

Rājayoga: The Reincarnations of the King of All Yogas

Jason Birch

In the late nineteenth and twentieth century, prominent Indian religious leaders such as Svāmī Vivekānanda and Svāmī Śivānanda developed systems of Yoga based on Patañjali's Aṣṭāṅgayoga and called them Rājayoga. They have promoted the *Yogasūtra* as the most authoritative source on Rājayoga. In contrast to this, there are modern Indian systems of Rājayoga which have very little to do with Pātañjalayoga, such as the one taught globally by the Brahma Kumaris. It is generally accepted that Rājayoga refers to types of Yoga which are based more on meditation than physical techniques such as postures (*āsana*), yet very little research has been done to explain why there are variations between modern systems of Rājayoga. Also, the term "*rājayoga*" (literally, "king-yoga") implies superiority, usually, over Haṭhayoga, but this raises the question of whether there was ever a justifiable basis for this claim of superiority, which I address here through examining the history of Rājayoga.

The history of the term "*rājayoga*" reveals that it did not derive from Pātañjalayoga. Indeed, it was not until the sixteenth century that this term was used in a commentary on the *Yogasūtra*. The earliest definition of Rājayoga is found in the twelfth century, Śaiva Yoga text called the *Amanaska*, which proclaimed Rājayoga to be superior to all other Yogas and soteriologies prevalent in India at that time. From the twelfth to the fifteenth centuries, Rājayoga was mainly used as a synonym for *samādhi*, yet after the sixteenth century, the textual evidence reveals many attempts to reinterpret the name and connect it with different systems of Yoga.

This calls into question the presumption that a Yoga tradition's survival depends on its success at faithfully preserving ancient teachings. In fact, the prominence of Rājayoga and even the *Yogasūtra* in the twentieth century is more a consequence of the role they have played in sanctioning innovation and in promoting the efficacy of meditation within the competitive environment of Hinduism's diverse soteriological practices.¹

Modern Interpretations of Rājayoga

In examining Svāmī Vivekānanda's claim that the *Yogasūtra* was a textbook on Rājayoga, Elizabeth De Michelis (2004: 178) has observed that the identification of Pātañjalayoga with Rājayoga may first have been made by the Theosophists and popularized by Svāmī Vivekānanda's book, *Raja Yoga*.² The pervasiveness of "Patañjali's Rājayoga" in both popular publications on Yoga and somewhat more scholarly ones³ reflects the influence of Theosophy and Svāmī Vivekānanda's books on modern Yoga in India and outside it.⁴ Many of these authors were probably aware that the term "*rājayoga*" is absent in the *Yogasūtra*, the *Yogabhāṣya*, Śaṅkara's *Vivaraṇa*, Vācaspatimiśra's *Tattvavaiśārādī*, and Bhoja's *Rājamārtaṇḍa*. In fact, as far as I am aware, *rājayoga* does not appear in a Yoga text until after the eleventh century. However, it seems to have a longer history in Indian astrology, for it is found in at least two early genethliological works, in which context it denotes astrological signs that foreshadow the birth of kings (Pingree 1981: 82).⁵

Nearly all published books on Rājayoga acknowledge the *Yogasūtra* as the textual source for this Yoga, and the structure of their expositions is usually the eight auxiliaries (*aṣṭāṅga*) of Pātañjalayoga. Often, their explanations of each auxiliary are a synthesis of various religious and philosophical ideas with meditation techniques, depending on the author's predilections. De Michelis (2004: 149–77) has shown how Svāmī Vivekānanda's *Raja Yoga* blends elements of Neo-Vedānta and Rāmakṛṣṇa's mysticism with concepts from Western science, philosophy, and occultism. His ideology was overlaid onto the basic framework of Aṣṭāṅgayoga and the *puruṣa-prakṛti* metaphysics. This process has also been described by Sarah Strauss (2005: 8–23), so there is no need for me to go into further detail here, though it is worth pointing out that a similar syncretic process is discernible in more recent works on Rājayoga, albeit with different

philosophical and religious elements. For example, Svāmī Śivānanda (2010: 61–68) of Rishikesh wrote an entire chapter on the Yoga of devotion (*bhaktiyoga*) in his book on Rājayoga, whereas Svāmī Vivekānanda (2003: 73) hardly expatiated on devotion when discussing *sūtras* (that is, 2.1, 32 and 45) on “worshipping god” (*īśvarapraṇidhāna*). Also, Svāmī Vivekānanda (2003: 17) dismissed posture (*āsana*), claiming that Rājayoga has little to do with Haṭhayoga, whereas Svāmī Rāma’s book (1998: 22–55) on Rājayoga devotes thirty-three pages to posture, including detailed explanations of Haṭhayogic poses such as headstand, *dhanurāsana*, and *mayūrāsana* along with their therapeutic benefits. Therefore, it is clear that even these modern interpretations of Rājayoga, which are encased by the framework of Pātañjalayoga, differ from one another in their emphasis and on certain details of content.

The Yogasūtra in Pre-Modern Syncretic Expositions of Yoga

The use of the *Yogasūtra* as a framework for a new syncretic exposition of Yoga was not an innovation of Svāmī Vivekānanda. Indeed, he was following, perhaps unknowingly, in the footsteps of several medieval writers of Sanskrit Yoga compilations, in particular, Śivānandasarasvatī and Bhavadēva.⁶ The most prodigious work of these two is Śivānandasarasvatī’s *Yogacintāmaṇi* which was written in the late sixteenth or early seventeenth century⁷ and has been estimated to have 3423 verses.⁸ The *Yogacintāmaṇi* integrated newer and older Yoga traditions of that time with material from the Purāṇas, Dharmaśāstras and epics, within the framework of Aṣṭāṅgayoga. Śivānandasarasvatī traces his lineage back to Śaṅkara,⁹ and Advaitavedānta viewpoints are indeed enmeshed in his commentary, which was written for the more learned Brahmin who appreciated not only the complexities of the *Yogasūtra* and its commentaries, but also the new discourse created by juxtaposing and blending together different systems of Yoga. Indeed, just as Svāmī Vivekānanda’s *Raja Yoga* combines practical instruction on *prāṇāyāma* and meditation with a lofty discourse on Eastern and Western esoteric teachings, the *Yogacintāmaṇi* combined the practical instructions of earlier Haṭhayoga texts with the philosophy and metaphysics of Pātañjalayoga, Advaitavedānta, Tantric Śaivism, and so on. However, the difference in this regard is that the *Yogacintāmaṇi* embraced Haṭhayoga, whereas Svāmī Vivekānanda (2003: 18) rejected it and preferred to invoke Śaṅkarācārya as an authority on

alternate nostril breathing.¹⁰

In the West, the term “*yoga*” tends to refer to postural practice and “meditation” to seated practice.¹¹ A similar distinction is seen in the dichotomy of Haṭhayoga and Rājayoga which is prevalent in India. Svāmī Vivekānanda (2003: 17) not only separated Rāja from Haṭhayoga, but also advocated the independence and superiority of the former over the latter. Indeed, in his view, Haṭhayoga was merely concerned with making the physical body strong, and he believed there were other, more effective ways to do that.¹² Svāmī Śivānanda maintained the distinction of Rājayoga as mental practice and Haṭhayoga as physical, but he also integrated Haṭhayoga into Aṣṭāṅgayoga by equating it as the auxiliaries of *āsana* and *prāṇāyāma*. His justification for this is worth quoting in full:

Hatha Yoga concerns with the physical body and control of breath. Raja Yoga deals with the mind. Raja Yoga and Hatha Yoga are interdependent. Raja Yoga and Hatha Yoga are the necessary counterparts of each other. No one can become a perfect Yogi without knowledge of the practice of both the Yogas. Raja Yoga begins where properly practised Hatha Yoga ends... (Svāmī Śivānanda 2010: 38).

As also noted above, Svāmī Rāma integrated Haṭhayoga into Aṣṭāṅgayoga in the same way, and he too interpreted Rājayoga as the meditative practice (that is, the internal auxiliaries) and Haṭhayoga as *āsana* and *prāṇāyāma*.¹³ As will be seen below, there are antecedents in medieval Yoga traditions for the opposing views of Svāmī Vivekānanda and Svāmī Śivānanda on the Rāja-Haṭha dichotomy as well as for construing Haṭhayoga as an auxiliary of Pātañjalayoga.

Modern Rājayogas Independent of the Yogasūtra

It should be noted that not all modern interpretations of Rājayoga adopt the Aṣṭāṅga format of Pātañjalayoga. A good example is the Rājayoga of Ram Chandra who hailed from Shahjahanpur and founded the Shri Ram Chandra Mission in 1945. In his book entitled the *Sahaj Marg Philosophy*, he promoted his Rājayoga, which is also called the “Sahaj Marg,” as a simple and easy way to realization (Chandra 2009: 331).¹⁴ His system begins with meditation (*dhyāna*) which he acknowledges to be the seventh

step in Pātañjalayoga. Indeed, it is clear that he saw his own Rājayoga as a simplification of Pātañjalayoga: the last two auxiliaries of Aṣṭāṅgayoga are retained as well as the practice of renunciation (*vairāgya*).¹⁵ Ram Chandra (2009: 169) referred to Svāmī Vivekānanda as an authority on spiritual matters, so his understanding of Pātañjalayoga as Rājayoga probably derives from Svāmī Vivekānanda's work. Nonetheless, there is very little of Pātañjalayoga's metaphysics, terminology, or structure in the Sahaj Marg's Rājayoga.

Seeing that the above Rājayogas have been uniquely shaped by the teachings of their founding *gurus*, it is likely that there are other modern systems of Rājayoga which are unknown outside of India. Though I suspect that most of these have been based, to some degree, on Pātañjalayoga since the time of Svāmī Vivekānanda, there is at least one Rājayoga whose name and content is entirely independent of Pātañjalayoga. It is taught by the Brahma Kumaris, a global organization founded by Prajapita Brahma (*aka* Dada Lekhraj) in the late 1930s. The Brahma Kumaris teach a system of Rājayoga without reference to or any discernible influence from Svāmī Vivekānanda's Rājayoga or Pātañjalayoga, because they believe that their teachings emanate directly from Śiva and that they represent the pure tradition from which "Hinduism" has become the corrupted version.¹⁶

One publication of the Brahma Kumaris defines their Rājayoga as follows:

Raja Yoga means the intellectual and lovelful communion of the soul with the Supreme Soul...Initiation, Meditation, Concentration and Realization are the four steps of Raja Yoga. Raja Yoga subsumes within itself the fundamentals of all methods of Yoga and confers the achievements of all of them naturally and easily, using one very simple method which anyone can learn (1986: 60).¹⁷

This definition appears to have been inspired by the meaning of Yoga as "union," which is salient in Śaiva Tantras (see Vasudeva 2004: 235–46) as well as the medieval Yoga traditions that followed them. The term "*rāja*," which literally means "king," is being understood metaphorically as the supreme soul; Rājayoga is thus the union of the individual soul with the supreme one. A later publication acknowledges Pātañjalayoga to be the "Raja Yoga...commonly known throughout the world" (Brahma Kumaris 1996: 129), yet it rejects Pātañjalayoga's authority on the grounds

that the meaning of Yoga as “union” is not evident in the *Yogasūtra*.¹⁸ The preface of the same publication also defines Rājayoga as “the King of Yogas or the Royal Yoga” (Brahma Kumaris 1996: 4),¹⁹ which is affirmed by their official website.²⁰ This definition of Rājayoga is well attested in earlier Śaiva Yoga traditions.

The History of Rājayoga

The Rājayoga of the Amanaska and the Aparokṣānubhūti

The earliest extant definition of Rājayoga occurs in the second chapter of a Śaiva Yoga text called the *Amanaska*, which was written before the twelfth century.²¹ In answering Vāmadeva’s opening question, Śiva states that there is an internal Yoga (*antaryoga*) called Rājayoga, and he defines it in two ways. It is called Rājayoga, first, because it is the king of all Yogas and, second, because it enables the *yogin* to reach the illustrious king, the supreme Self.²² The first definition is a broad declaration of Rājayoga’s superiority over all Yoga systems known at that time. Though these other Yogas are not named, it is likely that the author had in mind Mantrayoga, Layayoga, and Haṭhayoga because other verses in the *Amanaska* explicitly reject *mantras* (for example, 2.7) and Haṭhayogic practices such as *āsanas*, *prāṇāyāma*, *mudrās* and *bandhas* (2.7, 2.31, 2.42) as well as meditation techniques (*dhyāna*) (2.33, 2.37, and 2.39).²³ The superiority of Rājayoga over these three other Yogas is affirmed by most medieval Yoga texts which teach the tetrad of Mantrayoga, Layayoga, Haṭhayoga, and Rājayoga. However, unlike the *Amanaska*, they promote the first three Yogas as acceptable methods for attaining Rājayoga. The *Amanaska* dismisses the other Yogas, in much the same way as Svāmī Vivekānanda dismissed Haṭhayoga, and both base their dismissal on the critique that Haṭhayoga’s techniques are difficult to perform and its purpose questionable. The *Amanaska* (2.42ab) states:

*abhyastaiḥ kim u dīrghakālam anilair vyādhipradair duṣkaraiḥ
prāṇāyāmaśatair anekakaraṇair duḥkhātmakair durjayaiḥ |*

What is to be gained by [manipulating] the vital winds, [even when] practiced for a long time? [What gained] by the hundreds of [ways] of holding the breath, which cause sickness and are arduous, and by the

many *mudrās*,²⁴ which are painful by nature and difficult to master?

Svāmī Vivekānanda's *Raja Yoga* states:

We have nothing to do with [Haṭhayoga] here, because its practices are very difficult, and cannot be learned in a day, and, after all, do not lead to any spiritual growth (2003: 17).

