

COLLECTION INDOLOGIE – 98

पराख्यतन्त्रम्

THE PARĀKHYATANTRA
A SCRIPTURE OF THE ŚAIVA SIDDHĀNTA

A CRITICAL EDITION AND ANNOTATED TRANSLATION
BY DOMINIC GOODALL

INSTITUT FRANÇAIS DE PONDICHÉRY
ÉCOLE FRANÇAISE D'EXTRÊME-ORIENT

Comité de lecture

Colette Caillat,
Membre de l'Institut de France
François Gros,
Directeur d'études à l'École pratique des Hautes Études, Paris
Michael Hahn,
Professeur à l'Université de Marburg
Alexis Sanderson,
Spalding Professor of Eastern Religions and Ethics, All Souls College, Oxford
Raffaele Torella,
Professeur à l'Université de Rome

© Institut Français de Pondichéry, 2004 (ISSN 0073-8352)

© École française d'Extrême-Orient, 2004 (ISBN 2 85539-642-5)

Typeset by the author in 'Computer Modern' and Velthuis' Devanāgarī using
T_EX, L^AT_EX, and EDMAC (macros for the preparation of critical editions created
by John Lavagnino and Dominik Wujastyk).

Photo: Pañcamukheśvara, Kalahasti (Andhra Pradesh).

Cover design: N. Ravichandran (IFP).

2015 reprint of first edition of 2004, printed by Bhavish Graphics, Chennai.

INTRODUCTION

The Parākhyatantra and its place in the Saiddhāntika canon

As will be clear from the numerous testimonia that appear in the apparatus to the text, the *Parākhyā-* or *Saurabheya-tantra* was once a valued authority, much quoted both by writers of the period of the early pan-Indian Śaiva Siddhānta, i.e. up to and including Aghoraśiva, and also by thinkers of various of the subsequent South Indian strands of development that go by the name of the Śaiva Siddhānta. It is curious, therefore, that there seems to survive only one incomplete manuscript of the text,⁴⁸ transmitting *paṭalas* 1–6 and 14–15. The codex in which it is written (hereafter M^Y; I continue to use the siglum to which I assigned it for my edition of the *Kiraṇa*, GOODALL 1998) is of unique importance to our understanding of the early Śaiva Siddhānta because it is also the *codex unicus* for much of the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha*,⁴⁹ which, as I have argued in my introduction to the *Kiraṇavṛtti*, is the only part of the printed *Raurava* early enough to have been known to the lineage of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha II, and it is the only manuscript known to me which transmits the complete text of the *Svāyambhuvāsūtrasaṅgraha* with the chapters in the correct order (i.e. that preserved in the fragmentary Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript) and unmixed with other (later) chapters, as we find in most South Indian

⁴⁸I pass over here the other manuscripts listed in Mysore catalogues, MSS B 785 and B 811, transcripts on paper in Kannada script (see p. cii ff below). An examination of their readings reveals them to be apographs of M^Y.

⁴⁹Printed as the ‘*vidyāpāda*’ at the beginning and end of the first volume of N. R. BHATT’s *Rauravāgama*. A handful of South Indian manuscripts transmit up to 4:41 but no further. M^Y transmits an *upodghāta* and ten chapters. BHATT was not able to use M^Y for the constitution of the text of the *upodghāta* 1:1–4:41. (I intend soon to publish a list of improvements to the edition of the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha* and especially to this part of the text.)

manuscripts.⁵⁰ (Although the Mysore edition does not make clear that it is based on M^Y, the errors and gaps therein show that it must be.) Furthermore the codex's text of the *Kiraṇa* is the closest among those of all the manuscripts known to me to the text that Rāmakaṇṭha had before him—closer even than the text of the manuscripts that also transmit Rāmakaṇṭha's commentary.

⁵⁰For a fuller discussion of the extent of the *Svāyambhuvāsūtrasaṅgraha* and of its clumsy incorporation in South India into a larger text called *Svāyambhuva* see GOODALL 1998:xlvi–li, in particular fn. 111. (Neither of FILIOZAT's editions of the *Svāyambhuvavṛtti* discuss the structure or extent of the text of which it is a partial commentary, nor does his just published article on Sadyojyotis of the same period, beyond a sentence to the effect that the commented chapters, 1–5, appear as chapters 33–7 in some manuscripts (2001:24).)

I earlier offered no hypothesis about the relation of these texts to a *Sūkṣma-svāyambhuva* of which three *pādas* are cited a few times by early writers (e.g. by Abhinavagupta in *Tantrāloka* 15:2c–3b and by Rāmakaṇṭha in the *Mataṅgavṛtti* ad *vidyāpāda* 3:23c–25b and 26:63):

*yo yatrābhilaṣed bhogān sa tatraiva niyojitaḥ
siddhibhāñ mantrasāmarthyāt.*

This verse occurs also in the South Indian *Svāyambhuva* as 40:2c–3b (IFP MS T. 39, p. 148) and equipped with a final *pāda*: *syād atroktam avistarāt*. But, as VASUDEVA suggests (*2000:239, fn. 170),

The whole of the extremely short 40th chapter of the IFI transcript 39 is perhaps no more than a later South Indian fabrication specifically written to include an earlier, authoritative citation from a lost work.

Both VASUDEVA (ibid.) and myself (GOODALL 1998:373, fn. 607) mistakenly assumed that no other verses survived attributed to the *Sūkṣmasvāyambhuva*. In fact Vaktraśambhu quotes two and a half verses that he attributes to the *Sūkṣmasvāyambhuva* in the *Mṛgendrapaddhatiṭīkā* (IFP MS T. 1021, p. 127), and he plainly distinguished the work from the *Svāyambhuvāsūtrasaṅgraha*, for he twice mentions both works together in lists, one of which we have quoted above on p. lix, and the other is to be found on p. 208 of the transcript.

A further half-verse is attributed to the *Sūkṣmasvāyambhuva* in the appendix to the *Sarvamatopanyāsa*, quoted between C:52 and 53 in Appendix I, and another is quoted in the *Ātmārthapūjāpaddhati*, IFP MSS T. 795, p. 78, T. 323, p. 123, T. 321, p. 125, and T. 282, p. 116. Note that BRUNNER's listing (1977:698) of IFP MS T. 192 as a manuscript transmitting the *Sūkṣmasvāyambhuvāgama* and *Sūkṣmasvāyambhuvavṛtti* is a slip; the manuscript is a transcript of Madras GOML MS R 16797 transmitting the first four chapters of the *Svāyambhuvāsūtrasaṅgraha* (including the verses of chapter 4 not commented upon by Sadyojyotis) followed by Sadyojyotis's *Svāyambhuvavṛtti*, and its readings are reported in FILIOZAT's editions marked with the siglum *ka*. There is however other evidence of there having been a *Sūkṣmasvāyambhuvavṛtti*: Trilocanaśiva quotes from it in his *Somaśambhupaddhatiṭīkā* (see BRUNNER 1977:419, n. 244e).

It is true that quotations from the text are not especially common in the works of Saiddhāntikas up to and including Aghoraśiva—Rāmakaṇṭha quotes it by name only once (ad *Mataṅgavidyāpāda* 12:25–27b, pp. 347–8), Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha only twice (ad *Mṛgendravidyāpāda* 2:7, p. 58 and ad *Mṛgendravidyāpāda* 11:11, p. 231), and thus Aghoraśiva too, who in his works on doctrine rarely quotes an authority that has not previously been quoted by these important forbears, refers to it infrequently (ad *Nādakārikā* 12, *Bhogakārikā* 100c–101b (untraced in M^Y), and without attribution ad *Tattvatrayanirṇaya* 6, *Tattvaparakāśa* 25, 44–5, *Ratnatraya-parikṣā* 30ab and *Ratnatrayaparikṣā* 180c–182b).

Is it conceivable that the text's being taught by Prakāśa rather than by a form of Śiva himself diminished the authoritativeness of the *Parākhyā* in the eyes of some? A passage from Kṣemarāja's *Svacchandatanroddyota* (ad 10:516c–517b quoted in fn. 604 on p. 309 below) suggests this, but it seems likely that Kṣemarāja takes such a position there merely because he wishes to find a reason for upholding a teaching of the *Svacchanda* against assertions of the *Mṛgendra* and the *Parākhyā*. Judging from the number and range of its quotations, particularly in South Indian works, the *Mṛgendra*'s importance in the Saiddhāntika exegetical tradition seems to have been huge in spite of its being a redaction by Indra rather than Śiva's words.

Whatever be the reason for their relative paucity, these few early Saiddhāntika attestations, taken together with the very substantial quotations that appear in the tenth chapter of Kṣemarāja's *Svacchandatanroddyota*, serve to prove that this *Parākhyā* is an early work. Thus it may join the tiny list of surviving demonstrably early listed Siddhāntas⁵¹—the *Kiraṇa*, the *Niśvāsa*, the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha*, the *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha*, the [*Pauṣkara*-]*Pārameśvara*.⁵² For although it does not figure in the standardized South Indian list that Bhatt tabulates in his introduction to the first volume of the *Raurava*, it appears at the end of a number of early versions of the list of twenty-eight primary scriptures, namely those of the *Pārameśvara*, the *Śrīkaṇṭhīya*, the *Kiraṇa*,

⁵¹For a reasoned account of which Saiddhāntika scriptures we may assume to have predated the Kashmirian thinkers of the lineage of Rāmakaṇṭha II whose works helped to shape the school's theology see GOODALL 1998:xxxix–xlvi.

⁵²Some might include here the non-eclectic recensions of the *Kālottara* on the grounds that they are redactions of the scripture listed as the *Vāthula/Vātula* (see GOODALL 1998:xlvi–xlvi, fn. 103, quoting SANDERSON).

and that which prefaces the *Jñānapañcāśikā* recension of the *Kālottara*.⁵³

Two early Parākhyatantras?

Our *Parākhyā* does not, however, appear to be the same as that quoted in the *Bṛhatkālottara*.⁵⁴ Professor SANDERSON has kindly furnished me with his preliminary edition (*1996b) of the *śivabhedapaṭala* and the *tantrapattivyākhyapaṭala*⁵⁵ which purport to give the *mūla-* or *ādi-sūtras* of the twenty-eight root scriptures. The *Parākhyā* is last on the list, and its *sūtra*, and a brief commentary thereon, read as follows (verses 92–5b, f. 55^r, lines 2–5):

athāvyaktaṃ mahāliṅgaṃ puruṣātītavācakam
jñānaṃ śivātmakaṃ sūkṣmaṃ sarvavijñāptikāraṇam
ādisūtram idaṃ jñeyaṃ saurabheye parāhvaye
*athāvyaktamahāliṅgaproktyā tattvaṃ guṇātmakam*⁵⁶
tathā śivātmakoktyā tu śivam eva padaṃ smṛtam
tasya vācyasya ye mantrā vācakāḥ śaktirūpiṇaḥ
ata etatpadenoktaṃ puruṣātītavācakam

This *sūtra* appears nowhere in what M^Y transmits of the *Parākhyā* and, although it is possible that it occurred in one of the chapters that was not copied, this is unlikely, firstly because *ādisūtras*, as the name tells us, occur at or towards the beginning of a work and we seem to have what must have been intended to be the beginning of our *Parākhyā* preserved

⁵³See GOODALL 1998:402–17 for a tabulation of these lists, together with rudimentary editions of the lists that are drawn from unpublished sources. The list which prefaces the *Jñānapañcāśikā* I treated as belonging to the *Jñānapañcāśikā* in GOODALL 1998:412, but Dr. ACHARYA has pointed out to me that in other manuscripts than the one I consulted, a division is clearly marked between the account of the canon and the first speech of Kārttikeya, which in fact marks the beginning of the *Jñānapañcāśikā*. All the verses of this prefatory section from the seventh verse up to and including the one before the true beginning of the tantra are to be found in the *Pratiṣṭhālakṣaṇasārasamuccaya* as 2:107–29, which is in fact the list I referred to in GOODALL 1998:417, fn. 149, but had been unable to see.

⁵⁴This section of the *Bṛhatkālottara* has been discussed at greater length in GOODALL (1998:414–17). I repeat here a certain amount of that information since it is relevant to the *Parākhyā*.

⁵⁵*Bṛhatkālottara*, National Archives of Kathmandu 1-89, NGMPP Reel No. B 24/59, ‘*Kālottara*’, ff. 47^v–55^r.

⁵⁶guṇātmakam] *em.* SANDERSON; guṇātmakam smṛtam MS

in M^Y, and secondly that beginning contains a plausible *mūlasūtra* (1:4 or 1:5 or both).⁵⁷ It is possible then that the *Bṛhatkālottara* knew another *Parākhya*, and this is suggested by another passage in the same *tantropattivyākhyāpaṭala* in which divisions of the twenty-eight fundamental scriptures are listed (verses 16–30b, f. 51^r, line 6–52^r, line 1). In the last half-verse of this passage the *Parākhya* is said to be two-fold:

saurabheyam (em. SANDERSON; °*bhedam* MS) *parākhyaṃ ca*
dvidvidham ca parāhvayaṃ

This last half-verse may mean then that the redactor(s) of the *Bṛhatkālottara* knew of two parts of a *Parākhya* or of two independent works, one known as the *Saurabheya* and the other as the *Parākhya*. The *ādisūtra* it quotes must then be assumed to belong to the one not preserved in M^Y. As a source of information about the canon the *Bṛhatkālottara* must, however, be used with caution: very little of the material in these *paṭalas* can be verified (only the *ādisūtras* of the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha*, the *Kiraṇa*, and the *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha* can be found in surviving works) and some of the information does not fit as neatly as might be hoped.⁵⁸ Furthermore the solution is not entirely satisfactory because *Saurabheya* seems elsewhere to be used as an alternative name for our *Parākhya* (see p. cviii).

If we are to make sense of what the *Bṛhatkālottara* tells us, we might assume that what M^Y transmits is the *upabheda* of the *Parākhya* that the *Bṛhatkālottara* calls *Saurabheya*, since that name *Saurabheya* can be argued to be appropriate to it, as we shall see below,⁵⁹ and thus both names can be used of it. The lost work from which the untraced *ādisūtra* is quoted might then be the *upabheda* of the *Parākhya* which the *Bṛhatkālottara* actually calls *Parākhya*.

As for the appropriateness of the name *Saurabheya*, I quote SANDERSON's suggestion (GOODALL 1998:lxv, fn. 156):

⁵⁷It is clear that an *ādisūtra* need not be a unit of thirty-two syllables: Rāmakaṇṭha takes *Kiraṇa* 1:11c–12d to be the *ādisūtra* of that work (*Kiraṇa* 1:13, which is identified as the *ādisūtra* in the *Bṛhatkālottara* (f. 54^v, lines 3–4) Rāmakaṇṭha refers to as a *prati-jñāsūtrāntaram*), and for the *Vijaya* the *Bṛhatkālottara* identifies just two *pādas* as the *ādisūtra* (f. 52^v, line 2).

⁵⁸See, e.g., the information about the subdivision of the *Niśvāsa* quoted in GOODALL 1998:416.

⁵⁹We can assume that the reading *saurabhedam* is a slip, although this too could be appropriate, since the teacher of the tantra is the sun.

The interlocutors of the *Parākhya* are Prakāśa (the sun) and a certain Pratoda, who can be identified with Vasiṣṭha,⁶⁰ because this information is given when a passage from the *Parākhya* is quoted in Takṣakavarta's digest (f. 40^v, line 15): *pratodo bhagavān vasiṣṭha uvāca . . .*. This connection with Vasiṣṭha may explain the *Parākhya*'s other name: since Vasiṣṭha is closely associated in mythology with Surabhi, the 'cow of plenty' produced at the churning of the ocean, Professor SANDERSON proposes (in a letter of 2.ix.96) that *Saurabheya* means 'taught to Saurabha', Saurabha denoting Vasiṣṭha.

The same passage of Takṣakavarta's *Nityādisaṅgrahābhīdhānapaddhati* identifies Prakāśa as the sun, introducing his first speech with *prakāśo bhagavān sūrya uvāca*, and this identification is confirmed by the speaker indication before 4:40 in M^Y's text. I give below a translation of Takṣakavarta's quotation, which is to be found as A:1–8 in Appendix I.

The venerable Pratoda, [that is to say] Vasiṣṭha spoke:
Earlier [you taught that] the five *brahmantras* are arranged as limbs and subsidiary limbs [of Sadāśiva]. What is the point of these supposititious limbs that you call 'heart', etc.? (1)

Prakāśa, the Lord the sun, spoke:

These limbs being said to be limbs belongs to a teaching that is couched in figurative language (*upacāravidhīhitam*). For even those [mantras] that we call armour and sword [viz. the KAVACA and the ASTRA] are here [spoken of figuratively as] limbs. And those two are not [in fact] limbs; they become [spoken of figuratively as] limbs because they are occasioned by [real] limbs. (2–3b)

The HṚDAYA is put on like a protective cloth for the protection of the heart; the ŚIRAS is something wrapped about the head as a protection for the head; the CŪLIKĀ is a protection for the head; and the KAṆKAṆA is a protection for the body. (3c–4)

⁶⁰There are precious few instances of verse-filling vocatives in Prakāśa's speeches that could confirm this identification. Pratoda is once addressed with *mune* 4:166b and in *Śataratnasaṅgraha* 61, said in the commentary to be from the *Parākhya* but not traced in M^Y (see Appendix I.L:128), the address *munisattama* is used. One might also regard the final word of Appendix I.G:93d as a vocative and accept that it once formed part of our text.

Once he has grasped the weapons, the mantra-practitioner is fearsome, like a soldier; he cannot be vanquished by lower creatures; [he is] like [the bird] Tārksya among snakes. (5)

This fashioning of his ‘limbs’ [is performed] in the same way as the fashioning of his body [with the *brahmamantras*]. A making firm [of this body] of the *sādhaka*, which is produced with(?) pride/conviction, is then to be accomplished. Having become Śiva internally and externally, as Śiva he should worship Śiva. (6)

Pratoda spoke:

Since we see [in worldly interaction] that the relation between one who honours and one who is honoured is like [the relationship] of an inferior and a superior, if he has become Śiva and is then literally Śiva, how can he be a worshipper? (7)

Prakāśa spoke:

The Lord is in a palace atop the pure path; to reach Him is to become equal to Him. Without becoming equal to Him, the [aspirant] cannot worship Him. For we observe [in the world] that amity, which results in the [desired] fruit, [takes place] between those of like qualities. (8)

The passage quoted in Takṣakavarta’s digest does not overlap with the parts of the text that M^Y transmits; but its style and subject matter are certainly characteristic of M^Y’s *Parākhya*, and M^Y omits chapters 7–13, so we may suppose that the passage belonged to one of these. The same may apply to the numerous quotations, relating principally to ritual, which cannot be located in M^Y’s text. As we know from 6:81, ritual was to be treated in the now missing section of text that once followed the sixth chapter.

Now there is in fact other evidence for the existence of more than one *Parākhya*: the twelfth-century *Jñānaratnāvalī* of Jñānaśambhu (see p. cx below) quotes a number of verses on the theme of *prāyaścitta* which it attributes to a *Parāsaṃhitā* (Appendix I.D:59–77). This label by itself is of course not enough to show that he was quoting a different text from our *Parākhya* (Kṣemarāja’s quotations regularly use the label *parāyām*, which could be an ellipsis of either *parasamhitāyām* or of *parāsamhitāyām*, and Tryambakaśambhu’s quotation of 4:167 is prefaced by the latter); but the quotation here follows immediately on from another quotation treating

the same theme attributed to the *Parākhya* (Appendix I.D:56–8). The first quotation is a brief account that, while not distinctively characteristic of our *Parākhya*, would not seem obviously out of place in it; the quotation attributed to the *Parāsaṃhitā*, however, is a relatively prolix account that is, I think, not typical of our text. It is possible, then, that it is this lost *Parāsaṃhitā* that is the *Bṛhatkālottara*'s second *Parākhya*. And it should be borne in mind that some of the untraced quotations in Appendix I may belong to this lost source.

One further work should be mentioned that is confused with M^Y's *Parākhya*, and that is the (*Mahā*-)*Karavīramahāyāga*, a work belonging to the Kālīkulakrama listed under what is supposed to be an alternative title, *Parātantrāgama*, in the *New Catalogus Catalogorum* (Vol. XI, p. 201). It is clear that the names alone are the source of the confusion. The two manuscripts listed under this head that are recorded as listed in the Mysore catalogue of 1922 are of our Saiddhāntika *Parākhya* (see p. cii below) and the rest⁶¹ do not transmit our text.

Relative chronology

I suggested in the introduction to the *Kiraṇavṛtti* that the lists of Siddhāntas might reflect their chronology. I thought of withdrawing this afterwards, because there seemed to be no reason why this should have been so (the redactors would surely not have intended to construct lists that reflected the order of composition). But here, once again, the relatively 'modern' flavour of the *Parākhya*, which is last in every list in which it appears, supports the idea. (But of course we must not forget the possibility that the *Parākhya* that is listed is not the text transmitted in M^Y, but the other work of the same name known to the redactor of the *Bṛhatkālottara*.) If the lists grew as the tantras got written, then they might unintentionally have come to reflect roughly the order of their composition. A relative chronology of these is extremely difficult to establish, since the redactors of scripture try not to leave clues, and there is little external evidence. In my introduction to the *Kiraṇavṛtti* I grouped possible kinds of internal evidence under the following heads: cross-references;

⁶¹MSS 5953, 5954, 5955, and 6822 of the Collections of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, described by Haraprasāda SHĀSTRĪ in Volume VIII, Part I of their catalogue (1939:142–7 and 874), as well as Cambridge University Library MS Add. 1477 and India Office Library MS 2590.

discrepant lists of the principles (*tattva*) with which the universe is structured; the structure of the tantras; oddities of doctrine; peculiarities of language; positioning within the traditional lists of twenty-eight. We have mentioned the last of these, and the first gives us no help with the *Parākhya*. The evidence of peculiarities of language has to be used with care: in the case of the *Kiraṇa* it now seems clear to me that the passages which contain most *aiśa* forms are those giving injunctions and describing rituals, for it is in these that the redactor reveals his difficulties with constructing correct optatives (forms such as *hunet* are common) and his failure to distinguish when to use *lyap* and when *ktivā*. In the philosophical portion of the *Kiraṇa* relatively few *aiśa* usages occur. Of the *Parākhya* only the doctrinal portions are transmitted and these only in one manuscript. With this caveat stated, it is fair to observe that its Sanskrit seems in some respects ‘purer’ and is metrically more ambitious (each chapter ends with a verse not in *anuṣṭubh*), but see the discussion of the *Parākhya*’s language and metre below.

The use of developed terminology of the Śaiva Siddhānta I have also advanced as a criterion for the relative dating of the *Parākhya* (GOODALL 2001a:331), but this can be extremely treacherous. The term *pañcakṛtya*, a term common in commentatorial works for the ancient group of Śiva’s five cosmic functions (assumed by commentators to be listed in *Raurava-sūtrasaṅgraha* 1:15ab), but not, I think, attested in other early Siddhāntas with the exception of the (also relatively late) *Mṛgendravidyāpāda* (3:8d), is to be found in *Parākhya* 2:123d. Remarking on this in GOODALL 2001a, I alluded also to the mention of *pralayākala*s in *Parākhya* 4:20f as being perhaps the earliest instance of the use of the term in a Siddhāntatantra (2001a:331). In fact we find it in verse 4 of the fragment of what is probably the Ur-*Paṣkara* quoted in the *Jñānarātnāvalī* and reproduced on p. liii below. Thus it is perhaps that text, rather than the *Mālinī-vijayottara* (as suggested by SANDERSON, quoted by GOODALL 1998:184–5, fn. 71), that was the source of the Saiddhāntika classification of *akala* souls into *pralayākala* and *vijñānākala*.

In its list of the constitutive principles of the universe the *Parākhya* is the closest of the demonstrably early tantras to the canonical post-scriptural Śaiva Siddhānta of the exegetes, for from the *bhuvanapaṭala* (chapter 5) it is clear that its *tattvakrama* is exactly that of the *Tat-*

tvaprakāśa,⁶² but for the omission of *śakti*. (Since *śiva* and *śakti* are ontologically indivisible, it is not clear to me whether this omission need be regarded as a significant deviation from the *Tattvaprakāśa*'s list.) In this and in other matters of doctrine the *Parākhya*, like the *Kiraṇa* and the later, still more śāstric *Mataṅga* and *Mṛgendra*, is evidently trying to present and defend a reasoned, consistent world view. Pratoda's questions, like those of *Garuḍa* and *Mataṅga*, insistently probe possible doubts and inconsistencies and are not, as those of other interlocutors sometimes seem, the perfunctory requests for knowledge periodically required by the genre.

We may conclude that the *Parākhya* is probably the latest or one of the latest of the surviving listed pre-tenth-century tantras of the Saiddhāntika canon.

Excursus upon the *Raurava* and the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha*

One further observation should be added to this discussion. Since my discussion of the Saiddhāntika canon appeared in the introduction to the first volume of the *Kiraṇavṛtti*, one book has been published in this series that implicitly challenges the stratification I have proposed, and that is the translation of the *Raurava* by DAGENS and BARAZER-BILLORET (2000). They are not of the view that the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha* is the only part of the text sufficiently early to have been known to Kashmirian exegetes of the tenth century, and since this bears on my stratification, but I intend instead to leave a detailed examination of their argumentation to a later publication. Briefly, my own position is that the many quotations attributed to the *Raurava* in the works of early Saiddhāntika authors (i.e. up to and including the twelfth-century Aghoraśiva and his immediate disciples) that are to be traced to the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha* demonstrate that the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha* was the early *Raurava* known to those authors. These same early authors do not quote from the corpus that has been published as the '*kriyāpāda*' of the *Raurava*,⁶³ and this suggests that

⁶²The Bhoja who authored this work is, as GENGNAGEL argues (1996:21), probably to be placed in between Rāmakaṇṭha and Aghoraśiva.

⁶³One chapter of the '*kriyāpāda*', 58, contains material from *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha* 8, and that material is cited; but chapter 58 is cooked together out of quotations attributed to the *Raurava*, and the overlapping material derives, I believe, from the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha*. DAGENS and BARAZER-BILLORET imagined that they had found an independent quotation that confirmed the antiquity of the version found in chapter 58

the early authors did not know that corpus. The arguments of DAGENS and BARAZER-BILLORET (2000) for proving the relative lateness of the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha* and the relative antiquity of the ‘*kriyāpāda*’ of the *Raurava* seem to me to amount to a collection of conflicting strategies for explaining away the evidence of the many quotations attributed to the *Raurava* that we find in the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha*. They argue, for instance, (2000:xiv) that the quotations must be from an earlier *Raurava*, since they are labelled *Raurava* and not *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha* (this is in fact an exaggeration), and yet on p.xvi they acknowledge that the many quotations we find from the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha* show that, by claiming to be scripture at second or third remove, the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha* was not unsuccessful in attaining recognition. Later (2000:xlii) we find them suggesting that the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha* was a ‘memento’ of the *Raurava* sufficiently close to its original for subsequent authors to get confused about what they were quoting. Later still we find the claim (p.1) that the honour in which the exegetes of the tradition held the *Raurava* they quote shows that they could not actually have been quoting from so meagre and disorganised a work as the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha*, in which the quoted lines happen to occur but which is not their source. To me DAGENS and BARAZER-BILLORET make the impression of battling against rather than using each piece of textual evidence that might have helped them to build up a coherent account of the genesis of the *Raurava* ‘corpus’. And they have not discussed the earliest and most important evidence: the testimony of Sadyojyotis, the earliest Saiddhāntika exegete of whom works survive. For DAGENS and BARAZER-BILLORET it seems that all that was really great about the Ur-*Raurava* that has survived are its name and reputation (2000:1):

... quant à sa réputation passée elle est attestée moins par les citations dont on a parlé que par les innombrables signes que ce texte a été (très certainement à plusieurs reprises) adapté, mis au goût du jour et du lieu, pour demeurer une référence incontestable.

