

# The Meaning of *haṭha* in Early Haṭhayoga

JASON BIRCH  
OXFORD UNIVERSITY

## INTRODUCTION

This essay was prompted by the question of how Haṭhayoga, literally ‘the Yoga of force’, acquired its name. Many Indian and Western scholars have understood the ‘force’ of Haṭhayoga to refer to the effort required to practice it. Inherent in this understanding is the assumption that Haṭhayoga techniques such as *prāṇāyāma* (breath control) are strenuous and may even cause pain. Others eschew the notion of force altogether and favor the so-called “esoteric” definition of Haṭhayoga (i.e., the union of the sun (*ha*) and moon (*tha*) in the body). This essay examines these interpretations in light of definitions of *haṭhayoga* and the adverbial uses of *haṭha* (i.e., *haṭhāt*, *haṭhena*) in Sanskrit Yoga texts that predate the fifteenth-century *Haṭhapradīpikā*.

Implicit in the question posed above is the historical question of when the term *haṭhayoga* arose. There is evidence that it was used in Buddhist tantras, while it remained conspicuously absent from Śaiva tantras until late works such as the *Rudrayāmalottaratantra*. This is surprising given that the Śaiva tantras are replete with much of the terminology of the Haṭhayoga corpus. In the medieval Vedānta and Yoga literature (written after the eleventh century), *haṭhayoga* first appeared almost always in conjunction with *rājayoga*, which, as a system of Yoga, was based more on tantric Yoga rather than Pātañjalayoga. The rivalry between Rāja and Haṭhayoga, which was expressed most vehemently in the second chapter of a text known as the *Amanaskayoga* (eleventh to twelfth century), was based on the contention that Rājayoga was the superior Yoga because its methods were effortless and most efficacious, whereas Haṭhayoga required exertion and was superfluous. However, the rivalry was reconciled by other medieval Yoga texts, such as the *Dattātreyayogaśāstra* (twelfth to thirteenth century), into a hierarchy of four Yogas (i.e., Mantra, Laya, Haṭha, and Rājayoga), and a few centuries later Svātmārāma dismantled this hierarchy, in his *Haṭhapradīpikā*, by melding previous Haṭha and Rājayoga systems together and by asserting that Haṭha and Rājayoga are dependent upon one another. By doing so, he created a complete system of Yoga and called it Haṭhayoga.

The corpus of Haṭhayoga texts consulted for this essay is as follows:<sup>1</sup>

*Author’s note:* I am grateful to the following scholars for their assistance. Firstly, Professor Alexis Sanderson, who supervised this work and gave much advice, numerous references, and detailed comments at all stages of the work. Professor Francesco Sferra and Dr. Elizabeth De Michelis commented on an early draft, and Dr. Csaba Deszö and Dr. Jim Benson examined a final draft and made many comments. Péter-Dániel Szántó, Dr. Shaman Hatley, Dr. Peter Bisshop, Dr. Robert Goodding, Dr. Peter Thomi, Professor Jürgen Hanneder, and Professor Vesna Wallace gave assistance in specific areas. Thanks also to Stephanie Jamison for her editorial work. Finally, I must particularly thank Dr. James Mallinson for answering my questions at every turn, commenting on several drafts of this essay, and for sharing manuscripts and unpublished work. This work would not have been possible without the financial support of the Clarendon Fund, Oxford.

1. These dates are merely an approximate guide, designed to facilitate the reading of this essay.

Early texts: *Amṛtasiddhi* of Virūpākṣa (11/12th century<sup>2</sup>), *Amarāughaprabodha* (14/15th century<sup>3</sup>), *Dattātreyayogaśāstra* (12/13th century<sup>4</sup>), *Khecarīvidyā* (13/14th century<sup>5</sup>), the original *Goraḥśaśataka* (14/15th century<sup>6</sup>), *Śārṅgadharapaddhati* (1363 CE<sup>7</sup>), *Vasiṣṭhasaṃhitā* (12/13th century<sup>8</sup>), *Vivekamārtaṇḍa* (13/14th century) (including the *Goraḥśapaddhati*, the *Goraḥśaśataka*, *Yogamārtaṇḍa*, and one edition of the *Goraḥśasaṃhitā*<sup>9</sup>), *Yogayājñavalkya* (13/14th century<sup>10</sup>), *Yogabīja* (14/15th century<sup>11</sup>).

*Haṭhapradīpikā* (15th century<sup>12</sup>)

Late texts:<sup>13</sup> *Gheraṇḍasaṃhitā* (17/18th century<sup>14</sup>), *Haṭharatnāvalī* (17th century<sup>15</sup>), *Haṭhatattvakaumudī* (18th century<sup>16</sup>), *Śivasamhitā* (15th century<sup>17</sup>), *Yogacintāmaṇi* (16/17th century<sup>18</sup>), *Yogatārāvalī* (15/16th century<sup>19</sup>).

2. The dating of this text is based on Schaeffer's assessment of a Tibetan manuscript (2003: 517).
3. Owing to a direct borrowing of verses, the *Amarāughaprabodha*'s terminus a quo may be either the second chapter of the *Amanaskayoga* or, as Mallinson suggests (2008: 9), the *Amṛtasiddhi*. For its terminus ad quem, see Bouy 1994: 19.
4. The terminus ad quem of the *Dattātreyayogaśāstra* is the *Śārṅgadharapaddhati* (Mallinson 2008: 3).
5. Mallinson 2007: 4.
6. Mallinson 2011: 262–63.
7. Sternbach 1974: 17.
8. The Kaivalyadhama Research Department (2005: 30–32) has argued convincingly that the terminus ad quem of the *Vasiṣṭhasaṃhitā* is the *Yogayājñavalkya*. Also, it presents evidence for a terminus a quo of the twelfth century.
9. The *Vivekamārtaṇḍa*'s terminus ad quem is the *Khecarīvidyā* (Mallinson 2007: 4) or the *Śārṅgadharapaddhati* (Bouy 1994: 25). For a discussion of the various names and textual variations of the *Vivekamārtaṇḍa* and *Goraḥśaśataka*, see Bouy 1994: 18, 22–24, 83 n. 355, and Mallinson 2007: 166. I have followed Mallinson's convention (2008: 5–6) of using "Vivekamārtaṇḍa" to refer to the text found under all these titles.
10. The *Yogayājñavalkya*'s terminus a quo is the *Vasiṣṭhasaṃhitā* (see n. 8). Bouy (1994: 84) has identified a citation of the *Yogayājñavalkya* in the *Sarvadārśanasaṅgraha*, which gives it a terminus ad quem of the fourteenth century.
11. The date of the *Yogabīja* is discussed at length below.
12. Bouy 1994: 81–86.
13. The focus of this essay is the early Haṭha texts. This list does not define a late Haṭhayoga corpus, but includes only prominent Yoga texts written after the *Haṭhapradīpikā*, as well as others that are specifically mentioned in this essay. It is not easy to define a late Haṭha corpus because after the *Haṭhapradīpikā* many Yoga texts synthesized Haṭhayoga with other traditions such as Pātāñjalayoga (e.g., the *Yogacintāmaṇi* and the *Yuktabhavadeva*), Advaitavedānta (e.g., the late recension of various Yoga Upaniṣads such as the *Triśikhibrahmaṇopaniṣad*, *Varāhupaniṣad*, *Yogakuṇḍalyupaniṣad*, *Yogatattvopaniṣad*, and so on), Bhakti and Pūja (e.g., the *Śivayogadīpikā*), and so on. Also, compendiums such as the *Upāsanāsārasaṅgraha* and *Yogasārasaṅgraha* (see French Institute of Pondicherry transcripts T0859 and T095b respectively), which contain some material from earlier Haṭhayogic texts, are difficult to classify. Other texts that might be considered for inclusion in a later Haṭha corpus on the basis of their Haṭhayogic content are the *Yogamārgaparakāśikā*, *Binduyoga*, *Brhadyogasopāna*, *Haṭhayogasamhitā*, *Āyurveda* (e.g., *Yuktabhavadeva*), *Haṭhayogasandhyā*, *Yogakarṇikā*, *Ṣaṭkarmasaṅgraha*, *Kumbhakaḥpaddhati*, and so on. One might exclude those Yoga Upaniṣads that do not contain Haṭhayogic teachings (e.g., *Tejobindūpaniṣad*, *Advayaīrarakopaniṣad*, etc.) and texts that are concerned more with Nāth doctrine than Haṭhayoga, such as the *Siddhasiddhāntapaddhati* (seventeenth century) and *Goraḥśasiddhāntasaṅgraha* (eighteenth century).
14. See Mallinson 2004: xiii–xiv.
15. See Reddy 1982: introduction.
16. Both these texts were written by Sundaradeva, son of Govindadeva (see *Haṭhatattvakaumudī*, p. 721). He was also the author of the *Haṭhasaṅketacandrikā* (see Ms R3239, Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras). The *Haṭhatattvakaumudī*'s terminus ad quo is either the *Haṭharatnāvalī* or the *Kumbhakaḥpaddhati*, which appears to be a late work on the practice of *prāṇāyāma*.
17. See Mallinson 2007a: x.
18. Bouy 1994: 77–77.
19. In manuscript colophons this text has been attributed to a number of different authors, namely, Govindabhagavatpūjyapāda, Nandīśvara (Nandikeśvara), Sadāśīva, and, most commonly, Śaṅkarācārya (Kaivalyadhama Research Department 2005: 232–38). It is highly unlikely that Ādiśaṅkara (eighth century) authored the *Yogatārāvalī* because its author drew material from the twelfth-century *Amanaskayoga* (e.g., it refers to *śāmbhavamudrā* as *amanaskamudrā*, and *Amanaskayoga* 2.67 = *Yogatārāvalī* 20). Furthermore, the *Yogatārāvalī*

Referring to a corpus of “early Haṭhayoga texts” is somewhat arbitrary because some of these texts (e.g., the *Vivekamārtaṇḍa* and *Vasiṣṭhasaṃhitā*) do not refer to their Yoga as Haṭhayoga. However, the Yoga techniques in these texts came to characterize Haṭhayoga after they were incorporated into the *Haṭhapradīpikā*. The early texts are distinguished by similar teachings on *āsana*,<sup>20</sup> *prāṇāyāma*,<sup>21</sup> and one or more of what eventually became the ten *mudrās* of Haṭhayoga.<sup>22</sup> Other salient features of the corpus include instruction on dietary control (*mitāhāra*), the four stages of Yoga,<sup>23</sup> the *ṣaṭkarma*,<sup>24</sup> and *samādhi*. The division of the corpus into earlier and later texts is based on the probable date of the *Haṭhapradīpikā*, which is largely an anthology, as shown by Bouy (1994: 81–86) and Mallinson (2008: 2–3), who have identified the earlier texts by tracing the verses borrowed by the *Haṭhapradīpikā*.

#### MODERN WESTERN UNDERSTANDINGS OF THE TERM

In the nineteenth century some influential Indologists defined Haṭhayoga according to their understanding of the root *haṭh* as referring to force or violence,<sup>25</sup> which is in keeping with both Pāṇini’s *Dhātupāṭha*<sup>26</sup> and the *Amarakośa*.<sup>27</sup> The force or violence of Haṭhayoga was seen as the “self-violence” of extreme asceticism, and so, in the St. Petersburg *Wörterbuch*, Haṭhayoga was defined as “a form of Yoga which includes great self-torturing.”<sup>28</sup> In the same vein Monier-Williams (1899: 1287) gave a more elaborate explanation:

[It is] a kind of forced Yoga . . . treated of in the Haṭha-pradīpikā by Svātmārāma and performed with much self-torture, such as standing on one leg, holding up the arms, inhaling smoke with the head inverted &c.

Monier-Williams confounded Haṭhayoga with various extreme practices of asceticism (*tapas*) that appear in the purāṇas,<sup>29</sup> but not at all in the corpus of Haṭha texts used for this

---

refers to the three Haṭhayogic *bandhas*, *kevalakumbhaka*, and *nādānusandhāna*, as well as to more than one lineage of Haṭhayoga (*haṭheṣu*), which all suggest that it was written when Haṭhayoga was well developed (i.e., fifteenth century or later). In fact, the *Haṭhapradīpikā* may have influenced the *Yogatārāvalī*, because the latter follows the former’s seamless combination of Haṭha with Rājayoga. In the introduction to his edition of the *Yogatārāvalī* (1987: 3), Bhattacharya asserts that this text has not been quoted in any Sanskrit work written before the fifteenth century.

20. Mention of a seated posture can be found in all Haṭha texts, most of which elaborate upon one or more of them (usually *padmāsana* and *siddhāsana*). The inclusion of *āsana*s other than seated postures is seen in the *Vasiṣṭhasaṃhitā*, *Yogayājñavalkya*, *Haṭhapradīpikā*, and later Haṭha texts.

21. Most of the early Haṭha texts mention *kumbhaka*. The *Haṭhapradīpikā* and later texts distinguish eight kinds of *kumbhaka* (i.e., *sūryabhedana*, *ujjāyī*, *sītkārī*, *śītalī*, *bhastrīkā*, *bhrāmarī*, *mūrcchā*, and *plāvīnī*). These are preliminary to *kevalakumbhaka*.

22. The exceptions here are the *Vasiṣṭhasaṃhitā* and *Yogayājñavalkya*, which do not teach any *mudrās*. In the *Haṭhapradīpikā* (3.6) the ten *mudrās* of Haṭhayoga are *mahāmudrā*, *mahābandha*, *mahāvedha*, *khecari*, *udḍīyana*, *mūlabandha*, *jālandharabandha*, *viparītakaraṇī*, *vajrolī*, and *śaktīcālana*.

23. The four stages are *ārambha*, *ghaṭa*, *paricaya*, and *niṣpatti* (*Haṭhapradīpikā* 4.69–77).

24. The *ṣaṭkarma* (commonly referred to as cleansing practices) are *dhauti*, *basti*, *neti*, *trāṭaka*, *nauli*, and *kapālabhātī* (*Haṭhapradīpikā* 2.21–38). The *ṣaṭkarma* are a salient feature of the *Haṭhapradīpikā* and can be found in later Haṭha texts (such as the *Gheraṇḍasaṃhitā*). They do not appear in the early Haṭha texts.

25. Monier-Williams (1899: 1287) speculated that this root is “probably artificial.” Turner (1966: §13942) considers *haṭha* to be derived from the “hypothetical” root *haṭ* meaning ‘to move or exclaim violently’.

26. Pāṇini (335) gives three possible meanings: *haṭha plutiśaṭhatvayoḥ* ‘in [the meaning of] to jump or to be wicked’ as well as *haṭha balātkāra iti* ‘acting forcibly/violently’.

27. *prasahya tu haṭhārthakam* (*Amarakośa* 2869).

28. Böhtlingk and Roth (1889: 250): “eine gesteigerte mit grossen selbstquälungen verbundene form des Joga.”

29. The following references are to these forms of *tapas* mentioned in Monier-Williams’ definition. They are not described as practices of Haṭhayoga, but as austerities performed by gods, kings, sages, forest dwellers (*vānaprasthāśrama*), demons, etc. Standing on one leg (*ekapāda*): *Kūrmapurāṇa* 2.27.30, *Matysapurāṇa* 35.17, etc.; holding up the arms (*ārdhvabāhusthita*): *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* 7.3.2, *Liṅgapurāṇa* 1.69.76, *Matysapurāṇa* 171.1, etc.;

study. Their omission from these texts is significant because, if such practices had been part of Haṭhayoga, one would expect to see descriptions or at least some mention of them, since these texts provide extensive instruction on practice. Nor can it be said that the Haṭha texts describe Haṭhayoga as a practice that causes pain or affliction to the practitioner. Monier-Williams' definition of Haṭhayoga appears to have been influenced by recent traditions of Sādhus and Sannyāsins who have combined certain Haṭhayogic practices with extreme forms of *tapas* and consider the two synonymous.<sup>30</sup>

This view of Haṭhayoga as self-violence continued into the twentieth century and can be seen in various Indological works.<sup>31</sup> For example, in the *Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts at the British Library*, Windisch and Eggeling (1887–1935: 600) define the Haṭhayoga of the *Haṭhapradīpikā* as “the subduing of worldly desires by violent means.” However, most Western scholars known for their work on Yoga have not defined Haṭhayoga as self-torture, but have tended to understand its “force” or “violence” in terms of the effort required to practice it. Weston Briggs (1938: 274) believed that *haṭha* signified hard, extreme, or strenuous discipline, and Mircea Eliade (1958: 228) rendered Haṭhayoga as “violent effort.” Similar interpretations have persisted in modern scholarship where translations such as “exertion-yoga” (Larson 2009: 492), a “very strenuous” method (Gupta 1979: 180), and “a method of violent exertion” (White 1996: 5) have appeared in recent years, as well as the more ambiguous “yoga of forceful suppression” (Lorenzen, 1987: 214).

Modern scholarship on Haṭhayoga has also been influenced by a common prejudice that Jean Filliozat (1991: 375) described as follows:

The Indian yogin or fakir is still looked upon with suspicion: half-ascetic, half-conjurer, he lives on the credulity of the masses who are mesmerised by his awe-inspiring self-mortification, irrespective of whether it is genuine or affected, and by his extraordinary tricks.

This prejudice fostered the view of Haṭhayoga as a degenerate descendant, as it were, of Patañjali's “proper” school of Yoga, which was regarded as the pinnacle of Yoga's development; its pure, lofty philosophical achievement far overshadowing what Haṭhayoga became a thousand years later. Thus, Dasgupta (1962: 67) wrote,

Though all sorts of occultism and necromancy prevailed and still now prevail within the school of Haṭhayoga, and though with a large number of Indian Yogins, Haṭhayoga has become a science of physical feats, serenity prevails within the school of Yoga proper. As a philosophical system Yoga represents a purely idealistic view . . .

Though some modern scholars may have conflated the practice of Haṭhayoga with extreme forms of *tapas* and thereby defined it as self-torture or a method of forceful exertion,<sup>32</sup>

---

inhaling smoke (*dhūmapa*): *Kūrmapurāna* 2.27.31. I wish to thank Dr. Thankar Manik at Pune University for providing me with a chapter on *tapas* from her unpublished thesis, which led to my search for references in the purāṇas.

