

1.1

Translation: Homage to the glorious Ādinātha who taught the science of Haṭhayoga which is like a splendid stairway for one who wants to climb to the lofty royal terrace.

Testimonia:

Cf. *Yogasārasaṅgraha*, p. 54.

sadādināthāya namo 'stu tubhyaṃ
yenopadiṣṭā haṭhayogavidyā |
virājate pronnatarājayogam
āroḍhum icchor adhirohiṇīva ||

Gheraṇḍasaṃhitā 1.1

ādīśvarāya praṇamāmi tasmai
yenopadiṣṭā haṭhayogavidyā |
virājate pronnatarājayogam
āroḍhum icchor adhirohiṇīva ||

Commentary:

In his commentary *Jyotsnā* on *Haṭhapradīpikā* 1.1 Brahmānanda first states that the author Svātmārāma starts appropriately with a *maṅgala*, a verse of adoration addressing Ādinātha, i.e. Śiva, but in accordance with his non-sectarian approach leaves room for a second interpretation of the word as Viṣṇu. A sentence later this is contradicted by his explanation that Ādinātha, who first taught Yoga, taught it to Pārvatī, which limits the scope to Śiva.

The reading °*rājasaudham* in the third verse quarter is well attested by the manuscripts, including α₁. However, the most common reading in manuscripts on the lower branches of the stemma is °*rājayogam*, which was accepted by Brahmānanda in *Jyotsnā* 1.1 (see below). It appears that some scribes have made a concerted effort to replace words like *saudha*, *vidyā* and *mārga* with *yoga* in the opening verses of the text (see also 1.1d and 1.3b), even at the expense of the poetic imagery.

In light of the variants, which have led to our critical edition, Brahmānanda's choices and interpretation of the second half cannot be upheld. This is Brahmānanda's version and the relevant portion of his commentary:

śrīadināthāya namo 'stu tasmai
yenopadiṣṭā haṭhayogavidyā |
vibhrājate pronnatarājayogam
āroḍhum icchor adhirohiṇīva ||1.1||

Our choice of *virājate* in the third verse quarter reflects the relevant manuscripts

and rhymes with the following *rāja*-. However, the difference in the sense is so minor that it does alter the meaning.

The main problem in Brahmānanda's interpretation is his choice of *-rājayogaṃ* over *-rājamsaudhaṃ*, which he explains as follows:

rājayogaś ca sarvavṛttinirodhalakṣaṇo 'samprajñātayogaḥ. tam icchor mumukṣor adhirohiṇīva adhiruhyate 'nayety adhirohiṇī niḥśreṇīva vibhrajate viśeṣeṇa bhrājate śobhate. yathā pronnatasaudham āroḍhum icchor adhirohiṇy anāyāsena saudhaprāpikā bhavati evaṃ haṭhapradīpikāpi pronnatarājayogaṃ āroḍhum icchor anāyāsena rājayogaprāpikā bhavatīti upamālaṅkāraḥ. indravajrākhyam vṛttam.

Rājayoga is the yoga without cognition,¹ defined as the stopping of all movements of the mind. To a liberation seeker desiring this, [the science of Haṭhayoga] shines like a ladder.² Just as a ladder leads someone desiring to ascend to a lofty mansion easily to this mansion, in the same way also the *haṭhapradīpikā* leads someone desiring the lofty Rājayoga easily to Rājayoga. [In this verse] the trope is a comparison. The metre is Indravajrā.

The interpretation makes good sense: Haṭhayoga leads effortlessly to Rājayoga, just as a ladder leads one to the flat on the top floor. And the comparison as outlined by Brahmānanda has all the elements deemed necessary by Sanskrit poetology:

1. Particle expressing a comparison (*upamāvācaka*): *iva*
2. Standard of comparison (*upamāna*): ladder leading to the palace (*saudhaprāpikā adhirohiṇī*)
3. Thing that is compared (*upameya*): *Haṭhapradīpikā*³ that leads to Rājayoga (*rājayogaprāpikā haṭhapradīpikā*)
4. Common quality (*samānadharma*): Effortlessness (*anāyāsena*)

¹This must refer to the *asamprajñātasamādhi* of the *Yogasūtra* via the equation *yogaḥ samādhiḥ* in the *Bhāṣya* on *Yogasūtra* 1.1.

²The commentary adds etymological explanations: "*adhirohiṇī* means that by which one ascends, i.e. a ladder", and a synonym for "shines", which are not translated here.

³The text itself has *haṭhayogavidyā* in that position.

According to classical poetology a comparison containing all four elements is termed a “full comparison” (*pūrṇopamā*), whereas an elision of one or more elements is called a “deficient comparison” (*lūptopamā*). One element that cannot be omitted without losing the comparison is the *upamāna*. In the verse as given by Brahmānanda this would be “the ladder”. The implication is spelt out by Brahmānanda in his commentary: “Just as a ladder leads someone desiring to ascend to a lofty mansion easily leads him to this mansion, in the same way also the *haṭha-pradīpikā* leads someone desiring the lofty Rājayoga easily to Rājayoga.” However, his text version spells out only the side of the *upameya*, that is, “Haṭhayoga leads to Rājayoga”, but leaves the *upamāna* open to interpretation. His mention of the word *saudha* in the commentary suggests that this was one of the other options he found in manuscripts—this reading is very well attested—but was rejected by him. In this way Brahmānanda makes sure that the text states the obvious, but at the same time it loses part of the comparison, and it loses its dynamics, which is brought out in the reading *rājasaudha* preferred with good manuscript evidence in our critical edition. We think that Brahmānanda was eager to state at the outset the primacy of Rājayoga, and to this end sacrificed the more poetically elegant original reading that mentions the royal mansion as a sort of metaphor for the “royal yoga”.

Metre: Uṇjāti

1.2

Translation: After bowing to the glorious guru, the Lord, the yogi Svātmārāma teaches the system of Haṭhayoga solely for [attaining] Rājayoga.

Commentary:

1.3

Translation: For those who cannot find the royal highway because they are lost in the darkness of many doctrines, the compassionate Svātmārāma holds the Lamp on Haṭha.

Testimonia:

Haṭharatnāvalī 1.4

bhrāntīyā bahumatadhvānte rājayogam ajānatām |
kevalam rājayogāya haṭhavidyopadiśyate ||
rājayogam] rājamārgam P,T,t1

Commentary: Most witnesses (including α_2) have *rājayogam ajānatām* (‘for those ignorant of Rājayoga’) in 1.3b. The reading *rājamārgam ajānatām* (α_1 and α_3), “for

those unable to find the royal highway”, is more appropriate to the metaphor of being lost in darkness.

As Brahmānanda notes, the compound *krpākaraḥ* can be understood as one who is compassionate (*krpā + kara*) or one who is a mine (i.e., a rich source) of compassion (*krpā + ākara*). In the Devanagari transmission, the *kṣa* of *kṣamākaraḥ* probably arose as a mistake for *kr*.

1.4

Translation: For, Matsyendra, Gorakṣa, and other [perfected yogis] discovered the science of Haṭha, and the yogi Svātmārāma knows it through their favour.

Testimonia:

Haṭharatnāvalī 1.3

haṭhavidyāṃ hi gorakṣamatsyendrādya vijānate |
ātmārāmo 'pi jānīte śrīnivasas tathā svayam ||

Commentary: The word *athavā* (‘or’) is well attested but difficult to construe here. Brahmānanda understands it as conjunction (*athavāśabdaḥ samuccaye*), and this is how we have interpreted it. The variant *mahāyogī* in ϵ_1 and other manuscripts ($G_5J_4J_{11}K_0$) is probably an attempt to remove the difficulty of understanding *athavā*. One could emend to *tathā* in light of the attested reading *yathā* (C_7) but this would be a bold intervention given the weight of evidence supporting *'thavā*.

1.5

Translation: The glorious Ādinātha, Matsyendra, Śābara, Ānandabhairava, Cau-raṅgī, Mīna, Gorakṣa, Virūpākṣa, Bileśaya,

Testimonia:

Haṭharatnāvalī 1.80

śrīādināthamatsyendraśābarānandabhairavāḥ |
śāraṅgīmīnagorakṣavirūpākṣabileśayāḥ ||

Commentary: In Śaiva texts which predate the Haṭha corpus, Mīnānātha and Matsyendra are one and the same, but they are differentiated in later Tibetan and Indian lists of siddhas (Mallinson 2019: 273 n.35).

Two manuscripts of the α and δ groups have the variant reading °*virūpākṣaḥ savālikah* (J_5V_{19}) for °*virūpākṣabileśayāḥ*. In another α manuscript, N_3 , *savālikah* was corrected to *savālmikah*, perhaps in an effort to restore a name similar to Vālmīki, the celebrated author of the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

1.6

Translation: Manthānabhairava, Siddhabuddha, and Kanthaḍi, Goranṭaka, Surānanda, Siddhapāda and Carpaṭi,

Testimonia:

Haṭharatnāvalī 1.81

manthānabhairavo yogī siddhabuddhaś ca kandalī |
 korandakaḥ surānandaḥ siddhipādaś ca carpaṭī ||
 korandakaḥ] gonandaka P,T,J,n1,n4

Caturbhujā Misra's *Mugdhāvabodhinī* (1.7.8) on the *Rasahrdayatantra*

manthānabhairavo yogī siddhabuddhaś ca kanthaḍi |
 koraṇṭakaḥ surānandaḥ siddhapādaś ca carpaṭī ||

Commentary: The α manuscripts have *goranṭaka*, and several other manuscript groups have *pauranṭaka*. We are yet to find the name *goranṭaka* in other Sanskrit texts but it may be a Sanskrit rendering of *Goraṇṭakuḍu*, which is the name of a disciple of Gorakṣanātha in the *Navanāthacaritramu* (Jones 2017: 194 n.3). The spelling *koraṇṭaka* is attested in the *Haṭhābhyāsapaddhati*, and it is reasonably well attested by manuscripts of the *Haṭhapradīpikā*, as well as those of the *Haṭharatnāvalī* (which also has *gonandaka*).

The compound *siddhapāda* could be a respectful affix. However, it seems unlikely here because the name would cross the *pāda* break.

1.7

Translation: Kāṇeri, Pūjyapāda, Nityanātha, Nirañjana, Kapālī, Bindunātha, and the one named Kākacaṇḍīśvara.

Testimonia:

Haṭharatnāvalī 1.82

karoṭiḥ pūjyapādaś ca nityanātho nirañjanaḥ |
 kapālī bindunāthaś ca kākacaṇḍīśvarāhvayaḥ ||

Caturbhujā Misra's *Mugdhāvabodhinī* on the *Rasahrdayatantra*

kāṇeri pūjyapādaś ca nityanātho nirañjanaḥ |
 kapālī bindunāthaś ca kākacaṇḍīśvaro gajaḥ |

Commentary: It is possible that *pūjyapāda* could be a respectful affix to the name Kāṇeri. The variant *dhvaninātha* may have resulted from a transposition of the first two syllables of *nityanātha*.

The α group supports *kākacaṇḍīśvaro gayaḥ* but we have not been able to find

evidence for a Siddha called Gaya.

1.8

Translation: Allamaṃprabhudeva, Ghoḍācolī, Ṭiṇṭiṇī, Bhālukī and Nāgabodha and Khaṇḍakāpālīka.

Testimonia:

Haṭharatnāvalī 1.83

allamaṃ prabhudevaś ca naiṭacūṭiś ca ṭiṇṭiṇiḥ |
bhālukir nāgabodhaś ca khaṇḍakāpālīkas tathā ||
allamaṃ prabhudevaś] allamaṃprabhudevaś P,T,t1

Caturbhujā Misra's *Mugdhāvabodhinī* on the *Rasahrdayatantra*

āllamaṃ prabhudevaś ca ghoḍācolī ca ṭiṇṭiṇiḥ |
bhālukir nāgabodevaś ca khaṇḍī kāpālīkas tathā ||

Commentary: The name Allamaṃprabhudeva (sometimes Allama Prabhu Deva or Allama Prabhudeva in secondary literature) is frequently transmitted as *allamaṃ prabhudevaḥ* (cf. α_2), as though it were two names. However, manuscripts α_1 , α_3 and others (e.g., $V_3V_8V_{13}V_{16}V_{22}N_{24}N_{26}J_{y0}$) do not have the *visarga* and write it as one name (i.e., *allamaṃprabhudevaś ca*). This is also the case in some manuscripts of the *Haṭharatnāvalī* (P,T,t1 in Gharote 2009: 35 n. 8).

The names Nāgabodha, Nāgabodhi, Naradeva, Nāgabodeva all seem possible in 1.8c. The reading *nāgabodhaś ca* is attested across several primary groups of manuscripts.

The α_1 and α_2 reading of *siddhaḥ kāpālīkas* is an exception among the manuscripts and seems too vague to be referring to someone within a lineage. However, Khaṇḍakāpālīka is well attested by the manuscripts (including α_3) and this name appears in other literature. Examples include *Kathāsaritsāgara* 121.5 ff. (check??), *Brhatkathāmañjarī* 10.45 (check??) and Vajrapāṇi's *Laghutantraṭīkā*, p.45 (*vīrāḥ khaṇḍakāpālīkādayaś caturviṃśatiḥ*). It may be a derogatory name for a Kāpālīka, coined perhaps by an outsider and connoting something like a defective Kāpālīka in the sense of a 'part-time' Kāpālīka. Alternatively, it could simply refer to one who uses a broken skull as a bowl.

1.9

Translation: These and other great adepts used the power of hathayoga to smash the rod of death and [so] are roaming the worlds.

Testimonia:

Haṭharatnāvalī 1.84

ityādayo mahāsiddhāḥ haṭhayogaprasādataḥ |
khaṇḍayitvā kāladaṇḍaṃ brahmāṇḍe vicaranti te ||

Caturbhuja Misra's *Mugdhāvabodhinī* on the *Rasahrdayatantra*

ityādayo mahāsiddhā rasabhogaprasādataḥ |
khaṇḍayitvā kāladaṇḍaṃ trilokyāṃ vicaranti te |

Haṭhatattvakaumudī 17.24

ūrdhvaṃretahprabhāvena sanakādyā maharṣayaḥ |
khaṇḍayitvā kāladaṇḍaṃ yathecchaṃ viharanti te || 24 ||

Commentary: The reference to *brahmāṇḍa* ('the world') implies liberation-in-life (*jīvanmukti*) and physical immortality.

Metre: Anuṣṭubh (c: ra-vipulā)

1.10

Translation: Haṭha is a hut of refuge for those who are burnt by the scorching torment of transmigration. Haṭha is the tortoise that supports the worlds of all yogas.

Testimonia:

Yogasārasaṅgraha, p. 53.

saṃsāratāpataptānāṃ samāśrayaḥhaṭho haṭhaḥ |
aśeṣayogajagatāṃ ādhārakamaṭho haṭhaḥ ||

Commentary:

The α group omits the second hemistich of this verse, but this was probably the result of eyeskip (i.e., °*maṭho haṭhaḥ* is repeated). Both °*jagatām* and °*yuktānām* are well attested by the collated manuscripts. We have adopted °*jagatām* because it makes good sense with °*ādhārakamaṭhaḥ* in light of the cosmological notion that the tortoise supports all the worlds. This reading may not have been understood by some and was changed in other witnesses to °*yuktānām*, which was adopted by Brahmānanda in *Jyotsnā* 1.10.

Metre: Anuṣṭubh (c: na-vipulā)

1.11

Translation: The science of Haṭha should be kept completely secret by yogis who want success. It becomes potent when kept secret but impotent when revealed.

Sources:

Śivasamhitā 5.254

haṭhavidyā paraṃ gopyā yoginā siddhim icchatā |
 bhaved vīryavatī guptā nirvīryā ca prakāśitā ||
 haṭhavidyā ... icchatā] *om.* III–XII, XIV

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 141r

tathā haṭhapradīpikāyām—
 haṭhavidyā paraṃ gopyā yoginā siddhim icchatā |
 bhaved vīryavatī guptā nirvīryā tu prakāśiteti ||

Commentary: Either the singular or plural of yogin could be read here. The singular is well attested among the testimonia, but the manuscript transmission favours the plural.

1.12

Translation: In a well-ruled, righteous region, with plenty of food and free from upheaval, the Haṭhayogi should live in an isolated hut.