Now there may indeed once have been an Ur-*Raurava* that is now irretrievably lost. But we do not have the evidence to prove whether or not

(2000:xxviii, fn. 50), but they failed to realise that the quotation in question is in fact not independent but one of the quotations that is a principal source for chapter 58 of the edition.

such a thing existed. What the evidence of substantial early attributed quotations from the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha* and the absence of such quotations from the ‘*kriyāpāda*’ allow us to conclude is that the earliest now surviving *Raurava* is almost certainly the body of chapters transmitted to us of the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha*.

Dates and the Śaiva Tantric canon

... Concerning the chronology of the early scriptural sources of Tantric Śaivism we can do little more than assert for most of the texts known to us that they predate the citations that appear in the works of the earliest datable commentators, that is to say, in works of the tenth to early eleventh centuries from Kashmir or Mālava, and for a few of them, that they go back at least to the early ninth century since they survive in Nepalese manuscripts of that date. . .

Going back further than this we lose sight of titles and can only establish that Tantric Śaiva texts of certain familiar kinds must have been present and that these or some of these were probably works among those that were current later. Thus I propose that a scriptural corpus of the kind we find later in the Saiddhāntika scriptures must have been in existence by the beginning of the seventh century. There survive inscriptions recording the Saiddhāntika Śaiva initiation of three major kings during the second half of that century, and during its first half the Buddhist philosopher Dharmakīrti (c. 600–660) goes to the trouble of attacking the Tantric practice of initiation as the means to liberation. These facts reveal that Tantric Śaivism of this relatively public and strongly soteriological variety was not merely present in the seventh century but well established. And this implies the existence of Tantric Śaiva scriptures.⁶⁴

After his magisterial treatment of the earliest diverse pieces of external evidence that pin down the ‘limits before which Tantric Śaiva literature can be seen to have existed’⁶⁵ SANDERSON observes (2002:14–15):

⁶⁴SANDERSON 2002:2–11 [footnotes omitted].

⁶⁵SANDERSON 2002:14.

For evidence of what it postdates, we must look to the texts themselves. Since they have been composed as scripture, that is to say, as transmissions of a timeless revelation, they are less than generous in this respect. Their redactors seem to have been careful to avoid references to historical persons and events that would undermine faith by implying a *terminus post quem*; and the device of prophecy, which would have allowed reference to the past without this consequence, is rare in this predominantly prescriptive literature. So one is reduced to trying to get the better of the redactors by identifying elements in their texts which they probably considered timeless facts but whose introduction can nonetheless be dated, if only approximately.

One such element that SANDERSON goes on to mention and that we find in the *Parākhya* is the use of notions of Greek astrology, in particular the listing of the planets in the order of their lordship of the weekdays (*Parākhya* 5:115–27), since ‘[t]exts with these elements can hardly be earlier than the fourth century AD’ (SANDERSON 2002:15–16).

VASUDEVA’s illuminating discussion of the *nādiphāntakrama* (*2000:xli–lxii) ingeniously makes use of another kind of datable evidence that might once have appeared timeless: the graphemes of a particular script. He here convincingly demonstrates (particularly *2000:lviii–lxii) that the *nādiphāntakrama* is not an arbitrary sequence of characters but one that makes sense if derived from an arrangement of the characters of ‘the Kuṣāṇa and early Gupta version of the Brāhmī alphabet’ such that they make up the body-parts of the goddess Mālinī.⁶⁶ VASUDEVA is of course aware that this does not enable us to date any particular Trika text to between the second and fifth centuries (*2000:lx).

Such ingenuity is not required to date the *Parākhya*, which we can be certain does not belong to such an early phase of Saiddhāntika literature, for we can plainly discern the influence upon it of thinkers of the seventh century. It is worth remarking that the author of the *Parākhya* seems

⁶⁶.[I]n the Trika’s *Nādiphāntakrama* the written shape of each grapheme taken singly was identified as resembling a certain bodily limb or organ; taken together the whole syllabary represented the anthropomorphic body of the alphabet deity. When listed in the conventional head-to-toes order of the *nyāsa*-rite a particular rearrangement of the alphabet is arrived at, and this is the sequence beginning with NA and ending with PHA.’ (VASUDEVA *2000:lxii).

not to have been particularly careful in suppressing altogether references to historical personages if they seemed ancient enough. In his account of the conventionality of language he alludes to metrical terms in order to make the point that they are conventions rather than eternal givens (6:47). In other words, he implicitly admits that the terms would be incomprehensible to someone not familiar with the work of Piṅgala, and this point is made explicitly in the *Śābarabhāṣya*, on which, directly or indirectly, he is almost certainly drawing at this point. The same passage refers to the muni who codified grammar (6:48), and this can surely only be Pāṇini. (His position that the Vedas are not authorless, a corollary of the position that language is conventional, means that they too are not beyond time, but they are perhaps beyond historical time.) In short, the author of the *Parākhya* appears not to have wished to disguise altogether that the *Parākhya*, at least in this redaction, had a place in human history.

The sources and the date of the Parākhya

Like the *Mṛgendra* and the *Mataṅga*, and unlike most other surviving early Siddhāntas (*Niśvāsa*, *Pārameśvara*, *Kiraṇa*, *Sārdhatriśatikālottara*, *Sarvajñānottara*, etc.), the *Parākhya* treats theological and philosophical problems in great detail, is thematically tightly structured, and is written (in part) in what aspires to be the style of philosophical *kārikās*.

Although I have not recognised a very large number of close verbal echoes of śāstric texts outside the Śaiva tradition, the *Parākhya* very frequently reproduces the arguments of such texts. It is plain that the earliest Siddhāntas (the *Niśvāsa*, the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha*, and the *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha*) borrow much of their fundamental ontology from Sāṅkhya thinkers. Now the *Parākhya*, of course, inherits this ontology and draws on Sāṅkhya sources;⁶⁷ but it evidently belongs to a later (or at least conceptually later) phase, in which Saiddhāntikas were at pains to bring some of their doctrines into line with certain developments in śāstric thought that we can trace to the writings of quite different rivals: Mīmāṃsakas, Vedāntins, Vaiśeṣikas, and Naiyāyikas. I have earlier as-

⁶⁷Sāṅkhya ideas pervade the entire text, but for some particular instances see footnotes 141, 144 and 328 on pp.180, 182 and 235 below, and compare 4:4–5 with *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 7, 4:70–1 with *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 12, 4:107–8 with *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 38, and 4:125 with *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 27. Notice also the echo of *Yogasūtra* 1.23 in *Parākhya* 14:12c.

served (GOODALL 2001a:332) that Dharmakīrti's insistence on the *sādhya* and *sādhana* in formal argument being necessarily connected (*avinābhāvanīyama*), i.e. related by *kāryakāraṇabhāva* or by *svabhāva*, was probably the ultimate source for the pronouncement in *Parākhya* 2:6. This now seems to me impossible, as I will later explain (see fn. 103 on p.167 below);⁶⁸ but we do find an echo of Dharmakīrti in *Parākhya* 6:49cd, which recalls and may be based on *Pramāṇavārttika* 1:320ab.

The influence of Mīmāṃsaka thought is in evidence in almost all the *Parākhya*'s philosophical discussions. We have referred above to one passage based directly or indirectly on the *Śābarabhāṣya*. I suspect that there are a number of conscious echoes specifically of Kumārila's discussions, but this is often difficult to prove.

I have earlier argued (GOODALL 2001a:332–3) that such an echo is to be found in the *Parākhya*'s treatment of the proof of the existence of a creator god.

The *Kiraṇa*'s naïve presentation of the argument by which the Lord is inferred from his effect, the universe,⁶⁹ shows no awareness of Kumārila's objection that if the Lord's creativity is to be compared with the potter's, then the Lord should be perishable and have other such undesirable qualities of the potter.⁷⁰ Rāmakaṇṭha, of course, is aware of Kumārila's argument, which he quotes ad loc., and his response is that each craftsman is omniscient and omnipotent within his own sphere of action.⁷¹ Now the same line of response is implicit in the general rule formulated in *Parākhya* 2:29–30b:

⁶⁸Cf. *Mataṅgavidyāpāda* 3:9abc, quoted in fn. 103 on p.167 below. SANDERSON (2002:16) has pointed out a couple of other echoes of non-Śaiva śāstric texts in the *Mataṅga*: *Sāṅkhyakārikā* 62 is paraphrased in *vidyāpāda* 6:63c–64b and Dignāga's definition of *pratyakṣa* (*pratyakṣam kalpanāpoḍham*) given in the *pratyakṣapariccheda* of the *Pramāṇasamuccaya* is alluded to in *Mataṅgayogapāda* 4:15c–16a (*anirdeśyam asandigdham kalpanāpoḍhagocaram/ pratyakṣam*).

⁶⁹*Kiraṇa* 3:12: *sthūlam vicitrakam kāryam nānyathā ghaṭavad bhavet/ asti hetur ataḥ kaścit. karma cen, na hy acetanam.*

⁷⁰*Ślokavārttika, sambandhākṣepaparihāra* 79–80.

⁷¹*Kiraṇavṛtti* 3:12.26–7 and 30–1: *na ca viruddho hetuḥ ... dṛṣṭānte hi ghaṭādāv ayaṃ hetuḥ svasādhye svakāryasarvajñatvasarvakartṛtvalakṣaṇeneśvaratvena vyāptaḥ siddho yatas tasyāṃśenāpi vaikalyena ghaṭādarśanād avināśītenāpi kumbhakārātmano nityatvāt tasyaiva ca kartṛtvāt.*

*nimittam īśvarākhyam tad yad dr̥ṣṭam saha-
kāraṇam
upādānam ca yat sūkṣmam sarvakāryeṣu saṃhitam
kāraṇānām trayam tena sarvakāryeṣu saṃhitam*⁷²

And the point is reiterated in *Parākhya* 2:63–4b:

*sādhanaṅgaphalaiḥ sārḍham vetti sarvam idaṃ tataḥ
yathā tantvādikṛt kartā viṣayikṛtya tāni saḥ
tasmin pravartate kārye tadvat tasmin paraḥ śivaḥ.*

Some such echoes may be more apparent than real, but one verse contains what I think really must be an allusion to Kumārila. Consider the following objection of Pratoda (*Parākhya* 3:38):

*tathyaṃ yac codanāvākyam agnihotrādivācakam
tasya jñānasamutpattau nāprāmāṇyaṃ tridhā sthitam.*

True statements of Vedic injunction (*tathyaṃ yac codanāvākyam*) that teach such things as the Agnihotra are not non-authoritative in [any of the] three ways [in which something may be non-authoritative] (*tasya ... nāprāmāṇyaṃ tridhā sthitam*) when understanding [of them] arises (*jñānasamutpattau*).

Now these three are listed in *Ślokaṅgārttika*, *codanāsūtra* 54ab: *aprāmāṇyaṃ tridhā bhinnaṃ mithyātvājñānasamśayaḥ*. It is true that Kumārila is basing himself on a discussion in the *Śābarabhāṣya* ad *Mīmāṃsāsūtra* 1.1.4a (FRAUWALLNER 1968:26), but here Pratoda's distinctive formulation echoes that of Kumārila.

Other echoes of Kumārila can, I think, be discerned when Prakāśa refutes *vivartavāda* (1:44) and when the *Parākhya* adverts to the problem of the circularity of God and his scripture proclaiming each other (2:71c–72b); and *Mīmāṃsā* seems even to have influenced the choice of topics: much of chapter 3 (3:23ff) is devoted to an incongruous (for a Śaiva tantra)

⁷²The instigating cause is that which is called the 'lord'; that which is seen [such as the stick, wheel, etc.] is the auxiliary cause; that which is the material cause is matter. This triad of causes is involved in all effects and can therefore be inferred for every effect.' I have followed here the readings and interpretation of the *Śataratnollekhinī* ad *Śataratnasaṅgraha* 15 (= *Parākhya* 2:29); but see annotation ad loc.

discussion of whether the *apauruṣeyatva* of Vedic revelation can be proved by any of the six *pramāṇas*.

We find also echoes of philosophical tags from other disciplines. A catchy half-line of the *Brahmabindūpaniṣat* is to be found in *Parākhya* 1:42; a much used Cārvāka half-line intended to question the validity of *anumāna* occurs as *Parākhya* 2:10cd (though here it appears to be used inappropriately to reject *arthāpatti* as a *pramāṇa* while retaining *anumāna*); well-known Mīmāṃsaka tags are to be found in *Parākhya* 2:12 and 6:14.⁷³

In many passages, of course, we find what must already have been philosophical clichés by the time of the composition of the *Parākhya*, and so we cannot say that the texts in which they first occurred were direct sources for the redaction of the tantra: notable are the stock discussions of *sphoṭa* in 6:9ff, of the connection between word and meaning (*śabdārthasambandha*) in 6:17ff, of the *apauruṣeyatva* of Vedic revelation in 3:23ff, of the Cārvākas in 1:17ff, of *kṣaṇabhaṅgavāda* in 1:28ff. Another difficulty in dating the *Parākhya* by attempting to identifying its literary sources and thereby to establish its position in the history of philosophy should be at least alluded to here. The *Parākhya* may treat some philosophical themes but it is not a work of philosophy and we cannot therefore expect it to give a well-rounded and up-to-date reflection of contemporary Indian thought in the course of defending its own theology.

VASUDEVA (*2000:176) has identified a Vaiśeṣika allusion in *Parākhya* 14:95 whose formulation may be an echo not of the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* but of Candrānanda's *vṛtti* thereon (see fn. 836 on p. 380 below). If this is indeed an allusion to Candrānanda, then this may one day be a piece of evidence that could be used further to pin down the date of composition of the *Parākhya*. But the period in which Candrānanda wrote is not known. ISAACSON (*1995:140–1) reviews the evidence adduced to date and places him between c. 600 AD (on the strength of his reference to Uddyotakara) and the tenth century (on the strength of what are probably borrowings in Helārāja's commentary on the *Vākyapadīya*).

Among other tantras, as we have observed, the closest in style and tone appear to be the *Mṛgendra*, the *Mataṅga* and the South Indian *Pauṣkara*. My view that the *Pauṣkara* postdates Rāmakaṇṭha I have expressed before (GOODALL 1998:xlili–xlv and again GOODALL 2001a:329).

⁷³Other non-tantric clichés include 6:44ab, 6:47ab, 14:63cd, and 14:89a.

Furthermore I have argued (GOODALL 2001a:329–30) that for the portions that the *Pauṣkara* shares with the *Parākhya* it is the *Pauṣkara* that was the borrower; indeed it is not improbable, as I have there suggested, that the eighth chapter of the *Pauṣkara* (in which all the shared portions are to be found) is entirely an interpolation. One freshly discovered piece of evidence for its date is worth recording here, since it will be useful to us below in another context.

Excursus upon the Pauṣkaras

It may be recalled that the famous twelfth-century commentator Aghoraśiva appears to be the first author to have cited a number of distinctive verses belonging to the South Indian *Pauṣkara*, but that he never gives a labelled quotation from the text (GOODALL 1998:xliv, fn. 101⁷⁴). Aghoraśiva's not labelling these quotations, I have suggested, might be accounted for if we assumed that he was uncomfortably aware of two *Pauṣkaras*, and that his predecessors quoted from the other alone. This still seems to me a not implausible hypothesis, and indeed we find that Aghoraśiva's contemporary Jñānaśambhu, a South Indian, but living in Benares (see p. cx below), does not quote from the newer *Pauṣkara* but only from the older one. One of his quotations is of especial interest in part because, unlike most other fragments of the old *Pauṣkara* that have come to light, it overlaps with a teaching found in the new *Pauṣkara* (*Jñānaratnāvalī*, Madras GOML MS R 14466, p. 254, IFP MS T. 231, p. 281–2):⁷⁵

⁷⁴To the list given there of unlabelled quotations from the *Pauṣkara* in the works of Aghoraśiva should be added the quotation of *Pauṣkara* 1:91c–92b in the *Ratnatrayollekhinī* ad 263–4 (also quoted without attribution by Aghoraśiva's disciple Trilocanaśiva in his *Siddhāntasamuccaya*, IFP MS T. 284, p. 134).

⁷⁵As BRUNNER has indicated (1981:139–40) the first verse alone of this passage is cited, evidently from the *Jñānaratnāvalī* (since it is followed there by *ityādinā prakāntaram jñānaratnāvalyādau prasiddham*), at the end of the Śaiva section of the *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha* (p. 189). It is also cited with attribution to the *Pauṣkara* by Rāmakaṇṭha in his *Sārdhatriśatikālottaravṛtti* ad 1:3.

tathā paṣkare ca
patir vidyā tathāvidyā paśuḥ pāśās ca kāraṇam
tannivṛttāv iti proktāḥ⁷⁶ padārthāḥ ṣaṭ samāsataḥ⁷⁷ 1
śivaḥ sadāśivas tv īśaḥ saha tadbhuvanādibhiḥ
jñeyah patipadārtho 'sau. mantramantresālakṣaṇā⁷⁸ 2
śaktir⁷⁹ vidyā ca bhuvanair vidyākhyas ca prakīrtitaḥ⁸⁰
māyātattvam avidyākhyah karmabhāvaiḥ sabhauvanaiḥ⁸¹ 3
sarveṣām ātmanām⁸² ceha vijñānākalasaṃjñinām
pralayākalasaṃjñānām⁸³ sakalānām tathaiva ca 4
paśutvamalasaṃyogāt padārthaḥ paśusaṃjñitaḥ
pṛthivyādikalānto yo māyīyah pāśasaṅgrahaḥ 5
saha sadbhūtabhuvanair māyāgarbhādhikāribhiḥ⁸⁴
padārthaḥ pāśasaṃjñeyo⁸⁵ vijñeyah śivayogibhiḥ 6
tannivṛtteḥ kāraṇākhyah padārthaḥ paramaḥ śivaḥ
dikṣākarmasvarūpo 'yaṃ muktyupāyah prakīrtitaḥ 7. iti

Now this is recognisably the same list of *padārthas* that we find in the newer *Paṣkara* (1:8–14), but one of the accounts is plainly a reformulation of the other. Indeed BHATT (*upodghāta* to the first volume of the *Mataṅga*, p. xlvii) refers to the existence of quotations of the first half-line supposing it to be simply a variant of 1:8cd of the printed *Paṣkara*. Its relationship with the list of the *Mataṅga* (*vidyāpāda* 2:14–21) is also unmistakable, and we may assume that it is to be explained because all three texts (the *Mataṅga*, the printed *Paṣkara*, and the *Paṣkara* quoted by Jñānaśāmbhu) see themselves as redactions of the *Pārameśvara* division of scripture.⁸⁶

⁷⁶proktāḥ] conj.; proktaṃ R 14466; prokta T. 231

⁷⁷padārthāḥ ṣaṭ samāsataḥ] conj. (cf. new *Paṣkara* 1:9b); padārthāḥ ṣaṭ samānasaḥ +(taḥ)+ R 14466; padārtha ṣaṭ samānataḥ T. 231

⁷⁸lakṣaṇā] conj.; °lakṣaṇaḥ R 14466, T. 231

⁷⁹śaktir] conj.; śakti R 14466, T. 231

⁸⁰prakīrtitaḥ] conj.; prakīrtitaḥ/ śaktipadārthaḥ R 14466, T. 231 (I assume this *śaktipadārthaḥ* to be an inserted explanatory label.)

⁸¹sabhauvanaiḥ] conj.; sahovanaḥ R 14466, T. 231

⁸²ātmanām] conj.; ātmanaś R 14466, T. 231

⁸³pralayākalasaṃjñānām] conj.; praḷayākalasaṃvijñānaṃ R 14466, T. 231 (unmetrical)

⁸⁴māyāgarbhādhikāribhiḥ] conj.; māyāgavātikāribhiḥ R 14466, T. 231 (unmetrical)

⁸⁵pāśasaṃjñeyo] em.; pāśasaṃjñeyah R 14466, T. 231

⁸⁶For what may be another such indication, see 3:56ab and the apparatus and annotation thereto.

Parallels with other Siddhāntatantras

Other than the verses incorporated from the *Parākhya* into the eighth chapter of the *Pauṣkara*, I am not aware of shared verses between the two texts. Nor are there many *pādas* shared between the *Parākhya* and what is arguably the next closest (in spirit) of the Siddhāntatantras, the *Mataṅga*, and such as there are tend to be tantric clichés (*Mataṅgavidyāpāda* 17:189d \approx *Parākhya* 2:21d, *Mataṅgavidyāpāda* 4:55d = *Parākhya* 2:122d, *Mataṅgavidyāpāda* 3:20a = *Parākhya* 3:56a,⁸⁷ *Mataṅgavidyāpāda* 23:85b = *Parākhya* 5:6b, *Mataṅgavidyāpāda* 7:44a = *Parākhya* 6:27a). Although similar in their subject matter, the *Parākhya* and the *Mataṅga* are not particularly similar in style. The much longer *Mataṅga* tends to be more prolix, filled out with frequent vocatives and expressions whose only purpose is to pad out the verse. Observe, for instance, that there are more than a dozen half-verses in the *vidyāpāda* of the *Mataṅga* that end with *na saṃśayaḥ*, *asaṃśayaḥ* or *nātra saṃśayaḥ*,⁸⁸ and note the very large number of *pādas* filled out with *mune* or *mahāmune* or *muniṣṭava*. There is but a single vocative addressing Pratoda in the transmitted chapters of the *Parākhya* (4:166b)⁸⁹ and there are no lines ending in any of the formulae using the word *saṃśaya*. Nor are the particles *tu*, *hi* and *ca* used in loose profusion to fill out the verses. Another padding ploy much used in the *Mataṅga* is that of compounds ending in an otiose *-ātman* or *-antarātman*⁹⁰ or simply tacking on *mahātmanām* or *mahātmanaḥ* as an additional qualifier.⁹¹ In the *Parākhya* we find comparable otiose uses of *ātman* only in 3:63d and 15:20d, and one instance of *mahātmanā* (in 3:60d) which might be held to be otiose or nearly so.

The treatment of one particular topic, the story of the division by Ananta of mantras at creation related in *Parākhya* 3:57ff, may have been based on the treatment found in *Mataṅgavidyāpāda* 7; but it is

⁸⁷See annotation ad loc.

⁸⁸6:14d, 6:31d, 6:40, 8:45b, 10:28d, 13:29d, 15:13d, 17:62b, 24:14d, 24:34d, 26:73d.

⁸⁹See also fn. 60 on p. xl above.

⁹⁰E.g. *Mataṅgavidyāpāda* 1:11b, 2:10b, 4:32d, 4:41b, 7:9b, 8:68d, 11:17b, 13:32d, 17:40b, 17:47b, 17:77a, 17:90d, 17:153b, 25:58d, 26:64d, *yogapāda* 3:15d, etc.

⁹¹E.g. *Mataṅgavidyāpāda* 1:27b, 1:28b, 2:11d, 3:25d, 4:4b, 4:52b, 5:11b, 6:4b, 7:21d, 7:37d, 16:8d, 16:28b, 17:20d, 17:48b, 17:75b, 17:97d, 17:127b, 17:186b, 22:13d, 23:44d, 23:59d, 23:72d, 25:1d, 25:42b, 26:45d, etc. This usage is not linguistically remarkable—it is common outside tantric literature too—but it is often used here only to pad the metre.

not impossible that both were drawing on the same source or on related sources. And it is possible that *Parākhya* 4:27–28b (now corrupt) and *Mataṅgavidyāpāda* 9:28 go back to a common source. The puzzling treatment of perception in *Parākhya* 4:32–4 contains the term *dvāra* apparently as a term for the three internal organs, which is an oddity that I have elsewhere observed only in the *Mataṅga* (see annotation ad loc.)

I have noticed three half-verses that are shared with the *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha*: 1:80ab = *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha* 2:13cd, 4:41ab ≈ *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha* 2:17ab, and Appendix I.G:94cd = *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha* 10:3ab; and it seems possible to me that 1:52cd is a conscious echo of *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha* 2:4. A handful of clichés are shared with the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha*: 2:92ab ≈ *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha* 10:32cd; 2:121b = *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha* 1:15d; 2:123ab ≈ *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha* 1:14ab and 2:12ab; 5:144d = *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha* 3:13b (as transmitted in M^Y).

The only substantial passage that is almost certainly based on a particular Siddhāntatantra that I have been able to identify is in the concluding portion of *Parākhya* 4 (4:151ff). Here numerous verses echo in their formulation the treatment of the same ideas in the *Kiraṇa*. The *Kiraṇa*'s treatment is distinctive and the *Parākhya*'s reformulation would be extremely difficult to interpret without the *Kiraṇa*'s account to lay beside it. *Parākhya* 2:102–4 may be a reformulation of *Kiraṇa* 5:3–6b, but a rather distant one. Another echo, of *Kiraṇa* 6:1–4, is discernible in verses attributed to the *Parākhya* in the *Mṛgendrapaddhatiṭikā* Appendix I, C:50–1. But in this case this could equally be an echo of a pair of verses ascribed to the *Raurava* which Vaktraśambhu quotes in the same context.⁹²

The *Mṛgendra* (in *vidyāpāda* 2:12–14) and the *Parākhya* (in 1:42–50) appear to be the only early Siddhāntas to devote attention to the refu-

⁹²The quotation, on p. 189 of IFP MS T. 1021, is as follows:

śrīmadraurave 'pi
na śārīrasya saṃskāro na saṃyogavibhāgayoḥ
na cotpattivināśābhyāṃ nāpi jāter vidhīyate
cetanasyāpi śuddhasya kṣetrajñāsya śārīriṇaḥ
jñasvabhāvātmano 'kartus tasya saṃskāra iṣyate.