30. For a summary of these practices of *tapas*, see Clark 2006: 36–37 n. 44. A firsthand account of this is given by James Mallinson (2005: 109), who observed Rāmānandī Tyāgīs performing a “few” Haṭhayogic *āsanas* after their practice of *dhūmitap* (i.e., “the ascetic sits surrounded by smouldering cowdung fires under the midday summer sun”), and he adds, “this is usually the extent of their practice of yoga.”

31. Examples of this can also be found in recent books on Indian philosophy. For example, “Many practices such as different forms of self-torture, standing on one leg, holding up arms, inhaling smoke with the head inverted, piercing different parts of the body with sharp instruments and similar practices are included in the Hathayoga. This increases vitality in the body, gives good health . . .” (Venus 2001: 144).

32. It is also possible that some of the above-mentioned scholars have presumed that *āsanas* require great exertion or forceful effort, on the grounds that the average person finds them difficult to perform. However, reports from Yoga practitioners suggest that an *āsana* is not strenuous once it has been mastered. For example, in his most recent book, BKS Iyengar (2005: 265) write, “What I have endeavored to say about asana is that the posture should

the view that Haṭhayoga was strenuous to practice and even painful did not originate from modern scholarship on Yoga, but has a long history within India itself. For example, the *Laghuyogavāsiṣṭha* describes Haṭhayoga as causing suffering (*duḥkhada*), and the *Amanaskayoga* labels the practice of *prāṇāyāma* and *mudrās* as based upon pain (*kleśamūla*) and difficult to master (*durjaya*). In fact, the Rājayoga of the *Amanaskayoga* asserted its superiority over Haṭhayogic techniques by claiming that its own way to liberation was ‘effortless’ (*nirāyāsa*),<sup>33</sup> and it is not surprising that those Indian soteriologies that espoused methods of liberation based on gnosis or initiation alone would have viewed the *āsanas*, *prāṇāyāmas* and *mudrās* of Haṭhayoga as unnecessary physical exertion.<sup>34</sup>

#### THE USE OF HAṬHA IN HAṬHA TEXTS

The question “why was Haṭhayoga called forceful yoga?” is well worth asking when one considers that the word *haṭha* is never used in Haṭha texts to refer to violent means or forceful effort.<sup>35</sup> If the name Haṭhayoga were based on the notion of forceful effort, one would expect to find injunctions to forcibly (i.e., *haṭhāt* or *haṭhena*) perform its techniques.<sup>36</sup> Instead, a more neutral word for effort (i.e., *yatnena* or *prayatnena*) is used; in many instances this may be interpreted as ‘carefully’ or ‘diligently’,<sup>37</sup> sometimes as ‘vigorously’ or ‘energetically’ in cases such as *Bhastrikāprāṇāyāma*.<sup>38</sup> Attempts are seen in the Haṭha corpus to qualify the sort of effort a Yogin should apply. In fact, the qualification *śanaiḥ śanaiḥ*, which specifies that a technique should be performed gradually, slowly, or gently, depending on the context, occurs frequently.<sup>39</sup> For example, the practice of *mahābandha* and *aśvinīmudrā* require a

---

be comfortable and steady. The steadiness comes only when the effort has ended . . . In my āsanas, I have no strain anywhere as my effort ceased long ago . . .” The notion that *āsana* requires minimal effort goes back to Patañjali’s *Yogasūtra* 2.47 “[Posture becomes comfortable and steady] by means of relaxation of effort and union [of the mind] in a boundless [state]” (*prayatnaśaithilyānantasamāpattibhyām*).

33. These references in the *Laghuyogavāsiṣṭha* and the *Amanaskayoga* are discussed at length later in this essay. See below for the citations.

34. A good example of this view is found in *Siddhasiddhāntapaddhati* 5.55b–59 “Not because of *āsana* . . . holding the breath, holding a *mudrā*, yoga . . . [and] not by endless methods and efforts is the supreme state obtained. Having abandoned all these bodily practices, perfected men abide in the supreme state which is beyond the body” (. . . *na cāsanāt . . . prāṇadhāraṇāt . . . na mudrādhāraṇād yogāt . . . nānantopāyayatnebhyaḥ prāpyate paramaṃ padam || etāni sādhanāni sarvāṇi daihikāni parityajya paramapade ’daihike sthīyate siddhapuruṣair iti*).

35. In Haṭha texts the word *haṭha* most often refers to Haṭhayoga itself. E.g., *haṭhasya prathamāṅgatvād āsanaṃ pūrvam ucyate* (*Haṭhapradīpikā* 1.17ab) “Because it is the first auxiliary of Haṭha [Yoga], *āsana* is discussed first.” The word is also used adverbially (i.e., *haṭhena*, *haṭhāt*); these instances will be examined below.

36. One verse on *mūlabandha* (3.62) in the Kaivalyadhama edition of the *Haṭhapradīpikā* might appear to contain such a usage. However, for the correct reading of this verse, see n. 82.

37. E.g., *Haṭhapradīpikā* 1.45ab “Having carefully placed the upturned feet on the thighs . . .” (*uttānau caraṇau kṛtvā ūrusamsthau prayatnataḥ . . .*); 3.17cd “[*Mahāmudrā*] should be carefully concealed and not given to [just] anyone” (*gopaniyā prayatnena na deyā yasya kasyacit*); 3.89cd “Therefore, Yogins should diligently guard their semen and mind” (*tasmāc chukraṃ manaś caiva rakṣaṇīyaṃ prayatnataḥ*).

38. E.g., *Haṭhapradīpikā* 2.60 = the original *Gorakṣaśataka* 41cd–42ab. “Having taken full Padmāsana, the wise [Yogin] whose neck and torso are upright and who has closed [his] mouth, should exhale vigorously through the nose” (*samyak padmāsanaṃ baddhvā samagrīvodaraḥ sudhūḥ | mukhaṃ samyamya yatnena prāṇam ghrāṇena recayet*).

39. Most frequently in the *Haṭhapradīpikā* (e.g., 1.45, 2.8, 2.9, 2.11, 2.15, 2.24, 2.48, 2.49, 2.51, 2.69, 3.13, 3.21, 3.85, 3.86), but there are numerous instances in the early Haṭha texts including the *Vivekamārtaṇḍa*, *Dattātreyayogaśāstra*, *Khecarīvidyā*, *Yogabīja*, and *Vasiṣṭhasaṃhitā*. From the later corpus *Gheraṇḍasaṃhitā*, *Śivasamhitā*, *Haṭharatnāvalī*, *Haṭhatattvakaumudī*, etc.

very gentle (*śanaiḥ śanaiḥ*) contraction of the perineum.<sup>40</sup> On the whole, *śanaiḥ* tends to be used when caution is required in performing a technique. In fact, the more powerful a Haṭhayoga technique is, the greater the care (rather than force) the Yogin must exercise. This is demonstrated by instructions that caution the Yogin against impatiently forcing *prāṇāyāma* techniques. For example, “just as the lion, elephant, and tiger should be tamed very gradually, just so (should) the breath be cultivated; otherwise it kills the Yogin” (*yathā siṃho gajo vyāghro bhaved vaśyaḥ śanaiḥ śanaiḥ | tathaiva sevito vāyur anyathā hanti sādhakam*).<sup>41</sup> Likewise, the practice of *khecarīmudrā*, which is fully explained in the *Khecarīvidyā*, is a prime example of this: “The practice must only be carried out gradually, not all at once. The body of him who tries to do it all at once is destroyed. For this reason the practice is to be carried out very gradually . . .” (*śanair eva prakartavyam abhyāsam yugapan na hi | yugapad yaś caret tasya śarīraṃ vilayaṃ vrajet | tasmāc chanaiḥ śanaiḥ kāryam abhyāsam varavarṇini* [1.54–55] [tr. Mallinson 2007: 119]). The interpretation of Haṭhayoga as ‘violent exertion’ is, in effect, refuted by the *Haṭhapradīpikā* (1.15), which includes exertion (*prayāsa*<sup>42</sup>) as one of six factors that ruin Haṭhayoga.<sup>43</sup>

#### THE HA-ṬHA DEFINITION

If one puts aside the notion of forceful effort in Haṭhayoga, two possibilities arise. Either the ‘force’ of Haṭhayoga refers to something other than forceful effort, or the word *haṭha* had a technical sense that was not based on its root meaning. Perhaps in order to avoid the dilemma surrounding the ‘force’ in Haṭhayoga, many modern Yoga books favor the so-called esoteric definition<sup>44</sup> based on the syllables *ha* and *ṭha*.<sup>45</sup> This “esoteric” meaning was made known to the West in the nineteenth century by Srisa Chandra Vasu, who wrote in the introduction to his widely read English translation of the *Gheraṇḍasamhitā* (1895: xxii):

Another explanation—and a later one—is that Hatha Yoga means the Yoga or union between ha and ṭha; the meaning is the sun and the moon; or the union of the prāṇa and the apāna vāyus.

40. Descriptions of *mahābandha* appear in the earliest Haṭha texts (*Amarauḥaprabodha* 33 and *Dattātreyayogaśāstra* 27.123–24). *Aśvinimudrā* is described in *Gheraṇḍasamhitā* 3.46.

41. *Haṭhapradīpikā* 2.15. This verse has been quoted often. It is also found in the *Vivekamārtaṇḍa* 123 and two later Yoga Upaniṣads (i.e., *Śaṅḍilyopaniṣad* 7.6 and the *Yogacūdāmaṇyupaniṣad* 118). Caveats against forcefully manipulating the breath are also common in later Haṭhayoga texts. For example, in his commentary to the *Haṭhapradīpikā*, Brahmānanda discusses this at length and quotes without attribution the following verse at 2.49: *haṭhān niruddhaḥ prāṇo 'yam romakūpeṣu niḥsaret | dehaṃ vidārayaty eṣa kuṣṭhādī janayaty api* || “[When] the breath has been stopped forcibly, it departs through the hair follicles. This [action] tears the body to pieces and also generates [diseases] such as leprosy.”

42. *Prayāsa* can mean exertion, effort, pains, or trouble. Brahmānanda (*Jyotsnā* 1.15) glosses *prayāsa* as an “activity that is conducive to causing fatigue” (*śramajanānānukūlo vyāpārah*). The *Haṭhapradīpikā* (1.55) confirms that the practice of *āsanas* and *bandhas* should not cause fatigue: “The best of Yogins whose fatigue has ceased when [performing] postures and [internal] locks in this way should practice purification of the channels [in the body] . . .” (*evam āsanabandheṣu yogindro vigataśramaḥ | abhyasen nāḍikāśuddhim . . .*). Indeed, the practice of *śāvāsana* is designed to take away fatigue (*śāvāsanaṃ śrāntiharam . . .* 1.32c).

43. *atyāharaḥ prayāsaś ca . . . ṣaḍbhir yogo vinaśyati* (*Haṭhapradīpikā* 1.15). Brahmānanda (*Jyotsnā* 1.15) refers to these six factors as ‘obstacles’ (*pratibandha*).

44. It is not clear why some writers such as Georg Feuerstein (2000: 118) have called this definition ‘esoteric’, but it is probably because of its infrequent appearance in the Haṭha texts as well as the fact that it is not based on the lexical root (*dhātu*).

45. Numerous books on modern Yoga use this definition. Some examples are Earnest Wood (1962: 82), Swāmi Rāmedev (2005: 114), Christy Turlington (2003: 42), Susan Winter Ward and John Sirois (2002: xvii).

There is circumstantial evidence to support the possibility that this metaphysical definition was behind the name, Haṭhayoga. To begin with, the notion of union is central to Haṭhayoga,<sup>46</sup> and among the earliest Haṭha texts the *Amṛtasiddhi* defined Yoga as the union of the sun and moon.<sup>47</sup> Though the *Amṛtasiddhi* does not mention the term *haṭhayoga* nor associate the sun and moon with the syllables *ha* and *ṭha*, there are instances in tantric literature, such as the *Jayadrathayāmala*<sup>48</sup> and Kṣemarāja's commentary on the *Netratantra*,<sup>49</sup> in which the syllable *ṭha* is equated with the moon. There is also an instance in the medieval Vaiṣṇava tantric text of the Pāñcarātra, the *Jayākhyasaṃhitā*, in which the sun is equated with the in-breath and the syllable *ha*.<sup>50</sup> In fact, evidence is found in the *Jayadrathayāmala* and Abhinavagupta's *Tantrāloka* for equating the sun and moon with both the in- and the out-breaths.<sup>51</sup> In light of these precedents, one would expect the *ha-ṭha* definition to be a salient feature of the early Haṭha corpus, but it is absent in all except one text, the *Yogabīja* (148cd–149ab):<sup>52</sup>

46. Such words for “union” as *aikya* and *ekatva* occur in the earliest Haṭha texts, in verses that describe the state of meditative absorption (*samādhi*) as the “union” of all opposites, the “union” of the individual Self with the universal Self, or the “union” of the mind with the Self (e.g., *Goraḥṣaṣataka* 185–86). In the *Vivekamārtaṇḍa* (78–80) the highest state is obtained by “uniting” the sun and moon, in which case the sun is both Śakti and menstrual blood (*rajas*) and the moon is Śiva and semen (*bindu*, *śukra*). The “union” between semen and menstrual blood is effected by the practice of *śakticāla*. The *Vivekamārtaṇḍa* 73–75 only mentions but does not explain this practice. (For details on the confusion surrounding the practice of *śakticāla/śakticālana*, see Mallinson 2007: 226–27.) In the *Haṭharatnāvalī* (2.106–9), semen and menstrual blood are “united” by *vajrolimudrā*. *Mahābandha* and *mūlabandha* are said to effect a “union” (*aikya*) of the bodily winds of *prāṇa* and *apāna*, and *mahāmudrā* is known as the “unification” (*ghaṭana*) of the sun and moon (see *Vivekamārtaṇḍa* 62, 81 and *Śivasamhitā* 4.42). *Mahāvedha* creates a connection (*saṃbandha*) between the moon, sun, and fire (*Haṭhapradīpikā* 3.27), and in his commentary on this verse Brahmānanda glosses moon, sun, and fire as the *idā*, *piṅgalā*, and *suṣumnānāḍī* respectively. Elsewhere he defines *prāṇāyāma* as the “union” of sun and moon (e.g., *Jyotsnā* 1.1), and in light of the above references, it appears that the *mudrās* (such as *mūlabandha*, etc.) that are employed during *prāṇāyāma* (e.g., *Haṭhapradīpikā* 2.45–46) may be responsible for this, rather than the practice of any particular type of *kumbhaka*. Of the standard eight types of *kumbhaka* listed in Haṭha texts (e.g., *Haṭhapradīpikā* 2.44), no particular one is noted for bringing about the union of two things. Indeed, it would appear that *mudrās* are the chief means of unification in Haṭhayoga.

47. *candraṃ caiva yadā sūryo grhṇāti cābhramaṇḍalāt | anyonyaṃ jāyate yogas tasmād yogo hi bhanyate* ll4.10ll. “When the sun seizes the moon from the sphere of the sky, union with one another arises and therefore [this] is called yoga.” The *Amṛtasiddhi* contains instruction on controlling the breath (*vāyu*) through techniques such as *mahāmudrā*, *mahābandha*, and *mahāvedha*. For an overview of the text, see Schaeffer 2002.

48. Alexis Sanderson has kindly provided me with the following reference. In the *Jayadrathayāmala* a chapter called the *Varṇanāmapaṭala* gives the code names for each letter of the alphabet. Verse 31 equates *ṭha* with the full moon (*pūrṇacandra*) (*kūpavaktraṃ ṭhakāraṃ ca pūrṇacandraṃ ca vartulam | akhaṇḍamaṇḍalākāraṃ mayā te parikīrtitam*). For the dating of the *Jayadrathayāmala*, see Sanderson 2002: 1–2, where he says, “In fact the earliest firm evidence for the existence of the *Jayadrathayāmala* is a citation by Kṣemarāja, who flourished ca. A.D. 1000–1050.” Thus the *Jayadrathayāmala* would predate the earliest Haṭha texts. For Jayaratha's citations from this text, which he refers to as the *Tantrarājabhaṭṭāraka*, see Sanderson 2007: 252–53.

49. *śaśimaṇḍalaṃ ṭhakāraṃ* (Kṣemarāja's commentary to the *Netratantra* 17.10–13ab).

50. *sūryo hakārah prāṇas tu paramtmā prakīrtitaḥ* (*Jayākhyasaṃhitā* 6.56).

51. In the *Jayadrathayāmala*'s *Varṇanāmapaṭala*, verse 46, the in-breath (*prāṇa*) is one of several code names for the syllable *ha* (*haṃsaṃ śūnyaṃ tathā prāṇaṃ mahāravaṃ mahākālā | mahācchāyā dvikubjaṃ ca hakāraṃ nāmabhiḥ smṛtam*). Also see *Tantrāloka* 6.24c–27. I am grateful to Alexis Sanderson for providing me with these references and for pointing out that Abhinavagupta is paraphrasing the lost *Triśirobhairavatāntra* of the Trika, which is quoted by Jayaratha in his commentary on that passage.

52. There are three other Haṭha texts in which this definition is found: the *Yogaśikhopaniṣad* (1.133), the *Haṭharatnāvalī* (1.22), and the *Haṭhatattvakaumudī* (55.29). The *Yogabīja* is the most likely source from which these three texts acquired this verse. It is clear that the *Haṭharatnāvalī* is a later compilation (i.e., it frequently refers to and quotes the *Haṭhapradīpikā*, as well as quoting verses from other texts, such as the *Dattātreyayogaśāstra* and *Yogayājñavalkya*). It also borrows verses without quoting (e.g., *Haṭharatnāvalī* 4.25, 4.27 = *Amanaskayoga* 2.44, 2.9), and the *Haṭharatnāvalī* borrows from the *Yogabīja* (e.g., *Haṭharatnāvalī* 1.8, 2.7ab = *Yogabīja* 143cd–144ab,

The sun is known by the syllable *ha* and the moon by the syllable *ṭha*. Owing to the union of the sun and moon, Haṭhayoga is named [thus] (*hakāreṇa tu sūryo 'sau ṭhakāreṇendur ucyate | sūryācandramasor yogād haṭhayogo 'bhidhīyate*).

