

Differentiating the Concepts of “yoga” and “tantra” in Sanskrit Literary History

GERALD JAMES LARSON

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA BARBARA

Two of the most puzzling yet important terms in current research in South Asian Studies are the terms *yoga* and *tantra*, and the two books under review are important and welcome contributions to gaining some clarity regarding the meaning and significance of both. Both volumes are revised versions of Ph.D. dissertations, the former for the University of Bonn and the latter for Oxford University. Philipp André Maas provides the first critical edition of the first Pāda of the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra*, including both the *sūtrapāṭha* of the Samādhi Pāda and the *bhāṣya* attributed to Vyāsa, which he dates to the period of 325 to 425 C.E. James Mallinson provides the first critical edition of a well-known Hāṭha Yoga text, the *Khecarīvidyā*, many of the verses of which text are also to be found in the *Gorakṣasiddhāntasamgraha*, the *Yogakuṇḍalī Upaniṣad*, and the *Matsyendrasamhitā*, and a text that he dates to perhaps the fourteenth century C.E. or somewhat earlier. Both texts use the term *yoga* and both are important for understanding the meaning of the term *tantra*. What is striking, however, is that the two terms *yoga* and *tantra* have two distinctly different meanings in the respective traditions to which they belong, and before discussing these two new critical editions it is essential to make some historical and textual distinctions regarding the relation (*sambandha*) between *yoga* and *tantra* in these two environments. There is a great deal of popular as well as scholarly confusion regarding these terms that needs to be clarified and sorted out.

P. V. Kane in his massive *History of Dharmasāstra* makes the following observation:

... (t)here are really only two main systems of Yoga, viz., the one expounded in the *Yogasūtra* and its *Bhāṣya* by Vyāsa and the other dealt with in such works as the *Gorakṣasātaka*, the *Hathayogapradipikā* of Svātmārāmayogin with the commentary called *Jyotsnā* by Brahmānanda. Briefly, the difference between the two is that the Yoga of Patañjali concentrates all effort on the discipline of the mind, while Hāṭhayoga mainly concerns itself with the body, its health, its purity and freedom from diseases. (*History of Dharmasāstra*, vol. V [Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1977], 1427).

Pātañjala Yoga appears in the first centuries of the Common Era in a *sūtra*- compilation known simply as the *Yogasūtra*. It is presented, at least in its principal *bhāṣya* (attributed to a certain Vyāsa)—a *bhāṣya* that in nearly all manuscripts, printed or handwritten, appears with the *sūtrapāṭha*—as a *sāmāna-tantra* (‘common tradition’), or, perhaps better, as a *sāṃkhya-pravacana* (an ‘explanation of Sāṃkhya’), in other words, a classical system of Indian philosophy (*darśana*). Tradition links the compiler of the *sūtra-pāṭha*, Patañjali, with the famous

This is a review article of: *Samādhipāda: Das erste Kapitel des Pātañjalayogaśāstra zum ersten Mal kritisch ediert. The First Chapter of the Pātañjalayogaśāstra for the First Time Critically Edited.* By PHILIPP ANDRÉ MAAS. Geisteskultur Indiens. Texte und Studien, vol. 9. Aachen: SHAKER VERLAG, 2006. Pp. lxxxiii + 179. € 42,80.

The Khecarīvidyā of Ādinātha: A Critical Edition and Annotated Translation of an Early Text of Hathayoga. By JAMES MALLINSON. Routledge Studies in Tantric Traditions. London: ROUTLEDGE, 2007. Pp. viii + 299. \$125.

grammarians, Patañjali, of the *Mahābhāṣya*. Tradition likewise links the study of the self (*ātman*) or mind (*citta*) in Pātañjala Yoga with the two other principal “sciences” (*tantras* or *śāstras*) of the classical period (ca. third through the fifth century C.E.) in north Indian intellectual history. The two other sciences (or *tantras*) are, of course, the science of medicine (Āyurveda) and the science of grammar (Vyākaraṇa), both of which are also associated with the name Patañjali, and both of which were becoming mature *śāstras* in the early centuries C.E.

In addition to the association with the name Patañjali, all three *tantras* or ‘sciences’ likewise share three important features, namely, (1) an empirical evidentiary database, (2) systematic pragmatic experimentation, and (3) independence from religious authority. Regarding the latter feature, I mean that the focus of the subject matter in each instance is not dependent upon any particular sectarian orientation (Śaiva, Vaiṣṇava, Śākta, Buddhist, or Jaina), although, of course, the practitioners in each of the three *tantras* are often associated with various sectarian orientations. Sectarian orientation, however, is neither a necessary nor sufficient condition for the work in these *tantras*.

My own view is that the traditional linkage of Pātañjala Yoga, Āyurveda, and Vyākaraṇa is essentially correct both historically and intellectually, so long as one updates the historical data in the light of recent research. In this regard, the major issue has to do with the name Patañjali. The grammarian Patañjali, according to most researchers, worked in the second century B.C.E.; but the date of the *Yogasūtrapāṭha* attributed to Patañjali is apparently a good deal later. The *Yogasūtrapāṭha* is probably to be dated no earlier than the fourth century C.E. The principal reason for the later date of the *sūtrapāṭha* is the extensive incorporation of Buddhist notions and terms in all four books of the *Yogasūtrapāṭha*, notions and terms that can be traced plausibly only to the first centuries of the Common era. In this regard, Louis de la Vallee Poussin’s “Le Bouddhisme et le Yoga de Patañjali” (*Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques* 5 [1936–37]: 223–42), in which he traces some fifty terms and notions in all four Pādas of the *Yogasūtra* to Vasubandhu’s *Abhidharmakośa* and *Bhāṣya*, is still very much to the point in attempting to date the *Yogasūtrapāṭha*.