The last line is corrected to the reading in *Kiraṇavṛtti* 1:23.12–13, where the second of these verses is quoted (with attribution to the *Raurava*) by Rāmakaṇṭha. In T. 1021 it reads *jñūbhātmano kartuṃsta saṃskāra iṣyate*.

tation of a philosophical Vedānta.⁹³ I have presented and discussed both passages elsewhere (GOODALL forthcoming A), and suggested tentatively that, since the undated early Saiddhāntika writer Sadyojyotis appears to have been aware only of a Vedāntic *pariṇāmavāda*,⁹⁴ it is conceivable that

⁹³The *Sarvajñānottara*, as is well known (see, e.g., SANDERSON 1992:291), is exceptional among the early Siddhāntas for upholding rather than refuting a non-dualist position, but its non-dualism does not seem to me to be distinctively Vedāntic. In his (in almost every other detail inaccurate) preface to the Adyar edition, KUNJUNNI RAJA helpfully points out (p. vi) what is likely to be an instance of borrowing from what is usually accepted to be a Vedāntic source. *Sarvajñānottara* 111–12 (Tanjore edition [E_T]; 2:51–2 in Devakoṭṭai edition [E_D]; 99–100 in Adyar edition [E_A]; Nepalese MS f. 52^r, lines 4–5 [N₁]; IFP MS 47818, p. 44) read as follows:

*ghaṭasaṃvṛtam ākāśam nīyamāne yathā ghaṭe
ghaṭo nīyati nākāśam tadvaj jīvo nabhopamaḥ
bhinne kumbhe yathākāśam ākāśatvaṃ prapadyate
vibhinne prākṛte dehe tathātmā paramātmani.*

- ghaṭasaṃvṛtam ākāśam] 47818 E_T; ghaṭasaṃvṛtam ākāśam N₁;
ghaṭasaṃvṛta ākāśo E_DE_A • nīyati nākāśam] N₁; nayati nākāśam
47818; nīyeta nākāśam E_T; nīyata nākāśaḥ E_D; nīyeta nākāśaḥ E_A
 - nabhopamaḥ] 47818 E_TE_DE_A; nabhopama N₁ • bhinne kumbhe
yathākāśam] 47818 E_T; bhinnakumbhayathākāśam N₁; bhinne kumbhe
yathākāśaḥ E_D; chinne kumbhe yathākāśaḥ E_A
- [There are three *aiśa* usages here: *ākāśa* is treated as a neuter noun, *nabhas* as an *-a* stem, and N₁'s *nīyati* is a passive with the final vowel changed from an *e* to give the regular cadence of the *pathyā*.]

Compare these verses with those of Gauḍapāda's *Āgamaśāstra*, which might have inspired them (*Māṇḍūkya-kārikā* 3:3–4):

*ātmā hy ākāśavaj jīvair ghaṭākāśair ivoditaḥ
ghaṭādivac ca saṃghātair jātāv etan nidarśanam
ghaṭādiṣu pralīneṣu ghaṭākāśādayo yathā
ākāśe sampralīyante tadvaj jīvā ihātmani.*

In BHATTACHARYA's edition (p. 50) he quotes the first of our verses (in the form given by E_T) as being verse 3 of the *Tripurātāpanyupaniṣat*. It occurs also (with some variation) as 32:62c–63b of the *Nīśvāsakārikā*, IFP MSS T. 17, p. 232 and T. 127, p. 286.

But the source on which the *Sarvajñānottara* (and the *Nīśvāsakārikā*) drew may not have been a Vedāntic one. LINDTNER (1989:vi[a], referring to QVARNSTRÖM 1989:109) mentions that the *ghaṭākāśadr̥ṣṭānta* can in fact be traced back further, to the Buddhist *Āryasatyadvayavatārasūtra*.

⁹⁴First noted by SANDERSON (1985a:210, note 41), who formulated the observation cautiously, speaking only of Sadyojyotis's 'emphasis on transformationism' in the *Paramokṣanirāsakārikā* being something that 'suggests his relative antiquity'.

both the *Parākhya* and the *Mṛgendra* post-date him.⁹⁵ This now seems to me to have been premature, for I was assuming that in both tantras a developed Vedāntic *vivartavāda* was what was being discussed, and this is not actually clear in the case of the *Mṛgendra*, which makes essentially three claims about the non-dualism that it attacks that need not entail that that non-dualism is a form of *vivartavāda*. The claims are:⁹⁶ that non-dualism is devoid of external proof, that, since there is only one soul, experience must be unitary, and that, given this view, true liberation

⁹⁵I did not in that article discuss the evident influence of Vedānta upon the *Pauṣkara* on the grounds that that text did not belong to the ‘early’ canon, which is to say the group of tantras known to the Kashmirian tenth-century exegetes. It is worth just remarking in passing that that text’s response to Vedāntic ideas is more detailed and more sophisticated than that of either the *Mṛgendra* or the *Parākhya*. Particularly noteworthy in this regard is its discussion beginning with 3:11:

*prapañco ’yaṃ pramātrādibhedātmā nākṣagocaraḥ
yataḥ pratyakṣam arthānāṃ vidhātṛ na niṣedhakam.*

The verse is surely an allusion to Maṇḍanamiśra’s *Brahmasiddhi*, the *Tarkakāṇḍa* of which famously begins: *āhur vidhātṛ pratyakṣam na niṣedhṛ vipaścitaḥ*.

This heightened awareness of Vedāntic ideas (which we find addressed elsewhere in the text too, for instance in 4:74ff) is exactly what we would expect to find in the *Pauṣkara* when we recall that the evidence of quotations (which are to be found in the works of authors from the Tamil-speaking South from the middle of the twelfth century onwards) and of the distribution of manuscripts that transmit the work (all Southern) unequivocally suggests that it post-dated Rāmakaṇṭha and belonged to a South Indian milieu.

⁹⁶*Mṛgendra*vidyāpāda 2:12–14:

*vedānteṣv eka evātmā cidacidvyakti lakṣitaḥ
pratījñāmātram evedaṃ niścayaḥ kiṃnibandhanaḥ
atha pramāṇaṃ tatrātmā prameyatvaṃ prapadyate
yatraitad ubhayaṃ tatra caṣṭayam api sthitam
advaitahānir evaṃ syān niṣpramāṇakatānyathā
bhogaśāmyāvimokṣau ca yau neṣṭāv ātmavādibhiḥ.*

‘In the śāstras of the Vedānta there is only one soul, known through its manifestations, which are sentient and insentient. This is no more than mere assertion. What is the basis of this certainty? If you say that there is some valid means of knowing it [viz. scripture], then the soul must be the object of the valid knowledge. If you accept this pair [of means of knowing and object of knowledge], then all four [i.e. *pramāṇa*, *prameya*, *pramātr*, and *pramiti*] are proven to exist. [And] thus that would be the end of non-dualism; either that, or it must be without valid means of knowledge. And there would also result [the faults] that all must share the same experience and that liberation would be impossible, both which faults are not accepted by any who maintain the existence of the soul.’

must be impossible. In the case of the *Parākhya*, however, I think it is some form of *vivartavāda* that is attacked, but the attack itself does not help me to determine more precisely what form of Vedānta might be targeted and it is furthermore reminiscent of a passage in the *Śloka-vārttika* (see 1:44 and annotation ad loc.), which means that this passage may after all not have as much bearing on the dating of the *Parākhya* as I had supposed.

Nevertheless, it seems to me probable that the *Parākhya* is among the latest (if not itself the latest) of the demonstrably early (i.e. pre-tenth-century because known to the Kashmirian commentators of the lineage of Rāmakaṇṭha II) listed Siddhāntas to survive.

The earliest quotations from the *Parākhya* are probably those of Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha, whom we may date (very approximately) to c. 925–975 on the basis of the tentative dating of his son Rāmakaṇṭha II to c. 950–1000 (for which see GOODALL 1998:xiii–xviii, quoting evidence given by BRUNNER, SANDERSON and TORELLA), and thus it must have been written before the tenth century. SANDERSON (2002:5–6, fn. 3) has pointed out that it is conceivable that the *Parākhya* was alluded to in c. 830 AD in Ratnākara’s *Haravijaya*, in verses 6:79–170 of which the seasons praise Śiva in the terms of Saiddhāntikas. In 6:147 an allusion is made to five *padārthas*, which the commentator Alaka elucidates by quoting *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha* 4:48; but, as SANDERSON observes, the other surviving early Siddhānta that has five *padārthas* is the *Parākhya* (see 1:5), and the possibility cannot be excluded that it was the *Parākhya* that Ratnākara had in mind.

We may conclude that the *Parākhya* may have been composed in the eighth or ninth century AD.

The lost commentary

A handful of references and two quotations inform us that there was an ancient commentary on the *Parākhya*. About the author of that commentary we know only that he predated Aghoraśiva, who flourished in the middle of the twelfth century (see GOODALL 1998:xiii–xvii, fn. 24). Evidence of first-hand knowledge of the commentary is found only in the works of Aghoraśiva and of Aghoraśiva’s immediate disciples Vaktra-

śambhu and Trilocanaśiva⁹⁷ (the only later quotations I am aware of are quotations of the same portions to which Aghoraśiva and his disciples refer). The largest fragment quoted is a discussion of the *sambandhas*, a classification of types of transmission of a scripture in accordance with the rank of its transmitters. The theme is alluded to at the beginning of *Parākhya* 3, on which this may therefore be commentary, but it may have belonged to a sequence of opening verses (*Kriyākramadyotikā* p. 4):⁹⁸

. . . *tatra pare īśādayaḥ, apare devamuniprabhṛtayaḥ, parāpare
anantādayaḥ. tathā samākhyātaṃ śrīmatparākhyavṛttau*

*guravo bahavas tv atra parāparavibhedataḥ
codakādivibhedena tathā gurvādivibhedataḥ
īśaḥ sadāśivaḥ śānto guravaḥ paramā matāḥ
ekam eva paraṃ tattvaṃ svecchayā tu tridhā sthi-
tam
anantaḥ śrīgaḷaś comā skando viṣṇur vidhis tu ṣaṭ
parāpare 'pare devā munayo nṛgurūttamāḥ.*

The *Parākhya*'s transmitters fall into the last and lowest group. For the only other quotation known to me attributed to the commentary on the *Parākhya* see Appendix I.L:130 and its context.

Vaktraśambhu actually does not quote from the commentary on the *Parākhya*, but includes it, as Professor SANDERSON has pointed out to me, in an interesting list of tantras on which there are commentaries, then of uncommented tantras, then of *paddhatis* (IFP MS T. 1021, p. 111):

*api ca sadyojyotiḥprabhṛtibhir⁹⁹ mahadbhir ācāryair vyā-
khyāteṣu śrīmadrauravasvāyambhuvamṛgendrakiraṇaparā-*

⁹⁷For evidence of these both being Aghoraśiva's immediate disciples see GOODALL 2000:208–11. I there referred to Vaktraśambhu with the name Naṭeśaguru, but, as Professor Alexis SANDERSON has pointed out to me (letter of 23.v.2002), because of the fragmentary transmission of the concluding verses it is not certain whether this is a name or part of an epithet. Vaktraśambhu, however, a synonym of Tatpuruṣaśiva, was evidently his initiatory name. We could therefore call him Tatpuruṣaśiva (after all, Aghoraśiva sometimes gives his own name in the less common variant form Bahurūpaśambhu: see GOODALL 1998:xv), but I have chosen to retain the only form in which the name is attested.

⁹⁸The quoted block of verses appears, shortened and rearranged, as 3:69–70 of the *Śaivāgamaparibhāṣāmañjarī* (see DAGENS' 1979:117, note 169).

⁹⁹sadyojyotiḥ°] *em.*; sadyojyoti° T. 1021.

*khyamataṅgasūkṣmasvāyambhuvadviśatisārdhatriśaticatuḥ-
śatikāsarvajñānottaramohaśūrottareṣu, avyākṛteṣu¹⁰⁰ śrīma-
ttrayodaśaśatikāniśvāsādiṣu, śrīmatsomaśambhubrahmaśa-
mbhubhojarājavaruṇaśivādyair¹⁰¹ viraciteṣu paddhatiṣu ca,
tattadvyākhyāneṣu ca. . .¹⁰²*

As an aside it is perhaps worth spelling out to which commentaries on tantras he alludes. On the *Raurava* they are presumably Sadyojyotis's *Rauravavṛttis*, that is to say the *Bhogakārikā*, *Mokṣakārikā*, and *Paramokṣanirāsakārikā*, Sadyojyotis's lost *Sarvāgamaprāmāṇya* and lost commentary on the *Mudrāprakaraṇa*,¹⁰³ as well as the anonymous lost *Rauravavārttika* (if it was still known in twelfth-century South India), which was probably a work of Bṛhaspatipāda.¹⁰⁴ On the *Svāyambhuva-sūtrasaṅgraha* they are the *Svāyambhuvavṛtti* and the *Tattvatrayanir-*

¹⁰⁰avyākṛteṣu] conj. SANDERSON; vivyākṛteṣu T. 1021.

¹⁰¹°bhojarājavaruṇa°] conj. SANDERSON; °bhojarājavaruṇa° T. 1021.

¹⁰²ca] conj.; om. T. 1021.

¹⁰³For a reasoned account of what lies behind this assumption see GOODALL 1998:xx–xxvi. I there argued (p. xxv and fn. 57) that the lost *Mantravārttika* of Sadyojyotis might have formed part of this body of exegetical works on the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha* on the basis of a quotation of a verse and a half in Vidyākāṇṭha II's *Bhāvacūḍāmaṇi* prefaced with the attribution *uktaṃ ca rurusamhitāmantravārttike*. I had failed to notice that the quoted unit is in fact to be found in the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha* itself as verses 6–7b of what the edition calls the tenth chapter. Presumably the label is appropriate because that particular chapter of the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha* is in part a commentary on the VYOMAVYĀPIN mantra. There is thus in fact no strong evidence that the *Mantravārttika* was part of a commentary on the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha*, but we may recall that Rāmakaṇṭha may be implying it to have been a continuation of the *Paramokṣanirāsakārikā* in his *Paramokṣanirāsakārikāvṛtti* ad verse 3 (GOODALL 1998:xxvi).

¹⁰⁴This is the plausible suggestion of DVIVEDĪ (1983:70 and 63), for which the principal evidence is the identifications offered by Jayaratha of two allusions in the *Tantrāloka*. 1.) The label *ity etad gurubhir gītaṃ śrīmadrauravaśāsane* that appears in *Tantrāloka* 8:101cd is identified by Jayaratha as referring to a work of Bṛhaspatipāda. 2.) In *Tantrāloka* 8:345ab we read: *uktaṃ ca gurubhir itthaṃ śivatanvādyeṣu śāsaneṣv etat*. Jayaratha's *Tantrālokaviveka* thereon reads *ādiśabdād ruruvārttikādi; tad evāha*. There then follow a series of verses of the *Tantrāloka* in *āryā* (8:345c–355b) which we may assume to be a quotation from the *Śivatanuśāstra*. Briefly, these outline a notion of *mahāpralaya* in which the Vidyēśvaras attain liberation one after the other. This is contrasted with the position of the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha*, for Jayaratha quotes (in the *Tantrālokaviveka* ad 8:345c–353b) a verse that the editors of the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha* conjecture may have belonged in between *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha* 4:21 and 4:22, although it is in fact *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha* 2:13 in the form in which it appears in MS B 776, the apograph of M^Y:

ṇaya of Sadyojyotis with their subcommentaries, the lost *Svāyambhuvavṛttitippaṇaka* of Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha,¹⁰⁵ and the *Tattvatrayanirṇayavṛtti* of Aghoraśiva, as well as the lost *Svāyambhuvoddyota* of Rāmakaṇṭha. But it is possible that those particular commentarial works of Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha and Rāmakaṇṭha were not accessible to Vaktraśambhu (I know of no South Indian allusions to them), and Rāmakaṇṭha's *Tattvatrayanirṇayavṛtti* I do not include here because I assume that Vaktraśambhu did not know of it, since his guru Aghoraśiva evidently did not.¹⁰⁶ For the *Mṛgendra*, aside from the well known *Mṛgendravṛtti* and *Mṛgendravṛttidīpikā*, we may count the *Mṛgendrapaddhati* of Aghoraśiva,¹⁰⁷ on which Vaktraśambhu's work is a commentary. On the *Kiraṇa* we may assume that Vaktraśambhu knew Rāmakaṇṭha's *Kiraṇavṛtti*, but he quotes also from another *vṛtti* which he attributes to a certain Bhūtikaṇṭha

*anantoparame teṣāṃ mahatāṃ cakravartinām
vihitam sarvakartṛtvam kāraṇam paramam padam.*

This is interpreted to refer to the simultaneous liberation in *mahāpralaya* of all the Vidyeśvaras. Returning to *Tantrāloka* 8:345ab and Jayaratha's remark thereon, it seems possible that it is to be interpreted as follows: 'And this has been taught as follows by a venerable teacher in the *Śivatānuśāstra* and in others [of his works]:...'. Jayaratha's remark then might be identifying the *Rauravavārttika* as another of Bṛhaspatipāda's works. This hypothesis receives support from two parallel discussions of which DVIVEDĪ was unaware in 1983. The first is in Rāmakaṇṭha's commentary on the *Tattvatrayanirṇaya* (hitherto unmentioned, as far as I am aware, in the secondary literature), the *Tattvatrayanirṇayavṛtti*, to the sole surviving MS of which Dr. Kei KATAOKA has kindly drawn my attention. Here (f.107^r) Rāmakaṇṭha distinguishes the two views as being those of, among others, the author of the *Rauravavārttika* (*kaiś cid rauravavārttikakārādibhiḥ*...) and that of Sadyojyotis: *tat tv ayuktam, yugapanmuktīśruter iti darśitam rauravavṛttau guruṇā. proktaṃ hi raurave...* [there follows a quotation of 2:13, the same verse as Jayaratha quotes]. The passage of the *Rauravavṛtti* to which Rāmakaṇṭha here refers is probably *Mokṣakārikā* 93:

*amī rudrās tu sūkṣmādyā mantrās ca śivatulyatām
sānantāḥ svādhikārānte yānti muktiṃ hareraṇāt.*

In the commentary thereon we find the second passage that supports DVIVEDĪ's hypothesis, a quotation of three half-lines from the passage of the *Rauravavārttika* to which Jayaratha must have been referring in his *Tantrālokaviveka* ad 8:345ab.

¹⁰⁵See GOODALL 1998:x.

¹⁰⁶Aghoraśiva, who elsewhere follows Rāmakaṇṭha so closely, makes no reference to the work, not even in his own *Tattvatrayanirṇayavṛtti*, comments on readings of a number of the verses of the text that are different from those commented upon by Rāmakaṇṭha and differs in his interpretations.

¹⁰⁷See GOODALL 2000:209–10 for a brief treatment of the question of the authorship of this text.

(IFP MS T.1021, pp.208–9). This might be the same work as the *Bṛhatkīraṇoddyota* referred to by Jñānaśambhu, one of the gurus of his contemporary and co-pupil Trilocanaśiva (*Jñānaratnāvalī*, Madras GOML MS R 14898, pp.44 and 186) and quoted in the *Ātmārthapūjāpaddhati* (IFP MSS T.795, p.78, T.323, p.125, T.321, p.127, and T.282, p.116). On the *Mataṅga* Vaktraśambhu may have known only the *Mataṅgavṛtti* of Rāmakaṇṭha, for I know of no references to the lost commentary of Vyākhyāniguru other than that in *Śivadṛṣṭi* 3:14. We have no evidence for the authorship of the lost commentaries on the *Parākhyā* and the *Sūkṣmasvāyambhuva* (see fn. 50 on p.xxxvi above).

Commentaries by Aghoraśiva survive on the *Dviśatikālottara* and the *Sarvajñānottara* (the *Dviśatikālottaravṛtti* and the *Sarvajñānottaravṛtti*), and we know from Vaktraśambhu's opening verses¹⁰⁸ that Aghoraśiva composed a commentary (now lost) on the *Catuṣśatikākālottara* (referred to by Vaktraśambhu above as the *Catuṣśatikā*), and from the same verses, as well as from one of Aghoraśiva's concluding verses to his *Dviśatikālottaravṛtti*,¹⁰⁹ that he composed another now lost commentary on the *Mohacūḍottara*. Vaktraśambhu may also have been aware of an older, lost commentary on the *Sarvajñānottara* from which Rāmakaṇṭha quotes in his *Sārdhatriśatikālottaravṛtti* ad 22:8–9b.

A résumé of the text

Verse 1:5 provides a programme for the treatment of topics in the tantra. Thereafter the first chapter discusses the soul, refuting conceptions of other schools, notably that of Bauddhas and, exceptionally, of Advaita. Chapters 2 and 3 deal with the Lord and with the upper reaches of the universe comprehended within *vidyā*. Chapters 4 and 5 present the evolution of *māyā* and the cosmos within it. Chapter 6 discusses *nāda* at some length. Chapters 7–13 have not been transmitted, and it is clear that these, at least in part, related to ritual prescriptions and the like: as we have observed above (p.xli), we can assume this to have been so on the basis of 6:81.¹¹⁰ Chapter 14 discusses yoga, and finally chapter 15 investigates the rôle of the four '*sādhanas*' of *jñāna*, *kriyā*, *caryā* and

¹⁰⁸These are quoted by GOODALL 2000:210, fn. 18.

¹⁰⁹Quoted by GOODALL 1998:xv, fn. 24.

¹¹⁰The scribe of M^Y has copied almost exclusively what relates to doctrine and to yoga: see p.xcvii below.

yoga vis à vis *dikṣā*. As I have argued elsewhere (GOODALL 1998:lxiv–lxv), it is not clear whether or not the *Parākhya* was divided into sections of text named after these *pādas*. It seems unlikely, for the final colophon does not mention a *pāda* to which the final chapter belongs, nor does it plainly fit any one of them. But as I have there pointed out, the fragmentary penultimate verse of chapter 6 (6:81) shows that the author of the *Parākhya* either recognised the word *pāda* to refer to such divisions of a text (and not just, as in other early sources, to four basic topics with which a tantra deals) or used it unselfconsciously in a way that allowed it to be so interpreted. BRUNNER (1992a) has demonstrated that the division of Saiddhāntika scriptures into four parts bearing the names of these *pādas* is neither common nor early; but it is clear that the terminology itself—as the *Parākhya* and the *Kiraṇa* (e.g. in 1:13), as well as other non-Saiddhāntika works, tell us—is early.¹¹¹

Chapter 1. The soul

Pratoda sees Prakāśa in an *āśrama* on the Ganges and asks for teaching, which Prakāśa, after venerating Śiva, begins to give (1–2).

The tantra is described. Its five topics (*padārthas*) of the bound soul (*paśu*), the Lord (*īśvara*), scripture/knowledge (*vidyā*), the womb (*yonī*), and liberation (*mukti*) are listed (3–5) and then briefly characterised (6–10).

A (transmissionally corrupt) discussion of techniques of exegesis follows (11–14).

Verse 15 gives a list of attributes of the soul, and this serves as an agenda for the remainder of the first chapter.¹¹²

Pratoda advances the materialist Cārvāka’s refutation of the existence of the soul (16–17 and 21), which Prakāśa refutes (18–20 and 22–7).

Pratoda attacks the notion of the self from a Buddhist position that all things are momentary (28 and 30); Prakāśa refutes this on the basis of the evidence of memory (29 and 31–5).

The all-pervasiveness of the soul is attacked and then defended (36–9).

Vedāntic non-dualism is advanced (40, 42, and 45) and rejected (42, 43–4, 46–50).

¹¹¹For further details see GOODALL 1998:lviii–lxv and 182–4, fn. 69.

¹¹²See fn. 21 on p. 143 below.

Pratoda advances the position that the soul should be free of defilements (51), which Prakāśa answers with a demonstration of the logical need for a category of innate impurity (*mala*), distinct from passion (*rāga*) or from the retributive force of past actions (*karman*) (52–60).

Pratoda advances the view that the soul is essentially insentient, but has awareness when linked with a body and senses (61), and this Prakāśa counters with the position that the stimulus provided by the body and instruments of the senses only works because of the power of sentiency that belongs to the soul (62–71).

Pratoda questions the view that *karman* is the cause of the diversity of the universe (72) and Prakāśa refutes it (74–80).

Pratoda argues that agency belongs to the body rather than to the soul (81 and 85) and Prakāśa responds by defending the position that the soul is responsible for his *karman* (82–92) and that the Lord ensures that the proper *karman* is linked to each soul (93–4).

Summary verse (95).

Chapter 2. The Lord

This begins with a list of attributes of the Lord that gives us an agenda for the chapter (1).

That the universe is really an effect, of which the Lord is a cause, is called into question and defended (2–11).

In the course of this defence, circumstantial inference (*arthāpatti*) appears to be rejected, or rejected as an independent means of knowledge (9–10).

The Mīmāṃsaka position that the universe was never not as it now is advanced, and it is mooted that *karman* might be the cause of the universe (12).

Prakāśa responds to both arguments (13–14 and 15–19), insisting that a sentient cause is required and that *karman* is not sentient.

Pratoda poses the Buddhist dilemma that the activity of creation can neither have taken place all at a single moment nor gradually (20–1).

Prakāśa's reply reiterates the inescapability of the existence of causes for the production of effects, asserts that the Lord's activity of creation is both simultaneous and gradual, and states that all effects are produced by a combination of causes of three types: instigating causes, material causes, auxiliary causes (22–30).

The possibility of producing effects without resort to instruments is questioned (31) and justified by comparison with the sun and moon (32–4).

The Lord's power of action is said to be his 'instrument' and this, although one, is known by many names, in accordance with the functions it performs (35–42).

Nine powers (*śaktis*) whose names are drawn from the Vedic VĀMADEVA mantra are enumerated, together with the form of the Lord by whom they are controlled, and affective etymologies (*nirvacana*) of their names are given (43–61).

The Lord is omniscient because he creates everything (62–65b).

The 'supportlessness' of His power of knowledge does not prevent its operation, just as the supportlessness of wind does not prevent it from shaking branches (65c–67b).

Just so is the soul's condition in liberation, as is taught in the last part of the Veda (*vedānta*): consciousness characterised by powers of knowledge and action (67c–71b).

There is no fault of circularity in scripture being that which teaches us about the Lord and the Lord being the one who teaches us scripture (71c–73).

What is revealed by one means of knowledge (*pramāṇa*) does not need to be revealed by another (74–75b).

One cannot argue for the non-existence of something on the grounds that one does not perceive it by direct perception (*pratyakṣa*) (75c–76).

The Lord's existence is thus proved; conventional usage (*rūḍhi*) determines that the name *Īśvara* designates him (77–82).

His body is made up of the five Vedic *brahmamantras* (83–85b).

Īśvara's being *sakala* (equipped with powers/divisions) is not to be understood in the same way as the bound soul's being *sakala* (linked to the evolutes of primal matter); without His form He could not be worshipped and so liberation could not be attained (85c–88).

Affective etymologies (*nirvacana*) are given of the names of each of the *brahmamantras* (89–95b).

The supreme *Śiva* is the same as the Lord who resides in a body; the Lord is both *sa-kala* and *niṣkala* (transcendent/devoid of divisions); He is the cause of creation, maintenance, destruction and grace (96–7).

When He is *sa-kala*, He is called 'engaged in office' (*adhikārin*); he teaches the Rudras and others their duties; but the categorisation of the

Lord as ‘engaged in office’ (*adhikārin*), ‘engaged in experience/enjoyment’ (*bhōgin*), and ‘in resorption’ (*layin*) is not ultimately real (98–99b).

Śiva’s bestowing His grace depends on the transmission of His scripture (*śāstra*) from *ācārya* to pupil (99c–101b).

A descent of divine power (*śaktipāta*) comes upon a person, who then seeks a guru; this comes about as a result of the person’s suitability and not because of Śiva’s being partial (101c–113).

It is for the sake of bestowing grace that Śiva sets creation from primal matter (*māyā*) in motion; for this He awakens the mantras and the eight officiants known as Vidyeśvaras (114–17).

