

T-30619

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

DATE August 8 1988

William James Array

Author

8/1/52

Birth Date

The Vacchandatantram: History and structure of

Title of Dissertation

a Sanskrit scripture

South Asian Languages & Civilizations

Department or School

PH.D.

Degree

1988 Summer

Convocation

Permission is herewith granted to the University of Chicago to make copies of the above title, at its discretion, upon the request of individuals or institutions and at their expense.

William James Array

Signature of writer

Extensive Quotation or Further Reproduction of This Material by Persons or Agencies Other than the University of Chicago May Not Be Made without the Express Permission of the Writer.

9-61-88

Date filed

Number of pages

NOTE:

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE *SVACCHANDATANTRAM*:

HISTORY AND STRUCTURE OF A ŚAIVA SCRIPTURE

VOLUME ONE

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO

THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF SOUTH ASIAN LANGUAGES AND CIVILIZATIONS

BY

WILLIAM JAMES ARRAJ

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

AUGUST, 1988

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Research for this study was supported in part by fellowships from the American Institute of Indian Studies, Fulbright-Hays, and Wolfson College, Oxford. I would like to thank the members of my dissertation committee, David Gitomer and Edward Dimock, and especially my Sanskrit teachers, J.A.B. van Buitenen†, Alexis Sanderson, and my dissertation chairman and adviser, Edwin Gerow.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
I.1 HISTORY AND STRUCTURE OF SVACCHANDATANTRAM	1
I.1.1 Internal and External Historical Evidence	1
I.1.2 Methods of Textual Criticism	21
I.1.3 Tradition Criticism	28
I.1.4 Source Criticism.....	53
I.1.5 Redaction Criticism.....	63
I.1.6 Reconstructed History of the Text ..	69
I.2 THE COMMENTARY “UDDYOTAḤ” OF KṢEMARĀJAḤ.....	78
I.2.1 A Proponent of Monistic Śaivism ...	78
I.2.2 Interpretation and Reinterpretation of Ritual.....	90
I.2.3 Commentatorial Techniques	96
I.2.4 Harmonization and Commentatorial Goals.....	112
II. SUMMARIES	124
II.1 BOOK 1	125
II.2 BOOK 2	134
II.3 BOOK 3	141

TABLE OF CONTENTS—CONTINUED

Chapter	Page
II.4 BOOK 4	147
II.4.1 The Initiation Liturgy	147
II.4.2 The Rites of Joining	153
II.4.3 Concluding Rites and Consecration	162
II.5 BOOK 5	168
II.6 BOOK 6	181
II.7 BOOK 7	190
II.8 BOOK 8	204
II.9 BOOK 9	210
II.10 BOOK 10	218
II.10.1 Worlds in the Bottom Half of the Egg of Brahmā....	218
II.10.2 The Ritual of Purification	229
II.10.3 The Worlds in the Top Half of the Egg of Brahmā....	234
II.10.4 The Sāṃkhya Worlds.....	240
II.10.5 The Śaiva Worlds	274

VOLUME TWO

II.11 BOOK 11	298
II.11.1 The Emanation of the Planes of the Universe	296
II.11.2 The Maintenance and Reabsorption of the Planes	323
II.12 BOOK 12	334
II.12.1 The Nature of the Lower Planes	334

TABLE OF CONTENTS—CONTINUED

Chapter	Page
II.12.2 Meditations on the Planes	341
II.13 BOOK 13	357
II.14 BOOK 14	362
II.15 BOOK 15	366
III. TRANSLATION	373
III.1 PREFACE	373
III.2 BOOK 1 [vss.1-45a, pp.1-40]	376
III.3 BOOK 5 [vss.1-43a, pp.1-37]	409
III.4 BOOK 12 [vss.1-83a, pp.1-35]	435
III.5 BOOK 13 [vss.1-46a, pp.89-108]	457
III.6 BOOK 15 [vss.1-23, pp.125-139]	471
BIBLIOGRAPHY	482

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1 HISTORY AND STRUCTURE OF *SVACCHANDATANTRAM*

1.1.1 Internal and External Historical Evidence

This dissertation has as its subject the text published under the name of the *Svacchandatantram*, with the commentary *Uddyotaḥ*, by Kṣemarājaḥ.¹ Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ, who forms the ritual subject of the *Svacchandatantram*, and in his different forms, its narrator and supreme deity, has served as the basis for the title of this text. Manuscript lists and catalogues record the same text under variant names: "*Svacchanda-bhairava-tantram*," "*Svacchanda-bhairava-mahā-tantram*," and "*Svacchanda-lalita-bhairava-tantram*."² However, the "*Svatantratantram*" and

¹ Paṇḍit Madhusudan Kaul Shāstri, ed., *The Svachchanda=tantra with Commentary by Kshemarāja*, 7 vols., Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies 31, 38, 44, 48, 51, 53, 56 (Bombay: Nirnaya Sagar Press, 1921-1935). (All unmarked text references are to this edition by book (*paṭalam*) and page or verse number. The text in this edition contains 3648.5 verses, almost all *ślokāḥ*.) Now reprinted in two volumes with notes, indices and new introduction by Pt. Vrajavallabha Dwivedi, ed., *The Svachchandatantram with Commentary 'Udyota' by Kṣemarājācārya*, Parimal Sanskrit Series 16 (Delhi: Parimal Publications, 1985).

² For *Svacchanda-bhairava-tantram*, v., for example, Ramā Śāṅkar Tripāthi, *Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Gækwada Library, Bhārat Kalā Bhavana Library and Sanskrit Mahā-Vidyālaya Library*, Banaras Hindu University Sanskrit Series 6 (Banaras: Banaras Hindu University, 1971), mss.no.C4400, p.776; for

"*Svacchanda-paddhati*," noted in manuscript catalogues represent independent works belonging to a separate tradition not based on the *Svacchandatantram*.¹

In Nepal and northern India, catalogues record numerous manuscripts of *Svacchandatantram* written in *devanāgarī*, *śārada*, and *newarī* scripts. Moreover, the *devanāgarī* and *śārada* manuscripts appear to contain both the text and the commentary of Kṣemarājaḥ. Presuming a *śārada* autograph of Kṣemarājaḥ, it is probable that *śārada* archetypes underlie the *devanāgarī* manuscripts. The *newarī* manuscripts transmitted without commentary, however, potentially represent a version of the text differing from that utilized by Kṣemarājaḥ.

The printed edition in the Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies, based, according to the editors' notice, on three fairly uniform *śārada* manuscripts, has been utilized as the *textus receptus* for this study.² Although the printed text serves as a generally reliable and workable edition, a twofold critical edition remains a desideratum.³ First, an edition should be prepared of the text and commentary of Kṣemarājaḥ, using additional

Svacchanda-bhairava-mahā-tantram, v. Tripāṭhi, mss.no.3865, p.776; for *Svacchanda-lalita-bhairava-tantram*, v. The Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project, Kaiser Library, Kathmandu, tantra mss.no.68; cf. *Svacchanda-lalita-bhairava-stotram* in *Nepālarājakāyavirapustakālayastha-hastalikhitasamastapustakānām Saṃkṣiptasūcipatram*, Purāṭpattvaprakāśanamālā 18 (Kathmandu: Joragaṇeśa Press, 1963), p.167.

¹ For information about these, *Svacchandatantram*, and texts with related names, v. Gopināth Kavirāj, *Tāntrika Sāhitya*, Hindi Samiti Granthamālā 200 (Lucknow: Bhārgava Bhūṣaṇa Press, 1972), pp.720-721.

² On the mss. used for the printed work, v. Shāstri, ed., *Swacchanda-Tantra* 1: i-ii.

³ I am now preparing an historical-critical study of the text of *Svacchandatantram*.

manuscripts, and following the standard principles of textual criticism. Second, using primarily the *newari* manuscripts, one should prepare an edition of the text transmitted without commentary.

This second edition can not follow the principles used for the first, suitable for works of single author, but rather must follow those procedures elaborated for the anonymous, collectively authored works of ancient Indian literature. For remarks in the commentary of Kṣemarājaḥ and internal literary criticism indicate that the text of *Svacchandatantram* had undergone a long and complicated process of transmission before his commentatorial work.¹ In editing such anonymous works, the canons for establishing the earliest, correct reading must be supplemented by the systematic collection of significant variants reflecting successive, independent versions.²

Preliminarily, the distribution of extant manuscripts supports arguments for a north Indian origin of the text of *Svacchandatantram*, in agreement with what is otherwise known about the geographical popularity of the cult of Bhairavaḥ. Linguistic evidence based on an analysis of manuscripts, however, at present, does not permit an additional specification of the provenance of this text. For this specification, the non-standard, or better, non-Pāṇinian Sanskrit, designated by the later tradition as *aiśaḥ*, i.e., the usage of *īśaḥ*, the lord, in the corpus of extant

¹ V., esp., his remarks in bk.14, p.120. There Kṣemarājaḥ states that he has used old manuscripts to remedy the corrupt readings and interpolations found in the text.

² For a summary discussion of the differences between the two types of editions, v. Oskar von Hinüber, "Remarks on the Problems of Textual Criticism in Editing Anonymous Sanskrit Literature," in *Proceedings of the First Symposium of Nepali and German Sanskritists 1978* (Kathmandu: Institute of Sanskrit Studies, Tribhuvan University, Dang Nepal Research Centre, 1980), pp.28-40.

texts would first have to be thoroughly collected and analyzed.¹ Such work might enable the isolating of distinctive features of a "tantric Sanskrit," which, at least by frequency, might be differentiated from those irregularities shared with other forms of non-standard usage, variously designated as Buddhist hybrid, epic, purāṇic, or vernacular Sanskrit.² Even after such a collection of forms, however, any subsequent geographical localizing of the provenance of *Svacchandatantram* on the basis of features shared, for instance, with a middle Indic dialect, would be unlikely, due to the difficulty in localizing the known middle Indic dialects themselves. Currently, the manuscript evidence merely confirms what the substantive history of the content of Śaiva texts of this genus show: namely, an assimilation and reworking by more cultivated milieus. And the progressive excision of deviant forms by successive generations of copyists or commentators merely reflects this process.³ In sum, therefore, linguistic evidence corroborates the other evidence pointing to an origin in a non-Pāṇinian, non-*smārta* brāhmaṇical dominated tradition.

Besides manuscripts and linguistic analysis, information found in other related texts offers another potential source of evidence about the origin and history of *Svacchandatantram*. In the self-representation of these expressly Śaiva traditions, works such as *Svacchandatantram* constitute the scriptural corpus of revelation

¹ In his commentary, Kṣemarājaḥ regularly notes these non-standard forms, and glosses them with the correct usage.

² On the need for this work, v. Albrecht Wezler, review of *The Śaṭsāhasra Saṃhitā*, by J.A. Schotermann, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 135, 1 (1985): 143-146.

³ A tension exists between a conservative respect for scripture, and a need to adapt it either linguistically or ideologically to support altered circumstances. As an example of an ingenious solution that maintains the literal wording but with a transformed sense, v. infra 1.2.3.

that fulfills the function in the Śaiva community that Vedic texts fulfill in the explicitly brāhmaṇical *smārta* traditions. And, at some time during the growth and transmission of this Śaiva tradition, as it developed an independent identity, it applied classificatory schemata to its scriptures. Śaiva circles subsequently used and transmitted these schemata in several different ways: they either inserted these schemata into the body of existing texts, used them to elaborate and to incorporate “new” texts, or transmitted them concurrently in oral form.¹

One popular schema organized the scriptures in three branches according to their revealing deity, doctrine, and number of texts: ten dualistic scriptures revealed by Śivaḥ, eighteen dualistic-non-dualistic revealed by Rudraḥ, and sixty-four non-dualistic revealed by Bhairavaḥ. In later presentations of this pattern, the *Svacchandatantram*, revealed by Bhairavaḥ, naturally, falls among the non-dualistic group of sixty-four scriptures.² The historical value of the doctrinal classification, specifically, the labeling of *Svacchandatantram* as a non-dual scripture, becomes immediately suspect, however, by the very fact that Kṣemarājaḥ explicitly states that he composed his commentary to refute dualistic commentaries on

¹ For information on the classificatory schemata used in tantric texts, v. Teun Goudriaan and Sanjukta Gupta, *Hindu Tantric and Śākta Literature* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1981), pp.1–31.

² V. K.C. Pandey, *Abhinavagupta. An Historical and Philosophical Study*, 2d ed. The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Studies 1 (Varanasi: Chowkhamba, 1963): 138ff; Raniero Gnoli, trans., *Luce delle Sacre Scritture (Tantrāloka) di Abhinavagupta*, Classici delle Religioni, Sezione prima (Torino: Unione Tipografico-Editrice Torinese, 1972), p.70, n.17. The best summary of the traditional sources is given in the commentary by Jayarathaḥ on *Tāntrālokaḥ*, in Paṇḍit Madhusudan Kaul Shāstri, ed., *The Tantrāloka of Abhinava Gupta, with commentary by Rājānaka Jayaratha*, Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies, 23 (Allahabad: The Indian Press, 1918), 1, vs.18: 35ff.

Svacchandatantram.¹ And as will be shown, *Svacchandatantram* exhibits affinities with a wide spectrum of Śaiva and non-Śaiva texts, and lacks an explicit dualistic, qualified non-dualistic, or non-dualistic *credo*. Clearly, therefore, for *Svacchandatantram*, this particular schema represents an *ex post facto* superimposition reflective only of the later transmission of the text and not the circumstances of its early composition.

Similarly, the number sixty-four associated with the non-dualistic scriptures revealed by Bhairavaḥ, which is then divided into eight subgroups, appears to be a factitious and retrospective construction. It may have been based in part on traditional numerical associations, such as the eight bhairavāḥ, expanded by correlation with the sixty-four yoginyaḥ associated with Bhairavaḥ.² Though Śaiva tradition expressly associated *Svacchandatantram* with a subset of eight specifically Svachchanda-bhairava *tantrāṇi* in this list of sixty-four, Kṣemarājaḥ in his commentary, which is full of citations and references, does not extensively quote these works.³ This pattern argues that this

¹ V. the concluding verses to his commentary, in bk.15, p.146.

² On the sixty-four yoginyaḥ, v. Marie-Thérèse de Mallmann, *Les enseignements iconographiques de l'Agni-Purana*, Annales du Musée Guimet 67 (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1963): chap.8, esp., p.176, n.9, referring to the sixty-four bhairavāḥ. As she notes, only the eight main bhairavāḥ appear to be well defined. For a list and description of the sixty-four bhairavāḥ, v. Gopināth Rao, *Elements of Hindu Iconography* 2, 1 (Madras: The Law Printing House, 1916): 180ff.

³ In his commentary on *Tantrālokaḥ*, Jayarathaḥ, in Shāstri, M.K., ed., *Tantrālokaḥ*, 1: 42, quotes the *Śrīkanṭhī* describing this first group of eight as an expansion of Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ: "*svacchando bhairavaścandaḥ krodha unmattabhairavaḥ / asitāṅgo mahocchuṣma kapāliśastathaiva ca // ete svacchandarupāstu bahurūpeṇa bhāsitāḥ* / " V. also bk.1, p.10, where Kṣemarājaḥ recognizes this tradition, by quoting the *Śarvavīraḥ*, associating *Svacchandatantram*, with the first four texts in this group, the *Caṇḍaḥ*, *Krodhaḥ*, *Unmattabhairavaḥ*, and others. In his

association derived more from later, systematic considerations than intrinsic historical and material connections. If additional texts are discovered in manuscript and studied, however, perhaps more substantive reasons for their affiliation by these related patterns will come to light. Nevertheless, just as it lacks a non-dualistic *credo*, so *Svacchandatantram* itself does not refer to this schema of sixty-four Bhairava or eight Svachanda-bhairava *tantrāṇi*.¹

Another widespread classificatory schema divides the Śaiva scriptures into various streams (*srotāṃsi*) of scriptural revelation which emanate from the faces of Śivaḥ in his various forms.² Thus, in addition to assigning *Svacchandatantram* to the non-dualistic branch of sixty-four Bhairava scriptures, Śaiva tradition, as followed by Kṣemarājaḥ, further categorizes *Svacchandatantram* in this related schema as belonging to the *dakṣiṇa*, i.e., right or

commentary, however, Kṣemarājaḥ quotes only a *Rurusamgrahaḥ*. bk.10, p.402, (which may be identical to the Śaiva *Rauravāgamaḥ*) on the names of rudrāḥ, and more significantly, an *Ucchuṣmabhairavaḥ*. bk.7, p.315, bk.10, p.382, giving the same quote twice, which states that only one pure reality exists.

¹ In bk.10, pp.511ff, the text does mention the ten dualistic, and the eighteen, dualistic-non-dualistic texts, representing the twenty-eight traditional Śaiva scriptures. For a rejection of the historical significance of this division, into dualistic, and non-dualistic, v. Hélène Brunner-Lachaux, "On the Classification of Śiva Tantras," in *Summaries of Papers*, International Association of Sanskrit Studies, Fifth World Sanskrit Conference (Varanasi: Rashtriya Sanskrit Sansthan, 1981), pp.128-129.

² In the basic form of this model, the Śaiva scriptures are emitted from the five faces of Sadāśivaḥ; v., for a collection of these classifications, M. Arunachalam, *The Śaivagamas*, Peeps into Tamil Culture.6, Studies in the Agamas 1 (Madras: Gandhi Vidyalayam, 1983), pp.20ff, 99ff. This schema represents the Śaiva counterpart of the Vedic model in which the different Vedāḥ and other forms of knowledge are emitted from the four faces of Brahmā. For an example, v. Kṛṣṇaśaṅkara Śāstri, et al., eds., *Śrīmadbhāgavatapurāṇam* 3 (Varanasi: Samsara Press, 1965), bk.12, vss.34-48: 454ff.

southern, stream of scriptures.¹ Using an adage evidently popular in his own tradition, Kṣemarājaḥ ranks the various streams of scripture in the order, Śaivasiddhāntin, *vāma*, i.e., left or northern, *dakṣina*, and Kaula.² *Svacchandatantram* itself does not allude to this structure, and Kṣemarājaḥ explains it more fully only in his commentary on the *Netratantram*, which describes the presiding deity of each stream: Sadāśivaḥ for the Śaivasiddhāntin, Tumburuḥ for the left, Bhairavaḥ for the right, and Bhairavaḥ once again for the Kaula.³

The historical value of this schema is weakened, however, because only a single text survives that can be putatively attributed to the left stream.⁴ Just as the preceding schemata, so also this model apparently reflects more the conditions of the later transmission of texts in the various Śaiva schools than the actual circumstances of their composition. In particular, by dropping the *vāma*, this schema becomes just another expression of the later opposition between the dualistic Śaiva-siddhāntin and non-dualistic schools of Śaivism represented by Kṣemarājaḥ. As will be examined in full, much of *Svacchandatantram*, however, appears to predate

¹ V. bk.1, p.8.

² V. bk.11, p.55: "... śaivādvāmaṃ tu dakṣinaṃ / dakṣinātparataḥ kaulaṃ kaulātparataram nahi." Śaiva, as Kṣemarājaḥ explains, refers here to the Śaiva-siddhāntin texts.

³ V. Paṇḍit Madhusudan Kaul Shāstri, ed., *The Netratantra with Commentary by Kṣemarāja* 1, Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies 46 (Bombay: Tatva Vivechaka Press, 1926), bks.11-12, pp.239-259, and Hélène Brunner-Lachaux, "Un Tantra du Nord: Le *Netra Tantra*," *Bulletin de l'école française d'extrême orient* 61 (1974): 148ff.

⁴ V. Teun Goudriaan, ed. and trans., *The Viṇāśikhatantra, A Śaiva Tantra of the Left Current* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1985), p.27. "The Viṇāśikha is therefore of considerable importance as a unique document of the Tumburu tradition of Vāmastrotas within early Tantric Śaivism."

the split between these dualistic and non-dualistic schools. And, as will be discussed, the Kaula stream, though closely related to the *dakṣiṇa* as in this schema, only appears as an independent tradition considerably after the formation of the other scriptural branches.¹

The *Svacchandatantram*, in characterizing itself, uses two simpler schemata instead of referring to any of the preceding pattern of streams found in many scriptures and commentators. First, in the opening book, the text introduces the commonplace that this particular *tantram* represents a condensation of a much more extensive and primordial "*Ur-tantram*." The revelation of this particular text, in its accessible and abbreviated form, constitutes a particular act of grace.² Behind the theological cliché lies a possible historical kernel, for in his commentary, Kṣemarājaḥ refers to larger texts specified only as "*brhat-tantrāṇi*," which apparently, *in extenso*, supplement the data given by *Svacchandatantram*.³ Perhaps this citation warrants, with caution, the supposition that larger texts of this particular genre were extant at his time, and were to be taken as the context for explicating parts of *Svacchandatantram*. But the vague reference gives pause, being inconsistent with Kṣemarāja's usual commentatorial practice of citing texts by title.⁴

¹ V. infra II.15, the summary of bk.15.

² V. bk.1, pp.9-10, esp. vss.,6-7. Cf. Shāstrī, M.K., ed., *Tantrālokaḥ*, 36, vss.1-10, for a similar version of the condensation of revelation based, according to Abhinavaguptaḥ, on the *Siddhayogeśvarīmatam*. For a Purāṇic version of this idea, v. Ludo Rocher, *The Purāṇas, A History of Indian Literature* 2, 3 (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1986), pp.46-47.

³ V., for example, bk.10, p.223, referring to a *Brhattantram*, and bk.10, p.267, p.440, referring to unspecified *Brhattantrāṇi*.

⁴ This may also represent Kṣemarāja's shorthand for a general cross-reference to other Śaiva texts discussing the same topics: note

Second, in its version of the “*tantra-avatāraḥ*” book, the account of the origin of the scriptures found in most Śaiva texts, *Svacchandatantram* presents another longer and likely later account of the revelation and transmission of scripture.¹ Despite the relative sophistication of this account, however, it refers neither to groups of scriptures nor to specific individual scriptures. Instead it simply emphasizes the motivation of grace while otherwise summarily repeating the cosmogonic account in which the supreme sound manifests itself at successively grosser levels as described at great length in other books on formula (*mantraḥ*) practice, and cosmology. The additional designation of Śrikanṭhaḥ as a primary transmitter of the revelation, a role underscored several times by Kṣemarājaḥ in the course of his commentary, appears to be only an inherited feature from earlier Śaiva discussions of revelation.² Thus this theoretical and generalizing account, though in agreement with the rest of *Svacchandatantram*, is potentially applicable to any Śaiva scripture and offers no significant historical information.

Though omitting specific and applicable classifying information in its self-characterization, *Svacchandatantram* nevertheless refers to itself as a *tantram*. While the terms *āgamaḥ* and *tantram* both

on bk.4, p.13 his gloss of the text’s reference to other scriptures as referring to the *brhattantram*. In addition, if the text represented an abridgement of a larger, historical work, it might have an appropriate title indicating this derivation. Cf. Rocher, *The Purāṇas*, p.67: “... here as elsewhere in Sanskrit Literature we should expect Brhad-, Laghu-, Vṛddha-, etc., to refer to compositions which are secondary as compared to the corresponding titles to which these adjectives have not been prefixed.”

¹ Cf. the summary of bk.8, pp.17–23, in section II.8.

² For the literature on Śrikanṭhaḥ the disputed either legendary or historical found of the Pāśupatāḥ, v. Jan Gonda, *Medieval Religious Literature in Sanskrit, A History of Indian Literature*, 2, 1 (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1977), p.216. Also v. infra the discussion of the Pāśupatāḥ in section I.1.3.

designate primary Śaiva scriptures, it is often noted that their usage, at least in part, differs regionally: *āgamaḥ* is the normal term in the south, *tantram* in the north.¹ Although this differentiation may correctly reflect the later history of the Śaiva schools, in which the dualistic Śaiva-siddhāntin based on the twenty-eight *āgamāḥ* became dominant in the south, and the non-dualistic in Kāśmīr, it in no way reflects the religious conditions of earlier periods.² In addition, *Svacchandatantram*, like the other *āgamāḥ*, uses both terms in references interchangeably.³ Furthermore, even if this distinction were accepted, the use of the term, *tantram*, would merely argue for an unspecified north Indian origin for *Svacchandatantram*.

In its opening dialogue, the *Svacchandatantram* offers another self-characterization as the compendium of the great scripture (*mahātantram*) that has four seats or bases (*catuspiṭham*).⁴ This refers to another classificatory system, which, as explained by Kṣemarājaḥ quoting the *Sarvaviraḥ*, groups scriptures by one of four topics that they may predominantly treat, or for which they may serve as the basis: *mantraḥ* or formula; *vidyā* or (female) formula; *maṇḍalam* or diagram; and

¹ V., for example, Gonda, *Medieval Religious Literature in Sanskrit*, p.2, n.5.

² On this misconception, v., for example, Alexis Sanderson, review of *Mṛgendrāgama*, by Michel Hulin, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 46 pt.1 (1983): 161.

³ V. bk.4, p.13, for example, where *Svacchandatantram* refers to other *āgamāḥ*, or bk.4, p.101, to other *tantrāṇi*. Cf. on this topic Hélène Brunner-Lachaux, "Les Membres de Śiva," *Asiatischen Studien* 40, 2 (1986): 89, n.1.

⁴ Bk.1, p.10.

mudrā or gesture.¹ The *Sarvaviraḥ*, has classified *Svacchandatantram* as a formula text, an understandable assertion given the actual predominance of *mantra* practice in its content.² Kṣemarājaḥ proceeds to explain, however, that *Svacchandatantram*, as indicated by the opening verse, actually treats all four topics. This discrepancy suggests that this fourfold classificatory schema represents a later categorization of texts, rather than a compositional principle used in constructing early texts like *Svacchandatantram*.

In this way this fourfold schema resembles the other well known ideal description of an *āgamaḥ* as having four topical sections (*pādaḥ*) treating: *kriyā* or ritual; *vidyā* or doctrine; *caryā* or conduct; and *yogaḥ* or spiritual exercise.³ Almost all extant *āgamāḥ*, however, do not conform to this structure.⁴ Despite its vast similarity in shared content with these *āgamāḥ*, *Svacchandatantram* does not show any traces of this organization. Thus, this omission indicates that these organizing models stem, once again, from systematizing efforts effected during the later transmission of the Śaiva scriptural corpus.

As sources of historical information, the traditional views of scripture, represented in the preceding schemata and self-characterizations, should be supplemented by assorted direct and indirect external evidence. First, these Śaiva scriptures ostensibly

¹ Bk.1, p.10: "*mudrā maṇḍalapīṭhaṁ tu mantrapīṭhaṁ tathaiva ca / vidyāpīṭhaṁ tathaiveha catuspīṭhā tu saṁhitā.*"

² Ibid.

³ On this typical arrangement see, for example, Jean Filliozat, "Les Āgama Īvaītes," Introduction in *Rauravāgama* 1, ed. N.R. Bhatt, Publications de l'institut français d'indologie 18 (Pondichéry: Institut français d'indologie, 1961): vii.

⁴ V. Hélène Brunner-Lachaux, "Importance de la littérature āgarnique," *Indologica Taurinensia* 3-4 (1975-76): 109.

serve as the authority and basis for the later datable and identifiable Śaiva sectarian authors. And by default, their dates often serve as the *terminus ad quem* for the Śaiva scriptures. Accordingly, in the case of *Svacchandatantram* this *terminus* is the tenth century and Abhinavaguptaḥ, and probably prior to the historical figures in his *sampradāyaḥ* or teaching lineage.¹ Supplementary evidence must then help decide a suitable *terminus ab quo*.

At the outset, it should not be assumed that the composition of anonymous scriptures necessarily terminates at the time when more cultivated and historically self-conscious milieus begin theoretically expounding and elaborating them in works of a qualitatively different nature. A continuing parallel process of fabrication, recomposition, and transmission of scriptures, if not in the same, at least in other circles, should be presumed. And this process argues for prudence in pushing back the *terminus ab quo* for anonymous texts by a set amount determined by reasoning about the time needed for an evolution, as it were, of ideas to a more complex level, or rather, assimilation by a more sophisticated milieu. Nonetheless, in the case of *Svacchandatantram*, identical reasoning argues for a considerable prehistory, if not antiquity, in which the text could acquire prestige sufficient to motivate numerous commentaries, and even colonization by competing sects.

In the absence of direct evidence such as citations (prior to those of the Śaiva authors discussed previously), or inscriptions, dating a text such as *Svacchandatantram* depends on the dating, or periodization, of the genus of texts to which it is commonly

¹ The first historical figure in the non-dual lineage, for whom scriptures such as *Svacchandatantram* are the supposed scriptural basis is Vasuguptaḥ, who is the author-transmitter of the source text of this school, the *Śīvasūtrāṇi*, dated to the beginning of the ninth century. V. Pandey, *Abhinavagupta*, p.154.

attributed. Inscriptional evidence for other Śaiva *tantrāṇi* falls within the span proposed for the composition of *Svacchandatantram*: in the eighth century before the historical figures in the tradition of Kṣemarājaḥ.¹ A century earlier, the existence of Śaiva scriptures, if not the *āgamāḥ* of later tradition can be inferred from the South Indian inscription of the Pallava ruler Narasimhavarman II, in which he refers to the Śaiva-siddhāntaḥ.² Certainly, the organized cult of Śivaḥ, and, in particular, Śaiva sects, such as the Pāśupatāḥ, whose practices and beliefs have strongly influenced works like *Svacchandatantram*, predate this time by at least another century.³ And though from other evidence of Śaiva religious activity in earlier periods the concomitant existence of oral or even written traditions may be inferred, this evidence cannot warrant retroactive assumption of a corpus of Śaiva scriptures at this earlier period. More reasonably, their appearance can not be

¹ For the Cambodian inscriptions that attest the existence of Śaiva *tantrāṇi* from the beginning of the ninth century, v. Adhir Chakravarti, "New Light on Śaiva Tāntrika Texts Known in Ancient Cambodia," *Journal of the Asiatic Society (Bengal)* 15, 1-4 (1973): 1-10.

² E. Hultzsch, ed. and trans., *South Indian Inscriptions*, 1 in *Archæological Survey of India n.s.3* (1890; reprint, Varanasi, Delhi: Indological Book House, 1972): 12, 13-14, vs.5. On the dates of Narasimhavarman, c.690-91- c.728-29, v. T.V. Mahalingam, *Kāñcīpuram in Early South Indian History* (Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1969), pp.109ff.

³ The Pāśupatāḥ can be dated in the most conservative view to the preceding two centuries. For a reexamination of the debate on their date and origin, v. V.C. Srivastava, "The Antiquity of the Pāśupata Sect," in *K.C. Chaṭṭopādhyaya Memorial Volume*, Department of Ancient History, Culture & Archæology (Allahabad: Allahabad University, 1975), pp.109-125, especially p.111: "There cannot be any doubt that the Pāśupata sect was a well-established system in India in the early mediaeval period (7th-12th cent. A.D.)."

placed before the efflorescence of Śaivism produced by the patronage accorded by dominant Śaiva dynasties in the seventh and eighth century.¹

To complement historical evidence such as inscriptions, anonymous works of Sanskrit literature such as *Svacchandatantram* can be analyzed for isolated internal clues to their provenance that potentially can be dated or located in an external context. Identifiable and specific historical references naturally merit first consideration. Unfortunately, *Svacchandatantram*, with its predominantly ritual and meditational content, does not refer to specific historical figures or events, nor does it associate its deity with a definite pilgrimage center (*piṭham*).²

Comparable to references to historical events, persons, and places, literal citations from other known and datable works can provide reliable information about the anonymous text in which they are embedded. As might be expected, however, in an anonymous and collective composition that purports to be revealed scripture, paraphrase is the rule and quotation the exception.³

¹ For literature, v. François Gros, "Towards Reading the Tēvāram," introduction to *Tēvāram. Hymnes Śivaïtes du Pays Tamoul*, T.V. Gopal Iyer and François Gros, eds. (Pondichéry: Institut français d'indologie, 1984), esp., pp.1-liii.

² Cf., for an example of such a reference used in identifying the provenance of a text, J.A. Schotermann, ed., *The Yonitantra* (New Delhi: Manohar Publications, 1980), pp.3ff.

³ Cf. in reference to the Purāṇic texts, Ludwik Sternbach, *The Mānava-dharmaśāstra I-III, and the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa* (Varanasi: All India Kashi Raj Trust, 1974). He notes (p.4) how exceptional it is that the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇam* recopies *verbatim* the *smṛti* texts.

Next in importance as internal indicators come iconographic and architectural details.¹ Many *āgamāḥ* have extensive sections on temple construction, installation of images, and similar subjects, since they functioned in large part as guidebooks for temple priests. While sharing many other topics with these texts, *Svacchandatantram*, however, treats these subjects only in passing.

First, for iconographic evidence, though not matching exactly the meditational form of Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ described in *Svacchandatantram*, a bronze figure of Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ in union with Bhairavi has been found at Kangra and dated to the twelfth century.² This iconographic evidence corroborates other evidence locating the worship of Bhairavaḥ as the supreme form of Śivaḥ in north India, and specifically the northwest Himālayan region.³ The composition of *Svacchandatantram* as the principal scripture associated with the worship of Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ might then be inferred to have occurred in this region. This can not be concluded with certainty, however, for evidence attests the

¹ Cf. Teun Goudriaan, *Kāśyapa's Book of Wisdom (Kāśyapa-jñānakāṇḍaḥ). A Ritual Handbook of the Vaikhānasas* (Utrecht) Disputationes Rheno-Trajectinae 10 (The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1965) p.10, n.13: "The best way for finding some chronological clues is to consider the architectural and iconographic date offered by the text."

² B.Ch. Chhabra, "Svachchanda-Bhairavi Bronze Image from Kangra, *Journal of Indian History* 42, 1 (April 1964): 145-148. Cf. the description of Svachchanda's meditational form in bk.2, pp.51ff.

³ V. Brunner-Lachaux, "Les Membres de Śiva," p.114, "...celle du Bhairava à cinq têtes qui est au centre du culte du śivaïsme du Nord." V. also Alexis Sanderson, "Śaivism in Kashmir," in *The Encyclopedia of Religion* 13 (New York: Macmillan, 1987): 17: "... in Kashmir ... the principal Śaiva cult was...the worship of Svachchandabhairava and his consort Aghoreśvari"

existence for Bhairava cults in other centers of scriptural Śaivism, for example, in south India.¹

Second, for architectural evidence, though not describing the construction of temples, *Svacchandatantram*, as usual in texts of its kind, includes brief instructions for worshipping the deities on the door of the ritual pavilion (*yāgagrham*).² It locates the rivers Gaṅgā and Yamunā on opposite sides of the doors, a motif that became popular in temple architecture in the seventh century and was reputedly introduced by Lalitāditya into Kāśmīr in the eighth century.³ In addition, *Svacchandatantram* places Gaṅgā on the left and Yamunā on the right. Kṣemarājaḥ defends this placement as proper for texts of the *dakṣiṇa* Bhairava stream against previous commentators who, in commenting upon this passage, had reversed their stated position to conform to the usual Siddhāntin pattern.⁴ Elsewhere, it has been argued that the Siddhāntin placement represents the standard earlier pattern, and the placement found in *Svacchandatantram* typical and later tantric symbolism.⁵ Since temples throughout India, however, show both patterns, this detail unfortunately does not further specify the

¹ Cf., for example, V. Raghavan, "Tiruvorriyur Inscription of Chaturanana Pandita," in B.Ch. Chhabra, ed., *Epigraphia Indica* 27 (Delhi: Archaeological Survey of India, 1985): 298. Raghavan cites inscriptional evidence that as late as the time of the Chōla king Rājādhira II (second half of the twelfth century) the Soma-siddhāntin doctrine associated with Bhairavaḥ and the Kapālika-Pāśupatāḥ was being preached at this site near Madras.

² Bk.2, pp.13-14.

³ Heinrich von Stietencron, *Gaṅgā und Yamunā*, Freiburger Beiträge zur Indologie 5 (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1972), pp.35ff.

⁴ Bk.2, pp.13-14.

⁵ V. von Stietencron, *Gaṅgā und Yamunā*, pp.113ff.

date or provenance of the text.¹ Moreover, rather than with external structures, such as a Bhairava shrine or temple, here, as in its other statements about monuments or iconography, *Svacchandatantram* may be more concerned with internal modes of worship and meditation. Accordingly, later in the text, after prescribing construction of a ritual diagram (*maṇḍalam*) with colored powders, *Svacchandatantram* repeats its instructions to perform the same worship at the "doors." of the diagram.²

Svacchandatantram contains another potential indicator of its origin when it describes the construction of amulets written on birch bark (*bhūrjapatram*).³ Since birch bark was used as a writing material primarily in the northwest Himālayan region, Schrader, for example, argued that the Pāñcarātrin *Ahīrbudhnya Saṃhitā*, which describes the same kind of amulets, had been composed in Kāśmir.⁴ But as reported by Bühler, the use of birch bark for amulets and letters had a much wider distribution.⁵ Therefore, though providing another clue as to the provenance of

¹ For an exhaustive list of the distribution of this pattern in 314 temples, v. von Stietencron, *Gangā und Yamunā*, pp.16ff.

² Bk.5, p.23.

³ Bk.9, pp.54ff.

⁴ F. Otto Schrader, *Introduction to the Pāñcarātra and the Ahīrbudhnya Saṃhitā* (1916. Reprint. Madras: The Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1973), p.111.

⁵ Johann Georg Bühler, *Indian Paleography*, Appendix to *The Indian Antiquary* 33 (1904), ed. John Fleet, p.93: "According to a statement made to me by Bhāū Dāji, birch bark mss. occur also in Orissa, and amulets, written on Bhūrja, are still used throughout all the Aryan districts of India."

Svacchandatantram, the use of birch bark does not prove a Kāśmīri or northwest Himālayan origin.¹

Furthermore, even if this information pointed unmistakably to a Kāśmīri origin, it would not provide a certain starting point for the evaluation of *Svacchandatantram* as a whole. For in an anonymous work of this size, presumably transmitted in different regions over a long period, a detail permits the dating or locating of only a particular topical section of the work; its importance for the remaining sections must be corroborated by additional evidence.

Thus, isolated evidence for date and provenance found in specific sections of an anonymous and extensive scripture like *Svacchandatantram* must be evaluated more conservatively than that found in the unified work of a single, known author. In the same way, judging manuscript readings or interpreting single verses and larger sections in a composite work, requires an awareness of the intention of a lineage of distinct authors, and an understanding of the text's unique history of composition and transmission.

First, the text of *Svacchandatantram* has, as its basic compositional or organizing structure, a division into books (*paṭalam*). Just like the choice of *tantram* to designate the work as a whole, the choice of the term *paṭalam*, used throughout the genre to designate sections of a text, does not appear significant.²

¹ V. also Sanjukta Gupta's introduction to the *Lakṣmi Tantra*, in Sanjukta Gupta, trans., *Lakṣmi Tantra. A Pāñcarātra Text* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972), p.xxi, against arguments for provenance based on the used of birchbark amulets.

² On the historical significance of the term *paṭalam* in Vedic ritual literature, v. Asko Parpola, trans., *The Śrautasūtras of Lāṭyāyana and Drāhyāyana and their commentaries*, Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum, Societas Scientiarum Fennica, 42, 2 (Helsinki, 1968), pp.43ff; for references to the etymology and used of the term *tantram* in medical literature, v.

For the most part, these books coincide with the introduction of major new topics by the other main organizational structure of the text, the frame dialogue between Bhairavaḥ, who in this work assumes the role of promulgator, and his consort goddess, who plays the interlocutor. In addition, the goddess lists, in the first book, the major topics to be covered in the work.¹ Many anonymous, encyclopædic works like *purāṇi* have this short table of contents called a *sūciḥ* or *anukramaṇikā*.²

The actual number of topics treated in the text exceeds not only the number of books but also those topics listed separately in the opening *anukramaṇikā*. Thus, in his commentary on this initial *anukramaṇikā*, Kṣemarājaḥ attempts to demonstrate that the listed topics include and, thereby, imply the remaining topics. Similarly, in the fourth book, before discussing a series of previously unenumerated topics, the text supplies another *anukramaṇikā*.³ While the *anukramaṇikā* omits many topics, almost every topic is marked by the framing dialogue between Bhairavaḥ and the goddess. And where even this dialogue is lacking, Kṣemarājaḥ supplies it, by marking the beginning and end of added topics.⁴ He confirms, thereby, the perception that the

Reinhold F.G. Müller, "Wörterheft zu einigen Ausdrücken indischer Medizin," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung*, Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin Institut für Orientforschung 8, 1 (1961): 102.

¹ Bk.1, pp.11-12.

² On this organizational device in the *purāṇi*, v. Giorgio Bonazzoli, "Schemes in the Purāṇas," *Purāṇa* 24, 1 (January 1982): 149ff.

³ Bk.4, pp.142-143.

⁴ Cf., for example, bk.5, p.10, where Kṣemarājaḥ rationalizes the deficient dialogue introducing a topic without an appropriate question as due to the supernumerary grace of the lord:
"... anujighṛkṣorbhagavtyā āśayaparitoṣāyāpraśnitāmapi padādidikṣām nirūpayiṣyan"

dialogue frame forms the primary and even indispensable structure of the text.

Although these internal organizing structures, do not, in themselves, further specify the provenance and date of the text of *Svacchandatantram*, they do clearly identify its genre, and suggest the kind of historical and structural analysis that would further unravel its history. Along with the non-Pāṇinian Sanskrit and simple verses, the lack of a strict internally coherent organization marks the text as the collective and cumulative product of an oral and vernacular rather than literary tradition. In particular, the dialogue frame has permitted associated topics to be easily added to the text. While devices like the *anukramanikā* indicate the work of more careful redactors operating with traditional patterns, inconsistencies throughout the work point to the absence of a single author or editor.

1.1.2 Methods of Textual Criticism

Works carefully composed by known authors in documented circumstances, naturally permit a systematic textual and contextual interpretation not available for collective and anonymous texts. In order to compensate for this absence of textual cohesion and supplementary biographical and sectarian data, anonymous compilations must be critically analyzed both internally and comparatively. Once this analysis has identified individual textual components and thus furnished a context for interpretation, the particular process of their historical compilation can be studied to provide insight into the systematic significance of the text.

Provisionally, three interrelated stages of this analysis can be distinguished: first, literary criticism, or the hypothetical identification of written documents used to compile the text; second, tradition criticism, or the examination of the traditions underlying the text and its sources; and third, redaction criticism,

or the study of the processes by which documentary sources and traditions have been woven together to produce successive versions of the extant text. This analysis may assume that in constructing a text like *Svacchandatantram*, compilers not only have drawn on written documents, or sources, but also have used various tradition-complexes or residual collections of material of varying ages which had been handed down partly orally, and partly in written form. These traditions that form the context, i.e., the direct or mediated background accompanying the constructing and reworking of the text, may be identified as its underlying strata.¹

Redaction criticism may assume, as well, that for anonymous Sanskrit sectarian literature the composition, transmission, and recitation of texts do not fall into distinct phases but overlap and intermingle.² Thus, the extant text of *Svacchandatantram* resulted not only from successive but also from interdependent activities of compilation, redaction, interpolation, revision or normalizing correction, emendation, and commentary. Accordingly, in place of a single author or editor, stands a Śaiva tradition, composed of generations of teachers, ascetics, officiating ritualists, meditative practitioners, commentators, initiated patrons, and scribes.

This literary, tradition, and redaction criticism serve as primary methods for the internal analysis of a single text. For comparative analysis, many model studies already exist, which provide examples of the methods to be employed when examining

¹ For this terminology, adopted here with modifications, v. R.E. Clements, "Pentateuchal Problems," in *Tradition and Interpretation*, ed. G.W. Anderson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), esp., pp.96-97.

² On the overlapping of these processes, and the intermixture of oral and written tradition in the *purāṇi*, cf. Giorgio Bonazzoli, "Composition, Transmission and Recitation of the Purāṇas," *Purāṇa* 25, 2 (July 1983): 254-280, and esp., 279.

multiples versions of, for example, cosmological sections, found in many texts.¹ By reconstructing the historical context and ideological basis for the agreements and differences among versions, this comparative criticism of anonymous Sanskrit literature has been able to generate, at least in outline, doctrinal or sectarian history.²

Material from *Svacchandatantram* has already been extensively cited in the study of certain Śaiva rituals.³ Even without a specific interest in applying the comparative method for historical purposes, cross-referencing and accumulation of common material remain prerequisites for understanding any particular Śaiva scripture, especially in its ritual descriptions that are often at once, technical, stereotyped, laconic, and obscure. And the traditional commentators themselves, such as Kṣemarājaḥ, have pursued and relied on this type of comparative explanation.

Both the non-systematic explicative use of comparative data, and the methods of systematic historical and comparative analysis can be applied, without alteration, to comparable sections of the

¹ For the programmatic account of this comparative historical method, v. Paul Hacker, "Zur Methode der geschichtlichen Erforschung der anonymen Sanskritliteratur des Hinduismus," in Paul Hacker *Kleine Schriften*, hrsg. Lambert Schmithausen, Glaser-Stiftung 15 (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1978), pp.8-17. For a paradigmatic application, v. Klaus Rüping, *Amṛtamanthana und Kūrma-Avatāra*, Schriftenreihe des Südasien-Instituts der Universität Heidelberg (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1970).

² Hacker, "Zur Methode der geschichtlichen Erforschung der anonymen Sanskritliteratur des Hinduismus," p.14: "*Und da direkte historische Zeugnisse meist fehlen, ist die Textgeschichte bez., allgemeiner gesprochen, die Methode der Vergleichs der Mehrfachüberlieferungen, oft sogar das einzige wissenschaftliche Erkenntnismittel für die geschichtlichen Vorgänge.*"

³ V. Hélène Brunner-Lachaux, trans., *Somaśambhupaddhati*, troisième partie, Publications de l'institut français d'indologie .25, 3 (Pondichéry: Institut français d'indologie, 1977).

Śaiva scriptures. However, when applied to the ritual and meditative portions of these texts, instead of, for example, to their cosmological sections, these methods require prior reflection on their limitations and presuppositions.

Ideally, by assuming the abstract existence, as it were, of any particular ritual or meditation independent of its actual performance, traditional or contemporary exegetes can readily complement and fill out an incomplete description of a ritual in a particular text by references to other texts more fully describing the same ritual. Going even further, they might distinguish correct or better descriptions from wrong or inadequate accounts. And later commentators and writers of *paddhati*, or handbooks, undoubtedly operated, with theological or sectarian motivation, under this *prima facie* assumption.

Without this essentialist assumption of an "Ur-ritual," an exegete confronts a thicket of variation whose growth must be carefully examined on a case by case basis. Śaiva ritualists undoubtedly evolved, practiced, refined, revised, and transmitted their practices in diverse temporal and regional circumstances. Perhaps a pattern of attempted standardization or homogenization followed by subsequent differentiation repeated itself before the era of widespread literary diffusion promoted efforts to codify a canon and canonical rituals. The great number of overlapping, or seemingly redundant initiation procedures given by a text like *Svacchandatantram* suggests a complicated development of rituals in both pre-literary and literary contexts.

Even under the best conditions, detailed comparison with extant sources may be mistaken and yield only provisional results as long as potentially vital *Vorlage* remain as yet unedited or irretrievably lost. Since paraphrase and stereotyped phrasing rather than citation characterize these texts, attributions of priority, even in the case of seemingly parallel passages or descriptions, become difficult, even before considering the additional complication of a third common source. And even apparently

clear-cut cases of borrowing may instead conceal a secondary convergence through the *retouche* of redactors. A complete analysis of variants of a ritual through comparative analysis that sorts them according to a schema that associates different lineages of ritual practitioners with specific texts and regions would be an exaggeration and simplification. In fact, the model of contaminated manuscript transmission probably reflects the historical development of these rituals as much as the conservative unilinear model suggested by Vedic traditions. Therefore, a partially independent tradition criticism not generated by the application of textual comparison alone, must accompany and serve as a corrective to the results of the comparative or internal analysis of written sources.

Thus before applying the particular procedures of comparative analysis or internal analysis to a text like *Svacchandatantram*, they must be reevaluated and appropriately modified. Such modifications are demanded by the application of these methods to sections of the Śaiva scriptures that intrinsically differ from the material in other genera of Sanskrit literature for which these methods were developed. Intimately tied to a particular realization by performer or practitioner, a ritual or meditation practice has a nature that certainly parallels but also differs from the literary or verbal existence of any mythologeme, philosopheme, or narrative topos. Although ultimately inaccessible and thus bracketed or suspended from consideration, the inevitable effects of the subjectivity of the performer can not be discounted as a factor responsible for change and innovation in a tradition. And, at the other extreme, objective material conditions, from which purely verbal content is insulated, such as the availability of ritual substances, also affect the performance and thus the form of rituals.

The modifications entailed by the particular content of a text like *Svacchandatantram* affect some of the working rules or principles commonly used when analyzing anonymous works of

Sanskrit literature. The first rule used in comparing multiple versions of a tale, or the like, is that the shorter version is the older.¹ The correlative of this principle assumes the continuous accretion of anonymous works of Sanskrit literature. Despite cogent arguments against the universal application of this principle, in the absence of counter-evidence, which is obviously often difficult to locate, criticism must exclude questions of excision and subtraction and proceed with this working rule.² And, as will be shown, the text of *Svacchandatantram* would appear to confirm this rule, by showing repeated evidence of interpolation and of the extension of earlier systems. In some cases, however, the text qualifies descriptions as summary, and refers along with Kṣemarājaḥ to more comprehensive accounts in other books of *Svacchandatantram* and in other texts.³ This suggests that compilers and redactors could freely condense and reorganize source material, and cautions against the uncritical use of this nonetheless basic principle.

A second rule, or a variation on the first, indicates that the simpler version precedes the more complex.⁴ In

¹ This principle especially forms the basis of the critical edition of the *Mahābhārata*; v. Mahesh M. Mehta, *The Mahābhārata. A Study of the Critical Edition*, Bhāratiya Vidyā Series 34 (Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1976), pp.37ff.

² On the possibility of excision, v. Mehta, *The Mahābhārata*, pp.44ff.

³ For the references to other texts, v. supra the discussion on the *Brhattantrāṇi*; for typical cross-references, v., for example, bk.5, p.25, vs.38: "... *sampujayed ... pūrvoktena vidhānena*" For an example of an alternative procedure marked by the text as an abbreviated description, "*saṃkṣepena*" v. bk.4, vs.404b, p.256.

⁴ V. on the uncritical use of this principle, Rocher, *The Purāṇas*, p.102: "... I agree with the more cautious and open-minded approach, that 'when a series from simple to complex is considered providing the chronological framework, a counter argument that with the passage of time, the same complex situation would get simplified also requires to be carefully considered.'"

Svacchandatantram, while many complicated rituals appear to have been built up out of simple rites, other rites appear to be secondary simplifications of more complicated procedures.¹ In some cases, technical terms forming part of a prior complex system reoccur in simpler contexts. Here only careful examination of all the evidence about the relations of the traditions, and most importantly, the possibility that these terms might have been “de-systematized” and “re-contextualized,” can correct a premature attribution of priority according to the rule that simpler is earlier.

This caution reflects a third working rule that considers a smooth, unitary, and homogeneous treatment of a subject to be later than a traditional, digressive, less logically composed version.² This principle, in turn, relies on the evidence of redaction criticism, which looks for specific signs of textual reworking. Most often, anonymous texts develop through limited operations of compiling, redacting, and localized *retouche*. A thorough recasting characterizes the work of a later, educated milieu and the systematizing of individual authors.

This principle, in turn, reflects a fourth working rule, that a version closer to a Pāṇinian norm is later.³ Corresponding to this

¹ For an examination, in *śrauta* ritual texts, of the construction of complex rituals through the recursive embedding of smaller rites, v. Frits Staal, “Ritual Syntax,” in *Sanskrit and Indian Studies, Essays in Honour of Daniel H.H. Ingalls*, ed. M. Nagatomi, et al. (Dordrecht: E. Reidel Publishing Company, 1980), pp.119–142.

² On this principles in relation to the Upaniṣads, v. Joachim Friedrich Sprockhoff, *Samnyāsa. Quellenstudien zur Askese im Hinduismus*, *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 42,1 (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1976), pp.20–21.

³ V. Friedrich Otto Schrader, “The Kashmir Recension of the Bhagavadgītā,” in Friedrich Otto Schrader *Kleine Schriften*, hrsg. Joachim Friedrich Sprockhoff, *Glaserapp-Stiftung* 19 (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1983), p.182: “Experience in the field of Indian philology has yielded the rule that of two recensions of the same work the longer one is more often than not also the later one. And

presumed typical pattern of assimilation by more educated, or brāhmaṇical circles, comes a fifth principle, that the pronounced sectarian version is normally the later.¹ The same sectarian motives responsible for creating a particular recension of a work, have undoubtedly stimulated sects to construct sectarian variants of particular rituals, myths, or entire genera of literature.² While sectarian rivalry encourages imitation and thereby innovation, sectarian identity and self-consciousness simultaneously contributes to a reverential and conservative attitude toward their own scriptures or their particular recensions. This conservatism, in turn, moulds the redactional process, favoring accumulation, accommodation, and adjustment at the price of repetition, contradiction, and disorder.

1.1.3 Tradition Criticism

Working with such rules, internal literary and redaction criticism can attempt to reconstruct the historical development of the *Svacchandatantram* by carefully analyzing its structure. Before such an analysis, however, a preliminary enumeration of the traditions that have influenced the text would be useful. Such

equally, the approach to Pāṇini's standard, in pre-classical works, as against nonconformance with it, is prima facie a sign of lateness."

¹ Cf. Friedrich Otto Schrader, "Das Ṣaṣṭitantra," 1914, reprint in Friedrich Otto Schrader *Kleine Schriften*, hrsg. Joachim Friedrich Sprockhoff, Glasenapp-Stiftung 19 (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1983), p.110: "... *Ahīrbudhnya-Saṃhitā*, ein aus 60 *Adhyāyas* bestehendes *Śloka*werk, dessen relativ hohes Alter sich u. a. bekundet durch seiner auffallend unsektarischen Charakter." On the history and shortcoming of the sectarian is later reasoning, v. Rocher, *The Purāṇas*, pp.18ff.

² The *Īśvaragītā* offers a good example of this process; as noted by P.E. Dumont, trans., *L'Īśvaragītā. Le Chant de Śiva, texte extrait du Kūrma-purāṇa* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1933), p.8: "*L'Īśvaragītā apparaît donc comme une œuvre composite et surtout comme une imitation de la Bhagavadgītā.*"

tradition criticism, even in a general form, provides the general support and direction for more specific hypotheses about the actual documentary sources employed in constructing the text and the identity of its compilers and redactors. Once again, internal references to tradition found in the text, and the citations and cross-references made by Kṣemarājaḥ serve as the starting point, offering the initial blueprint for this tradition criticism. Some of these traditions undoubtedly affected the compilers of *Svacchandatantram* directly, in the form of source texts and traditional teaching; others perhaps affected them only indirectly through these sources, though later educated redactors and commentators clearly possessed first hand knowledge of multiple traditions.

Vedic and brāhmaṇical tradition, specifically *śrauta* and *smārta* precepts and practice, form the first stratum in the history of *Svacchandatantram*. In contrast to, and in the likeness of, this tradition, sectarian Śaivism has formed its own scriptures, rituals, and prescriptive identity. *Svacchandatantram* rejects the cornerstone of *smārta* tradition, the *varṇa* system and the preeminence of the brāhmaṇaḥ, which is replaced with the organized community of Śaiva initiates embracing all of society.¹ It remains possible, however, that this rejection may have had only a ritual extension, which left the social order intact, and which thus presumed complimentary coexistence with the *smārta* tradition.²

¹ The elimination of possible rebirths through the Śaiva initiation that bestows liberation (*nirvāṇadīkṣā*), includes purifying rebirth or current status as a brāhmaṇaḥ. In order to remove this status, the ritual proceeds by purifying each of forty-eight rites that confer and accompany brāhmaṇa existence, and thus presumes a knowledge of *dharma* texts. (V. bk.10, pp.159ff, and infra section II.10.2.)

² At the end of the initiation in bk.4, for example, when enumerating the obligations of the new Śaiva initiates, the text

Certainly, tantric ritual presupposes brāhmaṇical ritual, though for a particular scripture or even a group of scriptures it is difficult to determine whether they exhibit direct knowledge of *śrauta* and *smārta* rites, or only indirect influence through intermediary traditions.¹ The initiation liturgy (*dikṣā*) which forms the center of Śaiva ritual, and the daily worship at the fire, oblation, and so forth, parallel and develop *śrauta* ceremony.² Only once, however, during its description of the consecration of the Śaiva master (*ācāryaḥ*), which appears calqued on the Vedic royal consecration, does the text actually allude to this parallelism.³

Clarifying the relationship between sectarian and brāhmaṇical traditions would entail determining the formative role brāhmaṇāḥ conversant with orthodox traditions played in the development of Śaivism, and the role properly extra-brāhmaṇical circles had in the development of Śaiva practice. Counter-arguments exist that specific *smārta* rites, for example, of bathing (*snānam*), oblation

threatens punishment and prescribes expiation for anyone who even mentions prior caste. V. bk.4, vs.544b, p.331: "*prāgjātyudiraṇāddevi prāyaścitti bhavennaraḥ*." In the enumerating of obligations at the end of the initiation in bk.5, however, the text, mentioning the *smārta* tradition for the only time, states that it must be respected. V. bk.5, vs.45a, p.39: "*smārttaṁ dharmaṁ na nindettu ācārapathadarsakam*."

¹ Cf. *infra* section for a discussion of the Pāśupatāḥ.

² On the history of initiation rituals in India, v. Jan Gonda, *Change and Continuity in Indian Religion*, Disputationes Rheno-Trajectinae 9 (The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1965), pp.315-416.

³ Bk.4, vs.443b, p.278: "... *yathā nrpatve samprāpte kalaśaiścābhīṣicyate*." On the Vedic royal consecration v. J.C. Heesterman, *The Ancient Indian Royal Consecration*, Disputationes Rheno-Trajectinae 2 (The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1957), esp. pp.114-122.

(*homah*), and the like, actually developed in reaction to comparable *tantric* and *āgamic* rites.¹

This problem reflects the larger difficulty surrounding the development of Vedic tradition. For at the periphery of *śrauta* and *smārta* practice, but nevertheless in the Vedic tradition as represented particularly by texts like the *Śatarudriyam* associated with the *Yajurvedaḥ*, are found many antecedents to the practices presented by *Svacchandatantram*. These texts may be seen either as already reflecting extra-Vedic influence, or as documenting those portions of the Vedic tradition later elaborated in sectarian tradition.

Sections of these peripheral "Vedic" texts and their corresponding traditions, though closely related to the first stratum, may be considered a second Rudra stratum in the history of our text because of their less clear origin and historical association. Specifically, part of the *Śatarudriyam* has provided the Bahurūpa formula of *sakala Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ*, used in his primary rituals throughout *Svacchandatantram*.² In general, the cemetery and crossroads rites performed to Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ continue many of the rites in earlier *śrauta* texts directed to

¹ V. Vishwambhar Sharan Pathak, *Smārta Religious Tradition* (Meerut: Kusumanjali Prakashan, 1987), pp.33.ff.

² On the *Śatarudriyam*, v. Jan Gonda, "The Śatarudriya," in *Sanskrit and Indian Studies, Essays in Honour of Daniel H.H. Ingalls*, ed. M. Nagatomi, et al. (Dordrecht: E. Reidel Publishing Company, 1980), pp.75-91. The source for the thirty-two syllable Bahurūpa formula is *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā*, 2, 9, 10. (V. Leopold von Schroeder, hrsg., *Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā*, 2 (Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1923), pp.130.) Later Upaniṣads like the *Mahānārāyaṇa* also contain this formula. (V. Jean Varenne, *La Mahā Nārāyaṇa Upaniṣad* 1 Publications de l'institut de civilisation indienne 11 (Paris: Institut de civilisation indienne, 1960), vss.282-283, pp.70-71.) Cf. also infra the discussion of the Pāsupatāḥ for the Bahurūpa formula.

Rudraḥ.¹ The *Mānavaśrautasūtram*, for example, records a solitary formula rite to Rudraḥ that anticipates features both of daily worship and the special adept's practice described in *Svacchandatantram*.²

Many of the rites described in *Svacchandatantram* employ the Praṇava formula, considered the formula of *niṣkala*-Svacchandaḥ. These rites in which the practitioner meditates upon

¹ V., for example, Ernst Arbman, *Rudra. Untersuchungen zum altindischen Glauben und Kultus* (Uppsala: Appelbergs Boktryckeri Aktiebolag, 1922), pp.56ff; v. also Jan Gonda, *Vedic Ritual. The Non-Solemn Rites*, Handbuch der Orientalistik, Zweite Abteilung, Vierter Band Religionen, Erster Abschnitt Vedic Ritual (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1980), pp.238-239. For a typical magical rite at the crossroads in *Svacchandatantram*, v. bk.6, vs.74, p.155.

² V. Gonda, "The Śatarudriya," pp.77-78. Gonda dates this text, if not this section, to the third century A.D. The *Mānavaśrautasūtram* is associated with the *Maitrāyaṇi-Saṃhitā* of the *Kṛṣṇa-Yajurvedaḥ*. (V. Jan Gonda, *The Ritual Sūtras, A History of Indian Literature* 2, 2 (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1977): 525ff.) As in the rites described by *Svacchandatantram*, in this rite, notably, the practitioner identifies himself with Rudraḥ by imposing formulæ on his body and meditating on the form of Rudraḥ, who like later forms of Śivaḥ) has five faces, ten arms, and so forth. The text also lauds this formula repetition (*jāpaḥ*), performed with accompanying oblations, and the like, as if a separate ritual with tremendous efficacy and purifying power. (V. J. M. van Gelder, ed. and trans., *Mānava Śrautasūtra*, 1 Śata-Piṭaka Series, Indo-Asian Literatures 17 (New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1961), 11.7.1, 11.7.2, 11.7.3).

The Pāsupata tradition (on which v. infra) records a similar rite and likely mediated its transmission to circles who elaborated *Svacchandatantram*. (V. Kaundinya's *Pañcārthabhāṣyam*, in R. Ananthakrishna Sastri, ed., *Pasupata Sutras with Pancharthabhasya of Kaundinya*, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series 143 (Trivandrum: Oriental Manuscripts Library of the University of Travancore, 1940)) on 5, 30-38, pp.129ff, which enjoins the ascetic to conduct a meditation in a burning ground (*"śmaśānavāśī"*), or according to the commentary in another deserted place, in order to obtain union with Rudraḥ; v. also pp.60-61 of Minoru Hara, "Miscellanea Pasupatica," in *Kavirāj Abhinandana Grantha* (Lucknow: Akhila Bhāratiya Saṃskṛta Paṇḍit, 1967), pp.55-65.

various components of this formula in conjunction with the movements of his breath show the clear influence of both earlier Vedic traditions that condensed the study of the Vedāḥ into a meditation on the Praṇavaḥ, and of interiorized ritual, in rites such as the *prāṇāgnihotraḥ* focussed on the inner breaths.¹ These texts thus constitute a third strata in the history of *Svacchandatantram*, of Vedic meta-ritualist and ascetic speculation.² Once again, since many different sects and groups later cultivated these practices, the proximate source for scriptures

¹ For the early Vedic development of the practice of personal meditative recitation, and in particular concentration on the Praṇavaḥ, v. Charles Malamoud, *Le Svādhyāya. Récitation personnelle du Veda. Taittiriya-Āraṇyaka, Livre II*, Publications de l'Institut de civilisation indienne 42 (Paris: Institut de civilisation indienne 1977), esp. pp.24, 86-87. On the *prāṇāgnihotraḥ*, v. H.W.Bodewitz, trans., *Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa I, 1-65, Translation and Commentary, with a Study Agnihotra and Prāṇāgnihotraḥ*, Orientalia Rheno-Traiectina (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1973). When discussing the formula meditation pursued in the breath by the adept, Kṣemarājaḥ quotes a text that compares these rites to the *agnihotraḥ*. (V. bk.7, p.177, where he quotes the *Kakṣyāstotram*.)

² *Svacchandatantram* draws on and elaborates a complex of practices centered on the symbol of the *haṁsaḥ*, or migrating goose, which represents the breath or the H- that always accompanies the Praṇavaḥ, the individual and supreme soul, and the meditative realization of supreme identity embodied in the formula repetition this (*saḥ*) is I (*aḥam*). (V. for the meaning of the *haṁsaḥ*, Kṣemarāja's commentary on bk.6, pp.109ff, and for the *haṁsaḥ* meditation, bk.4, vs.399, pp.252-253.) In Upaniṣadic traditions the *haṁsaḥ* also symbolizes and designates the wandering ascetic or renunciate, and specifically classes of Śaiva ascetics. (On the symbolism of the *haṁsaḥ* in the older Upaniṣads v. Sprockhoff, *Saṁnyāsa*, pp.83ff.; on its designation of Śaiva ascetics, pp.132ff.)

like *Svacchandatantram* remains difficult to isolate.¹ Some continuity can be supposed between ascetic milieus cognizant of such meta-ritualistic speculations in the Brāhmaṇas and in older Upaniṣads and the bearers of Śaiva traditions.²

Closely related to the preceding strata, brāhmaṇical *śāstrāṇi* constitute a fourth stratum influential in the development of *Svacchandatantram*. Lacking organized expository or polemical sections, *Svacchandatantram* does not show direct evidence of borrowing from such texts. In their developed formula practice, technical terms, and verbal cosmology, however, the Śaiva scriptures display strong similarities to speculative grammatical thought as epitomized in the work of Bhartrhariḥ.³ Later Śaiva authors in Kāśmīr, of course, were fully versed in this thought, and if one accepts an early date for Bhartrhariḥ, then the influence of his school on the anonymous Śaiva texts as well seems

¹ For representative discussions of the Praṇavaḥ, showing the later widespread, cross-sectarian, nature of this practice, cf. Pandit Dhundhirāja Śāstri, ed., *Praṇava Kalpa from Śrī Skandapurāṇa with the commentary Praṇava Kalpa Prakāśa Praṇava Bhāṣya by Pandit Gangādharendra Sarasvatī*, The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series 418 (Benares: The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, Vidya Vilas Press, 1933); for a complementary work and study, cf. Patrick Olivelle, "Praṇavamīmāṃsā A Newly Discovered Work of Vidyāraṇya," *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 62 (1-4, 1981): 77-101.

Accordingly, in bk.5, p.108, Kṣemarājaḥ states that *Svacchandatantram* has asserted the identity of its Praṇavaḥ and knowledge of Śivaḥ, in order to differentiate it from the similar Praṇavaḥ found in other traditions ("vedagāruḍavaiṣṇavādiṣu rūpasāmye 'pi ...").

² V. also infra on the Pāsupatāḥ.

³ V. David Seyforth Ruegg, "La spéculation linguistique dans les Āgama Sivaïtes," in David Seyforth Ruegg, *Contributions à l'histoire de la philosophie linguistique indienne*, Publications de l'institut de civilisation indienne 7 (Paris: Institut de civilisation indienne 1959), pp.101-116.

likely.¹ Alternatively, this influence could have been mediated by a secondary tradition, or the similarities could derive from pre-scriptural sources known both to Bhartṛhariḥ and the compilers of the Śaiva scriptures.²

Like grammatical teaching, logic also had strong associations with Śaivas.³ *Svacchandatantram* mentions logic several times, but only to single it out for condemnation, beyond even its usual rejection of rival doctrines.⁴ In addition, astronomical and astrological learning (*jyotiḥśāstram*), herbal and anatomical teaching (*āyurvedaḥ*), and terms from musical treatises occur in *Svacchandatantram*, but perhaps had a general influence mediated

¹ Accepting the date proposed for Bhartṛhariḥ by Frauwallner, 450–510 A.D., would place him at the earliest limit for the development of the Śaiva scriptures. (V. Erich Frauwallner, "Landmarks in the History of Indian Logic," in Erich Frauwallner, *Kleine Schriften*, hrsg. Gerhard Oberhammer und Ernst Steinkellner, Glasenapp-Stiftung 22 (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1982), pp.856ff). Kṣemarājaḥ, for example, quotes Bhartṛhariḥ in bk.12, p.6.

² On the unclarified relations between sectarian Śaivas and Bhartṛhariḥ, v. Ruegg, *Contributions*, pp.62–63. V. infra on the name Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ for another sign of possible influence from the tradition of Bhartṛhariḥ.

³ On the connections between Pāsupata Śaivism and the later Naiyāyikāḥ, v. Gerhard Oberhammer, *Wahrheit und Transzendenz. ein Beitrag zur Spiritualität des Nyāya*, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens 18. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte 424 (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1984), esp., pp.67ff. Oberhammer notes (p.67): "Fest steht schließlich, daß Nyāya nach Pakṣilasvāmin, soweit er überliefert ist, śivaitisch geworden ist." (On p.vii, Oberhammer dates Pakṣilasvāmin Vātsyāyana, to c. fifth century A.D.).

⁴ Thus, for example, among the characteristics that disqualify a person as a good master, *Svacchandatantram* includes (Bk.1, vs.26, p.23) being a logician (*tārkikaḥ*). For an extended condemnation of logic as a useless discipline, v. bk.11, pp.98–100.

only by secondary texts like the Purāṇas.¹ Other *śāstraic* branches of learning appear only in Kṣemarāja's commentary.²

Other traditional doctrines (*darśanāni*), which stand farther removed from the brāhmaṇical associations of the preceding strata, constitute the fifth stratum in the history of *Svacchandatantram*. Some like the Jains, Vaiśeṣikāḥ, and materialists, mentioned solely in the lists of rejected doctrines, have left no discernible imprint on this text.³ The Buddhists, though very influential in the genesis of philosophical Śaivism, and mentioned frequently as a major sectarian rival, nevertheless appear to have had little direct influence on the text.⁴

The two doctrines of Yogaḥ and Sāṃkhyam, however, which come above the Buddhists in the more inclusive lists of inferior systems set out in *Svacchandatantram*, had great historical influence on this text.⁵ Śaiva metaphysics and cosmology have

¹ On the first, v., for example, bk.10, pp.216–217, where Kṣemarājaḥ, quotes *jyotiḥśāstram* to illustrate the astronomical statements of *Svacchandatantram*, but nevertheless denies that it should be interpreted according to the teaching of this school; on the second, v. bk.6, pp.149ff, where *Svacchandatantram* describes magical preparations using herbs; on the third, v., for example, bk.10, pp.344–345, where commenting on the musical world of Śrī, Kṣemarājaḥ refers to the *Nāṭyaśāstram*, to elucidate the statements of *Svacchandatantram*.

² A possible exception may be the reference (Bk.6, vs.20, p.123) to *prākṛta*- and *vikṛta*-forms of a formula, which may indicate, at least in this redactorial addition, awareness of basic *Mīmāṃsā* concepts.

³ For the most complete list of rejected doctrines, v. bk.10, p.282ff.

⁴ A possible exception might be the use of the term void (*śūnyam*) to characterize the relative degrees of existence in a series of meditational attainments. (V. bk.4, pp.185–189.)

⁵ In these lists and in its cosmological descriptions, *Svacchandatantram* ranks these systems by indicating the plane of

incorporated the Sāṃkhya system, and built their own categories upon its pre-existing edifice.¹ Repeated statements of superiority and differentiation from the Sāṃkhya system betray this undeniable indebtedness.² Precise charting of this well documented developmental borrowing runs into obstacles, however, due to the loss of early Sāṃkhya texts and related information about important Sāṃkhya teachers, their milieus, and meditational practices.³ It seems certain, however, that the compilers of Śaiva scriptures such as *Svacchandatantram* have drawn on Sāṃkhya material found both in the *Mahābhārata* and Purāṇic texts as well as in classical Sāṃkhya sources.⁴

As a sixth stratum in the development of the *Svacchandatantram*, therefore, come the epics and Purāṇas,

the universe that their adherents reach. Thus the Buddhists, though supposing themselves liberated, only attain the plane of the intellect (*buddhiḥ*), the Sāṃkhyam, the plane of the person (*puruṣaḥ*), and so forth. In this way, the text indicates its perceived closeness to these systems, and suggests the kind of historical connections it had with them.

¹ For a study of the connections between Sāṃkhya-Yogaḥ and a later Śaiva text, v. Gerhard Oberhammer, *Strukturen Yogischer Meditation. Untersuchungen zur Spiritualität des Yoga*, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasien 13. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte 322 (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1977), pp.57-133

² For a typical reinterpretation and depreciation of Sāṃkhya liberation, by *Svacchandatantram*, v. the summary of bk.12, p.32.

³ V. Oberhammer, *Strukturen*, pp.17-56 for an attempt on the basis of the *Yuktidīpikā*, to reconstruct a properly Sāṃkhya spiritual practice.

⁴ V. the summary of bk.10, pp.441-443, where *Svacchandatantram* as indicated by Kṣemarājaḥ appear to be quoting classical Sāṃkhya texts, and the summary of bk.11, pp.58ff, where *Svacchandatantram* appears to be utilizing Sāṃkhya material found in the *Mahābhārata*.

which *Svacchandatantram* explicitly acknowledges as an established base of traditional teaching.¹ In its extensive cosmological accounts, *Svacchandatantram*, accordingly, has borrowed, modified, and extended the Purāṇic cosmology.² Similarly, in describing the sequential emanation of the Sāṃkhya categories, *Svacchandatantram* appears to follow the order common in Purāṇic accounts rather than that established in classical Sāṃkhya.³ Whether the Purāṇas served as a mediator of other traditions and practices for the Śaivas, or whether Purāṇic and Śaiva scriptures both commonly drew upon documents and traditions no longer attested in other sources or extant in independent form, must be decided on a case by case basis. While the encyclopædic nature of the Purāṇas makes them invaluable resources for studying sectarian religion, their composite nature, which has changed continuously in the course of transmission, makes any attribution of genetic or source priority vis-à-vis individual sectarian texts historically problematic.⁴

¹ V., for example, bk.12, p.62, vs.120, where *Svacchandatantram* extolls the superiority of Śaiva knowledge vis-à-vis adherents of the Purāṇas and other doctrines deluded by Māyā: “*sāṃkhyavedapurāṇajñā anyasāstravidaśca*”

² Thus, for example, in commenting upon *Svacchandatantra*’s description of the winds, Kṣemarājaḥ quotes not another Śaiva text but the Purāṇas. (V. bk.10, pp.218–219.)

³ V. the summary of bk.11, pp.56ff.

⁴ Thus R.C. Hazra, for example, states that the “Tantras (including the Pāñcarātra Saṃhitās and the Śaiva Agamas” began to influence the Purāṇas only at the end of the eight or beginning of the ninth century A.D. (V. R.C. Hazra, *Studies in the Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs* (1940. Reprint. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1975), pp.260ff.). Vrajavallabha Dwivedi also argues that the Purāṇas have used *āgamāḥ* and *tantrāṇi* as primary sources. (Vrajavallabha Dwivedi, “Purāṇānām nūnam āgamamūlakatvam,” *Purāṇa* 26, 1 (1984): 3–15.)

Next in the inclusive hierarchy of sects listed in the *Svacchandatantram*, immediately before the properly Śaiva traditions, comes the Pāñcarātraḥ, which forms the seventh and most important non-Śaiva stratum to be considered in the development of texts like *Svacchandatantram*.¹ Both Śaiva and Pāñcarātra scriptures share many features and topics, and sectarian rivalry characterized by concurrent imitation certainly accounts for much of this similarity.² The *Mahābhāratam* mentions the Pāñcarātra sect, and some scholars, accordingly, have dated Pāñcarātra texts earlier than the Śaiva āgamāḥ.³ In that case, the Pāñcarātra tradition might have played a seminal role in the development of Śaiva traditions. If these early dates are rejected, however, then the similarities between Śaiva and Pāñcarātra scriptures must be examined on a case by case basis. An important contribution of the Pāñcarātraḥ might have been in

¹ V. bk.10, p.283, vs.676, for one reference to the Pāñcarātraḥ and Kṣemarāja's categorization of their doctrine.

² Schrader, *Introduction to the Pāñcarātra*, thought that many of the Pāñcarātra Sāṃhitās were composed in north India and specifically Kāśmir. (V. pp.18–22, 110ff.) For an introduction to Śaiva and Pāñcarātra scriptures, and a comparative study of the cosmology, v. Vrajavallabha Dwivedi, "Vaiṣṇaveṣu taditareṣu cāgemeṣu ṣaḍadhvavimarśaḥ," in *Tantra-Yātra*, pp.14ff.

³ V. Schrader, *Introduction to the Pāñcarātra*, pp.16–18 for a refutation of the arguments based evidence in the *Mahābhāratam*. In the introduction to his edition of the *Jayākhyasāṃhitā*, E. Khrishnamacharya dated the text on palaeographical grounds to 450 A.D. (V. Embar Krishnamacharya, ed., *Jāyākhyasāṃhitā of Pāñcarātra Āgama*, Gaekwad's Oriental Series 54 (1931. Reprint. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1967), p.34.) Gonda (*Medieval Religious Literature in Sanskrit*, pp.53–54) rejects this dating, and places the composition of the Pāñcarātra Sāṃhitās between 600 and 850 A.D.

the modification of the Sāṃkhya cosmology through the addition of Māyā as an essential phase in the theistic scheme of emanation.¹

Next, in a direct line of tradition stands the eighth stratum of the Pāśupatāḥ, which *Svacchandatantram* recognizes as the system ranking right beneath itself in the inclusive hierarchy of systems.² The Pāśupatāḥ form the oldest known Śaiva sect, and

¹ V. Schrader, *Introduction to the Pāñcarātra*, p.74; cf. Paul Hacker, *Vivarta. Studien zur Geschichte der illusionistischen Kosmologie und Erkenntnistheorie der Inder*, Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Mainz, Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur 5 (1953), p.235, and Paul Hacker, "Eigentümlichkeiten der Lehre und Terminologie Śaṅkaras," Paul Hacker *Kleine Schriften*, hrsg. Lambert Schmithausen, Glasenapp-Stiftung 15 (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1978), pp.97-98.

² V., for example, bk.11, pp.52-54. Cf. the summary of this section, which considers whether it contains an interpolation.

The text itself actually states that the Vaimalāḥ perform the Kapāla observance. In this case, they might tentatively be identified as Kāpālikāḥ. The Kārukāḥ, called in other sources, the Kāruka-siddhāntins, might then be later identified according to the hypothesis proposed by R.G. Bhandarkar, as the Kālāmukhas. Since the text mentions the Śaivas immediately afterward, it would then be distinguishing, as Bhandarkar noted in other later medieval sources, four Śaiva sects, the Pāśupatāḥ, the Kālāmukhāḥ, the Kāpālikāḥ, and the Śaivāḥ proper.

The close historical and social connections among the Pāśupatāḥ, the Kālāmukhāḥ, the Kāpālikāḥ, attested by the interchangeability of epithets, would account for Kṣemarāja's here classing the Mausulāḥ, Kārukāḥ, and Vaimalāḥ together as varieties of Pāśupatāḥ. (V. R.G. Bhandarkar, *Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism, and Minor Religious Systems* (1913. Reprint. New Delhi: Asian Educational Services, 1983), §91, pp.169-173.) David Lorenzen rejects Bhandarkar's derivation of the Kārukāḥ from a disciple of Lakuleśaḥ, but accepts their identification with the Kālāmukhāḥ, and confirms their close relation in practice and ritual with the Pāśupatāḥ. On Lakuleśaḥ, v. David Lorenzen, *The Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972), pp.175ff; on the Kārukāḥ, or Kāruka-siddhāntins, p.182; pp.175-176; and on the Kālāmukhāḥ, pp.97ff, especially p.107. On the location and various designations of Kārohaṇam, v. Minoru Hara, "Miscellanea Pasupatica," pp.58ff.

represent the organized precursor of scriptural Śaivism.¹ The text here apparently distinguishes three different branches of the Pāśupatāḥ, the Mausulāḥ, Kārukāḥ, and Vaimalāḥ. According to Kṣemarāja's interpretation, the Mausulāḥ are named after the disciple of Lakuleśaḥ, the traditional founder of the Pāśupatāḥ, Musālendrah, and the Kārukaḥ, after another disciple associated with the traditional site of Śiva's incarnation as Lakuleśaḥ at Kārohaṇam. They are distinguished by performing different forms of the Pāśupata observance (*vrataṃ*). The text states that the first two, the Mausulāḥ and Kārukāḥ, reach worlds in the plane of Māyā through their observance, while the Vaimalāḥ, who follow, according to Kṣemarājaḥ, another form of the Pāśupata observance, obtain the higher plane of Īśvaraḥ. Later sectarian Śaivas absorbed and modified many of their characteristic beliefs and practices.² These include, notably, the preeminence of formula practice, the ritual use of ashes, and the triadic theology of the

¹ An often quoted section in the "Mokṣadharmaparva" of the *Mahābhārata* (Vishnu S. Sukthankar and S.K. Belvalkar, eds., *The Mahābhārata* 16 *The Śāntiparvan*. 3 Mokṣadharma, B (Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1954) 12.337.58ff, pp.1974ff) lists the Pāśupatāḥ, alongside the Sāṃkhyam, Yogaḥ, Vedaḥ, and Pāñcarātraḥ, as established traditions. Significantly, this passage (vs.62) states that the promulgator of this doctrine is Umāpatiḥ, Śrīkaṇṭhaḥ. In *Svacchandatantram*, as well, Śrīkaṇṭhaḥ is the transmitter of the Śaiva revelation, which he received from Umāpatiḥ, who is equated with a lower form of Bhairavaḥ. (On Śrīkaṇṭhaḥ, v. bk.8, p.22-23; on the equation of Umāpatiḥ and Bhairavaḥ by both the text and Kṣemarājaḥ, v. bk.10, p.422.)

For the relations between scriptural Śaivism and Pāśupata Śaivism, v. Hélène Brunner-Lachaux, "The Pāśupatas as seen by the Śaivas," in *Sanskrit and World Culture*, ed. Wolfgang Morgenroth (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1986), pp.513-520.

² For a brief list of similarites, v. Brunner-Lachaux, "The Pāśupatas as seen by the Śaivas," p.520, n.27.

lord (*patiḥ*), bonded being or animal (*paśuḥ*), and the bond (*pāśaḥ*).¹ Building on this inherited symbolism, the Śaiva initiation liturgically acts out the cutting of the initiate's bond by the power of Śivaḥ incarnate in the master and the rest of the ritual paraphernalia. In particular, the Pāśupata scriptures prescribe the recitation of the Praṇavaḥ and of the Bahurūpa formula, which as the formula of Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ, constitutes the center of many of the practices set out by *Svacchandatantram*.² The Pāśupata theological characterization of the highest lord (*īśvaraḥ*) as the cause (*kāraṇam*) who acts without any external constraints through his own desire would seem to have provided the doctrinal

¹ On the smearing with ashes or the ash bath, v. *Pāśupatasūtram*, I, 2; it is performed by the ascetic Śaiva devotee, according to Kṣemarājaḥ, bk.2, p.10; on the triad *patiḥ*, and so forth, v. Sastri, *Pasupata Sutras with Pancharthabhasya of Kaundinya*, I, 1, pp.5ff.

² V. for the Praṇava meditation, v. Sastri, *Pasupata Sutras with Pancharthabhasya of Kaundinya*, 5, 24, p.124; for the use of the formula, "om̐ aghorebhyoḥ . . .," 3, 21-26, pp.89ff, and *Svacchandatantram*, bk.1, pp.34ff. On the designation Bahurūpaḥ, v. Sastri, *Pasupata Sutras with Pancharthabhasya of Kaundinya*, I, 17, p.39.

As indicated by the *Pāśupatasūtram*, and by the statement of *Svacchandatantram* itself, which calls this formula (Bk.10, p.36) the Aghoraḥ king of formulæ (*Aghoraḥ mantrarājaḥ*), Svachchanda-bhairava's formula is the identical to the formula of Aghoraḥ, one of Śiva's five faces, whose formulæ are drawn from the *Taittiriya Āraṇyaka*, 10, 43-47. This identity is confirmed by the designation Aghoreśvari (Bk.1, p.61) for Svachchanda's Devī. As the supreme Śivaḥ, however, Svachchandaḥ still retains Aghoraḥ as one of his five faces, though Kṣemarājaḥ apparently does not indicate (Bk.1, p.45) the continued use of the Bahurūpa formula for his worship. (On the formulæ of the five faces, v. the notes in Bhatt's edition of the *Rauravāgama*, N.R. Bhatt, ed., *Rauravāgama* 1, Publications de l'institut français d'indologie 18 (Pondichéry: Institut français d'indologie, 1961): 22ff.)

basis for the very name of "Svacchanda"-bhairavaḥ.¹ Though these Pāśupata scriptures can not be dated with certainty before the earliest stages in the compiling of the sectarian Śaiva scriptures, it remains nevertheless, highly probable that antecedent Pāśupata

¹ V. on the freedom of action of the lord, Sastri, *Pasupata Sutras with Pancharthabhasya of Kaundinya*, 2, 6, p.60; for the use of cause (*kāraṇam*) to designate *īśvaraḥ*, v. Minoru Hara, "Nakuliśa-Pāśupata-Darśanam," *Indo-Iranian Journal* 2, 1 (1958): 24, and n.102. In bk.11, vss.316ff, pp.170ff, the text characterizes the action of the lord in language very similar to that of Kaundīya's *Pañcārthabhāṣyam*.

The Pāśupata-Naiyāyikaḥ Bhāsarvajñaḥ expresses this theology in language even closer to that implied by the name of Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ. As summarized by Gerhard Oberhammer (Oberhammer, *Wahrheit und Transzendenz*, p.89): "*Versucht man nämlich jenen Begriff zu finden, in dem sich das Wesen dieses höchsten Ātmā verdichten und aus dem alle diese anderen Bestimmungen als notwendige Bedingungen seiner Möglichkeiten abgeleitet werden können, so ist es der eines absolute, souverän, d.h. unabhängig wirkenden Urheber (svatantraḥ kartā) aller Wirklichkeit.*" In this interpretation, "svacchanda-" in the name Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ may be taken as a synonym of "svatantra-."

Alternatively or complementarily, the conceptual basis for this name may have been supplied by the linguistic theology of Bhartrhariḥ. There, similarly on the basis of the Pāṇinian characterization of the agent (*kartā*) as autonomous (*svatantraḥ*), the lord, as supreme agent, has autonomy (*svātantryam*) as his first and highest (*śaktiḥ*). Similarly, in the Śaiva theology of emanation represented by *Svacchandatantram*, the lord first spontaneously manifests through his desire (*icchā*) which is his basic power or goddess. While the text does not refer to this concept directly, one section (Bk.7, p.318, vs.255) does characterize the realized adept who has become identified with Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ as autonomous and possessing undiminished capability (*"svatantra 'luptasāmarthyas-"*)

(On Bhartrhariḥ v. Ruegg, *Contributions*, p.66, and K. A. Subramania Iyer, *A Study of the Vākyapadiya in the light of the Ancient Commentaries*, Deccan College Building Centenary and Silver Jubilee Series 68 (Poona: Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute, 1969), pp.110ff; On the concept of the *svatantrā śaktiḥ*, v. Gopinath Kaviraj, *Aspects of Indian Thought* (Burdwan: The University of Burdwan, 1966), pp.220-223; for Kṣemarāja's explanation of the title v. his commentary in bk.1, pp.9-10.)

circles constituted the proximate and immediate source for many of the practices described in *Svacchandatantram*.¹ The Pāśupata tradition, therefore, has apparently transmitted the Vedic formulæ, discussed previously, and the ascetic traditions of formula meditation taught in *Svacchandatantram*. In addition, it appears to have first incorporated and adapted the Sāṃkhya system that serves as the foundation for the scriptural metaphysics of sectarian Śaivism. *Svacchandatantram* apparently has incorporated not only the Sāṃkhya system through the Pāśupatāḥ but even parts of their polemic against the Sāṃkhyam.²

¹ Kaundinya's *Pañcārthabhāṣyam* on *Pāśupatasūtram* is usually dated to c. 600 A.D., and the *Ganakārikā* with the *Ratnatikā* commentary attributed to Bhāsarvajñaḥ to c. 950 A.D. (V. Hara, "Nakuliśa-Pāśupata-Darśanam," pp.9-11; Oberhammer, *Wahrheit und Transzendenz*, pp.107-108, n.170 and n.171.) Other anonymous texts, such as the *Atharvaśīras* Upanisad, the *Līṅga* and *Kūrma-Purāṇas* also contain Pāśupata materials. The *Līṅga*, for example, records the Bahurūpa formula. (V. J.L.Shastri, ed., *Līṅgapurāṇa of Sage Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana Vyāsa with Sanskrit Commentary Śivatosinī of Gaṇeśa Nātu* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1980), 2, 26, 6, p.176.) In the absence of precise dates and clear sectarian history, however, the exact sources and lines of transmission of Pāśupata doctrines to the compilers of *Svacchandatantram* can not be determined.

² V. for the general incorporation of the Sāṃkhyam by the Pāśupatāḥ, Friedrich August Schultz, *Die philosophisch-theologische Lehren des Pāśupata-Systems nach dem Pañcārthabhāṣya und der Ratnatikā* (Walldorf-Hessen: Verlag für Orientkunde Dr. H. Vorndran, 1958), pp.27ff; on the polemics between the Pāśupata-Naiyāyikāḥ and Sāṃkhyam, v. Minoru Hara, "Pāśupata and Sāṃkhya-Yoga," *Journal of Oriental Research* (Madras) 34-35 (1973): 76-87, and George Chemparathy, "The Testimony of the Yuktidipikā Concerning the Īśvara Doctrine of the Pāśupatas and Vaiśeṣikas," *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens* 9 (1965): 119-146, esp. 123. There Chemparathy notes that the Yuktidipikākāra's explicitly rejects the *puruṣaḥ* as an agent. *Svacchandatantram* apparently contains direct echoes of this debate. In bk.12, p.31, the text attributes the identical assertion of non-agency to the Sāṃkhyam as the characteristic of their liberation, and rejects it as delusional; the self at this stage, the text confirms, remains subject to Īśvaraḥ.

In contrast to the Pāśupatāḥ, the Śaiva scriptures assign a preeminent and indispensable place to their ritual of *dikṣā* or initiation, though many of its promised benefits incorporate the stated results of Pāśupata practice.¹ Socially and historically, the two branches of Śaivism differ since the Pāśupatāḥ appear to have been exclusively brāhmaṇa ascetics, while at least by its own declarations, *Svacchandatantram* professes to be open to all ranks of initiates from all groups of society.² But the ascetic and

¹ For a declaration that only Śaiva initiation confers liberation, v. bk.10, vss.704-705, pp.296-297.

Unlike lower ranked and more distant systems, such as the Buddhists, *Svacchandatantram* states that the followers of the Pāśupata and Kāpālika observance, though not able to obtain liberation through their practice, nevertheless do not become subject once again to transmigration. Rather they proceed, after subsequent purification, from their comparatively high level of attainment, the plane of Īśvaraḥ, to liberation. (V. bk.11, p.103). Similarly, the Vaimalāḥ, who follow the Kāpālika observance, and who are closest to the Śaivāḥ proper, apparently obtain their slightly higher status due to their purification by an initiation related to the Śaiva initiation. (V. bk.11, p.53, vs.73, and commentary.)

Similarly, in the description of the cosmology in bk.10, (pp.252-253), the text mentions, without sectarian designation, *lingam* worshippers who inhabit the much lower world of Rudraḥ, still located at the plane of earth in the egg of Brahmā. The text apparently alludes here to early or causal Rudraḥ or Śivaḥ worshippers, prior to or outside of the organized Śaiva sects such as the Pāśupatāḥ. Though attaining only this low level and failing to attain liberation because they are deprived of the knowledge conferred by initiation, (*dikṣājñānavihināḥ*), they, nevertheless, the text asserts, do not reenter transmigration, but through supplemental grace proceed upward to the abode of the supreme Śivaḥ.

² A large part of Pāśupata practice requires concealing their status as celibate brāhmaṇāḥ and engaging in seemingly reprehensible practices in order to obtain merit by unjustified condemnation. (V. Minoru Hara, "Transfer of Merit," *Adyar Library Bulletin* 31-32 (1967-68): 397ff.). Both Kṣemarājaḥ and the text of *Svacchandatantram* confirm this brāhmaṇical association. When listing the brāhmaṇical rites that require purification during

brāhmaṇical base of the Śaivas often appears to have been equally strong, and accordingly, the two groups later competed for royal patronage.¹

These Śaivāḥ proper make up the ninth stratum in the history of *Svacchandatantram*. The text frequently praises the Śaiva knowledge or Śaiva revelation that it presents as the highest of all doctrines.² However, since these statements occur throughout the text in different contexts they do not permit a certain and univocal identification of the tradition to which they refer. First, the term may designate collectively all groups that acknowledge Śivaḥ as supreme lord or primarily worship him in any of his forms. This usage contrasts Śaiva to non-Śaiva, such as Vaiṣṇava, Sāṃkhya, and so forth. Second, the term may designate the Śaivāḥ, as one Śaiva tradition in contrast to others, such as the Pāśupatāḥ. Third, within this Śaiva tradition, the term may specifically designate the organized school of the Śaiva-siddhāntins or Siddhāntaḥ, in contrast to other schools such as the Vāmāḥ, Dakṣiṇāḥ, and so forth.³

initiation, *Svacchandatantram* lists several observances (*vratāni*) of the celibate brāhmaṇaḥ (*brahmacāri*), including the Pāśupata. Kṣemarājaḥ recognizes that these are found only in Śaiva texts, but asserts nonetheless that they were once also found in lost Vedic school. (V. bk.10, p.162).

For the caste openness of *Svacchandatantram*, v., for example, bk.4, p.262, where the text declares any caste can be a master.

¹ Cf., for example, Sant Lal Katare, "Kalanjara Inscription of V.S. 1147," in *Epigraphia Indica* 31, 4, ed. D.C. Sircar (Delhi: Manager of Publications, 1957): 164. This inscription records the patronage afforded by the Chandella king Kirtivarman (second half of the eleventh century) to both Śaivāḥ and Pāśupatāḥ.

² For a typical laud of the superiority of Śaiva knowledge, v. bk.11, p.106.

³ V. Brunner-Lachaux, *Somaśambhupaddhati*, troisième partie, pp.546ff, n.13.

While the text often praises the superiority of Śaiva knowledge or initiation over the non-Śaiva, and sometimes over the Pāśupatāḥ, it never refers to the Siddhāntaḥ or to other subsidiary Śaiva sects or traditions. Similarly, it never refers to other scriptures (*āgamāḥ* or *tantrāṇi*) except in general terms.¹ Nevertheless, though not the self-professed document of any Śaiva school, many sections of *Svacchandatantram* parallel the structure and content of the *āgamāḥ* that form the scriptural corpus of the

Cf. Hilko Wiardo Schomerus, *Arunantis Śivajñānasiddhiyār* 1, Beiträge zur Südasien-Forschung Südasien-Institut Universität Heidelberg 49a (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1981): esp. 2–3ff, 42ff, for the identification of various Śaiva sects and their most important opponents. This thirteenth century Tamil Śaiva-siddhāntin compendium successively classifies traditions, with appropriate names for each group, as Śaiva versus non-Śaiva, Siddhānta-related versus non-Siddhāntin related Śaiva, and so forth. In contrast, a list in the early Tamil epic *Maṇimēkalai*, written from a Buddhist viewpoint, enumerates in its list of doctrines only a single “śaivavādaḥ.”

The ambiguity in the use of the term existed at the time of Kṣemarājaḥ. When commenting on the passage praising the superiority of the Śaivāḥ over the Pāśupatāḥ, he notes, that it may designate either, as the context implies in another list of traditions he quotes, either the Śaiva-siddhāntin based on *āgamāḥ*, or, as in the passage in *Svacchandatantram*, the Śaiva tradition in general. (V. bk.11, pp.54–55) In a comparable list of doctrines in Shāstri, M.K., ed., *Tantrālokaḥ*, (12, vs.320), Abhinavaguptaḥ substitutes the term Siddhāntaḥ for the ambiguous Śaiva, and here and elsewhere in this section (for example, vs.317) uses Śaiva in a general sense contrasted with non-Śaivāḥ such as the Vaiṣṇavāḥ.

(For citations from texts using Śaiva to designate one of four Śaiva sects, v. Lorenzen, *The Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas*, pp.1–12. V. also on the use of the terms Śaiva and Śaiva-siddhāntaḥ, Brunner-Lachaux, “Importance de la littérature āgamique,” pp.114ff.)

¹ For example, the text (Bk.I, vs.13) simply characterizes the good master, as “knowing the scriptures of Śivaḥ (*śivaśāstravidhānājña-*),” the bad master as “delighting in other scriptures (*anyaśāstrarata-*).”

dualistic Śaiva-siddhāntins.¹ Moreover, by sharing and affirming Śaiva initiation ritual and coordinated cosmology, these sections imply that when *Svacchandatantram* was compiled, there existed, if not a socially and canonically defined sect of Śaivāḥ, then at least interacting lineages of ritualists and of teachers, and relatively stable collections of doctrines and of practices. And the compilers of *Svacchandatantram* drew on this tradition, but not exclusively. This lack of exclusivity, in turn, might further imply that their sectarian consciousness had not yet crystallized into theological tenets and set liturgical prescriptions, nor reached the maturity marked by later sub-sects and secondary traditions.²

Svacchandatantram differs from the preceding Śaiva *āgamāḥ* by sometimes designating or identifying the supreme Śivaḥ of the *āgamāḥ* as Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ. In addition to substituting Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ for Śivaḥ in standard Śaiva ritual, cosmology, and meditation, the text describes special modes of worshipping Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ. By occupying the place of the supreme Śivaḥ, Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ incorporates Śiva's retinue, and instead of forming an aspect of Śivaḥ, receives instead his own

¹ The long notes to Hélène Brunner-Lachaux's translation and study of the *Somaśambhupaddhatiḥ*, troisième partie, which discusses Śaiva initiation, frequently compare different statements of *Svacchandatantram* and the statements of *Svacchandatantram* with those of other Śaiva *āgamāḥ* and the Siddhāntin commentators.

² Cf. Brunner-Lachaux, *Somaśambhupaddhati*, troisième partie, pp.548-549: "Une lecture attentive de tous les Āgama parvenus jusqu'à nous et de leur commentaires permettrait peut-être de reconnaître un stade du śivaïsme āgamique où l'opposition Siddhānta/ écoles du Nord était ignorée, soit que les Tantra du Nord n'aient connus, soit que les différences entre ces Tantra (en particulier les Bhairavatantra, devenus Tantra du dakṣiṇamārga) et les Tantra ou Āgama de l'école du Sud n'aient pas été senties comme des oppositions fondamentales."

subsidiary retinue and manifestations.¹ And thus by placing Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ at its center in these ways, many sections of *Svacchandatantram* shows the formative influence of a Bhairava tradition, which has characteristic and recurrent features, and which can therefore be considered a separate tenth stratum in its development.

In *Svacchandatantram*, these distinctive Bhairava features include: the worship of Bhairavaḥ in a diagram (*maṇḍalam*) as the central deity surrounded by a retinue of eight subsidiary bhairavāḥ; his worship by a solitary adept in a desolate location or burning ground; the use in his rites not only of formulæ and other standard ritual paraphernalia, but also of skulls and of impure substances, such as wine, or gruesome substances, such as human flesh; the culmination of his worship in an identifying possession by Bhairavaḥ which bestows simultaneously liberation and powers, which may be malevolent.²

External historical evidence associates the cult of Bhairava with the Kāpālikāḥ.³ In support of this association, Kṣemarājaḥ

¹ Kṣemarājaḥ enumerates all these forms at the beginning of bk.12, pp.89-90. For the text's declaration of the emanation of a particular aspect, Koṭarākṣaḥ, v. bk.9, pp.28-29.

² On the worship of Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ and his eight bhairavāḥ during an initiation ritual, v. bk.5, p.26; on the solitary adept, v. bk.6, p.102, and on the burning ground, bk.13, p.95; on the enjoined ritual use of wine, and meat, v. bk.5, p.41; on the use of skulls, bk.6, p.160; on the adept's magical identification with Bhairavaḥ and his powers, v. bk.6, p.147, and p.162.

³ For the general association of Bhairava with the Kāpālika sect, v. Lorenzen, *The Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas*, esp., pp.83ff. V. also Heinrich von Stietencron, "Bhairava," in 17 *Deutscher Orientalistentag, Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Supplementa* 1, 3 hrsg. Wolfgang Voigt (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1969): 863-871. von Stietencron (p.869) dates the emergence of the figure of Bhairavaḥ to no later than the seventh century A.D., and attributes its development to the Kāpālikāḥ.

identifies the adept (*sādhakaḥ*) who undertakes the special worship of Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ, as a performer of the great observance

For the special use by Kāpālikāḥ of human flesh and bdellium (*guggulum*), v. Lorenzen, *The Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas*, pp.26-27; *Svacchandatantram* prescribes them as substances for oblation in bk.6, pp.146-147. V. Lorenzen, pp.20ff, for the association of worshippers of Bhairavaḥ with the Kāpālikāḥ. As he notes, in Bāṇa's *Harṣacaritam*, there is a Kāpālika ascetic named Bhairavācārya: "Bhairavācārya's name indicates he worshipped Śiva as Bhairava, the form of the god held in especial esteem by tantric groups such as the Kāpālikas." Cf. also pp.32ff, where Lorenzen recounts the legends of Śaṅkara's encounter with Kāpālika ascetics named Ugra-Bhairava and Unmatta-Bhairava. In these legends the Kāpālika ascetic has a form identical to that of the manifest Bhairavaḥ himself.

On the cult of the eight bhairavāḥ, and its connection with the Kāpālikāḥ and burning ground, v. P.H. Pott, *Yoga and Yantra*, Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Lang- en Volkenkunde, Translation Series 8 (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1966), esp., pp.82-83. "The eight bhairavas . . . form a series which occurs with only slight variations in more than one text, primarily in the texts which have great authority among the Kāpālikas or Aghori, followers of the god Bhairava."

Moreover, the name Koṭarākṣaḥ, for the terrifying aspect of Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ (Bk.9, pp.28-29), might suggest that he forms the male counterpart to the terrifying form of Devī, designated most often Cāmuṇḍā, who is frequently described as *koṭarākṣī*. Cāmuṇḍā, in turn, is part of a terrifying group of eight mothers connected with the cremation ground; this would then associate Koṭarākṣaḥ with the forms of Bhairavaḥ worshipped inside the circle of mothers (*mātrkā*), which are discussed in bk.1, pp.28-31, and bk.10, pp.418-421. V. also Pott, p.86: " . . . the eight Bhairavas can be conceived as the *krodha*-aspects of the eight guardians of the world, while the eight Mātrkāḥ thus form their śaktis. (V. on Cāmuṇḍā, Mallmann, *Les enseignements iconographiques*, pp.153-157.)

For references to entering another's body and possession (*āveśaḥ*), among the Pāśupatāḥ, and its later development as a form of mystical union documented in other Bhairava texts, v. Minoru Hara, review of *Le Bhakti*, by Lilian Silburn, *Indo-Iranian Journal* 9, 3 (1966): 212, n.3. Hara suggests that the mystical fusion of later non-dualistic Śaivism, expressed by terms such as "*samāveśaḥ*" represents a reinterpretation of Pāśupāta-Kāpālika concepts of possession or entering another's body (*āveśaḥ*).

(*mahāvratam*) traditionally connected with the Kāpālikāḥ.¹ In addition, like the Kāpālikāḥ, the *Svacchandatantram* rejects the applicability of caste, and other distinctions of purity or impurity, and even perhaps in antinomian fashion, any moral restrictions for the realized adept.² Perhaps acknowledging its closeness to this tradition, in its hierarchy of other schools, the text places those Pāśupatāḥ who perform the Kāpāla observance at the level right before the Śaiva proper.³

¹ Bk.9, pp.35–36. Alluding to the Purāṇic origin myth of the *mahāvratam*, where Śivaḥ atones for cutting off Brahmā's head by roaming the earth as Bhairavaḥ in the form of a Kāpālikāḥ, Kṣemarājaḥ explains that the adept pursues this vow in order to effect his imitation, sc. identity with the supreme Bhairavaḥ which will guarantee the efficacy of his ritual performance:

“bhasmoddhūlitatvādinā sādhakasya mantrārāadhanāvasare mahāvratitvamuktamata eva parabhairavānukāritvenāpi tadabhimānino vighnā naśyanti.” (On the *mahāvratam* and its connection with the Kāpālikāḥ, v. Lorenzen, *The Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas*, pp.73ff. For the myth, v., for example, Anand Swarup Gupta, ed., *The Kūrma Purāṇa* (Varanasi: All-India Kashiraj Trust, 1971), 2.31.)

The text seemingly labels one cremation ground rite as a Kāpālika practice (*“eṣa kāpālika yogo”*), (v. bk.6, p.150, vs.53), but Kṣemarājaḥ interprets this as indicating merely that the rite employs bones (*“kapālāirastibhīrṇirvṛtaḥ kāpālikaḥ”*). Moreover, as noted before, Kṣemarājaḥ elsewhere (Bk.11, pp.52–54) identifies the performers of the *kāpālavratam*, called by the text, the Vaimalāḥ, as a branch of the Pāśupatāḥ. Both he and the text at no time use the term Kāpālikāḥ, and thus it would appear appropriate to call this tradition, the Bhairava stratum rather than the Kāpālika stratum.

² V. bk.7, p.315ff, for a description of the realized adept who transcends ordinary limitations. Identified with the all powerful lord, he is notably, (p.314, vs.248) freed from normal rules (*“dharmādharmvinirmuktaḥ”*), and follows (p.317, vs.254) his own supreme rule (*“paradharmena vartayet”*). (For the Kāpālikāḥ rejection of caste, cf. Lorenzen, *The Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas*, pp.46–47)

³ Cf. *supra* under the divisions of the Pāśupatāḥ.

Historical evidence suggests that the Kāpālikāḥ and related Bhairava sects were the original propagators and transmitters of sexual rituals that later were incorporated in the tantric varieties of many traditions.¹ In Śaiva tradition, the later elaborate symbolic doctrine and ritual which developed surrounding the worship of Bhairava or Bhairavī in these sexual rites, and which was transmitted secretly within circles of adepts, became known as the Kaula tradition.² This later Kaula tradition, closely related to the preceding Kāpālika stratum, represents the eleventh and last stratum that left its mark on *Svacchandatantram*. Although this text does not describe sexual rituals explicitly, its last book explains both the code language (*chummakāḥ*) used by circles of adepts, and the inner significance of the encounter (*melakam*) between the adepts and female deities or partners (*yoginyah*).³

¹ For the association of Kāpālikāḥ and sexual rites, v. Lorenzen, *The Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas*, pp.88ff.

On the cemetery cult of Bhairavaḥ and the Kāpālikāḥ, as the source for later Buddhist sexual tantric practices, v. Shin'ichi Tsuda, "A Critical Tantrism," *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko* 36 (1978), pp.172-174; cf. also David Snellgrove, *Indo-Tibetan Buddhism. Indian Buddhists and Their Tibetan Successors*, 1 (Boston: Shambhala, 1987): 152ff. For the association in the Buddhist tradition, of non-sexual practices with Bhairavaḥ, similar to those described by *Svacchandatantram* v. the entry "Bairaba" in Paul Demiéville, ed., *Hōbōgirin* 1 (A-Bombai) (Tokyo: Maison franco-japonais, 1929): 47.

² On the nature and practices of the Kaula tradition and its development from the Kāpālika cult, v. Alexis Sanderson, "Purity and Power among the Brahmans of Kashmir," in Michael Carrithers, et al., ed., *The Category of the Person. Anthropology, Philosophy, History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp.202ff. (V. for the Kaula as a secret tradition within Śaivism, p.215, n.125; for the Kāpālika-Kaula origin of corresponding Buddhist practices, v. p.214, n.106.)

³ Cf. *infra* section II.15.

1.1.4 Source Criticism

In this way, a wide range of traditions or strata have influenced and moulded the composition of *Svacchandatantram* both in the early period of its compilation and in the ongoing course of its transmission. Following this tradition criticism, which has identified the text's respective strata, internal analysis should pursue literary criticism, which would attempt to identify the actual documentary sources used by compilers in constructing the text. Ostensibly, the degree of influence or impact of each stratum should directly correspond to its proximity to the text compilers, and therefore to the probability that they employed oral and written sources drawn from that stratum or tradition. Extremely detailed similarity or pervasive knowledge would strongly suggest that the text compilers and redactors had direct knowledge of the documentary sources of a specific tradition.

Unfortunately, in the case of *Svacchandatantram*, since many of the documentary sources of these traditions are lost, not yet published, or known only in altered form, literary criticism can only preliminarily identify or hypothetically reconstruct probable sources. This lack of positive, external evidence demands that literary criticism construct hypotheses from internal, negative, and analogous evidence. First, internal evidence such as consistent differences in content and style may point to different sources; second, negative evidence such as textual hiatuses and discontinuities may delimit sections drawn from these sources; and third, analogous evidence based on the compositional history of similar anonymous texts in Sanskrit and other branches of literature may suggest the procedures followed in compiling these sources.

These methods of determining individual sources, their number, and their sequence also depend upon and affect redaction criticism, which attempts to identify those who actually compiled, transmitted, and altered the text. This retrospective and internal

criticism, naturally, can not afford to ignore the slightest irregularity that might hint at the hand of a redactor, and thus runs the constant risk of over-interpreting and multiplying the number of sources, recensions, and compilers.¹ As a corrective to this tendency, a schematic and simplifying presentation of the more secure results of this analysis will precede a detailed discussion of methods and illustration of their application.²

The main deity, title, and dialogue participants of the present recension of *Svacchandatantram* strongly support the hypothesis that at its basis lies a written document from the "Bhairava" tradition. This document, the "Bhairava" source, as it were, likely recorded practices associated with the worship of

¹ For an example of a methodic attempt to read a text as a unity, in reaction to this type of criticism, v. Georg Feuerstein, *The Yoga-Sūtra of Patañjali, An Exercise in the Methodology of Textual Analysis* (New Delhi: Arnold Heinemann, 1979). Feuerstein programmatically argues (pp.39-40): "Past scholars, on the whole, proceeded from the assumption that the *Yoga-Sūtra* cannot possibly be a single homogeneous textual entity owing to its apparent disorganisation. In the following I shall commence from the opposite end as it were by *presupposing the perfect homogeneity* of the text. In other words, I shall look for points which seem to contradict, or at least seriously challenge, this basic working hypothesis. In this way I hope to avoid the fallacy common to all attempts of textual criticism so far, namely to cut more and more slices from the cake until it simply vanishes out of sight and nothing but disconnected fragments – quite meaningless in themselves – are left behind." He also attempts to isolate this critical tendency as a cultural basis: "... before one contrives distortions, interpolations, etc., one must ask oneself seriously whether what seems to be 'corrupt', 'confused' or 'patched together' is not merely the result of an unwarranted demand for absolute logical consistency characteristic of our specific thought pattern." As an exemplar in Indology of the dissecting type of text criticism, Feuerstein appropriately cites Friedrich Weller's critical study of the *Kāthopaniṣad*: Friedrich Weller, *Versuch einer Kritik der Kāthopaniṣad*, Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Institut für Orientalforschung. Veröffentlichung 12 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1953).

² V. infra in the summaries of individual books.

Bhairavaḥ, or specifically, Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ. Alongside information about formulæ, gestures, and other aspects of ritual, panegyric interludes probably mixed with iconographic cum meditational data. This Bhairava source might have served to codify the essential elements of the cult of Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ, and might have been used as a guide to rituals described not only in the text of *Svacchandatantram*, but also known through separate written and oral tradition. Thus, though not exhaustive, this source likely contained more detailed instructions for specific types of ritual, particularly, the malevolent rites conducted in the cremation grounds.

Perhaps a desire to exalt this Svachchandaḥ form of Bhairavaḥ formed the primary motive behind the compiling of this text. In that case, the Svachchanda stamp of nomenclature, attributes, and the like, could have been secondarily imprinted on an "Ur-Bhairava" source. Tantric texts of this period in many traditions, however, attest to the creation and multiplication of deities as the representation and personification of doctrinal and meditational concepts.¹ Accordingly, the "svachchanda-" epithet, and the details of his form may simply reflect a theological characterization of Bhairavaḥ when viewed as the supreme Śivaḥ, rather than the proper name of a particular minor deity who came to be identified with Bhairavaḥ.² Therefore, without

¹ So Marie-Thérèse de Mallmann asserts at the beginning of her *Introduction à l'iconographie du tantrisme bouddhique*, Bibliothèque du centre de recherches sur l'Asie centrale et la haute Asie 1 (Paris: Librairie Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1975), p.1: "*L'on se rappellera tout d'abord que cette iconographie est TOUJOURS le reflet ou l'illustration de notions religieuses ou de concepts philosophiques. En conséquence, aucun détail n'est gratuit: mensurations, couleurs, gestes, attitudes, expressions de physionomie, attributs, etc., ont tous une signification précise.*"

² V. supra section I.1.3 for a discussion of the significance of the attribute Svachchandaḥ.

additional evidence, it can not be assumed that Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ represented the exclusive deity of a region or group, or that organized cults existed devoted to aspects of Bhairavaḥ, among the larger groups of devotees who worshipped Śivaḥ as Bhairavaḥ.¹ More probably, a fluid interchange of traditions related to Bhairavaḥ persisted that enabled and encouraged the elaboration of different Bhairava texts and the addition of material resulting in enlarged recensions of *Svacchandatantram*.² Given the lack of information about the early history of the cult of Bhairavaḥ, therefore, discriminating between an "Ur-Bhairava" and a "Svacchanda-bhairava" source at the base of this text constitutes a speculative over-refinement.