The obvious anachronism can be explained in either of two ways. Either there were two Patañjalis, one the grammarian and the other the compiler of the *Yogasūtrapāṭha*. Most scholars tend to accept this explanation, but not all. Or a portion or some of the *sūtras*, for example, the Yogāṅga “section” (YS II.28–III.5, or, according to J. W. Hauer, YS II.28–III.55), the so-called “eight-limbed Yoga section,” can be traced to the grammarian Patañjali. Other *sūtras* were then collected by an unknown compiler (for example, someone such as Vindhyanātha, the Śāṃkhyā teacher) with the whole being attributed to Patañjali, both for the sake of legitimating the new learned Yogaśāstra and for the sake of highlighting the obvious intellectual affinity of the three *tantras*. The latter explanation, I suspect, will eventually be shown to be correct when sufficient evidence emerges, but currently either explanation is plausible. For a full discussion see Gerald James Larson and Ram Shankar Bhattacharya, eds., *Yoga: India’s Philosophy of Meditation*, Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies, vol. 12 (Delhi: Motilal Banarsi Dass, 2008), 54–70.

In any case, as mentioned earlier, there is a natural affinity among the three *tantras* in terms of an empirical evidentiary base, systematic pragmatic experimentation, and independence from religious authority. In the case of Yoga, the database includes the study of bodily postures, breathing mechanisms, sensing and motor functioning, the analysis of mental states, ego awareness, and general cognitive performance. The experimental component includes careful daily practice of physical exercises and cognitive meditations under the guidance of a recognized expert or experts. Yoga in this sense of Pātañjala Yoga lends itself to any number

of sectarian orientations, but most often its primary affiliation is with Sāṃkhya philosophy, as clearly indicated in the colophons of all four sections of the *Yogaśūtra*. In this regard, as will be discussed below, the evidence is overwhelming in all printed texts and handwritten manuscripts, where the colophons read, “*iti pātnājale yogaśāstre sāṃkhyapravacane . . .*”

In the case of Āyurveda, the database includes detailed classifications of symptoms, detailed categorization of *materia medica* (herbal medications or “pharmaceuticals” of all sorts), and the use of *yukti* or pragmatic reasoning in the identification and treatment of disease. The experimental component includes the extensive and ongoing seminars or symposia having to do with the application of the *materia medica* to various diseases in a trial-and-error or pragmatic manner, as evidenced in the *Carakasamhitā* and *Suśrutasamhitā*. Here again, as in Pātañjala Yoga, Āyurveda is employed widely in sectarian and “secular” contexts quite independently of religious or sectarian authority. I have discussed this in detail in my “Āyurveda and the Hindu Philosophical Systems,” *Philosophy East and West* 37 (1987): 245–59.

In the case of Vyākaraṇa, the database and systematic experimental component include the systematic description of the phonetic system of Sanskrit, the elaborate analyses of word formation, detailed citations of standard usage, the extensive meta-rules devised to describe all aspects of Sanskrit in a comprehensive manner, and the detailed and painstaking lists of verbal roots and derivatives, all of which were derived from empirical observation and listening, together with the construction of a theoretical framework that would exhibit the structure of the language. Again, as with Pātañjala Yoga and Āyurveda, sectarian affiliations, while certainly pertinent in terms of analyzing the formation and meaning of words as these may appear in sectarian contexts, in no way shape or determine either the method or substance of what is being studied.

The terms *yoga* and *tantra* in these environments are clearly products of an elite intellectual milieu, made up of literate *pandita* communities, most likely in north and northwestern South Asia, that is, the Gangetic plain region (in and around present-day Varanasi) and the Gandhāra, Kashmir, and Punjab regions, in the early centuries of the Common Era. Learned traditions were already taking shape, of course, a good deal earlier, in the time of the Vedas and Upaniṣads, and early Buddhist and Jaina traditions, and in the early epic period up through the Mauryan period and the reign of Aśoka. The *Mokṣadharma* portion of the *Mahābhārata* is symptomatic of the levels of intellectual sophistication achieved in these last centuries before the beginning of the Common Era, as is the grammatical theorizing found in such works as Patañjali’s *Mahābhāṣya*.

With the consolidation established in the northwestern region of the subcontinent under Kaniṣka (ca. 100 C.E.), together with the imperial Gupta consolidation fashioned on the Ganges River basin and the Gangetic plain (ca. 320–550), an even more prolific cultural and intellectual creativity emerged. The various technical traditions of Indian philosophy (Hindu, Buddhist, and Jaina) all begin to take shape in this period, each one centering around a “founding” figure and a collection of utterances (*sūtra*) or verses (*kārikā*). Vaiśeṣika, Nyāya, Mīmāṃsā, Vedānta, Jaina, and Yoga traditions all develop *sūtra*-collections associated with the respective lineage figures of Kanada, Gautama, Jaimini, Bādarāyaṇa, Umāsvāti, and Patañjali. Sāṃkhya, Mādhyamika, and Vedānta have primarily *kārikā*-collections with the lineage figures of Iśvarakṛṣṇa, Nāgārjuna, and Gauḍapāda. Systematic and comprehensive treatments in a variety of other areas of intellectual endeavor are developing, including grammar, medicine, poetry, astronomy, and law.

It is precisely in this creative and systematic era that the terms *yoga* and *tantra* (and the term *sāṃkhya* as well) begin to be widely used. The terms were used earlier, of course, but

for the most part they are late in appearing in classical Sanskrit literature. The term *yoga* first appears only in the *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* (II.4.1) and then in the *Kaṭha* and *Svetāśvatara Upaniṣads* (II.3.11 and II.11 respectively). Thereafter, of course, it appears widely in the epic and purāṇic literature. The term *tantra* appears only once in the *Rg Veda* in the sense of a ‘loom’ and the fabric on a loom (cf. Grassman’s *Wörterbuch zum Rig Veda*) and nowhere, so far as I can find, in the early or “principal” Upaniṣadic literature (cf. Jacob’s *Concordance*).