The Vidyeśvaras’ names are given and analysed by *nirvacana*; themselves free from the stain of primal matter (*māyā*), they administer the lower universe (118–121).

They are equal in power of action to the Lord, but they are subject to Him and perform their duties according to His bidding, these being the five cosmic functions (*pañcakṛtya*) of creation, maintenance, destruction, grace and occlusion (122–4).

Pratoda asks what need there is of these functionaries if Śiva is creator and whether it is right to speak of Śiva’s power if it is they who perform these duties (125).

Pratoda responds that it would tarnish Śiva’s glory if He were to act Himself, hence the others are employed (126–128d).

The discussion of the Lord (*īśvaratattva*) is thus concluded and reference is made to the subject of the next chapter (128e–129).

Chapter 3. Scripture and the pure universe

The opening verse giving the agenda defines *vidyā* as scripture, under which head it promises a discussion of the transmission and the authoritativeness of scripture, and mantras (1).

Śiva ‘awakens’ Ananta and the other Vidyeśvaras at the beginning of creation; these in turn ‘awaken’ Gauda and others, who in turn ‘awaken’ Bhava and others, and knowledge then passes to Vīrabhadra, Umeśāna, the gods, sages (2–6).

Pratoda questions how the formless supreme Śiva can create scripture and why it is necessary that he should if Ananta and others are ‘awakeners’ (7–8).

Prakāśa's response (9–21) mentions the condensed redactions of knowledge that are known in this world (15–16) and gives an affective etymology (*nirvacana*) of the word *vaktra*, 'mouth', from which knowledge issues (17–18).

Pratoda takes the position of a Mīmāṃsaka, questioning the authoritativeness of Śaiva scripture on the grounds that it is authored (*pauruṣeya*) and asserting that the Veda is authoritative on the grounds that it is without author (*apauruṣeya*) (22).

Prakāśa takes each of the six valid means of knowledge accepted by Mīmāṃsakas and shows that none of them proves the Veda to be authorless (23–37).

Pratoda's question in response appears to allude to Kumāriḷa's three criteria for non-authoritativeness, asserting that none of them applies to the Veda (38–9).

Prakāśa replies that one of them, doubt, is applicable; he then questions the Mīmāṃsaka notion that a means of knowledge is authoritative of itself (*svataḥprāmāṇya*), and asserts that the use of language, like the use of a lamp, depends upon an agent (40–5).

The passage that follows, which is unfortunately corrupt and badly damaged, treats of the authoritativeness of Śaiva revelation, which in spite of differences within it, all derives ultimately from Śiva (46–56).

The genesis of the seven crores of mantras, their sense of revulsion towards the created universe and their division by Ananta into two equal groups (of officiants and of fully liberated souls) is related (57–72).

Prakāśa gives an account of which of the principal mantras arise out of which parts of Śiva's 'body' (73–7).

A *nirvacana* of *vidyā*. in the sense of mantra is given (78) and the final verse sums up the topic of mantras and refers forward to the topic of the following chapter: 'the womb' (*yoni*) (79).

Chapter 4. The evolutes of primal matter

The opening verse gives a list of epithets of primal matter (*māyā*) that are justified in the course of the discussion of the chapter: subtle, perduring, formless, all-pervading, the abode of sentient entities, shaken by the Lord, producing the effects that are the constitutive principles (*tattva*) of the universe of our experience, ranging from that of limited power to act (*kalā*)

to earth,¹¹³ etc. (1–2).

Pratoda questions whether primal matter (*māyā*) is the material cause of the universe and observes that it is beyond our senses (3).

Prakāśa lists factors that prevent our perceiving entities that exist and concludes that *māyā*'s extreme subtlety prevents us from perceiving it but that it is known from scripture and reasoning (4–7).

He lists the tattvas, starting from the bottom (8–10), and argues for the necessity of there being a perduring material cause that produced them, concluding that scripture teaches us that that cause is primal matter (*māyā*) (11–16).

It is all-pervading, formless and the cause from which effects proceed and into which they are resorbed (17–20b).

A class of inert souls known as Pralāyākalas are trapped in it in phases of resorption of the universe, and for their embodiment the Lord stimulates primal matter (*māyā*) into action to produce her effects (20c–23).

The first of these is the principle of limited power to act (*kalā*), which effects a partial revelation of the soul's power of consciousness (24–9).

From this evolves the principle of limited power to know (*vidyā*), the necessity of which is justified by way of a discussion of the process of perception involving the sense faculties (*indriyas*) thought sufficient for the process by Sāṅkhya thinkers (30–6).

The tattva of passion (*rāga*) is added as the third of the three central cuirasses (*kañcukas*), it is distinguished from the disposition of the intellect (*buddhi*) known as 'lack of dispassion' (*avairāgya*), and it is explained to have a positive and a negative form (*rāga* and *virāga*), the latter being distinguished from true dispassion, which is the absence of both (37–44).

To these are added the cuirasses (*kañcukas*) of time (45–50) and binding fate (*niyati*), which ensure that the results of a particular soul's past actions accrue to that same soul (51).

The existence of binding fate (*niyati*) is questioned on the grounds that its function could be performed by *karman* itself (52), and then reasserted (53–4).

Its power acts upon the tattva of the person (*puruṣa-tattva*), which is located above secondary matter (*prakṛti*)¹¹⁴ and which is the locus of the

¹¹³That is to say the five-fold cuirass (*kañcuka*) that equips the bound soul for embodiment in the worlds in *māyā*, followed by the twenty-five tattvas of the Sāṅkhyas.

¹¹⁴The translation is not ideal: historically it is the material cause of Sāṅkhya thinkers,

group of eight worlds called the *yogāṣṭaka* (55–7).

From the principle of limited power to act (*kalā*) evolves secondary matter (*prakṛti*); etymologies are offered of its names (58–60).

Pratoda asks about the need for postulating *kalā* and the other tattvas above secondary matter (*prakṛti*), since the effects of *prakṛti* would be enough to account for bondage (61).

Prakāśa responds with arguments for *prakṛti* being an effect and therefore depending on a cause (62–6).

The Lord links souls to these effects (67–8).

The tattva of the three constitutive strands of existence (viz. the *guṇas* of *rajas*, *sattva* and *tamas*) evolves from secondary matter (*avyakta*: the unmanifest), its existence as a tattva is defended and its functions are touched upon (69–73).

From this evolves the intellect (*buddhi*), which has the eight properties of rectitude (*dharma*), knowledge (*jñāna*), dispassion (*vairāgya*), control (*aiśvarya*) and the opposites of these; the predominance of one or other of these is due to the predominance or otherwise of certain of the *guṇas* (74–5).

The ten moral injunctions and restrictions (*yamas* and *niyamas*) are enumerated (without these labels) as proceeding from rectitude (*dharma*) (76–8).

Knowledge (*jñāna*), which proceeds from different causes and applies to different domains (*adhyātma*, *adhibhūta* and *adhidaiva*), gives rise to dispassion (*vairāgya*), which in turn motivates a man to engage in yoga and to win thereby the eight yogic powers of being able to render oneself minute (*aṇiman*), etc. (79–83).

The results of a preponderance of the *guṇa* of darkness/occlusion (*rajas*) and therefore of non-rectitude (*adharma*) are touched upon (84–6), then of lack of dispassion (*anaīśvarya*) (87–9).

The last verse of Prakāśa's speech mentions that the intellect (*buddhi*) is responsible for determinative thought (*adhyavasāya*) (90).

Pratoda suggests that the soul must be insentient if all these properties reside really in the intellect (*buddhi*) (91).

Prakāśa explains that they are figuratively described as properties of the *buddhi* and that the *buddhi* enables perception in that it takes on the

which is arguably rendered functionless by the Śaiva addition of primal matter (*māyā*) at a higher level of the universe.

form of external objects (92–3).

The tattva of self-appropriation (*ahaṅkāra*) arises from the intellect (*buddhi*). It is of three kinds: Taijasa, Vaikṛta and Bhūtādi. The first gives rise to the five faculties of sense, the second to the five of action and the third to the five subtle elements (94–6b).

The function of each faculty is presented (96c–106b).

The subtle elements (of hearing, touch, sight, taste, and smell) that have arisen from Bhūtādi give rise to the five gross elements (106c–108).

Ether is characterised (109–114b).

Air, including the vital breaths, is characterised (114–117b).

Fire and its places in the body are treated (118–20).

Water and earth and their functions in the body are treated (121–2).

A summary is given of this creation from the principle of self-appropriation (*ahaṅkāra*), in the course of which it is mentioned that the mind (*manas*) belongs to both the Taijasa and Vaikṛta groups (123–8).

Pratoda suggests that the gross elements might be the fundamental causes rather than the grossest effects and questions the position that the faculties arise from *ahaṅkāra* (129).

Prakāśa refutes this objection and demonstrates the involvement of *ahaṅkāra* in the use of each of the faculties (130–3).

Pratoda asserts that the material cause should inhere in its effects like threads in a cloth (134).

Prakāśa responds by asserting that primal matter (*māyā*) is a subtle, partless cause that does not inhere in its effects. He counters the possible objection that this subtle power that is *māyā* is unknowable by asserting that it is inferred from its effects much in the way that the atoms postulated by Naiyāyikas are (135–8).

A Buddhist objection is raised and refuted to the effect that the existence of the external object cannot be known independently from the knowledge of the external object and that therefore one need not posit the existence of anything other than that knowledge (139–48).

In the remainder of the chapter the collection of effects of primal matter (*māyā*) is said to make up the subtle transmigratory body (149–51); the shaking of *māyā* (to generate creation) is said to be partial, not total, since this would otherwise destroy her (152–3); *māyā* is the locus of great variety and of deluded souls (154–7).

Pratoda asks whether innate impurity (*mala*) is primal matter (*māyā*), or an effect thereof, or a property of the soul (158).

Prakāśa rejects each suggestion, explaining that it enjoys vicariously a place on the ladder of constitutive principles of the universe (*tattva*) in that it is inseparable from the bound soul (who occupies the position of *puruṣatattva*: see 55–7 above) (159–165b).

Separation from innate impurity (*mala*) is impossible, but its power is blocked and thereby the soul realises his Śiva-hood; all this is possible when he has been connected to the evolutes of primal matter (*māyā*) (165c–170).

Conclusion, at the end of which the worlds, which are the subject of the following chapter, are mentioned (171–2).

Chapter 5. The cosmos

The contents of the chapter are listed (1).

The thickness of the shell of the cosmic egg in the *tattva* of earth (*brahmāṇḍa*) is said to be ten thousand *yojanas*, and the *yojana* is defined (2–4).

Kālāgnirudra and his world are located a hundred crores of *yojanas* above the shell at the base (5–10).

Above that are the hells; thirty-two (groups of?) hells are named and aetiologies for their names are given (11–32b).

Altogether they are said to be 140¹¹⁵ and their measurements are given (32c–34b).

Ninety lakh *yojanas* above them is the world of Kūṣmāṇḍa, who presides over the hells (34c–40b).

Nine lakh *yojanas* above that are the seven subterranean paradises (*pātālas*), which are listed, given etymologies (*nirvacanas*) and assigned each a Daitya, a Nāga and a Rākṣasa, presumably to serve as regents for the three parts into which each is divided (40c–52).

Above these is the world of Hāṭaka, who presides over them (53–60).

And above that is our world *bhūḥ*, whose seven continents and seven oceans are listed (61–63b).

¹¹⁵The number could be interpreted otherwise; though not explicit on the point, the text appears to be following the model according to which the first twenty-nine hells are fourfold and the last three eightfold.

Among these continents, Jambūdvīpa's central mountain Meru, its nine divisions, which are bounded by mountains, are described and their names explained with aetiological myths (63c–93).

The surrounding concentric bands of oceans and continents are described and their names analysed, until we reach the ring-shaped boundary that is the Lokāloka mountain (94–109b).

Beyond that is the ocean called Garbhoda, then darkness, then the shell of the cosmic egg (*brahmāṇḍa*) (109c–111b).

The overall dimensions of this world are given and it is stated that only here is the accumulation of past action (*karman*) possible (111c–113).

Above it is the world known as Bhūvarloka, in which are the sun and the planets of the weekdays and the planets Rāhu and Ketu; above these the stars, the seven ṛṣis, and the pole star (114–29).

Above are the worlds of Svarloka, Maharloka, Janaloka, Tapoloka, and Satyaloka, where Brahmā resides (130–138b).

Four crores above him is Viṣṇu and six crores above him is Śaṅkara, and above him the shell of the cosmic egg (*brahmāṇḍa*) (138c–140).

Ten Rudras who bear the *brahmāṇḍa* are listed (141–4).

There follows a list of the Rudras who rule over each of the tattvas from that of water up to that of primal matter (*māyā*) (145–155b).

Above *māyā*, in the pure universe, Śambara is placed in the principle of pure knowledge (*vidyātattva*), Ananta in *īśvarātattva*, Brahmā in *sadāśīvatattva*, and beyond him there is the supreme Śiva (155c–161).

Conclusion (162).

Chapter 6. Mantras

The opening verse lists as the topics of the chapter: the raising of mantras, the origin of the phonemes (*akṣara/varṇa*), the connection of words and sentences with meaning, the definition and the convention (?) of mantras and their particular fruits (1).

At the time of creation the Lord causes the phonemes to become manifest from 'the drop' (*bindu*) (2). Once shaken, the subtle material cause *bindu* produces the syllabary (*śabdārāśī*) in two groups: vowels and consonants (3–5).

They are the effects, the Lord is the instigating cause, *bindu* the material cause, human effort is an auxiliary cause; with them language, which is the basis for worldly interaction, is possible (6–8).

Pratoda suggests that the phonemes make manifest a power *sphoṭa* that is responsible for conveying meaning (9).

Prakāśa responds by asking whether this *sphoṭa* is the same as or different from the phonemes, and then showing that the two alternatives are to be rejected: meaning is conveyed by the final phoneme in conjunction with a trace left by the utterance of the preceding phonemes, and thus the phonemes themselves enable worldly interaction (10–16).

The nature of the relation between language and meaning is questioned (17); Prakāśa discounts various types of relation, states that the relationship is one of something that causes to understand and that which is to be understood, and asserts that an artificial convention is required to link them (18–24).

The question of whether this creation of convention was gradual or all-at-once is raised (25), and Prakāśa responds that it was created at once by God's will, and that the Lord was similarly the creator of the conventions that link mantras to their meanings (26–8).

Using the terminology of grammar, the principal parts of the fundamental mantra of the cult (ŚIVA) are identified (29–31).

The *brahmamantras*, *aṅgamantras* and the mantras of the Vidyeśvaras are raised (32–4).

The mantra-endings (*jāti*) are enumerated and their functions explained, and OM (*praṇava*) is mentioned as the *jāti* that belongs at the beginning of a mantra (35–7).

Thus power is said to reside in the beginning, middle and end of a mantra, in vowels, clusters of consonants, words and sentences (38–9).

Pratoda asks whether mantras, since they are made up of language, can be 'correct' and 'incorrect' (40).

Prakāśa suggests the futility of supposing a grammar of mantras and points out that both *go*, the 'correct' word for a cow, and *gāvi*, an 'incorrect' one, convey their meaning (41–3).

How, asks Prakāśa, can words convey meaning unless they are governed by grammar (44)?

Prakāśa illustrates the arbitrary conventionality of language, including examples of metrical termini used by metricians, in order to show that human sages have contributed conventions, and he concludes that mantras are similarly governed by conventions forged by Śiva (45–50).

Pratoda observes that mantras are just words articulated by the parts of the mouth, just like other words (51).

Prakāśa replies that stones and gems both share the common property of being stones, but only the latter category has special powers, and so too it is with ordinary words and mantras, whose power we can observe in the world when they are used to introduce or quell fever, destroy snakes (*nāga*) or spirits (*bhūta*), etc. (52–6).

An affective etymology (*nirvacana*) of mantra is offered, and the discussion is concluded with an assertion that the relation of them with their meaning is forged by Śiva (57–8).

Pratoda introduces the Mīmāṃsaka notion that deities are no more than words, and this is rejected by Prakāśa (59–64).

Pratoda wonders whether the deity is formless or corporeal: if formless, he cannot be what makes a sacrifice produce results; if corporeal, he could not simultaneously be present at many sacrifices (65–6).

Prakāśa resolves this dilemma by asserting that the deity may take on embodiments at will and that it is he who is the factor who produces the fruit of the sacrifice and not the ritual act itself (67–75).

As to the objection that the deity cannot be known since he is unseen, Prakāśa replies that the Mīmāṃsaka's heaven is also invisible, and he concludes that the ritual act is 'of the Lord' (*aiśvarī kriyā*), and that mantras are to be used in various rites (76–9).

In the last three verses, it is asserted that the *vidyāpāda*, with its four topics (*padārtha*)—that is to say the first four of the list given in 1:5—has been taught as it was taught by Śiva to Prakāśa, and the treatment of the last *padārtha*, that of liberation, is announced: Prakāśa states that he will now teach rituals (80–2).

Chapter 14. Yoga

The contents of the chapter are listed (1).

Suitable places for the practice of yoga are described (2) and the ideal state of mind (3).

A small number of postures are listed and described (4–7), one of which the yogin should adopt, folding his hands in his lap with their palms upwards, spreading out his chest, half-closing his eyes, and focussing them on the tip of his nose (8–9).

Six necessary auxiliaries of yoga (*yogāṅga*) are listed (*pratyāhāra*, *dhyāna*, *prāṇāyāma*, *dhāraṇā*, *tarka*, *samādhi*) (10) and briefly described (11–17). Stretching the breath (*prāṇāyāma*) is to be practised to conquer the five breaths (*prāṇa*, *apāna*, *samāna*, *udāna*, and *vyāna*), which are given etymologies (*nirvacana*) (18–25).

Breath-exercising techniques of ‘filling’ (*pūraka*), ‘retaining’ (*kumbhaka*), and ‘expulsion’ (*recaka*) are described (26–31).

Having thus conquered the breaths, the yogin should practise the five fixations (*dhāraṇā*) of the five elements (32–3).

That of earth is described (34–5), as well as the results of practising it (36ab), then that of water (36c–40b), that of fire (40c–43b), that of wind (43c–46), and that of ether (47–49b).

With a hundred *udghātas* conquest of the fixations (*dhāraṇā*) is achieved (49cd).

An *udghāta* (a timed retention of the breath such that, in the early stages of self-asphyxiation, the sensation is produced of a spontaneous upward surge of vital energy) is defined (50).

Having achieved conquest of the fixations (*dhāraṇās*), the yogin should practise yoga, for which his body is his base (51–2).

The variety of vessels in the body is mentioned and their function of transporting chyle about the body is adverted to (53–57b).

Eight principal vessels named after the directions and intermediate directions and reaching to the extremities of the petals of the heart’s lotus are listed, and it is stated that the soul, by moving into one of these, takes on the nature of its presiding deity (57c–61).

Pratoda asks how the all-pervading soul can move (62), and Prakāśa explains that ‘movement’ is used in a figurative sense: what is meant is ‘revelation of knowledge’ (62–8).

Prāṇa and *jīva* appear to be given here as terms for (respectively in-going and out-going?) breath, without which a body is declared dead (69).

The left and right channels (mentioned without their usual labels *iḍā* and *piṅgalā*) are given as two principal channels above the heart and associated with the moon and the sun respectively; the central channel is in some way associated with both (70–1).

An account of the utterance of a mantra (*mantroccāra*) is given, passing from the heart (homologised with *Brahmā*), through the throat (*Viṣṇu*), the palate (*Rudra*), between the brows (*Īśvara*), to the tip of the nose

(Sadāśiva), and these are further homologised with the five *kalās* that correspond to five tranches of the ladder of tattvas (72–7).

Each of these deities is said to be a name of the supreme deity, and their names are etymologised by *nirvacana* (78–80).

The HAṂSA-mantra (81–2).

‘Movement’ upwards, urged by the necessary auxiliary of yoga ‘discrimination’ (*tarka*), and the attainment of the meditative state of awareness (*samādhi*) (83–5).

The nature of the supreme tattva is discussed (86–90), on attaining which the soul enjoys mastery over the eight yogic powers (91–4).

The meaning of the term yoga is discussed (95–7).

Yogins possess supernatural powers which they should use to inspire faith in others (98–104).

Yogic suicide (105–7).

Conclusion (108).

Chapter 15. Liberation and the means to its attainment

Contents verse (1).

Knowledge (*jñāna*), rites (*kriyā*), religious observances (*caryā*) and yoga have been taught as a group of means necessarily preceded by initiation (*dīkṣā*) (2).

Pratoda asks which of these is really a means to liberation (3), to which Prakāśa replies that each of them is a necessary auxiliary (*aṅga*) to initiation (*dīkṣā*), since they depend on *dīkṣā* as their basis (4).

He gives a brief description of each and restates this position, concluding with an etymology (*nirvacana*) of *dīkṣā* (5–10).

Pratoda asks again which of *jñāna*, *kriyā*, *caryā* and yoga brings about liberation after initiation (*dīkṣā*) has first bestowed entitlement to follow them (11).

Prakāśa explains that *samayadīkṣā*, a preliminary initiation for neophytes, confers the entitlement to follow them, but that that preliminary initiation does not purge the soul of the fruits of past actions (*karman*) that it is to experience in other worlds (in the way that salvific initiation (*dīkṣā*) does), and therefore it is full *dīkṣā* that is salvific (12–14b).

None of the other means is sufficient by itself, for they are all dependent on each other; the initiating *ācārya* knows them all (14c–19).

Jñāna and *kriyā* are for ensuring continued memory, and therefore practice, of the Śaiva cult (20–1).

Pratoda asks why this ‘memory’ is not enough to accomplish liberation (22).

Prakāśa explains that it is the assemblage of all the factors (*sāmagrī*) that brings about the goal, and that this can be of two types: ‘independent’ (*nirapekṣā*), i.e. salvific initiation alone, without dependence on subsequent religious practice, and ‘dependent’ (*sāpekṣā*), i.e. salvific initiation dependent for its effect on the subsequent observance of the four means (24–6).

If there is ‘independent’ initiation (*nirapekṣā dīkṣā*), then are observances of celibacy (*brahmacarya*) and the like pointless, asks Pratoda (27).

Prakāśa reveals that the observance of social religion is to ensure that Śaivas are not looked down upon; it has no other particular benefit, but is honoured rather as the caste-hierarchy must be respected (28–30).

The removal of the obligation to perform post-initiatory observances (i.e. ‘independent’ initiation) only confers liberation on those incapable of the subsequent observances, such as children (31).

How can it be determined that children have received Śiva’s grace (*śakti-pāta*)? And how then can they receive initiation (*dīkṣā*) (32)?

Their grace they gain indirectly, which is to say they are brought by others to be initiated (33–5).

Pratoda asks whether someone is likely to be reborn if they once had *adhikāra* (he does not make explicit whether he means *adhikāra* in the sense of eligibility for *dīkṣā* or eligibility, through *dīkṣā*, for the post-initiatory means) (36).

Prakāśa replies that when *dīkṣā* has been correctly performed liberation will come about (37–38b).

If *dīkṣā* were not performed then the soul in question would become a Rudra and attain full liberation subsequently (38c–39b).

Following any one of the subsequent means after initiation leads to liberation (39c–41).

Pratoda asks how any one can by itself produce initiation (42), and Prakāśa responds that using all together is effortless, but that using only one, though requiring effort, is possible; in time blissful liberation will result (42–5).

Pratoda observes that others hold liberation to be an absence (46), a position which Prakāśa rejects; in liberation one should attain the qualities of the Lord (47–50).

Pratoda advances a Pāśupata position that the qualities of the Lord are transferred into the soul (51), and Pratoda rejects this on the grounds that the qualities of the Lord could not then be entirely in the soul or in the Lord (52–6).

Pratoda suggests that the absence of *karman* is held by some to bring about liberation (57), and Pratoda rejects this on the grounds that this does not account for the supreme bliss that should characterise liberation (58–60).

Pratoda advances another Pāśupata position: that the qualities of the Lord arise in the adept (61), and this too Pratoda rejects, concluding that liberation is the revelation (*abhivyakti*) of the qualities of the Lord which were innately present in the soul, these qualities being characterised as true rectitude (*saddharma*), true knowledge (*sajjñāna*), true dispassion (*sadvairāgya*) and true control/sovereignty (*sadaiśvarya*), in other words, as transcendent ektypes of the first four of the eight properties of the intellect (*buddhidharmas*) (62–7).

The liberated soul is further qualified (68–71).

Conclusion, in which Prakāśa recounts that he received this scripture (*śāstra*) from Pārvatīpati, who received it from Dīpteśa (72–3).

The language of the Parākhyatantra

In my brief account of *aiśa* language in the introduction to the first volume of the *Kiraṇavṛtti* (GOODALL 1998:lxv–lxx) I unaccountably made no reference to the lengthy treatment of the language of the *Kubjikāmatatantra* in the editors' introduction (GOUDRIAAN and SCHOTERMAN 1988:44–109). Mention should now also be made of the substantial and impressive discussion of the language and metre of the *Siddhayogeśvarīmatatantra* by Judit TÖRZSÖK (*1999:xxvi–lxix). TÖRZSÖK opens her discussion (*1999:xxvi) with the following gentle reproof.

The irregular forms are called *Aiśa*—characteristic of the language of Lord Śiva (*Īśa*)—following Kṣemarāja's usage of this word in his commentary on the *Svacchandatantra*. While one may hesitate to agree with Kṣemarāja that these must be

hallmarks of divine style, they perhaps should not be considered simply ‘erroneous forms that would make a learned man blench’, or ‘grotesque solecisms’ either.¹¹⁶ This is a language with its own rules, whose basis is Sanskrit but which shows influence from Prakrit and Apabhraṃśa. Although Sanskrit is a convenient point of comparison to describe what can be called Aiśa, it does not mean that Aiśa is simply ‘erroneous Sanskrit’—just as pidgin language is not erroneous English or French, even if it may best be described in comparison to English or French.

This seems to me to be truer of the *Siddhayogeśvarīmatatantra* than it is of some Siddhāntatantras, since that text’s language is much further removed from the language of other roughly contemporaneous texts considered to be written in ‘good’ Sanskrit. The *Parākhya*, however, with its discussion of other theological doctrines in what aspires to be the style of philosophical *kārikās*, is attempting to place itself within the mainstream of Sanskritic philosophical debate and, I think, to write ‘good’ Sanskrit. Of course this ‘*kārikā* style’ is not consistently maintained, and perceptions of style can seem arbitrarily subjective and largely influenced by subject matter. The treatment (in chapter 5) of cosmology, for instance, would not seem out of place in any Purāṇa (though an observant reader might notice the total absence of interjected vocatives and the relatively small quantity of other verse-padding material), whereas the discussion of the connection between word and meaning in the beginning of chapter 6 might in most. But the following seem to me features that suggest the style of philosophical *kārikās*: dense compression of ideas in certain passages (e.g. 6:14ab); awkward enjambements, i.e. having the syntactical units spill out beyond the boundaries of the metrical ones (e.g. 2:107cd–108a, 4:24–5, 4:140–1, 5:90–1, 6:3–4, 6:27–8, 6:62–3, 14:101–2); paucity of metrical padding (see discussion on p. liv above); frequent allusions to the doctrines of other schools (see p. xlvi ff above); the fact that, with the exception of chapter 5, the entire text takes the form of a debate; and the carefully organised and well sign-posted presentation of themes throughout the text.