Sources:

Testimonia:

Haṭharatnāvalī 1.66

surāṣṭre dhārmike deśe subhikṣe nirupadrave |
 ekāntamaṭhikāmadhye sthātavyaṃ haṭhayoginā ||

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 54r

haṭhapradīpikāyām—
 surāṣṭre dhārmike deśe subhikṣe nirupadrave |
 ekānte maṭhikāmadhye sthātavyaṃ haṭhayoginā ||

Commentary: The term *maṭhikā* occurs in narrative literature and yoga texts in the sense of a small hut. For example, in the *Kathāsaritsāgara* (12.9.14, 29–30), *maṭhikā* refers to the small hut built in a cremation ground by a young Brahmin who makes as his bed the ashes of the dead girl he had hoped to marry. In several other stories (*Kathāsaritsāgara* 6.6.132, 10.5.89, 12.25.35), *maṭhikā* is the term used for the hut of an ascetic. In an elaborate description of the huts (*maṭhikā*) used for Haṭhayoga, the author of the *Haṭhābhyāsapaddhati* states that the dimensions of the hut are four fore-arm lengths (*hasta*) high and wide, and it can be made of various materials, such as red earth, ashes, plaster and so on (Birch and Singleton 2019: 17–18).

In the *Īyotsnā* and printed editions of the *Haṭhapradīpikā*, including one by Digam-

bara and Kokaje (1970: 6), this verse has the additional hemistich, *dhanuḥpramāṇa-paryantaṃ śilāgnijalavarjite*. This hemistich derives from the *Goraḥśaśataka* (32cd), which has °*paryante* instead of °*paryantaṃ*. It stipulates that the hut should be built in a place measuring up to a bow length and free from rocks, fire and water. None of the early manuscripts has this hemistich, which suggests that it was added at a later time. Nonetheless, it appears in over a dozen manuscripts that were consulted for this edition. These manuscripts are not close to an early hyparchetype of the text.

1.13

Translation: It has a small door and is without cracks, holes and bumps. It is neither too high nor too low in extent and is thickly smeared with cow dung in the proper way. It is clean, free from all annoyances, pleasing on the outside with a verandah, altar and well, surrounded by a wall: these are the characteristics of the yoga hut as taught by the adept practitioners of Haṭha.

Sources:

Cf. *Dattātreyayogaśāstra* 54cd–57

suśobhanaṃ maṭhaṃ kuryāt sūkṣmadvāraṃ tu nirvraṇaṃ ||
 suṣṭhu liptaṃ gomayena sudhayā vā prayatnataḥ |
 matkuṇair maśakair bhūtair varjitaṃ ca prayatnataḥ ||
 dine dine susammṛṣṭaṃ sammārjanyā hy atandritaḥ |
 vāsitaṃ ca sugandhena dhūpitaṃ guggulādibhiḥ ||
 malamūtrādibhir vargair aṣṭādaśabhir eva ca |
 varjitaṃ dvārasampannaṃ vastrāvaraṇaṃ eva vā ||

Testimonia:

Suśrutasaṃhitā 6.17.67:

grhe nirābādhe

Yogacintāmaṇi 54r (attr. *Haṭhapradīpikā*)

alpadvāraṃ arandhragartaghaṭitaṃ nāpy uccanīcāyitaṃ |
 samyaggomayasāndraliptavimalaṃ niḥśeṣajantūjjhitaṃ |
 bāhye maṇḍapakūpavediracitaṃ prākārasaṃveṣṭitaṃ |
 proktaṃ yogamaṭhasya lakṣaṇaṃ idaṃ siddhair haṭhābhyāsibhiḥ ||
 °vimalaṃ] L, mavilaṃ N

Haṭharatnāvalī 1.67

alpadvāraṃ arandhragartapiṭharaṃ nātyuccanīcāyataṃ |
 samyaggomayasāndraliptavimalaṃ niḥśeṣābādhōjjhitaṃ |
 bāhye maṇḍapavedikūparuciraṃ prākārasaṃveṣṭitaṃ

proktaṃ yogamaṭhasya lakṣaṇaṃ idaṃ siddhair haṭhābhyāsibhiḥ |||
 °piṭharaṃ] piṭakaṃ J,n2, peṭakaṃ N

Commentary: The syntax of this verse is problematic. One would expect the features of the hut, which are listed in the first three quarters of the verse, to be in the nominative case. Then, the words *idaṃ lakṣaṇaṃ* in the fourth quarter would refer back to them. However, the compounds in the first three verse-quarters appear to qualify *lakṣaṇa* as though they were adjectives, and this seems to have been the way the verse was composed.

The manuscripts preserve many different readings at the end of the compound beginning with *arandhragarta*°. We have adopted *piṭaka*, which usually means “a basket” but can also mean “a boil or blister,” because it is well attested and might here refer to bumps on the floors or walls that would make them uneven. Another possibility is °*piṭharaṃ*, which can have the sense of potsherds and would here mean that the hut should be free of rubbish on the floor. One would expect a word for a defect in a hut that is similar to, but not the same as, cracks (*randhra*) and holes (*garta*). For this reason, the reading °*vivaraṃ* looks like a patch, as its meaning does not add anything to °*randhragarta*°. The reading °*viṭapaṃ* (‘the young branch of a tree or creeper’) attested in some manuscripts of the *Haṭha-pradīpikā* is difficult to construe in this context unless it was intended to refer to creepers or branches that might invade or encroach upon the hut.

Manuscripts of several groups, namely β, ε and η, have °*bādhajjitaṃ*, whereas δ and the *Yogacintāmaṇi* have the more easily understood reading of °*jantūjjitaṃ* (‘free from creatures’). The α group is split on this, with G₄ (*bodhojjitaṃ*) closer to °*bādhajjitaṃ* and N₃ (*jyaṃtyūpsitaṃ* and J₅ (*jaṃtūṣṇitaṃ*) closer to °*jantūjjitaṃ*. We have adopted the more unusual reading of °*bādhajjitaṃ* with the support of a similar description of a hut in *Suśrutasaṃhitā* 6.17.67 (*gr̥he nirābādhe*).

Metre: Śārdūlavikrīḍita

1.14

Translation: Staying in such a hut, free from all worry, in the way taught by his guru [the yogi] should practise nothing but yoga.

Sources:

Cf. *Amanaska* 2.15

evaṃvidhaṃ guruṃ labdhvā sarvacintāvivaraṇitaḥ
 sthitvā manohare deśe yogam eva samabhyaset

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f.54r (attr. *Haṭhapradīpikā*)

evaṃvidhe maṭhe sthitvā sarvacintāvivarjitaḥ |
gurūpaḍiṣṭamārgēṇa yogam eva sadābhyaset ||

Haṭharatnāvalī 1.68

evaṃvidhe maṭhe sthitvā sarvacintāvivarjitaḥ |
gurūpaḍiṣṭamārgēṇa yogam eva sadābhyaset ||

1.15

Translation: Overeating, exertion, idle chatter, not sticking to rules, socialising and sensuality: through [these] six, yoga is lost.

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 48v (attr. *Haṭhapradīpikā*)

atyāhāraḥ prayāsaś ca prajalpo niyamagrahaḥ |
janasaṅgaś ca laulyaṃ ca ṣaḍbhir yogaḥ praṇāsyati ||

Haṭharatnāvalī 1.77

atyāhāraḥ prayāsaś ca prajalpo niyamagrahaḥ |
janasaṅgaṃ ca laulyaṃ ca ṣaḍbhir yogo vinaśyati ||
niyamagrahaḥ] niyamāgrahaḥ NJ

Yuktabhavadēva 4.25 (attr. *Śivayoga*)

atyāhāraḥ prayāsaś ca prajalpo niyamāgrahaḥ |
janasaṅgaś ca laulyaṃ ca ṣaḍbhir yogo vinaśyati ||

Jyotsnā 1.15

śītodakena prātaḥsnānanaktabhojanaphalāhārādirūpaniyamasya gra-
haṇaṃ niyamagrahaḥ |

Yogaprakāśikā 1.48

niyamāgrahaḥ vakṣyamāṇāniyamāparipālanaṃ

Commentary: Since many scribes do not use an *avagraha* we cannot be sure whether to understand *niyamagrahaḥ* in *pāda* b as having a negative prefix. Although *yama* and *niyama* are not included in the *Haṭhapradīpikā* as auxiliaries of Haṭhayoga, verse 2.14 implies that *niyama* is necessary at least in the early stages of establishing a practice. Furthermore, verse 3.82 suggests that a yogi who does not practice *niyama* might obtain success in yoga through the practice of *vajrolī*. Ambiguity over the role of *yama* and *niyama* in Haṭhayoga may explain why two verses on ten *yamas* and ten *niyamas* were inserted in some manuscripts after the next verse (1.16). The additional verses derive from either the *Śāradātilakatantra* (25.7–8) or the *Vasiṣṭhasaṃhitā* (1.38, 1.53). In the *Jyotsnā*, Brahmānanda reads

niyamāgraha and takes it as though *āgraha* was implied, which yields the meaning of ‘over-insistence on rules’, and he relates it to extreme ascetic practice.

1.16

Translation: Zeal, daring, resolve, gnosis of the truth, conviction and avoiding contact with people: by means of six [virtues], yoga is successful.

Sources:

Dharmaputrikā 38cd–39ab

utsāho niścayo dhairyam santoṣas tattvadarśanam |
kratūnām copasaṃhāraḥ ṣaṭśādhanaṃ iti smṛtam |

Śivadharmottara 10 (W 122r):

utsāhān niścayād dhairyāt santoṣāt tattvadarśanāt |
muner janapadatyāgād ṣaḍbhir yogaḥ prasidhyati |

Īñānārṇava 20.1

utsāhān niścayād dhairyāt saṃtoṣāt tattvaniścayāt |
muner janapadatyāgāt ṣaḍbhir yogaḥ prasidhyati ||

Yogabindu 411 (by Haribhadra)

utsāhān niścayād dhairyāt saṃtopāt tattvadarśanāt |
muner janapadatyāgāt ṣaḍbhir yogaḥ prasidhyati ||

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 49r (attr. *Haṭhapradīpikā*)

utsāhāt sāhasād dhairyāt tattvajñānād viniścayāt |
janasaṅgaparityāgāt ṣaḍbhir yogaḥ prasidhyati ||

Haṭharatnāvalī 1.78:

utsāhān niścayād dhairyāt tattvajñānārthadarśanāt |
bindusthairyān mitāhārāj janasaṅgavivarjanāt |
nidrātyāgāj jitaśvāsāt pīṭhasthairyād anālasāt
gurvācāryaprasādāc ca ebhir yogas tu sidhyati ||
niścayād] niścālād- P,T

Commentary: α and several other groups of manuscripts have *tattvajñānāc ca darśanāt* or something very similar in the second *pāda* of the verse, but *darśana* by itself is problematic: a vision of what? The early sources of this verse, in particular the *Śivadharmottara*, indicate that the second verse quarter read as *santoṣāt tattvadarśanāt*, which makes much better sense of the word *darśana* (i.e., ‘seeing the truth’). However it seems likely that before the time of Svātmārāma other ver-

sions of this verse were circulating in which *santoṣāt* was not found, *niścayāt* had moved from the first to second verse quarter, *tattvadarśanāt* had become *tattva-jñānāt* and *sāhasāt* was introduced. It should also be noted that the word *tattva* could have a more specific meaning in the *Haṭhapradīpikā* (4.45–46) as Svātmārāma states that it is a synonym of *samādhi*. In other yoga texts, it can sometimes refer to the practices of yoga (e.g. *tritattva* in *Amṛtasiddhi* 13.12, 14.2–3) or, more generally, to the highest reality or truth (e.g. *Amanaska* 1.2, 1.20–21, 2.17, etc.).

1.17

Translation: Because it is the first auxiliary of Haṭha, *āsana* is taught first. This type (*tad*) of *āsana* brings about steadiness, good health and physical fitness.

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi 84r (attr. *Haṭhapradīpikā*)

haṭhasya prathamāṅgatvād āsanam pūrvam ucyate |
tat kuryād āsanasthairyam ārogyam cāṅgalāghavam ||

Haṭharatnāvalī 3.5

haṭhasya prathamāṅgatvād āsanam darśyate mayā |
tat kuryād āsanam sthairyam ārogyam cāṅgapāṭavam ||

Commentary: The reading of *aṅgapāṭavam* is attested among many of the early manuscripts, including the main one of the α group. Although this compound rarely appears in other yoga texts, a similar term *śarīrapāṭava* occurs in the *Śiva-saṃhitā* (2.35) as one of the benefits bestowed by digestive fire (*vaiśvānarāgni*), which indicates that the word *pāṭava* was used in relation to the body and the benefits of yoga. The compound *aṅgapāṭava* seems to imply the optimal functioning of the body. The variant reading, *aṅgalāghava* (‘lightness of the limbs’ or ‘dexterity’) is more common in yoga texts and similar formulations occur even in works known to Svātmārāma, such as the *Dattātreyayogaśāstra* (*śarīralaghutā*) and the *Amanaska* ([...] *laghutvam ca śarīrasyopajāyate*). It is likely that the less common term *aṅgapāṭavam* was changed to the more widely used notion of *aṅgalāghava*, perhaps early on in the transmission, as the latter is attested by manuscripts in several early groups (i.e., β, γ and δ).

1.18

Translation: I shall now teach some of the postures which have been accepted by sages such as Vasiṣṭha and yogis such as Matsyendra.

Testimonia:*Yogacintāmaṇi* 84r

haṭhapradīpikāyām—
 vasiṣṭhādyaiś ca munibhir matsyendrādyaiś ca yogibhiḥ |
 aṅgikṛtāny āsanāni vakṣyante kānicin mayā ||

Haṭharatnāvalī 3.6

vasiṣṭhādyaiś ca munibhir matsyendrādyaiś ca yogibhiḥ |
 aṅgikṛtāny āsanāni lakṣyante kāni cin mayā ||

Commentary: On the historical implications of these two traditions of postural practice in early Haṭhayoga, see Mallinson 2016 (119–122) and Birch 2018 (45–46).

Metre: Anuṣṭubh (a: na-vipulā; c: ra-vipulā)

1.19

Translation: Placing the soles of both feet well between the knees and thighs [and] sitting up with the body straight: they call that the auspicious pose (*svastikāsana*).

Sources:*Śāradātilaka* 25.12

jānūrvor antare samyak kṛtvā pādātale ubhe |
 ṛjukāyo viśed yogī svastikaṃ tat pracakṣate ||

Vasiṣṭhasaṃhitā 1.68

jānūrvor antaraṃ samyak kṛtvā pādātale ubhe |
 ṛjukāyas tathāsīnaḥ svastikaṃ tat pracakṣate ||

Yogayājñavalkya 3.3

jānūrvor antare samyak kṛtvā pādātale ubhe
 ṛjukāyaḥ sukhāsīnaḥ svastikaṃ tat pracakṣate

Testimonia:*Yogacintāmaṇi* f. 83v

yājñavalkyaḥ—
 jānūrvor antare samyak kṛtvā pādātale ubhe |
 ṛjukāyaḥ samāsīnaḥ svastikaṃ tat pracakṣate ||

Haṭharatnāvalī 3.52

atha svastikāsanam—
 jānūrvor antaraṃ samyak kṛtvā padātale ubhe |
 ṛjukāyasamāsīnaḥ svastikaṃ tat pracakṣate ||

Commentary: One might wonder how the soles of the feet could be placed be-

tween the knees and thighs. Brahmānanda explains that the region of the shank near the knee should be understood by the word ‘knee’ in this verse (*atra jānuśabdena jānusamnihito jaṅghāpradeśo grāhyaḥ jānusamnihito jaṅghāpradeśaḥ*). This is consistent with the earliest known description of *svastikāsana* in the *Pātañjalayogaśāstravivarāṇa* (2.46), which states that the big toe of one foot is tucked in between the shank and thigh of the other so it is not seen (*dakṣiṇaṃ pādāṅguṣṭhaṃ savyenorujaṅghena pariḡrhyādrīṣyaṃ kṛtvā tathā savyaṃ pādāṅguṣṭhaṃ dakṣiṇenorujaṅghenādrīṣyaṃ pariḡrhyā yathā ca pārśvibhyāṃ vṛṣaṇayor apīḍaṇaṃ tathā yenāste tat svastikāṃ āsanam*). For a discussion of *svastikāsana* in the Pātañjalayoga tradition, see Maas 2018: 68–69. The descriptions of *svastikāsana* in early Śaiva Tantras do not mention the inserting of the toes between the knees and thighs (see Goodall 2004: 348–350, fn. 371).

1.20

Translation: [The yogi] should place his right heel on the left side of the [lower] back, and the left [heel] on the right [side], in the same way. This is cow-faced pose (*gomukhāsana*), which [looks] like a cow’s face.