The *Amanaska* also rejects gradualist Yoga techniques for attaining *samādhi*, which would include any system based on auxiliaries (that is, Śaḍaṅgayoga, Aṣṭāṅgayoga, and so on).²⁵ The *Amanaska*'s Rājayoga is presented as an easy, direct, and simple way to *samādhi*,²⁶ which is described as a natural state (*sahajāvasthā*). Such rhetoric appears to be a clear precedent to the Brahma Kumaris' definition cited above, as well as Ram Chandra's Rājayoga which dispensed with the first six auxiliaries of Aṣṭāṅgayoga and was promoted by its founder as a direct and easy method and as the "king of yogas" (2009: 122). Indeed, the *Amanaska*'s position is more extreme than Ram Chandra's, because it begins and ends with *samādhi* whereas Ram Chandra accepted the seventh auxiliary of Pātañjalayoga (that is, *dhyāna*) and taught meditation for the attainment of *samādhi*. On meditation and the natural state of *samādhi*, the *Amanaska*'s position is made clear in verse 2.33bd:

...*dhyānādikarmākulāḥ* |
prāyaḥ prāṇigaṇā vimūḍhamanaso nānāvikārānvitā
dṛśyante na hi nirvikārasahajānandaikabhājo bhuvī ||

[...Some] are confounded by activities such as meditation. Generally speaking, [these] multitudes of people have deluded minds and various [mental] disturbances. For, those who experience nothing but the bliss of the undisturbed, natural state [of *samādhi*] are not seen in the world.

The *Amanaska*'s second definition of Rājayoga is based on the metaphor that the supreme Self (*paramātman*) is a "king" (*rājan*). This metaphor is found in one of the oldest Upaniṣads, the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* (2.5.15):

sa vā ayam ātmā sarveṣāṃ bhūtānāṃ adhipatiḥ sarveṣāṃ bhūtānāṃ rājā |

This very Self is also the ruler of all beings, [that is to say,] the king (*rāja*) of all beings.

This more esoteric meaning of Rājayoga reminds us of the Brahma Kumaris' definition of Rājayoga as "communion of the soul with the Supreme Soul." However, in the *Amanaska* the word "yoga" is better understood as "method" (that is, the method for [attaining] the Self) because its second definition indicates that Rājayoga is the means by which the *yogin* attains the Self.²⁷ Therefore, in the context of the *Amanaska*, Rājayoga is the no-mind state (*amanaska*) and both terms (that is, *rājayoga* and *amanaska*) are synonyms in the *Amanaska* and later Yoga texts.²⁸

Apart from the metaphor of the supreme Self as king in the *Amanaska*'s second definition of Rājayoga, it also plays on the root meaning of *rāj* as "to shine,"²⁹ in order to affirm Rājayoga as the method for realizing the "shining" (*dīpyamāna*) Self.

In light of the modern association of Rājayoga with the *Yogasūtra*, it should be noted that the *Amanaska* was not influenced directly by Pātañjalayoga. Key elements of the latter such as the *puruṣa-prakṛti* metaphysics and the levels of *samādhi*, Kriyāyoga, and Aṣṭāṅgayoga are absent in the *Amanaska*. The teachings of the *Amanaska*, which are spoken by Śiva, undoubtedly derive from earlier Śaiva traditions; for example, its central technique called Śāmbhavī Mudrā was known to the Kashmirian Śaiva exegetes, Abhinavagupta and Kṣemarāja, as Bhairava Mudrā.³⁰ Its rejection of gradualist approaches to liberation and its dislike of austerities (*tapas*) point to the influence of later Kaula schools whose texts also include terms such as *amanaska* and *unmanī* as synonyms for *samādhi*.³¹ Nonetheless, the *Amanaska* rejected Tantric sectarian affiliation, *mantras*, and ritual which suggests that it was conceived as a reformation of earlier Śaiva traditions. By emphasizing *samādhi* as well as practice (*abhyāsa*), detachment (*audāsīnya*), and the *guru*'s favor (*guruprasāda*) as the essential means to liberation, the *Amanaska* placed itself firmly among the Yoga traditions which became prominent from the twelfth century onwards.

Although the *Amanaska* provides the earliest extant definitions (*nirvacana*) of Rājayoga, it may not be the earliest Yoga text in which the term occurs, because the *Aparokṣānubhūti* has preserved a Vedāntic system of Yoga with fifteen auxiliaries (*aṅga*) called Rājayoga. This text has been attributed to Ādiśaṅkara, however it was probably written only

a century or two before its *terminus ad quem* of the fourteenth century.³² The *Aparokṣānubhūti*'s teachings on Yoga stand at a distance from the *Amanaska* because its Rājayoga is more of an attempt to homologize the auxiliaries of Yoga with Vedāntic doctrine and it appears to have had little influence on later Yoga traditions until the South Indian recension of the Yoga Upaniṣads.³³ Also, the *Aparokṣānubhūti* is unique in using the term “*rājayoga*” to denote a system of Yoga without the connotation of *samādhi*. In other medieval Yoga texts, Rājayoga is both a name for a type of Yoga based primarily on the practice of *samādhi* as well as a synonym for the state of *samādhi* itself (see Birch 2011: 542–43). Nonetheless, the *Aparokṣānubhūti* has led to the association of Śāṅkarācārya and Vedāntic teachings with Rājayoga as seen in the title of Manilal Nabhubhai Dvivedī's work, *Rāja Yoga, or The Practical Metaphysics of the Vedānta: Being a Translation of the Vākyasudhā or Drigdrishyaviveka of Bhāratī-tīrtha, and the Aparokṣānubhūti of Shri Shankarācārya*, which was published in 1885.

Early Rājayoga and Haṭhayoga

From the *Amanaska* until the fifteenth-century *Haṭhpradīpikā*, the meaning of Rājayoga as the practice of *samādhi* was ubiquitous among Yoga texts. However, unlike Mantrayoga and Haṭhayoga which were largely characterized by specific techniques, Rājayoga was associated with a diverse range of techniques, and for this reason, no typology of a system of Rājayoga is apparent. For example, in the *Amanaska*, Śāmbhavī Mudrā was the main technique for achieving Rājayoga (that is, *samādhi*), but in the *Dattātreyayogaśāstra* and the *Yogabīja*, Mantrayoga, Layayoga and Haṭhayoga were the means to Rājayoga.³⁴ In contrast to this, the *Amarāughaprabodha* states that Rājayoga is achieved by fusing the mind with an internal sound.³⁵ It also teaches the same tetrad of Yogas in the *Dattātreyayogaśāstra* and the *Yogabīja* and similarly affirms that the first three are for the attainment of Rājayoga,³⁶ so one could infer that the first three Yogas cause the internal sound and the mind's fusion with it. Yet, one might also infer that any technique which brings about the internal sound and the mind's fusion with it would be equally valid. The *Śārṅgadharapaddhati*³⁷ and the *Śivasamhitā* teach the same tetrad of Yogas, but their explanations of Rājayoga are even more disassociated from the other three Yogas than is the case in the *Amarāughaprabodha*.

In both texts, Rājayoga is brought about by visualization and meditation practices involving Cakras and Kuṇḍalinī.³⁸

The attainment of Rājayoga by Haṭhayoga is the central theme of the fifteenth-century *Haṭhapradīpikā*. In fact, one of its opening verses confirms that there were numerous conflicting views on how to achieve Rājayoga at the time it was written:

*bhrāntyā bahumatadvānte rājayogam ajānatām |
haṭhapradīpikāṃ dhatte svātmārāmaḥ kṛpākaraḥ ||*

The compassionate Svātmārāma has composed [this work called] the “Light on Haṭhayoga” for people ignorant of Rājayoga because they are lost in the darkness of many [different] opinions [on it] (*Haṭhapradīpikā* 1.3).

Svātmārāma solved the problem of conflicting views by amalgamating many different Yoga systems into one method which he called Haṭhayoga. He then promoted Haṭhayoga as indispensable for Rājayoga in terms almost identical to those of Svāmī Śivānanda cited above:

*haṭhaṃ vinā rājayogo rājayogaṃ vinā haṭhaḥ |
na sidhyati tato yugmam ā niṣpateḥ samabhyaset ||*

Without Haṭha, Rājayoga does not succeed, and without Rāja, nor does Haṭhayoga. Therefore, the [*yogin*] should practice both until the [fourth and final stage of Yoga called] Niṣpatti [is attained] (*Haṭhapradīpikā* 2.76 = *Śivasamhitā* 5.222).

Svātmārāma used the assortment of various meditation techniques associated with Rājayoga in earlier Yoga texts to compile the *Haṭhapradīpikā*’s fourth chapter on *samādhi*.³⁹ This chapter is perhaps the most concise and complete digest on Rājayoga in a medieval Yoga text. It focuses on Śāmbhavī and Khecarī *mudrās* and Nādānusandhāna (that is, fusion of the mind with the internal sound) for the attainment of Rājayoga. The *Haṭhapradīpikā* and its source texts confirm a consensus on the meaning of Rājayoga as *samādhi*, but there is no such consensus on the means for achieving it, nor the mechanisms (that is, piercing of Cakras or knots,

and so on) by which it is achieved.

Influence of the Pātañjalayogaśāstra and the Bhagavadgītā on Early Haṭhayoga and Rājayoga

One might wonder whether Pātañjalayoga influenced the *Haṭhapradīpikā* and those of its source texts which teach Rājayoga. In my opinion, Patañjali's influence was marginal at most, for none of these texts incorporate the *puruṣa-prakṛti* metaphysics nor the various levels of *samādhi* seen in his *Yogaśāstra*. Furthermore, Aṣṭāṅgayoga is rare in these texts, and in the one case where it was incorporated (that is, *Dattātreyayogaśāstra* 27–130), the auxiliaries are described in terms different to those of Pātañjalayoga.⁴⁰ Indeed, the Rājayoga of medieval texts is the stone-like *samādhi* of ascetic traditions which predate the *Yogaśāstra* (see Bronkhorst 1993: 20–28). The definition of Yoga in *Yogasūtra* 1.2 (*yogaś cittavṛttinirodhaḥ*) encapsulates the simplicity of this ascetic practice which is obscured by the complexities of other *sūtras*. A similar definition of Rājayoga is found in *Amarauḥaprabodha* 4d (*yaś cittavṛttirahitaḥ sa tu rājayogaḥ*) which might be seen as a rare salute to the *Yogaśāstra*, yet the absence of any further terminology, theory, or practice of Pātañjalayoga in the *Amarauḥaprabodha* merely accentuates the remoteness of the *Yogaśāstra* from this Rājayoga. The compound *cittavṛttinirodha* also occurs in the *Amanaska* (1.53) in a description of the supernatural power (*siddhi*) of knowing smells from afar. Such occurrences of *cittavṛttinirodha* confirm that it had become somewhat of a cliché by the fifteenth century⁴¹ and it is likely that it was used simply as another expression for *samādhi* in texts such as the *Amarauḥaprabodha* and the *Amanaska*.

As in the case of the *Yogasūtra*, it appears that the *Bhagavadgītā* had little influence on the *Haṭhapradīpikā* and its sources. Though the *Haṭhapradīpikā* contains verses which can be traced back to various texts such as the *Mokṣopāya* and *Kaulajñānanirṇaya*, there is not one from the *Bhagavadgītā*.⁴² The same is true for the *Amanaska*, so it is unlikely that its adaptation of the term “*rājayoga*” was inspired by *rājavidyā* (that is, “the king’s knowledge”) which is mentioned in *Bhagavadgītā* 9.2.

Rājayoga After the Fifteenth Century

After the time of the *Haṭhapradīpikā*, further variations on Rājayoga emerged in Haṭhayoga texts such as the seventeenth-century *Haṭha-*

ratnāvalī which defined a *rājayogin* as one who could retain his semen.⁴³ Also, the long recension of the *Yogaśikhopaniṣat* incorporated much of the *Yogabīja* and added several verses to the latter's brief explanation of Rājayoga.⁴⁴ Thus, in the *Yogaśikhopaniṣat*, Rājayoga is defined as the union of menstrual blood (*rajas*) and semen (*retas*).⁴⁵ Christian Bouy (1994: 106) estimated that this Upaniṣad was redacted in the first half of the eighteenth century, but in a table of parallel verses between the *Yogaśikhopaniṣat* and the *Yogabīja*, he (104) reports that this verse is in the *Yogasiddhāmṛta*, which appears to be a South Indian transmission of the *Yogabīja*.⁴⁶ I have yet to find a quotation attributed to a *Yogasiddhāmṛta* in any medieval text, and it is conspicuously absent from Yoga compendiums such as Śivānandasarasvatī's *Yogacintāmaṇi*, the *Upāsanāsārasaṅgraha* and the *Yogasārasaṅgraha*, the first two of which quote the *Yogabīja*. Therefore, the *Yogasiddhāmṛta* may well be a late South Indian redaction of the *Yogabīja*, and since the *Yogaśikhopaniṣat* is also a late work, it is probable that the definition of Rājayoga as the union of sexual fluids arose after the time of the *Haṭhapradīpikā*.⁴⁷ This is further confirmed by two eighteenth-century works, Jayatarāma's *Jogapradīpyakā* and Sundardās' *Sarvāṅgayogapradīpikā*, which state that Rājayoga arises from the practice of Vajrolī Mudrā.⁴⁸

By the eighteenth century many diverse practices were associated with Rājayoga by writers of various traditions. For example, Rājayoga is the sensual rapture (*rāsālīlā*) of the cult of the Goddess Tripurasundarī (Śrīvidyā) in Miṭṭhuśukla's *Haṃsavilāsa* (Vasudeva 2012: 242–43), and in Narahari's Vedāntic compendium called the *Bodhasāra*, it is the fourteen stages of Yoga (*yogabhūmikā*) taught in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* (Cover 2012: 1–2).⁴⁹ Seeing that the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, which is a rewriting of the earlier *Mokṣopāya*, provides a doctrine of liberation for kings (Hanneder 2009: 65), it is surprising that the term “*rājayoga*” did not appear in this text. In fact, my research has revealed only two texts which contain the gloss of Rājayoga as “the Yoga fit for kings.” Both are eighteenth-century Vedāntic works, namely, the *Rājayogabhāṣya*⁵⁰ and Divākara's commentary to the *Bodhasāra*.⁵¹

The association of Rājayoga with the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* was made by the sixteenth-century Vijñānabhikṣu, who, in his *Sāṅkhyasāra*, overlaid Haṭha-yoga and Rājayoga onto a division between Yoga and gnosis in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*.⁵² In a sense, Vijñānabhikṣu was following the preference of

earlier Advaitavedāntins for citing the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* in contexts of Yoga, the most conspicuous example being the fourteenth-century Vidyāraṇya in his *Jīvanmuktiviveka*. Like Vijñānabhikṣu, the eighteenth-century Ānandabodhendrasarasvatī also distinguished between Rājayoga and Haṭhayoga in his commentary on the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, but his distinction was not based exclusively on Yoga and gnosis, but on those Yoga techniques which are taught in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* (designated as Rājayoga) as opposed to those which are forceful and are not taught in scripture (Haṭhayoga).⁵³