The morphology of classical Sanskrit is relatively well defined because of the importance given to morphology in the grammatical tradition, but,

¹¹⁶Expressions quoted from GOODALL 1998:lxvi, fn. 158.

as TÖRZSÖK observes (*1999:xxvi), ‘the rules of the syntax and lexicon show much more flexibility’. While it may be more generally regular in its morphology than the earliest of the Siddhāntatantras, the author of the *Parākhya* displays a number of what strike me as irregularities in his syntax and compound formation. I list below a number of stylistic peculiarities.

overuse of hanging relative pronouns:¹¹⁷ 1:2a, 1:8, 1:36cd, 1:37, 1:52ab, 1:64a, 2:86cd, 2:100d, 4:75b, 4:109a, 4:110c, 4:120b, 4:123c, 5:33a, 6:29, 6:31a, 6:40ab, 14:16cd, 15:64, Appendix I.A:2ab and 7ab.

clumsy use of anaphoric pronouns (i.e. pronouns with no clear referent, or referring back to distant words or to words tucked away in compounds): 1:31, 1:43, 1:50, 1:69 (see note ad loc.), 2:40c, 4:21c, 4:23a.

a special instance of the last mentioned peculiarity is the repeated use of *asmin* by itself (where we would rather expect *iha* or *atra*) to mean ‘in this *śāstra*’: 1:50d, 2:10b, 2:19c, 2:28c, 2:44c, 2:61c, 2:66a, 2:80c, 3:5c, 3:6a, 3:67b, 4:90c, 15:33d, 15:40a.

a further special instance of this peculiarity is the tendency to use forms of the masculine pronoun to refer to the soul even when no words for the soul are nearby, e.g. in 1:84b, 4:56a. (Many examples of this could be cited.)

anacoluthon of various kinds: 1:12–13 (*vinā* used once with accusative and then supplied with a series of nouns one of which is in the instrumental), 1:61 (in the first half of which a *tatpuruṣa* compound containing *caitanya* occurs, and in the second the word must be supplied in the nominative case, even though no pronoun represents it), 3:4 (sudden change of construction in a series of parallel statements such that ellipsis of a neuter subject must be assumed), 3:5cd (singular in a relative clause and plural in the correlative); 2:25a and 14:61e (attraction of genitive pronoun to the case of a noun with which it is in construction).

¹¹⁷ SPEYER observes (1886:350) that the correlative pronoun is often omitted when the relative clause follows the correlative, and he mentions (1886:349) that it may be omitted when the relative clause precedes the correlative (of such an omission he gives no example), but it seems to me that the omission of correlatives in the *Parākhya* is much more frequent than is normal.

ablative for instrumental (expressing the *nimittakāraṇa*): 1:92d, 4:121b.
clumsy transferred epithets: 2:37ab.

somewhat too frequent use of compounds ending in *-ga* where a genitive (or other case ending) would be more normal: 1:13d, 1:41d, 1:68d, 2:28d, 2:45d, 2:53d, 2:55b, 2:72b, 2:102c, 3:25d, 3:26d, 3:29b, 3:35b, 3:48d, 3:49d(?), 4:33a, 4:38d, 4:44b, 4:49a, 4:83c, 4:99d, 4:136c, 5:68a, 5:92d, 5:111d, 5:117d, 5:134c, 5:153a, 5:156d, 6:35b, 14:11a, 14:15b, 14:28b, 14:33b, 14:45d, 14:48b, 14:57d, 14:71a, 14:75b, 14:75c, 14:75d, 14:78a, 14:81d, 14:89b, 14:90c, 15:19a, 15:46d, Appendix I.A:6d, Appendix I.B:10b.

a predilection also for compounds ending in *-anuga*: 2:55d, 2:56d, 2:61d, 2:112d, 3:26b, 3:35b, 4:105b, 14:38d.

also not infrequent are words ending in *-ja*: 1:3b, 1:17e, 1:39d, 1:52b, 2:14d, 2:26b, 2:41a, 2:103b, 3:74c, 3:75b, 4:53b, 4:66d, 4:82a, 4:82d, 4:91f, 4:103b, 4:133c, 5:35d, 5:140d, 5:162c, 15:59d, 6:13d, 6:14a. Such compounds should perhaps be classed together as manifestations of a general tendency of the author of the *Parākhyā* to employ short tags of one or two-syllables, usually to get the sense of different case-endings without spoiling the metre. Apart from *-ga* and *-ja*, the use of *-ka* in this sort of way seems to occur (e.g. 1:89b, 3:44d, 4:66b, 5:14d, 5:150a, 14:87c);¹¹⁸ *-uttha* is not uncommon (1:3a, 1:43c, 2:49c, 3:76c, 4:82c, 4:133d, 15:10a); *-ākhyā* is much used (1:7c, 1:8d, 1:47b, 1:80a, 2:15b, 2:19c, 2:29a, 2:35d, 2:36b, 3:62b, 4:15b, 4:92e, 4:115b, 4:124c, 4:154b, 5:12a, 5:12c, 5:13a, 5:13b, 5:16a, 5:41a, 5:41c, 5:42c, 5:45a, 5:45c, 5:47a, 5:48c, 5:72c, 5:78a, 5:86a, 5:90b, 5:101a, 5:133c, 5:143a, 5:145a, 5:145d, 5:146d, 5:147a (twice), 5:147d, 5:148b, 5:149b, 5:149c, 5:151a, 5:151c, 5:152b, 5:152c, 5:155d, 6:19c, 6:20c, 6:31b, 14:13d, 14:21c, 14:69a, 15:2cd (thrice), 15:31c, 15:44d, 15:64b, Appendix I.A:2c, Appendix I.B:15a),¹¹⁹ and there are an extremely (and, I think,

¹¹⁸And it is relatively liberally used as a metre-filling *bahuvrīhi*-marker (e.g. 1:22a, 1:66b, 2:15d, 2:35d, 2:39d, 2:71b, 2:94b, 4:14ab, 4:29f, 4:46d, 4:80d, 4:125d, 4:134d, 4:149b, 4:162b, 5:2d, 5:44b, 5:82d, 5:84b, 5:111b, 5:145d, 5:146b, 5:152b, 6:7b, 14:34d, 14:36b, 14:73d, 15:7c, 15:17c) and as an otiose syllable-filler in names and some nouns (see below under morphological peculiarities).

¹¹⁹Other forms derived from the root $\sqrt{khyā}$ are also frequent.

unusually) large number of words ending in *-taḥ* (a list seems unnecessary). Such a tendency can of course not be said to be typical only of the author of the *Parākhyā*.

non-*bahuvrīhi* compounds inflected as though they were *bahuvrīhis*: 1:32d, 3:1b, 4:1b, 4:2b, 4:2c, 4:34d, 4:93d, 6:8b, 6:45b, 14:20d, 14:37d, 15:19d. Observe that seven instances are of compounds ending in *āśraya*, *saṃśraya* or *samāśraya* (1:32d, 4:1b, 4:2b, 4:93d, 14:20d, 14:37d, 14:58d) and all but one of the rest¹²⁰ concern comparable verbal nouns formed with *kṛt* suffixes. Perhaps they could instead be grouped under the rubric of verbal nouns used as adjectives at the end of *tatpuruṣa* compounds.

‘split’ or incomplete compounds: 2:73b (*doṣas tv itaretaraḥ*), 6:18a (*kāryakāraṇo yogah*), 6:19a (*sādhyasādhanō yogah*),¹²¹ 6:31b (*śivākhyam mantralakṣaṇam*)¹²².

tautologous compounds to fill the metre: 1:52b, 4:103b (compounds ending in *-nimittaja*), 15:34c (*taddvārayogataḥ*).

a *dvandva* compound apparently followed by a *ca* or a *vā* connecting its two members: 4:102a, Appendix I.B:28c.¹²³

the suffix *-taḥ* apparently used as though it were *-tvāt* or *-tvena*: 3:40d, 4:8d, 4:69d, 5:85c, 15:50d(?). Apart from these rather strained uses of *tasil*, the suffix is, as we have remarked above, extremely frequently used in its commonly accepted senses.

āha with past-tense meaning: 1:2c, 1:18d.¹²⁴

¹²⁰The final member of the compound in 4:34d is *gocara*.

¹²¹These last two could perhaps be included under the above heading.

¹²²The required sense is that of *śivākhyamantralakṣaṇam*, but that would infringe the metre.

¹²³A similar case is noted by TÖRZSÖK (*1999:xlvi) in *Siddhayogeśvarīmatatantra* 8:8:

*sūtrayen maṇḍalaṃ divyaṃ sarvasiddhiphalodayam
caturaṣṭakaraṃ vāpi . . .*

¹²⁴This usage can be found in good classical authors too; see for instance GOODALL 2001b for its occurrence in the works of Kālidāsa.

present active participles used as main verbs: 2:59c, 4:22b, and perhaps 14:82d.

double sandhi: 4:21c, 4:67d, 5:52c, 5:93d, 5:96d(?), 5:132b, 6:79a, 14:50c, 14:57c, Appendix I.B:30c.

irregular sandhi of the masculine nominative pronoun *saḥ*: 5:87c.

sandhi applied when endings should be *pragṛhya*: 15:16a, 15:20c, Appendix I.A:2d–3a, Appendix I.B:12c.

hiatus within a *pāda*:¹²⁵ in 1:71c, 3:5a,¹²⁶ 3:69b, 4:52b.

treatment of vocalic *ṛ* as equivalent to *ri* or *ru* (excluding instances of hiatus): 4:101b, 5:15a, 5:20b, 5:132c, 14:98a (and perhaps also in 4:105d).¹²⁷ A special case is 5:129b, *ṛṣayo ṛṣubhāvanāḥ*, which is different from the above-mentioned instances of hiatus in that the final form of the first word has been modified as though the second began with *r* followed by a vowel. Such a treatment of the vocalic *ṛ* as though it were a combination of a consonant and a vowel is common enough in some Purāṇas: see, e.g., ADRIAENSEN, BAKKER, and ISAACSON 1998:27–8.

the locative of the singular used for the locative of the dual: 2:110d (*bodhābodhe*).

plural for dual: 5:4a.

neuter for masculine: 4:83c (*utkarṣam*) 5:95d (*udanvat*), 14:94d (*nijadharmam*).¹²⁸

¹²⁵Hiatus between two *pādas*, such as we find, for instance, between 2:61c and d, 14:22a and b, 14:104a and b, etc., seems not to be especially common in this text, but it is in any case so common in epic, puranic and tantric literature that it seems hardly worth recording here as a peculiarity.

¹²⁶These first two are instances of hiatus where the second word begins with a vocalic *ṛ*. Since hiatus inside a *pāda* is not a common feature of the style of this text, this suggests that in the redactor's pronunciation (and therefore usage) the vocalic *ṛ* had the phonetic value of *ri* or *ru*. There are a number of other indications that this was so, for which see next entry.

¹²⁷There are a number of indications that for the scribe too, and not just for the redactor, vocalic *ṛ* was so treated, e.g., his writing *kṛddhaḥ* (for *kruddhaḥ*) in 5:123a.

¹²⁸In this last instance, as well as in 4:83c, the neuter ending appears to be the result

masculine for neuter: 1:79e (*cetāḥ*).

simplex for causative: 6:21b and 6:61d (both instances of *pratyeti*).

occasional pleonasms: 5:62b, 5:139b.

The following are morphological peculiarities:

svākya with the sense, perhaps slightly intensified, of the possessive adjective *sva*.¹²⁹

abbreviations of certain nominal forms: 3:3c (*gauta* for *gautama?*), 14:4d (*cara* for *carāṇa*, perhaps to fit the metre), 15:11d (*adhikārikā* for *adhikārakārikā?*).

meaningless extension of some nouns (particularly names) to pad the metre with *-ka*: 5:5d, 5:14d, 5:48d, 5:68c, 5:69a, 5:112b, 5:118a, 5:147d, 5:148b, 14:4d, 14:7b, 14:73d.¹³⁰

irregularly formed past-participles: perhaps 14:12d and 14:90b (*anusandhita*), and perhaps 14:22d (*chindita*).

feminine stem in *-ī* replaced by a stem in *-yā*: 5:15c (*vaitaraṇyā*).

feminine stem in *-i* replaced by a stem in *-ī* to suit the metre: 6:69c (*āhūtī*).

the genitive *patyuh* mistakenly ‘regularised’ to *pateḥ*: 14:97c.

the genitive plural of *mūrdhan* mistakenly ‘regularised’ to *mūrdhānām*: 2:89b (*ex conj.*).

Stems in final *-s* are occasionally treated as stems in *-a/-ā* when at the beginning of a compound: 4:89a, 5:133d, 5:134b.

Stem in final *-is* treated as a stem in *-i* to fit the metre: 5:35d (*udbhūtānalajārcibhiḥ*).

of attraction to the gender of *aiśvarya*, the word to which both expressions stand in apposition.

¹²⁹See fn. 396 on p. 258 below.

¹³⁰This last, an instance of *tālu-ka*, finds parallel in a number of other tantric works, e.g., *Niśvāsamukha* 4:52 (f. 16^v), *Niśvāsa guhyasūtra* 1:133 (f. 44^v), *Svacchanda* 4:365, 5:75, 7:38, 10:1172, 15:25, *Kubjikāmata* 17:75, 25:93, and *Tantrāloka* 32:26.

Accusative for nominative in the masculine plural of stems in *n* and *nt*: 6:6b, 15:73.

One further observation on my use of the expression ‘*aiśa* language’ is worth making. A comparison of the above list with the accounts referred to above of deviant usages in the *Kiraṇa*, *Sārdhatrīśatikālottara*, *Siddha-yogeśvarīmata*, and the *Kubjikāmata* seems to me to reveal rather surprisingly little that is common to all those texts. We can observe in all of them a tendency (of very varying strength) to transform non-vocalic nominal stems into vocalic ones, particularly when this is metrically required, and a tendency to irregularities of sandhi (hiatus and double sandhi); but beyond this, each list tables largely idiosyncracies peculiar to each text. Even confusion over *lyap* and *ktvā*, which one might expect to be universally shared, appears not to be a common feature of the *Parākhya*.¹³¹ Certainly the *Parākhya*, in the form it has been transmitted to us, cannot be said to have been written in a distinct language whose basis is Sanskrit.

Welcome light on *ārṣa* (and therefore also *aiśa*) usage is shed by a grammar of epic Sanskrit that has just appeared: OBERLIES 2003.

Some remarks on the treatment of metre

The *Parākhya* ends each chapter with a verse in a different metre: chapters 1 and 6 are concluded with an *upajāti*, 2 and 14 with a *vasantatilakā*, 3 with a *mālinī*, and 4, 5 and 15 each with a *śārdūlavikrīḍita*. But in respect of its *anuṣṭubh* it is almost as remarkably bland as the *Kiraṇa* or the *Svāyambhuvāsūtrasaṅgraha*, both of which, as I have observed (GOODALL 1998:lxxi), not only restrict themselves to the *anuṣṭubh* but scarcely deviate from the *pathyā*. The occasional *vipulās* are these:

na-vipulā 1:18a, 1:60c, 2:76e, 5:35c, 5:104c, 15:65c, and Appendix I, verses B:40c, C:54a, and L:126c.

ra-vipulā 6:19d and 6:20d (identical *pādas*, both missing a caesura after the fourth syllable).

¹³¹A single instance is to be found in the chapters transmitted by M^Y (15:60c) and one is to be found in Appendix I.L:132a, but see also the apparatus ad loc. But I should add the caveat that we possess only fragments of the parts of the text most likely to contain plentiful absolutes, namely the parts giving ritual instructions.

ma-vipulā 1:66c, 2:111a (*ex conj.* and with the wrong preamble), 3:56a, 5:95c, 14:10c, Appendix I, verses E:79a (with no caesura after the fifth syllable), E:87c, and K:115a.

Even including the verses in Appendix I, not quite one percent of the half-lines have *vipulās*. Without the verses in Appendix I the percentage is yet lower.

A number of ‘errors’ with the *pathyā* occur when a short vowel in the fifth syllable is followed by a conjunct in which the second consonant is a semivowel: 5:4c, 5:44a, 5:76c, 5:124a. These could therefore be treated as *ma-vipulās*, irregular because they are not preceded by a *ra*-preamble. But I regard them rather as instances of the *pathyā* in which the weak conjunct at the beginning of the sixth syllable was not felt to strengthen the fifth. Of course conjuncts with semi-vowels do strengthen the syllables they precede; indeed, as we have seen above (see p. lxxxiii), it is clear that even a consonant followed by a vocalic *r̥* was felt in a number of cases to be sufficient metrically to strengthen the preceding syllable. But what I am suggesting is that they were felt not necessarily to do so. Occasionally we find conjuncts with semi-vowels being similarly treated as weak in the cadence of the even *pāda* too: 1:71d, 3:11d, 5:109d, 6:48b, 6:68d.

Two even-numbered *pādas* might originally have been faulty for being entirely iambic: 5:136ef (*ex conj.*; see fn. 613 on p. 312) and 4:86b (see fn. 391 on p. 257).

There are a couple of instances where metrical constraints have been entirely abandoned, both to be explained as the result of having to incorporate metrically awkward names: 2:43c, 14:91. Verse 1:14a is hypermetrical, but it belongs to a class of hypermetrical *pādas* that is not uncommon in *aiśa* and *ārṣa* language: we must treat its two initial short syllables as having the value of a single long.¹³² In 5:58a the hypermetry is the result of a conjecture, but one that seems not implausible (see fn. 541 on p. 294). In the text as constituted there are few metrical solecisms in the even *pādas*, and such as there are can for the most part, as we have seen, be ‘justified’. Since these give the cadence, they are the most inflexible part of the verse. In only a small handful of instances (1:51cd, 2:38ab, 3:65ab, 15:41ab, Appendix I.B:16cd and 17ab) does a word awk-

¹³²See GOODALL (quoting TOKUNAGA) 1998:lvii, fn. 132. A weak intervening consonant, such as a nasal or (as in our instances) a semivowel perhaps helps the collapse of two syllables into one.

wardly bridge an odd and an even *pāda*. In two instances the author (unless these are transmissional errors) has awkwardly split compounds in order to avoid a bad even *pāda* (2:35 and 6:31b).

The author of the *Parākhya* was not, we may conclude, a skilled handler of metre. He may have been very slightly more ambitious than the authors of the *Kiraṇa* and *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha*, but his verses in longer metres, unless the transmission has badly distorted them, are far from being smooth compositions. Perhaps their lack of clarity is in part to be explained by their being in each case densely packed summary verses.

Does the *Parākhya* tell us anything new?

The rediscovery of a large part of the *Parākhya* made possible by this edition does not provide us with a lot of new or surprising doctrines, and it should not radically change our picture of the old pan-Indian Sanskrit Śaiva Siddhānta. It could be said, in other words, to be just another scriptural formulation of a body of views that we find (with one or two variations here and there) in a number of published works. But we should take note that it is one more document of the period before the appearance of what seems to have been the most significant body of Saiddhāntika exegesis in the history of the school, namely the writings of the tenth-century Kashmirian lineage of Rāmakaṇṭha II. It joins, therefore, a very small corpus of published pre-tenth-century Saiddhāntika writings: the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha*, the *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha*, the *Sārdhatriśatikālottara*, the *Kiraṇa*, the *Sarvajñānottara*, the *Mataṅga*, the *Mṛgendra*, and the surviving writings of Sadyojyotis. Among the scriptures of this already modest list, the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha* is badly transmitted and, I believe, incomplete;¹³³ the greater part of both the *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha* and the *Kiraṇa* is, I maintain, uninterpretable as presented to us by their South Indian editions;¹³⁴ and of the *Sarvajñānottara* only a very small portion has been published, and in the only easily accessible edition of that small portion (that of the

¹³³See p. xcvi below.

¹³⁴The incomprehensibility of the Devakoṭṭai edition of the *Kiraṇa* (E_D) is plentifully illustrated in this volume: see footnotes 143, 726, 732, 755, 781, 846, and 904 on pp. 181, 347, 351, 358, 364, 383, and 402. Fewer illustrations are given of difficulties in the South Indian edition of the *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha*, but see footnotes 522 and 743 on pp. 290 and 355. VASUDEVA (*2000) draws attention to and repairs a number.

Adyar Library) its text is marred by large distortive interpolations,¹³⁵ non-sensical omissions,¹³⁶ and passages that deviate very widely from all the manuscripts I have consulted.¹³⁷ The corpus of published early scriptures is thus small indeed, and the addition to it of the *Parākhya* makes a considerable difference, if only in bulk. And even if it treats many of the same themes as other texts, naturally it has different emphases. Thus it devotes more attention than the other early published scriptures to theories about language, mantras and scripture, and to the relative importance of *dīkṣā* and the four *pādas*. The *Parākhya*'s fourteenth chapter is a welcome addition to the small collection of works on early Śaiva yoga. BRUNNER, in her article on the subject (1994), was obliged to rely (among the early Saiddhāntika sources) on the in some respects unusual account of the *Mṛgendra*, the uninterpretable corrupt account of the Devakoṭṭai edition of the *Kiraṇa*, and the difficult treatments of the *Mataṅga* and the *Sārdhatriśatikālottara*, the latter given piecemeal in a number of chapters.¹³⁸

In one respect this volume is quite new: it contains the first translation of an early Siddhāntatantra into English. The only complete translations of early Siddhāntatantras are those into French of the *Mṛgendra* (HULIN 1980 and BRUNNER 1985) and the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha* (DAGENS and BARAZER-BILLORET 2000), the latter being, in my opinion, of limited use because of the poor state of the text they followed. Of the *Svāyambhuvāsūtrasaṅgraha* only the first three and a bit chapters, out of twenty-three, have been translated into French and English (FILLIOZAT 1991a and 1994), and of the *Kiraṇa* the first twelve, out of sixty-four, have been translated into Italian (VIVANTI 1975), and the first seven into English (GOODALL 1996 and 1998).

A word about the arbitrariness of the annotation. The criticism may be raised that in some places I have quoted a great deal of tangentially relevant matter, and in others barely anything at all. The charge is unanswerable. All annotation is likely to be arbitrary to a certain extent, and of course I have followed up some things that interested me and not others.

¹³⁵One of these forms the subject of GOODALL forthcoming B.

¹³⁶One is referred to in fn. 838 on p. 381.

¹³⁷See footnotes 332 and 348 on pp. 238 and 245 below.

¹³⁸I cannot pretend fully to have understood the *Parākhya*'s treatment of the topic, but I have had the enormous advantage of having Dr. Somdev VASUDEVA's work (*2000) to draw on.

I have on the whole tried to quote most from the most closely related texts whenever I found in them matter that helped me to contextualise and to interpret what I found in the *Parākhya*. In other words, I have intentionally referred most to the early Siddhāntas, and among those particularly the *Mṛgendra*, *Mataṅga*, and *Kiraṇa*, which I judge to be closest in spirit to the *Parākhya*,¹³⁹ and then to exegetical Saiddhāntika literature, particularly when it contained quotations of passages of the *Parākhya* and commented on them. Relevant passages from texts of other schools of thought have been quoted less frequently.

It may be unfashionable to comment unfavourably on the literary quality of something one edits, particularly when it does not belong to one's own culture, but I think some remark on the subject belongs to a characterisation of the text. It is not, in my view, a work of beauty. It is, as we have seen, less prolix than the *Mataṅga*, and yet this does not render it as neat and clear as the *Mṛgendra*, nor indeed any clearer than the *Mataṅga*. It is less lively than the *Kiraṇa* and considerably less lively than the *Niśvāsa*. Metrically it is, as we have also seen, indifferent; indeed it seems to me that it does not in its use of metre, diction or any means aspire to be poetry. Its author's aim was a systematic presentation and justification of the principal doctrines of the Śaiva Siddhānta in unadorned verse.

The nature of this edition

Browsing in A. E. HOUSMAN's classical papers is an absorbing diversion for someone who aspires to edit ancient texts, but it is not without its stings. I recently came across the following and was uncomfortably reminded of my text and translation of the *Parākhya*:

Here then, between poets capable of much and copyists capable of anything, is a promising field for the exercise of tact and caution; a prudent editor will be slow to emend the text and slow to defend it, and his page will bristle with the obelus. But alas, it is not for specimens of tact and caution that one resorts to the editors of the *Culex*; it is rather to fill one's

¹³⁹I should reiterate that this 'closeness' may be illusory, given that so few early Siddhāntatantras are accessible to us. Perhaps they should not really form a group; but given what survives, they seem to.

bosom with sheaves of improbable corrections and impossible explanations.¹⁴⁰

Fortunately, since this is, as far as I am aware, the first edition of the *Parākhya*, I can reassure myself with the reflection that, by reporting as accurately as I can what all the sources for the text read and offering as many suggestions for improvement as occur to me and to others to whom I have shown the text, I am at least recording what is preserved by what appear to be the last, fast-decaying witnesses of the *Parākhya*, and am improving at least some parts of it for future readers.

And HOUSMAN offers this further consolation:

Some ancient authors have descended to modern times in one MS. only, or in a few MSS. derived immediately or with little interval from one . . . Others there are whose text, though in the main reposing on a single copy, can be corrected here and there from others, inferior indeed, but still independent and indispensable . . . There is a third class whose text comes down from a remote original through separate channels, and is preserved by MSS. of unlike character but like fidelity, each serving in its turn to correct the faults of others. . .

If I had no judgment, and I knew it, and were nevertheless immutably resolved to edit a classic, I would single out my victim from the first of these three classes: that would be best for the victim and best for me. Authors surviving in a solitary MS. are by far the easiest to edit, because their editor is relieved from one of the most exacting offices of criticism, from the balancing of evidence and the choice of variants. They are the easiest, and for a fool they are the safest. One field at least for the display of folly is denied him: others are open, and in defending, correcting, and explaining the written text he may yet aspire to make a scarecrow of the author and a byword of himself; but with no variants to afford him scope for choice and judgment he cannot exhibit his impotence to judge and choose.¹⁴¹

¹⁴⁰From HOUSMAN's "Remarks on the 'Culex' ", *The Classical Review* XVI (1902), p. 339, as quoted in HOUSMAN 1981:95.

¹⁴¹From HOUSMAN's preface to his edition *M. Manilii Astronomicon Liber Primus* (London, 1903) as quoted in HOUSMAN 1981:34–5.

There is so much that is noteworthy and quotable that strikes the reader in HOUSMAN's papers, and now that I have started it is difficult to stop, but I will restrict myself to just one more quotation, not because it is pithy and amusing, but because it illustrates something that must powerfully strike students of every branch of Sanskrit literature:

The Pithoeanus was first applied to the recension of Juvenal in 1585 by its godfather Petrus Pithoeus. His text, founded on this MS., served in 1613 as a model to Rigaltius, and Rigaltius served as a model to editors of Juvenal for near two hundred years. From 1800 onward, when P had long disappeared, Ruperti first, and then Achaintre and Heinrich, produced recensions founded on inferior MSS. But in the middle of the century the Pithoeanus was rediscovered in Montpellier and was restored to its pride of place by Otto Jahn and K. F. Hermann; and in the series of modern editions, Jahn's of 1851, Hermann's of 1854, Jahn's of 1868, Buechler's of 1886 and 1893, the text of Juvenal has drawn nearer and nearer to the text of P.¹⁴²

Across centuries, generations of scholars, building upon each others' achievements, have gradually worked towards re-constructing many classical Greek and Latin texts. In India, commentarial literature written from early times up to the present day has played its role in securing and rendering interpretable some Sanskrit texts. But it is only in recent times that editions of Sanskrit works based upon exhaustive collations of the sources have begun to appear, and it is evident that, although it is fashionable to question the fruits of such endeavours for some texts,¹⁴³ there is much to be gained from critical editions in every branch of Sanskrit literature.