Sources:

Cf. *Ahīrbudhnyasamhitā* 31.45cd–46

ubhayor gulphayoḥ kṛtvā pṛṣṭhapārśvāv ubhāv api ||
vyutkramenātha pāṇibhyāṃ vinyastābhyāṃ vighrya ca |
pṛṣṭhagābhyāṃ padāṅguṣṭhāv etad gomukhaṃ ucyate ||

Vasiṣṭhasamhitā 1.70

savye dakṣiṇagulphaṃ tu pṛṣṭhapārśve niveśayet |
dakṣiṇe ’pi tathā savyaṃ gomukhaṃ tat pracakṣate ||

Yogayājñavalkya 3.5cd–3.6ab

savye dakṣiṇagulphaṃ tu pṛṣṭhapārśve niveśayet
dakṣiṇe ’pi tathā savyaṃ gomukhaṃ gomukhaṃ yathā

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 83v (attr. Yājñavalkya)

savye dakṣiṇagulphaṃ tu pṛṣṭhapārśve niveśayet |
dakṣiṇe ’pi tathā savyaṃ gomukhaṃ gomukhaṃ yathā ||

Haṭharatnāvalī 3.53

atha gomukhāsanam—
savye dakṣiṇagulphaṃ tu pṛṣṭhapārśve niyojayet ||
dakṣiṇe ’pi tathā savyaṃ gomukhaṃ gomukhāsanam ||

Commentary: This posture first appears in some Vaiṣṇava *Samhitās* that predate the *Haṭhapradīpikā*, including the *Ahīrbudhnyasaṃhitā* and the *Vasiṣṭhasaṃhitā*, which is likely to have been the source of this verse. The position of the ankles is the same in all the source texts. The *Ahīrbudhnyasaṃhitā* adds that the hands are crossed behind the back and hold the big toes. For illustrations of six possible positions of the arms and hands, see Gharote, Jha, Devnath, Sakhalkar 2006: 111–113.

1.21

Translation: Fixing one foot on one thigh and placing the [other] thigh on the other foot is called hero pose (*vīrāsana*).

Sources:

Vasiṣṭhasaṃhitā 1.72

ekaṃ pādāṃ athaikasmin vinyasyorau ca saṃsthitam |
itarasmiṃs tathāivoruṃ vīrāsanaṃ itīritam ||

Cf. *Śāradātilakatantra* 25.15cd–16ab

ekaṃ pādāṃ adhaḥ kṛtvā vinyasyorau tathetaram |
rjukāyo viśed yogī vīrāsanaṃ itīritam |

Yogayājñavalkya 3.8

ekaṃ pādāṃ athaikasmin vinyasyoruṇi saṃsthitam |
itarasmiṃs tathā coruṃ vīrāsanaṃ udāhṛtam ||

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 83v (attr. Yājñavalkya)

ekaṃ pādāṃ athaikasmin vinyasyoruṇi saṃsthitam |
itarasmiṃs tathā coruṃ vīrāsanaṃ udāhṛtam ||

Haṭharatnāvalī 3.54

atha vīrāsanaṃ—
ekaṃ pādāṃ athaikasmin vinyased ūruṇi sthiram |
itarasmiṃs tathā coruṃ vīrāsanaṃ itīritam ||
sthiram] sthitam T

Commentary: Although most witnesses have *tathā* in 1.21a, the word *atha* has been accepted because it is attested by G₄ (α group) and V₁ (η group), the sources and the testimonia. It appears to be verse filler here rather than indicating a temporal sequence of actions. Svātmārāma borrowed the verse on *vīrāsana* from the *Vasiṣṭhasaṃhitā*, the redactor of which appears to have adapted its first hemistich from a description of this posture in the *Śāradātilakatantra*. This would explain

the rather strange syntax of the *Vasiṣṭhasaṃhitā*'s version, in which *adhaḥ kṛtvā* was changed to *athaikasmin*, and *tathetaram* became *ca saṃsthitam*. It seems that *saṃsthitam* must be understood with *ūruṃ* in the third *pāda* in the sense of *saṃsthāpya* (i.e., 'having placed').

Different versions of *virāsana* are found in earlier Tantras, such as the *Kiraṇatantra* (58.9), Hemacandra's *Yogaśāstra* and commentaries on the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra*. For a discussion of some of these sources, see Maas 2018: 66–68.

1.22

Translation: Knowers of yoga know that the tortoise pose (*kūrmāsana*) arises by carefully blocking the anus with the ankles crossed.

Sources:

Vasiṣṭhasaṃhitā 1.80

gudaṃ nirudhya gulphābhyāṃ vyutkrameṇa samāhitaḥ |
kūrmāsanam bhaved etad iti yogavido viduḥ ||

Cf. *Ahīrbudhnyasaṃhitā* 31.35

gudaṃ nipīḍya gulphābhyāṃ vyutkrameṇa samāhitaḥ |
etat kūrmāsanam proktaṃ yogasiddhikaram param ||

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 84r (attr. *Haṭhapradīpikā*)

gudaṃ niyāmya gulphābhyāṃ vyutkrameṇa samāhitaḥ |
kūrmāsanam bhaved etad iti yogavido viduḥ ||

Yuktabhavadēva 6.15

haṭhapradīpikāyām
gudaṃ niyāmya gulphābhyāṃ vyutkrameṇa samāhitaḥ |
kūrmāsanam bhaved etad iti yogavido viduḥ || iti kūrmāsanam ||

Commentary: In the first quarter of the verse, the witnesses are split between *nirudhya* ('having blocked'), *nibadhya* ('having bound'), *niyāmya* ('having restrained') and *niṣpīḍya* ('having pressed'). The source, the *Vasiṣṭhasaṃhitā*, and two manuscripts of the β and γ groups support *nirudhya* whereas one α manuscript (J₅) and the testimonia support *niyāmya* and another α manuscript (G₄) has *niṣpīḍya*. In terms of blocking or closing the anus by sitting on the ankles, *nirudhya* makes good sense, and *niṣpīḍya* ('having pressed the anus with both ankles') is also possible.

??The word *vyutkrameṇa* appears to describe the position of the ankles. Its basic meaning is 'against the normal direction,' which would suggest that the ankles are turned out or crossed rather than placed together naturally. If the yogi is in

a kneeling-type position, turning the feet out would bring the ankles together, blocking the perineal area. See *Yoga Mīmāṃsā*, vol 8, no. 2, pp. 29–30 for a discussion of *vyutkrameṇa* and the position of the ankles in *kūrmāsana*, and vol 8, no. 2, Figures 3–6 for photographs of a practitioner performing this *āsana*.

1.23

Translation: [The yogi] correctly assumes lotus pose, inserts the hands between the knees and thighs, places [the hands] on the ground, and remains in the air. This is the wild cock pose (*kukkuṭāsana*).

Sources:

Vasiṣṭhasaṃhitā 1.78

padmāsanaṃ samāsthāya jānūrvor antare karau |
bhūmau niveśya saṃsthāpya vyomasthaṃ kukkuṭāsanaṃ ||
[niveśya bhūmau – mss. la, va, śa]

Cf. *Ahīrbudhnyasaṃhitā* 31.38

kukkuṭāsanaṃ
padmāsanaṃ adhiṣṭhāya jānvantaraviniṣṛtau |
karau bhūmau niveśyaitad vyomasthaṃ kukkuṭāsanaṃ ||

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 84r (attr. *Haṭhapradīpikā*)

padmāsanaṃ tu saṃyojya jānūrvor antare karau |
niveśya bhūmau saṃsthāpya vyomasthaṃ kukkuṭāsanaṃ ||

Haṭharatnāvalī 3.73

atha kukkuṭāsanaṃ—
padmāsanaṃ susaṃsthāpya jānūrvor antare karau |
niveśya bhūmau saṃsthāpya vyomasthaṃ kukkuṭāsanaṃ ||

Yuktabhavadēva 6.16 (attr. *Haṭhapradīpikā*)

padmāsanaṃ tu saṃyojya jānūrvor antare karau |
niveśya bhūmau saṃsthāpya vyomasthaṃ kukkuṭāsanaṃ ||
iti kukkuṭāsanaṃ ||

Commentary: The names *kurkuṭa* and *kurkkuṭa* in some manuscripts are variant spellings of *kukkuṭa* attested in the *Pañcatantra* (M-W).

Metre: Anuṣṭubh (c: ma-vipulā)

1.24

Translation: While in the wild cock pose, [the yogi] binds the neck with the hands and lies [on his back] upturned like a tortoise. This is the upturned tortoise (*uttānakūrmaka*).

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 84r (attr. *Haṭhapradīpikā*)

kukkuṭāsanabandhastho dorbhyāṃ sambadhya kandharām |
bhavet kūrmavad uttānam etad uttānakūrmakam ||

Haṭharatnāvalī 3.74

kukkuṭāsanabandhastho dorbhyāṃ sambadhya kandharām ||
śete kūrmavad uttānam etad uttānakūrmakam || 74 ||

Yuktabhavadēva 6.17 (attr. *Haṭhapradīpikā*)

kukkuṭāsanabandhastho dorbhyāṃ sambadhya kandharām |
śete kūrmavad uttānam etad uttānakūrmakam ||
iti uttānakūrmāsanam ||

Commentary: The oldest dated manuscript, η_1 , has *kukkuṭāsanavat kṛtvā*, which is a simpler alternative to the widely attested reading *kukkuṭāsanabandhasthaḥ* (including α_2 and α_3), which we have accepted. Since there is no known source for this verse other than the *Haṭhapradīpikā*, it appears that the reading of η_1 was an isolated attempt to simplify the syntax.

1.25

Translation: Clasping the big toes with the hands and performing the action of drawing a bow as far as the ear is called the bow pose (*dhanurāsana*).

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 84r (attr. *Haṭhapradīpikā*)

pādānguṣṭhau ca pāṇibhyāṃ grhītvā śravaṇāvadhi |
dhanurākaraṇaṃ kṛtvā dhanurāsanam īritam ||

Haṭharatnāvalī 3.51

atha dhanurāsanam—
pādānguṣṭhau tu pāṇibhyāṃ grhītvā śravaṇāvadhi ||
dhanurākaraṇaṃ kṛtvā dhanurāsanam ucyate ||
ākaraṇaṃ kṛtvā] ākaraṇākṛṣṭaṃ P,T,t1

Yuktabhavadēva 6.18 (attr. *Haṭhapradīpikā*)

pādānguṣṭhau tu pāṇibhyāṃ grhītvā śravaṇāvadhi |

dhanurākaraṣaṇaṃ kṛtvā dhanurāsanam īritam ||
iti dhanurāsanam ||

Cf. *Haṭhayogasaṃhitā* p. 21

dhanurāsanam |
prasārya pādau bhuvi daṇḍarūpau
karau ca prṣṭhe dhṛtapādayugmau |
kṛtvā dhanustulyavivarttitāṅgaṃ
nigadyate vai dhanurāsanam tat || 25 ||

Commentary: Since the word *ākaraṣaṇa* in one form or other is so well attested in the third verse quarter, the reading *dhanurākaraṣaṇaṃ kṛtvā*, which is in ϵ_2 , as well as the principal testimonia (i.e., the *Yogacintāmaṇi* and *Haṭharatnāvalī*), fits the overall syntax of the verse. However, it is curious that *krṣṭam* (for *kṛtvā*) is well attested in some groups of manuscripts because it seems redundant with *ākaraṣaṇaṃ*. However, the following reading in Godāvaramiśra's *Yogacintāmaṇi* (f. 40r) makes sense of *krṣṭam* and might indeed be the original version of the verse: *dhanurākaraṣavat krṣṭam dhanurāsanam ucyate*.

A different version of *dhanurāsana* is described in the *Haṭhayogasaṃhitā*. On the two versions of *dhanurāsana*, see Hargreaves and Birch 2017.

One manuscript of the *Haṭhapradīpikā* (ms. no. 30051, f. 2v), which was consulted but not collated for this edition, has a scribal comment stating that *dhanurāsana* should be done continuously (*anavarata*) on the left and right sides (*tatra ekam dhanurākaraṣaṇāsanam āsanam savyāpasavyapādahastābhyām [abhy]ased anavaratam*). This would make *dhanurāsana* a dynamic practice as shown in [this video](#).

1.26

Translation: [The yogi] should hold the right foot, which is placed at the base of the left thigh, with the [hand of] the right arm, which is wrapped around the outside of the knee, and remain [like that] with his body twisted. This posture was taught by the revered Matsyendranātha.

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 84r (attr. *Haṭhapradīpikā*)

vāmorumūlārpitadakṣapādaṃ jānvor bahirveṣṭitadakṣadoṣṇā |
pragrhya tiṣṭhet parivartitāṅgaḥ śrīmatsyanāthoditam āsanam syāt ||

Haṭharatnāvalī 3.57

atha matsyendrāsanaṃ—
vāmorumūlārpitadakṣapādo jānvor bahirveṣṭitadakṣadoṣṇā |

pragr̥hya tiṣṭhet parivartitāṅgaḥ śrīmatṣyanāthoditam āsanam syāt ||
 °dakṣapādo] °dakṣapādam P, °dakṣapādau t1

Yuktabhavadeva 6.19 (attr. *Haṭhapradīpikā*)

vāmorumūlārpitadakṣapādam jānvor bahirveṣṭitadakṣadoṣṇā |
 pragr̥hya tiṣṭhan parivartitāṅgaḥ śrīmatṣyanāthoditam āsanam syāt ||

Commentary: In the second verse quarter, most of the manuscript groups have a compound with °doṣṇā at the end, as seen also in the *Yogacintāmaṇi*, *Haṭharatnāvalī* and *Yuktabhavadeva*. The instrumental ending (‘with the hand’) works well with the gerund (*pragr̥hya*) in the third verse quarter and the object (°dakṣapādam) in the first quarter. This reading indicates that the right foot is held by the hand of the arm that is wrapped around the outside of the left leg, which would be the right hand (°dakṣadoṣṇā) rather than the left (°vāmadoṣṇā), as shown in [Figure 1](#).

One manuscript of α (G₄) and most manuscripts of the *Haṭharatnāvalī* have °dakṣapādo in the first pāda. This reading yields the same meaning as the adopted one if read with °vāmapādam in the second. However, G₄ and manuscripts of the *Haṭharatnāvalī* read °vāmadoṣṇā, which is not good because it leaves the gerund without an object.

The version of this verse in *Jyotsnā* (1.26), which is supported by some manuscripts in two important groups, β and η, has two objects of the gerund, namely the left and right feet, without an instrumental or conjunctive particle. In his commentarial remarks, Brahmānanda proposes that the left foot is grasped by the right hand and the right foot by the left foot, as seen in [Figure 2](#).

Metre: Upajāti

1.27

Translation: Matsyendra’s seat is a destructive missile for the many terrible diseases that develop in the stomach; through practice it brings about in men the awakening of Kuṇḍalinī and steadiness of the spine.

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 84r (attr. *Haṭhapradīpikā*)

matsyendrapīṭham jaṭharapravṛddha-
 pracāṇdaruṇmaṇḍalakhaṇḍanāstram |
 abhyāsataḥ kuṇḍalinīprabodham
 daṇḍe sthīratvaṃ pradadāti puṃsām ||
 °pravṛddha] N : °pravṛddhim L

Haṭharatnāvalī 3.58

matsyendrapīṭhaṃ jaṭharapradīptaṃ
 pracaṇḍarugmaṇḍalakhaṇḍanāstraṃ |
 abhyāsataḥ kuṇḍalinīprabodhaṃ
 daṇḍasthiratvaṃ ca dadāti puṃsām ||
 °pradīptaṃ] pravṛttaṃ T,t1 °pravṛttaḥ N,n1,n3,J

Haṭhatattvakaumudī 7.8

matsyendrapīṭhaṃ jaṭharapracāṇḍa-
 ruṃmaṇḍalakhaṇḍanakhaṇḍanāstraṃ |
 abhyāsataḥ kuṇḍalinīprabodhaṃ
 daṇḍasthiratvaṃ ca dadāti puṃsām ||

Yuktabhavadēva 6.20 (attr. *Haṭhapradīpikā*)

matsyendrapīṭhaṃ jaṭharaprabuddhaṃ
 pracaṇḍaruṃmaṇḍalakhaṇḍanāstraṃ |
 abhyasataṃ kuṇḍalinīprabodhaṃ
 daṇḍasthiratvaṃ ca dadāti puṃsām ||

Commentary: The manuscript readings for the compound beginning with *jaṭhara* diverge significantly and include *jaṭharapravṛddha*°, *jaṭharaprabuddha*°, *jaṭharapradīpta*° and *jaṭharapracāṇḍa*°. As descriptive compounds, none of these makes good sense in regard to Matsyendra's seat. Since the stomach or abdomen (*jaṭhara*) is the first member of this compound, it seems more likely that it qualifies the terrible diseases (*pracaṇḍarug*) that are mentioned in the next verse quarter, as suggested by the reading *jaṭharapravṛddha*°, which is attested by η_2 and the *Yoga-cintāmaṇi* and suggested by γ_1 and δ_1 (*jaṭharapravuddh*°).