Pāṇini notes two roots *yuj* in his *Dhātupāṭha*, the first in IV.68 as *yuj samādhau* (root *yuj* in regard to concentration) and the second in VII.7 as *yujir yoge* (root *yuj* in regard to yoking or harnessing or uniting). Vācaspatimiśra points out that both he and Vyāsa understand the word *yoga* in the former sense and not the latter sense in Patañjali’s *Yogaśūtra*. In other words, in Patañjala Yoga *yoga* does not mean ‘union’; it means, rather, *samādhi*. Pāṇini likewise notes the term *tantra* in two places, first under *Aṣṭadhyāyi* VII.2.9 in regard to the suffix *tra*, meaning a ‘vehicle for something’, and then also in V.2.70 in regard to *tantra* as a cloth just removed from a loom (which presumably derives from the old Vedic reference). The root *tan* originally meant ‘spread’ or ‘stretch’, in part in the sense of spreading or stretching cloth on a loom.

In terms of Sanskrit intellectual history, it would appear that the term *tantra* is first a means for ‘extending’ or ‘stretching’. In its usage in learned, scientific environments, it is a learned system or *sāstra* in which all of the component parts are placed in their proper systematic place. M. Monier-Williams offers the following entries for the term *tantra* in this sense:

... a loom [the original Vedic references]; the warp . . . ; the leading or principal or essential part, main point, characteristic feature, model, type, system, framework; . . . doctrine, rule, theory, scientific work, chapter of such a work (esp. the 1st section of a treatise on astron. . . .)?

The old Sāṃkhya philosophy is, in this sense, called a *tantra*, namely, *Ṣaṣṭitantra* (that is, a learned system having sixty components, possibly referring to a text by that title or simply a name for the old Sāṃkhya). It is not only philosophical systems such as Sāṃkhya that are *tantras* in this sense. There are also *tantras* or learned traditions for many other intellectual inquiries. There are, for example, the learned traditions of Āyurveda, Dhanurveda, Darśana, Vyākaraṇa, Jyotiṣa, Gaṇita, Dharma, Rājanīti, Nṛtya, Nātya, Kāvya, and a host of others. Generally speaking, in Indian intellectual history, *tantra* is a category or classification notion, and as has been mentioned above, three learned traditions are characteristically referred to as salient examples of *tantra* in this sense, namely, Pāṇinian grammar or Vyākaraṇa, classical Indian Āyurveda of Caraka and Suśruta, and, of course, the classical Sāṃkhya (the *Ṣaṣṭitantra*) and Patañjala Yoga, described as *sāṃkhya-pravacana*.

Furthermore, a *tantra* has certain essential components called *tantra-yuktis*, involving the various methodological devices that are to be used in composing or devising a *tantra* or learned tradition or science. Such *yuktis* are found already in the Pāṇinian system of grammar and are discussed in detail in Kautilya’s *Arthaśāstra*, the medical treatises, *Carakasamhitā* and *Suśrutasamhitā*, and Vāgbhaṭa’s *Aṣṭāṅgasamgraha* and *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdaya*, and the introduction to the *Yuktidipikā* commentary on the *Sāṃkhya-kārikā*. Altogether thirty-two, thirty-four, or thirty-six such *yuktis* are cited as “devices” to be used in constructing a *tantra*. These include, for example, “reference to past authority” (*atikrāntavekṣana*), “use of analogy” (*atideśa*), “clarifying the topic of discussion” (*adhikaraṇa*), “citing exceptions to general rules” (*apavarga*), “mention in brief” (*uddeśa*), “mention in detail” (*nirdeśa*), “completing an expression of ellipse” (*vākyāśeṣa*), and perhaps most notably “coherence and consistency in presenting a subject matter” (*yoga*). A useful survey account of the various lists of *tantra-*

yuktis in this sense, together with detailed references from the classical Sanskrit texts, may be found W. K. Lele’s *The Doctrine of the Tantrayuktis: Methodology of Theoretico-Scientific Treatises in Sanskrit* (Varanasi: Chaukhamba Surabharati Prakashan, 1981), 19–32.

Thus far, it is quite clear what *yoga* and *tantra* mean in classical Sanskrit literature up through the fourth and fifth centuries of the Common Era, and the social reality in which the terms are used is reasonably clear, namely, learned *pañdita* communities in north and northwestern South Asia in the time of the Kuṣāṇa and the Gupta imperia. Then, however, what appears to be a sectarian turn occurs, especially in certain Buddhist and Śaiva (and to a lesser degree, Vaiṣṇava) environments in which the terms *yoga* and *tantra* come to have dramatically different meanings. Quite possibly, of course, these sectarian traditions were prevalent in various incipient forms prior to the fifth or sixth century, but there is not much textual evidence in Sanskrit prior to the middle of the first millennium C.E. Again, M. Monier-Williams’ entry under *tantra* is interesting. Immediately following the first citation of the meaning of *tantra* as mentioned above, Monier-Williams continues as follows:

. . . a class of works teaching magical and mystical formularies (mostly in the form of dialogues between Śiva and Durgā and said to treat of five subjects, 1. the creation, 2. the destruction, 3. the worship of the gods, 4. the attainment of all objects, esp. of 6 superhuman faculties, 5. the four modes of union with the supreme spirit by meditation . . .).

Beginning in the sixth century of the Common Era and thereafter, there is an explosion of literature known as *tantra* in this new sense of “magical and mystical formularies.” As Mark Dyczkowski has commented,

Although it is not possible to say exactly when the first Āgamas were written, there is no concrete evidence to suggest that any existed much before the sixth century. . . . If our dates are correct, it seems that the Śaivāgama proliferated to an astonishing degree at an extremely rapid rate so that by the time we reach Abhinavagupta [975–1025] and his immediate predecessors who lived in ninth-century Kashmir we discover in their works references drawn from a vast corpus of Śaivāgamic literature. (Mark S. G. Dyczkowski, *The Canon of the Śaivāgama and the Kubjikā Tantras of the Western Kaula Tradition* [Albany: State Univ. of New York Press, 1988], 5.)