Throughout the present text of *Svacchandatantram*, there occur various short rites, meditations, and teachings, which show no intrinsic connection to Bhairavaḥ, and which sometimes reoccur embedded in larger rituals. The meditation on the Praṇavaḥ offers

¹ In later periods better documentation exists of the historical process in which local and tribal deities became absorbed into the Hindu pantheon by their identification with Bhairavaḥ through the meditation of ascetic worshippers of Bhairavaḥ who circulated through these regions on the periphery of regions of Hindu cultural dominance. V. Günter-Dietz Sontheimer, *Birobā, Mhaskobā, und Khandobā*, Schriftenreihe des Südasien-Instituts der Universität Heidelberg 21 (Weisbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1976), esp., pp.95ff. (For an early period, illustrating the same process, cf. Heinrich von Stietencron, "The Śaiva Component in the Early Evolution of Jagannātha," in *The Cult of Jagannath and the Regional Tradition of Orissa*, ed. Anncharlott Eschmann, et al., South Asia Interdisciplinary Regional Research Programme, Orissa Research Project. South Asia Institute, New Delhi Branch, Heidelberg University. South Asian Studies .8 (New Delhi: Manohar, 1978), pp.119-123.)

² This appears likely from the references to a theology of partial manifestations of Bhairavaḥ referred to by the text and by Kṣemarājaḥ. (Cf. the preceding section on the Bhairava stratum, and Kṣemarāja's reference to other Bhairava aspects and texts, in bk.1, p.10.).

the best example. It is described as part of the grand initiation liturgy of the fourth book, and as an independent practice of the adept in the sixth book.¹ As noted previously, practices like the Praṇava meditation occur in many of the strata that have influenced the development of the text. But as their immediate source for these short practices, the compilers of *Svacchandatantram* likely drew upon an early Śaiva tradition of ascetics who stood close to the antecedent Pāśupata tradition and who had collected their practices for usage by their own nascent sect. The combination of this “early Śaiva” source and the Bhairava source marks the first stage in the compositional history of *Svacchandatantram*. In their work, these compilers effected or rather reflected the association of Svachanda-bhairavaḥ and his specific practices with more generic practices like the Praṇava meditation and Bahurūpa formula of Aghoraḥ. The structure of the initial *anukramaṇikā*, and the dialogue frame may date to this time.

The assumption of a single early Śaiva source likely telescopes a process that stretched over a long period, perhaps even after secondary redaction with different documents. The older, less elaborate content and disparate if not disorganized structure of this early Śaiva material, however, tends to corroborate the hypothesis that the long prehistory of its assemblage and evolution had reached some written closure, before the qualitatively distinct next stage in the compositional history of *Svacchandatantram*.

This second stage occurred when compilers incorporated extensive material from the established Śaiva tradition into the text of *Svacchandatantram*. The clearcut and numerous parallels with other extant *āgamāḥ* strongly warrant assuming a redaction

¹ Cf. the summaries of bk.4, pp.159ff, and bk.6, pp.104ff. Recognizing these similarities, Kṣemarājaḥ provides cross-references to the fourth book in his commentary on the sixth. (V., for example, bk.6, p.107, p.109, et al.)

using written documents, a "scriptural Śaiva source." Where possible, the redactors welded and incorporated the earlier Śaiva material into the later ritual procedures and teaching, or set them side by side, leaving evidence of redaction in redundancy and repetition. From this second source might derive, for example, the Praṇava meditation employed as part of the larger initiation ritual. This meditation, in turn, might derive from the same earlier Śaiva material preserved in an earlier form in other parts of the text and reintroduced in the initiation ritual in a more developed form.

These later compilers apparently made only minor adjustments to the frame dialogue and did not completely update the introductory table of contents, which does not mention, for example, all the classes of Śaiva initiates or the types of Śaiva initiation.¹ Their primary motivation appears to have been the desire to place Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ at the center of an already established Śivaḥ cult of the *āgamaḥ*.² As evidence of this process in the institutionalizing of Bhairavaḥ, they substituted the name Bhairavaḥ for Śivaḥ only sporadically and left Śivaḥ in many of the books that describe the standard *āgamic* rituals. In contrast, the name Bhairavaḥ occurs exclusively as the name of the deity in, for example, the cremation ground rites.

¹ Thus the introductory table of contents (Bk.1, p.12, vs.10b), which refers to the path (*adhvā*), may refer not to the grand initiation liturgy of the fourth book via six paths, but rather to the simpler initiation using the diagram of Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ in the fifth book (pp.11ff), or to the apparent initiation of the adept into the use of the Bhairava formula summarily indicated in bk.13, pp.90-92.

² Cf. Anncharlott Eschmann, "Hinduization of Tribal Deities in Orissa: The Śākta and Śaiva Typology," in *The Cult of Jagannath and the Regional Tradition of Orissa*, pp.79-117, for a discussion of the process by which once minor deities become assimilated to mainstream tradition and become the center of elaborate cultic ritual.

Svacchandatantram does not contain other important and standard Śaiva scriptural sections, e.g. that on the installation of temple images such as the *lingam*, an omission which may mirror the motives and historical circumstances of its compilers and the receptive limits of the already established text of *Svacchandatantram*. The other *āgamāḥ*, as well, undoubtedly underwent further revision and expansion, and thus may not be presumed to reflect a state of Śaiva scriptural activity prior to that evidenced by *Svacchandatantram*, which may preserve earlier features of this tradition.¹ Or, the omission or incomplete treatment of many topics by the compiler of *Svacchandatantram*, may be interpreted as indicating that an oral tradition accompanied the text, or similarly that other Śaiva scriptures complemented the text in these areas, and obviated the need for absolute exhaustiveness.

The tenth through twelfth books of *Svacchandatantram*, which contain several overlapping treatments of the worlds (*bhuvanāni*) and planes (*tattvāni*) that compose the universe, provide a notable example of the way in which the text preserves early stages in the development of Śaivism. Here the process of combining material from Sāṃkhya, Purāṇic, and Pāśupata sources with properly Śaiva categories and meditational schemes, remains visible in several unpolished and only partially standardized versions. Thus these sections illustrate the process through which compilers and redactors elaborated the Śaiva cosmology, an historical process that elsewhere in this and other texts often appears collapsed into two chronologically discontinuous stages: that of the early Śaiva and that of the scriptural Śaiva.

¹ For example, the purificatory initiation contained in the middle of the account of the cosmology may be a survival of an earlier and simpler initiation rite corresponding to a simpler worldview. (V. the summary of bk.10, pp.141ff.)

Thus the addition of scriptural Śaiva material, which placed Bhairava at the center of the *āgamic* cult, made *Svacchandatantram* into a Śaiva scripture, and promoted later commentaries both from the dualistic Siddhāntin school and the monistic school represented by Kṣemarājaḥ. Nevertheless, the later redaction of the text apparently did not parallel that of the other *āgamāḥ*. Instead of only revising and adding material related to *āgamic* ritual, redactors inserted material of a more “tantric” character at similar and thus appropriately receptive points in the text.¹ Although successive redactors, drawing on different documents and traditions, likely engaged in this supplementation, given the absence of information identifying individual hands, this material may be collectively attributed to a “tantric source.” The accretion of *Svacchandatantram* through this phase of supplementation from the tantric source probably continued interwoven around the next discernible major redaction.

Here, in this phase, redactors affixed additional sections of a specific Bhairava character to the text. The finished quality and self-contained structure of these sections, added to internal indicators of conflation, differentiate them from the primary Bhairava source, as a “later Bhairava” source, as it were.² This later Bhairava source actually probably comprised a number of distinct documents, but, once again, given the impossibility of ascertaining the number of redactors or redactional steps, for convenience, a single label may suffice. More importantly, these additions demonstrate the continued life of the text of *Svacchandatantram* within circles of Bhairava devotees, and

¹ V., for example, the summary of bk 7, which examines the elaborate meditation on time that has been apparently inserted in the middle of simpler practices.

² V., for example, the summary of bk.13, pp.95,ff, for an apparently supplemental collection of Bhairava practices.

hypothetically then, in continuity with the milieu of the primary document.

Within this same line, and probably close after this redaction using the later Bhairava source, occurs the last major stage in the compositional history of *Svacchandatantram* that brought the text close to the form of its final recension. At this time, redactors from the milieu of the last stratum discussed, the Kaula, appended well formed pieces of their own tradition to the text.¹ Apparently, by this time, the structure of *Svacchandatantram* had hardened to a degree that precluded a *rifacimento* to allow better integration of the segments from this "Kaula" source. Instead the redactors fastened them as appendices with only minimal editorial links.

The editing into books likely followed the secondary swelling by conflation of the text of *Svacchandatantram*.² Perhaps this division even preceded the later redactors who appended the material from the Kaula source, and led them to append their material in the form of another book. This hardening in the structure of *Svacchandatantram* coincides with the formation of its now extant recension and with its entrance into the final stage of its redaction. Here the act of editorial *retouche*, which as reflected by devices such as cross-references also ran concurrently with the conflation and assimilation of the major sources, becomes predominant. Consequently, circumscribed interpolation can be assumed to have replaced expansive supplementation.

These redactors not only added material but also in the course of rectifying the language of the text, likely deleted

¹ V. the summary of bk.15.

² As an example of the secondary editing into books, the unitary topic announced in the dialogue at the beginning of bk.7, (p.167) time (*kāla-*), and the portion (*-amśakam*), has been broken into two parts, with the second topic discussed in the eighth book. This separation may have occurred due to the increase by interpolation of the seventh book.

material. Perhaps these deletions went beyond the substitution of standard forms and even phrases to include substantive excisions and abridgements.¹ Although, naturally, no direct evidence exists for such large scale cutting, Kṣemarāja's commentary provides ample witness that the manuscripts which had reached him carried a text not only variant but also somewhat corrupted, fragmented, damaged and needing reconstitution.² Evidently, a chronological as well as a socially qualitative gap still separated the last anonymous editors from the sectarian commentators. These pre-commentatorial redactors or editors, thus, partially revised the language, harmonized the various books, and interpolated verses and smaller sections reflecting their own doctrinal position.³ The label "Śaiva redactorial" source might best cover their collective imprint where discernible as affecting the extant recension of *Svacchandatantram*. As with preceding sources, the documents that may have served as the paradigm for their operations on *Svacchandatantram*, remain obscure and only hypothetically

¹ Cf., for evidence of deletion in the Purāṇic literature, Rocher, *The Purāṇas*, pp.37-38. For example, many authors on *dharma*, both commentators and *nibandhakāras*, quote verses from the Purāṇas which can not be found in any extant version.

² V. bk.13, p.120, where Kṣemarāja, in a rare account of his commentatorial activity states: "And thus, as a rule, the interpolation of other books, the reversal [of the order] of books, and the reversal of readings of this book, [that have] a hundred branches, [which] are seen, are fabricated by the ignorant. That is removed by us through the investigation of ancient books, as regards the sense . . . (*evam ca prāyaśo granthāntarapraksepo granthaviparyāsaḥ pāthaviparyāsaśca asya granthasy durmedhobhiḥ parikalpitaḥ śataksākho drśyate / sa 'smābhiḥ purātanapustakānveṣaṇato yāvadgati apasārīta . . .*)"

³ V., for example, bk.4 p.13, where an editor has apparently added a verse marking the end of the daily ritual ("*nityakarma*") and the beginning of the occasional ritual ("*naimittikakarma*"), using these terms that do not appear elsewhere in the text except in the commentary of Kṣemarāja.

identifiable, since the text never refers to any other scriptures by name or even scriptural traditions.

1.1.5 Redaction Criticism

After enumerating the results of tradition and source criticism, redaction criticism must next attempt to dissipate the anonymity cloaking the identity of the groups of compilers and redactors who shaped the text of *Svacchandatantram*. Once again, in the absence of external evidence, redaction criticism can only reexamine the internal techniques, concerns, and values displayed in their handling of strata and traditions. Only these exist as clues to their — if not individual, at least collective — identities and dates, that in turn may further indicate the age and provenance of *Svacchandatantram*.

The preceding discussion of the rules for dating, and the number of strata and sources, has indirectly touched on many of these techniques. In general, any textual discontinuity signals a another textual layer just as fault lines in geology indicate the intersection and overlapping of different plates. Naturally, this procedure risks fabricating a fallacious compositional history from mere lapses and inadvertencies possibly stemming from a single hand. And the superimposition of alien ideals of textual unity can distort less “logical” but traditional patterns of organization. Nevertheless, the recurrence of strands of similar material in different texts externally corroborates, in most cases, the results of internal criticism in unraveling the work woven by anonymous generations. Moreover, for a tradition where innovation must masquerade as original revelation, the strands representing different sources or traditions become obscured in convincing compilations.

Among these textual discontinuities, differences in style, such as metre, vocabulary, and degree of standardness in usage, more

easily and overtly signal compositional layers.¹ In contrast to these surface indicators, signs of differences in content may lie more recessed in the structure of the text. Their loss of transparency increases with the patina of familiarity which covers over once glaring contrasts, now accepted as normative in later transmission. And successive redactors promote this habituation by their techniques of editorial integration.

The dialogue frame was used as the basic tool for this integration. Even where the nature and scope of the added material limits successful incorporation, and relegates it to an appendix or separate book, the frame furnishes a nominal transition.² Similarly, when redactors interpolated material, they often added a dialogue verse as a transition.³ When they embedded a segment in a larger topic, a dialogue verse often signals the return to the main subject through a *Wiederaufnahme* or resumptive repetition.⁴ Of course, since the first compilers used not a logical construction but the dialogue frame as their principal compositional structure, corroborating evidence, which indicates that the content likely derives from different milieus or traditions, must reinforce any supposition of interpolation.

¹ V., for example, the metrically distinct section of bk 13, p.95ff.

² V., for example, the opening dialogue of bk.14, p.109, which nominally links the gestures (*mudrāḥ*) not described elsewhere, to the rest of the text: "*mudrāṇām lakṣaṇam vaksye asmimstantre yathāsthitaṁ.*"

³ V., for example, bk.4, p.256, where dialogue introduces an abbreviated initiation procedure, which belongs, as Kṣemarājaḥ notes, with related procedures in the following book.

⁴ Thus, for example, in bk.6, after a digression on the nature of the Prāṇavaḥ that begins (p.123) with the words, "*pañcapraṇavasamyogāḥ,*" the main discussion recontinues (p.144) with the *Wiederaufnahme*, "*pañcapraṇavasamyuktam.*"

Besides this evidence furnished by the repetition, redundancy, and incongruity produced by interpolation, the interpolated material often retains parts of its own original frame structure. These pieces, commonly in the form of panegyric codas to the preceding ritual or meditation, clearly point back to a different original source.¹ Extensions of the frame along these same lines in the form of panegyrics of parts of the text, or praise and description of the promulgators of the text, often signal differing redactors.² Self-references, and cross-references to other texts and traditions function as clues in the same way, allowing for a moment the hand of the actual authors to reach from behind the screen into the shadow play of revelation.³ In sum, the very technique, which the redactors used positively in constructing a unified composition, internal criticism uses negatively in decomposing their work.

Thus the techniques utilized by the initial compilers and later redactors of *Svacchandatantram* favored the growth of the text by assimilation, accumulation, and incorporation. These techniques, in turn, plausibly reflect the concerns of the redactors, and permit inferring their motives. In particular, their references to other schools encapsulate their interest in integrating through adaptation or absorption in an inclusive hierarchy of sects symbolized by the successive pervasion of inferior planes by higher planes in their

¹ Note, for example, the panegyric closing line that follows the discussion of the Bahurūpa formula, "*smaraṇānnāśayeddevī, tamah . . .*," both in bk.1, p.39, and bk.6, p.148, with notably, the syntactically expected second half missing in bk.6.

² V., for example, the editorial adjustment in the cosmology (Bk.10, p.422) which has the narrating Bhairavaḥ acknowledge his identity with Umāpatih, and which praises his multiple manifestations, although the book otherwise shows no evidence of containing specific Bhairava material.

³ Cf. *supra* the discussion of the Śaiva stratum.

cosmology.¹ Combined with their rejection of caste, this tendency towards inclusion rather than exclusion, characteristic of many Indian traditions, must have strongly dominated in order to produce and accommodate the diversity of material found in *Svacchandatantram*.² Accordingly, when asserting the superiority of its own practices, the text, especially in the Bhairava sections, praises these practices not as the only means, but rather as the best means since they include the benefits that derive from any other text or tradition.³

The social underpinnings of this vigorous integrating point to a fluid sect, peripheral and developing with respect to other older traditions, and not yet entrenched enough to engage in a polemical defense of its own established practice and dogma. In the milieu of the text compilers, interest centered more on collecting and domesticating, as it were, popular and effective practices of meditation, more than theoretically justifying or elaborating the primacy of their beliefs. The theological scheme of partial or aspectual incarnation, and the division into superior and inferior manifestations, found in many sectarian traditions, furnished the

¹ V. supra for a discussion of this hierarchical integration. On the cosmological model, the "Akkumulationstheorie," in which higher elements or planes include the properties of the lower, v. Erich Frauwallner, *Geschichte der indischen Philosophie* 1 (Salzburg: Otto Müller Verlag, 1953): 122ff, 356.

² Cf. Paul Hacker, "Religiöse Toleranz und Intoleranz im Hinduismus," in Paul Hacker *Kleine Schriften*, hrsg. Lambert Schmithausen, Glasenapp-Stiftung 15 (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1978), pp.376-388, and esp., pp.386ff.

³ V., for example, the praise of the Bahurūpa formula in bk.6 (p.163, vs.94): "*evaṃ śatasahasrāṇi anyakalpothitāni ca prayogānāṃ karotyeṣa mantrarājeśvareśvaraḥ*." And as Kṣemarājaḥ explains: "*evaṃ karotyavisamvādinī sampādayati*."

text compilers and redactors with their basic tools for adaptation and incorporation.¹

The kind of hortatory and doctrinal material that the text compilers and redactors used reflects their practical rather than theoretical and polemical interest. The declarations extolling the efficacy of their rituals and teaching indicate an ongoing concern to expand their sectarian base. In addition, these declarations contain images and similes in order to illustrate their doctrinal teaching. Some of these images recorded by redactors probably came embedded in wholesale borrowings directly from literary sources.² Others, however, may reflect the custom of Śaiva teachers and ascetics who illustrated their teachings with apt images in the course of the transmission of their tradition. Interwoven with full scale panegyrics, whose parts, as noted, still lie throughout the text of *Svacchandatantram*, these metaphors may have formed the rhetorical web for the proselytizing or merchandizing discourse of these Śaiva masters.³ The images effectively convey and embody the magical and mystical principles at the base of their repertoire of rituals and meditations, which for later Śaiva systematic commentators like Kṣemarājaḥ became theorized in monistic or

¹ V., for example, the incarnations of Umāḥ described according to the Purāṇic soteriological model, in bk.10, pp.408ff.

² Cf., for example, the imagery of the macrocosmic chariot used to express similarity to Īśvaraḥ in bk.12, p.76ff, based on *Kāthopanīṣad*, 1.3.3.

³ V. bk.10, pp.148–156ff, where a Śaiva teaching discourse has been inserted into an early purification initiation, which in turn has been placed as a parenthetical section within the extended cosmological description of the egg of Brahmā. Here several extended similes are used to illustrate the Śaiva theology of bondage and liberation. Among others, the liberating of the soul by the master acting as Śivaḥ through formulæ is compared to the production of the fire latent in wood by the action of the rubbing stick, or the removal of the maculation of copper with a solvent to reveal gold.

dualistic theologies of union, grace, and control.¹ While the use of metaphors does not preclude philosophical argument, its absence in the text of *Svacchandatantram* argues that throughout its transmission this imagistic representation adequately served the needs of its redactors, who thus largely preceded or stood outside the sub-sects of the later systematic Śaiva schools. Thus the use of imagery in teaching does not rule out its containing systematic

¹ For example, the text (Bk.4, p.276) compares the relationship of the soul and Śivaḥ after initiation to that of a river, which once dissolved into the sea, does not return. For Kṣemarājaḥ this image and its accompanying assertions of unity offer a natural scriptural support for his non-dual and idealistic-emanational philosophy (*abhāsavādaḥ*). The compilers of the text, in contrast, may be expressing a simpler non-idealistic notion, which simply asserts that when liberated the soul is literally or materially dissolved in the supreme lord (*layavādaḥ*). The actual metaphysical status and philosophical implications of this ambiguous union would then have been open to several later interpretations.

Accordingly, the following verse (Bk.4, p.277, vs.443) restates the literal equivalent of this metaphor by saying that self becomes Śivaḥ (*śivibhāvati*) through having the same essence, or participation (*samarasatvena*). In *Svacchandatantram* this *samarasa-* or *sāmarasyam* is used to characterize one of the many procedures in which the master extracts the soul of the initiate and moves it up the planes of existence to dissolve it in the consciousness of Śivaḥ. Although apparently tending to support the later non-dual exegesis, this practice and the term (*sāmarasyam*) also occurs in the commentaries of dualistic Siddhāntins, and in the scriptures of other non-Śaiva traditions. (V. Kṣemarāja's *Pratyabhijñāhṛdayam*, Singh, *Pratyabhijñāhṛdayam*, p.49 for a definition of dissolution as non-dual fusion (*sāmarasyam*): "*parādvayasāmarasyāpādanātmani ca saṁhāre . . .*"; for the Siddhāntins, v. Brunner-Lachaux, *Somaśambhupaddhati*, troisième partie, pp.348ff, n.405; on *laya-* and *sāmarasya* in the Pāñcarātraḥ, v. Sanjukta Gupta, *Lakṣmī Tantra*, p.xxxiv, pp.127–134, esp., vs.41, p.131; for an example of the debate among later sectarian Śaivas over the nature of liberation, taking these images and related images as its point of departure v. Schomerus, *Arunantis Śiva jñānasiddhiyār* 1: 372ff.)

positions, but these positions can not be determined only on the basis of this ambivalent imagery.¹

1.1.6 Reconstructed History of the Text

In this way, the techniques and materials used by the compilers and redactors shed light, at least indirectly, on their values and concerns. This tentative redaction criticism, assisted by the results of literary and tradition criticism, may encourage further efforts to identify the anonymous collective authors of *Svacchandatantram*. Since external evidence about the history of sects and doctrines in this period provides only limited corroborating information, however, any conclusion based ultimately on an interlocking pattern of clues remains speculative.

At the base of *Svacchandatantram*, literary and tradition criticism point to a Bhairava source, representing a Bhairava stratum. And throughout the period of the early formation of the text, external evidence associates the worship of Bhairavaḥ with Śaiva ascetics, usually designated Kāpālikāḥ.² Accordingly, the practices commonly attributed to these Kāpālikāḥ, the rituals of the cremation grounds, match those that *Svacchandatantram*

¹ For a study of a single image used with multiple interpretations by many traditions, among them non-dual Śaivism, v. Erik af Edholm, "The Crystal and the Hibiscus Flower," in *Kalyāṇamitrārāgaṇam. Essays in Honour of Nils Simonsson*, ed. Eivind Kahrs, (Oslo: Norwegian University Press, 1986), pp.57-77. As he notes (p.57): "Some of the recurrent example-similes may be considered to belong to particular philosophical traditions, since they are especially well suited to their specific lines of arguments and regularly occur in their texts. A larger number of similes, however, cannot be connected in this way with particular philosophical schools, but are the common property of all *darśana-s* and form an organic part of the technique of Indian philosophical discourse."

² V. supra section 1.1.3.

explicitly associates with the worship of Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ.¹ Since the Bhairava sections appear restricted to select, ascetic practitioners, it seems likely that the compilers of the earliest version of *Svacchandatantram* were wandering ascetics who used this document to codify or accompany the transmission of the most important practices of their tradition. These practices may have included additional rituals and meditations not set out in the text that used the same formulæ or the rituals set out in the text as paradigms.²

This early source probably included other non-cremation ground material from the antecedent Pāśupata and early Rudra

¹ No texts stemming from the Kāpālikāḥ themselves have survived, and thus the works of their orthodox opponents and stereotypical literary portrayals provide the only information about their practices and doctrines. Contemporary accounts of Aghori ascetics, who conduct gruesome cremation grounds meditations yielding superhuman powers and subscribe to an experiential monistic doctrine, however, supply corroborating evidence that the practices described in texts like *Svacchandatantram* accurately reflect the rituals and practices of groups of Śaiva ascetics. (V. on the absence of Kāpālika literature, Lorenzen, *The Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas*, p.83; on the Aghoris v. Jonathan P. Parry, "The Aghori Ascetics of Benares," in *Indian Religion*, eds. Richard Burghart and Audrey Cantlie, Centre of South Asian Studies, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, Collected Papers on South Asia.7 (London: Curzon Press, 1985), pp.51-78, esp., p.58ff.)

² The first book of *Svacchandatantram*, therefore, sets out the formulæ, which are the manifest form of the deity, and thus indispensable basis for any practice. Once they and a basic procedure are known they can be used in a great variety of rites.

For a contemporary example of the central place of formulæ as the constitutive teaching of an ascetic order, v. Richard Burghart, "Secret Vocabularies of the 'Great Renouncers' of the Rāmānandī Sect," in *Early Hindi Devotional Literature in Current Research*, ed. Winand M. Callewaert, *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 8 (Leuven: Departement Oriëntalistiek, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 1980), pp.17-33, especially, pp.21ff.

traditions of worshipping Śivaḥ. *Svacchandatantram* itself shows that the worship of Bhairavaḥ has been modelled on these early forms of worshipping Śivaḥ in his Aghora aspect.¹ And, as an outgrowth or branch of the Pāśupatāḥ, these Kāpālikāḥ likely engaged in a range of ritual activity, which was not restricted to the rites that externally labeled them, and thus formed more a part of an interactive network of Śaiva ascetics, who had taken on the Kāpālika observance, rather than a isolated and distinct sect.

On the model of later groups of ascetics who worshipped Bhairavaḥ, these early Bhairava devotees may have functioned as priests in small shrines or temples at important pilgrimage centers for their group.² At such centers they likely became associated with other groups of Śiva worshippers, also heirs of the ascetic Pāśupata and Rudra traditions, who were elaborating the cult and ritual of what became *āgamic* Śaivism. Under their influence occurred the next stage in the redaction of *Svacchandatantram*, when the worship of Bhairavaḥ, or Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ became remodelled and expanded along the lines of the cult of Śivaḥ. The political or social events triggering this specific transformation of the cult of Bhairavaḥ remain unknown; alternatively, the cult

¹ V supra section I.1.3.

² An analogy for this activity may be offered by the contemporary Śaiva ascetics, the Gosāvis of Mahārāṣṭra and the Kānpḥaṭas of Nepal, who have developed important cult centers to Bhairava in outlying regions and served as the catalysts for the spread of Hindu culture and tradition. (V. Sontheimer, *Birobā, Mhaskobā, und Khanḍobā*, esp., pp.95ff, and Günter Unbescheid, *Kānpḥaṭā. Untersuchungen zu Kult, Mythologie und Geschichte Śivaitscher Tantriker in Nepal*, Beiträge zur Südasien-Forschung Südasien-Institut Universität Heidelberg 63 (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1980), esp., p.53.)

became incorporated as a subsidiary aspect of the *āgamic* worship of Śivaḥ.¹

In this way, this new version of *Svacchandatantram* became a Śaiva scripture that provided the general guidelines for this revised cult of Bhairavaḥ conducted by regular officiating ritualists. These ritualists presumably supplemented the laconic instructions of *Svacchandatantram* with oral tradition and knowledge of other Śaiva scriptures associated with different temples and teaching lineages. In presuming this supplemental context, these ritualists likely omitted in their revision of *Svacchandatantram* much of the material on temple ritual found in the other *āgamāḥ*, and emphasized that material appropriate for a cult still closely connected to the wandering ascetic tradition of Bhairava worship.²

The organization and practices of the Bhairava ascetics who shared in this emerging Śaiva tradition, then likely changed to an enlarged community of Śaiva worshippers as a result of providing regular services at pilgrimage centers or temples. The pivotal event in the growth of the Śaiva sect was the institutional offering to worshippers and patrons of the practices and benefits that had been previously restricted to the Śaiva ascetics.

Svacchandatantram retains clear evidence of this transition. Next to older and independent forms of meditational practice to be performed by an ascetic to gain liberation and powers, the text records new forms of the same practice, conceived as bestowing liberation alone, and done for a completely passive initiate as part

¹ Cf., for example, R.N. Nandi, *Religious Institutions and Cults in the Deccan* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1973), pp.24-26, who cites records of the Cāmuṇḍeśvari temple in Kolar, where the Bhairava cult was one of many tended by a secondary group of priests.

² In addition, as noted previously, the differences between *Svacchandatantram* and other Śaiva scriptures may indicate that it was compiled before their final elaboration. Cf. *supra* section I.1.3.

of a grand initiation liturgy commissioned from an officiating ritualist.¹

Thus, though the older order of Śaiva ascetics became largely institutionalized as a hierarchy of masters catering to different grades of initiates, the active and ascetic option did not die out immediately but was integrated as another optional grade of the adept (*sādhakāḥ*), who still sought superhuman powers.² And accordingly, in *Svacchandatantram*, the older rites have been collected under this nominal heading as the special entitlement of the adept. Increased success in drawing patronage, however, caused further institutionalization, increasing and hardening doctrine to enable the sect to compete effectively with other groups, and leading away from the practice oriented background of earlier Śaiva tradition. Part of this doctrinal expansion process may be reflected in the elaborate and lengthy tenth cosmological book of *Svacchandatantram*, which shows only marginal ritual justification. Eventually losing all but its formal connections to meditation practices, the ritual became mechanical, caste

¹ Cf., for example, the passive version of the Praṇava meditation, described as one of a set of passive practices done by the master for a passive initiate as part of the rite of union (*yojanikā*) in initiation, (Bk. 4, p.158ff.), and its active version (Bk. 6, pp.103ff.) done by the adept, and lauded (p.143) as conferring both powers and liberation. Kṣemarājaḥ clearly recognizes the similarity: "*sādhakānāmapī hyetanmantrakramena siddhimuktiparyavasānenaiveti yojanikāgranthe nirṇītam*."

² The same grades are found in the Pāñcarātra texts; v. Sanjukta Gupta, "The Changing Pattern of Pāñcarātra Initiation: A Case Study in the Reinterpretation of Ritual," in *Selected Studies on Ritual in the Indian Religions. Essays to D.J. Hoens*, ed. Ria Kloppenborg (Leiden: E.J.Brill, 1983), pp.69-91.

distinctions were introduced and the category of the adept virtually dropped.¹

The Bhairava side of the tradition, which experienced its own royal patronage and temple construction, however, retained stronger connections to the ascetic groups and openness to innovations deriving from the geographical and social periphery of organized Hinduism.² The text of *Svacchandatantram* likely reflects this relationship in the successive interpolations of esoteric practices. Specifically, the

¹ On the status of the *sādhakaḥ*, cf. Hélène Brunner-Lachaux, "Le *sādhaka*: personnage oublié du Śivaïsme du sud," *Journal Asiatique* 263 (1975): 411-443; Sanjukta Gupta, "The Changing Pattern of Pāñcarātra Initiation," pp. 87-89; and C. Caillat, "Le *sādhaka* śaiva à la lumière de la discipline jaina," in *Studien zum Jainismus und Buddhismus*, hrsg. Klaus Bruhn und Albrecht Wezler, Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien, Seminar für Kultur und Geschichte Indiens an der Universität Hamburg 23 (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1981), pp. 51-59.

For the continued externalization of ritual in the Śaiva-siddhāntaḥ and loss of meditational significance in contemporary Śaiva-siddhāntaḥ, cf. C.J. Fuller, *Servants of the Goddess, The Priests of a South Indian Temple* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), esp., pp. 29-30.

On the castes that existed already among Śaivas in eleventh century Kāśmir, v. Pierre-Sylvain Filliozat, "Le droit d'entrer dans les temples de Śiva au XI^e siècle," *Journal Asiatique* 263 (1975): 103-117. V. also Hélène Brunner-Lachaux, "Les catégories sociales védiques dans le Śivaïsme du Sud," *Journal Asiatique* 252 (1964): 451-472.

² V. M.A. Stein, ed., *Kalhana's Rājatarāṅgiṇī or Chronicle of the Kings of Kashmir* 1 (1892. Reprint. Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1960), 5, 55, p. 74, which refers to the existence of a Bhairava temple and *māṭṛkacakram* in Kāśmir in the reign of Avantivarman (c. 855/56-883 A.D.). V. bk. 1, pp. 28-31, for the worship of Bhairavaḥ and the *māṭṛkacakram*. On the royal patronage of Bhairava worship and the construction of Bhairava temples in Orissa beginning with the Bhañja dynasty, v. L.K. Panda, *Śaivism in Orissa* (Delhi: Sundeep Prakashan, 1985), pp. 132ff.

text shows the influence of the Kaula tradition, heirs of the Kāpālīka cremation ground tradition who worshipped Bhairava and Bhairavi in their own esoteric and erotic ceremonies. Members of this tradition may have simultaneously been the officiants of an external cult of Bhairavaḥ, based on a text like *Svacchandatantram*, and secretly initiates of the Kaula sect, or depending on the political and social climate, more openly devotees of a multileveled Kaula-Bhairava cult.¹ As noted, *Svacchandatantram* shows their influence in its last and possibly appended book, which treats their code language and esoteric rites.²

¹ V. infra section II.15. On the concealment of tantric identity v. Alexis Sanderson, "The Brahmins of Kashmir," p.205: "... one could be 'internally a Kaula externally a Śaiva [worshipping Svachchandaḥairava in the Kashmirian context] while remaining Vedic in one's social practice.'"

For royal patronage of the "Kaula-Kāpālīka" cult outside of Kāśmīr. v Hermann Goetz, "The Historical Background of the Great Temples of Khajurāho," in *Hermann Goetz. Studies in the History, Religion and Art of Classical and Mediaeval India*, ed. Hermann Kulke, Schriftenreihe des Südasien-Instituts der Universität Heidelberg 16 (Weisbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1974), pp.108-121.

² For a contemporary example showing the use of private code words to reinforce the group identity of an ascetic order, but not conceal this identity, cf. Richard Burghart, "Secret Vocabularies of the 'Great Renouncers' of the Rāmānandī Sect," p.20.

If this last book were not a later addition, then it would radically change the proposed recensional history of the text. For an analogous example in tantric literature of a final book which contains explanatory glosses and later doctrine, and which can be demonstrated by varying recensions to be an appendix, v. Giuseppe Tucci, "Some Glosses upon the *Guhyasamāja*," *Opere Minore* 1, Università di Roma. Studi Orientali Pubblicati a Cura della Scuola Orientale 6 (Rome: Dott. Giovanni Bardi, 1971): 337-348.

Evidence indicates that left hand sects flourished in regions like Kāśmīr, and produced numerous Bhairava *tantrāṇi* that came to be associated with *Svacchandatantram*.¹ However, these associations and Kaula influence had evidently not completely covered over the *agamīc* background of the text and the standard Śaiva aspects of its Bhairava cult. The Śaiva-siddhāntins, who represented the culmination of orthodox institutional dualistic Śaivism and who flourished as the dominant school of Śaivism in Kāśmīr at the time of Abhinavaguptaḥ, wrote commentaries on *Svacchandatantram*.² Kṣemarājaḥ states that he wrote his commentary to refute the previous Siddhāntin commentaries. Thus, these rival commentaries indicate considerable importance attached to *Svacchandatantram*, and an ideological rivalry between the dualists and non-dualists, which may imply a struggle over control of the cult of Svachanda-bhairavaḥ and Śaiva patronage. Unfortunately, since the Siddhāntin commentaries are lost, it is not known how they might have ritually used *Svacchandatantram*, and in particular, interpreted its

¹ V., for example, the references to ritual murderers (*samsāramocakas*), mentioned by many authors during the period of the formation of *Svacchandatantram*, and by the *Netratantram*, commented upon by Kṣemarājaḥ, collected by Wilhelm Halbfass, *Studies in Kumārila and Śaṅkara*, Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik, Monographie 9 (Reinbek: Dr. Inge Wezler Verlag für Orientalistische Fachpublikationen, 1983), pp.10ff. On the literary evidence for tantric practices in Kāśmīr, cf. Gyula Wojtilla, "Notes on Popular Śaivism and Tantra in Eleventh Century Kashmir (A Study on Kṣemendra's *Samayamātrkā*)," in *Tibetan and Buddhist Studies. Commemorating the 200th Anniversary of the Birth of Alexander Csoma de Körös*, ed. Louis Ligeti 2 (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1984): 381-389.

² V. Alexis Sanderson, "The Brahmans of Kashmir," pp.203-204.

cremation ground and tantric elements, or perhaps even worked with yet another recension different from that preserved by Kṣemarājaḥ.¹

¹ V.infra section I.2.1 for a discussion of the non-dualists' and the dualists' differing views of caste, and for the few passages such as bk.2, p.75, where Kṣemarājaḥ indicates that previous Siddhāntin commentators simply interpreted objectionable elements away.

Similarly, the commentary of the Kāśmīri Śaiva-siddhāntin Rāmakaṇṭhaḥ on the portions of the *Maṭaṅgaparameśvarāgama*, which treat the extreme practices of the *sādhakaḥ*, are no longer extant. (V. Alexis Sanderson, review of *Maṭaṅgaparameśvarāgama*, by N.R. Bhatt, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 48, pt.3 (1985), p.565)

1.2. THE COMMENTARY "UDDYOTAḤ" OF KṢEMARĀJAḤ

1.2.1 A Proponent of Monistic Śaivism

In his commentary on *Svacchandatantram* entitled, "Uddyotaḥ" or illumination, Kṣemarājaḥ clearly displays an awareness of both the analytic and synthetic aspects of his subject. His extensive and erudite cross-references and explication of details exhibit recognition of the need to analyze the text, i.e., to trace and to generate the micro-context that might clarify each component. And his systematic hermeneutic, philosophical apologetic, or technical, attempts to do justice to the work as a synthesis, i.e., to unfold and confirm it as scripture. In these two phases of his commentary, Kṣemarājaḥ fulfills the classical role of a Sanskrit commentator: to simultaneously transmit tradition by conserving and illuminating it, and in the interpretation and appropriation of that very tradition, annul change and validate innovation as continuity.

The wide gap, both chronological and social, that separated Kṣemarājaḥ from the first anonymous compilers of *Svacchandatantram*, intensified his commentatorial efforts to both conserve and reinterpret, and undoubtedly contributed to the length of his commentary. Kṣemarājaḥ, a student of Abhinavaguptaḥ, lived in Kāśmīr in the eleventh century, centuries after the first stage in the composition of *Svacchandatantram*.¹ In his commentary on *Svacchandatantram*, and in his other works, unfortunately, Kṣemarājaḥ gives little

¹ The dates of Abhinavaguptaḥ, (fl.c.975–1025 A.D.), suggest dating his direct disciple Kṣemarājaḥ to c.1000–1050 A.D. (For the life and dates of Abhinavaguptaḥ v. Alexis Sanderson, "Abhinavagupta," in *The Encyclopedia of Religion* 1 (New York: Macmillan, 1987): 8–9; v. also Pandey, *Abhinavagupta*, pp.253–257 on Kṣemarāja's dates and works; Kṣemarājaḥ, he suggests, may have been Abhinavagupta's cousin.)

biographical information about himself, other than devotional acknowledgement of his master Abhinavaguptaḥ. No evidence exists to support the once proposed identification of Kṣemarājaḥ with his Kāśmiri contemporary and fellow student of Abhinavaguptaḥ, the famous polymath, Kṣemendraḥ.¹ Kṣemarāja's extant works testify to an impressive scholarship in all branches of learning worthy of his teacher, although, unlike Abhinavaguptaḥ, he appears to have confined his literary activity to only properly Śaiva subjects.

At this period in Kāśmir, Śaivism enjoyed special royal favor and patronage.² Vaiṣṇavism, Buddhism, and many minor cults also flourished in an atmosphere of relative toleration and reciprocal influence undoubtedly stimulated by factors such as peripheral geographic location and openness to foreign contact. Abhinavaguptaḥ, according to his own statements, studied with masters of every persuasion.³ His encyclopædic learning and literary production testifies to this experience, which also molded his philosophical outlook.

¹ For a rejection of his theory v. Pandey, *Abhinavagupta*, p.266: "The only reason for identifying the one with the other is probably a scribal mistake which gives the name of Kṣemendra instead of that of Kṣemarāja in the colophons of the Spanda Sandoha and the Spanda Nirṇaya." (Additionally, it may be noted that in the exhaustive list of citations of poets in anthologies and inscriptions collected by Ludwik Sternbach, Kṣemarājaḥ never appears as a variant of Kṣmendraḥ. (V. Ludwik Sternbach, *A Descriptive Catalogue of Poets Quoted in Sanskrit Anthologies and Inscriptions* 1 (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1978): 240ff.))

² V. Krishna Mohan, *Early Medieval History of Kashmir* (New Delhi: Meharchand Lachhmandas Publications, 1981), pp.265ff.

³ For a list of his masters, v. Pandey, *Abhinavagupta*, pp.11-13. At M.K. Shāstri ed., *Tantrālokaḥ*, 13, vss.344ff, Abhinavaguptaḥ states that he studied with masters of all sorts, and justifies the legitimacy of this activity so long as one does not erroneously subscribe a higher status to the doctrines than they warrant.

In the monistic Śaivism, which Abhinavaguptaḥ elaborated as the highest truth, Śivaḥ manifests all appearances as his own essence. These appearances are neither ultimately unreal as in Advaita Vedānta, nor distinct and real as in Śaiva-siddhānta, but at once separate, real, and nevertheless unified in this highest reality which is Śivaḥ. This philosophy gave Abhinavaguptaḥ a means to give value to the multiplicity he experienced, account for it, and finally reconcile it all without conflict. In a royal setting, this monistic philosophy could function as an imperial ideology, for a kingdom whose realistic needs required upholding unity while rationalizing and accommodating social diversity in an integrated hierarchy under an ultimate sovereign. On a personal level, this monism gave Abhinavaguptaḥ a basis for justifying and accommodating a wide spectrum of concrete aesthetic and ritual experiences.¹

Abhinavagupta's encyclopædic magnum opus, the *Tāntrālokaḥ* in which he collected, organized, and re-presented the contents of the entire gamut of Śaiva scriptures, forms a counterpart to his philosophical and aesthetic writings. Just as he sought to theoretically unify all intellectual and all aesthetic experience, so in *Tāntrālokaḥ* he undertook the systematic selection, evaluation, and integration of all Śaiva writings in a unified Śaiva worldview. As Abhinavagupta's successor in this area, Kṣemarājaḥ continued his master's project in his commentary on *Svacchandatantram*. Among the Śaiva scriptures, this text had already obtained its own encyclopædic scope in ritual and cosmology through successive redaction, and had become aligned with his own tradition. It,

¹ V. Sanderson, "Abhinavaguptaḥ," p.9: "The study of aesthetics was traditional among the Śaivas of Kashmir, reflecting the importance of dance and music in their liturgies and the æstheticism of the Kaula mystical cults, which saw enlightenment not in withdrawal from extroverted cognition but in its contemplation as the spontaneous radiance of the self."

therefore, had the characteristics best suited for such a comprehensive commentatorial undertaking.

In his other writings, as well as his commentary on *Svacchandatantram* Kṣemarājaḥ sought to defend and develop the non-dual Śaiva philosophy of Abhinavagupta's lineage. Now there existed among all Śaivas a common recognition of the supreme and exclusive authority of scriptural revelation, over all other means of knowledge (*pramāṇāni*).¹ While independent philosophical works, using logical arguments, would be useful in discussions with rivals such as Vedāntins or Buddhists, within Śaivism, only arguments based on tradition had the power to convince.² Thus, in Kṣemarāja's overall project to continue the work of Abhinavaguptaḥ, his commentary on *Svacchandatantram* seeks to

¹ For a general discussion of scriptural revelation in traditional Indian thought, v. Gerhard Oberhammer, "Überlieferungsstruktur und Offenbarung. Aufriß einer Reflexion des Phänomens im Hinduismus," in *Überlieferungsstruktur und Offenbarung*, Gerhard Oberhammer und Hans Waldenfels, Publications of the de Nobili Research Library, Occasional Papers 1 (Wien: Institut für Indologie der Universität Wien, 1980), pp.11–36.

² V. bk.1, p.27 where Kṣemarājaḥ, defending the non-standard usage of the text, programmatically places scripture beyond rational criticism: (*"evam anyadapi paramēśvaravacaḥ sādḥveva bhagavaduktinām mitadṛṣṭibhiravikalpyatvāt"*). V. also bk.1, p.24.

The same relationship between logic and revelation exists within other systems, such as Advaitavedāntaḥ, v. Halbfass, *Studies in Kumārila and Śaṅkara*, pp.64ff. Summarizing the position of Padmapāda, for example, he writes (pp.66–67): "Reasoning, reflection (*tarka*) 'supports the means of knowledge' (*pramāṇānām anugrāhakas tarka iti*) insofar as it contributes to the subjective certitude concerning the object of valid knowledge, specifically the non-dual *ātman/brahman* which is the "object" (*viśayaḥ*) of the Vedic revelation. *Tarka* cannot add to or subtract from the validity (*prāmāṇya*) and objective certainty of this revelation. It can only make us ready to accept it without doubt and hesitation by demonstrating its possibility (*sambhāva*) and by removing apparent contradictions (*virodha*) from the Upaniṣadic 'great sayings.'"

find persuasive evidence of a scriptural non-dualism, and, thereby, formed an important complement to his independent treatises.¹

Along with these overtly philosophical and sectarian motives, undoubtedly an anxious desire to insure the unbroken and unaltered transmission of the meditational and ritual practices of the Śaiva tradition impelled Kṣemarājaḥ to write his commentary on *Svacchandatantram*, in the same way that it had stimulated Abhinavagupta to compose his *Tantrālokaḥ*.² Kṣemarājaḥ likely studied *Svacchandatantram* and related texts with Abhinavaguptaḥ, as he records his master's specific oral teachings at several places in his commentary.³ By implication, therefore, at least part of the rituals and meditations prescribed by the text remained alive or had practitioners at Kṣemarāja's time. His commentary, accordingly, sought to provide what he saw as the correctly transmitted context or mode of performance for the

¹ This leads Kṣemarājaḥ, naturally to extensive digressions on single verses of *Svacchandatantram* that actually state a virtual doctrinal position. Cf., for example, the commentary that begins bk.11.

² At the end of a lengthy commentary on the Praṇavaḥ, in bk.1 (p.58), for example, Kṣemarājaḥ justifies his work as needed to preserve the tradition that might otherwise be lost (*"alam mantrarahasyaprakāṣanena sampradāyastu mā paricchediti kiṃcidunmilitam"*). And similarly in the beginning of M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ* (1, vs.19), Abhinavaguptaḥ states that his work has been enjoined to teach those able students who are unable to receive the teaching from suitable masters (*ato 'trāntargataṃ sarvaṃ sampradāyojjhitairbudhaiḥ/ adṛṣṭa prakāṣikurmo gurunāthājñāyā vayam."*).

³ V., for example, bk.2, p.50, where Kṣemarājaḥ offers a specific interpretation of a meditation procedure as received from Abhinavaguptaḥ (*"... nyāsediti guruvah"*).

abbreviated prescriptions of the text, and, thereby, arrest the misinterpretation, misuse or decay to which they had fallen prey.¹

The structure and language of *Svacchandatantram* both enabled later commentary and made it necessary. As internal textual criticism has demonstrated, the text of *Svacchandatantram* grew over an extended period of time, in various only partially overlapping circles. At all times its summary and ambiguous verses must have required supplementation by oral tradition or other texts if they were to serve as the basis for ritual performance or meditation. Consequently, variation in practice must have been the rule, uniformity over time, an unlikely exception. And this ambiguity extended to the doctrinal portions of the text. For doctrine as well, in a practical handbook of this sort, only a summary, laudatory, or mnemonic treatment of topics could suffice, assuming a categorical philosophical position even existed in the circles of its transmission.

The closest approximation of a monistic assertion, sought to support his monistic doctrinal position, that Kṣemarājaḥ can find in the text of *Svacchandatantram*, comes in phrases praising the results of initiation as the obtaining of "Śiva-ness" (*śivatvam yāti . . .*).² He glosses this Śiva-ness, as identity with the supreme Śivaḥ (*"paramśivaikyaṃ"*), although no where does the text disambiguate this stereotypical assertion.³ Only at one place, does the text ever use language possibly referring to ideas of dualism or

¹ V., for example, bk.7, p.275, where Kṣemarājaḥ rejects an unnamed commentator's explanation of a prognostication using a breath meditation.

² V., for example, bk.10, p.155, vs.377: *"guruṇā tantraviduṣā hyātmā vai nirmalikṛtaḥ / na bhūyo malatām yāti śivatvam yāti nirmalam."*

³ Ibid. Kṣemarājaḥ also glosses the impurity idealistically as ignorance consisting in an erroneous and limited conception of the self (*"malatāmiti apūrnāmmanyatārūpāmakhyātim."*)

non-dualism, and even then, not in the context of a doctrinal discussion, but rather meditational practice.¹ The actual performance of many of the rituals in *Svacchandatantram*, such as the initiation ritual in which the master extracts the initiate's consciousness and fuses it with Śivaḥ, seem to presuppose a kind of functional identificatory monism, but certainly only in an implicit, pre-reflective, not yet philosophically theorized fashion.²

Textual evidence argues, then, in the case of *Svacchandatantram*, and by implication also other early Śaiva scriptures, for a later development of explicit non-dualistic and dualistic sectarian Śaiva schools. Undoubtedly, the increasing influence of the devotional or *bhakti* movements contributed to the explicit formulation of a dualistic Śaiva-siddhānta.³ Such dualism corresponds well with the underlying devotional image of the universe divided into obedient subjects and a compassionate but controlling supreme ruler. Similarly, the theoretical and ritual non-dualism of the Kaula lineage of Abhinavaguptaḥ might

¹ The verse in question (Bk.10, p.428, vs.1038) states that those who are devoted to Umāpatiḥ, who in the context of this book represents a lower form of the supreme lord, obtain his world as a reward (*"drṣtvā ca maṇḍalam tasya bhaktyā ca parayā bhr̥śam/ muktadvaitā yatātmanastatra yānti manīṣiṇaḥ."*). And Kṣemarājaḥ accordingly glosses this *"muktadvaitā"* as referring to the concentration of their devotion (*"umāpatireva ekā pāramārthiki devateti ..."*).

² This monism would also seem to be implied by identification of the master with Śivaḥ, required before any ritual practice, and expressed by the adage found in many *āgamaḥ* and quoted by Kṣemarājaḥ (Bk.2, p.22): *"śivo bhūtvā śivam yajet."* (*Svacchandatantram* states itself in the verse (vs.35): *"śivikāryastathātmaiva."*)

Cf. supra section I.1.5. for a discussion of the imagery used by the text compilers, and of the meditations conducted by Bhairava worshippers.

³ V. Iyer and Gros, *Tēvēram*, introduction "Towards Reading the Tēvēram," pp.liii-liv.

represent the consequent reflective evolution and maturation of a cult such as the Kāpālikāḥ in which identification with a deity through possession led to occult transformation and powers.¹ In general, then, monism could be interpreted as the presupposition of both the early Śaiva ritual and the magical Bhairava rites described in a text like *Svacchandatantram*.² And thus, though *Svacchandatantram* did not, *expressis verbis*, provide a scriptural basis for Kṣemarāja's formalized non-dualistic philosophy, it likely did represent the scriptural source, which among those commonly accepted by all Śaivas, stood closest to the mix of groups and practices that led to the non-dualistic system of his own period.

Kṣemarājaḥ refutes dualistic Śaiva-siddhāntin commentators on the *āgamāḥ*, throughout his work, occasionally even mentioning them by name.³ His own remarks suggest that even those not

¹ V. Sanderson, "The Brahmans of Kashmir," p.202: "... within the scriptural traditions which prescribed this Kāpālika cult of power through impurity ... there developed the new idealist vision of internal transcendence."

² Cf. Helmuth von Glasenapp, "Tantrismus und Śaktismus," in Helmuth von Glasenapp *Ausgewählte Kleine Schriften*, hrg. Heinz Bechert und Volker Moeller, Glasenapp-Stiftung 18 (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1980), p.387: "*Das Charakteristikum der Tantras besteht vielmehr darin, daß sie all'den in sich so oft verschiedene und mannigfaltigen Anschauungen und Handlungen eine gemeinsame Basis zu geben versuchen. Die Vorstellung, daß die ganze Welt mit der Fülle ihre Erscheinungen ein Ganzes bildet, bei dem auch das Kleinste auf das Größte eine Wirkung ausüben kann, weil geheimnisvolle Fäden auch das Geringste mit dem ewigen Weltgrunde verknüpfen, ist die eigentliche Grundlage aller tantrischen Philosophie.*"

³ The Śaiva-siddhāntin authors mentioned by Kṣemarājaḥ include: Sadyojyotiḥ, (fl.c.900 A.D.) (Bk.11, p.42) also called Khetapālāḥ (Bk.5, p.99) and Khetakanandanāḥ (Bk.8, p.23); Brhaspatiḥ (fl.c.900 A.D.) (Bk.1, p.3); Nārāyaṇakaṇṭhaḥ (fl.c.1075 A.D.) (Bk.4, p.130); and Bhullakaḥ (Bk.10, p.211, et al.) author apparently of a *Brhaṭṭikā* on *Svacchandatantram*, but not further identified by Kṣemarājaḥ; (The *Brhaṭṭikā* is also one title [along with

named directly belonged to the dualistic Śaiva-siddhānta, since he claims to have written his commentary to establish the non-dualistic character of scripture. And, in one extended section, almost a short treatise in length, he systematically argues against the opinions of Buddhist, Vedāntins, and at great length, these dualistic authors.¹

In his commentary, many of Kṣemarāja's disagreements with the dualists concern details like correct readings, glosses, and

Śaranniśā] of Nārāyaṇakanṭha's commentary on Sadyojyoti's *Tattvasaṃgrahaḥ*.) (V. Rohan A. Dunuwila, *Śaiva Siddhānta Theology* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1985), pp.62ff.)

V. bk.15, p.146, where Kṣemarāja states that he wrote his commentary on *Svacchandatantram* in order to wipe away dualistic interpretations (*"gatānugatikaproktabhedavyākhyātamo 'punat/tenādvaitāmṛtasphītaḥ svacchandoddyota umbhitaḥ"*). While sometimes Kṣemarāja appears to be rejecting specific previous interpretations by presumably dualistic commentators, such as Bhullakaḥ, on *Svacchandatantram*, he often appears to be using his interpretation of *Svacchandatantram* to reject commentary on comparable passages in other scriptural texts. Thus, through his commentary on *Svacchandatantram* he intends the rehabilitation, as it were, not only of *Svacchandatantram* but of all the Śaiva scriptures that have been distorted by dualistic commentary. (V., for example, his reference at bk.5, p.98 to the famous commentary of Sadyojyotiḥ on the *Rauravāgamaḥ*: *"rauravaśāstre 'pyuktam prāyastam vṛthaiva vṛttikṛtā."*) He can justify this undertaking by his presupposition of a unitary corpus of Śaiva revelation in which divisions into separate scriptures are secondary. (V.infra section I.2.4. on his idea of unitary scripture and his efforts to reconcile scriptural differences.)

For an example of Kṣemarāja's correction of previous textual reading of Bhullakaḥ, of a passage of *Svacchandatantram*, and by implication commentary, v. bk.11, p.137; for a clear correction of an interpretation of Bhullakaḥ, v. bk.11, pp.23-24; on a typical refutation of a scriptural interpretation, but not necessarily one by a previous commentator on *Svacchandatantram*, bk.10, p.447; and for a clear refutation on the basis of *Svacchandatantram* of a general scriptural interpretation, bk.11, p.42, against Sadyojyotiḥ.

¹ V. bk.5, pp.72-99.

points of ritual procedure.¹ In discrediting previous commentary on seemingly smaller issues, however, Kṣemarājaḥ, evidently sought to reinforce the general aura of superiority of his own interpretation and tradition for transmitting the true teaching of the Śaiva scriptures, especially, in the larger theoretical and doctrinal areas.² Among those issues closely related to the central debate over dualism or non-dualism, Kṣemarājaḥ notes disputes over the interpretation of statements in *Svacchandatantram* and other scriptures concerning the causal structure of the ritual.³ He takes pains to prevent any inappropriate inference from language in *Svacchandatantram* calling Śivaḥ the cause, the initiate, an effect, and the master an instrument. For this cause and effect language, which suggests a paradigm of an actual relationships between discrete entities, would seem to support the dualistic Śaiva-siddhāntin philosophy.⁴

The opposition between a realistic external world view of stable entities and relations, and an ideal interior world view of appearances projected by an underlying unity, underlies almost

¹ Cf., for example, bk.11, pp.50–51, on the preparation of a protective amulet, where Kṣemarājaḥ notes an alternative reading and corrects previous interpretations of some elements in the ritual procedure.

² Thus in bk.1, p.24, after asserting the conformity of his interpretation with revelation, which is the only valid means of knowledge, he rejects the statements of other interpreters as ridiculous nonsense (*“atra ca īśvaroktekapramāṇake upapattayaḥ ālajālaprāyā likhitāḥ tā upahāsyā eva”*).

³ V. bk.2, p.107, and bk.3, pp.225–225. Kṣemarājaḥ categorically declares (p.226) that there exists no cause and effect relations in the ritual (*“śivaḥ sāksātkartā prayojaka ācaryaḥ ityādi svoktena vyāhanyate/ na ca prayojyaprayojakabhāvaḥ kaścidatra purvatra vā granthe ‘stīti.”*). Cf. also the summary of bk.11, pp.1–7.

⁴ For the Śaiva-siddhāntin view of causality, v. Schomerus, *Aruṇantis Śivajñānasiddhiyār* 1: 60ff.

every contrasting position of the dualistic Śaiva-siddhāntins and the non-dualistic Śaivas. Moreover, this fundamental philosophical contrast mirrors their social sectarian disputes about ritual purity and caste. Sections of *Svacchandatantram* and other Śaiva scriptures enjoin as a preliminary part of initiation (*dikṣā*), the ritual extraction of the initiate's caste (*jātyuddhāraḥ*), and the endowment of a twice-born caste (*dviḥjatvāpādanam*), and finally of participation in Rudra (*rudrāṃśāpādanam*).¹ Prior Siddhāntin commentators had interpreted these rites as affecting not an initiate's actual caste, but only his qualifications for the Śaiva initiation ritual. While the Siddhāntin commentators differed from orthodox *dharmaḥ* in maintaining that their rituals could compensate for differences in purity and suspend caste obligations at least in a ritual setting, they insisted in the same way on the maintenance of their own caste distinctions outside of the ritual arena. For the Śaiva-siddhāntins, caste distinctions had a real existence, just like the rest of the impurities or qualities that the initiation excised or imparted.

For Kṣemarājaḥ, by contrast, these distinctions of purity and caste, like all distinctions, result from ignorance and have no ultimate foundation. Thus in the interpretation of these rituals he has no need to skirt the implications of extracting the currently existent caste of the initiate, and can straightforwardly accept its social implications.² In order to support his position, he refers to

¹ V. bk.4, pp.27ff. On these rites from the viewpoint of the Siddhāntin, v. Brunner-Lachaux, *Somaśambhupaddhati*, troisième partie, pp.132-136.

² The reintroduction of caste distinctions would explain the dropping of the rite of caste extraction (*jātyuddhāraḥ*) in later Siddhāntin handbooks and redactions of the *āgamāḥ*. (V. Brunner-Lachaux, *Somaśambhupaddhati*, troisième partie, p.134, who notes this omission.)

In his commentary on these rites, Kṣemarājaḥ notes the related rite later (Bk.10, pp.158ff.) prescribed for the purifying of

the concluding sections of the initiation described by *Svacchandatantram* that flatly declare the post ritual existence of only a single common Rudra or Bhairava caste.¹ Here the text unequivocally portrays the Śaiva initiate, even outside of a ritual setting, as truly liberated and beyond distinctions of caste and impurity.

Elsewhere in the text Kṣemarājaḥ notes seemingly small differences in details of ritual procedure that reflect this major split over purity and caste. Previous commentators, for example, had evidently rejected the prescription by *Svacchandatantram* that Bhairava should be worshipped with an offering of alcohol. Kṣemarājaḥ explicitly argues that these commentators in glossing alcohol as water deny the rite which has extracted the initiate's caste and revealed his participation in Bhairavaḥ.² Similarly,

different kinds of existence from plants up to the brāhmaṇaḥ and all forty-eight brāhmaṇical *saṃskārāḥ*. In the context of the apparently older initiation rite preserved in this book, the twice-born status appears to be conferred only so that it can be negated. Kṣemarājaḥ, accordingly must rationalize (Bk.4, pp.28-29) the rite in bk.4, which apparently represents a halfway stage back to the reacceptance of caste, as not conflicting with this procedure. Not surprisingly, this rite is downplayed by later Siddhāntin texts and commentators. (V. Brunner-Lachaux, *Somaśambhupaddhati*, troisième partie, pp.272-273).

¹ Bk.4, pp.330, vs.543a: "*ekaiva sã smṛtã jãtirbhairaviyã śivãvyayã*." The text continues by asserting that even the post-initiation mention of prior caste requires expiation. No separate caste rules exist after initiation, except for the differences enjoined by different grades of Śaiva initiation (Bk.4. p.321, vs.540: "*brāhmaṇāḥ kṣatriyā vaiśyāḥ śūdrāścānye 'thava priya/ sarve te samadharmāṇāḥ śivadharme niyojitāḥ*.")

² V. bk.2, vs.136a: "*paścadarghaḥ pradātavyaḥ surayā susugandhayā*," to which Kṣemarājaḥ comments: "*ye tu jãtyuddhãraparabhairavarũpatvonmilake 'pyasmin bhairavanaye surãśabdam jalavãcinamapi vyãcaksate te jãtigrahagrastãḥ*," He proceeds to buttress his position by referring to the post-initiation rules in bk.5 (p.41, vs.48) which enjoin respect for meat, fish, wine, and other forms of tantric behaviour.

Kṣemarājaḥ argues that when *Svacchandatantram* enjoins the master to use four colors on the ritual ground in order to construct the matrix of Bhairavaḥ and Bhairavi, it intends them to be mixed and thereby repudiates differences in castes.¹ These passages suggest that the Siddhāntin commentators consistently explained away Bhairava elements in the text not consonant with their position. Thus, while *Svacchandatantram* shared many rituals and practices with other *āgamāḥ* that could be used to bolster the Siddhāntin position, it nevertheless retained elements of antecedent Bhairava traditions that Kṣemarājaḥ could effectively emphasize to undermine the general authority of the Siddhāntin interpretation.

1.2.2 Interpretation and Reinterpretation of Ritual

Both Kṣemarājaḥ and the previous Siddhāntin commentators, therefore, had systematic prejudgments and prejudices that colored their commentary on *Svacchandatantram*. Moreover, a cultural and temporal hiatus separated them from the compilers and redactors of *Svacchandatantram*. Depending upon the section under consideration, therefore, the quality of their commentary, consequently, may have ranged from biased falsification to literal recording of a living tradition. Alongside his polemical and expository intent, Kṣemarājaḥ probably desired to offer a clear and coherent guide to the ritual and practices surrounding the scriptural cult of Bhairavaḥ. The paradigm of this undertaking is the digest (*paddhatiḥ*) or handbook of later medieval authors

¹ V. bk.1, p.24, vs.28: to the verse's injunction:
"sitaraktapitakṣṇāṃ bhūmim . . . , 'Kṣemarājaḥ comments:
"varṇānāṃ brāhmaṇādīnāṃ śveta . . . iti bhedadarsānavannātra
vibhāga uktaḥ saṃkirṇavarṇā tu bhūrvyacchinnā. "

intent on collecting, reorganizing, and harmonizing rituals described in many scriptures.¹

Besides their sectarian motivation, to some extent, the compiling of these collections, as of *Tantrālokaḥ*, must have occurred in response to the weakening if not dying out of the circles responsible for the transmission of the traditions represented in individual scriptures. In later periods, these handbooks completely supplanted use of the actual scriptures. And contemporary Śaiva-siddhāntin practice documents this historical progression; there the handbooks and later Tamil Siddhāntin literature has almost entirely displaced the ritual and dogmatic use of the *āgamāḥ*. The temple ritual survives and even flourishes, but in a form modified and taught according to the actual usage of the temple priests who point out the obstacles to performance that the impractical and even impossible prescriptions of the scriptures would entail. While nominally praised and acknowledge as authoratative revelation, the scriptures are used only due to revivalist efforts.²

Presumably, in his commentary, Kṣemarājaḥ would have therefore attempted to revive some practices of *Svacchandatantram*, to preserve others, and finally to transmit his knowledge of the living tradition of the remainder. Many times in his commentary, accordingly, he explicates the text from seeming firsthand knowledge, when he supplies a ritual procedure (*prayogaḥ*) not elaborated by the text.³ At other times, however,

¹ V. Brunner-Lachaux, *Somaśambhupaddhati*, premier partie, pp.ii-iv.

² On the contemporary Śaiva-siddhāntin practice in South India, v. Fuller, *Servants of the Goddess*, pp.142ff.

³ These supplied *prayogāḥ* usually specify the formula to be used with another action in a rite such as an oblation. V., for example, bk.2, p.99.

he supplements and contextualizes the statements of *Svacchandatantram* by cross-references in a way suggesting that the passage of the text and its ancillary tradition had not been preserved.¹

This reclamation of the text, especially of its Bhairava sections, which had induced apologetic exegesis from the other commentators, apparently had its limits, however, even for Kṣemarājaḥ. His perfunctory and abbreviated remarks on some of these sections reflect the distance that also separated him from the circles where these elements of *Svacchandatantram* had originated and thrived. These circles evidently cultivated, transmitted, and promulgated direct, self-contained practices that promised liberation (*mukṭiḥ*) and enjoyment (*bhukṭiḥ*) or specific powers (*siddhiḥ*). As noted, *Svacchandatantram* has retained these rites, often now embedded in larger structures, but still echoing these self-laudatory assertions of efficacy. For the later Siddhāntins the entire concept of enjoyments and powers had fallen into disrepute and disuse along with the initiatory category of the adept *sādhakaḥ*. And even for Kṣemarājaḥ, though these allegedly abrupt magical rites formed an integral part of his antecedent tradition, those promising malevolent powers required moral and mystical reinterpretation.²

¹ For an example of a passage requiring extensive supplementary explanation v. bk.5, pp.21-23. Here, in the course of describing the master's construction of a ritual diagram, *Svacchandatantram* provides only the briefest instructions about its doors, which Kṣemarājaḥ then must elaborate by citing two other texts, the *Lakṣmikaṭāraṇavaḥ* and *Parā* and a pair of general verses received through tradition (*"gurupāramparyenāyātam"*). As if offering an apologetic for his procedure, he notes that in these cases, the procedure stated in other texts and in other parts of *Svacchandatantram* should be followed in order to carry out the necessary operation.

² V. bk.6, pp.164. After commenting upon a series of such rites, Kṣemarājaḥ concludes with the summary qualification that

Moreover, the range of commentatorial reinterpretation encompassed the formal rituals of initiation found in *Svacchandatantram* and shared with the other Śaiva *āgamāḥ*. Along with the rest of Indian religious groups, the Śaiva scriptures accepted the fundamental doctrine of an eternal cycle of rebirth (*samsāraḥ*) propelled by the moral consequences of action (*karma*).¹ In addition to action, they viewed the bondage (*pāśaḥ*) of the soul (*paśuḥ*) as having two other fundamental and interrelated forms, that due to *Māyā* and that due to the ensuing delusion which caused the soul to conceive of itself as a delimited entity (*aṇuḥ*).² Only the grace of the lord (*patiḥ*), they believed, could disrupt this cycle by eradicating this fundamental triple impurity (*malam*) which caused the entrapment of the soul in this cycle and obstructed liberation. This grace mediated through initiation would confer true knowledge on the soul of its real state.³

At the heart of the complex initiation liturgy prescribed by the *āgamāḥ*, the master empowered as Śivaḥ literally enacts this

the morally restrained adept who would be initiated to such powers, would not unleash them unless responding to a malevolent attack initiated by another: *"sumedhaso yamaniyamādivaśikṛtadhiṣaṇasya ata eva yathākathañcitksudrakarmānyanārabhamāṇasya apitu mukhyasiddhyaṅgatayā svikārayogyasya vaśikaranādisiddhi-sāadhanaparipanthanaścoccāṭaṇādi avasare kurvataḥ."*

¹ On *karma* as a basic organizing principle and as a central focus of debate for many Indian schools v. E. Gerow, "What is Karma (Kṛm Karmeti)? An Exercise in Philosophical Semantics," *Indologica Taurinensia* 10 (1982): 87-116.

² V. bk.3, p.233, vs.175: *"pāsāstu trividhā bhāvyā māyiyāṇavakarmajāḥ caitanyarodhakāstvetē"*

³ V. bk.10, pp.295-297, vss.103-105: *"vinā prasādādisasya jñānametanna labhyate/ nacāpi bhāvo bhavati dikṣāmaprāpya dehinām// yadā tu kāraṇācchaktirbhavennirvāṇakārikā śivecchayā prapadyeta dikṣām jñānamayīm śubhām// mantrayogātmikām divyām tato mokṣam vrajetpaśuḥ/ nānyathā mokṣmāyāti api jñānaśatairapi//"*

liberation by visualizing this triple bondage as localized on cords, which he severs and destroys. The later sectarian Śaiva schools, however, arguing from mature theological and philosophical positions, retrospectively qualified the exclusive claims made for this ritual and selectively emphasized aspects of its symbolism to support their own viewpoint. Since both the dualistic Śaiva-siddhāntins and the non-dualists such as Kṣemarājaḥ acknowledged the Śaiva scriptures as revelation, they could not directly reject the inherited ritual of initiation. Instead they sought to temper the exclusive views of the Śaiva ritualists by reinterpreting the ritual and including it as one means in a hierarchy of means (*upāyāḥ*) with knowledge (*jñānam*), which, as in most schools, was accorded the top position.¹

While emphasizing knowledge and devotion (*bhaktiḥ*) as the highest means, the later Śaiva-siddhāntins through their dualistic philosophy could better tolerate the causal mediation of grace

¹ On the different means and preeminence of knowledge in later Śaiva-siddhānta, v. Schomerus, *Arunantis Śivajñānasiddhiyār* 1: 312ff. Here in the fundamental systematic work of Tamil Śaiva-siddhāntins composed c.1250 A.D., the traditional four topics of the *āgamāḥ*, are ranked in the ascending order of importance, *caryā*, *kriyā*, *yogaḥ*, *jñānam*. Only the last conveys true liberation: "Die endgültige, in der unzertrennlichen Gemeinschaft mit Śiva in seiner Transzendenz bestehende und unübertreffliche Seligkeit ist die durch jñāna- oder sanmārga erlangte Seligkeit."

On the hierarchy of means in monistic Śaivism, v. Bettina Baumer, "Die Unvermitteltheit der höchsten Erfahrung bei Abhinavagupta," in *Transzendenzforschung, Vollzugshorizont des Heils*, hrsg. Gerhard Oberhammer, Publications of the de Nobili Research Library 5 (Wien: Institut für Indologie der Universität Wien, 1978), pp.61-79. Here the means, all understood as ways of knowing, in ascending order are *ānava-*, *śākta-*, *śāmbhava-*, and *an-upāyāḥ*. As Abhinavaguptaḥ explains (M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ*, 1, vs.245) this schema constitutes the organizing theme of his entire presentation of the Śaiva scriptures.

implied by the ritual in its external and institutionalized forms.¹ For grace, they believed, always came mediated through the master for ordinary human devotees.² In their circles then, ritual and lower means persisted revalued and tolerated as propædeutics for the higher means, or heuristically sanctioned for those otherwise incapable of access to liberation.³ Similarly, transhuman powers, now devalued as ends in themselves, were totally repudiated by a milieu that came to see them as fundamentally incompatible with the seeking of liberation.⁴

For Kṣemarājaḥ, and the monistic Śaivas, liberation could not be produced by an action, but could only become manifest in an unmediated knowledge, or recognition of the true nature of the self.⁵ This view entailed a rejection of any mechanical and causal

¹ On the relation of *bhaktiḥ* and knowledge in the *Śivajñānasiddhiyār*, v. Mariasusa Dhavamony, *Love of God according to Śaiva Siddhānta* (Oxford: At The Clarendon Press, 1971), pp.235ff.

² V. Schomerus, *Arunantis Śivajñānasiddhiyār* 1: 290ff, on vs.2, and 319ff, on vs.28, which asserts the mediating role of the master not only in the various forms of initiation, (294ff, vs.3) but also for knowledge: "Wie das Brennglas Feuer hervorbringt, wenn die hell strahlende Sonne darauf scheint, so wird, wenn der edle Guru erscheint, in den Ātman das wahre Wissen entstehen."

V. the conclusion of bk.10, (p.557, vs.1278-1279b) where the same role of the master may be implied: "*gurvaktraprayogena tasminyojyeta śāsvate ... parame tattve.*"

³ V. Schomerus, *Arunantis Śivajñānasiddhiyār* 1: 295ff, 317ff.

⁴ On the later Śaiva-siddhāntins complete rejection of *siddhiḥ*, v. Schomerus, *Arunantis Śivajñānasiddhiyār* 1: 337ff.

⁵ For the programmatic rejection of all action, including reasoning, as a means to liberation, and the reinterpretation of all means as unmediated knowledge of the self, v. M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ*, 2, esp., vss.7-11: ("*tatra ye nirmalātmāno bhairaviyām svasamvidam/ nirupāyām upāsināstadvidhiḥ praṇigadyate// tatra tāvatkriyāyogo nābhyupāyatvamarhati/ sa hi tasmātsamudbhūtaḥ pratyuta pravibhāvyate// jñaptāvupāya eva*

conception of the operation of grace, and a reinterpretation of all ritual as a noetic act. For the school of Kṣemarājaḥ, the reinterpretation of liberation as insight into one's identity with the supreme consciousness led to a radical reinterpretation of the entire inherited panoply of rituals as meditative acts of knowledge. Here the monistic Śaivas replicated the argumentation of the Vedāntins who rejected any claims of the Mīmāṃsakas that an action, even a special ritual action, could confer liberation.¹ Since every action produces an effect that generates further action, the cycle, they argued, could be broken only by an insight, radically discontinuous with any activity.

1.2.3 Commentatorial Techniques

Accordingly, this monistic reinterpretation of ritual and reappropriation of the text from Śaiva-siddhāntins and Śaiva ritualists constitutes a recurrent and dominant theme of Kṣemarāja's commentary. Kṣemarājaḥ dwells upon any phrase of

*syāditi cejjñaptirucyate/ prakāśatvaṃ svaprakāśo tacca tatrānyataḥ
katham// saṃvittattvaṃ svaprakāśamityasminkim na yuktibhiḥ/
tadabhāve bhavedviśvaṃ jaḍatvādaprakāśakam// yāvānupāyo
bāhyaḥ syādāntaro vāpi kaścana/ sa sarvastanmukhaprekṣi
tatropāyatvabhākkatham. ")*

¹ For a summary of the contrast between Vedāntin and Mīmāṃsakāḥ, in Sureśvara's *Naiskarmyasiddhiḥ*, v. Otto Strauß, "A Contribution to the Problem of the Relation between Karman, Jñāna and Mokṣa," Otto Strauß *Kleine Schriften*, hrsg. Friedrich Wilhelm, Glasenapp-Stiftung 24 (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1983), pp.464-471. Cf. also Halbfass, *Studies in Kumārila and Śaṅkara*, pp.65-66. "Again and again, Sureśvara emphasizes that the Veda is self-sufficient, that its power and authority of revelation is neither dependent upon nor paralleled by worldly verification, and that the supreme truth which it teaches and which transcends all result-oriented 'works' (*karman*) cannot and need not be mediated by worldly activities."

the text that would appear to support his position.¹ This decontextualized reinterpretation was necessitated by the distance separating Kṣemarājaḥ from the intellectual and cultural milieu of the text's compilers. The Śaiva ritual and Bhairava devotees, who originally propagated many of the rites recorded in *Svacchandatantram*, certainly assumed the doctrine of *karma* and rebirth as the background for their practices. In contrast to the sectarian schools, however, they apparently purveyed their techniques as attractive and easy means for obtaining liberation or powers unencumbered by philosophical objections. And historical evidence indicates that these ritualist and magical practitioners not only represented an antecedent tradition, but also flourished in Kāśmīr at Kṣemarāja's time. Outside of the systematic Śaiva circles and thus unencumbered by their theorizing, circles of adepts may have made opportune use of the entire gamut of practices including the astrological lore and black magic described by texts like *Svacchandatantram*. Kṣemarāja's apparently knowledgeable and matter of fact commentary on these practices also indicates their continued life, though not necessarily in the traditions directly continued by the cultivated Śaiva teachers and priests.²

¹ V., for example, his commentary on the phrase in bk.10, (p.296, vs 704), that the auspicious initiation consists of knowledge ("*dikṣām jñānamayīm śubhām*"), which he interprets as asserting the primacy of knowledge over action and the equivalence of liberation and the realization of non-dual identity with the supreme consciousness: "*dikṣām jñānamayimītyanena proktavakṣyamānasamastādhvameyikaraṇalabdhaparapramāṭṭr-padānupraveśābhivyaktidām śubhām jīvanmuktirūpām jñānamayimītyanena kriyādikṣayāpi jñānasārataivetyādiśati.*"

² For a summary of the information provided by Kṣemendraḥ and Kalhaṇaḥ on the prevalence and influence of, in their view corrupt, tantric practitioners of all sorts in Kāśmīr at

Thus besides his Siddhāntin opponents, his commentary can be viewed as a theological and esoteric reappropriation and apologetic defense of the text from, in his perspective, concomitant misuse and vulgarization by the common tantric practitioner.

Kṣemarāja's project of reinterpretation runs interwoven with the more pedestrian parts of his commentary, in which he follows and fulfills the well accepted and defined classical role of *śāstraic* commentator.¹ First, Kṣemarāja remarks that he

this time, v. Mohan, *Early Medieval History of Kashmir*, pp.290–291.

Kṣemarāja gives additional indications of the living status of various rites in his commentary on the rules given by *Svacchandatantram* for priestly remuneration (*dakṣiṇā*). His remarks (Bk.4, p.282) underscore the necessity not only for honesty on the part of the initiate but also, notably, for lack of avariciousness on the part of the master. Elsewhere (Bk.2, p.74) he suggests the substitution of mental ritual substances for material ones as a way of avoiding unseemly wrangling over money. Here, once again, an interiorizing reformulation of external ritual as a noetic process, provides the *via regia* out of the otherwise inextricable morass of *karma*.

As indicated by passages (Bk.4, pp.326ff) in *Svacchandatantram* setting out the *dakṣiṇā* to be rendered, and stating that cheapness negated the effect of the initiation, these ritual performances must have provided the support for the Śaiva masters and ascetics who transmitted the text of *Svacchandatantram*. And consequently, an interiorizing interpretation like Kṣemarāja's would have had only limited appeal to such ritualists who benefitted by extolling the benefits of their ceremonies. (On the contemporary view of Tamil temple priests about *dakṣiṇā*, and a comparison with the brāhmaṇaḥ of other regions, v. Fuller, *Servants of the Goddess*, pp.65ff.)

¹ V. J.A.F. Roodbergen, trans., *Mallinātha's Ghaṇṭāpāṭha on the Kirātārjunīya, I–VI* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1984), pp.2, for the structure of the classical commentary: "... it is based on five elements ... *padacchedo 'nvayoktiś ca samāsādivivecanam / padārthabodhas tātparyo vyākhyāvayavapañcaka* ... '(1) marking off the words, (2) the statement of the words in their order of construction, (3) the examination of cps., etc.

expended a great deal of effort in establishing the correct readings for the text of *Svacchandatantram*.¹ He indicates that he used old manuscripts in order to reconstitute a text that a long series of interpolations and misreadings had corrupted and confused. Naturally, he has not left us a complete account of his editorial decisions, which expectedly would have often followed sectarian and logical rather than text-critical reasoning. Starting from the premise that the text represented part of a harmonious corpus of divine revelation, Kṣemarājaḥ clearly respected its readings, and using accepted commentatorial techniques relied on them and his ingenuity to generate the systematic sense that he desired. In order to deal with certain problems, however, he fell back on the explanation that in some cases human hands had disfigured the text by their own fabrications. By this theory of overall divine authorship and intermittent human intrusion, he rationalized his own procedure of conserving the text wherever possible, but leaving open the option for emendation and correction.² In some cases, therefore, Kṣemarājaḥ has simply noted a variant reading without

[compounds], (4) the explanation of word meanings, (5) (the statement of) the author's intention."

¹ Bk.13, p.120. Cf. supra section I.1.5.

² Cf. Srinavasa Ayya Srinavasan, *On the Composition of the Nāṭyaśāstra*, Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik, Monographie 1 (Reinbek: Dr. Inge Wezler Verlag für Orientalistische Fachpublikationen, 1980), pp.3-5, pp.74-75. As Srinavasan notes, in regard to a work that clearly represents a compilation such as the *Nāṭyaśāstram*, traditional Indian criticism had perceived that the work may have derived from more than one hand, e.g., Bharataḥ and his disciples. Abhinavaguptaḥ, however, rejecting the implications of this theory, preferred to approach the text as a unity, and thus wrote a harmonizing commentary of great theoretical interest. Similarly, Kṣemarājaḥ operates in the same way, with only necessary concessions to the problems of multiple, and in this case, human authorship.

comment, and in others, rejected a variant for various reasons that stem ultimately from human error.¹

Many of these variants, which had been introduced into the text during its redaction, did not affect the sense as much as the linguistic usage of the text. Later redactors tended to make the earlier vernacular Sanskrit of the text conform to Pāṇinian norms, while, as far as possible, still maintaining its original phrasing and metre.² The early compilers of *Svacchandatantram* likely employed this non-Pāṇinian Sanskrit, reflecting perhaps Middle Indic speech habits, unself-consciously, as the normal usage of their milieu. Their language shows no pseudo-vedicizing or deliberate archaizing, which would probably be precluded by their social status and anti-Vedic intentions. As this genre of text entered different circles in the course of its transmission, more educated redactors presumably normalized the usage to reflect their own standard, and perhaps with proselytizing intentions to enhance the claim of these texts to be authoritative scriptures. By the time the text had reached commentators like Kṣemarājaḥ, however, the acceptance of the text as scriptural authority brought a halt to this revision. The commentators felt simultaneously obliged to preserve the text as

¹ For an example of his simple noting of a variant, v. bk.2, p.124; for his justifying his reading as the older, v. bk.8, pp.6-7; for his rejecting a reading as conflicting with other passages, v. bk.12, p.65; for his rationalizing his not using an older reading, v. bk.5, p.39; for a rejection of an incorrect reading attributed to commentators, v. bk.11, p.117.

² On the characteristics of this vernacular Sanskrit and the priority of non-standard forms, v. Richard Salomon, "The Viṣṇu Purāṇa as a Specimen of Vernacular Sanskrit," *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens und Archiv für indische Philosophie* 30 (1986): 52-54.

is, and yet defend it from attack and further defensive alterations.¹

The Śaiva commentators like Kṣemarājaḥ, imitating the grammarians who had set the non-Pāṇinian usage within *smṛti* texts beyond censure as the usage of the seers (*ārṣaḥ prayogaḥ*), sanctioned the deviant usage within their scriptures, as *aiśaḥ*, i.e., the usage of the lord Īśaḥ.² Here they also followed the example of other non-Vedic traditions, such as the Buddhists and Jains who had earlier confronted the problem of non-standard but canonical usage.³ Instead of emending, therefore, Kṣemarājaḥ simply labeled and collected these forms in his commentary.⁴ Later redactors apparently continued to normalize and rationalize these forms, however, through adjusting the *pādapāṭhaḥ* or placing of word breaks in the continuous text that did not require changing the actual syllables. The commentators especially favored the more

¹ Cf. supra for the attitudes of the sectarian Śaivas to scriptures, and the citation of bk.1, p.27, where Kṣemarājaḥ declares that limited intellects should not question the utterances of the lord, either linguistically or substantively.

² On the application of the term (*ārṣaḥ prayogaḥ*), v. G.T. Despande, "Ārṣa Prayogas and Pāṇinian Rules," *Indological Papers* 1, Vidarbha Samshodhan Mandal Series 25 (Nagpur: Vidarbha Samshodhan Mandal, 1971), pp.78-89.

³ V. Richard Pischel, *Grammatik der Prākṛit Sprachen* (1900. Reprint. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1973), §16, pp.13-14.

⁴ V. bk.1, p.27; bk 4, p.77, p.146, p.242, p.324; bk.5, p.6, p.52; bk.6, p.129, p.143; bk.7, p.189, p.328; bk.9, p.31 p.39, p.60; bk.10, p.546.

ingenious of these adjustments that uncovered previously hidden sectarian enunciations.¹

Kṣemarājaḥ explains other grammatical irregularities or inconsistencies at various points throughout the text. Historically these irregular constructions likely derived from the same non-standard Sanskrit of the early compilers as those Kṣemarājaḥ explicitly labeled *aiśaḥ*. Since he could sometimes justify this usage by the application of grammatical rules, he perhaps refrained from marking it as *aiśaḥ*.² Similarly, irregularities due to metrical considerations, though noted, did not receive the label *aiśaḥ*.³ Kṣemarājaḥ, however, in many cases glossed an identical deviation as *aiśaḥ* in one place, and not in another, suggesting perhaps that all forms and usage he corrected or noted without rationalization, whether explicitly marked or not, he considered *aiśaḥ*.⁴

¹ Thus the middle imperative *kathayasva*, (Bk.1, vs.7, p.9; bk.5, vs.1, p.1; bk.11, vs.2, p.2; vs.316, p.170) becomes the more regular active imperative *kathaya* and the *sva* a vocative giving a non-dual sense in Kṣemarāja's gloss (Bk.1, p.9); ("*sva ātmarūpa paramēśvara*"). Note however that the phrase appears unbroken with its regular sense in bk.7 (vs.1, p.167). (Cf. for the apparent paradigm Abhinavagupta's commentary on the *Parātriśikā*, in Pandit Jagaddhara Zādoo Shāstri, ed., *Parātriśikā*, Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies 68 (Srinagar: Mercantile Press, 1947), vs.2, pp.2-3.)

² V., for example, his reasoning at bk.5.p.6, using the rule "*pātrāditvāt samāhāre stripratyayābhāvaḥ*," and bk.11, p.58, stating "*trn pratyayaḥ ... ata eva śaṣṭyabhāvaḥ*."

³ V. bk.11, p.66, where he notes a *metri causa* avoidance of *saṁdhiḥ*.

⁴ Thus in bk 4, (p.77) glossing an irregular compound, Kṣemarājaḥ states, "*pūrvanipātavyatya aiśaḥ*," and in bk.10, (p.228) simply "*pūrvanipātavyatyaḥ*."

Kṣemarājaḥ might have hesitated to ascribe non-standard forms to *aiśa* provenance or the original revelation because of his awareness of the defective transmission of the text. This awareness actively shaped another aspect of his straightforward commentatorial work, the blocking out of verses and or quarter verses (*pādaḥ*) as syntactic and semantic units. Primarily, this demarcation mirrored the commentator's possibly tendentious comprehension of the text, and provided a convenient structure for his remarks. In the case of *Svacchandatantram*, however, Kṣemarājaḥ often felt obligated to supply missing syntactic elements that completed the sense of these verse units. While some of these contextual additions merely represented a succinct and standard commentatorial way of rendering an interpretation, others might have recorded conjectures remedying genuine lacunæ and corruptions.¹ In other cases, Kṣemarājaḥ used more technical devices such as the principle of double construing to insure the requisite sense of the text.² Moreover, his division into verse units further mirrors his overarching concern to guarantee the unity and coherence of the text; accordingly, he selects precisely those units that

¹ V., for example, bk.3, p.221, commentary on vs.151, where Kṣemarājaḥ uses *śeṣaḥ* to mark the agent, apparently left unspecified due to the laconic form of the ritual instructions; and also, bk.4, p.60, commentary on vs.104, where Kṣemarājaḥ uses *śeṣaḥ* to mark the necessary subject either left unspecified because of the concision of the ritual instructions, or, as indicated by the difficult syntax, during the compiling of the text from another source.

² V. bk.4, p.62, where Kṣemarājaḥ uses the rule "*kāḥkāṣivat*" to produce the requisite sense from a set of verses.

maximize the continuity of the dialogue frame and the coherence of the topical arrangement. Frequently, he breaks off units that he can plausibly reconnect through his own interpositioning of logical links, in the form, for example, of arguments or supposed opponents' objections.¹ This restructuring represents an extension of his accepted responsibility as a commentator to demonstrate that the text of *Svacchandatantram* fulfills the stipulations of coherent expository speech.² And in this way, without tampering with the actual verses of the text, Kṣemarājaḥ could upgrade the level of its rhetorical and logical structure, and thus enhance its scriptural claims, while appropriating it for his own ends.

The repertoire of interpretative principles, developed by the Mimāṃsakas and utilized by all *śāstraic* commentators, furnished the ready instruments for much of Kṣemarāja's more straightforward commentary. Since he assumed that Śaiva texts had a scriptural nature like the Veda, Kṣemarājaḥ could apply Mimāṃsaka hermeneutics directly with minimal adaptation. In specific cases, he sometimes explicitly refers to their exegetical rules, or more often assumes their principles implicitly, throughout his remarks. Thus, though Kṣemarājaḥ does not refer to them, Mimāṃsaka principles guided his grouping and breaking up of verses into discrete syntactic and semantic units, and his supplying of missing, necessary parts of constructions.³ Another of

¹ V., for example, bk.4, p.178.

² V. his commentary on vs.11b-12a, in bk.1, pp.13-15, the first verse spoken by Bhairavaḥ, where Kṣemarājaḥ finds the standard elements of an introductory discourse such as the *adhikārin* and *prayojanam*. On these standard elements v. A. Foucher, trans., *Le Compendium des topiques. (Tarka-Saṃgraha) d'Annambhaṭṭa*, *Éléments de systématique et de logique indiennes* (Paris: Adrien-maisonneuve, 1949), pp.5ff.

³ For the principles of *ekavākyam*, "synatatical unit," *vākyabhedaḥ*, "syntactical split," and *anusāṅgaḥ*, "elliptical extension," v. Ganganath Jha, *Pūrva-Mimāṃsā in its Sources*

these basic principles, or extended application (*prasangaḥ*), recurs through out his commentary.¹ Acutely aware of the discontinuities in the text of *Svacchandatantram*, Kṣemarājaḥ regularly invoked this principle without elaboration as a convenient cover that maintained nominal textual continuity.² In the same manner, he justified his use of cross-references to interconnect and harmonize the rituals of *Svacchandatantram* by largely implicit application of the relationship of primary (*prakṛtiḥ*) and derivative rites (*vikṛtiḥ*), and the corollary transference of details (*atideśaḥ*).³ With these principles, he could sort and unify the various rites that had accumulated, historically stratified in the text, and disambiguate as desired, the laconic prescriptions, like *pūrvavat*, "as before," which once may have given leeway for individually varying performance. Similarly, he furnished ritual procedures (*prayogaḥ*) through the principle of the contextual modification of formulæ (*ūhaḥ*).⁴

(Varanasi: The Banaras Hindu University, 1964), pp.168ff. V. bk.1, p.7, where Kṣemarājaḥ uses the principle of *ekavākyam* to justify his unified interpretation of the opening verses of *Svacchandatantram*.

¹ V. Jha, *Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā in its Sources*, pp.310ff; v. for example, bk.2, pp.130–132, for a section marked *prasangaḥ*.

² And thus, for the textual critics, his marking of *prasanga* sections gives clues to the different sections of the text caused by successive compilation.

³ V. Jha, *Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā in its Sources*, pp.289ff. V. bk.2, p.92, where Kṣemarājaḥ justifies the use of cross-references to complete a ritual prescription by referring to the notion of *prakṛtiḥ* and *vikṛtiḥ*; v. bk.5, p.30, where he indicates the text's reliance on *atideśaḥ* to teach a ritual performance. V. bk.6, p.145, for the use by Kṣemarājaḥ of *āvāpaḥ*, to indicate a repeat of the details of a ritual; cf. Jha, *Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā in its Sources*, pp.307ff.

⁴ V. Jha, *Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā in its Sources*, pp.294ff. V. bk.2, p.109.

Where apt, Kṣemarājaḥ explicitly quoted interpretive rules or maxims (*nyāyaḥ*). Among these, the rule that in a conflict the requisite sense takes precedence over the textual sequence, provided him with a useful precedent for easily resolving apparent contradictions and inaccuracies in the text of *Svacchandatantram*.¹ In a particular case of such conflict, when confronted with a discrepancy in the number of arms given for a deity by *Svacchandatantram* and the number otherwise expected, Kṣemarājaḥ quoted the appropriate *nyāyaḥ* legitimating the interpretation of one as many.² Such maxims also appealed to commentators, who condemned wordiness, because of their succinctness and illustrative efficacy.³ The text of *Svacchandatantram* itself, has also incorporated a well known

¹ V. bk.1, p.43, bk.10, p.515: "*pāṭhakramādārthaḥ kramo baliyān*,". On this rule v. A.B. Gajendragadkar and R.D. Karmarkar, ed. and trans., *The Arthasaṃgraha of Laugākṣi Bhāskara* (1934; Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1984), §43, p.32. V. bk.10, p.272, where Kṣemarājaḥ refers to the rule "*pratipadoktasya vidheḥ*" to decide which ritual sequence to use; on this *paribhāṣaḥ*, ("*lakṣaṇapratipadoktayoh pratipadoktasya grahanam*") v. Louis Renou, *Terminologie grammaticale du Sanskrit*, Bibliothèque de l'école des hautes études 280-282 (Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1957), p.217.

² V. bk.1, p.47: "*grhaṃ saṃmārṣṭi itivat*," which implies that what is done to one extends to all, to which Kṣemarājaḥ adds the interpretive maxim of cross-referencing, ("*anāgatāvekṣana-rūpatantrayuktyā*") on the model of. "*prājāpatyā nava grahā bhavanti*," to get the eighteen arms later ascribed to Svacchanda-bhairavaḥ out of the pair described in the passage he is here commenting on. On this rule, v. Jha, *Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā in its Sources*, p.334.

³ V., for example, bk.9, p.48, where Kṣemarājaḥ uses the *daṇḍapūpiyanyāyaḥ*. V. Chhabinath Mishra, *Nyāyokti-Kośaḥ* (Delhi: Ajanta Publications, 1978), p.47.

maxim as an illustration.¹ This embedded maxim indicates that at least some of the redactors had knowledge of such popular maxims, if not detailed knowledge of *Mimāṃsā*.

In part, therefore, the *Mimāṃsaka* exegesis of Kṣemarājaḥ continued and elaborated the self-conscious scriptural compilation of these anonymous redactors. In one major area, however, Kṣemarājaḥ sharply distinguished Śaiva scriptures from Vedic scriptures, and unequivocally restricted the application of *Mimāṃsaka* principles: following Abhinavaguptaḥ he denied that the Śaiva revelation contained any explanatory material (*arthavādaḥ*).² The lord, he asserted, enunciated only injunctions or prescriptions (*vidhiḥ*) in his scriptures. Earlier commentators had evidently used the notion of *arthavādaḥ* to selectively de-emphasize segments of texts that no longer fitted with their sectarian religious sensibilities.³ This violated the fundamental

¹ V. bk.11, p.104, vs.186, bk.12, p.34, vs.82, where the text compares the wheel of transmigration to a Persian waterwheel (*"ghaṭayantravat"*, glossed by Kṣemarājaḥ as *"araghaṭṭaḥ"*). Cf. Mishra, *Nyāyokti-Kośaḥ*, p.39 *"ghaṭiyantranayaḥ"*. (On the Persian waterwheel, v. Vasudeva S. Agrawala, ed., *The Deeds of Harsha. Being a Cultural Study of Bāṇa's Harshacharita* (Varanasi: Prithivi Prakashan, 1969), p.82.)

As further possible signs of acquaintance with common exegetical terms on the part of redactors, v. bk.6, p.123, vs.20 which uses the terms *prakṛtiḥ* and *vikṛtiḥ*, and bk.6, p.112, vs.9, which invokes the concept of *codanā*, or scriptural injunction as the indispensable means of knowledge. (On *codanā*, cf. Jha, *Pūrva-Mimāṃsā in its Sources*, p.154.)

² Kṣemarājaḥ (Bk.1, p.40) quotes the following verse from the *Tantrālokaḥ* to support his position: *"vidhivākyamidam caiva nārthavādaḥ/ kadācana nārthavādābhirūpatvaṃ vākye māheśvare bhavet."*

³ Kṣemarāja's declaration that all the lord's statements are *vidhiḥ*, comes in his commentary on the panegyric coda that closes the description of the Bahurūpa formula in bk.1, (p.39, vs.45) and extolls its memorization as capable of removing all sin. This context suggests that other later commentators had wished to qualify this

apologetic intention of Kṣemarājaḥ in his commentary: both to safeguard the unity of scripture, and simultaneously, to find the entire doctrine of his school contained within the text.

Kṣemarājaḥ drew upon common Mimāṃsaka principles and rules, therefore, as the basis for much of the larger syntactic-interpretive sections of his commentary. Now an equally significant part of his straightforward commentating covered the individual semantic elements of the text. Thus he regularly analyzes compounds and glosses words. Usually these glosses explain by simple juxtaposition the primary, i.e., denotative meaning of words (*abhidhā*). Less often, he glosses words according to their putative secondary sense (*lakṣaṇā*). Typically, he intends not to supersede the primary sense but to supplement and adjust the information given by the text; in this way, use of an inclusive secondary sense (*ajahallakṣaṇā*) affords him another opportunity for expansion like that given by the frequent "etc." (*ādih*) of the text.¹ Finally, he often explains if a word is used in an additional specific technical (*pāribhāṣika-*) sense.²

assertion, stemming from earlier circles, that the formula could magically, as it were, yield liberation and success; a reasonable qualification, however, which Kṣemarājaḥ rejects: "... *sakala-bhogāpavargaprade mahāmantre nārthavādāśaṅkayā bhramitavyam.*"

¹ V., for example, bk.1, p.43, where to complete an iconographic description of Viṣṇuḥ, Kṣemarājaḥ understands the conch to be implied by the stated lotus: "*śaṅkena padmamupalakṣyate.*" On the extended use of *lakṣaṇā* in Vedāntin exegesis see J.A.B. van Buitenen, ed. and trans., *Rāmānuja's Vedārthasaṃgraha*, Deccan College Monograph Series 16 (Poona: Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute, 1956), pp.59ff.

² Many of these glosses concern the secret rituals, some of whose code or technical words (*chummakāḥ*) the text explains in bk 15. Thus, for example, in bk.13, (p.100) referring to this summary of code language Kṣemarājaḥ explains that the thread of a corpse means the ligament of a corpse (*mṛtasūtrena vakṣyamāṇa-chummkāyuktyā mṛtasnāyunā*).

Even in the absence of a seemingly appropriate passage or word, Kṣemarājaḥ could elaborate a desired philosophical or theological purport by glossing not the conventional sense (*rūḍha-*) of a word, but its etymological (*yaugika-*) sense.¹ Using this technique immeasurably widened the scope for sectarian commentary. With suitable creativity, commentators could appropriate even the most neutral and unmarked terms. Such etymologizing only loosely and occasionally followed the pattern of traditional derivation (*vyutpattiḥ*) utilizing the "*Dhātupāṭhaḥ*" and "*Uṇādisūtrāṇi*." A predetermined sectarian result precluded any objective weighing of the probabilities of phonetic and semantic similarity as done by traditional etymology (*niruktaḥ*).² Though Kṣemarājaḥ recorded numerous etymologies throughout his commentary, his own grammatical and intellectual training rule out assuming his own coinage of the more overt folk-etymologies. In their citation, as he indicates at various points in his commentary, he followed traditional sources.³ And thus he undoubtedly regarded their written preservation in his commentary as an essential part of his overall endeavor to conserve Śaiva traditions.

Some of these traditional etymologies, cited by Kṣemarājaḥ, closely follow the classical pattern of derivation from the most

¹ V. bk.3, p.233, where Kṣemarājaḥ offers a *rūḍha* derivation of the term *māyīya-*.

² Kṣemarājaḥ uses both *vyutpattiḥ* and *niruktam* interchangeably; v. their marking, for example, of etymologies in the same section of commentary in bk.1, pp.3-4.

³ At bk.1, p.4, he mentions as sources for his etymologizing both other scriptures and the apparently lost *Śivatanuśāstram* of the Śaivasiddhāntin Bṛhaspatiḥ ("*... evamāgameṣu niruktatvāt śrībrhaspatipādaiḥ śivatanāvanvarthavyākhyātasvarūpatvācca*").

semantically and phonetically similar verbal root.¹ Where appropriate, Śaivas likely borrowed these directly from grammatical-etymological circles or other earlier sources; for this type of etymologizing had a long prehistory in Vedic tradition from the Brāhmaṇas onward.² Other etymologies, more removed from the classical pattern and topically sectarian, likely had their origin

¹ V. the etymology of *devaḥ*, (Bk.1, p.3) that with a Śaiva extension builds directly on meanings of the root *divu*, such as *kriḍā*, *viḥgiṣā*, *vyavahāra*, *dyuti*, *stuti*, *gati*, and so forth, given in the traditional *Dhātupāṭhaḥ*.

The Śaiva etymologies resemble the non-grammatical etymologies found in the Brāhmaṇas in their loose derivations based on the principles of "*vṛttisāmānya*" and "*akṣaravarṇasāmānya*." Thus, for example, the derivation of Kailāsaḥ in bk.1 (p.4) from *kaṁ* (head), *elā* (cardamom seed), and *āsanam* (seat) (V. for these and other traditional etymological procedures, Madhukar Anant Mehendale, "The Science of Etymology (Niruktaśāstra)," in *Nirukta Notes, Series II* (Pune: Deccan College, Postgraduate and Research Institute, 1978), pp.63-80, especially, pp. 67ff.; Jan Gonda, "The Etymologies in the Ancient Brāhmaṇas," in *Selected Studies 2, Sanskrit Word Studies* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975): 32-57; for a study of popular etymologizing v. also Minoru Hara, "A Note on the Epic Folk-Etymology of *Rājan*," *Umesh Mishra Commemoration Volume* (Allahabad: Ganganatha Jha Research Institute, 1970), pp.489-499.)

In several places, (for example, bk.10, pp.86-87) Kṣemarājaḥ quotes mythic aetiological derivations of names, another type of non-grammatical etymology that occurs starting from the Brāhmaṇas. (On the *nidānavādin* school of etymologizing, who believed events gave rise to words, v. Mehendale, "The Science of Etymology (Niruktaśāstra)," pp.68-69.)

² Thus the etymology of Rudraḥ, quoted by Kṣemarājaḥ (Bk.11, p.149) "*rodanadrāvaṇakāritvādrudras*" builds on the traditional derivation from the root *rud-*, an etymology found first in the *Taittiriya-Saṁhitā* and *Śatapathabrāhmaṇam*. (For complete references to this etymology v. Manfred Mayrhofer, "Der Gottesname Rudra," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 103, 1 (1953): 140-150).

in specifically Śaiva groups.¹ At one point in its cosmological description, *Svacchandatantram* even has the narrating lord etymologize a proper name.² For this text, the inadvertent incorporation of a marginalium or redactional interpolation might explain these isolated etymologies. But considered with the evidence provided by Kṣemarājaḥ, this derivation suggests that sectarian etymologizing was already cultivated in the circles who compiled the scriptural Śaiva material used in *Svacchandatantram*.

Similarly, later groups of Bhairava devotees must have developed the intricate esoteric etymologies associated with his name and cult.³ Later, at the margin between etymology and

¹ V., for example, the etymology of *dikṣā* quoted by Kṣemarājaḥ (Bk.5, p.76) from an unnamed traditional source, that connects the word directly to Śaiva concept that initiation destroys bondage (deriving *ksā-* from the root *ksi-*) and gives knowledge of Śivaḥ (deriving *dī-* from the root *dā-* give): “*dīyate jñānasadbhāvaḥ kṣiyate paśuvāsanā/ dānakṣapaṇasaṃyuktā dikṣā teneha kirtitā.*”)

² V. bk.10, p.55, vs.119b-120a: “*hathādpraveśayellokāms-tadbhāvagatamānasān// tenāsau hāṭakaḥ prokto devadevo maheśvaraḥ.*” V. also bk.10, p.525, vs.1223 where the text explains the derivation of the cosmic level or meditation stage Nirodhini: “*nirodhayati devānsā brahmādyāmstu varānane / nirodhiniti vikhyātā.*” Cf. also the etymology of *ācāryaḥ*, given in bk.4, p.259, vss.408a-409b: “*evamācarate yastu ācāraṃ tu śivātmakam // śivena saha cāritvādācāryastena cocyate.*”

³ This etymology of Bhairavaḥ, which Kṣemarājaḥ gives at the beginning of bk.1, (pp.3-4) and Abhinavaguptaḥ at the beginning of M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ* (1, vss.94-100) evidently had been transmitted for some time in their antecedent lineage as a secret encapsulating essential features of doctrine and practice associated with Bhairavaḥ. Accordingly, at the end of his verses (vs.100) summarizing this etymological tradition, Abhinavaguptaḥ states that this etymology derives from the scriptures of the masters “*bhairava iti gurubhirimairanvarthaiḥ saṃstutaḥ śāstre,*” which Jayarathaḥ explains as “*gurbhiḥ tatacchāstrāvātārakaiḥ imaiḥ ebhiḥ samanantaroktaiḥ . . .*” For a simple form of this etymology contained in a scripture v. Paṇḍit Mukunda Rāma Shāstri, ed.,

commentatorial grammatical analysis, Kṣemarājaḥ offers a few specifically sectarian derivations that clearly had been modified by the avowedly non-dualistic circles of his immediate predecessors.¹ Here the etymologies of later redactors and commentators blur into the only vaguely etymologically occasioned or colored glosses of the metre filling vocatives frequently found in the text of *Svacchandatantram*.² This etymologizing over-interpretation of names demonstrates the later commentators' constant concern to reinforce and affirm the meaningfulness and unity of every syllable of scripture. And it displays, once again, the pervasive and basic pattern of thought that indivisibly connects every form (*rūpaṃ*) to a name (*nāma*), and which not only underlies the etymologizing, but also the rest of *Svacchandatantram*, from the magical use of formulæ, through the Śaiva metaphysics of the six paths, to the monism of Kṣemarājaḥ.³

I.2.4 Harmonization and Commentatorial Goals

In the Śaiva metaphysics of sound, the supreme Śivaḥ manifests himself not only in discrete names and formulae, but

Vijñāna-Bhairava, Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies.8
(Bombay: "Tatva-Vivechaka" Press, 1918), vs.130 p.113.

¹ V. bk.11, p.38, for Kṣemarāja's glosses of the powers of the supreme lord, Raudrī, Vāmā, Jyeṣṭhā, and "*samastarugdrāvaṇāt viśvavamanādabhedaprādhānyaprāśastyaprakarṣācca*."

² V., for example, Kṣemarāja's over-interpretive gloss (Bk 7, p.102) of the vocative "*varānane*" addressed to the goddess in the opening verse of bk.7 (p.101): "*varamutkr̥ṣṭam śāktasphāra-mayamānanam bhogāpavargaprapadaparapadapraveśo yasyāḥ*."

³ Kṣemarājaḥ epitomizes (Bk.11, p.15) this basic principle in his etymologizing monistic commentry on the text's declaration (Bk.11, p.14, vs.13) that Sadāśivaḥ is manifest as the formula ("*... -mantrasvarūpena*): "*mantra 'pi antarguptabhāṣaṇātmaka-paraparāmarśasatattvena mananatrāṇadharmā paratattva-prāptyupāyaḥ paramesātmāiva*."

also in his entire scriptural revelation.¹ This view of revelation has been incorporated into the text of *Svacchandatantram* in its traditional promulgation of the scripture (*tantrāvatāraḥ*) section.² According to this scripturally sanctioned and authoritative model, *Svacchandatantram*, or any particular scripture represents only a fractional manifestation of the totality of revelation. Kṣemarājaḥ, naturally, shares this view, in which each scripture, limited by grace in order to offer an accessible means for salvation, becomes, as it were, a chapter in the total book of revelation. Concretely, this entails and

¹ Thus just as Sadāśivaḥ manifests as the formula, so, the text declares (Bk.8, p.20, vss.31b-32a) he manifests as scripture: “*guruśiṣyapada sthitvā svayaṁ devaḥ sadāśivaḥ // pūrvottarapadairvākyaistantramādhārābhedaḥ*.” Kṣemarājaḥ also bases his introductory remarks (Bk.1, pp.6-7) about the nature of scripture on this verse.

On the magical use of etymology, v. Jan Gonda, “The Etymologies in the Ancient Brāhmaṇas,” pp.49ff.; on formulæ, v. Gonda, “The Indian Mantra,” in *Selected Studies 4 History of Ancient Indian Religion* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975): 248-301, esp., 284-285.

According to the cosmology found in the Śaiva scriptures, the universe has emanated in six interconnected and parallel paths (*śaḍadhvā*), divided into sonic (*nāma*) and physical (*rūpā*) sets of three, further ranked hierarchically by the size and number of their divisions. Thus the sonic path manifests successively in phonemes (*varṇaḥ*), formulæ (*mantraḥ*), and words (*padam*), the physical in portions or energy phases (*kalā*), planes (*tattvam*), and worlds (*bhuvanam*). Most importantly, each division in some way pervades contains all the others. Thus, an initiation via one path liberates from all the others as well. (V. Brunner-Lachaux, *Somaśambhupaddhati*, troisième partie, pp.xxiii-xxii. On the pre-Śaiva use of the term *adhvā*, v. Jan Gonda, “‘Ways’ in Indian Religions,” in *Selected Studies 4*: 317-336, esp., 320-322.)

² V. bk.8, pp.17ff; cf. supra section I.1.1 for a discussion of traditional models of revelation.

legitimizes his commentatorial practice that totalizes and interprets the statements of *Svacchandatantram* by references to the rest of revelation.

Historically, those who used or studied individual scriptures must have, in fact, understood them in the context of other written texts and oral tradition. As noted, Kṣemarājaḥ cites these sources throughout his commentary. Usually, the ideal of a unitary and harmonious revelation simply justified and supported his practical commentatorial effort to supply the necessary context for many of the statements of *Svacchandatantram*. Less often, this same ideal, however, generated problems for Kṣemarājaḥ when confronted with real textual difficulties.

For contradictions within the text of *Svacchandatantram*, the Mimāṃsaka hermeneutics often provided solutions. Kṣemarāja's rejection, on the authority of Abhinavaguptaḥ, of the distinction between secondary explanatory (*arthavādaḥ*) and primary injunctive (*vidhiḥ*) statements, however, greatly limited the general efficacy of this hermeneutic for resolving conflicts. Thus, for those problems, where he could find no specific rule to apply, Kṣemarājaḥ had to devise his own solution. When plausible, he glossed words and interpreted phrases in a way that explained away the apparent differences between statements made in different parts of the text.¹ If this procedure seemed untenable, then he rationalized the conflicts as due to mere differences in presentation, mode, and aspect

¹ V., for example, bk.2, p.134, where he attempts to explain away (*"na kaścitpūrvāparavyāghāto 'sti"*) conflicting statements in the text on the location of the Piṅgalā *naḍī*.

without any substantial significance.¹ For Kṣemarājaḥ, the same monistic insight that sublated external duality, could also account for the variation and redundancy of ritual procedures: the highest perspective not only annulled all differences but revealed them as facets of the ultimate unity.² The redactors of *Svacchandatantram* undoubtedly shared this idea of *pars pro toto* substitutability, though not in such a theorized form. Coupled with practical considerations, it provided them and ritual practitioners with a convenient justification for their collecting and use of overlapping, redundant, expanded or abbreviated ritual procedures

Similarly, when confronted with conflicts between the statements of different texts, Kṣemarājaḥ utilized these same rationalizations to uphold the ideal of harmonious revelation.³ In other cases, however, Kṣemarājaḥ attributed the differences to the vicissitudes brought on by human transmission of the scriptures, in the same way that he repudiated some readings

¹ V., for example, bk 1, p.29–31, where Kṣemarājaḥ rationalizes conflicting passages about the matrix Bhairavaḥ by stating that they actually refer to differing superior and inferior aspects of the deity. V. also bk.10, pp.430–431.