In 1.27d, the compound *daṇḍasthiratvaṃ* ('steadiness of the spine') is attested by all the important manuscript groups and testimonia, so it was likely original. However, the *Īyotsnā* (1.27d) has *candrasthiratvaṃ* ('steadiness of the moon'), and this reading is well-attested in many manuscripts that are lower on the stemma. Brahmānanda understands steadiness here as 'the absence of flow' (*sthiratvaṃ kṣaraṇābhāvaṃ*), a reference to the moon retaining its nectar.

Metre: Upajāti

1.28

Translation: [The yogi] should stretch out the legs on the ground [as straight] as a stick, hold the toes of both feet with the hands, and practise with the forehead placed on the knees. They call this the back-stretch (*pāścimatānam*).

Sources:

Cf. *Śivasamhitā* 3.108

prasārya caraṇadvandvaṃ parasparasusaṃyutam |
svapāñibhyāṃ dṛḍhaṃ dhṛtvā jānūpari śiro nyaset ||

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 84r (attr. *Haṭhapradīpikā*)

prasārya pāḍau bhuvi daṇḍarūpau
dvābhyāṃ ca pādadvitayaṃ grhītvā |
jānūpari nyastalalāṭadeśo
'bhyased idaṃ paścimatānam āhuḥ ||

Haṭharatnāvalī 3.66

atha paścimatānāsanam—
prasārya pāḍau bhuvi daṇḍarūpau
dorbhyāṃ padāgradvitayaṃ grhītvā |
jānūpari nyastalalāṭadeśo
vased idaṃ paścimatānam āhuḥ ||
dorbhyāṃ padāgradvitayaṃ] dvābhyāṃ karābhyāṃ dvitayaṃ n1,n3

Yuktabhavadeva 6.22 (attr. *Haṭhapradīpikā*)

prasārya pāḍau bhuvi daṇḍarūpau
dorbhyāṃ ca pādadvitayaṃ grhītvā |
jānūpari nyastalalāṭapaṭṭo
nyased idaṃ paścimatānam āhuḥ ||

Commentary: The reading *dorbhyāṃ padāgradvitayaṃ* is well attested but is somewhat strange because *dos* usually means ‘the arm’ rather than the hands. The variant *dvābhyāṃ karābhyāṃ dvitayaṃ*, “with both hands”, appears to be an attempt to remove *dorbhyāṃ*, but it introduces the problem of the toes not being mentioned.

Metre: Upajāti

1.29

Translation: Foremost among *āsanas*, the back-stretch thus makes the breath flow to the rear (i.e. in the central channel), increases the digestive fire, makes the belly thin and prevents diseases in men.

Sources:

Cf. *Śivasamhitā* 3.109–110

āsanāgryam idaṃ proktaṃ jaṭharānaladīpanam |
dehāvasādaharaṇaṃ paścimottānasaṃjñakam ||
ya etad āsanaṃ śreṣṭhaṃ pratyahaṃ sādhayet sudhīḥ |

vāyuḥ paścimamārgeṇa tasya saṃcarati dhruvam ||

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 84r (attr. *Haṭhapradīpikā*)

iti paścimatānam āsanāgryam
pavanam paścimavāhinam karoti |
udayam jaṭharānalasya kuryād
udare kārśyam arogitām ca puṃsām ||

Haṭharatnāvalī 3.67

iti paścimatānam āsanāgryam
pavanam paścimavāhinam karoti |
udayam jaṭharānalasya kuryād
udare kārśyam arogitām ca puṃsām ||

Commentary: The use of the word *paścima* to mean the central channel is found at *Yogabīja* 95 (*paścimamārgataḥ*), 108 (*paścime pathi*), 117 (*paścimadvāramārgeṇa*) and 121 (*paścimam*). Cf. the usages of *paścimamārga* in *Dattātreyayogaśāstra* 140 and *Śivasamhitā* 3.110 (from which this verse is likely to be derived). Brahmānanda understands *paścima* as referring to the *Suṣumṇā* (*Jyotsnā* 1.29): *paścimavāhinam paścimena paścimamārgeṇa suṣumṇāmārgeṇa vahatīti paścimavāhī*.

Metre: Śiśulilā

1.30

Translation: Supporting oneself on the ground with both hands, the elbows placed on either side of the navel, lifted up into the air in a raised posture [as straight] as a stick: they call this posture the peacock.

Sources:

Vimānārcanākālpa 96

karatale bhūmau saṃsthāpya kūrparau nābhipārśvayor nyasya nataśīrāḥ
(unnataśīrāḥ) pāḍau ḍaṇḍavad vyomni saṃsthito mayūrāsanam iti ||

Pāḍmasaṃhitā (*yogapāḍa*) 1.21c–22d:

avaṣṭabhya dharām samyak talābhyām hastayor dvayoḥ ||
kūrparau nābhipārśve ca sthāpayitvā mayūravat |
samunnamya śīrāhpāḍau mayūrāsanam iṣyate ||

Ahīrbudhnyasaṃhitā 31.36–37

mayūrāsanam
niveśya kūrparau samyañ nābhimaṇḍalapārśvayoḥ |
avaṣṭabhya bhuvam pāṇitalābhyām vyomni ḍaṇḍavat ||

Vasiṣṭhasaṃhitā 1.76–77

avaṣṭabhya dharāṃ samyak talābhyāṃ ca karadvayam |
 hastayoḥ kūrparau cāpi sthāpayan nābhipārśvayoḥ ||
 samunnataśiraḥpādo daṇḍavad vyomni saṃsthitaḥ |
 mayūrāsanam etad dhi sarvapāpavināśanam ||
 ca karadvayam] karayor dvayoḥ

Yogayājñavalkya 3.15–16

avaṣṭabhya dharāṃ samyak talābhyāṃ tu karadvayoḥ |
 hastayoḥ kūrparau cāpi sthāpayan nābhipārśvayoḥ ||
 samunnataśiraḥpādo daṇḍavad vyomni saṃsthitaḥ |
 mayūrāsanam etat tu sarvapāpapranaśanam ||

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 84r (attr. *Haṭhapradīpikā*)

dharāṃ avaṣṭabhya punaḥ karābhyāṃ
 tatkūrpare sthāpitanābhipārśvaḥ |
 tadāsane daṇḍavad utthitaḥ khe
 mayūram etat pravadanti santaḥ ||

Haṭharatnāvalī 3.42

atha mayūram
 dharāṃ avaṣṭabhya karadvayena
 tatkūrpare sthāpitanābhipārśvaḥ |
 uccāsano daṇḍavad utthitaḥ khe
 mayūram etat pravadanti pīṭham ||

Commentary: The source of this verse is unknown, but it has the same elements as the two verses in the *Vasiṣṭhasaṃhitā* (1.76–77), which are themselves derived from earlier Vaiṣṇava sources. The compound *uccāsanaḥ* in the third verse quarter seems to approximate in a somewhat vague way the *Vasiṣṭhasaṃhitā*'s reading *samunnataśiraḥpādaḥ*.

In the second verse quarter, the pronoun in *tatkūrpare* refers to the two hands (*karadvaya*). This is stated more explicitly (i.e., *hastayoḥ kūrparau*) in *Vasiṣṭhasaṃhitā* 1.76c and *Yogayājñavalkya* 3.15c.

Metre: Upajāti

1.31

Translation: The glorious peacock [posture] quickly gets rid of bloating and all other diseases of the abdomen, and overcomes humoral imbalances. It reduces to

ashes food which is bad or has been eaten to excess, kindles the digestive fire and causes strong poison to be digested.

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 84r (attr. *Haṭhapradīpikā*)

harati sakalarogān āśu gulmodarādīn
abhibhavati ca doṣān āsanaṃ śrīmayūram |
bahukadaśanabhuktaṃ bhasma kuryād aśeṣam
janayati jaṭharāgṇiṃ jārayet kālakūṭam ||

Haṭharatnāvalī 3.43

harati sakalarogān āśu gulmodarādīn
abhibhavati ca doṣān āsanaṃ śrīmayūram ||
bahukadaśanabhuktaṃ bhasma kuryād vicitram
janayati jaṭharāgṇiṃ jīryate kālakūṭam ||

Metre: Mālīni

1.32

Translation: Lying with one's back on the ground like a corpse is the corpse posture. It removes the fatigue [caused by practising] any *āsana* and calms the mind.

Sources:

Cf. *Dattātreyayogaśāstra* 24cd

uttānaśavavad bhūmau śayanaṃ cuktam uttamam ||

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 84r (attr. *Haṭhapradīpikā*)

uttānaṃ śavavad bhūmau śavāsanam idaṃ smṛtam |
śavāsanam śrāntiharam cittaśrāntisādhanaṃ ||

Haṭharatnāvalī 3.76

athāntimaṃ śavāsanam
prasārya hastapādaḥ ca śrāntyā śayanaṃ tathā |
sarvāsanaśramaharam śayitaṃ tu śavāsanam ||

Cf. *Haṭhatattvakaumudī* 7.12

śavāsanam hṛtkupitavātagranthivibhedakam |
sarvāsanaśrāntijit hṛtsramaghnaṃ yogisaukhyadam ||

Yuktabhavadēva 6.21

uttānaṃ śavavad bhūmau śayanaṃ tu śavāsanam |

śavāsanam śrāntiharam cittaviśrāntikārakam ||
iti śavāsanam ||

Metre: Anuṣṭubh (c: bha-vipulā)

1.33

Translation: Śiva has taught eighty-four *āsanas*. I shall take the four best from them and describe them.

Sources:

Śivasamhitā 3.96

caturaśīty āsanāni santi nānāvidhāni ca |
tebhyaś catuṣkam ādāya mayoktāni bravīmy aham ||

Cf. *Dattātreyayogaśāstra* 5

caturāśītilakṣānām ekaikaṃ samudāhṛtaṃ |
ataḥ śivena pīṭhānām ṣoḍaśonam śataṃ kṛtaṃ ||

Cf. *Vivekamārtaṇḍa* 5

caturāśītilakṣānām ekaikaṃ samudāhṛtaṃ |
ataḥ śivena pīṭhānām ṣoḍaśonam śataṃ kṛtaṃ ||

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 84v

haṭhapradīpikāyām—
caturaśīty āsanāni śivena kathitāni vai |
tebhyaś catuṣkam ādāya sārabhūtaṃ bravīmy aham ||

Haṭharatnāvalī 3.23

caturaśīty āsanāni śivena kathitāni tu |
tebhyaś catuṣkam ādāya sārabhūtaṃ bravīmy aham ||

Commentary: The word *tu* is often used to introduce a new posture, but in this case seems to be a verse filler.

In the first and third verse quarters, Svātmārāma appears to have rewritten *Śivasamhitā* 3.96 to include the information that it was Śiva (*śivena*) who taught the eighty-four *āsanas*, whereas in the source Śiva is himself speaking. Svātmārāma also changes the meaning of the second half of the verse, as the *Śivasamhitā* states that Śiva picked out the four best postures and taught them, whereas in the *Haṭhapradīpikā* it reads as though Svātmārāma himself is responsible for picking out the four best postures and teaching them. There are other instances in the *Haṭhapradīpikā* where Svātmārāma borrows a verse with a first person verb (e.g., 3.43,

4.2). However, in this instance, he may have intended to indicate that he chose the four postures coming after this verse (i.e., *siddha*, *padma*, *siṃha* and *bhadra*) because the *Śivasamhitā* follows 3.96 with teachings on the postures called *siddha*, *padma*, *paścimottāna* and *svastika*. Another possibility is that Svātmārāma borrowed 1.33–1.34 from an unknown source that contained a dialogue that was different to that of *Śivasamhitā*, as indicated by *sakhe* in 1.34.

Metre: Anuṣṭubh (a: ra-vipulā)

1.34

Translation: The adept, lotus, lion and auspicious pose: these four are the best and, among those, always sit in the adept's pose, my dear.

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 84v (attr. *Haṭhapradīpikā*)

siddham padmam tathā bhadram siṃham ceti catuṣṭayam |
śreṣṭham tatrāpi vai padmam tiṣṭhet siddhāsane sadā ||

Haṭharatnāvalī 3.24

siddham padmam tathā siṃham bhadram ceti catuṣṭayam |
śreṣṭham tatrāpi ca tathā tiṣṭhet siddhāsane sadā ||

tathā] satve P, sakhe T,t1

Commentary: It is likely that the original version of this verse contained the vocative with the imperative form of the verb (*sakhe tiṣṭha*). There are other instances where Svātmārāma included a verse with the vocative (e.g., 4.10, 4.12, 4.20, 4.72, 4.86, 4.88) as though the text were a dialogue. Other versions of this verse are transmitted by some manuscripts of the *Haṭhapradīpikā*, in which the vocative and imperative verb have been removed. In these cases, the *sukhe* and *sukham* is difficult to construe because the context suggests that the intended meaning was that one should always sit in *siddhāsana* (as opposed to the other three *āsanas*), rather than the prescription to always sit in a comfortable *siddhāsana*.

Metre: Anuṣṭubh (c: na-vipulā)

1.35

Translation: Now, the adept's pose (*siddhāsana*).

[The yogi] should put the heel at the perineum, firmly place the [other] foot on the penis, focus the mind, hold the body erect and [remain] motionless, his senses restrained, gazing between the brows with his eyes unmoving. This, which breaks open the door to liberation, is called the adept's pose.

Sources:*Vivekamārtaṇḍa* 7

yonisthānakam aṅghrimūlaghaṭitaṃ kṛtvā dṛḍham vinyasen
medhre pādām athaikam āsyahṛdaye dhṛtvā samam vighrahaṃ |
sthānuḥ saṃyamitendriyo 'caladrśā paśyan bhruvor antaram
etan mokṣakapāṭabhedajanakam siddhāsanam procyate ||

7a *mūlaghaṭitaṃ] *mulaghaṭanaṃ A • vinyasen] GHT; vinyase VA, vinyaset Y

7b medhre] meṃdhre A • athaikam āsyahṛdaye] H; athaikadeśahṛdayo V, athaikam
eva niyatam AGBGPk, athaikam eva niṣatam GL, athaikam eva hṛdayam GP, athaikam
ekahṛdayo T, athaikam ekahṛdayaḥ Y • dhṛtvā] VGBT; kṛtvā GLGPGPkY

7c paśyed] TH; paśyan VAGHSTvl, paśyad Y • antaram] VAGPkGLT; antare GBGP

7d hy etan] H; caitan VAGBGLGPT, etan GPkHS, tv etat Y • *janakam] *navidhau A,
*jananam GB, *nakaram Y • procyate] idam bhavet Y (unm.) ?? check

Testimonia:*Yogacintāmaṇi* f. 84v–85r (attr. *Pavanayogasaṅgraha*)

pavanayogasamgraha—

yonisthānakam aṅghrimūlaghaṭitaṃ kṛtvā dṛḍham vinyasen
medhre pādām athaikam ekahṛdayaḥ kṛtvā samam vighrahaṃ |
sthānuḥ saṃyamitendriyo 'caladrśā paśyed bhruvor antaram tv
etan mokṣakapāṭabhedanakaram siddhāsanam procyate ||

Haṭharatnāvalī 3.25

tatra siddhāsanam

yonisthānakam aṅghrimūlaghaṭitaṃ kṛtvā dṛḍham vinyasen
medhre pādām athaikam eva niyatam kṛtvā samam vighrahaṃ |
sthānuḥ saṃyamitendriyo 'caladrśā paśyan bhruvor antaram
caitan mokṣakapāṭabhedajanakam siddhāsanam procyate ||

yonisthānakam] yonidvārakam P,T. niyatam] hṛdaye T,t1,n2. *kapāṭa°] *kavāṭa° P,T,t1

Commentary:

The adopted reading *ekahṛdayo* is supported by two manuscripts of the *Haṭhapradīpikā* (J₂M₁) and is close to the α reading *ekahṛdaye*, which is also attested by the six-chapter *Vivekamārtaṇḍa* and the *Yogacintāmaṇi*, ..

which attributes this verse to an unknown work called the *Pavanayogasaṅgraha*. In this case, *ekahṛdayaḥ* would perhaps qualify the yogi as having a mind focused on one thing. The second verse quarter has many variations in the *Haṭhapradīpikā* manuscripts, as well as in the manuscripts of the sources and testimonia. α₁ has *athaikam ekahṛdaye dhṛtvā* and most of the collated witnesses have *athaikam eva hṛdaye dhṛtvā*. The repetition of *eka* appears to be a dittographical error and

hrdaye does not make sense without an object of *dhrtvā* (i.e., having held what on the chest?). In the adopted reading *athaikam āsyahrdaye dhrtvā*, which is attested by η_1 , the oldest dated manuscript, the compound *āsyahrdaye* can be understood with the gerund *dhrtvā* and *ekam* in the sense of ‘having held the face and chest together.’ This alludes to the practice of the Jālandhara lock, in which the chin is placed on the chest. This meaning is more clearly seen in the *Īyotsnā*’s version of the second verse quarter, *hrdaye kṛtvā hanuṃ susthiram* (‘having put the jaw firmly on the chest’). The compound *āsyahrdaye* is supported by other manuscripts, such as $N_{10}P_1P_6J_{16}$ and the variants *asyahrdaye* and *asyahrdayaṃ* also occur (e.g., $J_7J_{12}A_1V_4V_{18}V_{16}P_8P_9$).