The *Yogabīja* has been attributed to Gorakṣanātha, and if this were true, the text would date back as far as the twelfth to thirteenth century, placing it amongst the earliest Haṭha texts.<sup>53</sup> This attribution is made in both the Gorakhnāth Mandir edition of the *Yogabīja* and the critical edition of Dr. Brahmamitra Awasthi.<sup>54</sup> Yet, as Mallinson notes, there appears to be no manuscript evidence (i.e., colophons) to support Gorakṣanātha's authorship.<sup>55</sup> Moreover, if Gorakṣanātha's authorship of the *Yogabīja* is based solely on an attribution made by the Nāth sect, then it is questionable, because members of the Nāth sect have a tendency to ascribe Yoga texts to their founding Guru. One such example is the *Amanaskayoga*, which Gorakṣanātha could not have written if it is true that he was a master of Haṭhayoga.<sup>56</sup> The lengthy quotations of the *Yogabīja* in the Nāth compendium called the *Gorakṣasiddhāntasaṅgraha* (e.g., pp. 24–25) confirm that the Nāths were consulting the *Yogabīja* in the eighteenth century. In terms of internal evidence in the *Yogabīja*, it borrows many verses from early Haṭha texts, and this has led Mallinson (2008: 9) to conclude “The *Yogabīja* is thus, to some extent, a compilation and cannot be said with certainty to have been the source of the verses it shares with the Haṭhapradīpikā.” Therefore, it is unlikely that the *Yogabīja* is as old as the earliest Haṭha texts. Since it is the oldest source of the *ha-ṭha* definition, it is probable that this definition was conceived several centuries after the rise of Haṭhayoga.<sup>57</sup>

#### THE EARLIEST OCCURRENCES OF THE TERM HAṬHAYOGA

If one accepts that the *ha-ṭha* definition was a late contrivance, the other possibility is that the name was first adopted because its Yoga was forceful in some way other than ‘forceful

---

121cd). The first chapter of the *Yogaśikhopaniṣad*, in which the *ha-ṭha* definition occurs, is a reworking of the *Yogabīja*. Finally, the *Haṭhatattvakaumudī* identifies the *Yogabīja* as the source for this definition. It is fair to say that the *ha-ṭha* definition is prominent in the late Haṭha corpus.

Mircea Eliade was under the impression that the *ha-ṭha* definition was found in one of the earliest Haṭha texts, citing the *Gorakṣapaddhati* (which he mistakenly calls a commentary on the *Gorakṣasataka*) as the source of this definition (1969: 228–29). However, I have not found it in the editions of the *Gorakṣapaddhati*, *Vivekamārtaṇḍa*, *Gorakṣasataka*, or *Gorakṣasamhitā* listed in my bibliography. It is possible that Eliade was using a corrupted manuscript of the *Gorakṣapaddhati*, but he gives no details of the edition or manuscript he consulted.

The *ha-ṭha* definition is also quoted by Brahmānanda in his commentary on the first verse of the *Haṭhapradīpikā*, and he attributes the quote to the *Siddhasiddhāntapaddhati*. However, this verse is absent from all five manuscripts and three of the four printed editions used for the critical edition of the *Siddhasiddhāntapaddhati* by the Lonavla Yoga Institute (2005). The one source appears to be a printed edition published by the Yogashram Sanskrit College and denoted as P<sub>2</sub> in the Lonavla edition's apparatus. It includes the *ha-ṭha* definition at 1.69. If the manuscript evidence has been accurately represented in the apparatus of the Lonavla edition, it suggests that this verse has been added to the original *Siddhasiddhāntapaddhati* at a later stage and it would therefore be likely that Brahmānanda was using a corrupt manuscript.

53. For the dating of Gorakṣanātha, see White 1996: 90–101.

54. The title of this book (i.e., *Yoga Bija by Siddha Guru Gorakhnath*) is proof enough, but also see its introduction.

55. Mallinson 2008: 9. Also, there are two Nepalese paper manuscripts (circa seventeenth century) of the *Yogabīja* (Kathmandu National Archives: A 0061-12, A939/19) and neither of them mentions the author's name.

56. This is attested to in the *Śārṅgadharapaddhati* 4372ab *dvidhā haṭhaḥ syād ekas tu gorakṣādisusādhitāḥ* (“There are two types of Haṭhayoga. One was properly mastered by Gorakṣa and others”) and *Haṭhapradīpikā* 1.4ab *haṭhavidyām hi matsyendragorakṣādya vijānate* (“Matsyendra, Gorakṣa, and others knew the science of Haṭha”). For a discussion on the authorship of the *Amanaskayoga*, see Birch 2005: 2–3.

57. The terminus ad quem for the *Yogabīja* is Śivānanda's *Yogacintāmaṇi*, which has been dated between the late sixteenth and the early seventeenth century by Bouy (1994: 115).



effort'. In order to assess how the founders of Haṭhayoga might have understood the use of force in their Yoga, the earliest definitions of the term *haṭhayoga* and any instances of forceful action in the Haṭha texts, as denoted by such words as *haṭhena* and *balāt*, will be examined in detail.

In the texts consulted for this study, the earliest occurrence of *haṭhayoga* is in the eighteenth chapter of a Buddhist tantra called the *Guhyasamājantra* (eighth century<sup>58</sup>), in a discussion on the attainment of a visionary experience (*darśana*). If an aspirant is unable to achieve it after three attempts of practicing the methods described in this tantra for six months at a time, then he is to resort to Haṭhayoga, which brings awakening (*bodhi*) and the perfection of knowledge (*jñānasiddhi*).<sup>59</sup> Unfortunately, the *Guhyasamājantra* does not define or explain its Haṭhayoga, and there are similar, obscure references to Haṭhayoga in other Buddhist exegetical works such as the *Sekanirdeśa* and the *Caturmudrānvaya*, which are both ascribed to Advayavajra (tenth to eleventh century).<sup>60</sup> The *Kālacakratāntra* (tenth to eleventh century) alludes to *haṭhayoga* with the word *haṭhena*,<sup>61</sup> and it is Puṇḍarīka's commentary, the *Vimalaprabhā* (eleventh century), that provides the first definition of *haṭhayoga* in the Kālacakra tradition.<sup>62</sup> His definition was repeated verbatim in Anupamarakṣita's *Ṣaḍaṅgayoga*,<sup>63</sup> Nāropā's *Sekoddeśaṭīkā*,<sup>64</sup> and Raviśrījñāna's *Amṛtakaṇikā*,<sup>65</sup> as follows:

Now the haṭhayoga is explained. Here, when the unchanging moment does not take place because the vital breath is unrestrained, [in spite of] the image having been seen by means of withdrawal and so on, then [the Yogin]—after having made the vital breath flow in the central channel violently through the [ . . . ] exercise of sound—can realise the unchanging moment through non-vibration by arresting the bindu of the bodhicitta in the vajra-gem placed in the lotus of the wisdom. This is the haṭhayoga. (*idānīm haṭhayoga ucyate | iha yadā pratyāhārādibhir bimbe*

58. In the introduction to his critical edition of the *Guhyasamājantra*, Yukei Matsunaga has argued convincingly that it was mainly composed in the early eighth century, and the eighteenth chapter was added in the late eighth century.

59. *darśanaṃ yadi śaṃmāsair yad uktaṃ naiva jāyate | ārabheta tribhir vāirair yathoktavidhisambaraiḥ || 18.161 || darśanaṃ tu kṛte 'py evaṃ sādhakasya na jāyate | yadā na sidhyate bodhir haṭhayogena sādhayet || 18.162 || jñānasiddhis tadā tasya yogenaivopajāyate || 18.163ab ||*

60. Though he mentions a *haṭhayoga*, Advayavajra does not define it in these two works. Advayavajra has been dated to the tenth to eleventh century (Meiszahl 1967: 238). Francesco Sferra, who is working on a critical edition of Rāmapāla's commentary, the *Sekanirdeśapañjikā*, on Advayavajra's *Sekanirdeśa* has informed me that this commentary does not clearly define *haṭhayoga*.

61. *pratyāhārādibhir vai yadī bhavati na sā mantriṇām iṣṭasiddhir nādābhyāsād dhaṭhenābjagakuliśamaṇau sādhayet bindurodhāt (Kālacakratāntra 4.119cd)* "And if the desired *Siddhi* of the Mantrins does not arise through [methods such as] *Pratyāhāra*, etc., one should accomplish [it] forcibly (*haṭhena*) through the practice of *Nāda*, [in other words] through stopping *Bindu*, in the diamond (*kuliśa*) gem (*maṇi*) of the lotus (*abjaga*)." Puṇḍarīka understands *haṭhena* as *haṭhayogena* (i.e., by means of Haṭhayoga).

62. Puṇḍarīka's *Vimalaprabhā* can be dated to just after the *Kālacakratāntra*, i.e., eleventh century (Sferra 2005: 265–66).

63. The terminus ante quem for Anupamarakṣita's *Ṣaḍaṅgayoga* is fixed by the death of Nāropā, around 1040 CE. For a discussion on the chronology of the Kālacakra literature, see Sferra 2005: 266–67.

64. Nāropā can be ascribed to the late tenth or early eleventh century. On the date of Nāropā's death, see Wylie 1982: 687–91.

65. Raviśrījñāna's definition of Haṭhayoga does differ from the previous three commentators in some respects. However, the differences are small and his comments uphold that Haṭhayoga forcefully makes *prāṇa* flow in the middle channel. Of interest is his additional comment that Haṭhayoga is a means (*upāya*) for the purpose of making clear (*spuṭībhāvārtham*) the auxiliary (known as) *samādhi* (*upāyo haṭhayoga 'pi samādhyāṅgasphuṭībhāvārtham | evaṃ ca haṭhayogo yadā pratyāhārādibhir drṣṭe bimbe saty akṣarakṣanenotpadayate | ayantritaṭprāṇatayā nādanidānābhyāsāt sahañānandābhyāsād dhaṭhena hūmkāranādena prāṇaṃ madhyamāyāṃ vāhayet*; Raviśrījñāna's *Amṛtakaṇikā* 29). Raviśrījñāna is said to have come from Kashmir, possibly from the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries (Wallace 2001: 5).

*dr̥ṣṭe saty akṣarakṣaṇaṃ notpadyate ayantritaprāṇatayā tadā nādābhyāsād dhaṭhena prāṇaṃ madhyamāyāṃ vāhayitvā prajñābjagatakuliśamaṇau bodhicittabindunirodhād akṣarakṣaṇaṃ sādhasyena niḥspandeneti haṭhayogaḥ*).<sup>66</sup>

There are three features of the above definition that identify it with the Haṭhayoga of later texts. Firstly, the practice involves making *prāṇa* flow in the *madhyamā*, a term used in Haṭha texts for *suṣumnānāḍī*.<sup>67</sup> Piercing the mouth of *suṣumnā* with *prāṇa*,<sup>68</sup> holding *prāṇa* in *suṣumnā*,<sup>69</sup> and making *prāṇa* flow in *suṣumnā*<sup>70</sup> are all mentioned in the *Haṭhapradīpikā* for the purpose of entering the void (*sūnya*) or *samādhi* (*manonmanī*).<sup>71</sup> Secondly, the practice of *nāda* is mentioned and this figures largely in many Haṭha texts,<sup>72</sup> particularly the *Haṭhapradīpikā* (see 4.81–102) and some of the Yoga Upaniṣads.<sup>73</sup> And finally, the compound *bodhicittabindunirodha* which, in the context of the Buddhist Kālacakra tradition, appears to mean the arresting of the drops of sexual fluid,<sup>74</sup> is found in Haṭhayoga as *bindudhāraṇā* (“retaining sexual fluids”),<sup>75</sup> achieved through practices such as *vajrolīmudrā*.<sup>76</sup> Though the compound *bindunirodha* is absent, *nirodha* does appear elsewhere in the Haṭha texts.<sup>77</sup> The connection between the practice of *nāda* and the retention of *bindu* in the *Vimalaprabhā* is also significant, because these two words are sometimes used together in Haṭha texts. For example, in the *Haṭhapradīpikā*, the practice of *amarolīmudrā* (a variation of *vajrolīmudrā*),<sup>78</sup> which unites male and female sexual fluids, transforms a woman’s *nāda* into the state of

66. Translated by Francesco Sferra in his edition of the *Ṣaḍaṅgayoga* (p. 270). See Puṇḍarīka’s *Vimalaprabhā* (vol. 2, p. 212), Anupamarakṣita’s *Ṣaḍaṅgayoga* (pp. 108–9), Nārōpā’s *Sekoddeśaṭīkā* (p. 133), and Raviśrījñāna’s *Amṛtakaṇīkā* (see n. 65).

67. E.g., *Haṭhapradīpikā* 3.120ab. *Haṭhapradīpikā* 3.4 gives *madhyamārga* as a synonym for *suṣumnā*. Other relevant references include *Amarauḥgahprabodha* 9ab and *Haṭharatnāvalī* 2.3ab.

68. E.g., *suṣumnāvadaṇaṃ bhītvā sukhād viśati mārutaḥ* (*Haṭhapradīpikā* 2.41cd) “Having split the mouth of *suṣumnā*, the breath easily enters [it].”

69. E.g., *baddho yena suṣumnāyāṃ prāṇas tūḍḍiyate yataḥ | tasmād uḍḍīyanākhyo ’yaṃ yogibhiḥ samudāhṛtaḥ* (*Haṭhapradīpikā* 3.54) “Since *prāṇa* is held in *suṣumnā* and flies up [through it] because of the [application of this *bandha*], Yogins have called it by the name of *Uḍḍīyana[bandha]*.” Moving the breath into the middle channel is also achieved by *mahāvedha* (see *Haṭhapradīpikā* 3.26).

70. E.g., *suṣumnāvāhīni prāṇe sūnye viśati mānase* (*Haṭhapradīpikā* 4.12ab) “When *prāṇa* is flowing in *suṣumnā* and when the mind is entering the void . . .”; *kṛtvā vāyuṃ ca madhyagaṃ* (*Haṭhapradīpikā* 4.16b) “Having made the breath go into the middle [channel]. . .”

71. E.g., *suṣumnāvāhīni prāṇe siddhyaty eva manonmanī* (*Haṭhapradīpikā* 4.20ab) “When *prāṇa* is flowing in *suṣumnā*, the [state of] *samādhi* is achieved.” In the *Haṭhapradīpikā* (4.3), *manonmanī* is given as one of the synonyms of *samādhi*. Another reference to *prāṇa* flowing in *suṣumnā* is at *Haṭhapradīpikā* 4.12ab (see n. 70).

72. One should note that the technique of *nādābhyāsa* in the Kālacakra tradition cannot be said to be the same as that of the Sanskrit Haṭha texts. The importance in this case is in the association of *nādābhyāsa* with the term *haṭhayoga*.

73. E.g., the *Nādabindūpaniṣad* 30–52, *Dhyānabindūpaniṣad* 95–106, *Brahmavidyopaniṣad* 12–13, and *Haṃsopaniṣad* 8–9, 16.

74. The *bindu* of *bodhicitta* may refer to the four drops, which Vesna Wallace defines as “physical composites of the size of a small seed, which consist of red and white drops of the semen and uterine blood” (Wallace 2001: 158).

75. Chapter 7 of the *Amṛtasiddhi* is on *bindudhāraṇā*. See also *Dattātreyayogaśāstra* 143, *Haṭhapradīpikā* 3.88–89, and *Śivasamhitā* 4.31.

76. The section on *vajrolīmudrā* in the *Haṭhapradīpikā* contains the following verse: *marāṇaṃ bindupātena jīvanaṃ bindudhāraṇāt | sugandho yogino dehe jāyate bindudhāraṇāt ||* “Because of the loss of sexual fluids, death [occurs], and from the retention of sexual fluids, life. Because of the retention of sexual fluids in the body, the Yogin has a sweet smell” (3.87cd–3.88ab).

77. In fact, *nirodha* is one of the few technical terms of Pātañjalayoga that occurs with some frequency in the Haṭhayoga corpus. For example, it is found seven times in the *Haṭhapradīpikā* 2.2, 2.49, 3.22, 4.16, 4.19, 4.42, 4.68, and at least once in nearly all other Haṭha texts.

78. *sahaḥjoliś cāmarolir vajrolīyā eva bhedataḥ* (*Haṭhapradīpikā* 3.90ab).

*bindu*,<sup>79</sup> and in the *Amṛtasiddhi* the Yogin should accomplish “union” by means of *nāda*, *bindu*, and *citta* (mind).<sup>80</sup>

The notion of forcibly (*haṭhena*) making the breath to flow in the central channel was not expressed as such in Haṭha texts. In the few instances where the word *haṭha* or its equivalent *bala* is used adverbially (i.e., *haṭhāt/haṭhena*),<sup>81</sup> it most frequently refers to “forcibly” moving *kuṇḍalinī*, *apānavāyu*, or *bindu* upwards. For example, *mūlabandha* “forcibly” (*haṭhāt*) makes the downward-moving *apāna* move upwards. In another verse on *mūlabandha*, the anus is pressed with the heel and the Yogin forcibly (*balāt*) draws the breath upwards.<sup>82</sup> *Kuṇḍalinī* is to be forcibly seized (*balāt*),<sup>83</sup> roused from sleep and forcefully (*haṭhāt*) rises upwards by the practice of *śakticālana*.<sup>84</sup> Even if *bindu* flows down into the fire of the abdomen, it is to be stopped (*nirodha*) and forcibly (*haṭhāt*) moved upwards by the practice of *yonimudrā*.<sup>85</sup> In this context, it is apparent that the force of Haṭhayoga refers to forcing what normally moves down (i.e., *apāna*, *bindu*) and what is usually dormant (*kuṇḍalinī*) to move upwards.