Dyczkowski’s comment applies primarily to the Śaivāgama and its so-called “Kulāmnāya” (or the Western Kaula Tradition) branch, but the texts of other traditions of *tantra* in this new sense—for example, the Pāñcarātra Vaiṣṇava materials, the southern Siddhāntāgama and Śrī Vidyā traditions, the Buddhist *tantra* traditions and the Jaina *tantra*—are also evidently not much earlier than the sixth century, and in many instances are considerably later. Much work is now becoming available regarding the history and development of these various traditions of *tantra* in north and south India, for example, in the work of David G. White (*Kiss of the Yoginī* [Univ. of Chicago Press, 2003]), Alexis Sanderson (“Śaivism: Krama Śaivism,” “Śaivism: Śaivism in Kashmir,” and “Śaivism, Trika Śaivism,” in *Encyclopedia of Religion*, ed. M. Eliade, 13: 14–17), and Geoffrey Samuel (*The Origins of Yoga and Tantra* [Cambridge Univ. Press, 2008]).

“Tāntrika” in this new sense is usually contrasted with “Vaidika” (which latter term here is not so much “Vedic” as something like “conventional” or “traditional”). Just as *tantra* in the older sense, as we have seen, has certain characteristics, known as *tantra-yuktis*, so it appears that *tantra* in this new sense has some distinctive features, some of which are the following: (a) *bubhukṣu* (desire for worldly experience) rather than *mumukṣu* (desire for release); (b) focus on the modalities of “desire” (*kāma*); (c) liberation while living (*jīvan-mukti*); (d) quest for extraordinary “powers” (*siddhis*); (e) transgressive or antinomian ritual practices (either in fantasy or literally) involving onanism, coitus, cunnilingus, and fellatio

together with the exchange of sexual fluids; (f) what André Padoux has called a “swarming pantheon with its fearsome deities” (both fearsome and benevolent, and both male and female); (g) meditation practices that link the body of the practitioner (microcosm) with the body of the cosmos (macrocosm); and (h) the use of sacred sounds, that is to say, phonemes, syllables, *mantras*, and other ritual utterances in the context of prayer and/or magic. Perhaps the best summary characterization of the “*Tantrika*” *Weltanschauung* is the following comment by André Padoux:

[*Tantra* is] . . . an attempt to place *kāma*, desire, in every sense of the word, in the service of liberation . . . not to sacrifice this world for liberation’s sake, but to reinstate it, in varying ways, within the perspective of salvation. This use of *kāma* and of all aspects of this word to gain both worldly and supernatural enjoyments (*bhukti*) and capacities, and to obtain liberation in this life (*jīvan-mukti*), implies a particular attitude on the part of the Tantric adept toward the cosmos, whereby he feels integrated within an all-embracing system of micro-macrocosmic correlations. (A. Padoux, “*Tantrism*,” in *Encyclopedia of Religions*, ed. M. Eliade, 14: 273; cited in D. G. White, *Kiss of the Yoginī*, p. 15. See also Padoux’s excellent discussion of “*Tantrism*” in his *Vāc: The Concept of the Word in Selected Hindu Tantras* [Albany: State Univ. of New York Press, 1990], esp. 30–85.)

Closely related to these new Tantra traditions, at least in their Śaiva and Śakti-Śaiva formulations, is a new kind of Yoga, namely, *Hṝatha* Yoga (literally ‘Exertion-Yoga’), attributed by and large to the work of two *mahāsiddhas*, who worked somewhere between the ninth and twelfth centuries either in the northwestern or northeastern margins of South Asia: Matsyendranātha and his near-disciple Gorakṣanātha, said to be the founder of the Nātha Yoga order. Some have maintained that both Matsyendranātha and Gorakṣanātha are only legendary or mythical figures, but there seems to be a growing consensus that they were historical figures even though, of course, much hyperbole has come to surround their exploits.

The nature of this new *Hṝatha* Yoga is spelled out in summary form in the *Yogatattva Upaniṣad*, oddly enough a Vaiṣṇava text but containing an account of *Hṝatha* Yoga that is equally relevant for other sectarian groups. Four types of Yoga are listed in the *Yogatattva*; Rāja Yoga, *Hṝatha* Yoga, Laya Yoga, and Mantra Yoga. *Hṝatha* Yoga is briefly characterized as having twenty components, eight of which derive from the “*Yogāṅga*” portion of the *YS* and an additional twelve:

Yama, Niyama, Āsana, Prāṇasamyama, Pratyāhāra, Dhārana, Dhyāna of Hari in the middle of the eyebrows, and Samādhi. . . . (Thus) is Yoga said to be of eight stages. [These, of course, are the well-known “eight limbs” of *Yogasūtra* II.29–III.3.]

Mahāmudrā [‘great seal’—a particular posture], Mahābandha [‘great lock’—another posture], Mahāvedha [‘great penetration’—opening of the central channel], and Khecarī [‘going in the air’—turning the tongue back into the cranial area having cut the frenum]; Jālamdhara [‘throat restriction’ or lock], Uddiyāna [‘upward stomach restriction’ or lock], and similarly Mūlabandha [‘root lock’, restricting or controlling the breath]; Dīrgha-praṇava-samdhāna [‘prolonged recitation of the sacred syllable’], also Siddhānta-śravaṇa [‘listening to the doctrines’]; Vajroli [re-absorption of semen after ejaculation, mixed with the female discharge], Amaroli [drinking one’s urine and using the urine as a nasal douche], and Sahajoli [collecting urine but not drinking it or using it as a douche], considered as three aspects; these constitute the twelve divisions of *Hṝatha*-yoga. (*Yogatattva Upaniṣad*, vss. 24–27, in *The Yoga Upaniṣads*, ed. G. Śrinivāsa Murti, tr. T. R. S. Ayyangar [Adyar: Adyar Library, 1938], 306.)