The other well-attested reading, *athaikam eva niyatam*, was an attempt to fix the problem of *hrdaye* by replacing it with *niyatam*, which must be read with *medhre pādām athaikam* (‘having fixed one foot on the penis’). But *niyatam* is redundant here because of *vinyaset* in the first *pāda*.

Metre: Śārdūlavikrīḍita

1.36

Translation: However, in another school [*siddhāsana* is taught as follows]:

Place the left heel on the penis and put the other heel on top: this is the adept’s pose (*siddhāsana*).

Only the first teaching [on *siddhāsana*] is accepted by me.

Sources:

Vasiṣṭhasaṃhitā 1.81

medhrād upari nikṣīpya gulphaṃ tathopari |
gulphāntaraṃ vinikṣīpya muktāsanam idaṃ smṛtam ||

Yogayājñavalkya 3.15

medhrād upari nikṣīpya savyaṃ gulphaṃ tathopari |
gulphāntaraṃ ca nikṣīpya muktāsanam idaṃ tu vā ||

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 85r (attr. *Pavanayogasaṅgraha*)

tathā |
medhrād upari vinyasya savyaṃ gulphaṃ tathopari |
gulphāntaraṃ tu vinyasya siddhāsanam idaṃ bhavet ||

Haṭharatnāvalī 3.26

matāntare tu
 meḍhrād upari niḥkṣipyā savyaṃ gulphaṃ tathopari |
 gulphāntaraṃ ca niḥkṣipyā siddhāḥ siddhāsanam viduḥ ||

Commentary: Svātmārāma's introductory and following remarks to verse 1.36 indicate that he preferred the *siddhāsana* of the *Vivekamārtaṇḍa* over the version taught as *muktāsana* in the *Vasiṣṭhasaṃhitā* and *Yogayājñavalkya*.

1.37

Translation: Some call this the adept's pose (*siddhāsana*), others know it as the thunderbolt pose (*vajrāsana*), a few say it is the pose of the liberated (*muktāsana*) and some call it the secret pose (*guptāsana*).

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 85r (attr. *Pavanayogasaṅgraha*)

etat siddhāsanam prāhuḥ padmāsanam atho viduḥ |
 guptāsanam vadanty eke prāhur vajrāsanam pare |
 ke cin muktāsanam prāhur idam āsanam uttamam ||

Haṭharatnāvalī 3.27

etat siddhāsanam prāhur anye vajrāsanam viduḥ |
 muktāsanam vadanty eke prāhur guptāsanam pare ||

Cf. the Telugu *Śivayogasāramu* by Kolani Ganapatideva (date 14th c.)

siddāsanambunu, gondaru vajrāsanambaniyu |
 gondaru muktāsanambaniyu, gondadu gulbāsanam ||

and a Telugu verse by the poet Pingali Surana (active 16th c.)

kondaru siddāsanamani
 kondaru vajrāsanamani koniyādudurī
 pondaga dīnini mariyoka
 kondaru guptāsamānu kondru mahātmā

The last two references are taken from Reddy 1982: 41–42

1.38

Translation: Like measured diet amongst rules and non-violence amongst observances, the adepts know *siddhāsana* to be the single most important of all postures.

Sources:

Cf. *Dattātreyayogaśāstra* 33

laghvāhāras tu teṣv eko mukhyo bhavati nāpare |
ahiṃsā niyameṣv eko mukhyo bhavati nāpare || 33 ||

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 85r (attr. *Haṭhapradīpikā*)

niyameṣu mitāharo yathāhiṃsā yameṣv iva |
mukhyam sarvāsaneṣv evaṃ siddhāsanaṃ idaṃ viduḥ |

Commentary:**1.39**

Translation: From among the eighty-four postures, one should regularly practise just *siddhāsana*, in the same way from among the 72,000 channels [one should practise, focusing on] *suṣumnā*.

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 85r (attr. *Haṭhapradīpikā*)

caturaśītipīṭheṣu siddhāsanaṃ samabhyaset |
dvāsaptatisahasreṣu suṣumnām iva nāḍiṣu ||

Yogasārasaṅgraha p.9 (attr. *Yogasāramañjarī*)

caturāśītipīṭheṣu siddham eva samabhyaset |
dvisaptatisahasreṣu suṣumnām iva nāḍiṣu ||

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 79r (attr. *Haṭhayoga*)

maṇḍalā dṛśyate siddhiḥ kuṇḍalyabhyāsayoginaḥ |
dvisaptatisahasrāṇām nāḍīnām malaśodhanam ||

Cf. *Kumbhakaṇṭhapaddhati* 120 (on the effects of practising *kumbhaka*)

dvāsaptati saḥsārāṇām nāḍīnām malaśodhanam |
yatheṣṭam dhāraṇam vāyor vikārābhāva eva ca ||

Commentary: It is odd to have *suṣumnām* as the object of the verb *abhyaset*. This reading is well attested by manuscripts of the *Haṭhapradīpikā* and is also found in the *Yogacintāmaṇi*, which attributes it to the *Yogasāramañjarī*. Perhaps, the second hemistich was added somewhat haphazardly by Svātmārāma, and then others have tried to make sense of it by changing *suṣumnām iva nāḍiṣu* to *nāḍīnām malaśodhanam*, which occurs in the *Jyotsnā* (1.39). The reading *nāḍīnām malaśodhanam/e* is probably a patch as no other texts say that *siddhāsana* clears the channels. However, the idea of purifying the channels can be found in other contexts

(e.g., *Kumbhakapaddhati* 120) and may hark back to an earlier notion of flushing (*cālana*) the channels (e.g., *Amṛtasiddhi* 11.6).

1.40

Translation: By meditating upon the self, restricting the diet and regularly practising *siddhāsana* for twelve years, the yogi attains the *niṣpatti* stage. What's the point of the [other] many tiring postures when there is *siddhāsana*?

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 85r (attr. *Haṭhapradīpikā*)

ātmadhyāyī mitāhārī yāvad dvādaśavatsaram |
sadā siddhāsanābhyāsād yogī niṣpattim āpnuyāt |
śramadair bahubhiḥ pīṭhaiḥ kiṃ syāt siddhāsane sati ||

Yogasārasaṅgraha p. 9 (attr. *Yogasāramañjarī*)

ātmadhyāyo mitāhārī yāvad dvādaśavatsaram |
sadā siddhāsanābhyāsād yoganiṣpattim āpnuyāt |
śramadair bahubhiḥ pīṭhair alaṃ siddhāsane sati |

Commentary:

The notion of *āsanas* causing fatigue (*śrama*) was mentioned earlier in the verse on the corpse pose (1.32).

1.41

Translation: Just as the [state] beyond mind (*unmanī*) arises automatically, without effort, when the *prāṇa* breath has been carefully stopped in *kevalakumbhaka*, [...]

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 85r (attr. *Haṭhapradīpikā*)

prāṇānile sāvadhāne baddhe kevalakumbhake |
utpatsyate nirāyāsāt svayam evonmanī yathā ||

Metre: Anuṣṭubh (a: ra-vipulā)

1.42

Translation: [...] so too the three locks (*bandha*) arise automatically without effort, every time *siddhāsana* alone is firmly adopted.

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 85r (attr. *Haṭhapradīpikā*)

aṭhaikasminn eva dṛḍhaṃ baddhe siddhāsane sadā |
bandhatrayam anāyāsāt svayam evopajāyate ||

Commentary: It seems likely that *dṛḍhaṃ* (rather than *dṛḍhe*) was originally intended in 1.42a because *dṛḍhataram*, which is not ambiguous, is used in 1.48a to qualify how *padmāsana* should be adopted, and *dṛḍhaṃ* complements *sāvadhānam* in 1.41a.

Metre: Anuṣṭubh (a: bha-vipulā)

1.43

Translation: There is no posture like *siddhāsana*, no breath-retention like *kevala*, no seal like *khecarī*, [and] no [means for the] dissolution [of mind] like the internal sound (*nāda*).

Sources:

Śivasamhitā 5.47

nāsanam siddhasaḍṛṣam na kumbhasaḍṛṣam balam |
na khecarīsamā mudrā na nādasadṛśo layaḥ ||

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 75r (attr. *Haṭhapradīpikā*)

nāsanam siddhasaḍṛṣam na kumbhaḥ kevalopamaḥ |
na khecarīsamā mudrā na nādasadṛśo layaḥ ||

Haṭharatnāvalī 3.29

nāsanam siddhasaḍṛṣam na kumbhaḥ kevalopamaḥ |
na khecarīsamā mudrā na nādasadṛśo layaḥ ||
kumbhaḥ kevalopamaḥ] kumbhasaḍṛśo 'nilaḥ N,n1,n2,n3J

Commentary: The reading *na kumbhasaḍṛśo 'nilaḥ* ('no breath like a retention') is the lectio difficilior and attested by two early witnesses (η_1 and η_2) and is possibly original. However, the α manuscripts and several other important witness groups have the adopted reading *kumbhaḥ kevalopamaḥ*, as well as the *Yogacintāmaṇi* and some manuscripts of the *Haṭharatnāvalī*, suggesting that this reading, which makes much better sense, was in the transmission at an early stage.

Metre: Anuṣṭubh (a: na-vipulā)

1.44

Translation: Now the lotus pose (*padmāsana*).

Place the right foot on the left thigh, and the left on the right thigh, firmly hold the big toes with the hands crossed behind the back, put the chin on the chest and gaze at the tip of the nose. This, which destroys diseases for those who undertake the observances, is called the lotus pose.

Sources:

Vivekamārtaṇḍa 8

vāmorūpari dakṣiṇaṁ ca caraṇaṁ saṁsthāpya vāmaṁ tathā
yāmyorūpari paścimena vidhinā dhṛtvā karābhyāṁ dṛḍham |
aṅguṣṭhau hṛdaye nidhāya cibukaṁ nāsāgram ālokayed
etad vyādhivikārahāri yamināṁ padmāsanaṁ procyate || 8 ||

8a saṁsthāpya] vinyasya T

8b yāmyorūpari paścimena vidhinā dhṛtvā] VT; dakṣorūpari tasya bandhanavid- hau
dhṛtvā A, dakṣorūpari paścimena vidhinā dhṛtvā GPGPKY, tasyaivoparitaś ca vandhanavid-
hiṁ kṛtvā GB , tato dakṣorūpari tasya vaṁdhanavidhau pṛṣṭhe GL (unm.) • dṛḍham]
dṛḍha* ṁ * V

8c ālokayed] ālokayan GB

8d etad] antar° T • °vikārahāri yamināṁ] VAT; °vikāranāśanakaraṁ GPK Y, °vikāraṁ-
dadamaṇaṁ GB , °vināśakāri yamināṁ GL GP, °vighātahāri yamināṁ TvI • °nāśanakaraṁ
G

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 85v (attr. *Haṭhayoga*)

haṭhayoge—

vāmorūpari dakṣiṇaṁ hi caraṇaṁ saṁsthāpya vāmaṁ tathā
dakṣorūpari paścimena vidhinā dhṛtvā karābhyāṁ dṛḍham |
aṅguṣṭhau hṛdaye nidhāya cibukaṁ nāsāgram ālokayet
etad vyādhivikāranāśanakaraṁ padmāsanaṁ procyate ||

Haṭharatnāvalī 3.34

vāmorūpari dakṣiṇaṁ ca caraṇaṁ saṁsthāpya vāmaṁ tathā
yāmyorūpari paścimena vidhinā dhṛtvā karābhyāṁ dṛḍham |
aṅguṣṭhau hṛdaye nidhāya cibukaṁ nāsāgram ālokayed
etad vyādhivinaśakāri yamināṁ padmāsanaṁ procyate ||

Metre: Śārdūlavikrīḍita

1.45–46

Translation: However, in another school [*padmāsana* is taught as follows]:

Carefully put the upturned feet on the thighs and the upturned hands in the middle of the thighs, fix the eyes on the tip of the nose, raise the root of the uvula with the tongue, place the chin on the chest, gently [draw in] the breath [...].

Sources:

Dattātreyayogaśāstra 35–37

uttānau caraṇau kṛtvā ūrusaṁsthau prayatnataḥ |
 ūrumadhye tathottānau pāṇī kṛtvā tato dṛśau ||
 nāsāgre vinyased rājadantamūlaṁ ca jihvayā |
 uttabhya cibukaṁ vakṣasy āsthāpya pavanaṁ śanaiḥ ||
 yathāśaktyā samākṛṣya pūrayed udaraṁ śanaiḥ |
 yathāśaktyaiva paścāt tu recayet pavanaṁ śanaiḥ ||

Śivasamhitā 3.102–104

uttānau caraṇau kṛtvā ūrusaṁsthau prayatnataḥ |
 ūrumadhye tathottānau pāṇī kṛtvā tu tādṛśau ||
 nāsāgre vinyased dṛṣṭiṁ rājadantaṁ ca jihvayā |
 uttabhya cibukaṁ vakṣe saṁsthāpya pavanaṁ śanaiḥ ||
 yathāśaktyā samākṛṣya pūrayed udaraṁ śanaiḥ |
 yathāśaktyaiva paścāt tu recayed anirodhataḥ ||

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 85v

dattātreyah—
 uttānau caraṇau kṛtvā ūrusaṁsthau prayatnataḥ |
 ūrumadhye tathottānau pāṇī kṛtvā tato dṛśau ||
 nāsāgre vinyased rājadantamūlaṁ tu jihvayā |
 uttabhya cibukaṁ vakṣasy utthāpya pavanaṁ śanaiḥ ||
 yathāśaktyā samākṛṣya pūrayed udaraṁ śanaiḥ |
 yathāśaktyaiva paścāt tu recayet pavanaṁ śanaiḥ ||

Haṭharatnāvalī 3.36–3.37

dattātreyo 'pi
 uttānau caraṇau kṛtvā ūrvoḥ saṁsthāpya yatnataḥ |
 ūrumadhye tathottānau pāṇī kṛtvā tato dṛśau ||
 nāsāgre vinyased rājadantamūlaṁ ca jihvayā |
 uttabhya cibukaṁ vakṣaḥ saṁsthāpya pavanaṁ śanaiḥ ||

Commentary:

The syntax of this verse as we have presented it is incomplete: at its end *pavanaṁ śanaiḥ*, ‘the breath gradually’, is left hanging. In the source text, the *Dattātreyayogaśāstra*, the following verse completes the syntax with *pūrayed*, ‘one should

inhale”. Either Svātmārāma chose to leave the verse hanging (the following verse in the *Dattātreyayogaśāstra* adds nothing about the form of the posture, which is the topic here) or the verse that completes the syntax fell out, perhaps because of a scribal error that happened early in the transmission. In the *Dattātreyayogaśāstra* verses 36 and 37 both end with *pavanaṃ śanaiḥ*, the repetition of which may have caused an eyeskip.

The manuscript readings with *vakṣa sthāpayet* (J₇V₃J₈J₁₀J₁₇N₁₇) or something similar (V₁W₄) do not offer a solution to the incomplete syntax so do not indicate that Svātmārāma rewrote *Dattātreyayogaśāstra* 36 so that he could omit *Dattātreyayogaśāstra* 37. In the absence of evidence that Svātmārāma included *Dattātreyayogaśāstra* 37 or wrote a coherent version of *Haṭhapradīpikā* 1.46, we have made sense of *pavanaṃ śanaiḥ* by adding “[draw in]” in our translation.