However, Rājayoga's association with the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* was not the predominant one of the eighteenth century, because at that time, there were further formulations of a three-fold⁵⁴ and six-fold Rājayoga, the latter of which attempted to bring together Śāmbhavī, Bhrāmarī, Khecarī, and Yoni *mudrās* as well as devotion (*bhaktiyoga*) and trance.⁵⁵ Furthermore, unpublished manuscripts of Rājayoga texts in several libraries of Tamilnadu indicate a revival of Rājayoga in South India in perhaps the eighteenth century or later. These include the *Rājayogasiddhāntarahasya*,⁵⁶ the *Rājayogāmṛta*,⁵⁷ the *Rājayogasāra*,⁵⁸ and Agastya's *Rājayoga*.⁵⁹ The *Rājayogāmṛta* is almost identical to the *Rājayogasiddhāntarahasya*, and the colophons of the former confirm its connection to the latter.⁶⁰ The *Rājayogasāra* has verses in common with the *Rājayogasiddhāntarahasya* and *Rājayogāmṛta*,⁶¹ and these three texts are couched in the terminology and style of the Śaivāgamas. They take the form of a dialogue between Śiva and the goddess and teach a series of visualization practices involving piercing the knots (*granthi*), seeing an internal light (*jyotis*), hearing an internal sound (*nāda*) and fusing the mind with it, and raising Kuṇḍalinī. Unlike the *Amanaska*, these texts are not polemical, but integrate other Yogas such as Haṭha, Sāṅkhya, and Laya.⁶² Indeed, the *Rājayogasiddhāntarahasya* (ms. R635, pages 5–6) gives an extensive description of Layayoga as the process of fusing the mind in ten sounds. Spontaneous retention (*kevalakumbhaka*) is mentioned in several passages on Rājayoga, but the practice of *prāṇāyāma* is omitted. Rājayoga is defined variously, including the visualization of that which is endowed with *nāda*, *bindu*, and *kalā* within one's own internal light;⁶³ the fusion of the mind in an internal sound;⁶⁴ and seeing a light in the internal sound.⁶⁵

Agastya's *Rājayoga* differs from the above three in its content, terminology, and religious orientation which is Vaiṣṇavism. It could well be

part of a larger work because it begins with: “Now, the chapter on Yoga” (*atha yogādhyāyaḥ*; ms. 4374, folio 1r). It consists of six sections (*upadeśa*) in which a series of visualization practices are taught involving meditation on the five gross elements (*tattva*), the manipulation of the breath, the repetition of *om* (*praṇava*), visualizing Viṣṇu, Kṛṣṇa, Gaṅgā, Yamunā and Sarasvatī, and fixing (*nyāsa*) *mantras* in the body. There is very little mention of *samādhi*, yet the text begins with the lord’s declaration: “I shall speak about Rājayoga....”⁶⁶ All four of these South Indian texts on Rājayoga appear to be late works, because, as far as I am aware, they have not been cited in other texts and are conspicuously absent in compendiums such as the *Yogacintāmaṇi*, *Yogasārasaṅgraha*, and Sundardeva’s *Haṭha-tattvakaumudī*.⁶⁷ Unfortunately, none of the catalogs report a date of completion for any manuscript of these Rājayoga texts.

Rājayoga and Haṭhayoga in Pātañjalayoga

The earliest occurrence of the term “*rājayoga*” in a commentary on the *Yogasūtra* may be Vijñānabhikṣu’s *Yogasārasaṅgraha* which is generally ascribed to the second half of the sixteenth century. It is reasonably clear that Vijñānabhikṣu understood Rājayoga as *samādhi*, which was its predominant meaning before the sixteenth century. He does mention Rājayoga in relation to Haṭhayoga, but only to direct the reader to Haṭhayoga texts for instruction on *āsana* because his concern was with the topic of *samādhi*.⁶⁸ Had he understood Rājayoga to be Pātañjalayoga as a whole, one would expect to see the term “*rājayoga*” in a much more prominent place in his commentary. Nonetheless, his comment confirms that he preferred not to mix Pātañjala and Haṭhayoga, though he saw the opportunity to do so.

Such an opportunity was taken by the seventeenth-century Nārāyaṇatīrtha. In his commentary on the *Yogasūtra* called the *Yogasiddhāntacandrikā*, he integrated various medieval Yoga systems into Aṣṭāṅgayoga. As Ko Endo (1998: 34) has noted, Nārāyaṇatīrtha listed the following fifteen Yogas in his introduction to *Yogasūtra* 1.1: Kriyāyoga, Caryāyoga, Karmayoga, Haṭhayoga, Mantrayoga, Jñānayoga, Advaitayoga, Lakṣhyayoga, Brahmayoga, Śivayoga, Siddhiyoga, Vāsanāyoga, Layayoga, Dhyānayoga, and Premabhaktiyoga. In his commentary on *Yogasūtra* 1.34, he equates Haṭhayoga with *prāṇāyāma*,⁶⁹ and on *Yogasūtra* 1.20, Rājayoga with *asamprajñātasamādhi*.⁷⁰ Since *asamprajñātasamādhi* is

the highest level of *samādhi* in Pātañjalayoga, it is clear that Nārāyaṇatīrtha placed Rājayoga as the goal to be achieved by the other Yogas, as was the case in the standard medieval tetrad of Mantrayoga, Layayoga, Haṭhayoga, and Rājayoga. And he was certainly aware of the metaphor of the Self as the king:

*tad uktaṃ smṛtau—samādhis tatra nirbījo rājayogaḥ prakīrtitaḥ |
dīpavad rājate yasmād ātmā saccinmayāḥ prabhur iti |*

It has been said in the tradition: “here, seedless *samādhi* is declared to be Rājayoga because the lord, the Self, which is identical with pure consciousness, shines like a lamp” (*Yogasiddhāntacandrikā* 1.20).

Rājayoga Atop Fifteen Medieval Yogas

Nārāyaṇatīrtha’s *Yogasiddhāntacandrikā* may be the earliest work to overtly integrate Haṭhayoga into a commentary on the *Yogasūtra*. However, it was not the only one to form a hierarchy of fifteen medieval Yoga systems under Rājayoga. For, an almost identical list of Yogas is found in Rāmacandraparamahaṃsa’s *Tattvabinduḥ* which was probably written in the seventeenth or early eighteenth century.⁷¹ This text also goes by the names of *Tattvayogabindu*, *Yogabindu* and *Rājayoga*,⁷² and it shares significant parallel passages to a text called the *Yogasvarodaya* which is cited at length in the *Prāṇatoṣiṇī* of Rāmatoṣaṇa Vidyālaṃkāra who lived in Bengal in the early nineteenth century.⁷³ In fact, the parallels between the *Tattvabinduḥ* and the *Yogasvarodaya* are so extensive that one of these texts must have been based on the other.

Rāmacandra’s list of Yogas is identical to Nārāyaṇatīrtha’s with the exception that the former omits the latter’s Premabhaktiyoga. There appear to be no parallels between these two works other than the names of the various Yogas. This is largely because Nārāyaṇatīrtha’s explanations are governed by the *Yogasūtra* on which he was commenting, whereas Rāmacandra’s work is based on other Yoga traditions prevalent during his time. For example, as noted above, Nārāyaṇatīrtha equates Haṭhayoga with *prāṇāyāma*, but Rāmacandra describes two varieties of Haṭhayoga which involve practices such as the *ṣaṭkarma* (that is, *dhauti*, *nauli*, and so on) and visualization techniques.⁷⁴ Nārāyaṇatīrtha’s definition of Kriyāyoga follows *Yogasūtra* 2.1 as ascetic observances, recitation of scripture, and

contemplation of Īsvara (*tapahsvādhyāyeśvarapraṇidhānāni kriyāyogaḥ*), whereas Rāmacandra defines it as cultivating patience, discriminative judgment, detachment, peacefulness, and contentment.⁷⁵ Moreover, in the *Tattvayogabindu*, Rājayoga is not defined by the *Yogasūtra*'s terminology of *asampraññātasamādhi* or *nirbījasamādhi*, but by the *niṣkala* terminology of earlier theistic traditions.⁷⁶

Many of the above Yogas in the *Yogasiddhāntacandrikā* and *Tattvabindu* yoga are also found in the *Sarvāṅgayogapradīpikā*,⁷⁷ a Braj-*bhāṣā* work written by Sundardās who lived in the seventeenth century and was associated with the Dādupanthīs in Ghāṭrā (Thiel-Horstmann 1983: 13). The four chapters (*upadeś*) of this work teach three tetrads of Yogas: the first, Bhaktiyog, Mantrayog, Layayog, and Carcāyog; the second, Haṭhayog, Rājayog, Lakṣayog, and Aṣṭaṅgayog; and the third, Sāṅkhyayog, Jñānayog, Brahmayog, and Advaitayog. He, too, saw Rājayoga as the best Yoga of all these Yogas, and, playing on the root meaning of *rāj*,⁷⁸ he wrote that one who practices it, “shines” for a long time.⁷⁹ Sundardās’ description of the *rājayogin* is quite typical of that of a *yogin* in *samādhi*.⁸⁰

Concluding Observations on the History of Rājayoga

The following conclusions can be made about Rājayoga from the Sanskrit sources mentioned above. First, the second chapter of the *Amanaska* is the earliest extant evidence for the definition of the term “*rājayoga*” in a Yoga text. Second, the absence of *rājayoga* in earlier Tantras, and particularly in the *Mokṣopāya*, in which one would expect to find it, suggests that the term was not used in connection with Yoga before the tenth century. And finally, it is clear that with the exception of the *Aparokṣānubhūti*, the chief denotative meaning of Rājayoga in Yoga texts written before the fifteenth century was *samādhi* and its use in relation to sexual fluids, sexual practices such as Vajrolī Mudrā, the Yoga of the *Yogavāsīṣṭha* and Pātāñjalayoga occur after this time. However, the connotative meaning of Rājayoga as the “best Yoga” is always implied when the term is used in medieval and modern texts. In the early Haṭhayoga and Rājayoga traditions, Rājayoga’s superiority was implicit in the necessity of *samādhi* for attaining liberation while alive (*jīvanmukti*). After the fifteenth-century *Haṭhapradīpikā*, various other traditions including modern writers such as Svāmī Vivekānanda adopted the name as an emblematic term for the superiority of their innovative reinterpretations of Yoga.

Three Entwined Traditions

In Svāmī Vivekānanda's *Raja Yoga*, three traditions which have a history of their own converge: Rājayoga, Aṣṭāṅgayoga, and Pātañjalayoga. The last two are generally identified as one tradition, but Aṣṭāṅgayoga has had a life of its own⁸¹ and was adopted and reinterpreted by various Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava traditions as well as by the great Jain scholar, Hemacandra.⁸² Their interpretations are devoid of the metaphysics and terminology which characterize Pātañjalayoga. The tradition of Pātañjalayoga is a complex one from the time of its inception, owing to the close relation of the *Yogasāstra* to Sāṅkhya as well as the fact that its later commentators (for example, Vācaspatimiśra, Śaṅkara, Vijñānabhikṣu, and so on) have identified themselves with other traditions. As Gerard James Larson (2009: 487–88) has pointed out, the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* resembles a “common tradition” (*samānatantra*) which has remained outside any sectarian affiliation even though Śaivas and Vaiṣṇavas have consulted it. Also, the *Yogabhāṣya* appears to have been the preferred reference text on Yoga for the more scholarly commentator, and its influence on the early traditions of Haṭha-yoga and Rājayoga was at most marginal, as evinced by their Sanskrit texts such as the *Amanaska* and the *Haṭhapradīpikā*.

The success of any Indian Yoga text depends on whether it adds something new to past teachings, while also maintaining the eternal guise of the tradition which, in the case of medieval Yoga, emanated from a divine and timeless source. By using the *Yogasūtra* to sanction his eclectic views and innovations, Svāmī Vivekānanda would have satisfied his public's thirst, whether Theosophist or otherwise, for seemingly ancient teachings. The *Yogasūtra*'s aphoristic style and common tradition must have made it an attractive authoritative source to Svāmī Vivekānanda. Yet, one might wonder whether he would have deferred to the *Yogasūtra* had it not contained Aṣṭāṅgayoga, because he and other modern *gurus* have relied on Aṣṭāṅgayoga to give their own views a comprehensive structure and vital pertinence to the most salient practices and theories of Yoga. This is also evident in earlier Sanskrit works. For example, in the *Bhāgavatapurāna* (3.28), Aṣṭāṅgayoga serves to introduce a long description of a visualization practice on Viṣṇu, within the framework of other auxiliaries such as *āsana* for sitting upright and *prāṇāyāma* for purifying the mind, which would have satisfied and, perhaps, attracted Vaiṣṇava devotees with an

interest in Yoga. Moreover, by including Aṣṭāṅgayoga, the Bhāgavata faith was distinguishing its Yoga from Śaivism's Ṣaḍaṅgayoga while also ensuring that it covered the essential auxiliaries of Yoga.⁸³

A Sanskrit work would only be preserved if it was of value to someone, because scribes required payment for copying it. The extra-textual context for the transmission of Yoga texts is often assumed to be a living tradition of a lineage of *gurus* who combine the texts with oral teachings. Medieval Yoga texts repeatedly state that a *guru* is indispensable for success in Yoga. The *Yogasūtra* may well be an exception here, for it has endured on a scholarly plane as evinced by the erudition of its later commentaries such as Vācaspatimiśra's *Tattvavaiśārādī* and compilations such as Śivānandasarasvatī's *Yogacintāmaṇi*. Though the *Yogasūtra* may have inspired learned Yoga practitioners of past centuries, it has survived in literature without an apparent lineage of *gurus*. The text's value to *paṇḍitas* would have greatly contributed to the survival of its manuscript tradition, and more recently, Svāmī Vivekānanda's *Raja Yoga* ensured the survival and prominence of the *Yogasūtra* in the twentieth century. Though Svāmī Vivekānanda was intent on "transmitting" philosophical ideas which were not in Pātañjalayoga, later works on Rājayoga such as those by Svāmī Śivānanda and Svāmī Rāma have more closely followed the content of the *Yogasūtra*, and the subsequent interest in Pātañjalayoga, particularly outside India, has prompted practitioners and scholars to make historical and philological investigations into the textual tradition. The Haṭhayoga texts appear to have played the same role in the development of modern Yoga. Like Svāmī Vivekānanda's *Raja Yoga*, translations and commentaries of Haṭha texts have been written by prominent Yoga *gurus* who used them to sanction their innovations as well as to provide the structure and terminology of physical practices. This is evinced by the inclusion of Haṭhayoga's auxiliaries (that is, *ṣaṭkarma*, *prāṇāyāma*, *mudrā-bandha*, and so on) in most systems of modern Yoga.

