

THE TATTVAYOGABINDU OF RĀMACANDRA

Critical Edition and Annotated Translation of an Early
Modern Text on Rājayoga, with a Comparative Analysis of
the Complex Yoga Taxonomies from the Same Period



Contents

Contents	v
List of Figures	vi
List of Tables	vii
1 Introduction	I
I.O.O.I Reconstruction of the archetypal colophon	3
2 Critical Edition & Annotated Translation of the <i>Tattvayogabindu</i>	7
3 Appendix	9
3.I Figures	9
4 Bibliography	I3
Secondary Literature	I3

List of Figures

I	Folio IV of Ms. N _I	iii
2	Synoptic transcription of the manuscripts' colophons.	3
3	The <i>dehasvarūpa</i> of <i>ajapāgāyatrī</i>	10
4	Viṣṇu Viśvarūpa, India, Rajasthan, Jaipur, ca. 1800–1820, Opaque watercolor and gold on paper, 38.5 × 28 cm, Victoria and Albert Museum, London, Given by Mrs. Gerald Clark.	II
5	The Equivalence of Self and Universe (detail), folio 6 from the <i>Siddhasiddhāntapaddhati</i> (Bulaki), India, Rajasthan, Jodhpur, 1824 (Samvat 1881), 122 x 46 cm, RJS 2378, Mehragarh Museum Trust.	12

List of Tables

Chapter I

Introduction

1.0.0.1 Reconstruction of the archetypal colophon

The colophons of the manuscripts fall into two groups corresponding to the β - and γ -groups identified in the stemmatic analysis (p. ??). A close examination of these colophons reveals a gradual progression of corruptions in the transmission from β to γ .

beta-witnesses:	
iti paramarahasyām	śrīrāmacamdraviracitāyām tattvayogabimdu samāptah \D
iti śripāramahāsyām	śrīrāmacamdraviracitāyām tattvayogabimduh sampūrnām \J
iti paramahāsyām	śrīrāmacamdraviracitāyām tattvayodabimda samāptah \K1
iti śriparamahasyām	śrīrāmacamdraviracitāyām tattvayogabimdu samāptah \N1
iti śriparamahasye	śrīrāmacamdraviracitāyām tattvayogabindu samāptam \N2
iti śripāramahāsyām	śrīrāmacamdraviracitāyām tattvayogaviduh samāptah \U1
iti paramahāsasamhitāyām hamṣyām	śrīrāmacamdraviracitāyām tattvayogavicārah \V
gamma-witnesses:	
iti śri rāmacamdraparamahamsaviracitas tatvabimduyogasamāptah	\U2
iti śrīrāmacamdraparamahamsaviracitas tatvabinduyogasamāptah	\P
iti rājanacamdraparamahamsaviracitas tatvabimduyogasamāptam	\L
iti śrīrāmacamdraparamahamsaviracitas tatvabinduyogasamāptah	\K2
iti śrisarvaguṇasampannapāmditasukhānandamīśrasūrisūnupanditjavālā-prasādāmīśrakṛtabhāṣṭikāsahito rājayoge binduyogah samāptah	\E

Figure 2: Synoptic transcription of the manuscripts' colophons.

At the same time, a widespread misconception comes to light: the spiritual title *paramahāṃsa* turns out to be only a later attribution to Rāmacandra resulting from a corruption in the colophon—an error which, to complicate matters, already appears in one of the oldest dated manuscripts. Yet V is not a trustworthy witness: its readings diverge so markedly from the rest of the transmission, without contributing anything of value to the reconstruction of the text, that I was compelled to exclude it from the collation. The scribe introduced numerous redactional changes, consciously omitted sentences, and on almost every folio one encounters large numbers of (often unsuccessful) attempts to “improve” Rāmacandra’s admittedly less elegant Sanskrit. One such failed attempt is preserved in the colophon of V, which reads: *iti paramahāṃsasamhitāyām hamṣyām śrīrāmacamdraviracitāyām tattvayogavicārah* || The feminine endings in this colophon create the impression that Rāmacandra’s text formed part of another, perhaps larger, work entitled *Paramahāṃsasamhitā*—a title that does exist, though it bears no relation to

Rāmacandra's text. The readings of the colophons in the other manuscripts of the β -group reveal that this colophon is yet another failed attempt by the redactor to improve upon his exemplar. The other manuscripts of the β -group (for example, the second-oldest witness N₁, perhaps the best representative of the β -group) present the colophon along the following lines: *iti śrīparamarahasyāṁ śrīrāmacaṇḍraviracitāyāṁ tatvayogabimdu samāptah* || At first glance this colophon appears contradictory. On the one hand, the title of the text is clearly given as *Tattvayogabindu*; on the other, the feminine endings evoke the constructions typical of chapter colophons, which use the locative to indicate the overarching work and the final nominatives to provide the name of the concluding chapter. Taking the other witnesses of the β -group into account, it becomes evident that all members of the β -group continue to transmit the same grammatical irregularities and preserve the feminine endings. At a superficial level, the colophons of the γ -group do not appear to be of much help in resolving these issues. They all read approximately like U₂: *iti śrī rāmacaṇḍraparamahaṁsa viracitas tatvabimdu yogasamāptah* || One might therefore conclude that the manuscripts of the γ -group are preferable, since their colophons are almost grammatically correct. However, as I demonstrated in the introduction (see p. ??), we may safely assume that the original title was *Tattvayogabindu* and not *Tattvabinduyoga*. Moreover, when reflecting on the discrepancies between the readings of the two manuscript groups and taking into account the stemmatic conclusions—particularly the fact that the β -group preserves a version that on average must be closer to the original text than that of the γ -group—it becomes apparent that the colophons of the β -group are likely the result of redactional intervention. They represent, in other words, an attempt to emend an already corrupt colophon (presumably in a form similar to the colophons of the β -group).