Brahmānanda’s comment on the statement, ‘having raised the root of the uvula with the tongue’ (*rājadantamūlaṃ ca jihvayā uttabhya*) in 1.46 is worth noting. In the context of Haṭhayoga, one would assume this statement to be referring to a type of *khecarīmudrā*, in which the tongue lifts the root of the uvula, here called the ‘royal tooth’ (*rājadanta*, on the meaning of which see Mallinson 2007: 209 n. 258). However, Brahmānanda understands it differently (synonyms omitted for clarity):

Pushing against both roots of the front teeth on the left and right with the tongue [...] — this fixation of the tongue has to be understood from the mouth of the teacher.

rājadantānāṃ daṃṣṭrāṇāṃ savyadākṣiṇabhāge sthitānāṃ mūle ubhe mūlasthāne jihvayā uttabhya ūrdhvaṃ stambhayitvā | gurumukhād avagantavyo ’yaṃ jihvābandhaḥ |

Brahmānanda appears to have had in mind a probably older rule for meditation postures, according to which the tongue rests near the front teeth. One example of this is in *Svacchandatantra* (4.365f.), which teaches a meditation pose called *divyaṃ karaṇam*, in which the tongue is to rest at the tip of the teeth (*dantāgre jihvām ādāya*). Other Tantric texts have this or similar rules, in which the tongue is supposed to rest either on the teeth or the palate, early examples being the *Mrgendrāgama*, *yogapāda* 19 (*dantāgre jihvām ādāya*) and *Mataṅgapārameśvaratantra*, *yogapāda* 2.27 (*tālumadhyagatenaiva jihvāgreṇa*). Placing the tongue where it does not disturb the meditation seems quite appropriate for a ‘normal’ meditative practice.⁴

⁴The rule of placing the tongue at the palate is also found in *Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati* 18.120:

When the context is haṭhayogic physiology, placing the tongue at the uvula, which is the source of ‘nectar’, is more appropriate. Confusingly, yogic terminology includes many names for the uvula, and among these especially the term *rājadanta* may give rise to confusion, since, as we have seen, the tongue might also in some yoga systems be placed at the front teeth.

Furthermore, the haṭhayogic *khecarīmudrā* has been described in manifold ways. Usually the tongue is said to be inserted into the cavity above the palate but in some cases it is placed at the uvula. Thus the tenth-century *Mokṣopāya* (V.55.14c) says that the tongue rests at the ‘source of the palate’ (*tālumūlatalāagnajihvā*) and the commentary, the *Samśāratarāṇi*, on the parallel passage in *Laghuyogavāsīṣṭha* V.6.155, which reads *tālumūlāntarāagnajihvā*°, explains that this means that the tongue is to be placed in the middle of the two regions of the palate, and that this is the *nabhomudrā*, alias ‘*khecarī*’ (*tālumūlāntarāagnajihvamūlaḥ tālumūlayoḥ kākudamūladeśayoḥ āntare lagnam ālagnam jihvāmūlam yasyety anena nabhomudrā darśitā | yā hi khecarīty ucyate*).

A little later in the *Mokṣopāya* (V.78.24ab) it is made clear that one should reach the uvula, ‘at the root of the palate’ (*tālumūlagatām yatnāj jihvayākramya ghaṇṭikām*). In view of this background we must conclude that the author of the *Īyotsnā* was probably not aware of the yogic meaning of *rājadanta* and has tried his best to make sense of the passage, echoing the idea of the two roots of the palate (although his text is not talking about the palate), but then referring to the instruction of the teacher for practical details, probably noticing that his literal interpretation is somewhat opaque. In addition to his commentary on 1.46 (translated above), Brahmananda’s comments on *rājadantasthajihvāyām* at 3.22 indicate that he thought the *rājadanta* refers to the front teeth (*kutaḥ? yato dantānām rājāno rājadantā rājadanteṣu tiṣṭhatīti rājadantasthāḥ, rājadantasthā cāsau jihvā ca tasyām rājadantasthajihvāyām bandhaḥ, taduparibhāgasya sambandhaḥ śastah*).

1.47

Translation: This is called the lotus pose [and] it cures all diseases. It is difficult for just anyone to accomplish; it is accomplished by a wise person [here] on earth.

Only the second teaching [on the lotus pose] is approved by me.

Sources:

Dattātreyayogaśāstra 38

tāluke jihvām samyojya kiñcidvivṛtavaktro dantair dantān asaṃsprśan rjukāyaḥ. For similar references in tantric and other works see Mallinson 2007:17–24

idaṃ padmāsanaṃ nāma sarvavyādhivināśanam |
durlabhaṃ yena kenāpi dhīmatā labhyate bhuvi ||

38a nāma] P; *ma T, proktaṃ cett.

38d dhīmatā] dhīmatāṃ A • bhuvi] yadi M1, hi vai A

Śivasamhitā 3.105

idaṃ padmāsanaṃ proktaṃ sarvavyādhivināśanam |
durlabhaṃ yena kenāpi dhīmatā labhyate param ||

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 85v (attr. dattātreyā)

idaṃ padmāsanaṃ proktaṃ sarvavyādhivināśanam |
durlabhaṃ yena kenāpi dhīmatā labhyate bhuvi ||

Haṭharatnāvalī 3.38

idaṃ padmāsanaṃ proktaṃ sarvavyādhivināśanam |
durlabhaṃ yena kenāpi dhīmatā labhyate bhuvi ||

Commentary: In this context, the word *durlabham* is somewhat ambiguous as to whether the posture is hard to perform or hard to acquire (the more usual meaning). In commenting on *durlabham* in *Jyotsnā* 2.74, Brahmānanda glosses it as *duṣprāpam*, which means ‘difficult to attain’ and ‘inaccessible.’

The comment added to this verse by Svātmārāma indicates that he prefers the following version of *padmāsana*, which derives from the *Vivekamārtaṇḍa*, rather than the one he has borrowed from the *Dattātreyayogāśāstra*.

1.48

Translation:

A man should put his hands together in a bowl shape, very firmly assume *padmāsana*, place the chin tight on the chest and meditation in the mind. Raising the *apāna* breath over and over again [and] releasing the inhaled *prāṇa*, he attains unequalled knowledge through the power of the goddess [Kunḍalinī].

Sources:

Vivekamārtaṇḍa 36

kṛtvā sampuṭitau karau dṛḍhataṃ baddhvātha padmāsanaṃ
gāḍhaṃ vakṣasi sannidhāya cibukaṃ dhyānamś ca tac cetasi |
vāraṃ vāraṃ apānam ūrdhvaṃ anilaṃ proccālayan pūritaṃ
muñcan prāṇam upaiti bodham atulaṃ śaktiprabhāvān naraḥ ||

36a °puṭitau] GL GP GPK U; ghaṭitau VAGB T • baddhvātha] VTvl U; baddhvā tu
 AGBH, dhyānaṃ tu GL, dhyāyes ta° GP, dhyātvā ca GPK, baddhvā ca T • padmāsanam
] VGBTU; tac cepsitaṃ GL, °taś cepsitaṃ GP, tat prekṣitaṃ GPK
 36b dhyāyaṃś] TH; dhyānaṃ VAGU • °cetasi] °cetaṃ A
 36c proccālayan] ** T; pro cc ālayan V, prodvārayaṃ A, proccālayet GB, proccārayet
 GLGPK, prolāsayet GP, proccārayan U • pūri- taṃ] prerayaṃ A
 36d muñcan prāṇamupaiti bodhamatulaṃ śak- tiprabhāvān naraḥ] U; prāṇaṃ muñcati
 bodham eti śanakaiḥ proktaprabhāvād ataḥ V, pāṇaṃ muñcati bodham eti śanakaiḥ
 śaktiḥ prabhāvād ataḥ A, prāṇaṃ muñcati yāti bodham amalāṃ śaktipradhānoditaḥ
 GB, muñcan prāṇam upaiti bodham atulaṃ śaktiprabhāvād ataḥ GLGP, muñcan prāṇam
 upaiti bodham atulaṃ śaktiprabodhān naraḥ GPK, prāṇaṃ muñcati bodhameti śanakai
 (ścu?śśa)[sic] ktiprabodhān naraḥ T, muñcan prāṇam upaiti bodham akhilāṃ śaktiṃ
 prabhāvād ataḥ TvI

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 79v

tathā ca granthāntare—
 kṛtvā saṃpuṭitau karau dṛḍhataṃ baddhvā ca padmāsanam
 gāḍhaṃ vakṣasi saṃnidhāya civukaṃ dhyānaṃ ca tac cetasi |
 vāraṃ vāraṃ apānaṃ ūrdhvaṃ anilaṃ protsārayet pūrayet
 prāṇaṃ muñcati bodham eti niyataṃ śaktiprabodhodayāt ||

Haṭharatnāvalī 3.39

kṛtvā saṃpuṭitau karau dṛḍhataṃ baddhvā tu padmāsanam
 gāḍhaṃ vakṣasi sannidhāya cibukaṃ dhyānaṃ ca tac cetasi |
 vāraṃ vāraṃ apānaṃ ūrdhvaṃ anilaṃ proccārayet pūritam
 muñcat prāṇam upaiti bodham atulaṃ śakteḥ prabhāvān naraḥ ||
 proccārayet] proccālayat P,T,t1,n2

Commentary:

The text at end of the second verse quarter is uncertain. Later witnesses, including Brahmānanda, have *dhyāyaṃś ca* but none of the early ones has this reading. We are taking *dhyānaṃ* with *sannidhāya*, but this renders *tat* problematic because it has no clear referent. In the source text, the *Vivekamārtaṇḍa*, *tat* appears to refer to the *mokṣadvāra* broken by *kuṇḍalinī*, which is mentioned in the previous verse.

The two participles *proccālayan* and *muñcan* imply that the two things are happening at the same time, which is surprising but perhaps possible.

Metre: Śārdūlavikrīḍita

1.49

Translation: The yogi in *padmāsana* who fills [himself] up through the openings of the channels and holds the breath is sure to be liberated.

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 85v (attr. dattātreyā)

padmāsanasthito yogī nāḍīdvāreṣu pūrayan |
mārutam dhārayed yas tu sa mukto nātra saṁśayaḥ ||

Haṭharatnāvalī 3.40

padmāsane sthito yogī nāḍīdvāreṣu pūrayet |
pūritam dhṛiyate yas tu sa mukto nātra saṁśayaḥ ||

Dhyānabindūpaniṣat 70

padmāsanasthito yogī nāḍīdvāreṣu pūrayan |
mārutam kumbhayan yas tu sa mukto nātra saṁśayaḥ ||

Commentary: It is not unusual to read *pūrayan* with the locative as seen in this verse (cf. *pūrayen mukhe* in *Amaraughā* 21d).

γ₁'s reading of *niyatam* (instead of *dhārayed*) in the third verse quarter explains the passive verbs in other witnesses. The passive verbs do not make sense with *yas tu*. The passive verbs meaning to take in the breath (e.g., *pīyate*) may have been adopted to remove the reference to holding the breath because a breath retention is not mentioned in the previous verse describing *padmāsana* (only inhalation and exhalation).

In the third verse quarter, α₁ reads *māruto mriyate yas tu*, which does not make sense, but if one accepts *pūrayet* in the second verse quarter, one could emend α's reading to *māruto mriyate yasya*, which makes good sense (i.e., 'the yogi whose breath dies is undoubtedly liberated'). In the same vein, α₂ also has the plausible reading *mārutam mārayet yas tu*.

The *Jyotsnā* (1.49) has *nāḍīdvāreṇa* instead of *nāḍīdvāreṣu*, and Brahmānanda interprets it as the opening of the central channel (*suṣumnāmargeṇa*). This yields the idea of filling up the central channel (as opposed to other channels), which is described in the *Yogabīja* (94–95).

1.50–52

Translation: Now, the lion's pose (*siṃhāsana*).

[The yogi] should put both ankles at the sides of the perineal seam below the scrotum. He should place the left ankle on right, the right ankle on the left and both

hands on the knees, spread his fingers, open his mouth and gaze in deep concentration at the tip of his nose. This is the lion's pose, which is always honoured by yogis. It causes the three locks to arise together and is the best of [all] postures.

Sources:

Vasiṣṭhasaṃhitā 1.73–1.75ab

gulphau ca vṛṣaṇasyādhaḥ sīvanyāḥ pārśvayoḥ kṣipet |
dakṣiṇaṃ savyagulphena dakṣiṇenetaretaram ||
hastau jānau ca saṃsthāpya svāṅgulīś ca prasārya ca |
vyāttavaktro nirīkṣeta nāsāgraṃ susamāhitaḥ ||
siṃhāsanaṃ bhaved etat pūjitaṃ yogibhiḥ sadā |

Yogayājñavalkya 3.9–3.11ab

gulpau ca vṛṣaṇasyādhaḥ sīvanyāḥ pārśvayoḥ kṣipet |
dakṣiṇaṃ savyagulphena dakṣiṇena tathetaram ||
hastau ca jānvoḥ saṃsthāpya svāṅgulīś ca prasārya ca |
vyāttavaktro nirīkṣet nāsāgraṃ susamāhitaḥ ||
siṃhāsanaṃ bhaved etat pūjitaṃ yogibhiḥ sadā |

Sūtasamhitā 15.7–8

gulphau ca vṛṣaṇasyādhaḥ sīvanyāḥ pārśvayoḥ kṣipet |
dakṣiṇaṃ savyagulphena vāmaṃ dakṣiṇagulphataḥ ||
hastau ca jānvoḥ saṃsthāpya svāṅgulīś ca prasārya ca |
nāsāgraṃ ca nirīkṣeta bhavet siṃhāsanaṃ hi tat ||

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 83v (attr. yājñavalkya)

gulphau ca vṛṣaṇasyādhaḥ sīvanyāḥ pārśvayoḥ kṣipet |
dakṣiṇaṃ savyagulphena dakṣiṇena tathetaram ||
hastau jānūpari sthāpya svāṅgulīḥ saṃprasārya ca |
vyāttavaktro nirīkṣeta nāsāgraṃ susamāhitaḥ |
siṃhāsanaṃ bhaved etat pūjitaṃ yogibhiḥ sadā |

Haṭharatnāvalī 3.31–3.33

atha siṃhāsanaṃ
gulphau ca vṛṣaṇasyādhaḥ sīvanyāḥ pārśvayoḥ kṣipet |
dakṣiṇe savyagulphaṃ ca dakṣiṇe tu tathetaram ||
hastau tu jānvoḥ saṃsthāpya svāṅgulīḥ saṃprasārya ca |
vyāttavaktro nirīkṣeta nāsāgraṃ tu samāhitaḥ ||
siṃhāsanaṃ bhaved etat sevitaṃ yogibhiḥ sadā |
bandhatritayasamsthānaṃ kurute cāsanottamam ||

Commentary:

Spreading the fingers and keeping the mouth wide open mimic a lion, and this is depicted in some iconography of Yoganarasimha (for example, Yoga Narasimha, Vishnu's Man-Lion Incarnation, Samuel Eilenberg Collection, Bequest of Samuel Eilenberg, 1998, Accession Number: 2000.284.4. <https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/39251>).

As far as we are aware, there is no source for the hemistich (1.52cd) mentioning the three locks, so it may have been composed by Svātmārāma or borrowed from a lost work.

Metre: Anuṣṭubh (a: ma-vipulā)

1.53–54

Translation: Now, the friendly pose (*bhadrāsana*).

[The yogi] should put both ankles at the sides of the perineal seam below the scrotum. By firmly and very steadily holding the sides of the feet with the hands, the friendly pose arises, which cures all diseases and poisons. Yogis of the Siddha tradition call it Gorakṣa's pose (*gorakṣāsana*).

Sources:

Vasiṣṭhasaṃhitā 1.79

gulphau ca vṛṣaṇasyādhaḥ sīvanyāḥ pārśvayoḥ kṣipan |
pārśvapādaḥ ca pāṇibhyāṃ dṛḍhaṃ baddhvā suniścalam |
bhadrāsanaṃ bhaved etat sarvavyādhiviṣāpaham ||

Yogayājñavalkya 3.11cd–3.12ab

gulphau ca vṛṣaṇasyādhaḥ sīvanyāḥ pārśvayoḥ kṣipet
pārśvapādaḥ ca pāṇibhyāṃ dṛḍhaṃ baddhvā suniścalam
bhadrāsanaṃ bhaved etat sarvavyādhiviṣāpaham

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 83v (citing yājñavalkya)

gulphau ca vṛṣaṇasyādhaḥ sīvanyāḥ pārśvayoḥ kṣipet |
pārśvapādaḥ ca pāṇibhyāṃ dṛḍhaṃ baddhvā suniścalam |
bhadrāsanaṃ bhaved etat sarvavyādhiviṣāpaham |

Haṭharatnāvalī 3.30

atha bhadrāsanaṃ
gulphau ca vṛṣaṇasyādhaḥ sīvanyāḥ pārśvayoḥ kṣipet |
pārśvapādaḥ ca pāṇibhyāṃ dṛḍhaṃ baddhvā suniścalam ||
bhadrāsanaṃ bhaved etat sarvavyādhiviṣāpaham ||

Commentary: We have understood *pārśvapāda* as a *ekadeśitatpuruṣa* meaning

the side of the foot, like *agrapāda*, the toes.

Manuscripts of two early groups, β and γ , as well as the *Jyotsnā* (1.53), include an additional hemistich specifying that the left ankle is placed on the left side and the right ankle on the right (*savyagulphaṃ tathā savye dakṣagulphaṃ tu dakṣiṇe*). This hemistich appears to have been added to make it clear that the ankles are not crossed in *bhadrāsana*, unlike the previous pose, *śimhāsana*.

1.55

Translation: When the great yogi does not tire from adopting the *āsanas* in this way, he should practise the breath techniques with seals and so forth, from which purification of the channels arises.

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 85v (attr. dattātreyā)

evam āsanabandheṣu yogīndro vijitāśramah |
abhyāsen nāḍīśuddhiṃ ca mudrayā pavanakriyām || iti ||

Haṭhasaṅketacandrikā f. 23r

evam āsanabandhastho yogīndro vigatāśramah |
athābhyāsen nāḍīśuddhiṃ mudrādīpavanakriyām ||
nāḍīśuddhiṃ] *em.*, nāhiśuddhi ms. no. 2244

Commentary: The second hemistich can be interpreted in different ways. One possibility is to understand *nāḍīśuddhiṃ* as a *bahuvrīhi* qualifying *mudrādīpavanakriyām* in the sense that the yogi should practise the breathing techniques by way of the relevant *mudrās* and locks (taught in the third chapter), from which purification of the channels arise. Alternatively, one could separate *mudrādi* from *pavanakriyām* and understand three different techniques here, namely, the practice of purifying the channels (perhaps by the alternative nostril method mentioned at the beginning of the second chapter), the *mudrās* and the breathing techniques of *prāṇāyāma*. The absence of a conjunctive particle, such as *ca*, makes the second interpretation less likely. The version of this verse in the *Yogacintāmaṇi* (cited in the testimonia) was changed to make it clear that *nāḍīśuddhi* and *pavanakriyā* with *mudrās*, are two distinct things.

Metre: Anuṣṭubh (c: ra-vipulā)

1.55*1–2

Translation: Success arises for one engaged in practice. How can it arise for one who has no practice? Success in yoga does not arise by merely reading scriptures.

Translation: Wearing a robe does not bring about success, nor does talking [about yoga]. Practice alone is the cause of success. This is true, there is no doubt. In this system, [the practice] should not be given to one who wears robes and is devoted to sex and food.

Sources:

Dattātreyayogaśāstra 42cd–43ab, 46–47

kriyāyuktasya siddhiḥ syād akriyasya katham bhavet ||42 ||
na śāstrapāṭhamātreṇa kā cit siddhiḥ prajāyate |
na veśadhāraṇam siddheḥ kāraṇam na ca tat kathā |
kriyaiva kāraṇam siddheḥ satyam eva tu sāmṣṛte || 46 ||
śiśnodarārtham yogasya kathayā veśadhāriṇaḥ |
anuṣṭhānavihīnās tu vañcayanti janān kila || 47 ||

42c °yuktasya] °yuktaḥ sa PT • siddhiḥ] siddhi M1M2, siddhaḥ P
43a na śāstra°] śāstrasya PT • °mātreṇa] °rūpeṇa M1A
46a na] sa° BB- BP • °dhāraṇam] °dhāriṇām AM2, °dhāriṇam JYSS • siddheḥ] sidhya
M1, siddhiḥ A, siddhi° β, kiṃ cit Y
46b om. M AM (eye-skip) • kāraṇam na] kāraṇa°nn°a T SS 12 • na] tañ β • kathā]
W1VHPYCMK; katham PTβ, tathā JW2DYŠPT
46c kriyaiva] PTβW1VYCMPTKYSS; om. M1AM2, kṛpaiva JDYŠ, kṛyaiva W2 • siddheḥ
] siddhiḥ JYSS
46d satyam] satvam YSS • eva] PTW1W2VDYŠK; etad M1AM2YCM, ekaṃ J, etan HP,
etat PTYSS, etac β • tu sāmṣṛte] dhi sāmṣṛte M1AM2YCM, na saṃśayaḥ HP, ca sāmṣṛte
β
47a śiśno°] śiśno° JW2 47a °artham yogasya] °ās ca yogāś ca P, ☐ yogasya T, °artham
yogaś ca AM2, °arthayogaś ca β
47b kathayā veśadhāriṇaḥ] W1W2DYŠYCMK; katheyam veśadhāriṇaḥ PTYSS, kasyeyam
veśadhāriṇaḥ M1, katheyam veśadhāriṇām AM2, kaṃd- hāyām yogadhāraṇaḥ BBBP,
kathayan yogadhāraṇaḥ BA, katham yā veśadhāriṇi J1, katham vā veśadhāriṇi J2, katham
ye veśadhāriṇaḥ V, katham vā veśadhāriṇaḥ PT
47c anuṣṭhāna°] anuṣṭhānā° M1, annapāna° PT • °vihīnās tu] svayam nityam M1, °vi-
hīnās ca AM2
47d janān] janāḥ M1βV, janāt J, janā W1 • kila] sadā M1AM2, iha YSS • vañcayanti
janān kila] vañcayaty akhilān janān YCM

Commentary: 1.55*1–2 are omitted from the α, γ, δ and ε groups, so it is likely these verses were not in the earliest versions of the *Haṭhapradīpikā*. In fact, it appears that both were added (perhaps initially as marginal notes) to elaborate on the word *kriyā* in 1.55d. Both verses are similar to verses from the *Dattātreyayogaśāstra* (cited as the source). However, only the first half of *Dattātreyayogaśāstra*

yogaśāstra 47 is given in these later versions of the *Haṭhapradīpikā*, resulting in a near-nonsensical hemistich. Also, the syntax of 1.55.2ef is corrupt. One has to emend to *deyā* to make sense of it. These verses (except 1.55.2ef) appear in the *Jyotsnā* (1.65–66), but towards the end of chapter one.

1.55*3

Translation: Did this empty bubble we call the universe dissolve or arise in me, the pure ocean of awakening? Where does [this] veil of doubt come from?

Sources:

Tattvaratnāvalī 24

bodhāmbhodhau mayi svacchaṃ tac chāyam viśvabuddhayaḥ |
udito vā pralīno vā na vikalpāya kalpate ||

Testimonia:

Vārāhītantra p. 158

mayi bodhībudho svasthe tucho yaṃ viśvabudbudāḥ |
malīna udito vetti vikalpāvasaraḥ kutaḥ ||

Haṭhapradīpikā (10 chapters) 3.7

śīśnodararatāya hi na deyaṃ veśadhāriṇe ||
mayi bodhyaṃ buddhau svacche tad dheyāṃ viśvabudbudam ||

Yogaparakāśikā 3.7

“śīśnodararatāyaitan na deya” etat yogajñānam etena śīśnodararatas
tyājyo nanv etanmate tyājyapadārtho ‘prasiddha iti śaṃkāṃ nirasya-
ati mayi iti svacche bodhasvarūpasamudre budbudatulyasya viśvasya
heyatvād iti bhāvaḥ

Commentary: Verse 1.55.3 is only found in manuscripts of the δ group. It is very difficult to find a reason why this verse should be inserted here. It is apparently a *muktaka* that would befit an accomplished spiritual poem more than an instructional manual, like the *Haṭhapradīpikā*, even here, in what appears as a sort of miscellaneous section at the end of a chapter. In this verse, the lyrical subject wonders about why the mind is still able to doubt, despite its insight into the nature of reality. The reader might wonder how this illusionist verse could be understood to fit our Yoga text. We can only speculate that perhaps the scribe of the hyparchetype of the δ manuscripts was fond of it.

The source is, as far as we can say, the *Śāntiśataka* of the Kashmirian poet Sillana or Silhaṇa. The manuscripts of the *Svātmopalabdhiśataka* give the name as *Sillana*, the mostly Bengali manuscripts of the *Śāntiśataka* read *Silhaṇa*, as does Aufrecht

in his *Catalogus Catalogorum*, 1891 (for further details see Hanneder, forthcoming). Sillana cannot be dated with any certainty but predates the *Haṭhapradīpikā* by a few centuries. The edition of the *Śāntiśataka* – where a hundred original verses had to be identified – places the verse in question into an appendix of doubtful stanzas (see Karl Schönfeld: *Das Śāntiśataka*. Leipzig: Harrassowitz 1910, p. 90 [A9]). However, the editor did not provide a compelling reason to regard it as unoriginal except only the fact that it is not transmitted in all manuscripts. What prevents further investigation of the matter is the lack of Kashmirian manuscripts for the *Śāntiśataka* and its compilatory character: one quarter of the material is identical with Bhartṛhari's *Vairāgyaśataka*. A still superficial glance at Sillana's *Svātmopalabdhiśataka* gives the impression that our verse would fit there, but not so much in the *Śāntiśataka*. Perhaps its first citation is in Advayaavajra's *Tattvaratnāvalī* (24). While these are only preliminary observations the verse is likely not original to the *Haṭhapradīpikā*.

1.55*4

Translation: Realisation from scripture, realisation from one's own guru, realisation from oneself and the cessation of mind; all these methods have been combined and taught by the wise in this tradition.

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 48v

haṭhapradīpikāyām–
śrutipratītiḥ ca gurupratītiḥ svātmapatītiḥ ca manonirodhaḥ |
etāni sarvāṇi samuccitāni matāni dhīrair iha sādhanāni ||

Commentary: Verse 1.55.4 is in some of the *ḍ* manuscripts and is quoted in *Yogacintāmaṇi* with attribution to the *Haṭhapradīpikā*.

The reading in the *Yogacintāmaṇi* 'cessation of mind' (*manonirodhaḥ*) is better than *manaso 'pi bodhaḥ* (the *ḍ* reading) in a yogic context.

Metre: Upajāti

1.56

Translation: Posture, manifold breath retention, the bodily technique called seal, then concentration on the internal sound is the sequence of practice in Haṭha.

Sources:

Testimonia:*Yogacintāmaṇi* f. 111v

haṭhapradīpikāyām–
 āsanam kumbhakam citram mudrākhyam karaṇam tathā |
 atha nādānusandhānam abhyāsānukrameṇa ca ||

Commentary: This verse was omitted from η_1 , the oldest dated manuscript. The omission is probably deliberate as that manuscript does not have chapter four, which teaches *nādānusandhāna*. The numbering in η_1 suggests that its exemplar had this verse.

The term *kumbhaka* is almost always masculine but appears in this verse as a neuter in the majority of manuscripts of the important groups.

This verse is similar to 1.65, which has *mudrādīkaraṇāni ca*, so perhaps it was through confusion with 1.65 that the same reading is found in some witnesses of 1.56. It seems that the four auxiliaries (*aṅga*) of Haṭhayoga are being referred to in the singular (hence *āsanam*), whereas in 1.65 the plural is used (i.e., *pīṭhāni*). Therefore, the reading *citram* [...] *karaṇam tathā* is likely original for this verse.

1.57

Translation: Celibate, restricted in diet and devoted to yoga, the yogi becomes an adept after a year. No doubt about this should be entertained.

Sources:*Vivekamārtaṇḍa* 37

brahmacārī mitāhārī yogī yogaparāyaṇaḥ |
 abdād ūrdhvaṃ bhavet siddho nātra kāryā vicāraṇā ||

Testimonia:*Yogacintāmaṇi* f. 111v (attr. *Haṭhapradīpikā*)

brahmacārī mitāhārī tyāgī yogaparāyaṇaḥ |
 abdād ūrdhvaṃ bhavet siddho nātra kāryā vicāraṇā ||

Haṭharatnāvalī 3.28

brahmacārī mitāhārī tyāgī yogaparāyaṇaḥ |
 abdād ūrdhvaṃ bhavet siddho nātra kāryā vicāraṇā ||
 tyāgī] yogī P,T,t1

Commentary: The readings *tyāgī* and *yogī* are both well attested in *Haṭhapradīpikā* 1.57b. The confusion between the two appears to have started early in the transmission of the *Vivekamārtaṇḍa*. The occurrence of *tyāgī* in *Vivekamārtaṇḍa* 37 may be a dittographical type of mistake because the word *tyāgī* is in the previ-

ous hemistich of that work. But it is more difficult to determine whether Svātmārāma used a manuscript of the *Vivekamārtaṇḍa* with *tyāgī* or *yogī* in verse 37. Since the best α manuscript has *yogī*, as well as η_1 and many others, we have tentatively adopted it bearing in mind that it was changed early in the transmission of the *Haṭhapradīpikā*, most likely by a scribe who knew the reading of *tyāgī* in a manuscript of the *Vivekamārtaṇḍa*.

1.58

Translation: When very unctuous and sweet food is eaten for love of Śiva, leaving a quarter [of the stomach] empty (*caturthāṃśavivarjitaḥ*), it is called a restricted diet (*mitāhāra*).

Sources:

Gorakṣaśataka 12cd–13ab

susnigdhmadhurāhārāś caturthāṃśavivarjitaḥ ||
bhujyate śivasamprītyai mitāhāraḥ sa ucyate |

Testimonia:

Yuktabhavadēva 4.16

tad uktaṃ haṭhapradīpikāyām–
susnigdhmadhurāhārāś caturthāṃśavivarjitaḥ |
bhujyate śivasamprītyai mitāhāraḥ sa ucyate ||

Yogacūḍāmaṇyupaniṣat 43

susnigdhmadhurāhārāś caturthāṃśavivarjitaḥ |
bhuñjate śivasamprītyā mitāhārī sa ucyate ||

Commentary: This verse probably derives from the ‘original’ *Gorakṣaśataka* (12c–13b). It is also found, but reworked to be about the *mitāhārī*, in Nowotny’s *Gorakṣaśataka* (55), which is an extended recension of the *Vivekamārtaṇḍa*.

The expression ‘lacking a fourth part’ *caturthāṃśavivarjitaḥ* is somewhat vague but probably refers to the idea of leaving a quarter of one’s stomach empty, which is stated more clearly in the *Dharmaputrikā* 1.51–52:

ṣaḍrasopetasuṣnigdhasvādusāndrasugandhinā |
udarasyardhabhāgan tu bhojanena prapūrayet ||
pāniyena caturbhāgaṃ taccheṣaṃ śūnyam iṣyate |
vāyos sañcāraṇānārtham āhāranīyamaḥ smṛtaḥ ||

And, as noted by Brahmānanda in *Jyotsnā* 1.58, this idea also occurs in an āyurvedic work called the *Aṣṭāṅgahr̥dayasaṃhitā*, *Sūtrasthāna*, 8.46cd–47ab:

annena kukṣer dvāv aṃśau pānenaikaṃ prapūrayet |

āśrayaṃ pavanādīnāṃ caturtham avaśeṣayet ||

1.59

Translation: Pungent, sour, bitter, salty and hot foods, horseradish, sour gruel, [sesame] oil, sesame and mustard seeds, fish and intoxicating drink, flesh of goats and so forth, curds, diluted buttermilk, poor man's pulse, jujube fruit, the leftover paste of oily seeds, asafoetida, garlic and the like: they say that such [food] is unwholesome.

Sources:

cf. DYŚ 70ab lavaṇaṃ sarṣapaś cāmlam uṣṇaṃ rūkṣaṃ ca tīkṣṇakam|

+

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 54v

haṭhapradīpikāyām –
kaṭvamlatīkṣṇalavaṇoṣṇa haritaśāka-
sauvīratailatilasarṣapamatsyamadyam |
ajādimāṃsadadhitakrakulattakola-
piṇyākahiṅgulaśunādyam apathyam āhuḥ ||

Haṭharatnāvalī 1.72

kaṭvamlatīkṣṇalavaṇoṣṇa haritaśākaṃ
sauvīratailatilasarṣapamatsyamadyam |
ajādimāṃsadadhitakrakulattakodra-
piṇyākahiṅgulaśunādyam apathyam āhuḥ ||

Haṭhatattvakaumudī

atha varjyāni –
kaṭvamlatīkṣṇalavaṇoṣṇa haritaśāka-
sauvīratailatilasarṣapamatsyamadyam ||
ajāvimāṃsadadhitakrakulattakola-
piṇyākahiṅgulaśunādyam apathyam āhuḥ || 28 ||

Commentary:

On the meaning of *uṣṇa* (1.59a) in relation to food, Meulenbeld writes (1974: 254 fn. 13):

Cakra mentions as a variant: *katvamlalavaṇakṣāra* (pungent, acid, saline and caustic). Cakra remarks that the term 'hot' (*uṣṇa*) denotes hot on touch when it occurs the first time, and hot with regard to potency when it occurs for the second time.

The compound °*haritaśāka*° in 1.59a is spelt °*haritaśāka*° in other works. The spelling °*harita* was probably adopted for metrical reasons. In some Nighaṇṭus, °*haritaśāka*° is glossed as horseradish (*śigru*).

Rājanighaṇṭu 7.26

śigruṛ haritaśākaś ca śākapattrāḥ supattrakāḥ |

Sauśrutaniḡhaṇṭu 75ab

śigruko haritaśākaś ca mato vai mūlapatrakāḥ |

Brahmānanda's understanding of *haritaśāka* as *pattraśāka* is probably wrong if *pattraśāka* was intended as 'leafy vegetables.' But he may have used the term *pattraśāka* in the sense of horseradish (*śigru*) as the dictionary notes that *pattraśāka* is probably equivalent to *śākapattrā*, which is mentioned in *Rājanighaṇṭu* 7.26 (above).

The term °*sauvīra*° (1.59b) probably means sour gruel. Brahmānanda glosses *sauvīra* as *kāñjika*, which is 'fermented rice water.' On *sauvīra*, Meulenbeld (1974: 516–517) says, *sauvīra* is sour gruel made from barley and wheat.' The process of making it is described in the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* (1.44.35–40ab) as follows:

Roots of trivṛt etc., the first group (vidārigandhādi), mahat pañcamūla, mūrvā and śārṅgaṣṭā, and also of snuhī, haimavatī, triphalā, ativiṣā and vacā – these are taken and divided into two parts out of which one is decocted and the other is powdered; now, crushed barley grains are impregnated with the above decoction several times, dried and then slightly fried. Taking three parts of this and one part of the above powder are put in a jar and mixed with their (of trivṛt, etc.) cold decoction and fermented properly. This is known as *sauvīraka*. (trans. Sharma 2018 (vol.1): 406)

However, according to some Nighaṇṭus, *sauvīra* can also mean stibnite (an ingredient in some aṇjana's and medicines). For example, in the *Rājanighaṇṭu* (13.86):

añjanaṃ yāmunaṃ kṛṣṇaṃ nādeyaṃ mecakaṃ tathā
srotojaṃ dṛkpradaṃ nīlaṃ sauvirāṃ ca suvirājaṃ ||

Note also that the *Yogaprakāśikā* (1.53) takes *sauvīra* with *taila*, perhaps to solve the problem of *taila* on its own (see below for more on this). The compound *sauvirataila* is explained as 'oil produced in the place Suvīra' (*suvīradeśodbhavatailam*). According to Ali (1966: 144), Suvīra is known as a country that was

also called Suvira (V.79), Sauvira (XVI.21) and Sauviraka (IV.23). He identifies it with the Rohri/Khairpur region of Sind.

The word *taila* could refer to *tilataila*. This is supported by the following rule (*paribhāṣā*) in the *Śārngadharaśaṃhitā* (48): *anuktāvasthāyām paribhāṣāvidhiḥ* [...] *taila 'nukte tilodbhavam*. We thank Dominik Wujastyk for this reference.

Our translation of *madya* takes into account the following remarks of James McHugh (2021: 8):

The most general Sanskrit term to denote drinks that create a drunken state is *madya* “intoxicating [drink].” Translating this word is hard. “Inebriating drink” is clumsy to my ear. “Intoxicating” contains the unfortunate “toxic” element that is not present in the Sanskrit word, though at least in English this is a common word, applicable to various substances and states and lacking any “toxic” associations in everyday usage.

In the compound *ājādimāmsa°* (1.59c), the adjective *āja°* is required for the metre, so variants beginning with *aja°* can be dismissed. Another well-attested reading is *ājāvimāmsa°*. Although this was probably read as ‘goat and sheep flesh,’ *āvi* is not attested as an adjective of sheep, so this reading was probably not original. Moreover, only *ājādimāmsa°* makes good sense. Diwakar Acharya believes that the prohibition of goat flesh and fish in this verse suggests it derives from the North East of India.

The term *kulattha* means a kind of pulse, translated by Dominik Wujastyk (1998: 77) as ‘poor man’s pulse.’

The word *kola* is a name for *Zizyphus Jujuba* (Nadkarni 1926: pp. 919–920). It is also known as *badara*. This is how Brahmananda understands it in *Jyotsnā* 1.59 (*kolaṃ kolyāḥ phalaṃ badaram*). According to Nadkarni, the fruit of the wild variety is very acid and astringent. It is believed to purify the blood and assist digestion. The bark is astringent and a simple remedy for diarrhoea. The root is useful as a decoction in fever and delirium. There are references to *kola* being pungent, though this does not seem to indicate sufficiently why *kola* is mentioned separately in the *Haṭhapradīpikā* as an unwholesome food. Diwakar Acharya has informed us that *kola* can refer to a type of banana in some parts of India.

According to Sharma (1982: 69), *piṇyāka* is, ‘The remnant paste of oily seeds after pressing out the oil content is called *piṇyāka*.’ Diwakar says it is an oil cake that has a strong flavour, which may account for its inclusion in this list of unwholesome foods.

The term *hingu* means Asafoetida (Nadkarni 1926: 360–361). As to why it might be considered unwholesome, the following comments by Nadkarni give some indication:

If long continued, even in moderate doses, it gives rise to alliaceous eructations, acrid irritation in the throat, flatulence, diarrhoea and burning in the urine.

Metre: Vasantatilakā

1.60

Translation: One should know food to be unfit if it has been reheated, is dry, too salty or sour, contains an excess of leafy vegetables that are hard to chew, [or] is spoiled.

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 55v (attr. *Haṭhapradīpikā*)

bhojanam ahitaṃ vidyāt punar uṣṇīkṛtaṃ tathā |
atilavaṇaṃ sapalaṃ vā prasitaṃ śākotkaṭaṃ varjyam ||

Haṭhasaṅketacandrikā

bhojanam ahitaṃ vidyāt punar uṣṇīkṛtaṃ rūkṣaṃ |
atilavaṇādikayuktaṃ kadaśanaśākotkaṭaṃ duṣṭaṃ ||

Commentary: We have not found any conclusive evidence for the meaning of *tilapiṇḍa*. Brahmānanda glosses it as *piṇyāka* (on the meaning of which see the notes for the previous verse).

The meaning of the compound *kadaśanaśākotkaṭaṃ* is not clear. Brahmānanda understands it as a list (*dvandva*) consisting of *kadaśana*, *śāka* and *utkaṭa*, which he defines as bad food, prohibited vegetables and pepper, respectively.

There are various possible meanings of *utkaṭa*. According to some Nighaṇṭus, the word *utkaṭā* can mean pepper (e.g., *Rājanighaṇṭu* 5.16 *pārvatī śailajā tāmṛā lambabījā tathotkaṭā*) and, according to Monier Williams, *utkaṭa* can refer to *Saccharum Sara* and *utkaṭā* also to *Laurus Cassia* (cinnamon).

However, *utkaṭa* can be an adjective that means ‘abounding in’ at the end of a compound. Since this verse consists of many adjectives describing food that is unwholesome, it is likely that *kadaśanaśākotkaṭaṃ* was intended as an adjectival *tatpuruṣa*, in which case it means ‘[food] full of vegetables’ *śākotkaṭa* that are ‘bad food’ or, perhaps, ‘bad eating’ (*kadaśana*) in the sense of hard to chew.

Metre: Upagiti

1.61

Translation: In the same vein there is a saying by Goraksa: One should avoid places near bad people, frequenting fire, women and roads, and observances which harm the body such as early morning bathing and fasting.

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 48v

haṭhadīpikāyām—
varjayed durjanaprītiṃ vahnistrīpathasevanam |
prātaḥsnānopavāsādi kāyakleśādikaṃ tathā ||

Haṭharatnāvalī 1.73

tathā ca gorakṣavacanam—
varjayed durjanaprītivahnistrīpathasevanam |
prātaḥsnānopavāsādi kāyakleśādikaṃ tathā ||
°prīti°] °prāntaṃ P, prāptaṃ T,t1. kāyakleśādikaṃ] kāyakleśavidhiṃ P,T.

Yuktabhavadeva 4.18 (attr. *Haṭhapradīpikā*)

varjayed durjanaprītiṃ vahnistrīpathasevanam |
prātaḥsnānopavāsādikāyakleśavidhiṃ tyajet ||

Commentary: Manuscripts from the α, β and ε groups have the reading *durjanaprāntaṃ* (1.61a), which is the lectio difficilior in relation to *durjanaprītiṃ* ('the friendship of wicked people'). We have understood *durjanaprānta* in line with Brahmānanda's gloss in *Īyotsnā* 1.64, 'dwelling near bad people' (*durjanasamīpavāsa*).

1.62

Translation: The pure grains that are wheat, rice, śālī rice, barley, sixty-day śālī rice; milk, ghee, cream, fresh butter, ground sugar and honey; dried ginger, fruit of the snake gourd and so forth; the five vegetables; mung beans and so on; and rain water. [These] are wholesome for the best of ascetics.

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 54v (attr. *Haṭhapradīpikā*)

godhūmaśāliyaśāṣṭikaśobhanānnaṃ
kṣīrājyamaṇḍanavanītasitāmadhūni |
śuṇṭhīpaṭolakaphalādikapañcaśākam
mudgādi cālpam udakaṃ ca munīndrapathyam ||

Haṭharatnāvalī 1.71

godhūmaśāliyaṣaṣṭikaśobhanānnaṃ
 kṣīrājyamaṇḍanavanītasitāmadhūni |
 śuṇṭhīpaṭolaphalapatrajapañcaśākaṃ
 mudgādidivyaṃ udakaṃ ca yamīndrapathyam ||
 °phalapatraja°] phalādika N,n1,J. yamīndra°] yatindra° N,n1,J

Yuktabhavadēva 4.21

tathā ca śivayoge-
 godhūmaśāliyaṣaṣṭikaśobhanānnaṃ
 kṣīrājyakhaṇḍanavanītasitāmadhūni ||
 śuṇṭhīpaṭolakaphalādi ca pañcaśāka-
 mudgādidivyaṃ udakaṃ ca munīndrapathyam ||

Commentary: In 1.62b, *maṇḍa*, which is supported by α, β and γ, is more likely than *khaṇḍa* ('candied sugar') because it fits the context of diary products mentioned in this compound (i.e., *kṣīra*, *ājya* and *navanīta*). The term *navanīta* is discussed in *Suśrutasaṃhitā, sūtrasthāna*, 45.92 as follows:

Fresh butter (*navanīta*) is light soft, sweet, astringent, slightly sour, cold, intellect-promoting, appetiser, cordial, checking, aphrodisiac, non-burning, pacifies pitta and vāta and alleviates wasting, cough, wound, consumption, piles and facial paralysis [...] (trans. Sharma 2018 vol. 1: 434).

The word *sitā* is one of many words for ground sugar. Meulenbeld (1974: 507) comments that *sitā* is 'very white and looks like gravel.'

The term *paṭola* can refer to at least two different gourds. Meulenbeld (1974: 569) compiled a list of six possibilities, including *TRICHOSANTHES DIOICA* ROXB. ('pointed gourd'), *TRICHOSANTHES CUCUMERINA* LINN ('snake gourd').

Nadkarni (1954: 863, 518) has two entries on *paṭola*:

1. Snake gourd is common in Bengal and cultivated in Northern India and Punjab. The unripe fruit of this climbing plant is generally used as a culinary vegetable and is very wholesome, specially suited for the convalescent.
2. Smooth luffa is a hairy climbing herb extensively cultivated in several parts of India. The fruit is edible. Medicinally it is described as 'cool, costive, demulcent, productive of loss of appetite and excitive of wind, bile and phlegm.'

Sharma (1982: 156) adds that *paṭola* is a synonym of *kulaka* and is well known as *TRICHOSANTHES DIOICA* ROXB. Brahmānanda glosses *paṭola* as *kośātakī*, which is

LUFFA ACUTANGULA ROXB (Meulenbeld 1974: 586), suggesting that he thought it was some sort of luffa. He also mentions the vernacular term *paravara* for *paṭola*. Groups of five vegetables (*pañcaśāka* or *śākapañcaka*) have been defined in various yoga texts, but such grouping of vegetables does not seem to occur outside of literature on yoga. The earliest reference to a group of five vegetables known to us is the sixteenth-century *Yuktabhavadēva* 4.22, which attributes the verse to the *Śivayoga*. The same verse is also quoted in *Jyotsnā* 1.65 with attribution to a medical source (*vaidyaka*):

sarvaśākaṃ acāksuṣyaṃ cāksuṣyaṃ śākapañcakaṃ |
jīvantī vāstumatsyākṣī meghanādaḥ punarnavāḥ || iti ||

Another verse on a similar fivefold group of vegetables is also cited in the *Haṭhatattvakau-mudī* (4.26)

pañcaśākas tu-
kṣīraparṇī ca jīvantī matsyākṣī ca punarnavā
meghanādaś ceti budhaiḥ pañcaśākaḥ prakirtitaḥ || iti ||

And a group with more significant differences is mentioned in the *Gheraṇḍasaṃhitā* (5.20).

bālaśākaṃ kālaśākaṃ tathā paṭolapatrakam |
pañcaśākaṃ praśaṃsiyād vāstūkaṃ hīlamocikāṃ ||

It is not entirely clear how one should understand *divya* (1.62d). Brahmananda glosses it with *nirdoṣa* ('defectless') and takes it with *udaka*. Ayurvedic sources indicate more clearly that *divyodaka* was understood as rainwater. In a section on types of water (*jalavarga*) in the *Sūtrasthāna* of the *Carakasamhitā* (27.196–224), rainwater is referred to as '*divyaṃ udakam*' (1.27.198) in a discussion of the properties of water that has fallen from the sky. The compound *divyodaka* is used in other Āyurvedic works to refer to the use of rainwater in recipes and treatments (e.g., *Aṣṭāṅgahrdaya* 8.42–43). Also, the *Rājanighaṇṭu* (14.4) glosses *divyodaka* as rainwater:

divyodakaṃ kharāri syād ākāśasalilam tathā |
vyomodakaṃ cāntarikṣajalam ceṣvabhidhāhvayam ||

Metre: Vasantatilakā

1.63

Translation: The yogi should eat food that is sweet, delicious, unctuous, contains cow products, nourishes the bodily constituents (*dhātu*), is desired by the mind and is appropriate.

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi f. 54v (attr. *Haṭhapradīpikā*)

piṣṭaṃ sumadhuraṃ snigdhaṃ gavyaṃ dhātuprapoṣaṇam |
mano'bhilaṣitaṃ yogaṃ yogī bhojanam ācāret || iti ||

Haṭharatnāvalī 1.75

śreṣṭhaṃ samadhuraṃ snigdhaṃ gavyaṃ dhātuprapoṣaṇam |
manobhilaṣitaṃ yogaṃ caturthāṃśavivarjitaṃ |
śivārpitaṃ ca naivedyaṃ yogī bhojanam ācāret ||

Yuktabhavadeva 4.23 (attr. *Śivayoga*)

śreṣṭhaṃ sumadhuraṃ snigdhaṃ gavyaṃ dhātuprapoṣaṇam |
mano'bhilaṣitaṃ yogaṃ yogī bhojanam ācāret ||

Commentary: The variants of 1.63a all seem possible: *mṛṣṭaṃ*, *miṣṭaṃ* and *iṣṭaṃ*. The last is made somewhat redundant by *mano'bhilaṣitaṃ* in 163c. Both *mṛṣṭaṃ* (α and ρ) and *miṣṭaṃ* (β and γ) are well attested by manuscripts of important groups and there is hardly any difference in their meaning in this context. We have adopted *mṛṣṭaṃ* as it is supported by the α group.

1.64

Translation: Whether young, old, very old, sick or even weak, the diligent yogi succeeds in all yogas through practice.

Sources:

Dattātreyayogaśāstra 40

yuvāvastho 'pi vṛddho vā vyādhito vā śanaiḥ śanaiḥ |
abhyāsāt siddhim āpnoti yoge sarvo 'py atandritaḥ || 40 ||

Testimonia:

Yogacintāmaṇi 15r

haṭhapradīpikāyām—
yuvā bālo 'tivṛddho vā vyādhito durbalo 'pi vā |
abhyāsāt siddhim āpnoti sarvayogeṣv atandritaḥ ||

Haṭharatnāvalī 1.23

yuvā bhavati vṛddho 'pi vyādhito durbalo 'pi vā |
 abhyāsāt siddhim āpnoti sarvayogeṣv atandritaḥ ||

Commentary: η_1 , the oldest dated manuscript, has a different reading for the last verse quarter (164d): *sarvaṃ yogī yatendriyaḥ* ('the yogi whose senses are restrained wholly succeeds [...]'). Here, *sarvaṃ* is not easy to construe, and the readings of the α manuscripts and other important groups of *Haṭhapradīpikā* manuscripts indicate that *sarvayogeṣv atandritaḥ* was the reading adopted by Svātmārāma, which is more similar to the *Dattātreyayogaśāstra*'s (i.e., *yoge sarvo 'py atandritaḥ*).

1.65

Translation: The postures, various breath retentions, and heavenly techniques: the whole practice of Haṭha [is to be done] until Rājayoga results.

Sources:

Testimonia:

Haṭharatnāvalī 1.17

pīṭhāni kumbhakāś citrā divyāni karaṇāni ca |
 sāṅgo 'pi ca haṭhābhyāso rājayogaphalārthadaḥ ||