79. *tasyāḥ śarīre nādaś ca bindutām eva gacchati* ||3.96cd|| **3.96c** śarīre ] *Jyotsnā* : śarīra ed. (*Haṭhapradīpikā* 3.96cd). Brahmānanda explains that *nāda* is raised up from the pelvic region and becomes the state of *bindu* above the heart. Thus *nāda* becomes one with *bindu* (*mūlādihārād utthīto nādo hṛdayopari bindubhāvaṃ gacchati | bindunā sahaikibhāvati ity arthaḥ*). The *Śārṅgadhara*paddhati (4366) defines *bindu* as originating from *nāda* (. . . *nādaḥ binduḥ . . .*), and the *Amṛtasiddhi* (7.12) states that the union of *bindu* and *nāda* brings about the highest state (i.e., *samādhi*) (*binduś candramayaḥ prokto rajaḥ sūryamayas tathā | anayoḥ saṅgamād eva jāyate paramaṃ padam* || “Semen is made of [the substance of] the moon and menstrual blood, of the sun. Simply from the union of the two, the highest state arises”). (This version of the verse was quoted with attribution to the *Amṛtasiddhi* by Brahmānanda in his *Jyotsnā* 3.100.)

80. E.g., *nādo binduś ca cittaṃ ca tribhir aikiyaṃ prasādayet* ||7.21cd|| **7.21d** *prasādayet* ] conjecture : *prasādanam* ed. (*Amṛtasiddhi* 7.21cd). This verse is quoted in the *Yogacintāmaṇi* (folio 23) as *trayānām aikiyaśādhanam*, so perhaps the intended meaning was “[the Yogin] should accomplish the union of those three.” One could emend to *trīṇām aikiyaṃ prasādhayet* to yield this meaning.

81. In the *Jyotsnā*, Brahmānanda glosses *haṭhāt* as *balāt* in 2.10 and 3.104.

82. *gude pārṣṇīm tu sampīḍya vāyum ākuñcayed balāt | vāraṃ vāraṃ yathā cordhvaṃ samāyāti samīraṇaḥ* (*Dattātreyayogaśāstra* 131 = *Śārṅgadhara*paddhati 4416 = *Yogabīja* 116 = *Haṭhapradīpikā* 3.62) “Having pressed the heel on the anus, [the Yogin] should forcibly draw the breath [upwards], so that the breath goes upwards again and again.” In the Kaivalyadhama edition of the *Haṭhapradīpikā*, this verse reads *gudaṃ pārṣṇyā tu sampīḍya yonim ākuñcayed balāt | vāraṃ vāraṃ yathā cordhvaṃ samāyāti samīraṇaḥ* (3.62) “Having pressed the anus with the heel, [the Yogin] should forcibly contract the perineum, so that the breath goes upwards again and again.” In light of the wording of this verse in the *Dattātreyayogaśāstra* (the most likely source), the *Śārṅgadhara*paddhati, the *Yogabīja*, and five manuscripts of the *Haṭhapradīpikā* (see Kaivalyadhama edition p. 99 n. 119, manuscripts ga, ya, ra, la, va), as well as the fact that *yonim ākuñcayet* is largely redundant when preceded by *gudaṃ . . . sampīḍya*, it is fair to say that the editors have favored the wrong reading here, and *yonim ākuñcayet* should be *vāyum ākuñcayet*. Furthermore, the commentator, Brahmānanda, supports *vāyum ākuñcayet* and interprets it as “[the Yogin] should repeatedly draw *apāna* forcibly (*haṭhena*) upwards by contracting the anus” (*yathā yena prakāreṇa samīraṇo vāyur ūdhvaṃ suṣumnyā uparibhāge yāti gacchati tathā tena prakāreṇa balād dhaṭhād vāraṃ vāraṃ punaḥ punar vāyum apānam ākuñcayed gu[da]syākuñcanenākarṣayed*). This is further confirmation that the “force” refers not to how *mūlabandha* is performed, but to the way in which *apāna* (which normally moves downward) is drawn upwards by *mūlabandha*.

83. *gaṅgāyamunayor madhye bālarandām tapasvinim | balātkāreṇa grhṇīyāt tad viṣṇoḥ paramaṃ padam* (*Haṭhapradīpikā* 3.105) “[The Yogin] should forcibly seize the ascetic young widow [who resides] in the middle of the Ganges and Yamuna rivers. That [seizing of *Kuṇḍalinī*] is the supreme state of Viṣṇu.”

84. *pucche pragrhya bhujāṅgīm suptām udbodhayec ca tām | nidrām vihāya sā śaktir ūrdhvaṃ uttiṣṭhate haṭhāt* || “Having seized her tail, [the Yogin] should wake up the serpent [goddess] who was asleep. Free from sleep, [*Kuṇḍalinī*] Śakti rises up forcefully” (*Haṭhapradīpikā* 3.107 = *Haṭharatnāvalī* 2.110).

85. *calito ‘pi yadā binduḥ samprāptaś ca hutāśanam | vrajaty ūrdhvaṃ haṭhāt śaktiā niruddho yonimudrayā* || “Even when semen has moved [downwards] and reaches the fire [in the lower abdomen], it is stopped by *yonimudrā* and forcefully moves upwards along with *Kuṇḍalinī*” (*Vivekamārtaṇḍa* 75 = *Dhyānabindūpaniṣad* 85cd–86ab = *Haṭhapradīpikā* 3.42). This version of the verse is from Nowotny’s edition of the *Goraḥśasata* (71).

In the *Vivekamārtaṇḍa* there are only two instances where the adverb *haṭhāt* is used and both imply that Haṭhayogic techniques have a forceful effect, rather than requiring forceful effort. In the first instance the Yogin applies what appears to be *khecarīmudrā* and, while meditating on *kuṇḍalinī*, he drinks the liquid (*jala*) that trickles from a sixteen-petalled lotus in the head and is obtained forcibly (*haṭhāt*).<sup>86</sup> Here, the combination of three techniques (i.e., *khecarīmudrā*, meditation, and possibly some kind of *prāṇāyāma*<sup>87</sup>) enables the Yogin to forcibly retain his nectar, which would otherwise trickle away. The second instance occurs in a verse that was appropriated by at least five later Haṭha texts.<sup>88</sup> It reads “as one might forcibly (*haṭhāt*) open a door with a key, so a Yogin breaks open the door to liberation with *kuṇḍalinī*” (*udghāṭayet kapāṭam tu yathā kuñcikayā haṭhāt | kuṇḍalinyā tathā yogī mokṣadvāraṃ prabhedayet*). As Brahmānanda notes,<sup>89</sup> the most important word in this verse is *haṭhāt* because it serves as the proverbial “lamp on a threshold” to illuminate both the simile and the statement. He understands *haṭhāt* as both *balāt* and *haṭhābhyāsāt*, and the implication of this is that the practice of Haṭhayoga causes *kuṇḍalinī* to rise, which, like a key, forces the door of liberation to open. When coupled with other images that are used to convey the effect of Haṭhayoga on *kuṇḍalinī*, such as that of a stick (*daṇḍa*) beating a snake (e.g., *Haṭhapradīpikā* 3.10, 3.67), the implication is that the force of Haṭhayoga is the forceful effect of its practice on *kuṇḍalinī*.

#### HAṬHAYOGA IN THE ŚAIVA TANTRAS

The number of instances of *haṭhayoga* in Buddhist tantras is sharply contrasted by its scarcity in Śaiva tantras.<sup>90</sup> One would expect to find *haṭhayoga* in many Śaiva tantras

86. *mūrdhnaḥ ṣoḍaśapatrapadmagalitaṃ prāṇād avāptam haṭhād ūrdhvāsyo rasanām niyamya vivare śaktim parāṇ cintayan | utkallolakalājalam suvimalam dhārāmayam yaḥ piben nirdoṣaḥ sa mṛṇālakomalatanur yogī ciraṃ jīvati || Vivekamārtaṇḍa 140 ||* Abbreviations in the apparatus: Viv = *Vivekamārtaṇḍa*, Gś = *Goraḥṣaśataka*, HP = *Haṭhapradīpikā*, Brj = Brahmānanda's *Jyotsnā*.

**a** *mūrdhnaḥ* | Brj: *ūrdhvaṃ* Viv, Gś. **a** *ṣoḍaśapatrapadmagalitaṃ* | Gś, Brj: *ṣoḍaśapatrapadmagalitaṃ* Viv: *ṣoḍaśapatrapadmagalitaṃ* HP. **b** *niyamya* | Viv, HP, Brj: *vidhāya* Gś. **b** *vivare śaktim* | HP, Brj: *vivare sāntim* Viv: *vidhivac chaktim* Gś. **b** *cintayan* | Viv, HP, Brj: *cintayet* Gś. **c** *utkallola* | Viv, HP, Brj: *tat kallola* Gś. **c** *kalājalam* | Viv, HP, Brj: *kalākulam* Gś. **c** *suvimalam* Viv, Gś: *ca vimalam* HP, Brj. **c** *dhārāmayam* | HP, Brj: *dhārājalam* Gś: *jīhvākulam* Viv. **d** *nirdoṣaḥ* | Viv, Gś: *nirvyādhiḥ* HP, Brj. **d** *tanur* | Viv: *vapur* Gś, HP, Brj. “Having fastened his tongue in the cavity [above the uvula] the Yogin, whose face is [turned] upwards and who is meditating on the highest *Śakti* (i.e., *Kuṇḍalinī*), should drink the extremely pure fluid from the [moon's] digits, which is waveless and flows in a stream. [This liquid] has trickled [down] from the sixteen-petalled lotus in the head and is obtained forcibly through the breath, and [the Yogin who drinks it] lives a long time, free from diseases and with a body as soft as the fibers [of a lotus].” I have understood *utkallola* as *utaraṅga* in the sense of *niṣṭaraṅga* (i.e., without waves, still), but it could mean the opposite (i.e., with rising waves).

87. This inference is supported by Brahmānanda (*Jyotsnā* 1.151), who glosses *prāṇāt* with *sādhanaḥbhūtāt*, and he understands *ūrdhvāsyaṃ* as implying that the Yogin is in *viparīṭakaraṇi*. However, his gloss of *haṭhayogāt . . . prāptam* on *haṭhāt . . . avāptam* is clearly inappropriate in the context of the *Vivekamārtaṇḍa*, which at no time refers to its Yoga as Haṭhayoga. Therefore, Brahmānanda's gloss might be appropriate in the context of the *Haṭhapradīpikā*, but in the *Vivekamārtaṇḍa* it is better to understand *haṭhāt* as an adverb.

88. *Vivekamārtaṇḍa* 56 = *Haṭhapradīpikā* 3.101 = *Gheraṇḍasaṃhitā* 3.51 = *Haṭhasaṃhitā* 44.83.1 = *Dhyānabindūpaniṣad* 67 = *Yogacūḍāmaṇyupaniṣad* 39.

89. *yathā yena prakāreṇa pumān kuñcikayā kapāṭārgalotsāranasādhanaḥbhūtayā haṭhād balāt kapāṭam araram udghāṭayed utsārayet | haṭhād iti dehalīdīpanyāyenobhayatra sambadhyate | tathā tena prakāreṇa yogī haṭhād dhāṭhābhyāsāt kuṇḍalinyā śaktyā mokṣadvāraṃ mokṣasya dvāraṃ prāpakam suṣunnāmārgam vibhedayed viśeṣeṇa bhedayet | tayordhvam āyan na mṛtatvam eti' iti śruteḥ* (*Jyotsnā* 3.105).

90. I have found the term *haṭhayoga* in only one Śaiva tantra. It occurs once in the fifty-fifth chapter of *Rudrayāmalottaratantra*. Goudriaan and Gupta (1981: 11) speculate that some parts of the *Rudrayāmala* are old, but add, “the part of the text which is now available in edited form (the Uttara Tantra) shows unmistakable signs

given that the Śaiva origins of Haṭhayoga are affirmed by several Haṭha texts, which name Ādinātha (Śiva) as their founding teacher.<sup>91</sup> Furthermore, there are early Śaiva tantras that contain passages on Yoga that resemble the Haṭha texts in style and terminology.<sup>92</sup> The Śaiva tantras also provide instances where the word *haṭha* was used to describe a type of practice (*haṭhasādhana*),<sup>93</sup> combustion (*haṭhapāka*),<sup>94</sup> and gathering (*haṭhamelakamelāpa*)<sup>95</sup>—which, one would think, could have inspired an early Śaiva pioneer to call their system of Yoga *haṭha*, under the belief that it was particularly efficacious and powerful. The fact

---

of lateness and may have been added to the oldest core afterwards.” The authenticity of the reference to *haṭhayoga* in the *Rudrayāmālotaratantra* is questionable, because the term *haṭhayoga* occurs only in the first verse of chapter 55 and nowhere else in the chapter on tantra. The first verse states that Haṭhayoga was taught “because it is distinguished by body control” (*kāyavaśyaviśeṣaṇāt*). However, the rest of the chapter is a description of a visualization technique that yields the fruit of *manipūracakra*. The chapter does not mention any Yoga technique particular to Haṭhayoga nor does it elaborate on body control.

91. For example, *Vivekāmārtaṇḍa* 2, *Amaraughaprabodha* 1, *Dattātreyaयोगशास्त्र* 14, 19, 31, *Yogabija* 1, etc. A lengthy lineage beginning with Ādinātha is given in the *Haṭhapradīpikā* (1.5–1.9). For a survey of the lineages of Haṭhayoga, see White 1996: 80–86.

92. A good example of this is the *Niśvāsātattvasaṃhitā*’s *Nayasūtra* 4.11–67 and 4.99–143. For information on this text, see Sanderson 2006: 152–53.

93. *haṭhasādhana* is the subject of a chapter in the *Brahmayāmālatantra* (*paṭala* 48), and refers to a practice where the *sādhaka* digs a hole (*gartā*) and fills it with the five products of a cow (*pañcagavya*) (i.e., cow urine, cow dung, milk, purified ghee, and cow flesh), sexual fluids (*picu*), wine (*madya*), bits of sinews and bile (*snāyupitta*), and human flesh. He covers the hole with a cow’s hide or elephant’s skin, assumes the eight *mudrās*, salutes Bhairava, makes boisterous laughter (*aṭṭahāsa*) and the howl of a jackal (*śivārava*), plays a bell (*ghaṇṭā*) and drum (*ḍamaru*), and waves about a tail-feather (*piñcchakam*). He then enters the hole and meditates (*vicintayet*) on the powerful Goddess, Aghorī, and repeats (*jaṇet*) the *vidyā* (*[OM] HŪM CAṆḌE KĀPĀLINI SVĀHĀ*; see Sanderson 1988: 672). *Siddhis*, such as *mantrasiddhi*, arise progressively over a period of seven days, and on the eighth day he sees the shadow of Aghorī. Being pleased at his practice, she grants him a boon and on the ninth day she appears to him in her thousandfold splendor: “A great, terrible sound arises in the hole; a sweet breeze blows, a shower of flowers all around. The goddess Aghorī herself appears, surrounded by spirits of deformed visage; she speaks to the *sādhaka* directly: ‘you are dear to the Mother goddesses; you alone are the greatest of *sādhakas*; oh child, oh child, great hero, Indra among *sādhakas*, of great penance, choose a boon, Rudra; you are a Siddha, without a doubt.’ He then joins the Seven Mothers as their eighth member.” The chapter concludes that the brave *sādhaka* who knows the tantras and is fully endowed with devotion for the Guru accomplishes this *haṭhasādhana* by merely learning it. “Not by *japa*, not by sacrifice, not by ascetic observance nor *niyama* (*vrataniyama*); [rather.] having learned the tantra, one should accomplish the supreme *haṭhasādhana*.” Both quotations are translations by Shaman Hatley (p.c. 6/11/09 and 26/8/11).

94. *Haṭhapāka* (forceful combustion) is described by Abhinavagupta in his *Tantrāloka* (3.255–3.265) as one of three ways by which the worldly conditions (*upādhi*) of creation, existence, and destruction are transcended. The conditions are transcended either when they become invisible (*anullāsa*) or when they cease (*praśama*). Their cessation occurs either by tranquility (*śānti*) or by *haṭhapāka*. Thus, the three ways are *anullāsa*, *śānti*, and *haṭhapāka* (*Tantrāloka* 3.259b–3.260b). In contrasting tranquility (*śānti*) with *haṭhapāka*, the commentator, Jayaratha, describes tranquility as a “process of pleasant combustion” (*madhurapākakrama*). When the guru has been propitiated, the “tranquil” methods of initiation (*dikṣāsādhana*) and devotion to a religious practice (*anusṭhānaniṣṭhatā*) will bring about transcendence (*atyaya*) at the time of death. However, *haṭhapāka* is a sudden and violent process that burns up all things (*bhāva*) in the fire of intelligence. It destroys duality and is likened by Abhinavagupta to the enjoyment (*rasa*) of devouring enough (*alaṅgrāsa*). The commentator notes that *haṭhapāka* is a forceful action (*balātkāreṇa*) that transgresses the normal order (*kramavyatikramarūpa*) and, as noted earlier, this connotation of *haṭha* is implicit in Haṭhayoga’s effect of raising the downward-moving breath (*apāna*) and the normally dormant *Kuṇḍalinī*.

95. *Haṭhamelaka* refers to a “violent” meeting with Goddesses called Yoginīs and is sometimes contrasted with an agreeable gathering (*priyamelaka*). It is found in early Tantras such as the *Brahmayāmāla* and the *Tantrasadbhāva*, but also in later works such as Abhinavagupta’s *Tantrāloka*. On the distinction between *haṭhamelaka* and *priyamelaka*, Shaman Hatley has observed, “(it) is related to the variety of beings with whom the encounter is sought, and the means of their propitiation: Tantrasadbhāva (chapter 16) associates *haṭhamelaka* with dangerous *śākinīs*, and the Picumata/brahmayāmāla (chapter 99) with *dākinīs*, who are placed in contrast with ‘pure’ (*suddhā*) yoginīs (Picumata/brahmayāmāla (H) 99.10)” (Hatley, forthcoming, ‘priyamelaka,’ in *Tāntrikābhidhānakośa*).

that the term *haṭhayoga* is so rare in the Śaiva tantras suggests that the name has its origins elsewhere, but it is also possible that Śaiva Yogins such as Svātmārāma adopted the name because they were aware of an early Śaiva source that is now lost. Though the earliest known references to *haṭhayoga* appear to be in the Buddhist tantras, one must bear in mind that its role in them is a secondary one, because its practice was recommended when other techniques had failed.<sup>96</sup> This would suggest that the tantric Buddhists also appropriated the name and the practice from an earlier source.