This emerges, first, in the alteration of the title from the original *Tattvayogabindu* to *Tattvabinduyoga* in the γ -group; secondly, in the change from the β -reading *paramarahasya* to *paramahaṁsa*; and thirdly, in what appears to be a concomitant disregard for the feminine endings of the hyparchetype of the

β -group, on the basis of which the redactional changes in the β -transmission appear to have been undertaken.

Any remaining doubts the reader may entertain regarding the plausibility of these hypothetical reconstructions can be dispelled by an important observation. The final section of the *Tattvayogabindu*, namely LIX, which constitutes the undisputed culmination of the work, opens with the phrase *idam yogasāstrarahasyam samagrásāstramadhye*, after which the ideal form of yoga intended for Rāmacandra's audience is introduced. This makes it safe to assume that the occurrence of the forms of $^{\circ}$ *rahasya* in the final colophon ultimately originates here. I consider it probable that an originally section-concluding colophon once preceded the work-concluding colophon. This provides the crucial clue to how the corrupt forms of the β - and γ -colophons arose:

The most likely archetypal colophon, *iti śrīparamarahasyam | iti śrīrāmacandravirācito 'yam tattvayogabinduh samāptah ||*, was corrupted through simple and typical scribal errors: the omission of *iti* and the introduction of a feminine locative ending through a minor inaccuracy ($^{\circ}$ *virācito 'yam* → $^{\circ}$ *viracitāyām*), followed by what was likely an automatic adjustment of $^{\circ}$ *rahasyam* to $^{\circ}$ *rahasyām*. This produced the reading *iti śrīparamarahasyām śrīrāmacamdraviracitāyām tattvayogabimdu samāptah ||*, from which the subsequent corruptions took their course. Later witnesses of the β -group, such as D and U₁, copied the colophon from their exemplars, introducing further errors so that *śrīparamarahasyām* becomes *śrīpāramahāmsyām*. Due to the loss of the feminine referent and the aforementioned copying error, scribes of the γ -group were led to a consequential emendation. From the intermediate stage *iti śrīpāramahāmsyām śrīrāmacamdraviracitāyām*, a scribe apparently felt compelled to introduce a plausible correction and altered the reading of his exemplar to *iti śrīrāmacamdraparamahāmsaviracitas*. Thus, Rāmacandra was erroneously ascribed the spiritual title of a *paramahāmsa* and consequently presumed to have undergone initiation into the Daśanāmī Samnyāsī order. See Clark, 2006: 42–45

for a discussion of the term *paramahaṁsa* in the Daśanāmī Saṁnyāsī order.¹ Thus, even though looking at these somewhat confusing colophone transmissions, one might expect one *iti* to mark the end of a chapter and the second to close the work as a whole. Yet one has to bear in mind that the text offers no clear system of chapters; instead, it is divided into numerous sections introduced by *idāniṁ* or, more rarely, *atha* and similar markers. These sections—aside from this single exception—never conclude with a colophon. It is therefore unlikely that the *itis* before the final colophon should be interpreted as a chapter colophon. Rather, I propose understanding it as an emphatic concluding formula that marks the climactic end of the text.

¹I wish to thank Dr. Jason Birch for sharing his thoughts regarding the reconstruction of the colophon, which provided the decisive impetus for arriving at a satisfactory solution.

Chapter 2

The *Tattvayogabindu* of Rāmacandra Critical Edition & Annotated Translation

Chapter 3

Appendix

3.1 Figures



Figure 3: The *dehasvarūpa* of *ajapāgāyatrī*. The image, reminiscent of a hipogriff, is part of an illustrated Sanskrit manuscript written in the Śāradā script. Preserved as a single large scroll under Acc. No. 1334 at the Oriental Institute in Srinagar (Kashmir), it is entitled *Nādīcakra*. The manuscript contains a depiction of the yogic body's *cakras* and *nāḍis*. The text surrounding the figure closely corresponds to the additional material found in manuscript U₂ of the *Tattvayogabindu*. The manuscript reads (diplomatic transcription): *om daśame pūrṇagiripiṭhe lalāṭamāṇḍale candro devatā amṛtāśaktih paramātmā ṛṣih dvāviṁśaddalāni amṛtavāsinikalā 4: ambikā 1 lambikā 2 gha(m)ṭkā 3 tālikā 4 dehasvarūpam kākamukham 1 naranetram 2 gośrṅgam 3 lalāṭabrahmapara 4 hayagrīvā 5 mayūramuśchaṁ 6 hamsacārītani 7 sthāna.*



Figure 4: Viṣṇu Viśvarūpa, India, Rajasthan, Jaipur, ca. 1800–1820, Opaque watercolor and gold on paper, 38.5 × 28 cm, Victoria and Albert Museum, London, Given by Mrs. Gerald Clark.



Figure 5: The Equivalence of Self and Universe (detail), folio 6 from the *Siddhasiddhāntapaddhati* (Bulaki), India, Rajasthan, Jodhpur, 1824 (Samvat 1881), 122 x 46 cm, RJS 2378, Mehrangarh Museum Trust.

Chapter 4

Bibliography

Secondary Literature

Clark, Matthew. *The Daśanāmī-Samnyāśī. The Integration of Ascetic Lineages into an Order.* Leiden: Brill Academic Pub., 2006.