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Abstract The Amaraughaprabodha is a Sanskrit Śaiva yoga text attributed by its colophons to Gorakṣanātha. It was published by Kalyani Devi Mallik in 1954 and has been discussed in various secondary sources. Most notably, Christian Bouy (1994, pp. 18-19) identified this work as a source text for the Haṭṭhapradīpikā of Svātmārāma (mid-fifteenth century). This article presents new manuscript evidence for a shorter recension of the Amaraughaprabodha than the one published by Mallik. Comparing the differences between the short and long recensions reveals that the structure of the shorter one is more cohesive and closer to the original design of the work. The close relationship of the Amaraughaprabodha’s short recension with an eleventh-century Vajrayāna work on yoga called the Amṛtasiddhi provides unique insights into how early teachings on Haṭṭhayoga were formulated. Although the practice of the physical techniques is largely the same in both texts, the author of the Amaraughaprabodha removed or obscured Vajrayāna terminology, added Śaiva metaphysics and framed Haṭṭhayoga as subordinate to a Śaiva yoga known as Rājayoga. This article proposes that the Amaraughaprabodha’s short recension is probably the earliest known work to combine Haṭṭha- with Rājayoga, on the basis of this recension’s close relationship with the Amṛtasiddhi, its rudimentary nature and the likelihood that Svātmārāma used it, and not the long recension, for composing the Haṭṭhapradīpikā.

Keywords Yoga · South Asia · Indology · Manuscripts · Hatha · Raja · Vajrayana · Hinduism · Buddhism

Jason Birch

Published online: 2 July 2019
© The Author(s) 2019

Abstract The Amaraughaprabodha is a Sanskrit Śaiva yoga text attributed by its colophons to Gorakṣanātha. It was published by Kalyani Devi Mallik in 1954 and has been discussed in various secondary sources. Most notably, Christian Bouy (1994, pp. 18-19) identified this work as a source text for the Haṭṭhapradīpikā of Svātmārāma (mid-fifteenth century). This article presents new manuscript evidence for a shorter recension of the Amaraughaprabodha than the one published by Mallik. Comparing the differences between the short and long recensions reveals that the structure of the shorter one is more cohesive and closer to the original design of the work. The close relationship of the Amaraughaprabodha’s short recension with an eleventh-century Vajrayāna work on yoga called the Amṛtasiddhi provides unique insights into how early teachings on Haṭṭhayoga were formulated. Although the practice of the physical techniques is largely the same in both texts, the author of the Amaraughaprabodha removed or obscured Vajrayāna terminology, added Śaiva metaphysics and framed Haṭṭhayoga as subordinate to a Śaiva yoga known as Rājayoga. This article proposes that the Amaraughaprabodha’s short recension is probably the earliest known work to combine Haṭṭha- with Rājayoga, on the basis of this recension’s close relationship with the Amṛtasiddhi, its rudimentary nature and the likelihood that Svātmārāma used it, and not the long recension, for composing the Haṭṭhapradīpikā.

Keywords Yoga · South Asia · Indology · Manuscripts · Hatha · Raja · Vajrayana · Hinduism · Buddhism

Jason Birch

Published online: 2 July 2019
© The Author(s) 2019

Abstract The Amaraughaprabodha is a Sanskrit Śaiva yoga text attributed by its colophons to Gorakṣanātha. It was published by Kalyani Devi Mallik in 1954 and has been discussed in various secondary sources. Most notably, Christian Bouy (1994, pp. 18-19) identified this work as a source text for the Haṭṭhapradīpikā of Svātmārāma (mid-fifteenth century). This article presents new manuscript evidence for a shorter recension of the Amaraughaprabodha than the one published by Mallik. Comparing the differences between the short and long recensions reveals that the structure of the shorter one is more cohesive and closer to the original design of the work. The close relationship of the Amaraughaprabodha’s short recension with an eleventh-century Vajrayāna work on yoga called the Amṛtasiddhi provides unique insights into how early teachings on Haṭṭhayoga were formulated. Although the practice of the physical techniques is largely the same in both texts, the author of the Amaraughaprabodha removed or obscured Vajrayāna terminology, added Śaiva metaphysics and framed Haṭṭhayoga as subordinate to a Śaiva yoga known as Rājayoga. This article proposes that the Amaraughaprabodha’s short recension is probably the earliest known work to combine Haṭṭha- with Rājayoga, on the basis of this recension’s close relationship with the Amṛtasiddhi, its rudimentary nature and the likelihood that Svātmārāma used it, and not the long recension, for composing the Haṭṭhapradīpikā.

Keywords Yoga · South Asia · Indology · Manuscripts · Hatha · Raja · Vajrayana · Hinduism · Buddhism

Jason Birch

Published online: 2 July 2019
© The Author(s) 2019

Abstract The Amaraughaprabodha is a Sanskrit Śaiva yoga text attributed by its colophons to Gorakṣanātha. It was published by Kalyani Devi Mallik in 1954 and has been discussed in various secondary sources. Most notably, Christian Bouy (1994, pp. 18-19) identified this work as a source text for the Haṭṭhapradīpikā of Svātmārāma (mid-fifteenth century). This article presents new manuscript evidence for a shorter recension of the Amaraughaprabodha than the one published by Mallik. Comparing the differences between the short and long recensions reveals that the structure of the shorter one is more cohesive and closer to the original design of the work. The close relationship of the Amaraughaprabodha’s short recension with an eleventh-century Vajrayāna work on yoga called the Amṛtasiddhi provides unique insights into how early teachings on Haṭṭhayoga were formulated. Although the practice of the physical techniques is largely the same in both texts, the author of the Amaraughaprabodha removed or obscured Vajrayāna terminology, added Śaiva metaphysics and framed Haṭṭhayoga as subordinate to a Śaiva yoga known as Rājayoga. This article proposes that the Amaraughaprabodha’s short recension is probably the earliest known work to combine Haṭṭha- with Rājayoga, on the basis of this recension’s close relationship with the Amṛtasiddhi, its rudimentary nature and the likelihood that Svātmārāma used it, and not the long recension, for composing the Haṭṭhapradīpikā.

Keywords Yoga · South Asia · Indology · Manuscripts · Hatha · Raja · Vajrayana · Hinduism · Buddhism
Introduction

The Amaraughaprabodha, which literally means ‘awakening a flood of nectar’, is a Sanskrit yoga text that attributes its teachings to Gorakṣanātha, the alleged founder of the Nātha order and a physical type of yoga called Hathayoga. This text was first published in 1954 by Kalyani Devi Mallik, whose edition is a transcription of one manuscript. The text has seventy-five verses and has been dated by Bouy (1994, pp. 18–19) and others as being prior to the mid-fifteenth century, on the basis that Svātmārāma, the author of the Ṣaṭapadiṇī, borrowed verses from it (Bouy 1994, p. 19).¹ This article aims to reassess these conclusions in light of newly discovered manuscript evidence which indicates that two recensions of the Amaraughaprabodha exist; a longer one, as published by Mallik, and a shorter one that is preserved by two unpublished manuscripts. An analysis of the manuscript transmission and the differences between the recensions reveals that the shorter recension is the older of the two and was probably the one known to Svātmārāma. Its rudimentary nature and close relationship with an eleventh-century Vajrayāna work called the Amṛtasiddhi make it probable that the short recension of the Amaraughaprabodha was one of the earliest works to teach a fourfold system of yoga that combined Haṭha- with Rāja-yoga. The article concludes by discussing the significance of these findings within the broader history of yoga.

Previous Attempts to Date the Text

Bouy (1994, p. 19) examined the Amaraughaprabodha in Mallik’s edition and identified twenty-two and a half of its verses in the Ṣaṭapadiṇī.² In spite of the fact that Svātmārāma does not reveal the names of his sources, Bouy proposed that Svātmārāma borrowed the Amaraughaprabodha’s verses by demonstrating that the Ṣaṭapadiṇī is an anthology (1994, pp. 80–86). If one accepts this logic behind the direction of borrowing, the Amaraughaprabodha was composed before the mid-fifteenth century. Bouy (1994, p. 19) also notes that the Upāsanāsārasaṅgraha, which he dates from the sixteenth to seventeenth century (1994, p. 91), cites the Amaraughaprabodha by name. This provides a certain, albeit more recent, terminus ad quem.³

¹ Mallinson (2011, pp. 771–772, 2016b, pp. 111–113) and Birch (2011, p. 528).
² Mallinson (2014, p. 239) has estimated that the Ṣaṭapadiṇī borrowed twenty and a half verses from the Amaraughaprabodha. The discrepancy occurs because Bouy includes Amaraughaprabodha 9, which is very similar to Ṣaṭapadiṇī 4.14, and Amaraughaprabodha 38b–39a, which may have been heavily redacted to create Ṣaṭapadiṇī 3.25c–26a.
³ Bouy (1994, p. 19) does not provide a reference in the Upāsanāsārasaṅgraha to its citation of the Amaraughaprabodha. Instead, he (1994, p. 9 n. 5, 19 n. 55) says that the reference would be included in a forthcoming article. However, it seems that this article was never published. Although I have access to only chapters 3, 4 and 7 (out of 24), I can confirm that Amaraughaprabodha 38–41 is quoted with attribution (i.e., amaraughe) in the seventh chapter of the Upāsanāsārasaṅgraha (IFP T1095, p. 48).
Mallinson (2016) has identified at least five verses of the Amaraughapraboroda in the eleventh-century Amṛtasiddhi. Furthermore, the version of the Amaraughapraboroda in Mallik’s edition has borrowed a verse from the second chapter of the Amanaska (Birch 2011, p. 528), which can be dated to the eleventh or early twelfth century (Birch 2014, p. 406 n. 21), and another from the Dattātreyyogāsāstra, circa thirteenth century. There is also a verse cited and attributed to the Śrīsampaṭa and a short passage attributed to the Amaraughasāmśiddhi. These borrowings indicate that the Amaraughapraboroda in Mallik’s edition is a compilation, the terminus a quo of which was the Dattātreyyogāsāstra, bearing in mind that the Śrīsampaṭa and the Amaraughasāmśiddhi are unknown works. These observations led me to propose in an earlier publication (Birch 2011, p. 528) that the Amaraughapraboroda was probably composed in the fourteenth century, because it must have appeared after the earliest Hātha- and Rājayoga texts and before the Haṭhapradāpikā. The discovery of new manuscript evidence requires that these conclusions be revised.

Authorship

Among the earliest modern publications that mention the Amaraughapraboroda in any detail are the first volume of Madras University’s New Catalogus Catalogorum (1949) and Mallik’s edition (1954). Both attribute it to Gorakṣaṇātha. Before these publications, the Amaraughapraboroda is absent in lists of Gorakṣaṇātha’s works by modern scholars (e.g., Briggs 1938, pp. 251–257 and Dvivedī 1950, pp. 98–100) and in studies on the Nāths (e.g., Dasgupta 1946, pp. 219–294). However, it has

4 Amaraughapraboroda 20, 32cd, 37ab, 37cd, 38, 39cd, 40ab 45, 50c, 51ab = Amṛtasiddhi 16.1cd-16.2ab, 11.9cd, 11.3cd, 14.5cd, 14.6, 13.5cd, 13.7cd, 19.2, 25.1c, 22.2cd. Other sections of the Amaraughapraboroda appear to have been inspired by the Amṛtasiddhi. For example, a passage on the four types of student (Amaraughapraboroda 18–24), in particular the last called adhimātratara, is close to Amṛtasiddhi 15.1, 15.3, 16.1cd–17.1, 18.1–5 and a sequence of piercing knots (granthi) that causes various sounds to arise (Amaraughapraboroda 46–52) has some similarities to Amṛtasiddhi 13.10–11, 20.1ab, 20.7, 22.2cd, 25.1c, 31.1ab. The connection between the Amaraughapraboroda and the Śivasamhitā is less certain, despite the fact that they share a similar verse (Amaraughapraboroda 3 ~ Śivasamhitā 5.12) and have some identical compounds in the passage on the four types of student (e.g., Amaraughapraboroda 19, 21, 22 ~ Śivasamhitā 5.14, 5.21, 5.24). The Śivasamhitā is a compilation, which borrowed a large number of verses from the Amṛtasiddhi (Mallinson 2016a, pp. 127–128, n. 36). The similarities between the Amaraughapraboroda and the Śivasamhitā are largely explained by the fact that both borrow from the Amṛtasiddhi. In the few instances where the Amaraughapraboroda and the Śivasamhitā have something in common that is not in the Amṛtasiddhi, the direction of borrowing and the sources involved is not certain. The contradictions between the Śivasamhitā’s chapters (Birch 2018, p. 107 n. 13) suggest that it has been crudely cobbled together from various sources, an unknown one of which might be responsible for Amaraughapraboroda 3 and the similar compounds in the section on the four types of student.

5 Amaraughapraboroda 71cd–72ab = Dattātreyyogāsāstra 161.

6 The Sampūta is the name of a well-known Buddhist Tantra (Szántó 2016). However, the verse quoted by the Amaraughapraboroda is not found in this Buddhist work (Péter-Dániel Szántó, p.c. 27.4.2017). The verse is probably from a Śaiva text because it mentions the story of Matsyendranātha (by the name of Minanātha), who overheard Śiva’s teachings after he is swallowed by a fish. I have not been able to find the source of this verse.

7 See footnote 31.
been included in more recent lists (e.g., Banerjea 1962, pp. 26–28, Gonda 1977, p. 222 n. 28, etc.) and studies (e.g., Bouy 1994, pp. 18–19, White 1996, p. 141, etc.).

The attribution of authorship to Goraksñātha is supported by the final colophon of the manuscript used by Mallik, that states: “the Amaraughaprabodha, which was composed by the honourable Goraksñātha, is complete.”

Two of these verses (2 and 74), at the beginning and end of the text, assert that Goraksñātha taught the four yogas, which are the main topic of the work:

The awakening, which is proof [of itself], was taught by Goraksñātha for those who have undertaken Laya and the other [yogas] and whose minds are quarrelsome. […] The honourable Goraksñātha, who always abides in samādhi, taught Laya-, Mantra- and Hāthayoga solely for [the attainment of] Rājayoga.

It is probable that the scribe who added the colophon interpreted these statements as Goraksñātha referring to himself in the third person. However, it also possible to interpret these verses as statements made by an author within Goraksñātha’s lineage, who believed that the teachings of the Amaraughaprabodha were first revealed by Goraksñātha. Therefore, these verses do not necessarily confirm that Goraksñātha was the author. Nonetheless, the sectarian milieu in which the text was composed is a Śaiva siddha tradition, as evinced by the first verse, which pays homage to Ādinaṭha, Mīnanaṭha (i.e., Matsyendranāṭha), Cauranāṭīnaṇḍa and Siddhabuddha, as well as by references to Śiva elsewhere in the text.

Region

The manuscript used by Mallik (1954, p. 34) and the six surviving manuscripts of the Amaraughaprabodha are in south-Indian scripts. It is possible that the version published by Mallik was redacted in south India, because it has nine verses in

---

8 Mallik (1954, p. 55) (iti śrīmadgoraksañāṭhaviracitām amaraughaprabodhaḥ sampūrṇam).

9 G1 (ity amaraugha[ṃ] goraksaviracitam sampūrṇam); A2 (ity amaraugho śrīgorakṣaviracītāṃ śataḥ samāpyate); B (śrīgoraksañāṭhaviracitām amaraughaprabodhaḥ sampūrṇam); A1 (iti śrīmadgoraksañāṭhaviracitām amaraughaprabodhaḥ sampūrṇam); G2 (iti śrīmadgoraksañāṭhaviracitām amaraughaprabodhaḥ sampūrṇam); T (iti śrīmadgoraksañāṭhaviracitām amaraughaprabodhaḥ sampūrṇaḥ).

10 Amaraughaprabodha (Edition) 2: (layādipratipannanām kalahotsukacetasāṃ | goraksakena kathitāḥ prabodhaḥ pratayātmakaḥ ṣaḥ prabodhaḥ | conj. : prabodha- Ed.). Amaraughaprabodha (Edition) 74 (śrīmadgoraksañāṭhena sadāmaraughavartinīḥ layamantraḥ añāthoḥ prakātā rājayogyāya kevalam). On the meaning of amaraunya as samādhi, see below. The compound sadāmaraughavartinī could also be understood as ‘who always resides in the lineage (ogha) of the siddhas (amara).’

11 The beta recension of the Amaraughaprabodha has only a hemistich that pays homage to Caurangīṇāṭha and Buddhasidhā. Whether the salutations to Ādīnāṭha and Matsyendranāṭha were lost in the transmission of this recension is difficult to say. Nonetheless, Śiva is the object of meditation in both the Amaraughaprabodha’s Mantrayoga (25) and Laya-yoga (27). Also, the Rājayogin’s final accomplishment is to become similar to Śiva (64). Other Śaiva elements are discussed below.
common with the fifth chapter of the *Varāhopaniṣat*. This Upaniṣad is a compilation that was created in the mid-eighteenth century as part of the south-Indian corpus of one hundred and eight Upaniṣads (Bouy 1994, p. 106). If the long version of the *Amarauhaprabodha* was a source for this Upaniṣad, then it would have been known in south India in the eighteenth century, which may account for why its surviving manuscripts are in south-Indian scripts. Nonetheless, there is new evidence, which I will discuss below, that suggests a shorter version of the *Amarauhaprabodha* was composed in south India.

**Manuscript Transmission**

There are six manuscripts of the *Amarauhaprabodha* reported in various catalogues by the Kaivalyadhama Yoga Institute’s *Descriptive Catalogue of Yoga Manuscripts* (2005, pp. 22–25), and five of them have been consulted for this article. Also, another manuscript has been found and consulted at the Venkatesvara Oriental Institute in Tirupati. The six manuscripts consulted for this article are on palm-leaf and written in Grantha script. None of them have a scribal date. Four of the six preserve the version of the text in Mallik’s edition. Unfortunately, the single manuscript upon which Mallik’s edition was based has been lost by the library that used to hold it.

---

12. *Amarauhaprabodha* 38–41ab = *Varāhopaniṣat* 5.60cd–5.63 and *Amarauhaprabodha* 56–61ab ~ *Varāhopaniṣat* 5.1–5.6ab. There are also five and a half verses common to the *Amarauhaprabodha* (47–51ab, 52cd–53ab) and the *Saubhāgyalakṣmyupaniṣat* (2.5cd–10). However, all of these verses and more occur in the Ḥathapradipikā, so the *Amarauhaprabodha* text was probably not a source for the *Saubhāgyalakṣmī*. Bouy (1994, p. 85) notes that Ḥathapradipikā 4.5–7, 4.68–77b = *Saubhāgyalakṣmī* 2.14–16 and 2.4–10.

13. Bouy (1994, p. 92 [table]) notes that verses 50–75 of the fifth chapter of the *Varāhopaniṣat* were borrowed from the *Upāsanāśārasasangraha*, which cites the *Amarauhaprabodha* elsewhere (see footnote 3). Therefore, it is unlikely that *Varāhopaniṣat* 5.60cd–5.63 was borrowed from the *Amarauhaprabodha*, but *Varāhopaniṣat* 5.1–5.6ab (~ *Amarauhaprabodha* 56–61ab) may well have been.

14. This catalogue (2005, pp. 24–25) mentions a seventh manuscript of the *Amarauhaprabodha*, which is said to be at the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library in Chennai. It reports the manuscript number as D-4349. However, the catalogue of Raṅgācārya and Bahudur (1910, p. 3229) for this library indicates that D-4349 is a manuscript of the *Pīṭhaṇjalayogasūtram*. Therefore, the Kaivalyadhama catalogue appears to be mistaken here.

15. Two of these are held at the Adyar Research Library (ms. Nos. 70528 and 75278), one at the M.S. University of Baroda’s Oriental Institute Library (ms. No. 7970c) and two at the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Chennai (ms. No. D-4340 and R2831). Four of these are reported in the NCC (vol. 1 1949, p. 254); 7970c, 4339, 4340 and 2831(o). The sixth manuscript reported in Kaivalyadhama’s catalogue is the one used by Mallik, which is no longer available to researchers (see footnotes 18 and 19).

16. The details of the manuscript are: serial number 412 and stock number 179(a) in Sri Venkatesvara University and Sastri: 1956. I would like to thank Dr. S. V. B. K. V. Gupta for obtaining a copy of this manuscript for me.

17. Ms. Nos. 75278, D-4340, 7970c and 179(a). In this article, these are represented as A1, G2, B and T respectively.

18. Mallik (1954, p. 34) gives the manuscript number as D-4339. She mentions that it has nine folios 9 and is held at ‘Madras’. This information corresponds to the Descriptive Catalogue of the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library (Raṅgācārya and Bahadur 1910, pp. 3220–3221).
This manuscript has not been available to researchers since at least 2004. Although Mallik places several of her conjectures in round brackets, there is evidence to suggest that her transcription has tacit emendations and inaccuracies.

Two of the six manuscripts of the Amaraughaprabodha preserve a recension that is significantly shorter than Mallik’s edition. This recension has forty-six verses. Both manuscripts of the shorter recension are complete and do not contain any indication of lacunae.

The stemma of the manuscript transmission bifurcates into the four manuscripts of the long recension, which I shall call the theta hyparchetype, and the two of the short recension, the beta hyparchetype, as shown in Fig. 1. The manuscripts of each group are fairly close to one another, although none can be dismissed as an apograph of another.

In this article, I shall argue that the beta hyparchetype predates the fifteenth century, whereas theta was possibly created sometime between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries. If one includes Mallik’s edition, there are seven available witnesses that can be used to create critical editions of both theta and beta. The

---

19 I first requested the manuscript in 2004 and was told that the bundle to which it belonged could not be found. I have since requested it in 2010 and 2016, but to no avail.
20 The descriptive catalogue of the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library (Raṅgācārya and Bahadur 1910, pp. 3220–3221) transcribed the first four and last five verses of manuscript D-4339. When one compares this transcription to Mallik’s edition, there are two instances where the catalogue has suggested a correction in brackets, which has been adopted by Mallik (3b catalogue tṛtiya(kaḥ), Mallik tṛtiyakaḥ and 4a catalogue laya(h), Mallik layaḥ). Therefore, one wonders how many tacit emendations Mallik may have made. Without the manuscript at hand, it is not possible to determine whether the catalogue’s transcription is more accurate than Mallik’s. Nonetheless, the following discrepancies can be noted: several poor readings in the catalogue’s transcription may have been tacitly emended by Mallik (e.g., 71c catalogue rājayogam padam, Mallik rājayogapadam; 72d catalogue kleśāpaho, Mallik kleśāpahāḥ). Also, Mallik may have introduced the following errors: 2d catalogue prabodhah ānayātmakah, Mallik prabodhaprayātmakah; 4a catalogue pradiṣṭo, Mallik pradiṣṭāḥ; 4c catalogue mantrayogam, Mallik mantrayogam; 72c catalogue bhogāspadam, Mallik bhogāspadam; 73c catalogue proktā, Mallik proktāḥ.
21 Mss. Nos. R2831 and 70528, represented as G₁ and A₂ respectively, in this article.
22 As figure 1 depicts, the manuscripts that preserve the long recension bifurcate again because mss. 75278, 179(a) and D-4340 have more identical readings in common with one another than they do with 7970c, which has some distinct readings of beta.
reconstruction of the relatively large section on Haṭhayoga can be further improved by using the Amṛtasiddhi, the Śivasamhitā, and the Haṭhapsadīpikā. Also, the fifth chapter of the Varāhopaniṣat is helpful for editing some of the additional verses of theta.

### Differences between the Recensions

Both recensions have a similar structure, except for two significant differences. The structure (with these two differences in bold) has been summarised in Table 1.

Notwithstanding significant variant readings, the sections on Mantra-, Laya-, Haṭha- and Rājayoga are largely the same. The most obvious differences between the two archetypes is, firstly, theta’s ten additional verses on the four types of student and, secondly, its eighteen verses following Rājayoga, which I have called ‘miscellaneous topics’ for the sake of this discussion. Comparing these and other differences in theta and beta reveals that the structure of beta is more cohesive and closer to the original design of the work.

The first four verses of both theta and beta introduce the four yogas, which are the main topic of the text. In beta, this opening passage is followed by rhetorical verses on the efficacy of Rājayoga (5–9), the importance of the guru, semen (bindu) and resonance (nāda) (10–12) and the union of Śiva and Śakti (13). The last verse of this section introduces the teachings on the four yogas by asking how they are taught (14). None of verses 1–14 has yet been traced to an earlier source.\(^{23}\) In contrast to this, two or three additional verses in the introductory section of theta can be traced or identified as coming from an earlier work. One verse derives from the second

---

\(^{23}\) The possible exception is verse 2 (Śivasamhitā 5.12). However, this verse is almost generic among texts that teach the fourfold system of yoga and may have found its way into the Śivasamhitā via another text. In its current form, it is unlikely that the Śivasamhitā predates the beta recension of the Amaraughaprabodha (see footnote 4).
chapter of the *Amanaska* and another is quoted with attribution to an unknown work called the *Śrīsampuṭa*. Therefore, the redactors of *theta* increased the size of the *Amaraughaprabodha*’s introduction by adding at least two verses from other texts. Furthermore, *theta*’s seven verses on the ‘four types of student’ appear to have been inspired by the *Amṛtasiddhi* and possibly the *Śivasamhitā*, and its additional section on ‘miscellaneous topics’ contains a verse which can be traced to the *Dattatreyayogaśāstra*.

The tracing of two verses to the *Amanaska* and the *Dattatreya* and the references in *theta* to the *Śrīsampuṭa* and the *Amaraughasaṃsiddhi* elicit the hypothesis that the redactors of *theta* simply added verses to *beta*. The strongest evidence in support of this hypothesis is that some of the additional verses distort the structure of the text. There are two significant instances of this. Firstly, the introduction of *beta* ends with the question of how the four yogas are taught. This is immediately followed by the teachings on Mantra-, Laya-, Ḥathā- and Rājyoga, which has a logical structure, as can be seen in Table 2.

Although the above question appears to have been emended in the edition of the *Amaraugha* (see Table 3), the manuscript readings suggest that the same question was posed in *theta*, which is then followed by a passage on the four types of student. Had the redactors of *theta* been more careful, they might have rewritten the initial question to ask about the types of student to whom each yoga should be taught, but this does not appear to have been done. As shown in Table 3, it is apparent that the section on the four types of student (in bold) was inserted between the question on the four yogas (17cd) and the explanation of each of them (25–55).

Secondly, much of the content of *theta*’s additional passage on ‘miscellaneous topics’ (56–73) is extraneous to the main topic of the *Amaraugha* (see Table 3), which is the four yogas. This passage can be seen as consisting of three topics. The first (56–61) concerns the five elements (*pañcabhūta*). The final statement is that their loss

| Table 2 | Question on the four yogas in beta |
|---|---|
| Verses | Content of Beta |
| 14cd | *layādibhiḥ samāyuktaḥ caturdhodīryate katham*<sup>a</sup> | How is the fourfold [yoga,] which is endowed with Layayoga and the others, taught? |
| 15–16 | Mantrayoga |
| 17–18 | Layayoga |
| 19–41 | Ḥathayoga |
| 42–44 | Rājyoga |

<sup>a</sup> I would like to thank Dominic Goodall for proposing a slight emendation in this hemistich (i.e., *caturdhodīryate* for *caturdhodīryate*). Three manuscripts read *caturthodīryate* (i.e., A₂, G₁, G₂) and the other three *caturthodīryate* (B, A₁, T), in which the double *yakāra* indicates that *udīryate* was probably intended. The edition appears to have tacitly emended this reading to *diyate* for the reason stated below.

---

<sup>24</sup> See footnote 4.

<sup>25</sup> See footnote 4.

<sup>26</sup> See footnote 4.
leads to death and their retention (dhāraṇa) to life. The motivation for adding these verses might have been to elaborate on the notion of immortality, which is introduced early in the text and mentioned as a result of Mantra- and Hathayoga. However, this section does not indicate how the practice of any one of the four yogas might retain the five elements and the main section on the four yogas does not mention the five elements.

The second miscellaneous topic is on how the yogin can manipulate the sun and moon in the body. After completing an unspecified practice eight times for three hours, the yogin swallows his breaths and thereby replenishes his moon and controls both his sun and semen (bindu). Bliss and the attainment of Śivahood follow. The
motivation for adding these verses might have been to support the following comment in the section on Hathayoga, “One should know the connection between the moon, sun and fire in order to [attain] immortality.” However, the additional passage introduces new terminology for the sun and moon (i.e., śaśi, ravi and ṣoḍaśakalī). It may be an attempt to summarise a yoga similar to that of the Amṛtasiddhi, in which case the practice done eight times for three hours would be the three mudrās of that text and the Amaraughaprabodha. Furthermore, it is followed by a verse that suggests that the preceding verses were borrowed from a text called the Amaraughasamsiddhi, which is also attributed to Gorakṣanātha.

Thus, in the Amaraughasamsiddhi, the awakening that is brought about by adeptness in the methods of Layayoga and so forth and is proof [of its own efficacy], has been revealed by Gorakṣanātha.

Therefore, it is quite likely that this passage was borrowed from another text, which was probably on the same four yogas (i.e., Mantra, Laya, Ḥaṭha and Rājayoga/amaraugha) taught by Gorakṣanātha, but contained different terminology to the short version of the Amaraughaprabodha.

The third miscellaneous topic is mainly on Rājayoga and liberation-in-life (jīvanmukti). The content of this passage is relevant to the central concern of the text, which is the four yogas that result in liberation. Nonetheless, it begins with a verse which was most probably taken from a Buddhist text. This verse mentions the signs of success that arise from practice, and it closely parallels a verse from the Sekoddeśa. This indicates that the redactors of theta had access to Buddhist material or were using texts on the four yogas that had content borrowed from Buddhist works.

A subsequent verse in this section introduces a view of liberation-in-life which goes beyond that implied by beta. Whereas beta ends with the yogin’s attainment of samādhi and his becoming a second Śiva, additional verses in theta, including one from the Dattātreyayogasāstra, state that the yogin emerges from samādhi to live in the world however he so wishes.

After [liberation-in-life has been achieved], no one at all lives and no one will die. Having obtained the state of Rājayoga, which subjugates all beings, [the yogin] can do anything or nothing, behaving as he pleases. The king of yogis

Footnote 29 continued
bindur āyāti ] conj. Shaman Hatley : bindunāyāti A₁, B, G₂, T. tadaśivavyaguṇāḥ ] conj. Shaman Hatley and Somadeva Vasudeva : tadeśivavyaguṇāḥ A₁, B, G₂, T).

Footnote 30 Amaraughaprabodha (theta) 41ab (somasūryāgnisambandham jāniyād amṛtāya vai).

Footnote 31 I wish to thank James Mallinson for suggesting this to me.

Footnote 32 Amaraughaprabodha (theta) 65 (ity amaraughasamsiddhau gorakeṇa prakāśitah | layādyupāyakausalayaaprabodhaḥ pratayātmaḥākā | 65a -samsiddhau ] A₁, G₂, T, Ed : -samsiddho B. 65c -prabodhaḥ ] conj. Goodall : - prabodha- B, A₁, G₂, T, Ed).

Footnote 33 Amaraughaprabodha (theta) 67 (dhūmo maricikhadyotadipajyāvendubhāskarāh | tamah kalā mahābīmam viśvabīmam prakāśate ] 67a dhūmo ] T : rūmo B, A₁, G₂, Ed. 67c tamah ] diagnostic conj. : amī B, A₁, G₂, T, Ed). Cf. Sekoddeśa 26 (dhūmamaricikhadyotadipajyāvendubhāskarāh | tamah kalā mahābīmavīśvabīmam prabhāsvaram).

Footnote 34 I have discussed these differences in conceptions of jīvanmukti in Birch (2019) (forthcoming).
[may be] someone who [lives] naked in caves, wears divine clothes or sometimes [just] a loin cloth. He may be one who has great sex with divine women somewhere or elsewhere he may be a celibate. Sometimes he is intent on eating alms and at other times he obtains the state of wealth. His behaviour is always free and he allays all suffering.\textsuperscript{35}

There is no apparent reason as to why the passage on five elements is followed by another on the sun and moon and then further verses on Rājayoga and liberation. The infelicitous position of these additional verses suggests that this section of \textit{theta} was hastily redacted and inserted into the \textit{Amaraughaprabodha}. The redactor appears to have used at least one unknown work on the topic of \textit{amaruga} (i.e., the \textit{Amaraughasamsiddhi}), as well as Buddhist material and an early yoga text on the same four yogas (i.e., the \textit{Dattātreya yogasāstra}).

There is one other addition in \textit{theta} that provides some insight into how it was redacted. In the section on Hathayoga, a verse has been added to the beginning of the description of \textit{mahāvedha}.\textsuperscript{36} The first hemistich of this verse occurs in the \textit{Amrtasiddhi} (11.3cd), but the context is different. In the \textit{Amrtasiddhi}, this hemistich describes the yogin’s posture in \textit{mahāmudrā}, whereas in \textit{theta} it is appended to a passage on \textit{mahāvedha}.\textsuperscript{37} The second hemistich of the additional verse was taken from a different chapter of the \textit{Amrtasiddhi} (14.5cd). The inclusion of both hemistiches reveals that the redactor of \textit{theta} used the \textit{Amrtasiddhi} to augment and emend the original \textit{Amaraughaprabodha}. Nonetheless, despite having access to the source text, it appears that this redactor did not understand the practice of \textit{mahāvedha} in the \textit{Amrtasiddhi}, nor any Hathayoga text for that matter, because this \textit{mudrā} is not supposed to be done with both hands holding one extended leg.\textsuperscript{38}

One might ask whether the opposite hypothesis to the one I have just discussed is at all likely. In other words, could \textit{beta} be a more recent, truncated version of \textit{theta} or, more to the point, can \textit{beta} be seen as a deliberate attempt to rectify the problems of \textit{theta}? Perhaps, a redactor omitted the passages in \textit{theta} that are unrelated to the four yogas and removed \textit{theta}’s worst imperfections. It is true that the absence of

\textsuperscript{35}\textit{Amaraughaprabodha (theta)} 71–73 (na jivati tatah ko ‘pi na ca ko ‘pi marisyatī | rājayogapadām prāpya sarvasattavaśānkarāṁ \|71|| sarvam kuryāṁ na kuryād vā yathāruci viceṣṭāṁ ||72|| nagnāḥ ko ‘pi gahāsu divyavasanaḥ kaupināvāsāḥ kva cid divyastrāraṭāṁviṣto ‘pi kuha cit sa brāhmaçārī kva cīt bhikṣāhāraratāḥ kva cīt kva cid api prāṇatī bhogāpadām sarvatrāpratibaddhavīti akhilaklesānāh yogīrāḥ \|71b marisyatī | B, T, Ed : marisyatī A1 : ++++ G2. rājayogapadām ] B, G2 : rājayogam padām A1, T, Ed. 72a sarvaḥ ] sarva B, 72b kuryān na ] omitted B. 73a vāsāḥ ] B, A1, T : vāsā G2, 73b ‘pi ] omitted T (unmetr.) : 73d pratibaddha- ] A1, G2, Ed: pratibandha- B, T). Cf. Dattātreya yogasāstra 161 (rājayogavaram prāpya sarvasattavaśāmkaram | sarvam kuryāṁ na vā kuryād yathāruci viceṣṭām).

\textsuperscript{36}Amaraughaprabodha (theta) 37: (savayam prasāritam pādam karābhīyāṁ dhārayed drdham | āndolanam tatah kuryāc charīrasya trimārgataḥ \| 37cd kuryāc charīrasya ] B : kuryāch sarīrasya A1, G2 : kuryāt sarīrasya T). Amaraughaprabodha (theta) 37ab = Amrtasiddhi 11.3cd = Hathapradipikā 3.10cd Āruḥyasanhitāda 4.27ab (descriptions of mahāmudrā). Amaraughaprabodha (theta) 37cd = Amrtasiddhi 14.5cd.

\textsuperscript{37}Amrtasiddhi 11.3cd: “The [yogin] should hold firmly with both hands the left leg which has been extended” (savayam prasāritam pādam karābhīyāṁ dhārayed drdham). Cf. Amaraughaprabodha (theta) 37ab (see footnote 35).

\textsuperscript{38}As far as I’m aware, the \textit{theta} recension of the \textit{Amaraughaprabodha} (37ab) is unique in instructing that one leg should be extended for the practice of \textit{mahāvedha}.
some of theta’s passages, such as the four types of student and the five elements, makes the structure of beta more coherent. However, if creating a better structure were the purpose behind beta, one would have to explain why theta’s final verses on Rājyoga and liberation-in-life were deliberately removed, because they are relevant to the central topic of the four yogas. Furthermore, had the redactor of beta simply removed problematic verses of theta, it is unclear why this redactor also removed verses that are coherent but were borrowed from other texts, such as the Amanaska and the Dattātreya yogaśāstra. As we shall see below, the hypothesis that beta followed theta becomes even less likely when one attempts to date and understand the content of both recensions within the broader history of works that teach the same four yogas.

**Dating the Recensions**

The *terminus a quo* of the beta recension of the Amaraughaprabodha is the *Amṛtasiddhi* and not the Dattātreya yogaśāstra. The *Amṛtasiddhi* was composed before 1160 CE, which is the date of a colophon in the oldest available manuscript. This Vajrayāna work does not teach a system of yoga called Haṭha- or Rājyoga, but it was nonetheless a source text for three important Hathayogic mudrās, namely mahāmudrā, mahābandha and mahāvedha, and four distinct stages of yoga (ārambha, ghaṭa, paricaya and nispatti). The close relationship between the *Amṛtasiddhi* and the beta recension of the Amaraughaprabodha and the fact that this recension does not borrow from another work on Haṭha- and Rājyoga make it probable that the *Amaraughaprabodha* was one of the earliest works to formulate a fourfold system which included Haṭha- and Rājyoga.

The *terminus ad quem* of the beta recension remains the Haṭhapradīpikā, as Bouy determined. However, it is probable that Svātmārāma knew only the beta recension, because none of the additional twenty-nine verses of theta can be found in the Haṭhapradīpikā. These include theta’s additional verses on Rājyoga, which would have been relevant to the fourth chapter of the Haṭhapradīpikā. Although the following evidence is not conclusive, there are two differences between theta and beta that are significant enough to suggest that Svātmārāma borrowed from beta. Firstly, in one place, the order of the hemistiches diverges in beta and theta, and the order in beta is the same as that in the Haṭhapradīpikā. The second difference

---

39 For information on the dating of this manuscript, see Schaeffer (2002, p. 517), Mallinson (2016a, pp. 2–3) and Mallinson and Szántó (forthcoming).

40 Amaraughaprabodha (beta) 31–32 = theta 42ab, 43ab, 42cd, 43cd = Haṭhapradīpikā 3.30–31.
concerns the additional verse on mahāvedha in theta. The Haṭhapradīpikā’s description of the yogin’s posture for mahāvedha is more, but not entirely, consistent with beta than theta.41

A comparison of the variant readings of theta and beta with the critical edition of the Haṭhapradīpikā indicates that beta has twice the number of significant variant readings in common the Haṭhapradīpikā than theta (see “Appendix”). Although this result is worth noting, it is not in itself conclusive evidence for assessing whether theta or beta was the source of the Haṭhapradīpikā, because the comparison is based on a small sample of verses and on a critical edition of the Haṭhapradīpikā that is not dependable nor comprehensive in the manuscripts it reports.42 Nonetheless, this comparison raises an interesting question: if theta postdates the Haṭhapradīpikā, why would it have readings in common with the Haṭhapradīpikā that are not found in beta? If it is indeed true that theta was redacted sometime after the Haṭhapradīpikā, then its transmission must have been contaminated by manuscripts of the Haṭhapradīpikā. This contamination seems plausible because its redactor was, after all, inserting material from other yoga texts.

The terminus ad quem of the Amaraughaprabodha’s theta recension may be the eighteenth-century Varāhopaniṣat. It remains somewhat uncertain as to whether theta was a source for this Upaniṣad, because the available manuscripts of the Upāsanāsārasaṅgraha are incomplete and, as Bouy (1994, p. 19) noted, the fifth chapter of the Varāhopaniṣat contains a large passage that was borrowed from the Upāsanāsārasaṅgraha.43 The only other evidence, as far as I am aware, for the theta’s terminus ad quem is the four palm leaf manuscripts that preserve it, none of which is dated nor likely to be older than the eighteenth century.

41 Haṭhapradīpikā 3.26–27ab (mahābandhasthitō yoga kṛtvā pūrakam ekadhiḥ | vāyūnām gatim āvṛtya nihṛtam kañṭhamudrayā || samahastayaguo bhūmau śpicau sanādaye ca chanah). Cf. Amaraughaprabodha (beta) 27–28ab (punar āśphālayed katūm sūstellarīm kañṭhamudrayā || vāyūnām gatim ārvadhya kṛtvā pūrakakumabhakau || samahastayaguo bhūmau samāpādayaguo tathā) and Amaraughaprabodha (theta) 37 (see footnote 35). The posture for mahāvedha in the Amaraughaprabodha is similar to that described in the Amṛtasiddhi (i.e., a squatting type position in which the legs and arms are symmetrical), whereas in the Haṭhapradīpikā the posture is a cross-legged position, as stipulated for mahābandha (see Haṭhapradīpikā 3.19).

42 The only critical edition of the Haṭhapradīpikā is that by Swami Digambaraji and Pt. Raghunatha Shastri Kokaje in 1970 at the Kaivalyadhama, S.M.Y.M. Samiti. Most of the manuscripts which they used for this edition are from libraries in the state of Mahrāstra, so it is unlikely that regional differences in the transmission of this pan-Indic work are represented by their edition. More importantly, the editors appear to have been unaware of the significant number of parallel verses in early yoga texts such as the Dattātreyaugōkastra, the Amṛtasiddhi, the Amanaska, etc. Also, the critical apparatus is negative and it appears to include only the most important variants; the oldest manuscript has not been consulted (Bouy 1994, p. 84 n. 357) and the section on vajroli has been distorted by the editors’ belief that Hathayoga did not teach transgressive practices; e.g., the verse on anāmōli which describes it as drinking urine and emanating from a Kālīka tradition has been relegated to a footnote (Haṭhapradīpikā 1998: 112 n. 170), in spite of the fact that most of the manuscripts have it.

43 In footnote 3, I mentioned that the Upāsanāsārasaṅgraha cites with attribution Amaraughaprabodha 38–41. These verse numbers are based on Mallik’s edition of the Amaraughaprabodha (i.e., the theta recension), which Bouy used. However, it is very likely that the Upāsanāsārasaṅgraha borrowed from the beta recension of the Amaraughaprabodha (27–30) and not theta, because an additional verse on mahāmudrā in theta (for details, see footnote 35) is omitted from the Upāsanāsārasaṅgraha’s passage on this mudrā, which it attributes to the Amaraughaprabodha.
The Significance of the *Amaraughaprabodha*’s Beta Recension in the History of Yoga

The close relationship of the beta recension of the *Amaraughaprabodha* with the *Amṛtasiddhi*, or perhaps a rudimentary version of the *Amṛtasiddhi*, provides unique insights into how early teachings on Hatāyoga were formulated. Unlike early Hatha- and Rājāyoga texts, the *Amṛtasiddhi* contains extensive, detailed passages on the theory behind the practice, which reveal that its teachings were intended for esoteric Buddhists who had rejected deity yoga. As I shall discuss below, the redactor of the *Amaraughaprabodha* borrowed and modified only select portions of the *Amṛtasiddhi*, omitting much of the theory in the process, and introduced new ideas to formulate a system of Hatāyoga that would have appealed to Śaivas. Also, the sparing application of doctrine and metaphysics in the *Amaraughaprabodha* probably made its yoga more accessible to people of other religions.

The section on Hatāyoga in the *Amaraughaprabodha* is a terse account of the practice of the three mudrās and the four stages of yoga that are similar to those in the *Amṛtasiddhi*. As seen in Table 4, the content of the *Amaraughaprabodha* largely derives from nine of the *Amṛtasiddhi*’s thirty-six chapters.

In spite of this shared content, a significant difference between the *Amaraughaprabodha* and the *Amṛtasiddhi* is that the latter has extensive chapters on the theory and metaphysics underlying the practice of the mudrās and the stages of yoga that follow it. These additional chapters are in bold in Table 5. Most of the content of these chapters is not mentioned at all in the *Amaraughaprabodha*.

---

**Table 4** Parallel verses in the *Amaraughaprabodha* and the *Amṛtasiddhi*

| Amaraughaprabodha’s Haṭṭhayoga Verses | Corresponding verses of the *Amṛtasiddhi* | Chapter topic of the *Amṛtasiddhi* |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Mahāmudrā 19–23ab                   | ~ 11.3                                    | Mahāmudrā                         |
| Mahābandha 23cd-26                  | = 12.9cd                                  | Mahābandha                       |
| Mahāvedha 27–30                     | = 14.6, 13.5cd                            | Mahāvedha and Practice            |
| Practice and Results of the Mudrās 31–33 | = 13.7cd                                 | Mahāvedha                         |
| The Four Stages 34                  | ~ 19.2                                    | The Four Stages*                 |
| Ārambha (piercing brahmāgranthi) 35–37 | ~ 13.10–11                               | Mahāvedha                         |
| Ghaṭa (piercing viṣṇugranthi) 38–39ab | ~ 20.1ab                                  | Ghaṭa Stage                       |
| Paricaya (natural bliss arises) 39cd-40 | ~ 20.7                                   | Ghaṭa Stage                       |
| Nisṭatti (piercing rudraganthi) 41–43 | ~ 22.2cd, 25.1c, 31.1ab                   | Great Bliss, Mastery of Breath and Mahāmudrā |

*a* The name of this chapter is ‘the completion of the first stage’ (*prathamaśrāvastīṇispattī*). However, I have referred to its contents as ‘the four stages’ because its opening discussion reflects this.

---

44 On the *Amṛtasiddhi*’s sectarian affiliation and polemics against svādhiṣṭānayoga, see Mallinson (2016a) and Szántó (2016).
Metaphysics, such as the sun, moon and fire, are mentioned only in passing in the Amaraughaprabodha’s section on Hat ˙hayoga. Theory regarding matter (prakṛti), mind and the five bodily winds is absent. In the chapters of the Amṛtasiddhi that follow the practice of the three mudrās (i.e., chapters 11–14), many supernatural effects are enunciated and nearly all of these have been omitted by the redactor of the Amaraughaprabodha. Therefore, it can be generally said that, if the redactor of the Amaraughaprabodha did indeed use the Amṛtasiddhi, the process of redacting the section on Hat ˙hayoga was reductionist in the extreme and orientated almost entirely towards the practice of physical techniques and the results. This is also characteristic of other early works on Hat˙hayoga. As the physical techniques, which came to define Hatayoga, moved from one tradition to another, the theory underlying them was minimal and subject to syncretization.

The redactor of the Amaraughaprabodha did not altogether omit the terminology and theory that was peculiar to Buddhism. Terms were retained that Śaivas would have understood in contexts of yoga, such as mahāmudrā, ānanda and śūnya, on account of their use in earlier Śaiva works. Other terms that could be understood in a general sense, such as vimarda (‘pounding’) and vicitra (‘various’), were also retained. Nonetheless, when this terminology occurs in the Amṛtasiddhi, its meaning is specific to a system of four blisses, moments and voids that was unique to esoteric Buddhism. Furthermore, some of Amṛtasiddhi’s terminology that probably derived from Rasaśāstra, such as vedha, maraṇa and puṇa, was incorporated by the redactor of the Amaraughaprabodha, perhaps because the meaning of these terms was known outside of esoteric Buddhism.

The Śaiva orientation of the Amaraughaprabodha is established by the attribution of its teachings to Gorakṣanātha and verses that mention Śiva, Śakti or the liṅga in the introduction and the sections on Mantra-, Layā-, Hatha- and Rājayoga. Although the redactor integrates terminology and metaphysics of the Amṛtasiddhi, the explicit references to Śiva, Śakti and the liṅga affirm the Śaiva
orientation of the work. A good example of this is seen in the penultimate verse of the introduction, in which notions of the sun and moon that are central to the teachings of the Amṛtasiddhi are subsumed under the goal of uniting Śiva and Śakti above the apertures of the skull (brahmarandhra):

When the lord of thoughts is still and the sun enters completely the path of Meru (i.e., susumnā); when its fiery state has increased, the moon melts and the body is quickly made full; when an abundance of bliss rises up and the darkness of delusion, such as [the thoughts] 'yours' and 'mine', departs, and when the aperture of the skull bursts open, the extraordinary and unprece-dented union of Śiva and Śakti prevails.35

The above verse combines the metaphysics of the Amṛtasiddhi with those of earlier Śaiva traditions. Moving the sun into the central channel (meru) is mentioned in a passage of the Amṛtasiddhi (4.5–10) that describes a process of uniting the sun and moon. The aim of the Amṛtasiddhi’s yoga is to prevent the sun devouring the moon’s nectar. However, rather than conserving the nectar in the moon, the above verse incorporates the different idea of the moon melting and filling the body, presumably, with nectar. The notion of flooding the body with nectar in order to purify and rejuvenate it can be found in early Saiddhāntika works, including the Kiraṇa and Mrgendratatana (Tāntrikābhidhānakosa 2000 vol 1, p. 138). The verse concludes with uniting Śiva and Śakti, rather than the sun and moon. The association of śakti, or more specifically kuṇḍalinī, with nectar may not have been new to Śaivas, because a nectarean kuṇḍalinī (kuṇḍalī) is mentioned in the pre-tenth century Śaṅkta scripture, the Tantrasadbhā (Tāntrikābhidhānakosa 2000 vol 1, p. 136.),46 and kuṇḍalinī is associated with nectar (amṛta) in a pre-tenth century Saiddhāntika work, the Sārdhatriśatiśikālottara (12.1–2).47 Also, there is a precedent in the Śaiva work called the Jayadrathayāmala for the practice of a mudrā (karana) that releases nectar and unites Śiva and Śakti.48

45 Amaraughaprabodha (beta) 13 (nīrūte cittarāje viśati khararucu merumārgam samantād udriktē udriktē vahñibhāve dravati saṣadhare pārayaty āśu kāye | udyaty ānandavṛne tvajati tavamametyādi-mohānāhakāre prodbhinne brahmarandhre jayati śivāśivāsāngamaḥ ko ‘py apīryaḥ ll 13a nīrūte ] : nīrūte Ed. 13a cittarāje ] G1, A2 : cittarāte B, A2, G2, T, Ed. 13a viśati ] G1, A2 : vrajati B, A2, G2, T, Ed. 13a khararucu ] B, A2, G2, T, Ed : khararuce G1, A2, 12a merumārgam ] B, A2, G2, T, Ed : merudurge G1, A2, 13b udriktē ] conj. : udrikte T : udraṇē T, A2, G2 : durvyē Ed. 12b dravati ] G1, A2 : śravati B, A2, G2, Ed : +++ T. 13b saṣadhare ] +++ T. 13b pārayaty āśu kāye ] B, A2, G2, Ed : pārayāvā tu kāyām G1, A2 : ++aty āśu kāye T. udyaty ānandavṛne ] A2, G2, T, Ed : utp +utānānandake G1 : unmatyānandake A2 : udyatānandavrne B (unmetr.). 13c tvajati ] jatay A2, 13c tava- ] śiva- A2, 13c -mametyādi ] A2, G2, T, Ed : -mamevandī B : -mukhetīdi- G1, A2, 13c unmatyānandake ] + +hānāhakāre T. 13d śivāśivāsāngamaḥ ] A2, Ed : śivāśivāsāngamaḥ B, T, G1 : śivāśi+sangamaḥ A2 : śivāśivāsāngamaḥ G2 (unmetr.). 13d apīryaḥ ] apīryam B.

46 On the date of the Tantrasadbhā, see Sanderson (2001, p. 4 (n.1), 20–35).

47 See Hatley (forthcoming, pp. 2–3). On the date of this work, see Goodall (2004, p. lxxxvii).

48 For the reference and translation of this passage, see Mallinson (2007, p. 21, 177 n. 79). Also, two fourteenth-century works, the Khecarīvidyā (3.1–15) and a section on yoga in the Śāṅgadharapaddhati, contains passages on flooding of the body with nectar by uniting Śiva and Śakti (Mallinson 2007, pp. 28, 131).
Although the *Amaraughaprabodha*’s section on Ṣaiva terminology and metaphysics have been introduced at key places to give the impression that this is a Śaiva form of yoga. In order to demonstrate this, as well as examine other issues around the relationship between the two texts and the Śaiva conception of Ṣaiva yoga, I shall compare the descriptions of *mahāmudrā* and the results of practising it in both texts. The *Amaraughaprabodha* describes it as follows:

Having pressed the perineum with the left foot and having held the extended right foot with both hands, [the yogin] should breathe in through the mouth. Having fixed the lock in the throat, [the yogin] should hold the breath upwards. Just as a snake hit with a stick becomes [straight] like a stick, so, the coiled *śakti* [called] *kunḍalinī* suddenly becomes straight. Then, she resides in [a vessel] with two halves and has a death-like state. Great afflictions, etc., and problems, such as death, are destroyed. For this reason, the wisest call [it] the ‘great mudrā’.\(^{49}\)

As depicted in Fig. 2, the yogin in *mahāmudrā* is in an asymmetrical position, with one leg straight and the other bent. The heel of the bent leg presses against the perineum, his hands hold the foot of the extended leg, over which his torso is folded forward.

If one compares the description of *mahāmudrā* in the *Amaraughaprabodha* with the *Amṛtasiddhi* (11.3–10) states:

Having pressed the perineum carefully with the heel of the left foot, [the yogin] should hold firmly with both hands the right [foot of the] extended leg. Having put his hips on an āsana [mat], placed the chin on the chest, closed the nine doors [of the body], filled the belly with the breath, he should focus the mind on the crossroads and undertake control of the breath. Having broken the flow of the moon and sun, he should stop the breath. This digests impurity, assimilates semen and the inner resonance, causes *prāna* to move through all the channels and stimulates the fire [in the body]. By uniting body, speech and mind, mastery of body, speech and mind certainly arises through the practice [of this *mudrā*] by the yogin who has progressed on the path. Because of this

---

\(^{49}\) *Amaraughaprabodha* (beta) 19–22 (pādamūlāna vāmena yoniṃ sampāśya daṅśinām | pādaṃ prasāritam dṛtvā karabhāyaṃ pārayen mukhe ||19|| kānthe bandhaṃ samāropya dhārayed vāyum uṛdhvataḥ | yathā daṅḍāhaṭaḥ sarpo daṅḍakāraḥ praṭīye ṛjavāt | ṛjavāt tathā śaktih kunḍali sahasā bhavet | tadāsau maraṇāvaśaṭāḥ jāyate dvipūṣṭītāḥ ||21|| mahāklesādayo dosā bhidyante maraṇādayaḥ | mahāmudrāṃ tu tenaiva vadant vibuddhottamāḥ ||22|| 19c pādaṃ prasāritam | G1. A2 : prasāritam padam A1, G2, T. Ed : prasāritam pada B. 19c dṛtvā | G1, A2 : kṛtvā B, A1, G2, T. Ed. 19d mukhe | mukham B. 20a kānthe | kānthe B. 20a bandham | baddham T. 20a-b samāropya dhārayed | G1, A2 : samāropya kṛdhāraṇa A1 : samāropya dhāraṇa G2, T. Ed : samāropya cādhāraṇa B (unmetr.). 20c sarvo | sarvo B. 20d daṅḍakāraḥ | G1, A2, B. Ed : daṅḍakāra A1, G2, T. 21a ṛjavāt | G1, A2, Ed : ṛjavāt G2 : ṛjavāt B : ṛjavātā B : ṛjavātā A1 : ṛjavātā+ T. 21a tathā | G1, A2 : tathā B, A1, G2, Ed : ++ T. śaktih | G1, A2, Ed : śakti- B, A1, G2, T. 22a mahāklesādayo dosā | G1 : mahāklesādayo dosā A2 : mahārūpā mahāklesā B, A1, G2, T. Ed. 22b bhidyante | G1, A2 : jīryante B, A1, G2, T. Ed. 22c tu | G1, A2 : ca B, G2, T. Ed : ci A1. 22c tenaiva | G1, A2, B : tenainām A1, G2, T, Ed. 22d vibuddhottamāḥ | hi vibuddhottamāḥ B.
mudrā, everything [good] is sure to arise for a yogin. Therefore, one should diligently practice this great mudrā. Of all the mudrās, it is great and independent. Therefore, the best of the wise call it the ‘great mudrā.’ Death is held in check by it. Therefore, it is always beneficial. The exercise (yantra) is mastered by one whose mind is concentrated. 50

When these two passages are placed side by side, as in Table 6, the most conspicuous difference is that the Amaraughaprabodha is more succinct and uses different syntax and terminology. Furthermore, the Amaraughaprabodha has the additional instruction that the yogin should breathe in through the mouth (highlighted in bold in Table 6), and several other directives are missing, such as focusing the mind on the crossroads (catuḥpatha). These significant differences raise the question of whether the redactor of the Amaraughaprabodha used the Amṛtasiddhi or some other (currently unknown) source to redact the section on Haṭhayoga. If it was the Amṛtasiddhi, then the redactor radically truncated and modified the Amṛtasiddhi’s account of mahāmudrā. Some of the added details and omissions might be explained by variations or alternative views of the practice. However, it is more difficult to

50 Amṛtasiddhi 11.3–10 (yoniṃ sampūdya vāmena pādamūlena yatnataḥ | savyam prasāritaṃ pādaṃ karābhyaṃ dhārayed drīḍham | āsane kaṭim āropya cibukam ṛṇayopari | nava dvārāni saṇyamyam kuśim āpūrya vāyūnā | citam catuḥpathe kṛtvā ārāheta prāṇayantraṇam | candrārkayor gatim bhaṅktvā kuryād vāyuniवर्णam | jāraneyam kaṣāyasya cāranaṃ bindunādyoḥ | cāranaṃ sar- vanādiṃnaṃ analasya ca dīpanaṃ | kāyavākṣittayogena kāyavākṣittasādhanam | bhaved abhyāsato 'vāyaṃ mārgārūḍhasya yogināḥ | anayā mudrayā sarvam jāyate yogino dhruvam | tasmād enām pravatnena mahāmudrāṃ samabhyaset | sarvāśaṃ eva mudrānāṃ maḥaṭṭyam svayambhuvā | mahāmudrāṃ ca tenaināṃ vadvantī vibudhottamaḥ | anayā bādhyate mṛtyur hiteyam tena sarvadā | cetasā vidhṛtā yena yantraṃ teneiva nirjītam).
| Table 6  | Descriptions of Mahāmudrā in the Amṛtasiddhi and the Amaraughaprabodha |
|----------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Amṛtasiddhi 11.3–10 | Amaraughaprabodha 19–22 |

The practice of Mahāmudrā

| Amṛtasiddhi | Amaraughaprabodha |
|-------------|-------------------|
| yoniṃ sampūdya vāmena pādamālāna yatnataḥ 1 | pādamālāna vāmena yoniṃ sampūdya daksinam 1 |
| savyāṃ prasāritāṃ pādam karābhyyāṃ dhārayed ṣṛdham 113 1 | pādam prasāritāṃ dhṛtvā karābhyyāṃ pūrayen mukhe 119 1 |
| āsane kaṭim āropya cībukam hrdayopari 1 | kaṇṭhe bandhāṃ samāropya dhārayed vāyum ārdhvataḥ 1 |
| nava dvārāṃ samānyāṃ kākṣim āpūrya vāyunā 141 1 | |
| cītṛṭaṃ catuḥpathe kṛtvā ārabhēt prāṇayantraṇam 1 | |
| candrārkayor gatāṃ bhāṅktvā kuryād vāyunīvaṣṭaṃ 115 1 | |

The results of the practice

| Amṛtasiddhi | Amaraughaprabodha |
|-------------|-------------------|
| jāreṇyaṃ kaśāyasya cāraṇaṃ bindunādayoḥ 1 | yathā dāṇḍāhataḥ sarpo dāṇḍākāraḥ prayāyate 120 1 |
| cālanaṃ sarvanāḍṇāṃ analasya ca dīpanaṃ 116 1 | tṛvibhūtā tathā śaktiḥ kuṇḍalī sahasā bhavet 1 |
| kāyavākṛtayogena kāyavākṛtayogenaśāntaḥ 1 | tadāsau marāṇavasthaḥ jāyate dvipuṣṭāritā 121 1 |
| bhaṇde abhyāsato ‘vāyaṃ mārgārūḍhaṣya yogaṁ 171 1 | mahāklesādaṇḍaḥ dosā bhīdante marāṇaḍayah 1 |
| anayā mudrayā sarvaṃ jāyate yogino dhūvam 1 | mahāmudrāṇi tu tenaiva vadanti vibudhottamāḥ 122 1 |
| tasmād enaṃ prayatnena mahāmudrāṃ samabhyaṣet 118 1 | |
| sarvāṇaṃ eva mudrāṇaṃ mahātmyaṃ svayambhūvā 1 | |
| mahāmudrāṃ ca tenaivaṃ vadanti vibudhottamāḥ 119 1 | |
| anayā bādhyaṃ mṛtyur hiteyaṃ tena sarvadā 1 | |
| cetasaḥ vidhṛtā yena yantraṃ tenaiva nirjitaṃ 110 1 | |

---

**Notes:**
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propose reasons for why a redactor would truncate the *Amṛtasiddhi*’s account to the extent seen in the *Amaraughaprabodha*.

Indeed, it seems possible, if not probable, that the *Amaraughaprabodha* has preserved an older and more rudimentary account of this yoga than that of the *Amṛtasiddhi*. One might further propose that this older work was a source text for the *Amṛtasiddhi*, because the latter has verses in common with the *Amaraughaprabodha*. Even if the *Amaraughaprabodha*’s teachings on Haṭhayoga derive from a text that was older than the *Amṛtasiddhi*, the original source must have been composed in a Vajrayāna milieu because the remnants of this tradition’s distinct system of four blisses, voids and moments are apparent in the *Amaraughaprabodha*. Therefore, the most significant change made by the redactor of the *Amaraughaprabodha* to the description of mahāmudrā was the introduction of the Śaiva metaphysics of *kuṇḍalinī* (highlighted in bold in Table 6).

In the *Amaraughaprabodha*, mahāmudrā is likened, in effect, to a stick that is used to kill a snake. It strikes the coiled *kuṇḍalinī* and forces her to become straight. Such notions of force, as well as the metaphysics of *kuṇḍalinī*, are absent in the *Amṛtasiddhi*. So, it would seem that Śaivas understood the notion of force (haṭha) in Haṭhayoga as referring to the forceful effect of its practice on *kuṇḍalinī*. This understanding probably extended to the general aim of the three mudrās, which was to force *kuṇḍalinī* and prāṇa up through the central channel to pierce the three knots (granthi). Similar forceful effects, in particular on *apānavāyu*, semen and *kuṇḍalinī*, can be found in other early works on Haṭhayoga and, in my opinion, provide the strongest indication for the intended meaning of haṭhayoga in the formative phase of this type of yoga (Birch 2011, pp. 544–545).

Both the *Amaraughaprabodha* and the *Amṛtasiddhi* use terms from Rasasāstra, such as jāraṇa (‘digesting’) and cāraṇa (‘assimilating’), to describe the effects of mahāmudrā. In the *Amaraughaprabodha*’s description, the pressing of the perineum and the application of the throat lock (bandha) seem to create something akin to an alchemical vessel with two halves or lids (dvipaṭṭa). Presumably, this vessel is the central channel after it has been blocked above and below by the locks, which envelop and hold *kuṇḍalinī* in a death-like state (maraṇavasthā). Although the meaning of maraṇavasthā is not entirely clear to me in the context of raising *kuṇḍalinī* to meet Śiva in or above the brahmaraṇdhra, it seems that the redactor may have been alluding to the process of ‘killing’ (māraṇa), which in Rasasāstra refers to heating a substance in a burning pit (puṭa) until it turns to ash. These

51 I am assuming here that the term puṭa is referring more specifically to a vessel or burning pit, rather than the process of heating a metal, which involves a pit, an enclosed vessel and fuel for the fire (puṭapāka). Hellwig (2009, p. 307) states that both meanings are possible but can be difficult to distinguish in texts: “Die Erhitzung mit puṭas, der puṭapāka, ist eine zentrale Verfahrensweise der indischen Alchemie. Da sich Vorgangsbezeichnung (puṭapāka) und praktischer Aufbau (puṭa) an den meisten Fundstellen nicht unterscheiden lassen und der Begriff puṭa für beide Konzepte benutzt wird, werden sie in einem Artikel behandelt.” I would like to thank James Mallinson for this idea and the reference.

52 “Trotz oder gerade wegen seiner enormen Bedeutung für die indische Alchemie wird das māraṇa (‘Töten’) nicht formal definiert. Zentrales Element aller māraṇa-Vorschriften ist aber das Erhitzen einer Substanz, in dessen Verlauf diese Substanz in ein bhasman (‘Asche’) transformiert wird.” (Hellwig 2009, p. 238).
alchemical metaphors, which are also found in the *Amrtasiddhi*, imply that *kundalinī* is transformed irreversibly from her coiled to erect state in the central channel.\(^{53}\) The *Amaraughaprabodha*’s description of the second *mudrā* called *mahābandha* includes two metaphysical terms, namely *triveni* and *kedāra*, that do not occur in the *Amrtasiddhi*.\(^{54}\) The technical term *triveni*, which usually means the confluence of the three main channels in other Hatha- and Rājyoga texts,\(^{55}\) would probably have been known to a Śaiva audience judging by its appearance in earlier Śaiva works, such as the *Kubjikāmatatantra*, in which it is mentioned along with the channels (5.170–72) and located in the navel (25.93). The *Kuṭcitāṃghristava*, which was composed in Cidambaram in the fourteenth century, locates it in the heart. This confluence, also known as the *prāyāga*, was considered one of eight sacred places in early Śaivism, as attested in works such as the *Niśvāsaguhya* (1.29–34) and the *Tantrasadbhāva* (15.62).\(^{56}\) *Kedāra*, which is generally located in the head,\(^{57}\) is included in lists of forty sacred sites (śīrtha) in “the Śivadharma and throughout the scriptural authorities of the Mantramārga” (Sanderson 2003, p. 405).\(^{58}\) Both these terms appear to have been added by the redactor of the *Amaraughaprabodha* to make the practice of *mahābandha* appeal to a Śaiva audience.

The account of *mahāvedha* in the *Amaraughaprabodha* does not introduce terminology that is peculiar to Śaivism and absent in the *Amrtasiddhi*. In fact, the challenge the redactor appeared to face in composing the remaining portion of the section on Hathayoga was modifying or removing concepts unique to Buddhism, in particular the technical terms from the sexual yoga of some Vajrayāna works, which incorporate systems of four blisses, moments and voids (Sferra 2000, pp. 31–33), as seen in Table 7.

\(^{53}\) I wish to thank James Mallinson for pointing out to me the meaning and implications of this alchemical terminology in the *Amaraughaprabodha*, which occurs in the *Amrtasiddhi* in the passage translated above as well as 14.14ab. Until now, I have been inclined to understand *Amaraughaprabodha* (beta) 21cd as later commentators did (see below). I also wish to thank Dagmar Wujastyk for her comments on this hemistich and its alchemical metaphors.

\(^{54}\) *Amaraughaprabodha* (beta) 25: “And this [*mahābandha*] stops the upward flow of [air] in all the channels. It places the mind on the confluence of the three [main] currents and causes it to reach Kedāra (ayān ca sarvanādiṇāṁ ārḍhvasaṅgatinirodhakāḥ \ | trivenīśaṅgamaṁ dhatte kedaṁraṇaṁ prāpyan manah). *Amaraughaprabodha* (beta) 25ab ~ *Amrtasiddhi* 12.15ab (bandho *yaṁ* sarvanādiṇāṁ ārḍhvasaṅgatinirodhakaḥ) and *Amaraughaprabodha* (beta) 25cd is un traced.

\(^{55}\) The term *triveni* is used in the *Śivasamhitā* (5.169–172) to refer to the confluence of the Gaṅgā, Yamunā and Sarasvatī rivers, which are equated with *iḍā*, *pingalā* and the central channel, respectively. In the *Yogaprakāśikā* (5.27), Bālakṛṣṇa gives the same information (*iḍādīrtiyayārūpīṇī yā trivenī gaṅgāyamunāsaravatirūpā tāyā prāṇavāyoh sambandham [...]*). The *Gheraṇḍasamhitā* (5.88) locates it in the nostrils.

\(^{56}\) *Kedāra*’s description of the second *mudrā* called *mahābandha* includes two metaphysical terms, namely *triveni* and *kedāra*, that do not occur in the *Amrtasiddhi*.\(^{54}\) The technical term *triveni*, which usually means the confluence of the three main channels in other Hatha- and Rājyoga texts,\(^{55}\) would probably have been known to a Śaiva audience judging by its appearance in earlier Śaiva works, such as the *Kubjikāmatatantra*, in which it is mentioned along with the channels (5.170–72) and located in the navel (25.93). The *Kuṭcitāṃghristava*, which was composed in Cidambaram in the fourteenth century, locates it in the heart. This confluence, also known as the *prāyāga*, was considered one of eight sacred places in early Śaivism, as attested in works such as the *Niśvāsaguhya* (1.29–34) and the *Tantrasadbhāva* (15.62).\(^{56}\) *Kedāra*, which is generally located in the head,\(^{57}\) is included in lists of forty sacred sites (śīrtha) in “the Śivadharma and throughout the scriptural authorities of the Mantramārga” (Sanderson 2003, p. 405).\(^{58}\) Both these terms appear to have been added by the redactor of the *Amaraughaprabodha* to make the practice of *mahābandha* appeal to a Śaiva audience.

\(^{57}\) I wish to thank Somadeva Vasudeva for these references (p.c. 19.4.2018).

\(^{58}\) *Prāyāga* would refer to the confluence of sacred rivers in Allahabad and *kedāra* to Kedarnath in the Indian Himalayas.
The *Amṛtasiddhi* incorporates this terminology, with the exception of *viramāṇanda, vilkaṇaṇakṣaṇa* and *sarvaśūnya*. The *Amaraughaprabodha* does not mention the four moments at all, but includes three blisses and voids. Although this specific system of blisses and voids may be unique to Vajrayāna, terms such as *ānanda, paramānanda, śūnya* and *mahāśūnya* are scattered throughout Śaiva works. Furthermore, some Śaivas were probably familiar with progressive stages of sounds and void-like meditative states in their own tradition.⁵⁹ Therefore, it would seem that the redactor of the *Amaraughaprabodha* deliberately excluded terminology that was specific to Vajrayāna, but was willing to include terms that occur in Śaiva works. This strategy is evident in a comparison of the following parallel passages of the *Amṛtasiddhi* and the *Amaraughaprabodha*. In the first example, the *vicitra* moment has been emended to a ‘vicitra’ sound:

**Table 7** Blisses, moments and voids in Vajrayāna

| Blisses      | Moments | Voids         |
|--------------|---------|---------------|
| ānanda       | vicitra | śūnya         |
| paramānanda  | vipāka  | atiśūnya      |
| viramāṇanda  | vimardā | mahāśūnya     |
| sahajāṇanda  | vilkaṇa | sarvaśūnya     |

The *Amṛtasiddhi*:

When the first stage is completed and Brahmā’s knot pierced, then, a biting [sensation] and the perception of a little bliss in the central channel arise. One also enters into voidness and the *vicitra* moment arises.⁶⁰

The *Amaraughaprabodha*:

Because of piercing Brahmā’s knot, bliss arises in the void. The unstruck resonance, which has various [musical] sounds (*vicitraṇaka*), is heard in the body.⁶¹

Whether the redactor of the *Amaraughaprabodha* was responsible for this unobtrusive emendation is not certain because the south-Indian manuscripts of the *Amṛtasiddhi* also preserve *vicitraṇaka*, which is one of many instances where the Indian transmission has changed technical terms of Vajrayāna into something

---

⁵⁹ For a discussion of internal sounds and void-like meditative states, see Vasudeva (2004, pp. 263–271, 336–342).

⁶⁰ *Amṛtasiddhi* 19.14–15ab (ekāvasthā yadā pūrṇā vedho 'yaṃ brahmagranthitaḥ | tadā daṁśo bhaven madhye kiṃcidānandadarṣaṇāṃ || śūnyatānupraveśo 'pi vicitraṇaṇasaṃbhavam).

⁶¹ Amaraughaprabodha (beta) 35 (brahmagranthes tathā bhedād ānandā śūnyasambhavaḥ | vicitraṇakan dehe 'nāhataḥ śrīyate dhvaniḥ || 35a -granthes tathā | G1 : -grage satato A2 (unmetr.) : -granther bhaved B, A1, G2, T : -granthe bhaved Ed. 35a bhedād | G1, A2 : vedhād G2, Ed : vedhā B, A1, T. 35b ānandā śūnyasambhavaḥ | G1, A2, A1, G2, T : nandā śūnyasambhavaḥ B (unmetr.) : ānandā+nyasambhavam Ed. 35c -kvaṇako | B, A1, G2, T : -kvaniko G1 : -kako A2 (unmetr.). 35d 'nāhataḥ | A1, G2, T : nāhataḥ Ed : 'nāhate A2 : nāhate G1 : 'nvāhata B).
more intelligible to non-Buddhist yogins. Therefore, it is possible that vicitrakṣaṇa had already become vicitrakṣaṇa in a south-Indian version of the Amṛtasiddhi by the time the Amaraughaprabodha was written.

In another example, the redactor of the Amaraughaprabodha removed the reference to the vimardha moment by omitting the word for moment (kṣaṇa). In this case, vimarda would have been understood by a non-Buddhist in its more general sense of ‘pounding’.

The Amṛtasiddhi:

[…] When the second stage is complete, the [state] beyond the void arises. Then, the sound of the bherī drum occurs in the middle channel and the vimarda moment.

The Amaraughaprabodha:

[…] Then, because of piercing Viṣṇu’s knot, a pounding [sound] (vimarda), which is indicative of supreme bliss, arises beyond the void. Then, the sound of a bherī drum occurs.

It is worth asking why the redactor of the Amaraughaprabodha retained any of the Amṛtasiddhi’s technical terminology peculiar to Vajrayāna, given that less ingenuity would have been required to remove it altogether. For example, one might question the need of a verse at the end of the description of mahāvedha in the Amaraughaprabodha, which states that the yogin should know the conjuction of the moon, sun and fire in order to achieve immortality. These metaphysical notions are important in the Amṛtasiddhi, but none are mentioned elsewhere in the Amaraughaprabodha’s section on Haṭhayoga. The inclusion of this verse, as well as terms like vicītra and vimarda, suggests that the intended audience of the Amaraughaprabodha was familiar with the Buddhist origins of this yoga. Therefore, although the redactor of the Amaraughaprabodha may have composed the text to lay claim to Haṭhayoga as a Śaiva practice, it seems that the system of blisses, voids and sounds could not be dispensed with entirely, perhaps because this type of Vajrayāna yoga was still known at the time of writing. The likelihood of this and the possibility that the redactor was using a more rudimentary version of the Amṛtasiddhi points to an early date (i.e., the twelfth century) for the composition of the short recension of the Amaraughaprabodha. Be this as it may, it seems that the short recension of the Amaraughaprabodha was composed close to the time of the Amṛtasiddhi, when the yoga of the latter was still known, especially in communities transitioning from

---

62 For a discussion and more examples of such changes, see Mallinson (2016b).
63 I would like to thank Dominic Goodall for pointing this out to me.
64 Amṛtasiddhi 20.7 (sampūrṇāyām dvitiyāyām atisūnyam prajāyate | bheriśabdās tadā madhye vimardāsca saṃdhye).
65 Amaraughaprabodha (beta) 38 (viṣṇugranthes tato bhedēt paramānandāsucakah | atiśūnye vimardas ca bheriśabdās tato bhavet || 38a tato | G1, A2 : tathā B, A1, G2, T, Ed. 38a bhedēt A2 : vedhāt G2, A1, T, Ed : om. B (unmetr.). atiśūnye | A1, G2, T, Ed : atiśūnyo G3, A2, B. 38d bheriśabdās | bheriṇādās A2, 38d tato | G1, A2 : tathā B, Ed : tadā A1, G2, T).
66 Amaraughaprabodha (beta) 30ab (somasā rhys bounced jānyād amṛtya vai | 30a -sambandhaṃ | A1, G2, T, Ed : -sambandhā B : -sambandhāy G1, A2, 30b jānyād ] dāniryyād B).
Buddhism to Śaivism. This supports James Mallinson’s proposal (2016b, p. 11 n. 25 and forthcoming) that the Amaraughaprabodha was composed in such a community at Kadri in Karnataka, owing to the text’s opening invocation to the wise Siddhabuddha, a disciple of Matsyendranātha from that locality.

Apart from introducing Śaiva terms and metaphysics and obscuring or omitting Vajrayāna ones, the Śaiva appropriation of the Amṛtasiddhi’s yoga is achieved by making it subordinate to Rājayoga. This so-called ‘king of all yogas’ probably had an older association with Śaivism, as evinced by a Śaiva work known as the Amanaska, which teaches the attainment of the no-mind state by the practice of śāmbhavī mudrā. The Amanaska was known in Gujarat in the mid-twelfth century (Birch 2014, p. 406 n. 21), so it was probably composed in the eleventh or early twelfth century. The redactor of the Amaraughaprabodha alludes to the Śaiva origins of Rājayoga by referring to the liṅga in the final verse on Rājayoga,68 and by defining the term amaraugha (literally, ‘a flood of nectar’ or ‘a multitude of immortals’) as Rājayoga. It is likely that the term amaraugha would have reminded Śaivas of the divine stream of teachings known as the divyaugha in earlier Kaula scriptures,69 while also conveying meanings close to that of amṛtasiddhi (‘the attainment of nectar/immortality’). Moreover, any association Hathayoga might have had with Buddhism when the Amaraughaprabodha was composed would surely not have deterred Śaivas from adopting a system of yoga in which Hathayoga was only one option of several auxiliary methods for the attainment of Rājayoga.

Furthermore, the redactor of the Amaraughaprabodha appears to have distanced Hathayoga from the yoga of the Amṛtasiddhi by omitting any mention of semen (bindu) in the section on Hathayoga. In keeping with the sexual yoga of the Kālacakrā tradition (Sferra 2000, p. 32), the Amṛtasiddhi is very much concerned with retaining semen. An introductory verse of the Amaraughaprabodha states that there are two types of Hathayoga: one practised with the internal resonance (nāda) and the other with semen (bindu).70 Although the yogin is advised to avoid frequenting fire, women and roads in the initial stage of practice,71 the emphasis on internal sounds and the absence of references to semen indicate that the first type of Hathayoga, rather than the second, was taught. A further distinction can be seen in the way both works interpret nectar. In the Amaraughaprabodha, nectar (amara) is

67 See Mallinson (2016b) for information on the Buddhist milieu in which the Amṛtasiddhi was probably composed.

68 Amaraughaprabodha (beta) 44a: “[For the Rājayogin[,] that into which the universe is easily dissolved is called [Śiva’s] Liṅga” (līnāṁ yatra carāca raṁ sukhavasāt tāl liṅgam ity ucyate | 44a yatra | yatri A1. 44a sukhavasāt | G1, A2 : layavasāt B, A1, G2, T, Ed. 44a. taliṅgam | talyangam A2).

69 Amaraughaprabodha (beta) 14ab: “Only this unique amaraugha has the name Rājayoga” (eka evāmaragho ‘yaṁ rājayagābhidhānakah | 14a evāmaragho ‘yaṁ | emend.: evāmaragho yaṁ G1, A2 : evāmaragho hi B, A1, G2, T : evāmaragho hi Ed. 14b -dhiṅakaṇ B, A1, G2, T, Ed. -dhiṅakaṇ G1, A2). I am grateful to Somadeva Vasudeva for pointing this out to me. For more information on divyaugha, see the Tāntrikābhidhānakosa vol 3 (2013, p. 168).

70 Amaraughaprabodha (beta) 4cd (hātho ‘pi dvividhā proko nādbinduṇīveṇavāt | 4c dvividhā) B, A1, G2, T, Ed : dvividhā G1 : dvividhā G2, A2, 4c proko G1, A2 : kvāpi B1, A1, G2, T, Ed. 4d nāda- | G1 : rāda- A2 : vāyu- B, A1, G2, Ed : vāyu T, 4d : binduṇīveṇavāt | +++++++ T).

71 Amaraughaprabodha (beta) 33cd: “[The yogin] should avoid at first frequenting fire, women and roads” (vahnistrīpātheśevānām ādau varjanam ācāret || 33c -patha- | A2, A1, G2, T, Ed : -padha- B : -pathi- G1).
associated with Rājayoga, which is defined as meditative absorption, whereas in the Amṛtasiddhi nectar (amṛta) corresponds with semen in the male body.\textsuperscript{73}

Some of the metaphysics and terminology specific to the Amṛtasiddhi continued to be used by authors of works on Ṣaivism up until the nineteenth century, partly because of the significant amount of verses that Śvētāmbara borrowed from the Amaraughaprabodha's section on Ṣaivism. The passage on the four stages of yoga, in which the knots are pierced and various blisses, sounds and voids arise, was incorporated into the fourth chapter of the Hathapradīpiṇī as the practice of nādānusandhāna (‘fusing the mind with the internal resonance’).\textsuperscript{74} In other cases, the original meaning of the technical terminology was lost and reintepreted. For example, the alchemical terms dvipuṭa and putadvaya have been interpreted by commentators as dvināśāpūta (‘the two nostrils’) and the channels idā and piṅgala.\textsuperscript{75}

In the Yogacintāmaṇi, Śivānanda rewrote the verse on kundalini to say that she destroys the state of death, and Bhavadeva interpreted it to mean that, after the practice of mahāmudrā, kundalini resides in the two nostrils.\textsuperscript{76} Furthermore, it is likely that Śvētāmbara and others understood a verse on the conjunction of the moon, sun and fire as referring to the intersection of the channels called idā, piṅgala and suṣumnā,\textsuperscript{77} because this meaning of moon, sun and fire can be found in early Śaiva works and even two yoga texts, the Vivekamārtanda and the Śivasamhitā, known to him.\textsuperscript{78}

Conclusion

The relationship between the Amṛtasiddhi and the beta recension of the Amaraughaprabodha provides a window onto the early history of Ṣaivism, which was shaped significantly by the exchange of ideas and techniques between Buddhism and Śaivism in

\textsuperscript{73} Amaraughaprabodha (beta) 3d, 42ab: “Rājayoga is that [state] which is free of mental activity. […] Then, having become one [with the flute-like sound], the mind is called Rājayoga” (yaś cātvrṭīrhaṁ sa tu rājayogah || […] || ekbhītām tadā cītaṁ rājayogābhīdhānakan | 42b rājayogābhīdhānakan | G1, B, A1, G2, Ed : rājayogo bhādhīyte A2 : ++yogā hi dhānakam T). Also see footnote 67.

\textsuperscript{74} Hathapradīpiṇī 4.69–77 = Amaraughaprabodha (beta) 34–42.

\textsuperscript{75} After quoting on mahāmudrā from the Hathapradīpiṇī, Bhavadeva glosses dvipuṭāśrītā as nāsāpūtadvayāśrītā (Yuktabhavadeva 7.187). In the Jyotsnā (3.27), Brahmānanda glosses putadvaya as pūtayor davyam idāpīṅgalayor yugnam.

\textsuperscript{76} Yogacintāmaṇi, p. 133; “Then she destroys the state of death, which is the basis of adversity” (tathāsau maranāvasthāḥ harate vipadāśrayām). A similar reading is found in an eighteenth-century recension of the Hathapradīpiṇī with ten chapters (5.17ab) (tadā sā maranāvasthā harate dvipuṭāśrītā). A commentary on this text, the Yogaprakāśikā (5.17) understands this as mahāmudrā by destroying the state of death which resides in the two nostrils (yadā kundaliniḥ bodhasamaye vāyoy bahir nirgamanam antaḥ praveśa iti yat putadvayam tam āśrītām maranāvasthāḥ harate mahāmudre ṛbhaiḥ). In Yuktabhavadeva 7.187, Bhavadeva says, “When the retention of the breath is being done thus, kundalini becomes agitated and resides in the two nostrils along with apāna and pṛāṇa” (evaṁ vāyuḥāraṇāyam kriyamāṇāyaṁ vyākula bhūtā kundalini apānaprāṇḥbhāyam saha nāśāpūtadvayāśrītā bhavati)

\textsuperscript{77} Amaraughaprabodha (beta) 30ab (somasūryāgniṃ saṃbandhaṃ jāniyād amṛtya vair 30a -saṃbandham | A1, G2, T, Ed : -saṃbandhā | B : -saṃbandhā | G1, A2, 30b jāniyād | dānīnyād B).

\textsuperscript{78} In the context of nāḍīs, references to somasūryāgni occur in the Tantrasadbhāva (24.141) and Śvaścchandatana (7.153–154). Also, see Vivekamārtanda 20–21 and Śivasamhitā 2.17. In Jyotnsā 3.28, Brahmānanda understands them in this way (“ somaṃ ca sūryās ca cānī ti ca somasūryānyayaḥ, somasūryāgniḥ adhais tadadhiśhitā nādyā idāpīṅgalāsūnumnāgrāhyās teṣām saṃbandhāḥ).
south India around the 11th and 12th centuries. It seems that some sects associated with
these religions devised physical methods of yoga on the understanding that prāna could
be deliberately manipulated within the body to attain samādhi and liberation with greater
efficacy and certainty than other methods. Even though proponents claimed that
Hathayoga would cure diseases, old age, suffering, death and so on,79 the notion that
forcefully manipulating prāṇa was dangerous (Birch 2011, pp. 538–539), as well as
broader trends toward gnosis and ritual in these religions, may have prevented this type of
yoga from becoming a central teaching of Śaivism or Vajrayāna. Nonetheless, Hathayoga
evolved as an auxiliary practice in systems of yoga associated with Goraksanātha.

Comparing the Amaraughaprabodha with the Amṛtasiddhi reveals that the doctrine
and metaphysics used to teach a physical yoga practice could change significantly
from one tradition to another, while the physical techniques remained essentially the
same. Furthermore, although the physical practice of the Amṛtasiddhi’s yoga is the
same as that of the Amaraughaprabodha, only a fraction of the former’s underlying
document was adopted by the latter. Physical yoga could be taught with minimal
document, and the transposition of its techniques from one sect to another was probably
a contributing factor to the doctrinal simplicity of early Hathayoga, which relied upon
basic ideas that were extracted from Vajrayāna and Śaivism. Its simplicity would have
made it easy to disseminate and adapt for people of various religions and social
circumstances, which might explain why its teachings endured for most of the second
millennium. A core group of physical techniques, in particular the mudrās and
bandhas, came to define Hathayoga, across sectarian divides, throughout its history
and made it a unique method for achieving samādhi and liberation.

The short recension of the Amaraughaprabodha is probably the earliest work to
combine Hatha- with Rājayoga and it likely predates the Dattātreyayogaśāstra (13th
century), which is a more syncretic text, by at least a century. The number and
sophistication of physical techniques associated with Hathayoga gradually increased in
the centuries following the Amaraughaprabodha, but the doctrine and theory remained
simple until shortly after the Ḥathapradīpikā, when Hathayoga was absorbed by
Brahmanical traditions. This resulted in the physical practices being merged with more
complex systems of the subtle body and philosophical teachings from Pātañjalayoga,
Vedānta and Tantra. Thus, by the eighteenth century, some erudite Brahmins were writing
large compendiums on Hathayoga, such as the Hathasāṅketacandrikā, and others
composed encyclopaedic digests on yoga that incorporated the distinct methods of
Hathayoga. Also, at this time, Upaniṣads based on Hathayoga texts were created and
references to Hathayoga appeared in commentaries on the Pātañjalayogaśāstra, such as
Vijñānabhikṣu’s Yogavārttika and Nārāyaṇatīrtha’s Yogasiddhāntacandrikā. This process
of assimilation marked the decline of Hathayoga as a distinct method, insofar as its
physical techniques and its emphasis on bodily health had become essential components of
more general notions of yoga in the modern period.
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### Appendix

Twelve of *beta’s* variant readings and six of *theta’s* (in red) match those of the *Hathapradipikā*.

| Verse No. | Theta | Beta | Hathapradipikā Ed. | Hathapradipikā Mss. |
|-----------|-------|------|--------------------|--------------------|
| 9a        | citte samatvam | citte tu sattvam | citte samatvam | citte samatvam |
| 29c       | prasārītaṃ padaṃ | pādaṃ prasārītaṃ | prasārītaṃ padaṃ | pādaṃ prasārītaṃ Kha, Pa pādaṃ prasārītaṃ Ka, Ga, Pha |
| 29c       | kṛtvā | dṛtvā | kṛtvā | dṛtvā Kha, Pa, Ga, Pha |
| 32a       | mahāroga | mahākleśādayo doṣā | mahākleśādayo doṣāḥ | mahākleśādayo doṣāḥ |
| 32b       | jīryante | bhidyant | kṣiyante | jīryante Ga, Ta |
| 34b       | hṛdaye cibuke kṛte | cibukāṃ hṛdaye | hṛdaye cibuke | hṛdaye cibuke |
| 35b       | gatviśodhanah | gatvibodñakah | gatiniroñakah | gatiniroñakah |
| 35c       | gatvā | dhatte | dhatte | dhatte |
| 38c       | āvṛtya | ārūḍhya | āvṛtya | āvṛtya |
| 39a       | bhūtvā | bhūmnau | bhūmnau | bhūmnau |
| 40c       | samākramya | samākṛṣya (Ga) | atikramya | samākṛṣya Ka, Kha, Ta, Tha, Pa samākramya Ga |
| 42c       | caittad | caiva | caiva | caiva |
| 45d       | yogāvasthā caturvidhā | cetassas tasya bhūmiaḥ | syād avasthā | cetassas tasya bhūmiaḥ catuṣṭayam |
| 46a       | vedhād | bhēdād | bhēdād | bhēdād |
| 47b       | -gandhas tv | -gandho hy | -gandhas tv | gandhas tv |
| 47c       | -hṛdayah śūra | -hṛdaye śūnye tv | -hṛdayah śūnya | hṛdaya śūnyah |
| 48a       | dvitītyāyāṃ ghāṭikṛtya | dvitīye saṅghaṭikṛtya | dvitīyāyāṃ ghāṭikṛtya | dvitīyāyāṃ ghāṭikṛtya |
| 48d       | jñānād eva samaprabhabha | jñānī devasamad tada | jñānī devasamad tatha | jñānī devasamas tadda Ka, Gha, Ya, Va |
| 49a       | tathā | tato | tato | tato |
| 49a       | vedhāt | bhēdāt | bhēdāt | bhēdāt |
| 50c       | tāḍā | tato | tāḍā | tāḍā |
| 50d       | sarvasaṃdhhi | sarvasiddhi | sarvasaṃdhhi | sarvasaṃdhhi |
| 51a       | tato jītvā | rocītvā | tāḍā jītvā | tāḍā jītvā |
| 51c       | doṣaṃṛtyu | doṣaduljkha | doṣaduljkha | doṣaduljkha |
| 51d       | -duṣkha | -mṛtyu | -vyāḍi | -mṛtyu -Ga |
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