Final Remarks

The ever-present connotative meaning of Rājayoga as the superior Yoga has ensured its survival as a name for a type of Yoga. Apart from the examples cited in Sanskrit sources above, the scope for word play based on this compound is evident even in recent times, such as in the publica-

tions of the Brahma Kumaris:

Raja Yoga implies that those practicing it behave in a royal manner.... They become “carefree kings” unaffected by the sharp contrasts of sorrow and joy, gain and loss, success and failure, praise and defamation. Their royalty and wisdom do not permit them to violate the laws of nature...” (1996: 128).

Ernest Wood surmised that, “The adjective *rāja* means ‘kingly’ because the man becomes king or master of his own faculties...” (1954: 9). And in trying to explain Rājayoga’s association with Pātañjalayoga, Georg Feuerstein suggested that, “It could refer to the fact that Patanjali’s Yoga was practiced by kings, notably the tenth-century King Bhoja...” (2001: 29).

The history of the term reveals that it outlived the traditions which carried it to prominence in earlier centuries. Its survival points to the continuing importance of *samādhi* in Indian Yoga traditions as well as the constant competition between these traditions which have vied with one another in claiming to teach the “best Yoga.” As a foil for Haṭhayoga, it represents the mental, meditative, advanced, and purely soteriological Yoga techniques as opposed to the physical, preparatory, and Siddhi-orientated ones. The fault-line between Haṭhayoga and Rājayoga is an offshoot of the more ancient tension between ritual and gnosis in Indian religions. The efficacy and effortlessness of Rājayoga as opposed to the gradual progress and effort required for Haṭhayoga is still advocated today for the same reasons.

Notes

1. I wish to thank Jacqueline Hargreaves, Elizabeth De Michelis, James Mallinson, Gavin Flood, Jürgen Hanneder, Giles Hooper, Zoe Slatoff, Jennifer Cover, and David Gordon White for reading an early draft of this paper and for their many helpful comments; thanks are also due to Andrea Acri for his editing and Mark Singleton for providing me with a copy of manuscript PM1428 of the *Rājayogasāra*. All quotations and references to the *Haṭhapradīpikā* in this paper are from the 1998 Kaivalyadhama edition unless otherwise stated.

The following abbreviations are used: ms. is “manuscript,” mss. “manuscripts,” and ed. “edition.” The notation for conjectures, emendations, or corrections to the cited Sanskrit is as follows: *devadatta*] conjecture : *devadattā* ed. : *devadattam* ms. 123. This means that I have conjectured “*devadatta*,” whereas the edition has the reading “*devadattā*,” and the manuscript, numbered 123, has “*devadattam*.”

2. The source of the Theosophists’ conflation of Rājayoga with Pātāñjalayoga is not clear. There is a reference to Rājayoga as consisting of “eight stages” in Paul’s *A Treatise on the Yoga Philosophy* (1882: 28) which was first published in 1851. The eight stages are the auxiliaries of Aṣṭāṅgayoga, though Paul does not mention Pātāñjali, Aṣṭāṅgayoga, or the *Yoga-sūtra*. He simply says: “Yoga is chiefly divided into *Raja Yoga* and *Hatha Yoga*” (28). Paul and his book were known to Helena Petrovna Blavatsky, one of the founders of the Theosophical Society, who in her memoirs mentioned Paul and his informant, Captain Seymour, a British officer who went “native” and became a *yogin* (Neff 2003: 94). Also, the Theosophical society published Paul’s book in 1888 (Singleton 2010: 52), so it is clear that the Theosophists were influenced by it. There are earlier references to *rājayogins* by Westerners such as the French physician, François Bernier (1620–88), and the English missionary, William Ward (1769–1823) (for a discussion of their comments on Rājayoga, see Schreiner 2013: 764), but they do not associate *rājayogins* with Pātāñjalayoga. Indeed, Ward (1818: 349) mentions that Rājayoga derived from the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*. I wish to thank David Gordon White for the reference in Paul’s book.

3. Only a few examples of popular publications on Yoga can be given here: Svāmī Akhilānanda, *Hindu Psychology: Its Meaning for the West* (1948); Wood, *Great Systems of Yoga* (1954); Svāmī Satyānanda Sarasvatī, *Asana Pranayama Mudra Bandha* (1969); Svāmī Rāma, *The Royal Path: Practical Lessons on Yoga* (1979); Iyengar, *Light on Yoga* (1979); and Svāmī Śivānanda, *Raja Yoga* (2010 [1937]). Examples of scholarly accounts are: Frauwallner 1973: 225; Daniélou 1991: 91; and Feuerstein 2001: 28–29. Feuerstein posits that the association between Rājayoga and Pātāñjalayoga predates the Theosophists and Svāmī Vivekānanda, and his sixteenth-century estimate appears to coincide with the occurrence of the term “*rājayoga*” in Vijñānabhikṣu’s commentary on the *Pātāñjalayogaśāstra*; “[Rājayoga is] a comparatively late coinage that came in vogue in the

sixteenth century C.E. It refers specifically to the Yoga system of Patanjali...and is most commonly used to distinguish Patanjali's eightfold path of meditative introversion from Hatha-Yoga..." (2001: 28). The problem with this view is that the term "rājayoga" in late Pātañjala commentaries such as Vijñānabhikṣu's *Yogasārasaṅgraha* means *samādhi* and not Pātañjalayoga per se. For further details, see Birch (2011: 543n119).

4. In this paper, the term "modern Yoga" does not refer to a typology of Yoga, but more generally to Yoga taught and practiced in the twentieth century.

5. The term "rājayoga" is found in the *Yavanajātaka*, which predates the seventh century (Mak 2013: 17–18), and in his *Bṛhajjātaka*, the sixth-century Varāhamihira has forty-four Rājayogas in addition to Yavana's thirty-two. I wish to thank Christopher Minkowski for drawing my attention to these Sanskrit works.

6. Bhavadēva wrote the *Yuktabhavadēva* which has been dated to 1623 CE by M. L. Gharote (Gharote and Jha 2002: xvi) on the basis of a manuscript colophon.

7. Śivānandasarasvatī's *guru* was Rāmacandrasadānandasarasvatī. The *Yogacintāmaṇi* can be dated on the basis of two of its oldest manuscripts both completed in 1630 CE (for the first, see Bouy 1994: 77n333, and the second, Kaivalyadhama 2005: 226–27) and the fact that it borrowed from an earlier work of the same name written by Godāvaramiśra, dated by Gode (1953: 475) to the time of the monarch of Gajapati, Pratāparudradeva, who ruled in Orissa between 1497 and 1539 CE.

8. *Yogacintāmaṇi*, ms. 9785 (based on R635), page 257, line 14 (*śloka-saṅkhyā* 3423). This is a scribal comment that follows the final colophon.

9. As it is apparent from the introductory eulogy found in the *Yogacintāmaṇi*, page 2: *śrīvyāsaṃ yatīsaṅkaram bhavaguruṃ śrīrāmacandram guruṃ sāndrānandapadāmbujam ca sakalān natvā hi yogīśvarān | nānā-granthapayodhimadhyapatitam śrīyogacintāmaṇim niḥśeṣārthasamarthakam yatīśivānandaḥ karoti sphuṭam.*

10. Svāmī Vivekānanda teaches none of the postures specific to Haṭha-yoga, nor does he mention the *bandhas* or individual *prāṇāyāmas* such as Bhastrīkā which are distinct to Haṭhayoga. Though Svāmī Vivekānanda used terminology such as *īdā*, *piṅgalā*, *suṣumnā*, *kuṇḍalinī*, and the six Cakra system which is redolent of earlier Haṭhayoga texts (for example, the *Vivekamārtaṇḍa* and the *Śivasamhitā*), such terminology is also present

in chapters on *prāṇāyāma* in late Tantric texts (for example, chapter 25 of the *Rudrayāmalottaratantra*), various Purāṇas (for example, the first part of the *Bṛhannārādīyapurāṇa*, chapter 33), and alchemical/Āyurvedic texts (for example, the first part of the *Ānandakanda*, chapter 20). By the late nineteenth century these terms were probably widely known in India. They were certainly known to nineteenth-century Theosophists through the Yoga Upaniṣads. For example, the *Yogacūḍāmaṇi*, *Dhyānabindu*, and *Garbhopaniṣat* were translated by members of the Kumbakonam Theosophical Society and published in 1891 (see *The Theosophist* 12, 2 [May 1891 to September 1891]).

11. On the distinction between postural practice and meditation in modern Yoga, see De Michelis (2004: 8).

12. Svāmī Vivekānanda advocated that willpower alone was enough to keep the body strong: “There is not one muscle in the body over which a man cannot establish a perfect control; the heart can be made to stop or go on at his bidding, and, in the same way, each part of the organism can be made to work at his bidding” (2003: 17). For further citations on this, see De Michelis (2004: 160).

13. In a glossary, Svāmī Rāma defines Rājayoga as follows: “[It is the] ‘Royal path.’ Raja Yoga is the classical system of yoga philosophy and practice codified by the sage Patanjali in the *Yoga Sutra*. It is also known as the eight-limbed (*ashtanga*) yoga because it is divided into eight steps, some of which were elaborated into separate, specialized areas of discipline. Hatha yoga, for instance, is the science of psychophysical culture which developed out of the third limb, asana, or posture. Raja yoga is also used to signify the last four limbs taken together; *pratyahara*,...*dharana*,...*dhyana*,...and *samadhi*...” (1998: 131).

14. The introduction of Ram Chandra’s *Sahaj Marg Philosophy* states: “[Ram Chandra] introduced an improved system of Raja Yoga which later came to be known as ‘Sahaj Marg’ ” (2009: 292). It appears that the reason for the change of name was to avoid confusion between Patañjali’s Rājayoga and Ram Chandra’s Rājayoga. In his book called the *Efficacy of Raja Yoga*, Ram Chandra reveals the reason behind the simplicity of his Rājayoga: “The difficult methods, so far applied for attaining this simple thing [that is, the Sahaj Marg], have really made it complicated and intricate...Suppose a needle falls on the ground and you want to pick it up. It will be very easy to do so with the help of your fingers. If

however a crane...or some other complicated machinery is used for picking up the needle, it will be difficult to do so, and it is quite possible you may fail in your attempt. Exactly the same thing happens when you think of difficult and complicated methods for attaining the Reality which is very simple” (2009: 169–70).

15. Ram Chandra states: “Under Sahaj Marg system of training we start from *dhyān*, the seventh step of Patanjali Yoga, fixing our mind on one point in order to practice meditation....The practice followed in our Mission is meditation on the heart. The same method has been recommended by Patanjali” (2009: 331). More recent writings of the Sahaj Marg movement state that the first six auxiliaries of Aṣṭāṅgayoga have been omitted in order to suit the lifestyle of a modern householder. In an online document entitled the *Basics of Sahaj Marg*, Durai states: “Sahaj Marg is the ancient *raja yoga* modified and simplified to suit the lifestyles of modern human beings, particularly the *grihastha* (householder). Here an aspirant is inducted into meditation directly, bypassing the preliminary stages mentioned above.” These preliminary stages are those of Aṣṭāṅgayoga (that is, *yama*, *niyama*, *āsana*, and so on) which Durai had listed in a previous paragraph.

16. I wish to thank Suzanne Newcombe for pointing this out to me (personal communication, March 18, 2013).

17. This definition of Rājayoga is confirmed by their official website: “What is Raja Yoga? Raja (King)–Yoga (Communication). Raja Yoga is communication between the self and the Higher Being (God).” See: <http://www.bkwsu.org/srilanka/us/massachusetts/typeb.2009-07-23.5593975822/typec.2009-07-23.9585163482> (accessed December 10, 2013).

18. “...Patanjali nowhere states that the object of yoga is to forge a mental link with this Supreme soul. He merely uses yoga to concentrate and control the various modifications of the mind” (Brahma Kumaris 1996: 129).

19. Elsewhere in the text (Brahma Kumaris 1996: 21), Rājayoga is referred to as the “Highest Yoga,” which appears to derive from the “King of Yogas” definition.

20. <http://www.bkwsu.org/srilanka/us/massachusetts/typeb.2009-07-23.5593975822/typec.2009-07-23.9585163482> (accessed December 10, 2013).

21. This date is established on the likelihood that Hemacandra, the great Śvetāmbara Jain scholar, based most of the twelfth chapter of his *Yoga-*

śāstra on the second chapter of the *Amanaska*. The parallels have been identified by Muni Jambuvijaya in his edition of the *Yogaśāstra*.

22. See, respectively, *Amanaska* 2.3cd (*rājatvāt yyogānām rājayoga iti smṛtaḥ*) and 2.4 (*rājānaṃ dīpyamānaṃ taṃ paramātmānam avyayam | dehinam prāpayed yas tu rājayogaḥ sa ucyate*).

23. I am inferring that Layayoga was rejected by the *Amanaska* because the latter rejects the raising of Kuṇḍalinī (2.14), gazing points (*drṣṭi*) (2.37), and meditation techniques in general (2.33; see below) as methods for inducing the no-mind state. There are many systems of Layayoga (so-called because they “dissolve the mind”), but most are based on either fusing the mind in an internal sound (*nādānusandhāna*), piercing Cakras with Kuṇḍalinī or the use of gazing points. The first is mentioned in the *Śivasamhitā* (5.44), described at length in the *Haṭhapradīpikā* (4.65–4.103), and named Layayoga in other texts such as the *Śivayogadīpikā* (1.6) and the *Haṭhatattvakaumudī* (54.1); the second is in the *Śārṅgadhara-paddhati* (4350–4363); and third is prevalent among the simple, esoteric techniques (*saṅketa*) of Layayoga described in the *Dattātrayayogaśāstra* (15–26).