With this first edition of the *Parākhya* I have attempted to repair the text as much as possible, but I am aware that much of the text is lost, much is uninterpretable corrupt, much is suspect, and much that has not

¹⁴²From HOUSMAN's preface to his edition *D. Iunii Iuvenalis Saturae* (London, 1905) as quoted (with subsequent corrections incorporated) in HOUSMAN 1981:54.

¹⁴³Asserting the futility of attempting critical editions of *Purāṇas* in particular is perhaps no longer the *dernier cri*, but it is still not passé: see, for example, INDEN 2000, in particular the appendix, entitled 'Authorism and Contextualism, Empiricism and Idealism in the Study of Purāṇas'.

aroused my suspicions may not be in the state its author intended.¹⁴⁴ I am also aware that it is unlikely that generations of text-critics will follow who will gradually work at improving the text, winning nearer and nearer to its original state. And there are few passable editions of the surviving texts most closely related to the *Parākhya*; indeed many have not been printed at all. Although I have tried to read related literature, reading much of it inevitably involves editing it. There is, I have no doubt, much surviving material that I have missed and that I might profitably have adduced to repair and elucidate passages in the *Parākhya*. I could therefore allow further years to pass in the study of related material before daring to publish. But publishing now means that one further source for the intellectual history of Śaivism is made available to other students and editors of this body of literature.

Comparing the one surviving MS that transmits the *Parākhya* with the wealth of sources that transmit other Siddhāntatantras, for example the *Kiraṇa*, should make us mindful of another reason for being sceptical of, indeed inevitably dissatisfied with, the text offered in this edition. In the case of the *Kiraṇa* we can plausibly divide the surviving MSS into three groups. It seems likely to me that the Nepalese sources are the most ‘sincere’, which is to say that they appear not to have transmitted a lot of deliberate modifications, and such deviations as there are from the text as it was first composed seem likely in the main to be the result of accident, of ‘innocent’ error. The MSS M^Y and R^N reflect the text as it was transmitted to and by the tenth-century Kashmirian exegete Rāma-kaṇṭha II (in both cases, but certainly in the case of R^N , this may have been a South Indian text modified in accordance with the commentary): a slightly polished up Kashmirian text, from which a number of awkwardnesses had been removed by circumlocution. The other South Indian manuscripts transmit a text that has in places also been ‘improved upon’ in the interests of clarity—again not, it seems, with a view to modifying its doctrines (see GOODALL:1998:369–70, fn. 604)—and which has here and there suffered conflation with the other groups. Using these groups

¹⁴⁴In the introduction to my edition of the *Kiraṇavṛtti* I very briefly defended the practice of conjectural emendation (GOODALL 1998:cxiv); here I assume that no such defence is necessary, because I imagine that it will be clear to all who attempt to read the text as it has been transmitted by M^Y that it must be corrected if we make the minimal assumption that the text once made sense. But it is of course not only where it cannot be construed or cannot be plausibly construed that the text may be at fault.

and the surviving commentaries we can often infer what is likely to have been the original wording of a particular verse, and that is often very different from what we find in the Mysore codex M^Y.

Now in the case of the *Parākhya* we have only one source, the same Mysore codex M^Y, and that tells us almost all we can know about the transmission. Quotations attributed to the *Parākhya* reveal deviations, but these, as we can discover from comparable quotations in the same works of other more reliably transmitted texts, are not likely all to be reliable. But it is not improbable that the *Parākhya*, like the *Kiraṇa*, should have been transmitted with enormous variation, and that what we have preserved today is a corrupt and damaged exemplar of one version among several of the text. For it should not be supposed that the enormously varied transmission of the *Kiraṇa* is exceptional in this genre of literature. We have plentiful evidence (in the form of surviving Nepalese MSS) for the text of the *Sārdhatrīśatikālottara* that reveals that it too was transmitted with huge variation, a great deal of which is not reflected in the editions published to date.¹⁴⁵ Even for the *Mataṅga* a considerable amount of significant variation is not reflected in the apparatus: apart from the numerous surviving South Indian MSS not used for the IFP edition,¹⁴⁶ Nepalese MSS have not been consulted at all for the first volume, and yet the one Nepalese palm-leaf MS that has been consulted for the second volume (using a not wholly accurate transcript, IFP MS T. 970, reported with the siglum ‘ca’) could improve on the text offered in the first volume in many places.¹⁴⁷ For much of the second volume no Kashmirian source gives testimony, and yet a catalogued Śāradā MS survives in the BORI (MS No. 235 of 1883–84) which, unlike the other Śāradā sources, covers the commentary for the beginning of the text and, alone among all the sources, covers the commentary for almost all of the *yogapāda* (the end of chapter 6 and the beginning of chapter 7 are missing) and for the beginning of the *caryāpāda*. It also contains portions of the commentary on the *kriyāpāda* for which BHATT had no source. The

¹⁴⁵Some indication of this was given in GOODALL 1998:lxvi–lxviii; for further evidence see, for example, the short quotation with (minimal) apparatus in fn. 793 on p. 368 below.

¹⁴⁶A few of these are referred to by GOODALL 1998:lxxx, lxxxii and xcvi.

¹⁴⁷The original manuscript is MS 5-688 in the National Archives, Kathmandu: NGMPP Reel No. A 43/2.

manuscript is in some disorder,¹⁴⁸ but it gives a much more complete text of Rāmakaṇṭha's commentary than any which BHATT actually used.¹⁴⁹

It is not improbable then that M^Y might represent but a single strand of a multifarious transmission, perhaps a version close to that once transmitted by the lost classical commentary, just as M^Y's version of what it transmits of the *Kiraṇa* is close to the text presupposed by Rāmakaṇṭha's *Kiraṇavṛtti*.

¹⁴⁸It contains 253 folios divided up as follows: 101 folios labelled ff. 119–219; 18 unnumbered; 48 numbered ff. 1–18; 86 numbered ff. 1–86. The commentary on the *yoga-pāda* (from which I have cited in the annotation to chapter 14) is covered on ff. 44^r–83^v of the last sequence of pagination.

¹⁴⁹SANDERSON (1995b:565) mentions the omission of this source in his review, as well as of two other catalogued sources in North India that I have not seen: Sāhitya Saṁsthāna, Rājasthāna Vidyāpīṭha, Udaipur, Accession Nos. 205 and 334. In a letter of 27.ix.1997, Professor SANDERSON drew my attention to the existence of another Kashmirian MS in a collection recently acquired by the Staatsbibliothek in Berlin: it is part of a *Sammelhandschrift*, at that time labelled KA 1436, part of which has been consulted for its text of the *Mālinīvijayottara* and described by VASUDEVA (*2001:xiii).

SOURCES FOR THE CONSTITUTION OF THE TEXT

The Mysore Manuscript

The principal source for the text is University of Mysore, Oriental Research Institute MS P 258/9 (i.e. MS P 258, ff. 27^r–35^v). The last digit of the shelf-mark is intended to indicate the place of the text in the codex, but the *Parākhya* appears to be the eighth and not the ninth. This codex's text of the *Parākhya* is listed by MALLEDEVARU (1987:66–7), as are most, but not all, of the other works in the codex elsewhere in the same volume. The following account is a modified version of my description of the codex in the introduction to volume 1 of the *Kiraṇavṛtti* (GOODALL 1998:lxxxix–xci):

Palm-leaf (talipot). Nandināgarī. Folios of $2\frac{1}{2}'' \times 1'2\frac{1}{4}''$ with eighteen lines to a side. The leaves were numbered (perhaps at the time of writing) in Kannaḍa numerals in the left margins of each recto and later in Arabic numerals in the spaces round the string holes. I have followed the latter. The first verse of the text of the *Kiraṇa* (f. 35^v[12]) directly follows the colophon to the *Parākhya* (for which this is the *codex unicus*) on f. 35^v (labelled 35B), line 11. The penultimate folio of the *Kiraṇa* was placed after f. 70 of the codex, was noticed by the second numerator to belong earlier, and was labelled 39B. [...] The whole codex is beautifully written in a very small, neat hand and makes an old impression. The *Parākhya* is preceded in the same codex by the *Tattvapra-kāśavṛtti* (ff. 1–5^r); the *Prayogasāra* (ff. 5^v–9^r); *Rauravasūtra-saṅgraha* [for chapters 5 to 10 and for half of chapter 4 of which this is the *codex unicus*] (ff. 9^r[6]–12^r[15]); *Svāyambhuvasūtra-saṅgraha* [for which this is the only South Indian manuscript known to me in which all twenty-three chapters appear in the

correct order and unmixed with other material] (ff. 12^r[15]–18^v[16]); *Sārdhatrīśatikālottara* (ff. 18–22^r); *Kārajñāna* (f. 22^v); and the *Mṛgendrottara* [= *Mṛgendra*] (ff. 23^r–27^r [the text on f. 23 does not follow on from that on f. 22]). The *Parākhyā* is followed in the same codex by the chapters 1–11 and 58–9 (the last two being numbered 59 and 60 respectively) of the *Kiraṇa* (ff. 35^v–39^v); by the *Paṣkara* (ff. 39^v–48); *Goraṣaviracita-prabodha* (ff. 48–50^r) and *Yogadīpikā* (ff. 52^r–53^r). On f. 54^v appears the colophon *iti śrīmahādevaviracite aṣṭāṅgayogaḥ kārṭikeyasaṃvādaḥ muktisopānaśāstraṃ samāptaṃ*. Then follows the first *adhikāra* of Abhinavagupta’s *Īśvarapratyabhi-jñākārikāvimarśinī* (ff. 54^v–71^r). The last colophon of that work is that of the seventh *āhnikā*. F. 71^v is blank. I could not identify what text the last folios, 72–76^r, transmit. I noticed only one colophon-like phrase: *iti jainasamayānirākaraṇaṃ* (f. 72^r[13]). The same codex was used for its text of the latter chapters of the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha* (not for the first three and half) and cursorily described in BHATT’s edition of the *Raurava* (p. xviii and p. 174). It was not used by FILLIOZAT for his edition of the *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha*. The bulk of M^Y’s readings of the *Kiraṇa* probably coincide more nearly with the conjectured text of Rāmakaṇṭha than those of any other independent manuscript of the *mūla*. The text of the two *paṭalas* it transmits of the *yogapāda* is written without break after that of the *vidyāpāda*.

The work called *Kārajñāna* transmitted on f. 22^v, of which only the first five and a half chapters are given, is an unpublished hundred-verse recension of the *Kālottara* that is also transmitted in Nepal,¹⁵⁰ but is unmentioned in BHATT’s list of known recensions.¹⁵¹ Although the text

¹⁵⁰It is transmitted, for example, immediately following the recension in fifty verses, the *Jñānapañcāśikā*, on ff. 4^v–9^v (in the first foliation) of NAK MS 5-4632, NGMPP Reel No. B 118/7. As I have observed (GOODALL 1998:xc, fn. 184), the names *Kārajñāna* and *Kālottara* are used interchangeably in the colophons of the Nepalese manuscripts of the non-eclectic recensions. Here too in M^Y the name *Kārajñāna* occurs in the colophons of chapters 3–5, but *Kālottara* in that of chapter 2 (f. 22^v[7]).

¹⁵¹BHATT’s list, given on p. xlvi of his *upodghāta* to his edition of the *Sārdhatrīśatikālottara*, omits also the *Jñānapañcāśikā* (mentioned in the previous footnote) and the *Sārdhaśatika* recension, which is transmitted on ff. 1^v–6^v (in the second foliation) of NAK MS 5-4632, NGMPP Reel No. B 118/7.

breaks off in the middle, no folio appears to be missing: the Roman and the Kannaḍa foliations (the latter only partially visible here) tally for the preceding and following folios, and some blank space has been left at the end of the last line of f. 22^v, as though to indicate that the remainder of the text had been missing also in the scribe's exemplar. The text of the *Mṛgendrottara* (= *Mṛgendra*) begins straight away at the top of f. 23^r. It ends (with the colophon *iti śrīmṛgendrottare yogapādaḥ samāptaḥ*) at the end of line 15 of f. 27^r. The manuscript in fact transmits only the *vidyāpāda* and the *yogapāda*. The *kriyāpāda* and *caryāpāda* are not given. Thus for a number of texts—the *Mṛgendra*, the *Kiraṇa*, the *Parākhya*, and probably the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha*—the scribe has omitted chapters. In each case he appears to have retained the parts that focus on doctrine and yoga and to have omitted ritual prescriptions. From the *Kiraṇa*, as we have seen, he has copied only chapters 1–11, in other words all of what Rāmakaṇṭha treats as the *vidyāpāda* with the exception of the twelfth chapter, and 58–9, the two chapters that treat yoga. Of the *Parākhya*, the first six chapters and the last two (chapters 14 and 15) have been selected. I have suggested before (GOODALL 1998:xl, fn. 92) that M^Y's text of the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha* may be incomplete, but I failed to mention some evidence that bears upon this assumption: BHATT's apparatus records that the chapters numbered 7–10 in the edition are not so numbered in the manuscript: three are not numbered at all, and the eighth he reports as being numbered 10 in M^Y. In fact even the eighth chapter does not appear to be numbered in M^Y.¹⁵² Since, as we have seen, the scribe of M^Y has omitted chapters of other tantras copied in the same codex, it is possible that he might have done the same when transmitting the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha*. As with the *Kiraṇa*, *Mṛgendra*, and *Parākhya*, he may well deliberately have dropped passages that were not of interest to him.

Since I have been able to find no other manuscript of the *Parākhya*, excepting its apographs, which will be described below, and since M^Y is therefore our only source (directly or indirectly) for almost all of the text, some more remarks about its script and scribal practices are called for than I offered in the introduction to the *Kiraṇavṛtti*. Unlike in some

¹⁵²The colophon to the seventh chapter of Mysore MS B 776, the partial apograph of M^Y that covers the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha*, ends with *dhāraṇāpāṭalo daśaḥ*, which has been corrected to *dhāraṇāpāṭalaḥ* (f. 38^v), and this is perhaps the source of the confusion.

styles of South Indian Nandināgarī, a medial short *i* is notated as in Devanāgarī, that is to say it does not lack the vertical bar that precedes the letter to which it is attached (contrast, e.g., R^N in which the *Kiraṇavṛtti* is transmitted). This bar in M^Y , however, is often hooked slightly to the right towards its bottom. I mention this detail because it explains why I can sometimes with some confidence transcribe a medial *i* (rather than a medial \bar{a} , *o* or *au* belonging to the preceding *akṣara*) in portions where the tops of the *akṣaras* are invisible.

The scribe's convention for an initial \dot{r} appears to have a form that could be interpreted as $r\dot{r}$ (or perhaps he consistently wrote $r\dot{r}$, even where initial \dot{r} is required).¹⁵³ The reader should therefore bear in mind that wherever I have transcribed r , this could be interpreted as $r\dot{r}$, and vice versa. The scribe invariably writes *jh* for *jḥ*, a habit comparable to that of many other scribes of always writing either *cha* or *ccha*, regardless of which is required. The scribe has marked corrections variously: a single *akṣara* is cancelled by a superscript dot (not a small circle, as is used for an *anusvāra* or to make up a *visarga*); a long portion of text can be deleted by being enclosed in round brackets or encircled¹⁵⁴ and, in some cases, also drawn through with a horizontal line; part of an *akṣara* (e.g. the *r* of a *pra*) can be deleted by dense scribbling over it. It appears that all the corrections have been executed by the scribe himself.

Antecedents

There are a number of indications that there may have been at some point in the transmission of the text down to M^Y an intermediary in Grantha script: the confusion of *ha* and *bha* (in 1:28d, 4:77a, 4:83a, 4:102a, 4:164b?, 5:28c, 5:92a, 6:69c, 14:10a); the occasional confusion of *kṛ* and *kū* (in 3:28c, 5:37c);¹⁵⁵ the confusion of *va* and *pa* (e.g. in 2:105b, 2:115c, 4:47d, 4:104d, 4:107c, 4:118d, 4:120d, 4:152b, 5:14d, 5:27c, 5:44a, 5:95d, 5:109b, 5:114c, 5:149a, 6:36b, 6:43d, 14:27d, 14:37b, 14:58b, 14:98d, 15:1c, 15:27d, 15:37b); the confusion of *dha* and *ya* (e.g. in 4:166b and 5:137d); the confusion of *ta* and *na* in 4:54c; the confusion of *ca* and *pa*

¹⁵³Occasionally, as in 3:5a, 5:129b and 5:134c, B has actually transcribed $r\dot{r}$.

¹⁵⁴This is the practice referred to in *Naiṣadhīyacarita* 1:11.

¹⁵⁵There are various styles of writing both of these in Grantha (see GOODALL and VASUDEVA, forthcoming), and a graph that in one Grantha hand represents a *kū* may in another represent a *kṛ* (and vice versa).

in 4:120a; the confusion of *ta* and *ka* in 1:17f, 4:92f and 5:145d; the confusion of *pa* and *ba* in 1:32a and 5:124c; the confusion of *rtha* and *rdha* in 4:67c; and the confusion of *ndha* (consistently represented by *ṃdha* in *M^Y*) and *ddha* (in 1:12b, 2:5a, 2:57d,¹⁵⁶ 4:14d, 4:31a, 4:48a, 4:149c, 4:156c, 4:165c, 4:170d, 14:21a, and 14:23c). These are all confusions that are palaeographically possible when copying from a Grantha exemplar. The confusion between *pa* and *ba* and that between *rtha* and *rdha* could also be the result of failure to distinguish voiced and unvoiced stops (particularly when they are medial) in Tamilian pronunciation.¹⁵⁷ To the category of phonetic mistakes possible for Tamil-speakers (i.e. those who principally use Grantha script) belong the occasional confusions between *ka* and *ga*, e.g. in 4:46b¹⁵⁸ and 14:53b, between *ṭ* and *ḍ* (in 5:27b), between *t* and *d* (in 2:115d),¹⁵⁹ between *pa* and *bha* (in 5:91a), and between *tth* and *ddh* (in 4:133d), (these four being examples of confusion between voiced and unvoiced stops of the same *varga*), as well as instances of confusion between aspirated and unaspirated stops of the same *varga*, e.g. *da* for *dha* in 4:82a, 15:10c, and perhaps 5:18d. The writing of *iyāsā* for *iyāśā* in 4:59c would also be a mistake typical of a Tamil-speaker, since an initial palatal vowel is commonly pronounced prefaced by a *y*; but this Southern tendency is not exclusive to Tamil speakers.

There are also confusions in *M^Y* that, though they might result from copying a Grantha exemplar, are also possible results of copying from other scripts: the confusion of *ca* and *va* in 4:65c.

And there are also occasional confusions that are not likely to have resulted from a Grantha exemplar but that might suggest an intermediary in an early Northern script or Śāradā or in the script of *M^Y* itself: confusion between *pa* and *ya* (4:44a, 6:36b); *ta* and *bha* (4:4d, 4:21d, 4:32a, 4:106b); confusion of *nna* with *tra* in 15:22d. Apart from these, there are of course plenty of errors that do not suggest the existence of intermedi-

¹⁵⁶In this instance (of *maddhanāt* for *manthanā*) *nthā* was probably first mistaken for *ndhā*.

¹⁵⁷I do not mean to imply that we must assume, as some do in similar cases, that the *Parākhya* must have been dictated at some point in the transmission that reached *M^Y*. Phonetic similarities obviously colour the way we write down unspoken thoughts: are there English-speakers who have never written ‘there’ for ‘their’, or ‘hear’ for ‘here’?

¹⁵⁸Emending *ga* to *ka* in this instance may not be strictly necessary. But note that it is possible that one or two of the relatively large number of compounds ending in *-ga* elsewhere (see p. lxxxix above) were originally compounds ending in *-ka*.

¹⁵⁹This instance belongs to a special category: see fn. 206 on p. 200 below.

aries in any particular script, a number of which will have had nothing to do with confusion about the shapes of letters or with local vagaries in pronunciation.

Deviant orthography

By comparison with other South Indian manuscripts that I have studied, this codex appears to be the work of a remarkably careful and accurate scribe with remarkably careful and accurate exemplars before him. Many of my emendations to the text are no more than corrections of what the scribe would probably have regarded as possible orthographies rather than as errors: for example, he not uncommonly omits a *visarga* before a *kṣ*, *sy*, *sv* and other initial sibilants in ligature with semi-vowels or nasals—a practice so common among South Indian scribes that it should indeed perhaps be classed as a variant orthography,¹⁶⁰ along with the permitted omission of the *visarga* before an initial sibilant in ligature with an unvoiced stop (cf. GOODALL 1998:236, fn. 228). It is possible that a certain confusion about whether or not omitting the *visarga* before other unvoiced stops in ligature with semi-vowels is permissible may account for occasional instances where a *visarga* is omitted before, e.g., a *pra*, or, as it seems, erroneously supplied before one.¹⁶¹ Another relatively common and easily detected error is the degemination of what should be doubled consonants when in ligature with semi-vowels or nasals (e.g. 1:15d, 2:114a, 4:4b, 4:33c, 4:51a, 4:60d, 4:64a, 4:65a, 4:66b, 4:66c, 4:79b, 4:95b, 4:114cd, 4:124a, 5:4b, 5:9b, 5:24b, 5:57c, 5:111c, 6:22b, 14:94d) or of doubled consonants after a long vowel, e.g. in 2:34b, 2:111c, 2:113a, 4:65d, 4:85a, 4:102c, 4:126d, 6:17c, 14:2d, 14:5a, 15:15b.¹⁶² Instances of the first of these types of degemination have been corrected silently in the case of certain words, since degemination of this kind would probably also have been regarded as acceptable orthography by the scribe. By this I mean that he would have regarded both *budhyā* and *buddhyā* as possible orthographies (though the first is arguably not), just as he would have seen no difference between *smaryate* and *smaryyate* (which really are

¹⁶⁰e.g. in 2:103c, 2:119b, 3:18c, 3:64a, 4:38c, 4:92f, 4:126cd, 4:133ab, 5:26a, 5:50b, 5:83a, 5:88e, 5:119a, 5:130a, 5:149b, 5:162c, 6:3a, 6:15c, 6:22a, 6:36a, 6:40c, 14:18b, 15:10b, 15:64b.

¹⁶¹e.g. 2:119c, 3:26d, 4:20f, 4:140a, 5:28b, 5:108a.

¹⁶²Many of these concern the past-participle *ujjhita* at the end of a compound.

both correct orthographies). But I have not silently corrected instances of degemination at the juncture of two words in a compound. By this I mean that the correction, for example, of *digrahaiḥ* in 5:111d to *diggrahaiḥ* is signalled in the apparatus.

Transcription

I transcribed by hand M^Y's text of the *Parākhya* from the original in the summer of 1996, and returned to Mysore to collate my typed up transcriptions against the manuscript in autumn 1997 (when fever prevented me) and again for a week in September 1998, but unexpected holidays meant that I had time only to collate chapters 2–6 and 14 against M^Y and chapters 14 and 15 against M^Y's partial apograph MS B 811. I returned in October 1999 and checked chapters 1 and 15 against M^Y, and again in October 2001 to read the other partial apograph, MS B 785, as well as to check various other small points throughout the text about which I had suspicions. Some errors will, of course, still not have been eradicated.

Condition

The leaves of the codex are strung through their right-hand string-holes only. All M^Y's leaves of the *Parākhya* were correctly ordered and correctly situated in the codex when I first transcribed the text in 1996, but ff. 27 and 35 were broken in two by a vertical break through the centre of the left-hand string hole and f. 31 was broken in two by a vertical break about 1.5cm to the left of its centre. When I collated my transcriptions against the manuscript in 1998 I found the broken pieces not attached by the string were scattered (together with a number of other fragments now broken off from other leaves) through the codex. The leaves transmitting the *Parākhya* (ff. 27–35) were still internally correctly ordered in 1998, but these leaves had been removed and replaced in the codex in such a way that f. 27 was now next to f. 36 and f. 35 next to f. 26. In one or two places (parts of) some more *akṣaras* had been lost at the edges of leaves.

Apographs

MS B 811 (catalogued by MALLEDEVARU 1987:66 and Appendix I, p. 92) is an apograph of M^Y covering only chapters 14 and 15 of the *Parākhyā*. It is clearly by the same hand and copied on to the same sort of paper as other partial transcripts of M^Y , such as those of the *Prayoga-sāra*, *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha* and *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha* (B 776) and of the *Kiraṇa* (B 812).¹⁶³ Like these, MS B 811 is written in a florid Kannaḍa hand with a black fountain pen on paper water-marked ‘GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE’. Corrections have been made in copper-beech-coloured ink. MS B 811 comprises a single signature of 5 sheets (i.e. 10 folios of 19.5cm × 16cm) bound in pale blue buckram. On f.1^r in the right-hand margin is written in the copper-beech ink ‘16.5.07’, meaning presumably that it was copied on 16th May 1907 AD. A stamp on the cover reads ‘ORIENTAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE MYSORE FILMED.’ Over the dots is written ‘FN 1093’. As in K_2 the colophons have been amplified with obeisances to Rāma and Kṛṣṇa. The first speaker indication of chapter 14 (*prakāśa uvāca*) is preceded in MS B 811 by the following (f. 1^r[1–2]):

// śrīrāmacandrāya namaḥ — // śubham astu śrī// atha
parākhye yogapādaḥ// śrīkṛṣṇāya namaḥ//

Another apograph, clearly by the same hand, covers the first six chapters of the text: MS B 785. It appears to have been written on the three days before MS B 811, for the recto of its first folio has been dated ‘ $\frac{13}{15}$.5.07’. Corrections have been executed in pale red. Bracketed numeration has been added by a later hand—perhaps that of one of the editors of the *Śaivaparibhāṣā*, for see p. cxx below—in blue ink for the first thirty-six verses, as have occasional conjectured modifications. MS B 785 was once bound in black buckram (the binding has disintegrated) in four signatures, also of five sheets, and its text begins on f. 151^r and ends on f. 189^r. On the cover it has been noted that it has been filmed (Film No. 2306). The beginning of the tantra is preceded by the following:

parāgamaḥ śrīsāmbasadāśivāya namaḥ// śubham astu//
śrīr astu// śrī// atha parākhyatantre +vidyāpādaḥ+
prārabhyate// śrī// śrī// +jñānapādaḥ prārabhyate+

¹⁶³MS B 812, the apograph of M^Y ’s text of the *Kiraṇa*, is assigned the siglum K_2 and described in the introduction to volume 1 of the *Kiraṇavṛtti* (GOODALL 1998:xc).