² V. bk.4., p.59, where Kṣemarājaḥ at length explains away the differences in ritual procedures and texts, according to the maxim “*ekaikatra ca tattve ‘pi śaṭtriṃśattattvarūpatā.*”

³ V., for example, bk.10, p.97, where Kṣemarājaḥ explains a discrepancy between *Svacchandatantram* and the *Parā* about mountains as due to a mere difference in names (“*saṃjñāntareṇoktam*”). V. also bk.10, pp.470–471, where he explains a conflict between *Svacchandatantram*, the *Matangaśāstram*, and the *Pūrvaśāstram*, as due to a second difference in ritual procedures (“*tantraprakriyābhedaḥ*”).

in *Svacchandatantram*.¹ When commenting upon non-Śaiva texts naturally, he could simply invoke the authority of *Svacchandatantram* and the Śaiva scriptures, and dispense with considering those of other traditions.² Despite the necessity to engage in this exegetical justification and reinterpretation, at no point did this awareness of the mutability and even inconsistency of the scriptural transmission lead Kṣemarājaḥ to question the authority of the Śaiva scriptures or to supplant it. Presumably, a work like the *Śivasūtram*, which clearly expressed the monistic theology of his tradition, and which, consequently, his tradition mythically attempted to endow with revealed status, would be rejected by rival Śaiva schools.³ And with the exclusion of logical argumentation, which could be used

¹ V. bk.10, pp.221, where he explains differences in the order of worlds found in different texts; the order found in the *Parā, Mrgendraḥ*, and other texts he considers human (*"sa tadgrantha-saṃgrahakartr̥bhīstathānibaddhatvāt"*), that of the *Kiraṇaḥ*, divine (*"idam tu sākṣātparameśvareṇoktam"*).

² V., for example, bk.10., p.217, where after rejecting the information found in astronomical texts, Kṣemarājaḥ, extending a traditional maxim on the uniqueness of the Śaiva cosmology, unequivocally asserts that the Śaiva scripture as the complete manifestation of the supreme lord cannot be reasoned or debated with: *"sarvasarvajñamaheśvaraparidr̥ṣṭametadeveti na tena saha saṃvāḍavisamvāḍādicarcā kāryā / ata eva 'śāstrāntarairna yadr̥ṣṭam tadr̥ṣṭam pārameśvare / niyatyādi śivānte vāk kvānyatra paridr̥śyate."*

³ Kṣemarājaḥ relates the myth that Śivaḥ appeared to Vasuguptaḥ in a dream and told him that he could find these *sūtrāṇi*, which were intended to combat dualism, inscribed in rock on a neighboring mountain. (V. the introductory commentary of Kṣemarāja's *Śivasūtravimarśinī*, Jaideva Singh, trans., *Śiva Sūtras. The Yoga of Supreme Identity* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1979), pp.5-6.)

against other traditions, but which within the Śaiva tradition could play only an ancillary role, only the exegetical demonstration of his doctrine in a text like *Svacchandatantram* remained to win acceptance from those that accepted scriptural authority.¹ Finding support, even elliptically and embryonically, for his position in *Svacchandatantram*, therefore, would ease acceptance of the additional scriptures and theological tenets of his sect.

The non-dualists explained liberation as identification with the universal conscious subject or knower, realized exclusively by knowledge. Consequently, they interpreted the impurity binding the soul as ignorance of this identity. They repudiated, therefore, the notion that a ritual action removed an objective

¹ In his extended commentary defending and reinterpreting initiation in a non-dual perspective (Bk.5, pp.73–99), Kṣemarājaḥ logically argues (p.78) against his Buddhist opponent that the efficacy of initiation can be proven through objective means of knowledge. Inference establishes the interpretation of initiation as the manifestation of Śivaḥ, and perception establishes the power of the formulæ in many rites that leads to this inference: “*kiṃ pramāṇamiti cet mantraprabhāvasampāditatātkālikadehadarśana-prasamanodbhūta-manumānam yatha ca śāntyāpyāyavaśīkāra-dāhoccāttānaśoṣānamāraṇādi mantrasāmartyādbhavatyeva tathā dikṣāphalamapi bhavatyeva iti.*”

While Kṣemarājaḥ also uses logical argumentation against the Siddhāntins, he takes scriptural utterances as his point of departure, and tries to show that problematic scriptural passages actually do not contradict his position (V., for example, bk.5, p.95, where referring to bk.4, p.61, vs.105, he attempts to refute misinterpretations caused by *Svacchandatantra*’s declaration that the impurity (*malam*) is desire (*abhilāṣaḥ*). This might erroneously imply that the planes of the *kañcukam*, *Rāgaḥ*, and so forth, were the impurity or bondage, covering individual discrete souls at the plane of *Puruṣaḥ*.)

Kṣemarāja’s view of scriptural authority and hermeneutic procedures, therefore, parallels that of the Vedānta. (Cf. Halbfass, *Studies in Kumārila and Śaṅkara*, pp.27ff.

impurity; a ritual, which acts in a cause and effect relation, could not liberate one from a bondage which itself is the delusion that there exists a chain of cause and effect, or subject and object relations.¹ The logical consequence of this non-dualistic philosophy, however, would seem to entail devaluing external ritual entirely, in the manner of the Advaitavedāntins. But the weight of tradition, represented by the authoritative scriptures like *Svacchandatantram* that preserved an entire range of external practices, prevented the non-dualists from eliminating them. Instead, as noted previously, they established a hierarchy of *upāyāḥ* with unmediated noetic realization at the summit, and attempted to reinterpret their inherited tradition from this perspective.

Accordingly, Kṣemarājaḥ devoted a major part of his commentary to reinterpreting, at every suitable occasion, the external ritual presented by *Svacchandatantram* as a meditation or noetic event.² Some of the practices recorded in *Svacchandatantram* had this dominant if not exclusive noetic dimension, which with minor adjustments supported Kṣemarāja's position.³ An historical continuity may thus be

¹ V., for example, bk.5, pp.79-80: "*cidātmaikyaparamārthe yadanātmatayā jñānaṃ tadapi bandha eveti sarvathā vigalita-saṃkocacidekaghanaviśvaikātmyamayaśivatvābhivyaktireva muktiḥ / tatra cābhedaśāraṃ sarvaṃ jñātvā samāptameveti tatprāptiyarthameva dikṣāpravṛttiḥ.*"

² In bk.1, p.7, after his extended interpretation of the opening verses of *Svacchandatantram*, Kṣemarājaḥ alludes to apparently standard procedures of reading a text both exoterically and esoterically ("*evamāntarabāhyakramābhyām*").

³ V. bk.2, pp.86-87, where he interprets the elaborate interior worship (*pūjāḥ*) of Bhairavaḥ, described by the text as a rendering equivalent of interior and exterior

presumed to have existed between the non-dualistic exegetes and the tradition of the later redactors of *Svacchandatantram*.

These redactors had already incorporated parts of an interiorizing reinterpretation into the text of *Svacchandatantram* itself.¹ The text records, for example, a condensed noetic initiation, which apparently liberates with a single formula.²

Here, Kṣemarājaḥ followed the pattern of brāhmaṇical meta-ritualists who used the external Vedic ritual as a paradigm for interiorizing meditations, and as a point of departure for metaphysical speculations.³ The notion of microcosm and

(*"sabāhyābhyantaram kṛtvā"*) as an identifying with Bhairavaḥ, which confirms his non-dual interpretation of all ritual (*saha bāhyābhyantarābhyām dehapuryaṣṭakabhairavatvāpādanābhyām vartate yo yāga eka eva na tu karayordehe antaśca anyānyarūpo bhairavaikyasyaiva prāpyatvena "*).

¹ V. the summary of bk.13, pp.87–88, concerning a non-dual meditation on Svachchandaḥ, which may have been added by later redactors.

² V. bk.4, pp.316–317, vs.595: *"atha vijñānarūpeṇa sakṛduccāralakṣaṇā / heyopādeyapāsānām yugapadbhairaveṇa."* Kṣemarājaḥ connects this rite, found in other Śaiva āgamaḥ, with the praise of the potency of the Bhairava formula said (bk.1, p.390) to destroy all impurity with a single utterance. (Cf. the simple Bhairava initiation discussed in the summary of bk.13, p.92. Cf. also the initiation via a single plane, bk.4, pp.256–257.)

Brunner-Lachaux interprets this rite as the mirror image of this process, i.e., as a late construct of Śaiva ritualists intended to counter the growing influence of those who emphasized the indispensable importance of knowledge. In the scriptural liturgy, however, it follows the regular initiation as a superfluous concluding purification. (V. Brunner-Lachaux, *Somaśambhupaddhati*, troisième partie, pp.14–16)

³ V. supra section I.1.3. Cf. also bk.2, p.128, where Kṣemarājaḥ explains the worship of Bhairavaḥ by a single utterance, (*"sakṛduccārayogena pūjayedbhairaveṇa"*) through a comparison between the grammatical parts (*kāraka*) of the act of

macrocosm parallelism formed the conceptual and experiential basis for many of the practices of texts like *Svacchandatantram*.¹ Much of the appeal of these practices probably derived from the way in which they offered access to direct religious experience in the form of inducible psychosomatic events interpreted as transpersonal and cosmic realizations. The non-dualistic interpretation sought to preserve the attractive immediacy of these experiences, by removing their concrete and problematic structure and recasting them in a defensible and plausible theoretical mold. Thus, in his commentary, Kṣemarāja rationalized these practices in a universal monistic system by thematizing their latent conceptual structure, exemplified in the notion of micro- and macrocosmic parallelism. Abhinavagupta's *Tantrālokaḥ* offers numerous examples of the assimilation and

speech and the components of the sacrifice. (V. here Paṇḍit Mukund Rām Shāstri, ed., *The Tantrasāra of Abhinava Gupta*, Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies, 18. (Bombay: Nirnaya Sagar Press, 1918), bk 13, pp.135-136.)

¹ V., for example, bk.7, p.213, where commenting upon the results of the breath meditation that recreates and mirrors the external astro-temporal cycle and the rites conducted according to its rhythm, Kṣemarājaḥ formulates this principle explicitly: *"iha yadantastadbahiḥ iti sthityā yadyadāntare dinarātritatsamdhya-pakṣamāsādi ke phalamuktam tatadbāhye 'pi tatra tathaiveti mantavyam."* V. also bk.10, pp.259-260, vss.621-622) where the text, presuming this parallelism, suddenly switches from an external cosmological description of the egg of Brahmā to an internal meditative prescription about initiation: *"śatarudrāvadhi jñeyam sauvarṇam parivartulam / vajrasārādhikasāram durbhedyam tridaśairapi // huṃphaṭkāraprayogena bhedayettu varānane."* On the importance of this principle v.Edward C. Dimock, *The Place of the Hidden Moon* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1966), p.137 "The essence of Tāntric thought is that man is a microcosm. He contains within himself all the elements of the universe; he is a part that contains all the elements of the whole."

integration of other heterogenous magical practices and cultic rituals through the same hermeneutic reinterpretation.¹

The apologetic reinterpretation of ritual reflects psychological and heuristic considerations; though not thoroughgoing, the tendency to reserve external rituals for those incapable of higher attainments had already partially influenced the earlier scriptural systematization of initiation.² Undoubtedly, not only the weight of tradition, but also a recognition of the requirements of a functioning Śaiva community contributed to maintaining a plurality of religious practices. For a thoroughgoing rationalization of praxis and subsequent elimination of all lower means would have dramatically restricted the appeal of the non-dualistic school, and ceded the general support and patronage of Śaivism to the Siddhāntins.

Similarly, this restriction, particularly in the elimination of rites leading to superhuman enjoyments and attainments, would have rendered the non-dual Śaiva liberation virtually identical to that of the Vedāntin opponents. The same monistic hermeneutic, therefore, that accommodated the lower means of liberation, also provided a way to rehabilitate enjoyments. In the non-dual Śaiva system, the supreme Śivaḥ, unlike the

¹ V. supra section I.1.3 for a discussion of the Kaula stratum; cf. also section II.15 for the summary of bk.15, pp.140-143, which elaborates the micro- and macrocosmic aspects of the adept's encounter with the *yoginī*.

² V. bk.4, pp.44ff, for the division of the *nirvāṇadīksā*, into a *sabīja* form, which requires post initiation discipline from the initiate, and a *nirbīja* form, which requires only devotion to the master (*gurubhaktiḥ*), and which is therefore suitable, Kṣemarājaḥ explains, for the young, aged, mentally defective, and so forth. Cf. M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ*, 18-21, for a larger collection of condensed initiations to be administered in special circumstances.

brahma of the Vedāntins, is not only sheer passive luminous consciousness (*prakāśaḥ*), but also consciousness of consciousness (*vimarśaḥ*), in the active manifestation through Śaktiḥ as the universe.¹ And liberation that is identification with the supreme Śivaḥ, therefore, necessarily participates in this multiple enjoyment of union with Śaktiḥ. If the strictly hierarchical model devalued enjoyments, by equating them with the identification with deities, and thereby, limited levels of consciousness assigned to specific stages in the universe, the monistic philosophy restored enjoyment as a concomitant of liberation through identification with the supreme Śivaḥ. Using this monistic hermenutic, Kṣemarājaḥ could, to a degree, apologetically reclaim the naive equation of liberation and enjoyments depicted by the original ritual practitioners of *Svacchandatantram*, and theoretically maintain some continuity with their experiential vision of power and liberation through identificatory possession by the divine.

However, in perhaps the most important of his self-professed commentatorial goals — finding direct and unequivocal assertion of non-dualism in the text of *Svacchandatantram* — Kṣemarājaḥ appeared to have little success. The interiorizing reinterpretation and sectarian non-dual exegesis of specific rituals could rely on actual historical links in tradition and the implicit assumption of universal interconnection that provided the foundation for magical and yogic practices. Explicit non-dualism or dualism, by contrast, lay outside the chronological

¹ V. bk.5, p.98, for his brief refutation of the Vedāntins over the nature of the liberated self:

*"nacāsyeyadvimarśātmatāptau
parīṇatibrahmavādīpakṣoktadūṣaṇāvakāśaḥ kaścīdviśvātmaka-
svasvarūpaviṣṇubhāmāyatvena vivartaparīṇāmapakṣayor-
anabhyupagamāt."*

and intellectual circuit of the ritual or meditative practice that directed early compilers and redactors of the text. The implicit *layavāda* philosophy of *Svacchandatantram*, while seemingly at odds with systematic dualism, at best provided inconclusive evidence for non-dualism, and thus apparently was not immune to a dualistic elaboration.¹ Later classifications of the Bhairava scriptures as non-dual attest at least to a limited success for the viewpoint represented by Kṣemarājaḥ, if not for the entire canon of *āgamaḥ* then at least for *Svacchandatantram*. This non-dual classification was later historically strengthened by default through the loss of the dualistic commentaries and the preponderant transmission of the text, *Svacchandatantram*, with Kṣemarāja's commentary alone.

¹ Cf. the simile, for example, used to describe the final state of the soul (*jīvaḥ*) of the initiate, at the end of bk.4, (pp.252, vs.398.): "*supradipte yathā vahnau śikhā dṛśyate cāmbare / dehaprānasthito hyātmā tadvalliyeta tatpade.*" The next pair of verses (pp.252–253, vss.399–400) describe the same state from the viewpoint of the contemplation of the ritual master, who has functioned as Śivaḥ in the rite that has just extracted and dissolved the self of the initiate: "*tadvadevābhimānastu kartavya daiśikottamaiḥ / aham eva paro haṁsaḥ śivaḥ paramakāraṇam // matprāṇe sa tu paśvātmā linaḥ samarasigataḥ.*" (V. also supra section I.1.5 for a discussion of the imagery used in the text.)

CHAPTER II

SUMMARIES

The following summaries present a topical outline of the contents of each of the books of *Svacchandatantram*. They also note the most important and representative sections of commentary by Kṣemarājaḥ. Attention is focused on analyzing the topics in order to illustrate the compositional process that produced the complete and final text of *Svacchandatantram*. The summaries, therefore, should serve as complements to the presentation, given in the introduction, of the strata, sources, and redactors of *Svacchandatantram*. The overview of topics presented in the summaries, also can serve as a convenient basis for thematic studies utilizing material in *Svacchandatantram*, and for specific comparisons with related texts.¹

¹ The basic forms of *āgamic* Śaiva ritual have been examined in detail by Brunner-Lachaux, in her study and translation of the *Somaśambhupaddhati* and many secondary articles. In the third volume of the *Somaśambhupaddhati*, which examines the central ritual of initiation, she has included extensive comparative material drawn from *Svacchandatantram* and the commentary of Kṣemarājaḥ. Therefore, in the following summaries, the first five books of *Svacchandatantram* have not been studied for their content as extensively as the later books. Instead, attention has been directed only to analyzing their compositional structure and history, and elucidating selective passages of problematic or particularly significant content.

II.1 BOOK 1

The first book opens (p.2) with a stereotyped introductory setting for the text, that describes Bhairavaḥ seated on Mount Kailāsaḥ surrounded by his customary retinue.¹ Kṣemarājaḥ first supplies introductory verses paying homage to Śivaḥ and his master Abhinavaguptaḥ and sketching his non-dual philosophy. Then, in his commentary on the verses, which represents a masterpiece of commentatorial ingenuity and over-interpretation, he endeavors to demonstrate how they have encapsulated the entire essential teaching of the rest of *Svacchandatantram*.² His commentary decoding these verses offers: an excellent example of the most important interpretative procedures that he applied throughout his commentary; a useful summary of his understanding of the nature of this text as revelation and its place in tradition; and an outline of the tenets of his belief. Kṣemarājaḥ, notably, considers these introductory verses the enunciation of a specific intermediate figure, the scriptural presenter. Thus, compelled by logic, he concedes, at least minimally, the existence in the text of distinct compositional layers.³

After this hermeneutic tour de force, the text resumes (pp.8–9) with a request by the goddess that Bhairavaḥ reveal a

¹ All page references given in () refer to the edition of *Svacchandatantram* in The Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies.

² V. infra section III.2 for the translation of this commentary.

³ Kṣemarājaḥ, accordingly, considers passages, such as the opening verses, which speak of Bhairavaḥ in the third person, to be the work of secondary figures in the chain of scriptural transmission. (V. bk.1, p.7, where he explicitly designates the first three and a half verses of the text as such:

“sārdhaślokatrayātmakam tantrāvatāarakavākyametad-boddhavyam.”)

scripture, appropriately condensed from the ideal scripture for the sake of men. Kṣemarājaḥ enlarges upon the goddess' summary characterization of this ideal scripture, describes

Svacchandatantram in relation to these characteristics, and develops the theology of grace behind the revelation of this particular text. Next the goddess presents (pp.11–12) the list of requested topics for revelation, forming a type of abbreviated table of contents or *anukramaṇikā* for the work. This *anukramaṇikā* does not encompass the entire contents of *Svacchandatantram*. Evidently, as the work of the early compilers, it contains in sequence the topics of the text produced by the compilation of the early Śaiva and the Bhairava sources. Later redactors did not update this *anukramaṇikā*, but rather normally inserted material at the appropriate place in the text, sometimes introduced by another question added to the dialogue frame.¹ Kṣemarājaḥ also notes this lack of agreement between topics requested in the *anukramaṇikā* and the material presented, and occasionally in his commentary compensates for and rationalizes the discrepancy.²

Kṣemarājaḥ next extracts from the brief assent by Bhairavaḥ that he will proclaim the scripture (pp.13–14), all the essential components of a proper introduction to an expository text. The discussion of the topics then begins straightaway with the first one requested (p.15): the master (*guruḥ*). First comes the enumeration of the characteristics of the good master (pp.16–17), followed (p.19) by that of the bad master. In the same fashion follows the discussion of the next topic: the disciple (*śiṣyaḥ*), covering first the good disciple (p.20), and then the bad disciple

¹ V. the summary of bk.4, pp.142ff, for the inserting of a secondary *anukramaṇikā*.

² V. the opening commentary of bk.2, p.1, where Kṣemarājaḥ rationalizes the omission of the *nityapūjaḥ* from the opening *anukramaṇikā*, which mentions only the occasional ritual. (Cf. infra section II.2.)

(p.21). Next (p.22), the text describes the dangers of the bad master. Logically, this should follow immediately after the characterization of the bad master; this displacement warrants assuming, therefore, either confusion in the transmission of the text, or supplementation with material on the bad master from another source, added, as Kṣemarājaḥ notes, after the description of the bad disciple. Both *Svacchandatantram* itself and Kṣemarājaḥ in his commentary on these initial topics stress the same theme; the ritual does not work automatically, *ex opere operato*, but requires for its efficacy the fulfillment of stipulated preconditions on the part of both master and initiate.¹

The next topic, the ritual ground (*bhūmiḥ*) follows (p.24) in accordance with the sequence of requested topics. Then the text describes the ritually prepared master (pp.26–27), who constructs on this selected ground, a diagram of a matrix (*mātrkā*) from which he subsequently extracts the formulæ (*mantrāḥ*). The description of the matrix construction (pp.26–31) intervenes, therefore, between the explicitly requested topics of the ritual ground and the formulæ. Later redactors, therefore, might have interpolated this description of the matrix from other scriptures containing developed theories of emanation modeled on the Sanskrit alphabet. *Svacchandatantram* does not elsewhere refer to these speculations. If, instead, the early compilers considered the construction of the matrix to be an ancillary but required preliminary for any use of formulæ, then perhaps they did not feel any need to enumerate it separately in the table of contents. Or later redactors could have revised an original ritual of formulæ extraction to conform to alternative practices using such a matrix.

¹ In keeping with his overall noetic perspective, Kṣemarājaḥ (p.24) quotes a traditional adage, stressing that the essential characteristic of the master is knowledge: “*sarvalakṣaṇahino ‘pi jñānavāṅgururuttamaḥ*. ”

Additional internal evidence also points to at least partial interpolation. To the account of the construction and worship of the matrix, the text appends a description of the correlation of the phoneme classes (*vargāḥ*) and the seven mothers (p.29). At the end (p.31) come a panegyric coda, and the statement, "thus Bhairavaḥ said (*evam bhairavo 'bravit*)."¹ This coda and the self-reference to Bhairavaḥ, of a type not normally found in the dialogue frame of *Svacchandatantram*, suggest that redactors incorporated from another source a ceremony directed toward the popular seven mothers.¹ Kṣemarājaḥ corroborates this supposition by attempting to harmonize, as a mere ceremonial difference, the discrepancy between this enumeration of the seven mothers and the description found elsewhere in *Svacchandatantram* of the mothers.²

The rest of the first book (pp.31-69) describes the next requested topic, the formulæ, whose extraction or production comes after the worship of the matrix. Correct knowledge of the formulæ, naturally, forms the prerequisite for the performance of the rituals and meditations presented by the rest of the books of *Svacchandatantram*. The formulæ mediate interactions with the gods, with whom they share a virtual identity.³

During a ritual performance, the officiant must provide a seat for the invited deity. Thus, here, the text first describes the formula seat, Anantaḥ, represented by h + aum (pp.32-33). Then

¹ Cf., for example, the description and analysis of the emanation of phonemes from the matrix in Abhinavagupta's commentary (*Parātrimśikātattvavivaraṇam*) on the *Parātrimśikā* vss.5-9a, in Raniero Gnoli, *Il commento di Abhinavagupta alla Parātrimśikā*, Serie Orientale Roma 58 (Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1985), pp.57ff, and pp.219ff.

² V. pp.30-31, where Kṣemarājaḥ rationalizes a conflict with the statements about the mothers in bk.10, pp.418ff.

³ V. supra section I.2.3.

follows the formula for the main deity (pp.34–39) who resides on top of the seat, designated here (p.34) as the with parts (*sakala-*) form of Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ (pp.34–39). The early Bhairava stratum had evidently appropriated for its cult this well known “Om Aghorebhyo . . .” formula, incorporated here in the text of *Svacchandatantram*, as the main formula for Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ.¹ The panegyric coda at the end of the formula (p.39) gives evidence of this incorporation. The early Śaiva tradition had also evidently used the simple Praṇavaḥ, (h + aum) as the formula of Śivaḥ. The later redactors of the early Śaiva and Bhairava traditions attempted to resolve this discrepancy through the use of the *sakala-* and *niṣkala-* (without parts) distinction, retaining the “Om Aghorebhyo . . .” formula for the *sakala-* Svachchandaḥ, which also designates Svachchandaḥ as the Praṇavaḥ with his formulæ retinue, and the Praṇavaḥ alone for the *niṣkala-* Svachchandaḥ (p.55). Elsewhere in the text, however, rituals still employ their original “Om Aghorebhyo . . .” formula or Praṇavaḥ without these qualifications; as expected, Kṣemarājaḥ recognizes and attempts to harmonize these inconsistencies.²

As part of the identification of Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ and *sakala-* Śivaḥ, the text next (pp.40–49) presents the formulæ for the five faces of Śivaḥ. This description includes the patterns of their imposition on the body (p.41), the mode of their clarification with energies (*kalāḥ*) (pp.42–44), another pattern of their imposition with these energies (pp.45–46), and the enumeration of

¹ V. supra section I.1.3.

² V. for the redactorial attempts to harmonize these formulæ, bk.6, pp.120, vs.17: “*saguṇaḥ sakalo jñeyo nirguṇo niṣkalaḥ śivaḥ*,” and vs.19, “*rupaṁ sakalaṁ tasy dvidhāvasthaṁ prakāśitam*.” V. also Kṣemarāja’s commentary here (p.58) that declares their ultimate equivalence: “*atha ca akāroḥ kārāmakārabindvādikālāyogāc-catuṣkalaśabdavācyaḥ ‘pi vastuto niṣkalānāhatadhvani-paramārthatvāt niṣkalaḥ*.”

the names of these energies (48–49). Lack of any transition and brief, unclear ritual directions mark this description by *Svacchandatantram* of the clarification with energies, and indicate reliance on another more complete source and tradition. Kṣemarājaḥ, therefore, has to supply this missing context with extensive commentary, and harmonize conflicts between the statements of *Svacchandatantram* and what he considers the normative procedure.¹ After the enumeration of these energies, the text adds (p. 50) a ninefold and a threefold category (*tattvam*) imposition. Redactors evidently added this pair of impositions, used in abbreviated initiation procedures, at this point, because of their similarity to the proceeding energies, also ritually imposed upon the body.² Kṣemarājaḥ notes an alternative interpretation, which offers greater integration of the Śaiva and Bhairava material, glossing the ninefold category as Svachchandaḥ and the eight subsidiary bhairavāḥ

After the intervening description of the faces and their concomitant energies, the text picks up the description of *sakala*-Svacchandaḥ with a presentation announced in the dialogue frame (pp. 51–52) of the formulæ identified with his limbs (*aṅgāni*), relating them to the parts of the “Om Aghorebhyo . . .” formula, and giving their proper names. Though these limbs, like the faces described previously, were borrowed from Śaiva tradition in order to form the retinue of Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ, here and elsewhere in the text, they appear better integrated with Svachchandaḥ than the faces. The precise interweaving of these limbs with the syllables of the “Om Aghorebhyo . . .” reflects this superior

¹ V., for example, p. 43, where to restore the proper order of the faces he invokes the rule that the sense takes precedence over the textual reading (*“pāṭhakramādārthaḥ baliyān iti sthityā”*).

² For their use in the initiation via planes, v. bk. 5, pp. 6ff.

assimilation, and their specific names suggest an original tradition subsequently amalgamated with the standard Śaiva limbs.

Continuing this process of integration, Kṣemarājaḥ proceeds to summarize the entire retinue of *sakala*-Svacchandaḥ, before introducing the next formulæ (pp.53–55): those of the three highest powers (*śaktiḥ*). Representing in developed Śaiva metaphysics the first emanation from *niṣkala*-Svacchandaḥ, these powers come, properly placed, before the presentation (pp.55–58) of his formula, the Praṇavaḥ. This linkage of *niṣkala*-Svacchanda and the Praṇavaḥ occasions extensive commentary from Kṣemarājaḥ, in order to preserve unbroken, he asserts, the esoteric doctrine implied in the formula. Undoubtedly, a long line of interpretation of this formula both preceded and continued after its annexation by the Bhairavaḥ tradition. Accordingly, the formula's panegyric coda (p.58) also suggests incorporation from outside sources. Next comes (p.59) an enumeration of the standard Śaiva limbs and their ritual endings (*jātiḥ*). Then, once again, the panegyric coda of the Praṇavaḥ (p.60) restarts. Apparently, therefore, later redactors interpolated the section on the limbs cutting the panegyric coda in two. This interpolation also reduplicates the previous enumeration of the limbs; thus, Kṣemarājaḥ, as expected, must rationalize the surface discrepancy. Similar to the presentation of the faces, this material describing the limbs interpolated in the midst of the discussion of the Praṇava formula, seems to be cut from a ritual manual, and contrasts with the more straightforward description of the properly Bhairava formulæ. It still carries the signature of having been originally embedded in instructions for a ritual performance; the Bhairava source, by contrast, apparently organized material by first presenting formulæ, and then describing rites.¹

¹ V., for example bk.9, vss.600ff, pp.53ff, where the text describes the rites that use the formulæ of the eight bhairavāḥ described in the first book. Though the sequence of these bhairavāḥ

After presenting the limbs of the *niṣkala*-Svacchandaḥ, the text describes (pp.61–62) the formula of the consort of Svacchandaḥ, Aghoreśvarī, united to him as his main power and surrounded by her own retinue of limbs and faces. Notably, *Svacchandatantram* does not specify whether she is connected with *sakala*- or *niṣkala*-Svacchandaḥ. Though Kṣemarājaḥ partially resolves the ambiguity in favor of the *niṣkala* form, probably, she and her subsequent retinue is connected simply with Svacchandaḥ. No rituals found elsewhere in *Svacchandatantram* explicitly use the formula of this goddess, either alone or in conjunction with that of Svacchanda-bhairavaḥ. External iconographic evidence, however, confirms the depiction of the Svacchanda-bhairavaḥ in union with the goddess; perhaps, then, devotees employed the formulæ recorded here, in rituals of worship not covered by the text of *Svacchandatantram*.¹ Similarly, devotees might have employed, in rites additional to those included here, the following (pp.63–67) formulæ of the eight subsidiary bhairavāḥ, who form the most important traditional retinue of Bhairavaḥ.²

After these formulæ of the subsidiary bhairavāḥ, the first book concludes with the formulæ of the world guardians, who form the final outside retinue of Svacchandaḥ. The presentation of their formulæ, accompanied by embedded ritual instructions, once again, suggests a source different from that of the preceding eight bhairavāḥ. In his own fashion, Kṣemarājaḥ recognizes a possible discrepancy in the inclusion of the world guardians because elsewhere he acknowledges that the eight bhairavāḥ constitute the normal final limit of the retinue of Bhairavaḥ. He explains this by noting that the master does not extract or activate the formulæ of

matches their presentation in book 1, the text in book 9 does not restate their formulæ again and thus assumes the presentation of these formulæ in book 1.

¹ V. supra section I.1.1 about the probable origin of the text.

² V. supra section I.1.3 about the Kāpālika stratum.

the eight bhairavāḥ at the same time as those of the world guardians.¹

¹ Kṣemarājaḥ states that the extraction of the formulæ of the eight bhairavāḥ occurs in the second book. In this way, Kṣemarājaḥ (p.68) recognizes that for the Bhairava tradition the eight bhairavāḥ have been modelled after and usually supplant the eight guardians of the directions; therefore elsewhere (Bk.2, p.146) the need for the separate worship of the guardians of the directions is obviated:

*“bhairavāṣṭakarūpeṇa dhyātavyā’ iti vakṣyamāṇatvādiha
lokapālāṣṭakameva na tvanyatreva taddaśakam.*

II.2 BOOK 2

The second book of *Svacchandatantram* begins with a description of the normal, daily worship. According to the introductory *anukramaṇikā*, however, after the formulæ, the text should next discuss time (*kālaḥ*). Explaining this discrepancy, Kṣemarājaḥ notes that the obligatory (*nitya*) worship forms the basis for the occasional (*naimittika*) and the optional (*kāmya*) rites involving time; therefore, even though unrequested, the description of the daily worship should logically come at this point in the text.¹ Historically, this omission of daily worship from the *anukramaṇikā* suggests that redactors supplemented or updated the text of *Svacchandatantram* with a section on daily worship based on the standard Śaiva models.

As usual, the description of the daily worship (*arcanam*) begins (pp.3–10) with the directions for preliminary purification by means of a bath (*snānam*) using mud charged with formulæ. This bath includes (pp.7–8) the normal dawn and dusk prayers, with breath and formula preparations. In addition, the text describes (p.7) a supplemental application of fragrances, indicated, Kṣemarājaḥ notes, for householders, and a substitute bath (p.10) with ashes, he notes, for ascetics.² After more prayers and sprinkling with the formulæ of Bhairavaḥ and his limbs (p.11), the text describes the next sequence of preliminary rites. The worshipper approaches (p.12) the ritual house (*yāgagrhaṃ*), and after washing and tying up his hair, proceeds (pp.13–14) to worship the deities around the door and on the door-leaves. Next comes the description (15–16) of the entrance into the ritual

¹ V. bk.7, p.168, vs.1: "*kālāṃśakam ca deveśa kathayasva prasārataḥ.*"

² V supra section I.1.3 for a discussion of the ascetic use of ashes.

house, the use of formulæ for defense, and the worship of the overlord of the site (*vāstvadhiṣṭhātā*), Brahmā.

After establishing himself in the ritual house, the worshipper continues (pp.18–19) the preparatory rites, by imposing the formulæ of Svacchandaḥ and his retinue on his hands. Here, by including the eight bhairavāḥ among the retinue of Svacchandaḥ, the redactors have made the well known Śaiva rite, the construction of the hand of Śivaḥ, explicitly conform to the Bhairava formulæ listed in the first book. Normally, for the other Śaiva rites, by contrast, they effected this Bhairava adaptation through the simple substitution of the name Bhairavaḥ for Śivaḥ. Immediately after the preparation of the hands for the ritual, comes (pp.19–33) the ritual purification of the body. In meditation, the worshipper enacts the destruction of his impure body and sequentially replaces it, from the lowest to highest plane, with a pure formulæ body, which is equated with Śivaḥ. Naturally, for Kṣemarājaḥ, the identification of worshipper and deity in this rite gives support to his interpretation of *Svacchandatantram* as a monistic scripture. Just as for the previous rite of the hand, the redactors have apparently adapted the rite of purification of the body by reduplicating in its imposition of formulæ (pp.30–31) the pattern given in the first book. Recognizing this intended parallelism, Kṣemarājaḥ, accordingly, must account for the discrepancies between the two lists of formulæ.

At the conclusion of the preparatory rites of purification that have culminated in the identification of the impure self with the pure, universal Bhairavaḥ, the text begins (pp.34–88) to describe the actual ritual of his worship. This ritual operates through the same principle of micro- and macrocosmic identification; the worshipper visualizes the construction of a cosmic lotus in his body, representing the entire hierarchical universe. At the top of this lotus, he imposes both the with parts and without parts forms of Bhairavaḥ and their retinues, and meditatively enacts their

requisite worship. The description exhibits detailed knowledge of actual iconography and an inherited set of symbolic equivalences.¹ Here, the extent and degree of formalization displayed in the correspondances between meditation and cosmology, argue for a late date; in other sections, this underlying correspondance remains still implicit and unthematized. Kṣemarājaḥ, naturally, finds key support for his emphasis on the interior and noetic aspects of ritual, in the fact that the text dictates that here the internal ritual precedes, and largely supersedes and supplants the external worship. Giving precedence historically to either the external or internal ritual likely constitutes a simplification of a complicated process, in which both crystallized out of simpler and mixed procedures.

This rite also contains an extensive iconographical depiction (pp.50–56) of Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ. Kṣemarāja's commentary on this section provides an excellent example of the theological reinterpretation of inherited mythological features and attributes.² Similarly, the structure of this section gives a literal graphic example of the process of adaptation of earlier religious schemas; the redactors could simply graft Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ on top of a transplanted lotus, as it were, with only minor adjustments.

This section also contains (p.71) the first instruction to perform the fusion of the channels (*nāḍisaṃdhānam*). This rite forms an essential and often repeated component of the initiation ritual described in subsequent books. Historically, its presence here

¹ V., for example, the description of the lion's throne (*siṃhāsanaṃ*) constructed with the *bhāvāḥ* of the Sāṃkhyam: (Cf. Mallmann, *Les enseignements iconographiques*, pp.222–226).

² V. bk.14, where with an extensive commentary by Kṣemarājaḥ, the text presents the gestures (*mudrāḥ*), which the worshipper forms in body, voice, and mind, in imitation of the poses and attributes displayed by the eighteen arms of Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ.

might suggest a later interpolation into the ritual of interior worship and support dating the ritual of interior worship after parts of the initiation books (four and five).¹ At the least, evaluated structurally, the presence of this rite provides another example of the general process by which complicated rituals develop: that is, through the embedded repetition of smaller rites that also occur in independent contexts.

After the fusion of channels, come the offerings (pp.72-75) to the installed deities, and then prescription of (p.75) the repetition of formulæ (*jāpaḥ*). At this convenient juncture, redactors have appended (pp.76-86) a complete discussion of the types of repetition, including the different kinds of rosaries employed by various adepts. The general nature of the discussion and the particular declaration (pp.79-82) of the results produced by these various types of repetition, signal that this section has general applicability, beyond the confines of the ritual of interior worship. Thus, after the instruction on repetition, the interior worship ends (p.86), and the external worship begins.

The text specifically states that the worshipper commences the sacrificing (*yajānam*). This reference, therefore, after the intervening interior worship, reconnects to the sequence of topics expected by the original *anukramaṇikā*. Smoothing the transition, Kṣemarājaḥ glosses this sacrificing as the external worship. The worshipper prepares (88-90) a vessel for honoring a guest (*arghapātram*) and then proceeds to the worship of the deity. This

¹ V. the references given by Kṣemarājaḥ (pp.71-72). The master uses this procedure, in which *darbha* grass symbolizes the channels to extract and manipulate the consciousness of the disciple during initiation. (V bk.3, pp.220ff.) Here he explains away the text's prescribing a rite not yet described and here differently named through the interpretive principle of anticipatory cross-reference: "*ye tu tṛtiyacaturthapaṭalagranthamataṃ parāmrśya mantrasaṃdhānanādisaṃdhāne anyathā cānyathā ca vyācakṣate te bhrāntā eva anāgatāvekṣaṇaṃ tantrayuktiḥ iti hi vākyaavidāṃ niścayaḥ.*"

worship recapitulates (pp. 90–94) much of the interior worship. Now, the worshipper directs the imposition of formulæ upon the guest vessel instead of upon his body, and this vessel becomes the locus of the deity. This short section concludes (pp. 94–6) with some general instructions for this procedure of worship.

Next comes a short section (pp. 96–98) describing an offering to the eight bhairavāḥ in the burning ground. This section appears to represent the sacrificing described by the Bhairava source, sandwiched between analogous Śaiva material. Recognizing this textual interweaving, Kṣemarājaḥ, consequently, labels the preceding guest offering as a secondary topic. In this preceding section, repetition and variant terminology confirm the textual unevenness.¹ Kṣemarājaḥ also rationalizes the absence of this sacrificing to the bhairavāḥ in the parallel interior worship as due to their violence, and restricts its practice to ascetics. These qualifications, in turn, agree with the tantric tenor of Bhairava practices as described in the rest of *Svacchandatantram*, which envisage not a general Śaiva community but select adepts.

These abbreviated offerings to the eight bhairavāḥ, however, lack any specific instructions, in particular, those for constructing a ritual fire. Textual criticism suggests that the following elaborate scriptural Śaiva ritual for the construction of this fire (pp. 98–147), therefore, might have supplanted simpler instructions. The Bhairava adepts, apparently, have presumed and adopted this ritual fire construction for their own practices.

In this ritual of fire construction, the preparation of the fire container comes first (pp. 98–109), followed by (pp. 110–122) the actual production of the fire. Performing the customary

¹ Note the repetition (p. 86, vs. 155, and p. 90, vs. 159) of the phrase “he should commence the sacrificing (*yajanamārabhet*),” around the passage describing the implacement of the guest vessel, and the uncharacteristic use of the term *pūjā* in the summary verses (p. 96, vs. 168) describing this worship.

preparatory acts or sacraments (*saṃskārāḥ*) that accompany conception, birth, and growth, the ritual officiant generates the fire as if a human. When finished producing the fire, he proceeds (pp.122–128) to the preparation of the ritual utensils and oblatinal butter. The preparation of the butter includes (pp.128–132) the imposition of the five faces of Bhairavaḥ, and a parenthetical account of its specific oblatinal efficacy. A description follows (pp.133–136) of the meditative division of the butter into three sections embodying Somaḥ, Sūryaḥ, and Agniḥ, that when obliterated into the fire render it, in turn, possessed of these three forms. After a few more preparatory acts (pp.136–139), notably, the protective installation of Viṣṇuḥ, the text proclaims the ritual (*yaજñāḥ*) ready to commence, either for the bonded being (*paśuḥ*) or the adept (*sādhakaḥ*).

This statement, once again, reconnects to the topics listed in the first book in the *anukramaṇikā*. Specifically, it echoes the previous (p.90) declaration of the beginning of the sacrifice. Here an obvious conflation has occurred. The compilers, evidently, have inserted more complicated Śaiva rituals of fire construction and oblation into the simpler Bhairavaḥ sacrificing. This insertion conforms to their pattern of collecting in this book the parts of daily worship. Since an occasional ritual like the initiation discussed in the following book requires a fire, the instructions for its construction should logically come first. The Bhairava source, in contrast, likely had a looser structure. Here, various sacrifices and oblations, favored by devotees, were simply gathered under the same heading.

The text continues (pp.139–145) with additional meditative preparations of the fire. These acts appear to repeat some of those done before, with the notable variation of now including in the ritual transformations the nine tongues of fire. The properly scriptural Śaiva material then concludes (pp.145–147) with oblations for worshipping Bhairavaḥ and his retinue, and for expiation. The immediately following proclamation to perform the

oblation (p.147) reconnects, once again, to the *anukramaṇikā*, and to the Bhairava source. A brief description follows (pp.147–151) of a series of oblations with various substances chosen to realize specific ends. Following the probable reasoning of the compilers, Kṣemarājaḥ rationalizes the transition by indicating that here, the obligatory ritual ends, and the enumeration of occasional or optional rites begins.¹ Despite the logic of this integration with the preceding rite, the substances used for these oblations betray the heterogeneity of the text. In particular, the bdellium and human flesh employed for domination confirm in these oblations, an ascetic and tantric character, and thus a different source. The book then ends (pp.151–152) with a declaration that Bhairavaḥ guarantees the efficacy of these rites for the adept.

¹ V. p.147, vs.279, and commentary.

II.3 BOOK 3

The third book commences (p.153) with a declaration by Bhairavaḥ that he will proclaim the preliminary rites (*adhivāsaḥ*) that prepare all the elements for a major ritual.¹ Thus after the interruption of the previous obligatory ritual, this topic continues, as Kṣemarājaḥ notes, the expected sequence of the *anukramaṇikā*, where the *adhivāsaḥ* follows the oblation. The text first describes (pp.154–157) the properly prepared master, who performs the appropriate worship and defending the ritual area with formulæ outside and then inside of the sacrificial structure. When properly installed the ritual officiant then proceeds (pp.157–167) to repeat the entire mental sacrifice. Here, to fulfill the intention of this sacrifice, i.e., the identification with Bhairavaḥ necessary for the subsequent initiation to be effective, the master also employs the rite “of making divine,” using formula repetition and breath movement in his microcosmic self. Since later sections of the ritual will require the repetition of this basic and sometimes independent rite, its full description, as Kṣemarājaḥ notes, will come later. Its occurrence here, like the recapitulation of the rest of the mental worship, conforms, once again, to the typical pattern, “the ritual syntax,” whereby larger rituals develop by embedding and repeating smaller rites

This section concludes with a parenthetical laud (pp.167–172) of this mental sacrifice as indispensable for rendering the master equivalent to Śivaḥ, and the initiation effective. The praise goes on to suggest the superfluity of external rites and other texts, since this meditation more conveniently and

¹ V. Kṣemarāja's gloss in his commentary (Bk.1, p.13) to the opening *anukramaṇikā*: “*dikṣopayogisarvavastūnām yogyatāpādanātmā saṁskāraḥ adhivāsaḥ*. ”

directly realizes all their varied results. As noted previously, this type of panegyric coda characterizes an originally independent rite, subsequently incorporated into a larger ritual sequence. It also shows traces of redactors in the line continued by Kṣemarājaḥ, who apparently retained and modified this laud to reflect their own devaluation of external ritual and emphasis on interior realization through knowledge.

With the interior sacrifice concluded, the text next states (p.173) the beginning of the exterior preliminaries. The ritual officiant first (pp.173–175) meditatively contemplates and readies the materials to be used in the rite, such as fragrances and clothing. The *anukramaṇikā* of book one lists some of these items along with the five bovine products used shortly after.¹ The omission of the rest does not necessarily imply later interpolation and expansion, since the list in the *anukramaṇikā* obviously intended to be illustrative rather than exhaustive. The *anukramaṇikā*, however, gives no further indication of how an earlier source might have differently described these items or the entire preparatory ritual. The reconstruction of an alternative ritual, therefore, would require additional evidence.

The master next (pp.175–177) begins to prepare three different ritual containers by the appropriate imposition of formulæ. The text next enjoins (pp.177–181) the construction of the hand of Śivaḥ, described previously in the obligatory ritual. Here it appears as an interpolation, intervening without transition in the rites for preparing the vessels. Thus returning to the previous rite, the master (p.181) turns to the five bovine products. He uses (pp.181–187) them, because of their

¹ V. bk.1, p.11; this list includes the powders (*rajāmsi*), five bovine products (*pañcagavyam*), rice offering (*caruḥ*), and tooth cleaning stick (*dantakāṣṭham*). V. infra, bk.3, pp.244–245, for their use.

purifying power, to help prepare the ground and seat for the vessels, and to ready the vessels themselves to receive the deities. And for the same reason, he conserves them in their own vessel for use later in the ritual. After the imposition and worship of Śrīḥ, and various purificatory acts, the preparation of the vessel of Śivāḥ continues (pp.187-198) with additional impositions and services to the invoked deities. Among these, the notable variation is the installation of Vārdhānī (pp.189-194), in the vessel to the right of Śivāḥ, as his power and weapon.

Having completed the preparation of the vessels, and purified himself once again, the ritual officiant proceeds (pp.198-208) to the fire pit, and begins oblation. The oblations of rice, butter, and white fat, are directed to the entire range of installed ritual implements and deities, from the fire pit itself to Bhairavaḥ. After concluding expiatory oblations, there begin the preparations of the one to be initiated. The master readies (pp.208-212) the neophyte with formulæ, ashes, and water, then blindfolds him and leads him to the ritual area. After the tossing of a flower, the removal of the blindfold follows, explained as the removal of ignorance and opening up of knowledge. The master performs (pp.212-217) the imposition of formulæ (*sakalikaraṇam*) on the body of the one to be initiated, whose body is then "burned" and replaced. The master then (pp.218-220) imposes the hand of Śivāḥ and leads the disciple to the fire pit. Using blades of darbha grass symbolizing the subtle channels, the master next (pp.220-224) links himself to the one being initiated, and performs oblations to the formulæ located on the body of the one being initiated and in the fire pit.

The preceding rites used for preparing the disciple have virtually the same structure, in fact, as those later used in the

ritual of initiation.¹ Apparently, a once separate initiation ritual has been modified and incorporated here as part of the preparatory rites. The text instructs the master to perform acts that have meaning only as part of an initiation ritual. The flower toss, for example, normally used in the initiation of the adept as a method for choosing the deity who will be the focus of the adept's particular formula practice, occurs here without purpose.² This mechanical performance of de-contextualized acts, often performed elsewhere in more meaningful contexts, along with the frequent and seemingly superfluous repetition of rites, normally signals the imperfect reworking of later ritualists and compilers. Recognizing this unevenness, Kṣemarājaḥ, accordingly, inserts a break at this point in the text; the previous preparatory rites, he explains, are pre-initiation for the lowest level covenantor initiation (*samayidikṣā*) that gives entrance into the Śaiva community.³ In fact, it appears to be the actual covenantor initiation that has been used as preparation for the other higher initiations. Since the same ritual is repeated later on, Kṣemarājaḥ, therefore, attempts to harmonize the repetition by labeling it a preparation. The following rites, he continues, belong to the preparations for the initiation of the spiritual son and adept.

A description follows of these definite preparations, with the activation of the formulæ (pp.224–227) that will be used to

¹ V. bk.4, pp.20ff.

² On this primary use v. bk.8, p.7..Cf. the notes to bk.4, p.24–25. Kṣemarājaḥ indicates elsewhere that the flower placed in the hand indicates the officiating master's lack of greed concerning payment from the initiate; (On this use v. bk.4, p.282 and commentary; bk.3, p.243; also bk.4, p.310 for the adept.)

³ V. p.224: "*evam sāmānyena samayidikṣāviṣayamadhivāsam-uktvā*"

sever the bonds. Here a causal analysis of the different elements of the ritual accompanies this discussion of the formulæ, which continues (pp.227–229) with further preparations of the bonds. After having transformed the physical threads into the three metaphysical bonds, the master next (pp.229–233) unites himself to the self of the disciple by the fusion of channels, and joins the self of the disciple to the bonds. This transformed bond-self, the text states, should be bound, cut, and burned in the following initiation. Then, comparable to the prior parenthetical discussion, another brief causal analysis of the bonds (pp.233–235) intervenes.

Continuing the meditative transformation of the bonds, the master superimposes (pp.234–239) upon them the energies, Śāntyatitā, etc., explained collectively as the energy, Kriyā (activity) of the lord. The bonds have become the microcosm, and therefore, severed from them, the disciple will attain complete liberation from the macrocosm.¹ These theological asides likely indicate, once again, redactorial interpolations. The redactors evidently wanted to make these preparatory rites conform to the pattern of the main initiation described in the following books.² After finishing (pp.239–243) additional preparations intended to render the bonds fit for the following

¹ V. vs.188, p.242, and commentary: *“evam ca pāsasaṃyogājjīvaḥ ‘saṭṭriṃśattattvamadhyastho bhun̄kte bhogaṃ’ śuddham // anyacca pāsavicchedāttu netyāha ‘na cānyathā.’”*

² Historically, the initiation liturgy via any of the six paths appears to have developed through the superimposition of this cosmology on a simpler initiation based on severing the bondage of the triple impurity. V. infra, section II.4.1, the summary of bk.4, pp.50ff. (For the later development of this cosmology, cf. Brunner-Lachaux, *Somaśambhupaddhati*, troisième partie, pp.xiiff.)

initiation, the master removes them from the body of the disciple and places them in a vessel to await the rites of the next day. The text states (pp.244–248) some final purifying and expiatory acts, such as consumption and removal of offerings, that close this phase of the preparations.¹ The master and disciple then properly dispose themselves and go to sleep on the ritual ground.²

¹ These concluding acts include using three of the items given in the opening *anukramaṇikā*: the five bovine products (*pañcagavyam*), the rice offering (*caruḥ*), and tooth cleaning stick (*dantakāṣṭham*). Here they purify the ritual area and the ritual participants. In addition, the tooth cleaning stick, like the flower noted previously, is thrown randomly in order to be an augury of auspiciousness or inauspiciousness for, as Kṣemarājaḥ notes, the practice of the adept. It is impossible to determine from internal evidence alone whether these acts, which now and in other texts form a small part of the preparations, have been listed in the introductory *anukramaṇikā* because in an earlier or alternative ritual they formed the major part of the preparations for initiation (V. p.252, for their repeated use. Cf. on these substances, M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ*, 15, vss, 444b–447, and Brunner-Lachaux, *Somaśambhupaddhati*, troisième partie, pp.208–212. On the tossing of the teeth cleaning stick in the Buddhist tantric initiation to select the spot of initiation, v. the introduction of Mario Carelli, *Sekoddeśatikā of Naḍapāda (Nāropa)*, Gækwad's Oriental Series 90 (Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1941), p.26.)

² The master, alternatively, through his concentration on Bhairavaḥ, may remain awake in deep meditation:
“bhairavadhyānayogena samādhau jāgradeva vā' gururbhāvet śīṣyārtham iti śeṣaḥ.”

II.4 BOOK 4

II.4.1 The Initiation Liturgy

After (pp.1-2) preliminary acts of purification and the performance of the *sakalikaraṇam*, the disciple enters the ritual house in order to present his dreams to the master. The text then enumerates (pp.2-11) a list of auspicious and inauspicious dream images, and in order to negate the possible consequences of the latter, enjoins expiatory rites. After stating the performance of the obligatory ritual (pp.11-12), the text prescribes beginning the occasional rite with the construction of a diagram. Among other indicators, this use of the technical terms for the types of ritual signals that the material in this section of Book 4 derives from scriptural Śaiva sources.¹

After the master prepares (pp.12-19) the diagram and himself with numerous rites, he (p.20) enters the ritual space and proclaims the beginning of the ritual for the bound creature. In a new outside diagram, the one being initiated then (pp.20-23) receives the hand of Śivaḥ imposed by the master. Reentering the original diagram, the master (pp.24-25) covers the eyes of the disciple who then tosses a flower, which determines by its fall the new name given to the aspiring adept.² After performing

¹ V. vs.36, p.13: *"nityakarmasamāptau tu kuryānnaimittikaṁ budhaḥ."*

² The master (pp.24-25, vss.62b-63a) can use the random toss of the flower to determine the name and by implication deity that the initiate desiring to become an adept and experience pleasures (*bubhukṣuḥ*) will worship in his formulæ practice: *"puṣpapātavaśānnāma kuryādvai sādhakasya ca."* This illustrates the strong association of this rite with the adept, rather than the adept who wishes only liberation (*mumukṣuḥ*). (V. bk.8, p.7. Cf. Brunner-Lachaux, *Somaśambhupaddhati*, troisième partie, pp.102-104, where in keeping with the later devaluing of the adept in the Śaiva-siddhānta, this meaning of the flower toss has been

circumambulations, channel fusing, and oblations, the master executes (pp.27–30) the important extraction of the disciple's caste (*jātiḥ*) and its replacement by a twice-born caste. This brief statement of the text induces a long commentary by Kṣemarājaḥ, intended to demonstrate that this caste transformation has not only ritual significance but also enduring extra-ritual status.¹ Immediately after inserting the twice born caste, the master can then (p.30) endow the disciple with participation in Rudraḥ. The text proceeds to describe (pp.30–34) the rites of channel fusing and movement of the disciple's self, by which the master brings him to this state of participation in Rudraḥ. After some additional acts (pp.34–36), the disciple becomes a covenanter (*samayi*) or rule bound initiate into the Śaiva community, whose rights and obligations are then (pp.36–38) enumerated.

The covenanter's initiation makes the disciple eligible for the next two higher level initiations: either that of the spiritual son which gives complete liberation, or that of the adept, which gives powers and enjoyments.² Before beginning the ritual for these higher level initiations, the master first (pp.38–41) asks the disciple which level he desires.³ The next section of the text

discontinued. Cf. also Carelli's introduction to the *Sekoddeśatikā*, p.31 on the role in the Buddhist tantric initiation liturgy of the flower toss to select the family of deities used for initiation.)

¹ V. supra section I.2.1 for the differing views about caste and the interpretation of this rite by the Śaiva-siddhāntins and Kṣemarājaḥ.

² V. Kṣemarāja's commentary on p.39: "*samayinastu adhiṣṭātrkāraṇaviśeṣamātrapūrvamiśvaratattvārāadhanayogayogyatā iti taṃ prati na sūksmavidhānam nāpi parā muktirnāpi mantrārāadhanakrameṇa bhuktiriti bhāviputrakādipadaprāpti-yogyatājananamātram samayidikṣālakṣaṇam.*"

³ This disciple should choose in each case according to the latent impressions of previous lives. In addition, Kṣemarājaḥ explains (pp.40–41) that the master in the absence of the initiate's decision, performs the liberation initiation, concluding from the lack of choice

describes (pp.41–47) additional subdivisions of these two types of initiation.¹ Like the parenthetical discussions of bondage and causality in the preceding book, this material was likely interpolated by later redactors drawing on a scriptural Śaiva source. The text adds no separate ritual for these additional initiations, which apparently represent later theological refinements. Just as the early Śaiva opposition between liberation and enjoyments divided the unitary ritual of initiation hypothesized for the Bhairava source, so later philosophical problems have apparently motivated these additional subdivisions.

The lengthy initiation of the spiritual son (pp.47–141) begins with the imposition (pp.47–50) of the paths on the ritual elements of the fire, the jug, the diagram, and so forth. . . Kṣemarāja pauses here to explain (pp.50–53) the underlying metaphysics of the ritual. In brief, the manifest universe has six main interconnected dimensions, or paths. The master liberates the disciple from the universe, by superimposing these paths on the ritual microcosm, where they can be manipulated and superseded. The ritual described here, which conveys liberation, operates on one of these paths, that of the five *kalāḥ* or energies. One path

an absence of desire for enjoyments: *“yadā śiṣyaḥ svapratyayi tadā guruḥ tadvāsanānusāraṃ muktaye bhuktaye vā juhuyāt / yadā gurupratyayi tadāsau svavāsanānusāraṃ muktaya eva tasya bubhuḥśābhāvādityarthalabhyo ‘yamatrāśayaḥ.”*

¹ The main subdivisions are for the *nirvāṇadikṣā*, that into with (*sabīja-*) and without seed (*nirbīja-*), and for the consecration of the adept, that into the law of the world (*lokadharmi*) or the law of Śivaḥ (*śivadharmi*). The first kind of initiation retains post-initiatory obligations, the second, intended for the impaired, removes them. The first consecration leaves past *karma* intact so that the fruits of acquired merit (*iṣṭāpūrtam*) may be enjoyed; the second removes it leaving scope only for the merit to be acquired by the adept's particular formula practice. (V. for the initiation pp.44ff, and for the consecration, pp.41ff. Cf. Brunner-Lachaux, *Somaśambhupaddhati*, troisième partie, pp.190ff.)

can stand in for all the others, as the text itself explains (p.50), since each path pervades and interiorizes the other five.¹

The ritual commences (pp.54–60) with the description of the pervasion of the first and lowest of these energies, Nivṛttiḥ. The master will purify each of these, in turn, until the disciple gains complete initiation. Before describing the purification of the next energy, however, the text contains a lengthy interlude.

In the preceding book, the preparatory rites mentioned the energies, and the six paths only in a later parenthetical section.² Instead, these rites seemed primarily structured on imposing and readying the triple, bonding impurity for liberation. At this point, the text reintroduces the triple bond, as the object of the ritual purification, and Kṣemarājaḥ, accordingly, attempts to smooth the transition between the two alternative metaphysics: that of the six paths and that of the three bonds. Just as the path of the energies pervades and include the other paths, he states, so it pervades and includes the triple bonds, because ultimately, they both are only manifestations of the supreme lord's power of activity.³ Here he echoes the earlier statements and intentions of

¹ The text explains (p.49, vs.95, p.50, vs.96) this interiorization (*"antarbhāvi"*) of one path by another without further elaboration as possible through the relations of pervaded and pervader (*"vyāpyavyāpakabhedataḥ"*) and expressed and expresser (*"vācyavācakayogataḥ"*). (V. supra section I.2.4 on these paths.)

² V. bk.3, pp.234ff.

³ V. his commentary on pp.50–53. Since the text uses the terminology of pervasion and inclusion (pp.50–51), Kṣemarājaḥ naturally assumes that it shares his non-dual philosophy of emanation: *"asya sarvasya adhvaग्रन्थasyāyam pindārthaḥ parameśvaraścidānandaghanah svatantrabhaṭṭārakah ekādaśapaṭala-nirūpayiṣyamānasthityā unmanākhyayā svasvātantryaśaktyā śūnyādikṣityantamanantaṁ vācyavācakarūpaṁ svabhittau svānadhikamapyadhikamiva yugapadavabhāsayati."*

redactors, wishing to coordinate two originally separate initiation procedures.¹

After this transition, however, the text proceeds to describe yet (pp.62–96) another separate, extensive, and seemingly complete ritual for initiation. Apparently, the Śaiva ritualists have wrapped the initiation via the energies around this earlier initiation procedure, and integrated the earlier initiation procedure as a part of the surrounding larger initiation liturgy. This compilation is confirmed, when at the conclusion of the embedded procedure, the initiation via energies resumes and repeats this procedure for the next energy.

In this interpolated ritual, the master first (pp.62–63) imposes the power of the lord, the goddess of speech. A quarter verse stating that this power contains the energies provides the only transitional connection to the initiation via the energies.² The master then (pp.64–66) fuses with the self of the disciple, extracts it, and joins it to the power of the lord. The disciple has accumulated the effects of previous actions (*karma*) that would normally demand fruition in various future lives and levels of existence. Instead of having to undergo these experiences, he now (pp.66–77) experiences their ritual maturation and destruction. This purification includes liberation from experiences in other worlds and from the status of a brāhmaṇaḥ. At this point (p.75), the text clearly reveals the mark of a redactor, by giving a cross-reference to the tenth book where a more elaborate description of

¹ V. bk.3, p.237, vss.181–182b: *“bhāvayettrividhānpāsānpañcatattvādhvavyāpakān / trayānām vyāpikā śaktiḥ kriyākhyā pārameśvari śāntyatitādibhedena pañcasamjñāpratiṣṭhitā.”*

² V. p.62, vs.107a: *“ādau śaktiṃ nyaseddevi kalātattvasamanvitām.”*

the same rites occur.¹ The reduplication of the sacraments rendering one a brāhmaṇa and of the imparting of the participation in Rudraḥ, described previously in the same book, also signal compilation and redaction.

The next section (pp.77–81) connects the previous rites, which have eliminated *karma*, with the preceding operations on the bonds. After loosening and severing the bonds, the master (pp.82–86) restores the self of the disciple, then worships and gives leave to Brahmā, the overlord of the energy of Nivṛttiḥ, and the lady of speech. The text next includes a parenthetical discussion (pp.87–95) on *karma* and the different kinds of initiation. Quite logically, the adept, the text states, in contrast to the spiritual son, requires (pp.87–88) some *karma* in order to attain and experience his desired powers and enjoyments. Continuing this discussion, the text distinguishes two kinds of adepts and three kinds of initiation for spiritual sons.² After a statement lauding the indispensable role of the master, the parenthetical discussion concludes, and the description of the initiation via the energies resumes. This discussion repeats with some variation the other parenthetical statements in this book concerning the varieties of initiation and of initiates. This reduplication and the final panegyric tone, thus strengthen the evidence for assuming here a later redactorial interpolation.

The initiation via energies proceeds (pp.96–98) with the joining of Nivṛttiḥ to the next energy, Pratiṣṭhā. The ritual officiant then repeats for Pratiṣṭhā, the rites just performed for Nivṛttiḥ. The text abbreviates the description that varies only in its account of the energy and the relative pervasion of the other paths. Similarly, the master repeats the procedure with the

¹ V. p.75, vs.123, (*“saṃskārā aṣṭabhiḥ saha catvāriṃśad dvijatvāya vakṣyante bhuvanādhvani”*), referring to bk.10, pp.159ff.

² Cf. supra the summary of pp.41ff.

subsequent energies, *Vidyā* (pp.107–113), *Śāntiḥ* (pp.113–117), and *Śāntyatitā* (pp.118–131). In the midst of the description of *Śāntyatitā*, there intervenes a brief parenthetical discussion on liberation and the subdivisions of the paths.

The master next (pp.131–135) performs, at different levels of utterance, a triple set of reinforcing and expiatory oblations, directed at the three universally encompassing realities: of the object of knowledge, of knowledge, and of knower.¹ The ritual concludes (pp.135–138) with various minor rites, and with the important cutting of the initiate's topknot.

After this seeming end to the ritual, the master performs the rite of joining. The text only records the master's declaration accompanying this act, and does not explicate its structure. After exiting from the ritual area, the master performs (pp.138–141) several final acts for purification, and proclaims the end of the initiate's bonded condition.

II.4.2 The Rites of Joining

Transitional dialogue (p.141) now announces that the procedure for joining (*yojanikā*), prescribed previously, will be described here. The dialogue continues (pp.142–143) with a listing of the parts of this joining ritual. This list represents virtually another complete *anukramaṇikā*, which outlines the parts of this ritual which will take up much (pp.141–258) of the remaining fourth book. Each of the components of the joining ritual appears to constitute, in itself, a complete procedure bestowing liberation. Evidently, redactors have collected these rites here and integrated them, with devices like the *anukramaṇikā*, as parts of the ritual

¹ V. infra, pp.244ff, where the same set of three realities appears again in another appended rite, and bk.5, p.8, where the purification of these three planes forms an alternate form of initiation.

of joining. In the same way, they have attempted to integrate the joining ritual, as a component of the main initiation via one of the paths.

Later theological and sectarian concerns likely motivated this integration. A competitively sectarian community with a structured dogma and an organized religious hierarchy would, naturally, prefer to offer a closed set of controlled rituals, as the sole vehicle of initiation. The less liturgical and more heterogeneous meditation procedures, subsumed under these larger initiation rituals, evidently reflect the practices of circles of earlier Śaiva ascetics. In a less institutional and more fluid setting, marked by active master disciple relationships and oral tradition, they, undoubtedly, transmitted and cultivated various esoteric techniques yielding liberation and supernormal attainments.

For the sectarian Śaivas the initiate has no active role. In the ritual of joining, for example, the master, representing Śivaḥ, extracts and manipulates the self of a completely passive initiate. The theology of an omnipotent Śivaḥ and his institutionalized grace dictates this causal relationship. For ascetic circles, in contrast, disciples likely learned meditative practices from masters, and actively applied them to attain liberation, just as the adept, in the Śaiva schools, conducts his own service to attain powers and enjoyments. Accordingly, the text presents the following components of the ritual of joining as parenthetical instruction, needed by masters when initiating disciples. Following the model of the mutual pervasion of the six paths, redactors have rationalized these disparate and redundant practices as overlapping and substitutable aspects of the same process. Under the surface of redactorial integration, however, they still retain traces of their

original context and character, as independent meditative procedures.¹

The text first discusses (pp.145–150) the subtle course traversed in these meditations. After first enumerating the segments of this microcosmic ascent, and second designating the levels of awareness in the confluent breaths, it records (pp.149–150) a brief panegyric coda, celebrating the liberation achieved at the end of this course. Such verses, as noted elsewhere, likely echo the practice's original and independent context. A dialogue verse (p.150) then announces the third topic of the *anukramaṇikā*: how the breath course contains the sixfold path. Redactors likely added this dialogue transition, which marks their work in coordinating the microcosmic ascent with the cosmology underlying the larger initiation rituals. Notably, the redactors' attempt to make this ascent parallel the cosmology underlying the initiation includes the six paths, but does not include the triple bonds, thread, and the rest of the initiation liturgy. This omission, therefore, corroborates the evidence suggesting that compilers integrated the later metaphysic of the six paths with the earlier metaphysic of the three bonds.

The text proceeds (pp.160–167) with the fourth topic stated by the *anukramaṇikā*: the uttering of the *haṁsaḥ* formula throughout the course of breath up to Śivaḥ.² The fifth topic describes (pp.167–170) the “casting off” of the regents (*kāraṇatyāgaḥ*) of the microcosmic-macrocosmic levels, or their progressive superseding due to the application of portions of the Praṇavaḥ formula that ascend into successively higher regions of

¹ V. supra section I.1.5 on the redactional history of the text. Cf. bk.5, pp.57ff, where a much simpler joining practice is presented.

² V. supra section I.1.3. As noted previously, indicating its former independent status, this practice recurs as part of the adept's practice in bk.6, pp.103ff.

the microcosm. As noted by Kṣemarājaḥ, an additional description of related supercedings intervenes here (pp.171–185), before the next topic indicated by the *anukramaṇikā*. The first of these (pp.171–179) progresses through a sequence of relative levels of gross and subtle existents. This non-standard set of existents, comprising elements such as the void, contact, and light, has no obvious connection, aside from that provided by Kṣemarājaḥ, with the cosmological schemas of the larger initiation rituals. The text specifically correlates attaining these levels of non-standard existents with acquiring various powers, and uses terms to describe the practitioner such as best of exercitants (*yogindraḥ*).¹ This terminology and language, therefore, strongly argue for these rites' originating in circles not strictly demarcating rituals for liberation from rituals for power, nor yet recognizing the exclusive preeminence of the standard liberation ritual of the spiritual son. Finally, the evidence provided by this rite strengthens similar hypotheses concerning the rest of the rites collected in this book, as part of the ritual of joining.

The related topics continue (pp.179–185) with the casting off of time. Running in sequence through the seventeen divisions of time, the exercitant finally identifies with the permanent reality beyond time. Then, as noted by Kṣemarājaḥ, the text begins (pp.185–191) to discuss the void (*śūnyam*) and rejoins the fifth topic enumerated by the *anukramaṇikā*. The exercitant now progresses through a hierarchy of voids and finally dissolves in the seventh and last. The closing dialogue, affirming the success of this rite, once again, echoes its earlier context as an independent and complete meditation. The section concludes by discussing the relative meanings of the terms void, existence (*bhāvaḥ*), and non-existence (*abhāvaḥ*). These concepts and terms, also employed in

¹ V. p.170, vs.268: "... *nānāsiddhiphalapradaiḥ*."

the immediately preceding rites, signal, once again, a provenance differing from the standard Śaiva initiation ritual.

The sixth topic (pp.191–200) enumerates a series of “like-essences or savors, ” (*sāmarasyam*) or fusions. In contrast to the preceding rites, here the text describes the master as actively liberating the self of the disciple, and thus contains an overt connection to the surrounding ritual of liberation. Presumably, ritual officiants could perform this rite when the text calls elsewhere for a rite of joining. The category of fusion or unification actually appears to cover two interconnected procedures: one, effected by the master for a disciple, and operating via a series of unifications of breaths, channels, and formulæ; and another, effected by a practitioner, evidently for himself, who unites with progressively higher levels up to the last and universal unification. This section, like the preceding, concludes (pp.197–200) with a brief conceptual declaration, emphasizing the trans-conceptual nature of the supreme level and of its meditative attainment.

The text next discusses the equilibrium (*viśuvat*), a related topic, not listed, as Kṣemarājaḥ notes, in the *anukramaṇikā*.¹ The interpolation of this section here illustrates the straightforward working of redactors, who often simply added related material without thoroughgoing editorial integration that would eliminate discontinuity and redundancy. After briefly listing (pp.200–201) the seven equilibria, the text in more detail describes (pp.201–209) the components of each. A clearly parenthetical instruction (p.205) to perform initiation also reinforces the parallelism with the preceding section.² The rhetorical question concluding the rite,

¹ Kṣemarājaḥ (p.201) explains it as another form of identifying: “*viṣuṃ sām̐yarūpāṃ vyāptimarhatiti viśuvat.*”

² V. vs.325: “. . . *dikṣā kāryā tu daiśikaiḥ.*”

however, likely more accurately reflects its earlier independent context.¹

The text then announces the next topics: the splitting of the categories (*padārthabhedanam*); casting off (*tyāgaḥ*); joining (*yojanam*); and experience (*anubhavaḥ*). These categories do not exactly correspond to those in the *anukramaṇikā* that apparently has, at this point, a corrupt reading.² In addition, though not listed here, the phrase, “to be known” (*jñeyam*), that precedes these topics in the *anukramaṇikā* and has there an ambiguous meaning and syntax, now appears as a distinct but connected topic.³ Since the “needle of knowledge” splits or pierces the categories, the discussion of the “to be known” topic has logically been placed here.

A kind of miscellany, this section of five topics (pp.211–215) first compares the activity of knowing with a lamp, then proceeds to a discussion of the meaning of definition, the relationship of attribute and category, the means of knowledge, and finally the nature of scripture. Equating scripture with the *haṃsa* formula, the text then begins a lengthy excursus recapitulating (pp.215–225) the exercise of this formula. Differentiating this *haṃsa*

¹ V. p.209, vs.333: “... *viṣuvadevaṃvidhaṃ jñātvā ko na mucyeta bandhanāt.*”

² The number is the same but the order and names are different. Thus vss.232b–233a (p.142) reads “... *tyāgaṃ saṃyogaṃudbhavam // bhedanam ca padārthānām*; vs.334 (p.209), in contrast, reads “... *padārthabhedanam śṛṇu / tyāgaṃ cānubhavam caiva yojanam ca pare pade.*”

³ This is the construction of Kṣemarājaḥ (p.144); he also construes (pp.144–145) the following *bhāva*-prapti- with the *anubhavam*, and the triple pervasion of Ātmā, Vidyā, and Śivaḥ, with the final *jñātvā*. The complete verses (pp.142–143, vss.232b–233) read: “... *śūnyam samarasam jñeyam tyāgaṃ saṃyogaṃudbhavam // bhedanam ca padārthānām bhāva*prāptivaśātpunaḥ / *ātmavidyāśivavyāptimevaṃ jñātvā tu yojayet.*”

formula procedure from the preceding ascension by means of the *Prāṇavaḥ*, the text states that it will describe the meditative progression of the formulæ not in syllables but moræ.¹ A restating of the levels of the microcosm and their respective regents (pp.216–220) precedes the correlation (pp.220–225) of the moræ of the *haṁsa* formula to each level. Along with the number of moræ, the text includes here as a topic (p.220) the joining, which evidently reconnects back to sequence in the *anukramaṇikā*. This section on the “to be known” closes with a verse stating (p.225) that once the practitioner knows the procedure using moræ, he can then pierce the categories with the needle of the formula. Though repeating here the topics mentioned earlier in the section, including the *pramāṇam* or charting of the microcosmic course taken by the formula, the verse does not mention the expected casting off.² Understanding the casting off (*tyāgaḥ*), once again, as the casting off of regents (*kāraṇatyāgaḥ*), however, enables this topic to be reasonably included in the topic of the *pramāṇam* that contains a discussion of regents.³ This verse, therefore, provides the transition back to the stated sequence of topics.

After a brief theological preface (pp.226–227) explaining the tripartite powers underlying the use of the formula, the text proceeds to describe (pp.227–232) the psycho-physical techniques used in its correct manipulation. These include, notably, the divine figuration (*divyaṁ karaṇam*) featured in the yogic practices of

¹ Referring to p.162 vs.258 which describes the utterance as “*varṇoccāraḥ*” vs.341 (p.215), an apparent redactorial harmonization, states in contrast: “*haṁsayogaḥ purākhyātaḥ mātṛāsaṁkhyā tvathocyate.*”

² The *pramāṇam* is first mentioned on p.216, vs.341.

³ V. p.142, vs.232, which mentions both casting off (*tyāgaḥ*) and casting off of regents (*kāraṇatyāgaḥ*).

many traditions.¹ Its inclusion, here, corroborates assuming for these rites an earlier function in individual and direct praxis, rather than in collective and stylized liturgy. Emphasis on the interior aspect of practice continues in the next (pp.232–244) section describing the sonic experiences accompanying the piercing of the various categories by knowledge. A statement in the middle of this section (p.234) interrupts the description of these experiences to subsume the first three under the topic of experience (*anubhavaḥ*) mentioned by the *anukramaṇikā*. Similarly, a statement on the next page (p.235), apparently equates the remaining sonic experiences with the expected topic of *bhāvaprāpti*- or acquisition of existence. Confirming the interconnection, also affirmed by Kṣemarājaḥ, of these topics, a later verse characterizes the sound experienced at the level of Vyāpini as an experience (*anubhāvaḥ*).² This section concludes (pp.243–244) with a description of the final state attained by the piercing of the categories, the isolation of the purified soul (*jīvaḥ*).

The composition of the text, at this point, mirrors the history of sectarian Śaiva doctrine. Śaiva circles evidently borrowed the preceding practices from Sāṃkhya-Yogaḥ groups,

¹ The text here describes the practice frequently called the *khecari mudrā*, in which the adept, his body upright and his gaze level, moves his tongue upwards to the palate. V. bk.6, p.135, where the adept employs the same pose, and bk.7, p.232, where Kṣemarājaḥ describes, according to the *Trikasāraḥ*, the way in which this pose collects the effusions and secretions of the body: "... śakterminavanmukhapucchācchoṭanena tālubilākramaṇāttad-gatarasāsṡvādanataḥ sādhakasaṃvidāḥ" For other traditions, cf., for example, Swami Digambarji and M.L. Gharote, eds., *Gheraṇḍa Saṃhitā* (Lonavla: Kaivalyadharm S.M.Y.M. Samiti, 1978), 3, vss.21ff; George Weston Briggs, *Gorakhnāth and the Kānpaṭā Yogis* (1938. Reprint. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1982), pp.338–340.)

² V. p.235, vs.374b: "*tattadrūpaṃ bhavettasya sthānabhāvānurūpaḥ*."

where the isolation of the purified soul represented the final stage of liberation. Like the Pāśupatāḥ, the Śaivas rejected this view of liberation. They then added their categories above those of the Sāṃkhya-Yogaḥ. Thus in order to provide a transition to their own superadded and properly Śaiva categories, they qualified this preceding inherited description of the isolated soul.¹ They equated the soul with the self (*ātma*), and reinterpreted the previous rite as a mere preliminary part of the ritual of initiation via the three levels of Ātma, Vidyā, and Śivaḥ. These three, accordingly, constitute the last three topics listed in the subsidiary *anukramaṇikā*. As noted, the redactors' efforts at integration and harmonization, however, have introduced redundancy and discontinuity into the text, which also describes this ritual more appropriately as a separate initiation in the fifth book that contains the rest of the initiations via planes (*tattvam*).²

As if simultaneously acknowledging this dependency on the Sāṃkhya-Yogaḥ, and therefore needing to reassert once again the superiority of the Śaiva doctrine, the following section on the self (pp.243–248) polemicizes explicitly against these “self-worshippers” (*ātmopāsakāḥ*) for whom the self is the highest stage of liberation.³ After establishing the necessity for superseding the self, the text briefly discusses (pp.248–251) Vidyā and Śivaḥ. The following definition of Vidyā as Unmanā reconnects the text to the normal sequence of levels broken off at Samanā (p.243) by the excursus on the soul and self. Definitions and metaphors of fire illustrating the self's dissolution in Śivaḥ conclude this section

¹ Cf. section II.12 for the summary of bk.12, pp.30ff, which records the same process.

² V. bk.5, p.8.

³ V. p.247, vss.391b–392a: “*aviditvā param tattvam śivatvam kalpitam tu yaiḥ // ta ātmopāsakāḥ śaive na gacchanti param śivam.*”

(pp.252–255). Capsule instructions found here, directing the master to execute this rite for a initiate, also reintegrate this rite into the surrounding ritual of initiation.¹

This directive to reintegrate or join corresponds with the final member of the *anukramaṇikā*.² Accordingly, redactors have then placed summary verses marking the end of this long excursus treating topics listed by the *anukramaṇikā*. Starting with the three levels, these verses now recapitulate the topics in reverse order.³ They conclude by repeating the final instructions to the master. In his commentary, Kṣemarājaḥ recognizes that by discussing here an initiation via planes, the text reduplicates material treated earlier in this book and later in the following fifth book. Though nominally appended to the expiatory rites closing the initiation via energies, these rites, he notes, actually constitute a separate initiation.⁴ Confirming this separate status, the text proceeds (pp.256–258) to discuss another related initiation via a single plane. Because redactors did not list this procedure in the subsidiary

¹ V. vs.401, p.254: *"tadvatyojayate pare."*

² V. vs.233, p.143: *"... evaṃ jñātvā tu yojayet."*

³ V. vss.403–404a, p.255: *"tattvatrayaṃ paraṃ khyātānaparaṃ cādhvamadhyagam / bhedaṇaṃ tu padārthānāṃ tyāgānubhavayojanaṃ // pūrvoktāṃ ca idaṃ sarvaṃ jñātvā tattve niyojayet."* These summary verses appear to recapitulate the material covered only by the subsidiary *anukramaṇikā* of vs.334 (p.209).

⁴ V. his commentary on pp.255–256. Following redactors who have here qualified the rite concerning the three planes as inferior (*aparaṃ*), he considers (p.256) the primary form of this rite, although used earlier in the purificatory ceremony, to be that in the following book which constitutes an initiation proper: *"ātmavidyāśivākhyāṃ tattvatrayaṃ pūrvam prāyaścittaśuddhāvapi nirṇītametaṭ tritattvadikṣāyāṃ pradhānarūpaṃ"*

anukramaṇikā, it stands out more clearly as an independent ritual.¹

II.4.3 Concluding Rites and Consecration

This appended material continues (pp.259–264) with an aside characterizing the authentic Śaiva master. This characterization leads into the next section (pp.265–280), which describes the ritual executed by such a master. This section, Kṣemarājaḥ notes, marks a return to this book's main topic, the liturgy of the liberation initiation.² During the development of the Śaiva liturgy, ritualists integrated numerous and once independent practices into this grand liberation liturgy. And thus here, following the same pattern, they have apparently absorbed a separate ritual of initiation, and appended it as a rite of joining concluding the initiation via energies.³

This initiation requires only a single oblation, transformed by the master into a meditative realization. In this procedure, the parts of the oblation correspond (pp.265–270) to the microcosmic course leading to liberation. The master then performs (pp.271–273) the casting off of the regents through the formula ascent, and then leads the initiate's purified self to the pervasion of Śivaḥ. These acts clearly reduplicate segments of the previous rite of joining.⁴ Returning to the process of oblation, the text then

¹ Kṣemarājaḥ also introduces this rite as such: "... *bhāvi-caturbheda tattvadikṣāmadhye asaṃgrhitāmapī ekatattvadikṣāṃ prasaṅgena sūcayitumāha*."

² V. p.264, vs.418, and Kṣemarāja's introduction: "... *prakṛtaṃ āha*."

³ On this rite, v supra section I.2.4.

⁴ This material repeats, for example, the earlier (pp.243–248) polemic against the worshippers of self, and the exaltation of the

(pp.274–277) describes the procedure for imparting this pervasion of Śivaḥ to the initiate. A series of additional oblations (pp.277–280) then impart the qualities of Śivaḥ.¹

At this point, the long digression elaborating the appended rites of joining appears to end, when the text begins to describe (pp.280–281) the sprinkling or anointing (*abhiṣekaḥ*), intended to reinvigorate the body of the initiate desiccated by the intense formulæ applied during the initiation. In form and content, this rite appears to restart the description of the miscellaneous concluding rites that the excursus on the joining had interrupted. Accordingly, after indicating the exchange of a flower, final circumambulations, prosternations, and a contemplation of the initiate's new condition, the text proclaims the end of the liberation initiation.²

An initiate who has undergone the with-seed initiation defined in the beginning of book four, the text continues (p.285), can subsequently become a master (*ācāryaḥ*) by undergoing (pp.286–298) a special anointing or consecration (*abhiṣekaḥ*). The officiating master first (pp.286–289) prepares five jugs with select substances such as jewels and unguents. Into these prepared jugs, he then imposes the planes, energies, and worlds, followed by Bhairavaḥ and his retinue, and finally, the guardians of the directions. After he has installed the initiate on a special seat in a

superiority of the pervasion of Śivaḥ. Thus the text asserts (p.272, vs.434): "*ātmanavyāptirbhavedeṣā śivavyāptistato 'nyathā*."

¹ V. pp.278–279. These include such qualities as omniscience and autonomy. They render the initiate, Kṣemarājaḥ explains (p.279), different from any other conscious subject, who might possess one of these qualities but not others, and thus similar to Śivaḥ alone: "... *ekasyāpi śivanāthasyetthyaṃ vyāvṛttibhedena sarvajñatvādayaḥ śaṭ guṇā vyākhyeyāḥ*."

² As noted previously, this flower exchange (p.284), as interpreted by Kṣemarājaḥ, represents the disinterest of the ritual officiant in financial compensation and the honesty of the initiate in giving it.

diagram surrounded by the jugs, the master (pp.288–291), using the prepared water, consecrates him. The officiating master (pp.292–295) gives the initiate regal emblems such as a turban and a parasol, symbolizing his entitlement (*adhikārah*) to the new rank of master, and briefly explains this entitlement. The standard rites (pp.295–298), such as the oblations into the fire, the flower bestowal, prostrations, and the like, then conclude the ritual for consecrating a master.

There follows a similar ritual for consecrating an adept (*sādhakaḥ*). The text begins (pp.298–301) by categorizing this consecration, specified as a joining to the stage of Sadāśivaḥ. An initiate who desires this consecration, or initiation into the use of formulæ (*vidyādikṣā*), must first undergo the liberation initiation. Since the initiate desires superhuman powers, however, the text directs that his initiation ritual should not purify all of his *karma*. Otherwise, he could not act after his consecration as an adept who wields formulæ to attain and enjoy these powers.¹ The actual procedure for consecrating an adept (pp.302–306) matches that for consecrating a master. Instead of Bhairavaḥ, however, the master imparts the formulæ of the deity who will be the focus of the adept's practice. And instead of the regal symbols given to the newly consecrated master, the adept receives (p.307) symbols of his entitlement such as the rosary to be used in his formulæ service. The standard rites then conclude (pp.307–310) the consecration ritual.

The text next (pp.311–317) describes a ritual for the self (*ātmayāgaḥ*), explained by Kṣemarājaḥ as a rite removing any

¹ V. vss.486–487a, p.301: “yojanyavasare bhedo vimarśaḥ sādhakasya tu / prārabdhaṁ karma pāścātyam nacaikasthaṁ tu bhāvayet // sādhakasya tu bhūtyarthaṁ prāk karmaikaṁ tu śodhayet.” Cf. supra the summary of pp.41–47.

impurities incurred during the initiation ritual.¹ After the intervening consecrations, therefore, the concluding rites of the initiation have apparently resumed. Actually, this self ritual constitutes a seemingly complete initiation procedure that harmonizing ritualists have, once again, nominally incorporated as a subordinate rite in the larger, surrounding initiation via energies. The words, which end this section, "the subtle initiation has been proclaimed" (*sūkṣmadikṣā prakīrtitā*) clearly evince this adaptation.²

This self ritual has two optional forms, either a material (*prākṛti*) or a noetic (*vaijñāniki*). In the material (pp.312–316), the master performs, with minor variation, the familiar series of initiation rites, beginning with imposing the goddess of speech and the path of energies, and ending with uniting the self to Śivaḥ and final expiating. The noetic (p.317–318), in contrast, requires only a single utterance of the Bhairava formula.³

At this point (pp.318–323), the text appears to resume describing specific acts that conclude the initiation via energies. After worshipping with oblations, songs of praise, and circumambulations, the ritual officiant entreats the lord to forgive any defects in the performance of the ritual and to guarantee its efficacy. He then formally dismisses the lord. This dismissal ends when the master has retracted all the imposed formulæ and relodged them in his heart. The master proceeds (pp.324–328) to clear out the sacrificial area. He tends the fire to be kept for the daily worship, removes the leftovers, and renders offerings to the minor deities. The disciple, in turn, worships the master, and

¹ V. Kṣemarāja's explanation of this rite on p.311: "*ātmano yāgaḥ paratattvayojanātmā samucchedyapāśasaṃsparśavidhi-nyūnatādisaṃbhāvanāśāṅkāśāntaye kartavyaḥ.*"

² V. p.317, vs.596.

³ Cf. supra section I.2.4 for a discussion of this rite.

gives him an appropriate fee for the ritual. The text illustrates some of these fees, adjusted to the status of the initiate.¹ After prescribing (p.328) the consummation of the ritual food by the master and adepts in order of their Śaiva rank, the text declares (pp.328–332) the obligations of the new initiates.² Henceforth, forgetting their previous caste, all new initiates must follow the same Śaivite law (*dharmah*). Only rank in the Śaiva community retains any significance. The text stresses that any lapse, even mentioning previous caste, will require expiation and even obstruct the efficacy of the initiation ritual.

¹ V. p.326, vss.534–536. These fees range from a hundred villages for a king to a twentieth part of a field for a small landowner. Kṣemarājaḥ justifies the obligation of the initiate to feed the other gathered Śaiva ascetics (*"linginastarpayet"*) by a verse equating service to them with service to Śivaḥ: *"śivasya paripūrṇasya kiṃ nāma kriyate naraiḥ / yatkr̥taṃ śivabhakteṣu tatkr̥taṃ tu śive bhavet."*

² It seems appropriate that the text discusses its own rules about caste here at the time of the commensal post initiation feast, since food relations best reflect and crystallize out relations and attitudes about caste.

II.5 BOOK 5

A brief transitional dialogue (pp.1-2) begins the fifth book. Noting the conclusion of the initiation via energies (*kalāḥ*), the goddess now asks Bhairavaḥ to proclaim the initiation via planes (*tattvam*). Just as in the initiation via the energies, so in this initiation via planes, the path being purified pervades the other paths.¹ And purifying one path, therefore, gives total liberation from all paths.

The text describes (pp.3-10) several procedures for the initiation via planes. In the first ritual (pp.3-6), the master purifies all thirty-six planes. Breaking the thirty-six planes into nine blocks, he associates each block with one of the nine phonemes of the Vidyārāja formula.² As the coextensive expressers

¹ Cf. supra the summary of bk.4, pp.49ff, which uses the same notion of pervasion (*vyāptiḥ*) to explain the relation between the various cosmological and thus initiatory paths.

² Varieties of this nine syllable formula, also called the Navātma or nine selves, which here consists of ū, y, v, l, m, kṣ, r, h, and the Praṇavaḥ explained by Kṣemarājaḥ as m, appears in the texts of many traditions. (V. for example, M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ*, 30, vss.11b-12a; Paṇḍit Madhusūdhana Kaul Shāstri, ed. *Mālinivijayottaratantram*, Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies 37 (Bombay: "Tatva-Vivechaka" Press, 1922), 8, p.42, vss.21-23. Cf. for other references, C. Hooykaas, *Āgama Tīrtha. Five Studies in Hindu-Balinese Religion*, Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks Deel 70, 4 (Amsterdam: N.V. Noord-Holandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij, 1964), pp.36ff; and on the general history of this notion in the Buddhist tradition, Jean Przyluski, "Les Vidyārāja," *Bulletin de l'école française d'extrême orient* 23 (1923): 301-318.)

Kṣemarājaḥ defines (Bk.1, p.10) the *vidyā* as Svachchandaḥ manifest in the form of the matrix of formulæ ("*vidyā svachchandaśivarūpā sphurattā paramārthamātrkā*"), but the text appears to use the term in a much broader sense as equivalent to *mantraḥ*. Thus the text calls (Bk.1, p.52, vs.63) the formula retinue of Svachchandaḥ his *vidyādehaḥ*; it labels (Bk.1, p.36, vs.43) the great formula of Svachchandaḥ the *mantrarājaḥ* just as it labels the

(*vācakāḥ*) of the blocks, these phonemes evidently facilitate ritual operations on the planes. The text itself does not elaborate on the ritual procedure. Kṣemarājaḥ, however, does indicate that in order to purify the blocks of planes, the master uses the Vidyāraja formula and follows the procedures described in the previous book.

In the second ritual (pp.6–7), a close variant of the first, the master uses not nine blocks, but nine individual planes evidently selected as representative of the thirty-six planes. The text, once again, does not elaborate on the ritual, specified by Kṣemarājaḥ, however, as following the previously discussed procedure. In the third procedure (pp.7–8), using not the Vidyārājaḥ, but the five formulæ of Śiva's faces, the master purifies five planes. Specifying that the pervasion of these planes matches that of the five energies, the text also suggests that the ritual procedure follows that previously described for the energies. In the fourth and final procedure (pp.8–10), the master employs the Praṇavaḥ coordinated with the three planes of Ātmā, Vidyā, and Śivaḥ. This final ritual procedure, according to Kṣemarājaḥ, once again, follows that employed in the initiation via energies.

The dialogue then announces the initiation via words (*padam*), and begins instructing the master on how to impose the phonemes of the Vidyārājaḥ in the diagram to be described. As noted by Kṣemarājaḥ, this presentation (pp.10–30) comes unexpectedly, without an initial request by the goddess.¹ This inconsistency in the dialogue frame, serves as an initial signal of

formula here the *vidyārājaḥ*; and finally, it terms (Bk.4, p.300, vs.484) the initiation of the adept into the special use of a formula, the *vidyādikṣā*. In addition, in a list of demigods, the text refers (Bk.2, p.150, vs.287) to the *vidyādhari* (for which v. Przyluski, "Les Vidyārāja," pp.306ff).

¹ Rationalizing this deficiency in the dialogue, Kṣemarājaḥ (p.10) explains that the revelation of this procedure represents a supernumerary act of grace: "*evaṃ praśnitāṃ tattvadikṣāmuktavā anujighrṅksorbhagavatya āśayaparitoṣāyāpraśnitāmapi padādidikṣāṃ nirūpayiṣyan*"

the redactorial work that has given this book its current form. As the discussion of the following initiation will show, the initiation via planes originally formed part of this Vidyārāja initiation. Later ritualists have apparently separated out the initiation via planes, and made it a variant of the initiation via energies. The second initiation procedure discussed above, which utilizes nine representative planes, carries the clearest signature of this original context. The first procedure, using nine blocks of planes, evidently represents an attempted harmonizing of the inherited nine planes with the thirty-six planes of the mature Śaiva systems. Redactors have then apparently incorporated the three plane initiation here under the same heading. This incorporation, however, reduplicates the previous account of this rite in a different context, and ignores the divergent metaphysics underlying the system of three planes and the system of thirty-six planes. The third procedure, which employs the face formulæ and five planes, does not specify the precise ritual acts, but may represent an adaptation of a separate ritual discussed later in this same book.¹ In addition, the technical

¹ This initiation (p.7, vs.13a) apparently operates by purifying the elements from earth (*dharitri*) to ether (*kham*) through application of the formulæ of the faces. Similarly, the subsequently detailed noetic initiation (*viññānadikṣā*) (pp.43ff.) effects a successive transformation of the initiate's self through a series of formula elevations correlated with the five elements. In M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ* 11, vss.19-20, however, Abhinavaguptaḥ alludes to the *Kālottaraḥ*, which evidently had identified the five faces with the elements, which in successively higher forms also pervade the rest of the universe: "*śrīmatkālottarādau ca kathitaṃ bhūyasā tathā / pañcāitāni tu tattvāni yairvyāptamakhilam jagat // pañcamantra-tanau tena sadyojātādi bhanyate / isānāntaṃ tatra tatra dharādi-gaganāntakam.*" Though not mentioning this notion here, Kṣemarājaḥ later alludes to it (Bk.13, p.91) and rejects it in regard to the faces of Svachchandaḥ stated in this text. This identification of the faces and elements is evidently based on the early and widespread concept of Śiva's eight-fold manifestation (*aṣṭamūrtiḥ*) as the sun, moon, sacrificer, and five elements. V.infra the summary of pp.43ff.

language and cross-referencing, which occur throughout this section, indicate the harmonizing work of later redactors, intent on systematically interconnecting the various initiations procedures. The corresponding absence of specific ritual instructions corroborates the supposition that the arrangement of these rituals is a secondary extension, motivated by formal theological considerations. And finally, their enumeration, from the initiation using the greatest number of planes to that using the least, reflects a common pattern of these ritualists, who offer abbreviated alternatives to extensive ritual procedures.¹

The half-verse introducing the initiation via words echoes almost exactly the half-verse introducing the initiation via planes.² After the interpolation of the initiation via planes, therefore, the text resets, as it were, for application of the Vidyārājaḥ. Now, beginning a ritual inherently structured for its application, the text instructs (pp.11–23) the ritual officiant to construct a nine-centered (*navanābha-*) diagram. After receiving the imposition of the Vidyārājaḥ and all its correlated deities, this diagram will become the instrument for the liberation of the initiate. The laconic directives for its construction require lengthy exposition and cross-referencing from Kṣemarājaḥ. The master delineates (pp.11–14) a field with numerous subdivisions, then (pp.20–23) constructs nine lotuses in the center of this field, and finally (pp.20–23) finishes off the centerpiece with elaborate entrances.

¹ Offering abbreviated versions of larger rituals represents the complement and inverse of the other dominant structuring activity of the ritualists, the embedding of smaller rites in larger rituals.

² Cf. p.3, vs.4a, “*vidyārājasya ye varṇā navasamkhyopalakṣitāḥ*” with p.11, vs.18a “*vidyārāja tu ye varṇā navasamkhyopalakṣitāḥ*.”

This diagram is now identical to any temple or ritual pavilion.¹ Accordingly, after performing his preliminary purifications, the master (pp.23–25) enters the sanctuary and installs Svacchandaḥ and his limbs on the pericarp of the central lotus. On the leaves of the central lotus, he then imposes the phonemes of the Vidyārājaḥ and their corresponding planes from earth to Sadāsīvaḥ. On the other eight lotuses, the master (pp.25–27) repeats the same process, but now substitutes, for Svacchandaḥ, in turn, each of the eight bhairavas of his retinue. When he has worshipped the gods and purified the planes, he then (28–29) unites the initiate to the supreme Śivaḥ.

These procedures clearly constitute a complete and independent initiation ritual. Unlike the previous initiations, this ritual mentions and focuses on Svacchanda-bhairavaḥ. If, as the introductory *anukramaṇikā* indicates, the Bhairava source contained a formal initiation ritual, then it probably described a ritual of this sort. The brief instructions conform to the style of other Bhairava sections, and the absence of a temple and community setting agrees with the ascetic tenor of other Bhairava practices. The popularity of the nine-sectioned diagram and of the Vidyārāja formula undoubtedly motivated the compilers of the Bhairava source to adapt them for their own services.² Later

¹ The master repeats (p.23 vs.35), therefore, before the diagram, the preliminary rites prescribed in bk.2 before entering an actual sacrificial pavilion.

² This diagram occurs also with the same name in the Pāñcarātra texts. (For references, v. H. Daniel Smith, *A Descriptive Bibliography of the Printed Texts of the Pāñcarātrāgama* 2, Gækwad's Oriental Series 168 (Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1980), An Annotated Index to Selected Topics, p.77. On the construction and subdividing of this diagram in this tradition, v. Prabhakar P. Apte and Shreenivas G. Supekar, "Vāstupuruṣamaṇḍala in the Pauṣkarasaṃhitā and Br̥hat-saṃhitā," in *Agama and Silpa*, ed. K.K.A. Venkatachari, Ananthacharya Indological Research Institute

ritualists have then incorporated this already eclectic ritual as the initiation via words.

In the cosmology of the six paths, however, the path of words usually represents the lowest level in the descending triad of sonic manifestations, phoneme, formula, and word. Accordingly, the text here labels the parts of the Vidyārāja formula, which are distributed nine times on the nine lotuses of the diagram, as phonemes.¹ Without elaborate justification, however, in an earlier parenthetical explanation of the six paths, the *padam* were said to be eighty-one in number and to be made up of the phonemes identified as the breath.² In incorporating this ritual as an initiation via words, therefore, the later ritualists may have relied on other Śaiva texts that interpret the path of words differently. In this alternative interpretation, phonetic analysis reveals eighty-one half-moræ, or *padam*, in the fifty phonemes.³ Though these eighty-one *padam* correspond to the distributed eighty-one parts of the Vidyārājaḥ only in number and not in form, this partial agreement evidently sufficed to justify labeling the worship in the nine lotus diagram as an initiation via words. Alternatively, perhaps similar interests in correlating ritual and cosmology first

Series 16 (Bombay: Ananthacharya Indological Research Institute, 1984), pp.132-148.)

¹ V. supra p.11, vs.18a: "*vidyārāje tu ye varṇā . . .*"

² V. Bk.4, p.158, vss.251b-252: "*padādhva procyate 'dhunā // ekāśītipadānyeva vidyārājasthitānyapi / varṇātmakāni tānyatra varṇāḥ prāṇātmakāḥ sthitāḥ*." In his commentary, Kṣemarājaḥ here does not explain the occurrence of eighty-one *padam*.

³ For this concept of eighty-one half moræ, v. Raniero Gnoli, *Essenza dei Tantra (Tantrasāra)* 2 (1960. Reprint, Torino: Editore Boringhieri, 1979): 327-328. On the *padam* and the Vidyārājaḥ v. also André Padoux, *Recherches sur la symbolique et l'énergie de la parole dans certains textes tantriques*, Publications de l'institut de civilisation indienne 21 (Paris: Institut de civilisation indienne 1975), pp.276-278.

led to analyzing the path of words as eighty-one half-moræ, in order to provide a more cogent foundation for the ritual employing the nine centered diagram.

Redactors have thus split and relabeled the original and unitary initiation of the Bhairava source in order to yield the initiation via planes and via words. For the three remaining initiations, via phonemes, via formulæ, and via worlds (*bhuvanam*), the text simply commands (p.30), *mutatis mutandis*, the procedures already described for the initiation via energies. Continuing the work of the redactors, Kṣemarājaḥ then enumerates the corresponding sets of categories across the six paths. This enumeration completes the correlation of ritual and cosmology, and offers a practical reference for ritual officiants. Except for the description of an initiation via worlds, however, the text offers no evidence that the separate initiations via these last three paths were actual practices rather than theoretical options derived from the cosmology.¹

The text next (pp.38–43) declares the code of conduct required of new initiates. At the end of the initiation via energies, the text had already enumerated the obligations of these initiates.² If, as understood by the later ritualists, the initiations described in this book represent minor variations on the initiation via energies, then they should not require a separate code of conduct. This section, therefore, likely represents the concluding part of an earlier initiation described by the Bhairava source. The more

¹ For the initiation via worlds, v. bk.10, pp.141ff. On the artificial nature of these initiations, cf. Brunner-Lachaux, *Somaśambhupaddhati*, troisième partie, pp.xixff.

² V. bk.4, pp.328–332.

marked inclusivist and "tantric" character of this code of conduct also corroborates this hypothesis.¹

The text then (pp.43-72) describes additional procedures. In contrast, says Kṣemarājaḥ, to the previous action initiation (*kriyādikṣā*), the text (p.43) calls these rites, the knowledge initiation (*viññānadikṣā*). In fact, they resemble the assorted rites collected as the rite of joining and the noetic initiation, at the end of the initiation via energies. Once again, therefore, later ritualists have apparently collected originally separate rituals and nominally incorporated them as concluding rites. Though functionally similar, these sets of concluding procedures, however, do not correspond in form and content. In particular, the incorporation of rites appears less thoroughgoing, and the ritual retains more of its independent initiatory character. The repetition of these concluding ceremonies, just like the repetition of the code of conduct, therefore, supports the hypothesis that this book once described a separate Bhairava initiation. And the dissimilarity in the concluding ceremonies confirms the hypothesis that a complicated, but now largely hidden history of ritualist systematizing lies behind the larger and standard Śaiva rituals.

As in the preceding joining ritual, the master extracts the initiate's self, and by meditation with the breath and formula elevates it in the central channel, stage by stage, up to final union with the supreme Śivaḥ. Since this process operates interiorly without external props, the text has appropriately characterized the ritual as a noetic initiation. In this ritual (pp.43-55), specifically, the master successively purifies each of the five major elemental components of the initiate's self, from earth to ether. For each elemental purifying, in turn, the master must elevate the initiate's self in five stages. He attains and supersedes these stages and their deities, through meditation on

¹ Note, for example, the approbation of wine, meat, and so forth (p.41, vs.48), and of all codes of conduct (p.40, vs.46).

the five corresponding parts of the *Praṇavaḥ*. Meditating on the increasingly subtle and ascending sections of this formula, which rise in the breath and in the central channel, the master purifies the initiate's self and deposits it at the stage of *Vyāpinī*. Then (pp.55–56) the master, purifying *Samanā* and *Unmanā*, conveys the initiate's self up to the threshold of the supreme reality. A half-verse of dialogue then introduces the ritual of joining (pp.56–69) that will unite the initiate with the supreme reality.

In order to coordinate the three parts of the noetic initiation, *Kṣemarājaḥ* interprets the rites directed at the five elements as purifying the field of experience of the initiate, those directed at *Samanā* and *Unmanā* as purifying the latent impressions of these experiences, and those of the joining as effecting union with the supreme reality. When describing the joining, however, the text not only describes the final stages of union but also virtually reduplicates the first part of the initiation by recapitulating the entire course of the *Praṇavaḥ*. The overlapping of the first and of the last part of the noetic initiation, therefore, suggests that ritualist systematizers have combined separate rites.

The purifying of the five elements probably once formed a complete initiation procedure. Earlier in this book, the text briefly discussed an initiation via five planes.¹ Though not enumerating these planes, the text indicated there that the five representative planes used in this initiation were the five elements.² The text also directed that the five formulæ of Śiva's faces be used to purify the elements. As already noted, this evidence suggests that redactors had incorporated a pentadic elemental initiation into their schema of initiations via planes. Although using the *Praṇavaḥ* instead of the face formulæ, the elemental purifying in the noetic initiation apparently represents a simple variant of this kind of ritual.

¹ V. pp.7–8, vs.12b–13.

² V. supra the summary of pp.7–8 and notes on this rite.

Accordingly, just like the ritualist systematizers who integrated the preceding elemental initiation, Kṣemarājaḥ expands the scope of these elemental purifications.¹ By applying the principle of pervasion and subtle extension, he includes within these elements the remaining planes of the later Śaiva cosmology.²

As noted, some ritualists have then recast this elemental initiation as the first part of the noetic initiation, concluding the initiation ritual described in this book. Perhaps other ritualists had already appended various rites as a joining ritual concluding this once independent initiation ritual.³ In order to coordinate this pair of concluding rites, additional redactors have reinterpreted the elemental purifying as the first part of the noetic initiation, and as leading only up to the stage of Vyāpinī. They have then apparently added, as a link, the middle section on traversing Samanā and Unmanā, and reinterpreted the joining as the third part of this noetic initiation ritual. Alternatively, ritualists may have fashioned a complete and independent noetic initiation with these three parts, before other redactors incorporated it as an appendix to the greater initiation ritual.

Consequently, this multiple redaction has introduced inconsistencies in the systematizing of the initiation rituals. Thus, in the preceding book describing the paradigmatic initiation via energies, the joining rites preceded the noetic initiation. Here, in contrast, the term knowledge or noetic initiation apparently

¹ For the redactors v. p.8, vs.13: *"kalānām yāvati vyāptis-tattvānām tāvadeva hi."*

² V. his commentary on pp.54–55. These five elevations operate, he explains, through the five powers of the lord (*"cidānandecchājñāna-kriyākhyasakti-*) and purify all the elements contained in the first five lower elements: *"ata eva pañcatrīṃśattattvavyāptisārasusūkṣmapṛthivyādinī itthaṃ samśodhyāpi"*

³ V. the summary of bk.4, pp.141ff.

designates all the concluding rites, including the rites of joining.¹ Kṣemarājaḥ, accordingly, had previously explained the shorter noetic rite of self-sacrifice, sc. initiation, as a separate purificatory rite that like the joining concludes the larger initiation ritual.² In his commentary at the end of this book, however, Kṣemarājaḥ counts this comprehensive knowledge initiation, which includes the joining, as a separate type of initiation.³ Evidently, the discontinuities between the two functionally similar procedures has caused Kṣemarājaḥ to hedge in his classification. It remains ambiguous whether the knowledge initiation can ever supplant the normal ceremonial initiation, or can only occur as its regular or supernumerary conclusion.⁴

In addition, the text presents this rite of joining in a way that betrays its former independent status. The concluding half of the dialogue frame enclosing the account of this rite (pp.69–70), for example, rhetorically marks this practice as a separate, esoterically transmitted tradition.⁵ When outlining the stages of the Praṇava's ascension, the text, in keeping with its supposed presentation of an esoteric doctrine, stresses the correspondences between the micro- and macrocosm. This contrasts with the style of stereotyped prescriptions expected in an account of a familiar

¹ V. the summary of the post-joining rites in bk.4, pp.253ff.

² V. bk. 4, pp.311ff..

³ Bk.5, p.72: "*jñānadikṣā coddhātayuktyā dvādaśī.*"

⁴ V. supra section 1.2.4 on the noetic aspect of initiation, and cf. Brunner-Lachaux, *Somaśambhupaddhati*, troisième partie, pp.14ff, n.23.

⁵ V. p.69, vs.85: "*gurupāramparāyātaḥ sampradāyaḥ prakāśitaḥ;*" and the gloss of Kṣemarājaḥ attempting to emphasize the experiential and esoteric aspect underlying this rhetorical coda: "*pārampareṇāyāto rahasyānubhavasamcārakrameṇa mayā viditaḥ.*"

secondary rite. Kṣemarājaḥ recognizes and underscores the integral and doctrinal character of this practice, when he repeatedly cross-references it to the tenth book which describes the Śaiva cosmology.¹ The concluding dialogue also has a verse praising the universal importance and significance of this practice. Just like the separate dialogue frame, this panegyric tag frequently marks the incorporation of once separate procedures. In vaunting the universal power of this rite, the text points to an original context beyond its restricted application in the liberation initiation. The allusion to practices such as the “divine figuration,” further corroborate that this rite once represented an independent esoteric teaching.²

The end of the noetic initiation coincides with the end of the text’s description of initiation. In order to provide a coherent conclusion, redactors have apparently added dialogue instructing the ritual officiant to perform the noetic initiation for all the paths used in initiation. This directive, of course, reduplicates the instructions exhaustively prescribed at the end of the initiation via energies, which had already enjoined another form of the noetic initiation and other procedures as concluding rites. The dialogue then (p.71) proclaims the conclusion not of the noetic initiation but of the initiation via concentrations (*dhāraṇādikṣā*). Although Kṣemarājaḥ rationalizes this pair of designations as synonymous, the new and apt name, concentration, which suggests the context of an single exercitant, provides further evidence of the original

¹ V. his commentary, p.63, to vs.78a.

² V. the notes to the summary of bk.4, p.270, for references to the “divine figuration” mentioned here, p.64. In conclusion, the text itself (p.70, vs.86a) declares that this procedure has a universal application: “*evaṃ jñātvā varārohe sarvakarmāṇi kārayet.*” And Kṣemarājaḥ confirms that this rite forms an indispensable part of the practice of all higher level practitioners: “*ācāryasādhakādīṃśca svociteṣu karmasu eta jñānapūrvakameva prayuñjītyarthah.*”

setting of these rites.¹ Finally, the concluding verse of this book (p.72) confirms the extended application of these procedures, when it lauds their certain efficacy for both exercitants and adepts.²

The conclusion of the initiation also occasions (pp.72-99) lengthy commentary by Kṣemarājaḥ. He first (pp.72-73) enumerates all the initiations and consecrations that the text has discussed in books four and five, or will discuss in book ten. Counting all rituals for all grades of inities, whether touched on explicitly, or, as he sees it, implicitly, Kṣemarājaḥ totals seventy-four. After this enumeration, he begins his apologetic defense of initiation. In dense and formal commentatorial style, he exhaustively lists, then refutes the opponents' objections: treating first the Buddhists (pp.73-76); then, extensively, the dualistic Śaiva-siddhāntins (pp.76-98); and finally, very briefly, the Vivarta- and Pariṇāmaḥ schools (pp.98-99). As expected, this refutation, almost a separate treatise in itself, contains the most sustained exposition of his own philosophical position, usually presented in the rest of his commentary in summary fashion. And his naming of specific opponents provides otherwise wanting historical background.³ Underscoring the importance of the initiation and perhaps of his own commentary here, Kṣemarājaḥ ends this book with a greater than usual number of laudatory and summary verses.

¹ Cf. bk.12 which presents an ascending series of *dhāraṇā* practices.

² V. p.72, vss.87b-88a: "*kartavyā yoginātra tu // mantrasiddhena vā devi.*"

³ V. supra section I.2.1 on these opponents and his debates with the Siddhāntins on the interpretation of Śaiva initiation.

II.6 BOOK 6

The text next (pp.101–164) begins to discuss the practices of the adept, the topic of the sixth book..¹ This topic comes in the sequence stated by the *anukramaṇikā* of the first book, which follows the normal pattern whereby the adept pursues his special and individual attainments only after receiving the requisite entitlement by the proper initiation and consecration.² In a mountain or cave retreat, the adept undertakes (pp.101–104) the worship of Bhairavaḥ by repeating a lakh of the Bahurūpa formula. This service, the text continues, in conjunction with the Praṇavaḥ brings him, without fail, not only his desired attainments, but also liberation. By prescribing use of the Bahurūpa formula, which is the specific formula of Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ this section clearly signals its provenance from the Bhairava source. The straightforward promise of simultaneous superhuman success and liberation also characterizes the practices of this Bhairava source, which, as noted, appear unencumbered by the theological considerations of the systematic Śaiva material.

As described in the first book, and now noted again, the Bahurūpa formula has the Praṇavaḥ at its beginning. This association with the Praṇavaḥ has evidently given redactors the opportunity to insert here (pp.105–144) an extended description of the stages of the meditation on the Praṇavaḥ. This description reduplicates the preceding book's description of the Praṇavaḥ ascension, which, as noted, referred in passing to the adept in addition to the master. Thus, though adapted to the initiation as a rite of joining, the preceding Praṇavaḥ practice anticipated and

¹ On the adept (*sādhakaḥ*) v. supra sections I.2.4, and II.4.1 for the summary of bk.4, pp.41ff.

² V. bk.1, p.12, vs.10b: "*dikṣā cādhvābhisekau samayānsādhāni ca.*"

echoed this book's full-fledged application of the Praṇavaḥ in the adept's practice. This application adds to the evidence indicating that the master's use of the Praṇavaḥ upon a passive initiate in the ritual of joining represents a specialized and secondary ritual adaptation of a once independent and active meditation.¹ The long established tradition of the Praṇavaḥ, whose immense prestige led to its adoption in the practice of many traditions, however, complicates the unraveling of its prehistory. The same redactors, therefore, could have incorporated a Praṇava practice both into the knowledge initiation and into the adept's practice; or other redactors could have retroactively systematized varying Praṇava descriptions that had been gradually adopted by different ritualists from different sources. In either case, the extended discussion of the Praṇavaḥ in this book stands out as a digression interpolated into the description of the Bahurūpa formula.

The text first (pp.105–106) states that realizing the five increasingly subtle sections of the Praṇavaḥ leads to liberation. Before charting in detail the adept's ascension with the Praṇavaḥ, however, the text pauses for a general discussion of its nature. In addition to the content of this section, which clearly marks it as a digression, the repetition of an identical quarter verse at the beginning and at the end of the section also sets it off as an interpolation.² If not for the expansion by this interpolation, the treatment of the Praṇavaḥ in this book would more closely resemble that in the other books.

The opening verse of this section (p.107) lauds Śaiva revelation for surpassing all others, and the Praṇavaḥ for being its quintessence. Continuing the theme of this Praṇava's superiority

¹ V. the preceding discussions of the rites of joining in section II.4.2 summarizing bk.4, pp.141. ff, and section II.5 summarizing bk.5, pp.57ff.

² V. section I.1.5 for a discussion of this device of *Wiederaufnahme*.

and universal importance, the text asserts (pp.108–110) that the soul or breath functions only in indissoluble union with the Praṇavaḥ. Thus this assertion prescribes a structure of the Praṇavaḥ that has 'h' prefixed, representing the breath. By stressing this structure at various times in the text, the Śaivas, according to Kṣemarājaḥ, differentiated their Praṇavaḥ from the ordinary Praṇavaḥ of other traditions.¹

In a parenthetical declaration characteristic of this section's generalizing tone, the text next (pp.111–112) states that effective cognition, and, by implication, use of the Praṇavaḥ requires the urging (*codanā*) of the scripture. A similarly general or theoretical description of the components of the Praṇavaḥ follows (pp.113–124). Here (pp.113–115), the text equates the 'a' with the supreme lord in his transcendent aspect as the lord without parts (*niṣkalaḥ*). The 'ū' is equated with the lord with attributes (*sakalaḥ*). When united, they emanate the multileveled universe that corresponds to the pentadic Praṇavaḥ. The discussion of the next component, the 'ṁ', apparently follows (pp.116–118) in an elliptical aside describing a meditation where the exercitant reverses emanation and dissolves the 'ṁ' back into the supreme Śivaḥ. The panegyric quarter-verse closing this description signals, once again, that redactors have likely here interpolated a fragment from a longer and more coherent description of a Praṇavaḥ meditation. Kṣemarājaḥ, accordingly, maintains the

¹ V. section I.1.3 for the earlier use of the Praṇavaḥ. Here the previous traditions appear in vs.7a (p.110) which apparently equates the breath to the solitary soul ("*... jīva eko vyavasthitaḥ*"). Since previous commentators had also interpreted the breath in this restricted sense, instead of in the requisite universal sense, Kṣemarājaḥ (pp.109–110) has to refute them by reinterpreting this declaration in his commentary: "*eka iti advitiya / sarvamantraviryāntarvyavasthita ityavicaladrūpatayānuccāryaḥ athacāvyavasthito na kenacitpratiniyatena rūpeṇa sthito 'niyantritasphāra ityarthah.*"

comprehensibility and continuity of this description only with extensive commentary and cross-referencing.¹

The text then turns back to the description (pp.119) of the 'ū', noting that this component of the Praṇavaḥ actually represents the fusion of 'ū' and 'u', respectively, the sixth and fifth vowels. This additional phonological refinement in the description of the Praṇavaḥ again indicates the more theoretical tone of this section. In conclusion, after recapitulating its discussion of the relationship between the with and without parts forms of the lord and the Praṇavaḥ (pp.119–121), the text adds (pp.121–124) a further aspectual distinction. The with parts formula also has two forms: a primary (*prakṛtiḥ*) and a secondary (*vikṛtiḥ*). In the beginning of this book and in the first book, Kṣemarājaḥ notes, the text calls the Bahurūpa formula the formula of the lord with parts.² This section considers the Praṇavaḥ to be the formula both of the lord without parts and the lord with parts. Thus, in order to preclude a conflict between these statements, redactors have supplied this harmonizing addendum distinguishing between aspects of the with parts formula.³ The terms used for this distinction provide additional evidence of this interpolation. Like other statements in this section,

¹ For example, in order to provide a transition from this discussion of the 'm' meditation back to the u, in his commentary to verse 16b. (p.119), Kṣemarājaḥ states that the sixth vowel 'ū' also implies the m: *"ṣaṣṭhaḥ svarō bindvādyupalakṣaṇapara ityuktameva."*

² V. pp.102ff, and bk.1, pp.34ff.

³ Note that Kṣemarājaḥ considers this distinction as applying to the aspects of the without parts formula, and takes only vs.19, p.121 as applying to the two-fold with parts formula. Kṣemarājaḥ also disputes the interpretation of previous commentators over the implication of this verse that apparently distinguishes two forms of the formula for different grades of recipients of grace, "gods and demons (*surāsurāṇām* ...)."

they evidently derive from the educated milieu of later redactors, intent on systematizing the heterogeneous practices inherited from early sources.

After (p.124) a final general declaration of the universal extension of the Praṇavaḥ, the text returns to its interrupted description of the fivefold Praṇavaḥ. These five parts, however, are now seen as corresponding (pp.125–126) only to the five lower levels of the Śaiva meditational cosmology. In order to match the parts of the Praṇavaḥ to the upper five levels, the text then repeats (pp.127–128) the fivefold Praṇavaḥ. These two sets are then explained as superior (*para-*) and inferior (*apara-*) sets of the same formula, coupled with superior and inferior forms of the breath. At one time, perhaps in other traditions, the three or five member Praṇavaḥ likely sufficed to establish correspondences.¹ On account of the widespread acceptance of a different standard schema for the meditational ascent to Śivaḥ, however, later redactors have had to multiply the parts of the Praṇavaḥ. The introductory dialogue (p.127) stating that the lord will repeat the Praṇavaḥ signals the work of redactors who have here resorted to the device of reduplication in order to extend the Praṇavaḥ.² The concepts used, once again, to rationalize this redundancy also indicate a later redactorial milieu.

After a stereotypical closing verse (p.129) that praises these plural Praṇavas for bestowing both liberation and enjoyments, the text returns to its description of the singular fivefold Praṇavaḥ.

¹ For earlier speculation on the Praṇavaḥ, v. Padoux, *Recherches*, pp.26ff, and for simpler schemas in later traditions, v. Patrick Olivelle, ed. and trans., *Vāsudevadharmā Yatidharmaprakāśa*, Publications of the de Nobili Research Library 3 (Wien: Institut für Indologie der Universität Wien, 1976), §§42–44, pp.72ff.

² V. p.127, vs.25b: “*parataḥ praṇavāṇ pañca punareva vadāmyaham.*”

There follow several unconnected verses (pp.129–132) that laud the scope of the Praṇavaḥ and the power of this formula to liberate those who know it. These verses form a kind of preface to the next section (pp.134–142) that describes the ascending stages in the meditative uttering (*uccārah*) of the formula. Once again, the “divine figuration” accompanies this procedure (pp.134–137) that at higher levels now requires several reduplications of the fivefold Praṇavaḥ before arriving at the liberating level of Śivaḥ.

After lauding the exclusive power of the Praṇavaḥ to liberate, the text enumerates (pp.137–138) the elements and regents corresponding to the higher stages of the formula utterance. Just as redactors have reduplicated the fivefold Praṇavaḥ to accommodate the extended Śaiva cosmology, so here, employing the same rationalization of superior and inferior forms, they have reduplicated the correspondences. The text then (pp.140–142) indicates that by meditatively worshipping the regents of these levels during his descent, the practitioner can acquire an appropriate superhuman power from each level. This practice probably reflects the adaptation of an earlier independent procedure, where worship of the five elements and their correlated deities by the corresponding parts of the fivefold Praṇavaḥ yielded specific attainments. Later redactors have then incorporated this procedure into the vertical Śaiva cosmology.¹

With the mention of practices for adepts, the text rejoins the ostensible main theme of this book, that is, the specific practices reserved for adepts. Appropriately, following a transitional dialogue verse (p.144) that marks the end of the long digression on the Praṇavaḥ, the description (pp.144–164) of the adept’s use of the Bahurūpa formula resumes. After a brief transitional restatement

¹ Cf. the horizontal or directional meditation on the faces of Śivaḥ yielding various powers in bk.12, pp.67ff. Note that the closing panegyric verse (p.143, 49a) promises both liberation and powers: “... *siddhidāḥ sarve muktidāśca na saṁśayaḥ*.”

(pp.144–146) of the previous introduction, accompanied by Kṣemarāja's summarizing commentary on both formula and adept, the text begins to describe the oblations that the adept performs, while reciting the Bahurūpa formula. The text first prescribes that the adept, using substances such as human flesh and bellium smeared with ghee, should perform oblations and repetitions of the formula in a one to ten ratio, in order to obtain either lower, middle, or higher powers. Continuing these general prescriptions, the text then (pp.147–148) states that during the oblation the adept becomes like Svachchandaḥ, who is then portrayed as supreme lord and celebrated in several verses. As noted previously, external historical evidence associates the Kāpālikas with not only Bhairavaḥ but also solitary and gruesome rites conducted for superhuman powers.¹ Identification with the invoked deity, in a form of possession, evidently also characterized their practices. This evidence suggests, therefore, that Kāpālika circles originally cultivated and transmitted the practices in this book that use the Bahurūpa formula. And, by extension, it argues for a similar origin for the entire hypothesized Bhairava source.

Dialogue then (p.148) introduces the description of specific secondary rites, grouped according to the power that they yield. The adept renders them efficacious, Kṣemarājaḥ explains, by performing an appropriately modified version of the previously prescribed formula service. Actually, compilers appear to have collected here a medley of traditional magical practices in a kind of appendix. Each seems self-contained, having only superficial connections to the main ritual.

The first and largest group in this collection presents (pp.148–155) eight rites that promise to subjugate another to the adept's will (*vaśikaraṇam*). In each rite, the adept prepares potions according to different recipes. Notably, the text apparently

¹ V. supra section I.1.3 for a discussion of this sect.

designates one of these procedures as a Kāpālika practice.¹ This label, at least in passing, therefore, links these procedures, to the adept's main formula service, and possibly furnishes the only direct evidence for the provenance of the Bhairava source.

The text next (pp.155–157) describes a pair of rites directed at enemies. In these procedures, the adept first buries a simulacrum of an enemy, oblates over it with special substances and formulæ in a cremation fire, and thus causes the adept to wander the earth afflicted or be hated. Following these, the text prescribes an apotropaic rite of oblation that can reverse the effects of the preceding magical attacks. A brief description of a similar rite that induces good fortune follows (p.158). The text then (pp.158–159) describes a short set of three additional rites of subjugation.

As the final rite in this section, the text presents (pp.160–163) a longer procedure for murdering an enemy. After inscribing the name of the enemy with poison charcoal in a pair of skulls, the adept in the cremation ground identifies with Svachchandaḥ, worships him with the Bahurūpa formula, and then smashing the skulls simultaneously destroys the enemy. All the parts of this rite argue for recognizing it as an unmodified Kāpālika practice. Here the text reconnects to the main service of the adept that the interpolated collection of secondary rites had interrupted. In conclusion, the text lauds (p.163) the universal efficacy of this formula in securing the results promised by any other texts. After indicating (pp.163–164) the procedure for a pacifying milk oblation, and the appropriate application of assorted formula endings, the book ends with a brief characterization of the appropriate adept. Kṣemarājaḥ interprets the verse's statement

¹ V. supra section I.1.3 for a discussion of this verse (vs.63b–p.151).

that the adept uses time (*kālah*) and the portion (*aṃśah*), as a proleptic reference to the topics of the following books.¹

¹ V. infra sections II.7 and II.8 for the summaries of the introductions to bk.7 and bk.8.

II.7 BOOK 7

The book opens with a brief dialogue frame (pp.167–168), in which the goddess, after declaring that she has learned about the ritual (*kriyā*), requests to hear about time and the portion. According to Kṣemarājaḥ, time here (*kālaḥ*) comprises the occasions suitable for acquiring various powers, and the portion (*aṃśakaḥ*) the various incarnations of the supreme Bhairavaḥ in forms such as Brahmā or Viṣṇuḥ. Beginning his response to the goddess, Bhairavaḥ first (p.168) indicates that time is twofold, either solar (*saura-*), i.e., external, or internal (*ādhyātmikaḥ*). The text then (pp.169–171) lists some divisions of external time, such as the fortnight (*pakṣaḥ*), or equinox (*viṣuvad*). After noting merely that these divisions of external time are conducive either to merit or demerit, the text then begins a long discussion of the divisions of internal time (pp.171–269). Thus the brief listing of external time, without elaboration and specifying of rituals, evidently was intended only as a logical introduction to the main topic of the book, internal time.

Internal time exists because of the parallelism between the microcosm and the macrocosm. Accordingly, the text begins (pp.171–181) its discussion of internal time by enumerating the divisions of the body or the microcosm. Building on the Sāṃkhya model, the text lists (p.171) the components of the body and declares that the body contains all the levels (*tattvāni*) of the cosmos and their deities. The most important of the body's components, however, are the various breaths and their channels in which the self and its powers are preeminently manifest, and whose manipulation, therefore, offers to the adept a way to master and supersede the temporal structure of the manifest universe. Kṣemarājaḥ comments at length (pp.171–174) on this section in order to reinforce his non-dualist interpretation that the self manifest in the breath is none other than the cosmic self of Svachchandabhairavaḥ. Then (pp.174–179) after more general

statements about the pervasion of the body by a network of channels, the text enumerates by name (pp.179–180) the ten main channels and main breaths. These are lauded (p.181) for bestowing success upon adepts who carry out formula repetition that circulates within them. The text next (pp.181–182) praises three main channels as especially favorable for the practices of the adept.

At this point (p.182), however, before the description of the three main channels, Bhairavaḥ proclaims another topic, the temporal division of the breath. This dialogue signals the beginning of a long interpolation (pp.182–255), at whose end the description of the three channels simply resumes (p.255). Though seemingly the main topic of the book, this section on time appears as a later addition not only from its place in the composition but also its content.

A short preliminary section (pp.182–185) on the function and meaning of breath (*prāṇaḥ*) precedes the description of internal time. Since another half-verse of dialogue once again marks the opening of the section on time, the section on the breath likely represents another separate interpolation; or perhaps the dialogue inserted by redactors to open the section on time had inadvertently separated this section on breath from the previous section containing general statements about the breaths and channels.

The text opens the description of internal time by restating (pp.186–187) the units of temporal measurement up to a nychthemeron that are now included in the breath. After a parenthetical verse (p.188) identifying the goose (*haṁsaḥ*) with Śivaḥ, the sun, and the self, the text, continuing the microcosmic description of internal time, declares that astronomical bodies, such as the planets and stars also rise in the course of the

breath.¹ The next section (pp.190–202), elaborating the correspondence between time and the breath, maps out sections of the course of breath from the heart to the end of twelve center (*dvādaśāntaḥ*), whose traversal matches the elapse of a certain measure of time. The text first (pp.190–196) charts this course according to the rising and setting of the sun and moon during a nychthemeron, where, for example, the movement measuring nine digits from the heart to the throat center corresponds to the elapse of the first watch (*praharaḥ*) of three hours. The passing of an entire nychthemeron of eight watches, therefore, would equal the traversal of the entire course of seventy-two digits from the heart to end of twelve center (*dvādaśānta*), designated due to its location twelve digits beyond the top of the head, and back. Then the text summarily indicates (pp.197–198) that the rest of the astronomical bodies and figures, such as the planets, serpents, world guardians, and so forth, also rise and set in this internal day of the breath. Following extensive commentary by Kṣemarājaḥ on these bodies, two moments of this course, at midday and midnight, are praised as especially favorable for the success of the adept.

The text next moves to the second set of correspondences, between the course of the breath and larger units of time, such as fortnights, months, and so forth. In order to pursue practices involving these larger units, the adept must first know (pp.202–205) how they build up from the basic unit of a nychthemeron, and how many breaths make up a nychthemeron. The smaller units of measurement employed here in the verses, as Kṣemarājaḥ

¹ Cf. M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ*, 6, vss.26–129, whose discussion of practices based on the internal time of the internalized microcosm circulating in the breath primarily depends on the following sections of *Svacchandatantram*. On similar practices in the Buddhist tradition, v. Alex Wayman, *The Buddhist Tantras. Light on Indo-Tibetan Esotericism* (New York: Samuel Weiser, 1973), “Tantric Teachings about the Inner Zodiac,” pp.151–163.

notes, do not agree with those used elsewhere in the text, and thus his commentary must qualify these units in order to establish the coherence of this section and to maintain harmony with the other books. Several generalizing and laudatory verses on the goose and the adept, who having learned the numbers of breaths in the larger units of time and having dissolved in the goose moving in the breath successfully completes his practice, then (pp.205–208) seemingly conclude this section. This conclusion asserts, notably, that the upward course of the breath bestows liberation and the downward course attainments. Thus this remark provides further evidence for the historical process in which later systematizers have incorporated and compartmentalized once self-contained and complete teachings as parts of larger ritual systems. Here, in particular, these practices nominally reserved for adepts would theoretically only bestow attainments. The repeated mention, here and elsewhere in this book, of the goose formula, suggests that these rituals of internal time developed as variant elaborations of the basic meditation on the components of the *Praṇavaḥ* that recurs throughout the entire text.

After this apparent conclusion marked by a summary verse, however, additional dialogue (p.209) signals the resumption of the text's description of the fortnights and months (pp.209–225), and now more importantly for the adept in his quest for powers, of the lunar and solar eclipses that occur during this time. This section presents an alternative account of the internal fortnight and month, not, as before, in respect to numbers of breaths, but now in respect to the length of the course. Intermixed with varying accounts of eclipses and laudatory verses, this patchwork section, like the preceding, maintains continuity only through the commentary of *Kṣemarājaḥ*.

Here, the ascent and descent of the breath takes four fortnights, or two months; each fortnight has fifteen lunar nychthemera, divided equally between a day and night, and each nychthemeron covers a course of breath measuring one and one

eighth digits. In addition, each fortnight has at its end an additional period of half a nychthemeron. These additional half periods thus form, at the juncture of each light and dark fortnight, four intermediary periods each measuring one and one-eighth digits, which when added to the fortnights exactly corresponds to the course of breath of seventy-two digits. These intermediary periods of the full and new moon, in both the rising and the descending breath, the text declares, represent times favorable for the attainments of the adept. In addition, through a decrease or increase in the course of the breath caused by coughing and sighing (pp.212–213), the bright and dark fortnights sometimes overlap in these intermediary periods producing the internal equivalent of solar or lunar eclipses. And adepts who carry out their practices during these periods, the text asserts, obtain extremely favorable results. An aside (pp.215–217), apparently lifted straight from a description of an external event, interrupts the description of these internal fortnights, and describing the solar eclipse, lauds the efficacy of all rites conducted during this time.¹ This parenthesis clarifies the way this internal practice developed through the simple transposition of external astrological observances. Following the verses lauding the eclipses which conclude this section, the text also (pp.223–224) praises the efficacy of this knowledge in bestowing liberation on the adept. This coda, therefore, similar to that at the end of the previous section, points back, once again, to the former status of this practice as an independent and self-contained teaching.

The text then describes (pp.225–242) the correspondence between the course of breath and the next larger unit of time, the year. Every six digits of the course of the breath that the adept traverses corresponds to the sun's procession through another sign

¹ As noted by Kṣemarājaḥ (p.216) the eclipses occur in the manner described by astronomical texts (*"jyotiḥśāstroka-prakriyayā"*).

of the zodiac. Thus, the thirty-six digits of the ascending breath equal the sun's northern procession, and the thirty-six of the descending breath, the southern procession. Accordingly, the text first (pp.229–230) sets out the six signs of the zodiac in the northern movement, and then, praises (pp.229–235) the different successes including liberation that the adept's practice, particularly the formula service with the divine figuration, produces at different stages in this course, and especially at the internal equivalent of the equinox. These laudatory verses, using seasonal metaphors, sound as if borrowed from the description of external rituals. In comparable fashion, there follows the description (pp.235–242) of the descending course and the attainments it yields. As before, the section concludes (pp.242–245) with an assertion that this practice also conveys liberation, and, notably, includes a half-verse (p.245), likely tacked on by later redactors, that qualifies this liberation as knowledge of Bhairavaḥ. Otherwise, redactors appear to have adapted these meditations on internal time with minimal editorial reworking. This supposition also explains the frequent harmonizing commentary they require of Kṣemarājaḥ.

There follows the description of even larger units of time, of a dozen years (pp.244–248) and of sixty years (pp.248–252). Without new details, the text merely describes how these breath cycles fit into these larger units by subdividing into the course already laid out for a year. Then concluding summary verses (pp.252–254) extol the the internal temporal practices for their efficacy at yielding in a condensed cycle of a single breath, which may encompass up to sixty years, all the success that normally would require a prolonged sequence of external rituals. Mastering this exercise, the adept becomes omniscient, i.e. Kṣemarājaḥ explains, identical to the supreme lord.

At this point, the text then signals by a half-verse of dialogue (p.255) that it is resuming the description (p.182) of the three channels that the account of the internal temporal practices

had suspended. This account of the goose's movement in the three channels appears to be an alternative and simpler version of the practices just described. And this similarity likely occasioned the later interpolation of these more elaborate meditations from other sources. In contrast to the preceding procedure, as Kṣemarājaḥ notes, the goose moves in three channels and not just the central channel.¹ In addition, the text now lists (pp.255–260) not only astronomical or temporal correspondences to these channels, but also other correspondences such as energies, regents, qualities, and so forth. Then, proceeding to the astronomical correspondences, the text describes (pp.261–264) the internal equinoxes that the adept uses for his rites. These equinoxes apparently occur when the breath is flowing in both the right and the left channels. The concluding verses (pp.264–265) that laud these equinoxes also refer back, significantly, to the initiation ritual, stating that through this meditation the master gives liberation. This editorial remark, once again, corroborates the hypothesis that the concluding rites of the extended liberation liturgy were formerly separate practices.

There follow some additional verses (pp.266–269) that continue the discussion of the equinoxes and processions. Perhaps in order to clarify the often confusing preceding section, redactors here appended material from other sources. The mention (p.268) of concepts not mentioned previously like bodily humors (*dhātuh*), and the extended commentary by Kṣemarājaḥ, referring to other texts, supports this hypothesis.

After a quarter-verse closing the previous section, the text moves to a new topic (pp.269–277), the adept's prognostications through examination of the breath's course. The first preliminary verses (pp.270–272) describe the posture, concentration and procedure the adept assumes for this exercise. In the first

¹ V. his commentary (p.255): "*madhyamārgāśreyaṇa cārasthitiṣṭhā / idāniṃ dakṣe vāme tadubhayātmani ca viṣuvati yathā haṃso jaṅgamasthāvarātmani jagati carati . . .*"

examination (pp.272-277), the adept foretells his own death or that of another at an external time determined by the internal duration of breath that he observes flowing in his right channel; for example, a flow that lasts a nychthemeron indicates death in a year, two nychthemera, two years, and so forth. As noted in Kṣemarāja's extensive commentary, the succinct statements of the text that leave the exact process of this prognosticating unclear, had evidently led to conflicting and divergent interpretations.

The text next (pp.278-279) presents a related examination, able to be carried out by one not skilled in breath exercise, that prognosticates death from the audition or absence of an internal sound, said to resemble that of a cricket (*ciravākcīñci*).¹ This prognostication then leads to a discussion of related procedures that not only foretell, but also induce their effects. This transition, moreover, implies that the previous practices also could be put to this end. After enumerating (pp.279-285) the primarily destructive powers that the adept can wield through his breath mastery, the text returns to its discussion of the prognostication of death. Later redactors, therefore, appear to have interpolated this section from another "tantric" source.² After a brief description (pp.285-287) of additional prognostication procedures using the breath, this section ends (pp.287-288) with summarizing verses and dialogue.

The next topic, a meditation to conquer death, is then introduced by a transitional verse (p.298) that links it to the preceding procedures.³ In this practice, the adept meditates on

¹ V. p.278, vs.188: *"ghoṣamadhye param śabdaṃ ciravākcīñciniravam / māsamekaṃ sa jīvettu na śṛṇoti yadā priye."*

² Kṣemarājaḥ also marks off (p.285) the preceding material as supplementary: *"evaṃ prāsaṅgikamuktvāvaśiṣṭaṃ"*

³ V. p.288, vs.206: *"evaṃ śariraje kāle mṛtyuṃ cāsubhameva ca / jñātvā yogi jayenmṛtyumaśubhānyapyāśeṣataḥ."*

Svacchandaḥ as the lord of time (*kāleśaḥ*) and as the goose. Among the assorted time related practices described in this book, this is the first that focuses on Svacchandaḥ. Thus, when the *anukramaṇikā* of book 1 listed time, perhaps it referred to this kind of practice, which thus reflects the material contained in the early Bhairavaḥ source. In delineating this meditation (pp.288–293), the text provides no details other than locating Svacchandaḥ in the nasal aperture, and simply enumerates the benefits that accrue to the adept. As a further indicator of the likely Bhairava or Kāpālīka provenance of this meditation, however, the text does state that the adept achieves his mastery over time through identification with Svacchandaḥ.¹

As an extension of this practice, that also contains in its structure a sectarian lauding of the superiority of Śivaḥ, the text next (pp.293–295) describes how the adept also identifies himself with Brahmā, Viṣṇuḥ, Rudraḥ, Īśvaraḥ, and Sadāśivaḥ, located in different parts of the nasal aperture, and obtains their respective powers. Dialogue (p.295) then indicates the conclusion of the conquest of death or time, and announces another related topic (pp.295–298), the meditation or visualization of Bhairavaḥ the lord of nectar (*Amṛteśvarabhairavaḥ*), which generates immortality. The difference in result between this practice and the preceding is not readily apparent. This redundancy, therefore, likely resulted from the interpolation of a related and prestigious Bhairava practice from another source.² Vivid imagery

¹ V. p.291, vs.210: *“kālahamṣaṁ sa tu japandhyāyanvāpi maheśvari / sa bhavetkālarūpi vai svacchandaḥ kālavaccaret.”*

² Many of these rites associated with Amṛteśabhairavaḥ and the conquest of death are extensively treated in the *Netratāntram*. Though from the Bhairava tradition that has strongly molded *Svacchandatantram*, this text is likely later and thus not the proximate source for these practices. (Cf. on the relation between these texts. Brunner-Lachaux, “Un Tantra du Nord: le *Netra Tantra*,” pp.126–127.)

characterizes this meditation, in which the adept imagines his heart lotus being saturated with the nectar of immortality pouring from another lotus inverted over it, and then through its apertures pervading his entire body.

The accretion of similar practices for overcoming death continues with the mention (pp.298–299) of an alternative noetic practice. This practice, which dispenses with meditative props, and which, as Kṣemarājaḥ explains, is reserved for the most elite of adepts, conveys liberation in life through a direct unmediated insight. In contrast to the preceding practices, therefore, this procedure reflects the mature values of Śaiva systematizers, who had already established a hierarchy of practices with knowledge at the summit. These systematizers, if not already *ex professo* non-dualist, evidently represent a tradition directly antecedent to that of Kṣemarājaḥ. And as an adjunct to this practice, these circles then have added a section (pp.300–321) propounding their views on the nature of the supreme reality and of the adept who has experienced the highest realization. The rhetorical and polemical structure of this section, which rejects not only metaphysical but also social distinctions, stamps it as a nascent non-dualist credo.¹ Noting parallels to avowedly non-dualist works, Kṣemarājaḥ, naturally, comments at length on this section, which, among all those in *Svacchandatantram*, most closely supports his own philosophy.² Historically, this philosophical non-dualism apparently

¹ Vss.238–239b (p.307), for example, with rhetorical questions and stock images, reject any instrumental and thus implicitly dualistic view of the efficacy of formulæ, and emphasize the essential role of non-dual awareness: *"akṣareṣu kuto mokṣa ākāṣe kusumam kutah / yāvaduuccāryate vācā yāvallekhye 'pi tiṣṭhati // tāvatsa sakalo jñeyo niṣkalo bhedavarjitah."* For the rejection of social norms, v. pp.314–317, vss.248–245.

² He cites parallels, for example, with undisputed texts of his own non-dual tradition, such as (p.315) the *Vijñānabhairavaḥ* and *Mālinivijayottaratantram*, and (p.319) the *Spandakārikāḥ*.

grew out of theoretical reflection on the implicit non-dualism of magical practices where the adept obtained powers by identification with the deity. The close, (pp.320–321) of this section, where verses laud the exercitants identity explicitly with Svachchandaḥ, provides textual evidence of this historical development; depending on the context, these verses might plausibly be read either as a statement non-dualist doctrine, or the culmination of a possession rite.¹

The text then resumes discussing prognostication without examination of the breath, a topic that, as Kṣemarājaḥ precisely notes, had been broken off long before (p.287). This material, therefore, either became separated during the text's compiling, or reflects additions from two different sources. Introducing this section, transitional verses (pp.321–322) state that just as the realized adept can prognosticate because of his exercise, so the non-exercitant can prognosticate by signs. After an enumeration of these portents (pp.323–330), dialogue (pp.331) introduces a practice supposedly intended to counteract these pending calamities. Actually, as the dialogue indicates by announcing that the lord will reveal the "most secret exercise" what follows is an extended and complete practice, recapitulating exercises and meditations found in similar forms elsewhere in the text.² After setting out the preliminaries (pp.331–333) of place, posture, preparatory rites, and the like, the text discusses a "ten-part" exercise that the adept conducts employing the goose Svachchandaḥ.

¹ V. pp.320–321, vss.260–261: *"yogī svacchandayogena svacchandagaticāriṇā sa svacchandapade yuktaḥ / svacchandasamatām vrajet // svacchandaścaiva svacchandaḥ svacchando vicaretsadā."*

² V. the introductory vs.286a–287b (p.331): *"paramo yogasadbhāvo guhyādguhyataraḥ priye / yo na kasyacidākhyātastam yogam śṛṇu tattvataḥ."* Cf. section II.5 for the summary of bk.5, pp.7–8, pp.43ff. For similar *dhāraṇā* practices v. bk.12.

This exercise is evidently encapsulated in the next verse (p.334), which lists ten stages of an ascending meditation on the Praṇavaḥ that culminate in a non-discursive fusion with the ubiquitous highest reality.

The text then describes (pp.335–337) a four-part breathing exercise (*prāṇāyāmaḥ*), that stabilizes the mind of the adept. This practice, if actually related to the formula meditation, should precede it, in the standard sequence laid down by Yoga treatises, where the breathing exercise prepares the way to meditative realization. Accordingly, Kṣemarājaḥ interprets this breathing exercise, and the concentration (*dhāraṇā*), which follows it in traditional Yoga sequence, as preparatory practices listed in reverse order. The close, however, of this sequence of concentrations on the five elements (pp.337–339), visualized in successively higher regions of the body, states that this exercise, according to tradition, bestows all powers.¹ This quarter-verse likely survives from an earlier context, where the breathing exercise and concentrations were independent practices taught in traditional order. Redactors, therefore, probably adopted these breathing and concentration exercises, which show no intrinsic connection with either the Praṇavaḥ or Svachchandaḥ, from other sources or traditions, and incorporated them here, without significant alteration, as a part of this section describing the adept's "secret exercise."

After a verse summarizing the benefits produced by these exercises, the text proceeds to describe in more detail the different breaths. The text had previously (p.180) enumerated the breaths and channels right before the discussion of the internal temporal practices. Therefore, as noted before regarding the suspended discussion of the three channels, the text has here either resumed an account split by interpolation, or supplied related explanatory

¹ V. vss.298–300, with the closing panegyric "*sarvasiddhikarī smṛtā*."

material felt to be missing. Kṣemarājaḥ not only connects the two discussions, but also notes that the dialogue, which introduces this section, lacks its first half: the appropriate question of the goddess.¹ This lacuna, if accepted as such, gives further evidence of this textual recombination.

After first stating (pp.340–345) the location, form, sound and function, of the ten major breaths, the text briefly describes (pp.345–346) a procedure for mastering the breath, and then lauds the benefits, up to union with Śivaḥ, that this mastery bestows. Though seemingly aware of the composite nature of the last part of this book, Kṣemarājaḥ, nevertheless, marks this final verse, celebrating the acquiring of liberation, as if concluding a unitary text segment, previously introduced (p.331) as the “most secret exercise.” He then rationalizes the continuing description (pp.347–351) of breath meditations and their effects as a supplementary presentation of this teachings from another perspective.² These meditations differ from the preceding in correlating the localization of breath and ascension of the formula with successively ranked states of consciousness, from waking, sleep, and so forth, up to the final stage (*turyāṭitadaśā*) equated with liberation.³

After the celebration of this supreme state, the books ends with dialogue (pp.351–352) announcing that the discussion of time

¹ The question, supplied by Kṣemarājaḥ as a necessary part of the transitional dialogue leading back to this material, enumerates the characteristics of the breath, a topic first introduced earlier in this book (pp.180ff.). There quoting vss.306b–307a (*“jalpitam hasitam . . .”*) Kṣemarājaḥ refers (p.180) to this section, which, as he notes, will discuss related material about the breaths more extensively: *“ . . . paṭalānte vitatya vakṣyati. ”*

² V. in his commentary, p.347: *“ . . . darśanāntaroktavedha-samāveśasvarūpajñānam śikṣayati. ”*

³ V. on these states of awareness the summary of bk.11, pp.58ff.

has ended, and that the discussion of the portion (*aṃśakah*) will commence.

II.8 BOOK 8

The dialogue (p.1) beginning this book further specifies its topic as the sixfold portion (*aṃśakaḥ*). Elaborating on the gloss given at the start of the preceding book, Kṣemarājaḥ explains that the *aṃśakaḥ* or sub-portion properly designates the subjective aspect of the portion (*aṃśaḥ*), which refers to the fractional manifestations of the supreme lord in the form of other deities such as Brahmā, Viṣṇuḥ, and so forth.¹ These sub-portions specifically refer to the possible ways in which the adept becomes matched with a particular portion, i.e. comes to focus his special service on one of these partial manifestations in the quest for a correlated power. The text first (p.2) enumerates and then describes these six sub-portions. The adept may first (p.2-3) be inclined to the service of a particular deity by *bhāvaḥ*, or a innate disposition inherited, Kṣemarājaḥ explains, from past births. Second (p.3-7), the adept's *svabhāvaḥ*, i.e., nature or activity may match him with a specific deity; for example, the adept matched with Kāmaḥ is handsome, lucky, and loved.

At this point (p.6), the text interrupts the enumeration of sub-portions with a parenthetical declaration that all these deities are in fact the limbs of Bhairavaḥ and bestow powers in this fashion. After lifting this discussion of the sub-portions from another source, redactors probably interpolated this assimilating verse in order to supply the superficial signature of a Bhairava practice. For immediately after, the text states the end of the description of the nature sub-portion, and the beginning of the flower toss sub-portion. Selecting a deity by a flower toss (pp.7-

¹ V. Kṣemarāja's commentary, pp.1-2: "*parasya bodhabhairavasya śaktibhiḥ brāhmyādibhiradhiṣṭhitā brahmādyāstathābhāsitā aṃśāḥ tatastadanugrāhyā api tadāṃśā ityucyante / ato 'ṃśānārādhyatvena sthitān kāyati ayam brahmāṃśo 'yam viṣṇvaṃśa ityādikrameṇa yo vakṣyamāṇo bhāvasvabhāvādiḥ so aṃśaka ityucyate.*"

8), though discussed only in elliptical fashion by this text, formed a common part of the tantric ritual of many traditions.¹

Explaining the interrelationship among the sub-portions, Kṣemarājaḥ comments that selection of the deity in this fashion occurred for those not already predisposed by disposition or nature.

Then reversing the sequence set out in the preliminary enumeration, the text next (pp.8–10) discusses the twofold effecting (*āpādanam*) of a sub-portion, instead of the expected sub-portion of the formula.² If the adept desires to employ some formula whose sub-portion has not been assigned in one of the three prior ways, or whose assignment is impossible because its deity is unknown, then he can still resort to either of two procedures to effect this assignment.³ In the first (pp.8–9), the adept oblates with heroic substances (*vīradravya-*), such as the flesh of a hanged or impaled man, and thereby effects a sub-portion or participation that enables him to productively use even normally inefficacious or inappropriate formulæ.⁴ In the second (pp.9–10), intended, according to Kṣemarājaḥ, for adepts unqualified to undertake the rituals of a hero or higher level adept, the master specifically initiates the adept in order to empower him to use the desired formula. Kṣemarājaḥ interprets the brief instructions of the text, which seem to prescribe only an

¹ Cf. the notes to the summary of bk.3, p.210; bk.4, pp.24–25.

² Kṣemarājaḥ also recognizes (p.8) this break in the stated sequence: "*kramaprāptam mantrāṁśakamadhikavaktavyatvāt sampratyanuktvā*"

³ Kṣemarājaḥ first explains this on p.2: "*amśakāpādanam-amśasyānirūpitasyāpi mantrasya vīradravādihomena sādhanadikṣākrameṇa vā*" V. also his commentary before vss.15–16, which describes these procedures.

⁴ Either another master or adept, Kṣemarājaḥ adds (p.8), may execute this oblation: "*sādhaka ityārādhaka ācāryastatprayukto 'nyo 'pi vā sādhanam homayet*"

initiatory joining through a single oblation, as enjoining the complete formal ritual for the consecration of an adept.¹

Finally, coming to the sub-portion of the formula (pp.10–15), the text describes a technique for determining the suitability of any formula for a particular adept. When employed by a particular adept, formulæ may prove to be either very efficacious (*susiddha-*), efficacious (*siddha-*), somewhat efficacious (*sādhya-*), or even inefficacious, or dangerous (*ari-*). After lining up the name of the adept and the formula that have been separated into their individual letters, the master counts off series of four letters. His resting place in the final series determines the formula's relative efficaciousness for the adept. Then, the text concludes, the master should give to the adept only those formulæ that are very efficacious or efficacious, and which therefore can bestow powers and liberation.

In the description of this technique, the word portion (*aṃśaḥ*) appears, in contrast to its previous meaning, to designate the parts or individual letters of the formula.² This contrast indicates that compilers, using the same term as an organizing link, have collected, from various sources, different methods of assigning formulæ to adepts. The redundancy of methods, especially of the last technique that incorporates the popular fourfold classification of formulæ, and the repeated dialogue links inserted throughout the section, furnish additional evidence of this compilation.³

¹ Cf. the full liturgical consecration of the adept in Bk.4, pp.298–301, and the brief initiation for the adept in Bk.13, p.12, which Kṣemarājaḥ similarly interprets as implying the performance of the full liturgy.

² V. p.10, vs.18a: "*mantrāṃśaṃ gaṇayitvā tu . . .*"

³ For this common tantric classification of formulæ cf. the *Padārthādarśaḥ* commentary of Raghavabhaṭṭaḥ to the *Śāradātilakam*, in M.M. Pandit Śrī Mukunda Jha Bakshi, ed., *The*

Concluding this section (pp.15–16), the text, praising Bhairavaḥ as the pervasive reality underlying any portion or partial manifestation, enjoins his worship in the center of his retinue of bhairavas. These verses clearly continue an earlier verse in this section (p.6) that had identified the various portions or deities with the bhairavāḥ.¹ Thus, this earlier verse, which now seems like an isolated interpolation, actually belongs here and must have become separated from the others during the compilation of this section or during the transmission of the text prior to Kṣemarājaḥ. Whether taken singly or together, however, the intent of these verses remains the same. As noted before, they reflect the concern of redactors, who were devotees of Bhairavaḥ, to definitively stamp these disparate practices of adepts as their own.

Transitional dialogue then introduces a new section (pp.17–26) that describes the revelation of the text. This short account, filled out, however, by Kṣemarāja's extensive commentary, first presents the Śaiva theology of revelation, in which, for the sake of men, the supreme vibrational Śivaḥ assumes the gross and discursive sonic manifestation that is the Śaiva scripture. Then it charts the transmission of this scripture, again only in general steps, from Sadāśivaḥ to men. In this sequence, the account gives, following the standard Śaiva view, an important role to Śrikanṭhaḥ, and stresses that initiation forms the indispensable

Śāradātikalam By Lakṣmaṇadesīkendra With the Padārthādarśa Commentary By Raghavabhaṭṭa. Kashi Sanskrit Granthamala 107 (Varanasi: The Chowkhambha Sanskrit Series Office, 1963), pp.60–61. Note the inserted dialogue, (p.11, vs.18b) "*kathayāmi samāsataḥ*," which may indicate the work of compilers.

¹ V. vss.11b–12a (p.6), ("*bhairavāṅgasamālabdhāḥ ... sarvasiddhiphalapradāḥ*") which equate the formulæ with the bhairavāḥ, and which have a closing panegyric coda, and thus apparently should follow vss.24b–26a, (pp.15–16) ("*yaś tu ... na varṇāḥ paramārthataḥ*"), which describe the pervasion by the supreme Svachchandaḥ of all the bhairavāḥ and formulæ.

prerequisite for receiving this revelation. Accordingly, even the putative narrator of this text, Umāpatiḥ, must assert that he has received initiation.¹ A final injunction to reserve this secret revelation for the qualified, then closes this section and the book.

This section, recognized as a separate and additional topic by Kṣemarājaḥ, may have been constructed by later redactors or interpolated from another source in order to make *Svacchandatantram* conform to the structure of other scriptures.² It presents the scriptural Śaiva view of revelation, that complements the short and more properly Bhairava view given in the first book.³ Perhaps compilers placed this section here because they recognized the similarity between the notion of portion, presented in the first part of this book, and this view of revelation. Just as the first considers the different deities to be fractional manifestations of a supreme lord, so the second considers scriptures to be lower manifestations of the supreme lord. In his introductory commentary to the first book, Kṣemarājaḥ apparently refers to this section as the "book on the promulgation of the text."⁴ Since the introductory dialogue to book seven mentions both time and the portion as topics, at one time, they presumably formed a single textual unit. Later redactors, however, when dividing or continuing the division of *Svacchandatantram* into

¹ V. p.23, vs.35b: "mamāpi ca purā dikṣā tathā caivābhiṣecanam."

² V. bk.9, p.27, where Kṣemarājaḥ recognizes that this material represents a parenthetical discussion: "... *prasaṅgāt-tantrāvatāro darsītaḥ*." On these self-characterizing sections, common to many scriptures, v. supra section I.1.1 on traditional views of scripture.

³ V. bk.1, pp.9ff. Cf. bk.11, pp.7ff, for similar material on the manifestation of the supreme Śivaḥ as sound.

⁴ V. bk.1, p.8: "... *vyañjītantrāvatārapāṭalena pradarsītaḥ*."

books, placed these topics in separate books. Perhaps the increase in the size of book seven through repeated interpolation, led to this displacement, and left a short book eight that could easily accommodate another section on revelation, that otherwise might have formed an independent book.

II.9 BOOK 9

The ninth book continues the description of the practices of the adept that the discussion of Śaiva revelation interpolated at the end of the preceding book had interrupted. The first and longest section of this book (pp.27-49) sets out a complete ceremony that yields powers through the worship of Koṭarākṣaḥ. The introductory dialogue, which announces this topic as a new and secret teaching (pp.27-28), lacks, as Kṣemarājaḥ notes, its first half, the question of the goddess. This implies, once again, that it may be a supernumerary or unexpected topic, i.e., a secondary addition from another source. The identification, stated by the text (p.28), of Koṭarākṣaḥ as an emanated form of the great Bhairavaḥ, supports this implication, since identifying a different god as an incarnation forms a basic part of the assimilatory process that produced sectarian Hinduism.¹ The actual worship of Koṭarākṣaḥ that the text discusses in both its description of the god and the formulæ employed, however, almost exactly matches that stated for the worship of Svachchandaḥ. The sequence of formulæ listed in this book, for example, follows the enumeration of formulæ stated in the first book of *Svacchandatantram*. Historically, therefore, both Svachchandaḥ and Koṭarākṣaḥ probably represent only marginally divergent geographical or cultic variants of Bhairavaḥ, that were developed during religious practice or sectarian assimilation by connected circles of Bhairava ascetics. Perhaps when Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ became identified with the supreme

¹ On Koṭarākṣaḥ and these assimilatory processes v. supra sections I.1.3 and I.1.5. In addition, v. Giuseppe Tucci, "Nomina Numina," in *Myths and Symbols. Studies in Honor of Mircea Eliade*, ed. Joseph Kitagawa and Charles Long (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1969), pp.3-7, for the characteristic and easy way in which concepts and objects became reified as deities in Tantric thought leading to a tremendous proliferation in the pantheon of deities.

Śivaḥ for some worshippers, they no longer perceived him as terrifying (*ghora-*, *ugra-*), viz., the terrifying aspect of Śivaḥ. Consequently, they may have elaborated Koṭarākṣaḥ as the terrifying form of the supreme Bhairavaḥ, on the model of the earlier relationship of Śivaḥ and Bhairavaḥ, and on the general model of tantric deities who may display a pacific or terrifying aspect.¹ This historical similarity best explains their shared form of worship, or the readiness of later Bhairava redactors to conform the worship of Koṭarākṣaḥ to that of Svachchandaḥ.

The text first (pp.29–31) describes the terrifying meditational form of Koṭarākṣaḥ. At the end of the description, the text celebrates the supremacy of Koṭarākṣaḥ and repeats (p.31) his identification with Bhairavaḥ, specifically now, Svachchandaḥ. This identification, as Kṣemarājaḥ observes, means that Koṭarākṣaḥ has the same formula as Svachchandaḥ, the thirty-two syllable Bahurūpa formula. Accordingly, the next half-verse echoes the panegyric coda that ended the presentation of this formula in the first book.² Then the following half-verse (p.32), in a redactorial cross-reference, explicitly states that his formula is the thirty-two syllable formula, which was discussed previously.³ The adept

¹ V., de Mallmann, *Introduction à l'iconographie du tântrisme bouddhique*, p.2: "Selon les circonstances, une même divinité peut se manifester sous l'un ou l'autre aspect."

If Koṭarākṣaḥ represents the terrifying or angry form of Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ, then then promulgating deity of the text may have been considered to be a serene or pacific form of Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ; this might then explain the epithet "*lalita-*" (lovely or charming) prefixed to the name Bhairavaḥ in the title of some of the manuscripts of the text of *Svacchandatantram*. (V. supra section I.1.1 on variant titles using this epithet found in manuscripts.).

² V. bk.1, p.39, vs.45a: "*smaraṇānnāśayeddevi tamaḥ . . .*," and here p.31, vs.10b: "*smaraṇānnāśayeddevaḥ pāpa-saṃghātaṃ . . .*"

³ V. p.32, vs.11a: "*asya mantrāḥ purākhyāto . . .*"

should employ this formula in his service, the verse continues, along with the fivefold Praṇavaḥ. This additional specification thus marks the service of the adept described here as a variant of that discussed in the sixth book.¹ Recognizing this apparent reduplication, and evidently wishing to preclude any criticism of the scripture for redundancy, Kṣemarājaḥ comments that the differences between the two procedures suffice to distinguish them as separate ceremonies.²

Dialogue then (p.33) introduces the specific description (pp.33–42) of the procedure for employing this formula. At the outset, as the text begins by describing the area chosen by the adept for his service, there occurs another redactorial cross-reference to the sixth book.³ Instead of going on to describe, however, as in that book, either the components of the Praṇavaḥ, or the oblations accompanying the recitation of the Bahurūpaḥ, the text directs the construction of a diagram (pp.33–34) on which the formula, i.e., deity, and his retinue, will be imposed and meditatively worshipped. This procedure apparently refers back not to book six, but rather as Kṣemarājaḥ notes, to the diagrams constructed in book four or book five, for the sake of either the obligatory ritual or initiation.⁴ However, since the sixth

¹ Cf., for example, bk.6, p.103, vs.3b:

“...*pañcapraṇavasamyogājjapataḥ* . . . ,” and here vs.11b, p.32: “...*pañcapraṇavapūrvāntaṃ tatra linaṃ japeṇ*”

² This difference, he notes (p.32), depends on the different retinues: “...*aghoreśvayayuktatvāt bhāviviṣṭadevatā-parivṛtatvetarābhyāmasya dvātrimśadakṣarād anyatvamityanuṣṭhānāntaramevaitat*.”

³ V. here vs.12b: “*pūrvoktabhūpradeśe ca viśuddhe śubhalakṣaṇe*,” and compare bk.6, p.102, vs.2a: “*suśuddhe bhūpradeśe*”

⁴ V., bk.4, p.13, vs.35, as Kṣemarājaḥ indicates (p.34), or bk.5, pp.11ff.

book does not specifically describe how the adept performed his service of the Bahurūpaḥ, the previous cross-references, which have indicated a parallel between these books, support assuming that he performed a ceremony similar to that described here.¹

The text then (p.34) describes the adept who is ready to perform the formula service in the finished diagram.² Kṣemarājaḥ, further specifying the text's stereotypical description of the naked, ash besmeared Śaiva ascetic, adds that he is one who has undertaken the great observance (*mahāvratī*). This gives rare evidence suggesting a likely provenance for these Bhairava practices and the Bhairava source, since historically the great observance is associated with the Kāpālikas.³

This adept first imposes in the center of the diagram, the seat, the form of consciousness (*cinmūrtiḥ*), and above that Svacchandaḥ with parts, in the form of his formula, and then the Svacchandaḥ without parts and his inner retinue, comprising his six limbs. This sequence of formulæ follows that enumerated in the first book, and thus provides a ritual context suggested but otherwise not specified in that enumeration.⁴ The similarity may also point to secondary redaction intended to harmonize disparities produced by compilation. The text then enjoins their worship, by listing a few items in the standard series of rites that compose a complete worship ritual.

On the outer leaves, the adept next (pp.38-48) imposes and meditatively worships thirty-two goddesses corresponding to the

¹ V. bk.6, p.102, vs.2b, which merely instructs:
“...*bhairavaṃ tatra pūjayet.*”

² V. p.35, vss.18-19.

³ V supra section I.1.3.

⁴ The formulæ not used here, in turn, may point to interpolations in the first book.

syllables of the Bahurūpa formula. This section, whose formulæ are not enumerated in the first book, appears to describe an ancillary rite, secondarily interpolated into the sequence of the Bhairava worship. The text lists (pp.38–39) the names of these goddesses, and then (p.40) gives the general rule for their worship. This pause in order to give a procedural rule additionally stamps this material as new and supplemental. The text then (pp.41–42) proceeds to describe the goddesses' meditative forms, distributed in sets of four in the eight directions. A closing panegyric coda (p.43) promises success in this meditation in half a year. At the close of this section, redactors have interpolated more material, describing (pp.43–44) mountain ranges and river confluences auspicious for the adept's practice, and then generally characterizing (pp.44–45) his appropriate conduct. Continuing this interpolated Śaiva material, the text then (p.47) describes some of the cosmic domains supposedly subjugated by the adept's practice. Kṣemarājaḥ rationalizes this clearly interpolated material as a proleptic look at the contents of the next book, which will describe the Śaiva cosmology.

Transitional dialogue then (p.48) closes this section and resumes describing the service of the Bhairava formula. The transition is effected by distinguishing the worship of the goddesses as a plenary form of the worship of the simpler Bahurūpaḥ and limbs, now characterized as the "solitary hero" (*ekaviraḥ*). Right after this transition (p.49), a declaration of the certain efficacy of this practice closes this section.

Dialogue then (p.50) signals a new section, describing other rites that realize specific ends through written applications of formulæ, notably those of the eight bhairavāḥ.¹ Since the first book also enumerated their formulæ, this section thus continues the parallel pattern of the previous section in applying formulæ

¹ V. in his commentary, bk.1, p.67: "*... ete ca navame paṭale vakṣyamānatattatsiddhisādhakatvādevamabhidhānā uktāḥ.*"

enumerated in the first book. The first pair of these procedures (pp. 50–55) describe defensive techniques. The practitioner inscribes in yellow orpiment on a piece of birchbark various formulæ, including the Bahurūpaḥ, called here the Aghoraḥ, and its corresponding thirty-two goddesses, and the Vidyārājaḥ, the formula of both one of the eight bhairavāḥ and the nine-centered formula.¹ By worshipping the formulæ and then sealing the birchbark with beeswax and storing it in honey, he creates an effective charm against death. The second procedure (p. 56) describes the preparation of a similar charm, using as its primary formula Kapālīśaḥ, another of the eight bhairavāḥ. In the next procedure (pp. 57–58), an enemy whose name has been written boxed in by the formula of the bhairavaḥ Śikhivāhanaḥ, supposedly burns up, as contemplated, in seven days. Similarly, in the following procedure (pp. 58–59), by writing down a name on a piece of cloth taken from a cremation ground, and enclosing it in the formula of Krodharājaḥ, another of the eight bhairavāḥ, the practitioner can murder his enemy. The description of these malevolent rites continues (p. 60) with a brief description of a procedure for provoking fear in an enemy through the formula of the bhairavaḥ Vikarālaḥ. An account follows of two rites of subjugation (pp. 61–63), in the first of which the practitioner uses the bhairavaḥ Manmathaḥ, and in the second, Meghanādaḥ. In the next rite (p. 63), which produces prosperity, the practitioner uses the bhairavaḥ Somarājaḥ.

Although this section has now stated a separate procedure for each of the eight bhairavāḥ, at this point (p. 64), there occurs an additional procedure using Krodharājaḥ to induce madness. After this addition comes another (pp. 65–66), describing a technique to conquer death using once again the Bahurūpa formula, called here the Svachchandaḥ. This appended material continues with the

¹ For the formulæ of the eight bhairavāḥ v. bk. 1, pp. 66–67, and for the Vidyārājaḥ, bk. 5, pp. 11ff.

description (pp.66–68) of a pair of pacifying, protective techniques using the Svacchandaḥ in combination with his Netram or eye formula, which the first book also discussed.¹ Then (pp.68–70) there follows another variation of the procedure for fabricating a charm to protect against death. At the end of this procedure (pp.70–71), the text adds, notably, that the practitioner can make this charm into a protective amulet to be worn around his neck. Or the formula works equally well, the text continues (p.71), when simply recited over food or drink.

The next procedure describes (pp.72–73) the removal of poison by applying the Aghoraḥ formula to the afflicted spot. Its effective application requires the practitioner's meditative identification with Bhairavaḥ, visualized as burning off the poison. The form of Bhairavaḥ described resembles, as a redactorial cross-reference embedded in a verse indicates, that of Koṭarākṣaḥ given earlier in the book.² This procedure, the text adds (73), may also be used to expel disease causing demons (*grahaḥ*). A description follows (pp.74–77) of some herbal antidotes to poison, taken either as a potion or snuff. A verse introduces them by declaring that they are intended for those who are not capable of using the previous meditative technique. In the last method described in this section, instead of administering the herbs, the practitioner fashions them into an amulet to be worn as a ready defense in the event of a snake bite.

The book closes (pp.78–79) with a generalizing laud, stating that all procedures succeed through Svacchandaḥ. The text mentions some of these procedures by name, and these names, as

¹ V. bk.I, pp.51–52, vs.63, for the *netra* formula. Cf. The second book of the *Netratantram*, which discusses this formula at length.

² The "*pūrvārūpa*-" of p.73, vs.96, refers, according to Kṣemarājaḥ (p.73), to the form of Koṭarākṣaḥ described on pp.29–30 of this book.

Kṣemarāja's notes, are those of the first, sc. underworld stages, in the Śaiva universe that will be discussed in the following book on Śaiva cosmology. The final verse, therefore, reflect redactorial concern to provide a transition between the disparate subject matter of these two adjacent books, drawn from separate sources. The transition reduplicates that provided earlier, and thus indicates that not only have a Bhairava and Śaiva source been compiled in the adjacent books, but also that in the Bhairava material in this book, at least two major redactions have occurred.¹

¹ V. on this interpolated material supra the summary of p.47.

II.10 BOOK 10

II.10.1 Worlds in the Bottom Half of the Egg of Brahmā

The tenth book describes the Śaiva cosmology, or more properly one of the six paths (*adhvā*) or modes in which Śivaḥ emanates the universe, viz. that of the worlds (*bhuvana-*). By far the longest book in *Svacchandatantram*, it represents the Śaiva assimilation and extension of the entire Purāṇic cosmology. Introducing this book (pp.1-2), the goddess requests the revelation of this material for the sake of the adept. This specification for the adept effects the transition from the preceding book, but actually restricts the intended scope of the topic. Accordingly, Kṣemarājaḥ qualifies adept, as also implying master, etc., since not only the adept requires knowledge of the various worlds in order to realize attainments localized in them, but also the master must know the worlds to liberate from them during initiation. Though this material is ostensibly presented for ritual purposes, its presentation far exceeds the minimal knowledge required for ritual application, and thus must have also served as a kind of encyclopædic reference for systematic teaching of the Śaiva world view. Abhinavaguptaḥ based his presentation of the path of the worlds in *Tantrālokaḥ* almost entirely on this book of *Svacchandatantram*, and therefore indicates that *Svacchandatantram* must have already acquired at his time a reputation as the preeminent and exhaustive scriptural revelation of the Śaiva cosmology.¹

Starting from the bottom of the egg (*aṇḍaḥ*) of Brahmā, the innermost sphere of the universe, the first section of this book (pp.2-8) describes Kaṭāhaḥ, its carapace or shell, on top of which resides Kālāgni-rudraḥ, from whom pours the fire that devours the

¹ V. M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ* 8.

worlds at the end of a cosmic age.¹ Before the text proceeds to discuss Kālāgniḥ, it states that above Kaṭāhaḥ are found Anantaḥ and the worlds of the hundred rudrāḥ. This statement evidently led one commentator to place these rudrāḥ inside the egg of Brahmā. For Kṣemarājaḥ this represented a serious error, and he therefore comments at length (pp.3–5) to establish that these rudrāḥ lie not inside and above the base of the egg, but outside the egg of Brahmā, which represents only one of the innumerable spheres that make up the universe. These rudrāḥ support and define the universe and the text therefore (p.5) calls them *ūhakāḥ*, “delimiters,” because Kṣemarājaḥ explains, they delimit (*ūhyante*) the universe. After describing their pleasure worlds, shaped like female sexual organs (*yonyākāra-*), the text declares (p.7) that they become purified by the purification of their leader, Anantaḥ, in initiation. Through these asides, which allude to the framework of initiation, the Śaiva depiction of cosmology differentiates itself from the non-Śaiva source that it might be copying, and reconnects itself to the rest of the scripture.

As Kṣemarājaḥ explains, on the occasion (p.7) of this first aside, when a world becomes purified it will no longer be an obstacle to the liberation or enjoyment of an initiate. For the initiate desiring liberation, this means that any experiences he might have accumulated that would have had to have been discharged in this world have now been purified or negated, and no longer obstruct his liberation. For the initiate desiring pleasures, this means that any future experiences he might have in this world will not leave any consequences that might prove to be an obstacle to his future liberation. In general, just as the Śaiva scripture charts the universe only for ritual purposes, so Śivaḥ,

¹ His name “the rudraḥ of the fire of time ” indicates his function.

according to Śaiva theology, manifests the actual universe only for the sake of grace to men.¹

After this Śaiva excursus on Anantaḥ and the rudrāḥ, the description of Kālāgniḥ resumes (pp.7-8), only to be interrupted by another excursus (pp.8-12) on the Sāṃkhya categories and sequence of emanation and the units of measurement from an atom to a league (*yojanam*). Then the text, effecting a smooth transition from a league to Kālāgni's dimension in leagues, returns (pp.12-15), as Kṣemarājaḥ indicates, to the main topic, his description. Its image resembles that of Bhairavaḥ himself, in his terrifying form, often called Kāla-bhairavaḥ, and this similarity probably led Kṣemarājaḥ to justify its appearance here by noting that the supreme lord has assumed this particular form by grace.² Historically, this altered role resulted from the development of the text by compilation. This section evidently reflects the conceptions of a Śaiva source where Bhairavaḥ appeared only in a restricted

¹ V. his commentary (p.8): *"yadyapi pūrvoktanityā svatantrabhātākamayatvāt viśvasyordhvādharaprabhāgo nāsti tathāpi tadicchayaivārurukṣūnāmupadeśyopadeśakānāmamayam-itthamābhāsitaḥ kramah."* In this way, he provides a rationalizing apologetic for mythology inherited from a less sophisticated milieu.

² V. p.12, vs.23a, where Kālāgniḥ is called *"deveśaḥ kālo"*. The description here (pp.12-14) clearly echoes that of Koṭarākṣaḥ in the preceding book. Cf., for example, p.13, vss.26-27a: *"khaḍgakhēṭaka-dhārakaḥ śaraśārngavihastāśca pāsāṅkuśadharastathā // kapāla-khaṭvāṅgadhara varadābhaya-pāṇibhṛt,"* with bk.9, p.30, vss.7b-8: *"khaḍgakhēṭakadhārinam // pāsāṅkuśadharam devaṃ śaraśārngāvatānitam / kapālakhaṭvāṅgadharam varadābhaya-pāṇikam."* V. p.8, where Kṣemarājaḥ identifies Kālāgnirudraḥ and the supreme Bhairavaḥ: *"kālāgnyādiśca parabhairavamayatvāt vyāpako 'pi tadicchayaiva tathāvabhāsitaḥ tatra tathā tathā saṃniviṣṭhaḥ."*

On this and other forms of Bhairavaḥ, v. Arya Ramchandra G. Tiwari, "An Image of the 'Kala Bhairava' in the Watson Museum, Rajkot," in S.K. Bhowmik, ed., *Reflections on Indian Art and Culture* (*Kalā Kusumañjali* 28, 1978-1979), pp.259-275.

role, as an aspect of Śivaḥ; in the explicit Bhairava material, by contrast, this form represents that of the supreme lord.

After giving the dimensions of Kālāgni's realm, the text proceeds to the description (pp.15–30) of the regions lying above, the hells (*narakāḥ*). A list follows of the names of the one hundred and forty "most important" (*pradhānam*) of these hells. In his commentary, quoting the *Śrīpārā*, Kṣemarājaḥ supplies the ætiological derivation of these names; for example, the first listed has the name Aviciḥ, because, "[it] is covered with waves (*viciḥ*) that are pus, blood, and mud, etc." This long list of hells, limited only by the variety of imagined torments, surpasses the enumerations found in the Purāṇas, and offers an example of the typical way in which the scriptural Śaiva cosmology built on and extended earlier Purāṇic presentations.¹

Appropriately, at the end of this enumeration of hells, there follows a section (pp.30–39) describing first the conduct of the wicked that leads to hell, and then the proper conduct of a Śaiva. The verses ending this section assert that the proper conduct just described represents a summary of the scriptural rule (*tāntriko nyāyaḥ*), although the actual rules described appear to be generalizing injunctions about self-control and purity applicable to almost any tradition, and therefore possibly adopted from any number of sources.

At this point (p.39), dialogue announces, once again, that the most important hells will now be enumerated. The contradiction produced by conflating different lists of hells did not escape the notice of redactors, however, who here (pp.40–41) added a harmonizing introduction. In the initiation ritual, they explain, the officiant may substitute the shorter list of thirty-two hells, or even simply their three most important hells, for the one hundred

¹ On the hells in the Purāṇas, v. Willibald Kirfel, *Die Kosmographie der Inder* (1920. Reprint. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1967), esp., pp.161ff.

and forty hells just enumerated.¹ For the shorter sequences include the longer, just as the one hundred and forty hells themselves serve as ritual representatives for the innumerable crores of actually existing hells. In order to complete the coordination of these two sequences, Kṣemarājaḥ simply declares differently named hells from each list to be synonymous.² He further specifies that the ritual choice of sequences depends on the purity of the initiate; the greater impurity, naturally, requires the longer ritual.

After this harmonizing introduction, the text then (pp.41–46) lists by name the thirty-two hells, grouped under the three main hells, Avicīḥ, Kumbhipākaḥ, and Mahārauravaḥ. Above the hells (p.46) lies the world of their collective regent, Kūṣmāṇḍaḥ. Elaborating on the text's mere mention of Kūṣmāṇḍaḥ, Kṣemarājaḥ etymologizes his name and describes his form.³ Immediately after (pp.47–56) come the eight underworlds (*pātālāni*), which the text first names and then describes as the enchanted pleasure realms of minor deities where Śaiva adepts (*sādhakaḥ*) enjoy their superhuman attainments. In the highest underworld, Sauvarṇam, resides the most important regent, Hāṭakaḥ, whom the text

¹ V. p.40, vss.77–78. In M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ* 8, vs.24bff, only thirty-five are enumerated, in three groups.

² V. his commentary, p.45.

³ V. p.41, where Kṣemarājaḥ notes that according to the *Mālinivijayottaratantram* (5, p.27, vs.2) the hells may be purified by purifying their rudra regent Kūṣmāṇḍaḥ. Cf. M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ* 8, vss.28–30a, which adds that a single act of devotion to the supreme lord can negate a mass of accumulated evil acts that would have led to rebirth in these hells.

identifies as a perfection bestowing form of Maheśvaraḥ, sc. Śrikanṭhaḥ.¹

Next, after the underworlds and halfway up the egg of Brahmā, the earth begins with its shell, the Bhūkaṭāhaḥ. The description of the earth (pp.56–141) starts with an account (pp.56–88) of the central mountain, Meruḥ, and its environs. First (pp.56–57) on top of Meruḥ itself lies the palace (*sabhā*) of Brahmā, Manovati, where (pp.59–60) on the gleaming crystal peak of Kailāsaḥ resides Tryambakaḥ, sc. Umāpatiḥ. At this point (p.58), redactors have inserted in the mouth of the narrating deity, a self-conscious declaration that this deity, Tryambakaḥ, is indeed a part of himself, who rules through the will of the supreme lord.² This insertion harmonizes the mythologemes adopted here in the cosmological books from Śaiva and non-Śaiva sources with the perspective of the overall narrative framework of the text and with the theology of the developed Śaiva systems. It thereby anticipates the work of later commentators like Kṣemarājaḥ and thus demonstrates the continuity between them and the later redactors of the text.

Below the palace of Manovati lies (pp.60–62) the circle of cities (*puri*) of the the world guardians, Cakravāṭaḥ. Above Cakravāṭaḥ, the text enumerates (pp.62–71) twenty-six additional cities of various demigods. In this section, Kṣemarājaḥ, perhaps reflecting the æsthetic interests of his master, Abhinavaguptaḥ, pauses to comment at length only on the musical entities located in the city of the gandharvāḥ, by quoting the *Nāṭyaśāstram*. At the end of the section (pp.71–72) follows a celebratory description of all these paradises, which, the text adds, those who have

¹ V. his commentary, p.55: “*bhagavataḥ śrikanthasyaivetthaṃ bhogapradatvenānaya mūrtyā sthitatvānmaheśvaraḥ.*”

² V. p.59, vs.130: “*mamāṃśaṃ taṃ vijāniyāḥ surasiddha-namaskṛtaṃ / adhikāraṃ prakurute parecchāsaṃpracoditaḥ.*”

worshipped Tryambakaḥ, even a single time, or bathed in the water of the Gaṅgā, obtain. The mention of the Gaṅgā then cues a request by the goddess to be told about the descent of the Gaṅgā (pp.73–78).

After this parenthetical story, the text resumes the discussion of the environs of Meruḥ, by describing (pp.78–82) the four supportive mountain ranges (*viṣkambhāḥ*) that run out from it in the four cardinal directions. Each has special groves, ponds, magical trees, and the like. Then, after stating the dimensions of Meruḥ, and indicating that it lies at the center of the continent (*dvīpam*) of Jambudvīpam, which a salt sea surrounds, the text (82–88) sets out the eight mountain ranges that divide this continent into nine parts. At the end of this section, a list follows of eight more boundary (*simānta-*) ranges that lie in pairs in each of the four cardinal directions. Kṣemarājaḥ explains that they divide Jambudvīpam into nine additional divisions (counting the center space twice), and extend to the sea, indicating therefore, by implication, that they lie outside and run parallel to the previous ranges in the space between them and the salt ocean. In this case, however, these eight additional mountain ranges would reduplicate the function of the previous set of ranges and multiply the divisions of Jambudvīpam beyond the standard nine.¹ Perhaps they survive as a supplanted alternative tradition about the divisions of Jambudvīpam, which was reinterpreted in various ways. Support for this hypothesis comes from the shared names in the two sets of eight ranges, which Kṣemarājaḥ must rationalize,

¹ Probably for this reason Jayarathaḥ in his commentary on M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ*, 8, p.52, interprets them as support ranges (*viṣkambhaparvatāḥ*), and rejects the suggestion that they produce nine additional divisions.

and the absence later in the text of any discussion of the second set.¹

There follows a longer section (pp.89–102) describing the nine regions (*varṣam*) of Jambudvīpam, and their dimensions, principal mountain ranges (*kulaparvataḥ*), inhabitants, and their characteristic mode of existence. In the course of this account, after describing the northern region of Kurum, the text also describes a pair of islands, Candra- and Bhadra-dvīpam, lying in the salt ocean to its north.² Following a traditional pattern, the text, while characterizing life in Bhāratam as negative, also praises (p.103) its only and singular virtue; here alone actions yield a positive or negative result.³ After this mention of positive or negative action, a parenthetical verse (p.103) intervenes celebrating the power of specific ghats to bestow merit. Then there follows (pp.104–105) an enumeration of Bharata's nine divisions

¹ The location and function of this second set also vary in the Purāṇas. In most texts they serve as boundary ranges proximate to Meruḥ that separate it from the central region of Ilāvṛtam; v. Kirfel, *Die Kosmographie*, p.104, "Die Grenzgebirge I (*maryādāparvata*);" v. also H.H. Wilson, *The Vishṇu Purāṇa* (1840. Reprint. Calcutta: Punthi Pustak, 1961), p.140, n.14. Although Kṣemarājaḥ does not mention this interpretation, it fits the context of this passage in *Svacchandatantram*, which, immediately after discussing these mountains, begins to discuss Ilāvṛtam. Perhaps this is the intention of Jayaratha's interpretation of these ranges as supporting mountains, since this would also place them near Meruḥ around the previously discussed support mountains.

² They might properly be termed *antaradvīpam*, islands or in between continents, i.e., land masses that lie in the oceans that separate the continents or *dvīpam*; v. Kirfel, *Die Kosmographie*, pp.111ff.

³ V. p.103, vss.247b–248a: "*tatraiva yatkr̥tam karma śubham vā yadi vāśubham // vasanti tena lokāśca śivādyavicimadhyagāḥ*." For additional references to this widely held traditional notion, v. Vasudeva S. Agrawala, *Matsya Purāṇa – a Study* (Varanasi: All-India Kashiraj Trust, 1963), pp.190–191.

(*bhedāḥ*).¹ The text, however, only describes the last of these, Kumāri, and then proceeds to enumerate (pp.108–111) six smaller or secondary islands (*upadvīpam*), that lie in the ocean off the south of Bhāratam.² As appropriate for a Śaiva text, only the island of Malayam is described, because on its highest peak Tryambakaḥ is praised in the celebrated hermitage of Agastyah.

Having completed the description of the divisions of Jambudvīpam, the text now gives (pp.111–112) its dimensions along with those of the surrounding salt ocean. Then the text enumerates a dozen submarine mountains, distributed in sets of three in the cardinal directions, and named for heroes who took refuge in the salt ocean from Indraḥ. In the southern quadrant, between the last two mountains, the text notes, in addition, the location of Vaḍavāmukhaḥ.³ Then, as a link between the discussion of Jambudvīpam and the discussion of the other continents, there follows another section (pp.114–116) that lists the descendents of Manuḥ, the eponymous first lords of both the divisions of Jambudvīpam and of these other continents.

¹ They are evidently also designated *dvīpam*, since like the continents and islands which also have this name, they too are separated by water (p.104) "*sāgarāntarītāḥ*."

² In the Purāṇa these are the names of the larger islands, or *antaradvīpam*, and are distinguished from the smaller *upadvīpam*, which have different names; v. Kirfel, *Die Kosmographie*, p.112. According to Agrawala, *Matysa Purāṇa*, pp. 191–192, in the later cosmology, Kumāri came to designate India proper, when the former designation, Bhāratam, was employed for a larger geographical regions with subdivisions. In support of this interpretation, the text here summarily describes, without explanation, Kumāri as possessing the characteristics previously predicated of Bhāratam. V. p.106, vs 255: "*ye pūrvoktā guṇā loke bhārate varavarṇini / te tatraiva sthitā loke kumārisaṃjñake priye*."

³ Apparently a variant of Vaḍāvānalaḥ, the submarine fire, located at the southern pole.

After listing (pp.117–119) the names of the continents and of their surrounding oceans, and indicating their dimensions, the text proceeds (pp.119–130) to enumerate for each continent the further descendents of Manuḥ, who are the eponyms of their various subdivisions, their mountains, rivers, and the mode of existence that characterizes their inhabitants. This description, which recapitulates Purāṇic accounts, differs from many of them, however, in the sequence in which it enumerates the continents and oceans. Thus, for example, the text gives Śākadvīpam as the first continent instead of Plakṣadvīpam, and describes it just as these Purāṇas describe Plakṣadvīpam. Recognizing this difficulty, Kṣemarājaḥ, as a Śaiva apologist, simply affirms the Śaiva sequence and attributes the differing Purāṇic sequence to a human scribal error.¹ Historically, the Śaiva tradition appears to have combined two traditions that occur separately in the Purāṇas. While the text follows the sequence of names and oceans given in one group of Purāṇas, it copies the sequence of descriptions given in another group of Purāṇas.²

In the mountain range, Mānasottaraḥ, that divides the last continent of Puṣkaraṁ into two regions, lie (pp.130–131) the cities of the world guardians. After this comes (pp.130–132) the golden pleasure realm of the gods, Hemamayi, and beyond it, the Lokālokaḥ, “world not-world” range that separates the illuminated and inhabited earth from the surrounding regions of perpetual darkness. There reside the ultimate, as it were, world guardians, eight rudrāḥ whom the text names (pp.132–133), and who, as

¹ V. his commentary, p.117: “... *yathoktakrameṇaiva sthitāḥ sarveṣu pārameśeṣu evamevoktatvāt/ ... pātañjale yaḥ kramo drśyate sa lekhaḥ adosādvīparyasta*” On Kṣemarāja’s interpretative principles v. supra section 1.2.3.

² V. Kirfel, *Die Kosmographie*, pp.112ff, for the first group of texts whose descriptions *Svacchandatantram* follows, and pp.122ff, for the second group of texts whose sequence it apparently copies.

Kṣemarājaḥ explains, should not be confused with the traditional world guardians, Indraḥ, and so forth.

In as much as the sun sustains the various forms of existence, which are noted (p.134) in passing, inside of the Lokālokaḥ range, the text next (pp.134–139) briefly states the sun's course through the inhabited world. According to the common Indian astronomical conception, which Kṣemarājaḥ explains at length in his commentary, the sun rotates clockwise around Meruḥ and causes a continuous sequence of sunrises and sunsets in inhabited worlds that circle Meruḥ. Having the same height as Meruḥ, the sun, while shining, for example, in the region to the north of Meruḥ, causes day, while to the south of Meruḥ, which blocks its light there is night, and to the east morning, and so forth. Similarly, since the sun has the same elevation as the Lokālokaḥ range, the region beyond these mountains lies in perpetual darkness. In an attempt to clarify the ambiguous and questionable statements of the text about the sun's course, Kṣemarājaḥ also mentions the traditional view that the variable speed and location of the sun's orbit cause the seasonal changes in the relative length of day and night. Though apparently reading the traditional astronomical view into the text and thus circumventing any conflict, Kṣemarājaḥ, perhaps to preclude any further discussion, repeats the interpretative principle that the views of the *āgamāḥ* always takes precedence and that interpreters should therefore not make them conform to those of the astronomical texts.¹ For Kṣemarājaḥ, moreover, the Śaiva revelation, as grace, should communicate knowledge effective for interior transformation, and not external facts that are disputable or irrelevant. Accordingly, in his commentary at the end of this

¹ V. his commentary, p.135: "*evam saṃgatāgamikaprakriyayaiva etadvyākhyeyam natu parasparavisamvādiḥ śāstramatānusaraṇasaṃgatyā*." On his general interpretative principles v. supra section I.2.3.

section, perhaps impatient with justifying specific statements, and aware that the text has repeated well known cosmological data for a long time without any reference to its ritual or properly Śaiva significance, Kṣemarājaḥ presents a general apology for this material. Invoking the principle that the external is also internal, he indicates that this book has actually been simultaneously depicting the interior universe, and thus providing indispensable knowledge for the meditative practices of adepts.¹

II.10.2 The Ritual of Purification

Having come to the ends of the earth, as it were, the text concludes (pp.139–141) this section by calculating the dimensions of the circular plane from Meruḥ to the outer shell of the sphere of Brahmā. Before continuing upward, however, to describe the planes above the earth, the text suspends its cosmological narration for a discussion (pp.142–179) of the initiation via the path of the worlds. As noted previously, a redactorial cross-reference embedded in the fourth book, which describes the initiation via energies, the model for other modes of initiation, had already signalled that initiation would be discussed here in the tenth book.² This section, therefore, must have been incorporated, independently, into this cosmological book, before the final compilation of the earlier books describing initiation. Recognizing the redundancy of these separate accounts, Kṣemarājaḥ

¹ V. his commentary, p.137: *"etacca kālādhikāroktanītyā antariva bahirapi jñeyam."* On this pervasive micro- and macrocosmic parallelism v. supra section I.2.4.

² Bk.4, p.75, vs.123.

rationalizes this second account as a beneficial reminder and supplement to the first account.¹

The ceremony described here essentially recapitulates rites presented in the fourth book as preliminary acts intended to purify the neophyte in order to receive the liberation initiation.² As before, in its central act (pp.142–145), the officiant installs in the properly prepared fire, the goddess of speech (*vāgīśvari*). There he purifies the lower worlds, the atmospheric worlds, and most importantly, the world of the earth represented by the fourteen matrices (*yonayaḥ*) or varieties of existence, termed the circle of transmigration (*saṃsāramaṇḍalam*).³ Not many verses earlier, (p.134), the text had characterized the plane of the earth inside the Lokālokaḥ range as the realm of the fourteen kinds of existence acquired by one's own action.⁴ Evidently, this characterization provided the link prompting redactors to insert here a description of the ritual for purifying the circle of existence.

Within this interpolated ritual, there now follows a long parenthetical pericope (pp.145–157) on the bondage of transmigration, discussed in general terms with illustrative similes. This interpolation clearly represents a later, noetic, interiorizing school of interpretation, virtually, if not already *ex professo* monistic. In their view, as illustrated by their images and similies,

¹ V. his introductory commentary to vs.344b, p.141: “... *mā vismārṣīdupadeśya ityāśayena tameva tāvat smārayitumāha*. ”

² V. bk.4, pp.63ff; also earlier in book 4, pp.27ff, these same rites occur as a distinct preparatory initiation qualifying the neophyte (*samayi*) to receive the liberation initiation.

³ V. p.7 where Kṣemarājaḥ explains purification as removal of the potential bondage incurred through experience of a world or mode of existence: “... *śuddhyanti na bhogadatvena bandhakāni bhavantītyarthaḥ*. ”

⁴ V. p.134, vss.335b–336a: “*asya madhye varārohe yonayastu caturdaśa // ceṣṭante vividhākārāḥ svakarmaparirañjitāḥ*. ”

the ritual reveals the true Śiva nature of the self, just as a friction stick brings out the fire latent in wood, or alchemical solvents the gold hidden in mercury.¹ Specifically, this noetic interpolation likely represented one attempt by a later Śaiva school to reinterpret and assimilate an inherited, and already canonical ritual, sc. the purification of the fourteen matrices of existence. Leaving additional textual evidence of this interpolation, redactors have inserted at the end of this digression (p.156) a specific *Wiederaufnahme* in the dialogue, which restates the interrupted topic of the matrices.²

As noted previously, the purification of these fourteen matrices occurs twice in the fourth book in slightly different contexts, either as a separate preliminary initiation (*samayī-dikṣā*), or as part of the initiation via energies. Historically, they likely represent two other attempts by later systematizing Śaiva ritualists to reinterpret and incorporate the once independent ritual for purifying the matrices. At one time, these matrices probably represented the entire span of phenomenal existence, the “circle of transmigration,” and thus purifying or neutralizing their potential or actual *karmic* consequences equalled liberation. In the later and expanded Śaiva cosmos, with an increased range of possible existents, the purification of only these fourteen matrices would no longer suffice to convey liberation. Therefore Śaiva ritualists incorporated it here as a part of one mode of liberation, the initiation via worlds.

The description of the ritual provides evidence for this adaptation. The text indicates a separate and unique procedure for purifying the fourteen matrices, according to sequence, formula,

¹ V. pp.150–154, vss.365–376.

² V. p.156, vs.379b: “... *caturdaśavidhaṃ caiva yaduktaṃ tu mayāpurā // saṃsāraṃaṇḍalam*”

representative of genre, and so forth.¹ For the other worlds, however, it simply refers to the initiation procedure used in the previous liberation initiation described in books four and five.² And the directions to purify these worlds appear tacked on at the end of this section, or indicated elsewhere, in passing, during the description of the cosmos.³

The purifying of brāhmaṇa existence, one of the possible matrices, requires purifying the set of forty sacramental transformations (*saṃskārāḥ*) and of eight virtues that create a genuine brāhmaṇaḥ. Following the dharmaśāstra literature, the text enumerates (pp.158–175) these at length.⁴ The abbreviated previous mention of these rites in the fourth book depends on this extended list. In contrast to its earlier context, where it clearly represents a sectarian Śaiva display of superiority over śrauta orthodoxy, the intention of the ritual here appears more ambiguous. Though nominally intended to purify, to supersede this level of existence, the text's description here also shows traces of a context where it served rather as an alternative or option for obtaining this existence.⁵ A similar ambiguity resides in the text's directions for obtaining powers, which Kṣemarājaḥ correlates with

¹ V. p.158, vss.383–384b, and the commentary of Kṣemarājaḥ who supplies the ritual procedure: *"atra ca devadattāmane prāk-karmārjitasthāvarādi-jātipradhānabhūtaṃ saptacchadaṃ śodhayāmi svāhā ityādyūhaḥ kārya."*

² V. Kṣemarāja's commentary, for example, to vss.418b–419, p.178: *"etaccaturthapaṭala eva nirṇītaṃ tathā vakṣyamāṇamapi."*

³ V. the instructions given in vss.419–420, pp.178–179, and the commentary of Kṣemarājaḥ, which reconnect the purification of the worlds through their representative overlords to the standard liturgy set out in the fourth book.

⁴ V. Gnoli, *Luce delle Sacre Scritture*, p.500, .n.230.

⁵ V. p.171, vs.409a: *"... evaṃ brāhmaṇyamāpnuyāt."*

the demigod matrices of existence beyond the brāhmaṇa. Here explanatory verses reflect editorial attempts to define the ritual as solely purificatory and not acquisitive.¹ In the same vein, Kṣemarājaḥ delineates a compromise ritual procedure in which the master bestows powers, at least meditatively, and then immediately purifies them.²

The ambiguity found here in *Svacchandatantram* in the significance of the various rites purifying the brāhmaṇa *saṃskārāḥ*, may reflect the general differences in the later Śaiva attitude towards Vedic orthodoxy. The branches of sectarian Śaivism that evolved towards a rapprochement with orthodoxy interpreted this purifying rite in a negative way. The brāhmaṇa *saṃskārāḥ* that this rite endowed and purified did not affect, they insisted, the actual existing caste of those to be purified. The early Śaiva ritualists, who evidently rejected the orthodox system of caste, saw brāhmaṇa existence as simply another form of bondage that required purification like all other forms of limited existence. And they interpreted the qualifying rite administering the brāhmaṇa *saṃskārāḥ* as not merely an optional sequence of external rites but as a unique series of purifying transformations of consciousness which even brāhmaṇāḥ by birth had to undergo.³

Moreover, the variously resolved ambiguity in the significance of the ritual for purifying the brāhmaṇa rites likely reflects an earlier underlying ambivalence in the meaning of the

¹ V., for example, the rhetorical question of vs.418a, p.177: "anuddhṛte katham yogaḥ yāvat karma na bhuḥjyate."

² V. his commentary, p.176: "prāgvatsaṃhāarakrameṇa praṇavasadyo jāto cārapūrvam devadattasya paśācānimādimāpādayāmi svāhetyāhutiḥ pañca hutvā tadbhogaprāptimasya saṃcintya tenaiva mantreṇa paśācabhogamasya śodhayāmi svāheti pañcāhutirdadyāt."

³ V. supra section I.2.1 for the differing Śaiva attitudes about caste.

ritual for purifying the worlds. Specifically, in an extra- or pre-Śaiva ritual context, the rite for purifying the fourteen matrices of existence may have given a liberation conceived originally not only as freedom from but also enjoyment of or power over these levels of existence, especially those from the brāhmaṇa level up. The proponents of this rite then may have expanded its scope by claiming it conveyed all the benefits of orthodoxy, i.e., the entire set of brāhmaṇa *samskāraḥ* and virtues, which they simply lifted *verbatim* from the brāhmaṇical texts. When they adopted this rite, later Śaiva ritualists, motivated by different interests and burdened by theological problems, then added parenthetical explanations and refitted this ritual into the context of the liberation initiation that forms the overall framework of this book.

II.10.3 The Worlds in the Top Half of the Egg of Brahmā

After this long interlude to discuss ritual, the text resumes its cosmological discussion. Dialogue marks (p.180) the end of the section on the sphere of the earth, and the beginning of the section (pp.180–208) on the atmospheric world (*bhuvarlokaḥ*). Ten separate wind paths (*vāyupathāḥ*) compose this world, whose description will begin, the introductory dialogue indicates (p.181), with an enumeration of the clouds located in the first path. The section that follows (pp.181–197), however, enumerates not only clouds, but also levels of subordinate, as it were, winds, bearing clouds and inhabitants having specific properties and names. In addition, the text associates no specific clouds with the first two winds described, Ṛtarddhiḥ and Prācetasah, and lists only one level, Sattvavahāḥ, where clouds apparently reside without an associated wind.¹ Thus it appears that redactors have added the

¹ However Kṣemarāja's commentary by implication, in using the singular Sattvahāḥ, might be taken as indicating a wind here.

introductory dialogue, which indicates that clouds will be discussed, in order to cover the evident conflation of two separate sets of winds.

In addition, within this first list of winds, viz. the subordinate winds in the first path of the wind, the description of the inhabitants (pp.188–193), starting from the fourth wind, Oghaḥ, through the tenth wind, Viṣāvartaḥ, appears as part of a separate re-enumeration. From the eleventh wind, Durjayaḥ, onwards, the text describes the inhabitant and clouds simultaneously. This discrepancy suggests that the description of the fourth to tenth winds has combined material drawn from two separate sources.

Abhinavagupta's treatment of this material in *Tantrālokaḥ* appears to be a simple paraphrase of *Svacchandatantram*. Jayarathaḥ, in his commentary on *Tantrālokaḥ*, not only cites the appropriate source verse from *Svacchandatantram*, but also offers alternative readings for those which he judges defective and attributable to Kṣemarājaḥ.¹ His corrections, however, apparently have no textual basis, either in manuscripts of *Svacchandatantram* or parallel passages of other scriptures, and represent emendations intended to order the text more logically. Regardless of their value, however, his remarks give further evidence that this section of *Svacchandatantram* had been produced by compiling various sources without thoroughgoing redaction to produce a more coherent description.

In describing the second through ninth path of the winds, moreover, the text does not include any subordinate winds. Except for the extended celebration (pp.200–205) of the celestial Gaṅgā in

Abhinavaguptaḥ, however, appears to indicate only clouds at this level; v. M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ* 8, vs.124, p.93.

¹ V. M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ* 8, pp.102ff. Note how he describes (p.102) his emendations as logical remedies, "asmattarkitaḥ."

the seventh path, the description of each of these paths does not exceed that given for each subordinate wind of the first path. Thus, this parallelism further corroborates assuming that the discussion of the atmospheric world developed through compilation of at least two different sources.

Next, at the limit of the atmospheric world, the text describes (pp.208–210) the celestial chariot of the sun. Kṣemarājaḥ expands on the text's succinct restatement of the traditional allegorical equivalents of this chariot's parts. The sun, whose course, function, and dimensions the text next states (pp.210–212), marks the beginning of the world of heaven (*Svarlokaḥ*). In this world (pp.210–219), reside in upward sequence, the moon, the lunar asterisms, the planets, the constellation of the seven sages, the polestar and its accompanying fourteen stars. Once again, here when the text appears to be simply and often inaccurately recharting well known cosmological material without intrinsic religious significance, Kṣemarājaḥ intervenes to emphasize not only the authority of the text in these matters, but also the interior, esoteric import of this material.¹ Closing this section, the text indicates (pp.218–219) that in each of the seven orbits of the heavenly worlds move winds, whose names Kṣemarājaḥ supplies from Purāṇic sources.²

After noting the Vedic sacrificers who merit the heavenly world, the text briefly discusses (pp.220–221) the next world, Maharlokaḥ, the abode of various sages. Noting that the declaration of *Svacchandatantram* on the dimensions of these worlds differs from those of other scripture, Kṣemarājaḥ, notably,

¹ V. his commentary, pp.216–217, quoted supra in section I.2.4.

² These winds, explained neither by Kṣemarājaḥ nor the text, and which in contrast to the previous atmospheric winds should be understood as forces, cause the heavenly bodies to rotate around the polestar; v. Agrawala, *Matysa Purāṇa*, p.209.

resolves the potential conflict of revelation by attributing the discrepancy to the intrusion of human textual compilers.¹ Above follow Janalokaḥ (p.222), the abode of sages such as Ekapādaḥ, and Tapolokaḥ, the abode of the sons of Brahmā, Sanakaḥ, and so forth.² A parenthetical verse (p.223, vs.523), taken by Kṣemarājaḥ as a reference to the *Brhattantraḥ*, i.e., presumably, the original larger version of this and other tantras, then tallies up the number of worlds from Bhurlokaḥ, the earth, to the next world, Satyalokaḥ.

In Satyalokaḥ (pp.223–228), at the summit of the traditional brāhmaṇical cosmos, resides Brahmā, surrounded by the magnificent and embodied archetypes of the Vedic texts (pp.224–277). As befitting a sovereign, the text describes (pp.227–228) him seated on his throne, and surrounded by his retinue, at a suitable distance above Satyalokaḥ. At this point, after the standard seven worlds, sectarian cosmologies have added on their own additional worlds. This addition reflects the overall process of inclusion, adaptation, and extension that characterizes the evolution of sectarian Hinduism. Accordingly, as a Śaiva work, the text next describes, only briefly, the world of Viṣṇuḥ, where his devotees accede, and then extensively, the world of Rudraḥ lying beyond it.

The text glowingly depicts (pp.232–240) the rivers, flowers, and at length, especially the lovely women to be enjoyed in this world. There follows (pp.240–248) a similar glorifying depiction of the palace and then (pp.248–253) of the enthroned Rudraḥ himself and his consort. At one time, presumably, when this form of Rudraḥ was the supreme lord, these graphic verses celebrated, as

¹ V. his commentary, p.221, quoted supra in section 1.2.4.

² In some Purāṇas, by contrast, the sons of Brahmā reside in Janalokaḥ, and the Vairājaḥ gods in Tapolokaḥ; v. Kirfel, *Die Kosmographie*, p.142, and H.H. Wilson, *The Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, p.175.

a form of sectarian propaganda, as it were, the attractions of life in his paradise, accessible to his faithful devotees. Here in the later Śaiva system, this form of Rudraḥ represents only a lower aspect of the supreme lord, and the ideal of pleasure itself has given way to that of liberation.¹ Redactors have therefore, at the end of this section, added verses, qualifying this paradise as a reward attained by *linga* worshippers, who must still, however, be graced or initiated by Śrikanṭhaḥ in order to attain liberation in the supreme Śivaḥ.² Throughout this section, in as much as sharing this view, Kṣemarājaḥ largely restricts his commentary to the glossing of details.

Above the world of Rudraḥ, comes (pp.253–256) the realm of Daṇḍapāṇiḥ. Named for his function, he holds, as the text explains, a stick (*daṇḍaḥ*) in his hand (*pāṇiḥ*) with which he cracks open the shell of Brahmā to open the road to liberation for those who have worshipped Brahmā correctly. Presenting the interior significance of this figure, Kṣemarājaḥ interprets the stick as the breath rendered subtle in meditation that removes the ignorance covering the awareness centered in the heart. Furthermore, he rejects the esoteric interpretation which equates the top of the egg of Brahmā with the aperture of Brahmā, although the accepted parallelism of micro- and macrocosm would seemingly support it. Since the egg of Brahmā represents only the plane (*tattvam*) of the element earth, he argues, this interpretation would place the other planes of water, and so forth

¹ As an example of this change in the highest form of Śivaḥ, Kṣemarājaḥ, for example, (p.248) rationalizes, through the notion of aspectual manifestation, that the text here describes this lower rudraḥ as having the same kind of lion throne as Bhairavaḥ in bk.2 (pp.38–39): “... *pūrvoktabhairavāsana vacchivaśaktiparamārthā eva simhāḥ*.”

² V. p.252, vss.608b–609: “*dikṣājñānavihinā ye līṅgārādhana tatparāḥ // te prayānti harasthānam*”

outside of the body. And breaking the shell of the egg of Brahmā would not lead to liberation from all planes, but only from the plane of the earth. Historically, therefore, it would appear that the amalgamation of the Sāmkhya-Śaiva planes with the traditional cosmology disrupted an earlier schema of micro-macro parallelism where the egg of Brahmā represented the limit of both the interior and exterior cosmos.

After Daṇḍapāṇiḥ the text lists (pp.256–257) seven rudrāḥ who are overlords in seven worlds. Kṣemarājaḥ explains that they do not rule over seven worlds at this level, but rather serve as regent rudrāḥ in the seven worlds from Bhur- to Satya-lokaḥ, just as Kālāgniḥ, Kuṣmāṇḍaḥ, and so forth, in the lower worlds. His interpretation, moreover, evidently reflects the intention of the text, which then enumerates the regents of the worlds beyond Satyalokaḥ, for example, Viṣṇuḥ in his paradise.¹ In order to purify the worlds in initiations, Kṣemarājaḥ continues, their regents must be known. Having relegated the seven rudrāḥ to superintending these lower worlds, Kṣemarājaḥ adds that though not named by the text, Paśupatiḥ is the deity who actually resides as overlord in the world at this level.²

Coming to the end of the egg of Brahmā, the text summarizes (pp.257–259) its dimensions and characterizes its shell, as golden, spherical, and harder than diamond. Then in an aside (p.260) returning to the ritual and microcosmic significance

¹ To harmonize this interpretation with the preceding description, however, Brahmā, who traditionally resides in Satyalokaḥ (p.223, vs.524a) must then be displaced to a higher region. Thus Kṣemarājaḥ explains (p.256): "*satyalokānte brahmā*." Bhullakaḥ (pp.257–258) had apparently correlated the seven rudrāḥ beginning from the world of Anantaḥ, to the end of the egg of Brahmā by lumping several worlds together for one regent.

² This is also the interpretation of Jayarathaḥ; v. M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ* 8, p.117.

of the cosmology, a final verse asserts that the master can pierce this resistant shell with the *hum phat* formula.

II.10.4 The Sāṃkhya Worlds

Beyond lie the worlds of the hundred *rudrāḥ* (pp.259–273) who envelop and support the egg of *Brahmā*. Previously, the text had discussed these *rudrāḥ* at the base of the egg, and *Kṣemarājaḥ*, refuting other commentators, had explained that they reside outside of the egg of *Brahmā*.¹ The same coordinating explanations apply here, as well, since the text occasionally uses ambiguous language in locating the *rudrāḥ*.² Evidently confusion caused by the proliferation of *rudrāḥ* both inside and outside of the egg had also induced later redactors to add parenthetical adjustments. For example, a verse explains that the *Kālāgnirudraḥ* located below is another, second *rudraḥ*, different from the *Kālāgnirudraḥ* previously discussed.³ In his commentary at the end of this section, *Kṣemarājaḥ*, similarly harmonizes the text's varying numbers and sequences of *rudrāḥ* by interpreting them as presentations of a longer and shorter ritual procedure.⁴

¹ V. his commentary on pp.3–5, beginning with the gloss summarizing his position: *"tasya kaṭāhasyordhve prṣṭhe karparabāhye ityarthah."*

² For example, *"vyāpya (pervaded)"* (vs.645a, p.267) is glossed by *Kṣemarājaḥ* as *"parivṛtya (enveloped)."* The language closing the section is less ambiguous, for example, vs.658b (p.271), where *Virabhadraḥ* is said to be above the egg (*"... uparyāṇḍasya samsthitaḥ"*), and vs.666 (p.273), where the *rudrāḥ* are said to surround the egg (*"āvṛtyāṇḍam"*).

³ V. p.270, vs.657: *"adhaḥ kālāgnirudro 'nyaḥ sthitastvatra dvitiyakaḥ."*

⁴ V. his commentary, p.272: *"evamasyām vitatāyām bhuvanadikṣāyām sarva evaite pārthivāṇḍagatā yathokta-bhuvaneśvarāḥ śodhyāḥ natu prāk samkṣiptadikṣoktamaṣṭottaram-eva śatamiti"*

The text names the most important rudrāḥ, distributed in the ten major directions in sets of ten, then the overlords of the sets of ten, and finally their chief, Virabhadraḥ. After this enumeration, a few verses (pp.272–275), concluding this section of the cosmology, summarily characterize the egg of Brahmā as a region of extreme impermanence and ignorance. This sphere has radical limitations because in its entirety it only represents the manifest scope of the element earth, the lowest of the hierarchically ordered planes of the Sāṃkhya cosmology. Accordingly, following purāṇic tradition, the text then states (pp.273–281) the dimensions of the ascending planes of the Sāṃkhya universe, and then those of the planes superadded above by Śaiva tradition. As clarified by Kṣemarājaḥ, in succession, each higher element forms a larger sphere that englobes the smaller sphere of the preceding element. This structure reflects the Sāṃkhya and then Śaiva concept of the universe's manifestation, whereby each plane of the universe emits and pervades all those planes below itself.

The text, notably, describes the third highest plane, Sadāśivaḥ, as the drop (*binduḥ*) and the resonance (*nādaḥ*), and mentions the power Vyāpini, as if a separate stage beyond Śaktiḥ. These terms, referring to the microcosm, specifically, to stages in the ascent of the breath and formula during meditation, show that the higher levels of the cosmology depicted by *Svacchandatantram*, do not yet totally conform to the later standard lists of thirty-six planes.¹ Rather the non-standard, as it were, higher planes in *Svacchandatantram* appear to be the macrocosmic standardization or projection of the set of meditational stages which the text prescribes for the master's initiation procedure or the adept's

¹ For a list of the standard planes.v. n.17, pp.122–124, in Jaideva Singh, ed. and trans., *Pratyabhijñāhṛdayam* For charts of the components of the Śaiva cosmology, v. Brunner-Lachaux, *Somaśambhupaddhati* 3, pp.689ff.

special realization.¹ Thus, here and later on, Kṣemarājaḥ has to harmonize the discrepancies between these two lists of planes.

After this introductory presentation of the higher planes of the universe, the text begins their detailed description with the first plane above the egg of Brahmā, the plane of water (pp.281–352). Immediately following the dialogue beginning this section, however, there intervenes a parenthetical section (pp.282–288) that praises the exclusive Śaiva knowledge of these higher planes, and thus, by implication, of the way to authentic liberation. This section largely consists of a simple, negative listing of rival sects, whose identity, characteristic tenets, and shortcomings are then clarified by Kṣemarājaḥ.² As evidence that redactors interpolated this section, the dialogue closing this section and resuming the description of the water plane, echoes the precise wording of the verse preceding this section.³

Using varied similies and images, the text proceeds to portray (pp.289–295) the innumerable, multicolored, and multiform paradisaical worlds in the higher plane of water. Then another digression, (pp.295–300) lauding this knowledge as exclusively Śaiva, again interrupts this description. In contrast to the preceding parenthetical laud, this section emphasizes that Śaiva initiation, interpreted as true knowledge that comes through grace, is indispensable for liberation. Marking this section as an

¹ Note that Abhinavaguptaḥ, M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ* 8, vss.188–189, follows the list of *Svacchandatantram*.

² V. on these lists of rival sects section I.1.3. The Pāñcarātrikas, as noted by Kṣemarājaḥ, have a cosmology with twenty-six planes, that most closely resembles that of the Śaivas. They also recognize subsidiary regents of at least some of these planes. V. for their views, Schrader, *Introduction to the Pāñcarātra and the Ahirbudhnya Samhitā*, pp.31ff.

³ The “*ānābhuvanavistaraṃ*” of vs.683b, p.288, is a *Wiederaufnahme* of the the “*bhuvanānekavistaraṃ*” of vs.675a, p.282.

interpolation, the dialogue resuming the description of the worlds repeats *verbatim* most of the concluding dialogue that ended the previous parenthetical section.¹

After a verse recapitulating that the brilliant worlds of the eleven rudrāḥ lie above the egg of Brahmā, the cosmological description continues (pp.301–308) with the next world, Jayam of Bhadrakālī. This restatement of the eleven rudrāḥ and the egg of Brahmā provides further evidence that the material intervening in the text between here and their last mention (p.273) accrued through a number of supplementary and explanatory interpolations. Redactors apparently added this verse as a transition reconnecting to the cosmological description.

Except for a pair of verses before the last series of interpolations (p.273), the text lacks a description of the worlds of either the hundred rudrāḥ or of their eleven overlords. In the middle of these interpolations, however, there occurs (pp.289–295), as noted above, a vivid extended description of an infinity of worlds. The text indicates neither the location nor the regents of these worlds, though Kṣemarājaḥ interprets them as higher worlds that belong to the planes from water to Anāśritaśivaḥ.² The style and imagery used to describe these worlds and their inhabitants, however, strongly resembles that used to describe the worlds of the rudrāḥ both in the few earlier verses, at the end of the section enumerating their names, and in the section at the beginning of this book, which discusses the worlds surrounding the nadir rudraḥ, Anantaḥ.³ Apparently, therefore, interpolations

¹ V., for example, vs.684a, p.288: “*śṛṇuṣvaikamanā devi,*” and vs.709b, p.300, “*śṛṇuṣvaikamanāḥ priye.*”

² V. his commentary, p.295: “*etāni ca jalatattvādanāśritaśiva-tattvāntamidṛmśi uktāni.*”

³ V. pp.6–7, vss.7–10; p.273, vss.661–662b; pp.313–314, vss.745–749,; and the description of the Rudralokaḥ, pp.232–236,

separated the general description of the rudrāḥ worlds from that of particular worlds such as Jayam of Bhadrakālī.

This textual confusion reflects problems brought on by the attempt to combine and coordinate two separate cosmological models. In the first, the Śaiva mythological scheme, the rudrāḥ, as noted, envelop and support the egg of Brahmā, and in the second, the modified Sāṃkhya scheme, the egg or sphere of the element water, surrounds the egg of Brahmā that represents the element earth. Amalgamating these two conceptions necessitated identifying the egg of the rudrāḥ with that of the sphere of water, despite the lack of any intrinsic connection between the two.¹ Indicating this historic process of conflation, and attempting to resolve any residual ambiguity brought on by it, the text, for example, explicitly declares that the "realm of water" is called the "egg of Rudraḥ" or the "world of Rudraḥ."²

The actual presentation of the rudrāḥ, however, exhibits the typical repetitions and contradictions produced by conflation. Thus the text describes the chief rudraḥ, Virabhadraḥ, twice, at two different locations. In his commentary, Kṣemarājaḥ rationalizes this discrepancy by explaining the two as higher and lower aspects

vss.448-562a; compare, for example, the recurrent stereotyped imagery used here (p.290, vs.686a), to describe the higher worlds, "*kadambakeśaranibhaṃ*," with that earlier used to describe the rudrāḥ worlds, "*kadambakusumaṃ yadvat keśaraiḥ*," (p.273, vs.661).

¹ The historic association, in contrast, is with fire, as represented by Kālāgnirudraḥ. Virabhadraḥ, for example, is said (p.310, vs.737) to resemble the fire at the end of an æon ("*yugāntāgnisamaprabhaḥ*"), and (p.315, vs.753) to be seated on a throne which is a square fire ("*caturasrāṇalaprabham*").

² V. pp.317-318, vss.758-759: "*āpyamāvaraṇaṃ ... rudrāṇḍa iti vikhyātam*."

of the same figure.¹ The second Virabhadraḥ, moreover, has as his retinue innumerable rudrāḥ, whose description repeats the stereotyped language of preceding sections.²

Also, just as previously the text did not unambiguously locate the hundred rudrāḥ in relation to the egg of Brahmā, so here it does not unambiguously locate them in relation to the sphere of water.³ According to the *Tantrālokaḥ*, and the commentary of Jayarathaḥ, the worlds in the sphere of water begin with that of Bhadrakālī and end with that of Virabhadraḥ.⁴ Although the text of *Svacchandatantram* restates the worlds of the hundred rudrāḥ, the first new worlds it enumerates, after announcing it will enumerate the worlds in the plane of water, are also those of Bhadrakālī and of Virabhadraḥ. Thus by implication it agrees with *Tantrālokaḥ* about the worlds in the plane of water. Quoting texts other than *Svacchandatantram*, Abhinavaguptaḥ apparently locates the hundred rudraḥ in a zone between the egg of Brahmā or the plane of earth and the egg of Rudraḥ or the plane of water.⁵ This zone, ruled over by Śrikanṭhaḥ, consists of concentric spheres which have shells of metals such as silver and copper, and which successively double the dimensions of the gold shelled egg of Brahmā that they englobe. Here Abhinavagupta appears to be using a third

¹ The two descriptions begin with p.271, vs.658 (*"virabhadro vṛto ..."*), and with p.310, vs.737 (*"bhadrakālyāḥ paro devo ..."*). Kṣemarājaḥ (p.311) explains the double appearance of the set of eleven rudrāḥ as higher and lower aspects of the same figures: *"rudraikādaśikā ... yā pūrvamukta saiveha pararūpeṇa sthitā."*

² Cf. the preceding summary of pp.289-295.

³ Cf. the notes in the summary of pp.259ff.

⁴ V. M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ* 8, pp.142-143.

⁵ V. M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ* 8, pp.131ff, quoting the *Rauravavārtikaḥ*, and *Siddhāntantram*.

cosmological model, likely an alternative model now taken out of context, in order to harmonize the discrepancies produced by the amalgamation of the pair of models discussed previously. Except for mentioning the traditional gold shell of the egg of Brahmā, neither *Svacchandatantram* nor Kṣemarājaḥ refer to this third model.

Unlike that of the *Tantrālokaḥ*, the treatment by *Svacchandatantram* of this stage of the cosmology, and, in particular, of the rudrāḥ, appears repetitious and problematic. But these very problems and discontinuities, in fact, reveal the complicated prehistory behind the construction of the self-proclaimed exclusively Śaiva parts of the universe.

Thus, in Jayam (pp.301–310), the first world in the sphere of water, the text describes Bhadrakālī, a dazzling black figure set off by her attendants, crores of white celestial females. The text then (pp.305–308) explains that she becomes incarnate as different goddesses in order to benefit creatures, and explicitly identifies Durgā and Kumārī as some of her incarnations in the egg of Brahmā. This theology of aspectual incarnation provided sectarian systematizers a way both to rationalize the multiple appearances of the same figures in their own traditions, and a mechanism to appropriate the figures of other traditions. Specifically, as the Śaiva cosmology developed and fabricated additional planes of the universe to be populated with regents and worlds, the concept of incarnations enabled Śaiva systematizers to easily project extant mythic, legendary or cultic figures into these spheres. And to supplement projection, they also could easily convert abstractions into deities to stock the inherited upper planes of the universe.

After dialogue marking that the discussion of Bhadrakālī's world has apparently ended, some additional verses (pp.308–310) extoll initiation as the only means of acceding to her world. This addendum not only echoes the periodic asides in this book emphasizing that the cosmological exposition serves ritual ends, but

also expresses the proprietary claims of the Śaiva ritualists to have in their ritual the only key to these higher worlds.

In the next world Vijayam (pp.310–315), the text describes the great fiery rudraḥ, Virabhadraḥ, seated on a flaming throne and surrounded by innumerable rudra attendants who musically celebrate his majesty. After describing his world, the text declares in conclusion (p.315), that those accede here who have died violently in wind, water, fire, or by the sword. Kṣemarājaḥ specifies that these, violently dead from accidents while on pilgrimage, from warfare, or from ritual suicide, attain this world only if they think of Maheśvaraḥ at the point of death; otherwise they go to Vaidyutam in the path of the winds. This verse thus reflects a Śaiva adaptation or version of widespread beliefs about the efficacy of ritual suicide and the power of devotional contemplation at the moment of death.¹

As noted above, the text periodically reconnects its presentation of the cosmology to a ritual context. Usually, as exemplified in the preceding remarks concluding the description of Bhadrakālī's world, the initiation ritual supplies the framework that putatively interconnects and motivates the detailed account of various worlds. Here, for this and many of the following worlds and planes, in contrast, the text refers to other ritual or meditational contexts. Evidently, the compilers of *Svacchandatantram* found these sections of the cosmos already associated with these rituals and meditations in the sources they used to construct this section of text. Later redactors, then, did not revise these sections to thoroughly conform to the nominal framework of initiation, and, consequently, these parts of the cosmos retain references to earlier and variant ritual contexts. Perhaps the strong traditional associations between specific practices

¹ For inscriptional and literary records of ritual suicide at Prayāga, beginning from the sixth century A.D., v. Pathak, *Smārta Religious Tradition*, pp.77–80.

and worlds encouraged their retention. The presence here of these associations, whatever its ultimate cause, suggests that the systematic framework of correspondences between initiation and worlds represents a secondary appropriation of the traditional cosmology by Śaiva ritualists.¹

At this point several verses follow (pp.316–319) describing the dimensions, shape, and boundaries of the egg or sphere of Rudraḥ, identifying it with the sphere of water, and establishing that since it carries a full range of existents, sc. rudrāḥ, it is a complete sphere just like the egg of Brahmā. A parenthetical half-verse in this section (p.317), notably, locates a thumb-sized rudraḥ in the boundary shell of this egg.² In addition to the pair of worlds of Bhadrakālī and Virabhadraḥ, this sphere, another verse indicates, has thirteen other worlds.³

¹ The twelfth book, especially, presents the cosmos as clearly modeled, not for initiation ritual, but for the meditative practices of adepts.

² V. vs.757a, *“aṅguṣṭhāgrapramāṇakaḥ*, though it is unclear if this is a proper name or description; Kṣemarājaḥ elsewhere (p.438) calls his world the *“aṅguṣṭhamātrapramāṇarudrabhuvana-*,” which would make him a lower form of the similarly named rudraḥ Aṅgustamātraḥ, in the set of mahādevāḥ (p.430). Kṣemarājaḥ interprets this rudraḥ as a subtle form, especially assumed for meditation, evidently equal to the brāhmanical *aṅguṣṭhapuruṣaḥ*. For the myth and symbolism of the birth of Dakṣaḥ from the thumb of Brahmā, v. Agrawal, *Matsya Purāṇa*, pp.56ff.

³ V. p.318, vs.760: *“trayodaśabhiranyaiśca bhuvanair . . .”* Kṣemarājaḥ (p.319) interprets “thirteen” to refer to the pair of worlds of Bhadrakālī and Virabhadraḥ added to the worlds of the eleven rudrāḥ said previously (p.311) to accompany Virabhadraḥ, and “others” to refer to the world of Dharitṛi, etc. Abhinavaguptaḥ (M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ* 8, vss.199b–200a) and thus Jayarathaḥ, seemingly interpret the “other thirteen” as referring to the set of thirteen worlds from that of Dharitṛi to that of Amareśaḥ. The divergence in interpretations derives perhaps from Kṣemarājaḥ having to take into account the eleven rudrāḥ which *Tantrālokaḥ* omits from its discussion of Virabhadraḥ.

After this summary section, the text then proceeds to describe (pp.319–352) these additional worlds. Aside from indicating indirectly that they lie further on within the sphere of water, the text does not specify their exact location.¹ First comes (pp.319–327) the world of Dharitri or Dhātri, literally, the “holder” or “earth.” Since she embodies the highest form or archetype of earth, the text depicts her as a goddess mounted on a tortoise, surrounded by rudrāḥ and her chief attendants, Meruḥ and other mountain ranges in their highest form. Adhering to the pattern followed for the previous pair of worlds, the text then declares who qualifies for admission to her world. Those exercitants, it specifies (p.327), attain her, who die after performing a meditation or concentration (*dhāraṇā*) upon the sensory medium of odor (*gandhatanmātram*). This concluding remark reconnects this part of the cosmology to a context of practices unlike those associated with previous worlds. In general,

¹ Abhinavaguptaḥ, and following him Jayarathaḥ, give (M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ* 8, vss.199b–200a, and commentary) a different reading of vss.759b and 760a of *Svacchandatantram* (“*vīrabhadraniketaśca bhadrakālyālayastathā // trayodaśabhiranyaiśca bhuvanair upaśobhitam*”), which then states that these thirteen worlds lie between the worlds of Bhadrakālī and of Virabhadraḥ: “*āvīrabhadrabhuvanādbhadrakālyālayāttathā // trayodaśabhiranyaiśca bhuvanair upaśobhitam*.” This layout also accords with the hierarchical logic whereby the regent of a sphere resides at its summit. Since *Svacchandatantram* in this book presents the worlds in ascending hierarchical sequence, however, it would imply that these thirteen worlds are located above the world of Virabhadraḥ. Accordingly, the text (vs.853a, p.351) calls the last set of eight worlds, the “last world in the plane of water (*atraiva tvāpyatattve tvam śṛṇu vai bhuvanottamam*).” Thus, once again, while Jayarathaḥ disputes the logic of Kṣemarāja’s commentary and produces a corresponding logically emended text, Kṣemarājaḥ appears to be more closely adhering to the actual scriptural utterance. V. thus Jayaratha’s objection to Kṣemarājaḥ, M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ* 8, p.142: “*upaśobhitamiti arthādaptattvam evampāṭha eva ca āgama iti uddyotakāravayākhyayā na bhramitavyam*.”

the specific meditations on various planes, indicated for this and the following worlds, suggest their origin in sources linked not to the preceding sections of this book, but rather to the alternative cosmological model presented in the twelfth book.¹

Specifically, the text associates by meditation this world and the next, to the sensory media (*tanmātrāṇi*) corresponding to the elements earth and water. According to the structure established later in the twelfth book, meditation on the tutelary deity of a plane bestows as its fruition union with that deity or existence in that plane. In the usual sequences of cosmic emanation, however, the planes of the sensory media do not come, wedged, as it were, between the elements earth and water, but either higher up in the sequence, or correlated with their appropriate element.² And in fact, later on, the text does describe the planes of the sensory media with their regents and worlds in their usual position.³ This repetition and atypical location suggests, therefore, that this section represents material either interpolated from another source, or surviving from an earlier cosmological tradition which did not correspond to the organizing structure of emanation dominant in this book.

The practices indicated here, therefore, might not be meditations on sensory media, but rather meditations on the corresponding elements. A meditation on an element in its archetypal form, as embodied in a tutelary deity, might easily be later interpreted, in a more theoretical context, as a meditation on its more abstract sensory media. Especially in as much as the tutelary deity of the sensory media directs the emanation of its

¹ V. p.347 where Kṣemarājaḥ recognizes this and refers to the twelfth book: "*vāgdhāraṇā tattvasiddhipāṭale dvādaśe vakṣyate.*"

² Cf. Schrader, *Introduction to the Pāñcarātra and the Ahirbudhnya Saṃhitā*, pp.87ff.

³ V. for their description, pp.369–377.

corresponding element.¹ The absence elsewhere in the text of another meditation on the plane of the earth argues for interpreting the meditation on Dharitṛi as a meditation on the element earth. The following meditation on Varuṇaḥ, interpreted as on water, presents no problems since it occurs in the right position. Perhaps when the Sāṃkhya and Purāṇic cosmological schemes combined, and earth became identified with the egg of Brahmā, the paradise of Dharitṛi correlated with the earth element meditation had to be displaced upward. Similarly, the combination of the Rudraḥ and water spheres might have multiplied the number of worlds in the plane of water that once held only the elemental paradise of Varuṇaḥ.

The meditation (*dhāraṇā*) on the five elements occurs elsewhere in the text.² It follows a common textual pattern of pentadic meditations, usually correlated with the Pañca-Brahma or five faces of Śivaḥ. Accordingly, this meditation pattern continues with the element fire in the plane of fire. The text, however, presents here, in the plane of water, two additional meditations on the goddesses Śrī and Sarasvatī. Perhaps the source that contained the two preceding meditations, following the traditional pentadic pattern, also contained meditations on these goddesses, as representing the other elements. The rich traditional mythic content and associations of these goddesses and their worlds might have contributed to their preservation and transmission, despite the fact that they reduplicated meditations described elsewhere in the text and have no intrinsic association with the plane of water. Perhaps the entire source represented a sensory media meditation, which compilers reapplied to supply the missing first and second

¹ V. p.370, vs.899a: *"tasmāttu jāyate pṛthvī śarveśeṇa pracoditā."* And Kṣemarājaḥ generalizes this statement: *"anyathā jadasya tanmātrasya katham kāraṇatā syāt / evamanyatrāpi jñātavyam."*

² V. section II.5 for the notes to the summary of bk.5, pp.7-8.

elemental meditations. Elsewhere in the text these pentadic meditations often appear reinterpreted, as subsidiary parts of larger ritual structures. The material presented here, therefore, likely represents the remnants of one cosmological variant or extension of a pentadic element meditation that has once again been preserved and adapted for a new context.¹ The earlier context remains visible under the adaptation, however, trapped under the weight of tradition that blocks thoroughgoing logical revision.

Thus continuing the sequence of elements, after the earth world of Dharitṛi, comes (pp.327–330) the water world of Varuṇaḥ, surrounded by rivers in their archetypal form as goddesses. Here, the text declares, accede devotees who have meditated on the sensory media of taste. (*rasatanmātram*).

Further on comes (pp.330–341) the marvelous world, called either Śriniketaḥ or Padmagarbhaḥ, ruled over by Śrī. Depicted as brilliant as if the “radiance of all radiant objects, in one place, simultaneously, flashes forth,” she clearly embodies the archetype of the element fire.² Her description also includes several verses (pp.336–338) in purāṇic style, setting forth the history of her fractional incarnations, starting, as fitting for a Śaiva work, as a whole for Rudraḥ, then as a half for Viṣṇuḥ, and so forth, down to men. Then, concluding its description of her world, the text (p.338) declares that death at auspicious places such as Prayāgaḥ, or especially Śrīgiriḥ bestow her world. In addition to this

¹ Accordingly, at the end of the description of the water world Kṣemarājaḥ connects these meditations to the related discussion, in the fifth book (pp.43ff) where they form an alternative sequence in the initiation ritual. He also correlates the various elemental deities with the eight forms (*aṣṭamūrtiḥ*) of Śivaḥ. V. his commentary, p.330: “*aṣṭamūrtermahesituriyaṃ dvitīyā mūrtirjalādhiṣṭhātr-devatārūpā / dhāraṇāsvarūpaṃ prāgdhāraṇādikṣāvasare darśitam.*”

² V. p.334, vss.810–811: “*ekatra yugapattejastejasāṃ tu virājate . . . paramā devī.*”

declaration, several verses (pp.338–340) explain that she represents the goal of those seeking perfections or enjoyments under any form, and thus also becomes a form of bondage for those intent on liberation. The added length and content of this concluding declaration indicates that it represents an addendum which may have displaced a briefer declaration of an elemental meditation that paralleled those of the preceding and following worlds. The opposition between liberation and enjoyment, especially, typically reflects the dogmatic considerations of later redactors.

Above lies the world called either *Sārasvatam* or *Gāndharvam*, or alternatively like the preceding world, *Padmagarbham*. As the name indicates, here rules, evidently representing the archetype of the element ether, *Sarasvatī*, depicted as the quintessence of sound, particularly of music, who is surrounded and celebrated by troops of *gandharvāḥ*, the celestial musicians. After describing her world, the text names (pp.346–347) several chief *gandharvāḥ*, and asserts that worshippers can obtain their status by praising *Sarasvatī* while they renounce the fruits of their action. This assertion then leads into a standard declaration (p.347), which corresponds to those in preceding sections, that promises *Sarasvatī*'s world to those who meditate before death on speech or vibration (*vāk*). After this declaration that elsewhere marks the end of an account of a world, there follows a short section (347–351), apparently added by redactors cognizant that *Sarasvatī*'s location here might contradict the traditional accounts of her location. These verses explain her various aspects and then celebrate her multiple presence in a descending series of fractional incarnations.

Then, at the highest level of the sphere of water, the text lists (pp.351–352) eight worlds, named, *Kṣemarājaḥ* explains, after their regents. This pattern of eight *rudra* sovereigns and similarly named worlds continues up through the rest of the

elements to the world of the ego (*ahaṃkāraḥ*).¹ The traditional Śaiva concept of the eight forms (*aṣṭamūrtiḥ*) of Śivaḥ evidently formed the model for these other sets of eight, which represent subordinate manifestations of the eight forms projected at lower levels of the universe.² The pattern of eight worlds in each plane, moreover, corroborates the hypothesis stated earlier, that the other worlds at this plane, the plane of water, derived from the combination of separate cosmological schemes. Thus when Kṣemarājaḥ enumerated the worlds to be purified in initiation, at the plane of water, he lists, as for the following planes of fire, and so forth, only the set of eight.³ Though the text does not indicate how worshippers attain these worlds, Kṣemarājaḥ notes that these worlds have their incarnate counterparts, and thus presumably means of access, in various sacred bathing places (*tīrthāḥ*) on earth.

After describing all the subsidiary worlds in the plane of water, the text moves on to the plane of fire (pp.352-360). In this red realm dwells Śivāgniḥ, "the fire of Śivaḥ," surrounded by crores of fiery gaṇāḥ. The extended enumeration of his lower manifestations includes among other, Kālāgniḥ, the sun, and the assorted sacrificial fires. Those who perform a fire related meditation (*āgneyiṃ dhāraṇām*), a verse declares (p.357), accede to this lord. Unlike the prior meditations on earth and water, which focused on the corresponding sensory medium, here the text seemingly prescribes a meditation on the element itself. To

¹ Kṣemarājaḥ explains (p.352) that just as here this set of eight regents implies eight worlds, so also later on the other sets: "*ete ca bhuvaneśvarā bhuvanamapi etannāmakam ... prasiddhāḥ. evamanye 'pi vakṣyamāṇā jñātavyāḥ.*"

² On the *aṣṭamūrtiḥ*, v. Vasudeva S. Agrawal, *Śiva Mahādeva. The Great God* (Varanasi: Veda Academy, 1966), pp.23-27.

³ V. bk.5, p.34: "*jale ... lakuliśādinyamarāntānyaṣṭau.*"

conclude this section, the text enumerates a set of eight regent rudrāḥ, called extremely secret (*atiguhyam*), in order to emphasize their superiority to the secret (*guhyam*) octad in the preceding plane.

Next comes the plane of air (pp.360–364), where Vāyuḥ rules, surrounded by the wind deities (*mārutāḥ*). His lower manifestations are in the various breaths, and exercitants who meditate before death on these breaths in their own bodies can attain his world. The eight rudrāḥ residing here are called extremely secret (*guhyād guhyataram*), to be known (*veditavyam*) with effort. Reconnecting this octad to the context of initiation, Kṣemarājaḥ interprets “to be known” to mean that these rudrāḥ must also be purified in the initiation ritual.

A very brief description (pp.364–365) follows of the plane of the element ether (*ākāśaḥ*). The text, only repeating the standard properties of ether, does not graphically depict this world, and omits the name of its overlord, supplied by Kṣemarājaḥ simply as Ākāśaḥ. As before, exercitants acquire this realm by meditation on ether. And the eight rudrāḥ are simply and appropriately characterized as pure (*pavitra-*).

Next (pp.365–369), but apparently out of order, comes the plane of the ego (*ahaṃkāraḥ*), located “outside” (*bāhye*) of the preceding plane. According to Kṣemarājaḥ, by placing the ego here and characterizing it as exterior, the text indicates that the ego has interiorized, or serves as the proximate cause or source for manifesting the lower planes of the sensory media and of the organs.¹ This interpretation appears correct and not merely a cover for textual confusion, since, later on, the text places the ego

¹ Similarly, Kṣemarājaḥ explains (p.488) the statement (vs.1151 “*bāhye tasyaiśvaram tattvam*”) that the plane of Īśvaraḥ lies “outside” (*bāhye*) of the plane of Mahāvidyā, as indicating that the plane of Īśvaraḥ envelops and pervades that of Mahāvidyā: “*bāhya iti tadeva vyāptyā parivṛtya sthitamityarthah.*”

at its usual position and does not enumerates its set of eight rudrāḥ again, but rather, with a redactorial aside inserted in the dialogue, refers back to this section.¹ Similarly, the text locates the plane of the first sensory media above ether and below the ego.² In addition, its description of the sensory media includes a discussion of the elements that they each manifest. The compilers of this section of *Svacchandatantram*, therefore, probably used a source document that described these planes in their descending order of manifestation, as usual in standard Sāṃkhya or Purāṇic accounts. Underneath their partial adaptation to fit an ascending description of the cosmos, parts of the original structure remain.

Reflecting the important role of the intermediate cause assigned to the ego in traditional accounts of cosmic manifestation, the text indicates that Rudraḥ rules this plane. The set of eight rudrāḥ named here are characterized as firm or as the base (*sthānuḥ*), explained by Kṣemarājaḥ as indicating that they serve as the support for all experiences in the lower planes derived from the ego.³ Then, without introduction, the text lists the colors of the five sets of eight rudrāḥ enumerated to this point, and of the ten sets of the hundred rudrāḥ. A few additional verses echo previous depictions of their appearance and of their worlds. Kṣemarājaḥ simply notes that these colors should be used when meditating on these groups during initiation.

¹ V. p.387, vs.934: "*chagalāṇḍādayo devi pūrvam te kathitā mayā.*"

² V. p.369, vs.895: "*ākāśāvaraṇādūrdhvamahaṃkāradadhaḥ priye.*"

³ Cf. the same image used in *Sāṃkhya-kārikā* 41, p.400ff, in Pāṇḍurang Jāwaji, *The Sāṃkhya Kārikā of Mahāmuni Śrī Īśvarakṛiṣṇa with the Commentary Sārābodhini of Paṇḍit Śivanārāyaṇa Śāstri with Sāṃkhya Tattavakaumudi Commentary of Vāchaspati Mishra* (Bombay: Nirṇaya Sāgar Press, 1940).

Presumably, in an earlier source describing the planes of the cosmos, the regent Rudraḥ of this plane appeared surrounded, as normal for the chief Rudraḥ, by the retinue of the hundred rudrāḥ, and as overlord of the lower planes, by their sets of eight rudrāḥ. Inserted into this book's extended account of the cosmos, however, this material now reduplicated numerous mythic portrayals of chief Rudrāḥ and their rudra worlds.¹ Since the source document probably primarily discussed the planes of the cosmos for the purpose of meditational attainments, this material combined an interior, ritual and a pictorial, external description of rudrāḥ. Instead of adding another aspectual rationalization of the reduplication of chief Rudrāḥ and their rudra worlds, redactors probably truncated the external description and left the rest as parenthetical ritual instructions.

Next, in standard sequence, come (pp.369–373) the planes of the sensory media. The text first (pp.369–371) describes the multicolored sphere of the plane of odor (*gandhaḥ*), where Śarvaḥ is regent, and from which the element earth manifests. In this sequence of cosmic manifestation, each element emerges from its corresponding sensory medium, through, according to Kṣemarājaḥ, the agency of the sensory medium's regent. This scheme contrasts with the strictly successive and vertical model of later Śaivism, nominally structuring the cosmology of this book, and indicates that the compilers of this section of *Svacchandatantram* here used a source that followed this common but alternative schema.

After the plane of odor, comes (p.370) the plane of taste (*rasaḥ*), which has as regent Bhavaḥ, and from which emerges the element water. Then comes the plane of visible form (*rūpaḥ*), having Paśupatiḥ as regent, and fire as its manifested element. Next comes (pp.371–373) touch (*sparsaḥ*), with regent Īśānaḥ and with element air, from which, the text continues, come the

¹ On these rudra descriptions v. supra the notes to the summary of pp.289ff.

various breaths. Last follows (p.373) the plane of sound (*śabdah*), which has as regent Bhimaḥ, and which manifests the element ether.

These five regents are also the ruling deities or embodiments of elements that represent the first five forms of Śiva's eight form manifestation (*aṣṭamūrtiḥ*). Since the sensory media manifest the elements, they function like their ruling deities, and thus the sensory media have been identified with these ruling deities or assigned them as regents. Accordingly, adhering to the strength of this tradition, the text next (pp.374–377) enumerates the remaining three forms of the eight-form manifestation of Śivaḥ, viz., the sun, the moon, and the sacrifice, as if separate planes of the universe. In the standard Śaiva sequence of cosmic manifestation, naturally, these forms do not have this status. The planes of the sun, of the moon, and of the sacrifice, have as regents, respectively, Rudraḥ, Mahādevaḥ, and Ugreśaḥ. They form the archetypes, the text explains, behind the suns, moons, and sacrifices, manifest in lower spheres of the universe.¹

After discussing the manifestations of the eight forms of Śivaḥ, the text describes (pp.379–383) the next sphere of the instruments (*karaṇam*) comprising the planes of the organs (*indriyāṇi*). Harmonizing the return to the standard sequence of manifestation, Kṣemarājaḥ explains that, in contrast, the preceding categories collectively represented the sphere of the effect (*kāryam*).² In this short section, the text first enumerates the

¹ V. pp.377–378, vs.920: *"ityaṣṭau tanavastvetāḥ parā vai samprakīrtitāḥ aparā brahmaṇo 'ndam vai vyāpya sarvaṁ vyavasthitāḥ."* In a sectarian aside (p.377, vs.919), an allusion to developed Śaiva theology, the text states that the lord's power Vāmā controls the sacrifice (*"... yajñā yajñaphalāni ca tapodānādibhiḥ sārddham vāmaśaktyā niyantritāḥ"*) which, as Kṣemarājaḥ notes, represents the lower world of action and bondage.

² On the division of the planes of existence into these groups in the antecedent Pāśupata tradition, v. Schultz, *Die philosophisch-*

five organs of action (*karmendriyāṇi*), with their colors, but does not give the names of their regents, whom Kṣemarājaḥ must supply. Above them lies a sun-like sphere of light or consciousness (*prakāśakam*), from which emerge the five organs of perception. The text locates their animating regents in a sphere of fire, but, as before, does not list their names, which Kṣemarājaḥ supplies. Further on lies another sphere like the moon, from which emerge the five sensory media. After this sphere comes another moon, whose rays represent the preceding fifteen planes and whose full disc represents the perceptual organ (*manah*). The perceptual organ has Candramāḥ as its regent, and is equated with the medium of awareness (*cittam*) and awareness (*cetaḥ*). The description of the sensory media as the moon rays symbolizes their role as object of perception and their sequence of manifestation where they proceed from the corresponding organ of perception. In equating the perceptual organ, whose regent is Candramāḥ, with the moon, the text, according to Kṣemarājaḥ, alludes to the notion that the hidden sixteenth digit of the moon moves and enjoys the nectar of all the other phases.¹

Then, for the second time and at its normal position, the text describes (pp.384–387) the red world of the ego. Kṣemarājaḥ

theologischen Lehren des Pāśupata-Systems, pp.29ff. V. also bk.10, pp.450, vs.1089, where the text does mention the *kāryam*.

¹ On the sixteen digits of the moon, v. Tucci, pp.266ff, of "Note indologiche," *Opera Minora* 1, Università di Roma. Studi Orientali Pubblicati a Cura della Scuola Orientale 6 (Rome: Dott. Giovanni Bardi, 1971), pp.255–275. Note that later (p.395, vs.961) in the enumeration of the eight types of divine existents in the plane of the intellect, the world of the moon is called Manojam. The identification of the moon and the mind continues older traditions; v. *Brhadāranyaka-Upaniṣad* III, 1, 6, p.213, in *Eighteen Principal Upaniṣads* 1, ed. V.P. Limaye and R.D. Vadekar (Poona: Vaidika Saṁśodhana Maṇḍala, 1958).

In the Purāṇic symbolism of the eight forms, however, the *manah* is not represented by the moon but by the sacrificier; v for a full discussion, Agrawal, *Matsya Purāṇa*, pp.248ff.

comments at length in order to explain how this single macrocosmic ego can appear, as if individual, in every person. In addition to its previous remarks, the text now characterizes the ego in traditional fashion as coloring, or as Kṣemarājaḥ explains, delusionally creating a world like a blind man, forest fire or maddened elephant.¹

A much longer description (pp.387–431) follows of the plane of the intellect (*buddhiḥ*). The text mainly enumerates the worlds of assorted conceptual and mythic sets of eight, but does not, however, designate a central regent. The predominance of these octads derives not only, as before, from the model of the eight forms of Śivaḥ or the eight Vasavaḥ, but also from the concept of the (*puryaṣṭakam*), and from the eight dispositions (*bhāvāḥ*) associated with the intellect in Sāṃkhya tradition.

The first octad at the plane of the intellect comprises (pp.387–400) the archetypal worlds of the eight modes of divine existence. In hierarchical sequence, the text briefly describes each world, its regent, and his innumerable attendants. In the first (pp.388–389) red world of the piśācāḥ, Kakubham, reigns the regent Svanandaḥ; in the second (pp.390–391) dark blue world of the rakṣasāḥ, the regent Karālaḥ; in the third (pp.391–392) gold world of the yakṣāḥ, the regent Subhadraḥ; in the fourth (pp.392–393) bright yellow world of the gandharvāḥ, the regent Surūpaḥ; in the fifth (pp.393–395) white world of the bhūti-jāḥ or indrāḥ, the regent Vibhūtiḥ or Indraḥ; in the sixth (pp.395–396) the gleaming white world of the saumyāḥ, the supreme moon Amṛtaḥ; in the seventh (pp.396–397) the multicolored (*viśvarūpa-*) world of the viśvāḥ, the regent Prajēśaḥ or Amitadyutiḥ; in the eighth and last (pp.397–398) the white world of the brāhmāḥ, the regent Pitāmahaḥ or Brahmā. After this

¹ Cf. *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, 24, (Jāwaji, *The Sāṃkhya Kārikā* pp.346ff,) where similarly the function of the ego is *abhimānaḥ* (delusion).

enumeration, summary verses (pp.398–400) explain the presence of these divine existents both here and in the egg of Brahmā by restating the familiar theory of partial manifestation. Though never abandoning their supreme state, these existents can repeatedly assume, through the powers of Śivaḥ, limited lower forms.

In the middle of this extended description, there occurs (pp.400–401) a verse and a half, evidently interpolated by ritualists, that reconnect the cosmology to the framework of initiation. Cognizant in his own fashion of the function of these parenthetical remarks, Kṣemarājaḥ introduces them by observing that the narrating deity does not want the main subject matter (*prakṛtaṃ*) of the initiation via the worlds forgotten.¹ The first half verse indicates that using formulæ the officiant should purify the senses, and the sensory media and tripartite inner organ (*puryaṣṭakam*). The second verse indicates that after purifying the five octads, and the eight forms, and the intellect, he should purify the next octad of the angry rudrāḥ (*krodhaṣṭakam*). The mention of this last octad then smoothes the transition from this ritual aside back to the cosmological description.

The first half verse, in this parenthesis, probably came as an embedded fragment carried over from an earlier document that served as the source for the preceding description of the eight modes of divine existence. This half verse shows defective syntax, uses terms uncharacteristic of the surrounding material, and duplicates the content of the next verse.²

¹ V. his commentary, p.400: "*prastutabhuvanadikṣāyāṃ prakṛtaṃ mā vismārṣidityāśāyenāha.*"

² V. p.400, vs.975a: "*puryaṣṭakendriyaiḥ sārddhamātmā mantrairviśodhayet.*" Cf. the next verse (pp.400–401), which enjoins purification in more appropriate language.: "*pañcāṣṭakam*

Confronting this first half verse, later redactors probably added the second verse which harmonizes in language and content with the cosmology presented by previous sections, and more neatly picks up the disrupted narrative of properly Śaiva worlds.

Above lies (pp.401–402) the worlds of the octad of the angry rudrāḥ (*krodhaṣṭakam*). The text names these eight angry deities (*krodheśvarāḥ*) but not their overlord, indicated by Kṣemarājaḥ as Mahākrodhaḥ.¹ Above (pp.402–403) reside the fiery set of eight (*tejoṣṭakam*) or the fiery rudrāḥ

mūrtayo 'ṣṭau buddhitattvamanukramāt viśodhyaivaṃ prayatnena krodhāṣṭakamataḥ param." The use of the terms *ātmā* and *puryaṣṭakam* suggest the context of an earlier ritual from a school that conceived the microcosmic self to be built up with a smaller and different set of planes in the manner of the Sāṃkhyam. As another indication of the possible lifting from another source, the unsatisfactory syntax of this verse, and the anomalous accusative *ātmā*, which must be justified by Kṣemarājaḥ by emending the verb to a passive (*"viśodhyata iti tu spaṣṭaḥ pāṭhaḥ"*), contrast with the otherwise smooth description and correct language of surrounding sections. (V. the paraphrase of Abhinavaguptaḥ, M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ* 8, vs.235a, which avoids the difficulties of the verses in *Svacchandatantram*: "*jñātvaivaṃ śodhayedbuddhiṃ sārddham puryaṣṭakendriyaiḥ*." On this form for *ātmā*, v. Franklin Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar* (1953. Reprint. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1977), p.101, §17.54. Cf for the hypothesis of an earlier rite, the summary of pp.141ff.)

¹ Krodhaḥ is also one of the eight bhairavāḥ, who himself has a retinue of eight; these names, however, do not match those given for his retinue (cf. Rao, *Elements of Hindu Iconography* 2, 1, p.181.) The lists and locations of the rudrāḥ and bhairavāḥ in various texts appear unstable and interchangeable. Here, for example, without harmonizing the discrepancy, Kṣemarājaḥ quotes the names of these krodheśvarāḥ from the *Rurusamgrahaḥ* that differ from those of *Svacchandatantram*.

(*agnirudrāḥ*), in multicolored tortoise shaped worlds.¹ Then further on come the octad of exercise deities (*yogāṣṭakam*), whose crystalline worlds delight various exercitants.² The names of these hierarchically ranked worlds, according to Kṣemarājaḥ, correspond to the type of exercitant who attains them; thus, in the world called Vaiṣṇavam, for example, would be found exercitants who have followed the exercise taught in the Vaiṣṇava scriptures.³

The last pair of these worlds have the names Aumam and Śraikaṇṭham and presumably the regents, respectively, Umā and Śrikaṇṭhaḥ, whose descriptions therefore follow. Kṣemarājaḥ, however, interprets the following description of Umā (pp.405–423), and thus Śrikaṇṭhaḥ, as referring to a supreme manifestation located above the worlds of preceding octad.⁴

The text begins (pp.405–408) by describing her four chief attendants, and her retinue of aumāḥ or vaimānāḥ, and then proceeds (p.409–411) by enumerating her many incarnations as various goddesses in the egg of Brahmā. In addition, asides inserted in the dialogue frame have the narrating deity

¹ This description (p.403, vs.981b, "*kūrmākārāṇi citrāṇi*") repeats that given earlier (p.368, vs.895, "*purāṇi syuḥ kūrmākārāṇi*") for the worlds of the rudrāḥ attendents in the plane of the ego.

² Kṣemarājaḥ (p.404) attempts to harmonize a difference between *Svacchandatantram* and the *Mālinivijayottaratantram* (5, 24, p.29), which locates this octad at the level of matter (*pradhānam*).

³ V. his commentary, p.405: "*vaiṣṇavaśāstroktayogasevino vaiṣṇavapade.*"

⁴ Cf. Abhinavaguptaḥ, M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ* 8, vss.238–239.

expressly recognize that he is describing his partner and himself.¹ The mention of her consort, Umāpatiḥ, then leads to a description (pp.416–418) of him in his supreme aspect, and of his world, Sucāru, which lies beyond the world of Umā. The text also (pp.418–421) names and describes each of the seven mothers, who with Umā as the eighth, compose his innermost retinue, and then briefly (pp.421–423) sketches their fractional incarnations. Here a noteworthy verse, a probable later interpolation, (p.422) distinguishes their inferior forms who serve Umāpatiḥ, from their superior forms as svacchandāḥ, who serve Svacchandaḥ. By this aspectual distinction, redactors attempted to resolve the conflict, clarified in the same way by Kṣemarājaḥ, between the earlier role played by the seven mothers as the companions of Bhairavaḥ in the worship for the generation of the formulæ, and their role here as the companions of Umāpatiḥ.²

Above Umāpatiḥ dwells (pp.423–428) another octad, the eight forms (*aṣṭamūrtiḥ*) or lords of form (*mūrteśvarāḥ*). The text once again enumerates the overlords of the eight forms, and then after listing the eight forms themselves, explains, in now standard fashion, that their other, previous manifestations represent fractional incarnations of this highest set. In addition, concluding verses note that Umāpatiḥ has higher and lower forms, and identify Umāpatiḥ with the eight forms, and with

¹ V. p.408, vs.991: *"sāvatiryāṇḍamadhye tu mayā sārḍhaṃ varānane,"* and vs.1000, p.411: *"tvam devi sā . . . mām bhartāraṃ,"* and p.412, vs.1001: *"kailāsanilayaścāhaṃ tvayā sārḍhaṃ varānane."*

² Cf. the commentary of Kṣemarājaḥ in bk.1, pp.27–28, and here in bk.10, pp.420–422. V. supra section I.2.4 for this aspectual rationalization of scriptural conflict.

Śrikanṭhaḥ. The Śaiva exercise, they declare, combined with devotions and other virtues, bestows this world.

This concluding section, in correlating the world of Śrikanṭhaḥ or Umāpatiḥ to a type of sectarian exercise, reconnects to the section on the octad of exercise, which preceded the description of Umā and Umāpatiḥ. As noted previously, in his commentary on that section, Kṣemarājaḥ correlated the worlds in the octad of exercise to particular sectarian exercitants. These verses linking Śaiva exercise and the world of Śrikanṭhaḥ thus appear to logically belong with that earlier section. Evidently they became separated by the long descriptions of Umā and Umāpatiḥ. Redactors interpreted these interpolated descriptions not as those of the central regents of the worlds Aumam and Śraikanṭham in the octad of exercise, but as those of different regents in two different higher worlds. The traditional distinction between higher and lower aspects then rationalized this duplication. Further supporting this hypothesized duplication, the *Tantrālokaḥ* presents this simpler schema.¹ In identifying Umāpatiḥ and Śrikanṭhaḥ, the verses before the displaced verses on Śaiva exercise, (p.426) provide a transition from the interpolated descriptions back to the cosmological narrative. Finally, redactors appear to have added the last verse (p.428) in the verses lauding Śaiva exercise, in order to compensate for the displacement of Śrikanṭhaḥ to a higher level.²

¹ V. M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ* 8, vss.264ff. Following the *Mālinīvijayottara-tantram* (5, 24, p.29), as noted previously, the octad of exercise appears in the plane of the constituents.

² V. pp.427-428, vss.1037-1038: "bhaktyā ca brahmacaryeṇa satyeṇa ca damena ca / dr̥ṣtvā dehasṭhamātmānam te 'tra yānti maṇiṣiṇaḥ // dr̥ṣtvā ca maṇḍalam tasya bhaktyā parayā bhr̥ṣam / muktadvaita yatātmānastatra yānti maṇiṣiṇaḥ." These verses

Beyond these, the text continues, reside (pp.428–431) the twelve *suśivāḥ*.¹ As indicated by the name of their regent, Virabhadraḥ, this group of *Suśivāḥ* apparently represents a variation on the set of eleven *rudrāḥ*.² Just as for the preceding

primarily differ by the added characterization in the second verse of the exercitants as “*muktadvaitā*,” having duality removed. Redactors apparently intended to elevate this exercise, since it now focusses on Śrikanṭhaḥ as Umāpatiḥ, who has been identified as an aspect of Svachchandaḥ. This phrase also occurs in *Tantrālokaḥ*, (M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ* 8, vs.247a) and both Jayarathaḥ and Kṣemarājaḥ have interpreted it differently. Jayarathaḥ (p.170) glosses “*muktadvaitā*” as referring to the isolation given by Sāṃkhya practice (“*muktadvaitā iti sāmṅhyādikrameṇa labdhakaivalyāḥ*”); Kṣemarājaḥ (p.428) glosses it as recognition that Umāpatiḥ is the highest reality, but then qualifies it as referring only to the preliminary recognition conveyed by the first, lower level initiation (*samayadikṣā*): (“*samayadikṣām prāpya tadbhaktiā ca muktadvaitā ityumāpatireva ekā pāramārthiki devateti niścitya tatsevārtham prayatacittāḥ*”). Since Kṣemarājaḥ himself (p.405) correlated the attainment of the putatively lower Śraikanṭham world, with the Śaivasiddhāntin or dualistic exercise (“... *śraikanṭham ca dhāma śaivasiddhāntopadiṣṭaśaktiśaktimadārādhanapurāḥsaracittavṛtti-nirodhātmakanispannānām prāptipadam*.”), according to his own logic, a higher, non-dualistic exercise should bestow this level. The implication of this interpretation, whether surviving from an earlier presentation of this octad or introduced from a redactorial addition, obviously must be overridden by later commentators, however, because the intellect, where these deities reside, belongs, for their system, in the lower sphere of impure or of dualistic planes of existence.

¹ V. p.428, vs.1039: “*teṣāṃ caivopariṣṭāt*” Paraphrasing *Svacchandatantram*, Abhinavaguptaḥ (M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ* 8, vs.249) interprets “these” (*teṣāṃ*) as referring to the eight forms of Śivaḥ (“*mūrtyaṣṭakopariṣṭāt*”).

² V. for the first description and names of Virabhadraḥ, and the eleven *rudrāḥ*, pp.268–272, vss.647–659. On p.271, Kṣemarājaḥ quotes *Mālinīvijayottaratantram* 5, 14, which has a different set of eleven *rudrāḥ*, two of whose names, Anantaḥ and Sarvavidyādhīpaḥ, correspond to those of the *suśivāḥ* (p.429,

worlds, the text indicates that exercitants who meditate on Virabhadraḥ can attain his world. Above lies (pp.430–431) another set of eight, the mahādevāḥ, listed and then characterized by the text as free from Māyā. In the scheme presented by this text, however, this octad actually lies below Māyā, and therefore this characterization as free from Māyā must reflect a holdover from another context. Recognizing this discrepancy, Kṣemarājaḥ qualifies this characterization and, giving further evidence that it reflects a holdover, distinguishes this set from comparable sets of mahādevāḥ found at higher levels and in other texts.¹

At this point, the text finishes enumerating the regents in the plane of the intellect, which number sixty-two according to Kṣemarājaḥ, and begins describing (pp.431–440) the next plane of the constituents (*guṇāḥ*). The ritual officiant must purify all sixty-two worlds, Kṣemarājaḥ argues, in the extended initiation procedure described in this book; in the earlier abbreviated procedure, in contrast, he purifies only four sets of eight.² In this way, by appealing to optional variations in ritual, Kṣemarājaḥ

vs.1040), Vidyānāmadhipaḥ and Anantaḥ. They are also described here (vs.1042a) as residing in multicolored conch shaped worlds (*"bhuvaneṣu vicitreṣu śaṅkhākāreṣu saṁsthitāḥ"*), similar to those described throughout the text as the habitation of the rudrāḥ. Cf. p.6, vs.9b: *"bhuvaneṣu vicitreṣu yonyākāreṣu saṁsthitāḥ"*). The number twelve might also be modelled on other mythological sets of the twelve, such as the ādityāḥ or tuṣitāḥ.

¹ V his commentary, p.431: *"ete ca apareṇa rūpeṇehoktā maṇḍaleśvarāḥ pareṇa rūpeṇa tu kālatattve bhaviṣyanti."*

² V. bk.5, p.35: *"buddhau . . . devayonikrodhatejoyogāṣṭakāni catvāri bhuvanāni."*

explains a possible contradiction in dogma or cosmology. Similarly, he explains the absence from other texts of a separate constituent plane by the same ritual variations.¹ This text, in presenting the extended ritual procedure, describes the constituents as a separate plane instead of as a part of the plane of matter, as usual in the established Śaiva lists of planes. This appeal to ritual variation, therefore, enables Kṣemarājaḥ to harmonize otherwise problematic differences between the cosmology of *Svacchandatantram* and of other scriptures and systematic Śaivism.

In each of the constituents, located in ascending order, resides a series of masters (*gurupanktiḥ*): thirty-two in *tamaḥ*; thirty in *rajaḥ*; and finally, twenty-one in *sattvam*. The text names them all and characterizes them as *rudrāḥ*, who have three eyes and reside in elephant shaped worlds, and who are freed from transmigration (*saṃsāraḥ*) and delusion (*mahāmohaḥ*). Their names combine those of traditional deities, such as Yamaḥ, and those of texts and formulæ, such as Atharvavedaḥ and Svāhā.

After the enumeration of presiding deities in the plane of the constituents, a pair of verses (pp.438–440), in a redactorial aside, tally up the worlds from intellect to matter. And, in addition to these two hundred and seven, they note, there exist other worlds, interiorized in them, but not discussed here. Kṣemarājaḥ interprets this as referring to the regents of the worlds of error (*viparyayaḥ*), ability (*śaktiḥ*), and so forth, the members of the intellectual emanation (*pratyayasargaḥ*) of classical Sāṃkhya texts, who dwell, in the scheme of *Svacchandatantram*,

¹ V. his commentary, p.432: “*iha tu vitatatayā bhauvanavidhipratipādanasya prastutatvātprakṛtitattvādbhedena gunatattvaṃ darśitamiti nāgamavisamvādaḥ śaṅkaniyah*.” Both Kṣemarājaḥ and Abhinavaguptaḥ (M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ* 8, vss.253b–260a) explain that the constituents have as their essential function introducing a disequilibrium into the uniformity of matter in order to induce the variety of lower manifestation.

personified in the higher plane of the person (*puruṣaḥ*).

Kṣemarājaḥ interprets this remark, therefore, as an anticipatory answer to objections that, following the Sāṃkhya model, the intellectual emanation should occur not at the plane of the person, but at the plane of the intellect.

Next, for the plane of matter (*pradhānam*) the text briefly names the set of eight regent rudrāḥ, and characterizes matter as the supreme summit (*parā kāṣṭhā*) of the constituents.¹ Then there follows, more extensively described (pp.441–460), the plane of the person (*puruṣaḥ*). The first worlds (pp.441–443) comprise the nine satisfactions (*tuṣṭiḥ*) and the eight perfections (*siddhiḥ*).² These worlds, which consist only of consciousness, Kṣemarājaḥ explains, function as supports (*āśrayāṇi*) or phases in the limiting transformation of supreme consciousness by contraction. The person, he argues, is not only a passive witness, as in classical Sāṃkhya, but an active, although limited, knower. In the view of his school, the person does not have to depend on the intellect to know, and thus these attributes, the ideal or intellectual emanation (*pratyayasargaḥ*), belong to it, and not, as in the Sāṃkhya view, to the intellect. Thus while following the Sāṃkhya for the rest of his exegesis, Kṣemarājaḥ uses this seemingly minor disagreement between the Sāṃkhya and Śaiva

¹ Kṣemarājaḥ then (p.441) interprets this characterization as stating that the constituents are in equilibrium, or undivided in matter (*avibhāgāvasthā*).

² The feminine names differ slightly from those given in Gauḍapāda's commentary on the *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, 50, 51, pp.61ff, in *Les Strophes de Sāṃkhya (Sāṃkhyakārikā) avec le commentaire de Gauḍapāda*, ed. and trans., Anne-Marie Esnoul (Collection Émile Senart, Paris: Societe d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1964).

scriptures to sharply distinguish their fundamental philosophical positions.¹

The eight powers, miniaturization (*aṇimā*), and so forth, produced by Śaiva exercise, furnish the next (pp.443–444) set of worlds. Then come (pp.444–449) three series of masters and disciples, correlated just like the previous series of masters with the three constituents.² Twenty-two comprise the *tamaḥ* related set, twenty-five, the *rajaḥ* related, and finally, twenty, the *sattvam*. The names of combine those of traditional sages, such as Kaśyapaḥ in the first set, and those of deities, such as Umāpatiḥ in the third set.

Above these three sets, the text lists (pp.449–450) eight regents, who rule over the eight main channels (*nāḍi*) of the

¹ As noted above, Kṣemarājaḥ, however, had interpreted a verse of *Svacchandatantram* (p.440, vs.1065b) as stating that the regents and worlds of the intellectual emanation, though not stated, are found in the plane of the intellect: “*antarbhutāḥ sthitāścānye ye te noktā varānane’ viparyayāśaktitustisiddhyādibhuvaneśvarā ye brhattantreṣu rudrā uktāḥ te ’traivāntarbhūtāt tvātpṛthagīha noktāḥ*.” Thus, he does not dispute the existence of the intellectual emanation at the plane of the intellect, but only its restriction to this level. He harmonizes this difference in the location of the intellectual emanation by distinguishing, as usual, between higher and lower aspects. Thus, that at the intellect would be gross, at the person, subtle, and in Māyā supreme. V. his commentary, p.475: “*pūrvameva puruṣatattvanirūpaṇāvasare ... tuṣṭisiddhyādyā ... te iha pararūpeṇa avasthitā ... buddhitattve tu tuṣṭisiddhyādayaḥ ... sthularūpāḥ sthitāḥ*.”

² Kṣemarājaḥ explains this seemingly incongruous repetition of the constituents at the level of the person, as due to the person’s contact as enjoyer (*bhoktā*) with the enjoyed (*bhogyam*), which consists of the three constituents, and therefore brings the person into contact with their shadow. V. his commentary, p.444: “*bhogyasāmānyaguṇatrayabhokṛtvātpuṃso ’pi tadguṇatrayacchāyā-yogādguṇavattvam*.”

microcosm.¹ Beyond them come (pp.450–451) another octad of regents of the body (*vigrahaḥ*). Kṣemarājaḥ explains this set of abstractions as referring to subtle forms of the tutelary deities previously enumerated for lower planes. Thus, for example, means of realization (*sādhanaṃ*) stands for the three tutelary deities of the tripartite internal organ (*antaḥkāraṇam*).²

The text then announces that it will next enumerate the bonds of the body (*dehapāśāḥ*). In the same way as for the preceding two sets, Kṣemarājaḥ explains this group as referring to subtle counterparts or tutelary deities of the body's components. Since these factors construct the gross and subtle bodies that bind the person in transmigration, they are called bonds. Continuing its enumeration of these factors, the text enumerates (pp.451–452) the sub-components of the first of the dispositions (*bhāvāḥ*), order (*dharmaḥ*).³ As additional factors, the text then (pp.452–454) restates the sixteen planes from the sensory media to the perceptual organ, qualified at the start to avoid confusion, as in their supreme form.

The text then continues with an enumeration of the eight dispositions (*bhāvāḥ*), characterized by the text just like the

¹ The verse calls these regents *vidyā*, which, as noted previously, usually means in this text a female formula. V. section II.5 for the notes to bk.5, p.3, on the Vidyārājaḥ. Cf. Jayarathaḥ (M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ* 8, p.193) who simply explains them as the tutelary deities: “*nādirūpāśca tā vidyāstadadhiṣṭhātṛdevatā ityārthaḥ*.”

² The text, as noted previously, only mentions one of these abstractions, the instrument (*karaṇam*), during its enumeration of the lower planes. (V. supra the notes to the summaries of pp.379–383)

³ Kṣemarājaḥ, if not the text itself, here follows the teaching of the Sāṃkhyam, that the subtle body requires the dispositions (*bhāvāḥ*) for its existence. V. *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, 52, in Jāwaji, *The Sāṃkhya Kārikā*, pp.447ff.

Sāmkhyam as qualities of the intellect. Confronted with this apparent holdover from an earlier context, Kṣemarājaḥ, therefore, must once again explain that here in the plane of the person, these dispositions occur in a supreme form.¹ Also since the text repeats the first disposition, order, which had occurred just before, Kṣemarājaḥ must justify the repetition by interpreting the first as a different factor.²

Continuing the restatement of planes, the text then (pp.455–456) lists the ego in its tripartite forms; the modifying (*vaikārikam*), the fiery (*aijasaṃ*), and the first of the elements (*bhūtādīḥ*). The earlier discussion of the ego, however, contained no reference to these forms. This discrepancy, therefore, provides further evidence that when constructing this section on the plane of the person, compilers used a source different from those used earlier.³ Then, either as a holdover from this earlier source, or less likely, a redactorial aside, some verses (pp.455–456) then prescribe the purification during initiation of the three constituents and of the sensory media. Kṣemarājaḥ interprets this apparently

¹ V. vs.1092a, p.452: “*parabhāvena saṁsthitān . . .*” Kṣemarājaḥ, however, must qualify (pp.452–453) this qualification, however, since these dispositions recur a third time at Māyā: “*prāguktasthūlarūpāpekṣayā parabhāvena sūkṣmeṇa rūpeṇa sthitānityarthaḥ pararūpatayā tu māyāyām bhaviṣyanti.*” Cf. supra the notes to pp.441ff.

² V. his commentary, p.454, referring to vs.1091, p.452: “*prāguktādahimsāderdharmādayamanyo dharma iṣṭāpūrtalakṣaṇaḥ.*”

³ Kṣemarājaḥ harmonizes (pp.454–455) this material by interpreting these three forms of the ego as the sensory media, inner organ, and outer organ, which reside at the level of the person in subtle form, and which are manifestations of the first three of the traditional four circles of powers, the *bhūcari-*, *dikcari-*, and *gocarīcakraṇi*, of which the last, *khecari-* represents the subsequent levels of the *kañcukam*. On these energies, v. Kṣemarāja's *Śivasūtravimarśinī*, commentary on *sūtra*, 22, and note 2, pp.79–80 in Jaideva Singh, ed. and trans., *Śiva Sūtras. The Yoga of Supreme Identity* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1979).

incomplete and repetitious prescription as actually indicating the purification of subtle planes different from those previously enumerated. Though included but not discussed before, in the abbreviated initiation via worlds, the text states them separately here, he argues, because it is presenting the extended initiation procedure.

The list of bonds continues (pp.456-457) with a set of twenty-seven, consisting mainly of vices, such as lust (*kāmaḥ*), termed by the text adventitious or acquired (*āgantuka-*). Kṣemarājaḥ contrasts this set with the preceding bonds, which, he explains, are innate or congenital (*sahaja-*).¹ After these, the text names (pp.457-458) the members of two pairs of octads, the gaṇeśāḥ and the vidyeśāḥ.² Connecting these octads to the preceding sets of factors, concluding verses (pp.458-460) designating them as bonds, which also must be purified in initiation. At this point, Kṣemarājaḥ tallies up the total number of one hundred and ninety-seven worlds or bonds in this plane. A final verse declares that when all bonds, stated either in this text

¹ This list appears to present in one condensed set, selected items related to the various subgroups of the *pratyayasargaḥ* of the Sāṃkhyam, (V. *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, 46ff, Jāwaji, *The Sāṃkhya Kārikā*, pp.410ff.). Similarly, the contrast between adventitious or acquired (*āgantuka-*) and innate or congenital (*sahaja-*), parallels the Sāṃkhya distinction between original (*sāṃsiddhika-*), and acquired (*vaikṛtika-*) dispositions. (V. *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, 43, Jāwaji, *The Sāṃkhya Kārikā*, pp.402ff.)

² This group represents an inferior form of the group of vidyeśvarāḥ, with the same names and located with a supreme form in the plane of Īśvarāḥ. V. Kṣemarāja's commentary on vs.1161, p.493: "*te ca vidyātattvagatā api atra pareṇa rūpeṇa sthitāḥ.*"

or in others, become pure, then the person (*pudgalaḥ*) becomes liberated.¹

II.10.5 The Śaiva Worlds

The text then begins the discussion of the planes that in systematic Śaivism make up the jacket (*kañcukaḥ*), which represents the ways in which higher consciousness restricts or limits itself for lower forms of manifestation. In the first of these (pp.460–462), Niyatiḥ or restriction, the text names a set of twelve śaṅkarāḥ. Verses compare the self to a lotus, which has Niyatiḥ for the leaves, the ego for a stamen, and the intellect for a pericarp. According to Kṣemarājaḥ, this image represents the process by which awareness becomes localized and individualized through the ego, intellect, and the action of Niyatiḥ upon the leaves, which symbolize not Niyatiḥ but the rest of the organs.

Following the standard sequence, in the next plane (pp.462–463) of Kālaḥ or time, the text names ten śivāḥ described in contrast to the preceding golden śaṅkarāḥ, as crystalline rudrāḥ inhabiting tortoise shaped worlds. In Rāgaḥ or passion (pp.463–464), the text names a set of eight viśāḥ, and also a set of ten rudrāḥ, divided into five disciples and five masters.² Beyond in the

¹ Kṣemarājaḥ explains (p.460) that these other bonds stated in other texts, are emotions such as pleasure (*ratih*), humor (*hāsaḥ*), and so forth, stated in other texts such as the *Nāṭyaśāstram*.

² At this point, Kṣemarājaḥ offers his clarification of the association between these sets of rudrāḥ and planes; like the preceding rudrāḥ śaṅkarāḥ and śivāḥ, whose pacific names, by implication, reflect an attempt to pacify their violent nature, so the viśāḥ, or heroic lords, he explains, have these appropriate names because of the difficulty in getting past them to higher levels of awareness. V. his commentary, p.464: “*yathā niyatikālagatā rudrāḥ śaṅkarāḥ śivāścoktāḥ tathā ete viśā ucyante duṣpariharatvāccaivamuktāḥ*. In a similar fashion, he explains the attribute very strong (*mahābala-*) characterizing the rudrāḥ at the

plane of Vidyā or knowledge (pp.465–466) reside a set of nine powers (*śaktiḥ*). Though their names occur here in the masculine, as Vāmaḥ, and so forth, Kṣemarājaḥ interprets them as powers, and indicates that as normal for powers they elsewhere appear with feminine names.¹ Then, in Kalā or limited agency (pp.466–467), there resides a brilliant triad of mahadevāḥ (*mahādevatrayam*), Mahādevaḥ, Mahātejā, Mahājyotiḥ. A half verse states that this concludes only a summary (*samāseṇa*) description of Kalā, which indicates, according to Kṣemarājaḥ omission of the eight mahadevāḥ in their supreme form, who previously were enumerated in the plane of the intellect.²

Kṣemarājaḥ summarizes the function of the jacket, which like the husk of rice forms the first covering of the person. Then text closes (p.468) this section with some additional verses that describe the appearance of the rudrāḥ and of their worlds in these planes. Then there follows (pp.468–481) a longer section on the plane of Māyā. After a verse briefly describing Māyā as the manifestations of the lower path of the universe, the text names (pp.461–471) the twelve chief rudrāḥ of this plane. Six reside in the lower hole (*putaḥ*) of Māyā, five in the upper hole, and one,

plane of Māyā (p.469): *"mahābalā iti paramēśajñānaṃ vinā duṣpariharāḥ."*

¹ In M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ* 8, vs.297. While Kṣemarājaḥ notes and respects the textual differences, Jayarathaḥ, typically, in his commentary on *Tantrālokaḥ*, argues for adopting the feminine reading because of its general acceptance. V. M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ* 8, p.204: *"atra ca stripāṭha eva sādhumahājanaḥ parigrhītatvāt."* Kṣemarājaḥ later explains them as the gross form of the set found, with normal feminine names, in the plane of Mahāvidyā. V. his commentary, p.485: *"ye tu pūrvamaśuddhavidyāyā vāmādayo nava devāḥ strīṅgapāṭhādvāmādyā vā nava śaktaya uktāḥ te etadaṃśāvatārarūpāḥ sthulā boddhavyāḥ."*

² Kṣemarājaḥ indicates that this list should conform with that given earlier of the eight mahadevāḥ (p.430, vss.1043a–1045b).

Anantaḥ, in the middle. Kṣemarājaḥ notes differences between *Svacchandatantram* and other scriptures over the number, names, and locations of these rudrāḥ, but does not attempt to resolve them. In addition, the text describes this centrally located Anantaḥ as a kind of demiurge, ruling over the entire lower universe, and emanating souls at higher or lower levels by his powers of grace (*anugrahaḥ*) or punishment (*nigrahaḥ*).

A transitional verse (p.472) declares this division of rudrāḥ to be the first, and then proceeds (pp.473–474) to enumerate another division, having one Rudraḥ, Gopatiḥ in a lower node (*granthaḥ*), five rudrāḥ in an upper node, and, once again, Anantaḥ, in the center. Elaborating upon the rudimentary schema given by the text, Kṣemarājaḥ indicates that Māyā has not only a basic structure of two cavities and a node with their respective rudrāḥ, but also, in the node itself, a secondary structure of three divisions with their respective rudrāḥ. These divisions, correlated to hyper-subtle forms of the constituents, correspond in the microcosm to a triple structure in the palate.¹ The differences in scriptural accounts of the structure of Māyā, however, suggest that Kṣemarāja's interpretation represents an attempt to rationalize a partially repetitious conflation in *Svacchandatantram* of once separate accounts.²

The text then begins (pp.475–479) to enumerate other sets established in the plane of Māyā. First come the bonds, which, the text states, were previously discussed. Kṣemarājaḥ interprets

¹ On the significance of this structure in the palate, v. infra the notes to the summary of p.499.

² As evidence of these disparities, Kṣemarājaḥ (p.474) expressly refutes an alternative interpretation of Bhullakaḥ, who correlated these two structures to different branches of knowledge of Śiva, or of the scripture. For a summary of the complex views on the structure of Māyā, according to the *Śivatanuśāstram*, v. M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ* 8, vss.298b–325.

this as referring to the members of the intellectual emanation, such as the nine contentments, in the plane of the person, here established in a supreme form. In the same way, he interprets the next set stated, that of the lineage of sages (*ṛṣikulam*), as referring to the supreme form of the series of masters also established earlier in the plane of the person. Next comes the queen of speech (*vāgīśvari*), in, according to Kṣemarājaḥ, an intermediate, subtle form. Then follows a set of five, named for designations of the Praṇavaḥ, and interpreted by differing traditions reported by Kṣemarājaḥ, as of either rudrāḥ or of sages. After these come a set of eight rudrāḥ, called means of knowledge (*pramāṇāni*), and having the names, according to Kṣemarājaḥ of Pāśupata scriptures.¹ The text then describes the reigning chief rudrāḥ of this plane, in standard fashion, as three eyed, carrying tridents, adorned with ascetic's braid and moon-crest, and surrounded by hordes of attendant rudrāḥ inhabiting pleasure worlds shaped like female organs (*yonyākara*).²

Above these groups in the node and in the plane of Māyā, resides (pp.479–481) the power (*śaktiḥ*) of Māyā herself, described as the deluder (*vimohini*) of all creatures. Among the deluded, the text singles out for condemnation those who erroneously seek liberation through logic, for only the sword of Śaiva initiation, it asserts, can cut through the node or knot of Māyā blocking the path to liberation. Kṣemarājaḥ interprets this initiation noetically,

¹ For a suggestion that these represent the name of actual texts, v. Brunner-Lachaux, "The Pāśupatas as seen by the Śaivas," p.516.

² The description of their worlds (pp.478–479, vs.1138): "*bhuvaneṣu vicitreṣu yonyākāreṣu saṁsthitāḥ*") exactly repeats the language used to describe the worlds of the Anantaḥ at the base of the egg of Brahmā. (vs.9b, p.6): "*bhuvaneṣu vicitreṣu yonyākāreṣu saṁsthitāḥ*"). This suggests that a single mythic Anantaḥ, a great rudra lord, has served as the basis for later figures, having related functions, but located at different cosmological levels.

as removing the fundamental ignorance caused by Māyā, and thus opening access to the next plane (pp.482-487), of Mahāvidyā or the great knowledge.¹

The text also lauds Mahāvidyā as the supreme Queen of speech (*vāgīśvari*), and the matrix (*mātrkā*) that divides into the eight classes of sounds (*vargaḥ*). Thus, as her name indicates, Mahāvidyā forms the source not only of all knowledge (*vidyā*), but also of all formulæ, both the great female (*vidyā*) and innumerable male (*mantraḥ*). The nine powers, Vāmā, and so forth, constitute the worlds, in this plane.² They are extremely powerful, five-faced, three-eyed, brilliant gold in color, and surrounded by crores of attendant formulæ, who delight in lotus shaped worlds. In addition, the text lists a set of seven Vidyārājñyaḥ, or queens of the *vidyā*, who rule over, as Kṣemarājaḥ explains, the legions of not only *vidyāḥ* but also *mantrāḥ* formulæ in this plane. Then concluding this section, the text enjoins that all these be purified at the time of initiation.

The next section discusses the plane of Īśvaraḥ (pp.488-508), said to be outside (*bāhye*), that is, according to Kṣemarājaḥ, pervading and surrounding the plane of Mahāvidyā. In his introductory commentary, Kṣemarājaḥ presents the interpretation of these higher planes from the perspective of systematic Śaivism, where they represent stages in the self-objectifying of the absolute subjectivity of the supreme Śivaḥ.³ Though, undoubtedly, a developed philosophical viewpoint has structured these higher planes, it lies only implicitly in the presentation of

¹ Often called Śuddhavidyā, or pure knowledge.

² As noted, the earlier set (p.465), Vamaḥ, etc., in Vidyā, represent a gross, partial, incarnation of this supreme set of powers.

³ For this systematic exposition consult Kṣemarāja's own *Pratyabhijñāhṛdayam*, sūtra, 1, 2, 3, and commentary, in Singh, ed. and trans., *Pratyabhijñāhṛdayam*, pp.45ff.

Svacchandatantram itself, which directed to practical use, contains few explicit philosophical statements.

In this plane, the text first (pp.488–495) describes Īśvaraḥ, seated on a gigantic lotus of formulæ, and in the form of the traditional peaceful, moon crested (*candraśekharamūrtiḥ*) Śivaḥ, white, with five faces and ten arms, and making the gestures of boon-bestowing and fearlessness.¹ Vidyā rests on his lap, and the eight vidyeśvarāḥ, listed by name, surround him.² Kṣemarājaḥ quotes a long extract from the *Śivatānuśāstram*, describing the function of these eight vidyeśvarāḥ, as the retinue of the ruling Anantaḥ here in his supreme aspect as Īśvaraḥ.³

There follows a description of additional worlds (pp.495–497) located successively higher in this plane; first, the realm of form (*rūpāvaraṇam*), consisting of four rudrāḥ who are the positive dispositions, Dharmāḥ, etc.; second, the subtle realm (*sūkṣmāvaraṇam*), consisting of the three powers, Vāmā, Jyeṣṭhā, and Raudrī. The text then describes the crores of formulæ which surround these powers, and which resemble rudrāḥ with three-eyes and tridents, living in innumerable and marvelous worlds. A verse then (p.497) declares that in order to worship this god, one worships these formulæ in rituals. Kṣemarājaḥ interprets this statement to indicate that when a worshipper, while conscious of its pervading or equivalent deity uses a formula, it bestows that deity, or in this case, Īśvaraḥ.⁴ Similarly, the following verse

¹ V. Rao, *Elements of Hindu Iconography* 2, 1, pp.123ff.

² For a description of their appearance v. Rao, *Elements of Hindu Iconography* 2, .2, pp.392ff.

³ V. pp.494–495. Also quoted at length by Abhinavaguptaḥ in M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ* 8, vss.345–355a.

⁴ To reinforce this statement, Kṣemarājaḥ quotes (p.497) the *Bhagavadgītā* (9.27): “*yatkarosi yadaśnāsi yajjuhoṣi dadāsi yat / yattapasyasi kaunteya tatkuruṣva madarpaṇam*,” and emphasizes

(pp.498-499) then declares that those who carry out the Pāśupata observance (*vratam*) reach the level of Īśvaraḥ.

Another verse of this section then declares that Īśvaraḥ exercises the entitlement (*adhikāraḥ*) through the power of Śivaḥ. Kṣemarājaḥ, naturally, interprets this statement as confirming his previous interpretation quoted from the *Śivatānusāstram* equating Īśvaraḥ with the supreme form of the rudraḥ Anantaḥ, who holds sway over the entire lower emanation of the cosmos. Then (p.499), a verse seemingly concludes this section by indicating that at initiation the worlds at this level should be purified in the region above the palate. This reconnection by the text to the microcosmic itinerary of the formula meditation, then occasions Kṣemarājaḥ to recapitulate all the major correspondences between meditative locus and macrocosmic sphere.¹

the higher aspect of the formulæ employed in the ritual: "*nyāyena karmaviṣaye tamiśvaramārādhayitumete parivārarūpā mantrāḥ pūjyante . . .*" (V. J.A.B. van Buitenen, ed. and trans., *The Bhagavadgītā in the Mahābhārata* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1981), 31[9].27, p.106.)

¹ V. his commentary, p.500: "*tena brahmāṇḍagatāni bhuvanāni hṛdviśrāntyā jalādiprakṛtyantagatāni kaṇṭhaviśrāntyā prakṛtyādimāyāntagatāni tāluviśrāntyā tadūrdhvapadaviśrāntyā śuddhavidyātattvagatāni bhuvanāni śodhanīyāni / evaṃ lalāṭa-brahmarandhravyāpinipadaviśrāntyā sadāśivaśaktiśivatattvagatāni vakṣyamāṇāni bhuvanāni śodhanīyāni.*" (. . . whereby, the worlds located in the egg of Brahmā, by a repose in the heart; [the worlds] from water to basic matter, by a repose in the throat; [the worlds] from basic matter to Māyā by a repose in the palate; the worlds located at the level of Śuddhavidyā by a repose at the stage above the palate, should be purified. Similarly, by a repose at the stages of the forehead, the aperture of Brahmā, and Vyāpini, the worlds located at the levels of Sadāśivaḥ, Śaktiḥ, and Śivaḥ, which will be discussed, are purified.) Earlier (p.472), Kṣemarājaḥ used this micro-macrocosmic correspondence to explain the node structure of Māyā: "*asau susūkṣmatamasattvarajastamorūpatayā ūrdhvamadhyādharaग्रन्थibhedena tālुग्रन्थisamānarūpeṇa tridhā avasthitāḥ.*"

The preceding concluding verse, which directed the purification of the worlds in the plane of Īśvaraḥ, set their number at fifteen. Kṣemarājaḥ interprets these as including not only the worlds already discussed of Īśvaraḥ, and the of vidyeśvarāḥ, and so forth, but also the worlds about to be described in the following section, from the pure realm (*suddhāvaraṇam*) up to the realm of Suśivaḥ. *Tantrālokaḥ*, in contrast, apparently includes these worlds in the realm of Sadāśivaḥ.¹ Most probably, the cosmological schema presented by *Svacchandatantram* reflects an earlier and composite picture of upper worlds not yet standardized into the Śaiva model of five higher planes. The differing interpretations of Kṣemarājaḥ and Abhinavaguptaḥ result from alternative attempts at this standardization.²

¹ V. M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ* 8, vss.357b-358a:
"aiśātsādāśivam jñānakriyāyugalamaṇḍitam //
śuddhāvaraṇamityāhuḥ "

² Although both solutions might be logically acceptable, unlike Abhinavaguptaḥ who can present a harmonizing interpretation selected from many scriptures, Kṣemarāja's interpretation, as befitting a commentary on one scripture taken as the paramount authority, must adhere more closely to the problematic wording, sequence, and enumeration of *Svacchandatantram* alone. Jayarathaḥ (M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ* 8, pp.240-241) simply emends the readings of *Svacchandatantram* on the basis of other texts and then attributes these, in his view, defective readings to Kṣemarājaḥ (" . . . uddyotakāradṛṣṭaḥ pāṭhaḥ punarasādhurmahājanaira-parigrhitatvāt. ").

Supporting the interpretation of Abhinavaguptaḥ, Jayarathaḥ (p.237, "*vidyeśānāmaṣtau bhuvanāni*") counts the eight worlds of the vidyeśvarāḥ, for example, as separate, to reach the appropriate total indicated by the first injunction to purify. (V. p.499, vss.1171b-1172a: "*daśa pañca ca śodhyāni bhuvanāniśvare . . . dikṣākāle.* "). Kṣemarājaḥ (p.499), in contrast, interprets the verse as using world (*bhuvanam*) to mean realm (*āvaraṇam*), and thus counts this set of eight as a single unit, so that he can include in his total the realms to be stated up to the second injunction to purify the plane of Īśvaraḥ (V. p.506, vs.1185, which enjoins that a total of

Thus after preliminarily indicating the purification of the plane of Īśvaraḥ, the text describes (pp.500–508) additional upper worlds in this plane. There come in order; first, the realm of Śuddhaḥ, which has the pair of powers, Jñānam and Kriyā; second, the realm, supplied by Kṣemarājaḥ, of Vidyā, which has the pair of powers Bhāvaḥ and Abhāvaḥ; third, Pramāṇam, which has Tejśaḥ and Dhruveśaḥ; fourth, Mānaḥ, which has four rudrāḥ; fifth, Suśuddhaḥ, and three rudrāḥ; sixth, Śivaḥ, and one rudrarājaḥ, Dhruvaḥ; seventh, Mokṣaḥ, and eleven rudrāḥ, said to be located, microcosmically, above the palate; eighth, Dhruvaḥ, and one rudrāḥ of the same name; ninth, Icchā, which includes the triad of powers, Vāmā, Jyeṣṭhā, Raudrī, giving four; tenth, Prabuddhaḥ, and eight rudrāḥ; eleventh, Samayaḥ, and five rudrāḥ. A summary verse (p.506) then concludes this section, tallying up fifty-nine worlds in the plane of Īśvaraḥ to be purified above the palate at the time of initiation.

In standard fashion, Kṣemarājaḥ rationalizes the repetitions in this list, the multiple Dhruvaḥ, for example, as various higher and lower aspects of the same form. Embedded in this series of worlds, stray microcosmic correspondences, give further evidence that the higher planes presented by the text, represent macrocosmic projections of formula meditations.¹

fifty-nine worlds should be purified "*ekonasaṣṭirbhuvanam . . . dikṣākāle viśodhayet*." To reconcile these two injunctions, he counts the worlds here (p.506) separately, and, for example, enumerates the set of eight vidyeśvaraḥ as indicating eight worlds.) As Jayarathaḥ notes (p.243), this interpretation of Kṣemarājaḥ has *Svacchandatantram* indicating the purification of the plane of Īśvaraḥ twice (*anyathā hi ubhayatrāpi Īśvaratattvopasaṃhāragranthasya vyāghātaḥ . . .*"), which, however, appears to be the case.

¹ The number, complexity, and repetition of these worlds might further indicate that they represent combinations or survivals from practices that distinguished gradations in the ascent of formulæ different from that later standardized in the Śaiva initiation ritual.

After a brief description (pp.507–508) of the innumerable attendant rudrāḥ that surround each of these worlds, another section begins on the realm of Suśivāḥ (pp.508–520), which marks the beginning of the plane of Sadāśivāḥ, and in which Sadāśivāḥ resides.¹ This Sadāśivāḥ, Kṣemarājaḥ explains, actually represents an inferior Sadāśivāḥ, equivalent to the regent Suśivāḥ of this realm. Here Kṣemarājaḥ recognizes that although the text proceeds to describe this figure without qualification as if Sadāśivāḥ, it later describes another Sadāśivāḥ at a higher level.² In order to justify this splitting of Sadāśivāḥ, Kṣemarājaḥ offers a complex philosophical argument in which this second Sadāśivāḥ embodies, as a transitional stage in the movement from subjectivity to objectivity, the dependency of the objective represented by Īśvaraḥ on the subjective represented by Sadāśivāḥ.³

¹ V. p.508, vs.1190: *“īśvarasya tathordhve tu adhaścaiva sadāśivāt suśivāvaraṇam cordhve tasmiññīṇeyah sadāśivah.”* Jayarathaḥ (p.243) repudiates the problematic first half of this verse that conflicts with his position by apparently marking this realm as the end of Īśvaraḥ and the beginning of the realm of Sadāśivāḥ: *“uddiyotakṛtā punaḥ ‘īśvarasya tathordhve tu adhaścaiva sadāśivāt’ ityardham parikalpya itaḥ prabhṛti sādāśivam tattvamiti yaduktam tadayuktam asyārdhasya mahājanairagrhitatvāt.”*

² V. p.516, vs.1207b: *“... śrīmān devadevaḥ sadāśivah.”* The text also later presents an additional form which necessitates further harmonizing by Kṣemarājaḥ. (V. p.526, vs.1223a, and commentary: *“sādākhyaparabhāvena pañcamantramahātanaḥ,” ... para-bhāveneti prāgukto yaḥ sa eva anena sūkṣmeṇa ruṇenetyarthaḥ.”*)

³ V. his commentary, p.509. In order to explain the double appearance of Sadāśivāḥ caused by the description of the overlord of the realm of Suśivāḥ as if Sadāśivāḥ, (v. p.510, vs.1195a, *“bhruvormadhye tu vijñeyo devadevaḥ sadāśivah”*). Kṣemarājaḥ, as usual, presents (p.509) an aspectual rationalization: *“yadāha ‘tasmiññīṇeyah sadāśivah’ vakṣyamāṇapararūpāt sadāśivādanyo ‘yamapararūpa. ityarthah.”*

The text first (pp.509–512) describes the figure of Sadāśivaḥ himself and his retinue.¹ On a lion's throne resting on a white lotus, the moon crested, gleaming Sadāśivaḥ has fifteen eyes, five faces, and ten arms. In the microcosm, he resides in the middle of the brows. The five brahmāṇi, i.e., Sadyojātaḥ, and so forth, form the first circle of his retinue; their six limbs, i.e., the heart, and so forth, the second circle; eight rudrāḥ, listed by the text, the third; ten śivāḥ, named by the text and located in the ten directions, the fourth; and finally, eighteen rudrāḥ, the fifth and last circle of his retinue.² A verse then lauds Sadāśivaḥ, as the universal cause, the god without parts, who has a formula body, and who bestows liberation and enjoyments.³ In his commentary on these attributes, Kṣemarājaḥ also demonstrates the aptness of using, as done in this verse, Sadākhyāḥ as a synonym for Sadāśivaḥ.⁴

The text next describes the lotus seat (pp.513–514) of Sadāśivaḥ in more detail, as a mass of innumerable formulæ surrounded by his powers. Several verses (pp.514–517) then discuss his principal powers, whose names, function, and locations, Kṣemarājaḥ further elaborates. Through the most important of

¹ Cf. for a description of Sadāśivaḥ, Rao, *Elements of Hindu Iconography* 2, 1, pp.361ff.

² The ten śivāḥ and eighteen rudrāḥ represent the two streams of Śaiva scriptures said to come from the various faces of Sadāśivaḥ, just like the Vedāḥ from the faces of Brahmā. While the eighteen rudrāḥ nearly matches the names for scriptures usually found in other texts, those of the ten śivāḥ do not. Thus Kṣemarājaḥ (p.512) only notes that the eighteen refer to scriptures. (V. on these lists, Arunachalam, *The Saivagamas*, pp.100ff.)

³ V. pp.512–513, vss.1200–1201a.

⁴ V. his commentary, p.513: “*bhavanāmataḥ prabhṛti saditi vyapedeśapravṛtteḥ sadākhye sadāśivatattve bhavo devaḥ sādākhyāḥ.*”

these powers, Icchā, who resides united with him in the center, Sadāśivaḥ executes the five activities, emanation, reabsorption, and so forth, characteristic of the supreme lord.¹ While historically Sadāśivaḥ may once have held this paramount position, in the theological framework of this book he acts only as a manifestation of the supreme lord. A verse (p.516) then explicitly notes this changed status by designating Sadāśivaḥ as an inferior form of the supreme Śivaḥ.² Concluding this section, several more verses (pp.517–520) describe his retinue of marvelous, festive vidyāḥ and rudrāḥ, and declare that once they have exhausted their entitlement to this realm they do not reenter transmigration, but rather free from the impurity of Māyā become omnipresent śivāḥ.³

At this point (p.520) a verse indicates the end of the realm of Suśivaḥ, the source of formulæ (*mantragarbhaḥ*), and the beginning of the realm of Binduḥ (pp.521–523). Kṣemarājaḥ, significantly, interprets realm (*āvaraṇam*) as a synonym of plane (*tattvam*) whereas immediately preceding, he had it taken it as world.⁴ The inconsistent glossing of Kṣemarājaḥ results from his effort to conform the text to the standardized Śaiva cosmology,

¹ Cf. the similar characterization of Bhairavaḥ, which identifies him as the supreme lord in the first book (p.2, vs.3).

² V. p.516, vs.1206b: “*sa evāpararūpeṇa pañcamantramahātanuḥ*. ”

³ Kṣemarājaḥ (p.520), naturally, interprets this declaration in a non-dual fashion: “*tathā vyāpakaśivaikirūpā bhavantityarthā*. ”

⁴ Kṣemarājaḥ (p.521) also etymologizes that the levels, from Binduḥ on, are called *āvaraṇam*, literally coverings or obstacles, because they obstruct, *āvarakatvād*, the way to the highest level: “*athaca paripūrṇajñānaśālivyatiरेकेना anyesām parapadāvarakatvādeva tāni āvaraṇānityucyante*. ” Here he alludes to the effort required in the meditative formula ascent to pierce various nodes on the path to liberation.

while the text's heterogeneous use of realm (*āvaraṇam*), plane (*tattvam*), world (*bhuvanam*), sphere or egg (*aṇḍam*), world (*lokaḥ*), and circle (*maṇḍalam*), reflects the successive growth of the Śaiva cosmology by the conflation of various sources.

In particular, with Binduḥ, the text begins describing higher levels of the cosmos that unambiguously appear to be transpositions of well defined stages in the microcosmic meditational ascent of formulæ. As noted previously, redactors and commentators diverged when integrating these numerous levels into the few higher planes of systematic Śaivism. The redactors of *Svacchandatantram*, and Kṣemarājaḥ, following a widespread but not universal procedure, placed Binduḥ and successive stages with the plane of Sadāśivaḥ.¹ Since *Svacchandatantram* had apparently clearly placed the regent Sadāśivaḥ in a separate realm below Binduḥ, this identification necessitated the bifurcating of Sadāśivaḥ, noted earlier, into lower and higher aspects. While a redactorial aside notes this higher aspect of Sadāśivaḥ, in passing and without description, Kṣemarājaḥ alone has to coordinate the the remainder of the book with the established planes. The other pentadic regents of the subsidiary levels in this plane, undoubtedly also developed as additional aspectual variants of the five-faced Sadāśivaḥ. Historically, these sections of the text of *Svacchandatantram*, therefore, originated in circles extrinsic and

¹ A verse (31) in the later Śaiva systematizing *Tattvapraśāṣaḥ* of Bhojaḥ clearly illustrates this identification: "*nādo binduḥ sakalau sādākhyaṇtatvamāśritau kathitau/ vidyeśaḥ punaraiśe mantraṁ vidyāśca vidyākhye.*" Moreover, the commentary of Kumāradevaḥ (p.68) shows equally clearly the general problem which necessitated this kind of explicit identification: "*nanu nādaḥbindū śāstrāntare tattvamadhye kathitau / atastattvādhikyamanayorantarbhāvo vā vaktavyaḥ.*" (V. *Tattvapraśāṣaḥ Siddhāntaśaiva Darśanam By Mahārājādhirāja Bhoja With Tātparyadīpikā & Vṛtti Commentaries By Śrī Kumāradeva & Aghoraśivāchārya*, ed. and trans., Kameshvara Nath Misra, Chaukhambha Prachya Vidya Granthamala 2 (Varanasi: Chaukhambha Orientalia, 1976), pp.68ff.

perhaps prior to the circles that dogmatically fixed the thirty-six planes, or the six paths of the Śaiva universe.

In Binduḥ, as the central regent presides Śāntyatitāḥ, seated on a lotus, gleaming, five-faced, and bejeweled, named for the highest member from the set of five energies (*kalā*), that form one of the six modes of the universe's manifestations.¹ Named for the other four energies of this path, Nivṛttiḥ, Pratiṣṭhā, Vidyā, and Śāntiḥ, comprise the chief members of his retinue formed from innumerable minor śāntyatitāḥ.

Paralleling the stages in the ascent of the formula, the text next (pp.523–526) describes the stages beyond Binduḥ, of Ardhaacandraḥ and of Nirodhikā. Each has a retinue of five appropriately named energies or worlds; Ardhaacandraḥ, the “half moon,” for example, has Kāntiḥ, “loveliness”; Nirodhikā, the “obstructor,” for example, has Nirodhini, the “obstructing.” Then follow a pair of verses that provide additional evidence of the origin of these planes in formula practice. The first recapitulates the length in morae (*mātrāḥ*) that the formula vibrates at each of these stages, and the second etymologizes Nirodhikā, as the “obstructor,” which blocks even the gods, thus alluding to the skill and effort required in meditation to move the formula past this node.

The next verse, construed by Kṣemarājaḥ with the last quarter of the preceding, states that when one has split the node of Nirodhikā, he can then accede to Sadāśivaḥ in his supreme aspect, the great body of the five formulæ. The text then

¹ According to Kṣemarājaḥ (p.523), this Śāntyatitāḥ represents the highest form of Īśvaraḥ: “*eṣa ca śāntyatita īśvarabhaṭṭārakaparavyāptirūpaḥ*.” Though this declaration might conflict with the pattern of correspondences followed in this book, it conforms with earlier statements in the text, cited by Kṣemarājaḥ, which equated Binduḥ with Īśvaraḥ, and Nādaḥ with Sadāśivaḥ. (V. bk.4, p.168, vs.264b: “*binduścaiveśvaraḥ svayam*; and bk.12, p.83, vs.157b: “*... dhyātavyo binduriśvaraḥ*.”)

describes the next level (pp.526–529) in the formula ascent, Nādaḥ, colored like a stamen and enveloped by great souls (*mahadbhiḥ puruṣaiḥ*) as brilliant as crores of suns. Also at this level, surrounded by four radiant energies, in the center of a gigantic lotus sits the deity Ūrdhvageśvaraḥ in union with the fifth energy, Ūrdhvagā. Clarifying these verses, Kṣemarājaḥ identifies Nādaḥ, as Sadāśivaḥ, surrounded by the mahāmantreśvarāḥ, and Ūrdhvageśvaraḥ as the next level in the formula ascent, Nādāntaḥ. Since this marks for Kṣemarājaḥ the end of the Sadāśiva plane, in summary, he then counts the one hundred and thirty-six worlds from the realm of Suśivaḥ to Ūrdhvageśvaraḥ.

The text next describes the world of Suṣumṇā (pp.529–531), the beginning, for Kṣemarājaḥ, of the plane of Śaktiḥ (pp.529–536). In this world, as the deity presiding over the main and central channel (*nādiḥ*) in the microcosm, resides not only Suṣumṇā, but also her male counterpart, Suṣumṇeśaḥ, flanked on the right and left by the deities of the other main channels, Idā and Piṅgalā. The account of these upper worlds demonstrates more strongly than before that they originated as correlates of meditational practice. Only a few superadded traits distinguish this cosmological description from meditational directions. Accordingly, the text next (pp.531–532) states that the vibrating formula (*nādaḥ*) based in the central channel, after splitting through the entire lower universe dissolves in the aperture of Brahmā (*brahmabilam*). And then a ritual aside directs the purification of the entire lower path, which the adept has now cognized, in the sacrifice to Śivaḥ.

Reverting briefly to a descriptive style, the text next discusses the aperture of Brahmā (pp.533–534). There presides Brahmā, depicted like Śivaḥ, with ten arms, five faces, moon crest and ascetic's braid, and accompanied by his power Brahmāṇi, who controls the aperture that leads to ultimate liberation. By splitting or piercing through this level, the text continues, the meditator arrives at Śaktiḥ (pp.534–536), the

power, described as shaped like a sleeping, i.e., coiled snake, which supports the worlds. In order to avoid confusion, Kṣemarājaḥ explains that Śaktiḥ here refers not to the plane of Śaktiḥ, but to the realm of Śaktiḥ which is located in this plane. This double referent for the same designation reflects the historical combination of the two systems of philosophical planes and meditational grades.

In this realm of Śaktiḥ, which Kṣemarājaḥ locates microcosmically in the skin just beyond the aperture of Brahmā, resides a set of four deities surrounding another named Vyāpinī in the center. This Vyāpinī might be interpreted as the point in the formula ascent of the same name, which comes beyond the realm of Śaktiḥ, and which would thus be the last part of the Śakti plane. This interpretation would parallel Kṣemarāja's previous interpretation of the last central figure, Ūrdhvageśvaraḥ, in the preceding plane of Sadāśivaḥ, as the level in the formula course, Nādāntaḥ, marking the end of the Sadāśiva plane. After describing the set of five energies including Vyāpinī, the text, however, declares the end of the plane of Śaktiḥ and the beginning of the plane of Śivaḥ. Kṣemarājaḥ then enumerates the eleven worlds in this plane from Suṣumṇā to this set of five, but does not explicitly identify or locate Vyāpinī. Traditionally, in the schema of the formula ascent, Vyāpinī lies beyond Śaktiḥ. In the schema of planes, this might indicate that Vyāpinī lies beyond the specific power Śaktiḥ, but still in the plane of Śaktiḥ, or beyond the plane Śaktiḥ and in the plane of Śivaḥ. The ambiguity in the locating of Vyāpinī arises from differences in integrating the two schemas of formula and planes, and parallels broader conflicts concerning the boundaries and relations between the plane of Śaktiḥ and of Śivaḥ described in the next section.

The section on the plane of Śivaḥ (pp.537–542) begins by briefly describing its innumerable cities, adorned with jewels and golden ramparts and offering every enjoyment. In his commentary on this passage, Kṣemarājaḥ summarizes the non-dual view of the

relation between Śivaḥ and the rest of the universe. In addition, he prefaces his summary by deploring the ignorance of anyone who would interpret these introductory verses literally. This remark suggests that a large gap separated many users if not compilers of *Svacchandatantram* from more sophisticated redactors and commentators. The cosmology presented by the text, graphic and practical rather than abstract and dogmatic, encouraged later Śaivas to variously recast and reinterpret its statements about the highest levels, especially since the nature of Śivaḥ and his relation to the universe became the focus of their inter-sectarian debates.

In the center of the plane of Śivaḥ, enthroned on a gigantic lotus, presides the magnificent and omnipotent ruler of the universe, Anāśritaḥ. His name corresponds, as Kṣemarājaḥ explains, to his cosmological stature, for he does not (*an-*) depend (*-āśritaḥ*) on any world, but rather all worlds depend upon him. Four other regents, Vyāpakaḥ, Vyomarūpaḥ, Anantaḥ, and Anāthaḥ surround him. In addition, a similarly named feminine energy exists in union with each regent, thus Anāśritā with Anāśritaḥ, and so forth.

Dialogue then notes the end of the plane of Śivaḥ, which should be purified before proceeding to the next stage to be cognized, Samanā. The mind (*manaḥ*), the text declares, is not produced above her.¹ Etymologizing Samanā further, Kṣemarājaḥ explains that this level of consciousness still has (*sa-*) mind (*manaḥ*), or is the subtlest form of consciousness still organized by the polarity of subject and object. Then a section, recapitulating the higher levels, interrupts the description of Samanā.

Kṣemarājaḥ interprets this section (pp.543–549), which presents the cosmos in the sequence of emanation (*śṛṣṭiḥ*), instead of the sequence of reabsorption (*saṃhāraḥ*) like the rest of this book, as a preview of the next book. In his own fashion,

¹ V. p.543, vs.1256b: “*manaścordhvaṃ na jāyate.*”

therefore, he recognizes the parenthetical nature of these verses that may, as he suggests, be intended to harmonize the cosmological accounts of neighboring books. More importantly, they appear intended by redactors to clarify the location and relation of the higher planes described in the last sections of this book.

As indicated so far by the text, beyond the plane of Śivaḥ comes Samanā. Within the plane of Śivaḥ fall Anāśritaḥ, and the four other regents, all with their united energies. One of these regents, Vyāpakaḥ has as his regent Vyāpinī. Within the plane of Śaktiḥ, there also presides a Vyāpinī, surrounded by four powers. The text does not specify how these Vyāpinī should be related, and which represents the meditation level Vyāpinī.

When discussing these levels in *Tantrālokaḥ*, Abhinavaguptaḥ simply paraphrases *Svacchandatantram*.¹ This suggests that he either accepted the account of *Svacchandatantram*, or in some easy unstated way, could harmonize its difficulties. Jayarathaḥ, however, qualifies these locations at great length.² First he does not accept that Samanā lies beyond the plane of Śivaḥ. If Śivaḥ did not reside in the plane of Śivaḥ, then the number of planes would exceed the dogmatically fixed thirty-six. Second, Anāśritaḥ, therefore, does not reside in the plane of Śivaḥ, but in the plane of Śaktiḥ. More precisely, he resides in the level of Vyāpinī, beyond the level of Śaktiḥ but still in the plane of Śivaḥ. Third, by implication, he takes the first Vyāpinī mentioned to be the meditation level where Anāśritaḥ resides.

When *Svacchandatantram* declares that Samanā lies beyond the plane of Śivaḥ, just like Jayarathaḥ, Kṣemarājaḥ interprets

¹ V. M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ* 8, vss.395bff.

² V. M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ* 8, pp.268–270.

this as indicating beyond the level of Śivaḥ as Anāśritaḥ.¹ Similarly, he locates Anāśritaḥ in the meditational stage of Vyāpinī, which, however, he does not precisely locate microcosmically, but rather characterizes simply as the rest of the formula.² This would suggest that Vyāpinī occupies the rest of the path of the formula meditation up to the beginning of its end in Samanā. Unlike Jayarathaḥ, Kṣemarājaḥ does not dispute the declarations of the text about the boundaries of the planes by reinterpreting the meaning of plane (*tattvam*) as world. His restraint likely derives from a greater reluctance to tamper with unambiguous declarations of the text. Neither, moreover, clarifies the relations of the pair of Vyāpinī.

During the process of fitting the schema of levels or nodes in the formula ascent into the schema of planes, later redactors probably added these few statements about the boundaries of the upper planes. Unfortunately, since these scriptural remarks did not subsequently conform to the dogmatically fixed system of thirty-six planes, the commentators had to ingeniously reinterpret them. The bifurcation of Vyāpinī originates in a similar process of conflation, which combined two cosmic distributions of this meditation level: the first to the plane of Śaktiḥ, and the second, to the plane of Śivaḥ.

¹ V. his commentary, p.543: *"tataḥ śivatattvādūrdhvaṃ tvakśeṣasthavyāpinipadāvasthitānāśritabhaṭṭāarakāpekṣayā tatpadaviśrāntyā jñātavyā."*

² The reading (p.543) *tvacśeṣa-*, in the compound *tvac-śeṣa-stha-pada-vyāpinī*, should be interpreted in light of Kṣemarāja's early discussion of the location of Śaktiḥ in the fourth book (vs.384, and commentary, p.241) where Vyāpinī is said to be *"taccheṣe,"* i.e., in the rest of the formula left after piercing through the node of Śaktiḥ. There Kṣemarājaḥ explains that Vyāpinī, literally "the pervading," has received her name because she pervades the entire path up to Śaktiḥ.

As noted previously, the section that interrupts the description of Samanā probably represents another pre-commentatorial interpolation, intended to clarify these relationships. This section identifies Samanā as the power (*śaktiḥ*) and instrument or causal activity (*kāraṇam*) of Śivaḥ, through which he acts in his role as agent (*kartā*) or cause (*hetuḥ*) of the five causal activities (*kāraṇam*), of emanation, maintenance, and so forth, in all the eggs from earth to Śivaḥ.¹ Through his power, the text continues, Śivaḥ, the supreme cause (*paramakāraṇam*), distributes or sets in motion these five causal activities in successive hierarchical delegation to the set of five regents headed by Anāśritaḥ.² Each of these regents, acting as a subsidiary agent (*kartā*), in turn stimulates (*prerayate*) through his own power or causal activity (*kāraṇam*) the regent below him. Thus the causal activity passes from Samanā to Anāśritaḥ, then through his power, Anāśritā down to Anāthaḥ, and so forth, down to the stage of the great Māyā or Śaktiḥ. Śaktiḥ embodies a transitional stage in the process of emanation, that of object (*karma*), interpreted by Kṣemarājaḥ as the self-objectification of the subject or agent, which leads to the effect (*kāryam*), the rest of the universe of discrete objects interiorized in the stages of Nādaḥ and Binduḥ.

The process of emanation described in this section, and especially, the distinction between agent and cause, might be interpreted as a presentation of the philosophical viewpoint

¹ The use of the term egg coordinates the system of formula stages and planes that has organized the cosmology of these last sections with that of earlier sections and with the following book. Kṣemarājaḥ interprets these eggs as referring to the cosmological system elaborated in the *Mālinīvijayottaratantram*. (V. section II.11 for the summary and notes to bk.11, pp.26-29.)

² This theory explains the meaning of the word (*kāraṇam*) in this text, where it designates not only a cause, but also, in a restricted sense, the regent of a particular level of the universe.

elaborated later in the non-dualistic school and elsewhere introduced into the text by Kṣemarājaḥ.¹ As in previous sections, however, the text does not use logical-grammatical terms with sufficient precision to allow an inference of sectarian affiliation. In calling the supreme Śivaḥ the highest cause, as well as agent, this section does not appear to share the concern of the non-dualists to deny the applicability of causal relations to the highest realm, and the consequent implications of dualism. The terms used in this section, in general, seem intended rather to conceptualize already accepted religious beliefs about the supreme lord or the relations between deities and their female counterparts. Rather than an early stage of or encapsulation of a sectarian philosophy, this section, therefore, might well represent a secondary popularizing or mythicizing of a systematic philosophy of the sonic emanation of the universe drawn from works such as the *Vākyapadiyam*.

In the causal chain just described, the text locates Vyāpi and Vyāpinī and her regent Vyāpakaḥ above the power Śaktiḥ in the form of the coiled snake. This sequence then identifies the Vyāpinī associated with Anāśritaḥ, and the Vyāpinī above Māyā. Though *Svacchandatantram* did not name a regent for the Vyāpinī above Māyā, supporting this identification, Abhinavaguptaḥ lists the corresponding male, Vyāpīśaḥ.² Unlike the commentators, therefore, in this section which hierarchically combines regents and formula levels, Anāśritaḥ would reside right below Samanā, and there would be a single Vyāpinī, right above Śaktiḥ. Similar to the commentators, and in contrast to the preceding statements in the text, however, by designating Samanā as Śiva's power this section marks Samanā as the upper limit of the plane of Śaktiḥ. In reinterpreting Anāśritaḥ and the other regents as manifestations of

¹ V. section II.11 for the summary of his commentary on the first verses of bk.11, pp.2ff.

² V. M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ* 8, vs.397a.

the power, understood as causal activity, this section indicates that the plane of Śaktiḥ then stretches from Samanā down to Śaktiḥ. Śaktiḥ then forms the crucial transition to the next plane of Nādaḥ and Binduḥ, equivalent to the plane Sadāśivaḥ. The last verse of this section, accordingly, identifies all from Sadāśivaḥ to earth as subject to manifestation and destruction.¹

Dialogue, which refers to the “previously mentioned power,” then marks the resumption of the description of Samanā (pp. 549–550). The text describes her as intensely luminous at the head of the path, presumably at the threshold of the end of twelve center (*dvadāśāntaḥ*), which lies twelve digits beyond the crown of the head. After this verse the description of Samanā then breaks off, interrupted by a restatement (pp. 550–555) of the procedure for initiation. The last in this series of ritual prescriptions reconnects to the cosmological account by instructing the master to cast off the entire lower path up to Samanā and to locate the initiate’s self in the supreme level. In general, this parenthetical section demonstrates once again that meditation procedures, such as the rite of joining, served as the basis for constructing the upper levels

¹ Abhinavaguptaḥ, however, indicates in *Tantrālokaḥ* (M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ* 9, vss. 55b–59), that others, on the model of Sadāśivaḥ, had erroneously interpreted these causal forces, such as Anāśritaḥ, as separate planes of the universe: “*tena yatprāhurākhyānasādrśyena vidāmbitāḥ // gurūpāsāṃ vinaivāttapustakābhiṣṭadr̥ṣṭayaḥ / brahmā nivr̥ttyadhipatiḥ pr̥thaktattvaṃ na ganyate // sadāśivādyāstu pr̥thag ganyanta iti ko nayaḥ / brahmaviṣṇuhareśānasuśivānāśritātmani / śaṭke kāraṇasaṃjñe ‘rdhajaratiyamiyam kutaḥ / iti tanmūlato dhvastaṃ gaṇitaṃ nahi kāraṇam // yathā pr̥thivyadhipatir̥ṇpastattvāntaraṃ nahi / tathā tattatkalesānaḥ pr̥thak tattvāntaraṃ kathaṃ*.” His remarks, therefore, give further evidence of significant differences in the integration of these causal forces or regents into the standard planes of systematic Śaivism.

of the Śaiva macrocosmos.¹ Specifically, in this ritual restatement, the text names Bhairavaḥ as the central deity.² Thus this parenthetical section not only reconnects, like many preceding asides, the cosmology to a ritual context, but also seems intended to integrate the cosmology in a Bhairava centered ritual. Since this book soon ends, and throughout has, except for a few asides, not distinguished itself from a typical scriptural Śaiva account of cosmology, redactors may have inserted a ritual mentioning Bhairavaḥ as a way of establishing continuity with other books.

The text then (pp.555–556) describes the level which represents the transition to the supreme state, Unmanā. As explained by Kṣemarājaḥ, her name reflects her nature, for Unmanā denotes the stage beyond (*un-*) even the subtlest forms of discursive cognition (*manah*) found in Samanā. Another verse elaborates the negative characterization implicit in the name of Unmanā. Among the attributes negated, the text lists, notably, plane (*tattvam*). Kṣemarājaḥ interprets this statement as indicating in general that Unmanā does not have any of the characteristics, such as worlds, found in lower levels of existence.³ This verse also calls Unmana the mouth of the master (*guruvaktram*) which Kṣemarājaḥ glosses as indicating that Unmanā is the means for acquiring (*prāptyupāyaḥ*) the master who is the supreme Śivaḥ. Accordingly, the text next (p.557) declares that through the mouth of the master, the initiate's self should be united to the supreme stage beyond Unmanā. The next

¹ Kṣemarājaḥ (p.555) indicates that the text is describing the rite of joining (*yojanikā*) in the initiation procedure at the time when it reconnects to the description of Samanā.

² V. p.554, vs.1274b, and commentary: “*bhairavaṃ madhyadeśasthaṃ yāgasyetyarthāt / kiṃca 'bhairavāgniṃ samarcayet, ' ācāryaḥ pūjayet.*”

³ V. p.556, vs.1276b: “*nātra kālaḥ kalāścāro na tattvam naca devatāḥ.*”

verse ((p.558) then characterizes this supreme stage. Among the typical attributes of purity and imperturbability, the text also designates this level as the supreme plane (*paramam tattvam*). As before for Unmanā, Kṣemarājaḥ does not interpret this attribute as referring to a cosmic level. Though the wording of the text here is at best ambiguous if not contradictory, it appears to support previous statements, disputed by the commentators, on the boundaries of the upper planes. In the view of much of *Svacchandatantram*, the supreme Śivaḥ does not reside in the thirty-sixth plane of Śivaḥ, which is the realm of Anāśritaḥ, but rather beyond in a supreme plane, which would evidently constitute another plane were it not for the fact that it transcends the limited concept of plane.

The last verses of this book (pp.559–560) then declare that the path which has just been expounded leads to liberation in the supreme stage when realized in the body, fire, disciple, jug, or fire. Kṣemarājaḥ comments that the path of the worlds has been presented not only to accompany the purificatory activity of the initiation ritual, but also to serve as an object of knowledge. In the non-dualistic view, union with the supreme stage means becoming the supreme knowing subject who is everything, viz., the entire cosmos described in this book.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE *SVACCHANDATANTRAM*:

HISTORY AND STRUCTURE OF A ŚAIVA SCRIPTURE

VOLUME TWO

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO

THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF SOUTH ASIAN LANGUAGES AND CIVILIZATIONS

BY

WILLIAM JAMES ARRAJ

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

AUGUST, 1988

II.11 BOOK 11

II.11.1 The Emanation of the Planes of the Universe

In the introductory dialogue for book 11 (pp.1-2), the goddess requests that the path of the emanation (*śrṣṭiḥ*), of the universe, previously only alluded to (*sucita-*), be described (*varṇita-*) in full. Kṣemarājaḥ interprets this request as indicating that the topic of the book will be the path of planes (*tattvam*). As noted previously, the planes constitute one of the six major modes of manifestation or paths of the Śaiva universe. The exhaustive preceding book on cosmology described the planes of the universe in the course of describing the worlds (*bhuvanam*). The opening dialogue thus acknowledges this previous description and indicates the shift in order in this book, starting rather than ending with Śivaḥ, and the shift in emphasis from worlds to the planes. Historically, the two books represents different, overlapping cosmologies, both in harmony and conflict. In his commentary, therefore, Kṣemarājaḥ harmonizes the statements of the text not only with each other, but also with his developed non-dualistic philosophy.

The first verse (pp.2-4) in this section describes the base for the emanation of the universe, the supreme (*para-*), subtle (*sūkṣma-*) Śivaḥ who is the universal, instrumental cause (*nimittakāraṇam*).¹ Kṣemarājaḥ comments at length on this verse in order to preclude one from inferring that since the supreme Śivaḥ is the instrumental cause of the universe, then there exists a separate material cause (*upādānam*). In this case, Śivaḥ, as emanator or creator, would stand separate from the universe, as in the Śaiva-siddhānta image, like a potter who fashions a pot out of clay. Thus rejecting the characterization of Śivaḥ as an

¹ V. p.2, vss.1b-2: "yo 'sau sūkṣmaḥ paro devaḥ kāraṇam sarvagaḥ śivaḥ // nimittakāraṇam so 'tra kathitastava suvrate."

instrumental cause in the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika sense, like time, or space, and restating the standard non-dual position, Kṣemarājaḥ interprets the cause in the verse to mean agent (*kartā*), implying that Śivaḥ is both the cause and the universe itself, which he emanates on the screen of his own consciousness.¹ In the standard non-dual image, which Kṣemarājaḥ invokes, the universe has no more separate ontological status than an image of a city in a mirror.

The next verse describes the first moment in the emanation of the universe, when Śivaḥ, spontaneously without any need (*akāmāt*), and as part of his play (*līlayā*) shakes up (*saṃkṣobhya*) the ether or space (*vyoma*) with his own fire (*svatejasā*) and then emits the entire animate and inanimate universe. According to Kṣemarājaḥ this verse answers an anticipated moral objection to the supposition that Śivaḥ would knowingly emanate limited, suffering creatures. He acts, Kṣemarājaḥ argues, not as a normal agent for a purpose but spontaneously, as a manifestation of the autonomy (*svātantryam*) which is his nature. Kṣemarājaḥ interprets the space as Śiva's own self-consciousness embodied in the power Unmanā.² Its shaking through its own brilliance represents the first movement of that pure consciousness toward

¹ On the *nimittakāraṇam* and other causes in the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika system, v. Hans-Georg Tüerstig, *Über Entstehungsprozesse in der Philosophie des Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika-Systems* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1982), pp.14ff.

² Later in this book (p.30, vs.35), in order to illustrate the all pervasiveness and immanence of Śivaḥ, a verse compares him to the ether (*ākāśaḥ*), and to the empty space or ether (*vyoma*) in which all spatial manifestation occurs. Similarly, in the Pāñcarātra system, "The absolute void is the paramam dhāman, where God lives and with which he is identical." (V. Gupta, Introduction to the *Lakṣmī Tantra*, p.xxiii.) Later in this book (p.56, vs.78) *vyoma* also designates the element ether manifest from the sensory media of sound.

exteriorization of itself embodied in the power Samanā, which forms the screen for Śiva's subsequent projection of the universe.¹

The rest of this verse declares this space to be the material cause (*upādānam*) shaken up through inherence (*samavāyataḥ*).² Kṣemarājaḥ takes this verse as confirming his previous non-dual commentary. No separate objective stuff exists as a material cause of the universe; there is only the space or self-consciousness of Śivaḥ. Similarly, no external cause sets off the process of manifestation. The emanation of the universe proceeds inherently, as a game of self-objectification played entirely within the universal consciousness of the supreme subject.

While these first verses certainly describe a process of cosmic emanation analogous to that presented by Kṣemarājaḥ, they seem unable to bear the entire weight of his philosophical over-interpretation. At the least, this section presents a sequence of stages differing in name and number from both those of the thirty-six planes of systematic Śaivism and the regents and worlds described in the preceding book. Moreover, the text's peculiar and even conflicting combination of technical and imagistic language precludes assuming that Kṣemarājaḥ merely extrapolates an implicit viewpoint. In using the term instrumental cause (*nimittakāraṇam*) to characterize Śivaḥ in the first verse, the text, perhaps unintentionally, restricts his relation to the universe

¹ On the shaking as representing the intrinsic movement of consciousness in the first moment of self-exteriorization, cf., e.g., M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ*, 3, vss.82-83a. The text earlier (Bk.4, p.251, vs.397) had characterized the brilliance (*tejaḥ*) as the supreme consciousness and supreme causality: "... *vyañjayettejaḥ param paramakāraṇam*."

² V. p.6, vs.4b: "*upādānam tu tatproktaṁ samkṣubdham samavāyataḥ*."

in an expected opposition to other forms of causality.¹ The subsequent characterization of the action of shaking as occurring through Śiva's inherence (*samavāyataḥ*), which suggests through him as inherent cause (*samavāyikaraṇam*), thus conflicts with the preceding statement characterizing Śivaḥ as an instrumental cause. Equating the space with the material cause (*upādānam*) introduces further confusion, especially when this space becomes identified with Śiva's identical power or causal activity. These conflicting statements might intend a willful flaunting or disregard of conventional distinctions in order to state a proto non-dualistic theology in which Śivaḥ transcends all causes or subsumes all causality in himself. Or instead, this mixed language might reflect a religious milieu that has assimilated heterogeneous concepts and images to underpin their practice with the appearance of a philosophy equal to those of competing or established traditions.² These brief and elliptical first verses, for example, might be equally interpreted as describing: either an auto-emanation, where the supreme being manifests a power and emanates parts of himself and is thus might be called both the instrumental and material cause of the universe; or an emanation in which he merely stimulates or sets in motion, as the instrumental cause, a

¹ On the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika causal characterization of Íśvaraḥ, v. Tüerstig, *Über Entstehungsprozesse*, pp.18-20.

² Cf., as an example of this eclectic process, the accounts of emanation in Pāñcarātra texts which exhibit the same mix of multiple images and philosophical concepts echoing and paralleling various traditions. (V. Schrader, *Introduction to the Pāñcarātra and the Ahirbudhnya Saṃhitā*, pp.31ff.)

material cause characterized as the space or emptiness which then evolves its inherent effects.¹

The next verse (pp.7-8) in this section continues to describe the sequence of linear emanation. From the space comes the void (*śūnyam*), from the void, contact (*sparsaḥ*), from contact

¹ In the Pāñcarātra tradition, the *Lakṣmītantram*, for example, describes both these processes of emanation. Using imagery analogous to that of *Svacchandatantram*, this text discusses an auto-emanation by the supreme deity who manifests the universe as a part of himself after bifurcating by manifesting his power in the pure void of his consciousness (v. *Lakṣmī-Tantra. A Pāñcarātra Āgama*, ed. Pandit V. Krishnamacharya (Madras: Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1959) 7, vss.2-3, 9-10, p.26:

"*nirambhodāmbārābhāso nispandodadhisam̐nibhaḥ /
svacchasvacchandacaitanyasadānandamahodadhiḥ //*
*ākāradeśakālādiparicchedavivarjitaḥ / bhagavāniti vijñeyah
paramātmā sanātanaḥ //* nabhastu paramam̐ vyoma
*paramākāśaśabditam / yatra devo mayā sārddham
vibhajyātmānamātmanā //* kṛdate ramayā viṣṇuḥ paramātmā
sanātanaḥ sādgunyasya samunmeṣaḥ sa deśaḥ paramāmbaram.")
Another text of this school, the *Ahīrbudhnyasam̐hitā*, also describes the first moment of emanation in a way very similar to *Svacchandatantram*: (v. *Ahīrbudhnya-Sam̐hitā of the Pāñcarātrāgama*, ed. Pandit V. Krishnamacharya, 2d ed. rev., The Adyar Library Series 4 (Madras: Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1966) 5, vss.3b-5, p.40: "*tasya staimityarūpā yā śaktiḥ
śūnyatvarūpiṇī //* svātantryādeva kasmāccit kvacit
*sonmeṣam̐rcchati / ātmabhūtā hi yā śaktiḥ parasya brahmaṇo
hareḥ //* devī vidyudiva vyomni kvaciddiyotate tu sā /
śaktirvidyotamānā sā śaktirityucyate 'mbare.")

The *Lakṣmītantram* also alludes to the second type of emanation, and contains a verse characterizing primal matter (*prakṛtiḥ*), as space or void (*vyoma*). (V. *Lakṣmī-Tantra* 5, vs.19, p.19: "*aṇḍam̐adhye pradhānam̐ hi yattatsadasadātmakam̐ /
traiguṇyam̐ prakṛtirvyoma svabhāvo yoniraksaram̐.*" Cf. the second act of emanation from Māyā described here on pp.41-45) A shaking or an impulse (*kṣobhaḥ*) appears as the first act triggering emanation in the cosmogonies of many traditions. (V. Agrawala, *Matsya Purāṇa- A Study*, pp.36ff.)

resonance (*nādaḥ*).¹ In the last quarter of the verse, dialogue notes, in addition, a previous discussion of the resonance. Kṣemarājaḥ, appropriately, interprets this remark to refer to the discussion of the resonance in the preceding book.² He also correlates the other terms to stages presented in preceding discussions.³ The void corresponds to Vyāpinī, and the contact to Śaktiḥ.⁴ Along with Samanā, the three correspond, Kṣemarājaḥ adds, to the supreme, subtle, and gross forms of the supreme Śiva's principal power Icchā which differentiates itself further into the powers Jñānam and Kriyā.

According to Kṣemarāja's comments, therefore, the stages presented in the opening section of this book correspond to the major stages in the formula meditation, prescribed frequently in the rest of this work, and not to the planes stated in the introductory verse of this book as the purported topic. This account of sonic emanation, therefore, in stressing the macrocosmic scope and cosmogonic power of sound condensed in

¹ V. p.7, vs.5: *"tasmācchūnyam samutpannam śūnyātsparśasamudbhavaḥ / tasmānnādaḥ samutpannaḥ pūrvam vai kathitastava."*

² V. bk.10, pp.526-529.

³ Cf. the list with the corresponding meditation stages given in preceding books; e.g., bk.4, pp.172ff, bk.6, p.40.

⁴ In bk 4, the name contact (*sparsaḥ*) for the stage of Śaktiḥ, apparently derives from the meditator's experience at this stage, not of various sounds, as at lower levels of the formula ascent, but of a particular touch or sensation. (V. bk.4, p.241, vs.384: *"... sparsō yadvatpipilikā."*)

Though the text describes numerous voids (Bk.4, pp.185ff) Vyāpinī preeminently designates the void because it represents the stage where the full supreme existence first begins to give way to permit the emanation of the multitude of ultimately void phenomenal existents. (V. bk.4, vs.269 and commentary, p.172: *"tasyāparam punaḥ śūnyam' tasyeti samanātmāno bhāvasyāparam vyāpinirūpaṁ śūnyamaśeṣabhāvāsūtraṇarūpaṁ mahāśūnyam."*)

the root formula of Śivaḥ, serves as a conceptual complement or justification for the microcosmic practice of formula meditation described elsewhere in the text.

The text then (pp.8–10) lists the eight subsidiary, particularized (*vyaktaḥ*) manifestations of this Nādaḥ or resonance. Kṣemarājaḥ quotes a long explanatory passages detailing these particular sounds; the first, for example, noise (*ghoṣaḥ*) resembles the noise of a lit fire.¹ Earlier the text had presented a partially matching list of sounds correlated with different levels in the ascent of the formula; when the meditator splits the node of the heart, for example, he experiences the noise (*ghoṣaḥ*).² At that time Kṣemarājaḥ had referred to this section, thus confirming that the sequence of macrocosmic emanation described here parallels that of the previous microcosmic formula meditation.³ Confirming this parallelism, the text continues on here to describe the reasonance, as the ninth and great sound, pervading all the other sounds and thus established within all beings.

The text then (pp.10) declares that from Nādaḥ comes Sadāśivaḥ. With this statement the sequence of emanation begins to match that of the regents and worlds elaborated in the preceding book. Although the text would appear, as before, to place Nādaḥ above Sadāśivaḥ, Kṣemarājaḥ once again equates Nādaḥ and Sadāśivaḥ.⁴ The text then (pp.10–13) states that from Nādaḥ comes the drop or Binduḥ, established in ten particular manifestations. Kṣemarājaḥ interprets these ten manifestations as

¹ V. p.8: “*diptavahnisvanābhāsaḥ sa śabda ghoṣa ucyate.*” This extract is taken, according to Kṣemarājaḥ, from the *paddhatiḥ* of a Dharmaśivaḥ, mentioned also in M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ* 21, vs.50.

² V. bk.4, p.232ff, vs.370.

³ V. bk.4, p.233.

⁴ On these equivalences v.the summary of bk.10, pp.523ff.

referring to meditation practices described in the succeeding book, and refutes other commentators who had equated this tenfold manifestation of Binduḥ with phonemes found at the level of Vidyā.¹

From Binduḥ, the text continues (pp.13-14), comes Sadāśivaḥ. Kṣemarājaḥ, naturally, in keeping with the preceding book, interprets this Sadāśivaḥ as the gross form of the higher Sadāśivaḥ just described as equivalent to Nādaḥ.² He also notes, significantly, that previous commentators had read instead of the ablative "from Binduḥ" (*bindoḥ*), the nominative, Binduḥ (*binduḥ*), and accordingly equated Binduḥ with Sadāśivaḥ.³ This variant reading and its interpretation provide an economical alternative solution to the problematic preceding statement of the text that both Binduḥ and Sadāśivaḥ emanate from Nādaḥ. As noted before, evidence suggests that redactors aspectually divided Sadāśivaḥ when confronted in the preceding book with the problem of combining the sequence of formula stages with the sequence of planes and worlds. Though mentioning Sadāśivaḥ twice, the text does not refer to these as his aspects. Thus beneath the interpretation supported by Kṣemarājaḥ, these verses suggest a simpler combination of emanation sequences that linked planes and formula stages by identifying Sadāśivaḥ and Binduḥ.⁴

¹ On the ten-fold Binduḥ, v. the summary of bk.12, pp.81-82.

² V. the notes to the summary of bk.10, pp.521-523.

³ V. Kṣemarāja's commentary, pp.13-14, where he rejects this previous reading: *"sadāśiva iti pathitvā ghoṣādyastakāngyuktanādākhyasadāśivarūpo binduriti sāmānādhikaranyena vyākhyātam tadasat."*

⁴ As noted earlier, the text elsewhere also equate not Sadāśivaḥ but Īśvaraḥ with Binduḥ. (V. section II.10.5 for the notes to the summary of bk.10, pp.523-526.

After a verse summarizing the retinue of Sadāśivaḥ, the text (pp.14–15) continues his description by aspectually identifying him with the supreme Śivaḥ. Another verse then follows enumerating additional superior and inferior aspects of the supreme Śivaḥ. Kṣemarājaḥ correlates these forms, such as Kriyā, Jñānam, and Icchā, with the upper regents, respectively, of Īśvaraḥ, Sadāśivaḥ, and Anāśritaḥ. As the last pair of these aspects, the text lists sound (*śabdaḥ*), and thing (*vastu*). Kṣemarājaḥ explains that this indicates that the supreme lord becomes manifests both as the entire range of expressers (*vācakaḥ*) and of objects expressed (*vācyam*). Immediately after this last general distinction, the text again begins to describe the process of emanation starting from the supreme Śivaḥ. This second description, which stresses regents and planes, and which thus corresponds more to the preceding book and to the topic announced in the introductory verses, evidently represents emanation under the object (*vastu*) aspect. The first account of emanation, which corresponds more to the ritual formal practice discussed in earlier books, accordingly, represents emanation under the sound aspect. Through this verse, therefore, distinguishing between sound and object, redactors have sought to coordinate and identify two separate and only partially corresponding sequences of emanation.

Like the first account of emanation, the second begins (pp.16–17) by characterizing the supreme Śivaḥ. Instead of describing the highest Śivaḥ merely as subtle (*sūkṣma-*), the text distinguishes five aspects of Śivaḥ, gross (*sthūla-*), subtle, supreme (*para-*), supra-supreme (*parātita-*), and spotless (*nirañjanaḥ*), and therefore indicates, according to Kṣemarājaḥ, straightaway, that Śivaḥ emanates all levels of the universe as part of his own nature.¹ Also the text here unambiguously defines his own nature as the space (*vyomarūpasvarūpeṇa*), and as the powers Samanā

¹ V. his commentary, p.17: “*aśeṣaviśvātmanā parameśa eva sphuratiti.*”

and Unmanā. This greater precision suggests that this account derives from a milieu more systematically Śaiva than the preceding. Supporting this supposition, this opening verse labels its characterization of Śivaḥ as that found in the Śaiva *āgamāḥ*.

In contrast to the earlier discussion in this book, and in elaboration of the discussion in the preceding book, the next section (pp.17-23) then sets out the causal interaction of Śivaḥ and the rest of the universe. Whereas Śivaḥ rules over the levels of Unmanā and Samanā directly, he rules over lower levels by delegating his causal activity to the set of five regents Anāśritaḥ, and so forth. Then, expanding upon earlier discussions, the text sets out the precise secondary and tertiary delegations of this casual activity. Thus Anāśritaḥ, for example, in a lower manifestation, rules as the regent of the aperture of Brahmā, Anantaḥ as the regent Suṣumṇesaḥ of the next lower level, and so forth.¹ Subsequent verses then repeat the pentadic correlations for sets of even lower regents. There Anāśritaḥ, for example, rules as Brahmā, and also as Hūhukaḥ, at the base of the universe. Verses then explain the aptness of the name Anāśritaḥ; supported by his own power alone, the Śivaḥ without support or Anāśritaḥ, supports the entire universe. Then the text repeats his identification with Hūhukaḥ, described as the power of support. Historically, the metaphysical support of the universe in Anāśritaḥ

¹ The sequence of vertical delegation of causal activity discussed here, however, does not correspond to the hierarchical sequence described in the preceding book (pp.545-547) There, for example, after Anāśritaḥ comes Anāthaḥ. Recognizing this contradiction, Kṣemarājaḥ (pp.19-20) rationalizes any variation in sequence as negligible and illusory, since, ultimately and really, everything, he argues, is the non-sequential highest consciousness: *"natvatra ānulomyaṁ prātilomyaṁ vā kiṁcit apitu akrama evātra kramo vāstavena vṛttena sarveṣāṁ bhagavadekamayatvād-ityāśayena ayamidṛśaḥ kramo 'tra pradarsitaḥ."*

at the head, naturally became identified the mythic, graphic support in Hūhukaḥ at the base.¹

Then reversing the order of emanation followed in this book, another group of verses (pp.24–26) enumerates planes and realms from water up to Unmanā. After the last verse in this enumeration that declares that Unmanā is associated with eggs or spheres, follow additional verses (pp.26–29) elaborating the egg structure of the cosmos. Kṣemarājaḥ interprets these general verses according to the more precise structure set out in the *Mālinivijayottaratantram*.² Unmanā supports the four eggs of Śaktiḥ, Māyā, Prakṛtiḥ, and Brahmā. The egg of Śaktiḥ englobes the smaller egg of Māyā, which, in turn, englobes the smaller egg of Prakṛtiḥ, and so forth. In addition, while there exists only a single egg of Śaktiḥ and of Māyā, within them exist innumerable eggs of Prakṛtiḥ and Brahmā. Since these multiple eggs all have the same structure, the text continues, they do not require separate descriptions. This description of the egg structure then leads to a laud of the supreme Śivaḥ (pp.27–30). Dimensionless and immaculate like the ether, Śivaḥ transcends the eggs of the spatial universe, and simultaneously pervades it, immanent just like the empty space that grounds every discrete manifest object.³ This section then concludes with the declaration that those who know Śivaḥ in this way become permanently liberated.

¹ This Hūhukaḥ, as Kṣemarājaḥ notes (pp.21–22), is called Anantaḥ in the preceding book (p.3, vs.5); this aspectual identification perhaps explains his characterization there as supreme lord (*parameśvaraḥ*).

² He refers, therefore, to his previous interpretation of these eggs according to the *Mālinivijayottaratantram* in bk.10, p.544. (V. M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Mālinivijayottaratantram* 2, vss.49ff).

³ V. p.30, vss.35b–36a: “*evam sarvagato devaḥ śivaḥ paramakāraṇam // vyāpya devi jagatsarvaṁ vyomasu vyomavatsthitah*.” Cf. the preceding notes to vss.3b–4a, p.4.

Dialogue then (p.31) introduces the discussion of the pervasion (*vyaptiḥ*) of the causes or regents (*kāraṇam*). This dialogue, therefore, marks the resumption of the pentadic correlation broken off by the enumeration of planes (p.24), and suggests that a third separate account of the cosmogony has been spliced into this book. In this account, the reversal of the order of emanation, the repeat discussion of the nature of the supreme Śivaḥ, and the final rhetorical praise of this knowledge's power, provide additional evidence of its former self-contained status.

The first verses in this section (pp.31-39) coordinate members of the lower set of regents with the elements: Brahmā, for example, rules over earth, Viṣṇuḥ water, and so forth. After this comes a list of the astronomical bodies they rule: Brahmā, for example, the sun. Taken together these represent, according to Kṣemarājaḥ, another form of the *aṣṭamūrtiḥ* of Śivaḥ. The text then correlates these lower regents with the five brāhmāṇi or faces of Sadāśivaḥ; Brahma, for example, is Sadyojātaḥ, Viṣṇuḥ, Vāmaḥ, and so forth. These faces, in turn, correspond to different revelations; Sadyojātaḥ, for example, to the Ṛgvedaḥ. The next group of verses then list the various forms of knowledge that each face emits; Sadyojātaḥ, for example, emits the worldly knowledge (*laukikam vijñānam*), Īśānaḥ, notably, the paramount knowledge of formulæ.¹ Dialogue then introduces a series of correlations between the regents and sets of planes; in the set of thirty-six planes, Brahmā, for example, pervades the first twenty-four planes up to Prakṛtiḥ, and in the set of three main planes, he pervades the level of the self (*ātmatattvam*). In a final group of correlations, the text then matches regents and powers of Śivaḥ;

¹ This correlation between specific revelations and faces of deities occurs in many Śaiva texts, as variants on the widespread, earlier topos which describes Brahmā emitting the four Vedas from his four faces. (On the symbolism of the four and five-headed Brahmā, v. Agrawala, *Matsya Purāṇa- A Study*, p.28, 50ff.)

Jyeṣṭhā, for example, with Brahmā. This section then (p.38) closes by repeating the identification of Śivaḥ and the set of five causes.

At this point (p.39) the text resumes describing the first sequence of emanation that had been broken off at Sadāśivaḥ (p.13). This same sequence then continues, interrupted by some shorter interpolations, up to the end of all discussion of emanation (p.114). Kṣemarājaḥ recognizes this resumption in his own fashion, by explicitly interpreting the ambiguous verses that begin this section according to the statements made earlier in this sequence.¹ Picking up the interrupted sequence, the first verses (p.39) in this section list the planes which come after Sadāśivaḥ, of Īśvaraḥ, Vidyā (sc. Śuddhavidyā), and then Māyā. In Vidyā reside (pp.40–41) crores of rudra-bodied formulæ which bestow grace in the world of embodied beings.

Next, instead of a description of Māyā, there follows a possibly interpolated section (pp.41–45), linked to the preceding description of Vidyā and marked as a digression by Kṣemarājaḥ, that depicts another act of emanation. In the center of the rudraḥ just described stands Śivaḥ, the supreme cause, holding the trident symbolizing his three powers of knowledge, conation, and action. Using these powers, he shakes up (*kṣobhayet*) the world seed (*jagadbījam*) of Māyā which then emits the lower levels of

¹ Since the text has already described the emanation of Sadāśivaḥ, Kṣemarājaḥ interprets the verse which apparently states once again that Sadāśivaḥ, who is the lord or Īśvaraḥ, is emanated from Śivaḥ, as assuming that Īśvaraḥ is emanated from Sadāśivaḥ, evidently since he wishes to stress that from the highest perspective both Sādaśivaḥ and Īśvaraḥ are produced from or are really only Śivaḥ. (V. vs.53b, and commentary, p.39: “*sadāśivaḥ śivāddevi utpannaḥ prabhuriśvaraḥ yadapi bindoḥ sadāśivo jñeyah iti prāgupakṣiptam tathāpi pratipāditavyāpyavyāpakabhāva-paramārthadrśā sadāśivaḥ īśvaraśca prabhuh sampanna iti atra tātparyam.*”) The syntactical ambiguity of this verse may reflect confusion produced by the interpolation of the other accounts of emanation.

the universe and the collection of souls (*ātmavargaḥ*) located within her. A verse compares the emission of these souls to the scattering of juice when the fruit of a jujube tree (*badari*) is struck with a stick; some souls scatter upwards to liberation, some horizontally to Vidyā, and others downward into the terrible realms of transmigration below Māyā.

Kṣemarājaḥ comments at length in order to establish the non-dual sense of this passage. This act of emanation may represent either an alternative or a complement to the first act of emanation, if interpreted as occurring in the same sequence. In either case, the description of Māyā in this second act of emanation would seem more resistant than the first to Kṣemarāja's explanation. Here the text clearly characterizes the world seed Māyā, as permanent (*nitya-*) and all pervasive (*vibhutayāvyaya-*). This characterization would appear to accord with the dualistic Śaiva conception of Māyā, or the universe, as a separate, eternal category alongside Śivaḥ. Though less clearly stated, the text also seems, in agreement with the dualists, to assume as another eternal category, a plurality of individual souls. Śivaḥ also seems to function here only as the instrumental and not as the material cause of emanation. In contrast, the first act of emanation, emphasizing the transformation of sound and of innate powers, if not professedly non-dualistic, appears at least to approach monism in the manner of the *vivartavādaḥ* of Bhartṛhariḥ or the *pariṇāmavadaḥ* of the Pāñcarātra.¹ The complementary combination of these two acts of emanation in the same sequential account might be interpreted to indicate that while the pure, upper path originates in Śivaḥ himself, the impure, lower path originates from another source.

¹ V. Kṣemarāja's characterization of the Pāñcarātra as a type of *pariṇāmavadaḥ*, bk.10, p.283:

"*śadvimśatitattvarūpamahāvibhūtyātmakavāsudevākhyaparaprakṛti-pariṇāmātmakaprakṛtyādi jagadvādibhiḥ pāñcarātrikair*"

Returning to the sequence of emanation, the next verse (pp.46–47) enumerates the members of the jacket, (Kalā, Vidyā, Rāgaḥ, Kālaḥ, Niyatiḥ,), along with the Pumān or person and Prakṛtiḥ. Kṣemarājaḥ harmonizes conflicting statements in various scriptures about the number and sequence of these planes by attributing the differences to their function. Since these planes produce individual consciousness by restricting awareness, their sequence and number may vary according to the particularized experience of each restricted consciousness.¹ The text (pp.47–48) then lists the three constituents (*guṇaḥ*) of matter, *sattvam*, *rajaḥ*, and *tamaḥ*, correlates each of them to Brahmā, Viṣṇuḥ, and Rudraḥ, then to the function each deity performs, viz., emanation, maintenance, or reabsorption, and finally to the three states of consciousness of waking, sleep, and deep sleep.

The next verse (pp.49–50) then describes the plane of the intellect or Buddhiḥ, where Brahmā rules, and where the Buddhists find their highest attainment. Then, in a short digression, which repeats a rhetorical pattern found elsewhere in the text, the following verses (pp.50–55) name in ascending order the planes that other sects can reach and laud, in conclusion, the superiority of the Śaiva attainment.² Continuing the sequence of

¹ V. his commentary, pp.46–47: *“pumsām vicitrpratitikramānusāri kañcukakramah anyathā anyathā ca sambhāvyate pratipuṁ kalāditattvakramasyoktatvāditi tadanusāram tattacchāstrāvatārakaistathā tathā kramabhedamātrapratipādanam . . . vastutaśca . . . yugapadeva udbhūtā.”*

² As noted by Kṣemarājaḥ, the verse (vs.70b, and vs.74a) that correlates the Pāśupatas and the plane of Īśvaraḥ, and which echoes a verse in the preceding book (Bk 10, vss.1169b–1170a, p.498), has been split, notably, by an apparent interpolation subdividing the Pāśupatāḥ. These intervening additional verses assign the Mausula and Kārūka Pāśupatāḥ to the worlds of Kṣemeśaḥ and Brahmanēśaḥ in the plane of Māyā, and reserve the worlds Tejeśaḥ and Dhruveśaḥ in the plane of Īśvaraḥ for other Vaimala Pāśupatāḥ who have

planes, the text then (pp.55–58) enumerates the ego, sensory media, organs, and elements, and their order of secondary emanation. In contrast to the preceding book's description of the ego, the text here also enumerates the three subsidiary forms of the ego, the Bhūtādiḥ, Vaikṛtaḥ, and Taijasaḥ, commonly found in Sāṃkhya accounts of the planes, and specifies their role in the process of emanation.¹

At this point (p.58), dialogue closes the enumeration of planes by noting that the accompanying causes of the self or soul (*ātma-upakāra-kāṇi*) have been discussed. Kṣemarājaḥ explains that the planes receive this designation because they form the means (*sādhanaṃ*), and basis (*āśrayaḥ*), by which individual selves undergo their varied experiences.² This verse provides a transition to another section (pp.58–79), announced by dialogue, that discusses the five kinds of selves and five corresponding levels of awareness. For, as Kṣemarājaḥ explains, the variation in these accompanying factors causes the self to also vary.

undergone initiation, and who have performed, apparently in addition to the Pāsupata observance (*vratam*), also the Kapāla observance. Later on in this book, (p.103, vs.184) a verse assigns the Kāpālikāḥ and the Pāsupatāḥ to Īśvaraḥ and Dhruvaḥ. In addition, Kṣemarājaḥ, recognizing that he had formerly interpreted Śaiva in a restricted sense as referring only to the Siddhāntins, here (vs.74b) interprets “Śaiva” as including all the levels of Śaivas up to the Kaulas. (On these groups and verses, v. section I.1.3.)

¹ Cf. bk.10, pp.365ff for the previous description of the ego. In describing the emanation of the lower planes from these forms of the ego, however, the text (p.57, vs.80), in contrast to the classical Sāṃkhya view, where the Taijasaḥ or *rajaḥ*-related ego assists the other two forms of ego, has the organs of perception proceeding from the Taijasaḥ ego, and not the Vaikṛtaḥ. (V. *Sāṃkhyakārikā* 25, Jāwaji, *The Sāṃkhya Kārikā*, pp.347ff, and commentary.)

² V. P.58, vs.82a, p.58: “*ātmopakāra-kāṇyeva kathitāni yathārthataḥ*.” This verse echoes *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, 60, Jāwaji, *The Sāṃkhya Kārikā*, pp.470, which describes how matter, through its varied manifestations, actually exists to serve the purpose of an inactive, disinterested person (*puruṣaḥ*).

The text begins (pp.58–63) this section by describing the different selves. The first self, the plain self (*ātmā*), as it were, refers to the self that has no experiences due to the equilibrium of matter.¹ The second, the interior self (*antarātmā*), refers to the self that through contact with the subtle body (*puryaṣṭakam*) transmigrates and is bound to merit and dismerit. The third, the exterior self (*bāhyātmā*) refers to the self that has a gross body and therefore through its organs continually experiences objects (*viśayaḥ*).² The fourth, the non-self (*nirātmā*) has cast off phenomenal existence except for the impurity (*malam*) of Māyā.³ The fifth, the supreme self (*paramātmā*), has transcended all impurity and become the supreme lord.

Dialogue next announces the discussion (pp.63–79) of the five states of awareness. These five states of awareness present an expanded version of the teaching just promulgated in terms of the pentad of selves. The basis for this teaching rests in the underlying belief shared with many traditions that the emanated universe

¹ Though freed from the constraints of the body, this self remains bound, Kṣemarājaḥ explains, even in this profound unconscious state, by the planes that compose the constricting jacket (*kañcukam*). This state would apparently correspond to the pralayākala class of knowing subjects (*pramātā*) in systematic Śaivism. (On these levels of knowing subjects, v. the *Pratyabhijñāhṛdayam*, Singh, ed. and trans., *Pratyabhijñāhṛdayam*, sūtra 3, pp.52ff, and n.39, pp.129–130.

² This state would apparently correspond to the *sakala*-class of knowing subjects in systematic Śaivism.

³ Kṣemarājaḥ (p.61) equates this stage with the *vijñānākala*-class of knowing subjects in systematic Śaivism. In order to obtain an appropriate sense he etymologizes *nirātmā*, as the self (*ātmā*), “... that has exited from [*niṣkrāntaḥ*, glossing the *nir-* of *nir-ātmā*,] [its erroneously] defined essence ... , (*“nirātmā ātmanaḥ pūrvoktapāśaśatavalitāt pumstattvalakṣaṇāt svabhāvāt niṣkrāntaḥ”*), i.e., the identification with the body constructed from the lower planes.

exists for the sake of liberating souls.¹ In the teaching presented here, this belief has been doctrinally refined by coordinating stages in the soul's liberation with phases in the universe's emanation. Specifically, this teaching represents a variant or earlier form of the seven classes of hierarchically placed knowing subjects elaborated in systematic non-dual Śaivism. In this section, the early Sāṃkhyam evidently provided the proximate source for this the teaching, which in systematic Śaivism also developed by adapting and extending the Upaniṣadic teaching concerning the states of waking, dreaming, deep sleep.²

The first state of awareness, the non-aware (*abudhaḥ*), occurs when all the planes of existence have dissolved into Māyā, leaving the self to linger in unconsciousness without cognitive or perceptive activity until these planes re-emanate. The second state, the aware (*budhaḥ*), occurs when the action (*karma*) of a self becomes completely ripe (*paripāka-*) or ready to be experienced. In order that the self can have this experience, Īśvaraḥ, the lord, by his own conation, then produces a body for

¹ In non-theistic Sāṃkhyam, this belief underlies the idea that Prakṛtiḥ or matter actually evolves to serve the needs of Puruṣaḥ or the soul; in other theistic systems, Īśvaraḥ causes the universe to be emanated so that souls can have experiences. (V. *Sāṃkhyakārika*, 21, Jāwaji, *The Sāṃkhyā Kārikā*, pp.328ff, and commentary; for the Nyāya, v. George Chemparathy, *An Indian Rational Theology, Introduction to Udayana's Nyāyakusumāñjali*, Publications of the de Nobili Research Library (Vienna: Indologisches Institut der Universität Wien, 1972), pp.158ff.)

² For the epic Sāṃkhyā use similar terms based on the root *budh*, v. the *Mahābhārata*, the "Mokṣadharmaparvan" 12, 293, vss.42-46 (pp.1628-1629). For a complete exposition of the non-dualistic Śaiva interpretation of the five states (*avasthā*) of awareness, waking (*jāgrad*), dreaming (*svapnaḥ*), deep sleep (*susuptam*), the fourth (*turyam*), and the beyond the fourth (*turyātītakam*), and their correlation with the categories of knowing subjects, v. M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ* 10, vss.227bff.

it composed out of the planes from the jacket to earth.¹ The text then offers short explanations of the terms commonly used to designate this limited experiential self, such as person (*puruṣaḥ*), transmigrator (*saṃsari*), object-possessor (*viṣayi*), experiencer (*bhoktā*), and field-knower (*kṣetrajñāḥ*). The limited subject has the name field-knower, for example, because he ploughs the field (*kṣetram*) of objects with desire, sows seeds of his delusionally good or bad actions, nurtures an ego, and then harvests a fruit of pleasure and pain. The third state of awareness, the becoming aware (*budhyamānaḥ*), occurs when the soul begins to be revolted by all experiences and its body. This dispassionateness then leads the soul to the fourth state of awareness, the fully aware (*prabuddhaḥ*), in which it discriminates between its true nature and the surrounding impurity. Finally, in the fifth state of awareness, the very fully aware (*suprabuddhaḥ*), through initiation and exercise this insight into its true nature culminates in the soul's identifying with the supreme lord.

Kṣemarājaḥ correlates these last three states, respectively, with the sequence of grace, initiation, and liberation in life. Closing this section, the text affirms the veracity of these statements by calling them the word of Bhairavaḥ.² This rhetorical phrase recurs throughout parts of the text that describe specific Bhairava practices.³ This stylistic marker suggests that this section constitutes an interpolation from a Bhairava source into the standard Śaiva account of the cosmology. In content, as well, this

¹ Kṣemarājaḥ explains (p.67, .69–70) that the Īśvaraḥ, who manifests the body, refers to Anantesāḥ, the regent of Māyā, and that Śrikanṭhaḥ, who the text describes as binding the soul with material bonds, functions secondarily in this process as the lord up to matter.

² V. p.79, vs.125: "*bhairavasya vaco yathā.*"

³ Cf., for example, bk.9, p.48, vs.46; p.71, vs.93; p.73, vs.104; bk.13, p.94, vs.7.

section sets itself off from the surrounding material. Just as in other Bhairava sections, the text clearly describes the supreme state as identification with the supreme lord, including the complete participation in his powers (*aluptaśaktivibhava-*), and significantly, in his autonomy (*svatantra-*). The general emphasis in this section on knowledge and awareness, and the specific parallels with the classes of knowing subjects later elaborated by the non-dualistic school, argue that this section represents the tenets of circles of Bhairava worshippers in the line of traditions that led to systematic non-dualism.¹

After these intervening sections on the attainments of different sects and the five kinds of selves and five states of awareness, the text continues the sequence of emanation. As recognized by Kṣemarājaḥ, the dialogue that begins (p.80) this section announces the discussion of the different modes of existence (*bhāvabhedaḥ*). The text introduced these (p.49) at the first mention of the intellect, before the interpolated discussion of the attainments of the different sects. Then it apparently returned to the sequence of planes below the intellect (pp.55-58), before the interpolated sections on the selves and states of awareness. Since the text now re-enumerates these planes below the intellect, the previous section on the sequence of lower planes would also appear to be an interpolation. Without additional evidence, however, the actual sequence in the conflation of these two accounts remains uncertain. Though sandwiched between interpolated material, the first discussion of the lower planes might claim priority, since it emphasizes the sequence of emanation, the nominal topic of the book. Though apparently picking up the primary interrupted narration of the text, the second discussion, in contrast, appears intended to give a comprehensive enumeration

¹ Kṣemarājaḥ (p.80) accordingly indicates that this section pertains to gnostic exercitants (*jñānayogināḥ*).

of the lower components of the universe, without regard to the sequence of their manifestation.

Under the general heading of the different modes of existence (*bhāvabhedāḥ*), the text lists (pp.80–84): the ten and the three instruments (*kāraṇam*), comprising the ten externally directed organs, and the threefold inner organ; the ten effects (*kāryam*), comprising the the five sensory media and five elements; the eleven defects in the organs (*indriyavadhāḥ*)¹; the tripartite ego; the eight qualities (*guṇaḥ*) of the intellect, such as righteousness (*dharmaḥ*), and so forth; and finally, the five kinds of error (*viparyayaḥ*).² Summarizing this list, dialogue declares (p.84), once again, that the fifty different modes of existence (*bhāvabhedāḥ*) have been discussed. In classical Sāṃkhya, however, fifty refers to the number of items in the intellectual emanation (*pratyayasargaḥ*), which comprises, for example, the kinds of error just enumerated.³ The term *bhāvāḥ* refers to the eight different kinds of psychic dispositions just enumerated as the eight qualities of the intellect.⁴ And the manifest planes of existence (*tattvāni*) divided into the instruments and the effects represent another separate category.⁵

The preceding sections of this text, which discussed states of the self and levels of awareness, emphasized the subjective aspect

¹ V. *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, 49, and commentary, Jāwaji, *The Sāṃkhya Kārikā*, pp.423ff.

² V. *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, 47, and commentary, Jāwaji, *The Sāṃkhya Kārikā*, pp.416ff.

³ V. *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, 46–51, and commentary, Jāwaji, *The Sāṃkhya Kārikā*, pp.410ff.

⁴ V. *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, 23, and commentary, Jāwaji, *The Sāṃkhya Kārikā*, pp.333ff.

⁵ For this distinction, v *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, 32, and commentary, Jāwaji, *The Sāṃkhya Kārikā*, pp.369ff.

of the planes of existence. It considered them only in regard to the self, specifically, in regard to the experiences that they made possible for the self. In the classical Sāṃkhya, the term *bhāvāḥ*, denotes primarily the eight psychic dispositions, called here the qualities of the intellect, that along with the intellectual emanation shape the experience of the intellect and accompany the transmigrating subtle body.¹ They determine the experience of the self or soul, by structuring its consciousness. For this same reason, therefore, as Kṣemarājaḥ explained, in the preceding book, the text restates the lower planes of existence, the eight psychic dispositions, and the intellectual emanation, at the level of the person.² In this section, therefore, the term *bhāvāḥ*, retaining its sense as factors determining the experience of the subject, also refers to the lower planes of existence viewed from a subjective perspective. Historically, this extended sense may represent an innovation or a survival from an earlier context.³ The classification

¹ Kṣemarājaḥ acknowledges (p.80) the primary Sāṃkhya sense of *bhāvāḥ* in his gloss: "*bhāvayanti vāsayanti antaḥkaraṇamiti bhāvā dharmādayo 'ṣṭau*." He does not rationalize the extended sense of *bhāvāḥ* that includes planes. Adhering to the classical distinctions, he later notes at the end of the enumeration of the dispositions and intellectual emanation, that this represents the *bhāvasargaḥ*, or psychic factors emanation, which is included within the *tattvasargaḥ*, or emanation of planes. V. his commentary, p.90: "*evam tattvasargāntarito yo bhāvasargo 'bhihitah*."

² V. the summary of bk.10, p.442, where he explains that they delimit the experiencer or person.

³ V. J.A.B. van Buitenen, "Studies in Sāṃkhya (I)," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 76, 3 (1956): 153-157, where he argues that in the early Sāṃkhya the term *bhāvāḥ* originally denoted the lower planes of existence evolved from the intellect.

into fifty likely survives as a distorted echo of an earlier categorical distinction that has now lost its significance.¹

Dialogue then introduces an enumeration of the subdivisions (*bhedāḥ*) of the eight *bhāvāḥ*, or psychic dispositions called here the divisions (*bhedāḥ*) of the intellect. The classical Sāṃkhya commentators indicate, without specification, an interrelation between the eight psychic dispositions and the other fifty members of the intellectual emanation.² Exhibiting a concrete extension of this interrelation, this list presents, as subdivisions of the psychic dispositions, members of the intellectual emanation. And displaying its characteristic blurring of traditional categorical distinctions, the text also enumerates the subdivisions of the psychic dispositions given in the classical Sāṃkhya. Before beginning this list, some verses (pp.84–85) divide the set of eight dispositions according to the three constituents.³ As the only member of this set correlated with the good or light (*sattvam*), knowledge (*jñānam*) receives praise as that which liberates men, who delight in the Sāṃkhya

¹ For the history and significance of these sets of factors in the Sāṃkhya, Cf. Frauwallner, *Geschichte der indischen Philosophie* 1: 324ff, 370ff. On different groups of fifty and sixty categories in early Sāṃkhya, see also F. Otto Schrader, "Das Saṣṭitantra," pp.101–110.

² V., especially, Paramārtha's commentary on *kārikā*, 46, in Junjirō Takakusu, pp.1032ff, "La Sāṃkyakārikā étudiée à la lumière de sa version chinoise, (II) " *Bulletin de l'école française d'extrême-orient* 4 (1904): 978–1064.

³ V. p.85, vs.142: "*jñānam ca sāttvikam proktaṃ trayo 'nye rājasāḥ smṛtāḥ / tāmasāścāpyadharmādyāścatvāro vai varānane.*" In the classical Sāṃkhya, in contrast, the four positive *bhāvāḥ* have a *sattvam* nature, and the four negative a *tamaḥ* nature. V. *Sāṃkhya-kārikā*, 23, and commentary, Jāwaji, *The Sāṃkhya Kārikā*, pp.333ff.

doctrine.¹ Kṣemarājaḥ qualifes this assertion as an aside intended to indicate the restricted scope of the liberation achieved by Sāṃkhya adherents. Alternatively, this aside might be viewed as a survival from an earlier context that came embedded in the lists of categories lifted from a Sāṃkhya source document.²

In this section (pp.85–90), for the positive dispositions, the text enumerates: the ten kinds of righteousness, comprising the five rules (*yamāḥ*) and five restrictions (*niyamāḥ*); the eight kinds of knowledge, comprising in their deity names the eight perfections (*siddhayaḥ*); the nine kinds of dispassionateness (*vairāgyam*), comprising in their deity names the nine satisfactions (*tuṣṭayaḥ*); the nine kinds of mastery (*aiśvaryam*), comprising the nine superhuman attainments. Then, for the negative dispositions, the text simply lists the negated form of the items in these lists; for example, as the counterpart to the perfection Tāram, it gives A-tāram.³

The text then (pp.90–93) describes the distribution of the eight dispositions in the divine matrices of existence. After first

¹ V. pp.84–85, vs.141: “*badhnāti saptadhā sā tu puṃsaḥ saṃsāravartmani / mocayejjñānabhāvena sāmṃkhyajñānaratānnarān.*”

² V., for example, *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, 44, and commentary, Jāwaji, *The Sāṃkhya Kārikā*, p.405 “... *jñānena cāpavargo.*”

³ The five rules (*yamāḥ*) and five restrictions (*niyamāḥ*), appear to correspond more to the list given by Paramārthaḥ in his commentary to *kārikā* 23, than to Gauḍapādaḥ; (V. Takakusu, “La Sāṃkhyakārikā étudiée à la lumière de sa version chinoise, (II),” p.1009, n.1.) Kṣemarājaḥ also notes the discrepancy between the feminine ending of the perfections in the preceding book, and the neuter in this book; “... a difference merely in the reading; there is no difference, however, in the substance.” (V. his commentary, p.87: “*iha jñānasāmānādhikaranyena napuṃsakanirdeśena uktau kevalam pūrvam modamāneti yatpāṭhitam tatsthāna iha taramamiti pāṭhamātrabhedah natu vastubhedah kaścit.*” Cf. bk.10, p.442.)

distributing each disposition in a matrix, such as righteousness in the Indra-related, the text next notes the successively decreasing portions of mastery, which resides fully in the Brahmā-related matrix, allotted to each lower matrix. In men, in contrast, another verse adds, all the qualities occur in a very mixed up (*susamkīrṇa-*) state. In the existents below men, the four negative qualities predominate. Dialogue then introduces a list (pp. 94–97) distributing the three constituents in the matrices of existence; the gods, for example have a predominance of *sattvam*, animals *tamaḥ*. Cognizant that the text here appears to imitate not only the content but the structure of the *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, which also discusses this topic right after the intellectual emanation, Kṣemarājaḥ takes pains to point out the more precise distinctions drawn in this passage.¹ This section concludes by declaring that in men, due to action (*karma*) there exist an infinite variety of matrices; consequently, just like their qualities, so their constituents exist in a mixed state and can not be distinguished.

Nonetheless, the text immediately proceeds (pp. 97–102) to correlate human doctrines to the dispositions and constituents. First, correlated to the four negative dispositions and to darkness (*tamaḥ*), comes logic, singled out for extensive condemnation; second, correlated to righteousness (*dharmaḥ*) comes worldly (*laukikaḥ*) knowledge; third, correlated to righteousness and knowledge, the Vedic and Pāñcarātra; fourth, correlated to dispassionateness the Buddhist and Jain; fifth, correlated to knowledge and dispassionateness, the Sāṃkhya; sixth, correlated to knowledge, dispassionateness, and mastery, Yoga; and finally, seventh, the knowledge that lies beyond the dispositions of the intellect (*buddhibhāvānām atimārgaḥ*) equated by Kṣemarājaḥ,

¹ Kṣemarājaḥ (p. 96) even quotes *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, 54; v. also *kārikā* 53, and commentary, Jāwaji, *The Sāṃkhya Kārikā*, pp. 451ff, on the divine matrices and the distribution of the three constituents.

with the Śaiva (*pārameśvaram*). The following verses (pp.102–104) then expand these correlations, categorizing the adherents of the first through sixth doctrines as the bonded beings (*paśavaḥ*) subject to rebirth, and lauding the Śaivas, starting with the Kāpālikāḥ and the Pāśupatāḥ, as those who obtain the level of Īśvaraḥ and from there proceed to liberation outside of the cycle of existence.

A pair of verses (pp.104–105) then compare transmigration to the Persian water wheel (*ghaṭayantram*); there, for example, the plane Niyatiḥ, or necessity symbolizes the stick that sets it turning, Kālāḥ, or time, the force that keeps it swirling, and so forth.¹ Then, in contrast to the knowledge of the bonded beings which does not permit them to escape the wheel, the text (pp.106–110) celebrates the Śaiva doctrine which easily bestows not only everything offered by the other doctrines but also ultimate liberation. Kṣemarājaḥ comments at length on the attributes ascribed to this knowledge in order to furnish a non-dual interpretation.²

The text then closes (pp.110–113) the discussion of emanation with several verses characterized by Kṣemarājaḥ as a summary of the book and an additional glorification of the Śaiva

¹ V. vss.186–187: “*saṃsāracakramārūdhā bhramanti ghaṭayantravat/ dharmādyarakasaṃyuktamaṣṭāraṃ cakrakaṃ priye // īśvarādhiṣṭhitam devi niyatyādaṇḍakāhatam / malakarmakalāviddham bhramate kālavegataḥ*. ” In the following book, the same image occurs, as a brief allusion (vs.82, pp.34–35), compared by Kṣemarājaḥ to *Bhagavadgītā* 18, 61. (V. van Buitenen, ed. and trans., *The Bhagavadgītā* 40[18].61, p.142.)

² He glosses (p.108), for example, . . . without disruption (*nirupaplava-*), i.e., non-discursive (*nirvikalpa-*), i.e., having the form of autonomous consciousness alone, as the manifestor of everything in continuous manifestation (“*nirupaplavaṃ nirvikalpaṃ sataāvabhāsarvasarvābhāsakasvatantracidekarūpaṃ*”).

teaching.¹ In the planes of emanation just described, the text declares, which contain all worlds and all forms of knowledge and experience, only the Śaiva initiation can bestow non-binding enjoyments and final liberation.

II.11.2 The Maintenance and Reabsorption of the Planes

After announcing the end of the stated topic of the book, the emanation of the universe, dialogue then (p.114) introduces as new topics, the maintenance (*sthitih*) and the reabsorption (*saṃhāraḥ*) of the universe. Maintaining or reabsorbing the universe, Kṣemarājaḥ explains, depends upon the principles of Kālaḥ or time, and Niyatiḥ, or restriction. Accordingly, the text begins by exhaustively enumerating the standard divisions of time, (pp.114–126) from an instant (*kṣaṇaḥ*) to a day of Brahmā.² Following well established tradition, the text then (pp.126–134) connects these measures to maintenance and reabsorption.

A day of Brahmā, it declares, equals the duration of the seven underworlds and seven worlds. At the beginning of a night of Brahmā, when he falls asleep, there commences the reabsorption of his sphere. Seeing him asleep, Kālāgniḥ, the rudraḥ at the base of the underworld, emits a monstrous flame from his right face that burns through the underworlds up to Svarlokaḥ.

¹ V. his commentary, p.110: “... *anuvādabhaṅgyā upsamharan śivajñānamāhātmyam eva adhikāvāpena*”

² The text here defines the *kṣaṇaḥ* or instant, which designates the shortest measured duration, as one-eighth of the *nimeṣaḥ*, the length of the blinking of an eye. For other comprehensive lists of the standard units of time up to the lifespan of Brahmā, similar to that of *Svacchandatantram*, cf., for example, *Bhāgavatapurāṇam*, III, 11, in Śāstri, et al., eds., *Śrīmadbhāgavatapurāṇam* 3, 4: 395ff, and *Śivapurāṇam*, “Vāyaviyasamhitā, pūrvabhāgaḥ,” 8, in Khemraj Shrikrishnadas, publisher, *Śrīśivamahāpurāṇam* (Bombay: Shri Venkateshwar Press, n.d.), pp.510ff.

The smoke from this fire also rises and destroys Maharlokaḥ, Janalokaḥ, and Taparlokaḥ, and renders the inhabitants in Brahmā's own world, Satyalokaḥ, unconscious. Exhaling in his sleep, Brahmā blows away the ashes of these burnt up worlds, and sweating from the heat, he inundates his desolate sphere until it becomes a gigantic ocean. The souls remain submerged there, with their activity suspended but their latent impressions that will necessitate future experiences intact, until the dawn of a new day of Brahmā. When Brahmā awakes, in order that these souls can undergo their preset experiences, he re-emanates the worlds, and fills them with a new set of existents structured according to the same pattern of constituents as the previous emanation.

After describing the process of reabsorption and re-emanation in the egg of Brahmā, the text continues (pp.134-140) the enumeration of temporal measures. The day and night in each nychthemeron of Brahmā have equal duration, and each of his years has three hundred and sixty of these nychthemera. In order to ease the burden of calculating such large numbers, the text introduces the godly (*daivika-*) year, which equals three hundred and sixty normal (*laukika-*) years. The text then calculates the length of a *mahākālpaḥ*, or the hundred years which constitute the lifespan of Brahmā, in both measures, and to ensure their comprehension includes a short aside naming and defining the place value of the numbers from one to ten to the eighteenth power (*parārdham*).¹

After these calculations, the text continues (pp.139-141) describing the sequence of reabsorption. At the end of a *mahākālpaḥ*, Brahmā becomes reabsorbed in the next higher

¹ His lifespan equals by Kṣemarāja's calculation, written in numerals in his commentary, 870,912,000,000 godly years.

regent, Viṣṇuḥ, whose day equals Brahmā's lifespan.² The pattern of reabsorption repeats itself with the same temporal proportions for Viṣṇuḥ, who becomes reabsorbed after a hundred of his years in the next higher regent Rudraḥ, whose day equals Viṣṇu's lifespan. Each regent, in turn, re-emanates the regent below him at the end of his own night. Then there follows a short digression (pp.141–143) explaining that these processes actually operate through the conation (*icchā*) of Śivaḥ embodied in his undivided power (*śaktiḥ*), which divides herself in lower manifestations as powers such as Vaiṣṇavi, in order that the corresponding regents, such as Viṣṇuḥ, can exercise their functions of maintenance and reabsorption.

After this parenthetical Śaiva theologizing of the cosmic cycles, the text directly picks up (pp.144–147) the interrupted sequence of reabsorption. According to the pattern already established, Rudraḥ becomes reabsorbed in the hundred rudrāḥ. When their lifespan ends, then the egg of Brahmā, celebrated as the support of multiform existents, itself dissolves into the surrounding water. At the same time, Kālāgnirudraḥ becomes reabsorbed into the plane of time. The mention of time then leads

² Describing the end of a *mahākalpaḥ* (p.139, vs.264a), the text says simply that Brahmā dissolves in the next (*pare*) level (*"mahākalpasya paryante brahmā yāti pare layam"*). This would appear to indicate, according to the accepted view in which each successively higher plane pervades and includes the one beneath it, that Brahmā would be reabsorbed in the next higher level of Viṣṇuḥ. Later on, however, when describing the dissolution of Rudraḥ (p.144, vs.274a), the text says that when dissolved he goes to the highest (*param*) place and becomes the lord without parts (*niṣkalaḥ*) (*"so 'pi yāti param sthānam yadgatvā niṣkalo bhavet"*). Recognizing the text's conflicting use of *para*-, Kṣemarājaḥ explains both senses as possible outcomes of dissolution, dependent upon whether or not the regent has received divine grace. (V. his commentary, p.140: *"avṛttaparaśaktipātaḥ pare iti sāpekṣatayā prakṛṣṭe samanantare kāraṇe liyate vṛttaparaśaktipātaḥ paramaśive"*).

to short aside (pp.147–149) that sets out the regents in charge of the reabsorption of the planes. The supreme lord, who is time, the text declares, controls the main phases of reabsorption through his manifestation as the triad of rudrāḥ, specified by Kṣemarājaḥ as: Kālāgnirudraḥ, already described, who rules over the reabsorbing of earth; Anantaḥ, in the form of the Kālarūpi, who rules over the reabsorbing of the planes from water to Māyā; and finally, Maheśvaraḥ, himself, who rules over the reabsorbing of the pure planes that end in the power.

After this second parenthetical assertion of Śiva's control over the dissolution of the universe, the text describes (pp.149–156) the next major phase in the sequence of reabsorption. At the end of his hundred year lifespan, Amareśaḥ, the regent of water, becomes reabsorbed into the next plane fire. Each day of the regent of fire, Kṣemarājaḥ explains, equals as before, the lifespan of the lower regent of water. The text then generally declares that the reabsorption of the rest of the elements, sensory media, organs, ego, and intellect occurs in the same pattern and with the same proportional measures of time, up to the level of matter. In matter these planes all lie dissolved in an ungraspable, subtle, isolated atomic state.

Continuing its description of the unmanifest (*avyakta-*), viz., matter in its unmanifest state, the text mentions the range of creatures, such as the ancestors (*pitaraḥ*), manifest sounds, such as the Praṇavaḥ, sect adherents, such as of the Sāṃkhyam, and deities, such as of the intellect, which it has reabsorbed.¹ Over this realm, the text adds, presides, as supreme lord (*parameśaḥ*) and leader of the universe (*viśvanāyakaḥ*), Śrikanṭhaḥ, whose lifespan equals that of thirty-six thousand manifestations of

¹ V. p.153, vss.289–290: *“prajāḥ prajānām patayaḥ pitaro mānavaiḥ saha /sāṅkhyajñānena ye siddhāḥ vedena brahmavādināḥ // chandaḥ sāmāni coṅkāro buddhistaddevatāḥ priye ahni tiṣṭhanti te sarve parameśasya dhimataḥ.”*

Brahmā. Kṣemarājaḥ explains that this Brahmā refers to the rudraḥ who rules over the plane of the intellect immediately below.

Kṣemarāja's remarks point to an earlier identification of the intellect with Brahmā as the regent of the egg of Brahmā. Supporting this supposition, the text's description cited above of what has been dissolved into the unmanifest or Prakṛtiḥ reads as if a description of the dissolution of the egg of Brahmā.¹ Accordingly, many Purāṇic accounts of cosmogony identify Brahmā as the intellect, and the egg of Brahmā as the first manifestation of Prakṛtiḥ that contains all its manifest planes.² In its theistic varieties, these cosmogonies may have the supreme lord as the twenty-sixth principle, outside of the egg of Brahmā and beyond Prakṛtiḥ, just as the verses here designate the regent rudraḥ, Śrikanṭhaḥ.³ This would also parallel the declaration in the preceding book that locates Śrikanṭhaḥ above the world of Brahmā.⁴ These verses in *Svacchandatantram*, therefore, still

¹ As a reflection of this identification, in the preceding book (pp.397ff, vs.968) Brahmā, residing at the plane of the intellect, emanates the various matrices of existence.

² V. Agrawala, *The Matsya Purāṇa- A Study*, pp.5ff, for the many variants of the basic cosmogonic myth of the universe as a golden egg (*aṇḍam*) associated with Brahmā.

³ On the twenty-sixth principle as the supreme lord beyond the twenty-five principles up to Puruṣaḥ, v., for example, the *Mahābhārata*, "Mokṣadharmaparvan" 12, 306, vss.52-79 (pp.1692-1696).

⁴ In the preceding book (p.426), Śrikanṭha's world lies above Brahmā, in the plane of the intellect, but not in the plane of the person. As explained by Kṣemarājaḥ (p.155), twenty-six refers to Śrikanṭha's location here at the plane of Puruṣaḥ, above the twenty-five preceding planes that by counting the constituents as a separate plane end at Prakṛtiḥ. This would also explain his subsequent (p.156) identification with the planes of the jacket (*kañcukam*) that function to restrict, as explained before, the consciousness to a limited person

apparently echo the context of an earlier and simpler cosmogony.

The incomplete adaptation of this earlier account into the later Śaiva schema thus required adjusting commentary by Kṣemarājaḥ. In particular, as another sign of an earlier context, the text apparently describes the process of reabsorption of the planes from water to matter, in a linear, vertical sequence; the element water, for example, dissolves into fire, fire into air, and so forth, and then the elements into their originating sensory media. Kṣemarājaḥ, in contrast, reads these verses to conform with the standard cumulative sequence of emanation or reabsorption; there the earth dissolves into five sensory media, water into four, and so forth.¹

After discussing the second major phase of reabsorption, which occurs in Prakṛtiḥ, and which Kṣemarājaḥ calls the intermediate dissolution, the text describes (pp.156–160) the next phase which covers the planes up to Māyā. In this phase, Śrikanṭhaḥ, and all the rest of the planes of the jacket become reabsorbed into the plane of Māyā. This reabsorption, Kṣemarājaḥ notes, occurs simultaneously; the hierarchical sequence described by the previous book applies only to their location in space, and not to their temporal manifestation.² The text characterizes Māyā, as the root matter (*mūlaprakṛtiḥ*) of the universe, and the regent of Māyā, as the cave lord (*gahaneśaḥ*), referring to Ananteśaḥ who presides over the lower universe from the central cave or

(*puruṣaḥ*). The text, however, does not refer to the constituents, nor explicitly refer to the plane of the person.

¹ V. pp.150–151, vss.284b–285: *"āpastejasi liyante tattejaścānile punaḥ // tathānilo 'mbaram prāpya saha tenaiva liyate tanmātreṣu praliyante yathotpannāni ca kramāt.*" On the historical relationship and development of these two different sequences, v. Erich Frauwallner, "Zur Elementenlehre des Sāṃkhya," Erich Frauwallner *Kleine Schriften*, hrsg. Gerhard Oberhammer und Ernst Steinkellner, Glasenapp-Stiftung 22 (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1982), pp.140–144.

² V. his commentary, p.157: *"srṣṭirapi yugapadeva uktā."*

world matrix in the plane of Māyā.¹ As previously, the passing of his day signals the dissolution of the lower universe. The relation between his lifespan and those of the planes below him, however, does not follow the previously established pattern in which each day of the higher regent equals the lifespan of the lower. Instead, as interpreted by Kṣemarājaḥ, the text declares that each day of Māyā lasts not as long as the lifespan of the preceding plane but ten *parārdhāni* as long.²

These increased proportions also apply to the duration of the higher planes discussed in the next section (pp.160–165). Thus the text declares that a day of Īśvaraḥ lasts a hundred *parārdhāni* as long as the lifespan Māyā, and a day of Sadāśivaḥ a hundred *parārdhāni* as long as the lifespan of Īśvaraḥ. Kṣemarājaḥ, however, understands the plane of Vidyā, to be implied between Māyā and Īśvaraḥ; this interpretation would then maintain the increase by factors of ten *parārdhāni* up to Sadāśivaḥ. As fitting for the great duration of time indicated, a verse calls the dissolution that occurs in between two days of Sadāśivaḥ, the great dissolution (*mahāpralayaḥ*).

At this point, the text briefly enumerates the upper planes as if enumerating the higher progressions in the meditative formula ascent. The great body of the five formulæ, i.e., according to Kṣemarājaḥ the lower, gross Sadāśivaḥ, dissolves in Binduḥ. Then, the formula, after splitting Binduḥ, Ardhaśāstraḥ, and Nirodhikā, dissolves in Nādaḥ, and finally piercing through the

¹ Cf. section II.10.5 for the summary of bk.10, pp.470ff.

² Cf. the preceding discussion of pp.138–139 for these numbers. Dropping the equivalence between day and lifespan disrupts the coordination between emanation and reabsorption of the the lower regent and day and night of the higher regent. The text does not explain, for example, whether or not reabsorption of the lower regent still occurs when the lifespan of the lower regent runs out and the upper is still experiencing his day.

aperture of Brahmā, dissolves in the plane of Śaktiḥ. As before, Kṣemarājaḥ coordinates these formula stages with planes, and supplies their duration. Binduḥ, Ardhaśāstraḥ, and Nirodhikā represent stages in the plane of the lower Sadāśivaḥ, and the day of each last a hundred *parārdhāni* times the lifespan of the preceding. Nādaḥ represents the higher Sadāśivaḥ, and the mention of the middle channel Kṣemarājaḥ interprets as indicating the stages of Suṣumnā, and so forth, discussed in the preceding book.¹ Their day he indicates to be increased in the proportions stated for the preceding. A verse then indicates the lifespan of Śaktiḥ, however, to be a *parārdham*. Kṣemarājaḥ interprets this to indicate not a single *parārdham* but a *parārdham* of *parārdhāni* which he adds constitutes an extremely large number. This corresponds, he notes, to the intent of the text, where in the preceding book the spatial dimensions of the higher worlds grew at exponential rates.

In ascending sequence above Śaktiḥ comes the set of regents in the plane of Śivaḥ, Vyāpī, Vyomarūpaḥ, Anantaḥ, Anāthaḥ, and Anāśritaḥ. Kṣemarājaḥ explains the text's brief remarks on the duration of Anāśritaḥ as indicating that his day lasts a crore of *parārdhāni* times the life of Śaktiḥ, and that his life lasts a *parārdham* of *parārdhāni* of such days.²

After noting the duration of Anāśritaḥ, the text describes (pp.165–172) the highest Śivaḥ. In contrast to the previous planes subject to time through emanation, maintenance, and reabsorption, Śivaḥ is time (*kālaḥ*) itself, since he articulates (*kālayati*) the entire universe from Vyāpini to earth, with different temporal units (*kalā*). Continuing this word play,

¹ V. bk.10, pp.530ff.

² Neither the text nor Kṣemarājaḥ here discuss the duration of the other regents, Vyāpī, and so forth, or their relation to Anāśritaḥ. They may then be presumed to be coextensive with him.

following verses characterize his own nature as untouched by time (*kālavarjitaḥ*), inarticulable (*na kalyaḥ*), the lord devoid of articulations (*niṣkalaḥ*), where time is not found.¹ The text then declares that when as universal agent (*sarvakartā*) Śivaḥ emanates and reabsorbs the universe, he does so without desire (*akāmāt*) and without any change in his own nature.

Dialogue then has the goddess explicitly place the question, which Kṣemarājaḥ saw answered in the beginning verses of the book.² As interpreted by Kṣemarājaḥ, she asks: since all actions (*kriyā*) by an agent are preceded by a desire or intention (*saṅkalpaḥ*), then how can Śivaḥ, perfect and without desire, and therefore without action, emanate the universe.³ The text responds in its preferred manner of teaching, not with a formal argument, but rather with a pair of similes. The first compares Śivaḥ to the sun, and his power (*śaktiḥ*) to the sun-stone; just as the sun produces fire from the sun-stone, without any intention as a consequence of their innate nature, so Śivaḥ moves his power to manifest the universe. The second compares Śivaḥ to time and his power to a tree; just as a tree, through the passing of time, brings forth its sprout, so Śivaḥ induces his power to manifest the universe. As Kṣemarājaḥ recognizes, however, these similes are

¹ V. p.167, vss.310b-312: *'sa cādhaḥ kalayetsarvaṃ vyāpinyādim dharāvadhim // tutyādibhiḥ kalābhiśca devyadhvānaṃ carācaram / ūrdhvamunmanaso yacca tatra kālo na vidyate // na kalyaḥ kalyate kaścinniṣkalaḥ kālavarjitaḥ / yaḥ śāṅkaryunmanātitaḥ sa nityo vyāpako 'vyayaḥ.'*

² Cf. Kṣemarāja's commentary on vss.3b-4a of this book (p.4), which also state that Śivaḥ acts without desire (*akāmāt*).

³ V. p.170, vs.396, and commentary: *"akāmasya kriyā nāsti niṣkriyaśca srjetkatham / etaṃ praśnavaram guhyaṃ kathaya sva prasādataḥ' sarvā gamanapacanādikriyā saṅkalpapūrvā saṅkalpaśca cidānandaghane bhagavati neṣṭaḥ tatkathamakriyasya sraṣṭṛtvam athaca citprakāśātmakaparamaśvarasvarūpavyatiriktasya anyasya sattvameva na ghaṭate kimaṅga kartṛtvam."*

not entirely appropriate for illustrating the theology of non-dualism. Extending the comparison too far, he notes, would imply that Śivaḥ and Śaktiḥ are unconscious or separate like the sun and sun stone.¹ Thus, if these verses illustrating the action of Śivaḥ represent a later addition to this book on the planes, then the reservations expressed by Kṣemarājaḥ on their aptness, suggest that they were not appended by redactors in his own non-dual tradition.

¹ V. his commentary, p.171: "*natu jādyam bhinnatvam ca dārṣṭāntike śaṅkaniyam dṛṣṭāntadārṣṭāntikayoḥ sarvasādharmyāyogāt.*"

II.12 BOOK 12

II.12.1 The Nature of the Lower Planes

The opening dialogue of this book (pp.1-2) summarizes the topics of the preceding book, sc. the emanation, maintenance, and reabsorption of the planes, and introduces a related topic: knowledge of the planes (*tattvavijñānam*) that yields specific attainments (*siddhiḥ*) connected with them (*teṣu*).¹ Before presenting the announced topic, however, the text has a long section (pp.2-35) discussing the general nature of the lower planes. In content, this discussion both differs from and repeats those of the preceding two books. If the discussion of the planes for the sake of attainments depended on the general presentation of the planes by the preceding books, then this material would be superfluous. The re-presentation of the planes argues that in a source document, this general discussion accompanied, as a kind of explanatory preface, the examination of the planes for the sake of attainments. When constructing this section of the text, compilers then carried over this prefatory discussion accompanying the material on specific attainments. Hypothetically, as suggested by its primary interest in meditative attainments, this book may represent the core discussion of the planes in the Bhairava source. The preceding books, in contrast, as indicated by their emphasis on

¹ Kṣemarājaḥ explains *viññānam* or knowledge, as realizing (*sākṣātkāraḥ*) by practices such as concentration (*dhāraṇā*). (V. p.2, vs.2a, and commentary: “*tattvaviññānamākhyāhi siddhistēṣu yathā bhavet’ viññānam dhāraṇādikrameṇa sākṣātkāraḥ teṣvati tadviśayā siddhiryathā syāt.*”) By using the term *viññānam*, these dialogue verses apparently intend to distinguish the practical knowledge of the planes, directed to adepts, presented in this book, from the more theoretical knowledge (*jñānam*), presented in the preceding book. (V. for this distinction, Franklin Edgerton, *The Beginnings of Indian Philosophy* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965), p.361, with references.)

initiation ritual and doctrine, would then represent related material drawn from scriptural Śaiva sources.

The first part (pp.2–6) of this section describes the five elements in terms of their manifestations, not only externally, but also internally, in the body. First internally, under its form of hardness (*kathinarūpeṇa*), the element earth occurs in the body in hard substances as bone (*asthi*); water in fluids such as sweat (*svedaḥ*), fire in digestion (*pacanam*); air in the functions of the various breaths such as elimination (*visargaḥ*); and ether under the form of the nine apertures.¹ For the external manifestations, the text simply alludes to the traditional conception that the elements possess specific properties (*lakṣaṇam*) in a decreasing number, from earth with five to ether with one, but does not list them. Kṣemarājaḥ, therefore, supplies these in his commentary. He lists, for example, the specific sounds of the five elements, then the specific tactile quality for the four up to wind, and so forth.²

Next (pp.5–13), deviating, as noted by Kṣemarājaḥ, from the standard order, come not the sensory media but the organs of action and perception.³ The text first (pp.6–8) enumerates the characteristic activities for each organ of action. In addition to their activities, this characterization includes some related information, such as the kinds of speech, such as Sanskrit, Prakrit, and so forth, uttered by the organ of speech, or the kinds

¹ This list repeats basic concepts, codified in the Āyurvedaḥ, and current in many traditions, such as the Sāṃkhyam. (For the relationship between these systems and the properties assigned to the elements, v. R.F.G. Müller, esp. pp.72ff, of "Medizin der Inder in kritischer Übersicht," *Indo-Asian Studies* II, *Prof. Raghu Vira Memorial Volume*, ed. Lokesh Chandra, Śata-Piṭaka Series 37 (New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1965.), pp.3–124.

² V. his commentary, pp.4–5.

³ Cf. the description of *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, 26, 28, Jāwaji, *The Sāṃkhya Kārikā*, pp.349ff, 359ff.

of terrain, muddy, uneven, and so forth, traversed by the feet. After enunciating the general principle that the organs of perception (*budhindriyāṇi*) operate through contact with the intellect (*buddhiḥ*), the text next (pp.8–13) discusses them by enumerating the range of objects and properties (*viśayaḥ*) covered by their perceptive activity. For the first, hearing, there follows an extensive list of notes, scales, musical instruments, and the like. For the others, the text has shorter lists, such as soft, hard, and the like, for the skin, or colors for the eye. At the end of this list, a half-verse marks the field possessor (*kṣetri*) or knower, deluded by the ego as one who perceives the objects. This remark evidently echoes the common Sāṃkhya notion that the *puruṣaḥ* and not the perceptive organ cognizes objects.¹

After the organs, comes a verse and a half that (pp.13–14) briefly characterizes the activity of the internal perceptive organ (*manaḥ*), which by intention (*saṅkalpaḥ*) and conception (*vikalpaḥ*) coordinates the activities of the other organs.² Next a group of general verses (pp. 14–16) correlates each sensory medium (*tanmātram*) with the operation of a single sense organ, and the perception of a single object. As explained by Kṣemarājaḥ, the sensory medium, for example, of smell (*gandhatanmātram*), as an agent, localizes and restricts the sense organ of smelling (*ghrāṇā*), as an instrument, to a specific location, such as the tip of the nose, and to a single property, such as smell (*gandhaḥ*) as its object. Through their association with and location in the

¹ V. p.13, vs.30b: “*yenāsau buddhyate kṣetri ahankāreṇa mohitāḥ*.” Kṣemarājaḥ interprets this apparently Sāṃkhya statement in a non-dual fashion: “*śarīrādau baddhābhimānatvādeva vyatirekeṇa viśayānvetti*.” V. for this distinction in early Sāṃkhyaṃ, Edgerton, *The Beginnings of Indian Philosophy*, p.288, n.2.

² V. the similar characterization of the *manaḥ* in *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, 27, Jāwajī, *The Sāṃkhya Kārikā*, pp.351.

perceptive organ, they enable perception by limiting the activity of a given perceptive organ to its corresponding object. They further mediate between the perceptive organs and the ego, and thus allow ego impressions of a particular object to occur. Otherwise, if, as in the view of Nyāyaḥ, the sensory media constituted only subtle forms of objects, they would not leave a particular impression on the ego. And, if, as in the view of the classical Sāṃkhyaḥ, they were related only to the ego, then they would not be able to restrict perception to a particular object. Without the sensory media, the organs would be pervasive and unfocused like the ego, and cognition of specific objects would be impossible.¹

Several verses follow (pp.16–17) that enumerate the series of erroneous identifications, such as I am powerful, I am a victor in battle, and so forth, that stem from the ego, and cause bondage to transmigration. This section begins by declaring that above there is the transforming (*vaikārika-*) ego, and ends by declaring that the threefold ego has been discussed. Although, Kṣemarājaḥ interprets this first declaration as intentionally asserting that the constituent *rajaḥ* represented by the transforming ego dominates, the discrepancy probably indicates that the compilers have here inserted only part of a fuller description of the ego found in a source document.²

The section on the intellect (pp.18–26) consists of an extensive listing of its properties (*dharmaḥ*), which comprise the eight primary psychic dispositions (*bhāvāḥ*) and their secondary divisions. Before these lists of divisions, there comes a general

¹ V. his commentary, pp.15–16:

“niyamitatanmātroparaktāhaṅkārikatvamindriyāṇām anyathā sāṅkhyavatkevale āhaṅkārikatve niyataviśayasambandho na ghaṭate naiyāyikavadvā kevalabhautikatve tu ahaṁpratītyanugamo na syāt.”

² V. p.16, vs.36a: *“vaikārikastataś . . . ,”* and p.18, vs.40b: *“trividhasyāpyayaṁ dharmo ‘haṅkārasya prakīrtitaḥ.”*

verse that characterizes the intellect as binding the soul to transmigration by seven dispositions, and by the eighth, knowledge, deluding it, and which then in traditional fashion classifies the intellect's main activity as determination (*adhyavasāyaḥ*).¹ In the following lists, first, notably, for righteousness (*dharmaḥ*), comes a longer and different series of divisions than the preceding books. In order to preclude any intra-scriptural contradiction, Kṣemarājaḥ attempts to harmonize these lists by demonstrating that the longer list simply amplifies and alters the pattern but not substance of the shorter.²

Second, for knowledge, instead of a list, come several verses that appear to praise the Sāṃkhya knowledge that leads to liberation from matter. At the end of this description, however, the text declares that the lord (*īśvaraḥ*), the agent of emanation,

¹ V. p.18, vs.42b: "*badhnāti saptadhā sā tu jñānabhāvena mohayet.*" The contrast, marked by *tu*, might suggest that the verse originally read: by seven it, i.e., the intellect binds, but by the eighth, knowledge, it liberates. Redactors presumably have changed *mohayet* into *mohayet*. The original verse would then fit the praise given elsewhere of knowledge as liberating, and the alteration would correspond to the redactorial denigration of Sāṃkhya knowledge later in this section (V. pp.21-22, vss.50-51). Cf. the probable model of this verse found in a similar context in the preceding book (p.84, vs.141): "*badhnāti saptadhā sā tu pumsaḥ saṃsāravartmani / mocayejjñānabhāvena sāṃkhya jñānaratānnarān.*" V. *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, 63, and commentary, in Esnoul, *Les strophes de Sāṃkhya*, p.73, that contains the same model of seven that bind and one that liberates ("*rūpaiḥ saptabhir eva badhnātyātmānamātmanā prakṛtiḥ / saiva ca puruṣārtham prati vimocayatyekarūpeṇa.*" And in Gauḍapāda's commentary "*ekarūpeṇa jñānena.*" On the function of the intellect as *adhyavasāyaḥ*, v. *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, 23, Jāwajī, *The Sāṃkhya Kārikā*, pp.333ff.

² Thus, for example, Kṣemarājaḥ (p.20) has wisdom (*vidyā*), study (*abhyāsaḥ*), and guarding life (*jīvitārakṣā*), in this list, match obedience to the master (*guruśūśrūṣā*), in preceding lists (Bk.11, p.86), because they form its fruit (*phalam*) or consequence ("*vidyābhyāso jīvitārakṣā ca guruśūśrūṣāyāḥ phalam*").

nonetheless rebinds the soul to transmigration. The source document used to construct this section probably contained this praise of Sāṃkhya knowledge. Instead of excising it, in as much as it represented the entire description of the knowledge disposition, redactors retained it and added this final verse, qualifying this knowledge as subordinate to the lord.

Third, for dispassionateness, instead of members of the intellectual emanation as in preceding lists, the text lists specific austerities such as the five fires (*pañcāgniḥ*), and ritual suicide. For mastery, the text also lists specific acts, including, notably, criminal acts, which its realization makes possible. Without morally rationalizing the instructions to commit such reprehensible acts, Kṣemarājaḥ simply comments that acts like deceitful murder, for example, help acquire mastery of their corresponding constituent, in this case, *tamaḥ* or darkness. Closing this section, the text then discusses the negative dispositions almost as if an interconnected set of circumstances; acts of unrighteousness (*adharmāḥ*) lead, as it were, to the ignorance (*ajñānam*) which believes that no right or wrong exists. And in this misery, the person drags on suffering in passionateness (*avairāgyam*), or persists unconcerned in a worsening condition through lack of mastery (*anaiśvaryam*).

The next section (pp.26–30) characterizes matter and the three constituents. The first verse calls matter or the unmanifest that which contains the three constituents, the stimulator (*pravartakaḥ*) of transmigration, and that through which there is the production of the world (*jagadutpattiḥ*). Recognizing that these verses invite a Sāṃkhya interpretation, Kṣemarājaḥ adds the qualification that matter exercises these functions only through the impulse of the lord (*īśvaraḥ*). Historically, however, this unqualified characterization points to a probable earlier Sāṃkhya context for this section.

The text presents the three constituents by characterizing the prototypical men that would result from their unalloyed

embodiment. Though not named explicitly, the traits enumerated depict the perfect embodiment of the good (*sattvam*) as the serene brāhmaṇa sage, of the active (*rajaḥ*) as the violent kṣatriya king, of the dark (*tamaḥ*) as the criminal and indolent outcaste.

This description of the constituents (*guṇaḥ*), then leads directly to the next section (pp.30–35) on the person (*puruṣaḥ*) or soul. These verses not only characterize the person but in effect recount and celebrate the growing awareness of its nature that leads to liberation. In absolute contrast to the activity of matter and all its preceding manifestations, the person consists of pure, inactive, consciousness. No real connection exists between the two, and discriminating between them by realizing the true nature of the person immediately ends the person's bondage. At the end of this apparent celebration of Sāṃkhya knowledge, however, come several verses that denigrate it and the liberation it provides as limited, deluded, and ultimately leading back to the cycle of transmigration. The lord, they assert, actually controls the process of rebirth and the cosmic cycles. Consequently, the knowledge of Sāṃkhyam fails to liberate and the delusional identifying with activity re-engulfs the person in transmigration.

As before, compilers have apparently incorporated and then qualified a Sāṃkhya source by appending verses asserting theistic control of the universe. Their qualification, however, does not extend far enough for Kṣemarājaḥ. In particular, he must readjust the crucial assertion that the person is a non agent (*akartā*), which even the theistic qualification had left intact. His commentary stresses, accordingly, the standard non-dual Śaiva position, that the person remains bound not because he erroneously identifies himself as an agent, but because he fails to identify himself as the supreme agent, Śivaḥ. This differing criticism of the Sāṃkhya doctrine suggests that the compilers of this section belonged to Śaiva traditions other than those immediately antecedent to non-dual Śaivas like Kṣemarājaḥ.

II.12.2 Meditations on the Planes

At this point (p.35) dialogue marks an end to the exposition of Sāṃkhya knowledge and immediately introduces without transition a new topic, meditation (*dhyānam*) on the presiding deities (*adhidaivatam*). Thus the text here picks up the announced topic of the opening dialogue, knowledge of the planes for attainments. For as explained by Kṣemarājaḥ, each plane in the Śaiva universe has a presiding deity. When meditating on a plane in order to attain it and to obtain the powers correlated with it, therefore, an adept meditates on its presiding deity, and in worshipping or identifying himself with this deity receives the desired attainment.¹ Kṣemarājaḥ interprets these meditations as part of the practices set out for adepts in the sixth book, and as thus presuming the use of the preparations and observances described in that book.

The adept begins his meditations with the lowest set of planes, the elements (pp.36–41). Meditations on the elements formed a part of many traditions, and numerous texts describe these practices, elaborating the subtle forms assumed by the elements, the presiding deities, the duration of the practice, the locus in the microcosm, and the powers bestowed.² The tenth book, for example, although nominally discussing the worlds in the planes from the perspective of the initiation ritual, nevertheless

¹ V. his commentary, pp.35–36: “*prthivyāditattvānām dhyānam tatsaṃvācyatattvādhiṣṭhātṛdevatāsvarūpaṃ ca vaksyamānatattatsiddhipradam,*” and p.48: “*evamca vadato ‘yamāśayaḥ yatpārameśvare sarvatattvāni tattaddevatādhiṣṭhitānyeva na tu eṣām jaḍatvamevamiati atra devatāpradhānameva tattvadhyānamuktam.*”

² Cf. Sir John Woodroffe, *The Serpent Power* (1919. Reprint. New York: Dover Publications, 1974), pp.103ff, for the standard description of the microcosmic meditation on the elements and other planes.

included instructions about the attainment of the elemental worlds by concentration.¹ The continued transmission of this material indicates a strong traditional association between the elements and these meditations. Given the widespread accounts of elemental meditations, Kṣemarājaḥ, accordingly, proceeds to supplement the elliptical directives of *Svacchandatantram* with extracts from the *Pūrvaśāstram*, which contains an extensive treatment of these practices.²

The powers obtained by the elemental meditations roughly correspond to the properties of these elements. Thus, by meditating on earth, for example, the adept becomes invulnerable and unshakable. This correlation putatively gives, accordingly to Kṣemarājaḥ, a coherent structure to this book, in which the first half describes the lower planes from the perspective of their manifest attributes, and the second part the meditation to acquire these planes and their properties.³ Conforming at the outset to this structure, the first verse in this section which describes the meditation on earth echoes the opening verse which described the properties of earth: "earth, under its form of hardness (*kaṭhinarūpeṇa*)" ⁴

¹ V. bk.10: p.327, for earth; p.330, for water; p.357 for fire; p.363, for air; p.365, for ether.

² The *Śrīpūrvaśāstram* is another name for the *Mālinivīyayottaratantram*, one of the scriptures most highly esteemed by the non-dual Śaivas. The treatment of concentrations covers the twelfth to the sixteenth book.

³ V. his commentary, p.35: "*adhunā uccāraṇādikrameṇa tattatsiddhyartham sāksātkāryametatkāryatattvasvarūpaṁ sthūladṛśā pradarśya sūkṣmadṛśā paradṛśā ca ātmāśrayāṇi niyatyādisamastāni śuddhavidyādiśivāntāni ca siddhyarthameva tattvāntaradhyānāni darśayannupakramate.*"

⁴ V. p.2, vs.3a: "*pr̥thvi kaṭhinarūpeṇa,*" and p.36, vs.83b: "*pr̥thviṁ kaṭhinarūpeṇa.*"

For the meditation on earth, the text mentions a seed syllable and the traditional yellow color but not a presiding deity or microcosmic location. The form depicted, moreover, of mountains, animals, and oceans resembles more a portrait of the actual earth than of a schematized meditational shape or deity. In addition, the text does not otherwise specify the procedure followed, except to indicate that the adept should meditate. To make the practice of the text conform to the expected model, therefore, Kṣemarājaḥ indicates that the text implicitly refers to the tutelary deities discussed in the preceding books, and to the correlations between planes and the Vidyārāja formula discussed in book five.¹ Following the sequence of acts codified in Patañjali yogaḥ, he divides the procedure into two stages of a concentration (*dhāraṇā*) and a meditation (*dhyānam*). Though the meditational shape and color of these concentrations which Kṣemarājaḥ prescribes in accordance with the *Pūrvaśāstram*, matches those codified in later traditions, their basis differs.² According to this scripture, the adept does not focus on a particular microcosmic centre for his concentration, for example, on earth as a yellow square in the *mūlādhāram* center, but apparently contemplates his entire body as transformed into the element visualized in this shape and form.³ And finally, to the powers resulting from this meditation, which the text gives as invulnerability to poison and unshakableness, Kṣemarājaḥ adds mastery over the earth. For

¹ V. bk.5, p.3, vs.5. There ū represents all the planes from earth to matter.

² For the colors and shapes of the elements, cf. Woodroffe, *The Serpent Power*, pp.141–142; cf. also the *Śāradātilakam*, in Bakshi, ed., *The Śāradātilakam*, vss.21ff, pp.14ff.

³ V. M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Mālinivijayottaratantram* 12, 22, p.81: “*samyagāviṣṭadehaḥ syāditi dhyāyedananyadhiḥ / svadehaṃ hemasaṃkāśaṃ turyāśraṃ vajralāñchitam.*”

each meditation on a plane, he states, bestows mastery over that plane.

Similarly, for the meditation on water, the text directs the adept, using the same seed syllable as before, to imagine himself inundated by water. Then he acquires the powers of destroying poisonous creatures and counteracting any arid condition. As before, expanding upon the text, Kṣemarājaḥ supplies the missing components of this meditation, such as the shape and color for visualization. In agreement with Kṣemarāja's interpretations of these practices, the text, notably, here explicitly instructs the adept to focus this meditation on his body.¹ It also supports his commentary by directly using of the same seed syllable.

There then comes a half-verse that indicates that with its own seed the adept performs thousands of actions. Kṣemarājaḥ interprets this half-verse as the text's discussion of the meditation on fire, and proceeds to reconstruct the entire context for this statement with extracts from the *Pūrvaśāstram*. In particular, he disputes the interpretation of previous commentators, probably induced by the ambiguous declaration of the text, that the adept should employ the traditional seed syllable of fire, the phoneme *r*, (*rephaḥ*). Instead, he argues, once more that the same seed syllable, *ū*, should be used, since it includes all the planes from earth to matter.

For the meditation on air, the text directs the adept to focus with the seed syllable on a black spot in order to invigorate the bodies in the world and become a miracle worker. This statement, by specifying a color and shape for the visualization of the element, would appear to support Kṣemarāja's interpretation that a concentration of this sort accompanies each of these practices. For the ether meditation, using the seed of matter, the adept imagines his entire body and the universe as composed of

¹ V. p.38, vs.86a: "*jalāpūritasarvāṅgo jaladhyānena pūrayet.*"

pores (*suṣīram*), and becomes able to perform various works.¹ According to the *Pūrvaśāstram*, quoted by Kṣemarājaḥ, through this practice the adept obtains a great, invulnerable, subtle body.

After the elements, the text next describes (pp.41–45) the meditations on the organs of action and of perception including the internal perceptive organ, and the sensory media. Kṣemarājaḥ indicates that the procedures, such as the concentrations, seed syllables, and the like, previously discussed for the elements should be repeated for this group of planes.² Unlike the previous pattern of concentrations on the elements, which covered the entire body, however, as Kṣemarājaḥ notes, the text here locates the concentrations in specific parts of the body.³ In this way, and in listing specific presiding deities, the text appears to differ from the procedure described in the *Pūrvaśāstram* that localizes only the concentrations on the sensory media.⁴ This discrepancy evidently accounts for Kṣemarāja's use of extensive quotes from the *Pūrvaśāstram* in order to fill out the incomplete statements of the text on the sensory media, but not on the organs.

According to the pattern sketched by *Svacchandatantram*, which often omits a detail for each plane, every organ has a particularly colored presiding deity located within it. The adept

¹ The reading on p.40 that e is the seed syllable of matter, in agreement with Kṣemarāja's previous comments, should be read rather as ū.

V. Woodroffe, *The Serpent Power*, pp.123ff, for a discussion of the repeated pattern of dissolution of the organs and sensory media into the centers of the elements and through the concentrations indicated for the elements.

³ V. his commentary, p.41: "sa tu sarvadehagataḥ ayaṁ tu jīhvānusāriḥ rdayādīmūrdhāntavāgindriyadehāśraya iti viśeṣaḥ."

⁴ For the concentrations on the sensory media, v. M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Mālinīvijayottaratantram* 14, pp.91ff, and for the organs, 15, pp.97ff.

focuses his meditation on this deity and in turn receives a specific attainment related to his organ. Thus if he meditates, for example, on the black colored Prajāpatiḥ in the penis, he acquires tremendous control over his sexual activity. The color described enjoins, according to Kṣemarājaḥ, the repetition of the corresponding elemental concentration. Thus for the yellow Indraḥ in the hand, the adept would repeat the concentration on earth as a yellow square.

In contrast to the order of the *Pūrvaśāstram*, but in agreement with the sequence set out in the first part of this book, the text discusses the sensory media after the organs. Kṣemarājaḥ interprets the text's brief statements that simply correlate colors and sensory media in the same way as for the organs. Thus, for the sensory media of smell, the attribute yellow enjoins repetition of the elemental concentration on earth. In accordance with the statements of the *Pūrvaśāstram* and the previous discussion on the sensory media in this book, this concentration focuses on the locus of the sensory media of smell in the corresponding organ of the nose.¹ From the sensory media meditation, the adept, the text asserts, obtains the attainment most desired with respect to objects, implying, according to Kṣemarājaḥ, supersensory powers of perception.

Next (p.46) the adept meditates upon the Rudraḥ in the transforming (*vaikārika-*) ego, and attains freedom from the bondage caused by the ego. The reference to the transforming ego corresponds to the first part of the book that discussed only this form of the ego.² Since the text does not prescribe any procedure for this practice, Kṣemarājaḥ presumes that the adept should follow that set out in the *Pūrvaśāstram*, which enjoins meditation

¹ V. supra on vss.33-35, pp.14-16.

² V. supra on vs.36, p.16.

on a sixteen-spoked wheel.¹ Similarly, the text does not describe a procedure for the next (pp.46-47) meditation on Brahmā in the intellect except to indicate use of the preceding seed syllable. Kṣemarājaḥ, accordingly, refers again to the *Pūrvaśāstram*, which enjoins meditation on a brilliant eight-petaled lotus in the heart.² Through this meditation, the adept acquires a celestial intellect that perceives the past, present, and future.

The text next (pp.47-50) describes the meditation on matter. Using the syllable of the plane, the adept visualizes matter with a white upper body, a red heart, and a black lower body, which correspond to its three constituents, and with numerous arms, feet, and faces.³ After six months of this exercise, the adept attains the celestial eye that perceives the three worlds. The final verse in this section calls this procedure the matter related exercise (*prākṛto yogaḥ*), the highest (*para-*) cause of liberation (*moksakaraḥ*). This designation might equally refer to both to this particular practice and, as a type of summarizing marker, to the entire range of practices described from earth on. In an earlier version, the second part of this book on the practices bestowing attainments may have ended at this plane, just as the first part of the book on the properties of the planes ended with Prakṛtiḥ and Puruṣaḥ.

In his commentary, from this plane on, Kṣemarājaḥ no longer compares and supplements the instructions of

¹ V. M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Mālinīvijayottaratantram* 16, vss.1-7, p.103.

² V. M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Mālinīvijayottaratantram* 16, vss.8ff, pp.104ff.

³ V., for example, on this correspondence *Svetāśvatara-upaniṣad*, 3, 14, and 4, 5, in *Eighteen Principal Upaniṣads* 1, ed. V.P. Limaye and R.D. Vadekar, p.290, 292. The multicolored many headed and limbed matter appears in this passage to represent the macrocosmic body of the Puruṣaḥ located in the heart.

Svacchandatantram by references to the *Pūrvaśāstram*. The change in his commentary may reflect the divergence at this point between the two texts, which though still exhibiting general parallels, differ in particulars. Both discuss the emergence of the celestial eye, for example, but each presents a different basis for the meditation on matter. Although for the first time mentioning a duration for the exercise, in the style of the *Pūrvaśāstram*, the text, for example, gives a different length.¹

In addition, Kṣemarājaḥ redirects his commentary in order to concentrate on reinterpreting the statements of the text on the nature of matter and of the soul. Breaking with the apparent sense of the text, he interprets, for example, the declaration that the exercise related to matter is the highest (*paraḥ*) exercise which causes liberation to mean that the exercise causing liberation is beyond (*paraḥ*) the exercise related to matter.² In the same way, he takes the subsequent description of the person or soul (pp.50–55) as if a separate meditation, although the text appears to connect the section on the person to the preceding meditation on matter.³

In this section, the text describes the person as a subtle, pure consciousness, which lacks the normal attributes of objects, and which resides in the lotus of the heart. It animates the body, experiences pleasure and pain, and undergoes transmigration.

¹ V. M.K. Shāstrī, ed., *Mālinīvijayottaratantram* 16, vs.14, p.104, where the celestial eye emerges in three years: “divyacakṣuranāyāsātsiddhiḥ syādvatsaratrayāt.”

² V. p.50, vs.104b, and commentary: “‘mokṣakaraḥ paraḥ,’ para iti māyākhyāḥ prakṛteḥ sāksātkārayogādapi para uktaḥ.”

³ As an example of a theistic meditation where matter represents the highest level v. *Bhāgavatapurāṇam* 2, 2, vss.22–38, in Śāstrī, Kṛṣṇaśaṅkara, et al., eds., *Śrīmadbhāgavatapurāṇam* 1(2): 85ff. There in a progressive ascent through the planes of the universe, the adept becomes united with the supreme self and liberated when he surpasses matter.

Though beyond the range of normal experience, the celestial eye acquired by the previous meditation, the text concludes, enables exercitants to perceive the person brilliant like a star or a drop of golden water in a lotus.

With these verses the text appears to describe the climax of a liberating realization of the person freed from the bondage of matter and transmigration in the manner of Sāṃkhya and of Upaniṣads such as the *Śvetāśvatara*.¹ In his commentary, Kṣemarājaḥ, therefore, attempts to counter any implications of dualism, and to create a context for these statements consistent with the continuation of these meditations beyond this point. He reinterprets the statement, for example, that the person consists of consciousness (*citsvarūpaḥ*), and resides in the body, as actually asserting that all bodies are nothing but transformations of consciousness.² Ultimately, the entire content of this section conflicts with the basic tenet of the *Pratyabhijñā* school. As Kṣemarājaḥ observes in concluding his commentary on this section: the meditating subject can not cognize his self, which is the pure supreme consciousness, like another object, but rather re-cognizes that he is that consciousness, and removes the error of the subject-object dichotomy.³

The text continues (pp.56–61) by discussing the planes of the jacket, introduced as what causes the preceding pure consciousness

¹ Cf. for example, *Svetāśvatara-upaniṣad* 3, 20, in *Eighteen Principal Upaniṣads*.1, ed. V.P. Limaye and R.D. Vadekar, p.291: "aṇorāṇiyān mahato mahiyān ātmā guhāyāṃ nihito 'sya jantoḥ / tam akratuṃ paśyati vitāśoko dhātuḥ prasādānmahimānamīsam."

² V. pp.50–51, vs.105, and commentary: "ataḥ paraṃ tu puruṣaḥ padmamadhye vyavasthitaḥ / citsvarūpaśca sarveṣu dehamāpūrya saṁsthitāḥ' paramēśvaramāyāśaktivaśād-avabhāsitabhedeṣu sarvaprāṇiṣu saṁsthitāḥ ataśca tadupādhibhedādayaṃ bhinna iva na vastuta"

³ V. his commentary, pp.55–56: "... vāstavena tu citimātrātmānā rūpeṇa dhyātaiva ayaṃ natu dhyeyaḥ."

of the person to appear to have a form (*rūpavān*). Kṣemarājaḥ continues his non-dual commentary to ensure that these planes should not be misunderstood in dualistic Śaiva fashion as confining individual souls, but rather correctly seen as stages in the self-constricting of universal awareness. The text briefly describes the meditational form for each of these planes, and generally indicates the seed syllable employed for the meditation. The verses characterizing the form and function of these deities specify only a few details for each. To reconstitute a full description, Kṣemarājaḥ explains that the single details stated for each plane actually refer to all. Thus by stating that Kālaḥ has four faces, four arms, and three eyes, the text implies the rest have the same appearance. And as for the preceding planes, Kṣemarājaḥ specifies their seed syllables as those set down in the initiation using the Vidyārāja formula.

By Kṣemarāja's prescribing these seed syllables, and by the text's stating that the attainment realized through each meditation is freedom from the plane meditated upon, this practice becomes virtually identical to the initiation using the Vidyārāja formula. While in the initiation, the master effects this liberation on the passive initiate, here in these meditations, an active adept effects his own results. These active and passive mirror images confirm that parallelism previously noted, in the use of the Praṇavaḥ by master and by adept, and suggest the origin of many procedures of the external ritual in meditative practices.¹ Alternatively, this interconnection may suggest that an earlier series of concentrations and meditations on the planes up to matter used by adepts of many traditions, has been extended to the higher sectarian planes by the adaptation of practices associated with other rituals of these sects such as initiation.

¹ V. supra section I.1.6 on the development of Śaiva ritual.

After the planes of the jacket which surround the person located in the heart, the text next (pp.61-64) describes Māyā. The first verse here gives more details of her appearance, such as her brown hair, large belly, and red eyes, than of some preceding planes. In order to preclude any conflict, therefore, Kṣemarājaḥ restates his view that even though the text apparently prescribes a meditation merely on the essence of some planes (*tattvānām svarūpamātram*), and on the deity (*devatā*) of others, all planes in fact have presiding deities and should be meditated upon in that mode. The rest of her description repeats the familiar phrases of earlier books that characterize her as deluding other traditions, and representing the knot of error difficult to cut except by Śaiva initiation.¹ This stereotyped repetition in the context of a series of meditations emphasizing visualization, demonstrates the strength of the traditional associations of Māyā with the piercing of nodes by the formula and breath meditations.

The text then (pp.64-67) instructs the adept, using the appropriate seed, to meditate on a beautiful and youthful, four colored Vidyā, mounted on the wind and ether, who bestows celestial powers and knowledge. These few verses elicit extensive commentary from Kṣemarājaḥ. Drawing on other texts of the non-dual tradition, he unfolds the implicit referents of each attribute, in particular, the four colors which represent the powers of Ambā, Jyeṣṭhā, Raudrī, Vāmā, with their appropriate geometric forms, and the seed syllable kṣa, which comprises all other phonemes and thus the formulæ manifest in the universe below.

For the next plane (pp.67-73), Īśvaraḥ, the text presents, without introduction, a meditation on the five faces of Śivaḥ. It describes the appearance of each face, and the power which it

¹ V. supra section II.10.5 for the previous description of Māyā in bk.10, pp.480ff. Cf., for example, bk.10, p.481, vs.1142a: "śivadikṣāsinā cchinnā," and vs.122a, p.63: "dikṣāsinā ca tāṃ chittvā."

bestows. For example, after meditating for six months on the eastern face, the saffron colored Tatpuruṣaḥ with the ascetic's braid, the adept gains the sovereignty equivalent to that of a great horse sacrifice (*aśvamedhaḥ*). Compilers apparently have here inserted a traditional meditation on the five faces with only nominal adaptation to the new context. To maintain continuity with the previous meditations, Kṣemarājaḥ indicates that the seed syllable used for Īśvaraḥ in the Vidyārājaḥ, ra, be used for all the faces. The verses themselves do not specify the syllables employed, but both in the first book and in the fifth book, the faces have been ritually employed with their own formulæ.¹

The meditation on the upper face, Īśānaḥ, called here Maheśvaraḥ, may alternatively be performed by another meditation (pp.73-74) on him in the form of the resonance of a bell. Kṣemarājaḥ interprets this as a meditation on the Binduḥ or higher, sound form of Īśvaraḥ. Immediately after this meditation, the text describes another apparently separate meditation (pp.74-78) on the upper face, in which the adept, using the appropriate seed syllable, meditates on Īśvaraḥ in the form of the *liṅgam*. If the adept sustains this meditation for six months a subtle, crystalline *liṅgam* becomes manifest producing a celestial intellect and liberation. Subsequent verses describe this liberation as the attainment of equality with Īśvaraḥ, and illustrate it with traditional imagery identifying the macrocosmic self composed of the planes to the parts of a chariot.² As a mark of this section's original context as a separate pericope, the concluding verses rhetorically assert the absence of any agency for the self that have renounced all works and taken refuge in Īśvaraḥ.

¹ V. bk.1, p.41, and bk.5, pp.7-8.

² Cf. *Kaṭha-upaniṣad* 3, 3, in *Eighteen Principal Upaniṣads* 1, ed. V.P. Limaye and R.D. Vadekar, p.19.

In order to maintain textual continuity, and to generate an acceptable doctrinal meaning, Kṣemarājaḥ, naturally, reinterprets as much of this section as possible. The *lingam*, traditionally the phallic representation of Śivaḥ, for example, he glosses, as that “... which has the universe located within, as not made manifested, i.e., dissolved (*linam*) ... [that] consists of the light of the drop (*binduḥ*), which is made up of the awareness in non-duality of the entire universe. Kṣemarāja’s interpretation of Īśvaraḥ as Binduḥ, if not in keeping with the original intent and substance of much of this section, at least reflects the sequence constructed by later compilers. For immediately after the rhetorical verses describing Īśvaraḥ, the text begins describing the meditation on Sadāśivaḥ (78–83), first (pp.78–81) in the form of the eight particularized sounds previously equated with Nādaḥ.¹

The adept, using the seed syllable of Sadāśivaḥ, pursues the various forms of resonance in the cycle of the microcosmic day for increasing durations of time and obtains a corresponding succession of powers and finally liberation. In order not to conflate meditative procedures in the manner of the text, Kṣemarājaḥ, however, divides this first meditation in two parts: first a procedure using the seed syllable prescribed in the Vidyārājaḥ for Sadāśivaḥ, ha; and second, a procedure using the various resonances in the manner set out, as Kṣemarājaḥ notes, in the book on time.²

In the second procedure described by the text (pp.79–83), the adept meditates on the tenfold drop (*binduḥ*). Blocking his sense apertures in order to facilitate internal perception, the adept experiences a series of colored drops or dots. Then abandoning them in sequence, he fuses with the last dot that pulsating brilliantly, is Īśvaraḥ surrounded by his four energies, Nivṛttiḥ,

¹ Cf. bk.11, pp.8–10.

² V. bk.7, pp.185ff, for the meditation on internalized time.

Pratiṣṭhā, Vidyā, and Śāntiḥ. By calling the deity obtained at the end, Īśvaraḥ, instead of, as at the beginning, Sadāśivaḥ, the text betrays the conflicting ways, noted previously, in which Binduḥ and Nādaḥ became identified with Īśvaraḥ and Sadāśivaḥ. Cognizant of these problems, Kṣemarājaḥ breaks this procedure in two: the verses up to circle of light star refers to a meditation on the Binduḥ as Sadāśivaḥ; the later description of Īśvaraḥ surrounded by the four energies, he construes, as completing the description of the tenfold Īśvaraḥ, including the previously stated five faces and resonance of the bell.¹

The text then (pp.83–84) describes a brief meditation on Śaktiḥ. In the empty space, explained by Kṣemarājaḥ as the aperture of Brahmā, the adept visualizes the supreme, effulgent power with her four colored forms, and attains Śivaḥ. Kṣemarājaḥ qualifies this Śivaḥ as the form of the supreme Śivaḥ appropriate for this plane. In this way he continues the sequential integration of the meditations on Puruṣaḥ, Īśvaraḥ, and Sadāśivaḥ, as stages towards liberation, rather than as liberation itself. As before, however, the declaration of the text regarding the result of meditating on Śaktiḥ, point to an earlier context in which this practice bestowed unqualified liberation. Specifically, this practice appears analogous to the condensed meditations, classified under the heading of *śaktopāyaḥ*, collected in texts like the *Vijñānabhairavaḥ*, that quickly bestow liberation.² Similarly, the preceding meditation on the drop would be a lower type of

¹ V. bk.11, pp.10–13.

² V. the *Vijñānabhairava*, in M.R. Shāstri, ed., *Vijñāna-Bhairava*, vs.92, p.81: “*vyomākāraṃ svamātmānaṃ dhyāyeddigbhiranāvṛtam / nirāśrayā citiḥ śaktiḥ svarūpaṃ darśayettadā.*”

ānavopāyaḥ.¹ Though differing in rank and mode, any of these procedures can bestow liberation. They thus work concurrently, as it were, and not cumulatively as suggested by the framework of this book.

The text does not give any details for the meditation on the stage (pp.84–85) above Śaktiḥ, of Vyāpini, except to indicate that it bestows Svachchandaḥ. The reference to Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ might also suggest that these upper level practices derive from a tradition of Bhairava devotees antecedent to the non-dual school that elaborated the hierarchy of *upāyāḥ*. For the attainment of the quiescent Śivaḥ (*śāntaḥ*) Śivaḥ, beyond Samanā, and Unmanā, the text describes (pp.85–88) another seemingly complete practice, corresponding to the highest means of attainment, *śāmbhavopāyaḥ*. At any convenient place of time, the adept cultivates (*bhāvayet*) the non-existence (*abhāvam*), of Svachchandaḥ. Through this cultivation (*bhāvanāt*) the exercitant becomes one with Svachchandaḥ, and partakes of his powers.² In the manner stated for previous identifications with Svachchandaḥ, this empowering identification, whether professedly non-dual or not, precludes dualistic interpretations of liberation. As explained by Kṣemarājaḥ elucidating the views of his *Pratyabhijñā* or recognition school, these verses assert that since Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ is pure, transcendental, subjective consciousness, he can not be meditated upon or cognized by a subject like another

¹ V. the *Vijñānabhairava*, in M.R. Shāstri, ed., *Vijñāna-Bhairava*, vs.36, p.31: “*kararuddhadrgastreṇa bhrūbhedāddvāradhanāt / drṣṭe bindau kramālline tanmadhye paramā sthitiḥ.*”

² V. the *Vijñānabhairava*, in M.R. Shāstri, ed., *Vijñāna-Bhairava*, vs.127, p.110: “*yadavedyaṃ yadagrāhyaṃ yacchūnyaṃ yadabhāvagaṃ / tatsarvaṃ bhairavaṃ bhāvyaṃ tadante bodhasambhavaḥ.*”

object. He can only be re-cognized in the immediate intuition that the meditator and everything else is only this consciousness.

A single summary verse (p.88) then concludes this book. After knowing the essence of the planes, and meditating on this essence, it states, the adept gains attainments (*siddhyate*) and liberation.¹

¹ V. p.88, vs.138: *"svarūparūpakadhyānaṃ tattvānāṃ kathitaṃ mayā / evaṃ jñātvā ca dhyātvā ca siddhyate mucyate 'pica."*

II.13 BOOK 13

Kṣemarājaḥ introduces this book (pp.89–90) by listing twenty-two forms of Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ that the text has already enumerated for various ceremonies.¹ In this book, he explains, the text presents a twenty-third form, the essence of all the others, Svachchandaḥ as the lord without parts (*niṣkalanāthaḥ*). And intent on demonstrating textual continuity, Kṣemarājaḥ interprets the meditation just presented as directed to the realization of this form of Svachchandaḥ. In his own manner, therefore, Kṣemarājaḥ recognizes that after the preceding books that presented general Śaiva material, such as the planes and worlds, the text now turns to specific Bhairava practices.

In particular, as recognized by Kṣemarājaḥ, the first section of this book describes a Bhairava ritual related to the meditation that closed the preceding book. Dialogue begins (p.90) this section by requesting the ritual (*yāgaḥ*) which constitutes the essence (*sāraḥ*) of this scripture. In answer, a pair of verses apparently describe an initiation (*dikṣā*) effected by an oblation (*homaḥ*) performed with the formula of Svachchandaḥ, comprising the Praṇavaḥ and the face and limbs formulæ. Just like the preceding cultivation of Svachchandaḥ, therefore, that produced an immediate liberating intuition of his essence, so this rite seemingly initiates simply and directly. By both their focus on Svachchandaḥ and their condensed and immediate efficacy, these practices contrast with the standard Śaiva initiation set out in previous books that operates in a protracted ascent through the worlds and planes. In this way, though using material props, this initiation resembles

¹ According to Kṣemarāja's reckoning, these forms of Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ include: the lord of the matrix; Svachchandaḥ surrounded by the eight subsidiary bhairavāḥ and each of these bhairavāḥ taken separately; the ninefold self (*navātma*) formula taken together and singly; and Koṭarākṣaḥ alone and with his retinue.

the condensed noetic initiation (*viññānadikṣā*) set out in book four as an option to the standard initiation liturgy. According to Kṣemarāja's commentary, that noetic ritual also employed the formula of the Bhairava without parts. As he there notes, the first book, which set forth the formulæ, lauded the potency of his formula to remove impurities by a single utterance.¹ The first part of this book reflects the same exaltation of Bhairavaḥ and his tradition vis-à-vis other Śaiva traditions. Specifically, Bhairava adepts in the line of the tradition that codified the hierarchy of means (*upāyaḥ*), may have elaborated this ritual as a elite option to the preceding practices. This hypothesis would explain the placement of this ritual here, as a type of appendix, and its self-characterization as the essence of the text. Alternatively, the simplicity and empowering immediacy of this ritual may only indicate that it belongs to the uncomplicated core Bhairava material used to construct other Bhairava sections of the text. It would then have become displaced in the course of compiling the text, and its contrast with preceding books would be an effect of this compilation rather than of deliberation.

In his commentary, to counteract differing interpretations induced, no doubt, by the brevity and ambiguity of this pair of verses, Kṣemarājaḥ stresses the non-partite nature of the formula employed. Integrating this initiation into the standard Śaiva categories set out in the fourth book, Kṣemarājaḥ equates this rite with preliminary ceremonies undertaken by the adept who has received the law of Śivaḥ initiation (*śivadharmidikṣā*).² For the immediately following (pp. 93–94) verses describe the special practice of an adept employing the repetition (*jāpaḥ*) of the formula of the lord without parts. These verses instruct the adept,

¹ V. bk. 4, pp. 316–317. On other condensed, abbreviated initiations, cf. M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ* 18.

² V. bk. 4, p. 41, vs. 83.

properly prepared by concentration and restraint, while he repeats ten lakhs of this formula, to offer a lakh of oblations of bdellium smeared human flesh. Then, the text promises, he obtains the success of the high, middle, and low rites found in all other texts.¹

This final declaration carries the rhetorical marker, "so according to the word of Bhairavaḥ," found previously in other Bhairava sections of the text.² In such a section in the sixth book, the adept obliterated human flesh, characterized similarly as bestowing benefits of the three kinds of rites.³ There, however, the adept used the formula of Svachchandaḥ with parts, while here he uses the formula of Svachchandaḥ without parts. In the compiling of the text, therefore, these practices have not been combined, but arranged in parallel structures, differentiated by the formula employed. For this reason, no doubt, Kṣemarājaḥ insisted on the without parts nature of the formula employed in this book.

Immediately after the description of the adept's practice, dialogue introduces a collection of specific rites (pp.95–108), for the adept to perform, called the best treasury of teaching verses (*kārikākośam uttamam*).⁴ These rites, performed primarily for

¹ The text specifically mentions the three kinds of rites, high (*uttama-*), middle (*madhya-*) and low (*adhama-*) and the four kinds of texts, according to their seats (*catuspitham*). (For the levels, cf. bk.8, p.11, vs.19, and for the four kinds of text, bk 1, p.9, vs.5, and commentary, p.10.)

² V. p.94, vs.7b: " . . . *bhairavasya vaco yathā*." Cf. the other references in the notes to bk.11, pp.63–79. Kṣemarājaḥ explains this declaration as putting aside any doubts about the efficacy of the practice: "*bhairavasya vaco yathetyanena nātra māyāpramāṭṛsulabhāḥ saṁśayo grāhya iti ādiśati*."

³ V. bk.6, p.146.

⁴ To define the *kārikā*, Kṣemarājaḥ (p.95) quotes a traditional verse: "*svalpābhidhānenārtho yaḥ samāsenocyate budhaiḥ / sūtrataḥ sānusartavyā kārikārthopadarśini*."

subjugation (*vaśikāram*), continue the parallelism with the structure of the sixth book, which discusses similar rites after an exposition of the main formula. They do not, however, exhibit an intrinsic connection with the preceding ritual of initiation by referring to Svachchandaḥ or the formula without parts. As suggested by their use of different metres not found elsewhere in the text, and the collective label of the introductory dialogue, they may presumably have been interpolated into the text as a block lifted from another source.

Among these rites, the first nine (pp.95–102), which have distinctive metres, and which all describe rites of subjugation performed in a cremation ground, would appear to definitely compose the “treasury of verses.” The last five rites, written in normal *ślokāḥ*, and differing in content, probably represent a separate set.

In this first set of rites, the solitary adept, at night in the cremation ground, writes down in blood the name of someone to be subjugated or conjured. Through offering oblations into the cremation fire while reciting the name interlaced with formulæ, he becomes empowered to summon the subjugated demon, god, or king. Aside from differences in formulæ, or intended victims, the rites simply differ in details. Thus, for his ink the adept usually uses blood extracted from corpses of people who died particular violent deaths, but sometimes his own blood, or either mixed with pigments. He usually writes on skulls, but sometimes on the ground or on the wall of the cremation ground.

After the last of these rites, which uses the abode (*dhāma*), designating according to Kṣemarājaḥ the root formula, and a skull mounted on a spit, comes (pp.102–103) a pair of *ślokāḥ* that praise a special devotion to the formula on the skull for producing a king of the mountain, interpreted by Kṣemarājaḥ, as a highest adept. The philosophic characterization of the three forms of the *dhāma*, manifest (*vyaktam*), unmanifest (*avyaktam*), and manifest-unmanifest (*vyaktāvyaktam*), on which the adept

meditates in this devotion, contrasts with the style and content of the surrounding rites. In addition, only this last rite explicitly prescribes the root formula, presumably the Svachchandaḥ without parts, which supposedly all the rites in this book employ. Thus these last explanatory *ślokāḥ*, or the entire last rite, may represent a later interpolation. Excising this last rite would equally restore an exact parallelism with the sixth book which describes eight rites of subjugation.

Another rite of subjugation (p.103) follows, that differs from the preceding by substances and procedure, and by employing the formula of Svachchandaḥ without parts explicitly. Rather than with the preceding rites, therefore, it belongs with the three following (pp.104-108) rites for obstructing, for maddening and undoing this maddening, and for attracting and undoing this attraction, which all use similar substances and the formula of Svachchandaḥ without parts. Though connected to the preceding set of rites by association with the cremation ground, this set of rites, would actually appear to form an independent set, which, once again, more closely resembles the rites described in book six.

Since the second set of rites uses the formula of Svachchandaḥ without parts, bestowed on the adept in the initiation described in the first part of the book, they would seemingly represent the core practices initially used to construct this book. The set of nine rites of subjugation, in contrast, would then represent a later group of related practices, secondarily interpolated as a block into the text. As noted previously, however, the sixth book has a parallel structure, including the set of rites of subjugation. In the absence of external information, therefore, it remains possible that this book was constructed, at the outset, on the model of the preceding book, with both sets of rites.

II.14 BOOK 14

The opening dialogue of this book (p.109) announces a new, unrequested topic, the use of poses (*mudrā*), as employed in this text.¹ This introduction might suggest, therefore, that this book contains directions for poses used in numerous rituals throughout the text. As explained by Kṣemarājaḥ in his opening commentary, however, and later noted in the text itself, this book explains only those poses used in the worship of Svachchanda-bhairavaḥ.² More precisely, this book describes eighteen poses, which the master executes during the interior worship of Svachchandaḥ, and which imitate the weapons and poses displayed by his eighteen arms.³ Although the text explicitly enjoins the display of these poses only during the course of this worship, another half-verse, and the commentary of Kṣemarājaḥ indicate that, by extension, some of

¹ V. vs.1a, p.109: "*mudrāṇām lakṣaṇam vaksye asmiṁstantre yathāsthitaṁ.*"

² After enumerating all the poses, a summary verse (p.120, vs.20) states that the master displays them at the summoning, placing, and dismissing of Bhairavaḥ (*etā mudrā mahādevi bhairavasya pradarśayet / āvāhane nirodhe ca tathā caiva visarjane.*). This verse is intended, according to Kṣemarājaḥ, to preclude objections, which he anticipates (p.121), that the text has here failed to be exhaustive in its list of gestures. Instead, he argues, this book collects only those gestures whose display has been enjoined during the daily interior worship of Bhairavaḥ described in the second book (V. bk.2, p.60, vs.102b: "*mudrāṇ pradarśayetpaścāttridhā traikālyakarmani,*" and his cross-references there to this book.)

³ For the meditative visualization of this form of Svachchandaḥ, v. bk.II, pp.51ff. Kṣemarājaḥ, therefore, qualifies (pp.109–110) the general phrase, "in this text," in the opening verse (p.109) categorizing the poses to be described, as referring to the poses which have the form of the imitation of the weapons of the lord ("*bhagavadāyudhānukārarūpā yā mudrāḥ tāsāṃ lakṣaṇam tattvavyavasthāpakam rūpaṃ vakṣyāmi*").

these poses should be used in rituals for other forms of Svacchandaḥ and for members of his retinue.¹ This book forms a counterpart, therefore, to the first book, which collected, as a type of reference work, the formulæ related to Svacchandaḥ and his retinue. Kṣemarājaḥ considers this book necessary in order for the text to fulfill its self-definition as a complete scripture teaching the four bases (*piṭham*), of formula (*mantraḥ*), of female-formula (*vidyā*), of diagram (*maṇḍalam*), and of poses.²

After the introductory dialogue, the text gives short directions (pp.110–120) for forming the eighteen poses which include: the skull (*kapālam*); the staff (*khaṭvāṅgam*); the sword (*khaḍgaḥ*); the shield (*spharaḥ*); the hook (*aṅkuśaḥ*); the noose (*pāśaḥ*); the arrow (*nārācaḥ*); the bow (*pinākam*); the fearlessness giving (*abhayaḥ*); the boon-giving (*varaḍaḥ*); the bell (*ghaṇṭā*); the trident (*triśūlam*); the staff (*daṇḍaḥ*); the thunderbolt (*vajram*); the drum (*ḍamaruḥ*); the hammer (*mudgaraḥ*); the lute (*viṇā*); the ax (*paraśuḥ*). Kṣemarājaḥ compares and occasionally corrects the hand and finger movements prescribed by referring to the *Pūrvasāstram*.³ For the significance of these poses, which imitate the weapons or the undivided powers

¹ V. p.121, vs.21a: "*kapālaṃ caiva khaṭvāṅgamanukteṣu pradarsayet*." This half-verse follows the previously mentioned instruction to use these poses in the worship of Bhairavaḥ. Kṣemarājaḥ interprets (p.121) "for those not stated" to refer to the members of the retinue of Bhairavaḥ, for whom the skull and sword pose should be employed: "*ye vaktrāṅgabhairavādyā āvaraṇasthāḥ teṣāṃ sādharmaṇaṃ mudrābandhaṃ*." Kṣemarājaḥ cites (p.110) the same half verse enjoining a general application to the retinue and to the form of Koṭarākṣaḥ to explain the listing of these two poses first and out of their previous order: "*kapālakhaṭvāṅgayoḥ sarvāvaraṇagatadevatāsādhāraṇatvāt śrikoṭarākṣasabhaṭṭārakaviṣaye ca tayor prādhānyādātau tanmudrālakṣaṇamāha*."

² Cf. bk.1, p.10, and supra section I.1.1 on traditional classifications of scriptures.

³ V. M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Mālinivijayottaratantram* 7, pp.35ff.

of Svachchandaḥ, and which thus identify the worshipper with him, Kṣemarājaḥ refers to the teaching of Abhinavaguptaḥ and to his own work, "the Blessed Panegyric on Imitation of Bhairavaḥ," (*Śribhairavānukaraṇastotram*).¹ This work recapitulates in more elaborate verse the exoteric exegesis offered earlier in his commentary on Svachchanda's attributes in the second book. Therein, for example, the sword symbolizes his power of knowledge which cuts off the bondage of transmigration caused by ignorance.²

At the end of this enumeration (p.120), Kṣemarājaḥ rejects previous interpretations due to corrupt readings and interpolations which he claims to have corrected using reliable older texts. To the text's directions, he adds the teaching of Abhinavaguptaḥ that these poses should be considered secret. They should be performed therefore, in a private place. If they must be performed in a public place, the hands should be covered with a cloth or they should be done mentally. This section concludes with the summary verses (pp.120-121) that prescribe the usage of these poses.

Without introductory or transitional dialogue, a list then follows (pp.121-122) correlating these gestures with colors; the lute, for example, is golden, the staff, red. Kṣemarājaḥ introduces this list as presenting the mental form of the poses. In his commentary on the text's injunction in the second book, which stated that poses should be displayed in three ways, Kṣemarājaḥ quotes a tradition (*āmnāyaḥ*) that each pose has three

¹ Edited by Raniero Gnoli, pp.223-226 in "Miscellanea Indica," *East and West* 9 (1958): pp.215-266.

² V. p.112: "antaḥśaktikṛpāṇīm vyanakṣi saṁsṛtivibhedinimasiṇā / nijaśaktimahimasvikṛtasamastaviśvā hi viravarāḥ." Cf. bk.2, p.54: "khaḍgena jñānaśaktyātmanā pāśacchedanam."

expressions.¹ According to this teaching, the pose embodies the radiating powers of the supreme lord, and can thus be contemplated not only in a physical manifestation but also in a mental and a verbal manifestation.

A verse next declares (pp.122–123) that the basis of poses (*mudrāpiṭhaḥ*), which yield fruit for the four classes, i.e., of Śaiva initiates as Kṣemarājaḥ explains, has been discussed. After this seeming conclusion, however, another verse describes (p.123) the third, verbal expression of the poses. These pose formulæ, as it were, consist of the Praṇavaḥ, then the name of the pose, followed by *namaḥ*. As Kṣemarājaḥ notes, since the poses are in essence the powers of the lord, just like these powers, they have a formula manifestation.

These second and third expressions of the poses, which lack an introduction, and which surround an apparent concluding verse, may be secondary additions stimulated by later speculative elaborations of the meaning of poses. In the absence of external information, however, the historical construction of this book can not be determined with certainty.

Additional verses (pp.123–124) then close the book by lauding the efficacy of these poses. Referring to the *Pūrvaśāstram*, Kṣemarājaḥ explains that though all classes of Śaiva initiates employ these poses, they especially belong to the repertoire of practices used by adepts.²

¹ V. bk.2, p.60: “*manojā guruvaktrasthā vāgbhavā mantrasambhavā / dehodbhavāṅgavikṣepairmudreyam trividhā smṛtā.*”

² He quotes M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Mālinivijayottaratantram* 7, 1, p.35: “*athātaḥ sampravakṣyāmi mudrākhyāḥ śivaśaktayaḥ yābhiḥ samrakṣito mantri mantrasiddhimavāpnuyāt.*”

II.15 BOOK 15

The introductory dialogue of this book (p.225) announces a new, unrequested topic, the *chummakāḥ*, or hidden codes. As explained by Kṣemarājaḥ, the *chummakāḥ* are the technical designations (*pāribhāṣikasamjñā*) employed by adepts (*sādhakāḥ*) in order to conceal their tantric activity from other lower level initiates (*samayinaḥ*).¹ After the introductory verse, the text proceeds to list these designations (pp.126–140), without elaboration; Bhairavaḥ, for example, is said by tradition, to be the abode (*dhāma*), the master (*guruḥ*) the universal giver (*sarvadaḥ*), and so forth. In his commentary, Kṣemarājaḥ, elucidates the appropriateness of each codeword. For example, the adept has the designation, mountain (*giriḥ*), because he is unshakable and focused exclusively on his practice.² Thus though this code may be an artificial construction, not based on the conventional (*rūḍhaḥ*) or etymological (*yaugikaḥ*) associations of ordinary language, it has been constructed, nevertheless, by metaphorical and tradition-specific associations, and is not a random cipher.

Only two of the practices prescribed for adepts in this text, however, actually use any of these terms. In book thirteen, one of the subjugation practices refers to a dead person's thread (*mṛtasūtram*), which according to this book and Kṣemarāja's

¹ V. his commentary, pp.125–126: *“atha samayimadhye samayinām tāntrikavyavahāragopanena nirvighnasiddhisampattiyartham prākprameyaśeṣatayā paṭalamārabhamāṇaśchummakāśarmaparyāyapāribhāṣika-samjñābhirlokatāravayavahārapravarttanena gūḍhatayā śāstrasya asya rahasyatām”*

² V. his commentary, p.126: *“giririti aprakampyatvād-ārādhanāikatatparaḥ.”*

commentary on that verse, designates a ligament (*snāyuh*).¹ And in that same book, the last meditation, appended to the subjugation rites, refers to the powerful adept as the mountain lord (*girendrah*). Otherwise the text openly discusses the use of corpses, bloods, skulls, and the like.

On the one hand, the absence in the text of this code may be explained by assuming that the text itself was secret. In this case, the code, intended to mask the communication between adepts in public, would be superfluous. On the other hand, this absence may be interpreted as evidence that this book has been appended to the text. The location and content of the book support this hypothesis.

First, the location of this book at the end of the text, with an absence of any prior references to its topic in the initial *anukramaṇikā*, or elsewhere, argue that later redactors added it to the text.² Second, the text neither describes nor even alludes to the rituals implied by many of the terms in the code. For example, the list contains code words for female partners (*dūti*), semen, the vagina, menstruating women, and the like, that clearly refer to sexual rites. In the Śaiva tradition, such rites are normally found not in the right hand Bhairava scriptures like *Svacchandatantram*, but rather in the Kaula scriptures.³ These Kaula scriptures describe secret sexual rites, performed by a select group of adepts with female adepts (*yogini*). The code language enables these adepts to recognize and communicate in private with

¹ V. bk.13, vs.21a, "*mṛtasūtreṇa*," and commentary, p.100: "*mṛtasūtreṇa vakṣyamāṇachummakāyuktyā mṛtasnāyunā*." Here p.128, vs.5b: "*snāyuh sūtram prakirtitam*."

² Tucci has pointed out that the *Guhyasamājatantram* has the same kind of material appended in a final book. (V. Tucci, "Some glosses upon the *Guhyasamāja*," pp.337-348.

³ On these rites, v. M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ* 29.

these female adepts during their travels to various sacred centers (*piṭham*) where these female adepts reside.¹ In many texts, therefore, a discussion of these centers accompanies a discussion of the secret code.²

The Kaula tradition, moreover, as portrayed by initiates such as Abhinavaguptaḥ, represents not a separate sect, outside of other traditions, but rather an elite and secret transmission within the Śaiva tradition. This accounts for the secrecy from other initiates, stated, for example, as the purpose of the code by Kṣemarājaḥ in his introduction to this book. This historical background supports the hypothesis that this last book has been appended to this text. Specifically, at some stage during its transmission, therefore, the *Svacchandatantram* appears to have been used by ritualists who were simultaneously Kaula adepts. These Kaula adepts, who worship Bhairava in secret rites, have apparently appended this material to *Svacchandatantram*, which probably already constituted a standard work for earlier and more

¹ V. Alexis Sanderson, "Purity and Power among the Brahmins of Kashmir," pp.201-203.

² Buddhist tantras show the same system. In the *Hevajratāntram*, for example, the discussion of the centers follows that of the code (*chomā*). In this text, and related works such as the *Samvarodayatantram*, the *chomā*, (a variant of *chummakā*,) refers to the hand signals and nonverbal signs through which the adepts recognize each other and communicate their desires. These texts refer to the verbal code, separately, as the *saṃdhyābhāṣā*. (V. *The Hevajra Tantra* 2, Sanskrit and Tibetan Texts, ed. David Snellgrove, London Oriental Series 6 (London: Oxford University Press, 1959): I, vii, pp.20ff; II, iii, pp.60ff; and the *Samvarodayatantra*, in *The Samvarodaya Tantra, Selected Chapters*, ed. and trans., Shin'ichi Tsuda (Tokyo: The Hokuseido Press, 1974), 9, pp.102ff. On the derivation of *chomma*, from sanskrit *chadman*, v. pp.278-279, of K.R. Norman, "Middle Indo-Aryan Studies 16," *Journal of the Oriental Institute, Baroda* 32 (1983): 275-279.).

exoteric aspects of the worship of Bhairavaḥ.¹ The motives for this interpolation, naturally, can only be speculated upon. Perhaps this last book served as an mnemonic accompaniment to their oral transmission of secret rites, or to lend these rites the authority adhering to an established scripture.

In addition to their secret code words, Kaula adepts used a secret code of gestures. The last section of this book (pp.140–146) discusses these gestures and the secret rites which they accompanied. While the code words functioned only to enable private communication, the gestures had multiple levels of significance beyond this function, just as the rites had multiple modes of performance.

First, as described in other texts, the gestures, likewise termed *chummakāḥ*, functioned like the code words enabling adepts, who travelled to different pilgrimage centers, to recognize female adepts, and to arrange meetings (*melakam*) with them for the performance of secret rites.² Comparable to other ritual performances, these rites would lead to the

¹ As one ritual representation of the historical association between the right hand stream of texts, and the Kaula tradition, the *Netratantram*, for example, describes the same form of Bhairavaḥ as the central deity and promulgator of both. (V. M.K. Shāstrī, ed., *Netratantram*, bk.10, pp.223ff, bk.12, pp.252ff.) This work, similarly, also contains only one chapter on the Kaula tradition. (V. Brunner, "Un Tantra du Nord: Le *Netra Tantra*," pp.154–155.)

² V. M.K. Shāstrī, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ* 29, vs.40, and commentary, pp.29–30: "*iti saṅketābhijñāḥ bhramate pīṭheṣu yadi sa siddhīpsuḥ / acirāḷlabhate tattatprāpyaṁ yadyoginivadanāt' evaṁ mudrādivṛttaṁ jñānasya hi sādhaḱasya tattatsiddhikāmatayā pīṭheṣu paribhrāmyatastattanmudrādipradarśanakrameṇa yoginyo nijāṁ nijāṁ santatiṁ jñātvā kṣīprameva nikhilasiddhipradā bhavantītyarthaḥ.*" Cf. Also, Snellgrove, ed., *The Hevajra Tantra* 2, I, vii, pp.22ff.

attainment of different levels of the universe or awareness, yielding various supernatural powers and pleasures. Though *Svacchandatantram* does not discuss these gestures in this way, this primary function likely accounts for their enumeration right after the code words.

Second, instead of in a rite with a human female adept, an isolated adept could perform his sexual ritual with one of many terrifying goddesses, likewise termed *yoginī*. Induced to descend by his meditation, and satiated with an offering of his own body such as blood, these goddesses would perform the sexual rites with him and bestow supernatural powers. The solitary and visionary aspect of this second level of performance apparently forms the basis for a third, discussed by *Svacchandatantram* and Kṣemarājaḥ.

In this rite, the pilgrimage centers, deities, and sexual act become interiorized in the microcosm composed by the body of the adept. The goddesses are the descending powers or manifest grace of the supreme lord, and the pilgrimage centers the parts of the adept's own body.¹ These goddesses gesture to the adept by stimulating various parts of his body, and he responds by recognizing the macroscosmic awareness that this movement

¹ As a sign of this historical process of interiorization, the text retains the external language of display and indication, (*"darśayet, vinirdīśayet,"*) found in other descriptions of gestures, (V. here, Tsuda, ed. and trans., *The Saṃvarodaya Tantra* IX, pp.102ff.) Kṣemarājaḥ explicitly notes, however, its interior meaning: (p.141, for example, glossing *"kirtitaḥ,"* "designated, called," as *"sākṣātkṛtaḥ,"* "manifested, realized."). This interiorization apparently explains Abhinavagupta's reference to microcosmic centers as the *chummā*, or gestures. (V. M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ* 29, vs.37, p.27 ("... dvidāśāntordhvagakuṇḍali-baindavahrnnābhikandamiti chummāḥ"), and commentary, pp.28-29.

corresponds to.¹ In this interiorized rite, the complete sequence of correlated gestures and levels of awareness parallels the progression through the planes effected in the various modes of initiation.² For example, when the goddess displays the throat, she manifests the plane of Kālah, when she displays the heart, and so forth. Specifically, this sequence produces the same effect as the sexual rite in awakening the concealed awareness of the body through contact.³ Thus, in as much as this interior series of movements supplants the sexual rite itself, after enumerating and praising them (pp.140-144), the text proclaims (p.145) that the meeting (*melakam*) or the joining with the *yogini* has been proclaimed. And then, instead of an offering of his own blood, or of the mingled sexual fluids taken from the vagina of the *yogini*, the ritual offering (*carukaḥ*) he

¹ V. p.143, vs.32a, and commentary: "*evam melakāvasare devibhiśchummakāyām darśitāyām pratichummakā yādṛk sādakena darśayitavyā tādṛśīmāha 'śarīraṃ darśayeddevi sarvadevamayaṃ priye. '*"

² Kṣemarājaḥ (p.142) recognizes this in comparing the collection of planes to the use of the Vidyārāja formula ("*navātma-prakriyāvat-*"). Similarly, In the tradition of the *Hevajratāntram*, the gestures apparently have been interpreted by some commentators as part of an initiation, and an internal meditation on the *yogini*, substituted for an external rite. (V. for this interpretation of the *yogini* meditation, *The Chinese Hevajratāntra*, trans., Ch. Willemsen, Orientalia Gandensia 8 (Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 1983), p.59, n.2; 64ff.)

³ V. *Tantālokaḥ* 28, vss.372b-374a, and commentary, p.158: "*yoginimelakāccaṣo 'vaśyam jñānaṃ prapadyate // tena tatparva tadvacca svasantānādimelanam / saṃvitsarvātmikā dehabhedādyā saṅkucettu sā // melake 'nyonyasaṅghaṭṭapratibimbādvikasvarā. '*" For the definition in this book through the code words of *melakaḥ* as contact (*saṅghaṭṭaḥ*), according to Kṣemarājaḥ, with a deity, v. pp.135-136, vs.37b: "*'melakam caiva saṅghātaḥ' devatānām sambandhi yat melakam melanam tat saṅghāta iti ucyate. '*"

presents or consumes (pp.144–145) to obtain powers consists of the final non-dual awareness.¹

Despite the interiorized commentary of Kṣemarājaḥ, the laconic and ambiguous statements of *Svacchandatantram* do not permit determining the exact circumstances and context of the secret rituals and gestures described. Perhaps the text still presumes an adept who initiated contact by external gestures with an actual female adept representing the incarnation of a supernatural *yoginī* or power, and who had his awareness awakened in an external sexual rite that formed a necessary prop for his interior realization.

Without any concluding verses, this book then closes (pp.145–146) with a final laud of the efficacy of this rite for the adept. Accordingly, Kṣemarājaḥ then ends his commentary, but without specific summarizing remarks about this book or the text as a whole. Instead, he concludes with general verses explaining his motives for composing a commentary on this work: namely, to counteract the pernicious influence of prior dualistic interpretations.²

¹ V. p.132, vs.10, for the definition of *carukaḥ* in the code words (*"carukaḥ sārvaśāntikāḥ"*). For the offerings, v. Sanderson, "Purity and Power among the Brahmans of Kashmir," pp. 201, ff. The text here (vs.37a, p.145) ambiguously states, "he gives his own offering," (*"dadate carukam svakam"*), explained by Kṣemarājaḥ as she gives an offering related for the sake of the self to him: *"dada dāne ityasya ayam prayogaḥ / svakam svātmārtham sādhitamasāmanāmyamityarthaḥ"*. It might be equally interpreted with the adept as the subject referring to his own offering, or the *yoginī*, giving her own offering.

² V. supra section I.2.4 on his commentatorial goals.

CHAPTER III

TRANSLATION

III.1 PREFACE

The following selections from *Svacchandatantram* have been chosen for translation in order to represent the most important strata and sources in its compositional history, and to illustrate the major concerns and interpretative procedures of Kṣemarājaḥ.

The opening pages of the first book contain the opening verses and *anukramaṇikā*, important for unraveling the text's redactorial history. They also present the first topics of the master and the usage of formulæ, including the historically most important of these, the Bahurūpa formula of Svacchanda-bhairavaḥ.¹ In addition, they contain the introductory commentary of Kṣemarājaḥ in which he sets out his overall conception of the text and its place in the schema of Śaiva revelation, elaborates his underlying monistic philosophy, and offers exemplary samples of his commentatorial method of finding this philosophy in the text of *Svacchandatantram* through etymological and comparative exegesis, reinterpretation, and overinterpretation.

The next selection from the fifth book presents an excellent sample of the combination of Śaiva and Bhairava ritual material. Here the text describes a version of the Śaiva liberation initiation executed in a sacred diagram constructed for the worship of Svacchandaḥ and his retinue of eight bhairavāḥ, and employing a modified form of the important and widespread Vidyārāja formula.

¹ V. supra the summaries of these sections for a more detailed analysis of their compositional structure and history.

In addition, the elliptical and difficult instructions for the construction of this diagram exhibit corruption, textual displacement, and an evident reliance on supplementary traditions. Therefore, they offer a good sample of the interpretative problems posed by some sections of the text. Also, in his commentary on these sections, Kṣemarājaḥ provides a good example of another aspect of his commentatorial project: namely, his systematizing intention, reflected here in his cross-references and his coordinating summary of the cosmological structure of the various preceding initiatory procedures.

The selection from the twelfth book provides an example of the influence of earlier traditions on the text, and of the techniques of incorporation and adaptation used by the textual compilers in their handling of this material. In particular, it illustrates the importance of Sāṃkhya categories and concepts in the development of sectarian Śaivism.

Next, the thirteenth book offers an unalloyed example of the Bhairava stratum and its cremation grounds practices, apparently drawn from at least two distinct sources. In addition, in his opening commentary, in a kind of resume of Bhairava theology Kṣemarājaḥ summarizes the various forms of Bhairavaḥ presented throughout the text.

Finally, the fifteenth book, which is a collection of code words to be used by elite adepts in organizing their secret rituals, represents the last hypothesized stage in the transmission of the text, the Kaula stratum. The secret rituals alluded to in this book suggest the existence of a complex of Śaiva sub-sects and traditions within the mainstream of sectarian Śaivism, in a complex interaction and struggle for dominance that came to characterize the polemics of the later medieval Śaiva commentators.

In these selections, the pages of the printed text of *Svacchandatantram* are indicated in bold brackets [], and the verses numbers in bold slashes / / Expansions of the text in the

translation are marked with [], and Sanskrit terms, where useful, are supplied in italic parentheses () following their translated equivalent. Where Kṣemarājaḥ in his commentary glosses a term or phrase from a verse or adds further glosses, the portion of the verse or commentary is given first, followed by "i.e.," and the gloss or interpretation of Kṣemarājaḥ. Moreover, in order to display the sense of his grammatical and derivational glosses, many phrases in the verses are translated in an unidiomatic or still ambiguous fashion. Occasional numbers clarifying lists in the text are added in braces { }. For cross-references to other parts of the *Svacchandatantram* made by Kṣemarājaḥ, references to the printed Sanskrit edition are supplied in parentheses (). References to other texts are given in the notes, along with their standard and or complete name, if the texts are available in printed editions. Deviations between the form cited and the printed form are also noted. Emendations and corrections to the printed Sanskrit edition are also indicated in the notes.

III.2 BOOK 1
[vss.1-45a, pp.1-40]

[1] Oṃ Hail to the autonomous lord whose form is the universe
emanated by his autonomy.

Now the blessed *Svacchandatantram* along with the commentary
called the "Uddyotaḥ," composed by the blessed Śaiva master
Kṣemarājaḥ.

We praise Svachchandabhairavaḥ, whose body is supreme light,
who is the cause of the emanation, etc., of the universe, who is
the universe and identical to the universe./1/

Hail to Bhairavaḥ, the ocean, the storehouse of all perfections,
whose play are the waves of the world, which are the waves of
[his] power flowing forth./2/

Glory to that unique pearl shell (*śuktiḥ*) of power (*śaktiḥ*), from
the ocean of awareness, inside of which shines this complete
universe made up of pearls./3/

Let the vibrations of the best hymns of the master, whose mere
remembering wipes away all the sins of ignorance, be victorious in
the three worlds./4/

Kṣemarājaḥ, who knows the great Śaiva doctrine made perfectly
clear through devotion to him, comments a little upon the doctrine
of the blessed *Svacchanda[-tantram]*./5/

To put an end to the impressions of essenceless transmigration,
savor, O Men of Taste, the perfume from the lotus of my heart,
which has opened up through the rays of the sun of ever new
[*abhinava*, i.e., Abhinava-gupta's] awareness./6/

[2] Here, intent upon the supreme consciousness [in his] heart
having a savor which is the savor of the desire to show grace,
some disciple of the goddess said in order to introduce the book:

Bhairavaḥ, seated on the peak of Kailāsaḥ, free from sickness, by Caṇḍaḥ, Nandiḥ, Mahākālaḥ, Gaṇeśaḥ, [his] bull, the bees,/1/

Kumāraḥ, Indraḥ, Yamaḥ, Ādityaḥ, Brahmā, Viṣṇuḥ, [and his] retinue, being praised, the great lord, served by the gaṇāḥ [and] the mātāraḥ,/2/

the agent of emanation and reabsorption, the cause of obscuration and maintenance, the cause of grace, the god, the destruction of the defects of worshippers,/3/

having seen [that] Bhairavaḥ delighted, the goddess (*devi*) made a speech:

[3] Here, the ultimate reality of the supreme lord, who is sheer beatitude and consciousness, [and] who transcends the [ultimate] principle discussed in the brahma-system, consists of the vibrating of Svachchandaḥ. [And] just this is the name both of the lord and of this text. Having seen [that] god [called] the agent of the five acts, emanation, etc., with the intention [of indicating] that [his] agency [regarding] the five acts is identical to his own self, [being] delighted, the goddess, [so it was] said, made a speech. Therein, god (*devaḥ*), [implies by its derivation from the root] *div*, [in the senses of] play (*kriḍā*), etc., as stated [in the lists of roots]: [that he is] intent upon [his] play (*kriḍā*), which is the emanation of the entire [universe] from [the plane of] Śivaḥ to earth; [that he has] an urge to conquer (*viḡiḡṣā*), as surpassing the entire [universe] as far as [it extends]; [that he is] shining forth (*dyutiḥ*), under the form of the activities (*vyavahāraḥ*) of the world, by virtue of not being different from it, [which implies his] being praised (*stutiḥ*), [also] by Śivaḥ, the mahāmantrāḥ, etc.; [that] of all without a way, he is the way (*gatiḥ*) which should be obtained, and the essence of non-dual awareness.

Bhairavaḥ, i.e., having the form of bearing, [*bharaṇa*, from Bha-,] shouting [*ravaṇa*, from -ra-,] and vomiting [*vamana*, from -va-,] the universe. [And he is thus called Bhairavaḥ]

according to the [following] derivation[s]: fearlessness (*abhayam*) for the terrified (*bhīrūṇām*), i.e., he bestows fearlessness to those transmigrating; fear (*bhayam*) is fright (*bhīḥ*), i.e., the terror of transmigration, through which there is produced a roar (*ravaḥ*), i.e., a lamentation, i.e., a shout of fright (*bhīravaḥ*); [and] from that one [i.e., Bhairavaḥ] it is then produced, i.e., vibrated forth, for those having lamentation, i.e., this one is the producer, through the descent of [his] power, of this very shout of fear which is the reflection upon the fear of transmigration. [And] those shining [*bhāni*, from Bha-], i.e., the asterisms (*nakṣatrāṇi*), he impels [*īrayati* from -īra-] [and thus since] time (*bheraḥ*), is that which the bheravāḥ desiccate [*vāyanti* from -va], i.e., the exercitants (*yoginaḥ*) who savor the meditation which devours time, [as] their inner essence this one [is called Bhairavaḥ]. [4] For fear (*bhīye*), i.e., for terrifying the bonded beings, [there is] the shout (*ravaḥ*), i.e., the reflection upon the energies A, etc., arising from the [original] sound mass, of those bhīravāḥ, who are the goddesses of consciousness, having the form of the *khe-*, *go-*, *dik-*, and *bhū-cāri* circles, [as] the master of whom, this one [is called therefore, Bhairavaḥ]. [And finally,] similarly, Bhairavaḥ is the terrifier (*bhīṣaṇaḥ*), i.e., [he who] is intent upon the destruction of transmigration. [The name Bhairavaḥ is to be derived] in this way, on account of being [so] etymologized in the scriptures, and on account of [its] nature being [so] explained, in agreement with [its] meaning, in the *Śivatanu-śāstram*, by the honorable blessed Brhaspatiḥ.

For that very reason this one is delighted, i.e., he, who is joined to the power autonomy that is sheer eternal beatitude, has the name Bhairavaḥ only, not, in contrast, the form of Brahmā, Viṣṇuḥ, Īśaḥ, Sadāśivaḥ, [or] Śivaḥ, either by virtue of the non-existence of the nature of this one for them, according to what is described in the eleventh book, or by virtue of their being manifested and obscured by this one. For that very reason he is the great lord, i.e., the master of all these.

For that very reason, on the kaḥ [from Ka-], i.e., the cerebral aperture of Brahmā, [there is the] e/ā, [from -elā, lit., cardamom seed,] i.e., the radiating power, on which is [the] seat [-āsaḥ], i.e., seat (*āsanam*), i.e., the location above of this peak made up of Vyāpinī and Samanā, the stage residing beyond all the paths, which is the peak of Kailāsaḥ; therein he is seated, i.e., transcending that, [as] sheer and unitary light, and [immanent] having the form of the universe, by pervasion of that entire [universe].

Therefore, he is free from sickness (*āmayah*), i.e., what up to the limit (*ā-*), measures (*mimite*); i.e., [5] he is devoid of that, the Mahāmāyā, having the form of nescience which will be discussed (Bk.10, vs.1263b, p.547): "Below which, according to tradition, there is Māyā, having the form of the power [which is] the power Kuṇḍalī."¹ [Or, free from sickness, i.e.,] by whom the disease of [his] worshippers is removed.

[Being praised,] by those from Caṇḍaḥ to Kumāraḥ, i.e., only by those graced by him, having the form of the pervasion of the manifold [system] of the lord's powers; by the world guardians, Indraḥ, etc., having the form of the intimate retinue of lord Umāpatiḥ, whose form is the pervasion of the essence of that manifold [system of powers], who has the form of Bhairavaḥ and his name, on account of complete fusion with the radiation of Bhairavaḥ that has been explained, [and] who is seated on the peak of the Himālayas, called Kailāsaḥ, which will be described in the [book] on the path of the worlds; by all the rudrāḥ, the absorbers, implied by [stating] Yamaḥ; by all those made up of fire, implied by [stating] Ādityaḥ; by all those causes of

¹ Note the varying reading in Bk.10, which has instead of "*śaktirūpā smṛtā*," "*karmarūpā sthitā*." In his commentary (Bk.10, p.547), Kṣemarājaḥ glosses Māyā as Śaktiḥ, and thus may have incorporated his commentatorial gloss into his citation of the verse here.

emanation, reabsorption, and maintenance, lord Anantaḥ, etc., implied by [stating] Brahmā and Viṣṇuḥ; and also by the other [members] of his retinue become recipients of his uncontingent grace.

Being praised, i.e., being intuited as transcending everything, on account of [their] suppressing the artificial condition [of being limited] knowing subjects.

By the gaṇāḥ, i.e., by the set of eight bhairavāḥ, Kapālīśaḥ, etc., forming a retinue which will be discussed; by the mothers (*mātarāḥ*), i.e., the goddesses, Brahmī, etc., [or alternatively taking the compound as] by the mother (*mātrā*) of the gaṇāḥ, i.e., the goddess Umā, pervading the manifold, as being the principal one, [and thus located] in the middle of the intimate retinue that has been discussed; being served, i.e., being fused, through the extinction of nescience, only through his grace.

[The agent of emanation and reabsorption (*śṛṣṭisaṃhāarakartāram*), i.e.,] making emanation and reabsorption as [part of] his nature (*tācchilyena*); ¹ [6] [and] performing maintenance and obscuration, i.e., which is the fruition of specific sins and which consists of the manifold of emanation and reabsorption; and making grace, i.e., by virtue of being the essence of his nature, his title, etc., i.e., always the performer of these five acts.

For worshippers, i.e., for adepts, etc., the destruction of defects, i.e., by the endowing of whatever is desired.

[Thus, that] Bhairavaḥ being such [as described], delighted, the goddess, who has only the form of the god so stated, i.e., [his] power autonomy; having seen [him], i.e., having realized, made a speech, i.e., reflected upon [him] by [being his] total I-ness; her reflection is just that lord, the mass of sounds, which has the form of the condensation (*pratyāhāra*-) of all phonemes from A to

¹ V. Louis Renou, ed., *La Grammaire de Pāṇini* 1 (Paris: Ecole française d'extrême-orient, 1966): III.2.20, 183-184: "*kr̥ṇō hetutācchilyānulomyeṣu*."

Ha, [and] which has the form of the first sprout of the outflow of all treatises, [and] which has interiorized the entire universe; which he will discuss (Bk.8, vss.27b-28a, p.17): "The treatise which is supremely hard to attain, in the form of a resonance, coming forth, from the peaceful Śivaḥ, the supreme cause, having no visible form."

The lord Bhairavaḥ, who is nothing but consciousness, preceded by the taking on of the forms of Sadāśivaḥ, etc., having resorted to the form of Umāpatiḥ, who is the principal in the pervasion of the manifold with himself as [its] basis, delighted, i.e., as only being made up of Bhairavaḥ, on account of fusion with his [i.e., Bhairava's] own state of being, and [having resorted to] the form of lady Umā, being just as [described], by taking on the roles of master and disciple, for the sake of [giving] grace to the world, propounded a treatise, having the form of questions and answers. Which he will discuss (Bk.8, vss.31b-32a, p.20): [7] "The god, Sadāśivaḥ, having put himself at the stage of master and disciple, [revealed] a scripture, through the division [of his own] position, by statements having consecutive words."

Thus, this should be understood as the statement of the introducer of the scripture, consisting of three and one half verses, being a condensed statement (*sūtram*), on account of [its compactly] delineating (*sūtraṇāt*), the meaning of the treatise, through a [simultaneously] esoteric and exoteric sequence. And herein, this should be understood as a single statement (*ekavākyam*). The other qualifiers, viz., Kailāsaḥ, etc., are stated in order to clarify the meaning interiorized by the words god and Bhairavaḥ, as was explained. In this way, indeed, the two implicit meanings of the root play (*div*), play and activity, are clarified by the [qualifiers] from emanation to cause of grace; therein, grace has been explained by the first five books, and by the fourteenth book, on gesture (*mudrā*), which is a part of these; the nature of emanation is stated by the eleventh; the meaning of [whose] self is the urge to conquer, is elucidated by the word, Kailāsaḥ, etc.,

intending an esoteric meaning, and by the world great lord, is explained by the tenth book; the meaning of shines forth has been illuminated by the words without disease and delighted, [and] that, here and there has been propounded in the book : [e.g., (Bk.4, vs.317a, p.251)] "Therein he should manifest the supreme radiation, the supreme cause." The meaning of praise has been clarified by the words beginning with Caṇḍaḥ and ending with served; it has been explicated in passages [such as, (Bk.6, vs.19, p.121)]: [8] "For the sake of the success of gods and demons it is taught by the god of gods, the cause of the efficacy of the sacrifice." That meaning which has such a form as [all] those without a way, which was also elucidated by the words destruction of the defects of worshippers, is explained by the sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, twelfth, thirteenth, and fifteenth books. In this way the meaning of the word Bhairavaḥ, also should be construed; therein, the meaning of shouting, manifest by the [phrase] ending with made [a speech], is illustrated by the book on the introduction of the scripture. Likewise, the other meanings as well, should be construed, according to usage, as equivalent in meaning to the word god.

And also by the word, Kailāsaḥ, having a secondary sense, [giving] precedence to place, by the words god and Bhairavaḥ, and emanation, etc., [giving] precedence to condition, and by the [words] ending with being praised, [giving] precedence to praise, the introduction of this treatise, by that very statement of the introducer has been illuminated; by the [word] delighted, the condition of knowing the suitable occasion for questioning on the part of the disciple has been illuminated; and by the word Bhairavaḥ, is indicated the emergence of this text from the right stream. And we will illustrate the division of streams in the ninth book.

What did she say? I.e., to [satisfy] the expectation [produced by the statement, the goddess made a speech,] he [i.e., the introducer of the scripture] says:

The blessed goddess said: [9] [that] *Svacchanda-[tantram]* which was told to me by you, O Supreme Lord, /4/ extended for a hundred crores [of verses], spread out in an infinity of divisions, the four seat, the great text, bestowing the set of four fruition, /5/ men, who have little potency and energy, little life-spans, little wealth, and little spirituality, O Śaṃkara, are not able to [use]; /6/ for their sake, tell, O Self, by favor, of that a compendium, a little extension of the meaning of the scripture, bestowing enjoyment and liberation. /7/

O Śaṃkara, i.e., O happiness [i.e., *śaṃ-* as *śreyaḥ*,] maker [*-kara*,] through being intent solely on grace; O Self (*sva*), i.e., O Supreme Lord having the form of the self (*ātmarūpa*); what was told to me by you, [called] the *Svacchanda-[tantram]*, i.e., on account of being the expression of the unrestrained form of that Bhairavaḥ, of whom the inclination [*-chandaḥ*,], i.e., the impulse (*icchā*), is only his own [*sva-*]; [10] extended for a hundred crores, etc., i.e., according to what will be described in the book on the descent of the text; spread out in an infinity of divisions, i.e., Koṭarākṣaḥ, Vyādhībhakṣaḥ, Aghoreśvaraḥ, *Svacchandaḥ*, etc.; [the four seat, i.e.,] of the four, i.e., of female formulæ (*vidyāḥ*), [male-] formulæ (*mantrāḥ*), diagrams (*maṇḍalāni*), [and] gestures (*mudrāḥ*), the seat (*pīṭham*), i.e., support (*āśrayam*); i.e., [either actually, or] by mere potential, according to what has been set down in the blessed *Sarvaviraḥ*: “Gesture, the seat of diagrams, the seat of formulæ, the seat of female formulæ; so, here, a compendium (*saṃhitā*) has four seats.” [Or potentially] as [also stated there:] “The four other works, O Beautiful One, the *Svacchandabhairavaḥ*, the *Caṇḍaḥ*, the *Krodhaḥ*, and the *Unmattabhairavaḥ*, are formula seats.” Therein, the female formula is the matrix of the supreme reality, the vibrating having the form of *Svacchandaśivaḥ*; the formulæ are the four sections [of the om̐] etc.; the diagram is the nine-

centered, etc.; the gestures are the imitation of the skull, etc.; [bestowing the four fruition, i.e.,] for the set of four divided into divisions which will be described, being the covenanter (*samayī*), the spiritual son (*putrakāḥ*), the adept (*sādhakāḥ*), [and] the master (*ācaryāḥ*); such from which there is the [bestowing, i.e.,] the arising of that which is the fruition having the form of the gift of enjoyments and liberation, etc., is what [has been] told [to me by you]; [men (*manujāḥ*, i.e.,] men (*manuṣyāḥ*), i.e., who have natures of death [*maraṇam* from *manu-*] and birth [*janma* from *-ja*], are endowed with little potency (*viryaḥ*), i.e., power (*utsāhaḥ*), and energy (*parākramāḥ*), i.e., capability (*sāmarthyam*), and for that very reason are not able [to realize] the perfections of heroes, and by [their] little lifespan and little wealth [11] incapable [of performing] the great rituals; and by [their] little spirituality (*sattvam*), devoid of faith in the teaching [giving] knowledge of the great reality; they are not able, i.e., to hear, to study, not to mention practice; for their sake a compendium of this, i.e., the scripture, i.e., an abridgement, [viz., a little extension of the meaning of the scripture , i.e.,] such that its extension of the meaning of the text is little, [bestowing, i.e.,] giving as its nature, enjoyment and liberation, by favor (*prasādena*), i.e., by grace (*anugraheṇa*), consisting of the revelation of inner purity; tell.

Next, she enumerates the subjects to be explicated through [her] questions:

How should one know of what sort a master or adept [is, whether] a giver of danger [or] security, O Great Lord, and of what sort [are] the disciple and the [ritual] ground./8/
 Formulæ, in summary; and time; summarily, sacrificing; oblation; preparation; powders;/9/
 the five bovine substances; the rice porridge; the teeth-cleaning stick; diagram; [12] initiation; paths and consecration; covenant; means of realization;/10/

tell, O Great Lord, so they are efficacious in (*āsāḍya*) the Kaliḥ age.

He should know (*vidyāt*) of what sort [the subjects] from master to ground [are], i.e., he should know (*jāniyāt*) [how] to accept and reject [them]; the fifteen subjects, from formulæ to means of realization, how (*yathā*) they are efficacious, in [i.e., with the locative for *āsāḍya*] the Kaliḥ [age], so (*tathā*), tell. Therein, the master either should be examined, by the convenanter, who having [with his first initiation] heard the scripture, has the desire to obtain the stage of spritual son, or should be examined by even [another] master; the master, etc., are effects; here, the master, etc., are listed in sequence according to [their] importance; the disciple, i.e., the covenanter and the spiritual son, [whose] nature will be discussed; [of what sort a master is, i.e., whether] a good master, i.e., a bestower of security (*abhayam*) to the class of disciples, having the form of the set of four, master, etc., [or] a bad master, i.e., bestower of danger (*bhayam*), [and of what sort the disciple is, i.e.,] the good class of disciples and the bad class of disciples [who] bestow danger and security to themselves, viz., danger, i.e., on account of the obstruction of perfections and liberation; security, on account of the absence of that [obstruction]; bestowing danger and security should be construed, through change of [its] gender, etc., also with [the subjects] ground, formula, teeth-cleaning stick, etc., as appropriate according to what will be discussed; ground, i.e., the place for the extension [of the matrix] in the formula ritual; formulæ, i.e., [13] the seat, the form, the with-parts, the without-parts, etc.; time, i.e., the solar [viz., external] and the various internal; summarily [*samāsataḥ*, viz., inclusively], i.e., sacrificing and oblatin [as] common to all initiates; preparation (*adhivāsam*), i.e., the preparatory rite[s] (*saṃskāraḥ*), consisting of the effecting of suitability for all the things used in the initiation; powders (*rajaṃsi*), i.e., the pulverized rice, etc., employed in the nine-centered diagram which will be discussed; initiation

(*dikṣā*), i.e., which has the form of destroying [*kṣapaṇam* from -*kṣā*,] bonds and bestowing [*dānam* from *dī-*,] the stage of Śivaḥ; the path, i.e., having many divisions, being sixfold, having the forms of phoneme (*varṇaḥ*), formula, word, energy (*kalā*), plane (*tattvam*), and world; consecration (*abhiṣekaḥ*), i.e., the sprinkling with the water from the jug [charged with] formulæ at the end of the ritual for masters, etc.; covenants (*samayāḥ*), i.e., restrictive rules and prohibitions for the rest [of the lives] of the initiated; means of realization (*sādhanaṇi*), i.e., means for the success of adepts (*sādhakānām*); all the rest, the imposition (*nyāsaḥ*), repetition (*jāpaḥ*), preparation of the ghee, etc., on account of being included right here, are not enumerated separately.

Next, proceeding to the explication of [her] questions, blessed Bhairavaḥ spoke the first statement, beginning with encouragement, designating [the subject with] the intention, for motivating the disciple:

Good, Good, O Very Fortunate One; that, which was requested by you, [14] for [bestowing] grace to mortals, I now tell you:

Good, Good; by the reiteration, the god, praising [the goddess for her] asking at the [appropriate] occasion and [her] compassion for people, stimulates the intellect of the disciple for the effecting of the suitability for grasping the teaching. O Very Fortunate One; by that is praised [her] readiness for grace. For mortals, i.e., for all, in general who have the nature of mortality, not, in contrast, for a restricted, specifically entitled few; for [bestowing] grace, i.e., for effecting pleasures and liberation; which, i.e., the aggregate of topics (*prameya-*), requested (*paricoditam*), i.e., asked [*prṣṭam*, glossing -*coditam*] in a full enunciation [*paripāṭhyā* from *pari-*], that, only for [bestowing] grace to them, I now (*sāmpratam*), i.e., taking it (*kṛtvā*) [adverbially as both] at the occasion of [his] great extroversion (*mahāvīkāsa-*), opened up by penetration into the existence of the supreme Bhairavaḥ, and [*sāmpratam* as

suitably, i.e.,] as appropriate, by illustrating, among others, the initiation suitable for people that are young, foolish, wise, etc.; tell to you. And herein, the designated [object] (*abhidheyam*), is the knowledge [requested] by the full enunciation of topics enumerated previously, [and] indicated [here] by the word which; his intention is the [bestowing of] grace, consisting of enjoyments and liberation; and therein [i.e., between grace and the topics] there is a relation of means and end; the entitled are mortals; by there being [the god's] readiness with the supreme impulse to [bestow] grace, for the disciple having a desire for liberation and enjoyments, there is the stimulation of suitability; [15] and the god has described the fitness (*āptatām*), of himself, as being the occasion of [his] radiating opened up by reflection of the vibrations of the supreme Bhairavaḥ,¹ and of [this] set of six relations, which will be explicated in the ninth book, the having [as their] essence the supreme relation, although [he is] intent [here] in the first statment, on the propounding of [his] intention [which is] the most important.

Then he says in order to examine [the topics] as enumerated [in the question of the goddess]:

In the beginning, first, he should examine the master, the characteristic of auspiciousness. /12/

[Characteristic of auspiciousness, i.e.,] of whom the characteristic is auspiciousness (*śubham*), which is the [direct] apprehension (*pratitih*) of his own nature as not different from Śivaḥ, which will be discussed here (Bk.4, vss.408b–409a, p.259): "By his concourse (*sahacāritvād*) with Śivaḥ, one is thus renowned as a master (*ācāryaḥ*), " i.e., should be followed [*carāṇiya* from *-cāryaḥ*], i.e., served through being turned to [*ābhimukhyena* from *ā-*], by adepts, etc. In the beginning, i.e., a disciple (*śiṣyaḥ*), [i.e., a covenantor (*samayi*)] who has heard the

¹ Emend on p.15 "*-pratibhāga-*" to "*-pratibhāsa-*."

texts and compendia, who has [either] had the [supreme] reality brought to [his] notice by the speech of a friend, [or] brought by the power of grace, and who is [consequently] desirous for initiation as a spiritual son (*putrakah*), etc., [should examine the master], or else, the master should initially test the disciple in order to make him a master, which [examination] he will [state] (Bk.4, vs.454b, p.286): "He should endow the state of being a teacher on those whose conduct and character are known." [And] by the word first (*tāvat*) he implies [as well, its meaning of such extent, i.e.,] [16] that of this [master] the characteristic of auspiciousness, has only the form of the [non-dual] apprehension, [as] stated by the rule: "Although deprived of every [favorable] characteristic, [if a] master has knowledge, [then he is] the best;"¹ [and, in addition, this implication is confirmed,] on account of only that [insight] being liberating, according to what will be said (Bk.4, vs.399b, p.253): "I, in fact, am the supreme, the goose (*haṃsah*), Śivah . . . , " and on account of what will be shown, that also the ritual of initiation [has as its] essence, a non-dual pervasion by Śivah.

[Besides this insight which is the main cause of the efficacy of the ritual, the master's] being born in an Āryan country, etc., is a supernumerary cause, i.e., a component (*āṅgam*) [of the ritual that contributes] to the powers of the disciple; and for that very reason, he next discusses [these secondary characteristics]:

[Who is] born in an Āryan country, furnished with all limbs, knowing the rules and scriptures of Śivah, skilled in what should be known and knowledge, /13/
 delighting in works of the lord, peaceful, truthful, firm in vows, resolute and endowed with potency, joined to compassion and righteousness, /14/

¹ Cf. M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrāloka*.3, pp.66-67.

renouncing, free from deceit, steeped in the scriptures of Śivaḥ; [17] having obtained such a master, powers and liberation are not far off./15/

Āryan country, i.e., [a country which] has the four castes (*varṇaḥ*) completely distinguished, [concerning] which the *Viṣṇu-smṛtiḥ* states: "In whatever land is not found the basis of the four castes, that is a barbarian contry; the rest should be known to you as Āryan land."¹ Rites, i.e., initiation, etc.; in knowledge, i.e., in the scriptures of Śivaḥ, and in what should be known, i.e., in the reality of the supreme Śivaḥ, viz., in the pervasion of the different paths [of the universe], etc.; skilled, i.e., spotless; peaceful, i.e., having his senses controlled; that one is truthful and has firm vows, i.e., [one] who carries out what he undertakes; that one [is] resolute, i.e., unshakable, and endowed with potency, i.e., filled with the supreme truth [revealed] in the [state of] supreme awareness (*paramudrā*); compassion, i.e., the desire to show grace to the transmigrating; righteousness, i.e., selfless and well-disposed; renouncing, i.e., by whom money is thought of as grass; free from deceit, i.e., not having crooked behavior; steeped in the scriptures of Śivaḥ, i.e., although he is familiar with all sciences, his faith rests solely in the teachings of Śivaḥ. [Thus] such, i.e., [one] whose essence is the immediate awareness of his own self as not different from Śivaḥ, as was stated in the immediately preceding [section], is a master (*guruḥ*), i.e., teacher (*upadeṣṭā*); having obtained, i.e., having gotten [him to act, when he has] become the cause (*kāraṇam*) [identified with Śivaḥ in the ritual], [then] powers and liberation i.e., the effects,² are not far off, i.e., are [acquired]

¹ Pandit V. Krishnamacharya, ed., *Viṣṇusmṛti with the Commentary of Keśavavaijayanti of Nandapaṇḍita* 2 (Madras: The Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1964): vs.4, p.809.

² Emend *karṭṛya* to *kāryau*.

immediately. [18] [This is] the meaning. [Thus, the master's] having the auspicious characteristic, whose nature has been described [is the cause of] liberation, [and his] having an origin in an Āryan country, etc., is the cause of powers (*siddhiḥ*), for the disciple — this is the gist of what has been said (*uktaprāyam*). Thus, after he has discussed the nature of the master who bestows security, he says [to characterize] the opposite [kind of master]:

But that one who is, angry, unstable, vile, devoid of compassion and righteousness, cross-eyed, buck-toothed, one-eyed, bald, devoid of [learning in] the scriptures [of Śivah],/16/

excessively tall, short, thin, fat, wasting away, a logician, deceitful, turned away from truth and purity,/17/

delighting in other scriptures, is not a bestower of fruition liberation.

Angry, i.e., made up of anger; unstable, i.e., having a bad character, and not attending to his duties; vile, i.e., intent on the acquisition of vile powers; cross-eyed, i.e., whose eye has a wavering pupil; wasting away, i.e., afflicted with consumption; [19] a logician, i.e., solely fixated on the treatises of inferior logic. But logic, which is made up of [scripturally based] inference (*ūhaḥ*) is indeed praised in the *Śrīpūrvaśāstram*: "... logic is the highest branch of practice."¹ Turned away from purity, i.e., void of purity in worldly affairs (*arthaḥ*), etc. The rest is clear.

Such a master does not bestow on the adept the fruition, whose characteristic [is the acquisition of] powers. On the contrary, according to what will be stated, he only gives fear. But who has otherwise delighted in the Vaiṣṇava, etc., learning, and then has studied the scriptures of the supreme lord, in the manner of an eclectic dilettante (*cumbakaḥ*), etc., [and] has no real faith therein, [to him applies that] which has been stated: "Although

¹ M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Mālinivijayottaratantram* 17, vs.18, p.114.

performing initiation, etc., the wicked [master] is not a bestower of liberation." But one who delights in the scriptures of Śivaḥ is a bestower of the liberation fruition to all, [even those] devoted to [the worship] of any partial manifestation (*aṃśakaḥ*) [of the lord], since this [teaching of Śivaḥ] surpasses all other [doctrines]; which he will state (Bk.11, vs.74b, p.54): "The supreme stage surpassing all [other] paths [is that] of the Śaivāḥ." [A bestower of liberation fruition, i.e.,] one [who] bestows liberation fruition, i.e., liberation and the fruition, whose form is the [acquisition of various] powers.

[Thus] After having construed [the sense of this passage, in the preceding way], it must be [further] analysed [as I will now explain]. The bestowing of the opposite fruition, which will be described (in vss.22–27, pp.22–23) beginning: "He should find suffering in the angry . . . , " and ending: "Who is devoid of truth, etc., his formulæ are not effective," is to be construed [here] with the angry [master], etc.; [20] for the same reason, the bestowing of the reverse fruition on the part of [the master] devoted to another doctrine, who is not stated further on, is also correct (*yuktam*) [since this kind of wicked master is to be construed from this passage with the following passage describing the reverse fruition.] By not having read [the verse] "he should find suffering in the angry," although it comes in order here, [and in] reading it immediately after the description of the disciple, [the lord] implies that it is predominantly for the disciple that such a master is a bestower of danger.

He describes the nature of the student [who is] a bestower of security to himself:

The disciple [who is] compassionate, firm, devoid of deceit and deception, /18/

devoted to god, fire, and master, devoted to the scriptures, having resolute vows, intent on obedience to the master, endowed with very tranquil senses, /19/

such should be the disciple, who here is a vessel of grace.

Compassion, i.e., mercy directed to the poor, etc.; firmness, i.e., in every instance resolute; deceit, i.e., a murky state of mind; [21] deception, i.e., crookedness; having resolute vows, i.e., whose mind (*matih*) is firmly made up. And this [characteristic] has [as its] scope [the practice] of the adept (*sādhakaḥ*), i.e., of the disciple who has a master who is devoid of anger, etc., and is [thereby] entitled to [receive] the means of realization (*sādhanam*), precisely through that determined intellect (*dhi*), according to what will be explained at its own occasion [i.e., in the discussion of the adept, (Bk.4, vss.83ff, pp.41ff) according to the division into the law of the world (*lokadharmi-*) and the law of Śivaḥ (*śivadharmi-*) kind of adept; devotion to the set of four, the god, etc., i.e., devotion is the principal form of the disciple; but when the master is far away, there is obedience, i.e., the continual following of him, [i.e., conforming of oneself to him]; who here is a vessel of grace; by that [statement] is stated that this [kind of disciple] is a bestower of security to himself; [and the] second [repeated use of] the word disciple (*śiṣyaḥ*) has [as its intention, emphasizing] the final suffix [-ya of the gerundive, in the sense,] fit (*arha-*), [i.e., fit to be taught (*śis-*)].¹ The rest is clear.

He [next] states the opposite of that:

Filled with deception, malicious, cruel, lying, fond of quarrels, /20/

lustful, filled with greed, devoid of devotion of Śivaḥ, finding fault with the teachings of the masters, although such [a disciple may] be initiated, he does not partake of liberation. /21/

Malicious, i.e., whose heart is unclear; cruel, i.e., having a violent nature; fond of quarrels, i.e., disputatious; filled with greed, i.e., [22] even though having the means, deceitful

¹ Renou, *La Grammaire de Pāṇini* 1: III.3.169, p.256: "*arhe kṛtyatṛcaśca.*"

concerning money [to be paid out] for worship, etc.; [by the statement, devoid of] devotion to Śivah, etc., is stated [his being] tainted by the [lord's own] power of obsuration (*vilayaśaktiḥ*); by the statement, he does] not partake of liberation is stated his being a bestower of danger to his very own self; and this [statement] has as its scope [all the ranks of disciples] adepts, spiritual sons, and covenantors, since all are disciples.

Next how a master is a bestower of danger to disciples, he so describes:

He should find suffering in the angry, unstable fortune in the unstable; the vile master should remove the perfection [obtained by] formulæ, O Beautiful Lady;/22/

misfortune [will be brought] by one devoid of compassion; in the unskillful [he should find] the torment of slaves; there should be disease from the cross-eyed; the buck-toothed caused disputes;/23/

the one-eyed is a producer of enmity; a bald one destroys wealth; [23] in one devoid [of knowledge of] the scriptures, there should be no success in the initiation [ritual], etc., O One Lauded by Heroes;/24/

in a giant there should be known to be danger to a king; a midget is a destroyer of sons; a thin one should be known to be a cause of decline [in health]; a fat one causes accidents;/25/

from one afflicted with consumption there should be death; in a logician, murder and imprisonment; a deceitful one should be known to be a cause of sin, O Beautiful Lady;/26/ for one who is devoid of truthfulness, the formulæ are not efficacious; all these are not auspicious, O Goddess, both here and in the world to come./27/

He should find (*vindyāt*), [in the optative, has the sense of the indicative] he obtains (*labhate*); [the formulæ] are not efficacious (*siddhyanti*), i.e., they do not produce the [desired] effect of grace, etc.; and this [list] is stated with reference to the master

[who has] a predominance of ritual, [i.e., a ritualist]; but the master [who is] devoted to knowledge (*jñānam*) [or] exercise (*yogaḥ*), [24] although [he might be] touched by one-eyeness, etc., does no damage: "as stated [previously, p.16]: "Although deprived of every [favorable] characteristic, [if a] master has knowledge, [then he is] the best." The rest is clear. And here, where the sole authority is the utterance of the lord, the various positions [which] have been written [by other commentators] are mostly hocus-pocus (*ālajālāprāyāḥ*), [and thus] they are only laughable.

Next, he describes the ritual ground suitable now for the extension of the matrix (*mātrkā*), and further on for the [adept's] ritual (*yāgaḥ*), etc.:

White, red, yellow, black, purified by flowing water, free from thorns, endowed with all qualities, bestowing the objects of all desires, the ground;/28/

The rest [to be supplied is] having resorted to; on account of what will be discussed [Bk.4, vs.77ff, pp.23ff], that in the initiation there is extraction of [the initiate's] caste (*jātiḥ*) and endowment with the Bhairava caste, there is not stated here a division [of colors] as in the dualistic doctrine: "[the colors] of the castes (*varṇaḥ*), brāhmaṇa, etc., are white, red, gold, and black;"¹ in contrast, [here, in the non-dualistic tradition,] the ground should be delineated having the colors mixed together. By flowing [water], i.e., by sprinkling water on top [of it]; purified, i.e., having its slope to the north-eastern, eastern, or northern

¹ On p.24, emend " . . . *śvetā mṛtkāñcanā sitā*, " to read *svetā-asṛk-kāñcanā-asitā*, to accord with the stated colors of vs.28. Cf. N.R. Bhatt, ed., *Mṛgendrāgama (Kriyāpada et Caryāpāda) avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa-Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha*, Publications de l'institut français d'indologie 23 (Pondichéry: Institut français d'indologie, 1962), vs.3, p.84: "*himāsṛktālanilābhām*," and commentary: "*yathāsaṃkhyam brāhmaṇādinām himāsṛktālanilābhām himarudhiraharitālasyāma-varṇām*"

direction ascertained, or [having its being] level [ascertained], as was stated: "the best flow is northern etc. . . . ;"¹ [25] free from thorns, i.e., devoid of bones, cinders, etc.; [endowed with all] qualities; this very statement (*vākyam*), although [apparently] intended [to make] a [secondary] explanatory [statement] (*anuvādaḥ*), is [actually] injunctive (*vidhāyaka-*), on account of the absence [in this verse] of any other injunctive statement. [Then] having resorted to such a ground,

Endowed with choice fragrances, beautified with scattered flowers, abounding in the fragrance of fine incense, adorned with a pandal above;/29/

The rest [to be supplied is] after [he] has made the [ground]; the meanings is that first he should worship the ground [which is] the supreme lord's supportive power.

Next, he states the ritual procedure for the extraction (*uddhāraḥ*) of the formulæ, preceded by an illustration of the suitable master:

The master, having purified [himself], covered with sandalwood and aloes wood, beautifully incensed, his self clarified, holding chalk in his hand;/30/

[26] facing either east or north, concentrated, recollected, he should there sketch out the matrix, in sequence, from a to kṣa./31/

[having] purified, i.e., having performed the bath of his choice; [by the statement, covered] with sandalwood, etc., [is indicated] that the daily worship has been carried out; and for that very reason his self is clarified, i.e., has the [supreme] nature of Śivaḥ emerged, through the submersion of the [inferior nature] of the body, etc.; [and] it is stated that the master is facing either east

¹ Cf. N.R. Bhatt, ed., *Maṭaṅgaparamaśvarāgama, (Kriyāpāda, Yogapāda, et Caryāpāda), avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa-Rāmakāṇṭha*, Publications de l'institut français d'indologie 65 (Pondichéry: Institut français d'indologie, 1982), vs.45b, p.421: "udakplavaṃ sadā kāryaṃ"

or north, according to his desire, since the faces of Tatpuruṣaḥ and Sadyojātaḥ, [respectively] are the cause of powers and liberation;¹ concentrated, i.e., intent on contemplating the emergence of the formulæ; and for that very reason, recollected, i.e., having obtained the potency of the formulæ; the matrix (*mātrkā*), i.e., the mother of the universe unknown to bonded being, the genetrix of all formulæ and scriptures; [in sequence,] from a to kṣa, i.e., flowing forth in the sequence of powers beginning with the energy (*kalā*) whose essence is the pervasion of the transcendental energy (*anuttara-akulaḥ*) [i.e., a], [and continuing with the energies of beatitude (*ānandaḥ*) [i.e., ā,], and impulse (*icchā*), [i.e., i,] etc., [and] having as [its] essence the pervasion up to the limit, [which is] revealed in the ball (*piṇḍaḥ*) formula, which consists of the sound kṣa, which has the entire universe appropriated in itself by a condensation (*pratyāhāraḥ*) [of all the phonemes] from ka to sa; he should sketch out (*prastaret*), i.e., preceded [*pūrvam* from *pra-*] by the contemplation (*anusamdhīḥ*) of the pervasion of the written letters (*lipiḥ*), [which] consist of the set of four powers stated in the *Sarvaviraḥ* and *Bhargasīkhā*, [which is] the nasalization (*anusvāraḥ*), [which is] the concentrated awareness (*saṃcetanam*), of the outflow in reflective awareness (*āmarśaḥ*), of the fifty rudrāḥ and their powers, [which are] essentially (*svābhāvika-*) inherent in the powers of his own cognition; [27] [the reading] he should sketch out (*prastaret*), is a scriptural (*ārsāḥ*) reading for [the standard] he should sketch out (*prastṛṇiyāt*); and also elsewhere, the speech of the supreme lord is only correct (*sadhu*), [and should not be

¹ Normally, in Śaiva texts, however, the northern face is not Sadyojātaḥ, but Vāmadevaḥ; the text might then be corrected in regard to the direction, i.e., facing not north but west to Sadyojātaḥ, or in regard to the face, i.e., facing north not to Sadyojātaḥ but to Vāmadevaḥ.

corrected], since the utterances of the lord should not be discursively analyzed by limited intellects.

Thus, after he has illustrated the matrix, which is the first screen [for the manifestation of the lord], through his desire [to demonstrate] that this scripture has the female formula basis (*vidyāpīṭhatvam*) which was enumerated [earlier, vs.5, p.9], he describes the Śiva-Śaktiḥ form of this matrix:

Bhairavaḥ is said by tradition to be manifest [as] a, etc., by the sixteen division;/32/

Bhairavi is said by tradition to be the womb, the phoneme classes, [that begin with the respective sounds,] ka, ca, ṭa, ta, pa, ya, śa, and thus, a pair brought together with the constructor.

[As] a, etc., i.e., the first phoneme class; [sixteen, i.e.,] of the set of sixteen, invigorating the universe, beginning with the transcendent (*anuttaraḥ*), [i.e., a], and ending with the breathing (*visargaḥ*) [i.e., ḥ], [which first are] designated by the word vowel (*svaraḥ*), i.e., in as much as through themselves, [*svayam* from *sva-*], shining [*rājamanatayā* from *-ra*], i.e., having an essence [which is] sounding (*śabdanam*) [*svaraḥ* from *svṛ*, in the sense of sound *śabda-*], striking away duality (*upatāpakaḥ*) [*svaraḥ* from *svṛ*, in the sense of pain *utāpa-*], [and] projecting out the universe (*ākṣepana-*), [*svaraḥ* from in the sense of *ākṣepa-*, throw out]; [and which second] have the designation seed (*bijam*), [whose] essence is the radiation of supreme consciousness, on account of being the support for the outflow of all phonemes and [non-phonematic] existents, (*tattvam*), of the matrix, which has interiorized all expressers (*vācakaḥ*) and expressed (*vācyam*); [28] by the division [of these vowels], i.e., as the multiplicity [of these], Bhairavaḥ is manifest, i.e., by virtue of being made up of the entire universe, and by virtue of the non-duality of the expresser and the expressed; but the womb (*yonih*) [consisting] of ka, etc., i.e., [which are] designated by the word consonant (*vyañjanam*), i.e., in being manifest

(*vyangyitvena*) by the seeds, on account of compactness, as being the coagulation (*śyānibhāva-*) of the seeds, [and called womb] by virtue of being the cause the world through contact with the seeds, and thus, i.e., with the contractor as a phoneme class, i.e., the sound kṣa, [is said to be] Bhairavi.

After he has illustrated the sketching out of the matrix which is the form of Bhairavaḥ and [his] power previously stated, [now] while illustrating the worship of this [matrix] whose essence is the radiation of all the formula deities, as [if] a [subsidiary] rite in the extraction of the formulæ, he also indicates that it is a separate ritual performance:

He should worship the matrix Bhairavaḥ, with the 'a' class of phonemes, /33/

Bhairavi, should be worshipped with k, etc., the mothers with the phoneme classes.

[Matrix Bhairavaḥ, i.e.,] Bhairavaḥ, the regent of the matrix, [whose] nature [is that] of the lord without parts, [whose] ultimate reality [as Bhairavaḥ, consists of] the bearing [*bharaṇam* from bh-], the resonating [*ravaṇam* from -ra-], and the emitting [*vamaṇam* from -va] [of the universe], in being the radiation of that [matrix]; with the 'a' class of phonemes, i.e., with the set of sixteen whose nature has been described [in the preceding section], [29] he should worship; Bhairavi, i.e., [she whose] nature is identical to the lord without parts, should be worshipped [as] Umā having the form of Yogīśvarī, the queen of that [matrix], [and as] the womb, [appropriately, with ka, etc., i.e.,] with the phonemes from ka to kṣa, not-divided into classes of phonemes.

In the class of phonemes a, [etc.,] Mahalakṣmīḥ; in the class of phonemes ka, Kamalodbhavā; /34/

In the class of phonemes ca, Maheśānī; in the class of phonemes ṭa, Kumārikā; in the class of phonemes ta, Nārāyaṇī; Vārāhī, connected to the class of phonemes pa; /35/

Aindri located in the class of phonemes *ya*; Cāmuṇḍā connected to the class of phonemes, *śa*; these are the seven great mothers, established in the seven worlds.

The mothers, i.e., the seven, Brāhmī, Māheśvarī, Kaumārī, Vaiṣṇāvī, Vārāhī, Aindri, Cāmuṇḍā, [which have] the form of the rays of Bhairavī; [after he has distributed them] in the directions, southeast, northeast, north, south, west, east, southwest, [then] [30] on account of what will be stated (Bk.10, vs.1144a, p.483): "That matrix formula should be divided up into the eight classes of phonemes," and on account of having employed the class of phonemes *a*, with the seven classes of phonemes, *ka*, etc., only, separately distributed, he should worship [them]. Thus, even though this is a another [different] ritual performance [from that described earlier or that described later, it is] in fact, correct. And thus [later on]: after he has established the world of Umā, immediately after the octad of exercise (*yogāṣṭakam*), in the middle of the worlds of the intellect (*buddhiḥ*), in the path of the worlds, there is [next a discussion] of the nature of the meditation (*dhyānam*), etc., on Umāpatiḥ, [who is located] in the world named Sucāru,¹ [whose] form is the pervasion of the diversity (*prapañca-*) [manifest] by the supreme Bhairavaḥ, [and whose] retinue is the seven mothers,; accordingly, after having stated the meditation on him [in the verse] beginning (Bk.10, vs.1008b, p.415): "Umāpatiḥ, the lord of the universe, bestowing grace to all, the supreme;" [and] after having established [his] fusion in meditation, etc., with the mothers, Brāhmī, etc., with the [verse]s beginning (Bk.10, vs.1017a, p.418): "the seven beautiful mothers . . . ," [and] after having stated (Bk.10, vs.1029a, p.422): "They worship Svachchandaḥ according to a division of superior and inferior;" [then] with the [verse] beginning (Bk.10, vs.1029b, p.423): "Umā, having become sevenfold, through

¹ Emend (p.30) "*svacāru-*" on the basis of bk.10, vs.1006a, p.415, to *sucāru*.

various transformations of [her] form," a difference in the ritual performance [of worshipping the mothers] is established. But, therein, an inferior form of the lord is discussed; here, in contrast, a superior form; [this is] the difference, which he will [also] discuss (Bk.10, vss.1028b-1029a, p.422): "But other higher [forms of] the svacchandāḥ [goddesses] are established in the supreme void; they worship Svacchandaḥ according to a division of superior and inferior." [31]

Therefore, it is not consistent, that the worship of the matrix Bhairavaḥ, although it has a separate form of ritual performance, be [considered] a subsidiary [rite] (*aṅgam*) [selected] from [those included in] the extraction of the formulæ.

And this is correct, since he says:

He obtains all his desires, O Goddess; thus Bhairavaḥ said. But if the worship of the matrix Bhairavaḥ [just described] were a subsidiary [rite] of the [ritual of] the extraction of the formulæ, then according to the rule: "A subsidiary [rite is enjoined] in close proximity to [a main ritual that] has a fruition [specified, and] has no fruition,"¹ [then] this statement [enjoining a fruition] would be incorrect; [and this statement must refer to the worship of the matrix Bhairavaḥ, and not to the extraction of the formulæ,] on account of the inappropriateness of specifying a fruition for a ritual that has not been completed.

And after he has performed in this way,

At the end of this [worship], he should extract the formulæ according to [their] application in sequence. /37/

Of this, i.e., of the worship of the matrix; [according to their use in sequence, i.e.,] [according to that] application, which is in sequence, viz., in the sequence of the formula of the seat, the formula of the form, etc., [and] through which there is the focusing on the contemplation of the deities expressed by the

¹ On this rule v. Jha, *Pūrvamīmāṃsā in its Sources*, p.330, no. 9.

various formulæ, [and which] is the usage in sequence that is applied in the rites for the] imposition (*nyāsaḥ*) [of formulæ] which will be [described] in the second book.

[32] [Thus] here, the extraction of the formulæ also is stated in accordance with the sequence of imposition which will be [described]; therein,

The thirteenth, drop (*binduḥ*) united, the seat of Anantaḥ, the highest; he should unite everything, with that, located within the moon, the sun, the fire, /38/

Brahmā, Viṣṇuḥ, Maheśaḥ, up to the corpse (*śavaḥ*), he should construct;

The thirteenth, i.e., [the thirteenth vowel,] the sound o; [drop united, i.e.,] the sound of the Praṇavaḥ; the seat of Anantaḥ, i.e., although [this Praṇavaḥ] is the expresser of the supreme reality, now [in this context,] on account [of its] being used as the lord, who designates the seat, it [is] the appropriate form for the seat [comprising Anantaḥ, in all his forms, viz.,] the base Anantaḥ located below [under the egg of Brahmā, the Anantaḥ located in the middle,] up to the [stage of] Vidyeśaḥ, and Anantaḥ located at the [upper] limit, at the stage of Vyāpinī; [this is the] meaning. Thus [in this way] of the lord Anantaḥ, residing above every path, there is a pervasion of the manifold [manifest universe], [which has] an infinite (*ananta-*) form [going] lower and lower;¹ [and] this will be described [in the book on the worlds]. Thus here, the pervasion of the seat has [its] upper limit in the Anantaḥ located at the stage of Vyāpinī; and for that very reason, he calls it highest (*uttamam*), i.e., going beyond [*udgatam* from *ut-*] by superiority [*atiśāyena* from *-tama* ²], i.e., located at the head of all the paths; [this is] the meaning.

¹ On p.32 for “-eva dharā-” read *eva-adharā-*.

² Renou, *La Grammaire de Pāṇini* 2, V.3.55, p.70: “*atiśāyane tanaḥ*”.

[And] he manifests this [33] [highest form when], with that, i.e., the formula of the seat, all, i.e., [everything] located below, he unites, i.e., he contemplates as a single energy of support, [and this he does] in this way, having made Brahmā, Viṣṇuḥ, and Maheśānaḥ, located within the moon, the sun, and the fire. [And] this is the meaning: after he has made the collection of regents (*kāraṇam*), Brahmā, etc., located within, i.e., interiorized within the circle of the moon, sun, and fire, [whose] essence is the pervasion of all objects of knowledge (*prameyam*), means of knowledge (*pramāṇam*), and knowing subjects (*pramātā*), in the parts of the leaves, stems, and pericarp, in the lotus of knowledge, [whose] essence is the pervasion of the lotus of the power, [i.e.,] after he has contemplated [it] with a non-dual pervasion,¹ [in his interior worship, then] that seat such [as just described], at the end of which is lord Anāśritaḥ, who [resides] above that [entire path of the regents], [who is] the pervader of the corpse which will be described, by the Praṇavaḥ, i.e., with the pervasion [which] is the special contemplation established by the mouth of the master, [he should construct,] i.e., he should reflect upon (*parāṁśet*), as being so pervaded. In this way, by this imposition, duality is dissolved; [next] he states the dissolution of the atomized state [of impurity]:

He should construct the form with the swan syllable, split with the drop, /39/

[which] has the swelling made by the halfmoon, self-sounding, similar to snow.

With the syllable (*akṣaram*) [i.e., the Praṇavaḥ, which] following continuously the path of the swan (*haṁsaḥ*), is the reflection on the self which will be described (Bk.7, vs.30a, p.188): "the self is the swan . . . , " [34] [and which thus has the swan], i.e., the oscillating form which is the sound h, [that together] although

¹ On p.33 read "*kṛtvā bheda-*" as *kṛtvā abheda-*.

[constituting] the form of the fire-stick of all formulæ, [are joined with] the split drop (*binduḥ*), [which is] composed of the undifferentiated awareness [*vedanā* from *vid* in *b(v)induh*] of all formula knowledge (*vidyā*), and therefore in the manner which will be described in the section on the five Praṇavāḥ, can be uttered, through having become a formula [by adding that drop]; the form (*mūrtiḥ*), i.e., the establishment of the self designated as the form on account of loss of awareness (*moha-*) of the pervasion of duality up to the head [of the corpse], and on account of the emergence of the stage of the pure self; he should construct, i.e., he should reflect upon (*vimarśet*); [and] what sort of [form is this]; [it is that] by which there is an swelling (*ātopaḥ*), made residing on the form of the drop, i.e., on the halfmoon (*ardhacandraḥ*), i.e., [which] has an effort undertaken for splitting the knot of the forehead; [this] is the meaning. And by splitting that [knot, it is] self-sounding (*svasvanām*), i.e., in being the form of resonance (*dhvaniḥ*), it has the form of reflexive I awareness, and so is similar to snow, i.e., [it has] the form of the light of consciousness shaped like a ball of kadamba blossoms; [and] this has been stated in the blessed *Trikahṛdayam*: “When there is the emergence of Bhairavaḥ on Anantaḥ, [then] this is the intermediate form, through the mere touch of which, atomcity is dissolved.”

Next, also,

Above that he should construct the god Svachchandaḥ with parts./40/

[35] [Above] that, i.e., above the form of consciousness, after he has submerged the contraction of that [consciousness]; with parts, i.e., [whose] body is the totality of all expressers and things expressed; the god, i.e., [whose] essence is as previously explained, Svachchandaḥ, i.e., come forth after one has pierced the screen of the form of consciousness, for the sake of [giving] grace to those worthy of grace; he should construct, i.e., he should contemplate (*bhāvayet*).

The difference between the Bhairavaḥ with form, and the [Bhairavaḥ] without parts, is produced solely by imagination; [and] this he states:

He should utter first the sound 'om,' followed immediately by 'aghorebhyo;' [then next] having written, 'tha ghorebhyo,' then he should write another [word],/41/

'ghora,' and [then] he should utter 'ghoratarebhyaḥ sarvataḥ śarva;' and [then] another word, 'sarvebhyaḥ,' [followed by] 'namaste rudra;'/42/

and having written 'rūpebhyaḥ,' [he utters as an] ending the sound 'namaḥ;' [36] [this] is called the king of formulæ (*mantrarājaḥ*), Aghoraḥ, worshipped by the gods./43/

Here for the purpose of safeguarding the form of the words of the formula, the effect of euphonic combination (*saṃhitā*) has not been shown. This is the great formula (*mahāmantraḥ*), taught in verses, [which has] thirty-two syllables, not counting the om at the beginning and the sound namaḥ at the end. [Now] of this [great formula] this is the secret sense: [O] Rudra, i.e., O supreme lord, i.e., [in being the] cause of the obstruction [*rodhanam*, from Ru-] of the mind through fusion (*samāveśaḥ*) with the radiation of supreme consciousness, [and cause] of the melting away [*dravaṇam* from -dra] of all bonds; O Ghora, i.e., manifestor of the stages of Sadāśivaḥ, Īśaḥ, etc., made up of non-duality [mixed with] duality; O Śarva, i.e., form of protection [*śaraṇam* from Śar-] [and] concealment [*varaṇam* from vṛ in -va], in effecting the mere withdrawal of the states of emanation, maintenance, and reabsorption, [and] through manifesting the form of Māyā composed of duality; by these three vocatives, used in harmony with the three forms which will be described, he has invoked the supreme Bhairavaḥ, the lord, the body of the universe, [who is] intent on revealing all states [of awareness]. [When] he says you (*te*), i.e., the [genitive] of you (*tava*), [then he means, that the formula is directed to forms] related [to Bhairavaḥ], i.e., to those consisting of the circle of various rudrāḥ

and their powers, [whose] form [represents] a manifestation of the triad of [supreme] powers, called Raudri, Jyeṣṭhā, Vāmā, [i.e., those] etymologized, in sequence, in other compendia, with the names inferior, intermediate, and superior. [Thus, first:] to the non-terrible (*aghorebhyaḥ*), i.e., to the causes of the recognition of the nature of the self [as] consisting of the great Bhairavaḥ, non-duality, sheer supreme consciousness and beatitude, [37] [and second:] then (*atha*), i.e., to [those who] come immediately after, in being the spreading out of the screen [of consciousness [whose] form [was just stated], i.e., the bestowers of the stages consisting of duality in the form of Anāśritaḥ, Sadāśivaḥ, Īśvaraḥ, etc., and for that very reason, by the emergence of objectivity covered over by subjectivity, on account of being frightening in reference to the first form, [called] the terrible (*ghorebhyaḥ*); [then third:] to the very terrible (*ghoratarebhyaḥ*), [called such] on account of being extremely frightening, [in being] the bestowers of the extension of duality from Māyā to earth, [which is] stamped upon the mirror of [the lord's] own power, [which] is the emanator of subjectivity and objectivity emanated on the [supporting] screen [that is] an extension of the supreme consciousness; to the forms (*rūpebhyaḥ*), i.e., to his own natures (*svabhāvebhyaḥ*), by virtue of every single form being full, in being made up of the screen [whose] form is the supreme Bhairavaḥ; everywhere (*sarvataḥ*), i.e., in every form; to all (*sarvebhyaḥ*), i.e., [to those consisting of] the reflection of full subjectivity composed of the potency of the great formula, radiating, so that everything is composed of everything, at all times (*sarvadā*), [and] everywhere (*sarvatra*); hail (*namaḥ*), i.e., I become fused, by being inclined towards the stage of the knowing subject constructed from the body, etc., [which is] a mass of bonds, [now] being overpowered by the radiation of the triad of powers, [which] are the great rudrāḥ, [which] have been invoked by reflection on the words in the vocative; [this is] the meaning.

And this has been stated in the blessed *Mālinivijayaḥ*: “[Those,] who after grasping [beings] atomized by Rudraḥ, make [these] atomized [beings] fall lower and lower, [so that they become] completely dissolved in objects, are called by tradition, the more terrible, the inferior./31/ Those, who generate, as before, attachment to the fruition of mixed acts, [who are] the obstructors of the path [leading] to liberation, should be [known] as the terrible, the intermediate./32/ [38] [Those, who] as before, to the mass of creatures, are the bestowers of the fruition [which is] the abode of Śivaḥ, [are called] by their knowers, the non-terrible, the supreme, the illuminated, the powers of Śivaḥ./33/”¹ But in the blessed *Pañcārthapramāṇam*, [they are explained in the following way]: “[Those] in whom there is not found, that [which] is the fear maker, the connection to sin called the mass of bonds, i.e., the terrible, are proclaimed [to be] the non-terrible.{1} Those rudrāḥ, Vāmeśvari, etc., [who are] located above the root of the net [of bondage], are called the non-terrible; [now] hear in summary about the terrible.{2} Those who are the rudrāḥ, beginning with Gopatiḥ, and ending with Gahanaḥ, [who] have been discussed previously, [who] reside in various worlds, are called the terrible.{3} [Those] others, who are the great Śaiva [lords], beginning with Vidyēśvaraḥ, and ending with Anantaḥ, [who are] established below, are to be known as the very terrible.{4} In these, who are thus the non-terrible, terrible, and very terrible, the supreme lord’s powers are permanently established.{5} [These] powers, [are established] in all these forms, i.e., as the driving force of all objects, in maintenance, dissolution, and emanation, and in the activities of bondage and liberation.{6} To all these forms, the atomized [being] makes obeisance (*namaskāram*), i.e., obeisance [which is] renunciation

¹ M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Mālinivijayottaratantram*, III, 31–33, pp.17–18.

(*parityāgaḥ*), characterized as [a casting off of these] causes and [their] effects. {7}"

Thus, after he has stated the nature of the great formula, [which] is composed of the essence of the supreme lord consisting of everything in everything, [and which] though hard to obtain, is continuously obtained [by those] full of devotion [to him], he describes [the formula's] greatness:

[39] Uttered once, O Goddess, [this formula] destroys all the sins [which] have been accumulated by transmigrating [beings] during a thousand crores of births./44/

The rest [to be supplied is] when [the formula] is employed by the master at the time of the disciples initiation.

Accordingly,

Through [its] memoration only, [the formula] destroys the dark, like the rising sun.

Dark (*tamaḥ*), i.e., the impurity (*malam*) connected to the atomizing (*āṇava-*) [of the self], and connected to Māyā; dark, (*tamaḥ*), i.e., darkness (*andhakakāram*), [it] destroys like the rising of the sun, i.e., [it destroys] the dark [which is] the ignorance having the form of the erroneous supposition [that the self is] the body, etc., by initiation; [and the formula] destroys through its memoration (*smaraṇam*), i.e., by fusion with the deity, Bhairavaḥ, [who is] expressed by its own self; [and] also the darkness, i.e., for covenantors, the form of sins [incurred] by the negligent non-performance of [their] rules of conduct, and for adepts, the form of obstacles [to the successful completion of their practices], [the formula] destroys [through its memoration alone], i.e., through the memoration alone composed of the contemplation of [its] potency, [which is] the supreme reality [that just] has been commented upon.

And in regard to this great formula, [which is] a bestower of enjoyments and liberation. [40] [One] should not be lead astray suspecting [that this verse] is a [secondary] declaration

(*anuvādaḥ*). [For] as stated in the *Matāṅgaśāstram*: "The single

true means of knowledge is that utterance spoken by the lord;"¹
 [And this also] has been set down by our master, [who is] made
 up of the radiation of the supreme Bhairavaḥ, in the *Tantrālokaḥ*.
 "And this [utterance of the lord] is only a [primary] injunctive
 (*vidhiḥ*) utterance; there is never any [secondary] declaration;
 there can be [found] no appropriateness for [secondary] declarations
 in the Śaiva utterance."²

¹ N.R. Bhatt, ed., *Maṭaṅgaparameśvarāgama, (Vidyāpāda), avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa-Rāmakāṇṭha*, Publications de l'institut français d'indologie 56 (Pondichéry: Institut français d'indologie, 1977), III, vs.20a, p.67.

² Cf. M.K. Shāstri, ed., *Tantrālokaḥ* 4, vs.232b, and commentary, p.257.

III.3 BOOK 5
[vss.1-43a, pp.1-37]

[1] Hail to the supreme lord, the exclusive abode of grace, revealing the various means for the operation of initiation and initiating.

Next, making the [appropriate] connection (*saṃgatiḥ*), [between] books, preceded by a repeated mention of the initiation via energies [already] stated, in order to introduce the initiation via planes, the blessed goddess said:

The initiation via energies, O Lord of the Gods, has been told, O Supreme Lord; tell, in summary, by favor, the initiation via planes./1/

Lord of the Gods (*sureśānaḥ*), i.e., master of Brahmā, etc.; but [also] supreme lord, [2] i.e., on account of fusion with the being of the supreme Bhairavaḥ; in summary, i.e., in brief, on account of the extent of the procedure having been stated regarding the initiation via energies.

So requested, blessed Bhairavaḥ said:

In summary, I will tell, O Beautiful One, out of affection for you,

The initiation via planes, divided into various divisions, referred to previously by [your] question.

how the thirty six planes [or] the most important, from earth to Śivaḥ, O Pārvatīḥ,/2/

by their own pervasion, with accompanying qualities, are purified, [and] how they purify, O Queen of the Gods, so I tell you./3/

[Their own pervasion, with accompanying qualities, i.e.,] in the initiation via planes, there is predominance only of the planes with regard to the other paths, which are interiorized, i.e., [their] pervasion [of the other paths]; for the rest of the paths, in contrast [there is their] being [subordinate] qualities [of the

planes]. In the same way, elsewhere [in other kinds of initiation, one path is dominant and pervades the other subordinated paths]. [How, i.e.] by what mode they are purified (*śodhyāni*), i.e., should be purified (*śodhaniyāni*), and how they purify, [3] so, i.e., the mode relating to purifier and purified, to you who are intent solely on grace, I tell; [thus, his] proposal (*pratiṣṭhā*).

Therein,

Those, which are the phonemes designated by the nine numbers of the Vidyārājaḥ [formula], are the expressers of the planes,

Which must be installed as what is to be purified.

How they are, so

I tell, in sequence:/4/

Therein,

From earth to matter, the expresser is traditionally said to be the phoneme Ū; for the person, associated with the plane of passion (*rāgaḥ*), the phoneme Y;

Traditionally said to be (*smṛtaḥ*), i.e., by blessed Śrīkaṇṭhaḥ. And therefore, after he has installed the various planes, as in the installation of the energies, with that very phoneme, preceded by the uttering of the Praṇavaḥ, and the Nine-selved [formula], everything, from the conjoining of the paths, to the connection of the pure and impure planes, [4] should be done, as before. In the same way, elsewhere. Since the person is made up of desire, it is said to be associated with the plane of passion.

he should construct, O Beautiful One, the restrictor

(*niyāmikā*), endowed with the plane of knowledge, with the phoneme V, [and] time and energy with the phoneme L;/6/

There is the indication with the restriction (*niyatih*), of impure knowledge, consisting of knowing [only] something, on account of [its] penetration by restriction (*niyama-*), to some portion [of the knowable]. But there is the indication with time, of energy (*kalā*), consisting of [only] some agency, specified in [its] activity, on account of [its] necessarily being pierced through (*anuvedha-*), by

time; and this indication of with (*saha*), is for illustrating the relationship of expressed and expresser; the purifying, however, is only [done] separately.

Moreover,

the plane of Māyā, with the phoneme M; the plane of Vidyā, with the phoneme Kṣ; the plane of Īśvaraḥ with the phoneme R; Sadāśivaḥ with the phoneme H /7/

[5] similarly, the Śaktiḥ, O Beautiful One, should be imposed with the Praṇavaḥ.

With the Praṇavaḥ, i.e., with the drop (*binduḥ*) [ṁ]; power, i.e., the plane of the power having only the form of the supreme Śivaḥ.

For that very reason,

And there, above, he should purify Vyāpinī and Samanā. /8/ There, i.e., in the plane of Śivaḥ, namely, with the Praṇavaḥ. And all this, by the entire procedure discussed previously,

After he has purified, in [that] very sequence, with the root formula, O Lady of Noble Vows, the self should be united to the supreme plane, omnipresent beyond Unmanā, /9/ non-manifesting, supreme, quiescent, the lord, immutable, unborn;

In the body of the disciple, from the feet to the ankles [there is the plane of] earth; [6] from the ankles to the navel are the twenty-three [planes], from water to matter; from there to the palate, the seven [planes] from the person to Māyā; from there to the aperture of Brahmā, the three [planes] from Vidyā to Sadāśivaḥ; above that up to Samanā, the plane of Śivaḥ along with the Śaktiḥ; after he has imposed [these] planes, [and] after he has purified all these for the one to be initiated, in sequence, with the procedure previously stated, with the parts of the Nine-selved [formula] previously stated, the self, to the supreme level, i.e., the the supreme Śivaḥ, with the root formula, i.e., with the entire Nine-selved [formula] with respect to its [previously employed] parts, should be united. [And] to what sort of [supreme

level; namely, to that] beyond Unmanā, i.e., the possessor of the power, who should be obtained immediately after the fusing with that [power]; omnipresent, i.e., the pervader; [non-manifesting, *nirābhāse*, i.e.,] gone beyond [*niṣkrānte* for *nir-*] partial manifestations and the producer of every manifestation [*ābhāsa-*]; supreme, quiescent, i.e., on account of the neutralizing of all duality; lord, i.e., the lord of the universe; immutable and unborn, i.e., eternal.

Thus, in this fashion, one by one, as what should be purified,

The thirty-six plane[s] have been related.

In [this] collective compound (*samāhāraḥ*), there is an absence of the [expected] feminine suffix, according to the [*vārttikam*] *pātrādi* [-*bhyaḥ pratiṣedaḥ*].¹

Now I will discuss the nine plane[s]./10/

[7] Therein,

Matter, person, restrictor, time, Māyā, [pure-]knowledge,
and thus, Īśaḥ, Sadāśivaḥ, and Śivaḥ;/11/

These nine planes, i.e., the principal [mentioned previously], with the nine [phonemes] that are made up of the nine[fold formula], against the grain, with the procedure stated previously,

after he has purified, according to the rule, he should unite the self² with the pervasion.

For the disciple, however, by predominance,

When the five plane[s] are to be purified,

Then,

the face formulæ are the expressers;

And by these, in the sequence, Sadyojātaḥ, etc.,

¹ Vedavrataḥ Snātakāḥ Siddhāntaśiromaṇiḥ, ed., *Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣyam* 2 (Harayāṇā-Sāhityā-Samsthāna, 1963), 2.4.30.7, p.864.

² The variant reading "*ātmānam*" listed in the note appears preferable, since it parallels the construction of vs.16, p.10, as understood by Kṣemarājaḥ: "*śiṣyātmānam 'pare tattve niyojayet.*"

from earth to ether, he should purify, with that sequence.
 [8] He states that the five plane[s] have as their accompanying quality the purification of all the paths, i.e., the pervasion of the energies, Nivṛttiḥ, etc.:

Just as the pervasion of the energies, so, indeed, of the planes./13/

And speaking thus, here there is the entire procedure stated for the initiation via the energies; only [now] at the occasion [comparable to] the installing of the energies, the installing of the planes of earth, etc., should be performed with the formulæ of Sadyojātaḥ, etc.. And thereby, he teaches [that], by being the essence of the vibration of the formulæ of the faces of the lord, this set of five planes is only composed of the supreme Bhairavaḥ, i.e., [that there is] only the non-dual pervasion of him, [and that this is] the supreme means of realization of purity.

Next,

I will state the three planes and how they are to be purified,
 O Beautiful One:

Called the self, knowledge, [and] Śivaḥ, having the form of, object of knowledge, means of knowledge, and knower.

He states the pervasion of its expresser:

the phoneme A is celebrated as the expresser of the plane of the self;/14/

[9] Up to Māyā, he should know it.

The phoneme A, i.e., a part of the Praṇavaḥ; up to Māyā, i.e., not disconnected with the thirty-one planes [up to Māyā], the self, i.e., composed of the power of Śivaḥ, [he should know, i.e.,] up to so far only is its pervasion.

The phoneme U, also, of the [plane] called knowledge; that should be known up to the with parts.

Knowledge (*vidyā*), i.e., the power [of Śivaḥ] consisting of knowledge and activity; pervading pure knowledge [Śuddhavidyā] Īśvaraḥ, and Sadāśivaḥ; the with parts, i.e., Sadāśivaḥ.

Above that, of the pervader of the powers, Śaktiḥ, Vyāpini, Samanā,

Of Śivaḥ, however, the phoneme M, /15/
That [which] reaches above this, the point (*binduḥ*), whose
essence is the pervasion of Unmanā,
the ether-sound,
(*khasvaraḥ*), i.e., which (*svarayati*), illumines [or sounds, i.e.,]
makes sound (*śabdayati*), the ether (*khah*), [and therefore is] the
supreme ether (*para-ākāśam*).

Wherefore,

of the plane of Śivaḥ, having the form of the ether, is the
expresser.

[10] Then, in this fashion, for the connecting of these, as
previously, preceded by the installing of the path,

After he has purified, in sequence,

The self of the disciple,

he should unite to the supreme plane. /16/

With the Praṇavaḥ, whose essence is the pervasion stated of ether
sounding.

Thus, in this fashion, here,

The initiation via planes has been explained, established with
four divisions.

An initiation via one plane, also was stated, however, previously,
at the end of the book on the joining; [thus, the qualification of
four divisions, i.e.,] only [these are] illustrated [here].

Thus, after having stated the requested initiation via planes, in
order to completely satisfy the intent of the Lady desirous of giving
grace, the lord wishing to describe the initiation via words, even
though not requested, said:

I will proclaim the initiation via words, appropriately, in
sequence. /17/

[Appropriately, in sequence, i.e.,] the initiation via worlds having
a ritual procedure identical to the initiation via phonemes and
formulæ, at the occasion [of the exposition] of them, only, [and

not here, as might be expected], briefly, I will propound; [11] extensively, however, in the tenth book. Thus, he states next only the initiation via words.

Therein:

By a separate division of these which are the phonemes in the Vidyārājaḥ, indicated by the number nine, I will tell you an imposition./18/

Therein,

After he has made the body having nine navels, marked by nine lotuses;

[He says] how:

the wise one should trace out a dwelling, [measuring] nine hands, and an additional eight knots [per side].

Dwelling, i.e., the field of the diagram; [an additional eight knots, i.e.,] with eight knots, i.e., fingers, in addition, this entire field which is two hundred fingers with an additional twenty-four is a replica of the path of the worlds. In this [field], thirty-two fingers are produced for every single section by a structuring with seven sections of the whole; [12] [and] for that purpose, there is the giving of an additional eight fingers.

Next,

That made seven-sectioned,

He should make.

After having done what:

divided south to north, after having first demarcated a square marked out here with fish;/20/

In a way that will be described, from the place of Brahmā [i.e., the center], after he has marked the directions east and west, [then] with a thread that measures a field less about a quarter, held by the left hand on the east and west marks, [and] with the top portion placed in the right hand, after he has produced two lines having the form of a connection of fish, [i.e., an intersection of arcs,] on the sides, [then] in the middle of that, after he has cast the thread up and down, and made the field divided south

and north, [and then] with a thread measuring half a field, connected to the mark on the middle of the sides, after he has produced a set of four connections of fish, [i.e., intersection of arcs,] at the angles, there, by casting the thread, after he has demarcated a square, [etc.]; here is the meaning in sum.

[13] Thus, on the square field, divided seven ways by east and west running threads,

he should trace out with a thread forty-nine sections;
i.e., with six threads running north and south, located in the interior [of the field], he should produce forty-nine cells
(*koṣṭakāḥ*).

After he has done thus,

in the middle cell, a thread that measures thirty-two fingers, /21/

should be traced out,¹ O great goddess, [making the cell] divided in four sections;

The meaning is: [the cell is] divided, after having constructed a space with lines and empty space (*vyoma*), which will be [described] at the end, with four circles, from the place of Brahmā, having proportional sections.

Therein, [starting] from the center of the four sections,

on the first, he should make the pericarp, on the second, the filaments, /22/

[14] on the third, the joints of the petals, [and] on the fourth, the tips of the petals.

Where the petals are joined by their tips, these are the joints of the petals.

He states the procedure for turning out the circles, on the four sections mentioned previously:

¹ Emend "*samālikhya*" to *samālikhyaṃ* to agree with "*sūtram*," in vs.21, and to parallel the construction of vs.25a, p.14, "*sūtrāgraṃ ... bhrāmyam*."

After he has laid out eight lines in the [main] directions, and similarly in the intermediate directions,/23/

he should rotate out four circles, equally measuring four fingers.

After he has laid out, eight [lines] in the directions, i.e., in the eight [directions], [and] eight lines [in the intermediate directions, i.e.,] in the middle of these [main directions], from the place of Brahmā, on the marks of the previous sections, he should make four rotations.

Next,

After he has put down that thread, in the middle, by the two lines of the intermediate directions,/24/

then the tip of the thread should be rotated, through the pattern of a half-moon.

[15] For each petal joint,¹ for the pattern of a pair of half-moons, [i.e., arcs,] having held the thread with the left hand, at the middle, i.e., of the line of the eastern direction, [etc.,] [which is] in the pair of middles, [i.e., sectors,] marked by the two lines of the intermediate directions, he should rotate the tip of the thread from the side lines to the middle line. Here, every single side line, that should be divided through an extension from the middle, by [those] extension[s], becomes [the locus of] conjoined petals.

[Then] In order to grasp the middle, for the sake of establishing the filament, in the pair of middles, [i.e., sectors] of the intermediate direction lines, used for the production of the two half-moons:

A middle thread should be given by the wise, located on the stamen./25/

On the stamen, i.e., on the filament, [the thread is located, i.e.,] it is established for that purpose. Then, for the production of

¹ Emend "*pratīdalasam̐dhi*" to *pratīdalasam̐dhiṃ* in agreement with the similar construction "*pratīdalam̐*" on p.16.

a pair of stamens, on the sides of the stamen produced by the thread in the middle of the leaves, following along the middle of the half moon of each [petal], two threads should be laid down, when there is the first finding of the middle, [with the laying down of threads in the intermediate directions,] for the sake of the production of the pair of half-moons. Thus, in all, there are thirty-two threads.

[16] Summarizing this [procedure], he extends [its application] also elsewhere:

after he has thus executed the eastern leaf, just so the others,

He should execute.

And therein,

After he has traced out the filaments, twenty-four in number, /26/

he should set down a circular line at the tip of the leaf, exceedingly beautiful.

[Twenty-four in number, i.e.,] for each leaf there are three filaments. At the tip of the leaf, i.e., after he has produced the leaves, outside of them, [he should set down] an exceedingly beautiful (*susobhanām*), i.e., a complete (*saṃpūrṇām*), [circular line].

Moreover,

At the end of that a square should be made, with its dimensions. /27/

Of that, i.e., of the lotus whose end is the circular line; with its dimensions, i.e., equal in size to the circle.

[17] He says in order to state the first procedure being the basis for this entire procedure:

First, Brahmā should be prepared, by the sun located at the equinox.

Brahmā, i.e., the middle position; sun (*helih*), i.e., sun (*sūryaḥ*).

Therein, first,

He should execute that thread from east to west, with a
peg, /28/

O Dear One, measuring twelve fingers.

Peg (*śarīkuḥ*), i.e., a wooden peg (*kilakam*).

[He says] how:

After he has set up that peg in the middle, he should rotate
a line on the sides, measuring sixteen fingers. /29/

From the field of the peg, for the sake of a lotus [having a
diameter of] thirty-two fingers, he should lay out a circle [having
a radius of] sixteen fingers; and this is intended to mark the
desired field.

[18] And therein,

During the first [half of the] day, he should clearly mark out
the west shadow, [and] with the sun located in the west, he
should mark the east shadow, O Dear One. /30/

Thus, after he has performed the marking of east and west on top
of [the intersections of] the shadows and circle,

With the fixed (*dhruvaḥ*), he should mark north and south,
O Beautiful One.

With the fixed, i.e., with the peg which is the basis (*hetuḥ*), he
should mark [on] the circle [the points] located north and south,
with the thread [cast] in between the pair of fish, [i.e., arcs]
established on the directions [of east and west] previously
discussed. Or [alternatively, it may be interpreted:] on whatever
evening the ritual should be performed, with the fixed (*dhruvaḥ*),
i.e., the star, which is immovable, called Dhruvaḥ, [i.e., the
polestar,] having a body comprising fourteen stars, he should
perform the realization of the directions north and south. And
therein, thus, they say: after he has ascertained, by means of
the opening of a hollow tube, the fixed star at the opening, located
in the northern direction, [and] then following along that tube,
[19] after he has marked the northern direction, [then] following
along [from] the polestar [to] the star of the celestial equator,
[first] the center, and [next] following the star at the tail[-end] of

that [tube], [finally,] the south, he should mark. Then following along the aperture in the middle [of the tube,] he should also mark east and west. And for that very reason, elsewhere, it was stated: "Or with the piercing of the Dhruvaḥ north" But what was stated therein: "Or the east by the polestar . . . ,". should be construed: after he has constructed the center by [fixing] the intersection of the celestial equator with the polestar, and following along that, after he has set the east, he should, following along that, fix the west. [Or finally, alternatively: with the fixed, i.e.,] in a fixed way (*dhruvam*), i.e., preceded by the construction of a square through grasping the position of the fixed, [i.e., the polestar or center peg] he should construct a lotus in the manner previously stated, in the central section of the [the square divided into] forty-nine sections.

He summarizes:

Then he should trace out a lotus, with eight leaves and a pericarp.

Next,

After he has selected the cells of the directions, indicated by the [20] number eight, the rest, O Beautiful-bodied One, should be omitted, by means of an interiorizing of one./32/

After he has set aside the row of exterior cells, for the sake of [constructing] doors in the four directions, following along the middle of the lotus, in the major and intermediate directions, he should select for the sake of [constructing] a set of eight lotuses, eight cells, that have been interiorized by the omitting of a single [row] of cells. And thus, there is stated, the apportioning [of the remaining cells] through [the assigning of] a single string (*granthena*), only [cf cells], for [respectively,] the middle row, the field of eight lotuses, and the row of the doors.

And thus, in the eight sections,

Then an eightfold lotus, in the directions,

He should make.

Next,

and he should trace out doors in the exterior.

[He says] how:

He should construct, O Goddess, an outer door-pavilion
(*śobhā*), that measures half a row, /33/

he should trace out an inner door-pavilion, measuring that,
up to the end of an outer entrance way (*kapolaḥ*), [21] and
similarly, an inner entrance way (*kaṇṭhaḥ*), the measure of
that; [thus] the door has been proclaimed this. /34/

After he has laid out a thread in the lengthwise middle of the exterior row, [and] after he has made a row in the first half, he should construct out of the latter half, on top of the field of the row constructed [there], an outer door-pavilion, which measures half [that row], a wide section, forming the sides of the inner entrance way of the door, an inner door-pavilion, and a thin section, located under that. The outer entrance way is the wide section in the front of the door. The inner entrance way, however, the part preceding the outer entrance way, and [similarly] having the measure of that, i.e., according to length and width, having a measure of half of the row described, he should construct. Although here the measure of the outer entrance way was not stated, on account of being self-evident, nevertheless, according to length, the measure of a row, and according to width, half of that, [which is] determined through another compendium. [Thus] this [has been proclaimed the door;] the meaning is: the door is produced by the production of its parts. Thus, in this fashion,

The nine-naveled city, with a pattern of a set of eight doors,
is traditionally stated.

On account of tradition about a door in the intermediate direction, for each direction he should make a pair of doors for each interval of three lotuses. And thus, divided by a set of eight doors, [22] having nine navels, [and] having nine lotuses located at the place of each navel, there is this diagram of a city. And here, facing the god, a pair of doors should be closed. As stated in the

Lakṣmīkaulārṇavaḥ: "Three doors should be shut; the western, he should not shut; and thus, the eastern, he should know, as facing the god, with the goddess. But the eastern should be known as the western, and the western called eastern. The northern should be known as the southern, and the southern as northern. This general sequence of formulæ, declared by Śivaḥ, should be concealed, vigorously, from malevolent disciples." And this has been transmitted by the lineage of masters. Therein, thus: "I praise Bhairavaḥ, the lord of the nine selves, having the effulgence of the nine lotuses, in the manifest brilliance consisting of the three triads, Unmanā, Aghoraḥ, etc., above the set of eight doors, located in the body, clarified, supreme, through the eyes of the root [formula], etc., having the non-dual extension in the root [formula], etc., of planet, plane, node, and world, [who is] the self, the secret essence of the nine naveled diagram."

Here this imposition of substances on this [diagram] should be carried out having a pattern stated in other scriptures, according to what was stated previously (Bk.4, vs.35, p.13): "The throwing of powders, the white, etc., stated by the scriptures, with the abode." [23] And this is [discussed] in the blessed *Pārā*. "And here, first, white lines should be traced out, made with crushed rock; the pericarp, yellow and gold, mixed with the color of yellow ginger; there should be three stamens on a leaf, white, yellow, [and] brown. The doors he should make white or [some] other [color]. The corners red, the seat white, the intermediate lines white." Similarly: "The thumb is the drop (*binduḥ*), the possessor of power; the four fingers are the energies. After he has made the powder their support, and then [made] the power [have] contact with the drop, he should throw that which contains the power, and thus [make] the diagram [also possess] that power. Otherwise: "He should know the white lotus; he should contemplate the filaments, in sequence, white, yellow, red, from root, middle, and tip; the pericarp like gold, the lotus blossoms, according to

tradition, yellow." Here the throwing of the dust should be executed following the meditation stated for the interior sacrifice.

Next,

After he has bathed according to the rule, O goddess, he should enter the holy enclosure.

After he has worshipped [the deities located on] the door,

The master /35/

[24] Then

the charging with the formulæ, etc., according to the previously stated procedure,

He should execute.

then he should worship the god, Bhairavaḥ, the supreme lord. /36/

With what?

With the Praṇavaḥ.

The meaning is: [with the Praṇavaḥ] whose essence is the upward pervasion of the collection implied by the point [which are] the constituents of the nine-selved [formulæ].

He says how:

After he has given the seat, ending with Śivaḥ, O Beautiful Complexioned Lady,

With the Praṇavaḥ, should also be construed here according [to the [rule] like a crow's eye. This is the meaning: thus, [after he has given] the seat, with that Praṇavaḥ, which has the pervasion previously stated of the Anantaḥ at the beginning, the Anantaḥ at the middle, [and] the Anantaḥ at the end; then he should worship Bhairavaḥ, with [that Praṇavaḥ] which [consequently] has a [universal] pervasion from Anantaḥ to Unmanā, [and thus ends at Śivaḥ, i.e.,] signifies the supreme Śivaḥ not different from Unmanā. O Beautiful Complexioned (*varavarṇini*) Lady, i.e., who describes [*varṇayati* for - *varṇini*], i.e., reflects (*parāmrśati*) the best [*varam* for *vara-*], i.e., the preeminent (*utkr̥ṣṭam*), the supreme reality.

[25] He states where, what, and how, he should worship:

in the middle, he should worship the god, Svachchandaḥ, the supreme lord, /37/

endowed with [his set of] six limbs, according to the previously stated procedure.

Middle, i.e., on the pericarp of the [central] lotus; procedure, i.e., all [the rites] from the summoning (*āvāhanam*) to the offering of liquor; limbs, i.e., here one should also understand [that there is enjoined] the worship of the [set of eight] bhairavāḥ [of his retinue], Kapālīśaḥ, etc., and their limbs, which will be discussed, on the other lotuses, in this way: [with formulæ constructed] by placing on the inside different parts of the nine-selved formulæ, [and placing at] the beginning the Praṇavaḥ, [and at] the end, as the final marker, their own name.

Thus, in this way, in the the central lotus, on the pericarp, the imposition was stated of the phonemes and what is signified by them, the deities; [now] he also states that for the leaves.

On the set of eight leaves, in sequence from east to northeast he should impose the phonemes. /38/

Therein,

Beginning with Sadāśivaḥ, with the phoneme H, and ending with Prakṛtiḥ, in this way, O Lovely Lady, [26] he should know [them]; [then] in the middle, the construction of the lord of the throne. /39/

Lord of the throne (*pitheśaḥ*), i.e., lord Svachchandaḥ; [thus] after he has imposed [in the middle, i.e.,] on the middle pericarp, the regent of the Śiva plane, [then] after he has imposed, in the order of emanation, with the phonemes H, R, Kṣ, M, L, V, Y, Ū, [which are] connected with the nine-selved [formula], on the eight leaves, from east to northeast, Kapālīśaḥ, Śikhivāhanaḥ, Krodharājaḥ, Vikaralaḥ, Manmathaḥ, Meghanādaḥ, Somarājaḥ, Vidyārājaḥ, [who are now] the regents of the planes, Sadāśivaḥ, Īśvaraḥ, [Suddha]vidyā, Māyā, Kalā, Niyatiḥ, Puruṣaḥ, [and] Prakṛtiḥ, he should worship [them]; [this is] the meaning.

Having stated the [ritual] procedure [to be followed] in the middle lotus, he describes, in summary, [the procedure to be followed] in the lotuses [of the directions] east, etc.:

He should worship the eight gods, [who are] located on the pericarps of the [eight] lotuses of the [eight] directions.

[Using] those same phonemes, Ha, etc., with which [he worshipped] the bhairavāḥ, Kapāliśaḥ, etc., in the central lotus, on the leaves, [starting from] the east, etc., he should [now] worship them [Kapāliśaḥ, etc., located] on the [respective] pericarps of the lotuses of the directions, east, etc..

He states the location of lord Svachchandaḥ, in the lotuses of [the directions], east, etc.:

In their place, [Svacchanda-]Bhairavaḥ should be worshipped,

[27] with the Praṇavaḥ stated previously. [For example,] in the center of the eastern lotus, with the phoneme H, Kapāliśaḥ [should now be worshipped], but [in contrast to the central lotus] Svachchandaḥ [should be worshipped] with the Praṇavaḥ on the eastern leaf [occupied by Kapāliśaḥ in the central lotus].

[Similarly,] in the center of the southeastern lotus, with R, Śikhivāhanaḥ [should be worshipped, and] on the southeastern leaf, in the place [occupied by] Śikhivāhanaḥ [in the central lotus] the lord Svachchandaḥ [should be worshipped] with the Praṇavaḥ. The same [pattern of substitution should be followed] for the others. In this way, through imposing the lord Svachchandaḥ in the place of each of the bhairavāḥ, one demonstrates that his non-dual pervasion is the essence of all the bhairavāḥ, and that all the planes of the universe that are ruled over by these [bhairavāḥ] are pervaded by the plane of Śivaḥ. [And in this way] there is revealed the essence of this ritual performance [which is] the great esoteric mystery [that there is] the ultimate non-duality [of everything]; and for the same reason, the supreme lord in his great] formula nature is rendered manifest with the formal

specification, (Bk.1, vs.42, p.35) "everywhere to all (*sarvataḥ sarvebhyoḥ*).” Enough.

He says that the procedure stated for the imposition, etc., on the middle lotus, [should be repeated] for the separate leaves of the eastern [lotus], etc., [who have as their respective central] lords of the throne, Kapālīśaḥ, etc.:

the rest, with the phonemes, in sequence./40/

And this imposition of phonemes was extensively illustrated by us before. And here, [counting] by lotuses, separately, there [28] are nine [lotuses]; and [taking them] together, a single [great] lotus; [therefore] ten temples are produced. [In the same way,] since the lord Vidyārājaḥ [formula] has as its essence the drop (*binduḥ*), at the time of the worship of its [individual] parts, the point must necessarily be used; and [thus] every single phoneme [of the Vidyārājaḥ], through its pervasion in the sequence illustrated, is nothing but the effulgence of the complete Vidyārājaḥ, which he will state (Bk.8, vss.25a-26b, p.16): "Since the all pervasive lord, is said according to tradition, to be within all, he is therefore the bestower of power and liberation, not the phonemes, [when viewed] from [the perspective of] the ultimate reality."

Thus, after he has stated the imposition in the order of emanation, he states the initiation in the order of reabsorption:

He should purify from Prakṛtiḥ to Śivaḥ, O Beautiful Goddess. He should purify that aggregate of words (*padam*), of which Prakṛtiḥ, having the form of what is expressed, is the beginning, and Śivaḥ the end.

How:

Beginning in the northeast, he should purify the middle throne./41/

After he has uttered the set of nine words, which begin with the Praṇavaḥ and end with Ū, [and which each are] preceded by the uttering of the Praṇavaḥ and of the Vidyārājaḥ, in the sequence from east to north [when] starting on the northeastern leaf located

on the northeastern lotus [29]; and after he has meditatively performed here the interiorization of the manifold of other paths, [which are] interiorized, as previously, in the plane of Prakṛtiḥ, [which, in turn,] has interiorized [within itself] the aggregate of planes, from earth to the plane of the constituents (*guṇāḥ*); with the formula ending "to the set of nine words, hail (*namaḥ*)," he should perform the complete procedure previously stated, [which consists of the rites of] emplacing, etc.

Thus, in this sequence, he should [continue to] purify the words, up until the pervader of the plane of Śivaḥ, [which is] the set of nine words [that] beginning with the Ū and ending with the Praṇavaḥ are located in the central lotus.

But that, which is the [ritual] sequence illustrated by some [other commentator, who said to utter:] "to the set of nine words, the form of the plane of Prakṛtiḥ, etc., hail," is not correct, since it would lead to a repetition of the sequence of words stated in the initiation via energies (*kalā*), and of the uttering in the against the grain sequence established for the phonemes of the nine-selved [formula], and [thus] overlooks the previous sequence of reabsorption. [Consequently,] here in the initiation via words, just as in the initiation via nine planes, in the set of nine locations from the navel to Anāśritaḥ, [so] there should be performed an imposition with eighty-one words located in nine lotuses.

Thus, after he has purified the path of the words,

He should unite [the initiate] to the supreme plane, Śivaḥ,
the supreme regent. [30]

[Next] he teaches the initiation via phonemes, etc., through a transference (*atideśaḥ*) [of the procedure enjoined for the words]:

In this way, he should purify the phonemes, the formulæ,
[and] the worlds; /42/

He states what the range [is of this purification]:

from Kalāgniḥ to Śivaḥ;

He says how he should perform the initiation with phonemes, formulæ, and words.

He should resort to the range of the energies (*kalā*). The meaning [is that] he individually divides up the phonemes, etc., by following the pattern of the five sections stated in the initiation via energies. And here, the formulæ are to be employed just as in the initiation via energies. And here, according to the rule: "of the [mass of powers] produced from the mass of sounds . . . ,"¹ the phonemes are binders. And so that which was previously stated of the formulæ, [that] for what needs purifying, [they are] purifiers, should be recalled here [as equally applicable]. Thus, in this way, here, according to the division [into sets of] three, five, nine, [and] thirty-six [planes], there have been stated four kinds of initiation via planes, [and four kinds of] initiations via words, formulæ, phonemes, [and] worlds. Therein, in the initiation [via these] five [paths], on account of transference [of the details of ritual procedure], according to the rule (vs.13b, p.8) "such as is the pervasion of the [31] is energies [so is the pervasion of the other paths]," and according to what was [just] stated, "he should resort to the range of the energies," in the initiations via phonemes, formulæ, and worlds, the interiorization of the [other] five paths should be contemplated.

In the initiation via words, which is divided nine ways, {1} in the first Prakṛtiḥ-related set of nine words, from Ū to the Praṇavaḥ, there are interiorized: the energies, Nivṛttiḥ and Pratiṣṭhā; the twenty-five planes from earth to matter (*pradhānam*); the one hundred and sixty-four worlds from Kālāgniḥ to the octad of exercise (*yogāṣṭakam*); the forty-eight phonemes from Kṣ to Ṭ; [and] the formulæ, Sadyojātaḥ, Vāmadevaḥ, Hṛdayaḥ, Śiraḥ, [and] Śikhā.

{2} In the Puruṣaḥ-related set of nine [words] from Ū to Y, [there are interiorized:] the energy Vidyā; the planes Puruṣaḥ and

¹ V. Jaideva Singh, ed. and trans., *Spanda Kārikās* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1980), 3, 13, p.152.

Rāgaḥ; {1}the satisfactions (*tuṣṭiḥ*), and {2}attainments (*siddhiḥ*) [which count as two] worlds; {1}[the octad of the superhuman powers] miniaturization etc., {2-4}the three lineages of masters and disciples, {5}the [octad of] channels, {6}the octad of the subtle body (*vigrahaḥ*), {7}the [ten] bonds (*pāśaḥ*) of the [gross] body (*dehaḥ*), {8}the adventitious (*āgantū/-ka/-*) [bonds], {9}[the bonds connected to] Gaṇeśaḥ, {10}[the bonds connected to] Vidyēśaḥ, [which count as] ten worlds, {1}[the ten] rudrāḥ, Suhr̥ṣṭaḥ, etc., {2}the rudrāḥ, Kalyāṇaḥ, etc., and the masters (*guruḥ*), and the disciples (*śiṣyaḥ*), [which count as two worlds, giving a total of] fourteen worlds; the phonemes, Ñ and Jh; the formulæ, Aghoraḥ and Kavacaḥ.

{3} In the Niyatiḥ-related set of nine [words], from Ū to V, [32] [there are interiorized:] the energies and formulæ, as [for the set] before, and [then] in the same way, [for the sets] further on; the planes, Niyatiḥ and Vidyā; [the worlds] the world of the the octad of Vāmadevaḥ, etc., and the world of the ennead of Vāmā, etc.; the phonemes, J and Ch.

{4} In the Kālaḥ-related set of nine [words], from Ū to L [there are interiorized:] the planes, Kālaḥ and Kalā; the worlds, the decad of Śuddhaḥ, etc., and the triad, Mahādevaḥ, etc.; the phonemes, C and Ñ.

{5} In the Māyā-related set of nine [words] from Ū to Ma, [there are interiorized:] the plane, Māyā; the seven worlds from Gopatiḥ to Anantaḥ; the phoneme, Gh;

{6} In the [Śuddha-]Vidyā-related set of nine [words] from Ū to Kṣa, [there are interiorized:] the plane, [Śuddha-]Vidyā; the sole world of the Vidyārājñyaḥ, Triguniḥ, etc.; the energy, Śāntā; the formulæ, Tatpuruṣaḥ and the Aṣṭam; the phoneme, G.

{7} In the Īśvara-related ninefold [word] from Ū to R [there are interiorized:] the energies and formulæ, as before; the plane, Īśvaraḥ; fifteen worlds, from Īśvaraḥ to Jñāna-Kriyā; the phoneme, Kh.

{8} In the Sadāśivaḥ-related set of nine [words] from Ū to Ha, [there are interiorized:] the plane, Sadāśivaḥ; the single world, Sadāśivaḥ, the pervader of the worlds from Suśivaḥ [to] Anantaḥ; phoneme, K.

[33] {9} In the Śivaḥ-related set of nine [words], from Ū to the Praṇavaḥ, [there are interiorized:] the energy, Śāntyatitā; the plane Śivaḥ non-dually united with the plane of Śaktiḥ; ten worlds, from Śāntyatitā to Śivaḥ; the formula, Īśānaḥ, whose form [is] identical to the Netram; sixteen phonemes from the Visargaḥ (ḥ) to H.

The initiation via nine planes is like the initiation via words. Therein, in the place of the words, the planes beginning from Prakṛtiḥ should be established; but in the place of the planes, the words should be interiorized — this is the difference.

In the initiation via three planes, {1} in the plane of the self, there [are contained] thirty-one planes from earth to Māyā; [there are interiorized:] the energies, Nivṛttiḥ, Pratiṣṭhā, and Vidyā; one hundred and ninety-one worlds from Kalāgniḥ to Anantaḥ; sixty-nine words, beginning from the Praṇavaḥ located on the northeastern [lotus] in the Prakṛtiḥ cell, and ending with the Kṣa of the southern [cell] located on the eastern lotus; seven formulæ, Sadyojātaḥ, Vāmadevaḥ, Aghoraḥ, Hṛdayam, Śiraḥ, Śikhā, and Kavacaḥ; thirty-one phonemes from Kṣ to Gh.

{2} In the plane of Vidyā [there are interiorized:] the energy, Śāntā; the planes, Vidyā, Īśvaraḥ, [and] Sadāśivaḥ; seventeen worlds from [those of the] Vidyārājñyaḥ to Sadāśivaḥ; the [34] words, [beginning with those remaining] from the eastern lotus, three, Ra, Om, Ha, [and beginning] from [the remaining] central lotus, the eight, from Ū to Ha; the formulæ, Tatpuruṣaḥ and Agram; the phonemes, G, Kh, K.

{3} In the Śivaḥ plane, [there are interiorized:] the planes, Śivaḥ and Śaktiḥ; the word, the Praṇavaḥ; the worlds, etc., as for the preceding.

In the initiation via thirty-six planes, {1} in earth (*pr̥thivi*) [there are interiorized:] the energy, Nivṛttiḥ; one hundred and eight worlds; nine words¹ [beginning] from the lotus of Prakṛtiḥ, since only these [words] are employed up to the end of Prakṛtiḥ; the formulæ, Sadyojātaḥ and Hṛdayam; the phoneme, Kṣ.

{2} In water, [there are interiorized:] the energy, Pratiṣṭhā; the three formulæ, Vāmadevaḥ, Śiraḥ, [and] Śikhā; the nine words stated for the preceding; [and] the formulæ, energies, [and] words, [should be constructed] up to the end of Prakṛtiḥ; in this way, the phoneme, H; the eight worlds are eight from Lakuliśaḥ to Amaraḥ.

{3} In fire, [there are interiorized:] the phoneme, S; eight worlds from Bhairavaḥ to Hariścandraḥ.

{4} In wind, [there are interiorized:] the phoneme, Ṣ; the eight worlds from Bhimaḥ to Gayaḥ.

{5} In ether, [there are interiorized:] the phoneme, Ś; the worlds, from Sthāṇuḥ to Vastrāpadaḥ.

[35] {6} In odor, [there are interiorized:] the phoneme, V; the world, Śārvam.

{7} In taste, [there are interiorized:] the phoneme, L; the world, Bhavaḥ.

{8} In sight, [there are interiorized:] the phoneme, R; the worlds, Paśupatiḥ.

{9} In touch, [there are interiorized:] the phoneme, Y; the world, Īśānaḥ.

{10} In sound, [there are interiorized:] the phoneme, M; the world, Bhimaḥ.

{11} In the penis, [there are interiorized:] the phoneme, Bh; the world, Kaśyapaḥ.

{12} In the anus, [there are interiorized:] the phoneme, B; the world, Mitraḥ.

¹ Emend here *padmāni* to *padāni*.

- {13} In the feet, [there are interiorized:] the phoneme, Ph; the world, Viṣṇuḥ.
- {14} In the hands, [there are interiorized:] the phoneme, P; the world, Indrah.
- {15} In the voice, [there are interiorized:] the phoneme, N; the world, Agniḥ.
- {16} In the nose, [there are interiorized:] the phoneme, Dh; the world, Pṛthivi.
- {17} In the tongue, [there are interiorized:] the phoneme, D; the world, Varuṇaḥ.
- {18} In the eye, [there are interiorized:] the phoneme, Th; the world, Raviḥ.
- {19} In the skin, [there are interiorized:] the phoneme, T; the world, Vāyuḥ.
- {20} In the ear, [there are interiorized:] the phoneme, Ṇ; the world, Diśaḥ.
- {21} In the perceptual organ, [there are interiorized:] the phoneme, Ḍh; the world, Candrah.
- {22} In the ego, [there are interiorized:] the phoneme, Ḍ; eight worlds from Sthaleśvaraḥ to Chagalāṇḍaḥ.
- {23} In the intellect, [there are interiorized:] the phoneme, Ṭh; four worlds, [of the] Devayoniḥ, Krodh[eśvarāḥ], [octad of] Tejah, [and] Yogāṣṭakam.
- [36] {24} In matter, which has contained within it the [plane of the] constituents, [there are interiorized:] the phoneme, Ṭ; the three worlds of the charioteers of Śivaḥ and Śaktiḥ, beginning from the three lineages of masters, [and] the world of the octad of Krodheśvarāḥ, and the world of matter, [thus totaling] five worlds; and up to this limit, the energies, formulæ, and words are as for the preceding.
- {25} In the person, [there are interiorized:] the energy, Vidyā; the formulæ, Aghoraḥ and Kavacaḥ; and for the set of six ending at Māyā, the energies and formulæ are the same as these; the set of nine words [which are those] from U to Y, [and which are]

located on the lotus of the northern direction;; the phoneme, Ñ; the twelve worlds, {1}the Tuṣṭiḥ, {2}the Siddhiḥ, {3-6}[the superhuman powers, miniaturization, etc., and] the three lineages of masters and disciples, {7}the [octad of] channels, {8}the octad of the subtle body (*vigrahaḥ*), {9}the [ten] bonds (*pāśaḥ*) of the [gross] body (*dehaḥ*), {10}the adventitious (*āgantu/-ka/-*) [bonds], {11}[the bonds connected to] Gaṇeśaḥ, {12}the bonds [connected to] Vidyēśaḥ.

{26} In Niyatiḥ, [there are interiorized:] the set of nine words from Ū to V [which are] located in the northwestern lotus; the phoneme, Jh; the worlds, the octad, Vāmadevaḥ, etc.

{27} In the plane Kālaḥ, [there are interiorized:] [the set of nine words] from Ū to La [which are] located in the western lotus; the phoneme, J; the twelve worlds of the śivāḥ from Śuddhaḥ to Śamburāṭ.

{28}. In Rāgaḥ, [there are interiorized:] the set of nine words as [for Puruṣaḥ]; the phoneme, Ch; the world, of the ten rudrāḥ, Suhrṣṭaḥ, etc.; world; [of] the ten rudrāḥ, Suhrṣṭaḥ, etc., and the world of [the rudrāḥ,] Kalyāṇaḥ, etc., and [of] the masters and the disciples.

[37] {29}. In impure (*aśuddha-*) Vidyā, [there are interiorized:] the set of nine words just as for Niyatiḥ; the phoneme, C; the set of nine worlds, from Vāmā to Manonmanā.

{30} In Kalā, [there are interiorized:] the set of nine words just as for Kālaḥ; the phoneme, Ñ; three worlds, Mahādevaḥ, Mahātejaḥ, and Mahājyotiḥ.

{31} In Māyā, [there are interiorized:] the set of nine words, from Ū to Ma [which are located] on the southwestern lotus; the phoneme, Gh; seven worlds from Gopatiḥ to Anantaḥ.

{32} In Śuddhavidyā, [there are interiorized:] the set of nine words from Ū to Kṣa [which are located] on the southern lotus; the rest as in the initiation via words.

{33} In the plane of Ísvaraḥ, [there are interiorized:] the set of nine words from Ū to R [which are located] on the southeastern lotus; the rest as in the initiation via words.

{34} In the Sadāśivaḥ plane, [there are interiorized:] the set of nine words from Ū to H; [which are located] on the eastern lotus; the rest as in the initiation via words.

{35} In the Śivaḥ plane, [which is] non-dually united with [the plane of] Śaktiḥ, [there are interiorized:] the set of nine words, from Ū to the Praṇavaḥ [which are located] on the central lotus; the rest as in the initiation via words.

This pervasion of the paths [of the universe], [was] indicated in [this and in the preceding] book, but not elucidated [in full]; [now that I have presented it] here regarding the ritual procedure for a complete initiation, let attention be directed [to my exposition] by the wise.

III.4 BOOK 12

[vss.1-83a, pp.1-35]

[1] Let the lord Svacchandaḥ, radiating perfections identical to himself, in his own self, [which is] the radiance efflorescing [as] the various artificially constructed planes [of the universe] through his own impulse, triumph.

[While] repeating what was stated for the sake of a [transitional] connection between the books, through her desire to know the perfections of the planes, the blessed goddess said:

The emanation, maintenance, and reabsorption of the planes has been related by you, and the cause of the production of the universe;

Of the universe (*jagat*), i.e., [of the universe that] has the form of planes, elements, kinds of existents, worlds, etc., the cause (*hetuḥ*), i.e., the supreme cause (*paramakāraṇam*), [which is] the supreme Śivaḥ.

And this,

by your grace has been heard by me./1/

By grace, [should be understood] as [explained] previously.

[2] But now,

Relate the knowledge of the planes, how in them there might be a perfection.

Knowledge (*viññānam*), i.e., realization (*sākṣātkāraḥ*) by concentration (*dhāraṇā*), etc.; [how] in them [there might be] (*bhāvet*) a perfection (*siddhiḥ*), i.e., how the [different kinds of] perfection having these [planes] as [their respective] sphere (*viśaya-*) [of manifestation] should be (*syad*) [attained].

In order to relate this, blessed Bhairavaḥ said:

From earth to Śivaḥ, I [will now] tell, in summary,/2/

How in the body, and how in the exterior, [each plane] is established [for the sake of perfections]; in summary, i.e., in brief; but the extended [description] will come further on at the [description of the different kinds of] concentration.

Therein,

hear how earth, in a hard form, is established in the body.
How, i.e., under what form, viz., flesh, etc..

He states that:

In flesh, in bone, in connective tissue, hair, and nails,/3/
[3] in marrow and intestines, earth, abounding with the
five properties (*guṇaḥ*), should be known to be.

And this he will clarify further on.

In phlegm, blood, undigested food, urine, and in chyle,
sweat, and muscle fat,/4/

and in semen, and, in fact, in the collection, water, having
four properties, is established.

In fact (*eva*), i.e., in the body; chyle (*rasaḥ*), i.e., the first
element (*dhātuḥ*), supportive of the body, produced from the
digestion of food and drink; collection (*saṁgrahaḥ*), i.e., the
conglomerate (*saṁśleṣaḥ*), of earth, etc., digested under the form
of flesh, etc.

In cooking, in burning, and, in fire, in heat, established;/5/
[The meaning is:] the [element] fire (*tejaḥ*), is established: [in
cooking (*pacanam*), i.e.,] [as] the cause of the digesting (*pākaḥ*)
of food, etc.; [and is established in burning (*dahanam*), i.e.,] for
the burning which consists of the generating of bile (*mahākṣāraḥ*);
[in fire (*tejaḥ*), i.e.,] for valor and brilliance; [in heat (*ūṣmā*),
i.e.,] for [making the body] something perceptible (*upalabhya-*)
[i.e., a visible color-form], [for] sweat (*ūṣmā*), and
prosperity; (*ca*), i.e., in the body.

Thus, O Goddess, fire, [which has] a triple characteristic, is
established in illumination.

In illumination (*prakāśaḥ*), i.e., for displaying objects by means of
the rays of the eye; [4] [triple characteristic (*trilakṣaṇam*), i.e.,]
whose three qualities are [visible] color-form (*rūpam*), touch, and
sound; and by means of the invisible fruition (*adr̥ṣṭam*), [fire,
having] limited color-form and touch is manifest in the body,

The wind, having the qualities of exhaling, inhaling,

touching, and distribution;/6/

for discharge of urine and elimination, for the entering of food and drink;

Touching (*sparsanam*), i.e., grasping by external and internal touch; distribution (*vyūhaḥ*), i.e., arrangement; discharge (*uccāraḥ*), i.e., the processing of impurities; elimination (*visargaḥ*), i.e., expulsion.

Thus, in this fashion,

the wind, established with these, in the body, should be known having a double characteristic./7/

With these, i.e., with [these] functions [the wind] is secondarily characterized (*upalakṣitaḥ*); [having a double characteristic, i.e.,] that for which there are the two, i.e., sound and touch, as the characteristic, i.e., cause of knowledge, has a double characteristic (*dvilakṣaṇaḥ*), i.e., has a double property (*dviguṇaḥ*).

I tell how the ether, having a single property, is established; [Having a single property, i.e.,] of which there is one property, viz., sound. Therein, [in regard to these properties: first, for sound,] earth has the form of *khaṭakhata*; water has the condition of *chalachala*; fire has the form of *dhagadhaga*; wind has the nature of *śukaśuka*; ether [5] has the sound which is called echo; [second, for touch,] earth also has touch, not produced by cooking, not hot and not cold; water has a cold [touch]; fire has a hot [touch]; wind has a not hot and not cold [touch], not produced by cooking; [third, for color-form] earth has various [visible] color-forms, white, etc.; water is white; fire glowing; [fourth, for taste,] earth has a sixfold taste, sweet, etc.; water has a sweet [taste]; but [for the fifth, odor] only earth has odor, which has the form of fragrance. With these specific properties, in the body, the elements, earth, etc., are to be characterized. He clarifies what was stated [just before,] how [ether] is established [in the body]:

[ether] should be known, [as] consisting of pores (*suṣīram*), [and as] having the characteristic of the ninefold

aperture./8/

[Having the characteristic of the ninefold aperture, i.e.,] whose characteristic is the nine apertures (*chidrāṇi*), i.e., doors (*dvārāṇi*), located in the aperture of Brahmā, the eye, the ear, the nose, the mouth, the nipple, the navel, the penis, and the anus.

In this fashion, characterized by the ninefold aperture,

[This ether] having the property consisting of sound, has been told to you, O Lady of Noble Observance.

Thus, after having illustrated the set of five elements in the body, [and] after having elucidated their appropriators and their illuminators, viz., the organs of action (*karmendriyāṇi*) and the organs of perception (*buddhindriyāṇi*), [along with the] intellect (*buddhiḥ*), and perceptual organ (*manah*), [6] he will [then] discuss the sensory media (*tanmātrāṇi*), [which are] the non-specific (*aviśeṣa-*) forms of [the property of] color-form, etc., [and which are] to be inferred by means of the perception (*pratīti-*) of the elemental color-form, etc., [mediated] though the instrument of the [acting] organ. Therein, first,

Speech (*vāg*), the organ, speaks (*vadet*) speech (*vāṇi*); and that speech is fourfold:/9/

Samskṛtā, Prākṛti, Apabhraṣṭā, Anunāsikā.

Samskṛtā had its meaning stated by the honourable Bhartṛhariḥ: "Samskṛtā, namely, is the divine speech interpreted by the great seers." Prākṛti [is the speech] come about by the process of the elision of vowels, alteration, etc., of [speech] which has been the base (*prakṛtiḥ*); [about] which they say: "The pattern of Prākṛta [speech] is threefold: identical to that (*tatsamaḥ*) of Sanskrit, derived from that (*tadbhavaḥ*), and regional (*deśī*)." Apabhraṣṭā are the various regional languages; Anunāsikā ["nasalized,"] i.e., [speech] conforming [*anugatā* from *Anu-*,] to the nose [*nāsikā* from *-nāsikā*,] i.e., having the form of syllables which are being sung, adorned with melodic embellishments (*varṇaḥ*), thematic parts (*aṅgam*), and measures (*mitiḥ*).

Cutting, splitting, giving, piercing, constructing, /10/
grasping, and conquest; all are located in the organ of the
hand.

[7] Cutting, i.e., of ropes, etc.; splitting [*bhedah* for
bhedanam,] i.e., made by arrows, etc., and directed to a target;
conquest (*viṣayāḥ*), i.e., battle; [and note] the optional reading
victory (*viṣayi*).

Even, depressed, and elevated; clay, thorny, and
sandy; /11/

mud, water, and the inaccessible; highway, tower, and
mountain; [all] are traversed in the coming and going to
another place, by the organ of the foot. /12/

i.e., the cause of the coming and going to another place, i.e., the
places that are even, depressed, etc., by the organ of the foot,
are traversed.

In expulsion and in farting, the anus (*pāyuh*) is always
active.

Expulsion (*utsargaḥ*), i.e., the liberation of wastes; farting
(*parditam*), i.e., the reprehensible sound [made by] the aperture
of the anus (*gudaḥ*).

And the penis, maker of bliss, pursuer of accessible and
inaccessible. /13/

On account of being the maker of bliss, its nature is pursuing,
everywhere both the licit and prohibited, etc.; for that very
reason, restriction of its [activity] is made in the scriptures.

[8] Thus, in this fashion,

These organs of action operate thus in works;

And just as such as these [described above], so

the organs of perception, O Queen of the Gods, move through
contact with the intellect. /14/

Of the intellect (*buddhiḥ*), i.e., of knowledge; contact (*yogaḥ*),
i.e., [there is a] relation (*sambandhaḥ*) in regard to that, i.e.,
[they] move (*varṭante*), i.e., they operate (*pravartante*) for the
sake of that [knowledge.]

Therein, preceded by a description, in full, of the types of objects called sound, he [will] state that the organ of hearing is an effective means of obtaining that [sound]:

Ṣaḍjaḥ, Ṛṣabhāḥ, Gāndhāraḥ, Madhyamaḥ, Pañcamāḥ, O Dear One, Dhaivataḥ, and Niṣadhaḥ, are called the seven notes (*svaraḥ*);/15/

Gāndhāraḥ, Madhyamaḥ, Ṣaḍjaḥ, are the three basic scales (*grāmaḥ*), O Parvatiḥ;

In this fashion,

the seven notes, the three basic scales, the twenty-one secondary scales (*mūrchanā*);/16/

[9] the forty-nine tertiary scales (*tānaḥ*); this is the sphere of the gods.

Thus, in this fashion,

These subtle sounds are said by tradition to be located in the animate and inanimate [worlds]./17/

[Subtle sounds, i.e.,] they have the form only of subtle vibration (*dhvaniḥ*), and for that reason are located as sheer vibration, under the form of sounding (*ravaḥ*), everywhere, in the animate and inanimate [world].

Next,

I will proclaim the gross [sounds]; learn them, accordingly, from me: [that] produced by the *bheri* [drum], the *paṭaḥaḥ* [drum], and the conch; [that] produced by the *mṛdaṅgaḥ* [drum], and the *paṇavaḥ* [drum];/18/

the sound of the flute (*veṇuḥ*) and of the *gomukhaḥ*; the *mardalaḥ* [drum],¹ the *darduraḥ*, the resonance (*dhvaniḥ*); the varied string instruments, and those hand instruments;/19/

[that] produced by contact and separation; [that] produced by sticks, stones, and water; [10] [human speech, such as]

¹ Conjecturably read *mardalaḥ* for *mandalaḥ*.

Apabhraṃśaḥ, Anunāsiḥ, Saṃskṛtaḥ, Prākṛtaḥ, [and animal] sounds (*ravaḥ*)./20/

Produced by contact, i.e., produced by the hands with *hūḍukkaḥ*; but produced [by separation (*viyogaḥ*), i.e.,] by division (*vibhāgaḥ*), i.e., produced by the separating (*viśleṣaḥ*) of leaves, etc..

Thus, in this fashion [sounds],

Located in the seven tones, both distinct and indistinct, both stated and not stated, one grasps through contact with the organ of hearing./21/

[The meaning is:] the person grasps through the ear all that has the form of sound, consisting of musical instruments, Saṃskṛtaḥ [speech], etc., specifically located in the vibration consisting of the seven tones.

And thus,

This sound is the object-range of that by which the individual cognizes.

This, i.e., all the sound having the form previously discussed, is the object-range (*viśayaḥ*) of that, i.e., of the organ of hearing; [and, if one should ask:] what [organ] is that [he says it is that] by which the individual (*pudgalaḥ*), i.e., the person (*pumān*) cognizes (*budheta*), i.e., knows (*jānīyāt*); and likewise, further on [for the other organs], the [same] connection should be made [with the cognizing person.]

[11] Soft, hard, rough, cold,/22/

warm, slippery, clay, mud, sandy, arrow; spear, sword, bell, etc., hitting, cutting;/23/

these the organ of the skin, touching, knows.

The meaning is: being touching, it knows, i.e., knows through touching.

Thus, in this fashion,

This touch is the object-range of that, by which the person cognizes./24/

Next,

Hear from me the objects (*karmāṇi*) of the organ of the eye being discussed: white, red, yellow, black, green, gray,/25/ [12] light brown, brown, dark brown, [and] also others, by specification;

[Others, i.e.,] color-forms (*rūpāṇi*).

Similarly,

man, woman, domestic animal, wild animal; light, immobile, mobile;/26/

Thus, in this fashion,

[those] differentiated by color and shape, the eye sees everywhere.

Color, i.e., white, etc.; shape (*ākṛtiḥ*), i.e., collocation; [those] distinguished by these two, i.e., characterized by these two, i.e., objects, the eye sees. [And in that construction] the agency of that [eye] is used metonymically.

Thus, likewise,

The object-range of that by which the self (*ātmā*) cognizes is called color-form./27/

Sweet, sour, salty, acrid, pungent, astringent, mixed, and pleasant; [such] taste the tongue knows.

[13] In this fashion,

This taste is object-range of that by which the person cognizes. A fragrant celestial odor, and a foul odor, in various ways,/29/

the nose smells both in front.

The nose, i.e., the agent, smells both located in front.

And therefore, of that, this

Is the object-range called odor, by which that subject knows, deluded by ego./30/

In the body, etc., on account of the supposition of being bound, it knows objects as different [from itself]. And this should be construed with the preceding.

In volition, and in conception, and in the tenfold senses, it flows, the unrepulsed doubt, unconquerable, for all the

embodied ones;/31/

[14] this is called the mind, the right and wrong binder. In regard to the object-range of the organs of perception and of action, [the mind is] volition (*saṃkalpaḥ*), which [consists of resolutions, such as] this should be acquired, this I should perform; [and it is] conception (*vikalpaḥ*), which concepts of judgements [such as] this is such; [and] herein [in the ten senses] it flows (*dhāvati*), i.e., in whatever way [they act] it acts (*pravartate*), and for that very reason, this [mind] is unrepulsed doubt, i.e., everywhere is associated with doubt, [and is] what [is unconquerable for all embodied ones, i.e.,] not able to be conquered by anyone without knowledge; [and the right and wrong binder (*dharmādharmānibandhaḥ*), i.e., [it] binds with right and wrong, [and so is the] binder with these, i.e., makes [one have] contact with them.

Then, in order to illustrate the location of the sensory media (*tanmātrāṇi*) in the body, in accordance with production of the color-form, etc., [which are] the effect of the [appropriate] perceptual organ, he says:

I will discuss the own form nature of the sensory media, according to purpose./32/

Purpose (*arthaḥ*), i.e., goal; i.e., [according to purpose (*arthataḥ*), i.e.,] in accordance with that; of the sensory media, [I will discuss their own form nature (*svarūpadharmaḥ*), i.e.,] I [now] discuss [their] nature (*dharmāḥ*), i.e., essence (*svabhāvaḥ*), [which is] their own form (*svarūpam*), i.e., the form [which is] location [of the organs] in a basis (*āśrayaḥ*), restricted (*niyata-*) [according to] what is taken in (*upāgata-*). Therein,

The sensory media of odor smells odor by the tip of the nose;

[15] the sensory media of taste grasps taste collected with the tongue;/33/

the sensory media of form grasps form brought with the eye;

the sensory media of touch grasps touch brought with the

skin;/34/

and the sensory media of sound grasps sound with the ear. The agent, the sensory media of odor, etc., [that is] produced through the invisible fruition (*adr̥ṣṭam*), [and that is] located in [respectively,] the field of the nose, etc., [which field is] the basis of the sensory organs, [respectively,] of smelling, etc., [which organ, in turn, is] the means of realizing, [respectively,] the perception of odor, etc., [smells, i.e.,] grasps the [respective] property of odor, etc., only through that [respective sense organ of] smelling, etc.; [this is] the [correct] construing [of these verses]. And herein, this is [their] purport: although the [perceptive] organs are pervaders on account of being related to the ego, only when [they have] a clearly manifest location in the field of the nose, etc., restricted in location by the sensory media of odor, etc., [is there] then apprehension (*upalabdhiḥ*), of odor, etc., [which is] restricted by the sensory media of odor, [etc.,] to the activity (*vṛttiḥ*) produced [by the particular restricted organ of perception]. [In other words there is,] for the [perceptive] organs, ego-relatedness which is colored by the restricted sensory media; otherwise, as in the Sāṃkhya [view, if there were] solely ego-relatedness, [16] a connection to a restricted object would not possible; or as in the [view of the] Naiyāyikāḥ, on the other hand, [if there were] only element relatedness (*bhautikatvam*) [of the perceptive organs] there would not be the reception of a perception by the ego.

He summarizes this:

This is the subtle nature of the sensory media, through being the primary forms of the elements./35/

[The meaning is:] only since the sensory media are the primary forms (*prakṛtayah*) of the elements, is there then the apprehension of the property of odor, etc., located in the [respective] element of earth, etc., [by means of] the instrument [which is] the respective organ [of perception], supervised by the respective sensory media. [In other words,] of the sensory media

located in the [sensory] organs, there is this nature (*dharmah*) [which is] subtle, i.e., not able to be perceived by everyone.

He [next] illustrates the location of the ego in the body:

Above that is the transforming (*vaikārikah*) [ego], by which the person cognizes. I am knowledgeable; I am having experiences; I have been born in a great family;/36/

I am a giver; I am an experiencer; I am brilliant, powerful; [17] I am a victor in battle and the enemies are conquered by me;/37/

I, have good character, [am] virtuous, do the best, in the highest way; I am a sinner, bad in conduct, stupid, ugly in form;/38/

[something] is neither given nor enjoyed by me; having suffered, [of those] under the influence of mine-ness, [such are] the ego [filled] thoughts;/39/

[and thus] the ego binds [them] with hard bonds to transmigration.

[In other words,] the ego binds people with hard bonds that are the cause of transmigration, in the form of perceptions related to the good (*sattvam*) constituent, etc., such as [I am] knowledgeable, a cognizer, a sinner, etc.; above, i.e., in as much as being the pervader of the planes up to this.

[18] Thus, in this fashion,

The nature of the threefold ego has also been proclaimed./40/ That which was stated, above that is the transforming, [was intended] to illustrate the predominance of the active (*rajah*) [constituent] in the ego.

Next he states the existence in the body of the intellect, [which has] the form of [being] a possessor of properties (*dharmi-*) as [its own] main nature (*dharmah*):

Then I will proclaim to you, O Lady of Noble Observances, the properties of the intellect, order, etc.: order (*dharmah*), knowledge (*jñānam*), dispassionateness (*vairāgyam*), and mastery (*aśvāryam*), the fourth;/41/

disorder (*adharmah*), ignorance (*ajñānam*), non-dispassionateness (*avairāgyam*), non-mastery (*anaiśvaryam*).

From among these,

That [intellect] binds in seven ways, but by [the eighth] property (*bhāvaḥ*) knowledge, deludes./42/

Namely, [binds and deludes] those adepts of the Sāṃkhya [doctrine].

[19] And this [intellect] is thus characterized through [its] chief [activity], he says:

And the intellect makes determinations in regard to many, Things.

Hear, O Dear, next, the characteristics of the eight, order, etc.:

Therein,

Fasting, repetition, silence, non-anger, non-stealing, straight conduct, truth, purity, alms, compassion, and patience at all times,/44/

knowledge, study, shame, restraint of the senses, charitable acts, service at holy places, offerings to the forefathers,/46/ lack of fear toward all creatures, safeguarding of life; [20] this is the first property (*guṇaḥ*) of the intellect called order./46/

This [property], which was discussed previously (Bk.11, vss.144b-145a, p.86): "Non-anger, obedience to the master, purity, contentment, straight conduct, non-violence, truth, non-stealing, celibacy, non-maliciousness," is established here with another amplified pattern. Accordingly, restraint of the senses is an amplified statement of celibacy; shame, fasting, repetition, silence, alms, compassion, patience, [and the] the set of three beginning with charitable acts, etc., are an amplification of non-maliciousness; knowledge, study, and safeguarding life are the fruit of obedience to the master; lack of fear toward all creatures is a form of non-violence; patience and avoidance of stealing are forms of contentment and straight conduct.

Thus, in this fashion,

For those bound by order and works, moving in
transmigration, over and over again, a mortal [existence], a
heavenly, an animal. /47/

The rest [to be supplied is the verb] [there] is (*bhavati*).

[21] In this way,

The property (*bhavaḥ*) of order has been stated.

Now,

Hear from me the property of knowledge.

Property (*bhāvaḥ*), i.e., the property (*dharmah*) of knowledge.

He clarifies this:

That twenty-four part aggregate (*piṇḍaḥ*), endowed with the
organs and senses, /48/

should be known to be derived from matter (*prākṛta-*), the
stimulator of order and disorder.

[The stimulator of order and disorder, i.e.,] the accumulator of
order, etc., through the activities of the mind, speech, and body.

I am a non-agent, without properties;

Thus, split off from matter,

For me there is no matter-related bond. /49/

All this, solely,

I assume to be made by matter.

I.e., I determine to be activated by means of the intellect, etc..

Then, through the emergence of such discriminating knowledge,

From the traces he is liberated.

[22] Trace (*vāsanā*), i.e., latent impression (*saṃskāraḥ*); he is
liberated, viz., the Sāṃkhya mendicant.

Thus, this

Sāṃkhya knowledge has been proclaimed by me, by which
he is liberated from matter. /50/

I.e., becomes separate for some time.

Then,

Once again, the lord binds the one freed from the bond of
matter.

And he

Bound, transmigrates again, so long as he does not know/51/
the lord, the agent of emanation, the binder of all creatures.
[The Sāṃkhya view is incorrect] on account of the impossibility of
insensible matter being an agent, [and] on account of [their] not
admitting [instead] that [agency] for the person, [with the result
that] even in contact [between matter and the person, which they
deny] there would be no manifestation of the world; [thus,] as long
as he [viz., the Sāṃkhya adherent] does not attain the lord, the
determiner of the bondage and of the liberation of both of these
[i.e., matter and the person], although freed by the Sāṃkhya
[doctrine], so once more he revolves [in transmigration] on
account of the non-manifestation of the [true] knowledge of
reality.

[23] [Next] he says in order to characterize dispassionateness:

From dispassionateness he renounces sons [and] wives [that
are] cherished and very esteemed,/52/

elephants, horses, vehicles, and friends, pleasures, wealth.

[Very *su-*] i.e., well (*suṣṭhu*) esteemed, i.e., favorable.

Moreover,

Fasting, repetition, holy places, five fires, lying in
water;/53/

after having performed these terrible he renounces the body
all at once;

The penance (*tapah*) called the five fires is the placing [of oneself],
in summer, in the middle of five fires, called, Dakṣiṇaḥ [in the
south], Āhavanīyaḥ [in the east], Gārhapatyaḥ [in the west],
Aupasadikaḥ [in the north], and Sāvitraḥ [the sun overhead].
These [terrible], i.e., penances.

He says how he renounces [the body]:

from mountain, tree, water, and fire, by hurling off,
hanging, feeding [oneself]./54/

The meaning is: having [first] resorted to a mountain, etc.; tree,
i.e., a banyan (*vaṭaḥ*) located at Prayāgaḥ, etc.; feeding [oneself]

(*āśanam*), the construction is: eating (*aśanam*), [derived from] he eats (*aśnāti*), preceded by [the prefix] *ā-* (*aṭ*).

[24] [And] thus, also other such [terrible],
violent acts, as well, [he may perform after] having
assumed dispassionateness; having acquired the property of
mastery, he does not attain satisfaction by substances;/55/
by wives, by wealth, by pleasures, by retinues, nor by
vehicles; but for the sake of mastery he should perform
penance, vows, and formula [service];/56/

Moreover,

battle, gambling, deception, theft, injustice [and] violence,
as well as other illicit [acts], murdering under the guise of
trust;/57/

having acquired the property of mastery, he performs also
many [other such acts].

[25] [Thus, in order to acquire mastery, he should perform]
penance, vows, etc., causing the appropriation of the object of
[actions] connected to the good (*sattvam*) [constituent]; [he should
perform] battle, etc., [causing the appropriation of the object of
actions] connected to the active (*rajaḥ*) [constituent]; [and he
should perform] slaying through reliance, etc., [causing the
appropriation of the object of actions] connected to the dark
(*tamaḥ*) [constituent].

Having illustrated the set of four, order, etc., he illustrates, in
sequence, the disorder, etc., for the embodied:

Delighting continually in violence to living beings; engaged in
thievery, injustice, and deceit;/58/

a beggar, a giver of suffering; should be (*bhavet*) the
disorder conduct.

Thievery (*caurikā*), i.e., theft (*cauryam*); the meaning [of this
passage is]: delighting in violence to living beings, etc., this
[should be (*bhavet*), i.e.,] is (*bhavati*) [the disorder conduct,
i.e.,] the conduct of disorder.

There is neither order, nor disorder, nor anyone gone to

heaven and liberation;/59/

[in this way, when one] has acquired the property of ignorance, one says everything falsely; permanently suffering, a slave, also dragging a burden and vehicle,/60/ [26] and having a miserable life continuously, in non-dispassionateness, one is not exhausted;

The meaning is: [in there] being [the property of non-dispassionateness, one, i.e., one's passions, as a consequence, are not exhausted].

after having achieved sovereignty from one border to another, [losing power, the king next] becomes the overlord of a village;/61/

[then] deprived of [his] village, that lord persists with [control over] half of that [village]; [nevertheless] he does not grieve and is not upset, [and] plays as with [the] previous sovereignty;/62/

this [then is] the property of non-mastery, [which] in this way, has been presented to you.

Next, located in the body,

I will discuss the unmanifest (*avyaktam*) having three qualities, the stimulator of transmigration./63/

[The stimulator,] namely, through the impulse of the lord.

From this very [unmanifest, i.e.,]

From that there is the production of the world, and therefore it is called matter.

[27] [Since] all this, [the universe] from [the plane of] the intellect to [the plane of] earth, is made [*kriyate* from *kr̥tiḥ*], preemiently [*prakarṣeṇa*, from *pra-*,] i.e., is made manifold [*prapañcyate*, from *pra-*], by the lord, in this [matter, it is thus called] matter (*prakṛtiḥ*).

Moreover, [this, which is] the cause of perception, [and which is] located in the body,

The nature of that, I will proclaim, called, the good, the active, and the dark [constituents]./64/

Therein,

The property of illumination is the good, and order is based on the good;

The property of illumination (*prakāśabhāvaḥ*), i.e., the sensation in the form of the object; [order is based on the good, i.e.,] the good (*sattvam*) [consists of] the pure mental contents (*śuddhacittatā*) by which [there is manifest] the order previously discussed.

And [one] who through connection with the good, for others, of wealth, power, etc.,

is continually the distributor, and continuously benefactor of existents, /65/

endowed with patience and compassion, intent on knowledge and insight,

Is one related to the good (*sāttvikaḥ*); [this] is the meaning; benefactor of existents (*sattvopakāraka-*), i.e., benefitting living creatures even without gifts, through speech, etc.

[28] Moreover,

amity, alms, determination, wisdom, penance, purity, restraint, honesty and impartiality, knowledge through the celestial intellect; he, the best of men, in whom there are always these properties, should be known as related to the good.

Impartiality (*samadr̥ṣṭiḥ*), i.e., behavior toward others as to one's own self; celestial intellect (*divyabuddhiḥ*), i.e., intuition (*pratibhā*).

Next,

Hear from me the properties of the active [constituent]: cruelty, greed, hostility, anger, /68/

lusting, intent on excitement, afflicted, he should roam continuously, haughty, filled with pride, fixed on the ego, /69/

[29] a hero permanently delighted with fighting.

Lusting, [and] being intent on excitement, but not [ever] having

complete satisfaction and contentment.

Of he, who is such, this cruelty, etc.,

Is the characteristic property related to the active
[constituent].

Next,

The preponderance of lust and anger, association with
greed, /70/

envy, pride, depression, intoxication, frenzy, sleep and sloth,
non-action, foolishness, ignorance, /71/

disorder, stupidity, heresy, vacillation;

All this [is]

the dark.

I.e., has the form of the properties of the dark [constituent].

And therefore,

[30] That man wherein these signs are visible, should be
known as related to the dark, a person [who is] a seat of
impurity.

Thus, in this way,

This, the three constituents unmanifest, the three
constituents, has been presented. /73/

[The meaning is:] this unmanifest, [which] by virtue of being
united with the three constituents, has three constituents [has
been presented].

Having known this completely, one is freed from the
constituents derived from matter.

Having known [matter], i.e., having delimited [it] as an object of
knowledge; from the [constituents (*guṇaḥ*)] derived from matter,
i.e., from the properties (*dharmāḥ*) [of matter], one is freed,
i.e., accedes to a state of distinctness from matter.

In reality, however, he is not liberated since only this is his
conviction, namely, [that]

I am not the abode of properties, nor [am I] the property of
the intellect and ego; /74/

and deprived of the organs and senses, rid of elements and

sensory media, I am the non-agent, without properties, called traditionally the person (*puruṣaḥ*), [who is] sheer consciousness. /75/

[31] [Actually, the person] is equal to the regent of the [inner tripartite] organ [*antaḥ-*] (*karaṇam*) and external organs (*bāhyendriyāṇi*) [of perception and action]; called traditionally (*smṛtaḥ*), i.e., by the promulgators of the Purāṇic texts, etc.; and therefore [as a consequence of their statements, thinks erroneously,] I am the non-agent.

For that very reason,

Whatever action, mental, vocal, or physical, is done,
All that

I assume, is done by matter.

[In other words,] I consider [it] done by the mind, etc., connected with matter.

And from the fact that [one assumes that] there is neither being an inciter (*prayojakatvam*) [to action] nor principal agency of the person,

The person is called traditionally the non-agent; /76/

thus, having renounced actions, he is not active permanently; nor am I an agent, nor is there bondage for me; [and] thus, that man who becomes aware, is freed from matter, up until the lord emanates.

[32] The construction is: [thinking] thus (*evam*), [with thus used] with the sense of the direct speech marker (*iti*), [to mark the preceding statement,] having renounced actions [he is not active, etc.].

Thinking that discriminative [knowledge] of the self is merely [its difference] from matter, [and] thinking, through delusion, that the non-agent, inert matter has agency, and that the regent, the lord, the agent of bondage, etc., has non-agency, one, through lack of insight into reality, although for sometime having [rendered] the connection to matter inoperative, in reality, is not freed from the bondage to matter. Thus, [with this intention] he

says:

Deluded by the Sāṃkhya doctrine, liberation is assumed;/78/
there is not liberation for him; for sometime, separation
from the body.

[The meaning is:] since for sometime, there is that separation
from the body which is not liberation, therefore, deluded by that
knowledge of the Sāṃkhyam, liberation [is assumed
(*abhimanyate*), i.e.,] he only erroneously considers [himself
liberated].

Through such knowledge, that one merely

Remains, freed from matter, devoid of emanation and
reabsorption,/79/

[33] up until that lord, [who is] the supreme lord makes an
emanation.

[In other words,] he only has this liberation from matter, which
is this [state of] being devoid of the emanation and reabsorption of
the effect (*kāryam*) [comprising the elements and sensory media],
[the gross and subtle] body [(*śarīram*), i.e., the organ
(*karaṇam*) comprising the inner and outer organs,], etc., [which
all are produced from] matter. And thus, so long as the lord does
not, once more, initiate an emanation for the sake of the
experience of the persons, for so long that one is [in that state
characterized by a] predominance of the dissolution of matter;
[this] is [what] is stated. It is stated that [the lord is] the
supreme lord, i.e., master of the universe up to Anāśritaḥ, with
[this] intention: [to show, namely, that] his mastery is not
merely as emanator of such [as stated here], but also, has [as its]
scope, the entire path of the pure and of the impure.

[When their arises] a readiness to emanate [which] depends on the
lord, [and which is] for the purpose of giving [a field for]
experience in accordance with the maturation of accumulated
action, to [the unconscious] persons [separated from matter], then
the Sāṃkhya exercitant,

By that very matter bond, once more is projected in

transmigration./80/

Projected, he repeatedly transmigrates, in transmigration,
the terrible ocean; bound by order and disorder, deluded by
the Sāṃkhya doctrine./81/

[By] that very (*tāvat*) [matter bond], i.e., by that [which is]
the bondage of matter, which is not different from matter [itself];
[34] terrible, i.e., conveying hundreds of terrors; an ocean, i.e.,
like an ocean on account of the distance of the end.

And although it has been resolved [by him] with that
[declaration]: "I am not an agent, matter alone is the agent,"
nonetheless, this [resolution] is not effected since that [discriminative
intellect] is inert; [and] how should there be primary agency for
the intellect, [whose] consciousness is [merely] transferred in
contact with the penumbra of [the real source of] consciousness;
and for matter, on account of not having a preponderance of the
[luminous] good [constituent], there is not even the transferred
state of being conscious, as [befitting its] unsuitability for grasping
[even] the penumbra of consciousness; how [then could there be
through these] a connection with accumulated action, or how
[could there be] the acquisition of non-action through knowledge.
Therefore, necessarily, [in contrast to the Sāṃkhya teaching,]
there is agency, limited in scope, caused by connection with [the
power of limited agency called] Kalā, manifest through the
[primary power (*śaktiḥ*), the impulse] Icchā of the lord, for the
persons. [Consequently,] for one deluded by the Sāṃkhya doctrine,
there is bondage through [properties of the intellect such as] order
and disorder accumulated in a beginningless existence; [and this]
correct [interpretation] we will examine later on.
In this fashion, through the impulse of the lord, this one delights
in adhesion to transmigration:

I am the agent, the experiencer, I am the lord, possessor of
power.

So thinking, [he transmigrates.]

Deluded by my-ness, like the Persian wheel well

(*ghaṭayantravat*), he is rotated. /82/

[35] [Deluded by my-ness (*mamatvam*), i.e., the ego] since making mine (*mamakāra-*), has precedence in the ego; he is rotated, i.e., by the lord; which was stated in the *Gītā*: "This lord dwells in the heart of all beings, O Arjunaḥ, circulating all beings, mounted on a machine, through Māyā."²

He summarizes this:

The Sāṃkhya doctrine has been stated by me.

² V. van Buitenen, ed., *The Bhagavadgītā*, 6(63) 40[18].61, p.142.

III.5 BOOK 13
[vss.1-46a, pp.89-108]

[Let] Blessed Svachchandaḥ triumph, the master, bestowing every success, [and] permeated with an awareness whose essence is the condensation of the savour of supreme nectar.

Thus, in this part of the text, up to the end of the twelfth book, twenty-two different [forms of Svachchandaḥ-bhairavaḥ, the lord with-parts, manifest for different] rituals have been illustrated. Accordingly, [these forms are]: {1}Bhairavaḥ [as lord of the matrix] (*mātrkā*) [of the phonemes]; {2}blessed lord Svachchandaḥ surrounded by the set of eight bhairavāḥ, Kapālīśaḥ, etc.; {3-10} the eight [bhairavāḥ, the] lords, Kapālīśaḥ, etc., [who are] established with their own different retinues [as the central Bhairavaḥ, when identified with him] in the way stated by the text [(Bk.8, vss.24b-25a, p.15) which describes] the meditation on the parts: "Let Bhairavaḥ, freed from parts, O Beautiful Lady, be the one located in the middle, that he first worships and then imposes in the place of those [bhairavāḥ, Kapālīśaḥ, etc., located on the periphery];" {11-19} the nine[fold] self (*navātma*) formula, which, [when taken] separately, is ninefold by dividing the set of nine words (*padam*), [and when taken] as the originator [of the others], {20} is single; {21} lord Koṭarākṣaḥ, surrounded by [his retinue of] thirty-two goddesses; or {22} alone. Then next, [90] in order to induce [the lord] to explain the twenty-third [form of] Svachchandaḥ, [who is] only single, the lord without parts (*niṣkala-*), being the essence [underlying] the vision of [the twenty-two other forms] with-parts (*sakala-*), [and who] for the sake of a [transitional] connection between the books, was indicated at the end of the [preceding] book [in vs.166, p.87] with the phrase:] "Having remembered Svachchandaḥ . . . , " the blessed goddess said:

Relate that sacrifice which is the essence of this text, O

supreme lord, in summary, for the sake of the adepts./1/
 Relate the twofold [sacrifice]: sacrifice (*yāgaḥ*), i.e., [what] is
 sacrificed [to] (*ijyate*), i.e., the lord without parts, being the
 essence of all scriptures; [and] sacrifice, i.e., sacrificing
 (*yajanam*), i.e., the manner of worshipping him.

So asked, blessed Bhairavaḥ said:

The syllable of the root seed [formula], the leader of
 formulæ, the supreme, the lord mounted on the seat of the
 Praṇavaḥ [and] endowed with [his] limbs and [his] faces;/2/
 [this] supreme lord, with the collection of substances
 previously discussed, one should worship.

[91] The supreme, the syllable composed of the root seed
 [formula], i.e., the lord with four parts; lord, i.e., Svachchanda-
 bhairavaḥ having the form of a deity; supreme lord, i.e., master
 of everything; [leader of the formulæ, i.e.,] expresser of all the
 formulæ located in the retinues; [mounted on] the seat of the
 Praṇavaḥ, etc., i.e., as [commented upon] before (Bk.1, pp.32-
 33); [and endowed] with [his] limbs, i.e., with the highest
 properties, omniscience, etc., previously discussed [(Bk.1, vs.71,
 p.59), which begins] "the end of S, with the six long vowels . . . ;"
 and with [his] faces, i.e., only with [those] previously discussed,
 [(Bk.1, vs.45b, p.40) which states, in paraphrase:] "the
 phonemes from Y to V, united with the contractor [i.e., Kṣ];"
 this [statement,] however, [that the lord without parts is endowed
 with his faces] should not be commented upon [to indicate that he
 is endowed with these faces, which are] composed of the sound H,
 [which is connected to the] set of five [components of] the lord
 Prāsādaḥ [i.e., the Praṇavaḥ, which is] predominant, pervasive,
 [and which is] identical to the lord without parts as stated in the
 blessed *Kālottara[-āgamaḥ]*.¹ [In this regard, my mode of

¹ Cf. N.R. Bhatt, ed., *Sārdhatriśatikākalottarāgama, avec le
 commentaire de Bhaṭṭa-Rāmakaṇṭha*, Publications de l'institut
 français d'indologie 61 (Pondichéry: Institut français d'indologie,

commenting has been authorized] by revelation: "It is traditionally stated [that] when there is a difference between scriptures because of differences in ritual, etc., then, in each case, that [ritual] should be performed as it is stated [in the scripture being used for the ritual], and not according to another scripture." Therefore, only with the formulæ, limbs and faces as stated, [is the lord without parts] endowed (*samanvitam*), i.e., completely [*samyag*-glossing *sam*-of *sam-anvitam*,] i.e., non-dually, endowed (*-anvitam*), and not, however, with [them manifested separately in] a retinue; [this is] the meaning. For that very reason, [the lord without-parts is] fully endowed also with blessed Aghoreśvari [although she is not explicitly stated]. Although the revelation [that she is meditatively] constructed [as accompanying him] is [found] in texts that have a predominance of the radiations of the power (*śaktih*), [as, for example, in the instruction]: "Or he should construct, on [the lord's] lap, Gauri, occupying half his body," nevertheless, here, just like the limbs, faces, and formulæ, she is identical in essence to the holder of power (*śaktimat*), [92] [and thus] this formula of the holder of power, presented here, has this very radiation of the power interiorized. [With the . . .] previously stated; by that [statement, there are] included all [the rites,] the imposition of the form, of the energies, etc., [done before,] [with the exception] solely, [that] the imposition of the lord with-parts should be performed only with the lord without-parts, who pervades both [the lord] with and without parts. Since this [lord without parts is now] discussed after [the discussion of] lord Koṭarākṣaḥ, some [commentators argue, that] like him, this [lord without parts is] ten-armed; [this is incorrect,] the masters [declare] since [the lord without parts is] lord Svaccandaḥ, [he can] only [be] eighteen-armed. With the . . . collection of substances [he should worship]; by that [statement, there is enjoined that] the sacrificing, a part of the

[ritual to obtain] superhuman powers, should be performed with a great [amount of] provisions.

[Then] to this [lord without-parts, who has been] invoked [and] worshipped,

Just this is the oblation [and] setting down.

The meaning is: to the lord who has been set down in the ceremonially prepared (*samskr̥te*) fire, there should be performed a complete oblation, with ghee, etc., either one hundred or one thousand and eight times. And this ritual should be undertaken by one initiated by the initiation [which makes one a] Śiva's law (*śivadharmi*) [kind of] adept (*sādhakaḥ*) or by another.

And for this one,

Just this initiation has been proclaimed./3/

Just this, i.e., precisely [that Śiva's rule initiation] previously discussed.

Thus, [that adept] initiated by the initiation of the Śiva's rule [type which was] previously discussed, after having carried out the worship and offering to the lord,

[93] Who should repeat [the formulæ] ten lakhs [of times], concentrated, recollected, on the bank of an ocean going river, rid of companions,/4/

[who] should oblate a lakh [of oblations] of human flesh, along with bdellium, concentrated [and with his] senses subjugated, fixed in celibacy,/5/

should obtain the unobtainable, O Goddess; herein, there should be no vacillation.

[The adept is concentrated (*ekacittāḥ*), i.e.,] whose thoughts (*-cittam*), are in a single place [*ekatra*, glossing *eka*], i.e., on the lord without parts who alone is being repeated, and for that very reason [he is] recollected. And that river is oceangoing; the meaning is, a great river. Rid of companions; the meaning is: just as the god being worshipped is a solitary hero, so also the worshipper. According to the rule: " ... as the oblation, so the repetition," concentration, etc., [should be understood as] stated

also for the oblation.

[94] Moreover, for this [adept],

These rites which here are established in the four seats, /6/
[and which are] lower, middle, and higher, O Beautiful One,
succeed, O Queen of the Gods, through the word of
Bhairavaḥ. /7/

[In the four seats, i.e.,] in the Śaiva scriptures that are composed of the four seats, [these] which are the rites of [two of those seats, namely] the female and male formulæ, should be performed; [and which are] here, i.e., in the world, established [as] lower, i.e., as being the cause of the [adept's realizing] the pervasion of the regents from the underworlds to the ether; these succeed, i.e., [are successful] for the exercitant who has performed the prior [stipulated] service. [This is the way] it should be construed; but this should not be commented upon [to indicate that these rites have] the forms lower, middle, etc., [which are] to be spoken for deceiving, etc., since these [rites] have been previously enjoined to be realized by the limited prior service, [in the statement]: "The rites performed succeed through a lakh of repetition."¹ Through the word of Bhairavaḥ; [by this] he teaches that no doubt, [which is] easily assumed by knowing subjects at [the level of] Māyā (*māyāpramātā*), should be experienced here. Now, next, in order to teach to this adept, even though [he is] primarily intent on the means of realizing the primary perfection, [other] rites [which are] employed on various occasions, [95] [which are used for the] subjugation of ministers, etc., [and which are to be] effected by employing substances and formulæ, he states, with [verses in] different kinds of meters, Āryā, etc.:

Now, next, I will proclaim [that] highest teaching verse
treasury, which having known, the adepts practice. /8/
[Teaching verse treasury (*kārikākośaḥ*), i.e.,] a treasury (*kośaḥ*),

¹ Cf. the statements of bk.6, vs.3, pp.102-103, and vs.51, p.144.

i.e., a collection, of teaching verses (*kārikāḥ*), [as traditionally] defined: "A teaching verse [is that] illustrating of a meaning, which must follow a mnemonic verse (*sūtram*), [which is] that meaning stated in summary, by the wise, though a brief expression." Highest; the meaning is: by virtue of being the realm (*viṣayam*) of [the practice of elite adepts, i.e., the] heroes (*vīrah*), [and by virtue of] having [as its] object (*viṣayam*) an unobstructed fruition. For that very reason, [the adepts] practice (*vicaranti*), i.e., sport (*vilasanti*), at will, perfected with everything obtained in the palm of [their] hand; [this is] the meaning.

Therein,

Having taken the dried head of a hero felled in battle with a sword [while he was] facing [to the] front, [and] having rendered [it]: written on [using] blood and lac, with the designation joined with the formula in the [formula] body of the one to be effected; /9/

[then, having made it] well heated in a corpse fire at night; that royal emperor of demons or royal master of demons, for the sake of whom [the adept] repeats a hundred times, [96] [he] brings with the swiftness of the wind.

Head, i.e., skull; dried, i.e., rendered fleshless; blood and lac, i.e., lac together with blood belonging to a corpse, [and] with that, written on; joined with a formula, i.e., . interlaced (*-vidarbhitam*) with that [formula], according to the [coming] statement [vs.16, p.98] in the fifth procedure: "interlaced with the formula . . . ;" and this should be understood to be written on the forehead, [according to] what he will state in the seventh procedure [vs.20, p.99]: "the name of him on the forehead . . . ;" the designation, i.e., the name of the one to be effected (*sādhya-*) [by the rite], ending with the modified formula (*ūhah*), "bring;" [interlaced] in the body (*-tanau*), i.e., in the [formula] body (*-dehe*) of the one to be effected (*sādhya-*) [in this rite]; [this is] written out with these substances [on the skull; which] in a

cremation fire, at night, having [first] rendered very [*suṣṭhu*, for the *su-* of *su-taptam*] heated (*taptam*); [the adept next,] for the sake of (*kr̥te*) whom, i.e., facing in the direction of the one to be effected; repeats [the formula] as written, a hundred times; [and] that, i.e., the one to be effected, in regard to the application [of the effect of the formula], at the swiftness of the wind, i.e., very quickly, he [then] brings.

He brings, as before, the one to be effected, written with the lac of a dead person on the head of a man, [and] heated in a cremation fire, with force, from the world of Yamaḥ, also, quickly./11/

[97] As before, the one to be effected; there is continued here [from the the preceding verse, the instructions according to which the adept] repeats a hundred times the name of the one to be effected, joined with the formula; lac of a dead person, i.e., the blood produced from the body of a dead person; on the head of a man, i.e., even [a head] belonging to a non-hero; this is the difference from the preceding [rite].

Having taken the rib from a dead woman that was hanged by her left foot, [and] with a pigment of blood liquid [having written on it] the [formula] body of the one to be effected, joined with the formula,/12/

in a fire of khadiraḥ [wood], well heated, for half the night, [while] facing [it], with a hundred repetitions, [the adept] brings, Śaciḥ, or Ahalyā, after the hundredth part of a day./13/

Joined, i.e., written at the end; [joined and] well heated should be construed here [with] having made [it]; pigment (*rocanā*), i.e., the blood of a man; rib (*pāṃśuli*), others [read as] the rib-bone (*pārṣṇikāsthī*); the hundredth part of a day, i.e., a slight [amount of] time.

Having taken a rib from a woman that has been hanged by the ankle, [98] [and] having written on [it] with the blood of a corpse and his own blood, the body of the one to be

effected,/14/

[and] having made [that] well heated in a cremation fire, recited upon a hundred times, [and] joined with the formula and its own name,/15/

he quickly brings a yakṣaḥ, a deity, a demon, a puṁnagaḥ, or [puṁ-] nāri.

Previously, the blood of a corpse; but here, his own blood; [this is] the difference [in the rites].

[Having made] the name of the [one] to be effected written with a pigment of blood on his own left hand, [and having] joined this with a hundred repetitions, interlaced with the formula, [and made it] well heated, at night,/16/ in a smokeless fire of khadiraḥ, he brings, as swift as the wind, the master of demons.

Interlaced (*vidarbhitam*), i.e., at the end of the name, [and this] imposition of the name was illustrated previously.

[Having rendered] the [one] to be effected written with the designation, on the surface of the ground, with blood [and] gaurikam, [99] with the left hand rubbed with perfume, [and] joined with the seed of the substance, [and] having approached [that] written on the ground, [then while] facing the [one] to be obtained, for the time of half of a night,/18/ [the adept] brings, in the hundredth part of an instant, the king and his ministers.

Written, i.e., having rendered [it written] i.e., as previously, [by means of the designation interlaced with the formula; gaurikam, i.e., hīṅgulakam (cinnabar); with blood, i.e., from a corpse, and for that very reason, this surface of the ground is that of a cremation ground. And here [once again] there is established the standard [preceding] use of a hundred repetitions.

[Having made] the [one] to be obtained written on the middle of a human skull, with pigment mixed with blood,/19/

and having written the name of that one, interlaced with

the formula, on the forehead, [and] having made a second human skull, smeared with perfumed water, /20/

he should next completely tie up with a dead [person's] thread [the skulls made into] a skull bowl, [100] [and] having made it well heated [with a fire] of khadirah and charcoal, once again [having made it] smeared with bee's wax, /21/

then [heat it again] up until this wax smeared on the skulls dissolves; [doing this] with the employment of a hundred repetitions, in a mere instant, he draws forth the lord of the gods. /22/

With a dead [person's] thread, i.e., according to the usage of the code language (*chummakā*), which will be discussed, [this means] with a sinew of a dead [person]. Here the repetition is for a night; [so] it is established.

[Having first made] the name of that one, interlaced with a mass of formulæ [and] written with gaurikam on a wall, then, [while] facing the one to be effected, for a night, angry, reciting, [the adept, with the one to be effected] being overpowered with the left hand, /23/

by means of the hook of the sound *krom*, brings quickly gods and demons.

On a wall, i.e., of a burning ground; the name of that one, i.e., the name of the god or demon desired for bringing; by means of the hook of the sound *krom*; the meaning is: by means of an overpowering with the left hand [which has] the sound *krom* written [on it] in the form of a hook.

[101] He should oblate the flesh of a man [who was] felled by the blow of a weapon in battle, joined with the three sweet [substances]; /24/

[and then] having constructed the pose of the circle, in reverse, he should cast the [one] to be effected in the middle, [and then] having meditated in between the hands, upon the face, vibrating in the pocket of the hands struck

together, /25/

he brings a great man, even a king, after the hundredth part of a day.

"By rotation, by the two fingers, there should be the wheel cutting off evil," [i.e.,] by the contact of the surfaces of the extended finger of the right hand surrounded by the upraised left with an extended finger, [specifically] through rotation by the index finger of the right placed on the side of the small finger of the left, there is that circle pose stated in the scriptures; which, having constructed, in reverse, i.e., by the entering of the right side by the little finger of the left; [and] having meditated upon the one to be effected, [in the middle, i.e.,] located in the middle of that [and, vibrating in the in the pocket of the hands struck together, i.e.,] being vibrated by the striking together of the hands; [and finally,] having recited, a hundred times, the name of the one to be effected interlaced by the formula, [then] performing an oblation, at night, with the substances stated, he subjugates even a king; [this] is the meaning. The procedure established here is repetition, oblation, etc., at night, in a cremation ground.

[102] Having taken a head [which was mounted on] a banner, [and which is] free from a blow from a sharp weapon, /26/

[and] having written thereon the abode, joined with the sign, expressed by the triple form, for him [the adept] who [then] worships [that abode], /27/

[it then] bestows, Hariḥ, Pavanaḥ, Kamalajaḥ, Dhanadaḥ, Yamaḥ, and Indraḥ, along with siddāḥ and gandharvāḥ, the mass of powers that are manifold and excellent, [and] various other powers.

The head of that man which [is free from a blow from a sharp weapon, i.e., which] has not been damaged by a sword in the front, [and which is] on a banner, i.e., a skull of a man mounted on a spit; [and] therein, as before, he dries out [the

skull]; [and thereon] expressed by the triple form, i.e., [the three forms which are respectively,] the manifest form, the main form, and the unmanifest form; the abode (*dhāma*), i.e., the deity, designated by the root formula; having written, i.e., having praised; he, [i.e., the adept] who [worships (*pūjyayet*, i.e.,] continually worships (*arcati*), subjugates even the guardians of the directions.

He clarifies this [procedure] with respect to the [formula] pattern, with a pair of verses (*ślokāḥ*) [in normal meter]:

And for that sage who therein completely worships the abode [expressed by the] triple form, the manifest-unmanifest, the manifest, and the unmanifest,/28/

[103] in the manifesting of the [formula] body of the king of the mountain, the triple power is produced,/29/

completely, for the most determined king of the mountain.

Therein, i.e., on the skull of the man mounted on the trident; for the king of the mountain, i.e., according to the encrypted language, the lord of adepts.

Here he states the subjugation realized by a specific oblation of substances:

After combining red sandal powder, *rājikā*, salt,/30/

and dust from the foot of the one to be effected, he should grind [it] up, repeating the lord *Svacchandaḥ*, and rubbing together both hands;/31/

he should [then] oblate the powder in a funeral pyre, or in the fire of a *caṇḍālaḥ*, [104] [and] facing the one to be effected, he should carry out this procedure;/32/

then, when he repeats a hundred times, he [forcibly] attracts the king.

Dust from the foot, i.e., to be taken from the right foot of a man, and the left of a woman; after he has uttered the [*Svacchandaḥ*, i.e.,] the *Prāṇavaḥ*, the lord without parts, ending with *namaḥ*, [then] the formula, ending with the modified pattern, let N.N. be subjugated to me, *svāhā*, should be employed

in the repetition and the oblation.

Thus, that one attracted by the adept,

The lord of the earth comes under control, with [his own]
self, and [his] possessions./33/

He says that there should not be any doubt herein:

This procedure is effective and not another, I say to you.

Thus, after having stated the set of ten procedures for subjugation, and the procedure for realization of the highest, etc., he states the procedure for obstructing:

After having taken up that powder, mixed with the dust of copper,/34/

[105] and after having tied [it] up in cremation ground cloth, recited upon seven times, [then] at a crossroads, after having dug down seven fingers in the ground, that [bundle], connected with the name of the enemy,/35/

he should throw down, with the name of that one, who should become instantly obstructed.

Cremation ground cloth (*śmaśānacirake*), a piece of the cloth [used to wrap] a corpse; recited upon seven times, i.e., with the formula indicated, using the modified form, Obstruct N.N.

He states the procedure for maddening:

Having taken that powder, united with the five kinds of mad [making substances],/36/

[and] having tied [it] up in the cloth of a corpse, [and] having made it united with the name of the enemy, [then] recited upon seven times, he should bury [it] quickly in a burning ground,/37/

[and] the one to be effected becomes mad.

The five kinds of mad making [substances], i.e., datura, along with its five parts, namely, root, stem, leaf, flower, and fruit.

Herein, as well, the pattern [of the formula] to be used is:

Madden N.N.

He states the restoration of this one:

When extracted, he is freed.

I.e., the madness is lifted.

He says how:

After taking the extracted cloth, he should purify [it] with milk./38/

This restoration is effective; there is no doubt.

Extracted, i.e., removed from the cremation ground.

Once more he states another procedure for attracting:

Next, he should gather the flowers of the red aśvamāraḥ./39/

He should render a hundred and eight of them repeated [upon with the formula] a hundred [times], [and] with a flower repeated [upon] a single time, he should tap on the top of the sign./40/

Thus, day after day, very recollected, he should perform [this] for ten days.

After having collected the flowers, having the ritual preparation stated previously, of red aśvamāraḥ, i.e., of red oleander, he should install [them] well guarded, individually.

Then, after gathering together eleven of these flowers,/41/ [and] then after going to a great river, therein the knower of the formulæ, should make each one be carried along, in order, after reciting upon all, a single time./42/

There is the carrying along of the flowers of the first day, at the beginning, then the flowers of the second day, etc.; [this is] the meaning of in order.

He leads that, the last flower of [all] these, against the stream.

The meaning is: he carries [it] upward.

After taking it up, he should drink [it] mixed with water, untouched by [his] teeth./43/

I.e., he makes [its] water drunk.

Then, after rendering the red aśvamāraḥ flower, charged with the formula a hundred [times], [107] on the tip of [his] index finger, the wise one moves [it] with

his thumb./44/

I.e., the right [thumb]

Next,

The knower of formulæ should rotate the flower, from the left, reciting the Svaccandaḥ [formula] with the name of that one, whom he quickly attracts./45/

From the left, i.e., on the right side. Here, as well, the procedure is: Attract N.N.

He states the procedure for the dismissing of the attracted:

After having rotated from the right, once more, there is the dismissing of that one.

From the right, i.e., on the left side; i.e., rotating this aśvamāraḥ flower, he performs the dismissing of the one enjoined according to the procedure of the adept. [Let this commentary be] auspicious.

Let the supreme Svachchandaḥ Bhairavaḥ, revealing multiple miracles through the supreme power of autonomy, [and] bestowing grace, triumph.

III.6 BOOK 15
[vss.1-23, pp.125-139]

[125] ... Through repose in his own self, the master,
Svacchandaḥ triumphs.

Next, introducing [this] book, as the rest of the previous subject matter [which concerns the adepts], [which is] intended [to aid the] attainment of unobstructed perfections, by concealing the tantric activity of [these special] covenantors [when they are] in the midst of [conventional] covenantors, blessed Bhairavaḥ said, in order to illustrate the esotericism of this text, in being a secret, as the setting in motion of transcendent activity, by technical (*pāribhāṣika*-) designations [which function] as the protective synonyms in a code [language] (*chummakā*):

I will proclaim the code [words], O Beautiful One, to [be used by] the adept, [who is] fixed in repetition, meditation, etc., [and who] holds to [his prescribed] conduct [and] vows./1/

[126] Code, i.e., the technical designation [only able] to be noticed by one who has entered into that [special tantric] covenant; to the adept, i.e., as a basis for the abundance [of his powers].

Therein,

According to tradition, Bhairavaḥ is the abode; according to tradition, the master is the bestower of all; the adept should be known as the mountain; according to tradition, the spiritual son is the spotless./2/

Since the deity to be worshipped [by the adept] is the paramount [goal] to be realized [in the ritual], this statement is introduced with this [code word for Bhairavaḥ]. [Bhairavaḥ is the] abode (*dhāma*), i.e., [he is called] the abode on account of being the illuminator of the brilliance of the sun, the moon, and the fire, and on account of furnishing a locus for the repose of the

universe. [The master (*guruḥ*), is] the bestower of all, since the master [who is] without want, in being completely full in his own self, is solely the stimulus for the gain of others. [The adept (*sādhakaḥ*) is] the mountain, since [he is] unshakable, focused exclusively on [his] worship. [The spiritual son (*putrakaḥ*) is] pure (*vimalaḥ*), i.e., having impurity [*-mala*] removed [*vigataḥ* from *vi-*], by complete purification of the entire interior ground. According to tradition, i.e., through an unbroken sequence; [and] likewise further on [this should be glossed].

The covenanter [as] the beautiful body; the sisters [as] proud by strength.

[127] Beautiful body, i.e., who has a body [which is] beautiful, i.e., radiant by the fusion with pure knowledge; those women, that have become proud [by strength, i.e.,] by the fruition of the perfection of the formula, are sisters, as it were, of those established in the worship of the formula; thus [they] are called [proud by strength].

He states the code having as [its] particular scope the substances employed in the rituals of all of these [kinds of practitioners]:

The wine should be known as the gladdening;
[The gladdening (*harṣaṇam*),] construed as what cause gladness (*harṣayati*).

According to tradition, the liquor is the joyful;/3/
Joyful (*muditā*), i.e., joy (*muditam*), i.e., gladness (*harṣaḥ*), on account of being its cause.

Similarly,

the fish should be known as the water-goers;
Since the class of aquatic [existents] (*jalacaraḥ*) is the paramount [goal] to be realized in the sacrifice to Bhairavaḥ, through [the initiate's] being initiated by the consumption of the ritual food, according to the rule described in the blessed *Caryākulaḥ*, [it] thus has a designation by a code [word].

and meat is the increaser of strength.

By meat, i.e., by the cause of an uncommon [experience of]

relishing (*camatkāraḥ*), through a sequence of completely nourishing the six elements [of the body], nutrient fluid (*rasaḥ*), etc.; [and therefore,] by increasing strength, i.e., potency, i.e., [128] by multiplying, i.e., intensifying the strength, i.e., the potency related to the power consisting of the [fundamental] pulsation (*spandaḥ*), for exercitants, in the way described in the blessed *Vijñānabhāṭṭārakaḥ*: "Through opening up the bliss of taste, [which is] the flashing forth made from food and drink;"¹ in this way [therefore, meat has this code] designation. And meat is mentioned separately from fish, according to the maxim of the cow and the bull, [i.e., solely, for emphasis.]

They call the born the grown up, and the dead the averted. /4/

They call, i.e., [those] established in the tradition call [the dead the averted *parāṇmukham*, i.e.,] averted (*apavṛttam*), from facing the bondage of the body, breath, etc.

Blood they call nectar; the lotus-stalk the mass of intestines, semen is designated the moon; sinew is proclaimed the thread. /5/

For blood, heart-lotus, entrails, semen, and sinews, [which are] employed in particular kinds of assorted secret rituals, nectar, lotus, stalk, moon, [and] thread, are the secret names by convention; [and these substances have these names since] they can be construed here, in sequence, as [possessing similar properties expressed by] causal relationships (*hetavaḥ*). [Therein, first, blood is called nectar] on account of being [like nectar] the means of supreme invigorating; [second, the heart-lotus is called a lotus,] on account of being endowed with a pericarp and petals, etc.; [third, the entrails are a stalk] on account of having a thin and long form; [fourth, semen is the moon] on account of being endowed with whiteness and a maker of joy; [and the sinew is a thread] on account of being the means for interconnecting the

¹ M.R. Shāstri, ed., *Vijñāna-Bhairava*, vs.72, p.60.

various substances which are being gathered. Lotus; here through [the rule of] repetition (*āvṛtṭyā*), the word lotus [should be construed as] standing twice; whereby the heart[-lotus] [though not stated] should be designated by lotus; [this is] the meaning. In addition, the place of the conduct of heroes,

[129] The burning ground should be known as the tumult; Tumult (*dāmaram*), i.e., by virtue of raising a tumult, (*uddāmaratvāt*), in being the smasher through all fears and diseases (*ātankaḥ*).

In that place, as well, in whatever ritual [they are] employed, as a companion,

the rākṣasaḥ [should be known as] the fear-maker, the piśācaḥ the hair [bristling] generator.

On account of causing terror to the limited hearts of the inconstant, and on account of [causing] the upward movement of the hair with fear.

In whatever ritual [she] is being employed,

the menstruating woman should be known as the producing. /6/

The producing (*ruhā*), i.e., what is productive (*rohati*), i.e., being the basis for the [successful] conduct of the hero.

Know that the night is the concealer;

Concealer, i.e., what conceals the path not for the view of the bonded, [and] what promotes the conduct of the heroes.

Where, in contrast the secret conduct of heroes is not visible, that day should be [known as] the light;

[130] The meaning is: [it] is called the light (*prakāśaḥ*), on account of making visible (*prakaṣatvāt*).

Next, he gives technical designations to the eyes, tongue, etc., the parts of the body employed in particular kinds of rituals:

the eyes should be known as the waverers; they know the tongue as the grasper. /7/

On account of grasping the taste of the [bitter] *lambikā* [gourd], etc.

Similarly,

The hands should be known as the makers of wealth; the feet they known as the companions.

[Makers of wealth (*dhanakarau*, i.e.,) On account of [their] agency (*karṭṛtvam*) in setting up [*nidhānam* from *dhana-*] the worship [which is] the cause of obtaining the condition of the supreme lord; and [the feet are companions,] on account of the impossibility of a single one [performing the acts of] going, etc. In addition,

the phallus is the generator of satisfaction, the vagina the increaser of pleasure./8/

Both designations have clear meanings.

Wherever [it] is employed as a means of cutting the bond of the hero,

The sword [they know as] the generator of divisions;

[131] Similarly,

the razor is the [means of] realizing an effect;

i.e., it realizes the effect, [which is] the severing of the thread of the bond, etc.

Similarly,

the ritual consort should be known as the conveyor;

The ritual consort [*dūtī*, "messenger,"] i.e., the consort (*bhāryā*), is said to be the conveyor (*saṃvāhikā*), i.e., together (*samam*), i.e., with, she conveys (*vāhayati*), i.e., carries out (*nirvāhayati*), the secret conduct of the hero; [or] then, [considering] the ritual consort [as] the bell that together with (*samam*) an interior resonance, conveys (*vāhayati*), i.e., attains the exterior, [and] for this reason [is called] the conveyor (*saṃvāhikā*).

Similarly,

the incense is called the gladdening;/9/

the fragrance, the generator of satisfaction.

Fragrance, i.e., substance in an unguent. These technical names have clear meanings.

The holders are by tradition, the kings;
 These holders (*dhārakaḥ*), which are the stands (*ādhārās*) of
 lamps (*dipaḥ*), [which] are made up of bowls, etc., shine [as it
 were] (*rājante*), i.e., give light (*dīpyante*), [and] for this reason,
 are called kings (*rājānaḥ*). Others, however, have commented
 that those kings, i.e., lords of the earth, cause worship to be held
 (*dhārayanti*), [and] for that reason [are called] holders.

[132] The [sacrificial] animal should be known as the
 awakener.

That animal, which is presented to the gods, through the food, the
 marrow, blood, etc., awakens the various deities of consciousness,
 [and thus is called] the awakener.
 But that, which is whatever particular porridge has been accepted
 by the deities,

The porridge (*carukaḥ*) [should be known as] the all desire
 related./10/

[All desire related (*sārvakāmikaḥ*),] i.e., [because it] fulfills all
 desires; [and] for that reason [has this name].

The boiled rice (*annam*) is called the means [of fulfillment].
 When [the rice (*annam*) is] eaten (*annam*) again [after having
 first been offered to the deity,] then [it becomes] the means [of
 fulfillment, and is thus] designated [as such].

The fat is here called the froth.

On account of being common to all people, like the froth; froth,
 i.e., water [left over from boiled rice].

Next,

The face of the directions [is called] the hearing;
 Hearing, i.e., the ear, on account of being ruled over by the
 deities of the direction, is called the face of the directions.

the skin, according to tradition, is the perceiver./11/
 [the skin is that] by which a thing is able to be touched, i.e.,
 perceived, and for that reason [is called the perceiver].

[133] The nose is called the well established (*susthitam*);
 [The nose is that] in which the locus of [perception] is established

(*sthitam*) with pleasure [*sukhena* from the *su-*], by smelling fragrant substances, [and] for that reason [is called the well established].

the face [is called] the scanner;

The face, i.e., the head of the animal to be offered, taken [as that] by which a thing with visible form, etc., is scanned by the eye, etc., is called the scanner.

the animal should be known as the production.

Production (*pracārah*), i.e., on account of being the cause of the discharge into ash of all the [sacrificial fire]wood.

Thus, after having stated the code having as [its] scope the parts of the animal, he also states others:

The mother is called the bearer./12/

The father they know as the agent of emanation, the brother as the protector; the sister should be known as the maker of beauty, the female relative as realizing all objects./13/

The friend they know as the generator of virtues, [134] the enemy as the destruction of virtues.

[All these are] clear.

Once again, he enunciates the technical terms for the parts of the body:

The buttocks, O Goddess, are called the splitter;

Splitter, i.e., it splits in two parts, i.e., it reveals the layout of the lower body.

the eye is called sight./14/

Sight, i.e., the organ of vision. The eye (*caṣuḥ*), sees, [*caṣṭe*, "illuminates,"] i.e., makes clear [visible-]form.

The teeth should be known as the pieces;

For the reason [that they] render into pieces.

the stomach is called by tradition the base;

The stomach, on account of having eaten this and that, etc., i.e., on account of holding (*-dhāraṇād*), [*ā-*, i.e.,] up to the limit, [is called] the base (*ādhārah*).

the heart is called the secret;

The place of the heart, on account of being the locus of the secret self, is the secret. That which is [ordinarily called] the secret [i.e., the pudendum] previously was called the increaser of pleasure.

the bone you know as the hard./15/

[135] You should know the fat (*vasā*), as the fat (*medaḥ*); The bone is called the hard; the fat (*vasā*), is that which [is taken as] the fat (*medaḥ*), i.e., [what] makes fat.

The marrow according to tradition is called the plump maker;

[The marrow] is called the plump maker on account of the particular element called marrow, being the cause of plumpness.

know the excrement as the defiler;

It defiles, i.e., for the reason [that] it produces the transformed bodily condition.

the thread is here called the listening./16/

Listening (*śrāvaḥ*), i.e., hearing (*śravaṇam*).

The kāleyakam as the flower;

Kāleyakam, i.e., the black lotus. That [is] like the flower, since the flower, has a [similarity] to the self of the deity, in as much as being a cause of astonishment.

the smoke they know as the satisfaction-maker;

The smoke, here, is said to be produced in the burning grounds. And that, on account of being beloved of the gods, is called the satisfaction-maker.

and the meeting as the assembly;

[136] That meeting (*melakam*), i.e., meeting (*melanam*), which is connected with the gods, is called the assembly.

He, who by the precepts of this meeting, of the gods,

is a son, called by tradition, the illuminator./17/

Taken [as meaning] he illuminates the world by removing ignorance.

Moreover,

The ritual consort is known as the gladdener;

For the reason [that] she gladdens the world by the teaching of the truth.

they know the shaken as the wavered;

The [aspirant] desirous to ascend, on account of not having gained stability in the first practice of exercise, is called the shaken, i.e., the wavered.

the offender is called old age.

He who is an offender in some sacrifice, etc., on account of being the cause of decay, is called old age.

And the drunk is the praised;/18/

the eaten they say is the obtained; the vomited [they call] the maker of transformation.

Whatever secret substance there is that is drunk, is what is called the [137] praised. Exactly so, whatever is eaten, is what they call the obtained. Whatever is vomited, i.e., a large amount of sacrificial offerings being eaten during a series of devotions by participants [and] vomited through intoxication, is what is designated the maker of transformation.

In this fashion,

The damaged should be known as the dragged;

Whatever bone, etc., is damaged, this should be known as the dragged, [with] the meaning, having its motion removed.

the covenant they know as the agreed with./19/

The Śaiva covenant on account of having to necessarily be carried out, is called the agreed with.

The guardian should be known as the elder;

He, who is the guardian of the Śaiva conduct, is called the elder (*mahallaḥ*), for the reason [that] he receives [-*lāti* from -*laḥ*,] the great (*mahad-*), i.e., the highest Śaiva stage.

the goat is the little finger;

He, who is the goat, i.e., the bonded one [lit. *paśuḥ*, animal], is called the little finger (*kaṇiṣṭakaḥ*), since the middle finger is the elder [in this] sequence.

the discipline should be the body work;

[Body work, i.e., since] it makes a state of discipline.

[138] the repetition is called by tradition the means of realization. /20/

Means of realization (*sāadhanam*), i.e., by it liberation and enjoyment are realized (*sādhya*).

the obliterated is the generator of perfections;

That which is the oblation realized by the ritual of [giving] oblations, generates the threefold perfection.

Similarly,

The part is called by tradition the brightener;

That, which is a part, i.e., a portion of the grain offering, etc., is the brightener, taken [as meaning], it brightens, i.e., generates the supreme pleasure.

the group they call the troop;

That, which is the troop (*vr̥ndam*), i.e., the assemblage (*samūhaḥ*), of deities, [which are the] substances of heroes, etc., they call the group (*kadambam*).

the loose is called the un-embraced. /21/

Who, namely, has become separated from the conduct of heroes.

The disciple is called the spotless;

He, who is the disciple (*śiṣyaḥ*), [lit.,] who should be taught (*śāsaniyaḥ*), is the spotless (*vimalaḥ*), from the reason [that] through the grace of the master he has impurity (*-malaḥ*), removed [*vigataḥ*, glossing *vi-*].

and the command is proclaimed the impulse;

Where the command connected with the master, etc., is obtained, [139] there that impulse (*icchā*), his grace-giver, is established. Such [is the meaning].

the viewing of the deity is whatever;

The meaning is: whatever is uncommon is reflected upon in this fashion.

the obtained they know as the struck by a sword. /22/

He, who is the bonded one [lit., *paśuḥ*, animal] struck by the sword, they esteem as the obtained.

The night movement should be the cat;
 That hero, of whom the movement is at night, is called a cat; a
 cat, indeed, at night catches rats; this one, however, the animals
 of the hero.

and the cleavers are the ones having claws;
 Those, who cleave open the animals of the hero, are called the
 ones having claws, on account [of their having] the same nature
 of being a cleaver.

the brought should be known as the caused to flow;
 That great offering, etc., which is brought, is endowed with the
 same savor (*sāmarasyam*) [or essence as the deity], [and] for that
 reason is called the caused to flow [into that other essence].

the guarded is the shut-up./23/
 That, which is guarded is said to be shut up.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agrawala, Vasudeva S. *Matsya Purāṇa— a Study*. Varanasi: All-India Kashiraj Trust, 1963.
- . *Śiva Mahādeva. The Great God*. Varanasi: Veda Academy, 1966.
- . *The Deeds of Harsha. Being a Cultural Study of Bāṇa's Harshacharita*. Varanasi: Prithivi Prakashan, 1969.
- Apte, Prabhakar P. and Shreenivas G. Supekar.
“Vāstupuruṣamaṇḍala in the Pauṣkarasaṁhitā and Brhat-saṁhitā.” In *Agama and Silpa*, edited by K.K.A. Venkatachari, 132–148. Ananthacharya Indological Research Institute Series 16. Bombay: Ananthacharya Indological Research Institute, 1984.
- Arbman, Ernst. *Rudra. Untersuchungen zum altindischen Glauben und Kultus*. Uppsala: Appelbergs Boktryckeri Aktiebolag, 1922.
- Arunachalam, M. *The Saivagamas. Peeps into Tamil Culture*, 6. Studies in the Agamas 1. Madras: Gandhi Vidyalayam, 1983.
- Bakshi, M.M. Pandit Śri Mukunda Jha, ed. *The Śāradātikalam By Lakṣmaṇadeśikendra With the Padārthādarśa Commentary By Raghavabhaṭṭa*. Kashi Sanskrit Granthamala 107. Varanasi: The Chowkhambha Sanskrit Series Office, 1963.
- Baumer, Bettina. “Die Unvermitteltheit der höchsten Erfahrung bei Abhinavagupta.” In *Transzendenzerfahrung, Vollzugshorizont des Heils*, herausgegeben von Gerhard Oberhammer, 61–79. Publications of the de Nobili Research Library 5. Wien: Institut für Indologie der Universität Wien, 1978.

- Bhandarkar, R.G. *Vaiṣṇavism, Śaivism, and Minor Religious Systems*. 1913. Reprint. New Delhi: Asian Educational Services, 1983.
- Bhatt, N.R., ed. *Maṭaṅgaparameśvarāgama, (Kriyāpāda, Yogapāda, et Caryāpāda), avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa-Rāmakaṇṭha*, Publications de l'institut français d'indologie 65. Pondichéry: Institut français d'indologie, 1982.
- , ed. *Maṭaṅgaparameśvarāgama, (Vidyāpāda), avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa-Rāmakaṇṭha*. Publications de l'institut français d'indologie 56. Pondichéry: Institut français d'indologie, 1977.
- , ed. *Mṛgendrāgama (Kriyāpāda et Caryāpāda) avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa-Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha*. Publications de l'institut français d'indologie 23. Pondichéry: Institut français d'indologie, 1962.
- , ed. *Rauravāgama*. 2 vols. Publications de l'institut français d'indologie 18, 18-2. Pondichéry: Institut français d'indologie, 1961, 1972.
- , ed. *Sārdhatriśatikākālottarāgama, avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa-Rāmakaṇṭha*. Publications de l'institut français d'indologie 61. Pondichéry: Institut français d'indologie, 1979.
- Bodewitz, H.W., trans. *Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa I, 1-65, Translation and Commentary, with a Study Agnihotra and Prāṇāgnihotraḥ*. Orientalia Rheno-Traiectina. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973.
- Bonazzoli, Giorgio. "Composition, Transmission and Recitation of the Purāṇas." *Purāṇa* 25, 2 (July 1983): 254-280.
- , "Schemes in the Purāṇas." *Purāṇa* 24, 1 (January 1982): 146-189.
- Briggs, George Weston. *Gorakhnāth and the Kānpaṭā Yogis*. 1938. Reprint. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1982.

- Brunner-Lachaux, Hélène, trans. *Somaśambhupaddhati*. 3 vols.
Publications de l'Institut Français d'Indologie 25, 1, 2, 3.
Pondichéry: Institut français d'indologie, 1963, 1968, 1977.
- . "Importance de la littérature āgarnique." *Indologica Taurinensia* 3-4 (1975-76):107-124.
- . "Le *sādhaka*: personnage oublié du Śivaïsme du sud." *Journal Asiatique* 263 (1975):411-443.
- . "Les catégories sociales védiques dans le Śivaïsme du Sud." *Journal Asiatique* 252 (1964):451-472.
- . "On the Classification of Śiva Tantras." In *Summaries of Papers*, International Association of Sanskrit Studies, Fifth World Sanskrit Conference, 128-129. Varanasi: Rashtriya Sanskrit Sansthan, 1981.
- . "The Pāśupatas as seen by the Śaivas." In *Sanskrit and World Culture*, edited by Wolfgang Morgenroth, 513-520. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1986.
- . "Un Tantra du Nord: Le *Netra Tantra*." *Bulletin de l'école française d'extrême-orient* 61 (1974):125-197.
- Buitenen, J.A.B. van, ed. and trans. *Rāmānuja's Vedārthasaṃgraha*. Deccan College Monograph Series 16. Poona: Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute, 1956.
- . "Studies in Sāṃkhya (I)." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 76 (1956):153-157.
- , ed. and trans. *The Bhagavadgītā in the Mahābhārata*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1981.

Burghart, Richard. "Secret Vocabularies of the 'Great Renouncers' of the Rāmānandī Sect." In *Early Hindī Devotional Literature in Current Research*, edited by Winand M. Callewært, 17–33. *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 8. Leuven: Departement Oriëntalistiek, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 1980.

Bühler, Johann Georg. *Indian Paleography*. Edited by John Fleet. Appendix to *The Indian Antiquary* 33 (1904).

Caillat, C. "Le *sādhaka śaiva* à la lumière de la discipline jaina." In *Studien zum Jainismus und Buddhismus*, herausgegeben von Klaus Bruhn und Albrecht Wezler, 51–59. *Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien, Seminar für Kultur und Geschichte Indiens an der Universität Hamburg* 23. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1981.

Carelli, Mario. *Sekoddeśatikā of Nāḍapāda (Nārōpa)*. Gækwad's Oriental Series 90. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1941.

Chakravarti, Adhir. "New Light on Śaiva Tāntrika Texts Known in Ancient Cambodia." *Journal of the Asiatic Society (Bengal)* 15 (1–4, 1973):1–10.

Chemparathy, George. "The Testimony of the Yuktidīpikā Concerning the Īśvara Doctrine of the Pāśupatas and Vaiśeṣikas." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens* 9 (1965):119–146.

----- . *An Indian Rational Theology. Introduction to Udayana's Nyāyakusumāñjali*. Publications of the de Nobili Research Library. Vienna: Indologisches Institut der Universität Wien, 1972.

Chhabra, B.Ch. "Svachchhanda-Bhairavi Bronze Image from Kangra." *Journal of Indian History* 42, 1 (April 1964):145–148.

Clements, R.E. "Pentateuchal Problems." In *Tradition and Interpretation*, edited by G.W. Anderson, 96–124. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.

- Derniéville, Paul, ed. *Hōbōgirin*, premier fascicule (A-Bombai). Tokyo: Maison franco-japonais, 1929.
- Despande, G.T. "Ārṣa Prayogas and Pāṇinian Rules." In *Indological Papers* 1, 78-89. Vidarbha Samshodhan Mandal Series 25. Nagpur: Vidarbha Samshodhan Mandal, 1971.
- Dhavamony, Mariasusa. *Love of God according to Śaiva Siddhānta*. Oxford: At The Clarendon Press, 1971.
- Digambarji, Swami and M.L. Gharote, eds. *Gheraṇḍa Saṃhitā*. Lonavla: Kaivalyadharma S.M.Y.M. Samiti, 1978.
- Dimock, Edward C. *The Place of the Hidden Moon*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1966.
- Dumont, P.E., trans. *L'Īśvaragitā. Le Chant de Śiva, texte extrait du Kūrma-purāṇa*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1933.
- Dunuwila, Rohan A. *Śaiva Siddhānta Theology*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1985.
- Dwivedi, Pt. Vrajavallabha, ed. *The Svachchandantantram with Commentary 'Udyota' by Kṣemarājācārya*, Parimal Sanskrit Series 16. Delhi: Parimal Publications, 1985.
- . "Purāṇānām nūnam āgamamūlakatvam." *Purāṇa* 26, 1 (1984):3-15.
- Edgerton, Franklin. *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*. 1 Grammar. 2 Dictionary. 1953. Reprint. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1977.
- . *The Beginnings of Indian Philosophy*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.

- Edholm, Erik af. "The Crystal and the Hibiscus Flower." In *Kalyāṇamitrārāgaṇam. Essays in Honour of Nils Simonsson*, edited by Eivind Kahrs, 57–77. Oslo: Norwegian University Press, 1986.
- Eschmann, Anncharlott. "Hinduization of Tribal Deities in Orissa: The Śākta and Śaiva Typology." In *The Cult of Jagannath and the Regional Tradition of Orissa*, edited by Anncharlott Eschmann, et al., 79–117. South Asia Interdisciplinary Regional Research Programme, Orissa Research Project. South Asia Institute, New Delhi Branch, Heidelberg University. South Asian Studies 8. New Delhi: Manohar, 1978.
- Esnoul, Anne-Marie, ed. and trans. *Les Strophes de Sāṃkhya (Sāṃkhya-Kārikā) avec le commentaire de Gauḍapāda*. Collection Émile Senart. Paris: Societe d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1964.
- Feuerstein, Georg. *The Yoga-Sūtra of Patañjali. An Exercise in the Methodology of Textual Analysis*. New Delhi: Arnold Heinemann, 1979.
- Filliozat, Jean "Les Āgama Īvaītes." Introduction in *Rauravāgama* 1, edited by N.R. Bhatt, v–xv. Publications de l'institut français d'indologie 18. Pondichéry: Institut français d'indologie, 1961.
- Filliozat, Pierre-Sylvain. "Le droit d'entrer dans les temples de Śiva au Xle siècle." *Journal Asiatique* 263 (1975):103–117.
- Foucher, A., trans. *Le Compendium des topiques. (Tarka-Saṃgraha) d'Annambhaṭṭa*. Éléments de systématique et de logique indiennes. Paris: Adrien-maisonneuve, 1949.
- Frauwallner, Erich. "Landmarks in the History of Indian Logic." 1961. Reprint. In *Kleine Schriften*, herausgegeben von Gerhard Oberhammer und Ernst Steinkellner, 847–870. Glasenapp-Stiftung 22. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1982.

- Frauwallner, Erich. "Zur Elementenlehre des Sāṃkhya." 1927.
Reprint. In *Kleine Schriften*, herausgegeben von Gerhard Oberhammer und Ernst Steinkellner, 140–144. Glasenapp-Stiftung 22. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1982.
- . *Geschichte der indischen Philosophie*. 2 Bde. Salzburg: Otto Müller Verlag, 1953.
- Fuller, C.J. *Servants of the Goddess. The Priests of a South Indian Temple*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Gajendragadkar, A.B. and R.D. Karmarkar, ed. and trans. *The Arthasaṃgraha of Laugākṣi Bhāskara*. 1934. Reprint. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1984.
- Gelder, J.M. van, ed. and trans. *Mānava Śrautasūtra*. 2 vols. Śata-Piṭaka Series. Indo-Asian Literatures 17, 27. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1961, 1963.
- Gerow, Edwin. "What is Karma (Kṛm Karmeti)? An Exercise in Philosophical Semantics." *Indologica Taurinensia* 10 (1982):87–116.
- Glasenapp, Helmuth von. "Tantrismus und Śaktismus." 1936.
Reprint. In *Ausgewählte Kleine Schriften*, herausgegeben von Heinz Bechert und Volker Moeller, 385–398. Glasenapp-Stiftung 18 (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1980).
- Gnoli, Raniero, trans. *Luce delle Sacre Scritture (Tantrāloka) di Abhinavagupta*. Classici delle Religioni, Sezione prima. Torino: Unione Tipografico-Editrice Torinese, 1972.
- . "Miscellanea Indica." *East and West* 9 (1958):215–266.
- . *Essenza dei Tantra (Tantrasāra)*. 1960. Reprint. 2 vols. Torino: Editore Boringhieri, 1979.
- . *Il commento di Abhinavagupta alla Parātriṃśikā*, Serie Orientale Roma 58. Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1985.

Goetz, Hermann. "The Historical Background of the Great Temples of Khajurāho." 1958. Reprint. In *Hermann Goetz. Studies in the History, Religion and Art of Classical and Mediaeval India*, edited by Hermann Kulke, 108–121. Schriftenreihe des Südasien-Instituts der Universität Heidelberg 16. Weisbaden: Franz Steiner, 1974.

Gonda, Jan. *Change and Continuity in Indian Religion*. Disputationes Rheno-Trajectinae 9. The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1965.

----- . "The Etymologies in the Ancient Brāhmaṇas." 1955. Reprint. In *Selected Studies 2*, Sanskrit Word Studies, 32–57. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975.

----- . "The Indian Mantra." 1963. Reprint. In *Selected Studies 4*, History of Ancient Indian Religion, 248–301. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975.

----- . *Medieval Religious Literature in Sanskrit*. A History of Indian Literature 2, 1. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1977.

----- . *The Ritual Sūtras*. A History of Indian Literature 2, 2. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1977.

----- . "The Śatarudriya." In *Sanskrit and Indian Studies. Essays in Honour of Daniel H.H. Ingalls*, edited by M. Nagatomi, et al., 75–91. Dordrecht: E. Reidel Publishing Company, 1980.

----- . *Vedic Ritual. The Non-Solemn Rites*. Handbuch der Orientalistik, Zweite Abteilung, Vierter Band Religionen, Erster Abschnitt Vedic Ritual. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1980.

----- . "‘Ways’ in Indian Religions." 1965. Reprint. In *Selected Studies 4*, History of Ancient Indian Religion, 317–336. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975.

Goudriaan, Teun and Sanjukta Gupta. *Hindu Tantric and Śākta Literature*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1981.

Goudriaan, Teun, ed. and trans. *The Viṇāśikhatantra, A Śaiva Tantra of the Left Current*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1985.

----- . *Kāśyapa's Book of Wisdom (Kāśyapa-jñānakāṇḍaḥ). A Ritual Handbook of the Vaikhānasas*. (Utrecht) Disputationes Rheno-Trajectinae 10. The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1965.

Gupta, Anand Swarup, ed. *The Kūrma Purāṇa*. Varanasi: All-India Kashiraj Trust, 1971.

Gupta, Sanjukta. "The Changing Pattern of Pāñcarātra Initiation: A Case Study in the Reinterpretation of Ritual." In *Selected Studies on Ritual in the Indian Religions. Essays to D. J. Hoens*, edited by Ria Kloppenborg, 69–91. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1983.

-----, trans. *Lakṣmī Tantra. A Pāñcarātra Text*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972.

Hacker, Paul. "Eigentümlichkeiten der Lehre und Terminologie Śāṅkaras." 1950. Reprint. In *Kleine Schriften*, herausgegeben von Lambert Schmithausen, 69–109. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1978.

----- . "Religiöse Toleranz und Intoleranz im Hinduismus." 1957. Reprint. In *Kleine Schriften*, herausgegeben von Lambert Schmithausen, 376–388. Glasenapp-Stiftung 15. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1978.

----- . "Zur Methode der geschichtlichen Erforschung der anonymen Sanskritliteratur des Hinduismus." 1961. Reprint. In *Kleine Schriften*, herausgegeben von Lambert Schmithausen, 8–17. Glasenapp-Stiftung 15. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1978.

----- . *Vivarta. Studien zur Geschichte der illusionistischen Kosmologie und Erkenntnistheorie der Inder*. Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, Mainz, Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur 5, 1953.

Halbfass, Wilhelm. *Studies in Kumārila and Śaṅkara*. Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik 9. Reinbek: Dr. Inge Wezler Verlag für Orientalistische Fachpublikationen, 1983.

Hara, Minoru. "A Note on the Epic Folk-Etymology of *Rājan*." In *Umeshā Mishra Commemoration Volume*, edited by B. R. Saksena, et al., 489-499. Allahabad: Ganganatha Jha Research Institute, 1970.

----- . "Miscellanea Pasupatica." In *Kavirāj Abhinandana Grantha*, edited by B. R. Saksena, et al., 55-65. Lucknow: Akhila Bhāratiya Saṁskṛta Pariṣad, 1967.

----- . "Nakuliśa-Pāśupata-Darśanam." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 2, 1 (1958):8-32.

----- . "Pāśupata and Sāṁkhya-Yoga." *Journal of Oriental Research*, (Madras) 34-35 (1973):76-87.

----- . "Transfer of Merit." *Adyar Library Bulletin* 31-32 (1967-68):382-411.

----- . Review of *Le Bhakti*, by Lilian Silburn. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 9, 3 (1966):211-218.

Hazra, R.C. *Studies in the Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs*. 2d ed. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1975.

Hesterman, J.C. *The Ancient Indian Royal Consecration*. Disputationes Rheno-Trajectinae 2. The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1957.

Hinüber, Oskar.von. "Remarks on the Problems of Textual Criticism in Editing Anonymous Sanskrit Literature." In *Proceedings of the First Symposium of Nepali and German Sanskritists 1978*, 28-40. Kathmandu: Institute of Sanskrit Studies, Tribhuvan University, Dang Nepal Research Centre, 1980.

- Hooykaas, C. *Āgama Tirtha. Five Studies in Hindu-Balinese Religion*. Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks 70, 4. Amsterdam: N.V. Noord-Holandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij, 1964.
- Hultzsch, E., ed. and trans. *South Indian Inscriptions* .1, in Archaeological Survey of India, n.s.3, 1890. Reprint. Varanasi, Delhi: Indological Book House, 1972.
- Iyer, T.V. Gopal and François Gros, eds. *Tēvāram. Hymnes Śivaïtes du Pays Tamoul*. Pondichéry: Institut français d'indologie, 1984.
- Jha, Ganganath. *Pūrva-Mīmāṃsā in its Sources*. Varanasi: The Banaras Hindu University, 1964.
- Jāwaji, Pāṇḍurang, publisher. *The Sāṅkhya Kārikā of Mahāmuni Śrī Īśvarakṛiṣṇa with the Commentary Sārabodhini of Paṇḍit Śivanārāyaṇa Śāstri with Sāṅkhya Tattavakaumudī Commentary of Vāchaspati Mishra*. Bombay: Nirṇaya Sāgar Press, 1940.
- Katare, Sant Lal. "Kalanjara Inscription of V.S. 1147." In *Epigraphia Indica* 31, 4, edited by D.C. Sircar, 163-166. Delhi: Manager of Publications, 1957.
- Kaviraj, Gopinath. *Aspects of Indian Thought*. Burdwan: The University of Burdwan, 1966.
- . *Tāntrika Sāhitya*. Hindi Samiti Granthamālā 200. Lucknow: Bhārgava Bhūṣaṇa Press, 1972.
- Kirfel, Willibald. *Die Kosmographie der Inder*. 1920. Reprint. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1967.
- Krishnamacharya, Embar, ed. *Jāyākhyasamhitā of Pāñcarātra Āgama*. Gækwad's Oriental Series 54. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1967.

- Krishnamacharya, Pandit V. *Ahīrbudhnya-Saṃhitā of the Pāñcarātrāgama*. 2d ed. rev. The Adyar Library Series 4. Madras: Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1966.
- , ed. *Lakṣmī-Tantra. A Pāñcarātra Āgama*. Madras: Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1959.
- , ed. *Viṣṇusmṛti with the Commentary of Keśavavaijayanti of Nandapaṇḍita*. 2 vols. Madras: The Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1964.
- Limaye, V.P. and R.D. Vadekar. *Eighteen Principal Upaniṣads* 1. Poona: Vaidika Saṃśodhana Maṇḍala, 1958.
- Lorenzen, David. *The Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972.
- Mahalingam, T.V. *Kāñcīpuram in Early South Indian History*. Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1969.
- Mallmann, Marie-Thérèse de. *Introduction à l'iconographie du tântrisme bouddhique*. Bibliothèque du centre de recherches sur l'Asie centrale et la haute Asie 1. Paris: Librairie Adrien-maisonneuve, 1975.
- , *Les enseignements iconographiques de l'Agni-Purana*. Annales du Musée Guimet 67. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1963.
- Malmoud, Charles. *Le Svādhyaya. Récitation personnelle du Veda. Taittirīya-Āraṇyaka, Livre 2*. Publications de l'institut de civilisation indienne 42. Paris: Institut de civilisation indienne 1977.
- Mayrhofer, Manfred. "Der Gottesname Rudra." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 103, 1, (1953):140-150.

- Mehendale, Madhukar Anant. "The Science of Etymology (Niruktaśāstra)." In *Nirukta Notes, Series 1, 2* (I. Deccan College, Building Centenary and Silver Jubilee Series 24.) Pune: Deccan College, Postgraduate and Research Institute, 1965, 1978.
- Mehta, Mahesh M. *The Mahābhārata. A Study of the Critical Edition*. Bhāratīya Vidyā Series 34. Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1976.
- Mishra, Chhabinath. *Nyāyokti-Kośa*. Delhi: Ajanta Publications, 1978.
- Misra, Kameshvara Nath, ed. and trans. *Tattvaparakāśah Siddhāntaśaiva Darśanam By Mahārājādhirāja Bhoja With Tātparyadipikā & Vritti Commentaries By Śrī Kumāradeva & Aghoraśivāchārya*. Chaukhambha Prachya Vidya Granthamala 2. Varanasi: Chaukhambha Orientalia, 1976.
- Mohan, Krishna. *Early Medieval History of Kashmir*. New Delhi: Meharchand Lachhmandas Publications, 1981.
- Müller, Reinhold F.G. "Medizin der Inder in kritischer Übersicht" In *Indo-Asian Studies. 2, Prof. Raghu Vira Memorial Volume*, edited by Lokesh Candra, 3-124. Śata-Piṭaka Series 37. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1965.
- . "Wörterheft zu einigen Ausdrücken indischer Medizin." *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung*. Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin Institut für Orientforschung 8, 1 (1961):64-159.
- Nandi, R.N. *Religious Institutions and Cults in the Deccan*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1973.
- Nepālarājākāyavirapustakālayasthahastalikhitasamastapustakānām Saṃkṣiptasūcipatram*, Purāṭpattvaparakāśanamālā 18 Kathmandu: Joragaṇeśa Press, 1963.

Norman, K.R. "Middle Indo-Aryan Studies XVI." *Journal of the Oriental Institute, Baroda* 32 (1983):275-279.

Oberhammer, Gerhard. "Überlieferungsstruktur and Offenbarung. Aufriß einer Reflexion des Phänomens im Hinduismus." In *Überlieferungsstruktur and Offenbarung*, von Gerhard Oberhammer und Hans Waldenfels, 11-36. Publications of the de Nobili Research Library, Occasional Papers 1. Wien: Institut für Indologie der Universität Wien, 1980.

----- . *Strukturen Yogischer Meditation. Untersuchungen zur Spiritualität des Yoga*. Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens 13. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte 322. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1977.

----- . *Wahrheit und Transzendenz. Ein Beitrag zur Spiritualität des Nyāya*. Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens 18. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte 424. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1984.

Olivelle, Patrick, ed. and trans. *Vāsudevadharmā Yatidharmaprakāśa*. Publications of the de Nobili Research Library 3, 4. Wien: Institut für Indologie der Universität Wien, 1976, 1977.

----- . "Praṇavamīmāṃsā A Newly Discovered Work of Vidyāraṇya." *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 62, 1-4 (1981):77-101.

Padoux, André. "Un terme technique du *Mantrasāstra*: *Vidarbha*." *Journal Asiatique* 265 (1977):345-349.

----- . *Recherches sur la symbolique et l'énergie de la parole dans certains textes tantriques*. Publications de l'institut de civilisation indienne 21. Paris: Institut de civilisation indienne, 1975.

- Panda, L.K. *Śaivism in Orissa*. Delhi: Sundeep Prakashan, 1985.
- Pandey, K.C. *Abhinavagupta. An Historical and Philosophical Study*. 2d ed. The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Studies 1. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1963.
- Parpola, Asko, trans. *The Śrautasūtras of Lātyāyana and Drāhyāyana and their commentaries*. Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum, Societas Scientiarum Fennica 42, 2. Helsinki, 1968.
- Parry, Jonathan P. "The Aghori Ascetics of Benares." In *Indian Religion*, edited by Richard Burchart and Audrey Cantlie, 51-78. Centre of South Asian Studies, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London. Collected Papers on South Asia 7. London: Curzon Press, 1985.
- Pathak, Vishwambhar Sharan. *Smārta Religious Tradition*. Meerut: Kusumanjali Prakashan, 1987.
- Pischel, Richard. *Grammatik der Prākṛit Sprachen*. 1900. Reprint. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1973.
- Pott, P.H. *Yoga and Yantra*. Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde, Translation Series 8. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1966.
- Pryzluski, Jean. "Les Vidyārāja." *Bulletin de l'école française d'extrême orient* 23 (1923):301-318.
- Raghavan, V. "Tiruvorriyur Inscription of Chaturanana Pandita." In *Epigraphia Indica* 27, (1947-48), 1956, edited by B.Ch. Chhabra, 292-303. Reprint. Delhi: Archæological Survey of India, 1985.
- Rao, Gopināth. *Elements of Hindu Iconography*. 2 vols. Madras: The Law Printing House, 1916.

- Renou, Louis, ed. and trans., *La Grammaire de Pāṇini*. 2 vols. Paris: Ecole française d'extrême-orient, 1966.
- . *Terminologie grammaticale du sanskrit*. Bibliothèque de l'école des hautes études 280-282. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1957.
- Rocher, Ludo. *The Purāṇas*. A History of Indian Literature 2, 3. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1986
- Roodbergen, J.A.F., trans. *Mallinātha's Ghaṇṭāpāṭha on the Kirātārjuniya, I-VI*. Part One: Introduction, Translation, and Notes. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1984.
- Ruegg, David Seyforth. *Contributions a l'histoire de la philosophie linguistique indienne*. Publications de l'institut de civilisation indienne 7. Paris: Institut de civilization indienne, 1959.
- Rüping, Klaus. *Amṛtamanthana und Kūrma-Avatāra*. Schriftenreihe des Südasien-Instituts der Universität Heidelberg Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1970.
- Salomon, Richard. "The Viṣṇu Purāṇa as a Specimen of Vernacular Sanskrit." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens und Archiv für indische Philosophie* 30 (1986):39-56.
- Sanderson, Alexis. "Abhinavagupta." In *The Encyclopedia of Religion* 1, 8-9. New York: Macmillan, 1987.
- . "Purity and Power among the Brahmans of Kashmir." In *The Category of the Person. Anthropology, Philosophy, History*, edited by Michael Carrithers, et al., 190-216. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- . "Śaivism in Kashmir." In *The Encyclopedia of Religion* 13, 16-17. New York: Macmillan, 1987.
- . Review of *Matanigaparamesvarāgama*, by N.R. Bhatt. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 48, 3 (1985):564-568.

- Sanderson, Alexis. Review of *Mrgendrāgama*, by Michel Hulin. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 46, 1 (1983):161-2.
- Sastri, R. Ananthakrishna, ed. *Pasupata Sutras with Pancharthabhasya of Kaundinya*. Trivandrum Sanskrit Series 143. Trivandrum: Oriental Manuscripts Library of the University of Travancore, 1940.
- Schomerus, Hilko Wiardo. *Arunantis Śivajñānasiddhiyār*. 2 Bde. Beiträge zur Südasien-Forschung Südasien-Institut Universität Heidelberg 49a-b. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1981.
- Schotermann, J.A., ed. *The Yonitantra*. New Delhi: Manohar Publications, 1980.
- Schrader, Friedrich Otto. "Das Saṣṭitantra." 1914. Reprint. In *Kleine Schriften*, herausgegeben von Joachim Friedrich Sprockhoff, 101-110. Glasenapp-Stiftung 19. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1983.
- . "The Kashmir Recension of the Bhagavadgītā." 1930. Reprint. In *Kleine Schriften*, herausgegeben von Joachim Friedrich Sprockhoff, 173-226. Glasenapp-Stiftung 19. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1983.
- . *Introduction to the Pāñcarātra and the Ahirbudhnya Saṃhitā*. 1916. Reprint. Madras: The Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1973.
- Schroeder, Leopold von, hrsg. *Maitrāyaṇi Saṃhitā*, 1-2. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1923.
- Schultz, Friedrich August. *Die philosophisch-theologische Lehren des Pāsupata-Systems nach dem Pañcārthabhāṣya und der Ratnaṭikā*. Walldorf-Hessen: Verlag für Orientkunde Dr. H. Vorndran, 1958.

Shastri, J.L., ed., *Lingapurāṇa of Sage Kṛṣṇa Dvaipāyana Vyāsa with Sanskrit Commentary Śivatoṣiṇi of Gaṇeśa Nātu*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1980.

Shrikrishnadas, Khemraj, publisher. *Śrīśivamahāpurāṇam*. Bombay: Shri Venkateshwar Press, n.d.

Śāstri, Pandit Dhundhirāja, ed. *Praṇava Kalpa from Śrī Skandapurāṇa with the Commentary Praṇava Kalpa Prakāśa Praṇava Bhāshya by Pandit Gaṅgādharendra Sarasvatī*. The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series 418. Benares: The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, Vidya Vilas Press, 1933.

Shāstri, Pandit Jagaddhara Zādoo, ed. *Parātrīśikā*. Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies 68. Srinagar: Mercantile Press, 1947.

Śāstri, Kṛṣṇaśaṅkara, et al., eds. *Śrīmadbhāgavatapurāṇam*. 1-2, 3-4. Varanasi: Samsara Press, 1965-6.

Shāstri, Paṇḍit Madhusudan Kaul, ed. *The Swacchanda=tantra with Commentary by Kshemarāja*. 7 vols. Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies 31, 38, 44, 48, 51, 53, 56. Bombay: 'Nirnaya Sagar' Press, 1921-1935.

-----, ed. *The Tantrāloka of Abhinava Gupta, with Commentary by Rājānaka Jayaratha*. 12 vols. Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies 23, Allahabad: The Indian Press, 1918. 28, Bombay: Shri Venkateshwar Steam Press, 1921. 30, Bombay: "Tatva-Vivechaka" Press, 1921. 36, Bombay: "Tatva-Vivechaka" Press, 1922. 35, Allahabad: The Indian Press, 1922. 29, Allahabad: The Indian Press, 1921. 41, Bombay: 'Nirnaya-Sagar' Press, 1924. 47, Bombay: "Tatva-Vivechaka" Press, 1926. 59, Bombay: "Tatva-Vivechaka" Press, 1938. 52, Bombay: 'Nirnaya-Sagar' Press, 1933. 57, Bombay: 'Nirnaya-Sagar' Press, 1936. 58, Bombay: 'Nirnaya-Sagar' Press, 1938.

-----, ed. *The Netratantra with Commentary by Kshemarāja*. 2 vols. Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies. 46, 61. Bombay: Tatva Vivechaka Press, 1926, 1939.

- Shāstri, Paṇḍit Madhusudan Kaul, ed. *Mālinivijayottaratantram*. Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies 37. Bombay: "Tatva-Vivechaka" Press, 1922.
- Shāstri, Paṇḍit Mukund Rām, ed. *The Tantrasāra of Abhinava Gupta*. Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies 18. Bombay: Nirnaya Sagar Press, 1918.
- , ed. *Vijñāna-Bhairava*. Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies 8. Bombay: "Tatva-Vivechaka" Press, 1918.
- Siddhāntaśiromaṇiḥ, Vedavrataḥ Snātakaḥ, ed. *Vyākaraṇa-Mahābhāṣyam*. 5 vols. Ajmer: Harayāṇā-Sāhityā-Saṁsthāna, 1962-1963.
- Singh, Jaideva, ed. and trans. *Pratyabhijñāhṛdayam*. 2d ed rev. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1977.
- , ed. and trans. *Spanda Kārikās*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1980.
- , ed. and trans. *Śiva Sūtras. The Yoga of Supreme Identity*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1979.
- Smith, H. Daniel. *A Descriptive Bibliography of the Printed Texts of the Pāñcarātrāgama*. 2 vols. Gækwad's Oriental Series 158, 168. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1975, 1980.
- Snellgrove, David, ed. *The Hevajra Tantra*. 2, Sanskrit and Tibetan Texts. London Oriental Series 6. London: Oxford University Press, 1959.
- , ed. *Indo-Tibetan Buddhism. Indian Buddhists and Their Tibetan Successors*. 2 vols. Boston: Shambhala, 1987.
- Sonthheimer, Günter-Dietz. *Birobā, Mhaskobā, und Khaṇḍobā*. Schriftenreihe des Südasien-Instituts der Universität Heidelberg 21. Weisbaden: Franz Steiner, 1976).

- Sprockhoff, Friedrich. *Samnyāsa. Quellenstudien zur Askese im Hinduismus*. Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 42, 1. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1976.
- Srinavasan, Srinavasa Ayya. *On the Composition of the Nāṭyaśāstra*. Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik, Monographie, 1. Reinbek: Dr. Inge Wezler Verlag für Orientalistische Fachpublikationen, 1980.
- Srivastava, V.C. "The Antiquity of the Pāśupata Sect." In *K.C. Chattopādhyaya Memorial Volume*, Department of Ancient History, Culture & Archaeology, Allahabad, 109-125. Allahabad: Allahabad University, 1975.
- Staal, Frits. "Ritual Syntax." In *Sanskrit and Indian Studies. Essays in Honour of Daniel H.H. Ingalls*, edited by M. Nagatomi, et al., 119-142. Dordrecht: E. Reidel Publishing Company, 1980.
- Sternbach, Ludwik. *A Descriptive Catalogue of Poets Quoted in Sanskrit Anthologies and Inscriptions*. 2 vols. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1978, 1980.
- . *The Mānava-dharmaśāstra I-III, and the Bhaviṣya Purāṇa*. Varanasi: All India Kashi Raj Trust, 1974.
- Stietencron, Heinrich von. "Bhairava." In 17 *Deutscher Orientalistentag, Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Supplementa* 1, 3, herausgegeben von Wolfgang Voigt, 863-871. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1969.
- . "The Śaiva Component in the Early Evolution of Jagannātha." In *The Cult of Jagannath and the Regional Tradition of Orissa*, edited by Anncharlott Eschmann, et al., 119-123. South Asia Interdisciplinary Regional Research Programme, Orissa Research Project. South Asia Institute, New Delhi Branch, Heidelberg University. South Asian Studies 8. New Delhi: Manohar, 1978.

Stietencron, Heinrich von. *Gāṅgā und Yamunā*. Freiburger Beiträge zur Indologie 5. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1972.

Strauß, Otto. "A Contribution to the Problem of the Relation between Karman, Jñāna and Mokṣa." 1935. Reprint. In *Kleine Schriften*, herausgegeben von Friedrich Wilhel, 464–471. Glasenapp-Stiftung 24. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1983.

Sukthankar, Vishnu S. and S.K. Belvalkar, eds. *The Mahābhārata* 15–16 *The Śāntiparvan* 3. Mokṣadharma A–B. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1954.

Takakusu, Junjirō. "La Sāṃkhyakārikā étudiée à la lumière de sa version chinoise (II)." *Bulletin de l'école française d'extrême-orient* 4 (1904): 978–1064.

Tiwari, Arya Ramchandra G. "An Image of the 'Kala Bhairava' in the Watson Museum, Rajkot." In *Reflections on Indian Art and Culture*, edited by S.K. Bhowmik, 259–275. *Kalā Kusumañjali*, 28, 1978–1979.

Torella, Raffaele. "Il Sārdhatriśati-Kālottarāgama." *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 50 (3–4, 1976): 279–318.

Tripāṭhi, Ramā Saṅkar. *Descriptive Catalogue of samskrit Manuscripts in Gaekwada Library, Bhārat Kalā Bhavanā Library and Samskrit Mahā-Vidyālaya Library, Banaras Hindu University*. Banaras Hindu University Sanskrit Series 6. Banaras: Banaras Hindu University, 1971.

Tsuda, Shin'ichi. "A Critical Tantrism." *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko* 36 (1978): 167–231.

-----, ed. and trans. *The Saṃvarodaya Tantra, Selected Chapters*. Tokyo: The Hokuseido Press, 1974.

Tucci, Giuseppe. "Nomina Numina." In *Myths and Symbols. Studies in Honor of Mircea Eliade*, edited by Charles H. Long and Joseph M. Kitagawa, 3–7. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1969.

- Tucci, Giuseppe. "Note indologiche." 1929-1930. Reprint. In *Opere Minore* 1, 255-275. Università di Roma Studi Orientali Pubblicati a Cura della Scuola Orientale 6. Rome: Dott. Giovanni Bardi, 1971.
- . "Some Glosses upon the *Guhyasamāja*." 1935. Reprint. In *Opere Minore* 1, 337-348. Università di Roma Studi Orientali Pubblicati a Cura della Scuola Orientale 6. Rome: Dott. Giovanni Bardi, 1971.
- Türstig, Hans-Georg. *Über Entstehungsprozesse in der Philosophie des Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika-Systems*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1982.
- Varenne, Jean. *La Mahā Nārāyaṇa Upaniṣad*, 1-2. Publications de l'institut de civilisation indienne 11, 13. Paris: Institut de civilisation indienne, 1960.
- Wayman, Alex. *The Buddhist Tantras. Light on Indo-Tibetan Esotericism*. New York: Samuel Weiser, 1973.
- Weller, Friedrich. *Versuch einer Kritik der Kathopaniṣad*. Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Institut für Orientforschung. Veröffentlichung 12. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1953.
- Wezler, Albrecht. Review of *The Śaṭsāhasra Saṃhitā*, by J. A. Schotermann. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 135, 1 (1985):143-146.
- Willemen, Ch., trans. *The Chinese Hevajratāntra*. Orientalia Gandensia 8. Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 1983.
- Wilson, H.H. *The Viṣṇu Purāṇa*. 1840. Reprint. Calcutta: Punthi Pustak, 1961.

Wojtilla, Gyula. "Notes on Popular Śaivism and Tantra in Eleventh Century Kashmir (A Study on Kṣemendra's *Samayamāṭṛka*)."

In *Tibetan and Buddhist Studies. Commemorating the 200th Anniversary of the Birth of Alexander Csoma de Kőrös* 2, edited by Louis Ligeti, 381–389. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1984.

Woodroffe, Sir John. *The Serpent Power*. 1919. Reprint. New York: Dover Publications, 1974.