24. The term “*karāṇa*” in *Amanaska* 2.42b probably refers to Haṭhayogic *mudrās* such as *Viparītakaraṇī*.

25. *Amanaska* 2.53: “And [the *yogin*] who is made content by bliss, becomes devoted to constant practice. When the practice has become ever steady, there is no prescribed method and no step by step progress” (*ānandena ca santuṣṭaḥ sadābhyāsarato bhavet | sadābhyāse sthirībhūte na vidhir naiva ca kramah*). *Ṣaḍaṅgayoga* is rejected in 2.29.

26. The *Amanaska*’s preferred method is summarized by verse 2.26: “Always avoid the [Yoga] with components, mind, and effort. Always adopt the [Yoga] without components, mind, and effort” (*sakalaṃ samānaskaṃ ca sāyāsaṃ ca sadā tyaja | niṣkalaṃ nirmanaskaṃ ca nirāyāsaṃ sadā bhaja*).

27. Note that the causative verb (*prāpayet*) is used in *Amanaska* 2.4 (cited in note 22 above).

28. For example, in *Amanaska* 2.32d, the term “*rājayoga*” could only mean the no-mind state in the following compound; “[the state of] Rājayoga in which the mind is absent” (*vīgatanijāmanorājayoga*). In later Yoga texts, see *Haṭhapradīpikā* 4.3–4 (*rājayogaḥ samādhiś ca... amānaskaṃ...cety ekavācakāḥ*).

29. *Dhātupāṭha* 822: “*rāj*, in [the meaning of] shining” (*rājṛ dīptau*).

30. Compare *Amanaska* 2.10 (*antarlakṣyaṃ bahir dr̥ṣṭir nimeṣonmeṣavarjitā | eṣā hi śāmbhavī mudrā sarvatanreṣu gopitā*) with Abhinavagupta’s *Mālinīśloka-vārttika* 2.77cd (*parabhairavamudrāṃ tām antarlakṣyaḥ bahirdr̥ṣam*); Abhinavagupta’s *Tantrāloka* 5.80 (*asaṃkocavikāso ’pi tadābhāsanatas tathā | antarlakṣyo bahirdr̥ṣṭiḥ paramaṃ padam aśnute*); and Kṣemarāja’s *Svacchandodyota* on 2.89c (*viśālākṣam iti antarlakṣyo bahirdr̥ṣṭir nimeṣonmeṣavarjitāḥ ity āmnātaparabhairavas-phārāvasthitam*).

31. For example, *Kaulajñānanirṇaya* 14.83bd: “...My dear, [the yogin] becomes [motionless] like a piece of wood [or] a clod of earth, when the state of no mind of mind arises, O beautiful one” (...*kāṣṭhaval loṣṭavat priye | manasya unmanībhāvo yadā bhavati sundari* || 83 || 83a *ūrdhvama-dhyaṃ*] ms. NAK 3–362 : *ūrdhmadhyaṃ* ed.); *Ūrmikaulārṇavatāntra* 3.72: “Both Rudra and Rudra’s Śakti go to absorption in *amanaska*. Thus, this Kaula [knowledge] has not been taught in the innumerable Brāhmanical and Śaiva scriptures” (*rudraś ca rudraśaktiś ca amanaske layaṃ gatau | tat kaulikam idaṃ proktaṃ na śāstrāgamakoṭibhiḥ* || 72b *amanaske*] conjecture : *amanaske* codex. Apart from the fact that *amanaske* is odd Sanskrit, my conjecture, *amanaske*, is supported by the quotation of 3.72ab in Jayaratha’s commentary on *Tantrāloka* 3.67). For more information on Kaulism and its subitist teachings, see Vasudeva (2004: 444–45). Such teachings are also seen in the *Vijñānabhairavatantra*, a scripture of the Trika (Sanderson 1990: 74–76).

32. Strictly speaking, the *terminus a quo* of the *Aparokṣānubhūti* is Ādiśaṅkara which means that there is a window of at least five centuries in which this text may have been composed. However, for reasons I have stated previously (Birch 2011: 540), it appears more likely that the *Aparokṣānubhūti* was composed closer to its *terminus ad quem* (that is, the fourteenth-century Vidyāraṇya’s *Dīpikā*) than its *terminus a quo*.

33. See Bouy (1994: 112–13) for details on sections of the *Aparokṣānubhūti* borrowed by several Yoga Upaniṣads.

34. *Dattātreyaयोगशास्त्र* 159cd–160ab: “[The yogin] should practice [Yoga] by means of all these [techniques of Mantrayoga, Layayoga, and Haṭhayoga] which have been taught [in this text]. Because of them (*tato*), Rājayoga arises in due course of time and certainly not otherwise” (*etaiḥ sarvais tu kathitair abhyaset kālakālataḥ | tato bhaved rājayogo nāntarā*

bhavati dhruvam); and in the *Yogabīja* (143cd) the hierarchy is made clear: “Mantra, Haṭha, Layayoga are sequentially the stages in Rājayoga” (*mantra haṭho layo rājayoge ’ntar bhūmikāḥ kramāt* | 143d *rājayoge ’ntar bhūmikāḥ kramāt*] ms. 8627 : *rājayogāntarbhūmikāḥ kramāt* ed.).

35. *Amaraughaprabodha* 52–53ab: “...Then, having pierced Rudra’s knot, the breath goes to his throne [in the middle of the *yogin*’s eyebrows]. In the [state of] Niṣpatti, a flute-like sound whose tone [is like that] of a resonating lute arises. Then, the mind becomes fused [with that] which is called Rājayoga” (*rudragranthiṃ tato bhītvā śarvapīṭhagato ’nilaḥ | niṣpattau vaiṇavaḥ śabdaḥ kvaṇadvīṇākvaṇo bhavet* || 52 || *ekībhūtaṃ tadā cittam rājayogābhīdhānakam* | 52b *śarvapīṭha*] *Haṭhapradīpikā* 4.76 : *satvapīṭha* ed.). According to Brahmānanda’s gloss on *śarvapīṭha*, in his *Jyotsnā* (4.76), Rudra’s throne is in the middle of the eyebrows (*śarvasyeśvarasya pīṭham sthānam bhrūmadhyam...*).

36. *Amaraughaprabodha* 73cd: “Laya, Mantra, and Haṭha have been taught solely for [the attainment] of Rājayoga” (*layamantrahaṭhāḥ proktāḥ rājayogāya kevalam*).

37. Part of the section on Yoga in the *Śārṅgadharapaddhati* corresponds to an Upaniṣad called the *Yogarājopaniṣat*. This Upaniṣad consists of verses 4347–4363 of the *Śārṅgadharapaddhati*. That the *Yogarājopaniṣat* is a late duplication of part of the *Śārṅgadharapaddhati*’s Yoga section (or perhaps an unknown source text of the *Śārṅgadharapaddhati*) is evinced by its omission of the latter’s section on Rājayoga, which makes it an incomplete account of the Mantrayoga, Layayoga, Haṭhayoga, and Rājayoga that it claims to teach in its first verse (*Yogarājopaniṣat* 1cd = *Śārṅgadharapaddhati* 4347ab): *yogarājaṃ pravakṣyāmi yogināṃ yoga-siddhaye | mantrayogo layaś caiva rājayogo haṭhas tathā*. This flaw in the Upaniṣad as well as the absence of citations in late Sanskrit compilations on Yoga suggests that it was redacted recently. My comments are based on one manuscript of the *Yogarājopaniṣat* (ms. 46–461 at the Bharat Itihas Samshodak Mandal, Pune; the final colophon reads: *iti yogarājopaniṣat samāptaḥ*) which has the same number of verses as the printed version (manuscript not reported) in the Adyar Library’s *Unpublished Upanishads* (1938: 1–3).

38. The *Śārṅgadharapaddhati* (verses 4364–4371) offers a concise description of a Rājayoga which was perfected by Dattātreya and based on two methods. The first is piercing the three knots (*granthi*) by the mind

and breath which are raised up the central channel by contracting the pelvic floor (that is, *mūlabandha*). The second is piercing the five Cakras with Kuṇḍalinī which is awakened by creating upward surges of vitality (*udghāta*; on the meaning of this term, see Vasudeva 2004: 405–9). Outside Yoga traditions, the view that Rājayoga was achieved through visualizing Kuṇḍalinī is mentioned by the fifteenth-century Rāghabhaṭṭa in his commentary on *Śāradātilakatantra* 25.64: ...*ātmānubhavaikagamyakuṇḍalinīcintanarūpaṃ rājayogādiprakāram*....The *Śivasamhitā* omits definitions of Mantrayoga, Layayoga, and Haṭhayoga and instead describes over a dozen visualization and meditation practices, ranging from gazing at one’s shadow in the sun to visualizing Cakras and raising Kuṇḍalinī (see 5.20–5.207). Having identified these as the Rājayoga hidden in all the Tantras, a description of a Rājādhirājayoga, “the Yoga of the supreme king of kings,” follows (5.208). This is merely another meditation practice of making the mind supportless and free of thought, with a discussion on the gnosis that comes from it (5.209–5.221).

39. Verses from the second chapter of the *Amanaska*, the *Dattātreyayogaśāstra*, and the *Amarauḥaprabodha* are found in the fourth chapter of the *Haṭhapradīpikā*. Verses of the *Yogabīja* and *Śivasamhitā* are in the third chapter. See Bouy (1994: 82); Mallinson, forthcoming.

40. For general remarks on the terminology of the *Dattātreyayogaśāstra*, see Birch (2011: 548n146).

41. The first chapter of the *Amanaska* was probably written later than the second. Its *terminus ad quem* is the sixteenth-century *Yogacintāmaṇi* of Śivānandasarasvatī, and the absence of its verses from earlier anthologies such as the *Haṭhapradīpikā* suggests it was written between the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

42. For the sources of the *Haṭhapradīpikā*, see the appendix in Mallinson, forthcoming.

43. Śrīnivāsayogī’s *Haṭharatnāvalī* 2.104–2.105ab: “If one’s semen is always stable, longevity increases, [for] semen alone is the cause of birth, life, and death. Because [of this], one becomes a *rājayogin* and certainly not otherwise” (*āyusyaṃ vardhate nityaṃ yadi binduḥ sthīro bhavet | utpattisthitisamhāre bindur eko hi kāraṇam || tato bhaved rājayogī nāntarā bhavati dhruvam*). Śrīnivāsayogī’s willingness to redefine Rājayoga is also seen in his rewriting of verse 2.30 from the *Haṭhapradīpikā* in order to define Rājayoga as: “The [*yogin*] who is capable of Kevala Kumbhaka

can hold the breath [whenever and as long] as desired. Such is said to be Rājayoga, there is no doubt about it” (*śaktaḥ kevalakumbhena yatheṣṭam vāyudhāraṇam | etādṛśo rājayogo kathito nātra saṁśayaḥ*). Compare *Haṭhapradīpikā* 2.74: *śaktaḥ kevalakumbhena yatheṣṭam vāyudhāraṇāt | rājayogapadaṁ cāpi labhate nātra saṁśayaḥ*.

44. Verse 137 of the Adyar edition of the *Yogaśikhopaniṣat* is not in any of the following manuscripts of the *Yogabīja* which I have consulted: ms. 7851 (accession number 4732–17) at the Ganganath Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeeth, Allahabad; mss. 1854 and 1857 at the Man Singh Pustak Prakash, Jodhpur; mss. 2287 (accession number 16329) and 2288 (accession number 16927) at the Rajasthan Oriental Research Institute, Jodhpur; ms. 8627 (called the *Yogabījaprakaraṇam*) at Deccan College Library, Pune; and mss. A0939–19 and A0061–12 at the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project, Kathmandu National Archives.

45. *Yogaśikhopaniṣat* 1.137cd: *rajaso retaso yogād rājayoga iti smṛtaḥ*. The idea of *samādhi* as the union of menstrual blood and semen may have emanated from the belief that the mind is absent at the time of conception (that is, when semen and menstrual blood unite). For example, see *Sva-bodhodayamañjarī* 6ab: “At the time of fusion of semen and menstrual blood, the mind is nowhere [to be found]” (*śukraṣoṇitasamśleṣakāle nāsti manaḥ kvacit | 6a śukraṣoṇita*] correction : *śukraṣoṇita* ed.).

46. Bouy (1994: 105n414) consulted a manuscript of the *Yogasiddhāmṛta* at the Sarasvati Mahal Library in Tanjore. There is one other manuscript by this name in the Government Oriental Library, Mysore (Kaivalyadhama 2005: 334). I am yet to consult either of these manuscripts, but if they are the only manuscripts to preserve this text, then it appears that this is a South Indian transmission of the *Yogabīja*.

47. It has been suggested that the occurrence of *rājayoga* in a verse immediately following a description of the practice of Vajrolī Mudrā in the *Yogatattvopaniṣat* (128–129) confirms that Rājayoga was associated with a sexual practice, albeit as a mental state (Schreiner 2013: 761). This is only true in so far that Rājayoga was associated with Haṭhayoga, for the description of Vajrolī Mudrā in the *Yogatattvopaniṣat* is at the end of a passage describing the Haṭhayogic *mudrās*. Following this passage, one should read *tato bhaved rājayogo* in *Yogatattvopaniṣat* 129a as “from [all the above practices taught in this text], *samādhi* arises.” The *Yogatattvopaniṣat* is a truncated version of the *Dattātreyayogaśāstra*,

and unfortunately its redactor omitted the line *etaiḥ sarvais tu kathitair abhyaset kālakālataḥ* before 129a which makes it undoubtedly clear that all the Yoga practices described above this verse bring about Rājayoga (and not just the practice of Vajrolī).

48. See *Jogapradīpyakā* 551–560, in which Vajrolī is also called Vīraj Mudrā, and *Sarvāṅgayogapradīpikā* 3.14. I wish to thank James Mallinson for these references.