#### THE EMERGENCE OF HAṬHAYOGA IN VEDĀNTIC SOURCES

Apart from providing some clues about the basic features of Haṭhayoga before the time of the Haṭha texts, the aforementioned Buddhist tantras indicate that Haṭhayoga may have been an ancillary or preliminary practice before it became a tradition of Yoga in its own right. As I will now discuss, this seems also to be the case in some Vedāntic sources as well as several early Haṭha texts, which prescribe Haṭhayoga for a second-rate student, so to speak, who is unable to practice an advanced Yoga. Yet, just like the Buddhist tantras, these Vedāntic texts do not clearly define Haṭhayoga, though the comments of the fourteenth-century Vedāntin, Vidyāraṇya, suggest that he understood it to be Pātañjalayoga.

In its subordinate role Haṭhayoga was most often overshadowed by Rājayoga. A good example of this is the medieval Vedāntic text called the *Aparokṣānubhūti*, which has been attributed to Ādiśaṅkarācārya.<sup>97</sup> It is unlikely that this text dates back to the eighth century,<sup>98</sup> but it would predate the fourteenth century if the “Vidyāraṇya” who wrote a commentary on it called the *Dīpikā* is the same Vidyāraṇya who wrote the *Jīvanmuktiviveka*.<sup>99</sup> The *Aparokṣānubhūti* (102–3) presents a system of Rājayoga with fifteen auxiliaries (*tripañcāṅga*), which include the eight of Patañjali’s Yoga and others, such as *mūlabandha*, *drksthiti*, and so on. The final two verses of the *Aparokṣānubhūti* state that Rājayoga is for students who are devoted to the Guru and Deities and have a perfected mind (*paripakvaṃ manaḥ*), whereas Rājayoga should be combined with Haṭhayoga in cases where students have only partially extinguished their “defects” (*kīñcitpakvakaṣāya*).<sup>100</sup>

The *Aparokṣānubhūti*’s explanations of its auxiliaries have little in common with their meaning in either Pātañjalayoga or any medieval Yoga text. Though the *Dīpikā* does not pro-

96. This is the case for the *Guhyasamājantra* and the *Kālacakrantra* and its commentaries.

97. For a discussion of the authorship of the *Aparokṣānubhūti*, see Bouy 1994: 62–63.

98. Its system of Rājayoga with fifteen auxiliaries does not appear elsewhere in Śaṅkara’s commentaries on the principal Upaniṣads, and as K. S. Arjunwadkar (2006: Introduction) has noted, the occurrence of the word *upanetra* in verse 81 suggests that the *Aparokṣānubhūti* was written sometime after lenses or magnifying glasses became available in India. The context of *upanetra* in the text makes it clear that the meaning is some sort of magnifying lens and further research is needed to determine when such lenses were introduced to India. I have yet to find the word *upanetra* in any Sanskrit literature prior to the sixteenth century, nor the words *upalocana* and *upacakṣus*. P. K. Gode (1947: 32–46) refers to a Sanskrit work by Somanāthakavi called the *Vyāsayogīcarita* (the life of Vyāsarāya, dated to the fifteenth or sixteenth century), which he says contains a reference to spectacles (*upalocanagolaka*), but I have not been able to consult this work to verify it. On the basis of this reference, Gode claims that spectacles were introduced in India by the Portuguese in the fifteenth century. If the terminus ad quem of the *Aparokṣānubhūti* is the fourteenth century (i.e., Vidyāraṇya’s *Dīpikā*), then it appears that at the very least hand-held lenses were being used in India before the fifteenth century.

99. The *Jīvanmuktiviveka* has been dated at 1380 CE (see Gooding 2002: 1).

100. It is possible that the reference to Haṭhayoga was appended to the original text at a later time, because Haṭhayoga is mentioned only in the final two verses and is nowhere defined (I wish to thank Peter Thomi for suggesting this to me, p.c. 6/11/09). However, Vidyāraṇya’s commentary includes these verses, so they could predate the fourteenth century.

vide details on Haṭhayoga, it explains the difference between Rājayoga and Haṭhayoga. It calls Rājayoga the Yoga of Vedānta, which is independent of Pātañjalayoga,<sup>101</sup> while Haṭhayoga is the celebrated Aṣṭāṅgayoga taught by Patañjali.<sup>102</sup> The definition of Haṭhayoga as Pātañjalayoga may be peculiar to Vidyāraṇya's work, and further research is needed to determine the prevalence of this view in medieval Vedāntic literature.<sup>103</sup> In his *Jīvanmuktiviveka* he defines Haṭhayoga as the Yoga of "man-made effort," which includes practices such as *prāṇāyāma* and *pratyāhāra*. Since Vidyāraṇya quotes Patañjali's *Yogasūtras* when discussing *prāṇāyāma* and *pratyāhāra* elsewhere, it may be inferred that he conflated Pātañjalayoga with the term *haṭhayoga*.<sup>104</sup>

Taking the *Aparokṣānubhūti*'s subordination of Haṭhayoga to Rājayoga one step further, Vidyāraṇya gives an elaborate explanation as to why gentle yoga (*mṛduyoga*) is to be preferred to Haṭhayoga.<sup>105</sup> Throughout his *Jīvanmuktiviveka* he quotes the *Laghuyogavāsiṣṭha*, so he was obviously aware of that text's dim view of Haṭhayoga. As in the case of the *Guhyasamājatantra* and the *Aparokṣānubhūti*, Haṭhayoga is mentioned but not defined in the *Laghuyogavāsiṣṭha* (5.6.86/92).<sup>106</sup> There is no evidence in the text to indicate the type of

101. . . . *pātañjalābhimatayoganirapekṣo 'yaṃ vedāntābhīhito yogah . . . (Dīpikā 144)* "This [Rāja]yoga is declared in the Upaniṣads [and] is independent of the Yoga supposed [to be that] of Patañjali."

102. . . . *teṣāṃ haṭhayogena pātañjaloktena prasiddhenāṣṭāṅgayogena saṃyuto 'yaṃ vedāntokto yoga iti | śeṣaṃ spaṣṭam | (Dīpikā 143)*. "This [Rāja]yoga which is taught in the Upaniṣads [should be] accompanied by the celebrated Aṣṭāṅgayoga, taught as that of Patañjali, [that is to say,] Haṭhayoga, for those [whose defects are only partially extinguished]. The rest [of the verse] is clear."

103. In light of Vidyāraṇya's commentary on the *Aparokṣānubhūti*, Kokaje and Gharote (1981: 200) go so far as to say, ". . . the fact that until 1350 A.D. Patañjali's Aṣṭāṅgayoga was called Haṭhayoga becomes clear." Apart from Vidyāraṇya's work, I have not found an instance where the term *haṭhayoga* refers to Pātañjalayoga in any Yoga text written before the *Haṭhapradīpikā*. There is a reference to a Haṭhayoga with eight auxiliaries in the *Śārṅgadharaṣṭhānī* (4420–25), which was mastered by Mārkaṇḍeya and others (*mārkaṇḍeyādisādhitah*). However, the same text also describes another tradition of Yoga with six auxiliaries, mastered by Gorakṣa and others (4372–4419), so the *Śārṅgadharaṣṭhānī* confirms that Haṭhayoga was not solely based on the Aṣṭāṅgayoga format in the fourteenth century. The Aṣṭāṅgayoga in the *Dattātreyayogaśāstra* is related to but also distinguished from Haṭhayoga. Nonetheless, in medieval yoga texts the Aṣṭāṅgayoga format cannot be considered synonymous with Pātañjalayoga because the auxiliaries are often defined differently, in many cases using terminology from tantric Yoga (for examples, see n. 146). Aṣṭāṅgayoga had been used widely and reinterpreted by the time of the twelfth century in Śaiva (e.g., *Netratantra* 8.9–20) and Vaiṣṇava (e.g., *Ahīrbudhnyasaṃhitā* 31.16–47) tantras, Jain treatises (e.g., Hemacandra's *Yogaśāstra*), and purāṇas (e.g., *Agnipurāṇa* chaps. 371–75, *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* 3.28.1–38). Systems of Haṭhayoga with eight auxiliaries that were in existence before 1350 CE are more likely (on the grounds of terminology and content) to have derived from tantric sources (which may certainly have been influenced by Pātañjalayoga) rather than directly from Pātañjalayoga.

104. In the *Jīvanmuktiviveka* (1.3.25–27) Vidyāraṇya uses the term *haṭhayoga* when commenting on verses of the *Laghuyogavāsiṣṭha* (2.1.11/12) that distinguish two ways of quietening the mind: acts of appeasing (*sāntvana*) as opposed to those of "man-made" effort (*pauruṣaḥ prayatnaḥ*). He defines an act of man-made effort as forceful yoga (*haṭhayoga*).

105. Vidyāraṇya favors *mṛduyoga* because it works quickly, whereas Haṭhayoga works gradually. "Likewise, there are two ways to still the mind: by perceiving enemies, friends, etc., with equanimity and happiness, and by personal effort such as breath control and withdrawal of the senses. One will quickly coax the mind by the first way, which is gentle (mṛdu) yoga; one would not coax the mind quickly by the second way, forceful (haṭha) yoga, but only gradually" (tr. Gooding 2002: 87) (*tathā śatrumitrādisamatvasukhabodhanam prāṇāyāmapratyāhārādīpuruṣaḥ aprayatnaś cety etau dvau cittasāntyupāyau | tatrādyena mṛduyogena śīghram lālayet | dvitīyena haṭhayogena drāg iti na lālayet, kiṃ tu śanaiḥ śanaiḥ [Jīvanmuktiviveka 1.3.27]*). The purpose of the distinction between *mṛduyoga* and *haṭhayoga* appears to be to elevate the efficacy of traditional Vedāntic practices over that of Yoga techniques.

106. In the *Brhadhyogavāsiṣṭha* these verses are found at 5.54.9/16. Prof. Jürgen Hanneder has informed me that these verses appear in the *Mokṣopāya* (p.c. Mokṣopāya Project 2.11.2011), so that this occurrence of the term *haṭhayoga* can be dated to the tenth century (see Hanneder 2005: 14–17). The *Laghuyogavāsiṣṭha*, which can be considered a Vedāntic reworking of the *Mokṣopāya*, was extensively quoted in Vidyāraṇya's *Jīvanmuktiviveka*. I

“forceful action” being referred to, though it is important to note that some commentators, such as Ātmasukha in his *Vāsiṣṭhacandrikā* (5.6.86/92), have interpreted it as Haṭhayoga. Therefore, the *Laghuyogavāsiṣṭha* may be the earliest instance where the term *haṭhayoga* took on the negative connotation of being a cause of suffering (*duḥkhada*).<sup>107</sup>

#### THE TWO MEANINGS OF RĀJAYOGA

However, Vidyāraṇya’s and the *Laghuyogavāsiṣṭha*’s criticism of Haṭhayoga was somewhat tame compared to that made by a tradition of Rājayoga that had its roots in tantric Śaivism and was quite different from the Rājayoga of the *Aparokṣānubhūti*. It emerged before the twelfth century in a text called the *Amanaskayoga*,<sup>108</sup> and was vehemently opposed to the techniques of Haṭhayoga, while promoting itself as a simple and effortless way to liberation while living (*jīvanmukti*).

It is worth digressing here to point out that in the history of medieval Yoga the term *rājayoga* rose to prominence at approximately the same time as *haṭhayoga* (i.e., twelfth to fifteenth century), in texts such as the *Aparokṣānubhūti*, the *Amanaskayoga*, the *Dattātreyayogaśāstra*, the *Amarauḥaprabodha*, the *Śārṅgadharaḥpaddhati*, the *Yogabīja*, and the *Haṭhapradīpikā*.<sup>109</sup> In all of these texts *rājayoga* and *haṭhayoga* appear together,<sup>110</sup> and *rājayoga* occurs in two different contexts. In the first, Rājayoga is the name of a Yoga that is distinct from Mantra, Laya, and Haṭhayoga in texts such as the *Dattātreyayogaśāstra* (9), *Yogabīja* (143), and *Amarauḥaprabodha* (3). In this context Rājayoga is the practice of *samādhi*<sup>111</sup> whereas the other three Yogas are characterized by the practice of their own techniques (e.g., Mantrayoga by *mantras*, Layayoga by its *saṅketas*,<sup>112</sup> and Haṭhayoga by

---

wish to thank Peter Thomé, James Mallinson, and Jürgen Hanneder for providing me with references to *haṭhayoga* in the *Laghuyogavāsiṣṭha*.

107. This passage of the *Laghuyogavāsiṣṭha* (i.e., 5.6.80–141) explains how a sage (*muni*) should chant *om* (*praṇava*) in order to achieve the traditional types of *prāṇāyāma* (i.e., *recaka*, *pūraka*, and *kumbhaka*), which, according to the following verses, cannot be achieved through force (*haṭhāt*): “In the first stage of [reciting the syllable] *om*, this state [of *recaka* in which *prāṇa* has been expelled from the body] arose at will [and] not through [any] force at all. For Haṭhayoga causes suffering. . . . In the next stage of [reciting the syllable] *om*, this state [of *kumbhaka* in which the breath has ceased] arose at will [and] not through [any] force at all. For Haṭhayoga causes suffering” (*yāvadiccham avasthaiṣā praṇavaprathamakrame | babhūva na haṭhād eva haṭhayogo hi duḥkhadaḥ* ||86|| . . . || *yāvadiccham avasthaiṣā praṇavasyāpare krame | babhūva na haṭhād eva haṭhayogo hi duḥkhadaḥ* ||92|| **86a** *yāvadiccham*] *Vāsiṣṭhacandrikā*: *yāvadītham* ed. **86b**] *praṇavaprathamakrame* emendation: *praṇavaprathamakrame* ed. **92a** *yāvadiccham*] *Vāsiṣṭhacandrikā*: *yāvadītham* ed. [*Laghuyogavāsiṣṭha* 5.6.86 and 92]). It is possible that in the *Laghuyogavāsiṣṭha* *haṭhayoga* refers to Pātañjalayoga (as in the case of Vidyāraṇya’s *Dīpikā*). However, the *Vāsiṣṭhacandrikā* implicitly defines the term as Haṭhayoga (i.e., “restraining the mind by restraining the breath forcefully [balāt], through *mahāmudrā*, etc.”). This commentary also interprets a later instance of *haṭhāt* (6.7.4) as Haṭhayoga, but again there is no evidence for this in the root text, and the verse may be referring to a sage (*muni*) who conquers his senses through any Yoga technique considered to be forceful.

108. This text is referred to as the *Amanaska* in the majority of colophons of the seventy-five available manuscripts. However, I refer to it as the *Amanaskayoga* because the most recent published editions do so (i.e., Yognāth Swāmī 1967 and Tara Michael 1986).

109. The term *rājayoga* also appears in late Haṭha texts, such as the *Gheraṇḍasaṃhitā*, *Śivasamhitā*, *Haṭharatnāvalī*, *Haṭhatattvakaumudī*, and several Yoga Upaniṣads.

110. The exception is the *Amanaskayoga*, which does not mention Haṭhayoga by name, but refers to Haṭhayogic practices such as *prāṇāyāma*, *mudrās*, *bandhas*, etc.

111. In defining the four Yogas, the *Amarauḥaprabodha* (4gh–5ab) clearly defines Rājayoga as *samādhi*: “Rājayoga is that [Yoga] that is devoid of activity of mind. Rājayoga is sometimes divided into herbal and spiritual” (*yaś cittavṛttirahitaḥ sa tu rājayogaḥ* ||4gh|| *auśadho ’dhyātmikaś ceti rājayogo dvidhā kvacit* ||5abl| **5a** *auśadho ’dhyātmikaś* ] emendation: *ośadhyo ’dhyātmikaś* ed.).

112. E.g., *layayogaś cittalayaḥ saṅketaiḥ tu prajāyate* (*Dattātreyayogaśāstra* 14ab) “Layayoga, which is the absorption (*laya*) of mind, arises through [the practice of its] methods.” The term *saṅketa* literally means ‘convention’ but in this context it is better understood as the methods specific to Layayoga.



its auxiliaries). The Yoga of the *Amanaskayoga*, which is based on the practice of *amanaska* (i.e., *samādhi*), is called Rājayoga because it is the “king (*rāja*) of all Yogas” and because it enables a person to attain the imperishable Supreme Self, who is the “illustrious king” (*rājānaṃ dīpyamānam*).<sup>113</sup> In the second context, *rājayoga* is simply a synonym (*ekavācaka*) for *samādhi*, as explicitly stated in the *Haṭhapradīpikā*.<sup>114</sup> Rather than a type of Yoga, it refers to a state (*pada*)<sup>115</sup> that is non-dual<sup>116</sup> and often associated with the fourth stage of Yoga called *niṣpatti*.<sup>117</sup> The fact that many Yoga texts use the term *rājayoga* both as a name for a type of Yoga and as a synonym for *samādhi* is not a contradiction, because as a type of Yoga it basically refers to the practice of *samādhi*.<sup>118</sup> The conflation of Rājayoga with Pātañjalayoga is a much more recent phenomenon, which probably derives from authors of late medieval Yoga compilations and commentators on the *Yogasūtras* who equated Patañjali’s *asamprajñātasamādhi* with Rājayoga. A good example of this is found in Śivānanda’s *Yogacintāmaṇi* (ms. 9784, folio 6):

In [this state], nothing at all is cognized. Thus it is *asamprajñātasamādhi*. It is [also] called *nirbīja*, *nirvikalpa*, *nirālamba*, and Rājayoga (*na tatra kiṃcid samprajñāyata ity asamprajñātaḥ samādhiḥ | ayaṃ ca nirbīja iti nirvikalpa iti nirālamba iti rājayoga iti cocyate*).