Hṝatha Yoga, thus, has twenty components, the “eight-limbed” practices from the *Yogasūtra*, and the twelve additional practices, plus, of course, the physiology of the *cakras* and/or *maṇḍalas*, the theory of *nādīs*, and the notion of the *kundala* (or *kundalini*).

Even though Pātañjala Yoga differs dramatically from Haṭha Yoga, it is possible to trace the latter from the former, at least to some degree. The locus appears to be in Book III (The Vibhūti Pāda) of the *Yogaśūtrapāṭha*, and specifically III.29, “When the circle of the navel (becomes the focus for comprehensive reflection or *samyama*), knowledge (*jñāna*) of the orderly arrangement of the body becomes possible (*nābhicakre kāya-vyūha-jñānam*).” If one combines the reference to the “circle of the navel” with the preceding three *sūtras* (YS III.26, 27, and 28), that is, the solar entrance, the lunar entrance, and the pole-star correlations between the cosmos (*bhuvana*) and the Yogi’s body, and puts these together with the following *sūtras*, that is, the region of the throat (*kaṇṭha-kūpa*) (III.30), the tortoise-channel (*kūrmā-nāḍī*) (III.31), and “the light at the top of the head” (*mūrdha-jyotiṣ*), and the region of the “heart” (*hrdaya*) (III.34), it could well be the case that this very sequence of *sūtras* (III.26–34) represents an early, if not the earliest, evidence for what will later come to be known as the system of Haṭha Yoga. This is perhaps especially the case if one then combines these references with the list of ‘postures’ (*āsana*) enumerated in the *Vyāsa bhāṣya* under YS II.46 and the breath exercise of YS II.49–51. The basic components for Haṭha Yoga are all largely in place. There is an implicit “vital center” (*cakra*) theory. The notions of a solar entrance (*surya-dvāra*) (also called *suṣumma-dvāra* by Vācaspatimiśra) and a lunar entrance (*candra-dvāra*) are in place. There appears to be a theory of channels or veins (*nāḍī*). The notion of the “lotus of the heart” (*hrdaya-puṇḍarīka*) and the idea of an illumination at the top of the head or skull (*mūrdha-jyotiṣ*) are present. These components, when combined with a focus on a variety of body postures and an intensive concern for breathing exercises, appear to be the basic skeletal structure for later Haṭha Yoga. Whereas in Pātañjala Yoga these components are for the most part tangential or auxiliary to the main parameters of Yogic cosmology, psychology, physiology, epistemology, and rigorous philosophical dualism, in Haṭha Yoga, of course, they become the primary focus.

By the middle of the first millennium of the Common Era, then, there appear to be two notions of Yoga—on the one hand, an older Pātañjala Yoga as a *sāṃkhya pravacana*, and, on the other, an incipient Haṭha Yoga as an adjunct of a new sectarian *tantra*. Moreover, there appear to be two distinct notions of *tantra*: on the one hand, *tantra* as a class of works dealing with scientific subject-areas (grammar, medicine, psychology, and so forth), and, on the other, *tantra* as a class of works dealing with sectarian ritual systems, or, to use Monier-Williams’ idiom, “. . . magical and mystical formularies.” Precisely why these divisions developed when and how they did remains something of a mystery. It would well be the case that both tendencies developed in a parallel fashion for some period of time, one set of usages operating on a learned, elite level and another set operating on a popular, sectarian level.

Regarding this popular, sectarian level that becomes prominent in the later centuries of the first millennium of the Common Era, it must also be remembered that this is also the period in which popular *bhakti* spirituality becomes prominent. Thus, just as it is important to make distinctions between two kinds of Yoga and two kinds of *tantra*, so it is equally important to distinguish the newly prominent sectarian *tantra* from *bhakti*. As is the case with *yoga* and *tantra*, so it is the case with *tantra* and *bhakti*, but there has been an unfortunate tendency in popular as well as scholarly treatments to fail to make relevant distinctions.

In some respects, of course, both sectarian *tantra* and *bhakti* spirituality arise out of dissatisfaction with older elite religious traditions. Implicit as well seems to be an alienation from the hierarchies of ordinary conventional social life, a sense of the loss of empowerment on the level of ordinary social interaction (*ādhibhautika*) and, hence, a search for empowerment internally (*ādhyātmika*) and cosmically (*ādhidaivika*). Both types likewise turn away from philosophical conceptualizations or doctrinal formulations in their respective

traditions in search of more immediate and easier techniques. Both types, moreover, are much more oriented towards the body and towards involvement with the physical world. Both types of spirituality incorporate gender symbolism of male and female in contrast to older traditions of spirituality that focus more on some sort of neuter Absolute or Ultimate. Finally, both types of spirituality take seriously the aesthetic or feeling-components in human experience in contrast to older predilections for ascetic abstractions.

The two types of spirituality differ fundamentally, however, in their behavioral attitudes regarding the experience of the divine. For *bhakti* spirituality, God is a loving person, and the devotee experiences God as a trustworthy friend, a beneficent parent, an aroused lover, or as a servant in the presence of a kindly master (to use some of the common metaphors in Kṛṣṇa *bhakti* spirituality). Personal love is central in this sort of spirituality, and finally the experience of God as loving person is greater even than the old Ātman or Brahman of the *Upaniṣads*. Moreover, the personal relationship that the believer has with the person of Kṛṣṇa or Rāma overcomes or sets aside all prescribed patterns of behavior or hierarchy. The believer encounters Kṛṣṇa or Rāma directly and immediately, and the outpouring of spontaneous emotion through singing and dance cuts through all conventional behavior. The believer in Kṛṣṇa *bhakti*, for example, is ravished by the personal love of Lord Kṛṣṇa.