49. These stages are also in the *Mokṣopāya*, an earlier, tenth-century Kashmirian version of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* (Hanneder 2009: 64). It seems that Narahari’s conception of Rājayoga includes not only the fourteen stages of Yoga, but all the sections of the text following it, for his first verse (section 14) on Rājayoga says: “Beginning with the division of [fourteen] stages up to the completion of the text, Rājayoga is explained in this profound [work called the] *Bodhasāra*” (*bhūmikābhedam ārabhya yāvad granthasamāpanam | agādhābodhasāre ’smin rājayogo nirūpyate*). The commentator, Divākara, affirms this by stating: “...up to the completion of the text means the completion of the text called the *Bodhasāra*...” (*...granthasamāpanam yāvad granthasya bodhasārākhyagranthasya samāpanam...*). This would include thirty-eight further sections of the *Bodhasāra*, and it implies that Rājayoga is the principal teaching of this Vedāntic text. I wish to thank Jennifer Cover for providing me with this text and commentary.

50. *Rājayogabhāṣya*, page 1: *rājayogaḥ rājña upayukto yogas tathocyate*. This text also glosses Rājayoga as “the king of [all] Yogas” (*yogānām rājeti vā rājayogaḥ*). It has been called a commentary on the *Maṇḍalabrāhmaṇopaniṣat*. In fact, in Sastri’s edition (1896), the text is presented with the *Maṇḍalabrāhmaṇopaniṣat* to illustrate the parallels between the two texts. Furthermore, some colophons of the *Rājayogabhāṣya* confirm that it is “an expanded *Yogaśāstra*” (for example, ms. 570, 1884–87 at BORI, folio 4r, line 10: *iti śrīśankarācārya viracitaṃ vijṛmbhitayogaśāstrakṛte prathamāśvāsaḥ*). Also see the preface to Sastri’s edition (1896: iii) for a similar colophon. If it is a commentary on the *Maṇḍalabrāhmaṇopaniṣat*, it would post-date the eighteenth century (for the date of the *Maṇḍalabrāhmaṇopaniṣat*, see Bouy 1994: 44). Bouy suggests that the *Maṇḍalabrāhmaṇopaniṣat* may have borrowed from the *Rājayogabhāṣya*. If it did so, then it was a case of a more concise text borrowing from one full of the sort of prolixities which are to be expected in an “expanded

Yoga text.” It is more probable that both derive from a common source and parts of the *Maṇḍalabrāhmaṇopaniṣat* may well be closer to that source because of their conciseness.

51. In his commentary on the *Bodhasāra*’s first verse on Rājayoga (see note 49 above), Divākara says: “Rājayoga is the Yoga of kings, because rulers can accomplish it even when [they] remain in their position (that is, as kings). In this connection, its [main] characteristic is knowledge concerning the union of the individual self with Brahman” (...*rājayogo rājñāṃ nṛpāṇāṃ svasthāne sthitvāpi sādhayitum śakyatvāt tatsambandhī yogo jīvabrahmaikyaviśayakajñānalakṣaṇo*...). I wish to thank James Mallinson for his comments on this passage (personal communication, December 27, 2012).

52. *Sāṅkhyasāra* 6.2–3: “One who is not capable of Rājayoga, is suitable for Haṭhayoga. In the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, Vasiṣṭha was taught thus by Bhusuṇḍa; in Rājayoga, one reverts to gnosis and in Haṭhayoga, the breathing exercises and postures. [Both of] them are important; because they are auxiliaries, one [depends on] the other. They should [both] be practiced according to one’s capacity” (*aśakto rājayogasya haṭhayogo ’dhikāravān | vāsiṣṭhe hi vasiṣṭhāya bhusuṇḍenaivam īritam || jñānāvṛttī rājayoge prāṇāyāmāsane haṭhe | mukhye te ’ṅatayānyonyaṃ sevye śaktyanusārataḥ*). This division between gnosis and Yoga (that is, *prāṇāyāma*, and so on) in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* (5.78.8) goes back to the *Mokṣopāya* (5.78.8): “There are two methods of destroying the mind; Yoga and gnosis, O Rāma. Yoga is the cessation of the [mind’s] activity and gnosis is perfect perception” (*dvau kramau cittanāśasya yoga jñānaṃ ca rāghava | yogas tadvṛttirodho hi jñānaṃ samyagavekṣaṇam*). The reference on Rājayoga in the *Sāṅkhyasāra* is cited in Schreiner (2013: 763). I wish to thank Jürgen Hanneder for drawing my attention to the reference in the *Mokṣopāya*.

53. In the *Śrīvāsiṣṭhamahārāmāyaṇatātparyaparakāśa* (5.92.33), Ānandabodhendrasarasvatī makes the rather surprising comment: “When one is not able (*aśakti*) [to do] the practice of Haṭhayoga, Rājayoga should be practiced” (*haṭhayogābhyāsāśaktau rājayogo ’bhyasanīya ity āha*). The statement is surprising because in medieval Yoga texts Rājayoga is usually recommended to only the most gifted students, and those incapable of practicing it are prescribed Haṭhayoga (on the various types of student suited to Mantrayoga, Layayoga, Haṭhayoga, and Rājayoga, see Birch 2011: 546n135). However, in a subsequent comment on the term “*haṭha*”

in *Yogavāsiṣṭha* 5.92.37, Ānandabodhendra defines it as those practices not sanctioned by true scriptures or *gurus*: “Even though stopping the breath is a forceful [practice] because it is a method of suppressing [that which] is difficult [to restrain], other forceful [methods] in the form of brutal actions such as sitting and lying down [for a long time], withering the body [that is, fasting], [malicious] spells and amulets and cremation-ground practices, which are not on the path taught by true scriptures and *gurus*, are prohibited here...” (*yadyapi prāṇasaṃrodhanaṃ durdāntadamanopāyatvād haṭha eva, tathāpi sacchāstragurūpaḍiṣṭamārgarahitā anye copaveśanaśayanakāyaśoṣaṇamantrayantraśmaśānasādhanādisāhasarūpā haṭhā atra nivāryanta... || -mārgarahitā*] conjecture Mallinson : *-mārgarahito* ed.). Thus, those incapable of practicing Haṭhayoga are those who would not do so because its methods are prohibited. More importantly, Ānandabodhendra’s comment reveals that he did not consider the term “*haṭha*” in *Yogavāsiṣṭha* 5.92 to refer to the Haṭhayoga of *āsana*, *prāṇāyāma*, *mudrā*, and so on. One can infer that by Rājayoga, he meant those practices taught in this section of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*, which are summarized in 5.92.35ab–36: “The attainment of spiritual knowledge, association with the wise, abandoning habitual tendencies (*vāsanā*) and stopping the movement of the breath. According to tradition, these methods are powerful in conquering the mind” (*adhyātmavidyādhiḡamaḥ sādhusaṅgama eva ca || vāsanāsaṃparityāgaḥ prāṇasaṃpandanirodhanam | etās tā yuktayaḥ puṣṭāḥ santi cittajaye kila*). Thus, for Ānandabodhendra, Rājayoga included the practice of *prāṇāyāma* as it was taught in the *Yogavāsiṣṭha*. The reference on Rājayoga in the *Śrīvāsiṣṭhamahārāmāyaṇatātparyaparakāśa* is cited in Schreiner (2013: 762).

54. In the commentary called the *Saubhāgyabhāskara* on the *Śrīlalīṭhasahasranāmastotra* (180), the eighteenth-century Bhāskararāya mentions Sāṅkhya, Tāraka, and Amanaska as the three types of Rājayoga (*rājayogo ’pi sāṅkhyatārakāmanaskabhedāt trividhaḥ*). The Tārakayoga/ Amanaskayoga division may derive from South India, for it is present in the *Amanaska*’s South Indian recension (but not the North Indian and Nepalese) as well as the South Indian redactions of the *Advayatārakopaniṣat* and *Maṇḍalabrāhmaṇopaniṣat*.

55. *Gheraṇḍasaṃhitā* 7.4–6 (for a translation, see Mallinson 2004: 120–23).

56. GOMLM (Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras), ms.

4377. For details, see GOMLM Catalog (1910: 3263–64). A transcript R635 of this manuscript is in Kaivalyadhama’s Library, Lonavla.

57. GOMLM, ms. 4378. For details, see GOMLM Catalog (1910: 3265). There is also a paper manuscript of this text in the Prājña Pāṭhaśālā Maṇḍala in Wai; ms. 399 (L. number 6–4).

58. Adyar Library; ms. PM1428 (transcript number TR1163). The colophon attributes the text to a Śaṅkarācārya.

59. GOMLM, ms. 4374. For details, see GOMLM Catalog (1910: 3259–60). Further research is needed to determine whether manuscripts of similar titles in the GOMLM and Adyar Library are related to those mentioned above; for example, the *Rājayogarahasya* (Adyar, ms. 72327), the *Rājayogakrama* (Adyar, ms. 24–F11), the *Rājayogaprakaraṇa* (Adyar, ms. 70290), the *Rājayogalakṣaṇavicāra* (GOMLM, ms. D15980), and so on.

60. Ms. 4378: *iti śrīrājayogasiddhāntarahasye vedāntasāre īśvaromāsamvāde sakalarājayogāmṛte dvitīyaḥ paṭalaḥ*; ms. 399: *iti śrīrājayogasiddhāntarahasye rājayogāmṛte dvitīyaḥ paṭalaḥ*. Ms. 399 contains another two chapters which are probably a late addition to the text because they mainly consist of verses borrowed from the *Amanaska*. Ms. 4378 has only two chapters, and these are almost identical (albeit with numerous variant readings) to the first two chapters of ms. 399.

61. The beginning of the *Rājayogasiddhāntarahasya* (ms. R635, page 1, lines 1–12) has clear parallels in verses 6–10 (ms. PM1428, page 2, line 6–page 3, line 5) of the *Rājayogasāra*, which occur after five verses of salutation to Śiva; verse 10 is found in both the *Rājayogasiddhāntarahasya* (ms. 4378, page 2, lines 19–20) and the *Rajayogāmṛta* (ms. 399, folio 1r, line 3). There are approximately eighteen parallel verses in the *Rājayogasāra* and *Rājayogasiddhāntarahasya*.

62. The following passage from the *Rājayogasiddhāntarahasya* (ms. R635, page 10, lines 9–14) is a good example of this: “Having first practiced Haṭhayoga, spontaneous retention [arises] abruptly. [Then,] union of [the mind] in an internal sound [occurs] during the retention. Because of the internal sound, an [internal] light shines forth. Having seen the light in the heart-space, [the yogin] is undoubtedly free. [The practice of] *āsana* is for the destruction of diseases, *prāṇāyāma* for [the destruction of] sin. Then, the mind becomes steadier in the [practice of] fusing [the mind] with the internal sound. When the light shines [in the heart],

liberation [arises.] There is no other means to release [from *saṃsāra*]” (*ādau kṛtvā haṭhābhyāsaṃ haṭhāt kevalakumbhakam | kumbhakānte nādayogo nādāj jyotiḥprakāśakam | jyotir dṛṣṭvā hṛdākāśe sa mukto nātra saṃśayaḥ | āsanam vyādhināśāya prāṇāyāmena pātakaḥ | atha nādānusandhāne cittaṃ sthīrataram bhavet | jyotiḥprakāśe kaivalyaṃ nānyathā muktisādhanam | jyotiḥprakāśe] ms. 4378 (ma-vipulā) : jyotiḥprakāśa ms. R635).*

63. *Rājyogasiddhāntarahasya*, ms. R635, page 3, lines 8–10: *nirmalaṃ gaganākāram svayaṃjyotiḥprakāśakam | tasya madhye nādabindukalāyuktaṃ sadā smaret | rājayoga iti prokto yogināṃ mokṣadāyakaḥ.*

64. *Rājyogasiddhāntarahasya*, ms. R635, page 4, lines 4–5: *pūrṇanāde manor aikyaṃ rājyogābhīdhānakam | guruvākyena labhyate nānyathā granthikoṭibhiḥ.*

65. *Rājyogasiddhāntarahasya*, ms. R635, page 4, lines 6–7: *suṣumnā manasā dṛṣṭvā nādaṃ śrutvā nirantaram | nādāntarjyotisamvīkṣyo rājayoga udāhṛtaḥ || nādāntar] rājyogāmṛta ms. 399 : nādānte ms. R635. rājayoga] emendation : rājyogaḥ ms. R635.*

66. *Rājayoga*, ms. 4374, folio 30r: “The lord said: ‘I shall speak about the highly purifying Rājayoga which should be adopted by sages. It brings about liberation to its practitioners and increases longevity and health’ ” (*śrībhagavān uvāca | rājayogam ahaṃ vakṣye munigrhyaṃ supāvanam | sevakānāṃ mokṣakaram āyurārogyavardhanam).*

67. Also, these Rājayoga texts have not been cited in the following three chapters of the *Upāsanāsārasaṅgraha*: the *suṣumnā*-, *jīvaparamātmāsvārūpopāsanā*-, and *abhyāsayogaprakaraṇas*. As Bouy (1994: 90–91) noted, this compendium is of great value in dating Yoga texts written before the seventeenth century, and a search of its entire contents is needed here, but I have only had access to an IFP transcript (T1095b) which contains the above three chapters.

68. For a discussion on this and a translation of the relevant passages, see Birch (2011: 543n119).

69. *Yogasiddhāntacandrikā* 1.34: “In the tradition, Haṭhayoga is spoken of as *prāṇāyāma*: ‘the sun is known by the syllable “ha,” the moon by the syllable “ṭha.” The union of sun and moon is called Haṭhayoga.’ [Therefore,] Haṭhayoga whose [main] characteristic is the union of sun and moon, [that is,] *prāṇāyāma*, is known as *prāṇāyāma* in the *Yogabīja*” (*prāṇāyāmasya haṭhayogatvam uktaṃ smṛtau—hakāreṇa tu sūryo ’sau*

*ṭhakāreṇendur ucyate | sūryācandramasor aikyaṃ haṭha ity abhidhīyate | sūryacandrākhyayoḥ prāṇāyāmayor aikyalakṣaṇaḥ haṭhayogo yogabīje prāṇāyāmaḥ prakīrtita iti | yogabīje] conjecture : yogabījaṃ ed.). In Nārāyaṇatīrtha's commentary on *Yogasūtra* 2.46, he lists thirty-eight postures and quotes without attribution descriptions of them from texts such as the *Haṭhapradīpikā*, so one could argue that Nārāyaṇatīrtha integrated Haṭhayoga in Aṣṭāṅgayoga's *āsana* and *prāṇāyāma*. However, he only expressly mentions Haṭhayoga in regard to *prāṇāyāma*.*

70. *Yogasiddhāntacandrikā* 1.20: *tato paravairāgyād asampraññāta itareṣāṃ pūrvavilakṣānāṃ manuṣyāṇāṃ mumukṣūṇāṃ bhavatīty arthaḥ | ayam eva ca rājayoga ity ucyate*. For a translation of this passage, see Birch (2011: 543n120).