Both Vijñānabhikṣu<sup>119</sup> and Nārāyaṇatīrtha<sup>120</sup> appear to understand Rājayoga as *samādhi* or the internal auxiliaries (*aṅga*) as opposed to the external ones. The dividing of Pātañjalayoga into Haṭha and Rājayoga carried on into the nineteenth century. For example, in the introduction of his book, *Rāja Yoga or the Practical Metaphysics of the Vedānta*, Dvivedi (1885: 43)

113. *rājatvāt sarvayogānāṃ rājayoga iti smṛtaḥ | rājānaṃ dīpyamānaṃ taṃ paramātmānam avyayaṃ | dehināṃ prāpayed yas tu rājayogaḥ sa ucyate (Amanaskayoga 2.4).*

114. *rājayogaḥ samādhiś ca unmaṇī . . . cety ekavācakāḥ (Haṭhapradīpikā 4.3–4).*

115. E.g., *rājayogaṃ padaṃ prāpya (Amaraughaprabodha 71c), rājayogapadaṃ vrajet (Haṭhapradīpikā 2.77d).*

116. *caturtho rājayogaś ca dvidhābhavavivarjitaḥ (Amaraughaprabodha 3cd)* “And the fourth [Yoga] is Rājayoga which is free from the state of duality.”

117. *Dattātreyayogaśāstra 146–47, Amaraughaprabodha 52–53, Haṭhapradīpikā 4.76–77.*

118. The exception to this is the *Aparokṣānubhūti*. In the *Amanaskayoga*, Rājayoga is used in both contexts; however, as a type of Yoga it connotes a system of Yoga that is characterized by more than just the practice of *samādhi* (i.e., *sāmbhaviṃśā*, transcending the *tattvas*, honoring the guru, etc.).

119. The reference to *rājayoga* in Vijñānabhikṣu’s *Yogasārasaṅgraha* (90/106), which is generally dated to the sixteenth century, probably does not refer to Pātañjalayoga as a whole, but to *samādhi*, or perhaps *saṃyama* (i.e., the combined practice of *dhāraṇā*, *dhyāna*, and *samādhi*). In commenting on the *sūtras* on *āsana* (i.e., 2.46–49) he refrains from elaborating on the postures because the topic (*prakaraṇa*) at hand is Rājayoga (*āsanasya prapañcas tv atra rājayogaprakaraṇatvān na kriyate*). In other words, his concern is not with the physical practices described in Haṭhayoga texts, but *samādhi* and *saṃyama*. The second reference to Rājayoga is in a quoted passage from the *Nārāyaṇaharibhaktisudhodaya*, which Vijñānabhikṣu interprets as the practice of Patañjali’s internal auxiliaries (i.e., *pratyāhāra*, *dhāraṇā*, *dhyāna*, and *samādhi*) and *saṃyama* (*pratyāhāraṃ uktvā saṃyamaparakāram āha*). The external auxiliaries (i.e., *yāma*, *niyama*, *āsana*, and *prāṇāyāma*) are absent in Nārada’s account of Rājayoga.

120. In the *Yogasiddhāntacandrikā* Nārāyaṇatīrtha, who has been dated to the seventeenth century (Endo 1993: 54–56), equated the auxiliaries of Patañjali’s Aṣṭāṅgayoga with different types of medieval Yogas (including Laya, Haṭha, Mantrayoga). In his commentary on *sūtra* 1.20, Rājayoga is equated with *asamprajñātasamādhi*: “The meaning [of the *sūtra* is], ‘Because of [wisdom (*tato*)] and supreme detachment (*paravairāgya*), *asamprajñātasamādhi* arises for those other men who are different from the aforementioned [Yogins because they] are desirous of liberation.’ This alone is called Rājayoga. It has been said in the tradition, ‘in this regard, seedless *samādhi* is declared to be Rājayoga, because the abundant Self, which is full of pure consciousness, shines (*rājate*) like a lamp.’” (*tato paravairāgyād asamprajñāta itaresāṃ pūrvavilakṣānāṃ manuṣyānāṃ mumukṣūṇāṃ bhavātīty arthaḥ | ayaṃ eva ca rājayoga ity ucyate | tad uktaṃ smṛtau—samādhis tatra nirbījo rājayogaḥ prakīrtitaḥ | dīpavad rājate yasmād ātmā saccinmayāḥ prabhur iti*). Nārāyaṇatīrtha (1.34) quotes and follows the lexical definition of Haṭhayoga in the *Yogabīja* (see n. 52), and thus equates it with *prāṇāyāma*.

makes the following comment on Pātāñjalayoga: “This Yoga has been viewed by later writers from two different stand-points: and this circumstance has led to its division into Hatha (physical) and Raja (mental) Yoga . . .”<sup>121</sup>

#### RĀJAYOGA’S SUPERIORITY OVER HAṬHAYOGA

It is in the context of Rājayoga as a system of Yoga that its superiority over Haṭhayoga is most forthrightly asserted, particularly in those texts that present Rājayoga as a complete system in itself. The *Aparokṣānubhūti* focuses solely on Rājayoga, and Haṭhayoga is merely an unexplained adjunct to it (hence Vidyāraṇya’s observation that Rājayoga is “independent” of Haṭhayoga). In the *Amanaskayoga* the techniques of Haṭhayoga are rejected because the practice of *samādhi* alone is considered enough for liberation. In fact, since mind and breath are dependent on one another<sup>122</sup> and since the practice of *sāmbhavīmudrā* induces the no-mind state (i.e., *amanaskalsamādhi*), Haṭhayoga is considered superfluous in the *Amanaskayoga* because there is no need to stop the breath in order to stop the mind when the no-mind state has already been achieved.<sup>123</sup> Not only does the *Amanaskayoga* consider the techniques of Haṭhayoga superfluous; it attacks the belief that Yoga should require control and effort.<sup>124</sup> According to this approach of Rājayoga, all the Yogin need do is honor the Guru, sit comfortably, and remain very still (*sunīscala*), with the gaze directed at an empty space about an arm’s length in front.<sup>125</sup> The body is kept relaxed (*śīthila*)<sup>126</sup> and the mind allowed to wander wherever it will.<sup>127</sup> Eventually, the gaze becomes internal and the mind dissolves by itself.

121. As Elizabeth de Michelis (2004: 178–80) has noted, the early Theosophists may have been the first to refer to Pātāñjalayoga as Rājayoga and their mistake was popularized by Vivekānanda’s book *Rājayoga*.

122. *yāvan manas tatra marutpravṛttir yāvan maruḥ cāpi manaḥpravṛtṭiḥ || tatraikanāśād aparasya nāśa ekapravṛtṭer aparapravṛtṭiḥ | adhvastayoś cendriyavargabuddhir vidhvastayor mokṣapadasya siddhiḥ (Amanaskayoga 2.27cd–28)* “Therefore, as long as there is mind there is activity of breath, and as long as there is breath there is activity of mind. In that case, when one disappears, the other disappears and when one is active, the other is active. And when both are not dispersed, there is awareness of all the sense faculties. When both are dispersed, there is the attainment of the state of liberation.”

123. *amanaske ‘pi sañjāte cittādivilayo bhavet || cittādivilaye jāte pavanasya layo bhavet (Amanaskayoga 1.21cd–22ab)* “When the no-mind [state] has arisen, dissolution of thinking [*ahaṅkāra*, and *buddhi*] occurs. When dissolution of thinking [*ahaṅkāra* and *buddhi*] has arisen, the breath dissolves.”

124. E.g., *tatrāpy asādhyāḥ pavanasya nāśaḥ ṣaḍaṅgayogādiniṣevanena | manovināśas tu guruprasādān nimeṣamātreṇa susādhyā eva (Amanaskayoga 2.29)* “Therefore, [since the breath and mind depend on one another], the disappearance of the breath cannot be mastered by the practice of the Yoga with six auxiliaries and the like [because the mind remains active]. However, the complete disappearance of the mind [and, thereby, the breath] can easily be mastered in a mere instant as a result of the guru’s favor.” *akalaṃ samanaskaṃ ca sāyāsaṃ ca sadā tyaja | niṣkalaṃ nirmanaskaṃ ca nirāyāsaṃ sadā bhaja (Amanaskayoga 2.26)* “Always avoid the [Yoga] with form, mind, and effort. Always adopt the [Yoga] with no form, no mind, and no effort.” *nivāryamaṇaṃ yatnena dhartuṃ yaṃ naiva śakyate | sa tiṣṭhati kṣaṇenaiva mārutaḥ sahajodayāt (Amanaskayoga 2.73)* “The breath, which cannot be held [for long however] effortfully it is being restrained, instantly remains [held (i.e., ceases)] because of the arising of the natural [no-mind] state.”

125. *vivikte vijane deṣe pavitre ‘tīmanohare | samāsane sukhāsīnaḥ paścāt kiṃcit samāśritaḥ || sukhasthāpītasarvāṅgaḥ susthirātmā sunīscalaḥ | bāhudaṇḍapramāṇena kṛtadrṣṭiḥ samabhyaset (Amanaskayoga 2.49–50)* “In an isolated, solitary, clean, and very beautiful place [the Yogin] sits comfortably on a level seat and is supported a little from behind. His limbs are placed comfortably and he [remains] very steady and very still. Having fixed his gaze [on an empty space] the measure of an arm’s length [in front], he should practice [thus].”

126. *śīthilikṛtasarvāṅga ā nakhāgraśikhāgrataḥ | sabāhyābhyantare sarvacintāceṣṭāvivarjitāḥ (Amanaskayoga 2.51)* “[The Yogin] whose whole body is held relaxed, [even] up to the tip of his toenails and the tuft of hair on the crown of his head, is free from all thoughts and movement, both externally and internally.”

127. *yatra yatra mano yāti na nivāryaṃ tatas tataḥ | avāritaṃ kṣayam yāti vāryamaṇaṃ tu vardhate (Amanaskayoga 2.71)*. “Wherever the mind goes, it is not to be prevented [going] from there. Unobstructed, it comes to an

Both the *Aparokṣānubhūti* and the *Jīvanmuktiviveka* left the door slightly open for Haṭhayoga, whereas the *Amanaskayoga* closed it firmly. The extent to which the *Amanaskayoga* was opposed to Haṭhayoga can be demonstrated by comparing the following two verses. The first verse from the *Laghuyogavāsiṣṭha* was quoted in the *Jīvanmuktiviveka* as a statement referring to Haṭhayoga:

As a vicious elephant in rut cannot be controlled without a goad, just so the mind cannot be controlled without using a method [of restraint] (*aṅkuṣena vinā matto yathā duṣṭam ataṅgajāḥ | vijetum śakyate naiva tathā yuktā vinā manaḥ*).<sup>128</sup>

However, in the *Amanaskayoga* (2.72):

Just as an elephant without a goad, having obtained its desires, stops, so the mind, unobstructed, dissolves by itself (*yathā niraṅkuṣo hastī kāmān prāpya nivartate | avāritaṃ manas tadvat svayam eva vilīyate*).

The notion that Rājayoga was effortless, whereas Haṭhayoga required exertion continued for many centuries after the *Amanaskayoga*, and perhaps found its most succinct expression in the *Rājayogabhāṣya*:

The [Haṭha] Yogas spoken of earlier are performed with exertion of the body, (whereas) this (Rājayoga) effortlessly yields the goal of human life, in the form of liberation (*pūrvoktā yogā dehaprayāsakārāḥ | ayaṃ tu nirāyāsenā mokṣarūpapuruṣārthapradāḥ*).<sup>129</sup>

In light of Haṭhayoga's background as an ancillary practice, this view would have been an effective weapon in the hands of those who wished to promote Rājayoga over Haṭhayoga, and it was probably due to the rhetoric of Rājayoga's effortless efficacy that Haṭhayoga was dismissed as the Yoga of forceful exertion by those outside the Haṭhayoga tradition.

#### THE HAṬHA-RĀJA RELATIONSHIP IN THE EARLY HAṬHA CORPUS

In spite of such rivalry, Haṭha and Rājayoga were married, so to speak, in a fourfold system of Yoga. Four texts of the early Haṭhayoga corpus used in this study preserve this system, which consisted of Mantra, Laya, Haṭha, and Rājayoga. Three of these established a clear hierarchy among the four Yogas, in which Rājayoga is above the others. Perhaps the earliest, the *Dattātreya yogaśāstra*, states that Rājayoga is the best of these Yogas<sup>130</sup> and, after describing the various techniques of Haṭhayoga, then states that from practicing those techniques, Rājayoga arises and certainly not otherwise.<sup>131</sup> In the *Amaraughaprabodha* Laya, Mantra, and Haṭhayoga are taught for the sole purpose of attaining Rājayoga,<sup>132</sup> and

---

end. However, being impeded, it increases." *durnivāryaṃ manas tāvad yāvat tattvaṃ na vindati | vidite tu pare tattve mano naustambhakākavat* (*Amanaskayoga* 2.74) "As long as the highest reality is not known, the mind is unrestrainable. When the highest reality is known, however, the mind becomes [still] like a crow [perched] on the mast of a ship [moving on the ocean]."

128. *Jīvanmuktiviveka* (3.1.18), quoting the *Laghuyogavāsiṣṭha* (5.10.127). Tr. Gooding (2002: 184).

129. This is in the opening paragraph of the *Rājayogabhāṣya*. I am assuming that *pūrvoktā yogāḥ* refers back to the characteristics of Haṭhayoga (*haṭhayogalakṣaṇa*) mentioned at the beginning of the same paragraph. It is strange that the plural (i.e., *yogāḥ*) is used and perhaps should be emended to the singular (along with the rest of the sentence).

130. *mantrayogo layaś caiva haṭhayogas tathaiva ca | rajayogaś caturthaḥ syād yogānām uttamas tu saḥ* (*Dattātreya yogaśāstra* 9) "There is Mantrayoga, Laya, and also Haṭhayoga. Rājayoga is the fourth and it is the best of [these] Yogas."

131. *tato bhaved rājayogo nānyathā bhavati dhruvam* ||145cd|| **145d** *nānyathā* ] conjecture : *nāntarā* ed. (*Dattātreya yogaśāstra* 145cd).

132. *layamantrahaṭhāḥ proktā rājayogāya kevalam* (*Amaraughaprabodha* 73cd).

in the *Yogabija* the four Yogas are listed in sequential order of practice.<sup>133</sup> Therefore, all three of these texts assert both the superiority of Rāja over Haṭhayoga and the dependence of Rājayoga on the other three. As to why these four Yogas were brought together in this hierarchy, one might infer from the *Dattātreyaśāstra* (9–10) that they are connected to the four states (*avasthā*) of Yoga (*ārambha*, *ghaṭa*, *paricaya*, and *niṣpatti*), but the relationship among them is not clear. Rājayoga is connected with the fourth state, *niṣpatti*;<sup>134</sup> however, it is not stated that the first three Yogas are the means to the first three states respectively. It is more likely that the hierarchy of the four Yogas was based on four types of student. This is most clearly attested in the *Amarauḥaprabodha*, which prescribes Mantrayoga for the weak (*mṛdu*) student, Laya for the average (*madhya*), Haṭha for the capable (*adhimātra*), and, presumably, Rāja for the more than capable (*adhimātratarā*).<sup>135</sup>

#### THE ABSORPTION OF RĀJAYOGA INTO HAṬHAYOGA

Svātmārāma can be credited with bringing an end to any rivalry that might have once separated Haṭha and Rājayoga. In his *Haṭhapradīpikā*, he molded Haṭha and Rājayoga into a complete system of Yoga, in which the practice of Haṭhayoga leads to the state of Rājayoga.<sup>136</sup> Indeed, he makes it clear that without the practice of Haṭhayoga, Rājayoga is unattainable, and without the attainment of Rājayoga, Haṭhayoga remains fruitless.<sup>137</sup> By borrowing verses from both Rāja and Haṭhayoga texts, he combined the principal theories and techniques of Rājayoga (in particular, *śāmbhavīmudrā*) with a vast array of Haṭhayogic techniques. As though to heal the past rift between Haṭha and Rājayoga, Svātmārāma included the word *amanaska* as a synonym for *samādhi*<sup>138</sup> and incorporated a number of the

133. *mantra haṭho layo rājayogas tadbhūmikāḥ kramāt* ||143cd|| *eka eva caturdhāyam mahāyogo 'bhidhīyate* ||144ab|| *rājayogas tadbhūmikāḥ* ] Awasthi's ed.: *rājayogāntarbhūmikāḥ* ed. (*Yogabija* 143cd–144ab) “Mantra, Haṭha, Laya, and Rājayoga are the stages of [practice] according to their sequence. This one [Yoga] in four parts is called Mahāyoga.”

134. *Dattātreyaśāstra* 146–47. This is also the case in the *Amarauḥaprabodha* (52–53) and the *Haṭhapradīpikā* (4.76–78). In his *Jyotsnā* (2.76) Brahmananda glosses *niṣpatti* as *rājayogāsiddhi*.

135. *eka evāmarauḥo hi rājayogābhidhānakāḥ | mantrādibhiḥ samāyuktaś caturtho dīyate katham || mṛdumadhyādhimātraś ca adhimātrataras tathā | caturdhā sādhaḥko jñeyas tatsopānam ihocyste || mṛdave dīyate mantrā madhyāya laya ucyste | adhimātre haṭhaṃ dadyād amaraugho maheśvare* (*Amarauḥaprabodha* 17–18, 24) **17c** *mantrādibhiḥ* ] conj. : *mayādibhiḥ* ed. “For only the unique [state] of *Amarauḥa* has the name Rājayoga. How can the fourth [Yoga] along with Mantra, [Laya, and Haṭha] be given [to students]? Weak, average, capable, and more than capable are known as the four types of practitioner (*sādhaḥka*). In this system, it is said to be a ladder to that [state of *Amarauḥa*]. Mantrayoga is given to the weak, Laya to the average, Haṭha to the capable, and *Amarauḥa* (i.e., Rājayoga) [to the more than capable, who is a] Śiva.” Verses 19–23 describe each *sādhaḥka* in detail. Similar verses, including the hierarchy of four Yogas, are in the *Śivasamhitā* (5.12–27). The *Dattātreyaśāstra* partially supports this by stating that Mantrayoga is for the weak (*mṛdu*) and lowest (*adhama*) students (12–13), though it does not qualify the students who practice the other three Yogas.