I should perhaps have described MS B 785 before MS B 811, but I only saw it in October 2001. The existence of MS B 785 is not recorded in the same volume (MALLEDEVARU 1987) of the descriptive catalogue as that in which M^Y and B are recorded (the volume which purports to deal with *āgama*) but appears under the title *Parāgamaḥ* in a later volume that purports to deal with *tantra* (RAJAGOPALACHAR 1990:298–9 and Appendix, pp. 334–5).¹⁶⁴ In case others should be interested in the valuable testimony of M^Y, it is worth recording the three other partial transcripts of which I am aware: MS B 783, a transcription of M^Y's text of the *Sārdhatriśatikālottara*; MS B 784 of the *Mṛgendra*; and MS B 813 of the South Indian *Pauṣkara*.

Although they are apographs of M^Y, MSS B 785 and B 811 have nevertheless been collated not only for the few extra lines and *akṣaras* they preserve that have since been worn away at the edges of the leaves in M^Y, but for the whole text. It has been most useful to have somebody else's transcription of the early MS, since its dense, miniature hand is often difficult to read. Reading it with confidence from various photographic reproductions (the Oriental Institute of the University of Mysore twice kindly gave me permission to attempt to photograph M^Y) proved so unsatisfactory that, as I have related, I instead made frequent trips to Mysore to verify my transcription. Deviations in B's transcription from my own have frequently alerted me to errors, ambiguities and problems. But recording throughout the apparatus what the apographs read seemed unnecessary. For the most part B differs from M^Y only in accidental copying errors and details of orthography (homorganic nasals almost consistently replace *anusvāras*), and its readings are only relevant to the constitution of the text where M^Y is illegible, or where the scribe of B has consciously written something different from M^Y in order to emend. Since he does not mark his emendations, we cannot be certain where his deviations are willed and where accidental. My policy, therefore, has been to report B's readings in the apparatus to the edition only where M^Y is

¹⁶⁴I had long assumed that the two manuscripts in Mysore listed in the *New Catalogus Catalogorum* (Vol. XI, p. 201) under the heading *Parātantrāgama* must be M^Y and the partial apograph MS B 811; but I have recently (June 2001) been able to examine the Mysore catalogue there referred to (*Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Government Oriental Library, Mysore, 1922, p. 599*) and find this is not the case. That catalogue does not appear anywhere to record the existence of M^Y, and the two manuscripts it lists of the *Parākhya* are MS B 811 and MS B 785.

damaged and where it seems possible to me that B has deliberately differed. But in the apparatus to the unedited transcription of M^Y I have recorded B's readings throughout: thus a reader who so wishes may gain an impression of its faithfulness to its exemplar and of the kinds of errors to which it is prone.¹⁶⁵ Even in this apparatus, however, I have suppressed mention of most instances where the scribe miscopied and then corrected himself immediately (here the corrections are in black), as well as of most instances where he miscopied and corrected himself later, presumably while checking his text against that of M^Y (here the corrections are in copper-beech red). Nor have I recorded instances where B has, for example, *pañca* for M^Y's *paṃca*, or *kāryam* for M^Y's *kāryyaṃ*, or other such purely orthographic variants. Suffice it to say that, apart from consistently preferring to write homorganic nasals where M^Y has the *anuvāra*, B generally degeminates consonants in ligature with semi-vowels that M^Y has geminated, and frequently alters a *visarga* before a sibilant to the sibilant in question.

Transcription conventions

The above should explain why I decided that it was not worth supplying images of the leaves of M^Y with this edition; I have opted instead to give a diplomatic transcription of the whole, as well as an edition with a critical apparatus incorporating the readings of testimonia. The diplomatic transcription I have tried to keep as faithful as possible, deviating from the original only in supplying verse numeration enclosed in double *daṇḍas*. (In the manuscript itself there is no verse numeration and each half-verse—with very occasional exceptions—is concluded with a single *daṇḍa*.) I have marked the line changes of the manuscript with line numbers in roman numerals enclosed in round brackets. Strings of *akṣaras* of which the tops have been severed I have printed widely spaced and I have put an entry in the apparatus to draw attention to their tops being missing. Gaps left by the scribe I have marked with a \sqcup . Where the gap is large, I have often marked the number of syllables for which

¹⁶⁵Occasionally it confuses between *bha* and *ta*, and between *śra* and *sa*, for example. Some instances of medial and final *e* are marked long (Kannaḍa, unlike Sanskrit, distinguishes long and short *e*), a point without significance in itself but that perhaps goes some way to explaining the occasional confusions between *i* and *ī* (which are distinguished from one another in the same fashion in Kannaḍa script).

space has been left. Thus a gap left for six missing syllables is notated thus: ‘□[-6-]□’. Portions that are illegible or broken away have been indicated by a triple dash (---). Where I wished to indicate the number of syllables missing, I have added the number in square brackets: thus ‘---[-6]---’ indicates that six syllables are broken off or illegible. Letters that are enclosed between plus-signs (+...+) are letters that were added subsequently, sometimes in between lines or in a margin. ‘X’s are used to bracket text that has been written and then in some way cancelled (×...×).

Other editorial conventions

The apparatus is divided into three registers. On a page where all three registers are present, the uppermost register records testimonia and parallels; the middle register records lacunae or passages where the tops of *akṣaras* are damaged in the manuscript; and the bottom register records the variants. The apparatus is fully positive. Each entry is preceded by the verse number and *pāda* letter (a, b, c and d indicate *pādas* 1, 2, 3, and 4 respectively). There follows the lemma, printed exactly as it is printed in the *textus receptus*, then a lemma sign:]. After this appears the siglum (or sigla) of the source (or sources) that transmits the *textus receptus*, then the variants, separated from what precedes them and from each other by semi-colons, and each marked with the sigla of the sources that transmit them. A siglum with superscript *ac* (*ante correctionem*) marks the reading of a manuscript before correction (e.g. M^{Y^{ac}}); a siglum with a superscript *pc* (*post correctionem*) marks the reading of a manuscript after correction (e.g. B^{pc}). When a reading is unmetrical, this is recorded after the siglum of the source that transmits it.

No key is given for the abbreviations used in the bottom register of apparatus for the titles of the texts from which testimonia are drawn, for they have all been formed in the same way from the initial syllables of the principal parts of the names: thus *SvaU* stands for *Svacchanda-tantroddyota*, *JñāRa* for *Jñānaratnāvalī*, *SiDī* for *Siddhāntadīpikā*, etc. (A glance above at the register that records the testimonia should clear up any possible doubt.)

Repairs to the text about which I feel rather little doubt, typically small and obvious corrections of common scribal errors, are marked *em*.

(emendation); bolder conjectures are marked *conj.* (conjecture). The difference is of course subjective. It could be argued that in a fully positive apparatus there should be no need to signal where I have proposed improvements to the text, but these labels do make it less easy for the reader to overlook the fact that all transmitted readings have been rejected and they enable me to give some indication of how confident I feel about each conjectural restitution. The suggested conjectures of others that have been accepted are attributed; conjectures that I have considered and not accepted (whether my own or those of others) are occasionally referred to in the annotation to the translation, but they are not recorded in the apparatus. Double angled brackets in the *textus receptus* ($\llcorner \dots \lrcorner$) enclose ‘free’ diagnostic conjectures, that is to say conjectures made where the transmission is lacunose and that are therefore based rather on diagnosis of what the context appears to require than on transmitted *akṣaras*.

The verse numeration is to some extent arbitrary: for the most part the text is summarily divided up into four-*pāda* units. Occasionally considerations of sense led me to introduce some six-*pāda* verse; reflection at the last stages of editing often prompted me to introduce others, but I resisted doing so because the required alterations would have cost hours of extra work (changing the numeration of whole chapters in the edition, diplomatic transcription, *pāda*-index and translation) and increased the risk of further errors: the effort and risk seemed not commensurate with the gain.

Independent testimonia

Some remarks must be made about the use of testimonia. The eight chapters that M^Y transmits comprise 1839 half-verses;¹⁶⁶ for 357 of these (a little less than one fifth) testimonia, in the form of quotations and borrowings in other works, have been traced. For tracing these, my starting point was the *Luptāgamasāṅgraha* of Gopinath KAVIRAJA (1970) and Vrajavallabha DVIVEDĪ (1983). The card-index held in the French Institute of Pondicherry¹⁶⁷ enabled me to locate many more in some published

¹⁶⁶Including the five not actually transmitted in M^Y but that are found in testimonia and have been judged to fit into M^Y's text, namely 4:101cd, 4:105cd, and 5:78c–79.

¹⁶⁷This useful tool, compiled over many years principally by Messrs. R. SUBRAMANIAM and SAMBANDHAN of the IFP, contains an index of topics (principally relating to *kriyā*), a half-verse index of a wide range of tantric works, and a small index of quotations in

South Indian works, and Professor SANDERSON kindly referred me to yet others. The remainder, perhaps a half of those identified, I have come across gradually over the last few years. There are doubtless more to be found.

Almost all the quotations of portions of the text can be regarded as independent testimonies to its wording, since they have been transmitted independently in texts with entirely different transmissional histories. It should be noted, however, that there is one exception: quotations in the *Śaivaparibhāṣā* derive from the edition prepared in Mysore, where the editors evidently made use of M^Y or of MS B 785 (see p.cxx below). Many of the South Indian texts in which I have located quotations from the *Parākhya* are sadly themselves so poorly transmitted that their value as testimonia is not great. The editions of the *Śataratnollekhinī* and *Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati*, for example, are often garbled and evidently rest on poor manuscript evidence. But many other texts (e.g. the *Siddhāntasamuccaya*, the *Śivajñānasiddhisvapakṣadrṣṭāntasaṅgraha*, the works of Jñānaprakāśa, etc.) are yet worse served in that they have never been edited.

A large number of the later (typically sixteenth- and seventeenth-century) Saiddhāntika works are not just very poorly transmitted, they provide no meaningful context for most of their quotations, since they take the form of strings of quotations, often with no interconnecting material. Into this category fall the *Ñānāvaraṇaviḷakkattarumpatavivēkam*, the **Dīkṣādarśa*, the **Śivajñānasiddhisvapakṣadrṣṭāntasaṅgraha*, the **Śivāgamādimāhātmyasaṅgraha*, the *Śaivāgamaparibhāṣāmañjarī*, the **Śaivasiddhāntasaṅgraha*, the *Sakalāgamasārasaṅgraha*, and the *Śivayogaratna*.¹⁶⁸

Constraints of time and energy have held me back from the vast task of looking at all the manuscripts accessible to me of all the texts from which I draw testimonia. I know this to be a deficiency; but since the task would really be huge, I hope I shall be forgiven.

Apart from quotations, there is one other important source of testimo-

predominantly South Indian Saiddhāntika works arranged by the title of the work to which they are attributed.

¹⁶⁸The composite character of this text appears not to have been noticed by its editor and translator Tara MICHAËL. A cursory search enabled me to find just less than a half of the verses that make up its first and principal section in other sources, among which the *Sarvajñānottara* and the *Devikālottara* appear to be the most quoted.

nia: the eighth chapter of the South Indian *Paṣkara*, half of which is, I believe, drawn from the *Parākhya*. This has to be used with some caution, because its redactor appears to have introduced clarificatory modifications here and there; but it is of immense use because two commentaries of it survive: the *Paṣkarabhāṣya* of Umāpati and the unpublished *Paṣkara-vṛtti* of Jñānaprakāśa, of the last part of which I have made a preliminary edition using the three transcripts in the IFP and a manuscript from Hoshiarpur. In the annotations to my translation I have quoted extensively from these two works, and other commentarial material that expounds verses in the *Parākhya*.

Highly valued both for their help in constituting the text and for the proof they afford of the relative antiquity of the text are the quotations in tenth-century Kashmirian works: Kṣemarāja in his *Svacchandantrodya* quotes seventy-four half-verses from the *Parākhya* which are to be found in M^Y's text of chapter 5; Rāmakaṇṭha quotes 4:45c–46b in his *Matāṅgavṛtti* ad *vidyāpāda* 12:25–27b, pp. 347–8; and Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha quotes 4:35ab ad *Mṛgendravidyāpāda* 11:11, p. 281 and quotes 4:19abc¹⁶⁹ ad *Mṛgendra* 2:7, p. 59. The last of these is significant because Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha there attributes the quotation to the *Saurabheya*, which is said, e.g., in *Kiraṇa* 10:27d, to be an alternative name for the *Parākhya*. (Only one other exegete, Kṣemarāja [ad *Netratātra* 13:12ab], uses this name,¹⁷⁰ but in this instance the verse quoted is not to be found in what M^Y transmits.)

I give below a complete list of the works in which quotations from the *Parākhya* have been traced to date. Unless otherwise stated all quotations are attributed. Verses that appear in Appendix I are attributed to the *Parākhya*, but not found in the text that M^Y transmits. For ease of reference these verses have been roughly grouped by theme and consecutively numbered. Thus Appendix I is broken up as follows:

- A:1–8 on the *brahmamantras*
- B:9–40 on *snāna*
- C:41–55 on caste and *dīkṣā*
- D:56–77 on *prāyaścitta*
- E:78–88 on creation and dissolution

¹⁶⁹In the Devakōṭṭai edition (p. 67) four *pādas* are given.

¹⁷⁰I discount the instance in the *Sarvadarśanasāṅgraha* (p. 189), since that is evidently part of a block lifted from the passage of the *Mṛgendravṛtti* just referred to.

F:89–91 on *mudrās*
 G:92–4 on gurus
 H:95–110 on miscellaneous matters of ritual
 J:111–14 on *prāṇāyāma*
 K:115–20 on *karman*
 L:121–47 miscellaneous
 M:1–3 misattributions to the *Parākhya*¹⁷¹

Asterisked works are unpublished to date. Of some of the less well-known of the works I have made a few remarks about dating, provenance, and transmission.

***Ātmārthapūjāpaddhati** probably by the sixteenth-century author Vedañāna II (IFP MSS T. 282, T. 321, T. 323, T. 371 T. 795): Appendix I, verses B:12, 16–17, B:22–4, B:26–27b, 30ab, B:37, B:38–40, H:110, L:132–4. As DAGENS’ brief account of the text reveals (1979:7–9), the attribution and the transmission of the work are not unproblematic. The various transcripts deviate from one another enormously; in very many places quotations found in one transcript are not in the others.

Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati of Īśānaśiva: 1:5cd, 1:15, 4:14, 4:15cd and Appendix I, verses G:93, H:99, H:108, L:127. This is an eclectic, literary Śaiva ‘manual’ of ritual (it is styled *Tantrapaddhati* in 1.1:1) written principally in verse (in a range of metres) that quotes plentifully from a wide range of sources but predominantly from early Siddhāntatantras and related Saiddhāntika works. The date and place of its composition are disputed; but it is transmitted solely in Kerala, as are certain of the works it quotes (e.g. the *Prayogamañjarī* and a *Nārāyaṇīya*), and so may well have been composed there.¹⁷² Its author quotes from the works of Somaśambhu, Rāmakaṇṭha, Bhoja, and Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha, but not from the influential Saiddhāntika writings of the 12th-century South Indian exegete Aghoraśiva, and from this we might be led to conclude that

¹⁷¹Of course many of the other verses in this appendix may have been misattributed, but these three quotations have clearly been mistakenly ascribed.

¹⁷²The quotation (which I have not traced) ascribed to Īśānagurudeva in Anantaśambhu’s commentary on the last verse of the *yogapāda* of the *Siddhāntasārāvalī* (verse 125, BGOML XIX.1, p. 74) may be a non-Keralan quotation from this *paddhati*.

he could not have written much later than that Aghoraśiva; but he does refer to some Siddhāntas of which Aghoraśiva seems ignorant and of which the versions known to survive today appear to be relatively late South Indian redactions (e.g. *Kāraṇa*, *Ajita*). For further discussion of the author and his work, see UNNI 1987. The transmission of the text is evidently poor, for much in the edition (of T. GANAPATI SASTRI) is uninterpretable corrupt.

***Kiraṇavivṛti** of Tryambakaśambhu (IFP T.1102 and IFP 47658): 4:24cd, 4:165. This unpublished commentary on the *Kiraṇa* (surviving only on chapters 1–6) is of uncertain date and provenance. As I have pointed out in my brief characterisation of this text (GOODALL 1998:cvii–cix), its author was late enough to know and quote from Kṣemarāja’s *Svacchandatanroddyota*, but appears to have been ignorant of many important Saiddhāntika writings (including, remarkably, those of Rāmakaṇṭha II). The work is not well transmitted. This Tryambakaśambhu is certainly not to be identified with the late twelfth-century Trilocanaśiva who wrote the *Somaśambhu-paddhatiṭikā*, among other works.¹⁷³

Kriyākramadyotikā of Aghoraśiva. Appendix I.C:53. The text in question is that published with Nirmalamani’s commentary, the *Prabhāvyākhyā*. Suspicion about the authorship of the various other texts published as parts of the *Kriyākramadyotikā* by the South Indian Archaka Association has been expressed by GOODALL 1998:xiii–xvii, fn. 24, and independently by ISHIMATSU 2000:236.

***Kriyākramadyotikāvyākhyā** of Sadāśiva (IFP MS T.962, pp.1–56 [third numeration]): Appendix I.F:89–91.

***Jñānaratnāvalī** of Jñānaśambhu (the author of the *Śivapūjāstava*) as transmitted in IFP T.231 and Madras GOML MS R 14898, some of whose quotations are shared with a manuscript also purporting to transmit the *Jñānaratnāvalī* but that appears to be a manual based upon it: IFP T.106, pp.13–60:¹⁷⁴ 2:84c–85b, Appendix I, verses B:9–20, B:22–25, D:56–77, L:132–4. This text is a large manual,

¹⁷³For a reasoned discussion of which works did belong and which may have belonged to that Trilocanaśiva’s oeuvre, see GOODALL 2000:208–14.

¹⁷⁴See GOODALL 2000:209, fn. 11.

rich in quotations, by a South Indian brahmin living in Benares¹⁷⁵ who was, along with the celebrated twelfth-century Saiddhāntika Aghoraśiva, a guru of Trilocanaśiva,¹⁷⁶ and who therefore also belonged to the twelfth century. Although of great interest, the text is, as BRUNNER has pointed out (*ibid.*), poorly transmitted. But now that further sources have come to light some scholar may feel encouraged to respond to BRUNNER's exhortation (1998:lvi) to edit it. The uncatalogued manuscript in the GOML in Madras is in fact very closely related to the previously known manuscript IFP MS T.231: the IFP transcript is evidently an apograph of it and bears, without explanation, its library number (R 14898) on its cover. Shortly before going to press, I became aware of another corrupt but much less closely related source in the Oriental Research Institute in Mysore: MS P. 3801, a palm-leaf manuscript in a cursive Nandināgarī hand that is not easy to decipher. This preserves more of the beginning of the work.¹⁷⁷ An editor would also derive much help from testimonia, for the text is very often borrowed from and quoted in later *paddhati* literature.¹⁷⁸

Ñānāvaraṇaviḷakkattarumpatavivēkam of Velliyaṅbalavāṇasuvāmikaḷ: 1:73c–75b, 2:1ab, 2:2–3b, 2:29 (attributed to *Niśvāsa*), 2:64c–65b, 2:71c–73b, 4:86–7, 4:95c–96b, 4:97ab, 4:98ab, 4:99ab, 4:100ab, 5:67cd, and Appendix I, verses E:78–81, E:82, E:83–4,

¹⁷⁵See GOODALL 2000:212, fn. 22 (referring to information provided by Professor SANDERSON).

¹⁷⁶See GOODALL 2000:209–11. For confirmation of the long-known twelfth-century dating of Aghoraśiva see GOODALL 1998:xiii–xvii.

¹⁷⁷Another hitherto unmentioned source is IFP RE 39946, a palm-leaf MS in Grantha script. This deviates very considerably from the Mysore MS in the portions I have checked.

¹⁷⁸The relation of this text to the apparently lost *Bālaññānaratnāvalī* (or *Bālaratnāvalī*), to which we find references in the same literature (e.g. *Śivadīkṣāvīdhivyākhyāna* T. 542, pp. 41, 43) is uncertain. The two works are mentioned together in a versified list of *paddhatis* at the beginning of the *Ātmārthapūjāpaddhati* in such a way as to imply that they were by different authors (T. 323, p. 2):

*kṛptā jñānaśivena tatra guruṇā śrīññānaratnāvalī
jñānākhyādimaśaṅkareṇa ca kṛtā sā bālaratnāvalī
anyaḷ somaśivena sādhu racitaḷ satkarmakāṇḍakramo
'py uttuṅgena śivena paddhatir iyaṃ nāmānukūlā kṛtā.*

• racitaḷ sat°] conj.; racitā sāt° MS.

E:87–8, L:126, L:129. This is a voluminous Saiddhāntika work in Tamil, full of Sanskrit and Tamil quotations, that comments on the *Ñānāvaraṇaviḷakkam* (a work that is in turn in some sense a commentary on the *Civaññānacittiyār*) of Kuruññānacampantaparamācāriyar, the sixteenth-century founder of the Śaiva *maṭha* of Dharmapuram (Tanjore district).¹⁷⁹ According to the introduction (p. 15), Veḷḷiyambalavāṇasuvāmikaḷ took *śivadikṣā* and *śaivasannyāsa* under the fourth head of the same *maṭha*, and took *jñānadikṣā* under the fifth.¹⁸⁰

Tattvatrayanirṇayavṛtti of Aghoraśiva: 2:42ab (without attribution), 2:99ab (without attribution).

Tattvaparakāśavṛtti of Aghoraśiva: 2:99ab (without attribution), 6:6ab.

Tantrāloka of Abhinavagupta: Appendix I.L:125. The apparent absence of quotations of the text in the *Tantrālokaviveka* (and of an identification here of Abhinavagupta's quotation) suggests to me that Jayaratha may not have had access to the *Parākhyā*.

Dikṣādarśa of Vedajñāna II (IFP MSS T. 76, T. 153, T. 279): Appendix I, verses C:41–44b, 45–8, 54–5, G:94, H:103 and 104. This is characterised by BRUNNER (1977:liii) as

¹⁷⁹Publications of the Dharmapuram Adhinam often include a 'short life of Gurugnanasambandha' (e.g. MUDALIAR 1976:xxi–xxiv) in which a late sixteenth-century date is proposed (p. xxiii):

An inscription of Krishna Maharaya Ayyan, King of Tanjore and daughter's son of Krishnadeva Raya during the times of Sadasiva Maharaya appointed Tiruvarur Gnanaprakasa Pandaram as the Superintendent of the DEVADANAS OF SIKKI, VADAKUDI, ODACHERI etc. This order bears a date equal to 1561 AD. A stanza in the MAZHUVADI PURANA written by Kamalai Gnanaprakasa records the date of the composition as Salivahana Saka 1488 (equal to 1566 AD). These two authorities prove that Gurugnanasambandha lived about 390 years ago (in the second half of the sixteenth century).

¹⁸⁰It is evident that the conception of initiation here is not the classical one, nor is the hierarchy of initiations classical. For the movement away from an indispensable salvific ritual of initiation as the central point of the Śaiva Siddhānta, see GOODALL forthcoming B, in which Umāpati's treatment of the topic is briefly discussed, and see also DEVASENAPATHI 1966:238ff.

un assemblage de citations d'origines diverses, groupées en chapitres logiquement ordonnés, mais liées entre elles par un commentaire insignifiant. L'ouvrage aurait pu être très précieux pour les nombreux extraits qu'il donne de textes totalement ou partiellement perdu, s'il n'était désespérément corrompu, et ceci dans tous les mss. qu'on en connaît.

DAGENS (1979:6–14) has discussed the œuvre of Vedajñāna II and of his guru, Vedajñāna I, and established that they both lived in the sixteenth century, the latter having died in 1563 or 1564. The transmission of the work is indeed (*pace* DAGENS 1979:9) atrocious.

Nādakārikāvṛtti of Aghoraśiva: 6:14ab.

***Nityādisaṅgrahābhīdhānapaddhati** of Takṣakavarta (Śāradā MS: Bodleian MS Stein Or.d.43): Appendix I.A:1–8.¹⁸¹ This is a 'manual' of Śaiva (not exclusively Saiddhāntika) ritual from the Kashmir valley preserved in only one Kashmirian manuscript. It contains many lengthy quotations from a wide range of tantras.

Netroddyota of Kṣemarāja: Appendix I.L:124.

Paṣkarāgama (none attributed, all in chapter 8): 2:83–86b, 3:7, 3:9–10, 6:5c–11 (differently ordered), 6:13c–19, 6:22–3, 6:28c–29b. For the lateness of this (probably South Indian) tantra, see GOODALL 1998:xlili–xliv. All its borrowings from the *Parākhya* are in its eighth and final chapter, which (this and other) evidence suggests may be a secondary interpolation (see fn. 654 on p.326, drawn from GOODALL 2001a:330). In a number of cases the two commentaries (the unpublished *Paṣkaravṛtti* of the Ceylonese Jñānaprakāśa [IFP MSS T. 110, T. 180, and T. 188, Hoshiarpur MS 4385] and the *Paṣkarabhāṣya* of Umāpati [not the fourteenth-century author of Tamil Saiddhāntika works, for see COLAS-CHAUHAN 2002:305–6]) support different readings. Such differences have been recorded in my apparatus.

¹⁸¹I am grateful to Professor SANDERSON (letter of 2.ix.1996) for drawing my attention to this passage.

***Pratiṣṭhāvidhi** of a Candrasekharabhaṭṭāraka (IFP MS T.370, pp.246–302): Appendix I, verses C:41–44b and C:45. It may not be right to refer to this section of IFP MS T.370 as a *Pratiṣṭhāvidhi*. The reason for doing so is that after a colophon to the *antyeṣṭividhi* of Aghoraśiva’s *Kriyākramadyotikā* on p.246, there follows more manual material, full of quotations, in which the first colophon appears to be that on pp.299–300, which reads: *iti śrīmatkamalālayapurānīvāsīcandraśekharabhaṭṭārakaśiṣya-tannāmadhāriṇā aghoraśivadeśīkakriyamāṇarītim avalambya pratiṣṭhāvidhi[h] kṛtaḥ*.

Prabhāvvyākhyā of Nirmalamāṇi (a commentary on Aghoraśiva’s *Kriyākramadyotikā*): 2:78abc, 14:78ab, and Appendix I, verses A:8b, B:16c–17b, B:32–6, C:44c–f, C:49, H:96–8, H:110, L:130.

***Bhāvacūḍāmaṇi** of Vidyākaṇṭha II (Kashmirian Nāgarī MS: Jammu MS 5291): Appendix I, verses H:107, L:121–2, L:135–8. This is a commentary by Rāmakaṇṭha II’s pupil on a *pratiṣṭhātantra* called the *Mayasaṅgraha*. For further remarks about this work see GOODALL 1998:xi–xiii. The sole surviving manuscript is full of corruption.

Bhogakārikāvṛtti of Aghoraśiva: Appendix I.L:123.

Mataṅgavṛtti of Rāmakaṇṭha: 4:45c–46b.

***Mṛgendrapaddhatiṭikā** of Vaktraśambhu (IFP T. 1021): Appendix I, verses A:8a–d, C:41, C:50–1, H:100. This is a commentary on a *paddhati* attributed to Aghoraśiva that bases itself on the *Mṛgendra*. I know of only one source for the text, and it is far from being free of error. Along with Trilocanaśiva (see below s.v. *Somaśambhupaddhatiṭikā*), Vaktraśambhu appears to have been a pupil of Aghoraśiva and so to have belonged to the late twelfth century.¹⁸²

Mṛgendravṛtti of Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha: 4:19abc, 4:35ab and Appendix I, verses H:105, H:106.

¹⁸²See GOODALL 2000:209–10, but for the author’s name see also fn. 97 on p. lix above. For a brief characterisation of the text see BRUNNER 1985:xxiv.

Mṛgendravṛttidīpikā of Aghoraśiva: 1:56d, 2:29–30d, 2:42ab, 2:43c–44c, 2:79a, 2:99ab (without attribution), 4:79ab, 4:81ab, 4:112ab, 5:67cd, 5:155d, Appendix I.C:54ab (without attribution).

Ratnatrayollekhinī of Aghoraśiva: 2:99ab (twice without attribution).

Varṇāśramacandrikā: Appendix I, verses B:21, C:41–2, C:49, G:92. This is a manual about *adhikāra* largely consisting of quotations and composed c. 1600 AD (see Tamil introduction, p. 38) by Tiru-Ambaladeśikendra, the seventh head of Dharmapurādhīna, a Śaiva maṭha in Tanjore district.

Śataratnollekhinī: 1:29, 1:35, 1:37–9, 1:43–4, 1:49c–50b, 1:58cd, 1:59cd, 1:60cd, 1:68c–69, 1:77c–79b, 1:86–88b, 1:90c–91b, 1:91c–92b, 2:25–26b, 2:29, 2:70–71b, 6:3ab, 6:6c–7b, 15:4cd, 15:5cd, 15:6c–9b. This is an anonymous commentary on the *Śataratnasaṅgraha* (q.v.).¹⁸³ As I have pointed out (GOODALL 1998:xxxī–xxxīī, fn. 72), the author has without acknowledgement borrowed liberally from other Saiddhāntika writings. His opening verses suggest that he wrote in Chidambaram, and he quotes plentifully from a number of late South Indian Siddhāntatantras. The text of the commentary in the Tanjore edition (see p. iii of its Sanskrit preface) is entirely based upon the Calcutta one, and its deviations are therefore not reported in my apparatus.

Śataratnasaṅgraha of ‘Umāpati’: 1:1, 2:2–3b, 2:29, 2:78. This is an anthology of verses culled principally from Siddhāntatantras attributed to an Umāpati, who is not uncommonly assumed to have been the author of the *Paṣṭkarabhāṣya*, as well as of certain of the Tamil *Meykaṇṭacāttiraṅkaḷ*, including the *Caṅkarpanirākaraṇam*, a work which dates itself to 1313 AD. The identification of these three Umāpatīs as one man seems to me impossible. The verses herein are attributed by the work’s commentator, and labels of attribution, which sometimes differ from those offered by the commentary, are

¹⁸³For no reason that I can determine, a number of scholars have identified the compiler of the *Śataratnasaṅgraha* with its commentator: SIVARAMAN (1973:37); DAGENS (1979:41); BRUNNER (1981:122, fn. 107 and 1998:xlix); DAVIS (1991:92) and SMITH (1996, passim). The anonymous commentator twice distinguishes himself from the compiler in the first two pages. THIRUGNANASAMBANDHAN (1973:xix–xx) and BHATT (1996:71) have recognised that they are different people.

also found in MSS of the work that do not transmit the commentary; but it is possible that the compiler did not himself identify his sources. Proving beyond doubt that the *Śataratnasaṅgraha* was not compiled by either the author of the *Caṅkarpanirākaraṇam* or of the *Paṅṅkarabhāṣya* is impossible, for the *Śataratnasaṅgraha* consists entirely of verse quotations from Śaiva works. But it can, I think, be demonstrated that the *Śataratnasaṅgraha* is extremely unlikely to have been compiled by either of them, because both the range of sources drawn on as well as the range and character of ideas to which the anthology gives prominence would be untypical of either of them.

Fourteen *sūtras* that occur in a seventeenth-century Tamil translation of this work (the *Catamaṇimālai*) are not in the Calcutta edition.¹⁸⁴ These have been traced in a manuscript (of the Sanskrit work) in the Tiruvāṇṭūrai Maṭha by THIRUGNANASAMBANDHAN (1973:xx–xxi and 113–18), and have accordingly been added, in an appendix, to the Tanjore edition of 1976. They are also to be found in other manuscripts of the work, e.g., IFP MSS T.112 and T.804. Among these we find: *Parākhya* 1:92c–94d (see also Appendix I.M:1).

These are the sources that I can determine for the *Śataratnasaṅgraha*:

Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha 1:1–2 (1–2), 2:1 (19), 2:8

¹⁸⁴The Calcutta edition with the *Śataratnollekhinī* prints a garbled version of *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha* 1:10 as *sūtra* No. 39; but a footnote explains that the second half is not in the MSS, and has only been inferred from the commentary that follows. The same note explains that the commentary on *sūtras* 37 and 38 is missing (*pūrvoktamrgendrasūtradvayasya vyākhyā māṭrkāyām nopalabhyate*). From the Tamil translation (the *Catamaṇimālai*) of Turaimaṅgalam Śivaprakāśa-Svāmikaḷ that is printed as an appendix to the edition (*mūla* only) of THIRUGNANASAMBANDHAN (1973), it is clear that more than just this passage of commentary has dropped out. From the 2nd half of 39 through verse 52 in the Tamil version is not represented in the Calcutta edition.

The 39th verse of the Calcutta edition (of which, as we have seen, the second half has been supplied by the editor, and of which the first *pāda* looks as if it belongs to the tail-end of a passage of prose) is therefore to be expunged. The verses that are missing in the Calcutta edition and supplied in THIRUGNANASAMBANDHAN's appendix have here been numbered 40a, 40b, etc., following the numeration in that appendix. I have not been able to trace a source that preserves the missing parts of the commentary.

(26), 1:5 (34), 1:6 (35), 2:4 (36), 1:9 (40h), 1:10 (40o¹⁸⁵), 1:11–15 (40–4), 1:18 (63), 2:24 (68), 1:19 (73), 2:26 (79), 2:25 (86);
Mr̥gendravidyāpāda 1:23 (4), 1:1–3b (9–10), 3:4c–5b (12), 2:2 (17), 4:15 (18), 7:8 (20), 7:11–12 (21–2), 9:2 (27), 10:1 (29), 8:3c–5 (31–3), 2:5–6 (37–8), 7:2 (40a), 12:32c–33f (40e–f), 5:1 (45), 5:4–5b (46–7), 10:3 (55), 7:5 (63), 5:16 (67); *Mr̥gendrakriyāpāda* 3:41 (11);
Parākhya 1:3 (5), 2:78 (8), 2:29 (15), 2:1c–3b (16), 1:15 (18a), 1:92c–94 (40i–k), 1:91c–92b (56), 1:90c–91b (57);
Mataṅgavidyāpāda 3:9 (6), 4:45–8 (48–52), 4:58c–59 (69c–70); *Mataṅgakriyāpāda* 2:3ab (69ab), 7:40 (72);
Svacchanda 10.1263c–1264d (24);
Kiraṇa 3:10 (13), 3:26cd (28), 2:2–4 (40b–d), 2:7 (40g), 5:6c–7b (59), 4:13cd and variant from 4:20 (60), 2:31c–32b (87), 6:20 (88), 6:19 (89);
Sārdhatriśatikālottara 23:5 (76);
Sarvajñānottara, *adhvaprakaraṇa* 204 [last verse], IFP MS T. 334, p. 76 (54);
Niśvāsakārikā, *jñānakāṇḍa* 32.81c–82b, IFP MS T. 17A, p. 236 and IFP MS T. 127, p. 270 (74), *jñānakāṇḍa* 33, IFP MS T. 127, p. 283 (77 and 81), *jñānakāṇḍa* 26, IFP MS T. 127, p. 257 (85), *jñānakāṇḍa* 61, penultimate verse, IFP MS T. 127, p. 493 and IFP MS T. 150, p. 31 (91);
Devikālottara 18 (80);
Mokṣakārikā 111 (75).

The following I have not been able to trace:

Devyāmata (3, 71, 90);¹⁸⁶ *Viśvasārottara* (7, 23, 30);
Mr̥gendra (14); *Sarvajñānottara* (54); *Niśvāsakārikā* (58, 65–6); *Parākhya* (61–2); *Kālottara* (73); unknown (26 [similar to *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* 72], 40l [similar to *Ratna-*

¹⁸⁵This verse is omitted by THIRUGNANASAMBANDHAN 1973 but included in IFP MS T. 112 (p. 567).

¹⁸⁶Professor SANDERSON tells me that this is another name for the *Niśvāsapraṭiṣṭhā-tantra* that is transmitted in a few old palm-leaf MSS preserved in Nepal, e.g. NAK MS 5-446 (NGMPP, Reel No. A 41/13) and MS 1-279 (NGMPP, Reel Nos. A 41/15 and A 42/1).

trayaparīkṣā 82c–83b], 40m [similar to *Ratnatrayaparīkṣā* 84c–85b], 40n, 78, 82–4).

As far as one can judge from his selection, the theology of the compiler seems to have been that of the classical Śaiva Siddhānta. A very heavy emphasis is placed on the path to *mokṣa* consisting of *śaktipāta* and *dīkṣā*, and this theme occupies verses 45 to 73. None of these verses expresses the doctrines of the author of the *Pauṣkarabhāṣya*, nor are there verses drawn from some of the scriptures which one would most expect the *Pauṣkarabhāṣya* to cite. There are none, for instance, from the *Pauṣkara* itself, and the non-dualist *Sarvajñānottara*, upon which the author of the *Pauṣkarabhāṣya* heavily relies to support his position, is represented by a single verse asserting the indispensability of *dīkṣā* for attaining liberation (*Śataratnasaṅgraha* 54). As for the Umāpati accredited with authorship of a number of the Tamil *Meykaṇṭacāttiraṅkaḷ*, he too is, I think, unlikely to have compiled this anthology, since his positions too on the liberated state and how it is reached seem incompatible with the theology the *Śataratnasaṅgraha* appears to support. BHATT (1996:70), who actually suggests that the ascription of the *Śataratnasaṅgraha* to the same Umāpati who wrote the *Pauṣkarabhāṣya* is improbable, on the grounds that the conceptions of the liberated state in the two works are discrepant,¹⁸⁷ suggests, however, that the *Śataratnasaṅgraha* is closely parallel to the centum of Tamil verses attributed to Umāpati called the *Tiruvaruṭṭayan*. He observes that the themes of both works are treated in the same order and he goes so far as to suggest correspondences between groups of verses in each work (1996:72):

<i>Śataratnasaṅgraha</i>	<i>Tiruvaruṭṭayan</i>
7–17	1–10
18	11–20
19–33	21–30
34–70	31–70
71–8	71–90
79–91	91–100

This correspondence of themes, which I do not in any case find

¹⁸⁷ *Tiruvaruṭṭayan* (74–5) characterises the liberated state as neither non-dual nor dual.

particularly close, is, I think, the coincidental result of the author of each work indepently choosing to treat first the familiar Śaiva topics of *pati*, *paśu* and then *pāśa*, and then following this exposition with a discussion of liberation and the means to attain it. But the manner of the treatment of these themes seems to me not in the least similar: *dīkṣā*, for instance, which appears in 7 *sūtras* of the *Śataratnasaṅgraha*, is not mentioned once in the *Tiruvārūṭpayan*.

Śivajñānabodhavṛtti of Jñānaprakāśa: 1:43–4. This is a short Sanskrit commentary on the *Śivajñānabodhasūtra* by the Ceylonese Jñānaprakāśa of Śālivāṭī (in Jaffna).

Śivajñānabodhasaṅgrahabhāṣya of Śivāgrayogin: 1:94a–d, 2:2–3b. This is Śivāgrayogin's shorter Sanskrit commentary on the *Śivajñānabodhasūtra*.

Śivajñānabodhopanyāsa of Vedajñāna II, also known as Nigamajñānadeśika: 2:78abc (without attribution). This is a short sixteenth-century Sanskrit commentary on the *Śivajñānabodhasūtra* currently being re-edited and translated by Dr. T. GANESAN of the French Institute of Pondicherry.

***Śivajñānasiddhisvapakṣadrṣṭāntasaṅgraha** of Vedajñāna II, also known as Nigamajñānadeśika (IFP T. 317, pp. 968–1118, and IFP MS T. 533, pp. 197–224, which is incomplete and has only a few of the quotations listed below): 1:15, 1:39, 1:73c–75b, 1:82ab, 1:83ab, 1:92c–93b, 1:93c–94d, 2:1ab, 2:2ab, 2:3, 2:15cd, 2:29, 2:70–71b, 2:96, 4:35ab, 4:96c–97b, 4:98ab, 4:99ab, 4:100ab, 4:101ab, 4:101c–102b, 4:103ab, 4:104–5, Appendix I verses E:83–6, K:115–20, L:126, L:129, L:139–45. This is an anthology of verses culled from Siddhānta-tantras and from Saiddhāntika works compiled to provide corroborative authorities for the statements of the *svapakṣa* section of Aruṇandi's Tamil commentary (the *Civañānacittiyār*) on the *Śivajñānabodhasūtra*. For Vedajñāna II's sixteenth-century date and oeuvre, see DAGENS 1979:6–14.

***Śivadīkṣāvidhivyākhyāna** (IFP MS T. 542): Appendix I.A:3c–5. An anonymous commentary on a *Śivadīkṣāvidhi*.

***Śivapūjāpaddhativyākhyāna** (IFP MS T. 962, 1st and 2nd pagination): 14:78ab, and Appendix I, verses A:8b, H:95, L:130.

Śivapūjāstavavyākhyā: 2:44–60, 6:6ab, 15:69, Appendix I, verses H:96–8, H:101–2. This is an anonymous commentary transmitted in a number of South Indian manuscripts (e.g. IFP MS T. 962, 3rd pagination) on the *Śivapūjāstava* of Jñānaśambhu, the author of the **Jñānaratnāvalī* (q.v. above). Although the commentator's name is not known, he identifies himself as the great-great-grandson of the Trilocanaśiva who wrote the *Siddhāntasārāvalī* (q.v.).¹⁸⁸

Śivayogaratna of Jñānaprakāśa: 2:70c–71b (unattributed), 15:69.

Śivayogasāra of Jñānaprakāśa: 2:70c–71b, Appendix I.L:146.

***Śivāgamādīmāhātmyasaṅgraha** of Jñānaprakāśa (IFP MSS T. 281, T. 372, T. 1059): Appendix I.C:41–2, C:54–5, G:92. This is a *nibandha* of quotations from Siddhāntatantras and other Saiddhāntika material compiled by the Ceylonese Jñānaprakāśa. The transmission of the work is not good. The quotations attributed to the *Parākhyā* found in one source are not always to be found in the others.

Śivāgrabhāṣya of Śivāgrayogin: 1:94a–d and Appendix I.C:43c–44b. This is Śivāgrayogin's long Sanskrit commentary on the *Śivajñāna-bodhasūtra*. Śivāgrayogin has been shown, on the basis of information given in the opening verses of his *Śaivasannyāsapaddhati*, to have written in the sixteenth century.¹⁸⁹

Śaivaparibhāṣā of Śivāgrayogin: 1:15, 1:19–20, 1:22–3, 1:29, 1:31–5, 1:94a–d, 2:70, 6:6ab (without attribution), 14:78–79b, and Appendix I.C:43c–44f. This is an independent prose work characterising Śivāgrayogin's Śaiva Siddhānta. Unless otherwise specified, I refer always to the Mysore edition, which was the sole source of the Madras edition. The fact that the Mysore editors give verse numeration for the quotations from the early part of chapter 1 of the *Parākhyā* (e.g. on pp. 44 and 47) shows that they had access to an independent text of the work. The readings and the lacuna they report on p. 53 for the quotation of *Parākhyā* 1:29–35 and that they

¹⁸⁸See GOODALL 2000:212.

¹⁸⁹This was observed by S. ANAVARATAVINAYAKAM PILLAI in his introduction to the *Civaneṛippirakācam* (1936, pp. vii–viii) and later (apparently independently) by R. RAMASASTRI (1950, pp. 9–12 of the *bhūmikā* to his edition of the *Śaivaparibhāṣā*).

attribute to a manuscript in Mysore (*atra hastalikhitaparākhyapustake*) show that the manuscript they had before them was M^Y or the apograph MS B 785. I suspect the latter, since I suspect that one of the editors was responsible for adding the verse numeration and the occasional conjectured modifications in blue ink to the text of MS B 785 (see p. cii above). The quotations in this work are thus not wholly independent of M^Y.

Śaivasannyāsapaddhati of Śivāgrayogin: Appendix I, verses B:21, B:39–40, L:131.

***Śaivasiddhāntasaṅgraha** (IFP MS T. 46): Appendix I, verses B: 22c–23b, B:26–31, B:37, J:111–14. This is a *paddhati* made up of quotations of (predominantly late) scriptures and of other *paddhatis*.

Śaivāgamaparibhāṣāmañjarī of Vedajñāna II: 1:5, Appendix I.L:126.

Sakalāgama(sāra)saṅgraha: Appendix I.B:16c–17. This is a South Indian Saiddhāntika anthology of quotations culled from (principally late) Siddhāntatantras and *paddhatis* relating to temple worship. The work is transmitted (as are a few other works of the same and similar titles) in a number of South Indian manuscripts (e.g. IFP T. 199, 246, 351, and 374) and has been published by the South Indian Archaka Association (Madras, 1974).

***Sarvajñānottaravṛtti** of Aghoraśiva (Grantha MS: IFP 47818): 1:5cd, 1:15c, 1:43–4, 2:42ab (without attribution). For remarks on the transmission of this work see GOODALL 1998:lxii.

***Sarvamatopanyāsa's appendix** IFP MSS T. 284, pp. 1–23 and 23–30 (and T. 801, p. 1–23, disregarded because it is copied from the same source as T. 284): 15:2, 15:4–8, 15:9ab, 15:10, 15:14, and Appendix I, verses C:52 and C:54–5. The *Sarvamatopanyāsa* is a doxographical work in śloka that covers a handful of rival doctrines, concluding with the *śaivamata*. After its simple colophon (*iti sarvamatopanyāsaḥ sampūrṇaḥ*) there follows an appendix of confusingly labelled quotations, among which a few are from *Parākhyā* 15. This is concluded, on p. 30, with the following pair of verses: *iti sarvamatasthānām uktvā siddhāntam āditaḥ/ paścād aghoraśiṣyeṇa sarvātmaśambhunā mayā// śaivānām*

samayasthānām śaivasiddhāntadīpikā/ sadāśivapadasthena cittena samudīritā// iti śam. There then follows the familiar (because published, albeit with the title *Siddhāntaparakāśikā*) *Siddhāntadīpikā* of Sarvātmaśambhu, which is either the text referred to in the verse just quoted, or a quite different work that merely happens to follow and happens also to be called *Siddhāntadīpikā* and to be by a Sarvātmaśambhu. This seemed to me a remote possibility before (see GOODALL 2000:208, fn. 8), and I now think that it can definitely be excluded because of the evidence of a fragmentary and disordered text of the *Sarvamatopanyāsa* that is transmitted in an uncatalogued MS in the GOML in Madras: MS R 16820 (pp. 14–16 of 2nd pagination, pp. 1–8 of 2nd pagination, and pp. 1–12 of 3rd pagination). This MS has not been mentioned hitherto because it does not have the quotations from the *Parākhyā*; but it does have the beginning of an appendix tagged on after the final verse of the *Sarvamatopanyāsa*, and in the beginning of this appendix there is an explicitly labelled reference to an identifiable statement in the *Siddhāntadīpikā* of Sarvātmaśambhu.¹⁹⁰ It therefore now seems probable to me that the quotations of the *Parākhyā* belong to a passage interpolated by someone other than Sarvātmaśambhu between the *Sarvamatopanyāsa* and the *Siddhāntadīpikā*, which were once strung together by Sarvātmaśambhu when he added his *Siddhāntadīpikā* to an already existing *Sarvamatopanyāsa*. The above quoted verses leave open the possibilities that the latter was a composition of his own or of his guru's or of someone else. The presentation of different views in the *Sarvamatopanyāsa* is relatively sophisticated in comparison with that of the *Siddhāntadīpikā*, and this consideration makes the first possibility seem least likely.

***Siddhāntadīpikā** of Madhyārjuna (IFP MSS T. 112 and T. 284): 2:44, 2:90cd. This is a catechistic prose work with plentiful quotations from late South Indian Siddhāntatantras (e.g. from the *Ajīta*, *Makuṭa*, *Santāna*, and *Vātulaśuddhākhyā*), which a final verse ascribes to an abbot of a *maṭha* in Tiruviṭaimarutūr (the Sanskrit name of which is Madhyārjuna). The author also quotes (without

¹⁹⁰Cf. p. 32 (of DVIVEDĪ's edition) with the following (from p. 10 of 3rd pagination of the MS): *atha sarvātmaśambhuviracitāyām siddhāntadīpikāyām pāsupatamate āna<<va>>malan nāsti. . .*

always identifying the source he is quoting) the *Siddhāntasamuccaya* of Trilocanaśiva.

***Siddhāntaśikhāmaṇi** of Jñānaprakāśa (Grantha MS: IFP 10871): Appendix I.A:8a–d. This is an independent prose work by the Ceylonese author of the *Paṣkaravṛtti* presenting the tenets of the Śaiva Siddhānta.

***Siddhāntasamuccaya** of Trilocanaśiva (IFP T.284, pp.127–74, IFP T.206, pp.57–111, Madras GOML MS R 14394, and GOML MS R 16820, pp.1–14 in last sequence of numeration): 1:15, 2:1, 2:25–26b, 2:42ab (without attribution), 2:79a, 2:99ab (without attribution), 3:74–6, 4:69, 5:153cd, 6:3ab, 6:5c–6d, 6:26–29b, 6:60–4, 6:67–68b, and Appendix I.C:43c–44f. This text, still in line with the old Śaiva Siddhānta, is a useful source of quotations, many of which, since they are not all part of a common stock of verses found cited in many works, this author seems himself to have chosen (unlike the compilers of, for example, the *Śivajñānasiddhisvapakṣa-dṛṣṭāntasaṅgraha* and the *Ñānāvaraṇaviḷakkattarumpatavivēkam*, whose shared errors—e.g. in their quotations from the beginning of *Parākhyā 2*—suggest that they may not have selected their quotations independently). The other sources he cites are all early: old Siddhāntas (predominantly *Mṛgendra*, *Mataṅga*, *Kiraṇa*, *Sarvajñānottara*, *Parākhyā*, *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha*, *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha*, *Mohaśūrottara* [e.g. on p.143]), and works such as that of Somaśambhu (e.g. on p.174) and those of the *Aṣṭaprakaraṇa*. His conclusion (T.284, p.174) tells us that he was the head of a *maṭha* in Sitāraṇya (a Sanskrit translation of the Tamil toponym Tiruveṅkāṭu). He may also have been the author of the *Siddhāntasārāvalī* and of the commentary on the *Somaśambhupaddhati* (q.v. below).¹⁹¹ Sadly this work is badly transmitted.

Siddhāntasārāvalīvyākhyā of Anantaśambhu: 1:93c–94d, 14:78–80, Appendix I.L:132–4 and H:104. This is a commentary on Trilocanaśiva's *Siddhāntasārāvalī*, a Saiddhāntika 'manual' (though, like the *Tantrāloka* and the *Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati*, it is actually a literary work and not simply a handbook of instructions), of which there are numerous South Indian manuscripts.

¹⁹¹See GOODALL 2000:213–14.

Siddhāntasūtravṛtti of Sadāśivaśivācārya: 1:93c–94d, 14:78–79b, and Appendix I, verses C:44c–f. This is a short Sanskrit commentary on the *Śivajñānabodhasūtra*.

***Somaśambhupaddhatiṭikā** of Trilocanaśiva (IFP T.170, described by BRUNNER 1998:li–lii, and GOML MS R 14735): 2:1c, 2:42ab (without attribution), 2:99ab (without attribution), 3:68c, 14:78ab, 15:10c–f, and Appendix I, verses A:8b, H:95, L:130. Judging from their shared range of quotations, both this commentary on the *Somaśambhupaddhati* and the *Siddhāntasamuccaya* may be the work of the same author. Trilocanaśiva probably belongs to the late twelfth century, for he appears to have been a disciple of Aghoraśiva and of Jñānaśambhu, the author of the *Jñānaratnāvalī* and of the *Śivapūjāstava*.¹⁹²

Svacchandatanthroddyota of Kṣemarāja: 5:16c–18b, 5:19–31d, 5:38a–d, 5:42ab, 5:44ab, 5:45cd, 5:47ab, 5:48cd, 5:50ab, 5:51c–f, 5:66b, 5:71–72b, 5:73, 5:74c–75, 5:77, 5:79–82a, 5:82c–84, 5:85cd, 5:86c–88b, 5:89ab, 5:89d–90b, 5:108, 5:134ab, 5:135ab.¹⁹³

I cannot conclude this discussion of quotations attributed to the *Parākhyā* without an apologetic remark about my treatment of the quotations from portions of the text not transmitted by M^Y and so relegated to Appendix I. They are presented, in most cases, without translation or explanatory annotation, and it is certainly true that much more work could have been done on them. HOUSMAN's remarks on Lucilius reinforced my lazy reluctance to continue puzzling over them.¹⁹⁴

The truth is that the difficulties of the text of Lucilius are for the most part inexplicable and its corruptions for the most part irremediable. What more than anything else enables the critic and commentator of an ancient author to correct mistakes and to elucidate obscurities is their context; and a fragment has no context. An editor of Lucilius or Ennius or Nonius or the *Reliquiae scaenicae*, unless he is grievously self-deluded,

¹⁹²See GOODALL 2000:208–11.

¹⁹³I have here clubbed together consecutively numbered verses; Kṣemarāja has not necessarily quoted them together in these blocks.

¹⁹⁴From HOUSMAN's 'Luciliana', *The Classical Quarterly* I (1907), as quoted in HOUSMAN 1981:103.

must know that the greater number of his corrections, and of his explanations also, are false. There is a simple test, if he cares to use it. The bulk of Lucilius' fragments is preserved to us by Nonius only: take Nonius' citations of an author whose works survive, try to explain or emend them, and then compare your efforts with the author's text.

I have not attempted the kind of test HOUSMAN describes, although it could certainly be tried using citations in, for instance, the **Dīkṣādarśa*. But the bitter-sweet discovery of part of B (Mysore MS B 785) at a point when I thought that I had nearly finished my edition gave me a taste of the experience he speaks of: only occasionally had I correctly inferred the sense of the small fragments missing from the tops of folios in M^Y that I subsequently found to be transmitted in B (e.g. in 5:131d–132a), and not one of the restitutions proposed by myself or by friends—stylistically plausible as the restitutions seemed—was confirmed with the discovery of the apograph. In other words, even when equipped with the context, patching together the sense and wording of damaged passages of the *Parākhya* has proved not to be straightforward; raising the stakes by removing the context must make it yet more difficult. The following edition and annotated translation of the chapters of the *Parākhya* transmitted by M^Y may seem to some a monument of incaution, but I am not so recklessly incautious as to plunge myself into the task of elucidating all its fragments as well, at least not for the moment.