71. I am yet to determine a *terminus a quo* for the *Tattvabinduyoga*, but it is unlikely to have been written before the seventeenth century. The firmest *terminus ad quem* for the *Tattvabinduyoga* is a manuscript (BORI ms. 664, 1883–84) completed in 1810 CE (*saṃvat* 1867). Another manuscript (VSUL 30019) which is reported in Kaivalyadhama's catalog of Yoga manuscripts (2005: 104–5) is dated at 1841, but there is no mention of *śaka* or *saṃvat*. If it is the latter, then the manuscript evidence would confirm a *terminus ad quem* of 1784 CE. The *New Catalogus Catalogorum* (1974: 60) reports that the *Tattvabinduyoga* is cited by Sundaradeva in his *Haṭhasaṅketacandrikā*. Unfortunately, the *Haṭhasaṅketacandrikā* does not help to fix an earlier *terminus ad quem* for the *Tattvabinduyoga*, because it was composed sometime between the early seventeenth century (that is, Śivānandasarasvatī's *Yogacintāmaṇi*) and 1832 CE, the latter date being based on that of an incomplete manuscript in the Cambridge University Library (ms. Add. 2145). I have noted this in case the date of composition of the *Haṭhasaṅketacandrikā* becomes known.

72. Manuscripts of these names are reported in Kaivalyadhama's catalog of Yoga manuscripts (2005: 102–5, 246–47, 394–95), and they are attributed to a Rāmacandra. The colophon of the manuscript consulted by me (that is, BORI ms. 664, 1883–84) gives the name of the text as the *Tattvabinduyoga* which has been adopted above.

73. *Prāṇatoṣiṇī*, part 6, pages 830–48. According to sources cited in Goudriaan and Gupta (1981: 147), this work was completed in 1820 and printed in 1824. For an example of one of its parallel passages to the *Tattvabinduyoga*, see note 76 below.

74. *Tattvabindu yoga*, folio 7v, lines 4–folio 8r, line 3: “Now, Haṭhayoga is explained [as follows]. The practice of [stopping] the breath is accomplished by such methods such as exhalation, inhalation, and retention. And then, purification of the body occurs by means of the six cleansing practices such as *dhauti*. When the entire breath remains in the sun channel, then the mind becomes still. When the mind is still, direct perception of one’s essential nature as bliss manifests. Because of [this] Haṭhayoga, the mind dissolves into the void. Death does not go near [that *yogin*]. Now, the second type of Haṭhayoga is explained. Some white, yellow, blue, [or] red form with the splendour of ten million suns is visualized [by the *yogin*] in his body from his feet up to his head. Because of meditation on that [form], disease and [excessive] heat do not occur in his body and the length of his life increases” (*idānīm haṭhayogaḥ kathyate | recakapūrakakumbhaka ityādiprakāreṇa pavanasādhanam kartavyam | atha ca dhautyādiṣaṭkarmakaraṇāt śarīrasya śuddhir bhavati | sūryanāḍīmadhye pavanaḥ pūrṇo yadā tiṣṭhati tadā mano niścalaḥ bhavati | manaso niścalatve ānandasvarūpapratyakṣam bhāsate | haṭhayogakaraṇāt manaḥ śūnyamadye līnaḥ bhavati | kālah samīpe nāgacchati | idānīm haṭhayogasya dvitīyo bhedaḥ kathyate | padārabhya śiraḥparyantaḥ svaśarīre koṭisūryatejāsamānam śvetaḥ pītaḥ nīlaḥ raktaḥ kiṃ cid rūpaḥ cintyate | tad-dhyānakaraṇāt sakalāṅge rogajvalanam na bhavati | āyurvṛddhir bhavati || kālah] conjecture : kalāḥ codex. haṭhayogasya] conjecture : haṭhayoga codex. It is possible that *rogajvalanam* is a corruption of *rogajvaro*; a stronger digestive fire ([*jvalana*] is usually a desired outcome of Haṭhayoga).*

75. *Tattvabindu yoga*, folio 2r, lines 4–5: “He who causes such [mental states] as patience, discriminative judgment, detachment, peacefulness, and contentment to arise in his mind, he alone is said to be a *yogin* of [these] many Kriyās” (*yasyāntaḥkaraṇe kṣamāvivekavairāgyaśāntisaṅtoṣa ityādīny utpādyante, sa eva bahukriyāyogī kathyate*).

76. *Tattvabindu yoga*, folio 7r, line 1: *idānīm rājayogayuktasya puruṣasya yac charīracihnam kathyate | ...yasya janmamaraṇe na staḥ sukham na bhavati, kulaḥ na bhavati, śītalaḥ na bhavati, sthānaḥ na bhavati, asya siddhasya manomadye īśvarasambandhī prakāśo nirantaram pratyakṣo bhavati | sa ca prakāśo na śīto na coṣṇo na śveto na pīto bhavati | tasya na jātir na kiṃ cic cihnam | ayaḥ ca niškalo nirañjanaḥ alakṣaś ca bhavati*. Compare *Yogasvarodaya* (cited in the *Prāṇatoṣiṇī*, part 6, page

834): *na kṣobho janma mr̥tyuś ca na duḥkhaṃ na sukhaṃ tathā | bhedā-
bhedau manaḥsthau na jñānaṃ śīlaṃ kulaṃ tathā | prakāśakuśasam-
bandhiprasaṅgo 'yaṃ niraṅtaram | sarvaprakāśako 'sau tu naṣṭabhe-
dādir eva ca | asya jāter na cihnañ ca niṣkalo 'yaṃ nirañjanaḥ.*

77. I wish to thank James Mallinson for this reference.

78. For similar wordplay, see the *Amanaska*'s second definition of *rājayoga* (note 22 above) as well as Nārāyaṇatīrtha's definition (cited above on page 414–15).

79. *Sarvāṅgayogapradīpikā* 3.13cd: *rājayog sab upar chājai | jo sādhai
so adhika virājai.* My reading of this hemistich follows the commentary
of the editor, R. C. Misra: *rājayog = yog kā ek prakār | yah any yogapra-
kārom se sarvaśreṣṭh batāyā gayā haiṃ | ... | jo ise sādhatā hai, vah adhik
der tak [-lambe jīvan tak] śobhāyamān banā rahtā hai | chājai = śobhā-
yamān.*

80. *Sarvāṅgayogapradīpikā* 3.18–19: *rājayogi ke lakṣaṇ esai, mahāpuruṣ
baulai haiṃ taise | jākaum dukh aru sukh nahīṃ hoī, harṣ śok vyāpai
nahīṃ koī || jākaiṃ kṣudhā tuṣā na satāvai, nidrā ālasa kabahu na āvai |
śīt uṣṇ jākaiṃ nahīṃ bhāī, jarā na vyāpai kāl na ṣāī.* Compare *Haṭhapra-
dīpikā* 4.108 and 4.111: *khādyate na ca kālena bādhyate na ca karmaṇā |
sādhyate na sa kenāpi yogī yuktaḥ samādhinā || ...na vijānāti śītoṣṇaṃ
na duḥkhaṃ na sukhaṃ tathā | na mānaṃ nopamānaṃ ca yogī yuktaḥ
samādhinā.*

81. My research on the Yoga traditions which date from the twelfth
century onwards certainly confirms this view. However, there are occur-
rences of Aṣṭāṅgayoga being interpreted independently of Pātañjalayoga
before this time (for example, *Netratāntra* 8.10–21). David Gordon White
informs me that he has discussed expositions of Aṣṭāṅgayoga that differ
from that of the *Yogasūtra*, in five Purāṇas including the early *Viṣṇu-
purāṇa* (6.7), in his forthcoming book, *The Yoga Sutra of Patanjali: A
Biography* (2014) (personal communication, January 10, 2013).

82. For examples of the various traditions in which Aṣṭāṅgayoga is
found, see Birch (2011: 541n103).

83. Apart from the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*, other Vaiṣṇava texts which
incorporated Aṣṭāṅgayoga include the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* and the Pāñcarātrika
Ahīrbudhnyasaṃhitā, as well as the *Vasiṣṭhasaṃhitā*, the *Yogayājña-
valkya* and the *Dattātreyayogaśāstra*. Some Śaiva works such as the
Netratāntra and the *Agnipurāṇa* have also incorporated Aṣṭāṅgayoga.

References Cited

- Akhilananda, Swami. 2001 [1948]. *Hindu Psychology: Its Meaning for the West*. Taylor and Francis e-Library [internet].
- Amanaska. See Birch 2013.
- Amarauḡhaprabodha. See Mallik 1954.
- Ānandakanda. 1952. *Ānandakanda* (ed. S. V. Radhakrishna Sastri). Tanjore: Tanjore Sarasvati Mahal Sanskrit Library.
- Aparokṣānubhūti. 1988. *Aparokṣānubhūtiḥ—Vidyāraṇyakṛtayā Aparokṣādīpikākhyatīkayā Saṃvalitā* (ed. Kamla Devi). Allahabad: Akshayavata Prakashan.
- Bhāgavatapurāṇa. 1983. *Śrīmadbhāgavatapurāṇam with the Tikā Bhāvārthabodhinā of Śrīdharasvāmin* (ed. Jagadīsalala Sastri). Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Birch, Jason. 2011. “The Meaning of Haṭha in Early Haṭhayoga.” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 131, 4: 527–54.
- Birch, Jason. 2013. “The Amanaska: King of All Yogas. A Critical Edition and Annotated Translation with a Monographic Introduction” Ph.D. Dissertation. Oxford: University of Oxford Library.
- Bodhasāra. 2010. *Bodhasāra: An Eighteenth Century Sanskrit Treasure by Narahari* (trans. Jennifer Cover and Grahame Cover). Charleston: CreateSpace.
- Bouy, Christian. 1994. *Les nātha-yogin et les Upaniṣads: étude d’histoire de la littérature hindoue*. Paris: Diffusion de Boccard.
- Brahma Kumaris. 1986 [1981]. *Positive Health: Raja Yoga Meditation for Stress-Free, Peaceful and Healthy Life*. Delhi: Prajapita Brahma Kumaris Ishwariya Vishwa Vidyalaya.
- Brahma Kumaris. 1996. *Raja Yoga: New Beginnings*. Delhi: Prajapita Brahma Kumaris Ishwariya Vishwa Vidyalaya.
- Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣat. See Olivelle 1998.
- Bṛhannāradyapurāṇa. 1984. *The Nāradyamahāpurāṇam* (ed. N. S. Singh). Delhi: Nag Publishers.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes. 1993. *The Two Traditions of Meditation in Ancient India*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Chandra, Ram. 2009 [1989]. *The Complete Works of Ram Chandra*. Volume 1. Calcutta: Spiritual Hierarchy Publication Trust.
- Cover, Jennifer. 2012. “An 18th century Illumination of the Seven Steps

- of Raja-Yoga.” Paper Presented at the 15th World Sanskrit Conference, January 5–10, Delhi, India.
- Daniélou, Alain. 1991 [1949]. *Yoga: Mastering the Secrets of Matter and the Universe*. Rochester: Inner Traditions International.
- Dattātreyayogaśāstra. N.d. *Dattātreyayogaśāstra* (ed. James Mallinson, compiled with assistance from Alexis Sanderson, Jason Birch, Péter Szántó, and Andrea Acri). Unpublished.
- De Michelis, Elizabeth. 2004. *A History of Modern Yoga: Patañjali and Western Esotericism*. London: Continuum.
- Dhātupāṭha. 1969. *Dhātupāṭha of Pāṇini* (ed. Kanaka Lal Sharma). Haridas Sanskrit Series 281. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office.
- Durai, A. P. 2004. *Basics of Sahaj Marg*. Online book: <http://shivanand.tripod.com/download/meditationBASICS.htm> (accessed January 12, 2013).
- Dvivedi, Manilal Nabhubhai. 1885. *Rāja Yoga, or The Practical Metaphysics of the Vedānta: Being a Translation of the Vākyasudhā or Drigdrishyaviveka of Bhāratitirtha, and the Aparokshānubhuti of Shri Shankarāchārya*. Bombay: The “Subodha-Prakasha” Printing Press.
- Endo, Ko. 1998. “The Medieval Yoga-s and the Patanjala-Yoga: Narayana Tirtha’s Interpretation of the Yogasutra.” *The Journal of the Faculty of Letters, Nagoya University. Philosophy* 44: 25–39.
- Feuerstein, Georg. 2001 [1998]. *The Yoga Tradition: Its History, Literature, Philosophy and Practice*. Prescott: Hohm Press.
- Frauwallner, Erich. 1973 [1953–56]. *History of Indian Philosophy*. Volume 1: *The Philosophy of the Veda and of the Epic; the Buddha and the Jina; the Sāṃkhya and the Classical Yoga-System* (trans. V. M. Bedekar). Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Gharote, M. L. and Vijay Kant Jha, eds. 2002. *Yuktabhavadeva of Bhava-deva Miśra*. Lonavla: Lonavla Yoga Institute.
- Gheraṇḍasaṃhitā. See Mallinson 2004.
- Gode, P. K. 1953. *Studies in Indian Literary History*. Volume 1. Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhawan.
- GOMLM (Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras) Catalog. 1910. *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras*. Volume 9: *Systems of Indian Philosophy: Vaiśeṣika, Yoga, Mīmāṃsā and Vedānta-Advaita Philosophy* (eds. M. Rangacarya and Rao Bahadur). Madras: Superin-