136. *śrīādināthāya namo 'stu yenopadiṣṭā haṭhayogavidyā | vibhrājate pronnatarājayogam āroḍhum icchor adhirohiṇīva* (*Haṭhapradīpikā* 1.1) “Let us salute the honorable Ādināth by whom the science of Haṭhayoga was taught. It manifests as a ladder for one desiring to ascend to the lofty [state of] Rājayoga.” *kevalam rājayogāya haṭhavidyopadiṣyate* (*Haṭhapradīpikā* 1.2cd) “The science of Haṭhayoga has been taught solely for the purpose [of attaining] Rājayoga.” Also see 1.67 and 4.103.

137. *haṭhaṃ vinā rājayogo rājayogaṃ vinā haṭhaḥ | na sidhyati tato yugmam ā niṣpateḥ samabhyaset* (*Haṭhapradīpikā* 2.76) “Without Haṭha, Rājayoga is not accomplished, and without Rāja, Haṭhayoga is not accomplished. Therefore, [the Yogin] should practice both until [the state called] *Niṣpatti* [is attained].” *rājayogam ajānantaḥ kevalam haṭhakarmiṇaḥ | etān abhyāsino manye prayāśaphalavarjīṭān* (*Haṭhapradīpikā* 4.79) “Those who are ignorant of Rājayoga are merely performing Haṭhayoga. I think these practitioners are deprived of the fruits of their exertion.”

138. *rājayogaḥ samādhiś ca . . . amanaskam . . . cety ekavācakāḥ* (*Haṭhapradīpikā* 4.4).

*Amanaskayoga*'s verses on *śāmbhavīmudrā*, *laya*, and the dependence of mind and breath.<sup>139</sup> It is supremely ironic that the *Amanaskayoga*'s verses on mind and breath, which were the basis for its dismissal of Haṭhayoga as superfluous, were used by Svātmārāma in order to justify the practice of *prāṇāyāma*:

When the breath moves, mind moves, and when the breath is still, mind is still. [In order to] obtain the state of motionlessness, the Yogin should restrain the breath. (*cale vāte calaṃ cittaṃ niścale niścalaṃ bhavet | yogī sthāṇutvam āpnoti tato vāyuṃ nirodhayet*) *Haṭhapradīpikā* 2.2.

#### CONCLUDING REMARKS

As one of the four Yogas, Haṭhayoga was distinguished from Mantra, Laya, and Rājayoga by the practice of *āsanas*, *prāṇāyāma*, and one or more of its ten *mudrās*. For example, the *Amaraughaprabodha* provides a succinct definition of Haṭhayoga as the practice of stopping the breath,<sup>140</sup> and it teaches *mahāmudrā*, *mahābandha*, and *mahāvedha*. The *Yogabīja*'s lexical definition of *ha* and *ṭha* is similar to the *Amaraughaprabodha*'s definition of Haṭhayoga as *prāṇāyāma*; however, to speculate that the term *haṭhayoga* may have been synonymous with *prāṇāyāma* overlooks the importance of the ten *mudrās* in distinguishing Haṭhayoga from other practices of *prāṇāyāma*, which can be found in the classical Upaniṣads, Epic literature, Dharmaśāstras, Śaiva and Buddhist tantras, and so on.<sup>141</sup> Indeed, from the time of the *Dattātreyayogaśāstra*, the ten *mudrās* are a defining feature of Haṭhayoga and serve to distinguish it from all other Yogas.

The rise of Haṭhayoga occurred at the end of what might be called a second formative phase in the textual history of Yoga. The first phase, which encompasses the variety of Yogic practices that appear in early Buddhism, the principal Upaniṣads,<sup>142</sup> and the Epic literature,<sup>143</sup> culminated in the *Yogasūtras* of Patañjali. The coherent structure of his text, which integrated philosophy and practice to form a system known as “Yoga” led to Yoga later becoming one of the six schools of Indian philosophy, with its own commentarial tradition. The second formative phase probably has its origins in pre-tantric sects such as the Pāśupatas<sup>144</sup> and grew independently of Patañjali's commentarial tradition (though it was

139. *Amanaskayoga* 2.9–10, 2.27–28 = *Haṭhapradīpikā* 3.35–36, 4.24–25.

140. *yas tu prabhāñjanapidhānarato haṭhaḥ saḥ || pidhāna* ] Conjecture by Alexis Sanderson: *vidhāna* ed. (*Amaraughaprabodha* 4cd). “That which is intent upon stopping the breath is Haṭhayoga.”

141. I have yet to find a description of the practice of *prāṇāyāma* involving the Haṭhayogic *bandhas* and *mudrās* in a text written before the earliest Haṭha texts, which abound with such descriptions. For example, in the original *Goraṅkṣasāntaka* (67) “Breath retention ought to be always done with the three *bandhas*” (*kartavyaḥ kumbhako nityaṃ bandhatrayasamanvitaḥ*). The *Haṭhapradīpikā* affirms that the three *bandhas* are to be used during *prāṇāyāma* (2.45–46). In his *Jyotsnā* (2.7) Brahmānanda supports this: “Breath retention, which is stopping the breath, is accompanied by the *bandhas* such as Jālandhara” (*jālandharādibandapūrvakaṃ prāṇanirodhaḥ kumbhakaḥ*). One might infer from verse 2.7 of the *Haṭhapradīpikā* that *khecārimudrā* was used for manipulating the nostrils in the practice of alternate nostril breathing while the hands held the feet in bound lotus. Also, the first three Haṭhayogic *mudrās* (*mahāmudrā*, *mahābandha*, and *mahāvedha*) combine breath retention with *bandhas* and *āsanas*. (In fact, *mahāmudrā* may have been the first instance of *prāṇāyāma* being performed in a non-seated pose known as *jānuśīrṣāsana* in BKS Iyengar's system [1979: 148].)

142. The well-known examples suffice: the *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad* (ch. 2), the *Kathopaniṣad* (6.11), and the later *Maitrāyaṇyupaniṣad* (6.18, 6.25, etc.).

143. For references in the *Mahābhārata*, see Brockington 2003 and White 2006: 8–10.

144. The most convincing evidence for this is the last ten chapters of the Nepalese recension of the *Skandapurāna*, which describe a *pāśupatayoga*. This text was probably written from the sixth to the seventh century (see Sanderson 2009: 51–52 and nn. 23, 24). The chapters on *pāśupatayoga* mention various *āsana* (*svastika*, *padmaka*, *bhadra*, *siṃha*, and *kacchapa*), a fourfold *prāṇāyāma*, a Yoga with six auxiliaries, as well as some of the terminology of medieval Haṭhayoga, such as moving *vāyu* through *nāḍis*, *kumbhaka*, and some allusions to practices resembling

certainly influenced by Pātañjalayoga). Yoga techniques were incorporated into Hindu and Buddhist tantras, as one among several other means to liberation, which included initiation (*dīkṣā*) and gnosis (*jñāna*), and, in the case of Abhinavagupta, Yoga was subordinate to gnosis (Vasudeva 2004: 237). By the twelfth century Yoga texts had emerged that posited the practice of Yoga as the chief means to liberation, and the practice was accompanied by a radically simplified tantric metaphysics.<sup>145</sup> However, their terminology and practice was closer to tantric Yoga than Pātañjalayoga.<sup>146</sup> Some of these Yoga texts incorporated four kinds of Yoga (Mantra, Laya, Haṭha, and Rāja), which eventually coalesced in the fifteenth-century *Haṭhapradīpikā*.<sup>147</sup>

In compiling the *Haṭhapradīpikā* it is clear that Svātmārāma drew material from many different sources on various systems of Yoga such as Yājñavalkya's and Vaiṣṭha's Aṣṭāṅgayoga, the *Amanaskayoga*'s Rājayoga, the *Vivekamārtaṇḍa*'s Ṣaḍāṅgayoga, Ādināth's *Khecarīvidyā*, the Virūpākṣanātha's *Amṛtasiddhi*, and so on. He assembled it under the name of Haṭhayoga and, judging from the vast number of manuscripts of the *Haṭhapradīpikā*,<sup>148</sup> its numerous commentaries,<sup>149</sup> and the many references to it in late medieval Yoga texts,<sup>150</sup> his Haṭhayoga grew in prominence and eclipsed many of the former Yogas. As a label for the diverse Yoga of the *Haṭhapradīpikā*, Haṭhayoga became a generic term. However, a more specific meaning of the term is seen in the tenth- to eleventh-century Buddhist tantric commentaries, and this meaning is confirmed by an examination of the adverbial uses of the word *haṭha* in the medieval Yoga texts predating the *Haṭhapradīpikā*. Rather than the metaphysical explanation of uniting the sun (*ha*) and moon (*ṭha*), it is more likely that the name Haṭhayoga was inspired by the meaning 'force'. The descriptions of forcefully moving *kuṇḍalinī*, *apāna*, or *bindu* upwards through the central channel suggest that the "force" of Haṭhayoga qualifies the effects of its techniques, rather than the effort required to perform them.

---

the Haṭhayogic *mudrās*, such as fixing the tongue on the palate (*tālau jihvām samādhāya*) and locking the navel (*nābhībandhana*). These descriptions of Yoga demonstrate clear precedents to Haṭhayoga. I wish to thank Peter Bisschop for pointing out these chapters to me and providing his transcription.

145. The *Amanaskayoga* and *Dattātreyaयोगśāstra* are good examples of this.

146. For example, in explaining *prāṇāyāma*, the terminology used in the *Dattātreyaयोगśāstra* is tantric: i.e., *recaka*, *pūraka*, and *kumbhaka* (e.g., 68). Other elements not seen in Pātañjalayoga are the two *kumbhakas*, *sahita* (60) and *kevala* (68), alternate nostril breathing (55–57), and dietary requirements (64–67). Furthermore, Patañjali (3.1) and Vyāsa broadly define *dhāraṇā* as fixing the mind on *cakras*, a light in the head, a part of the body, or an external object. However, in most Haṭhayoga texts (e.g., *Dattātreyaयोगśāstra* 101–10) *dhāraṇā* is the practice of holding *prāṇa* in those parts of the body that correspond to the five elements (*tattva*). This appears to have derived from tantric Yoga (e.g., the *Nayasūtra* of the *Niśvāsātattvasamhitā* 4.115–16).

147. A third formative phase in the history of Yoga could be added to this model, from the sixteenth century onwards, when several important texts appeared (such as Śivānanda's *Yogacintāmaṇi*, Śrīnivāsayogī's *Haṭharatnāvalī*, Bhavadeva's *Yuktabhavadēva*, and various Yoga Upaniṣads), which attempted to integrate Haṭhayoga with traditions such as Pātañjalayoga, tantric Yoga, Advaitavedānta, Āyurveda, and so on. The commentaries of Brahmānanda and Upaniṣadbrahmayogin represent the final outcome of this phase's synthesis.

148. See Kaivalyadhama's *Descriptive Catalogue of Yoga Manuscripts* (2005: 496; serial numbers 813–20). The entry for the *Haṭhapradīpikā*, *Haṭhayogapradīpikā*, etc., is close to the size of Patañjali's *Yogasūtras* and its commentaries.

149. Gharote lists eight. See *Haṭhapradīpikā (Ten Chapters)*, xxviii.

150. See Bouy (1994: 10, 16–17, 35–36, etc.).

BIBLIOGRAPHY  
PRIMARY SOURCES <sup>151</sup>

- Advayavajrasaṅgraha*. Ed. Mahamahopadhyaya Haraprasad Shastri. Baroda: Oriental Institute Baroda, 1927.
- Agnipurāna*. Ed. Rajendralal Mitra. 3 vols. Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1870–1879.
- Ahīrbudhnyasaṃhitā of the Pāñcarātrāgama*. Ed. M. D. Ramanujacharya (under the supervision of F. Otto Schrader). Madras: Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1966.
- Amanaskayoga: A Critical Edition, Translation and Study*. Ed. Jason Birch. Unpub. honors thesis, Sydney Univ., 2005.
- Amarakośa*. Ed. Vāsudev Laxmaṅ Śāstrī Paṅśīkar. Bombay: Pāṇḍurang Jāvājī, 1940.
- Amarauḡhaprabodha* (see Mallik 1954).
- Amṛtasiddhi*. Unpub. manuscript, no. 1242. Man Singh Pustak Prakash Library, Jodhpur.<sup>152</sup>
- Aparokṣānubhūtiḥ—Vidyāraṇyakṛtayā Aparokṣadīpikākhyatikayā Saṃvalitā*. Ed. Kamla Devi. Allahabad: Akshayaṽaṽa Prakāśana, 1988.
- Āryamañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti with Amṛtakaṇikā-ṭīpaṇī*. Ed. Banārasī Lāl. Varanasi: Kendriya Ucca Tibbatī Śikṣā Saṃsthāna, 1994.
- Bhāgavatamahāpurānaṃ (mūlamātram)*. Ghanaśyāmadasa. Gorakhpur: Gītāpress, 1941–42.
- Brahmavidyopaniṣad* (see *Yoga Upaniṣads*).
- Brahmayāmalatantra*. Unpub. manuscript, National Archives of Kathmandu accession no. 3-370. Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project reel no. A42/6.<sup>153</sup>
- Caturmudrānvaya* of Advayavajra (see the *Advayavajrasaṅgraha*).
- Dattātreya yogaśāstra*. Ed. Dr. Brahmamitra Awasthī (with an English translation by Amita Sharma). Delhi: Swami Keshananda Yogasamsthan, 1985.
- Dhātupāṭha of Pāṇini with the Dhātvartha Prakāśikā Notes*. Ed. Pt. Kanakalāl Śarmā. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1969.
- Dhyānabindūpaniṣad* (see *Yoga Upaniṣads*).
- Eighteen Principal Upaniṣads*. Ed. V. P. Limaye and R. D. Vadekar. Pune: Vaidika Samsodhana Mandala, 1958.
- Gheraṇḡdasamhitā* (see Mallinson 2004).
- Gorakṣapaddhati*. Ed. Khemarāj Śrīkṛṣṇadās. Bombay: Śrīveṅkaṭeśvara, 1992.
- Gorakṣasamhitā*. Ed. Dr. Camanalāla Gautama. Bareilly: Saṃskṛti Saṃsthāna, 1985.
- Gorakṣaśataka (Original)*. Unpub. manuscript, no. R 7874. Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras University.<sup>154</sup>
- Gorakṣaśataka*. Ed. Fausta Nowotny. Cologne: K. A. Nowotny, 1976.
- Gorakṣasiddhāntasaṅgraha*. Ed. Janārdana Śāstrī Pāṇḡeya. Varanasi: Varanaseya Sanskrit Vishva-vidyalaya, 1973.
- Guhyasamājatantra*. Ed. Yukei Matsunaga. Osaka: Toho Shuppan Inc., 1978.
- Haṃsopaniṣad* (see *Yoga Upaniṣads*).
- Haṭhapradīpikā of Svātmārāma*. Ed. Swami Dīgambarajī and Pt. Raghunatha Shastri Kokaje. Lonavla: Kaivalyadhama S. M. Y. M. Samiti, 1998.<sup>155</sup>
- Haṭhapradīpikā of Svātmārāma with the Commentary Jyotsnā Brahmānanda*. Ed. K. Kunjunni Raja. Madras: Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1972.
- Haṭhapradīpikā of Svātmārāma (Ten Chapters) with the Yogapṛakāśikā Commentary by Bālakṛṣṇa*. Ed. M. L. Gharote and P. Devnath. Lonavla: Lonavla Yoga Institute, 2001.