Tāntrika spirituality, on the other hand, has a very different tonality. For the Tāntrika, ritual is much more important, and Śiva (in Śaiva Tāntrika practice) or Viṣṇu (in more moderate Pāñcarātra Tāntrika practice) or the Diamond Body of the Buddha (in Buddhist Vajrayāna) are never personal in the sense that Kṛṣṇa is personal. Śiva is utterly transcendent (*viśvottīrṇa* or *anuttara*), and there are carefully prescribed ritual hierarchies both microcosmically (in terms of the body) and macrocosmically (in terms of cosmic emanation) that one must follow under the careful guidance of a Guru or spiritual lineage. The characters in the “swarming pantheon” of Tāntrika spirituality are hardly affectionate or loving companions. They are often, rather, fearsome and terrifying apparitions, especially perhaps the threatening female *yoginīs*, who must be propitiated and whose fluids must be imbibed for the sake of attaining immortality and mystical powers (*siddhi*). Spontaneity of the believer is increasingly ruled out in favor of the spontaneity (*svātantryaśakti*) of the transcendent Śiva with his Śakti, or the Cosmic Buddha with the Prajñāpāramitā (“perfection of wisdom”). System and structure are fundamental in Tāntrika spirituality, and ritual performance, whether literal in erotico-ritual practice or symbolic in sublimated fantasy, becomes all encompassing, even perhaps obsessive on occasion. To be sure, in Tāntrika spirituality the purely philosophical abstractions of the older systems of Indian philosophy are set aside, but the systems return with a vengeance in the uncompromising rigor of hierarchical ritual performance.

With these important distinctions in mind, that is, the two varieties of Yoga (Pātañjala Yoga and Hāṭha Yoga), the two varieties of *tantra* (learned *tantra* and sectarian *tantra*), the distinction between “Vaidika” and “Tāntrika,” and, finally, the distinction between sectarian *tantra* and *bhakti*, let me turn now to focus specifically on the two volumes under review, Maas’s *Samādhipāda* and Mallinson’s *The Khecarīvidyā of Ādinātha*. I shall comment on these two works from three points of view: first (I), some brief summary remarks about the contents of the two works; second (II), one or two critical questions about each of the books; and third (III), some brief remarks about philological work in general.

(I) First, then, regarding the content of the two works. Maas nicely summarizes the scope of his work in appendix II: English section (p. 165) as follows:

The present edition of the first chapter (*Samādhipāda*) in the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* (PYŚ)—i.e., the *Yogasūtra* of Patañjali with its oldest commentary, the so called *Yogabhāṣya*—is based upon

the collation of 21 printed editions, and of 25 MSS in 8 scripts and from different regions of the Indian subcontinent. Moreover, a reconstruction of the basic text as commented upon in the first chapter of the *Pātañjalayogaśāstravivarāṇa* (YVi) has been used throughout as a further source. The textual witnesses are at variance in ca. 2600 cases of which about 1000 are substantial. The vast majority of readings has not been recorded in any previous edition.

The first eighty-three (i–lxxxiii) pages of Maas’s work include (a) a brief discussion of the authorship, title, and date of the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra*, (b) a detailed description of the printed editions of the text and the handwritten MSS together with an attempt to construct stemmatic diagrams of both the printed editions (p. xxxiv) and the MSS (p. lxxii), and (c) a listing of symbols and abbreviations used in setting forth the variant readings and some introductory comments on how to interpret the critical apparatus. Thereafter follows the critical edition itself (pp. 1–87), followed by critical notes (pp. 89–112) and a bibliography. The book concludes with appendix I, a reconstruction of the basic text of the *Samādhipāda* of the *Pātañjalayogaśāstravivarāṇa* based upon the work of Kengo Harimoto in collaboration with Maas, and appendix II: English section (primarily a brief summary in English on how to use the critical apparatus). Regarding authorship and date, Maas suggests that a certain Patañjali (not Patañjali the grammarian) is the compiler of a text entitled *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* and that the best date for the original is somewhere between 325 and 425 C.E. He argues that the *sūtras* and the *bhāṣya* make up a single text, or, in other words, that the *bhāṣya* is a *svopajñā*-commentary (a self-commentary), and that the *sūtras* with the *bhāṣya* were composed by a certain Patañjali. Regarding stemmatic analysis, the results are inconclusive other than to say that there is a quite old northern “Vulgate” version, which is the basis for most of the printed works of the text, which differs significantly from a southern transmission, and that the *Pātañjalayogaśāstravivarāṇa* is clearly in the southern tradition and probably, in Maas’s view, represents more original readings. In constructing the critical edition, Maas clearly favors the *Vivarāṇa* readings over the Vulgate tradings.

Mallinson likewise nicely summarizes the scope of his work (p. 3):

The *Khecarīvidyā* is a dialogue between Śiva and his consort, Devī. It calls itself a tantra and consists of 284 verses divided into four *paṭalas*. In the colophons of its manuscripts its authorship is ascribed to Ādinātha, the first of the gurus of the Nātha order, who is usually identified with Śiva. The first *paṭala* (77 verses) starts with praise of the text itself, followed by a coded description of the *khecarimanttra* and detailed instructions for the key physical practice of the text. This practice is called *khecarīmudrā*, and involves the freeing and lengthening of the tongue of the yogin in order that it might be turned back and inserted above the soft palate to break through the *brahmadvāra*, the door of Brahmā, so that the yogin can drink the *amṛta*, the nectar of immortality, which is stored behind it. The second *paṭala* (124 verses) describes the different *kalās* in the body where *amṛta* is stored. . . . The third *paṭala* (69 verses) describes practices involving the insertion of the tongue into the abode of Brahmā and the raising of Kundalini in order to flood the body with *amṛta* and defeat death by temporarily or permanently leaving the body. The short fourth *paṭala* (14 verses) describes herbal preparations which can effect various magical results (*siddhis*) for the yogin.

Mallinson’s work overall contains five basic sections: (a) an introductory section (pp. 3–16) that discusses the date of the text (1400 C.E. or earlier) and the manuscript “witnesses,” namely, some twenty-two *Khecarīvidyā* MSS, three MSS of the *Matsyendrasamhitā*, a MS in Grantha script from Pondicherry, a paper MS from the Asiatic Society of Bengal, and MSS of the *Yogakuṇḍalyupariṣad*, together with a stemmatic diagram (p. 11); (b) a short section (pp. 17–33) giving a brief history of the *khecarīmudrā* in the Pali Canon, early Sanskrit texts, and the later texts of tantric Śaivism; (c) a longer section (pp. 35–64) describing

in detail the various MSS; (d) the critical edition of the text in Devanāgarī script (pp. 67–113); and (e) an English translation of the *Khecarīvidyā* (pp. 117–36). Three appendices provide verses from other works and citations to works mentioned in the commentary on *Khecarīvidyā*, the *Bṛhatkhecarīprakāśa* by Ballāla. The book concludes with just under eighty pages of detailed and highly informative notations, a short bibliography, a pāda index to the text, and an index. Mallinson points out that the *Khecarīvidyā* is cited in part or extensively in other Hāṭha Yoga texts. For example, the second *adhyāya* of the *Yogakuṇḍalyupaniṣad* is nearly identical with the first *paṭala* of the *Khecarīvidyā*, and all four *paṭalas* of the *Khecarīvidyā* are included in the *Matsyendrasaṃhitā*. It would appear, then, according to Mallinson, that the *Khecarīvidyā* was not originally a separate text. It was extracted from various other Hāṭha Yoga texts for the sake of having a single text focusing on *khecarīmudrā*, a text that later becomes an authoritative text of the Nāṭha Yoga tradition.

(II) Second, let me raise a couple of brief critical questions or concerns about each of these works. Regarding the work of Maas, I am inclined to ask two critical questions. The first has to do with the lack of any discussion of the other three pādas of the *Yogasūtrapāṭha* and the *Vyāsa bhāṣya*. Surely a critical reading of the *Samādhipāda* cannot be persuasively established without some reference to the composition of the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra* as a whole. To be sure, one cannot do everything, but there should have been at least some discussion about the totality of the text.

Let me cite one puzzling example. Maas wants to argue that the *Pātañjalayogaśāstra-vivarāṇa* commentary is an old, perhaps the oldest commentary, on the *Yogaśāstra*, but there is an anomaly that appears at the outset of the *Vivarāṇa* text itself. The Vivaraṇakāra begins his commentary with a discussion of the utility (*prayojana*) of the *Yogaśāstra* in terms of medical science (*cikitsā-sāstra*), but there is no apparent reference either in the first *sūtra* or the first prose portion of the commentary (that is, the so-called *Vyāsa bhāṣya*) to medical science or to the usual conventional openings of sāstras. As Vācaspatimiśra noted in his opening comment on *YS* I.1 and the so-called *Vyāsa bhāṣya* in his *Tattvavaiśāradī*, the conventional matters that appear at the outset in sāstras are specifically not mentioned in the *Yogaśāstra*. In pāda II, however, and specifically under *YS* II.15 (and see p. 168 of the P. S. R. Sastri and S. R. Sastri edition of the *Vivarāṇa* [1952, Madras Government Oriental Series, no. 94]) not only is there a reference in the *Vyāsa bhāṣya* to medical science, but the reference is almost a word-for-word repeat of the opening comment of the *Vivarāṇa*. However one might wish to resolve this sort of puzzle, the matter cannot be solved without going beyond the first book of the *Yogaśāstra*. Of somewhat greater concern, however, is the lack of mention of T. S. Rukmani's arguments that the *Vivarāṇa* commentary is neither a commentary by the great Śaṅkara nor is it very old (T. S. Rukmani, tr., *Yogasūtrabhāṣyavivarāṇa of Śaṅkara*, 2 vols. [New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 2001]; see vol. 1, ix–xxx and vol. 2, 212–22 for discussions of the problem of authorship). Rukmani has written extensively regarding what she considers to be the *Vivarāṇa*'s dependence on Vācaspatimiśra's *Tattvavaiśāradī*. Whether one agrees with Rukmani or not, the matter requires careful discussion. Maas does in passing mention Gelblum's work (Tuvia Gelblum, "Notes on an English Translation of the *Yogasūtrabhāṣyavivarāṇa*," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 55 (1992): 76–89), which also does not accept the *Vivarāṇa* as an original work of Śaṅkara. In addition to Rukmani and Gelblum, A. Wezler and W. Halbfass have likewise expressed considerable skepticism about the authorship and date of the *Vivarāṇa*. (See Larson and Bhattacharya, *Yoga*, pp. 53–54 and p. 71 for summary accounts of the various views.) The matter has clearly not been satisfactorily resolved.

I am puzzled as to why Maas has not taken up this important scholarly debate, especially since the matters of authorship and date of the *Vivarāṇa* are clearly important if the *Vivarāṇa*’s readings are to be taken seriously in establishing a critical edition. Thus, to cite just two quick examples, on *YS I.45 sūkṣma-viṣayatvam cālingparyavasānam*, the Vyāsa text in the Vulgate that reads *pārthivasyāñor gandhataṇmāṭram sūkṣmo viṣayah*. . . . is a much more plausible reading than *pārthivasyāñor gandhamāṭram sūkṣmo viṣayah*. . . . in the *Vivarāṇa* reading accepted by Maas in his critical edition, given the obviously classical Sāṃkhya orientation of the text. Similarly at *YS I.2 yogaś cittavṛttinirodhah*, the Vyāsa text in the Vulgate concludes *citiśaktir apariṇāminy apratisaṃkramā darśitaviṣayā śuddhā ca anantā ca, sattvagunātmiṇā ca iyam ato viparitā vivekakhyātir iti* . . . , meaning something like “on the one hand, there is consciousness (*citiśakti*), which does not change, which has no intermixture, to which objects are presented, and which is pure and eternal, and, on the other hand, there is the realization of discrimination, constituted by the *guṇa, sattva*, that is opposite from that.” In other words, the passage clearly stresses the thoroughgoing dualism between *citiśakti* and *vivekakhyātī*. Maas’s critical edition reading, which for the most part follows the *Vivarāṇa*, however, reads *cicchaktir apariṇāminy, apratisaṃkramā, darśita-viṣayā, śuddhānāntāsattvā, puruṣātmiṇā seyam, ato viparitā vivekakhyātih*. . . .” I am not quite sure how Maas would construe this, since, of course, he does not provide a translation of the text, but clearly his reading of the Sanskrit appears to undercut the clear dualist understanding in the Vulgate in favor of a possible non-dualist (Vedānta-tending) reading of the passage.

Regarding the work of Mallinson, I would likewise raise a few critical questions. I find myself wondering, first of all, why this text is important as a distinct text in Hāṭha Yoga or in tantric Śaivism. Since most of its verses are extracted from other works and since discussions of *khecarimudrā* are generally well known in other Hāṭha Yoga works, one wonders why this particular extract is significant. Admittedly it is accepted as an authoritative work of the Nāṭha Yoga tradition, and I suppose that one might make the case for the importance of the text in terms of writing the history of the Nāṭha sect. I also wonder why the *Khecarī-vidyā* makes no reference to “flying,” which is often considered to be a salient feature of “*khe-cari-vidyā*,” which David Gordon White actually translates (somewhat tongue-in-cheek) as “The Aviator’s Science; or The Arcane Science of Flight” (in *The Alchemical Body: Siddha Traditions in Medieval India* [Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1996], 169). To be sure, Mallinson has a lengthy note (pp. 183–84, n. 113) about the absence of flying in his edition of *Khecarīvidyā*, but finally simply notes that the text does not mention flying. One possible explanation might be that the so-called “void” in the cranium that is supposedly experienced when the bent-back tongue releases the *amṛta* (or transformed semen) as a result of practicing the *khecarimudrā* may give rise to the fantasy of flying, but I do not recall seeing any discussion along these lines in Mallinson’s work. I also have many questions about the use of terms in Mallinson’s work, including “tantric Śaivism,” *tantra, hāṭhayoga, mudrā, mantra*, and, of course, the simple term *yoga* itself. Terms are not sufficiently defined, either conceptually or historically; hence, many traditions and notions are run together. Typical is his comment (p. 184, n. 116): “Although I distinguish between tantric Śaivism and *hāṭhayoga*, and between the text of both, it should be stressed that there is no clear-cut division between the two.” In my view, there *are* clear-cut distinctions among many of these notions, as I have tried to indicate in the earlier portion of this review. Hāṭha Yoga is clearly distinct from tantric Śaivism and is found in Vaiṣṇava, Śākta, Buddhist, and even Jaina contexts. Likewise Hāṭha Yoga is dramatically distinct from Pātañjala Yoga. Finally, Mallinson’s

presentation of the English translation of the *Khecarīvidyā* would be much more useful, at least to Sanskritists, who after all are the prime audience for this work, if he had either had the Sanskrit and English on facing pages throughout or, at least, had numbered the lines of the English rendering to match the numbering of the Sanskrit verses.

(III) Let me conclude this review with a comment about a possible problem I see with this sort of philological work. Both Maas and Mallinson present detailed philological analyses of two important Sanskrit texts, but unfortunately both texts float in an intellectual vacuum in which philology so dominates the discourse that the intellectual significance or lack thereof of the texts being critically edited is dealt with in a completely perfunctory manner or, indeed, is nearly overlooked. To be sure, each work has a short section regarding the meaning of their respective texts, pp. xii–xix in the case of Maas's book, and pp. 17–33 in Mallinson's book, but the overwhelming bulk of their work, some 180 printed pages in the case of Maas and some 300 pages in the case of Mallinson, is given over to establishing the proposed critical reading of the Sanskrit (in the case of Maas's work) and the proposed critical reading of the Sanskrit together with an annotated English translation (in the case of Mallinson's work) along with detailed notations of variants, elaborate descriptions of printed and handwritten manuscripts, stemmatic diagrams of the relations among the various printed texts and manuscripts, and extensive philological notations.

Let me be clear regarding my concern here. Both Maas and Mallinson are to be highly commended for their incredibly detailed and precise research. As we all know, serious philological research is the beginning of most of the important research in South Asian studies. When all of this detailed work has been accomplished, however, one would think that Maas and Mallinson would be in a position to discuss at length the significance of what they have accomplished, but evidently they have decided to stay within the confines of philology and not to venture into the broader area of interpreting the philosophical, historical, anthropological and religious significance of what they have critically edited. This, in my view, is a great pity. They could not have critically edited what they have studied without knowing a great deal about the larger framework in which their texts have flourished. The extensive bibliographies in their respective works give clear evidence of extensive reading in South Asian studies. One would expect, then, that some of the major questions about their texts would receive definitive answers. Both clearly have the expertise to offer authoritative interpretations regarding the history of the traditions in which they work, and more than that, the intellectual significance of the texts that they have critically edited. I am inclined to suggest that publication of this sort of philological work would have a more meaningful impact if it were reconfigured. In other words, the books might begin with a detailed original essay setting forth the historical, conceptual, social, and religious significance of the texts that have been critically edited, followed by two appendices that document the introductory essay—the first, the actual critical edition and accompanying translation, and the second, the various MS descriptions, stemmatic diagrams, and philological notations.