- tendent, Government Press.
- Goudriaan, Teun and Sanjukta Gupta. 1981. *Hindu Tantric and Śākta Literature*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Hanneder, Jürgen. 2009. “Dreams and Other States of Consciousness in the Mokṣopāya.” In Claudine Bautze-Picron, ed., *The Indian Night, Sleep and Dream in Indian Culture*, 64–102. Delhi: Rupa.
- Haṭhpradīpikā. 1972. *Haṭhpradīpikā of Svātmārāma with the Commentary Jyotsnā of Brahmānanda* (ed. K. Kunjunni Raja). Madras: Adyar Library and Research Centre.
- Haṭhpradīpikā. 1998. *Haṭhpradīpikā of Svātmārāma* (eds. Swami Digambarji and Pandit Raghunatha Sastri Kokaje). Lonavla: Kaivalyadhama Srimanmadhava Yogamandira Samiti.
- Haṭharatnāvalī. 2002. *Haṭharatnāvalī of Śrīnivāsayogī* (eds. M. L. Gharote, Parimal Devnath, and Vijay Kant Jha). Lonavla: Lonavla Yoga Institute.
- Haṭhatattvakaumudī. 2007. *Haṭhatattvakaumudī of Sundaradeva* (eds. M. L. Gharote, Parimal Devnath, and Vijay Kant Jha). Lonavla: Lonavla Yoga Institute.
- Iyengar, B. K. S. 1979. *Light on Yoga (Yoga Dīpikā)*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Jogapradīpyakā. 2006. *Jogapradīpyakā of Jayatarāma* (eds. Swami Mahesananda, and B. R. Sharma, G. S. Sahaya and R. K. Bodhe). Lonavla: Kaivalyadhama Srimanmadhava Yogamandira Samiti.
- Jyotsnā. 2002. *Haṭhpradīpikā Jyotsnā of Brahmānanda* (eds. Swami Mahesananda, and B. R. Sharma, G. S. Sahaya and R. K. Bodhe). Lonavla: Kaivalyadhama Srimanmadhava Yogamandira Samiti.
- Kaivalyadhama. 2005. *Descriptive Catalogue of Yoga Manuscripts (Updated)* (comp. Philosophico-Literary Research Department). Lonavla: Kaivalyadhama S.M.Y.M Samiti.
- Kaulajñānanirṇaya. *Kaulajñānanirṇaya*, manuscript NAK 3–362 (NGMPP reel A48/13), National Archives at Kathmandu, Nepal.
- Kaulajñānanirṇaya. 1934. *Kaulajñānanirṇaya and Some Minor Texts of the School of Matsyendranātha* (ed. Prabodh Chandra Bagchi). Calcutta Sanskrit Series 3.
- Larson, Gerald James. 2009. “Differentiating the Concepts of ‘Yoga’ and ‘Tantra’ in Sanskrit Literary History.” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 129, 3: 487–98.
- Mahābhārata. 1933–66. *The Mahābhārata for the First Time Critically*

- Edited* (eds. V. S. Sukthankar, S. K. Belvalkar, and P. L. Vaidya, general editors, and others). 19 volumes. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Mak, Bill M. 2013. "The Date and Nature of Sphujidhvaja's *Yavana-jātaka* Reconsidered in the Light of Some Newly Discovered Materials." *History of Science in South Asia* 1: 1–20.
- Mālinīśloka-vārttika. 1921. *Mālinīvijayavārttika of Abhinavagupta* (ed. Madhusudan Kaul). Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies 31.
- Mallik, Kalyani. 1954. *Siddha-Siddhānta-Paddhati and Other Works of the Nātha Yogīs*. Poona: Poona Oriental Book House.
- Mallinson, James. 2004. *The Gheranda Samhita: The Original Sanskrit and An English Translation*. Woodstock: Yoga Vidya.
- Mallinson, James. 2007. *The Shiva Samhita: A Critical Edition and an English Translation*. Woodstock: Yoga Vidya.
- Mallinson, James. Forthcoming. "Haṭhayoga's Philosophy: A Fortuitous Union of Non-Dualities." *Journal of Indian Philosophy*.
- Mokṣopāya. 2013. *Mokṣopāya: Upaśāntiprakaraṇa* (eds., Susanne Krause-Stinner and Peter Stephan). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Neff, Mary K. 2003 [1937]. *Personal Memoirs of H.P. Blavatsky*. Whitefish: Kessinger Publishing.
- Netratantra. 1926, 1939. *Netratantra with the Commentary (Netroddyota) of Rājānaka Kṣemarāja* (ed. Madhusudan Kaul). Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies 46, 59.
- New Catalogus Catalogorum. 1974. *New Catalogus Catalogorum: An Alphabetical Register of Sanskrit and Allied Works and Authors* (ed. Kumarapuram Kunjunni Raja). Volume 8. Madras: University of Madras.
- Olivelle, Patrick, trans. and ed. 1998. *The Early Upanisads: Annotated Text and Translation*. New York: Oxford University Press. Paul, N. C. 1882 [1851]. *A Treatise on the Yoga Philosophy*. Benares: Medical Hall Press.
- Pingree, D. E. 1981. *Jyotiḥśāstra: Astral and Mathematical Literature*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Prāṇatoṣiṇī (of Rāmatoṣaṇa Vidyālaṅkāra). 1898. *Prāṇatoṣiṇī* (ed. J. V. Bhattacarya). Calcutta: Srijiivananandavidyasagarabhattacharya.
- Rājayoga (of Agastya). *Rājayoga*, manuscript 4374, Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras.
- Rājayogabhāṣya. *Rājayogabhāṣya*, manuscript 570, 1884–87, Bhandarkar

- Oriental Research Institute Library, Pune.
- Rājayogabhāṣya. 1896. *Maṇḍalabrahmaṇopaniṣad with a Commentary (Rājayogabhāṣya)* (ed. Mahadeva Sastri). Government Oriental Library Series. Mysore: Government Branch Press.
- Rājayogāmṛta. *Rājayogāmṛta*, manuscript 399 (L. number 6–4), Prajna Pathasala Mandala, Wai.
- Rājayogāmṛta. *Rājayogāmṛta*, manuscript 4378, Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras.
- Rājayogasāra. *Rājayogasāra*, manuscript PM1428, Adyar Library, Chennai.
- Rājayogasiddhāntarahasya. *Rājayogasiddhāntarahasya*, transcript R635 (based on manuscript D4377), Kaivalyadhama Library, Lonavla.
- Rama, Swami. 1998 [1979]. *The Royal Path: Practical Lessons on Yoga*. Honesdale: Himalayan Institute Press.
- Rudrayāmalottaratantra. 2002. *Rudrayāmalam (Uttaratantram)* (ed. Ramakumara Raya). Varanasi: Krsnadasa Academy.
- Sanderson, Alexis. 1990. “The Visualization of the Deities of the Trika.” In André Padox, ed., *L’image divine: culte et méditation dans l’hindouisme*, 31–88. Paris: Éditions du CNRS.
- Sāṅkhyasāra (of Vijñānabhikṣu). 1986. *Sāṅkhyasāra: Hindī anuvāda sahita* (ed. Badari Narayana Pancoli). Delhi: Pancoli Pustakamala Prakasana Samiti.
- Śāradātilakatantra. 1996. *Śārada-Tilaka-Tantra* (ed. Arthur Avalon). Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Śārngadharapaddhati. 1987. *Śārngadharapaddhati* (ed. Peter Peterson). Delhi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishthan.
- Sarvāṅgayogapradīpikā. 1992. *Sarvāṅgayogapradīpikā in the Sundargraṅthāvalī* (ed. R. C. Misra). Delhi: Kitabghar.
- Satyananda Saraswati, Swami. 1969. *Asana Pranayama Mudra Bandha*. Munger: Bihar School of Yoga.
- Saubhāgyabhāskara. 1935. *Lalitāsahasranāmastotram with the Commentary Saubhāgyabhāskara* (ed. V. S. Panshikar). Bombay: Panduranga Tavaji Nirnaya Sagara Press.
- Schreiner, Peter. 2013. “Yoga: Rāja Yoga.” In Knut A. Jacobsen, Helene Basu, Angelika Malinar, Vasudha Narayanan, eds., *Brill’s Encyclopedia of Hinduism*, 760–69. Leiden: Brill.
- Singleton, Mark. 2010. *Yoga Body: The Origins of Modern Posture Practice*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Sivananda, Swami. 2010 [1937]. *Raja Yoga*. Tehri-Garhwal: The Divine Life Society.
- Śivasamhitā. See Mallinson 2007.
- Śivayogadīpikā. 1978. *Śivayogadīpikā (Sadāśivayogīśvaraviracitā)* (ed. Āśramasthapaṇḍitāḥ). Anandasrama Sanskrit Series 139. Pune: Anandasrama Press.
- Strauss, Sarah. 2005. *Positioning Yoga: Balancing Acts Across Cultures*. Oxford: Berg.
- Svabodhodayamañjarī. See Torella 2000.
- Svacchandoddyota. 1921–35. *Svacchandatantra with the Commentary (Svacchandoddyota) of Rājānaka Kṣemarāja* (ed. Madhusudana Kaul). Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies 31, 38, 44, 48, 51, 53, 56.
- Tantrāloka. 1918–38. *Tantrāloka of Abhinavagupta with the Commentary (-viveka) of Rājānaka Jayaratha* (ed. Mukund Ram Sastri). Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies 23, 28, 30, 35, 29, 41, 47, 59, 52, 57, 58.
- Tattvabinduyoga (of Rāmacandraparamahaṃsa). *Tattvabinduyoga*, manuscript 664, 1883–84, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Library, Pune.
- Thiel-Horstmann, Monika. 1983. *Crossing the Ocean of Existence: Braj Bhāṣā Religious Poetry from Rajasthan. A Reader*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Torella, Raffaele. 2000. “The Svabodhodayamañjarī, or How to Suppress the Mind with no Effort.” In Ryutaro Tsuchida and Albrecht Wezler, eds., *Harānandalaharī: Volume in Honour of Professor Minoru Hara on His Seventieth Birthday*, 387–410. Reinbek: Verlag für Orientalistische Fachpublikationen.
- Upāsanāsārasaṅgraha. *Upāsanāsārasaṅgraha*, IFP transcript T1095b (based on R2831[i], foliis 116a–139b), pages 15–63. (Available on the Muktabodha website, http://muktalib7.org/IFP_ROOT/access_page.htm).
- Ūmikaulārṇavatantra. *Ūmikaulārṇavatantra* (ed. Mark Dyczkowski). (Available on the Muktabodha website, http://muktalib7.org/IFP_ROOT/access_page.htm).
- 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.
- Vasudeva, Somadeva. 2012. “The Transport of the Haṃsas: A Śākta Rāsalilā as Rājayoga in Eighteenth Century Benares.” In David Gordon White, ed., *Yoga in Practice*, 242–54. Princeton: Princeton University

- Press.
- Vivekananda, Swami. 2003 [1896]. *Raja Yoga*. Leeds: Celephais Press.
- Ward, William. 1818 [1811]. *A View of the History, Literature, and Mythology of the Hindoos: Including a Minute Description of their Manners and Customs and Translations from their Principal Works*. Volume 1. Serampore: Mission Press.
- Wood, Ernest. 1954. *Great Systems of Yoga*. New York: Philosophical Library.
- Yoga Upaniṣads. 1968. *Yoga Upaniṣads with the Commentary of Śrī Upaniṣadbrahmayogin* (ed. Pandit A. Mahadeva Sastri). Madras: The Adyar Library and Research Centre.
- Yogabīja. *Yogabījaprakaraṇam*, manuscript 8627, Deccan College Library, Pune.
- Yogabīja. 1982. *Yogabīja of Gorakhanātha* (ed. Ramalala Srivastava). Gorakhapur: Gorakhanath Mandir.
- Yogacintāmaṇi (of Śivānandasarasvatī). *Yogacintāmaṇi*, manuscript 9785 (based on R635), Kaivalyadhama Yoga Institute Library, Lonavla.
- Yogacintāmaṇi (of Śivānandasarasvatī). N.d. *Yogacintāmaṇī* (ed. Haridas Sarma). Calcutta: Calcutta Oriental Press.
- Yogarājopaniṣat. *Yogarājopaniṣat*, manuscript 46–461, Bharat Itihas Samshodak Mandal, Pune.
- Yogarājopaniṣat. 1938. *Unpublished Upanishads* (ed. Kunhan Raja). Chennai: Adyar Library.
- Yogasārasaṅgraha. *Yogasārasaṅgraha*, IFP transcript T859 (based on D4373). (Available on the Muktabodha website, http://muktalib7.org/IFP_ROOT/access_page.htm).
- Yogasārasaṅgraha (of Vijñānabhikṣu). 1989. *Yogasārasaṅgraha of Vijñānabhikṣu* (ed. Ram Shankar Bhattacharya and Goswami Prahlad Giri Vedantakeshari). Varanasi: Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan.
- Yogaśāstra. 1977–86. *Yogaśāstram (Svopajñāvṛttivibhūṣitam) of Hemacandra* (ed. Muni Jambuvijaya). Bombay: Jaina Sahitya Vikasa Mandala.
- Yogasiddhāntacandrikā. 1910. *Yogadarśanam with a Commentary Called the Yogasiddhāntacandrikā of Nārāyaṇatīrtha* (ed. Paṇḍita Ratna Gopala Bhatta). Varanasi: Vidya Vilasa Press.
- Yogaśikhopaniṣat. See Yoga Upaniṣads.
- Yogasūtra. 1904. *Pātañjalayogasūtrāṇi (vācaspatimiśraviracitaṭīkāsamvalitavyāsabhāṣyasametāni...tathā bhojadevaviracitarājamarātaṇḍābhidha-*

vṛttisametāni (eds. Kasinatha Sastri Agase and Hari Narayana Apatē). Anandasrama Sanskrit Series 47. Pune: Anandasrama Press.

Yogavāsiṣṭha. 1918. *The Yogavāsiṣṭha of Vālmīki with the Commentary Vāsiṣṭhamahārāmayānatātparyaprakāśa* (ed. Vasudeva Laxman Sastri Panshikar). Bombay: Tukaram Jawaji.

JASON BIRCH is visiting assistant professor in Yoga Studies at Loyola Marymount University, Los Angeles.

letusconnect@hotmail.com