151. Arranged in Latin alphabetical order without taking account of vowel length or difference among sibilants.

152. I wish to thank James Mallinson for providing me with a transcription of this manuscript.

153. I wish to thank Dr. Shaman Hatley for a transcription of chapter forty-eight of this manuscript.

154. I wish to thank Dr. James Mallinson for providing me with a transcription of this manuscript.

155. All quotations and references to the *Haṭhapradīpikā* are from this edition unless otherwise stated.

- Haṭhapradīpikā Jyotsnā of Brahmānanda*. Ed. Swāmī Maheśānanda, Dr. Rāma Śarmā, Jñānaśaṅkara Sahāya, and Ravindranāth Bodhe. Lonavla: Kaivalyadhama Śrīmanmādhava Yogamandira Samiti, 2002.
- Haṭharatnāvalī of Śrīnivāsayogī*. Ed. M. L. Gharote, P. Devnath, and V. K. Jha. Lonavla: Lonavla Yoga Institute, 2002.
- Haṭhatatvakaumudī: A Treatise on Haṭhayoga by Sundaradeva*. Ed. M. L. Gharote, P. Devnath, and V. K. Jha. Lonavla: Lonavla Yoga Institute, 2007.
- Jayadrathayāmala Saṭka 4* (Varṇanāmapaṭala 71) NAK 1-1468, NGMPP b122/4. Paper manuscript, folios 199r3–201r5.
- Jayākhyasaṃhitā*. Ed. Embar Krishnamacharya. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1931.
- Jivanmuktiviveka* (see Goodding 2002).
- Jogapradīpyakā of Jayatarāma*. Ed. Swāmī Maheśānanda, Dr. Rāma Śarmā, Jñānaśaṅkara Sahāya, and Ravindranāth Bodhe. Lonavla: Kaivalyadhama Śrīmanmādhava Yogamandira Samiti, 2006.
- Jyotsnā of Brahmānanda* (see *Haṭhapradīpikā Jyotsnā*).
- Kālacakratantarāja*. Ed. Viśvanātha Devaśarma. Calcutta: Asiatic Society, 1985.
- Kathopaniṣad* (see *Eighteen Principal Upanisads*).
- Khecarīvidyā* (see Mallinson 2007).
- Kūrmamahāpurāṇa*. Ed. Kṣemarāj Śrīkṣṇadās. Bombay: Venkateśvara Steam Press, 1926.
- Laghuyogavāsiṣṭha with the Commentary Vāsiṣṭhacandrikā*. Ed. Vasudeva Sharma Panasikara. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1985.
- Līṅgapurāṇa Śrīvyāsamaharṣiproktam Śrīlīṅgamahāpurāṇam (with Gaṇeśa Nātu's Sanskrit Commentary, the Śivatoṣiṇī)*. Ed. Gaṅgāviṣṇu. Bombay: Venkatesvara Press, 1924.
- Maitrāyaṇyupaniṣad* (see *Eighteen Principal Upanisads*).
- Maṅḍalabrahmaṇopaniṣad with a Commentary (Rājayogabhāṣya)*. Ed. Mahādeva Śāstri. Government Oriental Library Series. Mysore: Government Branch Press, 1896.
- Matsyapurāṇa*. Ed. Nandlal Gor and Rajanarayana Shastri. Calcutta, 1954.
- Nādabindūpaniṣad* (see *Yoga Upanisads*).
- Nayasūtra of the Nīśvāsattatvasaṃhitā*. Unpub. transcript by Dominic Goodall, based mainly on a manuscript at the National Archives of Kathmandu, accession no. 1-127. Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project reel no. A 41/14. (The transcription was presented at the Second International Workshop on Early Tantra in Pondicherry, July 2009.)
- Netratantra with the Commentary (Netroddyota) of Rājānaka Kṣemarāja*. Ed. Madhusūdan Kaul Sāstrī. Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies, vols. 46, 59. Bombay, 1926 and 1939.
- Rājayogabhāṣya* (see *Maṅḍalabrahmaṇopaniṣad with a Commentary*).
- Rudrayāmalam: Uttarantram: "Saraḷā" Hindīvyākhyopetam*. Ed. Sudhākara Mālavīya. Delhi: Caukhambā Saṃskṛta Pratiṣṭhāna, 1999.
- Rudrayāmalottarantra* (see *Rudrayāmalam*).
- Ṣaḍaṅgayoga by Anupamarakṣita with Raviśrījñāna's Guṇabharaṇināmaṣaḍaṅgayoga-ṭippaṇī: Text and Annotated Translation*. Ed. Francesco Sferra. Rome: Istituto italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente, 2000.
- Śāṅḍilyopaniṣad* (see *Yoga Upanisads*).
- Śārṅgadharapaddhati*. Ed. Peter Peterson. Delhi: Caukhambā Saṃskṛta Pratiṣṭhāna, 1987.
- Sekaniṛdeśa of Advayavajra* (see the *Advayavajrasaṅgraha*).
- Sekoddeśa*. Ed. Giacomella Orofino. Rome: Istituto italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1994.
- Sekoddeśaṭikā of Nāropā*. Ed. Francesco Sferra (Sanskrit) and Stefania Merzagora (Tibetan). Rome: Istituto italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente, 2006.
- Siddhasiddhāntapaddhati with a Sanskrit Commentary by Pt. Dravyeśa Jhā Śāstrī*. Ed. Jñānirām Śāstrī. Haridwar: Yogashram Sanskrit College, 1939.
- Siddhasiddhāntapaddhati, a Treatise on the Nātha Philosophy by Gorakṣanātha*. Ed. M. L. Gharote and G. K. Pai. Lonavla: Lonavla Yoga Institute, 2005.<sup>156</sup>

156. All quotations and references to the *Siddhasiddhāntapaddhati* are from the Lonavla edition unless otherwise stated.



- Śivasamhitā* (see Mallinson 2007a).
- Skandapurāṇasya Ambikākhaṇḍa*. Ed. Kṛṣṇaprasāda Bhaṭṭarāi. Velajhuṇḍi: Mahendra Saṃskṛta Viśvavidyālaya, 1988.
- Śvetāśvataropaniṣad* (see *Eighteen Principal Upanisads*).
- Tantrāloka of Abhinavagupta with the Commentary of Rājānaka Jayaratha*. Ed. Mukund Rām Śāstrī. KSTS 23, 28, 30, 35, 29, 41, 47, 59, 52, 57, 58. Bombay and Srinagar, 1918–38.
- Vāsiṣṭhacandrikā of Ātmasukha* (see *Laghuyogavāsiṣṭha with the Commentary Vāsiṣṭhacandrikā*).
- Vasiṣṭhasamhitā (Yogakāṇḍa)* (see Kaivalyadhama Philosophical-Literary Research Department 2005).
- Vimalaprabhā: Śrīmañjuśrīyaśoviracitasya Paramādibuddhoddhrtasya Śrīlaghukālacakratantrarājasya Kalkinā Śrīpuṇḍarīkeṇa Viragitā Tikā*. Ed. Samdhong Rinpoche et al. Rare Buddhist Texts Series 13, vol. 3, 1994.
- Vivekamārtaṇḍa*. Ed. Rāmalāl Śrīvāstava. Gorakhpur: Gorakhanāth Mandir, 1983.
- Yogabīja of Gorakhnath*. Ed. Dr. Brahmamitra Awasthi. Delhi: Swami Keshawananda Yoga Institute, 1985.
- Yogabīja of Gorakhanātha*. Ed. Rāmalāla Śrīvāstava. Gorakhpur: Gorakhanāth Mandir, 1982.<sup>157</sup>
- Yogacintāmaṇi of Śivānanda Sarasvatī*. Unpub. manuscript, no. 9784. Kaivalyadhama Yoga Institute Library, Lonavla.
- Yogacūdāmanyupaniṣad* (see *Yoga Upanisads*).
- Yogadarśanam with a Commentary Called the Yogasiddhāntacandrikā of Nārāyaṇatīrtha*. Ed. Paṇḍita Ratna Gopāla Bhatta. Benares: Vidyā Vilāsa Press, 1910.
- Yogakuṇḍalyupaniṣad* (see *Yoga Upanisads*).
- Yogasārasaṅgraha of Vijñānabhikṣu*. Ed. Dr. Ram Shankar Bhattacharya and Goswami Prahlad Giri Vedantakeshari. Varanasi: Bhāratīya Vidyā Prakāśana, 1989.
- Yogaśāstram Svopajñavṛttivibhūṣitam*. Ed. Muni Jambūvijaya. Bombay: Jaina Sāhitya Vikāsa Maṇḍala, 1977–86.
- Yogasiddhāntacandrikā* (see *Yogadarśanam*).
- Yogasīkhopaniṣad* (see *Yoga Upanisads*).
- Yogatārāvalī*. Ed. Ram Shankar Bhattacharya. Varanasi: Bhāratīya Vidyā Prakāśana, 1987.
- Yogatattvopaniṣad* (see *Yoga Upanisads*).
- Yoga Upanisads with the Commentary of Śrī Upanisadbrahmayogin*. Ed. Pandit A. Mahadeva Sastri. Madras: Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1968.
- Yogayājñavalkya*. Ed. Sri Prahlad C Divanji. B. B. R. A. Society's Monograph, no. 3. Bombay: Bombay Branch Royal Asiatic Society, 1954.
- Yuktabhavadeva of Bhavadeva Miśra*. Ed. M. L. Gharote and V. K. Jha. Lonavla: Lonavla Yoga Institute, 2002.

## SECONDARY SOURCES

- Arjunwadkar, K. S. 2006. *Yogasutras of Patanjali, with the Bhasya of Vyasa, Commented on by Vacaspatimisra and with the Commentary of Nagojibhatta*. Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Birch, Jason. 2005 (see *Amanaskayoga* under primary sources).
- Böhtlingk, Otto von, and Rudolph von Roth. 1889. *Sanskrit Wörterbuch*. St. Petersburg: Buchdruckerei der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaft.
- Bouy, Christian. 1994. *Les Nātha-Yogin et les Upanisads*. Paris: Diffusion de Boccard.
- Briggs, George Weston. 1938. *Gorakhnāth and the Kānpaṭa Yogis*. Calcutta: Y.M.C.A. Publishing House.
- Brockington, John. 2003. Yoga in the Mahābhārata. In *Yoga: The Indian Tradition*, ed. Ian Whicher and David Carpenter. Pp. 13–25. London: RoutledgeCurzon.
- Cicuzza, Claudio, and Francesco Sferra. 1997. Brief Notes on the Beginning of the Kālacakra Literature. *Dhīḥ: Journal of Rare Buddhist Texts Research Project* 23: 113–26. Saranath: Vārāṇasī Saṃsthāna.

157. Quotations of the *Yogabīja* are from this edition.

- Clark, Matthew James. 2006. *The Daśanāmī-saṃnyāsīs: The Integration of Ascetic Lineages into an Order*. Leiden: Brill.
- Dasgupta, Shashibhusan. 1962. *Obscure Religious Cults*. Calcutta: Mukhopadhyay.
- Dvivedī, Manilal Nabhubhai. 1885. *Rāja Yoga or the Practical Metaphysics of the Vedānta*. Bombay: Subodhaprekasha Press.
- Eliade, Mircea. 1969. *Yoga: Immortality and Freedom*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.
- Endo, Ko. 1993. The Works and Flourishing Period of Nārāyaṇa Tirtha, the Author of the Yogasiddhāntacandrikā. *Nagoya Studies in Indian Culture and Buddhism*, vol. 14. Nagoya: Univ. of Nagoya.
- Feuerstein, Georg. 2000. *Shambhala Encyclopedia of Yoga*. Boston: Shambhala.
- Filliozat, Jean. 1991. *Religion, Philosophy, Yoga: A Selection of Articles*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Gode, P. K. 1947. Some Notes on the Invention of Spectacles and the History of Spectacles in India between A.D. 1500 and 1800. *B.I.S. Mandal Quarterly* 28, 1/2: 32–46.
- Goodding, Robert. 2002. The Treatise on Liberation-in-Life: Critical Edition and Annotated Translation of the Jīvanmuktiviveka of Vidyāraṇya. PhD diss., Univ. of Texas.
- Gourdriaan, Teun, and Sanjukta Gupta. 1981. *Hindu Tantric and Śākta Literature*, vol. 2. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Gupta, Sanjukta. 1979. Tantric Sādhanā. In *Hindu Tantrism*, ed. Sanjukta Gupta, Dirk Jan Hoens, and Teun Goudriaan. Pp. 163–83. Leiden: Brill.
- Hanneder, Jürgen. 2005. The Mokṣopāya: An Introduction. In *The Mokṣopāya, Yogavāsiṣṭha and Related Texts*, ed. Jürgen Hanneder. Aachen: Shaker.
- Hatley, Shaman. Forthcoming. ‘priyamelaka’. In *Tāntrikābhīdhānakośa: Dictionnaire des termes techniques de la littérature hindoue tantrique*, vol. III, ed. Dominic Goodall and Marion Rastelli. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Iyengar, B. K. S. 1979. *Light on Yoga (Yoga Dīpikā)*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Iyengar, B. K. S., with John J. Evans and Douglas Carlton Abrams. 2005. *Light on Life: The Yoga Journey to Wholeness, Inner Peace, and Ultimate Freedom*. Emmaus, Penn.: Rodale Books.
- Kaelber, Walter. 1989. *Tapta Mārga: Asceticism and Initiation in Vedic India*. Albany: State Univ. of New York Press.
- Kaivalyadhama Philosophical-Literary Research Department. 2001–8. *Yoga Concordance*, vols. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 7, ed. Swami Mahesanandaji, Dr. B. R. Sharma, Shri G. S. Sahay, and Shri R. K. Bodhe. Lonavla: Kaivalyadhama S. M. Y. M Samiti.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2005. *Descriptive Catalogue of Yoga Manuscripts (Updated)*.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2005a. *Vasiṣṭha Saṃhitā (Yogakāṇḍa) (Revised Edition)*.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2009. *Yoga Kośa: The Enlarged Edition*.
- Kokaje, R., and M. L. Gharote. 1981. A Note on the Words Haṭhayoga and Rājayoga. *Journal of the Oriental Institute (Baroda)* 30: 198–204. Baroda: Oriental Institute.
- Larson, Gerard James. 2009. Differentiating the Concepts of ‘yoga’ and ‘tantra’ in Sanskrit Literary History. *JAOS* 129: 487–98.
- Lonavla Yoga Institute. 2006. *Encyclopaedia of Traditional Asanas*, ed. M. L. Gharote, V. K. Jha, P. Devnath, and Dr. S. B. Sakhalkar. Lonavla: Lonavla Yoga Institute.
- Lorenzen, David. 1987. Haṭha Yoga. In *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, vol. 6, ed. Mircea Eliade. Pp. 213–14. New York: Macmillan.
- Mallik, Smt Kalyani. 1954. *Siddhasiddhāntapaddhati and Other Works of Nath Yogis*. Pune: Poona Oriental Book House.
- Mallinson, James. 2004. *The Gheraṇḍa Saṃhitā: The Original Sanskrit and an English Translation*. Woodstock, NY: YogaVidya.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2005. Rāmānandī Tyāgīs and Haṭha Yoga. *Journal of Vaiṣṇava Studies* 14: 1–2.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. *The Khecarīvidyā of Ādinātha: A Critical Edition and Annotated Translation of an Early Text of Haṭhayoga*. London: Routledge.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007a. *The Śiva Saṃhitā: A Critical Edition and an English Translation*. Woodstock, NY: YogaVidya.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2008. *Siddhas, Yogins and Munis, but No Nāths: The Early History of Haṭhayoga*. Unpub. paper.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2011. The Original Gorakṣaśataka. In *Yoga in Practice*, ed. David White. Pp. 257–72. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Meisezahl, Richard. 1967. *Die Göttin Vajravārāhī: Eine ikonographische Studie nach einem Sadhana-text von Advayavajra*. Leiden: Brill.
- Michael, Tara. 1986. *Aspects du Yoga*. Monaco: Editions du Rocher.
- Michelis, Elizabeth de. 2004. *A History of Modern Yoga*. London: Continuum.
- Monier-Williams, M. 1899. *A Sanskrit English Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Rāmdev, Swāmī. 2005. *Yog: Its Philosophy and Practice*. Haridwar: Divya Prakashan.
- Reddy, M. Venkata. 1982. *Hatharatnavali of Srinivasabhata Mahayogindra: With an Elaborate Introduction, Selected Text, English Translation, Critical Notes, Appendices, and Word Index*. Arthamuru, A. P.
- Sanderson, Alexis. 1988. Śaivism and the Tantric Traditions. In *The World's Religions*, ed. S. Sutherland, L. Houlden, P. Clarke, and F. Hardy. Pp. 660–704. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2001. History through Textual Criticism: In the Study of Śaivism, the Pañcarātra and the Buddhist Yoginītantras. In *Les Sources et le temps / Sources and Time: A Colloquium, Pondicherry, 11–13 January 1997*, ed. François Grimal. Pp. 1–47. Publications du département d'Indologie, vol. 91. Pondicherry: Institut français de Pondichéry/École française d'Extrême-Orient.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2002. Remarks on the Text of the *Kubjikāmatatantra*. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 45: 1–24.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2006. The Lākulas: New Evidence of a System Intermediate between Pāñcārthika Pāśupatism and Āgamic Śaivism. *The Indian Philosophical Annual* 24: 143–217.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. The Śaiva Exegesis of Kashmir. In *Mélanges tantriques à la mémoire d'Hélène Brunner / Tantric Studies in Memory of Hélène Brunner*, ed. Dominic Goodall and André Padoux. Collection indologie, vol. 106. Pp. 231–442 and (bibliography) 551–82. Pondicherry: Institut français d'Indologie/École française d'Extrême-Orient.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2009. The Śaiva Age: The Rise and Dominance of Śaivism during the Early Medieval Period. *Genesis and Development of Tantrism*, ed. Shingo Einoo. Institute of Oriental Culture Special Series, vol. 23. Pp. 41–350. Tokyo: Institute of Oriental Culture, University of Tokyo.
- Schaeffer, Kurtis. 2003. The Attainment of Immortality: From Nāthas in India to Buddhists in Tibet. *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 39: 515–33.
- Sferra, Francesco. 2005. Constructing the Wheel of Time: Strategies for Establishing a Tradition. In *Boundaries, Dynamics and Construction of Traditions in South Asia*, ed. Federico Squaricini. Pp. 253–85. Delhi: Firenze Univ. Press and Munshiram Manoharlal.
- Shastri, Haraprasad. 1927 (see *Advayavajrasaṅgraha* under primary sources).
- Sternbach, Ludwik. 1974. *Subhāṣita, Gnostic and Didactic Literature*. History of Indian Literature, vol. 4. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Swāmī, Yognāth. 1967. *Amanaskayoga*. Pune: Siddh Sahity Samsodhan Prakasan Mandal.
- Turlington, Christy. 2003. *Living Yoga: Creating a Life Practice*. London: Michael Joseph.
- Turner, R. L. 1962. *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*, fasc. 11. London: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Vasu, Chandra. 1895. *The Gheranda Samhita*. Bombay: T. Tatyā.
- Vasudeva, Somadeva. 2004. *The Yoga of the Mālinīvijayottaratantra: Chapters 1–4, 7–11, 11–17, Critical Edition, Translation and Notes*. Pondicherry: École française d'Extrême-Orient.
- Venus, A. George. 2001. *Self Realization (Brahmānubhava): The Advaitic Perspective of Shankara*. Washington: Council for Research in Values and Philosophy.
- Wallace, Vesna. 2001. *The Inner Kālacakratanta: A Buddhist Tantric View of the Individual*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.

- Ward, Susan Winter, and John Sirois. 2002. *Yoga for the Young at Heart: Accessible Yoga for Everybody*. Nataraj Publishing.
- White, David Gordon. 1996. *The Alchemical Body*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2006. "Open" and "Closed" Models of the Human Body in Indian Medical and Yogic Traditions. *Asian Medicine: Tradition and Modernity* 2: 1–13.
- Windisch, Ernst, and Julius Eggeling. 1887–1935. *Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Library of the India Office*, pt. IV. London: Gilbert and Rivington.
- Wood, Earnest. 1962. *Yoga*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Wylie, Turrell. 1982. Dating the Death of Naropa. In *Indological and Buddhist Studies*, ed. L. A. Hercus et al. Pp. 687–92. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications.