always said it was the power of God or his teacher that worked through him. He never claimed to have discovered anything by himself. Those who met him have often observed: he would take his teacher’s sandals and place them on his head as a gesture of surrender” (Sriwaivan 1997: 10). This is compatible with the emphasis on the salvific power of the teacher (ācārya) that is a prominent feature of the Sri Vaishnava tradition (cf. Narayanan 1987: 152). As it is also stated in the Yogācāratāram “Begin the day by worshipping the feet of God and teacher, then do āsana and prajñāyāma remembering the words of the Teacher” (Krishnamacharya 2001b: 49).

As Hardy (2001) has pointed out, in Sri Vaishnava practice the so-called “three secrets” (rāhasya-traya) are of central importance—a set of minute scriptural passages regarded as containing the entire theology of Sri Vaishnavism in a nutshell, a ‘miniature canon’ as it were. These are the tiru-mantra, consisting of “eight sacred syllables” (āstakṣara), ‘om namo nārāyaṇāya’; the dvayana (the “two” sentences directed to Nārāyaṇa); and finally the carana-māla (the “final word”), verse 18.66 of the Bhagavad Gītā. Basically, the soteriology implied by these three passages, taken together, is that the
human being finds salvation by acknowledging his fundamental dependence on Vishnu, primarily through an act of seeking refuge (prapatti). Neither of these passages, however, hold a prominent place within Viniyoga. Although all three are indeed present in the publications of KYM, they only seem to play a very minor role in Viniyoga as a whole.

Hardy has also noted the socio-political function that prapatti has had within Sri Vaishnavism: “While in Rāmānuja it is bhakti-yoga, which includes meditation that allows a person to achieve liberation, among the later authors this bhakti-yoga is either contrasted as an extremely difficult method—of which only the privileged few are capable—with the ‘easy’ means of prapatti, or it is rejected outright as a sign of human arrogance vis-à-vis the availability of divine grace. By virtue of being human, everyone has access to prapatti” (Hardy 2001: 52-3). In Viniyoga, by contrast, Bhakti-yoga is re-established as the primary path to tread, and it is simultaneously made accessible to all. Traditionally Bhakti-yoga was only to be accessed by male dvijas (“twice-born”). One had to be authorized for practicing Bhakti-yoga simply because it included the performance of Vedic rituals and Vedāntic meditation, which was only accessible to males from the higher classes (dvija, traiyāniha).

In the Yogaraahasa, however, Bhakti-yoga is made accessible to both women and non-dvijas. This is done by reinterpreting dvija as “learned person.” In one passage Desikachar comments, “Here, the word Dvija means one who seeks knowledge. We are born twice, once from the mother’s womb and secondly when we shed our ignorance (ajñāna). This happens through the Brahmacarya āśrama” (Desikachar 2003a 101). Although much of orthodox Vedic ritual is missing in Viniyoga, one does indeed chant Vedic mantras as well as discuss the importance of social obligations and ritual (albeit in Neo-Vedantic versions). Moreover, several compositions by Krishnamacharya are presented as the essence of the Vedas, thus making accessible the “truth” of these texts to each and everyone. As a consequence, it is surely no exaggeration to describe Krishnamacharya’s Bhakti-yoga as including elements of Vedic orthodox tradition, although reinterpreted and recontextualized. In the final analysis, then, Viniyoga is presented as being consistent with orthodox Vedic tradition, is furthermore structured conceptually with reference to Patañjali’s Asjānga-yoga, yet is ultimately dependent on a Bhakti-yoga that is inspired by Krishnamacharya’s Sri Vaishnavism (and especially by the gradualist approach to liberation in vātakalakā). This is offered as the “holistic teachings of Yoga” and taught to persons of all backgrounds, including those who were traditionally unauthorized to practice Bhakti-yoga.

Endnotes

1. In the following, “Modern Yoga” and “Yoga” are used as technical terms (see note 10 below), hence the capitalization. In quotes, however, small letters have been retained when applicable. Similarly, transcriptions of Sanskri used in quotes have been kept as in the original, even when the transliteration may be incorrect.

2. Although the epithet “Viniyoga” has recently been abandoned by Desikachar it is still in use by many of his students. Suffice it to say that I take it to be an appropriate name for a family of teachings and practices descending from Krishnamacharya and Desikachar, overlapping to some extent with lyengar Yoga and Ashtanga Vinyasa Yoga. The three schools (or styles) are occasionally referred to collectively as “Flow Yoga,” “Process Yoga,” “Power Yoga” and “Dynamic Yoga,” especially by teachers that attempt to synthesize them with each other. Such attempts are however typically grounded in Ashtanga Vinyasa. Nevertheless, Viniyoga does seem to increasingly influence the other two schools regarding therapeutic, philosophical and devotional orientations, not least due to Desikachar being regarded as an authority and “closer to the source of Yoga.” He was, after all, his father’s student for more than thirty years. Among influential students of T. K. V. Desikachar are Paul Harvey (England), Gary Kraftsow (USA) and Mark Whitwell (USA). Whitwell retains many of the teachings and practices of Krishnamacharya, yet also adds more Neo-Tantric practices spiced with a Neo-Advaita inspired by Nityananda and the “anti-gurus” Jiddu Krishnamurti and U. G. Krishnamurti. He is rather critical of what he perceives as Krishnamacharya’s conservative God-orientation and Vedāntic orthodoxy (Whitwell 2004: 13). There are also several students of Krishnamacharya in India that teach what is essentially similar to Viniyoga, such as A. G. Mohan and Sivatsa Ramaswami.

3. There are three published biographies on Krishnamacharya: Kausthub Deskachar (2005) The Yoga of the Yogis, Mala Srivatsan (ed., 1997) Sri Krishnamacharya the Prāmāṇārā, and Desikachar (1998) Health, Healing and Beyond. All three were prepared under the supervision of KYM and are very similar to each other. References to Krishnamacharya’s life are also found in accounts supplied for by some of his students, in particular by Srivatsa Ramaswami (2000), A. G. Mohan (1993), and Gary Kraftsow (2002), as well as in Desikachar (1995).

4. There is an interesting passage in the original preface (which was later replaced) to Yogamahavānda, Krishnamacharya’s first book, published and paid for by the Maharaj of Mysore: “. . . in later years he had an opportunity of being trained in Yoga śāstra in accordance with the prescribed canons of Prāṇyāma and the several vinyāsas by Sj Rammamohan Brahmacari Guru Maharaj of Mukta Narayan Ksetra (Banks of the Gandaki)” (reproduced in Sjoman 1999: 51). There is a Gan-
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daki river system in Nepal, which is rather far from Mount Kailash and Lake Manasarovar. As Sjoman (1999: 66, n. 61) points out there is also a Gandaki River in northern Karnataka, on the Maharashtra border. However, the phrase “Mukta Narayan Kśetra” indicates that it is probably the Kali Gandaki River in Nepal that is referred to. In one of the biographies it is stated that Krishnamacharya only passed the Gandaki River on his way through Nepal towards Mount Kailash to find his teacher (Desikachar 2005: 57). In any case, Krishnamacharya claims that Brahmacari taught him a text in Nepali, variously referred to as Yoga Kurunta or Kurunta. This text supposedly included information on the meaning of Yoga Sūtra and the therapeutic uses of Yoga. This lost work, attributed to sage Vāmana by Jōis, has been used to legitimate many practices that Krishnamacharya taught, in particular the sequencing style (vinīyāsa) later made world-famous through Pattabhi Jōis. Krishnamacharya claims that he found one text of this kind in Calcutta University Library around 1924, but it was in a bad condition and later was lost (cf. Jōis 2002: xv). Drawings of āsanas, purportedly done by Brahmacari’s daughter (reproduced in Desikachar 2005: 62-4), together with his teacher’s sandals, were the only souvenirs he brought with him from his stay with Brahmacari. The drawings look very similar to the ones found in the text Śrītattvamālī (reproduced in Sjoman 1999).

5. There is an interesting passage about Krishnamacharya in a book about the Sri Vaishnava teacher Śrīraṅga: “At about that time [early 1930’s], a teacher of Yoga by name Krishnamacharya was running a Yogasala in the Jagannāth temple. He also taught Asanas to the students in the Sanskrit College. . . . [Śrīraṅga’s] fine physique was a good advertisement for Yoga and the teacher loved him very much in the beginning. As a result, he was soon appointed as an instructor in the Yogasala” (Chau 1992: 5). “The Director of the Yogasala [i.e. Krishnamacharya] was highly volatile on the subject of Yoga and yet for Yoga exercises he had no idea of the inner bases of it. Between him and Śrīraṅga in whom the most esoteric truths and experiences of Yoga were fully realized, conflict of views and perceptions was inevitable. The former turning hostile, Śrīraṅga was so disgusted that he resigned his post in the Yogasala and returned to the village” (p. 18).

6. The Yoga Sūtra mentions no poses at all, other than the seated meditation posture, whereas the Hatha Yoga Pradīpikā lists 15. Several traditional texts on Hatha Yoga eschew mention of postures altogether, focusing instead on the subtle energy systems and chakras that the poses both reflect and influence. Conspicuously missing are the standing poses and Sun Salutations that form the backbone of most contemporary systems, as is the modern emphasis on precision of alignment, physical fitness, and therapeutic effects. Norman Sjoman (1999) argues that Krishnamacharya probably inspired by the Śrītattvamālī, a compendium of classical information compiled in the 1800’s by Mummadī Krishnarāja Wodeyar, found in the Mysore Palace library, and which includes the oldest illustrated āsana compilation known. The Śrītattvamālī depicts dozens of poses that do not show up in any older texts, probably drawing on techniques from a wide range of disparate traditions. In addition to variations on poses from earlier yogic texts, it also includes rope exercises used by Indian wrestlers and the dāṇḍa push-ups developed at indigenous Indian gymnasia. Sjoman argues that Krishnamacharya drew on the Śrītattvamālī and blended it with a number of other sources, such as techniques drawn from British gymnastics. The push-ups also show up as part of the Sun Salutation (sūrya-namaskārā), presented in a rudimentary form in the Śrītattvamālī. Alpert (2006: chp 4) traces the origin of the sūrya-namaskārā to the rāja of Uadhā (in present-day Maharashtra), who was inspired by the body-building Eugene Sandow, and who published a book in 1928 which details the practice just as it turns up with Krishnamacharya.

7. The term vinīyoga means “application” (from vi + ni + yoj), in another context denoting the application of mantras in ritual action. It was originally intended by Krishnamacharya as a name for a flexible approach to using Yoga, rather than a specific style in itself. This approach is based on the idea that Yoga practice must be prescribed considering the individual’s needs and qualifications. It is sometimes used in the phrase “vinīyoga of Yoga,” or together with krama or “progression,” thus adding the element of adapting to the individual’s stage of life. The word is also found in YS III.6 (tasya bhūtasya vinīyogah). This is taken as an authoritative source for legitimation (see, for example, Desikachar 2005: 8), although the context in YS is very different from the one used by Desikachar. The whole second chapter (“Vinyogadhyāyah”) of the Yogasūtrasya is devoted to explaining the approach of Vinīyoga. An interesting comparison is the use of vinīyāsa (the “sequencing” of āsana), also a term otherwise used in connection with Vedic ritual and mantras, similarly to vinīyoga. Sjoman speculates that vinīyāsa “appears to be used to imply some kind of Vedic sanction to yoga practices” (1999: 65, n. 55). I would argue that the term ‘vinīyoga’ might serve a similar function, and, moreover, granting the Yoga Sūtra similarly sanctions Yoga within Vedic orthodoxy, part of Krishnamacharya’s endeavour to “Vedicize” Yoga practice through his Sri Vaishnava background.

8. These are aligned with the Brahmanical system of āśrama, but omitting the third stage, the so-called vana-prastha or ‘forest-dweller.’ See the Yogasūtrasya (I.13, p. 100), and cf. Desikachar (2005), Kraflos (2002), and Ramaswami (2000).

9. This is, of course, typical of New Age cultic milieu (see Hanegraaff 1998; De Michelis 2004). It often takes the form of detraditionalization (Heelas 2002), i.e., the shift of authority from faith in, or reliance on, that which lies beyond the person to that which lies within; a movement from the establishments of traditions to the creativity of what believers see as the “spiritually inspired self.” Also cf. Heelas et al (1996).

10. Although Modern Yoga stems from classical Hindu traditions, De Michelis (2004) has shown that it is significantly influenced by Western esotericism and involves New Age and Neo-Vedantic beliefs. Indeed, it is precisely a modernized version, only very selectively related to historical forms, that has come to be understood as the most important and universally applicable form of Yoga—and suppressing the fact that many other interpretations, methods, views, and systematizations

11. Lately there have even emerged centers devoted to teaching only Vedic chant, for example the Vedavalli in Bristol which is led by Viniyoga teacher Paul Harvey. The practice is occasionally referred to as a form of Nāda-Yoga, or “Yoga of Sound.”

12. This invites for a performative approach to the role played by recitation and chant, as I have argued elsewhere (Nevin, forthcoming).

13. An interesting musicological detail is that in the Viniyoga chanting style one uses the three notes as is traditional in the recitation of Krishnayurveda in the Tañtriyā style (see Staal 1968). However, the “upper note” is a major second from the tonic note. This creates a more melodic “feel,” aesthetically pleasant as it were, compared to the usual minor second. My suggestion is that this is more attractive to Western students that are unfamiliar with the sound of a minor second, as well as the fact that it invites for a more “singing” style of chant.

14. In the Haṭhasāṅkheśa-bhāṣya of Sundara-deva (1675-1775), a voluminous and important text on Haṭhayoga, Yogaratna-bhāṣya is quoted twice, attributed once to Dattārāya and once to Nātha-muni. However, the verses quoted are not to be found in the version published by Desikachar (Balasubramaniam 2000).

15. In the following I will only be using the English rendering of the ślokas in Yogaratna-bhāṣya, because it is the English version that is transmitted to students of Viniyoga since rarely do any of them know Sanskrit. A detailed study of Krishnamacharya’s own words in Sanskrit must await another opportunity.

16. According to Schrader’s (1916: 123-4) summary the text refers to 10 yamās and niyamās respectively; eleven chief postures are mentioned; pratīkārā is described as a passive act, as “entering into God” (nīvānām bhavatā); dhāraṇā is said to be the “keeping of the mind in the Highest Self”; dhyāna is meditation on the “wheel-formed” Vīshnu (Sārūrthā Puruṣa), here described as eight-armed, clad in jewels, with lightning-shafts as the hairs of his head, etc; and finally sāmadhi is reached by gradually intensifying dhyāna until the magical powers (śiddhis) become manifest and spirits and gods begin to serve the Yogi. Although this is indeed an eight-limbed Yoga it is in many ways different from the version laid down in the YS.

17. Cf. Matsubara (1994: 77), who states that, in Pāñcarātra theology, true knowledge (jñāna or vidyā) is not obtained by study or similar extraordinary efforts, nor even by severe tapas. It is believed to be reached only through the supernatural power of yogic practices or through the grace of God (devat-prasāda) that is gained through ardent worship (bhakti).


19. This verse was quoted by Desikachar in an interview I conducted with him (2005-04-20), answering a question regarding the relationship between bhakti and Yoga.


21. Prapattī is seen by Rāmānuja as an integral part of Bhaktiyoga, so that self-surrender is necessary for Bhaktiyoga (Narayan 1987: 83). The doctrine of prapattī as an alternative way to the attainment of God is completely absent in Rāmānuja’s Gitārāja-saṅgheka (Van Buitenen 1968: 24). Thus, “Whenever God’s grace is mentioned, the personal efforts of the aspirant are stressed too” (ibid: 28). For the debate surrounding the tension between prapattī and bhakti, and between faith and works, see the article by Forshochel & Mumme (1999).


23. There is indeed a connection between the Karma-yoga of the Bhagavad Gītā and the īśvararājādihāna of the YS (cf. cf. Edholm 1989: 34). However, most important in the YS is the trance experience that involves a knowledge of the distinction between sattva and puruṣa, rather than the ultimate attainment of and surrendering to God, by understanding one’s dependence (śeṣa-tva) on Him, as is the case in the Śrī Vaishnava tradition (also see notes 25 and 26 below).

24. See Carpenter (2003) for the ritual role played by chant and recitation in the YS.

25. This is consistent with the views of Yāmuna and Rāmānuja, according to which the pursuit of Yoga always depends on one’s intentions, whether it is to gain worldly prosperity (āśīvya), and thus remaining in saṁsāra; to attain isolation (kaivalya), i.e., solitary Self-experience; or, with the “true” aspirant, the jñānī, to seek God as one’s only aim. To the jñānī, bhakti is an end in itself. Full liberation will only be granted to the devotee who surrenders fully to the Lord. Note, however, that the exact relation between release in kaivalya and in bhakti, or between the kaivalyāṭhī and the jñānayogin, does not seem clear (Van Buitenen 1968: 22, n. 56; 24, n. 53).

To the extent that kaivalya is not wholly integrated in Rāmānuja’s system, it seems to open up for a synthesizing of the YS with Bhakti-yoga. In Viniyoga, the kaivalya of YS is thus aligned within a devotionalist understanding, yet as an inferior and slightly egoistic goal.

26. Although īśvararājādihāna as mentioned in the YS (e.g. 2.45) may be interpreted as a way of achieving “omniscience” (saraṇa-jñāna), it seems that it is Vyāsa who gives it more of a devotional cast (Carpenter 2003: 25). In the original sūtras it is rather the intention to cultivate samādhi which is emphasized, in order to attain separation
between satya and puruṣa. In whichever way one might wish to interpret the VS, it is
dear that in Viniyoga it is the manifestation of the absolute as a personal redeemer
which is emphasized, at the expense of supernormal power of visual perception as
well as the realization of pure transcendence, i.e., the two other main categories of
trance experiences that are present in many Yoga texts (cf. al'Eidholm 1989: 39).

27. Rāmānuja also mentions that one must reject "the erroneous assumptions as
the relative position of higher and lower entities, and certain practices not war-
ganted by the Veda" (in Thibaut 1962: 531), without specifying any further.

28. Pace Lester (1976: 133-4, 140-1), who argues that, according to Rāmānuja,
yoga experience cannot be regarded as a valid source of religious knowledge because
only scripture is the source of knowledge, and because "Yoga does not give knowl-
edge of the Supreme Person" (1976: 125). However, in the Srībhāṣya, Rāmānuja states
that "the clause which denotes immediate perception (is seen)" appears quite suit-
able, since the highest Self is directly intuited by persons practising mystic concen-
tration of mind (Yoga), and "the higher kind of knowledge, which is called
upāsana, ... consists in direct intuition of Brahman" (SBh 1.2.14, 1.2.23, translated
from Thibaut 1962: 273, 284). Thanks are due to Martin Gansten for directing my
attention to these references.

29. For whatever purpose. Even if nirodha is intended to annihilate only the identi-
fication with "empirical consciousness" (attāntsit), as Whicher (1998) argues, and
not to eradicate affective-mental faculties altogether, it nevertheless differs from De-
sikachāра's interpretation.

30. At least in so far as puruṣa is understood as being different from Rāmānuja's
conception of Brahman/Nārāyaṇa (cf. above). Even without claiming a Shankarian
Advaita-like state of transcendence, as Whicher (1998) seems to imply, it is the goal
of never-ending bhakti that is missing in the VS. Moreover, it is also possible to inter-
pret the yogadārśana as proposing a multiplicity of puruṣos, which certainly is unac-
ceptable to Rāmānuja.

31. Of course, there are many ambiguities in the use of "realization" in Viniyoga,
which makes it susceptible to the choices of the individual. This reflects the use of
"Self" and "God-realization" in Modern Yoga in general: "a chameleonic concept,
with ambiguities that allows it to become all things to all people" (De Michels 2004:
223). Moreover, "... its ambiguity as descriptive of both material and intellectual
operations works perfectly well in whichever way the relationship between the two
terms 'self' and 'God' is defined... Indeed, it can even be made to accommodate
non-theistic, materialistic, sceptical or agnostic convictions" (p. 224). This flexibili-
ty of interpretation is particularly suitable to the polyvalent models found in many
cultic circles of New Age and contemporary religion. However, as I have tried to argue,
the options presented in Viniyoga depend, in the final analysis, on a Sri Vaishnava-
spired theology.

32. In the Yogārāṇya it is said: (1.11) "The teachings known as Nyāsa vidyā indeed
correspond to Prapatti." And, (1.12) "The six anga-s of Prapatti yoga are—(a) the
resolution to perform only those actions that please the Lord, (b) giving up actions
that distract from Him, (c) firm belief that the Lord will protect, (d) praising Him
constantly, (e) complete surrender and (f) humility before Him" (Desikachar 2003
a: 24). The six limbs are directly quoted from the Aḥirbudhnya Sanhītā (37: 289),
and nyāsa-vidyā is dealt with by Vedāntadeśika in his Rahasyatrayasāra (in XI-XII) as
one of the 32 vidyā-s mentioned in Vedanāsūtra (see Chari 1994: 269-275). In the Pa-
ṇcarātra, prapatti is synonymous to nyāsa, nīpāta, bhavanyāsa, śaravāga (Smith 1980:
65), discussed primarily in the Aḥirbudhnya (XXXVII: 22-57) and the Laksṇītaniṭā

33. Also, in an interview (2008-04-20), responding to a question about nōkṣa, De-
sikachāra referred to the view that recitation of the dōvāyam enables liberation from
all bondages, thus ultimately reaching Vaikuṇṭha after death.

Author's note: I wish to thank Erik af Edholm, Martin Gansten, and Mais
Lindberg for their valuable suggestions. My gratitude is extended also to
Hanna Persson and Karina Freij for inviting me to the Viniyoga course in
Stockholm.
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